

Chapter 1

Preface

The present grammar, which is chiefly intended for beginners, is believed to contain all the information that a student of Sanskrit is likely to want during the first two or three years of his reading. Rules referring to the language of the Vedas have been entirely excluded, for it is not desirable that the difficulties of that ancient dialect should be approached by any one who has not fully mastered the grammar of the ordinary Sanskrit such as it was fixed by Pāṇini and his successors. All allusions to cognate forms in Greek, Latin, or Gothic, have likewise been suppressed, because, however interesting and useful to the advanced student, they are apt to deprive the beginner of that clear and firm grasp of the grammatical system peculiar to the language of ancient India, which alone can form a solid foundation for the study both of Sanskrit and of comparative philology.

The two principal objects which I have kept in view while composing this grammar have been clearness and correctness. With regard to clearness, my chief model has been the grammar of Bopp; with regard to correctness, the grammar of Colebrooke. If I may hope, without presumption, to have simplified a few of the intricacies of Sanskrit grammar which were but partially cleared up by Bopp, Benfey, Flecchia, and others, I can hardly flatter myself to have reached, with regard to correctness, the high standard of Colebrooke's great, though unfinished work. I can only say in self-defence that it is far more difficult to be correct on every minute point, if one endeavours to rearrange, as I have done, the materials collected by Pāṇini, and to adapt them to the grammatical system current in Europe, than if one follows so closely as Colebrooke the system of native grammarians, and adopts nearly the whole of their technical terminology. The grammatical system elaborated by native grammarians is, in itself, most perfect; and those who have tested Pāṇini's work will readily admit that there is no grammar in any language that could vie with the wonderful mechanism of his eight books of grammatical rules. But unrivalled as that system is, it is not suited to the wants of English students, least of all to the wants of beginners. While availing myself therefore of the materials collected in the grammar of Pāṇini and in later works, such as the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*, the

Siddhānta-Kaumudī, the *Sārasvatī Prakriyā*, and the *Mādhavīya-dhātu-vṛtti*, I have abstained, as much as possible, from introducing any more of the peculiar system and of the terminology of Indian grammarians¹ than has already found admittance into our Sanskrit grammars; nay, I have frequently rejected the grammatical observations supplied ready to hand in their works in order not to overwhelm the memory of the student with too many rules and too many exceptions. Whether I have always been successful in drawing a line between what is essential in Sanskrit grammar and what is not, I must leave to the judgement of those who enjoy the good fortune of being engaged in the practical teaching of a language the students of which may be counted no longer by tens, but by hundreds.² I only wish it to be understood that where I have left out rules or exceptions, contained in other grammars, whether native or European, I have done so after mature consideration, deliberately preferring the less complete to the more complete, but, at the same time, more bewildering statement of the anomalies of the Sanskrit language. Thus, to mention one or two cases, when giving the rules on the employment of the suffixes *vat* and *mat* (§ 187), I have left out the rule that bases ending in *m*, though the *m* be preceded by other vowels than *a*, always take *vat* instead of *mat*. I did so partly because there are very few bases ending in *m*, partly because, if a word like *kim-vān* should occur, it would be easy to discover the reason why here too *v* was preferred to *m*, viz. that bases ending in *m* are not allowed to form denominatives. It is true, no doubt, that the omission of such rules or exceptions may be said to involve an actual misrepresentation, and that a pupil might be misled to form such words as *kim-mān* and *kim-yati*. But this cannot be avoided in an elementary grammar; and the student who is likely to come into contact with such recondite forms will no doubt be sufficiently advanced to be able to consult for himself the rules of Pāṇini and the explanations of his commentators.

My own fear is that, in writing an elementary grammar, I have erred rather in giving too much than in giving too little. I have therefore in the table of contents marked with an asterisk all such rules as may be safely left out in a first course of Sanskrit grammar, and I have in different places informed the

¹The few alterations that I have made in the usual terminology have been made solely with a view of facilitating the work of the learner. Thus instead of numbering the ten classes of verbs, I have called each by its first verb. This relieves the memory of much unnecessary trouble, as the very name indicates the character of each class; and though the names may at first sound somewhat uncouth, they are after all the only names recognized by native grammarians. Knowing from my experience as an examiner how difficult it is to remember the merely numerical distinction between the first, second, or third preterites, or the first and second futures, I have kept as much as possible to the terminology with which classical scholars are familiar, calling the tense corresponding to the Greek imperfect, *imperfect*; that corresponding to the perfect, *reduplicated perfect*; that corresponding to the aorist, *aorist*; and the mood corresponding to the optative, *optative*. The names of *periphrastic perfect* and *periphrastic future* tell their own story; and if I have retained the merely numerical distinction between the first and second aorists, it was because this distinction seemed to be more intelligible to a classical scholar than the six or seven forms of the so-called *multiform preterite*.

²In the University of Leipsig alone, as many as twenty-five pupils attended the classes of Professor Brockhaus in order to acquire a knowledge of the elements of Sanskrit, previous to the study of comparative philology.

reader whether certain portions might be passed over quickly, or should be carefully committed to memory. Here and there, as for instance in § 103, a few extracts are introduced from Pāṇini simply in order to give to the student a foretaste of what he may expect in the elaborate works of native grammarians, while lists of verbs like those contained in § 332 or § 462 are given, as everybody will see, for the sake of reference only. The somewhat elaborate treatment of the nominal bases in \bar{i} and \bar{u} , from § 220 to § 226, became necessary partly because in no grammar had the different paradigms of this class been correctly given, partly because it was impossible to bring out clearly the principle on which the peculiarities and apparent irregularities of these nouns are based without entering fully into the systematic arrangement of native grammarians. Of portions like this I will not say indeed, XXX, but I feel that I may say, XXX; and I know that those who will take the trouble to examine the same mass of evidence which I have weighed and examined will be the most lenient in their judgement, if hereafter they should succeed better than I have done in unravelling the intricate argumentations of native scholars.³

But while acknowledging my obligations to the great grammarians of India, it would be ungrateful were I not to acknowledge as fully the assistance which I have derived from the works of European scholars. My first acquaintance with the elements of Sanskrit was gained from Bopp's grammar. Those only who know the works of his predecessors, of Colebrooke, Carey, Wilkins, and Forster, can appreciate the advance made by Bopp in explaining the difficulties, and in lighting up, if I may say so, the dark lanes and alleys of the Sanskrit language. I doubt whether Sanskrit scholarship would have flourished as it has, if students had been obliged to learn their grammar from Forster or Colebrooke, and I believe that to Bopp's little grammar is due a great portion of that success which has attended the study of Sanskrit literature in Germany. Colebrooke, Carey, Wilkins, and Forster worked independently of each other. Each derived his information from native teachers and from native grammars. Among these four scholars, Wilkins seems to have been the first to compose a Sanskrit grammar, for he informs us that the first printed sheet of his work was destroyed by fire in 1795. The whole grammar, however, was not published till 1808. In the mean time Forster had finished his grammar, and had actually delivered his manuscript to the Council of the College of Fort William in 1804. But it was not published till 1810. The first part of Colebrooke's grammar was published in 1805, and therefore stands first in point of time of publication. Unfortunately it was not finished because the grammars of Forster and Carey were then in course of publication, and would, as Colebrooke imagined, supply the deficient part of his own. Carey's grammar was published in 1806. Among these four publica-

³To those who have the same faith in the accurate and never-swerving argumentations of Sanskrit commentators, it may be a saving of time to be informed that in the new and very useful edition of the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī* by Śrī Tārānātha-tarkavā-caspati there are two misprints which hopelessly disturb the order of the rules on the proper declension of nouns in \bar{i} and \bar{u} . On page 136, line 7, read XXX instead of XXX; this is corrected in the *Corrigenda*, and the right reading is found in the old edition. On the same page, line 13, insert न after विना, or join XXX.

tions, which as first attempts at making the ancient language of India accessible to European scholars, deserve the highest credit, Colebrooke's grammar is *facile princeps*. It is derived at first-hand from the best native grammars, and evinces a familiarity with the most intricate problems of Hindu grammarians such as few scholars have acquired after him. No one can understand and appreciate the merits of this grammar who has not previously acquired a knowledge of the grammatical system of Pāṇini, and it is a great loss to Sanskrit scholarship that so valuable a work should have remained unfinished.

I owe most, indeed, to Colebrooke and Bopp, but I have derived many useful hints from other grammars also. There are some portions of Wilson's grammar which show that he consulted native grammarians, and the fact that he possessed the remaining portion of Colebrooke's manuscript,⁴ gives to his list of verbs, with the exception of the *bhū* class, which was published by Colebrooke, a peculiar interest. Professor Benfey in his large grammar performed a most useful task in working up independently the materials supplied by Pāṇini and Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita; and his smaller grammars too, published both in German and in English, have rendered good service to the cause of sound scholarship. There are besides, the grammars of Boller in German, of Oppert in French, of Westergaard in Danish, of Flecchia in Italian, each supplying something that could not be found elsewhere, and containing suggestions, many of which have proved useful to the writer of the present grammar.

But while thus rendering full justice to the honest labours of my predecessors, I am bound to say, at the same time, that with regard to doubtful or difficult forms, of which there are many in the grammar of the Sanskrit language, not one of them can be appealed to as an ultimate authority. Every grammar contains, as is well known, a number of forms which occur but rarely, if ever, in the literary language. It is necessary, however, for the sake of systematic completeness to give these forms; and if they are to be given at all, they must be given on competent authority. Now it might be supposed that a mere reference to any of the numerous grammars already published would be sufficient for this purpose, and that the lists of irregular or unusual forms might safely be copied from their pages. But this is by no means the case. Even with regard to regular forms, whoever should trust implicitly in the correctness of any of the grammars hitherto published would never be certain of having the right form. I do not say this lightly or without being able to produce proofs. When I began to revise my manuscript grammar which I had composed for my own use many years ago, and when on points on which I felt doubtful, I consulted other grammars, I soon discovered either that, with a strange kind of sequacity, they all repeated the same mistake, or that they varied wildly from each other without assigning any reason or authority. I need not say that the grammars which we possess differ very much in the degree of their trustworthiness; but with the exception of the first volume of Colebrooke and of Professor Benfey's larger Sanskrit grammar, it would be impossible to appeal to any of my predecessors as an authority on doubtful points. Forster and Carey, who evidently depend almost entirely on

⁴See Wilson's *Sanskrit and English Dictionary*, first edition, preface, p. xlv.

materials supplied to them by native assistants, give frequently the most difficult forms with perfect accuracy, while they go wildly wrong immediately after, without, it would seem, any power of controlling their authorities. The frequent inaccuracies in the grammars of Wilkins and Wilson have been pointed out by others; and however useful these works may have been for practical purposes, they were never intended as authorities on contested points of Sanskrit grammar.

Nothing remained, in fact, in order to arrive at any satisfactory result, but to collate the whole of my grammar with regard not only to the irregular but likewise to the regular forms, with Pāṇini and other native grammarians, and to supply for each doubtful case, and for rules that might seem to differ from those of any of my predecessors, a reference to Pāṇini or to other native authorities. This I have done, and in so doing I had to rewrite nearly the whole of my grammar; but though the time and trouble expended on this work have been considerable, I believe that they have not been bestowed in vain. I only regret that I did not give these authoritative references throughout the whole of my work because, even where there cannot be any difference of opinion, some of my readers might thus have been saved the time and trouble of looking through Pāṇini to find the *sūtras* that bear on every form of the Sanskrit language.

By this process which I have adopted, I believe that on many points a more settled and authoritative character has been imparted to the grammar of Sanskrit than it possessed before; but I do by no means pretend to have arrived on all points at a clear and definite view of the meaning of Pāṇini and his successors. The grammatical system of Hindu grammarians is so peculiar that rules which we should group together are scattered about in different parts of their manuals. We may have the general rule in the last, and the exceptions in the first book, and even then we are by no means certain that exceptions to these exceptions may not occur somewhere else. I shall give but one instance. There is a root जागृ *jāgr*, which forms its aorist by adding इष *iṣam*, ईः *īh*, ईत् *īt*. Here the simplest rule would be that final ऋ *r* before इष *iṣam* becomes र् *r* (Pāṇini vi 1, 77). This, however, is prevented by another rule which requires that final ऋ *r* should take guṇa before इष *iṣam* (Pāṇini vii 3, 84). This would give us अजागरिषं *ajāgar-iṣam*. But now comes another general rule (Pāṇini vii 2, 1) which prescribes vṛddhi of final vowels before इष *iṣam*, i. e. अजागारिषं *ajāgāriṣam*. Against this change, however, a new rule is cited (Pāṇini vii 3, 85), and this secures for जागृ *jāgr* a special exception from vṛddhi, and leaves its base again as जागर् *jāgar*. As soon as the base has been changed to जागर् *jāgar*, it falls under a new rule (Pāṇini vii 2, 3), and is forced to take vṛddhi until this rule is again nullified by Pāṇini vii 2, 4, which does not allow vṛddhi in an aorist that takes intermediate इ *i*, like अजागरिषं *ajāgariṣam*. There is an exception, however, to this rule also for bases with short अ *a* beginning and ending with a consonant may optionally take vṛddhi (Pāṇini vii 2, 7). This option is afterwards restricted, and roots with short अ *a*, beginning with a consonant and ending in र् *r*, like जागर् *jāgar*, have no option left, but are restricted afresh to vṛddhi (Pāṇini vii 2, 2). However, even this is not yet the final result. Our base जागर् *jāgar* is after all not to take vṛddhi, and hence a new special rule (Pāṇini vii 2, 5) settles the point by granting to जागृ *jāgr* a special exception

from vṛddhi and thereby establishing its guṇa. No wonder that these manifold changes and chances in the formation of the first aorist of जागृ *jāgr* should have inspired a grammarian, who celebrates them in the following couplet:

गुणो वृद्धिगुणो वृद्धिः प्रतिघे ।
पुनर्वृद्धिर्नि ।

“Guṇa, vṛddhi, guṇa, vṛddhi, prohibition, option, again vṛddhi and then exception, these, with the change of *r* into a semivowel in the first instance, are the nine results.”

Another difficulty consists in the want of critical accuracy in the editions which we possess of Pāṇini, the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*, the *Laghu-Kaumudī*, the *Sārasvatī*, and *Vopadeva*. Far be it from me to wish to detract from the merits of native editors, like Dharaṇīdhara, Kāśīnātha, Tārānātha, still less from those of Professor Boehtlingk, who published his text and notes nearly thirty years ago, when few of us were able to read a single line of Pāṇini. But during those thirty years considerable progress has been made in unravelling the mysteries of the grammatical literature of India. The commentary of Sāyaṇa to the Rīgveda has shown us how practically to apply the rules of Pāṇini; and the translation of the *Laghu-Kaumudī* by the late Dr Ballantyne has enabled even beginners to find their way through the labyrinth of native grammar. The time has come, I believe, for new and critical editions of Pāṇini and his commentators. A few instances may suffice to show the insecurity of our ordinary editions. The commentary to Pāṇini vii 2, 42, as well as the *Sārasvatī* ii 25, 1, gives the benedictive ātmanepada वरीषीष्ट *varīṣīṣṭa* and स्तरीषीष्ट *starīṣīṣṭa*; yet a reference to Pāṇini vii 2, 39 and 40 shows that these forms are impossible. Again, if Pāṇini (viii 3, 92) is right in using अग्रगामिनि *agragāmini* with a dental *n* in the last syllable, it is clear that he extends the prohibition given in viii 4, 34, with regard to *upasargas*, to other compounds. It is useless to inquire whether in doing so he was right or wrong, for it is an article of faith with every Hindu grammarian that whatever word is used by Pāṇini in his *sūtras* is *eo ipso* correct. Otherwise, the rules affecting compounds with *upasargas* are by no means identical with those that affect ordinary compounds; and though it may be right to argue *a fortiori* from प्रगामिनि *pragāmini* to अग्रगामिनि *agragāmini*, it would not be right to argue from अग्रयान *agrayāna* to प्रयान *prayāna*, this being necessarily प्रयाण *prayāṇa*. But assuming अग्रगामिनि *agragāmini* to be correct, it is quite clear that the compounds स्वर्गकामिणौ *svargakāmiṇau*, वृषगामिणौ *vṛṣagāmiṇau*, हरिकामाणि *harikāmāṇi*, and हरिकामेण *harikāmeṇa*, given in the commentary to viii 4, 13, are all wrong, though most of them occur not only in the printed editions of Pāṇini and the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*, but may be traced back to the manuscripts of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*, the source, though by no means the model, of the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*. I was glad to learn from my friend Professor Goldstücker, who is preparing an edition of the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*, and whom I consulted on these forms, that the manuscripts of Vāmana which he possesses carefully avoid these faulty examples to Pāṇini viii 4, 13.

After these explanations I need hardly add that I am not so sanguine as

to suppose that I could have escaped scot-free where so many men of superior knowledge and talent have failed to do so. All I can say is that I shall be truly thankful to any scholar who will take the trouble to point out any mistakes into which I may have fallen; and I hope that I shall never so far forget the regard due to truth as to attempt to represent simple corrections, touching the declension of nouns or the conjugation of verbs, as matters of opinion, or so far lower the character of true scholarship as to appeal from the verdict of the few to the opinion of the many.

Hearing from my friend Professor Bühler that he had finished a Sanskrit syntax, based on the works of Pāṇini and other native grammarians, which will soon be published, I gladly omitted that portion of my grammar. The rules on the derivation of nouns by means of *kṛt*, *uṇādi*, and *taddhita* suffixes do not properly belong to the sphere of an elementary grammar. If time and health permit, I hope to publish hereafter, as a separate treatise, the chapter of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* bearing on this subject.

In the list of verbs which I have given as an appendix, pp. 245–299, I have chiefly followed the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* and the *Sārasvatī*. These grammars do not conjugate every verb that occurs in the *Dhātupāṭha*, but those only that serve to illustrate certain grammatical rules. Nor do they adopt, like the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*, the order of the verbs as given in Pāṇini's *Dhātupāṭha*, but they group the verbs of each class according to their voices, treating together those that take the terminations of the *parasmaipada*, those that take the terminations of the *ātmanepada*, and, lastly, those that admit of both voices. In each of these subdivisions, again, the simple verbs are so arranged as best to illustrate certain grammatical rules. In making a new selection among the verbs selected by Rāmachandra and Anubhūtiśvarūpāchārya, I have given a preference to those which occur more frequently in Sanskrit literature and to those which illustrate some points of grammar of peculiar interest to the student. In this manner I hope that the appendix will serve two purposes: it will not only help the student, when doubtful as to the exact forms of certain verbs, but it will likewise serve as a useful practical exercise to those who, taking each verb in turn, will try to account for the exact forms of its persons, moods, and tenses by a reference to the rules of this grammar. In some cases references have been added to guide the student, in others he has to find by himself the proper warranty for each particular form.

My kind friends Professor Cowell and Professor Kielhorn have revised some of the proofsheets of my grammar, for which I beg to express to them my sincere thanks.

Max Müller

Paris, 5th April, 1866.

Chapter 2

The Alphabet

§ 1. Sanskrit is properly written with the Devanāgarī alphabet; but the Bengali, Telugu, and other modern Indian alphabets are commonly employed for writing Sanskrit in their respective provinces.

Note—*Devanāgarī* means the *nāgarī* of the gods, or, possibly, of the Brāhmins. A more current style of writing, used by Hindus in all common transactions where Hindi is the language employed is called simply *nāgarī*. Why the alphabet should have been called *nāgarī* is unknown. If derived from *nagara*, city, it might mean the art of writing as first practised in cities (Pāṇini iv 2, 128). No authority has yet been adduced from any ancient author for the employment of the word *Devanāgarī*. In the *Lalitavistara* (a life of Buddha, translated from Sanskrit into Chinese 76 AD), where a list of alphabets is given, the *Devanāgarī* is not mentioned, unless it be intended by the *Deva* alphabet. (See *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 518.) Al-Biruni, in the 11th century, speaks of the *Nagara* alphabet as current in Malva (Reinaud, *Mémoire sur l'Inde*, p. 298).

No inscriptions have been met with in India anterior to the rise of Buddhism. The earliest authentic specimens of writing as the inscriptions of king Priyadarśi or Aśoka, about 250 BC. These are written in two different alphabets. The alphabet which is found in the inscription of Kapurdigiri, and which in the main is the same as that of the Arianian coins, is written from right to left. It is clearly of Semitic origin, and most closely connected with the Aramaic branch of the old Semitic or Phoenician alphabet. The Aramaic letters, however, which we know from Egyptian and Palmyrenian inscriptions, have experienced further changes since they served as the model for the alphabet of Kapurdigiri, and we must have recourse to the more primitive types of the ancient Hebrew coins and of the Phoenician inscriptions in order to explain some of the letters of the Kapurdigiri alphabet.

But while the transition of the Semitic types into this ancient Indian alphabet can be proved with scientific precision, the second Indian alphabet, that which is found in the inscription of Girnar, and which is the real source of all other Indian alphabets, as well as of those of Tibet and Burma, has not as yet been traced back in a satisfactory manner to any Semitic prototype (Prinsep's *Indian Antiquities by Thomas*, vol. ii, p. 42). To admit, however, the independent invention of a native Indian alphabet is impossible. Alphabets were never invented, in the usual sense of that word. They were formed gradually, and purely phonetic alphabets always point back to earlier, syllabic

or ideographic, stages. There are no such traces of the growth of an alphabet on Indian soil; and it is to be hoped that new discoveries may still bring to light the intermediate links by which the alphabet of Gīrnar, and through it the modern Devanāgarī, may be connected with one of the leading Semitic alphabets.

§ 2. Sanskrit is written from left to right.

Note—*Samiskṛta* (संस्कृत) means what is rendered fit or *perfect*. But Sanskrit is not called so because the Brāhmans, or still less, because the first Europeans who became acquainted with it, considered it the most perfect of all languages. *Samiskṛta* meant what is rendered fit for sacred purposes; hence purified, sacred. A vessel that is purified, a sacrificial victim that is properly dressed, a man who has passed through all the initiatory rites or *samiskāras*; all these are called *samiskṛta*. Hence the language which alone was fit for sacred acts, the ancient idiom of the Vedas, was called *Samiskṛta*, or the sacred language. The local spoken dialects received the general name of *prākṛta*. This did not mean originally vulgar, but derived, secondary, second-rate, literally ‘what has a source or type,’ this source or type (*prakṛti*) being the Samiskṛta or sacred language. (See Vararuci’s *Prākṛta-Prakāśa*, ed. Cowell, p. xvii.)

§ 3. In writing the Devanāgarī alphabet, the distinctive portion of each letter is written first, then the perpendicular, and lastly the horizontal line. Ex. XXX, XXX, क *k*; XXX, XXX, ख *kh*; XXX, XXX, ग *g*; XXX, XXX, घ *gh*; XXX, ङ *ṅ*, &c.

Beginners will find it useful to trace the letters on transparent paper till they know them well and can write them fluently and correctly.

§ 4. The following are the sounds which are represented in the Devanāgarī alphabet: