III. Grammar *(Vyâkarana).—*We found this subject enumer­ated as one of the six “limbs of the Veda,” or auxiliary sciences, the study of which was deemed necessary for a correct interpreta­tion of the sacred Mantras, and the proper performance of Vedic rites. Linguistic inquiry, phonetic as well as grammatical, was indeed early resorted to both for the purpose of elucidating the meaning of the Veda, and with the view of settling its textual form. The particular work which came ultimately to be looked upon as the “vedanga” representative of grammatical science, and has ever since remained the standard authority for Sanskrit grammar in India, is Panini’s *Ashtâdhyâyî, @@1* so called from its “ consisting of eight lectures *(adhyâya),”* of four *pâdas* each. For a comprehensive grasp of linguistic facts, and a penetrating insight into the structure of the vernacular language, this work stands probably unrivalled in the literature of any nation,—though few other languages, it is true, afford such facilities as the Sans­krit for a scientific analysis. Panini’s system of arrangement differs entirely from that usually adopted in our grammars, viz., according to the so-called parts of speech. As the work is com­posed in aphorisms intended to be learnt by heart, economy of memory-matter was the author’s paramount consideration. His object was chiefly attained by the grouping together of all cases exhibiting the same phonetic or formative feature, no matter whether or not they belonged to the same part of speech. For this purpose he also makes use of a highly artificial and ingenious system of algebraic symbols, consisting of technical letters *(anu- bandha),* used chiefly "with suffixes, aud indicative of the changes which the roots or stems have to undergo in word-formation.

It is self-evident that so complicated and complete a system of linguistic analysis and nomenclature could not have sprung up all at once and in the infancy of grammatical science, but that many generations of scholars must have helped to bring it to that degree of perfection which it exhibits in Panini’s work. Accordingly we find Panini himself making reference in various places to ten dif­ferent grammarians, besides two schools, which he calls the “eastern *(prânchas)* ” and “northern (*udanchas*) ” grammarians. Perhaps the most important of his predecessors was Sakatayana, @@2 also mentioned by Yaska—the author of the Nirukta, who is likewise supposed to have preceded Panini—as the only grammarian *(vaiyâ- karana)* who held with the etymologists *(nairukta)* that all nouns are derived from verbal roots. Unfortunately there is little hope of the recovery of his grammar, which would probably have enabled us to determine somewhat more exactly to what extent Panini was indebted to the labours of his predecessors., There exists indeed a grammar in South Indian MSS., entitled *Sabdânuśâsana,* which is ascribed to one Śâkatâyana; @@3 but this has been proved @@ 4 to be the production of a modern Jaina writer, which, however, seems to be

partly based on the original work, and partly on Panini and others. Panini is also called Dâkshîputra, after his mother Dâkshî. As his’birthplace the village Śalâtura is mentioned, which was situated some few miles north-west of the Indus, in the country of the Gandhâras, whence later writers also call him Śâlâturîya, the formation of which name he himself explains in his grammar. Another name sometimes applied to him is Śâlanki. In the *Kathâ- saritsâgara,* a modern collection of popular tales mentioned above, Pânini is said to have been the pupil of Varsha, a teacher at Pata- liputra, under the reign of Nanda, the father (?) of Chandragupta - (315-291 B.C.). The real date of the great grammarian is, how­ever, still a matter of uncertainty. While Goldstucker @@5 attempted to put his date back to ante-Buddhist times (about the 7th century B.C.), Prof. Weber holds that Panini’s grammar cannot have been composed till some time after the invasion of Alexander the Great. This opinion is chiefly based on the occurrence in one of the Sutras of the word *yavanânî,* in the sense of “ the writing of the Yavanas (Ionians),” thus implying, it would seem, such an acquaintance with the Greek alphabet as it would be impossible to assume for any period prior to Alexander’s Indian campaign (326 b.c.). But, as it is by no means certain @@6 that this term really applies to the Greek alphabet, it is scarcely expedient to make the word the corner-stone of the argument regarding Panini’s age. If Patanjali’s “great commentary” was written, as seems highly probable, about the middle of the 2nd century b.c., it is hardly possible to assign to Panini a later date than about 400 b.c. Though this grammarian registers numerous words and formations as peculiar to the Vedic hymns, his chief concern is with the ordi- nary speech *(bhâshâ)* of his period and its literature ; and it is noteworthy, in this respect, that the rales he lays down on some important points of syntax (as pointed out by Profs. Bhandarkar and Kielhorn) are in accord with the practice of the Brahmanas rather than with that of the later classical literature.

Pânini’s Sûtras continued for ages after to form the centre of grammatical activity. But, as his own work had superseded those of his predecessors, so many of the scholars who devoted them­selves to the task of perfecting his system have sunk into oblivion. The earliest of his successors whose work has come down to us (though perhaps not in a separate form), is Katyayana, the author of a large collection of concise critical notes, called *Vârttika,* intended to supplement and correct the Sutras, or give them greater precision. The exact date of this writer is likewise unknown ; but there can be little doubt that he lived at least a century after Panini. During the interval a new body of literature seems to have sprung up, @@7—accompanied with considerable changes of language,—and the geographical knowledge of India extended over large tracts towards the south. Whether this is the same Katyayana to whom the Vâjasaneyi-prâtiśâkliya (as well as the Sarvanukrama) is attributed, is still doubted by some scholars. @@8 Katyayana being properly a family or tribal name, meaning “the descendant of Katya, later works usually assign a second name Vararuchi to the writers (for there are at least two) who bear it. The Kathasaritsagara makes the author of the Varttikas a fellow-student of Pânini, and afterwards the minister of King Nanda; but, though this date might have fitted Katyayana well enough, it is impossible to place any reliance on the statements derived from such a source. Katyayana was succeeded again, doubtless after a considerable interval, by Patanjali, the author of the (*Vyâkarana-) Mahâ-bhâshya, @@9* or Great Commentary. For the great variety of information it incidentally supplies regarding the literature and manners of the period, this is, from an historical and antiquarian point of view, one of the most important works of the classical Sanskrit literature. Fortunately the author’s date has been settled by synchronisms implied in two passages of his work. In one of them the use of the imperfect—as the tense referring to an event, known to people generally, not witnessed by the speaker, and yet capable of being witnessed by him—is illus­trated by the statement, “The Yavana besieged Saketa,” which there is reason to believe can only refer to the Indo-Bactrian king Menander (144-c. 124 b.c.), who, according to Strabo, extended his rule as far as the Yamunâ. @@10 In the other passage the use of the present is illustrated by the sentence, “We are sacrificing for Push- pamitra,”—this prince (178-c. 142 B.C.), the founder of the Sunga dynasty, being known to have fought against the Greeks.10 We thus get the years 144-142 B.C. as the probable time when the work, or part of it, was composed. Although Patanjali probably gives not a few traditional grammatical examples mechanically repeated from his predecessors, those hero mentioned are fortun- ately such as, from the very nature of the case, must have been made by himself. The Mahâbhâshva is not a continuous com­mentary on Pânini’s grammar, but deals only with those Sûtras (some 1720 out of a total of nearly 4000) on which Katyayana had proposed any Varttikas, the critical discussion of which, in con­nexion with the respective Sutras, and with the views of other gram­marians expressed thereon, is the sole object of Patanjali’s com- mentatorial remarks. Though doubts have been raised as to the textual condition of the work, Prof. Kielhorn has clearly shown that it has probably been handed down in as good a state of pre­servation as any other classical Sanskrit work. Patanjali is also called Gonardiya,—which name Prof. Bhandarkar takes to mean “a native of Gonarda,” a place, according to the same scholar, probably identical with Gonda, a town some 20 miles north-west of Oudh,—and Gonikaputra, or son of Gonika. Whether there is any connexion between this writer and the reputed author of the Yogaśâstra is doubtful. The Maliabhashya has been commented upon by Kaiyata, in his *Bhdshyapradtpa,* and the latter again by Nâgojîbhatta, a distinguished grammarian of the earlier part of the last century, in his *Bhdshya-pradipoddyota.*

Of running commentaries on Panini’s Sutras, the oldest extant and most important is the *Kâsikâ Vritti, @@11 or* “comment of Kâśî (Benares),” the joint production of two Jaina writers of probably the first half of the 7th century, viz., Jayâditya and Vâmana, each of whom composed one half (four adhyâyas) of the work. The chief commentaries on this work are Haradatta Miśra’s *Padamanjarî,* which also embodies the substance of the Mahâbhâshya, and Jinendra-buddhi’s *Nyâsa. @@12*

Educational requirements in course of time led to the appearance of grammars, chiefly of an elementary character, constructed on a
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