

thology Photography Fiction Fishing  
Christianity Art Cooking Essays  
Buddhism Freemasonry Medicine Biology  
Music Ancient Egypt Evolution  
Carpentry Physics Dance Geology  
Metaphysics Fitness Sports  
Marketing Confidence  
Immortality Biographies Poetry  
Psychology Witchcraft Electronics  
Chemistry History Law Accounting  
Philosophy Anthropology Alchemy Drama  
Quantum Mechanics Atheism Sexuality  
Personal Health Ancient History Criminal  
Entomology Spirituality  
Metaphysics Investment Archaeology

# Forgotten Books

— [www.forgottenbooks.com](http://www.forgottenbooks.com) —

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

# JOURNAL

OF THE

# AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

NINTH VOLUME.

45422  
99

NEW HAVEN:  
FOR THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,

PRINTED BY TUTTLE, MOREHOUSE AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS TO YALE COLLEGE.

M D C C C L X X I.

SOLD BY THE SOCIETY'S AGENTS:

NEW YORK: B. WESTERMANN & CO., 471 BROADWAY;

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO., AND WILLIAMS & NORGATE;

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS.



2V  
A5  
v. 9

---

COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION  
OF THE  
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,  
FOR THE YEARS 1868-71.

---

EDWARD E. SALISBURY,	New Haven.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,	“
JAMES HADLEY,	“
EZRA ABBOT,	Cambridge.
ARNOLD GUYOT,	Princeton.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress<sup>88</sup>, in the year 1871, by the  
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,  
in the office of the Librarian of Congress<sup>88</sup>, at Washington.

---

# CONTENTS

OF

## NINTH VOLUME.

Page

ART. I.—THE TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTIÇÂKHYA, WITH ITS COMMENTARY, THE TRI- BHÂSHYARATNA: TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES. By WILLIAM D. WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College, - - - - -	1
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

### A P P E N D I X :

#### AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY :

<i>Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 16th, 1866,</i> - - -	i
<i>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 24th and 25th, 1866,</i> - - -	vii
<i>Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 22d, 1867,</i> - - -	xiii
<i>Additions to the Library and Cabinet, May, 1865—May, 1867,</i> -	xix
<i>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 16th and 17th, 1867,</i> - - -	xxvii
<i>Proceedings at Boston, May 20th, 1868,</i> - - - - -	xxxviii
<i>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 14th and 15th, 1868,</i> - - -	xli
<i>Proceedings at Boston, May 19th, 1869,</i> - - - - -	li
<i>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 21st and 22d, 1869,</i> - - -	lvi
<i>List of Members, October, 1869,</i> - - - - -	lxvi
<i>Proceedings at Boston, May 18th, 1870,</i> - - - - -	lxxiii
<i>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 20th and 21st, 1870,</i> - - -	lxxxv



THE TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTIÇÂKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA:

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

Presented to the Society October 14th, 1868.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ and Tribhâshyaratna is as follows:

1. **T.** A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript: but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original; presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in *pada*-text show a final *n*. It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed “Kṛishṇa-yajuh-prâtis’âkhyâ, by Kârtikeya.” On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know; it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter.

2. **W.** A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof. Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1-89, 100, 1-56), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25*a*, seven lines are written on a page; thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date; but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows: *ṣrîkṛshṇâr-pabhastu ṣrîkâlabhâiravaprasann om yâyakâṁḍavidhâyordhvaṁ ṛshayo ṛshayo ṛshih: ity âçîsraçîmakâpûrvaṁ ṛshaṁ ce ti svataṁ-tratâ: 1 kramyâdhvano bhavaty agre pâvako rpayatîti ca.* This just fills up the leaf; but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse: *visha-*



*yemgira ity evâpy agra ity âdi lupyate.2.*, and has added, as final benediction, *çriviçveçvaraprasann*.

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations. Considering that it thus presents every first fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct. Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder.

3. **B.** This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr. Bühler, in *Zeitsch. Deut. Morg. Ges.*, xxii.319) the Tribhâsh-yaratna is said to be not very rare. From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr. Bühler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof. Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr. Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered. The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one.

4. **O.** Through the kind offices of Prof. Max Müller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W.") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS. Bodl. W. 478), first described by Roth (*Zur Lit. und Gesch. des Weda*, pp. 54, 62 seq.), and used also by Weber (*Ind. Stud.* iv.77 seq.). It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii.12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work.

5. **G.** This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Grantham character. The copy was made for me by Dr. Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work. Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr. Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription. There are doubtless few other Sanskritists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest. The catalogue which Dr. Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc., as I am compelled here to omit.

6. **M.** The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the Prâtiçâkhya and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayâlam character. Of this, Dr. Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Grantham manuscript, in his transcript of the latter.

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged



that the rules of the Prâtiçâkhyâ are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk.

As regards the text of the Prâtiçâkhyâ itself, all these authorities agree very closely: there are but two, or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them. In respect to the text of the commentary, their accordance, as was to be expected, is much less: they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes; or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work. The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G.") and the Malayâlam ("M."), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other. My own manuscript ("W.") and that sent by Dr. Bühler from Bombay ("B.") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G. and M. As for the Oxford manuscript ("O."), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W. and B., having an especially near relationship to B., with whose slight variations of the text given by W. it almost uniformly agrees; later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves.

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W., partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G. and M.—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript. I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W. as closely as I could; and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B. and O., or of B. alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W. was of a character to be endured. At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison. Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such: I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B., as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account. The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of interpunction: they offer absolutely



no standard to follow. For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible; and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority. Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules; while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another.\* Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed. And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details.

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G. and M. regularly write a final sibilant instead of *visarjanîya* before an initial sibilant, and often, where a *m* is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of *anusvâra*. Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, *anusvâra* (ñ), or *m̐*, I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage.

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions: citations from the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added; and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule. Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage; but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prâtiçâkhyâ (Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, Vol. vii., 1862). The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work. The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhâshyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prâtiçâkhyâ. Possessing no *index verborum* to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, nor even a manuscript of its *pada*-text, I have not been able to try the Prâtiçâkhyâ by it with anything like the same

---

\* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv.10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity): *ingyasya antah ingyântah na ingyântah aningyântah*.



thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvan. What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and excerption of the Sanhitâ in a single good *samhitâ*-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr. Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof. Weber), I have endeavored to do. I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its *samhitâ* or *pada* readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of München, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge. Of references to the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition: and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment. The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility.

In making reference to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or *kânda*, *praçna*, and *anuvâka*. The further division of the sections or *anuvâkas*, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the Prâtiçâkhya (see notes to the rules of chapter iii.), that I have preferred to express it by the use of “superior” figures attached to that which indicates the *anuvâka*. Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the *anuvâka* is to be understood as composed of a single division.

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure; in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses. The abbreviation “om.” means ‘omit,’ and “ins.” means ‘insert.’

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke. The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the Journal of the American Oriental Society; it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i.1 (p. 10).



## CHAPTER I.

CONTENTS: 1-11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alphabet; 12-14, surd and sonant consonants; 15, list of prepositions; 16-21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters; 22-24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc.; 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules; 31-37, quantity of simple sounds; 38-40, the three accents; 41-47, details respecting the circumflex accent; 48, 49, compound words; 50-53, respecting cited words; 54-55, words consisting of a single vowel; 56-61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules.

THE commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows: "I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Gaṇeṣa, as also to the *gurus* and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment; which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prâtiçâkhya given by Vararuci etc., shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (*tribhâshyaratna*), approved of Brahmans." He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining *giram devîm*, 'divine Voice,' by *vâgdevîm*, 'Goddess of Voice,' and *bhûsura*, 'Brahman' (literally 'earth-god'), by *vidvat*, 'learned man, sage.' On *lakshana*, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

<sup>1</sup>*bhaktiyuktaḥ praṇamyâ 'ham gaṇeṣacaranadvayam :*  
*gurûn api giram<sup>2</sup> devîm idam vakshyâmi lakshanam.1.*  
*vyâkhyânam prâtiçâkhyasya vîkshya vârarucâdikam<sup>3</sup> :*  
*kṛtam tribhâshyaratnam yad bhâsate bhûsurapriyam.2.*

*çlokayor anayor ayam<sup>4</sup> arthaḥ. bhaktiyukto 'ham gaṇeṣacaranadvayam gurûn giram<sup>5</sup> api devîm : <sup>6</sup>vâgdevîm ity arthaḥ : tam ca<sup>6</sup> praṇamyâ lakshanam idam vakshyâmi ya<sup>7</sup> lakshanam tribhâshyaratnanâmakam bhûsurapriyam vidvatpriyam bhâsate : kîdrçam lakshanam : prâtiçâkhyasya vyâkhyânarûpakam<sup>8</sup> vârarucâdikam<sup>9</sup> bhâshyajâtam vîkshya<sup>10</sup> nyânâtirekaparihâreṇa kṛtam viracitam : âdiçabdenâ "treyamâhisheyâu gr̥hyete : ata eva tribhâshyaratnam iti nâmnâ upapattiḥ : trayânâm bhâshyânâm samâhâras tribhâshyam : tasya<sup>11</sup> ratnam bhûshanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. prefaces with *çrîgaṇeṣâya namaḥ. çrîgaṇeṣa prasanno 'stu. om.* B. prefaces with *çrîgaṇeṣâya namaḥ. çrisarasvatyâi namaḥ. çridattânnayâya namaḥ :* and the additional verse

*çuklâambaradharam devam çaçivarṇam caturbhujam :*  
*prasannavadanam dhyâyet sarvavighnopaçântaye.1.*

'The white raiment-bearing god, moon-hued, four-armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the surcease of all disturbance.'" It then numbers the other verses "2" and "3;" but proceeds to confess the unguineness of the inserted verse by reading, like the other MSS, *anayoh çlokayoh.*

<sup>2</sup> G. M. *girân* <sup>3</sup> B. *var-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *girâm.* <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>7</sup> G. M. *taî.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. *-rûpam;* B. *-pûrvakam.* <sup>9</sup> B. *var-;* W. *-ka.* <sup>10</sup> G. M. *samikshya.*  
<sup>11</sup> W. *om.*



with common usage, he makes no remark. To *vîkshya*, 'having examined,' he adds *nyûnâtirekaparihârena*, 'with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy.' The "etc." after "Vararuci" is declared to refer to Âtreya and Mâhisheya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name. Vararuci and Mâhisheya are, indeed, often (about ten times each: see Index) referred to in the sequel, and their discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed: Âtreya has only once (under v.1) the honor of being mentioned. Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed; nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge. Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age.

## अथ वर्णसाम्नायः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now the list of sounds.

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha*, 'now,' in the rule. He quotes Amara's definition of *atho* and *atha* (Amarakosha iii.4.32.8; p. 349 of Deslongchamps's edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atha*, it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here. In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *om*; "since the Çikshâ-makers declare, 'om and *atha* are deemed propitiatory.'" Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another; "the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of the *lakshana*: there hav-

---

1. *maṅgalānantarārambhapraçnakârtsnyeshv atho athe ?ti maṅgalādyanekârthatvād athaçabdasyâ 1rthanirṇayârtham eko 'rtho' niçcetavyaḥ: tatra prathamam tavan maṅgalârthatvam ucyate: tasya praṇavasādharmaḥ: tathâ hi samâcakshate çikshâkârâḥ2:*

*omkâraç câ 'thaçabdaç ca maṅgalâv iti kîrtitâv iti: âho3 svid ânantaryârthatâ4: vedâdhyayanânantaram lakshanaññanam kuryâd iti sâpekshatvâl lakshanasya pûrvam vedâdhi-game saty atha lakshanaaparîkshâvasaraḥ: atha vâ 'dhikârârtho 'thaçabdaḥ: tv atha i 've 'ti vinivartakâdhikârakâvadhârakâḥ (xxii.6) iti vidyamânatvât: atha varṇasamâmnâyaḥ pâthakramo5 'dhikriyata iti sûtrânvayaḥ: sam ity ekîbhâve: ân iti maryâdâyam: mnâya ity ânupûrvyeno 'padeçah6: ekîbhûtâ akârâdayo varṇâḥ svarabhaktipuryavasânâ ânupûrvyena pûrvaiḥ çishtâir' upadiçtâḥ.*



ing been study of the Veda before the *lakshana*, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the *lakshana*." Here, *lakshana* appears to be used to designate the Prâtiçâkhya itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, *atha* is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxii.6, below: "*tu, atha, and eva* are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative;" and the connection of the rule is that *now* the list of sounds, the order of reading (*pâthakrama*), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of *samâmnâya*, 'list, rehearsal,' is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean "the collective sounds, beginning with *a* and ending with the *svarabhakti*, in their order, as taught by former learned men."

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below): *a, i,* and *u* have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, *r* only a short and a long, *l* only a short (W. and B. take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long *r*, and a 1 after the *l*, to point out clearly the number of *moras* they respectively contain; and B. adds after the *âi* and *âu* a 2, for the same purpose); second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7); third, the four semivowels (rule 8); and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration; the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds *anusvâra* acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel; for, he says, "since it is made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality." A passage from the Çikshâ, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the

---

*tathâ hi: a â âs i î îs u û ûs r ṛ ḷ e âi o âu iti svarâḥ shodaça: ka kha ga gha ṅa ca cha ja jha ṅa ṭa ṭha ḍa ḍha ṅa ta tha da dha na pa pha ba bha ma iti sparçâḥ pañcaviñçatiḥ: ya ra la va iti catasro 'ntasthâḥ: ça sha sa ha ḥkaḥ ḥpaḥ iti shad âshmanâḥ: anusvâraç ca (i.34) iti sûtrenâ 'nusvâra uktaḥ: kâlaviçeshâçrayatvâd asâu <sup>11</sup>dharmî na tv<sup>10</sup> anunâsikavad<sup>11</sup> dharmâḥ: vidher <sup>12</sup> madhyasthanâsikya<sup>13</sup> iti çikshâvacane<sup>14</sup> sati<sup>15</sup> dharmadharminor abhedavivakshayo 'papadyate: atha visarjanîyaḥ (viii.5) ity anena<sup>16</sup> visarjanîya uktaḥ: nâsikâvivaraṇâd ânunâsikyam (ii.52) ity anena<sup>16</sup> raṅga uktaḥ: prkta svarât paro ḍam (xiii.16) ity anena<sup>16</sup> lakâra uktaḥ: sparçâd anuttamâd (xxi.12) iti catvâro yamâ uktaḥ: rep h o s h m a s a m y o g e r e p h a s v a r a b h a k t i r (xxi.15) iti svarabhaktir ukta: anena kramena*



Çikshâ (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later: see the additional notes): it is given again, with more fullness, under viii.15. Next, for the *visarjanîya*, which our Prâtiçâkhyâ does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final *h*. The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls *rañga*, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that “nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage.” The word *rañga*, ‘coloring,’ though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prâtiçâkhyâ, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii.52. What is described in the latter rule is in fact a “quality” (*dharmâ*), and not a “qualified” or concrete thing (*dharmin*); and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of *anusvâra* was but just now supported. It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the *nâsikya*, or euphonic insertion between *h* and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi.14; he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the *yamas*. The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which *n* and *m* are directed to be converted before *y*, *l*, *v* (v.26–8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the *rañga* to be meant to apply to their nasality; and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition: but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the *nâsikya*, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds. Further, rule xiii.16 is made the warrant for the lingual *l*, rule xxi.12 for the four *yamas*, and rule xxi.15, finally, for the *svarabhakti*: and the conclusion is reached that “by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yajur-Veda.”

*yâjurvedikavarṇānām*<sup>17</sup> *shashtisamkhyâ sūtrata eva vispashtâ drashtavyâ. nanu*

*trishashtiç catuḥshashtir vâ varṇâḥ çambhumate*<sup>18</sup> *matâḥ: iti çikshâvacane sati kutham shashtisamkhyâ niyamate: etal*<sup>19</sup> *lâukikavâidikasavarnavishayam*<sup>20</sup> *iti*<sup>21</sup> *çikshâvacane na virodhaḥ: atra tu*<sup>22</sup> *sūtrâir etâvatâm varṇānām*<sup>23</sup> *eva palambhâd esha eva*<sup>24</sup> *nirṇayo varṇitah*<sup>25</sup>.

*varṇānām samāmnâyo varṇasamāmnâyah.*

(1) G. M. *maṅgalâdyanekârtho*. 2 W. G. M. *çiksh-*. G. and M. always write *çikshâ*, B. and O. always *çikshâ*; W. has *çî-* only in one other place (under xiv.28). 3 W. B. *aho*. 4 G. M. *-ryatâ*; W. adds *vâ*. 5 G. M. *pâthe kramo*. 6 W. B. om. 7 W. *çishyâir*. 8 B. *shka*. 9 B. *shpa*. 10 G. M. om. (11) B. *dharmânatvâd anunâsikal*. 12 G. ins. *ddharma*. 13 G. M. *-kad*. 14 G. M. *-nam*. 15 B. om.; G. M. *tu*. 16 B. G. M. om. 17 W. *-vâid-*. 18 B. *amçumate*. 19 G. M. *tal*. 20 G. M. *-savarṇavarṇa-*. 21 G. M. ins. *na*. 22 G. M. om. 23 G. M. om. 24 G. M. om. 25 B. *nirṇitah*.



An objection is now raised and removed. “Considering that the Çikshâ says ‘the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Çambhu’ (Çikshâ, verse 3; see Weber’s edition of the treatise, in his *Indische Studien*, iv.348–9), how is the number sixty established? Answer: there is no inconsistency with the *dictum* of the Çikshâ, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life; while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise.”

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows:

Vowels	} simple,	<i>a ā á3 i î í3 u ū ú3</i>	9		
		} impure and diphthongs,	<i>ṛ ṝ ḷ e āi o āu</i>	7	16
Mutes	} guttural,		<i>k kh g gh ṅ</i>	5	
		} palatal,	<i>c ch j jh ñ</i>	5	
			} lingual,	<i>t th ḍ ḍh ṇ</i>	5
		} dental,		<i>ṭ ṭh ḍ ḍh ṇ</i>	5
			} labial,	<i>p ph b bh m</i>	5
Semivowels,					
Spirants,		<i>y r l v</i>		4	
Anusvâra,		<i>ṅ</i>		1	
Visarjanîya,		<i>h</i>		1	
Lingual <i>l</i> ,		<i>l̄</i>		1	
Nâsikya,		(not written)		1	
Yamas,		do.		4	
Svarabhakti,		do.		1	
				<hr/>	
	whole number of letters,			60	

With the exception of the nasal *y, l, v*, already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prâtiçâkhyâ. For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject; as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them. Only the Vâjasaneyi-Prâtiçâkhyâ includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii.1–31).

अथ नवादिः समानाक्षराणि ॥ २ ॥

2. Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

2. *athe 'ti samjñâdhikârârthah: asmin' varṇasamâmnâya âdita ârabhya nava varṇâh samânâksharasamjñâ bhavanti: 'yathâ: a ā á3 i î í3 u ū ú3'. samjñâyâh' prayojanam: dîrghañ samânâkshare savarṇapare (x.2) ity âdi. nanv îdrçî mahatî samjñâ kimarthâ': çikshâdiçâstraprasiddhyanurodhâye' 'ti brâmah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *tasmin*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. *a ā á3 ity âdi*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-jñâ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-tham*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *om. -di-*.



Literally, 'are homogeneous syllables;' *samânâkshara* and its correlative *samdhyaakshara*, 'syllable of combination,' being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong; the latter, however, is not used in this treatise. The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, *a â ă i î ı̄ u ū ũ*. The *ṛ* and *ḷ* vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described; the Rik Pr. (xiii.14), the Vâj. Pr. (iv.145), and the Ath. Pr. (i.37-9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include *ṛ* and *ḷ* among the *samânâksharas* (omitting *ḷ*, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferribly recognized by the last.

The commentator explains the *atha* of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (*samjñâ*), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel. Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word *samânâkshara* striking his mind, he asks "why such a big name?" and relieves himself by the answer, "we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Çikshâ and other text-books." The Çikshâ as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term.

द्वे सवर्णे ह्रस्वदीर्घे ॥ ३ ॥

3. Two and two, short and long, are similar.

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called "similar." The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as "similar"—to the exclusion, namely, of the *pluta* or protracted vowels. The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x.2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x.24. The *ṛ*-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule; and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one.

3. *teshu*<sup>1</sup> *samânâkshareshu dvedve hrasve dvedve dîrghe*<sup>2</sup> *hrasva-dîrghe*<sup>3</sup> *dîrghahrasve vâ* 'kshare *parasparam savarṇasamjñe bhavataḥ. iyam anvarthasamjñâ: savarṇatvam nâma sâdṛçyam ucyate: tasmâd akârâdînâm ikârâdibhir na savarṇasamjñâçañkâ bhinnasthânâprayatnatvâd*<sup>4</sup> *anayoḥ. samjñâdyâḥ prayojanam: dîrghañ samânâkshare savarṇapare (x.2) iti.*

*hrasvam ca dîrgham ca hrasvadîrghe.* •

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *vâ*. <sup>3</sup> B. om.; G. M. ins. *vâ*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-tnâd*.



The word translated 'similar' means literally 'of identical color' (i. e. sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound. It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (*anvartha*); and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of *a* and *i*, for instance, as "similar," because of their different mode of organic production. As example of the use of the term is again cited x.2.

न प्लुतपूर्वम् ॥ ४ ॥

4. Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes.

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr., i.1, r. 4). The commentator paraphrases the rule "a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed 'similar;'" and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies. In the phrase *agne: iti: aha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>), the word *agne* has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes *agnā'zi*. By the rule (x.2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form *agnā'zī' ti*. The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final *i*, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into *y* by rule x.15, the *y* dropped by x.19, and the coalescence of the remaining *āz* with the following *i* (as prescribed by x.4) prevented by x.24: thus is assured the reading *agnā'z ity aha*.

षोडशादितः स्वराः ॥ ५ ॥

5. The sixteen at the beginning are vowels.

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with *a* and ending with *āu*. As example of the use of the technical term

---

4. *plutapūrvam samānāksharam savarṇasamjñam na bhavati. plutam asmāt pūrvam iti plutapūrvam. yathā: agnāz ity āhe 'ty atra dīrghañ samānākshare savarṇapare (x.2) ity ekādeṣaḥ prasaktaḥ: tac cā 'nishtam: pratishiddhāyām tv evam savarṇasamjñāyām pāriṣeshyād ivarṇokārāu yavakārāv (x.15) iti pūrvasye 'kārasya yatvam syāt<sup>1</sup>: sa ca yakāro lupyete tv avarṇapūrvāu yavakārāv (x.19) iti lupyate: yakāre lupte sati ivarṇapara ekāram (x.4) ity ekārah<sup>2</sup> prasaktaḥ: so 'pi<sup>3</sup> nishidhyate na plutapragrahāv (x.24) ity anena: tasmād agnāz ity āhe 'ti prasidhyati<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ekādeṣaḥ. <sup>3</sup> G. M. vi. <sup>4</sup> G. M. sidhyati.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list). Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on.

Rule xiv.27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined.

पराश्रतसो ऽन्तस्थाः ॥ ८ ॥

8. The next four are semivowels.

The four semivowels are *y*, *r*, *l*, *v*. The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term "semivowel" (*antasthā*, i. e. *antasthā*, 'standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]': see note to Ath. Pr. i.30) is one (v.28) prescribing the treatment of final *m* before an initial semivowel.

परे षड्भूजाः ॥ ९ ॥

9. The next six are spirants.

Namely, the three sibilants, *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, the *jihvāmālīya*, *ç*, the *upadhmanīya*, *φ*, and the aspiration, *h*. As regards the sounds to which the name *ūshman*, 'flatus,' shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance. The Vâj. Pr. (viii.22) limits the class to the sibilants and *h*; the Ath. Pr. (see note to i.31) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct *visarjanīya*; the Rik Pr. (i.2), these and the *anusvāra*. We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the *visarjanīya*.

To instance the employment of "spirant," the comment cites the rule (xiv.16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel.

स्पर्शानामानुपूर्व्येण पञ्चपञ्च वर्गाः ॥ १० ॥

10. Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series.

The commentary paraphrases: "among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation 'series;' they begin respectively with *k*, *c*, *t*, *t*, *p*, and end with *ñ*, *ñ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *m*." This

---

8. *sparçebhyaḥ pare catvāro varṇā antasthāsamjñā bhavanti. samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: 'antasthāparaç ca savarṇam anu-nāsikam (v.28) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> A *lacuna* in W., extending to the word *prayojanam* in the commentary to the next rule.

9. *antasthābhyaḥ pare śaḍ varṇā ūshmasamjñā bhavanti. samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: ūshmā svaraparaḥ (xiv.16) ity ādi.*



exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms. Otherwise, we might divide ---- *pañca pañcavargâḥ*, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. (i.2), 'there are five series, of five each.'

The illustrative rule (xiv.20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series.

## प्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थोत्तमाः ॥ ११ ॥

11. And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last.

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as *t, th, ḍ, dh, n*; and these classes are named according to their order in the several series. The commentator makes no note here of the physical differences of the classes, but says "In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last. Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms 'first' and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration (?). How so? Why, to establish the designation 'first' and so on for *k* and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semivowels, spirants, etc., designations founded on their enumeration." And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii.9; xiv.12,24; viii.3: but the southern MSS. cite v.38 instead of ii.9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined.

10. *sparçânâm madhya ânupûrvyena pañcapañca varṇâ<sup>1</sup> vargasamjñâ bhavanti: ka-ca-ṭa-ta-pâdayo<sup>2</sup> ṇa-ṇa-ṇa-na-mântâ ity arthaḥ. samjñâyâḥ prayojanam: ṭavargaṣ ca tavargaparaḥ (xiv.20) iti.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -pâdyâḥ. <sup>3</sup> W. om. the cited rule; G. M. *ity âdi.*

11. *ekâikasmin varge yathâkramena<sup>1</sup> varṇâḥ prathamadvitîyatṛtîyacaturthottamasamjñâ bhavanti: siddhe 'pi samkhyânimitte nâmani<sup>2</sup> samkhyântarânabhidhânârtham<sup>3</sup> samkhyântaram<sup>4</sup> kathayitum prathamâdisamjñâvidhânânam: tat katham: kakârâdînâm eva<sup>5</sup> prathamâdisamjñâpratyaayârtham: svarântasthoshmaprabhrtishu tatsamkhyâsamjñâpratishedhârtham<sup>6</sup>. samjñâyâḥ prayojanam: prathama ūshmaparo dvitîyam (xiv.12): tṛtîyañ svaraghoshavatparaḥ (viii.3): kakâro hacaturtheshu (ii.9)<sup>7</sup>: nâ 'nuttama uttamaparaḥ (xiv.24): ity âdi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -kramam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. nâmnî. <sup>3</sup> B. samkhyântarâbh-; G. M. samkhyâbh-. <sup>4</sup> M. samjñântaram: as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. tu samkh-. <sup>7</sup> G. M. substitute for this rule part of v.38, viz. *prathamapûrvo kakâraṣ caturtham tasya sasthanam.*



The other Prâtiçâkhyas employ the same designations for the mutes (save that the Vâj. Pr. also calls the nasals *pañcama*, 'fifth'), but without taking the trouble to define them or prescribe their use by a rule.

## ऋष्विसर्जनीयप्रथमद्वितीया अघोषाः ॥ १२ ॥

12. The spirants, *visarjanîya*, and the first and second mutes, are surd.

The Rik Pr. gives (i.2,3) a similar statement; the Ath. Pr. uses the terms "surd" and "sonant" without defining which consonants form each class; the Vâj. Pr. (i.50-53) substitutes for the terms arbitrary formulas.

The physical peculiarity of the surd utterance is defined in the next chapter (rules 5,10).

The commentator illustrates the use of the term by the rule (ix.2) concerning the treatment of *visarjanîya* before a surd.

## न हकारः ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not *h*.

"*H* is not styled a surd; this is an exception rendered necessary by the circumstance that *h*, being [by i.9] a spirant, would otherwise be included [by the last rule] in the class of surds," says the comment.

All the phonetic treatises treat *h* as a sonant. For further definition of its character, see rules ii.6,9,46,47, below.

## व्यञ्जनशेषो घोषवान् ॥ १४ ॥

14. The rest of the consonants are sonant.

The commentary enters into a rather lengthy defense of the propriety of this rule, which reads literally as follows: "The remainder of the consonants other than the surds is styled sonant. Even though, when the surds have already been stated in rule 12, the sonant quality of the rest, on the principle of 'remainder,' is assured—just as, when it is said, 'of Devadatta and Yajñadatta,

---

12. *ûshmâṇaḥ ca visarjanîyaḥ ca prathamadvitîyâḥ<sup>1</sup> cā 'gho-shasamjñâ bhavanti. samjñâyâḥ prayojanam: aghoshaparas tasya sasthanam ûshmâṇam<sup>2</sup> (ix.2) ity âdi<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *prathamaḥ ca dv-*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. omit the last two words of the rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

13. *na bhavaty aghoshasamjñô<sup>1</sup> hakâraḥ: ûshmatvâd agho-shatve prâpte tadapavâdo 'yam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *-jñiko*.



Devadatta owns no kine,' the conclusion is assured that Yajñadatta is a kine-owner—nevertheless, the indication of the technical term is made in the text-book, for the sake of practical convenience (?). Also, because of the superiority of express mention over inclusion in a remainder. Otherwise—the name of surd is denied to *h* by rule 13, nor is *h* sonant, there being no rule to that effect; and so with the rest of the consonants; the vowels are also in like manner not sonant and not surd—this being the case, when the rule shall be given (ix.8) 'also when followed by a sonant,' the doubt would arise, 'followed by a sonant' means followed by what? Let not this be so: in this view the present rule is undertaken." It is added "In this rule, the distinctive meaning, in the form of objection and replication, is set forth by Mâhisheya." And the rule ix.8, already referred to, is quoted again by way of illustration of the use of the term "sonant."

The Rik Pr. (i.3), after specifying the surd letters, leaves the sonants to be inferred *pârîçeshyât*, 'by the remainder-principle,' as is expressly pointed out in the commentary on the passage (see Regnier's edition, note to rule i.12).

The vowels are not included under the designation *ghoshavant* 'sonant,' although (as is explained in rule ii.8) formed of the same material with the sonant consonants.

Our treatise does not, like the other Prâtiçâkhyas (R. Pr. i.3; V. Pr. i.54; A. Pr. i.10), define the "first" and "third" mutes as *soshman*, 'aspirated.'

14. *aghoshebhyo* <sup>1</sup> *vyañjanaçesho ghoshavatsamjño bhavati: yady apy ūshmavisarjanîyaprathameshv* <sup>2</sup> *aghosheshū 'kteshu vyañjanaçeshasya pârîçeshyād ghoshavattvam siddham: yathā* <sup>3</sup> *devadattayajñadattayor* <sup>4</sup> *apaçur devadatta ity ukte 'paraḥ paçumân iti siddham: tathā 'pi çâstre samvyavahârârtham* <sup>5</sup> *samjñā-nirdeçāḥ kriyate: pârîçeshyād api kañthokter viçeshât* <sup>6</sup> *: anyathā na hakâraḥ (i.13) iti hakârasyā 'ghoshasamjñā nishidhyate: nā 'pi hakâro ghoshavân: vidhyabhāvât: tathāi 'va vyañjanaçeshah: svarā api tathā* <sup>7</sup> *na ghoshavanto nā 'py aghoshāḥ: tathā sati ghoshavatparaç ca (ix.8) iti yatra* <sup>8</sup> *vakshyati tatra* <sup>9</sup> *samdehaḥ syât: ghoshavatparo nāma kimpāra iti: tan mā bhād itī 'dam sūtram* <sup>10</sup> *drabhyate* <sup>11</sup>.

*vyañjanarūpaḥ çesho vyañjanaçeshah* <sup>12</sup>.

*atra sūtre codyaparihârarūpa* <sup>13</sup> *esha viçesho mâhisheyabhâshitaḥ.*

*samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: ghoshavatparaç ca (ix.8) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. 'nyo. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ūshmavisarjanîye 'ty. <sup>3</sup> B. ins. ca. <sup>4</sup> W. -dattaitiyor. <sup>5</sup> W. samhâr-. <sup>6</sup> G. M. viçeshatvât. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. yatrayatra. <sup>9</sup> G. M. tatratatra. <sup>10</sup> B. çâstram. <sup>11</sup> G. M. repeat the rule itself here. <sup>12</sup> W. om.; B. adds yah çeshah. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om. rūpa.



## आप्रावोपाभ्यधिप्रतिपरिविनीत्युपसर्गाः ॥ १५ ॥

15. *Â, pra, ava, upa, abhi, adhi, prati, pari, vi, ni*—these are prepositions.

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vâj. Prâtiçâkhyas (R. Pr. xii.6; V. Pr. vi.24) and by Pânini (see the *gana prâdayah*). The commentator notes the discordance with Pânini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumingly cuts short the list of prepositions with the word *iti* in it. His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda. Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion “therefore there is no discordance whatever,” I do not see the point of. The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain. The term preposition (*upasarga*) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz. vi.4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x.9, and xiv.8: for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules.

## वर्णः कारोत्तरो वर्णाख्या ॥ १६ ॥

16. A sound followed by *kâra* is the name of that sound.

That is, for example, *akâra* is the name of *a*, *ekâra* of *e*, and so on. The Vâj. Pr. (i.37) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all. Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii.4). The word *kâra* means ‘making, producing.’ It is in the rules of the Prâtiçâkhyas added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (*varṇa*) as their names, but also to syllables like *aḥ* and *an* (see below, rules 23, 53), and the

---

15. . . . . *ity ete çabdâ upasargasamjñâ bhavanti. nanu praparâpasamanvavanirdurvyân ityâdi pâniniyâ viçeshena bhaṇanti<sup>1</sup>: katham atra sūtrakṛtâ nirargalam upasargâ itiçabdena samkucitâ ucyante. yajurvedavishaya etâvanta eve 'ti mantavyam. tarhi praparâpasam<sup>2</sup> iti samuccaye viçeshapâṭhaḥ<sup>3</sup> katham upalabhyate<sup>4</sup>. itiparatvavidhâne tasya tâtparyam na tâ 'pasargasamjñâ vidhâne viçeshapâṭhaḥ<sup>5</sup>: tasmân na kenacid virodhaḥ. samjñâyâḥ prayojanam: upasarganishpûrvo 'nudâtte pade (vi.4). itiçabdaḥ prakâravâcî.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. and G.p.m. *bhavanti*. <sup>2</sup> B. *prâpaparâvasam*; G. M. *prâpasam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *viçeshah*; W. *viçeshamp-*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-lakshyate*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *viçeshah p-*.

16. *kârottaro varṇo varṇasyâ 'khyâ bhavati. yathâ: athâi 'kârekârâv (iv.8) iti.<sup>1</sup> kâraçabda uttaro yasmâd asâu kârot-tarah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ity âdi*.



commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like *ca*.

Rule iv.8, respecting *e* and *î*, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught.

अकारव्यवेतो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. But with an *a* interposed, in the case of the consonants.

That is, the name of *k*, for instance, is (*k-a-kâra*) *kakâra*. Compare the equivalent rule, Vâj. Pr. i.38.

The commentator cites rule v.22, respecting the conversion of *t* to *c*.

न विसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयानुस्वारनासिक्यानाम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Not of *visarjanîya*, *jihvâmûlîya*, *upadhmanîya*, *anusvâra*, and the *nâsikyas*.

The term *nâsikya* designates here, of course, the nasal figments taught in rules xxi.12–14. All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form. The commentator explains that the appending of *kâra* to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of *varṇa*, ‘alphabetic elements’—is annulled by the rule: adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated. He then

17. *akâravayahito*<sup>1</sup> *varṇaḥ kâraçabdottaro vyañjanânâm âkhyâ bhavati. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *takâraç cakâram (v.22) ity âdi. akâreṇa vyavahito*<sup>3</sup> *kâravavetaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*vyaveto*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. put this word after the cited rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyaveto*.

18. *visarjanîyâdînâm varṇatvâviçeshât kârottaratvam prâptam anena nivartyate: na khalu visarjanîyâdînâm kârottaratâ bhavati: kutaḥ: sarvatra*<sup>1</sup> *prayogânupalambhât. nanu yathâ varṇaḥ kârottaro varṇâkhyâ (i.16) iti varṇaçabdavâcyasyâi 'va kârottaratvam nakâro ṇakâram (vii.1 or xiii.6) ity âdi: na tu vâcakasyâi 'va*<sup>2</sup>: *anyathâ varṇakâra iti syât: tadvad*<sup>3</sup> *visarjanîyâdînâm*<sup>4</sup> *atrâ 'pi vâcyagrahaṇam eva yuktam: nâ 'nyathâ: tathâ sati vâcakaparatayâ vararucyâdiviracitam*<sup>5</sup> *udâharaṇam avasâne ravisarjanîya (xiv.15) ity âdy aruciram: iti cet: mâi 'vam mañsthâḥ: vâcyânâm*<sup>6</sup> *kevalânâm aprayogâd atra vâcyavâcakayor abhedavivakshayâ sūtrasaraṇir ity udâharaṇaga manikâ.*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *tathâ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> W. *tad*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *vararucâd-*; G. M. *vârarucâd-*. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *vâcyâdînâm*. <sup>7</sup> W. -*ṇam gam-*.



goes on to raise and refute a very subtle and hair-splitting objection. In rule 16, he says, *kāra* is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (*vācaka*) *varṇa*, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (*vācya*) by that vocable; so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by *visarjanīya* etc. the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that *visarjanīya* and the other names given are, in default of those formed with *kāra*, the accepted designations for the sounds in question). This being the case, the illustrations given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv.15, speaking of *r* and "*visarjanīya*" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one. Such is the objection. The reply is: you must not think so; since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression; and the quoted example is proper enough.

रफस्तु रस्य ॥ १९ ॥

19. Of *r*, however, *epha* forms the name.

That is to say, the technical designation of *r* is *repha*; *ra* being also admitted, by rule 21, below: *rakāra* is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature. This peculiarity of treatment of *r*, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vâj. Pr. has an equivalent rule (i.40).

The word *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to *r* of both the rules 16 and 17. Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of *a* between *r* and the appended *kāra*; but this is wrong; for it would imply that the name of *r* was made sometimes by appending *kāra* and sometimes by appending *epha*, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between *ra* and *repha*, and exemplified by rules vii.11 and xxi.15; while no

19. *rasya tv ephaçabda<sup>1</sup> ākhyā bhavati. yathā: rephoshma-paraḥ<sup>2</sup> (xiii.2) iti. rephasya vyañjanatvāviṣeṣhāt prāptam kārot-taratvam akāravynetatvam ca: tad ubhayaṁ tuçabdo nivāra-yati. anye tv anyathā manyante: akāravynetatvam eve 'ti: tad. asādhu: tathā sati kadācid ephottaratā<sup>3</sup> kadācit kārottaratā ce 'ti vikalpaḥ syāt: yathā 'kāro vyañjanānām (i.21) iti vidhānād vikalpaḥ: tathā hi<sup>4</sup> rephoshmasamयोगे rephasvarabhak-tiḥ<sup>5</sup> (xxi.15): rashaḥpūrvohavanī (vii.11) ity ādi: na tv evam kārottaratvam api vikalpena<sup>6</sup> svīkṛtam<sup>7</sup> kutracit: tasmād asmad-ukta eva yukta tuçabdārthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *reph-*; and M. reads *rephas* in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> W. *-shmaçabda*. <sup>3</sup> B. *rephaksharatā*; W. *reph-*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *'pi*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *naka*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *taḥ*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



4) “*ya, va, na, ha*, when followed by vowels,” the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters. Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone.

As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants; names formed with *a* alone occur nearly sixty times; with *akāra*, nearly eighty times. This is exclusive of *r*, which is called *ra* four times, *repha* fifteen times.

Compare rule i.39 of the Vâj. Pr.

ग्रहणस्य च ॥ २२ ॥

22. As also, of a cited word.

The term *grahana* is used in only two other rules of the Prâtiçâkhya (i.24,50), but occurs in the commentary times innumerable, in the sense of ‘citation, word taken or extracted from the Sanhitâ to be made the subject of some prescription’ (root *grah*, ‘seize, take’). The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology; it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), or one which is the cause (*nimitta*) of an effect produced in some other word. The former is called *grahana* because it is “seized” (i. e. “affected”); the latter, because something is “seized” or “affected” by it. It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base. The *ca*, ‘also,’ of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of, the *a* of the preceding rule. The meaning is, then, that *a* forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur.

21. *vyañjanânâm akāra ākhyā bhavati. yathā: takāra ç cakārañ<sup>1</sup> çacachaparah (v.22) ity ādi. kāraçabdottaratvam idam ca vikalpyate: samuccaye tv akāravaveto vyañjanânām (i.17) iti vyartham syāt. nanu tarhi kārottaratā<sup>2</sup> kimarthā<sup>3</sup>: tadānīm api svarūpenā<sup>4</sup> ’kāralābhāt: sa evā ’khyā bhavatu. satyam: çikshādiçāstraprasiddhasamketānusāreṇ<sup>5</sup> ’ti parihārah. apare tu saṅgirante: akārah sarvasvarāntasya vyañjanasya grāhaka iti: yathā<sup>6</sup>: man-....: ghan-....: ukth-....: ity ādi na kshaparah (ix.3) iti nishedhasyo ’dāharaṇam syād iti. tad asāram: kutah<sup>7</sup>: vāghāshapūrvas tash ṭam (vii.13) iti shapūrvatvāt<sup>8</sup> takārasya ṭatve krte ish-.... ity syāt: tac cā ’nishtam: kim ca: yavanahasvarapareshv<sup>9</sup> (xii.4) iti atra svaraparaçabdo vyarthah syāt: bhavanmate sarvasvarāntasya<sup>10</sup> svīkāranīyamāt: tasmād anupapannam eva<sup>11</sup> tan matam manmahe: kim tu varṇamātrasyā ’khyā.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. omit these first two words of the rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -tvam. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -tham. <sup>4</sup> G. M. avyavāyarū-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -sārāya. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. shatvapū-. <sup>9</sup> W. yavanahaparasvar-. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -ntamātrasya. <sup>11</sup> G. M. evāi.



That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending *a*, all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule. Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi.13 and x.14), to justify such inclusions. The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a *nimitta*, or citation of an affecting cause; the cited word is *oṣṭha*, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding *a* or *ā*: the only two instances of this combination which the Sanhitā contains are quoted in illustration, viz. *svāh*" *oṣṭhābhyām* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>), and *upayāmam adharen' oṣṭhena* (v.7.12). As example of a *lakshya*, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi.26, with its illustrative citations, *kiñçilaç caturthaḥ* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), and *kiñçilāya cakshayanāya ca* (iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>). This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi.26).

This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final *a* is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included; and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in *a* are often cited "for the sake of the inclusion of many words" (*bahūpādānārtham*).

## अःकार आगमविकारिलोपिनाम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. *Aḥ* makes the name of an increment, or of an element suffering alteration or elision.

Here, again, is a precept hardly called for, as the construction and connection of each rule shows in what way any nominative it contains is to be understood, without such an explanation as this, which applies only to a part of the cases, and is unable to teach us which of the three possibilities it contemplates is the actuality in any given case. Moreover, it is faultily expressed, and the commentator is obliged to explain that *aḥ* here stands for the ending of the nominative case, in the dual and plural as well as the singular. He quotes in illustration five rules: xiv.5 exemplifies a singular increment; vii.1, a singular altered element; v.19, a singular elision; v.25, two-fold altered elements; xxi.12, plural increments.

22. <sup>1</sup>*lakshyam nimittam ca grahaṇam ity ucyate: gr̥hyata<sup>2</sup> iti grahaṇam: gr̥hyata anene 'ti nimittam api grahaṇam: padāikadeçah prātipadikam iti yāvat: cakārah pūrvasūtroktam akāram ākarshati: grahaṇasya prātipadikasya sarvāvasthasyā 'kāra<sup>1</sup> ākhyā bhavati. yathā: kiñçilakiñçilā (xvi.26) iti parakiñçilaçabdo lakshyam udāharāṇam: yathā: kiñç- cat-....<sup>3</sup>: kiñç- caksh-....: oṣṭhevaḥparō lupyate (x.14) iti tu<sup>4</sup> nimittam: yathā: svā-....: upay-....*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary.  
<sup>2</sup> G. *grahanyata*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. omit this example. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.



Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25–27 between is quite unaccountable.

Rik Pr. i.14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28.

ग्रहणं वा ॥ २४ ॥

24. Or the simple citation.

The commentator says: “Of these—namely the increment etc.—there is in some cases, alternatively, citation; the meaning is, without any *ah*.” And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi.29), alteration (vii.3), and elision (v.15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness.

आसन्नं संदेहे ॥ २५ ॥

25. In case of doubt, citation is made of the next.

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word *grahaṇam*, ‘citation,’ of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used. The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the Sanhitâ would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it. But the commentator’s first example and its exposition are quite peculiar. He quotes *svayamâtrṇṇâm ca vikarṇīm co ’ttame* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>), and remarks: “There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two *ca*’s in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the *pragraha*-character [to *uttame*], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [*kâryabhâj*, ‘the word undergoing the prescribed

---

23. *âgamâdînâm aḥkāra âkhyâ bhavati: aḥkāra iti prathamâ-vibhakter upalakṣhaṇam. âgamasya yathâ: ’dvitīyacaturthayoḥ tu vyañjanottarayoḥ pūrvah* (xiv.5): *vikārīṇo yathâ<sup>1</sup>: atha nakāro ṇakāram* (vii.1): *lopīno yathâ: tishthantyekayâ sapūrvah* (v.19): *ity ekavacanāni: laparâulakāram* (v.25): *iti dvivacanam: ānupūrvyān nāsikyâḥ* (xxi.12): *iti bahuvacanam. âgamaḥ ca vikārī ca lopī cā ’gama-vikārilopinah: teshām.*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om.

24. *teshām âgamâdînâm kvacid grahaṇam vâ bhavati: aḥkāreṇa vinâ ’pī ’ti<sup>1</sup> tâtparyam. âgamasya yathâ: âdiraṅhatir* (xvi.29) *ity âdi: vikārīṇo yathâ: hanyâdupyamānam ca* (vii.3) *ity âdi: lopīno yathâ: eśhasasya* (v.15) *ity âdi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. *iti*.



effect'] is to be assumed, in the rule reading *co 'ttame* [iv.11].” He seems to suppose that the “doubt” referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding *ca*'s is joined with *uttame* in the precept that establishes the latter's character as a *pragraha* word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken. This is little less than silly. His other example is taken from rule iv.15, where *â prshatî* is made *pragraha*, the *â* being the final letter of the preceding word *yuñjâ* (*yuñjâ prshatî*, iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>).

Under a later rule (iv.23) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied. See the note to that rule.

अनेकस्यापि ॥ २६ ॥

26. Even of more than one.

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident. The commentator declares the “even” (*api*) here to continue in force the word *sañdehe*, ‘in case of doubt,’ which is hardly to be approved. He interprets: “When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound,” and quotes *tishthanty ekayâ* (v.19) and *evo 'ttare* (iv.11) as examples. But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter; so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule. There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims; of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi.2,5 etc. I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous.

प्रथमो वर्गोत्तरो वर्गाख्या ॥ २७ ॥

27. A first mute, followed by the word “series,” is the name of the series.

25. *sañdehe saty<sup>1</sup> âsannam<sup>2</sup> varṇam<sup>3</sup> padam<sup>2</sup> vâ grhṇîyât: svay- . . . . ity atra cakâradvayasambhavât pragrahanimittatvena katarasyo 'pâdânam<sup>3</sup> kartavyam iti sañdehe yad<sup>3</sup> âsannam<sup>3</sup> kâr-yabhâjas tad eva svîkartavyâm<sup>3</sup> co 'ttame (iv.11) iti sūtre<sup>4</sup>. varṇasya yathâ: â prshatî (iv.15) ity âdi.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *padam varnam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yadâ*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *sarvatra*.

26. *sañdeha anekasya padasya varṇasya vâ grahaṇam bhavati: apiçabdah sañdeha ity anvâdiçati<sup>1</sup>. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: tishthanty ekayâ sapûrvah (v.19): evo 'ttare (iv.11) ity âdi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *âdiçati*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. om.



The commentator's example is rule xiv.20, "the *t*-series, followed by the *t*-series;" that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vâj. Pr. i.64.

अं विकारस्य ॥ २८ ॥

28. *Am* makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated. The commentator explains, as before, that *am* stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number; but the two examples he gives (v.38 and vii.1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning.

पूर्व इति पूर्वः ॥ २९ ॥

29. By preceding is meant preceding.

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part. Our commentator explains: "Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification 'preceding,' that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone; but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation. Thus, by the rules (iv.12,13) 'dyāvāprthivī is *pragraha*; also the preceding word,' the word *yāvatī* is made a *pragraha* in the passage *yāvatī dyāvāprthivī mahitvā* (iii.2.6<sup>1</sup>); but it is not therefore *pragraha* in the passage *yāvatī vāi prthivī* (v.2.3<sup>1</sup>)."

पर इत्युत्तरः ॥ ३० ॥

30. By following is meant succeeding.

---

27. *vargaçabdottarah prathamah svavargasyā<sup>1</sup> "khyā bhavati: tavargaç ca tavargaparah (xiv.20) iti. vargaçabda uttaro yasmād asāu vargottarah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. *sva.*

28. *am iti çabdo vikārasya "khyā bhavati: am iti dvitīyāvi-bhakter upalakṣaṇam. yathā: prathamapūrvō hakāraç caturtham (v.38): atha nakāro ṇakāram (vii.1).*

29. *yaḥ pūrvaçabdena nirdiṣṭaḥ<sup>1</sup> sa tatrāi 'va svena rūpeṇo 'palakshito jñātavyaḥ: na tu rūpasāmānyād anyo bhinnadeçasthaḥ. yathā<sup>2</sup>: dyāvāprthivī: pūrvaç ca (iv.12,13) iti<sup>3</sup> pragraho bhavati<sup>4</sup> 'ti vakshyati: pūrvatvād yāv-.... iti yāvatīçab- dah pragrahaḥ: yāv-.... iti tu<sup>5</sup> na syāt pragrahaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *viçishyate.* <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-vishyati.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *atra.*



This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms. His illustration is taken from rules iv.49,50, where *dve* and the word following it are declared *pragraha*. In the passage, then, *dve jâye vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>), *jâye* is *pragraha*, but not in the passage *yonir asi jâya e 'hi* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *e 'hi*).

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv.52; and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer.

ऋकार्लकारौ ह्रस्वौ ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *R* and *l* are short.

As examples of short *r* and *l*, the commentator cites *ṛtavo vâi* (vii.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *aklptasya klptyâi* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>).

अकारश्च ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Also *a*.

“Also” (*ca*), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of “short” from the preceding rule. His example of short *a* is *ayam puraḥ* (iv.3.2<sup>1</sup> or 4.3<sup>1</sup>).

तेन च समानकालस्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter.

Here again, the “also” continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told. The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are *i* and *u*, since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with *a* in the diphthongs. As examples from the Sanhitâ are quoted *ishe tvâ* (i.1.1 et al.), *upaprayanto adhvaram* i.5.5<sup>1</sup> or 7<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit *adhvaram*), and *atrâ "ha tad urugâ-yasya* (i.3.6<sup>2</sup>: but see the various readings below). The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,

---

30. *yaḥ para ity onena viçishyate so 'pi tatrâi 'va svena râpeṇa pratyetavyaḥ. yathâ: dve: paraç ca (iv.49,50) iti<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati 'ti vakshyati: paratvâd dve jâ-.... ity atra jâye iti<sup>2</sup> pragrahaḥ: <sup>3</sup>yo-.... ity atra<sup>4</sup> na pragrahaḥ<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *çabdaḥ*. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *tu*.

31. *ṛkâraç ca lkâraç ca hrasvasamjñâu bhavataḥ. yathâ<sup>1</sup>: ṛt-....: ak-....*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.

32. *akâraç ca hrasvasamjño bhavati: cakâro hrasvatvam<sup>1</sup> anv-âdiçati. yathâ: ay-.... iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-svam*.



with *nanu*), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form: "A is short: also any vowel having like quantity with it;" because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since *r̥* and *l̥* are of the same quantity as *a*, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule). But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape; for *r* and *l* inhere in *r̥* and *l̥*; and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short: hence the special rule concerning them. The treatise, as was noticed above (under i.2), nowhere describes the formation of *r̥* and *l̥*, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels.

The rule of the Vâj. Pr. (i.55) is nearly the same with this.

अनुस्वारश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Also *anusvâra*.

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, *anusvâra* is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel. The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows: rule xxi.6, which teaches that *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti* are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former; whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition.

The Vâj. Pr. (iv.147,148) allows *anusvâra* to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddly enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-

33. *tenâ 'kâreṇa yas tulyakâlah svarah sa ca hrasvo bhavati: atrâ<sup>1</sup> 'pi cakâro hrasvâdeçakah<sup>2</sup>: ikâra ukâraç ce<sup>3</sup> 'ty arthah: samdhyaksharânâm samânakâlatvâbhâvat<sup>4</sup>. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: ish- - - -: up- - - -: atr- - - -.<sup>6</sup> akâro hrasvas tena ca samânakâlasvara ity ârabdhavyam: ṛkâralkârâu hrasvâv iti tu<sup>7</sup> nâ "rabdhavyam: evam ârabhyamâṇe punaruktatayâ gâuravam bhaved iti. ucyate: ârabdhavyam evâi 'tat: kutah: ṛkâralkârâyor antarâ<sup>8</sup> rephalakârâu stah: tattatsthânatvâd<sup>9</sup> anayoḥ kâlavyabhicârah syât: hrasvatvam na<sup>10</sup> gamyeta<sup>11</sup>: tan mâ bhâd ity evam ârabhyate: ṛkâralkârâv<sup>12</sup> iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *tatrâ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *hrasvatvâdeçakah samânakâla svara iti*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-kâlasvaratvâ-*. <sup>5</sup> W. om. <sup>6</sup> B. *atrâ* "ha only; G. M. *atra hy*; both as if the introduction to what follows <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *anantare*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *tatsth-*. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *avagamyate*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *hrasvâu*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



tion of the term "protracted" rule x.24, which directs that a protracted and a *pragraha* vowel are not liable to combination.

All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity; see Ath. Pr. i.59-62, and the notes upon those rules.

ह्रस्वार्धकालं व्यञ्जनम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel.

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant. For, if it were the latter, the word "time" in rule xvii.5, which speaks of "the time of a consonant," would be open to the charge of redundancy. We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious. As example of a consonant, the word *vāk* (e. g. i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. read instead *vā*) is given us.

Of the other treatises, the Ath. Pr. (i.60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity.

उच्चैरुदात्तः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute.

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the definition of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii.9), where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described. He adds as example of an acute vowel *sa idhānāḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>: but all the MSS. save W. read *sá iti*), and quotes rule xiv.29 as exemplifying the use of the term *udātta*, 'acute' (literally 'elevated'). I have explained in the note to Ath. Pr. i.14-16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms *udātta*, *anudātta*, and *svarita*, to translate them by 'acute,' 'grave,' and 'circumflex,' respectively.

नीचैरनुदात्तः ॥ ३९ ॥

39. In a low tone, grave.

37. *vyañjanam hrasvārdhakālam bhavati: na tu vyañjanam iti sañjñā: anyathā<sup>1</sup> vyañjanakālaḥ ca svarasyā 'trā 'dhikah<sup>2</sup> (xvii.5) iti<sup>3</sup> kālaḥabdasya pāunaruktyāpatteḥ. yathā: vāk. hrasvasyā 'rdho<sup>4</sup> hrasvārdhaḥ<sup>5</sup>: 'hrasvārdhakālah<sup>6</sup> parimāṇam yasya<sup>5</sup> tat tatho 'ktam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. omit the last two words of the rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-dham*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *hrasvārdham kālah parimāṇakālo yasya*—a good and consistent reading; B. is corrupt. <sup>6</sup> W. *-lam*.

38. *dyāmo dāruṇyam (xxii.9) iti lakṣaṇalakṣitaḥ<sup>1</sup> svara udātta ucyate. yathā: sá----- sañjñāyāḥ prayojanam: udāt-tāt paro 'nudāttaḥ svaritam (xiv.29) iti.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-ta*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ity ādi*.



We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxii.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone. The example for the accent is *avadatâm* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. read *avadâtâm*), of which, in *pada*-text, all the syllables are grave; that for the term *anudâtta*, 'grave' (literally, 'not elevated'), is, in W. B., rule iv.43; but in G. M., rule xiv.29.

समाहारः स्वरितः ॥ ४० ॥

40. Their combination is circumflex.

The commentator explains *samâhâra*, 'combination,' as from *samâhriyate*, 'it is taken together, collected, combined;' and adds, "the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (*svarita*). This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent; its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place:" and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv.29, x.16, and xii.9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises. His example of a circumflexed syllable is *tè 'bruvan* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup> et al.).

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute; but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules.

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath. Pr. i.14–16); and Pânini's rules (i.2.29–31) are precisely the same with those here given. As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath. Pr. i.17).

तस्यादिरुच्चैस्तरामुदात्तादनन्तरे यावद्ध्रस्वस्य ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

39. *anvavasargah* (xxii.10) *iti*<sup>1</sup> *sâtralakshitaḥ*<sup>2</sup> *svaro 'nudâtta ucyate*<sup>3</sup>. *yathâ: av-* *sañjñâyâḥ prayojanam: anudâttona nityam* (iv.43) *iti*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -ta. <sup>3</sup> B. *lakshyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. give xiv 29, and *ity âdi*.

40. *tayor udâtânudâttayor yaḥ samâhârah sa*<sup>1</sup> *svarita ucyate. yathâ: tè----- samâhriyata iti samâhârah: tayor melanajanyasvarah*<sup>2</sup> *svarita*<sup>3</sup> *ity arthaḥ. svaritasvarâpavidhir ayam: uparishtât tu 'tatratatra svarito lakshyate*<sup>4</sup>: *yathâ: udâtât paro 'nudâttaḥ svaritam* (xiv.29): *udâttayoç ca paro 'nudâttaḥ svaritam* (x.16): *tasminn*<sup>5</sup> *anudâtte*<sup>6</sup> *pûrva udâttaḥ svaritam* (xii.9) *ity âdi*.

<sup>1</sup> M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -ra; B. -nyah *svara*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *vak-*. <sup>5</sup> W. om. <sup>6</sup> W. *tannudâtte*.



acute, the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is uttered in a yet higher tone.

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its first element; one is tempted to give the word *udāttāt* a double construction, as belonging in idea to *uccāistarām* as well as to *anantare*.

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule.

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words *sá idhánáh* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), already once given (under rule 38); the first syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule xiv.29, under which the same quotation is repeated.

उदात्तसमः शेषः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. The remainder has the same tone with acute.

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator, in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency. He claims, namely, that the word "same with" here signifies "a trifle lower than," "because otherwise there would be no circumflex"—the circumflex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher and lower tone. But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual "grave" tone which rule 40 prescribes: if, indeed, giving to its first portion a higher tone than "acute" be not an equal offense against the same rule.

सव्यञ्जनो ऽपि ॥ ४३ ॥

43. Along with the consonant, too.

Says the commentator—"the rule as formerly given applied to a pure vowel; now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant. The circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which directly follows an acute or another, is as defined. The 'too' (*api*) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel." To this explanation of *api*, as simply equivalent with *ca*, we must demur. As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

---

41. *udāttād anantare yaḥ svaraḥ svaryate tasyā "dis tāvad uccāistarām udāttataro bhavati yāvad dhrasvasyā 'rdham. ya-thā: sá-----*

42. *hrasvārdhakālāc chesha udāttasamo bhavati: 'na tū 'dātta eva: samaçabdaprayogāt kimcin nyūnatvam pratīyate<sup>1</sup>: anyathā svaritābhāvāt. pūrvoktam evo 'dāharaṇam.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after *bhavati*.



which it occurs, it is always best translated by 'even,' as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected.

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers *sákhā sákhībhyo várivah kṛṇotu* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>: all the MSS. except W. give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies; the second syllable of each has the enclitic *svarita*, and they are to be read and divided *sá-khīb-bhyo vá-rì-vaḥ*), and *tishyàḥ* (ii.2.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: but G. M. omit this example).

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached. Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection. It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone.

अनन्तरो वा नीचैस्तराम् ॥ ४४ ॥

44. Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone.

The comment explains *anantara* in this rule as equivalent to *çesha* (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that "the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41], is in a lower tone; that is, is *anudāttatara* ('lower than grave')." Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being "of the same tone with acute" (rule 42), is "of lower tone (than acute)," may well be made a question. It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave. The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding.

43. *kevalasyā 'yam vidhiḥ purastād uktah: idānīm vyañjanasahitatve 'pi 'svaritasya tathātvam ucyate: 'savyañjano 'pi 'svarita 'udāttād anantaro' 'nyo 'vo 'ktavidhir' bhavati: apiçabdah' 'svaritam ākarshati'. yathā: sakhā-...: ti.*

(1) W. om. (2) W. -ttānant-. (3) W. *vā mukhyā vi-*. (4) B. om. (5) G. M. -tākarshakah.

44. *tasya svaritasya hrasvārdhakālāc chesho nīcāistarām anudāttataro' bhavati: anantarah çesha ity arthah: tad evo 'dāharanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -dāttaro.



अनुदात्तसमो वा ॥ ४५ ॥

45. Or in the same tone with grave.

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the *vā*, 'or'): "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with *anudatta*."

आदिरस्योदात्तसमः शेषो ऽनुदात्तसम इत्याचार्याः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Its beginning is the same with acute; its remainder is the same with grave: so say the teachers.

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher,' the plural being used in token of respect: the word *ācārya* is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv.6) except in the expression *ekeshām ācāryāṅām*, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times. The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (*ishta*, literally 'desired') in the net-work (*jāla*) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41. It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent. The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists. The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx.), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules.

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx., which define the relation of

45. *tasya*<sup>1</sup> *svaritasya sa eva ṣesho 'nudāttasamo bhavati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

46. *tasyāi 'va svaritasyā "dirasvārdhakāla udāttasamo bhavati: 'ṣeshas tv anudāttasamo bhavati<sup>1</sup>: ṣeshas tv anudāttasamā ity ācāryā bruvate. yathā: sakh-.... tasyā "dir (i.41) ity ādyabhyāhite<sup>2</sup> 'smin vikalpajāles sūtram etad eve 'shtam: pra-ḥlishṭaprātikhatayor mṛdutarah (xx.11): tāirovyañjanapādavṛttayor (xx.12) iti lakṣhaṇānukūlyāt: na tū 'paritanam api sūtram ishtam: etallakṣhaṇaprātikūlyād eva.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. omit, which is better. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *ārabhyā 'bhīhite*; B. *ābhyahita* (?—corrupt). (<sup>3</sup>) W. B. *-lpya-* (*lppa?*); W. *-jāte*.



four of the kinds of circumflex to one another in respect to hardness of utterance, the commentator rejects in advance the next following rule, as being discordant with them. The ground of the asserted accordance and discordance I am not able to discover.

सर्वः प्रवण इत्येके ॥ ४७ ॥

47. It is all a slide, say some.

The commentator says: "The word 'slide' (*pravana*) is a synonym of 'circumflex:' the circumflexed vowel, along with its consonants, starting from its beginning, is all of it a slide: so some teachers have said." And he adds the same example already more than once given, *sâkhibhyo vârivah* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>). We have seen that, in his exposition of the preceding precept, he has rejected this one, upon grounds of inappreciable value. The view here taken is one that might well enough be held by any one, as virtually equivalent with the one before presented: the voice somehow makes its descent from the higher to the lower pitch within the compass of the accented syllable; whether by a leap or a slide, is a proper theme for hair-splitting argumentation, but of the smallest practical consequence.

नानापद्वदिङ्गमसंख्यानै ॥ ४८ ॥

48. A separable word is treated like separate words, except in an enumeration.

The meaning and application of this precept may be best exhibited by means of the examples which the commentator quotes. We have a rule (iv.40) that *te* and *the* at the end of a word of more than two syllables are *pragraha* if preceded by *â* or *e*. In the passages *oshatât tigmahete* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>) and *tat pravâte* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>), then, the final syllables would be *pragraha*, but that the words in which they occur are separable compounds, written in the *pada*-text *tigma-hete* and *pra-vâte*, and so are exempted by this rule from the

47. *pravanaçabdah<sup>1</sup> svaritaparyâyah: savyañjana eva svarita âdita ârabhya sarvah pravano bhavatî 'ty eka<sup>2</sup> âcâryâ ûcire. yathâ: sakh<sup>3</sup>-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. has *pranava* for *pravana* everywhere. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> M. *sarvebhyo*.

48. *iñgyapadam nânâpadavad bhavati: asaṁkhyânavishaye<sup>1</sup>: nânâpadavad iti kim: osh-----: tat---- ity âdâv âkârdîkâ-rapûrvas tu bahusvarasya te the (iv.40) ity atra<sup>2</sup> pragrahatvam mâ bhûd iti: asaṁkhyâna iti kim: dve: paraç ca: ekavyaveto 'pi (iv.49-51): <sup>3</sup> dve sav----- ity atra pragrahatvam bhavatu<sup>4</sup> iti vadâmah. nânâpadam iva nânâpadavat.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-ne vish-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *prabhavatu*.



operation of iv.40: the *te* is in each case the ending of a dissyllabic word. What is meant by "enumeration" is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word. The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv.49–51, the word *dve*, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made *pragraha*: hence, in the passage *dve savane çukravatî* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>), *çukravatî* (*pada*-text *çukra-vatî*) must be counted as a single word only, or the *î* of *vatî* would not be *pragraha*.

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prâtiçâkhyas, the word *îngya* (T. W. B. and O. more usually write *îngya*, or *înya*) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the *pada*-text. The St. Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound.

Compare Rik Pr. i.25, and Vâj. Pr. i.153.

तस्य पूर्वपदमवग्रहः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. Of such a word, the former member is called *avagraha*.

The example quoted is *devâyata iti deva-yate* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>)—an instance of *carcâ*, or repetition with *iti* interposed, such as is usual in the *krama*-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the *pada*-texts also. The existing *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply *deva-yate*, reserving the repetition with *iti* for words which are *pragraha* and separable at the same time: but that of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath. Pr. iv.74). In *deva-yate*, the part *deva* is denominated *avagraha*. As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv.2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing *pragraha*.

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words *pada* and *avagraha* in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine): compare under ii.7 and v.2.

The other Prâtiçâkhyas use the term *avagraha* in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it.

पदग्रहणेषु पदं गम्येत ॥ ५० ॥

50. In citations of a word, that word is to be understood.

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

49. <sup>1</sup>*tasye 'ngyapadasya pûrvapadam avagraha<sup>1</sup> ity ucyate. yathâ: dev-..... avagrahasamjñâyâḥ<sup>2</sup> prayojanam: nâ 'va-grahaḥ (iv.2) ity âdi. padâvagrahaçabdayor niyatalingatvânnyonyânvayaḥ<sup>3</sup> sambhavati.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om.    (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. om. *avagraha*.    (<sup>3</sup>) W. *niyamal*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## अप्यकारादि ॥ ५२ ॥

52. And even when preceded by *a*.

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix *a* attached to them. But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working. By iii.2, *çvâ* is included among the words whose final *â* is liable to be shortened; then, by this rule, *açvâ* is also included: e. g. *açvâvantañ* (p. *açva-vantam*) *sa-hasrinam* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>).

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under iii.2,8; v.13,16; vi.5,14; viii.8,13; xi.16; xvi.6,19).

## अन्कारादि च ॥ ५३ ॥

53. And when preceded by *an*.

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent: it is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules iii.7, viii.8, and xvi.29). The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example. The word *añçu*, by xvi.29, contains *anusvâra*; hence the same word preceded by *an* is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage *anañçu kurvantaḥ* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator now raises the question: how comes *kâra* to

52. *atrâ 'py apiçabdaḥ padânvâdeçakah: padagrahaṇeshv akârâdy<sup>1</sup> apî<sup>2</sup> padam vijñeyam: 'çvartâvayunâ (iii.2) iti hrasvâdeçe vakshyati: akârâder api tasya grahaṇasya hrasvatvam bhavati. yathâ: açv-..... akâra âdir yasya tat tathoktam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -diç. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ca. <sup>3</sup> G. M. prefixes the preceding three words of the cited rule.

53. *cakârah padam iti bodhayati: padagrahaṇeshv ankârâdy api padam vijñeyam: añçu (xvi.29) ity anusvârâgame vakshyati: ankârâder api tasyâ 'nusvârâgamah syât. yathâ: an-..... ankâra âdir yasya tat tathoktam.*

*nanv atra sûtire 'n ity asya kârottaratvam katham kriyate: varṇah kârottarah (i.16) iti 'sûtire varṇasya<sup>1</sup> kârottaratvavi-dhânabhaṅgaprasaṅgât. ucyate: satyam<sup>2</sup> etacchâstrabalân<sup>3</sup> na kriyate: kim tu çâstrântarabalât<sup>3</sup> kriyate: yathâ: pâninîyâ<sup>4</sup> evakâra apikâra<sup>4</sup> ityâdînam sâdhutvam kathayanti: evam atrâ 'pi evam aḥkâra âgama (i.23) ity atra<sup>5</sup> codyaparihârâu vijñeyâu.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. varṇaçabdasya. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. tasya. (<sup>3</sup>) B. om. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. evakâre 'pi.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. atrâ 'pi.



be added here to the syllable *an*? since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that *kâra* is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name. His answer is: true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book; but it is done by the authority of other text-books; for example, Pânini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as *evakâra*, *apikâra* (for the words *eva* and *api*). So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have *aḥkâra* for *aḥ*; and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there. See the note under rule 16.

एकवर्णः पदमपृक्तः ॥ ५४ ॥

54. A single sound composing a word is called *apṛkta*.

The commentator explains *ekavarṇaḥ* after the fashion usual with him in treating a *karmadhâraya* or determinative compound: "that is both single (*eka*) and a sound (*varṇa*); hence, a single sound." The term *apṛkta* means, he says, 'uncombined with a consonant.' As example of an *apṛkta* word, he quotes *sa uv ekaviñçavartaniḥ* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), where *uv* is, by rule ix.16, representative of the particle *u*; and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification "composing a word," *yajñapatâzv iti* (vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>), where *v*, though in a manner isolated, is not *apṛkta*, being only a fragment of a word. Rule ix.16 exemplifies the use of the term.

आद्यन्तवच्च ॥ ५५ ॥

55. And is treated both as initial and as final.

As an instance of the treatment of an *apṛkta* word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage *sa uv ekaviñçavartaniḥ* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G. M. have here a *lacuna*, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

---

54. *ekaç câ 'sâu varṇaç câi* <sup>1</sup> 'kavarṇaḥ: *sa cet padam bhavati so 'pṛktaḥ* <sup>2</sup> *syât. yathâ: sa----- padam iti kim: yaj----- sam-jñâyâḥ prayojanam: ukâro 'pṛktaḥ prakṛtyâ* <sup>3</sup> (ix.16) *iti. apṛkta iti vyañjanenâ 'sam'yuta* <sup>4</sup> *ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> B. ins. *sa.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-ktasamjña.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. add the remaining two words of the cited rule. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-yukta.*

55. *cakârânvâdishtam tad apṛktasamjñam padam âdyantavac* <sup>1</sup> *ca kâryabhâg bhavati. âdivad yathâ: sa---- ity atra* <sup>2</sup> *tasyâ "dir uccâistarâm* (i.41) *iti kâryam bhavati: antavad yathâ: o te---- ity atrâ* <sup>3</sup> *'ntaḥ* (iv.3) *iti pragrahakâryam* <sup>3</sup> *bhavati. âdiç câ 'ntaç câ "dyantâu: tâv ivâ "dyantavat.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *âdivad ant.* <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-ho.*



the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound—indeed, teaches no *kāryam*, ‘effect,’ at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage *o te yanti* (i.4.33), in which *o* is *pragraha*; with reference to rule iv.3, which teaches that only a final vowel is *pragraha*.

With this rule and the preceding compare Vâj. Pr. i.151–2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rik Pr. does not define the term *aprakta*, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, *indre*”’*hi* (*indra: á: ihi*), analogous with the one (*bhakshe*”’*hi*, iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>) quoted below, under v.3.

## वर्णस्य विकारलोपो ॥ ५६ ॥

56. Alteration and omission are of a single sound.

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v.19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, *dhārsháhāu* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>: by rule v.10); of omission, *sa te jānāti* (i.2.14<sup>2-3</sup>: by rule v.15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix.7).

## विनाशो लोपः ॥ ५७ ॥

57. Omission is complete loss.

As example of *lopa*, ‘omission,’ the commentator quotes the passage *sa im ’andrā suprayasaḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>1-2</sup>), where the initial *m* of *mandrā* is lost after *im* (by rule v.12: see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v.11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: “some have maintained the eternity of sound: in order to the confutation of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar.” Pāṇini’s corresponding precept (i.1.60) is *adarṣanam lopah*, ‘omission is disappearance from view.’

---

56 *varṇamātrasya vikāralopāu syātām na tu sarvasya padasya. vikāras tāvāt: dhū- iti: ’lopas tu’: sa . . . .*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. om. B. omits this whole comment, along with the following rule.

57. *varṇavināṣo<sup>1</sup> lopasamjño bhavati. yathā: sa . . . . samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: atha lopah (v.11) ity ādi. varṇasya nityatām kecid āhuḥ: tannirākaraṇāya vyākaraṇānusāreṇa sūtram etad abhāni.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *varṇasya v-*.



## अन्वदिशो ऽन्त्यस्य ॥ ५८ ॥

58. Continued implication is of that which was last.

The term *anvâdeça*, 'after-indication,' with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially *anvâkarshaka*, *âkarshaka*, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator's first example is entirely accordant with this understanding: in rule vii.3, namely, to the effect that the *n* of *hanyât* and *upyamânam* is changed to *ṇ*, the implication is "after *niḥ*," *niḥ* being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept: rule xv.8 says, "a, however, even in *saṃhitâ* [is protracted and nasalized];" and it is to be understood that only a "last" or "final" *a* is intended—as in *suçlokâñ3* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), protracted from *suçloka*; while in *brahmâzn tvañ râjan* (i.8.16<sup>1,2</sup>), *agnâz ity âha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>), *vicityaḥ somâz na vicityâz iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>), where the words protracted are *brahman*, *agne*, *somaḥ*, and *vicityaḥ*, and the *a* is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation: no rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv.3 and xv.8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an "affecting cause" (*nimitta*), like the *niḥ* brought forward from vii.2 to vii.3 in the first example, and an "affected" word or element (*nimittin*, 'having a cause'), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with *lakshya*, used in the comment to i.22) he defines as "something original (? *pradhâna* seems to be taken here in the sense of *prakṛti*) suffering a prescribed effect."

No one of the other Prâtiçâkhyas attempts to lay down any rules as to the *anvâdeça* (or *anuvṛtti*); and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the *sûtra* style of composition, because the *sûtras* are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

---

58. *nimittasya nimittino vâ 'ntyasyâ 'nvâdeço bhavati: nimittî 'ti pradhânam<sup>1</sup> kâryabhâg iti yâvat. nimittasya yathâ: hanyâd upyamânam ca (vii.3) ity asyâ 'tra<sup>2</sup> niḥçabdasya. nimittino yathâ: akâras tu sañhitâyâm api (xv.8) ity atra suçlokâñ3<sup>3</sup> ity antyasyâ 'kârasya: antyasye 'ti kim: brah-.....: ag-.....: vic-.....*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*nâm*; G. M. -*na*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om. all the signs of protraction.



## उपबन्धस्तु देशाय नित्यम् ॥ ५९ ॥

59. An *upabandha*, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect.

The commentator etymologizes *upabandha*, 'connection, tie,' as representing the meaning *upabadhyate*, 'it is tied up, bound to;' and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication "in that," and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv.22,23,48,52 as examples. An *upabandha*, then, is a connected part of the Sanhitâ, pointed out and defined by the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya in various ways: by citing the first words of a single verse (iv.20) or of an *anuvâka* (iv.25,48; xi.3); by the accepted title of a number of *anuvâkas*, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii.9,11; iv.52; ix.20; xi.3); by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv.22,23); or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv.52). Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things: first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule;—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases.'

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application. But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character. He tells us that the passage *ity âha devî hy eshâ devaḥ somaḥ* (vi.1.7<sup>7</sup>) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i.61), under the action of rule iv.25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it. The meaning is this: the passage quoted contains a series of four words, *ity âha devî hi*, which are also found at ii.6.7<sup>5</sup> (*devî devaputre ity âha devî hy ete devaputre*); and, as the *î* of *devî* in the latter passage is *pragraha* by iv.25, so, under the operation of i.61, it should be *pragraha* also in the other. Such, however, is not the case; for *devî* in *devî hy eshâ* is singular, while in *devî hy ete* it is dual. It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta-

---

59. *upabandhas tu svadeçâyâi 'va nityam nirdeçako bhavati: upabadhyata<sup>1</sup> ity upabandhaḥ: etasminn ity<sup>2</sup> adhikaraṇarûpaḥ saṁkhyânavishayaç ca pradeça upabandha ity ucyate. yathâ: irâvatî (iv.22) ity âdi sâtradvayam: somâya svai 'tasmin (iv.48): gamayato bhavataḥ (iv.52) iti ca. upabandhe yad uktam tad anyatra na bhavatî 'ti tuçabdârthaḥ<sup>3</sup>. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: ity.....: atra tripadaprabhṛtinyâyena (i.61) pûrvajeprabhṛty â'yam (iv.25) iti prâptiḥ. anyatra yo nishedhaḥ sa upabandhe na bhavatî 'ti nityaçabdârthaḥ. yathâ: sadohavirdhâne (iv.11) iti pragraho grahîshyate: kevalahavirdhâna<sup>5</sup> iti sarvathâ<sup>6</sup>*



tor to maintain that the present rule annuls the application of i.61, and, through it, of iv.25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible: for rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced; and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, *devî* at vi.1.77 is *pragraha* according to the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted: and the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an *upabandha* passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i.61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by *nityam*.

Further, the citation in rule iv.11 of the compound *sadoha-virdhâne* as *pragraha* implies that the simple word *havirdhâne* would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage *havirdhâne khyâyante* (vi.2.11<sup>1</sup>); but this implication does not hold in the passage *havirdhâne prâcî pravartayeyuh* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>), because of the inclusion of the latter among the *upabandhas* of rule iv.52. Here, however, is brought up an objection: the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an *upabandha* passage. For instance, in the passage *atha mithunî bhavatah* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>), the word *mithunî*, which would else be *pragraha* by iv.52, is made otherwise by iv.53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by *vâyava ârohanavâhau* (v.6.21), where *vâyave* ought to be *pragraha*, because occurring in the *anuvâka* to which iv.48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv.54. The answer is made, that in the case of *grâmî*, *vâyave*, *manave*, and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention; while the exception of *havirdhâne* is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good: specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

---

*na pragraho grhyate: yathâ<sup>7</sup>: hav-... ity ayam atra<sup>8</sup> nishedhah: hav-... ity atra na prasarati: gamayato bhavatah (iv.52) ity âdinâ prâptih. nanv etad anupapannam: anyatra nishedhasya kvacid upabandhe 'pi darçanât: yathâ: atha-... ity atra gamayato bhavatah (iv.52) ity upabandhaprâptir na grâmî (iv.53) ity âdinâ 'nyatra<sup>9</sup> nishedhena nishidhyate: tathâ<sup>10</sup>: vây-... ity atra somâya sva (iv.48) iti prâptir ate samânapada (iv.54) ity anenâ 'nyatra nishedhena nishidhyate. atro 'cyate: grâmî vâyave manava ity âdinâm kaṇṭhoktatvâd esha nishedhah prasaratu<sup>11</sup> kevalahavirdhâne<sup>12</sup> pragraho<sup>13</sup> ne 'ty ârthiko nishedho na prasaraty eva: ârthikakaṇṭhoktayoh kaṇ-*



But this suggests a further objection: why then is not the specific mention of *ate* and *ave* in rule iv.54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word *nityam*, 'in all cases,' in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding: the specific mention merely annuls the application of the *upabandha* rule; the addition of *nityam* avoids the application of any other rule. For example, in *dve jāye vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>), *vindate* should be *pragraha* (by rule iv.51), because separated by only one word from *dve*; and in *vanaspate vīdvañgah* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), the same character would belong to *vanaspate* (by iv.38) because followed by *vīd*—and we are left to infer that the *nityam* renders rule iv.54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the *pragraha* character of the two words in question. This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued; it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Mâhisheya.

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point. The term *upabandha* is doubtless better understood actively, as representing *teno 'pabadhyate*, 'that whereby there is binding up:' the presence of *deçāya* in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation. The intent of the specification *nityam* is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the *upabandha* passages: and such are iv.53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading. The force which the commentator ascribes to the *tu* of the rule belongs rather to *deçāya*, and the *tu* has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before.

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon. The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv.54).

## नानापदीयं च निमित्तं प्रग्रहादिषु ॥ ६० ॥

60. Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a *pragraha* or of a word containing *anusvāra*.

*ṭhoktasya prābalyāt. nanv ate ave (iv.54) ity anayoḥ kaṇṭhoktyāi 'vā 'lam: tatra nityagrahanena kim. ucyate: nitarām parihārah: kaṇṭhoktir upabandhaprāptim eva nivartayati nityaṣabdas tu prāptyanṭaram api pariharati: yathā: dve . . . ity atra ekavyaveto 'pi (iv.51) iti prāptih: van . . . iti <sup>14</sup> vīd (iv.38) ādiprāptih: evam ādy ūhanīyam<sup>15</sup>. mâhisheyamatānusāreṇai 'vam prapañcitam.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *upanibadhyata*. <sup>2</sup> W. *itya*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *tu*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *kevalam hav-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sarvadhā*. <sup>7</sup> W. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *anyatra*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *yathā*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-rati*. <sup>12</sup> B. *kevalam h-*. <sup>13</sup> W. *-he*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *-niyamam*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



the *avagraha* pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound: as, *ardha-māse*. On the other hand, the cause (*nimitta*) of alteration of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different *pada* from the letter it affects, is efficient only in *saṃhitā*: for example, *ḡucishad iti ḡuci-sat* (iv.2.1<sup>5</sup>), and *pravāhana iti pra-vāhanaḥ* (i.3.3): and this is the occasion of the rule.

I see no reason why this rule does not need to apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (*ṇ*) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter.

यथोक्तं पुनरुक्तं त्रिपदप्रभृति त्रिपदप्रभृति ॥ ६१ ॥

61. A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established.

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs: if repeated in a later part of the *Sanhitā*, where other rules, there applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence.

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator. In the third chapter (*praçna*) of the first book (*kāṇḍa*) of the *Sanhitā* occurs the phrase *devasya tvā savituḥ prasave ḡvinoḥ* (i.3.1<sup>1</sup>: but the same phrase is found also twice before, at i.1.4<sup>2,6</sup>), and the initial *a* of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi.1; hence, when it occurs again in a *vājapeya* passage (namely at i.7.10<sup>3</sup>), where, by xi.3, the elision of the *a* is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads as before. Again, the words *supathā rāye asmān* are first found at i.1.14<sup>3</sup>, where, as the *anuvāka* is a *yājyā*, the *a* of *asmān* remains unelided by xi.3; and when they occur again at i.4.43<sup>1</sup>, that letter still maintains its place. Once more, the phrase *sa jāto garbho asi rodasyoḥ* is read at iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>, and again at v.1.5<sup>3-4</sup>; the former time in an *ukhya* passage, where the *a* of *asi* is retained by xi.3; and it is therefore retained in the other passage also.

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it). In support of this limitation, he cites a case: at iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>, in an *ukhya* passage, occur

61. *trayāṅām padānām samāhāras tripadam: kāryabhājah padasya tr̥tīyatvam vijñeyam: idṛçam tripadam: tat<sup>1</sup> prabhṛty ādir yasya tat tripadaprabhṛti yathoktam pūrvoktam vidhiṃ karoti svaviçeshanam<sup>2</sup> yatra<sup>3</sup> tripadaprabhṛti punaruktam cet. tathā: <sup>4</sup> lupyate tv akāra ekāraukārapūrvah (xi.1) ity anena prathamakāṇḍatr̥tīyapraçne dev----- ity atrā 'kāre lupte tad eva vākyaṃ vājapeye 'py alopam bādhitvā tathāi 'va bhavati: tripadaprabhṛtivr̥t. ubhā vām (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>) ity atra sup----- ity etad ud u tyam jātavedasam (i.4.43<sup>1</sup>) ity atrā 'pi tathāi*



the words *pr̥thivîm anu ye antarikshe ye divi tebhyah* (W. B. omit the first two words of the citation), and the *a* of *antarikshe* is left unelided by xi.3; but at iv.5.11<sup>2</sup> (in the last *anuvâka* of the chapter called *rudra*: see rule xi.3) we read *ye pr̥thivyâm ye 'ntarikshe ye divi* (W. B., again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give *ye ant-*)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial *a* in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are *pâvako asmabhyam* (v.4.4<sup>5</sup> and iv.6.1<sup>3,5</sup>), *preddho agne* (v.4.7<sup>3</sup> and iv.6.5<sup>4</sup>), and *dadhikrâvno akârisham* (vii.4.19<sup>4</sup> and i.5.11<sup>4</sup>). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say: but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lamer work of defending. The term *tripadaprabhrti* means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words *divas pari prathamam jajñe agnir asmat* (W. B. omit *asmat*) occur at i.3.14<sup>4</sup>, in a *yâjyâ* passage, where *agniḥ* keeps its initial vowel by xi.3; again, the words *itaḥ prathamam jajñe agniḥ* are found at ii.2.4<sup>8</sup>: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of *agniḥ* founded upon it; but it is not proper to claim that the retention of *a* here has this ground; it is due to the inclusion (in rule xi.16) of *jajñe* among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the Sanhitâ no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed; and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

---

'va. <sup>5</sup> *saṁ te vâyur* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>) *ity atra sa . . . . ity etat krâram*  
*iva* (v.1.5<sup>1</sup>) *ity atrâ 'pi tathâi 'va. brâhmaṇavâkyeshu tu<sup>6</sup> tri-*  
*padamâtrâd vâ kâryam bhavati: brâhmaṇavâkyeshu pûrvastha-*  
*lasyâi<sup>7</sup> 'vo 'kteh<sup>8</sup>: yathâ: imâm agr̥bhṇan raçanâm<sup>9</sup>*  
*(iv.1.2<sup>1</sup>) ity atra mar . . . . ity etad vâkyam<sup>10</sup> ut krâma* (v.1.3<sup>1</sup>)  
*ity atrâ 'pi tathâi 'va bhavati. kâryabhâjah padasya tr̥tîyatvam*  
*iti kim: pr̥th . . . . ity<sup>11</sup> ukhye: ye . . . . iti rudrottamânuvâke.*  
*prabhrtî 'ti kim: tvam agne rudrah* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>) *iti yâjyâyâm*  
*divas . . . . iti vâkyam agnaye 'nnavate* (ii.2.4<sup>1</sup>) *ity atra*



interpretation of the word *tripadaprabhṛti* (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi.16 from the charge of repetition in a single point: we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered, by i.61 was overlooked.

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the *brāhmaṇa*-passages (*brāhmaṇavākya*) of the Sanhitâ a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the *brāhmaṇa*-passages of a previously-occurring phrase:" that is to say, because the prose part of the Sanhitâ is to so great an extent occupied with citing and commenting on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule. Thus, the words *maryaṣṛī sprhayad varṇo agniḥ* are quoted at v.1.3<sup>3</sup> (with the customary addition, *ity āha*), from the previous passage iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>: and although the *nābhim* which follows *agniḥ* at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a *tripadaprabhṛti* according to the commentator's construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the *a* of *agniḥ* has a right to stand

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one; it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere; in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern *niṭyam*, 'against all opposition,' the reading of the passage to which it relates.

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter. Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts; and, as it is thus farther ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the Prâtiçâkhyâ. G. M. repeat the whole rule in this case.

*itah . . . . iti punaruktam: tat<sup>12</sup> tathâi 'vâ 'bhavad<sup>13</sup> iti cet: mâi 'vam: tripadamâtrâd<sup>14</sup> eva tathâbhâva<sup>15</sup> iti<sup>16</sup> vaktum na yuktam: kim tu jajñe sañsphânaḥ (xi.16) iti jajñegrahaṇasâmarthyât: <sup>17</sup>anyathâ tasya<sup>18</sup> vâiyarthiyât<sup>17</sup>.*

*padavîpsâ<sup>19</sup> 'dhyâyaparisisamâptim dyotayati.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane  
prathamô 'dhyâyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -*nâya*; G. M. -*sheṇa*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *idam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *hi*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *tathâ*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *pûrvasyâi*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. '*ktah*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *ebhya*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. om. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *syâd*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *tripadâd*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *tathâ bhavatu*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>(17)</sup> W. om. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *tasyâi 'va*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *padâvrttyâ*.



## CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS: 1-11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of surd and sonant sounds, etc.; 12-29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs; 30, nasals; 31-34, difference of vowels and consonants; 35-39, mode of production of mutes; 40-43, of semivowels; 44-45, of spirants; 46-48, of *h* and *ḥ*; 49-52, of nasal sounds.

## अथ शब्दोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

## 1. Now for the origin of sound.

For the word *atha* in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations: it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand. Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule i.1. He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself. *Çabda* he explains by *dhvani*: both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xxii.1,2; xxiii.3). He paraphrases: “of the articulate sounds, *a* etc., the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, the apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description.” We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under i.57: our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light.

1. *ukto varṇasamāmnāyah: teshām varṇānām kīdrk<sup>1</sup> kāra-*  
*nam<sup>2</sup> katham vā tadupalabdhir ity ākāṅkshānantaram<sup>3</sup> nirūpyata*  
*ity ānantaryārtho 'thaçabdah. atha vā: ita uttaram yad vaksh-*  
*yate tac çabdotpattir ity etad<sup>4</sup> adhikṛtam veditavyam ity adhikā-*  
*rārthah. çabdo nāma dhvaniḥ: varṇānām akārādīnām upādā-*  
*nakāraṇam<sup>5</sup> tadutpattir<sup>6</sup> janma upalabdhir vā: yatho 'dakasya*  
*'darçanāt pūrvam eva bhāmāu jalam asty eva tat khaṇanād<sup>7</sup> drç-*  
*yate tadvat<sup>7</sup>: se 'yam ucyata<sup>9</sup> iti sūtrārthah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *kidrçam*. <sup>2</sup> W. *karaṇam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *tan*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> B. *-karaṇam*.  
<sup>6</sup> G. M. *tasya ut-*. <sup>7</sup> W. B. om. <sup>8</sup> MSS. *khaṇanā*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *ārabhyata*.



## वायुशरीरसमीरणत्कण्ठोरसोः संधाने ॥ २ ॥

2. By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast.

The first part of this rule (literally, 'from air-body-impulsion') is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni ('fire, warmth'—'heat of the body?'), he says, impels Vāyu ('air, wind'); that is what "air-body" means (but how?). From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsion, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Çikshâ (verses 8–9 of the Yajus version, verses 6–7 of the Rik version: see Weber's Ind. Stud., iv.350–1): "the mind impels the body-fire; that sets in motion air; and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone." Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation: but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of *vāyu-çarîra*, namely 'air-and-body:': "from the impulsion of those two." Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that *vāyu-çarîra* means 'the air in the body,' the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of *râjadanta*, 'upper incisor' (literally, 'king-tooth'—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, 'tooth-king, chief among the teeth'), and the other words composing that *gaṇa* (to Pân. ii.2.31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after *vāyu*; *çarîra-samîrana* meaning an 'impulsion by the body,' and *vāyu* being prefixed in a genitive relation, 'of the air.' This is harsh, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.

2. *vāyum agniḥ samîrayatî 'ti vāyuçarîram: tathâbhûtât samîranât: preranâd abhighâtâd<sup>1</sup> ity arthaḥ: kaṇṭhorasoḥ saṁdhâne madhyadeçe çabdopattir bhavatî 'ti<sup>2</sup>: çikshâ cāi 'vam astî 'ti<sup>3</sup>: manah kâyâgnim<sup>4</sup> âhanti<sup>5</sup> sa<sup>6</sup> prerayati mârutam<sup>7</sup>: mârutas tû 'rasi caran mandram janayati<sup>8</sup> svaram itis. vāyuç ca çarîram ca vāyuçarîre: tayoh samîranam: tasmât<sup>9</sup>. anye tv âhuḥ: vāyoh çarîre sataḥ samîranam: <sup>10</sup>tasmâc çabdopattir iti: tatre<sup>11</sup> 'ttham samâsaḥ: râjadantâditvâc charîrasya<sup>12</sup> paranipâtaḥ: çarîre vāyur<sup>13</sup> vāyuçarîram: tasya samîranam<sup>10</sup>: tasmât. asmin mate vāyoh samîranakartrtvam eva na tu karma-tvam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *abhipâ-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-gni*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *kânti*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sam*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(8)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *vāyuçarîrasamîranât*. <sup>(10)</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *atre*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-raçabdasya*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om.



Compare with what is taught by our treatise here and later (xxii.1,2; xxiii.1-3) Vâj. Pr. i.6-9; Rik Pr. xiii.1.

तस्य प्रातिश्रुत्कानि भवन्त्युरः कण्ठः शिरो मुखं  
नासिके इति ॥ ३ ॥

3. The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils.

The commentator explains *prâtiçrutkâni* as signifying 'the places of production (*sthânâni*), having to do with the resonance (*prâtiçrut=pratidhvani*, 'resonance'), of the aforesaid sound (*çabda*).' He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow. But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, surd, and *h*-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind.

The Çikshâ (v.13: Weber's Ind. Stud. iv.351) makes an enumeration of eight *sthânas*, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the "mouth" of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate.

संवृते कण्ठे नादः क्रियते ॥ ४ ॥

4. When the throat is closed, tone is produced.

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term *nâda*, 'tone,' and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (*kha*) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone. Compare also Vâj. Pr. i.11. It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat; but precisely how accurate a knowledge

3. *tasya prakṛtasya<sup>1</sup> çabdasyo 'raḥprabhṛtîni sthânâni<sup>2</sup> bhavanti: prâtiçrut<sup>3</sup> pratidhvaniḥ: <sup>4</sup>tatsambandhîni prâtiçrutkâni<sup>4</sup>.<sup>5</sup> samvṛte kaṇṭhe nâdaḥ kriyate (ii.4) etadâdinâ sūtratrāyena çabdatrâividhyam<sup>6</sup> ucyate: nâdaḥ<sup>7</sup> çvâso hakâraç ce 'ti: tâvan nâdalakṣhaṇam âha<sup>8</sup> <sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *prakṛti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *prâtiçrutkâni*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-çrutkâ*. <sup>(4)</sup> W. om. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. insert this (excepting the rule) at the beginning of the commentary to the next rule. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *çabdasya tr-*. <sup>7</sup> MSS. *nâda*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ucyate*.

4. *samvṛte kaṇṭhe yaḥ çabdaḥ kriyate sa nâdasamjño bhavati. samjñâdyâḥ<sup>1</sup> prayojanam: nâdo 'nupradânam (ii.8) iti<sup>2</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *nâdasam-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ity âdi*.



they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say.

विवृते श्वासः ॥ ५ ॥

5. When it is opened, breath is produced.

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term *çvāsa*, 'breath,' is ii.10.

मध्ये हकारः ॥ ६ ॥

6. When in an intermediate condition, the *h*-sound is produced.

*Madhye* is explained as meaning 'in a method intermediate between closed and opened:' the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is ii.9.

Of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, only that of the Rig-Veda sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath; and that (xiii.2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean. I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it. That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible. In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration; and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him.

ता वर्णप्रकृतयः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds.

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and *h*-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another. Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth.

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule. Since it is the office of a

5. *vivr̥te kaṇṭhe yaḥ çabdaḥ kriyate sa çvāsasaṁjño bhavati. saṁjñāyāḥ prayojanam: aghośeṣhu çvāsaḥ (ii.10) iti.*

6. *saṁvṛtavivṛtayor madhye madhyaprakāre yaḥ çabdaḥ kriyate sa hakārasaṁjño bhavati. saṁjñāyāḥ prayojanam: hakāro hacaturtheshv (ii.9) iti.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters. European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms "soft" and "hard," "weak" and "strong," and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view.

हकारो हचतुर्थेषु ॥ ९ ॥

9. In *h* and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is *h*-sound.

For the quality of this *h*-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr. (xiii.2,5: rules 6,17) connects in the same manner *h* and the "fourth" mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar *h*-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik Pr. hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Prâtiçâkhyas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of their marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the *h*-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last); but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since *h* and the "fourth" mutes are included (by i.13,14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

अघोषेषु श्वासः ॥ १० ॥

10. In surd consonants, it is breath.

Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule i.12.

9. *hakâraç<sup>1</sup> ca caturthâç ca hacaturthâh: teshu varṇeshu<sup>2</sup> hakâro 'nupradânam bhavati. nanu samjñâvidhânakramabhaṅga-prasaṅgân<sup>3</sup> nâ 'tre 'dam sūtram avatarati. ghoshavatsv iti sâmanyanâdo hacaturtheshu ca<sup>4</sup> prasajyata<sup>5</sup> ity atiprasaṅgaparihâ-rârthatvâd avataraty eve 'ti vadâmah<sup>6</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. haç. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. B. -bhaṅgân. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -jyeta. <sup>6</sup> G. M. vâdah.

10. *aghosheshu varṇeshu çvâso 'nupradânam bhavati<sup>1</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. omits rule and comment.



## भूयान्प्रथमेभ्यो ऽन्येषु ॥ ११ ॥

11. And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes.

Here *çvâsa*, 'breath,' is continued by implication from the preceding rule "in virtue of vicinage" (*sâmnidhyât*), as the commentator says (there being no *ca*, 'and,' in the rule, to indicate it directly). The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting *h*). There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inheres in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief emission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.6: rule 19) says "some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker"—an ambiguously indefinite expression.

## अवर्णे नात्युपसङ्कृतमोष्ठदन्तु नातिव्यस्तम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. In forming the *a*-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated.

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openness or of closeness in the utterance of *a* and *â*, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality. Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator; he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made: excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of *a*, and excessive separation in those of the long *â* and protracted *âz*. If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between *a* and *â* which is taught by the Ath. Pr. and Vâj. Pr. and by Pânini (see note to Ath. Pr. i.36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in *a* and over-closeness in *â*.

---

11. *sâmnidhyâc çhvâsa iti labhyate: prathamebhyo 'nyeshu aghosheshu çvâso<sup>1</sup> bhûyân adhiko bhavati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

12. *avarṇa uccâryamâṇa oshṭhahanu atyupasaṁhṛtam atisaṁ-  
çlishtam na bhavati: ativyastam ativivṛtam<sup>1</sup> ca na<sup>1</sup> bhavati.  
oshṭhâu ca hanû c' oshṭhahanu: dvandvaç ca prânitûryasenân-  
gânâm (Pân. ii.4.2) ity ekavadbhâvaḥ: tad etad<sup>2</sup> ekasminn ubha-  
yathâ na çakyate kartum iti yogavibhâgaḥ kâryaḥ<sup>3</sup>: akâre nâ<sup>4</sup>  
'tyupasaṁhṛtam âkâre ca<sup>5</sup> plute ca nâ<sup>5</sup> 'tivyastam iti.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. *na ca*. (<sup>2</sup>) W. *eva tad*; G. M. om. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. B. om. (<sup>4</sup>) W. G. *nâ*. (<sup>5</sup>) W. B. om.



The term *oṣṭhahanu*, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pāṇini (ii.4.2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound.

ओकारे च ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also in uttering *o*.

The “also” (*ca*) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule: this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips. In forming an *o*, then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated.

ओष्ठौ तूपसङ्कततरौ ॥ १४ ॥

14. But the lips are more nearly approximated.

“Vicinage” is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of *o*. The “but” (*tu*) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips: but Mâhisheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely-separated condition the *o* of such words as *bandhoḥ* (ii.5.87). This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the *o*, such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory. The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule i.2) from the category of simple vowels. The same, we shall see, is the case with *e* also.

इषत्प्रकृष्टावेकारे ॥ १५ ॥

15. In uttering *e*, they are slightly protracted.

---

13. *ca*kâro hanumâtrakâryânvâdeçakah: oṣṭhakâryasya parasûtreṇa viçeshavidhânât. okâra uccâryamâne hanû ativyaste na bhavataḥ.

14. *sâmnidhyâd okâra iti labhyate: okâre kârya oṣṭhâv<sup>1</sup> upasamhrtatarâu syâtâm: tuçabda oṣṭhayoḥ pûrvoktavidhim nivârayatî<sup>2</sup> 'ti vararucir uvâca. mâhisheyas tu babhâshe: bandhor ity âdikam okâram savyañjanam<sup>3</sup> vyastato<sup>4</sup> nivârayatî 'ti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *vâr*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyañj*-. <sup>4</sup> W. *vyes*-.



That “they” means the lips is, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective. *Prakṛshṭa*, ‘protracted,’ is glossed by *saṁnikṛshṭa*, ‘drawn down together, brought near.’

उपसङ्गतरे हनू ॥ १६ ॥

16. The jaws are more nearly approached.

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term *atiçayena*, ‘with excess.’

In the utterance of *e*, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule.

जिह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां चोत्तराञ्जम्ब्यान्त्स्पर्शयति ॥ १७ ॥

17. And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue.

The “and” (*ca*) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the *ekâra* of rule 15, “on the frog-leap principle”—that is to say, by overleaping the intervening rule. The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render *jambhyân* by ‘jaw-teeth, grinders.’ I cannot doubt that *jambhyân* is the true reading here, although the MSS. give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and *uttarân jambhyânt* is not once read: T. comes nearest to it, giving *uttarân jambhyâm*; W. has *uttarâ jambhyânt* in the rule, and *uttarâ jambhyân* and *jabhyân* in the comment; B., *uttarân jabhyât* in the rule, *uttarâ jabhyân* and *jambhyân* in the comment; G. and M., *uttarân jabhyâm* in the rule; G., *uttarâm jabhyâm* and *jambhyâm*, and M., *uttarân jabhyâm* and *jabhyâm*, in the comment. The verb *sparçayati* is equivalent to *sprçet*, the causative ending *nic* being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pân. iii.1.25), as in *pâlay* for *pâ*, and other like cases.

15. *prakṛshṭāv ity atra dvivacanena prakṛtāv oshṭhâu gr̥hyete: ekâre kârya oshṭhâv iṣhatprakṛshṭâu syâtâm. prakṛshṭatâ saṁnikṛshṭatâ.*

16. *sâminidhyâd ekâra iti labhyate: ekâre kârye hanû upasamhrtatare bhavataḥ. atiçayeno ’pasamhr̥te upasamhrtatare.*

17. *ekâre kârye jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm uttarân jambhyânt sparçayati sprçed ity arthaḥ: pâlayati<sup>1</sup> ’ty âdivat svârthe nic: jambhyân iti hanûmûlaprântadeçân<sup>2</sup> ity arthaḥ: maṇḍûkaplutinyâyena<sup>3</sup> cakâra ekâram âkarshati. jihvâyâ<sup>4</sup> madhyâm jihvâmadhyam: tasyâ ’ntâ<sup>4</sup>: tâbhyâm jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pâlây*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-çam*; W. *-ntaprade*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-kagaliny*-. <sup>(4)</sup> W. *madhya antâu*; B. *madhyasya anân*.



In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of *e*, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied; but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the "continental" sound of *e*, or that which it has in *they*, short in *met*. There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of *o*. A diphthongal utterance, however, as *ai*, *au* (in *aisle*, *house*), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath. Pr. i.40).

उपसङ्गततरे च जिह्वाग्रमृकार्कार्लकारिषु बस्वै-  
पूपसङ्हरति ॥ १८ ॥

18. The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in *r*, *ṛ*, and *l*.

The construction of this rule is very harsh: the subject *hanū*, 'jaws,' comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the *ca*, 'also;' while the second member starts off independently, "one approximates," with no connective to bind it to the other. These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation. The word *upasaṁharati*, 'approximates,' is glossed in the comment by *nikshipet*, 'let one throw down (or apply),' and *barsvās* is explained as 'the high places behind the row of teeth'—that is, the swelling of the inner gums.

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of *ṛ* and *l* in this rule into *r* and *l* after *a* (*ṛkâraralkâra*, from *ṛkâra-ṛkâra-lkâra*), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x.8: no case of the combination of *ṛ* and *l* occurring in the Sanhitâ, the Prâtiçâkhya makes no provision for it): he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other text-books; and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule i.31) of a like combination.

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives

18. *caçabdo hanvor<sup>1</sup> anvâdeçakah: ṛkâra ṛkâra lkâre ca kârye hanū<sup>2</sup> upasaṁhrtatare bhavataḥ: jihvâgram ca barsveshū 'pasamharati nikshipet: barsveshv iti dantapañkter uparishtâd uccapradeçeshv ity arthaḥ. nanv aram ṛkârapare (x.8) iti lakshaṇâ-sambhavâd<sup>3</sup> ṛkâraralkâreshv iti katham saṁdhiḥ sâdhuh. satyam nâi'tallakshaṇât: kim tu çâstrântarabalât<sup>4</sup>: evam ṛkâra-lkârâu hrasvâv (i.31) iti vijñeyam<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *hanvâr*; B. *h*; G. M. *hanor*. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-ṇas-*; B. *-ṇasamjñavâdâd*.  
<sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *sâdhuh*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *jñeyam*.



us for the utterance of the difficult *r* and *l* vowels. By i.2, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels. For the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting them, see note to Ath. Pr. i.37. However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi-vowels *r* and *l*, differing from them only as, for example, the *l* of *able* differs from that of *ably*, the *r* of (French) *aigre* from that of *aigri*. For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ. Am. Or. Soc. viii.362 seq.

## एकेषामनुस्वारस्वरभक्तयोश्च ॥ १९ ॥

19. As also, according to some, in *anusvâra* and *svara-bhakti*.

In this case, we are told, the “also” (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering *anusvâra*, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering the *svarabhakti*, according to the opinion of some; while others hold that *anusvâra* is simply nasal, and the *svarabhakti* (see xxi.15) equivalent to *r*. This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci’s explanation, and its truth is questionable. We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of “others.” The latter is perhaps most probable.

So far as regards *anusvâra*, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule; the definition of *svarabhakti* in connection with that of the *r*-vowels is natural enough.

## अनादेशे प्राणस्ता जिह्वा ॥ २० ॥

20. In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward.

When no such direction as “with the point of the tongue,” “with

---

19. *cakârah pûrvoktavidhim anvâdiçati: yathâsamkhyenâ<sup>1</sup> ’nusvârasvarabhaktyoḥ pûrvoktavidhir bhavati: anusvâre hanvor upasamhârah: svarabhaktâu jihvâgrasya barsveshû ’pasamhârah: etad ekeshâm matam. anyeshâm tu matam anusvârasyâ ’nunâsikamâtratvam: svarabhakter ṛkâratulyatvam. iti vararucimatam<sup>2</sup>: tac cintyam<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*khyo*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*ciracitam*. <sup>3</sup> W. *cityam*; B. *cânityam*.



the middle of the tongue” is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed. To explain *pranyastā*, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression “in a quiescent state;” as example, he cites *upa mā* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>: G. and M. spoil the citation by adding the following word, *dyāvāprthivī*), in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action. But this interpretation evokes a difficulty: “since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?” The reply is: *e* (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the *a* contained in that letter is of the same character; hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the *a*-quality, that *a* was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like *atha* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup> et al., if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes. To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as *a* in *e*, and that an *a* uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility. The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one; or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law.

## अकारवदोष्टौ ॥ २१ ॥

21. The lips are as in the utterance of *a*.

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, “in the absence of special direction.” The proper position of the lips for uttering *a* was given in rule 12, above. As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word *indrah* (*passim*); the southern manuscripts read instead *indriyāvaḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>).

20. *yatra jihvāgreṇa jihvāmadhyeṇe 'ty ādir<sup>1</sup> anādeṣas<sup>2</sup> tatra vishaye jihvā pranyastā tūshṇīmbhūtā<sup>3</sup> bhavati: prakarshena nyastā pranyasta<sup>4</sup>. yathā: upa----- nanv anādeṣe sarvakaraṇānām tūshṇīmbhāvasiddheḥ kimartha 'yam ārambhaḥ. ucyate: ekārasya jihvāmadhyāntanishpādyatvam<sup>5</sup> asti<sup>6</sup>: tadavayavasyā<sup>7</sup> 'kārasya tathātvam asti: akāratvasāmyād anyatrā 'py athe 'ty ādāu tathātvam prasajyeta: tac cā 'nisṭam: tan mā bhūd iti parihāraḥ. <sup>8</sup>nā 'deṣo 'nādeṣaḥ<sup>8</sup>: tasmin: upadeṣābhāva ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ādinā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *anupadeṣaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *-ṇībh-*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-dyamānatvam*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *astī 'ti*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>8</sup> W. *anvādeṣaḥ*; B. *anādeṣaḥ*.

21. *sāmnidhyād anādeṣa iti labhyate: oshṭhayor yatrā 'nādeṣas tatrā 'kāravād akāre yathā tath<sup>1</sup> oshṭhāu bhavataḥ: nā 'tyupa-samhṛtatarāv<sup>2</sup> ity arthaḥ. yathā: indra<sup>3</sup> iti.*

<sup>1</sup> MSS. *tathā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-hṛtāv*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *indriyāva*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



in the production of one sound. To get rid of this difficulty, a division must be made; the former description must be understood as applying to *e* by itself, and the present one to *e* combined with a consonant. How is this determination made? - Why, when we say in a general way "the letter *e*," it lies nearest, or is most natural, to understand that letter itself, without a consonant; hence, because of its prior suggestedness, the first definition belongs to it; and the other is left, to be applied to the same sound as combined with a consonant.

The utter artificiality of the answer to the second objection is too obvious to need pointing out; and even the first evokes more difficulties than it removes. There is no inconsistency whatever between rules 17 and 23, and we have reason to be surprised only at the repetition in the latter of what is implied already in the former. Rule 23 has the air of being an afterthought, slipped in, because of the really close relationship between *e* and *i*, with disregard of what had been taught before. The alleged difference of degree of approximation exists clearly enough, but would be very insufficiently intimated by a mere separation of one rule into two.

## ऋशोपसंहार उवर्णे ॥ २४ ॥

24. In the *u*-vowels, there is approximation of the lips.

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me. "Here," he says, "approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together" (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the *prakṛshtatā*, 'protraction,' of rule 15, which is there glossed by *samnikṛshtatā*?). "However, 'the lips drawn down together may be long'—this will be said hereafter" (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is

*jane tal lakṣhaṇam savyañjane tv etad iti. kuto 'yam niyamaḥ. ucyate: 'ekāra iti' sāmānyoktāu satyām<sup>10</sup> prathamam avyañjana-syāi<sup>10</sup> 'va grahaṇam mukhyam<sup>11</sup>: tathā sati prathamapratītes<sup>12</sup> tasmin prathamam lakṣhaṇam yujyate: savyañjane<sup>13</sup> pāriṣeshyād etad iti vijñeyam.*

(1) W. G. M. -*dhyāntāv*. (2) G. M. -*vyāu*. (3) G. M. -*tham*. (4) G. M. *ato*. (5) B. -*dhyāntābhyām nish-*; G. M. -*dhyānish-*. (6) G. M. om. (7) W. *nyasyāi*; B. *nye t-*. (8) G. M. om. (9) G. M. *ekārasya*. (10) B. *pratham av-*; G. M. -*nam vy-*. (11) W. *su-karam*. (12) G. M. -*nam pra-*. (13) G. M. ins. *tu*.

24. *uvarṇe kārya oshṭhopasaṁhāro bhavati: atro 'pasamhārah pūrvavan na samnikṛshtatāmātram: kim tu: samnikṛshtāv oshṭhāu dīrghāu syātām iti vakshyate: evam oshṭhāu tū 'pa-samhṛtatarāv (ii.14) ity atrā 'pi vijñeyam. yathā: ul----- oshṭhayor upasaṁhāra oshṭhopasaṁhārah<sup>1</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.



wont to be cited; but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary); “the same is to be understood in rule 14, above” (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to ii.18). A phrase is then cited from the Sanhitâ, containing *u* and *û*, namely *ulûkhalabudhno yûpaḥ* (vii.2.1<sup>3</sup>).

एकान्तरस्तु सर्वत्र प्रकृतात् ॥ २५ ॥

25. But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding.

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows:

By vicinage, “labial approximation” is here implied: everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation, a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one: by this is understood having the quantity of a *mora* interposed: that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one *mora* is the interval or interposition. This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation. The word “but” (*tu*) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where *o* [W. says, where *âu* or *v*] follows. Examples are: *utpûtaçushmam* (i.6.1<sup>1</sup>); *sûnnîyam iti su-unnîyam* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>); *atho oshadhîshu* (iii.5.5<sup>2</sup> and vi.3.9<sup>5</sup>); *bâhuvor balam* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>); *tanuvâu ghorâ 'nyâ* (v.7.3<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); *caturhotâ* (not found in the Sanhitâ: occurs *Tâitt. Brâh. ii.2.3<sup>2</sup>*).

Objection: in *yo 'ñçum* (iii.3.4<sup>3</sup>), the *anusvâra* has a *mora* [by i.34] and the *ç* a half-*mora* [by i.37]; since, then, the quantity being a *mora* and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer: it is assured by the principle “a hundred includes fifty.” Where there is a *mora* and a half, there is *à fortiori* a *mora*; in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word “one” excludes what does not belong to itself (?). For the same reason, the occurrence

25. *sâmnidhyâd oshṭhopasaṁhâra iti labhyate: sarvatr' oshṭhyasvareshu prakṛtâd oshṭhopasaṁhârât prṭhagosshṭhopasaṁhâraḥ<sup>1</sup> kartavyaḥ: sa ced ekântaraḥ<sup>1</sup>: ekântara iti mâtrâkâlavyavâya<sup>2</sup> iti labhyate<sup>3</sup>: ekamâtrâ 'ntaram vyavadhânam yasyâ 'sâv ekântaraḥ: iti prṭhagosshṭhopasaṁhârasya viçeshanam. tuçabda okâraparata<sup>4</sup> ekântaratvaniyamam<sup>5</sup> nivartayati. udâharaṇâni: ut-<sup>6</sup> sūn-....: atho-....: bâh-....: tan-....: cat-.... nanu yo-.... ity atrâ 'nusvârasya mâtrâkâlâḥ 'çakârasyâ 'rdhamâtrâkâlâḥ:<sup>7</sup> evam adhyardhamâtratve saty ekântaratvâbhâvât<sup>8</sup> katham prṭhagosshṭhopasaṁhârasiddhiḥ. ucyate: çatepañcâçannyâyena sidhyati: adhyardhamâtratve 'py<sup>9</sup> ekamâtratvam sutarâm<sup>10</sup> asti: tena kâryam bhavaty adhikam tu na nishidhyate: svâyogavyavachedakatvâd ekaçabdasya: ata eva bâh-.... ity âder<sup>11</sup> na*



of the double labial in such passages as *bāhuvor balam ūruvor ojah* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as *sphurita*, 'quavered,' is shown by the likeness of the example (?).

Second objection: then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two *u*'s following the *k* and *r* of *kusurubindah* (vii. 2.2<sup>1</sup>), since there occurs more than a *mora* and a half of interval between them?

Answer: not so; here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two *u*'s that follow *k* and *s*, because of the absence of its necessary condition; but to that following the *r* this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the *u* that follows the intermediate *s*; this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation: thus there is no offense against the rule.

So far the comment; but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance. I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a *mora*'s interval between them. No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it.

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the *u* in such words as *bāhuvoh* for the usual *bāhvoh* and *ūruvoh* for *ūrvoh* is denominated *sphurita*. The term does not occur elsewhere; nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here. It is a well-known characteristic of Tâittirîya texts, but is found in fewer words than one would be apt to imagine. Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Sanhitâ only the cases of *tanû* (*tanuvam*, e. g. i.1.8; *tanuvâ*, e. g. i.1.10<sup>2</sup>) and the word *suvar*, which are often met with. Of similar resolutions of an *i*-vowel into *iy*, the cases are more nu-

*dviroshṭhyam*<sup>12</sup> *mukhyam*: *kim tu sphuritatvam*<sup>13</sup> *udāharanātvābhāsatayā*<sup>14</sup> *darçitam. tarhi kus-ity atra kakārarephābhyām uttarayor ukārayoh katham pṛthagoshṭhopasamhāro na bhavati: adhyardhamātravyuvāyasambhavāt*<sup>15</sup>. *māi 'vam: atra*<sup>16</sup> *kakārasakārottarayor*<sup>17</sup> *ukārayos tāvad*<sup>18</sup> *apṛthagoshṭhatā*<sup>19</sup>: *etallakshanaśambhavāt: rephād uttarasya tu*<sup>20</sup> *prakṛtāt pṛthaktvābhāvān nā 'yam vidhiḥ:* <sup>21</sup>*kim tu*<sup>21</sup> *madhyasthasakārottarād ukārāt pṛthaktvam: tathā saty ekāntarābhāvaḥ*<sup>22</sup>: *tadavastha*<sup>23</sup> *eve 'ti lakshanaṃ idam avyabharitam*<sup>24</sup>.

(1) W. om.    2 G. M. -labhedavy-.    3 G. M. arthah.    4 W. āukāravakārap-.  
5 G. M. ekamātrānantaratva-.    6 G. M. om.    (7) B. om.    8 G. M. ekāratv-.    9 G. M. om.  
10 W. muttarām.    11 G. M. ādau.    12 G. M. -ṭhyatvam.    13 G. M. svar-.  
14 W. -haratvā-; B. -tvabh-; G. M. -ṇan tu ābh-.    15 G. M. -vyavadhānas-.  
16 G. M. om.    17 G. M. -rābhyām utt-.    18 G. M. -van.    19 G. M. na pṛthagoshṭhasamhāratā.  
20 W. u; B. om.    (21) W. B. om.    22 G. M. -vāt.    23 W. -sthay; B. -sthā.    24 G. M. vyabh-.



merous, but less frequent. I have collected the following (without exhausting the Sanhitâ, especially of themes in *iya*): *âgriya* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>), *aghniya* (i.1.1), *âçviya* (ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>), *asmadrîyañc* (i.4.21), *îdhrîya* (iv.5.7<sup>2</sup>), *dhîshniya* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>), *pâ'triya* (iii.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *budhnîya* (i.3.3), *rêshmiya* (iv.5.7<sup>2</sup>), *viçvápsniyâ* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup>), *viçvadriyañc* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>), *vr'shniya* (iii.2.5<sup>3</sup>), *çî'ghriya* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>), *sadhrîyañc* (i.2.14<sup>5</sup>); and, of oblique cases from themes in *i* or *î*, *indrâgniyoḥ* (i.3.12), *gâyatriyâ'* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>), *pâ'rshniyâ* (iv.6.9<sup>2</sup>), *pr'çniyâi* (ii.2.11<sup>4</sup>), *râ'triyâi* (iv.4.1<sup>1</sup>), *lakshmîyâ* (ii.1.5<sup>2</sup>), *viçpâtniyâi* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *svâdhîyam* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>). None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of the *u* are such as the euphony of the Tâittirîyakas does not tolerate: but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the *i*, only three are met with in the text—namely, *try* (e. g. i.8.22<sup>1</sup>: ii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), *tny* (iv.4.2<sup>2</sup>), and *çny* (v.5.6<sup>3</sup>). I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made.

अकारार्धमैकारौकारयोरादिः ॥ २६ ॥

26. The beginning of *âi* and *âu* is half an *a*.

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs.

संवृतकरणात्तमेकेषाम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed.

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii.12), our Prâtiçâkhya does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short *a*; for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination. Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long *i*" in *aisle*, *isle*, and *ou* or *ow* in *house*, *down*) to be the neutral vowel (*u* in *but*), rather than the open *a* (of *far*). But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each: they are slides; and to allow the organs to remain in

26. *âikârasyaâu "kârasya câ "dir akârârdham bhavati. akârasyâ 'rdham akârârdham.*

27. *sâinnidhyâd akârârdham iti labhyate: ekeshâm mate tad akârârdham samvrtakaraṇataram bhavati. samvrtâni sannikṛsh-tâni karaṇâni yasya tat samvrtakaraṇam: atiçayena samvrtakaraṇam samvrtakaraṇataram.*

B. reads *samvṛtta* throughout.



either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation.

The commentator glosses *saṁvṛta*, 'enveloped, shut up, closed,' with *saṁnikṛṣṭa*, 'drawn down together, approximated.'

इकारो ऽध्यर्धः पूर्वस्य शेषः ॥ २८ ॥

28. Of the former, the rest is one and a half times *i*.

Of the former—that is, of *āi*; *āi* and *āu* having been mentioned together in a preceding rule (ii.26), says the commentator.

उकारस्तूत्रस्य ॥ २९ ॥

29. But, of the latter, *u*.

That is to say, the remainder of *āu* is one and a half times *u*. To account for the word "but" (*tu*) in the rule, the commentator notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound, *a*, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound, *i*: this the "but" denies. This explanation merely intensifies and makes too precise the actual meaning of the word.

For the teachings of the other Prātiçākhyas as to the pronunciation of *āi* and *āu*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.40. As there remarked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their first element to have had originally more than a half-*mora* of quantity. If they must be limited to two *moras*, a better description of them would have been  $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}i$ , and  $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}u$ . If, as we may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the *āi* and *āu*, not less than the *e* and *o*, had by their time taken on a value notably different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic rules of the language were the faithful representation of living processes.

अनुस्वारोत्तमा अनुनासिकाः ॥ ३० ॥

30. *Anusvāra* and the last mutes are nasal.

As example of *anusvāra*, the comment cites *yo 'ñçum* (iii.3.4<sup>3</sup>);

28. *pūrvasyāi "kārasye 'ty arthaḥ: adhastād<sup>1</sup> āikāraukārayoḥ sahoccaritatvāt<sup>2</sup>: adhyardha ikāra āikārasya çesho bhavati. adhikam ardham yasyā 'sāv adhyardhaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *adhyardhas tāvad.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *uccar-*.

29. *uttarasyāu "kārasye 'ty arthaḥ: adhyardha ukāra āukāraçesho<sup>1</sup> bhavati: yathā 'nayor ubhayor apy ādir akāra eva tad-  
vad ikāra eva çeshaḥ<sup>2</sup> prasaktaḥ: tan<sup>3</sup> nishedhati tuçabdah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-rasya çe.* <sup>2</sup> W. B. *om.* <sup>3</sup> W. B. *tañ.*



of the “last” or nasal mutes, *pratyañ hotâram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>)—to which G. M. add *prâñcam upa* (v.2.7<sup>3</sup>), and *mañinâ* (vii.3.14).

The term *anunâsika* is interpreted by the commentator as signifying *nâsikâm anuvartate*, ‘it goes after the nostril’—that is to say, doubtless, ‘it finds exit by the nasal passages:’ an accurate definition of this class of sounds. As employed in this Prâtiçâkhyâ, *anunâsika* means simply, as adjective, ‘nasal,’ and its derivative noun, *ânunâsikya*, signifies ‘nasality, nasal utterance.’ Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter xvii. (rules 1–4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class. “Nasal,” or *anunâsika*, by the present rule, are the *anusvâra* and the five nasal mutes, *ñ, ñ̄, ñ̇, n, m*; the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which *n* and *m* (v.26–28) are under certain circumstances convertible; and at v.31, x.11, xv.1,6, xxii.14, we also hear of nasal (*anunâsika*) vowels. The other nose-sounds, the *yamas* and *nâsikya* (ii.49,50, xxi.8,12–14), do not anywhere receive this title.

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here.

All nasal (*anunâsika*) sounds are uttered (ii.52) by the mouth and nose together. An *uttama*, a “last” or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intonated breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series. In *anusvâra*, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intonated breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities. In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an *anusvâra* if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant. Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phonetists of the period represented by the Prâtiçâkhyas; none of them has allowed a final *anusvâra* before a pause, or an *anusvâra* before a mute, either in the same or a following word. As to the phonetic value, however, of the real *anusvâra*, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians. Some held it to be a pervading nasalization of the preceding vowel; others, a nasal addition to

---

30. *anusvâraç co 'ttamâç câ 'nunâsikâ bhavanti: nâsikâm anuvartanta ity anunâsikâh. yathâ: anusvârah: yo-...: uttamâç ca*<sup>1</sup> : *pra-...: prâ-...: mañ-*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *yathâ*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. om.



that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhyas, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no *tertium quid*. The Prâtiçâkhyas of the Rik and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an *anusvâra* as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vâj. Pr. iv.147-8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyas adopts prevailingly the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v.31, it is stated to be Âtreya's opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the preceding vowel is nasalized; and, in conformity with this, xv.1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of *m* and *n*, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv.2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct *anusvâra* to be inserted instead: here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x.11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation: see the rule). Once more, in xxii.14, among "heavy" syllables is reckoned one that is *anunâsika*, 'nasal.'

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation; it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a *b* differs from a *p* in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharvan school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in *anusvâra*. No one of the Prâtiçâkhyas gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of *anusvâra*, considered as an independent alphabetic element; if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (*u* of *but*) nasalized, or the sound of the French *un*, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an *r*—for example, in *there*, *here*, *oar*, *cure*, *fire*, *sour* (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanâgarî alphabet does not admit of much question; the writing of *am̐ça*, for example,\* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the nasality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

---

\* Namely, अंश, or अँश.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



the beginning of the sonant semivowels. For the exclusion of *r* from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the Prâtiçâkhyâ. For an assimilated *m*, the distinctive *anusvâra* sign is always written before *r*, as before the spirants; but before *l*, *y*, and *v* is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute. But as regards *n* before *l*, my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like *m*, as required by the Prâtiçâkhyâ, and writing the *n* unchanged, either with *virâma* or conjoined with the *l* (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former). The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the Prâtiçâkhyâ: it writes the *l* double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable. This is nonsense: if two *l*'s are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it. But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of *l* with *n* any more than with *m*, or than in the combination of *m* with *y* and *v*.

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T. and W.) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B. and O.), the text of the Prâtiçâkhyâ follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the Tâittirîya text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly; while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts. In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible: the proper *anusvâra* being represented by *ñ*, and the *m* assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by *m̄*. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. and M.) do not distinguish these two from one another.

स्वराणां यत्रोपसंस्कारस्तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३१ ॥

31. In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made.

The term *upasamhâra*, 'approximation,' is glossed by *upaçleshaviçeshah*, 'a sort of embrace'—unless, indeed, we are to read, with G. and M., *samçleshaviçeshah*, 'disunion of embrace,' i. e., 'embrace which does not come to actual contact.'

The terms *sthâna*, 'place,' and *karana*, 'organ,' denote, as in the other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. i.18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound.

31. *svarânâm tat sthânâṃ bhavati<sup>1</sup> yatro 'pasamhârah syât: upasamhâro nâmo 'paçleshaviçeshah<sup>2</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> W. 'paçlosh-; G. M. samçleshaviçeshah.



यदुपसंहरति तत्करणम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32. That is producing organ, which makes the approximation.

Here, “in the case of the vowels” is declared to be implied from the preceding rule; *upasamharati*, ‘approaches,’ is explained by *prâpayati*, ‘attains;’ and, as example of a *karana*, or producing organ, reference is made to the “tip of the tongue,” spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter.

अन्येषां तु यत्र स्पर्शनं तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made.

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels. The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves. The word “but” (*tu*) is meant to exclude the vowels; or, as Mâhisheya explains it, annuls for *anusvâra* and *svrabhakti* the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants. This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction; and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious.

येन स्पर्शयति तत्करणम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact.

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun *adhyetâ*, ‘reader’—or, rather, ‘repeater.’

32. *svarânâm iti sâmnidhyâl labhyate: svarânâm tat karanam bhavati: yat svarân upasamharati prâpayati: 'tat karanam'. yathâ: jihvâgram ṛkāra (ii.18) ity âdi.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *tat sthânam*; G. M. om.

33. *svarebhyo 'nyeshâm varṇânâm tat sthânâm yatra sparçanam bhavet: atra vyañjanânâm samçleshamâtram<sup>1</sup> kathyate: svarânâm tu<sup>2</sup> purastât samçleshaḥ<sup>3</sup> kathitaḥ: upasamhârasparçanayoḥ<sup>4</sup> çabdaçaktyâ viçesho<sup>5</sup> vidushâ vijñeyah<sup>6</sup>: tuçabdaḥ<sup>7</sup> svaranivṛttyarthah: athavâ<sup>8</sup>: anusvârasvarabhaktyor vyañjanavat<sup>9</sup> sparçanamâtrakatvanivartaka<sup>10</sup> iti mâhisheyabhâshitam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -çlosh-; G. M. -mâtratvam. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. -shaviçeshah; M. -shaviçleshaḥ  
<sup>4</sup> G. M. -hâra iti sparçana. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *jñâtavyah*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *çabda*.  
<sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> W. -nave; B. -na. <sup>10</sup> B. *sparçakamnamâ*; G. M. *sparçamâtrakâlan riv-*; M. -*virtata*.



In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes their essential difference (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.367 seq.), and which the Ath. Pr. states more fully (i.29-35 :—where, in rule 33, we should read *eke 'spr̥sh̥tam*), with specifications of degree of openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as represented by rule 45, below).

हनुमूले जिह्वामूलेन कवर्गे स्पर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

35. In the *k*-series, one makes contact with the root of the tongue at the root of the jaws.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.20, and the references to the other Prâtiçâkhyas there given.

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following rules, correspond with the *yatra*, 'where,' and *yena*, 'whereby,' of rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and organ of production of the different classes of sounds.

The singular number of *hanûmûla*, 'root of the jaws,' the commentator accounts for as used generically (*jâtyapekshâyâm*, 'with reference to the whole kind or class').

तालौ जिह्वामध्येन चवर्गे ॥ ३६ ॥

36. In the *c*-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.21, and the note upon it. The sonant aspirate of this series, *jh*, is not met with in the text.

जिह्वेया प्रतिवेद्य मूर्धनि टवर्गे ॥ ३७ ॥

37. In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back, in the head.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.22, and the note upon it. Our commentary says, "by the word 'head' (*mûrdhan*) is intended the upper part

34. *sâmnidhyâd anyeshâm iti labhyate: svarebhyo 'nyeshâm varṇânâm tat karaṇam bhavati: adhyetâ yena vyañjanâni sparçayati prâpayati tat karaṇam.*

35. *kavarga uccâryamâne jihvâmûlena<sup>1</sup> hanûmûle sparçayati prâpayed ity arthaḥ. hanvor mûlam hanûmûlam<sup>2</sup>: tasmin<sup>3</sup>:<sup>4</sup> jâtyapekshâyâm<sup>5</sup> ekavacanam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇam*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *mûlam iti*. <sup>5</sup> W. -*ksham*.

36. *çavarge kârye<sup>1</sup> jihvâmadhyena varṇân<sup>2</sup> tâlâu spr̥çet<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put *tâlâu* here. <sup>2</sup> M. -*nam*. <sup>3</sup> B. *spr̥çayet*; G. M. *sparçayet*.



of the mouth-cavity.” Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word “head” in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name *mûrdhanya*, ‘capital,’ had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined; and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition. For, that *mûrdhan* should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the ‘dome of the palate’ does not appear to me possible. As in the notes to the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the *t*-sounds as “lingual”—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other.

The commentator glosses the word *prativeshtya*, ‘having rolled it back,’ by “having done what? having rolled back (G. M. add in explanation *âveshtya*, ‘having rolled up’) the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitability” (i. e. of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at).

जिह्वग्रेण तवर्गे दन्तमूलेषु ॥ ३८ ॥

38. In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.24, and the note upon it.

ओष्ठाभ्यां पवर्गे ॥ ३९ ॥

39. In the *p*-series, with the two lips.

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ; and that the under lip is the organ of production.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.25, and the note upon it.

37. *tavarge kârye jihvâgreṇa* <sup>1</sup> *mûrdhni*<sup>2</sup> *varṇam spr̥çet*<sup>3</sup>: *kim kṛtvâ: yogyatvâj*<sup>4</sup> *jihvâgram prativeshtya*<sup>5</sup>: *mûrdhaçabdena vaktravivaroparibhâgo vivakshyate*<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put *varṇam* here. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *mûrdhani*. <sup>3</sup> B. *spr̥çayet*. <sup>4</sup> W. *-tvâ*; B. *-tvât taj*; G. *-tvân*; M. *-tvâyogyatvân*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-shtyâveshtya*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-kshitah*.

38. *tavarge kârye jihvâgreṇa varṇam dantamûleshu sparçayet*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *spr̥çet*.

39. *pavarge kârya oshthâbhyâm anyonyam sparçayet: atro*<sup>1</sup> *'ttaroshtha sthânam uttaratvasâmyâd*<sup>2</sup> *eshâm sthânânâm: adharoshthah karanam*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *tatro*. <sup>2</sup> B. *-râtvât sâmânyâd*; G. M. *oshthatva-*.



## तालौ जिह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां यकारे ॥ ४० ॥

40. In *y*, with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

The Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc., and in describing their formation throughout by special rule. Respecting *y*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

The description of the mode of production of *y*, here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive. The "edges" are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for *i* in rule 22, above.

## रेफे जिह्वाग्रमध्येन प्रत्यग्दन्तमूलेभ्यः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. In *r*, with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth.

*Pratyak* is explained by the phrase, "in the interior upper portion"—that is, 'within and above'—the equivalence of *pratyagâtman* and *antarâtman*, 'inner soul,' being pleaded as justification.

The somewhat discordant teachings of the Prâtiçâkhyâs with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.28. The most noteworthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the *r*-vowels: although in this treatise the definition of the latter (ii.18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semivowel. *R* could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English *r*, uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate.

## दन्तमूलेषु च लकारे ॥ ४२ ॥

42. Also in *l*, at the roots of the teeth.

According to the commentator, the "and" (*ca*) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both *jihvâgramadhya*, 'middle of the tongue-tip,' and *pratyak*, 'back from.' It

40. *yakâre kârye jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm tâlâu sparçayet. jihvâyâ madhyam: tasyâ 'ntâu: tâbhyâm jihvâmadhyântâbhyâm*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

41. *rephe kârye jihvâgramadhyena dantamûlebhyaḥ pratyak sparçayet: pratyag ity*<sup>1</sup> *abhyantara uparibhâga*<sup>1</sup> *ity arthaḥ:* <sup>2</sup>*yah pratyagâtme 'ty*<sup>2</sup> *antarâtmâ pratîyate.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. -*ntaropari*-. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *yathâ pratyagâtmani*.



appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of *dantamûleshu*, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums close upon them) as the *sthâna*, or 'place of production,' of *l*. This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase of the comment. The really distinctive characteristic of the *l*, that it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out: rather, we are left to infer that it and the *r* are produced in the same manner, only the *r* a little further back. No one of the other treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath. Pr. i.24, where I have given the Tâittirîya definition more credit than really belongs to it).

## श्रोष्ठान्ताभ्यां दन्तैर्वकारे ॥ ४३ ॥

43. In *v*, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth.

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness. The commentator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase "with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the upper teeth." But how comes the lower lip to have two edges? He adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of production. But then why does not the rule read *danteshu*, instead of the instrumental *dantâih*? It gives us two instrumentals, as if teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more "place" than the other. The lower lip, being the more passive organ, should be the "place" on which the teeth, as "organ," make their contact; but from taking this view the treatise and its comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other *sthâna*'s, which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts concerned in the contact. To make a good definition, the rule should read *adharoshthânte* for *oshthântâbhyâm*.

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath. Pr. i.25), the Vâj. Pr. gives the *v* a description corresponding with this, and showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our English *v*. This, of course, should not in the least stand in the way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound was that of our *w*. The *w* is a semi-vowel, standing in the same relation to *u* as *y* to *i*; but to call *v* a semi-vowel is a sim-

---

42. *lakâro jhivâgramadhyapratyaktvam anvâdiçati*<sup>1</sup>: *lakâre kârye jhivâgramadhyena*<sup>2</sup> *dantamûleshu pratyak sparçayet*<sup>3</sup>: *ayam arthaḥ: lakârasya dantamûlapratyâsannam pratyagantarapradeçasthânam*<sup>4</sup> *iti vijñeyam*<sup>5</sup>.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *jhivâmadhyam pratyaktvam câ "karshati.* (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *-hvâmadh-.* (<sup>3</sup>) W. B. put after *vijñeyam.* (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. *-sannapradeça sthânam.* (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. *jñeyam.*

43. *vakâre kârye dharoshthântâbhyâm uttaradantâgrâih saha sparçayet. dantâir iti sthânanirdeçah: oshthântâbhyâm iti karânanirdeçah.*



ple abuse of terms. We might nearly as well call our *j* a semi-vowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as *y*.

## स्पर्शस्थानेषुमाणा आनुपूर्व्या ॥ ४४ ॥

44. The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes.

By rule i.9, there are six spirants, and as there are but five "places" of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression "in their order:" *h*, therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46,47). To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute-classes, and cites from the Sanhitâ an example for each: namely, for *jihvâmûliya*, uttered in the place of a *k*-mute, *yaḥ kâmayeta* (ii.3.2<sup>4</sup> et al.: I follow the example of all the MSS., and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from *visarjanîya* by different signs); for *ç*, in the place of a *c*-mute, *madhuç ca mâdhavaç ca* (i.4.14, or iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last two words of the citation, and W. reads *manyuç ca*, which is found at iv.7.2<sup>1</sup>); for *sh*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *ashtâbhyah svâhâ* (vii.2.15); for *s*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *stanâ uparavâh* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>); and for *upadhmânîya*, in the place of a *p*-mute, *yaḥ pâpmanâ* (ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>).

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it. Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, *jihvâmûliya* and *upadhmânîya*; and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long *l*-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians. As for the *s*, there is no question as to its value. Nor ought there to be respecting that of the *sh*, which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our *sh* than *s*, but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate. It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

44. *âshmanâ ânupûrvyena yathâkramena sparçasthâneshû 'ccâranîyâ bhavanti. yathâ: jihvâmûliyah kavargasthâne: yaḥ k-: çakâraç cavargasthâne<sup>1</sup>: madhuç<sup>2</sup> ----: shakârash tavargasthâne: asht- ----: sakâras tavargasthâne: stanâ ----: upadhmânîyah pavargasthâne: yaḥ p-: ity ânupûrvyena<sup>3</sup>: ânupûrvyân<sup>4</sup> niyamât pañcasû 'shmasû 'kteshu hakâro viçishṭah<sup>5</sup>: tasya vidhim uparishṭâd âcashte.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *cavargîyas-*; B. *cakâras-*. <sup>2</sup> W. *manyuç*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-vyâ vijñeyâh*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-vya*. <sup>5</sup> B. *-çeshah*; G. M. *vasishṭah*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it: a loose version is as follows:

The expression “the same position as the beginning,” etc., implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel; but there is none such in *a*, *i*, *u*; as a vowel has but a single position, the word “beginning” is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply “of the same position with the vowel.” That is not so: a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs: the two rules (ii.28, 29) which teach that *i* and *u* form the final elements of *āi* and *āu* assure the difference of position for those two sounds; in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of *e* and *o*, they being included in the category of diphthongs. But again: even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very *a* which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, “the throat is the place of production of *a*, the *k*-mutes, *h*, and *visarjanīya*,” hence, as sameness of position [with the *a*, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition. You must not think so, is the reply; there is a difference between the *a* which forms the beginning of *e* and *o* and an *a* standing by itself: to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, “the lips and jaws not too widely separated,” etc.; to the other, that of rule 27, “with the organ of production more closed;” therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression “of the same position as the beginning” is to be understood as meaning “of the same place and organ as the beginning.” Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such; hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition.

---

47. *ekeshām mate hakāra<sup>1</sup> udayasvarādisasthāna ūtmana upari svarādisasthāno<sup>2</sup> bhavati 'ti vārarucoktam<sup>3</sup> syād etat. ādinā<sup>4</sup> sasthāna ity ukte 'ṣeshasya sthānāntaratvam<sup>5</sup> vaktavyam tad apy akārekārokāreshu nā 'sti: <sup>6</sup> svarasyāi "kam eva <sup>8</sup>sthānam<sup>7</sup> ity ādiṣabdavādiyarthyam syāt: svarasasthāna<sup>9</sup> ity etāvatai 'vā 'rthasiddhir<sup>10</sup> iti: māi 'vam: sandhyakshareshu ṣeshasya<sup>8</sup> sthānāntaropapatteḥ: ikāro 'dhyardhaḥ (ii.28) iti sūtradvayena ṣeshabhūtavarṇavyaktāu<sup>11</sup> tayo<sup>12</sup> sthānāntaram api prasiddham eva: evam<sup>13</sup> ekārāukārayor api vyākaraṇe<sup>14</sup> ṣeshasya sthānāntaram vihitam vijñeyam: sandhyaksharatvāviṣeshād anayoḥ. nanv evam apy akūhavisarjanīyānām kaṇṭha iti sandhyaksharādāv akārasyā 'pi kaṇṭhasthānatvāt tena samānasthānatve<sup>15</sup> kathyamāne<sup>16</sup> pūrvasūtroktena<sup>17</sup> pāunaruktyam asya<sup>18</sup> sūtrasya*



Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it.

A few further examples of the occurrence of *h*, before the various diphthongs, are added: *tigmahete* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), *yâvatîr vâsâmahâi* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>), *agnihotram juhoti* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *samprayatîr ahâu* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>).

The acuteness of observation of the "some authorities" who have made this definition of the character of a *h* certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment. It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth-organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character: thus, the *h* of *ha* is a surd *a*, so to speak; that of *he*, a surd *e*; that of *who*, a surd *u*; that of *hue*, a surd *y*; and so on (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.370 seq.). The rule would have been made better by reading *udayavarṇa*, instead of *udayasvarâdi*—'the following sound,' instead of 'the beginning of the following vowel'—for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels.

## पूर्वान्तसस्थानो विसर्जनीयः ॥ ४८ ॥

48. *Visarjanîya* has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel.

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of "some authorities," or as having the unqualified approval of the *Prâtiçâkhyâ*. From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former. He paraphrases: "*visarjanîya* is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself;" and adds that

*syât. mâi 'vam mañsthâh: ekârâdukârâdivartino*<sup>19</sup> '*kârasya kevalasya ca viçesho 'sti: kevalasya*<sup>20</sup> *karaṇam oshṭhahanu nâ 'tivyastam* (ii.12) *iti*<sup>21</sup>: *sandhyaksharâdâu vartamânasya tu samvṛtakaraṇataram* (ii.27): *tasmât sthânakaraṇayoḥ saha-caritatvâd*<sup>22</sup> *âdisasthâna ity ukta âdisamânasthânakaraṇa*<sup>23</sup> *iti vijñeyam. kim ca: pûrvasûtre karaṇâbhâva ity*<sup>24</sup> *uktaḥ: atra tu karaṇavattvam api*<sup>25</sup> *vidyata iti matântaram upapadyate: na pânâruktyam ca. tathâ*<sup>26</sup>: *tig-: yâv-: agn-: sam-: udayaçabda uttaraparyâyah*<sup>27</sup>: *udayaç câ 'sâu*<sup>28</sup> *svaraç ca*<sup>29</sup> : *tasyâ "diḥ: tena sasthânaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ekeshâm*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *udayasvar-*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *var-*. <sup>4</sup> W. *âdi*.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *-taram*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *tathâ sati*. <sup>(7)</sup> W. '*kasthânam evam*. <sup>(8)</sup> B. om.  
<sup>9</sup> G. M. *svarasya sa-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. *artha*; G. M. *-ddher*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-bhûtam v-*.  
<sup>12</sup> G. M. *tasyâ*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-ṇa*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *sthâ-*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *kalpy-*.  
<sup>17</sup> G. M. *-vok-*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *eva tasya*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *-rayor âdi-*. <sup>20</sup> W. ins. *tu*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *nâ 'tyupasamhṛtam ca; B. no 'pasamhṛtam*. <sup>22</sup> W. B. *-ri/vâd*. <sup>23</sup> W. *-sthâna*.  
<sup>24</sup> G. M. om. <sup>25</sup> G. M. om. <sup>26</sup> G. M. om. <sup>27</sup> G. M. *udayasvarâdisasthânaḥ*.  
<sup>28</sup> G. M. om. *asâu*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. ins. *udayasvaraḥ*.



here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning. His examples, again, are only of *visarjanīya* after a diphthong: they are *agneḥ* (i.1.10<sup>3</sup> et al.), *brāhmaṇāir āyushmat* (ii.3.10<sup>3</sup>), *bāhuvor balam* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), and *ā 'yam gāuh* (i.5.3<sup>1</sup>). In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the *visarjanīya*.

The teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting the *visarjanīya* are rehearsed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.19. All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound. The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the *h*, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final *h*.

नासिक्या नासिकास्थानाः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production.

The "nose-sounds," the commentary says, are the *yamas* (xxi.12,13); but why the *nāsikya* (xxi.14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see. Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given. As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted *rukman antaram* (v.1.10<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. B. give instead *rukmantam*, ii.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *yācñā* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>: but G. M. give instead *rājñā*, ii.6.2<sup>2</sup> et al.), *ātñārah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>), *ratnam abhajanta* (ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, *uccā ratnam ayajanta*, which I have not found in the Sanhitâ), and *pāpmānam* (i.4.41 et al.).

मुखनासिक्या वा ॥ ५० ॥

50. Or they are produced by the mouth and nose.

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present.

48. *visarjanīya ātmanah pūrvasvarāntena sasthanah samānasthānakaraṇo bhavati: atrā 'pi pūrvasvara iti sandhyaksharam ucyate: svarāntarasya<sup>1</sup> hi<sup>2</sup> sthānāntaratvābhāvāt. yathā: ag-<sup>3</sup> brāh-.....: bāh-.....<sup>4</sup> ā..... pūrvasyā 'ntah: tena sasthanah pūrvāntasasthanah<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -ntasya. <sup>2</sup> B. om.; G. M. bhinna. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> B. om.

49. *nāsikyā yamā nāsikāsthānā bhavanti. yathā: ruk-.....: yā-: āt-: rat-.....: pāp-*

50. *ta<sup>1</sup> eva nāsikyā mukhanāsikābhyām<sup>2</sup> uccāraṇīyā bhavanti. mukham ca nāsikā<sup>3</sup> ca mukhanāsike<sup>4</sup>: tatsambandhino mukhanāsikyāḥ. <sup>5</sup>uktāny evo 'dāharaṇāni<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. eta. <sup>2</sup> G. M. mukhena nāsikābhyām ca. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -ke. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -kam.

(<sup>5</sup>) G. M. put after bhavanti.



## वर्गवच्चेषु ॥ ५१ ॥

51. And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes.

The “and” (*ca*) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of ‘the lion’s look’ (a distant glance backward: the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series.

If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the “list of sounds” given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule xxi.12.

## नासिकाविवरणादानुनासिक्यं नासिकाविवरणादानु- नासिक्यम् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose.

*Ānunāsikya* is the quality of being *anunāsika* or ‘nasal;’ and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anusvāra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable; the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound.

The commentator explains *nāsikāvivarana* by *ghrāṇabila*, ‘hole of the nose, nasal passage,’ as if *vivarana* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule: it is *suçlokāzñ sumañgalāzñ* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>).

---

51. *siṅhāvalokanena*<sup>1</sup> *vargasyo* ’*ktam* *karaṇam cakāro* ’*nukarshati*: *eshu*<sup>2</sup> *nāsikyeshu* *vargavat karaṇam bhavati*. *vargasye* ’*va* *vargavat*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-kananyāyena*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. (as also in the text of the rule itself) *eteshu*.

52. *nāsikāvivaranaḍ* *ghrāṇabilāḍ*<sup>1</sup> *ānunāsikyam raṅgādi kar-tavyam*. *yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *suç- - - ity ādi*.

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane*  
*dvitīyo* ’*dhyāyah*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *nāsikāb-*. <sup>2</sup> B. *tathā*; W. om.



## CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS: 1, introductory; 2-6, cases of *á* at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text; 7, of *î* and *ú*; 8-12, of final *á* of verbal forms and particles; 13-14, of final *î* and *ú*; 15, of initial *á*.

## अथादावुत्तरे विभागे ह्रस्वं व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth.

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the *Sanhitâ* is taken up. And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final *a*, *i*, and *u*—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts. In the other treatises (*Rik Pr.* vii.-ix., *Vâj. Pr.* iii.95-128, *Ath. Pr.* iii.1-25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened: this is more in accordance with the general method of the *Prâtiçâkhyas*, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their *çâkhâs* in the analyzed condition of the *pada*-text, and proceed to construct the *samhitâ* from it. Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings. Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in *pada*, whenever a pause—either the *avagraha* separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after *iti*, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in *samhitâ*: thus, *devâdyata iti deva-yate*; *avanaḥ* (s. *avā naḥ*). Second, it is made in the so-called *jaṭā*-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted; this text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

---

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ādāu padādāv uttare padānte ca vartamānaḥ samhitāyām yo dīrgho 'sau vibhāge vibhāgasamaye vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate: 1 vyañjanaparativam 2 atra yathāsamhitāstham vijñeyam. nanu dīrghaḥ katham labhyate. 3 hrasvānantarabhāvitvād devāçikā (iii.2) "digrahaṇeshu plutādarçanāc ce 4 'ti brūmaḥ. samhitāyām ity asyā 'yam arthaḥ 5: kāryabhājaḥ padasyo 'ttarapadena saha sambandhaniyamaḥ 6: na tu pūrvapadena saha sambandhaniyamaḥ. vibhāgo 'tra*



their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again: for example, *âpo hi shthâ mayobhuvah* would become *âpo hi hy âpa âpo hi: hi shtha stha hi hi shtha: sthâ mayobhuvo mayobhuva stha sthâ mayobhuvah: mayobhuva iti mayah-bhuvah*: the treatment of the *â* of *sthâ* here illustrates the conditions of the restoration of the short vowel in such cases. Third, the same restoration takes place in the *saṁhitâ*-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the *anuvâkas* or sections of the *Sanhitâ* are divided. This division the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* does not recognize—or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in *sandhi*, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 13, below, *uçmasî gamadhye*, i.3.6<sup>1-2</sup>, where the edited text reads correctly *uçmasî: 1: gamadhye*).

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or paraphrased, as follows:

Here *atha*, 'now then,' is an introductory heading; *âdâu* [literally, 'at the beginning'] means 'at the beginning of a word' [including, also, a separable part of a compound word]; *uttare* [literally, 'in the latter part'] means 'at the end of a word:' a vowel occupying such a position, if it be long in *saṁhitâ*, becomes short *vibhâge*, i. e. 'in case of separation,' when followed by a consonant—that is to say, when so followed in *saṁhitâ*. But whence is derived the limitation to a "long" vowel? We answer, from its conversion into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any protracted (*pluta*) vowels among the instances included in the rules. The limitation "in *saṁhitâ*" implies that the word whose form is in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that follows it; not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless, as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the one liable to change of quantity]. "Separation" (*vibhâga*) is to be understood as division from the words with which it stands in natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of the fundamental text: otherwise, in the *jaṭâ*-text of the two words *sthâ mayobhuvah* (see above), the *stha* would retain its long *â* in its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connection with the following word: and that should not be so. The sense of the word *vibhâga* is, in case of a long initial vowel, separation from the preceding word; in case of a long final, from the

---

*prakṛtipadâir ucyate: prakṛtir nâma yathâpâthah: prakṛtipadâir iti kim: sthâ m- ity atra jaṭâyâm sthaçabdasya dvitîyoccârane 'pi dîrghah prasajyeta': uttarapadena vibhâgâbhâvât: sa<sup>8</sup> mâ bhûd iti parihârah. vibhâgapadasyâ<sup>9</sup> 'yam arthah: padâdâu<sup>10</sup> dîrghasya pûrvapadena vibhâgah: padânte<sup>11</sup> dîrghasyo 'ttarapadena vibhâgah. vibhâge vyañjanapara iti kim: ṛt-... ity atra mâ bhûd iti: nâdhâmâdhârayâ (iii.8) iti prâptih. saṁhitâyâm<sup>12</sup> dîrgha iti kim: esha-... ity atra prâptisampâdanârtham:*



following word. The limitation "in case of separation, if followed by a consonant" is for the sake of excluding such cases as *ṛtadhā-mā 'si* (i.3.3: in separated form, *ṛtadhāmā: asi*), which would otherwise come under the rule iii.8 [among the specifications of which, *dhāmā* is included]. The limitation "a long vowel in *saṁhitā*" is intended to bring *esha vo bharatā rājā* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup> et al.; *pada*-text, *bharatāḥ*) under the action of the rules; since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yājyā* in rule 11 of this chapter. Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as *tvā vāyavaḥ* (i.1.1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied].

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyañjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant.' Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, "the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the *saṁhitā*-text"—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in *saṁhitā* as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter. This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as *bharatā rājā* (the example quoted by the commentator: the *pada*-reading is *bharatāḥ: rājā*) and *adhā mā* (quoted under rule 9; *pada*-reading *adhāḥ: mā*), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11. It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in *saṁhitā* a long final vowel (*ā*) should be taken into consideration: but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small. For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules; and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in *āḥ* or *āi* occur; and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element. The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adhā* from *adhāḥ* with *adhā* from *adha*, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former. And this is what they have attempted to do: and it has cost them only two additional words—*agniyājyē* in rule 9, and *yājyāsu* in rule 11—together with an artifice of

*tathā sati bharatā yājyāsv* (iii.11) *iti yājyāpadam sārthakam nā 'nyathā. vyañjanam asmāt param*<sup>13</sup> *iti vyañjanaparaḥ. tvā . . . ity ādāv etallakṣhaṇasambhavād*<sup>14</sup> *ativyāptim*<sup>15</sup> *uttarasūtrāḥ pariharati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *padādāu ca padānte ca yo dīrgho vyañjanottaro vibhāge kriyamāne hrasvam samyāti.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-nam.* <sup>(3)</sup> M. om.; G. *hrasvānt.* <sup>4</sup> G. om. *ca.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-dhah.* <sup>(6)</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-yate.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *-gaçabd.* <sup>10</sup> W. *-dādi.* <sup>11</sup> W. *-nta.* <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *yo.* <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-ra.* <sup>14</sup> G. M. *eva tal.* <sup>15</sup> W. *atiprā.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



*ukthâ*, and *çuddhâ*, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated.

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification *ity avagrahaḥ*, 'these, as former members of a compound,' which applies alike to them all, standing at the end.

The examples quoted from the Sanhitâ in illustration of the rule are as follows. For *devâ*: *devâyate yajamânâya çarma* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for *devâyant*; we have *devayate* (with short vowel) twice, at i.2.12<sup>3</sup> and ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>: *devâyuvam* occurs ii.5.9<sup>6</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>3</sup>, but *devayuh*, iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>. For *çikâ*, *çikâyate svâhâ* (vii.5.11<sup>2</sup>), the only case. For *sumnâ*, *sumnâyanto havâmahe* (i.5.11<sup>4</sup>), also alone. For *çvâ*, *dyâvâprthivyâ çvâvit* (v.5.20): *çvâ*, however, by rule i.52, includes *açvâ*, for which is quoted *açvâvatîñ somavatîm* (iv.2.6<sup>4</sup>); I have noted farther only iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>, but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my excerption. For *rtâ*, *rtâyavaḥ purâ 'nnam akshan* (ii.2.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last word of the citation): there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes *rtâyuv* (e. g. i.4.5: but *rtayuv* once, ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>), *rtâyant* (e. g. iv.2.9<sup>3</sup>), *rtâvan* (e. g. i.3.14<sup>2</sup>) and its feminine *rtâvarî* (e. g. i.1.3), *rtâvrđh* (e. g. i.4.5), and *rtâsah* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>: but this word reads in *pada* as in *samhitâ*). For *vayunâ*, *vayunâvid eka it* (i.2.13<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>). For *hṛdayâ*, *hṛdayâvidhaç cit* (i.4.45<sup>1</sup>). For *aghâ*, *aghâyavo mâ gandharvo viçvâvasur âdadhat* (i.2.9: G. M. omit after *gandharvaḥ*): other cases of *aghâyuv* are found at iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>; 5.10<sup>4</sup>: v.7.3<sup>1</sup>; and of *aghâyant*, ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>. For *ukthâ*, *ukthâmadânâm dhenuḥ* (ii.4.11<sup>6</sup>): the same compound occurs again at iii.3.2<sup>1</sup> and v.6.8<sup>6</sup>, and *ukthâyuv* at i.4.12, twice. For *çuddhâ*, *âpo devîḥ çuddhâyuvavaḥ* (i.3.8<sup>2</sup> and vi.3.8<sup>4</sup>).

## इन्द्रा वदन्वान्परः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Also *indrâ*, when followed by *vat*, *van* and *vân*.

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated: *indrâvatîm apacitîm ihâ 'vaha* (v.7.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *apacitîm*), *indrâvanto marutaḥ* (iv.7.14<sup>1</sup>), and *indrâvânt svâhâ* (i.1.12); and I have noted no others. As counter-examples, he quotes: first, to show that not every long *â* is to be shortened before the three syllables named, *urnâvantam prathamah sîda yonim* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. give only the first two words), *asura prajâvân* (iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: but B. reads, I presume only by an

---

3. *indre 'ty asminn<sup>1</sup> avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vad van vân ity evamparo vibhâge hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: ind-....: ind-....: ind-.... indre 'ti kim: urn-....: as-....: praj-.... evampara iti kim: ind-....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasminn*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om*.



error, *pratâpavân*), and *prajāvatîr anamîvâ ayakshmâh* (i.1.1: but omitted in G. M.); second, to show that *indrâ* is not altered except under the circumstances specified, *indrâvaruṇayor aham* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>). This last is a case in which no *vibhâga*, or 'separation,' would be made in any text of the other Vedas; but the *Tâittirîya pada* reads *indrâvaruṇayor itî 'ndrâ-varuṇayoḥ*, and the example is therefore to the purpose.

चित्रा वपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also *citrâ*, when followed by *v*.

The illustrative passage cited is *citrâvaso svasti te pâram açîya* (i.5.5<sup>4</sup> and 7<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit after *te*). As counter-examples, are given *mitrâvaruṇâv eva* (ii.1.7<sup>3</sup> et al.: p. *mitrâ-varuṇâv*), and *citrâpûrṇamâse dîksheran* (vii.4.8<sup>2</sup>)—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to *citrâ*, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a *v*. I have found no farther instances falling under the rule.

प्रस्थेन्द्रियाद्रविणाविश्वेदेव्यादीर्घावीर्याविश्वावातावा-  
भङ्गुराकर्णिकावृष्णिायासुगोपर्कसामाघासत्रावर्षापुष्पामे-  
घाप्रास्वा ॥ ५ ॥

5. Also *prasthâ*, *indriyâ*, *draviṇâ*, *viçvadevyâ*, *dîrghâ*, *vîryâ*, *viçvâ*, *vâtâ*, *tvâ*, *bhaṅgurâ*, *karnakâ*, *vṛshṇiyâ*, *sugopâ*, *rksâmâ*, *aghâ*, *satrâ*, *varshâ*, *pushpâ*, *meghâ*, *prâ*, *svâ*.

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example. For *prasthâ*, *prasthâvad rathavâhanam* (iv.2.5<sup>6</sup>), the only case. For *indriyâ*, *indriyâvate purodâçam* (ii.2.7<sup>1</sup>): half a dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of *indriyâvin* (e. g. i.6.2<sup>4</sup>: ii.1.6<sup>3</sup>: vi.2.10<sup>6</sup>); the latter word, however, is not separated in the *pada*-text. For *draviṇâ*, *draviṇâvataḥ kurute* (v.3.11<sup>2</sup>), the only case. For *viçvadevyâ*, *viçvadevyâvate çvâtrâh* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>): the word occurs also at iv.1.6<sup>1,2</sup>. For *dîrghâ*, *dîrghâdhiyo rakshamâ-ṇâh* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), the only case. For *vîryâ*, *vîryâvantam abhimâti-śhâham* (i.2.7): the same theme is found in other passages, as are also its comparative, *vîryâvat-tara* (e. g. i.7.6<sup>3</sup>), and superlative, *vîryâvat-tama* (ii.4.2<sup>1</sup>), in which the shortening of the *â* is not authorized by the *Prâtiçâkhya*, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause: and the *pada*-text reads accordingly. For *viçvâ*, *viçvâmitrasya sâktam bhavati* (v.2.3<sup>3-4</sup>: G. M. omit

4. *citrâ ity asminn*<sup>1</sup> *avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vakâraparo*<sup>2</sup> *vibhâge hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *cit-..... citre 'ti kim: mitr-.....: vapara iti kim: citr-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasminn*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *vap-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*.



the last word): the same word occurs in other passages (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>: v.2.3<sup>3,4</sup>,10<sup>5</sup>; 4.2<sup>2</sup>), as also in the compound *viçvāmitrajamadagnī* (v.4.11<sup>3</sup>), where, as the division is *viçvāmitra-jamadagnī*, the *ā* is not shortened; and we have further the themes *viçvāvasu* (e. g. i.1.11<sup>1</sup>), *viçvāvanta* (iii.5.6<sup>2</sup>), *viçvārāj* (i.3.2<sup>1</sup>), and *viçvāsah* (i.4.17; p. *viçva-sāham*). For *vātā*, *vātāvada varshan* (ii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), the only case. For *tvā*, *tvāvato maghonaḥ* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>; p. *tva-vataḥ*): the Rik *pada*-text does not shorten the *ā* of this word. For *bhañgurā*, *bhattāram bhañgurāvataḥ* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> and iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>). For *karnakā*, *sūrmī karnakāvaty etayā* (i.5.7<sup>6</sup> and v.4.7<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For *vṛshṇiyā*, *vṛshṇiyāvatas tava* (iii.5.6<sup>2-3</sup>). For *sugopā*, *sa sugopātamo janah* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *sugopata-mah*: G. M. omit the first word): the Rik *pada* writes *su-gopā-tamah*. For *ṛksāmā*, *ṛksāmābhyām yajushā* (i.2.3<sup>3</sup> and iii.1.1<sup>4</sup>). For *aghā*, *aghāçvād evāi 'nam antar eti bhūtam* (iii.1.7<sup>2</sup>; p. *agha-çvāt*: G. M. omit the last two words); the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts write *agha-açva*: the themes *aghāyu* (e. g. i.2.9<sup>1</sup>) and *aghāyant* (ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>) are also found in the Sanhitā. For *satrā*, *satrājitam dhanajitam* (iv.1.1<sup>3</sup>; p. *satra-jitam*): the word *satrā* occurs repeatedly (e. g. i.6.12<sup>1</sup>) un-compounded, and maintains its long final in the *pada*-text also. For *varshā*, *varshāhvām juhota* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>; p. *varsha-hvām*). For *pushpā*, *pushpāvatiḥ supippalāḥ* (iv.1.4<sup>4</sup> and v.1.5<sup>10</sup>). For *meghā*, *meghāyate svāhā* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; p. *meghayate*; in the same division occurs also *meghāyishyate*, which is not divided: *meghayantī* is found at iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>). For *prā*, *prāvanebhiḥ sajoshasah* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>; p. *pra-vanebhiḥ*); the Rik *pada*-text writes this word *pravana*, without separation: other words beginning with *prā* are *prāsah* (e. g. i.3.14<sup>6</sup>; p. *pra-sahā*), *prāçrṅga* (ii.1.3<sup>4,5</sup>), *prāsaca* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; not divided in *pada*-text), *prākāça* (i.8.18; also not divided), and *prāvṛta* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup> et al.; also not divided). And for *svā*, *svādhiyam janayat sūdayac ca* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>; p. *sva-dhiyam*): but this the Rik *pada*-text writes *su-ādhiyam*.

## लोकश्चेष्ट ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also *ishtā*, after *loke* and *eva*.

The commentator cites the two cases: *sam amushmiṅ loka ish-tāpūrtena* (iii.3.8<sup>5</sup> twice: G. M. omit the first word), and *sa tv eve 'sh-tāpūrtī* (i.7.3<sup>3</sup>; p. *ish-ta-pūrtī*). Then, to show that *ishtā* after other words remains unchanged, he quotes *prati jāgrhy enam ish-tāpūrte sañ srjethām ayam ca* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>; p. *ishtā-pūrte*: W. B.

5. ----- *ity eteshv avagraheshv antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: pras-----: indr-----: drav-----: viçv-----: dīr-----: vīr-----: viçv-----: vāt-----: tvā-----: bhatt-----: sūr-----: vṛsh-----: sa-----: ṛks-----: agh-----: satr-----: varsh-----: pushp-----: megh-----: prāv-----: svā-----.*



omit before *enam*, G. M. after *-pârte*); and the same mode of treatment is followed by the *padu*-text at v.7.7<sup>2</sup>, which is the only other case I have noted. The ground of this difference does not appear. To show, further, that only *ishtâ* shortens its *â* in the defined position, the passage *sâkshâd eva prajâpataye* (v.1.2<sup>5</sup>) is given.

शक्तोरथीविषीवाशीरात्र्योषध्याहुतीव्याहुतीस्वाहा-  
कृतीद्वाहुनीशचीचितीश्रोणीपृष्टीपृत्यभीचर्षणीपर्यधीपा-  
रीशत्रूविष्वसूअनूहनूस्विभू इत्यवग्रहः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Also *çaktî*, *rathî*, *tvishî*, *vâçî*, *râtrî*, *oshadhî*, *âhutî*, *vyâhrtî*, *svâhâkrtî*, *hrâdunî*, *çacî*, *citî*, *çronî*, *prshî*, *pâtî*, *abhî*, *carshanî*, *parî*, *adhî*, *pârî*, *çatrû*, *vishû*, *vasû*, *anû*, *hanû*, *sû*, *vibhû*—all these, as first members of a compound.

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text. For *çaktî*, the sole instance is *çaktîvanto gabhîrâh* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>). For *rathî*, *rathîtamâu rathînâm* (iv.7.15<sup>3</sup>). For *tvishî*, *saspiñjarâya tvishîmate pathînâm* (iv.5.2<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last word, G. M. the first). For *vâçî*, *te vâçîmanta ishminah* (ii.1.11<sup>2</sup> and iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *râtrî*, *râtrîbhir asubhnan* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>): if there are other cases, I have failed to note them. For *oshadhî*, *oshadhîbhyo vehatam âlabheta* (ii.1.5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting. For *âhutî*, *âhutîbhir anûyâjeshu* (ii.6.9<sup>4</sup>). For *vyâhrtî*, *etâbhir vyâhrtîbhih* (i.6.10<sup>2</sup> and v.5.5<sup>3</sup>). For *svâhâkrtî*, *svâhâkrtîbhyah preshye 'ty âha* (vi.3.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *hrâdunî*, *svâhâ hrâdunîbhyah svâhâ* (vii.4.13: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For *çacî*, *viçvâ rūpâ 'bhi cashte çacîbhih* (iv.2.5<sup>4-5</sup>: W. B. omit before *cashte*). For *citî*, *citîbhyâm upâyan* (v.7.5<sup>7</sup>). For *çronî*, *çronîbhyañ svâhâ* (vii.3.16<sup>2</sup>): another case is found at v.7.15. For *prshî*, W. B. give *prshîbhir divam* (v.7.17), but G. M. read *prshîbhyah svâhâ* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>). For *pâtî*, *pâtîgandhasyâ 'pahatyâi* (ii.2.2<sup>4</sup>). For *abhî*, *abhîvrto ghrnîvân cetati tmanâ* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): we have also *abhîshah* at ii.3.2<sup>6</sup> (p. *abhi-sahâ*). For *carshanî*, *mitrasya carshanîdhrtah* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup> and iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>): another case at i.4.16. For *parî*, *vîravantam parînasam* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>; p. *parî-nasam*: compare rule vii.4). For *adhî*, *adhîvâsam yâ hiranyâny asmâi* (iv.6.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *pârî*, *pârînahyasye 'çe* (vi.2.1<sup>1</sup>; p. *pârî-nahyasya*: compare rule vii.4). For *çatrû*, *ça-*

6. *loke: eva: ity evampûrva ishte 'ty asmin<sup>1</sup> grahane<sup>2</sup> 'ntyasvaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ: sam.....: sa..... evampûrva iti kim: prati.....: ishte 'ti kim: sâk.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasminn*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *avagrahe*.



*trúyato hantá* (i.6.5<sup>3</sup> and iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>). For *vishú*, *vishúvān vishúvan-  
taḥ* (vii.4.3<sup>4</sup>): another case at vii.4.8<sup>2</sup>. For *vasú*, *aramatir vasú-  
yuh* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>). For *anú*, *anúrādhā nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>2</sup>); we  
have it also in the compounds *anúyāja* (e. g. ii.6.9<sup>4</sup>), *anúbandhya*  
(e. g. ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>), *anúkāṣa* (e. g. v.4.1<sup>3</sup>), and *anúvrj* (v.7.23). In the  
further compound of the first, *prayājānūyāja* (e. g. i.7.1<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-  
yāja-anūyājān*), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is  
no division after *anu*. Appealing to rule i.53 as his authority, the  
commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, *ananū-  
yājam prāyanīyam* (vi.1.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *ananu-yājam*). For *hanú*, *hanú-  
bhyāñ svāhā* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>). For *sú*, *sūyavasiniṁ manave yaçasye*  
(i.2.13<sup>2</sup>): *sūyavasa* occurs more than once (e. g. i.7.5<sup>2,3</sup>). For  
*vibhú*, *vibhúdāvne* (iii.5.8,9<sup>2</sup>).

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this  
rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as col-  
lectively *avagraha* (i.49), 'first members of compounds.'

अवासचस्वानुदामृडावर्धाशिक्षारक्षायाम्भावामज्ञायत्रा-  
चरापिबानाधामाधार्याधर्षाघावर्धयाबोधायत्रातत्रामुञ्चाश्च-  
स्यापृणस्वाहिष्ठावंतराजनिघ्रायुक्त्वाह ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also *avā*, *sacasvā*, *nudā*, *mṛdā*, *vardhā*, *çikshā*, *rakshā*,  
*adyā*, *bhavā*, *bhajā*, *yatrā*, *carā*, *pibā*, *nā*, *dhāmā*, *dhārayā*,  
*dharshā*, *ghā*, *vardhayā*, *bodhā*, *atrā*, *tatrā*, *muñcā*, *açvasyā*,  
*prṇasvā*, *hi shthā*, *tvam tarā*, *janishvā*, *yukshvā*, *achā*.

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the cate-  
gory of *avagrahas*, or former members of compounds, having been  
exhausted by the foregoing rules. There is cited in illustra-  
tion, for *avā*, *avā no devyā kṛpā* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>). For *sacasvā*, *sacasvā  
naḥ svastaye* (i.5.6<sup>2</sup>). For *nudā*, *pra nudā naḥ sapatnān* (iv.3.12<sup>1</sup>  
thrice, and v.3.5<sup>1</sup>). For *mṛdā*, W. B. give *mṛdā jaritre* (iv.5.10<sup>4</sup>),  
but G. M. read *mṛdā no rudra* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>): I have noted no other  
case. For *vardhā*, *vardhā no amavac chavaḥ* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>). For *çik-*

7. . . . . *ity eteshv avagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañja-  
naparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: çak- . . . : rath- . . . : sa- . . . :  
te . . . : rā- . . . : osh- . . . : āh- . . . : et- . . . : svā- . . . : svā-  
hā . . . : viç- . . . : cit- . . . : çro- . . . : prsh- . . . : pūt- . . . :  
abh- . . . : mitr- . . . : vīr- . . . : adh- . . . : pār- . . . : çatr- . . . :  
vish- . . . : ar- . . . : anū- . . . : ankārādi ca<sup>2</sup> (i.53) iti vacanād<sup>3</sup>  
anan- . . . ity etad<sup>4</sup> udāharanam bhavati: han- . . . : sūy- . . . :  
vibh- . . . : ity avagraha ity anena prakāreṇo 'ktiḥ<sup>5</sup> padasam-  
uddāye<sup>6</sup> 'vagraho vijñeyah<sup>7</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. sūtrāt. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *apy*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. 'ktaḥ.  
<sup>6</sup> G. M. -muccayah. <sup>7</sup> B. viçeshah.



*shâ*, *çikshâ no asmin puruhâta yâmani* (vii.5.7<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last two words): it is found again at iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>. For *rakshâ*, *rakshâ ca no adhi ca deva brâhi* (iv.5.10<sup>3</sup> and vii.5.24; G. M. omit the last two words): the form occurs also at ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>. I have pointed out in the note to the first rule of the chapter that a passage (i.4.24) in which *rakshâ* appears as euphonic alteration of *rakshâh* before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here. For *adyâ*, *adyâ devân jushtatamaḥ* (iv.6.7<sup>5</sup>): also at ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: iii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.2<sup>6</sup>. For *bhavâ*, *bhavâ pâyur viço asyâ adabdhaḥ* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): other cases are not infrequent; see i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 4.32: iii.2.5<sup>3</sup>; 4.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.7<sup>2</sup>; 2.5<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>4</sup>; 4.4<sup>7</sup>; and likewise ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>, where *bhavâ*, standing at the end of the first division of the *anuvâka*, is situated *vibhâge*, and loses its *â* even in the *saṁhitâ*-text. For *bhajâ*, *â gomati vraje bhajâ tvam naḥ* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>: W. B. begin at *vraje*): another case at iii.3.9<sup>2</sup>. For *yâtrâ*, *yâtrâ naro marutaḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>): other cases at iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>; 6.6<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>. For *carâ*, *pra carâ soma duryân* (i.2.10<sup>1</sup>). For *pibâ*, *pibâ somam indra mandatu* (ii.4.14<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): another case at i.4.19. For *nâ*, *ripavo nâ ha debhuḥ* (i.2.14<sup>5-6</sup>): in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note. For *dhâmâ*, *dhâmâ ha yat te ajara* (iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>): we have *dhâma*, plural, in *saṁhitâ* also, at iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>; 7.13<sup>4</sup>. For *dhârayâ*, *brhaspate dhârayâ vasûni* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup> and vi.3.6<sup>1</sup>): other cases at iv.1.5<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>. For *dharshâ*, W. B. have *dharshâ mânushân adbhyaḥ* (i.3.8<sup>1</sup>), but G. M., *dharshâ mânushân iti ni yunakti* (vi.3.6<sup>3</sup>). For *ghâ*, *uta vâ ghâ syâlât* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>): there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>. For *vardhayâ*, *tam agne vardhayâ tvam* (iv.6.3<sup>1</sup>): other cases are at i.5.5<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.4<sup>4</sup>; 7.13<sup>5</sup>. For *bodhâ*, *bodhâ no asya vacaso yavishtâ* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *atrâ*, *atrâ te rūpam* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>): other cases are at iv.6.7<sup>2</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>. For *tatrâ*, *tatrâ ratham upa çagmam* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>). For *muñcâ*, *pra muñcâ svastaye* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>): again at iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>. For *açvasyâ*, *ekas tvash-tur açvasyâ viçastâ* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>). For *pr̥nasvâ*, *sapta yonîr â pr̥nasvâ ghr̥tena* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup> and iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>). For *sthâ* after *hi*, *âpo hi shthâ mayobhuvah* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>); and, as counter-example, to show that the correption takes place only after *hi*, *pratishtâ vâ ekaviñçah* (v.2.3<sup>6</sup> et al.). For *tarâ* after *tvam*, *agne tvam tarâ mrdhaḥ* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *antaratarâ taptavrato bhavati* (vi.2.2<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *janishvâ*, *jani-*

8. ----- <sup>1</sup> *eteshv anavagraheshv antyasvaro vibhâge vyañjana-paro hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ: avâ-----: sac-----: pra-----: mṛ-----: var-----: çiksh-----: rak-----: adyâ-----: bhav-----: â go-----: yat-----: pra-----: pibâ-----: rip-----. api vikṛtam (i.51) apy akârâdi (i.52) iti dvâbhyâm<sup>2</sup> vacanâbhyâm prâ----- ity atra hrasvâdeçah kim na syât: mâi 'vam: api vikṛtam (i.51) iti vacanam kañthoktapadavishayam<sup>3</sup> na tv akârâdipadavishayam<sup>4</sup>: prânâ<sup>5</sup> ity asyâ 'py akârâditvân nâ*



*shvā hi jenyo agne* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup> and v.1.4<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *agne*). For *yukshvā*, *yukshvā hi devahūtamān* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup> et al.): other cases at iv.2.9<sup>5</sup>: v.5.3<sup>1,2</sup>. For *achā*, *achā nakshi dyumattamaḥ* (i.5.6<sup>3</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>8</sup>): other cases at i.7.10<sup>2</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.2.4<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.4<sup>2</sup> (if my MS. is correct; the Rik reads *acha*); 5.1<sup>2</sup>; 6.7<sup>5</sup>: but the compound *achāvāka* (vii.1.5<sup>5</sup>) is left undivided and unchanged.

The occasion of the commentator's delay and discussion over the word *nā* is given by the fact that the *pada*-text of the Tāittirīya Sanhitā (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvan: see note to Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides the word *prānāḥ* thus: *pra-anāḥ*. Hence, when we read in the Sanhitā, as in the passage which he quotes, *prānā vā aṅṣavaḥ* (vi.4.4<sup>4</sup>: W. B. read simply *prānā vāi*, which occurs in various other places; e. g. v.3.8<sup>2</sup>), he fears that, having this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the specification *nā* of the present rule applies to *prānā*, because we are taught in the first chapter (i.51,52) that a word cited in any rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or preceded by *a*. He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbitrary *dictum* that it is not permitted to vary the same word in both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the prefixion of an *a* to one so quoted: hence, he infers, the present rule does not apply to [the *anā* of] *prānā*, as it begins with *a*. But a further objection is interposed: in that case, why does it not apply to the part *anā* of the compound, in which is no altered *n*? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in *saṁhitā*, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better statement, because of the absence of any such word in *saṁhitā* as *anā* (for *anāḥ*) with a long vowel as its final. The second objection, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of bringing up and setting aside. The original difficulty is one growing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases of final *ā* in *saṁhitā* where a *visarjanīyā* has been lost after it (see note to rule 1). The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere.

## अध्याग्नियान्ये ॥ १ ॥

9. Also *adhā*, in *agni* and *yājyā* passages.

'*yam vidhiḥ. tarhi vikṛtatvābhāvād*<sup>6</sup> *anā ity asye*<sup>7</sup> '*nygāṅṣasya*<sup>8</sup>  
*kim na syād ayam vidhiḥ. evamrūpasya saṁhitāyām dīrghābhā-*  
*vāt. dhā-.....: brh-.....: dhar-.....: uta.....: tam.....: bo-*  
*dhā.....: atrā.....: tat.....: pra.....: ek-.....: sap-.....:*  
*āpo.....: hī 'ti kim: pra.....: agne.....: tvam iti kim:*  
*ant-.....: jan-.....: yuk-.....: achā.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. -*ktip*-; B. om. *pada*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. *pada*. <sup>5</sup> W. ins. *vā*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vāikṛtasyā 'bh*-. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> B. G. M. -*yāṅ*-.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*shinenā, dakshinenā vasūni patih sindhūnām asi* (iii.4.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit after *vasūni*). For *svenā, svenā hi vṛtrañ çavasā jaghantha* (vii.4.15: B. omits the last word; G. M. the last two). For *hantanā, tapasā hantanā tam* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>). For *jagāmā, ā jagāmā parasāh* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>). For *ruhemā, asravantīm ā ruhemā svastaye* (i.5.11<sup>5</sup>). For *vidmā, vidmā te agne tredhā trayāni vidmā te* (iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. stop at *agne*, thus instancing only one of the two cases; there are two more in the same verse): also at i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>. For *ṛdhyāmā, ṛdhyāmā ta ohāih* (iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>). For *cakṛmā, cakṛmā kac canā "gaḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>): other cases at i.8.3: ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>: iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>; 6.8<sup>3</sup>. For *kshāmā, kshāmā rerihad vīrudhaḥ* (i.3.14<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases at ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: iv.7.12<sup>3</sup>. For *starīmā, sushtarīmā jushānā* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>): here the application of rule i.51 becomes necessary. For *bharemā, añhomuce pra bharemā manīshām* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *varshayathā, yūyam vṛshtīm varshayathā purīshinaḥ* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the first word). For *īrayathā, ud īrayathā marutaḥ* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>). For *ārithā, yoner udārithā yaje tam* (iv.6.5<sup>4</sup>). For *pāthā, kshaye pāthā divo vimahasah* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>). For *athā, athā somasya prayatī yuvabhyām* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases are numerous, namely i.1.13<sup>1</sup> twice; 5.5<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup> twice; 7.13<sup>4</sup>: ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>; 6.12<sup>2</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>; 4.11<sup>6</sup>: iv.2.1<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>, 6<sup>1,2</sup>; 6.3<sup>4</sup> twice; 7.13<sup>5</sup>; and, as I doubt not, at the end of iii.2.11<sup>2</sup>, where, however, the present *samhitā*-text reads *atha*, because the word stands *vibhāge*. For *siñcathā, yatrā naro marutaḥ siñcathā madhu* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>). For *janayathā, āpo janayathā ca naḥ* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>). For *jayatā, upa pre 'ta jayatā nara sthirāḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ukshatā, ā ghr̥tam ukshatā madhuvarṇam* (iv.3.13<sup>8</sup>). For *avatā, asmān u devā avatā haveshu* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>): another case at iv.2.6<sup>3</sup>. For *yātā, devā rathāir yātā hiraṇyayāih* (iv.7.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *çṛnutā, marutaḥ çṛnutā havam* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>). For *kṛnutā, samvatsarāya kṛnutā br̥han namaḥ* (v.7.2<sup>4</sup>). Finally, for *bibhrtā, mâte 'va putram bibhrtā sv enam* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup>: W. B. begin at *putram*).

## भरता याज्यासु ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also *bharatā*, in *yājyā* passages.

10. ----- *ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv anavagraheshv<sup>2</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: kutrā-----: daksh-----: svenā-----: tap-----: āj-----: asr-----: vidmā-----: ṛdhy-----: cakṛ-----: kshā-----: susht-----: añh-----: yūyam-----: ud-----: yoner-----: kshaye-----: athā-----: yatrā-----: āpo-----: upa-----: ā-----: asmān-----: devā-----: mar-----: sam-----: mā-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *avag-*; G. M. om.



Which are the sections called *yâjyâ* has been pointed out above, under rule 9.

The cited passages are: *bharatâ vasuvittamam* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup>), *bharatâ jâtavedasam* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), and *pârvyam vaco 'gnaye bharatâ brhat* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains. As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to *yâjyâ* passages, is quoted *esha vo bharatâ râjâ* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>,12<sup>2</sup>), where *bharatâ* stands for *bharatâh*. If the text contained a *bharatâ* as instrumental of the participle *bharant*, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have better right to be specifically excluded; but I have not found such a form anywhere. Respecting *bharatâ* as standing in *samhitâ* for *bharatâh*, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter.

अत्ताभवतानदतातरतातपताजुहुतावोचतामुञ्चताचृ-  
ताघृष्याजनयावर्तयासाद्यापारयादीयाहराभरापाससाद-  
सृजातिष्ठयिना ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also *attâ*, *bhavatâ*, *anadatâ*, *taratâ*, *tapatâ*, *juhutâ*, *vocatâ*, *amuñcatâ*, *crtâ*, *ghushyâ*, *janayâ*, *vartayâ*, *sâdayâ*, *pârayâ*, *dîyâ*, *harâ*, *bharâ*, *apâ*, *sasâdâ*, *srjâ*, *tishthâ*, and *yenâ*.

The cited passages are: for *attâ*, *attâ havîñshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>). For *bhavatâ*, *âdityâso bhavatâ mṛdayantaḥ* (i.4.22 and ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>). For *anadatâ*, *samprayatîr ahâv anadatâ hate* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the first word). For *taratâ*, *suvo ruhânâs taratâ rajâñsi* (iii.5.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *tapatâ*, *gharmanî na sâmam tapatâ svṛktibhiḥ* (i.6.12<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. [O. begins in the comment to this rule] omit before *tapatâ*). For *juhutâ*, *pitre juhutâ viçvakarmane* (iv.6.2<sup>6</sup>). For *vocatâ*, *viçve devâso adhi vocatâ me* (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit to *adhi*). For *amuñcatâ*, *padi shitâm amuñcatâ yajatrâḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>). For *crtâ*, *ayasmayam vi crtâ bandham etam* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup>). For *ghushyâ*, *parushparur ani ghushyâ viçasta* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>). For *janayâ*, *manur bhava janayâ dâivyam janam* (iii.4.2<sup>2</sup>,3<sup>7</sup>). For *vartayâ*, *tâbhir â vartayâ punaḥ* (iii.3.10<sup>1</sup>). For *sâdayâ*, *sâdayâ yajñañ sukṛtasya yonâu* (iii.5.11<sup>2</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>3</sup>). For *pârayâ*, *agne tvam pârayâ navyo asmân* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>: all but W. omit the last word). For *dîyâ*, *brhaspate pari dîyâ rathena* (iv.6.4<sup>1-2</sup>: the text reads *dîya*, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section): another case is iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>. For *harâ*, *nihâram in ni me harâ nihâram*

11. *bharatâ ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahane<sup>2</sup> 'ntyasvaro yâjyâvishaye<sup>2</sup> vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ: bhar-----: bhar-----: pâr----- yâjyâsv iti kim: esha-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmin*. <sup>2</sup> B. *avagraheshv*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yâjyâyâm*, and put before the preceding word.



(i.8.4<sup>1</sup>). For *bhará*, *mā no mardhîr ā bhará dadhi tan nah pra dāçushe* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: O. omits after *bhará*; B. G. M. after *dādhi*): there is no other case, *bhará* at i.3.14<sup>3</sup> in the Calcutta edition being an erratum. For *apā*, *duro na vājan çrutya apā vrdhi* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>: W. B. omit the first two words). For *sasādā*, *agnir hotā ni sha sādā yajyān* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word): there is another case at iv.6.2<sup>1</sup>, requiring, like the others, the application of rule i.51. For *srjā*, *srjā vrshtim divah* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>3</sup>): there are other cases at ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.8<sup>3</sup>. For *tishthā*, *tishthā devo na savitā* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>): other cases at iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: v.2.1<sup>4</sup>, and perhaps also at iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>, where the word ends a division of the *anuvāka*. For *yenā*, *yenā sahasram vahasi* (iv.7.13<sup>4</sup> and v.7.7<sup>3</sup>).

### उष्मसीक्रयोऋधीश्रुधीयदी ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also *uçmasî*, *krayî*, *kṛdhî*, *çrudhî*, and *yadî*.

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows. For *uçmasî*, *te te dhāmany uçmasî gamadhye* (i.3.6<sup>1-2</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words); here, as *uçmasî* stands at the end of a division, or *vibhāge*, its *î* is short in the accepted text. For *krayî*, *rudra yat te krayî param nāma* (i.8.14<sup>2</sup>). For *kṛdhî*, *kṛdhî sv asmān aditeḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word). For *çrudhî*, *imam me varuṇa çrudhî havam* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>). For *yadî*, *yadî bhūmim janayan* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>).

### सूतनुमिथुमक्षु ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also *sû*, *tû*, *nû*, *mithû*, *makshû*, and *û*.

The cited passages are as follows: for *sû*, *mo shû na indra* (i.8.3). For *tû*, *ā tû na upa gantana* (i.5.11<sup>4-5</sup>): there are two other cases, i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>, both after *ā*. For *nû*, *etaçasya nû rane* (iv.6.1<sup>2</sup>). For *mithû*, *gātrāny asinā mithû kaḥ* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *makshû*, *makshû devavato rathaḥ* (i.8.22<sup>3</sup>). For *û*, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,

12. ----- *eteshv anavagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro<sup>2</sup> vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: attā-----: ād-----: sampr-----: suvo-----: ghar-----: pitre-----: viçve-----: padī-----: ayas-----: par-----: man-----: tābh-----: sād-----: agne-----: brh-----: nih-----: mā-----: duro-----: agnir-----: srjā-----: tish-----: yenā-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *av-*; G. M. *gvahaneshu*. <sup>2</sup> O. begins here.

13. ----- *ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> anavagraheshv<sup>3</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: te-----: rudra-----: kṛdhî-----: imam-----: yadî-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *eshv*. <sup>3</sup> W. *av-*; G. M. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



found in the existing *pada*-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a *pada*-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout; but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr. Haug at Munich, for verification in his *pada*-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the Prâtiçâkhyas has come to light. Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the Prâtiçâkhyas in fault. Thus *yojâ*, in the refrain *yojâ nv indra te harî* (i.8.5<sup>1,2</sup>), which is shortened to *yoja* in the *pada*-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr. vii.7) and the White Yajus (by Vâj. Pr. iii.106), remains *yojâ* in that of our Sanhitâ. Again, *eva* occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz. at i.8.22<sup>2</sup>: ii.1.11<sup>3</sup>: iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>; 3.13<sup>3</sup>; 7.15<sup>7</sup>: v.2.8<sup>3</sup>), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their Prâtiçâkhyas: see Rik Pr. vii.12,19; viii.20: Vâj. Pr. iii.123: Ath. Pr. iii.16, note, I.1.c.): but the Tâittirîya *pada* reads in each case *evâ*. Once more, in the passage *tava dharmâ yuyopima* (Rig-Veda vii.89.5; Ath. Veda vi.51.3; Tâitt. Sanh. iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>), the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read *dharma* (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr.; in the Ath. Pr. it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our Sanhitâ has *dharmâ*, like the *samhitâ*-reading.

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the *pada*-text. Separated, without correption of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are *uttarâ-vat* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>), *sahasâ-van* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>), *malmalâ-bhavant* (i.4.34), *vṛshâ-kapî* (i.7.13<sup>2</sup>), such copulative compounds as *indrâ-varuṇayoḥ* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>) and *agnâ-vishṇû* (i.1.12), and *ūrṇâ-mradas* (i.1.11<sup>1</sup>: while, nevertheless, we have *ūrṇa-mradas* at i.2.2<sup>2</sup>, the *pada*-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the *samhitâ*: where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading *ūrṇâmmradas* and *ūrṇammradas* is more than I can imagine).

---

15. *vî 'ty evampūrva utpūrvo vâ 'n ity esha ' svaro 'nudâtto 'nûshnavaty' ūshmarahite pade vartamāno vyañjanaparah padâ-dâu vartamānatvât pūrvapadena' vibhâge sati hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ: vyânâye 'ti vi-anâya: udânâye 'ty ut-anâya. evampūrva iti kim: yad----: pary----: nakârah kimarthah: yad----: udâ----: anudâtta iti kim: viçv----: nesh----: anûshnavatî 'ti kim: pathâ----: ud-----.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane  
trtîyo 'dhyâyah'.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *âkâra*. <sup>2</sup> W. *ûshm*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*de*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *çrîkṛshṇâya namah*.



Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correction of the vowel, are such words as *ṛtâshât* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>) and *turâshât* (i.7.13<sup>4</sup>), also *tvashtîmant* (i.2.5<sup>2</sup>), *anyâdr̥ç* (i.8.13<sup>2</sup>), *ubhayâdat* (ii.2.6<sup>3</sup>), *arâtîyant* (i.6.1<sup>1</sup>) and *arâtîvan* (vii.4.15), *atîkâça* (i.2.2<sup>2</sup>) and *prâkâça* (i.8.18), *avâçr̥nga* (ii.1.8<sup>5</sup>) and *prâçr̥nga* (ii.1.3<sup>1</sup>: as I doubt not: my information is deficient for this word), *upânah* (v.4.4<sup>4</sup>), *nîvâra* (iv.7.4<sup>2</sup>) and *nîhâra* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup>), and *purûravah* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup>).

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial: thus we read in *pada*-text, for example, *vâvr̥dhe* (i.4.20), *sâsahat* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup>), and *ushâsam* (iv.4.4<sup>2</sup>).

Many of these items constitute striking peculiarities of the Tâittirîya *pada*, and its careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

CONTENTS: 1-4, introductory; 5-54, rehearsal of cases of *pragrahas*, or uncombinable final vowels.

अथ प्रग्रहाः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now the *pragrahas*.

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator. The same subject is treated by the other Prâtiçâkhyas, at Rik Pr. i.18-19, Vâj. Pr. i.92-98, Ath. Pr. i.73-82. It occupies here a great deal more space, because the Tâitt. Pr. avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes. A rule in a later chapter (x.24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as *pragraha* are exempt from euphonic combination. The term *pragraha* is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead *pragr̥hya*.

नावग्रहः ॥ २ ॥

2. No former member of a compound is *pragraha*.

As the former member of a separable compound (*avagraha*: i.49) is regarded and treated as an independent *pada*, the rules declaring certain final vowels *pragraha* would apply to the finals

---

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah*: *pragrahâ ucyanta ity 'etad' adhikrtam veditavyam ita' uttaram yad vakshyâmah.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. om.    (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. om.



of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary. The commentator cites rules 5,6,36,37,49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the Sanhitâ in illustration *tanûnapâd asuraḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>1</sup>: the *tanû* of *tanû-napât* would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 5), *agoargham yajamânam* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup>: *ago-argham* would fall else under rule 6), *agnîshomâu mâ* (ii.5.2<sup>2</sup>: it is implied that the *pada*-text would write *agnî-somâu*, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36: such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and *dvedve puronuvâkye kuryât* (ii.2.9<sup>2</sup>: the *pada* writes *dve-dve*, so that both members would be declared alike *pragraha* by rule 49). The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified.

अन्तः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Only a final is *pragraha*.

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation *pragraha*. He cites, as example, the phrase *devate samṛddhyâi* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>). The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5,6,33—describe certain letters or syllables as *pragraha* without farther limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final. This in answer to the criticizing inquiry “whether a letter not final can also be *pragraha*?”—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured; for the word *api* of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle “continued implication is of that which is last” (i.58). The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to *api* a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever. Instead, however, of showing the

---

2. *avagrahaḥ pragraho na bhavati: ūkâraḥ* (iv.5): *okâro 'sâñhito 'kâravyañjanaparaḥ* (iv.6): *gnî* (iv.36): *na hiparaḥ* (iv.37): *dve* (iv.49) *iti vakshyate*<sup>1</sup>: *etad*<sup>2</sup> *uddiçya purastâdapavâdo 'nena vidhîyate. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *tan-.....: ago-.....: agn-.....: dve-.....: avagraha*<sup>4</sup> *iti jâtyapekshâyâm ekavacanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -ti; B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. tad. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. nâ 'v.

3. *padasyâ 'ntaḥ pragrahasamjño bhavati. yathâ: dev-..... atra 'ha: kim apadânto 'pi pragrahaḥ syât. atro 'cyate: ūkâraḥ* (iv.5) *ity aviçeshena vakshyati: okâro 'sâñhito 'kâravyañjanaparaḥ* (iv.6) *iti: cî yatpraparaḥ* (iv.33) *iti ca: apadântasyo 'kârasyâu 'kârasya cîçabdâsya vâ pragrahatvam*<sup>1</sup> *mâ bhûd iti.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



The commentator adds the limitation that, "if long in *pada*-text," the final *ū* is universally *pragraha*; referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii.14, of an *u* irregularly lengthened in *samhitā*. His examples are *hanū vā ete yajñasya* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word), *vāsantikāv rtū çukraç ca* (iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. omit after *rtū*), and *harinasya bāhū upastutam janima tat te arvan* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last four words; the others, the first word).

## ओकारो ऽसांहितो ऽकारव्यञ्जनपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also an *o* which is not the product of euphonic combination, if followed by *a* or a consonant.

Of words exhibiting in *pada*-text, as well as in *samhitā*, a final *o*, there are (apart from the theme *go*, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of *pragrahas*) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in *u*, the other of words whose final *a* or *ā* is combined with the particle *u*. The present rule deals, in general, with the former class; the one next following, with the latter class. The right of the vocatives in *o* to be treated as *pragrahas* is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the Prâtiçâkhya; for to say that such words are *pragraha* before *a* or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic *o* which comes from a final *as*; since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial *a*. The only instances in which a vocative in *o* exhibits a *pragraha* character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i.4.27: v.7.2<sup>4</sup>: vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>); the cases in which it is regularly changed to *av* before other vowels than *a* are much more numerous: namely, before *ā*, at i.4.39: ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>: vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>; before *i*, at ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>; before *u*, at i.2.13<sup>2</sup> twice; 6.12<sup>3</sup>: iii.2.10<sup>1</sup>; before *e*, at ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>. I have noted but two cases in the text where such an *o* stands before initial *a* without absorbing it; they are found at i.3.8<sup>1</sup>, 14<sup>7</sup>. And there are the same

5. *ākārah padāntaḥ sarvatra pragraho bhavati: padasamaye vartamānaḥ. yathā: hanū----: vās----- har----- padasamaye vartamāna iti kim: sātūnāmithūmakshūū<sup>1</sup> (iii.14) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. omit after *mithū*.

6. *asāmhita okāro 'kāraparo vā<sup>1</sup> vyañjanaparo vā pragrahaḥ syāt. yathā: vad-----: vish----- asāmhita iti kim: so-----: <sup>2</sup>pra----- evampara iti kim<sup>2</sup>: vish----- samhitānimittaḥ sāmhitāḥ: na sāmhito 'sāmhitāḥ: akāraç ca vyañjanam cā 'kāravyañjane: te pare yasmāt sa tatho 'ktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) W. B. O. om.



number of cases—namely, at ii.5.12<sup>5</sup> and vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>—in which it causes the elision of a following *a*.

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are *vad-mâ hi suno usi* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup>), and *vishno havyañ rakshasva* (i.1.3). To show the necessity of the limitation *asâmhitaḥ*, he cites *so 'bravît* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *pra so agne* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: omitted, however, by W. B. O.), where *so* is the *sâmhita* reading for *saḥ*; and, to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before *a* or a consonant (the *lacuna* of W. B. O. extends through this explanation), he gives us *vishṇav e 'hî 'dam* (ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>).

For the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas respecting this class of asserted *pragrahas*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.81.

## समहृद्यपित्पूर्वश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7. As also, when preceded by *s*, *m*, *h*, *d*, *th*, and *pit*.

The *anuvṛtti* of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual. Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former. The meaning is, that an original *o*, preceded as here specified, is *pragraha* even when followed by other vowels than *a*. The commentator is in error in saying that *ca* implies *okâraḥ* from above; he should have said *okâro 'sâmhitaḥ*.

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of *pragrahas* composed of words whose final vowel, *a* or *â*, is combined with the particle *u*. Of these, *atho* is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the Sanhitâ. Before *a* it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision; before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined. Along with it, *tatho* is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final *o* after *th*: it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below). The only word showing *o* after *s* is *so*, found only in two passages, as noted below. After *m*, we have *o* both in *mo* (in two passages, once before *sh*, at i.8.3; the other is cited by the commentator) and in *imo*, which latter is found only before *a* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule. The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of: they are *o* (once, i.4.33), *to*

---

7. *pûrvoktaparanimittâbhâve 'pi kâryavidhânârtham okâram viçinashṭi: cakâra okâram anvâdiçati. sa: ma: ha: da: tha: pit: evampûrvo 'sâmhita okâro 'kâravyañjanâbhyâm anyaparo 'pi pragraho bhavati. yathâ: so-----: mâ-----: upa-----: indo-----: tatho-----: sa----- evampûrva iti kim: 'çat-----: asâmhita iti kim<sup>1</sup>: pra-----*

(1) B. om.



(i.2.5<sup>2</sup> and vi.1.8<sup>5</sup>) and *uto* (five times), *upo* (four times), and *pro* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>).

Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the *h* is made for but a single case of the exclamation *ho*, which the commentator quotes: *upahūtāñz ho ity āha* (ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>); the *d* is for the vocative *indo*, which occurs twice: *indo indriyāvataḥ* (i.4.27), and *indo ity āha* (vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>): the commentator quotes the latter passage; the *pit* is for the vocative *pito*, only found once, as cited: *sa no mayobhāḥ pito ā viçasva* (v.7.2<sup>4-5</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words). These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the *Sanhitâ* affords of vocatives in *o* showing an uncombinable quality.

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the *o* is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated." As examples of words whose ending is combined with *u*, after the consonants specified, he gives *so evāi 'shāi 'tasya* (ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>; 5.5<sup>5</sup>), *mā bher māro mo eshām* (iv.5.10<sup>1</sup>), and *tatho evo 'ttare nir vapet* (iii.4.9<sup>7</sup>: W. B. O. omit after *uttare*). His counter-examples are *çatakratav ud vañçam iva* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *iva*), and *pra so agne* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>): but G. M., which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it *mā so asmāñ avahāya* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>); their separate application is manifest.

The treatment by the *Prâtiçâkhya* of words ending in *o* is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules. We should be justified in inferring from its statements that *o*, *to*, *uto*, *upo* and *pro* were not regarded as *pragrahas* at all, nor the vocatives in *o* except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with *iti* in the *pada*-text: while, doubtless, in every *pada*-text of the Black *Yajus*, as in those of the other *Vedas*, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombinable quality in *sanhitâ* or not. Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as *pragrahas*, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text.

## अथैकारिकारौ ॥ ८ ॥

8. Now follow cases of *e* and *î*.

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final *e* and *î* from the action of its rules. The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble.

---

8. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah: ekârekârâu<sup>1</sup> pragrahatvena vidhîyete<sup>2</sup> ity etad<sup>3</sup> adhikṛtam veditavyam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ekâra îkârah.* <sup>2</sup> W. O. *-yate*; B. *-yayate*; G. M. *viçishyata.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



शस्त्रेऋक्सामिऋक्तेऋपितैरेवतेपूर्तेप्रत्तेविधृतेऋनृतेऋहिद्रे-  
बहुलेपूर्वजेकृणुध्वंसदने ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also *devate*, *ubhe*, *bhâgadhe*, *ûrdhve*, *viçâkhe*, *çrînge*, *ene*, *medhye*, *tr̥ṇe*, *tr̥dye*, *kanînike*, *pârçve*, *çive*, *co 'ttame*, *evo 'ttare*, *çipre*, *rathamtare*, *vatsarasya rûpe*, *virûpe*, *vishurûpe*, *sadohavir-  
dhâne*, *adhishavane*, *ahorâtre*, *dhr̥tavrâte*, *stutaçastre*, *r̥ksâme*, *akte*, *arpite*, *râivate*, *pûrte*, *pratte*, *vidhr̥te*, *anr̥te*, *achidre*, *bahule*, *pûrvaje*, *kr̥ṇudhvañ sadane*.

For the *pragrahas* catalogued in this rule—all of them dual cases of feminines and neuters—the commentator quotes illustrative passages as follows. For *devate*, *devate samṛddhyâi mâitram* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>: the last word in G. M. only). For *ubhe*, G. M. have *achidre bahule ubhe: vyacasvatî samvasâthâm* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>); but W. B. O., blunderingly, *ime eva rasenâ 'nakti* (vi.3.11<sup>3</sup>: B. O. have *ubhe* for *ime*): the word occurs also in other passages. For *bhâgadhe*, *bhâgadhe bhâgadhâ asmâi* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>): also in the preceding division of the same *anuvâka*, and at v.5.9<sup>2</sup>. As counter-example, to show that *dhe* (itself a *pada*, *bhâga-dhe*) would not have answered the purpose alone, we have *agna udadhe* (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>: *pada*-text, *uda-dhe*). For *ûrdhve*, *ûrdhve samidhâv â dadhâti* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> and vi.2.1<sup>6</sup>). For *viçâkhe*, *viçâkhe nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>2</sup>): and as counter-example, to show the necessity of including the *vi* (of *viçâkhe*), we have *tasmint sahasraçâkhe*, stated to be found “in the text of another school.” About a score of such alleged citations from “another text,” assumed to have been had in view by the authors of the *Prâtiçâkhya* in constructing their rules, are given in various parts of the commentary (five of them in the comment upon this rule): they will be put together, and their bearing discussed, in an additional note at the end of the work. For *çrînge*, *antarâ çrînge tam devatâḥ* (vi.2.8<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *devatâḥ*): the word also occurs at i.2.14<sup>7</sup>. The next two words, *ene* and *medhye*, occur in the same passage, *medhye evâi 'ne karoti* (vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>), which the comment quotes, in W. O. giving *medhye* last, after the rest, by way of justifying the order in which the two words stand in the rule: but B. G. M. read the whole passage as it stands in the text, and G. M. make the rule read correspondingly *medhye ene* (T. has, like the others, *ene medhye*). *Ene* is also found in one or

11. ----- *etâni padâni pragrahasamjñâni<sup>1</sup> syuh<sup>2</sup>. yathâ: dev-  
-----: achid-----: bhâg-----: bhâge<sup>3</sup> 'ti kim: agna-----: ûr-  
-----: viç-----: vî<sup>4</sup> 'ti kim: tas----- iti çâkhântare<sup>5</sup>: ant-----:  
ev-----: me-----: asam-----: sam-----: yad-----: pâr-----:  
pit-----: vik-----: ce 'ti kim: sam-----: tatho-----: eve 'ti  
kim: nâi-----: pît-----: yad-----: samv-----: sam-----:  
vish-----: vatsarasyavivishv<sup>6</sup> iti kim: arû-----: 'rûpaçabdasya*



two other passages (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup> : vi.2.9<sup>1</sup> again; 3.9<sup>6</sup>). For *tr̥ṇṇe*, *asam-tr̥ṇṇe hi hanû atho khalu* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup> : only G. M. have the last two words). For *tr̥dye*, *samtr̥dye dhṛtyâi* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>). For *kanînike*, *yad atirâtrâu kanînike agnishtomâu yat* (vii.2.9<sup>1</sup> : W. B. O. begin at *kan-*) : the same word occurs twice more in the next division. For *pârçve*, *pârçve paraḥsamânaḥ* (vii.3.10<sup>3</sup>) : it is found a second time in the same division. For *çive*, *pitarah somyâsah çive no dyâvâpr̥thivî* (iv.6.6<sup>4</sup> : W. B. O. begin at *çive*). For *co 'ttame*, *vikarnîm co 'ttame upa dadhâti* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup> : only G. M. have the last two words) : and, to show the necessity of the *ca*, *samvatsarañ sampâdyo 'ttame mâsi* (vii.5.3<sup>1</sup>). For *evo 'ttare*, *tatho evo 'ttare nirvapet* (iii.4.9<sup>7</sup>) : and, to show why *eva* had to be included in the rule, *nâi 'ti shodacy uttare tena* (vii.1.4<sup>3</sup> : only G. M. have *tena*). For *çipre*, *pîtvâ çipre avepayah* (i.4.30 : W. B. O. begin with *çipre*). For *rathamtare*, *yad bṛhadrathamtare anvarjeyuh* (vii.5.3<sup>2</sup> : only G. M. have *yad*) : the same compound occurs in several places elsewhere. For *vatsarasya rūpe*, *samvatsarasya rūpe âpnuvanti* (vii.5.1<sup>4</sup>). For *virūpe*, *samanasâ virūpe dhâpayete* (iv.1.10<sup>4</sup> ; 6.5<sup>2</sup> ; 7.12<sup>3</sup>). For *vishurūpe*, *vishurūpe ahanî dyâur ivâ 'si* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup> : W. B. O. stop with *ahanî*). The necessity of including in the rule, besides the *pada rūpe*, the words *vatsarasya*, *vishu* (of *vishu-rūpe*), and *vi* (of *vi-rūpe*) is proved by the citation of *arûkshitam dr̥ça â rūpe annam* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup>), where *rūpe* is locative : and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in the South-Indian MSS.), “the separate specification of the word *rûpa* is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enunciation.” For *sadohavirdhâne*, *sadohavirdhâne eva sam minoti* (ii.5.5<sup>5</sup>) : the compound occurs twice more, at vi.2.6<sup>2</sup> ; 5.1<sup>5</sup>. To justify the inclusion of *sadaḥ*, the commentator quotes *uparavâ havirdhâne khâyante* (vi.2.11<sup>1</sup>) ; but the case appears to him one not to be so easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it, which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the connection. For *adhishavane*, *hanû adhishavane jihvâ* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>) : it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and at iv.7.8<sup>1</sup>. The *adhi* is justified by reference to *savanesavane 'bhi gr̥hñâti* (vi.4.11<sup>4</sup> ; 6.11<sup>3</sup>). For *ahorâtre*, *ahorâtre prâ 'viçan* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>) : the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere. The passage *atirâtre paçukâmasya* (vi.6.11<sup>4</sup>) is given to account for the inclusion of *ahaḥ* ; this implies, of course, that the Tâittirîya *pada*-text treats the word as a separable compound, *ahaḥ-râtre*. For *dhṛtavrate*, *dyâvâpr̥thivî dhṛtavrate âvinnâ devî* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup> : G. M. omit the last

---

*prativîçeshanam uccâraṇavispaštârtham<sup>8</sup> drashtavyam<sup>7</sup> : sada-  
 ---- : sada iti kim : up----- nanu padagrahaṇeshu pa-  
 dam gamyeta (i.50) iti sâmarchyâd<sup>9</sup> dhavirdhâne ity ekapada-  
 syâi 'va kâryasiddhiḥ : sadaḥpadam vyartham. mâi 'vam : pa-  
 dagrahaṇe sthalântare<sup>10</sup> bhinnarûpasya<sup>11</sup> sambhâvanâyâm<sup>9</sup> vi-  
 çeshanam sârthakam bhavati<sup>12</sup> : bhinnarûpatvâbhâve tu codyam  
 etad bhavet<sup>13</sup>. nanu tarhi devate iti padagrahaṇasya sthalântare<sup>14</sup>*



word); and, to account for the inclusion of *dhr̥ta*, *yasya vrate pushtipatih* (iii.1.11<sup>3</sup>). For *stutaçastre*, *stutaçastre evāi 'tena duhe* (v.6.8<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): it occurs again at vii.3.13. This time, resort is had to "another text" (*çākhāntaram*) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply *çastre*: it is *ūrdhve çastre pratishthite*. For *ṛksāme*, *ṛksāme vāi devebhyah* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>): the word is found twice in this division, and also at vi.5.9<sup>2</sup>; 6.7<sup>4</sup>. Here, again, a passage in "another text," *brahma sām̐e pratishthite* (G. M. omit the last word, and B. O. omit the *sā* of *sām̐e*), is appealed to in justification of the *ṛk*. For *akte*, *pururavā ghr̥tenā 'kte vṛshanam dadhāthām* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup> and [except *pururavāh*] vi.3.5<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first word, B. also the last). For *arpite*, *dyāvapr̥thivī bhuvaneshv arpite* (iv.7.13<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). For *rāivate*, *çākvararāivate sām̐anī* (i.8.13<sup>2</sup> and iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>): the same compound is found again at iv.3.2<sup>3</sup>. For *pūrte*, the different recensions give different examples: W. B. O. have *ishtāpūrte sañ sr̥jethām* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>); G. M., *ishtāpūrte kṛṇutāt* (v.7.7<sup>2</sup>): I have noted no other cases: for the treatment of the word in the *pada*-text see the note to iii.6. For *pratte*, *pratte kāmam annādyaṃ duhāte* (v.4.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *vidhr̥te*, again, W. B. O. have *vidhr̥te sarvatah* (vi.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and G. M. *tasmān nāsikayā cakshushī vidhr̥te samānī* (ii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), and the *vi* is justified by an alleged citation from "another text," *agnidhr̥te* (G. M., however, omitting the *agni*, thus leaving it to be understood that the simple word *dhr̥te* is found elsewhere not *pragraha*). For *anr̥te*, *satyānr̥te avapaçyan* (v.6.1<sup>1</sup>). For *achidre*, *achidre bahule ubhe* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *ubhe*), which answers also for *bahule*: it is the only passage containing either word. For *pūrvaje*, *pūrvaje pitarā navyasībhiḥ* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word): another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter. Once more a word, *prathamaje*, is cited from "another text," in order to explain why the rule does not say simply *je* (since the *pada*-text writes *pūrvaje*). For *kṛṇudhvañ sadane*, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, *gīrbhiḥ kṛṇudhvañ sadane ṛtasya* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit *ṛtasya*), with the counter-example *apām tvā sadane sādāyāmi* (iv.3.1: G. M. omit the last word), to show the necessity of *kṛṇudhvam*.

To return, now, to the long word *sadohavirdhāne*. The objection is raised, that its part *sadaḥ* is unnecessary, and that it would

---

*soma . . . . iti bhinnarūpatvād<sup>15</sup> viçeshanena bhavitavyam: tac canā 'sti. ucyate: devate ity akhaṇḍapadasyai 'va kāryavidhānād atra viçeshanam na yujyate: akhaṇḍavidhānam<sup>16</sup> iti katham pratīyate: te ity asya te mā pātam (iv.42) ity ādinā pr̥thakkarānād iti br̥mah: nāi<sup>17</sup> 'vam havirdhāne<sup>18</sup> ity asyā<sup>19</sup> 'khaṇḍatvadyotakam<sup>20</sup> kimcid apy<sup>21</sup> asti yena sadaḥpadavādiyarthyam ālambate<sup>22</sup>. hanū . . . .: adhī 'ti kim: sav . . . .: aho . . . .: ahar iti kim: ati . . . .: dyāv . . . .: dhr̥te 'ti kim: yasya . . . .: stu-*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



12. Also *amî*, *cakshushî*, *kârshṇî*, *devatâ phalgunî*, *mushtî*, *dhî*, *nâbhî*, *vapâçrapanî*, *ahanî*, *janmanî*, *sumninî*, *sâmanî*, *vâishṇavî*, *âikshavî*, *darvî*, *dyâvâprthivî*.

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows. For *amî*, according to W. B. O., *amî vâ idam abhūvan* (iii.3.7<sup>1</sup>); but according to G. M., *amî tvâ jahati* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>): I have noted elsewhere only vi.1.5<sup>4</sup>. For *cakshushî*, *cakshushî vâ ete yajñasya* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *yajñasya*): the word occurs about a dozen times. For *kârshṇî*, *kârshṇî upānahāv upa muñcate* (v.4.4<sup>4</sup>; 6.6<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *phalgunî*, *pitaro devatâ phalgunî nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>1</sup>): again in the next division of the same section. To show the necessity of including *devatâ* in the rule, is given *yad dvitīyañ sâ phalgunî* (ii.1.2<sup>2</sup>). For *mushtî*, *mushtî karoti vācam* (v.2.1<sup>7</sup> and vi.1.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *vācam*). For *dhî*, *pradhî tāv ukthyâ madhye* (vii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *madhye*). For *nâbhî*, *rajatanâbhî vâiçvadevâu* (v.5.24). For *vapâçrapanî*, *vapâçrapanî pra harati* (vi.3.9<sup>6</sup>): it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section. As counter-example, to explain the presence of *vapâ* in the rule, is given, "from another text," the compound *paçuçrapanî* (or, as G. M. read, *bhasmaçrapanî*): our Sanhitâ has *paçuçrapanam* at iii.1.3<sup>2</sup>. For *ahanî*, *ahanî dyâur ivâ 'si* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>). For *janmanî*, *ubhe ni pâsi janmanî* (i.4.22). For *sumninî*, *sumnâya sumninî* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>). For *sâmanî*, *sâmanî pratishthityâi* (iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>): also at i.8.13<sup>2</sup>. For *vâishṇavî*, *valagahanâu vâishṇavî brhann asi* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words). For *âikshavî*, *âikshavî tiraçcî* (vi.2.1<sup>5</sup> twice). For *darvî*, *darvî çrîṇîsha âsani* (ii.2.12<sup>7</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>). For *dyâvâprthivî*, *dyâvâprthivî eva svena* (ii.1.4<sup>7</sup>): the word is frequently found elsewhere. The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, *mahî dyâuh prthivî ca nah* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *ca nah*), as if the inclusion of *dyâvâ* required justification: but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Tâittirîya *pada*-text), *dyâvâprthivî* is inseparable, and therefore itself a single *pada*.

पूर्वश्च ॥ १३ ॥

13. As also, the preceding word.

That is to say (by the application of rule i.58), the word preceding the last one mentioned in the rule next above, or *dyâvâprthi-*

12. ----- <sup>1</sup> *etâni padâni pragrahasamjñâni syuh*<sup>2</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>3</sup>:  
*amî* ----: *caksh-* ----: *kârsh-* ----: *pit-* ----: *devate 'ti kim*:  
*yad* ----: *musht-* ----: *pra-* ----: *raj-* ----: *vap-* ----: *vape 'ti*  
*kim*: *paç-* ---- *iti çâkhântare*: *ah-* ----: *ubhe-* ----: *sum-* ----:  
*sâm-* ----: *val-* ----: *âiksh-* ----: *dar-* ----: *dyâv-* ----: *dyâve*  
*'ti kim*: *mahî* ----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *bhavanti*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. om.



*vî*. The examples given are *yâvatî dyâvâprthivî mahitvâ* (iii.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *âvinne dyâvâprthivî* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. invert the order of the two citations): I have noted only two other cases of the application of the rule, at ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>; 6.7<sup>5</sup>.

न रुन्धे नित्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. But not *rundhe*, in any case.

The case intended to be excluded is quoted by the commentator: *paçûn evâ 'va rundhe dyâvâprthivî gacha svâhâ* (vi.4.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words and the last). The specification *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' is intended to exclude also the operation of any other rule under which *rundhe* might chance to fall: for example, in *rundhe yadâ sahasram* (ii.1.5<sup>2</sup>), where, as preceding *yadâ*, it would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 38 of this chapter. I have noted no other case.

हरिसहुरीसहृतीकल्पयन्तीपृषतीआहुती ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *harî*, *sahurî*, *sahûtî*, *kalpayantî*, *â prshatî*, and *âhutî* are *pragraha*.

The cited examples are as follows. For *harî*, *harî te yuñjâ prshatî abhûtâm* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): it occurs in toward a dozen other passages. For *sahurî*, *sahurî sapa-ryât* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>); and the counter-example, to show the necessity of the *sa*, *tam âhurî hvayante* (but O. reads *tâm*, B. *hvayate*, and G. M. *ahurî vâcayati*), claimed to be found "in another text." This would imply, of course, that the *pada*-text reads *sa-hurî*—as is in fact the case. For *sahûtî*, *sahûtî vanatam giraḥ* (ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>); and, as counter-example, for the same purpose as the last, *hûtî punar juhoti* (but G. M. read *manur* for *punar*), also from "another text." For *kalpayantî*, *adhvaram kalpayantî ūrdhvam yaj-ñam* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, and W. B. O. the last): another case is found at vi.2.9<sup>3</sup>. For *â prshatî*, the passage already quoted for *harî*, *yuñjâ prshatî abhûtâm* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>); and, to justify the *â*, the counter-example *prshatî sthûlaprshatî* (v.6.12). For *âhutî*, *purodâçam ete âhutî juhoti* (i.5.2<sup>3-4</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words, W. B. O. the last): nearly the same phrase occurs again at

13. *cakâreṇâ 'nvâdishtadyâvâprthivî ity asmât<sup>1</sup> pûrvo 'pî*  
"*kâra ekâro<sup>2</sup> vâ padântaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathâ: yâv- . . . .:*  
*âv- . . . .*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmât*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. put before *îkârah*.

14. *rundhe ity antyasvaro<sup>1</sup> dyâvâprthivî ity etasmât pûrvo 'pî*  
*na pragraho bhavati: paçûn- . . . . nityaçabdaḥ prâptyantara-*  
*nishedhârthaḥ: rundhe- . . . .: vîdâdi<sup>2</sup> (iv.38) prâptiḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *antasv-*; B. O. *antaḥ sv-*. <sup>2</sup> O *vîdvârâv iti*.



i.5.4<sup>4</sup>. To account for the *ā* in this word, G. M. simply cites *hutī* as found in "another text:" but W. B. O. give the ph a *hutī tasmād evāḥ* (but W. O. read *hūtī*, and B. *dhātī*: W. also has *vivā iti* instead of *evā iti*).

पूर्वश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16. As also, the preceding word.

Namely *ete*, occurring before *āhutī* in the passage already quoted: *purodācam ete āhutī* (i.5.2<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. here omit the first word).

वाससीतपसीरोदसी ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also *vāsasī*, *tapasī*, and *rodasī*.

The examples are: *vāsasī iva vivasānāu* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>; the word is also found at i.8.18); *sākshād eva dīkshātapasī avā rundhe* (vi.1.1<sup>2</sup>: the compound occurs again in the same division: only G. M. have the first two words); and *ime vāi rodasī tayoh* (v.1.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. have dropped out *vāi*): the word is not rarely met with elsewhere.

परश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18. As also, the following word.

The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the comment, *anv indrañ rodasī vāvaçāne* (i.7.13<sup>1</sup>): there is, I believe, no other falling under it.

15. ----- <sup>1</sup> *eteshv antyasvarah<sup>2</sup> pragrahaḥ syāt<sup>3</sup>: harī-----: sah-----: se 'ti kim: tam---- iti çākhāntare: sah-----: se 'ti kim: hūtī----- iti çākhāntare: adh-v-----: yuñjā-----: 'e 'ti<sup>4</sup> kim: prsh-----: puro-----: e 'ti kim: hutī----- iti çākhāntare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *antyah sv-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *bhavati*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. *ākāreṇa*.

16. *caḥārvādeçād<sup>1</sup> āhutī ity etasmāt pūrva<sup>2</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: pur-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-anvādishta*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om.

17. <sup>1</sup>----- *ity etāni pragrahasamjñāni bhavanti<sup>1</sup>. yathā: vās-----: sāk-----: ime-----.*

(1) G. M. *eshv antyasvarah pragraho bhavati*.

18. *caḥārvādishtarodasī<sup>1</sup> ity etasmāt para<sup>2</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: anv-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-tād ro-*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



That is to say, *upasthe* is exempted from the action of the preceding rule: it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in *mâte 'va putram bibhrtām upasthe* (in the verse beginning *te ācarantī*, iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. give-only the last two words). To show that *sthe* would not have sufficiently defined the exception (*upa-sthe*), the commentator quotes *ye pratishthe (prati-sthe) abhavatām* (from the verse beginning with *urvī*, iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>).

## इरावतीप्रभृत्या दाधार ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in the passage beginning with *irāvatī* and ending with *dādihāra*.

The passage in question is found at i.2.13<sup>2</sup>, and contains six *pragrahas*, whereof one, *rodasī*, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above; it also contains a word in *e*, *manave*, which is not *pragraha*, being excepted by rule 54. The commentator quotes its beginning, *irāvatī dhenumatī hi bhūtam*.

## पूर्वजेप्रभृत्यायम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. And in the passage beginning with *pūrvaje* and ending with *ayam*.

Of this passage, found at ii.6.7<sup>5</sup>, the commentator quotes the first four words. In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it: *hwayate pūrvaje rtāvarī ity āha pūrvaje hy ete rtāvarī devī devaputre ity āha devī hy ete devaputre upahūto 'yam*. It contains ten *pragraha* endings, of which, however, two (*pūrvaje*) fall under rule 11, above. The word *ā*, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (com-

---

21. *etāsv ṛkshā 'pasthe ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>1</sup> padāntaḥ<sup>2</sup> pragraho na bhavati. yathā: māt----- upe 'ti kim: ye-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *antaḥ sv-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

22. *irāvatīprabhṛtī 'rāvatī iti<sup>1</sup> ṣabdām ārabhyā<sup>2</sup> dādihāra dādihāraṣabdaparyantam<sup>2</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: irā-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *paryantam*.

23. *pūrvajeprobhṛtyayamparyantam<sup>1</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: pūrv----- ānpadam<sup>3</sup> maryādāyām vartate. nanu pūrv----- ity ārabhyā 'yam---- ity etatparyantam sthalaṃ<sup>4</sup> etatsūtravishayaḥ<sup>5</sup> kim na syāt. ucyate: bhavatpaksha upabandhāntaḥpātivāt<sup>6</sup> kṛṇudhvañ sadane (iv.11) iti grahaṇasya<sup>7</sup> vāiyarthyaṃ<sup>8</sup> syāt: tan<sup>8</sup> mā bhūd iti: tasmād*



pare Pânini ii.1.13)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule; intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word *pûrvaje* a *pragraha* by two separate rules; but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device.

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated. The first objection is: how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with *pûrvaje pitarâ* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>) and ends with *ayam purobhuvah* (iv.3.2<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit *bhuvah*). Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of *kr̥ṇudhvañ sadane* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous. Objection second: the word *pûrvaje*, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made *pragraha* by rule 11; the rule should read “beginning with *varî*” (the concluding *pada* of the separable compound *ṛta-varî*). This, too, is repelled: the rule reads as it stands because *varî* occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be: moreover, as we are taught (i.25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit: in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the *pragraha* character of the first *varî* would not be established at all. But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of *pûrvaje*, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith. Not so, is the defense: *pûrvaje* is not desig-

---

*etat<sup>9</sup> sthalam etatsûtravishayo na bhavati. nanv atra pûrvajegrahanam anarthakam: pûrvajekr̥ṇudhvañsadane (iv.11) iti tatrâi 'vo 'ktatvât: <sup>10</sup>kim tu<sup>10</sup> varîprabhṛty<sup>11</sup> etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam. ne 'ti brûmah: varîgrahanadvayasambhavât: kutra vâ 'vadhiniyamatvena<sup>12</sup> svîkâra<sup>13</sup> iti samdehah syât: kim ca: âsannañ samdehe (i.25) iti vacanâd uttarâvudhisamnikṛshṭo<sup>14</sup> dvitîyavarîçabda eva svîkartavyah: tathâ sati pûrvavarîçabdasya <sup>15</sup>pragrahatvam na syât: tac câ 'nishtam. nanu bhavanmate 'pi pûrvajedvayasambhavât kutra vâ grahanam iti samdehah samânah: kim ca: yuktyuktam<sup>16</sup> anishtam ca<sup>17</sup> samânam<sup>18</sup>. mâi 'vam: pûrvaje iti padam atra kâryabhâktvena<sup>19</sup> no 'cyate <sup>20</sup>yena pânunaruktyam bhavet: kim tu pûrvaç câ 'sâu jeçabdaç ca pûrvaje: etatprabhṛtî 'ty<sup>21</sup> upalakshakatveno<sup>22</sup> 'cyate<sup>20</sup>. nanu tarhy<sup>23</sup> upahûta iti padam atikramyâ 'yam ity avadhithena kimartham<sup>24</sup> ucyate: <sup>25</sup>upahûta iti padânâm bâhulye <sup>26</sup>'py âsannañ samdehe (i.25) iti vacanât prâthamikasyâi 'va grahanasiddhiḥ<sup>27</sup>. mâi 'vam<sup>25</sup>: upahûta iti padagrahane<sup>28</sup> tatra<sup>29</sup> gâuravadoshah:*



nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11); but it means ‘the former *je* of the two,’ and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from! Again: why, at the end of the passage, is *ayam* pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of *upahūtaḥ*; for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, “in case of doubt, take the nearest” (i.25), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended. This also is disallowed: to quote the whole compound word *upahūtaḥ* (*pada*-text, *upa-hūtaḥ*) would be to incur the charge of excess; and as for *upa* by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a *pada*, its *pada* quality is of secondary rank, while that of *ayam* is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such]; hence, on the principle “where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place,” it was proper to cite *ayam*. The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [*je* being also a fragment of a word; and its predecessor *hvayate* should have been taken instead]. That cannot be made good, is the reply; for there a want of suitability in the primary word suggested: if you take the primary *hvayate*, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [*ā* being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in *e*] will appear to be cited as a *pragraha*: which is wrong. And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle “not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off,” it is better not

*upe 'ty etāvanmātrasyā 'dibhūtasya<sup>30</sup> 'ñçasya<sup>31</sup> padatvam gauṇam: ayam ity asya tu<sup>32</sup> mukhyam: mukhye sambhavati na gauṇam iti nyāyād ayam iti yuktaṁ grahaṇam. nanv etenāi 'va nyāyenā 'dyāvadhēr<sup>33</sup> anupapannatā. nā 'yam pakshaḥ: mukhyasambhavābhāvāt<sup>34</sup>: tathā hi: hvayata iti mukhye svīkrte 'bhividhinyāyena tasyā 'pi grahaṇam<sup>35</sup> syāt: tac cā 'nishtam: ate samānapade (iv.54) iti vacanād etad<sup>36</sup> anishtam na<sup>37</sup> bhavati 'ti<sup>38</sup> cet: prakshālanād dhi pañkasya dūrād asparṇanam varam iti nyāyād dhvayata ity uccārya tasya nishedhakathanād api tadanuccāraṇam eva ramañīyam<sup>39</sup>. iti mukhyasambhavābhāvo 'vastha<sup>40</sup> eva: tasmād asmint sūtre 'nupapattileṣo nā 'sti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. -*ti ā ayam-*; B. -*ti āyam-*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *idam*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *sūtr-*; G. M. -*yam*. <sup>6</sup> W. ins. *pūrvaje*. <sup>7</sup> W. *pragrahasya*. <sup>(8)</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(10)</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> W. B. *ṛtāvarî-*. <sup>12</sup> W. *vidhi-*; G. M. -*dhitvena*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *svīkriyata*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *uktāv-*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *yuktīyuktam*; G. M. *yad uktam*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. om. <sup>18</sup> B. O. *tulyam*. <sup>19</sup> B. O. -*ve*. <sup>(20)</sup> B. om. <sup>21</sup> G. M. om. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -*kshānat-*. <sup>23</sup> G. M. om. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *kim*. <sup>(25)</sup> B. om. <sup>26</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>27</sup> G. M. -*dheḥ*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. om. *pada*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. *sūtra*. <sup>30</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>31</sup> W. *'ñçabdasya*; G. M. *iñgyāñç-*. <sup>32</sup> G. M. om. <sup>33</sup> B. O. -*dyapadasya*. <sup>34</sup> O. G. M. -*khye s-*. <sup>35</sup> G. M. *pragrahatvam*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. *tad*. <sup>37</sup> G. M. om. <sup>38</sup> G. M. om. *iti*. <sup>39</sup> W. *svar-*; B. O. *varam*. <sup>40</sup> G. M. *tadav-*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



tion: B. O. begin the citation at *ime*); from the section *ápo varu-  
nasya patnayaḥ* (v.5.4: G. M. omit the last word), *ime evo 'pa  
dhatte* (v.5.4<sup>1</sup>: there are two more cases in the following divisions);  
from the section *sajúr abdāḥ* (v.6.4: G. M. omit the last word),  
*etaṣa ime aṣvinā saṁvatsaraḥ* (v.6.4<sup>1</sup>: the only case: only G. M.  
have the first word); from the section *brahma jajñānam* (v.2.7),  
*nā hī 'me yajushā 'ptum arhati* (v.2.7<sup>2</sup>: the only case: B. O. omit  
the last word). The last calls for a counter-example, to show the  
need of including in the rule the syllable after *brahma*: there is  
another section beginning *brahmanádino vadanty adbhiḥ* (ii.6.5:  
B. O. omit *adbhiḥ*), which contains an *ime* not *pragraha*: *traya  
ime lokāḥ* (ii.6.5<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *trayaḥ*).

पूर्णे च ॥ २६ ॥

26. As also *pūrṇe*.

The *ca*, 'and,' in this rule merely brings down the heading of  
the last *anuvāka* named in the one preceding. In that *anuvāka*,  
*pūrṇe* is *pragraha*: to wit, in *pūrṇe upa dadhāti pūrṇe evāi 'nam*  
(v.2.7<sup>2</sup>); but not elsewhere, as for example in *yo vāi pūrṇa āsiñ-  
cati* (vii.5.6<sup>1</sup>).

दृढे ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also *dr̥ḍhe* is *pragraha*.

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good:  
*dr̥ḍhe* is *pragraha* wherever met with. The example given is *yena  
dyāur ugrā pṛthivī ca dr̥ḍhe* (iv.1.8<sup>5</sup>). There is another case at  
iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>.

घ्नीचक्रे पपरे ॥ २८ ॥

28. Also *ghnî* and *cakre*, when followed by *p*.

26. *caṣabdo brahmajajñānam ity anvādiṣati: pūrṇe ity antya-  
svaro brahmajajñānam ity anvāke pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>1</sup>:  
pūrṇe-----<sup>2</sup>asminn anvāka<sup>2</sup> iti kim: yo-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. O. *brahmaja*.

27. *dr̥ḍhe ity asminn<sup>1</sup> antyasvaraḥ sarvatra<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati.  
yathā<sup>3</sup>: yena-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. O. G. M. om. •

28. *ghnî: cakre: ity<sup>1</sup> ete pade papare pragrahe<sup>2</sup> bhavataḥ.  
vār-----: cakre----- papare iti kim: yad-----: sam-----:  
ghnîcakre iti kim: ṣak-----: ye----- pakārah<sup>3</sup> paro yābhyām  
te papare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-gr̥hye*. <sup>3</sup> W. *paḥ*.



The examples are: *vārtraghnî pūrṇamāse* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>); *cakre pṛshthāni* (vi.6.8<sup>1</sup>): I have noted no other cases. We have then two pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are *pragraha* before *p* only, and only these words before *p*: the first pair are *yad virūpayā vārtraghnî syāt* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>) and *samidhāna cakre nīcā tam* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>: only W. has *tam*); the second, *çakā bhāumî pāntraḥ* (v.5.18) and *yeshām içe paçupatiḥ* (iii.1.4<sup>1-2</sup>).

न्वती ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also *nvatî*.

Two examples are cited: *omanvatî te 'smin* (ii.6.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), and *vṛdhanvatî amāvāsyāyām* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>): also a counter-example, proving that *vatî* alone would not have been sufficient: *karṇakāvaty etayā* (v.4.7<sup>3</sup>).

पपरो न ॥ ३० ॥

30. But not when followed by *p*.

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is *mārdhanvatî puronuvākyā bhavati* (ii.6.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word).

समीची ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *Samîcî* is *pragraha*.

For this word, G. M. cite *samîcî retah siñcataḥ* (v.5.4<sup>2</sup>); B. O. cite *paçcāt samîcî tābhiḥ* (v.2.3<sup>5</sup>); W. gives both passages. The word is met with a dozen times or more in the Sanhitâ.

नपरो न ॥ ३२ ॥

29. *nvatî ity antyasvarah<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: om-.....: vṛdh-..... nakāreṇa kim: karṇ-.....*

<sup>1</sup> B. *antah s-*; O. *antas-*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

30. *sāmnidhyān nvatî iti<sup>1</sup> labhyate: paparo nvatî ity<sup>2</sup> antyasvarah<sup>3</sup> pragraho na bhavati. yathā<sup>4</sup>: mūr-.....*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. om. <sup>3</sup> B. *antah s-*; O. *antas-*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

31. *samîcî ity antyasvarah<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: sam-.....: paç-.....*

<sup>1</sup> B. *antas-*; O. *antyah s-*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

32. *sāmnidhyāt samîcî iti labhyate: na khalu samîcî ity antyasvaro nakāraparah<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: sam-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. om.



32. But not when followed by *n*.

The case excepted is *samīcī nāmā 'si* (v.5.10<sup>1</sup>). I have noted no other.

ची यत्प्रपरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. *Cī* is *pragraha*, when followed by *yat* or *pra*.

The passages had in view by this rule are: *āikshavī tiraçcī yad āçvavālah* (vi.2.1<sup>5</sup>: W. O. omit the first word, G. M. B. the last; and B. has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and *prācī pretam adhvaram* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup> and vi.2.9<sup>3</sup>); besides two other cases before *pra* at vi.2.1<sup>5</sup>; 3.9<sup>6</sup>. The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples: to show that *cī* is not always *pragraha*, *prācī diçām* (iv.3.3<sup>1</sup> et al.: but W. B. O. read instead *yā prācī dik*, which is not to be found in the Sanhitā: *prācī dik*, without *yā*, occurs at several places, e. g. iv.3.6<sup>2</sup>); to prove the necessity of the *t* of *yat* and the *r* of *pra*, *gāur ghṛtācī yajño devān jigāti* (ii.5.7<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words) and *tas-māt paçcāt prācī patny anv āste* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words); to indicate that other endings than *cī* are not *pragraha* in the situations specified, *yad agnir vajra ekādaçinī yad agnāu* (v.5.7<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words) and *prajanane prajananañ hi vāi* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words).

आन्मही ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Also *ān mahî*.

The passage is *mahān mahî astabhāyat* (ii.3.14<sup>6</sup>). Elsewhere, *mahî* is not *pragraha*: e. g. in *mahî dyāuḥ pṛthivī ca naḥ* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit the last two words); and even after *n* preceded by any other vowel than *ā*: e. g. in *vayunāvid eka in mahî devasya* (i.2.13<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>1-2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word).

पती श्रुतिः ॥ ३५ ॥

33. *cī ity antyasvaro yatparaḥ praparo vā pragrahaḥ syāt<sup>1</sup>. yathā<sup>2</sup>: āiksh-.....: prā-..... evampara iti kim: prā-.....: ta-kārarephābhyām kim: gāur-.....: tas-.....: cī 'ti kim: yad-.....: praj-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. bhavati. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

34. *ān ity etadviçishte mahîgrahaṇe 'ntyasvaraḥ pragrahaḥ syāt<sup>1</sup>. yathā: mah-..... ān iti kim: mahî-.....: ākāreṇa kim: vay-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. bhavati.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



38. Also an.î or e followed by *vîḍ*, *dvârâu*, *kr̥shṇaḥ*, *carâvaḥ*, and *yadâ*.

The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example. The first is *dhishane vîḍâ satî vîḍayethâm* (i.4.1<sup>2</sup>), a double case; and, to show that *vî* alone would not have been enough, *âpaç ca me vîrudhaç ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>). Next, *devî dvârâu mâ mâ* (iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>), with *dvâdaça sam padyante dvâdaça* (i.5.7<sup>3</sup>), to prove the need of the *râu* of *dvârâu*. Again, *yajñâyâ 'tishtamâne kr̥shṇo rūpam kṛtvâ* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word; they also omit the last two words, while B. O. omit *kṛtvâ*); and *câtvâle kr̥shṇavishânâm prâ 'syati* (vi.1.3<sup>8</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words) justifies the *ḥ* of *kr̥shṇaḥ*. Again, *vivasânâu ye carâvaḥ* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>), with *râye ca naḥ svapatyâya deva* (v.5.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit *deva*) to show that *ca* alone would not have been enough: to prove that more than *car* or *carâ* is needed, the commentator does not attempt. Finally, we have *ajanan nannamâne: yade 'dam tâḥ* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *ajanan*). To this is raised the question whether *yatante*, as coming before *yad â-* in *çreṇiço yatante yad âkshishur divyam* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), is not also *pragraha*? The answer is an appeal to rule i.50, "in citations of *padas*, a *pada* only is to be understood:" but how we are to know that an integral *pada* is meant to be signified by *yadâ*, any more than by *vîḍ*, the commentator does not inform us.

न ज्ञे ऽह्ने नित्यम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39. But not *jñe* and *ahne*, under any circumstances.

The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are *varunâya râjñe kr̥shṇaḥ* (v.5.11), and *vanaspatînam eṇyahne kr̥shṇaḥ* (v.5.15: only G. M. have the first word): these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the

38. ----- <sup>1</sup>ity evampara<sup>1</sup> ikâra ekâro vâ <sup>2</sup>pragraho bhavati<sup>3</sup>. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: dhish-----: dakâreṇa<sup>5</sup> kim: âpaç-----: devî-----: râv iti kim: dvâd-----: yaj-----: visargeṇa kim: cât-----: viv-----: râva iti kim: râye-----: aj----- nanu<sup>6</sup> çre----- ity atra pragrahatvam kim na syât. padagrahaneshu padam gamyeta (i.50) iti<sup>7</sup> vacanân na bhavati<sup>8</sup> 'ti brûmaḥ.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. eshu pareshu. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. padântaḥ. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. vîḍ iti. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. atra. <sup>8</sup> W. pravartate; G. M. om.

39. *jñe: ahne: ity<sup>1</sup> etayor antyasvaṛo nityam pragraho na syât. yathâ: var-----: van-----: vîḍâdi* (iv.38) *prâptir anayoh. nityaçabdaḥ prâptyantarapratibandhakah<sup>2</sup>. yathâ<sup>3</sup>: yaj-----: gamayatobhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity âdinâ prâptiḥ: sv-----: somâyasva* (iv.48) *iti prâptiḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. -pratishedh-; G. M. prâptyânishedhaprayojanakah. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.



introduction here of this one. But the addition of *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' excepts the same words from the action of any other rule: for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages *yajñe 'pi kartor iti tâv abrûtâm* (ii.6.7<sup>1</sup>) and *svarâjñe 'novâhâu* (v.6.21).

## आकारिकारपूर्वस्तु बहुस्वरस्य ते थे ॥४०॥

40. *Te* and *the*, however, are *pragraha* in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by *â* or *e*.

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs. The commentator quotes several instances: *etasmin vâ etâu mrjâte yo vidvishânayoh* (ii.2.6<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words, and they omit the last word); *çukrâ manthinâu grhyete* (vi.4.10<sup>1</sup>); *pra prthivyâ riricâthe divaç ca* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first and the last two words); and *drñhanâ yañ nudethe* (iv.7.15<sup>2</sup>). Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding *â* or *e*, we have given us *â vrçcyate vâ etud yajamânañ* (iii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); of a polysyllabic word, *tat pravâte vi shajanti* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>: see under i.48) and *yad ete grhyante* (iii.3.6<sup>1</sup>); the restriction to the endings *te* and *the*, *anûcyamâna â sâdayati* (ii.2.5<sup>7</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>).

As to the special significance of *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, two of our commentator's three chief authorities, Vararuci and Mâhisheya, are reported by him as at variance. The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of *pragraha*-quality; the latter, that it prescribes the annulment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word *nityam*. Vararuci's view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class.

40. *bahusvarasya padasya sambandhî<sup>1</sup> te iti the iti vâ<sup>2</sup> "kârapûrva ekârapûrvo vâ pragraho bhavati. yathâ: et-...: çuk-...: pra-...: drñh-... evampûrva iti kim: â vrç-...: trîñi-...: bahusvarasye 'ti kim: tat-...: yad-...: tethe iti kim: anûc-... vîdâdi (iv.38) nimittasâpekshatânvartakas tu çabda iti vararucipakshañ: mâhisheyapakshas tu vakshyate<sup>3</sup>: pûrvasûtroktanishedhanityaçabdajñâpitânuvrttim<sup>4</sup> nivârayati<sup>5</sup> 'ti<sup>6</sup>: tatra<sup>7</sup> vararucimatañ ruciram. bahavañ svarâ yasmin tad bahusvaram: tasya. atra svaraçabdopâdânâc<sup>8</sup> ca<sup>9</sup> bahuçabdena vyaktibhedo vijñeyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -dhîya. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. çabdah. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ucyate. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -dham nit. <sup>5</sup> G. M. vâr-. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. atra. <sup>8</sup> W. bahusvaraçabdopâdânâtâ; B. O. bahu-svararûpaçabdena upâdânâtâ. <sup>9</sup> W. B. O. om.



The commentator's final remark as to *bahusvarasya* is obscure to me.

न शार्याति ॥ ४१ ॥

41. But not *çaryâte*.

Namely, in the passage *çaryâte apibah sutasya* (i.4.18: G. M. omit the last word). An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word.

ते मापातंनमएनमभिवायुर्गर्भमुपाहस्तुपरः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. *Te* is *pragraha* when followed by *mâ pátam*, *namaḥ*, *enam abhi*, *vâyuh*, *garbham*, *upa*, *ahas*, and *tu*.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: *vâm â rabhe te mâ pátam â'sya* (i.2.2<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words), with *te mâ'smin yajñe* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>), to show the necessity of including *pátam* in the rule; *punas te: namo 'gnaye 'pratividdháya* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), with *te na vy ajayanta* (v.4.1<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *na* alone would not have been enough; *te enam abhi sam anahyetâm* (ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>), with *ta enam bhishajyanti brahmanah* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: W. omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of *abhi*; *te vâyur vy avât* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), with *te vâcañ striyam* (vi.1.6<sup>5</sup>), to show why the *yuh* of *vâyuh* was needed; *te garbham adadhâtâm* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), without any counter-example to prove that *ga* would not have answered the purpose; *te upâ'mantrayanta* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *te ahorâtrayoḥ* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *te tv âva no 'tsrjye ity âhuḥ* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), with *te te dhâmâny uçmasi* (i.3.6<sup>1</sup>), to show that *t* not followed by *u* is not enough to determine the *pragraha*-quality. Then, as further counter-examples, we have *te devâḥ* (i.4.10<sup>1</sup> et al.) in proof that *te* is not *pragraha* before other words than those here mentioned; and *brhad ukshe namaḥ* (i.4.26), *amushmiñ loka upa çere* (v.3.7<sup>2</sup>), and *yanti*

41. *çaryâta ity antyasvarah<sup>1</sup> pragraho na<sup>2</sup> bhavati. yathâ: çâr-..... pûrvasûtraprâptâu<sup>3</sup> satyâm kañthoktanishedho<sup>4</sup> 'nenu<sup>5</sup> vidhîyate.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -yah s-. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -treṇa pr-; B. -tre pr-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -ktyâ n-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.

42. <sup>1</sup>..... *evamparas te iti çabdaḥ pragrahaḥ syât. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: vâm-.....: pátam iti kim: te-.....: punas-.....: ma iti kim: te-.....: te e-.....: abhî 'ti kim: ta-.....: te v-.....: yur iti kim: te v-.....: te ga-.....: te u-.....: te ah-.....: te tv-.....: ukârena kim: te te-..... evampara iti kim: te d-.....: te iti kim: brh-.....: am-.....: yanti-.....*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. ins. *te*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



they are not furnished. The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only *ete* is *pragraha* before the words specified, and *ete* itself before them only, are given by G. M., but omitted in the other manuscripts: they are *atha katama ete devā iti* (ii.6.9<sup>3</sup>), *manuta evāi 'nam etāni* (v.5.6<sup>1</sup>), *pushkaraparṇe hy enam upaṣṛitam* (v.1.4<sup>4</sup>: MSS. -*ṣru-tam*), *agre yajñapatini dhatta* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>), and *saptame pade juhoti* (vi.1.8<sup>1</sup>).

परश्च द्वयोः ॥ ४५ ॥

45. As also, the letter following the two last mentioned.

The "two" of the rule are *pad* and *ishtak*; and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is *pragraha* only when they themselves follow *ete*, as prescribed in the preceding rule. He quotes the passages referred to: *yajñasya hy ete pade atho* (v.1.6<sup>3-4</sup>: W. omits to *pade*, B. O. to *ete*), and *yad ete ishtake upadadhāti* (v.3.5<sup>2</sup>); adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples *saptame pade juhoti* (vi.1.8<sup>1</sup>), and *tasyās te devī 'shtake* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>).

स्थःपरः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Also one followed by *sthaḥ*.

There is a natural reason for this rule, *sthaḥ* being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun. I have noted near a dozen cases in the text; the one cited in illustration by the commentator is *vishṇoḥ ṣnyaptre sthaḥ* (i.2.13<sup>3</sup>). To show that *stha* instead of *sthaḥ* would not answer, is given *etasmiṅ loke stha yu-shmāñs te 'nu* (iii.2.5<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last three).

परश्चोभयोः ॥ ४७ ॥

47. As also, one following them both.

Following, namely, a *sthaḥ* and a preceding *pragraha* word: for example, *ṣilpe sthas te vam ā rabhe* (i.2.2<sup>1</sup>: but this citation is wanting in G. M.), and *dr̥dhe sthaḥ ṣithire samīcī* (iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>). A counter-example, of a word following *sthaḥ* only, is *vṛshanāu stha urvacī* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup>).

---

45. *nimittina upari vartamānayoḥ padishtakṣabdayoḥ<sup>1</sup> para<sup>2</sup> 'ikāra ekāro vā<sup>3</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: yaj-...: yud-...: nimittina upari vartamānayor iti kim: sapt-...: tas-....*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *dvayoḥ padishtak ity etayoḥ cakārānvādishtayoḥ*; G. M. *pat ishtaka ity etayoḥ cakārānvādishtayoḥ dvayoḥ*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *parata*. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. om.

46. *stha ity evampara ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: vish-... visargena kim: et-....*



The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—*dvayoh*, 'two,' being used in the one, and *ubhayoh*, 'both,' in the other—indicates a difference of meaning. Above, the two affecting causes (*nimitta*) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (*nimittin*), were intended; here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word.

सोमायस्वैतस्मिन् ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Also in the section beginning *somâya sva*.

The section in question is v.6.21: it was necessary to add *sva*, in order to distinguish it from that beginning *somâya pitṛmate* (i.8.5). It contains thirteen *pragrahas*, of which the commentator cites several together: *avî dve dhenû bhâumî* (v.6.21<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *bhâumî*): three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following.

द्वे ॥ ४९ ॥

49. Also *dve*.

This word, which occurs about forty times in the *Tâittirîya* text, is, of course, always *pragraha*. The commentator cites two instances: *dvedve sam bharati* (i.6.8<sup>2</sup>), and *yad dve naçyetâm* (ii.6.3<sup>5</sup>).

परश्च ॥ ५० ॥

47. *ca kârânvdishṭayoh pûrvasûtroktanimittanimittinor<sup>1</sup> ubhayoh para ikâra ekâro vâ padântaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathâ: çit-.....: drḍhe..... ubhayor iti kim: vṛsh-..... paraç ca dvayor (iv.45) iti<sup>2</sup> vâcyâ ubhayor iti çabdântaram<sup>3</sup> arthântara-jñâpakam<sup>4</sup>: nimittisahitayoh<sup>5</sup> pûrvasûtroktayor nimittayoh paraḥ pragraho bhavati: paraç ca dvayor (iv.45) iti sûtrârthaḥ: atra tu<sup>6</sup> sûtre nimittanimittinor<sup>7</sup> ubhayoh paraḥ pragrahaḥ syâd iti viçeshâd<sup>8</sup> bhedo vijñeyah<sup>9</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pûrvokta*-. <sup>2</sup> B. ins. *kim ca*; O. ins. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-taraprayogaḥ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-kah*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-ttas*-. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-ttinimittayoh*. <sup>8</sup> B. *-shana*; O. *-shena*; G. M. *vishaya*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *drashtavyah*.

48. *somâya svarâjñe (v.6.21) ity asminn anuvâka ikâra ekâro vâ padântaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathâ: avî---- ity âdi. sve 'ti kim: somâya pitṛmate (i.8.5) ity atra mâ bhûd iti.*

49. *dve ity antyasvaraḥ padântaḥ<sup>1</sup> sarvatra pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathâ<sup>3</sup>: dve-.....: yad-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.



50. As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one: *dve çukle dve kr̥shṇe mūrdhanvatīḥ* (v.3.1<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail.

एकव्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ५१ ॥

51. Likewise the next but one.

The *api*, 'likewise,' in this rule is explained as bringing forward *dve* from the last rule but one; another application of the "principle of the frog's leap." The cited examples are *dve hy ete devate* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. omit this citation), and *dve vāva devasatre* (vii.4.5<sup>1</sup>). By rule i.48, *devasatre*, though a divisible compound (*pada*-text, *devasatre iti deva-satre*), is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept: another like case, *dve savane çukravatī* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule. At vi.6.4<sup>3</sup> (*dve jāye vindate*) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv.54.

गमयतोभवतोऽनूकारात्परंतनूयदकरोत्कुर्यादिष्टिषब्रू-  
तांप्रवर्तास्ताऽस्तभृतांवाचयतिबिभृतस्ताग्निंगायत्रंताभ्या-  
मेवोभाभ्यामवान्तरंपर आ षष्ठात् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Before, and within six words of, *gamayataḥ*, *bhavataḥ* (except when it follows *û*), *tanû yat*, *akarot*, *kuryât* (in *ishti* passages), *abrûtâm*, *pra varta*, *âstâm*, *stabhnâtâm*, *vâcayati*, *bibhrtas ta*, *agnim gâyatram*, *tâbhyâm eva*, *ubhâbhyâm*, and *avântaram*.

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity; in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental.

The *â* in the rule is declared to be intended this time "inclusively" (*tena saha*, 'along with the specified limit:' compare the scholiast to Pânini ii.1.13); and the necessity of the specification

50. *cakâro dve ity anvâdiçati: dve ity etasmât<sup>1</sup> para ikâra ekâro vâ padântaḥ pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathâ<sup>3</sup>: dve-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. *asmât*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *syât*; G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

51. *ekavyaveto<sup>1</sup> 'pi dve ity etasmât para ikâra ekâro vâ padântaḥ pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathâ<sup>3</sup>: dve-----: dve----- ekena padena<sup>4</sup> vyaveta<sup>5</sup> ekavyavetaḥ. apiçabdo dve ity anvâdiçati maṇ-  
dūkaplutinyâyena.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *-vahito*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> W. *vyavahita*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



example *te 'dityāñ sam adhriyanta tvayā pra jānāme 'ti* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup> : G. M. end at *pra*), to show why *varta* was added to *pra*. For *āstām, ime vāi sahā 'stām* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup> : another case at iv.3.10<sup>2</sup>). For *stabhnītām, vāiçvadevāgnimārute ukthe avyathayanti stabhnītām* (iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>). For *vācayati, uttame āudumbarī vācayati* (v.1.10<sup>2-3</sup>). For *bibhṛtas ta, te eva yajamānasya reto bibhṛtas tasmāt* (v.6.8<sup>4</sup>); with the counter-example *manmahe yāv ātmanvad bibhṛto yāu* (iv.7.15<sup>3</sup>), to show that *bibhṛtaḥ* alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule. Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of *ta eva* in the Sanhitā which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one. For *agnim gāyatram, ete dadhāte ye agnim gāyatram* (vi.3.5<sup>3</sup>); with the counter-example *sadhasthe 'gnim purīshyam* (iv.1.3<sup>1</sup>), to show that the addition of *gāyatram* was needful. For *tābhyām eva, ete vāi yajñasyā 'ñjasāyanī sruṭī tābhyām eva* (vii.2.1<sup>2</sup>; 3.5<sup>3</sup>, 7<sup>3</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup>; 4.1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>). With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that *ete*, one of the words intended to be determined as *pragraha*, is not within six words of *eva*, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its *pragraha*-character within that distance; but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (*nimitta*) is within reach of that cause in its entirety. For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part: for example, people say "Devadatta has an ear-ring," when it is really his ear that has the ring. Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the *eva* is proved by the counter-example *apa hañsy agne tābhyām putema* (iv.7.13<sup>1</sup> : G. M. omit the last word). For *ubhābhyām, ye dve ahorātre eva te ubhābhyām* (vii.4.4<sup>4</sup>). Finally, for *avāntaram, utsrjye ity āhur ye avāntaram* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); with the counter-example *sañ te 'va te heḍaḥ* (ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *ava* would not have been enough alone.

## न ग्रामीवर्चसीमिथुनीमासिलोकेधत्ते ॥ ५३ ॥

53. But not *grāmî, varcasî, mithunî, mâse, loke, dhatte*.

*tram iti kim: sadh-----: ete----- atra padadvayam ekam<sup>8</sup> nimittam ity<sup>9</sup> etepadam<sup>10</sup> uddiçyā 'shashṭhaniyamabhaṅgaprasaṅga iti cet: 'nā 'yam bhaṅgaprasaṅgaḥ<sup>11</sup>: nimittāikadeçasya shashṭhatvopapatteḥ sakalasyā 'pi nimittasya<sup>12</sup> shashṭhatvam upapadyate: loke 'py avayavadharmenā 'vayavino 'pi<sup>13</sup> viçeshasiddheḥ: tathā hi: karṇe kuṇḍalam dhārayantam kuṇḍalī devadatta iti vadanti. eve 'ti kim: apa-----: ye-----: ut-----: antaram iti kim: sañ-----: ā shashṭhād iti kim: para ity uttaraḥ (i.30) iti paribhāshayā 'nantarasyāi 'va paratvam syāt: tan mā bhūd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *padam naño*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-tām*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-kārya*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *nāma*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-karahitāḥ*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> W. B. O. *ste*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *etan*. <sup>9</sup> O. *eve 'ty*. <sup>10</sup> O. *etat p-*. <sup>(11)</sup> B. O. *māi 'vam pras-*; G. M. om. *bhaṅga*. <sup>12</sup> W. O. *-syā 'pi*. <sup>13</sup> B. O. G. M. om.



These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be *pragraha* if not thus specially excepted. The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows: *grâmy eva bhavati gaṇavatî yâjyânuvâkye bhavataḥ* (ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>: another nearly identical case is found at ii.2.11<sup>4</sup>); *brahmavarcaṣy eva bhavaty ubhayato rukmâu bhavataḥ* (ii.3.2<sup>3</sup>); *atha mithunî bhavataḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>); *pûrṇamâse prâ'yachât tâv abrûtâm* (ii.5.2<sup>3</sup>); *loke pratitishthanto yanti dvâu shadâhâu bhavataḥ* (vii.4.11<sup>3</sup>); and *dhatte jyotishmantâv asmâ imâu lokâu bhavataḥ* (ii.6.2<sup>4</sup>).

अते समानपदे नित्यमवे चावे च ॥ ५४ ॥

54. Nor *ate*, in a single word, nor *ave*, under any circumstances.

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications "in a single word" and "under any circumstances" as both alike referring to each of the "parts of words" mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows: *ava rundhate 'tirâtrâv abhito bhavataḥ* (vii.2.6<sup>3</sup>; 4.1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, 3<sup>6</sup>: another nearly identical case is found at vii.4.5<sup>4</sup>); *abhyâhvayate vajram enam abhi pra vartayati* (iii.2.9<sup>1,7</sup>); and *anâtatâya dhr̥shṇave: ubhâbhyâm uta te namaḥ* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>: B. O. omit the last word, and G. M. the last two). To show the necessity of specifying that *ate* should form part of a single word, he quotes *eva te ubhâbhyâm* (vii.4.4<sup>3</sup>). The limitation *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (iv.52) here especially aimed at: for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule i.59, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point.

53. ----- *eteshv*<sup>1</sup> *antyasvaro gamayato bhavata ityâdiparo 'pi pragraho na bhavati. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *grâ*-----: *brah*-----: *atha*-----: *pûr*-----: *loke*-----: *dhatte*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshv*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

54. *nishedham cakâro 'nvâdiçati. ate: ave: ity anayoḥ padâikadeçayor antyasvarah samânapade vartamâno gamayato bhavata ityâdiparo 'pi nityam pragraho na bhavati. yathâ*<sup>1</sup>: *ava*-----: *abhy*-----: *anâ*----- *samânapada iti kim: eva*----- *atra nityaçabdah prâptyantaraparihârârthah. udâharanam*<sup>2</sup> *upabandhas tu decâya* (i.59) *iti sûtire*<sup>3</sup> *prasaṅgâd uktam. samânam ca tat padam ca samânapadam: tasmint samânapade*<sup>4</sup>.

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane  
caturtho 'dhyâyah.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *iti sodâ*-. <sup>3</sup> W. *sûtrena*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.



This finishes the rehearsal of the words with *pragraha*-endings contained in the *Sanhitâ*. As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence: it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form. Nor can I, without a *pada*-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed. It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in *o*, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete: my expection of the text has shown me no *pragraha*-endings in *i* and *e* which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final *i* or *e* not *pragraha* as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept. One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being *pragraha* are disposed of in another chapter (x.18).

## CHAPTER V.

CONTENTS: 1-2, introductory, relation of *pada* and *saṁhitâ* texts; 3, order of application of rules; 4-8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and *d*; 9-10, anomalous conversions of *r* and *h*; 11-19, anomalous omissions of *v*, *s*, *h*, *m*, and *yâ*; 20-24, treatment of final *n* and *t* before palatal letters; 25-26, before *l*; 27-31, of final *m* before a consonant; 32-33, of final *ñ*, *ṭ*, *n* before sibilants; 34-37, of initial *ç* after consonants; 38-41, of initial *h* after consonants.

अथ संहितायामेकप्राणभावे ॥ १ ॥

1. The following rules apply in combined text (*saṁhitâ*), within the compass of a single breath.

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the *Prâtiçâkhyâ*—the rules for the construction of the euphonically combined text (*saṁhitâ*) from its presupposed material, the *pada*-text, where

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah: saṁhitâdyâm ekaprâṇabhâva ity etad adhikrtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraiṁ yad vakshyâmaḥ. saṁhite 'ti ko 'rthaḥ: nânâpadasaṁdhânasamnyogaḥ'* (xxiv.3) *iti 'sûtreṇo 'ktaḥ<sup>2</sup> saṁhitârthaḥ<sup>3</sup>: paraḥ saṁnikarshaḥ saṁhite 'ti vâiyâkaraṇâḥ<sup>4</sup> paṭhanti<sup>5</sup>. ekasamutthaḥ prâṇa ekaprâṇaḥ: tasya bhâvas tadbhâvaḥ<sup>6</sup>: tasmin: ity âtreyamamatam. anyathâ 'pi samâsaḥ saṁgachate: ekaprâṇena bhâvyate janyata uccâryata ity ekaprâṇabhâvaḥ: ekeno 'chvâsena yâvân uccâryate vedabhâgas tâvân ekapâṇabhâva ity arthaḥ: ata evâ 'vasâne padavi-*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



## यथायुक्ताद्विधिः सा प्रकृतिः ॥ २ ॥

2. Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text.

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr., *saṁhitā padaprakṛtiḥ*, 'the *pada*-text is the foundation of the *saṁhitā*:' but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary. The latter explains that hereby is taught the *prakṛti*, or proper form, of *saṁhitā*, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv.5) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, "*prakṛti, vikrama, krama.*" An arrangement which does not deviate from the *pada*-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text. By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x.13, below; passages in which the fundamental or *pada* form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of euphonic combination: they are *svadhā asy urvī cā 'si* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *dhanvann iva prapā asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>), *sahasrasya prumā asi* (iv.4.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. put this citation before the preceding one), *pra budhniyā irate* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>), *jyā iyañ samane* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>), *ā pūshā etu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. omit this), and *aminanta evāiḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>). No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand: we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of *sandhi* being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in *saṁhitā* in their regular or natural shape as shown in *pada*-text—*prakṛtyā*, as it is elsewhere termed. And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv.5.

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of *avicalitaḥ*, 'unremoved, not deviating,' as connective between *vidhiḥ* and *yathāyuktāt*. I would sooner recur to the etymologic meaning of *vidhi*, 'dis-posal, putting apart,' and empha-

2. *prakṛtiḥ saṁhitāsvarūpam aneno 'cyate: prakṛtir vikramah kramah* (xxiv.5) *iti vijñeyatvavidhānāt*<sup>1</sup>. *yathāyuktād yathāsthītāt*<sup>2</sup> *padapāthāt kūtasthād avicalito*<sup>3</sup> *yo vidhiḥ sa prakṛti-saṁhitā*<sup>4</sup> *vijñeyā: vidhir vidhānam prakṛtir ity arthaḥ. yathā*<sup>5</sup>: *sva-....: dhan-....: sah-....: pra-....: jyā-....: ā pū-....: ami-....* *atra sūtre padānām parasparānvayo mahābhāshyavacanāc*<sup>6</sup> *ca*<sup>7</sup> *vijñeyah: tac ca vacanam tā varṇaprakṛtayaḥ* (ii.7) *ity atra paṭhanti*<sup>8</sup>: *evam atrā*<sup>9</sup> *'pi svaritayor madhye yatra nīcam* (xix.1) *ity ādāu mantavyam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *vijñeyatvavidhāt*; B. *-tvena vi-*; G. M. *jñeyatvena vi-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-thāvas-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-cāline*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. *-tiḥ s-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-canena*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>8</sup> O. G. M. *paṭhitam*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *anyatrā*.



size its prefix *vi* sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning 'separation from [the state] as combined;' and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither *vidhi* nor its synonym *vidhâna* occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning 'rule, prescription;' not infrequently also 'arrangement, disposal.'

The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of *sâ*, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the Mahâbhâshya in explanation of a like case (under ii.7); and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix.1.

तत्र पूर्वपूर्वं प्रथमम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. And here, that which comes first is first taken.

That is to say, in the construction of the *samhitâ* text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the Prâtiçâkhyâ respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in *bhaksha : â : ihi* (iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>), the first two words are first combined, according to x.2, and then their result, *bhakshâ*, is combined with *ihi*, by x.4, making *bhakshe* " 'hi, the true reading; whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming *e 'hi*, this would have coalesced with *bhaksha* into *bhakshâi 'hi*—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated; for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the *samhitâ*-reading *shaṇṇavatyâi* (vii.2.15) from the *pada*-reading *shatnavatyâi*: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii.2, which prescribes the conversion of *n* to *ṇ* after *shat*, and of viii.2,

3. *tatra samhitâvidhâne pûrvampûrvam padam sûtram ca prathamam kartavyam. yathâ : bhaksha : â : ihi : ity atra dîrghañ samânâkshare (x.2) iti dîrghaḥ : <sup>1</sup> bhakshâ : ihi : iti sthita ivarṇapara ekâram (x.4) ity ekâre kṛte bhakshe " 'hî 'ti bhavati : anyathâi 'hî 'ti kṛtvâ bhakshaçabde<sup>2</sup> saṁdhîyamâne bhakshâi 'hî 'ti syât : tac câ 'nishtam : pûrvapadakartavyatva etad udâharanam. pûrvasûtrakartavyatve 'pi<sup>3</sup> vadâmaḥ : yathâ<sup>4</sup> : shattri grâmanishpûrvaḥ (vii.2) iti nakârasya ṇatve kṛta uttamapara uttamañ savargîyam (viii.2) ity anena<sup>5</sup> takârasya ṇatve kṛte<sup>6</sup> shaṇṇavatyâ iti bhavati : anyatho 'ttamapara uttamam (viii.2) iti sûtre prathamam<sup>7</sup> pravṛtte sati<sup>8</sup> shaṇṇavatyâ iti syât : tac câ 'nishtam. tathâ<sup>9</sup> : vaṭṭh<sup>10</sup> svayamabhi-gûrtâye 'ty atra tanakârapûrvaç ca takâraḥ (v.33):*



which changes *t* before *n* to *ñ*: if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing *shat* to *shan*, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood *shannavatyái*. The next case is that in which the words *vat* and *svayamabhigártāya* come together (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> seven times: G. M. read *vashat* for *vat*, doubtless by a clerical error). Here, v.33 requires the insertion of a *t* between the *t* and *s*, and this inserted *t* is then, by xiv.12, made *th*; so that we are finally to read *vatth svay-*: if the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead *vatth svay-* (since v.33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination *thsv* would be prefixed a *t* of duplication, by xiv.1,5: the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly: and W. B. even make the blunder of substituting at last *vat sváhá*, apparently having in mind *-vát sváhá*, in the same division). Once more, in the passage *imam: vi: syámi* (i.1.10<sup>2</sup> and iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), we are first to convert the *s* of *syámi* to *sh* by vi.4, and then to duplicate the *sh* by xiv.1, making *vi shshyámi*: if the duplication were first performed, making *vi ssyámi*, then, by rule vi.4, we should have to read *vi shsyámi*. Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise.

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr. (ii.2) and Ath. Pr. (iii.38) have rules of like force with the present one.

## त्रपुमिथुपूर्वः शकारश्चपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. After *trapu* and *mithu* is inserted a *ç* before *c*.

*prathama úshmaparo dvitīyam* (xiv.12) *iti sūtradvayam prasaktam: tatra pūrvatvāt tanakārapūrvac ca takāra*<sup>11</sup> *ity etad eva prathamam kartavyam*<sup>12</sup>: *anyathá*<sup>13</sup> *vatth svayam iti*<sup>13</sup> *syāt: tac cá 'nishtam. athavá: imam vi shshyámī 'ty atro 'pasarganishpūrvó 'nudátte pade* (vi.4): *svarapūrvam vyañjanam*<sup>14</sup> *dvivarnam vyañjanaparam*<sup>14</sup> (xiv.1) *iti sūtradvayam*<sup>15</sup> *práptam: tatra dvitvasūtre*<sup>16</sup> *prathame kárye sati*<sup>16</sup> <sup>17</sup> *vi shsyámī*<sup>18</sup> *'ti syāt: tan·má bhūd iti shatvam eva prathamam kartavyam.*

*pūrvampūrvam iti*<sup>19</sup> *vīpsá sarvathái*<sup>20</sup> *'vam artham samarthayati*<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *tena*. <sup>2</sup> W. -*dena na*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> B. O. *sati*. <sup>7</sup> W. O. -*ma*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *vashatth*; B. *vata*; O. *vatt*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. om. <sup>12</sup> O. M. put before *prathamam*. <sup>(13)</sup> W. B. *vat sváhe 'ti*; O. *vat svayam iti*; G. M. *vashatth svayam iti*. <sup>(14)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -*tram*. <sup>(16)</sup> G. M. *prathamam kṛte*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ins. *imam*. <sup>18</sup> B. G. M. *shyámi*. <sup>(19)</sup> G. M. *vīpsayá sarvatrái 'tad áhâ'yam iti samarthanīyam*; B. *vīpsá sarvatrái 'vam arthayati*. <sup>20</sup> O. *sarvatrái*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



7. And before *akurva*, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, *ta ishuvñ sam askurvata* (vi.2.3<sup>1</sup>); the *pada*-text reading *sam : akurvata*. The counter-example is *agnihotram vratam akurvata* (iii.2.2<sup>2</sup>). As *pratyaya* occurs nowhere else in the treatise, we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively 'augment,' or, as in other of the Prâtiçâkhyas, 'affix' in general. The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating "that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct."

नीचापूर्वा दकार उच्चापरः ॥ ८ ॥

8. After *nîcâ* is inserted *d* before *uccâ*.

The passage is *madhyân nîcâd uccâ* (ii.3.14<sup>6</sup>); and the *pada*-text actually reads *nîcâ : uccâ*. This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas. To write *madhyena* for *madhyât* just before would be in itself quite as defensible. As counter-examples, we receive *lokam yanty uccâvacâ 'hni* (vii.4.3<sup>6</sup>), and *nîcâ tam dhakshi* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

At the end of the comment is made the remark "the above are cases of insertion" (*âgama*, 'accession'). The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up.

असंपूर्वा ऋकारः ॥ ९ ॥

9. After *asam*, *r* becomes *ar*.

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is *grhâ-nâm asamartyâi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), where the *pada*-text has, as the rule implies, *asam-rtyâi*. Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the *pada* text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the *asam* intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not *-a sam*); else such passages as *kalyânî rūpasamṛddhâ* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>), and *vahî hy esha*

---

7. *cakârah sampûrvatvam*<sup>1</sup> *âgamam*<sup>2</sup> *câ*<sup>3</sup> 'nvâdiçati. *akurva* 'ce 'ti' *grahane pratyayât parah sakâra âgamo bhavati sampûr-vaḥ. yathâ: ta----- pratyayo nâmâ 'kâra ucyate: pratîyanta*<sup>5</sup> *abhivyajyante vyañjanâny anene 'ti pratyayaḥ. sampûrva iti kim: agn-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-rvam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *sakârâg-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>(4)</sup> W. *ca*; O. G. M. *iti*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *pratyâyante*; G. M. *pratyayante*.

8. *nîcâpûrvo dakâra âgamo bhavaty uccâparaḥ. yathâ*<sup>1</sup>: *madh----- evampûrva iti kim: lok-----: evampara iti kim: nîcâ-----*

*âgamâ etc.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *om*.



*samr̥ddhyâi* (ii.2.2<sup>1</sup>) would be included. As counter-example, to show that *r̥*, not a syllable containing *r̥*, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted *asam̥tr̥ṇṇe hi hanû* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *hanû*).

अवग्रह आशीर्धुःसुवरिति रेफं परः सकारः षका-  
रम् ॥ १० ॥

10. Of *âçîḥ*, *dhûḥ*, and *suvaḥ*, when first members of a compound, the *visarjanîya* becomes *r*, and a following *s* becomes *sh*.

The word *avagraha* in this rule is the locative *avagrahe*, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words, taken separately. He supplies *visarjanîya*, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule. The illustrative passages quoted are *ity âçîrpadaya rcâ* (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>; the *pada*-text reads *âçîḥ-padayâ*), *dhûrshâhâv anaçrû* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>; p. *dhûḥ-sâhâu*), and *dadhishe suvarshâm jîhvâm agne* (iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *suvaḥ-sâm*: W. B. O. omit the first word of the citation, G. M. the last). The necessity of the specification "when first members of a compound" is shown by the counter-example *ye devâ devasva stha te* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>: p. *deva-suvaḥ*: G. M. omit the first two words and the last). *Âçîḥ* shows the same irregular combination also in *anâçîrkena* and *sâçîrkena* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup>), but these words are not treated as divisible by the *pada*-text. The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one: viii.23 would require *âçîshpadayâ*, and ix.2

9. *asam ity evampûrva ṛkâro 'ram vikâram âpadyate. yathâ: gr̥h-..... tatra<sup>1</sup> nimittam ekapadastham<sup>2</sup> vijñeyam: anyathâ kaly-.....: vahî-.....: ity âdâv api bhavet. ṛkâra iti kim: asam-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *atra*. <sup>2</sup> B. *-dasamstham*.

10. *avagraha iti saptamyantam padam âçîḥprabhṛtibhiḥ pratyekam abhisambadhyate. âçîḥ: dhûḥ: suvaḥ: ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv avagraheshu visarjanîyo repham âpadyate: ebhyaḥ<sup>2</sup> paro yadi sakâro<sup>3</sup> vartate tarhi shakâram<sup>4</sup> âpadyate. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: ity-.....: dhûr-.....: dadh-..... avagraha iti kim: ye-..... kakhapakâraparah<sup>6</sup> (viii.23) ity anenâ<sup>7</sup> "çîshpadaye 'ti prâptam: <sup>8</sup>aghośha-paras tasya sasthanam ūshmāṇam<sup>9</sup> (ix.2) iti dhûssâhâu<sup>10</sup> suvassâm<sup>11</sup> iti ca prâptam<sup>8</sup>: tadubhayabhaṅgâyâ 'yam ârambhaḥ. itiçabda eshâm evâi 'sha viçesho nâ 'nyeshâm iti prakâravâcî.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tebh-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put before *yadi*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. so 'pi *shatvam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. *parah*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om: <sup>(8)</sup> W. om. <sup>9</sup> B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> B. O. *dhûḥs-*. <sup>11</sup> B. O. *suvaḥs-*.



*dhāssāhāu* and *suvaśām* (or, as it is customary to write them, *dhāhsāhāu* and *suvaśām*: only G. M. are conscientious about giving the double sibilant, as demanded by the Prâtiçākhyā). The *iti*, he remarks finally, signifies that only the words mentioned, and no others, are intended—that is to say, it has no particular meaning at all. It would be well if he always as frankly acknowledged the insignificance of this word where it occurs in the rules.

## अथ लोपः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Now for cases of omission.

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 19, below, inclusive.

## इपूर्वो मकारः ॥ १२ ॥

12. A *m* is dropped, when preceded by *îm*.

The passage aimed at is *îm 'andrâ suprayasaḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup> : p. *îm* : *mandrâ*): it is the only one of its kind in the text. The Vâjasa-neyi-Sanhitâ reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii.15) *îm man-drâ*. To treat the loss of a *m* here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable. The particle *îm* is reduced to *î* in quite a number of Rik passages, and before other letters than *m*: they are duly noted in the Prâtiçākhyā (Rik Pr. iv.36). A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator: *îman me varuṇa* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>) shows that *m* is not dropped after another *m* in general; *agnim mitram varuṇam* (ii.1.11<sup>1</sup>), that *m* after short *i* does not exercise the specified effect; *îmkârāya svāhe 'nikr̥tāya* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>), that *îm* elides no other consonant than *m*. The yet farther restriction is applied, that *îm* here is a *padagrahana*, 'the citation of a complete *pada*;' for otherwise there would be an elision of a *m* in such cases as *pr̥thivîm mâ hiṅsîḥ* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>): G. M. add the further example *uta çravasâ pr̥thivîm mitrasya*, which I am unable to find in the Sanhitâ.

## तुनुपूर्व उदात्तयोर्वकारः ॥ १३ ॥

11. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah*: *lopa ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmaḥ. ayam adhikāras tiṣṭhantya ekayā* (v.19) *itisūtraparyanto veditavyaḥ*.

12. *makāra îm ity evampūrvo lupyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: îm . . . . evampūrva.iti kim: imam . . . .: dīrghena kim: agn- . . . . îm iti padagrahanam<sup>2</sup>: itarathā<sup>3</sup> pr̥th- . . . . ity ādāu makāro lupyeta<sup>4</sup>. makāra<sup>5</sup> iti kim: îm- . . . .*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -hacarnah. <sup>3</sup> G. M. anyathā. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -yate; and add *tac cā 'niṣṭā*. <sup>5</sup> W. -rapara.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



Here the *ca*, 'also,' is declared to continue the implication of "when a consonant follows" from the preceding rule. The *iti* is added for the sake of clearness; it shows the final *visarjanīya* of *syah*, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also. What indicates that this final *visarjanīya* is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident. The illustrative examples are *esha te gāyatraḥ* (iii.1.2<sup>1</sup>), *sa te jānāti* (i.2.14<sup>2-3</sup>: but G. M. substitute *sa topo 'tapyata*, iii.1.1<sup>1</sup>), and *esha sya vājī* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>). The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is *dama evā 'syāi 'sha upa tisṭhate* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>), where, if the *h* of *eshaḥ* were lost by this rule, x.5 would require the reading *esho 'pa*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii.4, Vâj. Pr. iii.15,16, Ath. Pr. ii.57.

नासः ॥ १६ ॥

16. But not *asah*.

Namely, in the passage *hrtsvaso mayobhân* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>; p. *hrtsu-asah*), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for *sah*, by i.52.

इद्विद्मश्मान्नौषधीःपरः सः ॥ १७ ॥

17. And *sah*, when followed by *id u*, *id agne*, *imâm nah*, *enâ*, *oshadhîh*.

These are the cases in the Sanhitâ where, after the regular loss of the final of *sah*, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x.25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rik Pr. ii.33,34, and Vâj. Pr. iii.14. The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows: *se 'd u hotâ so adhvarân* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>: B. O. omit the last word; G. M. the last two), *se 'd agne astu* (i.2.14<sup>3</sup>), *se 'mâm no havyardâtim* (iv.6.6<sup>6</sup>), *sâi 'nâ 'nîkena* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup> and 6.1<sup>5</sup>), and *sâu 'shadhîr anu rudhyase* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>). The first two need counter-examples, to show that *it* not followed by *u* or *agne* does not coalesce with *sa*: they are *sa ij*

15. *vyaktivishaya*<sup>1</sup> *itiçabdaḥ pratyekam esha ity âdîn*<sup>2</sup> *visarjanīyântân*<sup>3</sup> *dyotayati: cakâro vyañjanaparâtâm anvâdiçati. eshaḥ: saḥ: syah: eshu*<sup>4</sup> *visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo lupyate. yathâ*<sup>5</sup>: *esha* ----: *sa* ----: *esha* ----. *evampara iti kim: dama* ----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-tiçishta*; O. *-tiviçishta*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-nâm*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-yântatân*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ins. padeshu*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *om*.

16. *asa ity asmin*<sup>1</sup> *grahane visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo na lupyate. hrt* ----. *apy akârâdi* (i.52) *iti prâpter*<sup>2</sup> *nishedhaḥ*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etas*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-tiḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*.



*janena* (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>) and *sa id deveshu gachati* (iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>). The third also wants a counter-example, to prove the need of *naḥ* after *imâm*: it is found in *sa imâm abhy amṛçat* (v.5.2<sup>4</sup>). Finally, to show that only *saḥ* undergoes the prescribed effect before the words specified in the rule, we have *paro divâ para enâ* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup>).

## अत्रग्रह इत्येकम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Also *ity ekam*, when *ekam* is the former member of a compound.

The passage aimed at is *pâpîyânt syād ity ekâikam tasya juhuyât* (v.1.1<sup>2</sup>: but as given by W. O., without the first two words, it is also found again at v.4.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *juhuyât*); and the *pada*-text actually reads *ekam-ekam*. The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule. Two counter-examples are given, to justify the terms of the rule: they are *ardhukañ syād ity ekam agre 'tha* (vi.2.3<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words), and *yad ekamekañ sambharet* (i.6.8<sup>2</sup>).

## तिष्ठत्येकया सपूर्वः ॥ १९ ॥

19. Also *tishṭhanty ekayâ*, along with the preceding letter.

The commentator quotes the passage: *tishṭhanty ekâikayâ stritayâ* (vii.5.8<sup>4</sup>); the *pada*-reading is *ekayâ-ekayâ*. As counter-example, where the same word remains unmutated, is given *samânânâm karoty ekayâikayo 'tsargam* (vi.1.9<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first word).

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound *ékâika*, which (see the St. Petersburg Lexicon) is not very rare in the Çatapatha Brâhmaṇa and later.

17. ----- <sup>1</sup> *evamparaḥ saḥkâra*<sup>2</sup> *ity atra visarjanîyo lupyate. yathâ: se 'd-----: se 'd----- v<sup>3</sup> agna ity âbhyâm<sup>4</sup> kim: sa -----: sa-----: se-----: na iti kim: <sup>5</sup>sa-----: sâi-----: sâu-----: sa iti kim: paro-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *sakâra*; G. M. *sa*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *id*; G. M. O. *u*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. *etâbhyâm*. <sup>5</sup> A lacuna in B., to near the end of the comment on rule 18.

18. *itiçabdaviçishṭa ekam ity asminn avagrahe makâro lupyate. yathâ<sup>1</sup>: pâp----- avagraha iti kim: ardh-----: itiçabdaviçishṭa iti kim:<sup>2</sup> yad-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> End of the lacuna in B.

19. *tishṭhantiçabdaviçishṭa ekaye 'ty asmin grahaṇe 'ntyô<sup>1</sup> varṇaḥ sapûrvaḥ pûrvasahito lupyate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: tish----- tishṭhantî 'ti kim: sam----- pûrveṇa saha vartata iti sapûrvaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-yasvaro*. <sup>2</sup> O. om.



The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 15 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed. We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made.

नकारः शकारं चपरः ॥ २० ॥

20. A *n*, when followed by *c*, becomes *ç*.

The commentator's illustrative examples are *ahîñç ca sarvân jambhayan* (iv.5.1<sup>2</sup>), *ṛtûñç ca tasya nakshatriyâm ca* (vii.1.3<sup>2</sup> : G. M. omit *ca*), and *karnâñç câ 'karnâñç ca* (i.8.9<sup>3</sup>). The counter-examples, to show that only *n* is so changed, and *n* itself only before *c*, not before other palatal mutes, are *çam ca me* (iv.7.3<sup>1</sup>), and *tân chandobhir anu* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup> : G. M. omit *anu*).

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi.14 and ix.20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.26. At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the *sandhi* ñçc: the Atharvan and the Vâjasaneyi-Sanhitâ make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally. In the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ it is prevailingly usual: I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule.

The definition of the *sandhi*, of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv.1-3, which teach that, where *n* has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has *anusvâra* added to it. A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a *s* (or *visarjanîya*) and the change of *n* to *anusvâra* before it: but the makers of the Prâtiçâkhyas concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules.

नायन्नैर्यन्नाधुवन्ननड्डान्घृणीवान्वारुणानिवास्मिन् ॥ २१ ॥

21. But not the *n* of *âyan*, *âirayan*, *ârdhnuvan*, *anadvân*, *ghrñivân*, *vârunân*, and *evâ 'smin*.

The passages are: *lokam âyañ catasrah* (v.2.3<sup>4</sup>), *yâm âirayañ*

20. *cakâraparo*<sup>1</sup> *nakârah çakâram âpadyate. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *ah- . . . . : ṛt- . . . . : kar- . . . . . nakâra iti kim: çam . . . . : capara iti kim: tâñ . . . . . caḥ*<sup>3</sup> *paro yasmâd asâu caparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *caparo*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *cakârah*.

21. . . . . *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *grahaneshu nakârah çakâram nâ 'padyate caparo 'pi. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *lo- . . . . : yâm . . . . : loka . . . . : anadv- . . . . : ghrñ- . . . . : vâ- . . . . : evâ . . . . . 'eve 'ti kim:*<sup>3</sup> *asm- . . . . .*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## जपरो जकारम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. When followed by *j*, it becomes *j*.

The cited example is *taj jayānām jayatvam* (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: *tat pravāte* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>).

## नकार एतेषु जकारम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. A *n*, before the same letters, becomes *ñ*.

As *eteshu* is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them: that is to say, *ç*, *c*, *ch*, *j*. These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since *ñ* never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since *jh* is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental *n*, then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator's illustrative example for *n* before *ç* (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is *tenāi 'vāi 'nāñ chamayati* (iii.4.8<sup>4</sup>). As for *n* before *c*, he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the *n* does not become *ç* by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, *lokam āyañ catasraḥ* (v.2.3<sup>4</sup>). Before *ch*, he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, *tāñ chandobhir anu* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>); and before *j*, *aparūpam ātmañ jāyate* (iii.5.7<sup>3</sup>). As general counter-example, finally, he gives *tānt subdhān* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>), where *n*, coming before *s*, is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of *n* before *ch*, which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā. My own MS. reads every time *nch*, combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads *ñch*.

23. *sāmnidhyāt takāra iti labhyate: japarā takāro jakāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: taj----- evampara iti kim: tat-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

24. *eteshu iti bahuvacananirdeçāt<sup>1</sup> pratyāsannam evā 'napekshya<sup>2</sup> sūtradvayastheshu paranimitteshu sampratyayah<sup>3</sup>: tasmād eteshu iti: çacachajeshu<sup>4</sup> parata<sup>5</sup> ity arthaḥ: nakāro ñakāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>6</sup>: te-----: çatvāpattāu nishiddho<sup>7</sup> yo nakāraḥ so 'tra caparatvena vishayīkriyate. lok-----: tāñ-----: apa----- evampara iti kim: tānt-----*

<sup>1</sup> W. -rdiç-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. 'navek-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. praty-. <sup>4</sup> W. O. -chabhujeshu. <sup>5</sup> W. para; G. M. pareshu. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. B. O. put after yo.



The combination of final *n* with initial *ç*, producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17), *ñch*, is decidedly of more common occurrence. But here, too, my own MS. reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, *nch*: the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving *ñ* (as at ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>), now *n* (as at i.3.9<sup>1</sup>).

Final *n* is found yet more frequently before initial *j*, or some scores of times in all. As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between *nj* and *mj*. The Calcutta text is equally wavering; and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either: in both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary.

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the *Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ* ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* (either *ñ* or *m*), wherever a final *n* comes to stand before a palatal mute.

लपरौ लकारम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Both *t* and *n*, when followed by *l*, become *l*.

The dual *laparâu* indicates that the *t* and *n*, already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator. He cites as examples *yâl lohitam parâpatat* (ii.1.7<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), and *trîñ lokân ud ajayat* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *ud ajayat*). The combination of *n* and *l* is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto.

नकारो ऽनुनासिकम् ॥ २६ ॥

26. The *n* becomes nasalized *l*.

As the nasal quality of *n* itself is already established by rule ii.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the *anunâsikam* of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the *l* of like position into which the *n* is converted: this *l* is to be a nasal *l*. No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule.

There are in the *Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ* over a hundred cases of the meeting of final *n* with initial *l*, and in fully two-thirds of them

25. *dvivacanasâmarthyâd<sup>1</sup> grhîtâu prakrtâu<sup>2</sup> takâranakârâu lakâram âpadyete<sup>3</sup> laparâu. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: yâl....: trîñ..... lah<sup>5</sup> paro yâbhyâm tâu laparâu.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-thya*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> MSS. *-yate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *lakârah*.



my MS. reads *nl* simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another. In the remaining cases, it treats the *n* in the same way as it would treat a *m*, substituting for it the ordinary *anusvāra*-dot over the preceding *akshara*. =The Calcutta text varies between *nl* and *ñll*. Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the *Prâtiçâkhyā* is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal *l* shall be represented, there may be some question. As I have already mentioned (note to ii.30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an *anusvāra* between the preceding vowel and a doubled *l*, and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by *Âtreya*, as noted in a later rule (v.31). The method followed in my MS., on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of *n* and *l* and that of *m* and *l*: it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result. If the nasal *l* is to be written separately, it should properly have the *virāma* beneath and the sign of nasality over it. That is to say, one ought always to print either **अस्मिँल्लोके** or **अस्मिं लोके**, not **अस्मिँल्लोके**.

In romanized text, as the assimilated *m* is represented by *m̄*, so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated *n* may be very suitably represented by *n̄*; and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before *l* and before the palatals.

All the *Prâtiçâkhyās* (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.35) agree in converting both *n* and *m* before *l* into a nasal *l*.

**मकार स्पर्शपरस्तस्य सस्थानमनुनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥**

27. A *m*, when followed by a mute, becomes a nasal of like position with it.

The commentator's examples are *yam̄ kāmāyeta* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup> et al.), *çam̄ ca me* (iv.7.3<sup>1</sup>), *tam̄ te duçcakshâḥ* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>), and *tam̄ prat-*

26. *anusvārottamā<sup>1</sup> anunāsikāḥ* (ii.30) *iti nakārasya<sup>2</sup> 'nunāsikatve siddhe<sup>2</sup> punar atrā<sup>3</sup> 'pi tatkathanam unupapannam: tasmād atra lakṣhaṇayā nakāro nāma tatsthāno lakāra<sup>3</sup> ity arthaḥ: asāv<sup>4</sup> anunāsikam bhajate<sup>5</sup>. pūrvoktam evo 'dāharaṇam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *nanu anusvā-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *nak-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *lakāro*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *bhajeta*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



ly so used and applied in the Prâtiçâkhyâ, the difficulty is worse than hair-splitting; it is a downright perversion. The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it: “because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality; as, for example, when we say ‘a white cloth,’ ‘a blue lotus.’” As if the words “white” and “blue” strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean ‘of white color,’ ‘of blue color!’

न रेफपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29. But not when followed by *r*.

*R* being also a semi-vowel, *m* would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception. The instances given of the treatment of *m* before *r* are *pra samrâjam prathamam adhvarâṇām* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have only the first two words), and *sâmrâjyâya sukratuḥ* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup>). They are particularly ill-selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule; they fall, rather, under xiii.4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of *sam* before *râj*. We ought to have, instead, such passages as *pratyushtaṅ rakshaḥ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup>), *vi vayaṅ ruhema* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>)—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Sanhitâ.

The omission of *m* before *r*, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of *anusvâra* after the latter, are taught below, in rules xiii.2, xv.1–3. The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper *anusvâra* sign before *r*, while before *y*, *l*, *v* they write the assimilated *m* just as before the mutes.

यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३० ॥

30. Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the *m* to be treated before these letters as before *r*, and would acknowledge no

---

29. *antasthâtivâd rephaparasyâ<sup>1</sup> 'pi makârasya tatsavarṇânu-nâsikaprâptir<sup>2</sup> anena nishidhyate: na khalu rephaparo<sup>3</sup> makârah pûrvoktam bhajate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: pra-----: sâ-m----- rephaḥ paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *rephasya tatp-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-kâpattiḥ prâptâ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-pakâro*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.

30. *cakâro nishedhânvâdeçakah<sup>1</sup>: prakṛto<sup>2</sup> makâra ekeshâm âcâryâṇâm pakshe yakâraparo vâ<sup>3</sup> vakâraparo<sup>4</sup> vâ na savarṇam anunâsikam bhajate. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: sa-m- : sa-m-*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-âkarshakah*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *prâk-*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.



nasal semi-vowel save *l*. Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of *m* before *r* (xiii.3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the "some teachers" spoken of are the same with those here noticed: who they are, he does not attempt to tell us. The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prâtiçâkhyâ, as pointed out above (see Ath. Pr. ii.35, and the note upon it); but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prâtiçâkhyâ had here in mind the other one and its authors.

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of *m* should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an *anusvâra* at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which *m* might naturally pass before *y*, *r*, *l*, and *v*.

As examples, are repeated *saṁvatsarah* and *saṁyattâh* (see under rule 28, above).

उत्तमलभावात्पूर्वो ऽनुनासिक इत्यत्रियः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Âtreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the previous vowel is nasalized.

As has been pointed out above, Âtreya's view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition. It is not elsewhere supported in the Prâtiçâkhyas. Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert *m* and *n*, not into *l*, but into a nasal *l*. One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv., where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed.

The commentator gives Âtreya the title of *muni*, 'sage,' instead of *âcârya*, 'teacher.'

To illustrate the sage's style of making the combination, he cites *trîṅl lokân* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>) and *suvargaṅl lokam* (i.5.4<sup>2</sup> et al.); but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations. Finally, he adds the caution that "this rule and the preceding are not approved."

उपूर्वः ककारः सषकारपरः ॥ ३२ ॥

31. *uttamasya nakârasya makârasya<sup>1</sup> vâ labhâvâl lakârâpatteḥ pûrvasvaro 'nunâsiko bhavati 'ty âtreyo nâma munir manyate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: trîṅl lokân: suv-..... uttamayor labhâva uttamalabhâvaḥ: tasmât.*

*sûtradvayam etad anishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *nak-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.



32. After *ñ* is inserted a *k* before *s* and *sh*.

The commentator's examples are *pratyāñk somo atidrutah* (i.8.21: but G. M. have instead *sadrñk samānāih*, ii.2.8<sup>6</sup>), and *prātyāñk shadaho bhavati* (vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>: O. G. M. omit *bhavati*). As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>), and *tat savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *tat shodaçī* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup>).

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text. In the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ I have found no other instance of the meeting of *ñ* and *sh* than the one quoted; of *ñ* before *s*, besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi.3.1<sup>6</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>7-8</sup>; but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi*. Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the Prâtiçâkhyâ: and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter's authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv. Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of *t* between *n* and *s* (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write *ñk s* and *ñk sh*. The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W. B. O. reading *ñks*, and W. O. *ñksh* (with the *k* and *sh* united in the usual sign for *ksh*); while G. M. even yield to the requirement of xiv.12, and give us *ñkhs* and *ñkhsh*. This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts.

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.9, the teachings of the Ath. Pr. and Vâj. Pr. are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Rik Pr. merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities.

टनकारपूर्वश्च तकारः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. After *t* or *n* is inserted a *t*.

The examples given for these combinations are *vashatt svâhâ* (vii.3.12 nine times), and *vidvânt somena yajate* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>); and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of *t* with *sh*, one is dragged in from the *jatâ*-text: *anūyājāu shatt shad anūyājāv anūyājāu shat* (vi.6.3<sup>3</sup>): to which G. M. even add, from the

---

32. *sakâraparah*<sup>1</sup> *shakâraparo vâ kakâra âgamo bhavati ña-pûrvah. yathâ: praty-...: praty-... evampara iti kim: praty-...: evampûrva iti kim: tat-...: tat-...*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *vâ*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## स्पर्शपूर्वः शकारश्चकारम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. A *ç* preceded by a mute becomes *ch*.

The commentator gives only an example of a *ç* converted into *ch* after *t*, the *t* at the same time becoming *c* by rule 22, above: *çarac chrâutrî* (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>). He adds a counter-example, *âçuḥ çicânah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>). The occurrence of any other final mute than *t* and *n* (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial *ç* is very rare (excepting *m*, for which see the following rule); and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a *t*-sound and a *sh*-sound into the compound sound of our *ch* in *church* (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17). There is one case of a preceding *t* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>), where my MS. reads, as the Prâtiçâkhya directs, *t ch*, while the Calcutta text has *t ç*. A single case of preceding *p* is treated of below, in rule 36.

## न मकारपूर्वः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. But not when preceded by *m*.

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of *ç* to *ch* after *m*, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since *m* is a mute. He instances *sañcitam me* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup> and v.1.10<sup>2</sup>) and *sañçravâ ha* (i.7.2<sup>1</sup>). Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xiii.2 and xv.1–3, and the *m*, as before other spirants, becomes *anusvâra*. An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xiii.2 directs the omission of *m* before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of *ç* into *ch* as is here contemplated and guarded against. The reply, however, is a very easy one; that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into *ch*, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

---

34. *çakâraç chakâram âpadyate sparçapûrvaḥ*<sup>1</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *çarac*..... *evampûrva iti kim: âçuḥ*..... *sparçah pûrvo yasmâd asâu sparçapûrvaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. puts first. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. om.

35. *makârapûrvaḥ çakâraç chakâram nâ* "padyate. *yathâ: sañ*.....: *sañ*..... *sparçatvân makârasya* <sup>1</sup>*tatpûrve*<sup>2</sup> *çakâre*<sup>3</sup> *prâptam chatvam*<sup>4</sup> *anena nishidhyate. nanv* <sup>5</sup>*etad anupapannam: atha makâralopaḥ*<sup>6</sup> (xiii.1): *rephoshmaparaḥ* (xiii.2) *iti makârasya lopavidhânân na*<sup>6</sup> *çakârasya chatvâpattinimittam*<sup>7</sup> *astî* <sup>8</sup>*'ti. mâi* <sup>9</sup>*'vam: chatvâpâdakam malopâpâdakât pûrvam: atas*<sup>1,8</sup> *tatra pûrvampûrvam prathamam*<sup>9</sup> (v.3) *ity nyâ-*



duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading *samchitam me brahma*; which is wrong.

पकारपूर्वश्च वाल्मीकिः ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Nor, according to Vâlmîki, when preceded by *p*.

There is but a single case in the Sanhitâ of *p* before *ç*, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, *anushtup çâradi* (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>): so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above. Vâlmîki thinks it would be better to read *anushtup çâradi*—and I presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion.

व्यञ्जनपरः पौष्करसादेर्न पूर्वश्च जकारम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. Nor, according to Pâushkarasâdi, when followed by a consonant; and a preceding *n*, in that case, does not become *ñ*.

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part; translating 'and a preceding *n* becomes *ñ*;' but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v.24). The inquiry is raised, how we know that *pûrvah*, 'the preceding letter,' means here 'a preceding *n*.' The reply is, because only *n* is liable to conversion into *ñ*, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place.

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pâushkarasâdi are *âdityân çmaçrubhiḥ* (v.7.12), and *pâpîyân çreyase* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>). The edition has *pâpîyân chreyase* in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Prâtiçâkhyâ; but my MS. seems to have been written by a sectary of Pâushkarasâdi at this point (namely, in the margin: a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe). In the former, I

---

*yena chatvam eva pûrvam<sup>10</sup> kartavyam syât: tathâ sati makâra sparças<sup>11</sup> tatpare<sup>12</sup> çakâre chatvam<sup>12</sup> âpanne sam----- iti syât: tan mâ bhûd ity etat sûtram upapannam eva.*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om., excepting *lokavidhânân na*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*vasya*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*rasya*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. put before *prâptam*. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. put before *asti*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -*ttatvân*. (<sup>8</sup>) G. M. *chatvâpâdakasya sûtrasya malopasya ca chatvâpâdakasyâi 'va sapûrvatvât*. <sup>9</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> B. -*ça*. (<sup>12</sup>) G. M. *tasye 'ti makâre ñakaram*. <sup>13</sup> B. *pare*.

36. *çakârah pratishedhârthakah<sup>1</sup>: vâlmîker mate pakârapûrvah<sup>2</sup> çakâraç çakâram<sup>3</sup> nâ "padyate. yathâ: an-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. *dhâkarshakah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *pûpû-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *chatvam*.



find the reading *ādityān chmaçrubhiḥ*, which would satisfy neither side. There is one other case of the collision of *n* with *çr* (at v.6.7<sup>3</sup>), where I find read *n chr*. So also, at v.7.1<sup>3</sup> my MS. has *n chv*; and at vii.3.14, *n chy*. These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule.

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason: the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial *ç* to *ch* shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34.

प्रथमपूर्वा हकारश्चतुर्थं तस्य सस्थानं प्राक्षिकौण्डि-  
न्यगौतमपौष्करसादीनाम् ॥ ३८ ॥

38. According to Plâkshi, Kâuṇḍinya, Gâutama, and Pâushkarasâdi, a *h* preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter.

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial *h* with a final surd mute, are, as given by the commentator, *arvâg ghy enam* (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>), *sarad dhavâ açvasya* (v.3.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *açvasya*), and *tad dhiranyam* (v.4.2<sup>3</sup> and vi.1.7<sup>1</sup>). In giving the first two quotations, W. O. G. M. (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incautiously been admitted into some edited texts) write *ghgh* and *dhdh* instead of *ggh* and *ḍḍh*; and in the latter of them my MS. of the Sanhitâ does the same (see the note to xiv.5). As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have *pratyañ hotâram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>), *vâk ta â pyâyatâm* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>), *vashat te* (ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>); and, in W., *â 'tishthipat te* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>), but in all the other MSS. *tat te* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.).

This is one of several instances in which the Prâtiçâkhya, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest. The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

37. *pâushkarasâder mate vyañjanaparah çakara sparçapûrvo 'pi chatvam nâ "padyate: çakârapûrvo nakâraç ca ñakâram nâ "padyate. yathâ<sup>1</sup>: âd-----: pâp----- pûrva ity ukte nakâra iti katham labhyate. ñakârâpattir asyâi 've 'ti brâmah: prasaktasyâi 'va<sup>2</sup> hi<sup>3</sup> pratishedhât.<sup>4</sup> vyañjanam asmât param iti vyañjanaparah.*

*nâi 'tat sūtradvayam ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-dhah*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



## मीमांसकानां च मीमांसकानां च ॥ ४१ ॥

41. As also, according to the Mîmâṅsakas.

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of Çâityâyana and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent.

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved.

### CHAPTER VI.

CONTENTS: 1-5, conversion of *s* and *h* into *sh*; 6-13, exceptions and counter-exceptions; 14, insertion of *s* between final *n* and initial *t*.

## अथ षकारः सकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the conversions of *s* and *visarjanîya* into *sh*.

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule.

## स्वानासोदिव्यापोक्ष्यमुक्मोप्रोत्रीमहियविपद्यवग्र- हपूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2. A *s* is converted into *sh* when preceded by *svânâso divi*, *âpo hi*, *ayam u*, *kam u*, *û*, *mo*, *pro*, *trî*, *mahi*, *dyavi*, *padi*, or a former member of a compound.

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *uta svânâso divi shantv agneḥ* (i.2.14<sup>7</sup>: only O. has *agneḥ*; B. omits both that and the preceding word): with the

41. *caḥārah pūrvoktavidhim anvādiḥati: mîmāṅsakānām cā 'ntarāgamamataṁ sammataṁ. pūrvoktam evo 'dāharaṇam. mîmāṅsakānām<sup>1</sup> pūjārtham pṛthaksūtrārambhaḥ. nāi 'tat sūtratrayam ishtaṁ.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣākhyavivarāṇe  
pañcamo 'dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. omit to here.

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: sakāravisarjanîyāu shakāram āpadyete ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita utturaṁ yad vak-shyāmaḥ.*



counter-example *tr̥tîyasyâm ito divi somo âsît* (iii.5.7<sup>1</sup>), to show the powerlessness of *divi* to effect the change except after *svânâsah*. Then *âpo hi shthâ mayobhuvah* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the last word): the necessity of *âpo* is shown by the counter-example *na hi svah svan̄ hinasti* (v.1.7<sup>1</sup>). Next *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), and *kam u shvid asya senayâ* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>): with the counter-example *tad u soma âha* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *u* changes *s* only after *ayam* and *kam*. For *û*, the example is *ûrdhva û shu na ûtaye* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word): the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial *s* are i.5.11<sup>5</sup>: iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>: v.1.5<sup>3</sup>: vii.1.18<sup>2</sup>; 4.17<sup>2</sup>. For *mo*, the only passage is the one quoted, *mo shû na indra* (i.8.3). For *pro*, only *pro shv asmâi puroratham* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>). For *trî*, only *trî shadhasthâ* (ii.4.11<sup>2</sup> and iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: *mahi shad dyuman namaḥ* (iii.2.8<sup>2</sup>), *ya upa dyavi shtha* (ii.4.14<sup>5</sup>), and *padi shitâm amuñcatâ yajatrâḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every *s* beginning in *pada*-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to *sh*, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception “not after a consonant, or an *a*-vowel;” it means, then, that *s* is so changed after the *i*, *u*, and *r̥*-vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: *hañsah çucishad vasuh* (iv.2.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *çuci-sat*: only G. M. have the first word), *ayâ vissthâ janayan* (i.7.12<sup>2</sup>; p. *vi-sthâḥ*: only G. M. have *ayâ*), and *goshṭomam̄ dvitîyam* (vii.4.11<sup>1</sup>).

I have collected from the Sanhitâ all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial *s* of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Prâtiçâkhyâ and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succeeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, *anusthita*, whose unaltered *s* is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, *vishṇvanusthitaḥ* (ii.4.12<sup>3,4,5</sup>; p. *vishṇu-anusthitaḥ*), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

---

2. ----- *ity evampûrvo 'vagrahapûrvaç ca sakâraḥ shakâram âpadyate. yathâ: uta-----: svânâsa<sup>1</sup> iti kim: tr̥t-----: âpo -----: âpa iti kim: na-----: ayam-----: kam-----: ayamkam iti kim: tad-----: ûrdh-----: mo-----: pro-----: trî-----: mahi-----: ya-----: padi-----: hañs-----: ayâ-----: go----- avagrahaḥ pûrvo yasmâd asâv avagrahapûrvaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *svâna*.



## असदामासिञ्चश्च ॥ ३ ॥

3. Also *asadâma* and *asiñcan*.

The “also” (*ca*) in this rule implies, the commentator says, that the words mentioned are preceded by an *avagraha*, according to the final specification of the preceding rule: else such passages as *ajâyâm gharmanam prâ 'siñcan* (v.4.3<sup>3</sup>) would fall under the prescribed action. The examples are *yena kâmena nyashadâme 'ti* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *ni-asadâma*), and *mitrâvaruṇāv abhyashiñcan* (i.8.11; p. *abhi-asiñcan*). The rule is given, we are told, for the purpose of ordaining that, in the case of these two words, the conversion into *sh* after an *avagraha* takes place even notwithstanding the interposition of an *a*. Why not, then, puts in an objector, say “even when *a* interposes,” without specification of the words concerned? Because, is the reply, the rule would then apply to such cases as *hrtsvaso mayobhân* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>; p. *hrtsu-asah*).

## उपसर्गनिष्पूर्वी ऽनुदात्ते पदे ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also in an unaccented *pada*, when a preposition or *nis* precedes.

This rule can apply only to unaccented verbal forms, since they alone can be technically *anudâtta* throughout, having the *anudâtta* sign written under every syllable. In any compound beginning with a preposition like *pâri*, for instance, having an acute on the first syllable and an enclitic *svârîta* on the second, the syllables of the other member of the compound would not have the *anudâtta* accent, but the *pracaya*: such would fall under rule 2 of this chapter. The word *pada* in the rule, we are told, is intended to specify the text: “a word which is *anudâtta* throughout in the *pada*-text” is what the Prâtiçâkhyâ means—it being, in fact, impossible that any word should be so accented in *samhitâ*-text.

The commentator's examples are, for prepositions, *açmann ûrjam iti pari shiñcati* (v.4.4<sup>1</sup>), *imam vi shyâmi* (i.1.10<sup>2</sup> and iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), *sâmrâjyenâ 'bhi shiñcâmi* (i.7.10<sup>3</sup> twice, and v.6.3<sup>3</sup>: but B. O. read *shiñcati*, I presume by a copyist's blunder, as I find no such phrase in the text), *yajamâne prati shthâpayanti* (vi.1.4<sup>2</sup>), and *ni shasâda dhrtavrato varuṇah* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup>: only B. O. have *varuṇah*);

3. *asadâma*: *asiñcan*: *ity etayoḥ sakârah shakâram*<sup>1</sup> *âpadyate. yathâ: yena . . . .: mitr- . . . . cakâro 'vagrahapûrvatvânvdêçakah*<sup>2</sup>. *anvdêçenâ 'nena*<sup>3</sup> *kim: aj- . . . . avagrahapûrvatve 'py*<sup>4</sup> *akâreṇa vyaveta ity ayam ârambhaḥ. nanu lâghavâd akâravya-veto 'pî 'ty etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam: kaṇṭhoktyâ kim. ucyate: hr̥t- . . . . ity âdâu mâ bhûd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. and O. p.m. om. *pûrva*. <sup>3</sup> B. O G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *sati*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



*veḥ*, *sumatiḥ*, *mâkiḥ*, *îyuh*, *âyuh*, *âbhiḥ*, *sadhiḥ*, and *nakiḥ*, under all circumstances.

This is, the commentator remarks, a rule establishing exceptions in advance to rule 2 of the ninth chapter, which would require in every case *s* instead of *sh*. The examples are: for *agniḥ*, *avidushtarâsah*: *agnish tad viçvam* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>) and *medhyaç ca sapte: agnish tvâ* (v.1.11<sup>1</sup>); with a counter-example, *varshishthe adhi nâke 'gnis te tanuvam* (i.1.8: only G. M. have the first two words), to show that *agniḥ* becomes *agnis* after other words than the two specified in the rule. For *nis*, *nish tapâmi goshtam* (i.1.10<sup>1</sup>). For *viduh*, *vidushtarañ sapema* (ii.5.12<sup>5</sup>; p. *viduh-taram*), and also, in virtue of rule i.52, *avidushtarâsah* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; p. *aviduh-tarâsah*): *vidushtarah* occurs at ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>. For *mîdhuḥ*, *mîdhushtama çivatama* (iv.5.10<sup>4</sup>; p. *mîdhuḥ-tama*). For *pâyubhiḥ*, *pâyubhish tvañ çivebhiḥ* (i.4.24): with the counter-example *tasmâd açvas tribhis tishthañs tishthati* (v.4.12<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words), to show that the quotation of *bhiḥ* (of *pâyubhiḥ*) alone as *nimitta* would not have answered the purpose. For *veḥ*, *çoce vesh tvañ hi yajvâ* (iv.3.13<sup>5</sup>). For *sumatiḥ*, *sumatish te astu bâdhasva* (i.4.45<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last word): and, to justify the text in quoting *sumatiḥ* (p. *su-matiḥ*) in full, instead of *matiḥ* simply, we receive an asserted quotation from "another text," *pramatis te devânâm*. For *mâkis*, *mâkish te vyathir â dadharshît* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>). For *îyuh*, *îyush te ye pûrvatarâm apaçyan* (i.4.33). For *âyuh*, *âyush ta âyurdâ agne* (ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *agne*): we have *âyush te* again at i.3.14<sup>4</sup>. For *âbhiḥ*, *âbhish te adya gîrbhiḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *sadhiḥ*, *apsv agne sa-*

5. *râsah: sapte: 'ity etâbhyâm viçishte 'gnir ity asmin' grahaṇe: niḥ-----<sup>1,2</sup>----- nakiḥ: ity eteshu visarjanîyas takâraparah shakâram<sup>4</sup> âpadyate<sup>2</sup>. yathâ: avid-----: medh-----: etâbhyâm viçishta iti kim: varsh-----: nish-----: vid-----: apy akârâdi (i.52) iti vacanâd avidushtarâsa ity apy udâharaṇam: mî-----: pây-----: pâyv<sup>5</sup> iti kim: tasm-----: çoce-----: sum-----: sv iti kim: pram----- iti çâkhântare: mâk-----: îyush-----: âyush-----: âbhish-----: apsv-----: nakish----- nityaçabdaḥ kimarthaḥ: ṛkârarephavati (vi.8): avagrahaḥ (v.9) iti nishedham<sup>6</sup> vakshyati: avidur<sup>7</sup> ity atra visarjanîyasyâ 'vagrahasthatvât shatvam na syât: tan mâ bhûd iti: kañthoktir<sup>8</sup> vidur ity asyâi 'va<sup>9</sup> na tv avidur ity asye 'ti dâurbalyât: tatsamrakshaṇârtho nityaçabdaḥ prayujyate.*

*aghoshaparas tasya sasthanam (ix.2) ity asya purastâd apavâdo 'yam.*

(1) (2) W. transposes, breaking *mîdhuḥ* in the middle. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *etasminn*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *-yur*; G. M. *-yubhir*; B. corrupt. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *pratishedho*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *vid-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ins. *api*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *shatvam*.



*dhish tava* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup>,11<sup>3</sup>). And for *nakiḥ*, *nakish tam ghnanti* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>): *nakish tam* is found also at i.8.22<sup>4</sup>.

The final specification of the rule, *nityam*, 'under all circumstances,' is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word *aviduḥtarâsaḥ* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below. The word *viduḥ* itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is needed to bring in *aviduḥ* as its hanger-on. The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place. We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i.52 treated as demanding a special handling.

अथ न ॥ ६ ॥

6. Now for exceptions.

An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13).

अवर्णव्यञ्जनशकुनिपत्न्यृतुमृत्युमलिन्नुबृहस्पतिपूर्वः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Excepted is a *s* preceded by an *a*-vowel, a consonant, *çakuni*, *patnî*, *rtu*, *mṛtyu*, *malimlu*, or *brhaspati*.

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2. The commentator's examples are, for a preceding *a*-vowel, *antarikshasad dhotâ* (i.8.15<sup>2</sup> et al.: only G. M. have the second word) and *â siñcasva* (i.4.19: but G. M. omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4; and, for a preceding consonant, *ṛksâme vâi* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>). Then, for the words specified, we have *çakunisâdena* (v.7.14), *patnîsamnyâjânâm* (ii.6.10<sup>4</sup>: G. M. read *-yâjâḥ*, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), *ṛtusthâs tasya* (v.7.6<sup>6</sup>: the same compound is found at v.5.8<sup>1</sup>), *mṛtyusamnyuta iva* (i.5.9<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *iva*), *nâi*

6. *athe 'ty ayam adhikâraḥ: ne 'ty etad' adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmaḥ*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *vadayâmaḥ*.

7. *avarṇapûrvo vyañjanapûrvaç ca çakuni----- brhaspati: ity*<sup>1</sup> *evampûrvaç ca*<sup>2</sup> *sakâraḥ shakâram*<sup>3</sup> *nâ "padyate. yuthâ: ant-----: avagrahapûrvatvât*<sup>4</sup> *prâptiḥ: 'â siñ-----: upasarga-pûrvaṭvât prâptiḥ*<sup>5</sup>: *ṛk-----: çak-----: patn-----: rtu-----: mṛt-----: nâi-----: brh-----: 'avagrahapûrvatvâd eshâm prâptiḥ*<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *eshâm*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. om.; W. adds *sa visrasyaḥ: avagrahapûrvatvât prâptiḥ*.



'*nam malimlusenā vindati* (vi.3.2<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have the first two and the last words), and *br̥haspatīsutasya te* (i.4.27 and vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>); all of which, as the commentator points out, are cases falling under the last specification of rule 2, respecting the conversion of initial *s* of the latter member of a compound.

## ऋकारेफवति ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also in a word containing *ṛ* or *r*.

The commentator gives one example of each case, the former constituting an exception under rule 4, the latter under the last specification of rule 2: *vi sr̥jate śāntyāi* (i.7.6<sup>7</sup>), and *tasmāt sa visrasyah* (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>,10<sup>7</sup>: only G. M. have *tasmāt*).

Of other words falling under this rule, I have noted *parisrutam* (i.8.21), *visarjanam* (i.1.5<sup>2</sup>), *bahusūvarī* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), and *gosatram* (vii.5.1<sup>1</sup>). Compare the nearly corresponding rules of the other treatises, Rik Pr. v.11, Vâj. Pr. iii.81, Ath. Pr. ii.102,106.

## अवग्रहः ॥ ९ ॥

9. Also in the former member of a compound.

We should expect the word *avagraha* in this rule to be put in the locative case, so as to accord in construction with the preceding rule; and I have translated it as a locative. Its being a nominative makes the commentator some trouble: he declares *avagraha* here equivalent to *avagrahastha*, 'standing in *avagraha*,' and quotes as corresponding and customary expressions "the stages cry out," "the fat one knows," where "those occupying the stages," "the soul inhabiting a fat body," are really meant.

The occasion for such a precept as this arises out of rule 4, above, which provides for the conversion into *śh* of the initial *s* of a word wholly *anudātta*, after a preposition. It was aimed, as is there pointed out, at unaccented verbal forms. But the former members of compounds which are accented on the latter member

---

8. *ṛkāraṣ ca rephaṣ ca ṛkārarephāu: tāv asmint sta ity ṛkāra-rephavat: tasmin pade vartamānaḥ sakāraḥ śhakāram<sup>1</sup> nā "padyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: vi-...: <sup>3</sup>upasargapūrvatvāt prāptiḥ<sup>3</sup>: tasm-...: <sup>4</sup>avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptiḥ<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *śhatvam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(3)</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> W. om.

9. *avagrahasthaḥ sakāraḥ śhakāram<sup>1</sup> nā "padyate: upasarga-pūrvaṣ<sup>2</sup> ca<sup>3</sup>: avagraha ity avagrahastho<sup>4</sup> lakshyate<sup>5</sup>: mañcāḥ kro-ṣantī 'ty atra <sup>6</sup>mañcasthāḥ: <sup>7</sup>sthūlo jānātī 'ti<sup>8</sup> sthūladēhasthaḥ. udāharanāni: tasy-...: mukh-....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *śhatvam*. <sup>2</sup> W. *-va*; G. M. *visarjanīyaṣ*. <sup>3</sup> W. *sat*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. change place with *avagraha*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *labhy-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*. <sup>8</sup> B. O. om. *iti*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*bhaṇam* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>). There are no other words illustrating the rule, although *adhishavana* occurs in one or two other passages.

Considering that an appended specification constituting a rule often applies only to the last word given in the preceding rule (e. g. iv.13,16), it might well enough have seemed advisable to the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya to read here *dhipûrvayoh*, in the dual, instead of *dhipûrve*.

संतानेभ्यःसप्ताभिःसंमितास्तनाःसीतस्वशःसकसनि-  
सनिःसनीःसभेयःसत्त्वासस्यायै ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also in *saṁtānebhyah*, *saptâbhiḥ*, *sammitâm*, *stanâm*, *sîtam*, *spaçah*, *sak*, *sani*, *saniḥ*, *sanîḥ*, *sabheyah*, *sattvâ*, and *sasyâyâi*.

The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows. For *saṁtānebhyah*, *parisaṁtānebhyah svâhâ* (vii.4.21). For *saptâbhiḥ*, *trisaptâbhiḥ paçukâmasya* (v.2.6<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have only the first word). For *sammitâm*, *vedisammitâm minoti* (v.6.8<sup>2</sup>). For *stanâm*, *dvistanâm karoti* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>). For *sîtam*, *anusîtam vapati* (v.2.5<sup>5</sup>). For *spaçah*, *tanûpānah pratispaçah* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>). *Sak* is declared a part of a word, implying a variety of forms; for example, *paçcât prçnisaktho bhavati* (ii.1.3<sup>3</sup>), *prçnisakthâs trayo hâimantikâḥ* (v.6.23: G. M. omit the last word), *prçnisaktham âlabheta grâmakâmah* (ii.1.3<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), and *prçnisakthâya svâhâ* (vii.3.18): I have noted no other cases, and should regard *saktha* as (by i.22) the preferable form for the *grahana* in the rule. For *sani*, *tasmâd etad gosani* (vii.5.2<sup>2</sup>); for *saniḥ*, *asi stanayitnusanir asi* (iv.4.6<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word); for *sanîḥ*, *vṛshṭisanîr upa dadhâti* (v.3.1<sup>3</sup>,10<sup>1</sup>): *gosaniḥ* is found also at iii.2.5<sup>7</sup>, and *vṛshṭisaniḥ* at iv.4.6<sup>2</sup>. As it would satisfy all these cases to cite *san* alone, in the character of part of a word (like *sak*, above), the commentator inquires why that was not done, and the citation of whole words avoided; and he brings up in reply *mṛdhâ vâ esho 'bhishaṇṇo yasmât samāneshv anyah çreyân uta* (ii.4.2<sup>3</sup>: all but W. stop at *-shaṇṇo*), and *nishaṇṇâya svâhâ*

12. ----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *sakârah* *shakâram*<sup>2</sup> *nâ* "padyate. *yathâ*:  
*pari*-----: *tri*-----: *vedi*-----: *dvi*-----: *anu*-----: *tan*-----:  
*sag iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah*: *yathâ*: *paçc*-----: *prç*-----:  
-----: *prç*-----: *prç*-----: *tas*-----: *asi*-----: *vṛsh*-----: <sup>3</sup>*sann*  
*ity*<sup>3</sup> *etâvatâi* 'va<sup>4</sup> *siddhe kim akhilapadapâthena*<sup>5</sup>: *mṛdhâ*-----:  
*nish*-----: *ity âdâu mâ bhûd iti*: *sus*-----: *abhis*-----: *sus*-----:  
----- <sup>6</sup>*sattvâsaṁtānebhya ity etayor upasargapûrvatvât prâptiḥ*:<sup>6</sup>  
<sup>7</sup>*sarveshâm*<sup>8</sup> *anyeshâm avagrahapûrvatvât prâptiḥ*<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>(3)</sup> W. B. O. *san ity*; G. M. *sani 'ty*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. *pada*. <sup>(6)</sup> W. *satvâsasyâyâ ity ayor upasargâvagrahapûrv*; B. O. *saṁtānebhyah svâhâ*: *ity etayor up*. <sup>(7)</sup> W. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om.



(vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>), as examples of the alteration of *san*. *Sani* would not cover all the cases; and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in *i*, or any other vowel than *a*, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme. For *sabheyah* is quoted *susabheyo ya evam* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *evam*). For *sattvâ*, *abhisattvâ sahojâh* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>: all the MSS. read everywhere, in text, commentary, and Sanhitâ, *satvâ*). And for *susyâyâi*, *susasyâyâi supippalâbhyah* (i.2.2<sup>3</sup>).

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with *s*, after a vowel other than an *a*-vowel. The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts: see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4; but there is no ground for so doing.

न स्वरस्पर्धास्तरीमसाहस्रसारथिस्फुरतीस्तुब्धोति-  
रायुश्चतुःपूर्वस्तो ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not in *svara*, *spardhâh*, *starîma*, *sâhasra*, *sârathih*, *sphurantî*, *stuh*, and in *sto* when preceded by *jyotih*, *âyuh*, or *catuh*.

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing *r* or *r* from the conversion of their initial *s* into *sh*. The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows: *amba ni shvara* (i.4.1<sup>2</sup> and vi.4.4<sup>3</sup>); *vi shpardhâç chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—*sushtarîmâ jushânâ* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>); *dvishâhasram cinvîta* (v.6.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *cinvîta*), and *trishâhasro vâ asâu lokah* (v.6.8<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *vâi*)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of *sâhasra* by its theme-ending *a*, according to rule i.22: other forms do not occur in the Sanhitâ, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—*kâmayate sushârathih* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>); and *vishphurantî amitrân* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>).

The next case is a very anomalous one, being the conversion of *s* into *sh* after *a*, contrary to the first specification of rule 7. The phrase is *sashtup chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>2</sup>; p. *sa-stup*). Compare similar cases as noted in Ath. Pr. ii.95.

The combination of *sto* with the three words mentioned, although

---

13. ----- *stup: ity eteshu sakârah: jyotih:âyuh: catuh: evampûrvaç ca<sup>1</sup> sto ity atra sakâra rkararephavati* (vi.8): *avarṇavyañjana* (iv.7) <sup>2</sup>*iti co 'ktaṁ<sup>2</sup> nishedham nâ<sup>2</sup> padyate: kim tu shatvam pratipadyate: iti pratiprasavârtho 'yam nakârah. yathâ: amba-----: vi sh-----: upasargapûrvatvâd anayoḥ prâptih: susht-----: grahaṇasya ca<sup>3</sup> (i.22) iti vacanâd akâragrhitam<sup>4</sup> sâhasragrahaṇam anekârtham: yathâ<sup>4</sup>: dvish-----:*



not quite regular, has nothing strange in it. The final *visarjanīya* of the first member of the compound is lost by ix.1, and the sibilant is treated as it would be had no *h* been present. The examples are *jyotishtomam prathamam* (vii.4.10<sup>1</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>), *dyushtomam trīyam* (vii.4.11<sup>1</sup>), and *catushtomo abhavat* (iv.3.11<sup>2</sup>): *jyōtishtoma* and *catushtoma* occur in a number of other passages, which it is not worth while here to rehearse. The exception this time is to the second specification of rule 7, according to which the consonant *h* at the end of the former member of the compound would prevent the lingualization of the sibilant. Of course, according to the theory of the Prātiçākhyā (by v.3), the lingualization is first performed, giving *jyotiḥshtoma* etc., and then, by ix.1, the *visarjanīya* disappears, making *jyotishtoma*, as all the manuscripts, of comment and Sanhitā, constantly read.

The commentator remarks the fact that, from *starīma* on, the cases are such as fall under the last specification of the second rule of this chapter. He then adds, as counter-examples under *sto*, *yad akshnayāstomīyāḥ* (v.3.3<sup>1</sup>), *catustanām karoti* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>), and *jyotis tv 'ā asya* (ii.2.4<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. omit this example).

There are a few other words which we might expect to see included among those forming the subject of this rule. Such is *bār-hishad* (iv.6.1<sup>4</sup> et al.), i. e. *barhiḥ-sad*: but the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts adopt the omission of the final *h* as part of their own reading, and the Tāittirīya (p. *barhi-sad*) does the same, so that the irregularity of the word lies outside the Prātiçākhyā. Such, again, are *dushtara* (iv.4.12<sup>2</sup>) and *dushtarītu* (iv.4.12<sup>1</sup>), provided that, as seems to me probable (compare note to Ath. Pr. ii.85), they are regarded as compounds of *duḥ* with *stara* and *starītu*. But these words are written by the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas *du-stara* and *dustarītu*, and the *pada*-text of the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā reads *dushtara* and *dushtarītu*, so that there is no reason for their peculiar phonetic form being noticed by the Prātiçākhyā. Once more, *trishshamṛddhatvāya* (ii.4.11<sup>5</sup>) would call for inclusion here, but that the addition of the suffix *tva* at its end annuls the separation which would otherwise be made of the first element of the compound, *triḥ*, and the word stands in *pada*-text *trishshamṛddhatvāya*, and so does not require alteration in *saṁhitā*.

तर्हाऽस्तस्मिंलोकान्विद्वाऽस्ताऽस्त्रीन्युष्मानूर्धानम्बका-  
नृत्नश्मन्कृएवन्पितृननान्कपालाऽस्तिष्ठन्नायुदात्तेनेमि-

*trish*-----: *kām*-----: *vish*-----: *sash*-----: *jyot*-----: *āy*-----:  
-----: *cat*-----: *starīmādīnām eshām avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptiḥ*:  
*jyotirādipūrvatvena kim*: *yad*-----: *sto iti kim*: *cat*-----: *jyot*-----:  
-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.    <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *ity ādi*.    <sup>3</sup> W. B. om.    <sup>(4)</sup> W. B. O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



only G. M. have the first two words). For *anân*, *prânāñs tasyā 'ntar yanti* (vii.1.3<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-anân*): here rule i.51 is invoked to show that the lingualized *n* does not render the citation inoperative. For *kapālân*, *dvādaçakapālāñs tr̥tīyasavane* (vii.5.6<sup>4</sup>). For *tishthan*, *tribhis tishthañs tishthati* (v.4.12<sup>1</sup>): as counter-example, proving the necessity of the requirement as to accent, we have *na praty atishthan tā vasuko 'si* (v.3.6<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *na*), which would fall under the operation of the present rule by i.52. For *nemir devân*, *nemir devāñs tvam paribhūr asi* (ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *asi*); with the counter-example *jātavedo vapuyā gacha devân tvañ hi* (iii.1.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word), to show that *devân* is so treated only after *nemiḥ*. For *savane paçūn*, *mādhyandine savane paçūñs tr̥tīyasavane* (iii.2.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word); with the counter-example *prajām paçūn tenā 'vardhata* (vii.4.3<sup>2</sup>), to prove the need of *savane* in the rule. Then, as general counter-example, to bring out the fact that *n* is thus converted into *s* only before *t*, we have *tasmin prajāpatir vāyuh* (vii.1.5<sup>1</sup>): G. M. add also *lokân dravināvataḥ* (v.3.11<sup>2</sup>). And finally, the commentator proceeds to explain and illustrate the limitations "an original (*prākṛta*) *n*" and "a constant (*nitya*) *t*," given in the rule. An original *n* is one which is not the product of euphonic processes, but is read in the *pada*-text: in *tām tena çamayati* (v.7.3<sup>3</sup>), then, where the *m* represents a *n*, produced by the assimilation of *m* to the following *t* (by v.27), the rule has no force. A constant *t*, in like manner, is one which is found in all forms of the text, and not in *saṃhitā* alone: hence, in *vidānt somena yajate* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>), the *t* which is introduced (by v.33) between *n* and *s* does not cause the conversion of the *n* into *s*. The *t* in this case, to be sure, is (by xiv.12) to be turned into *th* (and is so written in the citation by W. G. M.); but, as the rules of the treatise (by v.3) have to be applied in their order, the danger of misapprehension upon the point in question requires to be guarded against: for a *t* inserted by authority of the fifth chapter might assibilate a nasal according to the sixth, before it was itself turned into an innocuous *th* by the fourteenth.

The cases in which the insertion of *s* between *n* and *t* is made in the Tâittirîya-Saṃhitâ are thus seen to number only thirty-one. On the other hand, the cases of the collision of *n* and *t* without interposition of *s* are very numerous: I have noted about two hundred

---

*praj-...: takārapara iti 'kim: tasmin-...: lokân-...: prākṛta iti kim: tām-...: vāikṛto<sup>4</sup> 'yam nakāro<sup>5</sup> makāra sparçaparaḥ (v.27) iti prāptatvāt: nitye takāra<sup>6</sup> iti kim<sup>3</sup>: vidv-...: anityo 'yam nakāro yataḥ padasamaye nā 'sti. takāraḥ paro yasmād asāu tathoktaḥ<sup>7</sup>.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane  
shashtho 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *nitye pade*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *aprākṛto*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *ins. yataḥ padasamaye nā 'sti*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *takāraparaḥ*.



and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion. In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath. Pr. ii.26) the condition of things is quite different: while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight). The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

CONTENTS: 1-12, cases of the conversion of *n* into *ṇ*; 13-14, of *t* and *th* into *ṭ* and *ṭh*; 15-16, exceptions to the conversion of *n* into *ṇ*.

अथ नकारो णकारम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for conversion of *n* into *ṇ*.

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14). We have treated here all the cases with which the Prâtiçâkhya has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of *pada*-text into *saṃhitâ*: chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq.) takes up the occurrence of *ṇ* in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Sanhitâ.

षुषूकृधिसुवःसमिन्द्रास्थूर्युरुवाःषट्त्रिग्रामनिष्पूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2. *N* becomes *ṇ* when preceded by *shu*, *shû*, *kr̥dhi suvah*, *sam indra*, *asthûri*, *uru*, *vâh*, *shat*, *tri*, *grâma*, or *niḥ*.

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows. For *shu*, *ûrdhva û shu ṇah* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup> and v.1.5<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first word); and, as counter-example, *gr̥heshu ṇah* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), where *shu*, not being a complete word, does not (by i.50) lingualize the nasal: but G. M. omit this passage and the accompanying explanation. For *shû*, *mo shû ṇa indra* (i.8.3). The commentator points out

---

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah*: *nakâro ṇakâram ûpadyata ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttarain yad vakshyâmah.*

2. ----- *evampûrvo nakâro ṇakâram ûpadyate. yathâ*<sup>1</sup>: *ûrdh-----: 'gr̥h----- ity atra ṇatvam na bhavati padagrahaneshv* (i.50) *iti vacanât*:<sup>2</sup> *mo-----: susû*<sup>3</sup> *ity etayor yadâ shatvam nâ 'sti tadâ ṇatvanishedhârtham vâikṛtagrahanam: ya-*



that *shu* and *shā* are cited in the rule in their altered form (not as *su* simply, which, by i.51, would include them both) in order to indicate that where their consonant is not lingualized they do not lingualize the following nasal; and he quotes in illustration *su na ūtaye* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>) and *sū na indra* (i.8.3). Both these passages are the same which have been already quoted to illustrate the conversion, and G. M. O. very properly put them into the form of another text (apparently a *krama*), reading *su naḥ : na ūtaye*, and *sū naḥ : na indra*. *Shu* converts *n* to *ṅ* also at iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>. For *kr̥dhi suvāḥ*, the passage is *brahmanā kr̥dhi suvar na çukram* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the first word: the Calcutta edition has the false reading *na*); and the necessity of *kr̥dhi* is shown by the counter-example *svāhā suvar nā 'rkah svāhā* (v.7.5<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first word). For *sam indra*, *sam indra no manasā* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>); and *vartaye 'ndra nardabuda* (iii.3.10<sup>1</sup>) shows that *indra* when not preceded by *sam* does not exercise the prescribed influence. For *asthūri*, *asthūri no gārhapatyāni santu* (v.7.2<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *santu*). For *uru*, *uru nas kr̥dhi* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup> and vi.3.2<sup>2</sup>): there is another like case at iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>. For *vāḥ*, *tasmād vār nāma vo hitam* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *śat*, *shaṅṅavatyāi svāhā* (vii.2.15). For *tri*, *triṅava stomo vasūnām* (iv.3.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word): the word *triṅava* is found in a considerable number of other passages. For *grāma*, W. B. give *grāmanī rājanyaḥ* (ii.5.4<sup>4</sup>), but G. M. O. have instead *grāmanīyam prā 'pnuvanti* (vii.4.5<sup>2</sup>): the word is found once more, at iv.4.3<sup>1</sup>. For *niḥ*, *nir nenijati tato 'dhi* (vii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words); and *ni no rayim* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>) is added, to show that *ni*, without *visarjanīya*, has no alterant force. *Nir nenikte* (vii.2.10<sup>4</sup>) and *nirṅij* (iv.6.8<sup>1</sup>) are the only other cases I have noted for *niḥ*.

## हृन्त्याडुप्यमानं च ॥ ३ ॥

3. Also in *hanyāt* and *upyamānam*.

That is to say, after *niḥ*, the last of the words given in the preceding rule. The passages are: *yoner garbham nir hanyāt* (v.6.9<sup>1</sup>:

---

*thā : su . . . . : sū . . . . : brah . . . . : kr̥dhī 'ti kim : svāhā . . . . : sam . . . . : sam iti kim : vart . . . . : asth . . . . : uru . . . . : tasmād . . . . : shaṅ . . . . : tri . . . . : grām . . . . : nir . . . . : visarjēṇa kim : ni . . . .*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *shushū*.

3. *cakāro nishpūrvatvam anvādiçati : niḥçabdottarayor<sup>1</sup> hanyād upyamānam ity etayor grahaṇayor<sup>2</sup> nakāro ṅakāram<sup>3</sup> āpad-yate. yathā<sup>4</sup> : yon . . . . : nir . . . . anvādeçah kimarthah : na . . . .*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-bdasyo 'tt-*; O. *nishpūrvayor*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. *ṅakātvam*; B. *ṅatvam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



between the preposition and the verb of the pause which separates the third and fourth divisions of the section.

A couple of counter-examples are given, to show us that the intervention of a letter of any other complexion than *a* prevents the change of nasal: they are *pari minuyât sapta* (v.2.6<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), and *praminâma vratâni* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>).

## वाहनउक्ष्यमानोयानमयन्यवेनवञ्च ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also in *vâhanah*, *uhyamânah*, *yânam*, *ayan*, *yavena*, and *van*.

According to W. B. O., the *n* becomes *ṇ* in these words "when they are preceded as implied by the word 'also' (*ca*)," the commentary failing to tell us what this implication is. G. M., however, confess that *pra* only is brought forward (from rule 4): which is a marked departure from the ordinary usage of the treatise, since in the intermediate rule *pra* and *pari* were both distinctly understood. The commentator omits, not to say avoids, noticing the irregularity. Perhaps he would be justified in claiming that *pari* and *pari* are never found preceding the words specified in the rule, and that therefore it makes no difference whether they be regarded as implied or not: still, even that consideration would not wholly excuse the want of accuracy and consistency. The examples are: for *vâhanah*, *pravâhano vahniḥ* (i.3.3; p. *pra-vâhanah*); to this, W. adds a counter-example, to show that, after any other word than *pra*, *vâhanah* remains unchanged—namely *havyavâhanah çvâtro 'si* (i.3.3): B. tries to do the same, but only succeeds in repeating one of the counter-examples of the last rule, *pari minuyât* (v.2.6<sup>3</sup>), which is not at all in place here. For *uhyamânah*, *prohyamâno 'dhipatiḥ* (iv.4.9; p. *pra-uhyamânah*). For *yânam*, *prayânam anv anya id yayuh* (iv.1.1<sup>2</sup>; p. *pra-yânam*: O. omits the last three words, G. M. the last two). *Ayan* is declared a part of a word, including a number of cases, of which G. M. give only three, *tasmâd âdityaḥ prâyanîyaḥ* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-ayanîyaḥ*: O. omits *tasmât*), *prâyanîyam kâryam* (vi.1.5<sup>3,5</sup>), and *prâyanam pratishthâm* (i.6.11<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-ayanam*); while W. B. O. add two others, *prâyanîyasya puronuvâkyâḥ* (vi.1.5<sup>5</sup>), and *prâyanîye 'han* (vii.2.8<sup>1</sup>). There are a number of other passages for *prâyanîya*; and *prâyana* occurs again at i.6.11<sup>2</sup> and vii.1.13, besides its compounds,

6. ----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *grahaneshu cakârâkr̥shṭapûrveshu*<sup>2</sup> *nakâro ṇatvam bhajate. yathâ: prav-----:* <sup>3</sup>*pre 'ti kim: havy-----:* <sup>3</sup>*proh-----: pray-----: ayann iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah: tasm-----: prây-----: prây-----:* <sup>4</sup>*prây-----: prây-----:* <sup>4</sup>*pray-----:* <sup>5</sup>*vann iti padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthah*<sup>5</sup>: <sup>6</sup>*yadi-----:* <sup>6</sup>*âhav-----: anvâdeçena kim: asi-----: uday-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-shṭaprapûrvo*. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. om.; O. om. the example. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. *ity âdi*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. O. B. om. <sup>(6)</sup> O. om.



*suprâyaṇa* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *su-prâyaṇâḥ*) and *agnishtōmaprâyaṇa* (vii.2.9<sup>1</sup>; p. *agnishtōma-prâyaṇâḥ*). For *yavena*, *prayavena pañca* (iv.3.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *pra-yavena*). *Van*, again, is (by W. alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases: only two are given, *yadi vâ tâvat pravaṇam* (ii.4.12<sup>1</sup>), and *âhavanî-yât pravaṇaṅ syât* (vi.2.6<sup>4</sup>), nor have I found any other, except the compound *purastâtpravaṇaḥ* (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *purastât-pravaṇaḥ*). Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule: they are *asîhavyavâhanaḥ* (i.3.3), and *udayanam veda* (i.6.11<sup>2</sup>).

## प्रापूर्वश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7. As also, when preceded by *prâ*.

The “also” (*ca*). of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely *van*. The example is *prâvanebhiḥ sajoshasaḥ* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>; p. *pra-vanebhiḥ*: compare iii.5). I have noted no other case.

## इन्द्रोऽयजुःपूर्व एनकेन ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also *enam* and *kena*, when preceded respectively by *indraḥ* and *ayajuh*.

There is nothing in the rule meaning ‘respectively,’ and if *enam* were found anywhere in the text preceded by *ayajuh*, or *kena* by *indraḥ*, their *n*’s would doubtless require lingualization: yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated. The passages are *indra enam prathamah* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>), and *yad ayajushkena kriyate* (v.1.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *ayajuh-kena*: G. M. O. omit *yad*). I find no other cases falling under the rule: there are, however, one or two other forms analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely *anâçirkena* and *sâçirkena* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup>); but they are written by the *pada*-text without division of *âçirkena*, or restoration in it of the dental *n* (thus: *anâçirkena*, and *sa-âçirkena*).

Counter-examples are added: to show that *enam* and *kena*, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, *rudra enam bhûtvâ* (iii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *brahmanâdinaḥ kena tad ajâmî ’ti* (vii.4.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. end with *kena*); to show that *indraḥ* does not exercise a lin-

---

7. *cakârákr̥shṭe<sup>1</sup> vann iti grahaṇe nakâraḥ pre ’ty evampûrvo ṇatvam bhâjate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: prâv-.....*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -shṭa; O. *cakâro ’nvâdishṭo*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

8. *indraḥ: ayajuh: pûrvayor<sup>1</sup> enam: kena: ity etayor nakâro ṇatvam bhajate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: indra-....: yad-.... evampûrva iti kim: rudra-....: brah-....: <sup>3</sup>enamkene<sup>4</sup> ’ti kim: indro-....<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *ity evampûrva*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> W. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *kene*.



gualizing effect upon other words, *indro neshad ati* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>: B. omits *ati*; W. omits the whole example).

## नृश्रीपूर्वा मनाः ॥ ९ ॥

9. Also *manāḥ*, when preceded by *nṛ* or *ṣrī*.

The examples are *nṛmanā ajasram* (i.3.14<sup>5</sup> and iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>: W. reads *yantrī* instead of *ajasram*, but doubtless by a copyist's blunder, for *nṛmanā yantrī* is not found in the *Sanhitā*), and *ṣrīmanāḥ ṣatapayāḥ* (iv.6.3<sup>2</sup>); with the counter-example *sumanā upāgāhi* (iii.3.11<sup>5</sup>). Of *ṣrīmanāḥ* I find no other example; *nṛmanāḥ* occurs also at iv.2.2<sup>1</sup> (a second time) and vii.1.12.

## अङ्गानामोनिगानिगानांग्यानियामिने ॥ १० ॥

10. Also *aṅgānām*, *one*, *gāni*, *gānām*, *gyāni*, and *yāmena*.

These words in *saṃhitā*, says the commentator: that is to say, in the only cases in which they occur as *padas*, they take *ṇ* in the combined text. The passages are: *yat tryaṅgānāṅ samavadyati* (vi.3.10<sup>6</sup>; p. *tri-aṅgānām*: only G. M. O. have *yat*, and O. omits the last word), *āyushi durone* (i.2.14<sup>3</sup>; p. *duḥ-one*: the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan do not separate this word), *ati durgāni viçvā* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; p. *duḥ-gāni*, like the other Vedas), *purogānām cakshushe* (iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>; p. *puraḥ-gānām*), *suvargyāny āsan* (v.3.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *suvaḥ-gyāni*), and *antaryāmenā 'ntar adhata* (vi.4.6<sup>1</sup>; p. *antaḥ-yāmena*: O. omits the last word). I have found no second example for any of these words, although there may be occurrences of *durone* which I have overlooked.

## रषःपूर्वा हवन्यक्केहन् ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also *havanī*, *ahne*, *han*, when preceded by *r* or *shaḥ*.

The cited examples are: *agnihotrahavanī ca* (i.6.8<sup>3</sup>; p. *agnihotra-havanī*); *ṣarady aparāhṇe* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>; p. *apara-ahne*: the Atharvan has *apara-ahnah*); and further, for *han*, which is declared to be a part of a word, involving several cases, *rakshohanam* (i.2.14<sup>6</sup> et al.; p. *rakshaḥ-hanam*: O. omits this example), *vāish-*

9. *nṛ*: *ṣrī*: *ity*<sup>1</sup> *evampūrvō manā ity atra nakāro ṇatvam bhajate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *nṛm*-----: *ṣrīm*----- *evampūrva iti kim: sum*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

10. ----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *nakārah saṃhitāyām ṇatvam bhajate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *yat*-----: *āy*-----: *ati*-----: *puro*-----: *su*v-----: *an*tary-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>. As counter-examples are given *yāni mṛnmayāni sākshāt tāni* (vi.4.7<sup>3</sup>: B. omits the last word, G. M. O. the last two), *agnaye 'nīkavate* (i.8.4<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *svanīkasaṁdr̥k* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>).

## वाघापूर्वस्तष्टम् ॥ १३ ॥

13. After *vāghā* and *sh*, *t* is changed to *ṭ*.

The passage for *vāghā* is given by O. as *dārvāghātas te* (v.5.15<sup>1</sup>); all the other MSS. have only the first word, in its complete *pada*-form, *dārvāghāta iti dāru-āghātaḥ*. The same word forms the subject of Vāj. Pr. iii.47. As counter-example, showing that *ta* does not become *ṭa* after *ghā* except when the latter follows *vā*, we have *praghāta ādityānām* (vi.1.1<sup>3-4</sup>). For the conversion of *t* to *ṭ* after *sh* is quoted *āyush ṭa āyurdā agne* (ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two), whose *sh* depends on rule vi.5, above. O. adds a counter-example for this second part of the rule also, namely *agnis te tejah* (i.1.10<sup>3</sup> and vii.5.17).

## यश्च ठम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also *th* to *ṭh*.

The cited example is *goshṭham mā nirmṛksham* (i.1.10<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last word); to which O. alone adds *prati shṭhāpayanti* (vi.1.4<sup>2</sup>). As counter-example is given *gacha goshānam* (i.1.9<sup>1,2</sup>).

## न तकारपरः ॥ १५ ॥

15. But not when *t* follows.

The commentator explains the connection of this rule by pointing out that the two preceding do not come under the introductory heading of the chapter—that is to say, that they deal with a subject unconnected with the rest of its contents—and that hence they are regarded as dropped out, and the present exception does not apply to them, but to the foregoing rules, for conversion of *n* into *ṇ*. This is well enough, though not a little awkward, as concerns the status of rule 15; but we should like to hear what he had to say in defense of the intrusion of rules 13 and 14 thus into

---

13. *vāghā: ity evampūrvāḥ shakārapūrvāḥ<sup>1</sup> ca takārash ṭakāram bhajate<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dārv-....: āyush-.... ve<sup>4</sup> 'ti kim: pragh-....: <sup>5</sup>shapūrvā iti kim: agnis-....<sup>5</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.; O. om. *kāru*. <sup>2</sup> O. *āpadyate*. <sup>3</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. *vāghā*; B. *vāghāta*. <sup>(5)</sup> Only in O.

14. *cakārah shapūrvatvākarshakah<sup>1</sup>: thakārah shakārapūrvāḥ<sup>2</sup> ṭhakāram bhajate. yathā: gosh-....: <sup>3</sup>prati-....<sup>3</sup> evampūrvā<sup>4</sup> iti kim: gacha-....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *shakārap-*; O. *-tvādeçakah*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. *kāra*. <sup>(3)</sup> Only in O. <sup>4</sup> O. *shap-*.



a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection. Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix; or else put at the head of chapter vii., before its general *adhikâra*.

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely *pary antarikshât* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require *an* at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made.

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii.15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of *punarukti*, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove. It is characteristic of the method of the *Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ* that it does not attempt to state the real *nimitta* or occasion of the lingual *n* in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.6, where the subject of the occurrence of *n* in the interior of a word is taken up.

**नक्षतिनूनंनृत्यत्यन्योऽन्याभिरन्यान्यत्तश्चात्तश्च ॥ १६ ॥**

16. Nor in *nahyati*, *nûnam*, *nṛtyanti*, *anyaḥ*, *anyâbhiḥ*, *anyâni*; nor when final.

The *ca* in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception. These words, and a final *n*, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual *n*. The commentator quotes as follows. For *nahyati*, *vâsasâ paryânahyati* (vi.1.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *pari-ânahyati*: O. omits the first word): he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5. For *nûnam*, *pra nûnam pârnavandhuraḥ* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *nṛtyanti*, *pari nṛtyanti* (vii.5.10). For the three cases of *anya*, *prâ 'nyah çañsati* (vii.5.9<sup>3</sup>), *prâ 'nyâbhir yachaty anv anyâi mantrayate* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *pra* in all these three examples, and in this, along with G. M., the last three words; B. omits the last word), and *prâ 'nyâni pâtrâni* (vi.5.11<sup>1,2</sup>): the commentator remarks that all these (since *nahyati*) are cases of exceptions under rule 4. He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

15. *vâghâshâdividhir*<sup>1</sup> *anadhikṛtatvâd utpannapradhvañsî: tasmâd atra*<sup>2</sup> *nâ 'yam nishedhaḥ*<sup>3</sup>: *'kim tu*<sup>4</sup> *prakṛto*<sup>5</sup> *ṇatvavidhir anena vishayîkriyate. takâraparo nakâro ṇatvam nâ 'padyate. yathâ: pary----*: *pârîpariparîprapûrvaḥ* (vii.4): *avarṇavyaveto 'pi* (vii.5) *ity etâbhyâm*<sup>6</sup> *prâptiḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *vâghâdi*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tatra*. <sup>3</sup> B. *viçeshaḥ*. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *prak-*. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *âdibhyâm*.

16. *nishedhâkarshakaç cakârah*<sup>1</sup>: ----- *eshu*<sup>2</sup> *grahaṇeshu nakârah padântaç ca*<sup>3</sup> *ṇatvam na bhajate*<sup>4</sup>: *yathâ*<sup>5</sup>: *vâs-----*: *avarṇavyaveto pi* (vii.5) *iti prâptiḥ: pra-----: pari-----: prâ*



are quoted in the rule, instead of the syllable *an*, which would include them all; and makes the very obvious answer, that it is on account of the passage *anu prā 'nyāt prathamām* (v.5.5<sup>2</sup>), already quoted under vii.5. Finally, as example of final *n̄* exempt from conversion, he cites *vṛtrahañ chāra vidvān* (i.4.42), remarking that it is a case otherwise falling under rule 11.

The exception of a final *n* from becoming *n̄* is also one of those made below, in rule xiii.15, for the class of cases to which that chapter relates.

I have not discovered in the Sanhitā any case of a lingual nasal arising in the conversion of *pada*-text into *samhitā* which is not duly provided for in this chapter.

## CHAPTER VIII.

CONTENTS: 1-4, conversion of a final surd mute to sonant or nasal; 5-7, of *h* to *r*; 8-15, conversions of *h* to *r* after *a* and *ā*; 16-22, treatment of *h* before *r*; 23-35, conversion of *h* to *s* or *sh* before *k*, *kh*, or *p*.

अथ प्रथमः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for changes of first mutes.

That is to say, of surds unaspirated, or *k*, *c* (only *c* nowhere occurs as a final), *t*, *t̄*, and *p*. The force of this heading only reaches, as the commentary points out, through rule 4—hardly far enough, one would think, to make a separate introductory rule necessary.

-----: *prā*-----: *prā*-----: *pārīparīparīprapūrvah*<sup>6</sup> (vii.4) *ity eshām*<sup>7</sup> *prāptih̄*. *anu ity etāvātā*<sup>8</sup> *siddhe 'nyonyābhiranyānī 'ti kim pratipadapāthena*<sup>9</sup>: *anu*----- *ity atrā 'nena*<sup>10</sup> *nishedho*<sup>11</sup> *na*<sup>12</sup> *prasarati*<sup>13</sup>. <sup>14</sup>*padānto nakāra natvaṁ na bhajate: yathā*<sup>14</sup>: *vṛtra*-----: *rashaḥpūrvah* (vii.11) *iti prāptih̄*.

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane  
saptamo 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. O. put first. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *eteshu*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.; O. adds *nakāro*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *āpadyate*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> W. B. om. *prapūrvah*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *eteshām*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. *-vatāi 'va*. <sup>9</sup> O. puts before *kim*. <sup>10</sup> O. *nāi 'sha*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *pratish-*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-tv iti*. <sup>14</sup> B. O. om.; G. M. *padāntaḥ ca*.

1. *athe 'ty 'ayam adhikārah*<sup>1</sup>: *prathama 'ity etad*<sup>2</sup> *adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmaḥ*: <sup>3</sup> *visarjanīya* (viii.5) *paryanto*<sup>4</sup> *'yam adhikārah*.

(<sup>1</sup>) W. *adhikārārthah*. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>3</sup>) O. ins. *atha*. (<sup>4</sup>) O. *itisūtrapa-*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



notices, finally, that the present rule establishes an exception to rule 2 of this chapter.

अथ विसर्जनीयः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Now for changes of *visarjanîya*.

Departing a little from his stereotyped mode of explanation of *atha*, the commentary declares it in this rule to cause *visarjanîya* to be understood, in the character of that respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), in the precepts that follow; and he adds that this understanding is to remain in force as far as rule 10 of the next chapter.

रेफमेतेषु ॥ ६ ॥

6. *Visarjanîya* becomes *r* before the classes of sounds last mentioned.

The examples are *tad agnir âha* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), and *âçîr ma ûrjam* (iii.2.8<sup>5</sup>: O. omits *ûrjam*); with the counter-example *agniç ca ma indraç ca me* (iv.7.6<sup>1</sup>). The commentator points out that it is the plural form of the pronoun (*eteshu*, literally 'before those') in this rule that shows the implication of the vowels and sonant consonants, in the character of following causes (*paranimitta*), since those are the only things which have been mentioned above (namely, in rule 3). That is doubtless so; still, the reference must be regarded as an unusually blind one, involving a "frog-leap" (*maṇḍâkapluti*) over two intervening obstacles, of which one is a general heading, that changes entirely the subject under treatment.

*kakud iti kim: ya-----: evampara iti kim: kakut----- makârah paro yasmâd asâu makâraparah. uttamapara uttamañ savargîyam (viii 2) ity asyâ 'pavâdo 'yam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *t-kâro*. <sup>2</sup> W. *makârah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. put after *trîtyam*. <sup>4</sup> W. *prâpyate*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.

5. *athaçabdo visarjanîyam lakshyatvenâ 'dhikarotî 'ta uttaram yad ucyate<sup>1</sup>. atha svaraparo yakâram (ix.10) ity avadhîbhûto 'yam adhikârah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *vakshyâmah*.

6. <sup>1</sup> *svareshu ghoshavatsu ca<sup>2</sup> parato<sup>3</sup> visarjanîyo repham âpad-yate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: tad-----: âçîr----- eteshv<sup>5</sup> iti bahuvacanântasya sarvanâmno<sup>6</sup> nirdeçât svaraghoshavatâm paranimittânâm upâ-dânam<sup>7</sup>: teshâm eva prakrtatvât. eteshv iti kim: agniç-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *pareshu*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *svareshv*. <sup>6</sup> W. O. *sarvânâma*; B. *-nâmino*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-nât*.



न रेफपरः ॥ ७ ॥

7. But not before *r*.

*R*, though a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final *visarjanîya* before it. What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq.). The examples here given are *suvo rohâva* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and *ahorâtre* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup> et al.: W. O. add *pârçve*, but there is no such collocation of words in the Sanhitâ, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for *prâviçan*, which follows next at the place referred to).

द्वारभार्वार्हारविभर्जीगरकरनन्तर्विवःसुवःपुनरहरहः-  
प्रातर्वस्तःशमितःसवितःसनुतस्तनुतस्तोतर्हीतःपितर्मा-  
तर्यष्टरेष्टर्नेष्टस्वष्टः ॥ ८ ॥

8. *Visarjanîya* becomes *r* in *hvâh*, *abhâh*, *vâh*, *hâh*, *abibhah*, *ajîgah*, *akah*, *anantah*, *vivah*, *suwah*, *punah*, *aharahah*, *prâtah*, *vastah*, *çamitah*, *savitah*, *sanutah*, *stanutah*, *stotah*, *hotah*, *pitah*, *mâtah*, *yashtah*, *eshtah*, *neshtah*, and *tvashthah*.

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original *r* after *a* and *â*, which is protected and brought to light by a following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original *s*, although both *r* and *s* are represented, as finals, by the indifferent *visarjanîya*. The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix.7,9,10. His illustrative examples are as follows. For *hvâh*,

7. *rephaparo visarjanîyo repham nâ* "padyate. *yathâ*<sup>1</sup>: *suvo* -----: *ahor*-----: *ghoshavattvâd rephasya pûrvavidhiprâptih*. *rephah paro yasmâd asâu rephaparah*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

8. <sup>1</sup>----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *visarjanîyo repham âpadyate svaraghoshavatparah*<sup>2</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *mâ*-----: *yonâv*-----: *vâr*-----: *mâ me*-----: *ab*-----: *osh*-----: *dev*-----: <sup>5</sup>*karâvar anudâtte padê*<sup>4</sup> (viii.9) *iti*<sup>5</sup> *vakshyati: tenâi 'vâi*<sup>6</sup> *'tad*<sup>7</sup> *api sidhyaty*<sup>8</sup> *apy akârâdi* (i.52) *iti vacanât: iti cet: mâi 'vam: anudâtte kaçcabde tad bhavati: idam tv anyasvarârtham iti*<sup>9</sup>: *yathâ*<sup>10</sup>: *arvâ*-----: <sup>11</sup>*âdyudâttas tv idam*<sup>11</sup>. *yajña*-----: *antar anâdyudâtte* (viii.10) *iti vakshyati: tasmâd ankârâdi ca*<sup>12</sup> (i.53) *iti vacanât sidhyati: iti cet:* <sup>13</sup>*mâi 'vam*<sup>13</sup>: *anâdyudâtte tad bhavati: âdyudâttârtham*<sup>14</sup> <sup>15</sup>*idam grahanam*<sup>15</sup>. *ca*-----: *suvar*-----: *punar*-----: *ahar*-----



according to W. B., *mā hvār mitrasya* (i.1.4<sup>1</sup>); but, according to G. M. O., *mā hvār vasūnām* (i.1.3): I have found the word only in these two sections. For *abhāḥ*, *yonāv abhār ukhā* (iv.2.5<sup>2</sup>). For *vāḥ*, *vār nāma vo hitam* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>). For *hāḥ*, *mā me pra hār asti vā idam* (ii.4.12<sup>3,4</sup>: vi.5.1<sup>1,2</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words): the word is found also at ii.4.12<sup>5</sup>; 5.2<sup>3,5</sup>. For *abibhaḥ*, as the only passage where it occurs (ii.5.1<sup>2</sup>) does not exhibit in *samhitā* the final *r*, we have the *jaṭā*-text quoted, namely *abibhas tam tam abibhar abibhas tam*. *Ajīgaḥ*, for the same reason, is treated in the same way in W. B. O., namely *oshadhīr ajīgar ajīgar oshadhīr oshadhīr ajīgaḥ: ajīgar ity ajīgaḥ* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>); but G. M. read simply *oshadhīr ajīgaḥ*. For *akāḥ*, *devātrā 'kar ajakshīreṇa* (v.1.7<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): it is found also at i.3.14<sup>2</sup> twice; 5.2<sup>3</sup>: ii.4.9<sup>2</sup>; 5.7<sup>1</sup>: iii.1.10<sup>3</sup>; 4.10<sup>4</sup>: iv.1.2<sup>4</sup>: v.2.1<sup>4,8</sup>: vi.4.8<sup>1</sup>. As for this *akāḥ*, the commentator supposes the objection raised that rule 9, which teaches that *kaḥ* and *āvah* change *h* to *r* in an unaccented word, combined with rule i.52, which would extend the force of that rule to *kaḥ* with *a* prefixed, is sufficient to cover the cases of its occurrence, without separate mention in the present rule; but he denies the pertinence of the objection, on the ground that the specification here made includes all instances of *akāḥ*, without regard to their accentuation—for example, *ákāḥ* at iv.1.2<sup>4</sup> which is accented on the first syllable, but exhibits *r* in its *jaṭā*-reading, *árvā' 'kar ákar árvā' 'rvā' 'kaḥ*. For *anantaḥ*, *yajñaparusho 'nantari-tyāi* (v.2.5<sup>6</sup>). A precisely similar objection is suggested to this word also, on the ground of rules viii.10 and i.53 combined; and it is similarly repelled, by reference to the difference of accent: *ánantar* has the acute on the first syllable, which rule 10 forbids. For *vivaḥ* is given, again in *jaṭā*-text, *ca vivar vivaç ca ca vivaḥ: vivar iti vivaḥ* (iv.2.8<sup>2</sup>; only O. has the final repetition of *vivaḥ*: the Atharvan reads *vi vah*, as two separate words, in the corres-

---

----: *ahārahāra*<sup>16</sup> (viii.13) *ity aniṅgyānto nishidhyate*<sup>17</sup>: *evam-rūpasya*<sup>18</sup> *nā 'yam niyamah*<sup>18</sup>. *prātar*----: *doṣhā*----: <sup>19</sup>*çṛtañ*----: <sup>19</sup>*deva*----: *ārāc*----: *stanutar*<sup>20</sup> *iti çākhāntare: etañ*----: *hotar*----: *marut*----: *pr̥thivi*----: *agne*----: *açīy'*----: *neshtaḥ*----: *çivas*----. *svaraghoshavatpara iti kim: ab*----: *punas*----: *avarṇapūrvas tu lupyate* (ix.9) *iti kvacil lopaprāptiḥ: <sup>21</sup>atha svaraparo yakāram* (ix.10) *iti kvacil yatvaprāptiḥ: okāram aḥ sarvo 'kārāparaḥ* (ix.7) *iti kvacid otvaprāptiḥ<sup>21</sup>: tā etāḥ prāptiḥ<sup>22</sup> pratisheddhum hvārabhār-ādyārambhaḥ.*

(1) O. ---- *eshu*; G. M. *hvār abhār vār hār ity ādi*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *svara*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. om. (5) G. M. *kar anudāttatvena*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. *eva*. <sup>7</sup> W. *tad*. <sup>8</sup> O. puts after *vacanāt*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om.; O. *api*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. O. om. (11) W. *ādyudāttasvarārthah*; G. M. O. *ayam* for *idam*. <sup>12</sup> O. om. (13) G. M. *na*; O. om. <sup>14</sup> B. -*āttam*; G. M. O. -*āttas*. (15) G. M. *tv ayam*; O. *tv ayam iti gr-*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. add *svar*. <sup>17</sup> W. -*dhyeta*; G. M. -*shedhita ity*. (18) G. M. *ayam nishedhaḥ*. (19) B. om. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *san-*. (21) O. om. <sup>22</sup> W. G. M. O. *ptiḥ*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



*suruco vena ávah*: *ávar ity ávah* (iv.2.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit *surucah*). For *ávaḥ* I find no other example; *kaḥ* occurs further at i.4.45<sup>1</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>1</sup>. As counter-examples, *ko 'syē 'ṣvaráḥ* (ii.6.7<sup>1</sup>), and *á'vo vá'jeshu yám juná'ḥ* (i.3.13<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words; O. omits the whole passage) show the necessity of the specification respecting accent; while *adhipám akaḥ samashtyáí* (vi.1.7<sup>6</sup>) shows that the *r* appears only before a sonant letter. This last example, it may be remarked, is brought under the action of the rule by i.52: it would be an example also under the preceding rule; compare what is there said in connection with the cited word *akaḥ*.

## अन्तर्नाद्युदात्ते ॥ १० ॥

10. Also in *antah*, except when accented on the first syllable.

The cited examples are: *antár agne rucá' tvám* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; 2.1<sup>5</sup>), *agním antár bharishyántí* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first word), and *antaryámé maghavan* (vi.4.6<sup>3</sup>: but O. omits the example—reasonably enough, since it is given again later in this very comment, in illustration of a special point). It were to no good end to rehearse the other cases of occurrence of so common a word. To show the necessity of the restriction respecting accent, the commentator quotes *eshó 'ntó 'ntam manushyàḥ* (vii.2.7<sup>2</sup>), where we have the noun *ánta*, which the rule was especially constructed to avoid including. To prove, again, the continued implication of “followed by a sonant letter,” is given *antás te dadhāmi* (i.4.3 and vi.4.6<sup>1-2</sup>). Then the comment proceeds to justify the form in which the restriction respecting accent is made in the rule: it might have been said, “when accented on the last syllable;” but then the rule would have applied only under those circumstances; whereas now is included the case when the word is not accented at all, as in *antarvedí mithuná'u* (vii.5.9<sup>4</sup>; p. *antah-vedí*) and *antaryámé maghavan* (vi.4.6<sup>3</sup>, as above: but G. M. omit). The mode of statement selected, however, it may be remarked, has this inconvenience—that it renders necessary the separate specification, in rule 8, of *anantah*, because that combination, where it occurs, happens to be “accented on the first syllable” (see note to rule 8). It would appear to admit of question, in-

10. *antar ity 'asmin pade' 'nádyudátte visarjaníyah svaragho-  
shavatparo repham ápadyate<sup>2</sup>. yathá<sup>3</sup>: antar-----: agním-----:  
antar----- anádyudátta iti kim: esho-----: evampara iti kim:  
antas----- 'antodátta iti vaktavye<sup>4</sup> bahusvaratvam bahúpádá-  
nártham<sup>5</sup>: anyathá tv' antodáttasyái 'va syát:<sup>6</sup> antarv-----: an-  
tary----- ádáv udátto yasya tad ádyudáttam: ná 'dyudáttam  
anádyudáttam: tasmin.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *etasmin*. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *ápnōti*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>5</sup>) W. O. *-thah*.  
(<sup>6</sup>) B. om. (<sup>7</sup>) G. M. *hy*.



deed, whether *ánantah* was not fairly included in the present rule, since the *antah* part of it, at any rate, is not “accented on the first;” but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side.

आवृत्परः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also a *visarjanîya* followed by *âvrt*.

The quoted examples are *jinvar âvrt svâhâ* and *ugnar âvrt svâhâ* (both ii.4.7<sup>1</sup>: B. has *bhîmar* for *ugnar*; O. reads in each case *âvrth*, according to the requirements of rule xiv.12). Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are *bhîmar âvrt*, *tveshar âvrt*, *çrutar âvrt*, and *bhûtar âvrt*. The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere.

इतिपरो ऽपि ॥ १२ ॥

12. And likewise when *iti* follows.

The word *api* in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of “a *visarjanîya* followed by *âvrt*.” According to the commentator’s exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the *jatâ* repetition of *çrutah* with its predecessor *iti*: as, *iti çrutah çrutar iti ’ti çrutah* (ii.4.7<sup>2</sup>). Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of *h* into *r* should be retained in the *jatâ*-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors. It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, *varshan jinvo jinvo varshan varshan jinvaḥ*.

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by *api*, we receive *ṛtubhir havanaçrutah* (ii.4.14<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit the first word; G. M. add *havam*, but no such word follows in the Sanhitâ, and the addition is doubtless a copyist’s error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its *pada* or *jatâ* form). Here both the *pada*-text (as the word is a compound) and the *jatâ* (as it stands before a pause) would read *havanaçruta iti havana-çrutah*, the ordinary *sandhi* being made of *çrutah* and *iti*.

अद्वारहःसुवरनिंग्यान्तः ॥ १३ ॥

11. *âvrd ity evamparo visarjanîyo repham âpnoti. jin v-.....: ugn-.....*

12. *apicabda âvrtparam<sup>1</sup> visarjanîyam anvâdiçati: asâu visarjanîya itiparo repham âpnoti. iti çr-..... anvâdeçah kimarthah: ṛtu-..... itih<sup>2</sup> paro yasmâd asâv itiparah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. -*paro*; G. M. -*para*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *iti*; O. *itiçabdah*.



13. Also in *ahâḥ*, *ahah*, and *suvah*, except at the end of a separable word.

There is a well-established difference of reading in the text itself of this rule. T. and W. read the last word *anīngyāntāḥ*, as plural, to agree with the three words mentioned, or else with the three cases of *visarjanīya* which they present; and at the beginning of the comment, both in W. and in O., is seen an attempt to explain the word as a plural—not, however, consistently carried out in either. As both readings are equally acceptable, I have adopted the one which is best supported.

The examples given in illustration of the rule are *ahār jātavēdā vicarshanīḥ* (iii.2.5<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word), *ahar māñsena* (v.7.20: but G. M. substitute *aharbhājo vāi*, vii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), and *suvar devāñ aganma* (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word): and, as counter-examples, first, to show that the *ḥ* in the words specified, when they stand as final members of compounds, is treated in the usual manner, *abhipūrvam tryahā bhavanti* (vii.3.9<sup>2</sup> et al.; p. *tri-ahāḥ*: O. omits the first word), *pratyañ tryaho bhavati* (vii.3.5<sup>3</sup> et al.; p. *tri-ahah*: but B. has dropped out the whole example, and G. M. O. substitute, O. with omission of the first word, *pratyañ shad-aho bhavati*, vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>), and *devasuva stha te* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>: but W. B. O. give simply the *pada*-reading of *devasuvah*, namely *devasuva iti deva-suvah*, since thus alone is the word put into circumstances which show its *ḥ* not to be convertible into *r*); and second, to show that the conversion takes place only before sonant letters, *prāyañīyam ahas tasmāt* (vii.2.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word), and *suvaç ca mūrdhā ca* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup> and iv.7.11<sup>2</sup>).

The commentator then proceeds to give an explanation, so far as *ahāḥ* is concerned, respecting the virtual intent of the rule, which, he says, is meant to establish an exception for that word when the final member of a compound; since the inclusion of *hāḥ* among the words cited in rule 8 would, under the operation of the often-quoted rule i.52, be authority sufficient for turning *ahāḥ* into *ahār* before a sonant letter. Upon this he next imagines the objection to be raised, that the reading in this rule also, as well as the other, should have been *hāḥ*, *ahāḥ* being then included along with it according to the principle referred to; and thus the liability to reproach for overdoing the explicitness of the rule would be avoid-

---

13. *ahāḥ*: *ahah*: *suvah*: *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *visarjanīyo*<sup>2</sup> 'niṅgyāntaḥ<sup>3</sup> *sva-  
raghoshavatparō repham āpnoti*<sup>4</sup>. *yathā*<sup>5</sup>: *ahār*----: *ahar*----:  
*suvar*----: *aniṅgyānta iti kim*: *abhip*----: *praty*----: *dev*  
---- *evampara iti kim*: *prāy*----: *suvaç*----. *hvārabhār*  
(viii.8) ° *ādisūtre hār ity anena grahaṇenā 'hāḥçabdasyā 'py*  
*akārādi* (i.52) *iti vacanād rephasiddhāu satyām atra punarva-*  
*canam iṅgyāntasyā 'hāḥçabdasya pratishedhārtham. nanv atrādi*  
*'va' hār iti vaktavyam: apy akārādi* (i.52) *iti vacanena kār-*  
*yasiddheḥ: na tu tadgāuravāpatteḥ*<sup>8</sup>: *iti cet: māi 'vam: aniṅg-*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



circumstances of the case restrict the application of the rule to *ahah*, and gives as examples *uttarāir ahobhiḥ caranti* (vii.5.14 : G. M. O. omit the last word), and *ṣam ahobhyām iti ni nayati* (vi.3.9<sup>1</sup>).

अहश्च सर्वेषाम् ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also not in *añhaḥ*, as all agree.

Some authorities, namely, the commentator informs us, accept this word as containing an *anusvāra*, others not; but all alike regard it as an exception under rule 13 (and therefore not liable to have its final *visarjanīya* converted into *r* under any circumstances). Those who accept the *anusvāra* still regard the word as falling under the action of rule 13, in virtue of the principle "a nose-sound occurring in the interior of a word is no bar to the application of a rule; hence it performs the offices of letters while itself only a quality" (if this be, in fact, the meaning of the second line of the verse, of which I am by no means confident; the readings of the manuscripts are here somewhat discordant, without being mutually explanatory). The first words of this verse were quoted in the comment on rule i.1, in connection with the discussion as to whether *anusvāra* was a concrete thing or a quality (see p. 8), and were credited to the *Çikshâ*—which, however, in the form in which we now possess it, neither contains such a passage, nor seems to furnish a connection in which it should naturally be introduced. I should question the sober verity of the considerations whereby the commentator tries to justify the rule. It is hardly credible that *añhaḥ* and *ahah* should be fairly identified by any authorities. And *anusvāra* is not a *nāsikya*, but an *anunāsika*, in the view of this treatise everywhere. It might be bet-

14. *sānnidhyena<sup>1</sup> labdhaḥ<sup>2</sup> pūrvasūtrokto visarjanīyo<sup>3</sup> bhirbhyām<sup>4</sup> evamparo<sup>5</sup> na repham āpnoti. arthād ahar ity atra visarjanīyah parigr̥hyate : itaratrasthitasyāi 'vamparatvābhāvāt. yathā : utt- ---- : ṣam- ----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. -*dhyāl*. <sup>2</sup> W. *labhyah*. <sup>3</sup> W. ins. *na*. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *ity*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *paro*.

15. *cakāro<sup>1</sup> nishedham ākarshati<sup>1</sup> : añha ity asmin<sup>2</sup> grahaṇe visarjanīyo na repham āpnoti : ahārahar (viii.13) iti prāptih. atra<sup>3</sup> grahaṇe kecid anusvāram ichanti<sup>4</sup> kecin ne 'chanti : sarveshām<sup>4</sup> teshām esha<sup>5</sup> nishedho bhavati : anusvāram ichadbhir api prāptir evam pratipādyate<sup>6</sup> :*

*vidher madhyasthanāsikyo na virodho<sup>7</sup> bhavet smṛtaḥ<sup>8</sup> :*

*tasmāt karoti<sup>9</sup> kāryāṇi varṇānām<sup>10</sup> dharmā eva<sup>10</sup> tv*

*iti. yathā<sup>11</sup> : añha- ---- : añho- ----.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. O. -*dhākarshakah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *etasmin*. <sup>3</sup> O. *asmin*. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *eva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*pady-*. <sup>7</sup> B. -*dhi*. (<sup>8</sup>) B. *bhavet : sataḥ*; G. M. *bhaved yataḥ*. <sup>9</sup> B. G. M. *kurvanti*. (<sup>10</sup>) W. *dharmānas*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. om.



ter to regard the specific exception of *añhaḥ* as simply a sort of supererogatory effort at extreme explicitness, intended to guard against the confusion with *ahaḥ*, even by a blunderer, of another word which was, indeed, definitely different from it, but different by only so inconspicuous an element as the nasalization of a vowel.

The illustrative examples are *añha indram evâ 'ñhomucam* (ii.2.7<sup>4</sup> : but O. writes . . . . *eva : añhomucam*, as if the latter word were a separate citation : it is found in other passages), and *añhomuce pra bharema* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup> : but O. substitutes *añhomuce purodâçam*, ii.2.7<sup>4</sup>).

अनवर्णपूर्वस्तु रेफपरो लुप्यते ॥ १६ ॥

16. But, when not preceded by an *a*-vowel, *visarjanîya* followed by *r* is omitted.

The commentator's example in illustration of the action of this rule is *revatî ramadhvam* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup> et al. ; p. *revatîḥ*) ; and he adds as counter-examples, first, to show the necessity of the restriction "not preceded by an *a*-vowel," *yo rudro agnâu* (v.5.9<sup>3</sup>), and again, to show that the omission takes place only before a *r*, *revatîr naḥ sadhamâdah* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup> ; 4.14<sup>4</sup>). This exhausts the evident intent of the rule : the *tu*, 'but,' which the latter contains, merely indicates the transition to a new and diverse subject ; it intimates no distinction between the classes of cases in which the *visarjanîya* represents a *s* on the one hand and an original *r* on the other ; and all the cases of final *aḥ* and *âḥ* are left to be treated alike, as prescribed by the rules given hereafter (ix.7-10)—*aḥ* being changed to *o*, and *âḥ* to *â*. This truly represents the usage of the Sanhitâ : the latter does not contain (if the special case which forms the subject of rules 18-22, below, be excepted) a single instance of *aḥ* converted into *â* before *r* : the occurrence before *r* of *aḥ* standing for original *ar* is very rare, and the product is always *o* : besides the cases of *ahorâtre* (*pada*-text, *ahaḥ-râtre*), I have

16. *avarṇâd anyasvarapûrvo rephaparo visarjanîyo lupyate. yathâ<sup>1</sup> : rev- . . . . . evampûrva iti kim : yo . . . . . : evampara iti kim : rev- . . . . . tuçabdârambhâd avarṇapûrvo 'pi hvârabhâr (viii.8) âdînâm visargo lupyate pûrvasvaraç ca dîrgham âpad-yate. yathâ<sup>2</sup> : rukmo . . . . . tarhi suvo . . . . . ity atra lopadîr-ghâu kim na syâtâm. dviruktatvâd iti brûmaḥ. tat katham. hvârabhâr (viii.8) âdisutre<sup>3</sup> : ahârahaḥsuvar (viii.13) ity atra ca. nanv ahorâtre ity atra katham otvam. anyârthena grahaṇasâmarthyene 'ti brûmaḥ. tat<sup>4</sup> katham. ahorâtre dhṛ-tavrate<sup>5</sup> (iv.11) ity evainrûpasâmyâd<sup>6</sup> ahorâtrâbhyâm ahorâtrayor<sup>7</sup> ity âdi vijñeyam<sup>8</sup>. 'evam ced adhishavane (iv.11) iti grahaṇasâmarthyenâi 'va<sup>9</sup> <sup>10</sup>shatve siddhe<sup>11</sup> <sup>12</sup>na dhi-pûrve (vi.11) iti <sup>13</sup>nishedhanishedhena virodhaḥ<sup>13</sup>. satyam : sa-*



only found four instances of *suvaḥ* before forms of *ruh*; namely *suvo ruhānāḥ* (iv.1.2<sup>4</sup>; 7.13<sup>1</sup>), *suvo rohāva* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and *suvo rokshyāmi* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>). The other Prātiçākhyas (Rik. Pr. iv.9, r. 28,29; Vâj. Pr. iv.34; Ath. Pr. ii.19, iii.20) convert *aḥ* to *ā* in like circumstances; and at least the Rik and Atharvan afford several instances of the *sandhi*.

So much for the rule and its meaning. The commentator, unfortunately, has found occasion to give it a forced and false interpretation; it leads him into a nest of difficulties, through which he flounders as best he can, coming out at the end with much discredit. There happens to be a single passage (or, if there be another, I have not noticed it) where a word with original final *r* follows in the Sanhitâ a word beginning with *r*—namely *rukmo antaḥ* (iv.1.10<sup>4·5</sup>; 6.5<sup>2</sup>; 7.12<sup>3</sup>)—and, of course, in the inversions of the *jaṭā*-text, comes to stand before its predecessor. The accepted *jaṭā*-reading, it appears (as given in full by the commentator), is *rukmo antar antā rukmo rukmo antaḥ*, the analogy of the Rik and Atharvan usage being followed in the treatment of *antaḥ*. In order, now, to find authority for this reading, the commentator declares that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule signifies that, even when preceded by an *a*-vowel, the words specified in rule 8 and its successors lose their *visarjanīya* and lengthen the preceding vowel. This is an attribution of portentous pregnancy of meaning to the particle such as is not very infrequently made, rarely with more evident falsity than here. The objection is immediately suggested—why, in that case, does not *suvaḥ* in *suvo rohāva* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>) lose its *ḥ* and lengthen its *a*? Because, is the acute reply, it has been mentioned twice, once in rule 8, and once in rule 13. What possible connection is to be discovered between this repetition and the use to which he would fain put it, he does not give himself the trouble to inform us: he takes care to raise only such difficulties as he conceives himself able to remove. The next which it pleases him to evoke is—how is the *o* of *ahorātre* to be explained? We rather

---

*vaçabdasyā 'dhishavane iti grahaṇasāmarthyena<sup>10</sup> shatvam sidhyatu: sthānaçabdasya katham sidhyet: grahaṇādisāmarthyābhāvāt<sup>14</sup>: tasmāt tadartham<sup>15</sup> tāvat<sup>16</sup> sūtram sārthakam iti<sup>17</sup> tadartham ca drashtavyam<sup>17</sup>: tadartham ce<sup>18</sup> 'ti guḍajihvikānyāyah<sup>19</sup>: tathā hi: grahaṇasāmarthyād<sup>20</sup> iti<sup>21</sup> gamanikāmātram<sup>22</sup>: kaṇthoktis tu viçeshah: tataḥ savaçabdārtham<sup>23</sup> sūtram iti bhāvah<sup>24</sup>.*

*avarṇād anyo 'navarṇah: asāu pūrvo yasmāt sa tathoktah. rephah paro yasmād asāu rephaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> W. B. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. ins. *aharahaḥ iti*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *adhishavane*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *pragrahe evanirūpasāmarthyād*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-tre*. <sup>8</sup> B. *jñeyam*. <sup>9</sup> O. *nanu anyārthena grahaṇenāi 'va*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> O. *siddhiḥ*. <sup>12</sup> B. ins. *nishiddhe*. <sup>13</sup> O. *shatvanishedhanishedho na vidheyah*; B. *nishedho na iti virodhah*. <sup>14</sup> B. *-ṇāsām-*. <sup>15</sup> B. *artham*; G. M. *tadavastham*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *vā tat*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. O. *saṁtoshtavyam*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *ve*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *gulu-*. <sup>20</sup> O. *-thyam*. <sup>21</sup> O. om.; G. M. *i*. <sup>22</sup> G. M. *kam-*. <sup>23</sup> G. M. *savasthānaçab-*; O. adds *api*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *gāvah*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



एष्टश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18. As also, in *eshtaḥ*.

This word has been already mentioned, in rule 8, as one of those whose final *ḥ* is liable to become *r*. It is here made the further subject of a special rule, because it is the only case in the Sanhitâ of *aḥ* changed to *ā* before *r* (see the note to rule 16). The passage in which it occurs is *eshtā rāyaḥ* (i.2.11<sup>1</sup> and vi.2.2<sup>6</sup>).

We have seen, however, that the commentator has felt obliged to give a false interpretation to rule 16, and one which renders superfluous the present rule, as applying to a case already included under that one. He is well aware of the objection to his interpretation thence arising, and himself points out that *eshtā rāyo rāya eshtar eshtā rāyaḥ* (only W. gives this) is a case analogous with *rukmo antar antā rukmo rukmo antaḥ* (W. B. omit the last two words), and that the loss of *ḥ* and lengthening of *a* in *eshtaḥ* is an effect of the *tu* in rule 16; but he does what he can toward removing the objection by alleging that the detail of discordant opinions which is to follow (in the next four rules) renders it more desirable to cite the case specially, in order that it may be understood to what those opinions apply. This is a tolerably ingenious subterfuge—but, after all, only a subterfuge.

नैकेषाम् ॥ १९ ॥

19. Not so, according to some authorities.

The commentator gives two alternative explanations of this rule—both, however, as he notices, leading to the same reading of the phrase under question. Vararuci, namely, holds that, in the view of some, the rule denies the conversion of *ḥ* to *r* in *eshtaḥ*, and therefore also the prolongation of the *a*; whence, by the general rule ix.8, the word would become *eshto* (in analogy with all the other cases in the text of *aḥ* before *r*). Mâhisheya, however, understands that some are said to deny that the *ḥ* of *eshtaḥ* is liable to conversion into *r* before another *r*—that is to say, he makes the rule establish so far an exception under rule 8 rather than rule

---

18. *eshtar ity asmin grahaṇe visarjanīyo rephaparo*<sup>1</sup> 'varṇa-pūrvvo 'pi<sup>2</sup> lupyate<sup>3</sup>. *yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *eshtā*----. 'caṣabdo lopadīrghayor ākarshakaḥ<sup>5</sup>. *nanv etad anupapannam: hvārabhār* (viii.8) *ādyantaḥpātītvād eshtar ity asya: 'eshtā*----:<sup>6</sup> *rukmo*---- *itivat*<sup>7</sup>: *anavarṇapūrvvas tu* (viii.16) *ity atra tuṣabdena*<sup>8</sup> *lopadīrghasiddhāu*<sup>9</sup>. <sup>10</sup>*māi 'vam*<sup>10</sup>: *vakshyamāṇamatabhedāṣrayatvajñāpanāya grhītam etad upapannataram: iti parihārah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *rephaḥ*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *pūrvvaṣ ca dīrghaḥ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. *-ghāv ākarshati*, and put at the beginning. <sup>(6)</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. *iti*; G. M. *iti padam*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ṣabde*. <sup>9</sup> B. *-ṣhaṣruteḥ*; G. M. O. *-ddhe*. <sup>(10)</sup> W. B. O. om.



18. There can be little question that Vararuci's explanation is the true one.

In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading.

द्वावुत्तमोत्तरीयस्य रेफम् ॥ २० ॥

20. According to Uttamottariya, two become *r*.

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Mâhisheya the other. The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (*çâkhin*, 'holder of a *çâkhâ* or recension of the sacred text'), the *visarjanîya* of *eshtaḥ* and the following *r* both become *r*—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single *r*: thus, *eshtarâyaḥ*—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case: see the various readings below. Mâhisheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name Dvâvuttamottariya, and as holding that the *ḥ* of *eshtaḥ* becomes *r* before *r*, making *eshtar râyaḥ*.

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Mâhisheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught; and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation.

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Prâtiçâkhyâ.

सांकृत्यस्योकारम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. According to Sâmkṛtya, the *visarjanîya* becomes *u*.

And this *u*, by x.5, unites with the preceding *a* to form *o*, so that the reading of the passage is *eshto râyaḥ*, as it is according

19. *ekeshâm mata eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparo na lupyate: ata eva pûrvasvaradîrghâbhâvaç ca: kim tu ghoshavatparaç ca (ix.8) <sup>1</sup>ity otvam<sup>1</sup>. yathâ: eshto râyaḥ. vararuciviracitam etat<sup>2</sup>: mâhisheyabhâshitam tv<sup>3</sup> evam: eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparo <sup>4</sup>repham nâ<sup>5</sup> "padyata iti<sup>4</sup>. siddharûpam ubhayoḥ samânam.*

(1) W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ca. (4) G. M. na repham âpnoti. <sup>5</sup> O. om. na.

20. *uttamottariyasya çâkhino<sup>1</sup> mata eshtar iti visarjanîyas<sup>2</sup> tatparo rephaç ca dvâv etâu repham âpadyete. yathâ: eshtar<sup>3</sup> râyaḥ. ayam artho vârarucoktaḥ<sup>4</sup>: mâhisheyoktas tu dvâvuttamottariya iti kasya cin nâma: tanmata eshtar<sup>5</sup> iti visarjanîyo rephaparo repham âpadyate: <sup>6</sup> eshtar<sup>7</sup> râya iti<sup>8</sup>.*

(1) O. -nor. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -yaç ca. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. -tâ; O. -târ. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. var-. <sup>5</sup> W. B. eshtâ râya. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. yathâ. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. -tâ. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om.



to the "some authorities" quoted in rule 19, above. This is pointed out by the commentator; who, however, declares that the reference to *Sâmkṛtya* in a separate place shows that he is not one of the people there spoken of. B. specifies (probably by a copyist's blunder) that the exposition given of the meaning of the rule is to be credited to *Mâhisheya*.

उख्यस्य सपूर्वः ॥ २२ ॥

22. And, according to *Ukhya*, along with the preceding letter.

That is, *eshtar* becomes *eshtu*, the *h* and its predecessor *a* coalescing into *u*. This is the only exposition given by W. and O. But G. M. and B., strangely agreeing for once to differ from the rest, ascribe this understanding of the meaning of the rule to *Mâhisheya*, and report *Vararuci* as holding it to signify that the *h* of *eshtah*, with its predecessor, becomes *r*. This last version of the *sandhi* seems little better than nonsense, and neither of the MSS. gives a reading to correspond.

The commentator declares, finally, that, in this network of alternative views, the first rule only (viii.18) is approved. In accordance herewith is the reading of the edited text and of my manuscript, *eshtā rāyah*.

The most interesting circumstance connected with this waste of half a dozen rules over the reading of a single word, is the indication afforded of the anomalousness of the combination as a phenomenon belonging to the *Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ*, while it is in other Vedic texts a natural and usual thing.

कषपकारपरः षमकारपूर्वः समवग्रहः ॥ २३ ॥

21. *sâmkṛtyasya mata eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephapara ukâram âpadyate*<sup>1</sup>. *tata*<sup>2</sup> *uvarṇapara okâram (x.5) ity otvam. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *eshto rāyah. asya ca nâi 'keshâm (viii.18) ity asya*<sup>4</sup> *deçabhedâd bhedah: siddhodâharaṇain*<sup>5</sup> *samânam.*

<sup>1</sup> B. adds *iti mâhisheyoktam.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. ins. câ. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. ins. *tu.*

22. *ukhyasya mate rephapara*<sup>1</sup> *eshtar iti visarjanîyah pûrva-varṇena saho 'kâram âpadyate: 'iti mâhisheyoktam*<sup>2</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *eshtu*<sup>4</sup> *rāyah. 'vârarucoktam*<sup>6</sup> *tv eshtar iti visarjanîyo rephaparah pûrveṇa saha repham âpadyata iti*<sup>7</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>8</sup>: *'eshtâ*<sup>10</sup> *rāyah*<sup>5,9</sup>. *pûrveṇa saha vartata iti sapûrvaḥ.*

*asmin vikalpajâle*<sup>11</sup> *prathamam eshtaç ca (viii.18) iti sūtram eve 'shtam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.; O. puts after *iti.* <sup>(2)</sup> W. om.; O. *iti.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *-to*; G. M. *-ta.* <sup>(5)</sup> W. O. om. <sup>6</sup> B. *var-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(9)</sup> M. om. <sup>10</sup> B. *-trâ.* <sup>11</sup> W. *-jâte.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



of *nish* before *p*, I find besides only *nish padyeran* (vii.3.10<sup>2</sup>); before *kh*, *nish khidati* (ii.2.10<sup>5</sup>); before *k*, the cases are more numerous, with forms of *krī* (e. g. v.5.7<sup>2</sup>), and *kram* (vi.4.10<sup>2-3</sup>: doubtless; the separation of the divisions prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi*); cases of *niḥ* with accented forms of verbs in *k* are yet more frequent, but come under the preceding rule, not this one. For *iḍaḥ*, *iḍas pade sam idhyase* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last two words): on the other hand, we have *iḍāyāḥ pade* at vi.1.8<sup>2</sup>. For *ṣaṣvataḥ*, *ṣaṣvatas kar haste* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup>). For *apa-saḥ*, *apasas pāre asya* (iii.2.11<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *asya*). For *deva rishah*, *uror ā no deva rishas pāhi* (i.4.45<sup>2</sup>: O. omits to *deva*); with *sa rishah pātu naktam* (i.2.14<sup>7</sup>; 5.11<sup>1-2</sup>) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after *deva*. For *añhasaḥ*, *añhasas pātu vāyuh* (iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>: only O. has *vāyuh*): another case is found in the same division, *añhasas pātam*. For *ati divah*, *ati divas pāhi samāvavṛtran* (i.8.14<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit after *pāhi*); with *divah pṛshthañ suvar gatvā miṣṛāḥ* (iv.6.5<sup>1</sup>: only B. has the last word; O. omits the last three) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after *ati*. For *viṣvataḥ*, *viṣvatas pari havāmahe* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases occur at i.5.3<sup>3</sup>: ii.1.11<sup>1</sup>; 3.14<sup>1</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.2.1<sup>3,3<sup>4</sup></sup>; 3.13<sup>8</sup> (in the various repetitions of only two phrases, always before *pari*); and, as first member of a compound, hence falling under the preceding rule, at iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>: an exception is noted in a later rule (viii.32). For *aṣmanah*, *tvam aṣmanas pari* (iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>). For *tamasah*, *ud vayam tamasas pari paṣyantah* (iv.1.7<sup>4</sup> and v.1.8<sup>6</sup>: - only O. has the last word, and it omits the first two).

## कृधिपिन्वपथेपरः ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also before *kr̥dhi*, *pinva*, and *pathe*.

The examples are: *uru ṇas kr̥dhi* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>), *apas pinva* (iv.3.4<sup>3</sup>), and *saprathā namas pathe* (iv.7.13<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *pinva* and *pathe* I find no further examples; but *s* before *kr̥dhi* occurs also at i.4.2 (where the edition has the false reading *ḥ*), 3: iv.2.9<sup>4</sup>; 5.10<sup>2</sup>: v.7.6<sup>3,4</sup>: vi.3.2<sup>2</sup>; 4.5<sup>4</sup>.

## न सक्रघकारपरे ॥ २६ ॥

26. But not when *s*, *kr*, or *gh* follows.

25. ----- *evamparo visarjanīyo yathāvidhim<sup>1</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: uru-----: apas-----: sapr-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. -*vihitam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om.

26. *sakraghe<sup>1</sup> 'ty evampare sati kr̥dhyādāu<sup>2</sup> visarjanīyo yathā-vihitam<sup>3</sup> nā "padyate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: tān-----: ṣam-----: rephena kim: uta-----: uru-----*

<sup>1</sup> W. adds *kāre sati*. <sup>2</sup> O. -*ādi*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*vidhim*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. G. M. om.



By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified; but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern *kr̥dhi*. The commentator's illustrations are: *tân ma âmanasaḥ kr̥dhi svâhâ* (ii.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the first two words, and it omits the last one), *çam ca naḥ kr̥dhi: kratve dakshâya* (iii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word), and *uru kshayâya naḥ kr̥dhi: ghr̥taṁ ghr̥tayone* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word); and to the second of these there is a counter-example, *uta no mayas kr̥dhi kshayadvîrâya* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>), to show that only *kr*, not *k* alone, gives occasion for retention of the *h*. The words *âmanasaḥ kr̥dhi svâhâ* occur again at ii.3.9<sup>2</sup>: I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator.

## पत्नीविपतीपतेपतयेपतिष्पतिपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also before *patnî ve*, *patî*, *pate*, *pataye*, *patih*, and *patim*.

The examples are: first, *brahmanas patnî vedim* (iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, to show that the word *patnî* must be followed by *ve*, *retodhâḥ patnî va ity âha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>: but O. reads *indriyâvataḥ patnîvantam*, i.4.27); further, *çubhas patî idam aham* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *aham*), *vâstosh pate prati* (iii.4.10<sup>1</sup>), *pracyavasva bhuvastate* (i.2.9 and vi.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *vâcas pataye pavasva* (i.4.2), *vâcas patir vâcam* (i.7.7<sup>1</sup>), and *vâcas patim viçvakarmânam utaye* (iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word). The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in *pat*, and in reply is quoted the passage *divam gacha svahâ pata* (iv.1.10<sup>5</sup> and v.1.10<sup>5</sup>).

The cases of retention of *s* before the cases of *pati* are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme *pati*; but such a proceeding is permitted (by i.22) only with themes ending in *a*. I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitâ: *manasas pati* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>; 4.44<sup>3</sup>), *pathas pati* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>), *brahmanas pati* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup>: ii.1.5<sup>7</sup>), *jyotishas pati* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>), *çavasas pati* (ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>), *jagatas pati* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), *sadasas pati* (ii.6.8<sup>2</sup>: iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>), *çatinas pati* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>), *nabhasas pati* (iii.3.8<sup>3,6</sup>), and *yas patih* (iv.7.14<sup>3</sup>). We have the genitive *pateḥ* in *br̥haspateḥ* (i.7.8<sup>4</sup>), but, as the *pada*-text reads *br̥haḥpateḥ*, the word does not fall under this rule: *tapaspati* (i.2.10<sup>2</sup>; p. *tapah-patih*)

27. ----- *evamparo visarjanîyo yathâvihitam<sup>1</sup> bhajate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: brah-----: va iti kim: reto-----: çubh-----: vâst-----: pra-----: vâc-----: vâc-----: vâc----- pad ity etâvatâi 'va siddhe<sup>3</sup> pratipadapâthena kim<sup>3</sup>: divam---- ityâdinishedhârthah<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. -vidhim. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -tḥ kimarthah; O. -tho. <sup>4</sup> O. -âdâu n.



belongs in the same category. Of the words quoted by the commentator, *bhuyas pati* occurs again at i.7.10<sup>2</sup>, and *vācas pati* at ii.6.8<sup>1,2</sup>.

## दिवःसहसपरिपुत्परः ॥ २८ ॥

28. Also in *divaḥ* and *sahasah*, before *pari* and *put*.

The cited examples are *divas pari prathamam* (i.3.14<sup>5</sup> and iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>), *divas putrāya sūryāya* (i.2.9: O. omits the last word), and *sahasas putro adbhutaḥ* (iv.1.9<sup>2</sup>). We have *sahasas putram* also at iv.4.4<sup>3</sup>, and *divas pari* at iii.3.3<sup>3</sup> and iv.2.10<sup>4</sup>; one case of *divaḥ pari* is excepted by rule 34, below. As counter-examples, are given *divaḥ pṛthivyāḥ pary antarikshāt* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: W. B. O. omit *divaḥ*, which is better, as this is used just below to illustrate another point), *parushaḥparushaḥ pari* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>), and *puṅśah putrāñ uta viṣvāyushaṅ rayim* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. have only the first two words), to show that only the words specified show *s* before *pari* and *put*; and *divaḥ pṛthivyāḥ pari* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *pari*, which is better this time), to show that those words show it only in the circumstances stated.

*Put* is declared a part of a word, involving more than one case.

## रायस्योपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also in *rāyah*, before *po*.

The commentator's examples are: *paçavo vāi rāyas poshaḥ* (v.4.6<sup>2</sup>), *sam ahaṅ rāyas posheṇa* (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>), *çamtanutvāya rāyas poshāya* (iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word and add *brhate*, which makes the reference belong to iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>), and *rāyas poshasya daditārah syāma* (iii.2.3<sup>1</sup>: only O. has the last word). As counter-examples, he gives *vibhuḥ posha uta tmanā* (iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>), to show that the rule applies to no other word than *rāyah* before *po*, and *eshtā rāyah pre 'she bhagāya* (i.2.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word),

---

28. *divaḥ: sahasah: ity ayor<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyah pariputpuro<sup>2</sup> yathāvidhim<sup>3</sup> bhajate. divas-----: divas pu-----: sah----- anayor iti kim: divaḥ-----: par-----: puṅ-----: evampara iti kim: divaḥ----- anekārthatvāt<sup>4</sup> pud iti padāikadeçah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *anayoh*; G. M. *etayoh*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *pari: put: ity evamparo*; O. do. except *ity*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *-vihitam*. <sup>4</sup> B. G. M. O. *-rthah*.

29. *rāya ity atra visarjanīyah po ity evamparo yathāvihitam<sup>1</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: paçavo----- po iti padāikadeço bahūpādānārthah: sam-----: çam-----: rāyas----- rāya iti kim: vibhuḥ-----: <sup>3</sup>po ity okāreṇa kim<sup>3</sup>: <sup>4</sup>eshtā-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-vidhim*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. *okārah kimarthah*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. to *yathā* in comment to next rule.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



32. Not in *adhvaram viçvatah, antah, jâtaḥ, viviçuh paruh,* and *punaḥ*.

These words constitute exceptions under the foregoing rules. The commentator specifies in each case under which rule the exception falls. The first example is *yajñam adhvaram viçvataḥ paribhâr asi* (iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word, W. B. the last): an exception under viii.24, which would require *viçvatas*; W. B. O. remark that the distinctive addition of *adhvaram* effects the exception, and W. O. add the counter-example *indram vo viçvatas pari* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>). For *antah*, the example is *mahâdevam antahpârçvena* (i.4.36: O. omits the first word): an exception under rule 23, *antah* being first member of a compound. For *jâtaḥ*, *bhûtasya jâtaḥ patir eka âsît* (iv.2.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first word, and alone adds *âsît*; G. M. omit *ekah* also): an exception under viii.27. For *viviçuh paruh*, *yâ âviviçuh paruhparuh* (iv.2.6<sup>4</sup>); with the counter-example *parushparur anughushyâ viçasta* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last word). For *punaḥ*, finally, *punaḥpunar hy asmât* (vi.5.1<sup>3-4</sup>: only G. M. have *asmât*). Both these last are exceptions under viii.23.

The versions of the comment to this rule are more than usually discordant, all being defective except W. and O., and even these having suffered considerable disarrangement. For the details, see the various readings below.

## धषवति ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Nor before a word containing *dh* or *sh*.

“By vicinage,” says the commentator, is understood a negative, in this and the next following rule. The meaning of the rule is that, when a word containing either of the letters *dh* or *sh* follows the *visarjanîya*, the latter is not liable to conversion into *s* or *sh*, as required by the foregoing precepts. The examples given are

32. ----- *eteshâm<sup>1</sup> visarjanîyo yathâvihitam<sup>2</sup> na bhajate<sup>3</sup>. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: yajñam-----: âvirnir<sup>5</sup> (viii.24) iti prâptih<sup>6</sup>: <sup>6</sup>adhvaraviçeshanân nivṛttih<sup>6</sup>: <sup>7</sup>adhvaram iti kim: indr-----: <sup>7</sup>mahâ-----: <sup>8</sup>kakhapakâra (viii.23) iti prâptih<sup>8</sup>: bhât-----: patnîvepatî<sup>9</sup> (viii.27) iti<sup>10</sup> prâptih<sup>8</sup>: <sup>11</sup>yâ-----<sup>11</sup>: viviçur<sup>12</sup> iti kim: parush-----: punaḥ-----: kakhapakâraparaḥ<sup>13</sup> (viii.23) ity anayoḥ prâptih.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ity eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-vidhim*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *âpadyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. add *idah*. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(7)</sup> B. G. M. om.; W. O. put next before *viviçur* *iti kim*. <sup>(8)</sup> B. om. <sup>9</sup> O. om. *patî*; G. M. *patishpatim*. <sup>10</sup> O. *ity âdinâ*. <sup>(11)</sup> W. B. O. put after *mohâ-----*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-çuh parur*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. O. om. *paraḥ*.

33. *sâmnidhyâd atra<sup>1</sup> paratra ca<sup>2</sup> nañartho labhyate. dhaç<sup>3</sup> ca shaç<sup>4</sup> ca dhashâu: tâv asmint sta iti dhashavat: tasmin dhashavati<sup>5</sup> pade parabhâte sati <sup>6</sup>pârvo visarjanîyo<sup>6</sup> yathâvihitam<sup>7</sup>*



*bahihparidhi skandât* (ii.6.6<sup>2</sup> and vi.2.8<sup>5</sup>: the same divisions contain each a second example of the compound), *purushahpurusho nidhanam* (vi.6.3<sup>2</sup>: the same division contains a second example of the compound), and *ubhayatahkshtûr bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>). I have noted besides only *parushahparushah pari* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>). That the word containing *dh* or *sh* must follow the *visarjanîya*, not be the one that itself ends in that letter, is shown by the counter-examples *adhaspadam krñute* (iv.7.13<sup>3</sup>), and *rtasya jyotishas patim* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>).

## परिवाप्रः ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Not before *pari vâ* or *pra*.

The examples are *rocanâ divah pari vâjeshu* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word)—with the counter-example *divas pari prathamam* (i.3.14<sup>5</sup> and iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>), to show the need of citing *vâ* after *pari*—and *tasmâd itahpradânâ devâh* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup>: O. omits *devâh*). Of these, the first is an exception under viii.28; the other, under viii.23. There is yet another passage, *bahihprâno vâi manushyah* (vi.1.1<sup>4</sup>), which needs to be brought under the rule; and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of *pra* in this rule with short *a* is intended to connote *prâ* also—just as, in a rule of the next chapter (ix.24), *athâ* connotes *atha* also, by a converse principle. This, however, suggests a difficulty: why then is not rule vii.7, prescribing for *prâ* an effect which had already been

*nâ "padyate. yathâ<sup>8</sup>: bahih-....: puru-....: ubhay-....: kakhapakâra<sup>9</sup> (viii.23) iti prâptih. parabhûta iti kim: adhas-....: rtasya-....<sup>10</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *sûtre*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *dhakâraç*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *shakâraç*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>(6)</sup> O. om.; G. M. *pûrvav-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-vidhim*. <sup>8</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> B. *-rapara*. <sup>10</sup> W. adds *tasminn iti nidishte pûrvasya. parivâpravarah*.

34. *pari vâ: pra: <sup>1</sup> evamparo visarjanîyo yathâvihitam<sup>2</sup> nâ "padyate. rocanâ-....: ve 'ti kim: divas-....: tasmâd-.... pre 'ti hrasvagrahanam dîrghasyâ 'py upalakshanam: <sup>3</sup> yatho 'dathâparaç ca (ix.24) iti dîrghagrahanam hrasvasyo 'palakshanârtham<sup>4</sup>. tarhi prâpûrvaç ca (vii.7) iti sûtram vyartham: praçabdasyâ<sup>5</sup> 'nuvrttasyâi 'va dîrghopalakshakatvâd<sup>6</sup>: iti cet: ucyate: pratyakshagrâhîtasyaâi 'vo 'palakshakatvam<sup>7</sup> nâ 'nukrshṭasye 'ti vijñeyam: 'tathâ hi: vâhanauhyamânaḥ (vii.6) ity atra<sup>8</sup> cakâreṇa praçabdâs tatrâ 'nukrshṭah: atra tu<sup>9</sup> parivâprapara<sup>9</sup> ity <sup>10</sup> upalakshakatvam<sup>11</sup> bhavati. tathâ satî 'dam apy udâharanam: bahih-....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-vidhim*. <sup>3</sup> B. ins. <sup>(3)</sup> here, as well as below, in its place. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *-nam*; B. *hrasvop-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-kshanatvâd*; O. *dîrghagrahanasyop-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-tvât*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *vâ-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. ins. *prapara iti pratyakshagrâhîtatvâd*; O. ins. *pratyakshagrâhîtatvâd*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-kshanam*.



prescribed for *pra*, a superfluity? Because, is the reply, such connotation is only proper in the case of a word directly cited, not of one that is brought forward by implication merely: and in rule vii.6 the *pra* was thus brought forward [from rule<sup>4</sup>], in virtue of the *ca*, 'and,' contained in the rule: whereas here the *pra* is expressly mentioned. This seems a case of rather questionable interpretation.

न निर्ण निः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. Not so with *nih*.

That is, as the commentator explains it, the exception established by the preceding rule does not hold good in the case of *nih*, which is treated as prescribed in rule 24, even before *pra*. The cases instanced in illustration of the rule are both of a doubtful character: the one is a *jaṭā*-reading, *prāñcāu nir ṇish prāñcāu prāñcāu nih* (vi.4.10<sup>2</sup>), the other an extract from the ending of the same *anuvāka* (vi.4.10), *ātmanā parā nish pra çukraçocishā*, these words being those which end respectively the first four divisions of the *anuvāka*. We shall find other quotations of the endings later; and their appearance is at least decisive of the recognition by the commentator of the breaking up of the *anuvākas* into divisions of fifty words each, whatever we may have to believe respecting its recognition by the Prâtiçâkhyâ. We are not, however, to take for granted that even the commentator accepted the division as now made in our manuscripts, involving a suspension of continuity of the *samhitâ*-text after each fiftieth word: there was probably at first a mere enumeration made, with an expression of its results at the end of the *anuvāka*. The endings, as may be seen in the Calcutta edition, are carefully accented, and written according to the rules of combination as laid down by the Prâtiçâkhyâ. The same rules are followed in the *jaṭā*-text; and hence, as (by rule vii.2, above) *nih* converts the following initial *n* into *ṇ* in *samhitâ*, so does it also in the repetitions of the *jaṭā* (*nir ṇish*). As a yet farther consequence, it has the same effect in the rules of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, and I have therefore accepted the reading *ṇa* instead of *na* in the repetition of the present rule, although it is supported only by T. and W.

---

35. *nir ity atra visarjanîyasya*<sup>1</sup> *praparatve*<sup>2</sup> 'pi shatvanishedho na bhavati: shatvam eva bhavati 'ty arthaḥ. prāñ-...: atm-  
-----

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane*<sup>3</sup>  
*ashtamo 'dhyâyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -*nîyah*. <sup>2</sup> O. *prapare*. <sup>3</sup> O. ins. *prathamapraçne*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



adopted and taught by the Prâtiçâkhyâ, and is usually (not without occasional exceptions) conformed to by the edition of the Sanhitâ, and by my manuscripts both of that and of the Prâtiçâkhyâ and its commentary. I have, therefore, treated it âs peremptory, and have everywhere governed by it the readings I have accepted. The same omission is prescribed by the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Prâtiçâkhyas, but not by the Atharvan (see Ath. Pr. ii.40, note).

## अघोषपरस्तस्य सस्थानमूष्माणम् ॥ २ ॥

2. Followed by a surd letter, it becomes the spirant of like position with that letter.

The commentator's examples are: *yax kâmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.; O. reads *-yate*); *agniç ca me* (iv.7.6<sup>1</sup>: O. omits this and the next example), *ulûkaç çaçah* (v.5.18), *agnis te tejah* (i.1.10<sup>3</sup> and vii.5.17: O. leaves out *te*), and *yaφ pâpmanâ grhîtaḥ* (ii.1.3<sup>5,4</sup>: W. leaves off the first word; G. M. O. omit the last).

The requirements of this rule are by no means complied with by the manuscripts, nor have I followed them in the present work. In the first place, no manuscript that I possess, or have ever seen, attempts to represent any such sounds as the *jihvâmûliya* and *upadhmanîya* (see i.9), or *ç* and *φ*; for these, *visarjanîya* is universally substituted, as if the sect of Âgniveçya and Vâlmîki (see rule 4, below) had supplanted all its rivals; and, in the second place, the agreement to leave *visarjanîya* unchanged before a sibilant (according to the view of the authorities referred to below, in rule 5) is nearly as general. In my MS. of the Sanhitâ, I have noted about thirty cases of conversion to a sibilant, in place of unchanged retention, and they are nearly all in a single limited neighborhood (in iv.5), where a different scribe has developed his originality a little. As is hinted above, in the introduction, however, G. and M. make with great regularity the assimilation of *h* to the following sibilant; O. does it not infrequently; the others, almost never.

I have put together, in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.40, a statement of the variously conflicting views respecting the treatment of *h* before the different classes of surd letters held by the different Prâtiçâkhyas, or referred to in their rules; and it is unnecessary to repeat it here. The sole point upon which all authorities agree is the conversion into *ç* and *s* before palatal and dental mutes respectively—and this is also the only point left unquestioned by the rules which follow here in our treatise.

## न क्षपरः ॥ ३ ॥

2. *aghoshaparo visarjanîyas tasyâ 'ghoshasya sasthânam ūsh-mânam bhajate. yax-----: 'agniç-----: ulû-----: 'agnis-----: yaφ-----.*

(1) O. om.



3. But not when followed by *ksh*.

That is to say, *visarjanîya* remains unchanged before *ksh*, the preceding rule for its conversion to *jihvâmûliya* being annulled. There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises. The commentator quotes a number of examples: *manah ksheme* (v.2.1<sup>7</sup>), *ubhayataḥkshnûr bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit *bhavati*: the *visarjanîya* was exempted from conversion into *s* before the *k* by viii.33), *ghanâghanah kshobhanah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>), *pûrvo 'rshtuh kshîyate* (iii.1.7<sup>1</sup>), and *dyâuh kshâmâ rerihat* (iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word).

कपवर्गपरश्चाग्निवेश्यवाल्मीक्योः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Nor, according to Âgniveçya and Vâlmîki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute.

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them "holders of a *çâkhâ*, teachers"), it appears, reject altogether the *jihvâmûliya* and *upadhmanîya*, since they prescribe the retention of *visarjanîya* in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise. The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages: *yah kâmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.), and *agniḥ paçur âsît* (v.7.26: O. has dropped out what follows *agniḥ*). Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites *madhuç ca mâdhavaç ca* (i.4.14 and iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>), *manas tatvâya* (iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>: but B. substitutes *namas talpyâya*, iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *âçuç çîçânah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>), *yas somam vamiti* (ii.3.2<sup>6</sup>).

उष्मपर एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then.

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commen-

3. *kshaparo visarjanîyah pûrvavidhim na bhajate. yathâ': man-....: ubhay-....: ghanâ-....: pûrv-....: dyâuh-.... kshakârasya 'ghoshavattvât prâptih.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

4. *'cakâro nishedham âkarshati. âgniveçyavâlmîkyoh' çâkhi-nor âcâryayor<sup>2</sup> mate<sup>3</sup> kavargaparah pavargaparo vâ<sup>3</sup> pûrvavidhim 'nâ "padyate<sup>4</sup>. yah-....: agniḥ<sup>5</sup> -.... kakâraç ca pakâraç ca kapâu: tayor vargâu<sup>5</sup> kapavargâu: tâu parâu yasmât sa tathoktah. evampara iti kim: madhuç-....: manas-....: âçuç-....: yas-....*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om.; O. *caçabdo nañâkarshakah: âgn-*. (<sup>2</sup>) O. om. (<sup>3</sup>) O. *kapavargaparo visarjanîyah*. (<sup>4</sup>) O. *na bhajate*. (<sup>5</sup>) O. *kavargaç ca pavargaç ca*.



tator, and although G. M. O. omit the negative in the interpretation (I presume, by a copyist's blunder only). Some authorities, who do not, like Âgniveçya and Vâlmîki, refuse to accept the *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmanîya*, nevertheless deny the doctrine of rule 2 to this extent—that they prescribe the retention of *visarjanîya*, not its assimilation, before a sibilant. Thus, they would write *âçuḥ çicānaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>). G. M., as is their constant custom, write here *âçuç*; and so does O., as is its common, though far from invariable, usage: but this means nothing; for we have no good reason to expect the manuscripts of the commentary to conform themselves in any such case to a reading which will truly illustrate the matter in hand; they simply make the *sandhi* in the manner usual with them: for example, under rule 2, no MS. attempts to indicate the  $\chi$  and  $\varphi$ , and W. B. give the *ḥ* instead of the sibilant before the sibilant.

If we reject this interpretation, our sole alternative is, so far as I can see, to hold that some authorities would accept rule 2 only so far as it relates to *ḥ* before a sibilant, but would retain *ḥ* everywhere else, even reading *agniḥ te tejaḥ*, *agniḥ ca me*. This seems altogether inadmissible. Yet we must acknowledge that it is to some extent favored by the commentator's selection of counter-examples, namely *manas tatvāya* (iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>: but B. substitutes again *namas talpyāya*, iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>), and *yaḥ kāmāyeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.). According to our preferred interpretation, there would be no particular reason for quoting the former of these, since the combination it illustrates has been made a question by no one: according to the other, it would be required (in the form *manaḥ tatvāya*), to show what these dissidents held should be done in such a case.

## न प्राक्षिप्राक्षायणयोः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Not according to Plâkshi and Plâkshâyaṇa.

The natural interpretation of this rule would seem to be, that Plâkshi and Plâkshâyaṇa are not of the number of those who hold the objectionable doctrine of the last rule, or of the last two rules. If, however, I rightly apprehend the commentator, he declares it

5. *ekeshâm âcâryânâm mata ūshmapara eva visarjanîyaḥ pûrvavidhim na<sup>1</sup> bhajate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: âçuḥ----- evakâreṇa kim: manas-----: <sup>3</sup>yaḥ-----<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. om.

6. *kapavargapara<sup>1</sup> ūshmaparaç ca visarjanîyaḥ plâkshiplâkshâyaṇayoḥ çâkhinoḥ<sup>2</sup> pakshe na khalu pûrvavidhim bhajate. yaḥ-----: yaḥ-----: âçuç----- evampara iti kim: manas-----<sup>3</sup>kapavargâdi sūtratrāyam anisṭam.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. *kavargaparah pavargaparaç ca.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. prefix *evam*, and put the whole at the end of the comment on the preceding rule; they also omit rule 6.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



be converted into *āv* by ix.15, and the final reading would be *samiddhāv añjan*. Or, again [supposing the present rule not to be given], the *visarjanîya* would become *y* by ix.10, the *y* would be dropped by x.19, the preceding *a* would be exempted from further combination by x.25, and the *samhitā*-reading would turn out *samiddha añjan*.

The Ath. Pr. (ii.53) avoids the same difficulty by prescribing the conversion of the *h* into *u*, which then combines with the preceding *a* into *o*. The other treatises (Rik Pr. ii.12; Vâj. Pr. iv.42) treat the combination in the same manner as our own. What becomes of the following *a* is taught in the eleventh and twelfth chapters.

## घोषवत्परश्च ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also when followed by a sonant consonant.

Only one example of this combination is cited, namely *mā no mitro varuṇaḥ* (iv.6.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word).

The commentator raises against this rule the objection that, as prescribing the same thing with the one preceding, it should not have been made a separate rule at all; and, in reply, he promises that the exposition of the meaning of *tu* in the next rule shall explain the reason of the proceeding.

## अवर्णपूर्वस्तु लुप्यते ॥ ९ ॥

9. But *visarjanîya*, when preceded by an *a*-vowel, is omitted.

In these rules, from 7 to 10 inclusive, the *anuvṛtti*, or continuance of implication, is intricate and irregular in an unusual degree, and even beyond the measure of what ought to be tolerated. The implication of *visarjanîya* being made all the way from viii.5 to

---

*bhavati: tasmiñç ca lupyete tv avarṇapārvāu yavakāráv* (x.19) *iti yakāre*<sup>10</sup> *lupte paraç ca paraç ca* (x.25) *iti*<sup>11</sup> *kāryāntarāprasiddheḥ*<sup>12</sup> *samiddha*<sup>13</sup> *añjann ity syāt: tan mā bhād ity*<sup>14</sup> *evam arthaḥ*<sup>15</sup>: *aḥsarva*<sup>16</sup> *ity uktam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om., and ins. *apy*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *okāram*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put at the beginning. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *sahito visarjanîya*. <sup>5</sup> O. *sidhyati*. <sup>6</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. *kim ca*; O. *kim tu*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. ins. *atha*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. ins. *vā*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>11</sup> O. ins. *sūtreṇa*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-prasakte*; O. *-prasaktiḥ tathā sati*. <sup>13</sup> W. *-ddho*; B. *-ddhāu*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(15)</sup> G. M. O. om.; B. om. *evam*. <sup>16</sup> B. om. *aḥ*.

8. *cakāra*<sup>1</sup> *okāram aḥsarvam cā 'nvādiçati*. *aḥ*<sup>2</sup> *sarvo ghosha-vatpara*<sup>3</sup> *otvam bhajate*. *yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *mā* . . . . *nanu vidhāu samāne pṛthakkaraṇām*<sup>5</sup> *anarthakam iti cet: uttarasūtre tuçabdavyākhyā-  
nena*<sup>6</sup> *sphuṭīkarishyata*<sup>7</sup> *iti parihāraḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put next before *anvādiçati*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *-raç ca*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-ksūtrak-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-khyāne*. <sup>7</sup> W. O. *-shya*.



ix.10 (as pointed out in the comment to viii.5), rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that “*visarjanîya*, when preceded by *a*, becomes *o* along with the latter, when *a* follows:” instead of which a new subject, “the whole syllable *aḥ*,” is introduced there; and *visarjanîya*, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again. But we find it implied without specification in the present rule; and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down “by vicinage” from rule 8, while the *tu*, ‘but,’ the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by *a*, as specified in rule 7. This is little less than absurd: if the sequence of *a* was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of. The *tu* is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator’s attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure. Our rule means, by its terms, that *aḥ*, *âḥ*, and *âṣḥ* lose their *ḥ* before a sonant consonant; only, as *aḥ* was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to *âḥ* and *âṣḥ*. The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of “preceded by an *a*-vowel” is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that *aḥ*, *âḥ*, and *âṣḥ* before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of *aḥ* before *â*, already provided for—convert their *ḥ* into *y*, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x.19. But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous matters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the *Prâtiçâkhyâ*. It is really made up of two independent parts: one, *atha svaraparâḥ*, ‘Now then, when followed by a vowel,’ which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next; the other, *visarjanîyo yakâram*, ‘*ḥ* becomes *y*,’ and their combination is made in order that the implication of *visarjanîya* and also of *avarṇapûrva* may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator’s examples of the application of the rule are *devâ gâtuvidâḥ* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>; 4.44<sup>3</sup>: vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>), and *vicityâḥ somâṣ na vicityâṣ iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>; *somâṣ* for *somâṣḥ*, by protraction from *somaḥ*: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three). He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spe-

---

9. *avarṇapûrvo ghoshavatparas tu* <sup>1</sup> *visarjanîyo lupyate: hrasvapûrvasyâu* <sup>2</sup> *’kâra* <sup>3</sup> *eva dîrghapûrvasya* <sup>3</sup> *plutapûrvasya ca lopâḥ. yathâ: devâ* ----: *viç* ----. *okâram aḥ sarvo* <sup>4</sup> *’kâraparâḥ* (ix. 7) *ity akâraparatvam pratyakshaṁ tuçabdena nivartyâ* <sup>4</sup> *’numânikaṁ ghoshavatparatvam parigr̥hyate sâmnidhyât: asyâ* <sup>4</sup> *’nuvartanam evâ* <sup>4</sup> *’bhîṣṭam atre* <sup>4</sup> *’ti pûrvasûtradvayasya* <sup>4</sup> *pṛthak-karanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. ins. *saḥ*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *vikâra*. <sup>3</sup> B. *-rva*; O. *-gha*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-trasya*.



cification of sequence by *a*, made in rule 7, is annulled by the word *tu*, and that an inferential sequence by a sonant consonant is assumed by vicinage [from rule 8]; and that the implication here of the latter only is the reason why rules 7 and 8 are given independently of one another. That is to say, such is the easiest way of arriving at the result desired, that the *h* of *áh* and *ázh* is not directly dropped before *a*, but passes through the intermediate step of conversion into *y*, as before the other vowels.

## अथ स्वरपरो यकारम् ॥ १० ॥

10. When followed by a vowel, it becomes *y*.

That is to say, *visarjanīya* does so, if preceded by an *a*-vowel (rule 9)—except in the case of *ah* followed by *a* (rule 7). And, as is intimated by the prefixion of *atha*, the specification “followed by a vowel” is of force also in the following rules (through chapter x.). I have remarked in the preceding note upon the anomalousness of this rule, as striving to fuse into one the winding-up of one subject and the introduction of another. It has not seemed possible to render the *atha* excepting by a longer and more tedious paraphrase than I was willing to introduce; accordingly, I have left it out in translating the precept.

The commentator's examples are *āpa undantu jīvase* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *jīvase*), *tā abruvan* (ii.3.5<sup>2</sup>; 5.1<sup>5</sup>), and *anvārabhyāz iti* (vi.3.8<sup>1</sup>; *anvārabhyāz* for *anvārabhyāzh*, by protraction from *anvārabhyah*); and he gives further, as counter-examples, *āpo varuṇasya* (v.5.4<sup>1</sup>: a not unexceptionably selected example, since *āpah* even before a vowel might not follow the present rule), and *agnir ekākshareṇa* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>: a case under viii.6, as the preceding under ix.8).

This conversion of *visarjanīya* into *y* is only the preliminary step to its complete loss, by rule x.19. The same course of conversion is followed by the Atharvan and Vâjasaneyi Prâtiçâkhyas (Ath. Pr. ii.41; Vâj. Pr. iv.36), but not by that of the Rik (ii.9,10).

## एकारो ऽयम् ॥ ११ ॥

11. *E*, before a vowel, becomes *ay*.

---

10. *'athaçabdo 'dhikârârthah<sup>1</sup>: svarah paro yasmâd asâu<sup>2</sup> svaraparah. ita uttaram yad ucyate<sup>3</sup> svarapara ity evam tatra nimittatvenâ 'dhikrtam veditavyam<sup>4</sup>. sâmniidhyâd avarṇapûrva<sup>5</sup> iti labhyate: svaraparo visarjanīyo 'varṇapûrvo<sup>6</sup> yakâram<sup>7</sup> âpad-yate. yathâ<sup>8</sup>: âpa-----: tâ-----: anvâ----- svarapara iti kim: âpo-----: avarṇapûrva iti kim: agnir-----.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah*; O. *-kârah*. (<sup>2</sup>) O. *so 'yam*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. *vakshyâmah*. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. O. *jñâtavyam*. (<sup>5</sup>) O. om. *pûrva*. (<sup>6</sup>) G. M. put before *svraparo*. (<sup>7</sup>) O. *yatvam*. (<sup>8</sup>) O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



The example is *āsāmahā eve 'māu dvādaçāu māsāu* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>: B. omits the last word, G. M. O. the last two).

To complete the *sandhi*, also, which is the subject of this rule and its successor, rule x.19 is needed.

अकार आवम् ॥ १५ ॥

15. *Āu* becomes *āv*.

The example is *ahāv anadatā hate* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>).

उकारो ऽपृक्तः प्रकृत्या वकारो ऽन्तरे ॥ १६ ॥

16. An *u*, uncombined with a consonant, remains unchanged, and *v* is inserted between it and the following vowel.

The definition of *apṛkta* was given above, at i.54, and such a word was directed to be treated both as initial and as final (i.55). This rule makes an exception for the particle *u*, which becomes *uv* before a vowel—which, moreover, never occurs after an *a*-vowel except as combined with it, forming part of the class of *pragrahas* in *o* which were treated above, in rules iv.6,7. The examples given are *sa uv ekaviñçavartaniḥ* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), and *adanty uv evā 'sya manushyāḥ* (ii.3.7<sup>4</sup>): I have noted further only iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>, but am not sure that I have been careful to mark all the cases. As counter-examples, *svapatyāya deva* (v.5.4<sup>4</sup>; p. *su-apatyāya*) shows that the *u* must be *apṛkta*, and *bhakshe 'hi* (iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>), that no other *apṛkta* vowel than *u* is thus treated.

न तत्तस्मात्सांहितः ॥ १७ ॥

17. But not in *sañhitā*-text, after *tat* and *tasmāt*.

The passages are *tad v āhur utsrjyam* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>: O. omits after *āhuḥ*), and *tasmād v āçyam* (vi.1.11<sup>6</sup>). So far as I have observed, these are the only instances which the text affords of *u* following

14. *svaraparahaḥ padānta<sup>1</sup> āikāra āyam vikāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: āsām-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. -nte. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om.

15. *āukāraḥ padāntaḥ<sup>1</sup> svarapara<sup>2</sup> āvaṁ vikāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: ahāv-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. -nte. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. invert the order. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.

16. *apṛktasamjñaka<sup>1</sup> ukāraḥ svaraparahaḥ<sup>2</sup> prakṛtyā 'vatish-  
thate: avikṛto<sup>3</sup> bhavati 'ty arthaḥ: ukārasvarayor antare 'vukā-  
raç cā "gamo<sup>4</sup> bhavati. yathā<sup>5</sup>: sa-----: adanty----- apṛkta  
iti kim: sva-----: ukāra iti kim: bhak-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. .jña. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. ukārasvaḥ. <sup>3</sup> G. M. karo. <sup>(4)</sup> O. vakārāg-. <sup>5</sup> W. B. G. M. om.



a consonant and preceding a vowel. Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rik Pr. ii.28; Vâj. Pr. iv.87; Ath. Pr. iii.36). The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x.15, and the *u*, like any final, is converted into *v*. To show the bearing of the specification *sâmhitah*, 'in combined text,' the commentator gives us the two passages in *pada* and *krama* form: thus—*tat : u : âhuḥ : tad u : uv âhuḥ : âhur utsrjyam* (but G. M. O. give simply the first two *krama-pada*'s), and *tasmât : u : âçyam : tasmâd u : uv âçyam* (here only W. has the statement in *pada*). It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the *u* as here prescribed; failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes *uv*.

## ह्रस्वपूर्वी उकारो द्विवर्णम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. A *ñ*, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled.

That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading *atha svaraparah* (ix.10) still continuing in force. The commentator adds also “when occurring at the end of a *pada*,” as he has done in his paraphrase of the preceding rules: this is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of *pada*-text into *sâmhitâ*. His illustrative examples are *nyaññ agniḥ* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>), and *tam u tvâ dadhyaññ ṛshiḥ* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup> and v.1.4<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words). That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by *parâñ â vartate* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup> and vi.3.8<sup>3</sup>); that a vowel must follow, by *sadrñk samânâiḥ syât* (ii.2.8<sup>6</sup>: only O. has the last word; only B. G. M. have the inserted *k*, required by v.32, and G. M. convert it to *kh*, by xiv.12), and *pratyañk shad-ahah* (vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>: here all have the *k*, but only G. M. make it *kh*).

17. *tat tasmâd ity<sup>1</sup> etâbhyâm sâmhitâ ukâro 'pṛktaḥ pûrvavi-dhinnâ "pnoti<sup>2</sup> : prakṛtyâvasthânam vakâraç<sup>3</sup> ca na bhavati 'ty arthah. tad-----: tasmâd----- i varṇokârâu yava kârâv (x.15) iti daçame<sup>4</sup> 'sya<sup>5</sup> vidhir vakshyate<sup>6</sup>. tat tasmât sâmhitâ iti kim: tat-----: tasm-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. "padyate; O. prâpn-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. -râgamaç. <sup>4</sup> O. -ma. <sup>5</sup> B. tasya. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. tasya purastâdapavâdo 'yam.

18. <sup>1</sup>*svaraparo ñakâraḥ padântavartî hrasvapûrvo<sup>1</sup> dvivarnam<sup>2</sup> bhajate. yathâ<sup>3</sup>: nyaññ-----: tam----- hrasvapûrva iti kim: par-----: svarapara iti kim: sad-----: praty----- hrasvaḥ pûrvo yasmâd, asâu hrasvapûrvaḥ: dvayor varṇayoḥ samâhâro dvivarnam.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. arrange *hr- sv- pad- ñak-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *dvitvam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.



## नकारश्च ॥ १९ ॥

19. As does also a *n*.

The *a* in this rule brings down, we are told, the preceding cause of duplication and the duplication itself. The cited examples are *nir avapann indrāya* (ii.4.2<sup>2</sup>), and *abruvann ṛdhnavat* (i.5.1<sup>2</sup>). The counter-examples, given for the same purposes as those under the preceding rule, are *niravapan yāny eva purastāt* (ii.4.1<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last two words), *omunvatī te 'smin* (ii.6.9<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word), *yān agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word; G. M. omit the whole example), and *vidvān etam agniṁ cinute* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>). The commentator does not give himself the trouble this time to inquire why two rules are furnished to prescribe a single process: the reason is, evidently, because continued implication of *n* only is desired in the rules that follow.

## अनितिपरो ग्रहोऽव्ययाऽपृथग्द्विरण्यवर्णौ येषीकारो- कारपूर्वा रेफमाकारपूर्वश्च यकारम् ॥ २० ॥

20. In *graha*, *ukhya*, *yājyā*, *prshthya*, and *hiranyavarṇīya* passages, a *n* preceded by *î* or *û* becomes *r*, preceded by *â* becomes *y*, except before *iti*.

The remainder of the chapter is occupied with rules respecting these conversions of a final *n* after *â*, *î*, and *û* before an initial vowel—conversions of which the original ground is the same with that which causes the combinations *ñçc*, *ñst* to result from the collision of *n* with *c* and *t* (vi.20, vi.14), namely the partial retention of an original *s* which followed the *n* as part of the declensional termination of the word. See note to Ath. Pr. ii.27 for a full statement of the teachings of the other Prātiçâkhyas respecting them. The conversion of *n* to *y* is equivalent to its omission, since the *y* is dropped by x.19. Rules xv.1–3 are also needed to complete the combinations intended, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of *anusvāra* after it.

---

19. *ca-kārah pūrvanimittam<sup>1</sup> dvitvam cā 'nvādiçati. hrasva-pūrho nakāro dvivarnam<sup>2</sup> bhajate<sup>3</sup> svaraparah. nir-----: abr----- evampara iti kim: nir-----: oman-----: evampūrva iti kim: yān-----: vid-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pūrvoktan-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *dvitvam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *āpadyate*.

20. *grahokhyādishu<sup>1</sup> vishayeshv îkārāpūrva ûkārāpūrvo vā ca-kārākṛshṭo nakāro 'nitipara<sup>3</sup> itivyatiriktasvaraparo<sup>3</sup> repham āpad-yate: âkārāpūrvaç ced yakāram. graho nāma caturō 'nuvā-*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



from the *hiranyavarnīya* section, *agnīñr apsushadaḥ* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>), and *sarvāñ agnīn* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>), which are the only cases. Counter-examples, of *n* not converted as here prescribed, because occurring outside the passages specified, are *trīn imān lokān iti* (vii.3.2<sup>1</sup>), *paçūn evā 'va rundhe* (v.1.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *tān indro 'ntaryāmenā 'ntar adhatta* (vi.4.6<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last two words). And the bearing of the specification "except before *iti*" is illustrated by examples from the *krama* and *pada* texts, namely *abhyavartanta dasyūn: dasyūn iti dasyūn* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>; *dasyūn* is thus repeated, as being the closing word of the *anuvāka*: but W. O. omit this repetition, which exhibits the very point requiring illustration, and B. adds only *iti dasyūn* to the first *dasyūn*), and *idāvān iti 'dā-vān* (iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>; *samhitā*-reading, *idāvāñ eshaḥ*).

Any general examination of the aspect of this mode of combination in the Tâittirīya text I defer to the end of the chapter.

मर्त्यानुद्यानमृतान्दुर्यानसोमपूर्वःसोअस्मानविमान्गो-  
मान्मधुमान्दृविष्मान्द्रुतमानर्षिचिकित्वानिडावान्कक्षी-  
वान्बाणवान्द्विपयस्वान्वशान्विदत्रानमित्रानरान्योषा-  
न्महाश्च ॥ २१ ॥

21. Also in the words *martyān*, *ud ayān*, *amṛtān*, *duryān* not preceded by *soma*, so *asmān*, *avimān*, *gomān*, *madhumān*, *havishmān*, *hūtamān* before any vowel belonging to the text, *cikivān*, *idāvān*, *kakshīvān*, *bāṇavān*, *hi payasvān*, *vaçān*, *vidatrān*, *amitrān*, *arān*, *poshān*, and *mahān*.

The *ca* in this rule, says the commentator, brings down from the preceding rule the specification "except before *iti*;" but we might fairly claim that it involves all the specifications there made excepting the restriction to certain passages: this exception the comment duly notes: "this and the rules that follow have a general application, without regard to special portions of the text."

The illustrative examples are: for *martyān*, *martyāñ āviveça* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>). For *ud ayān*, *ud ayāñ ajasram* (iv.6.3<sup>3</sup>): with a counter-example, *vayobhir evā 'yān ava rundhe* (v.2.10<sup>7</sup>), to show that

21. ....<sup>1</sup> .... *eteshu*<sup>2</sup> *grahaneshu nakāro 'nitiparo 'yakāram āpadyate*<sup>3</sup>. *anitiparatvākarshako 'yam*<sup>4</sup> *cakārah*. *vishayān*<sup>5</sup> *and-ārtya sarvārtho*<sup>6</sup> *'yam itaḥ*<sup>7</sup> *param ārambhah*. *yathā: mart-....: ud ay-....: ud iti kim: vayo-....: ud-....: bhad-....: na somapūrvah: duryān ity atra nakārah somapūrvvo yatvam*<sup>8</sup> *nā "padyate: pra-....: so-....: so iti kim: indro-....: avi-....: gom-....: madh-....: avigomadhu*<sup>9</sup> *iti kim: paçu-....: hav-....: hūtamān ārshe*<sup>10</sup>: *hūtamān ity atra nakāra*<sup>11</sup> *ārshe svare*



the *ut* before *ayân* needed to be quoted along with it. For *amṛtân*, *ud asthâm amṛtân̄ anu* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>). For *duryân*, *bhadrân dur-yân̄ abhye 'hi mām anuvratâ nyu* (i.6.3<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *mām* etc.): there are two other cases, at i.2.13<sup>1</sup>: vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>; and a single exception, *pra carâ soma duryân adityâḥ* (i.2.10<sup>1</sup>), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction "not preceded by *soma*." For *asmân*, so *asmân̄ adhipatîn karotu* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.2.7<sup>2</sup>): another example is at v.7.9<sup>1</sup>; and *asmân* becomes *asmân̄* also at i.6.12<sup>4</sup>, but in virtue of the preceding rule. The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing *so* in the rule, is *indro asmân asmin dvitîye* (iii.1.9<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the last word). For *avimân*, *avimân̄ aḥvî* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; 7.6<sup>7</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: but the last case falls under the preceding rule also). For *gomân*, *gomân̄ agne* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; 7.6<sup>7</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>—that is to say, in the same phrase with *avimân*). For *madhumân*, *madhumân̄ indriyâvân* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>). Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why *mân* would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts *avi*, *go*, and *madhu*: it is *paçumân eva bhavati* (vi.2.6<sup>2</sup> et al.). Then, for *havishmân*, *havishmân̄ â vivâsati* (i.3.12): the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at vi.4.2<sup>4</sup>. For *hûtamân*, *devahûtamân̄ ity ukhâyâm juhoti* (v.5.3<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last word): it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section. The specification "before any vowel belonging to the text (*ârshe*, 'coming from the *rshis*')," is declared to be meant as an annulment of the restriction, "except before *iti*," made in the preceding rule. And, to show that the *n* remains unchanged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the *pada*-reading *devahûtamân̄ iti deva-hûtamân̄*. There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text: "the specification 'before what comes from the *rshis*' has force in both directions, after the fashion of the crow's eye [Molesworth says, the crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

*pare*<sup>11</sup> *yatvam âpadyate*<sup>12</sup>: *dev-...: ârsha iti kim: dev-...:*  
<sup>13</sup> *ârshagrahaṇasâmarthyâd itiparatve*<sup>14</sup> 'pi <sup>15</sup> *yatvam bhavati: âr-*  
*sha iti kâkâkshivad*<sup>16</sup> *ubhayatra sambadhyate grahokhyâdimā-*  
*hânparyantam*<sup>17</sup>: *ârshasvayampâtha*<sup>18</sup> *ity arthaḥ. cikit-...:*  
*iḍâv-...: kak-...: viç-...: iḍâkakshîbâne*<sup>19</sup> 'ti kim: *ras-*  
*...: sam-...: hî'ti kim: ârj-...: ârsha itiparatvâd dev-...-*  
*itivâd yatvapráptir higrahaṇena nishidhyate*<sup>20</sup>. *stuto-...: su-*  
*vid-...: amit-...: arâñ-...: posh-...: agne-...*

<sup>1</sup> For *asomapûrvah*, G. M. read *ity esha nakâras somapûrvo 'nusvâran nâ "pad-*  
*yate*; B. O. *na som-*, as do T. G. M. in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *eshu*. <sup>3</sup> G. M.  
*yatvam bhajate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. *ayam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vidhân*. <sup>6</sup> W. *sarvo 'rtho*. <sup>7</sup> W. B.  
*iti*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *dvitvan*. <sup>9</sup> W. O. *avimâdhv*. <sup>10</sup> W. adds *cikitvân*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O.  
*ârshasvaraparo*. <sup>12</sup> W. *nâjadyate*; B. *bhavati*; G. M. O. *bhajate*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*.  
<sup>14</sup> G. M. *-pare*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. ins. *hûtamân ity ukhâyâm ity atra*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *kâksh-*; G.  
M. *-kshinyâyena*. <sup>17</sup> W. B. om. *mahân*. <sup>18</sup> B. *ârshaḥ sv-*; G. M. *ârshabhâvân*.  
<sup>19</sup> G. M. *iḍâdiviçeshena*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. O. *p'atish-*.



ball to the other, as it is needed]—namely, from the beginning of the preceding rule to the end of the present one.” This appears to mean that an *iti* belonging to the sacred text itself would admit the conversion of the *n* before it, in any case falling under these two rules. The opinion is doubtless a sound one; but, to prove its expression pertinent here, we require an example showing that there is a passage in the text requiring its application: and none such is furnished us: on the contrary, the addition of *ārshe* to *hūtamān* alone implies that none is to be found. The example for *cikivān* is *cikivāñ anu manyatām* (iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *iḍāvān*, *iḍāvāñ eshaḥ* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; also at iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>, but this is a case falling under the preceding rule). For *kakshīvān*, *kakshīvāñ auçijah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>). For *bānavān*, *viçalyo bānavāñ uta* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the first word). Next we have again a counter-example, *rasavān eva bhavati* (ii.2.4<sup>5</sup>), showing that, of words ending in *vān*, only those preceded as here specified undergo the prescribed effect. For *hi payasvān*, *sam asrkshmahi : payasvāñ agna ā 'gamam* (i.4.45<sup>3</sup>, 46<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *sam*; and G. M. O. omit the last two words): the necessity of the prefixed *hi* is shown by the counter-example *urjasvān payasvān ity āha* (i.7.3<sup>4</sup>). Here, however, is a case of *payasvān* before an *iti* which comes from the *rshis*, and therefore might seem to require the reading *payasvāñ*, like *hūtamāñ* in the passage *devahūtamāñ ity ukhāyām* (v.5.3<sup>1</sup>)—according to the extension made above of the natural and obvious meaning of *ārshe*; but the commentator declares that the mention in the rule of *hi* as necessary preceding word prevents the conversion of *n* to *y* in the passage: it is, to be sure, a case of *payasvān* before *iti*, but not of *hi payasvān*. For *vaçān*, the example is *stuto yāsi vaçāñ anu* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>). For *vidatrān*, W. O. give *suvidatrāñ apī 'ta* (i.8.5<sup>2</sup>), while G. M. have instead *suvidatrāñ avitsi* (ii.6.12<sup>3</sup>): B. is defective here, dropping out the last part of this quotation, and the first part of the next (reading *suvidatrāñ apabādhamānaḥ*); G. M. are in the wrong this time, for the passage they quote falls under the preceding rule. For *amitrān*, *amitrāñ apabādhamānaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>): an exception is provided for in the final rule of the chapter. For *arān*, *arāñ ivā 'gne nemiḥ* (ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *poshān*, *poshāñ apushyat* (vii.1.9). For *mahān*, *agne mahāñ asi* (ii.5.9<sup>1</sup>): another case at i.4.20.

इन्द्रोमेऽकृद्मिहाप्येवगन्मेडेन्यानायतिष्ठन्नाचर्त्तकुर्व-  
ताडुहृदितिरग्रेऽधरात्सपत्नानलंपरश्च ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also 'a *n* followed by *indro me*, *akah*, *ūdhvam*, *ihā*, *apy etu*, *aganma*, *iḍenyān*, *āyajishṭhaḥ*, *ā ca*, *ṛtu*, *akurvata*, *aduhat*, *aditiḥ*, *agre*, *adharānt sapatnān*, and *alam*.

22. . . . . *ity evamparo nakāra* <sup>1</sup>*ākārapūrvō yatvam* <sup>2</sup>*āpadyate. cakāra* <sup>1</sup>*ākārapūrvatvākarshakah. yathā : sap- . . . . : ma iti kim : yush- . . . . : nigr- . . . . : yūy- . . . . : agne- . . . . : dīrghena kim :*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



in its *samhitā*-form, and adding only a single *sandhi* from the *jaṭā*-text, while W. B. give the complete *jaṭā*-readings, and only those. The former quote first *amartyo martyāñ āviveça* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and add *martyāñ amartyaḥ*; W. gives *amartyo martyān martyāñ amartyo* 'martyo martyān, and *martyāñ āviveça* "viveça martyān martyāñ āviveça; B. only the latter (and, blunderingly, treats it as *amartyāñ āviveça*, throughout); next, G. M. O. have *ud asthām amṛtāñ anu: amṛtāñ asthām* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>): W. B., *amṛtāñ anv anv amṛtāñ amṛtāñ anu*. Then, in illustration of a second point, we receive two more examples: G. M. O. read *agne 'vimāñ aṣvī: avimāñ agne* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup> et al.), for which W. B. substitute *agne 'vimāñ avimāñ agne 'gne 'vimān*; and G. M. O., again, *ud ayāñ ajasram* (iv.6.3<sup>3</sup>), O. this time adding the full *jaṭā*-reading *ud ayāñ ayāñ ud ud ayān*, which G. M. also seem to mean to give (they actually have only *ayāñ ud ayān*); while W. B. set down the *jaṭā*-form of the other pair of words: *ayāñ ajasram ajasram ayāñ ayāñ ajasram*. Yet once more, two examples for a third point close the tale: in G. M. O. *agnis tāñ agre: tāñ agniḥ* (iii.1.4<sup>2</sup>), in W. B. *tāñ agre 'gre tāñs tāñ agre*; and, this time in all alike, *anyāñ adharān adharān anyāñ anyāñ adharān* (but G. M. have, doubtless by a copyist's blunder, *anyān* the second time, before *anyāñ*). It will be seen that the two versions are in part inconsistent with one another as regards the special points of combination to which they direct attention; and I am not able to make out what are the three classes of cases meant to be distinguished. The three points which one would most naturally think of as needing to be noticed are, perhaps, first, the occurrence of a word like *amṛtān* before itself—thus, *amṛtāñ amṛtān*—in the *jaṭā* repetition; second, its occurrence before a preceding word (not its defined or natural *nimitta*) when that word begins with a vowel—thus, *amṛtāñ asthām*; and third, its occurrence in *jaṭā* before the word which causes its alteration in *samhitā*—thus, *amṛtāñ anu*—if, indeed, this last can be regarded as requiring any special prescription. Or, the second and third cases might be expected to concern the treatment respectively of a word, on the one hand, like *martyān*, which is itself quoted in the rule as suffering the prescribed change (which is at the same time *grahaṇa* and *nāimittika*, or *nāimittikam grahaṇam*), and might therefore naturally be inferred to be liable to the change under all circumstances before a vowel; and one, on the other hand, like *anyān*, which is pointed

---

*tvam syād iti nāimittikasya ca nimittāpekshatvāt. grahaṇasya yathā: amartyo . . . : ud . . . . . evam nāimittikagrahaṇasya: agne . . . . : ud . . . . . evam grahaṇanāimittikasya<sup>9</sup>: agnis . . . . : anyāñ . . . . . evam sarvatra nakārasya yakārotpattir<sup>10</sup> drashṭavyā.*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. O. *yakāram*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>4</sup>) O. om.; W. G. M. read *yajishṭha iti kim* etc. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. a. (<sup>6</sup>) O. *-dhāne*; B. *-dhānasye*. (<sup>7</sup>) B. om. (<sup>8</sup>) G. M. O. om. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. O. *-ṇasya nāi-*. (<sup>10</sup>) G. M. *nakā-*.



out by means of the quotation of the following word *adharân* (which is itself, therefore, *nâimittika*, while *adharân* is *grahana*; or which is *grahananâimittika*, 'undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word'), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word. It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22. At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final *ñ* in *samhitâ* shows it also in *jaṭâ* before a following vowel of whatever kind. This is markedly different from its treatment in *pada*, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to *ñ* is lost altogether: and even in *jaṭâ* (as was shown in the note to iii.1), an altered letter usually exhibits its *samhitâ* form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in *samhitâ*-text.

न रश्मीञ्छ्रपयान्यमान्यतङ्गात्समानानर्चान्यज्ञीयान् ॥२३॥

23. The *n* of *raçmîn*, *çrapayân*, *yamân*, *patañgân*, *samânân*, *arcân*, *yajîyân* remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made: needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action. The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows: *purutrâ ca raçmîn anu* (iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>), *aditiḥ çrapayân iti* (iv.1.5<sup>4</sup>), *suyamân útaye* (iv.7.15<sup>4,5</sup>), *patañgân asamditah* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>), *samanâ samânân uçann agne* (iv.3.13<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), *arcân indra grāvānah* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>: G. M. have dropped out all but *arcâ*), and *yajîyân upasthe mātuh* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). The first two are from *ukhya* passages, the third from a *prshthya*, the rest from *yājyâ*—as is noted also by the commentator (but G. M. omit these notices, save the first). Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following *çrapayân* is *iti*, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says "except before *iti*"); but he urges in reply that the word *ârshē* in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

23. <sup>1</sup> ----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *grahāneshu nakārah svaraparo 'pi na khalu repham yakāram*<sup>2</sup> *vā bhajate. yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *puru*-----: *adi*-----: *ukhyatvād anayoḥ prāptiḥ*<sup>4</sup>. *nanv adi*----- *asye*<sup>5</sup> 'tiparatvād *eva nishedhe sati grahānam anartham*<sup>6</sup>: *iti cet: ārsha itiparatvāt*<sup>7</sup> *punaḥ prāptiḥ: tan mā bhūd iti brāmah. suy*-----: <sup>8</sup>*prshthyatvāt prāptiḥ*:<sup>8</sup> *patañ*-----: <sup>9</sup>*yājyāt*<sup>10</sup> *prāptiḥ*:<sup>9</sup> *sama*-----: *arcān*-----: *yajî*-----: <sup>11</sup>*eshām api sâi 'va prāptiḥ*.<sup>11</sup>

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *raçmîn ity ādishu*; O. *eshu* for *eteshu*. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *vā yatvam*. (<sup>3</sup>) B. *tathā*; the rest om. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. *-ptinishedhah*. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. *atra*. (<sup>6</sup>) G. M. O. *-thakam*. (<sup>7</sup>) O. om. *iti*. (<sup>8</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>10</sup>) O. ins. *asya*. (<sup>11</sup>) G. M. om.



“crow’s eye” interpretation) gives the former precept authority over it, which requires to be annulled.

## उद्यापरश्चोद्यापरश्च ॥ २४ ॥

24. Nor a *n* followed by *ut* or *athā*.

The phrases to which this rule relates are, as quoted by the commentator, *amitrān un nayāmi* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>), and *vidvān athā bhava* (iii.2.11<sup>2-3</sup>; our *samhitā*-text has *atha*, because the word stands *vibhāge*, at the end of a division of the section: see rule iii.10 and note): I have noted no other cases. The commentator gives a counter-example to the former, showing why *ut* could not have been extended to *uta*, but needed to stop at the consonant (*hal*): it is *trīñr uta dyān* (ii.1.11<sup>5</sup>). Such a counter-example is quite out of the usual course, and very superfluous; the example itself would be counter-example enough: the substitution of *uta* for *ut* would have excluded the very passage aimed at. Of the two phrases, the one comes from an *ukhya*-passage, the other from a *yājyā*: the commentator might better have spent his spare energy in telling us this.

What remains of the comment to this rule is not altogether free from difficulties. First the statement is made that the word *athā* in it implies also *atha*, with short *a*; in illustration, W. repeats, without change, *vidvān athā bhava*; B. gives the same twice over; only O. has, in *krama*-text, *vidvān atha: athā bhava*—which is doubtless correct, and shows the *krama*-reading (along, we may suppose, with the *jaṭā*) to be the matter aimed at. That the now accepted *samhitā*-reading—*vidvān atha: २: bhava*—is contemplated, is not at all to be assumed. Both the statement and its illustration are wanting in G. M.: and this, although those manuscripts contain, under viii.34, the reference to it in advance there made. In regard to what follows, also, the recensions are considerably at variance. The *jaṭā*-text is again under

24. *ut: athā<sup>1</sup>: ity evamparo nakāro yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> repham yakāram vā<sup>2</sup> nā<sup>3</sup> padyate. <sup>3</sup> yathā<sup>4</sup>: amit-....: halmātrena<sup>5</sup> kim: trīñr-....: vidv-....: <sup>6</sup>dirgho 'tra hrasvopalakshanam api: yathā: vidv-....<sup>6</sup> <sup>7</sup> yathāsamhitāstham<sup>8</sup> <sup>9</sup>eva nimittam<sup>10</sup> svakāryam karoti<sup>9</sup> <sup>11</sup>nishedharūpam <sup>12</sup> yathā: amit-.... vidhir apy<sup>13</sup> <sup>14</sup>evam yathāsamhitāsthanimitta evam sarvatra bhavaty<sup>11</sup> ato<sup>15</sup> 'vocāma<sup>14</sup>: <sup>16</sup> so-....: asm-....: evamādi veditavyam.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣākhyavivarane  
navamo 'dhyāyah.*

(1) W. B. O. *atha*. (2) G. M. O. put after *āpadyate*; G. M. *repham va yatvam vā*.  
<sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *cakāro nishedhākarshaḥ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. *ud iti*. (6) G. M. om.; B. om. *yathā*; O. om. *api: yathā*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *ity atra*; O. ins. *atra*.  
<sup>8</sup> G. M. O. *-stha*. (9) G. M. *nimittāir eva sambhavati*; O. *nimittāir eva sarvatra bhavati*.  
<sup>10</sup> W. B. *-tte*. (11) G. M. om. <sup>12</sup> O. ins. *vidhirūpam vā*. <sup>13</sup> W. *iti*. (14) O. only *yathā*.  
<sup>15</sup> W. *atho*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## दीर्घः समानाक्षरे सवर्णपरि ॥ २ ॥

2. In the case of a simple vowel, followed by a similar vowel, the product is long.

For the terms *samānākshara* and *savarṇa*, see rules i.2,3, where they are defined. The grammatical construction of the rule is not simple, or easily made homogeneous with that of its predecessor. The commentator brings it out thus: "there being a simple vowel, followed by one that is of like nature with itself, these two, being put in the relation of predecessor and successor, become a single long vowel." His examples are *tvacaṁ grhṇīshvā 'ntaritañ rakshaḥ* (i.1.8: only O. has the first word; only G. M. the last), *rāsnā 'sī 'ndrānyāi* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>), and *sūpasthā devo vanaspatiḥ* (i.2.2<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last word).

## अथावर्णपूर्वे ॥ ३ ॥

3. Now for cases in which an *a*-vowel stands first.

A new sub-heading, having force as far as rule 9, inclusive. The word *avarṇapūrve* is explained by the commentator after the manner of a *karmadhāraya* compound, as meaning 'that which is both an *a*-vowel and first,' but I do not see how such a construction can be defended: we have, rather, to understand *akshare*, and make the meaning analogous with that of rule 2: "when there is a syllable that has an *a*-vowel before it."

## इवर्णपरि एकारम् ॥ ४ ॥

4. When an *i*-vowel follows, the product is *e*.

The commentator explains *ivarnapare* in the same manner as *avarṇapūrve* in rule 3. The interpretations might hold good, if *pūrva* and *para* were taken substantively; but they are not so used anywhere in the treatise. His chosen example is *ne 'shtir bhava-*

2. *samānākshara ātmanah savarṇapare sati pūrvāparībhūte<sup>1</sup>  
ete ubhe<sup>3</sup> dīrgham ekam<sup>4</sup> āpnutaḥ<sup>5</sup>. yathā<sup>6</sup>: tvac-....: rās-....:  
sūp-.... savarṇam param yasmāt tat<sup>7</sup> savarṇaparam: tasmin<sup>8</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pūrvah parah te*. <sup>2</sup> W. O. ins. *saty*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *akshare*. <sup>4</sup> W. om.; G. M. *adhikam*. <sup>5</sup> B. *āpnoti*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. om.; O. *tatrat*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. O. om.

3. *'athe 'ty ayam adhikārah:<sup>1</sup> avarṇapūrve<sup>2</sup> satī 'ty<sup>3</sup> etad adhi-  
kṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmaḥ. 'idam adhikā-  
rāntaram<sup>4</sup> upasargapūrva āram (x.9) iti paryantam. avarṇaḥ  
cā 'sau pūrvaḥ cā 'varṇapūrvah: tasmin<sup>5</sup>.*

(<sup>1</sup>) O. om. (<sup>2</sup>) O. *-vatve*. (<sup>3</sup>) W. om. *ity*. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. *ayam adhikāra*. (<sup>5</sup>) O. adds *avar-  
ṇapūrve*.



*ti* (ii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: W. reads *neshtu*); and O. alone adds *mahendrāya* (v.5.21; p. *mahā-indrāya*).

## उवर्णपर ओकारम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. When an *u*-vowel follows, the product is *o*.

The commentator's single illustrative example is *ishe tvo* "rje *tvā* (i.1.1).

## एकारपर ऐकारम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. When *e* or *ai* follows, the product is *ai*.

The examples are *sam brahmaṇā pṛcyasvāi 'katāya svāhā* (i.1.8: O. omits the last word), and *somāindrā babhrulalāmāḥ* (v.6.15; p. *soma-āindrāḥ*).

The commentator again very elaborately explains *ekārāikārapare* as a *karmadhāraya* compound, formed upon *ekārāikāra* as a *dvandva*; and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule.

## ओकारौकारपर औकारम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. When *o* or *au* follows, the product is *au*.

The examples are *brahmāudanam pacati* (not found in the Tāit-

4. *avarṇapūrva ivarṇapare ca sati* <sup>1</sup> *te* <sup>2</sup> *ubhe akshare ekāram āpnutaḥ. ne 'sh-.....: mah. ivarṇaḥ cā 'sāu* <sup>3</sup> *paraḥ ce 'varṇa-paraḥ*<sup>3</sup>: *tasmin.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ubhe akshare.* <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> B. *pūrvaḥ ca avarṇapūrvaḥ.*

5. *avarṇapūrva uvarṇapare ca sati* *te* <sup>1</sup> *ubhe akshare* <sup>2</sup> *okāram āpnutaḥ. ishe-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om.

6. *avarṇapūrva ekārāikārapare ca sati* *te* <sup>1</sup> *ubhe akshare* <sup>2</sup> *pūrvāparibhūte* <sup>3</sup> *āikāram āpnutaḥ. sam-.....: som-..... ekāraḥ cāi 'kāraḥ cāi 'kārāikārāu: tayoh samāhāra ekārāikāram: samāhāre dvandvaḥ:* <sup>4</sup> *tac ca tatparam cāi 'kārāikāraparam karmadhārayaḥ: tasminn ekārāikārapare* <sup>5</sup>. *evam* <sup>6</sup> *uparitanē 'pi sūtre* <sup>6</sup> *samāsah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *pūrvāpare*, and put before *akshare.* <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>(6)</sup> O. *-tanasūtre 'pi.*

7. *avarṇapūrva okārāukārapare ca sati* *te* <sup>1</sup> *ubhe akshare* <sup>2</sup> *āukāram āpnutaḥ. brah-.....: dām-.....* <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. add *uktas samāsah.*



tirīya Sanhitâ, although it is read at Tâittirīya Brâhmaṇa i.1.9<sup>3</sup>: we have *brahmâudanam pacet* at v.7.3<sup>4</sup>, and *brahmâudanam apacat* at vi.5.6<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *pacati*, leaving the citation such as might have come from either passage), and *dâmnâ 'pâu 'mbhan* (ii.4.13).

## अरुकारपरे ॥ ८ ॥

8. When *r* follows, the product is *ar*.

The examples are *ardharca ekâm* (i.6.10<sup>5</sup>), and *âgneyya rcâ 'gnîdhram* (iii.1.6<sup>1</sup>; p. *âgneyyâ: rcâ*).

I have not noticed a single example in the Tâittirīya Sanhitâ of that retention of *r* unchanged after *a* and *â*, only with correption of the latter, which is the rule in the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâs, and which appears also in the Atharva-Veda, though against the authority of its Prâtiçâkhya (see Ath. Pr. iii.46 note).

## उपसर्गपूर्व आरम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. If a preposition precedes, the product is *âr*.

The commentator points out that, as the implication "when an *a*-vowel stands first" is still in force from rule 3, this virtually means "if a preposition ending in *a* or *â* precedes;" *r*, of course, is inferred from the preceding rule. According to the list of prepositions given at i.15, then, *â*, *pra*, *ava*, and *upa* would be the only words authorized to form with initial *r* the *vrddhi* vowel instead of the *guṇa*, *parâ* and *apa* being excluded. The commentator brings up but one example from the text, namely *upâ rchatî* (i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: G. M. read *upâ rchaty askandâya*, which I do not find anywhere: we have *askandâya* after other words at i.5.8<sup>5</sup>: ii.5.8<sup>6</sup>: vi.3.8<sup>1,3</sup>, the last time following *upâ 'syati*; possibly this text was in the mind of the scribe who added *askandâya* in the comment on the present rule); he gives another from the *jaṭâ*-text, *ṛtavvyâ upo 'pâ rtavyâ rtavyâ upa* (v.3.1<sup>1</sup>; 4.2<sup>1</sup>), and, further, as counter-example, showing that only a preposition ending in *a* or *â* produces the prescribed effect, *vyrddham vâ etat* (v.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: O. omits the last word). Additional cases of the same combination, with *â* and *ava*, are quoted under rule 10 (at the end); if the text affords yet others, I have failed to note them. Nor have I observed any cases of the different treatment of *parâ* and *apa* before *r*; so that here also I do not discover any reason for the strange restriction of the class of prepositions made at i.15.

---

8. *avarṇapûrva ṛkârapare ca sati te<sup>1</sup> ubhe akshare<sup>2</sup> aram iti vikâram âpnutah. ardh-----: âgn-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om.

9. *avarṇapûrva ity anuvartate<sup>1</sup>: tasmâd upasargapûrva ity aviçeshavarṇântoktâv<sup>2</sup> avarṇânto 'yam<sup>3</sup> upasargas tasyâi 'va grahanam: ṛkârah sâmnidhyâl labhyate. upasargapûrva ṛkârapare*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*tim* (iv.6.6<sup>6</sup>; p. *sáh*: *imá'm*: compare rule v.17), *tám ghé 'd agnír vrdhá'* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>; p. *gha*: *ít*: only G. M. have the last word), *savanamukhésavanamukhe káryé 'ti* (vii.5.5<sup>1</sup>; p. *káryá*: *íti*: B. omits the first *savanamukhe*), *sé 'd u hótá* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; p. *sáh*: *ít*: compare rule v.17: W. B. omit the last word): so many are examples under rule 4. Now follow those under rule 5: *prókshitam gopáyata* (vii.1.12; p. *prá-ukshitam*: G. M. omit this example), *úrja sthó 'rjam vo bhakshíya* (i.5.6<sup>1</sup>; p. *stha*: *úrjam*: O. omits the last word), *sváyúshó 'd óshadhínám* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>; p. *su-áyúshá*: *út*: G. M. omit this example also), and *imé evó 'pa dhatte* (v.2.7<sup>3</sup>; 5.3<sup>3</sup>; p. *evá*: *úpa*). The examples under rule 6 are *ná'i 'nam pratyóshati* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>; p. *ná*: *enam*), *éka evá yajetá'i 'kah* (vii.2.10<sup>3</sup>; p. *yajeta*: *ékah*), *áthá'i 'kam utthá'nam* (vii.2.1<sup>4</sup>; p. *átha*: *ékam*), *yán ná'i 'káñ raçaná'm* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>; p. *ná*: *ékám*), *indriyám evá'i 'ndréna* (vi.6.5<sup>2</sup>; p. *evá*: *áindréna*), *ví hí tát avá'iryaté 'ti* (vii.1.5<sup>4</sup>; p. *ava-á'iryata*), and finally, from the *jatá*-text, *devébhya á'indhá'i 'ndha devébhyo devébhya á'indha* (ii.5.9<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. give only the *samhitá*-reading, *devebhya áindha*). To illustrate rule 7, we have *kshatrásya cá'u 'jase juhomi* (iii.3.1<sup>1-2</sup>; p. *ca*: *ójase*: B. O. omit the last word), *svá'há'u 'shadhībhyah* (i.8.13<sup>3</sup>; p. *svá'há*: *ósh-*), *sá'u 'shadhír ánu rudhyase* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>; p. *sáh*: *óshadhīh*: another case under rule v.17: G. M. omit the last word), *prá'u 'kshīh kéná 'pá iti* (ii.6.5<sup>1</sup>; p. *prá*: *áukshīh*: G. M. omit the last word), and *arunó ha smá 'há'u 'paveçih* (vi.1.9<sup>2</sup>; p. *áha*: *á'upa-veçih*). Under rule 8, again, fall *ágneyyá rcá' 'gnídham* (iii.1.6<sup>1</sup>; p. *ágneyyá*: *rcá'*), *sá'i 'vá' 'syá rddhih* (vi.6.10<sup>2</sup>; p. *asya*: *r'd-dhih*), *á'indhá rshishtutah* (ii.5.9<sup>1</sup>; p. *á'indha*: *r'shi-stutah*), and *evá rshir asvadayat* (v.1.10<sup>1</sup>; p. *evá*: *r'shih*). Under rule 9, finally, we have *á'rtim á' 'rchatī* (i.5.2<sup>5</sup> et al.; p. *á*: *r'chati*), and *avá'rchaty evám áváram* (ii.6.3<sup>4</sup>; p. *ava-r'chati*).

## अनुनासिके अनुनासिकम् ॥ ११ ॥

11. When a nasal, the result is nasal.

The commentator quotes rule xv.6, which declares it to be the

*saty 'ubhāve çā (x.17) iti<sup>6</sup> sūtreṇa svaritasya viçeshavidhānād'  
iti brūmah. reto-----: van-----: tā----- evam samānākshara-  
samhitāyām ekībhāvo<sup>8</sup> 'nyatrā<sup>9</sup> 'pi drashtavyah<sup>10</sup>. evam avarṇa-  
pūrvatve<sup>11</sup> 'pi vakshyate<sup>12</sup>: se-----: tam-----: sav-----: se 'd-----:  
pro-----: ūrja-----: svā-----: ime-----: nāi-----: eka-----:  
athāi-----: yan-----: indr-----: vi-----: deve-----: ksha-----:  
svā-----: sāu-----: prāu-----: aru-----: āgn-----: sāi-----:  
á'indhā-----: eva-----: árt-----: avā----- evamādi<sup>13</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *práp-*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *-rmam*. <sup>3</sup> O. *-sminn*; G. M. *upasargāntam*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. *udāttānudāttasvaritānām pūrvatve ca paratve ca udāttayor udāttatve ca yathākramam*. <sup>5</sup> O. *prad-*. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. *ubhāv eva sati*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-vidhinā*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. *-ve*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *'trā*. <sup>10</sup> W. *-vyāh*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *varṇ-*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-ti*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-dayah*.



opinion of some authorities that final simple vowels, not *pragrahas*, are nasal; and he states that the present precept has reference to them: if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing *anusvāra*, which appears so unequivocally at xv.1; and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding *anusvāra*, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, *yaḥ* with *añṣum* would make *yo 'ñṣum*; *svāhā* and *añsābhyām* (vii.3.16<sup>1-2</sup>), *svāhā 'ñsābhyām*.

## स्वरितानुदात्तसंनिपाते स्वरितम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *kanyè 'va tunnā'* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>; p. *kanyā': iva*), *chavī'in chavyò 'pā'kr̥tāya svā'hā* (v.7.20; p. *chavyā': upa-ā'kr̥tāya: G. M. O. omit svāhā*), *yājyā'i 'shā' vā'i sap-tāpadā śākvarī* (ii.6.2<sup>6</sup>; p. *yājyā': eshā': G. M. O. end with 'shā'*), and *ātha kvā' 'syā havanī'ya iti* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>; p. *kvā: asyāḥ: O. omits the last two words*). He then goes on to point out that the word *svarita*, 'circumflex,' being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (*nitya*) or "independent" circumflex (see rule xx.2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words; but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

11. *apragrahāḥ samānāksharāṇy anunāsikāny<sup>1</sup> ekeshām<sup>2</sup> (xv.6) ity ekeshām<sup>3</sup> matam: tān uddiṣyā 'yam vidhiḥ. tasminn<sup>4</sup> udāttavaty anunāsike pūrvataḥ parata ubhayato vā sthite saty<sup>5</sup> ubhe<sup>6</sup> akshare anunāsikadharmam ekam āpnutaḥ. uktāny evo 'dāharaṇāni.*

*'etad anisṭam.'*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *yeshām*; B. *eshām*. <sup>4</sup> W. *tasmād*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. ins. *te*. <sup>6</sup> B. O. ins. *apy*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. om.; O. *ne 'dam sūtram isṭam*.

12. *svaritānudāttayoḥ samnipāta ekādeṣe saty ubhāv api tāv svaritam āpadyete<sup>1</sup>. yathā<sup>2</sup>: kan-----: chav-----: yāj-----: atha----- iha svaritasyā<sup>3</sup> 'viṣeṣeṇa<sup>4</sup> grahaṇe nityasvarita eva<sup>5</sup> gr̥hyate: tasya svaritasya<sup>6</sup> vyañjanānām aksharāṇām ca<sup>7</sup> padā-*



syllables and words, by the requirement of such rules as xiv.29 and xii.9; and therefore primary quality belongs only to the "constant" circumflex: whence, by the rule "when a general statement is made, that which is primary should be regarded as intended," it is proper that the constant circumflex should be here understood. In such cases, then, as *áthā 'bravīt* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>), where the long *ā* resulting from the combination of the final *a* of *átha*, which has the enclitic circumflex (by xiv.29), with the initial *a* of *abravīt*, which is grave, has itself the enclitic circumflex, this is not in virtue of the present rule, but falls under the same general rule (xiv.29) that prescribes the enclitic circumflex.

To this effect the commentator: and, whatever we may think of the argument by which he attempts to prove that *svarita* in the rule means only *nitya svarita*, we shall not question the soundness of his conclusions.

## न धामापासिपरोबुध्नियाज्यापूपामिनन्तार्षे ॥ १३ ॥

13. Exceptions are *dhā*, *mā*, and *pā*, when followed by *asi*; also *budhniyā*, *jiyā*, *ā pūshā*, and *aminanta*—before a vowel belonging to the text.

That is to say, these words constitute exceptions, not to the last rules respecting accentuation, but to those which prescribe the combination of a final *a* or *ā* with the following initial vowel. The commentator cites the passages in which the first three occur before *asi*, as follows: *svadhā 'asy urvī* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *sahasrasya pramā asi* (iv.4.11<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first word), and *dhanvann iva prapā asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the first two words). I have also noted, for *dhā*, *varcodhā asi* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *dhā asi svadhā asi* (ii.6.4<sup>4</sup>), and *abhidhā asi* (vii.1.11<sup>1</sup>); for *mā*, *pratimā asi*, *vimā asi*, and *unmā asi*, all in the same section and division (iv.4.11<sup>3</sup>) with *pramā*, as quoted: and, for *pā*, *vratapā asi* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 2.3<sup>1</sup>; vi.1.4<sup>6</sup>) and *cakshushpā asi* (i.2.1<sup>2</sup>). To explain the added specification "when followed by *asi*," the *pada*-readings are quoted for us, namely *svadhe*

*vayavānām utpattikāla eva sambhavāt: anyeshām tu<sup>8</sup> padotpat-  
tikālād<sup>9</sup> ūrdhvam aksharānām padānām ca<sup>10</sup> saṁhitāyām udāt-  
tāt paro 'nudāttaḥ (xiv.29) iti vidhānāt tasminn anudāt-  
te pūrva<sup>11</sup> udāttaḥ svaritam<sup>11</sup> (xii.9) ity ādi<sup>12</sup> ca: tasmān  
nityasyāi 'va mukhyatvam: sāmānyoktāu ca<sup>13</sup> satyām mukhye  
sampratyaya iti tasyāi 'va svīkāro yuktaḥ: athā... ity ādāv  
ekādeśasyo 'dāttānantarabhāvitvād<sup>14</sup> udāttāt paro 'nudāttaḥ  
svaritam (xiv.29) ity anenāi 'va svaritatvam vijñeyam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ekam āpnutah.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>3</sup> W. O. *-sya.* <sup>4</sup> B. *-shana;* G. M. *-shanam eva.* <sup>5</sup> O. *om.* <sup>6</sup> B. *-ta;* G. M. *sa;* O. *sarva.* <sup>7</sup> W. *om.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ca.* <sup>9</sup> G. M. *paro-;* O. *aparo-.* <sup>10</sup> W. *om.;* G. M. O. *vā.* <sup>(11)</sup> G. M. *udāttam.* <sup>12</sup> O. *om.* <sup>13</sup> W. *om.* <sup>14</sup> G. M. O. *-nānt-.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



endings exceptionally uncombinable in *samhitā* nevertheless combine with *iti* in *pada*-text, and also exhibit their uncombinable quality in *jaṭā* only before the words whose sequence calls out that quality in *samhitā*—*pūshā*, for example, uniting with its predecessor *ā* into *pūshā*, and *aminanta* with itself into *aminantā* 'minanta (only, if we may trust the example given, *svadhā* being held apart from its predecessor *asi*, because this happens to be the same word with its successor: and it is by no means impossible that the manuscripts are in the wrong upon this point). But this would be quite sufficiently intimated by the single restriction *ārshe*, without adding *asi* also; and that the latter is specifically intended to apply to the *pada*-readings, and the former to the *jaṭā*, is not easily to be believed. The *asi* would have best reason to be introduced because the words mentioned occur also before other vowels, with which they enter into combination—only, to be sure, I have not noted any cases in which they do so.

एष्टरेतनेमन्नोद्मन्नोष्टेवःपरो लुप्यते ॥ १४ ॥

14. When followed by *eshtaḥ*, *etana*, *eman*, *odman*, *oshtha*, or *evah*, an *a*-vowel is elided.

That the elision mentioned in the rule is of an *a*-vowel is a consequence of the continued implication of the introductory rule x.3, above—although, as the commentator fails to point out, that implication was interrupted by rules 10–12, and was expressly stated at the outset to remain in force through rule 9. The passages contemplated are quoted by the commentator, as follows: *açīy' eshtā rāyah* (i.2.11<sup>1</sup>), *çamitāra upetana* (iii.1.4<sup>3</sup>, 5<sup>2</sup>), *apām tv'' emant sādāyāmi* (iv.3.1), *apām tv'' odmant sādāyāmi* (iv.3.1: G. M. O. omit *sādāyāmi* in both these citations), *svāh'' oshthābhyām* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>), *upayāmam adharen' oshthena* (v.7.12: O. omits the first word), and *nir amimat' evaç chandaḥ* (v.3.5<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word). These are, so far as I have discovered, all the cases of application of the rule that the text contains. The commentator notes that rule i.22, which allows a theme ending in *a*, quoted in a rule, to stand for its various derivative forms, is the warrant for regarding *oshthābhyām* and *oshthena* as involved in *oshtha*. The

-----:<sup>8</sup> <sup>9</sup>*ārsha iti kim: sva*-----:<sup>9</sup> <sup>10</sup>*pra*-----:<sup>10</sup> *dhan*-----:*ā pu*  
-----:<sup>11</sup>*ākārah kimarthaḥ:*<sup>11</sup> *tam*-----:*ā te*-----:*ārshasvarapa*  
*ra*<sup>12</sup> *iti kim:* <sup>13</sup>*budh*-----:*jyā*-----:*pā*-----:*am*-----<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *eshv*. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *-sha*. <sup>4</sup> B. *pāthakāle*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. O. *eshv*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-shapāthe*. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>(8)</sup> O. om. <sup>(9)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(10)</sup> B. *evam ādi*; O. *dhru*-----; G. M. om. <sup>(11)</sup> G. M. *ākāreṇa kim*. <sup>12</sup> O. om. *para*. <sup>(13)</sup> See the note, above.

14. ----- *ity evamparo 'varṇo*<sup>1</sup> *lupyate: athā 'vārṇapūrve*  
(x.3) *ity anuvartanād*<sup>2</sup> *avarṇa*<sup>3</sup> *iti labhyate. açī*-----:*çami*-----:  
*apām*-----:*apām*-----:*svāh*-----:*oshthaçabdasya sarvāvastha*



same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to i.22). As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of “an *a*-vowel,” we have *çityoshṭhaḥ çitibhruḥ* (v.6.14), and *çityoshṭhâya svâhâ* (vii.3.17).

## इवर्णोकारौ यवकारौ ॥ १५ ॥

15. An *i*-vowel and *u* become respectively *y* and *v*.

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication “preceded by an *a*-vowel” ceases, but the implication “followed by a vowel” has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter. The rule says *ukâra*, ‘short *u*,’ instead of *uvarṇa*, ‘an *u*-vowel,’ because long *ū* has already (by iv.5) been declared *pragraha*, and protracted *ū* is made uncombinable below (by x.24). The examples are *abhy asthât* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), *ūty açyâma* (i.3.14<sup>3</sup>), and *â pûshâ etv â vasu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>).

## उदात्तयोश्च परो ऽनुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ १६ ॥

16. And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word “and” (*ca*), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the “*i*-vowel and *u*,” there described as suffering a certain effect. The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx.1) described as the *kshâipra*, are *vy èvâ'i 'nena pâri dhatte* (v.3.11<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words), and *apsv âgne* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>). As counter-examples, we have first *nîcâ' tâm dhakshy atasâm* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>) and *mâdhv agnâ'u juhôti* (ii.3.2<sup>9</sup>), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears; and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, *tâd yâd rçy âdhy akshârâni* (ii.4.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word), *sâ tv 'â'i yajeta* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> et al.: G. M. omit this whole example), and *in nv 'â' úpastîrṇam ichânti* (i.6.7<sup>3</sup>):

*sya grahaṇam bhavati grahaṇasya ca* (i.22) *iti vacanât: upay-*  
*-----: nir----- 'avarṇo lupyata' iti kim: çity-----: çity-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*napûrvo*. <sup>2</sup> W. -*tamânînâd*; G. M. -*tamânah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *avarṇapûrva*.  
(<sup>4</sup>) B. -*napûrvo l*; O. -*nalopa*; G. M. -*napûrva*.

15. *avarṇapûrvâdhikâro nivṛttah: svaraparâdhikâras tu var-*  
*tate: atha svaraparo yakâram* (ix.10) *iti pûrvâdhyâye pra-*  
*krântah. ivarṇokârâu padântâu<sup>1</sup> svaraparâu yathâsamkhyena<sup>2</sup>*  
*yavakârâv âpadyete. abhy-----: ūty-----: â pû----- dîrgha-*  
*sya pragrahavidhânât plutasya saindhinîshedhâd ukârasya kârot-*  
*taratvam<sup>3</sup> kṛtam: ivarṇokârâu yavakârâv iti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. puts after the next word. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*khyam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vakâr-*.



compare, for the peculiar *sandhi* in these last two examples, rule v.13.

## उभावि च ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also when *ū* is the product of the combination.

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule is interpreted as implying that, as in the case of the combination last considered, the first element going to form the *ū* must be acute, and the second grave. As examples of the combination and its accentual result are given *sū'n-nīyam iva* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *sū-unnīyam*), *sū'dgātā* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>; p. *sū-ud-gātā*), and *māsū' 'ttīshthan* (vii.5.2<sup>2</sup>; p. *māsú: ut-*); to which G. M. add *dikshū' 'padádhāti* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>; p. *dikshú: upa-dá-*). The only other case of the kind which I have noted in the Sanhitā is *sū'pa-sadanaḥ* (vii.5.20; p. *sū-upasadanaḥ*). The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: the first, *sūpasthá' deváḥ* (i.2.2<sup>3</sup>; p. *su-upasthá'h*), shows that the former *u* must be acute; the other, *tā' dikshū' 'pā' dadhata* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>), that the latter *u* must be grave.

A later rule (xx.5) gives this particular variety of the circumflex accent the name *praçliṣṭa*.

None of the other Vedic texts has an accentual usage corresponding with this. Indeed, there is not in the Atharvan a single case of a combination of two *u*'s such as is here contemplated, nor has any from the other Vedas come to my notice; if such there be, they are left to follow the general analogy of combinations of acute and grave into one homogeneous vowel (as illustrated under rule 10, above), the acute element raising the other to its own pitch and making the result acute. On the other hand, an exception to this general analogy is made in the other Sanhitās (and duly explained in their Prâtiçâkhyas: see Rik Pr. iii.7, Vâj. Pr. iv.132, Ath. Pr. iii.56), in favor of the coalescence of two short *i*'s into a long *î*; if the former be acute and the latter grave, they produce together a circumflex. Of such a combination, I have

---

16. *cakāraḥ pūrvasūtroktanimittināu<sup>1</sup> 'ivarnokāráu anvādiçati: udāttayor<sup>2</sup> ivarnokārayoḥ paro 'nudāttaç ca<sup>3</sup> svaritam āpadyate. vy----: apsv---- udāttayor iti kim: nîçā----: madhv----: paro 'nudātta iti kim: tad----: sa----: in----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ttino* 'pi. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> O. om.

17. *cakāraḥ pūrvodāttatvānvākarshakaḥ<sup>1</sup>: 'parasyā 'nudāttatvam anvādiçati ca<sup>2</sup>. pūrvēno 'dāttena parasyā 'nudāttasyo 'bhāve kriyamāne<sup>3</sup> svaritam jānīyāt. yathā: sūn----: sūd----: mā----: 'dik----:<sup>4</sup> pūrvēno 'dāttena kim: sūp----: parasyā 'nudāttasye 'ti kim: tā----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *pūrvasyo 'd-*; O. -*tvānuk-*; G. M. *pūrvodāttam paratvānudāttam ca 'karshati*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.; O. om. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



elision of final *v*; and O. boldly gives examples for this, as well: namely, *vāyav ishtaye* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>: W. adds *durone*), and *ahāv ana-data* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>), although the text, by a usage which the comment ratifies under the next rule but one (x.21), retains the *v* in such cases, and it is retained by O. in these very phrases given to illustrate its omission. W. has only the former of the two, foolishly prefixing to it *avarṇapūrva iti kim*, ‘why is it said, “when an *a*-vowel precedes?”’ The other manuscripts pass the point without notice here, leaving it to be settled under rule 21. The true counter-examples for this precept, showing that the elision takes place only after an *a*-vowel, are given by all alike: they are *abhyasthāt* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), and *hr̥tsvasaḥ* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>).

## नोव्यस्य ॥ २० ॥

20. Not so, according to Ukhya.

Ukhya denies that *y* and *v* are omitted in any case; and would therefore read *āpay undantu*, *imay eva*, *martyāñy ā*, and so on.

## वकारस्तु सांकृत्यस्य ॥ २१ ॥

21. Not *v*, according to Sâmkṛtya.

The connection of this rule is somewhat anomalous, but its meaning is sufficiently evident. Sâmkṛtya dissents from the principle laid down in rule 19, like Ukhya; “but” (*tu*) his dissent does not go the whole length of the latter’s; according to him, only *v* is “not” elided. As the commentator has it, the fact that this rule teaches an exception is inferred, “by vicinage,” from its predecessor: its *tu* is intended as an annulment of the opinion of former teachers. And he declares that it alone is approved, while the two that precede (the former of them, of course, only so far as it is inconsistent with this) and the two that follow (B. O. omit this) are rejected. The examples are those already given by a part of the MSS. under rule 19, namely *vāyav ishtaye durone* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>:

---

19. *avarṇapūrvāu svaraparāu yakāravakārāu*<sup>1</sup> *lupyete. yathā: āpa-...: dhru-...: na-...: ima-...: āsā-...:* <sup>2</sup> *vāy-...:* <sup>3</sup> *ahāv-...:* <sup>3</sup> *mart-... evampūrvāv*<sup>4</sup> *iti kim: abhy-...: hr̥t-... tuṣabda itarāu yavakārāu nivartayann ādeṣa-prāptayor evā ’nāyor lopavishayatvaṁ dyotayati. avarṇaḥ pūrvo yābhyāṁ tāv avarṇapūrvāu.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *yavak*. <sup>2</sup> W. ins. *avarṇapūrva iti kim*. <sup>(3)</sup> Only in O. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *avarṇap-*.

20. *ukhyasya*<sup>1</sup> *ṣākhinaḥ pakṣhe*<sup>2</sup> *’varṇapūrvāu*<sup>3</sup> *yavakārāu na*<sup>4</sup> *lupyete. uktāny evo ’dāharaṇāni.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *mate*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *mate*. <sup>3</sup> O. *’pūrvāu*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. G. M. have mixed together to some extent this and the following comment.



W. B. omit this example; O. puts it after the other one, and leaves off *durone*), and *ahâv anadatâ hate* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *hate*).

This is rather the most striking example afforded us of the over-riding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Prâtiçâkhya itself. The usage of the existing Tâittirîya text is on the side of the comment: we have a similar resolution of the final *a* of vocatives into *av*, with retention of the *v*, at i.2.13<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.39; 6.12<sup>3</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>4,8</sup>; 4.12<sup>3</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>: iii.2.10: vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>. Of *âv* as result of final *âu* before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples; but had there been any cases of the omission of the *v*, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them.

## उकारौकारपरौ लुप्येते माचाकीयस्य ॥ २२ ॥

22. According to Mâcâkîya, both are omitted when followed by *u* or *o*.

Instead of Mâcâkîya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Mâyikâya.

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that “respectively” (*yathâsamkhyam*) is to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop *y* before *u*, and *v* before *o*; but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one. It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read *ukârâukâraparo lupyate*, ‘*v* is dropped before *u* or *o*’ (it does not occur in the text before *u*); for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of *y* before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of *v* (*w*) before *u* (no real Sanskrit word begins with *vu*, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of *sandhi*); and, as thus amended, Mâcâkîya’s view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rik Prât. (ii.9–11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vâj. Pr. (iv.125).

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules:

21. *sâmnidhyân nishedho labhyate. sâmkṛtyasya mate 'varṇa-pûrvo vakâro na lupyate: yakâras tu lupyata eve 'ty arthaḥ.*  
<sup>1</sup>*vây- . . . .: ahâv . . . . pûrvâcâryamatanivartakas tuçabdaḥ.*

*sûtram idam eve 'shtam: na tu pûrvadvayam<sup>2</sup> paradvayam<sup>3</sup> ca.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. B. om.; O. puts after the other example. <sup>2</sup> O. *pûrvasûtrad-*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om.

22. *yakâravakârâv avarṇapûrvâv ukârâukâraparâu lupyete yathâsamkhyam<sup>1</sup> mâcâkîyasyâ<sup>2</sup> 'câryasya mate<sup>3</sup>. âpa . . . .: yâ . . . . evamparâv iti kim: ta . . . .: vây- . . . . lupyete itî 'ha punarârambhaḥ pûrvasûtradvayasthitanañah<sup>4</sup> sambandhaçañkânirâkarañârthaḥ<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om.; G. M. after *mate*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *mâyikâyasyâ*, as in the rule itself. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *matena*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*tajanana*; B. -*tajana*; O. -*tananabha*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. *çañkâ*; W. -*tham*.



*āpa undantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>), and *yā oshadhayaḥ* (iv.2.6<sup>4-5</sup>: so W. B.; but G. M. O. give instead *yā jātā oshadhayaḥ*, iv.2.6<sup>1</sup>); to which O. adds an example for *v*, namely *çatakṛataḥ ut* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: it ought, in illustration of the rule, to read *çatakṛata ut*),—putting it between the other two. Counter-examples are *ta enam bhishajyanti* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: we are to understand, apparently, that Mâcâkîya would read *tay enam*), and *vāyav ishtaye* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>).

The commentator remarks in conclusion that the repetition of *lupyete* in the present rule (it was read above, in rule 19) is intended to remove all suspicion of the continued implication of the negative which forms a part of the two preceding rules.

## लेशो वात्सप्रस्यैतयोः ॥ २३ ॥

23. According to Vâtsapra, they are imperceptibly uttered.

It might admit of question whether the “they” here spoken of are final *y* and *v* in general, or only *y* and *v* followed by *u* and *o*, as specified in the last rule. As things stand, the use of the demonstrative *etayoh* rather favors, though not unequivocally, the latter interpretation, and it is the one adopted by the commentator. But if the preceding rule be restored to what we have suggested above as its more probable original form, then the *etayoh* will be very well in place here as referring to *y* and *v* in general; and this interpretation is supported by the fact that the Ath. Pr. (ii.24) and Pânini (viii.3.18) ascribe a like opinion to another grammarian, Çakatâyana, whose peculiar views upon the subject are likewise hinted at by the Vâj. Pr. (iv.126). As the meaning of *leçā* is defined to be *luptavad uccāraṇam*, ‘utterance as if omitted,’ there is not much for the two opposing parties to contend about.

## न प्लुतप्रग्रहौ ॥ २४ ॥

24. Exceptions are protracted and *pragraha* vowels.

Such, namely, are exempt from the rules of combination—and not merely those given in this chapter, but also such as are found elsewhere: for example, at ix.11,12. There is nothing about the

23. <sup>1</sup>*vâtsaprasya mata etayor* <sup>2</sup>*yakâravakârayor* <sup>3</sup>*avarṇapûr-vayor leçāḥ syât*<sup>1</sup>. *leço nâma luptavad*<sup>4</sup> *uccāraṇam. etayor ity ukârâukârâparâu nirdiçati. uktâny evo 'dâharaṇâni.*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om., along with the rule. (<sup>2</sup>) Only in W. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. O. *yavak*-. (<sup>4</sup>) B. *-tam*.

24. <sup>1</sup>*na khalu plutaḥ pragrahaç ca* <sup>1</sup>*saṁdhividhim bhajete*<sup>2</sup>. *yathâ: astu . . . .: te . . . . ityâdividhâu nishiddhe 'nyasmiñç câ 'nârabhyamâṇe*<sup>3</sup> *prakṛtivad*<sup>4</sup> *bhavati.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *plutaç ca pragrahaç ca etâu na khalu*. (<sup>2</sup>) W. B. O. *-jate*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. *'rabh*-. (<sup>4</sup>) O. *-tyâ*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## CHAPTER XI.

CONTENTS: 1, initial *a* elided after *e* or *o*; 2-18, exceptions, cases of retention of initial *a* after *e* or *o*; 19, dissident view as to the nature of the elision.

लुप्यते त्वकार एकारैकारपूर्वः ॥ १ ॥

1. But *a* is elided when preceded by *e* or *o*.

The subject of the omission or retention of initial *a* after final *e* or *o*, and of the accent thence arising, occupies the whole of this chapter and of the one next following, the cases of retention being mostly rehearsed in this. No attempt is made, here any more than in the treatment of other similar matters in the work, to effect a real classification—much less, an explanation—of the facts dealt with. Nor have I, on the other hand, drawn up such a classification, as I did for the Atharva-Veda (see Atharva-Prâtiçâkhyâ, under rule iii.54). Doubtless, if drawn up, it would show nearly the same state of things to prevail in the Tâittirîya as in the Atharvan text: namely, that the elision is the greatly prevailing, almost exclusive, usage in the prose passages; while, in the metrical passages, the *a* is more usually retained where the metre requires its retention, and omitted where the metre requires its omission—although with numerous exceptions, of which the most regular is that the *a* is dropped in writing at the beginning of a *pâda*, where, of course, it was always retained in metrical utterance. The general subject of the relation of the written and spoken texts to one another in regard to this special point is well worth an elaborate investigation, founded on all the Vedic texts.

For the word “but” (*tu*) in the rule is given an alternative explanation. Some, the commentator says, regard it as suspending the force of the exceptional rule x.24; others, as marking the discontinuance of the general direction “followed by a vowel,” which has been in action since ix.10. As in other like cases heretofore, we have no good reason for applying it to any particular rule or phrase; it merely marks an abrupt transition to a new subject, somewhat exceptional in its relations to the principles already laid down. The subject was, however, anticipated and provided for in rule ix.13.

1. *ekârapûrva'okârapûrvo vâ 'kâro<sup>1</sup> lupyate. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: te . . . .<sup>3</sup> so . . . .<sup>3</sup> tuçabdo na plutapragrahâv (x.24) iti nishedhasambandhavidhim<sup>4</sup> nivartayatî 'ti kecit: svaraparâdhikâram nivârayatî<sup>5</sup> 'ty apare saṅgirante. <sup>6</sup>ekâraç câu 'kâraç câi 'kârâukârâu:<sup>6</sup> ekârâukârâu pûrvâu<sup>7</sup> yasmât<sup>8</sup> sa tathoktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> all the MSS. *akâro*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-bandhî*; O. *-bandham*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *nivartayatî*. <sup>(6)</sup> in W. only. <sup>7</sup> B. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *yasya*.



To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted: namely *te 'bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.) and *so 'bravît* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

In the other Prâtiçâkhyas, the apparent loss of initial *a* after *e* or *o* is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two. See Ath. Pr. iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested.

All the MSS. excepting B. read in the rule *ekâraokârapârvaḥ*; and, where the rule is quoted (i.61 and ix.13), we have six cases of this reading against three of *ekârâuk-*. But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p. 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of *sandhi*.

## अथालोपः ॥ २ ॥

2. Now follow cases of non-elision.

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial *a* is retained. First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional; then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of.

धातारतिरुपवाजपेयजुष्ट्येनायोव्यध्रुवन्नितिरियमेव-  
सायाग्निर्मूर्धारुद्रप्रथमोपोत्तमविकर्षविहव्यहिरण्यवर्णी-  
ययाज्यामहापृथ्ये ॥ ३ ॥

3. The *a* is not elided in the following sections: those beginning with *dhâtâ râtiḥ* and *upa*; those styled *vâjapeya*; those beginning with *jush'a* and *çyenâya*; those styled *ukhya*; those beginning with *dhruvakshitiḥ*, *iyam eva sâ yâ*, and *agnir mûrdhâ*; the first and the next to the last of the *rudra* chapter; and those styled *vikarsha*, *vihavya*, *hiraṇyavarṇîya*, *yâjyâ*, and *mahâpr-shthya*.

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or *anuvâkas*, in which *a* is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter). Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4.44; 5.5: iii.1.10; 2.8: iv.3.4,11; 4.4. The *vâjapeya* sections are six, namely i.7.7-12. The *ukhya* sections (as pointed out above, under ix.20) are twenty, namely iv.1.1-10; 2.1-10. The *rudra* chapter is iv.5, containing eleven sections;

2. <sup>1</sup>*athe 'ty ayam adhikârah:*<sup>1</sup> *alopa ucyata ity etad adhikrtam veditavyam ita uttarani yad vakshyâmah.* <sup>2</sup>*na lopo 'lopaḥ:*<sup>2</sup> *lopâbhâva ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. <sup>2</sup>) all MSS. *na lopaḥ alopah.*



those here referred to, then, are iv.5.1,10. The name *vikarsha* belongs to five sections, namely iv.6.1-5. Three sections, iv.7.12-14, are styled *vihavya*. The *hiranyavarṇīya* section (as shown under ix.20) is v.6.1. The *yājyās* have been repeatedly the subjects of prescription in earlier chapters (iii.9,11; ix.30); they are twenty-three sections, namely i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.46; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22: ii.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11,12: iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11: iv.1.11; 2.11; 3.13. The *mahāprshthya* sections, finally, are the first six of those which (as seen under ix.20) bear the name *prshthya*; they are iv.4.12; 6.6-9; 7.15.

Section i.4.44 is quoted by its two first words, instead of by *dhātā* only, according to the commentator, because of the occurrence in another *çākhā* of a section beginning *dhātā devebhyo 'surān* (G. M. omit *asurān*). Again, iv.3.4 is quoted by *dhruva-kshitiḥ*, instead of by *dhruva* (the first *pada* of *dhruva-kshitiḥ*, i.48), because *dhruva* (by i.22) would include *dhruvaḥ*, and there is another section beginning with this word, and containing cases of elision, *dhruvo 'si dhruvo 'hañ sajāteshu bhūyāsam* (ii.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words), which would otherwise be violations of the rule. Yet again, to quote iv.3.11 by *iyam* simply would not answer, because i.2.4 begins with *iyam te çukra tanūr*, and contains a case of elision, *sagarbhyo 'nu sakhā sayūthyah* (i.2.4<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the last word; G. M. omit the example). But why quote by so long a phrase as *iyam eva sā yā*, of which the last two words are unnecessary? To this objection there is an alternative answer: some say that it is for the benefit of the dull-minded; others, that it is intended to include a verse which, though occurring in another place (at i.4.33), is a remainder to this, and which contains the case of non-elision *o te yanti ye aparīshu paçyān* (i.4.33; G. M. O. omit *paçyān*). Now it is true that the single verse constituting i.4.33 is of kindred subject with iv.3.11, and in the Rig-Veda forms part of the same hymn (i.113) with parts of the latter; and it is also true that the combination *ye aparīshu* is not otherwise authorized by the Prātiçākhyā; but it is, of course, little less than absurd to assert that an excessive

---

3. <sup>1</sup>*dhātārātir ity*<sup>1</sup> *ādishv anuvākeshv ekārapūrva okārapūrvo vā 'kāro na lupyate.* <sup>2</sup>*dhātā rātir* (i.4.44) *ity atra yathā:*<sup>2</sup> *nidh-....: rātir iti kim: dhātā devebhyo 'surān iti çākhāntare.* <sup>3</sup>*upaprayanto adhvaram* (i.5.5) *ity atra yathā:*<sup>3</sup> *āre-.... deva savitaḥ pra suva* (i.7.7) *ity 'ādi shadānuvākānām*<sup>4</sup> *vājapeyasamjñā:* <sup>5</sup>*atra yathā:*<sup>5</sup> *te no-....: te agre-.... jushṭo vāca* (iii.1.10) <sup>6</sup>*ity atra yathā:*<sup>6</sup> *yas-....: 'yo-....*<sup>7</sup> *çyenāya* <sup>8</sup>*patvane* (iii.2.8) *ity atra yathā:*<sup>8</sup> *namaḥ-....: viçve-.... ukhye yathā:*<sup>9</sup> *çṛṇv-....: namo-.... dhruvakshitiḥ* (iv.3.4) <sup>10</sup>*ity atra yathā:*<sup>10</sup> *viçve-....: ūrmir-....: 'kshitiḥ* *iti kim: dhruve 'ty* <sup>12</sup>*akārāntasya yadi*<sup>12</sup> *grahaṇam syāt*<sup>11</sup>: *dhruvo-.... ity atra bhaved*<sup>13</sup> *iti.*<sup>14</sup> *iyam eva sā yā* (iv.3.11) <sup>15</sup>*ity atra:*<sup>15</sup>





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



first example here is not well chosen, since the *e* of *kr̥nvāne* is *pragraha*, and *pragrahas* are not contemplated in the general rules for elision: see xii.8 and note. From the *agnir mūrdhā*-section, *sa yojate arushah* (iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>) and *enā vo agnim namasā* (iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *namasā*); there are three other cases, and one exception. From the specified sections of the *rudra* chapter are taken *namo astu nīlagrīvāya* (iv.5.1<sup>3</sup>), *drāpe andhasas pate* (iv.5.10<sup>1</sup>), and *uta mā no arbhakam* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>); they afford fourteen cases, and five exceptions. From the *vikarsha* sections, *anyam te asmat tapantu* (iv.6.1<sup>3,5</sup>: only W. has *tapantu*) and *pāvako asmabhyam* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup> etc.); there are thirty-three cases, and ten exceptions. From the *vihavya* sections, *viçve adya marutah* (iv.7.12<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *marutah*) and *viçve devāso adhi vocatā me* (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *viçve*); ten cases and five exceptions. The *hiranyavarṇīya* section affords three cases only, of which one is cited, *eko devo apy atishthat* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>). The *yājyā* sections afford a hundred and twenty-nine cases, with thirty-eight exceptions; the selected examples are *supathā rāye asmān* (i.1.14<sup>3</sup>; repeated at i.4.43<sup>1</sup>) and *kāmena kr̥to abhy ānat* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. end with *abhi*). From the *mahāpr̥sh̥thyas*, finally, come *vivasvad vāte abhi nah* (iv.4.12<sup>4</sup>) and *somo adhi bravītu* (iv.6.6<sup>4</sup>: O. adds *no dim*, doubtless for *no 'ditih*, which follows in the text); they contain thirty-eight cases and nine exceptions.

This rule, accordingly, disposes at one stroke of three hundred and fifty-one cases of the retention of *a*; but it is at the cost of creating a formidable body of exceptions, a hundred and thirty-one in number, which have to be provided for by the counter-rules of the next chapter—while, once more, a considerable number of the cases falling under the rule have to be individually specified, partly in that chapter and partly in the two following rules of this, as exceptions under the counter rules. It is a complicated process, but it successfully attains at last its purpose.

*yasya vihavyasamjñā: tatra*<sup>28</sup> *viçve*----: *viçve*----. *hiraṇyavarṇīye*<sup>29</sup> *yathā*<sup>30</sup>: *eko*----. *yājyāsu yathā*<sup>31</sup>: *supathā*----: *kāmena*----. *samid diçām* (iv.4.12) *jīmūtasya* (iv.6.6) *yad akrando* (iv.6.7) *mā no mitro* (iv.6.8) *ye vājinam* (iv.6.9) *agner manve* (iv.7.15) *iti*<sup>32</sup> *shaṇṇām eshām*<sup>33</sup> *anuvākānām mahāpr̥sh̥thiyasamjñā: tatra*<sup>34</sup> *vivasvad*----: *somo*----: *mahe 'ti kim: pṛthivī*----

(1) W. B. -*rāti 'ty*. (2) G. M. *krameno 'dāharaṇāni*. (3) G. M. *upa* only. (4) G. M. *ādinām shaṇṇām an-*. (5) G. M. *tatra*. (6) G. M. om. (7) in O. only. (8) G. M. om.; W. omit *yathā*. (9) G. M. om. (10) G. M. om. (11) G. M. *ksh̥tigrāhaṇam*; O. adds *tadā* after *syāt*. (12) O. *etāvanmātrasya*. (13) G. M. *mā bhūd*; O. *api bhavet*. (14) O. om. (15) G. M. om.; O. adds *yathā*. (16) G. M. *ukte*; B. adds *kim anyāih*; O. *etāvatā 'lam kim ebhi*. (17) G. M. *atrā 'pī 'ty adhikopādānam*. (18) W. O. *yā ṛg*; G. M. *yā ṛk*; B. *yām ṛg*. (19) W. B. *svīkaroti*; O. adds *yathā*. (20) G. M. om. (21) G. M. *mā bhūd iti*. (22) G. M. om. (23) W. *pūrvah*. (24) G. M. *iti praçnasya āditah pañcānuvākānām*; O. *ādi* for *atra*. (25) O. *tatra yathā*. (26) G. M. om. (27) G. M. O. om. *atra*. (28) G. M. om.; O. *yathā*. (29) G. M. -*rñāh*. (30) G. M. om. (31) G. M. om. (32) B. om. (33) G. M. put before *shaṇṇām*, (34) O. ins. *yathā*.



अ॒हसो॑हतिरनि॒ष्टतो॑ऽवत्वस्मानवद्याद॒हनि च ॥४॥

4. Also in *añhasaḥ*, *añhatiḥ*, *anishṭṛtaḥ*, *avantv asmân*, *avadyât*, and *ahani*.

The cases of non-elision referred to are as follows: for *añhasaḥ*, *pramuñcanto no añhasaḥ* (iv.3.13<sup>5</sup>); for *añhatiḥ*, *pari dveshaṣo añhatiḥ* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>); for *anishṭṛtaḥ*, *vardhatâm te anishṭṛtaḥ* (iv.1.7<sup>2</sup>); for *avantv asmân*, *te avantv asmân* (ii.6.12<sup>3</sup>), with a counter-example, *te no 'vantu pitaro haveshu* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *haveshu*), to prove the necessity of giving *asmân* along with *avantv* in the rule; for *avadyât*, *mitramaho avadyât* (i.2.14<sup>6</sup>); and for *ahani*, *çuciḥ çukre ahany ojasînâ* (iv.4.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. stop at *ahani*). All of them occur in passages which are the subject of the preceding rule, and the commentator points out that the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages, and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the text, the rule does not apply; citing as example *sa evâi 'nam pâpmano 'ñhaso muñcati* (ii.2.7<sup>4</sup>: all but G. M. stop at *añhasaḥ*). At first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of part of the cases involved in the preceding one; in fact, however, its value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii.4, which teaches that even in the sections above specified, an *a* before a *y*, *v*, *n*, or *h*, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided. The only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connection in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the least, quite peculiar.

अनु घर्मासत्रापामर्तारथस्वोदत्तेवातःपूर्वः ॥५॥

5. Also in *anu*, when preceded by *gharmâsaḥ*, *âpaḥ*, *martah*, *rathah*, *tvah*, *datte*, and *vâtaḥ*.

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the preceding, as pointing out cases in which the *a* of *anu* is retained according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibition of rule xii.4; but in part it is of a more general character, since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3.

4. <sup>1</sup> *cakâro dhâtârâtir* (xi.3) *ityâdivishayânvâdeçakah*<sup>2</sup>: *añhasaḥ*----- *ity eteshu grahaṇeshu dhâtârâtirityâdisthaleshv*<sup>3</sup> *ekârapûrvo vâu*<sup>4</sup> *'kârapûrvo vâ*<sup>5</sup>-----*kâro na lupyate. yathâ*<sup>6</sup>: *pram*-----: *pari*-----: *vardh*-----: *te*-----: *asmân iti kim*: *te no*-----: *mitr*-----: *çuciḥ*----- *yavanahaparativâd*<sup>7</sup> (xii.4) *eshu prâpyamâṇalopeshv*<sup>8</sup> *alopo 'yam*<sup>9</sup> *vihitaḥ. anvâdeçah kimarthah*: *sa*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *eteshu grahaṇeshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-disthalavish-*. <sup>3</sup> B. adds *antarvartishu*; G. M. *-lâpattishu*; O. *-lavartishu satsu*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. *vâ*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. *-ratv*; G. M. *-hasvarapar-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ins. *satsu*. <sup>9</sup> W. om.; B. *na*.



The commentator explains the phraseology used as signifying that the words rehearsed, having their final *visarga* [with the preceding *a*] converted to *o* [of course, excepting *datte*], have the office of preceding causes—that is, of producing an effect upon the word that follows them; but he gives no hint of the partial suspension of the implication made in the preceding rule; intimating rather, that the cases rehearsed are all of them exceptions under rule xii.4. He quotes the passages, as follows: *trayo gharmāso anu* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>), *tasmād āpo anu sthanu* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>), *yadā te marto anu* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>), *anu tvā ratho anu* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>), *pīyati tvo anu tvah* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), *çukram ā datte anuhāya jāryāi* (iii.2.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit *jāryāi*), and *dhanus tad vāto anu vātu te* (v.5.7<sup>3,4</sup>: O. ends with *anu*). To show that other words than *anu* are not relieved from the action of xii.4, he gives us *amushmiñ loke vāto 'bhi pavate* (v.4.9<sup>4</sup>: all but G. M. begin at *vāto*); and further, to show that *anu* retains its *a* only after these words, *anu gāvo 'nu bhagaḥ kanīnām* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. O. have the last word).

I have noted ten cases in which the *a* of *anu* is elided under the operation of rule xii.4.

## अभिवात्वपश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also (after *vātaḥ*) in *abhi vātu* and *apah*.

The *ca*, 'also,' here brings down as *pūrvanimitta* simply *vātaḥ*, the word last specified in the preceding rule. The cases have nothing to do with xi.3: they are *mayobhār vāto abhi vātū 'srāḥ* (vii.4.17<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, and they alone have the last), and *yad vāto apo agamat* (vii.4.20: O. omits *agamat*); and, as counter-examples, the commentator quotes *vāto 'bhi* (v.4.9<sup>4</sup>) to show the necessity of giving *vātu* after *abhi* in the rule, and *avarundhe 'po 'gre 'bhivyāharati* (vi.4.3<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words) to attest the implication conveyed by the *ca*.

## अन्वगमच्च ॥ ७ ॥

5. *atra visargāntānām otvam āpannānām pūrvanimittatvam<sup>1</sup> iti<sup>2</sup> vijñeyam: gharmāsaḥ----- ity evampūrva anv ity atrā 'kāro na lupyate. yathā: trayo<sup>3</sup>-----: tasmād-----: yadā-----: anu-----: pīyati-----: çukram-----: dhanus<sup>3</sup>----- anv iti kim: amushmiñ-----: evampūrva iti kim: anu----- yavana-haparatvanishedhārtho<sup>4</sup> 'yam ārambhaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. G. M. -mittam. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> a lacuna in B. <sup>4</sup> G. M. yavanahasvarapa-; O. -shedhanisheçārtho.

6. *cakāro vāta ity anvādiçati: abhi vātu: apah: ity etayor akāro vātaḥpūrvo na<sup>1</sup> lupyate. mayo----- vātū iti kim: vāto -----<sup>2</sup>yad-----<sup>2</sup> anvādeçena kim: ava-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *khalu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. put before *vātū* etc.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



after the words specified that *asmān*, even before *a*, remains unmutilated.

The other case, that of preceding *rāye*, makes more difficulty, since the *saṁhitā* contains no passage in which *asmān*, when itself followed by *a*, has *rāye* before it. The commentator first declares the passage had in view to belong to another text (*ṣākhā*); but adds, as an alternative explanation, that the precept relates to the *jaṭā*-text, where we read *rāye asmān usmān rāye rāye asmān* (i.1.14<sup>3</sup>; 4.43<sup>1</sup>). He proceeds further to say that, in case any one objects that in the *saṁhitā* form of the passage the example does not hold good, since *asmān* is not there followed by *a* (it reads *rāye asmān viṣvāni*), he shall reply that the case is one falling under i.61. It is there taught, namely, that a passage of three words or more, if repeated in the text, reads as it read on its first occurrence: now the one in question first appears in i.1.14, which is a *yājyā* section, and hence the *a* of *asmān* is retained by xi.3; at i.4.43, then, its retention is assured. But then there ought to be no necessity for specially establishing its retention in *jaṭā*, any more than in any other case where an *a* is retained in *saṁhitā*. This difficulty the commentator evidently perceives, although he does not state it; for otherwise the *jaṭā* explanation would have satisfied him, and he would never have thought of suggesting another *ṣākhā*. The difficulty really remains unsolved, and a serious one: either there was a blunder on the part of the makers of the treatise, or a passage not contained in the present *Sanhitā* was contemplated by them: I incline to think the former more likely.

## तेपूर्वा ऽद्यान्धोऽञ्चुर्ये ॥ १० ॥

10. Also in *adya*, *andhaḥ*, *añcuḥ*, and *agne*, when *te* precedes.

The commentator quotes the passages, as follows: *paçum paçupate te adya* (iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: W. O. omit *paçum*), *upo te andhaḥ* (i.4.4 and iii.4.2<sup>1</sup>), *añcunā te añcuḥ* (i.2.6: B. omits the example), and *yate agne tejas tena* (iii.5.3<sup>2</sup>: only B. has *tena*). Counter-examples are, first, to show that only these words keep their *a* after *te*, *te gnaye pravate* (ii.4.1<sup>2</sup>: B. has a corrupted reading, *te enam*, and W. a *lacuna* to the end of the comment, putting in place of it an example from under the next rule, *tena tvā " dadhe gne aṅgiraḥ*),

१. *cakārákr̥shṭe 'smāngraḥaṇe 'kārapare sati' vartamāno' 'kāro rāye sa indra ity' evampūrvvo na lupyate. rāyepūrvvasyo 'dāharaṇam ṣākhāntare: 'atha vā' jaṭāyām bhavati: rāye-... yathā-saṁhitāyām' no 'dāharaṇam akāraparatvābhāvāt' tarhi' katham alopa' iti kecit': tripadaprabhṛtipunaruktatvād iti brūmaḥ. mā-...: indro-... akārapara iti kim: so-... evampūrva iti kim: sm o-... akārah paro yasmāt<sup>10</sup> tad akāraparam<sup>10</sup>: tasmin.*

<sup>1</sup> in W. only. <sup>2</sup> G. M. put before 'kārapare. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. ins. *tu*. <sup>6</sup> W. O. *-patvābh-*; G. M. *-parābh-*. <sup>7</sup> O. *tathā*; G. M. add *tadā*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *lopa*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. *cet*. <sup>(10)</sup> W. *tad akān*; G. M. *akāraparah*.



and second, to show that these words do so only after *te*, *prathamô* 'ñçu *skandati* (iii. .8<sup>3</sup>: only B. has *skandati*).

Of *agne* after *te*, the text presents eighteen other cases: namely i.2.11<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.43<sup>2</sup>; 5.2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>; 6.6<sup>2</sup>; 7.6<sup>4</sup>: iii.4.10<sup>5</sup>; 5.3<sup>2</sup> (a second case): v.4.7<sup>5</sup>; 7.4<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>3</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup> three times: vi.2.2<sup>7</sup>; 6.1<sup>2</sup>.

## मेपूर्वश्च ॥ ११ ॥

11. In *agne*, also, when preceded by *me*.

Only *agne*, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this. The commentator quotes *yan me agne asya* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit *asya*) and *imâ me agna ishtakâh* (iv.4.11<sup>3,4</sup> and v.4.2<sup>4</sup>); and there is another case in iv.4.11<sup>4</sup>. He adds, as usual, a number of counter-examples, of obvious intent: they are *tena tvâ* " *dadhe* 'gne *añgiraḥ* (i.2.12<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *añgiraḥ*), *prânaç ca me* 'pânaḥ (iv.7.1<sup>1</sup>), and *tad açakam tan me* 'râdhi (i.6.6<sup>3</sup>).

## अस्याश्चिनापरा च ॥ १२ ॥

12. As also, in *asya*, *açvinâ*, and *aparâ*.

That is to say, when these words follow *me*. The passages are *vīyantu devâ havisho me asya* (i.5.10<sup>3</sup>: O. begins at *devâ*), *punar me açvinâ yuvâm cakshuh* (iii.2.5<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last word, O. the last two), and *yad vâ me aparâgatam* (vi.6.7<sup>2</sup>).

## नःपूर्वो ऽसद्गिरघान्तमोऽभ्यस्मिन्नद्यपथि ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also in *asat*, *agniḥ*, *agha*, *antamaḥ*, *abhi*, *asmin*, and *adya pathi*, when preceded by *naḥ*.

The examples are *supârâ no asad vacē* (i.2.3<sup>1</sup> and vi.1.4<sup>4</sup>), *ayam no agnir varivaḥ* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup> and i.4.46<sup>3</sup>; there is another case of *no agniḥ* at v.7.9<sup>1</sup>), *rakshâ mâkir no aghaçañsa içata* (i.4.24 and

10. *adya*----- *eteshv*<sup>1</sup> *akâras ta ity evampûrvo na lupyate. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *paçum*----: *upo*----: <sup>3</sup>*añçunâ*----: <sup>3</sup>*yat*----. *eteshv iti kim*: <sup>4</sup>*te*----: *tepûrva iti kim*: *prathamô*-----<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> in W. only. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>(4)</sup> W. om., and ins *tena tvâ* etc.

11. <sup>1</sup>*cakâro* 'gna *ity anvâdiçati*: *mepûrvo* 'gna *ity atrâ* 'kâro<sup>1</sup> *na lupyate. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *yan*----: *imâ*----. *mepûrva iti kim*: *tena*----: *anvâdeçena*<sup>3</sup> *kim*: <sup>4</sup>*prânaç*----: <sup>4</sup>*tad*-----

<sup>(1)</sup> B. *cakârâkṛṣhte sati agna ity asminn akâro ma ity evampûrvo*; G. M. the same, omitting *sati*; O. the same, omitting *sati* and the second *iti*. <sup>2</sup> in W. only. <sup>3</sup> O. *-ça iti*. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om.

12. *mepûrva iti cakâro* 'nvâdiçati: *asya*----- <sup>1</sup>*eteshv*<sup>2</sup> *akâro mepûrvo na lupyate. vi*----: *punar*----: *yad*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> O. *eshv*.



iv.6.6<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit *īçata*), *agne tvam no antamaḥ* (i.5.6<sup>3</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>8</sup>), *sviṣṭim no abhi vasīyaḥ* (iii.1.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit *vasīyaḥ*), *çikshā no asmin* (vii.5.7<sup>4</sup>), and *tebhir no adya pathibhiḥ sugebhī rakshā ca naḥ* (vii.5.24: all but W. end with *pathibhiḥ*). The necessity of including *pathi* in the rule is shown by *no 'dya vasu vasatī 'ti* (ii.5.3<sup>6-7</sup>). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *tasmād aḥvād gardabho 'sattaraḥ* (v.1.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words), so *'gnir jātaḥ* (v.1.4<sup>1</sup>), *uttarato 'ghāyur abhidāsati* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit the last word), *te 'sminn āichanta* (vii.2.10<sup>1</sup>), *namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>: the example is found only in G. M.), and *te naḥ pāntu te no 'vantu* (i.2.3<sup>1</sup>; 8.7<sup>1</sup>: iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>).

## नमःपूर्वा ऽग्नेऽग्नेभ्योऽग्रियाय ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also in *agre*, *aḥvebhyaḥ*, and *agriyāya*, when preceded by *namaḥ*.

The passages are *namo agrevadhāya ca* (iv.5.8<sup>1</sup>), *namo aḥvebhyo 'ḥvapatribhyaḥ* (iv.5.3<sup>2</sup>: B. omits the last word; the whole example is wanting in W.), and *namo agriyāya ca* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>). Counter-examples are *apo 'gre 'bhivyāharati* (vi.4.3<sup>2</sup>) and *namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>).

## आविन्नःसोमःपूर्वा ऽग्निपरः ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also when *āvinnah* or *somah* precedes and *agni* follows.

It may be made a question whether the rule should not read *gniparah* (without sign of omission), and mean 'also an *a* preceded by *āvinnah* or *somah* and followed by *gni*.' But the authority of the comment (see below) is decidedly, though not unequivocally, in favor of what I have given, and the construction, though a peculiar one, has its analogies elsewhere in the treatise (compare x.4 etc.). The further difficulty remains, however, that the only passages in the text to which the rule can apply read *agnih*, in the nominative singular, after the two words specified, so that there appears to be no reason why we should not have simply '*gnih*', instead of '*gniparah*'. This the commentator does not fail to perceive,

---

13. *asat*----- *eteshv akāro na ity evampūro na lupyate.*  
*yathā*<sup>1</sup>: *supārā*----: *ayam*----: *rakshā*----: *agne*----: *svi-*  
*shṭim*----: *çikshā*----: *tebhir*----. *pathā 'ti kim: no*----  
*naḥpūrva iti kim: tasmād*----: *so*----: *uttarato*----: *te*----  
*eteshv iti kim: <sup>2</sup>namo*----:<sup>2</sup> *te*----

<sup>1</sup> in W. only. <sup>(2)</sup> in G. M. only.

14. <sup>1</sup>*agre*-----<sup>1</sup> *eteshv akāro namaḥpūro na lupyate. namo*  
 ----: <sup>2</sup>*namo aḥv*----:<sup>2</sup> *namo agri*----. *namaḥpūrva iti*  
*kim: apo*----: *eteshv iti kim: namo 'gn*-----

(1) O. om. (2) W. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



'ntam) to show the need of *vân*; *itah prathamam jajñe agnih* (ii.2.4<sup>8</sup>: only G. M. have *itah*; without it, also i.3.14<sup>5</sup>): see what is said of this passage, and of the rule as fixing its reading, under i.61; *sañsphāno abhi rakshatu* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), as counter-example to which, to show that *sphānah* in the rule would not have been enough, is given *gayasphāno 'gnishu* "from another *çákhá*," but the genuineness of the reason is open to doubt; *yuvayor yo asti* (iii.5.4<sup>1</sup>) with *yo 'psu bhasma praveçayati* (v.2.2<sup>5</sup>: only O. has the last word) to prove the need of *yuvayoh*; *nākasya pr̥sthe adhi rocane divah* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. O. omit *divah*; another nearly identical case at iii.5.4<sup>1</sup>); *yajñapatir vo atra* (v.7.7<sup>1</sup>), with *na vo 'bhágāni havyam* (v.1.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *havyam*) as counter-example; *goārgham eva somam karoti* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *-mam karoti*; *goargha* occurs twice more in this section, and at v.2.9<sup>4</sup> we have *goaçva* twice), to which, by rule i.52, *agoargham* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup> three times) is to be added as further example; *uchushmo agne yajamānāyai 'dhi* (i.6.2<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *edhi*, and O. omits also the preceding word; there is a second case, of *niçushmah*, in the same division); *agrepuvo agreguvah* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>); *samidddho añjan* (v.1.11<sup>1</sup>: and we have *samidddho agne* at i.6.6<sup>2</sup>; 7.6<sup>4</sup>: ii.5.8<sup>6</sup>), without any counter-example to show that *iddhah* would not have been enough to answer the needs of the rule; *dyām r̥shabho antariksham* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>: O omits *dyām*, and G. M. have, like the Calcutta edition, the false reading *yām*); *priyam pātho apī 'hi* (iii.3.3<sup>3</sup> three times); *ugram vaco apā 'vadhīm* (i.2.11<sup>2</sup>: another nearly identical case in the same division); *varshishte adhi náke* (i.1.8 and i.4.43<sup>2</sup>); *jushāno aptur ājyasya vetu* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup> and vi.3.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *vetu*); *yo rudro agnāu yah* (v.5.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), and, as counter-example, *yad upatr̥ñhyād rudro 'sya* (vi.3.9<sup>3</sup>: but O. reads *açñīyād* for *upatr̥ñhyād*, which makes the reference to i.6.7<sup>4</sup>); and, finally, *vṛshno açvasya saindānam asi* (ii.4.7<sup>2</sup>, 9<sup>4</sup>: O. stops at *açvasya*, which would make the reference include also vii.4.18<sup>2</sup> twice; and there are further cases of retention after *vṛshnah* at i.4.2 and vi.4.5<sup>3</sup>).

16. *dhīrásah*----- *evampūrvo na*<sup>1</sup> *khalv*<sup>2</sup> *akāro lupyate*.  
*yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *tām*-----: *adab*-----: *ekād*-----: *r̥shīṇām*-----: *r̥shī-*  
*ṇām iti kim*: *yaçya*-----: *yathā*-----: *ash*-----: *tvat*-----:  
*pr̥thivī*-----: *pr̥thivī 'ti kim*: *te*----- <sup>4</sup>*ity atra jatādyām*<sup>4</sup>: *adhya*-  
-----: *āsata iti kim*: *ye*-----: *mayi*-----: *gr̥hṇāmī 'ti kim*: *ash-*  
-----: *idāvāñ*-----: *vân iti kim*: *çukra*-----: *itah*-----: *sañs-*  
-----: *sam iti kim*: *gayasphāno 'gnishu iti çákhāntare*: *yuvayor*  
-----: *yuvayor iti kim*: *yo*-----: *nākasya*-----: *yajña*-----:  
*patir iti kim*: *na*-----: *go*-----: *apy akārādi* (i.52) *vacanād*<sup>5</sup>  
*agoargham* <sup>6</sup>*iti co 'dāharaṇam*<sup>6</sup>: *uchushmo*-----: *agrepuvo*  
-----: *samidddho*-----: *dyām*-----: *priyam*-----: *ugram*-----:  
*varsh*-----: *jushāno*-----: *yo*-----: *ya iti kim*: *yad*-----:  
*vṛshno*-----.

<sup>1</sup> O. puts next before *lupyate*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *iti prāptih*. <sup>6</sup> O. om.



अरतिमस्ययज्ञस्यातिद्रुतोऽतियन्त्यनृणोऽविष्यन्नमीवो-  
 ऽन्नेष्वर्चिरज्जीतानज्यानिमह्नियात्रम्बाल्यर्वन्तमस्त्वकृणोद्-  
 झिरोऽप्सुयोऽस्क्रभायदच्युतोऽश्वसनिरस्यभिरशिश्नेदङ्गे-  
 ऽघ्निय ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also in *aratim*, *asya yajñasya*, *atidrutaḥ*, *ati yanti*, *anṛṇaḥ*, *avishyan*, *anamîvaḥ*, *anneshu*, *arcih*, *ajîtân*, *ajyânim*, *ahniyâḥ*, *ambâli*, *arvantam*, *astu*, *akṛṇot*, *aṅgiraḥ*, *apsu yaḥ*, *askabhâyat*, *acyutaḥ*, *açvasaniḥ*, *asthabhiḥ*, *açicret*, *aṅge*, and *aghniya*.

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one *pada* in any case: *mûrdhânâṃ divo aratim pṛthivyâḥ* (i.4.13 and vi.5.2<sup>1</sup>: O. begins at *divaḥ*, and it alone has *pṛthivyâḥ*); *yan me agne asya yajñasya* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>), with the counter-example *ete 'syâ 'mushmin* (vi.1.10<sup>5</sup>); *pratyañk somo atidrutaḥ* (i.8.21: all the MSS. here insert the *k* before *somo*, as required by v.32, and G. M. even convert it to *kh*, according to xiv.12); *paçyanto ati yanti* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, *nai 'nañ somo 'ti pavate* (vi.5.11<sup>4</sup>: O. begins at *somo*); *tad agne anṛṇo bhavâmi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *bhavâmi*); *na yavase avishyan* (iv.4.3<sup>3</sup>); *svâveço anamîvo bhavâ naḥ* (iii.4.10<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit *bhavâ naḥ*); *ye anneshu vividhyanti* (iv.5.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word); *jâtavedo yo arcih* (v.7.8<sup>1</sup>); *çarado ajîtân* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>); *teshâm yo ajyânim* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>); *tiroahniyâ mâ suhutâḥ* (vii.3.13: O. omits *suhutâḥ*); *ambe ambâli* (vii.4.19<sup>1,2</sup> twice, <sup>3</sup> twice); *yo arvantam jighâñsati* (vii.4.15: O. omits the last word); *bahis te astu bâl iti* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup>: O. stops at *astu*; the text furnishes eleven other cases of *astu* with *a* retained, at i.2.3<sup>3</sup>; 4.45<sup>1</sup>; 8.14<sup>2</sup>: iii.1.1<sup>4</sup>; 2.5<sup>7</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>: v.5.9<sup>3</sup> twice; 7.2<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>3,4</sup>); *ita indro*

17. *aratim* .....<sup>1</sup> *eteshv akâro* <sup>2</sup>*na khalv*<sup>3</sup> *ekârapûrva okârapûrvo vâ lupyate. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *mûrdh-* .....: *yan* .....: *yajñasye 'ti kim: ete* .....: *pratyañ-* .....: *paçy-* .....: *drutoyantî 'ty âbhyâm*<sup>4</sup> *kim: nai* .....: *tad* .....: *na* .....: *svâv-* .....: *ye* .....: *jâtavedo* .....: *çarado* .....: *teshâm* .....: *tiro-* .....: *ambe* .....: *yo* .....: *bahis* .....: *ita* .....: *agne* .....: *yo* .....: *ya iti kim: açvo* .....: *yo* .....: *madâya* .....: *yo* .....: *sanir iti kim: açvebhyo* .....: *indro* .....: *bhir*<sup>5</sup> *iti kim: çam* ..... *ity atra' jâdyâm*<sup>6</sup>: *asthabhyo* .....: *varuṇo* .....: *aṅge* .....: *aghniye 'ty akâragṛhitaḥ padâikadeço bahûpâdânârthaḥ: etâni* .....: *yad* .....: *payo* .....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. the enumeration, and ins. *iti*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om. *khalu*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *tâbhyâm*; G. M. *etâbhyâm*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. *asthabhir*. <sup>(6)</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> B. om.



*akṛnot* (i.1.12); *agne aṅgiro yo 'syām* (i.2.12<sup>1</sup>: there is another case in the same division, and one at vi.2.7<sup>3</sup>); *yo apsu ya oshadhīshu* (v.5.9<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *açvo 'psujo vētasah* (v.3.12<sup>2</sup>: but O. gives instead *yo 'psu bhasma*, v.2.2<sup>5</sup>); *yo askabhāyaduttaram* (i.2.13<sup>3</sup>: G. M. O. omit *uttaram*); *madāya raso acyutaḥ* (i.2.6); *yo bhaksho açvasaniḥ* (iii.2.5<sup>7</sup>), and, as counter-example, *açvebhyo 'çvapatibhyaç ca* (iv.5.3<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *ca*); *indro dadhīco asthabhir iti* (v.6.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *iti*), and a counter-example from the *jatā*-text of the passage *çam asthabhyo majjabhyah* (v.2.12<sup>2</sup>: O. omits), namely *asthabhyo majjabhyo majjabhyo 'sthabhyo 'sthabhyo majjabhyah* (G. M. give simply *majjabhyo 'sthabhyah*); *varuno açiçret* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>); *aṅge-aṅge ni dedhyat* (i.3.10<sup>1</sup> and vi.3.11<sup>2</sup>: it would have been better to include in the example the preceding word *prāno*, to show that the first *aṅge*, as well as the second, furnishes an example under the rule; there is another like pair of cases, after *apāno*, in i.3.10<sup>1</sup>); and finally, it is explained that the quotation of *aghniya* with final *a* makes it (by i.22) a part of a word, intended to include a variety of cases, and three such cases (being all that the text contains) are quoted: namely *etāni te aghniye nāmāni* (vii.1.6<sup>8</sup>), *yad āpo aghniyā varune 'ti çapāmahe* (i.3.11: B. omits the last word; G. M. O. the last three), and *payo aghniyāsu hr̥tsu* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *hr̥tsu*, which would make the citation include also vi.1.11<sup>3</sup>). This exposition seems to prove that the proper reading at the end of the rule is *aghniya*, and I have ventured to adopt it, though all the MSS. (except T., which is ambiguous, running rules 17 and 18 together in *sandhi*) give *aghniyā*. *Aghniyā* would answer as including *aghniyāsu*, but it would not include also *aghniye*.

## अध्वर स्वरपरे ॥ १८ ॥

18. Also in *adhvara*, when a vowel follows [the *r*].

The examples given in illustration of the rule are *satyadharmāno adhware* (i.2.1<sup>2</sup>), *havishmān devo adhvarah* (i.3.12), and *upaprayanto adhvaram ity āha* (i.5.7<sup>1</sup>). In regard to the last of them, it is remarked that rule i.61 is not of force for it, since the conditions imposed by that rule do not arise in it. The rule, namely, directs that a passage of three words or more, being repeated in the text, is to be read as where it first occurred; now *upaprayanto adhvaram* was found at i.5.5<sup>1</sup>, where the retention of the *a* comes under rule 3 of this chapter; but here only two

---

18. *adhvara ity asmin*<sup>1</sup> *grahane svarapare*<sup>2</sup> *vartamāno 'kāro*<sup>3</sup> *na khalv*<sup>3</sup> *ekārādukārapūrho*<sup>4</sup> *lupyate. satya*-----: *havishmān*-----: *upa*-----: *atra*<sup>5</sup> *tripadaprabhṛti* (i.61) *nyāye na prasaratī*<sup>6</sup>: *tallakshanaśambhavāt. svarapara iti kim: çug*-----: *andho*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmin*. <sup>2</sup> O. ins. *sati*. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *ekārapūrva okārapūrvo vā*; G. M. adds *na*; B. adds *vā*. <sup>5</sup> M. *tatra*. <sup>6</sup> B. *sarati*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



*akâra* which in rule 1 is said to be dropped after certain "predecessors." We have had no *akâra alupta* spoken of, but only cases of *alopa* of *akâra*. And it seems to be taught here, in accordance with the doctrines of all the other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.53), that some regard the *a* as (not elided, but) so absorbed into the preceding diphthong as to become assimilated to, or identified with, the latter half of that diphthong. We may with plausibility conjecture the rule to be a later addition to the original substance of the chapter.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

CONTENTS: 1-8, elision and non-elision of initial *a* after final *e* or *o* in exceptional and special cases; 9-11, resulting accent.

अथ लोपः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for cases of elision.

This is a general heading to the chapter (that is to say, to its first eight rules); which, as the commentator points out, has for its sphere of action the passages specified in rule 3 of the preceding chapter. This is a matter of course: the general rule (by xi.1) being elision, there can be need of an additional authority for elision only where that rule is contravened by another of opposing character, and of wider application than to specific cases only.

असि ॥ २ ॥

2. The *a* of *asi* is elided.

The examples given are *suparṇo* 'si *garutmân* (iv.1.10<sup>5</sup>; 6.5<sup>3</sup>: v.1.10<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word) and *pratho* 'si *pr̥thivy asi* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>: O. stops at 'si). The elision is not infrequent in this word, usually occurring in the little prose phrases which are inserted among the verses in the sections concerned; I have noted eighteen other cases: but they are hardly worth detailed reference.

न गर्भःसंनद्धोयमोभद्रःपूर्वः ॥ ३ ॥

---

1. *athe* 'ty *ayam adhikârah*: *akârasya lopa ucyata ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah. dhâtârâtir* (xi.3) *ityâdivishayo 'yam adhyâyârambha*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etadadh*-.

2. *asî* 'ty *asminn akâro lupyata ekârâukârapârva*<sup>1</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *suparṇo* ----: *pratho* ----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-rvo vâ*. <sup>2</sup> in B. only.



3. But not when *garbhaḥ*, *saṁnaddhaḥ*, *yamaḥ*, or *bhadraḥ* precedes.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *garbho asy osha-dhînâm* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *saṁnaddho asi vîdayasva* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), *asi yamo asy âdityaḥ* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), and *tvam bhadro asi kratuḥ* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>). There is another case of *asi* after *garbhaḥ* at iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>, which is then repeated at v.1.5<sup>3</sup>, the *a* standing this time unelided by rule i.61.

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the inclusion of the double *pada sam-naddhaḥ*, instead of simply *naddhaḥ*, in the rule. Some, he says, quote as counter-example *upanaddho 'suraḥ* (iv.4.9); but its propriety is questionable, since the passage does not fall under xi.3, and moreover, there is no *asi* in it (O. has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd suggestion); and the valid counter-example is to be sought in another *çâkhâ*. We have here an unusually clear example of the arbitrary way in which the plea *çâkhântare* is resorted to, in order to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise-makers.

## यवनहृपरः स्वरपरेषु ॥ ४ ॥

4. *A* is elided before *y*, *v*, *n*, and *h*, when these are followed by a vowel.

The examples given are *hiraṇyaçrṅgo 'yo asya pâdâḥ* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *pâdâḥ*), *vanaspate 'va srijâ rarâṇaḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *rarâṇaḥ*), *vareṇyo 'nu prayâṇam* (iv.1.10<sup>4</sup>), and *jambhayanto 'him vṛkam* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *vṛkam*). These are but specimens selected from among a considerable number of cases: namely, before *y*, two; before *v*, nineteen; before *o*, fourteen (all but three of them, cases of *anu*, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of xi.5); before *h* (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi.4 show, includes also *ñh*), five; in all, forty. To show the necessity of the restriction "when these are followed by a vowel," are cited *çukram te anyat* (iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>) and *agre ahnân hitaḥ* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *hitaḥ*).

There is a well-established difference of reading here in the rule itself: T. B. G. M. have *yavanaha svaraparesu*, only W. and O. adding *para* (which I have amended to *paraḥ*) after *ha*. So also,

3. *garbhaḥ* ----- <sup>1</sup> *evampûrvaḥ sâmnidhyâl labdhe 'sî<sup>2</sup> 'ty as-min grahane<sup>3</sup> 'kâro<sup>4</sup> na<sup>5</sup> lupyate. garbho* -----: *saṁnaddho* -----: <sup>6</sup> *sam iti kim: upan* ----- *iti kecid udâharanti: tac cintyam: dhâtârâtir* (xi.3) *ityâdyantaḥpâtivâbhâvâd asiçabdâ-darçanâc<sup>7</sup> 'ca: mukhyam tu<sup>7</sup> çâkhântare vijñeyam pratyudâharaṇam<sup>6</sup>. asi* -----: *tvam* -----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> W. *tasminn asî*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *ekârapûrva okârapûrvo vâ*. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. simply *udâharaṇam çâkhântare*. <sup>7</sup> W. *câ 'mukhyam kimtu*.



where the rule is quoted under i.21, W. alone (there is no O. for that part of the work) introduces *para*; under xi.4 and 5, W. and B. alike have *yavanahaparatra* etc., but the testimony as to the rule is equivocal, since *para* might well have been added there by way of exposition instead of quotation. I have, as usual, followed W., although not without suspicion that the *para* is a gloss, introduced to help the otherwise blind and inaccurate phraseology of the rule—which latter, however, is not altogether discordant with the usage of the treatise elsewhere.

The exceptions under this rule, instead of being rehearsed after it, as is the general habit of the Prâtiçâkhya, are given in rules 4 and 5 of the preceding chapter, and, in the latter rule, mingled with instances of a wholly different character. Here, then, a particular specification of cases already included under a general rule is regarded as insuring against inclusion in a more general statement of exceptions under that rule. I believe that the treatise offers no other example of this canon of interpretation.

## ञकारग्रपर उदात्तः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Before *j* and *gn*, *a* is elided if acute.

The examples are *ojo* 'jâyathâḥ (i.6.12<sup>4</sup>) and *çuciḥ pāvaka vandyo* 'gne (i.3.14<sup>5</sup>); and the counter-examples, of *a* unaccented remaining unelided, are *ná tatṛshāṇó ajārah* (iv.6.1<sup>2</sup>) and *nidhipátir no agníḥ* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>). There is, as the examples show, a real reason in the accent: *ájâyathah* and *ágne* are both words that are accented only at the beginning of a *páda*, where (as remarked under xi.1) the elision of *a* is an almost universal rule. All the other cases of elision before *gn* (nine in number) are of the same kind; not, however, those before *j* (only two).

## मोवचोद्धानस्थेपूर्वश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6. Before *gn*, also when preceded by *maḥ*, *vacah*, *dadhānah*, and *sthe*.

The *ca*, 'also,' of this rule, brings down simply *gn* from its predecessor, the intent being to point out the cases where the *a* of *agni* is elided even when unaccented. *Maḥ*, it is stated, is a part

4. <sup>1</sup> *yakāravakāranakārahakāraparo* 'kāro<sup>2</sup> *lupyate teshu yakārādishu svarapareshu satsu. hiraṇ-.....: vanas-.....: vareṇyo.....: jambh-..... svarapareshu<sup>3</sup> iti kim: çukram-.....: agre.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ekāraokārapūrvā akārah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *-para*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *evam ādi*.

5. *jakāraparo<sup>1</sup> gnaparaç cá 'kāra<sup>2</sup> udātto lupyate. ojo-.....: çuciḥ-..... udātta iti kim: na-.....: nidhi-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *jakāraç ca*. <sup>2</sup> O. puts after *udātto*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



namely *viçve adya marutaḥ*, iv.7.12<sup>1</sup>); *adhi bravītu no 'ditih çarma yachatu* (iv.6.6<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit the first two words), and, as counter-example, *yathā no aditih karati* (iii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *karati* [reading it *karat*]; G. M. substitute a *jaṭā* reading, *aditir no no aditir aditir naḥ*, without anything to show whether it is put forward as the *jaṭā*-text of this passage, or of another, occurring at iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>, where the *samhitā* likewise reads *no aditih*); *adhvaram no 'gner jihvām abhi grṇītam* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>: B. omits the last word, O. the last two, G. M. the last and first), and, as counter-example, *vratā dadante agneḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>); *te no 'gnayah paprayaḥ* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>), and, as counter-example, *purīshyāso agnayah prāvanebhiḥ* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); *naro 'smākam indra* (iv.6.6<sup>7</sup>; there are two other cases, at iii.2.8<sup>6</sup> and iv.6.4<sup>3</sup>); *viçve 'sme dhatta* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>), with the counter-example *dravinam vājo asme : vājasya mā* (iv.7.12<sup>1</sup>: only B. has *mā*, and G. M. O. end at *asme*); *pari vrīdhi no 'çmā bhavatu nas tanūḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>4</sup>: G. M. end with 'çmā, and only O. has the last two words); for the phonetic complex *açvā*, however followed, *vṛshapānayo 'çvā rathebhiḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits after 'çvā), *pracetaso 'çvān* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), and *bharanto 'çvāye 'va* (iv.1.10<sup>1</sup>: O. omits this example), with two counter-examples, *cashālam ye açvayūpāya takshati* (iv.6.8<sup>2</sup>: O. alone has the last word, and it omits the first) and *kshatram no açvo vanatām* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *vanatām*), to show that *açva* would not have answered the purpose instead of *açvā*; *vājayanto 'çyāma dyumnānam* (i.3.14<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *dyumnānam*); *punas te 'māi 'shām* (iv.7.14<sup>3</sup>); *ye te 'ryaman* (ii.3.14<sup>4</sup>); *te 'smatpāçān* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>), with the counter-example *anyam te asmat tapantu* (iv.6.1<sup>3,5</sup>: v.4.4<sup>5</sup>: only O. has *tapantu*); *yaḥ pitā te 'smin yajñe* (ii.6.12<sup>6</sup>), with the counter-example *te asmiṅ javam ā 'dadhuḥ* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>); *prasitim drūnāno 'stā*

7. *abhyāvartin* . . . . . *eteshv akāro lupyate ekārāukārapūrvah*<sup>1</sup>.  
*yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *agne* . . . . : *āvartinn*<sup>3</sup> *iti kim : kāmēna* . . . . : *bhadra-*  
*çoce* . . . . : *agne* . . . . : *dadhāmī 'ti kim : baddho* . . . . : *anu* . . . . :  
*anv iti kim : pra* . . . . : *adhi* . . . . : *çarme 'ti kim : yathā* . . . . :  
*adhv-* . . . . : *jihvām iti kim : vratā* . . . . : *te* . . . . : *papraya iti*  
*kim : purīsh-* . . . . : *naro* . . . . : *viçve* . . . . : *dhatte 'ti kim : drav-*  
*-* . . . . : *pari* . . . . : <sup>4</sup> *açve 'ty asya*<sup>5</sup> *yatrayatra çrutis*<sup>6</sup> *tatratatra*  
*lopaḥ : vṛsha-* . . . . : *çrutir iti kim : prace-* . . . . : *bhar-* . . . . : *dīr-*  
*ghagrahanena* <sup>7</sup> *kim : cashālam* . . . . : *kshatram* . . . . : *vājay-*  
*-* . . . . : *punas* . . . . : *ye* . . . . : *te* . . . . : *pāçān iti kim : anyam* . . . . :  
*yaḥ* . . . . : *yajña iti kim : te* . . . . : *prasitim* . . . . : *mā* . . . . : *jane*  
*-* . . . . : *droham iti kim : bṛhas-* . . . . : *upa* . . . . : *ye* . . . . : *ma-*  
*hyam* . . . . : *çūra* . . . . : *pūrve* . . . . : *ye* . . . . : *gāya-* . . . . : *abhi*  
*-* . . . . : *asyām iti kim : rukmo* . . . . : *ye* . . . . : *sthe 'ti kim : tva-*  
*shṭā* . . . . : *rāyas* . . . . : *prṛthivyāḥ* . . . . : *aham* . . . .

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *lupyate*, and add *vā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> W. *abhyāv-*. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *açvā çrutih*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *çrūyate*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*.



'si (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *prasitim*); *mâ suparno 'vyathamândâ* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>); *jane 'bhidroham manushyâḥ* (iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *manushyâḥ*), with a counter-example, *brhaspate abhiçaster amuñcaḥ* (iv.1.7<sup>4</sup>: only W. has *amuñcaḥ*); *upa prâ 'gât sumanme 'dhâyi manma* (iv.6.8<sup>3</sup>: all but O. begin at *sum-*, and G. M. end with '*dhâyi*); *ye 'do rocane divaḥ* (iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *divaḥ*); *mahyam agne 'tho sîda* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; 2.1<sup>5</sup>); *çûra nonumo 'dugdhâḥ* (ii.4.14<sup>2</sup>); *pârve 'rishtâḥ syâma* (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: all the MSS. read *-shṭâ*); *ye pavayo 'rathâḥ* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have *ye*); *gâyatriṇo 'rcanty arkam* (i.6.12<sup>2-3</sup>: only G. M. have *arkam*); *abhi çûçuco 'ntar asyâm* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; another case at iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *rukmo antar vi bhâti* (iv.1.10<sup>4-5</sup> et al.); *ye 'tra stha purânâḥ* (iv.2.4<sup>1</sup>), with the counter-example *tvashṭâ no atra varivaḥ* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>); *râyas posho 'nnâya tvâ* (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *tvâ*); *prthivyâḥ sadhasthe 'ngirasvat* (iv.1.6<sup>1,2</sup> four times; other cases at iv.1.1<sup>3,4</sup> three times); and *aham tebhyo 'karam namah* (iv.5.1<sup>3</sup>).

गाहमानोजायमानोहेतयोमन्यमानोवनस्पतिभ्यःपते-  
स्त्रिधस्तपसःस्वधावोभामितोऽग्नयन्नायोऽध्वर्योऽक्रतोपूर्वः

॥ ८ ॥

8. An *a* is elided when preceded by *gâhamânaḥ*, *jâyamânaḥ*, *hetayaḥ*, *manyamânaḥ*, *vanaspatibhyaḥ*, *pate*, *sridhaḥ*, *tapasaḥ*, *svadhâvaḥ*, *bhâmitaḥ*, *agnayaḥ*, *âyo*, *adhvaryo*, and *krato*.

The quoted passages are *gâhamâno 'dâyaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>); *jâyamâno 'hnâm ketuḥ* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>); *hetayo 'nyam asmat* (iv.5.10<sup>5</sup>); *manya-mâno 'martyam* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>); *vanaspatibhyo 'dhi sambhrtâm* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word), with the counter-example *namah pitrbhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>); *annapate 'nnasya* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> and [by i.61] v.2.2<sup>1</sup>); *niho ati sridho 'ty acittim* (iv.1.7<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first two words); *tapaso 'dhi jâtaḥ* (iv.2.10<sup>4</sup>); *deva svadhâvo 'mrtasya dhâma* (iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the first word and the last), with the counter-example *anyâ vo anyâm avatu* (iv.2.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word); *bhâmito 'mitrasyâ 'bhidâsataḥ* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word); *yân agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *yân*); *agne 'dabdhâ-yo 'çîtatano* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *agne*); *adhvaryo 'ver apâzḥ* (vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>: O. ends at '*veḥ*); and *çatakrato 'nu te dâyi* (ii.5.12<sup>5</sup>).

A special explanation is required for the passage in which *agnayaḥ* occurs, since the following *pada* is *anu*, which might seem to

8. *gâhamânaḥ*----- *ity evampârvo*<sup>4</sup> '*kâro lupyate. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>:  
*gâh*-----: *jây*-----: *hetayo*----: *many*-----: *vanas*-----:  
*vanaspatî 'ti kim: namah* : *anna*-----: *niho*-----: *tapaso*  
-----: *deva*-----: *svadhe 'ti kim: anyâ*-----: *bhâmito*-----:  
*yân*--- : *ukârasya vakâravikriyâyâm vyañjanaparo nakâra*<sup>3</sup> *iti*  
*yavanaha* (xii.4) *nishedhâbhâvâd alope prâpte tadapavâdo*



fall under xii.4. Its inclusion here is necessary, because in *samhitā* the word becomes *anv*, so that its *n* is no longer "followed by a vowel," as required by that rule. The question might arise, whether rule i.51 would not, at any rate, cause *anv* to be implied along with *anu*; but the commentator does not raise it, and the course taken by the treatise is evidently the more reasonable and safer one.

The last three cases which the rule deals with are of a peculiar character, and quite different from all the rest falling under this chapter, being those in which a final *pragraha* or uncombinable vowel elides an initial *a*, either in the passages specified in xi.3 (like the last of the three) or elsewhere (like the other two). This the commentator points out, and declares that in every other instance the *a* remains after a *pragraha*. I have already noticed (under iv.6,7) what the usage of the text is after *pragrahas* in *o*: that, against the two cases here mentioned of *a* elided after a vocative in *o*, there are but two in which the *a* remains; but that after a final *o* containing the particle *u* we have twenty-one cases of *a* retained, and no case of its elision. The passages where *a* is retained after an *e* that is *pragraha*, I have omitted to note: but there is a considerable number of them, including many (e. g. i.4.30: ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>: vi.3.5<sup>3</sup>: vii.5.3<sup>2</sup>: the commentator cites a single one, *ime ācvinā samvatsarah*, v.6.4<sup>1</sup>) where the retention is not otherwise authorized: so that inability to cause elision is unquestionably involved in the very character of a *pragraha* vowel, according to the view of the treatise, and needs not to be expressly stated. At this we have a right to be surprised, especially for two reasons: first, that it is thought necessary to teach (see x.24) that *pragrahas* are not liable in general to combination with the initial vowels that follow them; and secondly, that according to this treatise there is no combination of the initial *a* with the preceding *e* or *o*, but an actual loss of it, leaving the *e* or *o* unaffected (except sometimes as to accent). But the essential character of the *pragraha* vowels, the reason of their peculiar treatment, and the proper significance of the term by which they are called, are obscure points as yet in Hindu phonetics and nomenclature.

It remains to inquire how complete and accurate is the enumeration by the Prātiçākhyā of the cases of elision or non-elision of *a* occurring in the Tāittirīya Sanhitā. I have, in looking through the Sanhitā, carefully considered every case with reference to the rules of the treatise, and the result is that, apart from *ye aparīshu*

---

'yam. agne . . . .: adhvaryo . . . .: çatukrato . . . .: atra yavanaha (xii.4) ityādināi 'va lope siddhe punar asya grahaṇam niyamārtham: āyo 'dhvāryo<sup>4</sup> krato ity etatpadatrayapūrvasyāi 'vā<sup>5</sup> 'kārasya<sup>6</sup> lopo na tv itarapragrahapūrvasye<sup>7</sup> 'ti: yathā: ime . . . .

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -vas tv. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. -rapara. <sup>4</sup> O. ādh-. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. kâra. <sup>7</sup> B. itaratra pr-.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



‘when the elided *a* is acute,’ from the preceding rule, and *sarvatra*, ‘in every case,’ as signifying ‘whether the circumflex be independent or enclitic.’ His examples are *bheshajám gávé ’çvāya* (i.8.6<sup>1</sup>) and *ójó ’jāyathāḥ* (i.6.12<sup>4</sup>), where the final syllables of *gáve* and *ójah* have the enclitic circumflex by xiv.29, and *átho ’kthyó ’thá ’tirátrāḥ* (vii.1.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit the first word), where the final syllable of *ukthyāḥ* has the independent circumflex before the elision.

We might perhaps also fairly conclude that *sarvatra* implies an inclusion of the case treated of in rule 9, and virtually teaches that a final circumflex, eliding an initial grave, is still circumflex.

With this chapter ends the first *praçna*, or section, of the treatise. The division into *praçnas* is a purely external and formal one, and (as I gave notice would be the case, in the Introductory Note to the Atharva Prâtiçâkhyâ) is made no account of in this edition. References made to the succeeding chapters by section and chapter will easily be found by adding twelve to the number of the chapter as given.

## CHAPTER XIII.

CONTENTS: 1–3, loss of *m*, before semivowels and spirants; 4, its retention before *râjan* etc.; 5–15, details of the occurrence of *ṛ*, otherwise than as the result of *sandhi*; 16, interchange of *d* and *l*.

अथ मकारलोपः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the omission of *m*.

11. *udâtta iti caçabdo jñâpayati: tasminn<sup>1</sup> akâra udâtte<sup>2</sup> sati sarva<sup>3</sup> ekâra okâro vâ svarita udâttam âpadyate. bheshajam -----: ojo ----- sarvatre ’ti vacanân nityasvarito<sup>4</sup> ’pi tathâi ’vatad vidhânâṃ syât: atho -----.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane*

*dvâdaço ’dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>5</sup>*iti prathamah praçnah.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *asm*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *lupte*; O. ins. *ca lupte*. <sup>3</sup> O. *sarvatra*; G. M. *sarvatra-sthita*. <sup>4</sup> O. *-ritasyâ*. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om.; G. M. *prathamapraçnas samâptah. hariḥ om: çubham astu om*; W. adds 1 *hari hi om*, and, as prelude to the next section, *çri-ga-ṇeçâyâ namah. hariḥ om*; B. adds *hariḥ om*.

1. *athe ’ty ayam adhikârah: makâralopa<sup>1</sup> ucyata ity etad adhi-kṛtaṃ veditavyam<sup>2</sup> ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah<sup>3</sup>. makârasya lopo makâralopah<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *-rasya l*-. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om.



A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4). The subject is a supplement to that treated at v.27-31, where we are told what is done with *m* before a mute, or before any other semivowel than *r*.

## रेफोष्मपरः ॥ २ ॥

2. A *m* is omitted, when followed by *r* or a spirant.

This omission of *m* is accompanied, according to xv.1-3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of *anusvâra* after it. Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to ii.30. The definition of the *m* as lost or omitted accords best with the former view: it is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized; if, however, an *anusvâra*, as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of *m* after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the *m* is directly converted into *anusvâra*. This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rik (iv.5) and Vâj. (iv.1) Prâtiçâkhyas, which acknowledge an *anusvâra*, while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath. Prât. (ii.32, i.67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel: our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p. 68), trims between the two views.

The commentator's examples are *pratyushtaṅ rakshaḥ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), *sañçitam me brahma* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>: v.1.10<sup>2</sup>), *taṅ shaḍ ahâni* (v.5.2<sup>6</sup>), *sañ-sam id yuvase vrshan* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *vrshan*), and *tvaṅ ha yad yavishtya* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples are given: to show that *m* before other letters is not dropped, *idaṁ vâṁ âsye* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>); to show that the dropped *m* must be a final, *tasmât tâmrâ âpaḥ* (vi.4.2<sup>4</sup>). The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation *padântaḥ*, 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it: it comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of *pada* and *saṁhitâ* texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters.

## यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

2. *rephaṇaṣ*<sup>1</sup> *co*<sup>2</sup> "shmaṇaṇaṣ *ca* *padânto*<sup>3</sup> *makâro lupyate. yathâ*<sup>4</sup>: *praty*-.....: *sañ*-.....: *taṅ*-.....: *sañ*-.....: *tvaṅ*-.....<sup>5</sup>  
*evampara iti kim: idaṁ*-.....: *padânta iti kim: tasmât*-.....<sup>5</sup>  
*rephaṇaṣ co* "shmaṇaṇaṣ<sup>6</sup> *ca* 'rephoshmaṇaṇaḥ: *te pare*' *yasmât sa tathoktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *rephaṇaṣ*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> B. *-nte*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *-mâ*.  
(7) B. G. M. O. *rephoshmaṇaṇâu tâu parâu*.



The authorities here quoted are, as the commentator does not fail to point out, the same with those referred to above, in v.30, where we were taught that some teachers hold *m* not to be assimilated to a following *y* or *v*, any more than to *r*. The accepted teaching of the treatise, however, is (v.28–9) that *m* before *y*, *l*, and *v* becomes a nasal counterpart to those letters respectively: whence the present rule is pronounced unapproved. For the bearings of the discordant doctrine, see note to v.30.

The examples are *tvañ yajñeshv îḍyah* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 2.3<sup>1-2</sup>: O. omits *îḍyah*) and *tañ vâ etañ yajamānaḥ* (v.6.9<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word): the ordinary and approved reading would be *tvam*, *tam*, and *etaim*—as all the MSS. in fact read, neglecting the illustration of the opinion set forth in the rule. A counter-example is given, *yam kāmayeta* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup> et al.).

## न सस्सामिति रापरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. But not the *m* of *sam* and *sām*, when followed by *rā*.

This is a precept applying only to the two words *samrāj* and *sāmrajya*, and in the other Prâtiçâkhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.36) these words or the root *rāj* are particularly specified; since, however, the syllable *rā* does not chance to occur in the Tâittirîya Sanhitâ except in these words after *sam* or *sām*, there is no inaccuracy in the more general statement as here made. The examples of the occurrence of the words in question selected by the commentator as illustrations are *pra samrājam* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>) and *sāmrajyāya sukratuh* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *sukratuh*). As counter-examples, we have *çañ rājann oshadhîbhyaḥ* (iii.2.3<sup>1</sup>) to show that no other words

3. *yakâraparo*<sup>1</sup> *vakâraparo vâ makâro lupyata ity ekeshâm*<sup>2</sup> *matam: ya evâ'sya pañcamādhyāye*<sup>3</sup> *savarṇâpattim*<sup>4</sup> *pratishedhayanti*<sup>5</sup> *teshâm evâi 'sha lopavidhir iti tân anvâdiçati cakâraḥ sinhâvalokanena*<sup>6</sup>. *yathâ: tvam*----: *tam*----: *evampara iti kim: yam*----. *yakâraç ca vakâraç ca yavakârâu: tâu parâu yasmât sa tathoktaḥ.*

<sup>7</sup>*etat sūtram anisṭam.*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *vâ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *âcâryânâm*. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *-mānuvâke*. <sup>4</sup> B. *savarṇam agre vartinah*; G. M. *-ṇapratip-*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *-dhanti*. <sup>6</sup> O. *-kāmnyâyena*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. O. *nâi 'tat sūtram isṭam*.

4. <sup>1</sup>*re 'ty*<sup>1</sup> *evamparaḥ*<sup>2</sup> *samsām ity etayor grahaṇayor*<sup>2</sup> *makâro na lupyate. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *pra*----: *sām*----. *sam sām iti kim: çañ*----: *râpara iti kim: sañrarāṇaḥ. padântaç ca vy-añjanaparaḥ prakṛta* (xiv.28) *iti*<sup>4</sup> *vakshyamāṇam*<sup>5</sup> *dvitva-nishedham itiçabdo*<sup>6</sup> *nivârayati: tasmād atra dvitvasiddhiḥ.*<sup>7</sup>

(1) the MSS., as usual in such a case, *râ ity*. (2) G. M. put at beginning; O. om. *grahaṇayor*. (3) in G. M. only. (4) O. om. (5) G. M. *-ṇa*. (6) G. M. *tuç-*. (7) G. M. add *itiçabdas sam sām ity anayor eve 'ti samarthayati*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



Already, in a previous chapter (vii.1-12,15,16), we have had detailed all the cases in which a *n* is changed to *ṇ* in the course of the combination of words into phrases, in the conversion of *pada* into *saṁhitā*; now, the treatise sets out to account for every single *ṇ* occurring in the whole text. And the present is the leading general rule, involving, with the extensions and restrictions imposed later, by far the greater number of cases.

The commentator's examples are *tribhir ṛṇavā jāyate* (vi.3.10<sup>5</sup>: O. has a *lacuna*, involving the beginning of this citation), *tvañ hotṛṇām* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>), *esha vā ṛco varṇaḥ* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>: but W. has instead *esha vā ahno varṇaḥ*, vi.1.3<sup>1-2</sup>), and *kr̥shṇo 'si* (i.1.11<sup>1</sup>); his counter-examples are *devānām vā antam jagmushām* (vii.5.8<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. have only *devānām*, which of course is found in various places; and O. omits altogether), where none of the lingual letters specified comes before a *n*, and *ebhir no arkāih* (iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>: O. omits *arkāih*), where the *r* is in another word than the *n*. All these are cases in which the alterant letter immediately precedes the altered.

## व्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ७ ॥

7. Even though other sounds are interposed.

Rule 15, below, puts a restriction upon this, pointing out what letters may not intervene between the affecting and the affected letter. The examples are *aparaṣuvṛkṇam dahati* (v.1.10<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit *dahati*; O. inserts *ha* between the other two words), *ātmann evā 'ramanam kurute* (vi.5.11<sup>4</sup>: only O. has the first two words, and it omits the last), *adhishavanam* (i.1.5<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. O. have *adhishavane*, iv.7.8 or vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>), and *kr̥shamāṇaḥ pratishthākāmaḥ* (iii.4.3<sup>3</sup>).

## हिरण्मयम् ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also in *hiraṇmayam*.

The only passage in which the word occurs is quoted by the commentator: *hiraṇmayam dāma dakṣiṇā* (ii.4.13: O. omits *dakṣiṇā*). The intent of the rule is to establish in advance a counter-exception to the exception "not when followed by a mute," made in rule 15, below.

---

7. *uktanimittapūrvō nakāro 'nyena* <sup>1</sup> *vyaveto* <sup>2</sup> *'pi* <sup>3</sup> *vyavahito* <sup>3</sup> *'pi* <sup>3</sup> *ṇatvam āpnoti. yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *ap- - - -*: *ātman-* - - -: *adhi-* - - -: *kr̥sh-* - - -.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇena*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> in O. only.

8. *hiraṇmayam ity asmin grahaṇe nakāro* <sup>1</sup> *ṇatvam āpnoti*<sup>1</sup>. *yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *hiraṇ-* - - - . *sparṣapara* (xiii.15) *iti*<sup>3</sup> *vakshyamāṇa-pratishedhasya*<sup>4</sup> *pratiprasavārtham idam sūtram.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *nakāram āpadyate*. <sup>2</sup> in B. only. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. *-ṇasya pr-*.



# पाणिगणपुण्यकण्वाणागाणवाणवेणुगुणमणिप्रवदिषु पूर्वः ॥ १ ॥

9. Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of *pâni*, *gaṇa*, *punya*, *kaṇva*, *kâṇa*, *gâṇa*, *bâṇa*, *veṇu*, *guṇa*, and *maṇi*, the first nasal is *ṇ*.

The word *pravâda* is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its commentary. From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to Regnier (note to Rik Pr. ii.39), it bears in the Rik Prâtiçâkhya. The latter makes it mean 'theme;' in our comment, on the other hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix; and I have translated it accordingly. So far as I can see, however, the same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik Pr. also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision.

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any intimation of it in the terms of the precept itself; it is only at the end of rule 14, below, that we find the word *prakṛtâḥ*, which we must understand as applying to rules 9-14—a kind of footing instead of heading (*adhikâra*): see another like case in the third chapter, rules 2-7 (note on iii.2). In this connected paragraph of rules we have an enumeration of the words in which a *ṇ* is "original," and hence found equally in all the forms of the text.

The examples are *supâṇiḥ svaṅguriḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>: O., in this and the two following examples, has only the first word), *vṛshapânayo 'çvâḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>), and *hiraṇyapâṇim ūtaye* (i.4.25: ii.2.12<sup>2</sup>): the text contains half a dozen other examples of the *pravâdas* of *pâni*;—*gaṇânâm tvâ gaṇapatiṅ havâmahe* (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word), *gaṇâ me mâ vi tṛshan* (iii.1.8<sup>2</sup>), *gaṇena gaṇam* (v.4.7<sup>7</sup>), and *dûreâmitraç ca gaṇaḥ* (iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>): the cases,

9. *pâni*'*tyâdiçabdânâm*<sup>1</sup> *pravâdeshu pûrvaḥ prathamô ṇakâraḥ prakṛtyâi* 'va *veditavyaḥ. prakarshena vâdaḥ*<sup>2</sup> *pravâdaḥ*<sup>3</sup>: *liṅga-vibhaktibhedasamâsataddhitâdibhir*<sup>4</sup> *nirdeçâ*<sup>5</sup> *ity arthaḥ. yathâ*<sup>6</sup>: *sup*-.....: *vṛshap*-.....: *hiraṇ*-.....: *gaṇânâm*.....: *gaṇâ*.....: *gaṇena*.....: *dûre*-.....: *punyo*.....: *sâ*.....: *kaṇvâ*.....: *tasyâi*.....: *akarṇayâ*.....: *gâṇap*-.....: *viçalyo*.....: *veṇur*.....: *veṇunâ*.....: *yad*.....: *yathâ*.....: *maṇinâ*.....  
<sup>7</sup>*nanu gaṇaçabdappravâdatvâd gâṇagrahaṇam ayuktam*: <sup>8</sup>*mâi 'vam*:<sup>9</sup> *gaṇappravâdatve sati tad bhavet: kimtu gaṇapatiçubdappravâdo 'yam. pûrva iti kim: gaṇ*-.....: *veṇ*-.....: *maṇ*-.....:<sup>7</sup> *ityâdishû 'ttarasya*<sup>9</sup> *ṇatvam mâ bhûd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -âdinâm grahaṇânâm. <sup>2</sup> W. -dâḥ. <sup>3</sup> W. -vadâḥ; G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. om. *bheda*. <sup>5</sup> W. *nirdiçtâ*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> W. *ivam*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. -*ra-nakârasya*.



compounds, and derivatives of *gaṇa* are found by dozens in the Sanhitâ;—*punyo bhavati vasantam* (i.6.11<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word) and *sā mā sarvān puṇyān* (vii.1.7<sup>1</sup>): *puṇya* occurs in five other passages, once (iii.3.8<sup>5</sup>) in composition;—*kaṇvā abhi pra gāyata* (iv.3.13<sup>7</sup>: O. ends with *abhi*): there are two other cases of declensional forms;—*tasyāi kāno yā dataḥ* (ii.5.1<sup>7</sup>: O. alone has the last word, and it omits the first; G. M. end with *kānaḥ*) and *akaraṇayā 'kāṇayā 'ḥloṇayā* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>: only W. has the last word): there is no other case;—*gāṇapatyān mayobhūr e 'hi* (iv.1.2<sup>2</sup>: O. has only the first word; only G. M. have the last two): I have noted but one other case;—*viçalyo bānavāñ uta* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the first word): we have a declensional case of *bāna* at iv.6.4<sup>5</sup>;—*veṇur vāiṇavī bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word), *veṇunā vi mimīte* (v.2.5<sup>2</sup>), and *yad veṇoḥ sushiram* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>): there are a couple more of cases;—*yathā guṇe guṇam* (vii.2.4<sup>2</sup>): we have elsewhere only *dviguṇa*, at v.2.5<sup>2,3</sup>;—and *maṇinā rūpāni* (vii.3.14): elsewhere only *maṇivāla*, at v.6.13. To explain the limitation *pārvaḥ*, 'the first nasal,' in the rule, the commentator quotes parts of passages already given—namely *gaṇānām tvā*, *veṇunā vi*, and *maṇinā rūpāni* (but O. omits the second example, and the second word of the third)—in which the *pravādas* exhibit a second nasal which is dental. He raises the objection, moreover, that the mention of *gāṇa* in the rule is unnecessary, since the word is a *pravāda* of *gaṇa*; but replies that the word (*gāṇapatya*) aimed at is a *pravāda* of *gaṇapati*, not of *gaṇa*. It is true, now, that *gāṇapatyāt* stands one degree farther removed from *gaṇa* than does, for instance, *gaṇapatibhyaḥ*, or than would *gāṇikaḥ* if it occurred in the text; yet we should hardly have expected it on that account to receive a different treatment.

## पणिपणिंवीयमाणऊण्योः ॥ १० ॥

10. Also in *paṇi*, *paṇim*, *vīyamāṇaḥ*, and *ūṇyoḥ*.

The passages are *agne deva paṇibhir vīyamāṇaḥ* (i.1.13<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), *paṇim goṣhu starāmahe* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word), *vīyamāṇaḥ : tam ta etam* (i.1.13<sup>2</sup>: O. has only the first word; G. M. read *-nas tam* etc., neglecting the pause of division between the two words), and *ūṇyoḥ kavikratum* (i.2.6<sup>1</sup>). These words are said to be made a separate rule of because there is no longer any inclusion of *pravādas* or derived forms.

## टवर्गपरः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also before a lingual mute.

10. <sup>1</sup> *paṇi 'tyādigrahaneshu*<sup>2</sup> *ṇakāraḥ prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyaḥ. apravādārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ. agne - - - : paṇim - - - : vīy- - - : ūṇyoḥ - - -*

<sup>1</sup> O. prefixes the whole series of words. <sup>2</sup> O. *-ādishu*; G. M. *-ādishu gr-*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



M. the last, W. O. the last two); *priyaṅgavaç ca me 'navaç ca me* (iv.7.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, O. the first three), with a counter-example, *anavas te ratham* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>), to prove the need of *ca* in the citation; *etaṁ vâi para ātñārah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>); *ya sthānuḥ hanti* (vii.3.1<sup>1</sup>): we have *yajñasthānu* twice at vi.1.2<sup>4</sup>; *yā tūnave yā vīnāyām* (vi.1.4<sup>1</sup>); *açlonayā 'saptaçaphayā krīnāti* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>: only O. has *krīnāti*); *pañetā 'goargham* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup>); *indram vānīr anāshata* (i.6.12<sup>2</sup>); *kalyāñī rūpasamṛddhā sā syāt* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>: only O. has the last two words): *kalyāñī* occurs in one or two other passages; *purushakuṇapam açvakūṇapam gāuḥ* (vii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *gāuḥ*): we have *kuṇapam* as independent word at vii.2.10<sup>2</sup>; *vānaḥ çatatantur bhavati* (vii.5.9<sup>2</sup>), with a counter-example, to show the necessity of adding *çata* in the rule, *ṛtāvānaç caya-mānā ṛñāni* (ii.1.11<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have *ṛñāni*; O. omits the example: *vānaḥ* is a *pada* in the word as divided, *ṛta-vānaḥ*); *çonā dhrshnū nrvāhasā* (vii.4.20: W. B. end with *dhrshnū*) and *çonāya svāhā* (vii.3.18: O. omits the example, along with the specification of the point it illustrates), the only examples of *çona* that the text contains; *ni jalgulīti dhānikā* (vii.4.19<sup>3</sup>); and *vanaspatīnām enī* (v.5.15: O. reads *enya*), with a counter-example, to show that the word only occurs after a *m*, *ubhayata enī syāt tad āhuḥ* (vii.1.6<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. end with *syāt*).

## अवग्रहो वृषण्हीर्षण्ब्रह्मण्क्षण्चर्मण्चर्षण् ॥ १३ ॥

13. As final of the former member of a compound, *ṇ* is found in *vṛshaṇ*, *çīrshaṇ*, *brahmaṇ*, *akshaṇ*, *carmaṇ*, and *carshaṇ*.

The term *avagraha*, we are told, is here taken in the sense of *avagrahastha*. The same interpretation has been given before (under vi.9); and the whole use of *avagraha* in the treatise verges toward an equivalence with its derivative. Only T. O. change the *ç* of *çīrshaṇ* to *ch* after *ṇ*; but, as this is in accordance with the teaching of the Prâtiçākhyā (v.34), I have adopted it.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *vāto apām vṛshaṇ-vān* (ii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *vāto*), *çīrshaṇvān medhyo bhavati* (vii.5.25<sup>1</sup>), *brahmaṇvanto devā āsan* (vi.4.10<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit *āsan*), *akshaṇvate svāhā* (vii.5.12<sup>1</sup>), and *carmaṇvate svāhā* (vii.5.12<sup>2</sup>): we have *vṛshaṇ-* also at ii.5.8<sup>4</sup>: iv.1.2<sup>1</sup>: vii.5.5<sup>1</sup>; *çīrshaṇ-* at vii.5.12<sup>1</sup>; and *brahmaṇ-* at v.7.8<sup>3</sup> and vi.4.10<sup>1</sup> (a second time). As counter-examples, to show that the *ṇ* occurs in these words only before a

13. *vṛshaṇṇ ityādigrahaṇeshv<sup>1</sup> avagraho ṇakārah prakṛtyāi'va veditavyaḥ. vāto-----: çīrsh-----: brahm-----: aksh-----: <sup>2</sup>car-m-----<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup>carshaṇgrahaṇasya<sup>4</sup> çākhāntare <sup>5</sup>vijñeyam udāharaṇam<sup>5</sup>: mitrasya---- iti kecid udāharanti<sup>6,3</sup>: tan na sādhu: anto 'lopād (xiii.15) iti vakshyamāṇapratiśhedhapratiprasavārtham uktatvād eshām grahaṇānām carshaṇīdhrta ity atra<sup>7</sup> ṇakārasya padāntatvābhāvāt. athavā: ṛkārarkāraraśhā<sup>8</sup> (xiii.6)*



pause of division, he gives (the whole subject is omitted in O.) *vrshann agne viçvâny arya â* (iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>), *tasmât saptaçîrshan* (v.1.7<sup>1</sup>), *brahman viçam vi* (ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *vi*), *akshann amîmadanta* (i.8.5<sup>2</sup>), and *paçûnâm carman* (vi.1.9<sup>2</sup>).

This disposes of all the *avagrahas* cited in the rule save *carshan*. No such *pada* as *carshan* is to be found in the *Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ*, nor, so far as has yet come to light, in any other Vedic text; nor does the word seem like one that could anywhere occur. One cannot help surmising that its presence in the rule may be by a blunder merely, it being, perhaps, an unintelligent repetition of *carman*. But, by whatever hap or mishap it found its way in, it is now an accepted part of the text, and has to be dealt with. And the commentator first creeps out of the difficulty through the hole to which he usually betakes himself in a like case, asserting that the passage aimed at is read in another text (*çâkhâ*). He then proceeds to state that "some quote as here referred to the passage *mitrasya carshanîdhrtah çravaḥ* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup> and iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *çravaḥ*): this is not good, since the words are quoted in the rule by way of antecedent exception to an exception [to rule 6] which is to be made farther on, by the words 'nor when final, nor by the omission of *a*' (rule 15); and in *carshanîdhrtah* the *ṇ* is not final. Or: others are of opinion that the words in question are specified for the sake of removing any doubt which might arise as to whether the *ṇ* in them were a product of alteration under rule 6 of this chapter; and, in this aspect, the citation of *mitrasya carshanîdhrtah* is to be approved." The logic of this final conclusion I entirely fail to see: for no question can possibly arise as to whether the *ṇ* of *carshanîdhrtah* falls under rule 6; that it does so is palpable and undeniable.

As we should expect, considering the way in which the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* treats the cases, these words are read with *ṇ* in the *pada*-text also: namely *vrshan-vân*, *brahman-vantah*, and so on. The same is the case in the *pada*-texts of the *Rik* and the *Atharvan* (see *Ath. Pr.* iv.99).

ऋषमण्णाम्णाराव्ण चेति प्राकृताः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also in *rṇṇ*, *shanṇ*, *shṇ*, *mṇ*, and *râvṇ*—these are original.

The application of the term *prâkrtaḥ*, 'original,' in this rule is, as was pointed out above (under rule 9), to all the cases rehearsed in rules 9–14.

"*diprâpter atra ṇakâro vâikṛta iti çâṅkânirâkaraṇârtham etâni grahaṇâni 'ty anye<sup>9</sup> manyante: tathâ sati mitrasya carshanîdhrtah ity udâharaṇam ramaṇîyam. <sup>10</sup>avagraha<sup>11</sup> iti kim: vrshann ----: tasmât ----: brahman ----: akshann ----: paçûnâm ----. avagrahastho<sup>12</sup> 'vagraha iti lakshyate.<sup>10</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*ṇe*; G. M. -*dishu gr-*. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> W. -*shanḥ-*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> W. -*haraṇam*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ṛkârâ*. <sup>9</sup> B. *anena*. <sup>(10)</sup> O. om. <sup>11</sup> W. -*ha-*  
*sthâ*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. put next before *lakshyate*.



The commentary, after pronouncing the citations of the rule “parts of words, intended to include a number of cases,” quotes examples, as follows: *svayamātrṇṇām upa* (v.2.8<sup>1</sup>; 3.2<sup>1</sup>,7<sup>4</sup>; 5.4<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *upa*), *asamtrṇṇe hi hanū* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *hanū*), and *svayamātrṇṇā jyotiḥ* (v.7.6<sup>2</sup>): I have noted *ṛṇṇ* elsewhere only in *anāchrṇṇam* (v.1.7<sup>4</sup>); *abhishaṇṇo yasmāt* (ii.4.2<sup>3</sup>), *nishaṇṇāya svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have this example), and *daçamāsā nishaṇṇā āsan* (vii.5.1<sup>1</sup>,2<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word); *pūshṇo rañhyāi* (i.3.10<sup>2</sup>), *pūshṇā sayujā saha* (iv.1.2<sup>2</sup> and v.1.2<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *saha*), and *pūshṇe prapathyāya svāhā* (vii.3.15: G. M. O. omit *svāhā*): I have noted further only *pāushṇa* (i.8.9<sup>2</sup> et al.); *aryamne carum nir vapet* (ii.3.4<sup>1</sup> twice, <sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. stop at *carum*): I find besides *sutrāmne* (i.8.9<sup>2</sup> et al.) and *nṛmṇa* (i.7.13<sup>2</sup>), which last, however, the rule was not specially intended for; finally, *dadhikrāvno akārisham* (i.5.11<sup>4</sup> and vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *akārisham*) and *ā grāvṇaḥ* (vi.3.2<sup>3</sup>: O. omits this example): further cases of *dadhikrāvan* and *grāvan* are met with in the text showing the combination *vn*; I have noted no other words in which it occurs. Counter-examples, showing that *vn* follows *rā* only, would have been easy to furnish: thus, *rāyasposhadāvne*, at i.2.10<sup>1</sup>.

Cases of quite various and discordant nature are here thrown together. Most unequivocally calling for treatment in the Prâtiçâkhyā, in order to determine their reading, are the three passages in which *sanna* is altered to *shaṇṇa* after *abhi* and *ni*, since (as quoted by the commentator below) the *pada*-text restores the original form of the word, reading *abhishaṇṇa ity abhi-sannaḥ* etc. Its *s* is converted to *sh* according to vi.2, but there is no authority excepting here for the change of *nn* to *ṇṇ*; chapter vii. does not deal with this, because it takes up only those cases in which the alterant cause and the altered nasal are found in different *padas*; and rule 6 of the present chapter does not apply to it because its first *n* is protected (according to xiii.15) by being “followed by a mute,” and its second *n* by “having a lingual mute interposed.” The case of *trṇṇa* is akin with this, only with the important difference that the alteration of its nasals lies beyond the ken of the Prâtiçâkhyā, the *ṇṇ* being read in every text. The remaining three all fall under rule 6 of this chapter, but they require specification because they are also covered by one of the exceptions in rule 16; for they exhibit, as compared with their

---

14. *atra<sup>1</sup> sūtre padâikadeçâ ete<sup>2</sup> bahûpâdânârtham uktâḥ: ṛṇṇâdishv eshu<sup>3</sup> ca<sup>4</sup> ṇakârâḥ prâkr̥tâ eva vijñeyâḥ. svay- ----: asam- ----: svay- ----: abhish- ----: nish- ----: daça- ----: pūshṇo- ----: pūshṇā- ----: pūshṇe- ----: aryamne- ----: dadhi- ----: ā- ----.*

*prâkr̥taçabdo 'yam pānyâdishv eva carshanparyanteshu mukhyah: catasṛshu samhitâsu ṇatvasadbhāvât<sup>6</sup>: ṛṇṇe<sup>7</sup> 'ty âdishu tu<sup>8</sup> na mukhyah: kintu prâptyabhâve 'pi<sup>9</sup> ṇatvaprapāṇârthaḥ. tathâ hi: ṛṇṇâdâu pūrvanâkârasya<sup>10</sup> sparçaparavân nishedhaḥ:*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*varṇa*-text is to be inferred also for *rṇṇ* and *shann* (O. says *rāvn*) in virtue of association with the others, they being found in the same rule with them; for all who understand the rules of affairs hold that the determination of equivocal classes is made by mention in connection with words unequivocal. Therefore the meaning of *prākṛta* (all but O. say *prakṛti*) as defined by us is alone acceptable.

By comparison with the explanations given above, it may readily be seen how much of reason there is in all this talk. The commentator raises an obscuring dust about the difficulty, but does not at all remove it. The *mukhyatvam* of the term *prākṛta* as here applied is more easily disproved than its *mūrkhātvam*.

न पुम्नो ऽग्निर्युष्मानीतो ऽन्तो ऽलोपात्स्पर्शपरो व्यवा-  
येषु शसचटतवर्जिषु ॥ १५ ॥

15. But not in *shumna*, *agni*, and *yushmānīta*; nor when final; nor after the omission of an *a*; nor when followed by a mute; nor when *ç*, *s*, or a palatal, lingual, or labial mute intervenes.

It would be rather more in accordance with the ordinary usage of the treatise to make five distinct rules of the five independent and unconnected specifications which are here crowded together into a single precept: in fact, we should be guilty of no great violence if we were to divide it into five, affixing to each its own (independently constructed, as if for an independent rule) portion of the comment. But in that case, at any rate, the first rule should read *na shumno'gniyushmānītaḥ* (not '*gnir*'). It is not unobjectionable as it stands, since we should expect the first and third complete *padas* to be quoted as they stand in the text, and the second, which is only a fragment of a *pada*, to be distinguished as such from a possible *agniḥ*. As to the first, moreover, there is a difference of reading among the MSS. of the text: only T. W. have *shumno*; B. O. have *sumno*; G. M. have *sushumno*; and, as is seen below, even W. has *sumnaḥ* in the reiteration of the rule by the comment. G. M., it may be added, read *vyavāyishu* for *-yeshu* in the last specification.

*apy*<sup>22</sup> *rṇṇashannayor*<sup>23</sup> *varṇasamhitāyām* *ṇatvabhāvo*<sup>24</sup> *manta-  
vyah*: *prasiddhapadasamabhivyāhāreṇā*<sup>25</sup> '*prasiddhapadārtha-  
samarthanam*<sup>26</sup> *arthaçāstravidāḥ*<sup>27</sup> *sarve khalu svīkurvate. tasmād  
asmadukta eva yuktaḥ prākṛtaçabdārthaḥ*<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.; O. *asmin*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. *eteshu*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>(5)</sup> in G. M. only. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-sambhavāt*. <sup>7</sup> O. *rṇṇ i*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. put after *na*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>10</sup> O. *-vanakāra*. <sup>(11)</sup> G. M. O. *uttarasya*. <sup>12</sup> W. B. *savarg-*; G. M. *tavarg-* (?). <sup>13</sup> O. *evā*. <sup>14</sup> W. om. *api*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *atra yo*. <sup>16</sup> B. G. M. *mukh-*; O. *anumu-*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *-yaç*. <sup>18</sup> B. G. M. *vidyate*. <sup>19</sup> O. om. <sup>20</sup> O. om. *rūpa*. <sup>21</sup> W. *-yo*; B. *-trayor*; G. M. *-trasthitayor*. <sup>22</sup> W. om. <sup>23</sup> O. *rṇṇarāvunaṇayor*. <sup>24</sup> W. B. G. M. *-tvābh-*; O. *eva ṇatvasadbhā-*. <sup>25</sup> W. G. M. *-ṇa*, but W. inserts a sign of omission before the following *pr-*. <sup>26</sup> B. *-dārtham*; G. M. *-dārthan na bhavati*. <sup>27</sup> B. *sarvaçā-*; G. M. *nnyaman çā-*. <sup>28</sup> W. B. G. M. *prakṛtiç-*.



Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: *sushumnaḥ sâryaraçmiḥ* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), *indrâgnibhyâm tvâ sayujâ* (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *sayujâ*; the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrâgni-bhyâm*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samânapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmânîto abhayam jyotiḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: only O. has *jyotiḥ*; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read *yushmâ-nîtaḥ*).

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>) and *pra mrñîhi çatrân* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vṛtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vṛtraghna indrâya tvâ* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the example) and *vṛtraghna stomâḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>)—for the derivative adjective *vârtraghna* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prâtiçâkhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *shṇ*, *mṇ*, and *râvṇ*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samânapade*, 'within the limits of the same *pada*,' while in *vṛtra-ghnaḥ* etc. the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, 'a lion's look'), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samânapade* is not in force: *ghnaḥ* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

---

15. *shumnaḥ*<sup>1</sup>: *agniḥ*<sup>2</sup>: *yushmânîtaḥ*: *eteshu*<sup>3</sup> *nakâro natvam nâ* "padyate: *sush*-...: *indrâ*-...: *yushm*-... *antaḥ*<sup>4</sup> *padânto nakâro natvam nâ* "padyate: *pitṛn*-...: *pra*-... *alopâd akâralopât*<sup>5</sup> *paro 'pi nakâro natvam nâ* "padyate: <sup>6</sup>*vṛtra*-...:<sup>6</sup> *vṛtra*-... *nanv atra nimittanimittinor bhinnapadasthatvâd vishamo dr̥shṭântaḥ: satyam: siñhâvalokananyâyena*<sup>7</sup> *prathamapraçne*<sup>8</sup> *saptamâdhyâye*<sup>9</sup> *çeshodâharanarûpeṇa*<sup>10</sup> *ghatate: tatra ca samânapadaniyamo*<sup>11</sup> *nâ 'sti: ghna ity asya hançabdavikṛtatvâd*<sup>12</sup> <sup>13</sup>*rashaḥpûrvo havanî*<sup>13</sup> (vii.11) 'ti prâptiḥ. <sup>14</sup>*sparçaparo nakâraç ca*<sup>15</sup> *natvam nâ* "pnoti<sup>16</sup>: *saṁkr*-...: *ava*-...:



nasal, by vii.11, is liable to lingualization. But *han*, by the usage of the treatise, signifies 'the syllable or audible complex of sounds *han*,' not 'the theme *han* and its derivatives;' and, as the text contains no example of the combination *ghn*, it would have been easy to exempt *n* from lingualization *ghakārāt*, 'after *gh*.'

The cited examples of *n* remaining unchanged when followed by a mute are *samkrandano* 'nimishah (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>: O. has the first word only), *ava rundhe tārpyam* (ii.4.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the last word), and *nakhanirbhinnam* (i.8.9<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator then proceeds to enter into a long discussion of more than usual subtilty and obscurity, of which I am by no means confident that I apprehend the meaning. The point aimed at, indeed, seems quite clear: by xiv.4, the *n* of such a word as *pūrṇa* is to be doubled, making *pūrṇṇa*; here, then, is a case where the first *n* is "followed by a mute" (*sparṣaparah*), and so would seem to have its lingual character forbidden by the present rule. The reasonable reply to so hair-splitting and impertinent an objection would appear to be that, a duplication being ordered by the treatise, the product can be nothing but *ṇṇ*, since *nṇ* would be no duplication at all. The commentator, however, prefers to get around the difficulty by limiting the word *sparṣa*, 'mute,' as here used, to one which is not the product of express prescription (?). For in *pūrṇā paścāt* (iii.5.1<sup>1</sup> et al.) there is duplication, making *pūrṇṇā* (not one of the MSS. writes the duplication), the one *n* being prescribed by xiv.4, the other being its occasion or root (*mūla*). With this, O. prudently ends; the other MSS. go on to explain "express" (? *prasiddha*) by referring to the word *nakhanirbhinnam*, already quoted above, as, with its like, also exhibiting an instance of occasion of prescription. This word, namely, falls under rules xiv.4,5 (becoming thereby *nakhanirbbhinna*); and in rule 5 the term "succeeded by a consonant" (*vyañjanottara*) is used in a different sense from "followed by a consonant" (*vyañjanapara*); the meaning of which will be there explained at full length (as we shall find to our cost, in one of the obscurest discussions of the entire treatise). The appositeness of the whole reference I do not understand.

Finally, examples are quoted of the suspension of nasalization by

---

*nakha*----- *sparṣo* 'trā<sup>17</sup> 'prasiddhalakṣhaṇavishayo<sup>18</sup> vivakshyate<sup>19</sup>: anyathā<sup>20</sup> *pūrṇā paścād ity ādāu ṇatvam na syāt: rephāt param ca* (xiv.4) *iti hi prasiddham*<sup>21</sup> *lakṣhaṇam tanmūlam ca*<sup>22</sup> *pūrṇṇe* 'ty atra *dvitvam*. <sup>23</sup>*prasiddhapadena kim* <sup>24</sup>: *nakhanirbhinnam ity ādāv api katham cil*<sup>25</sup> *lakṣhaṇamūlatvam sambhavati. kim tal lakṣhaṇam iti cet: dvitīyacaturthayor* (xiv.5) *ity atra sūtroktavyañjanottarayor*<sup>26</sup> (xiv.5) *iti vāco yuktyantaram iti brāmaḥ: tasya lakṣhaṇam tatrāi* 'va *sphuṭīkarishyate*<sup>27</sup> *mahatā prabandhena*<sup>28</sup>. *sparṣaḥ paro*<sup>28</sup> *yasmād asāu sparṣaparah*. <sup>29</sup> *ṣasacātataavargīyeshu* <sup>30</sup> *vyavadhāyikeshu*<sup>31</sup>





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



note to Ath. Pr. i.37) directly define it as so composed. The *l* liable to the change into *ḍ* is called in the comment *duḥḥlishta*, 'ill joined;' i. e., I presume, 'of difficult articulation' (G. M., to be sure, seem to apply this title the first time to the *ḍ* instead of *l*, and only O. attaches it the second time clearly to the *l*, the others' readings being corrupt; yet there can hardly arise a doubt as to its true connection); it is, of course, the lingual *l* which forms an acknowledged part of the alphabet of the Rig-Veda (Rik Pr. i.11-2, r. 52 etc.). But no such articulation belongs to the alphabet accepted by this treatise—although, on the strength of the present rule alone, it is crowded into that alphabet by the commentator under rule i.1. Nor does the edition of the Śānhitā, nor do the MSS., so far as known to me, make any use of a lingual *l*. As for the MSS. of the Prātiçākhyā and its comment on this rule, B. O. write the ordinary *l* throughout; W. alternates irregularly between the two; G. M. and T. have the lingual letter only. As regards the binding force of the rule, the commentator is right so far as this—that a *ḍ*, not *l*, is read of necessity in the words to which it relates; but that this is, to the makers of the Prātiçākhyā, the result of alteration of an original *l* there is no reason to believe; the euphonic exchange of the two letters is not less strange to the Tāittirīya text than to the Vājasaneyi (of the Mādhyandina *çākhā*: see Vāj. Pr. iv.143, viii.45) and Atharvan; and the rule is really *pūjārtham* only, and an intrusion into our treatise of something foreign to its system.

The commentator first gives his own explanation and illustration of the precept. As example of the operation of the rule, he cites *mṛḍātī* "dr̥ḥe (i.1.14<sup>3</sup>); and, as counter-example, to show that the change is made only after a "mixed vowel," he has nothing better to offer than an alleged passage "from another text," *nalām plavam*. For, in such words as *īditāḥ* (i.1.11<sup>1</sup>), *pravodhum* (i.1.14<sup>3</sup>), *idāyāḥ* (i.2.5<sup>1</sup>), *ayāḍ* (i.4.45<sup>2</sup>), *hedāḥ* (i.5.11<sup>3</sup>), *çrāushad* (i.6.11<sup>1</sup>), where the Rig-Veda reads regularly the lingual *l* and its aspirate, the Tāittirīya-Sānhitā maintains the *ḍ*, not less firmly than after *r*. This, the commentator goes on to say, is an interpretation (but the term he uses is *pāṭha*, properly 'reading' or 'ver-

---

16. *pr̥ktasvarād ṛkārāt<sup>1</sup> paro<sup>2</sup> lakāro duḥḥlishtasamjñiko<sup>3</sup> ḍakāram āpadyate: pāushkarasāder<sup>4</sup> mate<sup>5</sup>. mṛḍātī . . . . pr̥ktasvarād iti kim: nalām plavam<sup>6</sup> iti<sup>7</sup> çākhāntare. pāushkarasāder<sup>8</sup> grahaṇam pūjārtham<sup>9</sup> na tu vikalpārtham<sup>9</sup>. mūrdhasthānatayā duḥḥlishtaladakārayoḥ<sup>10</sup> sādṛçyam<sup>11</sup> asti 'ti vyākaraṇānusārī<sup>12</sup> sūtrapāṭho 'yam: katham anusāritvam iti cet: .<sup>13</sup>tathā hi<sup>13</sup>: sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ: sthāne prāpyamāṇānām<sup>14</sup> antaratama<sup>15</sup> ādeço bhavati 'ti.*

*sūtrasya<sup>16</sup> pāṭhāntaram api<sup>17</sup> vyākhyāyate: pr̥ktasvarāt paro lo ḍam<sup>18</sup> pāushkarasādeḥ<sup>19</sup>: atra samānapada<sup>20</sup> ity asyā 'nuvartanam vijñeyam: pāushkarasādeḥ çākhinaḥ<sup>21</sup> samānapade pr̥kta-*



sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the *duḥḥlishṭa l* and of the *ḍ*, as being both produced in the lingual position: and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pânini (i.1.50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken. I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever.

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed. It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii.6) *samânapade*, 'within the limits of a single *pada*;' taking, then, a different example, *te no mṛdayantu* (iv.4.3<sup>2</sup> et al.), with the counter-example *ilâmdam bhavati* (vii.5.9<sup>1</sup>)—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Sanhitâ of *iḍâ*, *iḍâvant*, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction *samânapade*, the phrase *pitṛlokañ somena* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *pitṛ-lokam*), where the *l* does not become *ḍ* after *ṛ*. But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty; namely, that in the compound *pitṛlokakâmasya* (vi.6.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *pitṛloka-kâmasya*) the *ṛ* and *l* do meet *samânapade*, and yet the *l* maintains itself: over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of *pitṛloka*, it is extended by association to the further compound.

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prâtiçâkhya a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough; and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure.

---

*svarâd ṛkârât<sup>22</sup> paro lakâro ḍakâram âpadyate. yathâ<sup>23</sup>: te-----  
prktasvarâd iti kim: ilâm-----: samânapada iti kim: pitṛl-  
----- sahaçâritvâd<sup>24</sup> ekasya<sup>25</sup> nishiddha<sup>26</sup> itarasyâ 'pi pitṛloka-  
kâmasye<sup>27</sup> 'ty asyâ 'pi<sup>28</sup> samânapadatve suty api nishedho bha-  
vati. idam api pâthânturam bahvâdṛtam.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane  
trayodaço<sup>29</sup> 'dhyâyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> B. om.; G. M. *lo dam*. <sup>3</sup> all but B. *duḥḥ-*; B. *-jñako*; O. *-jño*; G. M. *-jñakam*. <sup>4</sup> O. everywhere *pauska-*. <sup>5</sup> W. *-tena*; B. *-tam*. <sup>6</sup> B. *-vad*. <sup>7</sup> B. *iti 'ti*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. *-di*. <sup>9</sup> W. om. <sup>10</sup> all but B. *duḥḥ-*; W. B. *-shtadalak-*, O. *-lakâra-ḍak-*; G. M. *-ṭadakâr-*. <sup>11</sup> O. *sadrçyasañjño dakâram*. <sup>12</sup> W. *-sârât*; G. M. *-sâra*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *ucyate*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇânâm*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. O. *-mas sadrçatama*. <sup>16</sup> W. *asya*; O. *sûtra*. <sup>17</sup> B. *iti*. <sup>18</sup> B. ins. *iti*. <sup>19</sup> O. *-sâda ity*; G. M. *ity* only. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-dasya*, and om. *ity asya*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. ins. *pakshe*. <sup>22</sup> W. om. <sup>23</sup> O. om. <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. *-caritatu-*. <sup>25</sup> O. *-smin*. <sup>26</sup> B. *nishedha*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. *-kasye*; G. M. *-lokamasye*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. O. om. *api*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. O. *dvitiye praçne prathamô*.



## CHAPTER XIV.

CONTENTS: 1-7, duplication of one of the members of a group of consonants; 8, duplication of *ch*, *kh*, and *bh*, in certain cases; 9-11, insertion between a surd spirant and mute; 12-13, aspiration of a surd mute before a spirant; 14-28, exceptions to the rules for duplication, and discordant views of certain authorities respecting them; 29-33, occurrence of the enclitic circumflex.

स्वरपूर्वं व्यञ्जनं द्विवर्णं व्यञ्जनपरम् ॥ १ ॥

1. A consonant preceded by a vowel is doubled, if followed by a consonant.

The intricate and obscure subject of duplication in consonant-groups is treated at more length in this than in the other Prâtiçâkhyas (compare R. Pr. vi.1-3; V. Pr. iv.97-114; A. Pr. iii.26-32; also Pânini viii.4.46-52), but chiefly on account of the liberal citation here made of the discordant views of various teachers respecting it. The doctrines of the treatise itself are mainly in accordance with those of the rest. This first and leading principle, that the first consonant of a group is doubled, is stated in equivalent terms by all. The principal restrictions to its application are, as stated below, that *r*, *h*, *ç*, *ϕ* (rule 15), and a letter doubled, or a mute followed by another of the same series (rule 23), are exempted from duplication. For the details, see the following rules.

Of course, in applying the rules for duplication, we have to assume the form of the consonant-groups as determined by the other precepts of the Prâtiçâkhyas—treating *visarjanîya*, for example, as is prescribed in the ninth chapter, and making the insertions pointed out in the fifth (v.32,33 etc.). And further, to finish the matter, the rules for *yama*, *nâsikya*, and *svarabhakti* (xxi.12-16) must be duly taken into account.

In an additional note to the Atharva Prâtiçâkhyas, I gave a complete list of the consonant-groups of the Atharva-Sanhitâ, with the forms which they come finally to assume under the laws of combination. It has been necessary to prepare a similar one for the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, in testing the reach and bearing of the rules of the present treatise: but the scheme is hardly worth giving in full.

---

1. *svarapûrvam vyañjanam*<sup>1</sup> *vyañjanaparam*<sup>2</sup> *dvivarnam âpad-yate. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *uru*..... *evampûrva iti kim: tat*..... *evampara iti kim: uru*..... *vyañjanam iti kim: pra*..... *svaraḥ pûrvo yasmât*<sup>4</sup> *tat*<sup>5</sup> *svarapûrvam: vyañjanam asmât param iti vyañjanaparam: dvayor varṇayoḥ samâhâro dvivarnam.*<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put next before *dvivarnam*. <sup>2</sup> O. *param*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. ins. *asâu*. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. adds *svarapûrvam iti kim: prajananam: padbhyâm*.....: *vyañjanaparam iti kim: ugaṇâ uta: vyañjana iti kim: praugam*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



is itself doubled (except by Hârîta, rule 18), a first mute of the same series with the nasal is inserted before the latter (rule 9), and between the two mutes a *yama* (xxi.12); so that we have as final result the formidable combinations *ççpp̄m* and *ssp̄m*.

The Rik Pr. (vi.2) also requires a double mute after *l*, and the Vâj. Pr. (iv.99) after any semivowel—which last is equivalent with our rule, since *y* is never followed by a mute.

We have a right to be surprised at the introduction of this and the rule next following before rule 4, since the duplication they teach is analogous to that after *r*, and of secondary importance to it.

## स्पर्श एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. According to some teachers, the mute only.

That is to say, in the combinations just treated of, the mute is duplicated, but not the preceding semivowel also; and we are to read *kalppân* and *vibhādāvnne*.

According to the commentator, this rule represents the approved usage in the *çâkhâ*. It seems very strange to find such approved usage laid down in the Prâtiçâkhyâ merely as the *dictum* of certain authorities. But a rule (xiv.7) is given below, without any restriction, which plainly implies the validity of the present one.

## रेफात्परं च ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also a consonant that follows *r*.

The *r* itself being, by rule 15, not liable to duplication. This is the rule second in importance in the whole system, and is found in all the Prâtiçâkhyâs and in Pânini. The Ath. Prât. (iii.31), the Vâj. Prât. (iv.98), and Pânini (viii.4.46) ascribe the same effect to *h* as to *r*: and it is strange that our treatise, which is so liberal in its citation of discordant opinions, makes no reference to one so well supported as this. After *h* we find in the Sanhitâ only the three nasals specified in rule xxi.14 as requiring the insertion of a *nâsikya*, and the three semivowels *y*, *r*, *v*; *r*, on the other hand, forms numerous groups as first member: I have noted twenty-four of two consonants, forty-three of three consonants, and five of four consonants; a few of them are exempted from duplication by rules 16, 20–23. The cited examples are *arcanty arkam arkinah* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>:

3. *ekeshâm* <sup>1</sup> *mate lavakârapûrva*<sup>2</sup> *sparçâ*<sup>3</sup> *eva dvivarṇam*<sup>4</sup> *âpnoti*<sup>5</sup>: <sup>6</sup>*anendâ 'vadhâraṇena sâtrântarârambhanena ca pâushkarasâdimate lavakârayoç ca dvitvam asti 'ti gamyate*<sup>6</sup>.

*idam eva sûtram ishtaṁ na tu pûrvam*<sup>7</sup>. *pûrvoktâny*<sup>8</sup> *evo 'dâharaṇâni*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. ins. *âcâryâṇâm*. <sup>2</sup> B. *-rvaç ca*; G. M. put after *eva*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-çapara*, as also in the rule. <sup>4</sup> O. *dvitvam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. *âpadyate*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> O. *sûtram*. <sup>8</sup> O. *ukt-*.



i. e. *arccanty arkkam arkkinaḥ*), *arkeyeṇa vâi* (vii.5.9<sup>1</sup>: i. e. *arckyeṇa*: wanting in O.), and *ûrg vâ udumbaraḥ* (v.1.10<sup>1</sup> et al.: i. e. *ûrgg vâi*).

The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule, according to the commentator, implies duplication, and precedence of the *r* by a vowel (bringing down *svarapûrva* from rule 1). The question is raised by an objector whether sequence of the consonant following the *r* by another consonant (in virtue of *vyañjanaparam* in rule 1) is not also implied: but such sequence is declared not obligatory; and it is pointed out that later rules (15,16), exempting a consonant *in pausâ*, and a spirant before a vowel, from duplication after *r*, prove that the present rule prescribes duplication also where no consonant follows, and where a vowel follows; since there would be no propriety in denying by a special rule what had not been already enjoined by a general rule. In support of his assertion that the *r* must be preceded by a vowel, the commentator cites the word *tryambakam* (i.8.6<sup>2</sup>), in which he says that the *y* must not be doubled: and he fortifies his claim by appealing to Pânini's rule (viii.4.46), which expressly restricts duplication after *r* and *h* to cases in which these letters follow a vowel (G. M. add the remark that in Pânini also no implication of *vyañjanaparam*, 'followed by a consonant,' is found). The Vâj. Pr. (iv.102) makes an equivalent restriction explicitly. The groups are not numerous in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ in which a *r* that does not stand first is followed by a consonant, and the only consonant so following is *y*: the combinations are *jry*, *try*, *ñtry*, *ttry*, *ntry*, *stry*, and *tstry*.

This finishes the proper exposition and illustration of the rule; but the commentator suffers himself to be enticed into a lengthy and tedious refutation of a trivial suggestion which some one has been impertinent enough to make. There are those, he says, who

---

4. *rephât param*<sup>1</sup> *vyañjanam*<sup>2</sup> *dvivarnam âpadyate*<sup>2</sup>:<sup>3</sup> *yathâ*<sup>4</sup>:  
*arc*----: <sup>5</sup>*arky*----: <sup>5</sup>*ûrg*----. <sup>6</sup>*svarapûrvadvitvayor âkar-*  
*shakaç cakârah. nanu*<sup>6</sup> *vyañjanaparadvâkarshakah kim na syât:*  
*ne 'ti brûmaḥ: niyamâbhâvât: tathâ hi: avasâne*<sup>7</sup> (xiv.15)  
*ûshmâ svarapara* (xiv.16) *ity etannishedhadvayena rephât pa-*  
*rasya*<sup>8</sup> *vyañjanasya*<sup>9</sup> *vyañjanaparadvâbhâve*<sup>10</sup> *svarapûrvatve*<sup>11</sup> '*pi*  
*dvitvam asti 'ti niçcîyate*<sup>12</sup>: *aprasaktapratishedhânupapatteḥ*<sup>13</sup>.  
*svarapûrvatvânvâdeçena*<sup>14</sup> *kim: tryambakam ity âdâu mâ*  
*bhâd iti: kim ca:* <sup>15</sup>*aco rahâbhyâm dve iti*<sup>15</sup> *pâninîyasûtreṇâ*  
*'pi svarapûrvatve saty eva*<sup>16</sup> *dvitvam vidhîyate:* <sup>17</sup>*tasyâ*<sup>18</sup> '*yam*  
*arthaḥ: aca uttarâu yâu rephahakârâu tâbhyâm uttarasya yaro*  
*dve bhavata*<sup>19</sup> *iti.* <sup>20</sup>

*kecid evam ūcuḥ*<sup>21</sup>: *svarapûrvâdiçabdavad rephapûrvam iti*  
*vâcye*<sup>22</sup> *vâco*<sup>23</sup> *yuktyantaram arthântaram samarthayati*<sup>24</sup>: *a har*  
*---- ity âdâu*<sup>25</sup> *vâikṛtarephâd*<sup>26</sup> *uttarasya* <sup>27</sup>*na syâd dvitvam*<sup>27</sup> *iti.*  
*tad etadudhyayanaviruddhapaddhatim adhyâste*<sup>28</sup>: *vayam tu va-*



maintain that the analogy of *svarapūrvam* in rule 1 would require *rephapūrvam*, 'preceded by *r*,' to be employed here (instead of *rephāt param*, 'following *r*'), and that the difference of phraseology intimates a difference of meaning—namely, that a consonant coming after a *r* which is the product of euphonic alteration, as in *ahar devānām āsīt* (i.5.9<sup>2</sup>: only W. B. have *āsīt*), is not doubled. But this, he replies, enters upon a path which is at variance with the reading of this *çākḥā*; and he proposes himself to set forth the true ground of the different term employed. If *rephapūrvam*, namely, were used, the rule would be liable to the suspicion of meaning the direct opposite of its real intent, since *rephapūrvam* admits of being understood as *rephāt pūrvam*, 'preceding *r*.' And if it be retorted that this false implication is of no account, since the case it would involve is already provided for in the first rule of the chapter, and the present rule would be a mere useless repetition, and that the avoidance of such repetition is of itself enough to refute the implication—then the farther reply is made, that that is not sound doctrine, in view of the principle stated in the verse "non-contact with mud is far preferable to the washing of it off;" and the teacher uttered the rule in its form as given, with the intent that not even a particle of suspicion of wrong meaning should find occasion from it.

There is no good reason to suppose that the author of the treatise, in saying *rephāt param*, intended to do anything more than use a lawful discretion in the selection of his phraseology. The ambiguity which the commentator ascribes to the other reading is suffered to pass in numberless other cases. The more desirable cleanliness of him who has incurred no need of ablution has been referred to once before (under iv.23), in a case somewhat similar.

*dāmo vāco yuktyantaraprayojanam: rephapūrvam ity ukte viruddhavigraheṇa<sup>29</sup> sūtram saṁdigdham syāt: rephāt pūrvam rephapūrvam<sup>30</sup> iti: bhavatu<sup>31</sup> esha<sup>32</sup> vigraha iti cet: adhyāyādisūtrenāi 'tad gatam iti<sup>33</sup> pāunaruktyam asya sūtrasyā 'padyate: nanu pāunaruktyabhayād eva viruddhavigraham nivārayāmaḥ<sup>34</sup>: ne 'yam saralā vṛttiḥ: prakshālanād dhi<sup>35</sup> pañkasya dūrād asparṣanam varam iti<sup>35</sup> nyāyād<sup>36</sup> atra viruddhaçañkāleço 'pi nā 'vakāçam labhatām iti vāco yuktyantareṇa sūtram ācāryaḥ provāca.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. ca. <sup>(2)</sup> O. *dvitvam āpnoti*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *svarapūrvatvadvitvayor ākarshakaç cakārah na tu vyañjanaparavākarshakah*. <sup>4</sup> in G. M. only. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. *cakāro* only. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *atha na* (xiv.14) *ity uttaranishedhādhikāre avasānavisarjanīyajihvāmūlīyopadhmanīyāḥ* (xiv.15). <sup>8</sup> W. O. *paraç ca*. <sup>9</sup> W. B. om. <sup>10</sup> W. B. *-vena*; O. *-bhāne*; G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-raparatve*; O. om. <sup>12</sup> O. *gamyate*; G. M. *niçcaye katham*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-ktasya pra-*. <sup>14</sup> O. *-rvānv-*. <sup>(15)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *evam*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ins. *tat katham: aco rahābhyān dve*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *asy-*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *sta*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. add *tatrā 'pi vyañjanaparavaprasaktir na dṛçyate*. <sup>21</sup> O. *āhuh*. <sup>22</sup> B. om. <sup>23</sup> W. om.; G. M. *rephāt param iti vāco*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *-yatī 'ti arthāntarasyā 'dāharaṇam ucyate*. <sup>25</sup> G. M. *atra*. <sup>26</sup> W. om. *vāikṛta*. <sup>(27)</sup> G. M. *vyañjanasya dvitvan na syād*. <sup>28</sup> O. *-āsīta*. <sup>29</sup> W. *viruddhāv iti grahaṇena*; G. M. O. *-haṇe*. <sup>30</sup> W. B. *pūrvam*; O. corrupt. <sup>31</sup> W. B. *bhavaty*. <sup>32</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>33</sup> G. M. *tataḥ*. <sup>34</sup> O. *-ma iti cet*. <sup>(35)</sup> G. *pañke 'ti*; B. om. *varam*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. *-yenā*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



signifying that the increment-consonant is not itself to be doubled; but justly pronounces this to be inappropriate, as such duplication is forbidden by rule 23 of this chapter.

In this and the three following rules is contained, for all the cases which come within the purview of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, the explicit prohibition of a double aspirate. Such double aspirates are, however, sometimes written by the Hindu scribes, both in situations where the authority of the phonetic treatises directly forbids them, and elsewhere. Thus, my manuscript of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ has, three times, *dh dh* instead of *ḍ dh* as the result of combination of *t* and *h* (at ii.6.12<sup>5</sup> : iii.4.1<sup>4</sup> : v.3.12<sup>2</sup>), and the Calcutta edition, so far as printed, gives, unadvisedly, the same. Both authorities agree in reading *dididhḍhi* at iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>. The edition, absurdly enough, gives *adhaththâh* at i.1.13<sup>2</sup>, where my manuscript has *adhatthâh*. And I find a few cases of *khkh* and *chch*, which will be noted under rule 8, below.

As under the preceding rule, the commentator here also enters into a tedious and useless discussion of a verbal question; namely, why 'followed by consonants' is represented by *vyañjanottarayoh* instead of *vyañjanaparayoh*. Some, he says, have maintained that a difference of meaning is intended by the difference of phraseology; that it is desired, namely, to except cases like *abhy asthât* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), where the following consonant is the product of euphonic alteration. The ground alleged for this claim is not entirely clear to me: it seems to be that a specified following cause (one that produces an effect in something that precedes it) is common to the *saṁhitâ*-text and that which is not *saṁhitâ*; hence, a cause of increment occurring in either kind of text being in question, a citation of words from outside the *saṁhitâ* is alone suitable, on account of their constancy—that is, *abhi : asthât* not being citable as an example under the rule in its *pada*-form, it must not be so treated in its *saṁhitâ*-form, as well. But the claim is disallowed, as being opposed to the actual reading, and also to the fundamental

---

*virodhân mûlasûtravirodhâc*<sup>18</sup> *ca : tathâ hi : mûlasûtre svarapûrvatve vyañjanaparatve*<sup>19</sup> *ca sati vihitaṁ*<sup>20</sup> *dvitvam atra nishpadyate*<sup>21</sup> : *na tu*<sup>22</sup> *tatra vyañjanam viçeshitam : tadapavâdakatvâd atrâ*<sup>23</sup> *'pi tadviçesho vaktum ayuktaḥ*<sup>24</sup>. *çikshâdiparîkshanâd*<sup>25</sup> *adhyayanânurodhâc ca vâco yuktyantarâbhiprâyo 'smâbhir abhidhîyate*<sup>26</sup>. *apavâdyâpavâdakayor*<sup>27</sup> *anayor*<sup>28</sup> *niyamo nâ 'sti : kim iti*<sup>28</sup> *svrapûrvatve sati vyañjanaparam eva vyañjanam*<sup>29</sup> *dvitvam*<sup>30</sup> *bhajate :* <sup>31</sup> *dvitîyacaturthâu ca*<sup>32</sup> *vyañjanaparâv*<sup>33</sup> *eva pûrvâgamam*<sup>34</sup> *bhajata iti : kim tu prâcuryâbhiprâyeṇe 'dam sûtradvayam pravṛttam. katham niyamâbhâvaḥ : anyathâ*<sup>35</sup> *kuत्रचित् कार्यद्वयadarçanât.* <sup>36</sup> *attâ . . . : annapata ityâdâu dvitvam : pra . . . : addhi . . . ityâdâu pûrvâgamah*<sup>37</sup> : *tâñ hasta ity atra tu*<sup>38</sup> *prâptâu satyâm api ne 'dam kâryam drçyata iti ca*<sup>39</sup> *niyamâbhâvaḥ. çikshâ câi 'vam vakshyati :*



rule. For, the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv.1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied; and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant; hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed.

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phraseology, with due regard to the Çikshâ, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text. But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument. The point of it is an asserted absence of *niyama* in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception. *Niyama*, 'obligatory force,' appears to signify here joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence. When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant; and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant. But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity ('diversity' or 'independence?' *prâcurya* is not found elsewhere). How does an absence of *niyama* appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light. In *attâ havîñshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>) and in *annapate* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> et al.), and so on, there is duplication; in *pracchac chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have instead *acchâvâkah*, the reference for which I have failed to note) and *addhi tvam̐ deva prayatâ* (ii.6.12<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit *prayatâ*), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute; but in *tân̐ haste* (vi.1.3<sup>7</sup>: W. has *tân̐s te* [iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>], but doubtless by accidental omission of *ha*), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen: hence, there is

*svarât*<sup>40</sup> *pûrvasya*<sup>41</sup> *varṇasya kvacid dvitvam̐ ca kathyate*<sup>42</sup>:  
*na ca varḡadvitîyasya na caturthe kadâ*<sup>43</sup> *cana.*

*vyâkhyâtam̐ ca vacanam̐ etadvidvadbhiḥ:*

*kutracit svarayor madhye dvitvam̐ lakshyânusârataḥ:*  
*pûrvâgamas tathâ tatra jñeyo varṇavicakshaṇâiḥ.*

<sup>44</sup> *evam̐rûpam̐ aniyamaṁ sūcayitum̐ vyañjanottarayor*<sup>45</sup> *ity anta-*  
*rasvîkârah*<sup>46</sup>.

*vyañjanam̐ uttaram̐ yâbhyâm̐ tâu*<sup>47</sup> *vyañjanottarâu*<sup>48</sup>: *tayoḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. put next before *pûrv-*, O. adding *tu*. <sup>2</sup> in O. only. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. O. om.  
<sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *svarapûrvayor*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vyañjanottarayor*. <sup>6</sup> B. *utaratranî-*; G. M. *uttarasûtrani-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. *-tteḥ-*; O. om. *tan*. <sup>8</sup> B. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. *-tî 'ti*; G. M. add *tatra*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *sam̐hitâsam̐h-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *paramani-*; O. *uktani-*. <sup>12</sup> O. om.  
<sup>13</sup> O. *tatra*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-rasya*. <sup>15</sup> W. O. om. *tad*; B. *guṇam*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *evam*; M. exchanges the places of *eva* and *iti*. <sup>17</sup> O. *-tî 'ti*. <sup>18</sup> O. om. *sûtra*. <sup>19</sup> O. *-namâ-trapar-*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-ta*; O. puts after *dvitvam*, and adds *ity*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *nishidhyate*; O. *viçishyate*. <sup>22</sup> W. B. O. *nu*. <sup>23</sup> W. B. *tatr-*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *yuktaḥ*. <sup>25</sup> W. *-dipavâcaksh-*; G. M. *-ṇa*. <sup>26</sup> O. *abhikshî-*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. *apavâdâp-*. <sup>(28)</sup> G. M. *nâ 'sti virodha iti*. <sup>29</sup> O. *paramam̐*. <sup>30</sup> W. om. <sup>31</sup> O. ins. *svarapûrvo*. <sup>32</sup> B. *tu*; O. om. <sup>33</sup> O. *parâv*. <sup>34</sup> W. *-me*; G. M. *-mâu*. <sup>35</sup> B. G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. ins. *katham*. <sup>37</sup> W. B. *-mam̐*. <sup>38</sup> O. om. <sup>39</sup> W. om. <sup>40</sup> O. *-ra*. <sup>41</sup> W. *sarvasya*. <sup>42</sup> G. M. *vakshyate*. <sup>43</sup> G. M. *katham̐*. <sup>44</sup> O. ins. *ity*. <sup>45</sup> O. *-janayor*. <sup>46</sup> G. M. O. *uttarasv-*. <sup>47</sup> G. M. *tad*. <sup>48</sup> G. M. *-ram̐*.



absence of *niyama*. The examples here furnished, which ought to give us the clue to the commentator's meaning, seem to leave us wholly in the dark, since not one of them falls under either of the rules in question: the first, second, and fourth are by rule 23, below, exempt from duplication; the third is a case under rule 8; and the combination *ñh* is (see under rule 15) treated as a simple *h*. Next, the *Çikshâ* is quoted, to the effect that "in some cases, also, duplication of the first consonant of a group after a vowel is prescribed; not, however, of a second mute, nor of a fourth, under any circumstances;" and, by those versed in the subject, the statement is explained [in conformity with what follows]: "in some cases, there is duplication of a consonant between two vowels, in accordance with rule; so there also is to be understood prefixion of the preceding mute, by those skilled in alphabetic sounds" (in the known *Çikshâ*, it may be remarked, no such verses as these are to be found). And the final conclusion is, that the different term in *vyañjanottarayoh* is intended to signify an absence of *niyama* of this sort. That is to say, perhaps, the real independence of the two rules is intimated by the choice of a different term in expressing the common factor which they contain.

## रेफपूर्वयोश्च नित्यम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. As also, in all cases, when they follow *r*.

This, it is pointed out, has the value of an exception under rule 4. The dual number of *rephapûrvayoh* shows that the pair, "second and fourth mutes," spoken of just above, is intended. "Also" (*ca*) implies the increment by prefixion of the next preceding mute. And the meaning is, that second and fourth mutes, with the limitations prescribed, as preceded by *r*, take always their respective predecessors as increment. Thus, *ûrdhvo* (i. e. *ûrddhvo*) *bhava* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), and *ardhyavân* (i. e. *arddhy-*) *prâṇaḥ* (vi.5.2<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *prâṇaḥ*). *Nityam*, 'in all cases,' implies that the increment is made after *r* when the mute to be increased is followed by a vowel also (not alone when it is *vyañjanottara*, as specified in rule 5). Thus, in *artheta* (i. e. *artth-*) *sthâ 'pâm* (i.8.11: only B. has *apâm*), *mûrkhâm* (i. e. *mûrkkhâm*) *tajjaghanyâm* (vii.1.6<sup>4</sup>), and *goarggham* (i. e. *goarggham*) *eva* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup>).

## लकारपूर्वे च ॥ ७ ॥

6. *rephât param ca* (xiv.4) *ity asyâ 'pavâḍakam etat*<sup>1</sup>: *dvi-vacanena dvitīyacaturthâu gr̥hyete: saviçeshanayo*<sup>2</sup> *rephapûrvayor anayor*<sup>3</sup> *nityam pûrvâgamo bhavati*<sup>4</sup>: *âgamânvâdeçakaç cakâraḥ. yathâ*<sup>5</sup>: *ûrdh-.....: ardhy-..... nityam iti kim: svaraparatve 'pi bhavatu*<sup>6</sup> *etad iti: arthe-.....: mûrkhâm-.....: go-.....*

<sup>1</sup> W. *avadat*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *navi-*; G. M. O. *-shanâu*. <sup>3</sup> O. *tayor*. <sup>4</sup> O. *syât*. <sup>5</sup> in G. M. only. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-ty*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*dasam upa dadhâti* (v.3.8<sup>3</sup>), *savitra âticchandasâya* (vii.5.14), *dhâmacchad iva khalu vâi* (ii.4.10<sup>2</sup>: B. O. omit *vâi*), *paramacchado vare* (iv.6.2<sup>1</sup>), and *yad bhûtecchadân̄ sâmâni* (vii.5.9<sup>4</sup>).

Further examples of the increment of *ch*, falling under this rule, are *âcchad* and *pracchad* (at iv.3.12<sup>2,3</sup>) and *âcchettâ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup>): if there are others, I have omitted to note them. The usage in the manuscripts, of our commentary and of the Sanhitâ, is quite irregular, varying between *ch* simply, *cch*, and *chch*, without much regard to whether the case is one to which this rule applies or not. I have collected the cases in which my manuscript of the Sanhitâ has *chch*: they are *dhâmachchad* (ii.4.10<sup>2</sup>; but *dhâmachad* in the same division), *prachchach chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>), and *âyuchchad-bhyah* (iv.5.3<sup>2</sup>); and, in the combination of separate words (besides the case just quoted), *âcchach chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>2</sup>), *kakuch chandah* (iii.1.6<sup>3</sup>), and *yach chreshthah* (iii.4.8<sup>1</sup>). In every one of these instances, the Calcutta edition, so far as it yet reaches, reads correctly *cch*.

I have found no other cases of the increment of *khi* under the rule; but my manuscript has (without authority) *udakhkhidat* (ii.1.1<sup>4,5</sup>), *sam akhkhidat* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup>), and *akhkhidrâh* (iii.5.8), while (along with the MSS. of the comment) it reads *khkh* instead of *kkh* in the example (iv.5.9<sup>2</sup>) cited above. The edition reads *kkh* at ii.1.1<sup>4,5</sup>, remarking at the latter place that its manuscript authorities have *khkh*. Of course, the doubled aspirate is to be rejected, here as elsewhere, in obedience to sound phonetic theory as well as to the concordant authority of the Prâtiçâkhyas.

अघोषाद्रूप्मणः परः प्रथमो ऽभिनिधान स्पर्शपरा-  
त्तस्य सस्थानः ॥ १ ॥

9. After a surd spirant followed by a mute is inserted a first mute of the same position with the latter, as *abhinidhâna*.

The surd spirants are (see i.9,12,13) five, namely *ç* (*jihvâmûlîya*), *ç*, *sh*, *s*, and *φ* (*upadhmânîya*). The rule is to be paralleled with those in the Vâj. Pr. (iv.99,100), which direct that a mute be doubled after a spirant, and after *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmânîya* (which in that treatise are not reckoned as spirants); also with

8. *upasargapûrveshu pâtha----- evampûrveshu ca<sup>1</sup> satsu cha khi bhujje 'ty eteshu pûrvâgamo bhavati<sup>2</sup>. cakâra âgamânvâdeçakah. yathâ<sup>3</sup>: â-----: nama-----: ayak-----: je 'ti kim: vibhu-----: yâ-----: 'khî 'ti kim: nikh-----: datsv-----: upasarga<sup>5</sup> iti kim: sa-----:<sup>4</sup> etâny upasargapûrvâni. anyâny<sup>6</sup> ucyante: priyam-----: pâtha iti kim: ṛtubhir-----: ati-----: savitra-----: dhâma-----: parama-----: yad-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> O. *syât*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -*rgapûrva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. ins. *apy*.



that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely ç, sh, s, h, ç, φ, ñ). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the *lacuna* occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and Pâṇini have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tâittirîya usage more nearly into accord with that of the Rik and Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâs; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: *yaḥ kâmayeta* (i. e. *yax kâmay-*: ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.); *açmann* (i. e. *açpman*, or, after all rules are applied, *aççp̄man*) *urjam* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for φ); *grîshme* (i. e. *grîshpme* or *grîshshp̄me*) *madhyandine* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>); *ayasmayam* (i. e. *ayaspmayam* or *ayassp̄mayam*) *vi crtâ bandham* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup>: only W. has *bandham*); *yaḥ pâpmanâ* (i. e. *yaφ ppâ-*: ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>): O. adds to this last *tasmin* (vii.1.5<sup>1</sup> et al.: to be treated like *ayasmayam*, above), and, after *madhyandine*, *prâ'çnâti* (*prâççt̄nâti*: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first *çarady aparâhne* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>: but O. substitutes *brahmavâdino vadanti*, i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et al.), to show that the sonant spirant, *h*, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of *nâsikya*, xxi. 14); then *rukman upa dadhâti* (v.2.7<sup>1,2</sup>; the case is one for *yama*, xxi.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly *ishvâ ca vajrena ca* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely *yam apnavânah* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>) and *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup> et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) *agnaye svâhâ* (i.2.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

In all these combinations, *ç* and *φ* are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xiv.17,18) would leave them unchanged.

---

9. *sparçaparâd aghoshâd ūshmaṇaḥ paraḥ<sup>1</sup> prathama<sup>2</sup> âgamas<sup>3</sup> tasya sparçasya sasthânaḥ<sup>4</sup> samânasthâno 'bhinidhâno bhavati. abhinidhîyata<sup>5</sup> ity abhinidhânaḥ: âropaṇîya ity arthaḥ: <sup>6</sup>vedântare tasyâ<sup>6</sup> 'bhâvâd atrâ "ropaṇîyatvam. yathâ<sup>7</sup>: yaḥ----: <sup>8</sup>açm----: <sup>8</sup>grîsh----: ayasm----: yaḥ----. aghoshâd iti kim: çarady----. ūshmaṇa iti kim: <sup>9</sup>rukman----. <sup>9</sup>sparçaparâd iti kim: ishvâ----.*

*sûtram idam eve 'shtam: na tatparadvayam<sup>10</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *pratham*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-mo bhavati*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *-dhâyata*; B. *-niyata*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vedântarasyâ*; O. *-reṇa tad a*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> O. *yam apnavânaḥ: sa pratnavat*, and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). <sup>10</sup> G. M. *tu par-*.



The commentator illustrates with groups of two consonants only (of which the Sanhitâ presents twenty-three that would come under the action of the rule); the question arises, then, whether in groups of three or more consonants (of which there are over fifty)—where the mute is followed by another consonant (as *χkl*, *çny*, *shky*, *stm*, *stry*, *φpr*), or where the spirant stands second (as *rçm*, *kshn*, *rshny*, *tsk*, *tsphy*), or where each is the case (as *tstr*, *tstry*, *ntstr*), or where there are two spirants followed by mutes in the same group (as *χkshn*)—the rule is to be relentlessly applied. It can admit of little doubt that the sequence of another consonant would not affect the case; whether a preceding consonant would do so is more doubtful. Such resultant groups as *nthsttr*, *tthspphy*, *kkhshṭṭny*, and *χkkhshṭṭn*, have a tolerably frightful appearance; but whether they would stagger the heroic soul of a Hindu *çâkhin*, is another matter.

To the inserted mute is applied the name *abhinidhâna*, which the commentator explains by *abhinidhâyate*, 'it is set down against;' giving as its synonym *âropanîya*, (I presume, simply) 'to be inserted;' and adding the remark, "owing to the absence of this in any other Veda, there is here insertibility" (?). He takes no notice of the doctrine of *abhinidhâna* as a peculiar and imperfect utterance of certain letters in certain situations, which plays so formidable a part in the phonetic systems of the Rik and Ath. Prâtiçâkhyas (see especially the note to Ath. Pr. i.43): we, however, bearing that doctrine in mind, may conjecture with plausibility that the word here not merely signifies an insertion, but designates also a peculiar quality of the inserted letter.

## अघोषे प्लक्षेः ॥ १० ॥

10. According to Plâkshi, when the following mute is surd.

That is to say, not when it is a nasal: Plâkshi would ratify *χkk*, *χkkh*, *shṭṭ*, *shṭṭh*, and so on, but would make no insertion in *çm*, *shn*, and their like. This, as was remarked under the last rule, would correspond more nearly with the teachings of the Rik and Vâj. Prâtiçâkhyas. The commentator illustrates with *nishkevalyam* (iv.4.2<sup>2</sup>), *yaḥ kâmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.), *paçcât prâcîm* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>: B. reads *prâcî*, which is found in the same division; W. has *prâñcam*, which does not occur in the Sanhitâ after *paçcât*), *nishṭapâmi* (i.1.10<sup>1</sup>), *doshâvastah* (i.2.14<sup>4</sup> et al.), *yaḥ pâpmanâ* (ii.3.

10. <sup>1</sup> *aghosha eva sparçe*<sup>2</sup> *pare* <sup>3</sup>*saty aghoshâd ūshmanah* <sup>4</sup>*prathamâgamo*<sup>3</sup> *bhavati*: <sup>5</sup>*plâksheḥ pakshah*<sup>5</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>6</sup>: *nish*-----: <sup>8</sup>*yaḥ*-----: *paçc*-----: *nish*-----: <sup>7</sup>*aksh*-----: <sup>7</sup>*dosh*-----: *yaḥ*-----: *âsp*-----<sup>8</sup> *aghosha eve* <sup>9</sup>*ti kim*: *kūçmâñ*-----<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *plâksheç çâkhino mate*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. G. M. *-ça*; O. *-çe* 'pi. <sup>(3)</sup> O. *prathamô 'bhinidhâno*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *parah*. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. om.; W. puts out of place, before *aksh*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(8)</sup> O. substitutes *suçcandra*---: *sparçaparâd iti kim*: *agn*----- *sûtram idam eve* <sup>9</sup>*shtam na tu paradvayam*. 95. *aghosha eva sparçapare prathamâ yaç chandasâm*: *naç cid ati*: *syâtram*: *bṛhaspatisûrapate*. <sup>8</sup> O. adds *abhinidhânaniyamô nâ* 'sti.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



(vi.1.1<sup>2</sup>); and, as counter-examples, *nishkevalyam* (iv.4.2<sup>2</sup>), *yah kâmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al. : B. omits), *yah pâpmanâ* (ii.3.13<sup>2</sup> : G. M. omit), and *paçcât* (v.2.9<sup>4</sup> et al.). Plâkshâyana would read the first class as rule 9 requires, but would leave the mute without increment in the second class.

Then a second and wholly different interpretation is set forth as taught by certain authorities: namely, that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule, instead of negating Plâkshi's opinion, reverses the quality of the spirant as prescribed in rule 9, changing it from surd to sonant—that is to say, admitting the increment only after *h*. The examples given are *ahnâm ketuḥ* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>), *çarady aparâhne* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup> : only W. has *çarady*), and *brahmavâdino vadanti* (i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et al. : W. B. omit *vadanti*); the counter-examples, illustrating omission of the increment after a surd spirant, are *açmâ ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>), *grîshmo hemantaḥ* (v.7.2<sup>4</sup>), and *ayasmayaṁ vi çṛta* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup> : W. B. omit *çṛta*). This, which is in itself forced and inadmissible, would also be equivalent to limiting the insertion to the little class of cases in which a later rule (xxi.14) requires the interposition of a *nâsikya*.

In the exposition of this rule, O. goes its own peculiar way, and takes no notice of the second interpretation which the other manuscripts report. It furnishes no counter-examples, and its examples agree only in part with those already given: they are (corrected) *akshnayâ vyâghârayati*, *grîshme madhyandine* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>), *açnâti* (or *snâti*), and *ayasmayaṁ vi çṛta*.

The rule was pronounced unapproved by the commentator under rule 9.

## प्रथम ऊष्मपरो द्वितीयम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. A first mute followed by a spirant is changed into its corresponding aspirate.

Literally, becomes a second mute—of course, of its own series. The examples given are as follows: *visrpo virapçinn* (i. e. *viraphçin*; or, by xiv.1, *virapphçin*) *udâdâya* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup> : only O. has the first word, and it omits the last; W. reads *vâratrivadâya*, which is evidently merely a corruption); *tat shodaçy* (i. e. *-tth sh-*) *abhavat* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup> : only G. M. have *abhavat*); *pratyañ somaḥ* (i.8.21 : i. e. *pratyañk s-* by v.32; then *pratyañkh s-*); and *tat* (i. e. *tatth*)

12. *ûshmaparaḥ prathama sparçah<sup>1</sup> savargîyaṁ dvitîyam âpadyate. vis-.....: tat-.....: praty-.....: tat-.....* <sup>2</sup>*prathama iti kim: <sup>3</sup>tâh-.....* <sup>2</sup> *ûshmapara iti kim<sup>3</sup>: vâk-.....* <sup>4</sup>*arvâg-.....* *ity atra prathamapûrvo hakâraç caturtham tasya sasthânam* (v.38) *iti hakârasya caturthâpattir viçeshavihitatvât: tatas trtîyañ svaraghoshavatparas* (viii.3) *trtîyatvam.*

*idam eva sûtram ishṭam<sup>4</sup>.*

*ûshmâ paro yasmâd asâv<sup>5</sup> ûshmaparaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *âtmana*. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> W. B. om. <sup>(4)</sup> in O. only. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *sa*.



*savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.). As counter-examples, we have *tâh* (i. e. *tâs*, ix.2) *sañrohah* (v.3.6<sup>3</sup>: omitted by O.; dropped out in W. B.) and *vâk ta â pyâyatâm* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only O. has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place.

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O. alone. Such a case as *arvâk : hi : enam : parâih* (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>) might seem to fall under its action, the spirant *h* following a surd mute. But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v.38, *h* becomes a fourth mute by special prescription; and hence that rule viii.3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant.

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable. The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice.

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanhitâ attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required. The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G. M. O. aspirate the mutes, and W. B. leave them unchanged). Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the *varṇa-krama*, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tâittirîya text. Respecting the teachings of the other Prâtiçâkhyas upon the subject, see the note to Ath. Pr. ii.6.

## बाडभीकारस्यासस्थानपरः ॥ १३ ॥

13. According to Bâḍabhîkâra, when the following spirant is not of the same position with it.

Rule ii.44 teaches the accordance of the several (surd) spirants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production.

T. calls the individual here referred to Bâḍavîkâra, and W. O. have in the rule *vâḍabhîkâra*, but in the comment *bâḍabh-*; the rest have uniformly *b* as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than *v*. Weber gives the two forms *vâḍabh-* (V. Pr. p. 250) and *vâṭabh-* (ib., p. 78).

13. *bâḍabhîkârasya* <sup>1</sup> *mata âtmano*<sup>2</sup> 'sasthânoshmaparah prathamah savargîyam<sup>3</sup> dvitîyam âpadyate. <sup>4</sup>*samânam sthânam yasyâ 'sau sasthânah: na sasthâno 'sasthânah: sa paro yasmât sa tatho 'ktaḥ. yathâ*<sup>5</sup>: *vis- . . . : tat- . . .*<sup>4</sup> *asasthâna iti kim: tat- . . .*<sup>6</sup>

*ne 'dam sūtram ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *çâkhino*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. (and begin the next word *as-*). <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. *idarâ(?)sthâno yam sakârah*.



The commentary (except in O.) is at the pains to repeat a couple of the examples of aspiration already given, namely *visrpo virapçin* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>: W. omits *visrpo*) and *tat shodaçî* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup>): and it adds, in illustration of the peculiar view of the quoted authority, *tat savituḥ* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.), where the dental mute, being followed by the dental sibilant, remains unchanged.

This rule is pronounced unapproved.

अथ न ॥ १४ ॥

14. Now for exceptions.

A heading, introducing the detail of exceptions to the rules as already given, and continuing in force through rule 28.

अवसाने र्विसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयाः ॥ १५ ॥

15. A consonant before a pause is not doubled; nor *r*, *visarjanîya*, *jihvâmûlîya*, or *upadhmanîya*.

As example of a consonant before a pause, is given *ûrk* (iv.7.4<sup>1</sup> et al.: W. has instead so '*rkaḥ* [v.4.3<sup>3</sup>], but it is not an illustration of the rule, and is evidently here only a corrupted reading of *ûrk*), of which the *k* would otherwise be doubled by xiv.4. Of course, it is only a final after *r* that would fall under the rules of duplication before a pause. The text affords, I believe, no instance of a consonant occurring in this position in *samhitâ*, but such words as *ûrk* and *amârt* (vii.1.1<sup>2</sup> et al.) need to have their reading in the other forms of text determined by a rule like this. The commentator quotes *ûrk ca* (i. e. *ûrkk ca*) *me sūnrtâ ca me* (iv.7.4<sup>1</sup>: B. omits the last two words, G. M. O. the last three), as showing that the *k* is doubled when in *sandhi* with a following letter. To illustrate the exemption from duplication of the other letters specified, are given *nâ* "rtim *â rchati* (ii.2.4<sup>7</sup>), *manah ksheme* (v.2.1<sup>7</sup>), *yaḥ* (i. e. *yax*) *kâmayeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.), and *yaḥ* (i. e. *yaḥ*) *pâpmanâ* (ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>). According to the approved usage of this *çâkhâ* (see ix. 2,3), *visarjanîya* comes within the ken of this rule only when it

14. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah*: <sup>1</sup> *uktasya dvitvavidher*<sup>2</sup> *yathâ-sambhavam nishedho 'dhikriyata*<sup>3</sup> *ity 'etad adhikrtam*<sup>4</sup> *veditavyam ita* <sup>5</sup>*uttaram yad vakshyâmah*<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *atha*. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. *-dhe*; O. *vidh-*. <sup>3</sup> W. *-krta*. <sup>4</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> B. *no varṇah*.

15. *padâvasâne*<sup>1</sup> *vartamâno varṇo*<sup>2</sup> *repho visarjanîyo jihvâmûlîya upadhmanîyaç*<sup>2</sup> *ce*<sup>3</sup> *'ty ete varṇâ dvitvam nâ* "padyante<sup>4</sup>. *ûrk: rephât param ca* (xiv.4) *iti prâptih*. *avasânavacanam*<sup>5</sup> *virâmâbhiprâyam: tasmân na samdhâne nishedhaḥ: yathâ*<sup>6</sup>: *ûrk ca*----. *nâ*----: *man*----: *yaḥ*----: *yaḥ*----: *svara-pûrvam* (xiv.1) *ity anenâi 'shâm prâptih*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



manner suggested by the rules (literally, 'is expelled to a distance'), and consequently cannot be suspected of being taught here. If, on the other hand, *avasāne*, 'before a pause,' were set by itself, the inquiry would be "what under the sun is it that happens before a pause?" and the expression would appear meaningless. When, however, it is combined with the names of letters that follow, we naturally infer from the association that 'a letter *in pausā*' is intended. Hence, the inclusion of the two precepts in one rule is alone to be approved.

This defense of the unity of the rule is evidently of the most trifling and futile character, and the objectors are in the right—not, indeed, as the separation into two rules is absolutely necessary, but as it is decidedly preferable, and more in accordance with the general usage of the treatise elsewhere.

## उष्मा स्वरपरः ॥ १६ ॥

16. Nor a spirant, when followed by a vowel.

It is only, of course, after *r* (xiv.4) that a spirant can be liable to duplication before a vowel, so that the combinations to which the rule applies are *rç*, *rsh*, *rs*, and *rh*. All the other treatises excepting the Vâj. Prât. have the same rule (R. Pr. vi.2; A. Pr. iii.32; Pân. viii.4.49).

The commentator's examples are *darçapûrnamâsâu* (ii.2.5<sup>4</sup> et al.), *varshâbhyah* (vii.4.13: I presume; my MS. of the Sanhitâ has *varshyâbhyah* twice instead of *varshyâbhyah* and *varshâbhyah*: O. gives instead *suvarshâm*, iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>), *barsam̐ nahyati* (ii.5.7<sup>1-2</sup>), and *barhishâ* (i.7.4<sup>1</sup> et al.: G. M. have instead *barhisho 'ham*, also i.7.4<sup>1</sup>). To illustrate the limitation to a spirant, he gives *ebhir no arkâih* (i. e. *arkkâih*; iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>: O. omits); to show that a vowel must follow, *pârçve* (i. e. *pârççve*; vii.3.10<sup>3</sup>), *varshyâbhyah svâhâ* (i. e. *varshshy-*; vii.4.13: G. M. omit *svâhâ*), *barsvebhih* (i. e. *barssv-*; v.7.11), and *agnir hy asya* (i. e. *hhy*; v.1.5<sup>5</sup>)—but O. has a different series, namely *dârçyam̐ yajñam* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>), *varshye-bhih* (the MS. has *varshebhiih*; I have not succeeded in finding either word in the Sanhitâ), and *agner hy etat purîsham* (vi.2.8<sup>6</sup>).

The combinations in which the spirant after *r* is doubled, being followed by another consonant, are *rçm*, *rçy*, *rçv*, *rsht*, *rshn*, *rshm*, *rshy*, *rsv*, and *rhy*. To complete the *sandhi*, either with or without duplication, the rules for insertion of *svarabhakti* (xxi.15,16) have to be further applied.

---

16. *svarapara ūshmā dvitvam nā "padyate. svarah paro yas-mād asāu svaraparah. yathā<sup>1</sup>: darç-....: varsh-....: barsam̐....: barh-.....<sup>2</sup>rephāt param ca (xiv.4) iti prāptih. ūshme 'ti kim: ebhir-....<sup>2</sup> svarapara iti kim: pârçve: varsh-....: barsvebhih: agnir-....<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> O. *dā-....: varshebhiih: agner-....*



## प्रथमपरश्च प्लाक्षिप्लाक्षायणयोः ॥ १७ ॥

17. Or, according to Plâkshi and Plâkshâyaṇa, when followed by a first mute.

That is to say, these two *çâkhinâu* would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter. The groups which would be thus affected are *çc* and *çcy*, *çp*, *shk* and *shky* and *shkr*, *shṭ* and its further combinations (*shṭy*, *shṭr*, *shṭv*), *shp*, *sk*, *st* and its further combinations (*stm*, *sty*, *str* and *stry*, *stv*), and *sp*. One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely *çch* and *çchy*, *shkh*, *shṭh* and *shṭhy*, *sth* and *sthn*, *sph* and *sphy*) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications. It may be made a question whether the single case, *rsht*, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at; if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest.

The examples (which are lost in W.) are *suçcandra dasma* (iv. 4.4<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *dasma*) and *ashtâu krtvaḥ* (vi.4.5<sup>1</sup>); a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is *tasmâd evâm vidushâ* (vi.4.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *vidushâ*); but O. has, with B., omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, *ishvâ ca vajrena* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word *ca*, 'or,' in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to *ç*, *sh*, *s*, and *h*, since otherwise the mention of *ç* and *ç* in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept. The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prâtiçâkhyâ; in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissidents doubtless accepted

---

17. *plâkshiplâkshâyayayoh pakshe<sup>1</sup> 2prathamapara ūshmâ dvi-  
tvam nâ 3padyate. cakâra ūshmâṇam anvâdiçati. 4suçc-  
ashṭau-  
3prathamapara iti kim:3 tasmâd-  
2pratha-  
mah paro yasmâd asâu prathamaparah. 4*

*cakâro 5tra6 yady apy6 ūshmamâtrâkarshakas7 tathâ 8pi8 çâ-  
shasaheshv eva sampratyayah: anyathâ9 10vasâne ravisarja-  
nîya (xiv.15) iti10 sâtre jihvâmûlîyopadhmânîyayor grahanam  
vyartham: anenâi 11 12va nishedhasiddheḥ12.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *mate*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *prathamapara iti kim: ishvâ-  
5 G. M. O. om. 6 W. om. 7 G. M. ūshmâk-. 8 W. O. hi. 9 G. M. om. 10 W. O.  
om. 11 O. ins. shâi. 12 W. O. -shedhe s-*



rule 15, it was not necessary to regard the present statement of their views as having any reference to  $\chi$  and  $\varphi$ . That the rule is accepted in the *çâkhâ* represented by the commentator may be inferred also from the fact that (under rule 22) he pronounces the five that follow unapproved, but says nothing of this.

## उष्माघोषो हारीतस्य ॥ १८ ॥

18. According to Hârîta, a surd spirant is not doubled.

There is unusual variety and inaccuracy of reading among the different manuscripts of the commentary of this rule, and O. goes off upon a course of its own: yet the aim of all is the same, and not difficult to discover. The word *ûshmâ* (which was present or implied in the two preceding rules, and therefore might naturally enough come down into this by continued implication) is here expressly repeated, for the purpose of breaking connection with what goes before. If *aghosha*, 'surd,' only were specified, and *ûshmâ*, 'spirant,' implied, the latter would have to be implied along with the attributes attached to it above, namely "followed by a vowel," or "followed by a first mute," and to such a spirant the further qualification of "surd" would be given; while the meaning intended is that Hârîta would forbid the duplication of a surd spirant altogether, in any situation.

O. alone gives as first example *dârçyam yajñam* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>); all have *vâiçyo manushyânâm* (vii.1.1<sup>5</sup>); to which W. B. add *pushyati prajayâ paçubhiḥ* (ii.4.6<sup>2</sup>) and *vâiçvânarasya rūpam* (v.2.3<sup>2</sup> et al.), which O. omits, while G. M. substitute the single passage *asyâ 'parūpam* (iii.5.7<sup>3</sup>). As counter-example, showing the limitation to a surd spirant, W. B. give *tiroahniyâ mâ* (vii.3.13: B. omits *mâ*); but G. M. give instead *mahyam imân* (iii.1.9<sup>6</sup>), and O. *sapta jihvâḥ sapta* (i.5.3<sup>2</sup>).

18. <sup>1</sup> *hârîtasya* <sup>2</sup> *mate* <sup>3</sup> *ghosha ûshmâ dvitvam nâ* <sup>3</sup> *'padyate.*  
<sup>4</sup> *dârç-* .....: <sup>4</sup> *vâiçyo* .....: <sup>5</sup> *pushy-* .....: <sup>5</sup> *vâiçv-* .....<sup>5</sup> *aghosha*  
*iti kim:* <sup>6</sup> *tiro-* ..... *ûshmagrahaṇam* <sup>7</sup> *pûrvasûtrânapekshâr-*  
*tham* <sup>8</sup>: *atra yady apy ûshmagrahaṇam na kriyata ûshme 'ty etat*  
*svaraparatvena* <sup>9</sup> *sambaddham* <sup>10</sup>: *tasmâd ihâ 'pi tatsambandha-*  
*syâi 'vâ* <sup>11</sup> *'ghoshavattvaviçeshah* <sup>12</sup> <sup>13</sup> *syât:* *atas tannivṛttyartham*  
*ûshmagrahaṇam* <sup>14</sup> *atra kṛtam:* *ataḥ sarvâvastha ûshmâ 'tra*  
*dvitvanishedhabhâk* <sup>15</sup>. <sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. begins *ûshmagrahaṇam pûrvasûtrânapekshâtham: pûrvasûtre svaraparatvena prathamaparatvena ca sambandha iti aghoshagrahaṇam tasyâi 'va viçesham syât: atas tannivṛtayeshu punar ûshmagrahaṇam hârî-* etc. <sup>2</sup> O. ins. *çâkhino*. <sup>(3)</sup> O. *sarvâvasthâ eva ûshmâ 'ghosho nyo na dvivarnam á*. <sup>(4)</sup> in O. only. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om.; G. M. *asyâ* ..... <sup>(6)</sup> O. simply *sapta* ..... <sup>7</sup> W. *çûshmayâg-*; G. M. *-mâg-*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. *pûrvatran-*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>10</sup> W. *-bandham*; B. *-bandhah*. <sup>11</sup> W. B. *va*. <sup>12</sup> W. *-vatve vi-*; B. *-vatve 'ti vi-*; G. M. *'ghoshavattvaviçesham*. <sup>13</sup> W. B. ins. *na*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *ûshme 'ti gr-*. <sup>15</sup> W. *nishedhâyât*; B. *nishedhâya*, and adds, out of place, the first part of the comment to the next rule (to *rephaparo*, excl.).





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



account, since exempt from duplication by xiv.23), *shatkapālam niḥ* (i. e. *shatṭk-*; i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: wanting in O.), and *vid vāi marutaḥ* (i.e. *vidḍ vāi*; vi.6.5<sup>3</sup>).

## लतवर्गो यवकारपरौ ॥ २१ ॥

21. Nor *l* nor a dental mute, when followed by *y* or *v*.

Hârîta is this time implied "by vicinage" merely, there being no word in the rule to which his memory can be directly fastened. Examples of *l* before *y* and *v* are *kalyānî* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>) and *bāilvo yūpo bhavati* (ii.1.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *bhavati*); of a dental mute in like situation, *kanye 'va tunnā* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>) and *ishe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.). The accepted usage of the school requires *lly*, *llv*, *nnv*, *ttv*, while Hârîta would leave the groups as in the ordinary text.

Combinations of a dental mute with a following *y* or *v* are quite numerous (I have noted about twenty in the Sanhitâ).

## परश्च ॥ २२ ॥

22. Nor the following.

This rule completely puzzles the native comment, which has nothing of any value to say about it. Two explanations are suggested, evidently on the barest conjecture only, and it would be hard to say which of them is the more senseless. In the first place, it is said that *paraḥ*, being singular, implies the sound *v* (as being the one last mentioned in the preceding rule); it, namely, of the two affecting causes (*y* and *v*) specified in rule 21, does not suffer duplication: examples are *vibhūdāvne* (iii.5.8 et al.) and *ā grāvnaḥ* (vi.3.2<sup>3</sup>: W. B. omit *ā*); and a counter-example, showing the limitation to *v*, is *kalpān juhōti* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>). And the intent of the rule is to remove a restriction imposed in rule 3 of this chapter—that is to say, to allow the duplication of *l* before a mute, which is there forbidden. In the second place, *paraḥ* is said to be equivalent to *dvitīya*, 'second,' and to signify that, when the

*yasmād asāu tavargaparaḥ. tavarga<sup>7</sup> iti kim: <sup>8</sup>vāk-----: <sup>9</sup>tat  
-----<sup>9</sup> evampara<sup>6</sup> iti kim<sup>8</sup>: <sup>10</sup>shat-----: <sup>10</sup>vid-----.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *caçabdo*. <sup>2</sup> O. *-tasyā 'nv-*. <sup>3</sup> O. ins. *hârîtasya çākhino mate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(6)</sup> O. *tavargapara*. <sup>7</sup> W. *-gapara*. <sup>(8)</sup> B. om. <sup>(9)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(10)</sup> O. om.

21. *hârîtaḥ sâmnidhyâl labhyate: tanmate latavargāu na khalu yavakâraparāu dvitvam āpnutaḥ. <sup>1</sup>yathā: lakāraḥ: <sup>1</sup>kalyānî: bāilvo-----: <sup>2</sup>tavarge 'pi: <sup>2</sup>kanye-----: ishe----- yavakâraū<sup>3</sup> parāu yābhyām tāu tathoktāu<sup>4</sup>.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>3</sup>) W. B. *-ra*. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. *yavakâraparāu*.

My collation of O. gives nothing whatever upon rules 21 and 22 and their comment, and I do not know whether there is a *lacuna* in the MS., or whether the collator has overlooked the passage.



duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on *ad infinitum*. And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Hârîta's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules.

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence.

## सवर्णसवर्गीयपरः ॥ २३ ॥

23. A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated.

By *savarṇa*, 'of like color or sound,' we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production. The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (ii.44,45), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except  $\chi$  and  $\phi$ , rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin. The Ath. Pr. (iii.30) does so exempt them. The epithet *savarṇa*, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v.26,28) *n* and *m* are converted before *y*, *l*, and *v*.

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are *atvakkâya* (vii.5.12<sup>2</sup>), *attâ havîṅshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>), *pippakâ te çaravyâdyâi* (v.5.19: only O. has the last word), *saṁyattâḥ*

22. *cakāro hârîtâkarshakah<sup>1</sup>: para ity ekavacanena<sup>2</sup> vakāro<sup>3</sup> gr̥hyate: pûrvasûtrasthanimittayoḥ<sup>4</sup> so 'pi<sup>5</sup> na dvitvam âpad-yate. yathâ: vi-....: â-.... vakāra iti kim: kalpân-.... sparçâ<sup>6</sup> evâi 'keshâm âcâryâṅâm (xiv.3) ity<sup>7</sup> atrâ 'vadhâ-ranānirâkaraṅdyâ 'yam<sup>7</sup> ârambhah. athavâ<sup>8</sup>: taddvitve<sup>9</sup> kr̥te pa-ro dvitîyaparyâyo<sup>10</sup> <sup>11</sup>dvitvavidhir nâ 'sti<sup>11</sup>: anavasthâprasaṅgât. nanu savarṇasavargîyapara (xiv.23) iti parasûtrenâ<sup>12</sup> 'pi punardvitvanishedhah: <sup>13</sup> <sup>14</sup>pâunaruktyam mâ bhâd iti<sup>14</sup>: mata-bhedân nâi 'sha<sup>15</sup> dosha iti brûmah.*

*hârîtamatâd<sup>16</sup> âshma 'ghosha (xiv.18) ityâdisûtrapañca-kam<sup>17</sup> anisṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -tamatak-. <sup>2</sup> W. eva v-. <sup>3</sup> W. sav-, and puts after gr̥hyate. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. parah. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. hârîtamate. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -çapara. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. evandhâ-...-ṅâyâyâ 'yam. <sup>8</sup> W. B. yathâ. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. tad. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -âyeṅa. <sup>(11)</sup> G. M. -dhiṅ na prâp-noti. <sup>12</sup> W. om. para. <sup>13</sup> G. M. ins. tasmât. <sup>(14)</sup> W. -ktyo mâ bhavati; G. M. -ktyam âvahati. <sup>15</sup> W. va. <sup>16</sup> G. M. -mate. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ityâdi paraç ce 'tyantam sū-. O. wanting (see above).



(i.5.1<sup>1</sup> et al.: wanting in W. B.), *yal lohitaṃ* (ii.1.7<sup>2</sup>), and *tvaṃ vā-tāir aruṇāiḥ* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *aruṇāiḥ*). Those which illustrate absence of duplication of a mute before another of the same series are *aṅkāu nyaṅkāu* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>), *prāñcam upa* (v.2.7<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *upa*), *kāṇḍāt-kāṇḍāt* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup> et al.), *taṃ te duṣṣakshāḥ* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>), and *ambhā stha* (i.5.6<sup>1</sup> et al.). Then the commentator quotes from some unnamed authority a verse prescribing that “when a nasal precedes, a *k* or *g* is inserted before *t* or *dh* respectively,” and claims that, in virtue of it, there fall under the rule also such cases as *pāñkto yajñāḥ pāñktāḥ* (i.5.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: G. M. O. omit the last word) and *tān brūyād yuṅgdhvam iti* (iii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first two words). From this we should draw the inference that, in forms like those here quoted, the omission of the non-nasal mute (specially prescribed by the Ath. Pr., at ii.20) is the regular and proper reading of the *ṣākhā*, its presence, when found, being regarded as an irregular insertion, or a process forming part of the *varṇakrama*—which is just the opposite of the etymologically correct view. I have not collected all the passages illustrating the point, but the omission is certainly the prevailing, though not exclusive, reading in my manuscript of the Sanhitā, as also in the Calcutta edition. That the verse quoted is from some treatise dealing specifically with the Tāittirīya text may be inferred (not too confidently) from its making no mention of *th* as requiring the insertion of *k*; it being the fact that no example of *th* in such a situation is to be found in the Sanhitā.

Finally, as counter-examples, where the two mutes are of different classes, we receive (except in O.) *vāñ ma āsan* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. end with *me*), *shaṇ māsaḥ* (vi.5.3<sup>4</sup>), *vidathāni manmahe* (iv.7.15<sup>3</sup>), and *dāmnā 'pāu 'mbhañ* (ii.4.13: W. B. have *dāmnā* only): here the combinations are to be made *ññm*, *ṇṇm*, *ṇnm*, and *mmn*. The illustrations are quite one-sided, both for and against the rule, being only groups containing a nasal.

This rule furnishes the most important of all the prescribed

23. *savarṇaparaḥ savargīyaparaḥ ca dvitvaṃ nā 'padyate: savarṇatvaṃ nāma sārūpyam<sup>1</sup> ucyate: na tulyasthānakaraṇatā-mātram: savargīyaḥ samānavargasambandhī. yathā: atvak-kāya: attā-----: pipp-----: saṃyattāḥ<sup>2</sup>: yal-----: tvaṃ ----- savarṇaparāṇy evamādīni: savargīyaparāṇy<sup>3</sup> api<sup>4</sup> vadā-maḥ: aṅkāu-----: prāñcam-----: kāṇḍāt-----: taṃ-----: ambha-----.*

*anunāsikapūrvas<sup>5</sup> tu kakāro madhya<sup>6</sup> āgamaḥ:*

*gakāraḥ ca takāre<sup>7</sup> ca<sup>8</sup> dhakāra ca<sup>8</sup> yathākramam.*

*itivacanād idam apy udāharaṇam: pāñkto-----: tān-----  
<sup>9</sup>evampara iti kim: vāñ-----: shaṇ-----: vīda-----: dāmnā  
 -----<sup>9</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> B. -pyatvam. <sup>2</sup> W. B. om. <sup>3</sup> W. savarṇap-. <sup>4</sup> W. eva. <sup>5</sup> W. anusvārap-.  
<sup>6</sup> W. -dhyamā. <sup>7</sup> O. -raḥ. <sup>8</sup> W. om.; G. M. yak-. <sup>9</sup> O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*lv*. But O. has an inserted passage, so corrupted as to be hardly intelligible, which quotes a verse (easily made such by a little emendation) from some authority unspecified, making a distinction between *lv* as occurring in a circumflexed syllable or otherwise—that is to say, between *bilvāḥ* and *bāilvāḥ*.

All the groups here treated of are quite rare, *lç* occurring, I believe, only in *valça* (vii.3.19) and its compounds, and *lh* only in *malha*; *lv* is sometimes found also as the result of *sandhi* (as at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: ii.5.1<sup>6</sup>).

The commentator adds, finally, that the next rule also is not approved.

## स्पर्श स्पर्शपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27. Nor a mute that is followed by a mute.

This is a view of certain authorities merely, and unapproved. The examples are *vāg devī* (i.7.10<sup>2</sup>), *apām ojmānam* (iv.6.6<sup>6</sup>), *ātñārah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>), *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *yam apnavānah* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>): O. has only the first two of them.

## पदान्तश्च व्यञ्जनपरः प्राकृतः ॥ २८ ॥

28. Nor an original final that is followed by a consonant.

The natural meaning of this rule would appear to be simply that, in the opinion of some authorities, a final mute which is not the product of euphonic alteration is exempted from duplication before any initial consonant whatever (not before a mute only, as in the preceding rule). The commentator, however, manages to extract from it a very different value: namely, that *n* final is not liable to duplication before a semivowel or spirant (i. e. *h*); and he regards

26. <sup>1</sup> *ekeshām* <sup>2</sup> *mate haçavakâraparo lakâro*<sup>3</sup> *dvitvaṁ nā* "padyate. *malhā*----: *çata*----: *tato*----. <sup>4</sup> *evampara iti kim: kalmāshī: kalyāṇī*<sup>4</sup>. *hakâraç ca çakâraç ca vakâraç ca haçavakârāḥ: te*<sup>6</sup> *pare yasmāt sa tathoktah.*

*atra*<sup>7</sup> *haçapare kâryam ishṭam*<sup>5</sup> *na tu vakârapare: nā*<sup>8</sup> *'pi pârāsūtram*<sup>9</sup> *ishṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *sa*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *âcâryāṇām*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *lavakâro*. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om. <sup>(5)</sup> W. om. <sup>6</sup> O. *ete*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. ins. *lakârasya haçavakârapara iti sūtre sthitah kim kâraṇam nanu vakâra iti prayojanam asti: lakâravakârasya samyoga svarito yadi: tadâ samyukta eva syâd asamyuktas tadanyathâ: iti vacanâm asti tasmât kâraṇât: yadâ lakâravakârapara iti: tato bilvāḥ*. <sup>9</sup> O. *sūtram*.

27. *ekeshām*<sup>1</sup> *mate sparçapara sparço*<sup>2</sup> *dvitvaṁ nā* "padyate<sup>3</sup>. *vāg*----: *apām*----: *ātñārah: sa*----: *yam*----. <sup>4</sup> *sparçah paro yasmād asāu sparçaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *âcâryāṇām*. <sup>2</sup> O. puts next after *mate*. <sup>(3)</sup> O. *na dvitvam āpnoti*. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om.



this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this *çâkhâ*. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover.

In the first place, *vyañjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant,' is declared to mean 'followed by any other consonant than a mute,' because otherwise, as we have read 'followed by a mute' in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word; and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, *sparçapara* is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator's conclusion being that there is duplication of *n* before a mute, though not before a semi-vowel; and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of *anuvrtti* which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22): the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter; the latter is here qualified as final and as original; and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

---

28. *vyañjanapara iti sparçavyatiriktavyañjanapara ity arthaḥ: anyathâ sparçânâm api grahaṇe pûrvasûtre 'pi sparça' ity ukta- tvât pâunaruktyam syât. nanu nimittaviçeshân<sup>2</sup> nimittaviçesho<sup>3</sup> 'sti: padântatvam prakṛtatvam ca nimittino<sup>4</sup> viçeshâ<sup>5</sup> nimittasya tu sarvavyañjanâtmakatvam<sup>6</sup>: iti cet: tathâ 'pi sparçabhâge<sup>7</sup> ni- mittaviçeshasya<sup>8</sup> vâiyarthyam<sup>9</sup>: sparçapara ity<sup>10</sup> atra sâmanyenâ 'pi<sup>10</sup> nimittaviçeshasya<sup>11</sup> vigatatvât<sup>12</sup>: tasmâd<sup>13</sup> antasthâdaya evâ 'tra vyañjanaçabdeno 'cyante. <sup>14</sup>cakâro yady api sparçamâtrâ- karshakas tathâ 'pi pâriçeshyân<sup>14</sup> <sup>15</sup>nakârasya 'nukarshanam:<sup>15</sup> tathâ hi: antasthâdivyañjanaparatve 'nyasparçânâm<sup>16</sup> avikṛtâ- nâm padânte sthitir nâ 'sti: samrâḍ ity atrâ 'stî 'ti cet: mâi 'vam: na sañ sâm iti<sup>17</sup> râpara (xiii.4) ity atra vâiyarthiyât<sup>18</sup>: ity abdo makârasya dvitvasadbhâvam bodhayatî 'ty<sup>19</sup> adhyayanâ- nurodhâd upapâditam: tasmân nâi 'sha nishedhavishayaḥ. <sup>20</sup>nâ 'pi brahmaṇvantaḥ: nyañ . . . . ityâdivishayaḥ:<sup>20</sup> kutah: iha*



so far as mutes were concerned: the reason he gives is of course a mere quibble, and the point of it is so fine that I am not confident of seeing it rightly: it seems to be, that there is an absence of such qualification in the implied term *sparçapara*. At any rate, the comfortable conclusion is, that only the semivowels etc. are intended by the term "consonant" as employed in the rule. The next step is, to declare that *ca*, 'nor,' although it strictly brings forward 'a mute,' without qualification, yet really amounts, on the principle of exclusion, to an implication of *n* only. Namely, thus: no other consonant remains unchanged at the end of a word before a semivowel or spirant. It may be objected that *m* also does so before *r* (by xiii.4) in such words as *samrāj*: but this is of no account; for, if admitted as a reproach to the interpretation now under treatment, it would convict of superfluosity a part of rule xiii.4: namely, the *iti*, which was shown, in accordance with the received reading of the *çākhā*, to teach the duplication of the *m*. We see now why that atrociously forced and groundless construction of the meaning of rule xiii.4 was made; it was needed to bolster up in advance the forced and groundless construction to be put upon the present precept. As the *m*, then, constitutes no ground of exception, so neither do the nasals *n* and *ñ* in such cases as *brahmaṇvantaḥ* (vi.4.10<sup>1</sup>) and *nyañ raçmibhiḥ* (ii.4.10<sup>2</sup>). For why? the qualification *prākṛta*, 'original,' in the rule involves [as belonging to the letter to which it is applied] the quality of being alterable, since it would otherwise be meaningless; and there is no case to be found where either *n* or *ñ* is altered before a semivowel or spirant. If, then, the term *prākṛta* is to be allowed its proper force, the implication of any other mute than *n* must be excluded. Here is another most arbitrary act of construction—as if *prākṛta* meant necessarily ' (an alterable mute) when it retains its original form,' instead of simply ' (a mute) that retains its original form.'

*prākṛta iti viçeṣaṇam vikṛtasadbhāvam<sup>21</sup> kalpayati: <sup>22</sup>anyathā svasya<sup>23</sup> vāiyarthyaḥ: tac ca vikṛtatvam nakārasya<sup>24</sup> ṅakārasya<sup>25</sup> vā 'ntasthādiparatve<sup>26</sup> sati kvacid api padānte na drçyate: tasmāt prākṛta iti<sup>22</sup> prayogasāphalyāya<sup>27</sup> nakārasyaḥi 'vā 'nukarṣaṇam yuktam iti pāriçeṣyam.*

*kim ca: māhisheye 'pi nakārasyaḥi 'vā 'nukarṣaṇam siddhāvatkṛtyo<sup>28</sup> 'ktam: <sup>29</sup>tatre 'yam sūtrayojanā<sup>29</sup>: ekeshām<sup>30</sup> mate padāntaḥ prākṛto nakāro 'ntasthādivyañjanaparo<sup>31</sup> na dvitvam āpadyate. yathā: mitro----: om----: etān----. padānta iti kim: anyā----: anv----. antasthādipara iti kim: tān----: imān----. prākṛta iti kim: tān----: <sup>32</sup>vāish----<sup>32</sup> nanu katham atra<sup>33</sup> vikṛtatvam:*

*rephād rvarṇāt<sup>34</sup> pūrvaç ca tavargāc<sup>35</sup> ca paraç ca naḥ<sup>36</sup>: tavargasthāna<sup>37</sup> ity āhur atatsthāno<sup>38</sup> 'nya<sup>39</sup> ucyate. iti vacanād asti sthānabhede<sup>40</sup> kṛtam<sup>41</sup> vikṛtatvam<sup>42</sup> iti brūmaḥ.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## उदात्तात्परो ऽनुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ २९ ॥

29. A grave following an acute becomes circumflex.

The following rule shows that the substantive here to be understood is *svarah*, 'vowel.' All the other Prâtiçâkhyas, in their corresponding rules (R. Pr. iii.9, V. Pr. iv.134, A. Pr. iii.67), state the principle as applying to an *aksharam*, 'syllable.' In his explanation and illustration, however, the commentator is not careful to bear this in mind. He states the sphere of the rule to be all the three kinds of enclitic circumflex, the *prâtiyata* (xx.3), *pâdavr̥tta* (xx.6), and *tâirovyañjana* (xx.7), although these in part include cases to which only the next rule attributes the circumflexed quality. And his examples are *sá idhânáḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), *áthá 'bravít* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>), *vásvy asi* (i.2.5<sup>1</sup> et al.), *prâügam* (iv.4.2<sup>1</sup>), and *táyá devátayá* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup> et al.); of which only the first and fourth show the circumflex vowel following the acute without an intervening consonant (rule 30). Nor are all the examples unexceptionable in other respects: for though the *i* of *idhânáḥ* and the *a* of *asi* are really *anudatta*, 'grave,' in the *pada*-text, and so show an actual conversion into circumflex, the other exhibited cases of enclitic circumflex are circumflexed in the *pada*-text as well, and undergo no alteration in consequence of their change to *saṁhitá*. It is at this that the commentator aims, when he adds that, "there being grave quality in the condition of separation of letters, then, when these are combined together, circumflex quality appears in accordance with the present precept." That is to say, it is the natural unaccented quality of the syllable that is here implied in *anudatta*, not its being technically grave, and marked as such. This understanding is also needed in order to make good rule 31, where we are not taught that the enclitically circumflexed final of *átha*, for example, becomes grave before an acute or circumflex (as in *átha tvám*, *átha kvà*), but that the unaccented final *a*, which was made circumflex by rules 29 and 30 after *á*, is exempted from the change when so followed, and remains unaccented.

The enclitic circumflex is written in the recorded Tâittirîya text in the same manner as in the Rik and Atharvan; namely, by the perpendicular stroke above the syllable, the same that is used for the independent circumflex. The method is so familiar to all students of the Veda that it does not need to be illustrated here. Certain specialties of Tâittirîya usage will come up for notice under later rules (xix.3, xxi.10,11).

29. *prâtiyatapâdavr̥ttatâirovyañjanavishayam<sup>1</sup> etat: udattât paro 'nudattah svaritam apadyate. yathâ: sa----: athâ----: vasvy----: pra----: tayâ----. varṇavibhâgâvasthâyâm anudattatve saty<sup>2</sup>eva punas tatsaṁhitâyâm<sup>2</sup> eva<sup>3</sup> tallakshanasvaritativam<sup>4</sup> praügam ityâdâu vijñeyam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. *pâdavr̥tta*, and ins. *prâvr̥tta* before *-vish-*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. *evâ 'dhastât saṁ-*.  
<sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *etallakshañât sv-*.



For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accentual system, see the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (i.40) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accentual systems (see F. Misteli, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, vol. xvii., 1868; also Prof. J. Hadley, in the *Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Society* for Oct. 1869 [Journal, vol. ix., pp. lxii.–lxiii.]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent *svarita*, and should set down the latter as a “middle tone,” in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savors of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

व्यञ्जनान्तर्हितो ऽपि ॥ ३० ॥

30. Even when consonants intervene.

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the affected and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer; but he quotes, nevertheless, *tād agne anṛnó bhavāmi* (iii. 3.8<sup>2</sup>: B. O. omit *bhavāmi*) and *yás tvá hṛdā'* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>): in the first case, *ag-* and *bha-* are circumflexed; in the second, *tvá*.

नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29, the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (*nitya* or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of *anudatta*, as a vantage-ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception,

30. *vyañjanāntarhito*<sup>1</sup> 'py *udāttāt paro 'nudattaḥ svaritam*<sup>2</sup> *āpadyate. yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *tad*----: *yas*---- <sup>4</sup>*ity ādi*. *antarhito vya-* *vahita ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *ant*-. <sup>2</sup> B. *-tatvam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om.



all authorities are agreed (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.70); although we should not less naturally expect the double attraction, of a high tone on either hand, to exercise at least as much assimilating effect upon the pitch of an intermediate syllable as a preceding high tone alone exerts.

The commentators' examples are *sá imám lokám* (i.5.9<sup>4</sup>: but G. M. add *ajayan*, which doubtless means *tá imám lokám ajayan*, vii.1.5<sup>3</sup>), *tásmát tá ádyá' annadhá'nát* (vii.1.1<sup>5</sup>: only O. has the first word and the last), *kíríná mányamánaḥ* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>), and *tásyái vy'rddham áṇḍám ajáyata* (vi.5.6<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words): the vowels between acute and acute, or between acute and circumflex, in these examples, are *anudátta*, and written, as such, with the horizontal stroke beneath.

The three rules here given only apply, in strictness, to a single unaccented syllable following an acute; where there is more than one such, the rules for *pracaya* (xxi.10,11) come into force.

## नाग्निवेश्यायनस्य ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Not so, according to Âgniveçyâyana.

The significance of this rule (which is declared unapproved, in the comment to its successor) is more clearly stated by O., in an independent exposition, than by the other four versions of the comment. It is meant to exhibit an opinion contravening the doctrine laid down by its predecessor, and allowing the circumflex accent to stand, even when the following syllable has, or begins with, the high tone. No examples are given, except by O., which has *vódhavé* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *tásya kvà suvargáḥ* (ii.6.5<sup>5</sup>).

G. M. read, in rule and comment, Âgnivâiçyâyana.

## सर्वा नेत्येके सर्वा नेत्येके ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Some say not, in all cases.

31. *udátta-svaritapara*<sup>1</sup> *udáttát paro 'nudátto na*<sup>2</sup> *svaritam ápadyate*<sup>3</sup>. *yathá*<sup>4</sup>: *sa*----: *tas*----: *kír*----: *tasyái*----. *udáttaç ca svaritaç co 'dátta-svaritáu: táu paráu yasmát sa tatho 'ktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*paro nân*; B. *svaritaparo vá*; G. M. *udátta-para svaritaparo vá*; O. do., except *vá*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. put after *svaritam*. <sup>3</sup> B. *ápnōti*; O. *prápnōti*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.

32. *pûrvasûtrapratiprasavârtho*<sup>1</sup> *'yam nakâraḥ: udáttát paro 'nudáttaḥ svaritam*<sup>2</sup> *âgniveçyâyanasya*<sup>3</sup> *mata udátta-para*<sup>4</sup> *vá*<sup>5</sup> *svaritaparo vá*<sup>6</sup> *ná 'padyata iti na*<sup>7</sup>. *pûrvoktâny evo 'dâhara-nâni.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -*trasya prati*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*yana*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. G. M. -*ttát pa*-. <sup>5</sup> B. *'nudátta*; G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> B. G. M. ins. *svaritam*. <sup>7</sup> B. om.

O. substitutes *âgniveçyâyanasya çâkhino mate udátta-para svaritaparo vá udáttát paro 'nudátta svaritam ápadyate na pratishedhaḥ. yathá: vo*----: *tas*----.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



नकारस्य रेफोष्मयकारभावाद्युप्ते च मलोपाच्च पूर्व-  
स्वरो ऽनुनासिकः ॥ १ ॥

1. In case of the conversion of *n* into *r*, a spirant, or *y*—also when the *y* is omitted—or in case of the omission of *m*, the preceding vowel becomes nasal.

That this Prâtiçâkhyâ takes no distinct and consistent ground upon the question whether the so-called *anusvâra* consists in a nasalization of the vowel or in a nasal consonantal element following the vowel, has been already pointed out (note to ii.30); as also, that the present rule is the one where the former view is most unequivocally taken. As the school to which the commentator belongs has adopted the other view, he declares (under rule 2) that the doctrine here laid down is unapproved.

The “conversion of *n* into *r* or a spirant” is, of course, the retention of a historical final *s* after *n* unchanged before *t* (vi.14), or changed to *ç* before *c* (v.20), or to *r* before a vowel (ix.20 etc.); its “conversion into *y*,” with the (invariably) consequent “loss of the *y*” (ix.20 etc., x.19), goes back to the same cause. The commentator’s illustrative examples are *agnîñr apsushadaḥ* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>), *sa trîñr ekâdaçân̄ iha* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>: found in O. only), *karnân̄ç câ ’kar-nân̄ç ca* (i.8.9<sup>3</sup>), *trîñs trçân* (ii.5.10<sup>1</sup>), and *mahân̄ indrah* (i.4.20 et al.); of which the last is by part of the MSS., rather needlessly, quoted twice, once for the conversion of the *n* into *y* (for which it should be written *mahân̄y indrah*), and again for the loss of the *y*. For the loss of *m* (by xiii.2), the examples are *pratyushtañ rakshaḥ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *sañçitam me* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup> et al.).

The commentator explains *anunâsika* by *sânunâsika*, as if the word were properly a noun, and needed reduction to adjective form: in this treatise, however, it is always and only an adjective, meaning ‘nasal’ (see note to ii.30).

नैकेषाम् ॥ २ ॥

2. Some deny this.

1. <sup>1</sup>*nakârasya rephabhâvâd ūshmabhâvâd yakârabhâvâc cakârâkr̥shṭayakâre lupṭe ca <sup>2</sup>*sati* <sup>3</sup>*makâralopâc ca* <sup>3</sup>*pûrvasvaro ’nunâsiko* <sup>1</sup>*bhavati: sânunâsiko bhavati* <sup>1</sup>*ty arthaḥ.* <sup>4</sup>*yathâ: rephabhâvât*<sup>4</sup>: *agn-.....* <sup>5</sup>*sa-.....* <sup>6</sup>*atho ’shmabhâvât:* <sup>6</sup>*karn-.....* *trîñs-.....* <sup>7</sup>*yakârabhâvâd yathâ*<sup>7</sup>: *mahân̄-.....* <sup>8</sup>*yakâre lupṭe yathâ*<sup>9</sup>: *mahân̄-.....* <sup>8</sup> <sup>10</sup>*atha makâralopât:* <sup>10</sup>*praty-.....* *sañ-.....* <sup>11</sup>*ity âdi*<sup>11</sup>. *makârasya lopo makâralopaḥ*<sup>12</sup>: *tasmât.**

(<sup>1</sup>) wanting in B. (<sup>2</sup>) O. om. (<sup>3</sup>) W. om. (<sup>4</sup>) O. om. (<sup>5</sup>) in O. only. (<sup>6</sup>) O. om.; G. M. om. *atha.* (<sup>7</sup>) O. om.; G. M. om. *yathâ.* (<sup>8</sup>) W. O. om. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>10</sup>) O. om.; G. M. om. *atha.* (<sup>11</sup>) O. om. (<sup>12</sup>) B. *malo-*



This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead. The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this *çâkhâ*.

ततस्वनुस्वारः ॥ ३ ॥

3. And claim that, on the contrary, *anusvâra* is inserted after the vowel.

The *anusvâra* here prescribed is called by the commentator an *âgama*, 'increment.' Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the *tu*, 'on the contrary,' is the sign in the rule. There is one example given: *sa trîñr ekâ-daçãñ iha* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. omit *sa*).

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor; and the usage of the recorded Tâittirîya text corresponds.

सादिषु चैकपद् ऊष्मपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. *Anusvâra* is also inserted in the case of *sra* etc., in a single word, before a spirant.

"Also" (*ca*) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment. The *srâdayas*, '*sra* etc.,' are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of *anusvâra* in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1–3 of this chapter. The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it. The commentator quotes a single case, *çoñsã moda ive 'ti* (iii.2.9<sup>5</sup>: it falls under xvi.2); and then gives counter-examples, establishing the restrictions made: *tãsãm trîñi ca* (ii.5.8<sup>3</sup>) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi.; *tam mã sañ srja varcasã* (i.4.45<sup>3</sup> et al.: only G. M. have *varcasã*) and *prastaram â hi sîda* (ii.6.12<sup>6</sup>: found in O. only) show that it is to

2. *ekeshâm mate pûrvasûtrokteshu* <sup>1</sup> *sânunâsikyam* <sup>2</sup> *na* <sup>3</sup> *bhavati. uktâny evo 'dâharañâni.*

*idam* <sup>4</sup> *eve 'shṭam* <sup>4</sup> *na tu pûrvam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *sthâneshu.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *nâ 'nu-*. <sup>3</sup> W. G. M. O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> O. *eva sûtram ish-*.

3. *tata iti sarvanâmnâ parâmrshṭât* <sup>1</sup> *svarât* <sup>2</sup> *paro 'nusvâra* <sup>3</sup> *âgamo bhavati. yathâ* <sup>4</sup>: *sa* . . . . *parâmrshṭasvarasyâ* <sup>5</sup> *'nunâsi-* *kañ* <sup>6</sup> *guṇam tuçabdo nivartayatî* <sup>7</sup> *'ti* <sup>8</sup>: *tasmâd anunâsikapra-* *shedhapaksha* <sup>9</sup> *evâ 'yam anusvârâgamaḥ syât.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-shṭa.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-ra.* <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *-svâr.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *-shṭât svarâ.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-ka.* <sup>7</sup> O. *-vâray-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. *iti.* <sup>9</sup> W. B. *-dhât p-*; G. M. *-dhah vakshyamâna.*



be made only in a single word—that is to say, if I understand the meaning, that if *mā sám* and *hi sída* were single words, they would fall respectively under rules 8 and 13 of the next chapter, and have the increment—; and *māyá máyinām* (iii.1.11<sup>7</sup>) shows that a spirant must follow (*māyínām* otherwise falling under xvi.8). To the specification *ekapade*, ‘in a single word,’ the commentator adds in his paraphrase the explanation *akhaṇḍapade*, ‘in an undivided word;’ and then, in his illustration, he treats this as a restriction or limitation, and establishes it by an example, *trishāhasro vái* (v.6.8<sup>3</sup>; p. *tri-sāhasrah*); rule xvi.25 would otherwise require the increment after *tri*.

## नान्तविकारात्पूर्वः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Not before an altered final.

The illustrative example is *bahis te astu bál iti* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): we have in it a *s* following *hi* in a single undivided word; and hence, by xvi.13, should have to read *bahiñs*, but for this restriction. The alteration is from *h* to *s*, according to ix.2. As counter-example is given *mā hiñsír dvipádam* (iv.2.10<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), a case falling under the rule already referred to.

## अप्रग्रहाः समानाक्षराण्यनुनासिकान्येकेषाम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. According to some authorities, the simple vowels, except the *pragrahas*, are nasalized.

This and the remaining rules of the chapter have the aspect of an intrusion, as they interrupt the natural connection of what precedes and what follows, and merely give the view of certain authorities on points which the Prâtiçâkhyas in general leave untouched. They are brought in here as having to do with nasalized vowels, which are the subject of this chapter and its successor.

With the nasalization thus taught is to be compared that noticed in the Rik Prât. (at i.16, r. 63, lxiv), which teaches that the first

4. <sup>1</sup>*âgamânvâdeçakaç cakârah*: *srâdishv ekapade 'khaṇḍapada'* *ûshmaparo*<sup>1</sup> *'nusvârâgamo bhavati. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *çoñsâ*..... *srâdishv iti kim: tâsâm*..... *ekapada iti kim: tam*.....: *'prast*.....<sup>4</sup> *akhaṇḍaviçeshanena*<sup>5</sup> *kim: trish*..... *ûshmapara iti kim: mdyâ*.....

(<sup>1</sup>) wanting in B. (<sup>2</sup>) O. *pada*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. O. om. (<sup>4</sup>) in O. only. (<sup>5</sup>) O. *-sheṇa*.

5. *na khalu padântavikârât*<sup>1</sup> *pûrvasminn anusvârâgamo bhavati. yathâ*<sup>2</sup>: *bahis*.....: *hipujigâ* (xvi.13) *iti prâptiḥ. antavikârâd iti kim: mâ*..... *antasya vikâro 'ntavikârah: tasmâd antavikârât*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. *vik*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



in the *pada*-text; and the interpretation, as was remarked above, is fully supported by the specification of *samhitā* in the next rule.

As examples of nasalized protracted vowels, are given *tvīz ity abravīt* (ii.4.12<sup>6</sup>) and *astu hīz ity abrūtām* (vii.1.6<sup>1</sup>), both in *samhitā*-form, although it is again expressly pointed out that the nasalization is not made in *samhitā*: the two worthies referred to would read *tvīñz*: and *hīñz*. It is added that *ca*, 'also,' in this rule effects its connection with what is prescribed in the preceding one—or, as O., in more customary phrase, expresses it, brings forward by implication the preceding rule.

Some, we are further informed, restrict the application of the precept to words which contain a single vowel protracted, and would not regard it as authorizing nasalization in *na chinattīz iti* (i.7.2<sup>1,4</sup>) or *na vicinityāz iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *iti*).

The rule is declared to be of no binding force.

## अकारस्तु संहितायामपि ॥ ८ ॥

8. An *a*, however, is nasalized in *samhitā* also.

The commentator's explanation is that nasality and protraction are here implied (from the preceding rule) by vicinage; and that *tu*, 'however,' is intended to annul the implication that only the opinion of the two authorities specified in rule 7 is reported. And though the comprehensive statement "an *a*" is made in the rule, nevertheless, in virtue of rule i.58, "continued implication is of that which is last (or final)," the "also" (*api*) really brings down only a final *a* as suffering a prescribed effect by the attribution of nasal quality. The sense, then, is that a protracted final *a* is nasalized, both in *samhitā* and elsewhere. Examples are *suçlo-kāñz sumāṅgalāñz* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), *upahūtāñz* (ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>), *yaço mamāñz* (vii.4.20); these are, in fact, all the cases of protraction of simple final *a* which the text contains; and the edition (so far as it goes) and my MS. nasalize the *ā*, as required by the interpretation of the rule here given. The cases are much more numerous in which a final *aḥ* exhibits *āz* as the ultimate result of protraction, the *ḥ* being lost before a following vowel or sonant consonant: namely, at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: v.5.1<sup>3,3</sup> twice: vi.1.9<sup>1</sup> twice; 3.8<sup>1</sup>; 4.3<sup>4</sup>; 6.2<sup>3</sup>; and in one place, vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>, the same final *āz* comes from a protracted *e*: the question might possibly arise whether these do not also fall under

---

7. *yat*<sup>1</sup> *plutavat padam*<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup>*tac ca*<sup>3</sup> *padakāle* <sup>4</sup>*çāñkhāyanakāṇḍa-māyaṇayor mate*<sup>4</sup> *nunāsikam bhavati. yathā*<sup>5</sup>: *tvīz*----: *astu* ---- *padam iti kim: samhitāyām mā bhūt. cakārah*<sup>6</sup> *pūrvasū-troktavidheyasamuccayam*<sup>7</sup> *karoti*<sup>8</sup>. *apara āhuḥ*: <sup>9</sup>*plutāikasva-ram padam iti: anyam mā bhūt*:<sup>9</sup> *na*----: *na*----  
*ne 'dam sūtradvayam*<sup>10</sup> *ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *yatra*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> W. *tatra*. <sup>4</sup> O. puts after *bhavati*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *caçabdah*. <sup>7</sup> O. *-vidhim*. <sup>8</sup> O. *anvādiçati*. <sup>9</sup> O. *plutevarṇapadam iti 'ha mā bhūt*. <sup>10</sup> W. *sūtram*.



the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below); and the text reads accordingly. The manuscripts of the commentary give as found “in another *çâkhâ*,” one example, read *brahmâzn* in W. B. (O. is wanting), and *yadghrâ* in G. M.: I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school; *brahmâzn* is found at i.8.16<sup>1</sup> twice, <sup>2</sup> twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its *a* not being final; it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given. These are *satyarâjâzn* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), *agnâz ity âha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>: W. has dropped out *agnâz*), and *vicityah somâz na vicityâz iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>: O. has only this).

Finally, the commentator remarks that Çânkhâyana and Kâṇḍamâyana also accept this principle. He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities; and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary. It was noticed under i.58 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one. The implication of “final” is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all; whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could.

The Ath. Prât. gives (at i.105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates. This our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place. A final *a* is protracted to *âñz* at i.8.16<sup>2</sup> twice: ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>: vii.4.20: —*ah* to *âzh* at i.4.27: v.5.1<sup>3</sup>; and to *âz* (the *h* being lost) at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: v.5.1<sup>3,32</sup> twice: vi.1.9<sup>1</sup> twice; 3.8<sup>1</sup>; 4.3<sup>4</sup>; 6.2<sup>3</sup>: —*an* to *âzn* at i.8.16<sup>1</sup> twice, 16<sup>2</sup> thrice: ii.6.5<sup>6</sup>: —*am* to *âzm* at vi.1.4<sup>5</sup>; 5.9<sup>1</sup>: vii.1.7<sup>4</sup>; 5.7<sup>1</sup> twice: —*i* to *îz* at i.7.2<sup>1,4</sup>: ii.4.12<sup>6</sup>: vi.5.9<sup>1</sup>: vii.1.6<sup>1,74</sup>: —*ih* to *îzh* or *îzr* at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: vi.3.10<sup>1</sup>: —*in* to *îzn* at vii.4.20 twice: —*uh* to *ûzr* at vi.3.8<sup>1</sup>: —*e* to *âzi* at i.4.27: vi.1.4<sup>5</sup>; and

8. *sâmnidhyâd anunâsikaplutâu<sup>1</sup> gr̥hyete: tuçabdaḥ prakṛtâcâr̥yamatanivartakah<sup>2</sup>: ata<sup>3</sup> eva<sup>4</sup> saṁhitâyâm asaṁhitâyâm<sup>5</sup> câ 'kârah padântaḥ pluto 'nunâsiko bhavati: yady apy akâra iti<sup>6</sup> sâmanyeno 'ktaḥ: tathâ 'py anvâdeço 'ntyasya (i.58) iti vacanâd apiçabdo 'nunâsikadharmatayâ nimittinam padântam evâ 'kâram anvâdiçati. yathâ<sup>7</sup>: suçl- ----: upa- ----: <sup>8</sup>yaço- ----: brahmâzn<sup>9</sup> ity anyasyâm<sup>10</sup> çâkhâyâm<sup>8</sup>. apiçabdaḥ kimarthaḥ: <sup>11</sup>saty- ----: agn- ----: <sup>11</sup>vicityah- ----. çânkhâyana-kâṇḍamâyanayor apy ayam vidhir<sup>12</sup> akâre plute sammataḥ<sup>12</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -plute. <sup>2</sup> O. pûrvâcâr̥y-. <sup>3</sup> W. eta; M. tata. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> B. O. om. <sup>(8)</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. yadghrâ. <sup>10</sup> G. M. asya. <sup>(11)</sup> O. om. <sup>(12)</sup> G. M. -raplutas sammataṁ.



to *â* (see i.4) at vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>:—*âu* to *â3v* at vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>. The protracted syllable has always the acute accent.

सर्वमेकयमं पूर्वेषां सर्वमेकयमं पूर्वेषाम् ॥ १ ॥

9. According to the former ones, all is of one pitch.

The comment is completely at a loss as to how this rule is to be understood, and gives three more or less discordant interpretations of it, the first of which we are probably to regard as the preferred one, if there be a preference. "All" means 'every kind of articulate sound;' "of one pitch" is equivalent to *ekaçruti*, *yama* denoting the tone of an acute syllable; "the former ones" are 'the sacrificers;' the meaning is, then, that in the sacrificial usage of the sacrificers everything is uttered in acute monotone. O. has an exposition of its own, which is in great part too corrupt to be read without considerable emendation, and which conducts to the same conclusion: it quotes, *apropos* of *pârve*, a *pada* of a *trishtubh* verse from some sacred text, "the former ones spoke those words to the former ones."

The second interpretation differs from the first only in declaring *pârve*, 'the former ones,' to designate certain *çâkhinaḥ*, or 'holders of a Vedic text.'

The third is of quite another character; it makes *yama* to be equivalent to *svara* in the sense of 'vowel,' and explains 'every monosyllable is nasalized'—the intent being to annul the restriction to simple vowels only (as made in rule 6). Who the *pârve* are, is not told us this time.

The commentator consoles himself at the end by declaring the rule not approved. We may fairly extend the same condemnation

9. <sup>1</sup>*sarvam*<sup>2</sup> *varṇajâtam*<sup>3</sup> *ekayamam ekaçrutî* 'ti *pârveshâm*<sup>4</sup> *matam. yamo nâma svara*<sup>5</sup> *udâtta ity arthaḥ: pârve nâma yâjñikâḥ*<sup>6</sup>: *teshâm yajñakarmani sarvam*<sup>7</sup> *ekaçrutî*<sup>8</sup> *bhavati*<sup>1</sup>.

*anye manyante*<sup>9</sup>: *pârve nâma kecic çâkhinaḥ: teshâm sarvam*<sup>10</sup> <sup>11</sup>*ekaçrutî* 'ti<sup>11</sup>.

*athâ*<sup>12</sup> 'pare *kathayanti*<sup>13</sup>: *sarvam ekasvaram anunâsikam bhavati* 'ti<sup>14</sup>: <sup>15</sup>*samânâksharamâtrâpekshâm adhiksheptum*<sup>15</sup>.

*ne 'dam sâtram ishtam.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane*  
*pañcadaço*<sup>16</sup> 'dhyâyaḥ.

(1) O. substitutes *sarvam iti lakshyam lakshanaṅvishayam gr̥hṇâti: ekayam ekaçrutîḥ: yamaçrutisvara ity athântarâ pârveshâ pûrvâi nâma yâjñikâ pârve pârvebhyo vaca etad ucur iti darçanât: yâjñikânâm yajñakarmani sarvam ekaçrutîr bhavati.*  
<sup>2</sup> W. B. *sarva.* <sup>3</sup> B. *varṇam ajñâtam; G. M. -tayamam.* <sup>4</sup> W. *sarv-.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. put after *udâtta.* <sup>6</sup> W. *-ñiyâḥ.* <sup>7</sup> W. puts after *bhavati.* <sup>8</sup> B. *-tir.* <sup>9</sup> O. *âhuḥ.* <sup>10</sup> O. om. (11) W. *-çrutâni; O. -çrutîr bhavati.* <sup>12</sup> G. M. om. *atha.* <sup>13</sup> O. *vyâcakshate.* <sup>14</sup> O. om. *iti.* <sup>15</sup> O. *sarvam iti samânâksharânâm apekshâ grahavyudâsa sarvam tathâ vidhiyate; W. -ramatrâpekshâm apikshiptam; B. -ksham adh-; G. M. -mâtrapaksham âksheptum.* <sup>16</sup> G. M. O. *dvitīyapraçne tṛtīyo.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



word). For *ha*, *hañsaḥ çucishad* (i.8.15<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.1<sup>5</sup>); various other cases of *hañsa* are found in the text, and *hañsi*: that *há* is not treated in the same way is shown by *prajā mā mā-hāsīt* (v.6.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits). For *pá*, *pāñsura irávatī* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup>); other cases are *pāñsūn* and *pāñsavýāya*, at ii.6.10<sup>2</sup> and iv.5.9<sup>1</sup> respectively: that *pa* would not have been correct is shown by *áhatam gabhe pasah* (vii.4.19<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *áhatam*); *pási*, which would seem to fall under the rule, is excepted by rule 17, below. For *ça*, *yad ásinaḥ çañsati tasmát* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup>: W. B. G. M. omit *tasmát*, thus allowing the citation to be found also at iii.2.9<sup>6</sup>); cases of this combination, all of them coming from the root *çañs*, are not infrequent in the Sanhitâ. As general counter-examples, we have, to establish the necessity of the restriction "at the beginning of a *pada*," *agnir ukthena váhasá* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>), *somam pipáset* (ii.1.10<sup>1</sup>), and *dahá "çasah* (i.2.14<sup>6</sup>: O. omits); while *tasmát sa visrasyah* (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>, 10<sup>7</sup>: only O. has the first two words), *hastayoh* (iv.1.5<sup>3</sup> et al.: G. M. O. omit), and *kaviçastáh* (ii.6.12<sup>6</sup>: all the MSS. have *-çastah*, which I have not found in the text, but probably by my own fault) do the same service for the specification "when a vowel follows."

The commentator goes on to say that some authorities accept *hi* as a part of this rule: which is not to be approved, since "at the beginning of a word" is here implied, and so *ahiñsáyái* (v.2.8<sup>7</sup>) would be left without the increment. And if it be pleaded that *hiñsīḥ parame* (iv.2.10<sup>1-2</sup> et al.) should be an example here, the reply is made, that the *anusvára* is assured to it by rule 13, below, where there is no restriction to the beginning of a word; and that to repeat here the specification of *hi* would be useless. The only criticism to be offered upon this is that the objection has too little reason to be really worthy of notice.

---

2. *sra: ço: ha: pá: ça: ity ete grahaṇaviçesháh<sup>1</sup> padádayaḥ sakáraparás tasmint sakáre svarapare saty anusvárágamam<sup>2</sup> bhajante<sup>3</sup>. yathá<sup>4</sup>: vi-....: çoñsá-....: okáreṇa kim: áçá-....: hañsaḥ-....: <sup>5</sup>hrasva iti kim: prajā-....: <sup>6</sup>pāñsura-....: dīrghena<sup>6</sup> kim: áh-....: yad-.... padádaya iti kim: agnir-....: somam-....: <sup>7</sup>dahá-....<sup>7</sup>. svarapara iti kim: tasmát-....: <sup>8</sup>has-....: <sup>8</sup>kav-....*

*kecid atra sūtre <sup>9</sup>higrahaṇam<sup>10</sup> aṅgīkurvate<sup>11</sup>: tad anupapannam: padádaya iti niyamát: ahiñsáyá ity atrá <sup>12</sup>nusvárábhāvaprasaṅgát<sup>12</sup>. nanu hiñsīḥ-... ity etad atro <sup>13</sup>dāharaṇam iti cet: mái <sup>13</sup>vam: <sup>13</sup>hipujigá (xvi.13) ity atra niyamábhávát padádáv apadádáu ca<sup>9</sup> higrahaṇasya káryasiddheḥ punar atra grahaṇam vyartham.<sup>13</sup>*

*svarah paro yasmád asáu svaraparah: tasmín.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-ṇaparáh viç-*. <sup>2</sup> O. *-ma*. <sup>3</sup> O. *syát*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om.; G. M. *hrasvena kim* etc. <sup>6</sup> O. *-ghe*. <sup>(7)</sup> O. om. <sup>(8)</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(9)</sup> W. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *him*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *aṅgīmk-* <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-rabhá-*; O. *-rábodhapra-*. <sup>(13)</sup> B. om.



विकृते ऽपि ॥ ३ ॥

3. Even when the vowel is altered.

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the *s* has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant. A single example is cited, *apahañsy agne* (iv.7.13<sup>1</sup>; p. *apa-hañsi*); if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice.

रापूर्वश्च ॥ ४ ॥

4. As also, when they are preceded by *râ*.

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nârâçañsîbhyaḥ* (vii.5.11<sup>2</sup>); the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *çā* is not at the beginning of a *pada*. The *ca*, 'also,' brings down only *çā*; and we are assured that this is the reason why *çā* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels. Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order.

शस्त्वानतोदत्ते ॥ ५ ॥

5. Also in *çañstâ*, except when it is accented on the final syllable.

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel. The passage is *utâ çañstâ súvipraḥ* (iv.6.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *suvipraḥ*). The restriction as to accent

---

3. *apiçabdah svarânvâdeçakah<sup>1</sup>: sakârât pare tasmint svare vikṛtam âpanne 'pi vyañjanatâm upagate 'pi syâd<sup>2</sup> anusvâravidhiḥ<sup>3</sup>. yathâ: apa-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. *sakârân-*. <sup>2</sup> W. and O.(?) *svârad*. <sup>3</sup> *lacuna* in O., from (*anusvâra-*) *vidhiḥ* to *svara* under the next rule.

4. *'caçabdah srâdishu<sup>1</sup> çakâram anvâdiçati<sup>2</sup>: etadartham eva svaravyatyaye<sup>3</sup> 'pi çakâragrahaṇam tatrâ 'nte kṛtam. râ: ity evampûrvaḥ çakâraḥ sukâraparo 'nusvârâgamam bhajate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: nâr----- apadâdyartho<sup>5</sup> 'yam ârambhaḥ.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. *çabdasyâdishu*; B. *sacaçabdâdishu*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. ins. *çakâraḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyak-taye*; O. begins again with *vyatyaye*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *apadârtho*.

5. *çañstâ: ity etasmin<sup>1</sup> grahaṇe 'nantodâtte<sup>2</sup> sakârapare bhavaty<sup>3</sup> anusvârâgamah. uta----- anantodâtta<sup>4</sup> iti kim: açv----- sraçoha (xvi.2) iti prâptâu satyâm<sup>5</sup> sakârasya<sup>6</sup> svaraparavâ-*



is intended to exclude *áçvasyá viçastá'* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>: O. adds *dvá yam-*).

## अशंसन् ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also in *açañsan*.

Yet another case belonging with those disposed of by rule 2, but requiring special treatment because the *ça* in it does not stand "at the beginning of a *pada*." The passage is *abhi vy açañsan* (vi.6.11<sup>5</sup>).

O., in an added paragraph, brings forward the objection that, in virtue of rule i.52 (which makes the citation of any word include also the same word with *a* prefixed), *açañsan* has its *ñ* already assured by rule 2; but refutes it by pointing out that the principle appealed to has to do only with a *pada* or word, not with a mere fragment of one, like *ça* (compare rule 10, below). It adds that "another reading is *çañsán*."

## न शसनं विशसनेन ॥ ७ ॥

7. But not in *çasanam* and *viçasanena*.

These are exceptions, the only ones the Sanhitâ affords, under rule 2. The passages are *çasanam vâjy arvâ* (iv.6.7<sup>5</sup>: O. ends with *vâjî*) and *çuno viçasanena* (v.7.23).

T. and O. have the simple *pada çasanena*, instead of *viçasanena* (p. *vi-çasanena*) in the rule, and O. reads the same in its comment. This is doubtless an emendation, and makes a reading more strictly in accordance with the approved usage of the treatise. The comment has (especially in the fourth chapter) explained away many a like inaccuracy by the allegation of a phrase "in another *çâkhâ*:" and we might expect to find added here *vî 'ti kim: áçañsanene 'ti çâkhântare*.

*bhâve 'pi nâ 'yam vidhir nishidhyatâm ' iti grahaṇam<sup>8</sup>. anta<sup>9</sup> udâtto yasya tad antodâttam: <sup>10</sup>nâ 'ntodâttam<sup>10</sup> anantodâttam: tasmin. <sup>11</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. *asmin*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *antod-*. <sup>3</sup> O. *syád*. <sup>4</sup> W. *antod-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *çak-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>8</sup> B. *padagr-*. <sup>9</sup> W. O. *ante*. <sup>(10)</sup> O. om. <sup>11</sup> O. adds *apadâdyartho . . . . ity anetanâi* (which belongs at the end of the comment on rule 6).

6. *açañsann ity asmin grahaṇe syád anusvârâgamaḥ. ' abhi*  
----- *'apadâdyartho 'yam ârambhah<sup>1</sup>*.

<sup>1</sup> O. puts at end of comment on rule 5, and adds, partly there and partly here (a little amended), *kimartham idam. sraçohapâçâ* (xvi.2) *ity anenâi 'va tatsiddhâu: a py akârâdî* (i.52) *'ti vacanât: mâi 'vam: a py akârâdî 'ti vacanam padasya padâvayavaḥ çaçabdah: çañsânn iti pâthântaram*.

7. *çasanam: viçasanena<sup>1</sup>: ity etayor grahaṇayor<sup>2</sup> anusvârâ-gamo na syât. ças- - - - : çuno - - - - sraçoha* (xvi.2) *iti prâptiḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> O. *ças-*, as also (with T.) in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



rule 8—that is to say, to bring under that rule a word which would otherwise be excluded in virtue of the requisition “when beginning a *pada*.” The case is similar to that about which O. raises a question under rule 6. The passage is *amāñsakāya svāhā* (vii.5.12<sup>2</sup>).

## नावग्रहपूर्वः ॥ ११ ॥

11. But not when preceded by a former member of a compound.

Or, ‘by a pause of division (between the two members of a compound),’ taking *avagraha* in its more original sense. W. B. O. define the rule as establishing exceptions under rule 8; G. M., which have taken in this notification (less correctly) as part of the preceding comment, say simply that *mā* is to be understood as implied here by vicinage. The examples given are *pūrṇāmāse vāi* (ii.5.5<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *vāi*) and *ardhamāse devāḥ* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup> twice). The words would satisfy all the conditions of rule 8, the separated element *-māse* or *-māse* being itself (by i.48) a *pada*. Since *māñsa* nowhere appears as the latter member of a compound, this rule exempts from the increment of *anusvāra* all the cases in which forms of *mās* or *māsa* are found in such a situation; others are the subject of the next following precept.

## मासिमासुमासोमासामिति च ॥ १२ ॥

12. Nor in *māsi*, *māsu*, *māsaḥ*, or *māsām*.

These are words which, without special exception, would fall under rule 8. The examples for the last three are *daçāsu masū ṭṭishthan* (vii.5.2<sup>2</sup>), *shāṇ māso dākshinena* (vi.5.3<sup>4</sup>: only O. has the last word), and *māsām prātiṣṭhityāi* (vii.5.1<sup>6</sup>): we have *māsāḥ* also at vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>, and *māsām* at v.7.18. The first, *māsi*, raises a difficulty. Some, the commentator says, cite in illustration of it *prathamé māsi prshthāni* (vii.5.3<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word); but this is wrong; for the exemption of *māsi* in that passage is assured by rule 17, below: we are to assume, then, the occurrence in another text of some word of more than two syllables beginning

10. *caçabdo me 'ti jñāpayati: me 'ty evam<sup>1</sup> varṇaḥ sakāyaparo<sup>2</sup> 'nusvārāgamam<sup>3</sup> bhajate. am-.....<sup>4</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. O. *ayam*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *sakārap*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *nityam anu*-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *mā padādir anudāta* (xvi.8) *ity asyā 'yam apavādaḥ*.

11. <sup>1</sup>*mā padādir anudāta* (xvi.8) *ity asyā 'yam apavādaḥ: avagrahapūro me 'ty evam<sup>2</sup> varṇo nā<sup>3</sup> 'nusvārāgamam bhajate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: pūrṇ-.....: ardhā-..... avagrahaḥ pūro yasmād<sup>5</sup> asāv avagrahapūraḥ.<sup>5</sup>*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. have this as part of the comment on the preceding rule, and substitute here *sānnidhyān mā iti labhyate*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. O. *ayam*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. *na*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. *sa tathoktaḥ*; W. om. *asāv*.



with *mâsi*. This interpretation is, of course, forced and false: *mâsi* is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them; and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14. We have also *masî-mâsi*, more than once, at vii.5.1<sup>6</sup>.

हिपुजिगाजिघाह्सिनेऽतस्सयदाताऽसीत्कनीयाऽयाया-  
 द्राधीयार्धीयाश्रेयाह्रसीयावसीयाभूयाऽसोज्जिवाजघ्निवा-  
 जिगिवाजीगिवातस्थिवादाश्वादीदिवापपिवापीपिवावि-  
 द्वाविविशिवाशुश्रुवाससृवा ॥ १३ ॥

13. The following words have *anusvâra* before *s*: *hi*, *pu*, *jigâ*, *jighâ*, *chañsine*, *atañsayat*, *âtâñsît*, *kanîyâ*, *jyâyâ*, *drâghîyâ*, *raghîyâ*, *çreyâ*, *hrasîyâ*, *vasîyâ*, *bhûyâñsah*, *jakshivâ*, *jaghnivâ*, *jigivâ*, *jîgivâ*, *tasthivâ*, *dâçvâ*, *dîdivâ*, *papivâ*, *pîpivâ*, *vidvâ*, *viviçivâ*, *çuçruvâ*, *sasrûvâ*.

The commentator's examples are as follows: *hiñsîḥ paramavyoman* (iv.2.10<sup>1-2,3</sup>: O. omits *vyoman*, and G. M. substitute *mâ hiñsîs tanuvâ*, iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *cinute hiñsâyâi* (v.2.8<sup>7</sup>: O. omits *cinute*); respecting this first specification, see further below;—*tena puñsvatîḥ* (ii.5.8<sup>5</sup>) and *puñsah putrân* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>): I have only noted farther two cases of *puñsah*, at ii.6.5<sup>5</sup> and vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>;—*lokam ajigâñsan* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>: vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *lokam*): elsewhere only at iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>;—*tvashṭâram ajighâñsan* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>): the text presents fourteen other cases of *jighâñs*;—*brâhmaṇâchañsine* (i.8.18): the only case: a counter-example (but O. omits all the counter-examples), *pra yuchasy ubhe ni pâsi* (i.4.22), shows the necessity of including in the citation the *ne* of *chañsine*;—*gabhe mushtim atañsayat* (vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>), with a counter-example, *atasam na çushkam* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), to explain the citation of the whole word *atañsayat*;—*anvâtâñsît tvayi* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>: O. omits *tvayi*), with *anu vrâtâsas tava* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>), to prove the need of the final *ît*;—*kanîyâñso devâḥ* (v.3.11<sup>1</sup>): the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative, and about the same number of the next;—*jyâyâñso bhrâtarah*

12. <sup>1</sup>*cakâro nishedhâkarshakah<sup>1</sup>: mâsi . . . . . ity eteshu grahañeshu na syâd anusvârâgamah. eshâm api mâ padâdir* (xvi.8) *iti prâptiḥ. kecid atra prath . . . . . ity udâharanti<sup>2</sup>: tad asâdhu: na pade dvisvare nityam<sup>3</sup>* (xvi.17) *ity anenâi 'va nishedhasiddheḥ<sup>4</sup>: tasmâd anyaçâkhâyâm<sup>5</sup> bahusvaram aparam<sup>6</sup> udâharaṇam avadhâraṇîyam. daçasu . . . . . : shaṇ . . . . . : mâsâm . . . . .*

(<sup>1</sup>) O. om. (<sup>2</sup>) W. -*raṇam*. (<sup>3</sup>) W. O. *n*; G. M. om. (<sup>4</sup>) W. -*dham siddhah*; B. -*dhaḥ siddhah*. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. *anyasyâm ç*. (<sup>6</sup>) B. G. M. *param*; O. om.



(ii.6.6<sup>1</sup> et al.);—*drāghīyāñsāu bhavataḥ* (v.2.5<sup>1</sup>): the only case;—*atho raghīyāñsaḥ* (vii.4.9): also the only case;—*pra greyāñsam* (ii.4.1<sup>4</sup>: but O. substitutes the only other case, *creyāñsam pāpīyān*, v.1.2<sup>3</sup>);—*atha hrasīyāñsam ākramanam* (vi.6.4<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. O. omit the last word, thus allowing the citation to include also the only other case, found in the same division);—*vasīyāñsam bhāgadheyena* (v.4.10<sup>5</sup>): there are two or three further cases;—*bhūyāñso 'nyebhyaḥ* (vii.1.1<sup>5</sup>), with *annādo bhūyāsam* (i.6.2<sup>3</sup> et al.) as counter-example, proving that the final *ḥ* had to be cited with the rest of the word: there are seven other cases of *bhūyāñs* in the text;—*jakshivāñsaḥ papivāñsaḥ* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word): the only case;—*vṛtram jaghnivāñsam mṛdho 'bhi* (ii.5.3<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the first word, O. the first and last; G. M. have only the first two, which are read also at ii.5.4<sup>5</sup>): I have noted the word besides only at ii.1.10<sup>2</sup> three times, with the negative prefix;—*vājam jigivāñsaḥ* (i.7.8<sup>4</sup>): the only case;—for *jigivā* is found only a case “in another *çākhā*,” namely *jigivāñsasya* (so W. G. M., though the word is not grammatically admissible; O. has *jigivāñsamyaṃ* [i. e. *-ñsaḥ syāma?*]; B. is corrupt, running the previous citation and this together into *vājam jigivāñsam iti çākhāntare*);—*dyumnā tashivāñso janānam* (i.2.14<sup>4</sup>: O. alone has the last word): there is one other case, at iv.2.2<sup>2</sup>;—*dāçvāñso dāçushaḥ sutam* (i.4.16: O. alone has *sutam*): another case at ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>;—*çucayo dīdivāñsam* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>): another case at i.2.14<sup>4</sup>;—*papivāñsaç ca viçve* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>): the only case;—*pīpivāñsañ sarasvataḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>: O. has *-tas trayah*, probably corrupt for *-ta stanam*, as the text reads): the only case;—*vidvāñso vāi purā hotāraḥ* (ii.5.11<sup>1-2</sup>: only O. has the last two words) and *avidvāñsaç cakṛma* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>: O. begins *visṭāvid-*, by mutilation of the preceding word in the passage): the Sanhitā has over thirty cases of *vidvāñs*;—*praviviçivāñsam imahe* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>);—*yac chuçruvāñsaḥ* (ii.5.9<sup>2</sup> twice): there is another case at v.3.4<sup>1</sup>;—and, finally, *vājañ sasrvāñsaḥ* (i.7.8<sup>4</sup>).

After the second example (*ahiñsāyāi*), G. M. insert the remark that it is brought under the present rule by the principle of “prefixion of *a*” (i.52). This is wrong, being inconsistent with the

---

13. <sup>1</sup>hi . . . . .<sup>1</sup> ity evampūrvah sakāraparo 'nusvārāgamo<sup>2</sup> bhavati<sup>3</sup>. yathā<sup>4</sup>: hiñsīḥ . . . . .: cin- . . . . .: <sup>5</sup> tena . . . . .: puñsaḥ . . . . .: lokam . . . . .: tvasṭ- . . . . .: brāhm- . . . . .: <sup>6</sup> na iti kim: pra . . . . .: <sup>6</sup> gabhe . . . . .: <sup>7</sup> yad iti kim: atasam . . . . .: <sup>7</sup> anv- . . . . .: <sup>8</sup> id iti kim: anu . . . . .: <sup>8</sup> kan- . . . . .: jyāy- . . . . .: drāgh- . . . . .: atho . . . . .: pra . . . . .: atha . . . . .: vasī- . . . . .: bhūy- . . . . .: <sup>9</sup> visargena kim: ann . . . . .: <sup>9</sup> jaksh- . . . . .: vṛtram . . . . .: vājam . . . . .: jigivāñsasye 'ti çākhāntare: dyum- . . . . .: <sup>10</sup> dāçv- . . . . .: çucayo . . . . .: papiv . . . . .: pīpiv- . . . . .: <sup>10</sup> vidv- . . . . .: avid- . . . . .: pravi- . . . . .: yac . . . . .: vājañ . . . . . <sup>11</sup> dāçvāviviçivāçuçruve<sup>12</sup> 'ty atra srādishu cāi 'kapada (xv.4) iti prāptyā çakāraparo 'nusvārāgamaḥ kim





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



## आकारिकारोकाराः सिषिपराः पदान्तयोः ॥ १४ ॥

14. The vowels *ā*, *ī*, and *ū* have *anusvāra*, when they are followed by *si* or *shi* final.

This rule, of course, applies to the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural of neuters in *as*, *is*, and *us*. The illustrative examples are *vayāñsi pakvagandhena* (v.7.23), *tamāñsi gūhatām ajushtā* (i.8.22<sup>5</sup>: only O. has *ajushtā*), *daça havīñshi* (vii.5.14<sup>2</sup>), *jyotīñshi kurute* (v.4.1<sup>4</sup>: O. omits), *agna āyūñshi* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup> et al.), and *avabhṛthayajūñshi juhōti* (vi.6.3<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *juhōti*). To show that the *si* or *shi* must be final, are quoted *tasmād vāsishtho brahmā* (iii.5.2<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *brahmā*), and *manīshino manasā* (iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>: O. omits *manasā*). To show that the preceding vowel must be long, we have *yathā 'nasi yukta ādhīyate* (v.4.10<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), *jyotis tvā jyotishi* (i.1.10<sup>3</sup>), and *āyushi durone* (i.2.14<sup>3</sup>); and, finally, to show that no other vowel than *i* after the *s* or *sh* calls out the increment, *prajāsv eva prajātāsu* (vi.4.1<sup>3</sup>), *oshadhīshu* (iii.5.5<sup>2</sup> et al.), and *tanūshu buddham* (i.8.22<sup>5</sup>).

The last six counter-examples are omitted in O., which adds at the end the obvious remark that, as *si* and *shi* are here indicated as occasions of the preceding *anusvāra*, that value no longer belongs to *s* merely—that is to say, the force of the heading given in rule 1 is henceforth at an end.

## विकृते ऽपि ॥ १५ ॥

15. Even when the *i* is altered

That the *i* of the ending *si* or *shi* is here aimed at is in the nature of the case obvious enough, but not at all distinctly intimated by the terms of the rule. The commentator quotes in illustration *chandāñsy upa dadhāti* (v.3.8<sup>1,2</sup>), *havīñshy ā sādāyet* (i.6.10<sup>3</sup>), and *tapūñshy agne juhvā* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *juhvā*).

14. *sishiparā ākārekārokārās tayoh sishyoh padāntayoh sator anusvārāgamam bhajante*<sup>1</sup>. *yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *vay- - - -*: *tam- - - -*: *daça - - - -*: <sup>3</sup>*jyot- - - -*: <sup>3</sup>*agna- - - -*: *avabh- - - -*. *padāntayor*<sup>4</sup> *iti kim: tasmād- - - -*: *manī- - - -*. <sup>5</sup>*ākārekārokārā iti dīrghena*<sup>5</sup> *kim: yathā- - - -*: *jyotis- - - -*: *āyushi- - - -*. *sishī 'ty*<sup>6</sup> *atre 'kāreṇa kim: praj- - - -*: *osh- - - -*: *tan- - - -*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MSS. *-jate*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. *-ta*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. *dīrghāih*; O. om., with all that follows. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *ity*. <sup>7</sup> O. adds *sishiparanimittayor nideçāt sakārasya paranimittatva bhāti*.

15. *apiçabdānvādishte*<sup>1</sup> *sishyor ikāre vikṛte 'pi yakāram āpanne 'pi bhavaty anusvārāgamah*. *yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *chand- - - -*: *hav- - - -*: *tap- - - -*.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. *-bdonv-*; G. M. *-bdenā 'nv-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om.



## अनाकारो ह्रस्वः सांकृत्यस्य ॥ १६ ॥

16. According to Sāmkr̥tya, the vowel, except *ā*, is short.

That is to say, the two vowels *ī* and *ū*, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to: for example, in *haviñshi bhavanti* (v.5.17 et al.: O. omits *bhavanti*) and *samishṭayajūñshi juhōti* (vi.6.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *juhōti*), where Sāmkr̥tya would read *haviñshi* and *yajūñshi*, while in *vayāñsi* (v. 7.23 et al.: O. omits) he would admit the long vowel.

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustomed to regard as open to any difference of opinion. The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved.

G. M. add *ca* to the rule, after *sāmkr̥tyasya*.

## न पदे द्विस्वरे नित्यम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Not, under any circumstances, in a dissyllabic word.

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14; the addition *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' confirms its application to words ending in *si* or *shi* after *ā*, *ī*, or *ū* which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment.

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely *stuto yāsi vaçāñ anu* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. end with *yāsi*) and *yāsi dātah* (iii.5. 5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have dropped out *yāsi*). Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have *vidhatah pāsi nu tmanā* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>); and, as one under rule 8, *prathame māsi prshthāni* (vii.5.3<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above. The force of the *nityam* does not go so far as to prohibit an *anusvāra* in every dissyllabic word before *si*, what-

16. *ākārād anyo 'nākārah: ikāra ukāraç ce 'ty arthaḥ: tayor eva prakṛtatvāt. sāmkr̥tyasya mata ikāra ukāraç ca hrasvam āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: hav-----: sam----- <sup>2</sup>anākāra iti kim: vayāñsi.<sup>2</sup>*

*ne 'dam sūtram ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om.

17. *dvisvare<sup>1</sup> pade vartamānā<sup>2</sup> ākārekārokārāḥ<sup>3</sup> padāntasishi- parā<sup>4</sup> nā<sup>5</sup> 'nusvārāgamam<sup>6</sup> bhajante. yathā<sup>7</sup>: stuto-----: <sup>8</sup>yāsi ----- nityaçabdaḥ prāptyantarapratishedhārthaḥ: vidhataḥ -----:<sup>8</sup> <sup>9</sup>sraçoha<sup>10</sup> (xvi.2) iti prāptiḥ: prathame-----: mā pa- dādir<sup>11</sup> (xvi.8) iti prāptiḥ. dvāu svarāu yasmin<sup>12</sup> vidyete tad dvisvaram: tasmin.<sup>9</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. *dvitvasv-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-na*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *ākārah ikārah*; O. *ākāraukārāḥ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-ntas sishiparo*; O. *-ntā si-*. <sup>5</sup> B. om.; G. M. *nityan nā*. <sup>6</sup> B. ins. *na*; O. ins. *nityam*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(8)</sup> W. om. <sup>(9)</sup> B. om. <sup>10</sup> O. *-hapāça padādaya*. <sup>11</sup> O. *-dir ijās*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *pade*.



ever vowel precedes, or it would include *hañsi* also, and possibly other cases.

ऋजीषिजिगासिजिघास्यजासियजासिद्दासिद्धासिवर्तया-  
सि च ॥ १८ ॥

18. Nor in *rjîshi*, *jigâsi*, *jighâsi*, *ajâsi*, *yajâsi*, *dadâsi*, *dadhâsi*, and *vartayâsi*.

These are verbal forms which need to be excepted under rule 14, and which, as containing more than two syllables, are not reached by rule 17. The passages in which they occur are quoted by the commentary, as follows: *tena rjîshi sarvâni* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *sarvâni*), *achâ jigâsi* (iv.2.4<sup>2</sup>), *â tvam ajâsi garbhadham* (vii.4.19<sup>1</sup>), *havishâ yajâsy agne bṛhat* (iii.5.11<sup>2</sup> et al.: O. omits the last two words), *yâbhir dadâsi dâçushe* (iii.3.11<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *dâçushe*), *dadhâsi dâçushe kave* (iv.2.7<sup>2</sup>), and *açvam â vartayâsi nah* (vii.4.20). *Yajâsi* I have noted in two or three other passages; if the rest occur elsewhere, I have overlooked them. This leaves unaccounted for *jighâsi*, which is declared to occur "in another text," in the passage *prathame jighâsi*.

दंसनाभ्योदंसोभिर्दंसंवृषदंशोदंशुकादंष्ट्राभ्यां परः  
॥ १९ ॥

19. In *dañsanâbhyah*, *dañsobhih*, *dañsam*, *vṛshadañçah*, *dañçukâ*, and *dañshtrâbhyâm*, *anusvâra* is taken in the latter place.

The commentator's citations are *vâiçvânarasya dañsanâbhyah* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>); *sajoshâv açvinâ dañsobhih* (v.6.4<sup>1</sup>), to which is added as counter-example, proving the need of the *-bhih*, *yushmâko* "tî *riçâdasah* (iv.3.13<sup>3</sup>: O. has only the last word, and G. M. begin

18. <sup>1</sup> *cakâro nishedhâkarshakah*: *rjîshiprabhṛtishu*<sup>2</sup> *grahaneshu*<sup>3</sup> *nâ* 'nusvârâgamah *syât*: *âkârekârokârâ* (xvi.14) *iti prâptih*. *bahusvaratvâd*<sup>4</sup> *eshu*<sup>5</sup> *pûrvusûtranishedo*<sup>6</sup> *na sidhyatî* 'ty *atrâ*<sup>7</sup> 'yam *ârambhaḥ*. *yathâ*<sup>8</sup>: *tena*----: *achâ*----: *jighâsî*<sup>9</sup> 'ti *çâkhântare*: <sup>10</sup>*prathame jighâsî* 'ti<sup>10</sup>: *â*----: *havishâ*----: *yâbhir*----: *dadhâsi*----: *açvam*----

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. an enumeration of the words in the rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-ṛti*. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-râdi*. <sup>5</sup> B. *esha*; G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-tre ni-*; W. B. *-dhân*. <sup>7</sup> O. om. *atra*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *-añsi*: <sup>10</sup> O. om.; W. *prathame* — — — (as being illegible in the MS. from which the copy was made); B. *-ghâsati*.

19. <sup>1</sup> *dañsanâbhyah* *ityâdishu*<sup>2</sup> *grahaneshu* *para evâ* 'nusvârâgamah *bhavatî*<sup>3</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>4</sup>: *vâiçv*----: *saj*----: *bhir* *iti kim*: *yushm*----: <sup>5</sup> *purud*----: *vṛsh*----: *paçûn*----: *dañsh*----. *dañse* 'ty *etâvatâi* 'vâ 'lam: *kim akhilapadapâthena*<sup>6</sup>. *kur*----





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



which is powerful, not of that which is weak, is honorific; hence, the competency of the citation was to be insisted on in the former rule, but not here, in a weak position. Moreover, a<sup>2</sup>-superior man puts down, for honor's sake, a mighty opponent, but never a weak one. Therefore, the use of the word *para* here is right and proper!

All the MSS. except B. (and G. M., which have a slight *lacuna*, involving the word) read *dañsan* instead of *dañsam* in the rule.

म॒स्ये॒म॒स॒तै॒य॒स्य॒स॒न्व॒स॒ते॒व॒स॒गः ॥ २० ॥

20. Also in *mañsye*, *mañsatâi*, *yañsad*, *yañsan*, *vañsate*, and *vañsagaḥ*.

The commentator quotes as follows: *paçûn nâ 'bhi mañsya iti* (iii.1.9<sup>6</sup>), *anu nâu çûru mañsatâi bhadra indrasya ratayaḥ* (vii.4.15: O. alone has the first two words, B. alone the last one), *çocishâ yañsad viçvam ny atrinam* (iv.6.1<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit *çocishâ*), *ishavaḥ çarma yañsan* (iv.6.6<sup>4</sup>), *agnir no vañsate rayim* (iv.6.1<sup>5</sup>), and *tigmaçrîngo na vañsagaḥ* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>). The words here dealt with occur only in the passages quoted, except *yañsat*, which is found also at iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>; 7.14<sup>3</sup>. To the objection that it would have been enough to give *mañs*, *yañs*, and *vañs* (the MSS. leave it doubtful whether these are the precise forms suggested) in the rule, instead of citing whole words, the commentator replies by giving the counter-examples *uttamasyâ 'va dyati* (vi.3.10<sup>4</sup>), *yasya bhûyâñso yajñakratavaḥ* (iii.1.7<sup>3</sup>), and *adya vasu vasati* (ii.5.3<sup>7</sup>).

उ॒न्न॒ व॒श॒म् ॥ २१ ॥

21. Also in *vañçam*, after *ut* or *na*.

The passages are *ud vañçam iva yemire* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: W. has dropped out *yemire*, along with all the rest of the comment) and *prâcînavañçam karoti* (vi.1.1<sup>1</sup> twice). A counter-example, with a different preceding word, is *brahmararcasy eva bhavati vaçam vâ esha carati* (ii.1.7<sup>7</sup>: only O. has the first two words, and it omits the last two).

20. <sup>1</sup> *mañsya ityâdishu*<sup>2</sup> *syâd anusvârâgamaḥ. yathâ*<sup>3</sup>: *paçûn*  
-----: *anu*-----: *çoc*-----: *ishavaḥ*-----: *agnir*-----: *tigm*  
----- <sup>4</sup>*mañs*: *yañs*: *vañs*:<sup>4</sup> *ity etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam*: *kim akhila-*  
*padapâthena*: *utt*-----: *yasya*-----: *adya*---- *ityâdâu mâ bhûd*  
*iti*.

<sup>1</sup> O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule. <sup>2</sup> B. *-di*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> W. *bhadrayañ*; B. *sañsûr yañs vañs*; G. M. *mañsa*: *yañsa*: *vañsa*; O. *mañse*: *yañse*: *vañse*.

21. *ut*<sup>1</sup>: *na*: *ity evampûrve*<sup>2</sup> *vañçam ity asmin grahaṇe syâd*  
*anusvârâgamaḥ. ud*-----: <sup>3</sup>*prâ*----- <sup>4</sup>*evampûrva iti*<sup>4</sup> *kim*:  
*brahm*-----<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. *uñsyatebhrat*. <sup>2</sup> W. *-rvo*; B. *-rva*. <sup>3</sup> W. om. <sup>4</sup> O. *unne 'ti*.



अक्रंस्तक्रंस्यतेरंस्यतेभ्रंशते ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in *akraṅsta*, *kraṅsyate*, *raṅsyate*, and *bhraṅçate*.

The passages are *dyâm vâjy â 'kraṅsta* (vii.5.19<sup>1</sup>), *utkraṅsyate svâhâ* (vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>), *uparaṅsyate svâhâ* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit), and *nâ 'smâd râshtram bhraṅçate* (v.7.4<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the first two words); *bhraṅçate* occurs also at i.6.11<sup>1</sup> twice.

G. M. read *utkraṅsyate* for *kraṅsyate* in the rule.

रंक्ष्यै च ॥ २३ ॥

23. And also in *raṅhyâi*.

The only passage is *pûshṇo raṅhyâi* (i.3.10<sup>2</sup>). The significance of the *ca*, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule.

हेकार उख्यस्य नितान्तः ॥ २४ ॥

24. The *âi*, according to Ukhya, is excessive.

That is to say, according to the commentator, the *âi* of the word *raṅhyâi*, here brought forward by the *ca*, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule. *Nitânta*, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort.' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhya's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection.

विरिन्नि संख्यासु ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also in *vi*, *ri*, and *tri*, in numerals, except in *su*.

22. <sup>1</sup>*akraṅste 'tyâdishu syâd anusvârâgamah<sup>1</sup>. dyâm-----: utkr-----: <sup>2</sup>upa-----: nâ-----.*

(<sup>1</sup>) O. substitutes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule (except the last), and *eteshu grahaṇeshv anusvârâgamo bhavati*. (<sup>2</sup>) B. O. om.

23. *raṅhyâ ity asmin grahaṇe syâd anusvârâgamah. pûshṇo----- cakârasya 'vyatihâreṇâ 'nvaya<sup>1</sup> uttarasûtre prayojanam ucyate.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *vyavahârâd anvayâd*.

24. *raṅhyâ ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahaṇe pûrvasûtrasthacakârasamar-pita<sup>2</sup> âikâro nitânto bhavati<sup>3</sup> 'ty<sup>3</sup> ukhyasya<sup>4</sup> mate<sup>5</sup>. nitântas tîvra-taraprayatna ity arthah.*

*nâi 'tan matam ishtam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. *-trasya cak-*; O. *-treprayosthacak-*; G. M. *-pite*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *iti*. <sup>4</sup> W. *ukhya*; O. *ukhyasyâ 'câryasya*. <sup>5</sup> O. *-tam*.



The syllable *su* is here, the commentator tells us, the ending of the locative case, just as *aḥ* (at i.23) is used as representing the nominative case. This remark is called for, because (see the example below) the actual form in which the syllable appears in the cases aimed at is *shu*. We have a right to be surprised at finding it given as *su* in the rule; and perhaps, also, to conjecture that *samkhyāsu* was originally simply the locative plural of *samkhyā*, and that the other value was interpreted into it when the cases calling for exception were noticed.

The quoted examples are *viñçatyāi svāhā* (vii.2.13 et al.: O. omits), *yad viñçatir dve tena virājāu* (v.3.3<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three), *catvāriñçate svāhā* (vii.2.17: G. M. O. omit *svāhā*; B. has dropped out *-te svāhā*, the next example, and the first word of the next but one), *triñçate svāhā* (vii.2.17: O. omits *svāhā*), and *triñçat trayaç ca* (i.4.11<sup>1</sup>); there are other cases, which I have not taken the trouble to collect. The inclusion of *tri* in the rule, the commentator says, is for the sake of greater plainness, since *ri*, of course, involves *tri* also; it is to be compared with the inclusion of the *v* of *vāghā* in rule vii.13. Begging the commentator's pardon, however, the two cases are not at all analogous; and the citation of *tri* and *ri* together must be esteemed an oversight, and an offense against the law of economy of expression, obligatory in the *sūtra*-style. The need of restriction to numerals is illustrated by *viçe janāya* (ii.5.12<sup>3</sup>), *su rishah pātu naktam* (i.2.14<sup>7</sup> et al.: G. M. O. omit *naktam*), and *trishṭubhāi 'vā 'smāi* (ii.5.10<sup>1</sup> et al.). Finally, the specification "not before *su*" is established by *trishv ā rocane divah* (iv.2.4<sup>4</sup> et al.: O. omits *divah*); if there is another case of this kind, I have failed to note it.

There is yet another word, *trishāhasrah* (v.6.8<sup>3</sup>; p. *tri-sāhasrah*), which would properly fall under this rule, but is exempted by a pregnant interpretation of the word *ekapade* in xv.4 (see the note to that rule).

शिंशुमारःशिंपत्संश्वासंश्वासंसृष्टसंस्कृत्यसंस्कृत-  
तसंशितसंशिताकिंशिलकिंशिला ॥ २६ ॥

25. *vi: ri: tri: <sup>1</sup> evampūrva ūshmaparo<sup>2</sup> 'nusvārāgamah<sup>3</sup> syāt: ebhir yadi<sup>4</sup> samkhyo 'cyate<sup>5</sup>: asu<sup>6</sup> suçabdam varjayitvā. su<sup>7</sup> saptamī vibhaktir uktā: yathā 'hkārah<sup>8</sup> prathamāvibhaktiupala- kshanam<sup>9</sup>: viñ-....: yad-....: catv-....:<sup>10</sup> triñ-....:<sup>10</sup> triñ- çat-.... trigrahanam vispashtārtham: yato<sup>11</sup> viri samkhyā 'sv ity<sup>12</sup> etāvatāi 'vā 'lam: yathā vāghāshapura (vii.13) ity atra vakāro vispashtārthah. samkhye 'ti kim: viçe-....: sa-....: trishṭ-.... asv iti kim: trishv-....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> B. *ūkārāp-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-ra āg-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *yadā*. <sup>5</sup> O. *'cyeta*. <sup>6</sup> W. *a*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *sv iti*; O. *su iti*. <sup>8</sup> B. *ak-*; G. M. *āk-*. <sup>9</sup> O. *-kter up-*. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. om. <sup>12</sup> O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



Cases of various character are here intermingled. The first two and the last are indivisible words, of which the *anusvāra* forms an essential part, as of those cited in rules 19 and 20, or 29 and 30. The others come from combinations with the preposition *sam*, and are of two classes: *sañskṛtya* and *sañskṛta* the *pada*-text does not attempt to analyze, although (see v.6,7) it divides *sañskurute* and *samaskurvata*, ejecting the intrusive sibilant: those remaining are compounds with *sam* which enter into further composition, so that their compound character does not appear in the *pada*-text. And one or two cases of this last class seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise: they are *svādushañsadaḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>; p. *svādu-sañsadaḥ*) and *strīshañsādam* (ii.5.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *strī-sañsādam*). The former of them, indeed, is noticed in G. M., which introduce *sañsadaḥ* into the rule, after *sañskṛta*, and quote the compound in the comment—seeming to betray their consciousness that the word is not a part of the ordinary reading of the rule by saying “when *sañsadaḥ* is read, the instance is *svādushañsadaḥ*.”

There are further varieties of reading in the rule: G. M. have *ḥiñshati*; W. B. put *sañsrṣhta* between *sañskṛtya* and *sañskṛta*, and give its example a corresponding place among the examples; T. B. G. M. read *sañskṛtañ*, which is perhaps to be preferred; other differences are mere copyists' errors, and not worth reporting.

So far as I have discovered, *sañskṛtam* (i.2.9) and *sañçita* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup> a second time) are the only words included in this rule which occur further in the *Sanhitā*.

The commentator raises the question whether we must not suppose that an *anusvāra* is also to be inserted before the spirant *sh* in *sañsrṣhta*; but, without this time appealing to the “competency of the citation” to settle the reading, replies that, the word being associated here with others all of which have *anusvāra* only after the first vowel, we must assume the same to be the case with it also; all but O. adding that “there is no reason for inconsistency” in this respect.

## सितृद् द्वकारपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also after *si*, *tr*, or *dr*, when *h* follows.

The quoted examples are *siñho vayah* (iv.3.5), *çatatarhāñs trñhanti* (i.5.7<sup>6</sup> et al.), and *drñhasva mā hvāḥ* (i.1.3 et al.). Of the

---

*caryād*<sup>9</sup> *atrā* 'pi *tathāi* 'va<sup>10</sup> *vijñeyam*: <sup>11</sup>*na vāiparītye kāraṇam asti*<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words cited in the rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-dishu gr-*; O. *-dishu*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *sañsada iti pāthe svādushañsadaḥ*. <sup>5</sup> W. *param ki-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> W. G. M. *sarva*. <sup>8</sup> W. *varṇ-*; G. M. *-nāñcaram*. <sup>9</sup> O. *sāh-*. <sup>10</sup> B. 'vā 'pi. <sup>(11)</sup> O. om.; W. om. *na*.

27. *si*: *tr*: *dr*: *ity evampūrho hakāraparah*<sup>1</sup> *syād anusvārāgamah*<sup>2</sup>. *yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *siñho* . . . .: *çatat* . . . .: *drñh* . . . . <sup>4</sup>*evam-*



noun *siñha*, and of forms from the roots *trñh* and *drñh*, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanhitâ. Counter-examples are given (excepting in O.): to show that no other syllables take the increment before *h*, *sapatnasâhî svâhâ* (i.2.12<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. substitute *sapatnasâhîñ sam mârjmi*, i.1.10<sup>1</sup>) and *anatidâhâyo 'vâca* (v.2.10<sup>3</sup>); that *ṛ* takes the increment only when preceded by *t* or *d*, *grhânâm usamartyâi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>); that the increment is taken only before *h*, *sihâsantîh* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. read *sihâsah*, but doubtless by a blunder only), *trshvîm anu* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>), and *naktam drçe dîpyate* (v.6.4<sup>4</sup>).

## मन्दिष्ठस्य च ॥ २८ ॥

28. As also, in *mañhishthasya*.

That is to say, before the *h*, which is brought down from the preceding rule by *ca*, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of *anusvâra* before the *sh* and *s* in the same word. The passage is *mañhishthasya prabhrtasya* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>), and there is no other.

आदिरँहतिरँहोऽँहोरँहोमुगत्यँहाम्रँहसोऽँह-  
माँशमँशुभिरँशमुवाँश्चँशूँशवोऽँशुरँशुमँशु-  
नँशुनाँशोरँशायोपाँश्चँशौ ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also, after the first vowel, in *añhatiḥ*, *añhaḥ*, *añhoḥ*, *añhomuc*, *atyañhâḥ*, *añhasaḥ*, *añhasâ*, *añçam*, *añçubhiḥ*, *añçabhuvâ*, *añçu*, *añcû*, *añçavaḥ*, *añçuḥ*, *añçum*, *añçûn*, *añçunâ*, *añçoḥ*, *añçâya*, *upañçu*, and *añcâu*.

We have here a detailed list of complete *padas* (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole *pada*), in which *anusvâra* is found. The illustrative examples are as follows. For *añhatiḥ*, *pari dveshaso añhatiḥ* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>): the only case. For *añhaḥ*, *añhomucam vṛshabham yajñiyânâm* (i.6.12<sup>4</sup>; p. *añhaḥ-mucam*: G. M. O. omit the last word); *añhaḥ* is found four or five times in the Sanhitâ as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

*pûrva iti kim: sap-....: anati-....: ṛkāreṇâi 'vâ<sup>5</sup> 'lam: kim takâradakârâbhyâm: grh-....: evampara iti kim: sish-....: trshvîm-....: naktam-....<sup>4</sup> hakâraḥ paro yasmâd<sup>6</sup> asâu hakâraparaḥ.<sup>6</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -raç ca. <sup>2</sup> O. asâu hekâraparaḥ. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. O. om. (4) O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. eva. <sup>6</sup> G. M. sa tathoktaḥ.

28. *mañhishthasye 'ty asmin grahaṇe cakârâkr̥shṭahakâraparo 'nusvârâgamo bhavati<sup>1</sup>. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: mañh-....<sup>3</sup> cakâraḥ kimarthaḥ: atrâi 'va grahaṇe sashakâraparo mâ bhûd iti.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. syât. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. (3) O. om.



compound *añhomuc*—one of the forms of which, as we shall see farther on, has to be made separate account of. For *añhoh*, *añhoç cid yá* (i.4.22 and ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>): there is no other case. For *añhomuk*, *añhomugbhyám dvikapálah* (vii.5.22: O. omits *dvikapálah*, and W. B. put it in out of place); of all the forms of *añhomuc*, this is the only one in which *añhah* does not form a *pada* (it is divided, of course, *añhomuk-bhyám*), and which therefore is not disposed of by the citation of *añhah*. For *atyañháh*, *ṛtapáç cá 'tyañháh* (i.8.13<sup>2-3</sup>): the word is found again at iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>; it is more than a simple *pada* (p. *ati-añháh*), and the *ati* is included in the citation, we are told, to prevent confusion of *añháh* with *aháh* in such phrases as *shadáhá bhavanti* (vii.5.1<sup>4</sup>; *shat-aháh*). For *añhasah*, *te no muñcatam añhasah* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>: all except B. read *muñcantv*, which does not occur before *añhasah*): of this case of *añhas* I have noted about twenty instances. For *añhasá*, the only example is the one quoted, *añhasá vá esha grhítaḥ* (ii.4.2<sup>3</sup>: O. ends with *vái*). The commentator next raises the question why whole *padas* should have been cited, when *añha* (as part of a word) would have been sufficient to assure the reading, and replies by quoting *sa rasam aha vasantáya* (vii.2.10<sup>1</sup>: O. begins with *aha*), as an example of cases that required to be excluded. For *añçam*, *pari paçyámo 'ñçam á* (vii.1.6<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *á*): the form is found again in the same division. For *añçubhiḥ*, *shudbhir añçubhiḥ pavayati* (vi.4.5<sup>7</sup>: O. omits *yavayati*; W. B. put this example off until after that for *añçu*, which would be, to be sure, a more suitable place for it, if the same order were followed in the rule; but there all authorities agree: see further on). For *añçabhuvá*, *tvayá 'ñçabhuvá somam* (vi.4.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit *somam*): the word is found again at vi.4.8<sup>3</sup>. For *añçu*, *tená 'ñçumat* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>); and it is pointed out that, by rule i.53 (the comment blunderingly quotes i.52 instead), *anañçu kurvantaḥ* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>) is involved with *añçu* (O. has lost, of this, all but the example *anañçu ku*). For *añçú*, *vṛshṇo hy etáv añçú* (vi.4.5<sup>3</sup>). For *añçavaḥ*, *práná vá añçavaḥ* (vi.4.4<sup>4</sup>). For *añçuḥ*, *añçur añçus te* (i.2.11<sup>1</sup> et al.): the word is found in eight other passages. For *añçum*, *yam ádityá añçum ápyáyayanti* (ii.3.5<sup>3</sup> et al.: only W. has the last word): there are five other instances. For *añçún*, *añçún apa grhñáti* (vi.4.4<sup>4</sup>: lost in W.): it occurs further in the

---

29. <sup>1</sup> *añhatiḥ* . . . . . *eteshv ádir*<sup>2</sup> *anusvárágamo*<sup>3</sup> *bhavati*<sup>4</sup>. *ya-*  
*thá*<sup>5</sup>: *pari* . . . . .: *añho-* . . . . .: <sup>6</sup>*sútre samhítáyám otvavidhánád'*  
*ahar* . . . . . *ityádáu na syád ayam vidhiḥ: kimtu yasmin visar-*  
*janáyo repham ná 'padyate tasyái 'vo 'pádánam:*<sup>6</sup> *añhoç* . . . . .: <sup>8</sup>  
<sup>9</sup>*nanv ayam*<sup>10</sup> *cái*<sup>11</sup> *'kabandhaḥ: rephapráptasyá*<sup>12</sup> *'yam vidhiḥ:*  
*vihitánusvárasyái 'va*<sup>13</sup> *rephanishedhate*<sup>14</sup> *'ti: ná 'yam doshaḥ:*  
*siddhasyái 'vá*<sup>15</sup> *'nusvárasya bodhanam*<sup>16</sup> *na tu vidhir iti*<sup>17</sup>: *añ-*  
*hom-* . . . . .<sup>16,9</sup> *ṛtap-* . . . . .: *atí 'ti kim: shad-* . . . . .: *te* . . . . .: *añ-*  
*hasá* . . . . .: <sup>18</sup>*añhe 'ty*<sup>18</sup> *etávatá*<sup>19</sup> *siddhe*<sup>20</sup> *sakalapadapáthaḥ kim-*  
*arthah*<sup>21</sup>: *sa rasam* . . . . . *iti*<sup>22</sup> *nishedhárthaḥ: pari* . . . . .: <sup>23</sup>*shad-*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



not be included. The comment, however, puts this forward as a reason for including the *bhuvá* of *añçabhuvá*, which, according to the interpretation here offered, it would not be; and perhaps my comprehension of the argument is insufficient. I do not see any reason why, if the *pada*-text divides *añça-bhuvá*, the *bhuvá* should be given in the rule. Equally unexplainable to me is the special citation of *añçubhiḥ*, which, being divided in *pada* into *añçu-bhiḥ*, falls under *añçu*: we have also in the *Sanhitâ* *añçubhyâm* (i.4.2 and vi.4.5<sup>3</sup>), which is a case analogous with the other, and ought to be treated like it. Possibly we may infer from the unsuitable position of *añçubhiḥ* in the rule, and from the place of its example as given in W. B., next after that containing *añçu-mat* (as if it were, like the latter, a case of *añçu*), that it has been interpolated, by an awkward and blundering hand; but the conjecture is a more daring one than I venture seriously to make.

The first *excursus* of the comment is in connection with the second citation, *añhah*. Since the *sañhitâ*-form of this word, we are told, appears by the rule itself to be *añho*, the rule does not apply to *ahah*, which shows a different result of combination in *ahar devânâm* (i.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. read *aharahar*, which is not found in the *Sanhitâ* before *devânâm*), but only to a word the *visarjanîya* of which does not become *r*. This seems plausible enough; but what shall we say of the *ahah* which appears in *sañhitâ* as *aho* in *ahobhyâm*, *ahobhiḥ*, and *ahorâtre* (p. *ahah-râtre*)? Either the makers of the treatise overlooked these words, or they did not attribute to the form *añho* in the rule the significance which is here claimed for it.

The remaining passage is more obscure to me than any of the others. In G. M., it is both preceded and followed by the examples for *añhoḥ* and *añhomuk*; in W. B., these examples precede it, excepting the last word of the second, which comes after it. I imagine that its true place is between the two, and that its intent is to turn against the rule the argument just pleaded respecting *añhah*, pointing out that, as *añhoḥ* becomes *añhor* in the rule, it ought not to exhibit *anusvâra* except when occurring in that phonetic form: the objection being then evaded by the plea that the form is given merely as it happens to occur, and not with any

*tam*<sup>32</sup>. *âdir iti kim: sarveshu sthâneshu mâ bhûd iti: yathâ*<sup>40</sup>  
*'ñhasa ityâdi.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *âdih*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *svarâd*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-gamam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *bhajate*. <sup>5</sup> O. om.  
(<sup>6</sup>) O. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *otvasya*. <sup>8</sup> MSS. ins. *añhomugbhyâm*. (<sup>9</sup>) O. om. <sup>10</sup> W. *aya*.  
<sup>11</sup> G. M. *ca*. <sup>12</sup> W. B. *ekapr*-. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>14</sup> W. B. *-pham ni*-. (<sup>15</sup>) W.  
*'nusvârah syât: nodhyayana syât: tu vidhir iti dvikapâlah*; B. *'nusvâra syât: bodh-*  
*yatâ nanu vidhir iti: dvikapâlah*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *udbodhanam*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *ity añhoç cid*  
*yâ*. (<sup>18</sup>) W. *añh*; B. *aty*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *-atâi 'va*. <sup>20</sup> O. *-dheḥ*; B. *dheḥ kutah*. <sup>21</sup> W.  
*kim*; B. om. <sup>22</sup> B. *ity atrâ 'pi*; G. M. *ityâdi*; O. *ityâdâu*. (<sup>23</sup>) W. B. put next  
before *apy akârâdi*. <sup>24</sup> O. om. <sup>25</sup> G. M. *-vad*. <sup>26</sup> W. B. *açam*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. om.  
(<sup>28</sup>) O. *anañçu ku* simply. <sup>29</sup> W. om. (<sup>30</sup>) G. M. put before *vṛshno*..... (<sup>31</sup>) W. om.  
(<sup>32</sup>) O. om. <sup>33,34</sup> W. *añçr 'ty*; G. M. *añçe 'ty*. <sup>35</sup> B. *-vatâ*. <sup>36</sup> B. *uparigr̥ha*; G. M.  
*api grahanam*. <sup>37</sup> G. M. ins *katham*. <sup>38</sup> G. M. *-deçam*. <sup>39</sup> G. M. *-râgamah*.  
<sup>40</sup> W. O. *a*.



intent of prescription. But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression.

अवग्रह उदात्तो ऽसेऽसायाऽसाभ्यामऽसाविति ॥३०॥

30. Also in *añse*, *añsāya*, *añsābhyām*, and *añsāu*, when accented on the first syllable.

The term *avagraha* is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to *ādi* or *padādi*, 'beginning of the word.' This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none. There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification. Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as *avagraha*, 'former member of a compound.' The restriction is made with reference to *añsāu* alone, in order to distinguish it from *asā'u*. The examples are *dakshine* 'ñsa upa dadhāti (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>: O omits *dadhāti*; W. has lost the whole), *çityañsāya* (vii.3.17: W. has lost *çity*), *añsabhyāñ svāhā* (vii.3.16<sup>2</sup>), and *uttare* 'ñsāv eva prati dadhāti (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>: O. reads *tishthati* for *dadhāti*, but doubtless by a copyist's error only); the counter-example is *asāv abravīc citra-vihitā* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word); *añsābhyām* alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v.7.13).

नासावा नासावा ॥३१॥

31. But not in *asāv ā*.

There is a single passage where the pronoun *asāu*, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable; hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor. The passage is *brūyād āsāv é 'hī 'ty evām evā* (ii.4.9<sup>3</sup>: O. alone has *eva*; G. M. omit also *evam*, and B. blunderingly reads instead of it *atra*).

The Prātiçākhyā's rehearsal of the cases of interior *anusvāra* is,

30. *avagraha ādir ity arthaḥ: yadi<sup>1</sup> padādir udāttaḥ syāt tarhy añse<sup>2</sup> ----- ity eteshu<sup>3</sup> syād anusvārāgamah. itiçabdaḥ svarūpavācī. dakshine-----:<sup>2</sup> çity-----: añsā-----: uttare----- ādir udātta iti kim: asāv-----.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *pari*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-shām*.

31. *ādyudātte<sup>1</sup> saty apy<sup>2</sup> <sup>3</sup>asāv e 'ty<sup>3</sup> asmin <sup>4</sup>grahane na khalu<sup>4</sup> syād anusvārāgamah. brūyād-----.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne<sup>5</sup> prātiçākhyavivarane  
shoḍaço<sup>6</sup> 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *yady ud-*; B. *yady udāttatve*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. om <sup>(3)</sup> W. *asāv ii ty*; B. *asāu*; G. M. O. *asāv ity*. <sup>(4)</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. *çritri-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *dvitīyapraçne caturtho*.



so far as I have been able to discover, complete for the present Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, with the exception of the two compounds (*strî-shaṅśâda* and *svâdushaṅśad*) noticed under rule 26.<sup>7</sup> Whether its rules are so drawn as to involve no cases that require to be excluded, is a much more difficult question, and one which my examination of the text has not been close enough to enable me to determine; but I have noted no instances of inaccuracy, unless the possible confusion of *aṅhaḥ* and *ahaḥ*, pointed out under rule 29, is to be so considered.

## CHAPTER XVII.

CONTENTS: 1-4, opinions of various authorities, as to the degree of nasality in different nasal letters; 5, as to increase of quantity in connection with *anusvâra*; 6, as to increased effort required by certain accents; 7-8, as to other more general matters of utterance.

तीव्रतरमानुनासिक्यमनुस्वारोत्तमेष्विति शैत्यायनः ॥ १ ॥

1. Çâityâyana says that the nasal quality is stronger in *anusvâra* and the nasal mutes.

We have here a chapter entirely composed of the cited opinions of certain specified authorities, and none of them of any definite value or importance in themselves, though interesting as affording us a glimpse of subjects to which the attention of the old Hindu phonetists was drawn, and to their hair-splitting and discordant speculations respecting them.

The commentator's exposition adds nothing to our comprehension of the rule. It quotes the rule at the end of the second chapter (ii.52) as to the cause of nasal quality, and tries (without good reason) to connect with it the present one. Examples of the stronger nasal utterance are given, as follows: *agnîṅr apsushadaḥ*

1. <sup>1</sup>*anusvâraç co 'ttamâç<sup>2</sup> câ 'nusvârottamâḥ: teshu tîvratarām bhavaty ânunâsikyam iti çâityâyano nâma munir manyate<sup>1</sup>. tîvrâd adhikam tîvratarām: anunâsikatâ<sup>3</sup> 'nunâsikyam: nâsikâvivâraṅâd ânunâsikyam (ii.52) ity asya vidheḥ prayatnadârdhyam<sup>4</sup> upadiçyate. <sup>5</sup>yathâ<sup>6</sup>: agnîṅr-----: <sup>7</sup>tâṅs-----: martyâṅ-----<sup>7</sup>: yaṁ-----: <sup>8</sup>vañcate-----: maṅinâ-----<sup>8</sup> eteshv<sup>9</sup> iti kim: rukmā-----: tigmā-----: <sup>10</sup>suçl-----<sup>10</sup>*

(<sup>1</sup>) O. om. (<sup>2</sup>) W. -maç. (<sup>3</sup>) W. -sikâ; B. -sikânâm bhāvah. (<sup>4</sup>) W. O. -dirgham; B. -dârbyâm; G. M. prâyardârthyam. (<sup>5</sup>) O. ins. anusvârottamâ anunâsikâ ity etany anunâsikasthânâni. anusvârottameshu tîvratarām ânunâsikyam bhavati çâityâyano nâma manyate. (<sup>6</sup>) G. M. O. om. (<sup>7</sup>) in O. only. (<sup>8</sup>) O. prâṅ----- (<sup>9</sup>) O. anusvârottameshv. (<sup>10</sup>) O. sa-----: eteshu câi 'va tîvratarām.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



The term *anu*, 'faint,' is explained by *sūkshmatamam* (or, in G. M. O., *sūkshmataram*), 'exceedingly gentle.' In other nasals than *anusvāra*, we are told, Bhâradvâja accepts Çâityâyana's rule, that the nasal quality is extra-strong in the nasal mutes, and simply strong in the *yamas* etc. Most of the MSS. quote only *tanuvā jaya tvañ satvā* (iv.6.6<sup>1</sup>: B. has dropped out all but the beginning, *nanu*, and O. has lost *tanuvā ja* from the beginning); but O. adds counter-examples, *brahmanvanto devā āsan* (vi.4.10<sup>1</sup>), *rukman upa dadhāti* (v.2.7<sup>2</sup>), and *tat sañyatāñ sañyatvam* (v.2.10<sup>6</sup>).

नकारस्य रेफोष्मयकारभावाद्भुते च मलोपाच्चोत्तर-  
मुत्तरं तीव्रतरमिति स्थविरः कौण्डिन्यः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Old Kâuṇḍinya says that when *n* is converted into *r*, or into a spirant, or into *y* (with loss of the *y*), or when *m* is lost, it is stronger in each case successively.

The alterations of an original nasal mute are here rehearsed in the same order, and in the same terms, as in a previous rule (xv.1). The comment gives an example for each case: namely *trīñr ekāda-çāñ iha* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have lost *iha*, along with all that follows, to the last example; O. substitutes *trīñr uta dyūn*, ii.1.11<sup>5</sup>), *çuk-lāñç ca krshnāñç ca* (ii.3.1<sup>3</sup>: O. substitutes *ṛtūñs tanvate*, iv.3.11<sup>3</sup>), *mahāñ indraḥ* (i.4.20 et al.: O. substitutes *svavāñ indro asme*, i.7.13<sup>5</sup>), and *sañçitam* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup> et al.: O. substitutes *vihav-yañ çasyam*, vii.5.5<sup>2</sup>). The first combination is styled *sañyo-*

3. 'anu sūkshmatamam<sup>1</sup> ānunāsikyam anusvāre syād iti bhâradvâjo manyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: tanuvā----- anusvārād anyatra çâityâyanaavidhiḥ: uttameshu tivrataratvam yamādishu tivrāmātram iti.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. anusūkshmataram. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

O. substitutes for the whole *bhâradvâjasyā* "cāryasya mate 'nusvāre 'nur bhavaty ānunāsikyam: sūkshmataram ity arthah: ya tvañ-----: anusvāra iti kim: ato 'nyatra çâityâyanaavidhiḥ: brahm-----: ruk-----: tat-----.

4. nakārasya rephoshmayakârabhāvâc<sup>1</sup> cakârákrshṭayakâre<sup>2</sup> lupte<sup>3</sup> sati malopâc co 'ttaram uttaram<sup>4</sup> ānunāsikyam<sup>5</sup> ānupûr-  
vyena tivrataram syād<sup>6</sup> iti sthaviraḥ kâuṇḍinyo manyate. yathā<sup>7</sup>:  
<sup>8</sup>trīñr-----<sup>2</sup>ity atrā "nunāsikyam sañyogamātravat: çukl-----  
ity<sup>10</sup> atra sañçlishtam<sup>10</sup>: mahāñ-----: ity atra tivrataram:<sup>9</sup> sañ-  
----- ity atra tivrataram: ity ānupûrvyam vijñeyam<sup>8</sup>:<sup>11</sup>ato 'ny-  
atra<sup>11</sup> çâityâyanaavidhiḥ.

<sup>1</sup> O. rephabhāvâd ūshmabhāvâd yak-. <sup>2</sup> O. -shṭe ya-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. ca. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. (and read 'ttamam for 'ttaram uttaram in rule). <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. ānunāsikyam bhavati. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om.; O. sma. <sup>8</sup> O. substitutes *trīñr-----: ṛt-----: sv a-----: ā viveça: vih-----: trīñr----- ity atra tivrata sañyogamātram: ṛ t----- ity atra sañçlishtam: sv a----- ityatra tivrataram: vih----- itra tivrataram.* <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> W. atra tu çl-; B. atrānunā sañçl-. <sup>11</sup> W. B. G. M. atra.



*gamâtravat*, 'simple conjunction;' the second, *saṁçlishta*, 'fused together;' the third and fourth, only *tivratura*, 'more excessive.' And it is added at the end (only O. making the statement intelligibly) that in other cases Çâityâyana's rule (xvii.1) applies.

## व्यञ्जनकालश्च स्वरस्यात्राधिकः ॥ ५ ॥

5. And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant.

The "and" (*ca*) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kâuṇḍinya's opinion: according to this authority, here, in the prescription of *anusvâra*, the time of a consonant, half a *mora* (i.37), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by *anusvâra*; an example is *yuñjâthân rāsabham yuvam* (iv.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.). And "in this case" (*atra*, literally 'here') is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where *n* or *m* is converted into *l* (v.25,26,28).

O. states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, *çatrûñr anapavyayantaḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>) and *añhomuce* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup> et al.)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi.29), ought to be a counter-example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the *anusvâra* merely was added to the vowel. *Anusvâra*, namely, was declared by i.34 to have the quantity of a short vowel; and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that; if, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the *anusvâra* as an affection of the vowel merely; causing the latter's prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O. appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities: that *atra* signifies wherever *anusvâra* is prescribed: and that where there is *anusvâra*, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

5. *ca*kâra *sthavirakâuṇḍinyam*<sup>1</sup> *anvâdiçati*: *atrâ* 'nusvâravi-dhâne sânunâsikasvarasya vyañjanakâlo hrasvârdhakâlo 'dhikaḥ syâd iti sthaviraḥ kâuṇḍinyo manyate: *yuñj*---- *ityâdi*. *atrâi* 'va svarasye 'ti kim: *srâdishû* 'ttameshû\* 'ttamalabhâve<sup>2</sup> *câi*<sup>3</sup> 'tad *adhikakâlavidhânam*<sup>4</sup> *mâ bhûd* iti.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -rah kâu-; G. M. -nyamatam. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -mâbhâ-. <sup>3</sup> B. nâi; G. M. vâi. <sup>4</sup> W. *adhikâl*-; G. M. *adhîtakâl*-.

O. substitutes for the whole *atrâ* 'nusvâre vyañjanakâlo hrasvârdhakâlamâtraḥ svarasyâ 'dhiko bhavati svarakâlât: *çatr*-----: *añh*-----: *yuñj*----- *caçabdâ sthaviraḥkâuṇḍinyamatānvâdiçati*: *itarâcâryamate* 'nusvâra eva svarasvâ 'dhika syât: *atre* 'ti kim: *srâdishu* 'ttameshu *uttamalabhâve samânâksharâshu câi* 'tad *adhikâlavidhâna mâ bhûd teshu svarakâlâdhiko* 'nusvâra syât: *apara âhuḥ atre* 'tyanunâsikavidhâna *ity arthaḥ*: *anusvârabhâve* 'pi *vyañjanakâlo hrasvakâlo bhavati yadâ* 'nusvâras *tadâ sarvatra hrasvakâla eva syât*.



The Rik (xiii.13) and Vâjasaneyi (iv.147-8) Prâtiçâkhyas also concern themselves with the respective length of a vowel and of *anusvâra* as constituents of a syllable, but their rules stand in no definable relation to the one here given.

## स्वारविक्रमयोर्दृढप्रयत्नतरः पौष्करसादेः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Pâushkarasâdi says the utterance of *svâra* and *vikrama* is attended with firmer effort.

Most of the manuscripts supply in the comment *prayoga*, 'use, application,' as the subject involved in this rule; O. supplies simply *varṇa*, 'alphabetic sound.' *Svâra*, we are told, means *svarita*, 'circumflex;' O. signifying the same thing by pointing out that the *svâras* are enumerated in the twentieth chapter (xx.1-8). *Vikrama* is a particular kind of *anudâta*, 'grave;' or, O. says, is explained in the nineteenth chapter (xix.1,2). As examples are given *yò 'sya svò 'gnâs tám âpi* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last two words) and *âsyè havîḥ priyâm* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>), for the latter of which O. substitutes *çikyâm abhy úpa dadhâti* (v.2.4<sup>3</sup>): we have here two kinds of *svâra* or *svarita*, namely *abhinihata* (xx.4) and *nitya* (xx.2), and one or more cases of *vikrama* (the grave syllable standing directly between two that are either acute or circumflex) in each example. A counter-example is *gâ'm vá'vá tá'u tát páry avadatâm* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the last two words), which contains (except in O.'s addition) neither *svâra* nor *vikrama*.

## प्रयत्नविशेषात्सर्ववर्णानामिति शैत्यायनः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Çâityâyana says, of all the letters, according to their difference of effort.

The comment (except in O.) supplies the same subject as in the preceding rule, namely *prayoga*; and also continues the predicate of that rule, *dr̥ḍhaprayatnatarah*. The latter we can hardly approve, since to assert a specially firm effort of all alphabetic sounds without exception is little better than nonsense.. Çâityâyana may rather be credited with meaning that each constituent of the alphabet has its own proper (*svocita*) degree of articulative effort—which is more true than edifying.

6. *svâre vikrame ca prayogaḥ pâushkarasâder mate<sup>1</sup> dr̥ḍhaprayatnataro bhavati. svâraḥ svarita ity arthaḥ: vikramo nâmâ 'nudâttaviçeṣaḥ. yathâ<sup>2</sup>: yo-----: âsyè----- svâravikramayor iti kim: gâ'm----- dr̥ḍhaḥ<sup>3</sup> prayatno 'yasyâ 'sâu<sup>4</sup> dr̥ḍhaprayatnaḥ: atiçayena dr̥ḍhaprayatno dr̥ḍhaprayatnatarah.* \*

<sup>1</sup> B. -tam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. -dha; G. M. -dha eva. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. om.

O. substitutes for the whole *svârâ viñçadanuvâke gânyante: ekâttaviñçadanuvâke vikramâḥ svâreshu vikrameshu ca dr̥ḍhaprayatnataro vaṇo bhavati pâuskorasâdar mate çikyâm ... yo-----: svâravikramayor iti kim: gâ'm-----.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



ओकारं तु प्रणव एके ऽर्धतृतीयमात्रं ब्रुवते ॥ १ ॥

1. As *pranava*, some utter *o* with two and a half *moras*.

In the text of this rule, T. reads *oñkāram*, and B. *omkāram*; in the comment, at the beginning, W. B. have *omkāram*. Doubtless the unnasalized form is the true reading; that *oñ* or *om* should be uttered with more than the quantity of a long syllable would not be worth the trouble of specifying, in view of rules i.34 and xvii.5, which would require either three or two and a half *moras* for the combination. Whether we are to infer that this holy exclamation was not yet uttered with a nasal ending at the time when the Prâtiçâkhyâ was made, is a more doubtful question; the whole matter lies, at any rate, outside the proper province of a Prâtiçâkhyâ. By way of examples, the comment appears to intend to quote the first and last words of the Sanhitâ and of the Brâhmaṇa: namely *om ishe tvâ* (i.1.1), *samudro bandhuḥ om* (vii.5.25<sup>2</sup>? see below: B. omits the *om*), *om brahma saṁdhattam* (Tâitt. Brâh. i.1.1), and *yebhyaç câi 'nat prâhuḥ om* (B. omits the *om*: the Calcutta edition of the Tâittirîya-Brâhmaṇa being incomplete, I can only presume that these are the concluding words of that treatise). The manuscripts G. M. O. put these extracts in a different order, giving the two conclusions first, and then the two beginnings; G. M. add *om* at the end of each, while O. gives no *om* at all. G. M. further append two more citations, *bhadram karṇebhiḥ : om*, and *âi 'va tapati : om*, of which the former is the beginning, and the latter, I presume, the end, of the Tâittirîya-Âraṇyaka. With regard to the phrase *samudro bandhuḥ*, it is to be observed that the Sanhitâ as found in my manuscript (or rather, manuscripts, for mine contains the last leaf of another and entirely independent one, which has the same reading), and in those to which Prof. Weber has access, ends with *samudrah* simply; but another word like this is evidently wanting to complete the sense (the concluding sentence is *samudro vâ açvasya yoniḥ samudrah*), and is not less needed to make up the tale of words as enumerated in the ending, which counts "twelve" after *avahat*, while without *bandhuḥ* there are

1. *pranava*<sup>1</sup> *okāram*<sup>2</sup> *ardhatṛtīyamātram eke bruvate*<sup>3</sup>: *eka âcāryâ ardhatṛtīyamātram*<sup>4</sup> *âhur ity arthaḥ*<sup>4</sup>. *ardham*<sup>7</sup> *trtīyam yayos te ardhatṛtīye: ardhatṛtīyamātre*<sup>8</sup> *yasyâ 'sāv*<sup>6</sup> *ardhatṛtīyamātraḥ*<sup>9</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>10</sup>: *om ishe tvâ: samudro bandhuḥ: om: om brahma saṁdhattam: yebhyaç câi 'nat prâhuḥ: om*<sup>11</sup>. *kālanirṇaye 'py evaṁ*<sup>12</sup> *varṇitam;*

*svādhyâyârambhaçeshasya*<sup>13</sup> *pranavasya svarasya ca*<sup>13</sup>:

*adhyâyasyâ*<sup>14</sup> *nuvâkasyâ 'nte syâd ardhatṛtīyatâ*<sup>15</sup>.

*tuçabdasya*<sup>16</sup> *prayojanam ucyate: saṁdhyaksharâṇâm veda-pranavam*<sup>17</sup> *câ 'ntarâ tathè 'ti kālanirṇaye: saṁdhyaksharâṇâm*<sup>18</sup> *hrasvâ na santi*<sup>18</sup> *'ti*<sup>19</sup> *pâninîye 'py okāramātrasya*<sup>20</sup> *dīrghakālo*<sup>21</sup>



only eleven. This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Tâittirîya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word.

Then is quoted a verse "from the Kâlanirṇaya," to the effect that "the quantity of two and a half *moras* belongs to the *praṇava* and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section." The Kâlanirṇaya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mâdhava bearing the same title (Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS., No. 1166).

In explanation of the word *tu* in the rule, another half-verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kâlanirṇaya, and the authority of Pâṇini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity: hence for simple *o* long quantity is determined: here, "however" (*tu*), when the diphthong stands in *praṇava*, that quantity is negatived; and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the *praṇava*, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of?] a *m*. That is to say, the *tu* intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong *o*. And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different *praṇavas*.

## उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानां कस्मिंश्चिदिति शैत्यायनः ॥ २ ॥

2. Çâityâyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex.

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Çâityâyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents.

*nirûpitaḥ*<sup>22</sup>: *iha tu*<sup>23</sup> *praṇavasthatvaviçeshenâ*<sup>24</sup> 'sâu *kâlo nishidh-*  
*yate: vedasthapraṇave*<sup>25</sup> *tu syât*<sup>26</sup> *samakâradvimâtrate*<sup>26</sup> 'ti. <sup>27</sup>*pra-*  
*navaviçeshe kâlaviçeshah*<sup>27</sup> *pratyetavyah*.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -ve; G. M. -vena. <sup>2</sup> W. B. omkâ-. <sup>(3)</sup> O. -tryamâvate. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. ins. iti. <sup>(6)</sup> W. ardhatrṭiyamâtram bruvate : praṇave okâram. <sup>7</sup> B. O. ardhâ. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. mâtre. <sup>9</sup> G. M. -tryas tam; O. tryamâs tam : sârdhadvimât' a ity arthah. <sup>10</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>(11)</sup> G. M. sam- : om : ye- : om : ish- : om : brah- : om : bhad- : om : âi- : om ; O. sam- : ye- : ish- : brah- . <sup>12</sup> B. ins. ca. <sup>(13)</sup> B. praṇavasvaratasya <sup>14</sup> B. adhyâyâç câ. <sup>(15)</sup> G. M. -kasya tv ante 'to 'rdhatr-; O. -trye tâ. <sup>16</sup> B. nuç-; G. M. antaç-. <sup>17</sup> G. M. -dañ ca pr-; O. -dañ ca prâṇavâm. <sup>(18)</sup> O. -svo nâ 'sti. <sup>19</sup> W. om. iti. <sup>20</sup> O. okârasya. <sup>21</sup> W. G. M. -le. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -te. <sup>23</sup> B. om. <sup>24</sup> O. -shâd; G. M. -sha- nâd. <sup>25</sup> W. B. O. -sya pr-. <sup>(26)</sup> B. -kâlo dv-; G. M. -kâle dv-; O. -kâre dvimâtrete. <sup>(27)</sup> G. M. praṇavasya viçeshah.

2. *udâttânudâttasvaritânâm madhye kasmiñç cit svare praṇavaḥ prayoktavya iti çâityâyano brûte. yathâ : om.*

O. substitutes *utte anudâtte svarite vâ eshâ madhyatamena svareṇa prayoktavya syâd i çâityâyana mahâcâryo manyate : 03 03.*



## धृतप्रचयः कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3. According to Kâuṇḍinya, it is a sustained *pracaya*.

I have ventured to translate the word *dhṛta* in *dhṛtapracaya* by 'sustained,' but without feeling sure that it might not have been better to follow the lead of the commentator, who treats *dhṛtapracaya* as equivalent to simple *pracaya*. He brings up, it is true, the objection that in xix.2 the use of the term *pracaya* itself is attributed to this same Kâuṇḍinya, and that hence it should have been used here; but replies "not so; by this pair of words, even, an appellation is given: thus, namely: on the principle that even where there is no difference of meaning there may be a difference of application, the teacher exhibits a nicety of application: other examples of the principle are the names [of the second Pāṇḍava] Bhîmasena and Bhîma, [of one of Çiva's wives] Bhâmâ [G. M. say Satyâ] and Satyabhâmâ, *pidhâna* and *apidhâna*, *dîpa* and *pradîpa*." The *pracaya* is defined as the fourth accent; and O. adds that it is to be explained in the twenty-first chapter (namely, at xxi.10,11): it is there said to be of the same tone as *udâtta*, 'acute;' so that, unless *dhṛta* is to be regarded as signifying a modification, one does not see in what respect Kâuṇḍinya's opinion differs from that of Vâlmîki, given in rule 6 of this chapter.

## मध्यमेन स वाक्प्रयोगः ॥ ४ ॥

4. That application of the voice is with middle tone.

The meaning of this precept is very obscure, and the commentator's exposition does not give the impression that he comprehended it. According to him, the *sa*, 'that,' points us back to the utterance as prescribed by Kâuṇḍinya in the preceding rule: in whatever pitch of voice the application is made, the *praṇava* is to be used with medial effort, or with one that takes into account the

3. *kâuṇḍinyasya*<sup>1</sup> *mate praṇavo dhṛtapracayo bhavati: caturthaḥ*<sup>2</sup> *svaro dhṛtapracaya iti kathyate. nanu pracayapûrvaç ca kâuṇḍinyasya (xix.2) itivat pracaya ity etâvatâi 'vâ 'lam: 'kim dhṛtaçabdena. mâi 'vam:*<sup>3</sup> *padadvayenâ 'py anena nâmadheyam abhidhîyate*<sup>4</sup>: *tathâ hi: arthabhedâbhâve*<sup>5</sup> *'pi prayoga-bhedo*<sup>6</sup> *'stî 'ti prayogacâturyam*<sup>7</sup> *âcâryaḥ prakāṭayati: yathâ: bhîmaseno*<sup>8</sup> *bhîmaḥ: bhâmâ*<sup>9</sup> *satyabhâmâ*<sup>10</sup>: *pidhânam apidhânam: dîpaḥ pradîpa ityâdi.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -nya. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. -tha. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. *dhṛtaçabdo nâma: evam.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *evâ 'bh.* <sup>5</sup> B. *ardhabh-*; G. M. *ittham bhe-*. <sup>6</sup> B. -gaprabh-. <sup>7</sup> W -gântaracâ-. <sup>8</sup> W. -ne; B. -na. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. ins. *satyâ.*

O. substitutes *dhṛtahpracayo nâma turîyasvarah sa evâi 'kuvîṣe 'nuvâke vakshyate dhṛtapracaya iti nâmadheyam prayânâm api vyapadiçyata iti kauṇḍinya âcâryo manyate dhṛtapracayaḥ praṇavo bhavati yathâ om iti: udâttapracayo çrutya-bhedam tat svaravijñânukṛtam phalam anutryate.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



grave, the *om* is to be grave; before *ápa undantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>: wanting in W. B.), acute; before *vyṛddham* (v.1.2<sup>1</sup>: W. B. have instead, evidently as a corrupt reading only, *vyúddhaḥ*, with which word no *anuvāka* in the Sanhitā begins), circumflex.

The rule is declared unapproved—rather hard treatment for one which professes to lay down a principle accepted by all authorities.

## CHAPTER XIX.

CONTENTS: 1-2, occurrence of *vikrama*, between syllables of high tone; 3-5, of *kampa*, in a circumflex followed by a circumflex.

स्वरितयोर्मध्ये यत्र नीचः स्यादुदात्तयोर्वान्यतरतो  
बोदात्तस्वरितयोः स विक्रमः ॥ १ ॥

1. Where a syllable of low tone occurs between two circumflex syllables, or two acute, or two of which either one is acute and the other circumflex, that is *vikrama*.

The commentator paraphrases the rule as if *anyatarataḥ* meant 'between a preceding circumflex and a following acute,' and the following *udāttasvaritayoḥ* 'between a preceding acute and a fol-

7. *yathāprayogaçabdeno*<sup>1</sup> 'dātto 'bhidhīyatu iti māhisheyapa-  
kshaḥ: praṇave<sup>2</sup> yathāprayogaṁ vā kuryād iti sarveshām ṛshī-  
ṇām matam. vararucipakshas tu vakshyate: adhyeshyamāṇaṁ<sup>3</sup>  
yathāprayogaṁ yathāvidhasvaram 'tathāvidhena vā<sup>4</sup> svareṇa  
praṇavaḥ prayoktavya iti sarveshām matam iti. yathā<sup>5</sup>: ishe  
tve 'ty anenā 'dhyeshyamāṇenā<sup>6</sup> 'nudāttena praṇavo 'py anudāt-  
taḥ: 'ápa undantu ity udāttano 'dāttah<sup>7</sup>: vyṛddham iti<sup>8</sup> sva-  
ritena svaritaḥ.

ne 'dam sūtram ishṭam.

O. (corrected a little) substitutes *yathāvidhena svareṇā 'dhyeshyamāṇo bhavati: tathāvidhena svareṇāi 'va praṇavaḥ prayoktavyaḥ: esho vā sarveshām ácāryāṇāṁ sādharāṇapraṇavavidhir bhavet: ishe tve 'ty etad adhyeshyamāṇena udāttah pra-  
ṇavo vaktavyaḥ: ápa . . . ity udāttah: vyṛddham iti svaritaḥ: ácāryagraha-  
ṇaṁ teshāṁ kīrtiyartham: pakshaparigrahaviññānasadr̥ṣṭah parikalpanā: ne 'dam sūtram ishṭam.*

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane  
ashtādaço<sup>9</sup> 'dhyāyah.

<sup>1</sup> W. -gasaç-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -vaṁ. <sup>3</sup> W. adhyeprathamāṇaṁ. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -vidha. <sup>5</sup> W. B. om. <sup>6</sup> W. 'dhyayamāṇā; B. -māṇā. <sup>7</sup> W. B. om. <sup>8</sup> W. B. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. *dvitīyapraçne shashṭho.*



lowing circumflex.' He adds examples of a *vikrama* syllable in each of the four defined positions: namely *yò 'sya svò 'gnís tám ápi* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last two words), *vódhavé* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), *dhánvaná gá'h* (iv.6.6<sup>1</sup>), and *tásya kvà suvargó lokáh* (ii.6.5<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word, G. M. the last two). In the third example, the circumflex by which the *vikrama* syllable is preceded is the enclitic; this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex. As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii.6, where we are told that Pâushkarasâdi asserts the utterance of *svâra* ('circumflex') and *vikrama* with a firmer effort. The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here. It is found, among the other Prâtiçâkhyas, in that to the Rig-Veda only, and has there no such meaning.

The *vikrama* is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath. The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked.

The construction of *sa* in the rule, as agreeing in gender with *vikramah*, though referring to *nîcam* (*aksharam*), was alluded to above, under v.2.

## प्रचयपूर्वश्च कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ २ ॥

2. As also, according to Kâuṇḍinya, when a *pracaya* precedes.

The *pracaya* (see xxi.10,11) is the series of unaccented syllables following a circumflex (enclitic or independent) in connected discourse, and uttered, save the one next preceding another following circumflex or an acute, in the tone of acute. This last one of the

---

1. <sup>1</sup>yatra <sup>2</sup>svaritayor<sup>1</sup> madhya <sup>3</sup>udâttayor vâ<sup>4</sup> 'nyatarato ve 'ti svaritodâttayor ve<sup>5</sup> 'ty arthah: <sup>6</sup>udâttasvaritayor vâ<sup>7</sup> madhye nîcam yad aksharam sa vikramo<sup>8</sup> bhavati. svaritayor<sup>9</sup> madhye yathâ: yo ..... <sup>10</sup>udâttayor yathâ<sup>10</sup>: vódhave. svaritodâttayor yathâ: dhánv-..... udâttasvaritayor yathâ: tasya..... vikramasamjñadyâḥ prayojanam: svâravikramayor drḍhaprayatnatarâ (xvii.6) iti.

(<sup>1</sup>) O. yad dvayor. (<sup>2</sup>) B. G. M. ins. sthale. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. ins. vâ. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. om. vâ. (<sup>6</sup>) G. M. ins. iti vâ. (<sup>7</sup>) O. om.; G. M. put after madhye. (<sup>8</sup>) G. M. -masamjño. (<sup>9</sup>) O. tayor. (<sup>10</sup>) O. om.

2. cakâro<sup>1</sup> vikrama iti jñâpayati: <sup>2</sup>kâuṇḍinyasya mata udâttaparah svaritaparo vâ pracayapûrvaç ca vikramo vijñeyah. udâttaparo yathâ: pary .....<sup>2</sup> svaritaparo yathâ: upar-..... pracayah pûrvo yasmâd<sup>3</sup> asâu pracayapûrvaḥ.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. caçabdo. (<sup>2</sup>) W. om. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. sa tathoktah.



series, which retains its grave tone, is here declared to be, on Kâuṇḍinya's authority, likewise entitled to the appellation *vikrama*. This makes the term apply to all syllables in the *samhitā* that are marked by the horizontal stroke below, excepting those which, after a pause, precede the first accented syllable. The commentator cites two examples: *pāry avadatām yā' yajñé dīyāte* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup> : lost in W.; only O. has the last two words) and *upārishtāllakshma yājyā'* (ii.6.2<sup>3-4</sup> et al.), in the first of which the *prucaya* is followed by an acute, in the second by a circumflex.

It is to be observed that the *vikrama* appears, so far as this treatise is concerned, to be a mere name; no peculiarity of tone is claimed to belong to it: the other treatises offer nothing analogous.

As nothing is said of the non-approval of the rule, we may regard it as accepted in the school represented by the commentator.

द्वियम एके द्वियमपरे ता अणुमात्राः ॥ ३ ॥

3. According to some, in a circumflex syllable that is followed by a circumflex, quarter-*moras* are so.

I have rendered this rule according to my own persuasion of its true meaning, and not at all in conformity with the interpretation of the commentator, who says "*yama* [W. alone says *dviyama*] is a synonym of *svarita*; where there are two such *yamas*, without intervention of anything, that is a *dviyama*; what is followed by such a *dviyama*, that is *dviyamapara*: in the former, and also in the latter, where there is a third *yama* [so in G. M., which is the best reading: the others perhaps mean *triyame*], whatever circumflexed materials there are, all those are depressed at the end to the extent of a quarter-*mora*: so some think. An example of a *dviyama* is *tè 'nyò 'nyásmāi* (ii.2.11<sup>5</sup>: but B. G. M. have instead *tè 'nyò 'nyám*, vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>); of a *dviyamapara*, *sò 'pò 'bhy àmriyata* (vi.1.1<sup>7</sup>; 4.2<sup>3</sup>). Whence do we derive the implication 'at the end?' from the precept 'and likewise, at the end of a word are *kumpas*, quarter-*moras* depressed at the end.' And the implication of

3. *yamaçabdah<sup>1</sup> svaritaparyāyah<sup>2</sup>: dvāu yamāu yatra deçe nāirantaryeṇa<sup>2</sup> vartete sa dviyamah<sup>3</sup>: tasmin<sup>3</sup>: dviyamah<sup>3</sup> paro yasmād asāu dviyamaparah<sup>3</sup>: tasmiñç ca dviyame<sup>3</sup> sati yāḥ<sup>4</sup> svaritaprakṛtayas tāḥ sarvā antato 'ṇumātrā<sup>6</sup> nihatā<sup>6</sup> bhavantī 'ty eke manyante. dviyamo yathā: te . . . .: 'dviyamaparo yathā': so . . . . antata<sup>8</sup> iti katham pratīyate: padānte ca<sup>9</sup> tathā<sup>10</sup> kampā antata nihatāṇukā<sup>11</sup> iti vacanād iti brūmah<sup>3</sup>: nihatam<sup>12</sup> tu svaritayor madhye yatra nīcam (xix.1) ity<sup>13</sup> etatsāmnidhyāl labhyate. çikshā cāi 'vam vakshyati<sup>14</sup>:*

*nityo 'bhinihataç<sup>15</sup> cāi 'va kshāiprah<sup>3</sup> praçlishta eva ca: ete svārāḥ<sup>16</sup> prakampante yatro 'ccasvaritodayā<sup>17</sup> iti<sup>18</sup>: çeshasyo 'dāttatā vā syāt svāratā<sup>19</sup> vā vyavasthaye 'ti:*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



implying that there are two kinds of *kampa*: in the Sanhitâ, that before a circumflex; in other parts of the Veda, that before an acute; and concludes the exposition with pointing out (if I understand him) that this is a definition applying to those cases of *kampa* which are otherwise established; but that it is not a precept requiring *kampa*, since this would otherwise have to appear in such passages as *yò 'pá'm púshpam véda* (only G. M. have *veda*: the passage is not to be found in the Sanhitâ, and possibly is intended to be quoted from one of those "other parts of the Veda," referred to above). Finally, he remarks that the rule is unapproved.

The term *kampa* is not found anywhere in the text of our Prâtiçâkhya, or of that of the Rig-Veda, although the commentary to the latter (under iii.3,4), like our own, employs it to signify the peculiar modification undergone by the circumflex, when immediately followed by a high tone. The Atharva-Prâtiçâkhya (iii.65) gives to the same modification the kindred name of *vikumpita*. It is signified, in the Rik and Atharvan texts (as is fully explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65), by appending to the vowel of the circumflex syllable a figure, either 1 or 3, and applying to the figure the signs of both circumflex and grave accentuation. The theory of this mode of designation is obscure, and no account of it is given in any Prâtiçâkhya, nor, so far as I am aware, in any other Hindu authority that has yet come to light. We should imagine the figure to be a mere *point d'appui* for an added sign of grave tone, but that there appears in a part of the Vedic texts an accompanying prolongation of the *vikumpita* vowel (if the vowel be short), of which the figure, therefore, appears to be the sign: of this prolongation the Prâtiçâkhyas give no hint.

This accent wears a quite peculiar aspect in the Tâittirîya text, as compared with those to which reference has been made. In the first place, being limited to the case of a circumflex before a circumflex, it is relatively of rare occurrence, there being fewer examples of it in the whole Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ than in the first book alone of the Atharvan (it occurs in the former, if I have overlooked nothing, only at ii.1.6<sup>5</sup>; 2.11<sup>5</sup>: v.4.3<sup>3</sup>: vi.1.1<sup>7</sup>, 5<sup>1</sup>, 11<sup>2,5</sup>; 2.2<sup>1,2</sup>; 3.2<sup>5</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>; 4.2<sup>3</sup>, 9<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>; 6.8<sup>1</sup>: and in the ending to v.2.1). Secondly, it is always intimated by an appended figure 1, with simply the mark of *anudatta* tone, or of *vikrama*, written beneath, while the circumflex vowel retains the mark of circumflex accent\*—and this is clearly the method most easily defensible on theoretic grounds:

---

\* That is to say, this is uniformly the case in my manuscript, which, for example, writes the commentator's quoted instances as follows:

ते॑ न्यान्यस्मै                      सा॑ पा॑ भ्यम्रियत्

and the MSS of the comment all add the figure 1, although, as everywhere else, they omit the accent signs. In the two cases that occur in the part of the Calcutta edition thus far printed, it seems to be by mere unintelligent blundering that the above method is departed from, a 3 being added in the one (ii.1.6<sup>5</sup>), without any sign of *vikrama* beneath it, and no designation being attempted in the other (ii.2.11<sup>5</sup>).



the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the *vikrama* tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the *vikrama* sign. Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi.3.4<sup>2</sup>; 6.8<sup>1</sup>) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long.

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say. It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no *kampa* at all; and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-*çâkhiṇah* accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases. There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* in this chapter and the practice in the known *Tâittirîya* text (but see the note on the next rule); the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter; but this is the case also with the other Vedas.

The denial of *kampa* in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the *Tâittirîya* system of accentuation as compared with that of the *Rik* and *Atharvan*, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness. Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with *pracaya* tone (xxi.10); and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident. For example, *sò 'smâ't* and *sò 'smât* would be accented before a pause precisely alike; and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause: e. g. *sò 'smâd abhavat* and *sò 'smâ'd yó vâ'i tát.\** And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things: we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in *hy èshâ pr̥thi-vyâ'h*, but not in *hy ètâd devâ'h*, and the *saṁhitâ* does not tell us whether in *so 'smâd etarhi* the *asmât* is accented or toneless.† And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of *pracayas*, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes.‡ Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice.

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing *Tâittirîya-Brâhmaṇa* and *Âranyaka*, so that the commentator's allusion to "other parts of the Veda" as differing from the *Sanhitâ* in respect to *kampa* is of doubtful meaning.

\* Thus, *सो ऽस्माद्भवत् ।* and *सो ऽस्माद्यो वै तत् ।*

† Thus, *क्षेत्रं पृथिव्याः* and *क्षेत्रद्देवाः*, and *सो ऽस्मादितर्हि*.

‡ Thus, *सो ऽकामयत प्रजाः* may be either *sò 'kâmayata prajā'h* or *sò 'kâ'máyátá prajā'h*.



## तस्यामेव प्रकृतौ ॥ ४ ॥

4. In that very material.

The commentator's interpretation of this rule is just as violent and unsatisfactory as is that which he gave of its predecessor, and with which he forces it into strange connection. He says, "in a *dviyama* passage there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora only in that—namely, the former—circumflex material; but, in a passage where a *dviyama* follows, there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora of the two former materials; but they do not all share in the quarter-mora effect: that is what the *eva* means. And Kâuhaleya says thus: 'of two, the former is *aṇumātrika*; of three, the two former are *aṇumātrika*; beyond that, the natural condition holds.' "

I think we can have no hesitation whatever as to rejecting this: if the treatise had been intending to say what is here claimed, it would have said it in a very different manner. What is really meant, may be much more doubtful; but I imagine that we are directed to find our quarter-mora of *vikrama* in the very substance of the circumflex syllable itself; that is to say, not in any protraction of it; and so, that that treatment of the case which is signified by the insertion of a figure after the circumflex vowel is rejected. This, if established, would make the doctrine of the authorities (*eke*, rule 3) here reported in fact discordant with the practice followed in the recorded text.

## न पूर्वशास्त्रे न पूर्वशास्त्रे ॥ ५ ॥

5. Not in the former teaching.

A rule of very obscure import, and respecting which the commentator has only his guesses to give us. He ventures two: first, that *pârvaçâstra* signifies the rule respecting *vikrama*, and that in it this affection of the quarter-mora finds no place; second, that *pârvaçâstra* means the first rule of the chapter (which amounts, so far, to the same thing with the other), and that the name of

---

4. *dviyamasthale pârvasyâm 1eva tasyâm1 svaritaprakṛtāv aṇumātrayâ2 'pi3 nihatatvam4 bhavati: dviyamapare tu5 sthale pârvaḥ eva prakṛtyor6 aṇumātrayâ7 nihatatvam8 bhavati: na tu9 tâḥ sarvâ aṇukâryabhâja10 ity evakâro bodhayati. evam eva kâuhaleya11 âha: dvayoḥ pûrvo12 'ṇumâtrikas13 trishu 14 pûrvâv15 aṇumâtrikâv16 uttarah17 prakṛtye 'ti.*

(1) W. *aparasyâm*. 2 B. *-trayo*; G. M. *anumâtram a*. 3 O. *om*. 4 B. *-hit-*. 5 G. M. *tat*. 6 B. *-tyâyo*. 7 B. *ṇumâtrayor*; G. M. *anumâtrâyâ*. 8 B. *-hit-*. 9 W. O. *nu*. 10 G. M. *anuk-*; O. *aṇumâtram bhajate*. 11 W. *-liya*. 12 W. *-rva*; B. O. *-rvah*. 13 W. B. O. *aṇu-*; M. O. *-trakas*. 14 W. *ins. ca*. 15 O. *pûrvo vâ*; G. M. *pûrvo yathâ uparishṭ-* etc. (end of comment to rule 2, above). 16 W. *-kâ*; M. *-trakâv*; O. *-trako 'py*. 17 W. *-rataḥ*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



The examples are *vy èvâ'i 'nena* (v.3.11<sup>3</sup>) and *kr̥dhî' sv àsmâ'n* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>); counter-examples, where the altered vowel was not acute, are *vâsvy asi* (i.2.5<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *ânv enam mâtâ'*, which is not, I believe, to be found in the *Sanhitâ*; the nearest thing to it is *ânv enam viprâh* (iv.6.8<sup>3</sup>); *ânu tvâ mâtâ'* occurs several times (i.3.10<sup>1</sup> et al.).

All the *Prâtiçâkhyas* agree in calling this particular kind of circumflex by the name *kshâipra* (see note to *Ath. Pr.* iii.58).

स्यकारवकारं वक्षरं यत्र स्वर्यते स्थिते पदे ऽनु-  
दात्तपूर्वे ऽपूर्वे वा नित्य इत्येव जानीयात् ॥ २ ॥

2. But where a syllable containing a *y* or *v* is circumflexed in a fixed word, being preceded by a grave syllable, or not preceded by anything, that is to be known as *nitya*.

This definition of the original circumflex accent, which belongs to the word in which it occurs, and does not merely arise as a consequence of the combination of words into phrases (although ultimately of the same nature with the *kshâipra*, just described), is a long and awkward one, but fairly attains its purpose: only we do not see why the reading is not *anudâttapûrvam apûrvam vâ*, qualifying *aksharam* formally, as it does logically. A syllable that has the circumflex in *pada*-text (to which *sthite pade* is explained as equivalent), otherwise than enclitically after an acute, is an original (*nitya*, 'constant, invariable') circumflex. The other *Prâtiçâkhyas* (see note to *Ath. Pr.* iii.57) call it *jâtya*, 'natural.'

The commentator defines *aksharam*, 'syllable,' in the rule as meaning *svarah*, 'vowel;' and, in fact, the use of *aksharam* here is somewhat at variance with the general custom of the treatise, which elsewhere talks of the vowel, not the syllable, as having tone (compare i.43, xiv.29). He inserts *sarvatra*, 'everywhere,' in his paraphrase, and then explains it, as if it were a part of the rule, to signify that the accent holds in *samhitâ*, *pada*, and *jatâ* text. His examples are *vâyavyâm* (i.8.7<sup>1</sup> et al.), *kanyè 'va tunnâ'* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>: O. omits *tunnâ*), *tâto bilvâh* (ii.1.8<sup>2</sup>), *nyâñcam cinuyât* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>: W. B. add, after a pause, as if a new example, *anyañcam* [B.

2. sayakâram vâ savakâram vâ 'ksharam' svava ity arthah: sthite pade padakâla ity arthah: yatra sthale svaryate: anudâttapûrve<sup>2</sup> 'pûrve'<sup>3</sup> vâ pûrvâbhâve<sup>4</sup> sati<sup>5</sup>: nitya eve 'ti sarvatra jânîyât: sarvatre 'ti<sup>6</sup> samhitâpadajâtâsv ity arthah. yathâ: vâ y-  
----: kanye----: tato----: nyañ----: 'kva----: kvâ----  
iti jatâyâm. tuçabdo nityâdâv uccodayavishaye<sup>8</sup> no 'dâttasva-  
ritapara (xiv.31) iti nishedham nivârayati. nanu<sup>9</sup> nityah ka-  
tham etannishedhavishayah<sup>10</sup>: udâttât paro 'nudâtta<sup>11</sup> (xiv.  
29) itilakshanâsambhavât<sup>12</sup>. atro 'cyate: varṇavibhâgavelâyâm<sup>13</sup>  
udâttapûrvatvam<sup>14</sup> asti: samâhârah svarita (i.40) ity ucca-



reads -câm], but no such word is to be found in the Sanhitâ, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of *nyañcam*), and *kvà jâgatî ca* (vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>); and, from the *jaṭâ*-text, *kvâ 'syâ 'sya kvâ 1 kvâ 'sya* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>: B. has lost a part; it involves a case of *kampa*, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1: see xix.3). Counter-examples are given in O. only: namely, of a circumflex not found in *pada*-text, *vy èvâ'i 'nena* (v.3.11<sup>3</sup>: the MS. has *vevyâi*), *drvânnah sarpîh* (iv.1.9<sup>2</sup>; p. *drú-annah*); of one which has an acute before it, *mârtyânñ âvivéça* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>) and *sârvânñ agnî'n* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>). We have also one of the common attempts to give a profound significance to the word *tu*, 'but,' in the rule; and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of. He says the *tu* signifies that, so far as the *nitya* circumflex etc. (i. e. and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv.31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force. But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv.31 has nothing to do with the *nitya* at all, but only with the enclitic accent prescribed in rule xiv.29. His reply is, that in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv.29, the combination of the two, by i.40, giving the circumflex character. Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every *nitya* syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—*kvà* being equivalent to *kúa*, and *kanyâ* to *kanîâ*—admits of question. He expounds *anudâttapurve* as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and *apûrve* as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent;' it is doubtless better to supply in idea *tasminn akshare*, and to render 'when that syllable is' etc. The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me. O. brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, *yâjyâ'i ''vâ'i 'nam* (ii.3.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *yâjyâ : â' : evâ : enam*).

*pûrvatvât*<sup>15</sup> svaritasye 'ti nishedhavishayatvam. *anudâttuç câ 'sâu pûrvaç câ 'nudâttapûrvaḥ*: <sup>16</sup> *tasmin*: <sup>17</sup> *pûrvâbhâvo 'pûrvaḥ*: *tasmin*<sup>17</sup>. <sup>18</sup> *çûnye tu sarvatrapûrvatvât*<sup>18</sup> *pûrvatvaviçeshanaḍvayasyâ*<sup>19</sup> 'nyathâ<sup>20</sup> *vâiyarthiyât*<sup>21</sup>: *tasmât tatra*<sup>22</sup> *nityasvaritatvam*<sup>23</sup> *eva na*<sup>24</sup> *samjñântaram iti vijñeyam*.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.; G. M. add *yatra svaryate*. <sup>2</sup> O. ins. *vâ*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *vâ*. <sup>5</sup> G. om. <sup>6</sup> O. *pi*. <sup>7</sup> W. B. ins.: *anyancañ* <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. *-darkav-*; O. *-shayo*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *na tu*. <sup>10</sup> O. *nish-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *svaritam*. <sup>12</sup> O. *laksh-*. <sup>13</sup> all MSS. have the lingual *l*. <sup>14</sup> W. *-rvam*. <sup>15</sup> W. B. *ucyate pû-*. <sup>16</sup> W. ins. *tasmât*. <sup>(17)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(18)</sup> O. *na çunya ity arthaḥ : sthite pada iti kim : vy ---- : drv ---- : anudâttapûrva it kim : mart ---- : sar ---- kicid evam úcuḥ : yâj ---- ity âdi : prâtihamniçakaroty evakârḥ : pud-samucraye anudâttapûrvatvât*; G. M. *çûnyapûvasapûrvatvât*; W. . . . *sarvatrâ*; B. *bhûnye* etc. <sup>19</sup> W. *pûrvaviçesh-dv-*; B. *pûrvatraviçeshanaḍv-*; O. *pûrvaviç-*. <sup>20</sup> O. *ntathâ*. <sup>21</sup> W. *-thyam*; G. M. *-thyam syât*. <sup>22</sup> W. *am*; B. *tat*; O. *tra*. <sup>23</sup> W. O. *nityatvam*; B. *svaritatvam nityatvam*. <sup>24</sup> B. *ca*.



# अपि चेन्नानापदस्थमुदात्तमथ चेत्साङ्हितेन स्वयते स प्रानिहतः ॥ ३ ॥

3. If, moreover, there is an acute standing in another word, then, if there be a circumflex resulting from a rule of combination, it is *prâtiyata*.

The phraseology of this rule is very peculiar indeed, and its peculiarity hard to account for. The Rik and Atharva Prâtiçâkhyas distinguish only two kinds of enclitic circumflex: the *pâdavṛtta*, in which a hiatus intervenes between the acute and its successor, and the *tâirovyañjana*, in which the two are separated by consonants. According to the explanation, now, of our commentator, the present treatise sets off from the latter, as a separate class, a circumflexed syllable at the beginning of a word, following an acute at the end of the preceding word. He gives us four examples (of which, however, W. B. omit the first two, and O. the last two): *mâ' te asyâ'm* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>), *yâs tvâ hrđâ' kîrîṇâ* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *kîrîṇâ*), *ishê tvâ* (i.1.1 et al.), and *tâm te duççâkshâḥ* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>): the second word in each has the *prâtiyata* circumflex. As counter-examples, we have *yân nyânçam* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>: W. gives instead *yân nâvam* [ii.3.10<sup>1</sup> et al.], but it does not illustrate the point arrived at, and so is doubtless a corruption of the other), to show that the following circumflex must be a result of a rule of combination, and *tâyâ devâtayâ* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup> et al.: O. substitutes *tasmâd varupam*, which is corrupt; I have overlooked it in searching out the references, and do not know how, if it in fact represents a real citation, it ought to be amended), to show that the acute must stand in another word.

In working out this meaning for the rule, the commentator declares *api*, 'moreover,' to have the office merely of bringing down from the preceding rule the quality of going before (*pûrvatva*); *atha*, 'then,' according to him, either cuts off the continued implication of *nitya* (that is to say, means nothing at all), or else gives the value of a heading to "the being preceded by an acute standing in another word"—which is wholly to be rejected; in the first place because unnecessary (*tasmât* in the next rule having just that purpose), and in the second place because the word could at any rate make a heading only of what followed it in the rule, not of what went before.

3. *apiçabdah<sup>1</sup> pûrvatvamâtrâkarshakah<sup>2</sup>: athaçabdo nityasam-  
jñâvyavachedakah: nânâpadasthodâttapûrvatvâdhikârako<sup>3</sup> vâ:  
nânâpadastham aksharam udâttapûrvain<sup>1</sup> cet parato nîcam sâm-  
hitena vidhinâ svaryate cet sa prâtiyato 'tra<sup>4</sup> veditavyah. 'yathâ:  
mâ----: yas----:<sup>5</sup> 'ishe----: tam----:<sup>6</sup> sâmhitene 'ti kim:  
<sup>7</sup>yân----. nânâpadastham iti kim: tayâ----.'*

(1) W. *pûrvaç* simply. (2) G. M. om. *-tva-*; O. om. *-âtr-*. (3) O. *-kâro*. (4) G. M. om. (5) W. B. om.; G. M. om. *yathâ*. (6) O. om. (7) O. *tasmâdvarupam*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



the influence of an acute on the final of the first member, and which is therefore 'separated by an intervening pause' from the tone which calls it forth. Thus, the *va* of *çukrá-vatî* (as written the second time in the first marginal note on p. 369) has a *tâirovirâma svarita*, being marked by the ordinary *svarita*-sign. Now the *vatî*, as well as the *çukra*, in this word, is to the apprehension of the present treatise (i.48) a *pada*; and hence its syllable *va* appears to fulfil all the conditions laid down in rule 2, just above, as determining a *jâtya*: it is circumflexed in the *pada*-text; it is *apûrva*, or preceded by no other accent in the same *pada*; and it is *savakâra*, or contains a *v*. Here, now, as it appears to me, we have the best explanation of the value, and at the same time of the position, and also, at least in part, of the phraseology, of the rule under discussion. This accent needs definition, though enclitic, immediately after the *nitya*, lest it be confounded with the latter: "even if all the conditions of the previous rule are fulfilled, if there is likewise an acute [preceding the syllable] in another word, and the accent is one which is produced by a rule of combination, this accent is not *nitya*, but *prâtiyata*."

The most conspicuous difficulty in the way of accepting this interpretation is the fact, already referred to, that in the extant *pada*-text of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ there is no such circumflex as is here assumed; the *va* of *çukrá-vatî*, and all other syllables in like position, being grave, and marked as such. But the difficulty is more apparent than real, since we have no right to assume that this *pada*-text is precisely the same with that held by the school from which the Prâtiçâkhyas, or this particular rule, emanated; they may have accented their *îngyas*, or separable words, after the same fashion which prevails in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas. Of more account is the awkwardness of the whole expression, and especially the use of *nânâpadastham* instead of *avagrahastham*, which would be the proper term to use in this treatise (compare i.49) in the sense here indicated. But, if not completely acceptable, the interpretation has more for it and less against it, in my opinion, than either of those given above.

Professor Roth, in his early digest of the teachings of the Prâtiçâkhyas respecting accent (introduction to the Nirukta, p. lvii. etc.), identified the *prâtiyata* accent with the *tâirovirâma*, but only in consequence of a misunderstanding of the character of the latter, which he supposed (ibid., p. lxxv.) to designate an enclitic circumflex separated by consonants from its occasioning acute in a preceding word, thus giving it the same meaning which is attributed by our commentator to the *prâtiyata* in the present rule. And Weber (under Vâj. Pr. i.118), while defining the *tâirovirâma* correctly, repeats the same identification; I do not know whether as taking it incautiously from Roth, or as having arrived by conjecture at an independent interpretation of our present rule. He does not allude to any difficulties as connected with the latter, nor state his identification to rest upon a different basis from that of Roth.



## तस्माद्कारलोपि ऽभिनिहतः ॥ ४ ॥

4. After such a one, in case of the loss of an *a*, it is *abhinihata*.

The word *tasmāt* the comment explains as bringing down *nānā-padaṣṭham udāttam* from the preceding rule: 'after an acute occurring in another word.' But the specification (like that of *udāttayoḥ* in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary: rule xii.9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions: here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called.

O. has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning.

The examples are *sò 'bravīt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *tè 'bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.); and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is *bhrá'jo 'si devá'nām* (ii.4.3<sup>2</sup>).

All the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55) give to this circumflex the name *abhinihata*, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation.

## ऊभावे प्रशिष्टः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Where an *û* results, it is *praçliṣṭa*.

Rule x.17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of *praçliṣṭa* is here assigned; and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Sanhitâ affords. They read in this place *sū'nnīyam iva* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>), *sū'dgātā* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>), *māsū' 'ttisṭhan* (vii.5.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *mā*), and *dikshū' 'padādhāti* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit).

The same name (or, in the Ath. Pr., *prāçliṣṭa*) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short *i*'s, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.56).

## पदविवृत्यां पादवृत्तः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is *pādavr̥tta*.

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex. The examples given are *tā' asmāt sṛsṭā'h* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup>: B. omits *sṛsṭāh*), *sá idhánáh* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), and *yá*

4. *'tasmān nānāpadasthodāttāt parabhūtānudāttākārasya<sup>2</sup> lope sati yaḥ svaritaḥ so 'bhinihato veditavyaḥ<sup>1</sup>. yathā: so ----: te ----. tasmād iti kim: bhrájo ----.*

(<sup>1</sup>) O. substitutes *tasmāt sañhitena na svaryamānārdhe te: sadakāle asvarita ity arthaḥ: akāralupte ya svara ādiçyate so 'bhinihato nāma svarito bhavati.* <sup>2</sup> W. B. -dāttasya; G. M. parabhūtād anudāttasya akārasya.

5. *ūbhāve yatra svaryate sa praçliṣṭo veditavyaḥ. sūn-----: sūd-----: māsū-----: 'dikshū-----<sup>1</sup>*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. O. om.



*upasádaḥ* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>); while, as counter-example, to show that the hiatus must be between two *padas*, not two parts of the same *pada*, we have *práügam ukthám* (iv.4.2<sup>1</sup>: this implies, of course, that the *pada*-text does not treat the word as a separable one).

The Rik Pr. (iii.9,10) calls this accent *váivṛtta*, and there is nothing in its definition or in that of the Vâj. Prât. (i.119) which should limit the accent to the case of a hiatus between two *padas*, or deprive the *u* of such a word as *praüga* of its right to rank as a *pádavṛtta*. See the note to the next rule.

## उदात्तपूर्वस्तैरोव्यञ्जनः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Where an acute precedes, it is *táirovyañjana*.

The form of this rule, again, is almost unaccountably peculiar. The term *táirovyañjana* means 'with consonant-intervention,' and all the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.62) define the accent in accordance with this, as being one in which the circumflex is separated by intervening consonants from the occasioning acute. Here, to be sure, such a definition would hardly answer, as there is a single word in the Sanhitâ, *praügam*, in which a vowel is regarded as having *táirovyañjana*, although there is no consonant between it and the acute. But why specify *udáttapûrva*, 'preceded by an acute,' in this rule, when it was just as necessary in rule 6? The commentator says that, as the implication has been made all along, its repetition here is for the purpose of signifying that the acute is now to be understood to be in the same word with the circumflex. That may satisfy him, but is not calculated to content us. If *nânâpudastham udáttam* was implied in rule 6 from above, then *padavivṛtтыám* should have been simply *vivṛtтыám*. Things would be made much better by putting rule 6 after rule 7: then we should be able to give *udáttapûrva* in rule 7 a meaning, as recalling to mind the actual cause of these two accents; and rule 6 would stand as an exception to the other and more general statement, pointing out a class of cases in which, though depending on a preceding acute, another name was applied to the accent.

The commentator's examples are *yuñjánty asya* (vii.4.20), *vásvy*

---

6. *padayor vivṛtтиḥ padavivṛtтиḥ<sup>1</sup>: tasyám yaḥ svaryate sa pá-davṛtto veditavyaḥ.<sup>2</sup> yathá<sup>3</sup>: tá-----: sa-----: ya----- vivṛttir vyaktir<sup>4</sup> ity arthaḥ. padayor iti kim: pra-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> B. *bhavati*. <sup>3</sup> in O. only. <sup>4</sup> B. *vyáptatirikta*.

7. *udáttapûrvádhikáre sati punar atra tatkathanád<sup>1</sup> ekapada-sthodáttaviçesho<sup>2</sup> 'vagamyate<sup>3</sup>: tasmád ekapadasthodáttapûrvo yaḥ svaritaḥ sa<sup>4</sup> táirovyañjano veditavyaḥ. yathá<sup>5</sup>: yuñj-----: va-----: sa-----: tad-----: pra-----: tam-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *kath-*; O. *tu k-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-sthityavi-*; O. *-sthatvavi-*. <sup>3</sup> O. *gam-*. <sup>4</sup> O. *asáu*. <sup>5</sup> in O. only.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



9. In the *kshâipra* and *nitya*, the effort is firmer.

The commentator makes very short work of the remaining rules of the chapter, and we can afford to do the same, as they teach us nothing of value.

अभिनिहते च ॥ १० ॥

10. As also in the *abhinihata*.

The commentator says that *ca* in this rule is used in the sense of secondary adjunction (*anvâcaya*), and so signifies that the effort of utterance in the *abhinihata* is *dr̥ḍha*, 'firm,' merely—a less degree than the *dr̥ḍhatara*, 'firmer,' or 'quite firm,' of the preceding rule. The same may be also inferred, he adds, from the fact that the *abhinihata* is made the subject of a separate rule, instead of being included in rule 9, with the other two.

प्रश्निष्टप्रतिहृतयोर्मृदुतरः ॥ ११ ॥

11. In the *praçlišṭa* and *prâtiḥata*, it is gentler.

Nothing is to be inferred from its association here as to the real character of the *prâtiḥata*. This rule and its successor were referred to under i.46, but for no intelligibly useful purpose.

तैरोव्यञ्जनपादवृत्तयोरल्पतरौ ऽल्पतरः ॥ १२ ॥

12. In the *tâirovyañjana* and *pâdavṛtta*, it is feebler.

9. *kshâipre nitye ca prayatno<sup>1</sup> dr̥ḍhataraḥ kâryaḥ<sup>2</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*tna*; B. -*tni*; O. *yatno*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. om.

10. *anvâcaye vartamânaç cakâro dr̥ḍhamâtram bodhayati: abhinihate<sup>1</sup> ca<sup>2</sup> prayatno<sup>3</sup> dr̥ḍhaḥ<sup>4</sup> syât: na tu dr̥ḍhataraḥ: iti pr̥thaksûtrârambhâd api<sup>5</sup> pratîyate.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -*hite* (as also in the rule). <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. insert *mṛdutarah*, and rule 12. <sup>4</sup> O. -*ḍhataram*. <sup>5</sup> W. *abhi*; B. om.

11. *praçlišṭe prâtiḥate ca prayatno mṛdutarah kâryaḥ.*

12. *tâirovyañjane pâdavṛtte 'ca prayatno 'lpatarah syât<sup>1</sup>.<sup>2</sup>yady apy<sup>3</sup> alpamṛdudr̥ḍhabhâvas<sup>4</sup> tatro 'ktas tathâ 'pi<sup>5</sup> dîpavad venupatravad iti çikshânurodhât<sup>6</sup> komalaçiraskatvam<sup>7</sup> sarvatra vijñeyam<sup>8,9</sup>.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane  
viñço<sup>9</sup> 'dhyâyaḥ.*

(<sup>1</sup>) O. *câ 'lpataram karanam bhavati*. (<sup>2</sup>) W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *tatra*. <sup>5</sup> M. 'pi 'ti. <sup>6</sup> B. *kshithânurodhoktâu*. <sup>7</sup> B. *âlpaçisk-*; G. M. *kâivalyaçirastv-*. <sup>8</sup> O. *jñeyam: yathâ: yuvâ kavi*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. *dvitiyapraçne ashtamo*.



*Alpatara*, 'feebler,' is doubtless meant to signify a still less degree of force of utterance than *mṛdutara*, 'gentler.'

To the commentator, his Çikshâ appears to be a higher authority than the Prâtiçâkhyâ, at least in this part; and he adds that, although the qualifications 'feeble, gentle, firm' are here attributed to the accents in question, yet, in accordance with what the Çikshâ says, "like a candle, like a rush-leaf" (? unintelligible without the context), it is to be understood that there is softheadedness (?) in them all alike. And O. adds an example, *yúvâ kavîḥ* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>).

## CHAPTER XXI.

CONTENTS: 1-9, division of consonants in syllabication; 10-11, *pracaya* accent; 12-13, *yamas* or nasal counterparts; 14, *nâsikya*; 15-16, *svarabhakti*.

### व्यञ्जनं स्वराङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

1. The consonant is adjunct of a vowel.

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G. M.) to rule xxiv.5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of *aṅga*, 'adjunct' (literally 'limb, member'), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle: if, in such cases as *kûpa* and *yûpa* (and G. M. add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

1. <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>*vyañjanam svarâṅgam bhavati: çvâso nâdo 'ṅgam eva ca* (xxiv.5) *iti vijñeyatvena*<sup>2</sup> *vidhânâd ayam ârambhaḥ. nanu*<sup>3</sup> *kûpo yûpa*<sup>4</sup> *ityâdâuvyañjanam evâ 'rthaviçeshabodhakam*<sup>5</sup> *iti svaro vyañjanâṅgam kim na*<sup>6</sup> *syât. ucyate: vyañjanam kevalam avasthâtum na çaknoti: kim tu sâpeksham*<sup>7</sup>: *svaras tu nirapekshaḥ*<sup>8</sup>: *sâpekshanirapekshayor nirapeksham eva viçisṭam âcakshate prekshâvantah: viçisṭapratyaṅgatvam*<sup>9</sup> *aviçisṭasyâi*<sup>10</sup> *'va. kim ca: svaravâiçisṭyabodhakam anyad api vidyate*<sup>11</sup>: *durbalasya yathâ râshṭram harate*<sup>12</sup> *balavân nrpaḥ: durbalam vyañjanam tadvad dharate*<sup>13</sup> *balavânt svarah.*<sup>14</sup>

<sup>15</sup>*kim ca: çikshâvyâkhyâne*

*yaḥ svayam râjate tam tu svaram âha patañjaliḥ:*

*uparisthâyinâ tena vyaṅgam vyañjanam ucyate.*<sup>16</sup>

*svarâs tu*<sup>16</sup> *brâhmaṇâ jñeyâ ityâdi.*

*udâttaç câ 'nudâttaç ca*<sup>17</sup> *svaritaç ca svarâs trayah*<sup>18</sup>:

<sup>19</sup>*hrasvo dîrghah pluta iti*<sup>19</sup> *kâlato*<sup>20</sup> *niyamâ*<sup>21</sup> *acî*<sup>22</sup>

<sup>23</sup>*'ti*



of the consonant? The answer given is, that a consonant is incapable of standing alone, and so is dependent, while a vowel is independent; and that, as between a dependent and an independent, the enlightened regard the independent as superior; and it belongs to the inferior to be adjunct to the superior. Moreover, there is found also another proof of the superiority of the vowel, in the verse "as a mighty monarch takes possession of the realm of a weak one, so the mighty vowel takes possession of the weak consonant." The beginning of another verse is added: "the vowels are to be known as belonging to *brahman*." But between this part of a verse and the whole verse that precedes, G. M. insert another, which is asserted to come from "the exposition of the *Çikshâ*," and which gives a highly imaginative derivation for *svara*, 'vowel,' and *vyañjana*, 'consonant:' "Patanjali styled that a vowel which *shines by itself* [*sva-ra* from *sva-yam RÂ-jate*]: the consonant is so called as being imperfect [*vyañjana* from *vyañga*, literally 'limbless'] without [? the expression needs mending, to bring out a desirable sense] the other following it." Then all start together upon a new argument for the superiority of the vowel with yet another verse, which is actually found in the known *pāninīya Çikshâ* (verse 23; see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iv.353): "acute, grave, and circumflex, the three accents, and short, long, and protracted, these, in regard to quantity, are the necessary characteristics of the vowels;" which shows that acute tone and so on are attributes of vowels only, and of consonants in virtue of their being adjuncts of vowels.

*svarāṅgam evo 'dāttādayo dharmāḥ: 24 vyañjanānām 25 tu 26 tadaṅgatayā 27. vyañjanam ardhamaṭram 28: svaraḥ ca mātrākālah: tayoh saṁdhir 29 adhyardhamātraḥ 30: ity evaṁ dīrghakālah prasaktaḥ: tatpratishedhārtham vyañjanañ svarāṅgam ity uktam: svarasaṁśrṣṭasya 31 vyañjanasya svarakāla eva kālo drutavṛttāu 32 na tu 33 svarasyāi 'va 33 sarvatre 34 'ty arthaḥ. 35 drutavṛttāv iti kim: 35 hrasvārdhakālam vyañjanam (i.37) iti 36 vyartham syād iti brūmaḥ. yathā 37 kshīrodakasamparke 38 kshīrasyāi 'vo 'palabdhir no 'dakasya tathā svaravyañjanasamparke 39 svarasyāi 40 'vo 'palabdhir 41 vāḍiṣṭyam. 42*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *svarasyā 'ṅgam svarāṅgam*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *svara*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *na*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-pas sūpaḥ kālah vālah bālah: phāla*. <sup>5</sup> O. *-sha iti bo-*. <sup>6</sup> O. *om*. <sup>7</sup> W. B. *-kshā: O. sāksheyam*. <sup>8</sup> O. *-kshakah*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *-sṭam svaram prat-*; O. *-sṭam prat-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *-sya vyañjanasyāi*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *asti*. <sup>12,13</sup> G. M. *hareta*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-ra iti*. <sup>(15)</sup> in G. M. only <sup>16</sup> G. M. *ca*. <sup>17</sup> B. *om*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *put before svarās*. <sup>(19)</sup> G. M. O. *hrasvadirghaplutāḥ cāi 'va*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-lako*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *-yatā; O. -yatās*. <sup>22</sup> W. *ḥrayi; G. M. api; O. tate*. <sup>23</sup> G. M. ins. *vacanāt*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. ins. *na tu*. <sup>25</sup> O. *-janam*. <sup>26</sup> W. *tu dam; G. M. om*. <sup>27</sup> O. *tadharmatayā*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. *-trakam*. <sup>29</sup> O. *sam*. <sup>30</sup> B. G. M. O. *ardham-*; G. *-trika; M. -traka*. <sup>31</sup> W. *-rasamasṭi*. <sup>32</sup> W. *dut-*; B. *dūt-*; O. *dr̥gatātāu*. <sup>(33)</sup> W. *svārah sparṣasyāi 'va; O. om*. <sup>34</sup> B. *-vasye*. <sup>(35)</sup> B. *om;* W. *dūt-*; O. *dr̥tav-*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>37</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>38</sup> G. M. *-rkāḥ; O. kshīrāudake-sampa*. <sup>39</sup> G. M. *-rkāis*. <sup>40</sup> W. *sparṣasyāi*. <sup>41</sup> W. O. *-bdhir; B. -bdhāir*. <sup>42</sup> B. *vaḍiṣṭaya; G. M. -shyam*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



(ii.2.12<sup>4</sup> et al.), *tat* (*passim*: given by G. M. only), and *haviḥ* (i.2.4<sup>1</sup> et al.)

This principle, of course, is without exception in its application. It is either stated or implied in the rules of the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. i.57).

## संयोगादि ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also the first consonant of a group.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, of a group consisting of either two consonants or more than two. The “also” (*ca*) expressed in the next rule is declared to be implied here also, and to prescribe adjunction to the preceding vowel. The examples given are *yajñān vyādiḥat* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup>) and *apsv antaḥ* (i.4.45<sup>2</sup> et al.: but G. M. substitute *apsv agne* [iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>], and W. has the corrupt reading *aḥvataḥ*). If, now, we had only to take the groups of consonants as they stand in the ordinary text, and divide them, the application of this and of the remaining rules for syllabication would be simple enough; but we are required to apply also the rules for duplication etc. as found in chapter xiv., and to make the insertions required by the rules of the fifth (v.32,33) and the present chapter (12–16), which puts quite a different face upon the matter. In fact, in the examples furnished, *nt* is the only group which is divided *n-t* without farther ceremony; *gr* becomes and is divided *g-gr*; *nvṃ*, in like manner, *n-nvṃ*; *psv* is expanded into *p-phsv*; and *jñ* into *jñ-jñ* (writing the *yama*, as I have done elsewhere, with a straight line above the letter), where, by the action of the next rule, two consonants go to the preceding vowel. The class of groups consisting of two consonants only, and such consonants as (by xiv.23) are not liable to duplication, is the only one of which the division is settled by the present rule alone: it contains (in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ) thirty-nine groups, such as *nt*, *tth*, *pp*, *yy*, *m̄y*, *ṣṣ*.

The other treatises hold this same principle, and teach it in an equivalent manner (see Ath. Pr. i.56 and note)—save that the Rik Pr. (i.5, xviii.18) allows the letter to be adjoined to either the preceding or the following syllable.

-3. *avasitam padāntavartī<sup>1</sup> vyañjanam<sup>2</sup> pūrvasya svarasyā<sup>3</sup> ṅgam<sup>2</sup> syāt. yathā<sup>4</sup>: ūrk: vashaḥ: tat<sup>5</sup>: haviḥ.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *antarv*-. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *pūrvasvarāṅgam*. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. om.

4. <sup>1</sup>*dvayor<sup>2</sup> bahūnām<sup>3</sup> vā saṃyogo bhavati<sup>4</sup> : tasya saṃyogasyā<sup>5</sup> di<sup>5</sup> vyañjanam<sup>6</sup> pūrvasvarasyā<sup>7</sup> ṅgam<sup>1</sup> bhavati. yathā<sup>9</sup>: yajñān-----: apsv----- parasūtre cakārah<sup>8</sup> pūrvasvarāṅgavabodhaka<sup>11</sup> ity atrā<sup>12</sup> pi tal<sup>12</sup> labhyate<sup>10</sup>.*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. *varṇānām*; G. M. *sayyogānām*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *yadi*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *yad*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *tat*. <sup>7</sup> W. *pūrvasyā*; O. *-svarā*. <sup>(8)</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(10)</sup> W. O. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *svarasyā ṅg-*; B. *-ṅgam bo-*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. om.



The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood: B. has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it; O. omits the next rule, with passages before and after; W. has done the same, to a somewhat less extent; but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W.'s original, and its copyist has put them in in the wrong place, next before rule 6.

## परेण चासंश्लिप्तम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. And one that is not combined with the following vowel.

The comment supplies the word *svareṇa*, 'vowel,' as that with which *pareṇa* here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly. The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes. By way of illustration is given merely *tat savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.): a most insufficient and ill-chosen example; since, in the final form of the group *ts*, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable: thus, *t-ths*. But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavoring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states: "well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjunction to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group." And he replies, "you must not think that: for, in such cases as *maryaṣrîḥ* (iv.1.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) and *arvâ 'si* (i.7.8<sup>1</sup> et al.), in which the *y* and *v* are doubled after *r* by rule xiv.4, the former *y* or *v* is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the *r*, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel: and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place. So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled; and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question."

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations. Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but as a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position; and the two must be understood as if they read "the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel; and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel." The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception; to the latter, rules 7-9

5. <sup>1</sup>*pareṇa*<sup>2</sup>*svareṇâ*<sup>3</sup>*samhitam*<sup>4</sup>*asamyuktam*<sup>5</sup>*vyañjanam*<sup>6</sup>*pûrvasvarâṅgam bhavati*<sup>7</sup>. *yathâ*<sup>8</sup>: *tat*.... *nanu tarhi pûrvasûtram anarthakam: samyogâdibhûtasya*<sup>9</sup>*'pi vyañjanasyâ*<sup>10</sup>*'nenâi*<sup>11</sup>*'va pûrvasvarâṅgatvasiddheḥ. mâi*<sup>12</sup>*'vam maṁsthâḥ*<sup>13</sup>: *maryaṣrîḥ: arvâ 'si: ity atra yavakârâyo rephât param ca* (xiv.



establish very important and extensive classes of exceptions. If the mode of statement adopted in the treatise is open to some objection, we cannot help it; the slight inaccuracy is perhaps a consequence of the general prevalence of the doctrine of rule 4, to which its successor is added as an extension peculiar to this school.

No one of the other Prâtiçâkhyas recognizes any such principle as this: those of the Rik (i.5, xviii.18) and Atharvan (i.58) add to the initial consonant of a group only the first of a following pair which is the result of duplication, that of the White Yajus including further (i.104,105) the other one of the pair, provided a mute follows. Its sway is, as already remarked, much more limited than would be thought at first sight, because rule 7 establishes a different usage for the immense class of groups of which a semi-vowel stands as final member, and rule 9 for the much smaller but yet important class in which a spirant stands last, or followed by a semivowel. Its general effect is to attach to the following vowel only such consonants or groups as could begin a word, leaving the rest to belong to the foregoing syllable. There seems to be need of illustrating, more fully than the commentator has deigned to do, the sphere of its application.

This is, in consonant-groups originally of two members, to

1. Groups in which a mute is doubled (or its corresponding non-aspirate prefixed to it, as will be understood hereafter without special remark) after a surd spirant ( $\chi$  or  $\varphi$ , xiv.9,15),  $l$  (xiv.2,3), or  $r$  (xiv.4,15), the first member of the group remaining unchanged: thus,  $\chi k-k$ ,  $lk-k$ ,  $rk-k$ . These are twenty-seven in number; and to them may be added  $ry-y$ ,  $rl-l$ ,  $rv-v$ , which, by the final specification of rule 7, follow the same mode of division. In regard to these, the usage as fixed by our treatise is the same with that sanctioned by the rest, as already mentioned.

2. Groups in which a mute, or  $v$ , is doubled before a mute of another series: thus,  $kk-c$ ,  $vv-n$ . Of these there are fifty-one in the Sanhitâ.

3. The same, but with the addition (by xxi.12) of  $yama$  before the final member: thus,  $gg-\bar{g}n$ . Twenty-three groups.

4. Groups in which the initial spirant (sibilant) is doubled, and also the following mute (by xiv.9), only the last of all going to the following syllable: thus,  $\zeta\zeta-c$ . Thirteen groups.

5. The same, but with  $yama$ : thus,  $\zeta\zeta p-\bar{p}m$  ( $\zeta m$ ). Six groups.

6. Groups in which  $h$  is doubled before a nasal, with  $nâsikya$  (by xxi.14: but see the note to that rule, for a different interpretation): thus,  $hh-^n n$ . Three groups only.

Against these one hundred and twenty-six groups, growing out

---

4) *iti dvitve* <sup>9</sup> *kr̥te prathamayavakârayoḥ pareṇa câ 'sañhitam*<sup>10</sup> *ity anena pûrvasvarâṅgatvam*<sup>11</sup> *prâptam*<sup>12</sup>: *rephasya tu*<sup>13</sup> *nâ 'ntasthâparam asavarṇam* (xxi.7) *ity anena parasvarâṅgatvam*<sup>14</sup> *prâptam*<sup>15</sup>: *tac câ 'çakyaḥ: tathocçârâṅsambhavât: anyatarabâdhe*<sup>16</sup> *kartavye sati kim vâ bādhyam*<sup>17</sup> *iti samdehaḥ*<sup>18</sup>:





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



Sanhitâ (*ntstr* and *tstry*) are formed by added semivowels, and so do not come under the further action of the present rule.

G. M. read *asāñhitam* instead of *asañhitam* in the rule.

अनुस्वारः स्वरभक्तिश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti*.

By G. M., this rule is divided into two, *anusvârah* and *svarabhaktiç ca* (while, on the other hand, T. reads *anusvârasvarabhaktiç ca*); and such a division is noted, if not accepted, in the comment, by all the manuscripts, which say “of this rule (*svarabhaktiç ca*) is made a setting-apart, although the prescription is identical (with that made in the other rule, *anusvârah*).” And the object of thus separating what is confessed properly to belong together is stated to be “to bring about the adjunction of *svarabhakti*, in some cases, to the following vowel,” on the authority of a verse which is quoted, to the effect that “the knowing man should connect with its predecessor (?) the *bhakti* that follows a short vowel; and in *ṛtasya dhûrshadam* the *bhakti* is said to do as it pleases;” but G. M. substitute for the latter half of the verse “to it should be assigned one *mora*, also before a pause and in cases of hiatus.” The whole matter is exceedingly obscure, or quite unintelligible, without aid from the context of the quoted verse. The words cited as examples are not found in the Sanhitâ; but they occur in the Rig-Veda (at i.143.7), and also in the Tâitirîya-Brâhmaṇa (i.2.1<sup>12</sup>), where the *svarabhakti* has assumed the form of a full vowel, and the word reads *dhûrushadam*. It looks as if the commentators had set out to divide into two rules what they nevertheless have to acknowledge to be really only one, for the purpose of interpreting into the latter half of it, when set by itself, a license to the element in question to be treated either way; but, as they have not fully carried out their intention, I have preferred to retain the unity of the rule. It is quoted, we may further remark, under rule i.34, in all the manuscripts of the comment, apparently without any thought of a division.

6. *caḥārah samuccayakathanadvârâ<sup>1</sup> pûrvasvarâṅgatvâkarshakah. <sup>2</sup>anusvârah<sup>3</sup> pûrvasvaram<sup>4</sup> bhajate<sup>5</sup>. yathâ<sup>6</sup>: añç-.....<sup>2</sup> svarabhaktiç ca pûrvasvaram<sup>7</sup> bhajate. yathâ<sup>8</sup>: gâr h-..... vidhâu<sup>2</sup> samâne<sup>10</sup> sûtasyâ 'sya pṛthakkaranam<sup>11</sup>: kvacit svrabhakteḥ<sup>12</sup> parâṅgatvam<sup>13</sup> âpâdayitum<sup>14</sup>. tathâ hi:*

<sup>15</sup>*svarâd dhrasvât<sup>15</sup> parâm bhaktim pracayatvan nayed<sup>16</sup> budhah:*

<sup>17</sup>*ṛtasya dhûrshadam ce 'ti svatantrâ bhaktir ucyate<sup>17</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -ra; G. M. -thanâd vâ; O. -dvât. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. put after *anusvârah*, as its comment, giving all the rest as comment to *svarabhaktiç ca* as a separate rule. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> W. G. M. O. -svarâṅgam. <sup>5</sup> G. M. syât. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>7</sup> O. svar-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> O. samavi-. <sup>10</sup> O. -na; G. M. add *anusvâra svarabhaktiç ce 'ti*. <sup>11</sup> B. -kkâr-. <sup>12</sup> O. pṛthagnaktâuh. <sup>13</sup> W. B. G. M. padâ-. <sup>14</sup> W. B. -ditum. (<sup>15</sup>) B. *svarâṅga hr-*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *na ced*. (<sup>17</sup>) G. M. substitute *tasyâ mâtrâ bhaved ekâ virâme ca vivṛttishu*; O. adds (<sup>2</sup>) from comment to next rule.



*Anusvāra* appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be desired in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication; but I presume we may infer that it does not count as *saṃyogādi* at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel; and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there; that *ñçc*, for example, is to be made into *ñçc-c*, *ñsm* into *ñssp-p̄m*, and *ñstr* into *ñsst-tr*. The example given by the commentator is *añçunā te* (i.2.6); but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of *anusvāra*, no question could arise as to the division *añ-çunā*.

For *svarabhakti*, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi. 15,16). The example given is *gārhapatyah* (i.6.7<sup>1</sup> et al.), which we are to read and divide *gār<sup>r</sup>-ha-pat-tyah*.

## नान्तस्थापरमसवर्णम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it.

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. “Dissimilar” is simply explained by *vilakṣhaṇa*, ‘of diverse characteristics, different;’ it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which *n* and *m* are converted before *l*, and *m* before *y* and *v* (v.26,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *adhyavasātya diçah* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>; i. e. *ad-dhya-*), *madhumigreṇa* (v.2.8<sup>6</sup> et al.; i. e. *miç-çre-*), *açlonayā* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>; i. e. *aç-çlo-*), and *ishe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.; i. e. *i-shet-tvā*): they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of four-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

7. *nakārah pūrvasvarāṅgatvavyāvartakah: antasthāparam vyañjanam tasyā antasthāyā asavarṇam vilakṣhaṇam pūrvasvarāṅgam na bhavati: arthāt parasvarāṅgam <sup>1</sup>tad iti veditavyam<sup>1</sup>: <sup>2</sup>svata sthātum açakyatvāt<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: adhy- . . . .: madh- . . . .: açl- . . . .: ishe . . . . antasthā parā yasmāt tad antasthāparam. asavarṇam iti kim: pari- . . . .*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *iti vijñeyam*; O. om. (<sup>2</sup>) O. puts at end of comment on preceding rule; B. *svarani vinā sthā-*. (<sup>3</sup>) O. om.



groups. By way of further examples, we may cite the two groups of five; they are *vi-yu-yâtthst-tryas-sya* (ii.6.5<sup>4-5</sup>) and *ab-bru-vanthst-trî-kâ-mâ* (vi.1.6<sup>5</sup>).

But if the commentator's direct illustration of the rule is scanty, his counter-illustration is yet less satisfactory. To establish the necessity of the specification *asavarṇam*, 'dissimilar,' he cites only *paricāyām cinvīta* (v.4.11<sup>3</sup>). Such cases as this, however, are rather covered by the fundamental rule *saṁyogādi* (xxi.4), and the application of the present one is to the groups in which a semi-vowel is doubled after *r*, and which we are to read *ry-y*, *rl-l*, *rv-v*; while, on the other hand, in the half-dozen groups in which two different semi-vowels follow a mute, both of them, along with the preceding mute, go to the succeeding vowel: thus, *vish-shvañ-ñvyārc-chat* (ii.3.2<sup>6</sup>), *a-vit-trya-va-tu* (i.8.22<sup>1</sup>), and *gr-hād-dvrî-hîn* (ii.3.1<sup>3</sup>).

## नासिक्याः ॥ ८ ॥

### 8. Nor the nose-sounds.

The "nose-sounds" are here again (as under ii.49) defined as the *yamas* (xxi.12,13) only; but there is no reason why we should not regard the *nāsikya* (xxi.14) as likewise included (see the note on rule 14). The examples given are also of *yamas* only: *rukman upa dadhāti* (v.2.7<sup>1</sup> et al.: O. has *rukman* only) and *rājñe sūkarah* (v.5.11: O. substitutes *svarājñe*, v.6.21). The groups, in their full form, are read and divided *kk-k̄m* and *jj-jñ*. An example of the *nāsikya* would be *vahh<sup>n</sup>ni-ta-mam* (i.1.4<sup>1</sup>).

The Vâj. Pr. (i.103) reckons the *yama* to the preceding vowel; neither of the other treatises says anything about it.

## स्पर्शश्चोष्मपर ऊष्मा चत्परश्च ॥ ९ ॥

9. Nor a mute that is followed by a spirant—provided the following spirant is likewise in the same case.

The first *ca* (translated 'nor' here), the commentator says, effects the connection of the rule with its predecessor; the second (rendered 'likewise') implies adjunction to the following vowel. This is not very lucid, for the two things are really equivalent to one another. And in the further exposition, the *paraḥ* appears (the readings are not consistent or clear) to be taken as signifying *parasvarāṅgam*; but this cannot well be correct. The phraseology of the rule, indeed, is very peculiar, and I do not see how it is to be accounted for unless we may conjecture that the proviso *ūshmā cet paraḥ ca* is a later addition, made after it had been noticed that the more general statement *sparṣaḥ co "shmaparaḥ*

8. *nāsikyā*<sup>1</sup> *yamāḥ*<sup>2</sup> *parasvaram*<sup>3</sup> *bhajante*. *yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *rukman*  
-----: *rājñe*-----

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup>G. M. *yāḥ*. <sup>3</sup> W. *svaraparam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



ment in this Prâtiçâkhyâ has rendered necessary a fuller illustration than was thought worth while in connection with the others, in order to render apprehensible the views held regarding it by the authors of the treatise.

स्व॒रि॒तात्स॒ङ्घि॒तायामनु॒दात्तानां॑ प्रचय उदात्तश्रुतिः ॥ १० ॥

10. Of grave syllables following a circumflex in *saṁhitâ* there is *pracaya*, having the tone of acute.

The theory of the *pracaya* accent has been so fully set forth in the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65 that I do not need to spend many words upon it here. Its effect is, as there pointed out, to give to all the syllables which are left in the written text without any accent-mark the same high tone, whether they be *udâtta*, 'acute,' or *anudâtta*, 'grave.' Thus, in the example given by the commentator, *âgne dudhra gahya kiñçila vanya yâ' te* (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *yâ te*), which is written in *pada*-text

अग्ने॑ । दुध्र॑ । ग॒ह्य॒ । कि॒ञ्चि॒ल॒ । व॒न्य॒ । या॑ । ते॒ ।

the *saṁhitâ*-reading is

अग्ने॑ दुध्र॑ ग॒ह्य॒ कि॒ञ्चि॒ल॒ व॒न्य॒ या॑ ते॒ ;

the grave syllables *dudhra gahya kiñçila van-* being without written designation of accent, like the two acute syllables *âg-* and *yâ'*, and being by this rule uttered upon the same pitch with them. It makes no difference whether the circumflex which precedes the *pracaya* is enclitic (as in the illustration given) or independent; and I have pointed out above (under xix.3) that, owing to the absence of *kampa* in the Tâittirîya-Saṁhitâ where a circumflex precedes an acute, there are very numerous cases in the text where the *saṁhitâ* alone does not show us whether the unmarked syllables following a circumflex are *udâtta* or *pracaya*—whether, for example,

ह्येतद्दे॒वाः, सा॑ ऽस्माद्दे॒तर्हि, and सा॑ ऽकामयत प्र॒जाः,

are to be read *hy ètâd devâ'h* or *hy ètad devâ'h*, *sò 'smâ'd etârhi* or *sò 'smâd etârhi*, *sò 'kâ'mâyátâ prajā'h* or *sò 'kâmayata prajā'h*.

In the note referred to, I ventured the conjecture that the mode

10. *svaritât pareshâm anudâttânâm anudâttayor anudâttasya vâ saṁhitâyâm* <sup>1</sup> *pracayo nâma dharmo* <sup>2</sup> *bhavati. yathâ: agne* ..... *anudâttânâm iti kim: agnaye* ..... *saṁhitâyâm iti kim: agne* ..... *udâttasya çrutir iva çrutir yasyâ 'sâv* <sup>3</sup> *udâttâ-çrutir iti* <sup>4</sup> *pracayasvarûpanirûpanam* <sup>5</sup>: *ato na punaruktiçânkâ* <sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> B. ins. *ca.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *dheyo.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *sa* for *asâu.* <sup>4</sup> W. om. <sup>5</sup> B. *-svarûpanam.* <sup>6</sup> W. *-ktikâmvâ.*



of writing the accent might not have been without influence on the theory as to its character—that is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the *pracaya* syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, *because* they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified. The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and carefully considered. I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture; yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility. Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol. xvii., 1863, p. 799 ff.), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the *svarita* and *anudâtta*, so that the *udâtta* appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless *pracaya*—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent. And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the *anudâtta* tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber's Indische Studien, x. 397 ff.\*).

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of *pracaya* (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural *anudâttânâm* in the rule. To show that the conversion into *pracaya* is limited to grave syllables, he quotes *agnâye prâvate* (ii.4.1<sup>2</sup> et al.); to show that the conversion is made only in *samhitâ*, he gives part of the other passage in *pada*-form, namely *agne : dudhra : gahya : kiñçila : vanya* (O. adds *yâ*). We might naturally infer from this that the *pracaya* accent does not occur at all in *pada*-text; but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are *anudâtta* in their *pada*-form become *pracaya* in *samhitâ*, without implying that there may not be *pracayas* in *pada*-text which remain such in *samhitâ*), and would doubtless be erroneous; for at least the extant *pada*-text of the Tâittirîya-Samhitâ agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes *gîrvaṇase*, *antâriksham*, and *samâguchanta*, for example,

\* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems: this is no place to discuss the subject; but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable.



गिर्वणसे । अंतरिक्षं । and सुमगंहतेति संम्रगंहत ।,  
not गिर्वणसे । अंतरिक्षं । ---संम्रगंहत.

The peculiarity of this *pada*-text in treating the *avagraha* as a full *avasāna* in regard to the designation of accent (as shown in the third of the examples), has been already spoken of above (under rule xx.3).

The terms of the rule would justify us in understanding *pracaya* to have its etymological meaning of 'accumulation, continued series,' and translating 'a series of grave syllables following a circumflex in *samhitā* is of acute tone;' and perhaps this was actually the intent of the rule-makers; but I have preferred, as the safer course, to follow the authority of the commentator in translating. To him, indeed, the term is so distinctly a technical one, implying utterance with acute tone, that he thinks it necessary to explain that *udāttaçrutih* is added by way of definition of the peculiar character of the *pracaya*, and therefore is not open to the reproach of *punarukti*, or superfluous repetition.

## नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ११ ॥

11. But not when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, when such a series or *pracaya* of grave syllables is followed by an acute or a circumflex syllable, the one next preceding the latter is not made to be of acute tone, but retains its proper grave character, and is marked with the *anudātta* sign. The commentator offers as examples *táyā devā'h sutām* (iv.1.2<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit *sutam*, without which the passage is found elsewhere; G. M. substitute *táyā devātayā*, iv.2.9<sup>2</sup> et al.) and *tād āhuḥ kvā jāgati* (vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *jagati*). These illustrations are wanting in variety, inasmuch as they show between the two independent accents only two original grave syllables, whereof one becomes an enclitic circumflex and the other remains grave; we may take the first example under the preceding rule as showing how an actual *pracaya* ends with a grave before the following original accent.

The subject to be supplied with the predicate in this rule is *svarah*, of course. There is an objectionable ambiguity in the form of the rule, inasmuch as there might most naturally seem to be *anuvṛtti* of *pracayah*, and so a denial of that accent anywhere excepting before a pause.

We have seen at xix.2 that the name *vikrama* is given to the

11. *udāttaçrahaḥ svaritaparo vā 'nudāttaḥ pracayo na bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: tayā ---: tad ---. udāttaç ca<sup>3</sup> svaritaç co 'dāttaçvaritāu: tāu parāu yasmāt sa tatho 'ktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -ro vā. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



non-nasal, *sumnāya sumninī* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup> et al.: O. substitutes *sushumnaḥ*, iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>); and that it must be followed by a nasal, *sabdaḥ saḅarāḥ sumekāḥ* (iv.4.7<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *sumekāḥ*; O. substitutes *vashatt svāhā*, vii.3.12).

These examples are one-sided, in that they only exhibit the simplest form of group in which the *yama* is taken as increment. Of such simplest groups there are twenty-three met with in the Sanhitā: namely, after first mutes, *kn, kn, km, cñ, cm, tñ, tn, tm, pn, pn, pm*; after second mutes, *chm, thn*; after third mutes, *gn, gm, jñ, jm, dn, dm*; after fourth mutes, *ghn, dhn, dhm, bhn*. Then, of groups of three consonants involving such combinations: *jñy (jñ-jñy), tny; ñchm, ñjñ (ñj-jñ); dgħn (ddgh-għn), ngħn; rjm (rj-jm), rtn, rtm, rdhn, rdhm; stm (sst-ṭm), sthn*. And of groups of four consonants, *rjmy (rj-jmy)*.

According to the phonetic systems of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, this would finish the tale of *yamas*. But, by the peculiar rule (xiv.9) which here requires a surd mute to be everywhere inserted between a sibilant and a following nasal, is brought forth a new and numerous brood of these curious twins. Thus, in double groups, *çn (ççt-ṭn), çm, shñ, shm, sn, sm*. Of groups of three containing these: *çny, shñv; kshñ (kklshp-pm), kshñ, tsñ, tsm, psñ; rçm (rççp-pm), rshñ, rshm; ssm*. Of groups of four, *ñkshñ, ĸkshñ, ççny*. In all, of both classes, fifty-seven groups.

## तान्यमानिके ॥ १३ ॥

13. Some call these *yamas*.

The commentator adds nothing of value.

## हकारान्नामपरान्नासिक्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. After *h*, when followed by *n, ñ, or m*, is inserted *nâsikya*.

I have translated this rule according to its obvious and incontrovertible meaning, which, if it needed any external support, would find it in the almost precisely accordant rule of the Ath. Pr. (i.100: the teachings of the other treatises upon the subject are much less distinct: see the note on the Atharvan rule). But the commentator gives it an entirely different interpretation. The ablative *hakârân*, he says, is here used in the sense of an accusative (his addition, "in the absence of *lyap* [the suffix *ya*]," I do

13. *tân nâsikyân eke çâkhino yamân bruvate<sup>1</sup>. uktâny evo 'dâharanâni*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *iti vadanti*.

14. *hakârâd iti karmani<sup>1</sup> lyablope<sup>2</sup> pañcamî. tasmân nañama-param hakâram âruhya nâsikyam bhavati<sup>3</sup>: sânunâsikyo hakârah syâd ity arthaḥ. ahnâm . . . .: apar- . . . .: brahm- . . . .*

<sup>1</sup> W. *-ma*. <sup>2</sup> W. *lyapûlope*; B. *lyaplope*; O. *lyaçlope*. <sup>3</sup> B. *-ved iti*.



not understand); and the sense is, that a nose-sound is imposed upon the *h* itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a *h* preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a *h* is really an expiration of breath through the nose: it being not less true of *h* before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii.47) *udaya-varnâdisasthâna*, ‘produced in the position of the succeeding letter.’ The commentator’s exposition might have come from the “some authorities” to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are *ahnâm ketuḥ* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>), *aparâhne* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>), and *brahmavâdinaḥ* (i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et al.). Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxi.8 for the syllabic division, we should read *ahh-<sup>n</sup>nâm*: and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath. Pr. i.100, it is probably this separation of the *h* from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G. M. have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give *hakâran naṇamaparan nâsikyam* (the writing of *n* instead of *m* before *n* is frequent with these MSS.).

## रेफोष्मसंयोगे रेफस्वरभक्तिः ॥ १५ ॥

15. In the combination of *r* and a spirant, there is a *svarabhakti* of *r*.

The doctrine of our Prâtiçâkhyâ respecting the *svarabhakti* is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath. Prât. i.101–2); from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this “vowel-fragment” is to be an insertion between the *r* and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject; by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed

---

15. <sup>1</sup>*rephasya co* <sup>2</sup>*shmaṇaṣ ca saṁyoge sati* <sup>1</sup>*rephasvarabhaktir iti jânîyât*: <sup>2</sup>*svarasya bhaktiḥ svarabhaktiḥ*<sup>2</sup>: *yo* <sup>3</sup>*sya rephasya samânasvaras*<sup>3</sup> *tadbhaktiḥ syât*: *ṛkâraṣ câ* <sup>4</sup>*sya jihvâgrakarana-tvena*<sup>4</sup> *raçrutyâ*<sup>5</sup> *ca*<sup>6</sup> *samânadharmah*: <sup>7</sup>*bhaktir avayava ekadeça iti yâvat*<sup>7</sup>: *etad uktam bhavati*: *ṛkârâvayavo*<sup>8</sup> *bhavatî* <sup>9</sup>*’ty arthah. sâtrenâ* <sup>10</sup>*’nena svarabhaktir eva*<sup>9</sup> *vihitâ*: *svarabhaktisvarûpan*<sup>10</sup> *tu*<sup>10</sup> *vispashtam*<sup>11</sup> *vyâcashte vararuciḥ*: <sup>12</sup>*ṛkârâdir anumâtra*<sup>13</sup> *repho* <sup>14</sup>*’rdhamâtrâ madhye çeshâ*<sup>14</sup> *svarabhaktir iti*<sup>15</sup>. *asyâ* <sup>16</sup>*’yam arthah*<sup>12</sup>:

*indriyavishayo*<sup>16</sup> *yo*<sup>17</sup> *’sâv anur ity ucyate budhâih*:

*caturbhir*<sup>18</sup> *anubhir mâtrâparimânam*<sup>19</sup> *iti smṛtam.*<sup>10</sup>



in the abstract of it here given: the version of W. B. O., indeed, has rather the aspect of being an abbreviation of the other, and one not everywhere skilfully made.

At the outset, G. M. alone specify that the *svarabhakti* is combined with the spirant (and yet, by xxi.6, it is to be separated from the spirant in syllabication, going with the *r* to the preceding vowel). The term *svarabhakti* means 'a fragment, piece, or part of a vowel;' and a *rephasvarabhakti*, '*r*-vowel-fragment,' means a bit of the vowel that is akin, or has the same mode of utterance with, the *r*. Now the *ṛ* is of like quality with *r*, in being produced with the tip of the tongue and in having the sound of *r*: and it is a part of *ṛ* that is intended. The rule merely prescribes the insertion; the nature of the latter is clearly set forth by Vararuci (one of the three principal sources of the present comment: see note to the introductory verses, pp. 6,7). The vowels are defined at i.5, and since among them only *ṛ* agrees in place and organ with *r*, the "fragment" is of *ṛ*. The *ṛ* is by i.31 declared to be short, or of one *mora*; and Vararuci defines the short *ṛ* as composed of a quarter-*mora* of vowel at the beginning, a half-*mora* of *r* in the middle, and a quarter-*mora* of vowel (W. B. O. say, of vowel-fragment) at the end. Then a verse is quoted describing the word *anu* as signifying a quarter-*mora*. This half-*mora* of *r*, now, found in the middle of *ṛ*, being divided, its two parts, each combined with the quarter-*mora* of vowel, severally receive the name of *svarabhakti*. Hence there are two *svarabhakti*'s. And in answer to the question where this *svarabhakti* of half a *mora* occurs, the makers of the Çikshâ have declared that the one ending with the vowel element occurs before ç, *sh*, and *s*, and the one ending with the consonant element before *h*; the former, moreover, being open, and the latter close. And it is added that in *yo vâi çrad dhâm* (i.6.8<sup>1</sup>) there is no *svarabhakti*, on account of absence of the order prescribed in the rule.

*mâtrikasya rkârasyâ* "dir *aṇumâtrâ*<sup>21</sup> *svarabhâgo madhye repho*  
*'rdhamâtrâ*<sup>22</sup> *çesho*<sup>23</sup> '*py aṇumâtrâ*<sup>24</sup> *svarabhâgaḥ: etad ṛkârasva-*  
*rûpam. atra*<sup>25</sup> *rephe 'rdhamâtre bhajyamâne*<sup>26</sup> *sati*<sup>27</sup> *tâu bhâgâu*  
*pûrvottarâv*<sup>28</sup> *aṇusahitâu*<sup>29</sup> *pratyekam svarabhaktinâmadheyam*  
*bhajete*<sup>30</sup>: <sup>31</sup>*sâ ca svarabhaktir ardhamâtrâ. kutra*<sup>32</sup> *vâ*<sup>33</sup> *svara-*  
*bhaktir*<sup>31</sup> *ity âçañkya çikshâkârâir*<sup>34</sup> *uktam:*

*çashaseshu svarodayâm*<sup>35</sup> *hakâre vyañjanodayâm*<sup>36</sup>:  
*çashaseshu tu*<sup>37</sup> *vivṛtâm*<sup>38</sup> *hakâre samvṛtâm*<sup>39</sup> *vidur* *iti*<sup>40</sup>.  
*yo* . . . . *ityâdâu*<sup>41</sup> *sûtroktakramâbhâvân na svarabhaktiḥ.*<sup>41</sup>  
*svarabhaktyantaram*<sup>42</sup> *çikshâyâm uktam:*

<sup>43</sup>*kareṇuḥ karviṇî câi 'va harinî hârîte*<sup>44</sup> '*ti ca:*

*haṇsapade*<sup>45</sup> '*ti vijñeyâḥ pañcâi 'tâḥ svarabhaktayah.*<sup>43</sup>

<sup>46</sup>*kareṇû*<sup>47</sup> *rahayor*<sup>48</sup> *yoge*<sup>49</sup> *karviṇî lahakârayoḥ:*

*harinî*<sup>50</sup> *raçasânâm ca*<sup>50</sup> *hârîtâ*<sup>51</sup> *laçakârayoḥ.*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



inserts an "or" in the rule, and declares it to mean 'either when the spirant is doubled or when it is followed by a first mute.' This must evidently be condemned: for, in the first place, the text contains no "or;" and, in the second place, if that were the meaning, the specification would be superfluous, since the spirant is always doubled before a first mute, and so *krame* would include all the cases—except, indeed, according to the doctrine of Plākshi and Plākshâyaṇa, who (xiv.17) deny the duplication of the spirant in such a situation; and we are perhaps to connect his interpretation of the present rule with his apparent acceptance of the doctrine referred to, and suppose that he would read *rsh-t*, and *rçp-ṗm* etc. (namely, for *rçm*, *rshṇ*, and *rshm*), while the reading actually approved by the treatise is *rshsh-t*, *rççp-ṗm* etc. There are five groups—namely *rçy*, *rçv*, *rshy*, *rsv*, and *rhy*—in which the difference of interpretation would make a difference as regards the presence or absence of *svarabhakti*; if the "or" is implied, they will be read and divided *rç-çy* etc.; if not, they will be *r<sup>r</sup>ç-çy* etc.

The commentator's examples are *dârçyam yajñam* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>: only O. has *yajñam*; G. M. read *dârçyam hi*, which, if it be an actual passage, I have overlooked in searching out the references), *varshyâbhyah* (vii.4.13: W. B. O. read *varshâbhyah*), *barsvebhiḥ* (v. 7.11), and *etarhy ârûdhah* (v.1.5<sup>5</sup>: found in O. only), illustrating four of the five cases in which his interpretation would exclude the *svarabhakti*; and further, for cases in which a first mute follows, *adarçma jyotiḥ* (iii.2.5<sup>4</sup>: omitted in O.), *kârshnî upânahâu* (v.4. 4<sup>4</sup> et al.), and *varshṭâ parjanyaḥ* (vii.5.20: found in G. M. only).

## CHAPTER XXII.

CONTENTS: 1-2, formation of articulate sounds in general; 3-8, definition of terms used in the treatise; 9-10, mode of production of high and low tone; 11-12, established tone and pitch; 13, length of pauses in the text; 14-15, heavy and light syllables.

16. <sup>1</sup>*kramaçabdo dvitvaparyâyah: katham etat: prakṛtir vikramah krama* (xxiv.5) *ity atra dvitvasyâi<sup>2</sup> 'va<sup>1</sup> kramaçabdenâ<sup>3</sup> 'bhidhânâd atrâ 'pi sa evâ<sup>4</sup> 'rtha iti niçcinumah.<sup>5</sup> âshmanah krame sati<sup>6</sup> tasminn âshmani prathamapare vâ<sup>7</sup> sati na svarabhaktir bhavati.<sup>8</sup> 'krame yathâ<sup>9</sup>: dârç-....: varsh-....: bars-....<sup>10</sup>prathamapare yathâ: ad-....:<sup>10</sup> kâr-....<sup>11</sup>prathamah paro yasmâd asâu prathamaparah.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane  
ekaviṅço<sup>12</sup> 'dhyâyah.*

(1) O. om. (2) G. M. -*tvam asty e*. (3) W. -*bdo nâmâ*. (4) W. *rvâ*. (5) G. M. '*rtho niçcitah*. (6) O. om.; G. M. add *vâ*. (7) G. M. put after *sati*. (8) W. -*vet*. (9) O. om. (10) O. *etar-....*; G. M. *etasya prathamaparo y-*. (11) G. M. add *varshṭâ-....*. (12) G. M. O. *dvitīyapraçne navamo*.



## शब्दः प्रकृतिः सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Tone is the material of all articulate sounds.

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the Prâtiçâkhya proper. This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter. As under ii.1, the commentator explains *çabda* by *dhvani*; for *prakṛti* he gives as synonym *mûlakâraṇam*, 'radical cause;' and *varṇa* he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants.

## तस्य रूपान्यत्वे वर्णान्यत्वम् ॥ २ ॥

2. In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter.

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality: compare ii.3.

## तत्र शब्द्रव्याण्युदाहरिष्यामः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Here we will instance the offices of terms.

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9; which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation. The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point *apropos* of *çabda* in rule 1; the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense. The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing *çabda* a synonym of *çâstra*, 'text-book, body of doctrine;' which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of. He distinctly ascribes to *dravya* the sense of 'office, aim,' as the connection also requires,

1. *sarvavarṇânâm*<sup>1</sup> *çabdo*<sup>2</sup> *dhvaniḥ prakṛtir mûlakâraṇam bhavati: varṇaçabdena svaravyañjanâtmako râçir ucyate. sarve ca te varṇâç ca sarvavarṇâḥ*<sup>3</sup>: *teshâni*<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *nâma*. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *sarvavarṇânâm*.

2. *prâtiçrutkasthânabhedât*<sup>1</sup> *tasya*<sup>2</sup> *prakṛtibhûtasya*<sup>3</sup> *rûpânyatve sati varṇânyatvam syât*<sup>4</sup>. *yathâ: a: i: u: ityâdi*.

<sup>1</sup> B. *prat-*; G. M. *-nâd bhe-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *çabdasya*. <sup>3</sup> W. *pratibh-*. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

3. *teshâm varṇânâm sarvatra*<sup>1</sup> *saṅghâtaprayoge*<sup>2</sup> *çâstram*<sup>3</sup> *ity*<sup>4</sup> *ucyate:* <sup>5</sup> *tasya çabda*<sup>6</sup> *iti paryâyanâma: tatra tasmîñ châstre yâni dravyâni bhavanti tâny udâharishyâmaḥ. yat karma yena kriyate*<sup>8</sup> *tat*<sup>9</sup> *tasya dravyam*<sup>10</sup> *sâdhanam iti yâvat*<sup>11</sup>: *yathâ gha-*



giving *sādhana*, 'efficiency,' as its equivalent. As clay to a vessel, we are told, so are alphabetic sounds to a text-book.

## वर्णकारौ निर्देशकौ ॥ ४ ॥

4. *Varṇa* and *kāra* are indicatory.

These two terms have already formed the subject of rules i.16-20. Rules vi.1,7 are cited as examples of their use.

## चापीत्यन्वदेशकौ ॥ ५ ॥

5. *Ca* and *api* are implicative.

Rules vi.3 and iv.4 are cited as containing examples of the use of these signs of continued implication from something that has gone before.

## त्वथैवेति विनिवर्तकाधिकारकावधारकाः ॥ ६ ॥

6. *Tu*, *atha*, and *eva* are exceptional, introductory, and restrictive, respectively.

The use of these connectives is instanced by quoting rules i.19, v.1, and xiv.3 (G. M. substitute vii.1 for the second).

These rules are too trivial and superficial to make it worth while to enter, in connection with them, into any discussion of the use of the particles in the text of the *Prātiçākhyā*. The index, and the notes on each rule, will give the means of investigating the matter. We have often had occasion to animadvert upon the commentator's

*ṭasya mṛd ity evaṁ çāstrasya varṇāḥ*<sup>12</sup>: *yāni dravyāṇi samvyavahārārthāni kartavyāni tāni vyākhyāsyāmaḥ. çabdasya dravyāṇi çabdadravyāṇi: tāni.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -*ta*. <sup>2</sup> O. ins. *vā*. <sup>3</sup> W. -*tre*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *katham*; O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. B. ins. *tasya rūpāṇi*. <sup>6</sup> W. O. -*bdā*. <sup>7</sup> O. *pradarçayishy-*. <sup>(8)</sup> O. *karmayate*. <sup>9</sup> W. *tatra*; B. *na*. <sup>10</sup> B. -*ya*; M. om. <sup>11</sup> O. om. <sup>12</sup> W. -*ṇa*; G. M. -*ṇānām*; O. *savarṇaḥ*.

4. *varṇaçabdaḥ kâraçabdaç ca nirdeçakâu*<sup>1</sup> *nirdeçavâcakâu*<sup>2</sup> *syâtâm. yathâ: avarṇavyañjanaçakuni* (vi.7) *iti: atha shakârañ sakâravisarjanîyâv* (vi.1) *iti. varṇaç ca kâraç ca varṇakârâu.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -*deçakâu vâc-*; O. om.

5. *ca: api: ity etâv* <sup>1</sup> *anvâdeçakâu syâtâm. pûrvâpekshayâ*<sup>2</sup> *'nvâdeça ity ucyate. yathâ: asadâmâsiñcañç ca* (vi.3): *itiparo 'pi* (iv.4).

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *çabdâu*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *pûrvapaksho*; O. *pûrvo paksho*.

6. *tu: atha: eva: ity ete çabdâ yathâkrameṇa*<sup>1</sup> *vinivartakâdhikârakâvadhârakâ bhavanti: yatra tuçabdaḥ çrûyate tatra*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



tone, they might more easily have been regarded as describing real processes of articulation.

अन्ववसर्गो मार्दवमुरुता खस्येति नीचैःकराणि ॥ १० ॥

10. Relaxation, softness, wideness of aperture, are producers of low tone.

The exposition of this rule runs quite parallel with that of the preceding (only O., however, referring to the definition of *anudatta*, 'grave,' as of low tone, at i.39). To *anvavasarga* is given *vinatata*, 'drooping condition,' as synonym; to *mārdava*, *snigdhatā*, 'smoothness;' and to *urutā*, *sthūlatā*, 'bigness.' There is nothing at all to commend in such a description of the way in which low tone is produced.

मन्द्रमध्यमताराणि स्थानानि भवन्ति ॥ ११ ॥

11. Soft, middle, and loud are the three qualities.

Their use, we are told, will be explained farther on—namely, in rules 4–10 of the next chapter. I have ventured to render *sthāna*, literally 'place' or 'position,' by 'quality,' as better expressing the nature of the distinctions implied. The name apparently comes from such theories as that laid down in rule xxiii.10 as to the "place" of production of the different qualities of tone.

In answer, we are told, to the suggested inquiry, "of what are

9. *uccāir udatta* (i.38) *ity uktam: tadartham idam ārabhate: lokavad yādṛchikoccāraṇapratishedhārtham<sup>1</sup>: āyāmo gātrāṇām dāirghyam: dāruṇyam svarasya kaṭhinatā: <sup>2</sup>anūtā khasya galavivarasya<sup>3</sup> saṁvṛtatā:<sup>2</sup> etāni sādhanāni<sup>4</sup> ṣabdasyo 'ccāiḥkarāni<sup>5</sup> <sup>6</sup>ṣabdam uccāir udattam kurvanti<sup>7</sup> 'ty arthaḥ. uccaṣabdam uccārayatāi 'tat kartavyam iti vidhiḥ." 'uccāiḥ kurvanti<sup>7</sup> 'ty uccāiḥkarāni<sup>7</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *yāvach-*; B. *hādach-*; W. B. O. *-rthaḥ*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> B. *-viraraṇasya*; G. M. *-viralasya*, and put after *saṁvṛtatā* (B. O. *-vṛtā*). <sup>4</sup> G. M. *nāmadheyāni*. <sup>5</sup> W. *'ccāik-*. <sup>(6)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(7)</sup> W. G. M. om.; B. adds *kapaṇini*, and om. the following rule.

10. <sup>1</sup> *anvavasargo gātrāṇām vinatata<sup>2</sup>: mārdavam svarasya snigdhatā: khasyo 'rutā kaṭhasya sthūlate 'ty<sup>3</sup> etāni sādhanāni ṣabdasya nīcāiḥkarāni ṣabdam nīcam anudattam<sup>4</sup> kurvanti<sup>7</sup> 'ty arthaḥ: nīcaṣabdam uccārayatāi<sup>5</sup> 'tat kartavyam iti vidhiḥ: nīcāiḥ kurvanti<sup>7</sup> 'ti nīcāiḥkarāni.*

<sup>(1)</sup> O. ins. *nīcāir anudatta* (i.39) *ity uktam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *vistr̥tatā*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *iti*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ud-*. <sup>5</sup> W. *uddhārayanū*; B. *-yan*; G. M. *-raṇiyatā*; O. *-raṇatā*.

11. <sup>1</sup> *mandram madhyamam tāram ce 'ti<sup>2</sup> sthānāni bhavanti:<sup>1</sup> mandram iti prathamam: madhyamam iti dvitīyam: tāram iti*



these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule.

तत्रैकविंशतिर्यमाः ॥ १२ ॥

12. In them are twenty-one tones.

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii.11 etc.). As synonym of *yama* is given *svara*, 'tone.'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous.

ऋग्विरामः पदविरामो विवृत्तिविरामः समानपदवि-  
वृत्तिविरामस्त्रिमात्रो द्विमात्र एकमात्रो ऽर्धमात्र इत्या-  
नुपूर्व्येण ॥ १३ ॥

13. The verse-pause, *pada*-pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three *moras*, two *moras*, one *mora*, and a half-*mora*.

As example of the pause of three *moras* at the end of a verse is quoted *ubhâ vâjasya sâtaye huve vâm*: (i.5.5<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first two words); of the pause of two *moras*, in *pada*-text, between the *padas*, *ishe* : *tvâ* : *urje* : *tvâ* (i.1.1 et al.): and, for all that the *Prâtiçâkhya* tells us, we are to regard the *avagraha* pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the *Rik* [i.6, r. 29] and *Vâjasaneyi* [v.1] *Prâtiçâkhyas* give it only one *mora*); of the hiatus-pause, *sa idhânaḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), *ta enam* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>), and *tâ asmât* (ii.4.4<sup>1</sup>: W. prefixes *ā*, but doubtless only by

*tr̥tīyam* : *eteshām*<sup>3</sup> *sthânânām prayojanam uttaratra*<sup>4</sup> *vakshyate.*  
<sup>5</sup>*etāni sthānāni keshām ityapekshâyām āha parasūtram*<sup>5</sup>.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) O. 'ty etāni. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. O. *esh*-. (<sup>4</sup>) B. *ituratra*. (<sup>5</sup>) O. om.

12. *teshu sthāneshu ekaviñçatir yamāḥ svarā bhavanti* : *teshām yamānām uttaratra prayojanam vakshyate.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *tatra trishu*; B. adds *trishu*.

13. *ṛgvirāmādayas trimâtrâdikâlâ*<sup>1</sup> *yathâkramam*<sup>2</sup> *bhavanti.*  
*yathâ*<sup>3</sup> : *ubhâ* ---- : *ity ṛgvirāmāḥ* : *ishe* ---- : *iti padavirāmāḥ* :  
*sa* ---- : *ta* ---- : *tâ* ---- : *iti vivṛttivirāmāḥ* : *praügam iti samâ-*  
*napadavivṛttivirāmāḥ.* <sup>4</sup>*ṛci*<sup>5</sup> *virāma ṛgvirāmāḥ* : *padasya virā-*  
*maḥ padavirāmāḥ* : *padadvayavivṛttâu*<sup>6</sup> *virāmo vivṛttivirāmāḥ*<sup>7,4</sup>.  
*çikshâyām*<sup>8</sup> *asya viçesha uktaḥ* :



a copyist's blunder); of the pause of interior hiatus, *praiṅgam* (iv. 4.2<sup>1</sup>), which is, I believe, the only case. The commentator also quotes a couple of verses from his *Çikshâ*, laying down four subdivisions of the pause of hiatus, and assigning them different quantities: that between a short and long vowel is *vatsānusṛti*, and is one *mora* long; that between a long and following short is *vatsānusārinī*, of the same length; between two short vowels, *pākavatī*, three quarters of a *mora*; between two long vowels, *pipīlikā*, a quarter-*mora* only (Uvata's comment on the Rik Prât. [ii.1] states the intervals quite differently). In W. there are two verses which are not found in the rest; as they stand, their meaning is in great part obscure to me, and I prefer to leave them unamended and untranslated.

यद्यञ्जनान्तं षड् चापि दीर्घः

संयोगपूर्वं च तथानुनासिकम् ॥

एतानि सर्वाणि गुह्यणि विद्याच्

हेषाण्यतो ऽन्यानि ततो लघूनि ॥ १४ ॥

14. A syllable that ends with a consonant, one that has a long vowel, one that precedes a conjunction of consonants, one that is nasal—all these are to be accounted heavy; the rest, other than these, are light.

<sup>9</sup>*pipīlikā dīrghasame ca madhye*

*savarṇatā pākavatī padāikye :*

*dr̥shṭvā ca vatsānusṛjas tv asāmye*

*tv atho 'ci mukhyas tu virāmakālah.1.*

*svarodaye tv anusvāro bhaved adhyaṇumātrikaḥ :*

*virāmaṣ ca tayor madhye vāiṣeshikāc ca dīrghayoḥ.2.<sup>9</sup>*

*hrasvādir vatsānusṛtir<sup>10</sup> ante vatsānusārinī :*

*pākavaty ubhayahrasvā<sup>11</sup> dīrghobhayā<sup>12</sup> pipīlikā.*

<sup>13</sup>*mātrā<sup>14</sup> ca<sup>15</sup> vatsānusṛtis<sup>16</sup> tathā vatsānusārinī :*

*pādonā syāt pākavatī pādumātrā pipīlikā.<sup>13</sup>*

<sup>17</sup>*samānam ca tat padam ca samānapadam : ekapadam ity arthaḥ<sup>17</sup> :* <sup>18</sup>*samānapade vivṛtṭiḥ samānapadavivṛtṭiḥ : tasyām<sup>19</sup> virāmaḥ<sup>20</sup> samānapadavivṛtṭivirāmaḥ.* <sup>21</sup>*tisro mātrā yasyā 'sau trimātraḥ :* <sup>22</sup>*dve mātre yasyā 'sau dvimātraḥ : ekā mātrā yasyā 'sāv ekamātraḥ : ardhā mātrā yasyā 'sāv ardhamātraḥ<sup>22</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -trak-. <sup>2</sup> O. -mena. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(4)</sup> O. puts below, at 18. <sup>5</sup> W. ṛg; G. M. ṛco. <sup>6</sup> B. padavi-; O. -yamadhye vivṛtṭi. <sup>7</sup> W. B. om.; O. padaviv-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ins. apy. <sup>(9)</sup> in W. only. <sup>10</sup> W. -tsānujasṛtimadhyer; G. M. -nusūtr. <sup>11</sup> B. -yoh-; G. M. -yeh-. <sup>12</sup> G. M. -ghayos tu. <sup>(13)</sup> O. om. <sup>14</sup> G. M. -trikā. <sup>15</sup> G. M. om. <sup>16</sup> W. -nusṛjanti; G. M. -nukṛtis. <sup>(17)</sup> O. puts below, at 21. <sup>18</sup> O. puts (4) here. <sup>19</sup> W. om.; B. -smā; O. -sya. <sup>20</sup> W. om. <sup>21</sup> O. puts (17) here. <sup>(22)</sup> in G. M. only.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



अव्यञ्जनान्तं यद्भ्रस्वमसंयोगपरं च यत् ।

अननुस्वारसंयुक्तमेतल्लघु निबोधतै

तल्लघु निबोधत ॥ १५ ॥

15. A syllable that does not end with a consonant, that has a short vowel, and that is not followed by a conjunction of consonants, and one that is not combined with *anusvâra*—know that to be light.

This is a mere negative to the preceding rule, and a wholly superfluous addition to it—and an addition made, we may conjecture, by a different and later hand: the use of the term *anusvâra* distinctly suggests this.

The commentator quotes, by way of example of light syllables, simply *madudayanâ asan* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit the last word).

## CHAPTER XXIII.

CONTENTS: 1–3, causes of the differences of articulated sounds; 4–10, qualities or temperaments of voice; 11–19, tone or pitch of utterance; 20, general mode of correct utterance.

अथ वर्णविशेषोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the origin of the differences of articulate sounds.

15. *'avyañjanântam yad aksharam yac ca hrasvam yac 'câ 'saṁyogaparam' yac câ 'nanusvârasaṁyuktam etat sarvam aksharam laghu' nibodhata' jânîdhvam. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: mad-.... ityâdi. vyañjanam ante<sup>5</sup> yasya tad vyañjanântam: 'na vyañjanântam avyañjanântam: 'saṁyogaḥ paro yasmât tat saṁyogaparam: 'na saṁyogaparam' asaṁyogaparam: 'anusvâreṇa saṁyuktam' anusvârasaṁyuktam: 'nâ 'nusvârasaṁyuktam' ananusvârasaṁyuktam.*

*iti tribhâshyaratne prâtiçâkhyavivarane*

*dvâviñço<sup>10</sup> 'dhyâyah.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) W. *ca saṁyogapûrveram.* (<sup>3</sup>) W. B. *laghû.* (<sup>4</sup>) W. om. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. *antam.* (<sup>6</sup>) W. om. (<sup>7</sup>) G. M. *tadbhinnam.* (<sup>8</sup>) O. om.; W. *yuktam* only. (<sup>9</sup>) B. om.; G. M. *anusvârayogavirahitam.* (<sup>10</sup>) G. M. O. *dvitîyapraçne daçamo.*

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah: varṇânâm viçeshotpattir ucyata ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmaḥ. varṇânâm viçesho varṇaviçeshah: tasyo 'tpattiḥ sâ tatho 'ktâ.*



It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow.

अनुप्रदानात्संसर्गात्स्थानात्करणविन्ययात् ।

जायते वर्णविशेष्यं परिमाणाच्च पञ्चमाद् इति ॥ २ ॥

2. The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity.

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different. The *anuprâdana* is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate *h*-sound (ii.8-10); by *sañsarga* (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (*sparçana*, ii.33), approach (*upasañhâra*, ii.31), and the like (ii.14,16,45 etc.); *sthâna*, 'place, position,' and *karaṇa*, 'producing organ,' are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (*vinyaya*, which the commentator explains by *vinyâsa* [B. reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning); *parimâna*, 'measure' (used only here), is synonymous with *kâla*, 'time, quantity' (see i.31-37). The commentator takes *a* as an example, and says of it that its "emitted material" is tone; its "closure," in the throat; its "position," the two jaws; and its "disposition of producing organ," the two lips. Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work: *a* is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule; and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration.

वर्णपृक्तः शब्दो वाच उत्पत्तिः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice.

The commentator defines *prkta* by *miçra*, 'mixed,' and *utpatti*

2. *anupradânâdibhiḥ pañcabhiḥ<sup>1</sup> karaṇâir varṇavâiçeshyam<sup>2</sup> jāyate. akârasya tâvad anupradânâṁ nâdaḥ: sañsargaḥ kaṇṭhe: sthânaṁ hanû: karaṇavinyaya<sup>3</sup> oshṭhâu: vinyayo nâma vinyâsaḥ: parimânaṁ<sup>4</sup> mâtrâkâlaḥ: evaṁ sarvavarṇânâṁ boddhavyam. viçeshabhâvo<sup>5</sup> vâiçeshyam: varṇânâṁ vâiçeshyam varṇavâiçeshyam<sup>6</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -ṇânâṁ v-. <sup>3</sup> O. -nyâsa. <sup>4</sup> W. O. *parim-*, as also (with T.) in the rule. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. -shasya bh-. <sup>6</sup> W. O. om.; G. M. *tathâ*.

3. *prkto miçra ity arthaḥ: varṇamiçraḥ<sup>1</sup> çabdo vâco vâkyasyo*



by *upādāna* and *kāraṇa*, 'cause.' This combination denies the quality of voice to the mere "sound" of drums and the like.

सप्त वाच स्थानानि भवन्ति ॥ ४ ॥

4. Of voice, there are seven qualities.

Here is a different and expanded version of the doctrine of three qualities, as laid down above, in rule xxii.11. The following rules give the details. The commentator gives of *sthāna* the lucid definition "those whereby the voice is put to use, and that wherein it stands—that is *sthāna*."

उपांशुधाननिमदोपब्दिमन्मन्द्रमध्यमताराणि ॥ ५ ॥

5. Namely, inaudible, murmur, whisper, mumbling, soft, middle, and loud.

The rules that follow define the senses in which we are to understand the terms here given. They indicate plainly enough a continual progression, from inaudible and merely mental utterance up to loud and distinct speaking; but it is not easy to find words which shall represent them closely.

करणावदशब्दममनःप्रयोगमुपांशु ॥ ६ ॥

6. "Inaudible" is without sound, without application of mind, but with articulating action.

The commentator explains *karaṇavat* by *prayatnavat*, 'with effort,' and states its object to be to deny absolute silence to the *upāṅṣu*. "Without sound" signifies the exceeding littleness of

*'tpattir upādānaṁ<sup>2</sup> kāraṇam bhavati. varṇaprṛkta iti kim: dundubhyādiṣabdānāṁ vākya<sup>3</sup> mā bhūd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> MSS. -ṣra. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. O. -na. <sup>3</sup> B. -tvaṁ.

4. *'vacah sapta sthānāni bhavanti:<sup>1</sup> tāny uttarasūtre vakshyante. yāir vāk<sup>2</sup> prayujyate<sup>3</sup> yasmiṅ ca tishṭhati tat<sup>4</sup> sthānam: tāni yathākramam udāharishyāmaḥ.*

(1) G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. -kyaṁ. <sup>3</sup> B. yuj-; W. O. add se. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

5. *upāṅṣu iti prathamam vāca sthānam: dhvāna<sup>1</sup> iti dvitīyam: nimada<sup>2</sup> iti tritīyam: evam itarāṅy api nāmataḥ saptāi 'tāni sthānāni jānīyāt. uparitanam<sup>3</sup> sūtram ārabhya pratyekam eṣhām lakṣhaṇam<sup>4</sup> vakshyate<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -nam; G. M. -nam. <sup>2</sup> O. -dam. <sup>3</sup> B. O. -na. <sup>4</sup> G. M. sthānānām. <sup>5</sup> G. M. lak-.

6. *karaṇavat prayatnavad ity arthaḥ: nā 'sti ṣabdo dhvanir asminn ity<sup>1</sup> aṣabdām<sup>2</sup>: manasā prayogo manaḥprayogaḥ<sup>3</sup>: nā 'sti*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



I have rendered *nimada* by ‘whisper’ rather at a venture: whether the word accurately represents it or not is at any rate of very small consequence.

मशब्दमुपबिमत ॥ १ ॥

9. “Mumbling” is the same, with sound.

*Çabda* would seem to be used here in the sense of *nāda*, ‘tone,’ if the definition is to be made anything of; the term *upabdimat* is found in the *Tāittirīya-Sanhitā* (at iii.1.9<sup>1</sup>), used in antithesis to *upāñṣu*.

उरसि मन्द्रं कण्ठे मध्यमं शिरसि तारम् ॥ १० ॥

10. “Soft” is in the chest, “middle” in the throat, “loud” in the head.

The South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) divide this rule into three, and break up the comment into three corresponding parts, without other change. I presume that the treatment of the whole as one rule is more original; the subject joins on, as it were, to rule xxii. 11, and gives the received doctrine as to the mode of production of the three qualities of voice there laid down. And the distinction of the four other qualities by which “soft” shades off into utter inaudibility is a later addition to the doctrine—one of those pieces of useless over-refinement which are thoroughly characteristic of the Hindu mode of working.

The commentator points out that the first four of the seven *sthānas* described in this chapter are used “in sacrifices etc. ;” and the last three, at the morning, noon, and evening *savanas*, or somalibrations, respectively. And he quotes “from the *Çikshā*” a pair of verses which are found in the Rik-version of the *pāṇinīya Çikshā* (verses 36,37; see Weber’s *Indische Studien*, iv.363–4), to the effect that “in early morning, one must always read with chest-tone, resembling the growl of the tiger; at noon, with throat-tone,

9. <sup>1</sup> *aksharavyañjanānām saçabdam upalabdhir<sup>2</sup> upabdiman<sup>3</sup> nāma caturtham vāca sthānam bhavati<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *çabdena saha vartata iti saçabdam.* <sup>2</sup> W. O. om.; B. -bdhiman. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om.

10. *yatro 'rasi sthāne prayoga upalabhyate tan mandram nāma<sup>1</sup> vācaḥ pañcamam<sup>2</sup> sthānam<sup>3</sup>. yatra kaṇṭhe sthāne prayoga upalabhyate tan madhyamam nāma shashṭham vāca sthānam<sup>4</sup>. yatra çirasi sthāne prayoga upalabhyate tat tāram nāma sapta-  
mam vāca sthānam<sup>5</sup>. eteshv āditaç caturṇām<sup>6</sup> 'yajñādishu pra-  
yogaḥ<sup>7</sup>: mandram<sup>8</sup> prātaḥsavana upayujyate<sup>8</sup>: madhyamam mā-  
dhyandine savane<sup>9</sup>: tāram trītyasavane. çikshā cāi vaṁ vak-  
shyati:*



like the warble of the *cakravâka*; the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, *han̄sa* and *kokila*.”

The Rik Pr. (xiii.17) teaches the same three *sthânas*, but calls the third *uttama* instead of *târa*. The Vâj. Pr. (i.10,30) lays down their number and their place of production (assigning to the third the *bhrûmadhya*, ‘middle of the brows,’ instead of *çiras*, ‘head’), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance; the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper “registers” of a voice; and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

मन्द्रादिषु त्रिषु स्थानेषु सप्तसप्त यमाः ॥ ११ ॥

11. In the three qualities beginning with “soft,” there are seven tones each.

As synonym of *yama*, the commentator gives *svara*, doubtless here to be understood as ‘musical note, tone of the gamut;’ he adds ‘acute, and so on,’ which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant ‘accent’ instead of ‘musical tone,’ or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

*prâtaḥ pathen*<sup>10</sup> *nityam urasthitena*<sup>11</sup>  
*svareṇa çârdûlarutopamena*<sup>12</sup>:  
*madhyandine kaṇṭhagatena câi* ’va  
*cakrâhvasamkûjitasam̄nibhena.*  
*târam̄ tu vidyât savanam̄*<sup>13</sup> *tr̄tîyam̄*<sup>14</sup>  
*çirogataṁ*<sup>15</sup> *tac ca sadâ*<sup>16</sup> *prayoḥyam :*  
*mayûrahaṅsânyabhṛtasvanânâm*  
*tulyena nâdena çirasthitena*<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. put before *vâcaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. *kaṇṭhe madhyamam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. *çirasi târam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. <sup>6</sup> B. *caturvarnânâm*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. *-shû* ’pay-. <sup>(8)</sup> W. *-nam up-*; G. M. *-ne urasi prayu-*. <sup>9</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> W. *ka-*; G. M. *-than*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-sthalena*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-rato-*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-ne*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-ye*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *-otthitam̄*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *tathâ*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *çirogatena*.

11. *trishu mandrâdishu sthâneshv ekâikasmint saptasapta yamâ bhavanti: yamâḥ* <sup>1</sup>*svarâḥ: udâttâdaya*<sup>1</sup> *iti yâvat. saptasapte* <sup>2</sup>*ti vîpsâdyâ*<sup>2</sup> *ekâikasminn iti labhyate. ke te*<sup>3</sup> *yamâ ity âçañkyo* <sup>4</sup>*ttarasûtreṇo*<sup>4</sup> *’ttaram âha.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *svarâdaya*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *-yâḥ*; O. *-yâm*. <sup>3</sup> W. O. *ne*; G. M. O. put before *ke*. <sup>4</sup> W. *-tro*.



musical pitch—an identity which is the ground of their common appellation.

The same statement, as to the seven *yamas* or ‘tones’ in each *sthāna*, ‘register’ or ‘scale,’ and the same identification with the *svaras*, are made in the Rik Prât. (xiii.17). We are to assume, without much question, that the scales pass into one another by a constant ascending series, like the bass and soprano scales in our own system of musical notation.

## कृष्टप्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थमन्द्रातिस्वार्याः ॥ १२ ॥

12. Namely *kr̥shṭa*, first, second, third, fourth, *mandra*, and *atisvārya*.

These are not the ordinary names of the seven notes of the Hindu scale, or *svaras* (for which, see Jones “on the Musical Modes of the Hindus,” As. Res., vol. iii.; Weber’s Indische Studien, viii.259 ff.); but they are, apparently, alternative appellations for the same thing; they are given by Uvaṭa, in his comment on Rik Prât. xiii.17, as used *sāmasu*, ‘in the *sāmans*,’ or ‘in the Sâma-Veda’ (Müller’s Rik Pr., p. cclxxii.). Uvaṭa calls the first *krusṭa*, instead of *kr̥shṭa*, and the same is the reading of G. M. in our rules and their commentary, as also of T. in rule 14 only (Müller, l. c., p. cclxxiii., marginal note, states *krusṭa* or *kusṭa* to be the reading of O. also, but the maker of my collation does not note the fact, except once, under rule 14, in putting in on the margin a passage inserted out of place).

## तेषां दीप्तिजोपलब्धिः ॥ १३ ॥

13. Of these, the perception is born of brightness.

I have simply translated the problematical word *dīptijā* literally, without claiming to understand what it signifies. The comment throws no light upon it, nor do I get any from any other quarter. The former says merely that the perception of each preceding one is “born from the brightness” of its successor; namely, the per-

12. *kr̥shṭaḥ<sup>1</sup> ca<sup>2</sup> prathamāḥ ca<sup>3</sup> dvitīyāḥ ca trītiyāḥ ca caturthāḥ<sup>4</sup> ca mandrāḥ<sup>4</sup> cā ’tisvāryāḥ ca kr̥shṭaprathamadvitīyatṛtīyacaturthamandrātīsvāryāḥ<sup>5</sup>: te tatho ’ktāḥ: ’ete khalu<sup>6</sup> yamā nāma.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *krusṭaḥ* (as also in the rule). <sup>2</sup> O. om. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> O. om. *ca*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> B. *kr̥shṭādayo*.

13. *teshām<sup>1</sup> khalu saptayamānām<sup>2</sup> uttarottaradīptijā<sup>3</sup> pūrvapūrvopalabdhiḥ<sup>4</sup>,<sup>1</sup> syāt. tat<sup>5</sup> katham: atīsvāryadīptijā mandropalabdhiḥ<sup>6</sup>: mandrāc caturthopalabdhiḥ: caturthāt trītiyāḥ: trītiyād dvitīyāḥ: dvitīyāt prathamāḥ: prathamāt kr̥shṭa<sup>7</sup> upalabhyate.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *dīptijopalabdhiḥ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *saptasvarānām*. <sup>3</sup> B. *-rād-*; G. M. *-ran d-*. <sup>4</sup> O. *pūrvop-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *mantr-*; G. M. *nimadop-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *krusṭaḥ*; O. *kr̥shṭaḥ ity*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## द्वितीयान्मन्द्रस्तैत्तिरीयाणां तृतीयचतुर्थावनन्तरं त- च्चतुर्यममित्याचक्षते ॥ १६ ॥

16. According to the Tâittirîyas, the *mandra* proceeds from the "second," and the "third" and "fourth" come next after: this they style the tone-quaternion.

The order of the four tones is not made entirely clear by this rule, nor by the commentator's explanation of it. The latter says that "the *mandra* of the Tâittirîyas is born or produced from the 'second;'" and, if the expression be used in a manner akin with those under rule 13, this would imply that the *mandra* came first, and the "second" after—which would, of course, accord best with the value of the two names: *mandra* would thus be the lowest of the four *yamas*, as it is the lowest of the three *sthânas*. But the commentator then goes on to say that the series of *yamas* thus "beginning with 'second'" is styled tone-quaternion: and this would imply that the order is second, *mandra*, third, fourth. Yet further, he adds that "second" is *udâta*, *mandra* is *anudâta*, and "third" and "fourth" are *svârîta* and *pracaya*. This makes the impression of a purely formal and unintelligent identification, or a forcing through of a parallelism between the four tones and the four accepted accents (which, however, are in respect to tone only three, since the *pracaya* is "of *udâta* tone," xxi.10), without the slightest regard to the already defined tonic quality of the accents. The comment, in truth, through this whole subject, seems to be written with a very insufficient comprehension of the meaning of the text: see especially the rules that follow.

Our attention is called to the fact that the preceding rule laid down the number of the Tâittirîya *yamas*, the present one undertaking nothing more than to describe their order; and that the intention of the last words of the rule is therefore simply to give a name to the series. I have pointed out above, however, that rules 14 and 15 seem to have been put in by themselves, without any regard to 16.

16. <sup>1</sup>*tâittirîyâṇām dvitîyât khalu mandro jāyate: tadananta-*  
*ram<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>tr̥tîyacaturthâu syâtâm: etad eva dvitîyâdi<sup>3</sup> svaramaṇḍa-*  
*lam<sup>4</sup> caturyamam<sup>5</sup> ity âcakshate. yo <sup>6</sup>dvitîyah sa udâttaḥ: <sup>7</sup>yo<sup>6</sup>*  
*mandraḥ so 'nudâttaḥ: <sup>8</sup>*yâu tr̥tîyacaturthâu<sup>8</sup> tâu svaritapracayâv*  
*<sup>9</sup>ity arthaḥ<sup>9</sup>. anena sûtrena pûrveshâm<sup>10</sup> eva caturṇâm svarâṇâm*  
*kramaniyamah kriyate: catuḥsamkhyâ tu pûrvasâtrenâi <sup>11</sup>'vo<sup>11</sup>*  
*<sup>12</sup>'ktâ: tasmâd atra caturyamam ity etat sanjñâvidhiparam<sup>12</sup> iti*  
*pratîyate.**

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om. (along with all the rule save the first three words). (<sup>2</sup>) G. om. (<sup>3</sup>) W. B. O. -âdih. (<sup>4</sup>) W. B. -ṇḍanam. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. -yam. (<sup>6</sup>) B. dvitîyo udâttaḥ. (<sup>7</sup>) G. M. O. om. (<sup>8</sup>) W. dvitî-. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>10</sup>) W. sarv-; G. M. O. pûrvoktânâm. (<sup>11</sup>) O. om. eva. (<sup>12</sup>) W. O. -dhinâparamam; G. M. -dhânap-.



The mention of the Tâittirîyas here, and in this manner, seems to indicate that the Prâtiçâkhyâ does not belong to their school, or concern itself with their *çâkhâ*; although, perhaps, both stand in an especially near relation to it. See what is said upon this point in the concluding note.

## तस्मिन्द्वयमात्रा वृत्तिः ॥ १७ ॥

17. In it, progression is by intervals of two tones.

I have rendered this rule according to what seems to me most likely to be its real meaning—although, at the same time, I do not feel by any means confident that I understand it correctly. If the Tâittirîyas acknowledge only four notes in the scale or octave, it seems natural that they should fix these at wider intervals from one another; and the phraseology of the rule is well enough calculated to express this. The verification or rejection of my version may be left till we shall better comprehend the Hindu musical system, and its modification or adaptation as here presented. I am, at any rate, persuaded that my guess is more likely to be right than either of the two which the commentator ventures. Of these, the first is nothing less than absurd: it makes *tasmin* refer to *anudâtta*, although such an antecedent can only have tumbled in out of the clouds, there having been nothing whatever to suggest it in the preceding rules; and renders ‘in this *anudâtta* there is a being-within of two *yamas*; that is to say, in *anudâtta* inheres the quality of *svarita* and also that of *pracaya*’! And, as examples of this wonderful *anudâtta*, are quoted *sâ nah parshat* (not found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, but occurs Rig-Veda i.99.1; x.187.1–5; and Atharva-Veda vii.63.1), and *pâry avadatâm* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>).

The commentator’s second guess is so far better than his first that he gives the obviously correct interpretation of *tasmin*, as referring to *caturyamam* in the preceding rule; but he makes out the meaning to be that, in this series of *svaras*, two are contained in the interior, or are included between the other two. And he

---

17. *dvâu ca tâu yamâu ca<sup>1</sup> dviyamâu<sup>2</sup>: dviyamayor<sup>3</sup> antarâvṛttir madhyavṛttis<sup>4</sup> tasminn anudâtte<sup>5</sup> bhavati: svaritatvam pracayatvam câ ’nudâtte<sup>5</sup> bhavatî ’ty arthaḥ. yuthâ: sa----: pary-----.*

*kecid anyathâ kathayanti: tasmiñ<sup>6</sup> caturyame<sup>7</sup> svaramaṇḍale dviyamântarâ<sup>8</sup> vṛttiḥ: svaradvayasya<sup>9</sup> madhye vartamânani syât<sup>10</sup>.*

*anudâtto hr̥di jñeyo mûrdhny udâtta udâhṛtaḥ:*

*svaritaḥ karṇamûlîyah<sup>11</sup> sarvânge<sup>12</sup> pracayaḥ smṛtaḥ.*

<sup>13</sup>*asyâ ’yam arthaḥ: <sup>13</sup> udâttânudâttayor<sup>14</sup> <sup>15</sup>madhye svaritapracayayor<sup>15</sup> antarâvṛttir bhavati. <sup>16</sup>tathâ kâuhaleyahastavinyâśasamaye ’pi<sup>16</sup> svaritapracayayor antarâvṛttir upadiçyate:*



cites a verse: “*anudatta* is to be known as in the heart; *udatta* is uttered in the head; *svarita* is at the root of the ears (or of the throat, as G. M. have it); *pracaya* is declared to be in the whole member (or to belong to the whole mouth, W. says);” the meaning of which he states to be that *svarita* and *pracaya* are found between *udatta* and *anudatta*—forgetting that under the previous rule he had assigned them a different position. Further, he says that the interior position of *svarita* and *pracaya* is shown in Kâuhaleya’s system of motions of the hand, as appears from the verse “the chief of the digits (i. e. the thumb) points out *udatta* when its apex is applied to the root of the forefinger; when to the last but one (i. e. the ring-finger) and to the middle finger, it points out the *svarita* and the *dhr̥ta*; when to the little finger, the *anudatta*.” This verse occurs in the Rik-version of the *pāṇinīya* Çikshâ (as verse 43: see Weber’s Indische Studien, iv.365): the commentator does not regard it as a Çikshâ verse, but adds yet another which he claims to take from his Çikshâ, although it is not found in either version of the known treatise of that name (but compare verse 44, l. c., p. 366): “the little finger, the ring-finger, the middle finger, and the forefinger—these, along with the tip of the thumb, severally point out the grave, circumflex, *dhr̥ta*, and acute accents.” The *pracaya* is here twice called *dhr̥ta*, and it again, apparently, receives the same name in the last rule of the chapter (unfortunately, I overlooked these passages when commenting on the term *dhr̥tapracaya* in rule xviii.3): “sustained” or “continued” is a sufficiently natural substitute for *pracaya*, as appellation of the accent in question.

I do not understand precisely what and how much credit the commentator intends to claim for these two explanations in calling them (in his final remark) *mukhya*: if he means that they are the best among a number which had been suggested and might have been reported, it is so much the worse for the rest.

<sup>17</sup>*udattam akhyāti vr̥sho ’ngulīndm  
pradeçinīmūlanivishṭamūrdhā:  
upāntamadhye<sup>18</sup> svaritam dhr̥tam ca  
kanishṭhikāyām anudattam eve* ’ti<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>19</sup>*çikshâvacanam api<sup>19</sup> cāi ’vam vakshyati:  
kanishṭhikā<sup>20</sup> ’nāmikā ca<sup>21</sup> madhyamā ca pradeçinī:  
nīcasvāradhr̥todāttān aṅgushṭhāgreṇa<sup>22</sup> nirdiçet.  
mukhyam eva<sup>23</sup> vyākhyānavayam<sup>24</sup> etat.*

<sup>1</sup> MSS. om. <sup>2</sup> W. O. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. -mor. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.; B. *medhyev-*; O. *madhyev-*. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -iñç. <sup>7</sup> W. B. O. *ma*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. O. *dvitīy-*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. -*dvīyamasya*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. O. ins. *tathā hi*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *kaṇṭham-*. <sup>12</sup> W. *sarvāsyaḥ*; O. *sayāsye*. <sup>(13)</sup> W. om.; B. om. *asya*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *udāttānudāttasvarita*. <sup>(15)</sup> W. om. <sup>(16)</sup> O. om.; G. M. -*leye hast-*. <sup>(17)</sup> O. om.; G. M. *akhyāti yathā : pradeçinīmūla udattam upāntamadhyaḥ svaritam ca kanishṭhikāyām anudattam iti*. <sup>18</sup> W. *atecam-*. <sup>(19)</sup> O. *çikshā*. <sup>20</sup> O. -*shṭhā*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *cā ’pi*; O. *cā ’tha*. <sup>22</sup> O. *aṅgushṭhayena*. <sup>23</sup> G. M. *evam*. <sup>24</sup> W. O. -*nam dv-*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



garded as separating the different accentual pitches from one another, the commentator simply confuses the two together, and regards as said of the one what has reference only to the other.

क्रमिवक्रमसंपन्नामद्भुतामविलम्बिताम् ।

नीचोच्चस्वारसंपन्नां वदेद्भुतवतीः समां

वदेद्भुतवतीः समामिति ॥ २० ॥

20. It must be uttered with *krama* and *vikrama*, not hurried, not delayed, with grave, acute, and circumflex accent, with *pracaya*, and even.

The commentator supplies *vṛttim* as the subject of all these attributes, accounting for it as derived from rule 17, above. This is hardly admissible; but what is to be understood instead is doubtful, depending upon the connection in which this verse may have stood in the text from which it was taken. The same connection would perhaps explain what *krama* and *vikrama* are to be regarded as meaning: the commentator defines *krama* by *dvitva*, 'duplication' (taught in chapter xiv.), and *vikrama* as the accent of that name prescribed at xix.1,2; but it seems very unlikely that two things so dissimilar would be thus combined, or that a detail of accent would not be put in the second line, with the rest of its kind (compare rule xxiv.6, where *krama* and *vikrama* are found again in conjunction). *Dhṛta* is defined as synonymous with *pracaya*: compare the note to rule 17, above. *Samām* means, we are told, 'free from the faults of deficiency and excess in the matter of *udāta* and the other accents.'

There are slight variations of reading in the rule, T. giving *adhṛutām* in *pāda b*; B. *svara* for *svāra* in *c*; W. G. M. having *vade* for *vaded*, and W. *drutavatīñ* and T. *dratav-* after it; but they are mere errors of scribes, as the comment plainly shows.

20. *tāittirīyāhvāarakamatānirūpako*<sup>1</sup> 'yam ṣlokaḥ: *kramavikramābhyān*<sup>2</sup> *sampannām: kramo nāma*<sup>3</sup> *dvitvam*<sup>4</sup>: *vikramas tu svaritayor madhye yatra nīcam*<sup>5</sup> (xix.1) *ityuktalakṣaṇaḥ: adrutām atvaritām: avilambitām amandām: nīccasvārasampannām anudāttodāttasvaritasahitām*<sup>6</sup> *dhṛtavatīm pracayavatīm: samām udāttādibhir nyūnātirekādidosharahitām*<sup>7</sup>: *vaded brūyāt:* <sup>8</sup> *vṛttim*<sup>9</sup> *ity arthaḥ: vṛttim iti katham labhyate: tasmīn dviyamāntarā vṛttir*<sup>10</sup> (xxiii.17) *itiprakṛtatvād*<sup>11</sup> *iti brūmaḥ.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣākhyavivarane*  
*trayoviṅṣo*<sup>12</sup> 'dhyāyaḥ.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -rakam etan nir.; O. -rakāmatan nir. <sup>2</sup> W. -vikrama. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *dvitvaparyāyaḥ*. <sup>5</sup> O. -cañ syād. <sup>6</sup> B. -ritapracayasamh-. <sup>7</sup> B. *nyūnātirik-tādi-*; O. *nyūnādirek-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ins. *imām*. <sup>9</sup> B. om. <sup>10</sup> O. v. <sup>11</sup> O. -kṛtitv-. <sup>12</sup> G. M. O. *dvitīyapraṣṇe ekādaṣo*.



## CHAPTER XXIV.

CONTENTS: 1-4, the four *saṃhitâs* or texts; 5-6, qualifications of a Veda-reader and teacher.

अथ चतस्रः संहिताः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the four texts.

A simple heading to the following rules.

पदसंहिताक्षरसंहिता वर्णसंहिताङ्गसंहिता चे-  
ति ॥ २ ॥

2. Word-text, syllable-text, letter-text, and member-text, namely.

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of *saṃhitâs*. The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the *Prâtiçâkhyâ*. To the "word-text" he assigns chapters v.-ix., xi., xii., and xiii.1-4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of *pada*-text into *saṃhitâ*. To the "syllable-text" he assigns chapter x., which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two. With the "letter-text" are concerned chapters xiii. (i. e. except rules 1-4), xiv., and xvi., mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the *Sanhitâ* of *ṇ* and *ṅ*, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination. And the "member-text" is said to be taught in chapter

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikârah : catasrah saṃhitâ<sup>1</sup> ucyanta<sup>2</sup> ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyâmah<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *-yate*.

2. *padâksharavarṇâṅgâçrayâç<sup>1</sup> catasrah saṃhitâḥ kramena boddhavyâḥ. pañcamâdhyâyam<sup>2</sup> 'ârabhyâ<sup>3</sup> navamâd ekâdaçad dvâdaçâu<sup>4</sup> trayodaçasyâ<sup>5</sup> 'dâu sūtracatusṭayam ca padasaṃhitâ. daçamo 'ksharasaṃhitâ. trayodaçacaturdaçâu<sup>6</sup> shodaçaç ca varṇasaṃhitâ. 'vyañjanaṅ svarâṅgam (xxi.1) ity eshâ<sup>7</sup> 'ṅgasaṃhitâ. etâç<sup>8</sup> catasrah saṃhitâḥ. eteshv anyatra<sup>9</sup> vihitam nishiddham<sup>10</sup> ca kâryam sarvasaṃhitâsu<sup>11</sup> kuryât<sup>12</sup>: yatrâ<sup>13</sup> 'rshagrahaṇâdiko viçesho nâ 'sti<sup>14</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *-gâ ayâç*; O. *-gâyâç*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. O. *ârabhya â nav-*; G. M. *ârabhya ûnapadâikâdaç-*; W. O. *-dvâdaçâ*. <sup>3</sup> O. *-çâ*. <sup>4</sup> W. *-rdaçâ*. <sup>(5)</sup> B. G. M. *ekaviṅço*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> O. ins. *ca*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *nishidhyakañ*. <sup>9</sup> B. *-tâ*; G. M. *sarvatra saṃh-*; O. *sahit-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *syât*. <sup>11</sup> W. B. O. *atrâ*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. add *tatra kuryât*.



xxi. (rules 1-9), which prescribes of what vowel each consonant shall be regarded as "member" or adjunct, or lays down the rules of syllabication. And it is added that whatever is prescribed or forbidden elsewhere than in [the rules belonging to each of] these is of force in all the different texts, unless there be some special restriction, as by the use of the word *ārsha* (ix.21; x.13) or the like.

It is unnecessary to point out that the Prâtiçâkhya contemplates no such division of its rules and restriction of their application as is here made, and that, unless the distinction of texts laid down in the rule means something different from what the commentator explains it to be, it is trivial and worthless.

### नानापदसंधानसंयोगः पदसंज्ञितेत्यभिधीयते ॥ ३ ॥

3. Conjunction of independent words by euphonic combination is called word-text.

The commentator first explains *saṁdhâna* as modifying *saṁyoga* in quality of a locative, and then declares the use of the two equivalent terms to be for the purpose of signifying the exceeding closeness of the combination (if, as I presume to be the case, the reading of B. is here the correct one). And he quotes the rule of Pânini (i.4.109) as what "the grammarians" say upon the subject, giving the definition of *saṁhitâ* or combined text. As example of word-text, he gives *agne dudhra gahya kiñçila vanya yâ ta ishuh* (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *ishuh*).

This interpretation makes *padasaṁhitâ* signify what we are wont to call *saṁhitâ* simply, in distinction from *padapâtha*, or *padasaṁhitâ* as usually employed, 'pada-text.'

### यथास्वमन्त्रसंज्ञितादीनामप्येवम् ॥ ४ ॥

4. And in like manner with the syllable-text and the rest, in accordance with their several names.

The commentator explains *yathâsvam* as signifying 'it goes on without exceeding that which is its own,' and pronounces it a 'distinction of office or use;' thus, namely, the peculiar form of all the other specified texts is to be determined; the combination of inde-

3. *nânâbhûtayoḥ padayoḥ saṁdhâne yaḥ saṁyogaḥ sa pada-saṁhite 'ty abhidhîyata ucyata ity arthaḥ. yathâ: agne----- ekârthayoḥ saṁdhânasamyoğaçabdayoḥ<sup>1</sup> prayogaḥ saṁdhânâdhikyârthaḥ<sup>2</sup>. tathâ ca vâiyâkaraṇâḥ<sup>3</sup> paṭhanti<sup>4</sup>: paraḥ saṁnikarshaḥ saṁhite 'ti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -yogayoḥ; O. *saṁyogesambadhânaç-* sambandhikârthaḥ; O. *sambandhikthâdhârthaḥ.* <sup>2</sup> W. -*nâdikyâdityarthaḥ*; G. M. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. -*nâ.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *bhaṇanti*; O. *api.*

4. *svaṁsvam<sup>1</sup> anatikramya vartata iti yathâsvam: kriyâviçeshanam<sup>2</sup> evâi 'tat<sup>2</sup>: evam aksharasamhitâdînâm api yathâsvam<sup>3</sup>*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



The commentator explains *vedabhāshām* as meaning either 'voice having the form of Veda,' i. e. the uttered material of the Veda, or (according to another sense of *bhāshā*) 'explanation of the Veda.' The particle *tu* in the last half-verse (which I have omitted in translating, as being a mere expletive or *pādapūraṇa*), he states to mean that the reader referred to must by all means understand all this, but not any one besides. And he adds at the end that *vijñeya* indicates the peremptoriness of the rule, there being risk of harm in the absence of the required knowledge, as is shown by the verse "a *mantra* deficient in respect to accent or to letters" etc. This is the familiar verse, found in the *pāninīya* *Çikshā* (verse 52: see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iv.367-8), and quoted times innumerable in Hindu works, where the present subject is under consideration: O. alone adds the second *pāda*, "being falsely applied, does not express the intended sense;" the rest is, "it, an uttered thunderbolt, harms the sacrificer, like the word *indraçatru* [when used by *Tvashtar*] with false accent."

The rest of the comment is occupied with illustration of the points referred to in the rule, along with now and then a few words of explanation. For "heavy" quality (see xxii.14) is cited *vashatt svāhā* (vii.3.12); for "light" (see xxii.15), *akuruta* (v.5.8<sup>1</sup> et al.: W. B. give instead *akurvata* [i.7.3<sup>3</sup> et al.], which is less acceptable, as containing also a heavy syllable). *Sāmya*, 'evenness, sameness,' is defined as implying that, of two elements compared, there is—in respect to place and organ of articulation, quantity, etc.—sameness (so G. M., but B. O. read 'bigness' instead, and W. has 'steadiness'): what is really meant, is obscure; we may compare the use of the adjective *sama* in xxiii.20. The examples for short, long, and protracted, respectively, are *gamayati* (i.7.3<sup>4</sup> et al.), *vāyāv evā 'sya* (vi.3.7<sup>4</sup>), and *astu hīz iti* (vii.1.6<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *iti*). Elision is instanced by *īm 'andrāsu* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>: see above, v.12); increment, by *trapuṣ ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>: see above, v.4); euphonic conversion, by *sam indra no manasā* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *manāsa*: a case under vii.2). To illustrate *prakṛti*, 'original condition,' are given three phrases, *agne dudhra gahya kiñcila vanya yā te* (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>: W. B. end with *kiñcila*, and G. M. with *vanya*; and G. M. O. omit *agne*), *prāpā asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>), and *na mi-*

---

*gurutvam yathā: vashat\_... laghutā yathā: akuruta. sām-*  
*yam yathā: sthānakaraṇakālādibhir<sup>6</sup> anayor asti sthāuryam<sup>7</sup> iti.*  
*hrasvadīrghaplutāni ca<sup>8</sup> yathā: gamayati: vāyāv\_...: astu*  
*\_... lopo yathā: <sup>9</sup>īm\_... āgamo yathā: trapuṣ\_... <sup>10</sup>vī-*  
*kāro yathā: sam\_... prakṛtir yathā: agne\_...: prapā\_...:*  
*na\_...<sup>10</sup> vikramo yathā: vadhave. kramo nāma dvitvam <sup>11</sup>*  
*yathā: yad\_...: <sup>12</sup>yad\_...<sup>12</sup> svaritodāttanīcānām bhāvaḥ svari-*  
*todāttanīcatvam: <sup>13</sup>tad yathākramam<sup>13</sup> nirdiçyate<sup>14</sup>: nyañcam:*  
*gām\_...: avadatām. vivṛte çvāsa (ii.5) ity uktaḥ<sup>15</sup> çvāso*  
*yathā: pū\_... samvṛte<sup>16</sup> kaṇṭhe nādaḥ kriyata (ii.4) ity*



*thunî abhavan* (v.3.6<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *na*). Of these, the second is a case under x.13; the third, under x.18: both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains *prakṛtyâ*, or exempt from alteration. But the particular bearing of the first example, on the point of *prakṛti* is more obscure: the phrase is one in which the *samhitâ*-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the *pada*; and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken. Compare the comment and note to v.2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted. For *vikrama* is given the word *vódhavé* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), of which the second syllable has the accent called *vikrama*, by xix. 1. *Krama* is again (as under xxiii.20) defined as 'duplication,' and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, *yad vái hotâ* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>: i. e. *yad dvái*, by xiv.1): O. adds another of like character, *yad venoh* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>). We are permitted to doubt, however, here as at xxiii.20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them. The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by *nyañcam* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>), *gá'm vâ'vá tá'u tát* (i.7. 2<sup>2</sup>), and *avadatâm* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>). Reference is made to rule ii.5 as defining "breath," and as example of breath-sounds, or surd consonants, is cited *púshâ te* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>: B. has instead *púte*, and W. *púrte*, which occurs at iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>). Rule ii.4, again, is referred to as defining "tone" or sonant utterance, and the example is *bhâgadhe bhâgadhâh* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>). Finally, *aṅgam*, which I have rendered 'adjunction,' is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix.1 etc.), and a phrase is quoted, *tam matsyah prá 'bravít* (ii.6. 6<sup>1</sup>), which we are to divide *tam-mat-thsyaç-prâb-bra-vít*.

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rik Prât. (see Müller's edition, p. viii.).

पदक्रमविशेषज्ञो वर्णक्रमविचक्षणः ।

स्वर्मात्राविभागज्ञो गद्देदाचार्यसंस्तदं

गद्देदाचार्यसंस्तदमिति ॥ ६ ॥

6. He who understands the distinctions of the *pada-krama*, who is versed in the *varṇa-krama*, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers.

*ukto nâdo yathâ: bhâg-..... vyañjanañ svarâṅgam* (xxi. 1) *ity uktam aṅgam yathâ: tam-..... vijñeyatvam*<sup>17</sup> *iti*<sup>18</sup> *nitya-vidhiḥ: vipakshe bádhat: mantrô hînaḥ svarato varṇato ve*<sup>19</sup> *'tyâdi*<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*dasvar*-. <sup>2</sup> O. -*shâ*. <sup>3</sup> W. O. -*nât*; G. M. -*nâm*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*cta iti nish-*  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *anenâ 'dhiyatâ*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sthânakâb*-. <sup>7</sup> B. O. *sthâulyam*; G. M. *ti sâmyam*.  
<sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> W. ins. *etat sarvaṁ tu vijñeyam chândobhâvâdhâyatâ*. <sup>(10)</sup> B. om.  
<sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *tad*. <sup>(12)</sup> in O. only. <sup>(13)</sup> W. *padakr*-.; O. *tad yathâ*. <sup>14</sup> O. om. <sup>15</sup> MSS.  
-*tañ*. <sup>16</sup> W. om. <sup>17</sup> G. M. O. -*yam*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *ita*. <sup>19</sup> O. *vâ*. <sup>20</sup> W. -*dinâ*; B. -*dinâ*  
*nâma*; O. *mîthyâ prayukto na tam artham âha tyâdinâm*.



This verse also is prefixed to the Rik Prât. (Müller, p. viii.).

The commentator gives a merely mechanical explanation of the two terms composing the first half-verse, without telling us what he understands them really to mean. Doubtless the *pada-krama* is that which is commonly known as the “*krama-text*,” and for the construction of which the other Prâtiçâkhyas (Rik Pr. x., xi.; Vâj. Pr. iv.179–194; Ath. Pr. iv.101–126) give full directions; and the *varṇa-krama* is the text with duplicated consonants, according to the rules of our fourteenth chapter. The compound *svaramâtrâvibhâga* we are taught to treat as a dependent one; we might also be tempted to regard it as copulative, and to understand *vibhâga* in the sense of ‘separation’ (as in *pada-text* etc.), as in the only other place where it occurs in the treatise (iii.1). “Going to the assembly of teachers” is interpreted to signify not merely the sitting with them on earth, but the enjoyment with them of the abode of felicity, the *brahmaloka*—it being explained (except in G. M.) that “the teachers” are Vyâsa and his like. Then, *apropos* of this promise of heaven to those versed in the class of subjects of which the Prâtiçâkhyas treats, the commentator proceeds to quote from various *purâṇas* and kindred works the praises and promises there given to those who teach the Veda.

Thus, from the Garuḍa-purâṇa: “Of all kinds of knowledge, that of the Veda is called highest; hence, he who communicates that wins heaven and final beatitude. As chief of all sciences has been produced the *brahma-science*; hence, he who is devoted to giving it will receive the whole recompense of giving.” From the Devî-purâṇa: “To those twice born, the Veda is the chief means

---

6. <sup>1</sup>*padânâm kramah padakramah*<sup>2</sup>: *tasya viçeshah*: *tam jânâtî* ’*ti padakramaviçeshajñah*. *varṇânâm kramo varṇakramah*<sup>3</sup>: *tasmin vicakshano nipuno varṇakramavicakshanaḥ*<sup>4</sup>. *svarâç ca*<sup>5</sup> *mâtrâç ca*<sup>5</sup> *svaramâtrâḥ*: *tâsâm vibhâgaḥ*: *tam jânâtî* ’*ti svaramâtrâvibhâgajñah*<sup>1</sup>. *mâtrâçabdena kâlaviçeshah kaçcid ucyate*: *so*<sup>6</sup> ’*pi caturānur*’ *ityādishu*<sup>8</sup>: *evamvidhaḥ puruṣha âcâryasaṁsâdam*<sup>9</sup> *gachet*: <sup>10</sup>*âcâryâ*<sup>11</sup> *vyâsâdayaḥ*<sup>10</sup>: *teshâm*<sup>12</sup> *brahmaloke*<sup>13</sup> *sthânam*: <sup>14</sup>*yaç ce* ’*dam*<sup>14</sup> *çâstram jânîte so*<sup>15</sup> ’*py âcâryatvât teshâm sadrçam*<sup>16</sup> *brahmalokam gachati*<sup>17</sup>.

*tathâ ca*<sup>18</sup> *paurâṇikâ bhaṇanti*<sup>19</sup>. *gârudapurâṇe*<sup>20</sup>:

*âhuḥ samastavidyânâm vedavidyâm anuttamâm*<sup>21</sup>:

*atas taddâtur asty eva lâbhaḥ svargâpavargayoḥ*.

*vidyânâm paramâ*<sup>22</sup> *vidyâ brahmavidyâ*<sup>23</sup> *samîritâ*:

*atas*<sup>24</sup> *taddânaçîlaç ca*<sup>24</sup> *sarvam*<sup>25</sup> *dânaphalam labhet*<sup>26</sup>.

*devîpurâṇe*<sup>27</sup>:

*veda eva dvijâtînâm sâdhanam*<sup>28</sup> *yaçasaḥ phalam*<sup>28</sup>:

*ato*<sup>29</sup> *svâdhyayanâbhyâsât*<sup>30</sup> *param brahmâ* ’*dhigachati*.

<sup>31</sup>*tam eva çîlayet prâjñah çishyebhyas tam pradâpayet*:

*tadabhyâsapradânâbhyâm*<sup>32</sup> *etat kim nâ*<sup>32</sup> ’*dhigachati*<sup>31</sup>.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



Once more, the *vedāṅgas* and *upāṅgas* are rehearsed: the former, in the usual number and with the usual names: the latter, as *anupada*, *ānupada* (?), *chandobhāshā*, *mīmāṃsā*, *nyāya*, and *tarka*—the first two of these last are elsewhere called *pratipada* and *anupada* (see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iii.260–261, and the *St. Petersburg Lexicon*).

With this, in W. B., the *Tribhāshyaratna* ends; but G. M. O. have an added passage, the bearing of which is not in all points quite clear to me. It begins with stating that he who reads the Veda thus accompanied by the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, and with knowledge of the characteristic form and family, becomes purified. A verse then follows, in which it appears to be laid down how far the rules of the *Prātiçākhyā* have force: namely, as regards other texts, and passages which are not the subject of *sūtras* and are of human authorship (?). By way of illustration, nine passages are quoted, not one of which is to be found in the *Sanhitā* proper, although five are from its endings of sections, or the summaries of words with which the divisions of sections (half-centuries, *kaṇḍikās*) conclude: they are *pra nakshatrāya devyāya* (G. M. omit *devyāya*, and O. begins *anaksh-*), *sa im mamāda mahi karma kartave* (O. omits *karma*: *Tāittirīya-Brāhmaṇa* ii.5.8<sup>9</sup>; *Rig-Veda* ii.22.1), *mahi-saptadaçenā'vasyuvātāḥ* (from the ending of iv.4.12), *api-sīdamithunṃ ashtāu ca* (from the ending of vi.5.8), and *asmiṃs-tanuva-stuhi-pinākam* (from the ending to iv.5.10): in these the rules are said not to hold good; and *sinhe vyāghra uta yā pṛdākāu* (*Tāittirīya-Brāhmaṇa* ii.7.7<sup>1</sup>; *Atharva-Veda* vi.38.1; *Kāthaka* xxxvi.15), *dvādaçā 'gnishtomasya stotrāṇi* (O. *stotroni*), *ātmanāparā-nish-pra-çukraçocishā* (from the ending of vi.4.10: G. M. stops at *pra*), and *uçmasī-posham ekānaviṅçatiç ca* (ending of i.3.6: G. M. stop at *posham*), in which the rules are said to hold good. So much as this, now, seems clear: that the first two quotations in each class are given as coming from some other Vedic text than the *Tāittirīya-*

*vedāṅgāny ucyante:*

*çikshā kalpo vyākaraṇam niruktam jyotisham tathā:*  
*chandasām<sup>48</sup> lakshanaṃ ce 'ti shad aṅgāni vidur budhāḥ<sup>49</sup>.*  
*anupadam<sup>50</sup> cā<sup>51</sup> 'nupadam chandobhāshāsamanvitam:*  
*mīmāṃsānyāyatarkam<sup>52</sup> ca upāṅgāni vidur budhāḥ<sup>53</sup>.*

<sup>54</sup>*evam sāṅgopāṅgavedasya lakshanaṃ sampūrṇam.<sup>54</sup>*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane*  
*çaturviṅço<sup>55</sup> 'dhyāyah.*

*iti dvitīyapraçnaḥ samāptaḥ.*

(1) G. M. om.    2 W. B. om.    3 W. B. om.    4 O. om.    (5) O. om.    6 O. *sā*.    7 W. *caran-*; O. *-nuka*.    8 G. M. *ity avadishma*; O. *ity āvadishma*.    9 O. ins. *sthānam*.  
(10) G. M. *saṃsadam sthānam ācāryasya saṃsadam*.    11 W. B. O. *-ryah*.    12 O. ins. *ca*.  
13 W. *-kam*; G. M. *-ko hi*.    (14) B. *pada*.    15 B. om.    16 G. M. *sadnam*; O. *saṃsadam sthāna*.  
17 O. *gachet*.    18 W. om.    19 W. B. *bhuvanti*; O. *vadanti*.    20 B. *gar-*; G. M. *-de p-*.    21 W. B. *-man*.    22 G. M. *ca parā*.    23 W. om.    (24) G. M. O. *-nato rājan*.  
25 B. G. M. *-rva*.    26 W. B. *bhavet*; O. *bhet*.    27 O. *tathā ca dev-*



Sanhitâ (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brâhmaṇa or Âraṇyaka), and that the first class are offered as containing cases of combination at variance with the rules of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, while in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vii.4 would require *naksh-* after *pra*; in the second, v.12 would require *îm 'amâda*; in the third, the *s* of *sapta* should be *sh* by vi.2; in the fourth, the *î* of *mithunî* should remain unchanged by x.18; in the fifth, *asmin* is not included among the words which by vi.14 have an increment of *s* before *t*. In the other class, on the contrary, *agnishṭomasya* follows vi.2, *nish pra* is by viii.24 and 35 (see the comment to viii.35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and *uçmasî* by iii.13; the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the *na* in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to *ca*; and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhitâ proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhitâ are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Sanhitâ than to an editor of the Prâtiçâkhyâ: it seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged *î* of *uçmasî* retained in the ending, while the uncombinable character of the final of *mithunî* is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Tribhâshyaratna, which, with the Prâtiçâkhyâ, takes in general (the only exception is at viii.35) no account of the subdivisions of *anuvâkas*.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.

(28) W. *yasasaḥ ph-*; G. M. *çreyasâm param*; O. *çreyasaḥ param*.<sup>29</sup> G. M. O. *tato*.  
<sup>30</sup> G. M. *-dhyâyaniratât*.<sup>(31)</sup> W. B. om. <sup>(32)</sup> O. *tat ki yajñâ*.<sup>33</sup> O. *çucinâm*.<sup>(34)</sup> W. B. om.  
<sup>35</sup> O. *nadhiva*.<sup>36</sup> G. M. O. *-te 'pi*.<sup>37</sup> G. M. *çishyâya*.<sup>38</sup> G. M. O. om.  
<sup>39</sup> G. M. O. om.<sup>40</sup> W. O. *tulya*.<sup>41</sup> O. *gañi-*.<sup>42</sup> W. B. *avâp-*.<sup>43</sup> W. O. *svâtmâd*.  
<sup>44</sup> G. M. O. om.<sup>(45)</sup> O. *parabrahmañi*.<sup>46</sup> W. *-nâdhrîḥ*; O. *-shṭanânchi*.<sup>47</sup> G. M. *kâç-*.  
<sup>48</sup> W. *-dâñsi*.<sup>49</sup> W. *-dhâih*.<sup>50</sup> O. *-prad-*.<sup>51</sup> G. M. *nâ*.<sup>52</sup> W. B. O. *-rkaç*.  
<sup>53</sup> W. *-dhâih*.<sup>(54)</sup> B. *sâṅgopâṅgavedasvalakṣaṇam*, and put below, after *-varaṇe*; G. M. O. substitute *evam sâṅgopâṅgam vedaṁ gotrasvarûpâdijñânena* (G. M. *-divijânann*) *adhîyânaḥ pûto bhavati*. [yadrçayâ: *granthântare yathâtattvam* (O. *yathâ tadvad*) *idaṁ çâstram* (G. M. ins. *yathâvidhi*) *asûtriteshu* (O. *sûcakeshu*) *sthâneshu pâurusheshu na* (O. om.) *varatate*.  
*tathâ hi: pra-----: sa-----: mahi-----: api-----: asmin's-----: ityâdâu na* (O. om. *na*) *varatate* (G. *prav-*): *siñhe-----: dvâd-----: âtm-----: uçmasî-----: ityâdâu tu varatate*. *gached âcâryasaṁsadaṁ iti vîpsâ çâstrasamâptim* (O. *-traparisam-*) *dyotayati*.<sup>55</sup> B. *-ñçatimo*; G. M. O. *dvitiyapraçne dvâdaço*.



## CONCLUDING NOTE.

It seems desirable to present here, at the end of the work, a discussion and exposition of certain points which could not be connectedly or fully treated in the notes upon the rules.

A first important question is that of the relation of the Prâtiçâkhyâ to the known text of the Black Yajur-Veda, or to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ.

In considering this question, it is impossible to separate entirely the Prâtiçâkhyâ itself from its commentary. The former does not quote passages in its rules, but defines situations or specifies words, singly or in combination. Sometimes, indeed, either of these virtually amounts to the citation of a passage; but, in the great majority of cases, only the commentator can inform us what are the passages had in view. For example, we may regard *eshtaḥ* (viii.18) as in effect a reference to i.2.11<sup>1</sup> and vi.2.2<sup>6</sup>; but the words cited in viii.8 (as *abibhar*, *akar*, *punar*, *pitar*) are indefinite in their indications, and it would be impossible to say that any given passage in the Sanhitâ in which one of these words occurs either was or was not contemplated by the makers of the rule. I shall therefore present in connection with one another the evidence derivable from the text itself and that from the comment.

There are four words or parts of words specified in the Prâtiçâkhyâ-text which are not to be found in the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ: they are *stanutar* (viii.8), *carshaṇ* (xiii.13), *jîgivâ* (xvi.13), and *jîghâsi* (xvi.18). It is very remarkable, however, that each of these is a kind of reflex or varied repetition of another word preceding it in the same rule: thus, we have *sanuta stanutaḥ*, *carmaṇ carshaṇ*, *jîgivâ jîgivâ*, and *jîghâsi jîghâsi*. And this, taken in connection with the fact that all of them appear to be in themselves ungenue, never having been found, so far as I am aware, in any Vedic text, and being, at least in part, impossible or highly implausible forms, is sufficient to stamp them as probable corruptions, blundering intrusions into the Prâtiçâkhyâ, and of no force to prove that the latter was made for a text that contained them.

The cases are much more numerous in which the commentator declares the Prâtiçâkhyâ to have in contemplation phrases not to be found in the Sanhitâ. They are nearly all of this kind: in iv. 11, *viçâkhe* is declared *pragraha*; now the word is divided in *pada*-text, *vi-çâkhe*, and *çâkhe* is by itself a *pada* (according to i. 48); and therefore, unless there were some other *çâkhe* not a *pragraha* in the Sanhitâ, it would be enough to cite *çâkhe* alone in the rule; hence, as the citation of *bhâgadhe* (p. *bhâga-dhe*) just before implies that the maker of the rule had in view such a word as *uda-dhe*, whose *dhe* was not *pragraha*, so the citation of *viçâkhe* is declared to have in view such a word as *sahasra-çâkhe*, not a *pragraha*, "in another text." The phrases thus quoted from outside the Sanhitâ by the commentator are as follows: under iv.11, *tas-*





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



*çitikanthāya svāhā* (xiii.11: only G. M.), and *sa naḥ parshat* (xxiii.17: Rig-V. i.99.1 et al.).

Along with these may properly be reported the few phrases which are quoted by the comment, confessedly or impliedly from outside the text contemplated by the Prâtiçākhyā. Thus, we have under xviii.1 the beginning and concluding words of the Tâittirîya-Brâhmaṇa and the Tâittirîya-Âraṇyaka (that is to say, of the latter, the concluding words, *āi 'va tapāti*, of the fifth *prapāthaka*, with which, accordingly, to the apprehension of our commentator, the whole treatise appears to have ended); under xxiv.6 are given (by G. M. O.) *dvādaçā 'gnishtomasya stotrāni, pra. nakshatrāya devyāya, sa im mamāda māhi karma kartuṃve* (Tâitt. Br. ii.5.8<sup>9</sup> etc.), and *sinhe vyāghra uta yā prdākāu* (Tâitt. Br. ii.7.7<sup>1</sup> etc.); in a quoted verse under xxi.6 is read *ṛtasya dhūrshadam* (Tâitt. Br. i.2.1<sup>12</sup> etc.); and the comment to xix.3 has *yo 'pām pushpam veda*. Finally, we note that the comment gives, under xviii.1, a word, *bandhuḥ*, which ought to form the conclusion of the Sanhitā, by its own count, but which is lost in the known manuscripts.

In all this, again, there is no satisfactory evidence that the Sanhitā of the Prâtiçākhyā or its commentators was other than the one we know. The missing citations are in part found in a minority of the MSS.; in part, they are perhaps corruptions; in part, they are likely to have been taken by an error of the quoter's recollection from some other Tâittirîya-text—and the remainder, if there be a remainder, is too scanty to prove anything.

When we come farther to inquire whether any part of the Tâittirîya-Sanhitā as it exists was not before the authors of the Prâtiçākhyā, we seem to be brought to the same negative result. There are, to be sure, here and there points in the text which the rules do not cover, but we have reason only to wonder that in executing so immense and intricate a task as that undertaken by the Prâtiçākhyā there should have been so few oversights. These, so far as they have been discovered, have been pointed out in the notes; I recapitulate them here. The word *rakshā* (p. *rakshāḥ*), at i.4.24, should have been exempted in some way from the operation of rule iii.8, which requires its *ā* to be shortened when separated from the following word. *Devī*, at vi.1.7<sup>7</sup>, is made *pragraha* by the strict letter of rule i.61 (see under i.59), though the passage in which it occurs is not one to which that rule was meant to apply. In the rehearsal of cases of elision or non-elision of initial *a* (chapters xi. and xii.), there are a couple of cases which the commentator is driven into attempting to provide for by forced and false interpretations of the rules (see under i.61 for *ye 'ntarikshe* at iv.5.11<sup>2</sup>, and under xi.3 for *ye aparīshu* at i.4.33); and I have noted beside (under xii.8, at the end) only *so agniḥ* at v.2.3<sup>3</sup> as unaccounted for thus far (its companion case, *ūrdhvo asthāt*, is read first in an *ukhya*-passage, at iv.2.1<sup>4</sup>, as Prof. Weber has pointed out to me; and *so agniḥ* may yet find a like solution). And in the enumeration of cases of interior *ñ* (see under xvi.26), two compound words appear to have been overlooked, *svādushaṅsadaḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>) and *strī-shaṅsādam* (ii.5.1<sup>5</sup>).



I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Prâtiçâkhyâ to the Sanhitâ is not absolute, since I possess neither an *index verborum* to the latter nor a *pada*-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Prâtiçâkhyâ probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, the only *çâkhâ* left us (unless the Kâthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the text-book emanates directly from the Tâittirîya school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and “holders of *çâkhâs*” referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber’s notes to the Caranavyûha, in his Indische Studien, iii.256 ff.), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Mîmânsakas (v.41), Âhvârakas (xxiii.14), and Tâittirîyas (xxiii.15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school; its rules are those which apply “here,” “with us,” and only outsiders need specification; besides, the Tâittirîyas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the “schools” of Vedic study and their accepted texts or *çâkhâs*, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or *prâtiçâkhyas*; but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the *çâkhâs*, and that some were only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoepical form of the Tâittirîya-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Prâtiçâkhyâ.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of *h* before surd gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix.2), nor of *n* before palatals (against v.24) and *l* (against v.25), nor the omission of *t* (required by v.33) between *t* and *s*, nor of the various duplications and insertions and aspirations taught in chapter xiv., since these are matters on which we are to expect discordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Sanhitâ of *anusvâra* as an alphabetic element, while the Prâtiçâkhyâ wavers (see under ii.30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or *anuvâkas* in the recorded text into fifties of words, or *kandîkâs*, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e. g., of the *î* of *uçmasî*, at the end of i.3.6<sup>1</sup>: see under iii.



13). The retention of the final *v* of *av* and *āv* (from *o* and *āu*) before a vowel is also against the letter of rule x.19, and in accordance with a dissident opinion quoted in x.21. The *kampa* of a circumflex accent followed by a circumflex, consistently made in the Sanhitâ, is only mentioned in the Prâtiçâkhyâ (at xix.3) as taught by some authorities, nor is the form of the doctrine taught in full and clear accordance with the practice followed. And it is very questionable whether the prescription of nasalization of a final protracted *a* (xv.8) is not merely reported by the treatise as made by certain specified teachers. These are small matters, and few, and a degree of doubt, perhaps, hangs over them all; but they are worthy of notice, as being all that we have on which to found any discordance between the Sanhitâ of the manuscripts and that of the Prâtiçâkhyâ. While, on the other hand, the points of accordance, even in matters which are most specially characteristic of the Tâittirîya-text, are very numerous and important.\*

Of course, the existence of other forms of the text besides the ordinary *saṁhitâ* is assumed by the Prâtiçâkhyâ. Such a work without a *pada*-text at least as its foundation would be a thing inconceivable. Our treatise does not give, as the others do (see add. note 1 to the Ath. Prât.), formal rules for the construction of any of the other texts; its nearest approach to doing so is in the third chapter, where (see note to iii.1) it teaches us what final or initial vowels, long in *saṁhitâ*, are to be shortened whenever the word in which they occur is thrown out of *sandhi* with its next neighbor—a form of statement which applies to *krama* and *jatâ* text as well as *pada*. The occurrence of such terms as *pada*, *nâ-nâpada*, *îngya*, *avagraha*, implies also the familiar usages of the *pada*-text; and the employment of *iti* is directly alluded to in iv.4 and ix.20, and indirectly assumed in the use of *ârsha* in ix.21 and x.13. What were the limits to the use of *iti* in the *pada*-text held by the school from which the Prâtiçâkhyâ proceeded does not appear: its combination in the extant *pada* with the prepositions (thus *pré 'ti* for *pra*, *vî' 'ti* for *vi*, and so on—and without restriction to the ten words which alone are allowed by the Prâtiçâkhyâ, at i.15, to count as prepositions) does not come to light anywhere either in the text or commentary. Nor does the treatise chance to show whether its *pada* treated the *îngyas* or separable compounds after the same manner as the extant Rik and Atharvan texts—writing simply *upa-âyavaḥ*, for example—or as the extant *padas* of the Yajur-Veda (including that to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ) and the one assumed by the Atharva-Prâtiçâkhyâ (see note to Ath. Prât. iv.74)—writing *upâyava ity upa-âyavaḥ*. The commentator, however, accepts and follows the latter method. Reason has been

---

\* I have pointed out under rule ii.25 that the peculiar Tâittirîya orthography of such words as *suvar*, *tanuvâ*, *aghniyâ* finds no occasion for mention in the Prâtiçâkhyâ; nor is the very strange change of a final labial in certain words to a guttural (as in *trishtug indriye*, ii.4.11<sup>2</sup>; *trishtug yâjyâ*, ii.6.2<sup>5</sup>; *trishtugbhîḥ*, v.1.4<sup>5</sup>) noticed anywhere; I presume (I have omitted to obtain distinct information upon the point) that in every such case the *pada*-text also has the guttural—which would take the whole matter out of the sphere of the Prâtiçâkhyâ.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



the assumption that the peculiar *jaṭā* combinations were had in view by those who constructed the Prâtiçâkhyâ—or, at least, by those who brought it into its present form. I would add, that it seems to me not unlikely that the term *vikrama* (in the sense of *kramavikṛti*) signifies the *jaṭā*-text in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5.

The names of the divisions of the Sanhitâ, *kāṇḍa*, *praçna* (not *prapâthaka*), and *anuvâka*, are found only in the commentary (see Index); respecting the absence of the subdivision of *anuvâkas* into *kāṇḍikâs* see above, p. 427 (also under viii.35 and xxiv.6, where this division is acknowledged by the commentator). But the Prâtiçâkhyâ itself gives names to certain parts of the Sanhitâ; which names, for the sake of convenience, I will put together here, with a reference to the rule under which the part designated by each is stated (for further details of their occurrence, see the Index): they are *agni* (iii.9), *ishti* (iv.52), *ukhya* (ix.20), *graha* (ix.20), *prshthya* (ix.20), *mahâprshthya* (xi.3), *yâjyâ* (iii.9), *rudra* (xi.3), *vâjapeya* (xi.3), *vikarsha* (xi.3), *vihavya* (xi.3), and *hiranyavarṇîya* (ix.20).

A marked feature of the Prâtiçâkhyâ is its frequent citation of authorities by name. The list of names has been repeatedly put together by students of the Prâtiçâkhyâs (in Weber's Indische Studien, iv.77–8, may be found notices respecting the historical and geographical indications derivable from them), but ought not to be omitted here also. It is as follows (including the cases of mention in the commentary, distinguished by an added *c*):

- Âgniveçya, ix.4.
- Âgniveçyâyana, xiv.32.
- Âtreya, v.31, xvii.8.
- Ukhyâ, viii.22, x.20, xvi.24.
- Uttamottariya, viii.20.
- Kāṇḍamâyana, ix.1, xv.7,8c.
- Kāuṇḍinya, v.38, xviii.3,4c, xix.2; (*sthavira*), v.40c, xvii.4,5c.
- Kāuhâlîputra, v.40c, xvii.2: (Kāuhaleya, xix.4c, xxiii.17c).
- Gâutama, v.38.
- Pâushkarasâdi, v.37,38,40c, xiii.16, xiv.2,3c, xvii.6.
- Plâkshâyana, ix.6, xiv.11,17, xviii.5.
- Plâkshi, v.38, ix.6, xiv.10,11c,17, xviii.5.
- Bâdabhîkâra, xiv.13.
- Bhâradvâja, xvii.3: (Bharadvâja, v.40c).
- Mâcâkiya (or Mâyikâya), x.22.
- Vâtsapra, x.23.
- Vâlmiki, v.36, ix.4, xviii.6.
- Çânkhâyana, xv.7,8c.
- Çâityâyana, v.40, xvii.1,3c,4c,7, xviii.2.
- Sâmkṛtya, viii.21, x.21, xvi.16.
- Hârîta, xiv.18,19c,20c,21c,22c.

Of the three schools cited, the names have been already given (above, p. 427). And we have besides *âcâryâḥ* quoted in i.46; *eke âcâryâḥ* in v.30, ix.5, xiii.3, xiv.3,25; *eke* simply in i.47, ii.19, 27,47, v.39, viii.19, xi.19, xiv.33, xv.2,6, xviii.1, xix.3, xxi.13; *pûrve* in xv.9; and *sarve* in xviii.7.

The questions which all this array of authorities is called in to help settle may be classified as follows:

I. Matters of phonetic theory, with others of a general nature.



The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, i.46-7; with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the Prâtiçâkhyâ itself, expressed in rules 44-5; there is nothing else like it in the treatise; perhaps we may best assume that rules 44-7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of *anusvâra* and *svarabhakti*, ii.19. The quality of the  $\alpha$ -element in *âi* and *âu*, ii.27. The phonetic character of *h* and *ḥ*, ii.47-8. The nature of the combination of *e* or *o* with (elided) *a*, xi.19. The occurrence of lingual *l*, xiii.16: this the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the Prâtiçâkhyâ. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, xiv.32-3. Nasalization of final vowels, xv.6-8: the comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), xv.9. Correption of the final theme-vowel of neuters in *as*, *is*, *us* in the nom. pl. before *ñ*, xvi.16. Utterance of *âi* final in a single case, xvi.24. Degrees of nasalization, xvii.1-5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, xvii.6-8. *Kampa* between two circumflex syllables, xix.3-5. Use of the term *yama* for the nasal counterparts, xxi.13. Utterance of the syllable *om*, xviii.1-7. *Yama*-tones held by certain schools, xxiii.14-19.

## II. Matters of *sandhi* or euphonic combination.

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial *h*, v.38-41; where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at ix.1, the dropping of final *ḥ* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule x.19, prescribing the invariable omission of final *v*, was not meant to be modified by x.21. That the treatment of *anusvâra* as a distinct consonantal element is put by xv.2-3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone; it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the Prâtiçâkhyâ with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to ii.30). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with *l* as reported in xiv.2-3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (xiv.7) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the Prâtiçâkhyâ is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of *m* before *y* and *v*, v.30 and xiii.3 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration); the combination of *p* with *ç* and of *n* with *ç* before a consonant, v.36-7; the *sandhi* of *eshtar* with *râyah*, viii.19-22; the treatment of *h* before an initial consonant, ix.4-6; the utterance or omission of final *y* and *v*, x.20-23; the insertion



of a surd mute between spirant and mute, xiv.10–11; aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, xiv.13; duplication in certain specified cases, xiv.17–22, 25–8 (but the comment treats 28 as the direct prescription of the authors of the treatise); and *vikrama* accent after *pracaya*, xix.2.

Thus it is evident that, while this arraying of discordant opinions is a quite distinctive and a very interesting feature of our *Prâtiçâkhyâ*, it does not, except to a very limited extent, detract from the character of the latter as a consistent and positive record of the views of a school of Vedic study. Nor is it fairly to be brought into any relation to the peculiar character of the Black Yajur-Veda, as a text of which the constituent parts had been gathered together more miscellaneously, and less fully fused into conformity, than the other Vedic texts. No text could be so definitely constructed, and be made the object of so thorough and systematic study as the setting up of a text-book like the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* evinces, without assuming an established character, and being as authoritatively handed down and as accurately learned as any Vedic text.

It is by no means improbable that a part of these citations of authorities have been interpolated in the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* after the latter ceased to be a mere body of practical rules for the guidance of a school, and, in virtue of its thoroughness and comprehensiveness, gained more the character of a phonetic "treatise" on the Black Yajur-Veda, and was used in other schools than that which originated it. The commentator (as will be pointed out below) uses the citations as a cover under which to put upon the treatise certain doctrines which do not properly belong to it; and in other hands it may have undergone a like distortion in other directions.

Accretions of other kinds to the original text of the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* are plausibly to be presumed in various places. All the metrical rules (namely xvii.8, xxii.14, 15, xxiii.2, 14–15, 20, xxiv.5, 6) are to be set down without much question as unauthentic; they are proved such by their character not less than by their form; and several of them are found in other parts of the *Prâtiçâkhyâ* literature. We may include in the same category, indeed, with considerable show of reason, the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters, and all that follows the twenty-first, on the score of content alone: a part of their matter is inferior repetition of what had been given before; a part deals with subjects, and in a style, unsuited to a *Prâtiçâkhyâ*. That there is room at least to suspect the intrusion of rules in other parts of the work has been pointed out here and there in the notes: at this place, I will merely refer to certain rules which are put in strangely out of place, interrupting the natural connection of passages: such are i.25–7, 60, vii.13, 14, xiv.12–3, xv.6–9, xvi.24, xxii.3–8; of these, only vii.13, 14 are indispensable parts of a treatise like the present.

Another notable characteristic of our *Prâtiçâkhyâ* is its sparing use of technical terms belonging to general grammar, consequent upon its refusal to deal with words or classes of words according to their grammatical character, its laborious definition of its subject-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



without reason (as under ii.52, iv.4, v.29, vii.11, xix.3). Occasionally, false interpretations, of every degree of violence, are committed, for the purpose either of correcting an oversight or inaccuracy of the Prâtiçâkhyâ (as under i.61, iii.1, viii.16, xi.3, xvi.26), or else of imposing upon the latter a doctrine which it was not intended to teach, but which is held by the commentator and his school (as under i.58, xiii.4, xxi.14,16). For this last purpose, too, advantage is sometimes taken of the citations of varying opinions so liberally made in the rules; the *dictum* of the quoted authority is declared to be approved in usage, or is even imposed upon the Prâtiçâkhyâ, to the setting aside of what the latter really prescribes. Thus, Pâushkarasâdi's doctrine of the conversion of *l* to *ḷ* (xiii.16), which belongs neither to the Prâtiçâkhyâ nor to the Sanhitâ, is accepted; and the duplication of consonant-groups beginning with *l* which is ascribed (xiv.3) to certain unspecified teachers; and Plâkshi's mode of treatment of a spirant before a first mute (xiv.17), which has as further result a misinterpretation of xxi.16; and a part of rule xiv.26, respecting the duplication of *l*; and rule xiv.28, to which a strange interpretation is given, prepared for by a yet stranger one of xiii.4; and rules xv.2,3, which require *anusvâra* instead of nasalization of a vowel; and the nasalization of a final protracted *a* (xv.8); and two rules (xviii.1,6) from among those which concern the utterance of *om*; and rule x.21, as to the retention of final *v*, is given the preference over 19, which requires its omission; and the first rule (v.38) as to the combination of initial *h* with a preceding mute is ratified; and, in the variety of opinions respecting the circumflex tone, one (i.46) is selected for approval. In the few cases where the commentator does not express himself as to whether a rule is *ishta* or *anishta* (they are ii.19,27,47-8, xi.19, xix.2, xxi.13, xxiii.14-9), there may be question whether he means to have it regarded as approved, or thinks the matter of no consequence either way. There remain the majority of cases, in which he stands by the Prâtiçâkhyâ, rejecting the intruded doctrine (for further details, refer to the words *ishta* and *anishta* in the Sanskrit index).

Besides these more serious cases of misapprehension or intended modification of the teachings of his text-book, the commentator is not free from the ordinary and characteristic weaknesses of his craft in India: from feeble and puerile expositions, from attempts to find a wonderful pregnancy of meaning in some innocent particle or unintended difference of expression, from groundless etymologies, and the like; to these attention has been directed in the notes, and they are not of consequence enough to be recapitulated here.

For determining the personality of the commentator we have no data whatever, and for his place and period we have only the references to other authorities, which, though too few and indefinite to yield any statable result, need to be put together in this note. The three earlier commentators on whom the work is avowedly founded—namely, Vararuci, Mâhisheya, and Âtreya—are repeatedly appealed to, especially (as has been pointed out above)



in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index). Vararuci is a name very common in grammatical literature; to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme. Nor does Âtreya, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p. 430) twice quoted in the Prâtiçâkhya itself. From Pânini, rules are directly quoted under ii.12, iii.9, v.1, xiii.16, xiv.4, xxiv.3; and the *pâninî-yâh* or the *vyâkarana* are farther referred to under i.15, 53, 57, ii.47, xviii.1. Pâninean terms are, further, *nañ*, i.60, x.22, *nic*, ii.17, *hal*, ix.24, *yar*, xiv.4, and *lyap*, xxi.14. The Mahâbhâshya is professedly quoted under ii.7, v.2; but the passage given is actually from Kâiyyata's gloss. A definition is taken from the Amarakoça under i.1. Kâuhaleya is quoted under xiv.4, xxiii.17; and the Kâlanirṇaya under xviii.1. The Brâhmaṇa of the Vâjasaneyins is referred to under xiv.33, and extracts from the Mahâbhârata and various Purâṇas are set forth under xxiv.6.

But the authority most often appealed to is the "Çikshâ," by which the commentator intends a very different work from the *pâninîya* Çikshâ, and one much more comprehensive. He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i.1 (three times), ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3, xx.12, xxi.1, 15, xxii.13, xxiii.10, 17. Among these extracts are (under i.1, ii.2, xxi.1, xxiii.10) several passages which are found also in the *pâninîya* Çikshâ; and among the metrical extracts which are now and then given without specifying their source (under xiv.23, 26, 28, xix.3, xxi.1, 6, 15, xxiii.17, 19, xxiv.6) are likewise one or two (under xxiii.17, 19) which occur in the same treatise. That the commentator is inclined to regard his Çikshâ as of higher authority than the Prâtiçâkhya itself was pointed out under xx.12; that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi.15) in illustration of the varieties of *svarabhakti*.



## ANALYSIS.

## I. EXPLANATORY: TERMS AND THEIR USE, INTERPRETATION OF RULES, ETC.

1. *Terms and their use:*

*kāra* forms names of letters, xxii.4; of vowels, i.16; of consonants, i.17; exceptions, i.18.—*varṇa* forms names of letters, xxii.4; includes short, long, and protracted vowels, i.20.—*epha* forms name of *r*, i.19.—*varga*, with first mute, forms name of series, i.27.—*a* forms name of consonant, i.21; of a cited word, i.22.—*apṛkta*, a *pada* of a single letter, i.54.—*avagraha*, first member of a separable word, i.49.—*lopa*, loss, i.57.—*upasarga*, ‘preposition,’ includes what words, i.15.—offices of *ca*, *api*, *tu*, *atha*, *eva*, *vâ*, *na*, xxii.5–8.

2. *Interpretation of rules and forms, etc.:*

an increment, or word having euphonic change or elision, put in nominative, i.23; or in its text-form, i.24.—product of euphonic change put in accusative, i.28.—next element, or more, taken in case of doubt, i.25,26.—a cited *pada* means that *pada* only, i.50; but applies to it even when euphonicly altered, or preceded by *a* or *an*, i.51–3.—rules for a specified passage apply only there, and peremptorily, i.59; but a series of three or more words, if repeated, reads as the first time, i.61.—*pûrva*, ‘preceding,’ and *uttara*, ‘following,’ designate a word only under the specified circumstances, i.29,30.—continued implication is of what stood last, i.58.—words to be combined, and rules to be applied, in their order, v.3.—a separable word treated as two words, except in enumeration, i.48.—an *apṛkta* treated as initial and as final, i.55.—elision and euphonic alteration affect single letters only, i.56; after elision of *y* or *v*, no farther combination made, x.25.—in *pragrahas*. and in enumeration of words containing *anusvāra* a cause in another word maintains its force, i.60.

## II. PHONETIC: ENUMERATION, CLASSIFICATION, DESCRIPTION OF ALPHABETIC SOUNDS, QUANTITY, ACCENT, ETC.

1. *Enumeration and classification of alphabetic sounds:*

nine simple vowels [*a*, *â*, *â3*, *i*, *î*, *î3*, *u*, *û*, *û3*], i.2; sixteen vowels [the above, with *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ*, *e*, *âi*, *o*, *âu*], i.5; the rest consonants, i.6.—mutes, i.7; in five series, i.10; called “first” etc., i.11.—semivowels [*y*, *r*, *l*, *v*], i.8.—spirants [*ç*, *sh*, *s*, *φ*, *h*], i.9.—surd consonants, i.12; *h*, i.13; sonants, i.14.

2. *Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds:*

general mode of production of articulate sounds, ii.2,3,7, xvii.7,8, xxii.1,2, xxiii.2,3.—difference of surds, sonants, and *h*, ii.4–6.—mode of utterance of vowels, in general, ii.4,8,31,32; in particular, of *a*, *â*, ii.12; of *i*, *î*, ii.20–22; of *u*, *û*, ii.20,24,25; of *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ*, ii.18; of *e*, ii.15–17,23; of *âi*, ii.26–8; of *o*, ii.13,14; of *âu*, ii.26,27,29.—similar vowels, i.3,4.—mode of utterance of consonants, in general, ii.33,34; of sonants, ii.8; of surds, ii.10,11; of *h* and sonant aspirates, ii.6,9; of nasality, ii.52; difference of nasal quality in different nasal sounds, xvii.1–4; of nasal mutes, ii.30.—mode of utterance of consonants in particular: of *k*-series, ii.35; of *c*-series, ii.36; of *ṭ*-series, ii.37; of *t*-series, ii.38; of *p*-series, ii.39; of *y*, ii.40; of *r*, ii.41; of *l*, ii.42; of *v*, ii.43; of spi-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



### 3. *Final consonants* :

surd to nasal before nasal, viii.2; to sonant before all other sonant letters, viii.3; and, in a special case, before *m*, viii.4; to aspirate before spirant, xiv.12,13.

*visarjanîya* to spirant before surds, ix.2-6; except before *ksh*. ix.3; to *sh* before *t*, in certain cases, vi.5.—omitted before spirant and surd mute, ix.1; also in *sa* etc., v.15-17; also before *r*, viii.7.16,17; special case before *r*, viii.18-22.—changed to *r*, viii.6; do. after *a* and *â*, viii.8-15; exceptional cases, v.10.—changed to *s* or *sh* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, in compound words, viii.23; do. in independent words, viii.24-35; exceptions, viii.32,33.—*ah* final to *o*, before *a* and sonants, ix.7,8; special exception, viii.18-22; before other vowels, ix.10; *âh* final, ix.9,10.

final mutes: *ñ* doubled before vowel, ix.18; *ñ* before *s*, *sh*, v.32.—*ṭ* before *s*, *sh*, v.33.—*t* before palatals, v.22,23; before *l*, v.25; before *ç*, v.22.—*n* before palatals, v.20,21,24,37, xv.1-3; before *t*, vi.14, xv.1-3; before *l*, v.25,26,31, xv.1-3; before *ç*, v.24; before *s*, *sh*, v.33; changed to *r* or *y* [i. e. to *anusvâra*, xv.1-3] ix.20-24; doubled before vowel, ix.19.—*m* before mutes and semivowels, v.27-31, xiii.3; before spirants and *r*, xiii.1,2, xv.1-3; unchanged before *râ*, xiii.4; special case of loss, v.18.

### 4. *Initial consonants* :

*ç* to *ch*. v.34-7.—*s* to *sh*, in words independent or compound, v.10, vi.1,2,4,6-13.—*t* to *ṭ*, vii.13.—*h* after a mute, v.38-41.—*n* to *ṇ*, vii.2,4.  
elision of initial *m*, v.12; of *v*, v.13; of *s*, v.14.

### 5. *Interior consonants* :

*t*, *th* to *ṭ*, *ṭh*, vii.13,14.—*n* to *ṇ*. in same word with its cause, xiii.6-9,11,13-15; in other word, vii.3,5,6-12,15,16.—*s* to *sh*, vi.3.—*l* to *ḷ*, xiii.16.

### 6. *Abnormal insertions and elisions. duplication, etc.* :

insertion of *s* v.4-7; of *d*, v.8; of surd mute between sibilant and mute, xiv.9-11; of nasal counterparts (*yamas* and *nâsikya*), xxi.12-14; of *svarabhakti*, xxi.15-16.

elision of initial *m*, *v*, *s*, see Initial consonants.—in composition of forms of *eka*, v.18,19.

duplication in consonant-groups, xiv.1-7,14-28; of initial *ch*, *kh*, *bh* in certain cases, xiv.8.

## IV. SUNDRIES:

enumeration and specification of cases of *ṇ*, otherwise than euphonic, in interior of words, xiii.9,10,12; of *anusvâra*, do. do., xv.4,5, xxvi.2-31.

requirements in a scholar or teacher, xxiv.5,6.



## INDEX OF CITATIONS

MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TÂITTIRÎYA-SANHITÂ.

THIS Index contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text. If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence. It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations; and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter-example, by the makers of the treatise; whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on.

TS. i.	TS. i.	TS. i.
1.1 i.21,33, ii.22, iii.1,3, ix.1, x.5,10,19, xiv.21, xvii.7, xviii.1,7, xx.3, xxi.7, xxii.13.	2.12 <sup>1</sup> xi.11,17; <sup>2</sup> xvi.27.	4.14 ii.44, ix.4.
2 <sup>1</sup> xiii.2, xv.1, xxi.15; <sup>2</sup> x.2, xxiv.5.	13 <sup>1</sup> iii.2, iv.34; <sup>2</sup> iii.7, iv.15,22,33, xvi.2; <sup>3</sup> iv.46, xi.17.	16 xvi.13.
3 iv.6, viii.8, xvi.27.	14 <sup>1</sup> iii.8, ix.20,23, xii.7, xvi.15,27; <sup>2</sup> i.48, ii.47, iv.28, v.8, vi.5, viii.24, x.16, xiii.15, xiv.6, xvi.13; <sup>2-3</sup> i.56, v.15; <sup>3</sup> v.17, vii.10, xvi.14; <sup>4</sup> xiv.10, xvi.13; <sup>5</sup> viii.8; <sup>5-6</sup> iii.8; <sup>6</sup> vii.11, xi.4, xvi.2; <sup>7</sup> vi.2, viii.24, xvi.25.	18 iv.41, xi.16.
4 <sup>1</sup> viii.8.	3.1 <sup>1</sup> i.61.	19 vi.7, ix.20.
5 <sup>1</sup> iv.44, ix.22, x.25, xi.16; <sup>2</sup> vi.11, xiii.7, xxiv.4.	2 <sup>1</sup> vii.11; <sup>2</sup> iv.12, vii.11, xiv.28.	20 xv.1, xvii.4.
7 <sup>1</sup> x.10.	3 i.51,60, iii.1, vii.6 <i>ter</i> .	22 iii.12, iv.4,12, xvi.13,29.
8 vi.5, x.2,6, xi.8,16, xiv.1.	4 <sup>1</sup> viii.26; xi.13,16.	24 vi.5, xi.13.
9 <sup>1</sup> vi.10, vii.14; <sup>3</sup> iii.15, v.2,21, x.13 <i>bis</i> , xi.16, xiv.12,13.	5 xiv.26.	25 xiii.9.
10 <sup>1</sup> vi.5, vii.14, xiv.10, xvi.2,27; <sup>2</sup> v.3, vi.4, xi.16; <sup>3</sup> ii.48, vii.13, ix.2, xvi.14.	6 <sup>1</sup> iv.42; <sup>1-2</sup> iii.13; <sup>2</sup> i.33, x.10; end'g xxiv.6.	26 iv.42.
11 <sup>1</sup> xiii.6.	7 <sup>1</sup> iii.8, iv.11,47, viii.16; <sup>2</sup> viii.9, xi.16.	27 vi.7, viii.27.
12 iii.3, v.5, viii.8, xi.17, xiv.19.	8 <sup>1</sup> iii.8; <sup>2</sup> iii.2, ix.22.	30 iv.11.
13 <sup>1</sup> ii.20, ix.22 <i>bis</i> ; <sup>2</sup> xiii.10 <i>bis</i> , xvi.26; <sup>3</sup> iv.12, ix.9, xii.8, xxi.12.	9 <sup>1</sup> i.37, v.38 <i>bis</i> , viii.2, xiv.12,20 <i>bis</i> , xxi.3.	33 i.55, iii.14, vi.5, xi.3.
14 <sup>1</sup> i.61, iii.8,9,10; <sup>2</sup> viii.23, xi.3, xii.7; <sup>3</sup> i.61, xi.3, 9, xiii.16; <sup>4</sup> iii.12, v.17, vi.5 <i>bis</i> , vii.5,10, ix.22, x.10,25, xiii.3.	10 <sup>1</sup> xi.17; <sup>2</sup> xiii.14, xvi.23.	36 viii.32.
2.1 <sup>1</sup> ix.10, x.19,22,25, xi.8, xviii.7; <sup>2</sup> xi.18.	11 xi.17.	41 ii.49, xiv.24.
2 <sup>1</sup> iv.47, xiv.9; <sup>1-2</sup> iv.42; <sup>2</sup> xxi.3; <sup>3</sup> vi.12, x.2, 17.	12 ix.21, xi.18.	42 vii.16, ix.20.
3 <sup>1</sup> xi.13 <i>bis</i> ; <sup>3</sup> iii.5, xi.8.	13 <sup>1-2</sup> v.13; <sup>2</sup> iv.20, viii.9.	43 <sup>1</sup> i.61, xi.9; <sup>2</sup> xvi.26.
4 <sup>1</sup> xi.3, xxi.3; <sup>2</sup> xi.3.	14 <sup>1</sup> i.61, iii.12, ix.23, xiv.23, xvi.17, xx.12; <sup>2</sup> iii.10; <sup>2-3</sup> vii.12; <sup>3</sup> x.15, xii.7; <sup>4</sup> i.61; <sup>5</sup> vii.9, viii.28,34, xii.5; <sup>6</sup> iii.5; <sup>7</sup> iv.6, xvi.14; <sup>8</sup> viii.31, ix.22.	44 <sup>1</sup> vii.2, xi.3, xii.5,7, xiii.4, xxiv.5; <sup>2</sup> viii.3, ix.22, xii.7, xvi.13 <i>bis</i> .
5 <sup>1</sup> xiv.29; xx.1,7.	4.1 <sup>1</sup> iii.5, ix.20, xiii.15; <sup>2</sup> iv.38, vi.13.	45 <sup>1</sup> iii.2, vi.5; <sup>2</sup> viii.24, xiii.12, xxi.4; <sup>3</sup> ix.21, xi.7, xv.4.
6 xi.10,17, xiii.10, xvi.29, xxi.6.	2 viii.27.	46 <sup>1</sup> xii.8, xiv.30,31, xx.3; <sup>2</sup> xiii.15.
7 iii.5, iv.9 <i>bis</i> , xiv.28.	3 viii.10.	5.1 <sup>1</sup> v.28,30, xiv.23, xvii.2; <sup>2</sup> ix.19, x.10,13; <sup>3</sup> v.28,30, xx.7.
8 <sup>1</sup> ix.21,22, x.10, xi.16,17; <sup>2</sup> i.56, v.10.	4 xi.10.	2 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xiv.23; <sup>3</sup> iv.16; <sup>3-4</sup> iv.15; <sup>5</sup> x.10.
9 iii.2, viii.27,28.	9 v.27, xxi.12.	3 <sup>1</sup> ii.48; <sup>2</sup> xiv.18; <sup>3</sup> iii.8, ix.22.
10 <sup>1</sup> iii.8, ix.21; <sup>2</sup> iv.52.	10 iv.42, vi.4.	4 <sup>2</sup> xx.8; <sup>4</sup> v.28,31, xiv.28.
11 <sup>1</sup> viii.8,18-22,29, x.14, xvi.29; <sup>2</sup> xi.16.	11 xi.16, xvi.25.	5 <sup>1</sup> i.33, xi.3 <i>bis</i> , xiv.9,19, 27; <sup>2</sup> xxii.13; <sup>4</sup> iii.4.
	13 xi.17.	6 <sup>1</sup> x.10, xiv.23; <sup>2</sup> iii.8, viii.8; <sup>3</sup> iii.8, xi.13; <sup>4</sup> iii.5, v.32, xiv.5,12, 13, xxi.5.



- TS. i.  
5.10 <sup>1</sup>iv.17,38,42, xi.13,14, xx.8; <sup>1-2</sup>xi.16; <sup>2</sup>xi.16; <sup>3</sup>ix.22, xi.12; <sup>4</sup>ix.22.  
11 <sup>1</sup>viii.33, xvi.2,19; <sup>4</sup>iii.2, xiii.14; <sup>4-5</sup>iii.14; <sup>5</sup>iii.10.  
6.1 <sup>1</sup>ii.25.  
2 <sup>1</sup>xi.11,17, xiv.32, xix.1, xxiv.5; <sup>2</sup>xi.16; <sup>3</sup>xvi.13.  
3 <sup>1</sup>ix.21, xi.3, xiv.28; <sup>3</sup>xvi.19.  
5 <sup>1</sup>vi.14, xi.16; <sup>3</sup>iii.7.  
6 <sup>3</sup>xi.11; <sup>4</sup>ix.21 *quater*, 22, xi.16.  
7 <sup>1</sup>iv.36, xxi.6; <sup>3</sup>v.13, x.16, xiv.11; <sup>4</sup>xi.16.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xxi.15; <sup>2</sup>iv.49, v.18; <sup>3</sup>vii.3,11.  
10 <sup>2</sup>iii.7; <sup>3</sup>xvi.15; <sup>4</sup>v.27, xiii.3, xvii.1; <sup>5</sup>x.8.  
11 <sup>1</sup>vii.6; <sup>2</sup>vii.6; <sup>4</sup>xiii.9.  
12 <sup>1</sup>iii.8, v.13, viii.24,32; <sup>2</sup>iii.12, xiii.12; <sup>2-3</sup>xii.7; <sup>3</sup>iii.10, iv.7, v.29, viii.15, x.22, xiii.4, xiv.4, xvi.21, xvii.5; <sup>4</sup>xii.5,11, xvi.29; <sup>5</sup>iii.10, ix.13, xii.8, xx.3; <sup>6</sup>ix.20,23, xii.7, xiii.12.  
7.1 <sup>1</sup>ix.22; <sup>2</sup>iv.44; <sup>4</sup>xiv.9, 11, xxi.12,14.  
2 <sup>1</sup>v.35, xv.7; <sup>2</sup>i.39, xvii.6, xix.2, xxiii.17, xxiv.5 *bis*; <sup>4</sup>v.13.  
3 <sup>3</sup>iii.6, xxiv.5; <sup>4</sup>ix.21, xxiv.5.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xiv.16 *bis*.  
6 <sup>7</sup>vi.8.  
7 <sup>1</sup>viii.27, xi.3; <sup>2</sup>viii.4, xi.3, xii.7 *bis*, xiv.23.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xxi.5; <sup>2</sup>iv.20, xi.3, xii.4; <sup>3</sup>v.15, xii.7, xiii.12; <sup>4</sup>xvi.13 *bis*.  
9 <sup>1</sup>i.30, viii.7,13,16; <sup>2</sup>viii.13,29, ix.22, xii.7.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xiii.15; <sup>2</sup>xiv.27; <sup>3</sup>i.61, vi.4.  
11 <sup>1</sup>v.25,31, ix.10.  
12 <sup>2</sup>vi.2.  
13 <sup>1</sup>iv.18, xiv.28; <sup>3</sup>iii.12; <sup>5</sup>vi.2, viii.8, xvii.4.  
8 <sup>3</sup>iii.14, vi.2, vii.2 *bis*.  
4 <sup>1</sup>iii.12, vii.12, xv.6.  
5 <sup>1</sup>iv.48, vii.16, ix.21, xiv.20, xvi.17; <sup>2</sup>ix.21, xiii.13.  
6 <sup>1</sup>xii.11; <sup>2</sup>xiv.4.  
7 <sup>1</sup>xiv.2, xx.2,8.  
9 <sup>1</sup>xiii.15; <sup>3</sup>v.20, xv.1.  
10 <sup>2</sup>iii.1,11, v.10, viii.13, xi.17.  
11 vi.3, xiv.6.  
12 <sup>2</sup>iv.11,13, xi.15 *bis*; <sup>3</sup>xiii.12.  
13 <sup>1</sup>xiv.20; <sup>2</sup>iv.11; <sup>2-3</sup>xvi.29; <sup>3</sup>ix.1, x.10, xvi.29.
- TS. i.  
8.14 <sup>2</sup>iii.13, viii.24.  
15 <sup>2</sup>vi.7, xvi.2.  
16 <sup>1</sup>i.58, v.29, vi.4, xiii.4, xv.8; <sup>2</sup>i.58, ii.52, xv.8 *bis*, xvii.1.  
18 xvi.13.  
21 v.32, xi.17, xiv.12.  
22 <sup>1</sup>vii.4; <sup>3</sup>iii.14; <sup>5</sup>xvi.14 *bis*.
- TS. ii.  
1.2 <sup>1</sup>iv.6, ix.7, xi.1, xii.9, xx.4,6,8; <sup>2</sup>iv.12; <sup>3</sup>ix.2,4,5,6, xiv.9,10,11, 15; <sup>4</sup>xiv.26, xxi.15; <sup>5</sup>vii.11, xiv.9 *bis*, 11 *bis*, xxi.14.  
3 <sup>1</sup>xvii.2; <sup>2</sup>vi.12; <sup>3</sup>vi.12; <sup>5</sup>ix.2,6.  
4 <sup>7</sup>iv.12,52.  
5 <sup>1</sup>xi.7; <sup>2</sup>iv.14; <sup>3</sup>iii.7.  
7 <sup>2</sup>v.25, xiv.23; <sup>3</sup>iii.4, viii.16; <sup>7</sup>xvi.21.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xiv.21,26; <sup>2</sup>xiv.26, xx.2.  
9 <sup>2</sup>xi.8; <sup>3</sup>iv.3,4,11,51.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xvi.2.  
11 <sup>1</sup>v.12, xiii.13; <sup>2</sup>iii.7; <sup>3</sup>iii.10; <sup>4</sup>iii.5, v.14, vi.5; <sup>5</sup>iv.40, ix.24, xiii.12, xvii.4; <sup>6</sup>iii.13, iv.10, v.12, xiii.15.  
2.2 <sup>1</sup>v.9; <sup>4</sup>iii.7.  
3 <sup>3</sup>ii.49.  
4 <sup>1</sup>i.61; <sup>5</sup>ix.21; <sup>7</sup>xiv.15; <sup>8</sup>i.61, vi.13, xi.16.  
5 <sup>4</sup>xiv.16, xxi.15; <sup>5</sup>iii.2; <sup>6</sup>xiv.5; <sup>7</sup>iv.40.  
6 <sup>1-2</sup>iv.40; <sup>5</sup>xiii.12 *bis*.  
7 <sup>1</sup>iii.5; <sup>4</sup>viii.15 *bis*, xi.4; <sup>5</sup>iv.52, xv.6.  
8 <sup>3</sup>ix.1 *bis*; <sup>6</sup>v.32, ix.18.  
9 <sup>2</sup>iv.2; <sup>3-4</sup>v.21; <sup>7</sup>iv.7, xv.6.  
10 <sup>2</sup>i.43, iv.52.  
11 <sup>6</sup>xix.3.  
12 <sup>1</sup>viii.24, xiv.9,24,27; <sup>4</sup>v.38, xiv.20, xxi.3; <sup>5</sup>xii.7; <sup>6</sup>iii.7,12, vii.2,4; <sup>7</sup>iv.12; <sup>8</sup>iii.5, vii.2, viii.16, x.19,21,22, xv.6.  
3.1 <sup>3</sup>ix.1, xvii.4.  
2 <sup>3</sup>iv.53; <sup>4</sup>ii.44; <sup>6</sup>ix.4; <sup>9</sup>x.16.  
3 <sup>5</sup>iv.53, xiii.13.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xiii.14; <sup>3</sup>iv.52, vii.5.  
5 <sup>2</sup>ix.10; <sup>3</sup>x.10, xvi.29, xx.2.  
7 <sup>4</sup>ix.16.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xiii.12; <sup>2</sup>iv.11.  
9 <sup>1</sup>viii.26, xi.3.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xx.3; <sup>3</sup>ii.48.  
11 <sup>4</sup>iv.42, ix.11, x.22, xx.8, xxii.13; <sup>5</sup>viii.24.  
12 <sup>1</sup>v.21.  
13 <sup>2</sup>ii.44, xiv.9,10,11,15.  
14 <sup>1</sup>iv.15; <sup>3</sup>v.17, xiii.9; <sup>4</sup>xii.7; <sup>6</sup>iv.34, v.8.
- TS. ii.  
4.1 <sup>1</sup>iii.7, v.24,33; <sup>2</sup>ix.19, xi.10, xxi.10; <sup>4</sup>xvi.13.  
2 <sup>2</sup>ix.19; <sup>3</sup>vi.12, xiii.14, xvi.29.  
3 <sup>2</sup>xx.4.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xxii.13.  
5 <sup>1</sup>v.2, vii.2, x.13,15.  
6 <sup>2</sup>xiv.18.  
7 <sup>1</sup>iii.5, viii.11; <sup>2</sup>viii.12, xi.16.  
8 <sup>2</sup>iii.10 *bis*, 12.  
9 <sup>3</sup>xvi.31.  
10 <sup>2</sup>xiv.8,28; <sup>3</sup>iii.5, iv.24, ix.11, x.19, xxi.15.  
11 <sup>1</sup>x.16; <sup>2</sup>vi.2; <sup>4</sup>vi.14; <sup>6</sup>iii.2, xiii.15.  
12 <sup>3</sup>iv.6, vii.6, viii.8, ix.12, xv.6; <sup>4</sup>iii.9; <sup>6</sup>xv.7.  
13 x.7, xiii.8, xiv.23.  
14 <sup>1</sup>v.5, xii.8, xiv.11, xxi.14; <sup>2</sup>xii.7; <sup>3</sup>iii.8; <sup>6</sup>vi.2, viii.12.  
5.1 <sup>2</sup>viii.8 *bis*; <sup>3</sup>ix.13, xi.1, xii.9, xx.4; <sup>7</sup>xiii.9.  
2 <sup>2</sup>iv.2; <sup>3</sup>iv.53; <sup>5</sup>iv.28,29, 52, xvi.30.  
3 <sup>1</sup>xvi.13; <sup>6-7</sup>xi.13; <sup>7</sup>vi.9, x.10, xvi.20.  
4 <sup>4</sup>vii.2.  
5 <sup>2</sup>iv.52, xiii.12; <sup>3</sup>x.4, xiv.7 *bis*; <sup>4</sup>xvi.11; <sup>5</sup>iv.11.  
6 <sup>1</sup>iv.44; <sup>3</sup>ii.46, viii.8; <sup>5</sup>iv.42,44, x.24; <sup>6</sup>i.60, iv.11,44, xvi.11, xxiv.5.  
7 <sup>1</sup>xxi.15; <sup>1-2</sup>xiv.16; <sup>4</sup>iv.33.  
8 <sup>3</sup>xv.4; <sup>5</sup>xvi.13; <sup>7</sup>ii.14.  
9 <sup>1</sup>ix.21, x.10 *bis*; <sup>2</sup>xvi.13, 26; <sup>3</sup>vi.14, ix.21, xiv.10; <sup>6</sup>ix.22.  
10 <sup>1</sup>vi.14, xv.1, xvi.25.  
11 <sup>1-2</sup>xvi.13.  
12 <sup>1</sup>iv.52, vi.5, vii.13; <sup>2</sup>iii.3, xiv.28, xvi.13; <sup>3</sup>xvi.25; <sup>4</sup>v.2, x.13, xiv.33, xxiv.5; <sup>5</sup>vi.5, xii.8.  
6.2 <sup>1</sup>iv.12,44, xiii.16; <sup>2</sup>ii.49, iv.30; <sup>3-4</sup>xix.2; <sup>4</sup>iv.53; <sup>6</sup>x.12.  
3 <sup>4</sup>x.10; <sup>5</sup>iv.49.  
5 <sup>1</sup>iv.25, x.10; <sup>3</sup>iv.25; <sup>5</sup>xiv.32, xix.1.  
6 <sup>1</sup>xvi.13, xxiv.5; <sup>2</sup>viii.33; <sup>3</sup>iv.11, v.13, x.16.  
7 <sup>1</sup>iv.39, viii.9; <sup>3</sup>iv.7, xv.8, xvii.2; <sup>4</sup>x.10; <sup>5</sup>iv.23.  
8 <sup>4</sup>xvi.26.  
9 <sup>3</sup>iv.44; <sup>4</sup>iii.7; <sup>5</sup>iv.29, ix.19, xiv.28; <sup>8</sup>viii.30.  
10 <sup>2</sup>v.22, vii.3; <sup>4</sup>vi.7.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iii.8,9, xiii.2, xx.8; <sup>2</sup>vi.2, xi.4, xiii.10, xvi.29; <sup>3</sup>iii.8, vii.2, viii.25, x.10, xiv.1; <sup>4</sup>iii.9, viii.24, xiii.2, xvi.20.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



## TS. iv.

- 5.9 <sup>1</sup> i.22, ix.3,5,6, xvi.26;  
<sup>2</sup> xiv.8.  
 10 <sup>1</sup> iv.7, xi.3; <sup>2</sup> iii.8, viii.  
 26, xi.3; <sup>3</sup> iii.9; <sup>4</sup> iii.  
 8, vi.5, vii.4; <sup>5</sup> xii.8;  
 end'g xxiv.6.  
 11 <sup>1</sup> xi.17; <sup>2</sup> i.61, xi.16.  
 6.1 <sup>1</sup> vi.14, xi.3 *bis*, xii.8,  
 xiv.9, xvii.2; <sup>2</sup> iii.14,  
 xii.5; <sup>3</sup> xi.3, xii.7;  
<sup>5</sup> xvi.20 *bis*.  
 2 <sup>1</sup> xiv.8; <sup>2</sup> v.17; <sup>4</sup> iii.13,  
 iv.38, vi.11; <sup>5</sup> viii.27,  
 xvi.14; <sup>6</sup> iii.12.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> iii.8; <sup>2</sup> vii.9; <sup>3</sup> ix.21,  
 22; <sup>4</sup> ix.22.  
 4 <sup>1</sup> i.21, v.34, ix.3,4,5,6,  
 xiii.15, xvi.26; <sup>1-2</sup> iii.  
 12; <sup>2</sup> vi.12, ix.21, xii.  
 8; <sup>4</sup> iii.10 *bis*, xvi.  
 26.  
 5 <sup>1</sup> viii.24; <sup>3</sup> xii.6; <sup>4</sup> iii.  
 10, ix.7; <sup>6</sup> xiii.9.  
 6 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xi.3, xvii.3, xix.  
 1; <sup>1-2</sup> x.13; <sup>2</sup> iv.20,21,  
 v.2, vi.13 *bis*; <sup>3</sup> iii.7,  
 8, ix.20, xii.7, xiii.9,  
 xvii.5; <sup>4</sup> iv.11, xi.3,  
 xii.7 *bis*, xvi.20; <sup>5</sup> i.  
 59, ix.20, xii.3,7; <sup>6</sup> v.  
 17, x.10, xiv.27; <sup>7</sup> vi.  
 4, xii.7.  
 7 <sup>1</sup> vii.8, ix.20, xi.3, xii.3;  
<sup>3</sup> iii.8, viii.8, xi.5 *ter*,  
 xvi.13; <sup>4</sup> iv.38, xii.4,  
 xvi.8; <sup>5</sup> iii.8, xvi.7.  
 8 <sup>1</sup> ix.8,20, xi.3, xiv.8;  
<sup>2</sup> xii.7, xvi.5; <sup>3</sup> xii.7.  
 9 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xi.3, xvi.8; <sup>2</sup> iii.  
 7; <sup>3</sup> iii.8,12, viii.32,  
 xvi.5; <sup>4</sup> i.25, iii.14,  
 iv.15 *bis*, v.4 *bis*, 38,  
 viii.28, xii.7, xvi.  
 13.  
 7.1 <sup>1</sup> xi.11.  
 2 <sup>1</sup> ii.44.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> v.20,27.  
 4 <sup>1</sup> xiv.15; <sup>1-2</sup> v.4, xiv.8;  
<sup>2</sup> xiii.12.  
 5 <sup>1</sup> iv.38, v.4, xiv.11, xxii.  
 14, xxiv.5.  
 6 <sup>1</sup> viii.6, ix.2,6.  
 8 xiii.7.  
 9 <sup>1</sup> xxi.3.  
 10 <sup>2</sup> v.21.  
 12 <sup>1</sup> iii.10, xi.3 *bis*, xii.7  
*bis*; <sup>2</sup> ix.22.  
 13 <sup>1</sup> iv.52, xvi.3; <sup>2</sup> iv.11,  
 viii.25; <sup>3</sup> viii.33; <sup>4</sup> iii.  
 12; <sup>5</sup> iii.6, iv.11, vi.  
 14, xvi.13, xxiv.5.  
 14 <sup>1</sup> iii.3; <sup>2</sup> iii.12, xi.3, xii.  
 7; <sup>3</sup> viii.8, xii.7.  
 15 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xi.3, xiii.15, xvi.  
 13; <sup>2</sup> iv.40, v.4; <sup>3</sup> iii.  
 7, iv.52, xiv.23; <sup>4</sup> ix.  
 23, xvii.1; <sup>6</sup> iii.10, iv.  
 20 *bis*, 21, xvi.13,29;  
<sup>7</sup> iii.12,13, vi.2, xx.1.

## TS. v.

- 1.1 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xi.16; <sup>2</sup> v.18;  
<sup>4</sup> viii.33, ix.3, xiii.9  
*bis*, xiv.26, xxi.12,  
 xxiv.5.  
 2 <sup>1</sup> vii.8, x.9, xi.13, xviii.  
 7; <sup>3</sup> xvi.13; <sup>5</sup> iii.6.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> i.61, xi.18; <sup>3</sup> i.61.  
 4 <sup>1</sup> xi.13,15; <sup>4</sup> iv.44.  
 5 <sup>1</sup> i.61, iv.25; <sup>3-4</sup> i.61;  
<sup>4</sup> iv.17,25; <sup>5</sup> xiv.16,  
 xxi.16.  
 6 <sup>3-4</sup> iv.44,45; <sup>4</sup> vi.12,13,  
 vii.16, ix.1.  
 7 <sup>1</sup> vi.2, xiii.13; <sup>4</sup> viii.8,  
 xiv.8.  
 10 <sup>1</sup> x.10, xiii.7, xiv.4;  
<sup>2-3</sup> iv.52; <sup>3</sup> ii.49.  
 11 <sup>1</sup> vi.5, ix.7,13,20, xi.16;  
<sup>2</sup> iii.10, iv.20, vi.9,  
 13.  
 2.1 <sup>7</sup> i.21, iv.12, ix.3, xiv.15.  
 2 <sup>5</sup> xi.16,17.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> i.29; <sup>2</sup> xiv.18; <sup>3-4</sup> iii.  
 5; <sup>4</sup> v.21,24; <sup>5</sup> iv.31;  
<sup>6</sup> iii.8.  
 4 <sup>3</sup> xvii.6.  
 5 <sup>1</sup> xvi.13; <sup>2</sup> xiii.9; <sup>5</sup> vi.  
 12; <sup>6</sup> viii.8.  
 6 <sup>2</sup> vi.12; <sup>3</sup> vii.5,6.  
 7 <sup>1</sup> iv.25, xxi.8, xiv.9;  
<sup>2</sup> xvii.1,3, xxi.8; <sup>3</sup> ii.  
 30, x.10, xiv.23; <sup>4</sup> iv.  
 25,26; <sup>5</sup> iii.15, xiv.10,  
 11, xxi.9, xxiv.4.  
 8 <sup>1</sup> xiii.14; <sup>5</sup> xvii.1; <sup>6</sup> xxi.  
 7; <sup>7</sup> xvi.2,13.  
 9 <sup>4</sup> xiv.11; <sup>6</sup> xvi.19.  
 10 <sup>3</sup> xvi.27; <sup>6</sup> xvii.3; <sup>7</sup> ix.  
 21.  
 11 <sup>1</sup> ix.20, xiv.5,8 *bis*.  
 12 <sup>1</sup> ix.20; <sup>2</sup> xi.3,17.  
 3.1 <sup>1</sup> x.9; <sup>2</sup> xiv.28; <sup>3</sup> vi.12;  
<sup>4</sup> iv.50; <sup>5</sup> xvi.30 *bis*.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> vi.13; <sup>3</sup> xvi.25.  
 5 <sup>2</sup> iv.44,45; <sup>3</sup> vii.10; <sup>4</sup> x.  
 14.  
 6 <sup>1</sup> vi.14; <sup>2</sup> x.18, xxiv.5;  
<sup>3</sup> vi.14, xiv.12.  
 7 <sup>2</sup> iv.42; <sup>3</sup> i.25, iv.11,  
 33.  
 8 <sup>1</sup> xvi.15; <sup>3</sup> xiv.8.  
 11 <sup>1</sup> xvi.13; <sup>2</sup> iii.5, vi.14;  
<sup>3</sup> x.16, xx.1,2.  
 12 <sup>1</sup> xx.7; <sup>2</sup> v.38, xi.17.  
 4.1 <sup>1</sup> iv.42; <sup>4</sup> xvi.14.  
 2 <sup>3</sup> v.38.  
 3 <sup>3</sup> vi.3, xiv.15; <sup>4</sup> xxi.9.  
 4 <sup>1</sup> vi.4; <sup>4</sup> iv.12, xxi.16.  
 6 <sup>2</sup> viii.29.  
 7 <sup>3</sup> iv.29; <sup>7</sup> xiii.9.  
 8 <sup>5</sup> i.31, iv.52, xiv.2,22.  
 9 <sup>3</sup> iv.11; <sup>4</sup> xi.5,6.  
 10 <sup>2</sup> xvi.14; <sup>5</sup> xvi.13.  
 11 <sup>3</sup> xxi.7.  
 12 <sup>1</sup> vi.5,14; <sup>3</sup> v.6.  
 5.1 <sup>5</sup> v.21; <sup>7</sup> xvi.16.  
 2 <sup>4</sup> v.17; <sup>6</sup> v.33, xiii.2.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> ix.21; <sup>2</sup> ix.18, xvii.2,  
 xx.2,3, xxiv.5.

## TS. v.

- 5.4 <sup>1</sup> ix.25 *bis*, ix.10; <sup>2</sup> iv.  
 31; <sup>4</sup> iv.38, ix.16.  
 5 <sup>1</sup> xi.8,9; <sup>2</sup> vii.5,16, xvi.  
 26; <sup>3</sup> xxi.2; <sup>4</sup> x.10,  
 17 *bis*, xvi.13, xx.5.  
 6 <sup>1</sup> iv.44; <sup>2</sup> iv.37.  
 7 <sup>1</sup> iv.33; <sup>3</sup> viii.30, xi.5;  
<sup>4</sup> viii.23.  
 8 <sup>1</sup> x.18, xxiv.5.  
 9 <sup>1</sup> iv.11, xvi.26, xxi.10,  
 xxiv.3,5; <sup>2</sup> i.22, ii.25  
*bis*, 48, viii.2, xiv.23,  
 xvi.26; <sup>3</sup> viii.16, xi.  
 16,17.  
 10 <sup>1</sup> iv.32.  
 11 iv.39, xvi.26, xxi.8.  
 12 xvi.19.  
 15 iv.39, vii.13, xiii.12.  
 16 viii.17.  
 18 iv.28, ix.2.  
 19 viii.17, xiv.23.  
 20 iii.2.  
 21 x.4.  
 24 iv.12.  
 6.1 <sup>1</sup> iv.11, ix.20; <sup>2</sup> ii.47, iii.  
 12, ix.15,20 *bis*, x.19,  
 21, xv.1, xvii.1,2, xx.  
 2; <sup>3</sup> iii.15, vii.2, viii.  
 8, xi.3,5; <sup>5</sup> vi.10.  
 2 <sup>4</sup> xi.18.  
 4 <sup>1</sup> iv.25 *bis*, xii.8, xvi.19;  
<sup>4</sup> xvi.27.  
 5 <sup>3</sup> ii.49, ix.19,21, xiii.12,  
 xiv.24,27.  
 6 <sup>1</sup> v.22; <sup>3</sup> xi.17; <sup>3-4</sup> xvi.  
 26; <sup>4</sup> v.6.  
 7 <sup>3</sup> xvi.8.  
 8 <sup>1</sup> xvi.2; <sup>2</sup> vi.12,13; <sup>3</sup> vi.  
 13, xv.4; <sup>4</sup> iv.52; <sup>6</sup> iv.  
 11.  
 9 <sup>1</sup> vii.3; <sup>3</sup> xiii.3.  
 12 iv.15.  
 14 x.14.  
 15 x.6.  
 21 i.59, iv.39,48 *bis*, xxi.  
 8.  
 23 vi.12.  
 7.2 <sup>1</sup> vii.2; <sup>3</sup> vii.8, xi.17;  
<sup>4</sup> iii.10, xiv.11; <sup>4-5</sup> iv.  
 7.  
 3 <sup>1</sup> vi.12, xi.13, xiv.9,17;  
<sup>3</sup> ii.25, iv.44, vi.14.  
 4 <sup>2</sup> x.12, xx.2,8; <sup>3</sup> iii.3;  
<sup>4</sup> xvi.22.  
 5 <sup>2</sup> vii.2; <sup>7</sup> iii.7.  
 6 <sup>2</sup> viii.8, xiii.14; <sup>6</sup> vi.7.  
 7 <sup>1</sup> xi.16; <sup>2</sup> iv.11; <sup>3</sup> iii.15.  
 8 <sup>1</sup> xi.17.  
 9 <sup>1</sup> iv.7, ix.21,22,24, x.19,  
 xi.9,16, xvii.1,6, xix.  
 1, xx.2.  
 10 <sup>1</sup> xvii.1.  
 11 v.14, xiv.16, xxi.16.  
 12 i.22, v.37, x.14.  
 14 vi.7.  
 17 iii.7.  
 20 viii.13, x.12, xvi.8.  
 23 xiv.2,10, xvi.7,14,16.  
 26 ix.4, xx.8.



TS. vi.

- 1.1 <sup>1</sup>xvi.21; <sup>2</sup>iv.17, xiv.11;  
<sup>3-4</sup>vii.13; <sup>4</sup>viii.34;  
<sup>7</sup>xix.3.  
3 <sup>1</sup>iv.11,24,38,42 *bis*, vi.7,  
viii.16, xiii.6; <sup>1-2</sup>xiii.  
6; <sup>7</sup>i.34, xiv.5; <sup>8</sup>iv.  
38, xiii.11.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xiii.12; <sup>2</sup>vi.4, vii.14.  
5 <sup>1</sup>iv.52, vii.6, xix.3, xxi.  
7, xxii.15; <sup>3</sup>iii.7, vii.  
6; <sup>5</sup>vii.6.  
6 <sup>4</sup>i.48, xiv.1,5; <sup>5</sup>iv.42,  
viii.31; <sup>6</sup>ix.22; <sup>7</sup>iv.  
28, xiii.9,12, xxi.7.  
7 <sup>6</sup>viii.9; <sup>7</sup>i.59.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iv.44,45.  
9 <sup>1</sup>i.58, viii.23, ix.9, x.19,  
xv.7,8; <sup>2</sup>x.10, xiii.13;  
<sup>4</sup>v.19.  
10 <sup>1</sup>iv.2, xi.16 *bis*, xiii.12,  
xiv.6; <sup>5</sup>xi.17.  
11 <sup>2</sup>vii.16; <sup>6</sup>ix.17.  
2.1 <sup>1</sup>iii.7, vii.4; <sup>5</sup>iv.12,33;  
<sup>5-6</sup>ix.22.  
2 <sup>7</sup>iii.8.  
3 <sup>1</sup>v.7; <sup>3</sup>viii.8; <sup>5</sup>v.18.  
4 <sup>1</sup>ii.25, x.10,17, xx.5,6;  
<sup>2</sup>viii.17.  
6 <sup>2</sup>ix.21; <sup>4</sup>vii.6, xvi.9.  
8 <sup>4</sup>iv.11; <sup>6</sup>xiv.16.  
9 <sup>1</sup>iv.11 *bis*; <sup>3</sup>iv.33; <sup>4</sup>v.  
10, vi.8, xvi.2 *bis*, xx.  
8.  
11 <sup>1</sup>i.59, iv.11; <sup>3</sup>iv.5,11 *bis*,  
v.9, xiii.14; <sup>4</sup>ii.44, iv.  
11, vi.11, viii.16, xiv.  
8.  
3.1 <sup>2</sup>v.6, ix.22; <sup>5</sup>ii.30, v.  
32,38.  
2 <sup>3</sup>xiii.14, xiv.22; <sup>6</sup>vi.7.  
3 <sup>1</sup>v.38,39,40, xiv.12;  
<sup>3</sup>xxi.15.  
4 <sup>6</sup>xiv.8; <sup>8</sup>xiv.5.  
5 <sup>3</sup>iv.52.  
6 <sup>3</sup>iii.8, xiii.15.  
7 <sup>4</sup>xxiv.5.  
9 <sup>1</sup>viii.14; <sup>3</sup>xi.16; <sup>5</sup>iii.7;  
<sup>6</sup>iv.12.  
10 <sup>1</sup>viii.8; <sup>4</sup>xvi.20; <sup>5</sup>xiii.  
6; <sup>6</sup>vii.10.  
11 <sup>3</sup>iv.11,24; <sup>6</sup>xiv.2.  
4.1 <sup>3</sup>iv.14, xvi.14.  
2 <sup>4</sup>xiii.2.  
3 <sup>2</sup>xi.6,14; <sup>3</sup>viii.23; <sup>4</sup>xii.  
8, xx.8.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xvi.29; <sup>4</sup>iii.8, xvi.29  
*bis*.  
5 <sup>1</sup>xi.16, xiv.17; <sup>3</sup>xvi.29;  
<sup>7</sup>xvi.29.  
6 <sup>1</sup>vii.10, ix.20, xvi.29;  
<sup>3</sup>viii.10.  
7 <sup>2</sup>i.48, iv.40, v.23, xiv.1;  
<sup>3</sup>vii.12 *bis*, viii.2.

TS. vi.

- 4.8 <sup>2</sup>xvi.29.  
9 <sup>2</sup>viii.23, xiv.17.  
10 <sup>1</sup>iv.40, xiii.13, xiv.23,  
xvii.3; <sup>2</sup>viii.35; <sup>3</sup>iv.  
11; end'g viii.35,  
xxiv.6.  
11 <sup>4</sup>iv.11, vi.10.  
5.1 <sup>3-4</sup>viii.32.  
2 <sup>2</sup>xiv.6.  
3 <sup>1</sup>xiv.24; <sup>4</sup>xiv.23, xvi.12.  
5 <sup>3</sup>viii.2.  
6 <sup>1</sup>xiv.31.  
8 <sup>3</sup>ii.21, iv.7; <sup>4</sup>i.4,58, viii.  
27, xv.8, xvi.13; <sup>6</sup>i.  
59, iii.15, iv.53, viii.  
8, end'g xxiv.6.  
10 <sup>3</sup>xvi.9.  
11 <sup>1</sup>vii.16; <sup>4</sup>vi.10, xi.17,  
xiii.7.  
6.1 <sup>4</sup>xi.9.  
2 <sup>1</sup>xvi.16; <sup>3</sup>i.54.  
3 <sup>1</sup>viii.30, xvi.14; <sup>2</sup>viii.  
33; <sup>3</sup>v.33.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xiii.16; <sup>2</sup>xvi.13; <sup>3</sup>i.30,  
59, iv.35, x.10; <sup>6</sup>v.14.  
5 <sup>2</sup>vi.10, x.10; <sup>3</sup>xiv.20.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xi.12.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iv.28.  
10 <sup>2</sup>x.10, xvi.29.  
11 <sup>1</sup>v.32, xiv.12,13, xxi.4;  
<sup>4</sup>iv.11, vii.11; <sup>5</sup>xvi.6.

TS. vii.

- 1.1 <sup>2</sup>xvii.1; <sup>5</sup>xiv.18,31, xvi.  
13.  
3 <sup>1</sup>vi.14; <sup>2</sup>v.20.  
4 <sup>3</sup>iv.11, xx.2, xxi.11.  
5 <sup>1</sup>vi.14; <sup>3</sup>v.22; <sup>4</sup>x.10,  
xii.11, xiv.31; <sup>5</sup>xx.7.  
6 <sup>1</sup>x.24, xv.7, xxiv.5;  
<sup>2</sup>xvi.29; <sup>4</sup>xiv.6;  
<sup>5</sup>xiii.12; <sup>6</sup>iii.15, v.9,  
vii.5, xiii.12, xiv.2,21,  
26; <sup>8</sup>xi.17.  
7 <sup>1</sup>xiii.9.  
8 <sup>1</sup>vi.12, x.17, xx.5,8.  
9 ix.21.  
12 x.10.  
19 <sup>1</sup>v.12, vi.12, vii.5, xiii.  
14, xvi.22; <sup>3</sup>v.14,  
xvi.22.  
2.1 <sup>2</sup>iv.52; <sup>3</sup>ii.24; <sup>4</sup>x.10.  
2 <sup>1</sup>ii.25.  
4 <sup>2</sup>xiii.9.  
5 <sup>3</sup>viii.4.  
6 <sup>1</sup>i.31; <sup>3</sup>iv.54.  
7 <sup>2</sup>viii.10, xi.16.  
8 <sup>1</sup>vii.6, viii.13.  
9 <sup>1</sup>iv.11.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xi.13, xvi.29; <sup>2</sup>vii.2,  
xiii.12; <sup>3</sup>x.10.  
13 xvi.25, xxii.14.  
15 ii.44, v.3, vii.2, viii.2.

TS. vii.

- 2.17 xvi.25 *bis*.  
3.1 <sup>1</sup>xiii.12; <sup>3</sup>iii.15.  
2 <sup>1</sup>ix.20.  
4 <sup>1</sup>v.21.  
5 <sup>3</sup>viii.13.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xii.10.  
9 <sup>2</sup>viii.13.  
10 <sup>3</sup>iv.11, xiv.16.  
12 v.33, xiv.5, xxi.9,12,  
xxiv.5.  
13 xi.17, xiv.18.  
14 ii.30, xiii.9, xvii.1.  
15 xiii.14.  
16 <sup>1</sup>i.22, iii.7 *bis*, x.14; <sup>2</sup>iii.  
7, xvi.30.  
17 x.14, xvi.30.  
18 vi.12, xiii.12.  
4.2 <sup>5</sup>v.32, viii.13, ix.18.  
3 <sup>2</sup>vi.14; <sup>4</sup>iii.7; <sup>6</sup>v.8.  
4 <sup>3</sup>iv.54; <sup>4</sup>iv.52.  
5 <sup>1</sup>iv.51, viii.13; <sup>2</sup>vii.2.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xiv.1.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iv.52; <sup>2</sup>iii.4; <sup>3</sup>x.10.  
9 xvi.13.  
10 <sup>1</sup>vi.13; <sup>2</sup>vii.8.  
11 <sup>1</sup>vi.2,13; <sup>2</sup>iv.12; <sup>3</sup>iv.  
53.  
13 iii.7, xiv.16, xxi.16.  
15 iii.10, xi.17, xvi.20.  
17 <sup>1</sup>xi.6.  
19 <sup>1</sup>x.10, xi.17, xvi.18;  
<sup>3</sup>xiii.12, xvi.2; <sup>4</sup>xvi.  
13.  
20 viii.8, xi.6,7, xiii.12,15,  
xv.8, xvi.18, xx.7.  
21 vi.12  
5.1 <sup>1</sup>xiii.14; <sup>4</sup>iv.11, viii.14,  
xvi.29; <sup>6</sup>xvi.12.  
2 <sup>1</sup>ii.47, vi.3, ix.14, x.19,  
xvi.27; <sup>2</sup>vi.12, x.17,  
xvi.12, xx.5.  
3 <sup>1</sup>iv.11, xvi.12,17; <sup>2</sup>iv.  
11.  
5 <sup>1</sup>x.10; <sup>2</sup>xvii.4.  
6 <sup>1</sup>iv.26; <sup>3</sup>iv.42; <sup>4</sup>vi.  
14.  
7 <sup>1</sup>iv.42,52, ix.17; <sup>4</sup>iii.8,  
xi.13.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xiii.6; <sup>4</sup>v.19.  
9 <sup>1</sup>xiii.16, xiv.4; <sup>2</sup>xiii.12;  
<sup>3</sup>vii.16; <sup>4</sup>viii.10, xiv.  
8.  
10 vii.16.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iii.2,5, xiv.5; <sup>2</sup>xvi.4.  
12 <sup>1</sup>xiii.13; <sup>2</sup>xiii.13, xiv.  
23, xvi.10.  
14 xiv.8.  
15 <sup>2</sup>xiv.8, xvi.14.  
19 <sup>1</sup>xvi.22.  
20 xxi.16.  
22 xvi.29.  
24 iv.20, xi.13.  
25 <sup>1</sup>xiii.13; <sup>2</sup>xviii.1.



## SANSKRIT INDEX.

THE following Index contains the whole matter of the Prâtiçâkhyâ itself—both the proper vocabulary of the treatise, and the words and parts of words which it quotes from the Sanhitâ; the latter being distinguished by being printed with *spaced letters*. To this is added a very liberal selection from the vocabulary of the commentary; perhaps more liberal than may seem to some worth while, but I preferred to err in this direction rather than the contrary. The references to the commentary are designated by a prefixed *c*; and an added *v* indicates that the word is to be sought among the various readings given at the foot of the comment.

- a*, xiii.15.  
*ahkâra*, i.23:—*ci*.24, xvi.25.  
*aḥsarva*, ix.7.  
*añça*, *c* iii.8, iv.23, xxi.2*v*.  
*añçabhuvâ*, xvi.29.  
*añçam*, *añçâya*, xvi.29.  
*añçavaḥ*, xvi.29.  
*añçu*, xvi.29.  
*añçuh*, xi.10, xvi.29.  
*añçunâ*, *añçubhiḥ*, *añçum*, *añçû*, *añçûn*, *añçoh*, *añçâu*, xvi.29.  
*añsâbhyâm*, *añsâya*, *añse*, *añsâu*, xvi.30.  
*añhah*, viii.15, xvi.29.  
*añhatih*, xi.4, xvi.29.  
*añhasah*, viii.24, xi.4, xvi.29.  
*añhasâ*, xvi.29.  
*añhoh*, xvi.29.  
*añhomuk-*, xvi.29.  
*akah*, viii.8, ix.22.  
*akaram*, xii.7.  
*akarot*, iv.52.  
*akâra*, i.17,21,32,52, ii.21, 26, iv.6, viii.23, ix.7,13, xi.1,9, xv.8, xx.4.  
*akurva*, v.7.  
*akurvata*, ix.22.  
*akṛṇot*, xi.17.  
*akte*, iv.11.  
*akrañsta*, xvi.22.  
*akshana*, xiii.13.  
*akshara*, xx.2, xxiii.7:—*ci*.3, x.1,4–12, xix.1, xxii.14–5, xxiii.8–9: and *sam-dhyakshara*, *samânâkshara*.  
*aksharasamhitâ*, xxiv.2,4.  
*akhaṇḍapada*, *c* iv.11, xv.4.  
*akhilapada*, *c* vi.12, xvi.19, 20.  
*aganma*, ix.22.  
*agamat*, xi.7.  
*agnayah*, xii.8; *agnayah paprayah*, xii.7.  
*agni*, iii.9:—*ci*.2, ix.20 (*-kân-da*).  
*agni*, xi.15.  
*agnih*, vi.5, xi.13, xiii.15.  
*agnim gâyatram*, iv.52.  
*agnir mûrdhâ*, xi.3.  
*agne*, xi.10.  
*agner jihvâm*, xii.7.  
*agriyâya*, xi.14.  
*agre*, ix.22, xi.14,16.  
*agha*, xi.13.  
*aghâ*, iii.2.  
*aghosha*, i.12, ii.10, ix.1,2, xiv.9,10,18:—*ci*.14 etc.  
*aghoshatva*, *c* i.13.  
*aghoshavant*, *c* ix.1,3 (*-tva*).  
*aghniya*, xi.17.  
*aṅga*, xxi.1, xxiv.5:—*c* xxi.2 etc.: and *pratya-*  
*aṅgasamhitâ*, xxiv.2:—*c* xxiv.4.  
*aṅgânâm*, vii.10.  
*aṅgirah*, xi.17.  
*aṅgirasvat*, xii.7.  
*aṅgîkar*, *c* xvi.2.  
*aṅgushthâgra*, *c* xxiii.17.  
*aṅge*, xi.17.  
*ac*, *c* xiv.4.  
*acyutah*, xi.17.  
*achâ*, iii.8.  
*achidre*, iv.11.  
*ajâsi*, xvi.18.  
*ajîgah*, viii.8.  
*ajîtân*, xi.17.  
*ajyânim*, xi.17.  
*r. añj*, + *abhivi*, *c* v.7: and *vyañjana*, *ativyakta*, *avyakta*.  
*aṇavaç ca*, xiii.12.  
*aṇishthâḥ*, xiii.12.  
*aṇu*, xvii.3:—*c* xix.3,4–5 (*-kâr-ya*). xxi.15, xxiv.6.  
*aṇutâ*, xxii.9.  
*aṇumâtrâ*, xix.3:—*c* xix.4, xxi.15.  
*aṇumâtrika*, *c* xix.4, xxii.13 (*adhy-*).  
*ataḥ*, xxii.14.  
*atañsayat*, xvi.13.  
*ati*, xiv.8.  
*atidivah*, viii.24.  
*atidrutah*, xi.17.  
*atiprasaṅga*, *c* ii.9.  
*utiprâpti*, *c* iii.1*v*.  
*atiyanti*, xi.17.  
*atireka*, *c* intr., xxiii.20.  
*ativyakta*, xvii.8.  
*ativyasta*, ii.12:—*ci*.13.  
*ativyâpti*, *c* iii.1.  
*atiçaya*, *c* ii.16,27, xvii.6.  
*atispashta*, *c* xvii.8.  
*atîsvâr-ya*, xxiii.12:—*c* xxiii.13.  
*-ate*, iv.54.  
*attâ*, iii.12.  
*atyañhah*, xvi.29.  
*atyanta*, *c* xxiii.6,7.  
*atyupasamhṛta*, ii.12.  
*atra*, xvii.5:—*ci*.1,15 etc.  
*atrastha*, xii.7.  
*atrâ*, iii.8.  
*atha*, i.1,2, ii.1, iii.1, iv.1,8, v.1,11, vi.1,6, vii.1, viii.1, 5, ix.10, x.1,3, xi.2, xii.1, xiii.1,5, xiv.14,25, xvi.1, xx.3, xxii.6, xxiii.1, xxiv.1.  
*atha*, iii.10, ix.24.  
*atho*, xii.7.  
*adah*, xii.7.  
*adabdhâsah*, xi.16.  
*aditih*, ix.22; *aditih çarma*, xii.7.  
*adugdhâḥ*, xii.7.  
*aduhat*, ix.22.  
*adbhiḥ*, xi.8.  
*adya*, xi.10; *adya pathi*, xi.13.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



- aprayoga*, ci.18.  
*aprasakta*, cxiv.4.  
*aprusiddha*, cxiii.14,15.  
*apsu yah*, xi.17.  
*abibhaḥ*, viii.8.  
*abrûtâm*, iv.52.  
*abhâḥ*, viii.8.  
*abhâva*, ci.14,33,42, ii.20,25  
 etc., iv.52 etc.  
*abhi*, i.15.  
*abhi*, xi.13.  
*abhikhyâ*, cxiii.7.  
*abhighâta*, cii.2.  
*abhidroham*, xii.7.  
*abhidhâna*, ci.11, xxi.16.  
*abhinidhâna*, xiv.9:—c xiv.  
 10v.  
*abhinihata*, xx.4,10:—c xx.8.  
*abhiprâya*, cxiv.5,15.  
*abhimata*, cxviii.4.  
*abhi vâtu*, xi.6.  
*abhividhi*, civ.23,52.  
*abhi*, iii.7.  
*abhedavivakshâ*, ci.1,18.  
*abhyantara*, cii.41.  
*abhyaḥvartina*, xii.7.  
 -am, i.18.  
*amatra*, xvii.8.  
*amanahprayoga*, xxiii.6.  
*amâ*, xii.7.  
*amitrân*, ix.21.  
*aminanta*, x.13.  
*ami*, iv.12.  
*amukhya*, cxiii.14.  
*amuñcatâ*, iii.12.  
*amrtân*, ix.21.  
*ambakân*, vi.14.  
*ambâli*, xi.17.  
*ay*, ix.11.  
*ayajuh*, vii.8.  
*ayan-*, vii.6.  
*ayam*, iv.23.  
*ayamu*, vi.2.  
*ayân*, ix.21.  
*ayukta*, cxiii.9, xiv.5.  
 r. ar: samarpita, cxvi.24.  
*ar*, v.9, x.8.  
*aratim*, xi.17.  
*arathâḥ*, xii.7.  
*arân*, ix.21.  
*arishṭâḥ*, xii.7.  
*arcanti*, xii.7.  
*arcân*, ix.23.  
*arciḥ*, xi.17.  
*artha*, cviii.14,20, xxi.7:  
 and ana-, ekâ-, ârthika,  
 sârthaka.  
*arthaçâstra*, cxiii.14.  
*arthântara*, ci.7, iv.47, xiv.  
 4.  
*ardha*, i.37,41, ii.26, xi.19:  
 and adhya-.
- ardhatṛtiya*, xviii.1 (-mâ-  
 tra).  
*ardhamâtra*, xxii.13:—c i.34  
 (-tva), ii.25, xi.19, xxi.1.  
 15.  
*arpite*, iv.11.  
*aryaman*, xii.7.  
*arvantam*, xi.17.  
*alam*, ix.22.  
*alam*, ci.59, iv.23, v.1, vi.3,  
 x.25, xi.3, xvi.19,20,25,  
 27, xviii.3.  
*alopa*, xi.2:—c xi.4,9, xii.8.  
*alpa*, xx.12 (-tara):—c xvi.  
 19, xxiii.6 (-tû).  
*av*, ix.12.  
*ava*, i.15.  
*avakâça*, cxiv.4.  
*avagraha*, i.49, iii.7, iv.2, v.  
 10,18, vi.2,9, viii.23, xii.  
 13, xvi.11,30:—c iii.2-5,7,  
 vi.9, xiii.13 (-stha): and  
 anav-.  
*avatâ*, iii.10.  
*avadyât*, xi.4.  
*avadhâraka*, xxii.6.  
*avadhârana*, cxiv.3,22, xxi.  
 6.  
*avadhi*, civ.23 (-tva), 23,  
 viii.5.  
*avantv asmân*, xi.4.  
*avayava*, cii.20, iv.52, x.12,  
 xxi.15.  
*avayavin*, civ.52.  
*avarṇa*, ii.12, vi.7, vii.5,  
 viii.16, ix.9, x.3,19.  
*avasara*, ci.1.  
*avasâna*, xiv.15:—c v.1, xiv.  
 15.  
*avasita*, xxi.3.  
*avasthâ*, ci.22, ii.25, x.14,  
 xiv.18,29.  
*avasthâna*, cix.17.  
*avâ*, iii.8.  
*avântara*, cxxiv.4.  
*avântaram*, iv.52.  
*avikṛta*, v.39:—c ix.16, xiv.  
 28.  
*avicalita*, cv.2.  
*avimân*, ix.21.  
*avilambita*, xxiii.20.  
*aviçishṭa*, cxxi.1.  
*aviçesha*, ci.18,19, ii.47, iv.  
 3, x.9,12.  
*aviçhyan*, xi.17.  
 -ave, iv.54.  
*avyakta*, xvii.8.  
*avyañjana*, cii.23.  
*avyathamânâ*, xii.7.  
*açañsan*, xvi.6.  
*açakya*, cxxi.5,7 (-tva).  
*açabda*, xxiii.6.
- açicret*, xi.17.  
*açman*, vi.14.  
*açmanah*, viii.24.  
*açmâ*, xii.7.  
*açyâma*, xii.7.  
*açloṇayâ*, xiii.12.  
*açvasaniḥ*, xi.17.  
*açvasyâ*, iii.8.  
*açvâ*, xii.7.  
*açvinâ*, xi.12.  
*açvebhyaḥ*, xi.14.  
*ashâḍhaḥ*, xi.16.  
 r. as: syât, xix.1.  
 r. as: see vyasta, pranyasta.  
*asah*, v.16.  
*asamhita*, xxi.5.  
*asat*, xi.13.  
*asadâma*, vi.3.  
*asam*, v.9.  
*asambhava*, cii.25, xi.18,  
 xx.2, xxi.5.  
*asâmhita*, iv.6:—c iv.7, xiv.  
 5.  
*asâdhu*, ci.19, xvi.12.  
*asâra*, ci.21.  
*asâvâ-*, xvi.31.  
*asi*, x.13, xii.2.  
*asiñcan*, vi.3.  
*askabhâyat*, xi.17.  
*astâ*, xii.7.  
*astu*, xi.17.  
*asthabhiḥ*, xi.17.  
*asthûri*, vii.2.  
*asparçana*, civ.23, xiv.4.  
*aspashta*, cxvii.8.  
*asmat*, ci.19 (-ukta), xiii.14  
 (do.), xiv.5 (*asmâbhiḥ*).  
*asmatpâçân*, xii.7.  
*asmâkam*, xii.7.  
*asmân*, ix.21, xi.8.  
*asmin*, v.21, xi.13.  
*asmin yajñe*, xii.7.  
*asme*, iv.9.  
*asme dhatta*, xii.7.  
*asya*, xi.12.  
*asya yajñasya*, xi.17.  
 r. ah: âha, civ.3 etc.  
*ahaḥ*, iv.42, viii.13.  
*ahani*, xi.4.  
*ahanî*, iv.12.  
*aharahaḥ*, viii.8.  
*ahâḥ*, viii.13.  
*ahorâtre*, iv.11.  
*ahniyâḥ*, xi.17.  
*ahne*, iv.39, vii.11.  
 â. i.15, iv.22,23,52.  
*âkarshaka*, ci.43v, vii.14,  
 16, viii.18, ix.21,22, xiv,  
 4,7,17,22, xvi.12,18, xx.  
 3, xxi.6,9.  
*âkânkshâ*, cii.1.



- ākāra, iv.40, ix.20, xvi.14.  
 16 (anā-).  
 ākhyā, i.16, 27:—c i.16, 17, 19—  
 23, 27, 28.  
 āgama, i.23, xxiv.5:—c i.24,  
 53, 60, v.4—8, 32, 33, 40, 41,  
 ix.16, xiv.5—11, 23, xv.3—  
 5, xvi.2—31, xxi.12.  
 Āgniveçya, see p 430.  
 Āgniveçyāyana, see p. 430.  
 āñ, ci.1, 15, iv.23.  
 āca, ix.22.  
 ācārya, xxiv.6:—c i.47, ix.4,  
 x.21, 22, xiv.4, xv.8, xviii.  
 1, 3, xxiii.18; and see p.  
 430.  
 ātṇārah, xiii.12.  
 ātāñsīt, xvi.13.  
 āti, xiv.8.  
 -ātmaka, c xiv.28, xxii.1.  
 Ātreya, c intr., v.1; and see  
 p. 430.  
 ādi, i.41, 46, 52, 53, 55, ii.26,  
 47, iii.1, xvi.29, xxi.4,  
 xxiii.15; (=etc.), v.40,  
 xxiii.11, xxiv.4.  
 āditah, i.2, 5:—c i.47, xxiii.  
 10.  
 ādeça, ci.52, iii.8, ix.7, x.19,  
 xiii.16: and anād-.  
 ādeçaka, ci.33.  
 ādya, i.7.  
 ādyudātta, vi.14:—c viii.8:  
 and anā-.  
 ādhikya, c xxiv.3.  
 ān-, iii.15.  
 -ān mahī, iv.34.  
 ānantarya, ci.1, ii.1.  
 ānukūlya, ci.46.  
 ānunāsikya, ii.52, xvii.1:—  
 c xvii.3, 4: and sām-.  
 ānupada, c xxiv.6.  
 ānupūrvya, i.1, 10, ii.44, xxi.  
 12, xxii.13:—c i.1, xvii.4.  
 ānumānika, c ix.9.  
 r. āp, c viii.11—15, ix.17, x.  
 2, 4—8, 10, 11, xiii.7, 8, xiv.  
 3, 21; + pra, ii.32, 34, 35,  
 ix.13, x.13, xi.4, xiii.16,  
 xvi.29: and prāpaṇa,  
 prāpta, prāpti, ativyāpti.  
 āpah, iv.25, xi.5, 8.  
 āpatti, ci.37, 51, v.24, 31, 35,  
 viii.13, xiii.3, xiv.12.  
 āpādaka, c v.35.  
 āpūshā, x.13.  
 -ā prshatī, iv.15.  
 āpo hi, vi.2.  
 ābhāsata, ci.25.  
 ābhīh, vi.5.  
 āy, ix.14.  
 āyajishṭhaḥ, ix.22.
- āyan, v.21.  
 āyāma, xxii.9.  
 āyuh, vi.5, 13.  
 āyo, xii.8.  
 ār, x.9.  
 ārambha, ci.60, ii.20, 23, v.  
 10, 41, vi.3, viii.8, 16, 24,  
 ix.13, 21, x.22, xii.1, 6,  
 xiii.10, xiv.22, 24, xvi.4, 6,  
 18, xx.10, xxi.1.  
 ārambhana, c v.1, xiv.3.  
 āriṭhā, iii.10.  
 āropaṇiya, c xiv.9, 9 (-tva).  
 ārthika, ci.59.  
 ārdhnuvan, v.21.  
 ārsha, ix.21, x.13:—c ix.23,  
 xxiv.2.  
 āv, ix.15.  
 āvah, viii.9.  
 āvih, viii.24.  
 āvinnaḥ, xi.15.  
 āvṛt, viii.11.  
 āvṛtti, ci.61v.  
 āçih, v.10.  
 āçraya, c xxiv.2.  
 āçrayana, c ix.1.  
 āçrayatva, ci.1, viii.18.  
 r. ās: + adhi, c xiv.4.  
 āsate ye, xi.16.  
 āsanna, i.25.  
 āstām, iv.52.  
 āhuti, iii.7, iv.15.  
 Āhvāraka, xxiii.14.  
 r. i: + adhi, xxiv.5:—c xviii.  
 7, xxiv.6v; + prati, ci.30,  
 42, ii.41, iv.11, v.7, xviii.  
 1, xix.3, xx.10, xxiii.16:  
 and adhyayana, adhyetar,  
 vyaveta, etc.  
 ikāra, ii.28.  
 r. iṅg: + ut, xvii.8.  
 iṅgya, i.48:—c i.49, iii.8, iv.  
 10.  
 iṅgyānta, iv.10, viii.13 (an-):  
 —c viii.13, 13 (-tva).  
 idaḥ, viii.24.  
 idāvān, ix.21.  
 itaratra, c viii.14.  
 itarathā, c v.12.  
 iti, i.15, 29, 30, 46, 47, ii.3, iii.  
 7, iv.3, 10, v.10, 15, 31, xiii.  
 4, 14, xiv.33, xvi.12, 30,  
 xvii.1—4, 7, 8, xviii.2, xx.2,  
 8, xxii.5—10, 13, xxiii.2,  
 16, 19, 20, xxiv.2, 3, 6.  
 itipara, iv.4, viii.12, ix.20  
 (an-):—c i.15 (-tva), ix.2  
 (an-), 21 (-tva), 23 (do.).  
 itivat, ci.7 etc.  
 ittham, ci.2.  
 ity evam, v.18.
- id agne, v.17.  
 idam etc, i.46, ii.51.  
 idu, v.17.  
 idānim, ci.43, ix.11.  
 indra, vii.2.  
 indrah, vii.8, xi.9.  
 indrā, iii.3.  
 indriya, c xxi.15 (-vishaya).  
 indriyā, iii.5.  
 indrome, ix.22.  
 imāṇ nah, v.17.  
 ime, iv.24.  
 iyam eva sūyā, xi.3.  
 irāvati, iv.22.  
 iva, xvii.8.  
 ivarna, ii.22, x.4, 15, xx.1.  
 r. ish. ich, cv.1, viii.15:  
 + abhi, c ix.9: and ishṭa,  
 ishṭi.  
 ishṭa, ci.46, v.37, 41, viii.  
 22, x.21, xiv.3, 9, 13, 26, 33,  
 xv.2, 7, 9, xvi.16, 24, xvii.  
 7, xviii.5, 7, xix.3: and  
 ani-.  
 ishṭak-, iv.44.  
 ishṭā, iii.6.  
 ishṭi, iv.52.  
 ihā, ix.22.  
 ikāra, iv.8, ix.20, xvi.14.  
 r. iksh: + vi, c intr.; + apa,  
 cv.24 (anupekshya): and  
 apekshā.  
 idenyān, ix.22.  
 im, v.12.  
 iyuh, vi.5.  
 r. ir: + sam, ci.2.  
 irayathā, iii.10.  
 ishāt, ii.15.  
 u, xxii.14.  
 u, vi.2.  
 ukāra, ii.29, viii.21, ix.16,  
 x.15, 22, xx.1.  
 ukta, i.61, xxiii.19:—c iv.23  
 (-tva).  
 ukṭi, ci.61, ii.23, iii.7, viii.  
 13, x.9, 12.  
 ukthā, iii.2.  
 ukshatā, iii.10.  
 ukhya, ix.20, xi.3:—c i.61,  
 ix.23 (-tva).  
 Ukhya, see p. 430.  
 ugaṇā, xiii.12.  
 r. uc: ucita, c xvii.7.  
 ucca, i.38 (uccāih), xxiii.20:—  
 c ii.18, xviii.4, xx.2.  
 uccā, v.8.  
 uccāraṇa, c iii.1, iv.11, x.23,  
 xvi.13, xxi.5, xxii.9: and  
 anu-.  
 uccāihkara, xxii.9.



- uccāistara*, i.41.  
*uchvāsa*, c v.1.  
*ut*, iii.15, v.14, ix.24, xvi.21.  
*uttama*, i.11, ii.30, v.31, viii.2, xiv.11,24, xvii.1, xxi.12: and *anutt-*.  
*uttame*, iv.11.  
*Uttamottariya*, see p. 430.  
*uttara*, i.16,20,27,30, ii.17,29, iii.1, xiv.5, xvii.4:—c ii.25, iii.1 etc.  
*uttaratra*, c xxii.11,12.  
*uttaradanta*, c ii.43.  
*uttarapada*, c iii.1.  
*uttare*, iv.11.  
*uttaroshtha*, c ii.39.  
*utpatti*, ii.1, xxiii.1,3:—c ix.22, x.12.  
*utpala*, c v.28.  
*udaka*, c ii.1, xxi.1.  
*udaya*, ii.47.  
*udayān*, ix.21.  
*udāta*, i.38,41,42 (-*sama*), 46 (-*sama*), v.13, x.10,16, xii.5,9,10, xiv.29,31, xvi.30, xviii.2,6, xix.1, xx.1,3,7, xxi.11, xxiv.5:—c xxii.9, xxiii.16,17.  
*udāttatara*, c i.41.  
*udāttavant*, x.10.  
*udāttacṛuti*, xxi.10.  
*udāharaṇa*, c i.18,21,22,42,44, ii.25,50, iii.2,7, iv.54, v.3,26,41 etc.: and *pratyud-*.  
*upa*, i.15.  
*upa*, xi.3; iv.24,42.  
*upadeṣa*, c i.1, ii.20, xx.1.  
*upadhmaniya*, i.18, xiv.5:—c ii.44.  
*upapatti*, c intr., ii.23,47, iv.52: and *anup-*.  
*upabandha*, i.59:—c iv.23.  
*upabdimant*, xxiii.5.9.  
*upari*, c ii.47, iv.45.  
*uparitana*, c i.46, x.6, xxiii.5.  
*uparibhāga*, c ii.37,41.  
*uparishṭāt*, c i.40, ii.18,44.  
*uparishṭhāyin*, c xxi.1.  
*upalakshakatva*, c iv.23, viii.34.  
*upalakshana* c i.23,28, viii.34, ix.24, xvi.25.  
*upalabdhi*, xxiii.8,13:—c ii.1, xxi.1, xxiii.8,9: and *anup-*.  
*upalambha*, c i.1,18.  
*upaṣlesha*, c ii.31.  
*upasaṃhāra*, ii.24,31:—c ii.19,24,25, xxiii.19.  
*upasaṃhṛtatara*, ii.14,16,18: and *atyupasaṃhṛta*.  
*upasarga*, i.15, vi.4, x.9, xiv.8:—c vi.9,12.  
*upasthe*, iv.21.  
*upāñṣu*, xxiii.5,6.  
*upāñṣu*, xvi.29.  
*upāṅga*, c xxiv.6.  
*upādāna*, c i.25, ii.1, iv.40, viii.6, xvi.29, xxiii.3: and *bahūp-*.  
*upottama*, xi.3.  
*upyamānam*, vii.3.  
*ubha*, iv.47, x.1.  
*ubhayataḥ*, c x.10,11.  
*ubhayatra*, c ix.21.  
*ubhayathā*, c ii.12,23.  
*ubhābhayām*, iv.52.  
*ubhe*, iv.11.  
*uras*, ii.2,3, xxiii.10.  
*uru*, vii.2.  
*urutā*, xxii.10.  
*urvī*, iv.20.  
*ulbaṇam*, xiii.12.  
*uvarṇa*, ii.24, x.5.  
*uṣmasi*, iii.13.  
*uhyamānaḥ*, vii.6.  
*û*, iii.14, vi.2.  
*ûkāra*, iv.5,52 (*an-*), ix.20, xvi.14.  
*ûdhvam*, ix.22.  
*ûṇyoh*, xiii.10.  
*ûbhāva*, x.17, xx.5.  
*ûrdhva*, c x.12.  
*ûrdhvān*, vi.14.  
*ûrdhve*, iv.11.  
*ûshmatva*, c i.13.  
*ûshman*, i.9,12, ii.44, ix.1,2,5, xiii.2, xiv.9,12,16,18, xv.1,4, xvii.4, xxi.9,15:—c i.1 etc.: and *anûshmant*.  
*ûhaniya*, c i.59.  
*ṛkāra*, i.31, ii.18, v.9, vi.8, x.8, xiii.6:—c i.33, xxi.15.  
*ṛksāmā*, iii.5.  
*ṛksāme*, iv.11.  
*ṛgvirāma*, xxii.12.  
*ṛc*, c iv.20,21, xi.3.  
*ṛjīshi*, xvi.18.  
*ṛṇṇ*, xiii.14.  
*ṛtā*, iii.2.  
*ṛtu*, vi.7, ix.22.  
*ṛtūn*, vi.14.  
*ṛdhyāmā*, iii.10.  
*ṛvarṇa*, c xiv.28.  
*ṛshabhaḥ*, xi.16.  
*ṛshi*, c xi.19, xviii.7.  
*ṛshinām putrah*, xi.16.  
*ṛkāra*, ii.18, xiii.6.  
*lkāra*, i.31, ii.18:—c i.33.  
*eka*, iv.51, x.1; (*eke*) i.47, ii.19,27,47, v.30,39, viii.19, ix.5, xi.19, xiii.3, xiv.3,25,33, xv.2,6, xviii.1, xix.3, xxi.13.  
*ekatā*, c ii.7.  
*ekadeṣa*, c ii.23, iv.52, xxi.15: and *padāik-*.  
*ekapada*, xv.4:—c iv.11, v.9, xiii.6, xx.7, xxii.13, xxiv.4.  
*ekaprāṇabhāva*, v.1.  
*ekabandha*, c xvi.29.  
*ekam*, v.18.  
*ekamātra*, xxii.13.  
*ekayā*, v.19.  
*ekavacana*, c i.23, ii.35, iv.2, xiv.22.  
*ekavarṇa*, i.54.  
*ekaviñcati*, xxii.12.  
*ekaṣṛuti*, c xv.9.  
*ekasvara*, c xv.7,9.  
*ekādaśāsaḥ*, xi.16.  
*ekādeṣa*, c i.4, x.10,12.  
*ekāntara*, ii.25.  
*ekāra*, ii.15,23, iv.8,40, ix.11, x.4,6, xi.1.  
*ekikaraṇa*, c xiv.15.  
*ekibhāva*, -*bhūta*, c i.1, x.10.  
*ekāika*, c i.11, xxiii.11.  
*eṇī*, xiii.12.  
*eta* (pron.), iv.20,25,48, v.24, viii.6, x.23, xxii.14,15, xxiv.5:—c xiv.4.  
*etana*, x.14.  
*etāvant*, c i.1,15, ii.47, iv.23, etc.  
*ete*, iv.44.  
*enam*, vii.8.  
*enam abhi*, iv.42.  
*enā*, v.17.  
*ene*, iv.11.  
*epha*, i.19.  
*eman*, x.14.  
*eva*, ix.5, xiv.3, xix.4, xx.2, xxii.6, xxiv.5.  
*eva*, iii.6, iv.44; *evarase-na*, iv.24; *evā 'smīn*, v.21; *evo 'ttare*, iv.11.  
*evah*, x.14.  
*evakāra*, c xix.4.  
*evam*, xvii.8, xxiv.4.  
*eshah*, v.15, xi.16, xiv.8.  
*eshṭah*, viii.8,18, x.14.  
*āikāra*, ii.26, ix.14, x.6, xvi.24.  
*āikshavi*, iv.12.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



- garbhah*, xii.3.  
*garbham*, iv.24,42.  
*gala*, c xxii.9 (-*vivara*).  
*gāṇa*, xiii.9.  
*gātra*, c xxii.9,10.  
*gānām*, *gāni*, vii.10.  
*Gārudapurāna*, c xxiv.6.  
*gāhamānaḥ*, xii.8.  
*gir*, c intr.  
*guda*, c viii.16.  
*guṇa*, c i.35 (*dvi*-), 36 (*tri*-). xv.3.  
*guṇa*, xiii.9.  
*guru*, xxii.14:—c intr.  
*gurutva*, xxiv.5.  
*grhṇāmyagre*, xi.16  
*go*, xi.16.  
*gotra*, c xxiv.6.  
*gomān*, ix.21.  
*gāuṇa*, c iv.23.  
*Gāutama*, see p. 430.  
*gaurava*, c i.33, iv.23, viii.13.  
*gna*, xii.5.  
*gni*, iv.36.  
*gyāni*, vii.10.  
*grantha*, c xxiv.6v.  
r. *grah*, c intr., i.22 25,50,51, 59, ii.15, v.25,40, vi.13, viii.18,34, ix.13, x 12, xi.17, xiv.6,22, xv.8, xvi.29, xviii.4; + *pari*, c viii.14, ix.9.  
*graha*, ix.20.  
*grahana*, i.22.24 50:—c i.18, 22,26,50—3,59,61, ii.23, iii.1 etc., iv.9 etc., v.7 etc., vi.5 etc., vii.2 etc., viii.4 etc., ix.1 etc., x.9 etc., xi.3 etc., xii.3 etc., xiii.4 etc., xiv.17 etc., xvi.1 etc., xxiii.7, xxiv.2.  
*grāma*, vii.2.  
*grāmī*, iv.53.  
*grāhaka*, c i.21.  
  
*ghakāra*, viii.26.  
r. *ghat*, c xiii.15, xv.6.  
*ghata*, c ii.7, xxii.3.  
*gharmāsah*, xi.5.  
*ghā*, iii.8.  
*ghushyā*, iii.12.  
*ghṛṇivān*, v.21.  
*ghoshavant*, i.14, ii.8, viii.3, ix.8:—c i.14 (-*vattva*), etc.  
*ghnī*, iv.28.  
*ghrānabila*, c ii.52.  
  
*ṇa*, v.32.  
*ṇakāra*, ix.18.  
  
*ca* (c), v.4,20,22, xiii.15.
- ca*, i.22,32—4,53,55,60, ii.13, 17—9.23,42,51, iv.7,13,16, 18,25,26,46.47,50,54, v.5, 7,15,28,30,33,36,37,41,vi.3,vii.3,6,7,14,16, viii.4,15, 17,18, ix.4,8,19—22,24, x.16,17,25, xi.4,6,7,9,11,12, xii.6,10,11, xiii.3,14, xiv.2,4,6—8,17,19,20.22,28, xv.1,4,7, xvi.4,9,10,12,18, 23,28, xvii.4,5,8, xix.2, xx.10, xxi.5,6,9, xxii.5, 14,15, xxiii.2, xxiv.2,5.  
*cakāra*, v.22:—(=*ca*) c v.28, 30,33, etc.  
*cakrṃā*, iii.10.  
*cakre*, iv.28.  
r. *caksh*: + *ā*, xxiii.16:—c ii.44; + *vyā*, c xv.9v, xxi.15; + *samā*, c i.1.  
*cakshuṣṣi*, iv.12.  
*caṅkuṇa*, xiii.12.  
*catuḥ*, vi.13.  
*catur*, i.8, xxiii.15, xxiv.1.  
*caturtha*, i.11, ii.9, v.38,40, xiv.5, xxiii.12,16.  
*caturyama*, xxiii.16,19:—c xxiii.17,18.  
*catusṭaya*, c xxiii.19, xxiv.2.  
*candra*, v.5.  
r. *car*: + *ut*, c ii.12,13,28,35, 44,50, iv.23, v.1, xvii.8, xxi.15, xxii.9,10; + *vya-* *bhi*, c ii.25: and *uccāra-* *ṇa*.  
*carā*, iii.8.  
*carāvah*, iv.38.  
*carman*, xiii.13.  
*carshaṇ*, xiii.13.  
*carshaṇī*, iii.7.  
*cavarga*, ii.36:—c ii.44.  
*cātura*, c xviii.3.  
r. *ci*: + *niḥ*, c i.1, xiv.4, xxi.16: and *niṣcāyaka*.  
*cikītvān*, ix.21.  
*cit*, xviii.2.  
r. *cit*: *cintya*, c ii.19, xii.3.  
*citī*, iii.7.  
*citrā*, iii.4.  
*cī*, iv.33.  
r. *cud*: *codya*, c i.14,53, iv.11.  
*cupunīkā*, xiii.12.  
*cṛtā*, iii.12.  
*cet*, xx 3, xxi.9:—c ii.25, etc.  
*co'ttame*, iv.11.  
  
*cha*, v.22, xiv.8.  
*chaṅsine*, xvi.13.  
*chakāra*, v.34.  
*chatva*, c v.22,35,37.  
*chandasvatī*, iv.20.
- chandobhāshā*, xxiv.5:—  
c xxiv.6.  
  
*ja* (*j*), v.23.  
*jakāra*, v.23, xii.5.  
*jakshivā*, xvi.13.  
*jagāmā*, iii.10.  
*jaghanya*, c viii.13  
*jaghnivā*, xvi.13.  
*jajñe*, xi.16.  
*jatā*, c iii.1, xi.9,16,17, xx.2.  
r. *jan*: *jāyate*, xxiii.2; *jan-* *yate*, c ii.8, v.1.  
*janayathā*, iii.10.  
*janayā*, iii.12.  
*janishvā*, iii.8.  
*janman*, c ii.1.  
*janmani*, iv.12.  
*janya*, c i.40.  
*jambhya*, ii.17.  
*jayatā*, iii.10.  
*jala*, c ii.1.  
*jāta*, c xv.9 (*varṇa*-).  
*jātaḥ*, viii.32.  
*jāti* (-*tyapekshā*), c ii.35, iv.2.  
*jāyamānaḥ*, xii.8.  
*jāla*, c i.46, viii.22.  
*jigā*, xvi.13.  
*jigāsi*, xvi.18.  
*jigivā*, xvi.13.  
*jighā*, xvi.13.  
*jighāsi*, xvi.18.  
*jihvā*, ii.20.  
*jihvāgra*, ii.18, 37, 38, 41 (-*madhya*):—c ii.19,20, xxi.15.  
*jihvāmadhya*, ii.17 (-*ānta*), 22,36,40 (-*ānta*):—c ii.20.  
*jihvāmūla*, ii.35.  
*jihvāmūliya*, i.18, xiv.15:—c ii.44.  
*jihvikā*, c viii.16.  
*jīgivā*, xvi.13.  
*jushānaḥ*, xi.16.  
*jushṭa*, xi.3.  
*juhutā*, iii.12.  
*-jñā*, xxiv.6.  
r. *jñā*, xx.2:—c i.29,50, x.17; etc.; *jñāpay*, c iv.40, xii.6,11, xvi.9,10, xix.2; + *vi*: *viñneya*, xxiv.5:—c i.7,52, 53,61, ii.18, etc.; + *sam*, c xx.1: and *viñneyatva*.  
*jñāpaka*, c iv.47.  
*jñāpana*, c viii.18.  
*jñe*, iv.39.  
*jyā*, x.13.  
*jyāyā*, xvi.13.  
*jyotiḥ*, vi.13.  
  
*ñakāra*, v.24,37.



<i>ta (t)</i> , v.33, vii.13, xiii.15.	<i>tishthâ</i> , iii.12.	<i>dadhâsi</i> , xvi.18.
<i>tatva</i> , c i.21.	<i>tvratara</i> , xvii.1,4:-c xvi.24,	<i>danta</i> , ii.43:-c ii.18 (-pañkti).
<i>tavarga</i> , ii.37, xiii.11, xiv.	xvii.2,3 (- <i>tva</i> ).	<i>dantamûla</i> , ii.38,41,42.
20:-c ii.44, xiv.28.	<i>tu</i> , i.19,59, ii.14,25,29,33,45,	r. <i>dar</i> :+ <i>â</i> , c ix.21, xiii.16.
<i>tavargîya</i> , c xiii.14.	iv.40, viii.16. ix.9, x.19,	<i>darvî</i> , iv.12.
	21, xi.1, xiv 5,11, xv.3,8,	r. <i>darç</i> , c i.1, ii.2,5, iv.11,
<i>tha (th)</i> , vii.14.	xviii.1, xx.2, xxii.6, xxiv.	viii.16, ix.22, x.10, xiv.5,
	5.	28.
<i>da (d)</i> , xiii.16.	<i>tu</i> , iv.42, v.13.	<i>darçana</i> , c i.59, ii.1, iii.1
<i>dakâra</i> , c iv.38.	<i>tulya</i> , c i.33, ii.19 (- <i>tva</i> ), xiv.	( <i>ad-</i> ), xi.19 ( <i>ad-</i> ), xii.3
	23.	( <i>ad-</i> ), xiv.5,15, xv.9v, xvi.
<i>na (n)</i> , xxi.14.	<i>tû</i> , iii.14.	26.
<i>nakâra</i> , vii.1, xiii.6.	<i>tûnave</i> , xiii.12.	r. <i>dâ</i> :+ <i>anupra</i> , c ii.8; + <i>u-</i>
<i>natva</i> , c i.51,60, v.3, vii.2	<i>tûshnim</i> , c ii.20 (- <i>bhâva</i> ,	<i>pâ</i> , c ii.7,8: and <i>anupra-</i>
etc., xiii.7 etc.	- <i>bhûta</i> ), xxiii.6 (- <i>bhâva</i> ).	<i>dâna</i> , <i>upâdâna</i> .
<i>nic</i> , c ii.17.	<i>tr-</i> , xvi.27.	<i>dâdhâra</i> , iv.22.
	<i>trññe</i> , iv.11.	<i>dârunya</i> , xxii.9.
<i>ta (t)</i> , vii.13.	<i>trîya</i> , i.11, viii.3, xxiii.12,	<i>dârdhya</i> , c xvii.1.
<i>ta</i> (pron.), i.33,41,49, ii.3,7,	16:-c i.61 (- <i>tva</i> ), xxiii.10	<i>dâçvâ</i> , xvi.13.
31-4, v.27,38, ix.2, xii.9,	(- <i>savana</i> ).	<i>divah</i> , viii.24,28.
xiv.9, xix.3,4, xx.4, xxi.2,	<i>trdye</i> , iv.11.	<i>divi</i> , vi.2.
13, xxii.2, xxiii.13,16-9.	<i>te</i> , iv.40,42, xi.10.	r. <i>diç</i> :+ <i>â</i> , c xx.4v; + <i>anvâ</i> ,
<i>takâra</i> , v.22,33, vi.5,14, vii.	<i>te asya</i> , iv.20.	c i.26,32,51,55,60, ii.19,
15.	<i>te âcarantî</i> , iv.20.	etc.; + <i>ut</i> , c iv.2,52, x.11:
<i>tat</i> , ix.17.	<i>Tâittirîya</i> , xxiii.16,15 (- <i>ka</i> ).	+ <i>upa</i> , xxiii.18:-c i.1,60,
<i>tatah</i> , xv.3, xxii.14.	<i>tâirovyañjana</i> , xx.7,12:-	xvii.1, xxiii.6,17; + <i>nih</i> ,
<i>tatra</i> , v.3, xxii.3,12.	c xiv.29, xx.8.	c i.29, ii.7,23, x.23, xiii.
<i>tatrâ</i> , iii.8.	<i>trapu</i> , v.4.	9v, xxiii.17, xxiv.5; + <i>pra-</i>
<i>tathâ</i> , xxii.14.	<i>tri</i> , i.20, xxiii.11,14.	<i>tinih</i> , c ii.7: and <i>anvâde-</i>
<i>tathâtva</i> , c i.43, ii.20.	<i>tri</i> , vii.2, xvi.25.	<i>çâ</i> , - <i>çaka</i> , <i>âdeçâ</i> , - <i>çaka</i> ,
<i>tathâbhâva</i> , c i.61.	<i>trih</i> , i.36.	<i>nirdeçâ</i> , - <i>çaka</i> .
<i>tadânîm</i> , c i.21.	<i>tripadaprabhrti</i> . i 61:-c i.	r. <i>dih</i> :+ <i>sam</i> , c xiv.4.
<i>taddhita</i> , c xiii.9.	59,61 (- <i>tva</i> ), xi.9,18.	<i>dîdivâ</i> , xvi.13.
<i>tanuvâu</i> , iv.44.	<i>Tribhâshyaratna</i> , c intr. and	<i>dîpa</i> , c xviii.3, xx.12 (- <i>vat</i> ).
<i>tanûyat</i> , iv.52.	endings of chapters.	<i>dîptija</i> , xxiii.13.
<i>tantu</i> , c ii.7.	<i>trimâtra</i> , xxii.13.	<i>dîyâ</i> , iii.12.
<i>tapatâ</i> , iii.12.	<i>trirûpa</i> , c i.36.	<i>dîrgha</i> , i.3,35, viii 17, x.2,
<i>tapasah</i> , xii.8.	<i>trî</i> , vi.2.	xxii.14, xxiv.5:-c ii.24,
<i>tapasî</i> , iv.17.	<i>trîñ</i> , vi.14.	iii.1, v.12, etc.: and <i>dâir-</i>
<i>tamasah</i> , viii.24.	<i>trâividhya</i> , c ii.3.	<i>ghya</i> .
r. <i>tar</i> :+ <i>ava</i> , c ii.9.	<i>tvah</i> , xi.5.	<i>dîrghâ</i> , iii.5.
<i>taratâ</i> , iii.12.	<i>tvam tarâ</i> , iii.8.	<i>duhçlishta</i> , c xiii.16.
<i>tarâ</i> , iii.8.	r. <i>tvar</i> :+ <i>atvaritam</i> , c xxiii.	<i>dundubhi</i> , c xxiii.3.
<i>tarhân</i> , vi.14.	20.	<i>durbala</i> , c xvi.19, xxi.1.
<i>tarhi</i> , c i.15,21, ii.25, iii.8,	<i>tvashthah</i> , viii.8.	<i>duryân</i> , ix.21.
etc.	<i>tvâ</i> , iii.5.	<i>dr-</i> , xvi.27.
<i>tavarga</i> , ii.38, xiv.20,21:-	<i>tvishî</i> , iii.7.	<i>drdha</i> , xvii.6, xx.9 (- <i>tara</i> ):
c ii.44.	<i>tve</i> , iv.10.	-c xix.5, xx.10.
<i>tavargîya</i> , xiii.15.		<i>drdhay</i> , c xxiii.19.
<i>tasthivâ</i> , xvi.13.	<i>tha (th)</i> , iv.7, vii.14.	<i>drdhe</i> , iv.27.
<i>tasmât</i> , ix.17.	- <i>the</i> , iv.40.	<i>drshtânta</i> , c xiii.15.
<i>tasmin</i> , vi.14.		<i>deva rishah</i> , viii.24.
<i>tâtparya</i> , c i.15,24,35,36.	<i>da (d)</i> , iv.7.	<i>devatâ phalgunî</i> , iv.12.
<i>tân</i> , vi.14.	<i>dañçukâ</i> , <i>dañshtrâ-</i>	<i>devate</i> , iv.11.
<i>tâbhyâm eva</i> , iv.52.	<i>bhyâm</i> , <i>dañsam</i> , <i>dañ-</i>	<i>Devadatta</i> , c i.14, iv.52.
<i>tâmra</i> , c xxiv.6.	<i>sanâbhyah</i> , <i>dañso-</i>	<i>devâ</i> , iii.2.
<i>târa</i> , xxii.11, xxiii.5,10.	<i>bhih</i> , xvi.19.	<i>devân</i> , vi.14.
<i>tâlu</i> , ii.22,36,40.	<i>dakâra</i> , v.8.	<i>Devîpurâna</i> , c xxiv.6.
<i>tâvant</i> , i.35:-c i.1,41,56, ii.3,	<i>dakshinenâ</i> , iii.10.	<i>deçâ</i> , i.59:-c i.29, ii.17, viii.
25, viii.16.	<i>datte</i> , xi.5.	21, xix.3.
<i>tishthan</i> , vi.14.	<i>dadhâsi</i> , xvi.18.	<i>deha</i> , c vi.9.
<i>tishthantye kayâ</i> , v.19.	<i>dadhânah</i> , xii.6.	<i>dâirghya</i> , c xxii.9.



- dosha*, iv.23, xiv.15,22, xvi.19,29, xxiii.20.  
*dâurbalya*, c vi.5.  
*dyavi*, vi.2.  
*dyâvâpr̥thivî*, iv.12.  
*r. dyut*, c i.61, iv.10, v.15, x.19, xiii.14, xxiv.6v.  
*dyotaka*, c iv.11.  
*draviṇā*, iii.5.  
*dravya*, xxii.3.  
*drâghîyâ*, xvi.13.  
*druta*, c xxi.1 (-*vṛtti*): and *adr-*.  
*dva*, i.3, iv.45, viii.20.  
*dvandva*, c iii.9, x.6.  
*dvaya*, c iv.23,52 etc., xiv.4.  
*dvâr*, c xxi.6.  
*dvârâu*, iv.38.  
*dviḥ*, i.35.  
*dviguṇa*, c i.35.  
*dvitīya*, i.11,12, xiv.5,12, xxiii.12,14,15,16:-c i.28 (-*yâ*), xxi.12.  
*dvitva*, c v.3, xiii.4, xiv.2 etc., xxi.5,16, xxiii.20, xxiv.5 etc.  
*dvimâtra*, xxii.13:-c xviii.1 (-*tâ*).  
*dvīyama*, xix.3, xxiii.17:-c xix.4.  
*dviruktatva*, c viii.16.  
*dvirûpa*, c i.35.  
*dviroshthya*, c ii.25.  
*dvivacana*, c i.23, ii.15, v.25, ix.13, xiv.6.  
*dvivarṇa*, ix.18, xiv.1:-c xiv.2-4.  
*dvisvara*, xvi.17.  
*dve*, iv.49.  
*dha* (*dh*), viii.33.  
*dhakâra*, c xiv.23.  
*dhatte*, iv.53.  
*r. dhar*: + *ava*, c xvi.12, xxii.6: and *avadhâraka*, -*raṇa*.  
*dharma*, c i.1, iv.52, v.28, viii.15, x.10,11, xv.8 (-*tâ*), xxi.1,10,15.  
*-dharmaka*, c x.10.  
*dharmin*, c i.1, v.28.  
*dharsḥâ*, iii.8.  
*r. dhâ*: + *abhi*, xxiv.3:-c xiv.5,28, xviii.3,7; + *vyava*, c i.17, iv.51v, xiii.7,14, xiv.30; + *abhyâ*, c i.46; + *abhini*, c xiv.9; + *vi*: c i.34, iv.2,8,41, xiv.4; *vihita*, c ii.47, xi.4, xiii.15, xvi.29, xx.1, xxi.15, xxiv.2; *yathâvihitam*, c viii.24,26, 27,29-34, ix.24, x.18; + *sam*, c v.3: and *asamhita*, *abhidhâna*, *vidha* etc., *vihitatva*, *vyavadhâna* etc., *saṁdhâna* etc.  
*dhâ*, x.13.  
*dhâṇikâ*, xiii.12.  
*dhâtâ râtih*, xi.3.  
*dhâma*, xiv.8.  
*dhâmâ*, iii.8.  
*dhârayâ*, iii.8.  
*-dhi-*, vi.11.  
*dhî*, iv.12.  
*dhîra*, xvii.8.  
*dhîrâsah*, xi.16.  
*dhûh*, v.10.  
*dhṛta*, xviii.3 (-*pracaya*):-c xxiii.17.  
*dhṛtavant*, xxiii.20.  
*dhṛtavrate*, iv.11.  
*dhruvakshitiḥ*, xi.3.  
*dhvani*, c ii.1, xxii.1, xxiii.6.  
*dhvâna*, xxiii.5,7.  
*na* (*n*), iv.32, xii.4, xxi.14.  
*na*, i.4,13,18, ii.12, iv.2,14, 21,30,32,37,39,41,43,53, v.16,21,29,35,37, vi.6,11, 13, vii.15, viii.7,14,19,26, 32,35, ix.3,6,13,17,23, x.13,18,20,24, xii.3, xiii.4, 15, xiv.14,24,31,32,33, xv.2,5, xvi.7,11,17,31, xvii.8, xix.5, xxi.7,11,16, xxii.8.  
*-na-*, xvi.21.  
*nah*, xi.13.  
*naḥ pr̥thivî*, iv.19.  
*nakâra*, v.20,24,26,33, vii.1, ix.19, xiii.6, xv.1, xvii.4.  
*nakih*, vi.5.  
*nañ*, c i.60, viii.33, x.22.  
*nanu*, c i.1,2,15,18,21,53,59, ii.7,9,18,20,23,25,47, iii.1, iv.3 etc., v.1 etc., vi.3, viii.13 etc., ix.8 etc., x.10,25, xiii.9,15, xiv.4 etc., xvi.2 etc., xviii.3, xx.2, xxi.1,5.  
*r. nam*: in *vinatatâ*.  
*namaḥ*, iv.42, viii.30, xi.14.  
*navan*, i.2.  
*nahyati*, vii.16.  
*nâ*, iii.8.  
*nâda*, ii.4,8, xxiv.5:-c ii.3, xxiii.2.  
*nânâpada*, i.48 (-*vat*), xx.3 (-*stha*). xxiv.3:-c xx.4 (-*stha*).  
*nânâpadîya*, i.60.  
*nânâbhûta*, c xxiv.3.  
*nâbhî*, iv.12.  
*nâmataḥ*, c xxiii.5.  
*nâmadheya*, xx.8:-c xviii.3, xxi.15.  
*nâman*, c j.11.  
*nâsikâ*, ii.3,49,52:-c ii.30.  
*nâsikya*, i.18, ii.49,50 (*mu-khan-*), xxi.8,12,14:-c ii.50,51, viii.15, xxi.13.  
*ni*, i.15.  
*nih*, vi.4,5, vii.2, viii.24,35.  
*nitarâm*, c i.59, v.28.  
*nitânta*, xvi.24.  
*nitya*, i.59, iv.14,39,43,54, vi.5,14, xiv.6, xvi.9,17, xx.2,9:-c i.57 (-*tâ*), iv.40, x.12, xii.11, xiv.5 (-*tva*). 19, xx.8, xxiv.5: and *an-*.  
*nipuṇa*, c xxiv.6.  
*nimada*, xxiii.5,8.  
*nimitta*, i.60:-c i.11,22,25, 58, iv.3,6,40,47,52, v.9, 22,35, ix.10 (-*tva*), 19,22, 24, xi.5, xiii.7,15, xiv.22, 28, xvi.8 (-*tva*): and *pa-ran-*, *pûrvan-*.  
*nimittin*, c i.58, iv.3,45,47, x.16, xiii.15, xiv.28, xv.8.  
*niyata*, see *r. yam*.  
*niyama*, c i.21,49v, ii.23,25, 44, iii.1, iv.23,52, v.22, viii.8, xii.8, xiii.15, xiv.4, 5, xvi.2,8, xxi.1, xxiii.16.  
*nirapeksha*, c xxi.1.  
*nirargala*, c i.15.  
*nirâkaraṇa*, c i.57, x.22, xiii.13, xiv.22.  
*nirûpaka*, c xxiii.20.  
*nirûpaṇa*, c xxi.10.  
*nirṇaya*, c i.1.  
*nirdeça*, c i.14, ii.43, iv.3, v.24, viii.6, xiii.9, xxii.4.  
*nirdeçaka*, xxii.4:-c i.59.  
*nirvâha*, c iv.3.  
*nivartaka*, c ii.33, iv.40, x.21, xv.8, xvi.9.  
*nivṛtti*, c ii.33,45, viii.32, xiv.5,18, xxii.6, xxiii.6,19.  
*niçcâyaka*, c xxi.5 (-*tva*).  
*nishedha*, c i.21,59, iv.14,23, 40,41,54, v.16,30, vi.5 etc., vii.2 etc., viii.15 etc., ix.4 etc., x.15 etc., xi.1,5, xii.8, xiii.4 etc., xiv.4 etc., xvi.12,18,29 (-*tâ*), xx.2, xxiv.5.  
*nishedhaka*, c xiii.5.  
*nishpâdyatva*, c ii.20,23.  
*nihata*, c xix.3,4 (-*tva*).  
*nica*, i.39, xix.1, xxiii.20:-c xviii.4, xx.3, xxiii.17.  
*nîcatva*, xxiv.5.  
*nîcâ*, v.8.  
*nîcâihkara*, xxii.10.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



- punarvacana*, c viii.13, xxiii.7.
- purastât*, c i.43, iv.2, vi.5.
- puvâh*, xi.16.
- pushpâ*, iii.5.
- pûjâ*, c v.41, xiii.16.
- pûtî*, iii.7.
- pûrita*, c xvii.8.
- pûrṇa*, xvii.8.
- pûrṇe*, iv.26.
- pûrte*, iv.11.
- pûrva*, i.29, ii.28, iv.13,16, v.3,31,37, viii.17, xi.19, xii.9, xiii.9, xiv.5, xv.5, xxi.3; -*pûrva*, i.4, iii.15, iv.7,40, v.4-6,8,9,12-14, 32-6,38, vi.2,4,7,11,13, vii.2,4,7-9,11-13, viii.16, 23, ix.9,18,20,21, x.3,9, 19, xi.1,5,8-11,13-16, xii.3,6,8, xiii.6, xiv.1,2,6-8, xvi.4,9,11, xix.2, xx.2,2 (ap-), 7, xxii.14; *pûrva-*, ii.48, xv.1, xix.5; *pûrve*, xv.9; *pûrvam*, c i.1, ii.1.
- pûrvaje*, iv.11,23.
- pûrvatah*, c x.10,11, xi.3.
- pûrvatra*, c xvi.19.
- pûrvanimitta*, c ix.19, xi.5 (-*tva*).
- pûrvapada*, i.49:-c iii.1,15, v.3.
- pûrvâparibhûta*, c x.2,6.
- pûrvokta*, c ii.19, etc.
- pûshâ*, x.13.
- prkta*, xiii.16 (-*svara*), xxiii.3 (*varṇa-*): and ap-.
- prṇasvâ*, iii.8.
- prthak*, ii.23,25,25 (-*tva*), v.41, xiv.15, xx.10.
- prthakkarāṇa*, c iv.11, ix.8, 9, xiv.15, xxi.6.
- prthivî*, iv.19.
- prthivî yajñe*, xi.16.
- prshati*, iv.15.
- prshatî*, iii.7.
- prshthe*, xi.16.
- prshthya*, ix.20:-c ix.23 (-*tva*).
- po-*, viii.29.
- poshân*, ix.21.
- pâunaruktya*, c i.37, ii.47, iv.23, xiv.4,22,28.
- pâurāṇika*, c xxiv.6.
- pâurusha*, c xxiv.6v.
- Pâushkarasâdi*, see p. 430.
- pra*, i.15.
- pra*, iv.33, vii.4, viii.34.
- prakatay*, c xviii.3.
- prakarsha*, c ii.20, xiii.9.
- prakâra*, c i.15, ii.6 iii.7, v.10, xxiii.19.
- prakâçaka*, c iii.9.
- prakṛta*, ii.25:-c i.35, ii.3,7, 15, v.25,30, vii.15, viii.6 (-*tva*), xv.8, xvi.16 (-*tva*), xxiii.20 (-*tva*).
- prakṛti*, ii.7, v.2, ix.16, xix.4, xxii.1, xxiv.5:-c iii.1, v.22 (-*tva*), x.24 (-*vat*), xiii.9-13, xiv.28, xix.3 (*svarita-*), 4, xxii.2: and *prâkrta*.
- prakṛtipada*, c iii.1.
- prakṛshṭa*, ii.15.
- prakshâlana*, c iv.23, xiv.4.
- pragraha*, i.60, iv.1, x.24, xv.6 (ap-):-c iv.2 etc., x.15, xii.8, etc.
- pracaya*, xviii.3 (*dhṛtap-*), xix.2, xxi.10:-c xxi.6 (-*tva*), 11, xxiii.16,17,17 (-*tva*), 20.
- praṇava*, xviii.1:-c i.1, xviii.1-7.
- pranyasta*, ii.20.
- prati*, i.15.
- pratidhvani*, c ii.3.
- pratipatti*, c xi.3.
- pratipadapâtha*, c vii.16, viii.27.
- pratiprasava*, c vi.13, xiii.8, 13, xiv.24,32.
- pratibandhaka*, c iv.39.
- prativîçeshana*, c iv.11.
- pratiçrut*, c ii.3.
- pratishedha*, c i.11, iv.43, v.36,37, viii.13, xiii.8,13,15, xiv.4,24,32v, xv.3, xvi.17, xxi.1, xxii.9, xxiii.6.
- pratishedhaka*, xxii.8.
- pratiti*, c ii.23.
- pratte*, iv.11.
- pratyak*, ii.41:-c ii.42,42 (-*tva*).
- pratyaksha*, c viii.34, ix.9.
- pratyagâtman*, c ii.41.
- pratyāṅgatva*, c i.34, xxi.1.
- pratyaya*, v.7:-c i.11.
- pratyudâharāṇa*, c xii.3.
- pratyekam*, c v.10,15, xxi.15, xxiii.5.
- prathama*, i.11,12,27, ii.11, v.3,38, viii.1, xi.3, xiv.9, 12,17, xxi.16, xxiii.12,14:-c i.23 (-*mâ*), xxi.12.
- pradîpa*, c xviii.3.
- pradeça*, c i.59, ii.18,42.
- pradeçinî*, c xxiii.17.
- pradhâna*, c i.58, xxi.2 (-*tâ*).
- pradhvaṅsin*, c vii.15.
- prapañcita*, c i.59.
- prabandha*, c xii.9, xiii.15.
- prabala*, c ix.13.
- prabhṛti*, i.61, iv.22,23:-c i.11, ii.3, iii.9, v.10,38, xvi.18.
- prayatna*, xvii.6,7:-c i.3, xvi.24, xvii.1, xviii.4, xix.5, xx.9-12, xxiii.6.
- prayoga*, xviii.4,7 (*yathâ-*), xxiii.6:-c i.7,18,42, ii.7, xiv.28, xvi.19, xvii.6,7, xviii.3, xxii.3, xxiii.10,14, xxiv.3: and ap-.
- prayojana*, c i.2 etc., ii.4-6, v.1, xiv.4, xvi.23, xviii.1, xix.1, xxii.11,12.
- pravāṇa*, i.47.
- pravarṭa-*, iv.52.
- pravâda*, xiii.9:-c xiii.9 (-*tva*), 10.
- praçna*, c i.61, iii.9, iv.52, ix.20, xi.3, xiii.15, end'gs of chap. xii., xxiv., xiii.-xxivv.
- praçlishta*, xx.5,11:-c xx.8.
- prasakti*, c xiv.4v.
- prasaṅga*, c i.53, ii.9, iv.52, 54, v.22, xiv.22, xvi.2: and *atip-*.
- prasarāṇa*, c v.22.
- prasiddhi*, c i.2, ix.7.
- prasthâ*, iii.5.
- prâ*, iii.5, vii.7.
- prâkrta*, vi.14, xiii.14, xiv.28:-c v.22, xiii.14.
- prâcurya*, c xiv.5.
- prâna*, v.1.
- prâtaḥ*, viii.8.
- prâtaḥsavana*, c xxiii.10.
- prâtikûlya*, c i.46.
- prâtipadika*, c i.22.
- prâtiçâkhya*, c intr., and end'gs of chapters.
- prâtiçrutka*, ii.3:-c xxii.2.
- prâtihata*, xx.3,11:-c xiv.29, xx.8.
- prâthamika*, c iv.23.
- prânta*, c ii.17.
- prâpaṇa*, c xiii.14.
- prâpta*, c i.13,18,19,34, iv.43, v.3,10, vi.14 (-*tva*), xii.8, xiv.19, xvi.29.
- prâpti*, c i.59, iii.1, iv.14,39, 43,54, v.13 etc., vi.7 etc., vii.15-6, viii.7 etc., ix.3 etc., xiii.13-5, xiv.5 etc., xv.5, xvi.5 etc.: and *atip-*.
- prâbalya*, c i.59.
- prekshâvant*, c xxi.1.
- prerāṇa*, c ii.2.
- pro*, vi.2.
- Plâkshâyaṇa*, see p. 430.
- Plâkshi*, see p. 430.



- pluta*, i.4,36, x.24, xv.7, xxiv.5:—c i.20, ii.12, iii.1, ix.9, x.15, xv.7 (-vat), 8. *pluti* in *maṇḍûkap-*.
- phaṇat*, xiii.12.  
*phalgunî*, iv.12.
- r. *badh*: + *upa*, c i.59; + *sam*, c ix.21, xiv.18; + *abhisam*, c v.10: and *upabandha*, *prabandha*.
- r. *badh* (*bâdh*), c i.61, xvi.19: and *bâdha* etc.
- barsva*, ii.18:—c ii.19.
- bala*, c i.53, ii.18.
- balavant*, c xvi.19, xxi.1.
- bahule*, iv.11.
- bahuvacana*, c i.23, v.24, viii.6.
- bahusvara*, iv.40:—c viii.10 (-*tva*), xvi.12,18 (-*tva*).
- bahûpâdâna*, c vi.10,12, vii.6,11, viii.10,29, xi.15,17, xiii.14, xvi.26.
- Bâdabhîkâra*, see p. 430.
- bâṇa*, xiii.9.
- bâṇavân*, ix.21.
- bâṇijâya*, xiii.12.
- bâdha*, -*dhana*, c xvi.19, xxi.5, xxiv.5.
- bâdhya*, c xxi.5.
- bâhulya*, c iv.23.
- bibhṛtas ta*, iv.52.
- bibhṛtâ*, iii.10.
- r. *budh*, c i.53, xiv.28, xix.4, xx.10, xxiii.2, xxiv.2; + *ni*, xxii.15.
- budhniyâ*, x.13.
- brhatkapola*, c xxiv.6.
- brhadgala*, c xxiv.6.
- brhaspati*, vi.7.
- bodhaka*, c xxi.1.4.
- bodhana*, c xvi.29.
- bodhâ*, iii.8.
- brahma ja-*, iv.25.
- brahmaṇ*, xiii.13.
- Brahmapurâṇa*, c xxiv.6.
- brahmaloka*, c xxiv.6.
- brâhmaṇa*, c i.61 (-*vâkya*), xiv.33, xxi.1.
- r. *brû*, xviii.1:—c i.2,36,46, iii.1, iv.3 etc., v.22,37, viii.16, ix.23, x.10, xi.9, xiv.4 etc., xviii.2, xix.3, xxi.1,13, xxiii.20.
- bhakti*, c intr., xxi.6,15.
- bhaṅga*, c i.53, ii.9, iv.52, v.10,22.
- bhaṅgurâ*, iii.5.
- r. *bhaj*, c v.26-30,38, vii.5-16, viii.24-32, ix.2 etc., x.24, xi.19, xiv.5, xvi.2 etc., xxi.2 etc., 15 (*bhajyamâne*): and -*bhâj* etc., *vibhajya* etc.
- bhajâ*, iii.8.
- r. *bhaṇ*, c i.15,57, xxiv.3v,4, 6.
- bhadra*, xii.3.
- bhaya*, c xiv.4.
- bharatâ*, iii.11.
- Bharadvâja*, see p. 430.
- bharâ*, iii.12.
- bharishyantî*, iv.19.
- bharema*, iii.10.
- bhavataḥ*, iv.52.
- bhavatâ*, iii.12.
- bhavant*, c i.21, iv.23.
- bhavâ*, iii.8.
- Bhavishyatpurâṇa*, c xxiv.6.
- bhâga*, c v.1 (*veda-*), xiv.28, xix.3 (*veda-*), xxi.15 (*svara-*).
- bhâgadhe*, iv.11.
- bhâj*, c xiv.18 (*nishedha-*): and *kâryabhâj*.
- bhâjana*, c xvii.8.
- bhâmâ*, c xviii.3.
- bhâmitaḥ*, xii.8.
- Bhâradvâja*, see p. 430.
- bhâva*, v.1,31, x.17, xv.1, xvii.4, xx.1,5:—c i.61, ii.12, viii.16, xxiv.5: and *abh-*.
- bhâvitva*, c iii.1, x.12.
- r. *bhâsh*, c i.14, ii.14,33, viii.19.
- bhâshâ* in *chandobh-*.
- bhâshya*, c intr.
- r. *bhâs*, c intr.
- bhîh*, viii.14.
- bhinna*, c i.3,29, iv.11, xiii.15, xxiii.18.
- bhîma*, *bhîmasena*, c xviii.3.
- bhujâ*, xiv.8.
- r. *bhû*, ii.3, xxii.11, xxiii.4:—c v.1; + *sam*, c i.49, ii.7, iv.23, viii.13, xiii.15: and *sambhava*.
- bhûta*, c ii.2, iv.23, viii.5, etc. etc.
- bhûte*, xiv.8.
- bhûyans*, ii.11.
- bhûyâṅsaḥ*, xvi.13.
- bhûshana*, c intr., xvi.19.
- bhûsura*, c intr.
- bheda*, c iv.40,47, viii.18,21, xiii.9, xiv.22,28, xviii.3, xxii.2, xxiii.7,18, xxiv.4: and *abh-*.
- bhyâm*, viii.14.
- bhraṅcate*, xvi.22.
- ma* (*m*), iv.7, xv.1, xvii.4, xxi.14.
- mah*, xii.6.
- maṅsatâi*, *maṅsye*, xvi.20.
- maṅhishthasya*, xvi.28.
- makâra*, v.12,27,35, viii.4, xiii.1.
- makshû*, iii.14.
- maṅgala*, c i.1.
- maṅca*, c vi.9.
- maṇi*, xiii.9.
- maṇḍala*, c xxiii.16,17.
- maṇḍûkapluti*, c ii.17, iv.51.
- mata*, c i.21,59, ii.2,19,27, 47, v.1,36-41, viii.18,19, etc. etc.
- mati*, xvii.8 (*yathâm-*).
- madhumân*, ix.21.
- madhya*, ii.6,41,45, xix.1:—c i.10, ii.2 (-*deça*), viii.15 (-*stha*), xxi.15.
- madhyama*, xviii.4, xxii.11, xxiii.5,10:—c xxiii.17.
- r. *man*, c i.15,18,19,21, ii.47, v.2,31, viii.23, xiii.13, xiv.5,33, xv.9, xvii.1-8, xix.3, xxiii.19; + *sam*, c v.41, xv.8: and *mata* etc.
- manah*, xxiii.6.
- manâh*, vii.9.
- mantra*, c iii.9.
- manda*, c xxiii.20 (*am-*).
- mandadhî*, c xi.3.
- mandra*, xxii.11, xxiii.5,10, 11,12,15,16:—c xxiii.13.
- manyamânaḥ*, xii.8.
- mayâni*, vii.12.
- martah*, xi.5.
- martyân*, ix.21.
- maryâdâ*, c i.1, iv.23.
- r. *març*: + *parâ*, c xv.3: and *parâmarçin*.
- malimlu*, vi.7.
- mahân*, ix.21.
- mahâprshthya*, xi.3.
- Mahâbhârata*, c xxiv.6.
- Mahâbhâshya*, c ii.7, v.2.
- mahi*, vi.2.
- mahî*, iv.34.
- mâ*, x.13, xvi.8; *mâpâtam*, iv.42.
- mâkih*, vi.5.
- Mâcâkiya*, see p. 430.
- mâtaḥ*, viii.8.
- mâtra*, xviii.1, xxii.13:—c i.21,56,61, ii.13,19,25,33, etc. etc.
- mâtrâ*, xxiv.6.
- mâtrika*, c xxi.15.
- mâdhyandina*, c xxiii.10.
- Mâyikâya*, see p. 430.



- mârdava*, xxii.10.  
*mâsah*, *mâsâm*, *mâsi*,  
*mâsu*, xvi.12.  
*mâse*, iv.53.  
*Mâhisheya*, *c intr.*, i.14,59,  
ii.14,33, iv.40, viii.19,20,  
22, xiv.28, xviii.7.  
*mîthū*, v.4.  
*mîthunî*, iv.53, x.18.  
*mîthû*, iii.14.  
*miçra*, *c xxiii.3.*  
*miçrita*, *c ii.23.*  
*-misha*, *c xxiii.19.*  
*mî*, xvi.9.  
*mîdhuh*, vi.5.  
*Mimâñsaka*, v.41.  
*mukha*, ii.3,50.  
*mukhya*, *c i.43*, ii.23,25, iv.  
23,52, v.22, x.12,12 (-*tva*),  
xii.3, xiii.14, xxiii.17: and  
*am-*.  
*munâ*, iii.8.  
*muni*, *c v.31*, xvii.1.  
*mushṭî*, iv.12.  
*mûrdhan*, ii.37: -*c xiii.16*,  
xxiii.17.  
*mûla*, *c xiii.14*, xiv.5 (-*sûtra*).  
*mûlakârana*, *c ii.8*, xxii.1.  
*mṛdâ*, iii.8.  
*mṛtyu*, vi.7.  
*mṛd*, *c ii.7*, xxii.3.  
*mrđutara*, xx.11: and *mâr-*  
*dava*.  
*me*, xi.11.  
*meghâ*, iii.5.  
*-m enî*, xiii.12.  
*medhye*, iv.11.  
*melana*, *c i.40.*  
*mo*, vi.2.  
*mṇa*, xiii.14.  
  
*ya (y)*, v.30, x.15,19, xii.4,  
xiii.3, xiv.21, xx.1.  
*ya (pron.)*, ii.32,34, xxii.14.  
15.  
*yañsat*, *yañsan*, xvi.20.  
*yakâra*, ii.40, ix.10,20, xv.1,  
xvii.4, xx.2.  
*yajâsi*, xvi.18.  
*yajîyân*, ix.23.  
*yajurveda*, *c i.15*, xxiv.6:  
and *yâjurvedika*.  
*yajñâ*, iv.44.  
*yajñakarman*, *c xv.9.*  
*Yajñadatta*, *c i.14.*  
*yajñe*, xi.16.  
*yat*, iv.33.  
*yatra*, ii.31,33, xix.1, xx.2.  
*yatrâ*, iii.8.  
*yatva*, *c i.4*, viii.8, ix.7,13,  
21,22, x.18.  
*yathâ*, i.61 (-*ukta*), v.2 (-*yuk-*  
*ta*), xvii.8 (-*mati*), xviii.7  
(-*prayoga*), xxiv.4 (-*sva*).  
*yathâkrama*, *c i.11*, ii.44, x.  
10, xiv.5, etc.  
*yadâ*, iv.38.  
*yadî*, iii.13.  
*yadrçayâ*, *c xxiv.6v.*  
*yamîkrandasi*, iv.20.  
*r. yam: + ni*, *c i.1: niyata*,  
*c i.49*, xv.6.  
*yama*, xv.9 (*ekay-*), xxi.13,  
xxii.12, xxiii.11: -*c i.1*, ii.  
49, xv.9 xvii.3, xix.3, xxi  
8, xxiii.17: and *dviy-*, *ca-*  
*tury-*.  
*yamah*, xii.3.  
*yamân*, ix.23.  
*yavena*, vii.6.  
*yasṭah*, viii.8.  
*yâjurvedika*, *c i.1.*  
*Yâjñavalkya*, *c xxiv.6.*  
*yâjñiya*, *c xv.9.*  
*yâjyâ*, iii.9,11, ix.20, xi.3:  
-*c i.61*, iii.1, ix.23 (-*tva*).  
*yâtâ*, iii.10.  
*yâdrçhika*, *c xxii.9.*  
*yânam*, vii.6.  
*yâmena*, vii.10.  
*yâvat*, i.41 (-*ardha*): -*c i.22*,  
58, xxi.15, xxii.3, xxiii.  
11.  
*yukta*, v.2 (*yathâ-*): -*c i.18*,  
19,61, x.12, xiii.14, xiv.  
28: and *ay-*.  
*yukti*, *c iv.23*, xiii.15 (-*anta-*  
*ra*), xiv.4 (do.), 5 (do.).  
*r. yuj*, *c ii.23*, iv.11; + *pra*,  
*c vi.5*, xviii.2,4,7, xxiii.4;  
+ *upa*, *c viii.13*, xxiii.10;  
+ *sam*, *c xiv.26v*: and  
*yukta* etc., *prayoga* etc.,  
*yoga* etc., *samyukta* etc.  
*yukshvâ*, iii.8.  
*yuvayor yah*, xi.16.  
*yushmân*, vi.14.  
*yushmânîtaḥ*, xiii.15.  
*ye*, xi.16.  
*ye aprathetâm*, iv.20.  
*yenâ*, iii.12.  
*yogavibhâga*, *c ii.12,23.*  
*yogyatva*, *c ii.37.*  
*yojanâ (sûtra-)*, *c i.35*, xiv.  
28.  
*yo rudrah*, xi.16.  
  
*ra (r)*, i.19, vii.11, xiii.6,  
xiv.15.  
*rañsyate*, xvi.22.  
*rañhyâi*, xvi.23.  
*rakshâ*, iii.8.  
*raghîyâ*, xvi.13.  
*rañga*, *c i.1*, ii.52.  
*r. rac: + vi*, *c intr.*, i.18, viii.  
19.  
*rathah*, -xi.5.  
*rathamtare*, iv.11.  
*rathî*, iii.7.  
*r. rabh: + â*, *c i.2,5,14,33,47*,  
iv.22,23, v.1, x.10,24,  
xxii.9, xxiii.5. xxiv.2: and  
*ârambha* etc.  
*ramaniya*, *c iv.23*, xiii.13,  
xiv.15.  
*raçmîn*, ix.23.  
*r. rah: rahita*, *c iii.15*, xxiii.  
20.  
-*râ-*, xiv.4, xvi.4.  
*r. ráj*, *c xxi.1.*  
*râjadanta*, *c ii.2.*  
*râtrî*, iii.7.  
*râyah*, viii.29.  
*râye*, xi.9.  
*râvṇ*, xiii.14.  
*râçi*, *c i.6*, xxii.1.  
-*râsah*, vi.5.  
-*rî-*, xvi.25.  
*r. ric: vyatirikta*, *c iv.52*, ix.  
20, xiv.28, xxiv.5: and  
*atireka*.  
*rishah*, viii.24.  
*ru*, vii.12.  
*rucira*, *c i.18 (ar-)*, iv.40.  
*rudra*, xi.3: -*c i.61.*  
*rudrah*, xi.16.  
*r. rudh: + vi*, *c xiv.4*: and  
*anurodha*, *virodha* etc.  
*rundhe*, iv.14.  
*r. ruh: + â*, *c xiv.9.*  
*ruhemâ*, iii.10.  
*rûpa*, xxii.2: -*c i.14,29,30*,  
59, xiii.14, etc. etc.  
*r. rûp: + ni*, *c ii.1*, xviii.1,  
xxiv.4.  
*rûpe*, iv.11.  
*repha*, ii.41, v.10,29, vi.8  
(-*vant*), viii.6,7,16,20, ix.  
20, xiii.2, xiv.4,6,19, xv.  
1, xvii.4, xxi.15.  
*râivate*, iv.11.  
*rodasi*, iv.17.  
  
*la (l)*, v.25,31, xiii.16, xiv.2,  
21.  
*lakâra*, ii.42, v.25, xiv.7,26:  
-*c i.1.*  
*r. laksh*, *c i.40*, iii.9, vi.9,  
xiii.13; + *upa*, *c i.29,38*,  
39.  
*lakshana*, *c intr.*, i.1,38,46,  
ii.3,18,23,25, iii.1, iv.43,  
v.26, ix.1, xi.18, xiii.15,  
xiv.29, xv.9v, xix.3, xx.2,  
xxiii.5,7,20, xxiv.5,6: and  
*upal-*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



- vidhṛte*, iv.11.  
*vidheya*, c xv.7.  
*vinatutā*, c xxii.10.  
*vināṣa* i.57.  
*vinivartaka*, xxii.6.  
*vinyaya*, xxiii.2.  
*vinyāsa*, c xxiii.2, 17.  
*vipaksha*, c xxiv.5.  
*vibhakti*, ci.23,28, xiii.9, xvi.25.  
*vibhajya*, c v.13.  
*vibhāga*, iii.1, xxiv.6:—c ii.12, iii.1–15, iv.4, xiv.29, xx.2: and *yogav-*.  
*vibhū*, iii.7.  
*vijyoga*, c v.13.  
*virāma*, xxii.13:—c xiv.15, xxi.6v.  
*viruddha*, c xiv.4,4 (-*vigraha*).  
*virūpe*, iv.11.  
*virodha*, ci.1,15, ii.23, viii.15,16, xiv.5.  
*virodhin*, c xvi.19.  
*vilakshana*, c xxi.7.  
*vivaḥ* viii.8.  
*vivakshā*, ci.1,18.  
*vivara*, c ii.37, xxii.9.  
*vivarana*, ii.52, and end'gs of chapters.  
*viviçivā-*, xvi.13.  
*viviçuh paruh*, viii.32.  
*vivrta*, ii.5,45:—c ii.12 (*ati-*), xxi.15.  
*vivrṭti*, xx.6, xxi.6v, xxii.13.  
*viçasanena*, xvi.7.  
*viçākhe*, iv.11.  
*viçesha*, xvii.7, xxiii.1, xxiv.6:—c i.1,14,15, ii.13,31,33, 47, iv.47,52, v.10, viii.16, x.10, xi.19, xiv.5,12,18, 28, xvi.1,2,13,19, xvii.6, xviii.1, xx.7, xxi.1, xxii.6, 13, xxiii.2, xxiv.2,6: and *av-*, *vaiçeshya*.  
*viçeshana*, ci.61, ii.25, iv.11, viii.13,23,32, x.9, xiv.6, 28, xv.4, xx.2, xxiv.4: and *prativ-*.  
*viçlesha*, c ii.31v,33v.  
*viçvataḥ*, viii.24,32.  
*viçvadevyā*, iii.5.  
*viçvā*, iii.5.  
*vishama*, c xiii.15.  
*vishaya*, ci.1,15,48,59, ii.20, iii.8,9,11, iv.23, v.15, ix.20,21, x.19 (-*tva*), xi.4, xii.1, xiii.15, xiv.28,29, xv.9v, xx.2.  
*vishayikar*, c v.24, vii.15.  
*vishurūpe*, iv.11.  
*vishū*, iii.7.
- Vishṇudharmottara*, c xxiv.6.  
*visarga* ci.51, iv.38,46, vii.2, viii.16, xi.5, xvi.13.  
*visarjanīya*, i.12,18, ii.46, 48, vi.1, viii.5, xiv.15:—c i.1, ii.47, xxiii.7, etc. etc.  
*vispashta*, ci.1, iv.11, xvi.25, xxi.15.  
*vihavya*, xi.3.  
*vihitatu*, c xiv.12.  
*vid*, iv.38.  
*vināyām*, xiii.12.  
*vipsā*, ci.61, v.3, xxiii.11, xxiv.6v.  
*viyamāṇaḥ*, xiii.10.  
*viriyā*, iii.5.  
*vṛtti*, xxiii.17:—c xiv.4, xxiii.18,20.  
*vṛshadañçah*, xvi.19.  
*vṛshaṇ*, xiii.13.  
*vṛshṇah*, xi.16.  
*vṛshṇiyā*, iii.5.  
*veh*, vi.5.  
*veṇu*, xiii.9.  
*venupatra*, c xx.12 (-*vat*).  
*veda*, ci.1, v.1, xiv.9 (-*antara*), xviii.1, xix.3, xxiv.5: and *yajurv-*, *vaidika*.  
*vedāṅga*, c xxiv.6.  
*velā*, c xx.2.  
*r. vesht*: + *prati*, ii.37.  
*vāikalpika*, c xxii.7.  
*vāikṛta*, c v.22, vi.14, vii.2, xiii.13, xiv.4,5.  
*vaidika*, ci.1.  
*vaiparitya*, c xvi.26.  
*vāibhāshika*, xxii.7.  
*vāiyarthya*, ci.61, ii.47, iv.11,23, v.22, xiv.28, xx.2.  
*vāiyākaraṇa*, c v.1, xxiv.3.  
*vaiçishtya*, c xxi.1.  
*vaiçeshya*, xxiii.2.  
*vāishṇavi*, iv.12.  
*vāi sam*, iv.44.  
*vocatā*, iii.12.  
*vyakti*, c ii.47, iv.40, v.15, xx.6.  
*vyaṅga*, c xxi.1.  
*vyacasvatī*, iv.19.  
*vyañjana*, i.6,14,17,21,37, iii.1, iv.6, v.14,37, vi.7, xiv.1,5,28,30, xvii.5, xxi.1, xxii.14,15, xxiii.7:—c x.12, xvi.3 (-*tā*), xxi.1, etc.  
*vyatihāra*, c xvi.23.  
*vyatyaya*, c xvi.4.  
*vyabhicāra*, ci.33.  
*vyartha*, ci.21, iv.11, viii.34, xiv.17, xvi.2, xxi.1: and *vaiyarthya*.
- vyavachedaka*, c ii.25 (-*tva*), xx.3. =  
*vyavadhāna*, c ii.25.  
*vyavadhāyika*, c xiii.15.  
*vyavasthā*, c xix.3.  
*vyavāyā*, xiii.15:—c ii.25.  
*vyaveta*, i.17, iv.51, vii.5, xiii.7:—c i.19 (-*tva*), vi.3.  
*vyasta in ativ-*.  
*vyastataḥ*, c ii.14.  
*vyākaraṇa*, ci.57, ii.47, xiii.16: and *vaiyāk-*.  
*vyākhyāna*, c intr., ix.8, xxi.1, xxiii.17.  
*vyāvartaka*, c xxi.7.  
*Vyāsa*, c xxiv.6.  
*vyāhṛti*, iii.7.  
*vyudāsa*, c xv.9v.
- ça (ç)*, v.22, xiii.15, xiv.26.  
*ça*, xvi.2.  
*çañstā*, xvi.5.  
*r. çak*, c ii.12,23, xxi.1: and *açakya*.  
*çakāra*, v.4,20,34:—c ii.44.  
*çakuni*, vi.7.  
*çakti*, c ii.33.  
*çakti*, iii.7.  
*r. çāṅk*: + *ā*, c xxi.15, xxii.14, xxiii.11.  
*çāṅkā*, ci.3, x.22, xiii.13, xiv.4,15, xxi.10.  
*çaci*, iii.7.  
*çatepañcāçannyāya*, c ii.25.  
*çatrū*, iii.7.  
*çatva*, c v.24.  
*çabda*, ii.1, xxii.1,3,9, xxiii.3:—c intr., i.1,7,15–7,19–22,26–9,37,42, etc. etc.: and *aç-*.  
*çamitaḥ*, viii.8.  
*çarāva*, c ii.7.  
*çarira*, ii.2.  
*çaçvataḥ*, viii.24.  
*çasanam*, xvi.7.  
*çākhā*, c xv.8, xvi.12 (*anya-*); *çākhāntara*, c iv.11, 12,15,37, vi.5, viii.8, xi.3, 9,15,16, xii.3, xiii.13,16, xvi.13,18.  
*çākhin*, c viii.20, ix.4,6, x.20, xiii.16, xiv.10v,11v,13v, 19v,20v,32v,33, xv.9, xxi.13.  
*Çāṅkhāyana*, see p. 430.  
*çāryāte*, iv.41, xi.16.  
*çāstra*, xix.5 (*pūrva-*):—c i.2, 14,21,53, ii.18, xxii.3, xxiv.6.  
*çiñçumārah*, xvi.26.  
*çiñshat*, xvi.26.



<i>çikshâ</i> , c i.1,2,21, ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3,12, xxi.1,15, xxii.13, xxiii.10,17.	<i>shu</i> , vii.2.	<i>samjñâ</i> , c i.2-15, 31-9,49, ii.4-6,9, iii.9, iv.3.11,12, 17, xi.3, xv.6, xix.1,5, xx.2, xxiii.16.
<i>çikshâ</i> , iii.8.	<i>shumnah</i> , xiii.15.	<i>samjñika</i> , c i.13v, xiii.16.
<i>çikshâkâra</i> , c i.1, xxi.15.	<i>shû</i> , vii.2.	<i>sattvâ</i> , vi.12.
<i>çipre</i> , iv.11.	<i>shodaça</i> , i.5.	<i>satya</i> , c i.21,53, ii.18, viii.16, xiii.15.
<i>çiras</i> , ii.3, xxiii.10:—c xx.12 (komala-).	<i>shñâ</i> , xiii.14.	<i>satyabhâmâ</i> , c xviii.3.
<i>çive</i> , iv.11.	<i>sa</i> (s), iv.7, v.32, viii.23,26, xiii.15.	<i>satrâ</i> , iii.5.
r. <i>çish</i> :+vi, c i.30, ii.44, iv.7,34, v.18,19,28, vi.5, x.10, xiv.5,19, xxi.1: and <i>aviçishta</i> , <i>viçesha</i> etc., <i>vâiçishtya</i> .	<i>sa</i> (pron.), v.2, xi.19, xviii.4, xix.1, xx.3.	r. <i>sad</i> :+pratyâ, c ii.42, v.24: and <i>âsanna</i> .
<i>çishta</i> , c i.1.	<i>sah</i> , v.15,17, xi.9.	<i>sadane</i> , iv.11.
<i>çikâ</i> , iii.2.	<i>samyukta</i> , xxii.15:—c xxi.5 (as-).	<i>sadrça</i> , xi.19:—c v.28, xxiv.6.
<i>çirshañ</i> , xiii.13.	<i>samyuta</i> , c i.54 (as-).	<i>sadohavir dhâne</i> , iv.11.
<i>çukla</i> , c v.28.	<i>samyoga</i> , xxi.4 (-gâdi), 15, xxii.14,15, xxiv.3:—c xvii.4.	<i>sadbhâva</i> , c xiii.14, xiv.28, xvi.29.
<i>çuddhâ</i> , iii.2.	<i>samrakshana</i> , c vi.5.	<i>sadhîh</i> , vi.5.
<i>çuçruvâ</i> , xvi.13.	<i>samvrta</i> , ii.4,27:—c xxi.15, xxii.9 (-tâ).	<i>sani</i> , <i>sanih</i> , <i>sanih</i> , vi.12.
<i>çushmah</i> , xi.16.	<i>samvyavahâra</i> , c i.14. xxii.3.	<i>sanutah</i> , viii.8.
<i>çûnya</i> , c xx.2.	<i>sañçita</i> , <i>sañçitâ</i> , xvi.26.	<i>samtânebhayah</i> , vi.12.
<i>çrñge</i> , iv.11.	<i>samçlesha</i> , c ii.33.	<i>samdeha</i> , i.25:—c i.14,26, iv.23, v.1, xxi.2,5.
<i>çrnutâ</i> , iii.10.	<i>sañçvâ</i> , xvi.26.	<i>samdhâna</i> , ii.2, xxiv.3:—c xiv.15.
<i>çesha</i> , i.6,14,42,46, ii.28, xxii.14:—c i.44-5, ii.29,47, xiii.15, xxi.15.	<i>samsad</i> , xxiv.6.	<i>samdhi</i> , c ii.18, x.15,24,25, xxi.1.
<i>çeshabhûta</i> , c ii.47, iv.3, xi.3.	<i>sañsada</i> , xvi.26v.	<i>samdhya</i> , c i.33, ii.47, 48, xviii.1.
<i>Çâityâyana</i> , see p. 430.	<i>samsarga</i> , xxiii.2.	<i>samnaddah</i> , xii.3.
<i>ço</i> , xvi.2.	<i>sañsrshâ</i> , xvi.26.	<i>samnikarsha</i> , c xxiv.3.
<i>çonâ</i> , xiii.12.	<i>sañskrta</i> , <i>sañskrtya</i> , xvi.26.	<i>samnîpâta</i> , x.12.
<i>çyeti</i> , x.18.	<i>sañsphânah</i> , xi.16.	<i>sapûrva</i> , v.19, viii.22.
<i>çyenâya</i> , xi.3.	<i>sañsrâ</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sapta</i> , xxiii.4,11.
<i>çrapayân</i> , ix.23.	<i>samhitâ</i> , v.1, xv.8, xxi.10, xxiv.1-4:—c i.60,60 (as-), iii.1,8, v.3, vii.10, ix.22, 24, x.10,12, xi.9, xiii.5,14, xiv.29, xv.7, xvi.29, xix.3, xx.2: and <i>sâmhitâ</i> .	<i>saptamî</i> , c v.10, xvi.25.
<i>çravaṇa</i> , c iv.35.	<i>sak</i> , vi.12.	<i>saptâbhîh</i> , vi.12.
<i>çrî</i> , vii.9.	<i>sakala</i> , c iv.52, xvi.29 (-pada).	<i>sapte</i> , vi.5.
r. <i>çru</i> , c xxii.6.	<i>sakâya</i> , xvi.10.	<i>sabheyah</i> , vi.12.
<i>çruti</i> , iv.35, xii.7, xiii.12:—c xxi.15.	<i>sakâra</i> , v.6,10,14, vi.1,14, xvi.1:—c ii.44.	<i>sam</i> , v.6, xiii.4; <i>samindra</i> , vii.2.
<i>çrudhî</i> , iii.13.	<i>samiketa</i> , c i.21.	<i>sama</i> , i.42,45,46, xvii.2, xxiii.19.
<i>çreyâ</i> , xvi.13.	<i>samikshepa</i> , c xii.6.	<i>samabhivyâhâra</i> , c xiii.14.
<i>çronî</i> , iii.7.	<i>samikhyâ</i> , xvi.25:—c i.1,11, ii.19, x.15,22, xxiii.16.	<i>samaya</i> , c iii.1, iv.5, vi.14, xii.17.
r. <i>çlish</i> :+sam, c ii.12, xvii.4: and <i>upaçlesha</i> , <i>duhçlishta</i> , <i>praçlishta</i> , <i>samçlesha</i> .	<i>samikhyâna</i> , i.48 (as-):—c i.59.	<i>samarthana</i> , c xiii.14.
<i>çloka</i> , c xxii.14, xxiii.20.	<i>samghâta</i> , c xxii.3.	<i>samarthanîya</i> , c xvi.19.
<i>çvâ</i> , iii.2.	<i>sacasvâ</i> , iii.8.	<i>samarthay</i> , c v.3, xiii.4v, xiv.4.
<i>çvâsa</i> , ii.5,10, xxiv.5:—c ii.3.	r. <i>saj</i> :+pra, c ii.9,20, iii.1, xix.3; <i>prasakta</i> , c i.4, ii.29, v.3,37, ix.13, xiv.5, xxi.1: and ap-, <i>prasakti</i> , <i>prasaṅga</i> .	<i>samâna</i> , c ii.23,47,48, iv.23, v.27, viii.19,21, ix.8, xxi.6,15.
<i>sha</i> (sh), vii.13, viii.23,33, xiii.6.	<i>sajâtiya</i> , c x.1.	<i>samânakâla</i> , i.33.
<i>shah</i> , vii.11.	<i>sajûh</i> , iv.25.	<i>samânapada</i> , iv.54, xiii.6, xxii.13:—c xiii.15,16.
<i>shakâra</i> , v.10,32, vi.1:—c ii.44.	<i>samjñaka</i> , c ix.16.	<i>samânâkshara</i> , i.2, x.2, xv.6:—c i.3,4, x.10, xv.9.
<i>shat</i> , vii.2.		<i>samânân</i> , ix.23.
<i>shaññ</i> , xiii.14.		<i>samâmnâya</i> , i.1:—c i.2,5, ii.1.
<i>shatva</i> , c i.51,60, v.3, vi.4,5, 13, vii.2, viii.16,35.		<i>samâsa</i> , c ii.2, iii.9, v.1, x.6, xiii.9.
<i>shash</i> , i.9.		
<i>shashtha</i> , iv.52.		
- <i>shi</i> , xvi.14.		



- samâhâra*, i.40:—*c intr.*, i.61, ix.18, x.6, xiv.1, xviii.4.  
*samidhah*, xi.16.  
*samîcî*, iv.31.  
*samîraṇa*, ii.2.  
*samuccaya*, ci.15,21, xv.7, xxi.6,9.  
*samuttha*, cv.1.  
*samudâya*, ciii.7, iv.3.  
*samparka*, cxxi.1.  
*sampâdana*, ciii.1, xiv.15.  
*sampratyaya*, cv.24, x.12, xiv.17.  
*sambandha*, ciii.1, x.22, xi.1, xiv.18.  
*sambandhin*, ci.60, ii.3,50, iv.40, xiv.23,28.  
*sambhava*, ci.25, ii.18,25, iii.1, iv.23, x.12, xiv.14: and *as-*.  
*sambhâvanâ*, civ.11.  
*sammîtâm*, vi.12.  
*r. sar*: + *ut*, cxiv.15; + *pra*, ci.59, iv.3, vi.11, vii.16, xi.18: and *prasaraṇa*.  
*saraṇi*, ci.18.  
*sarala*, cviii.13, ix.1, xiv.4.  
*r. sarj*: + *vi*, cix.11; + *sam*, cxxi.1.  
*sarva*, i.47, ix.7, xiv.33, xv.9, xvii.7, xxii.1,14, xxiv.5; *sarve*, viii.15, xviii.7.  
*sarvatra*, ii.25, xii.11, xvii.2:—*c i*.18, iv.5,27,49, ix.22,24, xxii.3.  
*sarvathâ*, ci.59, v.3, xxiv.5.  
*sarvanâman*, cii.7, viii.6, xv.3.  
*sarvâṅga*, cxxiii.17.  
*sarvânudâtta*, cv.4.  
*sava*, vi.10.  
*savana*, cxxiii.10.  
*savane paçûn*, vi.14.  
*savargîya*, viii.2, xiv.23:—*c viii*.3,4, xiv.12,13.  
*savarṇa*, i.3, v.28, x.2, xiv.23, xxi.7:—*c i*.4.  
*savitah*, viii.8.  
*savyañjana*, i.43:—*c ii*.23.  
*saçabda*, xxiii.9.  
*sasâdâ*, iii.12.  
*sasrvâ*, xvi.13.  
*sasthâna*, ii.47,48, v.27,38, ix.2, xiv.9,13 (*as-*).  
*sasyâyâi*, vi.12.  
*sahacâritva*, cii.47, xiii.16.  
*sahasah*, viii.28.  
*sahita*, ci.43 (*-tva*), iv.47, v.19, xxi.15, xxiii.20.  
*sahurî*, *sahûtî*, iv.15.  
*r. sâ*: + *adhyava*, cii.7: and *avasita*.  
*sâmhitâ*, ix.17, xx.3:—*c xiv*.5, xx.4*v*: and *as-*.  
*sâkâṅkshatâ*, cxiv.15.  
*sânikalpika*, cxxiii.6.  
*Sânikṛtya*, see p. 430.  
*sâdayâ*, iii.12.  
*sâdrçya*, ci.3, xiii.16.  
*sâdhana*, cxxii.3,9,10.  
*sâdharmya*, ci.1.  
*sâdhârana*, cxiv.5, xviii.7*v*.  
*sâdhu*, ci.53 (*-tva*), ii.7,18, xiii.13: and *as-*.  
*sânunâsika*, cv.28, xv.1, xvii.5, xxii.14.  
*sânunâsikya*, cxv.2, xxi.14.  
*sâmnidhya*, ci.36, ii.11 etc. iv.30 etc., v.23, viii.14,33, ix.9,10, x.9,21,25, xii.3, xiv.21, xv.8, xix.3.  
*sâpeksha*, ci.1 (*-tva*), iv.40 (*-tâ*), xxi.1.  
*sâphalya*, cxiv.28.  
*sâm*, xiii.4.  
*sâmanî*, iv.12.  
*sâmarthya*, ci.61, iv.11, v.25, viii.16, ix.13,21, xiii.14, xvi.13,19.  
*sâmânya*, ci.29, ii.9,23, v.22, x.12, xiv.28, xv.8, xvi.19.  
*sâmya*, xxiv.5:—*c ii*.20,39, 45, viii.16.  
*sâra*, cxiv.5: and *as-*.  
*sârathih*, vi.13.  
*sârûpya*, cxiv.23.  
*sârthaka*, ciii.1, iv.11, viii.16.  
*sâhacarya*, cxiii.14, xiv.15, xvi.13,26.  
*sâhasra*, vi.13.  
*-si*, xvi.14,27.  
*sinhâvalokana*, cii.51, iv.4, xiii.3,15.  
*siñcathâ*, iii.10.  
*siddharûpa*, cviii.19.  
*siddhavatkṛti*, cxiv.28.  
*siddhi*, cii.20,25,47, iv.11, 23,52, v.22, viii.13,18, xiii.4, xiv.17, xvi.2,12, xxi.5.  
*r. sidh*, cii.25, viii.8,16, ix.7, xiii.14, xvi.18; *siddha*, ci.11,14, iv.3, v.26, viii.21, etc.; + *ni*, ci.4,14,59,60, ii.25,29, v.24,29,35, viii.8, ix.13,21, x.24, xiii.16, xvi.5, xviii.1, xxiv.2; + *pra*, ci.4; *prasiddha*, ci.21, ii.47, xiii.14,15, xix.3; + *prati*, ci.4, viii.8, xiii.3, xiv.33*v*: and *aprasiddha*, *nishedha*, *-dhaka*, *prati-shedha*, *-dhaka*, *prasiddhi*.  
*sîtam*, vi.12.  
*su*, v.5, xvi.25 (*asu*).  
*sugopâ*, iii.5.  
*sutarâm*, cii.25.  
*sumatih*, vi.5.  
*sumnâ*, iii.2.  
*sumninî*, iv.12.  
*suvaḥ*, v.10, vii.2, viii.8,13.  
*sû*, iii.7,14.  
*sûkshma*, cxvii.3.  
*r. sùc*, cxiv.5.  
*sûcaka*, ci.7.  
*sûtra*, ci.1,14,18,22,25,35, 39,46,50,53,57, ii.1 etc., iii.1, iv.3 etc, v.1, etc. etc.  
*sûtrakṛt*, ci.15.  
*sûtrita*, cxxiv.6*v* (*as-*).  
*sṛjâ*, iii.12.  
*so asmân*, ix.21.  
*sopâdhika*, cii.23.  
*soma*, ix.21.  
*somah*, xi.15.  
*somâya sva-*, iv.48.  
*stanâm*, vi.12.  
*stanutah*, viii.8.  
*stabhnîtâm*, iv.52.  
*starîma*, vi.13.  
*starîmâ*, iii.10.  
*stutaçastre*, iv.11.  
*stubbh*, vi.13.  
*sto*, vi.13.  
*stotah*, viii.8.  
*strîlînga*, cii.7.  
*-stha*, xx.3:—*c iii*.1, xvi.24, etc. etc.  
*sthaḥ*, iv.46.  
*sthala*, ci.61, iv.11,23, xi.4, xix.4, xx.2.  
*sthavira*, xvii.4.  
*r. sthâ*, xx.2:—*c v*.2, xxi.7; + *ava*, cix.16, xxi.1,2; + *vyava*, cxxi.2; + *upa*, cxxi.5.  
*sthâ*, iii.8.  
*sthâṇum*, xiii.12.  
*sthâna*, ii.31,33,44,46,49, xxii.11, xxiii.2,4,11:—*c i*.3, 33, ii.3,23,39,43,47, etc. etc., xviii.4.  
*sthânam*, vi.10.  
*sthita*, xx.2.  
*sthiti*, cxiv.28.  
*sthûṇâu*, xiii.12.  
*sthûla*, cv.9, xxii.10 (*-tâ*).  
*sthe*, xii.6.  
*sthâurya*, cxxiv.5.  
*sthâulya*, cxxiv.5*v*.  
*snigdhatâ*, cxxii.10.  
*spar dhâḥ*, vi.13.  
*r. sparç*, ii.17,34,35:—*c ii*.36  
 -43.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



## GENERAL INDEX.

THE references by Roman and Arabic figures together are, as in the other Indexes, to chapter and rule; those by Arabic figures alone (with *p.* prefixed), to page of the volume.

- a, â*: how uttered, ii.12; how combined with a following vowel. x.3-9:—*a*, is short, i.32; *ah* to *o* before, ix.7; lost before initial *e* or *o* of certain words, x.14; when initial, lost after *e* or *o*. xi.1; detail of cases of its elision or non-elision, xi.2-xii.8; resulting accent, xii.9-11:—*â*, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.2-6, 8-12; initial, do., iii.15:—*âs*, nasalized when final, xv.8.
- abhinidhâna*, xiv.9.
- abhinihata* circumflex, xx.4: its occurrence, xii.9; its comparative tone, xx.10.
- Accent: see Analysis, p. 437; also Acute, Circumflex, Grave, and the names of the various accents.
- Acute accent (*udâtta*), defined, i.38; mode of production, xxii.9; acute tone of grave syllables after circumflex, xxi.10-11.
- âi*, how uttered ii.26-8; peculiar utterance in a single word, xvi.24; combination with following vowel, ix.14, x.19-23; with preceding *a, â*, x.6.
- Alphabetic sounds, enumeration of. p. 8-10; classification, mode of production, etc., see Analysis, p. 436; names for, i.16-9.
- anudâtta*, see Grave.
- anusvâra* (*ñ*): its equivocal treatment by the Prâtiçâkhya, p. 67-70; is an independent element, p. 8; how uttered, ii.19,30; how designated, i.18; belongs to preceding vowel, xxi.6; its quantity, i.34; makes a heavy syllable, xxii.14; its occurrence, xv.1-3; do. otherwise than as result of euphonic combination, xv.4-5, xvi.1-31.
- Articulate sounds, see Alphabetic.
- Aspirate mutes: sonant, contain *h*-sound, ii.9; surd, contain more breath than non-aspirates, ii.11; substituted for non-aspirate before sibilants, xiv.12-3; how duplicated, xiv.5; double aspirates in the MSS., p. 290,294.
- âu*, how uttered, ii.26,27,29; combination with following vowel, ix.15, x.19-23; with preceding *a, â*, x.7.
- Authorities quoted in the rules of the treatise, p. 430.
- avagraha*, name of first member of a compound, i.49; quantity of the pause following it in *pada*-text, p. 399.
- b*, labial mute, ii.39.
- bh*, labial mute, ii.39; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.
- Brâhmaṇa-passages in the Sanhitâ, p. 48.
- c*, palatal mute, ii.36; insertion of *ç* before, v.4,5; *t* to *c* before, v.22; *n* to *ñç* or *ñ* before, v.20,21,24.
- ç*, palatal spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; initial, to *ch* after any mute save *m*, v.34-7; *t* to *c* before, v.22; *n* to *ñ* before, v.24; irregular insertions of, v.4,5; inserted after *n*, v.20-1.
- ch*, palatal mute, ii.36; product of *ç* after a mute, v.34-7; *t* to *c* before, v.22; *n* to *ñ* before, v.24; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.
- Cerebral mutes, see Lingual.
- Çikshâ, quoted in the comment, p. 435.
- Circumflex accent (*svarita*), mode of utterance, i.40-7; degree of effort in, xvii.6, xx.9-12; kinds of independent circumflex, xx.1,2,4,5; their occurrence, x.16,17, xii.9; kinds of enclitic circumflex, xx.3,6,7; its occurrence, xiv.29-33; *kampa* between two circumflexes, xix.3-5; nature of enclitic circumflex, p. 315.
- Citation, rules of, i.22,24,50-3.
- Citations in the comment not found in the Tâittiriya-Sanhitâ, p. 425-6.
- Commentary, see Tribhâshyaratna.
- Compound words, separable, count as two, i.48; first member called *avagraha*, i.49.
- Consonants, i.6; their classification and description, i.7-14, ii.8-11.30,33-52; names, i.17-8,21; quantity, i.34,37, p. 377; accent, i.43; belong to what vowel, xxi.1-9; relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72,375-7: see also the several letters and classes, and Groups.
- d*, dental mute, ii.38; irregular insertion of, v.8.
- ḍ*, lingual mute, ii.37; product of alteration of *l*, xiii.16.



- Dental mutes (*t, th, d, dh, n*), how formed, ii.38: see also the several letters.
- dh*, dental mute, ii.38.
- dh*, lingual mute, ii.37.
- Diphthongs (*e, âi, o, âu*): see the several letters.
- Duplication, of *ñ, n*, final, ix.18-9; of *ch, kh, bh*, xiv.8; of aspirate mutes in the MSS., p. 290,294; duplication in consonant groups, xiv.1-7,9-28.
- e*, how uttered, ii.15-7,23; combination with preceding *a, â*, x.6; with following vowel, ix.11,13, x.19; initial *a* elided after, xi.1 etc.; resulting accent, xii.9-11; final *a* elided before, x.14; *pragraha* ending, iv.8-54.
- Elision, see Omission.
- Euphonic alteration, concerns single element only, i.56; of a cited word, does not suspend rules, i.51; mode of intimating in rules, i.23,28.
- Final consonant. belongs to preceding vowel, xxi.3; makes heavy syllable, xxii.14.
- g*, guttural mute, ii.35.
- gh*, guttural mute. ii.35.
- Grammarians quoted by name in the rules and comment, p. 430.
- Grave accent (*anudâtta*), defined, i.39; how produced, xxii.10; grave syllable, when converted to enclitic circumflex, xiv.29-31; when uttered at acute pitch, xxi.10-1.
- Groups of consonants, occurring in Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ, detail of their division in syllabication, p. 380-2,385; make a heavy syllable, xxii.14.
- Guttural mutes (*k, kh, g, gh, ñ*). how formed, ii.35: see also the several letters.
- h*, a spirant, i.9; not surd, i.13; intermediate between surd and sonant, ii.6; inheres in sonant aspirates, ii.9; uttered in the throat, ii.46; has same position as following vowel, ii.47; combination with preceding final mute, v.38-41; before a nasal, *nâsikya* inserted after, xxi.14.
- h*, see *visarjanîya*.
- Heavy syllable, xxii.14.
- i, î*: how formed, ii.22; combination with preceding *a, â*, x.4; with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16:—*î*, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,13; *pragraha* ending, iv.8-54.
- Increment, how intimated, i.23.
- Insertions, of *ç, s, d*, anomalous, v.4-8; of *k, t*, v.32,33; after spirant before mute, xiv.9.
- j*, palatal mute, ii.36; *t* before, to *j*, v.23; *n* before, to *ñ*, v.24.
- iatâ*-text, p. 429-30.
- jh*, palatal mute, ii.36; not found in the Sanhitâ, p. 72.
- jihvâmûlîya* ( $\chi$ ), guttural spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.
- k*, guttural mute, ii.35; inserted after *ñ* before *s, sh*, v.32; *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii.23 etc.
- kampa*, peculiar affection of a circumflex followed by another circumflex, xix.3-5; differences between the Tâittirîya and other texts as to its occurrence and treatment, p. 362-3.
- kaṇḍikâs*, division of *anuvâkas* into, not recognized by the Prâtiçâkhya, p. 5,83, 427,430.
- Kârttikeya, asserted author of the Prâtiçâkhya, p. 1.
- kh*, guttural mute, ii.35; *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii.23 etc.; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.
- krama*-text, p. 429.
- kshâipra* circumflex, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its tone, xx.9.
- l*, semivowel, i.8; how produced, ii.42; assimilates preceding *t, m, n*, v.25,26,28; resulting nasal *l*, v.26,28; changed to *d*, xiii.16; duplication after, xiv.2,3, 7.
- l̄*, not a simple vowel, p. 11; of short quantity, i.31; how produced, ii.18.
- Labial mutes (*p, ph, b, bh, m*), how formed, ii.39: see also the several letters.
- Light syllable, xxii.15.
- Lingual mutes (*t, th, d, dh, n*), how formed, ii.37: see also the several letters.
- Long vowel, i.35: and see Prolongation.
- m*, labial mute, ii.39; assimilated to following mute, v.27; and semivowel (except *r*), v.28-31, xiii.3; irregularly dropped, v.12; to *ñ* before *r* or spirant, v.29, xiii.2; unchanged before *râ*, xiii.4.
- Manuscripts of Prâtiçâkhya and commentary: see Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya.
- Mutes, i.7; division and names, i.10,11; what mutes are surd, i.12; mode of formation of the various series, ii.35-9; their designation, i.27: see also the several series and letters.



- n*, dental mute, ii.38; change of, to *n̄*, before palatals, v.24,37; to nasal *l*, v.25-6,31; to *n̄ç*, v.20,21; to *n̄s*, vi.14; to *n̄r* or *n̄* (through *y*), ix.20-4; to *n*, vii.1-12,15,16, xiii.6-8,13-5; physical ground of this change, p. 281; adds *t* before *s*, *sh*, v.33; doubled ix.19.
- n̄*, guttural mute, ii.35; adds *k* before *s*, *sh*, v.32; doubled, ix.18.
- n̄*, palatal mute, ii.36; *n* changed to, v.24, 37.
- n̄*, lingual mute, ii.37; *n* changed to, vii.1-12,15,16, xiii.6-8,13-5; detail of its occurrence when not result of euphonic causes, xiii.9-12.
- n̄*, see *anusvāra*.
- Nasal, what sounds are, ii.30; nasal quality how given, ii.52; its differences of degree, xvii.1-4:—nasal mutes, surd mute to nasal before, viii.2; exception, viii.4; take a prefixed surd after a sibilant, xiv.9; take *yama* after preceding non-nasal, xxi.12; take *nāsikya* after preceding *h*, xxi.14: see also the several letters:—nasal semivowels, result of change of *m*, *n*, v.26,28:—nasalized vowel, alternative for *n̄*, v.31, xv.1; result of combination, x.11; discussion of the doctrine of the treatise as to *n̄* or nasal vowel, p. 67-70; nasalization of a final vowel, xv.6-8; its prolongation, xvii.5.
- nāsikya*, or *yama*, xxi.12; nose-sound, inserted between *h* and nasal mute, xxi.14.
- nitya* circumflex, xx.2; its tone, xx.9.
- Nose-sounds (*yamas*, *nāsikya*), how produced, ii.49-51; how designated, i.18; occurrence, xxi.12-4; how treated in syllabication, xxi.8.
- o*, diphthong, how produced, ii.13-4; when *pragraha*, iv.6,7; combination with preceding *a*, *ā*, x.7; with following vowel, ix.12-3, x.19-23; final *a* elided before, x.14; *ah* changed to, before *a* and sonant consonant, ix.7,8; initial *a* elided after, xi.1 etc.
- om*, utterance of, xviii.1-7.
- Omission (*lopa*), defined, i.57; how intimated, i.23; affects single elements only, i.56; cases of, irregular, v.11-19; omission of *h*, before spirant followed by surd, ix.1; before a vowel, ix.9; of *a* after *e* or *o*, xi.1 etc.; nature of this omission, xi.19.
- Organs of articulation, ii.3; their mode of action, ii.31-4: and see the several letters and classes.
- p*, labial mute, ii.39; *h* to *sh* or *s* before, viii.23 etc.
- pada*-text, peculiarities of, in Tāittirīya-Sanhitā, p. 85,98-9,369 note, 428-9.
- pādavṛtta* enclitic circumflex, xx.6; its tone, xx.12.
- Palatal mutes (*c*, *ch*, *j*, *jh*, *n̄*), ii.36: see also the several letters.
- Pāṇini, cited in commentary, p. 435.
- Pauses, quantity of, xxii.13.
- ph*, labial mute, ii.39.
- pluta*, see Protracted.
- pracaya* accent, xxi.10-1; of *om*, xviii.3; *vikrama* after, xix.2.
- praçliṣṭa* circumflex, xx.5; its occurrence x.17; tone, xx.11.
- pragraha* finals, detail of, iv.1-54; are uncombinable, x.24; rarely elide *a*, p. 264.
- Prātiçākhyā, see Tāittirīya.
- prātihata* enclitic circumflex, xx.3; its tone, xx.11; discussion of its true character, p. 369-70.
- Prepositions, list of, i.15; *a* of preposition combines with *r* to *ār*, x.9; usually take *iti* in *pada*-text, p. 229,428.
- Prolongation, irregular, of vowels in *saṁhitā*, iii.1-15; of vowel after loss of final *r*, viii.17; of nasalized vowel, xvii.5; of circumflex vowel taking *kumpa*, p. 362-3.
- Protracted (*pluta*) vowel, quantity of, i.36; uncombinable, x.24; detail of cases occurring in Sanhitā, p. 323-4; a vowel following, is not styled "similar," i.4; nasalization of, when final, xv.7,8; tone of (?), xv.9.
- Qualifications of a scholar and teacher, xxiv.5,6.
- Qualities (*sthāna*) of sound, xxii.11, xxiii.4-10.
- Quantity, see Analysis, p. 437.
- r*, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.41; its name, i.19; takes *svarabhakti* before a spirant, xxi.15; *h* converted into, v.10, viii.6-15; but lost before *r*, and preceding vowel lengthened, viii.16-7; *n* converted into, ix.20-4; causes duplication, xiv.4,6; changes following *n* to *n̄*, xiii.6; *m* to *n̄* before, xiii.2, xv.1-3.
- r̄*, *r̄*: not simple vowels, p. 11; their composition, p. 392; how uttered, ii.18; change following *n* to *n̄*, xiii.6 etc.: quantity of *r̄*, i.31; combination with preceding *a*, *ā*, x.8,9; anomalous conversion to *ar*, v.9.
- Repeated passages, treatment of, i.61.
- Repetition of compound words, with *iti*, in *pada*-text, p. 85.
- s*, dental spirant, i.9, ii.44; irregular insertions of, v.6,7; omission, v.14;





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



- 6,7,16-7; do. in anomalous cases, v.10; do. after *a*, *á*. viii.8-15; dropped after *â*, *âs*, ix.9; to *y* (which is dropped) after *a*-vowel, before vowel, ix.10:—*ah* to *o*, ix.7,8; do. before *r*, p. 192-3, viii.18-22.
- Vocatives in *o*, treatment of, as *pragraha*, iv.6.
- Vowels (*a*, *á*, *âs*, *i*, *î*, *îs*, *u*, *û*, *ûs*, *r*, *ŕ*, *l*, *e*, *âi*, *o*, *âu*), i.5; the first nine simple, i.2; similar vowels, i.3,4; their common designation, i.20; quantity of, i.31-3,35-6; are sonant, ii.8; how produced, ii.1?-29,31-2; combinations of vowels, and resulting accent, x.1-18; relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72, 375-7: see also the several letters, and Nasal vowels.
- Weight or quantity of syllables, xxii.14-5.
- y*, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.40; dropped as final, x.19-23; *h* converted into, after *a*-vowel, ix.10; *n* converted into, ix.20; resolution of usual *y* into *iy*, p. 64-5.
- Yajur-Veda, depiction of, p. 421.
- yamas*, nasal counterparts, xxi.13; occurrence, xxi.12; how produced, ii.49-51; belong to what syllable, xxi.8.
- yamas*, tones, xxii.12, xxiii.11 etc.
- yâ*, irregular omission of, v.19.



## ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

PART of these emendations are due to Prof. Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications. A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here.

p. 2, l. 25. The MS. used by Weber was another (No. 504) in the same collection, containing only the text (incomplete) of the Prâtiçâkhya.

p. 3, l. 1. Dr. Rost's description of these MSS. has not yet appeared. It appears, however, that the rules of the Prâtiçâkhya are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging).

p. 3, l. 4. The differences of reading in the Prâtiçâkhya text itself are more numerous than is here stated. They have been pointed out in the course of the work (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i.61, ii.17,51, iv.11,39 (T. W. *ahne*, for '*hne*'), v.13,20 (G. M. *çakâraç*, for *-ram*: a mere blunder), vii.8 (G. M. *yajush*, for *yajuh*), 12, viii.8 (T., it should be added, has dropped both *sanuta* and *stanuta*), 13,35, ix.21,22, x.11 (T. W. B. O. *anunâsikam*, for '*nun-*'), 13 (G. M. *-pâ asiparo budhniyâ jyâ â pûshâ aminanta ârshe*, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombinable finals their uncombinable quality in the rule also), 22, xi.16 (G. M. *adabdhâsa* and *ashâdhah*, with unelided *a*), 17 (G. M. *ahniyâ mâ "mbâli*), 18,19 (G. M. repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only), xii.4,9 (T. O. *asmin*, for *tas-*), xiii.4,13,14 (see farther on), 15, xiv.3,8 (G. M. *upasargaç ca pâtha*: a blunder only), 13,32, xvi.1,5 (G. M. *çanstân anant-*: a blunder), 7,13 (G. M. omit *pîpivâ* in the rule, as well as its example in the comment; but they give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment), 16,19,22,26, xvii.2,4, xviii.5 (T. *svaritaç ca pl-*), xx.9 (G. M. substitute in the text-MS. rule xvii.6, except the word *pâushkarasâdeh*), xxi.5,6,14, xxii.7 (W. O. also have *-shakah* in the rule, but not in the comment), xxiii.2,6,10,12,14,20, xxiv.4. The reading adopted for rule xiii.14 is that of T. G. M. (save that T. has *shtha* for *shna*, and *râvñna*, with *virâma* under the *v*; and G. M. have *râviñna* in the text-MSS., and *rârâvñna* in the MSS. with comment); W. gives *rññ shañ shta mña râvñ* (with *virâma* under both *v* and *n*); for (.) the collator has noted nothing; B. reads *rñ shañ shna mña râvñ grâvña*. Other evident copyists' errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice.

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSS. at ix.1,20 (where the MSS.-reading is *ikâraûkârap-*), xi.1,17. The writing of *iñgya* for *iñgya* was noted under i.48.

p. 9, l. 16. The commentator, as will be seen under xxi.14, interprets out of existence the *nâsikya* as an independent element.

p. 11, l. 7. The structure of *r* is defined by the commentator under xxi.15.

p. 18, l. 12. The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his Çikshâ? there is no trace of it in the Prâtiçâkhya), beginning *pra parâ 'pa sam*, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of *iti* (in the *pada*-text, namely, which writes *e 'ti* for *â*, *ape 'ti* for *apa*, and so on) and not to their receiving the name *upasarga*. I still fail to see any reason for the limitation of the class to half its usual number.

p. 23, l. 13. Dele the hyphen at the end of the line.

p. 33, l. 16. One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent; but, rules 44-7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone.

p. 34, rule 46. The same example (from iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>) is quoted by the comment under this rule as under rules 43 and 47.

p. 37, l. 19. Compare under rules xvi.26,29, where this claim is distinctly made. But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are *padas* are quoted as *padâikadeças*: thus *han* in vii.11, *pâ* in xvi.2, *hi* in xvi.13, etc.



- p. 42, ll. 28,32,43, read iv.23 (for iv.25).
- p. 46, l. 3. Read (in part of the edition) *alteration* for *nasalization*.
- p. 82, last line. Restore (in part of the edition) the lost figure 6 before *na*, at the beginning of the line.
- p. 83, l. 2. The passage is found at iv.1.5 1.
- p. 87, rule 5. For *aghâ*, in rule and translation, read *adyâ*; and the example, on the next page, is *adyâçvâd* (p. *adya-çvât*). The St. Petersburg lexicon (in the Appendix) has this word in its proper form, but I unfortunately overlooked it.
- p. 88, l. 28, and p. 99, l. 5. No division is made of *prâçrînga* in *pada*-text.
- p. 96, l. 28. Read *kah̄* for *kâh̄* (in part of the edition).
- p. 101, l. 20. I have little or no doubt that the interpretation here suggested is the true one.
- p. 103, l. 7 from below. *To* is not an independent word: see the St. Petersburg lexicon, s. v. *totah̄*.
- p. 104, l. 24. So far as the vocatives in *o* are concerned, the existing *pada*-text appears to accord with the Prâtiçâkhya: we have them with *iti*, as *pragrahas*, for example, at i.3.8 1,147; 4 27, and without *iti* at i.2.132; 4.39. But *o*, *uto*, *upo*, and *pro* are followed by *iti* wherever they occur (for *to*, see the preceding correction), although this is not authorized by the Prâtiçâkhya.
- p. 110, l. 32. The *pada*-text divides *dyâvâ-prthivi*.
- p. 121, ll. 23,24. Read (in part of the edition) *âindrâgnî* and *indrâgnî*.
- p. 123, l. 18. Insert the omitted example *trîṇi vratâ vidathe antar eshâm* (ii.1.115).
- p. 124, l. 12. Read (in part of the edition) *pâtam* for *patam*.
- p. 132, l. 15. But note the case reported under i.59 (p. 43).
- p. 138, l. 13. Read (in part of the edition) *nicâ* (for *nicâ*).
- p. 153, l. 27. I have omitted part of the passages in which *t* occurs before *sh*, namely vi.6.11 1,2; vii.2.87. It should have been added, too, that the Sanhitâ furnishes no example of *n* before *sh*.
- p. 157, l. 23. The citation is from vi.3.3 1, as under the two preceding rules.
- p. 160, l. 24. This is not correct, so far as the existing *pada*-text is concerned. I was not aware at the time of writing the note that that text treated the *avagraha*-pause as suspending the continuance of accentual influence (see p. 369, first marginal note). The application of the rule, however, is as stated, compound words having been already provided for by rule 2.
- p. 167, l. 14. The peculiarity of accentuation referred to in the preceding correction would allow of these examples being brought under rule 4.
- p. 173, l. 20. Read *-parânuttyâi*.
- p. 176, rule 11, translation. Read *havanî*.
- p. 179, l. 12. The suggestion of *punarukti* here is not well-founded, the sphere of action of the rules in this and in the thirteenth chapter being different.
- p. 183, l. 10. *Ahorâtre pārçve* is found in Tâitt Âraṇyaka, at iii.13.2.
- p. 193, ll. 9,10. References should have been given for the words *ahorâtrâbhyâm* and *ahorâtrayoh̄*; the former is found at ii.1.7 3 et al., the latter at vi.1.3 1. *Adhishavane* occurs only at vi.2.11 4.
- p. 194, l. 14. The reference for *rukmo antar* is iv.1.10 4-5 et al.
- p. 199, l. 9 from below. The *pada*-text leaves *brhaspati* undivided, so that the combination does not come within the ken of the treatise at all.
- p. 199, l. 13 from below. Read (in part of the edition) ii.1.5 7 for ii.1.57.
- p. 205, l. 14. The omission of *h̄* before a spirant followed by a sonant consonant, here referred to as a doctrine held in schools of the Black Yajus, is practised in the manuscripts of our treatise and its commentary to a degree far beyond what can be regarded as merely accidental. G. M. observe it almost without exception, and it prevails also in the others.
- p. 209, rule 7. Doubtless *aḥsarvo* is to be understood here as an adjective, qualifying *visarjanīyah̄* understood, '*h̄* completed to *aḥ*,' as the comment clearly intends. This also removes the difficulty of *anuvṛtti* spoken of on pp. 210-11. so far as the implication of *visarjanīyah̄* is concerned.
- p. 216, l. 2. Read *is* for *does*.
- p. 218, l. 5. The example *paçîn* etc. occurs first at i.5.2 1.
- p. 222, l. 12. Read (in part of the edition) '*gne* '*vimân* (for *-mân̄*).
- p. 224, l. 4. Read *Also* for *Nor*.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies







# AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

---

Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 16th, 1866.

---

THE Annual meeting was held at the usual place (the American Academy's room, in the Athenæum building, Boston), on Wednesday, May 16th, at 10 o'clock, A. M. In the absence of the President, the chair was taken by Dr. Jenks, the only Vice-President present, but was by him relinquished to Dr. Anderson, who conducted the deliberations of the meeting.

After the reading and acceptance of the minutes of the last meeting, the Committee of Arrangements announced their proposed programme for the present session, which was, on motion, ratified by the Society. After the noon recess, from 1 to 4 o'clock, the Society would re-assemble for hearing communications at Prof. Peabody's in Cambridge, and would adjourn at about 8 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation to a social gathering at Mr. L. R. Williston's.

## 1. *Treasurer's Report.*

### RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 17th, 1865,	-	-	-	-	-	\$632.39
Members' fees: ann. assessments for the current year,	\$265.00					
do. do. for other years,	125.00	390.00				
Sale of the Journal,					23.00	
Total receipts of the year,						413.00
						<u>\$1,045.39</u>

### EXPENDITURES.

Printing of Journal (vol. viii, Part 2), Proceedings, etc.,	-	-	-	-	-	\$479.31
Binding and sundries,	-	-	-	-	-	16.00
Expenses of Library and Correspondence,	-	-	-	-	-	45.96
Total expenditures of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	<u>\$541.27</u>
Balance on hand, May 16th, 1866,	-	-	-	-	-	504.12
						<u>\$1,045.39</u>

## 2. *Librarian's Report.*

The accessions to the Library, though not so numerous and valuable as last year, had been important. Besides many continuations of series, 34 new printed works and 3 manuscripts had been received. The names of the donors were read, and the donations briefly described.

## 3. *Report of the Committee of Publication.*

The second half of Vol. viii of the Journal was reported as completed, and in process of distribution to the members. The Committee were unable to state when the printing of the next volume would be begun.



4. *Report of the Directors.*

The Directors appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at New Haven, in October, and designated Professors Salisbury and Green and the Corresponding Secretary as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

They recommended for election as Members of the Society the following persons :

as Corporate Members,

Rev. Nathaniel G. Clark, D.D., of Boston.

Rev. Oliver Crane, of Carbondale, Pa.

Mr. Richard J. Haldeman, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Charles W. Zaremba, of St. Joseph, Wisc.

as Corresponding Members,

Rev. J. G. Auer, of West Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Hyde Clarke, of Smyrna.

Prof. Constantine Tischendorf, of Leipzig.

whereupon, ballot being taken, they were declared duly elected.

The Corresponding Secretary presented a list of the Members who had deceased since the last annual meeting :

## CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Prof. Charles Beck, of Cambridge.

Rev. David Green, of Westboro, Mass.

Rev. Edward C. Jones, of Philadelphia.

Dr. Joseph E. Worcester, of Cambridge.

## CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Rev. Henry Ballantine, of Ahmednuggur, India.

Rev. J. Edwards Ford, late of Sidon, Syria.

Rev. C. C. Hoffman, of Cape Palmas, W. Africa.

Rev. Homer B. Morgan, of Antioch, Syria.

Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, of Orûmiah, Persia.

## HONORARY MEMBERS.

Prof. Friedrich Rückert, of Coburg.

H. M. Pawarendr Ramesr, Second King of Siam.

Of Dr. Beck—one of the oldest surviving members of the Society (he was elected in May, 1843, within a few months of its origination), for many years a Vice-President, and always one of its most active friends—an eloquent eulogy was pronounced by Prof. George M. Lane, of Cambridge, embracing a history of his life, an account of his literary labors, and an estimate of his character as a scholar and as a man.

Dr. S. H. Taylor, of Andover, and Mr. Charles Folsom, of Cambridge, also expressed in a feeling manner their sense of the loss which the Oriental Society, the community of American scholars, and the public at large, had sustained by the death of Dr. Beck.

Mr. Folsom farther set forth the services rendered to learning by the eminent lexicographer Dr. Worcester, and paid a merited tribute of respect to his memory.

Rev. E. Burgess and Dr. C. Pickering, of Boston, spoke in recognition of the labors and virtues of the veteran Indian missionary Rev. H. Ballantine.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



The following communications were made:

1. Rev. M. A. Sherring, English missionary at Benares, being introduced to the meeting by Dr. Anderson, gave, by request, an account of Benares, as one of the chief religious and literary centres of India, and of its antiquities, which he had for many years been engaged in exploring.

2. Prof. Geo. E. Day, D.D., of New Haven, made a brief written communication, which was read by the Corresponding Secretary, respecting the Syriac version of the Revelation of St. Paul, of which the translation had been published in the last volume of the Journal. He explained the circumstances connected with the transmission to this country of the manuscript, which had been, at his own suggestion, searched out and transmitted to him by the late Rev. D. Stoddard. He then pointed out that the impression under which the Society had published the translation—namely, that the long-lost Revelation referred to by some of the Church Fathers had been now for the first time recovered—appeared to have been an erroneous one. On visiting Prof. Tischendorf in Leipsic, last summer, he had found him “just then engaged in preparing for the press a Greek text of the same apocryphal book, which he had discovered in Italy in 1843, and which he did not doubt was the original work referred to by Augustine and Sozomen. The volume in which it is contained, entitled “*Apocalypses Apocryphæ Mosis, Esdræ, Pauli, Johannis, item Mariæ Dormitio*” (Lipsiæ, 1866, 8vo), has just been received in this country. Dr. Tischendorf, it seems, had given an account of the contents of this Revelation of Paul in the “*Theologische Studien u. Kritiken*” for 1851. He still holds the view he there expressed, that the book was probably composed in the year of the death of the emperor Theodosius (A.D. 395), but now hesitates to fix upon Palestine as the place in which the author lived. On comparing the Greek text, as given in two different manuscripts, with Dr. Perkins’s translation of the Syriac text, he pronounces the Greek form undoubtedly the purer and more ancient. Considerable additions, together with transpositions and other changes, have been made in the Syriac version. Occasionally, however, the Syriac text appears to supply some deficiency in the original Greek. The Syriac additions (as translated into English), together with other variations, Dr. Tischendorf has given in notes at the foot of the page. As the matter now stands, we may regard the recovery of this part of the apocryphal literature of the New Testament as more complete than if either the Greek or the Syriac text alone had been published.”

3. Specimens of the recently printed Turkish Commentary on the Koran, by Mr. John P. Brown, of Constantinople; read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Brown’s letter, accompanying this paper, is dated January 16th, 1866, and reads as follows:

“I send you a translation of the 1st and 112th chapters of the Koran, made from a very interesting work which has recently been printed here, under peculiar circumstances. You are aware that the Sunnoe Moslems have always held that it is sinful to print the Koran, and even to attempt to translate it. Many commentaries, nevertheless, exist; some of them, probably, printed, though mostly to be found only in manuscript. It is said here that the Sultan, having become aware that the Christians possess the Bible in each of their own languages, while the



Koran remains in Arabic, and therefore unknown to the masses, ordered that a concise version should be printed in Turkish, under the title of a "Commentary." It is styled "A Translation (called *Mewâhib*, 'Gifts') of the Commentary called the *Mewâkib*, 'Escorts,' by the Member of the Divan of the Sublime Porte, Ismail Fer-rakh Effendi." The title *Mewâhib*, 'Gifts,' may also denote that it is printed mostly for private distribution: though it is, at the same time, actually for sale. I have a copy for the Oriental Society.

Most of the versions of the Koran are open to criticism, and I have not found one which does justice to the ideas of its author. Translated literally, and restricted to the words of the original, without some necessary license, a version gives but little satisfaction; and to explain the definition by notes is tedious. In making my literal translation of the Turkish definition, I have not examined any existing translation, to see how far the two agree with each other. It would be of interest to translate the whole of this work, as I am sure that it would throw some more light upon the ideas of the able and talented man who, for the purpose of withdrawing his fellow-men from idolatry, imagined so many sublime verses. I have selected the two chapters mentioned, as they are the basis of his particular creed, or belief, respecting the Deity."

The translation of the two brief chapters and of the commentary upon them, is expected to be given in full in the next volume of the Society's Journal.

#### 4. On the origin of the English Possessive Case, by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven; read by the Recording Secretary.

The paper of Prof. Hadley was a review of an essay on "The English Possessive Augment," by Serjeant James Manning, of Oxford, Eng., published in the Transactions of the Philological Society (London, 1864). Mr. Manning holds that the Anglo-Saxon genitive was given up in the 13th century, and its place supplied by *of* with the accusative; but that, for the *possessive* relation, a special form was then introduced, such as "father *his* book," "mother *his* gown," "children *his* plaything," which gradually passed into "father's book," "mother's gown," "children's plaything." Against the common view, which identifies the *s* of our possessive with that of the A.-S. genitive, he urges that the latter was not applied to feminines and plurals, and that it was used for many relations which are not expressed by our possessive. But Prof. Hadley referred to examples of grammatical forms (as the *s* of plural nouns in French and Spanish) extended to classes of words that once excluded them, and of forms (as the Latin perfect indicative active in all Romance languages) restricted in the range of meanings that once belonged to them. He examined the constructions of our possessive which Mr. Manning regards as inconsistent with its genitive origin. In "Cæsar's crossing the Rubicon," we have only the ordinary use of a genitive to denote the subject of an action. In "John and Walter's house," the possessive *s* is added to "John and Walter" taken as a complex whole: compare *eth* in "three and-twentieth." The same explanation applies to "King of England's crown:" compare *ism* in "Church-of-England-ism." In "a servant of my brother's," Lowth regarded "brother's" as depending on "servants" understood—an explanation which fails for "that wife of my brother's:" it is better to regard the genitive here as dependent on a general idea of "belongings," "that which belongs," the same idea which is evidently understood in "all mine is my brother's." Positive arguments for his own view Mr. Manning draws from the popular dialects of modern Germany, and from the usage of Semi-Saxon and early English writers. But while the common German says "des Vaters *sein* Buch," he says "der Mutter *ihr* Kleid:" if our English possessive were of the same nature, we should have, not "mother *his* gown" (according to Mr. M.'s theory), but "mother *her* gown." That the Gothic reflexive *seins* and the Latin reflexive *suus* mean *her* and *their* as well as *his*, proves, at most, only a possibility that *his* might be so used in place of *her*: that it was actually and currently used in this way, there is no sufficient reason for believing. In almost every instance where it seems to be used, *his* refers to a word like *wife*, *maiden*, *child*, which in Anglo-Saxon were neuter, not feminine. Mr. Manning gives great prominence to a comparison between the two manuscripts of Layamon's Brut. in the first of which, written about 1200 A.D., the genitive expressed by *his* is rarely, if ever, met with; while in the second, written perhaps sixty years later, such forms are of common occurrence. Even here, in ex-



aming the first 9000 lines of the poem, Prof. Hadley had found, from common nouns, about eighty genitives with inflectional *s*, and only two expressed by *his*: from proper names of place, thirteen with inflectional *s*, and two expressed by *his*: even from proper names of persons, where the genitives expressed by *his* are numerous there are nearly as many with inflectional *s*, and the two forms are freely and capriciously interchanged. In the *Ormulum*, written by a very careful scribe at a time not earlier than the second text of *Layamon*, the form with *his* is never once used. And although this form is often seen in old English writings, and down to the beginning of the last century, yet it appears, on the whole, as an occasional—and, seemingly, a merely orthographic—variation of the inflectional genitive—a variation suggested by a false, though plausible, etymology, and favored by the general confusion of early English orthography.

In connection with this paper, Prof. Whitney referred to another and wholly new account of our possessive suffix, given in the "Reader" for Sept. 24, 1864, in the form of a critique upon Mr. Manning's essay, under the signature of Th. G. [Prof. Goldstücker]. Its author accepts as satisfactory Mr. Manning's disproof of the relationship between the suffix in question and the ancient genitive-ending, but regards the former as a mere connecting-link between the name of the possessor and the thing possessed, binding them together into a kind of compound. Prof. Whitney combated this view, as in a high degree far-fetched and fanciful, and attempted to overthrow the arguments by which it was supported. There is no more difficulty, he claimed, in supposing the retention of a true synthetic form along with the elaboration of an analytic substitute for it in the case of *John's son* and *the son of John*, than in the case of *I loved* and *I did love*. The position of the possessive before the thing possessed is no more fixed in the case of a noun than in that of a pronoun, as *his* or *her*, which no one would think of denying to be ancient genitives. And the *s* in such German words as *Hilfstruppen*, *Liebesgabe*, is really a genitive-ending, or introduced after the analogy of such; precisely as is the *s* of *nachts*, formed after the analogy of *abends*, *morgens*, etc.

##### 5. On the Beginnings of Indo-European Speech, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

This paper was intended to meet the objections of those who are unwilling to receive the prevalent belief respecting the character of the germs of the languages belonging to our family—namely, that these are radical syllables, indicative of action or quality—and who hold that the first words must have been, rather, signs for concrete things. The fundamental error with such persons is that they confound the *primum cognitum* and the *primum denominatum*, which are, in fact, entirely independent of one another. Without doubt, the synthetic apprehension of concrete objects as such preceded the analytic apprehension of their qualities; but no language-making was possible until analysis had begun. It is impracticable to make a sign directly designating a complex existence; we can get hold of it only by its distinctive qualities. All the processes of word-making, throughout the later history of language, are based upon this principle, and the earliest must have been of the same character. The writer argued at some length against the doctrine that thoughts are impossible without words, and that general ideas are not conceived by beings inferior to man; and he endeavored to set forth and illustrate the characteristic differences between the mental action of man and of the lower animals. It was because all language-making is a devising of intelligible signs, to be used in communication between man and man, for ideas which have been conceived and for which expression is desired, and because an intelligible sign, uttered or acted, can only body forth an act or quality, that the first utterances must have directly meant the latter, and have been applied by a secondary process to designating the beings to which these belonged.

##### 6. On the Origin and Antiquity of the Hindu Astronomy, by Rev. E. Burgess, of South Franklin, Mass.

Mr. Burgess defended at considerable length the originality of the Hindu science. His arguments were briefly controverted by Prof. Whitney.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



or of the number and peculiarities of the dialects of this language. The gospel is advancing among the Karen people, and revealing new tribes and new varieties of speech.

“But this people are interesting not solely by reason of the variety of dialect exhibited by them. Like the Jews of heathen Greece and Asia Minor in the times of the Apostles, the Karens are the lodging-place for the beginning of the gospel.” . . . .

From Rev. H. H. Jessup, dated Beirut, Sept. 19th, 1866 :

“I take pleasure in sending you, for the Society, the first volume of Mr. Butrus Bistany's new Arabic Lexicon, the *Muhit el Muhit*. Mr. Bistany is going on with the publishing of the two remaining volumes as rapidly as possible. The price to non-subscribers will be four pounds sterling for the three volumes. I think you will be pleased with it.”

From Hyde Clarke, Esq., dated Smyrna, July 7th, 1866 :

“What is going on in these districts is chiefly in the way of illustration. For the Troad, Mr. Frank Calvert has communicated to me a new memoir, with his latest observations, which I publish in Murray's Handbook for Turkey, with other observations. The Baron Paul Des Granges, of Athens, a photographer of eminence has just visited me on his return from the Troad, where he has taken numerous views for the new work of the learned Dr. von Halin, the Austrian consul at Syra, who has lately taken up that region. Mr. R. Poppleton Pullane, an archeologist of reputation, has just arrived here. He is charged with a mission from the Dilettanti Society to excavate on the site of the temple of Apollo Smynthius, near Assos, in the southern Troad.

“It may be mentioned, as a curious confirmation of ancient traditions, that during the spring the fields in the neighborhood of Pergamus have been ravaged by hosts of mice. The Smynthian Apollo was the foe of mice. These vermin have this year done much harm to Turkey.

“On the Lydo-Assyrian monuments of our district I have already communicated to you the latest news.

“In the Ephesus district Mr. Svoboda has continued to take numerous photographs, and has proposed to me the publication of a joint work. I hope he will next take Magnesia ad Mæandrum. He has also executed fourteen views for a work on Ephesus proposed by Mr. J. T. Wood, an architect employed on excavations by the British Museum.

“M. Ernest Renan, I understand from his communications, will in his next volume embody his observations made during his investigations at Ephesus. I examined at his request the church of St. John, and obtained further evidence. My opinion is that this church and the great mosque are identical.

“I have not found anything in my late explorations of the Ephesus district. I spent some time fruitlessly on the question of the Roman roads beyond Aziziel, one the main road from Ephesus to Magnesia ad Mæandrum, and the other, perhaps, a road from the Panionium to Magnesia.

“Mr. Wood thinks he has discovered the shrine of St. Luke at Ephesus, but the opinion rests on no good evidence.

“Mr. Svoboda has photographed Aidin, the ancient Tralles.”

From the same, under the same date :

“I send you the *Revue Archéologique* of Paris, with a memoir by Messrs. Georges Perrot and Edmond Guillaume on the Pseudo-Sesostris of Ninfi. It gives some of the most recent opinions of the learned world on the Lydo-Assyrian monuments of Asia Minor, with many notes of my own, and will put the Society in possession of the present state of this new and important subject, which involves a modification in the ancient history of Asia Minor.

“I differ from the learned authors as to the road from Sardis to Smyrna and that from Ephesus to Phocæa, as referred to by Herodotus, and I think I have informed the Society of my last year's explorations. It is quite true that the present monument is off the road from Sardis to Ephesus; but this is only an error of Herodotus, and I doubt if ever he saw the monument. The present is not the first attempt to represent the pass in which the monument is as the road from Ephesus to Pho-



cæa. But I doubt the identification, for the following reasons: The pass in question does not appear to represent a main road. If treated as the road from Ephesus to Phocæa, the traveller would, on reaching the plain of Cassuba or the Ninfi Chai, have a troublesome route to Phocæa, either all the way around by Magnesia ad Sipylum and the valley of the Hermus, or crossing the difficult pass of Kavakli Dereh (the present road from Kassuba to Smyrna), and so along the Boornabat plain.

“There is another well-defined pass leading off the Ephesus road at the foot of the Takhlatu mountain by the villages of Takhlatu to the village of Achiklar, right into the Boornabat plain. At Takhlatu are such large remains as are only to be explained by a well frequented route. I now conceive that the second Sesostris is to be sought for at the back of the mountain on which is the first.

“I may observe that on the cliffs near Ephesus are some niches as well-defined as those of the Pseudo-Sesostris or Niobe.”

From the same, under date of June 18th, 1866:

“The receipt of the Pseudo-Sesostris has been already acknowledged by the Society, and I have since sent the photograph of the Niobe. I now send the photograph of the newly discovered colossal head near Smyrna, found by Mr. Frederick Spiegelthal, and photographed by Mr. A. Svoboda. This monument is on a smaller scale than the others, and does not embrace the whole figure. I consider it, however, as belonging to the same general group, and class it as Lydo-Assyrian. It is about one mile from the Caravan Bridge, and the same distance from the Baths of Diana (Hulka Boonar), on a part of the Boojah range, in the valley of St. Ann or the Meles, opposite Mt. Pagus. It is on the cliff or wall of an amphitheatral opening, partly quarried, and, as I think, partly natural, and which has doubtless been used as some kind of theatre.

“The head is carved on a projecting knob of limestone, and Mr. Svoboda's photograph shows the best side of the figure, but the necklace is not so well-defined on that side as on the other. The nose, left eyeball, and mouth are marked and injured by musket-balls, some of them fired by shepherds within the last few years. The large ears we consider to represent horns. The necklace is well cut, and consists of oblong dies strung together. What by others are considered as a human arm and hand I rather look upon as the paw and claws of a beast.

“On each side of the head, down below, are large rock-cut tombs, one of which, to the left, consists of two chambers, and is inhabited by a beggar. The neighboring amphitheatral formations also show signs of tombs.

“We continue our researches, in the hope of finding the other Pseudo-Sesostris described by Herodotus. In this month, Mr. Spiegelthal has made a most interesting discovery, namely, of a reproduction or *replica* of the well-known Pseudo-Sesostris of Nymphæum, described in my former paper. It is close by on the same brook, but lower down on the margin of the brook, and obscured by brushwood.

“Mr. Spiegelthal affirms that it is colossal, like the other, and has the same details, lance, bow, etc., but that the face is more injured. He has arranged for me to examine it.

“Mr. Georges Perrot has called my attention to a rock-cut monument mentioned by Mr. Hamilton as near Isbarteeh (Sparta tēs Pisidias), in the interior, and I had despaired of getting any account of it; but fortunately an archæologist has proceeded there, and I have applied to him.”

After the reading of the correspondence, communications were declared in order.

1. On the Niobe of Magnesia ad Sipylum; and, On the newly discovered Lydo-Assyrian Monument of Smyrna; by Hyde Clarke, Esq., of Smyrna.

These two brief papers were read by the Corresponding Secretary, in connection with the letters of Mr. Clarke on the same and kindred subjects, given in full above. Each was accompanied by a photograph of the monument treated of. Mr. Clarke expresses his opinion that the Niobe is altogether an artificial work, against those who hold that it is a natural formation, or such a formation touched up and per-



fectured by artificial labor. Besides the tomb near the other monument now occupied by a beggar, spoken of in the letter, Mr. Clarke says that in the adjoining hollow are evidences of rock-cut tombs blocked up with masonry, which he is hoping to explore.

These papers bear date of May 3d, 1866.

2. On the formation of the Chinese Language, by Rev. E. W. Syle, of Pelham, N. Y.

Mr. Syle gave a succinct account of the characteristic features of the Chinese, and of its mode of writing, illustrating his remarks by reference to written documents. He described the process of learning the written language practiced in the native schools, and thought that the absorption of time and mental effort in the task of acquiring and handling an instrument so unmanageable and burdensome was one of the main causes of the comparative stagnation of the Chinese mind.

3. Rev. S. H. Calhoun, D.D., of the Syrian Mission (at Abeih), explained the present position of affairs in the neighborhood of his field of labor, and described various journeys which he had made in and about the chain of Lebanon, speaking more particularly of his visits to Baalbec, and of the aspect of the ruins there.

---

The Society met again at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, in the same place.

Before the reading of communications was resumed, the Corresponding Secretary brought once more to the notice of the Society the subject of the Bopp Fund, first presented before them a year ago, and read from the last circular of the committee (dated May 16th, 1866) their proposal as to the disposition to be made of the income of the fund (which now amounts to 8000 thalers): it is to be applied to "the support of a young scholar, of whatever country, who shall have already completed his university studies, in order to the continuance of the same, wherever it may be; as also, to the bestowal of prizes for completed scientific labors, or to the support of scientific undertakings—in all cases, of course, only within the departments cultivated by Prof. Bopp, of Sanskrit philology and comparative grammar, with special reference to the Indo-European family." The Secretary stated that the American subscriptions to the fund now amount to two hundred dollars, which sum he hoped would be yet farther increased.

The Secretary also read, from the last-received number of the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, an account by Prof. Lepsius of his recent discovery of a bilingual (hieroglyphic and Greek) monument at Tanis in Egypt, longer than the celebrated inscription of the Rosetta stone, and in a perfect state of preservation. He pointed out the exceeding interest and importance of the discovery.

4. On the Chinese Musical Notation, by Rev. Mr. Syle.

Rev. Mr. Syle explained the method in which the Chinese managed to indicate musical tones, their length, and their accent, and in which the combination of the tones with the words intended to be sung to them was made. He further characterized the Chinese gamut and the style of the national music. His explanations were fully illustrated with charts and other documents.

5. On the Cedars of Lebanon, by Rev. Mr. Calhoun.

The speaker described his visits to the celebrated grove of these trees, so well known by the accounts of travelers, and gave a very interesting description of its





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



of their race, in two versions, as given by the Sgau Karens and by the eastern Bghais, two extreme members of the race. It represents them to have come from the west, along with their brothers, the Chinese, and to have been left behind by the latter. The Bghai tradition speaks of a metal plate as left by the departing Chinese for their ancestors, and of this plate Mr. Cross remarks: "The book, or brass and gold plate, spoken of in this tradition, is still in existence. It is said by a trustworthy and learned Karen, Rev. Quala, who has seen and examined it, to be a thin lamina of metal, of a very dark color, and smooth and shining; and one end seems to have been cut off, so as to destroy some of the letters. The letters are said by Quala to resemble those of the Hindustani, and to be entirely unlike the Burmese. The same authority states that the Red Karen King, Kaiphogyee, who holds this plate, has also in his possession five ivory plates, in shape and size like the ordinary Burmese palm-leaf strips, or about two feet in length by two and a half inches in width, and covered with the same kind of characters."

After the reading of this communication, the Society adjourned.



**Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 22d, 1867.**

THE Society met at the usual time and place, and was called to order by the President soon after 10 o'clock.

After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, it was voted, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of Arrangements, to adjourn the morning session about 1 o'clock, to re-assemble at 4 o'clock, at Dr. Peabody's, in Cambridge, and to adjourn at 8 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation kindly tendered by Dr. Peabody, to take tea socially with a few friends at his house.

The Treasurer's Report was presented, audited, and accepted. It showed the receipts and expenditures of the year to have been as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 16th, 1866,	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$504.12
Members' fees: ann. assessments for the current year,	\$410.00						
do. do. for other years,	-	185.00	595.00				
Sale of the Journal,	-	-	-	-	-	6.00	
Total receipts of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	-	601.00
							<u>\$1,105.12</u>

EXPENDITURES.

Binding books,	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$21.25
Expenses of Library and Correspondence,	-	-	-	-	-	-	34.11
Total expenditures of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>\$55.36</u>
Balance on hand, May 22d, 1867,	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,049.76
							<u>\$1,105.12</u>

The Librarian made a brief statement respecting the additions to the library and cabinet during the past year, and said that the full acknowledgments would be printed along with the Proceedings at this meeting (see below).

The Committee of Publication reported that, owing to unfavorable circumstances, nothing had been issued from the press by the Society during the past year; it was hoped that the printing of Vol. ix of the Journal would soon be begun: the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya, text, commentary, translation, and notes, was expected to occupy a considerable part of it, as already some time since announced. In view of the intermission of any issue of the Journal since the last annual meeting, the Committee had recommended that no annual assessment be levied upon the members for the year 1867-8, and this recommendation had been considered and approved by the Directors, and was, by their authority, presented to the Society for acceptance.

Hereupon, on motion, the recommendation was accepted by the Society, and the assessment for the year suspended.

The Directors announced that they had appointed the autumn meeting to be held in New Haven, on Wednesday, Oct. 16th, 1867,



unless the Committee of Arrangements—Prof. Salisbury of New Haven, Mr. Cotheal of New York, and the Corresponding Secretary—should see reason to fix on some other day in the same month. Also, that they had designated Prof. Hadley of New Haven and Mr. J. H. Trumbull of Hartford, with the Corresponding Secretary, a committee to examine, at the request of Prof. Henry, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, an ethnological essay by Mr. L. H. Morgan of Rochester, on systems of consanguinity, and to report upon its worthiness to be accepted for publication by the Institution.

The following gentlemen, recommended by the Directors, were elected Corporate Members of the Society:

Rev. Edson L. Clark, of Guilford, Conn.

Mr. John Fiske, of Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Charles M. Mead, of Andover, Mass.

Announcement was made to the meeting, by the Corresponding Secretary, of the Society's loss by death during the past year of three of its members, Rev. Dr. William Jenks of Boston, Rev. Dr. William Goodell, late of the Constantinople mission of the A.B.C.F.M., and Mr. Theodore Dwight of Brooklyn.

Rev. Dr. Anderson, of Boston, gave a sketch of the life and labors of Dr. Jenks. With him, as much as, or more than, with any other person, originated the idea of the American Oriental Society, one of whose Vice-Presidents he had been from its inception in 1842, although now long prevented by deafness from taking an active part in its deliberations. He was born in 1778. He held for some years the Professorship of Oriental and English literature in Bowdoin College. His chief literary work was the compilation of the *Comprehensive Commentary*. He was a man of profound learning and extensive reading, and his private library, thirty years ago, was reputed one of the best in New England.

Dr. Parker, of Washington, also spoke of the services rendered by Dr. Jenks to various departments of learning and philanthropic effort.

Rev. Dr. Clark, of Boston, paid the merited tribute to the worth of the venerable Dr. Goodell, who had finished his missionary labors in the East a year or two since, and returned to pass a brief remnant of life among his friends at home.

Rev. Mr. Syle, of Pelham, N. Y., spoke briefly and with much feeling of the character of Mr. Dwight, his devotion to every good work, and his services as for a long time Secretary of the American Ethnological Society.

Out of the remarks of Dr. Parker grew a discussion of the recent progress of western ideas and institutions in China and Japan, in which, besides himself, Rev. Mr. Syle, and Rev. Dr. Pitkin, of Buffalo, took a part.

Mr. J. S. Ropes, Dr. Clark, and Prof. Hoppin were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the next year. Pres. Woolsey desired to decline a nomination for reelection as President, but was prevailed upon by the general remonstrances of the members pres-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



carved in stone. Its interior width is 75 feet, its length 108 feet, its height to the eaves about 30 feet. But we could not examine the ruins as we would gladly have done, as we had only a couple of hours where one would need to spend weeks to examine all there is to be seen. Another object of interest is a watch-tower, about 100 feet high, some distance from the present walls, said to have been built by Saladin's nephew. It overlooks a valley in which an enemy might have approached the city unobserved but for this tower. The present ruins appear to have been built since the Christian era, but the mounds and scattered stones outside the city indicate a much earlier date. Some geographers suppose this to be the ancient Carthiocerta.

Out of the remarks upon this paper grew a discussion respecting the advisability and value of archæological, literary, and scientific investigations made by missionaries in their various fields of labor. Part was taken in the discussion by Dr. Anderson, Dr. Pitkin, Rev. Mr. Syle, Mr. Ropes, and Prof. Whitney. The opinion was unanimously expressed that such investigations, undertaken and carried on as opportunity offered, in the intervals of missionary work, were of very high importance in their bearing on the culture and freshness and activity of mind of the missionary himself, on his relation to the people and conditions among which his lot was cast, and on the general public—both in the way of direct enlightenment, and by attracting attention, admiration, and sympathy to the missionary cause and its representatives. Reference was made to the immense amount of valuable contributions to knowledge which had been brought before the world by missionaries, to their abundant labors in connection with this Society, as recorded in its Journal, and to the honorable estimation in which American missionaries were held everywhere by reason of these and other similar labors. It was thought that only the narrowest and least enlightened apprehension of the missionary work could find ground for aught but praise and satisfaction in the literary and scientific activity of the missionaries.

## 2. On the Niobe of Mt. Sipylus, by Rev. H. J. Van Lennep, D.D., Missionary in Syria of the A.B.C.F.M.; read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Dr. Van Lennep first rehearses the myth of Niobe, turned to stone upon Mt. Sipylus, as related by Homer and the other classic writers. He then gives a description of the mountain and its surroundings, and goes on to describe a journey which he made near it last autumn, in the course of which he observed and visited the remarkable and ancient work which he regards as Niobe's image. The situation is about five miles east of Magnesia, upon the high-road which skirts the mountain, and at the first *café*. There is a pond at the base of the mountain, and directly above it, about four hundred feet up, is an artificially smoothed wall of rock, in which is sunk a double niche, containing the colossal bust upon a pedestal, cut in very high relief—the whole much defaced, but still plainly recognizable. The rock is a hard white marble, with occasional blue veins, and one of these veins "begins at the region of the eyes, covers the lower part of the face, trickles down the neck and breast, and, falling upon the pedestal, there divides into two broad streams, which flow down to the platform beneath, perfectly representing the pouring of a dark-colored flood of tears."

Mr. Van Lennep quotes the passages of Pausanias, Strabo, etc., referring to the Niobe, and argues that their descriptions are applicable to this monument.

He also encloses a sketch of the monument and its immediate surroundings, taken from a little distance at its left.

## 3. On the old Egyptian Chronicle, by Dr. Charles Pickering, of Boston.

Dr. Pickering presented some of the main features of this document, with chronological conclusions of his own founded upon it.

Hon. J. D. Baldwin pointed out that the chronicle in question was by the best authorities, such as Lepsius, regarded as spurious, and that he fully concurred in their opinion.

## 4. On the rendering of the word God in Chinese, by Pres. Woolsey, of Yale College.



This was an essay on the Chinese equivalents for our word God which have been used by Christian missionaries. A historical account was first given of the terms adopted by the Catholics, from Ricci's time until the settlement of the disputes in relation to that matter at Rome near the beginning of the 18th century. Then the views of the Protestant missionaries in China were noticed, the decision of the American Bible Society in favor of *Shin* and against *Shang-ti* in 1850, the continuance of a part of the missionaries to use *Shang-ti* in their versions, and the rise in recent years of an opinion on the part of some very able translators in favor of *Tien-chu*. A comparison was then instituted between these three terms. It was claimed that *Tien-chu*—the term adopted by early Catholic teachers and authorized at Rome—had no shade of heathenish or pantheistic thought attached to it, and was well understood through China, as the term in use to denote the supreme object of Christian worship. At the same time it was admitted that *Tien-chu* was not properly a translation of the original words used for God in the Bible. The term *Shin* was next examined, and it was shown from printed statements of Messrs. Hartwell and Peet, as well as from the testimony of other missionaries, that it is far too vague to take the place of God in general, although, as most concede, it cannot be wholly dispensed with. Next, *Shang-ti* was discussed at considerable length, in connection with the disputes of the Jesuit and other Catholic preachers, and with the Chinese religious philosophy. The essay of the honest and able Jesuit, Langobardi, who condemned *Shang-ti* and strove to show that the Chinese were atheistic (or, as we should say, pantheistic) in their view of the universe, not only in modern times but from the very origin of Chinese speculation, was cited with approbation. The opinions also of modern writers on philosophy, of Schelling, and especially Wuttke in his *Geschichte des Heidenthums*, were made use of to corroborate the position taken by the author of the essay, that *Shang-ti*, as properly denoting heaven personified, a conception of naturalism and of pantheism, was an unsafe representative of the scriptural idea of God. On the whole, then, *Shang-ti* being condemned, and *Shin* as a leading term pronounced too vague and general, *Tien-chu* had the preference given to it.

Extended remarks were made upon this paper and its subject by Dr. Parker and Rev. Mr. Syle, both of whom agreed with the writer in his definitive rejection of *Shang-ti*, but thought more favorably than he of *Shin*, and less favorably of *Tien-chu*.

##### 5. On the views of Prof. Key and M. Oppert respecting Sanskritic and Indo-European Philology, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

In this paper Prof. Whitney defended the current methods and commonly accepted results of comparative philology against the attacks of Prof. Key (in the *Transactions of the Philological Society of London*, 1862-3) and M. Oppert (in the *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne* for 1866). He began with pointing out the nature and grounds of the dependence of general linguistic science upon Indo-European philology, and of the latter upon Sanskrit study, the limits to this dependence, and its liability to misapprehension and exaggeration by incautious or ill-informed students. The faults of detail which Mr. Key indicates in the work of particular scholars, as Müller and Bopp, do not affect their general philological method, and if his own basis of scholarship had been so extended as to embrace a good knowledge of Sanskrit, he might have been able to criticise their work from a higher point of view, separating its sound from its unsound portions, and duly estimating both. While many of his objections are well taken, others are insufficiently founded, and cannot be maintained. M. Oppert's assault is one of much more serious intent, but much weaker substance and result. He fully accepts the Boppian method, even going so far as to maintain that Bopp has exhausted the whole field of linguistic science, leaving nothing of consequence for others to do after him: but its conclusions he allows to be grammatical only, refusing them any value as historical and ethnological data; he strongly condemns also the introduction of any elements of the new historical philology into the methods of classical instruction. His conception of the scope, bearings, and condition of the science is as far as possible out of the way. He is not a general skeptic as to ethnological connections, as might be expected from his denial of the accepted sources of information respecting them: on the contrary, he puts forth the most detailed and definite state-



ments about the derivation and composition of the Indo-European races, in general and in particular; but they are mere *dicta*, resting upon no assignable basis, and in no small part explainable as the conversions of doubtful or half-understood hypotheses of linguists, drawn from linguistic data, into absolute facts. A main, if not the main, object of the essay is to deny that there is any race-connection, any tie of common descent, between the various nations speaking the branches of Indo-European language: the author does not attempt to disprove the connection, but treats it as a palpably unsound and absurd dogma; but his allusions show that he regards the exceptional propagation of the Latin and Arabic as, by their analogy, sufficiently accounting for the extension of Indo-European language over half a world of heterogeneous tribes. The analogy, however, is a wholly insufficient and inapplicable one, as was attempted to be shown by an inquiry into the causes of the spread of Latin and Arabic, and an indication of their absence in the ancient history of Indo-European speech. M. Oppert's essay is, from its beginning to its end, a tissue of misrepresentations, unwarranted assumptions, and unsound inferences, and cannot but seriously damage his reputation as a linguistic and ethnological scholar.

6. On Chinese Chronology, by Rev. E. Burgess, of South Franklin, Mass.

Mr. Burgess, basing himself mainly upon the discussions of the subject in the introduction to the last volume of Dr. Legge's edition of the Chinese Classics, attempted to show the unauthentic character of the accepted Chinese Chronology in its earlier period, previous to the time of Confucius.

After the reading of this paper, the Society adjourned, to meet again in New Haven in October next.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



The 'Alamgír-Námah. By Muhammad Kazim Ibn-i Muhammad Amin Munshi. Edited by Mawlawis Khadim Husain and Abd al-Hai, under the superintendence of Major W. N. Lees, LL.D. Fasc. i-vii.

The Bádsháh Námah, by 'Abd al-Hamíd Lahawrí. Edited by Mawlawis Kabír al-Dín Ahmad and Abd al-Rahím, under the superintendence of Major W. N. Lees, LL.D. Fasc. i, ii.

*From the Asiatic Society of Paris.*

Journal Asiatique. 6<sup>me</sup> Série. Tomes iii, iv, and Nos. 27-32. Paris: 1864-7. 8vo.

*From Rev. J. G. Auer, of West Philadelphia.*

Grebo Grammar. . . . . By the Rt. Rev. John Payne, D.D. New York: 1864. 12mo.

Grebo Primer. . . . . Under the direction of the same. Second edition. New York. 12mo.

*From Hon. J. D. Baldwin, of Worcester.*

Catalogue of Additions made to the Library of Congress, from Dec. 1, 1864, to Dec. 1, 1865. Washington: 1865. 8vo.

*From Dr. A. Bastian, of Bremen.*

Die Völker des Oestlichen Asien. Studien und Reisen von Dr. Adolf Bastian. Erster Band. Geschichte der Indochinesen. Zweiter Band. Reisen in Birma in den Jahren 1861-1862. Leipzig: 1866. 8vo.

*From the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.*

Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen. Deel xxix. Batavia: 1862. 4to.

Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde. . . . . Deel xii. Batavia: 1862. 8vo.

*From Rev. Cephias Bennett, of Rangoon.*

A Dictionary, English and Burmese. . . . . By A. Judson. Second Edition. Rangoon: 1866. roy. 8vo.

The Youth's Guide to Arithmetic. . . . . By L. Stilson. Rangoon: 1866. 8vo.

Genesis and Exodus in Burmese, with Dr. Judson's last emendations. . . . . Rangoon: 1864. 8vo.

The Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. . . . . 3d Burmese edition. Maulmain: 1837. 8vo.

A few Simple Rules for Land Measuring, by L. Stilson. . . . . Rangoon: 1865. 8vo.

Five Burmese tracts: The Golden Balance.—The Tree of Life.—The Awakener.—The Resurrection.—Glad Tidings. Rangoon: 1864-6. 12mo.

The Catechism. By Mrs. Judson. Rangoon: 1865. 18mo.

The Books of Genesis and Exodus, in Sgau Karen. Translated by Francis Mason. Rangoon: 1864. roy. 8vo.

An (Abridged) Arithmetic, for the use of Karen Schools, . . . . . by E. B. Cross. 3d edition. Maulmain: 1861. 8vo.

Primary Geography, in Sgau Karen. By Mrs. C. B. Thomas. Rangoon: 1865. 12mo.

The Psalms and Proverbs. Translated by Francis Mason. Rangoon: 1865. 12mo.

Hymns. [Sgau Karen.] 4th edition. Maulmain: 1860. 18mo.

Revival Hymns. By Rev. B. C. Thomas. 2d edition. Rangoon: 1866. 24mo.

A Catechetical History of the Saviour . . . . . in Pwo Karen. By Rev. D. L. Brayton. Rangoon: 1865. 24mo.

Pwo Catechism. . . . . By H. L. VanMeter. Rangoon: 1865. 24mo.

Acts of the Apostles. . . . . Rangoon: 1865. 8vo.

The Child's Book. By Mrs. C. H. Vinton. 3d edition. Rangoon: 1865. 24mo.

Hymns for Public and Social Worship. 8th edition. Rangoon: 1863. 24mo.

Catechism. By Rev. E. L. Abbott. 4th edition. Rangoon: 1865. 12mo.

The Child's Scripture Catechism. . . . . Prepared by Mrs. Whitaker. 2d edition. Rangoon: 1865. 12mo.

*From the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin.*

Monatsberichte der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. 1864, 1865, 1866. Berlin: 1865-7. 8vo.



Philologische und Historische Abhandlungen der etc. 1864, 1865. Berlin: 1865-6. 4to.

*From Prof. Otto Böhtlingk, of St. Petersburg.*

Indische Sprüche. Sanskrit und Deutsch herausgegeben von Otto Böhtlingk. Dritter Theil. St. Petersburg: 1865. 8vo.

*From Professors Böhtlingk and Roth.*

Sanskrit-Wörterbuch . . . . Bearbeitet von Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth. Lieferungen 28-33. St. Petersburg: 1865-7. 4to.

*From the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. No. xxii. Bombay: 1865. 8vo.

*From the Royal University of Norway, at Christiania.*

Nine scientific essays, published as University programmes, etc. Christiania: 1851-1865. 4to.

Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, herausgegeben und in Abhandlungen erläutert von Dr. C. P. Caspari. I. Christiania: 1866. 8vo.

*From Mr. Hyde Clarke, of Smyrna.*

Le Bas-Relief de Nymphi, d'après de nouveaux renseignements. Par MM. Georges Perrot et Edmond Guillaume. [Extrait de la Revue Archéologique.] Paris: 1866. 8vo.

A Help to Memory in learning Turkish. By Hyde Clarke. Constantinople: 1862. 12mo.

*From Professor Edward B. Cowell, of London.*

The Kavya Prakasa, or a Treatise on Sanskrit Rhetoric, by Mammata Bhatta, with Explanatory and Illustrative Notes. By Mahesa Chandra Nyayaratna . . . . By order of E. B. Cowell . . . . Calcutta: 1866. 8vo.

*From Rev. Oliver Crane, of Carbondale, Pa.*

Episcopal prayer-book, in Arabo-Turkish. Leipzig: 1842. 8vo.

An imperial firman, given by the Sultan Abd-ul-Mejid, of Turkey. One sheet, 22 by 31 inches.

A collection of coins (not yet identified and described).

*From Rev. C. H. A. Dall, of Calcutta.*

Dictionarium Anamitico-Latinum, primitus inceptum ab . . . . P. J. Pigneaux, . . . . dein absolutum et editum a J. L. Taberd . . . . Serampore: 1838. 4to.

Dictionarium Latino-Anamiticum, auctore J. L. Taberd . . . . Serampore: 1838. 4to.

*From Mr. Frank R. Forbes, of Shanghai.*

Notes for Tourists in the North of China. By N. B. Dennys. Hongkong: 1866. 8vo.

*From M. Garcin de Tassy, of Paris.*

Cours d'Hindoustani. Discours d'Ouverture du 4 Dec., 1865; . . . . du 3 Dec., 1866. Paris: 1865-6. 8vo.

*From the German Oriental Society.*

Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. xix, 3, 4; xx. Leipzig: 1865-6. 8vo.

Indische Studien . . . . herausgegeben von Albrecht Weber. ix, 1. Leipzig: 1865. 8vo.

Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, iv. 1-5, viz.:

Āçvalâyana's Grhyasûtras, Part ii, translation.

Çântanava's Phitsûtra. Mit verschiedenen Indischen Commentaren, Einleitung, Uebersetzung, und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Franz Kielhorn.

Ueber die Jüdische Angelologie und Daemonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus. Von Dr. Alexander Kohut.



Die Grabschrift des Sidonischen Königs Eschmun-ezer, übersetzt und erklärt von Dr. Ernst Meier.

Kathâ Sarit Sâgara. Die Märchensammlung des Somadeva. Buch ix-xviii. Herausgegeben von Hermann Brockhaus.

*From Prof. D. C. Gilman, of New Haven.*

Seven pamphlets on Java, bound in one volume, viz.: A discourse delivered on the 11th Sept., 1815. By the Honorable Thomas Stamford Raffles. . . . —Essay on the Geography, Mineralogy and Botany of the western portion . . . of Java. Addressed to the same, by Dr. Thos. Horsfield.—Short Account of the Medicinal Plants of Java.—An Inscription from the Kawi or Ancient Javanese Language, . . . translated into the modern idiom by Nata Kusuma . . . , rendered into English by Mr. Crawford, and submitted to the Society by the President, . . . Thos. S. Raffles.—Eruption from the Tomboro Mountain in the Island of Sumbawa on the 11th and 12th of April, 1815.—Byna Woordelyk Traslaat van een Javansch Geslacht-Register van de Vorsten van Java.—Uittreksels uit eenige Aanteekeningen uopens den Javaan. . . . Door F. van Boeckholtz. 1775.

*From the Ducal Library at Gotha.*

Die Orientalischen Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Gotha . . . verzeichnet von Dr. Wilhelm Pertsch. Zweiter Theil. Die Türkischen Handschriften. Wien: 1864. 8vo.

*From Prof. S. S. Haldeman, of Columbia, Pa.*

Affixes in their Origin and Application, exhibiting the Etymologic Structure of English Words. By S. S. Haldeman. Philadelphia: 1865. 12mo.

*From Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, of London.*

Office and Dewtie of Kyngis . . . be William Lander. . . . Edited by Fitzedward Hall. . . . [No. 3 of Early English Text Society's Series.] London: 1864. 8vo.

The Monarche and other Poems of Sir David Lyndesay. Edited by Fitzedward Hall. [Nos. 11 and 19 of the same.] London: 1865-6. 8vo.

Scriptorum Arabum de Rebus Indicis Loci et Opuscula inedita . . . recensuit et illustravit Joannes Gildemeister. Fasc. primus. Bonnæ: 1838. 8vo.

Supplement to the Glossary of Indian Terms. A-J. By H. M. Elliott . . . Agra: 1845. 8vo.

The Life of Sheikh Mohammed Ali Hazin, written by himself: edited from two Persian manuscripts. . . . By F. C. Belfour . . . London: 1831. 8vo.

The same, translated. By the same. London: 1830. 8vo.

Ikhwan us-Safa. 1846. 8vo.

Fusul Imadi. 1827. lithographed. 8vo.

Malavika et Agnimitra. Drama Indicum Kalidasæ adscriptum. . . . edidit . . . Otto Fridericus Tullberg. Bonnæ: 1840. roy. 8vo.

*From C. A. Holmboe, of Christiania, Norway.*

Six archæological essays, in Norwegian, extracts from the Vid.-Selsk. Forh. for 1864-5, viz.: Om Guul og Röd Jord i Gravhøie.—Om Vægtlodderne i Nummelandsfundet.—Om Eeds-Ringe. II.—Om Hesteoffer.—Om Helleristninger. II.—Om en Nordisk og Indisk Vægteenhed.

Ezechiel's Syner og Chaldæernes Astrolab. Af C. A. Holmboe. Christiania: 1866. 4to.

*From Mrs. Wooster Hotchkiss, of New Haven.*

Lettre sur la Découverte des Hiéroglyphes Acrologiques . . . par M. J. Klaproth. Paris: 1827. 8vo.

Essai sur les Hiéroglyphes d'Horapollon, et quelques Mots sur la Cabale. Par M. le Chevalier de Goulianoff. Paris: 1827. 4to.

*From Rev. H. H. Jessup, of Beirut.*

The Muhit al-Muhît, an Arabic Dictionary, by Butrus Bistany. Vol. I, a—r. roy. 8vo.

*From M. Nicolas de Khanikoff, of Paris.*

Mémoire sur l'Ethnographie de la Perse, par Nicolas de Khanikoff. [Extract from the Mémoires de la Soc. de Géographie de Paris.] Paris: 1866. 4to.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



*From the Royal Library at Munich.*

Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecæ Regiæ Monacensis. I. 2, Codices Arabicos complectens.—I. 3, Codices Persicos complectens. München: 1866. 8vo.

*From Mr. John Murdoch, of India.*

Classified Catalogue of Tamil Printed Books, with Introductory Notices. Compiled by John Murdoch. Madras: 1865. 12mo.

The Indian Missionary Manual: or, Hints to young Missionaries in India. With lists of books. Compiled by John Murdoch. Madras: 1864. 12mo.

Indian Year-Book for 1861. A Review of Social, Intellectual, and Religious Progress in India and Ceylon. Compiled by John Murdoch. Madras: 1862. 8vo.

The same, for 1862.

*From the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. New Series, II. Shanghai: 1866. 8vo.

*From Rev. A. T. Pratt, M.D., of Syria.*

Grammaire de la Langue Arménienne . . . . par J.-Ch. Cirbied. . . . Paris: 1823. 8vo.

A grammar of the Ottoman Turkish language, in Turkish, by Fuad Pasha. Constantinople. 8vo.

Catalogue and description of extant Turkish coins, in Turkish. Constantinople: A. H. 1280 (A. D. 1863). fol.

A manuscript of the New Testament, in Ancient Armenian; on parchment, 311 leaves, about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches.

*From Bâbû Râjendralâla Mitra, of Calcutta.*

Vividhârtha-Sangraha. A Bengali monthly periodical. Vols. iv–vii. Calcutta: 1856–9. 4to.

Rahasya-Sandarbha. A Bengali monthly periodical. Vol. I. Calcutta: 1862. 4to.

Prâkrta-Bhûgola, etc. A physical geography, in Bengali; by Râjendralâla Mitra. Calcutta: 1861. 12mo.

Vyâkarana-praveça, etc. An Introduction to Bengali grammar, in Bengali, by the same. Calcutta: 1862. 12mo.

Patra-Kaumudî; or, Book of Letters [in Bengali]. . . . . Compiled by the Hon'ble W. S. Seton-Karr and the same. Calcutta: 1863. 12mo.

Çilpika-darçana, etc. A life of Çivajî, in Bengali. Second edition. Calcutta: 1862. 12mo.

*From the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.*

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. New Series, i. 2; ii. 1, 2. London: 1865–7. 8vo.

*From the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences.*

Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Classe. xvi. 2, 3; xvii; xviii. 1–3. Leipzig: 1864–6. 8vo.

Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Classe der etc. iv. 5–7; v. 1, 2. Leipzig: 1865–6. roy. 8vo.

*From the Sanskrit Text Society, of London.*

The Jaiminîya-Nyâya-Mâlâ-Vistara of Mâdhavâchârya. Edited for the Sanskrit Text Society by Theodor Goldstücker. Parts i, ii. London: 1865. 4to.

*From Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.*

The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rig-Veda . . . . Edited, translated, and explained by Martin Haug . . . . Bombay: 1863. 2 vols. 12mo.

*From the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg.*

Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg. iv. 1; vii. 3–6; viii, ix. St. Petersburg: 1864–6. 4to.

Mémoires de l'Ac. Imp. etc. v. 1; vi. 10; vii–ix; x. 1, 2. St. Petersburg: 1862–6. 4to.



Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Iranischen Sprachen. II. Theil, 1 u. 3 Lief. Masanderanische Sprache . . . . herausgegeben von B. Dorn. St. Petersburg: 1866. 8vo.

*From Rev. M. A. Sherring, of Benares.*

The Transactions of the Benares Institute, for the Session 1864-5. Benares: 1865. 8vo.

Four archæological essays, by Rev. M. A. Sherring, viz.: Benares and its antiquities.—Description of the Buddhist Ruins at Bakariya Cund, Benares.—Some Account of Ancient Remains at Saidpúr and Bhitári.—Benares, Past and Present. Vidyásâra ['Essence of knowledge']. Mirzapore Educational Books. Hindi Series. No. I. 3d edition. Mirzapore: 1862. 8vo.

An illustrated work on natural history. do. Urdu Series. No. VI. Mirzapore: 1864. 8vo.

*From the Smithsonian Institution.*

Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections. vi. vii. Washington: 1867. 8vo.

Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. xiv. Washington: 1865. 4to.

*From Rev. J. P. Thompson, D.D., of New York.*

Grammar of the Hawaiian Language. By L. Andrews. Honolulu: 1851. 8vo.

A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language, to which is appended an English-Hawaiian Vocabulary . . . . By Lorrin Andrews. Honolulu: 1865. 8vo.

A short Synopsis of the most essential points in the Hawaiian Grammar . . . . By W. D. Alexander. Honolulu: 1864. 12mo.

*From Prof. C. J. Tornberg, of Lund.*

Ibn-el-Athiri Chronicon . . . . Edidit Carolus Johannes Tornberg. Volumen Septimum.—Volumen primum. Lugduni: 1865-7. 8vo.

*From the Tübingen University Library.*

Systematisch-alphabetischer Hauptkatalog der Königlichen Universitätsbibliothek zu Tübingen. F. Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften. pp. 1-120.—M. Handschriften. a. Orientalische. I. Indische Handschriften. Tübingen: 1865. 4to.

*From the U. S. Sanitary Commission.*

Documents of the United States Sanitary Commission. Nos. 1-95, May, 1861—Dec. 1865, bound in two volumes. New York. 8vo.

United States Sanitary Commission Bulletin. Nos. 1-40, Nov. 1863—Aug. 1865. New York. 8vo.

*From the Imperial Royal Geographical Society of Vienna.*

Mittheilungen der Kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft. vii; viii. 1, 2; ix. Vienna: 1863-5. roy. 8vo.

*From M. F. Wallmass, of Cairo.*

Paleologia Copta di Felice Walmass del Cairo di Egitto. Pisa: 1865. 8vo.

*From Prof. Albrecht Weber, of Berlin.*

Indexes, Latin and German, of lectures delivered at the University of Berlin, during the years 1859-66. 4to.

Ueber ein Fragment der Bhagavatî. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der heiligen Sprache und Literatur der Jaina. Von A. Weber. [Aus den Abh. d. Kön. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Berlin.] Erster Theil. Berlin: 1866. 4to.

*From Dr. M. C. White, of New Haven.*

Essai sur l'Origine et la Formation Similaire des Ecritures Figuratives Chinoise et Egyptienne . . . . par G. Pauthier. Paris: 1842. 8vo.

*From Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.*

Phrasis: a treatise on the history and structure of the different languages of the world . . . . By J. Wilson. Albany: 1864. 8vo.



*From Mr. C. W. Zaremba, of St. Joseph, Mich.*

A Calendar for 1836, in the Church Slavic, elegantly illuminated; one sheet, 8½ by 22 inches, folded.

Manuscript copy of a papyrus, inscribed with hieratic characters, in the Imperial library at St. Petersburg; one sheet, 10 by 30 inches.—Also, a description and translation of the same, by Dr. C. W. Zaremba.

A Russo-Tartaric Primer. Kasan: 1859. 8vo.

The gospels of Matthew and John, in Chinese. 8vo size.

Die Atlantis nach Griechischen und Arabischen Quellen von A. S. von Noroff . . . . St. Petersburg: 1854. 8vo.

Johann Christian Friedrich Meister's Anleitung zu Verständiger Ansicht jeder Hieroglyphen jeder Symbolischen Wortsprache. Breslau. 12mo.

Bemerkungen über die Phönizischen und Punischen Münzen. Erstes Stück . . . . von Johann Joachim Bellermann. Berlin: 1812. 12mo. (The last two stitched together in one volume.)

*From an unknown donor.*

A Hebrew Grammar. no title, place, or date. 8vo.

*By exchange.*

Seven Tamil works, printed on native presses, for native use, viz.: Pansa Perakaramam. On Saiva philosophy.—Agastiya's Science of Divination by Birds.—Nannul, a grammar by Pavananti, text and commentary; edited by Vesaka Perumal.—A work in praise of Krishna.—A comedy entitled Aressentera.—Tiruvala ur Puranam: a local Purana.—Nana Vettiyan, by Tiruvalluvar.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Dr. S. Wells Williams, under date of Peking, March 12th, 1867, says—

“You will be interested to learn that the Nestorian monument at Si-ngan-fu in Shensi has been recently visited by two foreigners, English missionaries, who found it in a good state of preservation, on the whole; the building in which it formerly stood, or in whose wall it was embedded, was in utter ruin, and the tablet remained upright, exposed to the weather. Mr. Lees and Mr. Williamson were quickly directed to the place, for the people knew the character of the inscription, and had no trouble in getting impressions of the engraving. It is a great and thick slab of black marble, and shows signs of the effects of the weather.

“The region around Si-ngan is now almost destitute of population, its inhabitants having fled to escape the horrible cruelties and exactions of the insurgents and Mohammedans during the last three years, who are still ravaging the country south of the mountains toward Hankau. Another Bible agent, Mr. Wylie, has just reached Peking from a journey across from Hankau through Kaifung, and narrowly escaped the hands of these marauding bands.

“I have just received the Society’s Proceedings for 1865, which are very interesting. The notice of Mr. C. W. Bradley contains a just tribute to a very energetic and liberal promoter of Oriental studies. It was, however, Mr. Reed, our minister, who induced him to come up to the Pei-ho; I do not remember that Mr. Bradley had much intercourse at that time with Lord Elgin. Mr. Reed, too, sent him with the Treaty to Washington in July 1858, and he returned soon to China. The expedition was not in the winter, at which time ice covers the stream. Mr. Reed was also the means of getting him placed on the Commission of Claims, which were all settled in six weeks; it was the refusal of the government at Washington to pay what all regarded as his just salary for this work as Commissioner that led him to resign.

“My spare time is all employed in the revision of my dictionary, or I would try to send something for the Society.”

Dr. J. Muir, of Edinburgh, writes under date of July 10th, 1867—

“I sent you some time ago Prof. Goldstücker’s summary in the Examiner of his reply read in the winter to my paper on the interpretation of the Veda. Lately I wrote to Dr. Rost to find out if the article *in extenso* was yet in type, as I was naturally desirous to read the author’s propositions in detail. But I was informed that Prof. Goldstücker was reserving the paper till he should be able to complete it by the addition of his proofs. When, then, if ever, the article is to see the light, must be left for the future to clear up; but I really wish he would let us have it, and show how he is going to demolish all his adversaries.

“Prof. Aufrecht is working steadily at his vocabulary—or concordance, as he calls it—of the Rig-Veda, having already sent his vocabulary of the Atharva-Veda to the press. Max Müller, as you will have become aware, is about to bring out a new translation of the Rig-Veda. He has been in rather weak health, but, I am glad to learn, is better now.

“I have been working all winter at a new edition of the first volume of my Sanskrit Texts, on Caste: it is partly printed, but will not be ready for at least another six months. It is very much enlarged.”

Dr. W. F. A. Behrnauer, of Dresden, writes from Leipzig, June 12th, 1867—

“I send you my programme of the Oriental Photolithographic Album, destined to be printed in Leipzig, Paris, and Beyroot; with a proof. Have the kindness to print it in your Journal.”

The Corresponding Secretary read the chief parts of the detailed (manuscript) prospectus, as follows:

“This great collection will contain in the first part fourteen Arabic works, in the second part six Persian works, in the third part four Turkish works, and in the fourth part the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the Royal Museum of Antiquities of Dresden; namely,



Section I. No. 1. Al-Ghazzâlî's ethical treatise entitled *Bedâyat ul-Hidâya*, 'The Beginning of the Right Way;' with an account of the philosophical systems of the Arab schools of the Middle Ages.—2. Plato's metaphysical treatise, known as the *Kitâb ar-Rawâbî*, 'Book of the Four Elements,' translated by Ahmed Ben al-Huḡain Ben Jihâr Bokhtâr; and Ahmed Ben 'Ali Esnabadi's treatise on the science of the divinity (*ilm ilâhîti*) and the sciences relating to the substance of the matter of the world (*al-'ulûm al-hak'ikiyya*).—3. A zoological treatise extracted from the *Nozha* of the Sheikh Ustâd Daud al-Baḡir, collated with an extract from the *Kharîdat al-'Ajâib* of Ibn al-Wardi; with an introduction to the study of the Arab zoologists and botanists, given in the '*Ajâib al-Makhlûkât*' of Kazwîni.—4. A specimen from the Arabic work of Abû 'Ali Yahya Ben 'Isa Ben Jazla, known as the *Minhâj ul-Beyân*, 'Methodical Exposition' of all that man wants for his life: with a special account of the author and his position among the Arab physicians.—5. The denominations of the medicaments (*al-adwiya al-mufrida*), ascribed to Ibn Sina (Avicenna), in the Arabic, Greek, Persian, and Turkish languages.—6. Two physiological extracts, one Arabic and one Turkish.—7. The little-known medical treatise, *al-Kâfiya al-Hârûniya*, by Mesih Ben Hakem; and an important physiological essay, of unknown authorship.—8. The well-known work entitled *Tadhkirat ul-Kalîm*, 'Memorial of the Oculists,' by 'Ali Ben 'Isa, with additions and various readings; also, an extract from the celebrated *pharmacopeia* entitled *Minhâj ud-Dukkân*, of the Jewish apothecary Kuben al-'Attar.—9. An important extract, of twenty-six pages, from the noted work called *Beinisâ'a*, a treatise on the diseases which can be treated in an hour, by the famous Abû Bakr Shamsaddîn Ben Zakariya ar-Razi.—10. An extract of, twenty pages from the *Kitâb ul-Idhâh fî 'Ilm in-Nikâh*, 'Exposition of the Science of Copulation,' of Abûlfaraj 'Abdarrahman Ben Nasr ash-Shirazi; with a biography of the author, and a short notice of the oneiromancy of the eastern peoples.

Section II. No. 1. A musical treatise of the poet Jâmi, with the latter's biography, being an account of the relation of the Persian musical system to the Arab, the names of instruments from the dictionary *Haft Kulzum*, etc.—2. The grand mystical work, *Rebâb-Nâme*, 'Book of the Violin,' by Sultân Walad, son of the great poet Jelâleddîn Rûmî, with biographical account and notes—3. A Persian work on astronomy by the astronomer 'Alaeddin 'Ali Kushji (son of the first Turkish mathematician, Kâdi Zade), named *Merkez-i-'alem*, 'Middle of the World;' with commentary.—4. Molla 'Abdul-'Ali's astronomical treatise on the division of time; with biography of the author.—5. An arithmetical treatise by the epitomizer of the Persian work *Hall-i-takwim*.—6. The remainder of Wazir Rashîdeddîn's great work *Jâmi' at-Tawârikh*, of which the first volume was published by Quatremère, together with the forty pages on the Chinese kings, with their portraits.

Section III. The four Turkish works composing this section are of a historical and scientific character, with appendixes, translations, and biographies. Their special description, as well as that of the Nineveh slabs whose photolithographic representation constitutes the IVth section, is omitted here.

From Rev. D. D. Green, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board at Hang-chau, China, comes a finely executed impression of a Chinese monument, with accompanying letter (dated May 7th, 1867), and translations:

"Enclosed please find a rubbing from a tablet in one of the monasteries near this city. It is a representation of the Goddess of Mercy, with her hundred hands, ready to do good to all. The inscription above the image is a Buddhistic chant, and contains so many foreign words that but few Chinese scholars can read it. Of the inscriptions under the image I send you a version. It is very unsatisfactory, but the best I can do with my present knowledge of the Chinese, in connection with the manifest ignorance of Chinese teachers as to the doctrines of the Buddhists. I send you this as an acknowledgment of the receipt of a copy of the Proceedings of the American Oriental Society for 1865, read about Jan. 1st, 1867."



The commemorative part of the inscription reads as follows:

“In the reign of the emperor Gyin-long, in the fiftieth cycle, during the spring, in [the city of] Vu-ling [*i.e.* Hang-chau], one having a good and believing heart sculptured this image of the Goddess of Mercy, and the sacred chant over it, and erected the tablet in the Dzin-z monastery, which is situated in the plain south [of the lake to the west of Hang-chau], in the hall of the god of longevity, by the favor of the Goddess of Mercy, the god presiding over the great present, and Buddha, whose ages cannot be numbered—to whom belong blessedness of community, in hope of the original unity without the least diversity. For the purpose of celebrating the praises of the pure perfection, these three chants were most carefully prepared. On examination, it is found that these three chants were anciently handed down from their author Wang, of the district city of Kyla-ding. His honorary title was Dzao-an, and his name was Zwüin-yiao.”

Mr. Green adds a note or two:

“The monastery was first built during the Tsin dynasty, a few years before the beginning of the Song. The buildings have been repeatedly burned down, and again built up sometimes by imperial patronage, but more often from funds collected by the priests. The place is now in ruins, like most of the temples in this vicinity, destroyed by the Tai-ping rebels. The tablet, however, is still standing.

“The date given in the inscription as that of the erection of the tablet is about A.D. 1795. The author of the verses lived about eight centuries earlier: the exact date could be ascertained, if access were had to the *hyien-ts* of his native place. The chants show that during the Song dynasty (A.D. 960–1280) scholars of no mean pretension were Buddhists.”

The following communications were presented at the different sessions of the Meeting:

1. On the Routes and the Chief Articles of Commerce from the East to Europe during the Middle Ages, by Pres't T. D. Woolsey, of New Haven.

President Woolsey spoke of the route which led from India, by the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates, to Babylon, and so to the Mediterranean, and by the Red Sea to Egypt, and especially to Alexandria. These were ancient routes, and the trade passing through them was principally in the hands of Constantinople, although Venice at an early day shared in it. Venice dealt even in Christian slaves with the Mohammedans. The Popes long tried in vain to prevent commercial intercourse with these enemies of the faith. From Constantinople the route of trade lay especially up the Danube, by Vienna and Ratisbon, and thus penetrated into the regions of northern Europe.

During the crusades, so long as the avenue by the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea were controlled by hostile Mohammedan powers, it became necessary to adopt another more expensive and circuitous route, requiring much land-carriage and several transfers of freight. This route led up the Indus, across the mountains on beasts of burden, thence by the Oxus, and so to the Caspian Sea. This, which was an ancient route, was now adopted by Venice and Genoa. From the Caspian it took especially the direction of the Volga, to a place called Zarizyn, thence across the country to the Don, where, at the river's mouth, in the town of Tana, now Azov, both Venice and Genoa had commercial privileges, and the former had a consul from the end of the 12th century. Afterwards an important entrepôt for Genoa was Theodosia, now Kaffa, in the Crimea.

When, in 1258, the Mongols under Hulagu Khan overthrew the Califate of Bagdad, Egypt being still hostile, it became possible to take the path by the Persian Gulf and the Tigris to Bagdad, and so through the Mongol dominions to the west. Two subordinate routes—one across the country to Tauris (Tabris) and the Black Sea, the other *viâ* Tabris to the north-eastern corner of the Levant—sent the productions of the Orient into Europe. The important marts of the Italians on the Black Sea and the coast of Cilicia were noticed. The trade also of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem was illustrated by reference to a chapter of the “assises





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



sent away and buried in the cemetery of spectres. But the queen interferes, and, in fulfilment of an old promise made her at the time of the child's birth, extorts a cession of the royal authority to him for the space of seven days, and, during their continuance, lavishes upon her son her entreaties that be-wili have pity on her, give up the part she is sure he is acting, and show the powers he possesses. This also failing, he is carried out, in accordance with the directions of the Brahmans, to be killed and hidden away. But while the king's charioteer, charged with putting him to death, is digging his grave, he tries and finds himself possessed of superhuman powers, receives consecrated garments from Indra, and preaches the law to his intending murderer till the latter is fully converted, and desires to join him in a hermit's life in the forest. He refuses the proposal, and sends the charioteer back to the palace with the apparel he had worn and the tidings of his condition. The king and queen, the court and army, come out to see him in his hermitage, are also converted by his preaching, and, forsaking the capital, take up a religious life. The same fate befalls five other kings with their armies, as they come in succession with the intent of warring upon Benares. "There was room enough for all these recluses, and for more to come. The elephants were turned loose in the jungle; the horses returned to their wild condition; the royal chariots decayed and fell in pieces, mouldering in the forest. Gold, silver, precious gems, and jewels were strewn about and covered the ground like sand. And all these Bre-Dabos and Bre-Dabosi, on the extinction of life, ascended to the upper terraces of the Brahma-world, abiding there together. Those beings which were brute animals, if they had shown themselves of a kind and benevolent disposition toward the hermits, were re-born, on their death, in one of the six heavens, where they enjoyed celestial riches, and all became sons and daughters of divinities, in god-like existence."

### 3. On the Egyptian Doctrine of the Future Life, by Rev. Joseph P. Thompson, D.D., of New York.

Of this long and elaborate paper, the following are the leading points:

The legend of Isis and Osiris, which was but a spiritualizing of the yearly phenomena of nature in the Nile valley, lay at the foundation of the Egyptian doctrine of the future life. The departed soul is called the son of Osiris, sometimes Osiris himself, and repeats in his own course through Hades the various experiences of that divinity. He is furnished also with statuettes which represent the mummified form of Osiris bursting its wrappings and coming forth to renewed activity. The sources of Egyptian eschatology are limited: Herodotus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Empedocles, and others, have given a fragmentary account of the Egyptian belief; but our principal source is the "Book of the Dead."

This Book, which Champollion had already designated the "Funereal Ritual," was published entire by Lepsius in 1842, from the text of a hieroglyphic papyrus at Turin, which dates from the twenty-sixth dynasty, or the seventh century before Christ. The most important chapters of the books are found in papyri of a much older date, and also upon tombs of the eighteenth dynasty and sarcophagi of the eleventh. Indeed, fragments of it can be traced back to the age of the third pyramid.

Fragmentary, repetitious, without logical order, it revolves about two central points—the judgment of the deceased after death, and his passage onward through various transformations, unto the highest felicity in the presence and likeness of "the Chief God."

Dr. Samuel Birch, of the British Museum, has published in volume fifth of Bunsen's "Egypt's Place in Universal History" the first translation of the entire book. This translation is so extremely literal as sometimes to be unintelligible, while the prevailing mysticism of the book throws a degree of obscurity over its doctrines. Translations of the most important chapters have been made by Vicomte de Rougé, Pleyte, Chabas, Reinisch, Brugsch, and others. Rougé is now issuing a superb edition of the text, illustrated with vignettes, which sometimes furnish a most effective commentary; and Lepsius has just published the fragments of the Book of the Dead written upon the inner sides of the sarcophagi of the Old Empire in the Berlin Museum, under the title *Aelteste Texte des Todtenbuchs*.



The Book teaches that the souls of all men, good and bad alike, continue to exist after death; that they all pass immediately into Hades, a doleful region, full of enemies and terrors, from whose ordeal the righteous cannot escape; here the wicked may be arrested and delivered to some devouring monster, or remanded to earth, for the discipline of animal transmigration, such being the Egyptian idea of metempsychosis. The righteous pass through a form of justification, and then, emerging at the gates of the West, follow the sun-bark in its bright career; they pass through various transformations, each advancing to a higher plane of existence, by the elimination of the mortal and the evil; then follows a solemn judgment-scene, in the Hall of Two Truths, where the heart of the deceased is weighed in the balance against the image of righteousness, and he is compelled to clear himself of each of the forty-two deadly sins, against as many accusers, who dispute his passage. Being acquitted, he enters the Elysian fields, and partakes of the food of the gods; after which he rises by a succession of grand halls and stair-ways to the Empyrean, the luminous presence-chamber of Osiris.

The consummation of blessedness, however, is not absorption into the divinity, for the soul retains throughout its consciousness and personal identity: and moreover, the soul visits the body, which has been so carefully preserved, and this is revived. The book clearly recognizes moral distinctions as the basis of divine judgment in the Hereafter, and the personal accountability of man to a supreme tribunal beyond the grave. There is not only a purgatory for the wicked, but a hell for the finally incorrigible.

Such, in general, is the theology of this remarkable book. The researches of scholars will eventually bring out its minuter shades of meaning, and perhaps reduce its doctrines to a well-ordered system.

#### 4. A Plan for a Universal History, by Prof. Joseph W. Jenks, of Boston; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Prof. Jenks states that he has been long engaged upon a work which he proposes to call "History re-read, or an attempt at a simple and instructive philosophy of history," of which he presents the fundamental outline. He claims that man is of necessity the universal type; that humanity in the complex resembles, in nature, progress, and destiny, humanity in the individual; and that, accordingly, the periods of human history correspond with the successive stages in the life of the individual. He hopes to be able to present, in a year or two, a true historic view of the "childhood" of the race, extending from the end of the period of mythology and fable to the time of Abraham, or about 2000 B.C.

#### 5. Critical Notice of Dr. Friedrich Böttcher's Hebrew Grammar, by Prof. George E. Day, D.D., of New Haven.

This grammar was issued last year from the press of J. A. Barth, in Leipzig. It is as yet unfinished, there being a second volume still to appear, which will be furnished with complete indexes to the whole work. The present volume is of six hundred and fifty-four royal octavo pages. Prof. Day recognized and commended the fidelity and care exhibited by the editor, Dr. Ferdinand Mühlman, a pupil of the deceased author, and characterized the work itself as deserving the attention of Hebrew scholars on account of its scientific treatment of Hebrew grammar, and the large number of methodized facts brought together in it. Dr. Böttcher has aimed to produce an exhaustive work, in which all the phenomena of the language should be subjected to the modern rational treatment. His divisions and subdivisions, although sometimes excessive and tedious, exhibit great thoroughness, and an evident mastery of the subject. After speaking favorably of the historical introduction, Prof. Day criticised the plan of the grammar. This volume is divided into two books, the former of which treats of the phonology, the other of the etymology of the language. The syntax is to follow in the second volume. In developing the sound-relations of the Hebrew, the author makes a constant distinction between what he calls "sonitals" and "spiritals," the latter class embracing the semi-vowels, as *Vav* and *Yodh*, and the gutturals, the former the vowels and most of the consonants. On the ground of this distinction, he



treats all the inflected words, whether nouns, verbs, or even particles, as either sonital, guttural, or semi-vocal. The treatment of the verb is quite general, while that of the substantive, which occupies two hundred and fifty pages, is unnecessarily long, in consequence of being burdened with an excessive citation of particulars. The paper dwelt upon a number of special points, in which the views of the author were either accepted or criticised, and closed with an appreciative estimate of the work, as in reality a thesaurus of materials for Hebrew grammar, and a valuable contribution to Semitic philology and to comparative philology in general.\*

## 6. On the Translation of the Veda, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

One of the leading philological problems of the present day, Prof. Whitney remarked, is to make a translation of the Veda, the Hindu Bible, both on account of its importance as exhibiting the ground-work of Hindu history, and because it is the most ancient existing Indo-European record, and the one that shows us the most primitive attainable phase of Indo-European life and institutions. By the Veda, we mean especially the Rig-Veda, the earliest and most extensive of the four hymn-collections which constitute the kernel of the sacred literature of India—together with such parts of the other collections as are akin with this in character. It has been handed down to us accompanied with a great body of accessory and explanatory works, of which the latest and fullest is the elaborate commentary of Sâyana, made in southern India, in the fourteenth century; in which is summed up the whole learning of the Hindu *pandits*, as gathered and transmitted by a long succession of generations. By the aid of this, especially, were made the first researches of European scholars into the Vedic language and antiquities. A question, now, has arisen as to the absolute value and authority of the commentary and its more ancient sources; the one side maintaining that it represents an immemorial tradition, and is to be, in the main, implicitly followed by us; the other, that it is the final product of a long-continued course of learned inquiry, and must be freely and searchingly criticised in every item, before acceptance. A number of important articles bearing on the controversy have been published within no long time, and of these Prof. Whitney's paper was mainly an abstract and review.

The first article is by Prof. Roth, of Tübingen, and is published in Vol. xxi. (for 1867) of the German Oriental Society's Journal. It sets forth the general principles bearing upon the point under discussion the conditions under which a so-called "traditional" interpretation grows up, and the impossibility that it should ever have the authority claimed for it; and points out that the historical circumstances which should make the case otherwise in India are wholly wanting, and that an examination of the interpretation itself shows it to be of the ordinary character—namely, founded only on a grammatical and etymological basis.

Into such an examination of Sâyana's commentary and its chief predecessor, Yâska's Nirukta, the next article reviewed enters in detail. It is by Dr. Muir of Edinburgh, and published in Vol. ii., Part 2 (1867), of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. With unimpeachable fairness, with great industry and learning, with clear statement and logical method, it goes over the whole ground, with great fulness of illustration; reaching the conclusion that "there is no unusual or difficult word or obscure text in the hymns in regard to which the authority of the Indian scholiast should be received as final [or his interpretation accepted], unless it be supported by probability, by the context, or by parallel passages;" and that hence, "no translation of the Rig-Veda which is based exclusively on Sâyana's commentary can possibly be satisfactory."

---

\* At the moment that this abstract of Prof. Day's notice is passing through the press, the first half of the second volume has come to hand. Its first ninety-five pages are occupied with the pronouns and pronominal suffixes, the remaining two hundred and twenty-four pages with the verb. The conclusion of the work is expected to be ready early in 1868.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



assumes the independent interpretations of the other party to be founded) is a peculiarly difficult problem, which has not yet been broached, much less settled. This claim requires farther explanation to make it intelligible: but, meantime, we are justified in going on to interpret simply by aid of the comparison of parallel passages—about which, certainly, there is no mystery, as it is the method successfully employed in every other language and literature besides the Vedic; not only as between authors of the same age, but through all the periods of every literature.

The principles of the “German school” are the only ones which can ever guide us to a true understanding of the Veda. We have within our reach precisely the same means of research which the Hindu schools had—namely, a knowledge of the classical Sanskrit and of modern Hindu institutions, and if our command of such knowledge is in some respects inferior to theirs, the deficiency is much more than made up by the superiority of our methods of research, and by our possession of a critical and historical spirit which was denied to them.

### 7. On Recent Geographical Explorations in the Hindu-Kuh Range, and its Vicinity, by Prof. D. C. Gilman, of New Haven.

Prof. Gilman gave an abstract of the results of several works which have appeared within no long time past, treating of this interesting region, especially of the alleged wanderings and observations of an anonymous writer, brought to light by the Russian traveller, M. Veniukoff, and recently printed in the London Geographical Society's Journal—the authenticity of the original document having been called in serious question by English geographers. He exhibited maps of the region, and pointed out how it was being approached from more than one side by geographical exploration and discovery.

Rev. Cyrus Byington, for nearly fifty years a missionary among the Choctaw Indians, being present, gave, by request, some account of the progress of civilization and religion in that community during his presence with them, and described, partly in answer to questions, some of the striking peculiarities of their language.

The Society then adjourned, to meet again in Boston, on the 20th of May, 1868.



**Proceedings at Boston, May 20th, 1868.**

THE Annual meeting of the American Oriental Society was held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 20th, at the usual hour and place. The President being absent, the chair was taken by Rev. Dr. R. Anderson, Vice-President. The day was very stormy, and the attendance of members unusually small.

The minutes of the preceding meeting (at New Haven, Oct. 1867) were read by the Recording Secretary and approved. Reports from the retiring officers were then called for:

The Treasurer's report was presented, in his absence, by the Recording Secretary. It showed the income and expenses of the year to have been as follows:

RECEIPTS.	
Balance on hand, May 22d, 1867,	\$1,049.76
Annual Assessments,	\$ 75.00
Sale of the Journal,	149.49
Interest on deposit in Savings Bank,	107.88
Total receipts of the year,	332.37
	\$1,382.13

EXPENDITURES.	
Printing of Proceedings, etc.,	\$ 92.72
Expenses of Library and Correspondence,	29.81
Total expenditures of the year,	\$ 122.53
Balance on hand, May 20th, 1868,	1,259.60
	\$1,382.13

The accounts, having been audited by a committee of two, appointed for that purpose, were accepted.

The Librarian presented a list of donors during the year to the Society's collections, and gave oral explanations of the character and value of the donations made. To the catalogue of the Library have been added 41 new titles, besides one manuscript title.

In behalf of the Committee of Publication, a report was made by the Corresponding Secretary. There has been no issue of the Journal during the past year, owing mainly to the lack of suitable material. Preparation of the edition of the Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya and its commentary, the Tribhâshyaratna, which work has been intended and expected to occupy a part of the next volume, has been delayed by unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances. The delay, however, was to turn out greatly for the advantage of the work, since new and very important manuscript material has been



recently secured. Besides a collation of the (imperfect) Oxford MS., obtained through the kind offices of Prof. Müller, a copy and collation of two other manuscripts, recently discovered in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London, has been secured. Information of these was sent to Prof. Whitney by Dr. R. Rost, Secretary of the Roy. As. Soc., last autumn; and the copy and collation has been made, with his kind coöperation and aid, by Dr. Julius Eggeling, a German scholar now residing in England, to whose generous and friendly devotion the work will be greatly indebted for its completeness. The manuscripts referred to have been for many years in the possession of the London Society, but, being written in the southern Indian characters (one in Malayâlam, the other, on strips of palm leaf, in Grantham), they have until now escaped identification and notice. Their assistance will render it possible to furnish a satisfactory text of the commentary, which it is accordingly proposed to add in full to the treatise and notes. There is no reason to believe that a half-volume will not be ready for delivery to the members by the next annual meeting, and the other half-volume in the course of 1869.

The Board of Directors announced that the autumn meeting would be held in New Haven, October 14th, and that Mr. Cotheal of New York, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, would act as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

They also gave notice that they had appointed Prof. Salisbury and Rev. Dr. Clark to aid the Corresponding Secretary in endeavoring to secure a more extended and active participation of American Missionaries in the work of the Society; and had committed the list of members for revisal to Professors Salisbury, Hadley, and Whitney, with directions to report at the next annual meeting.

Two gentlemen, recommended by the Board for election to membership, were balloted upon, and duly elected, namely:

as Corporate Member,

Prof. John B. Feuling, Madison, Wisc.

as Corresponding Member,

Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, of Dresden.

The Corresponding Secretary called the attention of the meeting to the unusual loss it had suffered during the past year in the death of four of its Honorary Members—namely, Prof. F. Bopp of Berlin, the Duc de Luynes and M. Reinaud of Paris, and Râja Râdhâkânta Deva of Calcutta. He gave a brief statement of the claims of each of these gentlemen to the respectful and grateful remembrance of Orientalists, entering into more detail respecting the brilliant achievements of Bopp in the department of comparative philology.

Notice was also taken of the death of Prof. C. C. Jewett of Boston, a Corporate Member, Prof. Peabody of Cambridge giving some account of his life and literary labors.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



which every element is intended to be directly symbolic of a physical act, so that each letter represents the whole method of production of the sound it stands for, and is, after the symbolism is learned, self-interpreting. Not only articulate sounds, but almost all audible utterances of which human organs are capable, are claimed to be representable by it: it aims at, and fairly accomplishes, more than any other system ever invented. Prof. Whitney gave an account of the contents of the work, and an analysis and criticism of its signs for sounds. He showed that, while these are exceedingly ingenious, and in the main sufficiently exact, they nevertheless are far from being entitled to all the credit claimed for them. Even in the consonantal part of the alphabet, Mr. Bell's analysis of not a few sounds is faulty, and his designation false; for example, in *s*, *z*, *th*, he either introduces symbols of unreal acts, or omits to symbolize other real acts of articulation, or both. With his treatment of the far more difficult matter of vowel utterance much more fault was found: his whole scheme of classification and description of the vowels was rejected, as being a step backward rather than forward, when compared with the labors of his predecessors. On the whole, it was asserted that Mr. Bell has not in a single point sensibly advanced the science of alphabets, although he has shown superior skill in the art of alphabetic notation. He is disposed also to overrate the value and usefulness of his invention, imagining that it is going to do away with the difficulties of learning to read, of learning to pronounce a foreign language, of analyzing and representing the sounds of unwritten tongues, and the like. Whereas, a scheme of alphabetic symbols is like a scheme of chemical symbols, or a nomenclature in any branch of science; a good nomenclature efficiently facilitates the mastery of a science, as a bad one throws obstacles in the way of it; but the nomenclature is of secondary consequence, and to acquire it is not to master the science. It is to phonetists that Mr. Bell's system must be chiefly valuable, and there seems no good reason why the task of spreading the knowledge and use of it should have been assumed by Government.

The construction of the volume presenting the system was criticised as being far too obscure and difficult. By first giving the physical descriptions of sounds complete, and putting off all illustration to another part of the work, the author has doubtless repelled many who might otherwise have learned to understand and favor the new alphabet.

After some discussion of the subject of this communication, the Society adjourned.



**Proceedings at New Haven, October 14th and 15th, 1868.**

---

THE Society met, as adjourned, at New Haven, in the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School, the President in the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read, the Committee of Arrangements presented their plan for the conduct of the present session, which was, on motion, adopted. The Society would adjourn at about 6 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation from the President, Dr. Woolsey, to take tea at his house. After tea, it would receive a communication from Dr. Martin, and would assemble again at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, to hear further communications.

The Directors gave notice that the next Annual meeting would be holden in Boston, on Wednesday, May 19th, 1869, and that they had appointed for it the same Committee of Arrangements as last year—namely, Mr. Joseph S. Ropes of Boston, and the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries.

They also recommended the election, as Corporate Members, of the following gentlemen:

Mr. John W. Barrow, of New York.

Prof. Albert S. Bickmore, of Hamilton, N. Y.

Rev. Edward L. Clark, of New Haven.

Mr. Albert F. Heard, of Boston.

Rev. William W. Hicks, of Williamsburg, N. Y.

Rev. William Patton, D.D., of New Haven.

Hon. Elisha R. Potter, of South Kingston, R. I.

Ballot being had, these gentlemen were declared duly elected.

Prof. Whitney, for the Committee of Publication, stated that still another manuscript of the *Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhyâ* and its commentary had been furnished for the benefit of the publication to be made of those works in the Journal. It was a copy, made by Dr. S. Goldschmidt, of a manuscript recently sent to Prof. Weber, at Berlin, by Prof. Bühler of Bombay. The Directors had suitably acknowledged the kindness of Dr. Goldschmidt in making the transcription. The work, it was further mentioned, was already in part prepared for the press, and its printing would be soon commenced.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and extracts from it were read, by the Corresponding Secretary.

Babu Râmachandra Ghosha, under date of Calcutta, Jan. 4, 1868, writes:

“The cultivation of Sanskrit in Europe and America excites a general interest; it has formed a new era in philology, it has opened the dark vistas of antiquity, and contributed to the establishment of great ethnographical facts. It is highly delightful to see a taste for the study of Sanskrit reviving in Bengal. Seven hun-



dred and ninety-five years ago, the Brahmins of Bengal were so ignorant in the higher branches of the Hindu 'Sástras, that King Adisur had to request the Raja of Kanuj to send down five Brahmins well known for their erudition. Schools of an elementary character may have existed at this time, but no institutions of a higher order were then to be found in Bengal. Now, many schools are found in Hálisahar, Bhátpará, and Nuddea, where the higher branches of the Hindu 'Sástras are carefully studied. Celebrated schools, especially of the Nyáya philosophy, however, had been established long before in Mithila. This prevalence of the Nyáya Philosophy in Mithila can be accounted for by the fact that Gotama established a school at a place not far distant from that renowned city, and the study was kept up by his pupils for a considerable time. The first regular school of philosophy established in Bengal was that of Bashudeva Sarvobhauma. Of the numerous students of that Pandit, the names of three have become known throughout the land. This constellation of bright names is composed of Raghunandana, Chaitanya, and Raghunátha 'Siromani. The first compiled the Smriti, whose dictum is now law; the second was the famous Vaishnava reformer; and the third, the genius whose philosophical acumen Bengal, nay India, may well be proud of. Raghunátha wrote a work exposing the fallacies of the several expositions of the Chintámani, a book written by Gangeshopádhyaýa, who had graduated at Mithila. This treatise is a full development of the abstruser parts of the science, as laid down in miniature by Gotama. Nuddea is still regarded as the focus of philosophical learning. A number of geniuses appeared one after another, and the profound works of these mighty minds have shed a glory on India itself. The number of the Pandits in Calcutta who have written treatises on different branches of learning in Sanskrit is very small. Here we have a very small number of men who take any interest at all in the labors of an antiquarian. Babu Rájendralála has already written several papers on different subjects appertaining to the primeval history of India, but has only reproduced the facts which have long since been brought to light by Lassen and others, in a different garb. Babu Rájendralála is now engaged in compiling a Prákrita Dictionary. Prof. Buhler of Puna College has finished his very learned essay on the Asvins, and is now busy with an edition of Gobhila's Grihya Sútra, with Náráyana's commentary.

"Having lately had occasion to refer to the Ganes'a Purána, I found that the author of this has artfully blended Buddhism with the other subjects of his work. The Ganes'a Purána comprises two Kándas. Both the Kándas sanction the worship of Ganes'a. An account of Gritsamada forms a part of this Purána. Gritsamada was the grandson of Rája Bhima of Vidarbha.

"My work on the Vedas is now in the press. When it is published, I shall be very happy to send you a copy of it. My essay on the Aryans is out of print. . . ."

Rev. A. P. Happer, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa., June 17, 1868:

"I have been quite interested in looking at the Proceedings of the two meetings as published, which you have kindly sent me with your circular. I have been especially interested in reading the summary of the contents of the paper read by Pres. Woolsey, of Yale College, on the word for 'God,' in Chinese. That is a subject which has engaged great attention in China. The discussion has all been conducted during the twenty-four years of my residence in China and connection with Chinese missions. The question is not, what word or compound term would be free from difficulties? That question could be easily settled. But the question is connected with the translation of the Sacred Scriptures, and it is very definite and precise. What Chinese word is the best to translate *Elohim* of the Hebrew and *Theos* of the Greek Testament? When answering the question, no philologist can say that *Tien-chu*, which is not a simple word, but a compound term, made by the Jesuit missionaries, and which means 'Heaven's Lord,' can in any way be regarded as a translation of *Elohim*, or *Theos*, or *God*.

"As a title of the true God, it may and it is very properly used; but it is so used very sparingly by Protestants, for this reason. By general usage of the Chinese, Roman Catholicism is designated "The religion of the Lord of Heaven," i. e. *Tien-chu kiau*: while, by a like general usage of the Chinese themselves, Protestantism is called "The religion of Jesus," *Ye-su kiau*. This usage originated from the Romanists' using that term to designate the true God; while, of course,





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Upon the subject of this letter, Dr. Martin, of Peking, at the invitation of the President, remarked somewhat as follows:

“The common objection that *Tien-chu* was coined by Europeans, and therefore is no Chinese word, is founded on an error. That term is found in the works of *Sze Ma-ts'ien*, the great historian of the Han dynasty, B.C. 122. It is there applied to one of eight divinities, who is called *Tien-chu*, the Lord of Heaven, in distinction from *Ti-chu*, the Lord of Earth, *Hai-chu*, the Lord of the Sea, etc. The composition of the term is therefore not original with the Roman Catholic missionaries. Nor was its application to the supreme and only God altogether so.

“On a mountain in the vicinity of Peking, a stone gateway, bearing the inscription *Tien-chu-kung*, ‘Palace of the Lord of Heaven,’ marks the site of a ruined temple. This might have been taken for the ruins of a Christian church, but for a more extended inscription on an adjacent pillar, which describes the temple as erected in honor of Shang-ti, the Jupiter of the Chinese Pantheon, who is there represented as the God of Nature. The term, in its later as well as its earlier sense, had become obsolete, and to the Roman Catholic missionaries belongs the credit of reviving it in its later and purer signification.

“In the recent movement towards the adoption of *Tien-chu*, those Protestant missionaries who favored it were influenced by four considerations: 1st, a desire to escape the difficulties besetting the use of the rival terms *Shin* and *Shang-ti*; 2d, to find a common ground on which all Christians, Catholic and Protestant, might unite; 3d, to profit by the experience of their Roman Catholic predecessors; 4th, to avail themselves of the advantage derived from the currency which has been given to *Tien-chu* by the Roman Catholics, and to *Chu* by the Mohammedans.

“Dr. Happer was wrong in supposing that *Tien-chu* was to be taken promiscuously for God, god, and gods. It was only used in a special signification, *shin* being retained for idol gods, and divinity in general. Nor does this use of *shin* preclude its use in the formula *Sheng-shin*, for ‘Holy Ghost;’ *shin* in the one case not departing more widely from its popular sense, than *ghost* does in the other.”

Dr. John Muir, Edinburgh, July 17, 1868:

“... In preparing the new edition of the third volume of my ‘Sanskrit Texts,’ I have had my attention drawn again to the Vedânta Sûtras, and to ‘Sankara’s account of the use made by the rival schools of Indian philosophy of the Vedic texts to support their own views—interpreting them as variously as Christian divines do the Bible. I have had the desire, experienced before, renewed in me of seeing a complete English version of ‘Sankara produced; as I think that these Indian speculations, even if they should be found to contribute little or nothing to the true theory of Being and the relation of the Finite and the Infinite (which I should be slow to affirm), are at least deserving of notice, more notice than they have yet received, in the history of human thought. I have recently written to K. M. Banerjea, to see if he can be induced to translate ‘Sankara. I also wrote not long ago to my brother (the author of the life of Mahomet), who has lately been appointed lieutenant-governor of the North-West Provinces of India, and has the Benares College under his control, to ask if he could get any one to complete the late Dr. Ballantyne’s translations of the Sûtras, of which only the Sâmkhya and most of the Nyâya were finished. . . .”

Rev. William Tracy, Norwich, Conn., Sept. 3, 1868:

“Just before leaving India last year, I procured a number of small copper coins, most of them apparently of considerable antiquity. There were also among them two small ancient gold coins, and a few silver ones, the latter mostly recent.

“These coins, of which I send you specimens, are dug up from the ruins of ancient towns and villages in the South of India, and their devices indicate the different dynasties under which they were coined; and in some cases also, the religion dominant at the time. Some appear to be Buddhistic, some Brahmanic, of the Vaishnava sect, and others of the Saiva sect. A few are Mohammedan. I



regret that I am unable to give a more definite description of these coins, but since obtaining them I have had neither time nor facilities for making a satisfactory examination of them. If you think they are of enough interest to warrant their being placed in the Cabinet of the Society, please make such a disposal of them.

“I take the liberty, also, of sending a few specimens of pottery, from what I suppose to be ancient Buddhistic sepulchres, such as are found in various parts of India. Some of the best specimens I had procured were entirely destroyed by the carelessness of the native coolies in India. Those which I send have been restored as far as possible; in one instance only a few fragments remain to show the original form of the vessel.

“The only metallic remains found in these sepulchres in Southern India, so far as I know, are in the form of daggers, or sacrificial knives. The oxidized fragments of an instrument of this kind, apparently a dagger, accompany the vessels sent. Similar remains are found in all parts of Southern India, and closely resemble those found in the Buddhist Topes of the Penjab.

“These ancient burial places, as found in Southern India, are of two kinds. The first is simply a large funereal urn, of coarse pottery, from three to four feet in height, pointed at the bottom, and covered with a closely fitting top, within which are deposited various earthen utensils, such as those I send you. These contain small fragments of bones and ashes; and, in one instance, I have found in them the husks of rice, in a good state of preservation. A large slab of stone, five or six feet square, is sometimes placed above the urn, one or two feet below the ground, and the place of burial is indicated by a large circle of stones on the surface. The places of burial were usually selected in a hard and dry gravelly soil.

“The second class of these ancient sepulchres is less common than the first. They are formed of slabs of stone, enclosing a small chamber, and covered by another slab, generally on a level with the surface of the ground. Quite a large collection of these is found about twenty-five miles from Madura, and a few rods to the east of the Trichinopoly road. Some of these are covered with heaps of stones, but most are surrounded with a circle of stones similar to those mentioned above. Some, I found on visiting them, had been opened, probably by some one in search of treasure. One or two, of better workmanship than the rest, were encircled by a carefully built and well preserved platform of stone. The sides were formed of slabs from six to eight feet square, and three or four inches thick; and a similar slab divided the room into two equal compartments. Three or four feet from the top, a shelf of stone, twenty inches wide and three inches thick, ran across the whole length of the tomb. Near the bottom of each compartment, a hole, fifteen to eighteen inches in diameter, was cut through the stone, forming a passage into the tomb, which was closed by a flat stone placed against it on the outside. Through this passage, probably, the remains of the dead were conveyed to their final resting place.

“One or two of the tombs were almost entirely above ground, and, having one of the sides partially broken out, were used as an occasional place of rest and shelter by the shepherds of the neighborhood.

“From the form of these tombs, I should judge that the bodies were deposited in them without having been burned. No signs of funeral utensils were seen, and my limited time would not allow me to make any fresh excavations.

“Tombs of this description are found in several places in the Madura district—in the mountains as well as in the plains, and also in the districts north of Madras. The present inhabitants have no knowledge of the people who constructed them. One tradition regards them as a race of men who never died, and who were placed in these tombs with a little rice and water in cups for their sustenance. Another tradition is, that in ancient times there lived here a race who were the enemies of the gods, and whose great wickedness led the latter to determine upon their destruction. They first attempted to accomplish this by a shower of fire, but the people constructed these stone dwellings, and thus protected themselves from the fiery storm. Afterwards, the gods poured out a flood of mud and water, which filled their dwellings and destroyed the wicked race.



"This tradition possibly refers to the destruction of the Buddhists, who were always regarded as the enemies of the Brahmanical deities, and who, if other local traditions are true, were persecuted, and finally exterminated, by the Brahmins and their adherents, a few scattered remnants alone having continued in existence till the eleventh or twelfth century.

"Regretting that the remains I send are so scanty, and my information respecting them so meager, I remain, etc."

Annexed to Mr. Tracy's letter is a list of the coins sent, numbering about one hundred and fifty, among them a dozen silver coins and two gold ones. The coins and the remains from the tombs were laid upon the table, for the inspection of the members present.

Mr. Hyde Clarke, London, Sept. 13, 1868:

After giving a statement of the various ethnographical inquiries which he is engaged in pursuing, Mr. Clarke concludes:

"Next season I lay the foundations of a new subject by a course of lectures at the London institutions on Comparative History, or the phenomena common to the history of many nations."

After the reading of the correspondence, communications were called for.

1. On the Study of Alchemy in China, by Rev. William A. P. Martin, D.D., of Peking.

After tracing briefly the connection between alchemy and chemistry, the paper proceeded to its main object, viz.: to demonstrate that the origin of European alchemy was to be sought in China.

In support of this view the following considerations were adduced, and illustrated by citations from Chinese and other works.

1. The study of alchemy had been in full vigor in China for at least six centuries, before it made its appearance in Europe. It did not appear in Europe until the fourth century, when intercourse with the far East had become somewhat frequent. It appeared first at Byzantium and Alexandria, where the commerce of the East chiefly centered, and was subsequently revived in Europe by the Saracens, whose most famous school of alchemy was at Bagdad, where intercourse with Eastern Asia was frequent.

2. The objects of pursuit in both schools were identical, and in either case twofold—immortality and gold. In Europe the former was the less prominent, because the people, being in possession of Christianity, had a vivid faith in a future life, to satisfy their longings on that head.

3. In either school there were two elixirs, the greater and the less, and the properties ascribed to them closely correspond.

4. The principles underlying both systems are identical—the composite nature of the metals, and their vegetation from a seminal germ. Indeed, the characters *tsing* for the germ, and *t'ai* for the matrix, which constantly occur in the writings of Chinese alchemists, might be taken for the translation of terms in the vocabulary of the Western school, if their higher antiquity did not forbid the hypothesis.

5. The ends in view being the same, the means by which they were pursued were nearly identical—mercury and lead being as conspicuous in the laboratories of the East, as mercury and sulphur were in those of the West. It is of less significance to add that many other substances were common to both schools, than to note the remarkable coincidence that, in Chinese as in European alchemy, the names of the two principal reagents are used in a mystical sense.

6. Both schools, or at least individuals in both schools, held the doctrine of a cycle of changes, in the course of which the precious metals revert to their baser elements.

7. Both are closely interwoven with astrology.

8. Both led to the practice of magical arts, and unbounded charlatanism.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



metic names for 'frog,' one signifies 'diver,' and the other, as it belongs also to the toad, is not likely to be truly imitative. And so on. If only one-fourth of a list carefully gleaned from three dialects can be fairly set down as onomatopœic, how much less is likely to be the proportion of such names to the whole vocabulary of any one tribe?

Mr. Trumbull affirmed that most Algonkin names of animals are descriptive derivatives, and that the few apparent exceptions belong to species which are more often heard than seen, while it is doubtful if any name of a quadruped is purely mimetic. To illustrate this, he gave a brief list of names, with their derivations. He further drew attention to certain curious features of Indian nomenclature, especially to the combination of a generic characteristic with specific names; as, for example, certain swimming animals have a common suffix of derivation coming from a root that means 'put the head above water;' others, one that means 'bite;' others, 'scratch.' or 'tear;' of plants, some are thus marked as to be eaten green, as nut-bearing, as having eatable roots, and so on. Such a suffix, in the Chippeway and allied tongues, is *gun*, the formative of the instrumentive participial; the occurrence of which at the end of the name for 'shooting-instrument' has misled Mr. Farrar into affirming (p. 34) that "in some cases the onomatopœic instinct is so strong that it asserts itself side by side with the adoption of a name" from a foreign language.

---

At the evening gathering, at Pres. Woolsey's, the Society was called to order, after tea, at about 8 o'clock, and listened to a lecture by Dr. Martin, on the present and prospective relations of China to the Western world. Some of the topics which he treated of and illustrated, may be briefly stated as follows:

It was a mistake to suppose that the Chinese mind is utterly immobile and incapable of change.

China had passed through no fewer than twenty-two dynastic revolutions. Most of these had indeed originated in no better motive than the lust of power, and had left the wheels of the government to run on in their old ruts. But some of them had involved high political principles; as, for instance, that which led to the overthrow of the feudal system, and the establishment of a centralized government, B.C. 240.

The whole mass of the population had more than once been profoundly agitated by what may be called a religious movement; especially when the three prevailing systems rose from small beginnings, and successively made their way to the throne of the empire and a place in the heart of the nation.

Periods of intellectual awakening had also occurred, distinct from these great systems of morals and religion; such, for example, as that which followed the restoration of the ancient classics, after their destruction by the tyrant of Ts'in; such as that occasioned by the invention of paper in the dynasty of Han; the discovery of the art of printing in the dynasty of T'ang, and the rise of speculative philosophy in that of Sang.

The movement now in progress involved all three of these elements—politics, letters, and religion.

The political change was exhibited in the foreign relations of China, not in her domestic administration, and the Embassy that had recently arrived in the West was its proper exponent. The liberal policy they had adopted, the Chinese learned in the school of adversity. War, the great civilizer, had been their teacher. The unequal conflict they had waged with the nations of the West had taught them that knowledge is power, and set them on the career of improvement on which they have now entered.

At two places might be seen bodies of troops training in foreign tactics. At four places they had established arsenals, for the manufacture of foreign arms; and at two places they had commenced navy yards, for the building of war vessels.

They were not, however, limiting themselves to learning the art of war. In three of the provinces, schools had been opened, under the auspices of the pro-



vincial viceroys, for instruction\* in the languages and sciences of the West; and at the capital, a College had been established, under the patronage of the Emperor, which it was intended to expand into the proportions of a University.

---

The concluding session of the Society was held in the Sheffield Library at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning.

Prof. Salisbury first gave the meeting an account of a volume of Arabic manuscript written by a slave at the south, which had a few months ago been placed in his hands for examination.

Rev. Hyman A. Wilder, missionary to the Zulus in South Africa, presented, in an off-hand way, some interesting details respecting the language, character, and manners and customs of that people.

Dr. Martin exhibited a roll of the law from the Jewish congregations at Kai-fung-fu in China. It was written on kid skins, neatly sewed together, and measured over one hundred feet in length, by two feet in breadth. He proposed at a future time to say something with regard to its character. The circumstance was mentioned that a much older roll from the same locality had been recently presented to the library of the American Bible Society in New York, by Dr. S. Wells Williams.

The following additional communications were presented:

5. On the Ancient Chinese, and its Connection with the Aryan Languages, by Rev. Joseph Edkins, of Peking; presented by Dr. Martin.

Mr. Edkins complains that comparative philologists have paid less attention to the Chinese than its merits deserve, while those who have treated it have taken generally without question the modern forms of the Mandarin dialect, disregarding the secular changes which the language has undergone. These are to be traced out by the aid of the phonetic elements in the written characters, as interpreted especially by the dialects of the south-eastern part of the country. The phonetic re-spelling used in Chinese native dictionaries of 1200 years ago shows the initials and finals in a very different condition from the present, and gives at least 700 separate words, instead of the 532 now in use. The odes of the Shi-King, in part from before 1100 B.C., are written in rhyme, which renders possible the restoration in many cases of the pronunciation then usual. The beginnings of Chinese writing were explained by Mr. Edkins, in order to show how the phonetic elements were used to determine earlier pronunciation, and many examples were given in illustration. The application of evidence from the existing dialects was in like manner illustrated. A summary of general results teaches us that the early vocabulary of the language may have contained from twelve to sixteen hundred words, with few or none of the distinctions of tone now prevalent, which have gradually grown up to supplement the deficient resources of expression, the *p'ing* and *ju* appearing first, then, after B.C. 1000, the *shang*, and about the time of Christ the *c'hiu*; the modern Mandarin, with a fifth tone, since A.D. 700.

Through the whole paper, abundant comparisons are made between words of the Chinese language and words of similar sound in the Mongol and Manchu, and also in various western tongues, including the English.

Prof. Whitney remarked, in criticism of this paper, that, while its attempts at restoration of an earlier phase of the Chinese were highly important and interesting, and the successful prosecution of such researches would bring that language under the consideration of comparative philologists in quite a different way from hitherto, the same value could not be attributed to the author's comparisons of



words. Mr. Edkins estimated the difficulties of comparison between tongues of different family far too lightly, neglecting for the western languages the historical inquiries whose necessity he very properly insisted on for the Chinese, and calling attention to verbal resemblances which could in many cases be clearly proved valueless, and in the rest were presumably so. The way was not yet cleared for fruitful comparisons of the kind here essayed.

## 6. On Recent Explorations in Jerusalem, by Rev. Edward L. Clark, of New Haven.

Mr. Clark pointed out how the investigations of the Palestine Exploration Society have confirmed many of the statements of Josephus which were once held in doubt, and proved the truth of the conjectures of later writers, such as Dr. Gustav Schultz, T. Tobler, and Dr. Edward Robinson. The site of the sepulchre of David on Mt. Zion is shown to be that claimed by the Moslems, but a lower cave contains the actual burial place; and the former approach is found on the western side of Mt. Zion, through a large vestibule of native rock, with the remains of steps, piers, and doors.

The strength of the ancient fortress of the Jebusites is attested by stairs cut on the western face of the hill upon which it stood.

The valley of the Tyropœon is found to be filled with rubbish nearly ninety feet deep, near the south-west angle of the temple walls; and, at that place, the massive pavement is laid bare. At the same time, piers decreasing in size as they are found successively on the west toward Mt. Zion, and opposite the wall whence spring the arches of Dr. Robinson's "bridge," suggest that this so-called bridge may have been a steep, broad stairway, an "ascent" to the holy house from the ancient Xystus. A corresponding break in the wall is noticed by Tobler on the south-eastern side, over against the Kedron.

Beneath the temple area, the substructions of walls, piers, and massive arches, many of them as old as the days of Solomon, are found in perfect preservation. The subterranean passages, the stables of the Knights Templars, bearing the marks of the horses' hoofs, and the stairways from the south gate, now closed, were described.

The supply of water from Etham and the "upper pool" were alluded to, and the system of conduits and sewers in the ancient temple, with their cisterns, were illustrated as they are given by Ermets Pierotti, architect-engineer to Surraya, Pasha of Jerusalem.

The water supplies for the district of Ophel, the towers over the "Virgin's pool" and Siloam, and the proofs that Mt. Ophel, rather than Mt. Zion, was the site of Solomon's palace, were other points touched upon. Some facts were added which may have weight in deciding as to the course of the first and second walls of the city.

No further papers being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston on the 19th of May, 1869.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Prof. Theophilus Parsons, LL.D., of Cambridge, Mass.  
 Prof. Edward J. Young, of Cambridge, Mass.  
 Rev. Kinsley Twining, of Cambridge, Mass.  
 Col. Thomas W. Higginson, of Newport, R. I.  
 Prof. Frederic Gardiner, D.D., of Middletown, Conn.  
 Mr. Francis P. Nash, of New York.  
 Prof. George L. Cary, of Meadville, Pa.

and the transfer, from the list of Corresponding to that of Honorary Members, of the names of Hermann Brockhaus, Gustav Flügel, Adalbert Kuhn, Max Müller, John Muir, Adolphe Regnier, Ernest Renan, Rudolf Roth, Friedrich Spiegel, Constantin Tischendorf, and Albrecht Weber. These recommendations were, by ballot and vote, duly accepted and adopted by the Society.

The Corresponding Secretary called attention to the decease within the year of two of the Corporate Members, Rev. Swan L. Pomroy, D.D., of Portland, Me., and Prof. John J. Owen, D.D., of New York, for many years a Director of the Society. Dr. Proudfit, being called upon, paid an appropriate tribute to the character of Dr. Owen.

The correspondence of the past six months was laid upon the table, and extracts from it were read. Of most interest were a letter from Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, of London, in reference to Bell's system of "Visible Speech" (criticised in a communication presented to the Society at the preceding annual meeting: see the Proceedings of that meeting), expressing and explaining his high opinion of the system; and a letter from Prof. B. Jülg, of Innsbruck (in the Tyrol), from which the following is an extract:

"In 1866 I published (at Brockhaus's in Leipzig) the Tales of the Siddhi-Kür in the Kalmuck language, and, in 1868 (at Wagner's, Innsbruck) the supplementary tales to the Siddhi-Kür and the History of Arji-Borji-Chân in Mongolian. Although I received from the Vienna Academy a subsidy toward the expense of publication, I was obliged to add a very considerable sum out of my own pocket, which can only be covered by sale of the volumes. Of scholars interested in this special department there are but few, and the sale is almost exclusively to the larger libraries, so that I am very far from being reimbursed as yet. Hardly a copy has hitherto gone to America; and I beg that you will use your influence to have at least the original edition in Kalmuck and Mongolian procured by one and another College or University or other public library, where philological studies are pursued."

The Corresponding Secretary commended the works in question to the attention of the members present, as contributions of great and acknowledged importance to an interesting and little cultivated branch of linguistics.

The following gentlemen were next chosen by ballot, upon nomination of a special committee appointed for the purpose, as officers of the Society for the ensuing year:

*President*—Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D., of New Haven.  
*Vice-Presidents* { Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D.D., " Boston.  
 { Hon. PETER PARKER, M.D., " Washington.  
 { Prof. EDW. E. SALISBURY, LL.D., " New Haven.  
*Corresp. Secretary*—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, Ph.D., " New Haven.



<i>Sec. of Class. Section</i> —	Prof. JAMES HADLEY, LL.D.,	“ New Haven.
<i>Recording Secretary</i> —	EZRA ABBOT, LL.D.,	“ Cambridge.
<i>Treasurer</i> —	Prof. D. C. GILMAN,	“ New Haven.
<i>Librarian</i> —	Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	“ New Haven.
<i>Directors</i>	Mr. A. I. COTHEAL,	“ New York.
	Prof. W. W. GOODWIN, Ph.D.,	“ Cambridge.
	Prof. W. H. GREEN, D.D.,	“ Princeton.
	Prof. A. P. PEABODY, D.D.,	“ Cambridge.
	Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,	“ Boston.
	Prof. JOHN PROUDFIT, D.D.,	“ New York.
	Prof. CHARLES SHORT, LL.D.,	“ New York.

The following communications were then presented:

1. On Early Inventions of the Chinese; by Rev. Prof. W. A. P. Martin, of Peking.

Dr. Martin spoke of the various inventions, or discoveries, or applications of the resources of nature, in which China has preceded the rest of mankind, and the knowledge of which has, either demonstrably or probably, found its way to the western world from China. He first referred to tea, as an important contribution to human comfort, and the chief staple of a commerce which has led to important political results. Porcelain and silk were made only in China, until Europe learned to rival or surpass its teachers in these arts. Gunpowder is probably Chinese. The discovery of America is in a double sense owing to China, as the wealth of Cathay attracted Columbus westward, and the magnetic needle, which had been used in China for more than two thousand years, directed his course. Paper-making the Chinese invented in the first century of our era, and printing at least eight hundred years before its reinvention in Germany. Inoculation for the small-pox they had long practised before Europe learned it from the Turks, to whom it had probably found its way from the extreme East. And alchemy, the forerunner of chemistry, was pursued in China, before the Christian era, for the same objects which the early alchemists learned from the Arabs to seek after. The Chinese of the present day have ceased to invent; and while, a few centuries ago, they were in advance of all the rest of the world in the arts of civilized life, they are now, simply by having ceased to progress, as far behind the most civilized nations. Their stagnation is to be in the main attributed to their reverence for ancient times, their absorption in the study of language, literature, and antiquity, with consequent neglect of physical science, and the absence of Christianity.

2. On a Hebrew MS. of the Pentateuch, from the Jewish Congregation at Kai-fung-fu in China, by Mr. John W. Barrow of New York; presented by Dr. Martin.

This is a synagogue roll, written on 112 skins of white leather, in 237 columns, of 49 lines each; it measures 143 feet in length. The skins are in two or three places put together in the wrong order, and one passage, from Exodus xxxviii. 18 to Leviticus i. 6, is wanting. They are generally in good condition, but a little water-stained. The character is clear and legible, though not elegant, and approaches the Spanish type. The text is the Masoretic, and the deviations from the received text are almost entirely mere errors in spelling. The original of which this is a representation must evidently have been of European and comparatively modern origin.

In the 26th chapter of Davidson's "Biblical Criticism" (ed. 1866, pp. 366-70), reference is made to the collation of another synagogue roll from the same source, with similar results. Dr. Lee, in the "Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Londinensia Minora," gives extracts from Koegler's "Notitiæ S.S. Bibliorum Judæorum in Imperio Sinensi" (Halle, 1805), in which the Kai-fung-fu manuscripts are discussed.

Appended to Mr. Barrow's paper was a detailed conspectus of the various readings of the MS. in question, as compared with the received text.



After reading this paper, Dr. Martin gave, by request, an account of his journey to Kai-fung-fu, his intercourse with the remnants of the Jewish colony there (from whom he obtained the roll forming the subject of the paper), and the conditions in which they now exist.

3. On Ophir and Sheba, by Prof. Joseph W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass.

Prof. Jenks detailed the instances of occurrence in the Bible of the word *Ophir*, with their different orthography, and with their varying representation in the Septuagint. He briefly stated the views which had been put forward respecting the position of the country; and he proposed to harmonize their discordance by assuming that the Hebrew-Syrian fleet of Hiram and Solomon sailed through the Red Sea to rendezvous at some port of southern Arabia; that it there separated, a part going eastward to India, and a part southward to Zanguebar and Mozambique; and that, re-assembling in due time, and adding the valuable articles of traffic of Arabia itself, it returned to Eziongeber laden with the products of three countries. Sheba was claimed to be the region on both sides of the straits of Babelmandeb.

4. On Prehistoric Nations, by Rev. Ebenezer Burgess, of South Franklin, Mass.

This communication was mainly a defense of the current views of ancient history and chronology, founded on the Bible. It opposed especially the opinions of Mr. J. D. Baldwin, as set forth in his recent work entitled "Prehistoric Nations" (New York, 1869).

5. On the Hill-People of Kamaon, India, by Rev. J. T. Gracey, Missionary of the Methodist Board in Central India.

Mr. Gracey explained that what he had to say referred to the general population of the province of Kamaon, not to the Bhotiyas of the mountain passes, nor to such exceptional tribes as the Nathas. These people appeared to be destitute of legends or traditions accounting for their origin. They acknowledge but three castes, Brahmans, Rajputs, and a low degraded class called Doms. Among their peculiar customs is a game called *patharânû*, 'stoning,' in which two parties, of about two hundred each, pelt one another with stones, in a valley between hills, which are crowded with spectators; the players defending their heads by aid of a brass-studded skin shield. Polyandry is said to have prevailed formerly, but is now replaced by polygamy, and the marriage-tie is a very loose one. Among the divinities worshipped in the Hills are Goêl and Sêm, and the goddess Nainî. Mr. Gracey gave some details respecting their worship, and related legends told of them. The people have an excessive dread of ghosts; those residing in the mountain passes are propitiated by the sacrifice of a bit of the clothing of each one who goes by.

A vocabulary of about two hundred words from the language of the hill-people of Kamaon, with their equivalents in Hindustani, was subjoined to the paper.

6. On the Competitive Examination-System in China, by Rev. Dr. Martin.

After briefly referring to the practical importance of his subject, and its bearing upon the question of an improved civil service in the United States, Dr. Martin began with speaking of the completeness and elaboration of the Chinese system, of the success with which it attained its object, the drawing in of the ablest minds of the empire to the service of the State, of the general capacity and culture of the mandarin class, and of the essential democracy of a constitution which neither recognized a hereditary aristocracy, nor left offices to be filled by the favorites of the Emperor or his representatives. The origin of the system is referred to the time of Shun (about B. C. 2200), who examined his officers every third year, for promotion or degradation. Under the Chau dynasty (about B.C. 1100), candidates for office, as well as officers, were examined in the six arts of music, archery, horsemanship, writing, arithmetic, and social and public etiquette. About the beginning





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



**Proceedings at New Haven, October 21st and 22d, 1869.**

The Society assembled for its autumn meeting on Thursday, October 21st, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair.

After the reading of the minutes, the Committee of Arrangements gave notice that they had accepted on behalf of the Society an invitation from the Secretary of the Classical Section, Prof. Hadley, to take tea and hold the evening session at his house. On motion, their action in the matter was approved.

The Directors announced that they had appointed the next Annual Meeting to be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 18th, 1870, and had designated Mr. J. S. Ropes, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, as Committee of Arrangements for the meeting.

They also recommended for election as members of the Society: to Corporate membership,

Rev. Mytton Maury, of Cold Spring, N. Y.

Mr. Nathaniel Paine, of Worcester, Mass.

Rev. William H. Ward, of New York.

Rev. Joseph K. Wight, of New Hamburg, N. Y.

to Corresponding membership,

Rev. Joseph Edkins, Missionary in China.

Rev. John T. Gracey, Missionary in Central India.

The gentlemen thus recommended were elected without dissent.

The Directors also informed the Society that, by a disastrous fire which occurred in the printing office of Messrs. Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, on the 21st September last, all the undistributed part of the edition of the half-volume of *Journal* just published (vol. ix. No. 1), along with the extra copies of the *Tâittirîya-Prâtiçâkhya*, had been destroyed. The Committee of Publication was now authorized by them to proceed to reprint the work and replace the loss, as soon as should be found convenient: the expense would be, it was expected, not far from two-thirds covered by an insurance of five hundred dollars which had been taken upon the Society's property in the building burnt.

Extracts from the correspondence of the past half-year were read by the Corresponding Secretary; among others, the following:

From Prof. G. Seyffarth, Dansville, N. Y., June 26th, 1869:

" . . . . I am about to publish a work entitled "*Clavis Aegyptiaca*: collection of all bilingual and some other hieroglyphic inscriptions, translated and explained. With the syllabic alphabet in hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic characters, and with glossaries and indexes." This volume will contain thirty-four inscriptions, of which the famous one found in the ruins of Pompeii, on the altar in the temple of Isis, will interest the Italians."



From the Rev. J. Perkins, D.D., Chicopee, Mass, Oct. 9th, 1869 :

“ . . . . . I am sorry to be obliged to report myself as confined to my room by protracted sickness, and not even able to use a pen. . . . By another hand I send you two manuscripts, which I beg you to present to the Society's attention at your convenience. They are a brief grammar and vocabulary of the Kurdish language, prepared by the late lamented Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, one of your corresponding members. He had commenced copying the grammar for you before his death. Of Mr. Rhea you already know something. He was one of the most gifted men of all our missionaries. He resided eight years in Kurdistan, a much longer time than any other civilized man ever lived in the country; and, while he made the Nestorians and their language the objects of his special attention, he yet freely mingled with the Kurds also during the whole period. Yet it is to be presumed that Mr. Rhea would not claim for his grammar and vocabulary any merits beyond those of the briefest epitome of the language. I would present these manuscripts to the Oriental Society in the name of his widow. . . . . I hope in a few weeks to send you a copy of an admirable memoir of Mr. Rhea [by Rev. D. W. Marsh].”

Mr. Rhea's manuscripts here spoken of were laid before the Society later in the meeting.

From Mr. William Gamble, Superintendent of the Presbyterian Mission Press at Shanghai, dated May 18th, 1869 :

“I shipped by the American Mail of March 20th two boxes of type for you, being the Chinese font ordered some time since for the American Oriental Society. Of the fund collected by Dr. Bradley there will still remain in your hands a considerable balance after paying for what are now sent. If you wish still to expend it in Chinese type, I would advise that, instead of having a larger font, you purchase the matrices for the more common sorts. In this way your font would be much more serviceable, if you wished to use it in printing. The great difficulty in printing Chinese with moveable type comes from our constantly running out of sorts. The total number of different characters in the font is 6000 full body, and 1500 primitives and radicals, which will by combination make a total of nearly 25,000 different characters. The type are in the cases, which are well packed in the boxes, and all you will have to do is to get a small cabinet made for the cases, and slip them into it according as they are numbered. . . . The Chinese and Japanese are commencing to use our method of printing to some extent.”

The Secretary explained that the font procured was one of small pica size, recently cut at Shanghai under the direction of Mr. Gamble himself, and highly approved both by Chinese and foreigners for the beauty and delicacy of its style, and its convenience of practical use with English type.\*

He was obliged to add that the packing had proved insufficient, and that the boxes had come to hand with most of the cases broken, and their contents in a state of *pi*, so that the font was not for the moment in condition to be used. The Directors have authorized such expenditure as should be required in order to restore its serviceableness.

From Dr. W. F. A. Behrnauer, dated Dresden, April 7th, 1869 :

“I communicate herewith an account of the Arabic inscription found on the hippogriff of the Campo Santo at Pisa, with a rubbing made by my friend Dr. Detlefsen, during his studies, made in Italy at the end of 1859 and the beginning of 1860.”

Dr. Behrnauer refers to the interpretation of this inscription given by M. Marcel

---

\* The following is a specimen of it: 人之初性本善



in 1839, in the *Journal Asiatique*, and characterizes it as hardly satisfactory. Lanci's plate, in his "Trattato delle simboliche rappresentanze Arabiche" (Paris, 1845, 4to, vol. ii., pp. 54, 154), is more accurate than Marcel's, but his explanation is also not to be approved: such is the opinion of Mr. Michel Amari, who gives a new reading of the inscription, copied by Dr. Behrnauer and translated as follows: "excellent benediction and high favor, perfect prosperity without envy, and perpetual wealth and unalterable health and happiness, and revenue not diminished for its possessor." Dr. Behrnauer quotes from De Morrona ("Pisa illustrata," Pisa, 1787, vol. i., p. 190-195) some account of the monument. It is  $1\frac{3}{4}$  metres (about five feet) high, and  $1\frac{1}{8}$  metres (a little over three feet) broad. It is said to have been found under ground while the foundations of the cathedral of Pisa were laid; and was placed as an ornament upon the point of the gable of the cathedral, where it remained until the beginning of the present century. It was somewhat damaged by musket-balls, fired at it while in that position.

The inscription of this monument has a great resemblance to the other legendary texts which are to be found on monuments of metal, on bowls and on vases, and the like.

The Corresponding Secretary also exhibited a copper fac-simile (electrotyped) of a supposed block-tin coin, stated to have been found, a foot and a half below the surface, at a place in Vermillion Co., Indiana, surrounded by forests but in the neighborhood of so-called "Aztec" mounds; and supposed to be a relic of the "mound-builders." It belongs at present to Mr. John Collett, of Eugene, Vermillion Co., Ind., who is desirous of having its true character determined. The characters on the coin were evidently Arabic, and several gentlemen present, practically familiar with Eastern coins, had no doubt of its being a quite modern Arabic coin, although no one was able to make out the legend. It was generally pronounced to belong to a class of spurious relics of which the West has been somewhat prolific of late.

Communications were now called for, and the following were presented:

1. On a Set of Ancient Chinese Scrolls, containing representations of early Emperors and other distinguished characters, by Dr. Peter Parker, of Washington, D. C.

These scrolls purport to be fac-similes of stones engraved during the Han dynasty (ended A. D. 260). They represent Hwang-ti (alleged date, B. C. 2596), Chuen-heuh Kaou-yang, son of Chang-i and grandson of Hwang-ti (B. C. 2400), Fuh-hi, the inventor of writing, and Tsang-tsing (B. C. 3254), Chuh-tsong, Shin-nung the Divine husbandman (B. C. 3114), Te-yaou (B. C. 2330), the illustrious, "benevolent as heaven, wise as god, whom the people approached as the sun, and looked up to as the clouds," and various other worthies celebrated in the annals of China.

Dr. Parker gave a partial explanation of the contents of the scrolls. The fac-similes are highly valued by the Chinese, and their treatment serves to illustrate the zeal and cleverness of Chinese antiquarians. Scores of the latter have expended study upon them, with results which are recorded on the scrolls, each comment being dated, and having the signature and the seal of its author affixed. The original inscriptions are in part so effaced by time that only portions of the characters remain; but from these the reading has been restored and the sense determined.

A set of the scrolls was presented to the Society by Dr. Parker, who proposed to furnish later a complete translation of their contents, with notes.

2. On the Algonkin name *Manit* or *Manitou*, sometimes translated 'Great Spirit' and 'God,' by Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



cided value here; and the collection and working up of it, in the leisure of a laborious life, was an evidence of scholarly taste and devotedness on the part of Mr. Rhea which was highly creditable to him, and could not but add to our sorrow for his early death.

#### 4. Recent Archæological Explorations and Discoveries in Asia Minor, by Rev. H. J. Van Lennep, Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Asiatic Turkey.

Dr. Van Lennep gave a summary account of some of the results of his own explorations in Asia Minor, mentioning at the same time that most of them would be found more fully described and illustrated in a forthcoming work of his, entitled "Travels in Asia Minor," now in process of publication (by Murray, London).

He spoke first of the remains of a very ancient fort on the top of a mountain which is called Star mountain (*Yıldız Dag*h). Strabo describes a mountain by this same name, asserting that the most valuable treasures of King Mithridates were kept in the castle at its summit, and that it was taken by the Romans. Dr. Van Lennep pronounced Strabo's description to apply closely to this mountain, as regards both its situation and its character. Two streams gush forth high upon its side and flow not far apart; when they reach the base, they turn in opposite directions, pass completely around the mountain, and, uniting on the other side, form what is still called the Star river. The mountain lies between Tocat and Sivas, and the fort is more than eight thousand feet above the level of the Black Sea. It commands a view as far as that sea on the north, and Mt. Argens on the south.

Referring to the sculptures on Yazili Kayah (near the ancient Pterium, one day's journey north of Yuzghat), Dr. Van Lennep assented to Texier's explanation of them, as representing the introduction of the worship of Astarte into Phrygia; but claimed that the youth behind the goddess, whom Texier calls simply a prince, must be recognized as the Cupid of the Greeks. Mr. Layard had equally failed to recognize the child-god in the procession he copies from the carvings at Nineveh. Dr. Van Lennep supported his view by a gem recently obtained by him in Asia Minor, on which is cut an intaglio figure of the Assyrian Astarte, with the three-pointed crown on her head and the star and crescent moon on either side; while behind her, on a chair, sits a child, who is none other than Cupid. This gem was pronounced to be of Assyrian subject and Greek workmanship, pure Greek and Assyrian intaglios being exhibited to illustrate its character.

Next were described the remains of an unfinished Egyptian building at Euyuk, a day's journey north of Yazili Kayah. Its material is black granite, while Grecian monuments are usually of marble. Egyptian sphinxes stand on either side of the entrance, from which a line of sculptured stones extends to the right and left, as in other ancient monuments, both Assyrian and Egyptian. The sculptures seem to represent the erection of the building, and the festivities and ceremonies observed on the occasion. The bull Apis stands on a platform, and sacrifices of goats and oxen are offered to him by the king and queen. The features and hair of nearly all the figures are African.

Farther, the figure of Sesostris was spoken of, found carved on a ledge near the mouth of a pass through Mt. Tmolus, not far from the ancient road from Smyrna to Sardis. This is one of the two figures of the conqueror described by Herodotus.

Finally, Dr. Van Lennep described the interesting remains that lie around Smyrna; especially the old rubbish-heap of ancient Smyrna, where valuable remains are often brought to light by the rains. He spoke of the opening of several tombs of a very ancient date. He also exhibited to the Society various figures or fragments of figures in *terra cotta*, of the highest artistic merit, which had been found in those tombs or in the soil, and which appear to him to have been originally gilded, and to have represented the household divinities of the ancient Symrniotes.

#### 5. On a Chinese Tablet illustrating the religious opinions of the literary class, by Dr. D. B. McCartee, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board at Ningpo, China.

Dr. McCartee said that the scroll which he exhibited was interesting both as a very favorable specimen of Chinese calligraphy, and as showing the views held by



a large proportion of the literary men of China with reference to the popular religion. He went on to set forth briefly the peculiar religious condition of China, explaining that the Chinese as a nation, instead of being divided between the Confucian faith, Buddhism, and the doctrines of Lao-tse, really accept them all, having recourse always to the particular divinity or rite which is reputed to be serviceable in such matters as they happen to have in hand. It has been stated that the *literati*, or so-called Confucianists, do not worship idols; but this is an error, for the stellar gods Win-chang (Ursa major) and Kwei-sing (polar star) are worshipped by the literary class as such, and by them alone, as the speaker could testify from personal observation, having lived in a temple with these idols for more than a year.

The scroll exhibited was an impression or rubbing from a stone tablet erected in the *Ch'eng-Hwang Miau*, or 'Temple of the Tutelar Deity' of the *Wei-hien* or 'district city of Wei,' in the province of Shan-tung, China; and the inscription was in the handwriting of *Cheu Pan-k'iau*, the *Chi-hien* or magistrate of the district—a literary gentleman celebrated as a poet, a calligrapher, and a wit, whose "Remains," consisting of poems, pencil drawings, and epistolary writings, have gone through many editions in China. The sentiments expressed in this document clearly mark Mr. Cheu as a disciple of the school of Chu-hi, who may be said to have been the Comte of China. The inscription bears the date of the 17th year of Kien-lung, the 9th of the then current cycle (of 60 years), and the 5th moon (about June, A. D. 1752). Mr. Cheu commences by referring to the *Ki-lin*, the *fung* or phoenix, the serpent, and the dragon; to each of which are ascribed bodily members, and distinct personal characteristics. He then speaks of the heavens, as an azure vault, and the earth as a massive clod, and man as the being who, dwelling between heaven and earth, is characterized by certain bodily organs, the faculty of speech, a sense of propriety, etc. But, he asks, how can we suppose Heaven to possess bodily organs like man's, and ascribe to it a personal existence? He says that from the time of the Duke of Chou (B.C. 1130) the name "Supreme Ruler" (*Shang-ti*) has been applied to Heaven, and that the vulgar have styled it the "Gemmeous Emperor" (*Yuh-Hwang*), and invested it with bodily organs, clothing, regalia, and a personal existence; have made images of it, and accompanied them with retinues of followers; and that subsequent ages have regarded it with awe and reverence. He then speaks of the *Ch'eng*, or wall which surrounds every city, and of the *Hwang*, or moat which encircles it, and asks why people have personified these as a god, and attributed to this god power over life and death, and jurisdiction over happiness and misery, surrounding (its images) with awe-inspiring objects, so that not only the common people are struck with awe, but even he himself confesses that, on entering the dark recesses of its temple, his hair stands on end, and his frame shudders, as though he stood in the presence of a demon. He quotes an ancient sage who says "these things are what make the people seek to conciliate them" (i. e., the gods), and adds that, unless the ignorant populace have a desire to conciliate the gods, the officers could not trust them (nor control them). After describing the repairs that had been thought necessary, and the expense incurred in making them, and in suitably furnishing the temple, he adds that some might be disposed to question the necessity, or propriety, of expending several thousand ounces of silver in erecting a pavilion and stage for theatrical exhibitions; and asks "Can it be that there are gods who delight in theatrical exhibitions?" He quotes from an ancient tablet an account of a female musician who "delighted the gods" with her performances, and cites from the Book of Odes the following passage: "With lyres and harps and strokes of the drum, welcome the Lord of the Fields;" and then asks, "Is there really a Lord of the Fields? and does he really delight in lyres and harps? If so, who ever heard of him?" He then explains it as being simply the natural way in which people give expression to their gratitude to the gods. He expresses his approbation of this system of instructing (and ruling) the people, devised by the ancients; and says that, since people have sacrificed to the *Ch'eng-Hwang* (literally 'City Wall and Moat') as though it had a personal existence, why not please it with songs and dances? And as to theatrical representations, he thinks the theatre, as a school of morals, has conferred great benefits upon mankind. All that he would stipulate is that indecent and otherwise unsuitable plays should be prohibited. In summing up, he says that Fu-hi, Shen-nung, Hwang-ti, Yau, Shun, Yü, T'ang, Wen-wang, Wu-wang, the duke of Chou, and Confucius,



really did exist personally before they were deified, and there seems to be a propriety in sacrificing to them as though they (still) had a personal existence. But Heaven, earth, the sun, moon, wind, thunder, hills and streams, rivers and mountains, soil and grain, the wall and moat, the corners of the house, the well, and the fire-place, although they have been deified, have really no personal existence, and should not (properly or *per se*) be sacrificed to as though they had. Yet even the sages from the ancient times have all sacrificed to them, as though they really and personally existed; and he asks, do the deities of heaven enjoy the viands or make use of the utensils used in sacrificing to them? And he replies that, although the sounds, the colors, and the odors and tastes of things in heaven cannot be imitated, yet all these devices are but the modes of giving expression to the feelings of reverence and veneration which naturally arise in the human heart. Hence he concludes that the erection of a tablet to perpetuate the memory of the repairs made upon the Ch'eng-Hwang temple is not an affair of mere local or temporary interest, but is inseparably connected with the doctrines and ceremonial observances of remote antiquity; and since others (whose names he mentions) had liberally contributed funds to defray the expenses, he (the writer) could not be so parsimonious as to grudge a contribution of penmanship to the same object.

Dr. McCartee remarked in conclusion that he had often heard similar sentiments advanced by officers and *literati* in China, and it was interesting to observe that the wisest of that ancient nation gave such unequivocal assent to the doctrine that belief in a personal God, who will render to every man according to his work, is both a natural acting-out of the human heart, and absolutely requisite in order to secure good government.

Dr. McCartee further exhibited a set of very fine rubbings, taken from stone tablets set up in a Buddhist temple at Hangchow, and representing, nearly in life size, sixteen of the eighteen Lo-han (Sanskrit *arhant*), or personal attendants of Buddha. These rubbings he presented to the Society's collection.

## 6. On the Theory of the Greek Accent, by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven.

The Greeks distinguished one syllable in each word by sounding its vowel on a higher key: this higher key was represented by the acute accent. The ordinary lower key was not represented in writing. But when it followed the higher key on the same long vowel, it was represented by the grave accent, which then united with the acute to form the circumflex. And when a high-tone ultima, followed by other words in close connection, dropped down to a lower key, it was written with a grave accent instead of the acute. The melodic character of the Greek accent Prof. Hadley illustrated from Dionysius Halic. (*de Comp. Verb.*, 12), who calls the interval between the higher and lower keys a fifth (three tones and a semitone). That there was any difference in stress (or force of utterance) between accented and unaccented syllables, is not intimated by the ancient writers: that such difference, if it existed, cannot have been great, is made probable by the total disregard of accent in ancient verse. The question has been raised whether any distinction was made among the lower tones; whether there was any middle tone, intermediate between the highest and the lowest. Some ancient writers speak of a middle tone; but the statements are not so definite as could be wished. G. Hermann (*de emend. rat. gramm. Graec.*) recognized a middle tone in the grave accent where it takes the place of an acute on the ultima. G. Curtius (*Jahn's Jahrb.*, vol. 72) recognized it also in the grave accent where it forms part of the circumflex. Recently, F. Misteli (*Kuhn's Zeitsch.*, vol. 17), founding on the analogies of the Sanskrit accent, holds that the high tone (acute accent), where it was not final, was always followed by a middle tone. Prof. Hadley set forth a theory based on that of Misteli, but with additions and modifications of his own. In the undivided Indo-European, as in Sanskrit, there was no restriction on the place of the accent; it might fall on any syllable of the longest word. Hence the high tone with the following middle tone might be separated from the end of the word by a succession of low-tone syllables. If now there came to be a prevailing dislike for such a succession, an unwillingness to hear more than one low-tone syllable at the end of a word, the result would be to confine the accent to the last three syllables. This





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



that it sometimes follows both wholly or in part, but only in the rarest instances (except a limiting genitive) precedes them, and that he had observed only one case in which an adverb modifying an infinitive with the article stood before the article, and that in a suspected piece of Xenophon, the *Apologia*.

In his treatment of the prepositions, he had first given their position with reference to their regimen and then added an elaborate section on a perplexing subject, the omission and repetition of the preposition under various circumstances; and after setting forth the prevailing usage in simple cases, he had considered the complex cases, and shown that the latter could be resolved into the former. He has perhaps discovered a law here not previously observed.

Where various readings existed affecting the matter of order, he had given the variation under its appropriate head and subjoined the name of the Editor who adopted it, and the examples in connection with which such reading was given might be regarded as so much testimony on its behalf.

## 8. On Prof. Max Müller's Translation of the Rig-Veda, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Prof. Whitney said that not more than two or three other Sanskritists had studied the Veda so long and so deeply as Prof. Max Müller, or were in position to furnish so authoritative a version of it. Hence, scholars had been looking forward with eager expectation to his translation, promised many years ago, and of which the first volume has left the press this season. The work as published would not be found in all respects to fulfil the expectations they had formed. Though advertised as one of a series of eight volumes, it actually contains only one seventy-fifth of the Vedic text (12 hymns out of 1017). The bulk of the volume is filled with a variety of material, which, though much of it valuable in itself, would gladly have been spared. The author has taken as his model Burnouf's work on the Avesta. But the circumstances of the two cases are so different that the model is an ill-chosen one. Burnouf was breaking a path in an entirely new subject. His work was left a fragment, and never could have been made any thing else. Müller has undertaken an impracticable task, that of accounting for and establishing his version of every passage. How incomplete, and open to criticism in regard to proportion, it is, appears from the circumstance that to the first verse translated there is a note of eleven pages on an adjective meaning 'ruddy,' while the making of an accusative plural (or gen. or abl. sing.) the subject of a verb, and the assumption that the sun could be regarded as Indra's horse, were let pass without any remark—and so in other cases, which were pointed out in a detailed criticism of a few verses. To the extension of the work by including a romanized text of the original hymns themselves, and the detailed versions of other translators, objection was taken on the score of want of necessity: since such things can be of service only to a professed Vedic scholar, who must be presumed to possess them in another form. If Müller would give simply his own understanding of the meaning of the hymns, with limited exposition of especially difficult points, he would consult the interests not only of the public at large, but also of his fellow-students in the same department.

The selection of this particular body of hymns (those to the Maruts, or storm-gods) for inclusion in the first volume is unfortunate, since they are among the most obscure and tedious of the collection, and may repel from a study of the Veda some who would have been attracted by a more pleasing first taste.

On the score of his over-abundant introductory and expository matter, Müller claims that his is the "first translation" of the Veda: a claim which few will be ready to admit. Burnouf called his work a "commentary," not a translation, though he had no real predecessor; while Müller has to quote several, one of whom (Benfey) has worked upon the same basis and with the same principles as himself, although doubtless with less thorough preparation. To Müller's method no exceptions can be taken: he utterly discards the native commentators as authority, and founds his interpretation upon grammar, etymology, and the comparison of parallel passages. He is also perfectly fair and modest in estimating the value of the results reached by him; putting forward his version as only a provisional solution of its very difficult problem, and as sure to be superseded by and by, when longer study shall have brought a better comprehension of the whole Vedic antiquity.



9. Notes on a Surveying Trip from the Phenician Coast to the Euphrates River, by Mr. Henry M. Canfield, of South Britain, Conn.

Mr. Canfield had expected to be present at the meeting, and to give an oral account of his trip; but, being unavoidably kept away, he sent instead a brief paper, which was read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Canfield joined Col. Romer's party, engaged to survey a route for a railroad from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, in April, 1868. The line surveyed started at the mouth of El Kebir, and followed the road to Hamath nearly to the Nessariëh range. With some difficulty, a practicable route was found through the pass between the Nessariëh and the Lebanon, then across the beautiful fertile plain of the Beky'aa, through the Jebel Homs to Homs, and north-easterly over the desert to Selamiëh, the farthest outpost of civilization; then, after extensive exploration reaching as far as Aleppo and Palmyra, through the great Wady in Jebel Assouet nearly to the Euphrates at Sheik Omar or Balis; when difficulties with the Arab tribes put an end, for the time, to the enterprise.

Mr. Canfield describes the Nusairi inhabitants of the mountains and desert as a large-framed race, usually with light hair and brown eyes, laborious, but treacherous and inhospitable; and speaks of their semi-subterranean dwellings, of their customs and religion. He was unable to discover or learn how they dispose of their dead. He calls attention to the square towers, called by the Arabs *bourgh*, scattered across the whole country to the Euphrates; also to the numerous castles of the middle ages, of which the finest he saw is Kalat el Husn, at the north-western edge of the Beky'aa. This is so immense a structure that it is now inhabited by 5000 people. The desert country beyond Selamiëh is marked in places by groups of broken columns and heaps of ruins; at one point, west of the Orontes and east of Sherbt el-Humun, forming regular streets and squares over a space three miles long and two wide; deserted villages, in various styles of building, are also numerous.

A chief of the Ismaeliyëh was met with who had just returned from a trip to India; showing that the old *Assassins* have and maintain correspondence with some Indian sect.

Rev. Mr. Blodget, missionary at Peking, addressed the meeting briefly respecting the religion of the Chinese, and respecting the translation into Chinese of the word *God*.

After this (at one o'clock, Friday noon) the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston, on Wednesday, May 18th, 1870.



## LIST OF MEMBERS.

OCTOBER, 1869.

## 1. CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Names marked with † are those of Life Members.

EZRA ABBOT,	Cambridge.
Pres. CHARLES A. AIKEN,	Schenectady, N. Y.
Prof. WILLIAM F. ALLEN,	Madison, Wis.
Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON,	Boston.
Prof. WILLIAM P. ATKINSON,	Boston.
Rev. GEORGE B. BACON,	Orange, N. J.
JOHN D. BALDWIN,	Worcester, Mass.
†JOHN W. BARROW,	New York.
Prof. ELIJAH P. BARROWS,	Middletown, Conn.
JOHN R. BARTLETT,	Providence, R. I.
Rev. WILLIAM H. BENADE,	Pittsburg, Pa.
Prof. ALBERT S. BICKMORE,	Hamilton, N. Y.
CHARLES L. BRACE,	New York.
J. CARSON BREVOORT,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Prof. FISK P. BREWER,	Chapel Hill, N. C.
Rev. CHARLES H. BRIGHAM,	Ann Arbor, Mich.
C. ASTOR BRISTED,	New York.
†J. CARTER BROWN,	Providence, R. I.
Rev. NATHAN BROWN,	New York.
WILLIAM C. BRYANT,	New York.
Prof. HENRY C. CAMERON,	Princeton, N. J.
Pres. WILLIAM H. CAMPBELL,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. GEORGE L. CARY,	Meadville, Pa.
PLINY E. CHASE,	Philadelphia.
Prof. THOMAS CHASE,	West Haverford, Pa.
Rev. EDSON L. CLARK,	North Branford, Conn.
Rev. EDWARD L. CLARK,	New Haven.
JOSIAH CLARK,	Northampton, Mass.
Rev. NATHANIEL G. CLARK,	Boston.
Prof. EDWARD B. COE,	New Haven.
†JOSEPH G. COGSWELL,	Cambridge.
JOSHUA COIT,	New Haven.
Rev. HENRY M. COLTON,	New York.
ALEXANDER I. COTHEAL,	New York.
BRINTON COXE,	Philadelphia.
Rev. OLIVER CRANE,	Carbondale, Pa.
Prof. ALPHEUS CROSBY,	Salem, Mass.
Rev. HOWARD CROSBY,	New York.
†EDWARD CUNNINGHAM,	Shanghai, China.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



JOSEPH HOWLAND,	Fishkill, N. Y.
Rev. WILLIAM HUTCHISON,	Norwich, Conn.
Rev. WILLIAM IRVIN,	Troy, N. Y.
Prof. MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS,	Allegheny City, Pa.
†Prof. JOSEPH W. JENKS,	Newtonville, Mass.
Rev. SAMUEL JOHNSON,	Salem, Mass.
HENRY C. KINGSLEY,	New Haven.
WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY,	New Haven.
Rev. EDWARD N. KIRK,	Boston.
†HENRY LEIGHTON,	Shanghai, China.
†JAMES LENOX,	New York.
J. PETER LESLEY,	Philadelphia.
Prof. TAYLER LEWIS,	Schenectady, N. Y.
Prof. JAMES R. LOWELL,	Cambridge.
Rev. DWIGHT W. MARSH,	Whitney Point, N. Y.
Rev. MYTTON MAURY,	Cold Spring, N. Y.
Prof. CHARLES M. MEAD,	Andover, Mass.
Prof. JAMES C. MOFFAT,	Princeton, N. J.
CHARLES E. NORTON,	Cambridge.
†ROBERT M. OLYPHANT,	New York.
Prof. LEWIS R. PACKARD,	New Haven.
NATHANIEL PAINE,	Worcester, Mass.
Dr. PETER PARKER,	Washington.
Prof. THEOPHILUS PARSONS,	Cambridge.
Rev. WILLIAM PATTON,	New Haven.
Prof. ANDREW P. PEABODY,	Cambridge.
†GREGORY A. PERDICARIS,	Trenton, N. J.
Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,	Boston.
Pres. HENRY M. PIERCE,	New York.
Rev. THOMAS C. PITKIN,	Detroit, Mich.
ELISHA R. POTTER,	South Kingston, R. I.
Prof. JOHN PROUDFIT,	New York.
JOSEPH S. ROPES,	Boston.
D. WALDO SALISBURY,	Boston.
†Prof. EDWARD E. SALISBURY,	New Haven.
STEPHEN SALISBURY,	Worcester, Mass.
FRANK B. SANBORN,	Springfield, Mass.
Prof. M. SCHELE DE VERE,	University of Virginia.
Dr. ERNST SCHMID,	White Plains, N. Y.
Rev. HENRY M. SCUDDER,	San Francisco, Cal.
Prof. GUSTAV SEYFFARTH,	Dansville, N. Y.
Prof. CHARLES SHORT,	New York.
Dr. JOHN H. SLACK,	Philadelphia.
Rev. E. BAILEY SMITH,	Middletown, Conn.
†E. M. SMITH,	Shanghai, China.
†THOMAS C. SMITH,	Hongkong, China.
Gen ADOLF VON STEINWEHR,	New Haven.
Prof. AUSTIN STICKNEY,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. LYMAN STILSON,	Nunda, N. Y.



†WILLIAM W. STONE,	New York.
†RUSSELL STURGIS,	London, England.
LEONARD TAFEL,	St. Louis, Mo.
Prof. RUDOLPH L. TAFEL,	St. Louis, Mo.
†GEORGE W. TALBOT,	Shanghai, China.
JOHN TAPPAN,	Boston.
BAYARD TAYLOR,	New York.
SAMUEL H. TAYLOR,	Andover, Mass.
Prof. THOMAS A. THACHER,	New Haven.
Rev. JOSEPH P. THOMPSON,	New York.
CHARLES TRACY,	New York.
Rev. SELAH B. TREAT,	Boston.
J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,	Hartford, Conn.
Rev. KINSLEY TWINING,	Cambridge.
†J. T. TWOMBLY,	Shanghai, China.
ADDISON VAN NAME,	New Haven.
Rev. THOMAS E. VERMILYE,	Hartford, Conn.
†THOMAS WALSH,	Shanghai, China.
Rev. FERDINAND DEW. WARD,	Rochester, N. Y.
Rev. WILLIAM H. WARD,	New York.
ALBERT B. WATKINS,	Fairfield, N. Y.
FRANCIS WAYLAND,	New Haven.
Rev. EDWARD WEBB,	Glasgow, Del.
CHARLES E. WEST,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
WILLIAM A. WHEELER,	Boston.
Pres. ANDREW D. WHITE,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Dr. MOSES C. WHITE,	New Haven.
Prof. JOSIAH D. WHITNEY,	Cambridge.
Prof. WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,	New Haven.
Rev. JAMES M. WHITON,	Lynn, Mass.
Rev. JOSEPH K. WIGHT,	New Hamburg, N. Y.
LYMAN R. WILLISTON,	Cambridge.
Dr. JOSEPH WILSON, U. S. N.	
Prof. SAMUEL J. WILSON,	Allegheny City, Pa.
Rev. GEORGE W. WOOD,	New York.
Pres. THEODORE D. WOOLSEY,	New Haven.
Prof. EDWARD J. YOUNG,	Cambridge.
CHARLES W. ZAREMBA,	St. Joseph, Mich.



## 2. CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Rev. JOHN C. ADAMSON.	
Prof. GRAZIADIO I. ASCOLI,	Milan.
Rev. JOHN G. AUER,	Missionary at Cape Palmas, W. Africa.
ADOLF BASTIAN,	Berlin.
Rev. CEPHAS BENNETT,	Missionary at Rangoon, Burmah.
Rev. WILLIAM A. BENTON,	Missionary at Bhamdun, Syria.
OTTO BLAU,	Serajewo, Bosnia.
WILLIAM H. I. BLEEK,	Capetown, S. Africa.
Rev. DANIEL BLISS,	Beirut.
Rev. HENRY BLODGET,	Missionary at Peking.
JOHN P. BROWN,	Constantinople.
Rev. SAMUEL R. BROWN,	Missionary in Japan.
Prof. HEINRICH BRUGSCH,	Göttingen.
Rev. ALBERT BUSHNELL,	Missionary at the Gaboon, W. Africa.
Rev. SIMEON H. CALHOUN,	Missionary at Abeih, Syria.
Rev. WILLIAM CLARK,	Milan.
HYDE CLARKE,	London.
Prof. EDWARD B. COWELL,	Cambridge, England.
Dr. BHAO DAJI,	Bombay.
Rev. CHARLES H. A. DALL,	Missionary at Calcutta.
Prof. AUGUST DILLMANN,	Berlin.
Prof. D. STUART DODGE,	Beirut.
Rev. JACOB L. DOEHNE,	Missionary in South Africa.
Rev. JOSEPH EDKINS,	Missionary in China.
Rev. ROMEO ELTON,	Exeter, England.
Prof. PHILIPPE ED. FOUCAUX,	Paris.
Dr. S. FRAENKEL,	Jerusalem.
Rev. JOHN T. GRACEY,	Missionary in Central India.
Rev. CYRUS HAMLIN,	Constantinople.
Prof. CHRISTIAN A. HOLMBOE,	Christiania, Norway.
Dr. SAMUEL R. HOUSE,	Missionary at Bangkok, Siam.
Rev. HENRY H. JESSUP,	Missionary at Abeih, Syria.
Rev. J. W. JOHNSON,	Missionary at Swatow, China.
Prof. MIRZA KASEM BEG,	St. Petersburg.
NICHOLAS VON KHANIKOFF,	Paris.
L. LEON DE ROSNY,	Paris.
Dr. DANIEL J. MCGOWAN.	
Prof. WILLIAM A. P. MARTIN,	Peking.
Rev. FRANCIS MASON,	Missionary at Toungoo, Burmah.
Prof. COTTON MATHER,	London.
Dr. D. B. MCCARTEE,	Missionary at Ningpo, China.
THOMAS T. MEADOWS.	
Dr. A. D. MORDTMANN,	Constantinople.
Dr. A. G. PASPATI,	Constantinople.
Bishop JOHN PAYNE,	Missionary at Cape Palmas, W. Africa.
Dr. ANDREW T. PRATT,	Missionary at Constantinople.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



## 3. HONORARY MEMBERS.

RAJA APURVA KRISHNA BAHADUR,	Calcutta.
JAMES BIRD,	London.
Prof. OTTO BOEHTLINGK,	Jena.
Sir JOHN BOWRING,	London.
Prof. HERMANN BROCKHAUS,	Leipzig.
RICHARD CLARKE,	London.
Prof. HEINRICH VON EWALD,	Göttingen.
M. CHAMPOLLION FIGEAC,	Paris.
Prof. GUSTAV FLUEGEL,	Dresden.
Prof. JULIUS FUERST,	Leipzig.
BRIAN HOUGHTON HODGSON,	Dursley, England.
Prof. STANISLAS JULIEN,	Paris.
Prof. ADALBERT KUHN,	Berlin.
Rev. JOHN DUNMORE LANG.	
Prof. CHRISTIAN LASSEN,	Bonn.
Prof. C. RICHARD LEPSIUS,	Berlin.
Prof. JULES MOHL,	Paris.
JOHN MUIR,	Edinburgh.
Prof. MAX MUELLER,	Oxford.
Prof. JULIUS HEINRICH PETERMANN,	Berlin.
Prof. AUGUST FRIEDRICH POTT,	Halle.
ADOLPHE REGNIER,	Paris.
ERNEST RENAN,	Paris.
Prof. EMIL ROEDIGER,	Berlin.
Prof. RUDOLF ROTH,	Tübingen.
SAFVET PASHA,	Constantinople.
Prof. FRIEDRICH SPIEGEL,	Erlangen.
Prof. GARCIN DE TASSY,	Paris.
Prof. CONSTANTIN TISCHENDORF,	Leipzig.
Prof. CARL J. TORNBERG,	Lund.
Prof. ALBRECHT WEBER,	Berlin.
Sir J. GARDNER WILKINSON,	London.
His Majesty PHRA-PARAMENDR MAHA MONGKUT, King of Siam.	



**Proceedings at Boston, May 18th, 1870.**

THE Society assembled at 10 o'clock A. M., at the rooms of the American Academy. President Woolsey being absent, the chair was occupied alternately by Dr. Anderson and Dr. Parker, Vice-Presidents.

The record of the preceding meeting was read by the Recording Secretary. It was arranged that there should be a recess of only one hour at noon, that the business of the meeting might be finished before evening.

The Treasurer's Report was read, audited, and accepted. It was as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$357.53
Annual assessments paid in,	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$515.00	
Life-membership,	-	-	-	-	-	-	75.00	
Sale of the Journal,	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.75	
							<hr/>	
Total receipts of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	608.75
								<hr/>
								\$966.28

EXPENDITURES.

Printing of Proceedings, etc.,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$43.24
Expenses of Library and Correspondence,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40.64
Paid for binding of books,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.25
								<hr/>
Total expenditures of the year,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 85.13
Balance on hand, May 18th, 1870,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	881.15
								<hr/>
								\$966.28

The Treasurer also made a statement respecting the condition of the fund for the purchase of Chinese type, provided by the kind offices of the late Hon. Charles W. Bradley. The arrival of the font ordered from Shanghai was reported at the last meeting. Its cost was as follows:

For type (180 lbs, small pica),	-	-	-	-	\$324.00
Type-cases,	-	-	-	-	12.00
Packing, freight, and insurance,	-	-	-	-	22.00
Premium on \$358 in Mexican dollars,	-	-	-	-	136.79
Expenses in New York, duty, cartage, etc.,	-	-	-	-	75.00
					<hr/>
Total expense,	-	-	-	-	\$569.79

To meet this, the Treasurer had drawn on Messrs. Baring, Brothers, & Co., of London, with whom the fund was deposited by Mr. Bradley, for £100, which yielded in currency \$670.08. The balance, about \$100, is deposited in the Townsend Savings Bank at New Haven to the credit of the fund, and about £92 still remains in the hands of Messrs. Barings.



The Librarian excused himself, on the score of other pressing occupations, for having come unprepared with a full Report of the condition of the Library, and gave a brief oral statement respecting the additions made to it during the year. The most important donations had come from the Vienna Academy of Sciences, and from Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall of London.

The Committee of Publication reported that, as authorized by the Directors last fall, they had commenced the reprinting of Vol. ix., Part 1, of the Journal, as soon as the printing office had been restored to working order after the fire; and that the work had since gone on without interruption, but was not yet quite finished. It was intended to proceed with the printing of Part 2, as soon as the other should be out of the way.

The Directors notified the next meeting, as to be held in New Haven on the nineteenth of October, unless the Committee of Arrangements (Prof. Hadley of New Haven, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries) should alter the appointment—which they were authorized to do, if it appeared desirable.

The following persons, on recommendation of the Directors, were elected members of the Society: namely,  
as Corporate Members,

Mr. Erastus B. Bigelow, of Boston.  
Prof. Ferdinand Bôcher, of Boston.  
Prof. J. Lewis Diman, of Providence, R. I.  
Mr. James B. Greenough, of Cambridge, Mass.  
Mr. Thomas S. Perry, of Cambridge, Mass.  
Mr. Charles T. Russell, of Cambridge, Mass.  
Rev. J. Herbert Senter, of Cambridge, Mass.  
Prof. Peter H. Steenstra, of Cambridge, Mass.  
Prof. Francis Wharton, D.D., of Brookline, Mass.  
Rev. Henry A. Yardley, of Middletown, Conn.

as Corresponding Members,

Rev. Albert L. Long, D.D., Missionary at Constantinople.  
Rev. Hyman A. Wilder, Missionary in South Africa.

Mr. J. S. Ropes of Boston, Rev. W. H. Ward of New York, and Hon. J. D. Baldwin of Worcester, were appointed by the chair a Nominating Committee, to propose a ticket for officers for the ensuing year; and the following gentlemen, nominated by them, were elected without dissent:

<i>President</i>	—Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D.,	of New Haven.	
<i>Vice-Presidents</i>	{	Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D.D.,	“ Boston.
		Hon. PETER PARKER, M.D.,	“ Washington.
		Prof. EDW. E. SALISBURY, LL.D.,	“ New Haven.
<i>Corresp. Secretary</i>	—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, Ph.D.,	“ New Haven.	
<i>Secr. of Class. Section</i>	—Prof. JAMES HADLEY, LL.D.,	“ New Haven.	
<i>Recording Secretary</i>	—Mr. EZRA ABBOT, LL.D.,	“ Cambridge.	
<i>Treasurer</i>	—Prof. D. C. GILMAN,	“ New Haven.	
<i>Librarian</i>	—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY,	“ New Haven.	





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



see it eat while I was near. The common people fear its power greatly, and dare not look at it, as they say it has power to blind their eyes. The traditions of most of the Karen tribes point to this tablet, I think, and it may be of very ancient origin. The character in which it is written is quite different from any of the characters in which the languages of the East are written, so far as I have been able to learn."

A copy of the inscription was exhibited to the members present, but no one could cast any light upon its strange characters. The Secretary said that he was hoping to obtain additional information upon the matter from Farther India, to be laid before the Society hereafter. The plate is one referred to in Mr. Cross's paper on the Karens and their language, read at the meeting in October, 1866, and reported in the Proceedings of that meeting (Journal, vol. ix., p. xii.).

From Rev. C. H. A. Dall, dated Calcutta, Nov. 27th, 1869:

"In Bombay, lately, I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Bhau Daji at the monthly meeting of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and was surprised to hear him say that within a year or so, or as soon as his practice (as a physician) would permit, he expected to visit England and America. I am not very sorry that you are likely to see, yet sooner, Babu Keshub Chunder Sen; of whom you have heard as the eloquent leader of the partly christianized Hindus, the *Brahmos*. He does not feel settled as to the American part of his visit; but, when calls reach him, as they are sure to do, he will yield to the pressure, and accomplish a visit which I am very desirous that he should make. The presence of these two cultured Oriental gentlemen will, I am sure, make Orientalism dawn on America as never before."

From Mrs. S. J. Rhea, dated Jonesboro, Tennessee, Dec. 5th, 1869; respecting her late husband's Kurdish papers, presented at the previous meeting, giving some explanations as to their character, and expressing her desire to be helpful in any way toward their publication.

From Dr. A. T. Pratt, dated Constantinople, March 16th, 1870:

". . . . I procured a fine copy of a Cufic inscription some time since and sent it to you; but, together with a valuable lot of coins, it was lost on the way. I am now hoping to send you the stone itself in the course of the summer. . . . I have a grammar of the Turkish language of my own, which I hope to forward as soon as I can get an English translation to go with it. During nearly two years past I have been here, engaged on the revision of the version of the Bible made by Dr. Goodell.

Dr. Paspati is getting out a large work on the Gypsy language, of which I presume you will receive a copy."

Communications being now in order, the following were presented:

1. On the Glagolitic Alphabet, by Rev. A. L. Long, of Constantinople; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

This was an inquiry into the origin of the Glagolitic character, in which a part of the oldest Slavic literature is preserved, and into its relation to the more usual character, the Cyrillitic. Of the two, the Cyrillitic is usually ascribed to the Slavic apostle Cyril, who used it for his translation of the Scriptures (about A.D. 862); respecting the other, opinions have been much divided, some attributing its invention to Methodius, Cyril's brother, others to Clement, archbishop of Velitsa in Bulgaria, and pupil of Cyril and Methodius; while yet others regard it as some centuries older than Cyril, and many accept the Dalmatian traditions which would make St. Jerome its inventor. Dr. Long, now, differing from all these, maintains that



the Glagolitic was the alphabet devised by Cyril, and was exclusively used in his time, while the so-called Cyrillitic, which is no independent invention, but only an adaptation of the Greek alphabet to the Slavic language, was the work of Clement (who died A.D. 916). The various considerations which appear to support this view are detailed in the paper. At the end, the author acknowledges his obligations to P. J. Schaffarik's work "On the Origin and Home of Glagolitic" (Prague, 1858).

Remarks upon this paper, approving its conclusions, were made by Mr. J. S. Ropes.

2. On the Moabite Inscription of King Mesha, by Rev. Wm. Hayes Ward, of New York.

Mr. Ward first detailed the history of the securing of the inscription by M. Ganneau, from the first discovery of the monument by the German Klein. After showing that it was undoubtedly genuine, and dated back to nearly nine hundred years before Christ, Mr. Ward laid before the meeting a transliterated copy of it in Hebrew characters, and the following translation :

<sup>1</sup> I am Mesha son of Chemosh [nadab] King of Moab [the D-] <sup>2</sup> ibonite. | My father reigned over Moab thirty years and I reigned <sup>3</sup> after my father. | And I made this high place to Chemosh in Karhah and [this House of Sal-] <sup>4</sup> vation because he has saved me from all the attacks and because he has caused me to look on all my enemies. | O [m r] i <sup>5</sup> was King of Israel, and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his [land]. | <sup>6</sup> And his son succeeded him, and he also said, "I will afflict Moab." | In my days he spake thus, <sup>7</sup> And I looked on him and on his house, | and Israel kept continually perishing. And Omri held possession of the land (?) of <sup>8</sup> Medeba. And there dwelt in it [Omri and his son and his grand-] son forty years. [But] <sup>9</sup> Chemosh [restored] it in my days. | And I built Baal-Meon and I made in it ————. And I [besieged] (?) <sup>10</sup> Kirjathaim. | And the men of Gad had dwelt of old in the land [of Kirjathaim]. And the King of Israel built <sup>11</sup> for him [Kirjathaim]. | And I fought against the city and took it. | And I slew all the [men of] <sup>12</sup> the city, a spectacle to Chemosh and to Moab. | And I brought back from thence the [altar of Jehovah, and <sup>13</sup> put] it before Chemosh in Kerioth. | And I caused to dwell therein the men of Shiran; and the men of ——— <sup>14</sup> Sharath. | And Chemosh said to me, "Go and take Nebo from Israel." | [And I ———] <sup>15</sup> went in the night and I fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon. | And I [took it and I] <sup>16</sup> [utterly destroyed] it, and I slew all of it seven thousand ——— <sup>17</sup> for to Ashtor Chemosh had [I] devoted [them]; and I took from thence <sup>18</sup> the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. | And the King of Israel [built] <sup>19</sup> Jahaz and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. | And Chemosh drove him from [before me. <sup>20</sup> And] I took from Moab 200 men, all told; | and I attacked (?) Jahaz and took it, <sup>21</sup> adding it to Dibon. | I built Karhah, the wall of the forests and the wall of <sup>22</sup> the hill (Ophel). | And I built its gates and I built its towers. | and <sup>23</sup> I made a royal palace, and I made reservoirs for the collection of the waters in the midst of the city. | <sup>24</sup> And there was no cistern in the midst of the city in Karhah; and I said to all the people, "Make <sup>25</sup> for you each a cistern in his house." And I dug ditches (?) for Karhah in [the road to] <sup>26</sup> Israel. | I built [A]roer, and I made the high way to Arnon. I built <sup>27</sup> Beth-Bamoth, for it was ruined, | and I built Bozrah, for it was deserted. And I <sup>28</sup> set in Dibon garrisons (?); for all Dibon was submissive. | And I filled (?) ——— <sup>29</sup> in the cities which I added to the land. | And I built ——— and <sup>30</sup> the temple of Diblathaim. | and the temple of Baal-Meon, and I raised up there ——— <sup>31</sup> ——— the land. | And there dwelt in Honoraim ——— <sup>32</sup> Chemosh said to me, "Go, fight against Honoraim." | And I <sup>33</sup> ——— Chemosh in my days . . . . <sup>34</sup> \* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Ward explained that in most points he agrees with either Ganneau, Schlottmann, Dérenbourg, Nöldeke, or Neubauer in their versions and corrections of the defective text. He drew, however, more especial attention to certain matters with regard to which he differed from previous commentators. The latter have made the perpendicular stroke near the end of the third line a mark of division between the sentences. This it cannot be, as the dot which divides the words also appears



here, and in no other case are both found together. The stroke can be either ו or ק, and is no doubt the former. This puts a repetition of במה out of the question. The reading suggested, וב[ת זה י]ש ע, seems plausible. The doubtful character at the beginning of the eighth line must be either ף or ק. The feminine form בקעה is often used for *plain*, which is just what we want. The masculine is put in the text. Still in Capt. Warren's impression the letter looks more like ף, which would allow ארץ. The suggested emendations for the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth line, and for the seventeenth line, are new. The *fac-simile* of Ganneau seems to show in line twenty-three a flaw in the stone. The fact that the letters as they stand hardly make sense is an indication that the flaw did not exist when the inscription was made, in which case the scribe would have continued the unfinished word on the other side of the flaw, as is the case in the ninth line of the great Sidonian inscription of king Eshmunezer. But the letters which we have, כלאי האשין, cannot be translated, the last word being neither plural of אש, 'man,' nor anything else imaginable. Schlottmann and others have suggested [אש]רה, 'out-pouring' This word and its masculine form are only used in the Bible in connection with the geography of the region of Moab, and אשר הנחלים of the old song of which we have a fragment in Num. xxi. 15 compares well with the אשר מין or אשר המין, which even may be preferable, which I would suggest. Such expressions as "troughs of the waters," Gen. xxx. 38, "brook of the waters," 2 Sam. xvii. 20, "well of the waters," "well" or "fountain of waters," "storm of waters," Hab. iii. 10, are frequent in the Bible. The third word in the eighteenth line I read ואקרבה from Capt. Warren's photographs, which he has misread. The first word in the twenty-second line is read from the photographs as העפל, giving us exactly the biblical phrase "wall of Ophel."

The language of the inscription is almost pure Hebrew, but with an approach toward the southern Semitic tongues. This appears in the comparative scarcity of quiescent letters, in the plural in *Nun*, and especially in the Hiptael conjunction, הלהח, which has its correspondences in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Assyrian. Another evident example of this is the use of verbs לו' instead of לה'. Thus we have אענו and יענו for אענה and יענה. In these cases Noldeke assumes that the final ו is a personal suffix, and that thus a double object is expressed, as is common in Syriac. But the language shows little assimilation to Aramaic peculiarities, and it is more probable that the root is preserved in these forms in a more archaic shape than in Hebrew.

The form of the characters proves the correctness of de Vogüé's assertion that the oldest Canaanite alphabet was distinguished by its sharp angles. Among the more interesting forms are the ך, which is for the first time found as a simple triangle, like the Greek Δ; ם which we first find here as a perpendicular crossed by three horizontal lines, which suggest the Greek Ξ; ן, which suggests the Greek Υ; ק, which is precisely the Greek Kappa; and ך, which is an oblique cross, or X.

The separation of words is found in some other very ancient inscriptions, as in the second inscription of Citium, that of Tucca, and two others.

The lacuna in the eighth line is very unfortunate, as it leaves the chronology in some doubt. Schlottmann is certainly wrong in supposing it possible to make forty years out of the Bible chronology of the reigns of Omri, Ahab, and Ahaziah, which occupied only thirty-one years. If these scriptural figures are correct, and they appear to be, it must be supposed either that Omri began to afflict Moab before he became king while general of Baasha's army, or that the successes of Mesha occurred after the campaigns mentioned in Scripture, and during the latter years of Jehoram. The "round number," which Noldeke, Schlottmann, and others have suggested, would have been *thirty* instead of *forty*, if this campaign be referred to the first rebellion of Mesha—even if a round number is assumable on such a monument.

### 3. Remarks on the Discovery of a second "Rosetta Stone," at Tanis in Lower Egypt, by Hon. J. D. Baldwin, of Worcester.

In this very brief paper, Mr. Baldwin called attention once more to the inscription of Tanis, brought to light by Lepsius in 1866, and published as a "bilingual decree" in the same year, the existence of its third, or Demotic, text being not then known. He read from a letter received by him from Lepsius, to the effect that "the original is now in the Museum of Bulaq. Its complete disinterment,





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



porte aux autres les mêmes sentimens qu'il a pour lui-même,' and again, 'agir envers les autres comme on voudrait les voir agir envers nous' (Mencius, vii. 4). Further, according to Pauthier, "Le Chouë-wen [the oldest Chinese dictionary, belonging to the first century] définit ce caractère par celui de *jin*, 'humanité, amour du prochain.' Le Commentaire de cet ancien Dictionnaire ajoute: 'Celui qui est humain, bienveillant envers les autres, doit être à leurs regards comme il voudrait que l'on fût envers lui, et agir ensuite conformément à ces principes.'" (Le *Ta Hio*, Paris, 1837, pp. 66, 67, note.)

From these statements and definitions Mr. Abbot drew the inference that the word *shú*, which in four of the passages of the Chinese Classics referred to above is used either alone (*Lun Yu*, xv.23; Mencius, vii.4, §3) or with *chung*, 'faithfulness, sincerity, uprightness' (*Lun Yu*, iv.15, §2; *Chung Yung*, xiii.3), to express the sum of moral duty in reference to others, must be regarded as not merely a precept to abstain from acts of wrong-doing, but as enjoining the exercise of active benevolence, according to the measure of the golden rule.

To the objection to this view, that in two of these examples (*Lun Yu*, xv.23; and *Chung Yung*, xiii.3) the word *shú* is explained and restricted by the negative precept which immediately follows, "Do not to others" etc., it was replied that this negative precept may be regarded merely as an application of the principle expressed by the word *shú*, put in the form of a prohibition because so often violated by positive acts of injury to others; but that such an application afforded no ground for supposing that Confucius intended to confine the duty signified by this word to mere abstinence from wrong-doing; on the contrary, we find in the *Chung Yung*, xiii.4, immediately after the negative precept, four distinctly positive applications of the principle, so that even Legge admits that here "we have the rule virtually in its positive form"—that Confucius "rises for a moment to the full apprehension of it, and recognizes the duty of taking the initiative" (Chinese Classics, Prolegom. to vol. i., p. 49; to vol. ii., p. 123).

It was remarked, however, by Mr. Abbot, that, though we appear to have found the golden rule in Confucius in something more than a merely negative form, he did not rise to the sublime height of the Christian principle of returning good for evil. According to the *Lun Yu* (Book xiv., c. 36), some one asked Confucius, "What do you say concerning the principle that injury should be recompensed with kindness?" The Master said, 'With what then will you recompense kindness? Recompense injury with justice, and recompense kindness with kindness.'" (Legge's Chinese Classics, i.152.)

## 5. On the Byzantine Pronunciation of Greek in the Tenth Century, as illustrated by a MS. in the Bodleian Library, by Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven.

The manuscript referred to consists of a few leaves, containing passages from the Greek text of the Septuagint, written in Anglo-Saxon characters. They are found in a codex made up of various pieces, which was described by H. Wanley in the second volume of Hickes's Thesaurus, published in 1705. Hickes himself in his preface called attention to the transliterations of the Septuagint, and gave some specimens, twenty-five verses in all. These specimens have been reprinted in a corrected form by Mr. A. J. Ellis, in the first volume of his "Early English Pronunciation" (pp. 516-527), where they are used to throw light on the sounds of the Anglo-Saxon. They throw light also on the current Greek pronunciation of the time when they were written. Mr. G. Waring, writing to Mr. Ellis, refers them to the latter part of the tenth century: they arose, he thinks, from the communication of Greeks and English at the court of Otho II. of Germany, whose wife was Greek and whose mother English. The proof is not strong; but the manuscript is probably not more recent than that date.

That the scribe aimed to represent the pronunciation, is shown especially by his treatment of *oi*, of the rough breathing, of *ai*, and of *phi*. He is generally independent of the Latin transliteration, though occasionally influenced by it: thus *oi* is never represented by *æ*; the rough breathing is represented (by *h*) only six times out of seventy-nine; *ai* by *æ* only eleven times out of eighty-eight; *phi* by *ph* only twice out of fifteen times. Inconsistencies and inaccuracies are frequent; but the scribe has his system, which he generally adheres to. Only as to *eta*, he vacillates



between *e* and *i*, using *i* fifty-five times and *e* sixty-two; the same word is written now with *e* and again with *i*; variations are sometimes found in the same line. To account for this vacillation by the influence of the Latin orthography is contrary to the analogy of the manuscript. It shows that  $\eta$  had a sound intermediate between Anglo-Saxon *e* and *i*, closer than the first, but less close than the second, nearly the same as (or perhaps a little closer than) the vowel-sound of Eng. *they*, *ail*.

That the scribe always writes *v* as *y*, never confounding it with  $\iota$ , shows that *v* still retained its old (not *oldest*) sound, that of French *u* and German *ü*. The diphthong  $\omicron\iota$  he regularly gives in the same way, as *y*. That  $\omicron\iota$  had this sound as far back as the fourth century has been shown by R. F. A. Schmidt (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grammatik, pp. 73 ff.), who explains the name  $\upsilon$   $\psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$  as meaning 'simple *v*' in distinction from the diphthong ( $\omicron\iota$ ) of the same sound. The similar name  $\epsilon$   $\psi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\nu$  is opposed to the diphthong  $\alpha\iota$ , which in this manuscript is regularly confounded with  $\epsilon$ , both being written as *e*.

The diphthongs *av*, *ev* (sounded in modern Greek as *af*, *ef*, before surds, and *av*, *ev*, before sonants) are written here as *au*, *eu*, which shows at least that they did not then have the sounds *af*, *ef*. The modern Greek sounds of  $\mu\pi$  as *mb*,  $\nu\tau$  as *nd*,  $\gamma\kappa$  as *ng*, find no support here, where these combinations are written *mp*, *nt*, *nc*, respectively. The middle mutes ( $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$ ) are written *b*, *g*, *d*; but there is room to doubt whether the scribe would have written differently, even if he heard the spirant sounds which the modern Greek gives to these letters.

In conclusion, Prof. Hadley remarked how widely the pronunciation indicated in this manuscript was still removed from that of the modern Greeks. The leading peculiarity of the modern pronunciation, the *itacism* which confounds  $\iota$ , *v*,  $\eta$ ,  $\epsilon\iota$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\omicron\iota$ , *vi*, in one vowel sound, extends as yet only to the  $\epsilon\iota$ ; the other five (*v*,  $\eta$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\omicron\iota$ , *vi*) were still more or less different in sound from  $\iota$ .

It was observed also that the codex in which this manuscript is found contains three other pieces remarkable for the Welsh glosses which they show; glosses which Zeuss, in his *Grammatica Celtica*, regards as the oldest monuments of the Welsh language, referring them to the close of the eighth or opening of the ninth century. Possibly, these transliterations of the Septuagint may have been written by a Welsh hand. But that supposition would require little change in the inferences before drawn from the manuscript.

In remarking upon this paper, Dr. Abbot referred to another transliterated Greek text, the *Codex Veronensis*, published by Bianchini as an appendix to his *Vindiciae Canoniarum Scripturarum*, Romae, 1740, fol. It contains the Greek text of the Psalms written in Latin characters, with the Old Latin version, in parallel columns. He spoke also of the confusion of  $\alpha\iota$  and  $\epsilon$  in manuscripts of the New Testament.

Prof. Goodwin observed that critics had been ready to assume a confusion of  $\epsilon\iota$  and  $\eta$  in the manuscripts of classical authors. Accordingly they had given indicatives or subjunctives in many places according to their ideas of Greek idiom, with little regard to manuscript authority. He had himself inspected the two Venetian MSS. of Aristophanes and ten Paris MSS. of that author, to obtain data for deciding the question of  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\mu\acute{\eta}$  in prohibition with the future indicative or the subjunctive. In all the passages of the *Clouds* and the *Frogs* which show this construction, he had found a great preponderance of manuscript authority for the subjunctive. That the copyists did not in these cases confound  $\epsilon\iota$  and  $\eta$  was evident from the fact that they rarely confound them where only one can be right. He regarded this as a further proof that the two diphthongs were not sounded alike until a pretty late period.

## 6. On Institutions of Western Learning in the East, by Prof. D. C. Gilman, of New Haven.

Prof. Gilman had gathered, and laid before the Society, from private letters to himself and others newspaper notices, published reports, and so on, the most recent intelligence obtainable respecting the Robert College near Constantinople, the Syrian College at Beirut, a proposed institution of a like character at Jaffna in Ceylon, and the school of western science and literature in Peking. The first has been temporarily established for some time at Bebek, but is about removing to its own grounds at Roumelie Hissar, on the Bosphorus, where the corner-stone of its



new building was laid last July. Its buildings, apparatus, etc., being finished, it is intended to meet its own running expenses by the income from students.

The Beirut College has five or six professors, and about seventy-five students. Its funds and property are near \$150,000; it has recently succeeded in securing an eligible location in the western part of the city. To its medical department, to which belong about a half of the students, are attached a hospital and ophthalmic institution, which are crowded with interesting cases, and in every way exceedingly successful.

The plan for a College at Jaffna is set on foot by the native community there, who propose to raise in Ceylon a sum sufficient to endow the native professorships and meet the ordinary expenses, appealing to America for a further sum of \$50,000, to support an American head and manager for the institution, procure apparatus, and the like.

Respecting the Peking College, the most interesting information was contained in a private letter from Dr. Martin to Prof. Gilman, from which extracts are here given:

“... Our embryo University, launched three years ago under the patronage of Prince Kung, and favored with something like an imperial charter, created a panic in the ranks of the orthodox Confucianists, who assailed it with every available weapon. The call issued by imperial command for graduates of the native schools to come forward as candidates for scholarships was denounced as a national humiliation; and one of the Censors, in an address to the throne, charged the prevalence of a severe dearth in the northern provinces on the heresy of establishing such a school, and prayed that it might be abolished without delay. These are but specimens of the multiform opposition which it has had to encounter from Chinese conservatism. Then came the ignorance of the Chinese language on the part of the new professors, and the unfortunate attempt to compel the students to acquire all their science through the medium of English and French. Some of the students, possessing high degrees and finished scholarship according to the native standard, were not less than forty or fifty years of age. As might have been anticipated, they failed utterly to acquire the first rudiments of a foreign tongue, and twenty of them were dismissed at one time. The mandarins were disheartened at the prospect, and threatened to disband the institution altogether, or rather to degrade it from the position of a seminary of science, the future *pharos* of the empire, to the condition of a small school, for the training of interpreters in foreign languages.

“This was the posture of affairs which hastened last year my return from America to China by the shortest route. On arriving, I found the newspapers filled with accounts of the “failure of the Peking college,” and almost abandoned the hope which till then I had cherished of doing something to revive it.

“Contrary to my expectations, the mandarins met me with great cordiality, and assured me that they were now ready to take in fresh scholars and to prosecute the enterprise with renewed energy. At the instance of Mr. Hart, inspector-general of maritime customs (the original projector and hitherto *de facto* director of the institution), its conduct was formally committed to my hands by Prince Kung and his counsellors. I enclose an extract from their despatch.”

Dr. Martin goes on to describe the ceremony of his installation, consisting of a public dinner at the Board of Foreign Affairs, the salutation of their new head on the part of the students (forty in number, and divided into four classes—English, French, Russian, and mathematical), and an inaugural address; and continues,

“Our externals are little like those of a western institution of learning. Our grounds are unadorned by a single tree; and our buildings, six in number, though neat, and altogether acceptable to Chinese taste, are only one story in height. There are three professors of foreign languages, three of Chinese, one of chemistry, and one of mathematics; while the chair of political economy and international law belongs to me, as heretofore. Our faculty, you perceive, is very incomplete; and it is not unlikely that, as soon as we get our machinery into running order, we shall apply to America for more experts in science.

“Our students are few, and not likely for a long time to count more than a hundred, even if they reach that number. But their selection from the ranks of the native scholars, the fact that they are all in training for the service of the government, and especially that they are the first students in modern times who have





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



by his treatment of surd and sonant letters, which he styles "hards" and "softs," and then lets those names determine his view of the historical relation of the two classes. His admission of the increment of vowels, as being a primary or organic process of word-formation in Indo-European speech, and having a "symbolic" significance, was objected to; the tendency, it was claimed, of the best linguistic science is to the clearer recognition of those processes of vowel-variation as at first euphonic merely, though afterwards more or less converted to the uses of radical or grammatical distinction.

8. How are the Traditions of the Earliest Ages of our Race to be studied? by Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass.

Prof. Jenks claimed that we needed to sympathize with the condition and character of childhood, in order to understand the formation of language, and the other features of the development of mankind, in the earliest ages of human history.

After the reading of this paper, a vote of thanks was passed to the American Academy for the use of its rooms for the meeting, and the Society adjourned, to meet in New Haven in October next.



**Proceedings at New Haven, October 20th and 21st, 1870.**

---

The Society assembled, as notified, at New Haven, on Thursday, Oct. 20th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair. The minutes of the annual meeting in May last were read by the Recording Secretary. The Committee of Arrangements communicated an invitation from Mr. Van Name, Librarian of Yale College, to a social gathering at his house in the evening; which was, upon motion, accepted with thanks.

From the Directors, notice was given that the next meeting would be held in Boston, on the 17th of May, 1871, and that Rev. Dr. Anderson, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, was appointed a Committee of Arrangements for it. Also the names of the following gentlemen were reported, with the recommendation that they be elected as Corporate Members:—

Rev. John Anderson, of Waterbury, Conn.  
Prof. John Avery, of Grinnell, Iowa.  
Prof. George F. Comfort, of New York.  
Mr. Alexander Meyrowitz, do.  
Mr. Frederick Stengel, do.  
Mr. Edward C. Taintor, of China.

The recommendation was adopted, and the gentlemen elected.

The Corresponding Secretary read extracts from the correspondence of the half-year. In presenting notes of excuse from several gentlemen, variously prevented from being present at the meeting, he also took occasion to refer to the unwonted absence of Prof. Salisbury, who had recently gone to spend the winter, and perhaps a longer time, in Europe. It was added, as a fact interesting and important to all students in this department in America, that Prof. Salisbury had, before leaving, presented to the library of Yale College in New Haven his whole collection of Oriental and philological books and manuscripts, comprising several thousand volumes, many of them of great cost and value, and had made liberal provision for completing the collection by further purchase. So large and generous a gift had rarely been made to an American library, or so rich a body of material for study in this department been thrown open at once to the public.

A letter from Rev. James Summers, dated London, August 5th, 1870, speaks of a magazine for Chinese and Japanese literature, which he was about commencing to publish in London, and expresses the hope that both encouragement and assistance may be obtained for it from America, whose interest in the affairs of that part of the world is so great, and which has done so much, by literature and diplomacy, to open it to the knowledge of the West. Mr. Summers is cataloguing the Chinese and Tibetan treasures of the India Office library in London, brought forth to light by the



energy of the late librarian, Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall. The first two numbers of the magazine referred to, the "Phœnix," more recently received, were exhibited to the members present and examined by them.

Letters from Rev. Mr. Ward, of New York, announce a donation made through him to the Society's collections, by the Palestine Exploration Fund Society of London, of a set of the full-size photographs of the impressions in soft paper taken from the Moabite inscription-stone of King Mesha, and of plaster casts of a number of the smaller fragments of the stone, colored in close imitation of the original. The photographs and casts were shown and described by Mr. Ward, who was present; besides clearing up one and another point, of greater or less consequence, in the reading, they proved in a striking manner the faithfulness and skill with which M. Ganneau's first copies of the inscription had been made.

Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass., sent a copy of an engraving, just made, of a Japanese "symbolical seal, or armorial bearing, whose lines are legally established symbols, to be interpreted, like those of our heraldic escutcheons, according to fixed rules, guarded from infringement by severe laws."

Prof. Weber, of Berlin, under date of Sept. 29th, 1870, writes of the then approaching celebration (Oct. 2d) of the 25-year anniversary of the German Oriental Society, and of the medal which was to be presented, struck in gold, to the first four managers of the Society's affairs, Professors Brockhaus, Fleischer, Pott, and Rödiger (of whom three are Honorary Members of our own Society). A copy of the medal in bronze was shown to the members present; the obverse represents "a powerful male figure, as emblem of the ancient Orient, resting upon a lion under a palm-tree, and raising himself as if awaking. His face, unveiled by a Genius, he turns toward the light, with which German science, as a Germania crowned with oak-leaves, approaches him." The following distich gives the simple meaning of the symbol:

Licht und lebendiges Wort kam einst den Deutschen vom Aufgang;  
Dankend erstatten sie heut', was sie empfangen, zuruck.

Prof. Weber is occupied with a (transliterated) edition of the *Tâittirîya-Sanhitâ*, of which a considerable part is ready for the press.

Dr. John Muir, under date of Edinburgh, June 1st, 1870, writes:

"The fifth volume of my *Original Sanskrit Texts* ["Contributions to a knowledge of the cosmogony, mythology, religious ideas, life and manners of the Indians in the Vedic Age"] is ready, and may, I hope, reach you about the time this letter does.

"Müller is reprinting his *Sanskrit grammar*, and printing his lectures preliminary to the study of the science of religions, in successive numbers of *Fraser's Magazine*. He says his second volume of the translation of the *Rig-Veda* will be on the same plan as the first—much annotation, and few whole hymns translated: when it is to come out, I do not know. *Aufrecht* hopes to begin to print his glossary to the *Rig-Veda* in August or September. *Monier Williams* has advanced as far as the letter *r* with his *Sanskrit-English dictionary*."





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies



nants the sounds which the corresponding characters in English have, regarding  $\phi$  as the equivalent of  $f$ ,  $\vartheta$  of  $th$  surd. Only  $\chi$  would have the sound of the German *ch*. This system would be less objectionable and more useful in a scientific and educational point of view than any other.

A brief discussion followed the reading of this paper, after which the Society adjourned for the day, and the remaining communications were presented at the session of Friday forenoon.

---

4. Thirteen inedited Letters from Sir William Jones to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Charles Wilkins, communicated by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, D. C. L.; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Dr. Hall's introductory note accompanying these letters is as follows:

"The venerated memory of Sir William Jones must abundantly suffice to justify the publication of the following letters; and I have only to say, by way of introducing them, that I am indebted for the favor of being allowed to make them public, to Charles H. Moore, Esq., who possesses the originals."

The letters range in date from Jan. 6, 1784, to Jan. 14, 1793, and are interesting as illustrating the progress of the writer's plans of study and their accomplishment, and casting additional light upon the small beginnings of a department of learning which has now assumed great and unlooked-for importance. A few sentences are extracted here.

" . . . . Happy should I be to follow you in the same track [of Hindu learning]; but life is too short and my necessary business too long for me to think at my age of acquiring a new language. All my hopes, therefore, of being acquainted with the poetry, philosophy, and arts of the Hindus. are grounded on the expectation of living to see the fruits of your learned labors." (April 24th, 1784.)

" . . . . I have just received from Benares a Sanscrit book, which puzzled me at first, and will, I hope, continue to puzzle, until it enlightens me. It is called . . . . the *Dherm Shástr Menu Smrety*. A version of this curious work is promised, and, when it comes, I will set about learning the original, if I can procure assistance from a good Pedit." (March 1st, 1785.)

" . . . . I have found a pleasant old man of the medical caste, who teaches me all he knows of the Grammar, and I hope to read the *Hit Upadès*, or some other story-book, with him. My great object is the Dherme S'astra, to which I shall arrive by degrees." (Sept. 17th, 1785.)

" . . . . You are the first European that ever understood Sanscrit, and will, possibly, be the last." (Oct. 6th, 1787.)

"I devoured, my dear Sir, your *Bhagavad-Gítá*, and have made as hearty a meal of your *Hitópádésa*, for which I thank you most sincerely. The ships of this season will carry home seven hundred copies of our first volume of Transactions; and the second will be ready, I hope, next year: but unless the impression should be sold in London, Harington & Morris (who print the book at their hazard) will be losers, and we must dissolve the Society. You have already done us capital service, and will continue to serve us by spreading over Europe your discoveries in Indian literature. You have the honor of being the first European in the world, and the only man, probably, that ever saw Europe, who possessed a knowledge of Sanscrit." (Feb. 27th, 1789.)

"I am so busy at this season, that I have only time to request your acceptance of a little Sanscrit poem, which Morris has printed, and which you are the only man in Europe who can read and understand." (Jan. 14th, 1793.)

5. On two Inscriptions in Sanskrit characters from Buddhist temples in China, by Mr. E. C. Taintor, of the Chinese Foreign Customs Service.

Mr. Taintor exhibited to the meeting an inscription, in mixed Chinese and Sanskrit characters, covering eight sheets, and explained that it was an impression taken from the faces of an octagonal marble column in the Hwa Yen T'an, a tem-



ple in the Chinese city (the southern section) of Peking, and that the inscription was first brought to light by Rev. Joseph Edkins, of the London Missionary Society. The date of its erection. A. D. 1491, is given in the last line of the eighth sheet. The first face of the column bears an inscription, in Chinese only, commemorating the rebuilding or repairing of the temple, and detailing the circumstances attending it, in the style usual in monumental records of this character, which are to be met with very commonly in temples in all parts of China. The second to the seventh faces, inclusive, contain Sanskrit characters, written after the Chinese style in vertical columns, and forming an inscription as yet untranslated. The eighth face comprises both Sanskrit and Chinese text. Considerable portions of the characters on several of the faces of the column, as given in the copied sheets, are nearly obliterated or quite indistinct, but can probably be restored on a careful examination of the original.

But one other inscription of this character, containing Sanskrit text, has, so far as I am aware, been observed in China. This was found by me in February, 1867, at the city of Ichow, which lies about seventy miles southwest of Peking, at the entrance to the beautiful valley in which are situated the Si Ling, or Western Tombs, the burial places of three of the seven deceased emperors of the present dynasty.

Outside the western gate of Ichow stands a neat little three storied pagoda; the temple attached is called *Pai T'a Sz*, or the 'White Pagoda Temple.' In front of the pagoda stand two octagonal white marble pillars, about a foot in diameter and six feet high. The westerly one bears only Chinese characters, and, in consequence of the soft and perishable nature of the stone, they are either obliterated or very indistinct. Seven of the eight sides are covered with characters, evidently used phonetically, without regard to their meaning. No date or emperor's name could be found. A block of marble, with sculptured figures, originally the capital of the pillar, lies a few feet from it. The easterly pillar is in better preservation. The S. face has eight columns of Chinese characters. On the S. E. face are one column of Sanskrit and two of Chinese characters; on the E. face two Sanskrit and two Chinese; on the N. E. face three columns of Chinese, representing phonetically Sanskrit(?) sounds; on the N. face, four columns of the same character; on the N. W. face three columns, and W. face three and one-half columns of Chinese, all evidently used phonetically. The S. W. face, the most important of all, as giving the date of erection, has four and one-half columns of Chinese, from which we learn that the column was placed in position on the fifteenth day of the eighth month of the fifth year of Süen Ho, of the Sung dynasty, corresponding to 1123 A. D.

As my own limited time prevented my copying the inscription (which was of about the same length as the one from Peking), I endeavored by the offer of a reward to induce some native to make a copy during my absence at the Tombs; but regretted to find on my return the following day that no one had ventured to undertake the task, on account of the great difficulty of making out many of the characters.

Prof. Whitney remarked that the Sanskrit characters were in an older form of Devanagari, quite different from that now in use, and that the hasty examination which he had yet been able to give to the inscription had not enabled him to make out any part of it, save the common Buddhist formula at the end, *om mani padma hum*.

6. On the System of Duplication in consonant groups, as taught by the ancient Hindu grammarians, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Our means of knowledge of the pronunciation of the ancient Sanskrit are its pronunciation by the modern Hindus, the teachings of the old Hindu writers on grammar, the euphonic laws of the language, and the comparison of the spoken alphabets of other related languages. Each of these, in its order, checks and corrects the others, and their combined effect is to give us a confident and satisfactory understanding of the phonetic form of the language—excepting, of course, that tone and coloring which no description can impart. The second source is worth more in India than elsewhere, since the ancient Hindu phonetists were



gifted with rare powers of observation and analysis, and carried the science of phonology further than it has been carried by any but the latest generation even of European scholars. Their results are laid down especially in the Prâtiçâkhyas, and constitute one main department of the interest attaching to that little body of works. But the characteristic defects of the Hindu character appear also in their phonetic science—their tendency to over-refinement of analysis, and to the setting up of arbitrary and artificial rules in place of simple natural laws, determined by pure observation. A striking example of this is their system of duplication in consonant groups; this forms a feature in all the Prâtiçâkhyas, and is found even in Pânini's great grammatical text-book, which has been the rule of correct Sanskrit speech for probably more than two thousand years. The system involves two chief rules: 1, that the first consonant in a group of two or more is to be pronounced double after a vowel; thus, *pra* after *á* is *á ppra*. *abda* is *abbdá*, *asya* is *assya*, and so on; 2, that an *r* thus situated is not doubled, but the consonant following is so treated instead, as in *arkka* for *arka*, *úrgg vái* for *úrḡ vái*, *úrḡgbhyas* for *úrḡbhyas*, and so on. In case the letter to be doubled is an aspirate mute, the corresponding non-aspirate is substituted for it in duplication: thus, *addhvara* from *adhvara*, *dirggha* from *dirgha*. To these rules there are certain extensions and restrictions, of minor importance, and variously given by the different authorities. They are combined, also, with a number of other insertions and modifications, which not infrequently produce very intricate and formidable results: turning *tsm*, for example, into *tthspmm*, and so on. In the case of some of these insertions and changes, we can seem to see the physical processes whose undue appreciation or gross exaggeration are their foundation: but the physical ground of the system of duplication itself no one yet has succeeded in tracing out and setting forth.

## 7. On Westphal's new Greek grammar, by Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven.

Prof. Hadley referred briefly to the series of works on Greek rhythm, metre, and music, by which Westphal has gained a high, and, on the whole, a deserved reputation. Since Hermann and Boeckh, no scholar has done so much for the progress of these studies. His merits are undeniably great, though marred by some faults—by haste, self-assertion, want of ingenuousness, and intemperance in controversy. In 1869, Westphal appeared in a new field, with a *Philosophisch-historische Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Here he gives, in general, the results arrived at by Bopp, Grimm, and their successors; but lays much stress on a theory of the origin of inflections, in which he differs from nearly all comparative philologists. He holds that most inflections were, at the outset, not words, previously separate, which losing their own accent became appendages of other words, but mere sounds, without independent existence, and without significance, until by the users of language they were employed as inflections. In his Greek Grammar, just published, the same theory is adhered to; though much less prominence is given to it. The author at first intended only to write a Greek Syntax, in which the syntactical categories of Hermann should at length be superseded by more appropriate norms, derived partly from comparison of other Indo-European languages, and partly from an intelligent examination of the Greek literature. But he was led to include the etymology, as without it his treatment of the syntax would often be unintelligible. Though subordinate in the plan of his work, it is treated on a large scale, receiving 447 pages, without including the verb, which will probably require as many pages more.

This great length may be partly the result of hasty composition, which shows itself in other ways. Thus, on p. xvii., the verb *οἰκῶ* is spoken of as if it were a contraction of *οικω* (instead of *οικέω*). On p. 58, the noun *στίχος*—a masculine of the second decl.—is set down as having its genitive in *ους*. On p. 17, *τύψω* is given as the future of *τύπτω*, whereas the classic writers have *τυπτήσω*, and *τύψω* does not appear until some five centuries after the Christian era. Still worse is it with *κάζω*, on p. 24, which does not occur until late in the middle ages, which Passow describes as unused, and Liddell and Scott omit altogether. On p. 55, a form *τεεῖο* (= *σοῦ*) is mentioned and explained at length: under pronouns, it re-appears, in connection with *τεοῖο*, pp. 377–8, where special attention is called to the latter form;—all this without an intimation that *τεοῖο* is confined to one line (twice re-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



This inscription, it will be perceived, names ten horsemen who died in Corinth, one of whom is Dexilaus, and the other inscription says that he belonged to "the five horsemen." What then can this expression in the first inscription, "the five horsemen," mean?

### 9. On Cox's Mythology of the Aryan Nations, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

After excusing the incompleteness and want of elaboration of his criticism of Mr. Cox's work, Prof. Whitney began with referring to the new era made in the study of classic mythology, as of classical language, by the wider Indo-European studies. The foundation of both is the same: the formation of certain religious views and mythical conceptions, as of certain ideas and expressions, in the period of Indo-European unity, and their transmission down to historical times. To find the traceable relics of these, is to make the nearest possible approach to the beginnings of religious thought in our branch of the human race. The comparison of Greek and Hindu mythology began as soon as the Veda was opened to study, and has ever since yielded more and more fruit. Max Muller has lately done the service of setting it forth in an attractive manner; and has also given such prominence to the elements of the sun and the dawn in the earliest mythology as almost to put a new aspect upon the whole subject of mythologic interpretation. His views are very attractive and plausible, as well as novel, but their soundness is yet to be established by careful criticism. To such criticism they are not subjected by Mr. Cox, who is rather, their implicit acceptor and their enthusiastic advocate, and who carries them to an extreme which even their originator, perhaps, would fail to approve. Mr. Cox's work (in two stout 8vo volumes, London, 1870) is eloquent and graceful, but wanting in scientific tone, as in soberness and coherence of reasoning; it is somewhat diffuse and repetitious; the author is so dominated by his theory as to be made often partial in his judgments, loose in his interpretations, and uncritical in his etymologies.

The main features of the solar interpretation—which Mr. Cox applies to the story of the Odyssey as well as of the Iliad, to the Nibelungen-Lied, the legends of Arthur and Charlemagne, the nursery-tales of Boots and Jack the giant-killer, and so on—were stated, and illustrated by extracts and comments.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston on the seventeenth of May next.













**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Get Smart

Over 2,000 years of  
human knowledge in  
797,885 volumes

Instant access  
\$8.99/month

**Continue**

\*Fair usage policy applies