

AUGUST, 1876.]

ON THE MAHÂBHÂSHYA.

241

ON THE MAHÂBHÂSHYA.

BY DR. F. KIELHORN, DECCAN COLLEGE, PUNÂ.

When last year I wrote for this journal (vol. IV. | I had just been reading, later perhaps than I ought
p. 107) a note on a passage of the *Râjataranginî*, | to have done so, Prof. Weber's valuable article

on the *Mahābhāṣya* (*Indische Studien*, vol. XIII. p. 293), and as there I had found some statements regarding the history of the text of that work for which there appeared to me to be little foundation, I deemed it advisable to conclude my note as follows:—

“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.”

My object in writing these lines was no other than to induce Professor Weber to reconsider the grounds for his assertions. From a note on p. 242 of the second edition of his lectures on *Indische Literaturgeschichte* I now learn that he has done so, but that he has seen no reasons to change his views. For Professor Weber, in reply to my remarks, sums up his own views in the following words:—

“On the other hand it follows, not only from the statements of the *Rājataranginī*, but also particularly from those at the end of the second book of Hari's *Vākyapadīya*. . . . that the *Bhāṣya* has suffered manifold fates, that it has been several times *vichchhinna* and newly rearranged, so that the possibility of considerable alterations, additions, and interpolations cannot be denied, and that in every case it remains *à priori* uncertain whether a particular example belongs to Patanjali himself, or is owing only to these later reconstructions. . . . Kielhorn, it is true, has strongly protested against the statement that ‘at some time or other the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* had been lost, that it had to be reconstructed, &c.’ and will only ‘perhaps allow a break so far as regards its traditional interpretation,’ while for the present he considers us bound ‘to regard the text of the

Mahābhāṣya as given by our MSS. to be the same as it existed about 2000 years ago.’ Let us await, then, his proofs; for the protest alone might, in opposition to the statements handed down to us by tradition (on three different occasions the terms *viplāvita*, *bhrashṭa*, *vichchhinna* are employed regarding the work), not be sufficient. It must, besides, be added that the South-Indian MSS. of the text, according to Burnell's testimony (see Preface to the *Vanīabr.* p. xxii., note), appear to differ considerably.”

So far as I am aware, the question at issue between Professor Weber and myself is, clearly stated, this:—

According to Professor Weber there are grave reasons for doubting the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*, as we find it in the existing MSS., to be the original text of that work. At the time of king Abhimanyu of Kāshmir the original text of Patanjali's work existed only in fragments,* from which a new text of the *Mahābhāṣya* was reconstructed by Chandrāchārya and others. This second text underwent in its turn the same fate as the original, and a new (third) text was accordingly prepared, under king Jayāpīḍa of Kāshmir. This third text is the one given by our MSS.

According to my own view no evidence has yet been adduced to prove that the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* as known to us from MSS. is not the original text of that work, and the only one that ever existed; and I shall now attempt to show why the reasons which have been brought forward to the contrary appear to me invalid. In the note from his lectures quoted above, these reasons are clearly implied by Professor Weber to be the following:—

(1) According to the testimony of Dr. Burnell, the South-Indian MSS. of the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* differ considerably from those found in other parts of India.

(2) From the verse IV. 487 of the *Rājataranginī* we learn that a new (what I have called above *third*) text of the *Mahābhāṣya* was prepared, under king Jayāpīḍa of Kāshmir.

(3) In another verse (I. 176) of the same work and in the concluding verses of the

* In his later articles Prof. Weber employs, so far as I remember, only the Sanskrit words *viplāvita*, *bhrashṭa*, and *vichchhinna*, but I believe that the above represents his views correctly. From a note on p. 297 of vol. XIII. of the *Ind. Stud.* I infer that the word *vichchhinna* is taken in the sense of ‘incomplete;’ on p. 315 Prof. Weber

speaks of ‘remodellations’ (*Bearbeitungen*), on p. 320 of ‘reconstructions,’ but on p. 321 distinctly of ‘fragments’ out of which a new text was constructed. On p. 160 of vol. V. *viplāvita* is translated by ‘devastated’ or ‘destroyed’ (*verwüstet*), on p. 161 *bhrashṭa* by ‘lost,’ and on p. 167 *vichchhinna* by ‘split into pieces.’

second book of Bhartṛihari's *Vākya-pāṭi* we are told that at the time of king Abhi-mānu of Kāśhmīr all that remained of the original text of the *Mahābhāṣya* were fragments, from which Chandra-chārya and others reconstructed a new (or second) text.

To the first reason Professor Weber himself does not appear to attach any very great importance; but it may be admitted that if the South-Indian MSS. really did contain a text considerably different from that which is given by MSS. from other parts of India, a fact such as this might prove, at any rate, the existence of different recensions of the *Mahābhāṣya*. All, however, I find Dr. Burnell to have stated regarding the difference of the text in the South-Indian MSS., is this: that in the introductory *Āhnika* the latter "omit the quotation from the *Atharvaveda*;" moreover, on p. 91 of his essay *On the Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians*, the same scholar deliberately states "that the Northern and Southern MSS. of the *Mahābhāṣya* differ to no great extent, though various readings occur." I may add that in the course of the last ten years I have examined MSS. from nearly every part of India, and that I have not been able to discover any traces of the existence of several recensions of Patanjali's great commentary.

I now proceed to verse IV. 487 of the *Rājataranginī*, which in the Paris edition is given thus:—

देशान्तरादागमस्य व्याचक्षणांश्चमापतिः ।
प्रावर्तयत विच्छिन्नं महाभाष्यं स्वमण्डले ॥

On p. 167 of vol. V. of the *Indische Studien* this passage has been translated—"The king (Jayāpīḍa) caused interpreters to come from other countries, and set the split Bhāṣya again going in his realm;" and from the remarks which immediately follow this translation it is clear that Prof. Weber, when first quoting and translating the passage, understood it to relate the 'introduction' or 're-introduction' of the *Mahābhāṣya* into Kāśhmīr, and not a 'reconstruction' of the text of the work. This view has been abandoned in vol. XIII. of the *Ind. Stud.*, for in the latter Prof. Weber speaks on p. 315 of a 'remodelling,' and on p. 320 (where the word व्याचक्षणा is rendered by 'knowing' or 'expert men') of a 'reconstruction'

of the text, as having been brought about at the instance of Jayāpīḍa.

If, for argument's sake, we were to admit that the word विच्छिन्न did convey the sense of 'incomplete' or 'existing in fragments,' which has been ascribed to it, and that under Jayāpīḍa fragments were all that was to be found of the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* in Kāśhmīr, would there be any reason for assuming the same to have been the case all over India? Do we not know of numbers of works of which fragments only exist in one part of India, while complete copies are to be found in others? And supposing that fragments only of the text existed in Kāśhmīr, what possible good could Jayāpīḍa have done when he desired to encourage the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* by sending for interpreters? For as to the meaning of व्याचक्षणा there can, I presume, be no doubt whatsoever.

In reality the context in which the term विच्छिन्न is employed in the above passage, as well as the manner in which विच्छिन्न and विच्छेद are used elsewhere, show that the former cannot in the above convey the meaning which has been assigned to it. Sanskrit writers frequently speak of अप्रयुक्तस्य विच्छेद, and call the study of a text विच्छिन्नसंयदाय; and in accordance with this usage I maintain that विच्छिन्न महाभाष्यम् can only mean "the *Mahābhāṣya* which had ceased to be studied" and was no longer understood in Kāśhmīr, and that the whole verse must therefore literally be translated thus:—"The king, having sent for interpreters from another country, brought into use in his realm the *Mahābhāṣya*, which had ceased to be studied" (in Kāśhmīr, and was therefore no longer understood).

Before I proceed, I find it necessary to point out two slight inaccuracies in Prof. Weber's remarks concerning the history of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Prof. Weber has stated more than once (see above, and this journal vol. IV. p. 247), and has apparently laid great stress on the fact, that the *Mahābhāṣya* on three different occasions has received the epithets *viplāvita*, *bhrashta*, and *vichchhinna*. In reality *vichchhinna* occurs in the verse of the *Rājataranginī* quoted above, and the words *viplāvita* and *bhrashta* are found, as will be seen below, in one and the same sentence of the *Vākya-pāṭi*, although not in one and the same verse. Moreover, the epithet

bhrashta has been applied by Bhartṛihari not to the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*, but to the *vyākaraṇa-gama*, the traditional knowledge of grammar as handed down from teacher to pupil,† a fact by which alone the force of Prof. Weber's argument would be considerably lessened. The terms *भट्ट* and *भंश* are indeed used occasionally with reference to the text of a work (ग्रन्थ), and when they are so used it must be admitted that the writer who employs them desires to state that such text is lost, either completely, or at any rate partly. But it does not follow that because the *आगम*, i.e. traditional interpretation of a text, has become *भट्ट*, or because a work is no longer studied, its text must necessarily have been lost too. P u n y a r ā j a,‡ the commentator of the *Vākya-padiya*, when accounting for the fragmentary state of the third chapter of that work, brings forward, as one of the probable reasons, the *आगमभंश*, the fact that part of Bhartṛihari's work had ceased to be studied,§ and his doing so sufficiently proves that although *आगमभंश* may in course of time lead to 'the loss of a text,' the former is not equivalent to the latter. There exist at the present day numbers of works in the libraries of this country, though their *आगम* has been lost, I am afraid, beyond the hope of recovery.

The passage of the *Vākya-padiya* from which Prof. Weber concludes that (at the time of king Abhimanyu) fragments only of the original text of the *Mahābhāṣya* were in existence, and that from these a new text of the work was prepared by Chandrāchārya and others, was first pointed out by the late Prof. Goldstücker; it was republished with corrections by Prof. Weber himself in vol. V. of the *Indische Studien*, and subsequently again reprinted, together with the commentary of Punyārāja, by myself on pp. 285-7 of vol. III. of this journal. After having stated

† From the way in which Punyārāja subsequently in the commentary on the verse वृत्तेनामज्ञ (see above, vol. III. p. 287), as well as in his *résumé* of the contents of the second book of the *Vākya-padiya* (प्रणीतो द्विविधवाच्यं मम व्याकरणगमः), employs the term व्याकरणगम, it is evident that व्याकरणगम cannot possibly mean 'the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*,' but can only mean 'the doctrine or the traditional knowledge of grammar.'

‡ The name of this scholar is spelt both *Punyārāja* and *Puñjārāja* in my MSS.

§ एतेषां च वितत्य सौपयनिके सतिदर्शनं स्वकृपं पदकाण्डे लक्षणसमुद्देशो विनिर्दिष्टमिति ग्रन्थकृतेन स्वकृती प्रतियादितम्। आगमभंशाख्येकप्रमादादिना वा लक्षणसमुद्देशश्च पदकाण्डमभ्येन प्रसिद्धः ॥

the reasons which induced Patanjali to compose his great commentary, and that the latter, on account of its difficulty, was not generally understood, Bhartṛihari proceeds thus:—

वैजिशौभवहर्षसैः शुक्तकानुसारिभिः ।

आर्षे विश्रविते ग्रन्थे.....॥¶

यः पातञ्जलिशिष्येभ्यो भट्टो व्याकरणागमः ।

काले स दाक्षिणात्येषु ग्रन्थमात्रे व्यवस्थितः ॥

पर्वतादागमं लब्ध्वा भाष्यबीजानुसारिभिः ।

स नीतो बहुसाखत्वं चन्द्राचार्यादिभिः पुनः ॥

Prof. Weber's translation of these lines on p. 160 of vol. V. of the *Ind. Stud.* is this:—
"Vaiji, Saubhava, and Haryaksha, addicted to dry reasoning, . . . destroyed the Rishi's work."

"The grammar-text, lost to Patanjali's pupils, existed for a while among the Dākṣhiṇātyas, in one MS. only."

"Thereupon Chandra and others, searching for the seed (i.e. the original) of the Bhāṣya, received the text from Parvata, and made many branches of it."

From the remarks which follow this translation it appears that the words 'destroyed the Rishi's work' are not to be taken literally, but must be understood to convey the sense (see p. 163) that Vaiji, &c. "rose up against the work of Patanjali and caused it to fall into disuse (*verdrängten es*) for a while." Moreover, from pp. 166 and 167 we learn that Chandra and the others recovered the *Mahābhāṣya*, and that they did not establish a new text. Whether Prof. Weber was justified by his own translation in speaking, on p. 168, "of the reconstruction (by Chandra and others) of a text which had been lost for a time,"—a view which, so far as I am aware, he has upheld in all his later writings,—I leave for the decision of the reader. But the translation itself—which was prepared

¶ I purposely have omitted the last word of this line, because both its reading and signification appear to me somewhat doubtful. The Puna, Benares, Lahore, and Dr. Burnell's Malayālam MSS. read संग्रहप्रतिकञ्चुके. Colebrooke's MS. has कञ्चुके: and Punyārāja appears to have read कञ्चुके: for he seems to explain it by संग्रहप्रतिपक्षमूले: 'enemies of the *Samgraha*,' on which, according to Punyārāja's statement, the *Mahābhāṣya* has been based. If संग्रहप्रतिकञ्चुके be correct, it must, as was pointed out by Prof. Stenzler, be an adjective qualifying ग्रन्थे, and its meaning may possibly be 'preserving the (contents of the) *Samgraha*.' The meaning of the whole passage, so far as we are concerned with it here, is not affected either way.

without the assistance of any commentary—is open to objections, for some of which I may refer to Prof. Stenzler's remarks in the *Ind. Stud.* vol. V. p. 448. Following Puṇyārāja's commentary I venture to render Bhartṛihari's words thus :—

“When the book of the Rishi had been perverted by Vaiji, Śaṅbhava, and Haryakṣa, because (in attempting to explain it) they had followed their own unaided reasoning,*

“The traditional knowledge of grammar, lost to the pupils of Pātanjali, in course of time existed only in books, amongst the Dākṣhiṇātyas.

“It was again widely diffused by Chandrāchārya and others, who, after they had received the traditional knowledge from Parvata, followed (by its means) the principles laid down in the Bhāṣhya.”

After a careful consideration of Bhartṛihari's statement and of all that has been written about it (see also Burnell, *loc. cit.* p. 91), I am unable to perceive that it contains any allusion to the history of the text of the *Mahābhāṣhya*. What the author of the *Vākya-pāṇīya* really tells us, so far as I understand his meaning, is this :—There were certain scholars, mentioned by name, who in the explanation of the *Mahābhāṣhya* rejected the assistance of the traditional interpretation handed down to them, and trusted each to his own unaided reasoning. Their attempt, as might have been expected, proved unsuccessful. The meaning of Patanjali's work became perverted; its text, indeed, continued to exist, but as its true meaning was no longer understood, this existence was a sham (अभास, as Puṇyārāja says,) rather than a reality. The traditional interpretation having been once neglected ceased to be handed down orally from teacher to pupil, and remained only written down in books, which I understand to mean in the shape of written commentaries,† among the

Dākṣhiṇātyas. Chandrāchārya and others got hold of these commentaries which gave the traditional interpretation, and made it again generally known; they developed and diffused the science of grammar after, by means of the traditional interpretation, they had mastered the principles laid down in the *Mahābhāṣhya*.

For the sense in which I understand verse I. 176 of the *Rājataranginī*, I may refer the reader to p. 108 of vol. IV. of this journal, and I may add that even according to Prof. Weber's own interpretation, as given in *Ind. Stud.* vol. V. p. 167, the verse must not be understood to refer to a ‘reconstruction,’ or, as Dr. Burnell, *loc. cit.* p. 91, has expressed it, a ‘revision,’ of the text of the *Mahābhāṣhya*, but relates only the ‘introduction’ of the work into Kāśmīr.

The above are, I believe, all the reasons which Prof. Weber has ever brought forward to prove that the text of the *Mahābhāṣhya* has been ‘several times newly rearranged.’ The more important of them were examined at length, after the publication of Prof. Goldstücker's *Pāṇini*, in vol. V. of the *Indische Studien*, and the conclusion to which they appeared to point then was, to use Prof. Weber's own words (p. 169), “that there existed no cogent reasons to doubt the authenticity of the text, so far as it was known,” fourteen years ago. Since then, it is true, the whole text of the *Mahābhāṣhya* has been made generally accessible; but, as I fail to perceive how *thereby* its authenticity should have become more doubtful than it was before, I consider myself still justified in maintaining “that for the present we are bound to regard the text of the *Mahābhāṣhya* as given by our MSS. to be the same as it existed about two thousand years ago.”

But I shall be told that even if all I have maintained in the preceding were correct, there would still remain sufficient internal evidence

* Instead of the epithet शुक्लकौमुदीभिः Puṇyārāja in his *résumé* uses the expression अविशविशैः ‘overpowered by conceit,’ i.e. Vaiji, &c. were too conceited to follow the traditional interpretation. विप्रवित्त is explained by आभासीकृत, literally ‘reduced to a semblance,’ i.e. after the treatment which the *Mahābhāṣhya* had received from Vaiji, &c. it indeed looked still like the *Mahābhāṣhya* (just as a *Hetvābhāṣya* looks like a *Hetu*), in reality however it had ceased to be the *Mahābhāṣhya*, because its true meaning had been perverted and was no longer understood.

† If it be objected that no such commentaries are known at present, I can only answer that commentaries

of which we know nothing must have existed even in Kaiyata's time, because he frequently introduces interpretations that differ from his own by अयं, अपरं, कश्चित्. And there is no reason why commentaries on grammatical works should not have been lost, as well as others. The commentaries on Pāṇini's Sūtras by Chauliḥḥaṭṭi and Nallūra, which are mentioned by Jinendrauddhi, are, so far as I am aware, not known to Sanskrit scholars even by name. And that commentaries on Kātyāyana's Vārtikas were in existence when Patanjali composed his own *Mahābhāṣhya* no one will deny who is acquainted with the latter.

to prove that what we are accustomed to call the *Mahābhāṣya* is but a modern compilation, prepared probably during or after the 7th century of our era. This at least is the view to which Dr. Burnell has given expression in his essay *On the Aindra School of Grammarians* (p. 91), and which has been approved of by Prof. Weber in his review of Dr. Burnell's book. As it is desirable that the case should be stated to the reader as fairly as possible, I am obliged to quote Dr. Burnell's opinion and arguments in full, the more so because it would seem as if the views of that scholar have been somewhat misrepresented by his reviewer.† "But," writes Dr. Burnell, "it appears to me that the form of the *Mahābhāṣya* is in itself a convincing proof that the text is not in its original form. That it is highly controversial has already been noticed, but I think that, as it now stands, it may be rather taken as a synopsis of arguments for and against the details of Pāṇini's system, and as a controversial manual. No doubt, Kātyāyana criticized Pāṇini, and Patanjali replied in justification of the former, but the *Mahābhāṣya* goes further than this. The first *āhnika*, which contains a long argument as to the utility of grammar, &c., and which fills no less than 27 pages in the splendid India Museum facsimile edition, has no parallel in the older commentaries, and certainly is not to be expected in a book of the second century before our era, but is just what we find in the controversial literature of the 7th and the following centuries A.D. How is it possible to believe that Patanjali himself found it necessary to furnish arguments which would justify the study to which he had devoted his life? Again, the whole arrangement and the matter are too systematic and copious for a mere refutation of Kātyāyana, whereas the epigrammatic forms of Kātyāyana's criticisms on Pāṇini point rather to an abridgment of Kātyāyana's words than to quotations. It must not be forgotten that Vārttikas of others besides Kātyāyana are occasionally given. Is it likely that these critics of Pāṇini merely stated their corrections, real or presumed, in the fewest possible words, and did not assign full reasons for

their opinions? It thus appears to me that the *Mahābhāṣya*, as it stands, is rather a skilful compilation of the views of Pāṇini's critics, and of their refutation by Patanjali, than the real text of the original works, and that it has been made with a view to practical polemics."

If I rightly understand these words, Dr. Burnell maintains that some time before the 7th century A.D. there existed certain works composed by Kātyāyana and others in which these scholars stated their criticisms on Pāṇini, assigning full reasons for their own opinions; that at the same time there existed another work by Patanjali which was exclusively devoted to a refutation of those criticisms; and that the *Mahābhāṣya*, as it stands, is rather a skilful compilation (prepared during or after the 7th century) of the views of Pāṇini's critics, and of their refutation by Patanjali, than the real text of the original works of Kātyāyana, Patanjali, &c. To corroborate this assertion, it is stated that the *Mahābhāṣya* looks like a manual of controversy:—

(1) Because the views of Kātyāyana and other critics of Pāṇini are given in it in an abridged form, the reasons which those critics must have assigned for their views having been omitted.

(2) Because what we are accustomed to consider as Patanjali's remarks are not confined to a refutation of Kātyāyana, as may be seen—

(a) From the long argument as to the utility of grammar, &c., filling no less than 27 pages; this argument is out of place in a refutation of Kātyāyana; it is not in keeping with Patanjali's date (the second century B.C.), nor in keeping with his devotion to the study of grammar.

(b) From the whole arrangement and the matter, which are too systematic and copious for a mere refutation of Kātyāyana.

I have examined these statements with that care and attention which Dr. Burnell's scholarship and wide range of reading are always sure to command from a fellow-worker, but I have been unable to convince myself of the truth of his premisses, or the fairness of the conclusion

† Prof. Weber in quoting from Dr. Burnell's book makes the latter say that the *Mahābhāṣya* is not 'the real text of the original work,' whereas in reality Dr. Burnell speaks of original works. This difference between the singular and plural shows clearly that Prof. Weber's and Dr. Burnell's views regarding the *Mahābhāṣya* are by no means the same. According to Prof. Weber some

such work as the *Mahābhāṣya* which we possess was actually composed by Patanjali, but had to be reconstructed when its original text in course of time had been reduced to fragments. According to Dr. Burnell our *Mahābhāṣya* has been compiled from several original works, and may therefore be called an original compilation from works which have been altogether lost. See below.

which has been derived from them. Whether the late Prof. Goldstücker was right in describing the nature and the object of the Vārttikas as he has done, I may have occasion to examine hereafter; but allowing for the sake of argument that the Vārttikas contain nothing but criticisms on Pāṇini, and that it was the sole aim of Kātyāyana 'to find fault' with that grammarian, it certainly appears to me that in the *Mahābhāshya* those 'criticisms' have in every case been given as fully as could be expected, that they are supported by reasons whenever their nature admits of or necessitates such support, and that the term 'abridgment' is as little applicable to them as it would be applicable to the Sūtras of Pāṇini. As regards Patanjali, it has nowhere been shown that he was bound to confine his remarks to a refutation of Kātyāyana, nor has it been proved that the justification of Pāṇini

§ A few examples must suffice here. On P. I. 1. 1 the two first vārttikas are:—

- (a) संज्ञाधिकारः संज्ञासंप्रत्ययार्थः ॥
(b) इतरथा ह्यसंप्रत्ययो यथा लोके ॥

Here the reason for which Kātyāyana demands a Samjñādhikāra is given in संज्ञासंप्रत्ययार्थः; and the fault which is said to arise from the non-adoption of such an *adhi-kāra* is stated in vārttika (b). It is unnecessary to state here how Kātyāyana himself subsequently shows that in reality no Samjñādhikāra is required.

On P. I. 1. 4 we read the vārttika (a) यङ्गुक्कृबलोपे प्रतिषेधः; the reason for the adoption of which is stated in (b) नृम्लोपस्त्रियनुबन्धलोपेऽप्रतिषेधार्थम्;

On P. I. 1. 5 the vārttika (a) क्तिप्रतिषेधे तन्निमित्तप्रहणम्; the reason for which is stated in (b) उपधारोत्पत्त्यर्थम्;

On P. I. 1. 9 the vārttika सवर्णसंज्ञायां भिन्नदेशोऽपि प्रतिषेधः; प्रत्यनसाधन्यात्, where the reason for the objection raised is given in the last word.

On P. I. 1. 12 in the vārttika मात्प्रगृह्यसंज्ञायां तस्यासिद्धत्वादयावकादेऽप्रतिषेधः the reason is given in the words तस्यासिद्धत्वात्.

On P. I. 1. 20 in the vārttika घुसंज्ञायां प्रकृतिप्रहणं शिदर्थम् the reason for the correction is stated in the word शिदर्थम्.

See also the vārttikas on P. I. 1. 23:—

- (a) संख्यासंज्ञायां संख्याप्रहणम् ॥
(b) संख्यासंप्रत्ययप्रहणम् ॥
(c) इतरथा ह्यसंप्रत्ययोऽकृत्रिमत्वायथा लोके ॥
(d) उत्तरार्थं च ॥

|| I need quote only *Vākyapadīya*, I. 23:—

नित्याः शब्दार्थसंबन्धास्तत्रास्मात् महाभिः ।
संज्ञायां सातुतत्राणां भाष्याणां च प्रणेतृभिः ॥
on which the commentator remarks:

अनुत्तमं वार्तिकम् । तत्राप्युक्तं सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे इति ॥

was the main object of his work. Moreover, so far from having attempted to bring forward anything in favour of the assertion that what we know of Patanjali's views has been compiled from a more extensive work of that grammarian, Dr. Burnell appears rather inclined to regard the *copiousness* of the matter in the *Mahābhāshya* as inconsistent with the idea of its being an original work. The long argument as to the utility of grammar, which to Dr. Burnell appears to be so much out of place in a refutation of Kātyāyana, fills in reality by far the smaller number of the 27 pages of the introductory *Āhnika*: for as early as the 12th page we read the words सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे, which, by the unanimous consent of all grammatical works known to me, form the first of Kātyāyana's Vārttikas. I too am inclined to believe that the reasons in favour of the study of

and Īśvarānanda's Bhāshyapradīpavivarana वारुचं वार्तिकम् । तद्धि मंगलाचरणपूर्वकं सिद्धे शब्दार्थेत्यादि ॥

The vārttikas commented on by Patanjali in the first *āhnika* are the following:—

सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे ।
लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मेनियम् ।
यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु ॥
अस्यप्रयुक्त इति चेन्नार्थे शब्दप्रयोगात् ।
अप्रयोगः प्रयोगान्यत्वात् ।
अप्रयुक्ते दीर्घसत्त्ववत् ।
सर्वे देशान्तरं ॥
ज्ञाने धर्मे इति चेत्याधर्मः ।
आचारो नियमः ।
प्रयोगे सर्वलोकास्य ।
शास्त्रपूर्वकं प्रयोगेऽभ्युदयस्तजुल्यं वेदशब्देन ॥
सूत्रं व्याकरणे षड्गुर्थाऽनुपपन्नः ।
शब्दाप्रतिपत्तिः ।
शब्दे ल्युडर्थः ।
भवे ।
प्रोक्तदयश्च तद्धिताः ।
लक्ष्यलक्षणं व्याकरणम् ॥
वृत्तिसमवायार्थे उपदेशः ।
अनुबन्धकरणाद्यर्थः ।
इष्टवृद्धयर्थेऽपि चेदुदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानुनासिकरीर्घ्यतानामन्युपदेशः ।

आकृत्युपदेशातिवृत्तिमिति चेत्संज्ञादानां प्रतिषेधः ॥

The so-called *Vārttika-pāṭha*, of which I possess a MS., appears to me to be a modern compilation, and does not decide the question of what are vārttikas and what not.

§ रक्षोहागमलपञ्चसंदेशः प्रयोजनम्, and तं सुराः up to सुदेशोऽपि वरुणः. That Patanjali has not himself collected the passages तं सुराः, &c. appears to follow from the fact that he understands the eighth of them, चत्वारि, to indicate *Rigveda*, IV. 58. 3, while at the same time he informs us

grammar, by which this *Vārttika* is preceded, have not been invented by Patanjali; but, so far from allowing them to be an addition made during or after the 7th century A.D., I would rather maintain that those arguments must have been current long before Patanjali, and that all he has done himself is to comment on them, and to quote the interpretation of another scholar which differs from his own. When a scholar of Yāska's antiquity has thought it desirable to bring forward arguments in favour of the study of *his science*,* the presence of such arguments cannot, surely, furnish any just cause for casting doubts on the authenticity of a work supposed to have been composed during the second century before our era, and it is accounted for, rather than rendered suspicious, by Patanjali's devotion to the study of grammar. To my mind the language and the style in what we are accustomed to call the *Mahābhāṣya* are a sufficient proof that that great work must have been composed a very long time before the 7th century. In the *Vākya-pādiya* native grammarians have given to us a specimen of such a compilation or controversial manual as has been described by Dr. Burnell, but I am unable to admit that the terms used by that scholar are fairly applicable to what tradition has taught us to regard as the original work of Patanjali.

And this leads me to touch upon one more question raised by Prof. Weber,—the question, namely, whether the *Mahābhāṣya* ought not to be considered the work of the *pupils* of Patanjali, rather than the work of their master.

"It is true," says Prof. Weber on p. 322 of vol. XIII. of the *Ind. Stud.*, "one of the arguments which I have brought forward in favour of this view, viz. that Patanjali in the *Mahābhāṣya* is *always* spoken of in the *third person*, and that his opinions are several times introduced with तु, or rather with पश्यति त्वाचार्यः, is no longer strictly valid. For, on the one hand, we several

times find in it also statements in the *first person* . . . on the other hand, according to Bhāṇḍārkar, we have to understand by the word आचार्य in such phrases as पश्यति त्वाचार्यः not Patanjali at all, but Pāṇini! As regards some passages, Bhāṇḍārkar appears to be strictly correct; by no means, however, as regards *all*: for on the one hand this would form too glaring a contrast with Nāgēśa's distinct statement to the contrary 'that in the Bhāṣya आचार्य denotes *only* Patanjali,' भाष्ये आचार्यपदेन शास्त्राचार्यको भाष्यकारा एव विवक्षितः, on the other hand, in many of those cases the reference to the statements of the Bhāṣya (and *not* to the wording of Pāṇini's Sātras) is perfectly clear and distinct. How matters really stand will still have to be specially investigated. But, in spite of these two corrections of my former statements, so much at any rate remains certain, that on the whole the cases in which the views of the Bhāṣyakāra are stated in the first person are *comparatively* rare, and that, *as a rule*, his statements, on the contrary, are made in the third person."

I was, I confess it, somewhat startled when first perusing these lines; for I also had studied portions at least of the *Mahābhāṣya*, and during that study it had always appeared to me that the word आचार्यः, in cases where no other Āchārya was particularly specified, denoted either Pāṇini or, though much more rarely, Kātyāyana; and, moreover, I could not remember to have found Patanjali, if I may say so, speaking in the third person. I was sorry, too, that a man of Nāgōjibhaṭṭa's vast learning and scholarship, whom I had found cause to regard as one of the greatest grammarians of modern times, should have been thought capable of making a statement the falseness of which could be demonstrated from almost every single page of the *Mahābhāṣya*. The first thing I had to do was to examine Nāgōjibhaṭṭa's remark for myself, and here I found that it admitted of a very different explanation.

that *another* understands by it *Rev. I. 164. 45*. I may add, too, that by (6) विभक्तिं कुर्वन्ति, (11) सारस्वतीम्, and (12) दशम्यां पुत्रस्य some other passages appear to have been intended than those which have actually been quoted by Patanjali.

* See Nirukta, I. 15. अथार्थादमन्तरेण मन्त्रेष्वर्थप्रत्ययो न विद्यते ऽर्थप्रतियतो नात्यन्तं स्वरसंस्कारोऽस्तदिदं विद्यास्थानं व्याकरणस्य कात्स्न्यं स्वाध्यायार्थं च ॥ (Compare herewith Patanjali's explanation of असंदेहार्थं जप्यध्यायं व्याकरणम्.)

- I. 17. अथापीदमन्तरेण पदविभागो न विद्यते ॥
अथापि याज्ञे देवतेन बहवः प्रदेशा भवन्तीत्यादि ॥
अथापि ज्ञानप्रज्ञा भवन्त्यज्ञानविन्दा च ॥
स्यापुरयं भारहारः ॥
यद्रहीतमविज्ञातम् ॥ (See Patanjali.)
उत त्वः पश्यन् ॥ (See Patanjali.)
उत त्वं सख्ये ॥

† Nāgōjibhaṭṭa says भाष्यकुदेव.

Nāgōjibhaṭṭa's declared object 'in composing his *Bhāṣyapradīpodyota* was to elucidate Kaiyata's *Bhāṣyapradīpa*, but he did not thereby regard himself as prevented from commenting on the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* as well, in cases where he deemed Kaiyata's commentary insufficient; and, to show the student at first sight that he was explaining the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*, and not that of Kaiyata's commentary, he adopted the practice of prefixing to such explanations the word भाष्ये (see Ballantyne's ed. pp. 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, &c.). This is exactly the case in the passage quoted by Prof. Weber (*loc. cit.* p. 36), भाष्ये आचार्यवदेन शास्त्राचार्यको भाष्यकृदेव विवक्षितः. Nāgōjibhaṭṭa considers that Kaiyata ought to have given a note regarding the meaning of the word आचार्य in तेन एवं विवक्षितवृत्तिः ५ ध्येत्यः सुहृद्व्याचारे इदं शास्त्रमन्वाचरे, because in this particular passage आचार्य does not appear to him to convey its ordinary meaning; and to supply this defect he is good enough to tell us that (in his opinion) आचार्य denotes, in this particular passage of the *Mahābhāṣya*, *exceptionally* the author of the *Bhāṣya* himself, and not those whom it denotes generally (Pāṇini or Kātyāyana).

Accurately to determine whether Prof. Weber was right in maintaining that in the *Mahābhāṣya* आचार्यः in such phrases as परयति त्वाचार्यः (by which I understand Prof. Weber to mean the phrases परयति त्वाचार्यः, आचार्यवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति, and ज्ञापयत्त्वाचार्यः) denotes in the majority of cases Patanjali, and that the latter, as a rule, is spoken of in the third person, or whether I was correct in believing that आचार्य (with possibly the one exception pointed out by Nāgōjibhaṭṭa) did not denote Patanjali, and that the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* in the body of the work ascribed to him (with perhaps the exception of those five passages in which, according to Professor Weber, the terms गोनदीय or गौणिकाय occur) was not spoken of in the third person, I should have had

to read through the whole of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Though I had not the time for doing this, I thought it right to study once more at least part of the work, with the view of testing, so far as was in my power, the truth of Prof. Weber's statements and of my own impressions. Accordingly I read through carefully the first 240 pages of the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* as given in the lithographed Benares edition, and the results at which I arrived by doing so were the following:—

(a) *As to the word आचार्य.* On the first 240 pages this word is found sixty times, and among those sixty passages in which it occurs there is only one, viz. that pointed out by Nāgōjibhaṭṭa, in which it denotes Patanjali himself, provided Nāgōjibhaṭṭa's statement be strictly correct. The phrase आचार्यवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति occurs twenty times, ज्ञापयत्त्वाचार्यः nine times, and परयति त्वाचार्यः seven times, and in them आचार्य *always* means Pāṇini. Besides, Pāṇini is denoted by आचार्य nine times (on pp. 11b, 12a, 40a, 46a, 47b twice, 94b twice, and 112b).

Four times आचार्य denotes Kātyāyana, viz. twice on p. 13a, once on p. 18b, and once on p. 75b (see his *vārt.* on P. VI. 1. 129).

The Āchārya Śākalya is mentioned on p. 82a.

The Āchāryas generally are spoken of six times; Āchāryas other than Śākalya once; and the Āchāryas mentioned by Pāṇini likewise once, viz. in the *vārt.* आचार्यदेशज्ञानेन च तद्विषयताः on p. 112a.

(b) *As to whether Patanjali is, as a rule, spoken of in the third person.* Since Patanjali (with the possible exceptions already pointed out) is not mentioned by name, the question to be decided is really this: whether for verbal forms such as पठति, वदयति, in cases where their subject has not been particularized in the *Mahābhāṣya*, and where it is impossible to supply the subject Pāṇini, § we have ever to supply the nominative पतञ्जलिः :

p. 24b, यदयं.....कराति p. 25a, 31b, &c.

Do. उच्चारयेत्.

p. 31a, अयमुपदिशेत्.

p. 34b, यदयं शुभनादिषु (P. VII. 4. 39) नूनमनशन्दं पठति.

p. 55b, किति प्रतिषेधं वदयति (P. I. 1. 5), &c.

As in all these and similar cases the context would show at once and beyond doubt that the subject of the verbs शास्ति, &c. can be no other than Pāṇini, it was unnecessary for Patanjali to tell the student that it was Pāṇini who had taught something by the rule अ अ, Pāṇini who had

† This *vārt.* and Patanjali's remarks on it are of some importance, for we learn therefrom that at any rate in P. IV. 1. 160 the word पाचाम् does not denote former grammarians, but has the sense of पाचां देशे. For the different view taken by Dr. Burnell see his essay *On the Aindra School*, pp. 24 and 26.

§ It is hardly necessary to state that we are very often required to supply the subject Pāṇini. For instances I refer to—

p. 22b, यदयम् अ अ (P. VIII. 4. 68) इति...शास्ति;
p. 32a, 33a, &c.

On the first 240 pages the verbal forms that have to be considered are the following :—

- p. 22a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*. See his *vārt.* on P. I. 1. 9, सिद्धं त्वात्वे तुल्यदेशमयन्त्वनवर्णम्, and the way in which it has been paraphrased by Patanjali on p. 69b.
- p. 27b, (अत उत्तरं) पठति; supply *Kātyāyana*. His *vārt.* is given immediately after the word पठति.
- p. 30a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VI. 4. 133.
- p. 40a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. I. 2. 45.
- p. 40b, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VIII. 2. 6.
- p. 55b, (अत उत्तरं) पठति; supply *Kātyāyana*; his *vārt.* follows immediately upon the word पठति.
- p. 59b, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on the same page.
- p. 66b, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. I. 1. 47.
- p. 69a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on the next page.
- p. 72a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VI. 1. 101.
- p. 77b, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. I. 4. 14.
- p. 86b, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VI. 1. 1.
- „ वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*; see his *vārt.* on P. VIII. 3. 59.
- p. 88a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. I. 1. 72.
- p. 99a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. II. 2. 35.
- p. 99b, 1. 3, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. II. 2. 35.
- p. 102a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VI. 2. 2.
- p. 106b, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VIII. 2. 3.

prohibited the substitution of *Guna* and *Vridhi* by his rule किति च, &c.

On the other hand, when, as has been shown in the above, Patanjali speaks of *Kātyāyana* without particularizing him, his doing so is in my opinion accounted for by the fact that *Kātyāyana*'s is the work on which he is commenting (or, as other scholars would say, the work which he is refuting), and in speaking of him in the third person without mentioning his name Patanjali has done what numbers of commentators have done besides him. On p. 101a, where

p. 117a, वक्ष्यति; supply *Kātyāyana*, *vārt.* on P. VI. 4. 72.

The only verbal forms of this kind which remain are वक्ष्यति on p. 24a, on p. 52a, and on p. 99b, line 1. As regards the two latter, it might indeed at first sight appear as if we had to supply for them the subject *Patanjali*; but to do so would in my opinion be incorrect. For in reality the statement which follows upon the word वक्ष्यति on p. 52a is not of Patanjali's invention, but it must, as we are told by Patanjali on P. V. 2. 4, be ascribed to *Pāṇini*; similarly the statement which follows the word वक्ष्यति on p. 99b is not Patanjali's, but is implied in *Kātyāyana*'s *vārt.* on P. II. 2. 35, and belongs therefore to him. Finally, not even the one remaining वक्ष्यति on p. 24a is likely to support Prof. Weber's view, for the best copy of the *Mahābhāṣya* accessible to me does in this case not read वक्ष्यति, but वक्ष्यते (see the lith. ed. of the India Office, p. 31).

As, then, the perusal of the first 240 pages of the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* does not appear to furnish any argument in favour of Prof. Weber's views, it will not, I trust, be thought unreasonable when for the present I venture to doubt their correctness, and when I continue to regard the supposition that the *Mahābhāṣya* may have been composed by the pupils of Patanjali, as void of foundation. The longer I study that great work the more I feel convinced that from beginning to end it is the masterly production of one and the same individual scholar, and that few works in the whole range of Sanskrit literature have been preserved to us as complete and intact as the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*.

I may be wrong, and when I find my views refuted by cogent arguments I shall be the first to say so. The *Mahābhāṣya*, besides being one of the most interesting works for the student of language, is in many respects also one of the most difficult, and every attempt to facilitate

Patanjali addresses both *Pāṇini* and *Kātyāyana* as authorities for one and the same thing, he does consider it necessary to inform us that he is quoting the *Vārtikakāra* : आचार्यपटुतिर्ज्ञापयति.....वाचिककारश्च पठति.

That no subject whatever need be supplied for the phrase इत्याह when it occurs in such sentences as नेत्याह, उभयमित्याह, लभमित्याह, गतमित्याह, &c., which give answers to questions that have been previously raised, those who are acquainted with the style of the *Mahābhāṣya* need hardly be reminded of.

the understanding of it, or to solve the problems to which it gives rise, must be received by all scholars with gratitude. But we ought never to forget that little will be gained by conjecture, or by a perusal of the bare text of

Patanjali's work, and that no attempt at understanding the true nature of the *Mahābhāshya* is likely to be successful unless it be based on a careful study of what the Hindu commentators themselves have written about it.||

|| May I venture to request Professor Bhândárkar to reprint his articles on Goldstücker's *Pāṇini* which were published in *Native Opinion*, so as to make them more generally accessible? Some of Prof. Goldstücker's views are being repeated and used as arguments although they have been refuted many years ago. I allude particularly to his explanation of Patanjali's remarks on P. I. 2. 53.