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 “ vedãnga ” representative of grammatical science, and has ever since remained the standard authority on Sanskrit grammar in lndia, is Panini’s *Äshtãdhyäyï,@@*1 so called from its “ consisting of eight lectures *(adhyaya),"* of four *pãdas* 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 *(anubandha),* used chiefly with suffixes, and 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 *(pranchas)"* and “ northern *(udañchas)”* grammarians. Perhaps the most important of his predecessors was Sãkatãyana,@@2 also mentioned by Yãska—the author of the Nirukta, who is likewise supposed to have preceded Pãnini—as the only grammarian *(vaiyä- 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 Pãnini was indebted to the labours of his predecessors. There exists indeed a grammar in South Indian MSS., entitled *Sabdanuéãsana,* which is ascribed to one Sãkatãyana;@@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 Pãnini and others. Panini is also called Dakshiputra., after his mother Dãkshï. As his birthplace the village Sãlãtura is mentioned, which was situated some few miles north-west of the îndus, in the country of the Gan- dhãras, whence later writers also call him áãlãturïya, the formation of which name he himself explains in his grammar. Another name sometimes applied to him is Sãlanki. In the *Kathã-saritsagara,* a modern collection of popular tales mentioned above, Pãnini is said to have been the pupil of Varsha, a teacher at Pataliputra, under the reign of Ñanda, the father (?) of Chandragupta (315-291 B.c.). The real date of **t** he great grammarian is, however, still a matter of uncertainty. While Goldstücker@@5 attempted to put his date back to ante-Buddhist times (about the 7th century b.c.), Professor Weber held 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 *yavanani,* 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 Papim’s age. If Patañjali’s “great commentary” was written, as seems most likely, 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 ordinary speech *(bhasha)* of his period and its literature ; and it is noteworthy, in this respect, that the rules he lays down on some important points of syntax (as pointed out by Professors Bhandarkar and Kielhorn) are in accord with the practice of the Brãhmanas rather than with that of the later classical literature.

Pãnini’s Sutras 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 Kãtyãyana, the author of a large collection of concise critical notes, called *Värttika,* 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 Kãtyãyana to whom the Vãjasaneyi-prãtisãkhya (as well as the Sarvãnukrama) is attributed, is still doubted by some scholars.@@8 Kãtyãyana 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 Kathãsaritsãgara makes the author of the Vãrttikas a fellow- student of Pãnini, and afterwards the minister of King Nanda; but, though this date might have fitted Kãtyãyana well enough, it is impossible to place any reliance on the statements derived from such a source. Kãtyãyana was succeeded again, doubtless after a considerable interval, by Patañjali, the author of the *(Výäkarana-) Maha~bhashya,@@*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 fairly 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 Sãketa,” 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 Yamuna.@@10 In the other passage the use of the present is illustrated by the sentence, “ We are sacrificing for Pushpamitra ”—this prince (178-*c*. 142 b.c.), the founder of the âunga 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 ratañjali probably gives not a few traditional grammatical examples mechanically repeated from his predecessors, those here mentioned are fortunately such as, from the very nature of the case, must have been made by himself. The Mahãbhãshya is not a continuous commentary on Panini’s grammar, but deals only with those Sutras (some 1720 out of a total of nearly 4000) on which Kãtyãyana had proposed any Vãrttikas, 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 Patañjali’s commentatorial remarks. Though doubts have been raised as to the textual condition of the work, Professor Kielhorn has clearly shown that it has probably been handed down in as good a state of preser­vation as any other classical Sanskrit work. Patañjali is also called Gonardïya—which name Professor Bhandarkar takes to mean “ a native of Gonarda,” a place, according to the same scholar, probably identical with Gonda, a town some 20 m. north-west of Oudh—and Gonikäputra, or son of Gonikã. Whether there is any connexion between this writer and the reputed author of the Yoga- sãstra is doubtful. The Mahãbhãshya has been commented upon by Kaiyata, in his *Bhãshyapradïpa,* and the latter again by Nãgojî- bhatta, a distinguished grammarian of the earlier part **of** the 18th century, in his *Bhãshya-pradìpoddyota.*

Of running commentaries on Päçtini’s Sutras, the oldest extant and most important is the *KäHkä Vzitti,@@*11 or “ comment of Kasi (Benares),” the joint production of two Jaina writers of probably the first half of the 7th century, viz. Jayãditya and Vãmana, each of whom composed one half (four adhyäyas) of the work. The chief commentaries on this work are Haradatta Misra’s *Padamañjarl,* which also embodies the substance of the Mahãbhãshya, and Jinendra-buddhi’s *Nyãsa.@@*12

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

@@@1 Printed, with a commentary, at Calcutta; also, with notes, indexes and an instructive introduction, by O. Böhtlingk (1839- 1840); and again with a German translation (1887).

@@@2 *Le.* son of Sakata, whence he is also called Sakatangaja.

@@@3 Compare G. Bünler’s paper, *Orient und Occident,* p. 691 seq.

@@@4 A. Burnell, *On the Aiñdra School of Sanskrit Grammarians,*

@@@5 *Pãnini, his Place in Sanskrit Literature* (1861).

@@@6 See Lassen, *Ind. Alt,* i. p. 723; M. Müller, *Hist, of A,S, Lit.*

p. 521; A. Weber, *Ind. Stud.* v. p. 2 seq.

@@@7 F. Kielhorn, *Kãtyãyana und Patañjali* (1876). The *Sangraha* a huge metrical work on grammar, by Vyadi, which is frequently referred to, doubtless belonged to this period.

@@@8 *E.g.* A. Weber. Goldstückerand M. Müller take the opposite view.

@@@9 Part of this work was first printed by Ballantyne ; followed by a lithographed edition, by two Benares pandits (1871) ; and a photo­lithographic edition of the text and commentaries, published by the India Office, under Goldstücker’s supervision (1874); finally, a critical edition by F. Kielhorn. For a review of the literary and antiquarian data supplied by the work, see A. Weber, *Ind. Stud.* xiii. 293 seq. The author’s date has been frequently discussed, most thoroughly and successfully, by R. G. Bhandarkar in several papers. See also A. Weber, *Hist. of I.L.* p. 223.

@@@10 Lassen, *Ind. Alt,* ii. 341, 362.

@@@11 Edited by Pandit Bala Sãstrî (Benares, 1876-1878).

@@@12 As it is quoted by Vopadeva it cannot be later than the 12th

century.