

—as [in the following example]—“The horse—the white—gallops.” For here the horse, the possessor of the quality “white,”—in the shape [of the unsuppressed term “horse”—and hence] of something “not swallowed” [§ 17],—is thought of as identical with the colour “white” which inheres in it :—[that is to say—“the horse” and “the white” are understood to mean here just one and the same thing].

b. [Secondly, we may have Superimponent Inclusive Indication—§ 17. a.—] the source [of the power—§ 14. a.—] being a Motive :—as [in the following example]—“These—the lances—enter.” Since the pronoun denotes the men bearing lances [—who—see § 14. a.—are denoted also by the word “lances”]—there is here a case of the Superimponent.

c. [Thirdly we may have] Superimponent Indicative Indication, [§ 17. a.], the source being Notoriety [§ 13. b.], as [in the example] “The Kalinga—the man—fights.” Here [it may be remarked that] the relation [which is notorious—see § 13. c.—] between the “man” and [the region of] “Kalinga” is that of location and located.

d. [Fourthly, we may have Superimponent Indicative Indication] the source [§ 14. a.] being a Motive—as [in the example] “Longevity—butter.” Here “butter,” the *cause* of “longevity,” is thought of as identical with the “longevity” related to it through the relation of cause and effect. The Motive [for speaking of butter as “longevity”] is the fact [which it is desired to call attention to] of its causing longevity differently from anything else [—no other article of Hindu diet being so nutritious—], and invariably [—butter, as a prolonger of life, being reckoned infallible].

e. Or [of this fourth case—§ 17. d.—to take other examples illustrating the most ordinary relations, besides that of cause and effect, by which this employment of language is prompted—] as—when a man belonging to the king is going—[one may say] “The king—this one—goes.” Here the relation is that called the relation of owner and owned. Or as—when [there is meant] only the foremost portion [of the arm from the elbow—all of which, in Sanskrit, is called “the hand;”—one may say] “The hand—this—[from the *wrist* downwards].” Here the relation is that called the relation of whole and part. [Or] when it is even a Bráhmaṇ [that one is speaking of; one may say] “The carpenter—he”—[while, strictly speaking, it is im-