

APRIL, 1875.]

NOTE ON RĀJATARANGINĪ I, 176.

107

NOTE ON RĀJATARANGINĪ I, 176.

BY F. KIELHORN, PH. D.

चन्द्राचार्योदिभिलेब्धादेशं तस्मात्तदागमम्।

प्रवर्तितं महाभाष्यम्॥

Thus the passage is read both in the Calcutta and in the Paris edition. So far as I am aware, all scholars who have had occasion to refer to it (Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, II. p. 486; Böhlingk, *Pāṇini*, vol. II. Introduction, p. xv.; Goldstücker, *Pāṇini*, p. 238, note; Weber, *Indische Studien*, vol. V. p. 166) agree in considering it to be corrupt; all of them have changed लब्धादेशं to लब्धदेशं, and in addition to this, Professors Lassen, Böhlingk, and Weber have substituted तदागमे for तदागमम्.

The translations which have been proposed are the following :—

Prof. Lassen: 'Chandra and other teachers introduced the Mahābhāṣhya, after having received his (viz. Abhimanyu's) orders to fetch it.'

Profs. Böhlingk and Weber: 'The teacher Chandra and others introduced the Mahābhāṣhya, after having received his (viz. the king Abhimanyu's) orders to come there (or to him).'

Prof. Goldstücker: 'After Chandra and the other grammarians had received from him (the king Abhimanyu) the order, they established a text of the Mahābhāṣhya, such as it could be established by means of his MS. of this work (literally: they established a Mahābhāṣhya

which possessed his—the king's—grammatical document, or, after they had received from him the order and his MS. they established the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*.)'

None of these translations appears to me to be tenable; for, to omit other considerations, I do not believe that the words लब्ध्वादेशं तस्मात्तदागमे can convey the meaning ascribed to them by Lassen, Böhtlingk, and Weber, nor am I aware that the word आगम is ever used in the sense of 'a grammatical document' or 'a manuscript,' claimed for it by Prof. Goldstücker.

Left entirely to conjecture—for MS. copies of the *Rājataranginī* do not seem to exist in this part of India—I propose to read the above passage

चन्द्राचार्यादिभिर्लेख्य देशान्तरात्तदागमम् ।

प्रवर्तितं महाभाष्यम्॥

and to translate thus :

'At that time Chandrāchārya and others brought into use the *Mahābhāṣya*, after having received its doctrine or traditional interpretation (आगमम्) from another (part of the) country.'

In support of this alteration and translation I must refer to the verse from the *Vākya-padiya*.

पर्वतदागमं लब्ध्वा भण्यवीजात्सारिभिः ।

स नीतो बहुशः खल्वं चन्द्राचार्यादिभिः पुनः ॥'

which I have reprinted in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. II. (Oct. 1874) p. 286. Those scholars in India and Europe to whom MSS. of the *Rājataranginī* are accessible will easily be able to ascertain how far my conjecture may be supported by the authority of the MSS., and none can be more willing than myself to adopt whatever other intelligible reading may be suggested by the latter; of hasty conjectures we have, I think, in Sanskrit enough already.

I cannot conclude this short note without protesting against the statement, which I find repeated over and over again, that at some time or other the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* had been lost, that it had to be reconstructed, &c. All we know at present amounts to this, that for some period of time Patanjali's great work was not studied generally, and had consequently ceased to be understood. We may perhaps allow a break so far as regards its traditional interpretation, but for the present we are bound to regard the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* as given by our MSS. to be the same as it existed about two thousand years ago.

Deccan College, February 1875.