

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO II, P. 154.

In my paper on Rudraṭa and Rudrabhaṭṭa (above p. 152 ff.) I have adduced the stanza कज्जलहिमकनकरुचः Kâvyâlaṅkāra 7, 36 as an auxiliary proof for the fact, already established by other evidence, that Rudraṭa was no Śaiva, as he does not give Śiva the first place in the Trimûrti. For in naming a number of gods or any persons

every body will name first that one whom he considers the most important. This rule can be demonstrated by many instances taken from classical writers. Now D^r R. OTTO FRANKE (*ZDMG* vol. 42, p. 435) has shown that in the case under consideration the order of the members of the Trimûrti forming a dvandva compound is regulated by a rule of Pâṇini (II, 2, 32). This objection is incontrovertible. Hence I retract my above argument, though not my assertion, which rests on other grounds.

To evade the objection of D^r FRANKE it might be suggested that an author could choose, among the many synonyms, such names of the gods which, not coming under Pâṇ. II, 2, 32, would permit him to name the gods in an order agreeing with his religious persuasion. But an analogous case I have lately lighted upon, shows that grammar is stronger than religious motives. For Trivikramabhaṭṭa, the author of the *Nalachampû*, is decidedly a Śaiva, as is proved by the *maṅgala* and the last verse of each *uchchhvâsa*; hence in 6, 38

लब्धाधर्चन्द्र ईशः कृतकंसभयं च पौरुषं विष्णोः ।

ब्रह्मापि नाभिजातः केनोपमिमीमहे नृप भवन्तम् ॥

he names Śiva first, as no other motive interferes. But in 6, 32

चक्रधरं विषमालं कृतमदकलराजहंससंचारम् ।

हरिहरविरश्चिसदृशं भजत पयोष्णीतटं मुनयः ॥

where the names of the three gods form a dvandva compound, Pâṇini's rule accounts for the order of the gods.

HERMANN JACOBI.