This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world’s books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that’s often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book’s long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ **Make non-commercial use of the files** We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ **Refrain from automated querying** Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google’s system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ **Maintain attribution** The Google “watermark” you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ **Keep it legal** Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can’t offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book’s appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google’s mission is to organize the world’s information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world’s books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at [http://books.google.com/](http://books.google.com/)
JOURNAL

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

NINTH VOLUME.

NEW HAVEN:
FOR THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
Printed by Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, Printers to Yale College.

MDCCCLXXI.

SOLD BY THE SOCIETY’S AGENTS:
NEW YORK: B. WESTERMANN & CO., 471 BROADWAY;
LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO., AND WILLIAMS & NORGATE;
LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

Library
COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
FOR THE YEARS 1868-71.

EDWARD E SALISBURY, New Haven.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY, "
JAMES HADLEY, "
EZRA ABBOT, Cambridge.
ARNOLD GUYOT, Princeton.

274112
Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1871, by the AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY in the office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.


**CONTENTS**

OF

**NINTH VOLUME.**

**ART. I.—THE TÁNTÇRÝA-PÁRÍČÁKHYA, WITH ITS COMMENTARY, THE TRI-
BRÁHÝMATÁTÝNA: TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.** By WILLIAM D.
WÎHTNEY, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College. - - - - - I

**APPENDIX:**

**AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 16th, 1866.</th>
<th>- -</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 24th and 25th, 1866.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 22d, 1867.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>xiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Additions to the Library and Cabinet. May, 1865—May, 1867.</em></td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 16th and 17th, 1867.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>xxvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at Boston, May 29th, 1868.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- xxxvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 14th and 15th, 1868.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- xli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at Boston, May 19th, 1869.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 21st and 22d, 1869.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- lxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>List of Members, October, 1869.</em></td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- lxxvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at Boston, May 18th, 1870.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- lxxxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 20th and 21st, 1870.</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- lxxxiv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTICLE I.

THE TÂITTIRĪYA-PRÂTIÇĀKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA:

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

Presented to the Society October 14th, 1868.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tâittrīya-Prātiçākhya and Tribhâshyaratna is as follows:

1. T. A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript; but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original; presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in pada-text show a final n. It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed “Krishna-yajuh-prātiçākhya, by Kārtikeya.” On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know; it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter.

2. W. A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof. Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1–89, 100, 1–56), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25a, seven lines are written on a page; thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date; but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows: 

This just fills up the leaf; but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse: visha-

vol. ix. 1
W. D. Whitney,

ye`hqira ity e`by agrha ity adi lupyate.2., and has added, as final benediction, `svıve`svıra`prasa`ıın.

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations. Considering that it thus presents every fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct. Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder.

3. B. This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr. Bühler, in Zeitsch. Deut. Morg. Ges., xxii. 319) the Tribhāṣyaratna is said to be not very rare. From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr. Bühler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof. Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr. Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered. The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one.

4. G. Through the kind offices of Prof. Max Müller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W.") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS. Bodl. W. 478), first described by Roth (Zur Lit. und Gesch. des Weda, pp. 54, 62 seq.), and used also by Weber (Ind. Stud. iv. 77 seq.). It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii.12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work.

5. G. This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Grantham character. The copy was made for me by Dr. Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work. Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr. Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription. There are doubtless few other Sanskritists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest. The catalogue which Dr. Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc., as I am compelled here to omit.

6. M. The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayālam character. Of this, Dr. Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Grantham manuscript, in his transcript of the latter.

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged
that the rules of the Pratiṣṭhākhyā are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk.

As regards the text of the Pratiṣṭhākhyā itself, all these authorities agree very closely: there are but two or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them. In respect to the text of the commentary, their accordance, as was to be expected, is much less: they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes; or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work. The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G.") and the Malayālam ("M."), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other. My own manuscript ("W.") and that sent by Dr. Bühler from Bombay ("B.") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G. and M. As for the Oxford manuscript ("O."), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W. and B., having an especially near relationship to B., with whose slight variations of the text given by W. it almost uniformly agrees; later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves.

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W., partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G. and M.—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript. I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W. as closely as I could; and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B. and O., or of B. alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W. was of a character to be endured. At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison. Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such: I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B., as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account. The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of punctuation: they offer absolutely
no standard to follow. For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible; and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority. Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules; while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another.* Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed. And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details.

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G. and M. regularly write a final sibilant instead of visarjaniya before an initial sibilant, and often, where a m is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of anusvāra. Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, anusvāra (उ), or .ret, I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage.

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions: citations from the Tāittirīya-Sānhitā, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added; and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule. Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage; but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference.

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prātiṣākhya (Journ. Am. Or. Soc’y, Vol. vii., 1882). The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work. The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhāṣyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prātiṣākhya. Possessing no index verborum to the Tāittirīya-Sānhitā, nor even a manuscript of its pada-text, I have not been able to try the Prātiṣākhya by it with anything like the same

* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv.10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity): tāgayāṁ antāṁ api

thuṣyantah na thuṣyantah antaḥtathā.
thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvakyan. What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and exception of the Sanhitā in a single good sanhitā-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr. Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof. Weber), I have endeavored to do. I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its sanhitā or pada readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of München, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge. Of references to the teachings of the other Prātiṣākhyas I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition: and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment. The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility.

In making reference to the Taīttirīya-Sanhitā, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or kanda, prāṇa, and anuvāka. The further division of the sections or anuvākas, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the Prātiṣākhyya (see notes to the rules of chapter iii.), that I have preferred to express it by the use of “superior” figures attached to that which indicates the anuvāka. Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the anuvāka is to be understood as composed of a single division.

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure; in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses. The abbreviation “om.” means ‘omit,’ and “ins.” means ‘insert.’

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke. The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the Journal of the American Oriental Society; it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i.1 (p. 10).
CHAPTER I.

CONTENTS: 1–11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alphabet; 12–14, surd and sonant consonants; 15, list of prepositions; 16–21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters; 22–24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc.; 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules; 31–37, quantity of simple sounds; 38–40, the three accents; 41–47, details respecting the circumflex accent; 48, 49, compound words; 50–53, respecting cited words; 54–55, words consisting of a single vowel; 56–61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules.

The commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows: “I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Ganeṣa, as also to the gurus and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment; which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prātiṣṭhākhyāya by Vararuci etc., shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (tribhāṣṭyaratna), approved of Brahmans.” He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining girain devin, ‘divine Voice,’ by vāgdevin, ‘Godess of Voice,’ and bhāṣura, ‘Brahman’ (literally ‘earth-god’), by vidvat, ‘learned man, sage.’ On laksana, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

bhaktiyuktāḥ pranāmyāḥ haṁ ganapacaranaadavayam:
gurūm api giraiṁ devim idaṁ vakṣhyāmi laksanaṁ.1
vyākhyānam prātiṣṭhākhyāya vikṣhyā vāraruḍdikāṁ:2
krtaṁ tribhāṣṭyaratnaṁ yad bāśate bhāṣuṣraṇiyam.2

1 bhaktiyuktāḥ pranāmyāḥ haṁ ganapacaranaadavayam: gurūm api giraiṁ devim idaṁ vakṣhyāmi laksanaṁ.1 vyākhyānam prātiṣṭhākhyāya vikṣhyā vāraruḍdikāṁ: krtaṁ tribhāṣṭyaratnaṁ yad bāśate bhāṣuṣraṇiyam.2

1 W. prefixes with śrīgaṇaṁya nāmaḥ. śrīgaṇaṁya prananaṁ ‘stu. ōṁ. B. prefixes with śrīgaṇaṁya nāmaḥ. śrīsarveśyaḥ nāmaḥ. śrīdattānayanāya nāmaḥ: and the additional verse

puhimbhārabadhānāṁ devaṁ rājvarṇīṁ caturbhūyaṁ: prasannanavadanaṁ dhvayot sarvarāharporgadīya.1

1 The white raiment-baring god, moon-hued, four-armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the suercess of all disturbance.’ It then numbers the other verses “2” and “3;” but proceeds to confess the ungenuineness of the inserted verse by reading, like the other MSS, anayoh lokayoh. 2 G. M. girūm. 3 B. var-. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. girūm. 6 G. M. om. 7 G. M. tal. 8 G. M. śrīpaṁ; B. pärvaśam. 9 B. var-. 10 W. -ka. 11 G. M. samikṣhyā. 12 W. om.
with common usage, he makes no remark. To *vikṣhya*, ‘having examined,’ he adds *nyānātirekaparīhārena*, ‘with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy.’ The “etc.” after “Vararuci” is declared to refer to Ātreya and Māhishēya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name. Vararuci and Māhishēya are, indeed, often (about ten times each: see Index) referred to in the sequel, and their discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed: Ātreya has only once (under v.1) the honor of being mentioned. Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed; nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge. Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age.

**Graha Vargasamālakāyā: II 11**

1. Now the list of sounds.

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha*, ‘now,’ in the rule. He quotes Amara’s definition of *atha* and *atha* (Amarakośa iii.432.8; p. 349 of Deslongchamps’s edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atha*, it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here. In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *oṁ*; “since the Čikṣā-makers declare, ‘oṁ and *atha* are deemed propitiatory.’” Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another; “the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of, the lakṣaṇa: there hav-

1. maṅgaldanantarābrambhapraṇakārtensyēḥo atho atho ’ti maṅgalādyanekārthathād athaṣaṭdanyāḥ ’ṛthanirṇayārtham eko ’ṛtho nipetavyaḥ: tatra prathamaṁ tīvan maṅgaldārthatvam ucyate: tuṣya prāṇavaśūdharmyāḥ: tathā hi samākṣaṁcikṣhākārāḥ:

onikāraṇ ca ’thaṣaṭdāk ca maṅgulāv iti kirtitāv
iti: āho’ svādānantaṁantarān lakṣaṁanaṁ kuryād iti sāpekṣhatvād lakṣaṁanasya pārvain vedādhiyoraya saty aṁ atha lakṣaṁnaparikṣhāvasaṁarah: atha vā ’dhiṁkārtho ’thaṣaṭdāḥ: te aṁthai ’ve ’ti vinivartaṁ dhikārakāvā dhārakāḥ (xxii.8) iti vidyamānatvat: aṁthā varṇaṁmaṁnāyaḥ pāṭhakramo ’dhikriyata iti sātrānvaṁyāḥ: sam ity ekīha: āṁ iti māryādāyam: mnātya ity ānupārīyena padeṣaḥ: ekīha ity akārādayo varṇāḥ svarabhaṅgipuryāvasānā ānupārīyena pārvaiḥ cīṣṭāṁ upaṇīṣadāḥ.
ing been study of the Veda before the lakshana, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the lakshana.” Here, lakshana appears to be used to designate the Prātiṣākhya itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, ātha is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxii.8, below: “tu, ātha, and eva are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative;” and the connection of the rule is that now the list of sounds, the order of reading (pāṭhakrama), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of sāmānānya, ‘list, rehearsal,’ is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean “the collective sounds, beginning with a and ending with the svarabhakti, in their order, as taught by former learned men.”

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below): a, i, and u have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, r only a short and a long, l only a short (W. and B. take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long r, and l after the १, to point out clearly the number of moras they respectively contain; and B. adds after the १ and २ a २, for the same purpose); second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7); third, the four semivowels (rule 8); and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration; the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds anuvāra acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel; for, he says, “since it has made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality.” A passage from the Cikṣā, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the
Çikshā (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later: see the additional notes): it is given again, with more fullness, under viii.15. Next, for the visarjaniya, which our Prātiṣākhya does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final h. The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls raṅga, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that “nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage.” The word raṅga, ‘coloring,’ though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prātiṣākhya, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii.52. What is described in the latter rule is in fact a “quality” (dharma), and not a “qualified” or concrete thing (dharman); and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of anuvṛtra was but just now supported. It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the nāsikya, or euphonic insertion between h and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi.14; he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the yamas. The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which n and m are directed to be converted before y, l, v (v.26–8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the raṅga to be meant to apply to their nasality; and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition: but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the nāsikya, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds. Further, rule xiii.16 is made the warrant for the lingual 4, rule xxi.12 for the four yamas, and rule xxi.15, finally, for the snarabhakti: and the conclusion is reached that “by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yājur-Veda.”

yajurvedikavarnānāṁ shakyasāṃkhyaḥ sūtrata eva vispākha

trishāstīg catuḥshashir vā varnāḥ cambhumate matāḥ:

iti cikshāvaccane sati katham shakyasāṃkhyaḥ niyamyate: etat

laukkavādi daksaravānapravishayam iti cikshāvaccane na virodah:

atra tvā sūtrāt adāvatām varṇānām eva palambhād esha
evā nirṇaya vartenāt

varṇānāṁ samāvadānāṁ varṇasamāmnāyāḥ.

(1) G. M. mahāpallīkanākātho. 3 W. G. M. rikh-. G. and M always write rikh, B. and O. always rikha; W. has ri- only in one other place (under xiv.28).

W. B. aho. 4 G. m. rikhād. W. adds evi. 5 G. m. pitha krama. 6 W. B. om.

7 W. rikhād. 8 B. pitha. 9 B. aho. 10 G. M. om. 11 B. dharmanavavād anuvṛtra.


16 B. G. M. om. 17 G. -rit. 18 B. avavumate. 19 G. M. tal. 20 G. M. avatāravāna-.

21 G. M. ins. na. 22 G. M. om. 23 G. M. om. 24 G. M. om. 25 B. nir-
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An objection is now raised and removed. "Considering that the Čikāhā says 'the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Čambhu' (Čikāhā, verse 3; see Weber's edition of the treatise, in his Indische Studien, iv.348–9), how is the number sixty established? Answer: there is no inconsistency with the dictum of the Čikāhā, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life; while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise."

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows:

Vowels
- simple, \( \{ a \ d \ s \ i \ s \ u \ d \ s \} \)
- impure and diphthongs, \( \{ r \ l \ e \ d \ o \ d \} \)

Guttural, \( \{ k \ h \ g \ h \} \)

Mutes
- palatal, \( \{ c \ h \ j \ h \} \)
- lingual, \( \{ t \ s \ d \ dh \} \)
- dental, \( \{ i \ t \ d \ dh \} \)
- labial, \( \{ p \ h \ b \ h \} \)

Semivowels, \( \{ y \ r \ i \ v \} \)

Spirants, \( \{ z \ s \ h \ s \ h \} \)

Anusvāra, \( \{ n \} \)

Visarjanīya, \( \{ h \} \)

Lingual \( l \)

Nāsīkṣya, (not written)

Yamas, do.

Svarabhakti, do.

 whole number of letters, 60

With the exception of the nasal \( y, l, v \), already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prātiṇḍākhyā. For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject; as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them. Only the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṇḍākhyā includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii.1–31).

मर्य नवादितः समानावरणिः॥ २॥

2. Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

2. atha 'ti saṁjñādhikārthāhi: aśmin' varṇasamāmnāya ādīta drabhya nava varṇāḥ samānākshaśrasaṇjñā bhavanti: 'yathā: a d s i t s u a d s'. saṁjñādhāh pravojānam: dirghāhaṁ samānākṣharaṁ sa varṇapare (x.2) ity adi. navu ṭṛṣi mahati saṁjñā kimarthā: 'piṣkhaḍiṣṭraprasiddhyanurodhyaṁ' 'ti brāhmaṁ.

1 B. sarman. 2 W. B. a d s ity adī. 3 G. M. jīd. 4 G. M. tham. 5 G. M. om. dh.
i. 3.] Tātissyā-Prātiṣṭākhya and Tribhūṣhyaratna.

Literally, ‘are homogeneous syllables;’ samāndākshara and its correlative samāndhāyakshara, ‘syllable of combination,’ being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong; the latter, however, is not used in this treatise. The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, a ā ḍā i ī ḍ u ā ḍā. The r and ṭ vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described; the Rāk Pr. (xiii.14), the Vāj. Pr. (iv.145), and the Ath. Pr. (i.37–9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include r and ṭ among the samāndāksharas (omitting ī, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferentially recognized by the last.

The commentator explains the atha of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (saṁjñā), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel. Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word samāndākshara striking his mind, he asks “why such a big name?” and relieves himself by the answer, “we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Cākṣāh and other text-books.” The Cākṣāh as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term.

8. Two and two, short and long, are similar.

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called “similar.” The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as “similar”—to the exclusion, namely, of the phuta or protracted vowels. The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x.2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x.24. The ṭ-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule; and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one.

3. teṣāṁ samāndāksharesu dvēdve hrāsve dvēdve dirghē ṛ hravardirghē
dirghahrasve vā 'kshare parasparaṁ savarpaśanijñē bhava-
tah, iyaṁ anuvṛthasamijñā: savarṇatvaṁ nāma sādṛṣṭam ucyate:
tasmād akārdādām ikārdābhir na savarṇasanijñāś ca bhin-
nasthānāpyataṁ nātyārā: anayaṁ. saṁjñādyāḥ prayojanām: dir-
ghañ samāndākshare savarṇapare (x.2) iti.
hrasvān ca dirghān ca hravardirghā.

1 G. M. olesł. 2 G. M. ins. ed. 3 B. om.; G. M. ins. ed. 4 B. -mdd.
The word translated 'similar' means literally 'of identical color' (i. e. sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound. It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (anvartha); and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of a and i, for instance, as "similar," because of their different mode of organic production. As example of the use of the term is again cited x.2.

4. Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes.

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr., i.1, r. 4). The commentator paraphrases the rule "a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed 'similar,'" and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies. In the phrase ágne: iti: dha (vi.5.84), the word ágne has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes ágnásí. By the rule (x.2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form ágnásí 'ti. The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final i, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into y by rule x.15, the y dropped by x.19, and the coalescence of the remaining ás with the following i (as prescribed by x.4) prevented by x.24: thus is assured the reading ágnás īty dha.

5. The sixteen at the beginning are vowels.

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with a and ending with āu. As example of the use of the technical term

4. plutapūrvam samānaksharam savarnasamjñām na bhavati. plutam asmāt pārvam iti plutapūravam. yathā: agnās īty āhe īty atra dirghaṁ samānakshare savarnapare (x.2) ity ekādeṣāḥ prasaktah: tuc ca nishtam: pratishiddhāḥam tv evam savarnasamjñāyam pārśeshyād īvarṇokārāv yavakārāv (x.15) iti pārvasye 'kāraṇya yuvām syat: sa ca yakāro lupyete tv avarṇapūrvau yavakārāv (x.19) iti lupyate: yakāre lupyate sati īvarṇaparo ekāram (x.4) ity ekāraḥ prasaktah: so 'pi nishidhyate na pluta-praghāv (x.24) ity anena: tasmād agnās īty āhe 'ti prasidhyati'.

1 W. om. 2 G. M. ekādeṣāḥ. 3 G. M. vi. 4 G. M. sidhyati.
svara, 'vowel,' he quotes the rule (ix.10) prescribing the conversion of visarjaniya into y before a vowel.

Our Prātiṣākhya is to be commended for not including in its list of vowels the long ī, and for postulating no useless protracted forms of r and ṭ.

6. The rest are consonants.

As example of the term vyanjana, 'consonant,' rule xxi.1, which pronounces the consonant a member of the adjacent vowel, is cited in the commentary, according to the two manuscripts from northern India; those from the south substitute for it the opening rule of the third chapter, and also omit the explanatory statement "beginning with k and ending with svarabhakti," which is given by the others.

7. The first twenty-five are mutes.

The commentator explains: "among the consonants, the first twenty-five letters are called mutes" (sparṣa, literally 'contact'). The northern manuscripts add, as under the last rule, "beginning with k and ending with m." It is next pointed out that rules 2 and 5 contain the specification adih, 'at the beginning,' and that the different phraseology of this rule, namely adih, 'first,' indicates a difference of meaning: it signifies that the sounds referred to

---

5. varnasamāṇmānyasyād "ditā ardhya shoḍaṣa varṇāḥ svarasvānijñā bhaṇanti: akārdaya dukāraparyantā ity arthāḥ. saṁjñādyāḥ pryojanam: atha svarapar-yakāram (ix.10) ity ādi.

6. svarebhyaḥ pesha varnarāśīr vyanjunaśaṁjñāḥ bhaṇati: 'ka-kārdaisvarabhaktiparyantā ity arthāḥ'. saṁjñādyāḥ pryojanam: 'vyanjunaśaṁjñā gam' (xxi.1) iti.

7. vyanjanesah ādyāḥ paścaśaṁcarāvānā sarpasaṁjñāḥ bhaṇanti: 'kakārdadayo makārāntāḥ'. saṁjñādyāḥ pryojanam: sarpā sarpaparāḥ (xiv.27)'. atha navā "ditāh samānākārānā (i.2): shoḍaṣā "ditāḥ svarāḥ (lv) iti ad ādita iti vaktavya ādyā iti sādāntara-prayogā "rthaśāntarācakāḥ: vyanjanesah ādyāḥ nu tu svareshub ādyā iti vijñeyam'.

---

1 G. M. varṇānāṁ sam.
2) G. M. om. 3) G. M. athā "dāv uttare viśhāya kravaṇaṁ vyanjano parā (iii.1).
4) G. M. om. 5) G. M. athā "dāv uttare viśhāya kravaṇaṁ vyanjano parā (iii.1).
6) G. M. om. 7) G. M. remove to end of exposition, and for sarpaparāḥ read sparṣa ity ādi. 8) G. M. jñeyam.
are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list). Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on.

Rule xiv.27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined.

8. The next four are semivowels.

The four semivowels are $y$, $r$, $l$, $v$. The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term “semivowel” (antarśthā, i.e. antah-śthā, ‘standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]’: see note to Ath. Pr. i.30) is one (v.28) prescribing the treatment of final $m$ before an initial semivowel.

9. The next six are spirants.

Namely, the three sibilants, $s$, $sh$, and $s$, the jihvāmālīya, $x$, the upadhmāniya, $q$, and the aspiration, $h$. As regards the sounds to which the name āsman, ‘flatus,’ shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance. The Vāj. Pr. (viii.22) limits the class to the sibilants and $h$; the Ath. Pr. (see note to i.31) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct visarjaniya; the Rik Pr. (i.2), these and the anusvāra. We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the visarjaniya.

To instance the employment of “spirant,” the comment cites the rule (xiv.16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel.

10. Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series.

The commentary paraphrases: “among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation ‘series,’ they begin respectively with $k$, $c$, $t$, $t$, $p$, and end with $n$, $n$, $n$, $n$, $m$.” This

8. sparśabhyaḥ pare catvāro varṇā antasthāsanjñā bhavanti. sanjñāyāḥ prayojanam: antasthāparaça sa savañām anuvādākam (v.28) ity ādi.

1 A lacuna in W., extending to the word prayojanam in the commentary to the next rule.

9. antasthābhyaḥ pare shāc varṇā uṣhmāsanjñā bhavanti. sanjñāyāḥ prayojanam: uṣhmā svarapaḥ (xiv.16) ity ādi.
exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms. Otherwise, we might divide — pañca pañcowargadh, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. (i.2), 'there are five series, of five each.'

The illustrative rule (xiv.20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series.

प्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थीतीमा: ॥ ११ ॥

11. And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last.

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as t, th, d, dh, n; and these classes are named according to their order in the several series. The commentator makes no note here of the physical differences of the classes, but says "In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last. Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms 'first' and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration (?) . How so? Why, to establish the designation 'first' and so on for k and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semivowels, spirants, etc., designations founded on their enumeration." And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii.9; xiv.12, 24; viii.3; but the southern MSS. cite v.38 instead of ii.9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined.

10. sparyanam madhyam admirable paurvyaṃ pañca-pañca varnā vargasanyāḥ bhavanty: ka-ca-ta-pàdayaexternal ng-ña-ña-mántà ity arthāh. saṁjñyādhaḥ prayajanam: tavargas ca tavargaparāh (xiv.20) iti.\(^1\)

\(^1\) B. om. \(^2\) G. M. -pàdaya. \(^3\) W. om. the cited rule; G. M. ity ādi.


\(^1\) G. M. -varam. \(^2\) G. M. -varam. \(^3\) B. saṅkhyāntarāḥḥ; G. M. saṁkhyābh. \(^4\) M. saṁjñādāsmaḥ: as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident. \(^5\) G. M. om. \(^6\) G. M. tu saṁkhyāḥ. \(^7\) G. M. substitute for this rule part of v.38, viz. prathamaparāho hakāro catuthēṣu tasya saṣṭhānam.
The other Prātiṣṭhākyas employ the same designations for the mutes (save that the Vāj. Pr. also calls the nasals pañcama, ‘fifth’), but without taking the trouble to define them or prescribe their use by a rule.

12. The spirants, visarjaniya, and the first and second mutes, are surd.

The Rik Pr. gives (i.2,3) a similar statement; the Ath. Pr. uses the terms “surd” and “sonant” without defining which consonants form each class; the Vāj. Pr. (i.50–53) substitutes for the terms arbitrary formulas.

The physical peculiarity of the surd utterance is defined in the next chapter (rules 5,10).

The commentator illustrates the use of the term by the rule (ix.2) concerning the treatment of visarjaniya before a surd.

13. But not h.

“H is not styled a surd; this is an exception rendered necessary by the circumstance that h, being [by i.9] a spirant, would otherwise be included [by the last rule] in the class of surds,” says the comment.

All the phonetic treatises treat h as a sonant. For further definition of its character, see rules ii.0,9,46,47, below.

14. The rest of the consonants are sonant.

The commentary enters into a rather lengthy defense of the propriety of this rule, which reads literally as follows: “The remainder of the consonants other than the surds is styled sonant. Even though, when the surds have already been stated in rule 12, the sonant quality of the rest, on the principle of ‘remainder,’ is assured—just as, when it is said, ‘of Devadatta and Yajñadatta,

12. uśmadṣa ca visarjaniyaḥ ca prathamadvidityāḥ ca ’ghoshasainjñā bhamanti. saujñāyāḥ prayojanam: aghoshaparas tasya susthānam uśmadām (ix.2) ity adī.

1 B. prathamā ca dv-. 1 W. B. omit the last two words of the rule. 2 G. M. om.

13. na bhavaty aghoshasainjñāḥ hakāraḥ: uśmatvād agho-

shate prōpō tadapavādō yam.

1 W. jōōo.
Devadatta owns no kine," the conclusion is assured that Yaśña-
datta is a kine-owner—nevertheless, the indication of the technical
term is made in the text-book, for the sake of practical conve-
nience (?) . Also, because of the superiority of express mention over
inclusion in a reminder. Otherwise—the name of surd is denied to
h by rule 13, nor is h sonant, there being no rule to that effect;
and so with the rest of the consonants; the vowels are also in like
manner not sonant and not surd—this being the case, when the
rule shall be given (ix.8) "also when followed by a sonant," the
doubt would arise, "followed by a sonant" means followed by
what? Let not this be so: in this view the present rule is under-
taken." It is added "In this rule, the distinctive meaning, in the
form of objection and replication, is set forth by Māhisheya.s."
And the rule ix.8, already referred to, is quoted again by way of
illustration of the use of the term "sonant."
The Rīk Pr. (i.3), after specifying the surd letters, leaves the
sonants to be inferred pārīcēṣhādū, "by the remainder-principle," as
is expressly pointed out in the commentary on the passage (see
Regnier's edition, note to rule i.12).
The vowels are not included under the designation ghoshavant
"sonant," although (as is explained in rule ii.8) formed of the same
material with the sonant consonants.

Our treatise does not, like the other Prātiṣākhyaas (R. Pr. i.3;
V. Pr. i.64; A. Pr. i.10), define the "first" and "third" mutes as
soshman, "aspirated."

14. aghosheshyō 1 vyāṇjanaḍesho ghoshavatsaṁjñō bhavati:
yady apy isticavasārjaniyaprathamesho 2 aghosheshyō "kteshu
vyāṇjanaḍeshaṇya pārīcēṣhādū ghoshavatvamā tāttam: yatḥā 3
devadattayajñādattayor 4 apaśur devadatta ity ukte pariṣa-pa-
mārā iti siddham: tathā 'pi āśtre saṁyavahārārthamā saṁyajñā-
nirdeṣah kriyate: pārīcēṣhādā apī kaṇṭhoṭär vīcēṣhāt: anyātaḥ
na hakaṛah (i.13) iti hakaṛasyā ghoṣhaṁjñā nityaṁhyate: na
'pi hakaṛo ghoṣhavaṇ: vidhyahāvāt: tathāiti "va vyāṇjanaḍeshah:
svarā apī tathā na ghoṣhavaṇo nā 'pi aghoṣhāḥ: tathā sati
ghoṣhaṁvatparāc ca (ix.8) iti yatra vākṣyaṁyati tatra śaṁdeṣah,
syāt: ghoṣhaṁvatparo nāma kimpara iti: tan mā bhūd iti 'daṁ
sōtram" 10 dhārityate11).
vyāṇjanaḍeṣād̐pah āṣhāo vyāṇjanaḍeṣaḥ12.
aṣṭra sāstrē codyaparīdhārārūpā 13 esha vīcēṣha māhisheyaḥadh-
śitah.
saṁyajñād̐yāḥ prayaṇaṁ: ghoṣhaṁvatparāc ca (ix.8) ity ādi.

1 G. M. ins. 'nyo. 2 G. M. isticavasārjaniyē ty. 3 B. ins. ca. 4 W. -dattaṭiyor.
5 W. saṁbārā. 6 G. M. vīcēṣhāvāt. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. yatraṁyātra. 9 G. M.
tatrātra. 10 B. 'śstrēm. 11 G. M. repeat the rule itself here. 12 W. om.; B.
adda yāh gōṣhāḥ. 13 G. M. om. riṣpa.

VOL. IX.
15. आ, pra, ava, upa, abhi, adhi, prati, pari, vi, ni—these are prepositions.

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vāj. Prātiśākyas (R. Pr. xii.6; V. Pr. vi.24) and by Pāṇini (see the gana prādayāh). The commentator notes the discordance with Pāṇini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumably cuts short the list of prepositions with the word iṣṭi in it. His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda. Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion “therefore there is no discordance whatever,” I do not see the point of. The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain. The term preposition (upasarga) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz. vi.4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x.9, and xiv.8: for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules.

वर्ण: कारोत्तरो वर्णाख्या ॥ १६ ॥

16. A sound followed by kāra is the name of that sound.

That is, for example, akāra is the name of a, ekāra of e, and so on. The Vāj. Pr. (1.37) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all. Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii.4). The word kāra means ‘making, producing.’ It is in the rules of the Prātiśākyas added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (varṇa) as their names, but also to syllables like aḥ and an (see below, rules 23, 53), and the
commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like ca.

Rule iv.8, respecting e and t, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught.

17. But with an a interposed, in the case of the consonants.

That is, the name of k, for instance, is (k-a-kāra) kakāra. Compare the equivalent rule, Vāj. Pr. i.38.

The commentator cites rule v.22, respecting the conversion of t to c.

18. Not of visarjānti, jihvānti, upādhamānti, anu-

The term nātikya designates here, of course, the nasal figments taught in rules xxi.12-14. All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form. The commentator explains that the appending of kāra to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of varṇa, 'alphabetic elements'—is annulled by the rule: adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated. He then

1. akārayavahito; varṇaḥ kārṣaadbottaravā vyajjanāndam

2. Ity adi. akārayavahito; 'kārayavahito.'

3. W. -vyavate. 4 W. B. put this word after the cited rule. 5 G. M. vyavate.

4. visarjāntiāndān varāntviṇīpi kārottāravārādāntābh iṣṭāṁ

5. na kārayavahito; 'kārayavahito.'

6. Ity adi. na tu vacakasya; 'vacakasya.'

7. anyathā varṇakāra iti syāt: tadeva visarjāntiāndān 'ātām

8. iti vacayogrā̃ham eva yuktam; na 'nyathā:

9. tathā sati vacakāparavāj vararcohādiviracitāṁ udāharanam

10. avasaṁ ravi visarjāntiā (xiv.15) ity vāc arucirām; iti cet:

11. mā 'vam mañastāḥ: vacayogāṅham kālayāṅham apryayogā asta vacayogāṅham abhedavacakaryā udāharanām iti udāharanamañikāṁ.'

goes on to raise and refute a very subtle and hair-splitting objection. In rule 16, he says, kāra is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (rācaka) tārṇa, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (vācya) by that vocable; so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by visarjaniya etc. the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that visarjaniya and the other names given are, in default of those formed with kāra, the accepted designations for the sounds in question). This being the case, the illustrations given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv.15, speaking of r and "visarjaniya" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one. Such is the objection. The reply is: you must not think so; since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression; and the quoted example is proper enough.

प्रसासन रस्त्व १११

19. Of r, however, epha forms the name.

That is to say, the technical designation of r is repha; ra being also admitted, by rule 21, below: rakāra is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature. This peculiarity of treatment of r, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vaiś, Pr. has an equivalent rule (i.40).

The word tu, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to r of both the rules 16 and 17. Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of a between r and the appended kāra; but this is wrong; for it would imply that the name of r was made sometimes by appending kāra and sometimes by appending epha, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between ra and repha, and exemplified by rules vii.11 and xxi.15; while no


1 G. M. reph-; and M. reads rephaś in the rule itself. 2 W. sāncaśabdā. 3 B. rephaksarātāḥ; W. reph. 4 W. B. pt. 5 W. B. om. 6 G. M. naka. 7 G. M. ṭak.
instance of a name formed with kāra is anywhere to be met with. This is a very easy demolition of a very insignificant man of straw.

20. The short vowel, with varṇa after it, is the name of the three vowels.

The “three vowels” referred to are the three quantities—short, long, and protracted—of the vowels a, i, u, respectively; varṇa, in this case, indicating only the ‘color,’ or phonetic complexion, of the vowel, without regard to its length. The Ath. Pr. has the same usage of this term, but without defining it by rule. As our treatise acknowledges no protracted r, and neither a long nor a protracted i, it does not admit the compounds pvarṇa and ṭvarṇa; of the other three it frequently avails itself. The instance selected by the commentator is rule x.4, which directs the combination of a with a following i, ī, is into ē.

21. An a forms the names of consonants.

This rule allows us to call a consonant not only, as prescribed in rules 18 and 17 above, by a name formed by adding kāra with a interposed, but also by one formed with a alone. The commentator’s example is rule v.22, where t and c are referred to as ta-kāra, ca-kāra, and c, c again, and ch, as pa, ca, and cha. If something merely additional to the kāra, instead of alternative with it, were intended in the rule, we are told, rule 17 would be made meaningless. But, says an objector, why use kāra at all for the purpose, when even along with it the a has to be brought into requisition? let this alone furnish the name. The reasonableness of the objection is conceded, but the commentator alleges as sufficient justification of the practice followed, that it is in accordance with that of the Čikāhi and other text-books.

He continues: others assert that the a added to a consonant indicates (not that consonant pure and simple, but) a syllable composed of the consonant and any following vowel; as for instance in rule ix.3, “visarjaniya followed by ksha is not assimilated;” where the examples are manah ksheme (v.2.17), ghanāghanah kshobhanah (iv.6.41: so all the MSS., both here and under ix.3; my MS. of the Sanshitā reads kshobhanih), and ukthaçasah kshāma (ii.6.124). This is unsound; for then we should have to read ishe tvād (for ishe tvā, i.1.1 et al.), by the rule vii.13, “after vāgdhá and ṣhā, t becomes ṭ,” which is wrong. Moreover, in the rule (xii.

20. varṇottaro hrasvo ¹ hrasvadirdhahaputām ákhyá bhavati. yathá: i eva rapan eva káram (x.4) ity ádī. varṇapadā uttarān yasmdā aśvā varṇottaraḥ.

¹ G. M. ins. trasyāṃśa.
4) "ya, va, na, ha, when followed by vowels," the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters. Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone.

As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants; names formed with a alone occur nearly sixty times; with akāra, nearly eighty times. This is exclusive of r, which is called ra four times, repha fifteen times.

Compare rule i.39 of the Vāj. Pr.

22. As also, of a cited word.

The term grahāna is used in only two other rules of the Prātiṣākhya (i.24,50), but occurs in the commentary times innumerable, in the sense of 'citation, word taken or extracted from the Sanhitā to be made the subject of some prescription' (root grah, 'seize, take'). The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology; it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (lakṣhya), or one which is the cause (nimitta) of an effect produced in some other word. The former is called grahāna because it is "seized" (i.e. "affected"); the latter, because something is "seized" or "affected" by it. It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base. The ca, 'also,' of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of the a of the preceding rule. The meaning is, then, that a forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur.

21. vyāñjanaṇām akāra dhāhyā bhavati. yathā: takāra ca kāra2 sa ca caϕha (v.22) ity adi. kāraṇaṁottaravām idām ca vikalpyate: samuccaye tv akārasyaveto vyāñjanaṇām (i.17) iti vyartham syāt. nanu tarkī kāroottaratā kimarthā: taddānā api swāpyendā 'kárādabhāt: sa eva "khyā bhavatu. satyam: ṣikṣādhipadāstraprasiddhasainiṣkaṇṭahāya' iti parīkṣaḥ. apare tu saṁgiṁrante: akāraḥ sarvasvarāntasya vyāñjanaṇasya grahāka iti; yathā: man...... ghan...... ukth...... ity adi na kṣaparāḥ (i.3) iti nishṇihṣeyo dāhārayāni syād iti. tūd aśram: kūṭaḥ; vāghāshapārvas tāśh ātaṁ (vii.18) iti shapavato dī takāraṇā tātē keśe kṣe itē...... iti syāt: tac ca 'nishṣam: kīṁ ca: yavanaḥ asaraparasho' (xii.4) iti atra svaraparāśад syāt: bhavannato sarvasvarāntasya svakāraniyamāt: tasmād anupapannam eva11 tan matam manahe: kīṁ tu varṇamārāasyād "khyād."

1 W. B. omit these first two words of the rule. 2 G. M. -maṇ. 3 G. M. -tham.
4 G. M. aravyagri. 5 G. M. -dṛṣṭa. 6 W. om. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. savapū.
9 W. yavanaḥaparavāra. 10 G. M. -nāmārāsyā. 11 G. M. evād.
That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending ə, all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule. Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi.13 and x.14), to justify such inclusions. The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a nimitta, or citation of an affecting cause; the cited word is oṣṭha, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding ə or ə: the only two instances of this combination which the Śanshitā contains are quoted in illustration, viz. svad” oṣṭhābhyaṁ (vii.3.161), and upayānam adharen’ oṣṭhena (v.7.12). As example of a lakṣhya, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi.28, with its illustrative citations, kīṭilaça caturthaḥ (v.5.92), and kīṭilaṭa ca kshhayandya ca (iv.5.91). This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi.28).

This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final ə is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included; and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in ə are often cited “for the sake of the inclusion of many words” (bahupaddāndretham).


23. A ə makes the name of an increment, or of an element suffering alteration or elision.

Here, again, is a precept hardly called for, as the construction and connection of each rule shows in what way any nominative it contains is to be understood, without such an explanation as this, which applies only to a part of the cases, and is unable to teach us which of the three possibilities it contemplates is the actuality in any given case. Moreover, it is faultily expressed, and the commentator is obliged to explain that ə is here stands for the ending of the nominative case, in the dual and plural as well as the singular. He quotes in illustration five rules: xiv.5 exemplifies a singular increment; vii.1, a singular altered element; x.19, a singular elision; v.25, two-fold altered elements; xxi.12, plural increments.

22. ‘lakṣhyam nimittaṁ ca grahaṇam ity ucyate: grahyaṁ ə iti grahaṇam: grahyaṁ anene ə niṃtām api grahaṇam: padākadeṣāḥ praṭiṇādikam ity yād: ca-kāraḥ pāraṇaṭrakam akāraṁ akṣaraḥ: grahaṇasya praṭiṇādikasya sarvākṣaraḥ kāraṁ ākhyān bhavati. yathā: kīṭilakīṭilā (xvi.28) iti parakīṭilakīṭilābdo lakṣhyam uddhārayanam: yathā: kīṭr cat....’

(0) W. inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary.

1 G. grahaṇaṣya. 2 G. M. omit this example. 3 G. M. om.
Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25–27 between is quite unaccountable.

Rik Pr. i 14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28.

24. Or the simple citation.

The commentator says: "Of these—namely the increment etc.—there is in some cases, alternatively, citation; the meaning is, without any ah." And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi.29), alteration (vii.3), and elision (v.15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness.

25. In case of doubt, citation is made of the next.

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word grahanam, 'citation,' of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used. The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the Sanskrit would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it. But the commentator's first example and its exposition are quite peculiar. He quotes suvyamātrāyānu ca vikārinī ca 'uttame (v.3.73), and remarks: "There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two ca's in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the pragraha-character [to uttame], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [kāryadāhy, 'the word undergoing the prescribed


(1) B om.

24. teshām āgamanāṃ kvacīt grahaṇāṃ vā bhavati: ākkhārena vinda 'pi 'ti tātporyam. āgamasya yathā: adīraṇāḥ hatir (xvi.29) ity dāi: vikārinī yathā: kṛtyādhyamāṇāṃ ca (vii.3) ity dāi: lopino yathā: eṣhāsasya (v.15) ity dāi.

1 G. M. om. śi.
effect] is to be assumed, in the rule reading co 'ttame [iv.11].” He seems to suppose that the “doubt” referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding ca’s is joined with uttame in the precept that establishes the latter’s character as a prayagraha word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken. This is little less than silly. His other example is taken from rule iv.15, where a prshati is made prayagraha, the a being the final letter of the preceding word yujjda (yujjda prshati, iv.8.8). Under a later rule (iv.23) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied. See the note to that rule.

26. Even of more than one.

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident. The commentator declares the “even” (api) here to continue in force the word saindehe, “in case of doubt,” which is hardly to be approved. He interprets: “When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound,” and quotes tishthanty ekayd (v.19) and evo ‘ttare (iv.11) as examples. But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter; so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule. There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims; of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi.2,5 etc. I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous.

27. A first mute, followed by the word “series,” is the name of the series.

25. saindehe saty adannam ‘varnam padam’ va grhniydt: svayy.... ity atra cakirdavyasaambhavat prayahanimitattvamna katarasya ‘padanam kartavyam iti saindehe ya’d adannam karmaydhjas tad eva svikartanydm co ‘ttame (iv.11) iti satre’. varnasya yathd: a prshati (iv.15) ity adi.

1 W. om. 2 G. M. padam varnam. 3 G. M. yadd. 4 W. B. sarvatra.


1 G. M. adhyati. 2 W. B. om.

VOL. IX.
The commentator's example is rule xiv.20, "the t-series, followed by the t-series;" that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vāj. Pr. i.64.

28. 

28. Am makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated. The commentator explains, as before, that am stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number; but the two examples he gives (v.38 and vii.1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning.

29. By preceding is meant preceding.

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part. Our commentator explains: "Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification 'preceding,' that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone; but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation. Thus, by the rules (iv.12,13) 'dēvāprthivi' is praśraha; also the preceding word, the word yavatī is made a praśraha in the passage yavāti dēvāprthivi mahīvā (iii.2.61); but it is not therefore praśraha in the passage yavāti vdi prthivi (v.2.31)."

30. By following is meant succeeding.

27. vargapcadottarār prathamaḥ seavargasyād khyāt bhavati: tavarag ca tavargaparagah (xiv.20) iti. vargapcada uttaro yasmād asād varttatah.

1 W. om. svā.

28. am iti gado vikārasaya khyāt bhavati: am iti dvitiyāva- bhaktah upalakshanam. yathā: prathama pārvo hakāras caturtham (v.38): aṣṭa nākāro nākāram (vii.1).

29. yah pārnapabda na nirdhishāh sa tārā laśena mūpene 'palakshito jñātavayā: na tu rupasāmāṇyād anyo bhinnadeśa-sthān. yathā: dēvāprthivi: pūrvac ca (iv.12,13) iti pragraha bhavati 'iti vAkāyati: pārnavadā yāv---- iti yavatīca bhai praśrahaḥ: yāv---- iti tv na syāt pragrahaḥ.

1 G. M. viśhtyātā. 2 W. om. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. viśhtyāti. 5 G. M. añtra.
This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms. His illustration is taken from rules iv.49,50, where \textit{dve} and the word following it are declared \textit{pragraha}. In the passage, then, \textit{dve jaye vindate (vi.6.4)\textsuperscript{2}}, \textit{jaye} is \textit{pragraha}, but not in the passage \textit{yonir asi jaya s'ahi} (i.7.9\textsuperscript{1}: G. M. omit \textit{s'ahi}).

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv.52; and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer.

\begin{Verbatim}
सकारात्मकारी इत्यतः ॥ ३१ ॥
\end{Verbatim}

31. \textit{R} and \textit{l} are short.

As examples of short \textit{r} and \textit{l}, the commentator cites \textit{ṛtavo vādi (vii.2.6\textsuperscript{1})}, and \textit{akl̄ptasya kl̄pṭyā (v.4.8\textsuperscript{4})}.

\begin{Verbatim}
ग्रामकारण ॥ ३२ ॥
\end{Verbatim}

32. Also \textit{a}.

"Also" (\textit{ca}), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of "short" from the preceding rule. His example of short \textit{a} is \textit{aṃparāḥ (iv.3.2\textsuperscript{1} or 4.3\textsuperscript{1})}.

\begin{Verbatim}
तेन च समानकालस्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥
\end{Verbatim}

33. Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter.

Here again, the "also" continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told. The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are \textit{i} and \textit{u}, since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with \textit{a} in the diphthongs. As examples from the Sanhitās are quoted \textit{īske vādā (i.1.1 et al.)}, \textit{upaprayanto adhvaram i.5.5\textsuperscript{1} or 7\textsuperscript{1}}: W. B. omit \textit{adhvaram}, and \textit{aṭṭā} \textit{ha tad urugāyasya (i.6.2\textsuperscript{2}: but see the various readings below). The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,}

30. \textit{yaḥ para ity onena vipishyate so 'pi tatṛti 'va svena rūpena pratyetavyaḥ. yathā: dve: paraḥ ca (iv.49,50) iti 'pragraho bhavati 'ti vakṣhyaḥ: paraḥ dve jā---- ity atra jāye iti ' pragrahaḥ: 'yo---- ity atra ' na pragrahaḥ'.

\textsuperscript{1} G. M. om. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. ins. \čaddā. \textsuperscript{3} B. om. \textsuperscript{4} G. M. ins. \h

31. \textit{rkaṇaḥ ca lkaṇaḥ ca krasvamāhīdū bhavataḥ. yathā:}\n\textit{ṛt----: ak--.}

\textsuperscript{1} W. B. om.

32. \textit{akaraḥ ca krasvamāhīdū bhavati: caśāh krasvatvam' anvāddati. yathā: ay---- iti.}

\textsuperscript{1} G. M. \textit{-svam.}
with nantu), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form: "A is short: also any vowel having like quantity with it;" because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since r and l are of the same quantity as a, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule). But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape; for r and l inhere in r and l; and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short: hence the special rule concerning them. The treatise, as was noticed above (under i.2), nowhere describes the formation of r and l, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels.

The rule of the Vāj. Pr. (l.55) is nearly the same with this.

34. Also anuṣvāra.

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, anuṣvāra is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel. The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows: rule xxi.6, which teaches that anuṣvāra and svarabhākti are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former; whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition.

The Vāj. Pr. (iv.147, 148) allows anuṣvāra to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddy enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-

---

1 G. M. tatrā. 2 G. M. hrasvātivedakāh samānkālaḥ Svāra iti. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. -kālamāvatāt-. 5 W. om. 6 B. aṭāḥ "ha only; G. M. aṭāḥ hy; both as if the introduction to what follows. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. anantas. 9 G. M. tatāḥ. 10 B. om. 11 G. M. anvagomāya. 12 G. M. ins. hrasvātā.
35. An element of twice that quantity is long.

The literal meaning of this rule is, says the commentator, that one of the before-mentioned short vowels, when doubled, is long; but its virtual intent is that a vowel having twice the quantity of a short is long. I have translated in accordance with the latter interpretation. As example of the use of the term “long” is quoted rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel.

36. An element of three times that quantity is protracted.

The commentator explains the virtual meaning of this rule in the same manner as that of the preceding, and quotes in illustra-

---

1 G. M. adj. 2 G. M. kramdk. 3 MSS. svarâm pr.; W. āgavād. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. 60. 6 G. M. 64.

35. távān iti prakṛto hrásva ucyate: dvir iti dvirāpah: távān hrásvo dhṛgharasñijo bhavati "ti sūtryojarnd: tātparyān tu hrāsvañgūṇakālaḥ svaro dhṛgharasñijo bhavati 'ti, saññīdhyā prayojanam: dhṛghaḥ samānākśhare savarṇāpāre (x.2) ity ādī.

1 G. M. -pam. 2 W. inserts here, out of place, saññīdhyā prayojanam. 3 B. 61; W. om. tā. 4 W. om. iti.

36. atrā 'pi ā hrásvo 'nuvartate saññīdhyāt: trir iti trirāpah: trirāpo hrásah piutasaññijo bhavati 'ti: tātparyān tu atrā 'pi brāmāh: hrāsvarigūṇakālaḥ svaraḥ piutasaññijo bhavati: saññīdhyā prayojanam: piutapragrahādav (x.24) iti.

1 G. M. ins. sa. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. om.
tion of the term "protracted" rule x.24, which directs that a protracted and a prayākaḥ vowel are not liable to combination.

All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity; see Ath. Pr. i.59–62, and the notes upon those rules.

37. A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel.

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant. For, if it were the latter, the word "time" in rule xvii.5, which speaks of "the time of a consonant," would be open to the charge of redundancy. We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious. As example of a consonant, the word vāk (e.g. i.3.9¹: but G. M. read instead vā) is given us.

Of the other treatises, the Ath. Pr. (i.60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity.

38. A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute.

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii.9), where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described. He adds as example of an acute vowel sa idāndāḥ (iv.4.4²: but all the MSS. save W. read sā iti), and quotes rule xiv.29 as exemplifying the use of the term udātta, "acute" (literally "elevated"). I have explained in the note to Ath. Pr. i.14–16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms udātta, anudātta, and svarita, to translate them by "acute," "grave," and "circumflex," respectively.

39. In a low tone, grave.

37. nyajanaṁ hrasvārdhakālaṁ bhavati: na tu nyajanan iti saṁjña: anyātā vyañjanakālaḥ ca svarasyād 'trā 'dhikah' (xvii.5) iti 'kārṣṭaś abhasya pāunarucyāpatteḥ. yathā: vāk. hrasvājita 'rdho' hrasvārdhah! 'hrasvārdhake' parimāno vasyaś tat tatho 'ktam.

1 G. M. om. ² G. M. omit the last two words of the rule. ³ G. M. ins. atra. ⁴ G. M. dham. ⁵ G. M. hrasvārdhake kikāh parimānalo vasya = a good and consistent reading; B. is corrupt. ⁶ W. -aṁ.

38. dyāmo dārūnyām (xxii.9) iti lakṣaṇaḥākṣhitah śvara udātta ucyate. yathā: sā... saṁjñaḥ prajyajanam: udāt- tāt paro 'nudattaḥ svarītaṁ (xiv.29) iti.²

1 G. M. -a. ² G. M. ity ādi.
We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxii.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone. The example for the accent is anudatām (i.7.2\textsuperscript{2}; but G. M. read avadatām), of which, in pada-text, all the syllables are grave; that for the term anudatta, ‘grave’ (literally, ‘not elevated’), is, in W. B., rule iv.43; but in G. M., rule xiv.29.

40. Their combination is circumflex.

The commentator explains samāhāra, ‘combination,’ as from samāhriyate, ‘it is taken together, collected, combined;’ and adds, “the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (svarita). This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent; its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place;” and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv.29, x.16, and xii.9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises. His example of a circumflexed syllable is ite bruva (iii.2.2\textsuperscript{3} et al.).

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute; but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules.

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath. Pr. i.14–16); and Pāṇini’s rules (i.2.29–31) are precisely the same with those here given. As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath. Pr. i.17).

41. Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

\begin{verbatim}
39. anavavasargah (xxii.10) iti satralakshita\textsuperscript{2} svaro ’nu-
adatta ucyate’. yathā: av. sami\textsuperscript{3}nādyah prayojanam: anudatto
na nityam (iv.43) iti.
\end{verbatim}

1 W. B. om. 2 G. M. -ta. 3 B. lakṣhyate. 4 G. M. give xiv.29, and ity ādi.

40. tayor udāttānudāttayor yaḥ samāhāraḥ sa\textsuperscript{1} svaro ucyate.
yathā: tē... samāhriyata iti samāhāraḥ: tayor melanjan-
yasvarahi\textsuperscript{2} svarita\textsuperscript{3} ity arthaḥ. svaritasvarāpavidhir ayam: upa-
rishitā tu tatratatra svarito lakṣhyate: yathā: udāttāt paro
’nudattah svaritam (xv.29): udāttayog ca paro ’nu’datt-
ah svaritam (x.16): tasminn’ anudatte\textsuperscript{4} pūrva udāttah
svaritam (xii.9) ity ādi.
\end{verbatim}

1 M. om. 2 W. -ra; B. -nyah svara. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. vak. 5 W. om.

W. kumuddāte.
acute, the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is uttered in a yet higher tone.

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its first element; one is tempted to give the word udāttā a double construction, as belonging in idea to uccāṣṭarām as well as to anantare.

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule.

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words sā idhānāh (iv.4.45), already once given (under rule 38); the first syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule xiv.29, under which the same quotation is repeated.

उदात्ताम: शेष: ॥ ७२ ॥

42. The remainder has the same tone with acute.

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator, in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency. He claims, namely, that the word “same with” here signifies “a trifle lower than,” “because otherwise there would be no circumflex”—the circumflex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher and lower tone. But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual “grave” tone which rule 40 prescribes: if, indeed, giving to its first portion a higher tone than “acute” be not an equal offense against the same rule.

सवधानी अपि ॥ ७३ ॥

43. Along with the consonant, too.

Says the commentator—“the rule as formerly given applied to a pure vowel; now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant. The circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which directly follows an acute or another, is as defined. The ‘too’ (apī) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel.” To this explanation of apī, as simply equivalent with ca, we must demur. As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

41. udāttād anantare yah svarah svaryate tasya "dis tāvad uccāṣṭarām udāttatara bhavati yād dvad dhrasvasya 'rāham. yathā: sā.....

42. hruvadrhakāde cheṣa udāttasamo bhavati: 'na tā 'datta eva: samacadbhuyogāt kiṃcīn nyānatvam pratiyate: anyathā svardābhavīt. prvoktam evo 'dharāpām.

(1) W. repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after bhavati.
which it occurs, it is always best translated by 'even,' as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected.

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers sākhā sākhābhīyo vārīvah kṛno ṭu (iii.3.11): all the MSS. except W. give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies; the second syllable of each has the enclitic svarita, and they are to be read and divided sā-khā-bhīyo vā-ri-vah, and tiṣṭyāḥ (ii.2.10² et al.: but G. M. omit this example).

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached. Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection. It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone.

44. Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone.

The comment explains anantara in this rule as equivalent to āṣeṣa (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that "the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41], is in a lower tone; that is, is anudāttataḥ ('lower than grave')." Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being "of the same tone with acute" (rule 42), is "of lower tone (than acute)," may well be made a question. It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave. The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding.


1 W. om. 2 W. śāhānta. 3 W. vā mukhyd vi. 4 B. om. 5 G. M. 'śākheḥ.

44. tasya svaritasya hravārdhakād chesha nicdistarāṁ anudattataraṁ bhavati: anantarāḥ āṣaḥ ity arthaḥ: tath evo 'dāharanam.

1 W. -dāhā. 2 W. 'dātarō.

VOL. IX.
45. Or in the same tone with grave.

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the vâ, 'or'): "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with anuddatta."

46. Its beginning is the same with acute; its remainder is the same with grave: so say the teachers.

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher,' the plural being used in token of respect: the word dârjya is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv.6) except in the expression ekeham dârjyândam, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times. The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (ishta, literally 'desired') in the net-work (jâla) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41. It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent. The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists. The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx.), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules.

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx., which define the relation of

45. tasyāt svaritasya sa eva āeshu anuddattasamo bhaṇavati.
1 G. M. om.

46. tasyāt va svaritasyā 'dhrasvārdhakāla udāttasamo bhaṇavati: āeshas tu anuddattasamo bhaṇavati: āeshas tu anuddattasama ity dâryād brwate. yathā: sakh-..... tasyāt 'dir (i.41) ity ādyabhyādhīte 'min vikalpa-jāde' sūtram etad eva 'ṣṭham: pruṣīṣṭapratīkhatayor mṛdutarah (xx.11): tāiro vyañjana-
padavṛttayor (xx.12) iti lakṣhanānakalyād: na ta 'parītanam
api sūtram ṛṣṭham: etalakṣhanapratīkūlīd yeva.
2 G. M. omit, which is better. 3 G. M. abhyād 'bhūḥita; B. abhyādita (r—corrupt). 4 W. B. ḫya- (ḥya?); W. ḫala.
four of the kinds of circumflex to one another in respect to hardness of utterance, the commentator rejects in advance the next following rule, as being discordant with them. The ground of the asserted accordance and discordance I am not able to discover.

47. It is all a slide, say some.

The commentator says: "The word 'slide' (pravana) is a synonym of 'circumflex:' the circumflexed vowel, along with its consonants, starting from its beginning, is all of it a slide: so some teachers have said." And he adds the same example already more than once given, sākhihyo vārivah (iii.3.11). We have seen that, in his exposition of the preceding precept, he has rejected this one, upon grounds of inappreciable value. The view here taken is one that might well enough be held by any one, as virtually equivalent with the one before presented: the voice somehow makes its descent from the higher to the lower pitch within the compass of the accented syllable; whether by a leap or a slide, is a proper theme for hair-splitting argumentation, but of the smallest practical consequence.

48. A separable word is treated like separate words, except in an enumeration.

The meaning and application of this precept may be best exhibited by means of the examples which the commentator quotes. We have a rule (iv.40) that te and the at the end of a word of more than two syllables are pragraha if preceded by a or e. In the passages osahatā tiṣṇa-hete (i.2.14) and tat pravāte (vi.4.72), then, the final syllables would be pragraha, but that the words in which they occur are separable compounds, written in the pada-text tiṣṇa-hete and pravāte, and so are exempted by this rule from the

47. pravāna-cābdhā' svaritoparyāyah: savyanjana eva svarita ādita drūthya sarvaḥ pravano bhavati 'ty eka' ādāryā ucire. yathā: sakhī' .

1 B. has pravāna for pravāna everywhere. 2 G. M. om. 3 M. sroebhīyo.

48. iṣyapadaśa nādāḥ padadvad bhavati: asaṅkhyānavishaya: nādāḥ padadvad iti kim: osh----- tat---- ity ādāv ākārdikārapāraśa tu bahuvarasya te the (iv.40) ity atra pragrāhatvam ma bhād iti: asaṅkhyāna iti kim: dve: pravāca:

1 G. M. -nē vākha. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. ins. th. 4 G. M. prabhavatu.
operation of iv.40: the te is in each case the ending of a disyllabic word. What is meant by "enumeration" is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word. The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv.49–51, the word dve, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made pragraha: hence, in the passage dve savane sukra-vati (vi.1.8), sukra-vati (pada-text sukra-vati) must be counted as a single word only, or the i of vati would not be pragraha.

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prātiṣākhya, the word ḫṛya (T. W. B. and O. more usually write ḫṛya, or ḫṛya) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the pada-text. The St. Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound.

Compare Rik Pr. i.25, and Vāj. Pr. i.153.

49. Of such a word, the former member is called avagraha.

The example quoted is devāyata iti deva-yate (iii.5.5)—an instance of carcd, or repetition with itsi interposed, such as is usual in the krama-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the pada-texts also. The existing pada-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply deva-yate, reserving the repetition with itsi for words which are pragraha and separable at the same time: but that of the Taftitrīya-Sanhitā treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath. Pr. iv.74). In deva-yate, the part deva is denominated avagraha. As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv.2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing pragraha.

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words pada and avagraha in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine): compare under ii.7 and v.2.

The other Prātiṣākhya use the term avagraha in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it.

50. In citations of a word, that word is to be understood.

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

---

49. 'tasye ṛgypadasya pūrvapadam avagrahaḥ ity ucya-te. yathā: dēv-...... avagrahāsanījāyāḥ prayojanam: nā 'vagrahaḥ (iv.2) ity ādi. pada-vagraha-ca-dhayor nīyata-liṅgagatvānnyonyuvayaḥ samabhavati.

identical in form with it. Thus (to take the commentator’s example), tve is later (iv.10) declared pragraha except at the end of a separable word, as in the passage tve kramam (iii.5.101); the exception specified is necessary, because the tve of a word like aditiive (p. aditi-tve) is also a pada or vocable;—but it is not therefore to be inferred that the tve of kramam, in the passage kramam dakshayam (iii.2.52; 3.11*), is also pragraha.

As the commentator had formerly derived grahanam (i.22) from ghrayate, so now he derives grahanam from ghranty, ‘they seize, take.’

The principle here taught is appealed to several times (under iv. 11.38; vii.2) hereafter, in order to the settlement of doubtful points.

It would seem possible to be still made a question whether the citation in any particular rule were a pada, ‘a full word,’ or a padaikadecha, ‘part of a word,’ since citations of the latter kind are also frequently made. Perhaps the commentator would settle the difficulty by asserting that no combination of articulate sounds which actually occurs in the Sanhitā as a pada is ever cited in any other character.

ग्रहितम् विक्रतम् ॥ ५१ ॥

51. But that word, even when phonetically altered.

The commentator gives two examples. The word vahanam, he says, is cited later (vii.6) as one whose n is liable to conversion into n; this conversion, then, still holds good, though the final syllable of the word have become o: thus, pravahanam vahini (i.3.3). Again, syah, by v.15, loses its final visarga; and it does so, even when its s is changed to sh, as in ayam u shya pra devayuh (iii.5.11*). As regards the former of these examples, it might seem to be provided for by rule i.22, above: but the commentator would doubtless plead that the rule would apply to vahanam, but not to vahan.

50. padagrahāneshu sātresu gṛhitam padam eva gamyeta: ¹ jñātavyam: na padākadeçaḥ. yathā: tve ity aniiṅgyantah² (iv.10) iti vaksyati: tathā sati tve... iti pragraha bhavati: kra... iti padākadeçaḥ na bhavati. gṛhānti: iti grahanam: padānāḥ grahanam padagrahānani: teshu.

¹ M. ins. 2d. ² G. M. -cāt. ³ W. aniiṅgy-; B. anīky-. ⁴ G. M. -cātān.

51. apiṣabdaḥ padam anvādiṣati: padagrahāneshu vikṛtam api padam avagantavyam. yathā: natoḍpaṭān vahana (vii.6) iti grahanam: padam iti kṛtā visarjaniya otvam āpam āpam ‘pi nātvam nā di va nivartate: pra...: eshuvasayaḥ (v.15) iti visarjanīyaloṣa pragrahānām pathishyate: aya... ity atra uktāre shatam āpam āpam ¹ visargalopa bhavatī eva.

¹ G. M. ins. ‘pi.
52. And even when preceded by a.

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix a attached to them. But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working. By iii.2, eva is included among the words whose final a is liable to be shortened; then, by this rule, api is also included: e.g. api(ā)vaṇaḥ (p. api(ā)va-vaṇat) sa-

haṇīnaṁ (iii.3.11)1).

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under iii.2,8; vi.13.16; vi.5.14; viii.8.13; xi.16; xvi.6,1u).

53. And when preceded by an.

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent: it is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules iii.7, viii.8, and xvi.29). The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example. The word api, by xvi.29, contains anuvāraḥ; hence the same word preceded by an is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage anauṣṇu kurvanataḥ (iii.2.2).

The commentator now raises the question: how comes kāra to

52. atra api apiṣadāḥ padānvādeṣakah: padagrahaṇeshv akāraṇy: api2 padan āśiṣeyum: ‘śvartāvayunā (iii.2) iti hrasvādeṣe vaksyati: akārāder api tasya grahaṇasya hrasva-

tvam bhavati. yathā: apiḥ— akāra ādir yasya tathoktam.

1 G. M. opt. 2 G. M. ca. 3 G. M. prefixes the preceding three words of the cited rule.

53. ačakāraḥ padam iti bodhayati: padagrahaṇeshv ankāraṇy: api padāṁ ā śiṣeyum: api śu (xvi.20) iti anuvāraṇaṃ vaks-

syati: ankārāder api tasya 'nusvāraṇaṃ syat. yathā: an— akāra ādir yasya tathoktam.

nām atra sitre 'n ity asya kārottaratvam kathau kriyate: varnāḥ kārottarah (i.16) iti 'sitre varṇasya' kārottaratvav-

dhāvāḥ saṁprapaśangat. utaye: satyam etacheśṭrabālān 'na kriyate: kiṁ tu ṣāstraṁcarabalāḥ kriyate: yathā: pāṇiniyā 'eva-
kāra api kāra ityādināṁ sādhvam kathayanti: evam atra 'pi evam aḥkāra ṅa ṅama (i.23) ity atraḥ cedyaparīhāram viśiṣyeyāu.

1 G. M. varṇaḥ-padaśya. 2 G. M. tasya. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. eva-kāra 'pi.
5 G. M. atra 'pi.
be added here to the syllable an since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that kāra is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name. His answer is: true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book; but it is done by the authority of other text-books; for example, Panini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as evakāra, api-kāra (for the words eva and api). So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have aṅkāra for aṅ; and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there. See the note under rule 16.

54. A single sound composing a word is called aprkta.

The commentator explains ekavarnakha after the fashion usual with him in treating a karmadharaya or determinative compound: "that is both single (eka) and a sound (varna); hence, a single sound." The term aprkta means, he says, 'uncombined with a consonant.' As example of an aprkta word, he quotes sa tv eva ekaviṅcavartaniḥ (iv.3.34), where tv is, by rule ix.16, representative of the particle tv; and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification "composing a word," yajñapatāsa iti (vi.6.23), where tv, though in a manner isolated, is not aprkta, being only a fragment of a word. Rule ix.16 exemplifies the use of the term.

55. And is treated both as initial and as final.

As an instance of the treatment of an aprkta word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage sa tv eva ekaviṅcavartaniḥ (iv.3.34), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G. M. have here a lacuna, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

1. B. ins. sa. 2 G. M. -kasaniṃ. 3 G. M. add the remaining two words of the cited rule. 4 G. M. -yukta.

55. cakārvāddhitān tad aprkta-indriyām padam adyantavac ca kāryabhad bhavati. aiddav yathā: sa. ity utra "tasyā "dir nucādistān (i.41) iti kāryam bhavati: antarad yathā: o te. ity utrā "ntuḥ (iv.3) iti prayāhakāryam bhavati. aidda ca 'ntac ca "edyantātu: tvu tvād "dyantavat.

1 G. M. aiddad ant. 6 G. M. om. 8 G. M. -ho.
the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound—indeed, teaches no kāryam, ‘effect,’ at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage o te yanti (i.4.33), in which o is pragrāha; with reference to rule iv.3, which teaches that only a final vowel is pragrāha.

With this rule and the preceding compare Vāj. Pr. i.151–2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rik Pr. does not define the term aprkta, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, indre” hi (indru: 8: ihi), analogous with the one (bhakshe” hi, iii.2.51) quoted below, under v.3.

56. Alteration and omission are of a single sound.

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v.19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, dhārṣṭhādau (i.2.82: by rule v.10); of omission, sa te jānātī (i.2.142–2: by rule v.15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix.7).

57. Omission is complete loss.

As example of lopa, ‘omission,’ the commentator quotes the passage sa im’andrā suprayasah (iv.1.81–2), where the initial m of mandrā is lost after im (by rule v.12: see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v.11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: “some have maintained the eternity of sound: in order to the confusion of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar.” Pāṇini’s corresponding precept (i.1.60) is adarçcanām lopāḥ, ‘omission is disappearance from view.’

56 varnmanātrasya vikāralopāu syātām na tu sarvasya pādasya. vikāras tānāt: dhā- iti: ‘lopas tu’: sa.....

(1) W. om. B. omits this whole comment, along with the following rule.

57. varnnavindopā lopasannijño bhavati. yathā: su..... saivjīyad pryojanam: atha lopāḥ (v.11) ity ādi. varnasya nityātām kecid āhūḥ: tannirakaranādya vyākarAnusāreṇa sātram etad abhānī.

1 G. M. varnasya v...
58. Continued implication is of that which was last.

The term anvādeca, ‘after-indication,’ with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially anvākarshaka, ākarshaka, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator’s first example is entirely accordant with this understanding: in rule vii.3, namely, to the effect that the n of hanyāt and upyamānam is changed to n, the implication is “after niḥ,” niḥ being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept: rule xv.8 says, “a, however, even in saṁhitā [is protracted and nasalized];” and it is to be understood that only a “last” or “final” a is intended—as in suslokāḥ (1.8.16), protracted from susloka; while in brahmān tvāṁ rājān (1.8.16), agnās ity dha (vi.5.4), vicityah somās na vicityād itī (vi.1.9), where the words protracted are brahmān, agne, somāḥ, and vicityāḥ, and the a is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation: no rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv.3 and xv.8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an “affecting cause” (nimittā), like the niḥ brought forward from vii.2 to vii.3 in the first example, and an “affected” word or element (nimittin, ‘having a cause’), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with lakṣāṇa, used in the comment to i.22) he defines as “something original (? pradhāna seems to be taken here in the sense of prakṛti) suffering a prescribed effect.”

No one of the other Prātiṣākhya attempts to lay down any rules as to the anvādeca (or anuvṛtti); and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the sūtra style of composition, because the sūtras are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

58. nimittasya nimittino vā 'nyasyd 'nvadeṣo bhavati: nimittī 'ti pradhānāvāh kāryabhāg iti yāvat. nimittasya yathā: hanyād upyamānam ca (vii.3) ity asyā 'tra' niḥsaṃbāsya. nimittino yathā: akāraś tu saṁhitāyām api (xv.8) ity abhy svuṣlokaḥ ity antyasya 'kārasya: antyasya 'ti kim: brah......: ag...... vici......

1 W. -ām; G. M. -na. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. om. all the signs of protraction.

VOL. IX.
59. An upabandha, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect.

The commentator etymologizes upabandha, 'connection, tie,' as representing the meaning upabandhyate, 'it is tied up, bound to,' and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication “in that,” and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv.22,23,48,52 as examples. An upabandha, then, is a connected part of the Sanhitā, pointed out and defined by the rules of the Prātiṣṭhāntika in various ways: by citing the first words of a single verse (iv.20) or of an anuvāka (iv.25,48; xi.3); by the accepted title of a number of anuvākas, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii.9,11; iv.52; ix.20; xi.3); by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv.22,23); or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv.52). Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things: first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word tu, 'however,' in the rule;—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word nityam, 'constantly, in all cases.'

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application. But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character. He tells us that the passage ity ādu devī hy eti devah somaḥ (vi.1.71) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i.61), under the action of rule iv.25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it. The meaning is this: the passage quoted contains a series of four words, ity ādu devī hi, which are also found at ii.6.7 (devi devapuruṣa ity ādu devī hy eti devapute); and, as the i of devi in the latter passage is pragrahā by iv.25, so, under the operation of i.61, it should be pragrahā also in the other. Such, however, is not the case; for devi in devī hy eti is singular, while in devī hy eti it is dual. It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta-

59. upabandhas tu svadepāyāt 'va nityam nirdeśako bhavati: upabandhyata ity upabandhah: etasmin ity' adhirakṣanārāpaḥ saṁkhyānacchālayas ca pradeś upabandha ity ucayate. yathā: irāvati (iv.22) ity ādu sātrāravayam: somāya svai tāsmin (iv.48): gamayato bhavatāḥ (iv.52) iti ca. upabandhe yad uktaḥ tad anyatra na bhavati 'ti tuptiddhāḥ'. yathā: ity.....: atra tripadaprabhīrtinyāyena (i.61) pārvājeprabhrty d'yaṁ (iv.25) iti prāptih. anyatra yo nishedhah sa upabandhe na bhavati 'ti nityagādiddhāḥ. yathā: saḥohavirādhāne (iv.11) iti pragrahoh grahishyate: kevalahavirādhāna iti sarvathā
tor to maintain that the present rule nulls the application of i.61, and, through it, of iv.25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible: for rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced; and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, devi at vi.1.7 is pragraha according to the rules of the Pratîṣṭhākhyā, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted: and the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an upabandha passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i.61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by nityam.

Further, the citation in rule iv.11 of the compound saioha-virdhâne as pragraha implies that the simple word huvirdhâne would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage huvirdhâne khyâyante (vi.2.111); but this implication does not hold in the passage huvirdhâne prâç pravartayeyuh (iii.1.31), because of the inclusion of the latter among the upabandhas of rule iv.52. Here, however, is brought up an objection: the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an upabandha passage. For instance, in the passage atha mithûni bhavatah (vi.5.8), the word mithûni, which would else be pragraha by iv.52, is made otherwise by iv.53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by vâyava árohaavâdâvâ (v.6.21), where vâyave ought to be pragraha, because occurring in the anuvaka to which iv.48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv.54. The answer is made, that in the case of grâmi, vâyave, manave, and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention; while the exception of huvirdhâne is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good: specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

na pragraho grhyate: yathâ: hav---- ity ayam atra nisheddhah: hav---- ity atra na prasarati: gamayato bhavatah (iv.52) ity dānā prâptih. nunv etad anupapannam: anyatra nishedhasya kvacîd upabandhe 'pi durçandât: yathâ: atha---- ity atra gamayato bhavatah (iv.52) ity upabandhaprâptir na grâmi (iv.53) ity dānâ 'nyatra' nishedhasa nishedhyate: tathâ: vây---- ity atra smâya sva (iv.48) iti prâptir ati samânapada (iv.54) ity anenâ 'nyatra nishedhasa nishedhyate, atro 'cyate: grâmi vâyave manave ity dānān kanâhoktavâd esha nisheddhah prasaratu" kevalahuvirdhâne" pragraho" ne 'ty ārthiko nishedho na prasaraty eva: ārthikakaññhoktayoñ kan-
But this suggests a further objection: why then is not the specific mention of \textit{ate} and \textit{ave} in rule iv.54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word \textit{nityam}, ‘in all cases,’ in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding: the specific mention merely annuls the application of the \textit{upabandha} rule; the addition of \textit{nityam} avoids the application of any other rule. For example, in \textit{dve} \textit{Jaye vindaete} (vi.6.4\textsuperscript{a}), \textit{vindaete} should be \textit{pragraha} (by rule iv.51), because separated by only one word from \textit{dve}; and in \textit{vanaspati vidvaragah} (iv.6.6\textsuperscript{a}), the same character would belong to \textit{vanaspati} (by iv.38) because followed by \textit{vid}—and we are left to infer that the \textit{nityam} renders rule iv.54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the \textit{pragraha} character of the two words in question. This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued; it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Māhīshēya.

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point. The term \textit{upabandha} is doubtless better understood actively, as representing \textit{teno 'pabadhyaete}, ‘that whereby there is binding up:’ the presence of \textit{depḍya} in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation. The intent of the specification \textit{nityam} is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the \textit{upabandha} passages: and such are iv.53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading. The force which the commentator ascribes to the \textit{tu} of the rule belongs rather to \textit{depḍya}, and the \textit{tu} has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before.

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon. The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv.54).

\begin{center}
\textbf{नानापदीयं च निनित्तं प्रग्रहस्तुवादिपु II ५० II}
\end{center}

60. Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a \textit{pragraha} or of a word containing \textit{anuvāda}.

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{ṭhoktaṣya prābalyāt. naṃv ate ave (iv.54) ity anayoḥ kāntoktydi 'vā 'lam: tatra nityagrahaṇena kim. ucyate: nitarām parihaṇāḥ: kāntoktit iti upabandhaprātipi eva nivartayati nityaśaśbdas tu prāptyantaram api purīharati: yathā: dve.... ity atra ekavyaveto 'pi (iv.51) iti prātipiḥ: van.... iti 19 \textit{vid} (iv.38) ādiprātipiḥ: evam ādy udhāniyam\textsuperscript{11}. māhīshēyamatānusūrdṇeṣu iti pranaścitōam.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1} B. \textit{upabandhyāta}. \textsuperscript{2} \textit{iti}. \textsuperscript{3} G. M. om. \textit{tu}. \textsuperscript{4} W. B. om. \textsuperscript{5} G. M. \textit{kevalāni} haw. \textsuperscript{6} G. M. sarvadhi. \textsuperscript{7} W. om. \textsuperscript{8} G. M. anyatra. \textsuperscript{9} G. M. om. \textsuperscript{10} G. M. \textit{yathā}. \textsuperscript{11} G. M. -ratī. \textsuperscript{12} B. \textit{kevalāni h}. \textsuperscript{13} W. -he. \textsuperscript{14} G. M. ins. \textit{atra}. \textsuperscript{15} G. M. -nityamam.
\end{flushright}
The intent of this rule is made sufficiently clear by the commentator, but he is unable to show satisfactorily its connection, or the implication in virtue of which it comes to mean what it does. He puts, however, a bold face upon it, and declares that the ca, 'also,' implies the negative (naḥ: compare Panini ii.2.6 etc.) meaning signified by tu (that is to say, the tu of the preceding rule). This is quite unintelligible. More defensible would be the continuance of nityam, 'constantly:' this, indeed, I conceive to be the real interpretation of the ca; although the rule is even thus insufficiently explained by its context. The term ardīṣṭu points us to the sixteenth chapter, where is to be found an enumeration of all the cases in the Sāhita exhibiting an anuvādha which is not a consequence of the phonetic rules of the treatise—of all the words which in their pada form contain an anuvādha—and this enumeration is led off (xvi.2) with the syllable sa. Many of this class of words are pointed out, as elsewhere in the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, by mentioning the words which they precede or follow; which latter, then, become in the view of the treatise their nimitta, or 'cause' (taking the post hoc or ante hoc for a propter hoc). Inasmuch, now, as the pragraha quality and the occurrence of this anuvādha belong to the word itself, independently of its surroundings, it becomes necessary to teach that, when a word has been defined by means of its surroundings as thus characterized, it retains its character even when separated from them, as it is in the pada-text. Or, in the language of the rule, the defined occasion of a pragraha or of a constituent anuvādha is of force, even when it is, or is in, another pada.

The commentator, in illustration of the action of the rule, refers us first to iv.28, where ghni and cakre are declared pragraha when immediately followed by p; these words are pragraha also in the pada-text of the same passages, when there is a pause between them and the p. Again, he quotes rule xvi.11, where mā is declared to have no anuvādha after it when preceded by an avagraha; that is, when it begins the second member of a compound, as in ardhāraṃsa dvedh (ii.5.6): here, too, the precept holds when

60. cakrās tuṣādānāpi paditāṇi naḍartham anvādiṣṭāni: pragraheshu sraddhau ca nandapadaśambandhi nimittam avahitāḥ yāmin api saukāryāṁ upadiṣṭi 'ti pragrahānuṣvārakāryāṁ na nivartate. yathā: vaśahyati: ghni cakre papaare (iv.28) pragrahābhaṃvata iti: otram pragrahātvape papaarenā padiṣṭha pada-kāle ' tathā 'va. sraddhau ca' yathā: nā 'vagrhapūrvavā (xvi.11) ity avagrahāṇd 'nuṣvārdgaṇe nishiddhe pada-kāle 'pi tathā 'va: yathā: ardhāh: svahāḥvātāddu 'tu nandapadiṣṭham nimittam avahitāḥ eva kāryāṁ karoti 'ti ayam ārambhāḥ: yathā: sva-.... prav-....

1 G. M. bṛāna nī. 2 G. M. dhā. 3 G. M. svik. 4 W. -vāra; B. -hanuvāc. 5 G. M. pakāraṇa. 6 G. M. ins. 'pi. 7 G. M. om. 8 W. om. 9 G. M. ins ca. 10 G. M. -yu. 11 W. om.
the avagraha pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound: as, ardha-māsē. On the other hand, the cause (nimitta) of alteration of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different pada from the letter it affects, is efficient only in sanhitā: for example, pucishad tīti puci-sat (iv.2.18), and pradvahana iti pradvahanaḥ (i.3.3) and this is the occasion of the rule.

I see no reason why this rule does not need to apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (ṅ) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter.

61. A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established.

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs: if repeated in a later part of the Sanhitā, where other rules, where applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence.

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator. In the third chapter (prāṣna) of the first book (kāṇḍa) of the Sanhitā occurs the phrase devṣuyā tvā suvītah pravāve 'śvinok (i.3.1): but the same phrase is found also twice before, at i.1.42,6, and the initial a of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi.1; hence, when it occurs again in a vājapeya passage (namely at i.7.10), where, by xi.3, the elision of the a is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads as before. Again, the words svapathā rāye asmān are first found at i.1.14, where, as the anuvāka is a yādyā, the a of asmān remains unelided by xi.3; and when they occur again at i.4.43, that letter still maintains its place. Once more, the phrase sa jāto garbhō asī rodosyok is read at iv.1.42, and again at v.1.534; the former time in an ukhya passage, where the a of asī is retained by xi.3; and it is therefore retained in the other passage also.

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it). In support of this limitation, he cites a case: at iv.2.83, in an ukhya passage, occur

61. trayāṇām padānāṁ samāhāras tripadām: kāryābhājāḥ padasya triyātvaṁ viṃśeyam: īḍṛṣāṁ tripadām: tathā prabhṛty ādir yasya tat tripadoprabhṛty yathoktam pūrvoktam vidhiṁ karotī svavipeshanāṁ yatā brahmaprabhṛty punarukanān cet. tathā: ‘ lupyate tv akāra ekārākārapūrvah (xi.1) ity anena prathamakāndatūtriyaprajne dev-. ity atra 'kāre lupta tād eva vākyaṁ vājapeya 'py uḍopam bādhitāv tathāi'va bhave ṛṣ: tripadoprabhṛtyātt. ubhā vāṁ (i.1.14) ity atra sup-. ity ity uṛ u tyam jātavēdasam (i.4.43) ity atra 'pi tathāi
the words prthivim anu ye antarikshe ye divi tebhayah (W. B. omit the first words of the citation), and the a of antarikshe is left unelided by xi.3; but at iv.5.112 (in the last unawåka of the chapter called rudra: see rule xi.3) we read ye prthivyāṁ ye 'antarikshe ye divi (W. B., again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give ye ant)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial a in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are pārako asmabhåyam (v.4.46 and iv.6.124), prēddho agne (v.4.73 and iv.6.54), and dādhirāno akārīṣhaṁ (vii.4.196 and i.5.114). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say: but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lamer work of defending. The term tripadaprabhṛti means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words divas purī prathamam jajie aṅgir aṣmat (W. B. omit aṣmat) occur at i.5.144, in a yājya passage, where aṅgir keeps its initial vowel by xi.3; again, the words itaḥ prathamam jajie aṅgh are found at li.2.46: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of aṅgh founded upon it; but it is not proper to claim that the retention of a here has this ground; it is due to the inclusion (in rule xi.16) of jajie among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the Sanhitā no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed; and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

\[\text{'va. sāṁ te vāyur (iv.1.41) ity atra sa... ity etat krūram iva (v.1.51) ity atṛ 'pi tathā 'va. brāhmaṇa-vākyesu tu' tri-padamātrād vā kāryam bhavati: brāhmaṇa-vākyesu pārvastha- lasyāt 'vo 'kṛtah': yathā: iṁām agrāhānam raśaṇāṁ (iv.1.21) ity atra mar... ity etad vāyam\]
interpretation of the word *tripadāprabhṛti* (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi.16 from the charge of repetition in a single point: we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered by i.61 was over-looked.

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the *brāhmaṇa-passages* (*brāhmaṇavākyas*) of the Sanhitā a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the *brāhmaṇa-passages* of a previously-occurring phrase:" that is to say, because the prose part of the Sanhitā is so great an extent occupied with citing and commenting on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule. Thus, the words *maryaṇā śṛṇavat varṇo agnīḥ* are quoted at v.1.5⁹ (with the customary addition, *itū dāh*), from the previous passage iv.1.2⁸: and although the *nādhim* which follows *agnīḥ* at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a *tripadāprabhṛti* according to the commentator’s construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the *a* of *agnīḥ* has a right to stand.

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one; it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere; in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern *niṣṭ-yaṃ*, ‘against all opposition,’ the reading of the passage to which it relates.

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter. Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts; and, as it is thus further ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the Prātiṣṭākhyā. G. M. repeat the whole rule in this case.

* itaḥ . . . iti punarāuktam: tat" tathāi 'vā 'bhavād" iti cet: māi 'vam: *tripadāmārādĕ* eva tathābhāva" iti 16 vaktu na yuktam: kim tu jajñe saǰāphānanah (xi.16) iti jajनेgrahāṇaṣadāsrthāyāt: "anyathā tasya" vāyarthāyāt".

* podāvāpīd" *dhyāyaparīsmāntiṃ dyōtayati.

* iti tribhāṣhayatate prātiṣṭākhyavivarane prathamo *dhyāyāḥ.*

CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS: 1–11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of surd and sonant sounds, etc.; 12–29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs; 30, nasals; 31–34, difference of vowels and consonants; 35–39, mode of production of mutes; 40–43, of semivowels; 44–45, of spirants; 46–48, of य and र; 49–52, of nasal sounds.

ग्रथ शब्दोत्पत्ति: ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the origin of sound.

For the word atha in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations: it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand. Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule i.1. He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself. Çabda he explains by dhvani: both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xxii.1,2; xxiii.3). He paraphrases: "of the articulate sounds, a etc., the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, the apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description." We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under i.57: our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light.

1. ukto varnasamānoneyha: teṣām varṇāṇāṁ kidṛkā kāraṇaih kathāṁ va tatupaladbhir ity dāṅkshānanantaraih nīrpyata ity āntanyārtha 'thaṣabdhā. atha va: ita uttarāṁ yaṁ vākṣyaṁ taccchadapattāṁ ity ādhyātāṁ veditavyam ity adhikārthāh. śabdō nāma dhvānim varṇāṇāṁ akārdāvān upāddānakāraṇaih tadapattāṁ janma upalabdhis vā: yatho 'dakṣaya 'daranāt pārvaṁ eva bhūmāv jalam oṣṭy eva tat khanāṇāṁ dṛṣyate tadvā: se 'yam ucyata iti sūtrārthaḥ.

1 G. M. kiṣeram. 2 W. karaṇam. 3 G. M. ina. tām. 4 G. M. om. 5 B. karaṇam. 6 G. M. tāṣya ut. 7 W. B. om. 8 MSS. khanand. 9 G. M. drabhyaṭa. 
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2. By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast.

The first part of this rule (literally, 'from air-body-impulsion') is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni ('fire, warmth' = 'heat of the body?''), he says, impels Vāyu ('air, wind'); that is what 'air-body' means (but how?). From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsions, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Čikāha (verses 6–9 of the Yajus version, verses 6–7 of the Rik version: see Weber's Ind. Stud., iv.350–1): "the mind impels the body-fire; that sets in motion air; and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone." Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation: but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of vāyu-parīra, namely 'air-and-body': "from the impulsion of those two." Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that vāyu-parīra means 'the air in the body,' the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of rājadanta, 'upper incisor' (literally, 'king-tooth'—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, 'tooth-king, chief among the teeth'), and the other words composing that gana (to Pān. ii.2.31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after vāyu; parīra-samāraṇa meaning an 'impulsion by the body,' and vāyu being prefixed in a genitive relation, 'of the air.' This is harsh, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.

2. vāyuṁ agniḥ samīrayati 'ti vāyu-parīram: tathāhūtāt sam-īranāt: preraṇād abhīghātād ity arthah: kṣanāторah sah samīhanā madhyadepe gadbottattīr bhavati 'ti: ākaha cāt 'vam asti 'ti:

manah kāyāgnim 'dhantī' sa' preraṇāti mārutam:

mārutas tā 'raśi caran madhram janayati 'svaram ātī'. vāyuṣ ca parīram ca vāyu-parīre: tasya samīranam: tasmāt

tasmāt. asmin mate vāyoḥ samāranakarītāv eva na tu karma
tvam.

1 G. M. abhāpā. 2 G. M. omm. 3 G. M. omm. 4 G. M. -gni. 5 G. M. kantī.
Compare with what is taught by our treatise here and later (xxii.1,2; xxiii.1–3) Vāj. Pr. i.6–9; Rīk Pr. xiii.1.

3. The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils.

The commentator explains prātipruttāni as signifying ‘the places of production (sthānāni), having to do with the resonance (prātiprut—pratidhvanī, ‘resonance’), of the aforesaid sound (pūda).’ He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow. But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, surd, and h-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind.

The Čikāha (v.13: Weber’s Ind. Stud. iv.351) makes an enumeration of eight sthānas, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the “mouth” of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate.

4. When the throat is closed, tone is produced.

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term nāda, ‘tone,’ and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term.

The Rīk Pr. (xiii.1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (kha) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone. Compare also Vāj. Pr. i.11. It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat; but precisely how accurate a knowledge

3. tasya prakṛtya śabdayo 'rahpribhṛtini sthānāni  s bhavati: prātiprut pratidhvanī: tatsambandhini prātipruttāni. 
    saṁvṛte kaṇṭhe nādāḥ kriyate (ii.4) etaddinā sūtraśrayeṇa śabdatrāvivekāyam  ucyate: nādāḥ  pūsāo hakāraṇ ce 'ti: tāvan nādālakheśanam āha  

1 G. M. prakṛti. 2 G. M. ina. prātiprutūnī. 3 G. M. -prukti. (4) W. om. (5) G. M. insert this (excepting the rule) at the beginning of the commentary to the next rule. 6 G. M. śabdaya tr. 7 MSS. nāda. 8 G. M. ucyate.

4. saṁvṛte kaṇṭhe yaḥ pādaḥ kriyate sa nādāsanījno bhavati. saṁkādyāh' pravojamā: nādā 'nupradānam (ii.8) iti'.
they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say.

5. When it is opened, breath is produced.

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term \textit{p\=usahaan}, 'breath,' is ii.10.

6. When in an intermediate condition, the \textit{h}-sound is produced.

\textit{Madhye} is explained as meaning 'in a method intermediate between closed and opened:' the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is ii.9.

Of the other \textit{Pr\=atische\=khyas}, only that of the Rig-Veda sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath; and that (xiii.2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean. I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it. That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible. In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration; and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him.

7. Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds.

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and \textit{h}-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another. Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth.

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule. Since it is the office of a
pronoun to call to mind things already mentioned, and the words nāda, āvāsa, and hakāra, which are referred to by the pronoun in this rule, are masculine, why is the pronoun feminine (tāh, instead of te)? The reply is: "by the dictum of the Mahābhāshya, 'pronouns effecting the equivalence of the thing pointed at and of that which is pointed out respecting it assume at pleasure the gender of either of the two,' is established the propriety of the form used in the rule; therefore there takes place a mutual accordance, or apposition." The passage referred to is apparently that found, not in the Mahābhāshya itself, but in Kaiyāra's Mahābhāshya-pradīpa, nearly at the beginning of the work (I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof. Goldstücker): in Ballantyne's edition (p. 7) it reads, with several variations from the text given by our commentator, udāiyamānapratinirdīyamānayor ekatvam āpādayanti sarvātmanī paryāyena tālīgam upādāda iti. Reference is again made to this passage for a similar purpose under v.2.

The Rik. Pr. (xiii.2) has this rule also, in nearly identical form.

8. In vowels and sonant consonants, the emission is sound.

The term anupradāna is etymologized as representing anupra-diyyate nena varṇaḥ, "therewith is given forth an articulate sound," and anupra-diyyate is farther explained by upādiyyate, "is obtained," and janyate, "is generated." As synonym for the same term is given mūlakāraṇa, "radical cause."

I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) called attention to the praiseworthy unanimity with which the Hindu phonetists define


1 G. M. om.  2 G. M. yacāra.  3 G. M. ins. parāmarṣitāh.  4 W. prakṛṭi-nirdeś.  5 W. āyuktiḥ; G. M. tatāt.  6 G. M. yasambhavaḥ.  7 G. M. om.

8. svareshu ghoshavatā ca varṇesu nādā 'napradānam bhavati: anupra-diyyate nena varṇaḥ ity anupradānam mūlakāraṇam: anupra-diyyata upādiyyate janyata ity arthaḥ.  

1 W. om.  2 W. B. qd.
the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters. European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms "soft" and "hard," "weak" and "strong," and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view.

9. In \( h \) and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is \( h \)-sound.

For the quality of this \( h \)-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr. (xiii.2,5: rules 6,17) connects in the same manner \( h \) and the "fourth" mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar \( h \)-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik Pr. hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Pṛitiçākhyaśas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of their marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the \( h \)-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last); but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since \( h \) and the "fourth" mutes are included (by i.13,14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

10. In surd consonants, it is breath.
Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule i.12.

---

9. hakārap' ca caturthāḥ ca hacaturthāḥ; teshu varneshu'ha -

kāro 'nupraddānam bhavati. nanu sanjñāvidhānakramubhaṅga-

prasāṅgān' nd 'tre'dain sūtram avatārati. ghoshavatv iti sāmā-

nyān nādo hacaturtheshu ca' prasajyata ity atiprasāṅgarparihā-
rdhatvād avatāraty.eve 'ti vadāmaḥ'.

1 W. hap. 2 W. om. 3 G. M. B. -bhaṅga. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. ājñata. 6 G. M. vaddaḥ.

10. aghosheshu varneshu āvāso 'nupraddānam bhavati'.

1 B. omits rule and comment.
11. And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes.

Here *ṛṣāsā*, 'breath,' is continued by implication from the preceding rule "in virtue of vicinage" (*sāṁnīdhyāt*), as the commentator says (there being no *ca, 'and,'* in the rule, to indicate it directly). The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting *h*). There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inheres in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief omission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.8: rule 19) says "some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker"—an ambiguously indefinite expression.

12. In forming the a-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated.

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openess or of closeness in the utterance of *a* and *d*, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality. Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator; he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made: excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of *a*, and excessive separation in those of the long *d* and protracted *ḍ*. If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between *a* and *d* which is taught by the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. and by Pāṇini (see note to Ath. Pr. i.36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in *a* and over-closeness in *d*.

---

11. *sāṁnīdhyāt* *ṛṣāsā* iti labhyate: *prathamebhyo 'nyeṣho aghosheśhu ṛṣaśo* bhāyān adhiko bhavati.

1 G. M. om.

12. *avarṇa ucbāryamāṇa oṣṭhahau aṭuyapakarṇam atisanti glishāh na bhavati: ativāstam ativiśtam ‘ca na’ bhavati. oṣṭhāv ca handa o oṣṭhahau: dvandva ca prāṇītyosendhagāṁ* (Pāṇ. ii.4,2) *ity ekavādadhavaḥ: tad etad ekamin udbhayathā na pahyate kartum iti yogavibhāgah kāryaḥ: akāre na* ‘tyaupakarṇam akāre ca’ phute ca na ‘ativāstam iti.

The term *os̹h̹thakárana*, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pāṇini (ii.4.2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound.

13. Also in uttering \( o \).

The "also" (ca) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule: this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips. In forming an \( o \), then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated.

14. But the lips are more nearly approximated.

"Vicinage" is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of \( o \). The "but" (tu) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips: but Māhisheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely separated condition the \( o \) of such words as *bandhoh* (ii.5.8\?). This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the \( o \), such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory. The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule i.2) from the category of simple vowels. The same, we shall see, is the case with \( e \) also.

15. In uttering \( e \), they are slightly protracted.

---

13. okaēro hanumātrakárāṃvādeṣakāh: oṣṭhakárasya parasūtraṇa vipeshavidhānta. okāra ucāryamāne pandā ativyaste na bhaveṣa.

14. sālimdhyād okāra iti labhyate: okāre kārya oṣṭhān' upasamākṛtataṃ syātām: tuṣabdha oṣṭhān' paraṇvādhiḥ nivārayati iti vararuci uvāca. māhisheya tu babhāshe: banakhor iti dākikam okāraṃ savyājanam' vyaṣṭatō nivārayati iti.

1 W. B. om. 2 G. M. vār. 3 G. M. vyās. 4 W. vyās.
That "they" means the lips, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective. Prakṛṣṭa, 'protracted,' is glossed by saṁnikṛṣṭa, 'drawn down together, brought near.'

16. The jaws are more nearly approached.

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term atipayena, 'with excess.'

In the utterance of e, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule.

17. And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue.

The "and" (ca) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the ekāra of rule 15, "on the frog-leap principle"—that is to say, by overlapping the intervening rule. The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render jambhyāṇ by 'jaw-teeth, grinders.' I cannot doubt that jambhyāṇ is the true reading here, although the MSS. give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and uttarāṇa jambhyāṇ is not once read: T. comes nearest to it, giving uttarāṇa jambhyāṇ; W. has uttarā jambhyāṇ in the rule, and uttarā jambhyāṇ and jambhyāṇ in the comment; B., uttarā jambhyāṇ in the rule, uttarā jambhyāṇ and jambhyāṇ in the comment; G. and M., uttarāṇa jambhyāṇ in the rule; G., uttarāṇa jambhyāṇ and jambhyāṃ, and M., uttarāṇa jambhyāṇ and jambhyāṃ, in the comment. The verb sparṣayati is equivalent to sparṣet, the causative ending nic being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pān. iii.1.25), as in pāliy for pā, and other like cases.

15. prakṛṣṭāḥ ity atra dvivacanena prakṛtāv osahāv gṛhyate: ekāre kārya oṣahāv ishatprakṛṣṭāv syātām. prakṛṣṭatā saṁnikṛṣṭatā.

16. sānineśād ekāra iti labhyate: ekāre kārya hanā upasannahṛtatare bhavataḥ. atipayeno 'pasanīhṛte upasannahṛtatare.


1 G. M. pādāy. 2 G. M. -paṃ; W. -naprāde. 3 G. M. -kagāmy. 4 W. madhyān anāṇu; B. madhyānya anāṃ.
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In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of e, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied; but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the "continental" sound of e, or that which it has in they, short in met. There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of o. A diphthongal utterance, however, as ai, au (in aisle, house), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath. Pr. i.40).

\[ \text{पूर्वसर्वस्त्रूति} \quad \text{च} \quad \text{जिन्द्राग्रम्कारकारस्तस्त्वर्तिः} \quad \text{वस्त्रे-} \]

18. The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in [randd, [r, and [l.

The construction of this rule is very harsh: the subject hand, 'jaws,' comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the ca, 'also;' while the second member starts off independently, "one approximates," with no connective to bind it to the other. These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation. The word upasamhara, 'approximates,' is glossed in the comment by nikshipet, 'let one throw down (or apply),' and barsvás is explained as 'the high places behind the row of teeth'—that is, the swelling of the inner gums.

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of [r and [l in this rule into [r and [l after a (ṛkāradṛkāra, from ṛkāra-ṛkāra-ṛkāra), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x.8: no case of the combination of [r and [l occurring in the Sanshitá, the Prátiśákhya makes no provision for it): he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other text-books; and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule i.31) of a like combination.

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives

18. caśabdo hanvor' anvādecakah: ṛkāra ṛkāra ṛkārca ca kārye hanvā upasamhiṣṭtataṁ bhavatāḥ: jihvāgra vā ca barsvāhā 'pāsamhārāti nikshipetā: barsvāḥ iti dantapāṇkter uparishṭāda uccapra-deśeśim ity arthāḥ. nānā aram ṛkārapare (x.8) iti lakshanda-sambhavāddā ṛkāradṛkārakanārāvāḥ iti kathāṁ smārdhāṁ śādhuṁ. satyamāṁ niś-tālakshandāṁ: kim tu ādrāntarabalāt ' evam ṛkāra-ṛkāra śādhuḥ kāpavēśa (l.31) iti vijñeyam'.

1 W. vanvör; B. h; G. M. hanor. ² W. om. ³ G. M. ṛvā-. ⁴ B. -pasamhāva. ⁵ G. M. insā. ⁶ G. M. jñeyam.
us for the utterance of the difficult r and l vowels. By i.2, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels. For the teachings of the other Prātiśākhayas respecting them, see note to Ath. Pr. i.37. However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi-vowels r and l, differing from them only as, for example, the l of able differs from that of ably, the r of (French) aigre from that of aigri. For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ. Am. Or. Soc. viii.362 seq.

19. As also, according to some, in anusvāra and svarabhakti.

In this case, we are told, the "also" (ca) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering anusvarā, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering svarabhakti, according to the opinion of some; while others hold that anusvarā is simply nasal, and the svarabhakti (see xx.15) equivalent to r. This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci’s explanation, and its truth is questionable. We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of "others." The latter is perhaps most probable.

So far as regards anusvarā, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule; the definition of svarabhakti in connection with that of the r-vowels is natural enough.

20. In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward.

When no such direction as "with the point of the tongue," "with


1 G. M. -khyo. 2 G. M. -ciraćitam. 3 W. cītyam; B. cānītyam.
the middle of the tongue” is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed. To explain pranyastā, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression “in a quiescent state;” as example, he cites upa mā (iii.2.41: G. and M. spoil the citation by adding the following word, dyāvaprthitaḥ), in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action. But this interpretation evokes a difficulty: “since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?” The reply is: e (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the a contained in that letter is of the same character; hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the a-quality, that a was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like atha (i.1.131 et al., if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes. To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as a in e, and that an a uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility. The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one; or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law.

21. The lips are as in the utterance of a.

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, “in the absence of special direction.” The proper position of the lips for uttering a was given in rule 12, above. As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word indraḥ (passim); the southern manuscripts read instead indriyāvah (vi.5.8).


1 G. M. ādīnd. 2 G. M. ins. anupadeṣah. 3 W. B. -niḥh. 4 W. B. om. 5 G. M. dyāmvāhānām. 6 G. M. asti 'R. 7 G. M. ins. 'pī. 8 W. om. anideṣaḥ; B. anādeṣaḥ.

21. aṅnānīdhīyād anādeṣa iti labhyate: oṣṭhayor yatra 'nādeṣas tātād 'kāravād akāre yathā tathā' oṣṭhānu bhaṭaṭhāḥ: nā 'tyupanāsāhārtatādāv ity arthāḥ. yathā: ināra iti.

1 MSS. tathā. 2 G. M. -hṛtāv. 3 G. M. indriyāvāh.
22. In the i-vowels, the middle of the tongue is to be approximated to the palate.

The comment supplies, without remark, the predicate “to be approximated,” and gives as example ishe tvā (i.1.1 et al.).

Also in e.

Here the “also” (ca) brings down the whole of the preceding precept, both the specification of the active organ (karana) and that of the passive organ or place (sthāna). The exposition of the meaning of the rule is very simple and easy; but the commentator does not fail to notice that its necessity is open to objection upon two grounds, and enters into its defense at considerable length. The first objection is, why make two separate rules (22 and 23) for a single direction?—that is to say, if the i-vowels and e are all produced by the approximation of the middle of the tongue to the palate, why not include them in one rule together? The answer given is that the degree of approximation is not the same in the two cases, but is less in the e than in the i-vowels. If it be asked, why is this so? the reply is made, because the e is mixed with a, and production of this a with the middle of the tongue is on account of its constituting a part of e, and not by reason of its own natural character (compare the comment to rule 20, above)—which special qualification is sufficient ground for the less degree of approximation. The second difficulty is stated thus: both place and organ of e have been already defined in rules 15–17, above; but here is laid down for the same letter something different: and it is not possible that both directions should be followed.

——-

22. ivarne kārye jihvāmadhyamānān tālāv upasānāh kartavyam.
   yathā: ishe...... 'jihvāyā madhyamānā jihvāmadhyamānā'.

(1) W. om.  2 B. om.

23. akāraḥ pāruvidhim anvādiça: ekāre kārye 'jihvāmadhyamānānān atāv upasānāh kartavyamānā'. nanu vidhāu samāne prathaksātrārambhāḥ kimarthorāḥ: ucyate: ivarne yathā jihvāmadhyopa-
   sanāhāro na khalv evam ekāre kiṁ tu tato' nyāna ity arthor: kūtaḥ: akāramiṣītavād ekārasya: akārasya ca tadekādecatvāj
   jihvāmadhyantaniśādāvatvamānāḥ na tu svataḥ: atā eva sarpadhikātvān nyānatvopapattih. ishatprakāṛtaṁ (ii.15) ity atra' sātrā vaiyati' kārasya athānakarāne nirdhibhī: śa tu tato 'nyat
   tasyāṁ' ca niṁśayate: tad ekasmin ubhayathā kartuṁ na sak-
   yate: virodhāt tasmād atra yogavibhāgaḥ kartavyaḥ: avyāh-
24. In the u-vowels, there is approximation of the lips.

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me. "Here," he says, "approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together" (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the prakṛṣṭatā, 'protraction,' of rule 15, which is there glossed by saṁnikṛṣṭatā). "However, 'the lips drawn down together may be long'—this will be said hereafter" (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is
wont to be cited; but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary); "the same is to be understood in rule 14, above" (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to ii.18). A phrase is then cited from the Sanhitā, containing u and ṛ, namely utākhaṭabuṭhno yāpah (vii.2.1*).

25. But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding.

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows:

By vicinage, "labial approximation" is here implied: everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation, a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one: by this is understood having the quantity of a mora interposed: that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one mora is the interval or interposition. This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation. The word "but" (tu) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where o [W. says, where du or v] follows. Examples are: upātūṣṣuḥmn (i.6.11); sānṇiyam iti su-sānṇiyam (vi.2.4¹); atho oṣhadhiṣu (iii.5.⁵ and vi.3.⁹); bāhuvar balam (v.5.⁹); tvunvādu ghorā nyā (v.7.³: G. M. omit the last word); caturhotā (not found in the Sanhitā: occurs Taitt. Brāh. ii.2.³).

Objection: in yo ṣṇun (iii.3.⁴), the anuvāra has a mora [by i.34] and the ṛ a half-mora [by i.37]; since, then, the quantity being a mora and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer: it is assured by the principle "a hundred includes fifty." Where there is a mora and a half, there is ā fortiori a mora; in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word "one" excludes what does not belong to itself (?). For the same reason, the occurrence

of the double labial in such passages as bhuhuv or bhuhuv aruvor qijah (v.5.9*: G. M. omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as sphurita, 'quavered,' is shown by the likeness of the example (?)

Second objection: then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two u's following the k and r of kusurubindah (vii. 2.21), since there occurs more than a mora and a half of interval between them?

Answer: not so; here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two u's that follow k and s, because of the absence of its necessary condition; but to that following the r this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the u that follows the intermediate s; this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation: thus there is no offense against the rule.

So far the comment; but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance. I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a morda's interval between them. No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Pratigākhyanas, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it.

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the u in such words as bhuhuvoh for the usual bhuhvoh and aruvoh for arvoh is denominate sphurita. The term does not occur elsewhere; nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here. It is a well-known characteristic of Taittirīya texts, but is found in fewer words than would be apt to imagine. Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Sanhitā only the cases of tanu (tanvam, e. g. i. 1.8; tanvd, e. g. i. 1.102) and the word suvar, which are often met with. Of similar resolutions of an i-vowel into iy, the cases are more nu-
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merous, but less frequent. I have collected the following (without exhausting the Sanhita, especially of themes in iya): ágriya (iv.5.5²), ághnîya (i.1.1), ágviya (ii.12.8), asmadriyāṇe (i.4.21), ádhriya (iv.5.7), dhâshnîya (iii.1.3¹), pāṭriya (iii.2.3³), budhnîya (i.3.3), râshnîya (iv.5.7²), vijnâpamd̐i (i.5.3²), vijnâdriyāṇe (i.7.13³), vrshnîya (iii.2.5³), pāghriya (iv.5.5²), sadhriyāṇe (i.2.14⁵); and, of oblique cases from themes in i or ī, indrâgniñoh (i.3.12), gâyâtriya (iii.2.9¹), pârshnîyā (iv.6.9²), prñiyâi (ii.2.11⁴), vâ triyāi (iv.4.1¹), lakshnîyā (ii.1.5²), vijnâniyâi (iii.1.1¹⁴), udâhâyam (i.3.14⁶). None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of u are such as the euphony of the Taittiriyakas does not tolerate: but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the i, only three are met with in the text—namely, try (e.g. i.8.22¹: ii.4.3¹), tny (iv.4.2²), and cny (v.5.6³). I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made.

26. The beginning of āi and āu is half an a.

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs.

27. Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed.

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii.12), our Prātiçākhya does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short a; for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination. Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long i" in isle, isle, and ou or ow in house, down) to be the neutral vowel (u in but), rather than the open a (of far). But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each: they are slides; and to allow the organs to remain in
either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or
final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation.
The commentator glosses sanuvarta, ‘enveloped, shut up, closed,’
with saninikrahita, ‘drawn down together, approximated.’

28. Of the former, the rest is one and a half times i.
Of the former—that is, of di; di and du having been men-
tioned together in a preceding rule (ii.28), says the commentator.

29. But, of the latter, u.
That is to say, the remainder of du is one and a half times u.
To account for the word “but” (tu) in the rule, the commentator
notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound,
a, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound,
i: this the “but” denies. This explanation merely intensifies and
makes too precise the actual meaning of the word.

For the teachings of the other Prâtiêkhyas as to the pronun-
ciation of di and du, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.40. As there re-
marked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their
first element to have had originally more than a half-mora of
quantity. If they must be limited to two moras, a better descrip-
tion of them would have been 1½+i, and 1½+i+u. If, as we
may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined
their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the di and du, not
less than the e and o, had by their time taken on a value notably
different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic
rules of the language were the faithful representation of living pro-
cesses.

30. Anuvâra and the last mutes are nasal.

As example of anuvâra, the comment cites yo 'çum (iii.3.45);

28. pūrnasyâdyi "kârasye 'ty arthah: adhastad' dâkårudukârayôh
nihocoveritavâdâm: adhyardha ikâra dîkârasya çesho bhavati.
adhiñam vratam yasyâ añår adhyardhah.
1 W. adhyardhas tavad. 2 G. M. occar.

29. uttarasasya "kârasye 'ty arthah: adhyardha ukâra dûkâ-
raçesso' bhavati: yathâ 'naylor ubhayor apy âdir akâra eva tad-
vâd ikâra eva çeshah' prasaktah: tun' nishedhati tugabdah.
1 G. M. -raya pâ. 2 W. B. om. 3 W. B. tan.
of the "last" or nasal mutes, pratyāṅ hotāram (vi.3.1)—to which G. M. add prāticam uṣa (v.2.7), and manīna (vii.3.14).

The term anumāsīka is interpreted by the commentator as signifying nāsikām anuvartate, 'it goes after the nostril'—that is to say, doubtless, 'it finds exit by the nasal passages': an accurate definition of this class of sounds. As employed in this Prātiṣṭhānyā, anumāsīka means simply, as adjective, 'nasal,' and its derivative noun, anumāsikya, signifies 'nasality, nasal utterance.' Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter xvii. (rules 1–4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class. "Nasal," or anumāsīka, by the present rule, are the anuvādāra and the five nasal mutes, n, n, n, n, m; the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which n and m (v.26–28) are under certain circumstances convertible; and at v.31, x.11, xv.1, &c., we also hear of nasal (anumāsīka) vowels. The other nose-sounds, the yamas and nāsikya (ii.49,50, xxi.8,12–14), do not anywhere receive this title.

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the Tațitirīya-Prātiṣṭhānyā respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here.

All nasal (anumāsīka) sounds are uttered (ii.52) by the mouth and nose together. An uttama, a "last," or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intonated breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series. In anuvādāra, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intonated breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities. In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an anuvādāra if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant. Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phonetists of the period represented by the Prātiṣṭhānyās; none of them has allowed a final anuvādāra before a pause, or an anuvādāra before a mute, either in the same or a following word. As to the phonetic value, however, of the real anuvādāra, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians. Some held it to be a pervading nasalization of the preceding vowel; others, a nasal addition to the external nasalization of the nasal mutes.

30. anuvādāraḥ ca 'tmanās cā 'nūmaśikā bhavanti: nāsikām anuvartamā ity anumāsikāh. yathā: anuvādārah: yo.... uttamaḥ ca 1: pra-....: 'pra-....: maṇ-'.

1 G. M. ins. yathā. 2 W. B. om.
that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prātiṣṭākhyas, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no tertium quid. The Prātiṣṭākhyas of the Rīk and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an anusvāra as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vāj. Pr. iv.147–8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tāṭlicāya-Prātiṣṭākhyas adopts prevailinglly the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v.31, it is stated to be Atreya’s opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes t, the preceding vowel is nasalized; and, in conformity with this, xv.1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of m and n, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv.2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct anusvāra to be inserted instead: here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x.11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation: see the rule). Once more, in xxii.14, among “heavy” syllables is reckoned one that is anusvārika, ‘nasal.’

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation; it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a ð differs from a þ in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharvan school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in anusvāra. No one of the Prātiṣṭākhyas gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of anusvāra, considered as an independent alphabetic element; if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (u of but) nasalized, or the sound of the French un, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an r—for example, in there, here, oar, cure, fire, sour (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc’y, viii.353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanāgarī alphabet does not admit of much question; the writing of aniga, for example,* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the nasality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

* Namely, भ्रंष्ट, or भ्रष्ट.
found for it a sign to stand between those of the other elements. This has actually been done, out of a true regard for consistency, by the writers of the Vājasaneyi and Tāttirīya texts: for lack of a better device, they have brought down one of the usual signs of nasality from above the syllable to a position between the syllables, giving it an addition which enables it to maintain its place there* —in the Tāttirīya texts, we have the dotted crescent, with the ni-rāma, the usual mark for a consonant not graphically combined with a following consonant, beneath it. The scribes of the Rig-Veda seem to have been less solicitous to make their practice square with their theory. It may well be made a question, however, whether the habit, now so common, of writing anikā, anīta, anībd, for anika, anita, anibd, etc.,† could have grown up until the opinion had become prevalent that the nasal sign in anicā also represented a nasal sound which followed the vowel, and was accommodated in its special mode of utterance to its successor.‡

One more point in the theory of the nasal sounds calls for notice. The assimilation of n to a following l, and of m to a following l, y, or v (v.26–8), is treated by the Tāttirīya, the Vājasaneyi, and the Rik Prātiṣṭhākyas as resulting in the production, not of anuṣvāra, but of a nasal counterpart to the semivowel—that is, the case is made analogous with that of a nasal before a mute, instead of before a spirant. Here, also, the Atharva-Prātiṣṭhākhyas pursues an independent course, and accepts no nasal y or v, but only a nasal l, as product of both m and n (see Ath. Pr. ii.35). In this case, as well as in the other, we have to assume merely a difference in the theoretical explanation of an identical mode of pronunciation; and I should not only favor the Atharvan view, but should be willing to give up the nasal l itself, as not worth distinguishing from an ordinary case of anuṣvāra—or of nasalized vowel, if we accept this understanding of the matter. Thus much, indeed, may be allowed—that, while the absence of sonant utterance in the spirants cuts them off from sharing in a nasal quality, it might be difficult to prevent the nasality of the preceding vowel from infecting at least

* Thus, for घ्रंश or घ्रंश, the Vā. S. writes घ्रंश, the Tātt. S. घ्रंश.

† That is, घ्रंक, घ्रंत, घ्रंब्रा, for घ्रंड, घ्रंत, घ्रंब्रा.

‡ No valid objection can be raised against the practically so convenient, imitation of this habit on the part of modern European scholars, so far as concerns the representation of an original m assimilated to a following consonant. To go farther than this, however, and write the anuṣvāra sign in the interior of a word for a nasal mute which is equally radical or thematic with the succeeding non-nasal, and, yet more, to write it for a final m, which no Prātiṣṭhākhyas allows to be pronounced otherwise than m, seems an indefensible practice, and one wholly to be disapproved and rejected. Of Müller’s seemingly elaborate defense of his adherence to it, given in the Preface to his Hitopadeśa, absolutely the whole point lies in the phrases (p. xi): “it is easier to write aniktā than aḥkktā. What applies to writing applies with still greater force to printing”—which latter consideration must be pronounced destitute of weight; since, on the contrary, we do expect our printing to be superior in accuracy to ordinary writing.
the beginning of the sonant semivowels. For the exclusion of r from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the Prātiṣṭhākhyas. For an assimilated m, the distinctive anusvāra sign is always written before r, as before the spirants; but before l, y, and v is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute. But as regards n before l, my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like m, as required by the Prātiṣṭhākhyas, and writing the n unchanged, either with virāma or conjoined with the l (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former). The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the Prātiṣṭhākhyas: it writes the l double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable. This is nonsense: if two l's are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it. But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of l with n any more than with m, or than in the combination of m with y and v.

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T. and W.) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B. and O.), the text of the Prātiṣṭhākhyas follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the Taittirīya text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly; while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts. In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible: the proper anusvāra being represented by nā, and the m assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by m. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. and M.) do not distinguish these two from one another.

31. In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made.

The term upasāmādāra, 'approximation,' is glossed by upaślesha-viśeṣāh, 'a sort of embrace'-unless, indeed, we are to read, with G. and M., saṁślesha-viśeṣāh, 'disunion of embrace,' i. e., 'embrace which does not come to actual contact.'

The terms sthāna, 'place,' and karana, 'organ,' denote, as in the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas (see note to Ath. Pr. i.18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound.

31. svarāṇādān tat sthānam bhavati yatra 'upasāmādāraḥ syāt: upasāmādāraḥ nāma 'paślesha-viśeṣāh'.

1 B. om. 2 W. paślesha; G. M. saṁślesha-viśeṣa.h.
32. That is producing organ, which makes the approximation.

Here, "in the case of the vowels" is declared to be implied from the preceding rule; upasainharati, 'approaches,' is explained by prapayati, 'attains;' and, as example of a karaṇa, or producing organ, reference is made to the "tip of the tongue," spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter.

33. But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made.

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels. The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves. The word "but" (tu) is meant to exclude the vowels; or, as Mahisheya explains it, annuls for anusvāra and svarabhakti the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants. This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction; and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious.

34. That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact.

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun adhyetā, 'reader'—or, rather, 'repeater.'
In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and
closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes
their essential difference (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.367 seq.),
and which the Ath. Pr. states more fully (i.29-35:—where, in rule
33, we should read eke 'sprśhām'), with specifications of degree of
openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as repre-
sented by rule 45, below).

35. In the k-series, one makes contact with the root of the
tongue at the root of the jaws.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.20, and the references to the other Prātiṣṭṭ-
khyaśas there given.

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following
rules, correspond with the yatrea, 'where,' and yena, 'whereby,' of
rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and
organ of production of the different classes of sounds.

The singular number of hanumāla, 'root of the jaws,' the com-
mentator accounts for as used generically (jātyapēkṣhāyām, 'with
reference to the whole kind or class').

36. In the c-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the
palate.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.21, and the note upon it. The sonant aspira-
rate of this series, jh, is not met with in the text.

37. In the t-series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back,
in the head.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.22, and the note upon it. Our commentary
says, "by the word 'head' (mūrdhan) is intended the upper part

34. sāṁnidhyād anyeshām iti labhyate: svarebhyo 'nyeshām
varṇāṇām tat karaṇām bhavati: adhyetā yena vyaśjanāni
sparśayātī prāpayati tat karaṇām:

35. kavarga uccāryamānē jihvāmālēnā 1 hanumāle sparśayāti
prāpayed ity arthaḥ. hānvor mūlām hanumālām: tasmin: 'jātyapēkṣhāyāṁ'
ekavacanam.

1 G. M. ins. varṇāṁ. 2 B. G. M. om. 3 W. B. om. 4 G. M. ins. mūlām iti.
5 W. -kāhan.

36. puvargē kārye 1 jihvāmadhyena varṇān' tālādu sprāyēt.

1 G. M. put tālādū here. 2 M. -naiṁ. 3 B. sprāyēt; G. M. sparśayēt.
of the mouth-cavity.” Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word “head” in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name mūrdhanya, ‘capital,’ had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined; and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition. For, that mūrdhan should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the ‘dome of the palate’ does not appear to me possible. As in the notes to the Atharva-Prātiṣṭhāna, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the t-sounds as “lingual”—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other.

The commentator glosses the word prātiṣṭhāya, ‘having rolled it back,’ by “having done what? having rolled back (G. M. add in explanation dvēṣṭhāya, ‘having rolled up’) the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitableness” (i. e. of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at).

38. In the t-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.24, and the note upon it.

39. In the p-series, with the two lips.

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ; and that the under lip is the organ of production.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.25, and the note upon it.

37. śavarga kārye jihvāgrena mūrdhani avarṇam śṛṣṭiś: kīm kṛtvā: yogatva’d jihvāgrām prātiṣṭhāyaś: mūrdhāsābandena vaktvāvaroparibhāgo vivakṣhyateśa.

1 G. M. put avarṇam here. 2 B. G. M. mūrdhāni. 3 B. śṛṣṭiś. 4 W. -tad; B. -tad kṣi; G. -tad; M. -tadgatvaiś. 5 G. M. -tadgatvaiś. 6 G. M. -kṣiśaḥ.

38. śavarga kārye jihvāgrena avarṇam dantamāleśhu śparṣayet.

1 G. M. śṛṣṭiś.


1 W. atro. 2 B. -rūpyaḥ sādāmyāḥ; G. M. oṣṭhātraḥ.
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40. In \( y \), with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

The Tāttirīya-Prātiṣākhya stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc., and in describing their formation throughout by special rule. Respecting \( y \), see the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

The description of the mode of production of \( y \), here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive. The “edges” are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for \( i \) in rule 22, above.

41. In \( r \), with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth.

Pratyak is explained by the phrase, “in the interior upper portion”—that is, ‘within and above’—the equivalence of pratyagdāman and antarādāman, ‘inner soul,’ being pleaded as justification.

The somewhat discordant teachings of the Prātiṣākhyas with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.28. The most noteworthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the \( r \)-vowels: although in this treatise the definition of the latter (ii.18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semivowel. \( R \) could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English \( r \), uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate.

42. Also in \( l \), at the roots of the teeth.

According to the commentator, the “and” (ca) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both jihvāgramadhyāya, ‘middle of the tongue-tip,’ and pratyak, ‘back from.’ It

---

40. yadāre kārya jihvādādhyāntābhhyāṁ tādāvam sparṣayet. jihvāyā madhyam: tasyām ‘ntāu: ‘tābhyāṁ jihvāmadhyāntābhhyāṁ’.

1 G. M. om.

41. rephe kārya jihvāgramadhyāna dantamālābhhyah pratyak sparṣayet: pratyag ity abhyantara aparidhāga ity arthaḥ: ‘yah pratyagdāme ity antarātmanu pratiyate.

(o) G. M. -nturopari-. (o) G. M. yathā pratyagdāmanī.
appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of danta-
muleshu, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to
regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums
close upon them) as the sthana, or ‘place of production,’ of l.
This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase
of the comment. The really distinctive characteristic of the l, that
it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the
sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out:
rather, we are left to infer that it and the r are produced in the
same manner, only the r a little further back. No one of the other
treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath. Pr. i.24, where
I have given the Taittirlya definition more credit than really be-
longs to it).

48. In v, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth.

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness. The comment-
tator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase
“with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the
upper teeth.” But how comes the lower lip to have two edges? He
adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of
production. But then why does not the rule read danteshu, instead
of the instrumental dantadh? It gives us two instrumentals, as if
teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more
“place” than the other. The lower lip, being the more passive
organ, should be the “place” on which the teeth, as “organ,”
make their contact; but from taking this view the treatise and its
comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other sthana’s,
which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts con-
cerned in the contact. To make a good definition, the rule should
read adharoshthaante for ossthantabhyaṁ.

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath. Pr. i.25),
the Vāj. Pr. gives the v a description corresponding with this, and
showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our
English v. This, of course, should not in the least stand in the
way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound
was that of our w. The w is a semi-vowel, standing in the
same relation to w as y to i; but to call v a semi-vowel is a sim-

42. cakāro jihvagramadhya-pratyaktaṁ anuddhati: lakāre
kārye jihvagramadhyena dantamuleshu pratyak sparṣayet:
a(y)am arthaḥ: lakārasya ‘dantamuleshyan pratyaganta-
rapradaeṣasthānam’ iti viṣṇeyam.

43. vakāre kārye ‘dharosṭhāntabhyaṁ uttaradantagṛāh’ sāha
sparṣayet. dantār iti sthānanirdeṣaḥ: osthāntabhyaṁ iti kara-
nanirdeṣaḥ.
ple abuse of terms. We might nearly as well call our j a semi-vowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as y.

44. The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes.

By rule i.9, there are six spirants, and as there are but five “places” of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression “in their order:” h, therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46,47). To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute-classes, and cites from the Sanhitā an example for each: namely, for jihvāmūlīya, uttered in the place of a k-mute, yah kā- mayeta (i.3.24 et al.: I follow the example of all the MSS., and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from visarjanīya by different signs); for ɡ, in the place of a c-mute, madhuś ca mādhavac ca (i.4.14, or iv.4.11: W. B. omit the last two words of the citation, and W. reads manyus ca, which is found at iv.7.21); for ṣh, in the place of a t-mute, ashādhīya svāhā (vii.2.15); for s, in the place of a t-mute, stand upāradhī (vi.2.11); and for upadhānīya, in the place of a p-mute, yah pāmpānd (ii.3.13).

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it. Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, jihvāmūlīya and upadhānīya; and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long l-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians. As for the s, there is no question as to its value. Nor ought there to be respecting that of the ṣh, which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our ṣh than s, but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reversed into the dome of the palate. It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

44. ashmāna ānapūrṇeṇa yathākramena sparasthāneshu 'cchānaṁ yānāṁ bhave. yathā: jihvāmūliya kavargasthāne: yah k: sa kāraṇa cāvarasthāne: madhuśa sa cāvar-
ghasthāne: aṣṭa: sa kāraṇas tāvarasthāne: stand: upa-
dhānīyaḥ pāvarasthāne: yah p: ity ānapūrṇeṇa: ānapūr-
ṇeṇñ niyamā paṇcaśā 'ashmāna ṣeṣkāra vicīṣṭaḥ: tasya vidhīm uparishṭād ącāśaḥ.

1 W. cāvarṣāyaḥ; 2 B. cākarās- 3 W. manyuṣ. 4 G. M. -vya vīṣṭāḥ. 5 G. M. -vya. 6 B. -ceṣṭha; G. M. varisṭhaḥ.
it with our śh; and, yet more, how that absurd distinction of the lingual and palatal sibilants (of which, so far as I know, Wilson was the originator) which defines the former as the same with our śh in śūn, and the latter with our ss in session, can still be repeated in the latest Sanskrit grammars. Absurd I call it, because there is really no difference at all between the pronunciation of śh in śūn and ss in session. If our śh be found in the Sanskrit alphabet, it is the palatal sibilant č, not the lingual, śh. The question of the value of č is connected with and depends upon that of the palatal series of mutes; and upon this I have nothing more to say than I said in the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

45. But the middle of the producing organ is unclosed.

The “but” (tu) of this rule, we are told, is intended to annul (so far) the similarity of organ of the spirants with the mutes. This prescription of an unclosure of the middle of the organ is a rather artificial device for saving the credit of the general prescription of actual contact in all the consonants. It is nearly equivalent with the rules of the Ath. Pr. (i.30,31) upon the same subject.

46. The throat is place of production of h and visarjanīya.

And, the commentator adds, they have no karana, or organ of production. As example of h, he cites aharahār havirdhānīnām (ii.5.63), but leaves visarjanīya uninstance.

The other Prātiṣṭhānyas give a corresponding definition of the utterance of these two sounds (see note to Ath. Pr. i.19). It is too indefinite to be of any particular use to us in determining their phonetic value. But the two rules which next follow in our treatise are very interesting and instructive.

47. In the opinion of some authorities, h has the same position as the beginning of the following vowel.

Our commentator first offers the simple paraphrase of this rule

45. teṣāṁ āṣhmanāṁ karaṇaṁadhyam tu vivarman bhavevi; sparśanāṁ karaṇaṁadhyanivṛttiparas tuṣabhad. karaṇaṁadhyam karaṇaṁadhyam.

1 B.-śatyāḥ.

46. hakāravisarjanīyāṁ karṇaṁsthānāṁ eyātām. karṇaṁ sthānam yayeś tādu tathoktaṁ. anayoḥ karaṇabhāvoḥ. aḥ-.....
which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it: a loose version is as follows:

The expression "the same position as the beginning," etc., implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel; but there is none such in a, i, u; as a vowel has but a single position, the word "beginning" is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply "of the same position with the vowel." That is not so: a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs: the two rules (ii.28, 29) which teach that i and u form the final elements of di and du assure the difference of position for those two sounds; in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of e and o, they being included in the category of diphthongs. But again: even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very a which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, "the throat is the place of production of a, the k-mutes, h, and visarjaniya," hence, as sameness of position [with the a, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition. You must not think so, is the reply; there is a difference between the a which forms the beginning of e and o and an a standing by itself: to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, "the lips and jaws not too widely separated," etc.; to the other, that of rule 27, "with the organ of production more closed;" therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression "of the same position as the beginning" is to be understood as meaning "of the same place and organ as the beginning." Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such; hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition.

47. ekeshām mate hakāra' udayasvarādisathāna atmana upari svarādisathāno bhavati 'ti vāravucktai' syād etat. adinā sasthāna ity ukte āsahasya sthānāntaravai' vaktavyai' tad apy akārekrodkarehu na 'sti: ' stava va 'sthānam' ity adipabdavādyarthain syāt: svarasasthāna ity etadvai' 'vā 'rthasiddhir' iti: mā 'vam: sandhyakshareshu āsahasya sthānāntaropapatteh: īkāro 'dhyaṇdhāḥ (ii.28) iti śātrudvayena āsahasbhātavarnavyakātā' tayo' sthānāntaram api prasiddham eva: evam' ekādravukrayor api vyākaraṇo' āsahasya sthānāntara vihitām viññeyam: sandhyaksharatadvipasād anayoḥ. nam evam apy akāvesvarajanyandhi kanthā iti sandhyaksharāddv akārasyā' 'pi kanthāsthānātvanena samānasthānātve' kathyamāne' pārvasūtroktena' pāmaruktyam asya' śūtrasya
Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it.

A few further examples of the occurrence of \( h \) before the various diphthongs, are added: \( \text{tīmahe} \) (i.2.14\(^2\)), \( \text{yāvotār vāsāmahā} \) (vii.5.2\(^1\)), \( \text{agnihotram puhoti} \) (i.5.9\(^1\)), \( \text{sampratār ahū} \) (v.6.1\(^2\)).

The acuteness of observation of the “some authorities” who have made this definition of the character of a \( h \) certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment. It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth-organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character: thus, the \( h \) of \( ha \) is a surd \( a \), so to speak; that of \( he \), a surd \( e \); that of \( wo, \) a surd \( u \); that of \( hue, \) a surd \( y \); and so on (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.870 seq.). The rule would have been made better by reading \( udayavarnā, \) instead of \( udayavaranīdī, -\) the following sound, instead of “the beginning of the following vowel” — for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels.

48. Visarjanīya has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel.

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of “some authorities,” or as having the unqualified approval of the Prātiṣṭhākyas. From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former. He paraphrases: “visarjanīya is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself;” and adds that

\[ \text{syāt. māi vam maṅṣṭhāḥ: ekārākārān divartino} \]"kārasya kevalasya ca viprasc sti: kevalasya "karaṇam osṛṭhahānu na tiṣṭayastam (ii.12) iti"; sandhyakarādā svaratmānasya tu samvrtakaranataram (ii.27) tiṣṭaḥ sthanakaranayo vahitāravatvād" adīsāsthāna iti ća aśāmānasthānakaranān īti viṣṇeyam. kiṁ ca: pārvaśtre karaṇābhāva āthityuktyā; atra tu karaṇavingaṁ apī "vidyata īti maṅṭataram upapadyate: na pānurakṛtyaj ca. tathā; tīg.: yāv.-...: agn.-...: saṃ-...:
udayaśabdā uṭṭara prāpyatāhā; udayaḥ ca 'śau" svarač ca " ca: tasyādh: tena sasthānāh.

here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning. His examples, again, are only of visarjaniya after a diphthong: they are agneH (i.1.10\textsuperscript{3} et al.), bṛāhmanādīr āyushmat (ii.3.10\textsuperscript{3}), bāhuvor balam (v.5.9\textsuperscript{2}), and ā'yan gāth (i.5.3\textsuperscript{1}). In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the visarjaniya.

The teachings of the other Prātiṇāyikas respecting the visarjaniya are rehearsed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.19. All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound. The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the ā, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final ā.

नासिक्या नासिकास्यानां: || ८२ ||

49. The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production.

The “nose-sounds,” the commentary says, are the yamas (xxi.12,13); but why the āsīka (xxi.14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see. Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given. As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted ruknam antaram (v.1.10\textsuperscript{3}); but G. M. B. give instead rukmantam, ii.2.3\textsuperscript{3}, yādā (i.5.7\textsuperscript{4}; but G. M. give instead rājā, ii.6.2\textsuperscript{2} et al.), ṣapārah (v.6.5\textsuperscript{3}), ratnam abhajanta (ii.6.12\textsuperscript{1}; but G. M. give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, uccā ratnam aya[janta, which I have not found in the Sanhitā), and pōpmyān (i.4.41 et al.).

नुष्णासिक्या वा || १५० ||

50. Or they are produced by the mouth and nose.

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present.

48. visarjaniya dīmanāḥ pūrvasvarāntena sastāhān̄m sādān̄sthānakarano bhavati: atṛd 'pi pūrvasvara iti sandhyaksharam ucyate: svaṅgantarasa\textsuperscript{1} hi sādāntaravābhāvāt. yathā: ag-.\textsuperscript{2} bṛāh-.\textsuperscript{3}: bāh-.\textsuperscript{4}: ā-.\textsuperscript{5} pūrvasya vntah: tena sastāhān̄m pūrvasvāntasaśṭān̄hān̄m\textsuperscript{6}.

1 W. B. -nasya. \textsuperscript{2} B. om.; G. M. bhīna. \textsuperscript{3} B. om. \textsuperscript{4} B. om. \textsuperscript{5} B. om.

49. nāsikād yāmā nāsikāstāhānabhavanti. yathā: ruk-.\textsuperscript{6}: yā-.\textsuperscript{7}: ṛa-.\textsuperscript{8}: pāp-.\textsuperscript{9}

50. ta' eva nāsikād mukhandasi-kābhāyām\textsuperscript{10} uccārāntiyā bhavanti. mukhān ca nāsikā ca mukhandāsikās: tathāsandhino mukhandasi-kābhāyām. yuktānō eva 'dāharanīnāṃ.

1 G. M. eka. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. mukhena nāsikābhāyām ca. \textsuperscript{3} G. M. -ke. \textsuperscript{4} G. M. -kam. \textsuperscript{5} G. M. put after bhavanti.
51. And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes.

The "and" (ca) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward: the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series. If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the "list of sounds" given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule xx1.12.

52. Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose.

*Anunāsikya* is the quality of being *anunāsika* or 'nasal;' and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anusvāra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable; the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound.

The commentator explains *nāsikāvivaraṇa* by *grāṇabīla*, 'hole of the nose, nasal passage,' as if *vivaraṇa* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule: it is *svālokāsū rumaṅgalasū* (i.8.16).

---

1. G. M. -kananyāyena. 2. G. M. (as also in the text of the rule itself) eteṣu.

52. *nāsikāvivaraṇād ghrāṇabīlād* *anunāsikyam* raṅgādi kartaṇyam. yathā: svop..... ity adi.

*iti tribhāshyaratnā pratiṣṭhākhyaśivavarana* deśityo 'dhānyāyaḥ.

1. G. M. -nātikāb. 2. B. tatāḥ; W. om.
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CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS: 1, introductory; 2–6, cases of a at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text; 7, of i and u; 8–12, of final a of verbal forms and particles; 13–14, of final i and u; 15, of initial a.

ग्रहाद्वृत्ते विभागे युस्म्ब व्याकरणः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth.

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the Sanskrit is taken up. And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final a, i, and u—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts. In the other treatises (Rīk Pr. vii.–ix., Vāj. Pr. iii.95–128, Ath. Pr. iii.1–25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened: this is more in accordance with the general method of the Prātiṣṭhānyas, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their pākhās in the analyzed condition of the padātext, and proceed to construct the saṁhitā from it. Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings. Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in padā, whenever a pause—either the avagraha separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after iti, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in saṁhitā: thus, devyata iti deva-yata; ava: nāḥ (s. and nāḥ). Second, it is made in the so-called jatā-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted; this text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

1. athi'ty ayam adhitārah: ādād pañādāv uttare paddante ca vartamānāḥ saṁhitāyām yo dirgho 'sau vi ḍhāge vi ḍhāgasamaṇya vyahiṣṭaparāh hrasvam āpadyate: 'vyahiṣṭaparātvaṁ atra yathāsaṁhitāsthān vijnayam. namu dirghah kathām labhyate. 'hṛṣṇāṁparabhāvādīdēvāsītā (iii.2) 'digrahāke thuḥ pūtādarṣanāce 'ti brūmiḥ. saṁhitāyām ity avyā 'yam arthāḥ: kāryabhājāḥ padasyo 'uttarapadena saha sambandhānyamāḥ: 'na tu pūrṇapadena saha sambandhānyamāḥ. vi ḍhāgo 'tra
their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again: for example, āpo hi sthvā mayobhuhvaḥ would become āpo hi hy āpa āpo hi; hi sthā saha hi hi sthā: sthā mayobhuvino mayobhava sthā sthā mayobhuhvaḥ: mayobhava iti mayaḥ-bhuvah: the treatment of the d of sthā here illustrates the conditions of the restoration of the short vowel in such cases. Third, the same restoration takes place in the samhitā-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the anuvākas or sections of the Sanhitā are divided. This division the Prātiṣṭhāya does not recognize— or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in san-dhi, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 18, below, upmasi gamādhye, i.3.612, where the edited text reads correctly upmasi: 1: gamādhye).

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or paraphrased, as follows:

Here atha, ‘now then,’ is an introductory heading; adā [literally, ‘at the beginning’] means ‘at the beginning of a word’ [including, also, a separable part of a compound word]; utara [literally, ‘in the latter part’] means ‘at the end of a word’: a vowel occupying such a position, if it be long in sanhitā, becomes short vihāge, i.e. ‘in case of separation,’ when followed by a consonant—that is to say, when so followed in sanhitā. But whence is derived the limitation to a “long” vowel? We answer, from its conversion into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any protracted (phute) vowels among the instances included in the rules. The limitation “in sanhitā” implies that the word whose form is in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that follows it; not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless, as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the one liable to change of quantity]. “Separation” (vihāga) is to be understood as division from the words with which it stands in natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of the fundamental text: otherwise, in the jatā-text of the two words sthā mayobhuhvaḥ (see above), the sthā would retain its long ā in its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connection with the following word: and that should not be so. The sense of the word vihāga is, in case of a long initial vowel, separation from the preceding word; in case of a long final, from the

prakṛtipadādir ucyate: prakṛtir nāma yathāpādah: prakṛtipadādir iti kim: sthā m- ity atra jatādyam sthapatasya devitiyocārane ‘pi dirghah prasajyeta: uttarapadena vihāgādhaṅcti: sa’ ma bhūtā iti pariḥdhaḥ. vihāgapadasya ‘yam arthah: padādāvēdirghasya pātraṇadena vihāgaḥ: padānte1 dirghasyo ‘tarapadena vihāgaḥ. vihāge vyaḥjanapara iti kim: rt- ity atra ma bhūtā iti: mādhamādhdhyayā (ii.8) iti prāptih. sanhitāyāṁ ” dirgha iti kim: esāḥ- ity atra prāptisampadandartham:
following word. The limitation "in case of separation, if followed by a consonant" is for the sake of excluding such cases as *ṛtadāmda* 'si (i.3.3: in separated form, *ṛtadāmda: aśi*), which would otherwise come under the rule iiii.8 [among the specifications of which, *adāmda* is included]. The limitation "a long vowel in *saṁhītā*" is intended to bring *esava* vo *bharatā rājā* (i.8.10.2 et sl.; *pada-text, bharatāh* under the action of the rules; since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yājya* in rule 11 of this chapter. Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as *tēd vāyuvaḥ* (i.1.1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied].

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyayaṅjanapara, "followed by a consonant." Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, "the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the *saṁhītā-text"—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in *saṁhītā* as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter. This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as *bharatā rājā* (the example quoted by the commentator: the *pada*-reading is *bharataḥ: rājā*) and *adāmda* (quoted under rule 9; *pada*-reading *adāh: mad*), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11. It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in *saṁhītā* a long final vowel (*ā*) should be taken into consideration: but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small. For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules; and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in *ā* or *ā* occur; and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element. The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adā* from *adāh* with *adā* from *adhu*, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former. And this is what they have attempted to do: and it has cost them only two additional words—*agniyāṣya* in rule 9, and *yājya* in rule 11—together with an artifice of

---

1 G. M. ins. *padādā* ca *padānte ca* yo dirgho *vyayaṅjanottara vibhūte kriyamāne kramam saṁiyādī.  2 G. M. -nam.  3 G. M. -om.; G. kramānt-.  4 G. om. ca.  5 G. M. -dhak.  6 W. om.  7 G. M. -pate.  8 G. M. -om.  9 G. M. -paṇḍ-.  10 W. -ddī.  11 W. -nta.  12 G. M. ins. yo.  13 G. M. -ra.  14 G. M. eva ta-.  15 W. aśīra-.  16 W. aśīra-.
construction under rule 8, in connection with the word prānāḥ. Without a complete index verborum to the Saṁhitā, or a laboriously minute examination of the whole text with reference to this particular point, I cannot tell just how nearly successful their attempt has been; but I have, I believe, discovered at least one case which they have overlooked. At i.4.24, namely, we read rakṣā mārkha (p. rakṣāh), and, by rule 8, the ā of rakṣāh should be shortened. That the section containing these words was really a part of the text for which the Prātiṣṭhākhya was constructed is proved by the fact that two of its peculiarities of reading are provided for in later rules (vi.5 and xi.13).

But with the interpretation thus given appears to be quite at variance the phrase containing the illustration rtadhamā 'si, where vibhāge and vyanjanaparāḥ are immediately connected, and made to mean ‘followed by a consonant in separated text’ (not rtadhamā: asī). This I can hardly believe to be a genuine part of the commentary. The second ā of rtadhamā 'si cannot be said to be either final or initial: it is a combination of both: it does not furnish a case to which the rules of the chapter apply with any propriety, as the saṁhitā reading cannot be affected by them. If not some later meddler, then the commentator himself, has suffered himself to be scared by an imaginary difficulty, and has unnecessarily twisted the rule a little away in order to its removal.

The specification vibhāge, ‘in case of separation,’ applies in the Tāttirīya pada-text more generally and more strictly than in those of the other Vedas. Where the separation of a compound is suspended on account of its further composition, the restoration of its natural form is suspended also: and we read, for example, virya-vat, but vīryāvat-tara; vīṣa-mitra, but vīṣodmitra-jamadagni; anu-raja and anam-yaña, but prayašya-anuyāja, and so on—and we shall find illustrations hereafter in connection with other changes than prolongation of vowels. Thus, also, in the full pada-readings, the word is given first, before itī, in its saṁhitā form, without change (except euphonic combination with the itī); and this part of the reading I shall accordingly usually omit in quoting the pada-text, setting down only the separated and restored form which follows itī, or the part which corresponds to the entire reading of the Rik and Atharvan pada-texts.

रेवाशीकासुधार्थनात्यथुद्वारायोक्ष्यशुद्धिः ॥ २ ॥

2. Devā, cikā, sumnā, svā, rā, vayunā, hṛdayā, aghā,

2. ity eteshu grahanēsvu avagrahēsvu antyanavaro vibhāge vyanjanaparāḥ kramam āpadyate. yathā: dev-.-.-. cik-.-.-. sumn-.-.-. dvā-.-.-. 'apy akaro (i.52) iti vacandā' idam apy udāharanam: aṣṭ-.-.-. rē-.-.-. vay-.-.-. hṛt-.-.-. agh-.-.-. ukth-.-.-. āpo-.-.-.

1 G. M. om. 2 B. om. 3 G. M. sāvrdrah. 4 G. M. -hartavyam.
ukthā, and śuddhā, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated.

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification ity avagrahāha, ‘these, as former members of a compound,’ which applies alike to them all, standing at the end.

The examples quoted from the Sanshitā in illustration of the rule are as follows. For devā: devāyate yajamāṇḍya gārma (iii.5.5: G. M. omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for devāyant; we have devayate (with short vowel) twice, at i.2.12² and ii.5.9²: devāyuvam occurs ii.5.9⁶ and iv.1.1³, but devayāh, iii.5.11¹. For gikā, gikāyate svāhā (vii.5.11²), the only case. For sumṇā, sumṇāyanto havo mahe (i.5.11⁴), also alone. For āvā, āvāprāthīyā āvāvīt (v.5.20): āvā, however, by rule i.52, includes āvā, for which is quoted āvāvatīt somavatīm (iv.2.6⁴); I have noted further only iii.3.11¹, but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my excerption. For rājā, rājāvah purā nām aksan (ii.2.5⁶: G. M. omit the last word of the citation): there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes rājy (e.g. i.4.5: but rāju once, ii.2.12⁴), rājyant (e.g. iv.2.9⁴), rājīv (e.g. iii.3.14⁸) and its feminine rājīvari (e.g. i.1.3), rājīvāh (e.g. i.4.5), and rājasaḥ (iii.4.7¹: but this word reads in pada as in sanhitā). For vayunā, vayunāvid ekā it (i.2.13¹ and iv.1.1¹). For hrdayā, hrdayāvidhāg cit (i.4.45¹). For aghā, aghāya ca mā gandharvo vīpa davaur ādādhat (i.2.9: G. M. omit after gandharvah): other cases of aghāya, are found at iii.3.11¹: iv.1.10³; 5.10⁴; v.7.3¹; and of aghāyant, iii.3.14¹. For ukthā, ukthāmadāndin dhenuḥ (ii.4.11⁶): the same compound occurs again at iii.3.2¹ and v.6.8⁶, and ukthāyā at i.4.12, twice. For śuddhā, āpo devi śuddhāvyuvah (i.3.8² and vi.3.8⁴).

3. Also indrā, when followed by vat, van and vān.

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated: indrācatām apacitām thā "vaha (v.7.4³: G. M. omit after apacitām), indrāvān marutāh (iv.7.14¹), and indrāvān svāhā (i.1.12); and I have noted no others. As counter-examples, he quotes: first that not every long ə is to be shortened before the three syllables named, ārāvāntam prathamaḥ sida yonim (iii.5.11¹: G. M. give only the first two words), anura praṇāvān (iii.1.11¹: but B. reads, I presume only by an

3. indre 'ty asminn' avagrahā 'ntyasvaro ca vān vān ity evamāra vīhāre hruacam āpadyate. yathā: in d......: in d......
ind......: indic......: indic......: indic......: indic......: indic......: indic......: indic......: indic......: indic......:

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om.
error, pratápayat), and prajávatār anamavid ayakshmdḥ (i.1.1: but omitted in G. M.); second, to show that inadrā is not altered except under the circumstances specified, inadrāvarunayor aham (ii.5.12²). This last is a case in which no vihāga, or 'separation,' would be made in any text of the other Vedas; but the Taittirīya pada reads inadrāvarunayor iti 'indrā-varunayoh, and the example is therefore to the purpose.

Also citrā, when followed by v.

The illustrative passage cited is citrāvuso svasti te padam aṣṭiṣa (i.5.5¹ and 7⁵: G. M. omit after te). As counter-examples, are given mitrāvarunāv eva (ii.1.7³ et al.: p. mitrā-varunāv), and citrāpārnamāse dīshērān (vii.4.8²)—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to citrā, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a v. I have found no farther instances falling under the rule.

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example. For prasthā, prasthāvad rathavaham (iv.2.5⁶), the only case. For indriyā, indriyābate purodāpani (ii.2.7¹): half a dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of indriyāvin (e.g. i.6.2⁴: ii.1.6²: vi.2.10⁶): the latter word, however, is not separated in the pada-text. For dravinā, dravināvatah kṣute (v.3.11²), the only case. For vīvadevyā, vīvadevyāvate svādri (i.4.1¹): the word occurs also at iv.1.6¹². For dirghā, dirghādhīro rakhamānāḥ (ii.1.11⁴), the only case. For vīrā, vīryāvantam abhimāti-śāham (i.2.7): the same theme is found in other passages, as are also its comparative, vīryāvat-tara (e.g. i.7.6³), and superlative, vīryāvat-tama (ii.4.2¹), in which the shortening of the ǎ is not authorized by the Prātiṣākhyā, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause: and the pada-text reads accordingly. For vīṣeṣ, vīṣeṣmitraṣya saktam bhavati (v.2.3⁵⁴: G. M. omit

4. citrā ity asminn¹ avagraha'ntyasvaro vakāraparāḥ vihāge kramam āpadyate, yathā: cit-..... citre 'iti kim: mitr-.....: vāpara iti kim: citr-....

¹ G. M. et al. ² G. M. vāpad. ³ G. M. om.
the last word): the same word occurs in other passages (iv.3.2:
v.2.33-4,10; 4.2), as also in the compound visvāmitra-jamadagni (v.4.11), where, as the division is visvāmitra-jamadagni, the ā is not shortened; and we have further the themes visvāvasu (e.g. i.1.11), visvāvant (iii.5.6), visvārūj (i.3.21), and visvāsah (i.4.17; p. visvā-sāham). For vātā, vātāvād varshān (i.4.7), the only case. For tvā, tvāvato maghnah (i.2.12); p. tvā-vatāh; the Rik pada-text does not shorten the ā of this word. For bhavi-
gūrā, bhettāram bhānguravatāh (i.5.6 and iv.1.2). For karna-
kā, sārni karnakāvata etayā (i.5.7 and v.4.7; G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For vrshniyā, vrshniyādatas tava (iii.
5.6-7). For sugopā, sa sugopātamo janaḥ (iv.2.11; p. sugopu-
tamah: G. M. omit the first word): the Rik pada writes sugopā-
tamah. For rksāmā, rksāmābhyāsā yajusā (i.2.3 and iii.1.4). For aghā, aghopād eva' nam antar et bhūtam (i.3.17; p. agha-
pod: G. M. omit the last two words); the Rik and Atharvan pada-
texts write aghā-apva: the themes aghāyu (e.g. i.2.91) and aghā-
yant (iii.3.14) are also found in the Sanhitā. For sārā, sārājītām
dhansātām (iv.1.3; p. sātra-jītam): the word sātra occurs re-
peatedly (e.g. i.6.12) uncompounded, and maintains its long final in the pada-text also. For varshā, varshāhāvāṁ jāhūti (i.4.10;
p. varsha-hāvān). For pushpa, pushpāvattisupipātāḥ (iv.1.4 and
v.1.5). For meghā, meghāyat svadhā (vii.5.11; p. megha-
yate; in the same division occurs also meghāyishyate, which is not divided: meghayanti is found at iv.4.5). For prā, prāvanebhāh
sajosahāḥ (iv.2.4; p. prāvanebhāḥ); the Rik pada-text writes this word prāvana, without separation: other words beginning with prā are prāsah (e.g. i.3.14; p. prā-sahā), prāśrīga (ii.1.34-5),
prāsca (vii.5.11; not divided in pada-text), prākāpa (i.8.18;
also not divided), and prārsta (iv.8.2 et al.; also not divided).
And for svā, svādhiyāṁjanayatvādayacā (i.3.14; p. svā-dhi-
yām): but this the Rik pada-text writes svādhiyam.

लोककथावेण ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also īshā, after loka and eva.

The commentator cites the two cases: sam amushmā loka iṣh-
tātàpātēna (iii.3.85 twice: G. M. omit the first word), and sa tu eva
'ishāpātē (i.7.3; p. iṣhina-pātē). Then, to show that īshā after other words remains unchanged, he quotes prati jātvya enaṁ iṣh-
tāpātē saṁ yṛjñāṁ ayaṁ ca (iv.1.18; p. iṣhā-pātē: W. B.

5. ity etesu avagraheshu antyasvaro viśādīgavajna-
naparā kravam āpadyate, yathā; pras—: inār—-
: drav—: visv—: dīr—: vir—: visv—: vāt—-
tvā—: bhett:—: sār:—: vṛsh:—: sa—: rka—-
agh:—: sātra—: varsh:—: pushp:—: megh:—-
prāv—: svā—.
omit before enam, G. M. after -pāte); and the same mode of treatment is followed by the pada-text at v.7.7², which is the only other case I have noted. The ground of this difference does not appear. To show, further, that only ishta shortens its ā in the defined position, the passage sākhād eva praśāpotaye (v.1.2⁵) is given.

7. Also cākti, raṭhi, tvśi, vāṭ, raṭrī, oṣhadhi, ṛuti, vyāhriti, svaḥākṛti, ṛdwuni, caci, citi, crenī, prṣṭi, pūtī, abhī, carṣanī, parī, adhī, pāṛī, cāṛī, visṛh, vaṣū, anā, hanā, sū, viḥhā—all these, as first members of a compound.

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text. For cākti, the sole instance is cāktivanta gābihṛdh (iv.6.6⁵). For raṭhi, raṭhitamadu raṭhinām (iv.7.1⁵). For tvśiḥ, asāpiṇjarḍya tvśihāme pathinām (iv.5.2¹): W. B. omit the last word, G. M. the first. For vāṭ, tv vāṭmanata ivaṁśiḥ (ii.1.1¹² and iv.2.1¹²: G. M. omit the last word). For raṭrī, raṭrībhīr anubhīna (ii.4.1¹¹): if there are other cases, I have failed to note them. For oṣhadhi, oṣhadhiḥyō vēhatam ālabheta (ii.1.5⁵: G. M. omit the last word): I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting. For ṛuti, ṛutibhir anāyāšeṣu (ii.6.9⁴). For vyāhṛtī, etabhīr vyāhṛtibhiḥ (i.6.1⁰ and v.5.5⁴). For svaḥākṛti, svaḥākṛtibhiḥ pṛṣṭhye tvāda (vi.3.9⁴: G. M. omit the last two words). For ṛdwuni, svaḥā ṛdwunibhiḥ svaḥā (vii.4.1⁵: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For caci, viṇḍa vāpō bhi caṣṭe pacetibhiḥ (iv.2.5⁴+⁵: W. B. omit before caṣṭe). For citi, citibhyām upāyaṁ (v.7.5¹). For crenī, crenibhiḥ svaḥā (vii.3.1⁶): another case is found at v.7.1⁵. For prṣṭi, W. B. give prṣṭibhir dhvam (v.7.1⁷), but G. M. read prṣṭibhiḥ svaḥā (vii.3.1⁶). For pūtī, pūtigandhasya pahatdyi (ii.2.2⁴). For abhī, abhīvṛto ghrnti vā dūnā caṣṭi tamad (i.5.1¹¹: G. M. omit the last two words): we have also abhīshāh at ii.3.2⁶ (p. abhi-sahā). For carṣanī, mitrasya carṣan-idhate (ii.4.1¹¹ and iv.1.6³): another case at i.4.1⁶. For parī, viṇvavatam parīnasam (ii.2.1²: p. parī-nasam: compare rule vii.4). For adhī, adhvīdesam yā hiranyāṁ asmī (iv.6.9⁴: G. M. omit the last word). For pāṛī, pāṛinahasyaḥ 'çe (vi.2.1¹: p. pāṛinahasya: compare rule vii.4). For cāṛī, ca-
trāyato hantā (i.6.53 and iv.2.13). For vishd, vishāvān vishāvan-
tah (vii.4.34); another case at vii.4.8. For vasād, aramātrī vasā-
yah (iv.3.18). For and, andrādāh nakhatram (iv.4.102); we have it also in the compounds antyādā (e.g. ii.6.94), antānāmīya (e.g. ii.2.97), antūdāsa (e.g. v.4.13), and anūnij (v.7.23). In the further compound of the first, prayājāndayāja (e.g. i.7.11; p. prā-
yāja-andyājān), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is no division after anu. Appealing to rule i.53 as his authority, the commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, anand-
yājam prayānīyaṃ (vi.1.53; p. ananu-yājam). For hant, hand-
hūtāna svādh (vii.3.16). For sā, sāyavasini manavaye yaspaye (i.2.13); sāyavase occurs more than once (e.g. i.7.523). For vishād, vishāddane (iii.5.8.92).

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as collectively avagraha (i.49), 'first members of compounds.'

8. Also avā, sacasā, nudā, mṛdā, vardhā, čikṣā, rakṣā, adyā, bhavā, bhajā, yatrā, card, pibā, nā, dhāmā, dhārayā, dharṣād, gḥā, vardhayā, bodhā, atrā, tatā, muñčā, acvāsā, prāsāvā, hi sthā, tvam tarā, janishvā, yukṣvā, achā.

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the category of avagrahas, or former members of compounds, having been exhausted by the foregoing rules. There is cited in illustration, for avā, and no devā kṛpā (iv.1.41). For sacasā, sacasād naḥ svastaye (i.6.52). For nudā, praṛudda naḥ sapatnān (iv.3.121 thrice, and v.3.51). For mṛdā, W. B. give mṛdā jariṁ (iv.5.104), but G. M. read mṛdā no rudra (iv.5.102): I have noted no other case. For vardhā, vardhā no amavac chavaḥ (ii.6.112). For čik-

7. ity etesāv avagrahesaḥ antyasvaro vibhāge vyanāpam hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: gak—— rath—— sa——
tē—— rē—— osh—— dh—— et—— svā—— svā——
vā—— vie—— ce—— gē—— prē—— pūt——
abh—— mitr—— vir—— adh—— pār—— gat——
vish—— ar—— and—— ankarādi ca (i.53) iti vacandā
anam ity etad ९ udhāraṇaḥ bhavati: han—— sāy——
vibh—— ity avagraha ity anena prakāreṇo 'kith' padasm-

४ B. vīcchād.
shā, cīkṣhā no asmin prurāhāta yādani (vii.5.74: W. B. omit the last two words): it is found again at iv.6.24. For rakṣā, rakṣā ca no adhi ca deva brāhi (iv.5.103 and vii.5.24; G. M. omit the last two words): the form occurs also at ii.3.141. I have pointed out in the note to the first chapter of the passage (i.4.24) in which rakṣāḥ appears as euphonic alteration of rakṣāḥ before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here. For adyā, adyā devā juchatamah (iv.6.75): also at ii.1.116: iii.4.112: iv.6.25. For bhavā, bhavā pāyur viṣaḥ asya adābhāh (i.2.144: G. M. omit the last two words): other cases are not infrequent; see i.1.144: 4.32: iii.2.53: 4.101: iv.1.712: 2.5: 74: 4.47; and likewise ii.6.128, where bhavā, standing at the end of the first division of the anuvāka, is situated vihāye, and loses its ā even in the saṁhitā-text. For bhajā, ā gomati vaja bhajā tvāma naḥ (i.6.121: W. B. begin at vaja): another case at iii.3.92. For yatrā, yatrā na tervat (iii.1.118): other cases at iv.4.41: 6.64,72. For cādā, prā cādā somo durīdān (i.2.101). For pibā, pibā somam indra mandatu (i.4.143: G. M. omit the last word): another case at i.4.19. For na, ripau na ha debhūḥ (i.2.145-6): in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note. For dhāmā, dhāmā ha yat te ajara (iii.1.118): we have dhāma, plural, in saṁhitā also, at iv.6.54: 7.13. For dhārayā, bhaṣpate dhārayā vasāmi (i.3.71 and iii.3.61): other cases at iv.1.54,72. For dharṣā, W. B. have dhāresḥā mānushān adbhāyāh (i.3.81), but G. M., dharṣā mānushān iti ni yunakī (vi.3.63). For gha, uta ṣa gha syālāt (i.1.141): there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at iii.4.116. For vardhaye, tama agne vardhaye tvam (iv.6.31): other cases are at i.5.52: iv.2.44: 7.13. For bodhā, bodhā no asya vacasa yavishēha (iv.2.34: G. M. omit the last two words). For atrā, atrā te ṛpam (iv.6.75): other cases are at iv.6.78,82. For vatrā, vatrā raham upa pagam (iv.6.83). For muṇḍā, prā muṇḍā svastaye (ii.2.83): again at iv.7.157. For apavasā, ekas tuvahār api apavasā vipastā (iv.6.93). For prānasat, saptā yonir ā prānasat ghrtena (i.5.3 and iv.6.5). For sthā after hi, ṣtā hi śtuḥā mayobhūvah (iv.1.51: v.6.14: vii.4.19): and, as counter-example, to show that the correction takes place only after hi, pratiṣṭhād ev ekaviñčah (v.2.32 et al.). For tārā after tvam, agne tvam tārā mṛdhāh (iv.1.93), with the counter-example antarātārā tapatrāt bhavati (vi.2.27: G. M. omit the last word). For janīshā, janī-

8. ....... ' eteshu anavagraheshu antyasvaro vihdāge vyauñjana-paro hrasvam apadyate. yathā: anāv.... sac.... pra.... mr.... var.... cīkṣh.... rak.... adyā.... bhav.... d go.... yat.... pra.... pibā.... rip.... api vikrtam (i.51) apy akāṛdī (i.52) iti dvāhdānā vauca-bhāyam prā.... iti atra hrasvādēcaḥ kīn na syāt: māi 'vam: api vikrtam (i.51) iti vacanam kauṭhoktapadavishayam na to akāṛdādipadavishayam': prāṇā iti asya 'py akāṛdādīvān na
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shvā hi jenyo agne (iv.1.3ª and v.1.4ª: G. M. omit agne). For yuvēka, yuvēka hi devahattamān (ii.6.11ª et al.); other cases at iv.2.9ª; v.5.3.11ª. For acha, acha nakhi dyumattamaḥ (i.5.6ª and iv.4.4ª): other cases at i.7.10ª; ii.2.12ª; 6.11ª; iv.2.4ª twice; 4.4ª (if my MS. is correct; the Rik reads acha); 5.1ª; 6.7ª: but the compound achaṇāka (vii.1.5ª) is left undivided and unchanged.

The occasion of the commentator’s delay and discussion over the word ad is given by the fact that the pada-text of the Tāttvīrīya Sanhitā (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvan: see note to Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides the word prāṇāḥ thus: pra-andh. Hence, when we read in the Sanhitā, as in the passage which he quotes, prāṇā vā anāpavaḥ (vi.4.4ª: W. B. read simply prāṇa vā, which occurs in various other places; e. g. v.3.3ª), he fears that, having this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the specification ad of the present rule applies to prāṇa, because we are taught in the first chapter (i.51,52) that a word cited in any rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or preceded by a. He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbitrary dictum that it is not permitted to vary the same word in both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the prefixion of an a to one so quoted: hence, he infers, the present rule does not apply to [the and of] prāṇa, as it begins with a. But a further objection is interposed: in that case, why does it not apply to the part and of the compound, in which is no altered a? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in sanhitād, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better statement, because of the absence of any such word in sanhitād as and (for andh) with a long vowel as its final. The second objection, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of bringing up and setting aside. The original difficulty is one growing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases of final ad in sanhitād where a visarjaniya has been lost after it (see note to rule 1). The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere.

Also adhā, in agni and yājña passages.

'yām vidhīḥ. tarhi vikrtatvābhavād and ādyasye 'hygāṅgasya kīn na syād ayaṁ vidhīḥ. evaṁrāpasya sanhitāyāṁ dirghahbhāvād. dhā—: bh—: dhar—: uta—: tam—: bodhā—: atrā—: tat—: pra—: ek—: sap—: dop—: hi 'ti kim: pra—: agne—: tvam iti kim: ant—: jan—: yuκ—: acha—.

1 G. M. ina. ity. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. kṣip; B. om. pada. 4 B. om. pada. 5 W. ina. etd. 6 G. M. u dikṣatasya bh. 7 B. G. M. om. 8 B. G. M. yāpa.
The commentator's first care is to define what parts of the Sanhitā are styled agni and yādyā. The former name, he says, designates those mantras which celebrate Agni—namely, the fourth kānda: by the latter are intended the concluding anvākas, or sections, of every praṇa, or chapter, from the beginning of the Sanhitā to the third praṇa of the fourth kānda, inclusive; and, besides, the eleventh anvāka of praṇa six, kānda two (i.e. i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.46; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22: ii.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11,12; iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11: iv.1.11; 2.11; 3.13—in all, twenty-three anvākas). The name agni does not occur again: the yādyās are the subject of further prescription below, in rules iii.11, iv.20, xi.3. The compound agniyājya (neuter singular) is justified by a simple reference to Pāṇini's rule (ii.2.29) defining a copulative compound.

The passages cited in illustration of the rule are adhā hy agne kṛatoḥ (iv.4.47), adhā ca nāḥ saṁrartaḥ yachā dvibharāḥ (iv.5.10 ): G. M. omit the last word, adhā te sumnam imāhe (ii.6.114), and adhā yathā nāḥ pitarāḥ (ii.6.124: W. B. omit the last word): I have noted no other cases. As counter-example, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is quoted adhā me 'tī tad viśeṣate tī prāyaḥchat (i.4.124: W. B. omit prāyaḥchat), where adhā stands for adhāḥ: see, for the bearing of the exception, the note upon the introductory rule of the chapter.

10. Also kutrā, dakshinānā, svenā, hantānā, jagāmā, ruhmadā, vismadā, rāhyāmā, cakrāmā, kshāmā, šarīmā, bharemā, varshayathā, irayathā, ārihā, pāthā, athā, sitcāthā, janayathā, jayātā, ukh ṣāt, avātā, yātā, īṣnuṭā, kṛṣnuṭā, bibhṛtā.

The commentator's illustrative passages are: for kutrā, kutrā cid yasya samṛṭāu (ii.1.113: G. M. omit the last word). For dakṣināna...
shinendra, dakshinendra vastra patiḥ sindhāndam asī (iii.4.114: G. M. omit after vastrī). For svend, svendhi vrtaṁ śuvasa jagnantha (vii.4.15: B. omits the last word; G. M. the last two). For hantād, tapaṁ hantād tam (iv.3.134). For jagadā, ā jagadā paraśyad (i.6.128). For rūmād, asravantīm ā rūmād svastaye (i.5.118). For vidmā, vidmā te agne tredhā trayānī vidmā te (iv.2.21: G. M. stop at agne, thus instancing only one of the two cases; there are two more in the same verse): also at i.7.138; ii.6.114. For rādyāmā, rādyāmā ta ohāh (iv.4.47). For caκrmd, caκrmd haka cand "yah (iv.7.156): other cases at i.6.3; i.6.122; iv.1.114; 6.88. For kshāndā, kshāndā rerihād virudhāh (i.3.142; iv.2.14,22: G. M. omit the last word): other cases at ii.6.124; iv.7.128. For starimā, sushtārind jushāndā (v.1.112): here the application of rule i.51 becomes necessary. For bharemā, añharmuce pra bharemā mantāhām (i.6.128: G. M. omit the last word). For varshayathā, yāyaṁ vrṣṭiṁ varshayathā purishināh (ii.4.82: W. B. omit the first word). For trayathā, ud trayathā marutāh (ii.4.82). For ārūdhā, yoner udārūdhā yaje tam (iv.6.54). For pādhā, kshaye pādhā dīvo vimūdhasaḥ (iv.2.112). For athā, athā somaṁya pravatī yuvvubhyām (i.1.141: G. M. omit the last word): other cases are numerous, namely i.1.132; 5.52,113; 6.42 twice; 7.134: ii.3.142: 6.122: iii.1.14: 4.116: iv.2.14,44,54,61:6, 6.34 twice; 7.134; and, as I doubt not, at the end of iii.2.112, where, however, the present saṁhita-text reads athā, because the word stands vihhāge. For sīncathā, yatā naro marutāh sīncathā madhu (iii.1.118). For yanayathā, āpo yanayathā ca nāḥ (iv.1.5: vi.6.1: vii.4.148). For jayatā, upa pre ūta jayatā nara sthirāh (iv.6.44: G. M. omit the last word). For ukshatā, ā ghrām ukshatā madhevarum (iv.3.138). For avatā, asmān u devā avatā havesu (iv.6.45): another case at iv.2.88. For yati, devā ratādir yati bhironyaṇāt (iv.7.12: G. M. omit the first word). For ṣruti, marutaḥ ṣrutiḥ havam (iv.2.118). For krnuṭā, samvatsarīya krnuṭā bhram namah (v.7.28). Finally, for bhṛtṛā, mātē 'va putram bhṛtṛā sv enam (iv.2.82: W. B. begin at putram).

भरता यात्रायास् ॥ ९२ ॥

11. Also bharatā, in yājya passages.

10. ity' etesho anavagrahesvā anityasvaro vihhāge vyāhjanaparo hrasam āpadyate. yathā: kutrā:... do-kṣh-... svendā:... tapā:... ṣr-... asrā:... vidmā:... rdhy-... caκr-... kṣhā-... susht-... aṁh-... yāh-... uā:... yonēr-... kshaye:... athā:... yatrā:... ūpo:... upa:... ā:... asmān:... devā:... marā:... saṁh-... mā:...
Which are the sections called yājya has been pointed out above, under rule 9.

The cited passages are: bharatā vasvittamam (iii.5.113), bharatā jātavedusam (iii.5.111), and pāravyam vaco 'gnaye bharatā bharatā (iii.2.111; G. M. omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains. As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to yājya passages, is quoted esha vo bharatā rājā (i.8.104,124), where bharatā stands for bharatāh. If the text contained a bharatā as instrumental of the participle bharatā, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have better right to be specifically excluded; but I have not found such a form anywhere. Respecting bharatā as standing in samhitā for bharatāh, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter.

12. Also attā, bhojatā, anadanatā, taratā, tapatā, juhutatā, vocatā, amucatā, crītā, ghushyā, janayā, vartayā, sādayā, pārayā, diyā, hard, bhard, apā, asādā, srjā, tishā, and yend.

The cited passages are: for attā, attā havīṣhi (ii.6.122). For bharatatā, dhīyāso bharatā mṛdayantāh (i.4.22 and ii.1.114). For anadanatā, samprayatār aḥāv anadanatā hute (v.6.12: W. B. omit the first word). For taratā, sūno rūḥānīs taratā rajānā (iii.5.42: G. M. omit the first word). For tapatā, ghrāmaṁ na sāman tapatā suṁtibhiḥ (i.6.12: W. B. O. [O. begins in the comment to this rule] omit before tapatā). For juhutatā, pitre juhutatā vīpavakarnāne (iv.6.24). For vocatā, vīpve devīso adhit vocatā me (iv.7.14: G. M. omit. to adhit). For amucatā, padi shitām amucatā yajātā (iv.7.15). For crītā, ayaśmayān vi crītā bandham etam (iv.2.58). For ghushyā, pārshupar aru ghushyā vīpasta (iv.6.98). For janayā, manur huvā janayā dāvyayā janaṁ (iii.4.23,31). For vartayā, tābhir a vartayā punaḥ (iii.3.101). For sādayā, sādayā yajñāḥ suktasya yonāḥ (iii.5.112 and iv.1.33). For pārayā, agne team pārayā navyo asmān (i.1.141: all but W. omit the last word). For diyā, brhaspate pari diyā radhena (iv.6.41-2: the text reads diyā, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section): another case is iii.1.118. For hard, niḥdram in ni me hard niḥdram

11. bharatā ity asmin' grahane 'nyasvaro yājyaśvihaye' vibhāge vyañjanaparohrasvam āpadyate. yathā: bhar-.....: bhar-.....: pur-.....: yājyāsv iti kin: esha.....

1 G. M. etasmin. 9 B. avagraheṣu. 1 G. M. yājyād, and put before the preceding word.
For bhará, mã no maráhir á bhará dadhi tan nah pra dāpushe (i.7.13²; O. omits after bhará; B. G. M. after dadhi): there is no other case, bhará at i.3.14⁸ in the Calcutta edition being an erratum. For apá, duro na vágá prutyá apá vrdhi (ii.2.12⁶; W. B. omit the first two words). For asáddá, agnír hotá ni sáá sadá yajyá (i.3.14¹ and iv.1.3⁴; G. M. omit the first word): there is another case at iv.6.2¹, requiring, like the others, the application of rule i.51. For šrdá, šrdá vṛṣṭihin divah (ii.4.8⁷,10³): there are other cases at ii.4.8³; iii.5.5²,10¹; iv.1.8³. For tishthá, tishthá devo na savitá (iv.1.4²): other cases at iii.1.4¹: v.2.1⁴, and perhaps also at iv.1.2⁸, where the word ends a division of the anuváka. For yená, yená sahasrám valahí (iv.7.13⁴ and v.7.7⁸).

Also ucmasi, kravyá, kṛdhí, śrødhi, and yadst.

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows. For ucmasi, te te dhámnay ucmasi gámadhye (i.3.8¹²: W. B. O. omit the first three words); here, as ucmasi stands at the end of a division, or viddles, its is short in the accepted text. For kravyá, rudra yat te kravyá parath náma (i.8.1²). For kṛdhí, kṛdhí so asman aditéh (iv.7.15⁷: W. B. O. omit the last word). For śrødhi, imám me varuna śrødhi havám (ii.1.11⁶). For yadst, yadst bhúmiḥ janayán (iv.8.2⁴).

Also sú, tá, ná, mithú, makshú, and á.

The cited passages are as follows: for sú, mo shá na indra (i.8.9). For tá, á tá na ypa gántana (i.5.11⁴-²): there are two other cases, i.7.13³: ii.2.12⁷, both after á. For ná, etapasya ná raṅge (iv.8.1²). For mithú, gátámy asínd mithú kah (iv.8.9⁴: G. M. omit the first word). For makshá, makshá devavato rathah (i.8.2²). For á, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,

12. eteshu anavagrahesvo antyavaro viddháge vyānjanaparo hravam épadyate. yathá: atád... dd... sampr... suvo... ghar... pitre... vigve... padi... ayaś... par... man... tábh... sád... agne... bh... nih... má... duró... agnír... šrdá... tish... yená...

1 W. av.; G. M. gavānásah. ² O. begins here.

13. ity eteshu anavagrahesvo antyavaro viddháge vyānjanaparo hravam épadyate. yathá: te... rudra... kṛdhí... imám... yadst.

1 G. M. om. ² G. M. eshv. ³ W. av.; G. M. om.
15. Also ōn, when unaccented, and preceded by vi or ut, in a word containing no spirant.

This rule applies simply to the compounds vyāna and udōna, in which the long ō of the radical syllable is treated by the pada-text as the effect of an irregular prolongation. The words are instance by the commentator in their full pada-form, vyānaye tī vi-ānāya (iii.5.8 et al.), and udānaye tī ut-ānāya (iv.2.91 et al.). In the same manner, prānāya and apa-ānāya are divided into pra-ānāya and apa-ānāya. As regards the treatment of this group of compounds, the different pada-texts are somewhat inconsistent and somewhat conflicting. The Atharvan pada (see Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides vi-ānā and sam-ānā, without corroboration of the radical ō, but leaves prānā and apa-ānā undivided. The Rik pada does not divide prānā; I do not know that any of the others are Rik words. The White Yajus, again (Vāj. Pr. v.38,39), divides apa-ānā and sam-ānā, but not prānā. The consistency of the Tāttirīya pākhinaḥ is to be commended; less, perhaps, their assumption that the ō of ānā is a mere Vedic irregularity, requiring restoration to a correcter form. They also, it may be remarked, divide prānatha (iv.1.41) into pra-ānatha.

The commentator goes on to cite counter-examples, proving the necessity of the restrictions imposed by the rule. To show that ōn is to be shortened only after vi and ut, he gives yad dvrcus tene ‘yam (vii.3.13: W. B. O. omit the last word), and paryāniyā havantyasya (vii.1.68). To show that only ōn, not ō followed by any other consonant, is shortened, he quotes yad ruknam vyāghrayati (v.2.75), and udādāya prthivim jiraddnā (i.1.93: G. M. omit the last word). To show that the ōn must not be accented, he gives viṣvākarmāḥ vyānaḥ (iv.2.104), and niśīṣam pāṭnām udānaya (vi.5.83). Finally, to show that the presence of a spirant in the word prevents the corroboration, we have pathā madhor dhārā vyānacuyā (v.7.73: all but W. omit the first word), and ud ōnīṣhur mahir iti (v.6.13).

The question is now in point, how complete is this rehearsal of the cases of prolonged vowels occurring in the Sanhitā; or, how closely does the pada-text which it assumes correspond with that
found in the existing pada-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a pada-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout; but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr. Haug at Munich, for verification in his pada-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the Prātiṣākhyas has come to light. Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the Prātiṣākhyas in fault. Thus yoja, in the refrain yoja nū īndra te hari (i.8.5.1), which is shortened to yōja in the pada-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr. vii.7) and the White Yajus (by Vāj. Pr. iii.106), remains yojā in that of our Sanhitā. Again, eva occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz. at i.8.22: ii.1.11: iv.2.9: 3.13: 7.15: v.2.8), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their Prātiṣākhyas): see Rik Pr. vii.12,19; viii.20: Vāj. Pr. iii.128: Ath. Pr. iii.16, note, I.1.c.): but the Tāttvārtha pada reads in each case eva. Once more, in the passage tava dharmā yuyopima (Rig-Veda vii.89.5; Ath. Veda vi.51.3; Tātt. Sanh. iii.4.11), the pada-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read dharma (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr.; in the Ath. Pr. it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our Sanhitā has dharman, like the sanhitā-reading.

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the pada-text. Separated, without correction of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are uttarā-vat (v.4.8), ahaṁ-van (i.8.12), malmā-dhavan (i.4.34), vṛsha-kapi (i.7.13), such copulative compounds as īndrā-varunayoh (ii.5.12) and āgni-vishāy (i.1.12), and ārṇa-mradas (i.1.11): while, nevertheless, we have ārṇa-mradas at i.2.2, the pada-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the sanhitā: where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading ārṇāmradas and ārṇāmradas is more than I can imagine.

15. vi 'ty evampūrva utpūrvo va "n ity esha `svaro 'nudatta 'nāshmavatya` uṣhmarahtie pada vartamāno vyahjanaparād padādū vartamānāvāt pūrvapadena` vihāgē sati krasvam āpādayate. yathā: viandāye 'ti vi-anāya: udāndāye 'ty ut-anāya. evampūrva iti kim: yad.....: pary.....: nakdrāḥ kimarthah: yad.....: udā.....: anudatta iti kim: viṣv.....: nesh.....: anūshmavat 'ti kim: pathā.....: ud.....

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣākhyavivaraṇe trītyo `āhyāyaḥ`.

1 G. M. ins. ākāra. 2 W. uṣhm. 3 G. M. -da. 4 G. M. add pūkhāyena na-mah.
iv. 2.] Tāttvīrya-Prātiṣṭhākhya and Trībhāṣhyaratna.

Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correnption of the vowel, are such words as rtāshat (iii.4.7), and turāshat (i.7.13), also tvashṭmant (i.2.5), anyādṛś (i.8.13), ubhayādat (ii.2.6), ardīyant (i.6.1) and ardītvan (vii.4.15), atikāpa (i.2.2), and prākāpa (i.8.18), avadṛṣṭga (ii.1.8) and prāgṛṣṭga (ii.1.3: as I doubt not: my information is deficient for this word), upānāh (v.4.4), nivāḍra (iv.7.4) and niḥṛdra (iv.6.2), and purūravah (i.3.7).

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial: thus we read in padatext, for example, vārdha (i.4.20), sāsahat (i.3.14), and ushadam (iv.4.4).

Many of these items constitute striking peculiarities of the Tāttvīrya pada, and it is careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious.

CHAPTER IV.

Contents: 1–4, introductory; 5–54, rehearsal of cases of pragramas, or uncombinable final vowels.

ग्रंथ प्रग्रहः: II 1 II

1. Now the pragramas.

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator. The same subject is treated by the other Prātiṣṭhākhya, at Rik. Pr. i.18–19, Vāj. Pr. i.92–98, Ath. Pr. i.73–82. It occupies here a great deal more space, because the Tātt. Pr. avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes. A rule in a later chapter (x.24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as pragrama are exempt from euphonic combination. The term pragrama is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead pragrha.

नाथग्रहः: II 2 II

2. No former member of a compound is pragrama.

As the former member of a separable compound (avagrama: i.49) is regarded and treated as an independent pada, the rules declaring certain final vowels pragrama would apply to the finals

1. athe ’ty ayam adhikārah: pragrama ucyanta ity ’etad’ adhi- kṛtām eṣātāvāṃ ita’ uttaraṁ yad vaksyāmad.

(1) W. om. * G. M. om.
of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary. The commentator cites rules 5,6,36,37,49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the Sanhitā in illustration tanunapād anurāh (iv.1.8), the tanah of tanunapāt would otherwise be pragrahā by rule 6, agoarghaṁ yajamānam (vi.1.101: ago-argham would fall else under rule 8), agnishomāṇa mā (ii.5.22: it is implied that the pada text would write agni-somaṁ, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36: such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and dvedvā puruṣomākye kuryāt (ii.2.92: the pada writes dve-dve, so that both members would be declared alike pragrahā by rule 49). The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified.

3. Only a final is pragrahā.

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation pragrahā. He cites, as example, the phrase devate samrādhyāt (ii.1.9). The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5,6,33—describe certain letters or syllables as pragrahā without farther limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final. This in answer to the criticizing inquiry “whether a letter not final can also be pragrahā?”—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured; for the word api of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle “continued implication is of that which is last” (i.58). The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to api a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever. Instead, however, of showing the


1 W. -t; B. O. om. 2 G. 3 om. 4 G. 5 om 'w.

3. padaśyā 'ntaḥ pragrahasyaṁjño bhavati. yathā: dev——
atra "ha: kim apadānta'pi pragrahāḥ sydt. atro 'cyate: ukārah (iv.5) ity aviceshenā vakṣhayati: okāro 'sādhito kāravyaṁjana-parāh (iv.6) iti: et yatpraparaḥ (iv.33) iti ca: apadānta yo kārasya 'kārasya oṣubāsya vā pragrahavatvam' mā bhūd iti.
objector to the door, the commentator proceeds elaborately to confute him. "We reply, not so: specification of finality is appropriate where there is a congeries of several letters; here, on the other hand, there is indication of a single letter. If the matter in question were the euphonic alteration or elision of अ and the other letters treated of, a final would be designated in virtue of the principle quoted: but here it is a simple case of application of the term pragṛaha, not of an affected nor an affecting letter: hence continued implication has no force."

इतियोगः अयः || 3 ||

4. It is followed by iti.

This is the interpretation of the commentator, who declares that the "also" (अपि) brings in by implication, from the first rule of the preceding chapter, the specification विभागे, 'in case of separation,' or in the पदा or other artificially divided texts. As example, he cites उहे iti (i.4.22 et al.: G. M. add devate iti, ii.1.98 et al.).

If such be its real meaning, the rule is a very anomalous one, as giving a single direct prescription respecting the mode of construction of the secondary texts. These are elsewhere only referred to or implied, in a more indirect manner. I should therefore prefer to translate 'even when followed by iti'—that is to say, a word here defined as pragṛaha in the ordinary text has that character also in the other texts before iti, not being combined with the latter.

उत्तकः || 5 ||

5. A long अ is pragṛaha.

namu siddham evai 'tat: uttaram uttarasātre' 'pipabdena 'nvadeço 'ntyasya (i.58) eva kārṇavivadhāt. ne 'ti brāmah: anekavārarṇasamudde 'hy antyavattam upapannam: ayaṃ punar evanvarṇanirdepaḥ: ukrāḥ (iv.5) ity śādvarṇasya yatu vikāralopāvaya tayor ' anvadeço 'ntyasya (i.58) ity anēna 'ntyāḥ: pragṛaha ity uktam' pragṛhasanirñāmaitrāṃ: na tu nimittaṃ nimitti vā: tasmād anvadeço na prasarati.

1 G. M. grahamam. 2 B. O. -cēhe; G. M. -būt. 3 G. M. ottarasya stā. 4 G. M. -vāhako. 5 B. O. anta. 6 G. M. ins. eva. 7 G. M. 'ntyāprāntyaya uktāḥ. 8 G. M. -ha iti sam-. 9 B. O. om.

4. apipādāḥ sīnhāvalokanenā 'thā "dāv uttare vībhāge (iii.1) ity utra vībhāgarpaṇam' anvādaipati: so 'yam pragṛaha vībhāga itiparō bhavati. yatathā: ' uthē iti. itiṣaipādāḥ paro yasmād asāv itiparāḥ.

1 G. M. -pam. 2 G. M. ins. devate iti.
The commentator adds the limitation that, "if long in pada-text," the final ए is universally pragraha; referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii.14, of an उ irregularly lengthened in sanśhitā. His examples are हनु वा एते यज्ञास्या (vi.2.11; W. B. O. omit the last word), वदानकिस र्तादुक्राण्या (iv.4.11; W. B. O. omit after र्तादु), and हरिनयास्या भवइ उपास्ततान्यामिन्य तत्वे अर्थन (iv.2.8; G. M. omit the last four words; the others, the first word).

6. Also an ओ which is not the product of euphonic combination, if followed by ए or a consonant.

Of words exhibiting in pada-text, as well as in sanśhitā, a final ओ, there are (apart from the theme गो, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of pragrahas) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in उ, the other of words whose final ए or ओ is combined with the particle उ. The present rule deals, in general, with the former class; the one next following, with the latter class. The right of the vocatives in ओ to be treated as pragrahas is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the Prātiṣṭhāṇyā; for to say that such words are pragraha before ए or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic ओ which comes from a final ओ; since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial ए. The only instances in which a vocative in ओ exhibits a pragraha character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i.4.27; v.7.2; vi.5.8); the cases in which it is regularly changed to ओ in before other vowels than ए are much more numerous: namely, before ए, at i.4.39; ii.2.12; 6.11; vi.4.3; before त, at ii.2.12; before उ, at i.2.13 twice; 6.123; iii.2.10; before e, at ii.4.12. I have noted but two cases in the text where such an ओ stands before initial ए without absorbing it; they are found at i.3.81,147. And there are the same

5. अकाराः पदान्ततः सर्वत्रा प्रग्राहो भवति: पदासमाये वर्तमानाः, यथाः: हानु.....: वद...: हर...: पदासमाये वर्तमाना इति किम: सत्यनमिथामाक्षादृ (iii.14) इत्यादि.

1 G. M. omit after मिथि.

6. असांहिताः ओक्श्रो कारपरो वद्वा व्याज्ञानपरो वद्य प्रग्राहाः स्यात। यथाः: वद...: विश...: असांहिताः इति किम: सो...: 'प्रव.... वामपत्रा इति किम: विश...: सांहितादिनित्ताः सांहिताः: नासांहितो सांहिताः: अकाराः ओ व्याज्ञानादृ कारपं व्याज्ञानादृ: ते परे यस्मात् सा तयो 'क्ततः.

1 G. M. om. (2) W. B. O. om.
number of cases—namely, at ii.5.12\textsuperscript{5} and vi.4.3\textsuperscript{4}—in which it causes the elision of a following $a$.

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are vad-mā hi suno usi (i.3.14\textsuperscript{7}), and visheh havyāṁ rakahana (i.1.3). To show the necessity of the limitation adhīṁhitāḥ, he cites so brūnit (ii.1.2\textsuperscript{1} et al.), and pra so agne (iii.2.11\textsuperscript{1}: omitted, however, by W. B. O.), where so is the sanhita reading for saḥ; and to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before $a$ or a consonant (the lacuna of W. B. O. extends through this explanation), he gives us viśnav e 'hi 'dham (ii.4.12\textsuperscript{8}).

For the teachings of the other Prātiṣṭhakhyas respecting this class of asserted praṇahās, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.81.

7. As also, when preceded by $s$, $m$, $h$, $d$, $th$, and $pit$.

The anuvṛtti of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual. Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former. The meaning is, that an original $o$, preceded as here specified, is praṇahā even when followed by other vowels than $a$. The commentator is in error in saying that $s$ implies okārta from above; he should have said okāro sāṁhitāḥ.

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of praṇahās composed of words whose final vowel, $a$ or $d$, is combined with the particle $u$. Of these, atho is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the Sanhitā. Before $a$ it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision; before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined. Along with it, tatho is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final $o$ after $th$: it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below). The only word showing $o$ after $s$ is $so$, found only in two passages, as noted below. After $m$, we have $o$ both in mo (in two passages, once before $sh$, at i.8.3; the other is cited by the commentator) and in imo, which latter is found only before $a$ (iv.3.13\textsuperscript{6}), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule. The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of: they are $o$ (once, i.4.33), $t$


\textsuperscript{(1)} B. om.
(i.2.5$^2$ and vi.1.8$^4$) and uto (five times), upo (four times), and prō (i.7.13$^6$).

Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the $h$ is made for but a single case of the exclamation ho, which the commentator quotes: upahūtāṃ ho īty āha (ii.6.7$^3$); the $d$ is for the vocative indo, which occurs twice: indo indriyāvatoḥ (i.4.27), and indo īty āha (vi.5.8$^3$): the commentator quotes the latter passage; the pit is for the vocative pito, only found once, as cited: sa no mayodāhāh pito ā vīpaśva (v.7.2$^4-5$): W. B. O. omit the first three words). These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the Sanhitā affords of vocatives in o showing an uncombínable quality.

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the o is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated." As examples of words whose ending is combined with $u$, after the consonants specified, he gives so evāt śā́dī tarsya (ii.2.9$^7$; 5.5$^8$), mā bhī māro mo esāṁ (iv.5.10$^1$), and tathā evo ītyān esāṁ (i.iii.4.9$^7$; W. B. O. omit after uttāra). His counter-examples are patakratāv ud vaṁpaṁ iva (i.6.12$^3$: G. M. omit iva), and pra so agne (iii.2.11$^1$); but G. M., which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it mā so amāṁ avahāya (v.7.9$^1$); their separate application is manifest.

The treatment by the Praśāntākhyā of words ending in o is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules. We should be justified in inferring from its statements that o, to, uto, upo and prō were not regarded as pragrahas at all, nor the vocatives in o except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with īti in the pada text: while, doubtless, in every pada-text of the Black Yajus, as in those of the other Vedas, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombínable quality in sanhitā or not. Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as pragrahas, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text.

8. Now follow cases of $e$ and ī.

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final e and ī from the action of its rules. The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble.

8. athe īty āyam adhikārāḥ: ekārekārāv pragrahatvena vidhīyetē īty ētad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam.

1 G. M. ekāra ikāra. 2 W. O. -yate; B. -yayate; G. M. viśishyate. 3 G. M. om.
9. Asme is pragaha.

The example cited by the commentator is, according to W. B. O., asme te bandhuh (i.2.7); according to G. M., sampatte gor asme sandrāñi (also i.2.7). Neither exhibits in saṁhitā the pragaha quality of the word, as is done at i.7.18* and elsewhere: asme is not uncommon in the Saṁhitā, occurring twenty-nine times.

10. Also tve, when not the final member of a separable compound.

The office of the word tī in this rule is differently explained by the two versions of the commentary: W. B. O. say that it indicates the quality of a separable cited word (they mean, doubtless, of an inseparable); G. M., that it indicates pragaha quality. Each interpretation is as good, and as worthless, as the other. The commentary is not infrequently at much pains to put some special, even wonderful, significance into tī when found in a rule; and generally with as little acceptable result as here.

The pronoun tve occurs seven times in the Saṁhitā (at i.3.14²: 4.36*: iii.1.11; 5.10*: iv.2.7*; 6.5*: vi.1.8*), exhibiting its pragaha-quality in saṁhitā only once (at iv.2.7*). The commentator's instance is tve kratum api (iii.5.10*: G. M. omit api); and his counter-instance, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is anāgatve aditiive ātiva (ii.1.11*: G. M. omit ātiva), where the pada-text reads anāgat-tve: aditiive.

9. asme ity asmin' grahaṇe 'nityasvarah pragraho bhavati, yathā: asme......

G. M. ekasmin.

10. iticapāda inyagrahanañatarvanī dyotayati: anīhyantsas tve ity eha padeh pragraho bhavati. yathā: tve...... anīhyanta iti kim: anto...... inyasya 'neta inyantaḥ: ne 'nyyanto 'niyantaḥ.

G. M. pragrahanātvan. T. W. B. O. write inyag throughout.
Also devote, ubhe, bhágadhe, úrdhve, viçākhe, gráge, ene, medhye, træne, træye, kæniñke, pærçve, çive, co 'tame, eva 'tare, çipre, rathavñare, vatsarasya rüpe, virüpe, vishurüpe, sadohavir-dhāne, adhishavane, ahorátre, durlavrate, stutacastre, rksåme, akte, arpite, rāivate, pärte, prattte, viliñte, anrte, achiñre, bahule, pårvaje, krñadwarn sadane.

For the pragrahas catalogued in this rule—all of them dual cases of feminines and neuters—the commentator quotes illustrative passages as follows. For devote, devate samrudhyā mātram (ii.1.93: the last word in G. M. only). For ubhe, G. M. have achiñre bahule ubhe: vyacavati samvasātham (iv.1.34); but W. B. O., blunderingly, ime eva rasena 'nakti (vi.3.119; B. O. have ubhe for ime): the word occurs also in other passages. For bhágadhe, bhágadhe bhágadhā asmi (ii.5.66): also in the preceding division of the same anuvāka, and at v.5.92. As counter-example, to show that dhe (itself a pada, bhág-a-dhe) would not have answered the purpose alone, we have agna udadhe (v.5.91: pada-text, ud-a-dhe). For úrdhve, úrdhve samidhāv ā daddhāti (ii.6.6 and vi.2.18). For viçākhe, viçākhe nañhatram (iv.4.109): and as counter-example, to show the necessity of including the vi (of viçākhe), we have tasmiñi sahasraçākhe, stated to be found “in the text of another school.” About a score of such alleged citations from “another text,” assumed to have been had in view by the authors of the Prátiçákhyas in constructing their rules, are given in various parts of the commentary (five of them in the comment upon this rule): they will be put together, and their bearing discussed, in an additional note at the end of the work. For gráge, antard gráge taññ devatāh (vi.2.84: only G. M. have devatāh): the word also occurs at i.2.147. The next two words, ene and medhye, occur in the same passage, medhye evaì 'ne karoti (vi.2.91), which the comment quotes, in W. O. giving medhye last, after the rest, by way of justifying the order in which the two words stand in the rule: but G. M. read the whole passage as it stands in the text, and G. M. make the rule read correspondingly medhye ene (T. has, like the others, ene medhye). Ene is also found in one or
two other passages (iv.6.24: vi.2.91 again; 3.96). For trne, asaṁ-
trne hi hanā ato khālu (vi.2.113: only G. M. have the last two
words). For tṛdye, samātrdye dhṛtydi (vi.2.113). For kanikāke,
yad atīrātrā kanikāke agnirātmā yad (vii.2.91: W. B. O. begin
at kan-): the same word occurs twice more in the next division.
For pārve, pārve parahsamādah (vii.3.103): it is found a sec-
time in the same division. For ċive, pitarah somyāsah ċive
no dyāvāprthīdī (iv.6.8: W. B. O. begin at ċive). For co ttame,
vikurinīḥ co ttame upa dadhāti (v.3.75: only G. M. have the last
two words): and, to show the necessity of the co, samvatsaraḥ
saṁpādyo ttame māh (vii.5.31). For evo ttare, tatho evo ttare
nirvupet (iii.4.97): and, to show why eva had to be included in
the rule, nā ti shodacy uttare tena (vii.1.49: only G. M. have
tena). For āśi, pītā āśi āvepayāh (i.4.30: W. B. O. begin
with āśi). For rathantare, yad bhadrathantare anvarjeyuk
(vii.5.32: only G. M. have yad): the same compound occurs in
several places elsewhere. For vatsarasya rāpe, samvatsarasasya
rāpe dpurānti (vii.5.15). For virāpe, samanād virāpe dhāpa-
yete (iv.1.104; 6.52; 7.123). For viśhrūpe, viśhrūpe ahaṁ dyūr
ved 'si (iv.1.119: W. B. O. stop with ahaṁ). The necessity of
including in the rule, besides the pada rāpe, the words vatsarasya,
viśhu (of viśhrūpe), and vi (of vi māpe) is proved by the cita-
tion of arākshitaṁ dṛpa ṅ rāpe annam (iv.3.132), where rāpe is
lative: and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in
the South-Indian MSS.), "the separate specification of the word
rāpe is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enun-
cation." For sadohavirādhāne, sadohavirādhāne eva sam
minoti (ii.5.54): the compound occurs twice more, at vi.2.62; 5.13. To
justify the inclusion of sadah, the commentator quotes uparavā
havirādhāne khāyante (vi.2.111); but the case appears to him one not to be so
easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it,
which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the
connection. For adhisahasane, hanā adhisahasane jihvā (vi.2.114):
it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and
at iv.7.84. The adhi is justified by reference to savanesavan eva
bhī ghrndāti (vi.4.114; 11.13). For ahaṁrā, ahaṁrā prā viṣaṁ
(i.5.97): the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere. The passage
atīrāte papuṭāsaya (vi.6.114) is given to account for the inclusion
of ahaṁ; this implies, of course, that the Tūtīrīya pada-text treats
the word as a separable compound, ahaṁrā. For dhītrārate,
dyāvāprthīvī dhrītrārate dvinnā devi (i.8.122: G. M. omit the last

pratīvīṣaṁaṁ ucchāranāvīsahāśrthāṁ draśṭavyāṁ: sad-
.....: sada iti kim: up-.....: nanu padagrahaṇeshu pa-
dāṁ gaṁyeta (i.50) iti sāmartyād dhaivirādhāne ity ekapa-
syaṁ 'va kāryasiddhiṁ: sadāpādaṁ vyartham. māṁ: 'vaṁ: pa-
dagrahaṇe sthalāntare bhinnarāpasyaṁ sambhāvanāyāṁ vi-
çeṣaṁāṁ sārthakam bhavatiṁ: bhinnarāpaṭvābhāve tu codyam
etuḥ bhavetiṁ. nanu tarhi devate iti padagrahaṇasya sthalāntare
word); and, to account for the inclusion of dhṛta, yasya vrata pustiptatih (iii.1.112). For stutacāstre, stutacāstre evāt 'tena duhe (v.6.89; G. M. omit the last word): it occurs again at vii.3.13. This time, resort is had to "another text" (pākhāntaram) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply pāstre: it is urdhvav pāstre pratishṭhite. For rksāne, rksāne vai devedhīyaḥ (vi.1.31): the word is found twice in this division, and also at vi.5.94; 6.74. Here, again, a passage in "another text," brahma sāme pratishṭhite (G. M. omit the last word, and B. O. omit the sa of sāme), is appealed to in justification of the pr. For akte, pu- rāvad ghitend 'kte vṛṣaḥanaṁ dadhāhīṁ (i.3.71 and [except purāvad] vi.3.58; W. B. O. omit the first word, B. also the last). For arpitē, dyavāpṛthi bhavaneṣeḥ arpitē (iv.7.132; only G. M. have the first word). For rāvate, pākvaravādavate sāmanī (i.8.132 and iv.4.23): the same compound is found again at iv.3.23. For pārte, the different recensions give different examples: W. B. O. have iṣṭāpārte sañj orṣthsam (iv.7.134); G. M., iṣṭāpārte kṛnuṭā (v.7.72): I have noted no other cases: for the treatment of the word in the pada-text see the note to iii.6. For pratte, pratte kānam annadyāvaṁ duhate (v.4.99; G. M. omit the last word). For vidhrte, again, W. B. O. have viḍhrte sarvataḥ (vi.4.102), and G. M. tāmśād nāsiṅkya rakṣaṁvi vidhrte sāmanī (ii.3.81), and the vi is justified by an alleged citation from "another text," agni-dhṛte (G. M., however, omitting the agni, thus leaving it to be understood that the simple word dhṛte is found elsewhere not progra-ka). For ante, satyānte avopasyan (v.6.11). For aṣṭānte, aṣṭānte bahuṁ ubhe (iv.1.32: only G. M. have ubhe), which answers also for bohule: it is the only passage containing either word. For pārdojē, pārdojē pitarāv navyaśibhiḥ (iv.1.114: W. B. O. omit the last word): another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter. Once more a word, pratha- njē, is cited from "another text," in order to explain why the rule does not say simply je (since the pada-text writes pārdo-je). For kṛṇudvān sadāne, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, ārthiḥ kṛṇudvān sadāne rāṣya (iv.1.114: G. M. omit rāṣya), with the counter-example apām eva sadāne sādayāmi (iv.3.1: G. M. omit the last word), to show the necessity of kṛnu- ḍvam.

To return, now, to the long word sadohavirdhāne. The objection is, raised, that its part sadā is unnecessary, and that it would

soma... iti bhinnard̄parvadd̄ viprṣeṇaṁ bhavītavyaḥ: tacc ca nā 'iti. uṣyate: devate ity akhaṇḍapadaśāyai 'va kātyāyihōnad̄ atra viprṣeṇaṁ na yuyate: akhaṇḍavidhānam iti katham pratiyate: te ity asya te mā pātaṁ (iv.42) ity ādīn pṛthakkar- randh iti brāmāh: nāi" varāvahirdhāne" ity asyā" khaṇḍa- tvadātakaṁ "kīciḍ apy" astī yena sadohpadaśāyarthāyam dāmbate". hant...: adhi 'ti kim: suv...: aho...: ahār iti kim: ati...: dyāv...: dhṛte 'ti kim: yasya...: stu-
have been sufficient to say *havirdhāne* simply; for rule i.50 teaches us that, in citations of *padas*, the cited *pada* alone is to be understood, not any collocation of words or letters phonetically equivalent with it: and *havirdhāne* is here a single *pada* (the compound being divided *sadhak-havirdhāne*, while its latter member, occurring by itself as a non-*pragaha*, is written *havth-dhāne*, and so is a congeries of two *padas*). It is replied: not so; a distinctive addition is properly made to a cited *pada*, in case of its occurrence in a different form in another passage; though the objection would hold good, were it not for such occurrence in a different form. But this explanation is not suffered to pass without challenge. In that case, retorts the objector, a distinction ought to be added to *devate*, because it occurs elsewhere in a different form (made up of two independent words), as in *soma deva te matividāh* (ii.2.52.8); and no such addition is made. The answer is, that no distinction need here be applied to *devate*, because its treatment is defined as of an undivided word: and, if you ask how its indivisibility is established, we reply that rule 42, below, treats of *te* as a separate *pada* in the various situations in which it is *pragaha* [whence the inference is clear that it is here an inseparable part of the word *devate*]; while there is nothing whatever to show in like manner the indivisibility of *havirdhāne*, and so to prove the addition of *sadhak* superfluous. The implication is, that if the *pada dhāne* happened to be described elsewhere as *pragaha* after certain other *padas*, of which *havth* was not one, then we could be sure that *havirdhāne* here meant a single undivided *pada*, and its mention by itself would be enough; while, as things are, one cannot be certain that its part *havth* is not, like the *vi* and *vishku* of *virdape* and *vishurtape*, a distinctive addition.
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-----: stute 'ti kim: ārdh---- iti sākhantare: rks----: rg iti kim: brakh---- iti sākhantare: pur----: dyāv----: cākV----: isht----: prag----: vi dh----: vi 'ti kim: agn- iti sākhantare: "sati----: ach----: pārv----: pārve 'ti kim: prag- iti sākhantare:" gir----: ṛṇudhvam iti kim: apām

12. Also amī, caśkūśā, kārshṇī, devatā phalgunī, mushṭi, dhī, nābhi, vaśāśarpan, ahaṇi, jaṃmanī, summīṇi, sāmanī, vāśhnavi, āikśhāvā, darvī, dyāvāprthiṃvī.

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows. For amī, according to W. B. O., amī va idam abhāvan (iii.3.71); but according to G. M., amī tvā jahatī (ii.2.113): I have noted elsewhere only vi.1.51. For caśkūśā, caśkūśā va eke yajñasya (ii.6.21 et al.; G. M. omit yajñasya): the word occurs about a dozen times. For kārshṇī, kārshṇī upānāhā vpa muṇicat (v.4.44; 6.61: G. M. omit the last two words). For phalgunī, pitāro devatā phalgunī nakshatram (iv.4.101): again in the next division of the same section. To show the necessity of including devatā in the rule, is given yad dvītyaṇi sā phalgunī (ii.1.22). For mushṭi, mushṭi karōti vācām (v.2.17 and vi.1.45: G. M. omit vācām). For dhī, pradhī tāv ukhyā madhye (vii.4.112: G. M. omit madhye). For nābhi, rajatānabhi vāṣṭvadeva (v.5.24).

For vaśāśarpan, vaśāśarpani pra harati (vi.3.86): it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section. As counter-example, to explain the presence of vāp in the rule, is given, "from another text," the compound pāpaṣrpani (or, as G. M. read, bhaṃsaṣrpani): our Sanhitā has pāpaṣrpanam at iii.1.82. For ahaṇi, ahaṇi dyāur ivā 'si (iv.1.113). For jaṃmanī, ubhe ni pāsī jaṃmanī (i.4.22). For summīṇi, summānīya summīṇi (i.1.133). For sāmanī, sāmanī pratiṣhthityā (iv.4.25): also at i.8.132. For vāśhnavi, vālasakhanāvā vāśhnavi bhran asī (i.3.2: only G. M. have the last two words). For āikśhāvā, āikśhāvā tiracī (vi.2.15 twice). For darvī, darvī prīṇahā daṇī (ii.2.127 and iv.4.46). For dyāvāprthiṃvī, dyāvāprthiṃvī eka svāna (ii.1.47): the word is frequently found elsewhere. The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, maḥi dyāvā prthiṃvī ca naḥ (iii.3.102 et al.; G. M. omit ca naḥ), as if the inclusion of dyāvā required justification: but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Tāttvīrīya pada-text), dyāvāprthiṃvī is inseparable, and therefore itself a single pada.

प्रवृत्ति १२

15. As also, the preceding word.

That is to say (by the application of rule i.58), the word preceding the last one mentioned in the rule next above, or dyāvāprthiṃvī:

1 G. M. ins. it. 2 G. M. O. bhavanī. 3 W. B. O. om.
The examples given are yāvati dyāvāprthivī mahītvā (iii.2.6\(^1\)), and avināre dyāvāprthivī (i.8.12\(^2\): G. M. invert the order of the two citations): I have noted only two other cases of the application of the rule, at ii.2.12\(^6\); 6.7\(^6\).

न सूचि नित्यम् II १४ II


The case intended to be excluded is quoted by the commentator: paśān evā va rundhe dyāvāprthivī gacha svāhā (vi.4.1\(^1\): W. B. O. omit the first three words and the last). The specification nityam, 'constantly, in all cases,' is intended to exclude also the operation of any other rule under which rundhe might chance to fall: for example, in rundhe yadda suhāram (ii.1.5\(^2\)), where, as preceding yadda, it would otherwise be pragraha by rule 38 of this chapter. I have noted no other case.

सूचिकारंस्यास्तिकत्वयथात्रृप्राप्तितीत्राधार्यती II १५ II

15. Also hari, sahuri, sahūti, kalpayanti, ā prshati, and āhuti are pragraha.

The cited examples are as follows. For hari, hari te yuñjā prshati abhātām (iv.6.9\(^4\): G. M. omit the last two words): it occurs in toward a dozen other passages. For sahuri, sahuri saparṇātī (iv.2.11\(^1\)); and the counter-example, to show the necessity of the sa, tām āhuri kavyante (but O. reads tām, B. kavyate, and G. M. āhuri vačayati), claimed to be found “in another text.” This would imply, of course, that the pada-text reads sahuri—as is in fact the case. For sahūti, sahūti vanatain girāh (ii.3.14\(^1\)); and, as counter-example, for the same purpose as the last, hūti punar juhoti (but G. M. read manur for punar), also from “another text.” For kalpayanti, adhvarāṁ kalpayanti ārdhuvam yajñam (i.2.13\(^2\): G. M. omit the first word, and W. B. O. the last): another case is found at vi.2.9\(^3\). For ā prshati, the passage already quoted for hari, yuñjā prshati abhātām (iv.6.9\(^4\)); and, to justify the ā, the counter-example prshati sthulaprasrati (v.8.12). For āhuti, puroddaśam ete āhuti juhoti (i.5.2\(^3\)-4: G. M. omit the first two words, W. B. O. the last): nearly the same phrase occurs again at

13. caeśāraṇā 'nvādīśtadādyāvāprthivī ity asmat' pūrvo 'pi "kāra ekāro" vā padāntāḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: yāv—
āv—

---

1. G. M. etasmāt. 2. G. M. put before tikhraḥ.

14. rundhe ity antyasaṁravā dyāvāprthivī ity etasmat pūrvo 'pi na pragraho bhavati: paśān—.. nityacabdaḥ prāpyantara-

nishedhārthaḥ: rundhe—..: vidādhi (iv.38) prāptīḥ.

1. W. antarva; B. O. antaḥ ev.. 2. O vidādharvā ukā.
i.5.4. To account for the द in this word, G. M. simply cites हुति as found in "another text:" but W. B. O. give the phrase हुति तुस्माद ववह (but W. O. read हूति, and B. अधाति: W. also has विवा इति instead of एव इति).

पूर्वग्रं ॥ १६॥

16. As also, the preceding word.

Namely etc, occurring before अधाति in the passage already quoted: पुरोहिते एव अधाति (i.5.2: W. B. O. here omit the first word).

वासिन्यपरिश्रोदसि ॥ १७॥

17. Also वाससि, तपसि, and रोदसि.

The examples are: वाससि वा विवासान् (i.5.10; the word is also found at i.8.18); सृक्षाद वा दिक्षातपसि वा रिम्द्वे (vi.1.12: the compound occurs again in the same division: only G. M. have the first two words); and स्म वद रोदसि तायोह (v.1.5: G. M. have dropped out वद): the word is not rarely met with elsewhere.

प्रथम ॥ १८॥

18. As also, the following word.

The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the comment, अन्व इति सूत्र रोदसि वावशसि (i.7.18): there is, I believe, no other falling under it.

15. ....... "eteshu antyasvarah pragrahah syat: harī......
sah...... se 'ti kim: tam...... iti pākhāntare: sah...... se 'ti
kim: hūt...... iti pākhāntare: adhva...... yunja...... 'e 'ti
kim: prsh...... puro...... e 'ti kim: huti...... iti pākhāntare.

1 G. M. ins. ity. 2 B. O. anityah sv. 3 G. M. bhavati. (G. M. akāraṇa.

16. cakārāṇvādeśaḥ अधृति इत्य एत्समत पारो "इकारो एकादो वा
padāntah" pragrahoh bhavati. yathā: pur......

G. M. anūdhisya. (G. M. om.

17. "..... ity etāni pragrahahasmānāni bhavanti'. yathā:
vās...... sāk...... tame......

1 G. M. etā kāra pragraho bhavati.

18. cakārāṇvādeśadāśaḥ "itī etāmāt para "इकारो एकादो वा
padāntah" pragrahoh bhavati. yathā: anv......

1 G. M. -dād ro. 2 G. M. om.
19. Also vyacarvati, bharishyanti, and naḥ prthivi.

The examples are: vyacarvati saṃ varāthām (iv.1.8²); agnim antar bharishyanti jyotishmantaṃ (iv.1.8²: G. alone has the last word); and dyāvā naḥ prthivi imān sidhram (iv.1.11⁴). The needed counter-example for the last is supplied by rejate agne prthivi makhebhyah (iv.1.11⁴).

20. Also in the verses beginning ye aprathetām, urvī, te asya, yanā krandaṃ, chandasvati, te doaranti, and antaṃ.

The commentator cites only the beginning of each verse, as a word with pragraha final occurs at or near the beginning in every case. Thus: ye aprathetām amatībhīh (iv.7.15⁷: there are three other cases of pragrahas in the verse): with the counter-example ye te pañthānāḥ (vii.5.24), to show that ye alone would not have defined the verse; urvī rodasi varivāḥ (iv.7.15⁷: G. M. omit the last word: three cases, besides rodasi, already disposed of by rule 17); te asya yoshāne (iv.1.8²: one more case: the te is therefore made no account of in rule 42, below): with the counter-example te vardhanta svatavasa mahiśvand (iv.1.11²), to show the necessity of asya; yanā krandaṃ awaś (iv.1.8⁴: contains two other cases): and, as counter-example, for a like purpose, yam agne prṣu mar-tyam (i.8.13²); chandasvati uhasā (iv.3.11¹: it contains seven cases); te doaranti (iv.6.6²: also seven cases): with te no avanto havamanagruśāḥ (i.7.8²) as counter-example, to prove that te alone would not be enough; and, finally, antaṃ mitrāvarūṇāḥ caranti (v.1.11²: with four cases).


19. "etehaḥ antyayaśvaraḥ" padāntah' pragrahā bhavati. yadhā: vyacarvati: agnim: dyāvā: na iti kim: rej-

1 G. om. 2 B.-tayā sv. 3 G. om. 4 G. om.

20. etev yēsāḥ kākrā ekāro' vā padāntah pragrahā bhavati. yadhā: ye... aprathetām iti kim: ye te...: urvī...: te...: asya iti kim: te 'v...: yan...: yan...: yan...: yan...: chand...: te a...: doaranti iti kim: te no...: ant...-

1 G. M. put before ikāra.
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That is to say, upasthe is exempted from the action of the preceding rule: it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in māte 'oa putram bibhratām upasthe (in the verse beginning te decharati, iv.6.3: W. B. O. give only the last two words). To show that the would not have sufficiently defined the exception (upa-the), the commentator quotes ye pratishthe (prati-sthe) abhavatām (from the verse beginning with urvī, iv.7.16).

22. Also in the passage beginning with iravati and ending with dādhara.

The passage in question is found at i.2.13², and contains six pragrahas, whereof one, rodast, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above; it also contains a word in e, manave, which is not pragraha, being excepted by rule 54. The commentator quotes its beginning, iravati dhenumati hi bhūtam.

23. And in the passage beginning with purvaje and ending with ayam.

Of this passage, found at ii.6.7³, the commentator quotes the first four words. In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it: hvayate purvaje rāvari ity āha purvaje hy ete rāvari devi devapatre ity āha devi hy ete devapatre upahāto 'yam. It contains ten pragraha endings, of which, however, two (purvaje) fall under rule 11, above. The word d, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (com-
pare Pāṇini ii.1.13)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule; intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word pūrvaj a pra-
graḥa by two separate rules; but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device.

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated. The first objection is: how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with pūrvaj pītārī (iv.1.114) and ends with ayaṃ purobhuvah (iv.3.21: B. O. omit bhuvah). Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of kṛṇu-
dvāḥ sadane (iv.1.114), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous. Objection second: the word pūrvaj, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made pragraha by rule 11; the rule should read “beginning with vārī” (the concluding pada of the separable compound rta-vārī). This, too, is repelled: the rule reads as it stands because vārī occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be: moreover, as we are taught (i.25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit: in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the pragraha character of the first vārī would not be established at all. But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of pūrvaj, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith. Not so, is the defense: pūrvaj is not desig-

etat sthalam etatāt travishayo na bhavati. nanu atra pūrvajegra-
haṇam anarthakam: pūrvajekṛṇuṁ dhvāṁ sadane (iv.11) iti tatrādī ’vo ’katavād: “kiṁ tu” variprabṛty “etavādī ’vam lam. ne ’ti brāmhaḥ: varigrahaṇu devayosambhavāt: kutra vā ’vadhī-
niyamatvena” svākāra” iti saṁdehaḥ syāt: kiṁ ca: āsanaḥ saṁdehe (i.25) iti vacanād uttarāvadhiśaṁnikrśhato” dvitiyava-
rivaṇa eva svākātvaḥ: tathā sati pūrvavariṇuvadasya “pūr-
grahaṇaṁ na syāt: ta’c ca ’nīśṭam. nanu bhavanmava ’pi pūrvajedvayosambhavāt kutra vā grahaṇam iti saṁdehaḥ saṁ-
naḥ: kiṁ ca: yuktāyuktaṁ” anīśṭaṁ ca” saṁdhimān” mā i’van: pūrvaj iti padam atra kārtyabhāktvam no ’cyate ”yena pūnāraktyam bhavet: kiṁ tu pūrvac ca ’sau jepādaś ca pūrvaj: etatprabṛty’tu” upalakshaktvam” ’cyate”. nanu tār-
hy” upahāta iti padam atikramya ’yam ity avadhītvam kimar-
tham” ’cyate: ”upahāta iti padādnam bāhule “’py āsanaḥ saṁdehe (i.25) iti vacanād prāhāsikasya’va grahaṇapiṇḍhāḥ”. mā i’van”: upahāta iti padagrahaṇa” tatra” pūrvavadosehaḥ:
nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11); but it means 'the former je of the two,' and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from! Again: why, at the end of the passage, is ayam pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of upāhātāḥ; for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, "in case of doubt, take the nearest" (1.25), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended. This also is disallowed: to quote the whole compound word upāhātāḥ (pada-text, upa-hātāḥ) would be to incur the charge of excess; and as for upa by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a pada, its pada quality is of secondary rank, while that of ayam is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such]; hence, on the principle "where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place," it was proper to cite ayam. The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [je being also a fragment of a word; and its predecessor hvayaṭe should have been taken instead]. That cannot be made good, is the reply; for there a want of suitableness in the primary word suggested: if you take the primary hvayaṭe, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [je being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in e] will appear to be cited as a pragraha: which is wrong. And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle "not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off," it is better not

upe 'ty etdvamādavasya "dibhātasya" nipaya" padaavatim gīva
nam: ayam ity asya tu mukhyam: mukhye sambhavati na gau
nam ity nyāyād ayam iti yuktam grahaṇam. navo etendā 'va
nyāyānā "dyavadher" anupapannatā. nā 'yam pakṣāḥ: mukhyesambhavadbhūtvā: tathā hi: hvayaṭe iti mukhye nīkṣte
bhividhinīyena tasya 'pi grahaṇaṁ syāt: tāc od nīṣṭhmā: 
ate samānapade (iv.54) iti vacanād etad" anīṣṭān na" bhavatī
ti" cet: prakshāhanād dhi paśkaṣya dārōd aśarpānan
varam iti nyāyād dhvayaṭe ity uccārya tasya nīshedhakathānd
āpi tadāmūrdhramaṇ eva ramāniyam" iti mukhyesambhavā
bhāvo 'vastha" eva: tasmād ammānā sūtre 'nupapatīloṣṇa
nd 'sti.
to quote _havyate_ at all than to quote it and then make it the subject of an exception. The case, then, is one where no suitable primary word is to be found; and not the slightest charge of impropriety can be maintained against the rule as given.

Both parties to this controversy are about equally open to the charge of hair-splitting absurdity; but the objector must be acknowledged to have the right of it so far as this—that the rule is really ambiguous, considering the presence of the two words _pārva_je. That _pārva_je, as used in it, means 'the former _je_,' I do not at all believe.

24. Also _ime_, when followed by _garbhā_, _upa_, and _eva_ _rasena_.

The passages referred to are: _yād ime garbhām adadhātām_ (iii.4.3²: G. M. omit the last word), _ime upāvartasyataḥ_ (vi.1.3¹), and _ime eva rasena 'nakti_ (vi.3.11⁸). Two counter-examples are given: one to show the necessity of _rasena_ after _eva_, _ima eva evā_ _amā lokāḥ_ (ii.4.10²), and one to show in general the need of specifying the situations in which _ime_ is _pragraha_, _adhvartavyād_ _vā_ _ime devāh_ (iii.2.2⁸).

25. As also, in the sections beginning with _krūram_, _āpaḥ_, _sajāḥ_, and _brahma_ _ja_.

That is to say, _ime_ in the sections specified is always _pragraha_, even when otherwise followed than by the words mentioned in the preceding rule. The commentator quotes the beginning words of each section, and a single example from each: thus, from the section _krūram iva vā_ (v.1.5: only G. M. have the last two words), _rodasyor ity āhe 'me vā_ _rodasi_ (v.1.5⁴: the only case in the sec-

24. _ime ity antyasvaro garbhāḥ:_ _upa:_ _eva_ _rasena:_ _evamparāḥ_ _padastāḥ_ _pragrahāḥ syat._ _yathā:_ _yād:_ _ime:_ _ime:_ _raṇe:_ _ti_ _kim:_ _ima:_ _evamara_ _iti_ _kim:_ _ado-hy-._

1 G. M. om.

25. _ime iti caṣa-bdo-‘nvādi-ṣaṭiti:_ _krūram:_ _āpaḥ:_ _sajāḥ:_ _brahma_ _ja:_ 'eteshv _anuvādi savo ity antyasvarah_ _pārvatoparanimittabha-vā_ 'pi _pragraha bhuvati._ _krū-_: _ity atra yathā:_ _rod:_ _āpo:_ _ity atra 'me:' _saj:_ _ity atra yathā:_ _eṣa:_ _brah-_: _ity atra yathā:_ _na:_ _iti_ _kim:_ _brah-_: _ity atra _traya-_: _ity anya_ _pragrahatvam mā bhūd_ _iti._
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tion: B. O. begin the citation at *ime*; from the section *apo varu-
nasya patnayah* (v.5.4: G. M. omit the last word), *ime eva *pa
*dhate* (v.5.4\#1: there are two more cases in the following divisions); 
from the section *saivar abdah* (v.6.4: G. M. omit the last word), 
esta *ime acoming samwarsarah* (v.6.4\#: the only case: only G. M.
have the first word); from the section *brahma jejunam* (v.2.7), 
*nà hi ’me yajushdh ’ptom arhati* (v.2.7\#: the only case: B. O. omit 
the last word). The last calls for a counter-example, to show the 
need of including in the rule the syllable after *brahma*; there 
is another section beginning *brahmagudino vadanty adbhih* (ii.8.5: 
B. O. omit *adbhih*), which contains an *ime* not *pragraha*: *traya 
ime lokah* (ii.8.5\#: only G. M. have *traya*).

**praśa II 26**

26. As also *pārne*.

The *ca*, ‘and,’ in this rule merely brings down the heading of 
the last *anuvāka* named in the one preceding. In that *anuvāka*, 
*pārne* is *pragraha*: to wit, in *pārne *upa dadhiti pārne eva ’nam 
(v.2.7\#); but not elsewhere, as for example in *yo vai pārne adhit-
cati* (vii.8.81).

**śrutī II 27**

27. Also *ādhe* is *pragraha*.

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good: 
*ādhe* is *pragraha* wherever met with. The example given is *yena 
ādhe ugrā pṛthiv ca ādhe* (iv.1.8\#). There is another case at 
iii.2.4\#.

**prīchakre pāre II 28**

28. Also *ghnī* and *cakre*, when followed by *p*.

---

26. *capabdho brahmaśajñanam ity anuvāditati: pārne ity antya-
svaro brahmaśajñanam ity anuvāke pragraha bhavati. yathā: 
pārne....... ’asminn anuvāka* iti *kim: yo......."

---

27. *ādhe ity asmi‘antyatvarah sarvatra pragraha bhavati. 
yathā*: *yena......."

---

vār...... cakre...... papaśe iti *kim: yad...... sam......: 
ghnīcakre iti *kim: sak...... ye...... pakārah* para yābhidyān 
te papaśe.

---
The examples are: vātraghni pūrṇāmāse (ii.5.28); cakre prsthāni (vi.8.1): I have noted no other cases. We have then two pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are pragraha before p only, and only these words before p: the first pair are yad virālapāyā vātraghni sydt (vi.1.67) and samidhāna cakre nicā tam (i.2.142: only W. has tam); the second, pākā bhadumi pāntrah (v.5.18) and yeshāṁ īṣe papupatī (iii.1.41-2).

29. Also nvaṭi.

Two examples are cited: omannati te 'smīn (ii.6.96: G. M. omit the last two words), and vrddhanvaṭi anādasyayām (ii.5.28): also a counter-example, proving that nvaṭi alone would not have been sufficient: karnakāvacya etayā (v.4.72).

30. But not when followed by p.

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is mārdhvanvaṭi puronuvākyā bhavati (ii.6.28: G. M. omit the last word).

31. Samicī is pragraha.

For this word, G. M. cite samicī retaḥ sīnucaṭah (v.5.42); B. O. cite papūt samicī tābhiḥ (v.2.34); W. gives both passages. The word is met with a dozen times or more in the Sanhitā.

29. nvaṭi ity antyaśvarah pragraho bhavati. yathā: om----: vrddh---- nakāreṇa kim: kara----

1 B. antah r; O. antas. 2 B. O. G. M. om.

30. saṁniḍhyāṇa nvaṭi iti 'labhyate: paparo nvaṭi ity antyaśvarah pragraha na bhavati. yathā: mār----

1 B. om. 2 B. antah r; O. antas. 4 B. O. G. M. om.

31. samicī ity antyaśvarah pragraho bhavati. yathā: sam----: pap----

1 B. antas; O. antah r. 2 B. O. G. M. om.

32. saṁniḍhyāt samicī iti labhyate: na khaṭu samicī ity antyaśvaro nakāraparah pragraho bhavati. yathā: sam----

1 G. M. om. 2 W. G. M. om.
32. But not when followed by n.

The case excepted is samīcī nāmā 'si (v.5.10\(^1\)). I have noted no other.

33. "Cī is pragraśa, when followed by yat or prā." 

The passages had in view by this rule are: dīkṣhavit tiraścī yad dhavāviddāh (vi.2.1\(^a\): W. O. omit the first word, G. M. B. the last; and B. has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and prācī prāśam adhvaram (i.2.13\(^b\) and vi.2.9\(^a\)); besides two other cases before pra at vi.2.1\(^b\); 3.9\(^b\). The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples: to show that cī is not always pragraśa, prācī dīcān (iv.3.3\(^1\) et al.: but W. O. read instead yā prācī dīk, which is not to be found in the Sanhitā: prācī dīk, without yā, occurs at several places, e. g. iv.3.6\(^2\)); to prove the necessity of the t of yat and the r of pra, gāur ghrītāc yajñō devā jīgātī (ii.5.7\(^4\): only G. M. have the last two words) and taśmāt pascat prācī patny anv ṅste (v.3.7\(^5\): only G. M. have the first two words); to indicate that other endings than cī are not pragraśa in the situations specified, yad agnī vajra ekādaśini yad aṅgā (v.5.7\(^1\): only G. M. have the first three words) and prajaṇane prajananaṁ hi vāi (i.5.9\(^1\): only G. M. have the last two words).

34. Also ān mahā. 

The passage is mahān mahā astābhāyat (ii.3.14\(^a\)). Elsewhere, mahā is not pragraśa: e. g. in mahā dyāah prthiś ca nāh (iii.10\(^a\) et al.: G. M. omit the last two words); and even after n preceded by any other vowel than ā: e. g. in vaṁnāvid eka in mahā devāya (i.2.13\(^1\) and iv.1.1\(^1\)-2: G. M. omit the last word).

35. cf. ity antyasvaro yatparaḥ prapo yā pragraṣaḥ syāt. yathā. dīkṣh. prā. svampara iti kim: prā. tākārarephābhyyān kim: gāur. tā. iti kim: yad. pra. 

\(^{1}\) G. M. bhave. \(^{2}\) G. M. om.

36. ān ity etadviṣese maṁgraśane 'ntyasvarah pragraśaḥ syāt. yathā: mah. ān iti kim: mah. dākāraṇa kim: vāy. 

\(^{1}\) G. M. bhave.
35. Also the combination of sounds pati.

The commentator explains: wherever there is gruti, i.e. 'hearing' of pati, there we are to understand a case of pragrahaka-quality. Hitherto we have been dealing only with padas, or complete individual words; but the i of pati is uncombineable, even when that audible combination is only a part of a pada. The selected examples are, first, dvātu pati vindate (vi.6.4+) and śubhas pati śdam aham (iii.2.10+; only G. M. have the last word), where pati is a pada; then yam āśirā vampati vāmam asnutaḥ (iii.2.8+; only G. M. have the first two words) and priyam āndrābhaspati (iii.3.11+), where it is part of a pada: there are a few other cases.

It is remarked at the end of the comment, that, from this rule on, parts of words are also subjects of prescription of pragrahaka-quality.

भृ || ३६ ||

36. Also gni.

I have noted a number of cases of gni as dual of agni and its compounds. The commentator gives two: antarāgni paśādām (i. 6.7+), and viṣvāmitrajamadagni vasiekithena (iii.1.7+ and v.4.11+).

न चिपर || ३७ ||

37. But not when followed by hi.

The case excepted is that of gni occurring as nominative singular feminine of āndrāgna: āndragni hi bāhrhaspatyā (v.5.6+). The commentator pleads the occurrence of āndragni havāmahe "in another text," as justification of the rule, in saying "by hi," instead of "by h." But we may question whether the justification is not officious and uncalled for.

वीउद्दातिकृष्णप्रक्रियेवोकासपर || ३८ ||

35. pati ity asya yatra grutiḥ pravanam asti tatra tatra pragrahavām viśyeyam. yathā: dvātu-. . . śubh-. . . . grutir iti kim: yam-. . . . priy-. . . ity ādāv apiḥ padākadesa pragrahavāya+.

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. -ānam.

36. gni iti pragraha bhavati. yathā: ant-. . . . viṣv-. . . .

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om.

37. gni iti sāmnidhyā labhyate: na khalu gni iti 1 padātto hi- paraḥ pragraha bhavati. yathā: āndr-. . . . evampara iti kim: inār-. . . . iti cākhāntare.

1 G. M. ina. apī. 2 G. M. om.
38. Also an ī or e followed by viḍ, dvārāu, krṣṇaḥ, carāvaḥ, and yadda.

The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example. The first is dhishane viḍā satī vidayethām (i.4.12), a double case; and, to show that vi alone would not have been enough, āpaca ca me virudhaç ca me (iv.7.54). Next, devi dvārāu mā mā (iii.2.45), with dvādaśa sam padyaṃte dvādaśa (i.5.73), to prove the need of the rdū of dvārāu. Again, yajñāyā ściṣṭhamānānā krṣṇān rāpaṃ kṛtvā (vi.1.36: only GM have the first word; they also omit the last two words, while B. O. omit kṛtvā); and cātvā re krṣṇavāṇīnām prā syati (vi.1.84: GM omit the last two words) justifies the h of krṣṇāh. Again, vivaśādau ye carāvaḥ (i.5.103), with rāye ca naḥ svaḥ svapāḥ yātva (v.5.44: GM omit deva) to show that ca alone would not have been enough: to prove that more than car or carā is needed, the commentator does not attempt. Finally, we have ajñanā nannmānānaḥ: yade ḍaṃ tāḥ (iv.6.24: only GM have ajñan). To this is raised the question whether yatante, as coming before yad d—in creṇīṣo yatante yad dūkhīrhit dīvin yām (iv.6.74: only GM have the first word), is not also pragyataḥ? The answer is an appeal to rule i.50, “in citations of padae, a pada only is to be understood:” but how we are to know that an integral pada is meant to be signified by yadda, any more than by viḍ, the commentator does not inform us.

39. But not jñāe and anhe, under any circumstances.

The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are varunāya rājne krṣṇāh (v.5.11), and vanapalāṇām eyaḥ naḥ krṣṇāh (v.5.15: only GM have the first words): these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the
introduction here of this one. But the addition of nityam, 'constantly, in all cases,' excepts the same words from the action of any other rule: for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages yajñe 'pi karta r iti tav abhritām (ii.6.71) and svarājña novahādu (v.6.21).

40. Te and the, however, are pragraha in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by ā or ē.

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs. The commentator quotes several instances: etasmin vā etadu mrjute yo vidvishdnavah (ii.2.61-2: only G. M. have the first three words, and they omit the last word); gukā manthindu grhyeta (vi.4.101); pra prthivyā rīricdhe divaś ca (iv.2.111: only G. M. have the first and the last two words); and dr̥ñhanda yaṁ nudithe (iv.7.16). Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding ā or ē, we have given us ā vṛcyate vā etadu yajamānah (iii.3.81: G. M. omit the last word); of a polysyllabic word, tat pravāde vi śhajanti (vi.4.72: see under i.48) and yad ete grhyante (iii.3.61); the restriction to the endings te and the, anucyāmāna ṣāddayati (ii.2.57,111).

As to the special significance of tu, 'however,' in this rule, two of our commentator's three chief authorities, Vararuci and Māhīśeṣya, are reported by him as at variance. The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of pragraha-quality; the latter, that it prescribes the annullment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word nityam. Vararuci's view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class.

40. bahusvarasya padasya sambundhi te iti the iti vā ""kārapūrva ekārapūrvo vā pragraho bhavati. yathā: et..... guk..... pla..... dhṛḥ..... evampūrva iti kim: a vṛṣ..... trīṇi..... bahusvarasye 'ti kim: tat.....: tethe iti kim: anu-..... viḍādi (iv.38) nimittasāpekṣhādānīvantakas tu-ca-badu iti vararucipakṣah: māhīśeṣyapakṣhas tu vakṣyāta: pūrvanātrotkanishedhanityaṣaṣadajādāpūtānurvtiṁ nibhāyati'^ 'ti': tatra vararucimataṁ ruci-rām. bahavaḥ svarā yaśmin tad bahusvaram: ārya. atra svarācābudopādāṇo ca' bahusubbhena vyakṣāhīdho viṇēyāh.

\[1\] W. -ādiya. \[2\] G. M. ins. cābad. \[3\] G. M. ucya-te. \[4\] G. M. -dhan niit. \[5\] G. M. vdr-. \[6\] G. M. om. \[7\] G. M. uṣr. \[8\] W. bahusvarācābudopādāṇi; B. O. bahusvarācābudopādāṇa upādāṇat. \[9\] W. B. O. om.
41. But not śāryāte.

Namely, in the passage śāryāte apiḥaḥ sutasya (i.4.18: G. M. omit the last word). An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word.

42. Te is pragrahā when followed by mā pātam, namāḥ, enam abhi, vāyuḥ, garbham, upa, ahas, and tu.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: vām ā raḥhe te mā pātam ā'eyā (i.2.2:2: only G. M. have the first three words), with te mā 'smin yajña (iii.2.4), to show the necessity of including pātam in the rule; puṇas te: nāmo 'grūte 'prativeddhiyā (i.5.10: only G. M. have the last word), with te na 'vy ājayanta (v.4.11), to prove that na alone would not have been enough; te enam abhi 'sum anahyetām (ii.5.6), with ta enam bhishajyanti brahmanah (ii.3.11): W. omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of abhi; te vāyur 'vy āvāt (iii.4.31), with te vedaḥ striyām (vi.1.5), to show why the vṝh of vāyuḥ was needed; te garbham adadhdām (iii.4.31), without any counter-example to prove that ga would not have answered the purpose; te upā 'mantrayanta (vi.1.31); te ahodātrayōḥ (vi.1.31); te to dva no 'terjye ity abhi (vii.5.7: G. M. omit the last two words), with te te dhamāny upmān (i.3.61), to show that it not followed by u is not enough to determine the pragrahā-quality. Then, as further counter-examples, we have te deviḥ (i.4.10 et al.) in proof that te is not pragrahā before other words than those here mentioned; and br̥had ukṣeh namāḥ (i.4.26), amushmān loka upa cere (v.3.7), and yanti

41. śāryāta ity antyasvarah pragrahā na bhavati. yathā: śār-. . . . pārvasūtraprāptām satyām kaṇṭhoktanishedhām 'nena' vidhiyate.

1 B. 'yaḥ s. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. 'teṣā pr.; B. 'te pr. 4 G. M. 'khyd n. 5 G. M. om.

42. . . . . . . evamparas te iti çabdaḥ pragrahā syāt. yathā: vām-. . . . pātām iti kim: te-. . . . puṇas-. . . . maiti kim: te-. . . . te ev-. . . . abhi 'ti kim: tu-. . . . te v-. . . . yur iti kim: te v-. . . . te ga-. . . . te u-. . . . te ah-. . . . te tv-. . . . ukṝpā kim: te te-. . . . evamprā iti kim: te d-. . . . te iti kim: br̥h-. . . . am-. . . . yanti-. . .

1 W. B. O. 'ma. 2 G. M. om.
vā ete savanādyey ḥah (vii.5.6²), showing that only te is pragraha in the situations defined.

These are not all the instances found in the Sanhitā of te as pragraha: one was disposed of by rule 20 above, and at least one or two others come under the action of other rules of this chapter.

43. But not when unaccented, under any circumstances.

That is to say, even in such a situation as would bring it otherwise under the preceding rule. The example quoted is bāhuḥśyāṁ uṣa te namah (iv.5.1¹): if the text contains others, I have failed to notice them. The specification nityam has its usual force, as suspending the application of all rules to the contrary, wherever found: for example, that of rule 52, below, in the passage nāmas te ostv dyayāhya (iv.5.1⁴).

44. Ete is pragraha when followed by tanuvā, vāi sam, eva, hi, yajña, pad, and ishitak.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: tasyāī te tanuvā (v.7.3); ete vāi sanīvataraṣya cakshūḥ (ii.5.6¹: G. M. omit the last word), with ete vātīdāyī stāndāḥ (i.7.1²: G. M. omit the last word) as counter-example, showing that before vāi not followed by sam the word is not pragraha; sa ete eva namasyann upāḥ dhavaḥ (ii.5.6⁴: only G. M. have the first word, and they omit the last two); ete hi devāṁ (ii.5.6⁵: another case at vii.5.7¹); cakshūḥ vā ete yajnasya (ii.6.2¹ et al.: compare also the nearly identical passage vi.2.11¹); yajnasya hy ete pade atho (v.1.6⁴: W. omits the first word); and yad ete ishitake upadādhati (v.3.5²). Counter-examples would have been in place to show that, in citing the last three fragments of words, the rule had taken no more than just what was sufficient for its purpose; but

43. maś pātam ityādīparo 'pi te ity antyasvaro 'nudattō nityam pragraho na bhavati. yathā: bāḥ— nityam iti kim: laśkaḥāntaraṣprāptasyā 'pi pratisheḍho yathā syāt: na—: gama
mayatobhavataḥ (iv.52) ity adindha práptih.

44. '...... ete ity evamara ete ity antyasvarah" padāntah pragraho bhavati. yathā: tās—: ete—: sam iti kim: ete—:
sa—: ete—: cak—: yaf—: yad—: ete iti kim: atha—: ete iti kim: man—: push—: agre—: sapt—-".


1 B. O. ina ṣte. ² O. -yaḥ sa. ³ G. M. om. ⁴ W. B. O. om.
they are not furnished. The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only ētē is pragrāha before the words specified, and ētē itself before them only, are given by G. M., but omitted in the other manuscripts: they are athā kutama ētē devā iti (ii.6.9a), manuta evā 'nam etāni (v.5.61), pushkaraparne hy enam upaçritam (v.1.44; MSS. -pratam), agrē yajñapatini dhatta (i.1.81), and saptame pade juhoti (vi.1.81).

पर्यः द्वारः: ॥ ८४ ॥

45. As also, the letter following the two last mentioned.

The "two" of the rule are pad and ishtak; and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is pragrāha only when they themselves follow ētē, as prescribed in the preceding rule. He quotes the passages referred to: yajñasya hy ētē pade atho (v.1.634; W. omits to pade, B. O. to ētē), and yad ētē ishtake upadadhāti (v.3.52); adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples saptame pade juhoti (vi.1.81), and tasyādo te devi 'ishtake (iv.2.52).

स्यःपरः: ॥ ८५ ॥

46. Also one followed by sthaḥ.

There is a natural reason for this rule, sthaḥ being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun. I have noted near a dozen cases in the text; the one cited in illustration by the commentator is vishnoh cnyaptre sthaḥ (i.2.133). To show that stha instead of sthaḥ would not answer, is given etasmiṁ lokē stha yuṣmnāṁ te 'nu (iii.2.56: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last three).

पर्योऽभयेः: ॥ ८६ ॥

47. As also, one following them both.

Following, namely, a sthaḥ and a preceding pragrāha word: for example, cilpe sthus te vam ā rabhē (i.2.21; but this citation is wanting in G. M.), and ērde ērde sthāḥ githire uṣmay (i.3.24). A counter-example, of a word following sthaḥ only, is vṛshandū sthā urvact (i.3.71).

45. nimittina upari vartamānayoḥ padishṭakṣadāyoh1 para2 'ikāra ekāro va' pragrāho bhavati. yathā: yaj-.-.-.-. yud-.-.-.-

nimittina upari vartamānayor iti kim: sapt-.-.: tas-.-.-.-.

1 B. O. dvaṣyoh padishtak ity etayoḥ cakārāviṭṭahāyoh; G. M. pat ishtaka ity etayoḥ cakārāviṭṭahāyoh dvaṣyoh. 2 B. O. parāta. © G. M. om.

46. stha ity evampara itkāra ekāro va' padāntah pragrāho bhavati. yathā: viṣh-.-.-. visargena kim: et-.-.-.-.
The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—dvayoh, 'two,' being used in the one, and ubhayoh, 'both,' in the other—indicates a difference of meaning. Above, the two affecting causes (nimitta) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (nimittin), were intended; here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word.

48. Also in the section beginning somāya sva.

The section in question is v.6.21: it was necessary to add sva, in order to distinguish it from that beginning somāya pitrāte (i.8.5). It contains thirteen pragrahās, of which the commentator cites several together: avi dvē dhēna bhāumi (v.6.211: G. M. omit bhāumi): three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following.

49. Also dvē.

This word, which occurs about forty times in the Tāttirīya text, is, of course, always pragrahā. The commentator cites two instances: dvē dvē sam bharati (i.6.82), and yad dvē nācye tām (ii.6.32).

47. ca kārdvānaśīkṣayoh pārvasātroktanimittanimittinor ubhayaḥ paraśa ekāro vā paddantāh pragraham bhavati. yathā: slim...... dhāre...... ubhyore iti kim: vṛṣeh...... paraś ca dvayor (iv.45) iti 'vācya ubhyore iti caddantaram arthāntara-jñāpakaṃ' nimittahālakayoḥ pārvasātroktayor nimittayoh paraś pragraham bhavati: paraś ca dvayor (iv.45) iti sūtrārthaḥ: ātra tu's cātre nimittanimittinar ubhyore paraś pragraham syād iti viseshaḥ' bhedo vijñeyoḥ.

48. somāya svadājīne (v.6.21) ity asminn anuvāka tkāra ekāro vā paddantāh pragraham bhavati. yathā: avi..... ity ādi. sve 'ti kim: somāya pitrāte (i.8.5) ity ātra ma bhūd iti.

49. dvē ity antyasaṣṭhī paddantōḥ sarvatra pragraham bhavati. yathā: dvē...... yad......

1 G. M. pūrva-kā. 2 B. ins. kim ca; O. ins. ca. 3 G. M. -tāpa-gravya-h. 4 G. M. -kā. 5 G. M. -tāha. 6 G. M. -tām. 7 G. M. -āśīlakayo. 8 B. -shāpa; O. -shāpa; G. M. uṣhāya. 9 G. M. duśāhāya.

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. O. om.
50. As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one: *dve sukle dve krihne mūrdhanvatiḥ* (v.3.14: G. M. omit the last word). Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail.

51. Likewise the next but one.

The aṣṭi, “likewise,” in this rule, is explained as bringing forward *dve* from the last rule but one; another application of the “principle of the frog’s leap.” The cited examples are *dve hy eṣa devate* (ii.1.19: but G. M. omit this citation), and *dve vāy mā devate* (vii.4.51). By rule i.48, *devasatre*, though a divisible compound (*pada-text, devasatre iti deva-satre*), is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept: another like case, *dve sa-vane sukravati* (vi.1.16), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule. At vi.6.43 (*dve jāye vindate*) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv.54.

52. Before, and within six words of, *gamayataḥ, bhavataḥ* (except when it follows *ti*), *tanā yat, akarat, kuryāt* (in *ishti* passages), *abṛtām, pra varā, ṛṣṭām, stāhṇād, vācāya, bāḥrās ta, agnim gāyatram, tābhyām eva, ubhābhyyām, and avāntaram.*

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity; in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental.

The *ti* in the rule is declared to be intended this time “inclusively” (*tena saha, ‘along with the specified limit’*; compare the scholiast to Pāṇini ii.1.13); and the necessity of the specification

---

50. *cakāro dve ity avādi paṭi: dve ity etasmāt para śūkra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragrahaī bhavati*. yathā: *dve......*  
1 O. om. 2 B. O. nyāt; G. M. om. 3 G. M. om.

1 B. O. -vahito. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. om. 5 W. vyavahita.
“within six words” is explained as arising from rule i.30, which would limit the meaning of “before” to “the word standing next before.” This involves a misinterpretation of the rule referred to, which was made for quite another purpose (see the note upon it). No such special and technical ground is needed to justify the terms of the present rule, which are of obvious and incontestable propriety.

The commentator’s example for gamayataḥ is te eva ‘nam pratishtāṁ gamayataḥ (ii.1.47): I have noted no other case. For bhavataḥ, he gives uttaravati bhavataḥ (v.4.8); with the counter-example dīksante ‘tanāmāṇdv tvā bhavataḥ (vii.4.8), to show the necessity of the restriction imposed by the rule in the case of this word. There are quite a number of other passages where bhavataḥ assures the pragṛha-quantity to words in its neighborhood: I have noted ii.2.3,11a–5; 3.2a,3a,4a,5a,8a; iii.1.7a,9a; 5.4a; v.4.6a; 5.12; vii.1.4a; 2.13 twice. With regard to the limitation anākārē, the commentator remarks that although simple absence is the primary significance of its negative prefix, yet another meaning is here assumed, in accordance with the requirements of the case: that is to say, “after a not-ā” is to be understood as ‘after any letter but ā.’ For tānā yat, we have ete vāi mahāyajñasya nitye tānā yat (ii.2.7); I have found no other case); and, as counter-example, to justify the inclusion of yat, pariḥataye tvā grīhāmi tānāpātre tvā (i.2.10: only W. has the last word). For akerot, budhnavati agravati yajyāṇvākye akerot (ii.3.4a; another case at ii.2.8a). For kuryāt, mānavo tānā dhāyye kuryāt (ii.2.10a; another case at ii.3.3a); with the counter-example agraya dātre purodāsām ashtākāpālaṁ kuryāt (ii.5.5a), to explain the restriction to īṣṭi-passages. The īṣṭis are defined as being “the three pragṛhas beginning with the tenth, but excepting their final anuṇākas” (which have before received the designation yajya); that is to say, ii.2.1–11; 3.1–13; 4.1–13. There are other passages besides the one quoted proving the necessity of the restriction in question: thus v.4.7; vii.5.5. For abratāṁ is cited & abratāṁ varain yajvālāḥ (ii.5.2a,6a; another case at v.2.3a). For pravartaḥ, havardhane prdo pravartayeyuḥ (iii.1.31); with the counter-
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example te 'dityaṁ sam adhriyanta tvayā pra jānāme 'ti (vi.1.5 : G. M. end at pra), to show why varta was added to pra. For āstām, ime vāi sahaś 'stām (iii.4.3 : another case at iv.3.10). For stabhāntām, vāivadevāṃnārute ukthe avathayanti stabhāntām (iv.4.2). For vācayati, uttame adhumbari vācayati (v.1.102-3). For bibhrtaś ta, te eva yajamānasya reto bibhrtaś taṃmāt (v.6.8); with the counter-example manmāhe yāv atmanvad bibhrta yāv (iv.7.155), to show that bibhrtaḥ alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule. Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of ta eva in the Sanshitā which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one. For agnīṃ gāyatraṃ, etc dadhāte ye agnīṃ gāyatraṃ (vi.3.54); with the counter-example sadhasthe gñim purīshyam (iv.1.31), to show that the addition of gāyatraṃ was needful. For tābhāyām eva, etc vāi yajānasya 'rijasyanti sṛuti tābhāyām eva (vii.2.12 : 3.53, 7.9 ; 4.1.3, 2.4, 9). With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that etc, one of the words intended to be determined as pragraha, is not within six words of eva, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its pragraha-character within that distance; but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (nimitta) is within reach of that cause in its entirety. For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part: for example, people say “Devadatta has an ear-ring,” when it is really his ear that has the ring. Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the eva is proved by the counter-example apa hāṣya agne tābhāyām putema (iv.7.19 : G. M. omit the last word). For ubhābhāyām, ye dve adhūrāt eva te ubhābhāyām (vii.4.44). Finally, for avāntaram, utṣṛcje ity āhum ye avāntaraṃ (vii.5.71); with the counter-example sam te 'va te hedaḥ (ii.5.121), to prove that eva would not have been enough alone.

58. But not grāmi, varcasi, mithuni, māse, loke, dhatte.
These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be \textit{pragrahā} if not thus specially excepted. The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows: \textit{grāmy evo bhavati ganañvāte yādjīyāvām kye bhavatāh} (ii.3.3\textsuperscript{a}; another nearly identical case is found at ii.2.11\textsuperscript{a}); \textit{brahmaśocayā eva bhavatī udbhayato rukmīṇa bhavatāh} (ii.3.2\textsuperscript{a}); \textit{atha mithunī bhavatāh} (vi.5.8\textsuperscript{a}); \textit{pārṇamāse prāyacat tāv abrātām} (ii.5.2\textsuperscript{a}); \textit{loke pratīśīhate yanti dvāu shadāhū bhavatāh} (vii.4.11\textsuperscript{a}); and \textit{dhatte jyotishmantāv asmā imādi lokāu bhavatāh} (ii.6.2\textsuperscript{a}).

54. Nor \textit{ate}, in a single word, nor \textit{ave}, under any circumstances.

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications "in a single word" and "under any circumstances" as both alike referring to each of the "parts of words" mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows: \textit{ava rundhate tirātrāv abhito bhavatāh} (vii.2.6\textsuperscript{a}; 4.1\textsuperscript{a}, 2\textsuperscript{a}, 3\textsuperscript{a}; another nearly identical case is found at vii.4.5\textsuperscript{a}); \textit{abhadhvāyate vajram enam abhi prā vaṁtyate} (iii.2.9\textsuperscript{a}; 7); and \textit{anātāt-ya dhrahāvane: udbhābyām aha te namah} (iv.5.1\textsuperscript{a}: B. O. omit the last word, and G. M. the last two). To show the necessity of specifying that \textit{ate} should form part of a single word, he quotes \textit{eva te udbhābyām} (vii.4.4\textsuperscript{a}). The limitation \textit{nityam}, 'under any circumstances,' is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (iv.52) here especially aimed at: for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule i.59, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point.

53. \ldots eteshv' antyasvaro gamayato bhavata ityādiparo 'pi pragrahā na bhavati. yathā: grā:- brah:- atha:- pār:- loke:- dhatte:-

1 G. M. esh. 2 G. M. om.

54. nishhedham cakāro 'nvāḍi-carita. ate: aye: ity anayoḥ padāb-

darṣaẏatvar antyasvaroḥ samānāpade vartamāno gamayato bhavata ityādiparo 'pi nityam pragrahā na bhavati. yathā: aya- 

...... abhy-...... anā:- samānāpade iti kīṃ: eva-...... atra nityapadbādḥ prātyantaraparidhrārthāh. udāharanām upa-bā- 

\textit{dhas tu deśāya} (i.59) iti sūtra pranaṁ dād uktam. samānām 

eca tat padam ca samānāpadam: tasmin sāmānāpade

\textit{iti triḍhāshyaratne pratiṣṭākyavivaraṇe} 

caturtho dharmāyaḥ.

1 O. om. 2 G. M. iti sād. 3 W. sātreyya. 4 G. M. om.
This finishes the rehearsal of the words with pragraha-endings contained in the Sanhitā. As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence: it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form. Nor can I, without a pada-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed. It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in o, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete: my exception of the text has shown me no pragraha-endings in i and e which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final i or e not pragraha as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept. One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being pragraha are disposed of in another chapter (x.18).

CHAPTER V.

CONTENTS: 1–2, introductory, relation of pada and sanhitā texts; 3, order of application of rules; 4–8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and d; 9–10, anomalous conversions of r and h; 11–19, anomalous omissions of v, s, h, m, and yd; 20–24, treatment of final n and t before palatal letters; 25–26, before l; 27–31, of final m before a consonant; 32–33, of final n, t, n before sibilants; 34–37, of initial r after consonants; 38–41, of initial h after consonants.

ānath sāṅghitāyāmikprāyānāvāc || 91 ||

1. The following rules apply in combined text (sāṅhīḍ), within the compass of a single breath.

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the Prātiṣṭhākyā—the rules for the construction of the euphonically combined text (sāṅhīḍ) from its presupposed material, the pada-text, where

1. athe 'ty ayaṃ adhikārāḥ: sāṅhitāyām ekāprāṇabhāva ity etad adhikrtam neditavyam ita uttaram yad vākṣyāmaḥ. sanhitē 'tī ko 'rthāḥ: nānāpadasmādhānasanyogāḥ (xxv.3) itī 'sātram 'titaḥ sāṅhitārthāḥ: parāḥ samāñkarṣah sanhitē 'tī vāyākaranāḥ 'prāthanti'. ekāsmutthāḥ prāṇa ekāprāṇāḥ: tasya bhāvas tadbhāvāḥ: tasmā ity ātreyamatam anyathā 'pi sanāsaḥ suṅgachate: ekāprāṇaṇa bhāvyatā ācāryātā ity ekāprāṇabhāvāḥ: ekeno 'chāyama yādācu ātreyam pradabhāgās tāvān ekāprāṇabhāva ity yathā: ||
each word stands separate, as if occurring independently. It is a rule of far-reaching force, applying through many chapters (for an attempt to define precisely how far, see the comment to xxiv.2). The matters treated in the first two chapters—the mode of utterance of elementary sounds, definitions, general explanatory precepts, and the like—were with propriety first disposed of; the separate rehearsal of the prāgraṇa-endings, made in chapter iv., is more questionable, but defensible on the ground that those endings exhibit their prāgraṇa character also in the pada-text, before it: but the exclusion of the vowels irregularly protracted in saṁhitā, as rehearsed in the third chapter, is quite anomalous (see note to iii.1).

The commentator defines saṁhitā by quoting a later rule (xxiv.3), which declares it to be "the union of separate words in euphonic combination;" referring at the same time to the rule of Pāṇini (i.4.109), as the account of it given by "the grammarians." For ekapraṇābhāve he first gives us Atreyā's simple paraphrase; but then goes on to explain it more fully, as "that which is brought about, generated, uttered, with a single breath; such portion of the Veda, namely, as is uttered by the help of one expiration"—the condition of pada, or separated and euphonically independent words, recurring with the pause that follows the expiration. That is to say, if the repeater of the text has to pause to take breath where there is no regular anusāna, or pause of interpolation (such as separates the pādas of a verse: its length is taught in rule xxii.13), his last word is thrown out of saṁhitā with the next, and the end of the one and the beginning of the other must assume their pada form.

Now is interposed an objection: of what use are the two specifications "in combined text" and "within the compass of a single breath?" the former is enough by itself. To this it is replied: if the latter specification were not made, then no pause after a pada would be authorized in the continuous saṁhitā arrangement: and if the other were not made, then that respecting the single breath would apply also to the pādas; hence doubt would arise as to where any direction to be given would have force: there is, therefore, good reason for the double specification.

dhiḥ. nanu saṁhitāyām ity etāvatāt 'vā' 'lam: ekapraṇābhāva iti vā ubhayādrambhāvanā' kim. ucyaite: ekapraṇābhāva ity andrābhyaṁdane pravṛttasya saṁhitāvidheḥ padāvāsanātvam ne 'bh-yate: saṁhitāyām ity anārāhyamāne tu padesv apy ekapraṇā- bhāva upapadyata iti; vakṣhyamānāni kāryān kva bhavati 'ti sanātakāh syād: tasmād asminn ubhayādrambhāne pravṛ-jñānam aṣṭi.

2. Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text.

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr., sanhitā pada-prakṛtiḥ, ‘the pada-text is the foundation of the sanhitā;’ but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary. The latter explains that hereby is taught the prakṛti, or proper form, of sanhitā, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv.8) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, “prakṛti, vikrama, krama.” An arrangement which does not deviate from the pada-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text. By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x.13, below; passages in which the fundamental or pada form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of combinative combination: they are svadāḥ any urvī ca ‘si (i.1.98), dhunāṇaṃ śva prapāti aṣi (ii.5.124), sahasravāya pramāṇa aṣi (iv.4.118): G. M. put this citation before the preceding one, pra bhadriyād itare (iv.3.138), jyā īyān samane (iv.6.63), pāśkā etu (ii.4.51: W. B. O. omit this), and aminantu evātā (iii.1.118). No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand: we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of sandhi being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in sanhitā in their regular or natural shape as shown in pada-text—prakṛtyā, as it is elsewhere termed. And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv.5.

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of avicāritaḥ, ‘unremoved, not deviating,’ as connective between vidhiḥ and yathādyuktāt. I would sooner recour to the etymologic meaning of vidhi, ‘dis-posal, putting apart,’ and empha-

2. prakṛtiḥ sanhitāsvārāpam aneno 'cyate: prakṛtir vikramaḥ kramaḥ iti viṇeyatavaśvārāpam 1. yathādyuktāt 2. yathāsāntaḥ pada-prakṛśad kūtaśhād avicārito 3. yo vidhiḥ sa prakṛti-sanhitā viṇeyāḥ: vidhīr vidhānam prakṛtir ity arthāḥ. yathā: svā...- dhan...- sah...- prā...- jyā...- pū...- am...- atra sūtra pada-prāpyā, parasparātpaṇyā, mahābhāṣyā-vacanāḥ ca viṇeyāḥ: tuc ca vacanaṃ tā varṇapraṇātayāh (ii.7) ity atra pāthanī: evam atra 'pi svārātyāor mādhya yatra nīcam (xix.1) ity dādū mantavyām.

---

1 W. viṇeyatavaśvārāpam; B. -svāra vi.; G. M. viṇeyatavaśvāra vi. 2 G. M. -thdayā. 3 G. M. -cārīna. 4 W. B. O. -dā s. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. -cārīna. 7 G. M. om. 8 O. G. M. -pāthitām. 9 G. M. anayād.
size its prefix vi sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning ‘separation from [the state] as combined,’ and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither vidhi nor its synonym vidhāna occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning ‘rule, prescription;’ not infrequently also ‘arrangement, disposal.’

The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of sa, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the Mahābhāṣya in explanation of a like case (under ii.7); and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix.1.

तत् पूर्वपूर्व प्रथमम् ॥ २ ॥

3. And here, that which comes first is first taken.

That is to say, in the construction of the saṃhītā text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the Prātiṣṭhāna respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in bhakshā: ā: ihi (iii.2.5), the first two words are first combined, according to x.2, and then their result, bhakshā, is combined with ihi, by x.4, making bhakshē”hi, the true reading; whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming ehi, this would have coalesced with bhakshā into bhakshā ēhi—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated; for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the saṃhītā-reading śaṅnavatyaḍi (vii.2.15) from the pada-reading śatnavatyaḍi: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii.2, which prescribes the conversion of n to n after śat, and of viii.2,

3. tatra saṃhītāvidhānena pārvamātavam padam sūtrān ca prathamaṁ kartavyaṁ. yathā: bhakṣaḥ: ā: ihi: ity atra dirghaṁ samānākṣhare (x.2) iti dirghaḥ: bhakṣaḥ: ihi: iti sthita ivarṇapara ekāram (x.4) ity ekāre kṛte bhakṣe”hi”hi ti bhavati: anyathā”hi”hi ti kṛte bhakṣapadeśe saṃdhīyamāne bhakṣā”hi”ti syāt: tae cā ‘nissītam: pārvapadakartavyathā etad udgharanam. pārvasutrakartavyatve pi vaddāmāḥ: yathā: saṅñigrāmanāsāhā (vii.2) iti nakārasya nāvve kṛte uttamaparāt uttamaṁ savargyam (viii.2) ity anena tākārasya nāvve kṛte śaṅnavatyā iti bhavati: anyathā”tātmaparā uttamaṁ (viii.2) iti sātre prathamam pravṛtte suti śaṅnavatyā iti syāt: tae cā ‘nissītam: tathā: vāṭṭh”svayamabhi-gārītaye ity atra ṣaṅkārapūrvas ca takāraḥ (v.33):
which changes t before n to n: if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing shot to shan, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood shannavatya. The next case is that in which the words vat and svayamabhigataya come together (ii.2.8 seven times: G. M. read vasvat for vat, doubtless by a clerical error). Here, v.33 requires the insertion of a t between the t and s, and this inserted t is then, by xiv.12, made th; so that we are finally to read vasath svay-. If the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead vasath svay- (since v.33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination thsv would be prefixed a t of duplication, by xiv.1.5: the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly: and W. B. even make the blunder of substituting at last vat svadh, apparently having in mind -vdt svadh, in the same division). Once more, in the passage imam: vi: sydmi (i.1.10 and iii.5.61), we are first to convert the s of sydmi to sh by vi.4, and then to duplicate the sh by xiv.1, making vi shshydmi: if the duplication were first performed, making vi ssydm, then, by rule vi.4, we should have to read vi shshydmi. Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise.

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr. (ii.2) and Ath. Pr. (iii.38) have rules of like force with the present one.

4. After trapu and mithu is inserted a ç before c.

prathama ashtamaparo dvitiyam (xiv.12) iti sutradvayam prasaktam: tatra purovati tanakara pravas ca takara" ity etad eva prathamam kartavyam": anyatho "vasath svayam iti" syat: tac c"n shyaath. athavâ: imam vi shshydmi ty atro 'pa-sargani shya prvo nuddte pade (vi.4): svaraparva vyayjanai "dvivarnam vyayjanaparam" (xiv.1) iti sutradvayam" praptam: tatra dvitvastre "prathama kurye sati" "vi shshydmi" iti syat: tan ma bhud iti shava eva prathamam kartavyam.

purgamaparam iti "vipes sarvathit" 'vam artham samartha-
yati".

1 G. M. ins. tena. 1 W. drena. 1 W. dena na. 1 W. O. om. 1 B. O. om. 1 B. O. om. 1 B. O. om. 1 B. O. om. 1 B. O. om. 1 G. M. vashath; B. vata; O. vdt. 11 G. M. om. 11 O. M. put before prathamam. 12 G. M. vut svadhe tI; O. vut svayam iti; G. M. vashaths svayam iti. 14 G. M. om. 15 G. M. om. 16 G. M. prathamam krte. 17 G. M. ins. imam. 17 B. G. M. shydmi. 18 G. M. vipesya sarvatrai 'tad ahd 'yam iti samartaniyam; B. vipes sarvatrai 'vam artha-
yati. 19 O. sarvatrai.
The passages are svaṁ ca me trapuṣ ca me (iv.7.5), and mithuḥ carantam upayitī (iv.7.15): the existing pada-text reads trapu and mithu, as this rule would lead us to expect. But the right of trapu to be recognized as an independent word by the side of trapu is assured by the derivative adjective trāpuṣa, and the close analogy of manu, manus, mānusha.

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: one, vi-bhu ca me prabhū ca me (iv.7.4.1-2), to show that not every u has a s added before s; the other, asinā mithā kah (iv.6.94), to show that the insertion is only made before s, after the words specified.

5. As also after su, before candra.

The example quoted by the commentator is svaṁca ndra dasma viśpate (iv.4.4): the word occurs once more, at ii.2.127. The pada-text reads su-candra. Counter-examples are: pṛa candra-mās tiratī dirgham dyuh (ii.4.14: G. M. omit the last two words), and ā mā su ca rīte dhaja (i.1.12): their application is obvious.

9. After sam is inserted s before kuru.

The commentator's example is yajamānaḥ saṁskurute (v.6.6 and vi.5.5). The pada-text reads sam : kurute. Counter-examples are puroddāpān alai kurv iti (vi.3.12: G. M. have a lacuna involving this passage), and saṁskṛtya chāvākasānam bhavati (v.4.129). The text has further saṁskṛtya and saṁskṛta, but (as is also implied in rule xvi.26) they are read in the pada-text as in saṁkhyā, without division, or ejection of the intruded s.

---

4. trapu: mithu: evampārvaḥ pākāra ḍagamo bhavati caparaḥ: yathā: sti—... mith—... evampārva iti kim: vi—...: evampara iti kim: as—...
1 G. M. ca kārap-

5. ca kāraḥ  pākāraḥ anvādiṣati: suṁpārvaḥ pākāra ḍagamo bhavati candraparāḥ. yathā: su—... evampārva iti kim: pra ṣ...: evampara iti kim: ā mā... sv iti esha śabdaḥ pūrvo yasmād asā suṁpārvaḥ.
1 G. M. om.

6. sam ity evampārvaḥ sakāra ḍagamo bhavati kurupaḥ. yathā: yaj—... evampārva iti kim: 'pur—...: evampara iti kim: saṁ—...: kurupa bahi paro yasmād asā kurupaḥ.
1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om.
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7. And before _akurva_, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, _ta ışhuṇ sam akurvata_ (vi.2.31); the _pada_ text reading _sam: akurvata_. The counter-example is _agnihotraṁ vratam akurvata_ (iii.2.22). As _pratyaya_ occurs nowhere else in the treatise, we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively ‘augment,’ or, as in other of the Práti-gákhyás, ‘affix’ in general. The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating “that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct.”

8. After _nīcā_ is inserted _d_ before _uccā_.

The passage is _madhyān nīcād uccā_ (ii.3.14); and the _pada_ text actually reads _nīcā: uccā_. This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the _pada_-texts of the other Vedás. To write _madhyena_ for _madhyād_ just before would be in itself quite as defensible. As counter-examples, we receive _lokāṁ yanti uccāvocā 'hni_ (vii.4.36), and _nīcā tam dhakṣi_ (i.2.142).

At the end of the comment is made the remark “the above are cases of insertion” ( _dgama_ , ‘accession’). The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up.

9. After _asam_, _r_ becomes _ar_.

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is _grhānām asamartyaśi_ (iii.3.82), where the _pada_ text has, as the rule implies, _asam_ - _ṛtyā_. Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the _pada_ text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the _asam_ intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not _-a sam_); else such passages as _kalyāṇī rāpasamṛḍhā_ (vii.1.66), and _vahī hy eṣa_
v. 10.] Tātātipya-Prajñākhyāya and Trībhadāhyaratna.

samrādhyāī (ii.2.21) would be included. As counter-example, to show that r, not a syllable containing r, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted asaṁtryṇaś hi handā (vi.2.113: G. M. omit hand).

10. Of ṣcīḥ, dhūḥ, and suvaḥ, when first members of a compound, the visarjaniya becomes r, and a following s becomes sh.

The word avagraha in this rule is the locative avagrahe, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words, taken separately. He supplies visarjaniya, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule. The illustrative passages quoted are ity āśir-padaya rod (vi.2.94; the pada-text reads āśiḥ-padayaḥ), dhūṛṣthā-
v ānaśrā (i.2.82; p. dhūḥ-saḥāu), and dādhishe svaraśāṁ jī-
v ānam ugne (iv.4.41; p. suvaḥ-sām: W. B. O. omit the first word of the citation, G. M. the last). The necessity of the specification “when first members of a compound” is shown by the counter-example ye devā devasvau sāhu te (i.8.102: p. deva-shuaḥ: G. M. omit the first two words and the last). Āciḥ shows the same irregular combination also in adācākṣena and sācākṣena (i.6.104), but these words are not treated as divisible by the pada-text. The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one: viii.23 would require ṣcīḥpadayaḥ, and ix.2

9. asam ity evampūroa ṣkāro 'ram vikāram āpadyate. yathā:
ṛgh—.... tatra nimitam ekapadasthamā viṁśayam: anyathā
kaly—.... vaḥ—.... ity adhā api bhavet. ṣkāra iti kim:
asam—....

1 G. M. O. atra. ² B. -dasaṁasthamā.

10. avagraha iti saptamāntam padam āśiḥpraḥṛtibhiḥ pra-
tyekam abhisambadhyaṭe. ṣcīḥ: dhūḥ: suvaḥ: ity ετεσα ṣvā-
graheśu visarjaniyo repham āpadyate: ebhyāḥ3 para yadi sa-
kaśa ā vartate tarhi shakāram āpadyate. yathā: ity—.... dhūr-
.....: dādhi—.... avagraha iti kim: ye..... kakhapakāra-
parah3 (viiii.23) ity anena "ṣcīḥpadaye iti prāptam: 'aghosha-
paras tasya saśānam āśīhānam (ix.2) iti ṣcīḥpadayaḥ suva-
svānām11 iti ca prāptam: tadubhayābahāṅgāya 'yam drambhāḥ.

11. Now for cases of omission.

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 19, below, inclusive.

12. A m is dropped, when preceded by ım.

The passage aimed at is ım 'andrā suprayasah (iv.1.8² : p. ım : mandrā); it is the only one of its kind in the text. The Vājasesneyi-Sahhitā reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii.15) ım mandrā. To treat the loss of a m here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable. The particle ım is reduced to ı in quite a number of Rik passages, and before other letters than m: they are duly noted in the Prātiṣākhya (Rik Pr. iv.36). A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator: ım 'm me varuna (ii.1.11⁶) shows that m is not dropped after another m in general; agnim mitram varunam (ii.1.11⁴), that m after short ı does not exercise the specified effect; ımkarāya svāhe "nīkṛtāya (vii.1.9¹), that ım elides no other consonant than m. The yet farther restriction is applied, that ım here is a padagrahāṇa, 'the citation of a complete pada,' for otherwise there would be an elision of a m in such cases as prthivim mā hīśih (iv.2.9¹); G. M. add the further example ıtā gravasā prthivim mitrasya, which I am unable to find in the Sahhitā.

11. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: lopa ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣhayāmaḥ. ayam adhikāras tishṭhanty ekacya (v.19) itisātraparyanto veditavyah.

12. makāra ım ity evampāro lupyate. yathā: ım..... evampāra iti kim: ımam..... dirghena kim: agn..... ım iti padoagrahānān: itaratāḥ prthī-. ity ıtā ita makāro lupyetaḥ. makāraḥ* iti kim: ım.....

¹ G. M. om. ² W. ṣacarṣṇaḥ. ³ G. M omayath. ⁴ G. M. -yate; and add tac od 'nīḥd. ⁵ W. -rapa.
13. A v is dropped when preceded by tu or nu, in case these are accented.

It is when the particle vāi, or vāva, follows tu and nu that this anomalous mutilation is made. The commentator quotes sa tu 'di yajeta (ii.6.63 and vii.1.31: p. sah : tu : vāi), and in nu 'á upastirnām ichanti (i.6.7: p. it : nu : vāi). The same sandhi of tu and vāi is not infrequent elsewhere (the passages are i.7.14, 82: ii.2.4, 5.41: iii.2.92; 3.92; 5.13: v.5.94: vi.4.31: vii.2.103); that of nu and vāi is comparatively rare (only at i.5.90 twice); that of tu and vāva I have found only once, at vii.5.86. Here, again, it would seem better to regard the final u as suffering elision, instead of the initial v. The specification "if accented" is explained as intended to exclude such passages as anu vṛtrahatye (i.6.121; 7.131), where anu would fall under this rule by i.52 (even if the nu here, like the sm in the preceding rule, were regarded as a padagrahānam). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are idāṃ vām āye havīh (iii.3.111), and pra tu janayati 'ti (i.7.24) and viduṣho nu yajñāṃ (i.3.13.12).

14. A s is dropped after ut, when a consonant follows.

The commentator’s example is praty uttābdhāyāt sayatrāya (vi.6.4: p. ut-stabāhyāt). This is, so far as I have discovered, the only case in the Sahitya from the root stabh: similar forms from sthā occur variously (anāṭhāya, iii.4.103; upotthāya, vii.1.68; 5.15.12; uṭṭhāsyant, vii.1.193; uṭṭhita, vii.1.193; 2.93; and uṭṭhāṇa, vii.2.1 thrice). As counter-examples are given jagatsthā devāḥ (ii.1.114), utkṛṣṭayate svāhā (vii.1.193), and uṣādēna jihvām (v.7.11).

This familiar sandhi is also the subject of Ath. Pr. ii.18, and Vāj. Pr. iv.95.

15. Also esah, sah, and syah.

13. tu : nu: ity evampūrvo vakāro lupyate tayos tuntor udāttayoh sator iti nibhajya viyogō viṣṇeyah. yathā : sa tu..... in nu..... udāttayor iti kim : anu..... apy akārādi (i.52) iti prāptih : evampūrva iti kim : 'idaṁ..... vakāra iti kim: pra..... : vid..... tuç ca nuç ca tumā : tāu pūrvāṇa yasmāt sa ta-thoktaḥ.

1 B. O. nu, as also B. in the rule itself. 2 G. M. viniy. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. tumu.

14. vyāñjanaparāh sakāra utpūrvo lupyate. yathā : praty..... vyāñjanānam usmāt param ity vyāñjanaparāh. evampūrva iti kim: jag..... : sakāra iti kim : ut..... : evampara iti kim : ut.....
Here the *ca*, "also," is declared to continue the implication of "when a consonant follows" from the preceding rule. The *iti* is added for the sake of clearness; it shows the final *visarjanīya* of *syaḥ*, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also. What indicates that this final *visarjanīya* is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident. The illustrative examples are *esha te ghyatraḥ* (iii.1.23), *sa te jānīti* (i.2.144-5): but G. M. substitute *sa topo 'tapya*ta, iii.1.13), and *esha *sya vājī* (i.7.38). The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is *dama eva 'syā ṣha upa tiṣṭhate* (i.5.74), where, if the *ḥ* of *esauḥ* were lost by this rule, x.5 would require the reading *esau ṣpa*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rīk Pr. i.4, Vāj. Pr. iii.15,16, Ath. Pr. ii.57.

16. But not *asaḥ*.

Namely, in the passage *hṛṣṇasā mayobhān* (iv.2.112; p. *hṛṣṇa*-asaḥ), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for *saḥ*, by i.52.

17. And *saḥ*, when followed by *id u*, *id agne*, *imāṁ nah*, *endo*, *osahādiḥ*.

These are the cases in the Sanhitā where, after the regular loss of the final of *saḥ*, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x.25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rīk Pr. ii.38,34, and Vāj. Pr. iii.14. The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows: se 'd u *hott adhvarān* (i.1.144: B. O. omit the last word; G. M. the last two), se 'd *agnu esau* (i.2.143), se 'māṁ no havyadātim (iv.8.68), sāt 'nā 'nikena* (iv.3.133 and 6.15), and sād 'shadār anu *rudhyāse* (iv.2.33, 118). The first two need counter-examples, to show that it not followed by *u* or *agne* does not coalesce with *sa*; they are *sa ṣyā*.

15. *vyaktinīshaya* itiṣabdhā pratyekam *esā ity adān* 'visarjanīyāntāṁ' dyotayati: cakāro vyanjanaparādāṁ anuvādīpati.

16. *asa ity asmin* gṛhaṇe visarjanīyo vyanjanaparā ṣaḥ *hṛt* . . . aṣṭo akṛārādī (i.52) iti pṛipterś nishedhaḥ.

---

1 G. M. *tīrīṣṭa*; O. *tirīṣṭa*. 2 G. M. *nām*. 3 G. M. *yāntatāṁ*. 4 G. M. ins. padeśu. 5 G. M. om.

1 G. M. *das-. 2 G. M. *tīh-. 3 G. M. om.
janena (ii.3.14) and sa id deveshu gacati (iv.1.111). The third also wants a counter-example, to prove the need of nah after imām: it is found in sa imām abhy amṛcat (v.5.24). Finally, to show that only nah undergoes the prescribed effect before the words specified in the rule, we have paro divā para end (iv.6.22).

18. Also ity ekam, when ekam is the former member of a compound.

The passage aimed at is pāpiy联动 syād ity ekākatvā tasya juhu-yāt (v.1.12: but as given by W. O., without the first two words, it is also found again at v.4.5: G. M. omit juhu-yāt); and the pada-text actually reads ekam-ekam. The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule. Two counter-examples are given, to justify the terms of the rule: they are ardhukaḥ syād ity ekam agre tha (vi.2.34: only G. M. have the first two words), and yad ekamekaḥ sambharet (i.8.8).

19. Also tishtanthy ekayā, along with the preceding letter.

The commentator quotes the passage: tishtanthy ekākatvā statyā (vii.5.84); the pada-reading is ekayā-ekayā. As counter-example, where the same word remains unmutilated, is given samānānā karoty ekayāikayo 'tsaryam (vi.1.94: only G. M. have the first word).

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound ekākṣa, which (see the St. Petersburg Lexicon) is not very rare in the Čatapaṭha Brāhmaṇa and later.

17. eγανμπάραγα sahakārā ity atra visarjanyo lupyate. yathā: se 'd... se 'd... v' agna ity abhyānī kim: sa... sa... se... na iti kim: 'sa... sa... sāi... sāu... sa iti kim: paro......

1 G. M. ins. di. 2 W. B. O. sakira; G. M. sa. 3 W. B. id; G. M. O. u. 4 B. O. etdhyam. A lacuna in B., to near the end of the comment on rule 18.

18. itisabdavipishṭa ekam ity asminn avagrahe makāro luptyate. yathā: pāp... avagraha iti kim: ardh... itisabda-vipishṭa iti kim: yad......

1 G. M. om. 2 End of the lacuna in B.

19. tishtanthisabdavispiṣṭa ekaye 'ty asmin grahahe 'ntyo' varṇaḥ sapūrvah pārvasahito luptyate. yathā: tis... tishtanthi iti kim: sam... pārveṇa saha varitata iti sapūrvah.

1 G. M. -yassvare. 2 Om.
The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 16 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed. We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made.

20. A \( n \), when followed by \( c \), becomes \( ç \).

The commentator's illustrative examples are \( ahi\{Ā\} ca sarvān jambhayan (iv.5.1\textsuperscript{2}) \), \( ṛtu\{Ā\} ca tasya nakshatriyaṃ ca (vi.1.3\textsuperscript{2}) \). G. M. omit \( ca \), and \( karnān\{ā\} ca 'karnān\{ā\} ca (i.8.9\textsuperscript{3}) \). The counter-examples, to show that only \( n \) is so changed, and \( n \) itself only before \( c \), not before other palatal mutes, are \( gā\{i\} ca me (iv.7.3\textsuperscript{1}) \), and \( tā\{n\} chandobhir anu (i.5.97\textsuperscript{1}) \). G. M. omit \( anu \).

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi.14 and ix.20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.26. At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the \( sandhi\{ā\} Ṛg- \) : the Atharvan and the Vājasaneyi-Sanhītā make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally. In the Tāttvārtha-Sanhītā it is prevailingly usual: I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule.

The definition of the \( sandhi\{ā\} \), of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv.1–3, which teach that, where \( n \) has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has \( anuvṛddha \) added to it. A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a \( s \) (or \( vēśarjāṇīya \)) and the change of \( n \) to \( anuvṛddha \) before it: but the makers of the Prātiṣekhāyas concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules.

21. But not the \( n \) of \( dāya\{n\} \), \( dār\{y\}a\{n\} \), \( ār\{dh\}nu\{v\}an \), \( an\{a\}dv\{ā\}n \), \( ghr\{u\}v\{ā\}n \), \( vāru\{n\}ān \), and \( ev\{ā\} \) \( s\{m\}in \).

The passages are: \( lokam dāya\{n\} ca\{t\}asraḥ (v.2.3\textsuperscript{4}) \), \( yām \) \( dā\{y\}a\{n\}a\{y\}a\{n\}a \).

\[ \text{20. cakāraparo}^{1} \text{ nakāraḥ cakāram āpudaye. yathā: ah-} \text{. \( \text{r} \)-} \text{. kar-} \text{. nakāra iti kim: \( \text{gā\{i\}} \)} \text{. \( \text{c} \)-} \text{. capara iti kim: \( tā\{n\} \)-} \text{. cah-} \text{. paro \( \text{y} \)-} \text{. \( \text{a} \)-} \text{. \( \text{a} \)-} \text{. caparaḥ.} \]

\[^{1} \text{G. M. cakāra.} \quad^{2} \text{O. om.} \quad^{3} \text{G. M. O. cakāra.} \]

\[ \text{21. \( \text{etēshu} \) grahanēshu nakāraḥ cakāraṁ nā "pudya\{te\} caparo \( \text{pi. yathā: lo-} \text{. yām-} \text{. loka-} \text{. ana\{d\}-.} \text{ ghr\{n\}-} \text{. vār-} \text{. evā-} \text{. āve\{ty\} ki\{m\};} \text{. as\{m\}-} \text{.} \]

\[^{1} \text{G. M. eshu.} \quad^{2} \text{G. M. O. om.} \quad^{3} \text{B. om.} \]
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candramasi (i.1.93); lokā ardhanuṣu caturā 'emin (v.5.16; only G. M. have the first word), anādīn ca me dhenuṣa ca me (iv.7.104),
ghṛṇiṇā cetaī tmanā (ii.5.111), nārundān cauṣahkapān nīr va-
pet (ii.3.121; only W. has the last two words), and eva 'emin cak-
shur dhattā (ii.2.93-4; 3.82). Eva 'emin is found once more, in a
slightly different connection, at ii.3.81: the others occur only in
the passages cited. A counter-example, aṃsīṅ ca 'muṣaṁaṅ ca
(vii.3.41,52), is given to prove the need of specifying eva before
aṃsīṅ.

By rule 24, below, the n in all these cases is assimilated to the
c, and should be so written in the text. My own manuscript of the
Sanhitā, in fact, follows the authority of the Prātiṣākhya, and
represents the assimilated nasal in the same manner as an assimilated
m, except in a single case (ardhanuśu car-). The Calcutta edition,
however, in the part hitherto published, gives n c only once (i.1.98),
and everywhere else n c.

ताकाशकारः शाश्वतः ॥ २२ ॥

22. A t, when followed by k, c, or ch, becomes c.

The form assumed by initial ρ after this assimilation is taught
in rules 34-37, below.

The commentator's examples are: tāc chaṇyokh (ii.6.102,3-8),
tac ca 'dātā (vii.1.59), and tac chaṇḍaśān chaṇḍāstvam (v.6.61).
He proceeds to point out that the p, c, and ch, all mentioned in the
rule as upon the same footing, are to be understood as original
(not the products of previous euphonic processes), that being their
chief or primary value: otherwise the mention of ρ at all would
be superfluous; since, the c being (by v.34) ordered changed to ch
after a mute, it would be enough for this rule to say "when fol-
lowed by c or ch." Moreover, if the latter rule were applied, then,
after it, the application of the earlier rule would not be suitable
(svarasa, 'having its own proper flavor;'; the word is not used else-
where), as it would constitute an offense against the third rule
of this chapter.

22. cačchaṃpara takāraṣ caḍaṃ ṁdāyate. yathā: tac....
tac....: tāc....: atra cačchaṃpara iti sāmhnyoktānānā ni-
mittānānā prāktīvamā vijnayam: mukhyatāt: tata' prākṛta-
vādṛtāyoh prāktāmānānā prādhvanānā vijñayate: kuto vā
dyāyam: sparśapārvav caḍaṃ cakāraṃ (v.34) iti caḍārya ca.
chete kṛta takāraṣ caḍaṃ cačchipara employment cāḥvati 'ca siddhaḥ iti śrūmaḥ. kim ca: parasātre pravṛtte
sati paḥcit parāsātra-praprasāram na svarasaṃ: tata' pār-
vampārvam prathamam (v.8) iti niyamabhāṅgaprasāngade."

1 G. M. B. O. myeno 'kā. 2 W. O. prami. 3 G. M. prāktvam. 4 G. M. onm.
5 G. M. -katvam. 6 G. M. -yud ca. 7 G. M. B. cačchaṃ. 8 G. M. siddhaḥ. 9 G. M.
bhavanā. 10 G. M. nydyābh.
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23. When followed by \( j \), it becomes \( j \).

The cited example is \textit{taj jayāndān jayavatam} (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: \textit{tat pravātē} (vi.4.7²).

24. A \( n \), before the same letters, becomes \( ṇ \).

As \textit{etesu} is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them: that is to say, \( s, c, ch, j \). These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since \( ṇ \) never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since \( jh \) is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental \( n \), then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator's illustrative example for \( n \) before \( c \) (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is \textit{tenādi vādī 'nānā chamayati} (iii.4.8). As for \( n \) before \( c \), he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the \( n \) does not become \( c \) by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, \textit{lokam āyaṁ caivāraḥ} (v.2.34). Before \( ch \), he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, \textit{tān chandbhir anu} (i.5.9'); and before \( j \), \textit{aparāpam ātmanā jāyate} (iii.5.7¹). As general counter-example, finally, he gives \textit{tānti sūdhrān} (ii.4.1¹), where \( n \), coming before \( s \), is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of \( n \) before \( ch \), which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Taśitrīya-Sanhitā. My own MS. reads every time \( nch \), combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads \( nch \).

---

23. \textit{sānimīdhyāt takāra iti labhyate: japaras takåro jaκåram āpadyate. yathā: taj..... evamāpya iti kim: tat.....}

1. G. M. om.

24. \textit{etesu iti bahuvacananirdeśe pratydeannam eva 'napa-khiyaḥ' śītradvayastheshu paranimitteshu sampratayah: tasmād etesu iti: saccachajeshu parata ity arthaḥ: nakāraḥ nakāram āpadyate. yathā: te..... śatvāpattāu nishiddho' yo nakāraḥ so 'tāra āparatvena vishayākriyāte. lok..... tān..... : apa..... evamāpya iti kim: tānt.....}
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The combination of final ṇ with initial ṇ, producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions: see note to Ath. Fr. ii.17), ṛṇḥ, is decidedly of more common occurrence. But here, too, my own MS. reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, ṛṇḥ: the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving ṇ (as at ii.2.123), now ṇ (as at i.3.94).

Final ṇ is found yet more frequently before initial ṛ, or some scores of times in all. As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between ṇṛ and ṇṛ. The Calcutta text is equally wavering; and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either: in both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary.

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the Taittirīya-Sanhitā ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the Prātiṣṭākhya (either ṛ ṇ or ṇ), wherever a final ṇ comes to stand before a palatal mute.

लपरी लकारम् ॥ २५॥

25. Both ṭ and ṇ, when followed by ḷ, become ṇ.

The dual laparā indicates that the ṭ and ṇ, already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator. He cites as examples yavl lohitam parāpatai (ii.1.22; G. M. omit the last word), and trin lokāṇ udq ajetat (i.7.111; only G. M. have udq ajetat). The combination of ṇ and ḷ is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto.

नकारी अनुस्तिरितम् ॥ २६॥

26. The ṇ becomes nasalyzed ṇ.

As the nasal quality of ṇ itself is already established by rule ii.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the anunāstikam of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the ḷ of like position into which the ṇ is converted: this ḷ is to be a nasal ṇ. No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule.

There are in the Taittirīya-Sanhitā over a hundred cases of the meeting of final ṇ with initial ḷ, and in fully two-thirds of them

---

25. dvivacanasādmarthṣyād gṛhitā prakṛtāv takāraṇakārāv lakṣāram लपराव यत्ताः yāḥ... trīṇ... laḥ paro yāḥbhāyāṁ tāṁ laparāv.

1 G. M. -hya. 2 G. M. om. 3 MSS. -yate. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. lakāraḥ.
my MS. reads nI simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another. In the remaining cases, it treats the n in the same way as it would treat a m, substituting for it the ordinary anuṣvāra-dot over the preceding akṣara. The Calcutta text varies between nI and all. Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the Prātiṣṭhākyas is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal l shall be represented, there may be some question. As I have already mentioned (note to ii.30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an anuṣvāra between the preceding vowel and a doubled l, and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by Ahīsya, as noted in a later rule (v.31). The method followed in my MS., on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of n and l and that of m and l: it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result. If the nasal l is to be written separately, it should properly have the viḍama beneath and the sign of nasality over it. That is to say, one ought always to print either नृसिंह लोके or नृसिंह लोके, not नृसिंह लोके.

In romanized text, as the assimilated m is represented by m, so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated n may be very suitably represented by n; and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before l and before the palatals.

All the Prātiṣṭhākyas (see note to Ath. Pr. i.35) agree in converting both n and m before l into a nasal l.

मकारश्वरप्रस्थस्य सास्थानमनुनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. A m, when followed by a mute, becomes a nasal of like position with it.

The commentator’s examples are yāṁ kāmayeta (i.6.10 $^4$ et al.), suṁ ca me (iv.7.81), tasmā te duṣcakṣāḥ (iii.2.10 $^2$), and tam prav-

26. anuṣvārottaṁ da anuṇḍikāḥ (ii.30) iti nākārayaḥ nuṇḍikātme sīdhe $^1$ punar atrā 'pi tatkathānam anupaṇnam: tasmād atrā lakṣaṇāyaḥ nākāro nāma tatsthamo lakāraḥ ity arthāḥ: asao 'anuṇḍikām bhajate'. pārvoktam evo 'dāharanam.

1 W. nāma anuṇḍved-. 2 G. M. ins. 'pi. 3 G. M. nak-. 4 G. M. ins. lakāra. 5 G. M. bhajeta.
nathā (i.4.9). Of m before a lingual he is able to give no example, as such a concurrence is not to be found in the Sanhitā.

28. Following by a semivowel, it becomes a nasal of like quality with it.

From the class of semi-vowels is excepted r, by the next rule. Examples are given for the others, as follows: sanhastūt dhana (i.5.1 et al.), swargastūt lokam (i.5.4 et al.), sanvastūrāh (i.5.1 et al.: the pada-text, like that of the Atharvas, reads sanvastūrāh, while that of the Rik leaves the word undivided). No attempt is made in the manuscripts or the printed text of the Sanhitā to give a special representation to these nasal semi-vowels standing for an assimilated m: it is left to be understood that the sign of nasality over the preceding akṣara stands for a nasal letter of like quality with the following consonant in the case of the semi-vowels, just as in that of the mutes, provided for by the preceding rule. Nor are the manuscripts of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā and its commentary any more particular—saving that G. M. usually write, instead of ṇy, the combination yy, without any sign of the nasality of the first y.

Only the Ath. Pr. disagrees with our treatise in its treatment of m before the semi-vowels, acknowledging no nasal y or v, but a l alone (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.55).

The commentator explains the word anundesika, ‘nasal,’ in the rule, by anundesikadharmanpīśita, ‘distinguished by nasal quality,’ but afterward raises a difficulty over it, in terms which imply that he regards it as a noun, ‘a nasal,’ asking, how we are to understand it here as equivalent to sāṇundesika, ‘combined with nasality.’ As it is, in fact, originally and properly an adjective, signifying ‘possessed of nasal quality,’ and is constant-


1 W. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. G. M. om.


1 B. O. om. 2 W. om.; O. ity anena sāṇundesikam ‘katham upalambhāmaḥ’; G. M. saṁkālam upalambhāmah yathā. 3 O. om. 4 W. dharmāya; O. avita. 5 G. M. ita. 6 G. M. iti.
ly so used and applied in the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, the difficulty is worse than hair-splitting; it is a downright perversion. The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it: "because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality; as, for example, when we say 'a white cloth,' 'a blue lotus.'" As if the words "white" and "blue" strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean 'of white color,' 'of blue color!'  

न रेफायम्: II 29

29. But not when followed by r.

R being also a semi-vowel, m would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception. The instances given of the treatment of m before r are prā som̐rajam prathānam adhārdnām (i.6.123; G. M. have only the first two words), and sāmā́jyāya sūkrah (i.6.163). They are particularly ill-selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule; they fall, rather, under xiii.4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of sam before rāj. We ought to have, instead, such passages as pratymesha rakṣah (i.1.21), vi vayān ruhema (i.1.22)—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Sanhitā.

The omission of m before r, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of anuvāra after the latter, are taught below, in rules xiii.2, xv.1–3. The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper anuvāra sign before r, while before y, l, v they write the assimilated m just as before the mutes.

यवकार्यश्रेणिकामाचर्यायामी: II 30

30. Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by y or v.

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the m to be treated before these letters as before r, and would acknowledge no

29. antasthātvadā rephāparasyad 'pi makāraṇya tatasvaranānudāsikapārāpti' anena nishdhyate: na khaḥ rephāparo' makāraṇ pārvoktām bhajate. yathā: pra..... sām..... rephā paro yasmiyā adśu rephāparah.

1 G. M. rephāsa lat̐.  2 G. M. kātapatiḥ prāptā.  3 G. M. -pākaro.  4 G. M. om.

30. ca kāraṇo nishedhānvadēcakāh: prakrto makāra ekṣhām adānyām pakshe yakārīparo vā vakārīparo vā na savarnam anumāṇikam bhajate. yathā: sain-: sain-

1 G. M. -dāraschakāh.  2 W. B. prā̂k.  3 B. O. om.  4 B. om.  5 G. M. om.
nasal semi-vowel save l. Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of m before r (xiii.3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the "some teachers" spoken of are the same with those here noticed: who they are, he does not attempt to tell us. The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prātiṣākhya, as pointed out above (see Ath. Pr. ii.35, and the note upon it); but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prātiṣākhya had here in mind the other one and its authors.

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of m should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an anusvāra at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which m might naturally pass before y, r, l, and v.

As examples, are repeated samvatsaraḥ and samyaktāḥ (see under rule 28, above).

उत्तमलभावात्युते भनुनासिक इत्यत्रेयः II 31Ⅲ

31. Ātreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes l, the previous vowel is nasalized.

As has been pointed out above, Ātreya's view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition. It is not elsewhere supported in the Prātiṣākhya. Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert m and n, not into l, but into a nasal l. One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv., where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed.

The commentator gives Ātreya the title of muni, 'sage,' instead of ṛṣeya, 'teacher.'

To illustrate the sage's style of making the combination, he cites triśūla lokaḥ (i.7.11) and svargamālā lokaḥ (i.5.44 et al.); but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations. Finally, he adds the caution that "this rule and the preceding are not approved."

ढूः ककारः सप्तवार्यः II 32Ⅲ

31. uttamaṇya nakāṇya nakāṇya vā lubhavāl lakṣārapatthe
pārvasvaro 'mūrisko bhavati 'ty ātreya nāma munir manyate.
yathā: triśūlāḥ: svu-... uttamaṇya labhāva uttamalabhāvaḥ: tuṣāt.

ṣūtraṇāyaṃ etad anisṛtm.

1 G. M. put before nak. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. om.
32. After ˆ is inserted a k before s and ˆk.

The commentator's examples are pratyanik samamdrutah (i.8.21: but G. M. have instead sadrak samamdruh, ii.2.8*), and pratyanik shadaha bhavati (vii.4.2*: O. G. M. omit bhavati). As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives pratyanik hotaram (vi.3.1*), and tat savituh (i.5.6* et al.) and tat shodap (vi.6.11').

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text. In the Tāttvīrya-Sanhitā I have found no other instance of the meeting of ˆ and ˆk than the one quoted; of ˆ before s, besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi.3.1* and iv.4.4*†; but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the sandhi. Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the Prātiṣṭhāna; and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter's authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv. Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of t between n and s (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write ˆk s and ˆk sh. The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W. B. O. reading ˆksh, and W. O. ˆksh (with the k and sh united in the usual sign for ksh); while G. M. even yield to the requirement of xiv.12, and give us ˆkks and ˆkksh. This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts.

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.9, the teachings of the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Rīk Pr. merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities.

33. After t or n is inserted a t

The examples given for these combinations are vashat evahā (vii.3.12 nine times), and vidvānt somena yajate (iii.2.2*); and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of t with sh, one is dragged in from the jātā-text: andyādāv shat shad andyādāv andyādāv shat (vi.6.3*): to which G. M. even add, from the

32. sakāraparāh 1 shakāraparā vā kakāra ágamo bhavati haproha. yathā: praty-.....: praty-..... evampara iti kim: praty-.....: evampārva iti kim: tat-.....: tat-.....

1 G. M. ins. ud.
same source, tant subdhan subdhams tanis tant subdhан (ii.4.11). Counter-examples are shaḍ và rtaḥ (iii.4.8a), and tan rudrā abruvan (v.5.28).

The final lingual f occurs before s, according to my notes upon the text, in ten other passages (iii.2.8 eight times: iv.4.81; 6.14: v.4.34,4.3; 5.26: vi.2.34; 6.33: vii.1.51: 4.102); and my MS. does not once employ the intermediate t. The manuscripts of our commentary, however, all introduce it; and this time B. abets G. M. in converting it into ta, by rule xiv.12. The combination is without doubt a very troublesome one, in the demand it makes upon the tip of the tongue: but whether the transition is helped by the intrusion of a t is a much more serious question—and one to exercise and gratify the subtlety of a Hindu phonetist. The Ath. Pr. also requires its (ii.8), but the Rik Pr. (iv.6) only notices the mode of sandhi as enjoined by certain teachers.

It is indeed true that the strict letter of the rule requires a t to be inserted between a f and sh, as illustrated by the commentator from the jatā-text. But it would be wholly preposterous to suppose that the authors of the Prātiṣṭākhyā intended to teach any such insertion—which would convert the consonant combination from one wholly natural and easy to one in a high degree harsh and difficult, if not absolutely impossible. They evidently relied on the non-occurrence of sh after f anywhere in the Sanhitā for the annulling of that part of the rule’s prescription—either having no regard to a jatā-text, or overlooking the fact that in it the two letters would come in contact.

Twice in the Tātāṭīrtya text we have a final t before an initial sh (at v.5.28: vii.5.6). Although their collision might seem to call for mediation in somewhat the same manner as that of f and s, the Prātiṣṭākhyā makes no special provision for it, and the manuscript text simply combines the two letters.

The meeting of final n with initial s, the other case contemplated by the rule, is very frequent (there are sixty instances in the first two kāndas: I have not collected them through the whole text). Neither the printed text nor my manuscript is absolutely faithful in inserting the prescribed t; yet I have found but six cases in the whole Sanhitā in which the latter omits it; and out of the seven passages in kāndas i. and ii. where the former leaves it out, my manuscript confirms the omission in only one. As the requirement of the Prātiṣṭākhyā receives so much support from the usage of the scribes, and also accords with the prescriptions of the Ath. Pr. (ii.9) and Vāj. Pr. (iv.14), there can be no question that it ought to be followed by an editor of the Tātāṭīrtya Veda.

33. cakrath sashakārāv anvādiapti: takārapāro vā nakārapāro vā takāra āgamo bhavati sashakāraparāh. vash...: vi'd...: and...: tant...: evampara iti kim: shaḍ...: tān...
34. A ś preceded by a mute becomes ch.

The commentator gives only an example of a ś converted into ch after t, the t at the same time becoming c by rule 22, above: śaraṇaḥ chṛdātri (iv.3.2²). He adds a counter-example, aṣṭo uṣṭānah (iv.6.4¹). The occurrence of any other final mute than t and n (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial ś is very rare (excepting m, for which see the following rule); and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a t-sound and a sh-sound into the compound sound of our ch in church (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17). There is one case of a preceding t (i.3.14⁶), where my MS. reads, as the Prātiṣākhya directs, t ch, while the Calcutta text has t ś. A single case of preceding p is treated of below, in rule 36.

35. But not when preceded by m.

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of ś to ch after m, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since m is a mute. He instances sañcitam me (iv.1.10³ and v.1.10²) and sañgravāḥ ha (i.7.2¹). Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xiii.2 and xv.1–3, and the m, as before other spirants, becomes anusvāra. An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xiii.2 directs the omission of m before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of ś into ch as is here contemplated and guarded against. The reply, however, is a very easy one; that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into ch, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

---

34. śaṅkāraḥ śaṅkāram āpadyate sparçapārvah¹. yathā: saṅkāraḥ evampūrṇa iti kim: aṣṭo uṣṭānah sparṣaḥ-pūrvo yasyād asā sparṣapārvah.

¹ G. M. puts first. ² W. G. M. om.

35. makārapāvaḥ śaṅkāraḥ śaṅkārin nā "padyate. yathā: saṅkāraḥ evampūrṇa makārasya 'tāpūrvo' śaṅkāre prāptaḥ chātakānāh anena niṣhidhyate. nanv etad anupāpamān: 'aṁha makāralopaḥ' (xiii.1): repohshmaparihaḥ (xiii.2) iti makārasya lopavidhānān na śaṅkārasya chātōpattinimittam' asti ti. māi 'vam: 'chātōpādākānāh molopādūkāt pūrvaṁ: atasāṁ tatra pūrvāmpūrvaṁ prathamām' (v.3) ity nyā-
duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading *saṁchitam me brahma*; which is wrong.

36. Nor, according to Vālmīki, when preceded by *p*.

There is but a single case in the Sanshitā of *p* before *g*, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, *anuśṭupa chārati* (iv.3.28); so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above. Vālmīki thinks it would be better to read *anuśṭupa gārati*—and I presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion.

37. Nor, according to Pāushkaraśādī, when followed by a consonant; and a preceding *n*, in that case, does not become *n*.

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part; translating 'and a preceding *n* becomes *n*', but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v.24). The inquiry is raised, how we know that *pṛvacād*, the preceding letter, means here 'a preceding *n*.' The reply is, because only *n* is liable to conversion into *ṇ*, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place.

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pāushkaraśādī are *aditalin smaprubhīḥ* (v.7.12), and *pāpiyān chreyase* (i.5.74). The edition has *pāpiyān chreyase* in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā; but my MS. seems to have been written by a sectary of Pāushkaraśādī at this point (namely, in the margin: a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe). In the former, I

---

*yena chatvam eva pārvan*¹ kartavyaṁ syāt: tathā sati makāra sparṣaṁ ² "tapas"³ ca kāre chatvam⁴ ²paṁne sami⁴ iti syāt: tan ma bhād ity etat śātram upapannam eva.

---


---

38. ca kāraṁ pratishedhārthakāḥ: vālmīker maite pakārapār- vaṁ "pakarāp chaṅkiraṁ" na "padyate. yathā: an...---

¹ B. G. M. dākārakaṁ. ² G. M. pāpū. ³ G. M. chatvam. 
find the reading ṛdditiṇaḥ chmaṣṭudhiḥ, which would satisfy neither side. There is one other case of the collision of n with pr (at v.6.7²), where I find read n chr. So also, at v.7.12 my MS. has n chv; and at vii.3.14, n chy. These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule.

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason: the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial p to cḥ shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34.

38. According to Plākṣi, Kauṇḍinya, Gāutama, and Pāushkarasādi, a ḥ preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter.

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial ḥ with a final surd mute, are, as given by the commentator, arvāg gḥy enam (vi.3.3¹), sarad dḥavā aṭavaya (v.3.12²; G. M. omit aṭavaya), and tad dhiranyam (v.4.2² and vi.1.7¹). In giving the first two quotations, W. O. G. M. (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incantiously been admitted into some edited texts) write gḥḥḥ and dḥḥḥ instead of gḥh and dḥḥ; and in the latter of them my MS. of the Sanhitā does the same (see the note to xiv.5). As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have praṃyaḥ hūḍhram (vi.3.1²), ṣaḥ ta ṣa ṭāyātām (i.3.9¹), vasaḥ te (i.2.12⁴); and, in W., aḥ 'tisṭhīpat te (iv.6.9⁴), but in all the other MSS. tat te (i.3.9¹ et al.).

This is one of several instances in which the Prātiṣākhya, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest. The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

37. pāushkarasādiḥ mate vyājanaparāḥ saḥkara saṅcappārvo
'pi chatvān nāḥ "padyaṭe: saṅkṛapārvo nakāraṣ ca nakāraṃ nā"padyaṭe. yathā: ad—...: pāp—... pārwa ity ukte nakāra iti katham labhyate. saṅkṛapatiḥ asyāḥ 've 'ti brāhmaḥ: prasaṅgasasyāḥ 'va hiḥ pratisedhāt. ' vyājanam asmāt param iti vyājanaparāḥ.

nādi 'tattvādvaṣyam ivaṃ.

1 W. om. ² G. M. om. ³ G. B. O. om. ⁴ G. M. -dhaḥ.
approved; but this does not satisfy us. We might, to be sure, regard ourselves as justified in assuming that the doctrine of the authors of the work is first stated, with due and respectful mention of the authorities upon whom they especially rely in maintaining it: but such an assumption does not in all cases help us out of the difficulty.

39. According to some authorities, it remains unchanged.

That is to say, the authorities here referred to would read, for example, in one of the passages already quoted (vi.3.3), arvākḥ hy enam.

As the euphonic treatment of ḥ as a sonant instead of a surd letter is one of the most perplexing anomalies of the Sanskrit phonetic system, such indications as this of the fluctuating and antagonistic views of the old Hindu phonetists respecting it, and the willingness of some of them to give it the value of a surd in making combinations, are worth a great deal to us.

40. According to Čāityāyana and others, a fourth mute is interposed.

These respectable authorities would, if their views are not misrepresented, approve the very strange-looking and hardly defensible reading arvākgh ḥy enam (so writes W., with the utmost possible explicitness; B. reads arvāk ḥya ḥy; O. gives arvagḥ ḥy; G. M. have arvaghy). The commentator tells us (one would like to know on what authority) that the “others” are Kauṭuliputra, Bharadvāja, Old Kauṇḍinya, and Pāushkarasūḍī. All are mentioned elsewhere (see Index) in the text itself.

38. pādkāhiprabhṛtāṇāṁ mate prathampārvo hákāras tasya prathamasya sasthānam caturtham bhajate. yathā: arv—.: saraṇa: tadh.: evampārva iti kim: prat—.: hákāra iti kim: vāk—.: vā:—.: a'ī:—. prathamaḥ pārvo yasvād aśau prathampārvaḥ.

1 G. M. om.

39. ekśhāṁ mate prathampārvo hákāro 'viktō bhavati. yathā: arv—.: 40. Čāityāyanādināṁ mate hákāraprathamayor antare madhye prathamācaturthānām caturthāgamo bhavati. yathā: arv—.: aśīṣabdāṇa kauṭuliputrabharadvājaḥsthirakauṇḍinīyapāushkarasūḍāyata' igrīyante.

1 G. M. ādityānāṁ, and then a lacuna to pujārthām under the next rule.
41. As also, according to the Mīmāṃsākāras.

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of Cāityāyana and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent.

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved.

CHAPTER VI.

Contents: 1–5, conversion of s and ś into sh; 6–13, exceptions and counter-exceptions; 14, insertion of s between final n and initial t.

1. Now for the conversions of s and visarjanīya into sh.

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule.

2. A s is converted into sh when preceded by svānāso divi, āpo hi, ayam u, kam u, o, mo, pro, tri, mahi, dyavi, padi, or a former member of a compound.

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows: uta svānāso divi shantv agneḥ (i.2.147): only O. has agneḥ; B. omits both that and the preceding word): with the

41. cakāraḥ pārvoktavidhim anvādiṣṭiḥ: mīmāṃsākānāṁ cā 'ntarāgamamatāṁ sammatam. pārvoktam evo 'ddharaṇam. mīmāṃsākānāṁ' prajārtham prthaksātrādbhāḥ. nāi 'tat satrārayam iṣṭāṁ.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarane 
pañcamo 'dhyāyāḥ.

1 G. M. omit to here.

1. athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: sakāravisarjanīyau shakāram āpadyete ity etad adhikārāṁ veditavyam ita utarāṁ yad vakṣyāmaḥ.
counter-example trīyasyām ito divi somo deśit (iii.5.71), to show the powerlessness of divi to effect the change except after svānāsah. Then ṛpo hi sīthā mayobhunah (iv.1.51; v.8.14; vii.4.194; only G. M. have the last word): the necessity of ṛpo is shown by the counter-example na hi svāh svānā kinaśti (v.1.71). Next ayam u shya pra devayuh (iii.5.111), and kam u shvid aṣya senyād (ii.6.112): with the counter-example tad u soma dhā (iv.2.81), to prove that u changes s only after ayam and kam. For ṛu, the example is ārdhva u śu na utaye (iv.1.45: only G. M. have the first word): the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial s are i.5.116; iii.5.101; iv.6.54; v.1.59; vii.1.182; 4.172. For mo, the only passage is the one quoted, mo śu na indra (i.8.9). For pro, only pro śu asmāi puroratham (i.7.185). For tri, only tri shadasthā (ii.4.112 and ii.2.111). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: mahi shad duryān nanah (iii.2.82), ya uṇa dvāvī sīthā (ii.4.144), and padi shītām anuṇātā vajrātā (iv.7.1457: G. M. omit the last word). To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every s beginning in pada-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to sh, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception “not after a consonant, or an a-vowel,” it means, then, that s is so changed after the i, u, and r-vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: haṅsah cuciḥṣad vasuḥ (iv.2.151; p. cuci-set: only G. M. have the first word), ayaḥ viṣṭhā janayaḥ (i.7.122; p. viṣ-thā: only G. M. have aya), and gośhūmanah dvitiyam (vii.4.1111).

I have collected from the Sanhitā all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial s of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Prātiṣṭhākhyā and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succeeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, anuṣṭhitā, whose unaltered s is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, viṣṇu-anuṣṭhitah (ii.4.1254.451; p. viṣṇu-anuṣṭhitah), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

2. ity evampāravo vagrahapārvah ca sakāraḥ shakāram āpadyate. yathā: u tā :... svānāsā' iti kim: ṛṭī-' : ṛpo ... ṛpo iti kim: na :... ayam :... kam :... ayaniṣkām iti kim: tad :... ārdh :... mo :... pro :... ṛṭī- : mahī :... ya :... padi :... haṃs :... ayā :... go :... avagrahāḥ pārvo yasmād asāv avagrahāpārvah.

1 W. B. svānā.
3. Also asadāma and asiñcan.

The "also" (ca) in this rule implies, the commentator says, that the words mentioned are preceded by an avagraha, according to the final specification of the preceding rule: else such passages as ajāyāśin ghormam prā 'śiñcān (v.4.3) would fall under the prescribed action. The examples are yena kāmena nyāshadāme 'ti (vii.5.2; p. ni-asadāma), and mitrvarunād abhyāshiñcan (i.8.11; p. abhi-asiñcan). The rule is given, we are told, for the purpose of ordaining that, in the case of these two words, the conversion into śh after an avagraha takes place even notwithstanding the interposition of an a. Why not, then, puts in an objector, say "even when a interposes," without specification of the words concerned? Because, is the reply, the rule would then apply to such cases as hṛstoṣo mayodbhān (iv.2.11; p. hṛsto-asah).

4. Also in an unaccented pada, when a preposition or nis precedes.

This rule can apply only to unaccented verbal forms, since they alone can be technically anudāta throughout, having the anudāta sign written under every syllable. In any compound beginning with a preposition like pāri, for instance, having an acute on the first syllable and an enclitic svartita on the second, the syllables of the other member of the compound would not have the anudāta accent, but the pracaya: such would fall under rule 2 of this chapter. The word pada in the rule, we are told, is intended to specify the text: "a word which is anudāta throughout in the pada-text" is what the Prātipākṣya means—it being, in fact, impossible that any word should be so accented in saṃhitā-text.

The commentator's examples are, for prepositions, apmann arjān iti pari śiñcitati (v.4.4), imam vi śhyāmi (i.1.102 and iii.5.61), sāmradjaṇa bhi śiñcāmi (i.7.103 twice, and v.8.3: but B. O. read śiñcāti, I presume by a copyist's blunder, as I find no such phrase in the text), yajamāne prati śhīṁpāvantī (vi.1.42), and ni śhadeśa dhrīvāvātā varunā (i.8.16: only B. O. have varunā);

3. asadāma: asiñcan: ity etayō sakāraḥ sakāram āpadyate. yathā: yena...... mitr...... cakāro 'vagrahapūrvatvānvādeca-kah'. anvādeparā 'nena' kim: aj...... avagrahapūrvate 'py' akāraṇa vyavata ity ayaṃ drambhāḥ. nanu ṛgahād akrāravya-veta 'py' ety etavādi 'vā' lam: kanṭhokṣyā kim. ucayate: hṛt...... ity ādānu mā bhād iti.

1 G. M. shatvam. 2 W. B. and O. p.m. pūrva. 3 B. O. G. M. om. 4 G. M. sat.
for nis, ni shaniti durita (iv.6.67): all the manuscripts of the comment, along with my manuscript of the Sanhitā, read thus, as required by ix.1: compare the similar cases noted under rule 13, below). A number of counter-examples are given, showing the effect of absence of any one of the conditions contained in the rule: they are sodane sida sumudre (iv.3.1), brhatah parmani syam (iv.1.51), ni simatah surucah (iv.2.82: G. M. omit this example), and abhi samatvā pahi (i.4.10,11).

The cases coming under this rule are not so numerous but that it may be worth while to report them. Of verbal forms after adhi I have found none; after abhi, I have noted abhi shyāma (i.4.482), and forms of abhi shśicāmi (i.7.102 et al.) and abhi shṣunomhi (iii.1.82); after prati, forms of prati śvāpāyāmi (i.7.52 et al.), and prati shṭobhanti (i.2.122); after pari, forms of pari shśicē (iii.3.11 et al.), and pari śvādī (i.7.132); after vi (besides that quoted under rule 13, below), vi shajantī (vi.4.72), and forms of vi śvādī (iii.4.116); after ni (besides the one under rule 13), ni shaśādā (i.8.161 et al.), and forms of ni śvādī (iii.5.111 et al.). Such cases as ni-shādāyati (v.3.72), where the preposition, losing its accent before the accented verbal form, is combined with the latter in the pada-text, belong under rule 2, above. The same is the case with vyātīshājūt (vi.6.42 et al.), where the verb has two prepositional prefixes, and is therefore written in combination with them (vyātīshājūt), and with altered sibilant. But for this circumstance, we should require a separate and special treatment of the word; for ati is by this Prātiṣākhyā (i.15) excluded from the list of upasarga, prepositions, and so could not by the present rule cause the alteration of an initial s of a root. Anu is also thus excluded, whence the passage anus athana (v.6.15) does not fall under the rule, and the retention of its dental sibilant needs no specific authorization. It is the only case, so far as I have discovered, in which the restriction of the class of prepositions to half its usual number has any bearing upon the objects of this rule.

5. Also the visarjanīya, which followed by t, of agni preceeded by rāṣaḥ or sarpa, and of nih, vidūḥ, mīdhūḥ, pāyūbhīḥ,

4. sarvānuduttā pade vartamanāh sakāra upasargapūrvo nish-pūrvo vā śhvatam āpadyate. yathā: aśm....: imām....; sām....: yaj....: ni.... etāny upasargapūrvaṁ. nishparvaṁ api: ni sh.... evampūrva iti kim: sad....: brā....: sarvānudattā iti kim: vi....: abhi....: pada iti kim: kalārtham: padakālē' nudattā ity athāḥ.

1 G. M. et. 2 G. M. rpd. 3 W. -kd a.
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veh, sumathi, makih, iyuh, dyuh, abhih, sadhis, and nakih, under all circumstances.

This is, the commentator remarks, a rule establishing exceptions in advance to rule 2 of the ninth chapter, which would require in every case s instead of sh. The examples are: for agnih, avidusarthasad; agniph tad vijham (i.1.14); and medhyaca sapte; agnisch tud (v.1.11); with a counter-example, vanisheth adhi nake 'gnis te tanvam (i.1.8): only G. M. have the first two words, to show that agnih becomes agnis after other words than the two specified in the rule. For nis, nish tapami gosetham (i.1.10). For viduh, vidushtar thapena (ii.5.12); p. viduh-taram, and also, in virtue of rule i.52, avidushtarasaah (i.1.14); p. avidushtarasaah): vidushtara occurs at ii.6.11. For miduh, midhushtama savatama (iv.5.10; p. miduh-tama). For padyubhih, padyubhis thar pivebhih (i.4.24); with the counter-example taamad apyas tribhis tishthaish tishthati (v.4.12): only G. M. have the first two words, to show that the quotation of bhik (of padyubhih) alone as nimittha would not have answered the purpose. For veh, coco vesh thar hi yad (iv.3.13). For sumathi, sumathi te astu bhadhava (i.4.45: only G. M. have the last word); and, to justify the text in quoting sumathi (p. su-mathi) in full, instead of matih simply, we receive an asserted quotation from "another text," pramatis te devdaanam. For makih, makith te vyathir a daadharshih (i.2.14). For iyuh, iyush te ye purvatar anapaayam (i.4.33). For dyuh, dyuh te dyardh agne (ii.5.12: only G. M. have agne): we have dyuh te again at i.3.14. For abhih, abhishe te adya girbhih (iv.4.47: G. M. omit the last word). For sadhih, apsv agne sa-

5. rasaah: sapte: 'ity etabhya'n vi'cish'eta 'gnir ity asmin' grahane: nihi----'' nakih: ity esheu visarjanayasa takdara para shakdram' apadyate. yathâ: avid----; medh----: etabhyan visish'eta iti kim: varsh----; nish----; vid----; apy akardâ (i.52) iti vacanâ avidushtarasa ity apy udhara'nam: mi----; pdy----; pavy' iti kim: tasm----; coco----; sum----; sv iti kim: pram---- iti gakhantare: mak----; iyush----; dyush----; abhishe----; apsv----; nakish----; nityapadbh kimarthaha: kârarephavati (vi.8): avagraha (v.9) iti nisetham' vakhyati: avidur' ity atra visarjanayasyad 'vagrahasthatvat' shatvam na syâ: tan md bhod iti: kan'hotkhir ' vidur ity asyai 'oa' na tv avidur ity asye 'ti durbalvut: tat-smrakshandhtho nityapadbh prapuyate.

agoshaparas tusya sasthaman (ix.2) ity asya purastdad apavaddo 'yam.
The final specification of the rule, nityam, ‘under all circumstances,’ is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word avidutashtaraśā (i.1.14*), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below. The word vidūḥ itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is needed to bring in avidūḥ as its hanger-on. The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place. We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i.52 treated as demanding a special handling.


An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13).

7. Excepted is a s preceded by an a-vowel, a consonant, çakuni, pātni, ṛtu, mṛtyu, maṭimu, or brhañpati.

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2. The commentator’s examples are, for a preceding a-vowel, antarikṣasat dhotā (i.8.15* et al.; only G. M. have the second word) and ā sīncasva (i.4.19; but G. M. omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4; and, for a preceding consonant, rkaṁat vā (vi.1.31*). Then, for the words specified, we have ākuniśadēna (v.7.14), pātirismatyājānām (ii.6.10*; G. M. read yātūḥ, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), rtauḥās tasya (v.7.6*: the same compound is found at v.5.81*), mṛtyusmatyūta iva (i.5.9*: only G. M. have iva), nāï

6. athe 'ty ayan adhikārāḥ: ne 'ty etad' adhiprātaṁ vedītavyam ita uttaram yad vakashtyādah'.

1 G. M. om. 2 W. vadāyamah.

7. avarṇapādve vyanjanaparvāc ca çakuni.... brhañpati: itya evamaparvāc ca sakāraḥ sakāraṁ' nā 'padyate. yathā: ant-....: avarghapūrvarvāṇāt 'prāptih: 'ā sit-....: upaspargapārvarvāṇāt prāptih: rkt-....: çak-....: pātn-....: ṛtu-....: mṛt-....: nāï-....: brh-....: 'avargapūrvarvāṇāt esad prāptih'.

1 O. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. shavam. 4 G. M. ins. eahm. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. om.; W. add as visvānāḥ: avarghapūrvarvāṇāt prāptih.
'nam mālimhunāṃ vindati (vi.3.26: only G. M. have the first two and the last words), and brhaṇapatīntasya te (i.4.27 and vi.5.82); all of which, as the commentator points out, are cases falling under the last specification of rule 2, respecting the conversion of initial s of the latter member of a compound.

8. Also in a word containing r or r.

The commentator gives one example of each case, the former constituting an exception under rule 4, the latter under the last specification of rule 2: vi pṛjate caṃtyā (i.7.87), and taṃmat sa vīraṇayah (vi.2.94,107: only G. M. have taṃmat).

Of other words falling under this rule, I have noted parimrutam (i.8.21), visarjanam (i.1.58), bahuśvartī (iii.1.111), and goṣṭram (vii.5.1). Compare the nearly corresponding rules of the other treatises, Rīk Pr. v.11, Vāj. Pr. iii.81, Ath. Pr. ii.102,106.

9. Also in the former member of a compound.

We should expect the word avagraha in this rule to be put in the locative case, so as to accord in construction with the preceding rule; and I have translated it as a locative. Its being a nominative makes the commentator some trouble: he declares avagraha here equivalent to avagrhaṣṭha, 'standing in avagraha,' and quotes as corresponding and customary expressions "the stages cry out," "the fat one knows," where "those occupying the stages," "the soul inhabiting a fat body," are really meant.

The occasion for such a precept as this arises out of rule 4, above, which provides for the conversion into š of the initial s of a word wholly anuddita, after a preposition. It was aimed, as is there pointed out, at unaccented verbal forms. But the former members of compounds which are accented on the latter member

8. rkaṇaḥ ca rephaḥ ca rkaṇurephadvā: tāv asmin sta ity rkaṇu

rephaḥvāt: tasmin pade vartamānaḥ saṅkaraḥ saṅkāraṇī mad "padyate. yathā: vi...... "upasargapūrṇavat prāptih: tasmi...... "avagrhaḥpūrṇavat prāptih"

1 G. M. shatam. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. B. O. om. 4 W. om.

9. avagrahaṃsthaḥ saṅkaraḥ saṅkāraṇī mad "padyate: upasarga-

pūrṇac ca" avagraha ity avagrahaṃstho lakṣayate: maṅgala kro-

canī tyatra maṅgaṅhaḥ: "sthūlo jānāti 't' sthūladehaḥsaṅkāra,

.udāharaṇāni: tasy...... mukh......

1 G. M. shatam. 2 W. -va; G. M. visarjanyā. 3 W. sat. 4 G. M. change place with avagraha. 5 B. O. labhy-. 6 G. M. inā. yathā. 7 G. M. inā. yathā. 8 B. O. om. iti.
would also come under the rule, as being anudatta throughout, and also entitled to the designation pada, 'word,' equally with completely independent vocables: hence the necessity of providing for their exclusion from its action. The commentator illustrates with a couple of examples: tasyān devā ādhi saśvāsantuḥ (iii.5.11), and mukhaṁ yajñānām abhi saśvādānē (v.1.11\textsuperscript{2}: only G. M. have the first word). W. B. O. introduce a third, between the other two, namely abhi sāṁ agachanē 'ti (ii.5.37); but, as is shown by the accentuation and division, it does not fall under either the fourth rule or this, and has evidently come in by somebody's blunder.

It is very possible that the Sanhitā contains other cases requiring the application of this rule; but if so, they have escaped my notice.

ववस्थानम् \| १० \| ।

10. Also in sava and sthānam.

The cited passages are agnisavaç cītyāḥ (v.6.1\textsuperscript{5}), anusavanam puroddātān (vi.5.11\textsuperscript{4} and vii.5.6\textsuperscript{4}), saśavānave 'bhi gṛhyāti (vi.4.11\textsuperscript{4}; 6.11\textsuperscript{3}), prasavaśa sāvitrāh (vi.6.5\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit the last word; and the whole example is a blunder, since there is nowhere a rule requiring the lingualization of the sibilant in prasa-vāya), and gacha gosṭhānam (i.1.91\textsuperscript{2}).

The word sthānam being cited with its special case-ending, the rule would not apply to such forms as sthānāḥ, sthānī, which in fact occur in the compound pratisṭhāna (e.g. i.7.6\textsuperscript{6}; ii.4.4\textsuperscript{1}), with their sibilant converted to śh. Sava, however, having no case-ending, falls under rule i.22, and is employed as "part of a word, in order to the inclusion of a variety of cases," as the comment duly points out, and as his selected examples illustrate.

न गियौर्वं \| ११ \| ।

11. But not when dhī precedes.

The examples are adhishavanam asi (i.1.5\textsuperscript{2}: W. omits this example), adhisthavane jihvā (vi.2.11\textsuperscript{4}), and adhisthānam daram-

10. sava: sthānam: ity\textsuperscript{1} ayoḥ sakāraḥ shukāraṁ\textsuperscript{2} nā "pad-route. save 'ti paddikadeśo bahūpādānārthāḥ'. a gn-\textsuperscript{1}: anus-
\textsuperscript{2}: sav----: pras-\textsuperscript{3}: gacha----.
\textsuperscript{1} G. M. om. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. shakavan. \textsuperscript{3} B. bahānāṁ padānāṁ arthāḥ.

11. sava: sthānam: ity ayoḥ\textsuperscript{1} sakāre\textsuperscript{1} dhipūrvam nīsheho na prasaratī. yathā: adh-\textsuperscript{1}: adh-\textsuperscript{1}: dhi 'ty ayaṁ varṇaṁ pūrvo yasmadb adhu dhipūrvaṁ: tasmin.
\textsuperscript{1} B. G. M. ayoḥ. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. sakārya pūrva. \textsuperscript{3} G. M. put first. \textsuperscript{4} W. om.
bhūnam (iv.8.24). There are no other words illustrating the rule, although adhiśahavya occurs in one or two other passages.

Considering that an appended specification constituting a rule often applies only to the last word given in the preceding rule (e.g. iv.13,16), it might well enough have seemed advisable to the authors of the Prātiṣākhya to read here dhipārvaṇah, in the dual, instead of dhipārvus.

12. Also in saṁtānebhyaḥ, saptābhiḥ, sammiṭām, stānām, sitam, spacaḥ, sak, saṁi, saṇiḥ, saṇiḥ, sabhyaḥ, satvā, and sasyāyāti.

The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows. For saṁtānebhyaḥ, parisamtaṁebayah svadhā (vii.4.21). For saptaṁebhiḥ, trisaptābhiḥ paśu-kārasya (v.2.62: G. M. have only the first word). For sammiṭām, vedisaṁmiṭām mīnōti (v.6.82). For stānām, dvistaṁ māroti (v.1.64). For sitam, anustitaṁ vapi (v.2.56). For spacaḥ, tantrapāṇah pratispaṇah (v.7.31). Sak is declared a part of a word, implying a variety of forms; for example, pupeśṭaṁ prapniśaktho bhavati (ii.1.33), prapniśakthas trayo hāmanti kikha (v.6.23: G. M. omit the last word), prapniśakthas a loheta graṁakāmāh (ii.1.32: G. M. O. omit the last word), and prapniśakthāya svadhā (vii.3.18): I have noted no other cases, and should regard sakha as (by i.22) the preferable form for the grahaṇa in the rule. For saṁ, tvāmād etad gosani (vii.5.22); for saṇiḥ, avi stamāyin samārịr avi (iv.4.62: G. M. omit the first word); for saṇiḥ, vṛṣṭhaṁ upa duddhāt (v.3.19,101): gosaniḥ is found also at iii.2.57, and vṛṣṭhasaniḥ at iv.6.62. As it would satisfy all these cases to cite saṁ alone, in the character of part of a word (like sak, above), the commentator inquires why that was not done, and the citation of whole words avoided; and he brings up in reply mṛḍhā vā esho bhishpaṁ yasmat saṁdnebh itanyāḥ creyān uta (ii.4.22: all but W. stop at -tarmaṇa), and nishaṇṇāya svadhā.

---

1. G. M. coṣa. 2 G. M. kātaṁ. 3 W. B. O. sam iṣṭay. 4 G. M. om. eva. 5 G. M. om. pada. 6 W. saṁdnebhyaṁ ity evaj upasargaṇaḥvāyantat prōptih. B. O. sanmānebhyaḥ svadhā: ity evaj upa. 8 G. M. om.
(vii.1.19) as examples of the alteration of san. Sani would not cover all the cases; and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in i, or any other vowel than a, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme. For sabhayah is quoted susabheyo yu evam (vii.1.8; G. M. omit evam). For satvad, abhisattvad sabojah (i.6.4²: all the MSS. read everywhere, in text, commentary, and Sanhitā, satvā). And for suṣyayā, suṣasyayā supippalabhayāh (i.2.2³).

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with s, after a vowel other than an a-vowel. The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts: see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4; but there is no ground for so doing.

13. But not in svara, spardhā, starima, sāhasra, sārathiḥ, sphurantī, stubbh, and in sto when preceded by jyotih, āyuḥ, or catuḥ.

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing r or r from the conversion of their initial s into sh. The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows: amba ni shvara (i.4.1² and vi.4.4³); vi shpardhā chandah (iv.3.12³)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—suṣṭarimā Justhand (v.1.11²); dvishāsraṁ cinvita (v.6.8²; G. M. omit cinvita), and trishāsraṁ na asdu lokah (v.6.8³; G. M. omit after ni)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of sāhasra by its theme-ending a, according to rule i.22: other forms do not occur in the Sanhitā, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—kāmayate suskārathih (iv.6.8²); and visphurantī amitrān (iv.6.8²).

The next case is a very anomalous one, being the conversion of s into sh after a, contrary to the first specification of rule 7. The phrase is sushepya chandah (iv.3.12²; p. sa-stup). Compare similar cases as noted in Ath. Pr. ii.95.

The combination of sto with the three words mentioned, although
not quite regular, has nothing strange in it. The final visarpjaniya of the first member of the compound is lost by i.1, and the sibilant is treated as it would be had no h been present. The examples are jyotishthomam prathamam (vii.4.10¹, 11¹), dyushthomain triyam (vii.4.11¹), and catushtho abhavat (v.3.11²); jyotishthoma and catushthoma occur in a number of other passages, which it is not worth while here to rehearse. The exception this time is to the second specification of rule 7, according to which the consonant h at the end of the former member of the compound would prevent the lingualization of the sibilant. Of course, according to the theory of the Prātiṣākhya (by v.3), the lingualization is first performed, giving jyotishthoma etc., and then, by i.1, the visarpjaniya disappears, making jyotishthoma, as all the manuscripts, of comment and Sanhitā, constantly read.

The commentator remarks the fact that, from starima on, the cases are such as fall under the last specification of the second rule of this chapter. He then adds, as counter-examples under sto, yad aksnavāstoniydhi (v.3.3¹), catustandin karoti (v.1.6¹), and jyotis tu 'd asya (ii.2.4³: but G. M. omit this example).

There are a few other words which we might expect to see included among those forming the subject of this rule. Such is barhishad (iv.6.1⁴ et al.), i.e. barhi-sad: but the Rik and Atharvan pada-texts adopt the omission of the final h as part of their own reading, and the Tāttirīlya (p. barhi-sad) does the same, so that the irregularity of the word lies outside the Prātiṣākhya. Such, again, are dushtara (iv.4.12²) and dushtaritu (iv.4.12¹), provided that, as seems to me probable (compare note to Ath. Pr. ii.85), they are regarded as compounds of duh with stara and startu. But these words are written by the pada-texts of the other Vedas du-stara and dustaritv, and the pada-text of the Tāttirīlya-Sanhitā reads dushtara and dushtaritv, so that there is no reason for their peculiar phonetic form being noticed by the Prātiṣākhya. Once more, trishaghramādhatvā (ii.4.11⁴) would call for inclusion here, but that the addition of the suffix tev at its end annuls the separation which would otherwise be made of the first element of the compound, trih, and the word stands in pada-text trishaghramādhavāty, and so does not require alteration in sanhitā.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{trish} & \quad \text{kan} & \quad \text{vish} & \quad \text{sash} & \quad \text{yot} & \quad \text{ay} \\
\text{cat} & \quad \text{starimādina} & \text{ehām avagrahapārvvatād prāptih} & \text{jyotirādipārvatena kim} & \text{yad} & \text{sto ili kim} & \text{cat} & \text{yot} \\
\end{align*}\]

¹ G. M. om. ² G. M. āty detach. ³ W. B. om. ⁴ W. B. O. om.
14. 

14. In tarhán, tasmin, lokán, vidván, tán, trín, yushmán, ārdhván, ambakán, rtán, açma, kṛvan, pitn, anán, kapalán, tishthan when accented on the first syllable, nemīr deván, and savane pačán, an original n, followed by a t, becomes s, when the t is a constant one.

There seems to be no particular reason why this rule is introduced here, instead of anywhere else in the work, as it has no relation with the rest of the contents of the chapter. It is a complete rehearsal of the cases in which the old s, with which most Sanskrit words in n originally ended, is retained under the protection of a following initial t. The combination, of course, is historically identical with that of n c into nqc, treated of in the preceding chapter (v.20: see the note upon that rule). The "conversion" of n into s, as the treatise chooses to state the case, involves, by xv.1–3, the prefixation of anvusodra to the sibilant.

The examples quoted by the commentator are as follows. For tarhán, potatarahánā trihantī (i.5.44 and v.4.71). For tasmin, tasmiña tvā dadhmānī (i.6.51; 7.51). For lokán, imán eva lokahānā tirvā (ii.5.43): there is another case of lokahān at ii.3.61. For vidvān, ya evāṁ vidvānā traivedhātāviyena yajate (ii.4.111: G. M. stop with -yena: the Taittirīya-Saṅhītā has paṇukāmo before yajate, which W. B. O. have doubtless dropped out by an oversight). For tān, kakshēva aghāyava tānā tvā dadhmānī jambhāyoh (iv.1.103: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last one): tānā is also found at ii.4.114: iii.1.94: iv.1.102 twice: vi.3.14 twice: 4.1034. For trīn, trīnām triām mu (ii.5.101). For yushmān, yushmānā te 'nu (ii.2.54): we find yushmānā again at vii.1.52. For ārdhvān, yān ārdhvinānā tān upadīmatāh (iii.1.91: only G. M. have the first word). For ambakān, tryambakānām tryāvanam akurnata (iii.2.23: G. M. omit the last word). For rūn, rūnān tanvate kavyathā pahānatin (iv.3.113: G. M. omit after tanvate). For açma, açmānā te keshu (iv.6.11 and v.4.41). For kṛvan, punah kṛvanāḥ tvā pitarānāh yavānām (iv.7.184: only W. has the last word). For pitn, oja iti pitīnān tantak iti (v.3.61: 14. 

14. 

14. ——- ādhyātta tishthangrahaṇe——— eshu grahaṇeshu prākṛto nakārah padoṣamaye vartamānaḥ takāraparāh sakāram ēpadyate. yathā: get——— tasm——— imān——— ya———: 

kaksh——— triḥ——— yush——— yān——— tryam——— rt——— açm——— punaḥ——— oja——— prān——— api vikram (l.51) iti vacanāt etad bhavati: dvād——— triḥb———: 

ādhyātta iti kim: na——— apy akāraṇi (l.52) iti prāptih: nema——— nemir iti kim: jat——— mādh——— savana iti kim:

VOL. IX. 22
only G. M. have the first two words). For anān, prāṃsāḥ tasyāṁ
'neti yanti (vii.1.3): p. pro-anān: here rule i.51 is invoked to show
that the lingualized n does not render the citation inoperative.
For kāpaddān, daddapakapaddāns tṛtyaśavane (vii.5.6). For tis-
ṭhān, tīdhīs tisṭhānās tīśṭhāti (v.4.12): as counter-example,
proving the necessity of the requirement as to accent, we have sa
praty atisṭhānām ta vasukō 'si (v.3.6): G. M. omit na), which
would fall under the operation of the present rule by i.52. For
nemīr devān, nemīr devāṇī tvām paribhir āsi (ii.5.9: G. M. omit
āsi); with the counter-example jātavedo vasayā gache devān tvān
hi (iii.1.4: G. M. omit the first word), to show that devān is so
treated only after nemīh. For savane paśān, mādhyāndane sa-
vane paśānās tṛtyaśavane (iii.2.9: G. M. omit the first word);
with the counter-example prajām paśān tenār cārdhuta (vii.4.3),
to prove the need of savane in the rule. Then, as general counter-
example, to bring out the fact that n is thus converted into s only
before t, we have tasmān prajāpatir vāyūh (vii.1.5): G. M. add also
lokān draviniśvatah (v.3.11). And finally, the commentator pro-
ceeds to explain and illustrate the limitations “an original (prāktu)
n” and “a constant (niśya) t,” given in the rule. An original n is
one which is not the product of euphonic processes, but is read in
the pada-text: in tām tena samayati (v.7.3), then, where the in
represents a n, produced by the assimilation of n to the following
t (by v.27), the rule has no force. A constant t, in like manner, is
one which is found in all forms of the text, and not in saṁhitā
alone: hence, in vidhāt somena yajate (ii.2.2), the t which is in-
roduced (by v.33) between n and s does not cause the conversion
of the n into s. The t in this case, to be sure, is (by xiv.12) to be
turned into th (and is so written in the citation by W. G. M.); but,
as the rules of the treatise (by v.3) have to be applied in their
order, the danger of misapprehension upon the point in question
requires to be guarded against: for a t inserted by authority of the
fifth chapter might assimilate a nasal according to the sixth,
before it was itself turned into an innocuous th by the fourteenth.
The cases in which the insertion of s between n and t is made in
the Taṁśīrīya-Saṁhitā are thus seen to number only thirty-one. On
the other hand, the cases of the collision of n and t without inter-
position of s are very numerous: I have noted about two hundred

praj....: tākārapara iti 'kim: tasmān....: lokān....: prā-
kṛta iti kim: tām....: vāyūtayā nakāro 'makaṇa spar-
śaparāha (v.2): iti prāptata: niśya takāra iti kim: vaid-
....: anityo 'yam nakāro yataḥ padasamaye na 'asti.
tākāraḥ paro yasmād asmau tathāktaḥ'.

iti tīdhīhāṣyaratne prātipādhyāvācārane
shashēko 'dhṛtyān.'

1 B. o. asaka. 2 G. M. niśya pada. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. aparātya. 5 G. M. ins.
6 B. o. asaka padasamaye na 'asti. 7 G. M. om. 8 G. M. tākārapara. 
and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion. In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath. Pr. ii.26) the condition of things is quite different: while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight). The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts.

CHAPTER VII.

CONTENTS: 1–12, cases of the conversion of n into n; 13–14, of t and th into t and th; 15–16, exceptions to the conversion of n into n.

1. Now for conversion of n into n.

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14). We have treated here all the cases with which the Prātiṣṭhāṣṭrya has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of pada-text into sanhitā: chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq.) takes up the occurrence of n in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Sanhitā.

1. uthe īty ayam adhikāraḥ: nakāraḥ nakāram āpadyata ity etad adhikśatam veditavyam ita uttaraṃ yad vakṣyāmah.

2. 1st example nākāraḥ nākāram āpadyate. yathā: urdhā... *grh... ity atra nātvam na bhavati pada-gra-haneshu (i.50) iti vacanāt: mo...: susa ity etayor yadd shatvam nā 'sti tadd nātvamishedhārtham vādikṣta-grahanaṃ: ya-
that śu and śā are cited in the rule in their altered form (not as su simply, which, by i.51, would include them both) in order to indicate that where their consonant is not lingualized they do not lingualize the following nasal; and he quotes in illustration su na stāye (iv.1.42) and sā na indra (i.8.3). Both these passages are the same which have been already quoted to illustrate the conversion, and G. M. O. very properly put them into the form of another text (apparently a krama), reading su nāh: na utāye, and sā nāh: na indra. Shi converts n to n also at iv.6.56. For kṛdhī swāh, the passage is brahmaṇā kṛdhī svār na gukram (ii.2.126: O. omits the first word: the Calcutta edition has the false reading ni); and the necessity of kṛdhī is shown by the counter-example svāhā svār na r̥kaḥ svāhā (v.7.52: O. omits the first word). For sam indra, sam indra no manasā (i.4.441); and vartaye 'ndra nārdabula (iii.3.101) shows that indra when not preceded by sam does not exercise the prescribed influence. For aṣṭūrī, aṣṭūrī no gāhapatyāṇa samtu (v.7.21: only O. has samtu). For uru, uru nās kṛdhī (ii.6.111 and vi.3.28): there is another like case at iv.7.14. For vadh, tasmād vār nāma vo hitam (v.6.13: G. M. omit the last two words). For śat, shannavatādī svāhā (vii.2.15). For tri, triṇava stoma nāśanasī (iv.3.91: G. M. O. omit the last word): the word triṇava is found in a considerable number of other passages. For grāma, W. B. give grāmāni rājanyah (ii.5.41), but G. M. O. have instead grāmānyam prā 'puvantī (vii.4.52): the word is found once more, at iv.4.31. For niḥ, nir nenijoti tato 'dhi (vii.2.102: G. M. omit the last two words); and ni no rāyim (ii.2.128) is added, to show that niḥ, without visarjanya, has no alterant force. Nir nenikte (vii.2.104) and nirṇī (iv.6.81) are the only other cases I have noted for niḥ.

3. Also in hanyāt and upyamanām.

That is to say, after niḥ, the last of the words given in the preceding rule. The passages are: yoner garbhāṃ nir hanyāt (v.6.91: 

thā: su...... sā...... brah...... kṛdhī 'ti kim: svāhā...... sam...... sam iti kim: vart...... aṣṭū...... uru...... tas-

mād...... shan...... tri...... grām...... nir...... visargaṇa kim: ni......

1 G. M. om. 2 O. shuḥū. 3 G. M. om. 4 O. shuḥū.

3. cakāro nishpārnavam anvāḍiṣati: niḥṣabdhottarayor1 han-

yād upyamanām ity evayor grahaṇayor2 nākāra ṇakāram3 āpady-

yate. yathā: yon...... nir...... anvādeṣāḥ kimarthuḥ: na

1 G. M. 'bdanyo 'it: O. nishpārnavor. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. 'nakāvam; B. 'tvam. 4 G. M. om.
O. omits the first word), and nirupamam abhi mantreyeta (i.6.8²: O. omits the last word). A counter-example, showing hanyat without altered n, is na ni hanyan na lohitain kuryat (i.6.10²).

4. Also after pari, pari, parī, and pra.

The illustrative citations of the commentator are pārīnāhyasye "pe (vi.2.11), pari no rudraya (iv.5.10⁴), vīravatam pārīnasam (ii.2.12²), and pra no devi sarasvatī (i.8.22¹: O. omits the last word). For pari (p. pārīnāhyasya: compare iii.7) there is no other case; nor for pari (p. pari-nasam: compare iii.7); for pari, I find only pari nayati (ii.3.4⁹ et al.) But for pra the examples are quite numerous: we have pra naḥ at i.5.11⁴; 6.4³; 7.10⁴ twice; ii.5.12¹; iii.1.1¹²; 3.11¹; iv.2.6⁸; v.5.7⁵; vii.4.1⁹; pra nāmāni at iv.3.1³; forms of pra nayāmi at i.6.8¹ et al., of pra nade at ii.1.3⁴ et al.; praṇāṇḍya at i.3.5⁴; praṇītāno at iv.4.9¹; pra nenekti at vi.2.9¹; praṇi at ii.5.9⁴, praṇi at i.4.1⁸ and su-praṇi (but p. su-praṇi) at i.5.11⁴ et al., praṇeṣṭa at iii.5.1¹, and praṇa at i.3.2⁶. Parāṇuṭti occurs only in composition (vi.2.3²; p. bhadravāya-parāṇuttī).

5. And that, even when an a-vowel intervenes.

The word "even" (api) here brings down by implication, according to the commentator, the words in the preceding rule from pari on—that is to say, virtually, pari and pra, for there is no case of pari exercising such an effect. The examples for pari are agram pary anayat (ii.3.4⁹: all but O. omit agram: I find besides only pary anayan, at vi.5.7²), and paryāṇyaḥ "havanīyasya (vii.1.6⁵). For pra, we have praṇāṇḍya svadhā (vii.1.1⁹¹); p. pra-anayya, and anu praḥ nyāt praṭhāmān (v.5.5³; p. pra 'ti: anyāt: only O. has anu). The occurrence of praṇa is very frequent: of other cases, I have noted only praḥ 'ndata at vi.2.3², and praḥ 'nudanta at vi.4.1³⁴—where, however, the linguilization of the n is suspended in our text, as at present constituted, by the intervention

4. .... evampūrvo nakāro nakāram āpadyate. yathā: pārī...... pari...... vīr...... pra......

1 G. M. O. om.

5. apiṣcadūḥ paryādyā' avadācitāḥ: paryādāṭūro nakāro avārnavyaveto 'pi nātyam bhujate. yathā: agram..... paryā...... praṇ..... anu..... avārnavyavetā iti kim: pari..... pra.....

1 B. pārī. ² G. M. O. 'adeṣakāh. ³ B. pārī. ⁴ G. M. āpadyate. ⁵ G. M. O. om.
between the preposition and the verb of the pause which separates
the third and fourth divisions of the section.

A couple of counter-examples are given, to show us that the in-
tervention of a letter of any other complexion than ṛ prevents
the change of nasal: they are pari minuyāt supta (v.2.6\(^3\): G. M.
omit the last word), and pramīnāma vṛatī (i.1.14\(^4\)).

6. Also in vāhanah, uhyānānah, yānam, ayan, yavena, and
van.

According to W. B. O., the ṷ becomes Ṽ in these words "when
they are preceded as implied by the word 'also' (ca.)," the
commentary failing to tell us what this implication is. G. M., how-
ever, confess that pra only is brought forward (from rule 4): which
is a marked departure from the ordinary usage of the treatise,
since in the intermediate rule pra and pari were both distinctly
understood. The commentator omits, not to say avoids, noticing
the irregularity. Perhaps he would be justified in claiming that
pari and pari are never found preceding the words specified in
the rule, and that therefore it makes no difference whether they be re-
garded as implied or not: still, even that consideration would not
wholly excuse the want of accuracy and consistency. The exam-
plars are: for vāhanah, pravāhano vāhanīh (i.3.3; p. pra-vāhanah);
to this, W. adds a counter-example, to show that, after any other
word than pra, vāhanah remains unchanged—namely havyavāha-
nah śvātro 'si (i.3.3): B. tries to do the same, but only succeeds in
repeating one of the counter-examples of the last rule, pari minu-
yāt (v.2.6\(^3\)), which is not at all in place here. For uhyāmānah,
prohyānāno 'dhipatiḥ (iv.4.9; p. pra-uhyāmānah). For yānam,
pravyānam anu anya id yunuh (iv.1.12; p. pra-yānam: O. omits
the last three words, G. M. the last two). Ayan is declared a part
of a word, including a number of cases, of which G. M. give only
three, tasamād adityah prāyaṇiyah (vi.1.5\(^1\); p. pra-ayaniyah: O.
omits tasamā), prāyaṇiyam kāryam (vi.1.53\(^5\)), and prāyaṇam pra-
tikthān (i.6.11\(^1\); p. pra-ayanam); while W. B. O. add two others,
prayayiṣyāya purovūkyāḥ (vi.1.5\(^2\)), and prāyaṇye 'han (vii.2.
8\(^1\)). There are a number of other passages for prāyaṇiya; and
prāyaṇa occurs again at i.6.11\(^2\) and vii.1.13, besides its compounds,

---

1 G. M. oṣu. 2 G. M. 'ṣṭapropārvo. 3 G. M. om.; O. om. the example.
4 G. M. ity utt. 5 G. M. O. B. om. 6 G. M. om.
supradhana (v.1.112; p. supradhanā) and agnishtomapradhana (vii.2.91; p. agnishtoma-pradhanā). For yavana, prayavena pada (v.3.112; p. pra-yavana). ṇa, again, is (by W. alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases: only two are given, yadi va tāvat prayanam (ii.4.121), and dhavanīyāt prayanaḥ syat (v.2.64), nor have I found any other, except the compound purastāt-prayanah (v.3.15; p. purastāt-prayanah). Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule: they are asi havyanāhanaḥ (i.3.3), and udayanam vedā (i.6.112).

प्रापृव्र्थी || 7 ||

7. As also, when preceded by pra.

The “also” (ca) of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely van. The example is prāvanebhih sajoshanaḥ (iv.2.42; p. prā-vanebhiḥ: compare iii.5). I have noted no other case.

इन्द्रोध्यनुशूर्व एनकेन || 8 ||

8. Also enam and kena, when preceded respectively by indraḥ and ayajukh.

There is nothing in the rule meaning ‘respectively,’ and if enam were found anywhere in the text preceded by ayajukh, or kena by indraḥ, their n’s would doubtless require lingualization: yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated. The passages are indra enam prathamaḥ (iv.6.71), and yad ayajukhekena kriyate (v.1.28; p. ayajukh-kena: G. M. O. omit yat). I find no other cases falling under the rule: there are, however, one or two other forms analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely anācirkena and saācirkena (i.8.104); but they are written by the padu-text without division of ācirkena, or restoration in it of the dental n (thru: anācirkena, and saācirkena).

Counter-examples are added: to show that enam and kena, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, rudra enam bhūtvā (i.3.109), and brahmavādinah kena tad ajāmi tī (vii.4.102: G. M. O. end with kena); to show that indraḥ does not exercise a lin-

7. cakāramāthṣe vann iti grahiṇe nakāraḥ pra’ty evamprāro nātram bhajate. yathā: pra-v-....

1 W. B. -ṣā; O. cakāro ‘nudalṣāto. 9 G. M. om.


1 G. M. O. ity evamparva. 9 G. M. O. om. 9 W. om. 9 B. kena.
qualizing effect upon other words, indro neshad ati (v.7.23: B. omits ati; W. omits the whole example).

9. Also manah, when preceded by nr or cri.

The examples are nrmanda ajasram (i.3.144 and iv.2.21: W. reads yunti instead of ajasram, but doubtless by a copyist’s blunder, for nrmanda yunti is not found in the Sanhita), and grimah yanapayah (iv.6.31); with the counter-example sumand upaguki (iii.3.114). Of grimah I find no other example; nrmanda occurs also at iv.2.21 (a second time) and vii.1.12.

10. Also ahgdnam, one, gdn, gdnam, gyni, and yamen.

These words in sanhita, says the commentator: that is to say, in the only cases in which they occur as podas, they take in the combined text. The passages are: yat tryaṅgdnām samavadyati (vi.3.101; p. tri-āngānam: only G. M. O. have yat, and O. omits the last word), ayushi durone (i.2.144; p. duh-one: the padu-texts of the Rik and Atharvan do not separate this word), ati durvāni viṣpā (i.1.144; p. duh-āni, like the other Vedas), purogānāni ca kshushe (iii.2.44; p. purah-ānām), svārgyānī āsan (v.3.51; p. svāgānāni), and antaryānena ‘ntar adhatta (vi.4.61; p. antah-yāmena: O. omits the last word). I have found no second example for any of these words, although there may be occurrences of durone which I have overlooked.

11. Also havani, ahne, han, when preceded by r or shah.

The cited examples are: agnihotraḥ havani ca (i.6.83; p. agnihotra-havani); çarady aparādhā (ii.1.25; p. aparā-ahne: the Atharvan has aparā-ahnah); and further, for han, which is declared to be a part of a word, involving several cases, rakshohanam (i.2.146 et al.; p. rakshah-hanam: O. omits this example), vāish-

9. nr: cri: ity‘ evampārva mand ity atra nakrō natvar bha¬jate. yathā: nr-m-—: cri-— evampārva iti kim: sum-

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. om.

10. ...... estehu nakrāh sanhitāyahānā natvar bha¬jate. yathā: yat-—: dy-—: ati-—: puro-—: suv-—: ant¬ary-—

1 G. M. O. eshu. 2 W. G. M. O. om.
11. havani: ahne: han: eshu grahaneshu nakaro rephaparvah 'sha ity evamparvo' vad natvam bhajate. yatd: agnih:
            ... gar....: hann iti padakadeso bahupadaanartah: rakh......: vaish......: vtr...... evamparva iti kim: sahna
            ..... vad.
1 W. O. havani. 2 G. M. ahan. 3 W. evam. 4 G. M. shakdra. 5 W. B. skarp.; G. M. pardo. 6 G. M. aham.

12. mayani: ani: ity atra rasparvo nakaro natvam bhajate. 
yatd: 'daruam-----' tev...... evamparva iti kim: yanii.....
            aghaye..... repaharanena kim: svan.
1 W. O. ani, as also (with T.) in rule; G. M. anika, as also in rule. 2 G. M. O. put after atra. 3 W. G. M. om. 4 G. M. om.
13. After vāghā and sh, t is changed to t.

The passage for vāghā is given by O. as dāravghātasya (vi.5.15\(^1\)); all the other MSS. have only the first word, in its complete padav-form, dāravghāta iti dāravghātah. The same word forms the subject of Vāj. Pr. iii.47. As counter-example, showing that t does not become ta after ghā except when the latter follows vā, we have praghātā aśityānā (vi.1.1\(^4\)). For the conversion of t to t after sh is quoted dyush ta dyurdah agne (ii.5.12\(^1\): G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two), whose sh depends on rule vi.5, above. O. adds a counter-example for this second part of the rule also, namely agnis te tejah (i.1.10\(^2\) and vii.5.17).

14. Also th to th.

The cited example is gośham mā nirmksham (i.1.10\(^1\): W. B. omit the last word); to which O. alone adds prati shthapayanti (vi.1.4\(^2\)). As counter-example is given gacha gośhanam (i.1.9\(^1\).\(^2\)).

15. But not when t follows.

The commentator explains the connection of this rule by pointing out that the two preceding do not come under the introductory heading of the chapter—that is to say, that they deal with a subject unconnected with the rest of its contents—and that hence they are regarded as dropped out, and the present exception does not apply to them, but to the foregoing rules, for conversion of n into n. This is well enough, though not a little awkward, as concerns the status of rule 15; but we should like to hear what he had to say in defense of the intrusion of rules 13 and 14 thus into

---

\(^1\) G. M. om.; O. om. kāru. \(^2\) O. śpadyate. \(^3\) W. G. M. om. \(^4\) W. vāghā; B. vāghāta. \(^5\) Only in O.

14. cakārah shaparvataśkaryah; thakārah shakārapūrvah; thakārah bhajate. yathā: gosh----- 'prati'----- evam-pūrvah iti kim: gacha-----

\(^1\) G. M. shakārap; O. thadeśakah. \(^2\) O. om. kāru. \(^3\) Only in O. \(^4\) O. shap-.
a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection. Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix; or else put at the head of chapter vii., before its general adhikāra.

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely pary antarikshāti (iii.1.102), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require an at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made.

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii.15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of pauruṣa, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove. It is characteristic of the method of the Tāttvīrya-Prātiṣṭākhyā that it does not attempt to state the real nimitta or occasion of the lingual n in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.8, where the subject of the occurrence of n in the interior of a word is taken up.

नक्षत्रितनूृत्वसृष्टिशृव्याबिधिसृत्यस्त्राणःस्रातः || १६८||

16. Nor in nāhyati, nānām, nṛtyanti, anyah, anābhīḥ, anyāṇi; nor when final.

The ca in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception. These words, and a final n, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual n. The commentator quotes as follows. For nāhyati, vāsasāḥ paryānahyati (vi.1.112; p. pari-nāhyati: O. omits the first word); he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5. For nānām, pra nānām pār
navandhāraḥ (i.8.5: O. omits the last word). For nṛtyanti, pari nṛtyanti (vii.5.10). For the three cases of anya, prd 'nyaḥ caṇādi (vii.5.9.), prd 'nyaḥhyāḥ yachaty ann anyādi mantrayate (v.1.6: O. omits pra in all these three examples, and in this, along with G. M., the last three words; B. omits the last word), and prd 'nyaḥ pārāṇi (vii.5.112): the commentator remarks that all these (since nāhyati) are cases of exceptions under rule 4. He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

15. vāgdhahādēvidhīr anadhikṛtatvād utpānnaṃ upadhravāṇi: tasmād atān na 'yān nishedhāḥ: 'kiṁ tu prakṛto' nātvavidhir anena vishayakriyate. takdāraparā nakāra na naṁ na 'padyate. yathā: pary....: pārīparipariprāparvāh (vii.4): avar-naṇyaaveto 'pi (vii.5) iti etābhāyaḥ śrotrapiḥ.

1 W. O. vāghāda. 2 G. M. tvāra. 3 B. viṃshah. 4 O. om. 5 W. O. prak.
6 W. B. ādibhydham.

16. nishedhākarshakac cakāraḥ: ....... ehu' grahanehu na-kāraḥ paśantac ca' natvāṁ na bhajate: yathā: vāḥ....: avar-naṇyaaveto 'pi (vii.5) iti prāpītiḥ: pra....: pari....: prā
are quoted in the rule, instead of the syllable an, which would include them all; and makes the very obvious answer, that it is on account of the passage anu prāṇyāt prathamān (v.5.5), already quoted under vii.5. Finally, as example of final n exempt from conversion, he cites vrtraḥḥaḥ cāra vidvān (i.4.42), remarking that it is a case otherwise falling under rule 11.

The exception of a final n from becoming n is also one of those made below, in rule xiii.15, for the class of cases to which that chapter relates.

I have not discovered in the Sanshitā any case of a lingual nasal arising in the conversion of pada-text into sanhitā which is not duly provided for in this chapter.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONTENTS: 1–4, conversion of a final surd mute to sonant or nasal; 5–7, of k to r; 8–15, conversions of k to r after a and a; 16–22, treatment of k before r; 23–35, conversion of k to s or sh before k, kh, or p.

ग्रंथ: प्रथम: ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for changes of first mutes.

That is to say, of surds unaspirated, or k, c (only c nowhere occurs as a final), t, s, and p. The force of this heading only reaches, as the commentary points out, through rule 4—hardly far enough, one would think, to make a separate introductory rule necessary.

....: prā....: prā....: pāṃprāpariparipraprāvah (vii.4) ity eṣām' prāptih. ann ity etdāṭaḥ siddhe 'nyonyābhiranyāni 'ti kin pratipadaṇḍhena': anu.... ity atṛd 'nena'' nishedho' na'' prasaratī". "padānto nakāra nitravān na bhajate: yathā": vrtra....: rasthaḥprāvah (vii.11) iti prāptih.

iti trībhāshyaratne prātipākhyanivaranən savantar 'dhyāyaḥ.

1 B. G. M. O. put first. 2 B. O. eteṣu. 3 G. M. om.; O. adds nakaro. 4 G. M. upadyate. 5 G. M. O. om. 6 W. B. om. prapāvah. 7 G. M. eteṣaṁ. 8 G. M. O. -vāda va. 9 O. puts before kām. 10 O. nā 'sha. 11 G. M. prāśe. 12 G. M. O. om. 13 G. M. - vā. 14 B. O. om.; G. M. padānto ca.

1. athi 'ty 'ayam adhikāraḥ: prathamān 'ity stud adhikṣaṇaṃ vedātavyām ita uttaram yad vakṣyāmaḥ: ' visarjantiya (vii.5) paryanto' 'yam adhikāraḥ.

(0) W. adhikārārddhak. (0) G. M. om. 0 O. ins. aṭha. 4 O. tisthtrapā.
2. A first mute, followed by a last mute, becomes a last mute of its own series.

The examples selected by the commentator to illustrate this mode of combination are vāḥ ma āsom (v.5.9*), shanuvatyaśi svadhā (vii.2.15), and tan mahendra (vi.5.5*). For the conversion of p into m he is able to offer no instance, as none occurs in the Sanhitā. As counter-examples, showing that only a nasal causes the conversion, and causes it only in a “first” mute, he brings up vāk ta d pyāyātan (i.3.9*: only G. M. have the last word), and imāṁ no vācma (vi.4.7*).

All the Prātiçākhyas join in treating this conversion as necessary, not as alternative with conversion into a sonant (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.5).

3. Followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant, it becomes a third mute.

The examples are rāhag ayād rāhag uta (i.4.44*), and yud vādi hotā (iii.2.9*).

4. Also in kakut, when m follows.

Namely, in the passage kakudmān pratiṛtir vījasātmāh (i.7.7*; p. kakutmān: G. M. O. omit the last word). As counter-examples are given ya uṃmadīte (iii.4.8*: G. M. O. omit yathā), and, according to W. B., kakut trayastiṇčāh (vii.2.5*); for which G. M. O. substitute kakuc chandaḥ (iv.3.12*). The commentator

2. uttama paraḥ prathamaḥ śavargiyam uttamaṁ āpadyate. yathā: vāḥ.....: shan.....: tan..... evampuru iti kim: vāk.....: prathama iti kim: imāṁ.....: uttamaṁ paro yasmād asdo uttama paraḥ.

1 G. M. O. inā. 2 G. M. om.

3. śavargohavatparaḥ prathamaḥ śavargiyam tṛtiyam āpadyate. yathā: rāhag.....: yad.....: ity ādi śavargo hañvanti ca śavargohavanāḥ: te pare yasmād āsād sa ta-thoktaḥ.

1 B. om.; G. M. O. śavargo-hañvanta ca. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 G. M. om.

4. kakud ity asmin grhaṇe 'ntyo varno' maṅgāraṇaḥ ca kārākṛteḥ śavargiyam tṛtiyam āpadyate. yathā: kakud.....

1 G. M. O. inā. 2 G. M. om.
notices, finally, that the present rule establishes an exception to rule 2 of this chapter.

5. Now for changes of visarjaniya.

Departing a little from his stereotyped mode of explanation of atha, the commentary declares it in this rule to cause visarjaniya to be understood, in the character of that respecting which something is to be enjoined (laksya), in the precepts that follow; and he adds that this understanding is to remain in force as far as rule 10 of the next chapter.

6. Visarjaniya becomes \( r \) before the classes of sounds last mentioned.

The examples are \( \text{tad agnir aha (iv.2.81)} \), and \( \text{apar ma urjam (iii.2.85)} \); O. omits urjam); with the counter-example \( \text{agnic ca ma indrac ca me (iv.7.61)} \). The commentator points out that it is the plural form of the pronoun (etesu, literally ‘before those’) in this rule that shows the implication of the vowels and sonant consonants, in the character of following causes (paranimitta), since those are the only things which have been mentioned above (namely, in rule 3). That is doubtless so; still, the reference must be regarded as an unusually blind one, involving a “frog-leap” (maudikapulti) over two intervening obstacles, of which one is a general heading, that changes entirely the subject under treatment.

\[ \text{kakud iti kim: ya...: evampara iti kim: kakut... makaraha yasmd adha makdarparah. uttamarapa uttama\text{\textregistered} saurasgiyam (viii 2) ity anya 'punado 'yam.} \]

1 G. M. t-koro. 2 W. makara. 3 G. M. O. put after tritiyam. 4 W. pratyate. 5 G. M. om.

5. atapabdo visarjaniya\text{\textregistered} lakshyatvena dhikaroti 'tha uttara\text{\textregistered} vay vacye\text{\textregistered}. atha svaramparo yakaram (ix.10) ity avadhibhuto 'yam adhikara\text{\textregistered}.

1 G. M. vakshyamah.

6. \( \text{svarashu ghoshamat ca parato visarjaniyo repham apadayate. yathd: tad...: apar... estesu iti bhuvane} \text{\textregistered} samad\text{\textregistered} nirde\text{\textregistered} svaramgoshavatam paranimittanam upddnam: teesam eva prakrtatud\text{\textregistered}. etesu iti kim: agnic...} \)

1 G. M. ins. estesu. 2 G. M. om. 3 O. parashu. 4 G. M. O. om. 5 W. B. svarashu. 6 W. O. svaramadma; B. -nāmī. 7 G. M. -ndā.
7. But not before r.

R, though a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final visarjanīya before it. What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq.). The examples here given are suvo rohāva (i.7.9), and ahorātre (i.5.97 et al.: W. O. add pārṣe, but there is no such collocation of words in the Sāhityā, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for prāvīgan, which follows next at the place referred to).

Visarjanīya becomes r in kvāh, abhāh, vāh, hāh, abibhāh, ajīgah, akah, anantah, vivah, suvah, punah, aharah, prālah, vastah, camīlah, savīlah, sanūlah, sanūlah, stolah, holah, pīlah, mālah, yasīlah, esīlah, nesīlah, and tvasīlah.

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original r after a and ṣ, which is protected and brought to light by s following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original s, although both r and s are represented, as finals, by the indifferent visarjanīya. The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix.7,9,10. His illustrative examples are as follows. For kvāh,

1. repahaparo visarjanīyo repahāṃ nā "padyate. yathā": suvo ahor....: ghoshavatvād repahṣya pārvavidhīprāptīḥ. repahāḥ paro yasmād asū rephapahāḥ.

2. eteṣu' visarjanīyo repaham ōpadyate svaraghoshavatparah: yathā: mā..... yonāv..... vār..... mā me..... āb..... oṣha..... dev--.....'karāvar anudātte pade' (viii.9) iti vahṣyati: tendi 'vai' 'tad' api sidhyati' api aksārdi (i.52) iti vacanāti: iti cet: māi 'vam: anudātte khaṭabde tad bhavati: idān tv anyavardhānīti: yathā: arvā..... "ādyuddattas tv idam". yajñā..... antar anādyuddatte (viii.10) iti vahṣyati: tamād anākārdi ca" (i.53) iti vacanāt sidhyati: iti cet: "māi 'vam": anādyuddatte tad bhavati: ādyuddārtham" "idān grañṇam". ca..... suvar..... punar..... ahor....
according to W. B., ma havr mitrasya (i.1.4); but, according to G. M. O., ma havr vasandm (i.1.3): I have found the word only in these two sections. For abhad, yonav abhdr ukha (iv.2.5). For vah, nar nama vo hitam (v.6.1). For hah, ma me pra hah asti va idan (ii.4.12-5; vi.5.11-2: only G. M. have the last two words): the word is found also at ii.4.12; 5.2;5.6. For abhah, as the only passage where it occurs (ii.6.12) does not exhibit in sahita the final r, we have the jatd-text quoted, namely abhahas tambum abhahar abhahas tam. Ajigah, for the same reason, is treated in the same way in W. B. O., namely oshahdir ajigar ajigar oshahdir ajigar: ajigar ity ajigar (iv.6.7); but G. M. read simply oshahdir ajigar. For akah, devatr hkar ajakhirena (v.1.7): G. M. omit the last word: it is found also at i.3.14 twice; 5.2: ii.4.9; 5.7; iii.10.8; 4.10: iv.1.2: v.2.18, 87; vi.4.8. As for this akah, the commentator supposes the objection raised that rule 9, which teaches that kah and dhah change h to r in an unaccented word, combined with rule i.52, which would extend the force of that rule to kah with a prefixed, is sufficient to cover the cases of its occurrence, without separate mention in the present rule; but he denies the pertinence of the objection, on the ground that the specification here made includes all instances of akah, without regard to their accentuation—for example, akah at iv.1.2, which is accentEd on the first syllable, but exhibits r in its jatd-reading, ahrd hkar dkar arvd rvd kah. For anantah, yaaparisho nantari tyd (v.2.5). A precisely similar objection is suggested to this word also, on the ground of rules viii.10 and i.53 combined; and it is similarly repelled, by reference to the difference of accent: anantar has the acute on the first syllable, which rule 10 forbids. For vivah is given, again in jatd-text, ca vivar vivac ca ca vivah: vivar iti vivah (iv.2.8); only O. has the final repetition of vivah: the Atharvan reads vi vah, as two separate words, in the corres-
ponding passage, iv.1.1). For suvāh, swar asv swar me yacha (v.7.6: O. omits the last word): the numerous passages in which this word occurs it would be quite useless to rehearse. For punah, punar avidya sadanam (iv.2.3: O. omits the last word): this, too, is of too frequent occurrence to be worth detailed reference. For aharahah, aharahar havirdhānīnām (ii.5.8): the same repetition of aharah is found further at i.5.9 twice,7 ii.5.6. In connection herewith is made the remark that aharah when not at the end of a separable compound is the subject of rule 13, below; but that that rule does not apply to a case like the one here in hand. For prātaḥ, prātar upasadaḥ (vi.2.3): prātaḥ is found also at i.4.7; ii.1.29; 5.63; iii.1.7; 3.84; 4.10; vi.4.2. For vastah, doshā-vastur dhīyā vajam (i.5.6; p. doshā-vastah): also at i.2.14. For saṁitaḥ, priṅ havish āsanī rī trishatāh (vi.3.10: only G. M. have the first word, only O. the last). For savitaḥ, deva savitar etat et (iii.2.7): the word is found also in about a dozen other passages. For samataḥ, ardā cid dvedaḥ āsanī śūyotu (i.7.13). For stanataḥ we are simply referred to “another text” (pakāhānta): but G. M. read samata, and omit stanata in the rule itself. For stotah, etān stotor etena (vii.4.20). For hotah, hotar yavishṭha sukraṭo (i.2.14: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.14; 6.29; iv.3.15; v.1.4; vi.3.8; 4.3. For pitah, resort is had to the ātā-reading, since the only passage (iii.3.9) in which the word occurs does not bring to view the ā: thus, marutāṁ pitah pitur marutāṁ marutāṁ pitah. For mātah, prthivi mātār mā mā hīṁśī (iii.3.29: O. omits the last word). For yashtah, agne yashtar idam namah (i.12). For eshtaḥ, again a ātā-reading, upūtaḥ eshtar eshtar agyā ’dhy ātāḥ (i.2.11): its treatment before the word which follows it in suṁhitā is the subject of rules 18–22 of this chapter; that of the preceding word, of x.14. For neshtaḥ, once more the ātā is drawn upon, neshtaḥ putiṁ putniṁ neshtaḥ putniṁ (vi.5.8). For tvanśtaḥ, finally, cīvas tvanśtaḥ śdā ṣamah (iii.1.11: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.7, 10: iii.1.11; vi.3.6, 11.2.

The commentary adds a couple of counter-examples, illustrative of the fact that these words show their ā only before a vowel or sonant consonant: they are abihhas tum bhūdāni (ii.5.12), and punas te māśdham (iv.7.14).
For āvah I find no other example; kāh occurs further at i.4.45; ii.12.1. As counter-examples, kō 'sye ṣuvaḍh (ii.6.7v), and āvō vājēsva yāṁ jumāh (i.3.13γ): G. M. omit the last two words; O. omits the whole passage) show the necessity of the specification respecting accent; while adhīpāṁ akāh samashtyāi (vi.1.7ε) shows that the r appears only before a sonant letter. This last example, it may be remarked, is brought under the action of the rule by i.52: it would be an example also under the preceding rule; compare what is there said in connection with the cited word akāh.

10. Also in antah, except when accented on the first syllable.

The cited examples are: antār agne ruca tvām (iv.1.9α; 2.1α), ṛgnīm antār bhārīshyānti (iv.1.3γ: O. omits the first word), and antaryāmē maghavaṁ (vi.4.6β: but O. omits the example—reasonably enough, since it is given again later in this very comment, in illustration of a special point). It were to no good end to rehearse the other cases of occurrence of so common a word. To show the necessity of the restriction respecting accent, the commentator quotes eshō 'ntō 'ntam manushyāh (vii.2.7v), where we have the noun anta, which the rule was especially constructed to avoid including. To prove, again, the continued implication of "followed by a sonant letter," is given antās te ādadāmi (i.4.3 and vi.4.61β). Then the comment proceeds to justify the form in which the restriction respecting accent is made in the rule: it might have been said, "when accented on the last syllable;" but then the rule would have applied only under those circumstances; whereas now is included the case when the word is not accented at all, as in antarvedī mithunāḥ (vii.5.9α; p. antah-vedī) and antaryāmē maghavan (vi.4.6β, as above: but G. M. omit). The mode of statement selected, however, it may be remarked, has this inconvenience—that it renders necessary the separate specification, in rule 8, of anantah, because that combination, where it occurs, happens to be "accented on the first syllable" (see note to rule 8). It would appear to admit of question, in—

10. antar ity 'asmin pade' Ṛdvyūddāte visarjaniyāh svaragho-
shavatparo repham ṛpadyate: yathā: antar......: ṛgnīm......: antar...... anādvyūddāta iti kim: esho......: evamara iti kim:
antasa...... "antodatā iti vaktave' bahusvaratvam bahāpaddā-
nārtham': anayathā tv' antodattasyāyī 'va syāt: antar.....: ant-
tary...... adhō udātto yasya tad ādvyūddatam: nā "dvyūddatam
andādvyūddatam: taśmin.

(i) G. M. etāmin.  
(ii) G. M. ṛṇo.  
(iii) G. M. om.  
(iv) G. M. om.  
(v) W. O. -ṭhak.  
(vi) B. om.  
(vii) G. M. ḥy.
deed, whether anantah was not fairly included in the present rule, since the antah part of it, at any rate, is not “accented on the first,” but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side.

11. Also a visarjaniya followed by avrt.

The quoted examples are jinvar avrt svādā and ugnar avrt svādā (both ii.4.7: B. has bhīmar for ugnar; O. reads in each case dvarth, according to the requirements of rule xiv.12). Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are bhīmar avrt, tveshar avrt, grutar avrt, and bhūtar avrt. The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere.

12. And likewise when iti follows.

The word api in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of “a visarjaniya followed by dvarth.” According to the commentator’s exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the jata repetition of grutah with its predecessor iti: as, iti grutah grutar iti ‘iti grutah (ii.4.7). Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of ā into r should be retained in the jata-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors. It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, varsha ā jinvo jinvo varsha ā jinvo.

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by api, we receive stuvhir havanaprutah (ii.4.14: G. M. and O. omit the first word; G. M. add havam, but no such word follows in the Sanskrit, and the addition is doubtless a copyist’s error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its pada or jata form). Here both the pada-text (as the word is a compound) and the jata (as it stands before a pause) would read havanacruta iti havana-grutah, the ordinary sandhi being made of grutah and iti.

11. avrd īty evampara visarjanīyo repham āpnoti. jinv—.....: ugn—.....

12. api cadda avrpamarit visarjanitam anavācāti: asu vi-
sarjanīya itiparo repham āpnoti. iti ēr—..... anvākṣaḥ kim-
arthaḥ: tpu—..... itiḥ paro yasmāḥ asu itiparah.

1 W. O. para; G. M. para. 2 W. B. iti; O. iticabdo.
13. Also in ahāḥ, ahaḥ, and suvah, except at the end of a separable word.

There is a well-established difference of reading in the text itself of this rule. T. and W. read the last word anīngyaṇṭāḥ, as plural, to agree with the three words mentioned, or else with the three cases of visarjaniya which they present; and at the beginning of the comment, both in W. and in O., is seen an attempt to explain the word as a plural—not, however, consistently carried out in either. As both readings are equally acceptable, I have adopted the one which is best supported.

The examples given in illustration of the rule are ahār jātaveśātām viṣarjanātāḥ (iii.2.54: O. omits the last word), ahār maṁśena (v.7.20: but G. M. substitute aharbhājo vātī, vii.4.51), and suvar devāḥ aganam (i.7.92: O. omits the last word): and, as counter-examples, first, to show that the h in the words specified, when they stand as final members of compounds, is treated in the usual manner, abhipūrvo ni tryahī bhovanti (vii.3.92 etc.; p. tri-ahaḥ: O. omits the first word), pratyahā tryaho bhavati (vii.3.55 et al.; p. tri-ahaḥ: but B. has dropped out the whole example, and G. M. O. substitute, O. with omission of the first word, pratyahā shad-aha bhavati, vii.4.28), and devasva stha te (i.8.102: but W. B. O. give simply the pada-reading of devasvaḥ, namely devasva iti deva-suvah, since thus alone is the word put into circumstances which show its h not to be convertible into r); and second, to show that the conversion takes place only before sonant letters, prāyaniyaḥ ahas tuṃmat (vii.2.81: O. omits the first word), and suvaṇ ca mūrdha ca (i.7.91 and iv.7.112).

The commentator then proceeds to give an explanation, so far as ahāḥ is concerned, respecting the virtual intent of the rule, which, he says, is meant to establish an exception for that word when the final member of a compound; since the inclusion of hāḥ among the words cited in rule 8 would, under the operation of the often-quoted rule l.52, be authority sufficient for turning ahāḥ into ahār before a sonant letter. Upon this he next imagines the objection to be raised, that the reading in this rule also, as well as the other, should have been hāḥ, ahāḥ being then included along with it according to the principle referred to; and thus the liability to reproach for overdoing the explicitness of the rule would be avoid-

13. ahāḥ: ahaḥ: suvah: eteshu' visarjaniyo' niṅgyāntah' suvrāghosahavaparo repham āpyoti'. yathā: ahār: ahār: suvar:...: niṅgyānta iti kim: abhip:...: praty:...: dev:...: evamprabha iti kim: prav:...: suvar:...: khaḍrabhār (vii.8) 6 āditye hār ity anena grahamed 'hāḍabahya' 'py akārādi (l.52) iti vacanād rephasiddhāya satyām atra punarvacanāni niṅgyantasyā 'hāḍabahu pratisvedhātham. nanv atrāv 'va' hār iti vaktavyam: apy akārādi (l.52) iti vacanena kārvasiddheḥ: na tu tadāduravāpateḥ: iti cet: mādi 'vam: anīng-
ed. But he replies, reasonably enough, that, as the rule says "when not the final member of a separable word," it is to be inferred that the words specified do occur as such members: and with hāḥ that is not the case; wherefore the distinction would be meaningless with reference to hāḥ. And it would be a poor enough side to take, and altogether unworthy of approval, to give a direction which did not apply to a word itself, but only to that word with a prefixed. Hence the quotation is made in proper form.

Just as long a discussion might have been raised with equal reason over ahaḥ and suvaḥ, both of which are also included in the former rule. So far as ahaḥ is concerned, indeed, it is easy to see that this is the general rule, applying to the cases of occurrence of that word in the main, with a specific restriction; and that ahaḥ-ahaḥ in rule 8 is a sort of exception in advance, made for a single case which would otherwise fall under this restriction (since, in ahaḥ-ahaḥ, the second ahaḥ is in fact the final member of a compound). But I am unable to discover any justification of the way in which suvaḥ is treated: it is made the subject of two general rules, to the one of which a needed restriction is attached, to the other, not. For ahaḥ and suvaḥ, the present rule should, it seems, have taken distinctly the form of an exception merely: nā 'hāḥ- suvaḥ ināyāntāḥ; 'not, however, ahaḥ and suvaḥ, when final members of compounds,' and ahaḥ should have been separately treated, or else included with them and a further counter-exception added.

न निर्भायवः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Not, however, when followed by bhīḥ or bhyaṃ.

There is violation of the ordinary usage of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā in this rule also. The only one of the words mentioned in the preceding rule which is found with the case-endings bhīḥ and bhyaṃ following it is ahaḥ; and hence, to it alone the present precept applies. We should expect it, therefore, in accordance with the principle of which i.58 is an expression, to have been placed last in the trio of which it forms a member. The commentator does not remark upon the irregularity, but simply points out that the

yānta ity uktē śaṅgâyāntavam iti sambhāvaniyam: tāc ca hār ity evaṁrāpe grahaṇe nā 'eti 'ty atre 'dān vipeshanum anar-thakaṁ nyāt: tathā 'py' evaṁrāpe nā bhūḍ iti: 'kīṁ tu' akā-rādīte bhavati 'ti jaghanyah paksahā: na tu saralāḥ: iti sātre 'hār' iti grahaṇam upayujyate.

circumstances of the case restrict the application of the rule to ahaḥ, and gives as examples uttārdir ahobhiḥ caranti (vi.5.14: G. M. O. omit the last word), and caḥ ahobhyāṁ iti ni nayati (vi.3.9')

अष्टत्रयं सर्विषयम् ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also not in ahaḥ, as all agree.

Some authorities, namely, the commentator informs us, accept this word as containing an anusvāra, others not; but all alike regard it as an exception under rule 13 (and therefore not liable to have its final visarjaniya converted into r under any circumstances). Those who accept the anusvāra still regard the word as falling under the action of rule 13, in virtue of the principle "a nose-sound occurring in the interior of a word is no bar to the application of a rule; hence it performs the offices of letters while itself only a quality" (if this be, in fact, the meaning of the second line of the verse, of which I am by no means confident; the readings of the manuscripts are here somewhat discordant, without being mutually explanatory). The first words of this verse were quoted in the comment on rule i.1, in connection with the discussion as to whether anusvāra was a concrete thing or a quality (see p. 8), and were credited to the Čikṣā—which, however, in the form in which we now possess it, neither contains such a passage, nor seems to furnish a connection in which it should naturally be introduced. I should question the sober verity of the considerations whereby the commentator tries to justify the rule. It is hardly credible that ahaḥ and ahaḥ should be fairly identified by any authorities. And anusvāra is not a nāśika, but an anusāsika, in the view of this treatise everywhere. It might be bet-

14. śūnāmidhyena labāhaḥ pūrvasūtrokta visarjaniyo । bhir-bhyām ecamparaṇa repam āṇoti. arthād ahaḥ ity atra visarjaniyā parīrghyute: itararosthitasyādi vamparavatābhavat. yathā: utt.…..: caḥ…….

1 G. M. O. -ḥyde. 2 W. labhyāḥ. 3 W. ins. na. 4 O. ins. ity. 5 G. M. paro.

15. caukāro 'nishedham ākarshati': aṇha ity asmin' grahane visarjaniyo na repam āṇoti: aḥāraḥar (viii.13) iti prāptiḥ. atra' grahane kecid anusvaram ichanti 'kecin ne 'chanti: sarve-shāṁ teshām esā' nishedho bhavati: anusvaram ichadhīhir api prāptir evam pratipādyate':

vidhān madhyasthānāśīkya na virodho 'bhavet śṛṣṭaḥ':

tasnāt karoti kāryāni varṇāṇāṁ "dharma eva" tv iti. yathā': aṇha.....: aḥha.....

(1) G. M. O. -ḥikārakahāk. 2 G. M. etasmin. 3 O. etasmin. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. eva. 6 G. M. -pady-. 7 B. -dhī. 8 (B) bhavet: sataḥ; G. M. bhaved yatāḥ. 9 B. G. M. kuvan. 10 (B) W. dharmaṇaśa. 11 G. M. om.
ter to regard the specific exception of añhā as simply a sort of supererogatory effort at extreme explicitness, intended to guard against the confusion with aḥā, even by a blunderer, of another word which was, indeed, definitely different from it, but different by only so inconspicuous an element as the nasalization of a vowel.

The illustrative examples are añḥā indram eva 'añhomucam (ii.2.74: but O. writes—eva: añhomucam, as if the latter word were a separate citation: it is found in other passages), and añho-
mucam pra bharema (i.6.123: but O. substitutes añhomuce purodd-
śam, ii.2.74).

ग्रन्थवर्णपूर्वस्तु रेपयरो लुप्तिः II १६ II

16. But, when not preceded by an a-vowel, visarjanīya followed by r is omitted.

The commentator’s example in illustration of the action of this rule is revati ramadākvan (i.3.71 et al.; p. revatīḥ); and he adds as counter-examples, first, to show the necessity of the restriction “not preceded by an a-vowel,” yo rudro aṇḍau (v.5.93), and again, to show that the omission takes place only before a r, reva-
tīr naḥ sadhamādah (ii.2.128; 4.144). This exhausts the evident intent of the rule: the tu, ‘but,’ which the latter contains, merely indicates the transition to a new and diverse subject; it intimates no distinction between the classes of cases in which the visarjanīya represents a s on the one hand and an original r on the other; and all the cases of final aḥ and āḥ are left to be treated alike, as prescribed by the rules given hereafter (ix.7–10)—aḥ being changed to o, and āḥ to ā. This truly represents the usage of the Sanhitā: the latter does not contain (if the special case which forms the subject of rules 18–22, below, be excepted) a single instance of aḥ converted into ā before r: the occurrence before r of aḥ standing for original ar is very rare, and the product is always o: besides the cases of ahorāṭre (pada-text, aḥaḥ-rātre), I have

16. avarṇād anyusvaraparavo rephaparo visarjanīyo lupyate. yathā: rev—— evanṇārva iti kim: yo—— evanparva iti
kim: rev—— tucaḥdārambhād avarṇaparva ‘pi ṣvāraḥbhār
(viii.8) adinnā visarṣa lupyate pūravasarpa ca dergham āpad-
yate. yathā: rukmo—— tari suvo—— ity atra lopadṛg-
ghādū kim na syātām. dviruktavād iti brāmaḥ. tat katham.
svāraḥbhār (viii.8) adisute 1 : aḥraḥahḥuvaḥ (viii.13) ity
 ātra ca ca. nane ahorāṭre ity atra katham otram. anyārthena
grahanaṃśmatyene ’ti brāmaḥ. tat katham. ahorāṭre dh-
tavrate 2 (iv.11) ity evanivrṣaṣāmyād 3 ahorāṭreḥyaṃ
ahorāṭrayor ity aḥ viṇeyam 4. evam ced adhishavana
(iv.11) iti grahanaṃśmatyendā ’va ’va ’shatec sidhāh ’ha na dhī-
puṛve (vi.11) iti ’nishedhunishedhena virodhaḥ’. satyam: sa-
only found four instances of *swabh* before forms of *rud*; namely *sworu ruhindh* (iv.1.24; 7.131), *sworu rohava* (i.7.91), and *sworu rokhadya* (i.7.91). The other Pritigākhyas (Rik. Pr. iv.9, r. 28,29; Vāj. Pr. iv.34; Ath. Pr. ii.19, iii.20) convert *adh* to *d* in like circumstances; and at least the Rik and Atharvan afford several instances of the *sandhi*.

So much for the rule and its meaning. The commentator, unfortunately, has found occasion to give it a forced and false interpretation; it leads him into a nest of difficulties, through which he flounders as best he can, coming out at the end with much discredit. There happens to be a single passage (or, if there be another, I have not noticed it) where a word with original final *r* follows in the Sanhitā a word beginning with *r*—namely *rukmo antah* (iv.1.104b; 6.52; 7.125)—and, of course, in the inversions of the *jātād*-text, comes to stand before its predecessor. The accepted *jātād*-reading, it appears (as given in full by the commentator), is *rukmo antar anti rukmo rukmo antah*, the analogy of the Rik and Atharvan usage being followed in the treatment of *antah*. In order, now, to find authority for this reading, the commentator declares that *tu*, 'but,' in the rule signifies that, even when preceded by an *a*-vowel, the words specified in rule 8 and its successors lose their *visarga* and lengthen the preceding vowel. This is an attribution of portentous pregnancy of meaning to the particle such as is not very infrequently made, rarely with more evident falsity than here. The objection is immediately suggested—why, in that case, does not *swah* in *sworu rohava* (i.7.91) lose its *h* and lengthen its *a*? Because, is the acute reply, it has been mentioned twice, once in rule 8, and once in rule 13. What possible connection is to be discovered between this repetition and the use to which he would fain put it, he does not give himself the trouble to inform us: he takes care to raise only such difficulties as he conceives himself able to remove. The next which it pleases him to evoke is—how is the *o* of *ukhātāre* to be explained? We rather

> *vṛṣabadosyā 'dhishavane iti grahānasāmarthyaena* shatvainiśāhvatu: sthinaṣpadasya kathāṃ sīdhayet: grahanīdisāmarthyaḥ bhāvāt: tasmāt tadarthanāṃ tāvat śūtinaḥ sārthakam iti "tadarthan ca drishtavayam": tadarthan ce" 'ti gudajihvikāṇyāyaḥ": tathā hi: grahanāsamahyāt "iti" gamunikādātram "iti" kṣantoḥkita tu viçeṣaḥ: tathā uṣpayadbārthayaḥ śūtraṁ iti bhāvāt: "
>
> "avarnād anyo 'navarṇaḥ: aṣṭu pärvo yasmāt sa tutkhotah.
> repahā pārvo yasmād aṣṭu repahaparāḥ.
>
> 1 B. G. M. O. om. 2 W. B. G. M. om. 3 W. B. ins. *ahara* iti. 4 W. B. O. om. 5 O. *adhishavane. 6 G. M. *pragrahau evānirāsamārthyaḥ. 7 G. M. *tre. 8 B. *jñeyam. 9 O. *nau anyārthaḥ grahanēva va. 10 G. M. om. 11 O. *iddhiḥ. 12 B. ins. *nīvātāve. 13 O. *agrantahena nīhāha na vidheṇaḥ; B. nīheṇaḥ na iti vārodhaha. 14 B. *pānaṃ. 15 B. *artham; G. M. tadartham. 16 G. M. tu tu. 17 G. M. O. saṃkhyāyam. 18 G. M. et. 19 G. M. gāvah. 20 G. M. gāvah. 21 G. M. kam. 22 G. M. savasthaṇaṇāb; O. adds *api. 23 G. M. gāvah.
expect to hear him reply—because ahah also is twice mentioned, in the same two rules with munaḥ. But no; we do injustice to the tenderness of his exegetical conscience, in supposing him capable of such gross arbitrariness of interpretation, when in rule 8, instead of ahah, aharahah is read. He alleges instead the competency of a form cited for another purpose (compare Rik Pr. i.18, r. liv.55): we have read in rule iv.11 ahordre, where the prayrahās are under treatment, and this suffices, by analogy of form, to determine the reading also of ahordrābhyaṃ and ahordrāyoh. If this be so, it is next retorted, then, as the sh of adhishavane, which is cited in the same rule, is assured by the citation itself, rule vi.11, prescribing the sh, in the way of an exception to an exception, is out of order. That is true, the commentator confesses: but, granting that the sh of sava is established by the previous mention of adhishavane, how is that of sthana, the other word specified in the same rule, established? the rule is therefore to be deemed of force so far as relates to that word, and to be regarded as intended for it. Of what follows, not all is clear to me: it appears that the rule is, after all, defended as it stands, on “the principle of sugar-candy and little tongue” (i.e. as merely giving more than is absolutely required of what one cannot receive too much of, as the palate of candy—?): for to establish the reading on the authority of a previous citation is only doing just what will answer (gamanikā occurs in only one other passage, the comment on i.18, and I find nowhere anything that explains its use), while specific mention is a distinction; hence the rule has a meaning as applied to sava also: such is the understanding.

The commentator might much better, surely, have acknowledged that his text-book had omitted to provide for the special case of jadā-reading which has caused all this trouble, than have forced it within the contemplation of the rules at such cost.

रीर्घ च पूर्वः ||१७||

17. And the preceding vowel is made long.

The “and” (ca) in the rule is declared to signify that the lengthening of the vowel takes place only when visarjaniya has been omitted. The cited examples are rudā rauḍraḥ (v.5.19), tittiri rohit (v.5.16), and visnud rupam krtvā (vi.2.42: only G. M. have the last word). As was noticed in the comment upon the preceding rule, there is no such case of ah changed to d before r, except the one forming the special subject of the following rules.

17. samadḥ reaparavisarjaniyād luptāt pūrvo 'pi yah svara hravah ca ca dīrgham āpayate. yathā: rudā .... tittī—....
visnud—.... yadd visarjaniyasya lopas taddi' va dīrghatvaṁ yathā sydd ity evunarthās caśadbhāh.

1 O. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. O. ins. kayya.
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18. As also, in esñṭah.

This word has been already mentioned, in rule 8, as one of those whose final h is liable to become r. It is here made the further subject of a special rule, because it is the only case in the Sanhitā of ah changed to d before r (see the note to rule 16). The passage in which it occurs is esñṭā rādyā (I.2.111 and vi.2.28).

We have seen, however, that the commentator has felt obliged to give a false interpretation to rule 16, and one which renders superfluous the present rule, as applying to a case already included under that one. He is well aware of the objection to his interpretation thence arising, and himself points out that esñṭā rādyā rāya esñṭar esñṭā rādyā (only W. gives this) is a case analogous with rukmo antar antā rukmo rukmo antah (W. B. omit the last two words), and that the loss of h and lengthening of a in esñṭah is an effect of the tu in rule 16; but he does what he can toward removing the objection by alleging that the detail of discordant opinions which is to follow (in the next four rules) renders it more desirable to cite the case specially, in order that it may be understood to what those opinions apply. This is a tolerably ingenious subterfuge—but, after all, only a subterfuge.

19. Not so, according to some authorities.

The commentator gives two alternative explanations of this rule—both, however, as he notices, leading to the same reading of the phrase under question. Vararuci, namely, holds that, in the view of some, the rule denies the conversion of h to r in esñṭah, and therefore also the prolongation of the a; whence, by the general rule ix.8, the word would become esñṭo (in analogy with all the other cases in the text of ah before r). Māhishayya, however, understands that some are said to deny that the h of esñṭah is liable to conversion into r before another r—that is to say, he makes the rule establish so far an exception under rule 8 rather than rule

---

1 W. B. repah. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. ins. pūrvaḥ ca dirgyah. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. ghad akarshati, and put at the beginning. 6 B. G. M. Q. om. 7 W. iti; G. M. iti padam. 8 G. M. pade. 9 B. - ḫapudeḥ; G. M. O. -dāhe. 10 W. B. O. om.
18. There can be little question that Vararuci’s explanation is the true one.
In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading.

20. According to Uttamottariya, two become r.

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Māhīśheya the other. The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (cākhiṇa, ‘holder of a cākha or recension of the sacred text’), the visarjanīya of eshṭaḥ and the following r both become r—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single r: thus, eshṭarādyah—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case: see the various readings below. Māhīsheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name Dvāvat-tamottariya, and as holding that the h of eshṭaḥ becomes r before r, making eshṭarādyah.

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Māhīsheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught; and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation.

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Prātipākhya.

21. According to Sāmkrtya, the visarjanīya becomes u.

And this u, by x.5, unites with the preceding a to form o, so that the reading of the passage is eshṭo ῥāyaḥ, as it is according


*) W. om. 3 G. M. om. 3 G. M. ca. 5 G. M. ca. 5 G. M. ῥeḥam ῥeḥnoti. 5 O. om. no.

20. uttamottariyaṁca cākhiṇa’ mata eshṭar iti visarjanīyośa tatpardo repaḥ ca dvāv etāṁ ῥeḥam ῥāpadyate. yathā: eshṭarādyah. ayam artho vādaucoktāḥ: māhīsheyoktā tu dvāvat-tamottariya iti kasya caṁ nāma: tanmata eshṭar iti visarjanīyo repaharo repaḥā ῥāpadyate: ‘eshṭarādyah iti’.

*) O. -mom. 3 G. M. -yac ca. 3 B. G. M. -tā; O. -tā. 4 W. B. O. var. 4 W. B. eshṭā ῥāya. 6 O. ita. yathā. 1 B. G. M. -tā. 6 G. M. O. om.
to the "some authorities" quoted in rule 19, above. This is pointed out by the commentator; who, however, declares that the reference to Śāṃkṛtya in a separate place shows that he is not one of the people there spoken of. B. specifies (probably by a copyist's blunder) that the exposition given of the meaning of the rule is to be credited to Māhisheya.

22. And, according to Ukhya, along with the preceding letter.

That is, eshtār becomes esṭu, the ā and its predecessor a coalescing into u. This is the only exposition given by W. and O. But G. M. and B., strangely agreeing for once to differ from the rest, ascribe this understanding of the meaning of the rule to Māhisheya, and report Vararuci as holding it to signify that the ā of esṭu, with its predecessor, becomes r. This last version of the sandhi seems little better than nonsense, and neither of the MSS. gives a reading to correspond.

The commentator declares, finally, that, in this net-work of alternative views, the first rule only (viii.18) is approved. In accordance herewith is the reading of the edited text and of my manuscript, esṭāṛ āṛyaḥ.

The most interesting circumstance connected with this waste of half a dozen rules over the reading of a single word, is the indication afforded of the anomalousness of the combination as a phenomenon belonging to the Tāttvītya-Sanhitā, while it is in other Vedic texts a natural and usual thing.

21. śāṃkṛtyasya mata eshtār iti visarjaniyo rephapara ukṛtam āpadyate1. tataḥ uvānapara okṛram (x.5) ity ovam. yathā: eshto āṛyaḥ. asya ca nāti 'kesñām (viii.16) ity asya 'depophedā dhedaḥ: siddhodāharaṇaṁ śaṁdnām.

1 B. adds iti māhisheylkam. 9 G. M. om. W. B. G. M. om. G. M. O. ins. 9 G. M. O. ins. to.

22. ukhyasya mata rephapara1 eshtār iti visarjaniyaḥ pūrva-varṇena saho 'kṛram āpadyate: 'iti māhisheylkam'. yathā: eshtārā rāyaḥ. uḍrabucoktanam tv eshtār iti visarjaniyo rephaparaḥ pūrvena saha repham āpadyata iti. yathā: 'eshtārā rāyaḥ'2. pūrvena saha vartata iti sapūrvalo.

asmin vikalpajjīte3 prathamam eshtāc ca (viii.18) iti śadrāmaṁ eva 'eshtām.

28. At the end of the former member of a compound, before \( k, \) \( kh, \) or \( p, \) \textit{visarjanīya} becomes \textit{sh}—or \textit{s}, if preceded by \textit{a}.

The commentator notes the fact that, as a different following occasion is here introduced, the implication “followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant,” which has so long been in force (namely, since rule 8 of this chapter), comes to an end. His illustrative examples are: \textit{ahā haviṣṭādān eva} (vi.4.3\footnote{G. M. shud.}), \textit{grasati nishkhidati} (vi.1.9\footnote{G. M. -paratvān.}), \textit{bhāṣṭarvāṇa upasadyaḥ} (vi.4.9\footnote{G. M. -hārta}; O. omits the last word), \textit{nāmakaśarād enāś nami} (vi.5.7\footnote{G. M. -hārta}), and \textit{pathaspātah pari-patim} (i.1.14\footnote{G. M. -hārta}; O. omits the last word). As counter-example, to show that the \( h \) must end the first member of a compound, not an independent word, we have \textit{puṣpātah prasāvātih} (iv.2.8\footnote{G. M. -hārta}), and \textit{namah pūrṇhī yo abhi} (iii.2.8\footnote{G. M. -hārta}; only G. M. have abhi).

This is a general rule, applying to almost all the compounds in the Sāṁhitā which show a final \( h \) before an initial \( k, \) \( kh, \) or \( p \) of the second member. A few exceptions are mentioned farther on (rules 32, 33).

\[ \text{Yāvichārīya: Šrṣṭīya-सत्तदिवरिष्टोहस्वोगतिविवरी-श्यन्त्राः-श्यन्त्र} \]


This rule, the commentator remarks, relates to words which are not first members of compounds. His examples are: for \textit{āvih}, \textit{āvih kṛpahāva} (i.2.14\footnote{G. M. -hārta}). For \textit{nīḥ}, \textit{ghṛtāṁ nish pibati} (ii.3.11\footnote{G. M. -hārta}).

\[ \text{23. atra paranimittaviśeshahādā etātparāntaṁ varaghoṣhayat-} \]

\[ \text{parānurūttitarā mantavyād. avagrahāntavartā visarjanīyaḥ kakāra-} \]

\[ \text{khakārapakāraparāḥ shakdrām āpadyate: akārapūrvaḥ cet sakā-} \]

\[ \text{ram, yathā: atō śrī: graś: bhāish: naman: apath:} \]

\[ \text{avagrhābhītī kim: puṣh: naman: kakāraḥ ca khakāraḥ ca pakāraḥ ca kakārapakārah: te} \]

\[ \text{pāre} \]

\[ \text{yamād ādū tathākṣataḥ. akāraḥ pūrvo āsavā akārapūrvaḥ.} \]

\[ \text{1 G. M. -hārta. 2 W. -etapet. 3 G. M. -paratvān. 4 W. -hārta; B. -ha; G. M. -hārta. 5 G. M. -hārta. 6 G. M. -hārta. 8 G. M. -hārta. 9 G. M. -hārta.} \]

24. \textit{eṣu} \textit{visarjanīyaḥ} \textit{kakha-pakāraparo} \textit{yathāvihiti-}

\[ \text{tām} \]

\[ \text{bhajate. yathā: āvih:} \]

\[ \text{ghṛtām:} \]

\[ \text{idāś:} \]

\[ \text{graś:} \]

\[ \text{apasaḥ:}\]

\[ \text{uro:}\]

\[ \text{deve 'tī kim:} \]

\[ \text{aṁ-} \]

\[ \text{hasas:} \]

\[ \text{ati:} \]

\[ \text{tī 'tī kim:} \]

\[ \text{divah:} \]

\[ \text{viśv:} \]

\[ \text{tvam} \]

\[ \text{ud:} \]

\[ \text{anavagrahārtho 'yam} \]

\[ \text{drambhāḥ.} \]

\[ \text{1 G. M. -hārta; śīvīyamāno. 2 G. M. ins. hi shakdrām akārapūrvaḥ cet sa-} \]

\[ \text{kāram} \]

\[ \text{tāḥ. 3 G. M. -hārta. 4 G. M. -hārta.} \]
of nish before p, I find besides only nish padyarvan (vi.3.102); before kh, nish khidati (ii.2.106); before k, the cases are more numerous, with forms of kri (e.g., v.5.73), and kram (vi.4.102-3; doubtless; the separation of the divisions prevents the exhibition of the sandhi); cases of nih with accented forms of verbs in k are yet more frequent, but come under the preceding rule, not this one. For idah, idas pode sam idhyase (ii.6.114 and iv.4.44: O. omits the last two words): on the other hand, we have iddhah pode at vi.1.82. For caqvatah, caqvatas kar haste (ii.2.121). For apasah, apasa nãre asya (iii.2.112: O. omits asya). For deva ri-, shah, uoro ãno deva rishas pahi (i.4.452: O. omits to deva); with sa rishah pati naktam (i.2.147; 5.111-2) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after deva. For ainhasa, ainhasas pati vaduh (iii.2.4-8: only O. has vaduh); another case is found in the same division, ainhasas pati tam. For ati divah, ati divas pahi samadurvan (i.8.142: G. M. O. omit after pahi); with divah prshthañ swar gatvã misrã (iv.8.51: only B. has the last word; O. omits the last three) as counter-example, to show that the prescribed effect takes place only after ati. For vicvatãh, vicvatas pari havãmakhe (i.6.121: G. M. omit the last word): other cases occur at i.5.34: ii.1.111; 3.141: iii.1.144: iv.2.133: 3.138 (in the various repetitions of only two phrases, always before pari); and, as first member of a compound, hence falling under the preceding rule, at iv.6.24: an exception is noted in a later rule (viii.52). For aqmanah, tvam aqmanas pari (iv.1.26). For tamasa, ud vayam tamasa pari paryanta (iv.1.74 and v.1.88: only O. has the last word, and it omits the first two).

25. Also before krdhi, pinva, and pathe.

The examples are: uru nas krdhi (ii.6.119), apas pinva (iv.3.49), and sapratã namãs pathe (iv.7.132: G. M. omit the first word). For pinva and pathe I find no further examples; but s before krdhi occurs also at i.4.2 (where the edition has the false reading ā), 3: iv.2.94: 5.102: v.7.34: vi.3.22: 4.54.

26. But not when s, kr, or gh follows.

25. ------ evamparo visarjanya ho yathdvahim bhajate. yathâ: uru.... apas...: sapr....
1 O. -vihitam. 2 G. M. O. om.

26. sakraghe 'ty evampare sati krâhydããu visarjanya ho yathdvihitanir nã "padyate. yathâ: tân....: sam....: rephena kim: u-ta....: uru....
1 W. adds kâra satã. 2 O. -tti. 3 G. M. -vihitam. 4 W. B. G. M. om.
By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified; but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern kṛdhi. The commentator’s illustrations are: tān ma āmanasah kṛdhi svāhā (ii.3.9: only W. has the first two words, and it omits the last one), cāhī ca nāh kṛdhi: krātve daśahāya (iii.3.114: O. omits the last word), and uru kshayāya nāh kṛdhi: gṛtāhī ghrāyone (i.3.4: G. M. O. omit the last word); and to the second of these there is a counter-example, uṣa no mayas kṛdhi kṣhayadvāra (iv.5.10²), to show that only kṛ, not k alone, gives occasion for retention of the ā. The words āmanasah kṛdhi svāhā occur again at ii.3.9: I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator.

27. Also before pati', ve, pate, pataye, pate, and patim.

The examples are: first, brahmānapas pati' vedim (iii.5.6:), with a counter-example, to show that the word pati' must be followed by ve, retodāh pati' va ity da (vi.5.8: but O. reads indriyāva ity dhāma (i.4.27); further, subhasa pātī idam āham (iii.2.10: only O. has āham), vāstok pate prati (iii.4.1), pra cyana eva bhūvas pate (i.2.9 and vi.1.11:), vācas pātāye pavasna (i.4.), vācas pātī vācām (i.7.7), and vācas pāti' śvārābhinām ataye (iv.6.2: G. M. O. omit the last word). The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in pati', and in reply is quoted the passage divaih gachh evah pata (iv.1.10: and v.1.10:).

The cases of retention of s before the cases of patei' are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme patei'; but such a proceeding is permitted (by i.22) only with themes ending in a.

I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitā: manasas patei (i.1.3:; 4.4:), patahas patei (i.1.4:), brahmānapas patei (i.5.6:; ii.1.5:), jyotishas patei (i.5.11:; iv.4.4:), pavasas patei (ii.2.12:), jagatias patei (ii.4.1), sadasas patei (ii.6.8:; ii.2.4:), patinas patei (ii.6.11:; iv.4.4:), nabhasas patei (iii.3.3:), and yas patei (iv.7.1:). We have the genitive patei in brhaspatei (i.7.8:), but, as the pada-text reads brhah-patei, the word does not fall under this rule: tapospatei (i.2.10:; p. tapah-patei).

belongs in the same category. Of the words quoted by the commentator, dhuvak pati occurs again at i.7.10², and vedas pati at ii. 6.81 ².

28. Also in divah and sahasah, before pari and put.

The cited examples are divas pari prathamam (i.3.14 ² and iv.2.2 ¹), divas putraya saryaya (i.2.9: O. omits the last word), and sahasas putro adhahatah (iv.1.9 ²). We have sahasas putram also at iv.4.4 ², and divas pari at iii.3.3 ³ and iv.2.10 ⁴; one case of divah pari is excepted by rule 34, below. As counter-examples, are given divah prthivyah pary antarikshat (iii.1.10 ² et al.: W. B. O. omit divah, which is better, as this is used just below to illustrate another point), parashahparashah pari (iv.2.9 ²), and putshah putrahet uta viprayasaha rayam (iv.6.9 ⁴: G. M. O. have only the first two words), to show that only the words specified show s before pari and put; and divah prthivyah pari (iii.1.10 ² et al.: G. M. omit pari, which is better this time), to show that those words show it only in the circumstances stated.

Put is declared a part of a word, involving more than one case.

29. Also in rgyah, before po.

The commentator’s examples are: papavo vdi rgyas poshah (v.4.6 ²), sam ahaṃ rgyas poshena (i.7.9 ²), sananuvodi rgyas poshaya (iii.2.5: G. M. omit the first word and add brhate, which makes the reference belong to iv.1.10 ²), and rgyas poshasya dasidaraḥ syama (iii.2.3: only O. has the last word). As counter-examples, he gives vihuh posha uta tmonā (iii.1.11 ²), to show that the rule applies to no other word than rgyah before po, and eshtā rgyah pre’she bhagāya (i.2.11 ¹: G. M. omit the first word),

28. divah: sahasah: ity ayor' visarjanyah pari putparo yathāvidhim bhajate. divas....: divas pu....: sak.... anayor iti kim: divah....: par....: puḥ....: evambara iti kim: divah.... anekārthatvat pud iti padikadephah.

1 B. anayoh; G. M. stayoḥ. ² G. M. pari: put: ity evambara; O. do. except ity. ³ G. M. O. viḥām. ⁴ B. G. M. O. rthāh.

29. rgyah ity atra visarjanyah po ity evambara yathāvidhitam bhajate. yathā': papavo..... po iti padikadesa bahządātāmāratāh: sam.....: cān.....: rgyas.....: rgyah iti kim: vihuh.....: 'po ity okārena kim': 'eshtā....

¹ G. M. viḥām. ² G. M. O. om. ³ G. M. okāraḥ kimarthāh. ⁴ B. om. to yathā in comment to next rule.
to show that only po, not p when otherwise followed, calls out the prescribed effect in rāyah.

I have not attempted to note the numerous instances of the occurrence of rāyas posha in the Sanhitā. In the derivative rāyas-poshavani (i.2.12; 3.12), where the division is before vanī, the pada-text, according to its custom, leaves the s of rāyas unchanged (reading rāyasposha-vani).

30. Also in namah, before karo.

The examples illustrating the action of the rule are saṁvatsarena namas karomi (v.5.7ª); and ubhayābhyyo namas karoti (ii.6.9ª; O. reads karomi); counter-examples, showing the uselessness of either specification of the rule without the other, are namah kaṃdrina ca (iv.5.1ª; W. omits ca; O. omits the example), and ekahāyanadd enah karoti (vi.6.3ª).

Other instances of namas karoti are found at v.5.5ª,7ª; vi.3.8ª; and of -vatsarena namas karomi at v.5.7ª twice, 7ª twice.

The printed text has pryasas karat and vasyasas karat (but, by a strange inconsistency, immediately after, pacumatah karat) at i.8.6ª; but, as these combinations are unauthorized by the Prātiçākhya, and not supported by my manuscript, I do not doubt that the readings are erroneous.

31. Also in vasuh, before k.

The passage is sa idhāno vasuh kavih (iv.4.4ª), and I have found no other. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are given: viprah pucih kavih (i.3.14ª; 5.5ª), mayi vasuh puro vasuh (iii.2.10ª), and vipravasuh pary amushhit (vi.1.6ª,11ª; B., which is quite defective just along here, omits the first word).

30. nama ity atra' visarjanīyāh karo ity evamparam yathāvihiti-
tam bhajate. yathā; saṁv-.----; ubhay-.----; 'karo iti kim: namah-.----; 'nama iti kim: ekah-.----.'

1 G. M. O. om. 2 G. M. vidhīm. 3 G. M. O. om.; B. omits here. 4 O. om. 5 G. M. put before ubhay-.; B. puts after ubhay-.; and om. karo iti.

31. 'vasur ity atra' visarjanīyāh kakāraparo yathāvihitam' āpadyate. yathā'; sa----; vasur iti kim: viprah----; evamparam iti kim: mayi----; viprā----.'

6 B. om. 7 G. M. vidhīm. 8 G. M. O. bhajate. 9 G. M. O. om. VOL. IX. 26
32. Not in adhvaram visvataḥ, antah, jātaḥ, viviṣṭaḥ pariḥ, and punah.

These words constitute exceptions under the foregoing rules. The commentator specifies in each case under which rule the exception falls. The first example is yajñam adhvaram visvataḥ paribhār asi (iv.1.111: O. omits the first word, W. B. the last): an exception under viii.24, which would require visvataṣ; W. B. O. remark that the distinctive addition of adhvaram effects the exception, and W. O. add the counter-example indraṃ vo visvataṣ pari (i.6.121). For antah, the example is mahādevam antah-pār-vena (i.4.36: O. omits the first word): an exception under rule 23, antah being first member of a compound. For jātaḥ, bhātasya jātaḥ patir ekə deṣṭ (iv.2.82: O. omits the first word, and alone adds deṣṭ; G. M. omit ekaḥ also): an exception under viii.27. For viviṣṭaḥ pariḥ, ya dviviṣṭaḥ pariḥ-paṇaḥ (iv.2.64); with the counter-example pariḥ-pariḥ anughaṣṭaḥ viviṣṭaḥ (iv.6.93: only G. M. have the last word). For punah, finally, punah-punar hy āsmāḍ (vi.5.124: only G. M. have āsmāḍ). Both these last are exceptions under viii.23.

The versions of the comment to this rule are more than usually discordant, all being defective except W. and O., and even these having suffered considerable disarrangement. For the details, see the various readings below.

धष्वविल् ॥ २३ ॥

33. Nor before a word containing dh or sh.

"By vicinage," says the commentator, is understood a negative, in this and the next following rule. The meaning of the rule is that, when a word containing either of the letters dh or sh follows the visarjanīya, the latter is not liable to conversion into s or sh, as required by the foregoing precepts. The examples given are

32. ...... eteshāṁ visarjanīya yathāvibhūtanā na bhajate. yathā: yajñam.....: dvirnir (viii.24) iti prāptiḥ: 'adhvaraviṣṭeṇaṃ niṣṭhirā: 'adhvaram iti kim: indrā.....: mahā.....: 'kakhaṇḍakāra (viii.23) iti prāptiḥ: bhāt.....: punaṃ-vat (viii.27) iti prāptiḥ: 'yā.....: viviṣṭe iti kim: paruḥ.....: punaḥ.....: kakhapanḍaparaha (viii.23) ity anayoh prāptiḥ.

1 G. M. ity etehā. 2 G. M. vadhā. 3 G. M. O. apadayate. 4 G. M. O. om. 5 G. M. add idaḥ. 6 G. M. om. 7 B. G. M. om.; W. O. put next before viviṣṭa iti kim. 8 B. G. M. om. 9 B. G. M. O. om. pariḥ; G. M. pariḥipati. 10 O. ity dhīnd. 11 W. B. O. put after mahā..... 12 G. M. -rūḥ pariḥ. 13 G. M. O. om. pariḥ.

33. saṃvidhiyād atre 'paraṇa ca' naśārtho labhyate. dhaś ca saś ca dhashāvā: tāke āsmīta iti dhashavati: tamūn dhashavati pade pariḥbhāte sati 'pūrvo visarjanīya yathāvibhūtanā'
34. Not before pari vā or pra.

The examples are rocana divah pari vyāsah (iv.2.11) only G. M. have the first word—-with the counter-example divas pari prathamanam (i.3.14) and iv.2.21), to show the need of citing vā after pari—and tasmād itahpradānām devah (iii.2.14: O. omits devah). Of these, the first is an exception under vii.8; the other, under vii.23. There is yet another passage, bahiḥprāṇo vā manunyayah (vi.1.14), which needs to be brought under the rule; and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of pra in this rule with short a is intended to connote prā also—-just as, in a rule of the next chapter (ix.24), atha commends atha also, by a converse principle. This, however, suggests a difficulty: why then is not rule vii.7, prescribing for prā an effect which had already been

nā "padyate. yathā: bahiḥ——: puru——: ubhay——: kakhapa kārā" (viii.23) iti prāptih. parabhūta iti kim: adhas——: riṣaya——: 10

1 G. M. ins. ca. 2 G. M. ins. sūtre. 3 G. M. O. dhakāra. 4 G. M. O. shakāra. 5 B. G. M. O. om. 6 O. om.: G. M. pūrvay. 7 G. M. -viśhū. 8 B. G. M. O. om. 9 B. -prapara. 10 W. adds tasmāṁ iti vidhāṁ purvasya. pariśvapraśaṁ.

34. pari vā: pra: ' evamparo visarjanayo yathāvihitam' nā "padyate. rocana——: ve 'tī kim: divas——: tasmād——: pre 'tī hravagrahanam dirghasya 'py upalakshanam: ' yatho 'dathāparas ca (ix.24) iti dirghagrahanam hravasyo 'palakshanartham'. tathā prāpūrvas ca (vii.7) iti sūtram vyartham: praśabdasyā 'nurttasyādi 'va dirghapalakshhatvād: iti cet: ucyate: pratyaśaghritasyādi 'vo 'palakshakatvam' nā 'nukrśhāya 'tī vijñayam: 'tathā hi: vāhanauḥyamānaḥ (vii.8) ity atra' cakreṇa praśabdas tatā 'nukrśhā: atra tu ' pariḥ prapara ity ' upalakshakatvam' bhavati. tathā satt 'dam apy uddharanam: bahiḥ——: 11

1 G. M. ins. ity. 2 G. M. -viśhū. 3 B. ins. 4 here, as well as below, in its place. 5 G. M. O. vām; B. hravay. 6 G. M. ins. eva. 7 G. M. -khaṇitvād: O. dirghagrahitravop—. 8 G. M. -vāt. 9 G. M. om. 10 G. M. vā-. 11 G. M. ins. prapara iti pratyaśaghritvād; O. ins. pratyaśaghritvād. 12 G. M. -khaṇam.
prescribed for pra, a superfluity? Because, is the reply, such connotation is only proper in the case of a word directly cited, not of one that is brought forward by implication merely: and in rule vii.6 the pra was thus brought forward [from rule 4], in virtue of the ca, 'and,' contained in the rule: whereas here the pra is expressly mentioned. This seems a case of rather questionable interpretation.

न निर्मा नि: || २१ ||

35. Not so with niḥ.

That is, as the commentator explains it, the exception established by the preceding rule does not hold good in the case of niḥ, which is treated as prescribed in rule 24, even before pra. The cases instanced in illustration of the rule are both of a doubtful character: the one is a jatā-reading, prāṇḍu niḥ prāṇḍu prāṇḍu niḥ (vi.4.10²), the other an extract from the ending of the same anuvāka (vi.4.10), atmanā paṇḍ niḥ pra ṣukhaṇcaḥ, these words being those which end respectively the first four divisions of the anuvāka. We shall find other quotations of the endings later; and their appearance is at least decisive of the recognition by the commentator of the breaking up of the anuvākas into divisions of fifty words each, whatever we may have to believe respecting its recognition by the Prātiṣṭākhya. We are not, however, to take for granted that even the commentator accepted the division as now made in our manuscripts, involving a suspension of continuity of the samhitā-text after each fiftieth word: there was probably at first a mere enumeration made, with an expression of its results at the end of the anuvāka. The endings, as may be seen in the Calcutta edition, are carefully accented, and written according to the rules of combination as laid down by the Prātiṣṭākhya. The same rules are followed in the jatā-text; and hence, as (by rule vii.2, above) niḥ converts the following initial ni into n in samhitā, so does it also in the repetitions of the jatā (nir niḥ). As a yet farther consequence, it has the same effect in the rules of the Prātiṣṭākhya, and I have therefore accepted the reading na instead of na in the repetition of the present rule, although it is supported only by T. and W.

35. nir ity atra visarjantyasya praپraparavoc'pi shatvanishedho na bhavati: shatvam eva bhavati 'ty arthaḥ. prāṇ-—....: ātm-—....

iti tr̥īḥdaṇyaratne prātiṣṭākhyanavivarane'
ashṭamō 'dhyāyah.

1 O. niyaḥ. ² O. praپraparava. ³ O. ins. praṭhamapraपraṇe.
CHAPTER IX.

Contents: 1–6, treatment of final ḥ before initial surd letters; 7–10, treatment of final ḍh and ḍ; 11–15, of final diphthongs before initial vowels; 16–17, of the particle u; 18–19, duplication of final ḍ and m; 20–24, conversion of final ḍn, ṭn, ṭr, to ḍh, ṭh, ṭh.

उभयाः श्लोषाये नुयते काण्डमायनम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Visarjaniya, when followed by a spirant which has a surd letter after it, is dropped, according to Kāṇḍamāyana.

The commentator, after a brief paraphrase of the rule, gives a couple of examples to illustrate its working: namely, catustuṣṭātm karoti (v.1.8); p. catuḥ-ṣṭātm), and vāyava stho 'pāyava stha (i.1.1). The mention of Kāṇḍamāyana is declared to be made on account of a difference of views: others, namely, hold that ḥ is dropped before a spirant that is followed by a sonant letter as well, as addhya svādā (i.3.13), ye puksā sṛṇa tam (ii.3.1.2: W. B. omit tam), yo hatamānd svayampāpah (ii.2.8: O. omits yo; G. M. omit pāpah), and dānākāmā me praṛṣa sṛṇā (ii.2.8: O. omits the first word; G. M., the first two). I am not sure that I understand the consideration further alleged, in view of which it is decided that “the rule is all right;” it appears to be that, reference having thus been made to a discordance of views, those words will be hereafter specified in which there is omission made under any other prescription—but what this refers to, I am unable to see.

Every MS. that I have reads ghoshaparo as second word in the rule: but the comment so plainly implies the reading gāre, and the sense so obviously requires it, that I have ventured its adoption.

Although the prescription here given is put upon the authority of an individual, it is pretty evidently to be regarded as definitely

1. uṣmāparo visarjaniyāḥ kāṇḍamāyanasaṁyate uṣmāni aghoshavatpare sati. yathā: catu—.: vāy—.: kāṇḍamāyanagrahāntahi vakalpārthām: anyeshāṁ mate ghoshavatpare 'py uṣmāni visarjaniyō uṣmāte: yathā: aḍbhyā—.: ye—.: yo—.: dāna—.: evam ca vakalpārtyaṁ sati lakshanāntaragatam' yeshu padeshu uṣmāte tāni padāni vakshyāṁ śi vacanāṁ saralām bhavati.

uṣmā paro yasmdā 'asad uṣmāparah: na ghoshavān aghośaḥ: aḍā' paro yasmdā 'sa tathoktaḥ: tasminn aghoshapare.

1 G. M. O. om. yat. 2 G. M. -yanasa gr. 3 W. -tani. 4 O. -ṣṭātm. 5 G. M. -ṣṭātm. 6 W. O. -dānta. 7 G. M. O. prav. 8 G. M. su kātha kīaś. 9 G. M. om. 10 G. M. om.
adopted and taught by the Prātiṣṭāhikṣya, and is usually (not without occasional exceptions) conformed to by the edition of the Sanhitā, and by my manuscripts both of that and of the Prātiṣṭāhikṣya and its commentary. I have, therefore, treated it as peremptory, and have everywhere governed by it the readings I have accepted. The same omission is prescribed by the Rik and Vājasaneyi Prātiṣṭāhikṣyas, but not by the Atharvan (see Ath. Pr. ii.40, note).

2. Followed by a surd letter, it becomes the spirant of like position with that letter.

The commentator’s examples are: yax kāmaveta (ii.i.28 et al.; O. reads -yate); agnīc ca me (iv.7.81: O. omits this and the next example), ulīkaṣ papah (v.5.18), agnīs te tejāḥ (i.1.108 and vii.5.17: O. leaves out te), and yax pāpaṃā gṛhitāḥ (ii.1.35, 48: W. leaves off the first word; G. M. O. omit the last).

The requirements of this rule are by no means complied with by the manuscripts, nor have I followed them in the present work. In the first place, no manuscript that I possess, or have ever seen, attempts to represent any such sounds as the jīhavāmātya and upaṃhāmātya (see i.9), or χ and φ, for these, visarjanīya is universally substituted, as if the sect of Agniveṣya and Vālmiki (see rule 4, below) had supplanted all its rivals; and, in the second place, the agreement to leave visarjanīya unchanged before a sibilant (according to the view of the authorities referred to below, in rule 5) is nearly as general. In my MS. of the Sanhitā, I have noticed about thirty cases of conversion to a sibilant, in place of unchanged retention, and they are nearly all in a single limited neighborhood (in iv.5), where a different scribe has developed his originality a little. As is hinted above, in the introduction, however, G. and M. make with great regularity the assimilation of h to the following sibilant; O. does it not infrequently; the others, almost never.

I have put together, in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.40, a statement of the variously conflicting views respecting the treatment of h before the different classes of surd letters held by the different Prātiṣṭāhikyas, or referred to in their rules; and it is unnecessary to repeat it here. The sole point upon which all authorities agree is the conversion into g and s before palatal and dental mutes respectively—and this is also the only point left unquestioned by the rules which follow here in our treatise.

2. aghoshaparo visarjanīyas ātyād ‘ghoshasya sasthānam adhmānam bhajate. yax−−−: ‘agni−−−: uld−−−:‘ agnīs−−−: yaf−−−:

(1) O. om.
8. But not when followed by kṣh.

That is to say, visarjanyā remains unchanged before kṣh, the preceding rule for its conversion to jīvāṃśīya being annulled. There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises. The commentator quotes a number of examples: manah kṣhena (v.2.17), udbhayataḥ kṣhnaṁ bhavati (v.1.14: W. B. omit bhavati: the visarjanyā was exempted from conversion into s before the k by viii.33), ghandghanah kṣhobhānaḥ (iv.6.41), pārvo 'reṣuḥ kṣhiyate (iii.1.71), and dyauḥ kṣhāmba rerihat (iv.2.12: O. omits the last word).

4. Nor, according to Āgniveṣya and Vālmīki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute.

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them “holders of a pākha, teachers”), it appears, reject altogether the jīvāṃśīya and upadāṃśīya, since they prescribe the retention of visarjanyā in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise. The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages: yathā kāmayeta (ii.1.28 et al.), and agnīḥ pare davit (v.7.36: O. has dropped out what follows agnīḥ).

Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites madhuḥ ca madhavaḥ ca (i.4.14 and iv.4.111), manas tatādiya (iv.1.12; but B. substitutes namas tāpyāyā, iv.5.91), āyuṣ śīvānaḥ (iv.6.41), yas somaḥ vaṃtī (ii.3.28).

5. According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then.

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commentator.

3. kṣhapa ro visarjanyāḥ pārvavidihiṁ na bhajate. yathā:\nman-\nubhay-\nghand-\npār-\ndyau-\nkṣhākārasya ghoṣavaṭtod prāptih.

1 G. M. O. om.

4. 'cakrō nisṛdaḥmā ākarshati. āgnīvēṣyavālmiṅkyaḥ pākha-nor ādhyayor' mate 'kavargaparāḥ pāvarga pārā pārvavidihiṁ nā pādvatiye. yathā\nagnīḥ\nkākra ca pākra ca kapāu\ntayor vargāu kapavargāu\ntāu pāru yasmi sa\ntathoktaḥ\nevan para tī kīm: mādhuḥ\nmanā\nduṣ\nyas-

9 G. M. O.; O. cakrād nisṛdaḥmā ākarshatā; ēyg-. 1 G. O. O. kāpavargaparā visarjanyāh. 9 G. O. na bhajate. 9 O. kavārqa ca pāvarga ca.
tator, and although G. M. O. omit the negative in the interpretation (I presume, by a copyist’s blunder only). Some authorities, who do not, like Agniveçya and Vālmki, refuse to accept the ji-ňāmāliya and upadhmāniya, nevertheless deny the doctrine of rule 2 to this extent—that they prescribe the retention of visarjaniya, not its assimilation, before a sibilant. Thus, they would write ḍuḥ ṣiṣānaḥ (iv.6.41). G. M., as is their constant custom, write here ḍuṣ; and so does O., as is its common, though far from invariable, usage: but this means nothing; for we have no good reason to expect the manuscripts of the commentary to conform themselves in any such case to a reading which will truly illustrate the matter in hand; they simply make the sandhi in the manner usual with them: for example, under rule 2, no MS. attempts to indicate the χ and ξ, and W. B. give the ḥ instead of the sibilant before the sibilant.

If we reject this interpretation, our sole alternative is, so far as I can see, to hold that some authorities would accept rule 2 only so far as it relates to ḥ before a sibilant, but would retain ḥ everywhere else, even reading agniḥ te tejāḥ, agniḥ ca me. This seems altogether inadmissible. Yet we must acknowledge that it is to some extent favored by the commentator’s selection of counter-examples, namely manas tatvāya (iv.1.11: but B. substitutes again nāma tatvāya, iv.5.91), and yah kāmayeta (ii.1.28 et al.). According to our preferred interpretation, there would be no particular reason for quoting the former of these, since the combination it illustrates has been made a question by no one: according to the other, it would be required (in the form manah tatvāya), to show what these disidents held should be done in such a case.

न प्रभुमानायायायोः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Not according to Plākṣi and Plākṣhāyaṇa.

The natural interpretation of this rule would seem to be, that Plākṣi and Plākṣhāyaṇa are not of the number of those who hold the objectionable doctrine of the last rule, or of the last two rules. If, however, I rightly apprehend the commentator, he declares it

5. ekeshām dcaryāndam mata dcshmapara eva visarjantyāḥ pār-vavidhiṁ na dhajate. yathā: ḍuḥḥ... evakāreṇa kim: ma-nas...... 'yaḥ......'

1 G. M. O. om. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 G. M. om.

6. kapavargaparaś dcshmaparaś ca visarjantyāḥ plākṣhīplāk-

kṣhaṇayayoh ṣākhinoḥ pakeśe na khalu pār-vavidhiṁ bhajate.

yāḥ...... yah...... ḍuṣ...... evampara iti kim: manas......

'kapavargādī śatratravayān anishṭam.'

1 O. kavargaparās pavariparāsa ca. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. prefix evam, and put the whole at the end of the comment on the preceding rule; they also omit rule 6.
to mean "in the opinion of these two authorities, it does not—that is, A does not follow the prescription of rule 2 either before a guttural or palatal mute or before a spirant." This is equivalent to a ratification of rule 4, and a ratification or rejection of rule 5, according as we adopt the one or the other of the two interpretations proposed for the latter; and it is, in my view, quite unsuited to the connection. The discordant explanations of some of the other views of designated authorities given in the rules of the treatise show us that the commentators had not in all cases, at least, any certain knowledge by tradition of the matters referred to, but simply interpreted as well as they were able the notices of their text-book—and we have the same right as they in this respect. If the particular point here under discussion were of more practical consequence, I should be inclined to go into a fuller discussion of it; as the case stands, it has perhaps cost us already more words than it is worth.

The commentator illustrates by repeating several of the quotations already given—namely yah kâmayeta (ii.1.23 et al.), yah pâpmand (ii.1.3 et al.), áśuḥ cûcânaḥ (iv.6.41): these as direct examples; as counter-example, according to W. O., manus tatuva (iv.1.11), for which B. once more substitutes namas tulpyâra (iv.5.9), while G. M. read aqm ca me (iv.7.61)—the readings of which, as regards the visarjaniya, each manuscript gives in its usual fashion (except that W. has this time áśuḥc cûcânaḥ, by a blundering divergence in the wrong direction), so that we are deprived of any farther aid from that quarter to the understanding of the rule.

Finally, rules 4–6 are declared not approved.

7. Aḥ, the whole of it, when followed by a, becomes o.

The commentator's cited examples are preddho agne (iV.6.5 and iv.7.8), samiddho aṅjañ (v.1.11), and so 'braviś (ii.1.2 et al.). He then enters into a long exposition intended to prove the necessity of the specification sarvah, 'the whole of it,' in the rule. Without it, we are told, the reading samiddho aṅjañ (in the second example given) would not be established: for, by 1.56, alteration and omission concern only a single letter; hence, if sarvah were omitted, only the final visarjaniya would be converted to o; this, with the preceding a, would become a by x.7; the a would

7. aḥsarvo visarjaniya' otvam' bhajate 'kāraparah': aḥsarva ity akāreṇa sahe 'ty arthaḥ. pre-.....: sam-.....: so-.....: aḥ- sarva iti kim: samiddho aṅjann iti na sidhyet: kim tu varṇasya vikāralopa (i.56) iti visarjaniyamātrasya sydd otvam: tata okār dukāraparah (x.7) ity dukāre kṛta dukāra dvam (ix.15) ity dvadepah: tathā sati samiddhau aṅjann iti sydt. 'yad vā: ' svāruparo yākāram (ix.10) iti yatvam'
be converted into ṣv by ix.15, and the final reading would be samiddhā anjān. Or, again [supposing the present rule not to be given], the visarjanīya would become y by ix.10, the y would be dropped by x.19, the preceding a would be exempted from further combination by x.25, and the samihāt-reading would turn out samiddhā anjān.

The Ath. Pr. (ii.53) avoids the same difficulty by prescribing the conversion of the h into u, which then combines with the preceding a into o. The other treatises (Rik Pr. ii.12; Vāj. Pr. iv.42) treat the combination in the same manner as our own. What becomes of the following a is taught in the eleventh and twelfth chapters.

8. Also when followed by a sonant consonant.

Only one example of this combination is cited, namely mā no mitro varṇah (iv.6.81: G. M. O. omit the last word).

The commentator raises against this rule the objection that, as prescribing the same thing with the one preceding, it should not have been made a separate rule at all; and, in reply, he promises that the exposition of the meaning of tu in the next rule shall explain the reason of the proceeding.

9. But visarjanīya, when preceded by an a-vowel, is omitted.

In these rules, from 7 to 10 inclusive, the anuvrtti, or continuance of implication, is intricate and irregular in an unusual degree, and even beyond the measure of what ought to be tolerated. The implication of visarjanīya being made all the way from viii.5 to bhavati: tasmiṣca lupyete tv avarṇapūrvau yavakarav (x.19) iti yakāre16 lupte parac ca paraṣ ca (x.25) iti19 kāryānta-rāprasiddhe18 samiddhā19 anjann ity syāt: tan mā bhād ity14 evam arthaḥ15: ahaśarvaḥ16 ity uktam.

1 G. M. om., and ins. apy. 2 G. M. okāram. 3 G. M. put at the beginning. 4 G. M. sakti: visarjanīya. 5 O. sikhdyet. 6 B. G. M. om. 7 G. M. kim ca; O. kim tu. 8 G. M. O. ins. atha. 9 G. M. O. ins. ed. 10 G. M. O. om. 11 O. ins. niśresā. 12 G. M. -praktke; O. -prakkeśe iśāḥ sāti. 13 W. -dāho; B. -dāhū. 14 G. M. om. 15 G. M. O. om.; B. om. evam. 16 B. om. aḥ.

8. odkaraḥ okāram ahaśarvan ca 'nvedipati. aḥ sarvo ghoshavatparāpavam dhajate. yathā: mā ...... nanu viśdāu samāne prathakkarānam anarthakam iti ceta: uttarasūtre tuṣṭabdavyākhyānena' sphutikarikṣyataḥ iti pariḥṣrāh.

1 G. M. put next before anuvṛtta. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. O. -raṣ ca. 4 G. M. O. om. 5 G. M. -ksṛarak. 6 G. M. -khyāne. 7 W. O. -āhyā.
ix. 10 (as pointed out in the comment to viii.5), rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that “visarjaniya, when preceded by a, becomes o along with the latter, when a follows;” instead of which a new subject, “the whole syllable ah,” is introduced there; and visarjaniya, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again. But we find it implied without specification in the present rule; and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down “by vicinage” from rule 8, while the tu, ‘but,’ the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by a, as specified in rule 7. This is little less than absurd: if the sequence of a was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of. The tu is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator’s attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure. Our rule means, by its terms, that ah, dh, and sh lose their h before a sonant consonant; only, as ah was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to dh and sh. The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of “preceded by an a-vowel” is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that ah, dh, and sh before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of ah before a, already provided for—convert their h into y, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x.19. But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous matters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the Prātiśākhya. It is really made up of two independent parts: one, aṭha svaraparāḥ, ‘Now then, when followed by a vowel,’ which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next; the other, visarjaniya yadāram, ‘h becomes y,’ and their combination is made in order that the implication of visarjaniya and also of avarnapātra may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator’s examples of the application of the rule are devā gātavidā (i.1.13; 4.44; vi.6.28), and vicētyāh somās na vicētyās iti (vi.1.9; somās for somāh, by protraction from somaḥ: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three). He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spe-
cification of sequence by a, made in rule 7, is annulled by the word tu, and that an inferential sequence by a sonant consonant is assumed by vicinage [from rule 8]; and that the implication here of the latter only is the reason why rules 7 and 8 are given independently of one another. That is to say, such is the easiest way of arriving at the result desired, that the h of ah and dh is not directly dropped before a, but passes through the intermediate step of conversion into y, as before the other vowels.

श्रेण्य स्वारपर: यकारम् ॥ १० ॥

10. When followed by a vowel, it becomes y.

That is to say, visarjaniya does so, if preceded by an a-vowel (rule 9)—except in the case of ah followed by a (rule 7). And, as is intimated by the prefix of atha, the specification “followed by a vowel” is of force also in the following rules (through chapter x). I have remarked in the preceding note upon the anomalousness of this rule, as striving to fuse into one the winding-up of one subject and the introduction of another. It has not seemed possible to render the atha excepting by a longer and more tedious paraphrase than I was willing to introduce; accordingly, I have left it out in translating the precept.

The commentator’s examples are āpa undantu jivase (i.2.11: G. M. O. omit jivase), tā abhravan (i.3.52; 5.18), and anvārabhyās īti (v.3.81; anvārabhyās for anvārabhyād, by protraction from anvārabhyād); and he gives further, as counter-examples, āpa vārunya (v.5.41: a not unexceptionably selected example, since āpa even before a vowel might not follow the present rule), and āgnir ekādakaḥśeṇa (i.7.111: a case under viii.6, as the preceding under ix.8).

This conversion of visarjaniya into y is only the preliminary step to its complete loss, by rule x.10. The same course of conversion is followed by the Atharvan and Vājasaney Prātiṣākhyaas (Ath. Pr. ii.41; Vāj. Pr. iv.36), but not by that of the Rik (ii.8,10).

एकारो अघु ॥ ११ ॥

11. E, before a vowel, becomes ay.


Of which, then, the  is lost by x.19, leaving only  ; and this, by x.25, is not liable to further combination. The commentator’s examples are  (ii.4.10), and  (ii.3.11).

12.  

The example is  (ii.4.12). For the further treatment of the  thus produced, see x.19 and the following rules.

13. But not, in either case, when followed by  .

The dual number of the attribute in this rule, we are told, sufficiently shows that the two letters  and  , last mentioned, are its subject. There are two different rules in the treatise applying to the case of a final  or  coming to stand before initial  —namely rule 11, above [or rule 12], and rule xi.1, which directs that the latter shall be elided—and, since the rules of this chapter are of paramount force, as preceding the other, the present precept is required in order to annul them.

The commentator’s examples are  (i.5.12),  (v.1.11), and  (ii.5.1 et al.).

14.  

11.  .  idam idántám ucya te; svaraparah padánta ekáro ‘yam iti vikáram ápadyate. imá: tā:  

1 G. M. svarah.  

12. svaraparah padánta okáro ‘vam iti’ vikáram ápadyate. yathā: vish——  

1 G. M. svarah.  

13. dvivacanasámartyaghitáv ekárdukárav akáraparav párvavidhiin na prépnutah. yathā: mad...: sam...: te...: tā ádáv ekáro ‘yam (ix.11) tūpyata te akára ekárdukárav párvah (xi.1) iti sútrdayam prasaktam: tatd ‘pi párrate it te prakárayat yatvavidhiin nisheedhun ayam drambhaḥ. akáraḥ para yábhyañ tāv akáraparavā.  

1 B. G. M. O. -yyat gr.; and G. M. O. add samāhitān.  

O. inna ekáraṃya.
The example is āśāmāḥ eve 'māv dvāḍagdu mādāv (vii.5.2): B. omits the last word, G. M. O. the last two).
To complete the sandhi, also, which is the subject of this rule and its successor, rule x.19 is needed.

15. Āu becomes āv.
The example is ahāv anadātā hate (v.6.13).

16. An u, uncombined with a consonant, remains unchanged, and v is inserted between it and the following vowel.
The definition of aprkta was given above, at i.54, and such a word was directed to be treated both as initial and as final (i.55). This rule makes an exception for the particle u, which becomes ūv before a vowel—which, moreover, never occurs after an a-vowel except as combined with it, forming part of the class of pragrahas in o which were treated above, in rules iv.6,7. The examples given are sa ūv ekaviśapavartaniḥ (iv.3.33), and adanty ūv ovē 'syā manuśyāḥ (ii.3.74): I have noted further only iv.6.94, but am not sure that I have been careful to mark all the cases. As counterexamples, svapatyāya deva (v.5.43; p. svapatyāya) shows that the u must be aprkta, and bhakshe ʾḥi (iii.2.51), that no other aprkta vowel than u is thus treated.

17. But not in saṅhitā-text, after tat and tasmāt.
The passages are tad v dhur uterjyam (vii.5.7): O. omits after dhū), and tasmād v āgyam (vi.1.11). So far as I have observed, these are the only instances which the text affords of u following

14. svāparah padānta āḍkāra āgyam vikāram āpadyate. yathā: āśām—

15. āḍkāra padāntaś svāparah āvām vikāram āpadyate. yathā: ahāv—

16. aprktaśaṁjñaḥ ʾukāraḥ svāparah prakṛtyaḥ vatishe-ḥate: avikṛto bhavati ty arthāḥ: ukāraśvārayor antare vikāraḥ od "gamo bhavati. yathā: sa:... adanty... aprkta iti kim: svā-...: ukāra iti kim: bhāk—

1 B. G. M. -nte. 2 G. M. O. om.
15. B. G. M. -nte. 2 G. M. O. om.
17. G. M. -nte. 2 G. M. O. om.
a consonant and preceding a vowel. Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rīk Pr. ii.28; Vāj. Pr. iv.87; Ath. Pr. iii.36). The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x.15, and the $u$, like any final, is converted into $v$. To show the bearing of the specification $sāṁhitaḥ$, "in combined text," the commentator gives us the two passages in $pada$ and $krama$ form: thus—$t$: $u$: $dhuh$: $tad$ $u$: $uv$ $dhuh$: $āhur$ $uterjyam$ (but G. M. O. give simply the first two $krama$-$pada$'s), and $tasmaṭ$: $u$: $ācyam$: $tasmaḍ$ $u$: $uv$ $ācyam$ (here only W. has the statement in $pada$). It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the $u$ as here prescribed; failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes $uv$.

18. A $u$, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled.

That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading $atha$ $svaraparāḥ$ (ix.10) still continuing in force. The commentator adds also "when occurring at the end of a $pada$," as he has done in his paraphrase of the preceding rules: this is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of $pada$-text into $sāṁhita$. His illustrative examples are $nyāśhī$ $agnīḥ$ (v.5.82), and $tus$ $tūd$ $dadhyośānī$ $reśīḥ$ (iv.1.8 and v.1.4*: only G. M. have the first two words). That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by $pūrāḥ$ $a$ $vartate$ (iii.2.97 and vi.3.83); that a vowel must follow, by $sadrūk$ $samāṇīḥ$ $ṣyāt$ (ii.2.8*: only O. has the last word; only B. G. M. have the inserted $k$, required by v.32, and G. M. convert it to $kh$, by xiv.12), and $pratyāṇaḥ$ $shad-ākhaḥ$ (vil.4.2*: here all have the $k$, but only G. M. make it $kh$).

17. tat $tasmaḍ$ ity' etāḥyāṁ sāṁhīta ukāro 'prktaḥ purvavīdhinānāḥ "protoi" : prakṛtyāvasthānānāḥ vākāraṇaḥ ca na bhave 'ty arthāḥ. tad....: $tasmaḍ$..... $iṇaṁkāraṁ$ $yavakāraṁ$ (x.15) iti daśamā 'syā vidhīr vākṣyaṁtē. tat $tasmaḍ$ sāṁhīta iti $kim$ : tat......: $tasm$.....

1 G. M. om., 2 G. M. "padyate; O. prōm-. 3 G. M. O. -rāgama. 4 O. -ma. 5 B. tasya. 6 O. ins. tasya purastadopavido 'yam.

18. 'svaraparo śakdaraḥ padāntavarti hrasvapūrvo dhivānāṁ "bhajate. yathā": $nyāśiṁ.....: tam..... hr̥svapūrva iti $kim$: par.....: svarapara iti $kim$: saḥ.....: $praty$..... hr̥svaḥ pūruḥ $aśmaḥ aśaḥ hr̥svapūrvaḥ: dvāyor varṇayoh samāhāro $dvivānāṁ$.

1 G. M. arrange hr: uv- pad- śak-. 2 G. M. O. ins. dvivānā-. 3 G. M. om.
19. As does also a ṅ. 

The ṅ in this rule brings down, we are told, the preceding cause of duplication and the duplication itself. The cited examples are nir avapann ivrdrya (i.4.2\(^2\)), and abravam rāhanvat (i.5.1\(^2\)). The counter-examples, given for the same purposes as those under the preceding rule, are niravapam yāṇy eva puras-tāt (i.4.1\(^2\): O. omits the last two words), onunvat te 'śmin (i.6.9\(^3\): O. omits the last word), yāṇ agnayo 'nvatapyaṇta (i.2.8\(^3\): O. omits the last word; G. M. omit the whole example), and vidvān etam agnēṃ cinute (v.6.5\(^3\)). The commentator does not give himself the trouble this time to inquire why two rules are furnished to prescribe a single process: the reason is, evidently, because continued implication of ṅ only is desired in the rules that follow.

19. cakāraḥ pārvanimittaṁ dvitvam ed "nuddipati. hravapārvo nākāro dvivaram" bhajate svaparapo. nir.....: abr....: evampara iti kim: nir.....: oman.....: evampārva iti kim: yāṇ.....: vid.....


20. grahokhyddishu vishayesu ākārapārvo ākārapārvo ed ca-kārdeṣṭho nākāro 'nītparo' itiivyatritavarpārva repah āpadyate: ākārapārvo ed yakdraṃ. graho nāma caturo 'nudd-
As in other similar cases, the commentator, after his preliminary paraphrase of the rule, proceeds first to define the passages of the Sanhita designated by the titles it contains. By graha is meant the fourth chapter of the first book, excepting its last four sections—or i.4.1–42. By ukhya, the first two chapters of the “Agni” book (see iii.9), excepting their final sections (which are yajya)—or iv.1.1–10; 2.1–10. The yajya have been already defined (iii.9, note), as the concluding sections of all the chapters to book fourth, chapter third, together with ii.6.11. By prshthya are intended nine sections, pointed out by the citation of the first words of each: they are iv.4.12; 6.6–9; 7.13: v.1.11; 2.11; 2.12. Hiranyavarṇiyā designates only a single section, v.6.1. Examples are then given from each set of passages. From graha passages, we have jahi pātraṁ apa mrdo nudasva (i.4.42), and marutvaṁ indra yashabhaḥ (i.4.19: G. M. O. omit the last word): there are four other cases, at i.4.20 twice, 21,41. From ukhya passages, ye vā vanaspātiṁ anu (iv.2.83), and madhumāṁ ātu suryaḥ (iv.2.93): there are ten others, at iv.1.33 twice, 9.3,10.4, 2.42,51, 92 twice. From yajya passages, tāṅkṛ tūpate yaje ha (iv.3.134: only O. has the last two words), to which W. B. O. add amavād ibhena (i.2.141); but for this G. M. substitute madhumāṁ indriyadān (iii.11.02), which is not in a yajya passage at all, but falls under the next rule: I have noted more than thirty other cases, namely at i.1.144; 2.142; 3.144; 4.462; 5.112; 6.124; 7.134; ii.1.114 thrice; 2.123; 3.142; 4.111; 6.111 thrice 4 twice, 12; ii.1.111 thrice, 7; 2.111 twice; 4.113; 5.112; iv.2.113; 3.132;44 twice. The same passages contain five exceptions, which are duly provided for in rules 23 and 24, below. From prshthya passages, the examples are patrāṁ anaparyayantarāḥ (iv.6.83) and jaghādāṁ upa jighnate (iv.6.85): other cases at iv.6.75,94 twice; 7.155: v.1.114. Finally, kān varjayitāv dāde grāvā (i.4.11) iti praṇah: agnikānda- syād dyaṁ praṇadavayām uttamānuvākavarjam ukhyam: ākhyā- yate: uktā yajyaḥ: samid diṣām (iv.4.121) jīmatasya (iv.6.81) yad akrāndah (iv.8.71) mā no mitraḥ (iv.8.81) ye vājīnam (iv.8.91) agner manve (iv.7.151) samiddhā añjan (v.1.111) gāyatri (v.2.111) kṣ ā tvā (v.2.121) ity anuvākanava- kam prshthyaḥ iti paṭhyate: hiranyavarṇāḥ (v.6.1) ity anuvāko hiranyavarṇiyāḥ. "grahe yathā: jahi: mar: ukhya: ye: madḥ: yajyadu: tāṅkṛ: ama: prshthya: paṭr: jagh: hiranyavarṇiyāḥ: agni nṛ: sar: anitipara iti kim: abhy: idā: grahaśvā iti kim: trīn: pagān: tān: itīh paro yasmād āśe itiparāḥ: na 'tiparō 'nītiparāḥ.

1 G. M. read prh throughout. 2 B. om. 3 G. M. O. ity asamād anyāsar; B. iti 'by etid asamād anyāsar. 4 G. M. O. 'nityānum. 5 G. M. -d eti. 6 G. M. O. ins. ity. 7 G. M. anuvādāḥ. 8 W. O. pakhyāt; G. M. pakhyante. 9 G. M. om.
from the hiranyakavarnita section, agnīḥ aprusshadah (v.6.12), and sarvāḥ agnim (v.6.12), which are the only cases. Counter-examples, of s not converted as here prescribed, because occurring outside the passages specified, are trāṇ imān lokān iti (vii.3.21), paṣaṇ eva va randhe (v.1.1 et al.), and tān indro 'ntaryāmend 'ntar adhata (vi.4.61: G. M. O. omit the last two words). And the bearing of the specification “except before iti” is illustrated by examples from the krama and pada texts, namely abhyavartanta dasyaṇā: dasyaṇ iti dasyaṇ (i.8.126; dasyaṇ is thus repeated, as being the closing word of the anuvāka: but W. O. omit this repetition, which exhibits the very point requiring illustration, and B. adds only iti dasyaṇ to the first dasyaṇ), and idāvān iti 'iddāvān (iii.1.111; saṁhitā-reading, idāvān eshaḥ).

Any general examination of the aspect of this mode of combination in the Tāttvīrīya text I defer to the end of the chapter.

21. Also in the words martyāṇ, ud ayaṇ, amṛtaṇ, duryāṇ not preceded by soma, so asmaṇ, avimaṇ, madhumāṇ, havishmaṇ, hātāmāṇ before any vowel belonging to the text, cicitāṇ, udāvāṇ, kaksihāvān, bāzāvān, hi payasvāṇ, vaṣaṇ, vidyātāṇ, amitrāṇ, arāṇ, poshāṇ, and mahāṇ.

The ca in this rule, says the commentator, brings down from the preceding rule the specification “except before iti,” but we might fairly claim that it involves all the specifications there made excepting the restriction to certain passages: this exception the comment duly notes: “this and the rules that follow have a general application, without regard to special portions of the text.”

The illustrative examples are: for martyāṇ, martyāṇ āniveṣa (v.7.91). For ud ayaṇ, ud ayaṇ ajāram (iv.6.83): with a counter-example, sayobhir eva 'yān ava randhe (v.2.107), to show that.

21. ......' etesu' grahānesu nakāro 'niitipar o'yakāram āpadyate'. anitiparāvākashakā 'yānih' caṅkāro. visheṣānānandārtya saurvārtho 'yam itoḥ' poram ārambhah. yathā: mart......: ud aya......: ud iti kih: vayo......: ud......: bhad......: na somapāroḥ: duryāṇ ity atra nakāraḥ somapāro yatvān' ud "padyate pra......: so......: so iti kih: indo......: avī......: gom......: madī......: avigombhī iti kih: paṣu......: hav......: hātāmān ārṣhe": hātāmān ity atra nakāra "ārṣhe svare
the ut before ayaṇ needed to be quoted along with it. For amṛtāṇ, ud aśthām amṛtāṇ anu (i.2.8). For duryāṇ, bhaśadrān duryāṇ abhy e'hi mān anuvratā ny u (i.8.3; G. M. O. omit mān etc.): there are two other exceptions, at i.2.13; vi.2.9; and a single exception, pra ca redaṃ somu duryāṇ adityāḥ (i.2.10), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction "not preceded by soma." For aṣṭmān, so aṣṭmāḥ adhipatīn karotu (i.6.5 and iii.2.7²): another example is at v.7.9; and aṣṭmān becomes aṣṭmāḥ also at i.6.12, but in virtue of the preceding rule. The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing so in the rule, is indro aṣṭmān aṣṭmān devīye (iii.1.9²: W. B. omit the last word). For avimāṇ, avimāṇ uṣṭi (i.6.6; 7.6: iii.1.11¹: but the last case falls under the preceding rule also). For gomāṇ, gomāṇ agne (i.6.6; 7.6: iii.1.11¹—that is to say, in the same phrase with avimāṇ). For madhumāṇ, madhumāṇ indriyāvāda (iii.1.10²). Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why mān would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts avī, go, and madhū: it is paṇumāna eva bhavati (vi.2.6² et al.). Then, for hāvishmāṇ, hāvishmāṇ ā vidvā (i.3.12): the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at vi.4.2. For hātumāṇ, devahātumāṇ īti uthāya āna jahoti (v.5.3¹: W. B. omit the last word): it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section. The specification "before any vowel belonging to the text (ārṣhe, "coming from the ārṣhe")," is declared to be meant as an annullment of the restriction, "except before iti," made in the preceding rule. And, to show that the n remains uncharged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the pada-reading devahātumāṇ īti deva-hātumāṇ. There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text: "the specification 'before what comes from the ārṣhe' has force in both directions, after the fashion of the crow's eye [Molesworth says, the crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

dev..... ārsha īti kim: dev..... 12 ārshagrahaṇasāmarthyaḥ itiparotvā "pi "yatvam bhavati: ārsha īti kākākhivaḥ 13 ubhāyatra gamadhyaṭe grahokhyādimaḥ-paryantam: ārsha-vayampátha 14 ity arthaḥ. cikid..... 12 idāv.....: kak.....: viṣ.....: iḍākakhivaḥ 13 īti kim: ras.....: sam.....: hi īti kim: ārj.....: ārsha itiparotvād dev..... itivad yataprāptā higrhaṇaṇe niṣhidhyate. stuto.....: vid.....: arāḥ.....: pohc.....: agne..... 12 For aṣṭmānuḥ, G. M. read āyaṇaṁ aṣṭmānuḥ sopmaro "numeṇān na "pad-}

1 For aṣṭmānuḥ, G. M. read āyaṇaṁ aṣṭmānuḥ sopmaro "numeṇān na "pad-}
ball to the other, as it is needed)—namely, from the beginning of the preceding rule to the end of the present one.” This appears to mean that an iti belonging to the sacred text itself would admit the conversion of the n before it, in any case falling under these two rules. The opinion is doubtless a sound one; but, to prove its expression pertinent here, we require an example showing that there is a passage in the text requiring its application: and none such is furnished us: on the contrary, the addition of ḍṛṣke to hātāmān alone implies that none is to be found. The example for cikīvān is cikīvān anu manyatām (iii.1.41: O. omits the last word). For idāvān, idāvān eṣṭāh (i.6.64; also at iii.1.111, but this is a case falling under the preceding rule). For kahāvān, kahāvān duṣṭāh (v.6.55). For bānāvān, vipāyō bānāvān uta (iv.5.14: O. omits the first word). Next we have again a counter-example, rassavān eva bhavati (ii.2.48), showing that, of words ending in vān, only those preceded as here specified undergo the prescribed effect. For hi payasvān, sam aṣṭakshmaḥ : pa- yasvān agna d’gaman (i.4.45a,46a: only O. has sam; and G. M. O. omit the last two words): the necessity of the prefixed hi is shown by the counter-example ārjasvān payasvān ity āha (i.7.84). Here, however, is a case of payasvān before an iti which comes from the reśha, and therefore might seem to require the reading pa- yasvān, like hātāmān in the passage devahātāmān ity ukṛtyām (v.5.31)—according to the extension made above of the natural and obvious meaning of ḍṛṣke; but the commentator declares that the mention in the rule of hi as necessary preceding word prevents the conversion of n to v in the passage: it is, to be sure, a case of payasvān before iti, but not of hi payasvān. For vāsān, the example is stutō yadi vāsān anu (i.8.51). For vidatān, W. O. give suvidatān api ta (i.8.54), while G. M. have instead suvidatān avitis (ii.6.125): B. is defective here, dropping out the last part of this quotation, and the first part of the next (reading suvidatān apabādhamānāh); G. M. are in the wrong this time, for the passage they quote falls under the preceding rule. For amitrān, amit- rān apabādhamānāh (iv.6.42): an exception is provided for in the final rule of the chapter. For arān, arān tvā ’gyne nemih (ii.5.93: O. omits the last word). For poshān, poshān apushyat (vii.1.9). For mahān, agne mahān avī (ii.5.91): another case at i.4.20.
The implication here, the commentator tells us, is of a n preceded by a only: he does not explain why, but would have a right to appeal to the mention of an last in rule 20, and the exclusion of any other cases than those of a final an in rule 21. His examples are as follows. For indro me, sapatnān indro me (i.1.13¹; 6.4²: iv.6.3⁴); with a counter-example, yushmān indro vrñita (i.1.5¹), to illustrate the need of specifying me. For aakah, nigrīdhana 'dharan aakah (i.1.13¹; 6.4²: iv.6.3⁴: that is to say, in the same passage as the preceding: O. omits the first word). For adhvam, yāyān devān 'ādhvam (i.3.8²: O. omits the first word). For iha, agne devān iha' vaha (i.3.14⁸; 5.5³: iv.6.1⁸); with a counter-example, yajñīyan iha yān havmade (i.5.10³: only W. has the last word), to show that the nimitta in this case is iha, not iha. For apy etu, gharma devān apy etu (i.5.10¹: B. omits gharma: again at i.6.3⁵); with the counter-example, vidvān api janyeshu (vi.1.6⁸), to show that api without etu does not cause the conversion. For aganma, suvar devān aganma (i.7.9³). For idényan, idāmahā devān idényan (ii.5.9⁶). For dyajīthah, devān dyajīthah svasti (iv.3.13¹; 6.1⁸: O. omits the last word). For ā ca, devān ā ca vakshat (iv.6.3⁴ twice, and v.4.6⁸ twice); but this example is omitted by G. M., and they also omit the itemā ca in the rule itself. A counter-example, yān ā vaha upatah (i.4.44²: G. M. omit the last word), is given by all but O.: in G. M., it should show that ā causes the only when followed by yajjīthah; in W., only by yajjīthah and ca; but W. states the occasion for it in the same manner as G. M., and B. alone sets it in its proper relation to both the foregoing examples. For ṛtu, the example is, in W. B., vājō devān rūbhiḥ (iv.7.12³), but G. M. M. give instead yebhir devān rūbhiḥ (i.1.14⁸): I have found no other case. For akuruva, viśvā kāmāc akuruva (i.5.9³). For adhu, yajīo svān adhu (i.7.11). For aditiḥ, vivvasvān aditiḥ (i.5.3⁵). For agre, agnis tān agre (iii.1.4²): we have also vājan tān agre in the same division. For adharān, anyān adharānt sapatnān (iii.2.8⁴): with a counter-example, bhṛativyan adharān padayāni (iii.5.3¹). For alam, purodācah alam kuru iti (vi.3.1²). Finally, to show that the rule applies only to an, paridhīn akuruva (vi.2.1⁵⁴).

The comment closes with an exposition which I must confess that I do not fully understand. It is evidently intended to determine the readings which the words treated in these rules shall have in jata-text; and it furnishes abundant illustrations, in reference to the form of which, however, there is not a little difference between the different recensions: G. M. O. generally citing the passage first

yajī-.....: ghar-.....: eto iti kim: vidvān.....: suvar.....: iţa-.....: devān.....: 'devān.....: 'yajjīthasa ce'ti kim: yān.....: vājō.....: vit.....: yajīo.....: vivas.....: agnis-.....: anyān.....: sapatnān iti kim: bhra-.....: puro-.....: anvāde-.....: kimarthah: pari-.....: tattatpadagrahane kartavye parapa-.....: dagrahanam 'andrehe 'pi' saṁhitāvidhdāo' agraṇahasya' ca' ya-
in its saṁhitā-form, and adding only a single sandhi from the jāta-text, while W. B. give the complete jāta-readings, and only those. The former quote first amartyaḥ maryādī āviveśa (v.7.9\(^1\)), and add maryādī amartyaḥ; W. gives amartyo maryādī maryādī amartyo 'maryādī āviveśa 'viveśa maryādī maryādī āviveśa'; B. only the latter (and, blunderingly, treats it as maryādī āviveśa, throughout); next, G. M. O. have uḥ asthān amṛtān anu: amṛtān asthān (i.2.8\(^1\)): W. B., amṛtān anu anu amṛtān amṛtān anu. Then, in illustration of a second point, we receive two more examples: G. M. O. read agne 'vimāṇ agne: avimāṇ agne (i.6.6\(^*\) et al.), for which W. B. substitute agne 'vimāṇ avimāṇ agne 'gne 'vimāṇ; and G. M. O., again, ud ayān ajāvāram (iv.6.3\(^3\)), O. this time adding the full jāta-reading ud ayān ayān ud ud ayān, which G. M. also seem to mean to give (they actually have only ayān ud ayān); while W. B. set down the jāta-form of the other pair of words: ayān ajāvāram ajāvāram ayān ayān ajāvāram. Yet once more, two examples for a third point close the tale: in G. M. O. agnis tān agre: tān agniḥ (iii.1.4\(^2\)), in W. B. tān agre 'gre tān tān agre; and, this time in all alike, anayān adharān adharān anyān anyān adharān (but G. M. have, doubtless by a copyist's blunder, anyān the second time, before anyān). It will be seen that the two versions are in part inconsistent with one another as regards the special points of combination to which they direct attention; and I am not able to make out what are the three classes of cases meant to be distinguished. The three points which one would most naturally think of as needing to be noticed are, perhaps, first, the occurrence of a word like amṛtān before itself—thus, amṛtān amṛtān—in the jāta repetition; second, its occurrence before a preceding word (not its defined or natural nimiṭta) when that word begins with a vowel—thus, amṛtān asthān; and third, its occurrence in jāta before the word which causes its alteration in saṁhitā—thus, amṛtān anu—if, indeed, this last can be regarded as requiring any special prescription. Or, the second and third cases might be expected to concern the treatment respectively of a word, on the one hand, like marṭyān, which is itself quoted in the rule as suffering the prescribed change (which is at the same time grahana and nāmiṭṭika, or nāmiṭṭikāni grahanam), and might therefore naturally be inferred to be liable to the change under all circumstances before a vowel; and one, on the other hand, like anyān, which is pointed

\[\text{tvaṁ syaṁ iti nāmiṭṭikāsyasya ca nāmiṭṭāpekasūvat. grahanasya yathā: amartyo...: ud...: evam nāmiṭṭikagrahanasya: agne...: ud...: evam grahanandāmiṭṭikāsyasya: agnis...: anyān...: evam sarvatra nakārasya yakārotattir\(^*\) drushta-vyā.}\]

\(^1\) B. om.  
\(^2\) G. M. O. yakāram.  
\(^3\) G. M. om.  
\(^4\) G. M. om.; W. G. M. read ya- 
\(^5\) G. M.  
\(^6\) G. M. a.  
\(^7\) O. -dhine; B. -dhānasye.  
\(^8\) B. om.  
\(^9\) G. M. O.  
\(^10\) G. M. O. -nasya nāi.  
\(^11\) G. M. itaka.
out by means of the quotation of the following word adhārān (which is itself, therefore, nāmīttika, while adhārān is grahaṇa; or which is grahaṇandīmittika, 'undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word'), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word. It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22. At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final ञ in saṁhīḍa shows it also in jātā before a following vowel of whatever kind. This is markedly different from its treatment in pada, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to ञ is lost altogether; and even in jātā (as was shown in the note to iii.1), an altered letter usually exhibits its saṁhīḍa form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in saṁhīḍa-text.

28. The n of raṃcī, ṛapāyān, yamān, pataḥgān, saṃmānān, arcān, yaṇyān remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made: needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action. The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows: pu-ratrā ca raṃcī anu (i.1.12), aditiḥ ṛapāyān iti (i.1.5), suya-mān ātaye (i.7.15), pataḥgān asaṁdītah (i.2.14), saṃsāmān uṣaṁ agne (i.3.13: only G. M. have the first word), arcān indra grahaṇāh (i.6.12: G. M. have dropped out all but arcā), and yaṇyān uṣas te mātah (i.3.14: O. omits the last word). The first two are from uṣkhyā passages, the third from a prāṣṭhyā, the rest from yaṇyā—as is noted also by the commentator (but G. M. omit these notices, save the first). Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following ṛapāyān is iti, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says "except before iti"); but he urges in reply that the word dṛśe in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

29.  "..... eteṣu grahaṇesu nākāraḥ svapaparpo 'pi na kha- ku rephaṃ yakāraḥ vā bhajate. yathā: puru..... adi.....: ukhyatvād anayoḥ prāpṭih'. nantu adi..... aṣṭe "tiparavād eva nisodeshe sati grahaṇam anartham": iti cet: ārṣa itiparavād punah prāpṭih: tan mā bhūd iti brāmaḥ. sva.....: "prāṣṭhyatvād prāpṭih:" pataḥ.....: "yaṇyātūḥ" prāpṭih." saṃa.....: arcān.....: yaṇī.....: "ūṣām api adi 'a prāpṭih.' 1

1 G. M. raṃcīṁ ity dhīteḥ; O. esu for eteṣu. 2 G. M. vā yakāraḥ. 3 B. lathā; the rest om. 4 G. M. -piṇmṛdāḥ. 5 G. M. atra. 6 G. M. O. -dhamam. 7 O. om. iti. 8 G. M. om. 9 G. M. om. 10 O. uṣa. 11 G. M. om.
"crow’s eye" interpretation) gives the former precept authority over it, which requires to be annulled.

24. Nor a n followed by ut or athā.

The phrases to which this rule relates are, as quoted by the commentator, amītrān un nayāmi (iv.1.103), and vidvān athā bhava (iii.2.112-3); our saṁhīta-text has athā, because the word stands vidhāya, at the end of a division of the section: see rule iii.10 and note: I have noted no other cases. The commentator gives a counter-example to the former, showing why ut could not have been extended to uto, but needed to stop at the consonant (ḥaṭ): it is triṅṛ uta dyān (ii.1.118). Such a counter-example is quite out of the usual course, and very superfluous; the example itself would be counter-example enough: the substitution of uto for ut would have excluded the very passage aimed at. Of the two phrases, the one comes from an ukhya-passage, the other from a yūḍhā: the commentator might better have spent his spare energy in telling us this.

What remains of the comment to this rule is not altogether free from difficulties. First the statement is made that the word athā in it implies also athā, with short a; in illustration, W. repeats, without change, vidvān athā bhava; B. gives the same twice over; only O. has, in krama-text, vidvān athā: athā bhava—which is doubtless correct, and shows the krama-reading (along, we may suppose, with the jāṭa) to be the matter aimed at. That the now accepted saṁhīta-reading—vidvān athā: 2: bhava—is contemplated, is not at all to be assumed. Both the statement and its illustration are wanting in G. M.; and this, although those manuscripts contain, under viii.34, the reference to it in advance there made. In regard to what follows, also, the recensions are considerably at variance. The jāṭa-text is again under

24. ut: athā: ity evamparo nakāro yathāvīhilātan 'rephāṇ yakāraṇa vā nā "padyate. ' yathā: amit-...... halmātrenā' kim: triṅṛ...... vidv-...... "dirgho 'tra hrasvopalakṣhanān api: yathā: vidv-...... " yathāsaṁhiṭṭhastham" eva nimittam" svakhyāya karoti "nishedhārūpam" yathā: amit-...... vidhīr api" "evaṁ yathāsaṁhiṭṭhasthanimitta evaṁ sarvatra bhavaty" "ato"' 'vocdā": " so...... asm-...... evamādi veditavyam.

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātipādhyavivarana
nuanno 'ādhyāyaḥ.

treatment; and it appears to be laid down that any word has in that text the same form as under analogous circumstances in sanshita, whether it fall under an exception or under a rule. Then, as example of an exceptional word, is given, as established by the present precept, amitrān ud ud amitrān amitrān ud (iv.1.106), amitrān retaining its n throughout; and again, as examples falling under the more general rule, so asmān asmānta sa so asmān: asmān avahāyāvahāyāvahāyāvahāyā (v.7.9: under rule 21).

So far, now, as I have been able to discover, the teachings of the Prātiṣṭākhya in rules 20–24 of this chapter precisely correspond with the conditions of the known Tālttīrīya text: I have not found in the latter a single case of final ḍh, ḍhr, ḍhr which they do not duly notice, nor an exception to the more general rules which is not provided for. Of course, my observation is more to be trusted upon the former point than upon the latter.

The sanshāt here treated of is comparatively unusual in our Sanhitā, as it is in those of the other Vedas. According to my count, there are (including repetitions) 115 cases of ḍh (including also one at iv.6.67, omitted above), 5 of ḍhr, and 4 of ḍhr—in all, 124; while, of final ḍn remaining unchanged before a vowel, I have noted down over 450 instances (and probably not without overlooking a score or two), of ḍn, about 150, of ṅn, 16, and of ūn, 4—in all, about 620, or not less than five times as many. The numerical relation in the Atharva-Veda is probably nearly the same. See the end of the note to Ath. Pr. ii.27.

CHAPTER X.

Contents: 1–9, combination of final and initial similar vowels, and of final a or d with initial vowels and diphthongs; 10–12, resulting accentuation and nasalization; 13, special cases of uncombineable final d; 14, of elision of final a, d before initial s and c; 15–17, combination of final s and u vowels, and resulting accentuation; 18, special cases of uncombineable final i; 19–23, elision of final y and ū; 24–25, uncombineable final vowels.

शैल्वकम्ये || 11 ||

1. Now for the coalescence of two vowels into one.

An introductory heading to the whole chapter. The commentator paraphrases: “both syllables become one form, of the same kind.”

1. athe 'by ayam adhikāraḥ: ubhe akshere ekam rūpam sajāśyam āpdyeta ity etad adhikāraṁ veditavyam ita uktaram yad vākṣyātmaḥ.

1 O. antes before rūpam. 2 MSS. -yāta.
2. In the case of a simple vowel, followed by a similar vowel, the product is long.

For the terms *samândâkshara* and *savarna*, see rules i.2,3, where they are defined. The grammatical construction of the rule is not simple, or easily made homogeneous with that of its predecessor. The commentator brings it out thus: “there being a simple vowel, followed by one that is of like nature with itself, these two, being put in the relation of predecessor and successor, become a single long vowel.” His examples are: *tvacaṁ ghnāhātvā ṇantarākṣhaḥ* (i.1.8: only O. has the first word; only G. M. the last), *rāmā ēti nārāṇyādi* (i.1.2), and *sāpasthā devo vanaspatiḥ* (i.2.2: only G. M. have the last word).

3. Now for cases in which an a-vowel stands first.

A new sub-heading, having force as far as rule 9, inclusive. The word *avarṇapārṇa* is explained by the commentator after the manner of a *kamadāhāra* compound, as meaning ‘that which is both an a-vowel and first,’ but I do not see how such a construction can be defended: we have, rather, to understand *akshara*, and make the meaning analogous with that of rule 2: “when there is a syllable that has an a-vowel before it.”

4. When an i-vowel follows, the product is e.

The commentator explains *iavarṇapare* in the same manner as *avarṇapārṇa* in rule 3. The interpretations might hold good, if *pūrva* and *para* were taken substantively; but they are not so used anywhere in the treatise. His chosen example is *ne շhtir bhava-*

1. *samândâkshara պtama քavarṇapare դati pārvedpārtehāte* 'ete uhe' *dirghan ekam' āpnuahā'. yathā: *tvato-...: rā-...: sāp-...: savarnam param yasmat tat savarnaparam: tasmin*.


3. *ādhe 'ty eyam adhikāraḥ! avarṇapāra' duration *ey* atad adhikāraḥ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakshyamah. 'idam adhikāraṁ rātvām upaśārāpāro a dram (x.9) iti paryantam. avarṇaṁ od śād pāraḥ od 'varṇapārvaḥ: tasmin*.

5. When an u-vowel follows, the product is o.

The commentator's single illustrative example is ishe tvd (i.1.1).

6. When e or āi follows, the product is āi.

The examples are sam brahmaṇa prayasvai 'katāya svahā (i.1.8; O. omits the last word), and somāṇḍra babhruladadhā (v.6.15; p. soma-dindrāh).

The commentator again very elaborately explains ekārdikārapare as a karmadhāraya compound, formed upon ekārdikāra as a dvandva; and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule.

7. When o or āu follows, the product is āu.

The examples are brahmāudānam pacati (not found in the Tāit-
tirtya Sanhitā, although it is read at Tāttvāy Sanhitā Brāhmaṇa i.1.9: we have brahmādānam pacet at v.7.34, and brahmādānam apacat at vi.5.61: O. omits pacati, leaving the citation such as might have come from either passage), and dāmna 'pdu 'mbhan (ii.4.13).

8. When r follows, the product is ar.

The examples are ardharca ekām (i.3.10), and agneyya roḍ "gnidhram (ii.1.61; p. agneyyd: roḍ).

I have not noticed a single example in the Tāttvāy Sanhitā of that retention of r unchanged after a and d, only with corruption of the latter, which is the rule in the Rik and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās, and which appears also in the Atharva-Veda, though against the authority of its Prātiṣhākhya (see Ath. Pr. iii.46 note).

9. If a preposition precedes, the product is ar.

The commentator points out that, as the implication "when an a-vowel stands first" is still in force from rule 3, this virtually means "if a preposition ending in a or d precedes;" r, of course, is inferred from the preceding rule. According to the list of prepositions given at i.15, then, a, pra, ava, and upa would be the only words authorised to form with initial r the yuddhi vowel instead of the guna, pard and apa being excluded. The commentator brings up but one example from the text, namely upa ṛkati (i.5.98: G. M. read upā ṛkati aśkandya, which I do not find anywhere: we have aśkandya after other words at i.5.84: ii.5.84: vi.3.8:12, the last time following upa ʿyati; possibly this text was in the mind of the scribe who added aśkandya in the comment on the present rule); he gives another from the jāṭa-text, ravayd upo īd tavyd tavyd upa (v.3.11' 4.2'), and, further, as counter-example, showing that only a preposition ending in a or d produces the prescribed effect, yuddhām va etai (v.1.21 et al.: O. omits the last word). Additional cases of the same combination, with d and ava, are quoted under rule 10 (at the end); if the text affords yet others, I have failed to note them. Nor have I observed any cases of the different treatment of pard and upa before r; so that here also I do not discover any reason for the strange restriction of the class of prepositions made at i.15.

8. avarṇapāravā ṛkārāpar ce sati te ubhe aksārē aram iti vikāramā ṛṇatāḥ. ardh-.....: agn-.....

1 O. om. 2 G. M. O. om.

9. avarṇapāravā ity anuvartate: tasmād upasargapāravā ity avīśaḥavarnāntokāravā avarṇanto 'yam' upasargas tavyādi va grahaṇām: ṛkāraḥ sāṃśidhyād labhyate. upasargapāravā ṛkārāpare
10. When an acute enters into the combination, the result is acute.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, when the first constituent, or the second constituent, or both constituents, have the *uddatta* accent, their combination is *uddatta*. He gives a long list of examples in illustration of the working of the rule, promising that they shall exhibit the whole series of vowel-combinations just prescribed, from the second rule to the ninth, with all possible conditions of accentual combination. Thus, *sa-vi-ta* prā 'rpayahatu (i.1.1; p. prā: arpt: W. reads -yati), brāhma yachā 'pā' gne (i.1.7; p. yacha: āpa), yājyād' 'ud' i'nam (ii.3.5); p. yājyā: d': evā: enam: the pāda-manuscripts have ā'tī for ā'; and so with the other prepositions), pāsd' 'dhatta (i.5.12; p. pāsd: d': adhatta: W. B. read -te), div's va cākṣhūh (i.3.62 and iv.2.94; p. divī: īva: for this accent, which is opposed to the teachings of all the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas, see under rule 17 of the present chapter), adyā vān vasa-ti 'ti 'nāra hi devand'nam (ii.5.37; p. vasa-ti: īti: indraḥ: O. reads at the end 'nāram eva, which I do not find anywhere in the Sanhitā); mātīrṇvarunī 'ti dā (i.6.74; p. -nti: īti). The question is then raised, whether the word *sānnyayam* (vi.2.41) does not fall under this rule, since it exhibits a coalescence into one syllable of two vowels, whereof one is acute; but the reply is made, that a special rule in a later part of the chapter (r.17) prescribes for it the circumflex. The examples are continued: réko dādāhāt' k satyādā (vii.4.19; p. dādāhāt: ut), vānaspātāyō 'nd' t tiśhāntī tāṇ (vii.4.8; p. ātū: ītū: only G. M. have tān), and tā dīkṣāh' 'pa' dādāhāt (v.5.54; p. dīkṣāhā: īpa: G. M. omit tā). So many are examples of the combination of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel: the rest illustrate the cases of coalescence in which a or ē precedes. They are sāmā mā in no havyādā-

ca sati te 'ubhe akshāre dāram iti vikāram āpṇuṭha, upā-.....
ṛ-..... avarnāntopasaṅgavipūshanena kim: vṛ-..... upasaṅ-
graḥ ca 'sau pārṇaḥ co 'pasarvāpūraḥ: tasminn 'pasarvāpūro

1 G. M. O. om. amu. 2 W. viṣṇahāra-, B. viṣṇahākā sathā; G. M. viṣṇahāka pāra; O. viṣṇahākā apī. 4 G. M. om. 8 G. M. O. om. 8 G. M. O. om. 8 G. M. O. om. 8 G. M. B. -ṣoma. 8 B. om. 8 G. M. om.

10. uddāttadharmanicisti varṇa pārṇaḥ paratāḥ ubhaya tva 
śīte sati te 'ubhe apy ekādeśam āpangne uddāttadharmaṃ āp-
ṇuṭha. uddatto sād 'sti 'ty uddattavān: tasminn uddattavātii. sa-
māṅkāsaḥram abhivyav sarvasmād ekābhāve 'yaḥ kāramam udd-
tānmuddattavārātāpaṛava ubhayaḥ uddāte vṛt 'dāharaṇīni darpa-
śīyamāh. sav-..... braz-..... yā-..... pāsh-..... dīv-.....
adya-..... māi-..... nanu sānnyam ity atro 'dāta-
nāi' kādeṣa sati kim na syād āyam viśiṣṭaḥ: uddātāpārvādīkāre
tim (iv.6.6; p. sāḥ: imād: compare rule v.17), tāṁ ghe 'd agnir vrddha' (ii.6.11; p. gha: st; only G. M. have the last word), savanamukhe savanamukhe kārye 'ti (vii.5.4; p. kārya: sāḥ: B. omits the first savanamukhe), sā 'd u hātā (i.1.14; p. sāḥ: st; compare rule v.17: W. B. omit the last word): so many are examples under rule 4. Now follow those under rule 5: prakśhitam gopāyata (vii.1.12; p. pratukshitam: G. M. omit this example), d'ya sthō 'rjaṁ vo bhakṣāya (i.5.6; p. sthā: d'yaṁ: O. omits the last word), svaduyāsa 'd śhādānim (i.2.8; p. svā-dūyāsa: st; G. M. omit this example also), and śmē evō 'pā dhatte (v.2.7; 5.3; p. evā: stya). The examples under rule 6 are nā'i nām pratyāhāti (i.5.9; p. nā: enam), eva evō yajedī 'kāḥ (vii.2.10; p. yajeta: ekāḥ), ādhā'i jom utthānam (vii.2.1; p. dha: ekam), yān nā'i 'kān rapan' (vii.6.4; p. nā: ekām), indriyām evō 'ndreṇā (vii.6.5; p. evā: dindreṇā), vi hī tàd avāyātā 'ti (vii.1.4; p. avā-āyāta), and finally, from the jāta-text, devēbhya d'indhā 'nāhā devēbhya devēbhya d'indhā (i.5.5; but G. M. give only the saṁvitā-reading, devēbhya d'indhā). To illustrate rule 7, we have kṣatrīya ca 'u jñahāṁ (iii.3.11; p. ca: ājñā: B. O. omit the last word), svad'āu ūshādibhiyāḥ (i.8.18; p. svad'āu: ūshī), svad'āu ūshādi śrutih (iv.2.3; 11; p. svad: ūshādik: another case under rule v.17: G. M. omit the last word), prāvā 'kśih kēnā 'pā 'ti (ii.6.5; p. prāvā: 'kṣih: G. M. omit the last word), and arunō ha svad ūhū 'pavecāḥ (vi.1.9; p. dha: 'arpavecāḥ). Under rule 8, again, fall 'agnvayā rōcā 'gnidharā (iii.1.6; p. āgnyayā: rōcā), svā tā evō rādhikā (vi.6.10; p. asya: rādhikā), d'indhā rahiśṭutah (ii.5.9; p. d'indhā: rahiśṭutah), and evō rśh reṣavidayat (v.1.10; p. evā: rśh). Under rule 9, finally, we have 'ātim d' 'rchati (i.5.2 et al; p. d': rchati), and avāraha evām dvāram (ii.6.3; p. avār'chati).

11. When a nasal, the result is nasal.

The commentator quotes rule xv.6, which declares it to be the

satyā 'ādhāv ca (x.17) iti sāvāna svārataya vīpeshavīḍhānādi iti brimah. reto..... van.....: tā..... evān samāndakshara-saṁhitāyām ekūhāvā 'nyatrd 'pi drashtavayāhi. evam avarṇa-pāravate" 'pi naktvate: "se.....: tam.....: sav.....: se'd.....: pro.....: ārja.....: svā.....: ime.....: nāi.....: ekā.....: athāi.....: yan.....: indr.....: vi.....: deve.....: ksha.....: svā.....: sav.....: prād.....: aru.....: āṛn.....: si.....: dindha.....: eva.....: āṛt.....: avā.....: evamādi".

1 W. prā. 2 B. G. M. -rūm. 3 O. -mān; G. M. upasārgātanām. 4 G. M. uddātinindāntavarāndām pāravate ca parāte ca uddāttoj uddāttoj ca yathābra-mām. 5 O. prāt. 6 G. M. 'ubhāv eva sahā. 7 G. M. -vīdhā. 8 W. B. -ve. 9 G. M. 'brd. 10 W. -vyāk. 11 G. M. vārpa. 12 G. M. -kā. 13 G. M. -dāyāk.
opinion of some authorities that final simple vowels, not pragrahas, are nasal; and he states that the present precept has reference to them: if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing anusvāra, which appears so unequivocally at xv.1; and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding anusvāra, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, yāh with añcum would make yō 'ñcum; svādā and añsbhyām (vii.3.161²), svādā 'ñsbhyām.

12. When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows: kanyā 'vā tunnā (iii.1.118; p. kanyā: 'vā); chāvīn chāvī 'pā'kṛtyā svāhā (v.7.20; p. chāvī: 'vā, 'pā'sā; G. M. O. omit svāhā), yādiā 'śā 'va' saptāpādā pāvāri (ii.6.28; p. yādiā: 'śā'; G. M. O. end with 'śā'), and áthā kvā 'eyā havanāyā ītī (v.7.42; p. kvā: 'eyā: O. omits the last two words). He then goes on to point out that the word svārita, 'circumflex,' being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (nitya) or "independent" circumflex (see rule xx.2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words; but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

\[\text{11. apragrahāḥ samānāksharāṁy anundśikāṁ ye}
\text{keshāṁ (v.6) ity keshāṁ matam: tāṁ uddhupā 'yam vidihiḥ, tāminn uddattavaty anundśikāṁ purvataḥ paraśa ubhayaḥ vā sthite}
\text{satī 'ubhe so kṣare anundśikādharmam ekam āpnumaḥ.}
\text{uktāy evo 'dāharāṇāṁ.}
\text{etad anishtam.}^1\]

1 O. om. 2 B. G. M. O. om. 3 G. M. O. yeshāṁ; B. caḥtāṁ. 4 W. tamādā. 5 G. M. O. ins. te. 6 B. O. ins. apy. 7 G. M. om.; O. ne 'dām nēram ishtam.

12. svārītsūdattayōḥ saṁnipata ekādeṣe satī ubhāv api tāṁ svāritaṁ āpadyete; yathā: kan--...: chāv--...: yād--...:
\text{atha--... iha svāritisāyā 'vicyeṣaṇā grahaṇe nityavārīta eva}
\text{grhyate: tasya svāritisāya vyaṇjanānāṁ aksharāṇāṁ ca' paddā-}
syllables and words, by the requirement of such rules as xiv.29 and xii.9; and therefore primary quality belongs only to the "constant" circumflex: whence, by the rule "when a general statement is made, that which is primary should be regarded as intended," it is proper that the constant circumflex should be here understood. In such cases, then, as dirdhā bravītt (iii.2.119), where the long d resulting from the combination of the final a of dirdhā, which has the enclitic circumflex (by xiv.29), with the initial a of abraavit, which is grave, has itself the enclitic circumflex, this is not in virtue of the present rule, but falls under the same general rule (xiv.29) that prescribes the enclitic circumflex.

To this effect the commentator: and, whatever we may think of the argument by which he attempts to prove that svarīka in the rule means only nitya svarīka, we shall not question the soundness of his conclusions.

13. Exceptions are dhd, md, and pd, when followed by asi; also bhedhīyā, jyā, & prshē, and aminanta—before a vowel belonging to the text.

That is to say, these words constitute exceptions, not to the last rules respecting accentuation, but to those which prescribe the combination of a final a or d with the following initial vowel. The commentator cites the passages in which the first three occur before asi, as follows: svadhā asy urot (i.1.93), sahasasya pramāṇa asi (iv.4.112), O. omits the first word, and dhanevam iv ra prpaasi (ii.5.124), O. omits the first two words. I have also noted, for dhā, varadhā asi (i.2.11), dhd asi svadhā asi (ii.6.44), and abhidhā asi (vii.1.111); for md, pratini asi, vidm asi, and mad asi, all in the same section and division (iv.4.119) with pramāṇa, as quoted: and, for pd, urato asi (i.1.144; 3.31; vi.1.44) and caksuḥpādasi (i.2.11). To explain the added specification "when followed by asi," the pada-readings are quoted for us, namely svadhā

vayavānām utpattikā na sambhavāt: anyeshām tu padopat- tikādā yadhām akshardhām pado 'nudattāḥ (xiv.29). iti vidhāṇat taśmin anudattē pārva "uddātaḥ svarītām" (xii.9) iti dādī ca: taśmā nityasyādy va mukhyatvam: sāmānyoktāu ca satyām mukhyā sampratīyā iti tasyā iti mukhyō yuktā: athādhō iti dādī ekādeṣām yo 'dṛdāṁ nāntarabhāvītvād uddattē pārva 'nudattāḥ svarītām (xiv.29) ity anendī va svarītāvām viśeyām.

1 G. M. aham dvānāh. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. O. -ṛga. 4 B. -sarga; G. M. -sarga eva. 5 O. om. 6 B. -sa; G. M. ca; O. sarva. 7 W. om. 8 G. M. ca. 9 G. M. para-. 10 W. om.; G. M. O. ed. (10) G. M. uddattm. 11 O. om. 12 W. om. 13 G. M. O. -nārti.
'ti svadā (only W. has svadā in the repetition), prame 'ti pra-
mā, prape 'ti prapā (O. omits the readings of pramā and prapā).
Further, to explain the final specification ārhe, 'before a vowel
belonging to the text,' W. gives next the jāda-readings of svadā
asi and prapā asi, namely svadā asy asi svadā svadā asi, and
prapā asy asi prapā prapā asi; O. has only the former, and sub-
stitutes for the latter dhruvā 'si dharun (iv.3.9; 3.7), which
would be in place as a counter-example showing that other words
than those specified in the rule are not treated as prescribed before
asi, but is not introduced as such, and does not make its
appearance at all in the other versions; B. also has only the for-
mer (reading at the end svadā 'si), and adds evam dhi, 'and so
on.' G. M. give no jāda-readings at all here, but pass directly
from the pada-readings to the quotations illustrating the remain-
ing words of the rule, namely: pra budhniyā trate (iv.3.18; G.
M. omit pru); dhanvān jyā iyam (iv.6.6¹; only G. M. have the
first word); ā pāśā etu ā vasu (ii.4.5¹), with a counter-example,
tram pāśā 'dhatta (i.5.1²), to show that pāśā after any other
word than ā is not uncombining; and ā te suparna aminanta evādi
(iii.1.11; § G. M. omit the first two words, O. the first three).
Now the question is asked again, "why is it said, 'when a vowel
from the text follows?"' and W. O. having settled the point
already so far as dhā, mā, and pd were concerned, reply by quoting
the jāda-readings of the other four words, each with its successor,
thus: budhniyā trate trate budhniyā budhniyā trate (but B. reads
budhniye trate, and O. budhniye trate, the last time), jyā iyam
iyam jyā jyā iyam (O. again have jye 'yam at the end), pāśā
etu etu pāśā pāśā etu (B. O. again pāśā etu in the third re-
petition), and aminanta evār evār aminanta 'minanta evādi (B. O.
one more aminanta 'va di to close with)." G. M., however, who
have the application of ārhe in the first part of the rule still to
illustrate, give us here a most liberal series of extracts from the
jāda-text: first, for asi svadā (i.9³ or ii.6.4⁴), namely asi svadā
svadā asy asi svadā; then for svadā asi, as set down above
(with svadā 'si at the end, like B.; but it seems a merely acciden-
tal coincidence, for in all the other cases the third pair of words
reads like the first, with the hiatus); for isa prapā, isa prapā
prape 've 'nu prapā; for prapā asi, as above reported from W.;
for pra budhniyā; for budhniyā trate, as in W.; for dhanvān jyā;
for jyā iyam, as in W.; for ā pāśā, ā pāśā pāśā "" pāśā;
for pāśā etu, as in W.; for suparna aminanta, suparna amin-
anta 'minanta suparna suparna aminanta, and for aminanta
evādi, as in W. From all this illustration, we seem authorized
to draw the inference that the words mentioned in the rule as having

13. dhā: mā: pd: ' etesho antyavara ārhe pāthe 'siparāh:
budhniyā: jyā: ā pāśā: aminanta: etesho antyavara ārhe:
svaparāh pūrvevidhiṇa na prāpyatī. yatd: svā----: sah----:
dhan----: asipara iti kīn: svā----: 'pra----: pra-
vol. ix. 30
endings exceptionally uncombinable in saṅhāḍa nevertheless combine with ulti in pada-text, and also exhibit their uncombinable quality in jata only before the words whose sequence calls out that quality in saṅhāḍa—pūsha, for example, uniting with its predecessor ā into pūsha, and aminanta with itself into aminanta 'minanta (only, if we may trust the example given, svadha being held apart from its predecessor asi, because this happens to be the same word with its successor: and it is by no means impossible that the manuscripts are in the wrong upon this point). But this would be quite sufficiently intimated by the single restriction drūhe, without adding asi also; and that the latter is specifically intended to apply to the pada-readings, and the former to the jata, is not easily to be believed. The asi would have best reason to be introduced because the words mentioned occur also before other vowels, with which they enter into combination—only, to be sure, I have not noted any cases in which they do so.

14. When followed by eshtaḥ, etana, eman, odman, oṣṭha, or evaḥ, an a-vowel is elided.

That the elision mentioned in the rule is of an a-vowel is a consequence of the continued implication of the introductory rule x.3, above—although, as the commentator fails to point out, that implication was interrupted by rules 10–12, and was expressly stated at the outset to remain in force through rule 9. The passages contemplated are quoted by the commentator, as follows: apīṣṭo esṭaḥ rūṭah (i.2.111), pramāṭā upetana (i.1.145, 55), apān tvūʾ emant sādayāmi (iv.3.1), apān tvūʾ odmanī sādayāmi (iv.3.1: G. M. O. omit sādayāmi in both these citations), svāḥ oṣṭhābhyām (vii.3.181), upayamam adharen oṣṭhena (v.7.12: O. omits the first word), and nir aminat evaḥ chandah (v.3.54: O. omits the last word). These are, so far as I have discovered, all the cases of application of the rule that the text contains. The commentator notes that rule 1.22, which allows a theme ending in a, quoted in a rule, to stand for its various derivative forms, is the warrant for regarding oṣṭhābhyām and oṣṭhena as involved in oṣṭha. The


14. ity evam para varnaprave itaḥ 'varnaparve (x.3) ity anuvartandaśa varna' iti labhyate. apānī...
same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to i.22). As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of "an a-vowel," we have sītyoṣṭhakāḥ sītibhrāḥ (v.6.14), and sītyoṣṭhāyā svāhā (vii.3.17).

15. An i-vowel and u become respectively y and v.

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication "preceded by an a-vowel" ceases, but the implication "followed by a vowel" has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter. The rule says ukāra, 'short u,' instead of uvarna, 'an u-vowel,' because long ā has already (by iv.5) been declared pragāra, and protracted ās is made uncombinable below (by x.24). The examples are abhy aśṭā (iv.2.8¹), āty aṣyāma (i.3.14⁸), and ā pūṣhā eto ā vasū (ii.4.5¹).

16. And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word "and" (ca), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the "i-vowel and u," there described as suffering a certain effect. The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx.1) described as the kshāipra, are vy ēva'd i 'nena pāri dhatte (v.3.11²: only G. M. have the last two words), and aṃve dvau (iv.2.11⁸). As counter-examples, we have first niṭad tām dhakṣhy asadām (i.2.14⁸) and mādhv aṃvau juhāti (i.3.2⁶), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears; and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, tād yād rey ādhā akshāṇāni (ii.4.1¹¹: G. M. omit the first word), sā tv 'dī yajeta (ii.6.6⁸ et al.: G. M. omit this whole example), and in uto 'dī āpastaṁ īchānti (i.6.7³):

sya grahaṇam bhavati grahaṇasya ca (i.22) iti vacanāt: upay-
-----: nir----- 'avaro lupyata' iti kim: sītī----: sītī----

1 G. M. -apārva. ² W. -omānāta; G. M. -omānāk. ³ G. M. avarṇapārva.
⁴ B. -apārva t; O. -aardopa; G. M. -apārva.

15. avarṇapārṇādhikāro nivṛttaḥ: svaraparādhikāras tu var-
tate: aṭha svaraparo yakāram (ix.10) iti pārvāhyāye prak-
krāntāh. avarṇokārdvad paḍāntāvī svarapardvā yathāsāṁkhyaṇa
ya vakārāt āpadyete. abhy----: āty----: ā pū---- dirgha-
sya pragrahovidhāntā phutasya savāṁśikshedhād ukārasya kārot-
karatvasā kṛtam: iavarṇokārdvā yakārāv iti.

1 W. puts after the next word. ² G. M. -khyam. ³ G. M. vakhr.
compare, for the peculiar sandhi in these last two examples, rule v.13.

अभिव च || १३ ||

17. Also when ā is the product of the combination.

The "also" (ca) of this rule is interpreted as implying that, as in the case of the combination last considered, the first element going to form the ā must be acute, and the second grave. As examples of the combination and its accentual result are given sān-

niyam iṣa (v.2.41; p. sā-unniyam), sād-dā (vii.1.81; p. sā-ud-
dā), and maṣā ṭhāthun (vii.5.22; p. maṣā: ut); to which G. M. add dikaḥ 'padādhati' (v.5.54; p. dikaḥ: upa-dā). The only other case of the kind which I have noted in the Sanhitā is sāpa-
sadanā (vii.5.20; p. sā-upasadanaḥ). The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: the first, sāpapadā devāḥ (i.2.23; p. sā-upasadāḥ), shows that the former ā must be acute; the other, ta dikaḥ 'pāda dadhata' (v.5.54), that the latter ā must be grave.

A later rule (xx.5) gives this particular variety of the circumflex accent the name prakīśita.

None of the other Vedic texts has an accentual usage corresponding with this. Indeed, there is not in the Atharvāna single case of a combination of two ā's such as is here contemplated, nor has any from the other Vedas come to my notice; if such there be, they are left to follow the general analogy of combinations of acute and grave into one homogeneous vowel (as illustrated under rule 10, above), the acute element raising the other to its own pitch and making the result acute. On the other hand, an exception to this general analogy is made in the other Sanhitās (and duly explained in their Prātiśākhya: see Rīk Pr. iii.7, Vāj. Pr. iv.132, Ath. Pr. iii.56), in favor of the coalescence of two short ā's into a long ā; if the former be acute and the latter grave, they produce together a circumflex. Of such a combination, I have

16. ca-kāraḥ pārvasātrotkatanimittināvāvāronākāvāravānāvādātīcāt: uddātayor āvāronākāvatāh pari 'nudatta ca' svaritam āpadyate. vāy.... asv.... uddātayor iti kim: niṣā.... maḥv.... pari 'nudatta iti kim: tad....: sa....: in....

1 G. M. -tino 'pi. ² G. M. om. ³ O. om.

17. ca-kāraḥ pārvoḍātātvānamākārākāhā: 'parasyā 'nudatta-

tvam anāvādātīcāt. pārveno 'dattena parasyā 'nudattayao 

bāvve kriyamānē svaritam jāntyat. yathā: sān....: sād-

....: ma....: 'dik....: 'parasyā 'dattena kim: sāp-....

'parasyā 'nudattaya 'tī kim: tā....

1 B. O. pārvano 'd; O. -dvārakā; G. M. pārvoḍātātvānamākārākāhā ca 'kār-

shātī. ² G. M. om. ³ O. om. ca. ⁴ G. M. om. ⁵ W. B. O. om.
noted about thirty cases in the Taittirya text (examples, one in each book, are i.3.6²; ii.1.3¹; iii.5.5²; iv.1.6²; v.1.7²; vi.1.1⁶; vii.5.7¹); the accentuation is throughout acute, as we should expect.

18. Exceptions are cyeti and mithuni.

That is to say, these words are exceptions to rule 15—and, being thus exempt from the conversion there prescribed, and there being no other rule requiring their alteration, they remain unchanged, as if they were pragrahas. Their examples are gyātēna cyeti akurata (v.5.8⁴: O. omits the first word; cyeti occurs also in the next division of the same section, though not before a vowel), and na mithuni abhavan (v.3.6²: B. omits na). The latter word is found in two other places—at iii.4.9¹ and vi.5.8⁶—exhibiting the same uncontrollable quality; and in the latter place it has been made (at iv.58) the subject of special exception as not a pragraha. The pada-text, in fact, writes both words as if no peculiar character belonged to them.

19. But y and v are elided, when preceded by an a-vowel.

The word “but” (tu) in this rule, the commentator says, annuls the application of the rule to any other y and v than such as are the products of prescribed euphonic processes, and makes these alone the subjects of its action. As a y or v can never occur as final except by euphonic conversion, the particle has no very useful office to fill, according to the interpretation. Evidently enough, it is used here, as elsewhere in the treatise where a specific force is sought for it by the comment, simply as indicative of a sudden change of subject.

Vastly the largest class of cases falling under the rule is that in which, by ix.10, a visajaniya has been converted into y after a, d, d after another vowel than a. In illustration of this class, the commentator quotes ṅpa undantu (i.2.1¹), dhruvā asmin gopaṭhā (i.1.1: G. M. O. omit the last word), and na vicitiyās iti (vi.1.9¹). The next class consists of cases of final e and ā, converted into ay and āy by ix.11,14: the examples are ima eva 'smāti (ii.4.10⁸), and dedmāha eev 'māau (vi.5.2¹). Yet another class embraces the endings in ān of which the n was turned to y (with nasalization of the ā, or with amudra added, by xv.1–3) according to the rules at the end of the last chapter (ix.20–24): the selected example is martyāh dviveça (v.7.9¹). But the rule teaches also the

---

18. cyeti: mithuni: ity etayor antyaevaro yathāvihitam yathâm nd "padyate. yathâ": cyāi-----: na-----

1 O. om. ² W. G. M. O. om.
elision of final \( v \); and O. boldly gives examples for this, as well: namely, \( \text{vy} \hat{v} \text{ay ishtaye} \) (ii.2.12\(^8\): W. adds \( \text{durmone} \)), and \( \text{aha} \hat{u} \text{ ana-data} \) (v.6.1\(^2\)), although the text, by a usage which the comment ratifies under the next rule but one (x.21), retains the \( v \) in such cases, and it is retained by O. in these very phrases given to illustrate its omission. W. has only the former of the two, foolishly prefixing to it \( \text{avarnapārva iti kim} \), "why is it said, "when an a-vowel precedes"?" The other manuscripts pass the point without notice here, leaving it to be settled under rule 21. The true counter-examples for this precept, showing that the elision takes place only after an \( a \)-vowel, are given by all alike: they are \( \text{abhy asthāt} \) (iv.2.8\(^1\)), and \( \text{hitvaseh} \) (iv.2.11\(^9\)).

\[ \text{वन्ध्यस्य} \| २० \| \]

20. Not so, according to Ukhya.

Ukhya denies that \( y \) and \( v \) are omitted in any case; and would therefore read \( \text{āpāy undantu}, \text{imāy eva}, \text{marṭyādy d}, \) and so on.

\[ \text{वकार्ज्ञ्यो सांक्रयस्य} \| २१ \| \]

21. Not \( v \), according to Sāmkṛtya.

The connection of this rule is somewhat anomalous, but its meaning is sufficiently evident. Sāmkṛtya dissent from the principle laid down in rule 19, like Ukhya; "but" (\( tu \)) his dissent does not go the whole length of the latter's; according to him, only \( v \) is "not" elided. As the commentator has it, the fact that this rule teaches an exception is inferred, "by vicinage," from its predecessor: its \( tu \) is intended as an annulment of the opinion of former teachers. And he declares that it alone is approved, while the two that precede (the former of them, of course, only so far as it is inconsistent with this) and the two that follow (B. O. omit this) are rejected. The examples are those already given by a part of the MSS. under rule 19, namely \( \text{vy} \hat{v} \text{ay ishtaye durone} \) (ii.2.12\(^8\):

\[ 19. \text{avarnapatvā avarpatvā yakāravakārānu lūphyete. ya-} \]
\[ \text{thā: } \text{āpā....: dhru........: na...... ima.....: dsā-.....: vdy-y-} \]
\[ ....: \text{aha} \hat{u} ....: \text{marṭ-..... evarpatvā} \text{ iti kim: abhy} \]
\[ ....: \text{hit-..... tuṣabdā itārānu yavakārānu nivartayann adep-} \]
\[ \text{pratayor evd' nayor lopavishayavani dyotatadi. avarṇah pārvo} \]
\[ \text{yābhidyān tāv avarṇapatvā.} \]

\(^1\) G. M. yavak. \(^2\) W. ins. \( \text{avarpatvā} \) \( \text{iti kim} \). \(^3\) Only in O. \(^4\) G. M. \( \text{avar-} \]

\[ 20. \text{ukhyasya } \text{śākhinaḥ pakshe 'varṇapārvaḥ yavakārānu na} \]
\[ \text{lūphyete. uktāndy eva 'dāharaṇāni.} \]

\(^1\) G. M. ins. mate. \(^2\) G. M. mate. \(^3\) O. pārva. \(^4\) B. om. G. M. have mixed together to some extent this and the following comment.
W. B. omit this example; O. puts it after the other one, and leaves off *dureṇa*), and *ahāv anandaḥ hāte* (v.6.12: O. omits *hāte*).

This is rather the most striking example afforded us of the overriding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā itself. The usage of the existing Tāttiṅrīya text is on the side of the comment: we have a similar resolution of the final *a* of vocatives into *au*, with retention of the *v*, at i.2.13^2^ twice; 4.39; 6.12^2^; ii.2.12^4^; 4.12^2^; 6.11^1^: iii.2.10: vi.4.3^3^.

Of *au* as result of final *dv* before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples; but had there been any cases of the omission of the *v*, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them.

उक्तारौकार्याः तुण्यते नाचार्यायस्य \| ॥ २२ ॥

22. According to Mācākiya, both are omitted when followed by *u* or *a*.

Instead of Mācākiya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Māyikāya.

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that "respectively" (*yathāsaṁkhhyān*) is to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop *y* before *u* and *v* before *o*; but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one. It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read *ukāruukāraparo lupyate*, *v* is dropped before *u* or *o* (it does not occur in the text before *a*); for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of *y* before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of *v* (*u*) before *u* (no real Sanskrit word begins with *vu*, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of *sandhi*); and, as thus amended, Mācākiya's view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rīk Prāt. (ii.9–11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vāj. Pr. (iv.125).

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules:

---


sūtram idam esse 'śhām: na tu pūrvačāyaṁ pārvačāyāṁ ca.\[1\]  

W. B. om.; O. puts after the other example. \[1\] O. pūrvaśāstra. \[2\] B. O. om.

22. *yakāravakāraṁ avamapārṇaṁ ukāruukāraparduṁ lupyete yathāsaṁkhhyāṁ mācāκhyasyāṁ "cāryasya mate: āpa-...... yād...... evampardu iti kim: ta-...... vāy-...... lupyete iti "ha punarārambhāḥ pūrvaśāstradvayasthitānaṁ sambandhasaṅkā- niśrākaraṇārthaḥ".\[2\]

---

1 O. om.; G. M. after mate. 2 G. M. māyikāyasyā, as in the rule itself. 3 B. G. M. mate. 4 W. kṣatanā; B. kṣana; O. kṣanabha. 5 O. om. rākṣi; W. śhom.
23. According to Vātśapra, they are imperceptibly uttered.

It might admit of question whether the "they" here spoken of are final y and v in general, or only y and v followed by u and o, as specified in the last rule. As things stand, the use of the demonstrative étavoh rather favors, though not unequivocally, the latter interpretation, and it is the one adopted by the commentator. But if the preceding rule be restored to what we have suggested above as its more probable original form, then the étavoh will be very well in place here as referring to y and v in general; and this interpretation is supported by the fact that the Ath. Pr. (ii.24) and Pāṇini (viii.3.18) ascribe a like opinion to another grammarian, Cākāṭiyana, whose peculiar views upon the subject are likewise hinted at by the Vāj. Pr. (iv.126). As the meaning of leṣa is defined to be luptavaḍ ucčrān̄aṁ, 'utterance as if omitted,' there is not much for the two opposing parties to contend about.

24. Exceptions are protracted and praṇaraṇa vowels.

Such, namely, are exempt from the rules of combination—and not merely those given in this chapter, but also such as are found elsewhere: for example, at ix.11,12. There is nothing about the
rule pointing out that it has a bearing so extensive. Only one example is given for each class: astu his itty abrutam (vii.1.6*), and te enam abhi (ii.5.6*).

The commentator points out, as he did not take the trouble to do under rule 18 of this chapter, that, the rules of combination being thus suspended with reference to these two classes, and no other rule being given about them, they remain in their natural condition.

All the Prātiṣṭhānyas have rules equivalent to this (Rik Pr. ii.27; Vāj. Pr. iv.84; Ath. Pr. iii.33; in the note to Ath. Pr. i.73 I overlooked the present precept of the Tāttvārtha-Prātiṣṭhāna); none assumes that the pronouncing a vowel to be pragruhu exempts it, evo īpso, from phonetic combination.

श्य परश्य ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also the remaining vowel.

That is to say, the vowel remaining after the omission of the final y or v is, like those mentioned in the preceding rule, exempt from farther combination. According to the commentator, the “also” (ca) of the rule brings forward “y and v,” the fact of their constituting an exception is inferred from the neighborhood of the preceding rule, and parah means ‘another,’ and qualifies saṁādhiḥ understood: “no further combination takes place.” This seems to me inadmissible, as there has been no suggestion of any such word as saṁādhi. Perhaps para may be better understood of the vowel “following” the y and v of which the chapter has been treating. It needs, at any rate, some violence to bring in the rule with the meaning which it is evidently intended to bear: no one would have any right to guess, from its form and position alone, at what it is aimed.

The commentator’s examples are āpa undantu (i.2.11) and agra imam (i.1.5*). In reply to the objection that it would be enough to state the implication of the rule as “where an omission has taken place” instead of “an omission of y or v,” he brings up se ‘d u hotā (i.1.14*), sā ’nā ’nikena (iv.3.13* et al.), and sāu ’śādhiḥ (iv.2.3*), as examples of an elision of a final which does not prevent the further combination of its predecessor and its successor under the rules of this chapter.

25. cakrākṛṣhtayor yavakārayor lope sati parah ’saṁdhīr na bhavati: yathā: āpa...... agra...... saṁnidhyān nishedho labhyate. nunu lope sati ’ty etāvatāi ’vad ’lam: yavakārayor iti kim. se ’d...... ’sāi...... ’sāu......: ity ādi.

iti tribhāṣāyaratne prātiṣṭhāvivaraṇe
dāçamo ’dhyāyaḥ.

(*) G. M. saṁādhiḥin na bhajate. 9 G. M. om. 8 W. om. iti. (40) om. 5 O. adds pratikramapasā."
CHAPTER XI.

Contents: 1. initial a elided after e or o; 2–18, exceptions, cases of retention of initial a after e or o; 19, dissident view as to the nature of the elision.

1. But a is elided when preceded by e or o.

The subject of the omission or retention of initial a after final e or o, and of the accent thence arising, occupies the whole of this chapter and of the one next following, the cases of retention being mostly rehearsed in this. No attempt is made, here any more than in the treatment of other similar matters in the work, to effect a real classification—much less, an explanation—of the facts dealt with. Nor have I, on the other hand, drawn up such a classification, as I did for the Atharva-Veda (see Atharva-Prātiṣṭhānya, under rule iii.54). Doubtless, if drawn up, it would show nearly the same state of things to prevail in the Taittiriya as in the Atharvan text: namely, that the elision is the greatly prevailing, almost exclusive, usage in the prose passages; while, in the metrical passages, the a is more usually retained where the metre requires its retention, and omitted where the metre requires its omission—although with numerous exceptions, of which the most regular is that the a is dropped in writing at the beginning of a pāda, where, of course, it was always retained in metrical utterance. The general subject of the relation of the written and spoken texts to one another in regard to this special point is well worth an elaborate investigation, founded on all the Vedic texts.

For the word “but” (et) in the rule is given an alternative explanation. Some, the commentator says, regard it as suspending the force of the exceptional rule x.24; others, as marking the discontinuance of the general direction “followed by a vowel,” which has been in action since ix.10. As in other like cases heretofore, we have no good reason for applying it to any particular rule or phrase; it merely marks an abrupt transition to a new subject, somewhat exceptional in its relations to the principles already laid down. The subject was, however, anticipated and provided for in rule ix.13.

1. ekārapūrṇa okārapūrṇa va 'kāro' hupyate. yathā: te...: "so..." tuṣabdō na pluṣapragrāhāv (x.24) iti nishṛdaḥsambandha-viḥ kim nivartayati 'ti kṣeṣa: svaraparādhi-kāraṇa nivāraṇa-vyādi 'ty aparādha śaṁgiranta. ekāraṇa cau 'kāraṇa ca ū 'kāraṇa 'kāraṇa: ekāraṇa 'kāraṇa pāraṇā' yamāt sa tathoktaḥ.

1 all the MSS. akāra. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. -bandi; O. -bandhāṃi. 5 G. M. nivartayati. 6 G. M. 19 in W. only. 7 B. om. 8 G. M. yaṣya.
To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted: namely te 'bruvum (ii.5.13 et al.) and so 'bravit (ii.1.24 et al.).

In the other Prātiṣṭhākhyaśas, the apparent loss of initial a after e or o is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two. See Ath. Pr. iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested.

All the MSS. excepting B. read in the rule ekāraokārupūrvaḥ; and, where the rule is quoted (i.61 and ix.13), we have six cases of this reading against three of ekārāuk. But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p. 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of sandhi.

2. Now follow cases of non-elision.

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial a is retained. First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional; then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of.

3. The a is not elided in the following sections: those beginning with dhātā rāthi and upa; those styled vājapeya; those beginning with jūṣa and cyendāya; those styled ukhyā; those beginning with dhruvakshīthik, iyam eva sā yā, and agnir mūrthi; the first and the next to the last of the rudra chapter; and those styled vikarsha, vihavya, hiranyavarnîya, yājyā, and mahāprakṣhiya.

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or anuvākas, in which a is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter). Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4.44; 5.5; iii.1.10; 2.8; iv.3.4,11; 4.4. The vājapeya sections are six, namely i.7.7–12. The ukhyā sections (as pointed out above, under ix.20) are twenty, namely iv.1.1–10; 2.1–10. The rudra chapter is iv.5, containing eleven sections;

2. 'athe 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ.' alopā ucyata ity etad adhikrtaṁ veditavyam ita uttarāni yad vakṣhyāmaḥ. 'na lopa lopaḥ.' lopa bhūva ity arthaḥ.

(1) G. M. om. (2) all MSS. na lopa alopā.
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those here referred to, then, are iv.5.1,10. The name \textit{vikarsha}
belongs to five sections, namely iv.6.1–5. Three sections, iv.7.12–
14, are styled \textit{vihaya}. The \textit{hiranyakarniya} section (as shown
under ix.20) is v.6.1. The \textit{yajyu} have been repeatedly the subjects
of prescription in earlier chapters (iii.9,11; ix.30); they are twenty-
three sections, namely i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.46; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22;
ii.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11,12; iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11;
iv.1.11; 2.11; 3.13. The \textit{mahapreshthya} sections, finally, are the
first six of those which (as seen under ix.20) bear the name
\textit{preshthya}; they are iv.4.12; 6.6–9; 7.15.

Section i.4.44 is quoted by its two first words, instead of by
\textit{dhatu} only, according to the commentator, because of the
occurrence in another \textit{gakhda} of a section beginning \textit{dhatu devbhayo}
\textit{surdn} (G. M. omit asurdn). Again, iv.3.4 is quoted by \textit{dhruvakakshith},
instead of by \textit{dhruva} (the first padu of \textit{dhruva-kshithi},
1.48), because \textit{dhruva} (by i.22) would include \textit{dhruva}, and there
is another section beginning with this word, and containing cases
of elision, \textit{dhruvo sri dhruvo hahn sujateshu dhayasam} (i.3.91;
only G. M. have the last two words), which would otherwise be
violations of the rule. Yet again, to quote iv.3.11 by \textit{iyam} simply
would not answer, because i.2.4 begins with \textit{iyam te gurau tanur},
and contains a case of elision, \textit{pargisho nus sakhdh sayathyad}
(i.2.42; only O. has the last word; G. M. omit the example). But
why quote by so long a phrase as \textit{iyam eva sad ya}, of which the
last two words are unnecessary? To this objection there is an
alternative answer: some say that it is for the benefit of the dull-
minded; others, that it is intended to include a verse which,
though occurring in another place (at i.4.38), is a reminder to
this, and which contains the case of non-elision \textit{o te yanti ye}
\textit{aparihu pacydn} (i.4.33: G. M. O. omit pacydn). Now it is true
that the single verse constituting i.4.33 is of kindred subject with
iv.3.11, and in the Rig-Veda forms part of the same hymn (i.113)
with parts of the latter; and it is also true that the combination
\textit{ye aparihu} is not otherwise authorized by the \textit{Pratisakhya}; but
it is, of course, little less than absurd to assert that an excessive

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{dhatu-ratir ity} adisho anuvakshe ekdruprava okdrupravo 
vad 'karo na lupyate. \textit{dhatu ratir} (i.4.44) \textit{ity atra yathd}.
\item \textit{nirdh-}.... \textit{ratir iti kim: dhatu devbhayo surdn iti gakhbantare.}
\item \textit{upakranya} \textit{adhraram} (i.5.5) \textit{ity atra yathd}: \textit{are}....
\item \textit{deva savita} \textit{pra suru} (i.7.7) \textit{ity} \textit{adhi shoanuvakhana}n
\item \textit{vajapeyasanvahd: atra yathd: te no....: te agre..... jushho}
\item \textit{vaca} (ii.1.10) \textit{ity atra yathd}: \textit{yas....: 'yo....'} \textit{cyeyaha}
\item \textit{pattane} (ii.3.8) \textit{ity atra yathd}: \textit{namah.....: vi$\mathbf{c}$ve....}
\item \textit{ukhye yathd: gruv.....: namo..... dhruvakakshir} (iv.3.4)
\item \textit{ity atra yathd}: \textit{vi$\mathbf{c}$ve.....: \textit{urmir.....: "kshitir iti kim: dhruve}
\item \textit{ity "akdrantasya yadi" grahaim sydt: dhruvoro....}
\item \textit{ity atra bhaved} \textit{iti}..... \textit{iyam eva sad ya} (iv.3.11) \textit{ity atra}:
\end{enumerate}
quotation of the beginning of the one anuvāka has any right, or can have been intended, to include the other. The right of 1.4.33, it may be remarked, to stand in the text to which our Prātiṣṭākhyā applies, is assured by the contemplation of others of its phonetic phenomena by rules found elsewhere (most unequivocally by vi.5); its case of non-ellipsis would seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise, but discovered by the commentators, some of whom have tried to force it violently within the ken of their rules. It is necessary to quote iv.4.4 by two words, because i.6.3 also begins with agnih, and in it we find yo me nī dīre ṛātiyati (i.6.31; the example is wanting in G. M.). Finally, instead of prṣṭhya passages, the mahāprṣṭhya are specified, because of such cases as prthi ī te nārikeshna (v.2.122; the anuvāka is prṣṭhya, but not mahāprṣṭhya).

The commentator cites one or more examples from each of the sections or sets of sections which the rule specifies, as follows. From the section beginning dhāttā rātiḥ is taken nidhipatir no agnih (1.4.441); it contains three more cases, and one exception. From that beginning with upa comes are aune ca (i.5.51); it contains six other cases, and one exception. From the vāja pear sections, te no arvantaḥ (1.7.82) and te agre aṣavam d yāṣyant (1.7.72); they contain eleven examples, and eleven exceptions. The section beginning with jukta yields ya te aṅguk (iii.1.101), and O. alone adds yo dṛapso aṅguk (iii.1.101); there are two other cases, and no exception. From the gnāyā section, namah pīṭhhyo abhi (iii.2.83) and viṣve aṇapā edhate (iii.2.84); there are four other cases, and two exceptions. From the ukhya sections, grñanta viṣve amṛtasya putrāḥ (iv.1.12; only W. has putrāḥ) and nāma astu sarpebhyaḥ (iv.2.83); they yield seventy-five cases, and forty-five exceptions. From the section dhrumakṣhitāḥ are cited the only two examples, viṣve abhi grñantu (iv.3.42) and ṛṁmir dṛapso apām asi (iv.3.43; only G. M. have asi); there are no exceptions. From the section beginning iyaṃ etc. are taken ketaṃ kṛnvine ajaṃ (iv.3.111; G. M. omit ketaṃ) and trayo gharmādo anu (iv.3.111); there are three other cases, and one exception. The
first example here is not well chosen, since the *e of kṛtvātīne is pragraha*, and pragrahas are not contemplated in the general rules for elision: see xii.8 and note. From the *agnir mūrdhā section, sa yojate aruṣah* (iv.4.4*) and *end vo agnim namsā* (iv.4.4*): O. omits *namsā*; there are three other cases, and one exception. From the specified sections of the *rudra* chapter are taken *nomo astu niṣṭakroṇīya* (iv.5.1*), *drāpe andhasas pate* (iv.5.10*), and *uta ma no arbhakam* (iv.5.10*); they afford fourteen cases, and five exceptions. From the *vikārāya sections, anyāni te amśa tapanta* (iv.6.1*): *only W. has tapanta* and *pāva ko amsa bhayam* (iv.6.1* etc.); there are thirty-three cases, and ten exceptions. From the *vihaṇya sections, viṣve adya marutah* (iv.7.12*): O. omits *marutah* and *viṣve dēvos adhi vocāt me* (iv.7.12*): O. has *viṣve*; ten cases and five exceptions. The *hiranyavarṇīya section affords three cases only, of which one is cited, *eko devo api atithhat* (v.6.1*). The *yājñā sections afford a hundred and twenty-nine cases, with thirty-eight exceptions; the selected examples are *supatāḥ riye aśmin* (i.1.14*): repeated at i.4.43* and *kāmena krtō abhy ānat* (i.1.14*): W. B. O. end with *abhi*). From the *mahāprāṣṭhyaya*, finally, come *vivasva dāte abhi nāh* (iv.4.12*) and *soma adhi bhrāṇu* (iv.6.6*): O. adds *no dīn*, doubtless for no *dīthik*, which follows in the text); they contain thirty-eight cases and nine exceptions.

This rule, accordingly, disposes at one stroke of three hundred and fifty-one cases of the retention of *a*; but it is at the cost of creating a formidable body of exceptions, a hundred and thirty-one in number, which have to be provided for by the counter-rules of the next chapter—while, once more, a considerable number of the cases falling under the rule have to be individually specified, partly in that chapter and partly in the two following rules of this, as exceptions under the counter rules. It is a complicated process, but it successfully attains at last its purpose.
4. Also in aṇhāsaḥ, aṇhātiḥ, anishtṛaḥ, avantu asmān, ava-

dyāt, and ahani.

The cases of non-elision referred to are as follows: for aṇhāsaḥ,
pramaṇcanto no aṇhāsaḥ (iv.3.138); for aṇhātiḥ, pari deeshaśa
aṇhātiḥ (ii.6.112); for anishtṛaḥ, vardhātām te anishtṛaḥ (iv.1.
72); for avantu asmān, te avantu asmān (ii.6.123), with a counter-
example, te no 'vantu pitaṁ havesu (ii.6.124: only G. M. have
havesu), to prove the necessity of giving asmān along with
avantu in the rule; for avadyāt, mitramahā avadyāt (i.2.146);
and for ahani, pucih gührre ahany qasāṁ (iv.4.121: G. M. O. stop
at ahani). All of them occur in passages which are the subject of
the preceding rule, and the commentator points out that the "also"
(ca) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages,
and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the
text, the rule does not apply; citing as example sa evāt 'nam pāp-
mano ṛhaso muñcatai (ii.2.74: all but G. M. stop at aṇhāsaḥ). At
first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of
part of the cases involved in the preceding one; in fact, however,
it's value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii.4, which
teaches that even in the sections above specified, an a before a y,
v, n, or h, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided. The
only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connec-
tion in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the
least, quite peculiar.

5. Also in anu, when preceded by gharmāsaḥ, āpakh, martah,
rathah, tvah, datte, and vīdah.

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the pre-
ceding, as pointing out cases in which the a of anu is retained
according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibi-
tion of rule xii.4; but in part it is of a more general character,
since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3.

4. 1 cakāro dhatārātir (xi.3) ityādīviśhayānāvādeśakah:
aṇhāsaḥ..... ity eteshu grahaṇeshu ḍhatārātiryādīśṭahasā
ekāparvavo vāu 'kārapāvo vā 'kāro na lupyate, yathā:
pram..... pari..... vardh..... te..... asmān iti kim:

te no..... mitr..... pucih..... yavanahaparātapādā
(xii.4) eshu prāpyamāṇalopeshu 'alopo 'yānī vihūtāh, avādeśah
kimarthāh: sa......

1 G. M. ins eteshu grahaṇeshu.  2 G. M. -dīṭhaśvih.  3 B. adds antarpurtaḥsh; G. M. -dīṭhaśvih; O. -antarvitaḥ satam.  4 G. M. O. om. nd.  5 O. om.  6 G. M. O. om.  7 W. -ratv; G. M. -hasaropar.  8 G. M. ins. satam.  9 W. om.; B. na.
The commentator explains the phraseology used as signifying that the words rehearsed, having their final visarga [with the preceding a] converted to a [of course, excepting datte], have the office of preceding causes—that is, of producing an effect upon the word that follows them; but he gives no hint of the partial suspension of the implication made in the preceding rule; intimating rather, that the cases rehearsed are all of them exceptions under rule xii.4. He quotes the passages, as follows: 

\[ \text{trayo gharmaśo anu (iv.3.11)}, \] 
\[ \text{taṇṇḍā ṛṣe anu sthāna (v.6.1)} \] 
\[ \text{yadh te marto anu (iv.6.7)}, \] 
\[ \text{anu tvā ratho anu (iv.6.7)} \] 
\[ πιयατι το ανο τοα (v.2.3) : only G. M. have the last word}, \] 
\[ \text{cukram d ṛṣate anuhāya jāryāti (iii.2.2) : G. M. O. omit jāryāti, and dhanus tad vāto anu vātu te (v.5.7)} \] 
\[ \text{O. ends with anu}. \]

To show that other words than anu are not relieved from the action of xii.4, he gives us amuśhiṁ lōke vāto 'bhi pavaśa (v.4.9) : all but G. M. begin at vāto) ; and further, to show that anu retains its a only after these words, anu gado 'nu bhagāḥ kavīnām (iv.6.7) : only G. M. O. have the last word).

I have noted ten cases in which the a of anu is elided under the operation of rule xii.4.

6. Also (after vātoḥ) in abhi vātu and apah.

The cu, 'also,' here brings down as pārvaniṁṭita simply vātoḥ, the word last specified in the preceding rule. The cases have nothing to do with xi.3: they are muṣobhār vāto abhi vātā 'orāḥ (vii.4.17) : G. M. omit the first word, and they alone have the last), and yadh vāto ṛṣe apamata (vii.4.20 : O. omits apamata) ; and, as counter-examples, the commentator quotes vāto 'bhi (v.4.9) to show the necessity of giving vāto after abhi in the rule, and ava ṛṇdhē po 'gre bhīrīyāharati (vi.4.32 : G. M. omit the last two words) to attest the implication conveyed by the cu.

5. atra visargāntānām oste anam punanānām pārvaṁimittatam

iti vijñeyam: gharmaśoḥ...... ity evampūrva anu ity otrā 'kāro na lūpyate. yathā: trayo...... tosmiḥ...... yadh......

anu...... piyati...... cukram...... dhanus...... anu iti kimi amuśhiṁ...... evampūrva iti kimi: anu...... yavana-

harpāraṁvanishedhārtho 'yam ārambhāḥ.

1 W. G. M. -mīttam. 4 O. om. 0 a lacuna in B. 4 G. M. yavanasāhvarapa; O. -shedhānśeśārtho.

6. cakāro vāto ity anvādiṣati: abhi vātu: apah: ity etayor akāro vātāḥpūrṇo na lūpyate. muṣo...... vāto iti kimi vāto

...... 'yadh......' anvādeṣena kimi: ava......

1 G. M. ins. khalu. O G. M. put before vāto etc.
7. Also (after apaḥ) in anu and agamat.

Here, again, the ca, ‘also,’ brings forward only the last word in the preceding rule, namely apaḥ—and what is more, gives that word a new character, changing it from nimittin to nimitta or affecting cause. Of this the commentator takes no notice, and we are doubtless to regard it as quite in order, and as merely adding another to the formidable list of uncertainties involved in the curious system of anuvṛtī or continued implication. The passages had in view are apo anuv acārīsham (i.4.45.3,46.2; B. reads apo adyā un, which is the version of the Rig-Veda, i.23.23) and apo agamad indrasya (vii.4.20); as counter-example, is given paśavo nā d āyam (ii.1.5.1), to prove the implication of apaḥ.

8. Also in udhhiḥ, apāṁ napāt, and asmān, when preceded by āpaḥ.

The passages are sam ṣam adhīr agmata (i.1.8), devīr ṣam apāṁ napāt (i.2.3.3,4; vi.1.4.8,4.3.3), and ṣam asmān mātāraḥ cundhantu (i.2.1.1; O. omits cundhantu). The necessity of specifying napāt after apāṁ is shown by vāruṇīr ṣam pāṁ ca (ii.1.9.2), and the restriction to preceding āpaḥ by so smān pātu (v.5.5.1).

9. In asmān, also, if followed by a, when rāye, saḥ, and indraḥ precede.

The ca, ‘also,’ again brings down the word last mentioned in the preceding rule. The passages for saḥ and indraḥ are nā so asmān acuḥāye (v.7.9.1) and indro asmān asmī nātiye (iii.1.9.2; O. omits nātiye); and other cases of asmān after saḥ are to be found at i.6.6.4 and iii.2.7.2. As counter-examples, are given so smān pātu (v.5.5.1), to show that the asmān must be followed by a; and smo smān amūtra (vi.6.1.4: all the MSS. of the commentary have the false reading so ‘smān; such a phrase would be precisely out of place here as illustration), to show that it is only

7. apa iti cakāro 'nvādiḍuti: anu: agamat: ity etayor akāro 'na khalu' apahpārvo lupyate. apo anu---- apo ag---- evampārva iti kim: paśavo----

(1) G. M. O. om. khalu, and put na next before lupyate.

8. adhhiḥ------- eteshv' akāra āpahpārvo na lupyate. sam ------ devīr------ napād iti kim: vāruṇīr------ ṣam------ evampārva iti kim: so------

1 G. M. esēh; O. esēh grahamahv.
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after the words specified that āsmān, even before a, remains unmutated.

The other case, that of preceding rāye, makes more difficulty, since the saṁhitā contains no passage in which āsmān, when itself followed by a, has rāye before it. The commentator first declares the passage had in view to belong to another text (pākhā); but adds, as an alternative explanation, that the precept relates to the jaṭā-text, where we read rāye āsmān āsmān rāye rāye āsmān (i.1.14; 4.43). He proceeds further to say that, in case any one objects that in the saṁhitā form of the passage the example does not hold good, since āsmān is not there followed by a (it reads rāye āsmān vāgyāni), he shall reply that the case is one falling under i.61. It is there taught, namely, that a passage of three words or more, if repeated in the text, reads as it read on its first occurrence: now the one in question first appears in i.1.14, which is a yajyā section, and hence the a of āsmān is retained by xi.3; at i.4.43, then, its retention is assured. But then there ought to be no necessity for specially establishing its retention in jaṭā, any more than in any other case where an a is retained in saṁhitā. This difficulty the commentator evidently perceives, although he does not state it; for otherwise the jaṭā explanation would have satisfied him, and he would never have thought of suggesting another pākhā. The difficulty really remains unsolved, and a serious one: either there was a blunder on the part of the makers of the treatise, or a passage not contained in the present Sanhitā was contemplated by them: I incline to think the former more likely.

तेपूर्वी अभान्धोऽध्यात्मिकम् ॥ १०॥

10. Also in adya, andhaḥ, aṇḍuḥ, and agne, when te precedes.

The commentator quotes the passages, as follows: pāṣum pāṣapate te adya (iii.1.4; W. O. omit pāṣum), upo te andhaḥ (i.4.4 and iii.4.2); aṇḍuḥ te aṇḍuḥ (i.2.6; B. omits the example), and yat te agne tejas tena (iii.5.3; only B. has tena). Counter-examples are, first, to show that only these words keep their a after te, te āgnaye pravate (ii.4.12; B. has a corrupted reading, te enam, and W. a vacuna to the end of the comment, putting in place of it an example from under the next rule, tena tvā "dādehī'gne anigraha),

9. cakrākrśante 'smāngrahan'e 'kārapare sati' vartamāno' 'kīro rāye sa indra ity evampūrva na lupyate. rāyeśvarasyo 'dāharā

or aḥaṁ cākhāntare: 'athu vā' jātāyāṁ bhavati: rāye—..... yathā

saṁhitāyāṁ: no 'dāharā, akāraparatecābhāvātī tarhi' katham

aloṇa iti kecit: tripadopahṛtīpinarūkṣitutvād iti brāhman. mā

......: indrō...... akārapara iti kim: so...... evampūrva iti

kim: smo.... akārah pari yasmāt 'tad akāraparam': tasmin.

1 in W. only. 2 G. M. put before 'kārapare. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 O. om. 5 G. M. O. ins. tu. 6 W. O. -patvābh. 7 G. M. -parvābh. 8 O. tathā; G. M. add tadā. 9 G. M. lopa. 10 G. M. O. cet. 11 W. tad akām; G. M. akāraparāh.
and second, to show that these words do so only after te, prathamo
hau skanda\(i\) (iii. 8\(a\): only B. has skanda\(i\)).

Of agne after te, the text presents eighteen other cases: namely
i.2.11\(a\) twice; 4.43\(a\); 5.2\(a\), 3\(a\), 4\(a\); 6.6\(a\); 7.6\(a\); iii.4.10\(a\); 5.3\(a\) (a second
case); v.4.7\(a\); 7.4\(a\), 6\(a\), 8\(a\) three times: vi.2.2\(a\); 6.1\(a\).

मेष्यर्वम् \| ११ \|

11. In agne, also, when preceded by me.

Only agne, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this.
The commentator quotes yun me agne asya (i.6.2\(a\), 10\(a\): W. B.
omit asya) and imā me agne ishtakā (iv.4.11\(a\), 4\(a\); and there is another case in iv.4.11\(a\).
He adds, as usual, a number of counter-examples, of obvious intent: they are tena tvad “dadhā
gne anigraḥ (i.2.12\(a\): O. omits anigraḥ), prāṇaḥ ca me pānāḥ
(iv.7.1\(a\)), and tād aśakaiān tan me rāḍhi (i.6.6\(a\)).

ग्रस्यादिनायः \| १२ \|

12. As also, in asya, aśvinā, and aparā.

That is to say, when these words follow me. The passages are
viṣṇu deva haviṣho me asya (i.5.10\(a\): O. begins at deva), punar
me aśvinā yuvāṃ cakṣuh (iii.2.5\(a\); W. B. omit the last word, O.
the last two), and yad vā me aparāgataṃ (vi.6.7\(a\)).

नःपृवी \| १३ \|

13. Also in asat, agniḥ, agha, antamaḥ, abhi, asmin, and adya
pathi, when preceded by naḥ.

The examples are supūrā no asad vace (i.2.3\(a\) and vi.1.4\(a\), aṣayā
no agnir vairava (i.3.4\(a\) and i.4.46\(a\); there is another case of no
gṇih at v.7.9\(a\), rakra mākī no aghaṇaṃ iṣata (i.4.24 and

10. adya........ eteshv akāras ta ity evampūrvo na lupyate.
yathā: paścaṃ...... upo..... “aṣyaṇā.....” yat..... eteshv
iti kim: “te..... tepūrva iti kim: prathamamo.....”

1 O. chh. \(b\) in W. only. \(c\) B. om. \(d\) W. om., and ins tena tvd etc.

11. ‘cakāro ‘gna ity anvādaci: me pūrvo ‘gna ity atrā ‘kāro
na lupyate. yathā: yun..... imā..... me pūrvo iti kim:
tena.....: anvādencena’ kim: “prāṇaṣa......” tād.....

\(b\) B. caṅkāroṣyate saty aṣya ity asmin akāro ma ity evampūrvo; G. M. the same,
omitting sati; O. the same, omitting sati and the second iti. \(a\) in W. only. \(b\) O.
\(c\) iti. \(d\) O. om.

12. me pūrvo iti cakāro ‘uvādaci: asya........ ‘eteshv akāro
me pūrvo na lupyate. vi.....: puna.....: yad.....

G. M. ins. iti. \(a\) O. chh.
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iv.6.8*: G. M. omit ścata), agne tvam no antamah (i.5.6³ and iv.4.4*), svishṭiṁ no abhi vasiyāḥ (iii.1.9²: G. M. O. omit vasiyāḥ), pıkśhā no asmin (vii.6.7*), and tebhir no adya pathibhiḥ ngebhī rakkha ca naḥ (vii.5.24: all but W. end with pathibhiḥ). The necessity of including pathi in the rule is shown by no ‘adyu vams vasati ‘ti (ii.5.3⁹*). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are tasmād apiṁd garhābh ‘sattarah (v.1.2¹: G. M. omit the first two words), so ‘gnir jñatāḥ (v.1.4¹), utterato ‘ghāyur abhidīvati (v.7.3¹: B. O. omit the last word), te sūmin dichanta (vii.2.10¹), namo ‘gnaye ‘pratīvidhāyā (i.5.10¹: the example is found only in G. M.), and te naḥ pāntu te no ‘vantu (i.2.3¹; 8.7¹: iv.3.3²).

नमः पूर्वी अग्रेशेयोऽग्रियाय || १४ ||

14. Also in agre, acvebhyaḥ, and agriyāya, when preceded by namaḥ.

The passages are nama agrevadhāyā ca (iv.5.8¹), nama acvebhya ‘cnapatibhyāḥ (iv.5.3²: B. omits the last word; the whole example is wanting in W.), and nama agriyāya ca (iv.5.5²). Counter-examples are apo ‘gre ‘bhivyādharati (vi.4.3²) and nama ‘gnaye ‘pratīvidhāyā (i.5.10¹).

ग्राविनि: सोम: पूर्वी अग्रियः || १५ ||

15. Also when āśvināḥ or somaḥ precedes and agni follows.

It may be made a question whether the rule should not read gniparāḥ (without sign of omission), and mean ‘also an a preceded by āśvinah or somaḥ and followed by gni.’ But the authority of the comment (see below) is decidedly, though not unequivocally, in favor of what I have given, and the construction, though a peculiar one, has its analogies elsewhere in the treatise (compare xx.4 etc.). The further difficulty remains, however, that the only passages in the text to which the rule can apply read agnih, in the nominative singular, after the two words specified, so that there appears to be no reason why we should not have simply gniḥ, instead of gniparāḥ.

This the commentator does not fail to perceive,

18. asat...... eteshv akāro na ity evampūrvo na lupyate. yathā: supārā:...... ayaṁ:...... rakṣāḥ:...... agne:...... svishṭiṁ:...... pıkśhā:...... tebhir:...... pathi ‘ti kim: no...... nahpūrva ‘ti kim: tasmād:...... so:...... utterato:...... te...... eteshv iti kim: ‘namo......’ te......

* in W. only.  (a) in G. M. only.

14. ‘agre......’ eteshv akāro namahpūrvo na lupyate. namo...... ‘namo acv......’ namo agri...... namahpūrva iti kim: apo....... eteshv iti kim: namo ‘gn......

(1) O. om. (2) W. om.
and accordingly—resorting, as we cannot well help saying, to one of his usual subterfuges—he declares *agni* (or, according to W. B. O., *gni*) "a part of a word, intended to include a number of cases occurring in another *cākhā;*" not going so far, however, as to quote any of these cases. I suspect *gniparāh* to be either a corruption of *gnih,* or originally intended as equivalent with it.

The passages are *āvinno agnir grhapatīh* (i.8.122) and *somo agnir upa devah* (iii.2.41); and the commentator adds counter-examples, so *gnir jātāh* (v.1.4) and *āvinno 'yam ādāv* (i.8.122).

16. Also *u* is retained when preceded by *dhīrāsaḥ, adābdhāsaḥ, ekadācāsaḥ, rshīnām putrāḥ, pārītā, asūdhāḥ, pūdrāḥ, pṛthivī yajñe, āsate ye, grhnāmy agre, vāṁ eṣāḥ, jajñe, sakṣphānaḥ, yu-vayor yah, pṛsthē, patīr vaḥ, go, cūsmahā, puvāḥ, samiddhāḥ, rshabhaḥ, pāṭhāh, vachāḥ, varśhishīthē, jūśānā, yo rudrāḥ, or vṛṣhnaḥ.

The passages had in view are quoted as follows: *tāh dhīrāso anudṛṣya yajjante* (i.1.9); G. M. O. omit the last word; *adabdhāsaḥ adābdhyam* (i.1.10 and iii.5.8); *ekadācāsaḥ apruṣhadah* (i.4.11); *rshīnām putro adhīrāju esah* (i.3.7); G. M. O. omit the last word), with a counter-example, *yasya putro jātāh* (i.8.8; 7.8), to show the need of including *rshīnām* in the *nimitta; yathā pārītā apibah* (i.4.18: G. M. O. omit *yathā;* *asūdhāḥ agnī* (i.5.10); *tvatpūdāro agne devāh* (i.5.16); G. M. O. omit *devāh;* *pṛthivī yajñe asmīn* (i.6.5), with a counter-example, *te mā 'śmin yajñe* (iii.2.4), where, as only W. B. point out, the *jaṭa*-text shows the mutilation of *asmīn after yajñe* not preceded by *pṛthivī* (thus, *asmīn yajñe yajñē 'śmin asmīn yajñē*); *adhyāstare ye antariksbe* (iii.5.4), with *ye pṛthivīyānī ye 'ntarikṣe* (iv.5.12: only O. has the first ye) as counter-example; *māyā grhnāmy agre anām* (v.7.9), with *asūdā krto 'gre 'bhi shunotī* (vi.4.5: O. omits *shunotī*) as counter-example; *idāvāh eho asura* (i.6.6 and iii.1.11), with *pukra esho 'nto 'ntam manushyāh* (vii.2.7): O. stops at

15. *āvinno: somah:* ¹ evamārava 'kāro 'gniporo' na ṣṛyate: *agnī* 'ti pāddikadechaḥ cākhāntare bhūpūdānārthah, *āvinno...... somo...... evamārva iti kim: so...... evamāra iti kim: *āvinno.....

¹ G. M. *ma. i.ūy. ² G. M. *agnī i.ūy evamārava akāro; B. akāraḥ agnīporo. ³ W. B. O. *gni.*
to show the need of vacā; itah prathamān jajñē aṃśiḥ (ii.2.4a: only G. M. have itah; without it, also i.3.14b): see what is said of this passage, and of the rule as fixing its reading, under 1.61; samaprāhā ṛaṃ rākṣaṇaḥ (iii.3.8b), as counter-example to which, to show that śāṅkāḥ in the rule would not have been enough, is given gṛasyaṃ pṛṇaḥ 'gīnḥu “from another gāthā,” but the genuineness of the reason is open to doubt; yuvayor yo astī (iii.5.41) with yo 'puḥ bhaveṃ praveṣayati (v.2.2b: only O. has the last word) to prove the need of yuvayoh; nākasya pṛṣṭhe adhi rocane divāḥ (iii.5.5a: G. M. O. omit divāḥ; another nearly identical case at iii.5.41); yohaṇapātīr va atro (v.7.7a), with na va bṛdguṇi havyāṃ (v.1.11a: O. omits havyam) as counter-example; goartyaṃ eva somānā karoṭi (vi.1.101: O. omits -maṅ karoṭi; goartya occurs twice more in this section, and at v.2.9 we have goartya twice), to which, by rule i.52, agouroṣaḥ (vi.1.101 three times) is to be added as further example; uchāṣmo aṃge yājamaṇḍyāyai 'dhī (i.6.22: only G. M. have edhi, and O. omits also the preceding word; there is a second case, of nīpūṣahāḥ, in the same division); aṃgroṣu aṃgroṣāḥ (i.1.51); samiddho aṃjan (v.1.111: and we have samiddhaḥ aṃge at i.6.8a; 7.6a: ii.5.8b), without any counter-example to show that iḍḍhaḥ would not have been enough to answer the needs of the rule; dyāṃ rābpito antārīkṣaḥ (i.2.8a: O. omits dyāṃ), and G. M. have, like the Calcutta edition, the false reading yām); priyam pāṭhā api 'hi (iii.3.3 three times); upagāḥ vacā apā vadhāṁ (i.2.11b: another nearly identical case in the same division); varṣiṣṭhē pi ṛṣaḥ na ke (i.1.8 and i.4.43a); jāṭhāḥ no aṁpū ṛṣaya vetaḥ (i.3.4a and vi.3.2a: G. M. omit vetaḥ); yo rudro aṅgāḥ yah (v.5.9a: G. M. O. omit the last word), and, as counter-example, yadh upatṛṇāḥyād rudro 'ṣya (vi.3.9a: but O. reads aṇṇiyād for upatṛṇāḥyād, which makes the reference to i.6.7a); and, finally, aṃprāṣaḥ samāṇānaiti asti (ii.4.7a,9b: O. stops at aṃprāṣaḥ, which would make the reference include also vii.4.18b twice; and there are further cases of retention after aṃṣhuaḥ at i.4.2 and vi.4.5a).

16. dhīrāśah...... evamāṃso naḥ khalo akāra ṭuvyate. yathā: tāṃ...... aḍab-. .-. ekād.--. rṣhīnām.--. rṣhī- yāṃ iti kim: yasya...... yathā:...... aṣṭ.: . . pṛthivi-. .-. prthivi' iti kim: te: ...... 'ity atra jatāyāṃ: aḍha-y. .-. āṣata iti kim: ye: ...... mayi-. .-. gṛhāṇi' iti kim: aṣṭ-. .-. iḍāvā-. .-. vān iti kim: gukra:...... itoh:...... sañ-. .-. sam iti kim: gṛasyaṃ gīnāḥ iti viṣāḥtāre: yuvayor...... yuvayor iti kim: yo:...... nākasya:...... yajña:...... patir iti kim: na:...... go:...... upy akārādi (i.52) vacamād aṃgroṣaḥ 'iti co dāharaṇam: uchāṣmo:...... aṃgroṣu:...... samiddhaḥ:...... dyāṃ:...... priyam:...... ugran:...... varṣ:...... jāṭhāno:...... yo:...... ya iti kim: yad:...... aṃṣhno:......

1 O. puts next before ṭuvyate. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. O. om. 5 O. tīt prāpitaḥ. 6 O. om.
Also in aratim, asya yajñasya, atidr̥taḥ, ati yanti, anṛṇah, avishyay, anavimāḥ, annesuḥ, arcīḥ, ajītan, ajāyim, ahniyāḥ, ambāī, arvantam, astu, akṛtot, anaghīrāḥ, apsu yah, askabhāyai, acūtah, acvasaniḥ, astabhiḥ, acvīre, anēg, and agniyā.

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one pada in any case: mṛdhaṇi dīvo aratim prthivyāḥ (i.4.13 and vi.5.21: O. begins at dīvah, and it alone has prthivyāḥ); yan me agne asya yajñasya (i.6.21,102), with the counter-example etc 'śyā murāmin (vi.1.108); pratyanyāk somo atidr̥taḥ (i.8.21: all the MSS. here insert the k before somo, as required by v.32, and G. M. even convert it to kk, according to xiv.12); pacuyanto ati yanti (iii.2.21), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, nai 'naḥ somo ti pave (vi.5.114: O. begins at somo); tad agne anṛṇo bhavāmi (iii.3.82: O. omits bhavāmi); na yavase avishyan (iv.4.33); svāveṣo anamīvo bhavā naḥ (iii.4.19: B. O. omit bhavā naḥ); ye annesuḥ vividhyanti (iv.5.114: O. omits the last word); jātavedo yo arcīḥ (v.7.81); sarado ajītan (v.7.22); teshāṁ yo ajīyāmin (v.7.22); tiroahniyād ma suhūtāḥ (vii.3.13: O. omits suhūtāḥ); ambe ambāī (vii.3.19-12 twice, 3 twice); yo arvantam jighāntati (vii.4.15: O. omits the last word); bahis te astu bīl iti (iii.3.102: O. stops at astu; the text furnishes eleven other cases of astu with a retained, at i.2. 32; 4.451; 8.142; iii.1.14; 2.57,82; v.5.93 twice; 7.24, 4.54); iti indro

17. aratim......1 eteshv akāro "na khalo" ekārapārma okārapārvo vā lupaye te, yathā: mṛdhaḥ......: yaḥ......: yajñasya ti kim: ete......: pratyaṁ......: pacy......: drutojante 'ty abhyāṁ kim: nāi......: tad......: na......: svāv......: ye......: jātavedo......: sarado......: teshāṁ......: tiro......: ambe......: yo......: bahis......: ita......: agne......: yo......: ya iti kim: advyo......: yo......: maḍḍayā......: yo......: sanir iti kim: agvehyo......: indro......: bhīr iti kim: 'cama...... ity atra' jādyāṁ: astabhīyo......: narunyo......: anēg......: agniye 'ty akaraṣṭhitāh padākadeva bahupadānārthāh: etāni......: yad......: payo......

1 G. M. om. the enumeration, and ins. iti. 2 G. M. om. khalo, and put na next before lupaye. 4 G. M. O. om. 4 B. tābhyām; G. M. etābhyām. 5 B. G. M. astabhiḥ. 6 O. om. 7 B. om.
akṣrṇot (i.1.12); aque aṅīro yo 'syām (i.2.12\(^1\)); there is another case in the same division, and one at vi.2.7\(^3\); yo āpsu yo oṣha-
dhishu (v.5.8\(^3\)), with the counter-example āpsu peṣu vētaṁ (v.3.
12\(^2\)); but O. gives instead yo peṣu bhāmu, v.2.2\(^3\); yo asakbhāyaṁ
uttaram (i.2.13\(^4\)); G. M. O. omit uttaram); madhyā rasō acṣutah
(i.2.6); yo bhaksō apravaṁ (iii.2.5\(^7\)), and, as counter-example,
aṃbhāya 'వపడిత్రసావాం (iv.5.3\(^2\); only O. has ca); indro dadhico
asthābhīr iti (v.6.6\(^2\); O. omits iti), and a counter-example from
the jātī-text of the passage gam asthābhīyo mañjābhīya (v.2.12\(^2\).
O. omits), namely asthābhīyo mañjābhīyo mañjābhīyo 'sthābhīyo
'stha-
bhīyo mañjābhīya (G. M. give simply mañjābhīyo 'sthābhīya);
varunō acṣīṣet (i.8.10\(^2\)); aṅge-aṅge ni dēdḥyāt (i.3.10\(^1\) and vi.8.
11\(^2\); it would have been better to include in the example the pre-
ceding word prāno, to show that the first aṅge, as well as the
second, furnishes an example under the rule; there is another like
pair of cases, after apāno, in i.3.10\(^1\); and finally, it is explained
that the quotation of aghniya with final a makes it (by i.22) a part
of a word, intended to include a variety of cases, and three such
cases (being all that the text contains) are quoted: namely etān
te aghniye nāmānī (vii.1.6\(^8\)), yad āpo aghniya varunē 'ti āpā-
mahe (i.3.11: B. omits the last word; G. M. O. the last three),
and pāyo aghniyāduḥ ṛtsu (i.2.8\(^1\); O. omits ṛtsu, which would
make the citation include also vi.1.11\(^3\)). This exposition seems to
prove that the proper reading at the end of the rule is aghniya,
and I have ventured to adopt it, though all the MSS. (except T.,
which is ambiguous, running rules 17 and 18 together in sandhi)
give aghniya. Aghniya would answer as including aghniyādu,
but it would not include also aghniye.


gāthā ्स्वरपि ॥ १८॥

18. Also in adhvarā, when a vowel follows [the r].

The examples given in illustration of the rule are satyadhar-
maṇo adhvarā (i.2.1\(^2\)), havishmān devo adhvarā (i.3.12), and
upaprayanto adhvaram ity āha (i.5.7\(^1\)). In regard to the last of
them, it is remarked that rule i.61 is not of force for it, since the
conditions imposed by that rule do not arise in it. The rule,
namely, directs that a passage of three words or more, being
repeated in the text, is to be read as where it first occurred; now
upaprayanto adhvaram was found at i.5.5\(^1\), where the retention
of the a comes under rule 3 of this chapter; but here only two

\[1\] G. M. et al.\n\[2\] O. in. sati.\n\[3\] G. M. om.\n\[4\] G. M. O. ekārapūrva ekārapūrṇa vi; G. M. adde na; B. adde vi.\n\[5\] M. katra.\n\[6\] B. sarati.
words, instead of three, are cited in the repetition. As counter-examples, showing the value of the restriction "when a vowel follows," are given nugi va agniḥ so 'dhvayam (v.6.24) and andho 'dhvayah syat (v.1.31 and vi.1.88: O. alone has syat, and, without that addition, the phrase is found also at v.1.32). This proves that what is to be "followed by a vowel" is the r of adhvara; but how that meaning is conveyed by the terms of the rule is not easy to discover. The MSS. are at variance as to the reading of the first word of the rule, T. W. B. O. giving adhvara, and G. M. adhvara, between which I am at a loss to decide confidently, because neither of them appears to be what is wanted. But I prefer adhvara, both because it is better supported, and because it is not the usage of the treatise to put in a case-form the words or themes which it cites from the text.

An additional case falling under the rule is ardha va adhvarah (i.1.12); and yet others (as i.5.51 twice, and, doubtless, i.4.462-3), to which it would else apply, are disposed of under the general rule xi.3.

19. In the opinion of some, it becomes half-similar with its predecessor.

This is a very blind precept, and we are permitted to doubt whether its purport is interpreted aright by the commentary; in which, moreover, there are peculiar and unintelligent variations of reading. What letter is the subject of the rule—the elided a, or the non-elided? The comment says the latter (although the majority of MSS. blunderingly say the "non-protracted" instead), and states that it acquires a quantity similar to half a mora, or becomes one and a half moras long. It is added, that no special examples are given, because such would not bring to light any difference (1 only O. has the reading that means this: W. B. omit the "not;" G. M. are unintelligible). This appears to me quite unsatisfactory. The distinct demonstrative sa in the rule ought to point back to something distinctly stated above, and that is the

---


iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣṭhakhyavivaranā11 ekādoṣo 'dhyāyaḥ.12

---

1 W. B. O. apuktaḥ. 2 G. M. ekāmākāraprāṣṭita. 3 W. -trāṇi sad; G. M. -trāṇā-. 4 G. M. sāmān. 5 O. dāryaṇī. 6 O. om. 7 W. B. O. -trāṣṭita; B. G. M. -tra syāt. 8 W. B. O. -shāṭ̣ar; G. M. -sāḍ̣ar; G. M. doṣaṇāt. 9 G. M. yāḥ. 10 O. om. 11 O. instr. prāthamopagrañcī. 12 G. M. udi viśeṣāyā namāḥ.
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akāra which in rule 1 is said to be dropped after certain “predecessors.” We have had no akāra alupā spoken of, but only cases of alopa of akāra. And it seems to be taught here, in accordance with the doctrines of all the other Prātiṣeṣṭya (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.53), that some regard the a as (not elided, but) so absorbed into the preceding dipthong as to become assimilated to, or identified with, the latter half of that dipthong. We may with plausibility conjecture the rule to be a later addition to the original substance of the chapter.

CHAPTER XII.

CONTENTS:  1–8, elision and non-elision of initial a after final e or o in exceptional and special cases;  9–11, resulting accent.

ग्रन्थ्य लोपः ॥ १॥

1. Now for cases of elision.

This is a general heading to the chapter (that is to say, to its first eight rules); which, as the commentator points out, has for its sphere of action the passages specified in rule 3 of the preceding chapter. This is a matter of course: the general rule (by x.i.) being elision, there can be need of an additional authority for elision only where that rule is contravened by another of opposing character, and of wider application than to specific cases only.

ग्रन्थि ॥ २॥

2. The a of asi is elided.

The examples given are suparno ‘si garutmān (iv.1.10:; 6.5:; v.1.10:; O. omits the last word) and pratho ‘si prthivy asi (iv.2. 9:; O. stops at ‘si). The elision is not infrequent in this word, usually occurring in the little prose phrases which are inserted among the verses in the sections concerned; I have noted eighteen other cases: but they are hardly worth detailed reference.

न गर्मिःसन्दीयमोमधुरम् ॥ ३॥

1. athe ‘ty ayam adhikāraḥ: akāraya lopu ucyata ity etad adhikṣitaṃ veditavyam iti uttaram yad vāksyānāḥ. dhātārātir (xi.3) ityavidisthayo ‘yam adhyāyānabhāh'.
1 G. M. etadāḥ.

2. asi ‘ty asminn akāro lupyata ekārdvārāpārvāḥ. yathā: suparno….. pratho…..
1 G. M. -revo ed. 2 in B. only.
3. But not when garbhāḥ, saṁnaddhāḥ, yamāḥ, or bhadrāḥ precedes.

The examples quoted by the commentator are garbhō asya osha-
dhīnām (iv.2.33), saṁnaddhō asyā vidayusva (iv.6.6), asyā yamō
dādiyāḥ (iv.6.7: G. M. O. omit the last word), and tvam
bhadrō asyā kratāḥ (iv.3.13). There is another case of asyā after
garbhāḥ at iv.1.4, which is then repeated at v.1.5, the a standing
this time unelided by rule i.81.

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the
inclusion of the double pada sam-ṇaddhaḥ, instead of simply
naddhaḥ, in the rule. Some, he says, quote as counter-example
upanaddhō 'ṣurāḥ (iv.4.9); but its propriety is questionable, since
the passage does not fall under xii.3, and moreover, there is no asyā
in it (O. has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd
suggestion); and the valid counter-example is to be sought in
another śākhā. We have here an unusually clear example of the
arbitrary way in which the plea śākhāntare is resorted to, in order
to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise-
makers.

4. A is elided before y, v, n, and h, when these are followed by
a vowel.

The examples given are hīranyagṛṅgo 'yo asya pāddāḥ (iv.6.7:2;
O. omits pāddāḥ), varṇaṃ 'va sṛjā rārānāḥ (iv.1.83: O. omits
rārānāḥ), vareṇyo 'nu pr)vānum (iv.1.104), and jambhavayānto 'hi
vrkam (i.7.82: O. omits vrkam). These are but specimens selected
from among a considerable number of cases: namely, before y, two;
before v, nineteen; before o, fourteen (all but three of them, cases
of anu, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of
xi.5); before h (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi.4 show,
includes also ṣh), five; in all, forty. To show the necessity of the
restriction “when these are followed by a vowel,” are cited
ṣākrāna te anyat (iv.1.112) and agra āhānā hitaḥ (iv.1.34: O. omits
hitā).

There is a well-established difference of reading in the rule itself:
T. B. G. M. have yaunaḥa svarapareshu, only W. and O.
adding para (which I have amended to paraḥ) after ha. So also,

3. garbhaḥ...... 1 evampravah śaunīdhyaḥ labdhaḥ 'si? 'ty as-
mīn grahaṇe 'kāro 'nu nuprayate. garbhō...... saṁnaddhō
......: sam iti kim: upan...... iti kecid uddharaṇiti: tuc cin-
yam: dāhātārātir (xi.3) ityādyantaḥ pātitvābhāvād asiśabdā-
darśande 'ca: mukhyaiḥ tu śākhāntare viñeyam pratyuddhara-
ṇam. asī:...... tvam......

1 G. M. ins. īty. 2 W. tasmān asī. 3 B. O. om. 4 G. M. ins. ekdaraṇīva okira-
pūrvārd. 5 B. om. 6 G. M. ins. ekadaraṇīva okira-
pūrvārd. 7 W. eva mukhyaiṁ kimḥ.
where the rule is quoted under i.21, W. alone (there is no O. for that part of the work) introduces para; under x.4 and 5, W. and B. alike have yavanaahaparatva etc., but the testimony as to the rule is equivocal, since para might well have been added there by way of exposition instead of quotation. I have, as usual, followed W., although not without suspicion that the para is a gloss, introduced to help the otherwise blind and inaccurate phraseology of the rule—which latter, however, is not altogether discordant with the usage of the treatise elsewhere.

The exceptions under this rule, instead of being rehearsed after it, as is the general habit of the Prātiṣākhya, are given in rules 4 and 5 of the preceding chapter, and, in the latter rule, mingled with instances of a wholly different character. Here, then, a particular specification of cases already included under a general rule is regarded as insuring against inclusion in a more general statement of exceptions under that rule. I believe that the treatise offers no other example of this canon of interpretation.

5. Before j and gn, α is elided if acute.

The examples are ojo 'jāyathā' (i.6.12) and gucīh pāvaka vandyo 'gne (i.3.14); and the counter-examples, of a unaccented remaining unelided, are nā tattvāhād ajārah (iv.6.12) and nidhi-pātir no aghī (i.4.44). There is, as the examples show, a reason in the accent: jāyathāḥ and āgne are both words that are accented only at the beginning of a pāda, where (as remarked under xi.1) the elision of a is an almost universal rule. All the other cases of elision before gn (nine in number) are of the same kind; not, however, those before j (only two).

6. Before gn, also when preceded by māh, vacah, dadhānāh, and sthe.

The ca, 'also,' of this rule, brings down simply gn from its predecessor, the intent being to point out the cases where the a of agni is elided even when unaccented. Māh, it is stated, is a part

4. 1 yakāramakāramakārahakāraparo 'kāra' lupyate teshu yakā- 
radishkā svaparāshēnu satsau hiraṇ-.-.-. vanas-.-.-. varṇyo 
-----: jambh-.-.-. svaparāshēnu iti kim: ākram-.-.-. agre

1 G. M. ins. ekdrākārapārva akāraḥ. 2 G. M. om. 3 O. -para. 4 G. M. add evam dī. 5 yakāraparo gnaparag cā 'kāra' uddatto lupyate. ojo-.-.-. 
gucīh-.-.-. uddāta iti kim: na-.-.-. nidhi-.-.-. 
1 G. M. jākāra ca. 2 O. puts after uddāta.
of a word, so given for the sake of conciseness, and including the two cases anēgirasvad ache 'mo 'gnim anēgirasvad bharishyāno 'gnim (both iv.1.2²: O. omits anēgirasvad in each). The other passages had in view the rule are vaco 'gnaye bharatā bhrat (iii.2.11¹: O. omits the last two words), daddhāno 'gnir hotā (iv.1.3⁴), and sadhasthe 'gnim purishyam (iv.1.3¹: O. omits purishyam). To prove the implication of gn only, is given sadhasthe adhy utkarasam (iv.6.5³; 7.13⁴; v.7.7²: O. omits).

By xi.16, vacaḥ does not as a general thing elide the following a; but there is no clashing between the two rules, as they have reference to different parts of the text.

7. The a is elided in abhyārvatin, apūpam, api dadhmāmi, adyā 'nu, aditiḥ carma, agner jihvām, ognayaḥ paprayaḥ, asmakam, asne dhatta, acaṃ, açvā wherever found, açyāma, amā, aryaman, asmatpācān, asmin yajñe, astā, avyathamānā, abhidroham, adhāyī, adāh, aho, adugadhāh, arishṭāh, arathāh, aranti, antar asyām, atra stha, annāya, anēgirasvā, and akaram.

The commentator gives an example for each specification of the rule, with counter-examples for every case in which more than one pada is taken, as follows: agne abhyārvatin (iv.2.1²), and, as counter-example, kāmena kṛto abhy ānad arkaṃ (i.1.14²; G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two); bhadrapoṣe 'pūpaḥ deva (iv.2.2²: only W. has deva); agne pi dadhmāyā deye (iv.1.10²), and, as counter-example, baddhō opikakeṣa āsani (i.7.8³: O. omits the last word); anu no 'dyā 'numatiḥ (iii.3.11³; iv.4.12³; 7.15⁴), and, as counter-example, pra tat te adya cipīvishta ānā (ii.2.12³: O. ends with adya, and G. M. substitute another passage,

6. gnapara iti cakāro jīḍpayati: maḥ...... ity evampūro gnapūro "nudatto 'py" "akāralopo bhavati:" aṅgi......: ma ity 'atra padādikadecagrahaṇam' samkshepaḥram: aṅgir......: vaco......: daddhāno......: sadhasthe......: "anvadevaḥ kimarthāḥ:" sadh...... gnapanasya 'kārasya'"nudattārtho 'yam ārambhāḥ."
namely viçe adya marutah, iv.7.12\textsuperscript{1}; adhi bravstu no 'ditih çarma yachatu (iv.6.6\textsuperscript{4}: G. M. O. omit the first two words), and, as counter-example, yathā no aditiḥ karati (iii.4.11\textsuperscript{2}: only O. has karati [reading it karit'; G. M. substitute a jatih reading, aditir no no aditir aditir naḥ, without anything to show whether it is put forward as the jatih-text of this passage, or of another, occurring at iv.6.9\textsuperscript{4}, where the saṁhitā likewise reads no aditiḥ); adhvarāmin no 'gner jihvāmin abhi grñitam (iv.1.8\textsuperscript{2}: B. omits the last word, O. the last two, G. M. the last and first), and, as counter-example, vratā dadante ًayeh (iv.1.8\textsuperscript{2}); te no 'gnavah paprayah (i.7.7\textsuperscript{2}), and, as counter-example, purishyāso apanayāḥ prāvanebhāḥ (iv.2.4\textsuperscript{3}: G. M. omit the last word); naro 'śudkam indra (iv.6.6\textsuperscript{7}), there are two other cases, at iii.2.8\textsuperscript{6} and iv.6.4\textsuperscript{3}); viçe 'smē dhatta (i.4.4.4\textsuperscript{2}), with the counter-example draśvāmin oḍjo asme : viṣṇyaya mā (iv.7.12\textsuperscript{1}: only B. has mā, and G. M. O. end at asme); pari vṛīdhī no 'cma bhavatu nas tanāḥ (iv.6.6\textsuperscript{6}; G. M. end with 'cma, and only O. has the last two words); for the phonetic complex aṉā, however followed, vrshapāṇya० 'vṛīdhi rathabhiḥ (iv.6.6\textsuperscript{3}: O. omits after 'vṛīdhi), pračetasa० 'vāṇā (iv.6.8\textsuperscript{4}), and bhāvati 'vāyaye० (i.1.10\textsuperscript{1}: O. omits this example), with two counter-examples, cashālam० apanīpyādyā takshāti (iv.6.8\textsuperscript{3}: O. alone has the last word, and it omits the first) and kshatraṁ no aśva vanatāṁ (iv.6.9\textsuperscript{4}: O. omits vanatāṁ), to show that aśva would not have answered the purpose instead of aṝā; viẏajanto 'cāma dyumnām (i.3.14\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit dyumnām); punas te 'māt 'sahām (iv.7.14\textsuperscript{3}); ye te 'ṛyaṁan (ii.3.14\textsuperscript{4}); te 'amatpāṇān (iv.3.13\textsuperscript{4}), with the counter-example anyaṁ te aṣmāt tāpanāt (iv.6.1\textsuperscript{3.5}; v.4.4\textsuperscript{5}: only O. has tāpanāt); yaḥ pitā te 'śmin yaṁe (ii.6.12\textsuperscript{6}), with the counter-example te aṣmin javam a'dadāḥ (i.7.7\textsuperscript{2}); prasitiṁ drāṇāno 'stānā

7. abhyādvartin... eteshv akāro ṣaspate ekārakākāraṁbrāh.
yathā: agne... dvartinīṁ iti kim: kāmena... bhadrā
goce... agne... dadhami 'ti kim: baddho... anu...;
anu iti kim: pra... adhi... çarme 'ti kim: yathā...;
adhy... jihvām iti kim: vratā... te... papryā iti
kim: puṣīṁ... naro... viçe... dhate 'ti kim: draśvā
... pari... aṣpe 'ty anya 'yaṛayatra prutiḥ
tatratatra lopāḥ... vrṣha... śrutir iti kim: prace... bhār... dir
ghagharāṇeṇa 'kim: cashālam... kshatraṁ... vāja
... punas... ye... te... pāṇān iti kim: anyāṁ...;
yāḥ... yajña iti kim: te... prasitiṁ... md... jane;
droham iti kim: bhava... upa... ye... mā
hyam... gṛā... pūrve... ye... gāyā... abhi... asyām iti
kim: rukmo... ye... she 'ti kim: tvac
šātā... vāyas... prthivyāḥ... ahaṁ..."
8. An a is elided when preceded by gāhamānah, jāyamānah, hetayaḥ, manyamānah, vanaspatībhayaḥ, pate, sriddhāḥ, tapasāḥ, svadhāvah, bhāmitaḥ, agnayaḥ, āyō, adhvaryaḥ, and krato.

The quoted passages are gāhamāno dāyay (iv.6.4²); jāyamāno 'hnāṁ ketuḥ (ii.4.14¹); hetaya 'nyam aṃmat (iv.5.10⁵); manyamāno mārtyaṃ (i.4.46¹); vanaspatībhyaḥ 'dhi sambhrītām (iv.6.1¹; O. omits the last word), with the counter-example nāmaḥ pīthībhya abhi (iii.2.8⁵); annapon 'masya (iv.2.3¹ and [by i.61] v.2.2¹¹); niḥo ati sriddho 'ty acīttum (i.1.7³; O. omits the first two words); tapaso 'dhi jātāḥ (iv.2.1⁴); deva svadhāvo 'mrtsya dhāmā (iii.1.11⁶; O. omits the first word and the last), with the counter-example anyā vo anyāṃ avatu (iv.2.6³; O. omits the last word); bhāmito 'nitrasya 'bdhiśvātah (i.6.1²⁵; O. omits the last word); yin aṅgaya 'nvatupyoṇta (iii.2.8³; O. omits yin); agne 'dabdhāyo 'cītānto (i.1.13³; O. omits agne); adhvaryo 'ver apiḥ (vi.4.3⁴; O. ends at 'vēh); and katakrato 'nu te dāyī (ii.5.12⁶).

A special explanation is required for the passage in which agnayaḥ occurs, since the following pūda is anu, which might seem to...
fall under xii.4. Its inclusion here is necessary, because in sanhita the word becomes anuv, so that its a is no longer "followed by a vowel," as required by that rule. The question might arise, whether rule i.51 would not, at any rate, cause anuv to be implied along with anu; but the commentator does not raise it, and the course taken by the treatise is evidently the more reasonable and safer one.

The last three cases which the rule deals with are of a peculiar character, and quite different from all the rest falling under this chapter, being those in which a final pragraha or uncombinable vowel elides an initial a, either in the passages specified in xi.3 (like the last of the three) or elsewhere (like the other two). This the commentator points out, and declares that in every other instance the a remains after a pragraha. I have already noticed (under iv.6,7) what the usage of the text is after pragrahas in o: that, against the two cases here mentioned of a elided after a vocative in o, there are but two in which the a remains; but that after a final o containing the particle u we have twenty-one cases of a retained, and no case of its elision. The passages where a is retained after an e that is pragraha, I have omitted to note: but there is a considerable number of them, including many (e. g. i.4.30: ii.5.6: vi.3.5: vii.5.3: the commentator cites a single one, ine aṣvind saṁvatsaraḥ, v.6.4) where the retention is not otherwise authorized: so that inability to cause elision is unquestionably involved in the very character of a pragraha vowel, according to the view of the treatise, and needs not to be expressly stated. At this we have a right to be surprised, especially for two reasons: first, that it is thought necessary to teach (see x.24) that pragrahas are not liable in general to combination with the initial vowels that follow them; and secondly, that according to this treatise there is no combination of the initial a with the preceding e or o, but an actual loss of it, leaving the e or o unaffected (except sometimes as to accent). But the essential character of the pragraha vowels, the reason of their peculiar treatment, and the proper significance of the term by which they are called, are obscure points as yet in Hindu phonetics and nomenclature.

It remains to inquire how complete and accurate is the enumeration by the Pratīcākhya of the cases of elision or non-elision of a occurring in the Tāttirīya Sanhitā. I have, in looking through the Sanhitā, carefully considered every case with reference to the rules of the treatise, and the result is that, apart from ye aparishu

'yam. agne....: adhvaryo....: gatakrato....: atra yavanah (xii.4) ityāṇḍī'va lopa siddhe punar asya grāham niyāṇartham: dyo 'dhvaryo' krato ity etapadatvaṃpūrvayādi 'na' kārasya lopa na tv ātāpraṅgrahapūrvasye 'ti: yathā: ime.......

1 G. M. -vus tv. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 B. -rapara. 4 O. adh-. 5 B. om. 6 O. kāra. 7 B. śarastra pr-.
(i.4.33) already treated of under xi.3 (p. 244), I have found only two cases of a retained which are not accounted for: namely,  
udhahvo asthā (v.2.1³; R-V. x.1.1) and so agnih (v.2.3³; R-V. vii. 1.16); and both these I suspect to fall under i.61, I having failed to note the previous occurrence of the passages. Of cases explained by i.61 there is a considerable number; only, as was remarked under that rule (see p. 47), there are three among them to which, if the commentator’s forced interpretation of its terms be admitted, it cannot be made to apply. Of cases of elision of a unaccounted for, I have found none. Of course, my examination of the Sanhitā, having been made by the help of a single sanhitā manuscript, is not to be credited as absolutely accurate: yet I have a good deal of faith in the trustworthiness of its result.

9. When the elided a is grave, the preceding diphthong, if acute, becomes circumflex.

All the Prātiṣṭhākhyas, and the usage of the known Vedic texts, are in accord upon this point (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55). To the particular circumflex hence resulting, the treatise gives later (xx.4) the name abhinihata; the others call it abhinihita. The examples given are tē ‘bruvan (ii.5.1³ et al.) and sō ‘bravīt (ii.1.2⁴ et al.).

The representation of the tone of the elided a in the resulting accent of the eliding diphthong, of course, favors the view that regards it as absorbed into the latter, rather than elided.

10. When it is acute, the preceding diphthong, if grave, becomes acute.

This, also, is a universal usage. The commentator quotes two examples: āva rundhatē satraṁ vā i (vii.3.8¹: O. omits āva) and ānapate ‘nnasya (iv.2.3¹ and v.2.2¹).

11. As also, in every case, if circumflex.

The commentator explains ca, ‘also,’ as bringing down uddāte,

9. yam’ adhihṛtyā ’yam prabandha uktas yusminn okāre ’nu  
uddāte lupte suti pārva ekāra okāro vo ’dattah svaritam āpdāyate. 
yathā: tē ... sō ...

1 G. M. āyam. ² G. M. asm. ³ G. M. put next after pārva. ⁴ in B. only.

10. yusminn eva ‘kāra uddāte’ lupte sati pārva ekāra okāro vā  
’nuddāte uddātim āpdāyate. yathā: āva..... anna.....

1 O. asm. ² O. puts next after āva. ³ O. om. ⁴ in O. only.
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when the elided $a$ is acute,' from the preceding rule, and sarvatra, 'in every case,' as signifying 'whether the circumflex be independent or enclitic.' His examples are bheshajar an gāvē śvāya (i.8.61) and och jāyathāh (i.6.124), where the final syllables of gāvē and och have the enclitic circumflex by xiv.29, and atho 'kthyō 'thā 'tirātrāh (vii.1.54: G. M. O. omit the first word), where the final syllable of ukthyōh has the independent circumflex before the elision.

We might perhaps also fairly conclude that sarvatra implies an inclusion of the case treated of in rule 9, and virtually teaches that a final circumflex, eliding an initial grave, is still circumflex.

With this chapter ends the first prapna, or section, of the treatise. The division into prapnas is a purely external and formal one, and (as I gave notice would be the case, in the Introductory Note to the Atharva Prātiṣṭhāṇya) is made no account of in this edition. References made to the succeeding chapters by section and chapter will easily be found by adding twelve to the number of the chapter as given.

CHAPTER XIII.

CONTENTS: 1–3, loss of m, before semivowels and spirants; 4, its retention before rṣaj etc.; 5–15, details of the occurrence of $q$, otherwise than as the result of sandhi; 16, interchange of $d$ and $l$.

पृष्ठ मात्रालोप: || ||

1. Now for the omission of m.

11. uddāta iti oṣabalo jāyāyati: tasminn' akāra uddāte ' sati sarve ekāra okāro vā svaritā uddātum āpadyate. bheshajar a......: ojo...... sarvatre 'ti vacanām nityasvarito' pi tathā 'va tud viḍānām syāt: atho......

iti tībhāshyaratne prātiṣṭhāṇyaśivavarūṇe dvādasa 'dhyāyaḥ.

'iti prathamaḥ prapnaḥ.'

1 O. asm. 2 G. M. ins. lute; O. ins. ca lute. 3 O. sarvatra; G. M. sarvatra-sthita. 4 O. rikṣayā. 5 O. om.; G. M. prathama-prapna-samāpiḥ. hariḥ om; su-bham astu om; W. adds 1 hari hi om, and, as prelude to the next section, prag-ṇāpya namah. hariḥ om; B. adds hariḥ om.

1. the 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: makāralopa' ucyata ity etad adhi-kṛtaṁ veditavyam 'ita uttaraṁ yad vakṣeyāmaḥ. makārasya lopo makāralopah.'

1 O. rṣaya l. 2 W. B. om. 3 B. om.
A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4). The subject is a supplement to that treated at v.27–31, where we are told what is done with m before a mute, or before any other semivowel than r.

2. A m is omitted, when followed by r or a spirant.

This omission of m is accompanied, according to xv.1–3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of anuvāda after it. Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to ii.30. The definition of the m as lost or omitted accords best with the former view: it is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized; if, however, an anuvāda, as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of m after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the m is directly converted into anuvāda. This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rikk (iv.5) and Vāj. (iv.1) Prātiṣṭhikhyas, which acknowledge an anuvāda, while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath. Pārt. (ii.32, i.67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel: our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p. 68), trims between the two views.

The commentator's examples are pratyushṭaṇaḥ rakṣah (i.1.2 et al.), saṃcitam me brahma (iv.1.108: v.1.108), taṁ shad ahdini (v.5.28), saṁ-sam id yuvase vṛṣān (ii.6.114: iv.4.44: only G. M. have vṛṣān), and tvān ha yaud yavishthya (ii.6.111). Counter-examples are given: to show that m before other letters is not dropped, idam vāṁ dasye (iii.3.114); to show that the dropped m must be a final, tasmāt tāmrā dpah (vi.4.24). The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation pādāntah, 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it: it comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of pada and sanhitā texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters.

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by y or v.

2. rephaparac ca "shmaparac ca padānto" makāro lupyate. yathā: praty-..... saṁ-..... taṁ..... saṁ-..... tvān..... evampara iti kim: idam..... padānta iti kim: tasmāt.....
rephac ca "shmānac ca" reposhmaṇah: te pare' yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

1 W. repach. 2 O. om. ca. 3 B. -nite. 4 G. M. om. 5 O. om. 6 G. M. O. -md. 0 B. G. M. O. reposhmaṇau tāu parād.
The authorities here quoted are, as the commentator does not fail to point out, the same with those referred to above, in v.30, where we were taught that some teachers hold m not to be assimilated to a following y or v, any more than to r. The accepted teaching of the treatise, however, is (v.28-9) that m before y, i, and v becomes a nasal counterpart to those letters respectively: whence the present rule is pronounced unapproved. For the bearings of the discordant doctrine, see note to v.30.

The examples are tvan yaññeshv idyah (i.1.141; 2.31-2; O. omits idyah) and tañ v ā etan yañjañdayah (v.6.93; O. omits the last word): the ordinary and approved reading would be tvam, tam, and etam—as all the MSS. in fact read, neglecting the illustration of the opinion set forth in the rule. A counter-example is given, yam kāmayeta (i.6.104 et al.).

4. But not the m of sam and sām, when followed by rā.

This is a precept applying only to the two words samrāj and sāmrājya, and in the other Prātiṣekhayas (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.36) these words or the root rāj are particularly specified; since, however, the syllable rā does not chance to occur in the Taativṛtya Sanhitā except in these words after sam or sām, there is no inaccuracy in the more general statement as here made. The examples of the occurrence of the words in question selected by the commentator as illustrations are pra samrājam (i.6.128) and sāmrājyaya sukratuḥ (i.8.161; O. omits sukratuḥ). As counter-examples, we have cañ rājannah oshadhīhyah (iii.2.31) to show that no other words

3. yakārapuro 'vakāraparo v ā makāro lupyata ity ekeshāḥ matam: ya eva 'ya paricamādhyādeśavarnāpattīm pratisvēdha- yanti' teshām evā 'aśa lopavidhār iti tān anuvadīcārī cakṛāraḥ sīhīva-lokānena'. yathā: tvam.....: tam.....: evampara iti kim: yaṁ.....: yakāraḥ ca vakṛaḥ ca yavakṛdrā: tāṁ parādu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

'etat svātram anishṭam.'

4. 're 'ty evamparaḥ 'saṁsām ity eyayor grahanayoḥ makāro na lupyate. yathā: pra......: sāmr...... sam sām iti kim: gañ......: rāpara iti kim: saṁrādayah, padāntaṣ ca vy- ahjanaparāh prākṛta (xiv.28) iti vakhyaṁdham śvātni-ishedham itiṣpado' nivārayati: tasmād atra dvitivasiddhiḥ.

(0) the MSS., as usual in such a case, rā ity. (0) G. M. put at beginning; O. om. grahanayor. (i) in G. M. only. (ii) G. M. om. (iii) G. M. -ya. (iv) G. M. tā. (v) G. M. add uṣadham saṁ sām ity eyayor eva 'ti samarīkhyati.
retain an unchanged m before rd, and saññaróṇah (i.4.44) to show that only rd, not ra, effects the retention.

According to W. B. O., the particle iti in the rule is intended to deny the application to the word here had in view of rule xiv.28, respecting duplication, and to assure the duplication of the m before the r. But G. M. insert tu, 'but,' in the rule after iti, ascribing to it the effect just defined, and making the iti simply signify that the words mentioned, and no others, are the subjects of the rule. And G. (not M.) writes the examples accordingly, saṁmṛdjayā and saṁmṛdjayāya. That this bit of constructive interpretation is a pure figment of the commentators does not need to be pointed out; respecting its occasion and bearing, see the note to xiv.28. I have adopted the reading of W. etc., which is presumably the older and more genuine: in the comment on xiv.28, even G. M. agree with the others in making iti the bond of connection between the two rules.

श्रय वर्णानाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. Now of individual sounds.

According to the comment on rule xxiv.2 (see the note to that rule), we have here one of the main division lines of the treatise. Thus far, from the beginning of the fifth chapter, we have had to do chiefly with the combination of separate words or padas into connected text; now we turn to the determination of individual letters, which are read alike in both forms of text. That the intention of the treatise-makers recognized so grand a transition here may be doubted; but that the change is one of some importance is not questionable.

ककार्कारसपूर्वी नकारो एकारश समान्यदे ॥ ६ ॥

6. Within the same word, a n preceded by r, ṛ, r, or sh, becomes n.

5. athi’ya am adhikāraḥ: varṇāṁ saṁhītā vākṣhyata’ ity etad adhyāta vedi vāyam: "athu vā," athu sabdah saṁhītā mahādhyānaḥ.

O. ucyata. 3 B. sabdah. 4 B. duṣyāṁ nāh.


O. has a lacuna, beginning with -napade at the end of the rule, and ending with tribidden r in the first example. 1 G. M. rākṣarae. 2 G. M. saṁhīta. 3 B. G. M. duṣyā. 4 O. om.
Already, in a previous chapter (vii.1-12,15,16), we have had detailed all the cases in which a n is changed to ň in the course of the combination of words into phrases, in the conversion of pada into samhitā; now, the treatise sets out to account for every single ň occurring in the whole text. And the present is the leading general rule, involving, with the extensions and restrictions imposed later, by far the greater number of cases.

The commentator's examples are tridhīr rnavād jāyate (vi.8.104: O. has a lacuna, involving the beginning of this citation), tvan hotṣunām (iv.3.134), esha vā reco varnāh (vi.1.31: but W. has instead esha vā ahu varnāh, vi.1.31-2), and kṛṣṇo 'si (i.11.11); his counter-examples are devānaṁ vā antaṁ jagauhām (vii.5.81: but G. M. have only devānam, which of course is found in various places; and O. omits altogether), where none of the lingual letters specified comes before a ň, and ebhīr no arkāā (iv.4.47: O. omits arkāā), where the r is in another word than the ň. All these are cases in which the alterant letter immediately precedes the altered.

7. Even though other sounds are interposed.

Rule 15, below, puts a restriction upon this, pointing out what letters may not intervene between the affecting and the affected letter. The examples are aparagoparvānām dāhati (v.i.10}: W. B. omit dāhati; O. inserts ha between the other two words), dāmann evā ramaṇāṁ kurute (vi.5.114: only O. has the first two words, and it omits the last), adhiśhavānam (i.1.52: but G. M. O. have adhiśhavane, iv.7.8 or vi.2.114), and kṛshmanāṁ pratishtthākāmā (ii.3.33).

8. Also in hiraṇmayam.

The only passage in which the word occurs is quoted by the commentator: hiraṇmayam dāma dakhīnd (ii.4.13: O. omits dakhīnd). The intent of the rule is to establish in advance a counter exception to the exception "not when followed by a mute," made in rule 15, below.

7. utkanimittapārvo nakāro 'nyena 1 'vyaveto 'pi 'vyavahito 'pi natvam āpnoti. yathā: ap..... dāmann..... adhi..... kṛsh.....

1 G. M. ins. varṇena. 3 W. O. om. 4 G. M. om. 4 in O. only.

8. hiraṇmayam ity asmin grahaṇe nakāro 'natvam āpnoti. yathā: hiraṇ..... spārṣapara (xiii.15) iti' vakyadhāna-pratishedhāya pratisprasavāditham idaṁ śītām.

3 G. M. nakāram āpadyate. 4 in B. only. 3 O. om. 4 O.-parpa pr-. 
9. Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of pāṇi, gana, punya, kaṇva, kāṇa, gāṇa, bāṇa, venu, guna, and mani, the first nasal is ṇ.

The word pravāda is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its commentary. From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to Regnier (note to Rik Pr. ii.39), it bears in the Rik Prātiṣākhya. The latter makes it mean 'theme'; in our commentary, on the other hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix; and I have translated it accordingly. So far as I can see, however, the same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik Pr. also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision.

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any intimation of it in the terms of the precept itself; it is only at the end of rule 14, below, that we find the word prakṛtyā, which we must understand as applying to rules 9–14—a kind of footing instead of heading (adhikāra): see another like case in the third chapter, rules 2–7 (note on iii.2). In this connected paragraph of rules we have an enumeration of the words in which a n is "original," and hence found equally in all the forms of the text.

The examples are supāṇiḥ svahūriḥ (iii.1.114; iv.1.69; O., in this and the two following examples, has only the first word), vṛṣhpalayo ‘punāḥ (iv.8.68), and hiranyapānīṁ utaye (i.4.25: ii.2.12): the text contains half a dozen other examples of the pravādas of pāṇi,—gāṇānāṁ tu gānapatiḥ āryāh (ii.3.14: O. omits the last word), gand me mā vi śrāvan (iii.1.82), ganena ganaṁ (v.4.17), and dūresātanā ca gaṇāḥ (iv.8.56): the cases,

9. pāṇi 'tyādipadānām pravādesu pūrvah prathamo nakāraḥ prakṛtyā 'va veditavyah. prakārṣena vādah pravādah: līṅga-vibhaktibhedasamāsātaddhitādhibhir nirdeśaṁ ity arthah. yathā: sup.... vṛṣhpa.... hiran.... gāṇānām.... gāṇa.... ganaṇa.... dāre.... punyo.... sā.... kaṇva.... tasyadi.... akarnayā.... gāṇap.... vipalayo.... venur.... venunā.... yad.... yathā.... maṇinā.... naṇu gaṇapadā pravādatvād gānagrahaṇam ayuktam: "māi 'vam." gānapravādatve sati tud bhavet: kiṁtu gānapatiśubhād pravādo 'yaṁ. pūrva iti kīṁ: gaṇ.... ven.... maṇ....' ityādijāta 'ttarasya' natvam mā bhūd iti.

1 G. M. अदिनाम gānagraha. 2 W. -dah. 3 W. -vaddah; G. M. om. bheda. 4 W. nirādiḥṣa. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. om. 7 W. viṣom. 8 G. M. O. -nākdrasya.
compounds, and derivatives of *gāna* are found by dozens in the Sanhitā;—*punyo bhavati vasantam* (i.6.114: O. omits the last word) and *ād mā sarvāṇ punyaṇ* (vii.1.71: *punya* occurs in five other passages, once (iii.3.85) in composition;—*kanyā abhi pra gāyata* (iv.3.137: O. ends with *abhi*): there are two other cases of declensional forms;—*tasāyā kānō yā dātāḥ* (ii.5.17: O. alone has the last word, and it omits the first; G. M. end with *kāṇāḥ*) and *akarnāyā kānāyā chōnāyā* (vi.1.67: only W. has the last word): there is no other case;—*gānapatyān mayobydhār e 'hi* (iv.1.22: O. has only the first word; only G. M. have the last two): I have noted but one other case;—*vipātyo bānavaṇ uta* (iv.5.14: O. omits the first word): we have a declensional case of *bāna* at iv.6.48;— *venur vānavi bhavati* (v.1.14: O. omits the last word), *venunā vi nimite* (v.2.52), and *yad venoh mushiram* (v.1.14): there are a couple more of cases;—*yathā gune gunam* (vii.2.42): we have elsewhere only *dvīnūṇa, at v.2.52.3*;—and *maninā rāpāṇi* (vii.3.14): elsewhere only *maninā, at v.6.13. To explain the limitation *pārvak, 'the first nasal,' in the rule, the commentator quotes parts of passages already given—namely *gāṇāndān tuv, venunā vi, and maninā rāpāṇi* (but O. omits the second example, and the second word of the third)—in which the *pravādas* exhibit a second nasal which is dental. He raises the objection, moreover, that the mention of *gāṇa* in the rule is unnecessary, since the word is a *pravāda* of *gāna*; but replies that the word (*gānapatyā*) aimed at is a *pravāda* of *gānapati*, not of *gāna*. It is true, now, that *gānapatyāt* stands one degree farther removed from *gāna* than does, for instance, *gānapatibhyah*, or than would *gānikāh* if it occurred in the text; yet we should hardly have expected it on that account to receive a different treatment.

10. Also in *pañi, pañim, viyamānah*, and *ānyoh*.

The passages are *agnē deva pañibhir viyamānah* (i.1.132: only G. M. have the last word), *pañīṁ gosha stardmahe* (ii.6.112: O. omits the last word), *vīyamānah: tāṁ ta etān* (i.1.132: O. has only the first word; G. M. read *-nas tam etc., neglecting the pause of division between the two words), and *ānyoh kaviṛatam* (i.2. 61). These words are said to be made a separate rule of *pravādas* or derived forms.

11. Also before a lingual mute.

---

10. *pañi 'tyādigrahamesha' nakārah prakṛtyāi 'ra veditavyah. apravādīrtho 'yam ārambhā. agne...... pañīṁ...... viy...... ānyoh......*  
1 O. prefixes the whole series of words.  
2 O. -ddēhu; G. M. -ddēhu gr.
The examples are ṣītikaṇṭhāya ca (iv.5.5); but G. M. have instead ṣītikaṇṭhāya svāhā, which I do not find in the text, not even at vii.3.17, where a number of similar expressions are read) and kandaṭe pāmanambhāvukā (vi.1.8; O. has the first word only). The combinations nṛ and nāh do not occur in the Sānhitā.

12. Also in caṅkūna, phanat, sthāṇā, hinuyāt, hinoti, kā nye yah, anisṭhthāḥ, ubānaṃ, uganā wherever found, cupunikā, bāṇjāḍya, anavac ca, āṛḍaḥ, sthāṇum, tānave, vināyām, aclo- nāya, pāneta, vānīḥ, kalyāṇi, kuṇapam, vānāḥ cāta, conā wherever found, dhanīka, and m etc.

The passages aimed at are quoted by the commentator as follows: avabhṛtha nicaṅkūna nīceruh (i.4.45); all but O. omit nīceruh, which would allow the passage to be found also at vii.6.3; O. omits avabhṛtha: nicaṅkūna occurs a second time in i.4.45; anvāparipānanat (i.7.8); aṭtāṭhāṇā vāditā (i.8.12); bhrātvāya prā hinuyāt (ii.2.6; O. begins with pra); eva 'emī prā hinoti (ii.2.6); rajano vii kānve yah (iii.3.8); ye 'nīshthās tān (ii.5.5); yajña ubanain kriyate (iii.4.3), and also, by i.53, anubā- nam (at iii.4.3); dhvādhir niganī uta (iv.1.10; the example is wanting in W.) and uganābhīs trāhitihāy (iv.5.4; O. omits the last word); varṣayanti cupunikā nāma 'śi (iv.4.5; only W. has the first word, and it omits the last); mantriṇe bāṇjāḍya kakshāṇāṃ potaye (iv.5.24; B. G. M. omit the first word, G.

11. 'tavagare pare' nakāraḥ prakṛtyāi 'va veditayaḥ, sītī..... kānḍ..... 'tavagah paro yasmat sa tathoktaḥ,

12. caṅkūna..... eshu nakāraḥ prakṛtyāi 'va veditayoḥ, avabh.... anv.... aya.... bhrāt.... eva.... rajano.... ye.... yajña.... yatruyatra prutīr uganāgra- nasya tatratatra naTRAN karanīyam: "āvyā....." ugang.... varsh.... mantriṇe..... priy..... ce 'ti kim: anavas.... etān..... yā..... acloṇāyā..... pānē..... indrami..... kalyāṇi..... purushak..... vānāḥ..... gate 'ti kim: "ṛtāv....." conā..... 'prutīr iti kim: conāya....." nī..... vānas..... nakāreṇa kim: ubhāy.....

1 G. M. O. put before yatrag. 2) W. om. 3) O. om. 4) O. om.
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M. the last, W. O. the last two); priyamgavaç ca me 'navaç ca me (iv.7.4² : G. M. omit the first word, O. the first three), with a counter-example, anuvr us te ratham (i.8.12⁸), to prove the need of ca in the citation; etain va pa sādāraḥ (v.6.5⁸); yā stānaḥ hanti (vii.3.1¹) : we have yojañathānu twice at vi.1.2⁴ ; yā tānave yā vināyām (vi.1.4¹); așclonayā 'sopṭaśapathyā krīṇāti (vi.1.6⁷: only O. has krīṇāti); pāneta 'goarham (vi.1.10¹); īndrām vānir anāśata (i.6.12⁸); kuleñā rūpasunyādāḥ sū syāt (vii.1.6⁶: only O. has the last two words); kuleñā occurs in one or two other passages: puruśakūnāpam aśvakaṇuṇāpam gāduḥ (vii.2.10²: only O. has gāduḥ); we have kūnāpam as independent word at vii.2.10²; vānāḥ cātatantar bhavati (vii.5.9²), with a counter-example, to show the necessity of adding pata in the rule, rtaśvānas aya-manāḥ ṛṇāni (ii.1.11⁵: only G. M. have ṛṇāni; O. omits the example; vānāḥ is a pada in the word as divided, rta-vānāḥ); ānā ṅriśrāṇaḥ uṣāhāsa (vii.4.2⁰: W. B. end with ṅriśrāṇaḥ and ṅriśaṣa svādhā (vii.3.1⁸: O. omits the example, along with the specification of the point it illustrates), the only examples of ānā that the text contains; ni jalguṭitā ḍhānīkā (vii.4.1⁹⁴); and vānaspathām eni (v.5.1⁵: O. reads enya), with a counter-example, to show that the word only occurs after m, ubhaṇyata eni syāt tad āhū (vii.1.6⁵: G. M. O. end with syāt).

13. As final of the former member of a compound, n is found in vṛṣṇaḥ, cīrṣnaḥ, brahmaṇ, akṣaṇa, carmaṇ, and carṣaṇa.

The term avagraha, we are told, is here taken in the sense of avagrahaṇa. The same interpretation has been given before (under vi.9); and the whole use of avagraha in the treatise verges toward an equivalence with its derivative. Only T. O. change the ṣ of cīrṣnaḥ to cḥ after n; but, as this is in accordance with the teaching of the Prātiṣṭhikṣa (v.3⁴), I have adopted it.

The examples quoted by the commentator are vātō apādī vṛṣhaṇ-vān (ii.1.1¹¹: O. omits vātō), cīrṣhaṇ-vān medhīyo bhavati (vii.5.2⁵¹), brahmaṇvanto devā decency (vi.4.1⁰¹: W. B. omit decency, akṣhanvate svādhā (vii.5.1²), and carmaṇvate svādhā (vii.5.1²⁸): we have vṛṣhaṇ- also at ii.5.⁸⁴°: iv.1.²¹: vii.5.⁵¹; cīrṣnaḥ- at vii.5.¹²¹; and brahmaṇ- at v.7.³ and vi.4.1⁰¹ (a second time). As counter-examples, to show that the n occurs in these words only before a

13. vṛṣhaṇaṁ ityādīgraṇaṇevu' avagrahavo nakaraḥ prakṛtyai' eva vediṇavyāḥ vātō : cîrvr̥ṣhaḥ: brahmaḥ: akṣhaṁ: 'carm-': 'cārṣhaṇgrahaṇasya' sākhāntare 'vijnayam uddhaṇaṁ: mitrasya: iti kecid uddhārunti'°: tān na sadhu: ato 'lōpād (xiii.5) iti vakṣhyamūnapratishedhapatparaprasavārtham uktaudvē sādāḥ grahaṇānāṁ carṣhaṇīdīṛta ity atra' nakṛṇasya paddātātābhāvāt: athāva: 'ṛkār kār kār aśā' (xiii.⁶)
pause of division, he gives (the whole subject is omitted in O.)
vṛṣṇaṁ agne viṣṇuṁ aryā d (iv.4.48), tamāt saptācīrthaṁ (v.1.
71), brahmaṁ viṣṇuṁ vi (ii.3.3*: G. M. omit vi), ākṣhaṁ amini-
danta (i.8.5*), and paṣaṇāṁ carmaṁ (vi.1.9*).

This disposes of all the avagrahas cited in the rule save carṣhaṁ.
No such pada as carṣhaṁ is to be found in the Taṭṭṭīrya-Sanhitā,
nor, so far as has yet come to light, in any other Vedic text; nor
does the word seem like one that could anywhere occur. One can-
not help surmising that its presence in the rule may be a blunder
merely, it being, perhaps, an unintelligent repetition of carmaṁ.
But, by whatever hap or mishap it found its way in, it is now an
accepted part of the text, and has to be dealt with. And the com-
mentator first creeps out of the difficulty through the hole to which
he usually betakes himself in a like case, asserting that the passage
aimed at is read in another text (pākhā). He then proceeds to state
that "some quote as here referred to the passage mitrasya carshan-
idhṛtaḥ grāvah (iii.4.11* and iv.1.6*): O. omits grāvah): this is not
good, since the words are quoted in the rule by way of antecedent
exception to an exception [to rule 6] which is to be made farther
on, by the words ‘nor when final, nor by the omission of a’ (rule 15);
and in carshanidhṛtaḥ the n is not final. Or: others are of opinion
that the words in question are specified for the sake of removing
any doubt which might arise as to whether the n in them were a
product of alteration under rule 6 of this chapter; and, in this
aspect, the citation of mitrasya carshanidhṛtaḥ is to be approved."
The logic of this final conclusion I entirely fail to see: for no
question can possibly arise as to whether the n of carshanidhṛtaḥ
falls under rule 6; that it does so is palpable and undeniable.

As we should expect, considering the way in which the Prāti-
Gaṅghya treats the cases, these words are read with n in the pada-
text also: namely vṛṣhaṁ-vān, brahmaṁ-vantah, and so on. The
same is the case in the pada-texts of the Rik and the Atharvan
(see Ath. Pr. iv.99).

14. Also in ṛṇ, śanī, śhr, mṛ, and rāvṇ—these are original.

The application of the term prākritāḥ, ‘original,’ in this rule is, as
was pointed out above (under rule 9), to all the cases rehearsed in
rules 9–14.

1 W. -. 2 G. M. . 3 G. M. didu gr. 4 O. om. 5 B. om. 6 W. -shan-. 8 G. M. om. 2 W. -vana-. 7 G. M. om. 3 G. M. rākrd. 9 B. amara-. 10 O. om. 11 W. . 12 G. M. put next before lakṣhyate.
The commentary, after pronouncing the citations of the rule "parts of words, intended to include a number of cases," quotes examples, as follows: svayamāṛṣṇāṁ upa (v.2.8; 3.21.74; 5.4.3; O. omits upa), asaṁtriṇe hi kau (v.2.11; O. omits kau), and svayamāṛṣṇaḥ jyotih (v.7.82): I have noted ṛṇi elsewhere only in andehṛṇam (v.1.74); abhishāṇno gauṁ (i.4.23), nishāṇṇya svadhā (vii.1.19: only G. M. have this example), and daṣaṁsad nishāṇṇā āsan (vii.5.1.21: O. omits the first word); pūṣno raṁyādī (i.3.102), pūṣnā saṣaṁ saha (iv.1.2 and v.1.24: only G. M. have saha), and pūṣne ṁprasāṛṇya svadhā (vii.3.15: G. M. O. omit svadhā): I have noted further only pūṣnā (i.8.92 et al.); aryamne caruṁ niṟ vapeṭ (ii.3.4.1 twice, 2: G. M. O. stop at caruṁ): I find besides sutrāṁne (i.8.92 et al.) and nṛṣṇī (i.7.13.2), which last, however, the rule was not specially intended for; finally, daṣaṁkāno akṛṣṇam (i.5.114 and vii.4.194: O. omits akṛṣṇam) and ā grāvnaḥ (vi.3.23: O. omits this example): further cases of daṣaṁkān and grāvan are met with in the text showing the combination νη; I have noted no other words in which it occurs. Counter-examples, showing that νη follows ṛṇ only, have been easy to furnish: thus, rāyasposhadāne, at i.2.101.

Cases of quite various and discordant nature are here thrown together. Most unequivocally calling for treatment in the Prātiṣṭhān in order to determine their reading, are the three passages in which saṁnu is altered to shanna after abhi and ni, since (as quoted by the commentator below) the pada-text restores the original form of the word, reading abhishāṇaṁ ity abhi-sannāḥ etc. Its s is converted to sh according to vi.2, but there is no authority excepting here for the change of nn to νη; chapter viii. does not deal with this, because it takes up only those cases in which the alterant cause and the altered nasal are found in different padaus; and rule 6 of the present chapter does not apply to it because its first n is protected (according to xiii.15) by being "followed by a mute," and its second n by "having a lingua mute interposed." The case of tṛṣṇa is akin with this, only with the important difference that the alteration of its nasals lies beyond the ken of the Prātiṣṭhās, the νη being read in every text. The remaining three all fall under rule 6 of this chapter, but they require specification because they are also covered by one of the exceptions in rule 16; for they exhibit, as compared with their

14. atraś uvre padāikadeśa etc bahūpaddānārtham uktāḥ: rṇādiśhu eshu ca nakārāḥ prakṛṭā eva viśṇeydhi. svay-.....: asaṁ-.....: svay-.....: abhish-.....: 'nīsh-.....: daṣa-.....: pūṣno-.....: pūṣna-.....: pūṣne-.....: aryamne-.....: daḍha-.....: d.....: prakṛtavabdo 'yam pūnyādiśhu eva carṣhamparīyanteśu mukhyāḥ: caataraṇau saṁhitāv na viṣṇadāvāvāt: tṛṣṇe 'ty ādiṣhu tū' na mukhyāḥ: kātu prāṭyaḥbhāve 'nu' nātvaprāṇārthah. tathā hi: rṇādānu pūrvanakāraśya sparcṣaparavān nishedhāḥ:
themes (aryaman, kravan, gravan), a "loss of a" (alopa): compare what is said of this alopā below.

As regards the application of the term prākṛta, 'original,' their discordance is more essential, and, indeed, irreconcilable. In ṛṇa, to be sure, the cerebral n's are as original as in the words specified by rule 13, since, in all alike, the alteration is an accomplished fact in all the forms of text, although ultimately referable to the cause laid down in rule 6. But the last three cases, although also read alike in all texts, are introduced here as counter-exceptı̂ons to rule 15, and their n is no more original than is that of any other of the words falling under rule 6. And finally, there is no sense whatever in the lingual nasals of shanyana are "original." To call them all original, then, seems even more than a looseness or inaccuracy in the use of that term: it is a blunder.

The commentator perceives the difficulty, and attempts to remove it by a lengthy passage of special pleading. The term prākṛta, he says, is mukhya, 'of primary value' or 'of full force,' as applied to the words beginning with pūni (rule 9) and ending with caraśana (rule 13), since in them the lingualized nasal is found in all the four samhitās; but in ṛṇu and the rest it is not mukhya, but is simply intended to authorize the nasalization even in the absence of a rule prescribing it. Thus, namely: in ṛṇu etc. (i.e. in ṛṇu and shanyana), the first nasal constitutes an exception (under rule 6) as being followed by a mute (rule 15); the other nasal, as having a t-mute between it and the altering cause (rule 15). In shn and mn, again [why not in ṛṇu?], the nasal falls under the exception touching the loss of a (rule 15). And if it be objected that the nasalization is assured by the competency of the citation—still [it is answered], the implication is avoided that the occasion of the citation is the originality of the n [?]. Moreover, the word cu, 'also,' in the rule, being used in the sense of subsidiary adjunction (anuḍayya), shows the nasalization to be not of primary value; if it were primary, it would be found in all the four kinds of text; but it is not so found; for we read in pada-text abhisanya ity abhi-sannāh and nishanantye iti ni-sannāya. And since, from the words pūshn and aryaman, which end in n, such forms as pūshno raṅhyai and aryamne carum are read in the varṇa-text, therefore the conversion into n (all but O. say "non-conversion into n") in

"Itarasya 'tamasya' tavargiyayavahitatvāt:" sāṃmagnagrahanañyos tv alopā diti nishedhaḥ. grahanasaṁarthyaḥ eva" nātvam sidhyati iti cet: evam svabhāvatvam eva grahanasyāḥ ptisva mālam iti parihiṛaḥ. kim ca: anuḍayaḥ vartumānascakro 'py eteṣhaḥ nātvam amukhyaṃ" iti dyotayati: mukhyaṃ" cet: caturṣha saṁhitādu vidyeta": na ca 'tra vidyate: tathā hi: abhisanyāḥ ity abhi-sannāḥ: nishanantye iti ni-sannāya: ity atra" padaśaṁhitāyām: pūshnāryamnāditi nakārāntakabadda- yoḥ: pūṣhno raṅhyai: aryamne carum: ity ādi sidhārā- patudā" atra varṇasaṁhitāyād etatvāhacaryād ekasūtraḥṣṭhaḥyornāi"
varna-text is to be inferred also for rnu and shann (O. says rānu) in virtue of association with the others, they being found in the same rule with them; for all who understand the rules of affairs hold that the determination of equivocal classes is made by mention in connection with words unequivocal. Therefore the meaning of prakṛta (all but O. say prakṛti) as defined by us is alone acceptable.

By comparison with the explanations given above, it may readily be seen how much of reason there is in all this talk. The commentator raises an obscuring dust about the difficulty, but does not at all remove it. The mukhyatvam of the term prakṛta as here applied is more easily disproved than its mūrkhatvam.

15. But not in shumna, agni, and yushmānita; nor when final; nor after the omission of an a; nor when followed by a mute; nor when c, s, or a palatal, lingual, or labial mute intervenes.

It would be rather more in accordance with the ordinary usage of the treatise to make five distinct rules of the five independent and unconnected specifications which are here crowded together into a single precept: in fact, we should be guilty of no great violence if we were to divide it into five, affixing to each its own (independently constructed, as if for an independent rule) portion of the comment. But in that case, at any rate, the first rule should read na shumno'gniyuṣhmānitāḥ (not 'gnir). It is not objectionable as it stands, since we should expect the first and third complete padas to be quoted as they stand in the text, and the second, which is only a fragment of a pada, to be distinguished as such from a possible agnih. As to the first, moreover, there is a difference of reading among the MSS. of the text: only T. W. have shumno; B. O. have simno; G. M. have sushumno; and, as is seen below, even W. has sumnna in the reiteration of the rule by the comment. G. M., it may be added, read uṇavdyīṣu for -yeshu in the last specification.

apyo ṛṇaśaunmayor vṛṇasaṁhitāyāṁ nātvabhāvo manta-vyāḥ: prasiddhapadasaṁmahīnivāhārenā! prasiddhapadārthasaṁarthanam arthaśāstra vādād arthaśāstrasamartanam sarve khalu svākhyate. tasmād asmaduktu eva yuktā prakṛtaśabdarthāḥ
d

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: sushumnah sûryarâçmîh (iii.4.71), indrägnihdhymân tvâ sayujâ (iv.4.51; G. M. omit sayujâ; the pada-reading is doubtful indrägni-bhyâm, so that the r and n are samânâpade, as required by rule 6), and yushmâmîto abhayain jyotiḥ (i.1.116; only O. has jyotiḥ; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in pada-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read yushmâ-nilaha).

Examples of final n not lingualized are pitân havisha atêave (ii. 6.121) and pra mrâhiśi satrân (i.2.142).

The precept touching the omission of an a has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of vrtrahan, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely vrtraghna indráya tvâ (i.4.11; O. omits the example) and vrtraghna stômâh (iv.7.151)—for the derivative adjective vrtraghna (ii.5.2 et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental n in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prâtiçâkyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely śnu, mnu, and rdvñ), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising samânâpade, ‘within the limits of the same pada,’ while in vrtraghna etc. the affecting cause is in one pada and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, ‘a lion’s look’), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction samânâpade is not in force: ghñâh etc., namely, are altered forms of han, whose

15. shumnâḥ: agnih: yushmâ-nilāh: etesnu nakâro natvaṁ nā ’padyaṁ: susk: indrâ-... yushm-... antâ pañânto nakâro natvaṁ nā ”padyaṁ: pitā-... pra-... alopaq akâralopêt para ’pi nakâro natvaṁ nā ”padyaṁ: ’vrtra-... ’vrtra-... narv âtra nirmitanimitinor bhinnapadasthatuṇād vishamo drishtântâḥ: satyam: sînhâvalokamanadyena’ pradhmaprâśene sapamâdhyâye’ ceshodâharanarâpêna” ghaṭate: tatra ca samânâpadaniyâno” nā ’sti: ghna ity aya naçâbâvachâktauṣād” ’’rushaḥprûvo havani” (vii.11) ’ti prâiptih. ’’sparçaparo nakâraḥ ca” natvaṁ nā ”piotâ”- samâk-...: ava...:
nasal, by vii.11, is liable to lingualization. But han, by the usage of the treatise, signifies the syllable or audible complex of sounds han, not the theme han and its derivatives; and, as the text contains no example of the combination ghn, it would have been easy to exempt n from lingualization ghakrāt, 'after gh.'

The cited examples of n remaining unchanged when followed by a mute are savākrandāno 'nimishah (iv.8.4): O. has the first word only), ava rundhe tārpyam (ii.4.11b: O. omits the last word), and nakhunirbhinnam (i.8.9).

The commentator then proceeds to enter into a long discussion of more than usual subtlety and obscurity, of which I am by no means confident that I apprehend the meaning. The point aimed at, indeed, seems quite clear: by xiv.4, the n of such a word as pārṇa is to be doubled, making pārṇa; here, then, is a case where the first n is "followed by a mute" (sparcyparāh), and so would seem to have its lingual character forbidden by the present rule. The reasonable reply to so hair-splitting and impertinent an objection would appear to be that, a duplication being ordered by the treatise, the product can be nothing but mūn, since nūn would be no duplication at all. The commentator, however, prefers to get around the difficulty by limiting the word sparṣu, 'mute,' as here used, to one which is not the product of express prescription (?). For in pārṇa pācāt (iii.5.1 et al.) there is duplication, making pārṇa (not one of the MSS. writes the duplication), the one n being prescribed by xiv.4, the other being its occasion or root (mūndo). With this, O. prudently ends; the other MSS. go on to explain "express" (prasiddha) by referring to the word nakhunirbhinnam, already quoted above, as, with its like, also exhibiting an instance of occasion of prescription. This word, namely, falls under rules xiv.4,5 (becoming thereby nakhunirbhinnam); and in rule 5 the term "succeeded by a consonant" (vyuñjanottara) is used in a different sense from "followed by a consonant" (vyuñjana-para); the meaning of which will be there explained at full length (as we shall find to our cost, in one of the obscurest discussions of the entire treatise). The appositeness of the whole reference I do not understand.

Finally, examples are quoted of the suspension of nasalization by

nakha... sparṣu 'trā' prasiddhalakshanavishayo" vivakshyate": anyathā pārṇa pācād ity adāv natava na syāt: rephāt paraṁ ca (xiv.4) iti hi prasiddhānī lakshanān tamālas" pārne ity atra dvītavam. "prasiddhapadena kim": nakhunirbhinnam ity adāv api kathām cic lakshanāmātavam sam bhuvatī. kim tā lakshanam iti cet: dvātīya-caturthaya (xiv.5) ity atra nītrokta vyuñjanaottaraya (xiv.5) iti vācō yuktavataram iti brāhma: tasya lakshanam iti tārā 'va sphyāsākarishyate" mahātā prabandhena" sparṣaḥ para" yasmād usdu sparṣuparaḥ. " yuvacatavartyayeshu " vyavadhavyikesu"
an intervening r or s, or a palatal, lingual, or dental mute: namely rṣanāṃ ā datte (vi.3.8), agne rasena tejasa (i.4.42): only G. M. have tejasa, rocante rocanti divi (vii.4.20: O. omits rocante), somaṁ rājānam (i.7.101 et al.), prakṛdināh payodhā (iv.3.137), prītand jayāmi (iii.5.812), and janaprathaṇḍya svāhā (iii.2.81: only O. has svāhā; G. M. have the false reading praḥkār, and O. has dropped out a part of the word, giving jaṇadhāna).

In the note to Ath. Pr. iii.94, I have pointed out the physical reason why these sounds, by their interposition, prevent the lingualization of the nasal: they are, all of them, such as call into action for their utterance the tip of the tongue, throwing it out of adjustment for the lingual contact. The tendency which the history of Aryan utterance in India exhibits toward the conversion of dentals into linguals shows itself most actively in the case of the nasal: the tongue, being rolled back into the position of lingual articulation by the utterance of r, r, or s, hangs suspended there, as it were, and makes the next nasal contact lingual, unless the tendency is satisfied by the intermediate production of such a contact, or frustrated by the transfer elsewhither of the articulating organ.

The Prātiṣṭhākyās enumeration of the cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal is, so far as I have been able to determine, complete. No one of the other treatises undertakes such an enumeration.

16. In the opinion of Pāushkarasādi, l after a mixed vowel becomes ḍ.

The mention of Pāushkarasādi (O. has everywhere Pāuskaraśādi), the commentator says, is out of respect, and not because the rule is not a peremptory one. "Mixed vowel" is a term which is not elsewhere employed by the treatise, nor does the latter contain anything that should intimate an explanation of its meaning. The comment glosses it by the sound r̥: it appears, then, that r is thus styled, from having its vocalic quality "mixed" with consonantal, namely, with the ṛ-sound. The other Prātiṣṭhākya (see

satu nakāro nātvam nā "padyate: yathā": rṣanāṁ....
agnē....: rocante....: somaṁ....: prakṛti....: prītand
.....: jana.....: rkarakār (xiii.5) "diprāpate" pratisheitoṭh
yān vihitāḥ.

not to Ath. Pr. i.37) directly define it as so composed. The l liable to the change into d is called in the comment duholidha, ‘ill joined,’ i.e., I presume, ‘of difficult articulation’ (G. M., to be sure, seem to apply this title the first time to the d instead of l, and only O. attaches it the second time clearly to the l, the others readings being corrupt; yet there can hardly arise a doubt as to its true connection); it is, of course, the lingual l which forms an acknowledged part of the alphabet of the Rig-Veda (Rik Pr. i.11–2, r. 52 etc.). But no such articulation belongs to the alphabet accepted by this treatise—although, on the strength of the present rule alone, it is crowded into that alphabet by the commentator under rule i.1. Nor does the edition of the Sanhitā, nor do the MSS., so far as known to me, make any use of a lingual l. As for the MSS. of the Prātiṣākhya and its comment on this rule, B. O. write the ordinary l throughout; W. alternates irregularly between the two; G. M. and T. have the lingual letter only. As regards the binding force of the rule, the commentator is right so far as this—that a d, not l, is read of necessity in the words to which it relates; but that this is, to the makers of the Prātiṣākhya, the result of alteration of an original l there is no reason to believe; the euphonic exchange of the two letters is not less strange to the Tāṭṭīriya text than to the Vājasaneyi (of the Mādhyandīna pākhā: see Vāj. Pr. iv.143, viii.45) and Atharvan; and the rule is really pājārtham only, and an intrusion into our treatise of something foreign to its system.

The commentator first gives his own explanation and illustration of the precept. As example of the operation of the rule, he cites 

mrddati’drṣe (i.1.14); and, as counter-example, to show that the change is made only after a “mixed vowel,” he has nothing better to offer than an alleged passage “from another text,” nam plavam. For, in such words as iditah (i.1.111), pravodham (i.1.14), irdyāh (i.2.51), ayād (i.4.452), hedah (i.5.112), prūṇah (i.6.11), where the Rig-Veda reads regularly the lingual l and its aspirate, the Tāṭṭīriya-Sanhitā maintains the d, not less firmly than after r. This, the commentator goes on to say, is an interpretation (but the term he uses is pātha, properly ‘reading’ or ‘ver-

16. prktavardād rkarat’ paro’ lakāro duholidhastāmānīkā’ dūkāram āpadyate: paushkarasāder mate. mrddati... prktavardād iti kim: nam plavam iti pakhāntore. paushkarasāder grahanam pājārtham na tu vikalpārtham. mūrdhasthānatoyā duholidhādokāryaḥ sādrgyam uasti ’ti vyākarāṇāyanīriṃ saṭrapāḥo ’yam: katham anusāritam iti cet: “tathā hi”: sthāne ’ntaratumāḥ: sthāne prāpyaniyātām “antaratama” ādeśo bhavati ’ti.

saṭrapāyāḥ pāthāntaram api vyākhyāyate: prktavardāt paro lo gam’ paushkarasādeḥ: ’atra samānapaṇḍa ity asya ’ntaratanām vijñeyam: paushkarasādeḥ pākhinaḥ ’’ samānapade prktu-
sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the *duḥplīṣṭha* l and of the d, as being both produced in the lingual position: and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pāṇini (i.1.50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken. I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever.

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed. It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii.6) *samānapadā*, 4 within the limits of a single *pada*; 5 taking, then, a different example, *te no nṛdayantu* (iv.4.32 et al.), with the counter-example *iḍāndam bhavati* (vii.5.9)—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Šanhitā of *iḍā, iḍāvant*, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction *samānapadā*, the phrase *pitṛloka somena* (ii.6.21; p. *pitṛ-loka*), where the l does not become d after r. But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty; namely, that in the compound *pitṛlokapādamsya* (vi.6.41; p. *pitṛloka-kāmasya*) the r and l do meet *samānapadā*, and yet the l maintains itself: over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of *pitṛloka*, it is extended by association to the further compound.

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prātiṣṭhākhya a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough; and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure.

svarād ṭkārād*  paro lakāro ṭakāram āpudyate. yathā*: te...... prktasvarād iti kim: itiāṃ--; *samānapadā iti kim: *pitṛ-..... suḥcitrītvād* ekasya* nishiddha* itarasya *pi pitṛloka-kāmasya*" "ty aṣṭa *pi*  *samānapadote soti api nishedha bhavati. iti āpi pāthāntaram bahovādātām.

1 W. B. om. 2 B. om.; G. M. ṣūdam. 3 all but B. ṛuḍ; B. ṛ̣ụko; O. ṛ̣o; G. M. ṛ̣ākān. 4 O. everywhere phāko. 5 W. -tena; B. -ten. 6 B. -vad. 7 B. iti ṭi. 8 G. M. O. -ti. 9 W. om. 10 all but B. ṛuḍ; W. B. -ṛuḍātāk; O. -akārātāk; G. M. ṛuḍākār. 11 O. sāḍṛṣṣaṃsya ṭakāram. 12 W. -sūt; G. M. -sūra. 13 G. M. wṣya. 14 G. M. ins. varṣāṇī. 15 G. M. O. -rān suṣṭram. 16 W. aṣṭa; O. sūtra. 17 B. iti. 18 B. ins. iti. 19 O. -sāḍa ity; G. M. ity only. 20 G. M. āṣya, and om. ity aṣṭa. 21 G. M. ins. phāke. 22 W. om. 23 G. M. O. -vaiśeṣ. 24 G. M. -min. 25 B. nishedha. 26 W. B. -kāṣe; G. M. -kāmasye. 27 G. M. O. om. apī. 28 G. M. O. dviṭye praṣṇe prathamo.
CHAPTER XIV.

CONTENTS: 1–7, duplication of one of the members of a group of consonants; 8, duplication of $ch$, $kh$, and $bh$, in certain cases; 9–11, insertion between a surd spirant and mute; 12–13, aspiration of a surd mute before a spirant; 14–28, exceptions to the rules for duplication, and discordant views of certain authorities respecting them; 29–33, occurrence of the enclitic circumflex.
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1. A consonant preceded by a vowel is doubled, if followed by a consonant.

The intricate and obscure subject of duplication in consonant-groups is treated at more length in this than in the other Prātiṣṭhāṇyaks (compare R. Pr. vi. 1–3; V. Pr. iv. 97–114; A. Pr. iii. 28–32; also Pāṇini viii. 4.46–52), but chiefly on account of the liberal citation here made of the discordant views of various teachers respecting it. The doctrines of the treatise itself are mainly in accordance with those of the rest. This first and leading principle, that the first consonant of a group is doubled, is stated in equivalent terms by all. The principal restrictions to its application are, as stated below, that $r$, $h$, $x$, $ φ$ (rule 15), and a letter doubled, or a mute followed by another of the same series (rule 23), are exempted from duplication. For the details, see the following rules.

Of course, in applying the rules for duplication, we have to assume the form of the consonant-groups as determined by the other precepts of the Prātiṣṭhāṇya—treating visarjaniya, for example, as is prescribed in the ninth chapter, and making the insertions pointed out in the fifth (v. 32, 33 etc.). And further, to finish the matter, the rules for $yama$, $nāsikya$, and svarabhakti (xxi. 12–16) must be duly taken into account.

In an additional note to the Atharva Prātiṣṭhāṇya, I gave a complete list of the consonant-groups of the Atharva-Sanhitā, with the forms which they come finally to assume under the laws of combination. It has been necessary to prepare a similar one for the Taṇṭirīya-Sanhitā, in testing the reach and bearing of the rules of the present treatise: but the scheme is hardly worth giving in full.

1. svarapūravān vyañjanām vyañjanaparamā dvicarnam ēpadyate. yathā: uru..... evampūrva iti kim: tat...... evampura iti kim: uru..... vyañjanam iti kim: pra..... suvarā pūrvo yasmāt 1 tat svarapūravam: vyañjanam asmit param iti vyañjanaparam: dvāyor varnayoḥ samāhīro dvicarnam. 6

1 G. M. put next before dvicarnam. 6 O. param. 6 G. M. om. 4 W. ins. add. 6 R. om. 6 G. adda svarapūravān iti kim: pra jana nanām: padbhīyān..... vyañjanaparam iti kim: ugaṇḍ uta: vyañjanā iti kim: praṣgaṃ.
The commentator offers a single example, *uru prathasva*, i.e. *uru prathasva* (i.1.8 et al.: the MSS. of the comment only very rarely and irregularly write the groups in their duplicated form, so as to illustrate the rules of the chapter), and adds counter-examples: first, to show that the consonant is liable to duplication only after a vowel, *tatt pravite* (vi.4.7: hardly a well-chosen example, since, though the *p* of *pra* is this time unchanged, the *t* before it must be doubled, *tatt pr*.; *a pra* after a pause would have answered better); second, that the duplication takes place only before a consonant, *uru křrd uru nāh* (ii.6.11:): third, that only a consonant, not a vowel, in the defined position, is duplicated, *pratgam uktahau* (iv.4.2). O. appends a new set of counter-examples, as if a part of a new exposition; namely *prajana†am* (i.5.91), *padbhya†in deś savane* (vi.1.8*: an ill-chosen example, containing cases of duplication as well as of its omission), and *ugand u†a* (iv.1.10:).

2. Likewise, according to Pāushkarasādi, a mute preceded by *l* or *v*.

The commentator declares that the *ca*, 'likewise,' in this rule brings down from the one preceding the being preceded by a vowel, and duplication. The former part of the defined implication is at least otiose, since *l* and *v* never occur in the Sanskrit before a mute, except as themselves preceded by a vowel: *v*, indeed, is found in combination only with the nasal *mutes, n* and *n*; *l*, in the groups *lk*, *lg*, *lp*, *lb*, *lbh*, *lm*, and *lpy*. The examples quoted are *kalpān juhoti* (v.4.8*) and *vibhādāvne* (iii.5.8*,82: all save B. actually read this time -dāvne, with doubled *n*). According to the interpretation given to the next rule, the worthy Pāushkarasādi does not regard the duplication of the mute after the semivowel as suspending the duplication of its predecessor also, by rule 1; and he would accordingly read *kallppān* and -dāvne; and this part of his doctrine is, as we shall see, declared unapproved.

Counter-examples are given: *kalyānī rāpadasamrddhā* (vii.1.6*: to be pronounced *kalyānī, or, by rule 21, kalyānī* and *vāvyavam* (i.8.7* et al.: to be made *vāvyavam*), to show that no other letter than a mute is thus doubled; and *kāṃrīn chakubhik* (v.7.23) and *tamas etat* (vi.3.11†), instancing other consonants than *l* and *v*, with the following mute not doubled: in these words, the sibilant.

2. *pāushkarasāder* mate lakaṇaphurvo *vakārapturvo va sparço
devirvam āpadyate. kalpān. . . : vibh- . . . svaparpurvalvo
dvitrān ānādīṣati cakārah. 'sparço' iti kim: kaly-
. . . vāyu- . . . evampyra iti kim: kāp-. . . tasm- . . .
lakāraḥ ca vakārāca ca lavakārānu: tāu pārdu yasmat sa tathoktaḥ.

1 O. *pauka*, as also in the rule. 2 B. G. M. ins. vi. 3 O. *devitvaṃ āpnoti.
4 G. M. put at beginning of clause. 5 O. om. 6 G. M. *sparço*para. 7 W. O.
*lakā*-ovak.
is itself doubled (except by Hārīta, rule 18), a first mute of the same series with the nasal is inserted before the latter (rule 9), and between the two mutes a yama (xxi.12); so that we have as final result the forimidable combinations ççççç and ñññññ.

The Rik Pr. (vi.2) also requires a double mute after l, and the Vāj. Pr. (iv.99) after any semivowel—which last is equivalent with our rule, since y is never followed by a mute.

We have a right to be surprised at the introduction of this and the rule next following before rule 4, since the duplication they teach is analogous to that after r, and of secondary importance to it.

3. According to some teachers, the mute only.

That is to say, in the combinations just treated of, the mute is duplicated, but not the preceding semivowel also; and we are to read kalppān and vibhāddvane.

According to the commentator, this rule represents the approved usage in the pākhā. It seems very strange to find such approved usage laid down in the Prātiṣṭhāya merely as the dictum of certain authorities. But a rule (xv.7) is given below, without any restriction, which plainly implies the validity of the present one.

4. Also a consonant that follows r.

The r itself being, by rule 15, not liable to duplication. This is the rule second in importance in the whole system, and is found in all the Prātiṣṭhāyas and in Pāṇini. The Ath. Prāt. (iii.31), the Vāj. Prāt. (iv.98), and Pāṇini (viii.4.46) ascribe the same effect to h as to r; and it is strange that our treatise, which is so liberal in its citation of discordant opinions, makes no reference to one so well supported as this. After h we find in the Sanskrit only the three nasals specified in rule xxi.14 as requiring the insertion of a nāsīkya, and the three semivowels y, r, v; r, on the other hand, forms numerous groups as first member: I have noted twenty-four of two consonants, forty-three of three consonants, and five of four consonants; a few of them are exempted from duplication by rules 16, 20–23. The cited examples (are) arcanty arkam arkinah (i.6.12):

3. ekeshā 1 mate lavakārapāva 2 sparca 3 eva dvīvarṇam 4 āpnoti: "unend 'vadhiraśena sātāntarārām Śāhenena ca pāūshkarasādimate lavakārantc ca dvītvam uṣti 'ti gūmyate". idam eva sātram ishtāna na tu pūrvam'. pārvoktānay 5 evo 'dāharaṇāni. 1 G. M. O. insa. dvirydaṇā. 2 B. -rvač ca; G. M. put after eva. 3 G. M. -rapara, as also in the rule. 4 O. dvītvam. 5 G. M. O. āpadyate. 6 O. om. 7 O. sātram
8 O. ukt.
4. repañat param' vyanjanavai' doivar nam apadyate: 'yatdha':
arc......: 'arky......: 'ary......: 'svarapuvaditvayor akarshaka ca karaha. namu vyanjanaparatvarkashaka' klim na syut:
ne 'tri brahah: niyamabhavat: tathah hi: avasande' (xiv.15)
aha' svarapara (xiv.16) ity etamishedhadvayena repañat parasya' vyañjanavya' vyanjanaparabhadvydha'svapuvratvate' 'pi
doivar asiti 'ti nicetyate': aprasaktapratishthahunnapatteh',
svarapuvratvadivadeva' klim: 'tryambakam ity adau ma' bhad iti: klim ca: "aco rahabhavam dve iti" panihitvamadre 'pi svarapuvratvate saty eva' doivar nam vihyate: "tuva' 'yam
arthah: aco utarau yau repahanaburu tadbhavam uttaraasya yuro
dve bhunata" iti. "

kecid evam auyah": svarapuvraddhavah auyaram iti
vadye' vado' yuktayantaram arthantaram samarthayati": akar
.... ity adau" vihkarapradh" uttaraasya" na syad doivar" iti,
tad etadahyayanadviruddhapaddhatim adhyate": vaya'tu va-
maintain that the analogy of svārṣaṇḍ in rule 1 would require repaḥpāṛvam, 'preceded by r,' to be employed here (instead of repaḥ param, 'following r'), and that the difference of phraseology intimates a difference of meaning—namely, that a consonant coming after a r which is the product of euphonic alteration, as in ahor devānāṁ āsit (i.5.92; only W. B. have āsit), is not doubled. But this, he replies, enters upon a path which is at variance with the reading of this pādāḥ; and he proposes himself to set forth the true ground of the different term employed. If repaḥpāṛva, namely, were used, the rule would be liable to the suspicion of meaning the direct opposite of its real intent, since repaḥpāṛvam admits of being understood as repaḥ pāṛvam, 'preceding r.' And if it be retorted that this false implication is of no account, since the case it would involve is already provided for in the first rule of the chapter, and the present rule would be a mere useless repetition, and that the avoidance of such repetition is of itself enough to refute the implication—then the further reply is made, that that is not sound doctrine, in view of the principle stated in the verse "non-contact with mud is far preferable to the washing of it off;" and the teacher uttered the rule in its form as given, with the intent that not even a particle of suspicion of wrong meaning should find occasion from it.

There is no good reason to suppose that the author of the treatise, in saying repaḥ param, intended to do anything more than use a lawful discretion in the selection of his phraseology. The ambiguity which the commentator ascribes to the other reading is suffered to pass in numberless other cases. The more desirable cleanliness of him who has incurred no need of ablation has been referred to once before (under iv.26), in a case somewhat similar.

1 G. M. ins. ca. 2 O. dṛṣṭam ēpok. 3 G. M. ins. svārṣaṇḍaṁ dvitivāyor akṣaraḥ cakriṇaṁ na tu vyaktanapraṇākṣaraḥ. 4 in G. M. only. 5 O. om. 6 G. M. cakram only. 7 G. M. sāhā na (xiv.14) ity utkaranisuddhidhikāre avāsaṁvārjanīyāṁ iṣyappadhamānīyāṁ (xiv.15). 8 W. O. paraḥ ca. 9 W. B. om. 10 W. B. -vena; O. -bhane; G. M. om. 11 G. M. -reparatve; O. om. 12 O. -vāyate; G. M. niṣcaye katham. 13 G. M. -kasya pra. 14 O. -āradaḥ. 15 G. M. om. 16 W. O. evam. 17 G. M. ins. tat katham; aco rakāḥpahnān dev. 18 G. M. asp. 19 G. M. sta. 20 G. M. add tatāḥ 'pi vyaktanapraṇākṣaraḥ dhṛtyate. 21 O. dhṛtya. 22 B. om. 23 W. om.; G. M. repaḥ param iti vāco. 24 G. M. -yath 'iś arthaṁkāraṁ 'iś doharoḥnam ucyate. 25 G. M. atrā. 26 W. om. visēkā. 27 G. M. vyaktanāya dṛṣṭam na syād. 28 O. -istā. 29 W. vṛddhiḥ iti prākāsana; G. M. om. 30 W. B. dūravā. 31 O. corrupt. 32 W. B. bhavaṁ. 33 G. M. om. 34 G. M. tātāḥ. 35 O. -mā iti cet. 36 G. pāke 'iti; B. om. vāram. 37 G. M. -yend.
5. In place, however, of second and fourth mutes, when followed by consonants, is put the preceding mute.

That is to say, when an aspirate occurs between a preceding vowel (as the commentator specifies in his paraphrase of the rule) and a following consonant, or in such circumstances that by rule 1 it would be doubled, it receives instead an increment (āgama) of the mute next preceding it in its own series, or of its corresponding non-aspirate. Examples are vikhyāya (i.e. vikkhhyāya) cañkṣhāṭ tvam (iv.1.2³: only G. M. have the last two words) and meghyā (i.e. megghyā) vidyuto vācaḥ (v.2.11¹: only G. M. have vācaḥ); to which W. B. add tat savītuḥ (i.5.6⁴ et al.; the t is converted to th by xiv.12, and to the th is then prefixed t, making tatth savītuḥ) and sādhya (i.e. sādhyā) vai devdh (vi.3.4⁹ et al.). To show that only the aspirates are thus treated, is quoted ādyam (i.e. ād-dyam) aṣyā nannam (ii.2.5⁶: O. omits annam); to show that a vowel must precede, vauḥat svaḥḍaḥ (vii.3.12: by v.33, t is inserted between ṭ and s, and the inserted letter is made th by xiv.12; then, by this rule, no further change of the th occurs, and we read vaṣṭhhṭḥ, not vaṣṭhhth; W. goes so far on this road as to read vaṣṭhth svaḥḍā) and pāḍbhyāṁ (i.e. pāḍbhyāṁ, not pāḍbbhyāṁ) dve savince (vi.1.6⁴)—but G. M. O. substitute for the former another similar case, vat svayambhāgāṭāya (i.ii.2.9¹ seven times; i.e. vaṭṭh sv—O. writes vaṭṭh sv)—to show that a consonant must follow, ukhāyāt sādane sve (iv.1.9³ et al.; W. B. omit sve) and megahāyate svaḥḍā (vii.5.11¹). The word tu, ‘however,’ in the rule, the commentator (with more than his usual success in dealing with this particle) explains as intimating the denial of duplication, enjoined by rule 1. He adds that some give the particle a different interpretation, as
signifying that the increment-consonant is not itself to be doubled; but justly pronounces this to be inappropriate, as such duplication is forbidden by rule 23 of this chapter.

In this and the three following rules is contained, for all the cases which come within the purview of the Prātiṣṭhāyakya, the explicit prohibition of a double aspirate. Such double aspirates are, however, sometimes written by the Hindu scribes, both in situations where the authority of the phonetic treatises directly forbids them, and elsewhere. Thus, my manuscript of the Tāttirīya-Saṁhitā has, three times, dḥ dh instead of d dh as the result of combination of ṭ and h (at ii.6.12; iii.4.1¹; v.3.12²), and the Calcutta edition, so far as printed, gives, unadvisedly, the same. Both authorities agree in reading dididāhi at iii.1.1¹. The edition, absurdly enough, gives adhiadhāh at i.1.1³, where my manuscript has adhāthāh. And I find a few cases of khkh and chch, which will be noted under rule 8, below.

As under the preceding rule, the commentator here also enters into a tedious and useless discussion of a verbal question; namely, why ‘followed by consonants’ is represented by vyaṇjanottarayoh instead of vyaṇjanaparayoh. Some, he says, have maintained that a difference of meaning is intended by the difference of phraseology; that it is desired, namely, to except cases like abhy asthāt (iv.2.8¹), where the following consonant is the product of euphonic alteration. The ground alleged for this claim is not entirely clear to me: it seems to be that a specified following cause (one that produces an effect in something that precedes it) is common to the saṁhitā-text and that which is not saṁhitā; hence, a cause of increment occurring in either kind of text being in question, a citation of words from outside the saṁhitā is alone suitable, on account of their constancy—that is, abhi: asthāt not being citable as an example under the rule in its pada-form, it must not be so treated in its saṁhitā-form, as well. But the claim is disallowed, as being opposed to the actual reading, and also to the fundamental

virodhān mālsātravirodhāc" ca: tathā hi: mālsātre svaramāṇvavatave vyaṇjanaparavate" ca satī vihitān" dvītvam atra nishpād-
yate": na tu" tatra vyaṇjanam viṣeṣhitam: tadapāvādakatavād atra" "pi tadvisēsho vaktum ayuktah". ṣikṣādiparīkṣanaṁd" adhyayanānurodhāc ca vācō yuktyantarābhīprāyo 'smādhīr abhi-
dhiyate". aprāṇdyāvādakāyor" anayor "niyāmo nā'sti: kim iti."²" svaramāṇvavato sati vyaṇjanaparam eva vyaṇjanam" dvītvam" bhajate: " dvītīyaśacarvāthu ca" vyaṇjanaparavā eva pā-
vyāgamaṁ" bhajata iti: kim tu prācūryābhīprāyene 'dān sātra-
dvayam pravṛttam. kathāṃ niyomābhāvāh: anyathā " kutracīt kāryadyayadarśanāt. " attha...: annapata ityādā dvītvam: pra...: addhī... ityādā pārvāgamah": tāh hasta ity atra tu" prīptātu satyam api ne 'dān kāryaṁ śṛgyata iti ca" niyomābhāvāh. sikhā caī 'vam vakhyaːti:
rule. For, the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv.1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied; and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant; hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed.

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phrasology, with due regard to the Çikṣa, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text. But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument. The point of it is an asserted absence of niyama in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception. Niyama, 'obligatory force,' appears to signify here joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence. When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant; and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant. But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity ('diversity' or 'independence?' prakṛtya is not found elsewhere). How does an absence of niyama appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light. In attā havīśaka (ii.6.12²) and in annapate (iv.2.3¹ et al.), and so on, there is duplication; in pracchacchantah (iv.3.12³): G. M. have instead acchedavakāh, the reference for which I have failed to note) and adhi tvāṁ deva prayatā (ii.6.12⁴: G. M. O. omit prayatā), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute; but in tāṁ haste (vi.1.3⁷: W. has tāṁ te [vi.1.10], but doubtless by accidental omission of ha), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen: hence, there is

svarāt² pāravaṣya¹ varṇasayā kvacid doivatam ca kathaye⁴. na ca vargaṃvīryaṣya na caturthe kudda² cana.

vyākhyātaṁ ca vacanam etadvidvadbhīḥ: kṣatrācit svarayor madhye doiyatam lakṣhyānusārataḥ: pārādhamas tathā tatra jñeyo varṇavicakṣanāti.

"evavrīpaṁ aniyamam sūcayitum vyaṇjaṭottaror" ity antaravikāraḥ⁴.

vyaṇjaṇam uttarāṇaṁ yābdhyān tāt" vyaṇjaṭottarau": tayoḥ.

absence of *niyama*. The examples here furnished, which ought to
give us the clue to the commentator’s meaning, seem to leave us
wholly in the dark, since not one of them falls under either of the
rules in question: the first, second, and fourth are by rule 23,
below, exempt from duplication; the third is a case under rule 8;
and the combination *ñ* is (see under rule 15) treated as a simple
*ñ*. Next, the *Cikshā* is quoted, to the effect that “in some cases,
also, duplication of the first consonant of a group after a vowel is
prescribed; not, however, of a second mute, nor of a fourth, under
any circumstances;” and, by those versed in the subject, the state-
ment is explained [in conformity with what follows]: “in some
cases, there is duplication of a consonant between two vowels, in
accordance with rule; so there also is to be understood prefixion
of the preceding mute, by those skilled in alphabetic sounds” (in
the known *Cikshā*, it may be remarked, no such verses as these are
to be found). And the final conclusion is, that the different term
*vyahjanottarayoh* is intended to signify an absence of *niyama*
of this sort. That is to say, perhaps, the real independence of the
two rules is intimated by the choice of a different term in express-
ing the common factor which they contain.

6. As also, in all cases, when they follow *r*.

This, it is pointed out, has the value of an exception under rule
4. The dual number of *rephapūrvayoh* shows that the pair,
“second and fourth mutes,” spoken of just above, is intended.
“Also” (*ca*) implies the increment by prefixion of the next preced-
ing mute. And the meaning is, that second and fourth mutes,
with the limitations prescribed, as preceded by *r*, take always their
respective predecessors as increment. Thus, *ūrdhva* (i.e. *ūrdhva*)
*bhava* (i.2.14\(^2\)), and *ardhyayoh* (i.e. *ardhy-*) *prayah* (vi.5.2\(^2\);
only G. M. have *prayah*). *Nityam*, ‘in all cases,’ implies that the
increment is made after *r* when the mute to be increased is followed
by a vowel also (not alone when it is *vyahjanottar* as specified in
rule 5). Thus, in *arthe* (i.e. *arth-*) *stha* *pām* (i.6.11: only B.
has *apām*), *mūrkham* (i.e. *mūrkkham*) *tajaghanydham* (vi.1.6\(^4\),
and *goaryham* (i.e. *goarygham*) *eva* (vi.1.10\(^1\)).

6. *rephāt paraṁ ca* (xiv.4) *ity astā pavādākum etat*: *dvai-
vacanena dvitiyaçaturthād guhyete: savishedhayayo* *rephapūr-
vayor anayor* nityam pūrvāgamo bhavati: *āgamāvādasakap
cakārah. yatāḥ*: *ūrdh*-... *ardhy*-... nityam iti kim: *varoparatoc pi bhavato etat iti: arthe*-... *mūrkham*-...:

1 W. *avanāt*. 2 W. B. navi; G. M. O. *shānti*. 3 O. *sayer*. 4 O. *syed*. 5 in G.
M. only. 6 G. M. -sy.
7. And when \( l \) precedes.

The \( ca \), 'and,' here brings down from rule 5 only the fourth mute [the last of the two there mentioned] and the increment. The second mute is not also included, because (see note to rule 2) no second mute occurs after \( l \) in the Sanhitā. The examples are pragalbho (i.e. -galbhho) 'ya jáyate (ii.5.5\textsuperscript{a}: only G. M. have jáyate) and nāmo maḥyamāyā ca 'pagalbhāya (i.e. -galbh-) ca (iv.5.6\textsuperscript{1})—but, in place of the latter, G. M. give apagalbhō jáyate (ii.5.5\textsuperscript{3}: O. reads apagalya simply, which doubtless means the first word of this).

As was remarked above (under rule 3), the laying down of the present precept without any limitation appears to confirm the commentator's interpretation of rules 2 and 3, as teaching the accepted doctrine of the cākha. It would, to be sure, be not impossible to understand \( lbh \) for \( lbh \) as required here, without any reference to the other groups—\( tk, lg \) etc.—in which the duplication after \( l \) depends upon the earlier rules; but that seems quite unlikely.

उपर्यायप्रवृत्तोऽस्यानिधानपरमभूतेयोऽवृत्तः कहिष्ठेनुष्

\( च २ १ । ४ \)

8. Also the preceding mute is inserted before \( ch, khi, \) and \( bhujā, \) when these follow either a preposition, \( pāθa) \) \( eshāh, ati, \) \( āti, \) \( dhāmā, \) \( parama, \) or \( bhāte. \)

The examples after a preposition (in which situation alone the increment of \( khi \) and \( bhujā \) is made) are first given by the commentator: they are \( a \) caksrputi (v.1.7\textsuperscript{4}: the preceding word, andechrṇṇam, might well have been included, as an additional instance; my MS. has simple \( ch \) in both cases); nama ākṣhidad ca prakṣhidad ca (iv.5.9\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit the first word, G. M. O. the last two); ayakṣkṣmaya paribbhujā (iv.5.1\textsuperscript{4}), with vibhū ca me prabhū ca me (iv.7.4\textsuperscript{1-2}: O. stops at the first \( me \) as counter-example, to show the necessity of saying bhujā, instead of bhū simply, in the rule; and \( yā \) ca vicchandā (v.2.11\textsuperscript{1}). Then follow counter-examples: first, to show that \( kh \) is increased only when followed by \( i, nikhātam \) \( manuṣhyādām \) (vi.3.4\textsuperscript{6}) and datv adhi khādati (vi.2.11\textsuperscript{4}: only G. M. have datv); next, to show that the increment takes place only after a preposition, vachandā \( yā \) (v.2.11\textsuperscript{1}). The examples after the remaining words, as particularly specified in the rule, are priyam apy etu pāthah : esha cchāgah (iv.8.8\textsuperscript{1}: only O. has priyam), with rtubhih \( vā esha \) chandobhāh (vii.5.15\textsuperscript{2}), to prove the need of quoting pāthah along with esha in the rule; aticechan-

\begin{itemize}
  \item 7. caṅkāra caṅturthāgumayor\textsuperscript{1} ākarṣkhaḥ : caṅturthasparṣe\textsuperscript{2} laṅkārapūrve sati pārvagamo bhuvati. prag——: nāmo——: laṅkāraḥ pārno yaśmād nāhi\textsuperscript{2} laṅkārapūrvaḥ : taismin.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1} G. M. -gam. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. -se. \textsuperscript{3} G. M. O. sa.
dhamma upa dadhāti (v.3.83), savitra śtecchandādyā (vii.5.14),
dhāmačchad iva khalu vādi (ii.4.10²; B. O. onuit vādi), parama-
chado vare (iv.6.2¹), and yad bhūtecchudānā sāmāni (vii.5.94).

Further examples of the increment of ch, falling under this rule, are
ādechad and āraechad (at iv.3.12²,³) and āechettā (i.1.2¹): if
there are others, I have omitted to note them. The usage in the
manuscripts, of our commentary and of the Sanhitā, is quite irregu-
lar, varying between ch simply, cch, and czech, without much
regard to whether the case is one to which this rule applies or not.
I have collected the cases in which my manuscript of the Sanhitā
has czech: they are dhāmaechchad (ii.4.10²; but dhāmaechad in
the same division), āraebechach chandah (iv.3.12³), and āyuchchad-
bhya (iv.5.3²); and, in the combination of separate words (besides
the case just quoted), āebechach chandah (iv.3.12²), kavak chandah
(iii.1.6²), and yach chreethah (iii.4.8¹). In every one of these
instances, the Calcutta edition, so far as it yet reaches, reads
correctly cch.

I have found no other cases of the increment of khi under
the rule; but my manuscript has (without authority) udakkhidat (ii.
1.1⁴,5¹), sam akkhidat (vi.6.1¹), and akkhidach (iii.5.8), while
(along with the MSS. of the comment) it reads kkh instead of kkh
in the example (iv.5.9²) cited above. The edition reads kkh at ii.
1.1⁴,5¹, remarking at the latter place that its manuscript authori-
ties have kkh. Of course, the doubled aspirate is to be rejected,
here as elsewhere, in obedience to sound phonetic theory as well as
to the concordant authority of the Prātiṣṭhikyas.

सङ्क्लापार्थम्: परः प्रथमो अभिनिधान स्वर्यार-
तस्य सम्भवः: II ॥ ॥

9. After a surd spirant followed by a mute is inserted a first
mute of the same position with the latter, as abhinidhāna.

The surd spirants are (see i.9,12,13) five, namely ṇ (jihvāmālīya),
ś, ṡh, s, and φ (upadhāṃnīya). The rule is to be paralleled with
those in the Vāj. Pr. (iv.99,100), which direct that a mute be
doubled after a spirant, and after jihvāmālīya and upadhāṃnīya
(which in that treatise are not reckoned as spirants); also with

8. upasargapārveshu pātha.... evampārveshu ca' sateu cha
khi bhute 'ty eteshu pārvagamo bhavati?: cakāra ugamāṇvādeca-
kah. yathā: ā....; nama....; aya-k....; je 'ti kim: vi-bhu
....; yā....; 'khi 'ti kim: nikh....; datav....; upasarga
iti kim: sa....; etān upasargapārvāni. anyāy * ucyante:
priyam....; pātha iti kim: rtyubhir....; ati....; savitra
....; dhāma....; parame....; yad....

¹ G. M. om. ² O. sydt. ³ G. M. O. om. ⁴ G. O. om. ⁵ G. M. -ṛgāpīrva. ⁶ G. M. O. ina. apy.
that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely श, ष, ष्ट, ष्ट्त, ष्ट्त्त). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the lacuna occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and पाणिनि have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tāttirīyā usage more nearly into accordance with that of the Rik and Vājasaneyī Sanhitās; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: याह कमयेता (i. e. यक् kām-; ii.1.2 et al.); अग्न्यम (i. e. agjan, or, after all rules are applied, अग्यप्यम) दृजम (iv.6.1): O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for य; ग्रिश्मे (i. e. grishmē or grishkṣīmē) madhyandine (ii.1.2); अयस्मयम (i. e. अयस्मयम or अयस्मयम) vi cē bandham (iv.2.5): only W. has bandham; याह पाप्माण (i. e. याह पप्माण; ii.8.13): O. adds to this last anāmin (ii.1.5 et al.: to be treated like अयस्मयम, above), and, after madhyandine, प्राक्षनति (प्राक्षनति: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first परायो दपार्थ (ii.1.2: but O. substitutes brāhmavādino evanānti, i.7.1 et al.), to show that the sonant, ल, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of नसिक्यa, xxii. 14); then rukmam upa dadhät (v.2.71: the case is one for yama, xxii.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly इशव ca vajreça ca (v.7.31), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely याम अपनवानाह (i.5.5) and sa pratnavat (ii.2.12 et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) agnaye svāhā (i.2.2 et al.).

In all these combinations, च and ष are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xv.17,18) would leave them unchanged.

9. sparçaparāḍ āgoshād uśmanāḥ parah prathamaḥ agmanā
tasya sparçasya sastrānāḥ samānāsthāno bhinidhāno bhavati.
abhinidhīyataḥ ity abhinidhānāḥ: ṛopanīya ity arthāḥ: "vedānt-
tare tasyāḥ" bhavād atraḥ "ropanīyatavaṁ, yathā: yah....
"āc-..." grish-....: ayas-....: yah..... āgoshād iti kim: parādy.... uśmānaḥ iti kim: "rukman...." sparç-
parāḍ iti kim: iṣhva....
sūtraṁ idam eva uṣṇam: na tatparadvayam".

1 G. M. om. 2 B. O. pratham. 3 G. M.-mo bhavati. 4 B. om. 5 W. O.-dā-
yata; B.-niyata. 6 G. M. vedāntarasya; O.-reṣa tad a. 7 G. M. O. om. 8 O. yam apnavānāḥ: sa pratnavat, and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). 10 G. M. tu par.
The commentator illustrates with groups of two consonants only
(of which the Sanhitā presents twenty-three that would come under
the action of the rule); the question arises, then, whether in groups
of three or more consonants (of which there are over fifty)—where
the mute is followed by another consonant (as zkk, zny, shky, atm,
str, vpr), or where the spirant stands second (as rzm, kshn, rshny,
tek, tephy), or where each is the case (as trkr, trkr, ntrr), or where
there are two spirants followed by mutes in the same group (as
zkn)—the rule is to be relentlessly applied. It can admit of little
doubt that the sequence of another consonant would not affect the
case; whether a preceding consonant would do so is more doubtful.
Such resultant groups as nthtn, ndvpp, kkhkshpy, and ndhkh-
shpy, have a tolerably frightful appearance; but whether they
would stagger the heroic soul of a Hindu gkhn, is another matter.

To the inserted mute is applied the name abhinidhn, which the
commentator explains by abhinidhipya, ‘it is set down against’;
giving as its synonym ofapanya, (I presume, simply) ‘to be
inserted’; and adding the remark, “owing to the absence of this
in any other Veda, there is here insertibility” (?). He takes no
notice of the doctrine of abhinidhna as a peculiar and imperfect
utterance of certain letters in certain situations, which plays so
formidable a part in the phonetic systems of the Rik and Ath.
Prātiṣākhyaform (see especially the note to Ath. Pr. 143): we, however,
beating that doctrine in mind, may conjecture with plausibility
that the word here not merely signifies an insertion, but designates
also a peculiar quality of the inserted letter.

10. According to Plākshi, when the following mute is surd.

That is to say, not when it is a nasal: Plākshi would ratify zkk,
zkkh, shkt, shkt, and so on, but would make no insertion in zmn,
shn, and their like. This, as was remarked under the last rule,
would correspond more nearly with the teachings of the Rik and
Vāj. Prātiṣākhya. The commentator illustrates with nishkeva-
nyam (iv.4.22), yah kāmayeta (ii.1.2 et al.), pascā prācin (v.3.7):
B. reads prdei, which is found in the same division; W. has
prdei, which does not occur in the Sanhitā after pascā, nish
prāci (i.1.101), doshāvacat (i.2.14 et al.), yah pīptān (ii.3.

1. agnoseva sparṣa pare saty aghoshād āshmanah prā-
thamāgamā dvavati: plākṣe prakṣe. yathā: nish......: yah......: pascā......: nish......: 'aksh......: dosp......: agnoseva eva 'ti kim: kāmaṇā......'

1 O. ins. plākṣe, gkhnîgo mate. 2 W. B. G. M. -r; O. -r. ‘pr. (3) O. prathama 'bhniḥāno. (4) G. M. ins. parak. (5) O. om. (6) G. M. om. W. puts out of place, before aksh. (7) G. M. om. (8) O. substitues surcandar.....: sparaparid 'ti kim: agn......: sitram idam eva 'shām nā tu parāditam. 95. agnoseva spar-
arpate prathama yā r chandaśām nāc cid ati: syātram: bhavaśāsū-
rapate. (9) O. adds abhinidhipyano nd 'ni.
132), and āpātram juhār devānām (ii.5.93: G. M. have only the first word). All these are examples quite needless to be given, as they are read by Plākshi precisely as prescribed by the preceding rule. Counter-examples, exhibiting his discordant view, are kucmān chakabhīh (v.7.23: W. G. M. have kucmān only, and B. reads kākṣmāndān), which I have not found in the Sanhitā, although kucmānda occurs in the Tūttī. Āraṇyaka, at ii.7.8) and akshnaya vyāghārayati (v.2.76 et al.: given only by W. B., and introduced out of place, between nish tapāmi and doshāvastah, above).

O. follows an independent course in the interpretation and illustration of this rule. It calls the insertion an abhinidhāna (though adding at the end "there is no obligation of abhinidhāna") and, for the examples yah kāmayaeta to āpātram, it substitutes suṣcandra daśma viṣpate hanyādy (iv.4.46: the MS. omits daśma), yaś chandasad (the thing nearest to this that I have found in the text is praṇāpatīc chandasad, iii.3.71), naś cid ati (this I have overlooked in searching out the references), syātram (doubtless meant for āpātram), and brhaspatisūrapate (probably brhaspatiśūrapate, i.4.27).

The present precept was pronounced unapproved in the comment to rule 9.

उत्तमयर्थम् प्राचाययासम् ॥ ११ ॥

11. But according to Plākshāyaṇa, on the contrary, when the following mute is a nasal.

This can only mean to teach the precise opposite of the preceding rule; or, that there is no insertion when a surd mute follows the spirant, but only when a nasal follows. And it is first so explained by the commentator, who gives as examples akshnayā vyāghārayati (v.2.76 et al.), aṣnati (i.8.76 et al.), and tīrthe sāti

11. 'plākshāyaṇasya tu paksā uttamaparādā aghoshād uṣmānāh parah' prathamagamo bhavati. yathā: aksh-', aṣnati: tīrthe-.... uttamaparādā iti kim: nish-.... "yah k-...." "yah p-...." paṣcāt. tuṣabdāḥ plākṣeḥ paksam prakshipati'.

kecid evam ucaḥ: aghoshatvam uṣmānās tuṣabdāḥ nīvartayah 'ti'. tadā 'yām sustrārtah: uttamavatā tu' goshaḥvata uṣmānāḥ parah prathamagam bhavati. "āhām-.... śarady-....: brahma-.... goshaḥvata iti kim: aṣmā-.... grish-....: ayās-....

(1) G. M. om. 2 G. M. om. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. om. 5 W. apakshiyati; B. kshiyati. 6 G. M. om. et al. 7 in W. only. 8 G. M. goshaḥ. 9 G. M. agh.

O. substitutes for the whole comment aghoshaprapkātyā tuṣabdāḥ nīvayaḥ: plākshāyaṇasya śūkhoṣe māte aghoshād uṣmānāh uttamaparāparatā: sasthānāprathamagamo bhavati: aksh-.... grish-.... aṣnati: ayās-....
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Then a second and wholly different interpretation is set forth as taught by certain authorities: namely, that tu, 'but,' in the rule, instead of negating Plakši’s opinion, reverses the quality of the spirant as prescribed in rule 9, changing it from surd to sonant—that is to say, admitting the increment only after a. The examples given are ahuṇām ketaḥ (ii.4.14), parady apardhāne (ii.1.2: only W. has parady), and brahmavāddino vadanti (i.7.1: et al.: W. B. omit vadanti); the counter-examples, illustrating omission of the increment after a surd spirant, are aṣmā ca me (iv.7.51), grīshmo hemantah (v.7.24), and aṣamasayaṃ vi cṛta (iv.2.5: W. B. omit cṛta). This, which is in itself forced and inadmissible, would also be equivalent to limiting the insertion to the little class of cases in which a later rule (xxi.14) requires the interposition of a nāsikya.

In the exposition of this rule, O. goes its own peculiar way, and takes no notice of the second interpretation which the other manuscripts report. It furnishes no counter-examples, and its examples agree only in part with those already given: they are (corrected) aksññāyā vyāpīṣayati, grīshme mudhyandine (ii.1.2), aṣmāti (or endī), and aṣamasayaṃ vi cṛta.

The rule was pronounced unapproved by the commentator under rule 9.

12. A first mute followed by a spirant is changed into its corresponding aspirate.

Literally, becomes a second mute—of a spirant, of its own series. The examples given are as follows: viṣpa viṣapīṃ (i. e. viṣapīṃ; or, by xiv.1, viṣapīṃ) uḍāḍāya (i.1.9: only O. has the first word, and it omits the last; W. reads vāratrīvadāya, which is evidently merely a corruption); tat skodasy (i. e. -tiḥ šā-) abha-vat (vi.6.11: only G. M. have abhavat); pratyah somaḥ (i.8.21: i. e. pratyahāk s- by v.32; then pratyahāk s-); and tat (i. e. tatth)

12. aṣmāparah prathama sparpaḥ savargityaṃ dvṛttyam āpadyate. viś...: tat...: praty...: tat... 'prathama iti kim: 'tāḥ...' aṣmāparah iti kim: vāk... 'avṛg... ity atra prathamapūrvo hakaṛaḥ caturthāṃ tasya sa-sthānam (v.38) iti hakaṛayā caturthapattīr vikṣeṣhavihitavāt: tatas trīyāḥ sūragniḥ vahatparas (viii.3) trīyāvatam.

idam eva sūtram ishtam.
aṣmāḥ paro yasmad asidv. aṣmāparah.

1 O. dimana. 2) O. om. 3) W. B. om. 4) in O. only. 5) G. M. sa.
savitaḥ (i. 5. 64 et al.). As counter-examples, we have tāḥ (i.e. tās, ix. 2) sāṇḍrohaḥ (v. 3. 65; omitted by O.; dropped out in W. B.) and vāk ta a pṛtyatām (i. 3. 91; only O. has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place.

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O. alone. Such a case as arvāk : hi : enam : parāh (vi. 3. 31) might seem to fall under its action, the spirant ġ following a surd mute. But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v. 38, ġ becomes a fourth mute by special prescription; and hence that rule viii. 3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant.

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable. The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice.

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanhitā attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required. The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G. M. O. aspirate the mutes, and W. B. leave them unchanged). Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the varṇa-krama, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tāṭṭīrīya text. Respecting the teachings of the other Prātiṣṭhāya upon the subject, see the note to Ath. Pr. ii. 6.

वाउभीकारस्यासस्थानपरे: || १३ ||

13. According to Bādabhikāra, when the following spirant is not of the same position with it.

Rule ii. 44 teaches the accordance of the several (surd) spirants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production.

T. calls the individual here referred to Bādavākāra, and W. O. have in the rule vādabhikāra, but in the comment bādabh-. the rest have uniformly b as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than v. Weber gives the two forms vādabh- (V. Pr. p. 250) and vādabh- (ib., p. 78).

---

13. bādabhikārasya 1 matu ātmano 2 'sasthānośhmaparah pra-thamah savargyam 3 dvitiyam āpadyate. 'samānaṁ sthānam yasyaś eśu sasthānaḥ: na sasthāno 'sasthānaḥ: sa paro yasmāt sa tathā 'ktah. yathā: viḥ- ...: tat.... 4 asasthāna iti kim: tat..... 5 ne 'daṁ sātram ishtam.

---

1 O. ins. pāṭhāno. 2 G. M. O. om. (and begin the next word as). 3 O. om. 4 O. om. 5 B. om. 6 O. ins. īdānd(!)sthāno yam sakraḥ.
The commentary (except in O.) is at the pains to repeat a couple of the examples of aspiration already given, namely **viserpo viarp-**
**pa** (i.1.94: W. omits **viserpo**) and ** tat shodapi** (vi.8.11): and it adds, in illustration of the peculiar view of the quoted authority, **tat savinah** (i.5.8 et al.), where the dental mute, being followed by the dental sibilant, remains unchanged.

This rule is pronounced unapproved.


A heading, introducing the detail of exceptions to the rules as already given, and continuing in force through rule 28.

15. A consonant before a pause is not doubled; nor **r**, **visar-janiya**, **jihvamultiya**, or **upadhmantiya**.

As example of a consonant before a pause, is given **urma** (iv.7.41 et al.: W. has instead **so rka** [v.4.38], but it is not an illustration of the rule, and is evidently here only a corrupted reading of **urma**), of which the **k** would otherwise be doubled by xiv.4. Of course, it is only a final after **r** that would fall under the rules of duplication before a pause. The text affords, I believe, no instance of a consonant occurring in this position in **sainhita**, but such words as **urma** and **amarti** (vii.1.15 et al.) need to have their reading in the other forms of text determined by a rule like this. The commentator quotes **urma ca** (i.e. **urma ca**) **me santrta ca me** (iv.7.41: B. omits the last two words, G. M. O. the last three), as showing that the **k** is doubled when in **sandhi** with a following letter. To illustrate the exemption from duplication of the other letters specified, are given **nâ “râm ah rehphi” (ii.2.47), munah kshene (v.2.17), yah** (i.e. **yaz**) **kâmayeta (ii.1.28 et al.), and yah** (i.e. **yap**) **pâypamad** (ii.3.13). According to the approved usage of this **âkha** (see ix. 2,3), **visarjiniya** comes within the ken of this rule only when it

---

14. athe ‘ty ayam adhikdrasha: 1 uktrya dvivavidher yathâ-
sanibhavam nishedho ‘dhikriyata’ ity ‘stad adhikrtami’ vedita-
vyanam ita ‘uttarain yad vakshyamañah’.

1 G. M. ina aha. 1 W. G. M. -dhe; O. vidh-. 1 W. -krta. (6) B. G. M. om (6) B. no varpah.

15. paddvauvâne vartamâno varno ‘rephpo visarjanîyo jihvâmi
lya upadhmântiyq’ce ‘ty ete varṇâ dvitvâ in “padyant
urma: rephât paraiv ca (xiv.4) iti prêpith. avasânavacana
virâmâbhridyam: tuvâm na sanibhâne nishedhah: yath
urma ca.... nâ....: man....: yah....: yah....: svâ
nirvam (xiv.1) ity anendî ‘shâm prêpith.”
precedes *ksh*, since elsewhere it can stand only in *pausā*. *Jhodamāliya* occurs (by the conversion of final *h* according to ix.2) in the groups *zhk*, *xk*, *xkr*, *xksh*, *xkshv*, and *xkh*; upadāṁśayya, in like manner, in *φp*, *φpy*, *φpr*, *φpl*, and *φph*; the combinations of *r* have been enumerated above (under rule 4).

The other Prātiśākhya has rules equivalent with this, into the variety of expression of which we do not need to enter.

It is to be accounted as a reprehensible omission on the part of our treatise, that it gives no direction as to the treatment of a group beginning with *anuvārā*. The Vāj. Prāt. (iv.107) expressly exempts *anuvārā* from duplication; and, in the Rik Prāt., in the fundamental rule (vi.1), *anuvārā* is ruled out of account in the estimation of consonant groups, it being taught that a consonant is doubled after it in the same manner as after a vowel. There is no good reason to doubt that the same is to be understood as the doctrine of the present work, and that it would have *anuvārā*, so far as duplication is concerned, deemed and taken as merely an affection of the vowel to which it is attached. That this is not explicitly stated, stands in connection with the equivocal position of the Tātt. Prāt. in reference to the nature of *anuvārā* (see p. 68) according to the view taken at the beginning of the next chapter (xxi.1), rules respecting it are no more required than in the Ath. Prāt., where they are equally wanting.

The commentator notices that some would read the rule now under discussion as two, cutting off *avasāne* from the rest; and for the reason that otherwise, as the rule stands, it seems natural to understand that "*r, h, z*, and *φ*, when standing before a pause," are not doubled; as a similar construction was made in rule 10 of the fifth chapter. But he denies the validity of the objection, since duplication of *r* and the rest before a pause is not in the remotest

---

1 avasāna iti: "caturmān varṇāṇām" prthagy eva sūtrāni "kecid uvah." ekikarane doshadarpanāt: asātu dosaḥ: avasāne varṇānāṃ rephāviparjānyadāya" ity anuvānśāmānam" avagaha dīś dīshā uvvar (v.10) itiṇād iti cetā: nāūśa dosaḥ: ravisarjanaśādānām paddāvasāne "dvitvaprāptīn" dārot-sārite iti ne 'yam atra ānukā 'stī: avasāneprthukkarane satyā avasāne" kiṁ vā bhavati 'ti sākṣiśhvatryā" vacanām anarthakaṁ sāya: ekikarane tu ravisarjanyetivārṇāsādācaryādāv avasāne varṇānāṃ varṇa iti" labhyate: tasmād ekikaranaṃ eva ramanīyām.

---

1 W. B. yad-. 9 W. B. combine, as in rule. 2 O. om. ca. 4 G. M.-dyeran. 5 G. M.-ina iti v-. 6 O. om. 7 G. M. kecid iti sūtrāni prthagy eva "cuh" avasāna iti ca: ravisarjanyajhodamāliyopadāmnayā iti ca: kecain prthukkaranyām. 9 W. caturmaṇāḥ; B. om. varṇānām. 10 W. corrupt. 11 G. M. O. ka śāu. 11 G. M. O. rau-. 12 W. mupī. 13 G. M. avsyavasānabāvamān; O. sya doraśān saṁyā. 14 O. om. 15 O. avasānyapārīkṣaṭhālā vist. 16 B. om. 17 W. rephāprāptīk. 18 W. tādā; O. dūrotā-. 19 G. M. kiṁ cit; O. kiṁ ca. 18 G. M. O. prth-. 20 W. stī; G. M. niṣṭī. 21 G. M. kāhā jathā; O. kāhāyā. 22 B. arth-. 23 W. savir.; B. vist-. O. om. varṇa. 24 O. om.
manner suggested by the rules (literally, 'is expelled to a distance'), and consequently cannot be suspected of being taught here. If, on the other hand, avasāne, 'before a pause,' were set by itself, the inquiry would be 'what under the sun is it that happens before a pause?' and the expression would appear meaningless. When, however, it is combined with the names of letters that follow, we naturally infer from the association that 'a letter in pauṣā' is intended. Hence, the inclusion of the two precepts in one rule is alone to be approved.

This defense of the unity of the rule is evidently of the most trifling and futile character, and the objectors are in the right—not, indeed, as the separation into two rules is absolutely necessary, but as it is decidedly preferable, and more in accordance with the general usage of the treatise elsewhere.

अष्टादशः || १६ ||

16. Nor a spirant, when followed by a vowel.

It is only, of course, after r (xiv.4) that a spirant can be liable to duplication before a vowel, so that the combinations to which the rule applies are rc, rs, and rh. All the other treatises excepting the Vāj. Prāt. have the same rule (R. Pr. vi.2; A. Pr. iii.32; Pān. viii.4.49).

The commentator's examples are darpapūrnamāsāu (ii.2.54 et al.), varṣādbhyah (vii.4.13: I presume; my MS. of the Sanhitā has varṣādbhyah) twice instead of varṣādbhyah and varṣādbhyah: O. gives instead swarṣādī, iv.4.41), barsāin nāhyyātī (ii.5.71-2), and barhīshā (i.7.41 et al.: G. M. have instead barhīshō ham, also i.7.41). To illustrate the limitation to a spirant, he gives ebhīr no arkkāiḥ (i.e. arkkāiḥ; iv.4.47: O. omits; to show that a vowel must follow, pāṛṣe (i.e. pāṛṣe; vii.3.10), varṣādbhyah svāhī (i.e. varṣābhyah; vii.4.13: G. M. omit svāhā), barsvebhīh (i.e. barsveḥ; v.7.11), and agnir hy aaya (i.e. hhy; v.1.5)—but O. has a different series, namely dāṛgyam yajnām (iii.2.29), varṣhyebbhīḥ (the MS. has varṣhebhīḥ; I have not succeeded in finding either word in the Sanhitā), and agner hy etat purisham (vi.2.8).

The combinations in which the spirant after r is doubled, being followed by another consonant, are rpm, rc, rcv, rs, roh, rohn, roh, rohy, res, and rhy. To complete the sundhi, either with or without duplication, the rules for insertion of svarabhakti (xvi.15,18) have to be further applied.

16. svaraparā uṣhmā dvītīyaḥ nā "padyate. svarah paro yas-
mād aśū svaraparāh. yathā: durg-.-.-. varsh-.-.-. bar-
sain-.-.-. barh-.-.-. "rephāt paraṁ ca (xiv.4) iti prāptiḥ. uṣhme "ti kim: ebhīr-.-.-." svaraparā iti kim: "pāṛṣe:
varsh-.-.-. barsvebhīḥ: agnir-.-.-."

1 O. M. O. om. 2 O. om. 3 O. dā-.-.-. varshebhīḥ: agner-.-.-.
17. Or, according to Plākshi and Plākshāyaṇa, when followed by a first mute.

That is to say, these two pākhindau would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter. The groups which would be thus affected are ćc and ćcy, cy, sh, shk and shky and shkr, sht and its further combinations (shty, shpr, shtv), shy, sk, st and its further combinations (stn, sty, str and stry, stv), and sp. One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely pch and pchy, shkh, sht and shkhy, sth and sthn, sp and sphy) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications. It may be made a question whether the single case, rshd, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at; if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest.

The examples (which are lost in W.) are suścandra dasma (iv. 4.46: O. omits dasma) and aśhādu kṛtvāh (vi.4.51); a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is tasmad evām viduśhā (vi.4.92: O. omits viduśhā); but O. has, with B., omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, iśuḍa ca vajreṇa (v.7.31).

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word ca, ‘or,’ in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to ć, sh, s, and ṣ, since otherwise the mention of ṛ and ṣ in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept. The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prātiṣṭākhyā; in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissidents doubtless accepted

17. plākshiplākshāyaṇayoh pakshe 'prathamapara uśmā dvītvam nā "padyate. cakāra uśmānām anyaśīci. suṣc-.-.: aśhādu-.-. 'prathamapara iti kim: tasmād-.-. 'prathamaparā para yasmād asāu prathamaparāh. "

cakāro 'tra yady apy' uśhmātrākṣaṇaḥ 'tathā 'pi' gaśhaśasheṣva eva sampratīcyah: anyathā "vasāne raviśaśraṇiṇya (xiv.15) iti" sātre jihvāniṣyeyupadhmāniṣyeyor grahamān vyartham: anenā 11 "va nisbedhaśuddheḥ" 12.

1 O. mec. 2 B. om. 3 B. om. 4 O. ins. prathamapara iti kim: iśuḍv-.-. 5 G. om. 6 B. om. 7 G. M. uśmāk-. 8 W. om. 9 G. M. om. 10 W. om. 11 O. ins. aśhā. 12 W. O. -śeśthe s.
rule 15, it was not necessary to regard the present statement of their views as having any reference to χ and φ. That the rule is accepted in the gākhād represented by the commentator may be inferred also from the fact that (under rule 22) he pronounces the five that follow unapproved, but says nothing of this.

18. According to Hārīta, a surd spirant is not doubled.

There is unusual variety and inaccuracy of reading among the different manuscripts of the commentary of this rule, and O. goes off upon a course of its own: yet the aim of all is the same, and not difficult to discover. The word āshmd (which was present or implied in the two preceding rules, and therefore might naturally enough come down into this by continued implication) is here expressly repeated, for the purpose of breaking connection with what goes before. If aghoṣha, ‘surd,’ only were specified, and āshmd, ‘spirant,’ implied, the latter would have to be implied along with the attributes attached to it above, namely ‘followed by a vowel,’ or ‘followed by a first mute,’ and to such a spirant the further qualification of ‘surd’ would be given; while the meaning intended is that Hārīta would forbid the duplication of a surd spirant altogether, in any situation.

O. alone gives as first example dārymya yaṇham (iii.2.22); all have vaicyo maṇṇyāṇām (vii.1.1); to which W. B. add pushyati praṣyayā paśubhiḥ (ii.4.62) and vaicyānaṁ raṇam (v.2. 83 et al.), which O. omits, while G. M. substitute the single passage asya ‘pardīpam’ (iii.5.73). As counter-example, showing the limitation to a surd spirant, W. B. give tiroṣhiṇyā mā (vii.3.13: B. omits mā); but G. M. give instead maḥayām iṇḍān (iii.1.9), and O. septa jihvāḥ septa (i.5.32).


1 O. begins āṣmagrahaṇam pārvatātraṇapkeḥāḥ-thāṁ: pārvatātra svaraparastvāna prathama-parastvāna ca saṁbandha iti āṣmagrahaṇam hārī etc. 3 O. ins. yākaḥino. (a) O. svaṁvasthā eva āṣmā ‘ghoṣho nyo na dvitvaramā. (b) in O. only. (c) O. om.; G. M. aṣy/ 4 O. simply saptas... (e) W. pārvatā plaster. G. M. aṣy/ 5 W. B. pārvatā. 9 G. M. ins. va. 10 W. B. bandham; B. bandāhah. 11 W. B. va. 12 W. -vākte vi.; B. -vāke ‘ti vi.; G. M. ‘ghoṣhavatvaṇvishedaḥ. 13 W. B. ins. na. 14 G. M. āṣmē ‘ti gr. 15 W. n’ādhāhāhā; B. n’ādhāhā, and adds, out of place, the first part of the comment to the next rule (to repaharo, excl.).
Rules 18–22 are pronounced unapproved under rule 22.

19. Nor \( h \), when followed by \( r \).

The word \( ca \) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of "according to Hārīta." This individual having in the former rule limited his denial of duplication to a surd spirant, and so left the sonant spirant \( h \) (\( ? \) the MSS. say "a surd spirant") liable to be always doubled, it is now taught that \( h \) with the distinctive mark of a following \( r \) remains single. The example given, alike in all MSS., is \( dudhārake ahrayaḥ \) (I.5.51); counter-examples are \( juḥve \) (i.e. \( juḥvē \)) by \( agnis tvā "havyati \) (I.1.12: G. M. end with \( agniḥ \); W. B. omit altogether, along with the introductory explanation to the next citation), to show that \( h \) would be doubled by Hārīta before any other letter than \( r \); and \( gukraṁ \) (i.e. \( gukkrānī \)) \( te anyat \) (I.1.11²: O. omits), to show that any other letter than \( h \) would be doubled before \( r \).

O., though using two of the citations given by the other MSS., has a wholly independent exposition of this rule.

20. Nor a lingual mute, when followed by a dental.
account, since exempt from duplication by xiv. 23), *ṣaṭkāpālāṁ
nih (i. e. *ṣuṭṭk- ; i.8.5 : wanting in O.), and *vīḍ vāi morutah
(i.e. *vidvā vāi ; vi.8.5*).

21. Nor l nor a dental mute, when followed by y or v.

Hārīta is this time implied "by vicinage" merely, there being
no word in the rule to which his memory can be directly fastened.
Examples of l before y and v are kalyāṇī (vii.1.68) and bāilvo
yāpi bhave (ii.1.81 : G. M. omit bhave); of a dental mute in
like situation, kanye 'va tumā (iii.1.118) and ishe tvā (i.1.1 et al.).
The accepted usage of the school requires *hy, *lav, *nny, *ttv, while
Hārīta would leave the groups as in the ordinary text.

Combinations of a dental mute with a following y or v are quite
numerous (I have noted about twenty in the Sanhitā).

22. Nor the following.

This rule completely puzzles the native comment, which has
nothing of any value to say about it. Two explanations are sug-
gested, evidently on the barest conjecture only, and it would be
hard to say which of them is the more senseless. In the first place,
it is said that parah, being singular, implies the sound v (as being
the one last mentioned in the preceding rule); it, namely, of the
two affecting causes (y and v) specified in rule 21, does not suffer
duplication: examples are *vidhādāvme (iii.5.8 et al.) and ā grā-
vit (vi.3.28 ; W. B. omit ā); and a counter-example, showing
the limitation to v, is kalyāṇ jukoti (v.4.84). And the intent of
the rule is to remove a restriction imposed in rule 3 of this chap-
ter—that is to say, to allow the duplication of l before a mute,
which is there forbidden. In the second place, parah is said to be
equivalent to dvitiya, "second," and to signify that, when the

1 O. ṣapāde. 2 O. ṣaṭyā 'n. 3 O. ins. हर्षित्या pākhino mate. 4 G. M. O. om.
5(G. M. om. (b) O. tavargapara. (W. -gapara. (c) B. om. (p) G. M. om. (m) O.

21. Hārītaḥ śūnāṇidhyād labhyate: tanmate latavargāu na khalu
yavakārpatrād dvitvam āpnotah. 'yathā: lakārah: ' kalyāṇī:
bāilvo.... 'tavargē 'pi: kanye.... ishe.... yavakārāu
parāv yābhityān tān tathoktātāv.'

1 G. M. om. (b) G. M. om. 8 W. B. -ra. 4 G. M. yavokārpatrāu.
My collation of O. gives nothing whatever upon rules 21 and 22 and their com-
ment, and I do not know whether there is a kacnā in the MS., or whether the
collator has overlooked the passage.
duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on ad infinitum. And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Hārītau's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules.

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence.

सर्पणासवर्गीयं: ॥ २३ ॥

23. A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated.

By savarna, 'of like color or sound,' we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production. The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (i.14,15), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except ः and ¥, rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin. The Ath. Pr. (iii.30) does so exempt them. The epithet savarna, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v.26,28) न and म are converted before ः, ः, and ः.

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are atavakkāya (vii.5.12), utā havīkṣā (ii.8.12), pippakā te saravādyādi (v.5.19: only O. has the last word), sarīyattāh

 indian aparaṭhā. ॥ ॥

22. cakāro hāritākarshakah: para ity ekvacanena vakāro gṛhyate: pauravasthitamimittayoh 'so 'pi 'na dvīvan āpiyate. yathā: vi:.... a... vakāra iti kim: kalpana.... sparça evā 'keshām ācāryām (xvii.5) ity 'atra 'vadhāraṇanirākaranāṃ 'yam' ārambhah. athavā: taddhīve' kste pūro dvītīyapāryāyo '1 '1 dvītvavaidhīrh āt sti:1: anavasthitopatraṇāt. nanu savarnasavarśiyapara (xviii.3) iti parasātrenda 'pi punarādintaranishedah: '11 'pāmaraṇukyam mā bhūt iti: mata- bhedān nāt 'sha1 dosha iti brāmah.

hāritamātā11 aśmā 'ghosha (xviii.18) ityadiśutrapuṇa- kam11 anishātam.

1 G. M. -kamātā. 2 W. eva v-. 3 W. sa-. 4 G. M. ins. pārah. 5 G. M. ins. hāritamāte. 6 G. M. -pārṣa. 7 G. M. evaṇḍā-. 8 G. M. -āro. 9 G. M. evaṇḍā-. 10 G. M. -dyaṇa. 11 G. M. -dhiṇa na prāṇā. 12 W. om. para. 13 G. M. ins. tamāl. 14 W. 'kyo mā bhuvati; G. M. 'kṛjam evāhah. 15 W. va. 16 G. M. -mate. 17 G. M. 'yuddi paraḥ cē 'tamanān ev-. O. wanting (see above).
(i.5.11 et al.: wanting in W. B.), yal lohitam (ii.1.72), and tvam vá-
tādir arundāh (i.3.141: only O. has arundāh). Those which illus-
strate absence of duplication of a mute before another of the same
series are aṅkāu nyāṅkāu (i.7.72), prāṅcam upa (v.2.73: O. omits
upa), kāndāt-kāndāt (iv.2.92 et al.), tān te duṇacakṣāh (iii.2.102),
and ambha sthā (i.5.61 et al.). Then the commentator quotes from
some unnamed authority a verse prescribing that “when a nasal
precedes, a k or g is inserted before t or dh respectively,” and
claims that, in virtue of it, there fall under the rule also such cases
as pāṅkto yajñāh pāṅkātāh (i.5.21 et al.: G. M. O. omit the last
word) and tān brāyād yuṅgāvam iti (iii.4.82: O. omits the first
two words). From this we should draw the inference that, in
forms like those here quoted, the omission of the non-nasal mute
(specially prescribed by the Ath. Pr., at ii.20) is the regular and
proper reading of the cākhā, its presence, when found, being
regarded as an irregular insertion, or a process forming part of
the varnakrama—which is just the opposite of the etymologically
correct view. I have not collected all the passages illustrating the
point, but the omission is certainly the prevailing, though not
exclusive, reading in my manuscript of the Sanhitā, as also in the
Calcutta edition. That the verse quoted is from some treatise
dealing specifically with the Tāttvārjya text may be inferred (not
too confidently) from its making no mention of th as requiring
the insertion of k; it being the fact that no example of th in such a
situation is to be found in the Sanhitā.

Finally, as counter-examples, where the two mutes are of different
classes, we receive (except in O.) vāh ma āsan (v.5.92: G. M.
end with me), śan māsāh (v.5.34), viduthāni manmahē (iv.7.153),
and dāmnd paṅcām (ii.4.13: W. B. have dāmm only): here
the combinations are to be made nūm, mm, nmn, and mnm.
The illustrations are quite one-sided, both for and against the rule,
being only groups containing a nasal.

This rule furnishes the most of all the prescribed
restrictions to the sphere of duplication, as there are somewhat over a hundred consonant groups to which it applies.

24. Unless, indeed, it be a non-nasal followed by a nasal.

This is a precept of counter-exception, contravening in part the exceptions established by the foregoing rule. Examples are yācāḍa (i.5.7*: the only example of this combination which the text affords), yajñē-yajñē (iii.1.11*: but O. has yajñena, vi.5.3 et al.), अःप्यरः (v.6.5*: also the sole instance), सु प्रत्नवा (ii.1.2.1 et al.; in O. only), and pāpmāna (i.4.41 et al.): a counter-example is tām mā devāḥ (iii.3.2*: wanting in O.).

The cases here denied exemption from duplication are those in which, according to xx1.12, yama is introduced between the two mutes. According to the Vāj. Prāt. (iv.111), yama suspends duplication.


A simple heading for the rules that follow, in force as far as rule 28 inclusive—or, according to the commentator’s interpretation of rule 28, through 27 only.

26. A l is not doubled when followed by h, c, or v.

The commentator’s examples are mālḥā d’labhanta (ii.1.2*: but B. O. have -bheta, which is found in the same division, and G. M. read -bhate, which is doubtless a corruption of the same path), patavalōc vi roha (i.3.5 and vi.3.3*: O. omits vi roha), and tato bīlovaḥ (ii.1.8*: O. substitutes bīloko yōpah, ii.1.81*: his counter-examples (omitted in O.) are kalmāṣē (v.1.1*) and kalyāṇī (vii.1.6*).

This rule, we are told, determines the usage of the school so far as the combinations lh and lc are concerned, but not in the case of


pāpmānaḥ: ‘anuttama uttamapara iti kim: tan.... ’ utta- maḥ paro yasmdā asēv° uttamaparaḥ. savarnasavargyapara° (xiv.23) iti pratishehadhapraptaḥ avyām ārambhāḥ.

1 O. pravārtha. 2 O. om. 3 O. om. 4 in O. only. 5 O. om.; B. om. anut- tama; W. om. uttama. 6 G. M. om. para.

25. athe ‘ty avyām adhikāraḥ: ekeśām ‘mate’ kriyata’ ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttarāni yad vakhṣyāmaḥ.

1 G. M. ins. doāryādām. 2 G. M. matam; O. maṣcitam. 3 G. M. O. adhikri-
lv. But O. has an inserted passage, so corrupted as to be hardly
intelligible, which quotes a verse (easily made such by a little
emendation) from some authority unspecified, making a distinction
between lv as occurring in a circumflexed syllable or otherwise—
that is to say, between bīlavāh and bālavāh.

All the groups here treated of are quite rare, lc occurring, I
believe, only in vala (vii.3.19) and its compounds, and lh only in
mathā; lv is sometimes found also as the result of sandhi (as at
i.5.08; ii.5.16).
The commentator adds, finally, that the next rule also is not
approved.

27. Nor a mute that is followed by a mute.

This is a view of certain authorities merely, and unapproved.
The examples are vāg devś (t.7.108), apām vajānām (iv.6.68),
dhārā (v.6.58), sa pratnavat (ii.2.121 et al.), and yam apnavā-
nāk (i.5.11): O. has only the first two of them.

28. Nor an original final that is followed by a consonant.

The natural meaning of this rule would appear to be simply that,
in the opinion of some authorities, a final mute which is not the
product of euphonic alteration is exempted from duplication before
any initial consonant whatever (not before a mute only, as in the
preceding rule). The commentator, however, manages to extract
from it a very different value: namely, that n final is not liable to
duplication before a semivowel or spirant (i.e. ḷ); and he regards

26. ā kesām ā mate haçavakāraparo lāko rah dvitiṁ nā
"padyate. matḥā..... śata..... tato..... "evampara iti
kim: kaṁāḥi: 'kalyānī. hākāra ca gākāra ca vakāra
c a hācavakārāh: teśa pare yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.

atra haçapare kāryam ishām nā tu vākārapare: " nā 'pi pa-
rasūtram" ishām.

27. ā kesām ā mate sparçapara sparṣoḥ dvitiṁ nā "padyate.
vāg..... apām..... "ātānāra: sa..... yam..... " sparṣa
paro yasmād eva tu sparçaparāh.

1 G. M. ins. sa. 2 G. M. O. ins. acīrayānā. 3 G. M. lavāko. 4 O. om. 5 W.
6 O. etc. 7 G. M. O. om. 8 O. ins. lakārasya haçavakārapara iti sūtre sthitāk
kinn kāraṇai nanu vakāra iti prayojanam asti: lakārakārasya saṁyoga svarilo
yadi: tadd mamukka eva eyā dasiyukta tadanyathā: iti vacānām asti kasmāt kā-
raṇāt: yadda lakārakārapara iti: tato bīlavā. 9 O. sūtram.

1 O. ins. acīrayānā. 2 O. puts next after mate. 3 O. na dvitiṁ āptoti. 4 O.
om.
this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this pākha. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover.

In the first place, vyañjanapara, 'followed by a consonant,' is declared to mean 'followed by any other consonant than a mute,' because otherwise, as we have read 'followed by a mute' in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word; and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, sparçapara is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator's conclusion being that there is duplication of n before a mute, though not before a semi-vowel; and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of anuvrtti which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22): the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter; the latter is here qualified as final and as original; and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

28. vyañjanapara iti sparçavyatirkavyañjanapara ity arthaḥ: anyathā sparçānām api grahaṇe pārvasūtre 'pi sparçā' ity uktiva tāt pārunakṣyam sydt. nanu nimittavīcēśhān' nimittavīcēsho 'sti: padnantvam prākṛtīvāca nimiṣītī vīcēśdā nimittasāy tu sarvayāñjanātmakatvam': iti cet: tathā 'pi sparçabhāge' nimittavīcēshasā vāiyarthyam: sparçapara ity 'atra sāmānyana 'pi' nimittavīcēshasā' vigatātntād': tasmād antasthādaya eva 'tra vyañjanaṇaṇadena 'vyante. 'cakāro yady api sparçamātrā- kartakakas tathā 'pi pāriṣēṣhān': 'nukārasya 'nukarṣhānam.:" tathā hi: antasthādiveayājanaparatve 'nyusparçānām' avikrtānām pādante sthitir nā 'sti: samrād ity atrā 'sti 'ti cet: māi 'vam: na saṃ sām iti " rāpara (xiii.4) ity atra vāiyarthyād": itiṣabdō makārasya dvitvasadhbhavam bodhayati 'ty' adhyayanānuruddhād upapadditam: tasmān nāi 'śa nishedhavishayaḥ. "nā 'pi brahmunvantaḥ: nava... ityādivishayaḥ:" kutah: iha
so far as mutes were concerned: the reason he gives is of course a mere quibble, and the point of it is so fine that I am not confident of seeing it rightly: it seems to be, that there is an absence of such qualification in the implied term spargapara. At any rate, the comfortable conclusion is, that only the semivowels etc. are intended by the term "consonant" as employed in the rule. The next step is, to declare that ka, 'nor,' although it strictly brings forward 'a mute,' without qualification, yet really amounts, on the principle of exclusion, to an implication of n only. Namely, thus: no other consonant remains unchanged at the end of a word before a semivowel or spirant. It may be objected that m also does so before r (by xiii.4) in such words as samraj: but this is of no account; for, if admitted as a reproach to the interpretation now under treatment, it would convict of superfluousness a part of rule xiii.4: namely, the iti, which was shown, in accordance with the received reading of the pākhā, to teach the duplication of the m. We see now why that atrociously forced and groundless construction of the meaning of rule xiii.4 was made; it was needed to bolster up in advance the forced and groundless construction to be put upon the present precept. As the m, then, constitutes no ground of exception, so neither do the nasals n and ŋ in such cases as brahmanvantah (vi.4.101) and nyāsī rāpniśibhiḥ (ii.4.102) For why? the qualification prākṛta, 'original,' in the rule involves [as belonging to the letter to which it is applied] the quality of being alterable, since it would otherwise be meaningless; and there is no case to be found where either n or ŋ is altered before a semivowel or spirant. If, then, the term prākṛta is to be allowed its proper force, the implication of any other mute than n must be excluded. Here is another most arbitrary act of construction—as if prākṛta meant necessarily (an alterable mute) when it retains its original form,' instead of simply 'a mute' that retains its original form.'

prākṛta iti vipēṣhañāṁ vikṛtasadbhāvaṁ" kalpayati: "anyathā svasya" vājyathyāt: tac ca vikṛtataṁ nākāraṣyaṁ nākāraṣyaṁ vā 'ntasthādīparataṁ" suti kvacid api padānte na śreyate: tasmāt prākṛta iti" prayogasadphalyāya" nākāraṣyaṁ iti 'nukarṣamān yuktam iti pāriceṣṭhyam.

kim ca: māhisheyā 'pi nākāraṣyāī vā 'nukarṣamānāṃ Siddhāvvaṅkatryō" "ktam: "tutte 'yam sauṣṭrayojand": ekṣahān "mate pa-dāntaḥ prākṛto nākāro 'ntasthādivyajanaparo" na dviśvaṁ āpadyate. yathā: mitro...: om...: etāṁ...: padānta iti kim: anyā...: anv... antasthādipara iti kim: tān...: imān... prākṛta iti kim: tān...: "vāish..." nanu katham atra" vikṛtataṁ:

rephād tvarānāt" tvarān ca tavargāc ca parāc ca nah": tavargasthāno" ity āhūr 'ntasthāno' 'nāya' ucyate. iti vacandā asti sathānabhideḥ krtaṁ" vikṛtataṁ "iti brāmāh.
The authority of Māhīśeṣya (see note to the introductory verses, p. 7) is further appealed to as making the same restriction of implication. His explanation is that, in the view of some teachers, a final unaltered n followed by a semivowel or spirant is not doubled. Examples are ni-tra janin yaṭyati (iii.4.11; only G. M. have ni-tra), omanvati te (ii.6.9; p. oman-vati), and etān homān (i.5.4); in all which we are to understand that the n remains single. On the other hand, there is duplication in anyā (i.e. ananyā) yanti (ii.5.12) and anv (i.e. annv) aha madh (i.7.13), where the n is not final; in tān (i.e. tān) kulpayati (v.3.12) and imān (i.e. imānn) bhadrān (i.8.21), where the n is followed by a mute; and also in tān rakṣādhanām (i.2.7) and dāśīrāṇān rakṣādhanāh (i.3.22), where, it is asserted, the n does not maintain its original form. Since, however, there is no rule in the Prātiṣṭhāyaśa for altering a n in this last pair of cases, the commentator quotes (from the same authority, we may conjecture, which has been recently twice appealed to, under rules 23 and 26) a prescription to the effect that n when preceding a r or an r-vowel, or when following a lingual (the MSS. say, a dental) mute, is uttered in the lingual position; thus, he says, in virtue of its change of position, the n is phonetically altered. Finally, he makes an alleged citation from the Ckāśa (not found in the version known to us), which teaches that a final n preceding r exhibits a peculiarity, and is liable to duplication. Such a modification of the utterance of n forms no part of the phonetic system of any of the Prātiṣṭhāyas.

Thus is brought to an end the tedious subject of duplication, the physical foundation of which is of the obscurest, although the pains with which the Hindu gākhinaḥ have elaborated it, and the earnestness with which they assert their discordant views respecting it, prove that it had for them a real, or what seemed like a real, value.

---

29. A grave following an acute becomes circumflex.

The following rule shows that the substantive here to be understood is *svarūḥ*, 'vowel.' All the other Prātiṣṭhākyas, in their corresponding rules (R. Pr. iii.9, V. Pr. iv.134, A. Pr. iii.67), state the principle as applying to an *akṣharum*., 'syllable.' In his explanation and illustration, however, the commentator is not careful to bear this in mind. He states the sphere of the rule to be all the three kinds of enclitic circumflex, the *prātiṣṭhāta* (xx.3), *pādavṛtti* (xx.6), and *tātirṇyanājana* (xx.7), although these in part include cases to which only the next rule attributes the circumflexed quality. And his examples are *sā idhānāḥ* (iv.4.4b), *āthā bṛvacīt* (iii.2.11f), *ndasy aśi* (i.2.5 et al.), *prāyāgam* (iv.4.21), and *tāyā devādayā* (iv.2.92 et al.); of which only the first and fourth show the circumflex vowel following the acute without an intervening consonant (rule 30). Nor are all the examples unexceptionable in other respects: for though the *i* of *idhānāḥ* and the *a* of *āśi* are really *anuvātta*, 'grave,' in the *pada*-text, and so show an actual conversion into circumflex, the other exhibited cases of enclitic circumflex are circumflexed in the *pada*-text as well, and undergo no alteration in consequence of their change to *samhitā*. It is at this that the commentator aims, when he adds that, "there being grave quality in the condition of separation of letters, then, when these are combined together, circumflex quality appears in accordance with the present precept." That is to say, it is the natural unaccented quality of the syllable that is here implied in *anuvātta*, not its being technically grave, and marked as such. This understanding is also needed in order to make good rule 31, where we are not taught that the enclitically circumflexed final of *āthā*, for example, becomes grave before an acute or circumflex (as in *Ātha tvām, ātha kṛvā*), but that the unaccented final *a*, which was made circumflex by rules 29 and 30 after *ā*, is exempted from the change when so followed, and remains unaccented.

The enclitic circumflex is written in the recorded Tātītirīya text in the same manner as in the Rik and Atharvāṇ; namely, by the perpendicular stroke above the syllable, the same that is used for the independent circumflex. The method is so familiar to all students of the Veda that it does not need to be illustrated here. Certain specialities of Tātītirīya usage will come up for notice under later rules (xix.3, xx.10,11).

---


1 O. om. *pādavṛtti*, and ins. *prādyota* before *viḥār.-
2 W. eva ‘dhaśātā sam-.
4 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. O. *tallakṣaṇaḥ* sv.
For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accental system, see the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (1.40) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accental systems (see F. Misteli, in Kuhn's Zeitschrift, vol. xvii., 1868; also Prof. J. Hadley, in the Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Society for Oct. 1869 [Journal, vol. ix., pp. lxii.-lxiii.]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent \\textit{svarita}, and should set down the latter as a "middle tone," in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savors of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

\\textit{व्यञ्जनाचित्रिती श्र्वी II ३० II}

30. Even when consonants intervene.

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the affected and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer; but he quotes, nevertheless, \textit{tad ugne avarnō bhuvāmi} (iii. 3.8²: B. O. omit \textit{bhuvāmi}) and \textit{yās tvā hṛdad} (i.4.46¹): in the first case, \textit{ag}- and \textit{bha}- are circumflexed; in the second, \textit{tvā}.

\\textit{नोदातस्वर्णययः II ३१ II}

31. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29, the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (\textit{nītya} or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of \textit{anudāta}, as a vantage-ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception,

30. \textit{vyañjanāntarhitā} \textit{py udātāt puro nūdātāh svoritam} \textit{āpadyate. yathā: tad....: yas....: ity ādi. antarhito vyavahita ity arthāḥ.}

¹ O. om. ² B. -laksom. ³ G. M. om. ⁴ G. O. om.
all authorities are agreed (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.70); although we should not less naturally expect the double attraction, of a high tone on either hand, to exercise at least as much assimilating effect upon the pitch of an intermediate syllable as a preceding high tone alone exerts.

The commentator's examples are sá imám lokám (i.5.9*; but G. M. add ájíyan, which doubtless means tá imám lokám ájíyan, vii.1.5*), tásmát tá ádyá tannadhánát (vii.1.1*; only O. has the first word and the last), kíríná mányamánah (i.4.46*), and tásyá ávṛddham ángám ájíyata (vi.5.6*; only G. M. have the last two words): the vowels between acute and acute, or between acute and circumflex, in these examples, are anudáta, and written, as such, with the horizontal stroke beneath.

The three rules here given only apply, in strictness, to a single unaccented syllable following an acute; where there is more than one such, the rules for praacyá (xxi.10,11) come into force.

32. Not so, according to Ágniveygyáyana.

The significance of this rule (which is declared unapproved, in the comment to its successor) is more clearly stated by O., in an independent exposition, than by the other four versions of the comment. It is meant to exhibit an opinion contravening the doctrine laid down by its predecessor, and allowing the circumflex accent to stand, even when the following syllable has, or begins with, the high tone. No examples are given, except by O., which has ádádré (i.6.2* et al.) and tánya kvā svargád (ii.6.5*).

G. M. read, in rule and comment, Ágnivágyáyana.

33. Some say not, in all cases.

31. udáttasvaritaparásu udáttat paró 'nudátto na' svaritam ápadyate. yathá: sa...... tas......: kir......: tasyá...... udáttá ca svaritaḥ co 'dáttasvaritáḥ: tát pariś yasmát sa tatho 'kthah.

32. párvasútrapratiprasaváartho 'yaná nukáthah: udáttat paró 'nudáttaḥ svaritam 'ágniveygyáyana' muta udáttaparásu 'svá' svaritaparásu 'vd' svaritaparásu 'vd' 'vd' 'ná' 'padyata iti na'. púrvoktaṁ evo 'dáharaṇáni.

1 W. paró nán; B. svaritaparásu 'vd'; G. M. udáttaparásu svaritaparásu 'vd'; O. do., except vi. 7 G. M. O. put after svaritam. 3 B. ápnoti; O. prapnoti. 4 G. M. om.

1 B. -páryá prati-. 2 G. M. om. 3 G. M. -yana. 4 W. B. G. M. -tát pa-. 5 B. 'nudáttaḥ; G. M. om. 6 B. G. M. ins. svaritam. 7 B. om.
According to the majority of MSS. of the comment, the denial of these skeptical people is not limited to the enclitic svarita, but extends to the whole accent, in all its seven forms (xx.1–8). Thus, namely; in the brāhmaṇa of the Vājasaneyins (that is to say, the Catapatha-Brāhmaṇa) there are only two accents, the acute and the grave. But O. has once more a version of its own, stating that the authorities here referred to would not, like Āgṅgiyāyana, annul rule 31 simply, but would also deny the rules in general for the enclitic circumflex, as in sā idhāṇāḥ (iv.4.4¹) and prapāṭha (MS. prathā) asī (ii.5.12⁴). We cannot well hesitate to prefer the latter interpretation; there has been no question here of the independent circumflex, and a denial of its existence would be altogether out of place and impertinent. Nor is the reference to the Catapatha-Brāhmaṇa one at all likely to have been intended by the Prātiṣṭhākyā. And it is not true, except so far as the mode of designating the accents is concerned, that that treatise has no circumflex accent: it writes, to be sure, only the anudattā sign, so that, if the value of this were the same as in the other usual systems of designation, all its syllables would be either grave or acute: and on this foundation, later Hindu systematists have declared them such, and painfully elaborated an exposition of them (see Weber's Ind. Studien, x. 397 ff.).

Rules 32 and 33 are, naturally enough, declared unapproved; but to us it is both interesting and important to find that there were Hindu phonetists in the ancient time who did not admit such an element of utterance as the enclitic circumflex.

CHAPTER XV.

CONTENTS: 1–3, nasalization of vowels, or insertion of anuvṛtra, in cases of the loss or alteration of n or m; 4–5, the same, in the cases detailed in the next chapter; 6–8, the same, in the case of certain finals; 9, utterance in monotone.

33. na kevalom uddattat parah: kim tu surva eva saapavidhah-svarito na'asti 'ty eke cākhino manyante. tathā hi: vājasaneyi-brāhmaṇe'duva eva svarāv: uddattas cā'nuddattas ca.
ne 'dān sātrādavayam' ishtam.

O. substitutes eke cākhino manyante na kevalinuddattak uddattassaritaparak : pratiṣṭhāyati kim tari uddattakapārvakaḥ ca: sā...... prathā...... ne 'dān etc.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣṭhākyavyavaraṇe
caturdāsō'dhydyuh.

¹ W. vajñeprādā.-; B. -nehir-.; G. M. -neyabr.-. ² W. -drom. ³ G. M. O. divitiye prače deśiyo.
1. In case of the conversion of \( n \) into \( r \), a spirant, or \( y \)—also when the \( y \) is omitted—or in case of the omission of \( m \), the preceding vowel becomes nasal.

That this Prātiṣṭhāna takes no distinct and consistent ground upon the question whether the so-called anumāna consists in a nasalization of the vowel or in a nasal consonantal element following the vowel, has been already pointed out (note to ii.30); as also, that the present rule is the one where the former view is most unequivocally taken. As the objection which the commentator belongs has adopted the other view, he declares (under rule 2) that the doctrine here laid down is unapproved.

The “conversion of \( n \) into \( r \) or a spirant” is, of course, the retention of a historical final \( s \) after \( n \) unchanged before \( t \) (vi.14), or changed to \( p \) before \( c \) (v.20), or to \( r \) before a vowel (ix.20 etc.); its “conversion into \( y \,” with the (invariably) consequent “loss of the \( y \)” (ix.20 etc., x.19), goes back to the same cause. The commentator’s illustrative examples are aṃnīṣṭḥ aprasīkṣad (v.6.13), sa triṃś ekādaśiṃtha (iii.2.113: found in O. only), kārnāḍca kār-

nāḍca (i.8.93), triṇa tricā (ii.5.101), and mahaṃ ināra (i.4.20 et al.), of which the last is by part of the MSS., rather needlessly, quoted twice, once for the conversion of the \( n \) into \( y \) (for which it should be written mahaṃ ināra), and again for the loss of the \( y \). For the loss of \( m \) (by xiii.2), the examples are pratyusīśā rakṣaḥ (i.1.21 et al.) and eukṣātīm me (iv.1.103 et al.).

The commentator explains anumāna by sānumāna, as if the word were properly a noun, and needed reduction to adjective form; in this treatise, however, it is always and only an adjective, meaning ‘nasal’ (see note to ii.30).

2. Some deny this.


This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead. The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this pākhā.

3. And claim that, on the contrary, anusvāra is inserted after the vowel.

The anusvāra here prescribed is called by the commentator an āgama, 'increment.' Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the tu, 'on the contrary,' is the sign in the rule. There is one example given: sa triñh ekādaśan iha (iii.2.113: W. B. omit sa).

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor; and the usage of the recorded Taittirīya text corresponds.

4. Anusvāra is also inserted in the case of sra etc., in a single word, before a spirant.

"Also" (ca) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment. The srādayas, 'sra etc.,' are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of anusvāra in the Taittirīya-Sanhitā otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1–3 of this chapter. The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it. The commentator quotes a single case, poñāḥ moda īve 'ti (iii.2.93: it falls under xvi.2); and then gives counter examples, establishing the restrictions made: tāsāṁ triñh ca (ii.5.83) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi.; tasmā saṁ avy āvarasa (i.4.453 et al.; only G. M. have āvarasa) and prastaraṁ dhi sūka (ii.6.128: found in O. only) show that it is to

2. ekaśāṁ mate pūrasūtrokteshu 1 sānumāṣikyanā 2 na 3 bhavati. uktaṁ evo 'dāharaṇāni. idam 'eva 4 śaktiṁ 5 na tu pūrvam.

1 G. M. na 'na. 2 W. G. M. O. om. 3 W. G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. om. 5 O. evo śukram iṣṭa.

3. tata iti sarvanāmāṃ parāṁ śaktatā svaratā paro 'nuvāra' āgamo bhavati. yathā: sa 7 .... parāṁ śaktasvarasāyā 'numāṣikānā' gahā tūpadō niyartayaś 'tī': tasmādi anumāṣikapraśā ṣhadāpaksā evā yam anusvārāgamānuḥ syāt.

1 G. M. -śāka. 2 G. M. -ra. 3 B. G. M. -vār. 4 G. M. om. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. -śaktā svarā. 7 G. M. -ha. 8 O. -vāraya. 9 G. M. O. om. 10 W. B. -dhāt p.; G. M. -dhaṅ vāk- śyamānā.
be made only in a single word—that is to say, if I understand the meaning, that if mā sām and hi stū were single words, they would fall respectively under rules 8 and 13 of the next chapter, and have the increment—; and māyā māyām (iii.117) shows that a spirant must follow (māyām otherwise falling under xvi.8). To the specification ekapade, 'in a single word,' the commentator adds in his paraphrase the explanation akhandapade, 'in an undivided word;' and then, in his illustration, he treats this as a restriction or limitation, and establishes it by an example, trishāhara vāt (v.8.83; p. tri-sāhasrah); rule xvi.25 would otherwise require the increment after tri.

5. Not before an altered final.

The illustrative example is bahis te astu bād iti (iii.3.102: G. M. omit the last two words): we have in it a s following hi in a single undivided word; and hence, by xvi.13, should have to read bahisna, but for this restriction. The alteration is from h to s, according to ix.2. As counter-example is given mā hiṁsira dvipādam (iv.2.101: G. M. O. omit the last word), a case falling under the rule already referred to.

6. According to some authorities, the simple vowels, except the pragṛahas, are nasalized.

This and the remaining rules of the chapter have the aspect of an intrusion, as they interrupt the natural connection of what precedes and what follows, and merely give the view of certain authorities on points which the Prātiṣṭhākhyas in general leave untouched. They are brought in here as having to do with nasalized vowels, which are the subject of this chapter and its successor.

With the nasalization thus taught is to be compared that noticed in the Rik Prāt. (at i.16, r. 63, lxiv), which teaches that the first

4. 'āgamānvadeṣakus cakāraḥ: srādisṛ ekapade 'khandupada' uṣṇaparor 'nusvārāgamo bhavati. yathā: goṁsa... srādisṛ iti kim: tāsāṁ... ekapade iti kim: tām...: 'prast... akhandaviseśhaṇena' kim: trish... uṣṇapar a iti kim: māyā....

5. na khalu padāntavikārāḥ pūrvaśmiṃ anusvārāgamo bha-vati. yathā: bahis...: hiṣujjā (xvi.13) iti praptih. antavikārād iti kim: mā... antasya vikaśa 'ntavikāraḥ: taśmad antavikārād.'

1 W. vik. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 G. M. om.
eight vowels (namely a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, r, ř) are by [some?] teachers declared nasal when they are not pradhyāna, and stand as finals before a pause. This is different, first, in including r and ř (which are not samāndaksharānī according to our treatise: compare i.2; but the difference amounts to nothing, as the vowels in question never occur avasāne, but only avagrahe); and secondly, in limiting the nasalization to finals, before a pause. But it is perfectly evident that our rule also applies to finals only, and, as we shall see, the commentator resorts to great violence to bring in the implication of “final” in rule 8, below. Again, the specification “in samāndaksharānī also,” in rule 8, and the interpretation of padam in rule 7 as signifying padakāle, ‘in pada-text,’ sufficiently prove that the present precept does not apply in samāndaksharānī—that is, that avasāne, ‘in padāl,’ is implied here. And the absence of statement or anuvrata of these two essential implications is strong additional evidence that the rules are interpolated.

By most of the MSS., only one example is given, namely kulāyini vasumati (iv.3.41), which, if our understanding, as above explained, is correct, is to be read, in pada-text, kulāyinī : vasumati. O. adds trīsatantā evādī (i.1.11b), one of the cases of suspended combination falling under x.13, and (by R. Pr. ii.31,32) in the Rig-Veda requiring nasalization of the uncombined final: its citation seems to indicate that O. would not limit the operation of the rule to the pada-text. To show that the nasalization does not take place in uncombinable vowels, or pragrahās, are quoted, in pada-form, antī iti (ii.3.71 et al.) and tanā iti (ii.2.75: omitted in O.). To illustrate the limitation to simple vowels, we find in most MSS. so evāi ’shāi ’tasya (ii.2.97); but O. gives instead agnaye 'nikavate (i.8.41 et al.), vishnav e 'hi 'dam (ii.4.125), and vāyav ishtaye (ii.2.128).

The commentator, as he has done repeatedly before (under i.49, ii.7, v.2), notices the apposition in the rule of apragrahāh and samāndaksharānī, two words of different gender. He signifies, further, under the next rule, that both that and this are unapproved.

7. As is also, according to Čaṅkhaṇyana and Kāṇḍamāyana, a protracted pada.

By pada is here signified, according to the commentator, a word

6. 1 yāni samāndaksharānī apragrahāsāṃjñānī tāny īkṣeṣāṁ mate bhavaṇty ‘anunāśikāni. 1 kul-.-- apragrahā iti kīm: antī itī: tanā itī: samāndaksharānī ‘ti kīm: ‘so-.-- apragrahaksharapadādyayor nityālaṅgatayā pariṣparānyavo ghaṭate. na apragrahā apragrahāh’. 1 O. ins. ekṣeṣāṁ dārṣṭyāṁ mate. 2 O. om. 3 O. -kṣaṇīṇī patasākante. 4 O. ins. a.m-.-- 5 O. om. 6 O. aγh-.--: viṣh-.-: vāy-.-- 7 W. niyaṃtu.
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in the pada-text; and the interpretation, as was remarked above, is fully supported by the specification of sanhitā in the next rule.

As examples of nasalized protracted vowels, are given teṣa ity abravīt (i.4.12) and astu his ity abhratām (vii.1.6), both in sanhitā-form, although it is again expressly pointed out that the nasalization is not made in sanhitā: the two worthies referred to would read tvīṇa; and hiṇa. It is added that ca, ‘also,’ in this rule effects its connection with what is prescribed in the preceding one—or, as O., in more customary phrase, expresses it, brings forward by implication the preceding rule.

Some, we are further informed, restrict the application of the precept to words which contain a single vowel protracted, and would not regard it as authorizing nasalization in na chinattā iti (i.7.2) or na vicitṛśa iti (vi.1.9): G. M. omit iti.

The rule is declared to be of no binding force.

8. An a, however, is nasalized in sanhitā also.

The commentator’s explanation is that nasality and protraction are here implied (from the preceding rule) by vicinage; and that tu, ‘however,’ is intended to annul the implication that only the opinion of the two authorities specified in rule 7 is reported. And though the comprehensive statement “an a” is made in the rule, nevertheless, in virtue of rule i.58, “continued implication is of that which is last (or final),” the “also” (apū) really brings down only a final a as suffering a prescribed effect by the attribution of nasal quality. The sense, then, is that a protracted final a is nasalized, both in sanhitā and elsewhere. Examples are suṣṭakāṃ sūnavigalāṃ (i.8.16), upahittāṃ (ii.8.7), yajo mamāṃś (vii.4.20); these are, in fact, all the cases of protraction of simple final a which the text contains; and the edition (so far as it goes) and my MS. nasalize the a, as required by the interpretation of the rule here given. The cases are much more numerous in which a final aḥ exhibits aṣ as the ultimate result of protraction, the ḥ being lost before a following vowel or sonant consonant: namely, at i.5.9; v.5.1,3.2 twice; vi.1.9 twice; 3.8; 4.3; 6.2; and in one place, vi.5.8, the same final aṣ comes from a protracted e: the question might possibly arise whether these do not also fall under

---

1 W. yastra. 2 O. om. 3 W. tatra. 4 O. puts after bhavati. 5 G. M. om. 6 G. M. O. dāpakāh. 7 O. -vidhim. 8 O. anuddicatī. 9 O. putakaṇapadam iti ha ma bhūt. 10 W. suīram.
the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below); and the text reads accordingly. The manuscripts of the commentary give as found "in another gāthā," one example, read brahmān in W. B. (O. is wanting), and yadghrā in G. M.: I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school; brahmān is found at i.8.16\(^1\) twice, \(^2\) twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its a not being final; it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given. These are satyayājaś (i.8.16\(^2\)) agraś āty dāha (vi.5.8\(^4\); W. has dropped out agrās), and viciṭyaḥ somās na viciṭyaḥ iti (vi.1.9\(^1\); O. has only this).

Finally, the commentator remarks that Čānkhāyana and Kānda-māyana also accept this principle. He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities; and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary. It was noticed under i.58 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one. The implication of "final" is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all; whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could.

The Ath. Prāt. gives (at i.105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates. This our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place. A final a is protracted to dāḥ at i.8.16\(^2\) twice; ii.6.7\(^3\); vii.4.20: --aḥ to dāḥ at i.4.27; v.5.1\(^3\); and to dā (the ā being lost) at i.5. 9\(^6\); v.5.1\(^3\); *vi.1.91 twice; 3.8\(^1\); 4.3\(^4\); 6.2\(^3\): --au to dāṃ at i.8.16\(^1\) twice, 16\(^2\) thrice; ii.8.5\(^6\): --am to dāṃ at vi.1.4\(^5\); 5.9\(^1\); vii. 1.7\(^4\); 5.7\(^1\) twice: --i to ṣi at i.7.2\(^1\); i.4.12\(^6\); vi.5.9\(^1\); vii.1.6\(^1\); 7\(^4\): --uḥ to ṣaḥ or ṣaḥ at i.5.9\(^6\); vi.3.10\(^1\): --in to ṣaṃ at vi.4.20 twice: --uḥ to ṣaṛ at vi.3.8\(^1\): --e to ṣaḥi at i.4.27; vi.1.4\(^5\); and

8. sāṃniḥyād anunāsikaplustāv̄ grhyate: tupaḥprakrīdāryamatānivartaṅkaḥ: ata' eva saṁhītiyād a saṁhitāyānī ca 'kāraḥ padāntaḥ pluto 'nunāsiko bhavati: yady aṣya akāra iti sāmānayo 'ktaḥ: tathā 'py anvādego 'ntyasya (i.58) iti vacanād api pārdo 'nunāsinkdharmatayād nimittinaśaṃ padāntam eva 'kram anvādiṣitaḥ. yatāḥ: sukṣ...: uṣṭ...: yya...: brahmānā ity anyasyānī "gāthāyām". api pabbah kimarthāh: "sate...: aga...:1" viciṭyaḥ...: gāthāyanaṇaṃ adhaṃyaṇyayor api ayaśevidhīr "akāre pluto sammataḥ".

---

1 G. M. -phuta. 4 O. -pūrvaśīry-.
2 W., et al.: M. -tala. 4 O. om. 5 W. O. om.
6 O. om. 7 B. O. om. 9 O. om. 10 G. M. -yadgrā. 11 G. M. -anya.
15 O. om. 16 O. -mpīrās sammatām.
to ā (see i.4) at vi.5.8⁴:—ādu to āsv at vi.6.2⁸. The protracted syllable has always the acute accent.

9. According to the former ones, all is of one pitch.

The comment is completely at a loss as to how this rule is to be understood, and gives three more or less discordant interpretations of it, the first of which we are probably to regard as the preferred one, if there be a preference. "All" means 'every kind of articulate sound,' "of one pitch" is equivalent to ekāṣṛuti, yama denoting the tone of an acute syllable; "the former ones" are 'the sacrificers;' the meaning is, then, that in the sacrificial usage of the sacrificers everything is uttered in acute monotone. O. has an exposition of its own, which is in great part too corrupt to be read without considerable emendation, and which conducts to the same conclusion: it quotes, apropos of pūrve, a pada of a trīṣṭubh verse from some sacred text, "the former ones spoke those words to the former ones."

The second interpretation differs from the first only in declaring pūrve, 'the former ones,' to designate certain pākhīnāḥ, or 'holders of a Vedic text.'

The third is of quite another character; it makes yama to be equivalent to svara in the sense of ‘vowel,’ and explains ‘every monosyllable is nasalized’—the intent being to annul the restriction to simple vowels only (as made in rule 6). Who the pūrve are, is not told us this time.

The commentator consoles himself at the end by declaring the rule not approved. We may fairly extend the same condemnation

9. 'sarvam' varṇjātām ekayaṁam ekāṣṛuti 'ti pūrveshām' matam. yama nāma svara udātta ity arthaḥ: pūrve nāma yājñikāḥ: teshāṁ yajñakarmanī sarvam ekāṣṛuti bhavati.

anye manyante: pūrve nāma kecic chākhānāḥ: teshāṁ sarvam ekāṣṛuti 'ti' athā' pare kathayanti: sarvam ekāṣvaram anunāṣikam bhavati 'ti': 'samāṇāksharamātrapekhāṁ adhikseptum'.

ne 'dam sātram ishām.

iti triṇāḥśhvaratne prātiṣṭhāhyavivaṃse paṃcadoṣo 'dhyāyāḥ.

to his treatment of it, and conjecture that, if he could only have 
told us what it meant, we might have found in it something to 
approve. We are tempted to seek in it some statement as to the 
accent of the protracted syllable, or pada; and, if it were allowed 
to amend pāreśhām to ekeshām, we might translate, 'some hold 
that the whole word in which protraction occurs is to be uttered 
in the same tone'—only then, to be sure, we should look for a 
statement of the usage actually followed in the text.

CHAPTER XVI.

CONTENTS: I—31, detail of the cases of occurrence, in the Sanshitā, of ś in the inte-
rior of a word, before a spirant.

ग्रह संकारपरः || 1 ||

1. Now for cases in which s follows.

A simple heading, of force through a considerable part of the 
chapter (i.e. through rule 13). The essential item of the precept 
laid down was given above, in xv.4, which directed that in all the 
cases to be specified in this chapter is to be assumed the presence 
of anuvāda following a vowel and followed by a spirant. Words 
in which that spirant is s form by far the most numerous class, and 
until rule 14 they alone are treated.

The Rik Pr. is the only one of the other treatises which offers 
anything at all analogous with this enumeration; it (at xiii.7–10) 
gives rules for the occurrence of anuvāda after long vowels only.

सशीतपाशः पदाद्यः स्वरपरे || 2 ||

2. ṣra, ṣo, ha, pa, and ṣa, at the beginning of a pada, take 
anuvāda before a s that is followed by a vowel.

The commentator cites examples, as follows. For ṣra, viṣṇa-
ayed amehend 'dhvaryaḥ (vi.2.94,107: G. M. O. have only the first 
word); we have other cases at ii.5.72: v.1.61: viii.3.109, all from the 
same root, ṣras. For ṣo, poṇāṇa modā ṯe 'ti (iii.2.92: G. M. omit 
the last word, O. the last two); I have noted no other case: as 
counter-example, to show that only o after ṣ takes the increment, 
is given Ṗāsānād śudamanasm (i.1.101: O. alone has the latter

1. athe 'ty ayam adhikaraḥ: ita uttare grahanaviceshāh sakā-
raparāh ity etad adhikraṇaṃ veditavyam. sakāraḥ paro 'yebhyas 
te sakāraparāh'.

 varios

word). For ha, haṅsaḥ cuciṣhād (i.8.15²: iv.2.1²); various other cases of haṅsa are found in the text, and haṅsi: that ha is not treated in the same way is shown by praṇā mā mā haṅsi (v.6.8¹: O. omits). For pa, pāṅśura śravaṇa (i.2.13²); other cases are pāṅśād and pāṅśavyāda, at ii.6.10² and iv.5.9¹ respectively: that pa would not have been correct is shown by dhataṁ gābe pasah (vii.4.10³: O. omits dhataṁ); pās, which would seem to fall under the rule, is excepted by rule 17, below. For pa, yad asināh caṅsaṭi tasmāt (ii.2.9⁷: W. B. G. M. omit tasmāt, thus allowing the citation to be found also at iii.2.9⁶); cases of this combination, all of them coming from the root caṅs, are not infrequent in the Sanhitā. As general counter-examples, we have, to establish the necessity of the restriction "at the beginning of a pada," agnir uktthena vāhad (i.5.11¹), somam pipāset (ii.1.10¹), and dhāda chaṅsaḥ (i.2.14⁶: O. omits); while tasmāt sa vārasyah (vi.2.9⁴,10⁷: only O. has the first two words), hasthayoh (iv.1.5³ et al.: G. M. O. omit), and kavicareh (ii.6.12⁶: all the MSS. have -castāḥ, which I have not found in the text, but probably by my own fault) do the same service for the specification "when a vowel follows."

The commentator goes on to say that some authorities accept hi as a part of this rule: which is not to be approved, since "at the beginning of a word" is here implied, and so ahiṅsādyā (v.2.8⁷) would be left without the increment. And if it be pleaded that ahiṅsāḥ parame (iv.2.101² et al.) should be an example here, the reply is made, that the anusvāra is assured to it by rule 13, below, where there is no restriction to the beginning of a word; and that to repeat here the specification of hi would be useless. The only criticism to be offered upon this is that the objection has too little reason to be really worthy of notice.

2. 2. sra: ya: ha: pa: ca: ity ete grahamavipeshāḥ paddādayaḥ sakāraparas tasmānt sakāre svarapare saty anusvāryanam bhajante. yathā: vi:...... gosā:...... okāreṇa kim: dya:...... haṃsāḥ:...... "hrasa iti kim: praṇā:......" pāṅsura:...... dirghena kim: âh:...... paddādaya iti kim: aghnir:...... somam:...... "dha:......" svarapara iti kim: tasmāt:...... "has:......" kav:......

keci atra sātre "higrāhānāṁ" añgikurvate¹; tad anusvāraṇam: paddādaya iti niyamāt: ahiṅsādyā ity otrā "nusvārabha-vaprasaṅgāṁ". nanu hiṃṣiḥ:...... ity etad atra "dāharānāṁ iti cet: māt 'vam: "hipujiṅgā (xvi.13) ity atra niyamābhāvā paddādāv aṭpaddādā ca" higrāhāṇāya kāryasiddheḥ punar atra grahamāḥ vyartam.¹²

svarāḥ paro yasmād aṣṭu svaraparaḥ: tasm. ¹³

---

3. Even when the vowel is altered.

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the $s$ has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant. A single example is cited, *apaḥaṁsy agne* (iv.7.13; p. *apa-haṁsi*); if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice.

4. As also, when they are preceded by *rā*

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nāḍrāpaṁśiḥ*bhayah (vii.5.112); the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *ca* is not at the beginning of a *pada*. The *ca*, ‘also,’ brings down only *ca*; and we are assured that this is the reason why *ca* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels. Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order.

5. Also in *caṇḍa*, except when it is accented on the final syllable.

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel. The passage is *utā caṇḍa suvīpaṁh* (iv.6.8.2: O. omits *suvīpraṁh*). The restriction as to accent

---

3. *apiṣadāḥ svāraṇvādegacakah*; *sakārāt pare tasmānt svare vikṛtam āpanne ‘pi vyaḥjanatām upagate ‘pi sydā anuvādraśvadhiḥ*. yathā: aha-......

1 B. *sakrān*. 2 W. and O. (?) *svadadha*. 3 lacuna in O., from (anuvādra-) *vadhiḥ* to svara under the next rule.

4. ‘capabāḥ srādhiḥ’ *caṇḍam anuvāḍcāti*; *etadartham eva svaraṇvātyāye ‘pi caṇḍagrahaśaṁ Ông tatrā 'nte kṛtām. rā: ity evaṃpārvarah caṇḍāraḥ sakārapaḥ ‘nuveṛdāgamām bhajate. yathā*: nār-...... *apaddāyartho* ‘yam drambhaḥ.

5. *caṇḍāt: ity etasmin grahaṇe 'naxtodātā' sakārapare bha-vatyā anuvādraśvadha. uta...... anaxtodātā iti kim: aṣu...... svraṣṭaḥ* (xvi.2) iti prāptau satyaṁḥ *sakāraṇa* *svaṇarapatvā*
is intended to exclude *āpaavya vicaśad* (iv.6.9\#; O. adds *ād vya*).

अशासनः II 6 II

6. Also in acaśāsan.

Yet another case belonging with those disposed of by rule 2, but requiring special treatment because the *ca* in it does not stand “at the beginning of a pada.” The passage is *abhi vy acaśāsan* (vi.6.11\#).

O., in an added paragraph, brings forward the objection that, in virtue of rule 1.52 (which makes the citation of any word include also the same word with a prefixed), acaśāsan has its *ā* already assured by rule 2; but refutes it by pointing out that the principle appealed to has to do only with a *pada* or word, not with a mere fragment of one, like *ca* (compare rule 10, below). It adds that “another reading is paśādn.”

न शतमन्त्र विशासनेन II 7 II

7. But not in caśanam and vičasanaṇa.

These are exceptions, the only ones the Sanhitā affords, under rule 2. The passages are *caśanam vājy arvā* (iv.6.7\#; O. ends with *vāj*) and *cuno vičasanaṇa* (v.7.23).

T. and O. have the simple *pada caśanena*, instead of *vičasanaṇa* (p. vi-caśanena) in the rule, and O. reads the same in its comment. This is doubtless an emendation, and makes a reading more strictly in accordance with the approved usage of the treatise. The comment has (especially in the fourth chapter) explained away many a like inaccuracy by the allegation of a phrase “in another pākha,” and we might expect to find added here *vi ti kim: acaśāsanena ti pākhaṇāre*.

bhāve ‘pi na ’yaṁ viḍhitr niṣhidhyatām iti grahaṇām*1. anta’
uddāto yaṣya taṇ antodāttam: “na ‘ntodāttam” anantodāttam:
tasmin. 11  

1 O. asmin. 3 W. B. O. antod-. 4 O. sudd-. 4 W. antod-. 6 G. M. om. 8 W. B.  
 podrá-. 9 G. M. ins. eva. 8 B. podium-. 8 W. O. anle. 11 O. om. 11 O. adds apa-duḍāyaṛtha . . . ity aneṇaṇā (which belongs at the end of the comment on rule 6).

6. acaśāsan ity asmin grahaṇe syād anuvārdgamaḥ. abhi 
*— * 'apaddāyaṛtho 'yaṁ drambhai'.

6. O. puts at end of comment on rule 5, and adds, partly there and partly here (a little amended), kimāraṇaṁ iđam. saṛcoḥapāga (xvi.2) ity aneṇā ‘va talāṭhāṁ: apery akāraṇi (1.52) ‘hi vacānā: maṭ vam: apery akāraṇi ‘hi vacānā padpana
paṭḍāyanaḥ saṛcoḥaḥ: saṭṭhāṁ iti pākhaṇāre.

7. caśanam: vičasanaṇa: ity etayor grahaṇayor anuvārd-
gamo na syāt. caḥ . . . : cuno . . . : saṛčoḥa (xvi.2) iti prāptiḥ.  

1 O. sar-, as also (with T.) in the rule itself. 3 O. om.
8. Mā takes anusvāra when beginning a pada and unaccented.

All the implications of rule 2 are here cut off (as is distinctly enough intimated by the express repetition of one of them, padaṇī), and hence it is to be understood that the increment takes place before a s whether this be or be not followed by a vowel. The examples are āhar matsena (v.7.20) and māṇopācanyā (iv.6.91). The restriction to the beginning of a pada is established by quoting sīlikamadhyamāsah (iv.6.74); that as to the accent, by māśaṁ dikshitāḥ syāt (v.6.73: only O. has syāt).

So far as I have discovered, this rule applies only to forms and combinations of māṇasa, which are not infrequent in the Sanhitā. The four following rules give it certain extensions and limitations.

9. As also when preceded by pu or mi, under all circumstances.

The closing specification of the rule amounts to a removal of the restriction as to accent, imposed in rule 8—that as to initial position being virtually removed by the prescribed prefixion of pu or mi. The examples quoted are ut pumāṇasāh harantī (vi.5.109: O. omits haranti, and B. runs the two citations together, having dropped out a part of each) and mimāṃsante kādye (vi.2.64). We have pumāṇasāṃ again at iv.6.65, and other forms of mimāṃsā at vi.2.64 and vii.5.71: I have noted no other words as falling under the rule.

10. And when followed by sakāya.

The ca, ‘and,’ we are told, here brings down mā; and G. M. add that the intent of the rule is to establish an exception under

---

8. mā: ity evaini' varṇāḥ padaṇī anudattaḥ sakārāparo 'nu-
svārāgamam bhajate. utra niyamābhāvāt sakārasa vavarapa-
tvābhāve'pi nimitatvam bhavaty eva. yuthā: ahar...: māṇo-
...... padaṇī iti kim: sīli...... anudatta iti kim: māsanī

9. čaśabdāṃ me 'ti jñāpayati: pu: mī: ity evuṁpirvo me 'ti' 
varṇāḥ sakārāparo niyam anuśvārāgamam bhajate. ut......: 
mīm...... anudattatvanivarita'ko niyamah. 

---

G. M. O. ayām. 1 O. om.

G. M. O. ins. ayām. 1 O. -niyamāyāvar-.
rule 8—that is to say, to bring under that rule a word which would otherwise be excluded in virtue of the requisition “when beginning a pada.” The case is similar to that about which O. raises a question under rule 6. The passage is amāśāsakāya svāhā (vii.5.122).

नावयस्यूर्यः II ११ II

11. But not when preceded by a former member of a compound.

Or, ‘by a pause of division (between the two members of a compound),’ taking avagraha in its more original sense. W. B. O. define the rule as establishing exceptions under rule 8; G. M., which have taken in this notification (less correctly) as part of the preceding comment, say simply that mā is to be understood as implied here by vicinage. The examples given are pūrṇamāde vādī (i.5.54: O. omits vādī) and ardhamāde devadh (ii.5.66 twice). The words would satisfy all the conditions of rule 8, the separated element -māde or -māde being itself (by i.48) a pada. Since mānsa nowhere appears as the latter member of a compound, this rule exempts from the increment of anusvāra all the cases in which forms of mās or māsa are found in such a situation; others are the subject of the next following precept.

मासिमासुमातोमाताज्ञिनि  च II १२ II

12. Nor in māsi, māsu, māsah, or māslam.

These are words which, without special exception, would fall under rule 8. The examples for the last three are daśas Su mām 
"tīṣṭhan (vii.5.22), śāṇ māśō dākahinena (vi.5.84: only O. has the last word), and māśem prāṭisṭhitīyai (vii.5.16): we have māsah also at vii.5.7, and māsdam at v.7.18. The first, māsi, raises a difficulty. Some, the commentator says, cite in illustration of it prathamē māsi prsthāni (vii.5.31: O. omits the last word); but this is wrong; for the exemption of māsi in that passage is assured by rule 17, below: we are to assume, then, the occurrence in another text of some word of more than two syllables beginning

10. caṇabdo me ti jñāpayati: me 'ty evam' varṇah sakāyaparo

nusvārdgamam bhajate. am-....

1 B. G. M. O. ayam. 2 W. B. sakārey. 3 G. M. nityam anu-. 4 G. M. add mā paddādir anudātta (vii.8) ity asyā 'yam aparādah.

11. 'mā paddādir anudātta (xvi.8) ity asyā 'yam aparādah: avagrahapūrvo me 'ty evam' varṇo nā 'nusvārdgamam bhajate. yathā: pūrṇ-.... ardha-.... avagrahaḥ pūrvo yasumād 'asāv avagrahāpūrṇah.

(0) G. M. have this as part of the comment on the preceding rule, and substitute here śāntihyin mā ni labhyah. 2 B. G. M. O. ayam. 2 B. om. na-. 4 G. M. O. om. 6 G. M. sa tathātāḥ; W. om. arāv.
with māsī. This interpretation is, of course, forced and false: māsī is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them; and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14. We have also māsi-māsī, more than once, at vii.5.16.

The following words have anusvāra before s: hi, pu, jīgha, chaśiśe, atānāyat, dārāśīt, kaniyā, jāyā, drāgīyā, ra-ghiyā, greyā, hrasiyā, vasiyā, dhūyāsah, jākshivā, jaqhnivā, ji-gwā, jīgivā, taśhivā, dāṉā, didivā, papivā, pīpivā, vīvivā, vīvivā, čučrvā, sasvā.

The commentator's examples are as follows: hiṃṣṭh parame vyoman (iv.2.10;3: O. omits vyoman, and G. M. substitute mā hiṃṣṣīk tanuvaḥ, iv.2.31 et al.) and cīnute 'hiṃṣṣdai (v.2.87: O. omits cīnute); respecting this first specification, see further below;—tena puṇśvatih (ii.5.85) and puṇśh putṛṇ (iv.6.94): I have only noted farther two cases of puṇśah, at ii.6.55 and vi.5.82;—lokam ajīghāsan (v.5.54; vi.5.82: O. omits lokam); elsewhere only at iii.2.33;—tvāṣṭrāram ajīghāsan (vi.5.84): the text presents fourteen other cases of jīghās—brāhmaṇaḥ chaśiśe (i.8.18): the only case: a counter-example (but O. omits all the counter-examples), pra yuchasy ubhe ni pāśi (i.4.22), shows the necessity of including in the citation the ne of chaśiśe;—gabhe mukṣṭhaṃ atānāyat (vii.4.194), with a counter-example, atarain na pūṣkam (i.2.142), to explain the citation of the whole word atānāyat;—anvidhaśi tvaya (vii.7.13; O. omits tvaya), with anu vṛtthas tvana (iv.6.73), to prove the need of the final it;—kaniyāṇaḥ devāḥ (v.3.111): the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative, and about the same number of the next;—jīdyānoh bhātvah

12. 'cakāro nishedhakarshakah': māsī. ity etesu grahaneshu na syād anusvārāgamah. esham api mā padādir (xvi.8) iti prātih. kecid atra prath. ity uddharantā: tad asādu: na pada dvīsvaras ityam (xvi.17) ity anenā 'va nishedha-siddhah: tsamād anyacākhyāyam bahovaram aprarim uddharaṇam avadāramyam. dācasu:.... shap....: māsām....

0 O. om. 1 W. raṇān. 3 W. O. n; G. M. om. 4 W. -dhaśāṃ siddhāḥ; B. -dhaś Siddhāḥ. 4 G. M. om. āhūnātā. 6 B. G. M. param; O. om.
(ii.6.61 et al.); — drāghiyānāvā bhavatāh (v.2.51): the only case; — atho rāghiyānāsaḥ (vii.4.9): also the only case; — pra pravāṇam (ii.4.14: but O. substitutes the only other case, pravāṇam pāpyān, v.1.23): — athu kṛsya śāstām dhramanām (vi.6.42: but G. M. O. omit the last word, thus allowing the citation to include 'also the only other case, found in the same division'); — vāsyaśrām bhrāgadhyaṇeṇa (v.4.106): there are two or three further cases; — bhūyaṇaḥ nyebhyah (vii.1.15), with annādo bhīyāṣṇam (i.6.23 et al.) as counter-example, proving that the final h had to be cited with the rest of the word: there are seven other cases of bhūyaṇa in the text; — jākṣhivāṇaḥ papivāṇaḥ (i.4.442: O. omits the last word): the only case; — vrtraṁ jāghivāṇaṁ mṛdho 'bhī (ii.5.31: W. B. omit the first word, O. the first and last; G. M. have only the two, which are read also at ii.5.48): I have noted the word besides only at ii.1.102 three times, with the negative prefix; — vājāṇa jīgivāṇaḥ (i.7.84): the only case; — for jīgiva is found only a case "in another cākha," namely jīgivāṇuṣya (so W. G. M., though the word is not grammatically admissible; O. has jīgivāṇaṃyāna [i. e. । sāḥ syāna? ]; B. is corrupt, running the previous citation and this together into vājāṇa jīgivāṇaṃ iñi cākhantare); — dyumna tasthivāṇo jandāṇaḥ (i.2.144: O. alone has the last word): there is one other case, at iv.2.22: — dāgvāṇo dāpurah sutan (i.4.16: O. alone has sutan): another case at ii.2.128: — vacaya dīvivāṇaṁ (ii.5.122): another case at i.2.144: — papivāṇaḥ ca vipe (i.4.44): the only case; — papivāṇaḥ sarvasaṇāḥ (iii.1.112: O. has -tas trayaḥ, probably corrupt for -ta stanam, as the text reads): the only case; — vidvāṇo vāi puraḥ hotāraḥ (ii.5.111-2: only O. has the last two words) and avidvāṇaḥ ca kṛma (iv.7.156: O. begins viśṛṣṭvā́, by mutilation of the preceding word in the passage): the Sanskrit has over thirty cases of avidvāṇa; — pravivivāṇaṁ imahe (iv.7.151): — yac chūpruvāṇaḥ (ii.5.92 twice): there is another case at v.3.41; — and, finally, vājāṇa sarvāṇaḥ (i.7.84).

After the second example (aḥiṃsāyāt), G. M. insert the remark that it is brought under the present rule by the principle of "prefixation of a" (i.52). This is wrong, being inconsistent with the
exposition given under rule 2 (see note on that rule) of the reason why hi was not there included: hi here is meant not as initial only, but wherever found in a word. Since, however, it is only in this one word that hiḥś- occurs otherwise than as initial, it would seem better to have disposed of the single case as of those which form the subject of rules 6 and 10, and to put hi into 2, where it would look much more at home than here at the head of a troop of perfect participes and comparatives. And why pu was not put into rule 2 without any ceremony, I cannot see at all; unless I have overlooked some case or cases of its occurrence, puṇa is invariably initial.

The commentator raises the question why rule xv.4 does not require us to insert an anusvāra before the ṝ of dāṣvā, vīvīvā, and pūṣvā, since these too are sṛddayāḥ; and he makes answer that it is because the restriction conveyed in xvi.1 is still in force. But in that case, he goes on to say, is there not a nasal increment before the s of kṛṣīyā, ṣaṇyā, tāṣhīvā, and saṣṣvā? The answer to this objection is twofold. First, the competency of the citation is pleaded—that is to say, the words being read in the rule itself without nasal, that is to be understood as their authoritative form (compare under rule 19, where this plea leads to a further discussion). Secondly, the words in question being found associated with dāṣśātī, kāṇyā, ṣyād, and so on, all of which show the anusvāra to follow a long vowel, we are to infer that in the others also it does not follow a short vowel. The first of these answers is not such as is wont to be pleaded in this treatise, and the second is evidently very weak: I should almost prefer to assume that the difficulty was not remarked by the authors of the treatise, and that the commentators who have discovered it have been forced to make the best excuse they could for it.

A more serious objection to the rule, it seems to me, is that it mixes together cases of two different classes—those in which chaṣṭi etc.) the nasal appears in the word itself as cited, and those in which it is to be added before a following s. Of this, however, the comment takes no notice.

na syāt. atha sakārāparāḥ (xvi.1) ity aśmavipiseshasyaḥ sakārasyaḥ 'nuvṛttir iti vaddāmaḥ. tarhi kṛṣīyāvāsyād tāṣhīvāsyārve 'ty atra "sakārapuru eva "gamaḥ" kīh na syāt. uccāraṇa-sāmarthiyād eve 'ty prathamaḥ" pariḥāraḥ. atha vā: dāṣīṣṭhākaṇiyādyāye 'tydādhi sarvatra dirghānantaṁ eva 'nuvāstraṁ tānam iti sāhacaravādū atrā 'pi na syād aśmavāsyaḥ kṛṣīvānantaṁ sthānam ity aparāḥ pariḥāraḥ.

(1) B. om. 2 O. maṇi. 3 G. M. syāt; O. bhajate. 4 O. om. 5 G. M. ins. apy sakārādāś (1.52) prāptih. 6 O. om. 7 O. om. 8 O. om. 9 O. om. 10 G. M. om. 11 G. M. ins. naṇu. 12 O. evādṛṣṭo evānupraśnāsanaṇu. 13 W. om. para; G. M. -para. 14 G. M. -kānasya. 15 G. M. -i.ter. 16 W. mākārasyād "gamaḥ"; O. ... eva 'nuvāryā. 17 G. M. -ma. 18 W. -avīraḥ. 19 G. M. O. tāṣhā-. 20 W. G. M. hraṃvān. 21 W. iti 'ty.
14. The vowels a, i, and u have anusvāra, when they are followed by si or shi final.

This rule, of course, applies to the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural of neuters in as, is, and us. The illustrative examples are vayānsi pakvagandhenu (v.7.23), tamānsi ghatām ajushtā (i.8.22): only O. has ajushtā, dāpa hauniśi (vii.5.14), jyotishtī kurt(e) (v.4.14): O. omits, agna aynilsi (i.3.14 et al.), and avabhṛthayajunīshi juhoti (vi.6.3): G. M. omit jujotī. To show that the si or shi must be final, are quoted tasmaā vāsishṭho brahmā (iii.5.21): only G. M. have brahmād, and manuṣhino manasad (iv.6.2): O. omits manasād. To show that the preceding vowel must be long, we have yathā nosi yuktā adhīyate (v.4.10): only G. M. have the last word, jyotis tvā jyotisī (i.1.10), and dyuṣhi durone (i.2.14): and, finally, to show that no other vowel than i after the s or sh calls out the increment, prajāsv eva prajātāv (vi.4.19), oshadhiśhu (iii.5.52 et al.), and tanuṣhī baddham (i.8.22).

The last six counter-examples are omitted in O., which adds at the end the obvious remark that, as si and shi are here indicated as occasions of the preceding anusvāra, that value no longer belongs to s merely—that is to say, the force of the heading given in rule 1 is henceforth at an end.

15. Even when the i is altered

That the i of the ending si or shi is here aimed at is in the nature of the case obvious enough, but not at all distinctly intimated by the terms of the rule. The commentator quotes in illustration chandānay upa dudhāti (v.3.8), haviṇsya ā sādayet (i.6.10), and tapuṇsya agna juvhād (i.2.14): G. M. omit juhvd. 
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16. According to Sāṃkṛtya, the vowel, except ā, is short.

That is to say, the two vowels ṭ and ṣ, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to: for example, in haviṃśi bhavaṇti (v.5.17 et al.: O. omits bhavaṇti) and samiśṭhyajāṅśi juhoti (vi.6.21: G. M. O. omit juhoti), where Sāṃkṛtya would read haviṃśi and yajāṅśi, while in vayāṅśi (v. 7.23 et al.: O. omits) he would admit the long vowel.

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustomed to regard as open to any difference of opinion. The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved.

G. M. add ca to the rule, after sāṃkṛtyasya.

न पदे दिस्वरे नित्यम् II १७ II

17. Not, under any circumstances, in a disyllabic word.

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14; the addition nityam, 'under any circumstances,' confirms its application to words ending in si or shi after ṭ, ṭ, or ṣ which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment.

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely stuto yāsi vapaṅ ṣu (i.8.51: G. M. O. end with yāsi) and yāsi dātah (iii.5. 58: G. M. have dropped out yāsi). Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have vidhataḥ pāsi tū mān (i.3.141); and, as one under rule 8, prathama māsi prsthāṇī (vii.5.31: G. M. omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above. The force of the nityam does not go so far as to prohibit an anuvādā in every disyllabic word before si, what-

16. ākārād anyo nākārāh: ikāra ākāraṣ ca te 'tv arthah: tayor eva pratītāt. sāṃkṛtyasya mata ikāra ākāraṣ ca hravam āpadyate. yathā: hav-.—: sam-.—: "anākāra iti kim: vayāṅśi."

ne 'dāin nātram iṣṭam.

1 O. om. 2 O. om.

17. divasvare' pade vartamānā ākārekārokaṛāḥ padāntasish-īparā nā 'nuvārāgamaṃ bhajante. yathā: stuto-.—: "yāsi ..... nityaacabdah prōptyaantarapratishedhārthah: vidhataḥ ..... "sraçoḥa" (xvi.2) iti prāptih: prathame-.—: mā pa- dēdīr" (xvi.8) iti prāptih. dvāu svarādu yasmin "vidyete tad divascaram: tasmin."

1 O. dvātram. 2 G. M. -na. 3 G. M. ikāraḥ itkāraḥ; O. ākārekārāḥ. 4 G. M. -nastrīśśvāpo; O. -na si-. 5 B. om.; G. M. nityam nd. 6 B. ins. -sa; O. ins. nityin. 7 G. M. O. om. 8 W. om. 9 B. om. 10 O. -prāspa paddālaya. 11 O. -dir īdā. 12 G. M. ins. pade.
ever vowel precedes, or it would include haśi also, and possibly other cases.

स्मृतिनिदर्शनिदिंदधारतत्त्वधिशिविद्वारयाता-
सि ॥ १८ ॥

18. Nor in ṛśi, jīgāśi, jīghāsi, ajāśi, yajāśi, dādāśi, dādāśi, and vartayāśi.

These are verbal forms which need to be excepted under rule 14, and which, as containing more than two syllables, are not reached by rule 17. The passages in which they occur are quoted by the commentary, as follows: tena ṛśiśi sarvāṇi (iii.2.21): only O. has sarvāṇi), aḥaḥ jīgāśi (iv.2.42), a tvam ajāśi gur-bhadham (vii.4.19), havishāḥ yajāśy aghne bhṛt (iii.5.112 et al.: O. omits the last two words), yādbhirدادśi dāgushe (iii.3.113: G. M. omit dāgushe), dādāśi dāgushe kave (iv.2.72), and aṇvam a vartayāśi nah (vii.4.20). Jādāśī I have noted in two or three other passages; if the rest occur elsewhere, I have overlooked them. This leaves unaccounted for jīghāsi, which is declared to occur “in another text,” in the passage prathame jīghāsi.

दर्शनायाम् दीर्घकाकारीत्वारथकान्तहोरूद्धकोषायाम् परः

॥ १५ ॥

19. In dañsanābhyah, dañsobhīh, dañsam, vrshadaṁyaḥ, dañ-
cakā, and dañshtrābhyāṃ, anusvāra is taken in the latter place.

The commentator’s citations are vāgīvāmṛatva dañsanābhyah (i.5.111); sajōshāv aṇvīṇā dañsobhīḥ (v.6.41), to which is added as counter-example, proving the need of the -bhih, yuṣhmāko ’tī ripādaśah (iv.3.132: O. has only the last word, and G. M. begin

18. 1 cakāro nishedhākarehākaḥ: ṛśiprabhṛtishu graha-
shu' nā 'nuscāragamanah syat: ākārekārokārā (xvi.14) iti prī-
tiḥ. bahūsvaratvaś eshu pūrvanātranishēdu na sidhyati 'ty
atṛa 'yam árambhāḥ. yathā: tena.... aḥaḥ.... jīghāsi?
'ti cākārāhare: "prathame jīghāsi 'tī": ā.... havishāh
.... yādbhir.... dādāśi.... aṇvam....

1 O. ins. an enumeration of the words in the rule. 2 G. M. -vṛt. B. ṛśi; G. M. om. 3 G. M. -vṛtā. 4 B. esha; G. M. om. 5 G. M. -vṛtā; W. B. -dhān. B. ṛśi. 6 O. om. 7 G. M. oi. 8 G. M. -vṛtā. 9 O. om.; W. prathame — — (as being illegible in the MS. from which the copy was made); B. -vṛtā.

19. 1 dañsanābhyāṁ ityādīshu grahaṇeśu para eva 'nuscāra-
gama bhvanaiḥ: yathā: vai śca.... sajā.... bhir iti kim:
yuṣhmāko ’tī porūṇā: vrśh.... porūṇā: dañsobhīh
.... dañsobhīh eva vālam: kim ākhilapadapāṭhena. kur-
with ātī; prārddāṣaṁ suṁīm (iv.2.4 3); vṛṣṭādhiṁ te dhātuḥ (v.5.12): there is another case at v.5.21; paścān dañcukāḥ sūryaṁ viśhācinaṁ (v.2.9 6): O. omits the first word, and it alone has the last two; and dañcācīrdhīyāṁ mālamātā (iv.1.10 8): there is another case at v.7.11. To the objection that the citation in the rule of dañcāSa simply might have saved the rehearsal of whole words [in a part of the cases given], the commentator replies by quoting kaurvata me mo 'pu dissat (1.6.3 3 et al.) as an example of cases which need to be excluded. The addition of puraḥ, 'in the latter place,' is because vṛṣṭadāṇca contains two places at which, by xv.4, the anusvāra would otherwise require to be inserted.

This last point, however, does not pass (except in O.) without farther question and discussion. The objection is raised that the mere citation of vṛṣṭadāṇca without anusvāra before the former sibilant is enough to settle its reading, according to the same principle that was appealed to under rule 13, for hrasvīyā, vṛṣṭīyā, and so on. This is undeniable; and the only real answer to be made is that there was no harm in adding para here, to make the matter sure, while it could not have been employed in rule 13 without occasioning a great deal of additional trouble. The commentator, however, prefers to have recourse to a plea of exceptionally puerile character. In xv.4 (the rule here in force), he says, the spirants in general are implied, but in xvi.1 (in force at rule 13) a special spirant, s; and it is an acknowledged principle that, as between a generality and a specification, the specification is the more powerful. That being the case, the putting down of that

\[ \text{vito... ityādāu ma bhūd iti. 'para iti kim: vṛṣṭadāṇca ity atrā' sthānadvaye 'pi śrādisu cāi 'kapada (xv.4) iti prāptāu sotyām pārvatrau ma bhūd iti. mūna grahataṁśamputhyāva 'nusvārāh' pārvatrau na bhūvati: yathā hrasvīyāsvayī (xvi.13) ityādāu grahataṁśamputhyāva uapaḍādum. nāi 'sha dosah: śrādisu cāi 'kapada (xv.4) ity atrā 'shnyaṁyam uktam: uta sakāra padā (xvi.1) ity utra tu tadbhavah uktah: sāmaṇvīccheyor viṣeṣho balavān iti nyāyah: tathā sāti 'bolavādbhādana' eva bhūṣham ānta 'nā tu' durbalabdhādana iti 'tata 'va grahataṁśamputhyāva' samarthanaṁ: na tu utra' durbalabhdhāne: tathā 'pi'; 'adhipāla purwāḥ virodhināma' 'adhipaṁ eva bādhaṁ bhuṣhamutrāt: na tu kudācīd alpabalam\]"
which is powerful, not of that which is weak, is honorific; hence, the competency of the citation was to be insisted on in the former rule, but not here, in a weak position. Moreover, a superior man puts down, for honor's sake, a mighty opponent, but never a weak one. Therefore, the use of the word para here is right and proper!

All the MSS. except B. (and G. M., which have a slight lacuna, involving the word) read dāṇṣan instead of dāṇṣaṁ in the rule.

20. Also in maṁṣye, maṁṣattī, yaṁśad, yaṁśan, vaṁṣate, and vaṁṣagah.

The commentator quotes as follows: paçun nā 'bhi maṁṣya iti (iii.1.9\*), ānu nās pāru maṁṣattī bhaudṛa indrasya rātaṇay (vii.4. 15: O. alone has the first two words, B. alone the last one), cocīshā yaṁśaṇa vīpocān ny utrīsun (iv.6.1\*): G. M. O. omit cocīshā), ivaṁvaḥ puruṣa yaṁśaṇa (iv.6.6\*), agnir na vaṁṣate rayīn (iv.6.1\*), and tigmapṛṇgam na vaṁṣagah (ii.6.11\*). The words here dealt with occur only in the passages quoted, except yaṁṣat, which is found also at iv.1.11\*; 7.14\*. To the objection that it would have been enough to give maṁs, yaṁs, and vaṁs (the MSS. leave it doubtful whether these are the precise forms suggested in the rule, instead of citing whole words, the commentator replies by giving the counter-examples uttamasyā 'va ṛjāti (vi.3.104\*), yaṁṣa bhāyāṇo yaṁṣakṛtānav (iii.1.7\*), and adya vaṁṣati (ii.5.3\*).

21. Also in vaṁṣam, after ut or na.

The passages are ud vaṁṣam īva yemire (i.6.12\*): W. has dropped out yemire, along with all the rest of the comment) and prācinavāṁsau kuroti (vi.1.1\* twice). A counter-example, with a different preceding word, is brahmavacāsa eva bhavaṁ vuoṁ na eva esha kuroti (ii.1.7\*: only O. has the first two words, and it omits the last two).

20. 1 maṁṣya ityādishuṣ syād anuvārdāgamaḥ. yaṁśa: paçun ...: ānu...: coc...: ivaṁvaḥ...: agnir...: tigma...
   'maṁs: yaṁs: vaṁs: ity etāvatā 'vād 'lam: kīm akhila-
   padopāthena: ut...:�asya...: adya...: ityādau mā bhūd
   iti.

1 O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule. 2 B. -di. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 W. bhodrayast; B. saṁsūr yaṁs vaṁs; G. M. maṁsa; yaṁsa; vaṁsa; O. maṁs: vaṁs: vaṁs.

21. ut': na: ity evampūrve vaṁṣam ity asmin grahane syād
   anuvārdāgamaḥ. ud...: prā...: 'evampūrve iti' kīm:
   brahm-...'

1 O. utyāvadābhārat. 2 W. -rva; B. -rva. 3 W. om. 4 W. om. 'b.
22. Also in akraśīta, krahṣyate, raṃsyate, and bhraṅgate.

The passages are dyām vaśī vā 'kraśīta (vii.5.19), utkraśīyate svāhā (vii.1.19), uparāśīyate svāhā (vii.1.19: B. O. omit), and nā 'smād rāśhrham bhraṅgate (v.7.4: O. omits the first two words); bhraṅgate occurs also at i.6.11 twice.

G. M. read utkraśīyate for krahṣyate in the rule.

23. And also in raṃhyāī.

The only passage is pūshno raṃhyāī (i.3.10). The significance of the ca, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule.

24. The dī, according to Ukhya, is excessive.

That is to say, according to the commentator, the dī of the word raṃhyāī, here brought forward by the ca, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule. Nītyāta, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort.' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhya's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection.

25. Also in vi, ri, and tri, in numerals, except in su.
The syllable su is here, the commentator tells us, the ending of the locative case, just as ah (at i.23) is used as representing the nominative case. This remark is called for, because (see the example below) the actual form in which the syllable appears in the cases aimed at is shu. We have a right to be surprised at finding it given as su in the rule; and perhaps, also, to conjecture that saṅkhyaṣu was originally simply the locative plural of saṅkhyā, and that the other value was interpreted into it when the cases calling for exception were noticed.

The quoted examples are viṅgaṭyāt svādā (vii.2.13 et al.; O. omits), yad viṅgatur deve tena virājātu (v.3.3: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three), caturāṅgate svāhā (vii.2.17: G. M. O. omit svāhā; B. has dropped out -te svāhā, the next example, and the first word of the next but one), triṅgate svāhā (vii.2.17: O. omits svāhā, and triṅcat tayag ca (i.4.111); there are other cases, which I have not taken the trouble to collect. The inclusion of tri in the rule, the commentator says, is for the sake of greater plainness, since ri, of course, involves tri also; it is to be compared with the inclusion of the v of vāghā in rule vii.13. Begging the commentator's pardon, however, the two cases are not at all analogous; and the citation of tri and ri together must be esteemed an oversight, and an offense against the law of economy of expression, obligatory in the sūtra-style. The need of restriction to numerals is illustrated by viṣe jādaya (iī.5.125), sa rishā pādu nakta (i.2.147 et al.; G. M. O. omit nakta), and triśrūbhaidu vā 'smā (ii.5.101 et al.). Finally, the specification "not before su" is established by triṣvā a rocane divah (iv.2.44 et al.; O. omits divah); if there is another case of this kind, I have failed to note it.

There is yet another word, triśahasraḥ (v.6.83; p. tri-sahasraḥ), which would properly fall under this rule, but is exempted by a pregnant interpretation of the word ekapade in xv.4 (see the note to that rule).

**25. vi: ri: tri: 1 evampūrva uṣṇaparaṇuḥ 'nusvarágamāra' syāt: ebhir yadi saṅkhyā 'cyate': asu 'sṛṣabdhān uṣṇayitvā. suṣuptāmi vibhaktir uktā: yathā 'hāraḥ' prathamācibhaktipaḻukṣhaṇam; viṣi... yad... catur..." triṅ..." triṅ..." triṅ..." triṅriṣṭramu vispaṣṭārtham: yato'vi saṅkhyā 'su ity' etārāte 'rā 'lam: yathā vāghāshapuṇa (vii.13) ity atra vākāro vispaṣṭārthāḥ. saṅkhyā 'ti kim: viṣe... sa... triṣvā... uṣe iti kim: triṣvā...**

1 G. M. O. ins. ity. 2 B. uṣṇaparaṇuḥ. 3 G. M. -su ṛ. 4 G. M. yaddā. 5 O. 'cyate. 6 W. a. 7 G. M. sv iti; O. su iti. 8 B. ak; G. M. ak. 9 O. -ker ṛ. 10 B. om.
11 G. M. om. 12 O. om.
26. Also in cīṇḍumāraḥ, cīṇshat, saṅkṣā, saṅsrā, saṅsrshhīa, saṅskṛtya, saṅskṛta, saṅcīla, saṅcīla, kīṅcīla, and kīṅcīla.

The passages, as quoted, are sindhoḥ cīṇḍumāraḥ hiṃavatōḥ (v. 5.11: only O. has the last word); kiṁ tata uc cīṇshatī tī yād dhīrānyeshtakāḥ (v.5.52: only O. has the last two words, and it omits the first two); ubhayatāh śauśrvāyā kuryād avadāyā 'bhi (ii. 0.84: only O. has the last two words, and it leaves off ubhayatāh); saṅsrāvadvādā 'ētha (i.1.132); saṅsrśṭajit somapāh (iv.6.41: W. B. put this after the next following example; see farther on); carṣṭrum eva saṅskṛtyā 'bhyrohati (v.6.84*4: O. omits the first two words; and all but O. omit the last one, thus making a citation which is also found again in v.6.64*); tan naḥ saṅskṛtam (i.4.482); brahmāsāṅścitō hy eṣa ghrāvahavaniḥ (ii.5.92: only O. has the last word); garave brahmāsāṅścitā (iv.6.4*); kīṅcīla vanya yā ta iṣkhu (v.5.91: all but G. M. end with te); and kīṅcīla caturtho vanyaḥ (v.5.92: G. M. alone have vanyaḥ) and kīṅcīla ca kṣayaṇādā ca (iv.5.91: O. ends with the first ca). The commentary prefaces the last two passages with the remark that the second citation of kīṅcīla is that of a part of a word, including a variety of cases. But this, in the first place, would imply that the reading of the rule end was kīṅcīlakīṅcīla, which is the case only in T.; and, in the second place, even were that the reading, the explanation would be a bad one, and the repeated kīṅcīla should be defined as a theme ending in a, and so including the declensional forms of that theme, by i.22: in fact, it was expressly cited under that rule, as an example of its application. If kīṅcīla is the true reading (as I presume to be the case), then we must suppose that the makers of the rule intended both words as padākadeśaś, the one involving the first two examples quoted, the other the third, and the case being quite parallel with that of saṅcīta and saṅcītā, just preceding; but the comment has discovered a difficulty, namely, that kīṅcīla is actually a pada in the text (v.5.91), and therefore cannot be quoted without ceremony as a padākadeśa (see under rule 29, where this is more distinctly brought out); and hence its efforts to amend the reading and interpretation—efforts in which it is too intent upon the end to be gained to be mindful of consistency in the means employed. In short, here as in many other places, the Prātiṣṭhakhyā is less minutely accurate in its modes of statement than the commentator would fain have it, and he undertakes to make it what it should be by forced interpretation.
Cases of various character are here intermingled. The first two and the last are indivisible words, of which the anuvātra forms an essential part, as of those cited in rules 19 and 20, or 29 and 30. The others come from combinations with the preposition sam, and are of two classes: saññakṛtya and saññakṛta the pada-text does not attempt to analyze, although (see v.6.7) it divides saññakurute and samaskurute, ejecting the intrusive sibilant: those remaining are compounds with sam which enter into further composition, so that their compound character does not appear in the pada-text. And one or two cases of this last class seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise: they are svādusāṁsadaḥ (iv.6.6; p. svādusāṁsadaḥ) and strisāṁsadaṃ (ii.5.1; p. strisāṁsadaṃ). The former of them, indeed, is noticed in G. M., which introduce saññadah into the rule, after saññakṛta, and quote the compound in the comment—seeming to betray their consciousness that the word is not a part of the ordinary reading of the rule by saying "when saññadah is read, the instance is svādusāṁsadaḥ."

There are further varieties of reading in the rule: G. M. have ciññahati; W. B. put saññarahta between saññakṛtya and saññakṛta, and give its example a corresponding place among the examples; T. B. G. M. read saññakṛtuḥ, which is perhaps to be preferred; other differences are mere copyists' errors, and not worth reporting.

So far as I have discovered, saññktāsam (i.2.9) and saññikta (iv.6.4* a second time) are the only words included in this rule which occur further in the Sanhitā.

The commentator raises the question whether we must not suppose that an anuvātra is also to be inserted before the spirant śh in saññarahta; but, without this time appealing to the "competency of the citation" to settle the reading, replies that, the word being associated here with others all of which have anuvātra only after the first vowel, we must assume the same to be the case with it also; all but O. adding that "there is no reason for inconsistency" in this respect.

27. Also after si, tr, or dr, when ḥ follows.

The quoted examples are siṁho vayah (iv.3.5), caturtarāḥs tṛṅhantī (i.5.7* et al.), and dṛṅhusva mā ḥudh (i.1.3 et al.). Of the
caryādaatra'pi tathā 'va' vijñeyam: "na vaiparītya kāraṇam atri".  

1 O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words cited in the rule. 2 G. M. -dīsu; O. -dīhu. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. hūśa sansaḍa iti pāṭhe svādusāṁsadaḥ; W. parava ki. 4 G. M. om. 5 W. G. M. sansaḍa. 6 W. hūśa; G. M. -dīsaram. 7 G. M. -dīha. 8 B. "ed'pi. 91 O. om.; W. om. na.

27. si: tr: dr: ity evamāravo hakūraparāh śyād anuvārdagamah. yathā: siṁho..... catur..... dṛṅḥ..... "evam-
noun sīṃha, and of forms from the roots śrī and dṛṇa, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanskrit. Counter-examples are given (excepting in O.): to show that no other syllables take the increment before h, saputnasādhi svāhā (i.2.124) but G. M. substitute saputnasādhi sam mārjmi, i.1.101) and anatidāhāyō vāca (v.2.109); that r takes the increment only when preceded by t or d, grhāṇām usamārtyā (iii.3.82); that the increment is taken only before h, sīhāsātih (vii.5.21: G. M. read sīhāsāth, but doubtless by a blunder only), ṭṛṣṭvān anu (i.2.141), and naktaḥ drpe dipyate (v.6.44).

28. As also, in maṅhishṭhasya.

That is to say, before the h, which is brought down from the preceding rule by ca, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of anuvātra before the ah and s in the same word. The passage is maṅhishṭhasya prabhṛtasya (iv.2.34), and there is no other.

We have here a detailed list of complete padas (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole pada), in which anuvātra is found. The illustrative examples are as follows. For anāhatih, pari dveṣhado anāhatih (ii.6.112): the only case. For anāhaḥ, anāhaucaḥ ṭṛṣṭvān yoṣyāyām (i.6.124: p. anāhaucaḥ: G. M. O. omit the last word); anāhaḥ is found four or five times in the Sanskrit as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

pārva iti kim: sop... anati... ṭkārṇādi vo'vam: kim takāradakārabhyam: grh... evampara iti kim: sīsh... tṛṣṭvām... naktaṁ... 'hakaṁ paro yasmāt 'asāv hintaṁ parahaparāh."

1 G. M. sāt ca. 2 O. asāvahāparāh. 3 B. G. M. O. om. 4 O. om. 5 G. M. om. eva. 6 G. M. sa tāhoktaḥ.

28. maṅhishṭhasya 'ty asmin grahaṁ cakārākṛṣṭaḥ hakāraṇapar 'nuvārdagamo dhāvati. yathā: maṅh... 'cakāraṁ kimarah... atraī va grahaṁ sashūkāraparām ma bhūd iti.'

1 G. M. O. syāt. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 O. om.
compound *āṇhomuc—one of the forms of which, as we shall see farther on, has to be made separate account of. For *āṇhoḥ, *āṇhop cidd yā (i.4.22 and ii.1.114): there is no other case. For *āṇhomuk, *āṇhomugbhyāṃ dvikapālakā (vii.5.22: O. omits dvikapālakā, and W. B. put it in out of place); of all the forms of *āṇhomuc, this is the only one in which *āṇhoḥ does not form a *padā (it is divided, of course, *āṇhomuk-bhyām), and which therefore is not disposed of by the citation of *āṇhaḥ. For *āyāṁyāḥ, ṛtavyāś ca *tamaṇāḥ (i.8. 13²-3): the word is found again at iv.6.5²; it is more than a simple *padā (p. *āti-āṇhaḥ), and the *āti is included in the citation, we are told, to prevent confusion of *āṇhaḥ with *āṇhā in such phrases as *śadaḥā bhavanti (vii.5.14; *śat-āṇhāḥ). For *āṇhasaḥ, te no mun- catām *āṇhasaḥ (iv.7.166: all except B. read muncaitr, which does not occur before *āṇhasaḥ): of this case of *āṇhasaḥ I have noted about twenty instances. For *āṇuḥārd, the only example is the one quoted, *āṇhasaḥ vā esu grhitaḥ (ii.4.2³: O. ends with vai). The commentator next raises the question why whole *padas have been sufficient to assure the reading, and replies by quoting sa rasam yāna vyāntaya (vii.2.1: O. begins with aha), as an example of cases that required to be excluded. For *āṇcam, pari pacyamo 'ṛṣyaṃ ā (vii.1.8²: O. omits ā): the form is found again in the same division. For *āṇubhiḥ, 'aṇubhiḥ pavaṇayi (vi.4.5¹: O. omits yanayi); W. B. put this example off until after that for *āṇca, which would be, to be sure, a more suitable place for it, if the same order were followed in the rule; but there all authorities agree: see farther on). For *āṇubhaḥ, tasyāḥ *ṇubhūrā somam (vi.4.3²: G. M. O. omit somam): the word is found again at vi.4.8². For *āṇcu, tend 'ṛṣum (iii.2.2¹): and it is pointed out that, by rule i.53 (the comment blunderingly quotes i.52 instead), anīcuv krvantāh (iii.2.2¹) is involved with *āṇcu (O. has lost, of this, all but the example anīcuv ku). For *āṇcī, vṛṣmho hy etāv aṇcu (vi.4.5³). For *āṇcuvaḥ, pratā ṣad aṇcuvaḥ (vi.4.4⁴). For *āṇcuḥ, aṇcuḥ aṇcuḥ te (i.2.11¹ et al.): the word is found in eight other passages. For *āṇcu, yam ādityaḥ aṇcuṁ āpyāyantī (ii.3.5³ et al.: only W. has the last word): there are five other instances. For *āṇcīn, *āṇcīn apa gṛhuti (vi.4.4¹: lost in W.): it occurs further in the

29. *aṇhatiḥ...* etehv ādir' anuvārāgamo' bhavati... yu-thāḥ: pari...: aṇho...: *sūtre samhitāyām otvaridhānād* ahar...: ityādāu na syād ayaṁ vidhiḥ: kintu yasmīn visajānīyō repahā nā *padyate tasyāt 'vo 'pādānām,* aṇhop...: *"nānā yānī" caī *'kabandhāḥ: repahāpyātasyāt* 'yam vidhiḥ: vihitānuvarāsayāt 'vo' repahāniśṭhitaye 'ti: nā 'yam dosahā: siddhyātī 'vā 'nuvarāsyā bodhanām* na tu vidhir itī: aṇhom...-14: *ṛtāp...: ati 'ti kim: shad...: te...: aṇ-hasā...: "aṇhe 'ty' etavatāt* siddha' sukalapadyapāthah kim-arthāḥ*: sa rasam... it* nishedhārthah: pari...: "shad-
same division, and in no other. For aṅcūṇā, aṅcūṇā te aṅcūḥ (i.2. 6; G. M. O. end with te). For aṅcūḥ, yo vā aṅcūr āyatanān veda (vi.6.10: O. omits the last two words, and B. has lost the whole example, with most of the preceding one). For aṅcāya, aṅcāya svāhā bhāgya (i.8.13: G. M. omit bhāgya). For upāṅcū, upāṅcūvavana yaḍ upāṅcūvavana (vi.4.4: O. omits the first two words). The word upāṅcū, when not further compounded, is separated in pada-text into upa-aṅcū, and so most of its forms come under the various citations of the cases of aṅcū already illustrated (thus, it furnishes additional instances, not counted above, to aṅcū, aṅcūh, aṅcūm, and aṅcūḥ, twenty in all); but in its compounds it makes, of course, a single pada of itself (thus, upa-aṅcū-vavanaḥ), and so has to be cited in the rule as such (we have other combinations, namely, with pātra, yāja, and ontaryāma); and, moreover, we have one case, upa-aṅcū, showing a form of aṅcū which does not appear independently, and so furnishing the final citation, for which the example is tam upa-aṅcū sam asthāpayan (vi.4.6:); there is another in the same division.

The restriction ādhi, ‘after the first vowel,’ is intended to guard against any one’s imagining that the s of aṅhāsah and so on is to be preceded by anusvāra.

What has thus been given represents the whole comment as found in O.; the other MSS. make two or three troublesome additions, to which it is necessary to return. The last of them regards the citation of aṅcū and its inflectional forms (namely, those that contain aṅcū as a part, or aṅcūbhī, aṅcūh, aṅcūm, aṅcūnd); and, if I understand it aright, it asserts that, if aṅcū alone were cited, the other forms would not be included, because aṅcū itself occurs as a pada (and would therefore have to be taken as such, and not as a part of a word, padākādaṇa); and if it be proposed to cite it with each value, as was done with kiṃcāta (in rule 28: see note to that rule), there remains the difficulty that, as a phonetic complex only, it would involve such cases as paścū paścūte te adhy (iii. 1.4: W. omits paścū)—where, namely, we have the same elements in combination, only without the anusvāra. With regard to aṅca, a somewhat similar statement appears to be made: namely, that, if aṅcū simply were quoted, it would be understood as a pada (being such in aṅcā-blau), and hence aṅcām would

..." tvayā.... ": bhuve 'ti kim: aṅcā 'ty etārataḥ grāhane tathāvidhapaḍadābhāvād aṅcām" ity atra no" syāt:=" tene.... ": "arp akārādi (i.52) iti vacanād aṅcā... ity arp" uddhāranaḥ : vrāhno.....: prāṇa.....: "aṅkura....." yam.....: "aṅcūnā.....": aṅcūnā.....: yo.....: aṅcūyā.....: upāṅcū.....: tām.....: "aṅcūرة ity etārataḥ grāhā itaresām aparigrāhaḥ" syāt " tathāvidhapaḍadābhāvāt : ato 'bhavyan grāhyate padam ekadāyaḥ' eva kiṃcārta: tathā sati padākādaṇaḥ sa paścū..... ityādīśu pāpamayaḥ anusvāraḥ": tac ca 'nāk-
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not be included. The comment, however, puts this forward as a reason for including the bhūvā of aṅgabhūvā, which, according to the interpretation here offered, it would not be; and perhaps my comprehension of the argument is insufficient. I do not see any reason why, if the pada-text divides aṅga-bhūvā, the bhūvā should be given in the rule. Equally unexplained to me is the special citation of aṅgubhīth, which, being divided in pada into aṅga-bhīth, falls under aṅgu; we have also in the Saṁhitā aṅgubhyām (1.4.2 and vi.4.5), which is a case analogous with the other, and ought to be treated like it. Possibly we may infer from the unsuitable position of aṅgubhīth in the rule, and from the place of its example as given in R. B., next after that containing aṅgu-mat (as if it were, like the latter, a case of aṅgu), that it has been interpolated, by an awkward and blundering hand; but the conjecture is a more daring one than I venture seriously to make.

The first excursum of the comment is in connection with the second citation, aṅghā. Since the saṁhitā-form of this word, we are told, appears by the rule itself to be aṅgho, the rule does not apply to aṅgha, which shows a different result of combination in ahaṛ devāṇām (15.902: G. M. read ahaṛahār, which is not found in the Saṁhitā before devāṇām), but only to a word the visarjaṇīya of which does not become r. This seems plausible enough; but what shall we say of the ahaṛ which appears in saṁhitā as aho in ahohyām, ahohīth, and akohōtre (p. ahaṛ-rātre)? Either the makers of the treatise overlooked these words, or they did not attribute to the form aṅgho in the rule the significance which is here claimed for it.

The remaining passage is more obscure to me than any of the others. In G. M., it is both preceded and followed by the examples for aṅghoh and aṅghomuk; in R. B., these examples precede it, excepting the last word of the second, which comes after it. I imagine that its true place is between the two, and that its intent is to turn against the rule the argument just pleaded respecting aṅghā, pointing out that, as aṅghoh becomes aṅghor in the rule, it ought not to exhibit anuṣṭāṇa except when occurring in that phonetic form: the objection being then evaded by the plea that the form is given merely as it happens to occur, and not with any

tam. adīr iī kim: sarvesaḥ athānena ma bhūd iti: yathā
tāhāśa ityāddī.

intent of prescription. But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression.

30. Also in añce, aṁśya, aṁśabhyām, and aṁśāu, when accented on the first syllable.

The term amagraha is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to ādi or pūjādi, 'beginning of the word.' This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none. There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification. Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as amagraha, 'former member of a compound.' The restriction is made with reference to aṁśāu alone, in order to distinguish it from aṁśāu. The examples are dukshīne 'nās aupa dadhāti (v.3.15: O omits dadhāti; W. has lost the whole), cītyaṁśaya (vii.3.17: W. has lost cīty), aṁśabhyām sraddā (vii.3.162), and uttare 'nād eva eva prati dadhāti (v.3.16: O. reads tīsthāti for dadhāti, but doubtless by a copyist's error only); the counter-example is aṁśāv abhrānic citra-vihātā (ii.5.2: O. omits the last word); aṁśabhyām alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v.7.13).

31. But not in aṁśā u.

There is a single passage where the pronoun aṁśāu, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable; hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor. The passage is brāyād aṁśā eva 'hi ty evam eva (ii.4.95: O. alone has eva; G. M. omit also evam, and B. blunderingly reads instead of it atra).

The Prātiṣṭhākyas's rehearsal of the cases of interior anusvāra is,

30. amagraha ādir ity arthaḥ: yuddi' pūjādir udātaḥ syāt tarhy aṁce ⁴..... ity eteshu' syād anusvārāghanah. itiṣabdhā samavācī. dukshīne ⁵..... cīty-..... aṁśā-..... uttare..... ādir udāta iti kim: aṁśāuyān.

1 B. parī. ² W. om. ³ G. M. śhāmān.

31. 'ādyudatā' saty api 'aṁśā eva ty' asmin 'graṁхane na khalu' syād anusvārāghanah. brāyād.....

iti tribhāṣhyaratne prātiṣṭhākyavivaranā slokānām dhyāyāh.

1 W. yady ud.-; B. yady udātative. ² B. O. om ³ W. aṁśā iti ty; B. aṁśā; G. M. O. aṁśā ity. ⁴ B. prātri-. ⁵ G. M. O. dvitiyapraṇe caubhūto.
so far as I have been able to discover, complete for the present Taütțīrya-Sanhitā, with the exception of the two compounds (stṛikaṣṭikāda and svādushtanānd) noticed under rule 26. Whether its rules are so drawn as to involve no cases that require to be excluded, is a much more difficult question, and one which my examination of the text has not been close enough to enable me to determine; but I have noted no instances of inaccuracy, unless the possible confusion of aiōhaḥ and ahāḥ, pointed out under rule 29, is to be so considered.

CHAPTER XVII.

CONTENTS: 1–4, opinions of various authorities, as to the degree of nasality in different nasal letters; 5, as to increase of quantity in connection with anusvāra; 6, as to increased effort required by certain accents; 7–8, as to other more general matters of utterance.

तीत्रत्सर्णानुसास्यन्नुस्त्वारोत्तरिनिधित्वं शिल्पयानं: ॥ ९ ॥

1. Cāityāyana says that the nasal quality is stronger in anusvāra and the nasal muted.

We have here a chapter entirely composed of the cited opinions of certain specified authorities, and none of them of any definite value or importance in themselves, though interesting as affording us a glimpse of subjects to which the attention of the old Hindu phonetists was drawn, and to their hair-splitting and discordant speculations respecting them.

The commentator's exposition adds nothing to our comprehension of the rule. It quotes the rule at the end of the second chapter (ii.52) as to the cause of nasal quality, and tries (without good reason) to connect with it the present one. Examples of the stronger nasal utterance are given, as follows: agniḥ apusushadh

1. 'anusvāra ca 'tumāç' ca 'nusvārottamāḥ: tēshu tīrvatārām bhavaty ānunāsikāya iti cāityāyano nāma munir manyate'. tīrṇād adhiyā� tīrvatāram: ānunāsikatā' nāsikāya: nāsi-kāvivaranād ānunāsikāya (ii.52) ity asya vidheh prayatnādārthām' upadiṣyate. 6 yathā: agniḥ: 'tāṁs: ... martyrān: āyaḥ: 'vañcate: ... maṇiḥ: ...' ete-śvō 'iti kim: rukmam: ...: tīgmam: ...: 'supt: ...

(0) O. om. 2 W. -maṭ. 3 W. -nikā; B. -ṣikāṇāḥ bhaiḥ. 4 W. O. -dirgham; B. -dārīśāṃ; G. M. prāyādārthām. 5 O. ins. anusvārottamā ānunāsikā ity eteśā ānunāsikāsthānāṃ. anusvārottamāśu tīrvatāram ānunāsikāyam bhavati cāityāyano muna manyate. 6 G. M. O. om. 7 (0) in O. only. 8 O. prāḥ. 9 O. anusvārotāmāśu. 10 O. sa: ...: eteśau cai'va tīrvatāram.
(v.6.12), yam kāmam kāmayate (vii.1.12): G. M. O. substitute yam kāmayeta, i.6.104 et al.), vañcata pritiñcata (iv.5.31), and mañindā rāpāddī 'ndrebā (vii.8.14); but O. introduces after the first taḥīs teدادāmī (iv.1.109) and mátyādī dvisepa (v.7.91), and substitutes for the last two prāṇ prā 'dravat (v.7.101). Counter-examples, of the weaker utterance, are rukmam upa đadhāti (v.2.72: but W. substitutes, by an evident blunder, kārmam upadādhāti, v.2.85), tigmam áyunham (iv.7.154), and suplokañs smanñgallās (i.8.162); O. giving instead of the last sa imāñ lokam (i.5.94), and spoiling the whole illustration by adding, "in these likewise it is stronger." The first two counter-examples are evidently given for the yama which, by xx.12, is to be inserted between the mute and nasal in each: the last is a case falling under xv.8, which prescribes nasalization of a protracted final ā. The other nasal sounds are the nāsikya (xxi.14), and the nasal semivowels into which m and n are to be converted (v.26.28) before l, y, and v: these last are instanced by the phrase quoted in O. alone.

The manuscript O. follows an independent course in the exposition of this rule, as of the rest composing the chapter.

2. Kāuhaliputra says that it is the same everywhere.

The comment interprets sañā, 'same,' as signifying here tivrataram, which it had explained above as an absolute rather than a relative comparative—'very excessive,' rather than 'more excessive.' That does not seem likely to be the real meaning. As examples, are cited, rather needlessly, sañurānāh (iv.8.11 et al.), sañnayātāh (i.5.11 et al.), nynāñ agnīc cetavyāh (v.5.32: only O. has cetavyāh), and upukhātāh ho (ii.8.73). O. gives an entirely different, though equivalent, exposition, and only the last two of these examples, with two others, namely sarvān agnīhr apruskañāh (v.6.12) and imāñ lokān (ii.1.31).

The name of the authority quoted is given by G. M. as Kāuhaliyaputra, and by O. as Kohaliputra, in both the text and commentary.

3. Bhāradvāja says it is faint in anusvāra.

2. sarvāṛā 'nundāśikavarneshu' tivrataratvāṁ 'sumam itī' kāhu-

haliputo, manyate. sañr.—: sañy.—: nyanā.—: upa—:

ityādi.

1 W. B. -sikya; G. M. -sikya in. 2 W. sarvate 'ti. 3 G. M. (as also in the rule) -eyop.

O. substitutes for the whole anusvratamudīshu sarveshu samavreṣhṇi nundā-

śikyaḥ nyātī koḥaliputra; nityāyo manuyata sma: tivrataram tiy arthaḥ: nyanā

—: sarvāḥ.—: imāñ.—: upa—.
The term "anu, 'faint,'" is explained by sūkṣmatamam (or, in G. M. O., sūkṣmataram), 'exceedingly gentle.' In other nasals than anusvāra, we are told, Brāhadāvajja accepts Caityāyana’s rule, that the nasal quality is extra-strong in the nasal mutes, and simply strong in the yamas etc. Most of the MSS. quote only tanuvā jaya tvan śatā (iv.6.61: B. has dropped out all but the beginning, nanu, and O. has lost tanuvāja from the beginning); but O. adds counter-examples, brahmaṇvantō deva āsan (vi.4.101), ruknam upa dadhāti (v.2.72), and tat sunyatāṁ saṁyataṁ (v.2.108).

4. Old Kāṇḍinya says that when n is converted into r, or into a spirant, or into y (with loss of the y), or when m is lost, it is stronger in each case successively.

The alterations of an original nasal mute are here rehearsed in the same order, and in the same terms, as in a previous rule (xv.1). The comment gives an example for each case: namely triṅ kāśa-dvān ṭha (iii.2.113: G. M. have lost ṭha, along with all that follows, to the last example; O. substitutes triṅr uṣa ḍyān, ii.1.113), gukānaṁ ca kṛṣṇānuṁ ca (ii.3.13: O. substitutes ruknāṁ tanvant, iv.3.13), mahāṁ indraḥ (i.4.20 etc. al.: O. substitutes svaṁ indra asme, i.7.19), and saṁcitām (iv.1.103 etc. al.: O. substitutes vihan-yam ca, vi.7.5 5). The first combination is styled sunya-

3. 'anu sūkṣmatamam' ānundāsikyam anusvāre syād iti bhārāvajjo manvate: yathā: tanuvād... anusvārin anyatra gātīyāyanavidhiḥ: uttaneshu tivratarānām yamādhiṣu tivramādram iti.

1 G. M. anusvāhatah. 2 G. M. om. O. substitutes for the whole bhārāvajjasya "cāryasya mate 'nuvēre 'nuh bhavati ānundāsikyan : sūkṣmataram ity arthāḥ: ya tvan...: anusvāra iti śitaṁ: udo anyatra gātīyāyanavidhiḥ: brahm...: ruk...: tatt...

4. nakāraṇya repahshmayyakāraṇadvac cakārāṣṭhyayakāre lupte sati malopac ca 'uttaram uttaram' ānundāsikyam ānupūr-vyaṇa tivrata-raiḥ syād iti sthavirah kāṇḍinyaḥ manyate. yathā: 'triṅr...: ity atra "munāsikyan samyogānātra vā: guk...: ity "atra sūpīlīṣyam": mahān...: ity atra tivrata-rām: ity ānupūr-vyaṇa viñjeyam: "uto 'ny-ātra" gātīyāyanavidhiḥ.

1 O. repahshmayvūkāraṇadvac uδmahabhāvoc yaka. 2 G. M. ins. ca. 3 G. M. om. (and read 'uttaram for 'uttaram uttaram in rule). 4 G. M. om. 5 O. anusvāhyakaṁ bhavati. 7 G. M. om.; O. sva. O. substitutes triṅr...: r...: sva...: d vīrāya: vih...: trih...: ity atra tivrata samyogānātra: r...: ity atra saṁśiṣṭān: sva...: ity anyatra tivrata-rām: vih...: ity atra tivrata-rām. 9 G. M. om. 10 W. atra tu r; B. abhinundayaṁ. 11 W. B. G. M. atra.
5. And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant.

The “and” (ca) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kauṇḍinya’s opinion: according to this authority, here, in the prescription of anusvāra, the time of a consonant, half a mora (i.37), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by anusvāra; an example is yuṣṭādāṁ rāsbhabhāṁ yuvam (iv.1.2) et al. And “in this case” (atra, literally ‘here’) is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where n or m is converted into t (v.28,28,28).

O. states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, patrāṁ anapavyayantah (iv.6.6)3 and aṅkhomuce (i.6.122 et al.)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi.29), ought to be a counter-example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the anusvāra merely was added to the vowel. Anusvāra, namely, was declared by i.34 to have the quantity of a short vowel; and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that; if, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the anusvāra as an affection of the vowel merely; causing the latter’s prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O. appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities: that atra signifies wherever anusvāra is prescribed: and that where there is anusvāra, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

5. cakārā sthavrakāṇḍīnyam evodātipati: atrā ‘nuṇāvāri... dhāne sāmavākṣyasvarasya vyayjaniakālo hraṇvārdihkalo ‘dhikāḥ syād iti sthavrāḥ kāṇḍīnyo manyate: yuṣṭaṁ... ityādi. atrā ‘va svarāsyā ‘ti kīṁ: sādhisah ‘tameshū ‘tamaśalabhāye cāti ‘tad adhihakālvidhānam mā bhād iti.

1 W. B. -raḥ kīṁ; G. M. -nyamātām. 2 W. B. -mahā. 3 B. nāti; G. M. nāti.
4 W. adhikālī; G. M. adhitakaī.
5 O. substitutes for the whole atrā ‘nuṇāvāre vyayjanakālo hraṇvārdihkālaṁatītrah svarasyā ‘dhikā bhavati svarakālaḥ: satrā... aṁhā... yuṣṭaṁ... ca yahāda sthavrakāṇḍīnyo evatātipati: tarsādhyatma ‘nuṇāvāra eva svarāma ‘dhikā syāt: atrā ‘ti kīṁ: sādhisah ‘tameshū ‘tamaśalabhāye sāmavākṣyakālo ‘tad adhitakālvidhānam mā bhād itali svarakālādhikā ‘nuṇāvāra syāt: apara ‘dhikā atrā ‘tamasameti... kālo ‘tad adhitakaīlvidhānam mā bhād itali svarakālādhikā ‘nuṇāvāra syāt: apaṇā... kālo ‘tamasameti... kālo ‘tad adhitakaīlvidhānam mā bhād itali svarakālādhikā ‘nuṇāvāra syāt.
The Rik (xiii.18) and Vājasaneyi (iv.147–8) Prātiṣṭākhyas also concern themselves with the respective length of a vowel and of anuvāra as constituents of a syllable, but their rules stand in no definable relation to the one here given.

6. Pāushkaraśādi says the utterance of svāra and vikrama is attended with firmer effort.

Most of the manuscripts supply in the comment prayoga, ‘use, application,’ as the subject involved in this rule; O. supplies simply varna, ‘alphabetic sound,’ Svāra, we are told, means svarita, ‘circumflex;’ O. signifying in the same thing by pointing out that the svāras are enumerated in the twentieth chapter (xx.1–8). Vikrama is a particular kind of anudattā, ‘grave;’ or, O. says, is explained in the nineteenth chapter (xix.1.2). As examples are given yo ‘sva var ‘gna tām āpi (v.7.9.1: G. M. O. omit the last two words) and dasya harāḥ priyām (iii.3.11.1), for the latter of which O. substitutes pikyām abhy āpi dadhāti (v.2.13): we have here two kinds of svāra or varita, namely abhinīhata (xx.4) and nitya (xx.2), and one or more cases of vikrama (the grave syllable standing directly between two that are either acute or circumflex) in each example. A counter-examples is yoṣm viśvā tāt tāt pāry anadatām (i.7.2.2: only O. has the last two words), which contains (except in O.’s addition) neither svāra nor vikrama.

7. Čāityāyana says, of all the letters, according to their difference of effort.

The comment (except in O.) supplies the same subject as in the preceding rule, namely prayoga; and also continues the predicate of that rule, drīḍhaprayatnatah. The latter we can hardly approve, since to assert a specially firm effort of all alphabetic sounds without exception is little better than nonsense. Čāityāyana may rather be credited with meaning that each constituent of the alphabet has its own proper (spocitā) degree of articulative effort—which is more true than edifying.


1 B.-sam. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. B.-dha; G. M.-dha eva. 4 G. M. om. O. substitutes for the whole svāra viṣādanuvāke gāṇyało: ekālāviṣādanuvāke vikramaḥ svāraḥ vikramaḥ ca drīḍhaprayatnataro vasya bhavati pāushkaraśādār mate’ fikyām... yo.... svāravikramayor iti kim: gāṁ....

1 B.-sam. 2 G. M. om. 3 W. B.-dha; G. M.-dha eva. 4 G. M. om. O. substitutes for the whole svāra viṣādanuvāke gāṇyało: ekālāviṣādanuvāke vikramaḥ svāraḥ vikramaḥ ca drīḍhaprayatnataro vasya bhavati pāushkaraśādār mate’ fikyām... yo.... svāravikramayor iti kim: gāṁ....
As example, is cited the first phrase of the Sanhitā, \textit{ishe tvoc} "rje tod" (1.1.1: only O. has the last two words).

The manuscripts of the commentary leave us quite in a quandary as to the value of these seven rules, W. B. calling them approved, but G. M. O. unapproved.

\textit{सरस्वतीप्रायोगिकम् तद्यथायते।}
\textit{वर्गमूलिकामान्तरः दुर्स्थीति यथामनि।}
\textit{स्त्राणिः।}

8. Ātreyā says, one must utter the sounds not over-distinguishly and not indistinguishly; taking, as it were, a vessel filled with drink, steady, according to the sense.

The commentator gives only a simple paraphrase of this verse, and casts no real light upon its meaning, even as regards the naïve and not very instructive comparison in the second line.

\textit{SARVAVARANĀM PRAYOGAḥ SVOCITAPRAYATNAVIJESHAḥ DṛḍHA-PRAYATNATARObhavati 'ti pātyāyano manyate. yathā: ishe..... ityādi.  \textit{tāni} satapātṝṇi 'ṣhtāni.}

\textit{7. sarvavarṇānām prayogah svacitaprayatnavijeshāḥ dṛḍha-prayatnataro bhavati 'ti pātyāyana manyate. yathā: ishe.... ityādi. \textit{na} 'tāni sapta sātṝṇi 'ṣṭāni.}

\textit{3. B.ṣa. 2 B. svoc.; W. B. -ṣaḥ; G. M. -ṣaḥ. 3 W. -naḥ prayatnavama; B. -naḥ prayatnavama. 4 G. M. om. 5 B. etāni.}

O. substitutes for the whole \textit{pātyāyanaṣya pātyāyanaṣya sarvavarṇānām vājēṣyād dṛḍhaprayatnavataraḥ evam varṣeshu bhavati: na vedanā-}

evadavrākṣamayor eva 'u: yathā: ishe.... 'nā 'tāni etc.

8. atiṣṭhakam atiṣṭhakam avyaktaṃ avyaktaṃ uspāśtaṃ ca yathā na bhavaty evam varṇān udāṅguyed uccārayed 'ity arthaḥ: payah-pārtam sadā 'matraṃ kṣīrapārtātāḥ bhājanam 'harunā iha 'yathāmati matiṃ anatikramya 'ahi 'dhyeta 'dhyetaṃ bhaved' ity ātreyo manyate.

\textit{iti trikāśaḥ trikāśaḥ prātiśāyaḥ prātiśāyaḥ saptatīṣaḥ 11 'dhyayāḥ.}

\textit{1. W. 'heā. 2 O. om. 3 G. M. om. 4 O. om. īva. 5 W. kṣīraṃ api; B. }

\textit{iropāripā; O. -raiṇi pi. 6 G. M. amatram. 7 O. pīraṇāva. 8 W. O. ut. 9 W. O. om. āhiro; G. M. adhyātī yathā āhiro. 10 G. M. -eti ātīte. 11 G. M. O.}

\textit{dṛṣṭiopaprame pācakamo.}

\textbf{VOL. IX. 45}
1. As *prāṇava*, some utter *o* with two and a half *moras*.

In the text of this rule, T. reads *oṅkāram*, and B. *oṅkāram*; in the comment, at the beginning, W. B. have *oṅkāran*. Doubtless the unnasalized form is the true reading; that *oṅ* or *oṅ* should be uttered with more than the quantity of a long syllable would not be worth the trouble of specifying, in view of rules i.34 and xvii.8, which would require either three or two and a half *moras* for the combination. Whether we are to infer that this holy exclamation was not yet uttered with a nasal ending at the time when the Prātiṣṭhākhyas were made, is a more doubtful question; the whole matter lies, at any rate, outside the proper province of a Prātiṣṭhākhyas. By way of examples, the comment appears to intend to quote the first and last words of the Sanhitā and of the Brāhmaṇa: namely *oṅ* *iśe tvā* (i.1.1), *samudro bandhuḥ oṅ* (vi.5.25? see below: B. omits the *oṅ*), *oṅ brahma saṁdhattam* (Ṭātt. Brāh. i.1.1), and *ye ṭhyaḥ caĩ 'nat prāhuḥ oṅ* (B. omits the *oṅ*): the Calcutta edition of the Tāṭṭīrīya-Brāhmaṇa being incomplete, I can only presume that these are the concluding words of that treatise. The manuscripts G. M. O. put these extracts in a different order, giving the two conclusions first, and then the two beginnings; G. M. add *oṅ* at the end of each, while O. gives no *oṅ* at all: G. M. further append two more citations, *bhadrāṁ karaṇebhūḥ oṁ* and *āva tapati oṁ*, of which the former is the beginning, and the latter, I presume, the end, of the Tāṭṭīrīya-Aranyaka. With regard to the phrase *samudro bandhuḥ*, it is to be observed that the Sanhitā as found in my manuscript (or rather, manuscripts, for mine contains the last leaf of another and entirely independent one, which has the same reading), and in those to which Prof. Weber has access, ends with *samudraḥ* simply; but another word like this is evidently wanting to complete the sense (the concluding sentence is *samudra ṣaṅgaṇvya yoṁiḥ samudraḥ*), and is not less needed to make up the tale of words as enumerated in the ending, which counts "twelve" after *avahat*, while without *bandhuḥ* there are
only eleven. This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Tāttirīya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word.

Then is quoted a verse "from the Kālanirnaya," to the effect that "the quantity of two and a half morae belongs to the pranava and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section." The Kālanirnaya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mādhava bearing the same title (Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS., No. 1166).

In explanation of the word tu in the rule, another half-verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kālanirnaya, and the authority of Pāṇini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity: hence for simple o long quantity is determined: here, "however" (tu), when the diphthong stands in pranava, that quantity is negated; and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the pranava, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of?] a m. That is to say, the tu intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong o. And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different pranava.

उद्दातनानुसारं स्वारुपरूपम् कस्मिन्द्रिस्तिम् श्रीत्यायनः ॥ २ ॥

2. Čāityāyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex.

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Čāityāyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents.

nirāpitaḥ; ida tu pranavasthitavripheshaḥ] sād kālo nishidhyate: nādasthapranave tu syāt "samakārādvinītrate" tī. "pranavavriphesha kālanvireshaḥ" pratyetavyah.


2. udattādudattasvarādānāṁ madhye kṣaśiṣṭaḥ sitvatra pranavah prayoktavya iti ċāityāyano brāte. yathā: oṁ.

O. substitutes utte anuddite svaritve vi eṣā madhyatamena svareṇa prayoktavya syd 1 ċāityāyanamahāḥ deśīrye maṇyate : oṁ oṁ.
3. According to Kāṇḍinya, it is a sustained prācaya.

I have ventured to translate the word dhṛta in dhṛtaprācaya by 'sustained,' but without feeling sure that it might not have been better to follow the lead of the commentator, who treats dhṛtaprācaya as equivalent to simple prācaya. He brings up, it is true, the objection that in xix.2 the use of the term prācaya itself is attributed to this same Kāṇḍinya, and that hence it should have been used here; but replies 'not so;' by this pair of words, even, an appellation is given: thus, namely: on the principle that even where there is no difference of meaning there may be a difference of application, the teacher exhibits a nicety of application: other examples of the principle are the names [of the second Pāṇḍava] Bhūmasena and Bhūma [of one of Śiva's wives] Bhūmā [G. M. say Satyā] and Satyabhāma, piddhāna and apiddhāna, dipa and pra-dipa. The prācaya is defined as the fourth accent; and O. adds that it is to be explained in the twenty-first chapter (namely, at xxi.10,11): it is there said to be of the same tone as udātta, 'acute;' so that, unless dhṛta is to be regarded as signifying a modification, one does not see in what respect Kāṇḍinya's opinion differs from that of Vālmiki, given in rule 6 of this chapter.

4. That application of the voice is with middle tone.

The meaning of this precept is very obscure, and the commentator's exposition does not give the impression that he comprehended it. According to him, the so, 'that,' points us back to the utterance as prescribed by Kāṇḍinya in the preceding rule: in whatever pitch of voice the application is made, the prācaya is to be used with medial effort, or with one that takes into account the

combination of high and low tone. The relation of vāk in the compound is described as that of a locative case, and the word is paraphrased by vīdeah sthāne, 'in position (i.e., I presume, 'quality' or 'temperament:' compare xxii.11, xxiii.4,5) of voice.'

5. According to Plākshi and Plākshāyaṇa, it is circumflexed.

This rule is, along with its three predecessors, pronounced by the commentator unapproved.

6. According to Vālmīki, it is acute.

This is the only rule in the chapter, except the first, which the commentator allows to stand as approved. In his school, then, the vowel part of the sacred exclamation is to be two and a half moras long, and of acute tone. This agrees with the teaching of the Vāj. (ii.51) and Rik (xv.3) Prātiṣṭhākhyas, save that these give (what is really equivalent to the same thing) three moras to the whole word om; and the Rik Pr. mentions other opinions both as to its quantity and its accent.

7. All allow that it may also be according to the application.

The commentator first quotes an absurd opinion of Māhisheya's, to the effect that yathāprayogam, 'according to the application,' here means udāttā, 'acute,' but then goes on to set forth, as given by Vararuci, what appears to be the real meaning of the rule: namely, that with whatever tone the passage to be read [i.e. its beginning] is used, that tone is to be given also to the introductory exclamation. Thus, before īsu tād (i.1.1 et al.), which begins with

4. prayuṣyāta iti prayogyah: madhyameno 'ocanicasamādhāravi-
cakshanena prayatnena pranavah: yatraś kvacana vde sthāne
prayogho bhavati sa iti kāndinyābhimathāḥ pārvokto grhyate,
vāci prayogyo vākyprayogyah.

1 W. -vi; G. M. -vah prayaktaryah. 2 W. anya-. 3 W. B. na. 4 B. om.
O. substitutes ko 'yami prāṇavo nimna cāvyprayogah [i.e. vākpr-] kāndinyāmatam
ddṛṣyā yatra kvacana sthāne dvyan ; tena madhyamena evoreṇa prayaktaryah.

5. plākshi plākshāyaṇayoḥ 1 paksheśu svarito bhavati,
nād 'tad satrācañṣāḥṣayam ishtam.

O. ins. acīrayore. 9 O. mate; G. M. O. add prāṇasa.

6. vālmikero mate prāṇasa udātto bhavati. 1

1 O. adda yathā.
grave, the om is to be grave; before āpa undantu (i.2.11: wanting in W. B.), acute; before vṛddham (v.1.2): W. B. have instead, evidently as a corrupt reading only, vṛūdhah, with which word no anusvāra in the Sanhitā begins), circumflex.

The rule is declared unapproved—rather hard treatment for one which professes to lay down a principle accepted by all authorities.

---

CHAPTER XIX.

CONTENTS: 1-2, occurrence of vikrama, between syllables of high tone; 3-5, of kampa, in a circumflex followed by a circumflex.

स्वरित्योपदेशं यत्र नीचस्य स्वादुदात्योपदेशान्यतरस्मी बोधात्मकतित्योः स विक्रमः II 11

1. Where a syllable of low tone occurs between two circumflex syllables, or two acute, or two of which either one is acute and the other circumflex, that is vikrama.

The commentator paraphrases the rule as if anyatāraḥ meant 'between a preceding circumflex and a following acute,' and the following udātanavāritatayoh between a preceding acute and a fol-

7. yathāpragyogacodeno 'datto 'bhiddhiyatan iti māhisheyapa-
kahah: pranēṣu yathāpragyogaih vai kuryād iti surveshām rishi-
nām matam. varvarucpakahs tu vakshayate: adhyeshyamāṇam yathāpragyogaih yathāvidhāsasaram 'tathāvidhena vai svareṇa pranāvah prajvaktya iti surveshām matam iti. yathā: ishe tve 'ty anena 'dhyesyamāṇena 'uddattena pranāvay 'py anuddāt-
ah: 'āpa undantu ity udāttena 'dattah: vṛddham iti svā-
ritena svāritah.

ne 'dani sūtram itṣṭam.

O. (corrected a little) substitutes yathāvidhena svareṇā dhyeyamāna bhavati: tathāvidhena svareṇā 'ta pranāvah prajvaktyah: eho vai surveshām acaryānām svādhānavāsanavāritah bhavai: ishe tve 'ty etad adhyeyamānena udāttaḥ pranāvah vākavyayā: āpa... ity udāttaḥ: vṛddham iti svāritah : acaryāgra-

yānai tathāvī kṣeyarthāh: pakṣhaparipravāhavānaśvādrātaḥ parikalpanā: ne 'dani sūtram itṣṭam.

iti trībhāṣhataḥ prātiṣṭhakhyavārave asiddaśceto 'dhyeyah.

1 W. -gasa. 2 G. M. -amā. 3 W. adhyesrathamānam. 4 G. M. -vidha. 5 W. B. om. 6 W. 'dhyayamāṇa; B. -māṇa. 7 G. M. -mā. 8 W. B. om. 9 G. M. O. avityasraṇe shashīho.
allowing circumflex.' He adds examples of a vikrama syllable in each of the four defined positions: namely yō 'ṣya svō 'ygrás tám āpti (v.7.9): G. M. O. omit the last two words), vodhavē (i.6.21 et al.), dhāvanā gāh (iv.6.61), and tasya kva svāvyog lokāh (ii.6.5): O. omits the last word, G. M. the last two). In the third example, the circumflex by which the vikrama syllable is preceded is the enclitic; this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex. As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii.6, where we are told that Pūshkarāsādi asserts the utterance of svāra ('circumflex') and vikrama with a firmer effort. The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here. It is found, among the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas, in that to the Rig-Veda only, and has there no such meaning.

The vikrama is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath. The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked.

The construction of sv in the rule, as agreeing in gender with vikraman, though referring to nicam (aksharam), was alluded to above, under v.2.

2. As also, according to Kāṇḍinya, when a pracaya precedes.

The pracaya (see xxi.10,11) is the series of unaccented syllables following a circumflex (enclitic or independent) in connected discourse, and uttered, save the one next preceding another following circumflex or an acute, in the tone of acute. This last one of the

1. 'yatā svartavār maṇhya uḍāttvār vā 'nyatārata vē ti svaritodāttvār vē 'ty arthāh: uḍāttaḥsvartavitavār vā hadhyena nicān yād aksharaṁ sa vikramaḥ bhavati. svaritavār maṇhya yathā: yō..... uḍāttvār yathā: vodhavē. svaritodāttvār yathā: dhunvē..... uḍāttaḥsvartavitavār yathā: tasya..... vikramanaṁjñāyāḥ pravojanam: svāravikramatvār dṛṣṭaṁ pratyatnatara (xvii.6) iti.


2. okaḥvār vikramana iti jñāpayati: 'kāṇḍinīyaṁya mātā uḍāttvār vā pracaḥprāvāvā vā vikramo vijñayāḥ. uḍāttaḥvār yathā: pary..... svaritaparvō yathā: upar..... pracayaḥ pārva vamādān udvā pracaḥprāvāvāḥ.

(1) G. M. O. caṇḍa. (2) W. om. (3) G. M. sa tathakāh.
series, which retains its grave tone, is here declared to be, on Kāṇḍinya's authority, likewise entitled to the appellation vikrama. This makes the term apply to all syllables in the sanākhyā that are marked by the horizontal stroke below, excepting those which, after a pause, precede the first accented syllable. The commentator cites two examples: pāry avadatāṁ yā' yajñē diyāte (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>: lost in W.; only O. has the last two words) and upārishtāllakṣhaṁ yāyāṁ (ii.6.2<sup>4</sup>* et al.), in the first of which the pravara is followed by an acute, in the second by a circumflex.

It is to be observed that the vikrama appears, so far as this treatise is concerned, to be a mere name; no peculiarity of tone is claimed to belong to it: the other treatises offer nothing analogous.

As nothing is said of the non-approval of the rule, we may regard it as accepted in the school represented by the commentator.

3. According to some, in a circumflex syllable that is followed by a circumflex, quarter-moras are so.

I have rendered this rule according to my own persuasion of its true meaning, and not at all in conformity with the interpretation of the commentator, who says "yama [W. alone says dviyama] is a synonym of svairita; where there are two such yamas, without intervention of anything, that is a dviyama; what is followed by such a dviyama, that is dviyamapara: in the former, and also in the latter, where there is a third yama [so in G. M., which is the best reading; the others perhaps mean triyane], whatever circumflexed materials there are, all those are depressed at the end to the extent of a quarter-mora: so some think. An example of a dviyama is tē 'nyō 'nyāsāt (ii.2.11<sup>b</sup>: but B. G. M. have instead tē 'nyō 'nyāṁ, vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>); of a dviyamapara, sō 'pō 'bhy dviyātya (vi.1.1<sup>7</sup>; 4.2<sup>2</sup>). Whence do we derive the implication 'at the end?' from the precept 'and likewise, at the end of a word are kampas, quarter-moras depressed at the end.' And the implication of

3. yamācārabāḥ svairitaparyāyah: dūda yamādu yatra deśa nirantarayena vartate sa dviyamah; tasmān: dviyamah paro yasmad asūdā dviyamaparaḥ: tasmān ca dviyamev sa tīyā svairitaptayās tīḥ sarvāḥ ontato 'numitāṁ' nihaṭā bhavantī 'ty eke manyante. dviyamev ye tathā: tē...... dviyamaparā yathā: so...... antaye iti katham pratiyate: padānte ca tathāṁ kampā antauta nihaṭāṁkāṁ iti vaścāntā iti brūmah: nihaṭāṁ tu svairitaya mādhye yatra nicum (xii.1) ityī etatsāṃucchayā la-bhaye. cikāḥ cā'vāṁ vaścāntāṁ iti:

"nityo bhūnihaṭai ca va kshaiprah praśiṣṭa eva ca:
ete svārākṣ prakampante yatra 'ccasvirito'asiyāṁŚ' "iti";
"cēsāsya 'dattāṁ vā syat svārātāṁ vā vyavasthaye "iti:"
depression comes by vicinage from rule 1, above, where a syllable of low tone between two that are circumflexed is spoken of. This seems to me entirely inadmissible. In yama as a synonym of svarita, and meaning 'circumflex,' I cannot in the least believe; and the designation of a case of three successive circumflexes as dviyamapara would be excessively awkward, even without the omission of the ca, 'and,' which would be needed to connect it, in that signification, with dviyama. On the other hand, dviyama, 'of double pitch,' is an entirely natural and acceptable synonym for svarito, 'circumflex,' the essential characteristic of which is that it combines the high and the low tone within the limits of the same syllable; and "a circumflex followed by a circumflex" includes every possible case. The limitation "at the end" is properly enough left to be understood from the nature of the case; but that the predicate "depressed," the most important part of the precept, should remain to be inferred by vicinage only, and from the subject, not the predicate, of the two preceding rules, is not to be tolerated.

And I have no doubt that the tāḥ in the rule is the predicate, and represents vitarkama, its gender and number being adapted to those of anumātrāḥ by the grammatical figure anyonyānvyayu, to which the commentator (see under ii. 7, v.2) has several times appealed in other like cases. There remains, as the only difficulty, the plural number of both words: we should certainly expect rather sūrī-mātrāḥ; but even if we have to let this pass unexplained, it is vastly more easy to get along with than the difficulties which beset the other interpretation. One hardly dares presume to suggest that the present reading is the result of an alteration, made after the meaning given in the comment was ascribed to the rule.

The commentator goes on to quote a verse from the Čikšā, to the effect that the four kinds of independent circumflex (see xx.1, 2,4,5) suffer kampā when they precede either an acute or a circumflex. This verse is (save that it gives the Tāttvīrīya instead of the Rik names to the accents) the same with that which is interpolated in the Rik Pr., at the end of the third chapter (iii.19). He adds further, in another half-verse, doubtless from the same authority, that "of the remainder, there may either be the quality of acute or of circumflex, respectively;" and explains this "respectively" as

vyāvasthāpabdena nena dviwidhāḥ kampā uktaḥ; saṁhitāyāṁ svaritakampā itaracchedabhāgā uddāttakampā iti ye kampāḥ prasiddhāḥ te ṣeva etal lakṣaṇam na tu kampavidiḥyakam: anyathā yo ityādu kampāḥ prasajyeta.

ne'dami sātram isḥtam.

1 W. dviy. 2 W. norāh; O. norāntārya. 3 G. M. śrīyayame. 4 W. yānī; M. vd. 5 O. sra. 6 W. niyati; B. abhihūta; G. M. bhihiti. 7 G. m. om. 8 O. anāta. 9 O. ka. 10 W. B. yathā. 11 O. hi hāt. 12 G. niḥit; O. tāvāni. 13 B. om. 14 O. s. 15 B. hātup. 16 G. M. svar. 17 W. tuva; M. ecacaras; O. caucayam; G. M. yād; O. g. 18 O. om. 19 B. -tor; G. M. svarito. 20 W. sīra; O. om. anena. 21 W. -tāk k; B. -ta uklak k. 22 G. M. -rē ve. 23 W. -tāk k. 24 W. B. O. om. 25 G. M. om. 26 B. O. inā eva.
implying that there are two kinds of kampa: in the Sanhitā, that before a circumflex; in other parts of the Veda, that before an acute; and concludes the exposition with pointing out (if I understand him) that this is a definition applying to those cases of kampa which are otherwise established; but that it is not a precept requiring kampa, since this would otherwise have to appear in such passages as yā pāṁ pūshpaṁ veda (only G. M. have veda: the passage is not to be found in the Sanhitā, and possibly is intended to be quoted from one of those “other parts of the Veda,” referred to above). Finally, he remarks that the rule is unapproved.

The term kampa is not found anywhere in the text of our Prātiṣṭākhya, or of that of the Rig-Veda, although the commentary to the latter (under iii 3.4), like our own, employs it to signify the peculiar modification undergone by the circumflex, when immediately followed by a high tone. The Atharva-Prātiṣṭākhya (iii.65) gives to the same modification the kindred name of vikampita. It is signified, in the Rik and Atharvan texts (as is fully explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65), by appending to the vowel of the circumflex syllable a figure, either 1 or 3, and appending to the figure the signs of both circumflex and grave accentuation. The theory of this mode of designation is obscure, and no account of it is given in any Prātiṣṭākhya, nor, so far as I am aware, in any other Hindu authority that has yet come to light. We should imagine the figure to be a mere point d’appui for an added sign of grave tone, but that there appears in a part of the Vedic texts an accompanying prolongation of the vikampita vowel (if the vowel be short), of which the figure, therefore, appears to be the sign: of this prolongation the Prātiṣṭākhyas give no hint.

This accent wears a quite peculiar aspect in the Tātātirīya text, as compared with those to which reference has been made. In the first place, being limited to the case of a circumflex before a circumflex, it is relatively of rare occurrence, there being fewer examples of it in the whole Tātātirīya-Sanhitā than in the first book alone of the Atharvan (it occurs in the former, if I have overlooked nothing, only at ii.1.6, 2.11, v.4.3; vi.1.11, 5, 11.2, 2; 2.21, 3.2, 42, 4.2, 9.10; 8.8; and in the ending to v.2.1). Secondly, it is always intimated by an appended figure 1, with simply the mark of anudatta tone, or of vikrama, written beneath, while the circumflex vowel retains the mark of circumflex accent*—and this is clearly the method most easily defensible on theoretic grounds:

* That is to say, this is uniformly the case in my manuscript, which, for example, writes the commentator’s quoted instances as follows:

and the MSS of the comment all add the figure 1, although, as everywhere else, they omit the accent signs. In the two cases that occur in the part of the Calcutta edition thus far printed, it seems to be by mere unintelligent blundering that the above method is departed from, a 3 being added in the one (ii.1.6), without any sign of vikrama beneath it, and no designation being attempted in the other (ii.2.11).
the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the *vitraisa* tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the *vitraisa* sign. Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi.8.2; 6.81) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long.

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say. It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no *kampa* at all; and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-*dakshina* accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases. There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the *Pratigya* in this chapter and the practice in the known Taittirya text (but see the note on the next rule); the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter; but this is the case also with the other Vedas.

The denial of *kampa* in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the Taittirya system of accentuation as compared with that of the Rik and Atharvan, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness. Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with *pracaya* tone (xxi.10); and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident. For example, so *smaït* and so *smui* would be accented before a pause precisely alike; and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause; e.g. so *smaäd abhauat* and so *smaâd yâ vâi tát.* And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things: we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in *hy eshá prthi-vydâh*, but not in *hy étud devâh*, and the *sanhitâ* does not tell us whether in so *smaâd etarhi* the *asmi* is accented or toneless.* And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of *pracayas*, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes.† Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice.

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing Taittirya-Brâhma and Aranyaka, so that the commentator’s allusion to “other parts of the Veda” as differing from the Sanhitâ in respect to *kampa* is of doubtful meaning.

---

* Thus, सा अस्मादवत् । and सा अस्माधो वै नतू ।

† Thus, क्रम पृष्ठियः; and क्रमद्रवः; and सा अस्माधितितिः.

‡ Thus, सा अक्षायण प्रजा: may be either so ‘kamayata praâh’ or so ‘kalâmaryata praâh’.
4. In that very material.

The commentator's interpretation of this rule is just as violent and unsatisfactory as is that which he gave of its predecessor, and with which he forces it into strange connection. He says, "in a dviyamā passage there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora only in that—namely, the former—circumflex material; but, in a passage where a dviyama follows, there is depression to the extent of a quarter-mora of the two former materials; but they do not all share in the quarter-mora effect: that is what the eva means. And Kāuhaleyā says thus: 'of two, the former is anumāṭrika; of three, the two former are anumāṭrika; beyond that, the natural condition holds.'"

I think we can have no hesitation whatever as to rejecting this: if the treatise had been intending to say what is here claimed, it would have said it in a very different manner. What is really meant, may be much more doubtful; but I imagine that we are directed to find our quarter-mora of vikrama in the very substance of the circumflex syllable itself; that is to say, not in any protraction of it; and so, that that treatment of the case which is signified by the insertion of a figure after the circumflex vowel is rejected. This, if established, would make the doctrine of the authorities (eka, rule 3) here reported in fact discordant with the practice followed in the recorded text.

5. Not in the former teaching.

A rule of very obscure import, and respecting which the commentator has only his guesses to give us. He ventures two: first, that pārvacāstra signifies the rule respecting vikrama, and that in it this affection of the quarter-mora finds no place; second, that pārvacāstra means the first rule of the chapter (which amounts, so far, to the same thing with the other), and that the name of

---

4. dviyamāsthale pārvayām 'eva tasyāṁ svurituprakṛtyā anumāṭrayā 'pi nihutatvam bhavati: dviyamatāre tu sthale pārvay eva prakṛtyor anumāṭrayā nihutatvam bhavati: na tu tāṁ sarvā anukṛtyabāhāṁ ity evakāro bodhayati. evam eva kāuhaleyāṁ āha: dvayoḥ pārvoḥ 'numāṭrikās' trisvāḥ pārvoḥ anumāṭrikāv uttaraṁ prakṛtye 'it.

---

1) W. aparayāṁ. 2) B. -raya; G. M. anumāṭram a. 3) O. om. 4) B. -i. 5) G. M. tā. 6) B. -raya; 1) B. numāṭrarayor; G. M. anumāṭrdy. 8) B. -i. 9) W. O. nu. 10) G. M. anuk. O. anumāṭram bhajate. 11) W. -i. 12) W. -raya; B. O. -va. 13) W. B. O. -my.; M. O. -trakas. 14) W. ins. ca. 15) O. pārvo ed; G. M. pārvo yathā upaśtāt; etc. (end of comment to rule 2, above). 16) W. -i.; M. -trakas; O. -trakop. 17) W. -raya.
vikrama, there given, does not apply here in the rule for kampa, since, by xvii.6, vikrama is uttered with a firmer effort of the organs, while that is not the case with kampa. There is nothing in either of these proposals to commend it to our acceptance. If we were ourselves to guess, we should perhaps say that the reference was to rule 4 only, which teaches kampa without any protraction, and that this was confessed to be a doctrine not before authoritatively taught. But we should not presume to put the conjecture forward with any confidence.

CHAPTER XX.

CONTENTS: 1-8, names of the different kinds of circumflex, independent and enclitic; 9-12, different degrees of force of their utterance.

1. When i, i, and u are converted into y or v, the accent is kṣāśṭra, if they were acute.

The conversion of i, i, and u into y or v is by rule x.15; a does not fall under such a rule on account of its being always pragrāha (iv.5). Rule x.16 prescribes the conditions under which a circumflex accent is the result of such a conversion; and the addition of uddātayoh to the present rule is wholly unnecessary—a case to exercise the ingenuity of the commentator in defending the treatise from the charge of pārstrorukta: but either it escapes his notice, or he declines to touch it, as beyond his powers. Of course, if it be necessary to explain here that the altered vowel is acute, it needs to be added that the following vowel is grave.

5. 'pārstrorātānam nāma vikramavidhiḥ: tasminn etad anukarṇyaḥ na bhavati. evam va nitrārthaḥ: pārstrorātām 'dhyāya-prathamasātre yā vikramasatīno 'ktā 'sā kampavidhāv atra' na bhavati: vikramasya ḍṛḍhprāyatnatvatāt' kampasya tadābhāvad iti. 1

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiṣeṣākyavivarāne
eknaviṇcā 'dhyāyaḥ.

1 udāttayor iṣvarokārayor yathopadeṣaṁ yavakārādbhaye satī yathā svarīto vihitah sa kṣāśtrā iti samjñayate. yathā: vy:..... kṛddhi..... udāttayor' iti kim: ṣaḥ:.....: anu:.....

1 W. -rā; O. -ra. 2 G. M. jād jāyate. 3 G. M. om. 4 W. -ttā.
The examples are vy ēva'ī 'lena (v.3.11\textsuperscript{3}) and kṛdhī ēva āsmaṇ (iv.7.15\textsuperscript{7}); counter-examples, where the altered vowel was not acute, are ēdvy ēsa (i.2.5\textsuperscript{1} et al.) and ādv ēnam mātā', which is not, I believe, to be found in the Sāhitas; the nearest thing to it is ādv ēnai vīprāh (iv.6.6\textsuperscript{8}); ēdv tū āma tā occurs several times (i.3.10\textsuperscript{1} et al.).

All the Prātiṣṭhāṇyakhas agree in calling this particular kind of circumflex by the name kṣāḍipra (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.58).

2. But where a syllable containing a ū or ū is circumflexed in a fixed word, being preceded by a grave syllable, or not preceded by anything, that is to be known as nitya.

This definition of the original circumflex accent, which belongs to the word in which it occurs, and does not merely arise as a consequence of the combination of words into phrases (although ultimately of the same nature with the kṣāḍipra, just described), is a long and awkward one, but fairly attains its purpose: only we do not see why the reading is not anudāṭtapāravam apāravant vā, qualifying akṣharaṇam formally, as it does logically. A syllable that has the circumflex in pado-text (to which sthīte pade is explained as equivalent), otherwise than enclitically after an acute, is an original (nitya, 'constant, invariable') circumflex. The other Prātiṣṭhāṇyakhas (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.57) call it jāṭya, 'natural.'

The commentator defines akṣharaṇam, 'syllable,' in the rule as meaning svaraḥ, 'vowel;' and, in fact, the use of akṣharaṇ here is somewhat at variance with the general custom of the treatise, which elsewhere talks of the vowel, not the syllable, as having tone (compare i.43, xiv.29). He inserts sarvarā, 'everywhere,' in his paraphrase, and then explains it, as if it were a part of the rule, to signify that the accent holds in saṁhitā, pādū, and jāṭya text. His examples are vyāyam (i.8.7\textsuperscript{1} et al.), kṛṣṇa 'va tūnā (iii.1.11\textsuperscript{8}: O. omit tūnā), tātā bīha (ii.1.8\textsuperscript{2}), nyānaṁ cīnyaḥ (v.5.3\textsuperscript{2}: W. B. add, after a pause, as if a new example, anyaṁcāṁ [B.}

2. saivārāvin vā savārāvin vā 'ksaraṇi' svara ity arthaḥ: sthīte pade padakāla ity arthaḥ: yatra sthale svaryate: anudāṭtapārve 'pūvē vā pāvēbhāve ' sati: nitya eev 'ti sarvarā jānīyat: sarvatre 'ti saṁhitāpādajātāsv ity arthaḥ. yathā: vāy: kanye.....: tuto.....: nayān.....: ' kva: kva: iti jāṭyaṁ: tuçabdo nityādāv uccodayaśīhaye no 'dāttasvāritapura (xiv.31) iti nishedhāṁ nivārayati. nāmī nityāḥ kathām etanśhāhavishyahaḥ: uddāṭtā pari 'nudāṭta 11 (xiv.29) itilakṣhānasabhamavat'. atro 'cyate: varṣavībhāgavelāyām* uddāṭtapāravant ' asti: saṁhāraṁ svartā (i.40) ity uca-
reads -cāṁ], but no such word is to be found in the Sanhitā, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of nyācām), and kvā yāgati ca (vi.1.4); and from the jata-text, kvā sūya sūya kvā 1 kvā sūya (v.7.42: B. has lost a part; it involves a case of kampa, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1: see xix.3). Counter-examples are given in O. only: namely, of a circumflex not found in pada-text, vy kādī 'nena (v.3.112: the MS. has nṛvyā), dṛṇānaḥ sarpīḥ (iv.1.94; p. dṛṇ-anāḥ); of one, which has an acute before it, mārtīyāḥ dvīvēca (v.7.9) and sārōkā agnīn (v.6.10). We have also one of the common attempts to give a profound significance to the word tu, 'but,' in the rule; and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of. He says the tu signifies that, so far as the nitya circumflex etc. (i.e. and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv. 31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force. But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv.31 has nothing to do with the nitya at all, but only with the enclitic accent prescribed in rule xiv.29. His reply is, that only in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv.29, the combination of the two, by i.40, giving the circumflex character. Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every nitya syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—kvā being equivalent to kāa, and kanyā to kaniḍ—admits of question. He expounds anudātāpāvīre as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and aprāve as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent;' it is doubtless better to supply in idea tasmin ākhashi, and to render 'when that syllable is;' etc. The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me. O. brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, yājyaḥ 'vāi 'nam (ii.3.53; p. yājya : d : eva : enam).

pūrṇatvāt śvarītaye 'ti nishēlhaśvānyante, anudātāc ca 'sāvā pūrvāc ca anudātāpūrvāḥ; 'tasmin: 'pūrṇādhūve pūrvāḥ: tasmin'. 'pūrne tu svaratnopārvatvāt śvarūteśeviṣaḥsaḍadva- yasyā ntyāśa vāyā̄thyāti'; tasmin tatra nityasvarītāya; eva na saṁjñāṇāṁśu iti viṇēyaṁ.

1 W. B. om.; G. M. add yātra svarīeya. 2 O. inv. vi. 3 B. om. 4 G. M. ins. vi. 5 G. om. 6 G. M. ins. vi. 7 O. pī. 8 W. B. ins.: anyayanci. 9 G. M. O. darkav.; O. shayo. 10 G. M. na tu. 11 G. M. ins. svarībhram. 12 O. kāhe. 13 ill MSS. have the linguistic l. 14 W. -rems. 15 W. B. uṣyate pū. 16 W. ins. tasmi. 17 (G. M. om. 18 G. m. na pūrṇa tī therāh: sthāte pada viśī kim; viy..... dvi..... anudātāpāvīra ti kim: marī..... sarī..... kīd ey sign: yāv..... ty aśi: prādīvavāna- karvy evakāvah: pad: samvāye anudātāpūrvatvāt; G. M. cāyapārvavasapūrvatvāt; W. . . . . . sarvārā; B. bhāya etc. 19 W. pūrvāvēcāvēcāvēcāvēc. 20 B. pūrvāvāt, aśeṣadāv. 21 O. pārvavēc. 22 O. nāthā. 23 W. -thāyā; G. M. -thāyā syāt. 24 W. an; B. tat; O. tra. 25 W. O. nityatvām; B. svarītāya nityatvām. 26 B. ca.
3. If, moreover, there is an acute standing in another word, then, if there be a circumflex resulting from a rule of combination, it is prāthiṣṭa.

The phraseology of this rule is very peculiar indeed, and its peculiarity hard to account for. The Rik and Atharva Prātiṣṭhikhyas distinguish only two kinds of enclitic circumflex: the pādavrata, in which a hiatus intervenes between the acute and its successor, and the tāśroṇyaṇaṇa, in which the two are separated by consonants. According to the explanation, now, of our commentator, the present treatise sets off from the latter, as a separate class, a circumflexed syllable at the beginning of a word, following an acute at the end of the preceding word. He gives us four examples (of which, however, W. B. omit the first two, and O. the last two): mā te asyām (i.6.12), yā tva hṛdyā kriṇā (i.4.46); only O. has kriṇā, tāśa tva (i.1.1 et al.), and tāśa te dāpākṣahā (ii.2.10): the second word in each has the prāthiṣṭa circumflex. As counter-examples, we have yān nyācām (v.5.3): W. gives instead yān nāvam [ii.3.10 et al.], but it does not illustrate the point arrived at, and so is doubtless a corruption of the other), to show that the following circumflex must be a result of a rule of combination, and tāyā devaṁya (iv.2.9 et al.: O. substitutes tuṣmād varupam, which is corrupt; I have overlooked it in searching out the references, and do not know how, if in fact represents a real citation, it ought to be amended), to show that the acute must stand in another word.

In working out this meaning for the rule, the commentator declares api, 'moreover,' to have the office merely of bringing down from the preceding rule the quality of going before (pārvaṭra); atha, 'then,' according to him, either cuts off the continued implication of nitya (that is to say, means nothing at all), or else gives the value of a heading to "the being preceded by an acute standing in another word"—which is wholly to be rejected; in the first place because unnecessary (tuṣmād in the next rule having just that purpose), and in the second place because the word could at any rate make a heading only of what followed it in the rule, not of what went before.

---

3. apiṣādah 'pārvaṭvamātrākxarshakah': athapo dode nityasain- jñāṇavachakah: nāṇāpadasthodattapārvaṁākārtikrako' va: nāṇāpadastham aksharam udāttapārvam' cet parato niçaiñ sāṁhitenā vidhīna sovarya cet sa prāthiṣṭa 'tron' veditavyah. 'yathā: mā.... yas....' 'ishe..... taṁ.....' sāṁhitena 'ti kim: 'yana.... nāṇāpadastham iti kim: tayā.....'
If this be indeed the original intent of the rule, it would seem that, to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, there was difference enough between the enclitic circumflex which te in tāṁ te assumes in samhitā, having been grave in pada-text, and that which the śāh of ducākśāh has in samhitā as well as in pada, to furnish ground for a difference of classification and nomenclature.* But there are various obstacles in the way of our accepting the interpretation as satisfactory. In the first place, why ought not the same distinction to apply where the acute and circumflex are separated by a hiatus, as well as by consonants? or why, when a circumflex after an acute in the same word is called tāirovyanjana, alike whether a hiatus or consonants intervene, should a circumflex after an acute in another word have a different name according as it is preceded by a consonant or not? In the second place, why should the rule be thrust in here, wholly out of connection with the others respecting the enclitic circumflex, and with such a frightful sacrifice of that economy of expression which the sātrakāra proverbially rates so highly? for, following rule 7, a simple nāṇapadasthāt tu prātihataḥ would have done the whole business, and much more unequivocally. Not one of the other treatises mixes together thus the enclitic and independent svāritas, when they come to be defined and named. Nor, again, does any other authority found a separate species of accent upon the basis here laid down. I have been inclined, therefore, to conjecture that the rule ought to be rendered *when there is besides (upi) a [preceeding] acute in another word, then, provided a circumflex arises as the result of a rule of combination, it is prātihata:* understanding an independent svārita (except a nitya) to be intended, whenever that svārita was preceded by an acute, and so held a position which would make it an enclitic svārita as well; and the reason for thus calling attention to it being that, as written, it is not distinguished from a mere enclitic accent.† But there are too many difficulties connected with this interpretation also to allow of its being accepted as at all satisfactory.

The Vaiśasaneyi-Prātiṣākhya (i.118) gives a special name, tāirovirāma, to the enclitic circumflex which falls in the pada-text upon the first syllable of the second member of a compound, under

---

* And this difference, it should be noted, applies in the same manner where division is made between the two parts of a compound word; for the extant Tāṭṭīrya pada-text, in marked contrast with those of the other Vedas, regards the avagraha pause as suspending; like the avasana, all accentual influence, and writes puṣkrama, for example, in the same fashion as it writes puṣkram: asti—that is to say, 

šūṇkṛṣṭvātī instead of śūṇkṛṣṭvātī, as the rest would read.

† For example, gṛṭādīr vy udyate (iii.1.114) and dinaśāndh svāhistāḥ (iii.1.92) are written precisely as if they were gṛṭādīr vy udyate and dinaśāndh svāhistāḥ; namely, 

गृहे कर्त्त्वात् and ग्राहणशान:: स्विष्टिः: this is an ambiguity which is common to all the Vedic texts.
the influence of an acute on the final of the first member, and which is therefore 'separated by an intervening pause' from the tone which calls it forth. Thus, the va of gukrā-vati (as written the second time in the first marginal note on p. 389) has a tāirovirdāma svarita, being marked by the ordinary svarita-sign. Now the va, as well as the gukrā, in this word, is to the apprehension of the present treatise (i.48) a pada; and hence its syllable va appears to fulfil all the conditions laid down in rule 2, just above, as determining a jītya: it is circumflexed in the pada-text; it is apārā, or preceded by no other accent in the same pada; and it is svatākāra, or contains a v. Here, now, as it appears to me, we have the best explanation of the value, and at the same time of the position, and also, at least in part, of the phraseology, of the rule under discussion. This accent needs definition, though enclitic, immediately after the nītya, lest it be confounded with the latter: "even if all the conditions of the previous rule are fulfilled, if there is likewise an acute [preceding the syllable] in another word, and the accent is one which is produced by a rule of combination, this accent is not nītya, but prātihāta."

The most conspicuous difficulty in the way of accepting this interpretation is the fact, already referred to, that in the extant pada-text of the Tātātriya-Sāhita there is no such circumflex as is here assumed; the va of gukrā-vati, and all other syllables in like position, being grave, and marked as such. But the difficulty is more apparent than real, since we have no right to assume that this pada-text is precisely the same with that held by the school from which the Prātiṣṭākhya, or this particular rule, emanated: they may have accented their inṛyas, or separable words, after the same fashion which prevails in the pada-texts of the other Vedas. Of more account is the awkwardness of the whole expression, and especially the use of nānāpadustham instead of avagrahastham, which would be the proper term to use in this treatise (compare i.49) in the sense here indicated. But, if not completely acceptable, the interpretation has more for it and less against it, in my opinion, than either of those given above.

Professor Roth, in his early digest of the teachings of the Prātiṣṭākhyas respecting accent (introduction to the Nirukta, p. lvi. etc.), identified the prātihāta accent with the tāirovirdāma, but only in consequence of a misunderstanding of the character of the latter, which he supposed (ibid., p. lxv.) to designate an enclitic circumflex separated by consonants from its occasioning acute in a preceding word, thus giving it the same meaning which is attributed by our commentator to the prātihāta in the present rule. And Weber (under Vāj. Pr. i.118), while defining the tāirovirdāma correctly, repeats the same identification; I do not know whether as taking it incautiously from Roth, or as having arrived by conjecture at an independent interpretation of our present rule. He does not allude to any difficulties as connected with the latter, nor state his identification to rest upon a different basis from that of Roth.
4. After such a one, in case of the loss of an a, it is abhinihata.

The word *tasmat* the comment explains as bringing down *nāṇapadaśtaṇam udāttaṁ* from the preceding rule: 'after an acute occurring in another word.' But the specification (like that of *udāttayah* in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary: rule xii.9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions: here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called.

O. has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning.

The examples are so 'bravīt (ii.1.21 et al.) and tē 'bruvan (ii.5.13 et al.); and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is bhrājo 'si devāṅām (ii.4.32).

All the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55) give to this circumflex the name abhinihita, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation.

5. Where an ā results, it is praśishta.

Rule x.17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of praśishta is here assigned; and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Śanhitā affords. They read in this place sānniyam iiva (vi.2.41), sṛdgātā (vii.1.81), māsu 'tishathom (vii.5.22; G. M. omit mā), and dīkṣaṇa pādaḥsūti (v.5.54; G. M. O. omit).

The same name (or, in the Ath. Pr., praśishta) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short ā's, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.56).

6. Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is pādaṅgta.

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex. The examples given are tā' asomat sṛṣṭāḥ (ii.1.21; B. omits sṛṣṭāḥ), sā idhānāh (iv.4.48), and yā
dātā pādaṅgtaṁ.

4. 'tasman nāṇapadaśthaḥ padat parabhūtānudātākāraṇya' lope suti yathā svaritaḥ so 'bhinihato vedītavyah'. yathā: so......: te..... tasmaḥ iti kim: bhrājo......

(1) O. substitutes asomat sṛṣṭīhna na svaryamāṇarddhe te : sadakale svarita ity arthah : akāraṇya ya svara ādi-ṛṣyate so 'bhinihato nāma svarito bhavati. W. B. -dātāya; G. M. parabhūtā amudātāsya akāraṇya.

5. abhāve yatra svaryate sa praśishto vedītavyah. sūn...... sūd......: māsū......: 'dikṣā......'

(1) G. M. O. om.
upsádha (vi.2.41); while, as counter-example, to show that the hiatus must be between two padas, not two parts of the same pada, we have pradýgam ukthám (iv.4.21: this implies, of course, that the pada-text does not treat the word as a separable one).

The Rāk Pr. (iii.9.10) calls this accent vāinrtu, and there is nothing in its definition or in that of the Vāj. Prāt. (i.119) which should limit the accent to the case of a hiatus between two padas, or deprive the u of such a word as pruṣa of its right to rank as a pādavrta. See the note to the next rule.

उदात्तपूर्वकः || ||

7. Where an acute precedes, it is táirovyañjana.

The form of this rule, again, is almost unaccountably peculiar. The term táirovyañjana means ‘with consonant-intervention,’ and all the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.62) define the accent in accordance with this, as being one in which the circumflex is separated by intervening consonants from the occasioning acute. Here, to be sure, such a definition would hardly answer, as there is a single word in the Sanhita, pradagam, in which a vowel is regarded as having táirovyañjana, although there is no consonant between it and the acute. But why specify uddātapuruṣa, ‘preceded by an acute,’ in this rule, when it was just as necessary in rule 6? The commentator says that, as the implication has been made all along, its repetition here is for the purpose of signifying that the acute is now to be understood to be in the same word with the circumflex. That may satisfy him, but is not calculated to content us. If nānapadastham uddattam was implied in rule 6 from above, then padavivṛttyām should have been simply vivṛttyām. Things would be made much better by putting rule 6 after rule 7: then we should be able to give uddāta puruṣa in rule 7 a meaning, as recalling to mind the actual cause of these two accents; and rule 6 would stand as an exception to the other and more general statement, pointing out a class of cases in which, though depending on a preceding acute, another name was applied to the accent.

The commentator’s examples are yuṇjántya asya (vii.4.20), vásvy

1. padayor vivṛttyāḥ padavivṛttyāḥ: tasyāṁ yah svaryate sa pādavrto veditavyah.2 yathā: tā....: sa.....: yā.....: vivṛttir vyaktir ity arthaḥ. padayor iti kim: pra.....

1 W. B. O. om. 2 B. bhavati. 3 in O. only. 4 B. vyiptaśriktā.

7. uddātapuruṣavādhikāre sati punar atra tatkathanād ekapada-sthodātaviveśho ‘vagamyate3: tasmād ekapadasthodātāpuruśo yah svaritaḥ sa táirovyañjano veditavyah. yathā: yuṇj.....: var.....: sa.....: tād.....: pra.....: tām.....

1 G. M. kath; O. tu kr. 2 G. M. -sthitya; O. -sthatvai. 3 O. gam-. 4 O. asū. 5 in O. only.
8. These are the names of the circumflex accents.

The commentator simply gives examples for each accent, in part new, in part the same with those furnished under the rules defining each: namely, for the kṣaṭā (omitted in G. M.), abhy asthāt (iv.2.8*), adhvaryo vek (vi.4.3*): this is a blunder, there being no kṣaṭā in the phrase; B. O. reads instead adhvaryuḥ (vi.2.9* et al.), which does not mend the matter); for the nitya, vāyavāyam (i.8.7* et al.) and kva 'vya (v.7.4*): G. M. have kva simply); for the pratiṣṭhāt, sā te lokāḥ (v.7.28: G. M. omit lokah) and yat tod kruddhāḥ (i.5.4*): G. M. omit kruddhāḥ; for the abhinītā, sā 'bravīt (ii.1.2* et al.); for the pratiṣṭhāt, sā 'dhyātā (vii.18*); for the pādvṛttā, tā evam (ii.3.11*: W. reads, blunderingly, tā m nam [ii.6.11*], and B. substitutes sā 'dhyānāh, iv.4.4*); and for the tāirovyaṇājana, māma nāma (i.5.10*).

8. Ity etāni supta svaritūnāmadheyānyā' ākhyātāni? yathā: ’abhy.... a dhv.... iti kṣaṭāh. vāy.... kvā.... iti nityāh. sā.... yat.... iti pratiṣṭhātāh. so.... iti abhinītāh. sā.... iti pratiṣṭhātāh. tā.... iti pādvṛttāh. māma.... iti tāirovyaṇājanaḥ.

1 W. मन्य; B. यद्यमि स्वरितंदम्. 2 O. व्यक्त. 3 G. M. om.
9. In the *kṣhāipra* and *nīya*, the effort is firmer.

The commentator makes very short work of the remaining rules of the chapter, and we can afford to do the same, as they teach us nothing of value.

10. As also in the *abhinihata*.

The commentator says that *ca* in this rule is used in the sense of secondary adjacency (*anvācaya*), and so signifies that the effort of utterance in the *abhinihata* is *dṛḍha*, 'firm,' merely—a less degree than the *dṛḍhatara*, 'firmer,' or 'quite firm,' of the preceding rule. The same may be also inferred, he adds, from the fact that the *abhinihata* is made the subject of a separate rule, instead of being included in rule 9, with the other two.

11. In the *prācliṣṭa* and *prātiḥata*, it is gentler.

Nothing is to be inferred from its association here as to the real character of the *prātiḥata*. This rule and its successor were referred to under i.46, but for no intelligibly useful purpose.

12. In the *tāiravyaṁjana* and *pādvṛtte*, it is feebleer.
Alpatura, ‘feeble,’ is doubtless meant to signify a still less degree of force of utterance than mrudutra, ‘gentler.’

To the commentator, his Cikshā appears to be a higher authority than the Prātiṣekhya, at least in this part; and he adds that, although the qualifications ‘feeble, gentle, firm’ are here attributed to the accents in question, yet, in accordance with what the Cikshā says, “like a candle, like a rush-leaf” (? unintelligible without the context), it is to be understood that there is softheadedness (?) in them all alike. And O. adds an example, yūvā kuvā (i.3.14¹).

---

CHAPTER XXI.

CONTENTS: 1-9, division of consonants in syllabication; 10-11, pracṛya accent; 12-13, yūmas or nasal counterparts; 14, nāṣekhya; 15-16, svarabhākta.

1. The consonant is adjunct of a vowel.

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G. M.) to rule xxiv.5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of anāṅg, ‘adjunct’ (literally ‘limb, member’), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle: if, in such cases as kūpa and yūpa (and G. M. add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

```
1. 1 'vyanjanam svaranγam bhavati: yasas na do 'anγam eva ca (xxiv.5) iti viṣayatena vidhānād āyam ārāmghāh. namu kūpa yūpa ityādā vyanjanam eva 'rthiviveshabodhakam iti svaro vyanjanāngam kīm na syād. ucyate: vyanjanam kevalam avasthātāh na ca kākoti: kīm tu sāpeksham: svaras tu niṃpekṣaḥ: sāpekshanirapekṣhayor nirapekṣham eva viṣayati dvākṣate prakṣabāvantah: viṣayatpraṇyaṅgataṁ avivāṣṭhanyāṁ vū. kīm ca: svaravāpiṣhtyabodhakam anyata api vidyate: durbalasya yathā rāṭhrāit hūrataḥ balavān nyapāḥ: durbalāṁ vyāṇjanam tadvād dharate balavāṁ svarāḥ. kīm ca : cikṣhāvyākhyāne
  yah svaγam rākitam tu svaram āha pataγaḷiḥ: uparīṣṭhāyinā tena vaγaṁ vyāṇjanam ucyate. svaras tāḥ brāhmaṇā jñeyā ityādi.

udāttaḥ ca 'nudāttaḥ ca' svaritaḥ ca svaras trayaḥ: "hṛṣavo dīrghaḥ pluta iti" kālaḥ niyamā uci." "itu"  ""
of the consonant? The answer given is, that a consonant is incapable of standing alone, and so is dependent, while a vowel is independent; and that, as between a dependent and an independent, the enlightened regard the independent as superior; and it belongs to the inferior to be adjunct to the superior. Moreover, there is found also another proof of the superiority of the vowel, in the verse "as a mighty monarch takes possession of the realm of a weak one, so the mighty vowel takes possession of the weak consonant." The beginning of another verse is added: "the vowels are to be known as belonging to brahmān." But between this part of a verse and the whole verse that precedes, G. M. insert another, which is asserted to come from "the exposition of the Čikṣā," and which gives a highly imaginative derivation for swarā, 'vowel,' and vyañjana, 'consonant.': "Patanjali styled that a vowel which shines by itself [sva-ra from sva-yaṁ rājate]: the consonant is so called as being imperfect [vyāñjana from vyañga, literally 'limbless'] without [? the expression needs mending, to bring out a desirable sense] the other following it." Then all start together upon a new argument for the superiority of the vowel with yet another verse, which is actually found in the known pāññāya Čikṣā (verse 24; see Weber's Indische Studien, iv.353): "acute, grave, and circumflex, the three accents, and short, long, and protracted, these, in regard to quantity, are the necessary characteristics of the vowels;" which shows that acute tone and so on are attributes of vowels only, and of consonants in virtue of their being adjuncts of vowels.
Next we pass to the consideration of another reason why the principle stated in the rule needed to be laid down. The consonant (by i.37) has half a \textit{mora} of quantity; and a vowel has [for example] a \textit{mora}: their combination, then, would seem to have a \textit{mora} and a half, and so would be liable to be understood as of long quantity: this untoward conclusion is avoided by the present rule, which implies that in fluent utterance the quantity of the vowel belongs in all cases to the combination of consonant and vowel, and not to the vowel alone. The specification "in fluent utterance" (literally, "in running action") is made in order to save the significance of rule i.37.

Finally, the superiority of the vowel is once more inferred from the fact that, when it is combined with a consonant, it alone is perceptible; just as, when milk and water are mingled, the milk alone is perceived, and not the water.


tvārastvam ॥ ॥

2. And it belongs to the following vowel.

The commentator explains \textit{parasvaram} as a descriptive compound (\textit{karmadhāraya}), governed by \textit{bhajate} understood; such an ellipsis, however, is so violent as to be hardly admissible, and the word is perhaps better taken as a possessive (\textit{bahurvīdhi}), somewhat anomalously used. The occasion of the rule, we are told, is the doubt which is liable to arise as to when the consonant—which, owing to its having the vowel as a superior, is unable to stand by itself—is an adjunct of the preceding, and when of the following vowel. A single phrase is quoted as example, namely \textit{imān eva lokān upadhāya} (v.5.5\textsuperscript{a}: O. omits the last word).

"This is the leading and introductory principle in all the Prāti-çākhya (see note to Ath. Pr. i.55); it is greatly restricted in its application by the following rules."


grahasthitaṃ purvaṣṭya ॥ ॥

3. A consonant \textit{in pāusaḥ} belongs to the preceding vowel.

The commentator explains \textit{avasitam} as meaning 'standing at the end of a \textit{pada}', and gives as examples \textit{ārk} (i.2.2\textsuperscript{a} et al.; W. has instead \textit{ṛk} [iv.7.9\textsuperscript{1} et al.], and O. has \textit{vāk} [i.3.9\textsuperscript{1} et al.]), \textit{vashaṭ}

2. svavapradhānatayā kevalam avasthātum usahamānani\textsuperscript{1} 'vyanājanāṁ kāda pūrvasya 'ūganī\textsuperscript{2} 'kādā parasya 'ūgam\textsuperscript{3} iti saṁdehe vyavasthāpayati: tad aṅgubhūtān\textsuperscript{4} vyastiṣanam parasvaram bhajate. yathā: imān....... paraç ca 'satu svaraç ca parasvaraç: ' taisv' svavaparam\textsuperscript{5}.

1 O. om. \textsuperscript{2} G. M. om. \textsuperscript{3} W. O. om.; G. M. kādācād apar-. \textsuperscript{4} G. M. -ham. \textsuperscript{5} W. aṅgubhūtā; O. ekaśṭhātāni. \textsuperscript{6} B. om. \textsuperscript{7} W. inā paraṃ svarī. \textsuperscript{8} O. om. \textsuperscript{9} G. M. O. om.
(ii. 2. 124 et al.), tut (passim: given by G. M. only), and haviḥ (i. 2. 41 et al.)

This principle, of course, is without exception in its application. It is either stated or implied in the rules of the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. i. 57).

4. Also the first consonant of a group.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, of a group consisting of either two consonants or more than two. The “also” (ca) expressed in the next rule is declared to be implied here also, and to prescribe adjunction to the preceding vowel. The examples given are yajñān vyāddhat (vi. 6. 111) and apsv antah (i. 4. 452 et al.; but G. M. substitute apsv agne [iv. 2. 113], and W. has the corrupt reading apsvañah). If, now, we had only to take the groups of consonants as they stand in the ordinary text, and divide them, the application of this and of the remaining rules for syllabication would be simple enough; but we are required to apply also the rules for duplication etc. as found in chapter xiv., and to make the insertions required by the rules of the fifth (v. 32, 33) and the present chapter (12–16), which puts quite a different face upon the matter. In fact, in the examples furnished, nt is the only group which is divided n-t without farther ceremony; gr becomes and is divided g-gr; nvy, in like manner, n-nvy; psv is expanded into p-phsv; and jn into j-jn (writing the yama, as I have done elsewhere, with a straight line above the letter), where, by the action of the next rule, two consonants go to the preceding vowel. The class of groups consisting of two consonants only, and such consonants as (by xiv. 23) are not liable to duplication, is the only one of which the division is settled by the present rule alone: it contains (in the Taittiriya-Sanhità) thirty-nine groups, such as nt, th, pp, yy, ny, cc.

The other treatises hold this same principle, and teach it in an equivalent manner (see Ath. Pr. i. 56 and note)—save that the Rik Pr. (i. 5, xviii. 18) allows the letter to be adjoined to either the preceding or the following syllable.

3. avasitam paddantavarti vyanjanam 'parvasy varasayd 'agni' 'syat. yathā: arāk: voṣhaṭ: tut': haviḥ.'

1 G. M. antare. 2 G. M. parvasvarāṅgini. 3 B. om. 4 O. om. 5 W. O. om.

4. 'dvayor bahnāni vā samyogā bhavati t: tuṣyam samyogasya diś c vyanjanam 'parvasvarasayi 'agni' bhavati. yathā; yajñān.... apso.... paraśātre vākānā: 'parvasvarāṅgatvabodhaka' ity atrā 'pi tuḥ' labhyate.'

The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood: B. has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it; O. omits the next rule, with passages before and after; W. has done the same, to a somewhat less extent; but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W.'s original, and its copyist has put them in in the wrong place, next before rule 6.

5. And one that is not combined with the following vowel.

The comment supplies the word svarena, 'vowel,' as that with which parena here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly. The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes. By way of illustration is given merely tat svārtub (i.5.6 et al.): a most insufficient and ill-chosen example; since, in the final form of the group ts, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable: thus, t-ths. But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavoring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states: "well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjacency to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group." And he replies, "you must not think that: for, in such cases as maryjacīrī (iv.1.26 et al.) and arvā'isi (i.7.81 et al.), in which the y and r are doubled after r by rule xiv.4, the former y or r is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the r, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel; and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place. So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled; and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question."

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations. Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but as a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position; and the two must be understood as if they read "the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel; and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel." The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception; to the latter, rules 7-9
establish very important and extensive classes of exceptions. If the mode of statement adopted in the treatise is open to some objection, we cannot help it; the slight inaccuracy is perhaps a consequence of the general prevalence of the doctrine of rule 4, to which its successor is added as an extension peculiar to this school.

No one of the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas recognizes any such principle as this: those of the Rik (i.5, xviii.18) and Atharvan (i.58) add to the initial consonant of a group only the first of a following pair which is the result of duplication, that of the White Yajus including further (i.104, 105) the other one of the pair, provided a mute follows. Its sway is, as already remarked, much more limited than would be thought at first sight, because rule 7 establishes a different usage for the immense class of groups of which a semi-vowel stands as final member, and rule 9 for the much smaller but yet important class in which a spirant stands last, or followed by a semi-vowel. Its general effect is to attach to the following vowel only such consonants or groups as could begin a word, leaving the rest to belong to the foregoing syllable. There seems to be need of illustrating, more fully than the commentator has deigned to do, the sphere of its application.

This is, in consonant-groups originally of two members, to

1. Groups in which a mute is doubled (or its corresponding non-aspirate prefixed to it, as will be understood hereafter without special remark) after a surd spirant (x or q, xiv.9,15), l (xiv.2,3), or r (xiv.4,15), the first member of the group remaining unchanged: thus, kk-k, lk-k, rk-k. These are twenty-seven in number; and to them may be added ry-y, rl-l, rv-v, which, by the final specification of rule 7, follow the same mode of division. In regard to these, the usage as fixed by our treatise is the same with that sanctioned by the rest, as already mentioned.

2. Groups in which a mute, or v, is doubled before a mute of another series: thus, kk-c, vv-n. Of these there are fifty-one in the Sanshīta.

3. The same, but with the addition (by xxi.12) of yama before the final member: thus, gg-qn. Twenty-three groups.

4. Groups in which the initial spirant (sibilant) is doubled, and also the following mute (by xiv.9), only the last of all going to the following syllable: thus, ccc-c. Thirteen groups.

5. The same, but with yama: thus, ggp-qn (cm). Six groups.

6. Groups in which h is doubled before a nasal, with nāsīkya (by xxi.14: but see the note to that rule, for a different interpretation): thus, hh-n. Three groups only.

Against these one hundred and twenty-six groups, growing out

4) iti dvīte " kṛte prathamayavakārayoh paraṇa ca 'sañhi-
tam' ity anena pūrvasvarāṅgatvam" prāptam": rephasya tu" nā 'nasthāparam asaṣvaram (xxi.7) ity anena paraṃsvāṅga-
tvam" prāptam": taci ca 'gakyam: tathoccaranāmbhavāt:
anyatararūbdhe" kartavye suti kim vā bādh ymax" iti saṁshuḥ":


of original simple pairs, there are eighty like k-ky (from ky) and k-ksh (from ksh), in which, by rules 7 and 9, only the initial consonant of the finally resulting group goes with the preceding vowel.

When, now, the pairs here rehearsed come to be extended to triplets by the addition of a third member, if that member be a semi-vowel, or a spirant (sibilant) following a mute, the point of division remains just where it was before. And so also, of course, in the like extension of the groups mentioned under rule 4, above, as undergoing no change in the varnakrama. Thus, ggr (g-gr) is divided like gg (g-g); cgy (ccp-cy) like cc (ccp-c); nkh (n-ksh) like nk (n-k); and rks (rk-ksh) like rk (rk-k). And the very great majority (one hundred and fifty-four) of the groups of three consonants occurring in the Sanhitā have a semi-vowel as their final member; with final sibilant there are only seven.

If, on the other hand, double groups are extended to triplets by appending a mute, either non-nasal or nasal (which happens in thirty-one cases), the point of division is, by the operation of the present rule, shifted toward the end of the group. Thus, we have

1. n-k, but nk-t, two groups; and n-ch, but nj-n, two groups;
2. rk-k, but rkk-c, five groups; and rj-j, but rjj-m, five groups;
3. dd-g, but dgh-ghn, two groups;
4. sst-t, but ssttn, two groups;
which are extensions of the groups of two members already treated of, and advance the division only one point. But further, groups ending in a sibilant, and falling under rule 9, below, and those which by rule 15 have suvarabhakti, exhibit, when a mute is added, a still greater transference forward of the point of division, and we have

5. k-khs (ks), but kkhst (ks), four groups; and k-ksh (ksh), but kkhsh-pm (kshm), five groups; and finally,
6. r-rk (rsh), but rsh-ť (rsh), and r-rç, but rççp pm (rçm), three groups.

In the yet further extension to groups of four members, the same principles prevail. There are found nineteen such groups in which the additional letter, being a semi-vowel, has no effect upon the division; and only three in which the division is altered by an added mute. These last are: nkkhst (nkshn), from nkkh; hkkhst (hkshn), from h-ksh (hksh); and nkhst (nsh), from n-ths (nts).

Finally, the only two groups of five consonants occurring in the

tatra nicipyakatvena19 saynyogādi25 (xxi.4) sūtram upatih-thate.21

1 O. om., with the rule; W. puts, with the rule, at the end of the comment, having here also parmasvarṣagam bhavati. 2 B. svar.- W. adds saṃvara. 3 G. M. śavāna (as also in the rule). 4 W. ins. ca; G. M. ins. yād. 5 G. M. ins. tat. 6 B. G. M. om. 7 W. -dibh-. 8 G. M. om. 9 G. M. ins. ca. 10 G. M. š̄avāna. 11 O. -iva. 12 G. M. -h. 13 W. B. om. 14 O. -iva. 15 O. -iva. 16 W. B. anyaddha. 17 O. sāvyaṃ. 18 G. M. -ha nyāt. 19 W. nīyakarv.; B. nīcikarv. 20 G. M. -di 'ti. 21 O. iva iti.
Sanhitā (*anuvrta* and *stotry*) are formed by added semivowels, and so do not come under the further action of the present rule.

G. M. read *asvinhitam* instead of *asvinhitam* in the rule.

6. Also *anuvāra* and *svarabhakti*.

By G. M., this rule is divided into two, *anuvāraḥ* and *svarabhakti ca* (while, on the other hand, T. reads *anuvāravāravabhakti tyag ca*); and such a division is noted, if not accepted, in the comment, by all the manuscripts, which say “of this rule (*svarabhakti ca*) is made a setting-apart, although the prescription is identical (with that made in the other rule, *anuvāraḥ*).” And the object of thus separating what is confessed properly to belong together is stated to be to bring about the adjunction of *svarabhakti*, in some cases, to the following vowel, on the authority of a verse which is quoted, to the effect that “the knowing man should connect with its predecessor (?) the *bhakti* that follows a short vowel; and in *ṛtyasya dhūrshadam* the *bhakti* is said to do as it pleases;” but G. M. substitute for the latter half of the verse “to it should be assigned one *mora*, also before a pause and in cases of hiatus.” The whole matter is exceedingly obscure, or quite unintelligible, without aid from the context of the quoted verse. The words cited as examples are not found in the Sanhitā; but they occur in the Rig-Veda (at i.143.7), and also in the Taiktirya-Brihmana (i.2.112), where the *svarabhakti* has assumed the form of a full vowel, and the word reads *dhūrshadam*. It looks as if the commentators had set out to divide into two rules what they nevertheless have to acknowledge to be really only one, for the purpose of interpreting into the latter half of it, when set by itself, a license to the element in question to be treated either way; but, as they have not fully carried out their intention, I have preferred to retain the unity of the rule. It is quoted, we may further remark, under rule i.34, in all the manuscripts of the comment, apparently without any thought of a division.


---

1 B. -ru; G. M. -thanād ni; O. -dīt. 2 G. M. put after *anuvāraḥ* as its comment, giving all the rest as comment to *svarabhakti ca* as a separate rule. 3 O. om. 4 W. G. M. O. -svārangam. 5 G. M. syat. 6 G. M. O. om. 7 O. svar. 8 G. M. O. om. 9 O. saṃavi. 10 O. -na; G. M. add *anuvāraḥ svarabhakti ca 'ti. 11 B. -kār. 12 O. prthaknakātāh. 13 W. B. G. M. padda. 14 W. B. -dītum. 15 B. svāranga hr. 16 G. M. na ead. 17 G. M. substitute *sasāya matsrā bhaved eko virime ca viśīthuḥ; O. adds (t) from comment to next rule.
Anuvāra appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be desired in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication; but I presume we may infer that it does not count as samyogadi at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel; and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there; that ṅc, for example, is to be made into ṅc-c, ṅm into ṅmp-pm, and ṇstr into ṇst-tr. The example given by the commentator is aṅcunā te (i.2.6); but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of anuvāra, no question could arise as to the division aṅ-cunā.

For svarabhakti, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi. 15,16). The example given is gārhapatyah (i.6.71 et al.), which we are to read and divide gār-ha-pat-tyah.

नालास्यायमस्वर्णाम् || 7 ||

7. But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it.

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. "Dissimilar" is simply explained by vilakshaṇa, 'of diverse characteristics, different;' it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which n and m are converted before l, and m before y and v (v.28,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are adhyavasayya đicah (vi.1.53; i.e. ad-dhya-), madhumisren (v.2.88 et al.; i.e. mic-cre), aslonayā (vi.1.67; i.e. ac-clo), and ishe teṇā (i.1.1 et al.; i.e. iṣṭa-tva); they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of four-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

7. nakāraḥ paurusvarāṅgatavyāvartakāḥ: antasthāparāṁ vyañjanam tasyā antasthāyāṁ asparaṁ vilakshaṇam paurusvarāṅgai na bhavati: arthāḥ paurusvarāṅgai 'tad iti vedītavam:' 'svatu śatam uṣṇakratvāţ. yathā: adhy-.....; madh-.....; acī-.....; ishe-..... antasthī pura yasmāt tad antasthāparāṁ, asparaṁ iti kim: purī-.....

(1) G. M. iti vinīayum; O. om. (2) O. puts at end of comment on preceding rule; B. svarāṁ vīna othā. 2 O. om.
groups. By way of further examples, we may cite the two groups
of five; they are vi-yu-yatūtha-trīyas-sya (ii.6.54-5) and ab-bru-
-vantāhtrikā-mā (vi.1.6).

But if the commentator’s direct illustration of the rule is scanty,
his counter-illustration is yet less satisfactory. To establish the
necessity of the specification asavarmam, “dissimilar,” he cites only
paricāyam cīvita (v.4.113). Such cases as this, however, are
rather covered by the fundamental rule saṁyogdādi (xxi.4), and
the application of the present one is to the groups in which a semi-
vowel is doubled after r, and which we are to read ry-y, rl-l, rv-v;
while, on the other hand, in the half-dozen groups in which two
different semi-vowels follow a mute, both of them, along with the
preceding mute, go to the succeeding vowel: thus, viśh-shvān-
-hīyāda-chat (ii.3.26), a-viś-trīya-va-tu (i.8.221), and gr-hād-dvī-
-hin (i.3.13).

नामिच्छा: ॥ ४ ॥

8. Nor the nose-sounds.

The “nose-sounds” are here again (as under ii.49) defined as the
yamas (xxi.12,13) only; but there is no reason why we should not
regard the nāṣikya (xxi.14) as likewise included (see the note on
rule 14). The examples given are also of yamas only: rukma-
num upa dādhtā (v.2.7 et al.: O. has rukman only) and rājne saka-
rah (v.5.11: O. substitutes svarājne, v.8.21). The groups, in their
full form, are read and divided kk-km and jji-jn. An example of
the nāṣikya would be vuh-hni-tā-mam (i.1.41).

The Vāj. Pr. (i.103) reckons the yama to the preceding vowel;
neither of the other treatises says anything about it.

स्वरशृंगय उष्मा चेत्यर्श ॥ ५ ॥

9. Nor a mute that is followed by a spirant—provided the
following spirant is likewise in the same case.

The first ca (translated “nor” here), the commentator says,
effects the connection of the rule with its predecessor; the second
(rendered “likewise”) implies adjunction to the following vowel.
This is not very lucid, for the two things are really equivalent to
one another. And in the further exposition, the paraḥ appears
(the readings are not consistent or clear) to be taken as signifying
parasaṃvarṣayam; but this cannot well be correct. The phrase-
ology of the rule, indeed, is very peculiar, and I do not see how it
is to be accounted for unless we may conjecture that the proviso
isthāna cet paraḥ ca is a later addition, made after it had been
noticed that the more general statement sparṣaḥ ca “shnamparaḥ

8. nāṣikya’ yamānī parasaṃvaram bhajante. yathā: rukman

...... rājne......

1 B. om.  3 G. M. yāh.  3 W. svaraparam.  4 G. M. O. om.
included too much. The meaning is clear: that a spirant which itself belongs to the following syllable, as being either directly combined with the vowel of the latter (xxi.5) or followed only by a semivowel before that vowel (xxi.7), carries with it a preceding mute; but if, on the other hand, it be cut off from the succeeding vowel by a mute, so as itself to belong to the antecedent syllable, a mute before it goes, of course, to the same syllable. The examples given in the comment are this time well selected, and illustrate the three cases involved: they are šhått sam paḍyante (v.4. 34 et al.) and vāshatt svēḥā (vii.3.12); in both of them a t is inserted, by rule v.33, between the t and s, and the final reading and division is tt-ths and tt-thsv. As counter-example we have akṣhṇayād vyagdhārayati (v.2.75 et al.), where, after all rules are satisfied, we have kkhsht-ṭṇ.

As compared with those to which rule 7 applies, the consonant groups falling under this rule are few, only forty-six in all; in thirty of which the spirant carries the mute before it to the following vowel, while in the remaining sixteen both go together to the one that precedes. The detail is as follows.

Of double groups, composed of a single mute and spirant, there are seven: for example, k-kšh (kšh).

Of groups containing three consonants, the largest class is that formed by the addition of a semivowel to the preceding: for example, k-kšh-y (kshy): it contains ten groups. Then there are two like n-kšh (nḵšh), three like t-t-kšh (tkšh), and the isolated r-kšh (rks).

Of groups of four consonants there are seven on this side, all but one (rr-t-ths=rts) like those of three, but with an added semivowel, which does not (xxi.7) change the division.

On the other side, where the spirant goes back to the vowel of the antecedent syllable, there are, of course, no groups of two consonants. Of groups of three we have nine, four with following non-nasal mute (as kkhsht-t=xst), and five with following nasal (as kkhsht-ṭ=xst). Of groups of four, there are two (as tthst-tx= tatr) formed from the foregoing with added semivowel, and three from triplets ending in a sibilant increased by a mute, either non-nasal (namely nths-t=xst) or nasal (as ākkhsht-ṭ=xkshṭ). The two groups of five consonants, which also belong here, have been given above, under rule 7.

This finishes the subject of the division of consonant-groups in syllabication, the special elaborateness and intricacy of whose treat-
ment in this Prātiṣṭākhaṇḍya has rendered necessary a fuller illus-
tion than was thought worth while in connection with the others,
in order to render apprehensible the views held regarding it by
the authors of the treatise.

10. Of grave syllables following a circumflex in saṁhitā there
is pracaya, having the tone of acute.

The theory of the pracaya accent has been so fully set forth in
the note to Ṙath. Pr. iii.65 that I do not need to spend many words
upon it here. Its effect is, as there pointed out, to give to all the
syllables which are left in the written text without any accent-
mark the same high tone, whether they be uddatta, 'acute,' or ahu-
datta, 'grave.' Thus, in the example given by the commentator,
āgne dudhra gahya kiṃcit vanyā yā te (v.5.91: G. M. omit yā
te), which is written in pada-text

ग्रंथम् । दुध्र । गच्छ । किंशिल । वन्य । या । ते ।

the saṁhitā-reading is

ग्रंथम् । दुध्र । गच्छ । किंशिल । वन्य । या । ते ।

the grave syllables dudhra gahya kiṃcit being without
written designation of accent, like the two acute syllables āg-
and yā, and being by this rule uttered upon the same pitch with them.
It makes no difference whether the circumflex which precedes the
pracaya is elicit (as in the illustration given) or independent;
and I have pointed out above (under xix.3) that, owing to the
absence of kampā in the Taṭṭṭīrīya-Saṁhitā where a circumflex
precedes an acute, there are very numerous cases in the text where
the saṁhitā alone does not show us whether the unmarked syllables
following a circumflex are uddatta or pracaya—whether, for example,

चैतत्तवा; । सा । अल्पदृढं । एवं । सा । अक्षमयत्र । प्रजा:;

are to be read hy etād devāh or hy etād devāh, so 'smād etārhi
or so 'smād etārhi, so 'kāmāyita praṇāh or so 'kāmāyana praṇāh.'

In the note referred to, I ventured the conjecture that the mode

10. svaritīt paresāhām anuddattānam anuddattayor anuddattaśya
va saṁhitāyām 'pracaya nima dharma bhavati. yathā: aghne
..... anuddattānam iti kīn': aghnaye..... saṁhitāyān iti kīn:
aghne..... anuddattāya grutir ivas grutir yasyā 'sāv' udattta-
grutir iti 'pracayasyavāparātāpiṇḍopānāh': ato na punarśāpiṇkāh'.

1 B. ins. ca. 2 G. M. dhēya. 3 G. M. sa for asān. 4 W. om. 5 B. -svarīpānāh.
6 W. -kīkhāvā.
of writing the accent might not have been without influence on
the theory as to its character—that is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the prācaya syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, because they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified. The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and carefully considered. I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture; yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility. Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol. xvii., 1863, p. 799 ff.), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the navīta and anuddatta, so that the udatta appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless prācaya—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent. And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the Čatapatha-Brahmana (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the anuddatta tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber's Indische Studien, x. 397 ff.*).

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of prācaya (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural anuddattānām in the rule. To show that the conversion into prācaya is limited to grave syllables, he quotes agnīye právate (ii.4.12 et al.); to show that the conversion is made only in sāṁhitā, he gives part of the other passage in pada-form, namely agne: dudhre: gahya: kiścīla: vēnya (Ō. adds ya). We might naturally infer from this that the prācaya accent does not occur at all in pada-text; but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are anuddatta in their pada-form become prācaya in sāṁhitā, without implying that there may not be prācayas in pada-text which remain such in sāṁhitā), and would doubtless be erroneous; for at least the extant pada-text of the Tāttvīrya-Sāṁhitā agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes gīrvanāse, antāriksham, and samāyuchanta, for example,

* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems: this is no place to discuss the subject; but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable.
The peculiarity of this \textit{pada}-text in treating the \textit{avagraha} as a full \textit{avastāna} in regard to the designation of accent (as shown in the third of the examples), has been already spoken of above (under rule \textit{xx.3}).

The terms of the rule would justify us in understanding \textit{pracaya} to have its etymological meaning of ‘accumulation, continued series,’ and translating ‘a series of grave syllables following a circumflex in \textit{samhitā} is of acute tone;’ and perhaps this was actually the intent of the rule-makers; but I have preferred, as the safer course, to follow the authority of the commentator in translating. To him, indeed, the term is so distinctly a technical one, implying utterance with acute tone, that he thinks it necessary to explain that \textit{udāttācāryah} is added by way of definition of the peculiar character of the \textit{pracaya}, and therefore is not open to the reproach of \textit{punarukti}, or superfluous repetition.

11. But not when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, when such a series or \textit{pracaya} of grave syllables is followed by an acute or a circumflex syllable, the one next preceding the latter is not made to be of acute tone, but retains its proper grave character, and is marked with the \textit{anudātta} sign. The commentator offers as examples \textit{tāyā devīḥ sutām} (iv.1.2\textsuperscript{1}: W. B. omit \textit{sutām}, without which the passage is found elsewhere; G. M. substitute \textit{tāyā devātayā}, iv.2.9\textsuperscript{2} et al.) and \textit{tād āhuk kvā jagati} (vii.1.4\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit \textit{jagati}). These illustrations are wanting in variety, inasmuch as they show between the two independent accents only two original grave syllables, whereas one becomes an eonic circumflex and the other remains grave; we may take the first example under the preceding rule as showing how an actual \textit{pracaya} ends with a grave before the following original accent.

The subject to be supplied with the predicate in this rule is \textit{svarāh}, of course. There is an objectionable ambiguity in the form of the rule, inasmuch as there might most naturally seem to be \textit{anuvṛtti} of \textit{pracayoḥ}, and so a denial of that accent anywhere excepting before a pause.

We have seen at \textit{xix.2} that the name \textit{vikrama} is given to the

\begin{footnotes}
\item [11] \textit{udātta-parah}, \textit{svaritaparo} vā \textit{nudatthoh} \textit{pracayo} na \textit{bhavati}, \textit{yathā: tāyā . . . . . . tād . . . . . . udātta ca} \textit{svarita ca} \textit{dāttavari-tādu: tād puruṣa yasmāt sa tatho 'kīnḥ.}
\item [1\textsuperscript{o}] \textit{ro} \textit{rā}. \item [2\textsuperscript{G. M. O. om.}] \item [3\textsuperscript{B. om.}]
\end{footnotes}
grave following a *pracaya*, as well as to one that comes immediately after a circumflex.

**स्वराधनुितमातृतमपरादारनुपूर्वायांत्रिकिवः** II १२ II

12. After a non-nasal mute, when it is followed by a nasal, are inserted, in their order, nose-sounds.

Which nose-sounds, as we are told in the next rule, some call *yamas*; and by this familiar name, which the other Prātiṣṭhākyas apply to them directly, we shall here, as we have done elsewhere, know them. The treatise teaches us nothing more about them, except (ii.49–51) that their place of production is either the nose or the mouth and nose, and that the producing organ is as in the series of mutes; and farther (xxi.8), that in syllabication they are to be reckoned with the following vowel.

The theory of these curious and equivocal constituents of the ancient Hindu alphabet I have discussed pretty fully in the note to Ath. Pr. i.99, and I have no new light to throw upon the subject here. They are transition-sounds, assumed to intervene between non-nasal and following nasal, as a kind of nasal counterpart to the non-nasal, and therefore called its *yama* or 'twin.'

The meaning of *āṇupāroyāt, 'in their order,' is ambiguous, as it might be understood to refer to the order either of the twenty non-nasal mutes or of the five nasals; or, of the four kinds of non-nasal mutes in each series—in which last sense the comment understands it, declaring that the first *yama* follows a first mute, the second a second, and so on; and he has before (under i.1) reckoned the *yamas* as four in the catalogue of alphabetic sounds. I have pointed out under ii.51 how difficult it is to reconcile this view with that of a variation of their organ of production as in the five series of mutes.

The commentator's examples are *tam* prathnādh (i.4.9), *vimath-ṇādāh* (iii.5.4), *vidmā te agne* (iv.2.2: O. omits *agne*), and *dārāṇi ṛadāhmasi* (iv.1.10)—one, namely, for each of the four classes of mutes. As rule xiv.24 expressly enjoins duplication of the non-nasal mute in these combinations, we are to read and divide pratt-ṇāthā, viddā-āma, and so on. The counter-examples (of which all but the last are lost in W.) are as follows: to show that the insertion is made only after a mute, kalānāh bhavati (v.1.14: O. substitutes *brahmavādinañāh*; i.7.14 et al.); that this mute must be a

12. uttamaparādā anuttamāt sparçād ¹ āṇupāroyād yathākrūrāmāṃ niśikyā ugamā bhavanti: prathamasparsāt prathamaniśikāḥ: ādvitiyād ādvitiyāḥ: evam *anyatra pī* yathā: tam ........: *vim:* ........: *vidmā:* ........: dār:* ........: ityādi. sparçād iti kim: *kalim:* ........: anuttamād iti kim: sum: ........ uttamaparādā iti kim:* sadbāh* ....

non-nasal, sumunāya sumninī (i.1.13 et al.; O. substitutes subham-
nah, iii.4.7); and that it must be followed by a nasal, subdaḥ
sagurah sumnekaḥ (iv.4.72: G. M. omit sumnekaḥ; O. substitutes
vaskati svādā, vii.3.12).

These examples are one-sided, in that they only exhibit the
simplest form of group in which the yama is taken as increment.
Of such simplest groups there are twenty-three met with in the
Sanhitā: namely, after first mutes, ku, kn, km, cū, cm, tū, tn, tm,
pū, pn, pm; after second mutes, chm, thn; after third mutes, gm,
jī, jm, dn, dm; after fourth mutes, ghn, dhn, dhn, bhū.
Then, of groups of three consonants involving such combinations:
jīy (jījīy), ṛny; āchm, jījī (jījī); ṛghn (dṛghīngn), ṛghn;
ṛjm (ṛjṛjm), rtn, rtm, rdhn, rdhm; sṛm (sṛṭṁ), sṛhm.
And of groups
of four consonants, ṛnym (ṛjṛjīmy).

According to the phonetic systems of the other Prātiśākhya,
this would finish the tale of yamās. But, by the peculiar rule
(xiv.9) which here requires a surd mute to be everywhere inserted
between a sibilant and a following nasal, is brought forth a new
and numerous brood of these curious twins. Thus, in double
groups, cp (cṛṭ-in), cm, shn, shn, sn, sm. Of groups of three
containing these: gny, ashn; kshn (kṣkshp-ṛmn), kshn, ten, tnm,
pun; rṛmn (ṛṟṛmn), rṣhn, rṣhm; sṛm. Of groups of four, ṛkshn,
ṛkshn, gṛny. In all of both classes, fifty-seven groups.

13. Some call these yamās.
The commentator adds nothing of value.

14. After h, when followed by n, m, or m, is inserted nāsikya.

I have translated this rule according to its obvious and uncon-
trovertible meaning, which, if it needed any external support,
would find it in the almost precisely accordant rule of the Ath. Pr.
(i.100: the teachings of the other treatises upon the subject are
much less distinct: see the note on the Atharvan rule). But the
commentator gives it an entirely different interpretation. The
ablative hakārāṇ, he says, is here used in the sense of an accusa-
tive (his addition, “in the absence of ḫyup [the suffix ya],” I do

13. tān nāsikyaṁ eke gākhīno yamān brurtaḥ, uktānī eva
'dhārajāni.

1 G. M. iti vadanti.

14. hakārād iti kurmanī lyālope' pañcamā. tasman nānamparāṁ
hakāram āruhyā nāsikyaṁ bhavati: sūmnāsākṣo hakāraṅ
syād ity arthaḥ. aṁnāṁ...... apar..... brahma......

1 W. -ma. 2 W. lyālope; B. lyālope; O. lālope. 3 B. -re iti.
not understand); and the sense is, that a nose-sound is imposed upon the ḫ itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a ḫ preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a ḫ is really an expiration of breath through the nose: it being not less true of ḫ before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii.47) udaya-rvarudhanāśiṣṭhina, 'produced in the position of the succeeding letter.' The commentator's exposition might have come from the "some authority" to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are ahnām ketuk (ii.4.141), aprāhne (ii.1.24), and brahmaṇādīnā (i.7.14 et al.). Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxi.8 for the syllabic division, we should read ahk-"nam: and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath. Pr. i.100, it is probably this separation of the ḫ from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G. M. have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give hakīraṇ nanumaparan nāśkvan (the writing of n instead of m before n is frequent with these MSS.).

15. In the combination of r and a spirant, there is a svarabhakti of r.

The doctrine of our Prātiṣākhya respecting the svarabhakti is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath. Prat. i.101–2); from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this "vowel-fragment" is to be an insertion between the r and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject; by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed.

15. 'rephasyu ca "śintirca ca saṁyoge sati" rephasyvarabhaktir iti jāṇiyāt: "svayam bhaktih svarabhaktih": yo 'syarephasyu saṁmārasvarus tadābhaktih syut: ṭkāru ca 'syajīhotyakarana-trenā' rupaya ca' saṁmādharunih: 'bhaktih avayava ekadeśa iti yāvat: etad uktum bharati: ṭkāravayuvo bharati 'ty arthah. saṭreṇa 'nena svarabhaktir eva vijityā: svarabhaktiṣvarāpāṇi tu" vispuskvāni vyacāhite varuruciḥ: 'ṭkārdhir annudātra" repho 'rdhumāṭrā madhye cedhā" svarabhaktir iti" avyā'yan arthah":

indriyāvishayo" yo" 'adv "pur ity ucyaate budhāḥ:
caturbhīr" anubhīr mātṛparīṇaṃ" iti śrutam."
in the abstract of it here given: the version of W. B. O., indeed, has rather the aspect of being an abbreviation of the other, and one not everywhere skilfully made.

At the outset, G. M. alone specify that the *svarabhakti* is combined with the spirant (and yet, by xxi.6, it is to be separated from the spirant in syllabication, going with the *r* to the preceding vowel). The term *svarabhakti* means 'a fragment, piece, or part of a vowel,' and a *rephe-svarabhakti*, 'r-vowel-fragment,' means a bit of the vowel that is akin, or has the same mode of utterance with, the *r*. Now the *r* is of like quality with *r*, in being produced with the tip of the tongue and in having the sound of *r*: and it is a part of *r* that is intended. The rule merely prescribes the insertion; the nature of the latter is clearly set forth by Vararuci (one of the three principal sources of the present comment: see note to the introductory verses, pp. 6,7). The vowels are defined at i.5, and since among them only *r* agrees in place and organ with *r*, the "fragment" is of *r*. The *r* is by i.31 declared to be short, or of one *mora*; and Vararuci defines the short *r* as composed of a quarter-*mora* of vowel at the beginning, a half-*mora* of *r* in the middle, and a quarter-*mora* of vowel (W. B. O. say, of vowel-fragment) at the end. Then a verse is quoted describing the word *annas* signifying a quarter-*mora*. This half-*mora* of *r*, now, found in the middle of *r*, being divided, its two parts, each combined with the quarter-*mora* of vowel, severally receive the name of *svarabhakti*. Hence there are two *svarabhaktis*. And in answer to the question where this *svarabhakti* of half a *mora* occurs, the makers of the Čikšā have declared that the one ending with the vowel element occurs before *g*, *sh*, and *s*, and the one ending with the consonant element before *h*; the former, moreover, being open, and the latter close. And it is added that in *yo vā vṛddhāṃ* (i.6.81) there is no *svarabhakti*, on account of absence of the order prescribed in the rule.
So much by way of (would-be) explanation of the rule. But the commentator goes on to say that the Čikṣā teaches other svāravāhktis, to the number of five: namely, the karṇaṭ, between r and ū, as in bārhi (i.1.24 et al.); the karṇī, between l and ū, as in maḷāḥ (ii.1.24); the karṇī, between r and ū or s, as in dārṣṭāmāndrā (i.2.5 et al.) and bārśam (ii.5.7); the hārī (or hārī), between l and ū, as in saḥṣastraśālā (vi.3.3); and the haṇaspadā (or haṇaspadā), between r and ū, as in varśādhdm (ii.4.10)—and he who wants to go to heaven (on the score, no doubt, of patience, faith, and punctiliousness) must utter the five kinds of bhakti, as thus laid down. It appears, then, that the commentator's Čikṣā, like the Vāj. Pr. (iv.16), regards l, not less than r, as followed by svāravāhkti before a spirant.

16. But not in case of krama, when a first mute follows the spirant.

The commentator defines krama as the equivalent of dvīta, 'duplication,' and refers as authority to rule xxiv.5, where the word occurs again without, according to him, admitting any other meaning: whence, he infers, it must signify the same thing here also. We should rather turn the argument the other way, and say that, as krama can have no other meaning here, it may be conjectured to signify the same thing at xxiv.5. He further coolly

"ya tu haṃsapadā nāma sā tu" rephashaṅkārayoh:
"evam paṇcavāhktāṃ bhaktiṃ uccaret svāravāhktukānaṃ."
inserts an "or" in the rule, and declares it to mean 'either when the spirant is doubled or when it is followed by a first mute.' This must evidently be condemned: for, in the first place, the text contains no "or;" and, in the second place, if that were the meaning, the specification would be superfluous, since the spirant is always doubled before a first mute, and so krane would include all the cases—except, indeed, according to the doctrine of Pâlaksh and Pâlakshâyana, who (xiv. 17) deny the duplication of the spirant in such a situation; and we are perhaps to connect his interpretation of the present rule with his apparent acceptance of the doctrine referred to, and suppose that he would read rsh-t, and rcp-pm etc. (namely, for rsm, rshu, and rshm), while the reading actually approved by the treatise is rshh-t, rcp-pm etc. There are five groups—namely rcy, rsv, rshy, rsu, and rshy—in which the difference of interpretation would make a difference as regards the presence or absence of swarabhakti; if the "or" is implied, they will be read and divided rcp-rcy etc.; if not, they will be rcp-rcy etc.

The commentator's examples are dârcyam yajñam (ii.2.25): only O. has yajñam; G. M. read dârcyam hi, which, if it be an actual passage, I have overlooked in searching out the references), varshâbhâyah (vii.4.13: W. B. O. read varshâbhây), bsrâbhâth (v. 7.11), and etury dâdânah (v.1.55: found in O. only), illustrating four of the five cases in which his interpretation would exclude the swarabhakti; and further, for cases in which a first mute follows, adârcma jyotih (iii.2.55: omitted in O.), kârshâ upânahâ (v.4. 45 et al.), and varshâ parjanya (vii.5.20: found in G. M. only).

CHAPTER XXII.

Contents: 1–2, formation of articulate sounds in general; 3–8, definition of terms used in the treatise; 9–10, mode of production of high and low tone; 11–12, established tone and pitch; 13, length of pause in the text; 14–15, heavy and light syllables.

16. 'kramâdabdo dvitvaparyâyahi: katham etat: prakrtir vi-krama krama (xxiv.5) ity atra dvitvasyâd 'va' kramaâb-dena' bhidhânâd atri 'pi sa eva' "rtha iti nischinumah." ushmâ-nah krame sati tasmin ushmanî prathamapare va' sati na swarabhaktir bhavati. 'krame yathâ: dârc...: varsh......: bars... "prathamapare yathâ: ad......:" kâr...... " prathamâp para yasmda aâdu prathamaparah.

iti trividhâshvatne pratisâksavyavivarane ekaviđo" dhidayah.

शब्द: प्रकृति: सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Tone is the material of all articulate sounds.

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the Prātiṣṭhāya proper. This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter. As under ii.1, the commentator explains पुष्टि by dhvani; for prakṛti he gives as synonym मलकरानम्, ‘radical cause;’ and वर्ण he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants.

नस्य द्रवण्ये वर्णान्यानम् ॥ २ ॥

2. In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter.

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality: compare ii.3.

नत्र शब्दवर्णयुक्तहृदिष्ठाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. Here we will instance the offices of terms.

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9; which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation. The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point apropos of पुष्टि in rule 1; the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense. The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing पुष्टि a synonym of प्राची, ‘text-book, body of doctrine,’ which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of. He distinctly ascribes to द्रव्य the sense of ‘office, aim,’ as the connection also requires,

1. sarvanāpānāṁ śabdō dvaniḥ prakṛtir mālakarānam bhavati: varṇapādena varṇavyayinānāṁ rdgir ucyate. sarve ca te varṇāc ca sarvanāpānāḥ: teshāṁ.

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. ins. nāma. 3 O. om. 4 G. M. add sarvanāpānām.


1 B. prat; G. M. add bhe. 2 G. M. ins. pādasya. 3 W. pratiḥ. 4 O. om.

3. teshāṁ varṇānāṁ sarvatra śvāngbhātiprāyoge āṣāstraṁ ity ucyate: tasya śabdō iti paryāyanāṁ: tatra tvamīḥ chāstre yaṁ dravyāṁ bhavanti tany udāharisyānāṁ. yat karma yena kriyate tat tasya dravyāṁ sādhanam iti yāvat: yathā gha-
giving sādhana, ‘efficiency,’ as its equivalent. As clay to a vessel,
we are told, so are alphabetic sounds to a text-book.

वर्णाकृति निदेशाकृति II 8

4. Varna and kāra are indicatory.

These two terms have already formed the subject of rules i.16–
20. Rules vi.1,7 are cited as examples of their use.

चार्याथ्याष्टेशाकृति II 5

5. Ca and api are implicative.

Rules vi.3 and iv.4 are cited as containing examples of the use
of these signs of continued implication from something that has
gone before.
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6. Tu, atha, and eva are exceptional, introductory, and re-
strictive, respectively.

The use of these connectives is instanced by quoting rules i.19,
vi.1, and xiv.3 (G. M. substitutes vii.1 for the second).

These rules are too trivial and superficial to make it worth while
to enter, in connection with them, into any discussion of the use
of the particles in the text of the Pritipākhya. The index, and the
notes on each rule, will give the means of investigating the matter.
We have often had occasion to animadvert upon the commentator's

\[
\text{तत्त्वा मध्ये त्यात् स्वतः वर्णान्: यानि द्रव्याणि सम्बन्धाया-
हारानि कर्तव्याणि तानि रूपाणि निदेशाणि। तानि तान्त्रिका
पद्धतिः।}
\]

1 O. om. 2 W. -tre. 4 W. B. katham; O. om. 6 W. B. ins. tāya
rūpānī. 6 W. B. add. 1 O. pradārgahātya. 10 O. karmayate. 8 W. lātra; B. na.
18 B. -ya; M. om. 11 O. om. 19 W. -ta; G. M. -pāthā; O. savarpā.

4. varṇaçaśādaḥ kārācaśādaḥ ca nirdeṣakaḥ nirdeṣapadačakaḥ
syātām. yathā: avarṇaçāyañjanaçakaṇi (vi.7) iti: atha
shakārañ sakarañsvarjanañyā (vi.1) iti. varṇa ca kāra
cā varnākārādū.

1 G. M. om. 2 W. -deçakād vāc; O. om.

5. ca: ity etāv 1 anvādeçakād syātām. pūrvāpekoñhayā
d'nuñdepa ity ucyate. yathā: asadāmāśiñcāca (vi.3): iti
paro 'pi (iv.4).

1 G. M. ins. abdhā. 2 W. B. pūrvaśakāha; O. pūrvo pakho.

6. tu: atha: eva: ity etāva gādā yathākramena vinivartakā-
dhikārakāvadhārakā bhavanti: yatra tuṣṣadāḥ prāyute tatra
tendency to put into them (especially into tu) a meaning which they were never intended to bear.

7. Vā is alternative.
Rule ii.50 is quoted as example.

8. Na is prohibitive.
The example this time is xiii.15 (G. M. substituting xiv.14); and in it appear again some of the differences of reading which were noted in the rule itself where it occurred.

9. Tension, hardiness, smallness of aperture, are producers of high tone.
Reference is made to rule i.38, in which the acute accent is defined as consisting in high tone; and the present precept is declared to be given for the sake of that, and in order to prohibit that slack or indifferent utterance which prevails in common life. Āyāma, ‘tension,’ is explained as meaning rather ‘extension (literally ‘longness’) of the members;’ dārśana, as ‘severity of the vowel;’ and apūtā khaśya, as ‘closure of the orifice of the throat;’ this is what one who would utter a sound in high tone must do.
There is evidently much more guess-work than true observation in this rule and the one next following; if they had been given as definitions of sonant and surd utterance, instead of high and low

nivrttiḥ: yatrā ’thacatās tatrā ’dhikārah: yatrām ’nacatās tatrā vadhāram ṇeditanyam. yathā: ephās tu rasya (i.19); atha sañhitāyām ekaprañabhāve (v.1). sparśa evā keshām acaryānam (xiv.3). viseshaṃ nivartayati ’ti vini-vartakah: adhikaroti ’ty adhikārakah: avadhārayati ’ty avadārakah.

1 G. M. -man. 2 G. M. O. ins. ev ’k. 3 G. M. atha nakāro nakāram (vii. 1). 4 O. om. 5 G. M. -papara. 6 W. O. G. M. -raḥ.

7. ve ’ty esha pābdo vādbhāshiko1 vāikalpiko bhavati. yathā: mukharāsikyā vā (ii.80).
1 G. M. -shako (as also in the rule).

8. ne ’ty esha pābdoḥ pratisedhako bhavati: yathā: ’na shumognir (xiii.18) iti.”
1 G. M. O. syāt. 2 G. M. atha na (xiv.14); B. na sushu; O. na sum; W. B. -gni ’ti.
tone, they might more easily have been regarded as describing real processes of articulation.

10. Relaxation, softness, wideness of aperture, are producers of low tone.

The exposition of this rule runs quite parallel with that of the preceding (only O., however, referring to the definition of anuvādita, 'grave,' as of low tone, at i.39). To anuvāsarga is given vinatatā, 'drooping condition,' as synonym; to mārdava, snigdhata, 'smoothness,' and to urudh, sthulata, 'bigness.' There is nothing at all to commend in such a description of the way in which low tone is produced.

11. Soft, middle, and loud are the three qualities.

Their use, we are told, will be explained farther on—namely, in rules 4—10 of the next chapter. I have ventured to render sthāna, literally 'place,' or 'position,' by 'quality,' as better expressing the nature of the distinctions implied. The name apparently comes from such theories as that laid down in rule xxiii.10 as to the 'place' of production of the different qualities of tone.

In answer, we are told, to the suggested inquiry, 'of what are

9. uccādir udāttā (i.38) ity uktam: tadartham idam ārabhyate: lokvad yādṛṣṭhikoocchāraṇapratishtedhārtham: ādyamo gātrāṇām dāirghyam: dūrmuyu svarasya kāthinatā: 'aṇutā khaśya galavivaraya' saṁveṣṭatā: etāni śādhanaṁ śuddhaṁ 'uccāhikarani' śabdāṁ uccādir udāttāṁ kuryanti 'ty arthaḥ: uccāsadām uccārayatāṁ 'tut kartavyam iti vidhiḥ: 'uccāh kuryanti 'ty uccāhikarani'.

1 W. yāvacch; B. hidachch; W. B. O. -rthaḥ. 2 W. om. 3 B. vīrānāņaya; G. M. vīraśaya, and put after samveṣṭatā (B. O. -vṛddā). 4 G. M. nāmadehunī. 5 W. ucchā. 6 G. M. om. 7 W. G. M. om.; B. adds kapaṇīṇī, and om. the following rule.

10. anuvāsargo gātrāṇāṁ vinatatā: mārdavāṁ svarasya snigdhataḥ: khaśya 'rūta kauṭhasya sthulate 'ty etāni sādhanaṁ śabdāṁ nipāhi karāṇī śabdāṁ nicam anuvātāṁ kuryanti 'ty arthaḥ: nīcāsadām uccārayatāṁ 'tat kartavyam iti vidhiḥ: nīcāḥ kuryanti 'tā niyathi karāṇī.

1 W. ins. niyādir anuvātā (i.39) ity uktam. 2 G. M. O. viśṛṣṭatā. 3 G. M. om. 4 G. M. uṣ. 5 W. uccādārayantā; B. -yan; G. M. -raśiṣṭā; O. -raṣṭā.

11. mandram madhyamam tāram ce 'tī sthānāṁ bhavanti: mandram iti prathamam: madhyamam iti dvītyam: tāram iti
these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule.

तत्त्रत्र विशेष निर्धारणम्: ॥ १२ ॥

12. In them are twenty-one tones.

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii.11 etc.). As synonym of yama is given svara, 'tone.'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous.

सम्बिरः पदविरः विवृत्तिविरः समानयद्वि-वृत्तिविरः विवृत्तिविरः दिमात्र एकामात्र यथात् र्या-नु* नुपूर्विः ॥ १३ ॥

13. The verse-pause, pada-pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three moras, two moras, one mora, and a half-mora.

As example of the pause of three moras at the end of a verse is quoted ubhā vājasya sañayera have vām: (i.5.5: O. omits the first two words); of the pause of two moras, in pada-text, between the padas, ishe: tād: ārje: tād (i.1.1 et al.); and, for all that the Prātiṣṭhākhyā tells us, we are to regard the avagraha pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the Rik [i.6, r. 29] and Vājasaneyi [v.1] Prātiṣṭhākhyas give it only one mora); of the hiatus-pause, sa iṣānāḥ (iv.4.4*), ta enam (ii.3.11*), and tā amāt (ii.4.4*: W. prefixes ā, but doubtless only by

13. ṛgvīrāṃdāyas trimaṭrādikādā yathākramamā bhavanti. yathā: ubhā.... ity ṛgvīrāmanāḥ: ishe.... iti padavirāmanāḥ: sa.... tā.... tā.... iti viṛtvi-rāmanāḥ: prāg am iti samānopa da viṛtvi-rāmanāḥ. 'reći virāṇa ṛgvīrāmaḥ: padaṇya virāṇaḥ padavirāmaḥ: padadhyayavivrttau virāmo viṛtvi-rāmanāḥ:'.

* pūrṇaḥ: ity iṣānāḥ prāya viṛtvi-rāmanāḥ: sa ity aṣṭaḥ śatāḥ.
a copyist’s blunder): of the pause of interior hiatus, *pratgam* (iv. 4.21), which is, I believe, the only case. The commentator also quotes a couple of verses from his Cikshā, laying down four subdivisions of the pause of hiatus, and assigning them different quantities: that between a short and long vowel is *vatsānuverti*, and is one *mora* long; that between a long and following short is *vatsānusdrinī*, of the same length; between two short vowels, *pākavati*, three quarters of a *mora*; between two long vowels, *pīpilīkā*, a quarter-*mora* only (Uvaṭā’s comment on the Rik Prat. [ii.1] states the intervals quite differently). In W. there are two verses which are not found in the rest; as they stand, their meaning is in great part obscure to me, and I prefer to leave them unmended and untranslated.

14. A syllable that ends with a consonant, one that has a long vowel, one that precedes a conjunction of consonants, one that is nasal—all these are to be accounted heavy; the rest, other than these, are light.

*pīpilīkā dirghasume ca madhye
svarnata pākavati padhikye:
dṛṣṭvā ca vatsānusdrinīs tu asāmye
tv atlogo mukhyas tu virāmākālaḥ. 1.
svarodaye tv anusvārdo bhaved adhyānumātrikāḥ:
virāmaḥ ca tayor madhye vādiśikāca ca dirghayoh. 2.
hrasuddir vatsānuvertiṁ ante vatsānusdrinīṁ:
pākavaty ubhayahrasvedī dirghobhayaṁ pīpilikā.
"madrā ca" vatsānuvertiṁ uthāṁ vatsānusdrinīṁ:
pādonō suyā pākavati pādamātrā pīpilikā. 11.
"samānas ca tat padāvina ca samānapadām: ekopadā ity arthāḥ”: 12 samānapade virūttih samānapadavirūtthih: taṇyāṁ 12 virāmaṁ sāmānapadavirūtthingvāmaṁ. 11 tiṣo mātrāṁ yasyāṁ śāyāṁ trimātraṁ: 12 dvāmaḥ yasyāṁ śāyāṁ dvāvāmātraṁ: ekā mātrāṁ yasyām 12 śāva ekāmātraṁ: ardhā mātrāṁ yasyāṁ śāva ardhāmātraṁ". 11

The commentator instances the different kinds of "heavy" syllable, as follows: one ending with a consonant, māte 'aṇa puṭrā (iv.2.33 et al.: G. M. omit); one long by its vowel, te te 'dhīpatayāḥ (iv.4.113: G. M. omit the last word); one followed by a consonant-group, āpṇā ca me (iv.7.51: W. has ūṇāyind, which appears to be merely a corrupt reading; I have found nothing at all like it in the Sanhitā); one that is nasal, viṃgaṭāyā (vii.2.13 et al.).

The distinction of the syllable as "heavy" or "light" has value only in a metrical point of view, and does not make its appearance elsewhere in our treatise (except as it is referred to in rule xxiv.5—which rule we might have expected the commentator to quote here, as the occasion of this one). The quality of "long" or "short" belongs to the vowel alone, and (see xxi.1 and its comment) the consonants accompanying the latter are regarded as absorbed into it, and forming part of its natural quantity. This separation of "heavy" and "long," or of weight and quantity, is practically convenient, perhaps, but theoretically indefensible; and we have reason to be surprised that phonetic observers so acute as the Hindus had not worked the theory of syllabic quantity into a more consistent shape. The other treatises agree with this; see Ath. Pr. L.51–54, and notes.

The use of the word anūṇāsika in describing a syllable containing anuśvāra is (as already noted, under ii.30) one more sign of a theory which regards the anuśvāra as a quality and not an element. The Ath. Prāt., which holds this theory, uses the same term in its definition (i.53). It deserves to be noted, however, that to read anuśvāram instead of anūṇāsikam in the verse would help the metre, making the four pādas similar.

This rule is enough by itself to determine the weight of any syllable whatever: but, as the commentator points out, the one following is added to resolve any doubts which might after all arise as to what syllables were light.

14. vyaṇjāṇāntam yad akharam: 'vyāṇjanam ante yasya tad vyaṇjāṇāntam; yad u cā 'pi dirgham 1 akharam: 5 saṇyogapūrvam ca yad akharam: 5 saṇyogotpūrvam saṇyogapūrvam: tathā 'nundisikam: sānunāsikam' yad akharam: uktaṇy etāni sarvāni akṣarāṇi gurūṇi vidyāt: jānīyāt. yathā 'vyāṇjāṇāntam: mātē 5 yathā dirgham: te 5 yathā saṇyogotpūrvam: aṃmā 5 yathā 'nundisikam': viṃgaṭāyā. 11 šeshāny ato 'nūnd' 11 ato' ato' ebhyo gurūbhyyah sṛṣṭān anāṇy akṣarāṇi 'tato 'nandurāṇah' laghāni viṃgaṭāyāt: sṛṣṭān 11 kāni 'ty uṣānīkṣo tṛtaropakena' viṃgaṭāyāt:

---

15. A syllable that does not end with a consonant, that has a short vowel, and that is not followed by a conjunction of consonants, and one that is not combined with anusvāra—know that to be light.

This is a mere negative to the preceding rule, and a wholly superfluous addition to it—and an addition made, we may conjecture, by a different and later hand: the use of the term anusvāra distinctly suggests this.

The commentator quotes, by way of example of light syllables, simply madudayand asan (vi.1.5: B. O. omit the last word).

CHAPTER XXIII.

CONTENTS: 1–3, causes of the differences of articulated sounds; 4–10, qualities or temperaments of voice; 11–19, tone or pitch of utterance; 20, general mode of correct utterance.

16. 'ayyanjanāntam yad akṣarām yac ca hrusvām yac 'ca 'saṁyogoparaṁ' yac ca 'nausvārasaṁyuktam etat sarvam akṣarām laghuś nibodhata jāṇidvam yathā: mad-. . . ityadi. vyanjanam antē yasya tad. vyanjanāntam 'na vyanjanāntam avyañjanāntam.' saṁyogah paro yasmāt tat saṁyogaparam: 'na saṁyogaparam' asaṁyogaparam: 'anuvāreṇa saṁyuktam' anuvārasaṁyuktam: 'na 'nausvārasaṁyuktam' 'anausvārasaṁyuktam'.

iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyaavīvarane dvāvīno 'dhāvīno.'


1. athe 'ty ayam adhihārahā: vṛṇāṇāṁ vīpesho vīpeshtattir ucyata ity etad adhittrtan veditayam ita uttaran yaḥ vakshyānāḥ. vṛṇāṇāṁ vīpesho vārnavīpeshaḥ: tamo 'tipattih ēd tathā 'keśa.
It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow.

2. The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity.

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different. The anupradāna is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate h-sound (ii.8-10); by saṁsarga (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (sparcana, ii.33), approach (upasaṁhāra, ii.31), and the like (ii.14, 16, 45 etc.); sthāna, ‘place, position,’ and karana, ‘producing organ,’ are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (vinyaya, which the commentator explains by vi-nyāsa [B. reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning); parimāna, ‘measure’ (used only here), is synonymous with kāla, ‘time, quantity’ (see i.31-37). The commentator takes a as an example, and says of it that its “emitted material” is tone; its “closure,” in the throat; its “position,” the two jaws; and its “disposition of producing organ,” the two lips. Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work: a is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule; and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration.

3. Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice.

The commentator defines prkta by miśra, ‘mixed,’ and utpatti.

1 G. M. om. 2 G. M. O. -nādiṁ v. 3 O. -nyāsa. 4 W. O. parim-, as also (with T.) in the rule. 5 G. M. O. -śaṣya dh. 6 W. O. om.; G. M. lathd.

3. prkto miśra ity arthaḥ: varṇamīśraḥ। cabdo vāco vākyayyo
by upādāna and kāraṇa, 'cause.' This combination denies the
quality of voice to the mere "sound" of drums and the like.

4. Of voice, there are seven qualities.

Here is a different and expanded version of the doctrine of three
qualities, as laid down above, in rule xxii. The following rules
give the details. The commentator gives of sthāna the lucid defi-
nition "those whereby the voice is put to use, and that wherein it
stands—that is sthāna."

5. Namely, inaudible, murmur, whisper, mumbling, soft,
middle, and loud.

The rules that follow define the senses in which we are to under-
stand the terms here given. They indicate plainly enough a con-
tinual progression, from inaudible and merely mental utterance up
to loud and distinct speaking; but it is not easy to find words
which shall represent them closely.

6. "Inaudible" is without sound, without application of
mind, but with articulating action.

The commentator explains karaṇavat by pratyatnavat, 'with
effort,' and states its object to be to deny absolute silence to the
upāṇa. "Without sound" signifies the exceeding lappiness of

'tpattir upādānam kāraṇam bhavati. varnaprkta iti kim: dundubhyḍiapubhānād rākyutā' mā bhād iti.

1 MSS. -tra. 2 B. G. M. O. -na. 3 B. -svarā.

4. 'vañca sopta sthānānī bhavanti:' tāny uttarāsūtre vāk-
shyante. yār vāk prayujyate yasminś ca tīshṭhati tat sthā-
nam: tāni yathākramam udāharishyāmaḥ.

5. upāṇey iti prathamaṁ vāca sthānam: dhanāṁ iti devityam:
nimādaṁ iti śṛtyam: evam iturūṇy api nāmaṭh saptāṁ 'tāni
sthānānī jñāniyat. uparitanaṁ satram dhrabhyu pratyekam eṣāṁ
lakṣhānaṁ vākshyate. 6

6. karaṇavat pratyatnavad ity arthaḥ: nā 'sti sabdo dhvani
asminn ity 'cābdayāṁ: manasā prayogo manahprayogāḥ: nā 'sti
sound in this mode of utterance. "Without application of mind" excludes any intentional use of *udātta* etc. This last is not very satisfactory; and, indeed, we should as soon expect the contrary term, *manahprayoga*, 'with application of mind,' to be read, as indicating an utterance in which the mind does its full part, though not the voice also (G. M., in fact, read it in the rule).

7. "Murmur" is inaudibleness of syllables and consonants.

The commentator explains *akshara*, 'syllables,' as meaning here 'vowels,' but there seems no need of refusing the word its ordinary signification. Inaudibleness, we are further told, being a characteristic of *upānchu* also, it is here again specified in order to teach that there is no actual sound heard. Of what follows, a great part has dropped out in B. G. M., and is much corrupted in the other two manuscripts, so as to be very obscure. The separate mention of syllables and consonants is for the sake of clearness (?), and indicates exceeding inaudibleness: and there is added a comparison with tame and wild cattle, of which I fail to make any sense. Others say that the inaudibleness is of *s, h*, and so on. All of which is very trivial and unedifying.

8. "Whisper" is their audibility.

*manahprayogoyasmin* ity *amanahprayogam*. *vācāsthānam idryam* *upānchu* ity *upadīcyate*. *tatra karaṇavad iti tukṣhimbhavanirvittārtham*: *apādbd iti pabdasya* *tyantarpatārtham*: *amanahprayogam* ity *udāttādānām* sāṃkhalpikaprayogapratisnehārtham*.

1 W. B. put before asiṅ. 2 G. M. -daḥ. 3 W. manah; B. -gaḥ stvam; O. manasah pr-. 4 G. M. O. 'sminn. 5 G. M. -gaḥ. 6 G. M. sthānam vācā ichedi-. 7 G. M. -thaḥ. 8 G. M. -thaḥ. 9 G. M. sāṃkhalpikaprasaḥ; B. G. M. -thaḥ.

7. *akṣharāṇāṁ svarāḥ*: *akṣharāṇāṁ vyāṇjānāṁ* ca 'nupalabdhir dhvāno nāma dvitiyam vācā sthānam. *upāṇcukṣaṅhe* 'py anupalabdhiḥ satyāṃ punarvacanam* aṇapodapalabdhiḥ dvividhānāraṁ*: *akṣharāvyanjānāṁ bheda-grahaṇaṁ* abhidhārtham*: *atyantānupalabdhir* ity arthaḥ. 8 ane tā 'aḥuk. 9 *akṣharāvyanjānāṁ savaisarjāntiyādānāṁ* anupalabdhiḥ iti.

1 G. M. svarāyāṁ. 2 W. B. -cana; O. -canaṁ. 3 W. B. O. sābāḥ; G. M. -rathāḥ. 4 B. G. M. om. 5 O. bhedena gr-. 6 W. ābhāṣkhaṇyayeśārtham; O. dēḥ-. 7 O. nā-paḥ-. 8 W. ins. yāmasyasya pāsor arorasyasya pi bīcyam iī; O. ins. yathā na grāmyasya pāsor ānte nāyasyādhaḥvyācyam iī. 9 O. om. tā. 10 G. M. vis-.

8. *akṣharāvyanjānānām upalabdhiḥ nimudo nāma tṛṣiyāṁ vācā sthānam bhavati.
I have rendered nimada by 'whisper' rather at a venture: whether the word accurately represents it or not is at any rate of very small consequence.

9. "Mumbling" is the same, with sound.

Caabda would seem to be used here in the sense of nādu, 'tone,' if the definition is to be made anything of; the term upabdimat is found in the Tāttirīya-Sanhitā (at iii.1.9), used in antithesis to upārīṇa.

10. "Soft" is in the chest, "middle" in the throat, "loud" in the head.

The South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) divide this rule into three, and break up the comment into three corresponding parts, without other change. I presume that the treatment of the whole as one rule is more original; the subject joins on, as it were, to rule xxii. 11, and gives the received doctrine as to the mode of production of the three qualities of voice there laid down. And the distinction of the four other qualities by which "soft" shades off into utter inaudibility is a later addition to the doctrine—one of those pieces of useless over-refinement which are thoroughly characteristic of the Hindu mode of working.

The commentator points out that the first four of the seven sthānas described in this chapter are used "in sacrifices etc.;" and the last three, at the morning, noon, and evening sūvandās, or somitations, respectively. And he quotes "from the Čikṣā" a pair of verses which are found in the Rik-version of the pāṇiniya Čikṣā (verses 36,37; see Weber's Indische Studien, iv.363-4), to the effect that "in early morning, one must always read with chest-tone, resembling the growl of the tiger; at noon, with throat-tone,

9. 1 akshara-vyañjananāṁ suṣabdām upalabdhiḥ upabdīmanī
nāma caturthāṁ veda sthānam bhuvoti.

1 G. M. ina. cabena suha varuta ili suṣabdām. 2 W. O. om.; B. -bdhīman. 2 B. om. 4 W. B. O. om.

10. yatra 'rasi sthāṇe prayoga upalabhyate tān maṇḍrall nāma'
vācaḥ pañcamaṁ1 sthānam 2. yatra kujjaśa sthāṇe prayoga upalabhyate tān maḍhyamāṁ nāma shashṭhāṁ veda sthānam 3. yatra ciraśa sthāṇe prayoga upalabhyate tāt tārāṁ nāma suṣṭamāṁ veda sthānam 4. eṣhāvd bītāṣa caturthāṁ 5 yajñādhisu prayogāḥ: maṇḍraṁ prakṛtiḥ svapnavam upayogāte: maḍhyamāṁ maḍhyandine savane: tārāṁ tṛṣyasuvane. Čikṣā cāi vānī vāk-

shyati:
like the warble of the cakranāka; the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, haisa and kokila."

The Rik Pr. (xiii.17) teaches the same three sthānas, but calls the third uttama instead of tāra. The Vāj. Pr. (i.10,80) lays down their number and their place of production (assigning to the third the bhrūmadhya, 'middle of the brows,' instead of giras, 'head'), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance; the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper "registers" of a voice; and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

曼्द्रादिपु त्रिपु स्थानेषु सतसत्त्व यमा: ॥ ११ ॥

11. In the three qualities beginning with "soft," there are seven tones each.

As synonym of yama, the commentator gives svara, doubtless here to be understood as 'musical note, tone of the gamut;' he adds 'acute, and so on,' which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant 'accent' instead of 'musical tone,' or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

prātaḥ pathen10 nityam urasthitena11
svarena cārdālarutopamena12:
madhyandine kanthagatena cādi 'va
ca krahvasanakajitasaumibhena.
tāraṁ tu vidyāt savannain13 tṛtyaṁ14
śirogatam15 tuc ca saddā16 prayojyam:
mayārahaṁśīnyahṛtasvananāṁ
 tulayena nādena śirasthitena17.


11. trishu mandrādipu sthānesv ekākāsimit saptasaptā yamā bhavanti: yamāḥ 'svarāḥ: udāttādaya' iti yāvat. saptasaptā 'ti vipyādyā ekākāsimin iti labhyate. ke te' yamā ity āsākṣyo 'ttarastreto' 'ttaram dāha.

1) G. M. svarādaya. 2) W. B. -yāh; O. -yām. 3) W. O. ne; G. M. O. put before ke. 4) W. ṭre.
musical pitch—an identity which is the ground of their common appellation.

The same statement, as to the seven yamas or 'tones' in each sthāna, 'register' or 'scale,' and the same identification with the svaras, are made in the Rik Prat. (xiii.17). We are to assume, without much question, that the scales pass into one another by a constant ascending series, like the bass and soprano scales in our own system of musical notation.


These are not the ordinary names of the seven notes of the Hindu scale, or svaras (for which, see Jones "on the Musical Modes of the Hindus," As. Res., vol. iii.; Weber's Indische Studien, viii.259 ff.); but they are, apparently, alternative apppellations for the same thing; they are given by Uvāṭa, in his comment on Rik Prat. xiii.17, as used sāmaṇṇu, 'in the sāmaṇṇu,' or 'in the Sāma-Veda' (Müller's Rik Pr., p. cclxixii). Uvāṭa calls the first kṛṣṭa, instead of kṛṣṭa, and the same is the reading of G. M. in our rules and their commentary, as also of T. in rule 14 only (Müller, l. c., p. cclxiii., marginal note, states kṛṣṭha or kṛṣṭa to be the reading of O. also, but the maker of my collation does not note the fact, except once, under rule 14, in putting in on the margin a passage inserted out of place).

13. Of these, the perception is born of brightness.

I have simply translated the problematical word dīptijñ literally, without claiming to understand what it signifies. The comment throws no light upon it, nor do I get any from any other quarter. The former says merely that the perception of each preceding one is "born from the brightness" of its successor; namely, the per-

12. kṛṣṭa ca prathama ca dvitiya ca tṛtiya ca caturtha ca mandra ca tīrvāya ca kṛṣṭapratathamadyatiṣṭhacaturthamandrādītiṣṭhānām:
1 G. M. kruṣṭa (as also in the rule).  8 O. om. ca.  3 O. om. ca.  6 B. O. om.  8 G. M. O. om.  6 B. kṛṣṭādayo.

13. teṣāṁ khalu saptayamāṇām uttarottaradīptijñātmurvatāravāropalabhāhś:  1 W. dīptijñāropalabhāh.  2 G. M. O. saptasvarayām.  3 B. -rād; G. M. -ram d.  4 O. pārvavat.  8 G. M. om.  6 W. B. mantri; G. M. nimado.  8 G. M. kruṣṭaḥ; O. kṛṣṭaḥ ity.
ception of manda from that of atisvarya; that of the fourth, from manda; and so on through the series. Perhaps the expression is nothing more than one violently figurative, signifying that each tone receives light from, or is set in its true light by, the rest, or the ones or one nearest it: only, in that case, we should look for some word combined with dipti to indicate the source of the light.

Müller (under Rik Prat. xiii.17, r. decili.) surmises that the present rule may mean the same thing with the rule of the Rik Prat. anantara ca 'tra yamo 'viceshah, which he translates 'in these three places (sthåna) a yama without another yama is undistinguishable.' It is very doubtful, however, whether he is justified in rendering anantara by 'not having another,' and whether his rule is not rather intended to signify that the three scales pass directly into one another, the first note of the second being equivalent to an eighth of the first, and so on.

14. "Second," "first," and kṛṣṭa are the three tones of the Ṝvārakas.

This rule makes a choka with the one that follows: which is, of course, a marked indication that both are interpolated here. The same thing may be inferred from the fact that rule 15 teaches nothing which is not found also in 16.

The comment adds nothing whatever to our understanding of the rule.

The Ṝvārakas are mentioned in the Caranaavyūha (paragraph 12: see Weber's Indische Studien, iii.287) as holders of one cākhā of the Yajur-Veda.

15. The four beginning with manda and ending with "second" are those of the Tāttiriyas.

This second half-verse, as already pointed out, is superfluous in view of the next rule, which treats the same subject, and much more explicitly.


O. inserts the whole comment out of place, after that to the next rule. 1 G. M. krush- (as also, with T., in the rule); O. kush-; 2 B. ins. dvitiyādāyah; 3 W. -kasv.; O. -kārd. 4 O. om. 5 G. M. -ke. 6 B. -kshedāvarādāh; G. M. -kasvarādāh.

15. mandrīdayaḥ citāro' dvitiyāntāḥ svarāh mandracaturthaśtriya dvitiyaśa tāttiriyakāh syuh.

1 G. M. O. -ra svard. 2 G. M. O. om. 3 O. teshān tāttiriyake prayogo veditavyah.

vol. ix. 52
16. According to the Tāttirīyas, the *mandra* proceeds from the "second," and the "third" and "fourth" come next after: this they style the tone-quaterrnion.

The order of the four tones is not made entirely clear by this rule, nor by the commentator's explanation of it. The latter says that "the mandra of the Tāttirīyas is born or produced from the 'second,'" and, if the expression be used in a manner akin with those under rule 18, this would imply that the *mandra* came first, and the "second" after—which would, of course, accord best with the value of the two names: *mandra* would thus be the lowest of the four *yamas*, as it is the lowest of the three *ṣṭāṇas*. But the commentator then goes on to say that the series of *yamas* thus "beginning with 'second'" is styled tone-quaterrnion: and this would imply that the order is second, *mandra*, third, fourth. Yet further, he adds that "second" is *udātta*, *mandra* is *anudātta*, and "third" and "fourth" are *svarita* and *pracāya*. This makes the impression of a purely formal and unintelligent identification, or a forcing through of a parallelism between the four tones and the four accepted accents (which, however, are in respect to tone only three, since the *pracāya* is "of *udātta* tone," xx.10), without the slightest regard to the already defined tonic quality of the accents. The comment, in truth, through this whole subject, seems to be written with a very insufficient comprehension of the meaning of the text: see especially the rules that follow.

Our attention is called to the fact that the preceding rule laid down the number of the Tāttirīya *yamas*, the present one undertaking nothing more than to describe their order; and that the intention of the last words of the rule is therefore simply to give a name to the series. I have pointed out above, however, that rules 14 and 15 seem to have been put in by themselves, without any regard to 16.


The mention of the Taṭṭīrīyas here, and in this manner, seems to indicate that the Prātiṣṭhākhyas does not belong to their school, or concern itself with their pākhā; although, perhaps, both stand in an especially near relation to it. See what is said upon this point in the concluding note.

नमिन्द्रियानात्तरयोत्तमी II १७ II

17. In it, progression is by intervals of two tones.

I have rendered this rule according to what seems to me most likely to be its real meaning—although, at the same time, I do not feel by any means confident that I understand it correctly. If the Taṭṭīrīyas acknowledge only four notes in the scale or octave, it seems natural that they should fix these at wider intervals from one another; and the phraseology of the rule is well enough calculated to express this. The verification or rejection of my version may be left till we shall better comprehend the Hindu musical system, and its modification or adaptation as here presented. I am, at any rate, persuaded that my guess is more likely to be right than either of the two which the commentator ventures. Of these, the first is nothing less than absurd: it makes taṃmin refer to anudatta, although such an antecedent can only have tumbled in out of the clouds, there having been nothing whatever to suggest it in the preceding rules; and renders ‘in this anudatta there is a being-within of two yamas; that is to say, in anudatta inheres the quality of svarita and also that of pracaṇya’! And, as examples of this wonderful anudatta, are quoted sa nāh parshat (not found in the Taṭṭīrīya-Sanhitā, but occurs Rig-Vala 1.99.1; x.187.1–5; and Atharva-Veda vii.63.1), and parya anudattan (i.7.22).

The commentator’s second guess is so far better than his first that he gives the obviously correct interpretation of taṃmin, as referring to caturyamam in the preceding rule; but he makes out the meaning to be that, in this series of svaras, two are contained in the interior, or are included between the other two. And he

17. dūdu ca tā tu yamāu ca dviyamāu; dviyamayor antara-vṛttir madhyavṛttis taṃmin anudattā bhavati: svaritvam pracaṇyavam cā ’nudattā’ bhavati ’ty arthaḥ. yathā: sa...: parya...:

kecīd anyathā kathayanti: taṃmin’ caturyama’ svaramaṇḍale dviyamāntard vṛttih: svaradāyasaya madhye vartamānaḥ syāt.

anudattā hṛdi jñeyo mūrdhny uddatta udāhṛtaḥ:

svaritaḥ karmamādhyaḥ saṃvāṅgeḥ pracaṇyaḥ smṛtaḥ.

"asyā ’yam arthaḥ’; udāttānudattāyor” “madhye svaritapraçaṇyayor” antara-vṛttir bhavati. “yathā kālajñeyahastastvinydsamaye ’pi’ svaritapraçaṇyayor antara-vṛttir upadiṣyate;
cites a verse: "anudāṭa is to be known as in the heart; udāṭa is uttered in the head; svarīta is at the root of the ears (or of the throat, as G. M. have it); pracayya is declared to be in the whole member (or to belong to the whole mouth, W. says);" the meaning of which he states to be that svarīta and pracayya are found between udāṭa and anudāṭa—forgetting that under the previous rule he had assigned them a different position. Further, he says that the interior position of svarīta and pracayya is shown in Kāhaleya's system of motions of the hand, as appears from the verse "the chief of the digits (i. e. the thumb) points out udāṭa when its apex is applied to the root of the forefinger; when to the last but one (i. e. the ring-finger) and to the middle finger, it points out the svarīta and the dhṛtā; when to the little finger, the anudāṭa." This verse occurs in the Rik-version of the pāṁśīya Čikshā (as verse 43: see Weber's Indische Studien, iv.365): the commentator does not regard it as a Čikshā verse, but adds yet another which he claims to take from his Čikshā, although it is not found in either version of the known treatise of that name (but compare verse 44, l. c., p. 366): "the little finger, the ring-finger, the middle finger, and the forefinger—these, along with the tip of the thumb, severally point out the grave, circumflex, dhṛtā, and acute accents." The pracayya is here twice called dhṛtā, and it again, apparently, receives the same name in the last rule of the chapter (unfortunately, I overlooked these passages when commenting on the term dhṛtāpracayya in rule xvii.3): "sustained" or "continued" is a sufficiently natural substitute for pracayya, as appellation of the accent in question.

I do not understand precisely what and how much credit the commentator intends to claim for these two explanations in calling them (in his final remark) mukhyayā: if he means that they are the best among a number which had been suggested and might have been reported, it is so much the worse for the rest.

"udāṭtam ākhyaṭi vr̥ṣe 'ṅgulīnām
pradeśināmaṇāni visiṣṭamārdhā:
upāntamudhyeyā svarītām dhṛtāṁ ca
kaniṣṭhikāyām anudāṭtam eva 'ti".

"cikshāvacanam api" cāi 'vām vākhyaṭāi:
kanishṭhikā' nāmīkā ca madhyāṇa ca pradeśinī:
nīcasvāradhṛtoḍāttān aṅgushṭhāgrena" nirdiṣṭ.
mukhyam eva" vyākhyānādāvyayam" etat.

18. That progression we will set forth.

The commentator declares tām here to bring forward solely the word vṛttam from the preceding rule (not that word with its qualifications), and the vṛtti aimed at to be the fourfold progression of the caturyama taught in rules 16 and 19. This is, of course, forced and unacceptable. I imagine that, on the contrary, in the oral tradition of the Prātiçākhya, an uttered illustration of the four tones, separated by double intervals and so covering the whole octave, was given—which illustration, of course, could not be set down in the written text.

19. That is what is called the quaternion of tones.

This is naturally enough explainable as a winding-up remark, after the exemplification of the four Tāttvīrya tones notified in the preceding rule has been duly given. To the commentator, it is a mere repetition of what had been already stated above, in rules 16 and 18; and he excuses it as being intended, under the guise of a summing-up, to confirm the view laid down, and repel other opinions inconsistent with it. For, he adds, some people hold the doctrine that there are three svaras only, as appears from the half-verse "acute, grave, and circumflex are the three accents." This verse (from the pāṇiniya Čikāhā) was quoted in full above, under rule xx.1; and W. adds the second half of it here also.

The futility of this exposition, as well as of much that precedes it, will, I think, be obvious to any one. Instead of tracing and pointing out the relation which actually exists between the accents and the yamas, and letting us see what musical intervals are required.
garded as separating the different accentual pitches from one another, the commentator simply confuses the two together, and regards as said of the one what has reference only to the other.

20. It must be uttered with krama and vikrama, not hurried, not delayed, with grave, acute, and circumflex accent, with pracaya, and even.

The commentator supplies vṛttim as the subject of all these attributes, accounting for it as derived from rule 17, above. This is hardly admissible; but what is to be understood instead is doubtful, depending upon the connection in which this verse may have stood in the text from which it was taken. The same connection would perhaps explain what krama and vikrama are to be regarded as meaning: the commentator defines krama by dvitva, 'duplication' (taught in chapter xiv.), and vikrama as the accent of that name prescribed at xix.1,2; but it seems very unlikely that two things so dissimilar would be thus combined, or that a detail of accent would not be put in the second line, with the rest of its kind (compare rule xxiv.8, where krama and vikrama are found again in conjunction). Dhṛta is defined as synonymous with pracaya: compare the note to rule 17, above. Samāṃ means, we are told, 'free from the faults of deficiency and excess in the matter of udāta and the other accents.'

There are slight variations of reading in the rule, T. giving adhuratāṃ in pāda b; B. svāra for svāra in c; W. G. M. having vade for vaded, and W. drutavatīn and T. dratar- after it; but they are mere errors of scribes, as the comment plainly shows.


iti trībhaḥśyaratne pratiṣṇākhyaśivarāne
truvaniśo' dhyāyaḥ.

1 W. B. -rakam etan nir: O. -rakimātan nir. 2 W. -vikram. 3 G. M. O. om. 4 G. M. dvit app. 5 O. -cūt syād. 6 B. -ritpracayayastam. 7 B. nyāndīrītādittād; O. nyāndīrītāadī. 8 G. M. ins. idām. 9 B. om. 10 O. v. 11 O. -kriye. 12 G. M. O. dvit app. okkāda.
CHAPTER XXIV.

Contents: 1–4, the four sāṁhitās or texts; 5–6, qualifications of a Veda-reader and teacher.

Gṛth Chautra: Sāṁhitā: || 1 ||

1. Now for the four texts.
   A simple heading to the following rules.

Padyāsāṁhitānārthasāṁhitā: Varṇasāṁhitānārthasāṁhitā Chēti || 2 ||

2. Word-text, syllable-text, letter-text, and member-text, namely.

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of sāṁhitās. The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the Prātiṣṭhāhya. To the “word-text” he assigns chapters v.–ix., xi., xii., and xiii.1–4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of pāda-text into sāṁhitā. To the “syllable-text” he assigns chapter x., which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two. With the “letter-text” are concerned chapters xiii. (i. e. except rules 1–4), xiv., and xvi., mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the Sanhitā of n and ſ, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination. And the “member-text” is said to be taught in chapter

1. atha 'ty ayam adhikāraḥ: caturah śaṁhitā 1 ucyanta 2 ity etad adhikṛtaṁ vedītvam iti uttaraṁ yad vakṣhyāmah'.
   1 G. M. ins. ity. 2 O. om. 3 O. -yate.

2. paddyakṣharavarnāṅgārayaḥcaturah śaṁhitāh kramena boddhavyaḥ prakaṃdhyayam 'dṛabhyaḥ' navamād ekadada- doddadāvāh trayaḍaṣṭasyaḥ 'dāv śātracatusthāyaṁ ca padasamāhitā. dācamo keharasāmāhitā. trayaḍaṣṭacuṭurdaṣṭāv śoḍaṣaçaḥ ca var-nasamāhitā. 'vyanjananaṁ svarāṅgam (xxi.1) ity esa śa- ngaśaṁhitā. etāḥ ca caturah śaṁhitāḥ. etesv anvayata ' vihitaiś ni- shuddhāni ca kāryaiś sarvaśaṁhitāṁ kuryāt': yatṛ 11 'rsha- grahanandikā vishesho nā 'sti 11'.
   1 W. -ga ayaḥ; O. -ga yaḥ. 2 W. B. O. dṛabhya d nav; G. M. dṛabhya śapana- dākādār; W. O. -dāḍa ca. 3 O. -rā. 4 W. -rāṣṭa. 5 B. G. M. ekānto. 6 G. M. om. 7 O. ins. ca. 8 G. M. nishāḥyakah. 9 B. -hi; G. M. sarvatra saṁha; O. sahit. 10 G. M. syāt. 11 W. B. O. utṛ. 12 G. M. add tatra kuryāt.
(rules 1–9), which prescribes of what vowel each consonant shall be regarded as “member” or adjunct, or lays down the rules of syllabication. And it is added that whatever is prescribed or forbidden elsewhere than in [the rules belonging to each of] these is of force in all the different texts, unless there be some special restriction, as by the use of the word *ārśha* (ix.21; x.13) or the like.

It is unnecessary to point out that the Prātīcākhya contemplates no such division of its rules and restriction of their application as is here made, and that, unless the distinction of texts laid down in the rule means something different from what the commentator explains it to be, it is trivial and worthless.

3. Conjunction of independent words by euphonic combination is called word-text. The commentator first explains *samādhāna* as modifying *sam-yoga* in quality of a locative, and then declares the use of the two equivalent terms to be for the purpose of signifying the exceeding closeness of the combination (if, as I presume to be the case, the reading of B. is here the correct one). And he quotes the rule of Pāṇini (i.4.109) as what “the grammarians” say upon the subject, giving the definition of *sāvīhitā* or combined text. As example of word-text, he gives *agni dudhra gahya kiñcita vanyā ya ta ishuh* (v.5.91: only G. M. have *ishuh*).

This interpretation makes *pada-sāvīhitā* signify what we are wont to call *sāvīhitā* simply, in distinction from *padapātha*, or *pada-sāvīhitā* as usually employed, ‘pada-text.’

4. And in like manner with the syllable-text and the rest, in accordance with their several names.

The commentator explains *yathāsvam* as signifying ‘it goes on without exceeding that which is its own,’ and pronounces it a ‘distinction of office or use;’ thus, namely, the peculiar form of all the other specified texts is to be determined; the combination of inde-
pendent syllables is syllable-text—and so on. And he quotes three passages from the text, by way of illustration: athā 'bravita (iii.2. 11), adhishvanam asi (i.1.52), and akshaya vyaghārayati (v. 2.7) et al.). Of these, the first is an example of the combination of two separate syllables (vowels) into one syllable, by a rule (2) of the tenth chapter; the second, of the occurrence of n after sh, by rule xiii.6,7; the third offers (like almost any other pair of words in the Sanhita) cases of the division of consonant-groups, akkhśiṇa-ya-vya-etc. Or, by a different treatment of the successive distinctions, it is said that the combination of two vowels alone is “syllable-text;” that of a vowel and consonant in one word is “letter-text;” that of consonants alone in one word (consonants being “members” or adjuncts of vowels, xxi.1) is “member-text;” anything else than these is “word-text.”

It appears from all this that svānihita is here used nearly in the sense of savindhi, ‘euphonic combination,’ and that these four rules have no significance whatever, being a mere bit of outside classification, in which some one has amused himself by indulging.

5. Heaviness, lightness, evenness; short, long, and protracted quantity; elision, increment, and euphonic alteration; natural state, viśrama, krama; circumflex, acute, and grave quality; breath, tone, and adjunction—all this must be understood by him who reads the Veda language.


1 W. B. svam. 2 G. M. om.; O. om. eva. 3 O. eva. 4 G. M. put also after rule 4 in the text of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, as if rules 5 and 6. 5 O. om. 6 W. om.; G. M. evāhāra. 7 G. M. om. 8 B. om.

5. yad guruvaśyāshtādaśāvidham etat sarvāṁ chandobhāshāṁ vedarūpāṁ iva ca adhiyāta paṭhatā viṣṇeyam. atha va chandobhāshāṁ vedulakshaṇam ity arthāḥ. tuṣabdō dhyetvyaśātrikstanishedbārthāḥ: anena tu sarvathā viṣṇeyam ity arthāḥ.
W. D. Whitney,

The commentator explains *vedabhāsāham* as meaning either 'voice having the form of Veda,' i.e. the uttered material of the Veda, or (according to another sense of *bhāsāda*) 'explanation of the Veda.' The particle *tu* in the last half-verse (which I have omitted in translating, as being a mere expletive or *pādaśpiruna*), he states to mean that the reader referred to must by all means understand all this, but not any one besides. And he adds at the end that *vijñeyā* indicates the peremptoriness of the rule, there being risk of harm in the absence of the required knowledge, as is shown by the verse 'a *mantra* deficient in respect to accent or to letters' etc. This is the familiar verse, found in the *pāṇiniya* Čikāha (verse 52: see Weber's Indische Studien, iv.367–8), and quoted times innumerable in Hindu works, where the present subject is under consideration: O. alone adds the second *pāda*, "being falsely applied, does not express the intended sense;" the rest is, "it, an uttered thunderbolt, harms the sacrificer, like the word *indrapatu* [when used by Tvashtar] with false accent."

The rest of the comment is occupied with illustration of the points referred to in the rule, along with new and then a few words of explanation. For "heavy" quality (see xxii.14) is cited *vashātt svāhā* (vii.3.12); for "light" (see xxii.15), *akuruta* (v.5.8 etc.); W. B. give instead *akurvata* (v.7.5 etc.), which is less acceptable, as containing also a heavy syllable. *Sāmya*, 'evenness, sameness,' is defined as implying that, of two elements compared, there is—in respect to place and organ of articulation, quantity, etc.—sameness (so G. M., but B. O. read 'bigness' instead, and W. has 'steadiness')—what is really meant, is obscure; we may compare the use of the adjective *sama* in xxiii.20. The examples for short, long, and protracted, respectively, are *gamyati* (v.7.5 etc.), *vādyav eva 'sya* (vi.3.74), and *astu hās iti* (vii.1.61: G. M. omit *iti*). Elision is instanced by *in 'andrisu* (iv.1.82: see above, v.12); increment, by *trapuṣ ca me* (iv.7.51: see above, v.4); euphonic conversion, by *sam indra no manasi* (i.4.441: only O. has *manasi*: a case under vii.2). To illustrate *prakṛti*, 'original condition,' are given three phrases, *agni dūdra gaha ya kiścīla vanya ya te* (v.5.91: W. B. end with *kiścīla*, and G. M. with *vanya*; and G. M. O. omit *agni*), *prapā asi* (ii.5.124), and *na mi-

---

guruvam yathā: vashaṭ..... laghutā yathā: akuruta. sām-
yāni yathā: sthānakarānakaśādibhir* anayor asti sthāuryam* iti. hravādīrghaḥphutani ca* yathā: gamayati: vāyāv..... astu
..... lopo yathā: " im..... ágamo yathā: trapuṣ..... "vi-
kāro yathā: sam..... prakṛtir yathā: agne..... prapā..... na....." vikrama yathā: voḍhāve. krano nāma dvitvam "
yathā: yad..... "yad....." svarītodattānādiṃ bhāvah svarī-
todattānicavam: "tat yathākramān{i} nirdicyate": nīyaṃc-
ami..... avadādān. viro vāsā (i.8) ity uktaiḥ* pāso
yathā: pā..... saṃvṛte" kaще nādāḥ kriyata (ii.4) ity
thuni abhavan (v.3.6\textsuperscript{2}: G. M. omit na). Of these, the second is a case under x.13; the third, under x.18: both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains prakṛtyā, or exempt from alteration. But the particular bearing of the first example on the point of prakṛti is more obscure: the phrase is one in which the samuhāra-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the pada; and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken. Compare the comment and note to v.2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted. For vikrama is given the word vōdhavē (i.6.2\textsuperscript{1} et al.), of which the second syllable has the accent called vikrama, by xix. 1. Krama is again (as under xxiii.20) defined as ‘duplication,’ and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, yađ vāśi hotā (iii.2.9\textsuperscript{1}: i.e. yađ dvā, by xiv.1): O. adds another of like character, yađ venoh (v.1.1\textsuperscript{4}). We are permitted to doubt, however, here as at xxiii.20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them. The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by nyādhac (v.5.3\textsuperscript{2}), gaṃ vāda tāḍu tāḍ (i.7. 2\textsuperscript{2}), and avadatām (i.7.2\textsuperscript{2}). Reference is made to rule ii.5 as defining “breath,” and as example of breath-sounds, or surd consonants, is cited prāshā te (i.1.2\textsuperscript{2}: B. has instead pāte, and W. pāte, which occurs at iv.7.13\textsuperscript{4}). Rule ii.4, again, is referred to as defining “tone” or sonant utterance, and the example is bhāgyadē bhāgyadēh (ii.5.6\textsuperscript{2}). Finally, anāgam, which I have rendered ‘adjunction,’ is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix.1 etc.), and a phrase is quoted, tam matisyah prābravīt (ii.6.6\textsuperscript{1}), which we are to divide tam-mati-thyu-prā-brā-va-vi.

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rik Prāt. (see Müller’s edition, p. viii.).

6. He who understands the distinctions of the pada-krama, who is versed in the varna-krama, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers.

\begin{align*}
\text{ukt}\text{a nādō yathā: bhāy-\ldots\ldots vyaṃjanaḥ svarāṅgam (xxi.} \\
1) ity uktam anāgīn yathā: tām\ldots\ldots viṣṇeyatvam\textsuperscript{11} iti\textsuperscript{10} nitya-
vidhīḥ: vipaṃkhe bādhāt: mantro kinnāh svarat varam na\textsuperscript{11} 
\text{tyādyūt\textsuperscript{10}}\text{.}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{1} G. M. -davorn. \textsuperscript{2} O. -ēh. \textsuperscript{3} W. O. -āt; G. M. -ēh. \textsuperscript{4} W. -kta iti na\textsuperscript{10} thē-
\textsuperscript{5} G. M. anēnē dhiyati. \textsuperscript{6} G. M. sthānādē. \textsuperscript{7} B. O. sthānyam; G. M. ti sēmyam. \textsuperscript{8} (G. M. O. om. \textsuperscript{9} W. ins. etat sarvān tu viṣṇeyam chañḍobhāvādhyātā. \textsuperscript{10} B. om. \textsuperscript{11} G. M. ins. tad. \textsuperscript{12} (b) in O. only. \textsuperscript{13} W. padaŷa; \textsuperscript{14} O. tad yathā. \textsuperscript{15} O. om. \textsuperscript{16} MSS. 
-tāṁ. \textsuperscript{17} W. om. \textsuperscript{18} G. M. O. -yam. \textsuperscript{19} G. M. īta. \textsuperscript{20} O. -ād; W. -dīn; B. -dīn 
dāma; O. mūlaya prayuktā na tam artham ēha tyādīndām.\textsuperscript{11}}
This verse also is prefixed to the Rik Prāt. (Müller, p. viii.).

The commentator gives a merely mechanical explanation of the two terms composing the first half-verse, without telling us what he understands them really to mean. Doubtless the pada-krama is that which is commonly known as the “krama-text,” and for the construction of which the other Prātiṣṭhākhyas (Rik Pr. x., xi.; Vāj. Pr. iv.179–194; Ath. Pr. iv.101–120) give full directions; and the varna-krama is the text with duplicated consonants, according to the rules of our fourteenth chapter. The compound svarāmātrāvidhāga we are taught to treat as a dependent one; we might also be tempted to regard it as copulative, and to understand vidhāga in the sense of ‘separation’ (as in pada-text etc.), as in the only other place where it occurs in the treatise (iii.1). “Going to the assembly of teachers” is interpreted to signify not merely the sitting with them on earth, but the enjoyment with them of the abode of felicity, the brahmaloka—it being explained (except in G. M.) that “the teachers” are Vyāsa and his like. Then, apropos of this promise of heaven to those versed in the class of subjects of which the Prātiṣṭhākhyas treats, the commentator proceeds to quote from various purāṇas and kindred works the praises and promises there given to those who teach the Veda.

Thus, from the Garuḍa-purāṇa: “Of all kinds of knowledge, that of the Veda is called highest; hence, he who communicates that wins heaven and final beatitude. As chief of all sciences has been produced the brahma-science; hence, he who is devoted to giving it will receive the whole recompense of giving.” From the Devī-purāṇa: “To those twice born, the Veda is the chief means

6. 'padānāṁ kramāḥ padakramāḥ': tasya viṣeṣaḥ: tāṁ jānāti 'ti padakramāviaśēṣajñāh. varnānāṁ kramo varnakramāḥ': tasmin vicāśaṇo nipūno varnakramavicāśaṇāḥ: svarā Sanskrit ca 'mārā ca svarāmātraḥ: tādesāṁ vidhāgaḥ: tāṁ jānāti 'ti svarāmātra vidhāgajñāh': mārāgadibha kāla viṣeṣaḥ kāṣṭha ucyate: so 'pi caturanur ityādīhur: eva viṣeṣāḥ puruṣāḥ acāryavaisvadānāṁ gacchāt: "acāryā" vyāsādayah: teshāṁ 'brahma-loke' sthānām: "yaḥ ca 'ṛdhī' pādrām jāte so'py acāryavāt teṣaṁ sadāśām" brahmālokāṁ gachati".

tathā ca' paurānikā bhananti". gṛdhopurāne".

dhūḥ samastavidyānāṁ vedavidyām anuttamām".

atas taddātur uyta eva labhaḥ svargāpavargayoh.

vidyānāṁ paramā" vidyā brahmaṇavidyā" samārtitaḥ.

atas "taddānaśilā " ca" survāṁ" dānapalāni labheta"

devipurāne".

veda eva dvijānāṁ sādhanaṁ "yāsasāḥ phalam".

ato" sūdhayayānābhidyāt" param brahma dhīgacchati.

"tam eva śilayat prājñāḥ śishyeybhyaṁ tam pradāpayet:

tadābhīdāsoprahānābhyām "etat kiṁ na" dhīgacchati"
of obtaining good things; hence, by application to the reading of the Veda one attains the highest brahma. To that let him who is wise especially devote himself; that let him deliver over to pupils; by application to that and communication of it what is there that one does not attain?” From Yājñavalkya: “Above all sacrifices, and ascetic practices, and pure works, the Veda is the highest means of felicity to the twice-born ones. The Brahman who, not reading the Vedas, expends his labor in other directions—he quickly falls, while living, into the condition of a Cādra, and his posterity with him” (the latter of these two verses, which is not given by W. B., is found in Manu, at ii.168). From the Mahābhārata: “Whoever shall repeat to pupils the religious, sacred Sarasvatī, he shall gain a reward equal to that from the giving of land and kine.” From the Vishnudharmottara-purāṇa: “By imparting the Veda, a man attains all the fruits of sacrifices; by imparting an upaveda, he shares in the bliss of the Gandharvas.” From the Brahma-purāṇa: “That reward cannot be told in a thousand words, which, oh sage! one obtains by even a very little teaching of the Veda.” And from the Bhavishyat-purāṇa: “The sonless obtains sons; the poor becomes rich; but he who is ever devoted to the study of the Veda is dissolved in the highest brahma.”

Next we are told the characteristic form of the Veda: “The Yajur-Veda is brown-eyed, slim-waisted, big-throated, big-cheeked, black-footed, dusky, born of the family of Kaśyapa.” If there is (as may be the case) real meaning hidden under these apparently senseless epithets, it escapes my discovery.

tathā ca yājñavalkyaḥ:
yajñānāṁ tapasaṁ cāt i ca v uṣhānāṁ cāt i ca kurmaṁ:
veda eva dvijānāṁ niṣṭhreyasyaśakaraḥ paraḥ.
“yo nādhīya” dvijo vedān anyatra kurute śramam:
sa jīvann eva cādraṁam aśu gachati sānvayaḥ”.
mahābhārata:
“ya brāyāc ca ’pi śīṣhyāvyo” dharmyām brāhmaṁ sarasvatīm:
prthivigopraḍāṅgadhyāṁ so tulyaphalam avyate.
vishnudharmottare ’pi”:
vedadāndd avānoptri sarvasi yajñaphalam naraḥ:
upavedapraddhānena gandharvāḥ saka modate.
brāhmaṇpurāṇe ’pi”:
na tat” kalpatahaśreṇa gaditum” cakyaṭe phalam:
yad vedādāndd ānoptri” svalpāś ” api mahāmate.
bhavishyatpurāṇe ’pi”:
aputro labhate putrād adhano dhanavān bhavet:
sadāḥ sīmyayatanuṣṭa tu ”pare brahmaṁ” bhaye.
vedasvarūpāṃ ucayate:
yajurvedaḥ pīṅgālāyāhaḥ krṣamadhyo bhṛdāgraḥ:
bṛhatkapalāḥ krṣhāṅghris” tāmrah kaśyapagotrajaḥ.”
Once more, the *vedāṅgas* and *upāṅgas* are rehearsed: the former, in the usual number and with the usual names: the latter, as *anupada, anupada (?), chandobhūṣā, nimāśā, nyāya, and τέρκα*—the first two of these last are elsewhere called *pratipada* and *anupada* (see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iii.280–281, and the St. Petersburg *Lexicon*).

With this, in W. B., the Tribhūshyaratna ends; but G. M. O. have an added passage, the bearing of which is not in all points quite clear to me. It begins with stating that he who reads the Veda thus accompanied by the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, and with knowledge of the characteristic form and family, becomes purified. A verse then follows, in which it appears to be laid down how far the rules of the Pratiṣṭhākyas have force: namely, as regards other texts, and passages which are not the subject of *sūtras* and are of human authorship (?). By way of illustration, nine passages are quoted, not one of which is to be found in the Sanhitā proper, although five are from its endings of sections, or the summaries of words with which the divisions of sections (half-centuries, *kandikās*) conclude: they are *pra nakshatrayu dēvyāya* (G. M. omit *dēvyāya*, and O. begins *anakṣh*), *sa im mamāda māhi karma kartave* (O. omits *karini*: *Tāttvīrya-Brāhmaṇa* ii.5.8⁴; *Rig-Veda* ii.22.1), *mahī-saptadaśendrā-vāyu-vādāh* (from the ending of iv.4.12), *api-sida-mithuny ashtīv ca* (from the ending of vi.5.8), and *anuvāna-tanvāna-stūki-pīnākam* (from the ending to iv.5.10): in these the rules are said not to hold good; and *śiśi vyāghra uṣa yā prādākā* (*Tāttvīrya-Brāhmaṇa* ii.7.7⁴; *Athravā-Veda* vi.38.1; *Kāṭhaka* xxxvi. 15), *dvādaśī hṛṣitomaya stotram* (O. *stotram*), *atmanāpād-vistuṣṭ-sūcīpocitāh* (from the ending of vi.4.10: G. M. stops at *pra*), and *ucchasi-poṣham ekānnaviṣhṭaḥ ca* (ending of i.3.6: G. M. stop at *poṣham*), in which the rules are said to hold good. So much as this, now, seems clear: that the first two quotations in each class are given as coming from some other Vedic text than the *Tāttvīrya-

vedāṅgya ucyante:

*čikāh kaṇpo vyākaraṇānaṁ niruktair jyotishaṁ tathā;*

*chandaśaṁ* ca *ti shad aṅgāṁ vidur buddhāh*.

*anupadaṁ* ca *"nupadaṁ chandobhūṣaṁsanavatām:*

*mimāṁsānyāyatarkaṁ" ca *upāṅgāṁ vidur buddhāh*,

"evam sāṅgopāṅgavedasya lakṣaṇanāṁ sāmpūrṇaṁ."⁴⁴

*iti tribhūshyaratne pratiṣṭhākyavivarāne*

*ṣūtravīṇo* "dhyāyaḥ.

*iti dūtīyavrpaṇāṁ samāptah.*

Sanhitā (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brāhmaṇa or Aranyakas), and in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vii.4 would require nākṣṭhā after pra; in the second, v.12 would require in 'umāda; in the third, the s of sapta should be š by vi.2; in the fourth, the t of mithunī should remain unchanged by x.18; in the fifth, asmin is not included among the words which by vi.14 have an increment of s before t. In the other class, on the contrary, agnīṣṭhomasya follows vi.2, nīṣṭ pra is by viii.24 and 35 (see the comment to viii. 35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and ucmāsi by iii. 13; the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the na in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to ca; and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhitā proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhitā are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Sanhitā than to an editor of the Prātiṣṭhakhyā: it seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged t of ucmāsi retained in the ending, while the uncombable character of the final of mithunī is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Tribhāshyaratna, with which the Prātiṣṭhakhyā, takes in general (the only exception is at viii.35) no account of the subdivisions of anuvākas.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.
CONCLUDING NOTE.

It seems desirable to present here, at the end of the work, a discussion and exposition of certain points which could not be connectedly or fully treated in the notes upon the rules.

A first important question is that of the relation of the Prātiṣṭhā bya to the known text of the Black Yajur-Veda, or to the Tātātirīya-Saṁhitā.

In considering this question, it is impossible to separate entirely the Prātiṣṭhā bya itself from its commentary. The former does not quote passages in its rules, but defines situations or specifies words, singly or in combination. Sometimes, indeed, either of these virtually amounts to the citation of a passage; but, in the great majority of cases, only the commentator can inform us what are the passages had in view. For example, we may regard eshtah (viii.18) as in effect a reference to i.2.11 and vi.2.28; but the words cited in vii.8 (as abibhar, akar, punar, pitar) are indefinite in their indications, and it would be impossible to say that any given passage in the Saṁhitā in which one of these words occurs either was or was not contemplated by the makers of the rule. I shall therefore present in connection with one another the evidence derivable from the text itself and that from the comment.

There are four words or parts of words specified in the Prātiṣṭhā bya-text which are not to be found in the Tātātirīya-Saṁhitā: they are stanatar (viii.8), carshan (xiii.13), jigivā (xvi.13), and jighāsī (xvi.18). It is very remarkable, however, that each of these is a kind of reflex or varied repetition of another word preceding it in the same rule: thus, we have sanata stanatar, carman carshan, jigivā jigivā, and jighāsī jighāsī. And this, taken in connection with the fact that all of them appear to be in themselves ungenuine, never having been found, so far as I am aware, in any Vedic text, and being, at least in part, impossible or highly implausible forms, is sufficient to stamp them as probable corruptions, blundering intrusions into the Prātiṣṭhā bya, and of no force to prove that the latter was made for a text that contained them.

The cases are much more numerous in which the commentator declares the Prātiṣṭhā bya to have in contemplation phrases not to be found in the Saṁhitā. They are nearly all of this kind: in iv. 11, viçākhe is declared pragraha; now the word is divided in pada-text, viçākhe, and cākhe is by itself a pada (according to i. 48); and therefore, unless there were some other cākhe not a pragraha in the Saṁhitā, it would be enough to cite cākhe alone in the rule; hence, as the citation of bhāgadhe (p. bhāga-dhe) just before implies that the maker of the rule had in view such a word as uda-dhe, whose dhe was not pragraha, so the citation of viçākhe is declared to have in view such a word as sahastra-cākhe, not a pragraha, “in another text.” The phrases thus quoted from outside the Saṁhitā by the commentator are as follows: under iv.11, tās-
mint sahastraçàkhe, ārdhve çaste pratiśthite, brahmaśāme pra-
tiśthite, ayāndhante, and prabhamañe; under iv.12, pāçuçrapaṇi (or
bhumaçrapaṇi); under iv.15, tami (or tām) åkhvī havyante (or rd-
cayati), hāti punar (or manar) juhoti, and huti tavād vividdh (or
erdh); under vi.37, indrāṇī havañmahi; under vi.5, pramadite
devainām; under xi.3, as beginning of an aunnāka, dhātā
derebhīyo 'surān; under xi.16, gayasphāno 'gīnīhu. All this, in
my view, is false and arbitrary interpretation; the Prātiśākhyā is less
careful to limit itself to the minimum citable than the commenta-
tor would have it, and it quotes, for example, the whole word
visākhe instead of -sākhe alone, simply because sākhe occurs as
 pragraha only in that word.* The same implication is appealed
to by the commentator under xi.9,15, xii.3, xvi.12 (though without
actual citation of phrases), to explain away what would otherwise
be inaccuracies in the Prātiśākhyā; nalam plavam is given under
xiii.16, in the course of the unjustifiable exposition of that rule;
and brahmāsya, though found in the Sanshitā, is credited under xv.
8 to another sākhe. I do not regard anything in this whole class of
cases as authorizing us to suppose that the Prātiśākhyā had in
view a text including anything not found in the Tātanī-
Sanhitā.

Next, as to citations made in the commentary as if from the text
to which the Prātiśākhyā relates, but not found in the Sanhitā.
And here I have first to report a few phrases which are among
those occurring only in the manuscripts that came last to my hands,
and which escaped my notice when preparing for my last search
through the Sanhitā, so that I have not looked for them (not
having had the courage to undertake the long and tedious quest
through the Sanhitā a fourth time for so little). They are ochā-
vākah (xiv.5), uccā ratnam ayajanta (ii.49), tasāā vartipam
(xx.3), dhāryah hi (xxi.16), naça cīd ati (xiv.10), pṛāṇāti (xiv.9),
and bhāsapti śrīrapate (xiv.10). Respecting several of these, it
is doubtful whether they are not mere corruptions of phrases actu-
ally found and referred. Then there is kaviçastāh (xvi.2), instead
of which, by an error, I sought and found kaviçastāh. There
remain, of quotations hunted for but not discovered, the follow-
ing: adya vasu vasati 'li 'nārām eva (x.10: O. only), anv enam
mātā (xx.1: Weber refers me for this to Āṅkh. vi.17.2 [?], Ácval.
iii.3; also Ait. Brāh. ii.8), ahorātre pārpe (vii.7: only W. and [?]
O.: found in Tāttt. Ar. iii.13.2), uta çraçvā pithivām mitacya
(v.12: only G. M.), upārchaty askandaya (x.9: only G. M.), ca-
turhotā (ii.25: Tāttt. Br. ii.2.39), brahmādvanam pacati (x.7:
Tāttt. Br. i.1.98), yaç chandānam (xiv.10: O. only), yā prāci dik
(iv.33: W. B. O.), varshābhīyañ (xiv.16: but I am not certain that
I did not satisfy myself with varṣahbhīyañ and omit to search
for this), varshyebhih (xiv.16: O. only, and it reads varshyebhih).

* The quotation of dhātā rādā (xi.3), to be sure, is more out of the way, and only
to be explained as irregularly pleonastic, like that of iyem eva sa yā (xi.3), into
which the commentator, with equal arbitrariness, tries to interpret a very different
meaning.
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piṭikānḍhāya svāhā (xiii.11: only G. M.), and sa naḥ purushat (xxiii.17: Rig-V. i.99.1 et al.).

Along with these may properly be reported the few phrases which are quoted by the comment, confessedly or impliedly from outside the text contemplated by the Prātiṣākhyā. Thus, we have under xviii.1 the beginning and concluding words of the Tāttvīrīya-Brāhmaṇa and the Tāttvīrīya-Āraṇyaka (that is to say, of the latter, the concluding words, āt 'ea tapati, of the fifth pratāṣṭhāna, with which, accordingly, to the apprehension of our commentator, the whole treatise appears to have ended); under xxiv.6 are given (by G. M. O.) dvādaśa 'gniśtomasya stotrāṇi, pra nakṣatrīrya de-vyāya, sa im mamādu maḥi karma kartave (Tātt. Br. ii.5.86 etc.), and siṁhe vyāghra uta yā prādāku (Tātt. Br. ii.7.71 etc.); in a quoted verse under xxi.6 is read tāsya dhūrrshadam (Tātt. Br. i.2.112 etc.); and the comment to xix.3 has yo 'pdm pusphaṇ veda.

Finally, we note that the comment gives, under xviii.1, a word, bandhav, which ought to form the conclusion of the Sanhitā, by its own count, but which is lost in the known manuscripts.

In all this, again, there is no satisfactory evidence that the Sanhitā of the Prātiṣākhyā or its commentators was other than the one we know. The missing citations are in part found in a minority of the MSS.; in part, they are perhaps corruptions; in part, they are likely to have been taken by an error of the quoter's recollection from some other Tāttvīrīya-text—and the remainder, if there be a remainder, is too scanty to prove anything.

When we come farther to inquire whether any part of the Tāttvīrīya-Sanhitā as it exists was not before the authors of the Prātiṣākhyā, we seem to be brought to the same negative result. There are, to be sure, here and there points in the text which the rules do not cover, but we have reason only to wonder that in executing so immense and intricate a task as that undertaken by the Prātiṣākhyā there should have been so few oversights. These, so far as they have been discovered, have been pointed out in the notes; I recapitulate them here. The word rakshā (p. rakshā), at i.4.24, should have been exempted in some way from the operation of rule iii.8, which requires its ā to be shortened when separated from the following word. Devi, at vi.1.71, is made prayagraha by the strict letter of rule i.61 (see under i.59), though the passage in which it occurs is not one to which that rule was meant to apply. In the rehearsal of cases of elision or non-elision of initial a (chapters xi. and xii.), there are a couple of cases which the commentator is driven into attempting to provide for by forced and false interpretations of the rules (see under i.61 for ye 'ntarikshe at iv.5.112, and under xi.3 for ye upariṣāhu at i.4.33); and I have noted beside (under xii.8, at the end) only so agnih at v.2.33 as unaccounted for thus far (its companion case, ārdhvo aṣṭhit, is read first in an ukiṣṇa-passage, at iv.2.14, as Prof. Weber has pointed out to me; and so agnih may yet find a like solution). And in the enumeration of cases of interior ṇ (see under xvi.29), two compound words appear to have been overlooked, svādushaṅsudah (iv.8.69) and strī-saṅsudum (ii.5.11).
I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Prātiśākhya to the Sanhitā is not absolute, since I possess neither an index verborum to the latter nor a pāda-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Prātiśākhya probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Tāttvārtha-Sanhitā, the only pākhā left us (unless the Kāthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Tāttvārtha-Prātiśākhya, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the textbook emanates directly from the Tāttvārtha school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and "holders of pākhās" referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber's notes to the Caranaavyāha, in his Indische Studien, iii.256 ff.), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Māṁśākās (v.41), Ahvārakās (xxiii.14), and Tāttvārthas (xxiii.15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school; its rules are those which apply "here," "with us," and only outsiders need specification; besides, the Tāttvārthas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the "schools" of Vedic study and their accepted texts or pākhās, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or prātiśākhyas; but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the pākhās, and that some were only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoepical form of the Tāttvārtha-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Prātiśākhya.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of h before surd gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix.2), nor of n before palatals (against v.24) and l (against v.25), nor the omission of ū (required by v.38) between ū and s, nor of the various duplications and insertions and aspirations taught in chapter xiv., since these are matters on which we are to expect discordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Sanhitā of anuvṛtra as an alphabetic element, while the Prātiśākhya wavers (see under ii.30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or anuvākās in the recorded text into fifties of words, or kandikās, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e. g., of the h of ucmāsi, at the end of i.3.61: see under iii.
18). The retention of the final \( v \) of \( av \) and \( dv \) (from \( o \) and \( du \)) before a vowel is also against the letter of rule x.19, and in accordance with a dissident opinion quoted in x.21. The kampa of a circumflex accent followed by a circumflex, consistently made in the Sanhitā, is only mentioned in the Prātiṣṭākhya (at xix.3) as taught by some authorities, nor is the form of the doctrine taught in full and clear accordance with the practice followed. And it is very questionable whether the prescription of nasalization of a final protracted \( a \) (xv.8) is not merely reported by the treatise as made by certain specified teachers. These are small matters, and few, and a degree of doubt, perhaps, hangs over them all; but they are worthy of notice, as being all that we have on which to found any discordance between the Sanhitā of the manuscripts and that of the Prātiṣṭākhya. While, on the other hand, the points of accordance, even in matters which are most specially characteristic of the Tastrapiya-text, are very numerous and important.*

Of course, the existence of other forms of the text besides the ordinary sanhitā is assumed by the Prātiṣṭākhya. Such a work without a pada-text at least as its foundation would be a thing inconceivable. Our treatise does not give, as the others do (see add. note 1 to the Ath. Prāt.), formal rules for the construction of any of the other texts; its nearest approach to doing so is in the third chapter, where (see note to iii.1) it teaches us what final or initial vowels, long in sanhitā, are to be shortened whenever the word in which they occur is thrown out of sanhitī with its next neighbor—a form of statement which applies to kramu and jatā text as well as pada. The occurrence of such terms as pada, nāmpada, iṅgya, avagraha, implies also the familiar usages of the pada-text; and the employment of iti is directly alluded to in iv.4 and ix.20, and indirectly assumed in the use of ārha in ix.21 and x.13. What were the limits to the use of iti in the pada-text held by the school from which the Prātiṣṭākhya proceeded does not appear: its combination in the extant pada with the prepositions (thus pre ’iti for pra, vi ’iti for vi, and so on—and without restriction to the ten words which alone are allowed by the Prātiṣṭākhya, at i.15, to count as prepositions) does not come to light anywhere either in the text or commentary. Nor does the treatise chance to show whether its pada treated the iṅgyas or separable compounds after the same manner as the extant Rik and Atharvan texts—writing simply upa-āvah, for example—or as the extant padas of the Yajur-Veda (including that to the Tastrapiya-Sanhitā) and the one assumed by the Atharva-Prātiṣṭākhya (see note to Ath. Prāt. iv.74)—writing upāyava ity upa-āvah. The commentator, however, accepts and follows the latter method. Reason has been

* I have pointed out under rule ii.25 that the peculiar Tastrapiya orthography of such words as uṣuṣ, tuṣuṣ, apuṣṭa finds no occasion for mention in the Prātiṣṭākhya; nor is the very strange change of a final labial in certain words to a guttural (as in triṣṭhun indriya, ii.4.11; triṣṭhun yādyā, ii.6.25; triṣṭhunabhā, v.1.4) noticed anywhere; I presume (I have omitted to obtain distinct information upon the point) that in every such case the pada-text also has the guttural—which would take the whole matter out of the sphere of the Prātiṣṭākhya.
found (under xx.3) for questioning whether in the *pada*-text belonging to the makers of the Prātiṣṭākhyā the peculiar rule followed by the known Taṭṭṭiriya *pada*-text as to the accentuation of its separable words was of force. The latter text is of a very peculiar, not to say an anomalous character in many respects; in these it is supported by the Prātiṣṭākhyā, so far as the latter goes (I will instance as examples only the treatment of *yojā* and *eud*, and other cases noticed under iii.15, of *nīcād*, v.8, and of *ekāikuyā*, v.19): whether it does not contain other peculiarities which are ignored by the Prātiṣṭākhyā, and which consequently prove it not to be the one which this presupposes, I cannot say; but, from an item or two of information received from Prof. Weber, I imagine that it does so. The question will, at any rate, be cleared up by the discussion of the Taṭṭṭiriya *pada*-text which Weber, as I rejoice to learn, intends to add to his transliterated edition of the Sanhitā, now going through the press.

I attribute it only to a (very unusual) awkwardness of statement on the part of the Prātiṣṭākhyā, that it appears to leave a part of the words ending in an original *o* out of the category of *pragrahās* (see under iv.7), and so to deny them the right to be followed by *iti*, as they are in fact followed in the known *pada*-text.

The *krama*-text ("word-krama") appears to be mentioned in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, and more unequivocally in xxv.6 (all of them, however, of suspicious authenticity as original parts of the Prātiṣṭākhyā: see below); but it is only three times quoted in the comment (under vii.2, ix.17, 20), and so makes but a small figure there as compared with the *jatā*. Examples from the latter are given under iii.1, v.33, viii.8,12,16,35, ix.22, x.9,10,13, xi.9,16,17, xii. 7, xx.2, and sometimes in considerable number and at great length; and once (under xx.2), where the commentator has occasion to mention the various kinds of text, he specifies *sāṁhitā, pada*, and *jatā*, ignoring the *krama* altogether. This seems strange, inasmuch as the *jatā* is regarded* as a secondary form of *krama*, and founded upon it; but the simple explanation appears to be that the *krama* brings up no questions of *sandhi* which do not arise also in *sāṁhitā* and *pada*, and so needs no special attention where only methods of *sandhi* are taught; while the inversions of the *jatā* bring new elements into contact, and so create new cases of combination which require to be settled. If we may trust the commentator's interpretation, rules viii.12,35 are given expressly for cases that arise only in *jatā*-text; under viii.16, he commits an obviously false explanation in order to reach a *jatā*-case; under v.33, he makes a *sāndhi* which the Prātiṣṭākhyā certainly never intended, because it is required by the letter of the rule, in a case which the makers of the treatise had apparently overlooked; under xi.16,17, the *jatā* is resorted to, apparently with reason, for counter-examples to justify the form of statement adopted in the rule. The weight of evidence, upon the whole, is decidedly in favor of

---

*See Dr. Thibaut’s "Jaṭāpāṭāla," Leipzig, 1870.*
the assumption that the peculiar \textit{jatā} combinations were had in view by those who constructed the Prātiṣaṭhyā—or, at least, by those who brought it into its present form. I would add, that it seems to me not unlikely that the term \textit{vikrama} (in the sense of \textit{kramavātriti}) signifies the \textit{jatā}-text in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5.

The names of the divisions of the Sanhitā, \textit{kāndu}, \textit{prapūta} (not \textit{prapāthaka}), and \textit{anuvāda}, are found only in the commentary (see Index); respecting the absence of the subdivision of \textit{anuvādas} into \textit{kāndikās} see above, p. 427 (also under viii.35 and xxiv.6, where this division is acknowledged by the commentator). But the Prātiṣaṭhyā itself gives names to certain parts of the Sanhitā; which names, for the sake of convenience, I will put together here, with a reference to the rule under which the part designated by each is stated (for further details of their occurrence, see the Index): they are \textit{agni} (iii.9), \textit{ishṭi} (iv.52), \textit{ukhyā} (ix.20), \textit{graha} (ix.20), \textit{prsthya} (ix.20), \textit{mahāprsthya} (xi.3), \textit{yādyā} (iii.9), \textit{rudra} (xi.3), \textit{vājapeya} (xi.9), \textit{vikaraka} (xi.3), \textit{vikarana} (xi.3), and \textit{hāinavavarṇya} (ix.20).

A marked feature of the Prātiṣaṭhyā is its frequent citation of authorities by name. The list of names has been repeatedly put together by students of the Prātiṣaṭhyās (in Weber's \textit{Indische Studien}, iv.77–8, may be found notices respecting the historical and geographical indications derivable from them), but ought not to be omitted here also. It is as follows (including the cases of mention in the commentary, distinguished by an added \textit{e}):

\begin{itemize}
  \item Āgniveṣṭya, ix.4.
  \item Āgniveṣṭiyaṇa, xiv.32.
  \item Atreyā, v.31, xvii.8.
  \item Ukhya, vii.22, x.20, xvi.24.
  \item Uṭṭamottariya, viii.20.
  \item Kāṇḍamāṇa, ix.1, xv.7.8c.
  \item Kāṇḍīṇya, v.38, xvii.3.4c, xix.2; (\textit{śaśavirya}), v.40c, xvii.4.5c.
  \item Kāṇḍālaya, v.40c, xvii.2: (Kāṇḍāleśa, xix.4c, xxiii.17c).
  \item Gāumāṇa, v.38.
  \item Pāushakaraśādi, v.37,38,40c, xiii.16, xiv.2,3c, xvii.6.
  \item Pāthakaleśa, ix.6., xiv.11,17, xvii.5.
  \item Plākshi, v.38, ix.6, xiv.10,11c,17, xvii.5.
  \item Bhādeśā, xiv.12.
  \item Bāhārvāja, xvii.3: (Bāhārvāja, v.40c).
  \item Mācukiya (or Māyikāya), x.22.
  \item Vāṣapra, x.23.
  \item Vālmiki, v.36, ix.4, xvii.6.
  \item Cāṅkhaṇaya, xv.7.8c.
  \item Cālītyāyaṇa, v.40, xvii.1,3c,4c.7, xvii.2.
  \item Śāmkṛtya, vii.21, x.21, xvi.16.
  \item Hārīṇa, xiv.18,19c.20c.21c.22c.
\end{itemize}

Of the three schools cited, the names have been already given (above, p. 427). And we have besides \textit{devṛyād} quoted in i.46; \textit{ekē devṛyād} in v.30, ix.5, xiii.3, xiv.3,25; \textit{ekē} simply in i.47, ii.19, 27,47, v.39, vii.19, x.19, xiv.38, xv.2,6, xvii.1, xix.3, xii.13; \textit{purē} in xv.9; and \textit{sarve} in xviii.7.

The questions which all this array of authorities is called in to help settle may be classified as follows:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{I. Matters of phonetic theory, with others of a general nature.}
\end{enumerate}
The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, i.46-7; with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the Prātiṣṭākhyā itself, expressed in rules 44-5; there is nothing else like it in the treatise; perhaps we may best assume that rules 44-7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of anusvāra and svaraḥkṛti, ii.19. The quality of the a-element in ā and āu, ii.27. The phonetic character of ā and ā, i.47-8. The nature of the combination of e or o with (elided) a, xi.19. The occurrence of lingual l, xiii.16: this the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the Prātiṣṭākhyā. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, xiv. 32-3. Nasalization of final vowels, xvi.6-8: the comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), xv.9. Correction of the final theme-vowel of neuters in as, is, us in the nomin. pl. before ṛ, xvi.16. Utterance of di final in a single case, xvi.24. Degrees of nasalization, xvii.1-5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, xvii.6-8. Kampa between two circumflex syllables, xix.3-5. Use of the term yama for the nasal counterparts, xxii.13. Utterance of the syllable om, xxvii.1-7. Yama-tones held by certain schools, xxiii.14-19.

II. Matters of sandhi or euphonious combination.

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial ā, v.36-41; where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the Prātiṣṭākhyā, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at ix.1, the dropping of final ā before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule x. 19, prescribing the invariable omission of final v, was not meant to be modified by x.21. That the treatment of anusvāra as a distinct consonantal element is put by xv.2-3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone; it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the Prātiṣṭākhyā with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to ii.30). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with l as reported in xiv.2-3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (xiv.7) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the Prātiṣṭākhyā is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of m before y and v, v.30 and xiii.3 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration); the combination of p with ḷ and of n with ṇ before a consonant, v.36-7; the sandhi of esṭar with rāyāḥ, vii.19-22; the treatment of ā before an initial consonant, ix.4-6; the utterance or omission of final y and v, x.20-23; the insertion
of a surd mute between spirant and mute, xiv.10–11; aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, xiv.13; duplication in certain specified cases, xiv.17–22,25–8 (but the comment treats 28 as the direct prescription of the authors of the treatise); and vikrama accent after pracaya, xix.2.

Thus it is evident that, while this arraying of discordant opinions is a quite distinctive and a very interesting feature of our Prātiṣākhya, it does not, except to a very limited extent, detract from the character of the latter as a consistent and positive record of the views of a school of Vedic study. Nor is it fairly to be brought into any relation to the peculiar character of the Black Yajur-Veda, as a text of which the constituent parts had been gathered together more miscellaneously, and less fully fused into conformity, than the other Vedic texts. No text could be so definitely constructed, and be made the object of so thorough and systematic study as the setting up of a text-book like the Prātiṣākhya evinces, without assuming an established character, and being as authoritatively handed down and as accurately learned as any Vedic text.

It is by no means improbable that a part of these citations of authorities have been interpolated in the Prātiṣākhya after the latter ceased to be a mere body of practical rules for the guidance of a school, and, in virtue of its thoroughness and comprehensiveness, gained more the character of a phonetic "treatise" on the Black Yajur-Veda, and was used in other schools than that which originated it. The commentator (as will be pointed out below) uses the citations as a cover under which to put upon the treatise certain doctrines which do not properly belong to it; and in other hands it may have undergone a like distortion in other directions.

Accretions of other kinds to the original text of the Prātiṣākhya are plausibly to be presumed in various places. All the metrical rules (namely xvii.8, xxii.14,15, xxiii.2,14–15,20, xxiv.5,6) are to be set down without much question as unauthentic; they are proved such by their character not less than by their form; and several of them are found in other parts of the Prātiṣākhya literature. We may include in the same category, indeed, with considerable show of reason, the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters, and all that follows the twenty-first, on the score of content alone: a part of their matter is inferior repetition of what had been given before; a part deals with subjects, and in a style, unsuited to a Prātiṣākhya. That there is room at least to suspect the intrusion of rules in other parts of the work has been pointed out here and there in the notes: at this place, I will merely refer to certain rules which are put in strangely out of place, interrupting the natural connection of passages: such are i.25–7,60, vii.13,14, xiv.12–3, xv.6–9, xvi.24, xxii.3–8; of these, only vii.13,14 are indispensable parts of a treatise like the present.

Another notable characteristic of our Prātiṣākhya is its sparing use of technical terms belonging to general grammar, consequent upon its refusal to deal with words or classes of words according to their grammatical character, its laborious definition of its subject-
matter in the Sanskrit by position and surroundings merely. There are but two cases of its departure from this method: namely, its use of *adopa* at xiii.15, and of *karśkhyāsnu* at xvi.25; and in neither one is its success precisely of a character to make us wish it had gone farther in the same direction. This peculiarity renders impossible any profitable comparison of its phraseology with that of other grammatical works.

The general character of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā is that of an earnest, sensible, consistent treatise, thoroughly worked out and dealing with its proper task with completeness and accuracy, and confining itself quite strictly to that task. There is no labored feebleness and artificial obscurity, as in parts of the Vājasaneyi-Prātiṣṭhākhyā, nor any inclusion of matters pertaining to general grammar, as in the Atharvā-Prātiṣṭhākhyā. It has its minor inaccuracies and inconsistencies, its obscurities of *anuvṛtti* inseparable from the *śatār*-style, and its rules that seem to defy interpretation: but these are inconspicuous blemishes; no one of the other works of its class is more thoroughly respectable throughout.

Turning, now, to the more special consideration of the commentary, we have to note, as the most important point, a break of continuity between it and the Prātiṣṭhākhyā. The commentator is not the recipient of a certain tradition, that gives him surely and precisely the import of the rules which he has to expound; the text-book has come down to him as something authoritative and sacred, indeed, yet in some points obscure, so that he is in doubt as to what it means; in others imperfect, so that it needs emendation; in others not in accordance with the views held by him and his school respecting the text, so that these have to be interpreted into it.

Thus, in the first place, the instances are frequent in which, to his own interpretation of a rule, he adds a different view held by other interpreters: either without naming them (as under i.19,21, xiii.16, xiv.5,11, xvii.5, xiii.7), or referring to one of his special sources and predecessors (as under ii.19,33), or setting off against one another the views of two of these, Vararuci and Māhiṣeyya (as under ii.14, iv.40, viii.19,20,22, xviii.7). In a large proportion of the instances, it is true, the difference of opinion is upon some utterly trivial point, turning on the interpretation of a *tu* or the like, and only illustrating the hair-splitting tendencies of the native exegetes; but in some cases it is of more consequence, and once goes so far as to question (under viii.20) whether an authority referred to is Uttamottariya or Dvāvuttamottariya. Again, where a rule is really obscure, the commentator has sometimes, palpably, nothing more than guesses to give at its meaning, and ventures two or three of them (as under ii.2, xiv.22, xv.9, xix.5, xxiii.17), among which it would be hard to choose the least acceptable; or, if he gives but one (as under xi.19, xviii.4, xxiii.18,19), it is no less unsatisfactory. There are yet other cases in which what seems to be the evident meaning of a rule is misapprehended and distorted,
without reason (as under ii.52, iv.4, v.29, vii.11, xix.3). Occasionally, false interpretations, of every degree of violence, are committed, for the purpose either of correcting an oversight or inaccuracy of the Prātiṣākhyā (as under i.61, iii.1, viii.16, xi.3, xvi.26), or else of imposing upon the latter a doctrine which it was not intended to teach, but which is held by the commentator and his school (as under i.58, xiii.4, xxi.14, 16). For this last purpose, too, advantage is sometimes taken of the citations of varying opinions so liberally made in the rules; the dictum of the quoted authority is declared to be approved in usage, or is even imposed upon the Prātiṣākhyā, to the setting aside of what the latter really prescribes. Thus, Pāṇinharaśādi's doctrine of the conversion of ṭ to ḍ (xiii.16), which belongs neither to the Prātiṣākhyā nor to the Sanshātā, is accepted; and the duplication of consonant-groups beginning with ṭ which is ascribed (xiv.3) to certain unspecified teachers; and Plākshi's mode of treatment of a spirant before a first mute (xiv.17), which has as further result a misinterpretation of xxi.16; and a part of rule xiv.26, respecting the duplication of ṭ; and rule xiv.28, to which a strange interpretation is given, prepared for by a yet stranger one of xiii.4; and rules xv.2, 3, which require anusvāra instead of nasalization of a vowel; and the nasalization of a final protracted a (xv.8); and two rules (xviii.1, 6) from among those which concern the utterance of oṁ; and rule x.21, as to the retention of final v, is given the preference over 19, which requires its omission; and the first rule (v.38) as to the combination of initial ḍ with a preceding mute is ratified; and, in the variety of opinions respecting the circumflex tone, one (i.46) is selected for approval. In the few cases where the commentator does not express himself as to whether a rule is ishta or anishṭa (they are ii.19, 27, 47–9, xi.19, xix.2, xxi.13, xxiii.14–9), there may be question whether he means to have it regarded as approved, or thinks the matter of no consequence either way. There remain the majority of cases, in which he stands by the Prātiṣākhyā, rejecting the intruded doctrine (for further details, refer to the words ishta and anishṭa in the Sanskrit index).

Besides these more serious cases of misapprehension or intended modification of the teachings of his text-book, the commentator is not free from the ordinary and characteristic weaknesses of his craft in India: from feeble and puerile expositions, from attempts to find a wonderful pregnancy of meaning in some innocent particle or unintended difference of expression, from groundless etymologies, and the like; to these attention has been directed in the notes; and they are not of consequence enough to be recapitulated here.

For determining the personality of the commentator we have no data whatever, and for his place and period we have only the references to other authorities, which, though too few and indefinite to yield any stabile result, need to be put together in this note. The three earlier commentators on whom the work is avowedly founded—namely, Vararuci, Māhisheya, and Ātreyā—are repeatedly appealed to, especially (as has been pointed out above)
in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index). Vararuci is a name very common in grammatical literature; to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme. Nor does Ātreya, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p. 430) twice quoted in the Prātiṣākhya itself. From Pāṇini, rules are directly quoted under ii.12, iii.9, v.1, xiii.16, xiv.4, xxiv.3; and the pāṇiniyā or the vyākaraṇa are farther referred to under i.15, 53, 57, ii. 47, xviii.1. Pāṇinean terms are, further, naṅ, i.60, x.22, nic, ii.17, hāl, ix.24, yar, xiv.4, and lyap, xxi.14. The Mahābhāṣya is professedly quoted under ii.7, v.2; but the passage given is actually from Kāṇyāta’s gloss. A definition is taken from the Amarakoṣa under i.1. Kauhaleya is quoted under xix.4, xxiii.17; and the Kālanirnaya under xviii.1. The Brāhmaṇa of the Vaiṣṇavayins is referred to under xiv.33, and extracts from the Mahābhārata and various Purāṇas are set forth under xxiv.6.

But the authority most often appealed to is the “Cikšā,” by which the commentator intends a very different work from the pāṇiniyā Cikšā, and one much more comprehensive. He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i.1 (three times), ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3, xx.12, xxi.1, 15, xxii.13, xxiii.10, 17. Among these extracts are (under i.1, ii.2, xxi.1, xxiii.10) several passages which are found also in the pāṇiniyā Cikšā; and among the metrical extracts which are now and then given without specifying their source (under xiv.23, 28, 28, xix.3, xxi.1, 6, 15, xxiii.17, 19, xxiv.6) are likewise one or two (under xxiii. 17, 19) which occur in the same treatise. That the commentator is inclined to regard his Cikšā as of higher authority than the Prātiṣākhya itself was pointed out under xx.12; that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tāvānirya-Sānhitā may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi.15) in illustration of the varieties of svarambhakti.
ANALYSIS.

I. EXPLANATORY: TERMS AND THEIR USE, INTERPRETATION OF RULES, ETC.

1. Terms and their use:

kāra forms names of letters, xxii.4; of vowels, i.16; of consonants, i.17; exceptions, i.18.—varśa forms names of letters, xxii.4; includes short, long, and protracted vowels, i.20.—ephas forms name of r, i.19.—varga, with first mute, forms name of series, i.27.—a forms name of consonant, i.21; of a cited word, i.22.—aprkta, a pada of a single letter, i.54.—asapragha, first member of a separable word, i.49.—kopa, loss, i.57.—upasarga, 'preposition,' includes what words, i.15.—offices of ca, api, tu, aha, evo, etc. na. xxii.5–8.

2. Interpretation of rules and forms, etc.:

an increment, or word having euphonic change or elision, put in nominative, i.23; or in its text-form, i.24.—product of euphonic change put in accusative, i.28.—next element, or more, taken in case of doubt, i.25,26.—a cited pada means that pada only, i.50; but applies to it even when euphonically altered, or preceded by a or an, i.51–3.—rules for a specified passage apply only there, and peremptorily, i.59; but a series of three or more words, if repeated, reads as the first time, i.61.—pārca, 'preceding,' and uttara, 'following,' designate a word only under the specified circumstances, i.29,30.—continued implication is of what stood last, i.58.—words to be combined, and rules to be applied, in their order, v.3.—a separable word treated as two words, except in enumeration, i.48.—an aprkta treated as initial and as final, i.55.—elision and euphonic alteration affect single letters only, i.56: after elision of y or r, no farther combination made, x.25.—in prapraphas, and in enumeration of words containing anuēdra, a cause in another word maintains its force, i.60.

II. PHONETIC: ENUMERATION, CLASSIFICATION, DESCRIPTION OF ALPHABETIC SOUNDS, QUANTITY, ACCENT, ETC.

1. Enumeration and classification of alphabetic sounds:

nine simple vowels [a, a, i, ï, ñ, u, û, ù], i.2; sixteen vowels [the above, with r, r, l, s, ñ, o, ña], i.5; the rest consonants, i.6—mutes, i.7; in five series, i.10; called 'first,' etc., i.11; semivowels [y, r, l, v], i.8; spirants [x, ñ, ñ, ñ, ñ], i.9; surd consonants, i.12; ñ, i.13; sonants, i.14.

2. Mode of formation of alphabetic sounds:

general mode of production of articulate sounds, ii.2,3,7, xvii.7,8, xxii.1,2, xxiii.2,3.—difference of surds, sonants, and ñ, i.4–6.—mode of utterance of vowels, in general, ii.4,8,31,32; in particular, of a, d, i.12: of i, i, ii.20–22; of u, û, ii.20,34,35; of r, r, r, i.18; of e, ii.15–17,23; of ñ, ii.26–8; of ñ, ii.13,14; of ña, ii.26,27,29.—similar vowels, i.3,4.—mode of utterance of consonants, in general, ii.33,34; of sonants, i.8; of surds, ii.10,11; of ñ and sonant aspirates, ii.6,9; of nasality, ii.52; difference of nasal quality in different nasal sounds, xvii.1–4; of nasal mutes, ii.30.—mode of utterance of consonants in particular: of k-series, ii.35; of c-series, ii.36; of t-series, ii.37; of t-series, ii.38; of p-series, ii.39; of y, ii.40; of r, ii.41; of l, ii.42; of v, ii.43; of ñd-
3. Quantity:
quantity of short and long vowels, i.31–3,35; of protracted vowels, i.36; of consonants, i.37; of anuvrddra (or nasalized vowel), i.34, xvii.5; of syllables ("heavy" and "light"), xxii.14,15; of pauses and hiatus, xxii.13; of om, xviii.1.

4. Accent:
general character of accents: acute, i.38, xxii.9; grave, i.39, xxii.10; circumflex, i.40–47, xvii.6.—varieties of independent circumflex: nitya or original, xx.2; its quality, xx.9: kha/dha, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its quality, xx.9: abhinidha, xx.4; its occurrence, xii.9; its quality, xx.10: pra/nidha, xx.5; its occurrence, x.17; its quality, xx.11.—enclitic circumflex: its occurrence, xiv.29–33; its varieties: pra/nidha, xx.3; its quality, xx.11: pada/nida, xx.6; its quality, xx.12: tari/vid/ana, xx.7; its quality, xx.12.—prasasa accent, xxi.10,11.—vitra/na, xii.1,2; its quality, xvii.6.—kampa, between two circumflexes, xix.3–5.—accent resulting from combination of two syllables into one, x.10,12,16,17, xii.9–11.—accent of om, xviii.2,3,5–7.—accent of protracted vowel (?), xv.9.

5. Syllabication:
division of syllables, xxi.1–9.

6. Mode and tones of utterance:
general mode of utterance, xxiii.20; the three sthanas or qualities, xxii.11; the seven do., xxiii.4–10; the twenty-one yamas or tones, xxii.12, xxiii.11–19.
—tone of om, xvii.4.

III. Sandhi or euphonic combination:
introductory, v.1–3; four kinds of combination, xxiv.1–4.

1. Final vowels:
final vowels not liable to combination, pragra/has, iv.1–54, x.24; special cases of uncombining finals, x.13,18; protracted finals, x.24; their nasalization, xv.7,8.—nasalization of final vowels, xv.6.—the particle u, ix.16,17.—lengthening of final a, iii.2–6,8–12; of final i and u, iii.7,13,14.
combination of simple final vowels: with similar initial, x.2; of final a with initial vowels, x.4–9; exceptions, x.13; lost in certain cases before e or o, x.14; i, i, u, final, x.15, ix.17; exceptions, ix.16, x.18.—combination of final diphthongs, ix.11,12,14,15; e and o with initial a (see also Initial vowels), ix.13; treatment of the resulting y and v, x.19–23; after their loss, no further combination, x.25.
accent resulting from combinations of final vowels, x.10,12,16,17, xx.1,5,9,11; resulting nasalization, x.11.

2. Initial vowels:
initial vowel lengthened, iii.15.—loss of a after final e or o, ix.13, xi.1; detail of cases of loss, and exceptions, xi.2–19, xii.1–8; resulting accent, xii.9–11, xx.4,10—r to ar in special case, v.9.
3. **Final consonants:**

surd to nasal before nasal, viii.2; to sonant before all other sonant letters, viii.3; and, in a special case, before m, viii.4; to aspirate before spirant, xiv.12,13.

visarjanavya to spirant before surds, ix.2–6; except before ks, ix.3; to sh before t, in certain cases, vi.5—omitted before spirant and surd mute, ix.1; also in sa etc., v.15–17; also before r, viii.16,17; special case before r, viii.18–22—changed to r, viii.6; do. after a and d, viii.8–15; exceptional cases, v.10.

—changed to s or sh before k, kh, p, in compound words, viii.23; do. in independent words, viii.24–35; exceptions, viii.32,33—ad final to o, before a and sonants, ix.7,8; special exception, viii.18–22; before other vowels, ix.10; da final, ix.9,10.

final mutes: ́ doubled before vowel, ix.18; ́ before s, sh, v.32—t before s, sh, v.33—t before palatals, v.22,23; before t, v.25; before r, v.22—n before palatals, v.20,21,24,37, xv.1–3; before t, vi.14, xv.1–3; before t, v.25,26,31, xv.1–3; before r, v.24; before s, sh, v.33; changed to r or y [i.e. to anusvāra, xv.1–3] ix.20–24; doubled before vowel, ix.19—m before mutes and semivowels, v.27–31, xiii.3; before spirants and r, xiii.1,2, xv.1–3; unchanged before rd, xiii.4; special case of loss, v.18.

4. **Initial consonants:**

r to ch, v.34–7.— s to sh, in words independent or compound, v.10, vi.1,2,4,6–13—t to t. vii.13.—h after a mute, v.38–41.—n to n, vii.2,4.

elision of initial m, v.12; of v, v.13; of s, v.14.

5. **Interior consonants:**

t, th to ṭ, ṭh. vii.13,14.—n to n, in same word with its cause, xiii.6–9,11,13–15; in other word, vii.3,5,6–12,15,16.—s to sh, vi.3.—s to ṣ, xiii.16.

6. **Abnormal insertions and elisions. Duplication, etc.:**

insertion of s v.4–7; of d, v.8; of surd mute between sibilant and mute, xiv.9–11; of nasal counterparts (yamasa and niśīkṣa), xxi.12–14; of avarābhakta, xxi.15–16.

elision of initial m, n, s, see Initial consonants.—in composition of forms of eka, v.18,19.

duplication in consonant-groups, xiv.1–7,14–28; of initial ch, kh, bh in certain cases, xiv.8.

IV. **Sundries:**

enumeration and specification of cases of ṣ, otherwise than euphonic, in interior of words, xiii.9,10,12; of anusvāra, do. do., xv.4,5, xxvi.2–31.

requirements in a scholar or teacher, xxiv.5,6.
INDEX OF CITATIONS

MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TAITTIRIYA-SANHITA.

This index contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text. If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence. It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations; and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter-example, by the makers of the treatise; whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on.

Taittiriya-Pratisthakya and Tribhushyaratna.

439
SANSKRIT INDEX.

The following Index contains the whole matter of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā itself—both the proper vocabulary of the treatise, and the words and parts of words which it quotes from the Sanhitā; the latter being distinguished by being printed with spaced letters. To this is added a very liberal selection from the vocabulary of the commentary; perhaps more liberal than may seem to some worth while, but I preferred to err in this direction rather than the contrary. The references to the commentary are designated by a prefixed c; and an added v indicates that the word is to be sought among the various readings given at the foot of the comment.

a, xiii.15.
akāra, i.23; -c.i.24, xvi.25.
akāra, ix.7.
añca, iii.1, iv.23, xvi.21.
añcadbhūtā, xvi.29.
añcam, añcāya, xvi.29.
añcāyā, xvi.29.
añca, xvi.29.
añca, xii.10, xvi.29.
añcam, añcāya, añcam, añcāyā, añcam, añcāyā, xvi.29.
añcāyā, xvi.29.
añcāyā, xvi.29.
añcāyā, xvi.30.
añcam, añcāyā, xvi.29.
añcam, añcāyā, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
añcam, xvi.29.
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adhit, iii.5.8 (instead of agha).
adhu, vii.7.
advita, ii.35.
adharāni metaphatā, ix.22.
adharoshtha, c.i.39.43.
adhistā, c.i.28.
adhi, iii.9.
adhiya, xi.7.
adhi, i.35.
adika, xvi.5.-cii.12.5,28. xvi.19, xvii.1: and adhika.
adikarana, c.i.59.
adikāra, c.i.12, ii.1, ii.1, iv.1.8, etc.
adikaraka, xii.6.-c c.3.
adigama, c.i.1.
adishavane, iv.11.
adhi, iii.7.
adhyaya, c.i.1, xiv.4.5.28.
adhyārtha, i.28.-cii.25.58. xix.19, xxi.1.
adhyāya, c.i.61. x, xii.15, xii.3.16. xiv.4, xix.5, xxiv.3, and endings of chapters.
adhydvar, c.i.34, xvii.8, xxiv.5.
adhar, xi.18.
adharāni virvatah, xii.32.
adhyārtha, xii.8.
andavīn, v.21.
annada, iii.12.
annātikārata, c.vii.15.
anattah, viii.8.
anantaś, i.41.44, xxii.16.-c c.12. etc., iv.53, x.12, xvi.13.
anantodita, xvi.5.
anapēkha, xii.18.
anamvā, xi.17.
anarthā, c.i.23.
anarthakā, c.iv.23, viii.13.
anarthakā, c.i.42.15, xvi.15, xi.5.
anavagrabha, c.i.8.10.12.-4.
anavasitkā, c.iv.22.
anīdeva, ii.20.-c ii.21.
andāyudhīta, viii.10.
-anān, vi.14.
animika, cxxi.17.
anārā, cxxi.22.
anāyugama, viii.13.-c c.8.
anītya, c.xi.4.
anishtha, c.i.4.21, ii.20, iv.23. v.5.31, ix.6, x.11, xii.3.
xiv.22, xvi.29.
anishṭā, xi.4.
an iti, xi.12.
anu, xix.5.7.
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anukarṣaṇa, xiv.28.
anucitraṇa, c.iv.23.
anudama, xiv.24, xii.12.
anudīta, i.39.45.46, iii.15.
iv.43, vi.4, vii.9.12,16, xii.12.
xii.9,10, xiv.29, xvi.8.
xvii.2, xx.2, xxi.10.:c x.
xii.6, xvi.10, xvi.10.
ixi.17.
anudīṭātara, c.i.44.
anuṣikā, c.iii.30, v.26.-8, 31.
xix.11, xvi.18, xxi.14.-c c.1, ii.19.30, v.29.-31, xvi.23, xv.7.-9, xviii.1.
(xo): and simun, ānuṣāntika.
anupada, c.xiv.6.
anupapati, c.iv.23, xiv.4.
anupāpaṇa, c.12.19, iv.23.
anupāpaṇda, c.xxii.7.


antara, xii.17.
anya, ii.11.34, xvi.14.-c c.19, ii.2,19, ix.1, xiv.5, xv.9.
anya, vii.16.
anya, c.i.1, xiv.23: and anonyānye, poras-porasa.
anavarta, c.i.3.
anavartaka, c.xxii.10.
anavāraka, c.34, x.x.17.
anavārya, c.xxii.14, xv.10.
anvadā, i.68.-c ii.3.16, vi.3, vii.3.6, viii.12, ix.22, xi.4,6,11, xii.8, xiv.4, xxii.6.
anvāda, c.xxii.5.-c c.52.
i.13.18, v.3.3, xi.4, xiv.6,8,20, xv.4.
appk, xi.6.
appāra, c.i.21, xi.1, xvi.7.9.
apūrṇa, xi.12.
apūrṇa, c.xxv.1.
apūrṇidāka, c.xxv.6.
apukṣa, c.i.14.
apaṣa, c.vii.24.
apāta, iii.12.
apāda, c.16, ix.8.
apata, c.xii.6.
apata, c.xxxi.13.
apaśa, c.xxii.17.
aprāt, iv.11.
apraka, i.26.


anukarṣaṇa, c.xiv.28.
anucitraṇa, c.iv.23.
anudama, xiv.24, xii.12.
anudīta, i.39.45.46, iii.15.
iv.43, vi.4, vii.9.12,16, xii.12.
xii.9,10, xiv.29, xvi.8.
xvii.2, xx.2, xxi.10.:c x.
xii.6, xvi.10, xvi.10.
ixi.17.
anudīṭātara, c.i.44.
anuṣikā, c.iii.30, v.26.-8, 31.
xix.11, xvi.18, xxi.14.-c c.1, ii.19.30, v.29.-31, xvi.23, xv.7.-9, xviii.1.
(xo): and simun, ānuṣāntika.
anupada, c.xiv.6.
anupapati, c.iv.23, xiv.4.
anupāpaṇa, c.12.19, iv.23.
anupāpaṇda, c.xxii.7.


antara, xii.17.
anya, ii.11.34, xvi.14.-c c.19, ii.2,19, ix.1, xiv.5, xv.9.
anya, vii.16.
anya, c.i.1, xiv.23: and anonyānye, poras-porasa.
anavarta, c.i.3.
anavartaka, c.xxii.10.
anavāraka, c.34, x.x.17.
anavārya, c.xxii.14, xv.10.
anvadā, i.68.-c ii.3.16, vi.3, vii.3.6, viii.12, ix.22, xi.4,6,11, xii.8, xiv.4, xxii.6.
anvāda, c.xxii.5.-c c.52.
i.13.18, v.3.3, xi.4, xiv.6,8,20, xv.4.
apukṣa, c.i.14.
apaṣa, c.vii.24.
apāta, iii.12.
apāda, c.16, ix.8.
apata, c.xxxi.13.
apaśa, c.xxii.17.
aprayoga, c.i.18.
apravasta, cxiv.4.
apruwiddhi, c.xiii.14, 15.
apṣu yah, xi.17.
аббдак, viii.8.
abrātām, iv.52.
abhāj, viii.8.
abhāvāna, c.i.14, 33, 42, ii.20, 25.
avstaca, iv.52 etc.
abhāj, i.16.
abhī, xi.13.
abhikṣādā, c.xiii.7.
abhīṣhita, c.ii.2.
abhīdṛḍhāha, xii.7.
abhīdṛḍhāna, c.i.11, xvi.16.
abhīdṛḍhāna, xiv.9.--c.xiv. 10c.
abhīnālama, xx.4, 10.--c.xx.8.
abhīprāya, cxiv.5 15.
abhīmata, cxvii.8.
abhīṣu ṭātu, xi.6.
abhīvādiḥ, cv.23, 52.
abhī, ii.7.
abhīvaṃvahēkaḥ, c.ii.18.
abhīyāntara, c.ii.41.
abhīyāṭartin, xii.7.
-am, l.28.
amatra, xvi.8.
amanahprāya, cxviii.6.
amā, xi.7.
amiśra, ix.21.
amānta, x.13.
amā, iv.12.
amukhā, cxii.14.
amunacatā, iii.12.
amrutā, xv.21.
amakāś, vi.14.
amabāh, xi.17.
ay, ix.11.
ayajuh, vii.8.
ayam, vii.6.
ayam, iv.23.
ayam u, vi.2.
ayan, ix.21.
ayukta, cxii.9, xiv.5.
r. ar: samarpita, cxvi.24.
ar, v.9, x.8.
aratim, xi.17.
arathāḥ, xii.7.
ara, ix.21.
arṣah, xii.7.
arṣaṭā, xii.7.
arṣā, xii.7.
arṣā, ix.23.
arṣaḥ, xi.17.
artha, cxvii.14, 20, xii.7: arishtam, xii.17.
and ona, ov.-ov. arithaka,--ave, iv.54.
-srīdhaka.
arthaśstara, cxii.14.
arthaśstara, c.i.7, iv.47, xiv.4.
artha, i.37, 41, ii.26, xi.19: arishtam, xii.7.
and adhyātma.
ardhatiṣya, xvi.1 (mātra).
-ṭa), ii.25, xi.19, xii.1: 16.
arṭa, iv.11.
arṣamah, xii.7.
arpun, xii.17.
arṣamah, xii.12.
arṣamah, xii.17.
arṣamah, xii.8.
arṣaṇī, xi.12.
arṣaṇī, xi.14.
arṣasya, aśād, xii.16.
araḥ, xii.16.
arṣaṇī, xii.1.
r. as: syāt, xii.1.
r. as: see vyāsta, prayāṣṭa.
arāṣṭra, xii.16.
arāṣṭra, xi.15.
arāṣṭra, xi.13.
arāṣṭra, xi.12.
arāṣṭra, xi.10.
arāṣṭra, xi.9.
arāṣṭra, xi.7.
arāṣṭra, xi.5.
arāṣṭra, xi.4.
arāṣṭra, xi.3.
arāṣṭra, xi.2.
arāṣṭra, xi.1.
arāṣṭra, v.9.
arāṣṭra, cv.25, xi.18.
arāṣṭra, xii.16.
arāṣṭra, xii.15.
arāṣṭra, xii.14.
arāṣṭra, xii.13.
arāṣṭra, xii.12.
arāṣṭra, xii.11.
arāṣṭra, xii.10.
arāṣṭra, xii.9.
arāṣṭra, xii.8.
arāṣṭra, xii.7.
arāṣṭra, vii.6.
arāṣṭra, xi.5.
arāṣṭra, xii.4.
arāṣṭra, xii.3.
arāṣṭra, xii.2.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
arāṣṭra, xii.1.
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ādīrāyan, v.21.
okāra, ii.13, iv.6, ix.7,12, x.5,12, xii.1, xvi.1.
oṅkāra, c.ii.1.
ofra, cii.4, viii.8,16,19,21, ix.7,8, xi.5, xvi.29.
odaṇa, x.14.
one, vii.10.
osaḍhī, iii.7.
oṣadah, v.17.
oṣ̐ thai, ii.12, (ṣanau), 14,21, xvi.1, xxii.2, and adhara, utararo, oṣtha, x.14.
oṣ̐thin, iv.43.
oṣ̐thya, cii.23.
dukāra, ii.26, ix.15, x.7.
ka (pron.), xviii.2, cii.2, caat, ci.57, viii.15, xi.1,3,9, xii.3, xiii.13, xiv.4,5,11, 16, xv.9, xvi.12, xxii.17.
ka, vii.9.
kasmī, v.12, vii.31.
kaut, vii.4.
kakiṣvāna, ix.21.
kāthitā, cxxii.9.
kātā, ii.3,4,46, xxii.10, -ci.47, xxii.10, xxii.2, 17te (-mūṣya).
kātañcikā, cii.59,59 (-toa).
ili, vii.4.
kaṇḍa, cii.9.
kaṭu, cii.11,53, iii.33,47, v.28, x.3, x.9, xviii.3.
kaṇḍāthikā, cxxiii.17.
kaṇṇaikā, iv.11.
kaṇṇiya, xvi.13.
kapālu, iv.14.
kaṁ u, vi.2.
r. kampu+pra, c ix.3.
kapu, cix.3,5.
r. kar, ii.4, c i.61, v.3,35, etc.; kārī, cii.14 etc.; kac, cii.10.
kātā, cxxiii.12; -adi, ci.1, vii.5, xii.9, xvii.4, 14, xxi.6, adhikāra, cii.10, ci.10, ci.20, cixv.22, etc.; adhāna, cixv.22.
kārā, cixv.1, cītava, v.10, etc.; adhāna, cixv.22.
kāra, cì.27, 32, 54, 45, xxii.5, cixv.22, cixv.5.
2,6 (va)-cixv.22, etc., cixv.22, cixv.5.
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kareṇa, cxxi.15.
karo-, viii.30.
kara, civr.52, xxii.17 (-mūṣya).
karna, civr.52, xxii.17 (-mūṣya).
karanā, cxi.2.
karmadhāra, cxi.6.
karm, cxxi.14, xxii.3.
karnā, cxxi.15.
r. karṣha+ana, cii.51.
jā, xxii.18; d, civr.22, d, vii.17, vii.6, vii.4,15, vii.4,20, etc.; saśvini, vii.15.
4,27, viii.23, 3; and koma, cixvi.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
śrāṇa, cixv.12.
garbhāh, xii.3.

garbham, iv.24,42.
gābi, cxxii.9 (-niva.rā).
gīna, xii.9.
gīrā, cxxii.9,10.
gūndam, gūndi, vii.10.
Gāndhārapadava, cxxiv.6.
gāhamānā, xii.8.
gir, c. intr.
gūda, cvii.16.
gūna, c.35 (dv), 36 (trī) xvii.3.
gūṇa, xii.9.
gūr, c. intr. cxxiv.5.
gūruda, cxxiv.5.
ghrāmāy agre, xi.16.
gō, xi.16.
gotra, cxxiv.6.
gōmān, ix.21.
gōpā, c. v.23.
Gūndam, see p. 430.
gūndam, c.33, iv.23, viii.13.
gna, xi.5.
gna, iv.36.
gyānī, vii.10.
grāhā, cxxiv.6v.
rg. graha, c. intr. i.22,25,50,51.
60, i.16, v.25,40, vi.13.
88,18,34, ix.13, x.12, xi.
17, xiv.6,22, xv.8, xvi.29.
xvii.6, + parā, c. viii.14, ix.9.
graha, ix.20.
grahana, 1.22,24,50, -c.11.8.
22,26,50,-5,59,61, ii.23.
ili.1 etc., iv.9 etc., v.7 etc.
vi.5 etc., vii.2 etc., viii.1.
etc. ix.1 etc., x.9 etc., xi.
etc. xii.3 etc., xiii.4 etc.,
xiv.17 etc., xvi.1 etc.,
xvi.7, xvi.8.
graha, ix.20.

grahana, 1.22,24,50, -c.11.8.
22,26,50,-5,59,61, ii.23.
ili.1 etc., iv.9 etc., v.7 etc.
vi.5 etc., vii.2 etc., viii.1.
etc. ix.1 etc., x.9 etc., xi.
etc. xii.3 etc., xiii.4 etc.,
xiv.17 etc., xvi.1 etc.,
xvi.7, xvi.8.
graha, ix.20.

grahana, 1.22,24,50, -c.11.8.
22,26,50,-5,59,61, ii.23.
ili.1 etc., iv.9 etc., v.7 etc.
vi.5 etc., vii.2 etc., viii.1.
etc. ix.1 etc., x.9 etc., xi.
etc. xii.3 etc., xiii.4 etc.,
xiv.17 etc., xvi.1 etc.,
xvi.7, xvi.8.

grahana, 1.22,24,50, -c.11.8.
22,26,50,-5,59,61, ii.23.
ili.1 etc., iv.9 etc., v.7 etc.
vi.5 etc., vii.2 etc., viii.1.
etc. ix.1 etc., x.9 etc., xi.
etc. xii.3 etc., xiii.4 etc.,
xiv.17 etc., xvi.1 etc.,
xvi.7, xvi.8.

\[\text{Sanskrit words}\]

\[\text{English translation}\]

ca (c). v.4,20,22, xiii.15.

\[\text{Sanskrit words}\]

\[\text{English translation}\]

ca, i.22,32, -4,5,53,55,60, ii.13,
chandobhidhā, xxiv.5:-
18,25,26,46,47,50,54, v.5,
7,15,28,30,33,36,37,41, vi,
ja (j), v.23.
3,vi.3,6,7,14,16, vii.4,16,
jakara, v.23, xil.5.
17,18, ix.4,9,19,22,24, x.
yakṣiṣṭvā, xii.13.
16,17,25, vii.4,6,7,9,11,12,
jajapāda, iii.10.
xii.6,10,11, xiii.3,14, xiv.
jayāhāra, c.vii.13.
2,4,6-8,17,19,20,22,28,
jayāhāra, xvi.13.
xv.1,4,7, xvii.4,9,10,12,18,
jaññ, xi.16.
23,28, xviii.4,5,8, xix.2,
jaññ, c.xxxi.1, xix.16,17, xx.
xv.10, xix.6,9, xxi.5, xxi.5,
jana, c.xxxi.2, c.xxxii.2,
14,15, xiii.2, xii.2, -4,
janayā, vi.1.
sakara, c.vii.23, c.xxxi.2, c.28.
30,38, etc.
janayā, vi.12.
cakṛmā m. ii.10.
cakre, iv.28.
r. caukā : - d, xii.16,-cii.
xaum, iv.12.
cakṣuṣṭ, c.10..
+ samād, c.i.1.
cakṣuṣṭ, iv.12.
caukṣuṣṭ, xii.12.
caukṣuṣṭ, vi.13.
catur, i.8, xxii.15, xv.14.
caturthā, i.11, ii.9, xv.3, xvi.40.
caukṣuṣṭ, xxi.12,16, cxxiv.6v.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.16,19, cxxxii.17.
caukṣuṣṭa, cxxxii.17,18.
caukṣuṣṭa, c.xxxii.19, xvi.2.
candra, v.5.
r. cara : + ut, c.ii.12,13,28,35.
candra, vi.13, c.xxxii.12,13,19.
caukṣuṣṭ, vi.13, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
caukṣuṣṭ, c.xxxi.12, + yāṇa, c.xxxi.10.
W. D. Whitney,

dosha, iv.23, xiv.15,22, xvi.
sam, c.v.3; and asaśihi-
ta, abhidhāna, vidhā etc.,
vikstāvā, vyavādhiā etc.,
svaśa, jātiā etc.,

vāst, vi.11.

dvār, civ.11.
dvāra, ā.11.
dvārā, xii.3.
dvārā, c.vi.13.
dvāra, cxxi.1 (-ṣāti): and
dvāra, iv.12.
dvāra, xii.19.
dvāra, xii.18.
dvāra, xii.16.
dvāra, xii.8.
dvāra, vi.10.
dvāra, vi.11.
dvāra, xii.20.
dvāra, xii.19.
dvāra, xii.18.
dvāra, xii.12.
dvāra, cxxi.6.
dvāra, xii.4.
dvāra, xii.3.
dvāra, xii.17.
dvāra, xii.16.
dvāra, xii.15.
dvāra, xii.14.
dvāra, xii.13.
dvāra, cxxi.5.
dvāra, cxxi.4.
dvāra, cxxi.3.
dvāra, cxxi.2.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
dvāra, cxxi.1.
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pluta, i.4.36, x.24, xvii.7, xxiv.5: =ci.120, i.12, iii.1, ix.9, x.15, xvii.7 (=vūt), 8.
pluti in manāṇkap.-

phañat, xili.12.
phāiyu, iv.12.

r. bhadha, c.61, xvi.9: =ci.15, iv.18; =abhaśam, c.v.10; =upābhendha, probhenda.

r. bhadha (bhadh), c.61, xvi.19: =ci.15, iv.18; =bhāṣa etc.

bāla, c.53, ii.18.
balavant, cxxi.19, xxii.1.
bāhule, iv.11.
bhāvavaca, c.23, v.24, vii.

bahuvaraya, iv.40: =c.vii.10, iv.20, cxxi.12, 18 (c-i).
bahāśipāda, cxxi.10, 12, vii.6,11, viii.10, 29, xi.15, 17, xii.14, xvi.26.

Bhādabhākārā, see p. 430.
bdāna, xiiii.
bdānavān, xii.
bdānīdya, xiiii.
bdānā, bdāna, cxxi.19, xxii.1, 5, xxiv.5.

bdāhāya, cxxi.5.
bdāhulī, cix.

bībhīṣas ta, iv.52.
bībhīṣa, iii.10.
r. bhadha, c.53, xiv.28, xiv.4, xx.12, xxv.2, + m, xili.15.

buddhīyā, xiiii.

bṛhakapala, cxxv.6.
bṛhagadha, cxxv.6.
bṛhospāti, vi.7.
bṛstdaka, cxxi.1.
bṛstika, cxxi.29.
bṛdha, ii.8.

brahma, xvi.25.
brahma, xiiii.13.

Brahmapurāya, cxxiv.6.

brahmaloka, cxxiv.6.

brahma, c.61 (=vukya), xiiii.32, xiii.23.

brā, xviii.1: =ci.12, 36, 46, 1ii.1, iv.3ceto, v.22, 37, vii.

16, ix.23, x.10, x.19, iv.4 etc., xvi.2, xiii.3, xiiii.1, 13, xiiii.20.

bhakti, cintr, xili.16.
bhāga, c.53, ii.9, iv.52, v.10, 22.
bhāgūrdhā, iii.8.
r. bhāj, c.v.26-30, 38, vii.5- =bhānate, xvi.22.
ma (m), iv.7, x.1, xvi.4, xiiii.14.
mañ, vii.8.
mañcātī, manaye, xvi.20.

mahisāśaya, xvi.28.

makara, iv.11.
managala, c.1.
manaka, c.Vii.

mañgala, c.11.
mañgala, c.11.
mañgala, c.11, iv.51.
mañgala, c.13, xvi.58, ii.2, 18, 27, 47, v.136-41, vii.18, 19, 15, etc.

mañgala, xiiii.6.
mañgala, xiiii.6.

madhumān, iv.21.

madhyā, ii.6, 41, 46, xix.1- =c.10, ii.2 (=dāpti), vii.15 (=dāht), xiiii.15.

madhyāma, xvi.4, xiiii.11, xiiii.5, 10- =c.xiiii.17.

r. man, c.15, 18, 19, 21, ii. 3, v.2, 31, vii.23, xiii.13, xiv.5, 4, xix.9, vii. 1-8, xix. 3, xili.19; =sam, c.v.41, xiii.8; =manaya etc.

manakā, xiiii.6.

manaka, c.9.

mantra, c.ii.9.

manda, c.xiiii.20 (am-).

mandadhi, c.vi.3.

mandra, xiiii.11, xiiii.5, 10, 11.12, 16, iv.13- =c.xiiii.13.

mandraya, c.ii.13, viii.8.

martya, iv.21.

mariyāda, c.1, iv.23.

marc = pard, c.v.3: =paradarmiya, xiiii.7.

mahā, vi.2.

mahā, vi.24-32, xii.2 etc., xiiii.19, xiiii.2 etc, 15 (bhajyamāne): =bhuj etc.

bhāj, i.ii.8.

bhāja, c.15.57, xiiii.3v, iv.4.

bhāra, i.ii.11.

bhāra, i.ii.12.

bhāṣyamānti, i.ii.19.

bhārā, i.ii.10.

bhārāyā, i.ii.52.

bhārā, i.ii.12.

bhāvant, i.ii.23.

bhāv, i.ii.8.

Bhāṣyasthāpāṇa, cxxix.6.

bhūya, c.v.1 (veda-), xiiii.3 (veda-), xiiii.15 (veda-), xiiii.18 (veda-)

bhagadhe, i.ii.11.

bhagā, c.ii.18 (mishadha-)

and kārayāhājāgājājana, c.ii.8.

bhājanā, c.ii.3.

bhāmā, xiiii.5.

Bhrāvadūya, see p. 430.

bhāva, c.1, vii.17, xiiii.4, xiiii.5, =c.61, ii.12, vii.16, xiiii.5: =abh-

-Bhāvā, cix.1, xii.12.

bhā, c.61, =c.14, 14, 33, vii.10, xiiii.19, xiiii.20.

bhāsā in chandobh-

bhās̄ya, cintr.

bhūś, cintr.


bhīṣma, c.329, ix.11, xiiii.15, xiiii.18.

bhīṣma, bhīṣmāna, cxxviii.3.

bhūṣya, xvi.8.

bhū, ii.3, xiiii.11, xiiii.4: =c.1, =sam, c.49, i.7.

bhūv, xiiii.13, xiiii.16: =sambhāva.

bhū, c.ii.2, xiiii.23, vii.5.

bhūte, xiiii.8.

bhūyans, ii.11.

bhūyāsākha, xiiii.13.

bhūṣya, cintr.

bhūda, c.40.47, viii.18, 21, 21, 56, 31, =c.13.9, 25, 32, xiiii.19, xiiii.22, xiiii.3, xiiii.2, xiiii.7, 18, xiiii.4: =matra, xiiii.6.


matra, cxxviii.10.

Mātyākṣya, see p. 430.
W. D. Whitney,
sparṣa, i,7,10.ind.d.; v,27,34. 11. xiv,29,31; xv,ii,2,5. 9,12.
sparṣana, ii,33. and os-.
sparṣaḥ, vii,12. 
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparṣana, ii,33. and os-.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparṣana, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
sparsaṇa, vii,10,11, xv,ii,5. 9,12.
GENERAL INDEX.

The references by Roman and Arabic figures together are, as in the other Indexes, to chapter and rule; those by Arabic figures alone (with p. prefixed), to page of the volume.

a, d: how uttered, ii.12; how combined with a following vowel, x.3-9:—a, is short, i.32; ad to o before, ix.7; lost before initial e or o of certain words, x.14; when initial, lost after e or o, xi.1-2; stall causes mute elision or non-elision, xi.2-xii.8; resulting accent, xii.9-11;—a, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.2-6, 8-12; initial, do, i.16:—ad, nasalized when final, xv.8.

abhiniḍhata, xiv.5.

abhiniḥāṣata circumflex, xx.4: its occurrence, xii.9; its comparative tone, xx.10.

Accent: see Analysis, p. 437; also Acute, Circumflex, Grave, and the names of the various accents.

Acute accent (aḍāda), defined, i.38; mode of production, xxii.9; acute tone of grave syllables after circumflex, xxii.10-11.

ā, how uttered ii.26-8; peculiar utterance in a single word, xvii.24; combination with following vowel, ix.14, x.19-23; with preceding a, d, x.6.

Alphabetic sounds, enumeration of, p. 8-10; classified—a, mode of production, etc., see Analysis, p. 436; names for, i.16-9.

amudāṭa, see Grave.

anaśvari (ṇ): its equivocal treatment by the Prātiṣṭhāṇīya, p. 67-10; is an independent element, p. x; how uttered, ii.19-30; how designated, i.18; belongs to preceding vowel, xxii.6; its quantity, i.34; makes a heavy syllable, xxii.14; its occurrence, xv.1-3; do, otherwise than as result of euphonic combination, xv.3-5, xii.1-31.

Articulate sounds, see Alphabetic.

Aspirate mutes: sonant, contain a sound, ii.9; sound, contain mute breath than non-aspirates, ii.14; substituted for non-aspirate before sibilants, xii.12-3; how duplicated, xiv.5; double aspirates in the MSS., p. 290.294.

ā, how uttered, ii.26, 27, 29; combination with following vowel, ix.15, x.19-23; d, dental mute, ii.38; irregular insertion of, xviii.8.

Authors quoted in the rules of the treatise, p. 430.

Avagraha, name of first member of a compound, i.49; quantity of the pause following it in pada-text, p. 399.

Brahmaṇa-passages in the Sanhitā, p. 48.

Cerebral mutes, see Lingual.

Cikṣā, quoted in the comment, p. 435.

Circumflex accent (aṃavīra), mode of utterance, i.40-7; degree of effort in, xvii.6, xx.9-12; kinds of independent circumflex, xx.1-2, 4-5; their occurrence, x.16, 17, xii.9; kinds of enclitic circumflex, xx.3-6, 7; its occurrence, xiv.29-33; kampa between two circumflexes, xii.3-5; nature of enclitic circumflex, p. 315.

Citation, rules of, i.22, 24, 50-3.

Citations in the comment not found in the Tilṭṭāṭīya-Sanhitā, p. 425-6.

Commentary, see Tilṭṭāṭīya-Sanhitā, p. 436.

Compound words, separable, count as two, i.48; first member called avagraha, i.49.

Consonants, i.6; their classification and description, i.14, ii.9-11, 30, 43-52; names, i.17-8, 21; quantity, i.34, 37, p. 377; accent, i.43; belong to what vowel, xxii.1-9; relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72.375-7; see also the several letters and classes, and Groups.

Consonants, i.6; their classification and description, i.14, ii.9-11, 30, 43-52; names, i.17-8, 21; quantity, i.34, 37, p. 377; accent, i.43; belong to what vowel, xxii.1-9; relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72.375-7; see also the several letters and classes, and Groups.

labial mute, ii.39.

labial mute—labial mute, ii.39; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.

labial mute, ii.39.
Dental mutes (t, ṭ, d, ḍ, n), how formed, ii.38; see also the several letters.

Dh, dental mute, ii.38.

Ḍh, lingual mute, ii.37.

Ḍiphthongs (e, de, o, ōu): see the several letters.

Duplication, of य, u, final, xiv.18–9; of त, xii.10; of ध, bh, xiv.8; of aspirate mutes in the MSS, p. 290, 294; duplication in consonant groups, xiv.1–7, 9–28.

G, how uttered, ii.15–7, 23; combination with preceding अ, ए, x.6; with following vowel, x.11, 13, x.19; initial ए elided after, x.1 etc.; resulting accent, xii.9–11; final ए elided before, x.14; pranqaha ending, iv.8–54.

Elision, see Omission.

Euphonic alteration, concerns single element only, i.56; of a cited word, does not suspend rules, i.51; mode of intimating in rules, i.23, 28.

Final consonant, belongs to preceding vowel, xxi.13; makes heavy syllable, xxi.14.

G, guttural mute, ii.35.

Gb, guttural mute, ii.35.

Grammarians quoted by name in the rules and comment, p. 430.

Grave accent (anudatta), defined, i.39; how produced, xxi.10; grave syllable, when exchanged to enclitic circumflex, xiv.29–51; when uttered at acute pitch, xxi.10–1.

Groups of consonants, occurring in Tātātirīya-Sanhitā, detail of their division in syllabication, p. 380–2, 385: make a, not a simple vowel, p. 11; of short quantity, i.31; how produced, i.18.

Guttural mutes (k, kh, g, gh, ḡ), how Labial mutes (p, ph, b, bh, m), how formed, ii.35; see also the several letters.

H, a spirant, i.9; not surd, i.13; intermediate between surd and sonant, i.6; inheres in sonant aspirates, i.9; uttered in the throat, i.46; has same position. Long vowel, i.35; and see Prolongation. as following vowel, i.47; combination with preceding final mute, x.38–41; m, labial mute, ii.39; assimilated to following mute, x.27; and semivowel (except r), x.28–31, iii.13; irregularly dropped, x.12; to r before r or spirant, x.29, xii.2; unchanged before rd, xxi.4.

H, see visarjanātya.

Heavy syllable, xxi.14.

I, t. how formed, ii.22; combination with preceding अ, ए, x.4; with following vowel, x.16; resulting circumflex, x.16—4, final, result of irregular prolongation, i.7, 13; pranqaha ending, iv.8–54.

Increment, how intimated, i.23.

Insertions, of g, s, d, anomalous, v.4–8; of k, t, v.32, 33; after spirant before mute, xiv.9.

I, palatal mute, ii.36; t before, to j, v.23; a before, to ā, v.24.

Iṣṭvāṃśāya (ṣ), guttural spirant, i.9, ii.41–5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2–4.

K, guttural mute, ii.35; inserted after ṣ before s, sh, v.32; ṭ to s or sh before, vii.23 etc.

Kampa, peculiar affection of a circumflex followed by another circumflex, xix.3–6; differences between the Tātātirīya and other texts as to its occurrence and treatment, p. 382–3.

Kanyādikas, division of anuvākas into, not recognized by the Prātiṣṭhikhyā, p. 5, 83, 427, 430.

Kārttikeya, asserted author of the Prātiṣṭhikhyā, p. 1.

Kh, guttural mute, ii.35; ṭ to s or sh before, vii.23 etc.; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.

Krama-text, p. 429.

Kshāśraya, circumflex, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its tone, xx.9.

K, semivowel, i.8; how produced, ii.42; assimilate* preceding t, m, a, v.25, 22.

L, final, v.26, 28; changed to d, xii.16; duplication after, xiv.2, 3, 7.

Linguistic mutes (t, ṭ, d, ḍ, n), how formed, ii.37; see also the several letters.

L, a spirant, i.9; not surd, i.13; intermediate between surd and sonant, i.6; inheres in sonant aspirates, i.9; uttered in the throat, i.46; has same position. Long vowel, i.35; and see Prolongation. as following vowel, i.47; combination with preceding final mute, x.38–41; m, labial mute, ii.39; assimilated to following mute, x.27; and semivowel (except r), x.28–31, iii.13; irregularly dropped, x.12; to r before r or spirant, x.29, xii.2; unchanged before rd, xxi.4.

Manuscripts of Prātiṣṭhikhyā and commentary: see Tātātirīya-Prātiṣṭhikhyā.

Mutes, i.7; division and names, i.10, 11; what mutes are surd, i.12; mode of formation of the various series, ii.35–9; their designation, i.27; see also the several series and letters.
W. D. Whitney,

\( \text{a, dental mute, ii.38; change of, to } \hat{a} \text{, before palatals, v.24,37; to nasal } l, \text{ v.25-6,31; to } \hat{r}, \text{ v.20,21; to } \hat{d}, \text{ vi.14; to } \hat{b} \text{ or } \hat{f} \text{ (through } y), \text{ ix.20-4; to } n, \text{ vii.1-12,15,16, xiii.6-8,13-5; physical ground of this change, p. 281; adds } \hat{f} \text{ before } s, sh, \text{ v.33; doubled, ix.18.} \)

\( \hat{a}, \text{ guttural mute, ii.35; adds } k \text{ before } s, sh, \text{ v.32; doubled, ix.18.} \)

\( \hat{a}, \text{ palatal mute, ii.36; } n \text{ changed to, v.24, 37.} \)

\( \hat{n}, \text{ lingual mute, ii.37; } n \text{ changed to, vii.1-12,15,16, xiii.6-8,13-5; detail of its occurrence when not result of euphonic causes, xiii.9-12.} \)

\( \hat{a}, \text{ see anusvāra.} \)

Nasal, what sounds are, ii.30; nasal quality how given, ii.52; its differences of degree, xvi.1-4.—nasal mutes, surd mute to nasal before, viii.2; exception, vii.4; take a prefixed surd after a sibilant, xiv.9; take yama after preceding non-nasal, xxi.12; take nāsītya after preceding h, xxi.14: see also the several letters:—nasal semivowels, result of change of m, n, v.26,28.—nasalized vowel, alternative for \( \hat{a}, \text{ v.31, xv.1; result of combination, x.11; discussion of the doctrine of the treatise as to } n \text{ or nasal vowel, p. 67-70; nasalization of a final vowel, xv.6-8; its prolongation, xvii.5.} \)

nāṣītya, or yama, xxi.12; nose-sound, inserted between \( \hat{h} \) and nasal mute, xxi.14.

nitya circumflex, xx.2; its tone, xx.9.

Nose-sounds (yamas, nāṣītya), how produced, ii.49-51; how designated, i.18; occurrence, xxi.12-4: how treated in syllabication, xxi.8.

o, diphthong, how produced, ii.13-4; when pragraha, iv.6,7; combination with preceding a, i.7, with following vowel, ix.12-3, x.19-23; final a elided before, x.14; a changed to, before a and sonant consonant, ix.7,8; initial a elided after, xii. etc.


Omission (lopā), defined, i.57: how intimated, i.23: affects single elements only, i.56: cases of, irregular, v.11-19: omission of \( \hat{h} \) before spraint followed by surd, ix.1; before a vowel, ix.9; of after e or o, x.1 etc.; nature of this omission, i.19.

Organs of articulation, ii.3; their mode of Repeated passages. treatment of, i.61.

action, i.31-4: and see the several Repetition of compound words, with \( \hat{h}, \) in pada-text, peculiarities of, in Tāttiriya-Sanhitā, p. 85,98-9,369 note, 428-9.

pādavṛttī enclitic circumflex, xx.6; its tone, xx.12.

Palatal mutes (c, j, jh, \( \hat{a} \)), ii.36: see also the several letters.


Pauses, quantity of, xxi.13.

ph, labial mute, ii.39.

pūtā, see Protracted.

pracārya accent, xxi.10-1; of om, xviii.3.

vikrama after, xix.2.

predāśita circumflex, xx.5; its occurrence, x.17; tone, xx.11.

pragraha finals, detail of, iv.1-54; are uncombinable, x.24; rarely elide a, p. 264.

Prātiśākhya, see Tāttiriya.

prātihāta enclitic circumflex, xx.3; its tone, xv.11; derivation of its true character, p. 369-70.

Prepositions, list of, i.15; a of preposition combines with \( \hat{r} \) to \( \hat{h} \), x.9; usually take \( \hat{i} \) in pada-text, p. 229,428.

Prolongation, irregular, of vowels in sanhi- hiti, iii.1-15; of vowel after loss of final \( \hat{r}, \) vii.17; of nasalized vowel, xvii.5; of circumflex vowel taking kampā, p. 362-3.

Protracted (pūtā) vowel. quantity of, i.36; uncombinable, x.24; detail of cases occurring in Sanhitā, p. 323-4; a vowel following, is not styled "similar." i.4; nasalization of, when final, xv.7-8; tone of (?) (？), xv.9.

Qualifications of a scholar and teacher, xxiv.5,6.

Qualities (śibha) of sound, xxi.11, xxiii.4-10.

Quantity, see Analysis, p. 437.

semivowel, i.8: how uttered, ii.41; its name, i.19; takes svarabhakti before a spirant, xxi.15; \( \hat{a} \) converted into, v.10, vii.6-15; but lost before \( \hat{r} \), and preceding vowel lengthened, vii.16-7; \( \hat{a} \) converted into, ix.20-4; causes duplication, xiv.4,6; changes following \( n \) to \( \hat{a}, \) xiii.3; \( m \) to \( \hat{a} \) before, xiii.2, xv.1-3.

?: not simple vowels, p. 11; their composition, p. 392; how uttered, ii.18; change following \( n \) to \( \hat{a}, \) xiii.6 etc.: quantity of, i.31; combination with preceding a, i.8,9; anomalous conversion to \( \hat{r}, \) x.9.

p. labial mute, iii.39; \( \hat{a} \) to \( sh \) or \( s \) before, s, dental spraint, i.9, ii.44; irregular insertions of, v.6,7; omission, v.14.
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conversion to sh, v.10, vi.1–13; inserted after a before t, vi.14; insertions of k and t before, v.3–32; s from k before k, kh, ph, viii.23–35.

Schools of Vedic study cited by name, p. 427.

Semivowels (y, r, l, v), i.8; their effect on division of syllables, xxii.7: and see the several letters.

sh, lateral spirant, i.9, ii.44; conversion of s to t, v.10, vi.1–13; insertions of k and t before, v.32–33; changes following t, th, to t, th, vii.13–4; n to n, xiii.8 etc.; sh from k before k, kh, ph, vii.23–35.

Short vowels, i.31–3.

Sibilants (c, sh, s), see the several letters, and Spirants.

Similar vowels, i.3.4.

Sonant utterance, ii.4; sonant consonants, i.14.

Spirants (x, sh, s, φ, h), i.9; quality as regards sonancy, i.12–3; require more breath, ii.11; mode of articulation, ii.44–5; h converted into, ix.2–6; insertions after, xiv.9–11; aspiration of a surd mute before, xiv.12–3; effect of, on division of syllables, xxi.9; see also the several letters.

Surd mute, converted to sonant before sonant, viii.3; to nasal before nasal, viii.24.

Surd utterance, i.5,10; surd consonants, i.12.

svarabhakti, how uttered, ii.19; occurrence, xxi.15–6; belongs to what syllable, xxi.6; various kinds of, p. 392–3.

svari, see Circumflex.

Syllabication, xxi.1–14.

Syllables, heavy and light, xxii.14–5.

t, dental mute, ii.38; changed to c or j before palatals, v.22,23; to l before l, v.25; n becomes ñ before, vi.14; inserted after t, n, before s, sh, v.33; changed to t after sh, vii.13.

t, lateral, ii.37; adds t before s, sh, v.33; t changed to, after sh, vii.13.

tātrītyavājāna enclitic circumflex, xx.7; its tone, xx.12.


Tāttīrīya-Prātiṣṭhākhyā, manuscripts of, p. 1–3; various readings in its text, see Additions and Corrections, p. 467; its commentary, see Tribhūṣyaṅvatā; right to its name, p. 427; relation of the text it implies to the known Tāttīrīya-Sanhitā, p. 424–5; grammarians quoted by it, p. 430; classification of their quoted doctrines, p. 430–2; unmistakable alterations in it, p. 432; its character, p. 432–3.

Tāttīrīya-Sanhitā, relation of, to the text assumed in the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, p. 424–7; its divisions, p. 430; names of different parts of, p. 430.

Text, four kinds of, xxiv.1–4; various forms of, assumed by the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, p. 428–30.

th, dental mute, ii.38; changed to th after sh, vii.14.

th, lateral, ii.37; th changed to, after sh, vii.14.

Tones (yama), the twenty-one, xxii.12, xxiii.11 etc.; tone of om, xviii.4.

Tribhūṣyaṅvatā, manuscripts of, p. 1–3; different versions, p. 3; its sources, and meaning of its name, p. 6–7; works quoted in it, p. 435; its relation to and treatment of the Prātiṣṭhākhyā, 433–4; quotation of phrases not found in the Sauti, 424 6.

u, u: how formed, ii.24–3; combination with preceding a, x.5—combination of u with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16:—u, pragrāha as final, iv.5; result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,14; occurrence of pratiṣṭhita circumflex in x.17.

u, particle, combination of, ix.16–7; finals combined with, p. 102–4.

udhita, see Acute.

Uncombinable final vowels, x.13,18,24,25.

upadhānyāna (ϕ), labial spirant, l.9, ii.44–5; its designation, l.18; occurrence, ix.2–4.

Upanāga, enumerated, p. 422.

v, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.43; irregular omission of, as initial, v.13; final, dropped, x.19–23; nasal v from m, v.28,30; duplication after, xiv.2; resolution of usual v into u, p. 64.

Vājasaneyi-Brahmaṇa, referred to in commentary, p. 317.

vārāmaṇa, see Duplication.

Veda, rewards promised for studying or teaching, p. 420–1; see also Yajurveda.

Tāttīrīya-Sanhitā.

Vedāṅgas, enumerated, p. 422.

vīrāma accent, xiii.1,2; its tone, xviii.6.

vyājanyā (ϕ), not a spirant, x.14; how uttered, ii.46,48; is surd, i.12; its designation, i.18; authorized in saṁhitā only before pause and ke, ix.3; becomes spirant before surd, ix.2; dropped before spirant followed by surd, ix.1; to s or sh, before k, kh, ph, viii.23–35; to sh before t, vi.6; omitted in asā etc., xix.7; to v (except before r), vii.
67-16-7; do. in anomalous cases, v.10; do. after a, d. viii.8-15; dropped after a, ña, ix.9; to y (which is dropped) after a-vowel, before vowel, ix.10; – aā to o, ix.7,8; do. before r. p. 192-3, viii.18-22.

Vocatives in o, treatment of, as pragaha, iv.6.

Vowels (a, i, ña, ñ, i, ia, u, ū, ña, r, ñ, ē, e, ñi, o, ou), i.8; the first nine simple; i.2; similar vowels. i.3.4; their common designation, i.20; quantity of, i.31-3,35-ñ; are sonant, ii.8; how produced, ii.1-29,31-2; combinations of vowels, and resulting accent, x.1-18; gamas, tones, xxii.12, xxiii.11 etc. relation of consonant and vowel, p. 72; yd. irregular omission of, v.19.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Part of these emendations are due to Prof. Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications. A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here.

p. 2, l. 25. The MS. used by Weber was another (No. 504) in the same collection, containing only the text (incomplete) of the Pratićākhyā.

p. 3, l. 1. Dr. Rosé's description of these MSS. has not yet appeared. It appears, however, that the rules of the Pratićākhyā are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging).

p. 3, l. 4. The differences of reading in the Pratićākhyā text itself are more numerous, and there exist no analogies (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i.61, ii.17,51, iv.11,39 (T. W. shne, for 'hne'), v.13,20 (G. M. ṣakāra, for -ra: a mere blunder), vii.8 (G. M. yajuha, for yajuḥ), 12, viii.8 (T., it should be added, has dropped both sanuṭa and stanuṭa), 13,3,5, ix.21,22, x.11 (T. W. B. O. annmastakam, for 'anu-'). 13 (G. M. -pā assailo buddhyā iyi 'piśhi amānanta āśrhe, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombining finals their uncombining quality in the rule also), 22, xi.16 (G. M. adabdhāsā and adabdhāk, with unelided a), 17 (G. M. ahniyā mā 'mbudā). 18,19 (I. M. repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only). xii.4,9 (T. O. amin, for tās), xiii.1,13,14 (see farther on), 15, xiv.3,8 (G. M. upasargya ca pitha: a blunder only), 13,32, xvi.1,5 (G. M. sanuṭan anuṭan: a blunder), 7,13 (G. M. omit pārīḍa in the rule, as well as its example in the comment; but they give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment), 16,19,22,26, xvi.2,4, xviii.7 (T. O. mūrlo ca pād), xx.9 (G. M. substitute in the text-MS. rule xvii.6, except the word pitihkaranade), xxii.1,5,6,14, xxii.7 (W. O. also have śabah in the rule, but not in the comment), xxiii.2,6,10,12,14,20, xxiv.4. The reading adopted for rule xiii.14 is that of T. G. M. (save that T. has śthā for śhā, and rāvigna, with virāma under the r; and G. M. have rāvigna in the text-MS., and rāvigna in the MSS. with comment); W. gives ṛn śaśa śāsā maśa ṛvigna (with virāma under both r and n); for O. the collator has noted nothing; B. reads ṛn śaśa maśa ṛvigna. Other evident copyist's errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice.

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSS. at xi.1,120 (where the MSS.-reading is skārakārap, xi.1,17). The writing of śhāga for śhāga was noted under i.48.

p. 9, l. 16. The commentator, as will be seen under xii.14, interprets it out of existence the nāṭika as an independent element.

p. 11, l. 7. The structure of ṛ is defined by the commentator under xii.15.

p. 18, l. 12. The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his Čikšā? there is no trace of it in the Pratićākhyā), beginning pra parā 'pa sam, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of tī (in the padā-text, namely, which writes e 'ti for n, ape 'ti for apa, and so on) and not to their receiving the name upasargya. I still fail to see any reason for the limitation of the class to half its usual number.

p. 25, l. 13. Dele the hyphen at the end of the line.

p. 33, l. 16. One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent; but, rules 44-7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone.

p. 34, rule 46. The same example (from iii.3.111) is quoted by the comment under this rule as under rules 43 and 47.

p. 37, l. 19. Compare under rules xvi.26,29, where this claim is distinctly made. But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are padāś are quoted as pādākadeśas: thus hān in vii.11, pā in xvi.2, hi in xvi.13, etc.
p. 42, ll. 28-32, 43, read iv.23 (for iv.25).
p. 46, l. 3. Read (in part of the edition) alteration for nasalization.
p. 82, last line. Restore (in part of the edition) the lost figure 8 before no, at the beginning of the line.
p. 83, l. 2. The passage is found at iv.1.51.
p. 87, rule 5. For aghih, in rule and translation, read adya; and the example, on the next page, is adya-rvati (p. adya-rviti). The St. Petersburg lexicon (in the Appendix) has this word in its proper form, but I unfortunately overlooked it.
p. 89, l. 28, and p. 90, l. 5. No division is made of pratiṣṭhā in pada-text.
p. 101, l. 20. I have little or no doubt that the interpretation here suggested is the true one.
p. 103, l. 7 from below. 7b is not an independent word: see the St. Petersburg lexicon, s. v. totah.
p. 104, l. 24. So far as the vocatives in o are concerned, the existing pada-text appears to accord with the Prātiṣṭhākhyā: we have them with iti, as pragrāhas, for example, at i.3.8.1, 1.47:4.27, and without iti at i.2.13:s.4.39. But o, uko, uko, and pro are followed by iti wherever they occur (for to, see the preceding correction), although this is not authorized by the Prātiṣṭhākhyā.
p. 110, l. 32. The pada-text divides dyāv-priyāvās.
p. 123, l. 18. Insert the omitted example tirūśvī rātaṇ viñathe antar eśhāṃ (ii.1.153).
p. 124, l. 12. Read (in part of the edition) pātāmaṃ for pātāmaṃ.
p. 132, l. 15. But note the case reported under i.59 (p. 43).
p. 136, l. 13. Read (in part of the edition) mṛt (for mūrt).
p. 153, l. 27. I have omitted part of the passages in which t occurs before s, namely vi.6.11.1-2; vii.2.87. It should have been added, too, that the Sanhitā furnishes no example of a before s.
p. 157, l. 23. The omission is from vi.3.31, as under the two preceding rules.
p. 160, l. 24. This is not correct, so far as the existing pada-text is concerned. I was not aware at the time of writing the note that this text treated the avagraha-pause as suspending the continuance of accentual influence (see p. 369, first marginal note). The application of the rule, however, is as stated, compound words having been already provided for by rule 2.
p. 167, l. 14. The peculiarity of accentuation referred to in the preceding correction would allow of these examples being brought under rule 4.
p. 173, l. 20. Read -praseṣṭiyān.
p. 175, rule 11. Translation. Read bhavanā.

p. 179, l. 12. The suggestion of puṇarvāki here is not well-founded, the sphere of action of the rules in this and in the thirteenth chapter being different.

p. 183, l. 10. Aḥorātra priyāvāsa is found in Tāṅt. Āraṇyaka, at iii.13.2.

p. 193, II. 9, 10. References should have been given for the words ahorātra-bhāgīm and ahorātraśāk; the former is found at ii.1.78 et al., the latter at vi.1.34. Aḥorātraśāk occurs only at vi.2.114.

p. 194, l. 14. The reference for rūkmo antar is iv.1.104-5 et al.

p. 199, l. 9 from below. The pada-text leaves bhāṣapatī undivided, so that the combination does not come within the ken of the treatise at all.

p. 199, l. 13 from below. Read (in part of the edition) ii.1.57 for ii.1.57.

p. 205, l. 14. The omission of 8 before a śrāvaṇa followed by a sonant consonant, here referred to as a doctrine held in schools of the Black Yajus, is practised in the manuscripts of our treatise and its commentary to a degree far beyond what can be regarded as merely accidental. G. M. observes it almost without exception, and it prevails also in the others.

p. 209, rule 7. Doubtless ahorātra is to be understood here as an adjective, qualifying visarjanasyāḥ understood, 'āḥ completed to ṛch,' as the comment clearly intends. This also removes the difficulty of aṣeṣṭāti spoken of on pp. 210-11. so far as the implication of visarjanasyāḥ is concerned.

p. 216, l. 2. Read is for dosa.

p. 218, l. 5. The example parśaṇa etc. occurs first at i.5.21.

p. 222, l. 12. Read (in part of the edition) 8mś 8mś (for 8mś).

p. 224, l. 4. Read Also for Nor.
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 16th, 1866.

The Annual meeting was held at the usual place (the American Academy's room, in the Athenæum building, Boston), on Wednesday, May 16th, at 10 o'clock, A.M. In the absence of the President, the chair was taken by Dr. Jenks, the only Vice-President present, but was by him relinquished to Dr. Anderson, who conducted the deliberations of the meeting.

After the reading and acceptance of the minutes of the last meeting, the Committee of Arrangements announced their proposed programme for the present session, which was, on motion, ratified by the Society. After the noon recess, from 1 to 4 o'clock, the Society would re-assemble for hearing communications at Prof. Peabody's in Cambridge, and would adjourn at about 8 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation to a social gathering at Mr. L. R. Williston's.

1. Treasurer's Report.

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, May 17th, 1865, - - - - - $632.39
Members' fees: ann. assessments for the current year, $265.00
    do. do. for other years,  125.00  390.00
Sale of the Journal, - - - - -  23.00
Total receipts of the year, - - - - -  418.00

$1,045.39

EXPENDITURES.

Printing of Journal (vol. viii, Part 2), Proceedings, etc., - - - $479.31
Binding and sundries, - - - - - -  16.00
Expenses of Library and Correspondence, - - - - - -  45.96
Total expenditures of the year, - - - - - -  $541.27
Balance on hand, May 16th, 1866, - - - - - -  504.12

$1,045.39

2. Librarian's Report.

The accessions to the Library, though not so numerous and valuable as last year, had been important. Besides many continuations of series, 34 new printed works and 3 manuscripts had been received. The names of the donors were read, and the donations briefly described.


The second half of Vol. viii of the Journal was reported as completed, and in process of distribution to the members. The Committee were unable to state when the printing of the next volume would be begun.

VOL. IX.
American Oriental Society:


The Directors appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at New Haven, in October, and designated Professors Salisbury and Green and the Corresponding Secretary as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

They recommended for election as Members of the Society the following persons:

as Corporate Members,

Rev. Oliver Crane, of Carbondale, Pa.
Mr. Richard J. Haldeman, of Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mr. Charles W. Zaremba, of St. Joseph, Wisc.

as Corresponding Members,

Mr. Hyde Clarke, of Smyrna.
Prof. Constantine Tischendorf, of Leipzig.

whereupon, ballot being taken, they were declared duly elected.

The Corresponding Secretary presented a list of the Members who had deceased since the last annual meeting:

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Prof. Charles Beck, of Cambridge.
Rev. David Green, of Westboro, Mass.
Rev. Edward C. Jones, of Philadelphia.
Dr. Joseph E. Worcester, of Cambridge.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Rev. Henry Ballantine, of Ahmednuggur, India.
Rev. J. Edwards Ford, late of Sidon, Syria.
Rev. C. C. Hoffman, of Cape Palmas, W. Africa.
Rev. Homer B. Morgan, of Antioch, Syria.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Prof. Friedrich Rücker, of Coburg.
H. M. Pawarendr Ramesr, Second King of Siam.

Of Dr. Beck—one of the oldest surviving members of the Society (he was elected in May, 1843, within a few months of its origination), for many years a Vice-President, and always one of its most active friends—an eloquent eulogy was pronounced by Prof. George M. Lane, of Cambridge, embracing a history of his life, an account of his literary labors, and an estimate of his character as a scholar and as a man.

Dr. S. H. Taylor, of Andover, and Mr. Charles Folsom, of Cambridge, also expressed in a feeling manner their sense of the loss which the Oriental Society, the community of American scholars, and the public at large, had sustained by the death of Dr. Beck.

Mr. Folsom farther set forth the services rendered to learning by the eminent lexicographer Dr. Worcester, and paid a merited tribute of respect to his memory.

Rev. E. Burgess and Dr. C. Pickering, of Boston, spoke in recognition of the labors and virtues of the veteran Indian missionary Rev. H. Ballantine.
Dr. R. Anderson, of the American Board, performed the same office toward his former colleague, Rev. Mr. Green, and the missionaries whose names are included in the list.

The Corresponding Secretary added a few words respecting some of them, and spoke more particularly of the renowned Orientalist and poet, Rücker, describing an interview which he had with him in 1862.

The election of officers being next in order, Mr. Folsom of Cambridge, Dr. Taylor of Andover, and Prof. Packard of New Haven were, in accordance with custom, appointed a Nominating Committee to make up and propose a ticket. To them was referred a communication from Prof. Salisbury, of New Haven, referring to the unwillingness with which he had accepted the office of President, to which he was elected three years before, and positively declining a re-election. The Committee presented the following candidates, who were then duly elected by ballot:

  (Rev. William Jenks, D.D., Boston.)
Vice-Presidents  Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., Washington.
  (Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, New Haven.)
Corresp. Secretary—Prof. W. D. Whitney, Ph.D., New Haven.
Secr. of Classical Section—Prof. James Hadley, New Haven.
Recording Secretary—Mr. Ezra Abbot, Cambridge.
Treasurer—Prof. D. C. Gilman, New Haven.
Librarian—Prof. W. D. Whitney,
    Mr. A. I. Cothral,
    (Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., Boston.)
  (Prof. A. P. Peabody, D.D., Princeton.
    Dr. Charles Pickering,
    (Prof. John Proudfoot, D.D., Cambridge.

Mr. Folsom accompanied the report with remarks upon the withdrawal of Prof. Salisbury, which he was requested to commit to writing. This being done, those remarks were, on motion, formally adopted by the Society as an expression of its sentiments, and ordered to be entered upon the records of the meeting. They were as follows:

"When the Committee accepted their appointment, it was with the belief that they should find their duty limited to the indication of a successor to our late lamented Vice-President, Dr. Beck; and it is with deep regret that they have yielded to an understood necessity of naming for the office of President some other than the present incumbent. Not that they have hesitated for a moment whom to propose, if there must be a change.

"But the actual President of the Society so early began, and has so long continued, to contribute much of the best labor of his scholarly life to enriching the pages of the "Journal," and, in all its pecuniary exigencies, has taken such liberal care for its publication, that we have rejoiced in the hope of seeing him long at the head of an institution he has done so much to foster and adorn.

"As the Committee are happy to learn that the President's retirement from his present office is not owing to reasons of health, they propose that the Society do not relinquish him from the corps of its officers, feeling assured that in no condition will his personal efforts or other means of influence be withdrawn from that department of learning which he has hitherto so signaliy served."
The following communications were made:

1. Rev. M. A. Sherring, English missionary at Benares, being introduced to the meeting by Dr. Anderson, gave, by request, an account of Benares, as one of the chief religious and literary centres of India, and of its antiquities, which he had for many years been engaged in exploring.

2. Prof. Geo. E. Day, D.D., of New Haven, made a brief written communication, which was read by the Corresponding Secretary, respecting the Syriac version of the Revelation of St. Paul, of which the translation had been published in the last volume of the Journal. He explained the circumstances connected with the transmission to this country of the manuscript, which had been, at his own suggestion, searched out and transmitted to him by the late Rev. D. Stoddard. He then pointed out that the impression under which the Society had published the translation—namely, that the long-lost Revelation referred to by some of the Church Fathers had been now for the first time recovered—appeared to have been an erroneous one. On visiting Prof. Tischendorf in Leipsic, last summer, he had found him just then engaged in preparing for the press a Greek text of the same apocryphal book, which he had discovered in Italy in 1843, and which he did not doubt was the original work referred to by Augustine and Sozomen. The volume in which it is contained, entitled "Apocalypses Apocryphae Mosis, Eadre, Pauli, Johannis, item Marci Dormitio" (Lipsiae, 1866, 8vo), has just been received in this country. Dr. Tischendorf, it seems, had given an account of the contents of this Revelation of Paul in the "Theologische Studien u. Kritiken" for 1861. He still holds the view he there expressed, that the book was probably composed in the year of the death of the emperor Theodosius (A.D. 395), but now hesitates to fix upon Palestine as the place in which the author lived. On comparing the Greek text, as given in two different manuscripts, with Dr. Perkins's translation of the Syriac text, he pronounces the Greek form undoubtedly the purer and more ancient. Considerable additions, together with transpositions and other changes, have been made in the Syriac version. Occasionally, however, the Syriac text appears to supply some deficiency in the original Greek. The Syriac additions (as translated into English), together with other variations, Dr. Tischendorf has given in notes at the foot of the page. As the matter now stands, we may regard the recovery of this part of the apocryphal literature of the New Testament as more complete than if either the Greek or the Syriac text alone had been published."

3. Specimens of the recently printed Turkish Commentary on the Koran, by Mr. John P. Brown, of Constantinople; read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Brown's letter, accompanying this paper, is dated January 16th, 1866, and reads as follows:

"I send you a translation of the 1st and 112th chapters of the Koran, made from a very interesting work which has recently been printed here, under peculiar circumstances. You are aware that the Sunnese Molems have always held that it is sinful to print the Koran, and even to attempt to translate it. Many commentaries, nevertheless, exist; some of them, probably, printed, though mostly to be found only in manuscript. It is said here that the Sultan, having become aware that the Christians possess the Bible in each of their own languages, while the
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Koran remains in Arabic, and therefore unknown to the masses, ordered that a concise version should be printed in Turkish, under the title of "A Commentary." It is styled "A Translation (called Mevâlîb, 'Gifts') of the Commentary called the Mevâlîb, 'Escorts,' by the Member of the Divan of the Sublime Porte, Ismail Fer rakîh Efendi." The title Mevâlîb, 'Gifts,' may also denote that it is printed mostly for private distribution: though it is, at the same time, actually for sale. I have a copy for the Oriental Society.

Most of the versions of the Koran are open to criticism, and I have not found one which does justice to the ideas of its author. Translated literally, and restricted to the words of the original, without some necessary license, a version gives but little satisfaction; and to explain the definition by notes is tedious. In making my literal translation of the Turkish definition, I have not examined any existing translation, to see how far the two agree with each other. It would be of interest to translate the whole of this work, as I am sure that it would throw some more light upon the ideas of the able and talented man who, for the purpose of withdrawing his fellow-men from idolatry, imagined so many sublime verses. I have selected the two chapters mentioned, as they are the basis of his particular creed, or belief, respecting the Deity."

The translation of the two brief chapters and of the commentary upon them, is expected to be given in full in the next volume of the Society's Journal.

4. On the origin of the English Possessive Case, by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven; read by the Recording Secretary.

The paper of Prof. Hadley was a review of an essay on "The English Possessive Augment," by Sergeant James Manning, of Oxford, Eng., published in the Transactions of the Philological Society (London, 1864). Mr. Manning holds that the Anglo-Saxon genitive was given up in the 13th century, and its place supplied by of with the accusative; but that, for the possessive relation, a special form was then introduced, such as "father's book," "mother's gown," "children's playing," which gradually passed into "father's book," "mother's gown," "children's playing." Against the common view, which identifies the s of our possessive with that of the A.-S. genitive, he urges that the latter was not applied to feminines and plurals, and that it was used for many relations which are not expressed by our possessive. But Prof. Hadley referred to examples of grammatical forms (as the s of plural nouns in French and Spanish) extended to classes of words that once excluded them, and of forms (as the Latin perfect indicative active in all Romance languages) restricted in the range of meanings that once belonged to them. He examined the constructions of our possessive which Mr. Manning regards as inconsistent with its genitive origin. In "Cesare's crossing the Rubicon," we have only the verb to denote the subject of an action of "Cesare's going and Walter's house," the possessive s is added to "John and Walter" taken as a complex whole: compare cth in "three and-twentieth." The same explanation applies to "King of England's crown:" compare ism in "Church-of-England-ism." In "a servant of my brother's," Lowth regarded "brother's" as depending on "servants" understood—an explanation which fails for "that wife of my brother's:" it is better to regard the genitive here as dependent on a general idea of "belongings," "that which belongs," the same idea which is evidently understood in "all mine is my brother's." Positive arguments for his own view Mr. Manning draws from the popular dialects of modern Germany, and from the usage of Semi-Saxon and early English writers. But while the common German says "des Vaters sein Buch," he says "der Mutter ihr Kleid:" if our English possessive were of the same nature, we should have, not "mother's gown" (according to Mr. M.'s theory), but "mother her gown." That the Gothic reflexive seins and the Latin reflexive suus mean her and their as well as his, proves, at most, only a possibility that his might be so used in place of her: that it was actually and currently used in this way, there is no sufficient reason for believing. In almost every instance where it seems to be used, his refers to a word like wife, maiden, child, which in Anglo-Saxon were neuter, not feminine. Mr. Manning gives great prominence to a comparison between the two manuscripts of Layamon's Brut, in the first of which, written about 1200 A.D., the genitive expressed by his is rarely, if ever, met with; while in the second, written perhaps sixty years later, such forms are of common occurrence. Even here, in ex-
American Oriental Society:

amining the first 9000 lines of the poem, Prof. Hadley had found, from common nouns, about eighty genitives with inflectional s, and only two expressed by his; from proper names of place, thirteen with inflectional s, and two expressed by his; even from proper names of persons, where the genitives expressed by his are numerous there are nearly as many with inflectional s, and the two forms are freely and capriciously interchanged. In the Ormulum, written by a very careful scribe at a time not earlier than the second text of Layamon, the form with his is never once used. And although this form is often seen in old English writings, and down to the beginning of the last century, yet it appears, on the whole, as an occasional—and, seemingly, a merely orthographic—variation of the inflectional genitive—a variation suggested by a false, though plausible, etymology, and favored by the general confusion of early English orthography.

In connection with this paper, Prof. Whitney referred to another and wholly new account of our possessive suffix, given in the “Reader” for Sept. 24, 1864, in the form of a critique upon Mr. Manning’s essay, under the signature of Th. G. [Prof. Goldstücker]. Its author accepts as satisfactory Mr. Manning’s disproof of the relationship between the suffix in question and the ancient genitive-ending, but regards the former as a more connecting-link between the name of the possessor and the thing possessed, binding them together into a kind of compound. Prof. Whitney combated this view, as in a high degree far-fetched and fanciful, and attempted to overthrow the arguments by which it was supported. There is no more difficulty, he claimed, in supposing the retention of a true synthetic form along with the elaboration of an analytic substitute for it in the case of John’s son and the son of John, than in the case of I loved and I did love. The position of the possessive before the thing possessed is no more fixed in the case of a noun than in that of a pronoun, as his or her, which no one would think of denying to be ancient genitives. And the s in such German words as Hisweg, Liebesgabe, is really a genitive-ending, or introduced after the analogy of such; precisely as is the s of nachs, formed after the analogy of abends, morgens, etc.


This paper was intended to meet the objections of those who are unwilling to receive the prevalent belief respecting the character of the germs of the languages belonging to our family—namely, that these are radical syllables indicative of action or quality—and who hold that the first words must have been, rather, signs for concrete things. The fundamental error with such persons is that they confound the primus conceptus, which are, in fact, entirely independent of one another. Without doubt, the synthetic apprehension of concrete objects as such preceded the analytic apprehension of their qualities; but no language-making was possible until analysis had begun. It is impracticable to make a sign directly designating a complex existence; we can get hold of it only by its distinctive qualities. All the processes of word-making, throughout the later history of language, are based upon this principle, and the earliest must have been of the same character. The writer argued at some length against the doctrine that thoughts are impossible without words, and that general ideas are not conceived by beings inferior to man; and he endeavored to set forth and illustrate the characteristic differences between the mental action of man and of the lower animals. It was because all language-making is a devising of intelligible signs, to be used in communication between man and man, for ideas which have been conceived and for which expression is desired, and because an intelligible sign, uttered or acted, can only body forth an act or quality, that the first utterances must have directly meant the latter, and have been applied by a secondary process to designating the beings to which these belonged.


Mr. Burgess defended at considerable length the originality of the Hindu science. His arguments were briefly controverted by Prof. Whitney.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned.
Pursuant to adjournment, the Society assembled on Wednesday, October 24th, at 3 o'clock, r. m., in the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College, at New Haven.

The chair was taken by the President, Pres. Woolsey of Yale College.

The minutes of the preceding meeting were read by the Recording Secretary and approved.

The Committee of Arrangements reported the order proposed by them for the present meeting: that the literary session be adjourned at about 6 o'clock, till 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, and that the Society accept the invitation of the Corresponding Secretary to meet socially at his house on Wednesday evening. The report was accepted, and the order adopted.

The Directors announced that they had designated Wednesday the 15th of May, 1867, as the day on which the next Annual meeting should be held in Boston, and had appointed Prof. Peabody of Cambridge, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, a Committee of Arrangements for that meeting.

They further recommended for election to membership, as Corporate Members:

Rev. William H. Penn, of Portland, Me.
Mr. Henry M. Pierce, LL.D., of New York.
Rev. Thomas C. Pitkin, D.D., of Buffalo, N. Y.
Dr. Ernst Schmid, of White Plains, N. Y.
Rev. E. Bailey Smith, of Middletown, Conn.
Gen. A. von Steinwehr, of Wallingford, Conn.
Mr. Albert B. Watkins, of Fairfield, N. Y.

and, as Corresponding Member:

Dr. Adolf Bastian, of Bremen.

The correspondence of the past half-year was next presented, and read in part. Among the extracts read were the following:

From Rev. E. B. Cross, dated Toungoo, May 17th, 1868:

"I enclose to you a paper which I have prepared on the Karens and their language. In 1853, I gave the Society, by request, an article on the traditions and religious beliefs of the Karens.* A great deal which was then unknown in regard to the different tribes of this remarkable people has since been discovered.

"I have dwelt on the peculiarities of Karen grammar, without entering into extended comparisons with the grammars of other languages. It will be seen that this is plainly a member of the general family of languages of Farther India; and the distinctness of its peculiar features might almost entitle it to claim the place of typical language of the family. The philosophy of its grammar is essentially different from that of the grammars of the West. It may be safely said that, if an intelligent and competent scholar should reduce the Karen grammar to its true system, without taking western grammars for his model, nearly the whole nomenclature of the science would be changed.

"I have by no means exhausted the subject, either of the general characteristics,

or of the number and peculiarities of the dialects of this language. The gospel is
advancing among the Karen people, and revealing new tribes and new varieties of
speech.

"But this people are interesting not solely by reason of the variety of dialect
exhibited by them. Like the Jews of heathen Greece and Asia Minor in the
times of the Apostles, the Karesus are the lodging-place for the beginning of the
gospel." . . .

From Rev. H. H. Jessup, dated Beirut, Sept. 19th, 1866:

"I take pleasure in sending you, for the Society, the first volume of Mr. Butrus
Bisanty's new Arabic Lexicon, the Muhit el-Muhit. Mr. Bisanty is going on with
the publishing of the two remaining volumes as rapidly as possible. The price to
non-subscribers will be four pounds sterling for the three volumes. I think you
will be pleased with it."

From Hyde Clarke, Esq., dated Smyrna, July 7th, 1866:

"What is going on in these districts is chiefly in the way of illustration. For
the Troad, Mr. Frank Calvert has communicated to me a new memoir, with his
latest observations, which I publish in Murray's Handbook for Turkey, with other
observations. The Baron Paul Des Granges, of Athens, a photographer of
eminence, has just visited me on his return from the Troad, where he has taken nu-
cerous views for the new work of the learned Dr. von Halin, the Austrian consul at
Syria, who has lately taken up that region. Mr. R. Poppleton Pullane, an archæo-
gist of reputation, has just arrived here. He is charged with a mission from the
Dilettanti Society to excavate on the site of the temple of Apollo Sminthus, near
Assos, in the southern Troad.

"It may be mentioned, as a curious confirmation of ancient traditions, that
during the spring the fields in the neighborhood of Pergamus have been ravaged by
hosts of mice. The Smythian Apollo was the foe of mice. These vermin have
this year done much harm to Turkey.

"On the Lydian-Assyrian monuments of our district I have already communicated
to you the latest news.

"In the Ephesus district Mr. Svoboda has continued to take numerous pho-
ographics, and has proposed to me the publication of a joint work. I hope he will
next take Magnesia ad Meandrum. He has also executed fourteen views for a
work on Ephesus proposed by Mr. J. T. Wood, an architect employed on excava-
tions by the British Museum.

"M. Ernest Renan, I understand from his communications, will in his next vol-
ume embody his observations made during his investigations at Ephesus. I exam-
ined at his request the church of St. John, and obtained further evidence. My
opinion is that this church and the great mosque are identical.

"I have not found anything in my late explorations of the Ephesus distri-t. I
spent some time fruitlessly on the question of the Roman roads beyond Aziziel,
one the main road from Ephesus to Magnesia ad Meandrum, and the other, per-
haps, a road from the Panionium to Magnesia.

"Mr. Wood thinks he has discovered the shrine of St. Luke at Ephesus, but the
opinion rests on no good evidence.

"Mr. Svoboda has photographed Aidin, the ancient Tralles."

From the same, under the same date:

"I send you the Revue Archéologique de Paris, with a memoir by Messrs. Georges
Perrot and Edmond Guillaume on the Pseudo-Sesostrias of Nind. It gives some of
the most recent opinions of the learned world on the Lydian-Assyrian monuments of
Asia Minor, with many notes of my own, and will put the Society in possession of
the present state of this new and important subject, which involves a modification
in the ancient history of Asia Minor.

"I differ from the learned authors as to the road from Sardis to Smyrna and that
from Ephesus to Phocsea, as referred to by Herodotus, and I think I have informed
the Society of my last year's explorations. It is quite true that the present monu-
ments from Sardis to Ephesus; but this is Sardis to Ephesus, not Sirus to Ephe-
dus, and I doubt if ever he saw the monument. The present is not the first attempt
to represent the pass in which the monument is as the road from Ephesus to Pho-
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The Society assembled, as notified, at New Haven, on Thursday, Oct. 20th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair. The minutes of the annual meeting in May last were read by the Recording Secretary. The Committee of Arrangements communicated an invitation from Mr. Van Name, Librarian of Yale College, to a social gathering at his house in the evening; which was, upon motion, accepted with thanks.

From the Directors, notice was given that the next meeting would be held in Boston, on the 17th of May, 1871, and that Rev. Dr. Anderson, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, was appointed a Committee of Arrangements for it. Also the names of the following gentlemen were reported, with the recommendation that they be elected as Corporate Members:—

Rev. John Anderson, of Waterbury, Conn.
Prof. John Avery, of Grinnell, Iowa.
Prof. George F. Comfort, of New York.
Mr. Alexander Meyowitz, do.
Mr. Frederick Stengel, do.
Mr. Edward C. Taintor, of China.

The recommendation was adopted, and the gentlemen elected.

The Corresponding Secretary read extracts from the correspondence of the half-year. In presenting notes of excuse from several gentlemen, variously prevented from being present at the meeting, he also took occasion to refer to the unwonted absence of Prof. Salisbury, who had recently gone to spend the winter, and perhaps a longer time, in Europe. It was added, as a fact interesting and important to all students in this department in America, that Prof. Salisbury had, before leaving, presented to the library of Yale College in New Haven his whole collection of Oriental and philological books and manuscripts, comprising several thousand volumes, many of them of great cost and value, and had made liberal provision for completing the collection by further purchase. So large and generous a gift had rarely been made to an American library, or so rich a body of material for study in this department been thrown open at once to the public.

A letter from Rev. James Summers, dated London, August 5th, 1870, speaks of a magazine for Chinese and Japanese literature, which he was about commencing to publish in London, and expresses the hope that both encouragement and assistance may be obtained for it from America, whose interest in the affairs of that part of the world is so great, and which has done so much, by literature and diplomacy, to open it to the knowledge of the West. Mr. Summers is cataloguing the Chinese and Tibetan treasures of the India Office library in London, brought forth to light by the
energy of the late librarian, Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall. The first two numbers of the magazine referred to, the "Phœnix," more recently received, were exhibited to the members present and examined by them.

Letters from Rev. Mr. Ward, of New York, announce a donation made through him to the Society's collections, by the Palestine Exploration Fund Society of London, of a set of the full-size photographs of the impressions in soft paper taken from the Moabite inscription-stone of King Mesha, and of plaster casts of a number of the smaller fragments of the stone, colored in close imitation of the original. The photographs and casts were shown and described by Mr. Ward, who was present; besides clearing up one and another point, of greater or less consequence, in the reading, they proved in a striking manner the faithfulness and skill with which M. Ganneau's first copies of the inscription had been made.

Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass., sent a copy of an engraving, just made, of a Japanese "symbolical seal, or armorial bearing, whose lines are legally established symbols, to be interpreted, like those of our heraldic escutcheons, according to fixed rules, guarded from infringement by severe laws."

Prof. Weber, of Berlin, under date of Sept. 29th, 1870, writes of the then approaching celebration (Oct. 2d) of the 25-year anniversary of the German Oriental Society, and of the medal which was to be presented, struck in gold, to the first four managers of the Society's affairs, Professors Brockhaus, Fleischer, Pott, and Rödiger (of whom three are Honorary Members of our own Society). A copy of the medal in bronze was shown to the members present; the obverse represents "a powerful male figure, as emblem of the ancient Orient, resting upon a lion under a palm-tree, and raising himself as if awaking. His face, unveiled by a Genius, he turns toward the light, with which German science, as a Germania crowned with oak-leaves, approaches him." The following distich gives the simple meaning of the symbol:

Licht und lebendiges Wort kam einst den Deutschen vom Aufgang;  
Dankend erstatte sie heut', was sie empfingen, zurück.

Prof. Weber is occupied with a (transliterated) edition of the Tāittirīya-Sāñhitā, of which a considerable part is ready for the press.

Dr. John Muir, under date of Edinburgh, June 1st, 1870, writes:

"The fifth volume of my Original Sanskrit Texts ["Contributions to a knowledge of the cosmogony, mythology, religious ideas, life and manners of the Indians in the Vedic Age"] is ready, and may, I hope, reach you about the time this letter does.

"Müller is reprinting his Sanskrit grammar, and printing his lectures preliminary to the study of the science of religions, in successive numbers of Fraser's Magazine. He says his second volume of the translation of the Rig-Veda will be on the same plan as the first—much annotation, and few whole hymns translated: when it is to come out, I do not know. Aufrecht hopes to begin to print his glossary to the Rig-Veda in August or September. Monier Williams has advanced as far as the letter r with his Sanskrit-English dictionary."

...
Communications were then presented, as follows:


Mr. Bunker describes his visit, in company with Rev. Mr. Vinton, to the village of Kai pho-gyee, chief of Western Karenese, on the Salwen river, twelve days' journey east from Toungoo. One of the main objects of his expedition was to obtain a sight, and if possible a copy, of the celebrated Plate (see these Proceedings for Oct., 1866, p. xii., and for May, 1870, pp. lxxv-6). This, however, he found it very difficult to accomplish, as the possession of the Plate is the chief's main title to authority and source of revenue, and the article is kept as sacred, and invested with great mystery and formidable power. A few days of careful diplomacy, however, secured the consent of the chief and head-men to its being examined and even copied, although the taking of an impression in wax, for which preparation had been made, was forbidden. Mr. Bunker encloses his original copy, which it is proposed to reproduce in lithograph in the forthcoming Part of the Society's Journal. The chief denied having any ivory plates, but there is no doubt that he possesses such, and Mr. Bunker hopes on a future visit to obtain sight of them.

2. On the Talmud, by Dr. Alexander Meyrowitz, of New York.

Dr. Meyrowitz gave a brief statement of the principal facts in the history of the Talmud, and described its character, reading by way of illustration a number of passages, in translation.


There are three principal theories of Greek pronunciation: that we should pronounce the language as the ancients did, or each nation according to the rules of its own language, or as the modern Greeks do.

The main objection to the first is that it is practically impossible to discover what the sounds of the language at any given period in antiquity were, with certainty and precision. In attempting to do so, we must rely chiefly on written testimony, which cannot accurately convey an idea of sound.

The objections to the second system are that it produces confusion and variety where uniformity is desirable, that it applies modern sounds to an ancient language in such a way that the effects of time and of difference of race upon sounds, and, for the speakers of English, that it forces upon Greek the laws of a language abnormally irregular in its pronunciation. It also increases the difficulty of teaching the principles of etymology, and deprives the student of the benefit of learning a pronunciation different from that of his own language and having in itself a historical and scientific value.

For the third system there are no valid arguments to be urged. The fact that the modern Greeks give a certain sound to a given character by no means proves that the ancient Greeks did the same, or that modern scholars need do so. The increased facility of communicating with the modern Greeks is of no weight as an argument, because there is so little occasion for such communication, and because so much besides the pronunciation must be learned to make it possible. When we examine the particular features of this pronunciation, we find no early authority for it, and no support in the structure of the language. The modern sound of η, for instance, as ες, has no early evidence for itself, and the facts of the language testify against it.

When then we wish to decide how we should pronounce the language, we should consider first the use we make of it. We use it purely for scientific and educational purposes. Hence we should settle upon a system upon scientific grounds alone, not laying too much stress upon an exact determination of precisely how the ancient Greeks at any given time pronounced their words. Such a system would be settled with substantial agreement by philological scholars. It would give to the vowels the Italian sounds, distinguishing quantity by the time used in utterance. In the diphthongs it would give effect to each of the two elements, combining them as nearly as possible into one sound. It would give to the conso-
nants the sounds which the corresponding characters in English have, regarding \( @ \) as the equivalent of \( f, \& \) of \( \theta \) sound. Only \( \chi \) would have the sound of the German \( \chi \). This system would be less objectionable and more useful in a scientific and educational point of view than any other.

A brief discussion followed the reading of this paper, after which the Society adjourned for the day, and the remaining communications were presented at the session of Friday forenoon.

4. Thirteen inedited Letters from Sir William Jones to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Charles Wilkins, communicated by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, D. C. L.; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Dr. Hall's introductory note accompanying these letters is as follows:

"The venerated memory of Sir William Jones must abundantly suffice to justify the publication of the following letters; and I have only to say, by way of introducing them, that I am indebted, for the favor of being allowed to make them public, to Charles H. Moore, Esq., who possesses the originals."

The letters range in date from Jan. 6, 1784, to Jan. 14, 1793, and are interesting as illustrating the progress of the writer's plans of study and their accomplishment, and casting additional light upon the small beginnings of a department of learning which has now assumed great and unlooked-for importance. A few sentences are extracted here.

"... Happy should I be to follow you in the same track [of Hindu learning]; but life is too short and my necessary business too long for me to think at my age of acquiring a new language. All my hopes, therefore, of being acquainted with the poetry, philosophy, and arts of the Hindus, are grounded on the expectation of living to see the fruits of your learned labors." (April 24th, 1784.)

"... I have just received from Benares a Sanskrit book, which puzzled me at first, and will, I hope, continue to puzzle, until it enlightens me. It is called ... the Dharma Sāstra Mens Sana. A version of this curious work is promised, and, when it comes, I will set about learning the original, if I can procure assistance from a good Pendid." (March 1st, 1785.)

"... I have found a pleasant old man of the medical caste, who teaches me all he knows of the Grammar, and I hope to read the Hit Upades, or some other story-book, with him. My great object is the Dharma Sāstra, to which I shall arrive by degrees." (Sept. 17th, 1785.)

"... You are the first European that ever understood Sanscrit, and will, possibly, be the last." (Oct. 6th, 1787.)

"I devoured, my dear Sir, your Bhagavad-Gītā, and have made as hearty a meal of your Hitopades, for which I thank you most sincerely. The ships of this season will carry home seven hundred copies of our first volume of Transactions; and the second will be ready. I hope, next year: but unless the impression should be sold in London, Harington & Morris (who print the book at their hazard) will be losers, and we must dissolve the Society. You have already done us capital service, and will continue to serve us by spreading over Europe your discoveries in Indian literature. You have the honor of being the first European in the world, and the only man, probably, that ever saw Europe, who possessed a knowledge of Sanscrit." (Feb. 27th, 1789.)

"I am so busy at this season, that I have only time to request your acceptance of a little Sanscrit poem, which Morris has printed, and which you are the only man in Europe who can read and understand." (Jan. 14th, 1793.)

5. On two Inscriptions in Sanskrit characters from Buddhist temples in China, by Mr. E. C. Taintor, of the Chinese Foreign Customs Service.

Mr. Taintor exhibited to the meeting an inscription, in mixed Chinese and Sanskrit characters, covering eight sheets, and explained that it was an impression taken from the faces of an octagonal marble column in the Hwa Yen Tan, a tem-
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ple in the Chinese city (the southern section) of Peking, and that the inscription was first brought to light by Rev. Joseph Edkins, of the London Missionary Society. The date of its erection, A. D. 1491, is given in the last line of the eighth sheet. The first face of the column bears an inscription, in Chinese only, commemorating the rebuilding or repairing of the temple, and detailing the circumstances attending it, in the style usual in monumental records of this character, which are to be met with very commonly in temples in all parts of China. The second to the seventh faces, inclusive, contain Sanskrit characters, written after the Chinese style in vertical columns, and forming an inscription as yet untranslated. The eighth face comprises both Sanskrit and Chinese text. Considerable portions of the characters on several of the faces of the column, as given in the copied sheets, are nearly obliterated or quite indistinct, but can probably be restored on a careful examination of the original.

But one other inscription of this character, containing Sanskrit text, has, so far as I am aware, been observed in China. This was found by me in February, 1867, at the city of Ichow, which lies about seventy miles southwest of Peking, at the entrance to the beautiful valley in which are situated the Si Ling, or Western Tombs, the burial places of three of the seven deceased emperors of the present dynasty.

Outside the western gate of Ichow stands a neat little three storied pagoda; the temple attached is called Pai Ta Sze, or the ‘White Pagoda Temple.’ In front of the pagoda stand two octagonal white marble pillars, a foot in diameter and six feet high. The western one bears only Chinese characters, and, in consequence of the softer and perishable nature of the stone, these characters are either obliterated or very indistinct. Seven of the eight sides are covered with characters, evidently used phonetically, without regard to their meaning. No date or emperor's name could be found. A block of marble, with sculptured figures, originally the capital of the pillar, lies a few feet from it. The easterly pillar is in better preservation. The S. face has eight columns of Chinese characters. On the S. E. face are one column of Sanskrit and two of Chinese characters; on the E. face two Sanskrit and three Chinese; on the N. E. face three columns of Chinese, represented phonetically Sanskrit (?) sounds; on the N. face, four columns of the same character; on the N. W. face three columns, and W. face three and one-half columns of Chinese, all evidently used phonetically. The S. W. face, the most important of all, as giving the date of erection, has four and one-half columns of Chinese, from which we learn that the column was placed in position on the fifteenth day of the eighth month of the fifth year of Siuen Ho, of the Sung dynasty, corresponding to 1123 A. D.

As my own limited time prevented my copying the inscription (which was of about the same length as the one from Peking), I endeavored by the offer of a reward to induce some native to make a copy during my absence at the Tombs; but regretted to find on my return the following day that no one had ventured to undertake the task, on account of the great difficulty of making out many of the characters.

Prof. Whitney remarked that the Sanskrit characters were in an older form of Devanagari, quite different from that now in use, and that the hasty examination which he had yet been able to give to the inscription had not enabled him to make out any part of it, save the common Buddhist formula at the end, om mani padma hum.

6. On the System of Duplication in consonant groups, as taught by the ancient Hindu grammarians, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Our means of knowledge of the pronunciation of the ancient Sanskrit are its pronunciation by the modern Hindus, the teachings of the old Hindu writers on grammar, the euphonie laws of the language, and the comparison of the spoken alphabets of other related languages. Each of these, in its order, checks and corrects the others, and their combined effect is to give us a confident and satisfactory understanding of the phonetic form of the language—excepting, of course, that tone and coloring which no description can impart. The second source is worth more in India than elsewhere, since the ancient Hindu phonetists were
gifted with rare powers of observation and analysis, and carried the science of phonology further than it has been carried by any but the latest generation even of European scholars. Their results are laid down especially in the Prātiṣṭhāya, and constitute one main department of the interest attaching to that little body of works. But the characteristic defects of the Hindu character appear also in their phonetic science—their tendency to over-refinement of analysis, and to the setting up of arbitrary and artificial rules in place of simple natural laws, determined by pure observation. A striking example of this is their system of duplication in consonant groups; this forms a feature in all the Prātiṣṭhāyas, and is found even in Pāṇini’s great grammatical text-book, which has been the rule of correct Sanskrit speech for probably more than two thousand years. The system involves two chief rules: 1, that the first consonant in a group of two or more is to be pronounced double after a vowel; thus, prā after ā is ā prā, ābda is ābāda, āṣeya is āṣēya, and so on; 2, that an r thus situated is not doubled, but the consonant following is so treated instead, as in arṅka for arṅkā, uryg vīt for uryg vī, uryg bhīyaḥ for uryg bhīya, and so on. In case the letter to be doubled is an aspirate mute, the corresponding non-aspirate is substituted for it in duplication: thus, adhivara from adhvāra, divyga from divyā. To these rules there are certain extensions and restrictions, of minor importance, and variously given by the different authorities. They are combined, also, with a number of other insertions and modifications, which not infrequently produce very intricate and formidable results: turning ēs, for example, into kīsīpam, and so on. In the case of some of these insertions and changes, we can seem to see the physical processes whose undue appreciation or gross exaggeration are their foundation: but the physical ground of the system of duplication itself no one yet has succeeded in tracing out and setting forth.

7. On Westphal’s new Greek grammar, by Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven.

Prof. Hadley referred briefly to the series of works on Greek rhythm, metre, and music, by which Westphal has gained a high, and, on the whole, a deserved reputation. Since Hermann and Boccck, no scholar has done so much for the progress of these studies. His merits are undeniably great, though marred by some faults—by haste, self-assertion, want of ingenuity, and intemperance in controversy. In 1869, Westphal appeared in a new field, with a Philosophisch-historische Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. Here he gives, in general, the results arrived at by Bopp, Grimm, and their successors; but lays much stress on a theory of the origin of inflections, in which he differs from nearly all comparative philologists. He holds that most inflections were, at the outset, not words, previously separate, which losing their own accent became appendages of other words, but mere sounds, without independent existence, and without significance, until by the use of language they were employed as inflections. In his Greek Grammar, just published, the same theory is adhered to; though much less prominence is given to it. The author at first intended only to write a Greek Syntax, in which the syntactical categories of Hermann should at length be superseded by more appropriate norms, derived partly from comparison of other Indo-European languages, and partly from an intelligent examination of the Greek literature. But he was led to include the etymology, as without it his treatment of the syntax would often be unintelligible. Though subordinate in the plan of his work, it is treated on a large scale, receiving 447 pages, without including the verb, which will probably require as many pages more.

This great length may be partly the result of hasty composition, which shows itself in other ways. Thus, on p. xlvii., the verb ὀἰκῶ is spoken of as if it were a contraction of ὀἰκου (instead of ὀκεῖο). On p. 58, the noun στῆχος—a masculine of the second decl.—is set down as having its genitive in ous. On p. 17, ῥῆξω is given as the future of ῥῆκα, whereas the classic writers have ῥῇκα, and ῥῆκα does not appear until some five centuries after the Christian era. Still worse is it with κάω, on p. 24, which does not occur until late in the middle ages, which Pas- sow describes as unused, and Liddell and Scott omit altogether. On p. 55, a form τετίο (= τσει) is mentioned and explained at length: under pronouns, it re-appears, in connection with τετίο, pp. 377–8, where special attention is called to the latter form—all this without an intimation that τετίο is confined to one line (twice re-
peasted) in Homer, and that rēdio is a mere conjectural variation for reō in that line.

Cases of self-contradiction were also pointed out. Thus on p. 30, the author explains φαινόμενος as being for φαινους; on p. 70, he explains it as being for φαινους; while on p. 207, he pointedly rejects the second explanation and returns to the first. The two derivations proposed for ἕλως—the one formerly received from a root *eal, *to shine,* and the one suggested by G. Curtius from an, *to burn*—are both found here, the first on p. 180, the second on p. 198, each without reference to the other.

Several points in the Lautehris were made subjects of special criticism: particularly, the failure to recognize the true difference between sonants and surds, as consisting not in softness or hardness, but in the presence or absence of tone. So, the sounding of γ before μ as αγ; the assertion that Doric ἄμων was an earlier form of ἄμων; the assumption that the Homeric eis in the dative plural was made from at by doubling the σ; the statement that the Greek had no objection to a final λ, supported only by the form ἡλ (== ἡλας) in a late epic poet, etc.

Among other cases of venturous etymology, was mentioned Westphal’s suggestion that the Indo-European numeral ‘four’ contained the word ‘three’ under the form των, with a prefix to express unity, which prefix had from the outset three forms πα, κα, τα. That the first speakers of the Indo-European, while agreed on the five sounds in των, and agreed that a surd must precede them, were hopelessly divided into three parties on the question which surd must be taken, and that this division was propagated to the first speakers of the Graeco-Latin, down to the first speakers of the Greek itself—is a strange hypothesis, and an unnecessary one, as a primitive k might by explicable euphonic processes pass into a p or a t.

Finally, it was remarked that Westphal deserves credit for his attempt to treat the Greek grammar in the light of comparative philology. The difficulty of the attempt might be admitted as an excuse for many imperfections. The work would certainly be useful in overcoming the prejudices, still strong in Germany, against any application of comparative philology to Greek or Latin grammar.

8. On two recently discovered Greek monuments, by Pres’t Woolsey, of New Haven.

Pres’t Woolsey showed to the Society a photograph of a beautiful monument found at Athens several years ago, and rendered more interesting by a more recent discovery. The monument presents to us the figure of a young horseman over a fallen foe, and the inscription on the base is this: “Dexilous, son of Lyssias, of Thoricus, was born when Teiander was archon, died when Eubulides was archon, in Corinth, one of the five horsemen.” The dates are, of his birth, 414 B. C. (the archon being called Pheidias by Diod. Sic., xii. 7), and of his death, 394 B. C., when the great battle in the territory of Corinth and near the city took place, described in Xenophon’s Hellenica. iv. 2, 9–23, which is assigned to the year of Eubulides by Diod. Sic., xiv. 85–86. In the inscription there is nothing deserving notice except—1, that Teiander is either a mistake of the lapidary for Pei-sander, or else an early instance of Τει for Τι, common enough afterwards, especially on marbles of Asia Minor, in words from the root Τι; 2, that one of “the five horsemen” naturally seems to mean one of the five who died in that “great battle,” as it was called by Demosthenes.

Another inscription lately found (in March last), and published from the copy of Mr. Robert P. Keep, our consul at Peireus, in the Yale Courant of April 30 last, records that

“These horsemen died in Corinth:
Moleias, Onetorides, Lyssithes, Pandias, Nicomachus,
Theangelus, Phanes, Demosthees, Dexilous, Edelus;
In Coroneas, Neotheles.”

Mr. Keep’s copy gives Edelus, but there can have been no such name.

This inscription, on the cap or frieze of a monument of Pentelic marble, occurs on the way taken by Pausenias from the city to the Academy (Atlen 29, 2, which Mr. Keep cites). He says “those who fell around (or near) Corinth he here.”
This inscription, it will be perceived, names ten horsemen who died in Corinth, one of whom is Dexilias, and the other inscription says that he belonged to "the five horsemen." What then can this expression in the first inscription, "the five horsemen," mean?


After excusing the incompleteness and want of elaboration of his criticism of Mr. Cox’s work, Prof. Whitney began with referring to the new era made in the study of classic mythology, as of classical language, by the wider Indo-European studies. The foundation of both is the same: the formation of certain religious views and mythical conceptions, as of certain ideas and expressions, in the period of Indo-European unity, and their transmission down to historical times. To find the traceable relics of these, is to make the nearest possible approach to the beginnings of religious thought in our branch of the human race. The comparison of Greek and Hindu mythology began as soon as the Veda was opened to study, and has ever since yielded more and more fruit. Max Müller has lately done the service of setting it forth in an attractive manner; and has also given such prominence to the elements of the sun and the dawn in the earliest mythology as almost to put a new aspect upon the whole subject of mythologic interpretation. His views are very attractive and plausible, as well as novel, but their soundness is yet to be established by careful criticism. To such criticism they are not subjected by Mr. Cox, who is, rather, their implicit acceptor and their enthusiastic advocate, and who carries them to an extreme which even their originator, perhaps, would fail to approve. Mr. Cox’s work (in two stout 8vo volumes, London, 1870) is eloquent and graceful, but wanting in scientific tone, as in soberness and coherence of reasoning; it is somewhat diffuse and repetitious; the author is so dominated by his theory as to be made often partial in his judgments, loose in his interpretations, and uncritical in his etymologies.

The main features of the solar interpretation—which Mr. Cox applies to the story of the Odyssey as well as of the Iliad, to the Nibelungen-Lied, the legends of Arthur and Charlemagne, the nursery-tales of Boots and Jack, the giant-killer, and so on—were stated, and illustrated by extracts and comments.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston on the seventeenth of May next.
This was an essay on the Chinese equivalents for our word God which have been used by Christian missionaries. A historical account was first given of the terms adopted by the Catholics, from Ricci's time until the settlement of the disputes in relation to that matter at Rome near the beginning of the 18th century. Then the views of the Protestant missionaries in China were noticed, the decision of the American Bible Society in favor of Shsin and against Shang-t'ie in 1850, the continuance of a part of the missionaries to use Shang-t'ie in their versions, and the rise in recent years of an opinion on the part of some very able translators in favor of Ten-chu. A comparison was then instituted between these three terms. It was claimed that Ten-chu—the term adopted by early Catholic teachers and authorized at Rome—had no shade of heathenish or pantheistic thought attached to it, and was well understood through China, as the term in use to denote the supreme object of Christian worship. At the same time it was admitted that Ten-chu was not properly a translation of the original words used for God in the Bible. The term Shsin was next examined, and it was shown from printed statements of Mees, Hartwell and Peets, as well as from the testimony of other missionaries, that it is far too vague to take the place of God in general, although, as most concede, it cannot be wholly dispensed with. Next, Shang-t'ie was discussed at considerable length, in connection with the disputes of the Jesuit and other Catholic preachers, and with the Chinese religious philosophy. The essay of the honest and able Jesuit, Langobard, who condemned Shang-t'ie and strove to show that the Chinese were atheistic (or, as we should say, pantheistic) in their view of the universe, not only in modern times, but from the very origin of Chinese speculation, was cited with approbation. The opinions also of modern writers on philosophy, of Schelling, and especially Wuttke in his Geschichte des Heidenthums, were made use of to corroborate the position taken by the author of the essay, that Shang-t'ie, as properly denoting heaven personified, a conception of naturalism and of pantheism, was an unsafe representative of the scriptural idea of God. On the whole, then, Shang-t'ie being condemned, Shsin as a leading term pronounced too vague and general, Ten-chu had the preference given to it.

Extended remarks were made upon this paper and its subject by Dr. Parker and Rev. Mr. Syle, both of whom agreed with the writer in his definitive rejection of Shang-t'ie, but thought more favorably than he of Shsin, and less favorably of Ten-chu.


In this paper Prof. Whitney defended the current methods and commonly accepted results of comparative philology against the attacks of Prof. Key in the Transactions of the Philological Society of London, 1862-3 and M. Oppert in the Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne for 1866. He began with pointing out the nature and grounds of the dependence of general linguistic science upon Indo-European philology, and of the latter upon Sanskrit study, the limits to this dependence, and its liability to misapprehension and exaggeration by incautious or ill-informed students. The faults of detail which Mr. Key indicates in the work of particular scholars, as Müller and Bopp, do not affect their general philological method, and if his own basis of scholarship had been so extended as to embrace a good knowledge of Sanskrit, he might have been able to criticize their work from a higher point of view, separating its sound from its unsound portions, and duly estimating both. While many of his objections are well taken, others are insufficiently founded, and cannot be maintained. M. Oppert's assault is one of much more serious intent, but much weaker substance and result. He fully accepts the Boppian method, even going so far as to maintain that Bopp has exhausted the whole field of linguistic science, leaving nothing of consequence for others to do after him: but its conclusions he allows to be grammatical only, refusing them any value as historical and ethnological data; he strongly condemns also the introduction of any element of historical philology into the methods of classical instruction. His conception of the scope, bearings, and condition of the science is as far as possible out of the way. He is not a general skeptic as to ethnological connections, as might be expected from his denial of the accepted sources of information respecting them: on the contrary, he puts forth the most detailed and definite state-
ments about the derivation and composition of the Indo-European races, in general
and in particular; but they are mere dicta, resting upon no assignable basis, and in
no small part explainable as the conversions of doubtful or half-understood hypothe-
ses of linguists, drawn from linguistic data, into absolute facts. A main, if not the
main, object of the essay is to deny that there is any race-connection, any tie of
common descent, between the various nations speaking the branches of Indo-Euro-
pean language: the author does not attempt to disprove the connection, but treats
it as a palpably unsound and absurd dogma; but his allusions show that he regards
the exceptional propagation of the Latin and Arabic as, by their analogy, sufficiently
accounting for the extension of Indo-European language over half a world of het-
ogeneous tribes. The analogy, however, is a wholly insufficient and inapplicable
one, as was attempted to be shown by an inquiry into the causes of the spread of
Latin and Arabic, and an indication of their absence in the ancient history of Indo-
European speech. M. Oppert's essay is, from its beginning to its end, a tissue of
misrepresentations, unwarranted assumptions, and unsound inferences, and cannot
but seriously damage his reputation as a linguistic and ethnological scholar.

6. On Chinese Chronology, by Rev. E. Burgess, of South Frank-
lin, Mass.

Mr. Burgess, basing himself mainly upon the discussions of the subject in the in-
troduction to the last volume of Dr. Legge's edition of the Chinese Classics, at-
tempted to show the uns authentic character of the accepted Chinese Chronology in
its earlier period, previous to the time of Confucius.

After the reading of this paper, the Society adjourned, to meet
again in New Haven in October next.
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From Prof. G. J. Adler.

From the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

From the American Antiquarian Society.

From the American Philosophical Society.


From Prof. G. I. Ascoli, of Milan.

From the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Bibliotheca Indica, Nos. 181, 190-92, 196-7, 204-12; and New Series, Nos. 56-100, viz.: The Taittiriya Sanhitâ, etc. Fasc. xx, xxi.
The Taittiriya Brâhma, etc. Fasc. xiv-xxi.
The Taittiriya' Aranyaka of the Black Yajur Veda, with the Commentary of Skandâcharya, edited by Rajendralâla Mitra. Fasc. i-xiv.
The Nyâya-Darśana of Gotama, with the Commentary of Vâtsyâyana, edited by Pandita Jyândârayâna Tarkapanchanâna. Fasc. i-iii.
The 'Srauta-Sûtra of 'As'valâyana. Fasc. ii-x.
The Kâmañdakiya-Nitiśâra. Fasc. iii.
The Śhâíyâ-Darpana, or Mirror of Composition, a Treatise on Literary Criticism; by Visvanâtha Kavîrjâ. Translated into English by Bhûnu Framadâna Mitra and the late James R. Ballantyne, L.L.D. Fasc. i-iii.
The Sânkhya Aphorisms of Kapila, translated. Fasc. ii.
The Das'a-Rûpa of Dhananjaya. Fasc. iii.
The Sânkhya-Bûra; a Treatise of Sânkhya Philosophy, by Vijnâna Bhikshu. Edited by Fitz-Edward Hall. Fasc. i.
The Mimâmsâ-Darşana. Fasc. ii, iii.
The Nârada-Panchârîtra. Fasc. iv.
Wis o Râmîn. Fasc. v.
Iqâbînâmah-i Jehânârî of Motamad Khan. Edited by Mawlavis Abd al-Hadi and Ahmad Ali. 5 Fasc.
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From the Asiatic Society of Paris.

From Rev. J. G. Auer, of West Philadelphia.

From Hon. J. D. Baldwin, of Worcester.

From Dr. A. Bastian, of Bremen.

From the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.

From Rev. Cephas Bennett, of Rangoon.
Genesis and Exodus in Burmese, with Dr. Judson's last emendations . . . . Rangoon: 1864. 8vo.
The Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ . . . . 3d Burmese edition. Maulmain: 1837. 5vo.
The Psalms and Proverbs. Translated by Francis Mason. Rangoon: 1865. 12mo.

From the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin.
Additions to the Library and Cabinet.

Philologische und Historische Abhandlungen der etc. 1864, 1865. Berlin: 1865–6. 4to.

From Prof. Otto Böhtlingk, of St. Petersburg.

From Professors Böhtlingk and Roth.

From the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

From the Royal University of Norway, at Christiania.
Nine scientific essays, published as University programmes, etc. Christiania: 1851–1865. 4to.
Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbolls und der Glaubensregel, herausgegeben und in Abhandlungen erläutert von Dr. C. F. Caspari. I. Christiania: 1866. 8vo.

From Mr. Hyde Clarke, of Smyrna.
A Help to Memory in learning Turkish. By Hyde Clarke. Constantinople: 1862. 12mo.

From Professor Edward B. Cowell, of London.

From Rev. Oliver Crimie, of Carbondale, Pa.
An imperial firman, given by the Sultan Abd-ul-Mejid, of Turkey. One sheet, 22 by 31 inches.
A collection of coins (not yet identified and described).

From Rev. C. H. A. Dall, of Calcutta.
Dictionarium Latino-Anamiticum, auctore J. L. Taberd . . . . Serampore: 1838. 4to.

From Mr. Frank R. Forbes, of Shanghai.

From M. Garcin de Tassy, of Paris.

From the German Oriental Society.
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From Prof. D. C. Gilman, of New Haven.

Seven pamphlets on Java, bound in one volume, viz.: A discourse delivered on the 11th Sept., 1815. By the Honorable Thomas Stamford Raffles. —Essay on the Geography, Mineralogy and Botany of the western portion of Java. Addressed to the same, by Dr. Thea. Horstfield.—Short Account of the Medicinal Plants of Java.—An Inscription from the Kawi or Ancient Javanese Language, translated into the modern idiom by Nata Kusuma, rendered into English by Mr. Crawford, and submitted to the Society by the President. Thos. S. Raffles.—Eruption from the Tomboko Mountain in the Island of Sumbawa on the 11th and 12th of April, 1816.—Byna Woordelyk Traalaat van een Javansch Geeslacht-Register van de Vorsten van Java.—Uittreksels uit enige Aanteekeningen oopens den Javaan. Door F. van Boeckholtz. 1775.

From the Ducal Library at Gotha.


From Prof. S. S. Haldeman, of Columbia, Pa.


From Prof. Fitz-Ellard Hall, of London.


From C. A. Holmboe, of Christiania, Norway.


From Mrs. Wootser Hotchkiss, of New Haven.


From Rev. H. H. Jessup, of Beirut.


From M. Nicolas de Khanikoff, of Paris.

Mémoire sur l'Etnographie de la Perse, par Nicolas de Khanikoff. [Extract from the Mémoires de la Soc. de Géographie de Paris.] Paris: 1866. 4to.
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From the University of Kiel.
Schriften der Universität zu Kiel. XI. Aus dem Jahre 1864.—XII. Aus dem Jahre 1865. 4to.

From Prof. Adalbert Kuhn, of Berlin.
Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Sprachforschung. iv. 3, 4; v. 1, 2. Berlin: 1865–7. 8vo.

From Prof. Christian Lassen, of Bonn.

From Rev. John Liggina, of Japan.

From M. L. Léon de Roma, of Paris.

From the University of Lund, Sweden.

From the Minister of Public Instruction of France.

From Mr. John Muir, D.C.L., of Edinburgh.
Six essays on Hindu religion, by J. Muir (extracts from the Journal of the Roy. As. Soc'y), viz: Progress of the Vedic Religion towards Abstract Conceptions of the Deity.—Yama and the Doctrine of a Future Life according to the Rig-, Yazur- and Atharva-Vedas.—Contributions to a knowledge of the Vedic Theogony and Mythology, No. II.—Miscellaneous Hymns from the Rig and Atharva Vedas.—On the Relations of the Priests to the other Classes of Indian Society in the Vedic Age.—On the Interpretation of the Veda.

From the Royal Bavarian Academy at Munich.
Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der etc. Vols. i–vii; ix. 1, 2; x. 1, 2. München: 1833–66. 4to.
Monumenta Secularia. Herausgegeben von der etc. zur Feier ihres Hundertjahri-
gen Bestehens am 28 März 1859. München. 4to.
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From the Royal Library at Munich.

From Mr. John Murdoch, of India.
The same, for 1862.

From the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

From Rev. A. T. Pratt, M.D., of SyriA.
Grammaire de la Langue Arménienne ... par J.-Ch. Cibied. ... Paris: 1823. 8vo.
A grammar of the Ottoman Turkish language, in Turkish, by Fuad Pascha. Constantinople. 8vo.
A manuscript of the New Testament, in Ancient Armenian; on parchment, 311 leaves, about 4½ by 3½ inches.

From Bibi Râjendralâla Mîtra, of Calcutta.
Prákâra-Bhūgola, etc. A physical geography, in Bengali; by Râjendralâla Mîtra. Calcutta: 1861. 12mo.
Vyâkaranapravocâ, etc. An Introduction to Bengali grammar, in Bengali, by the same. Calcutta: 1862. 12mo.
Patra-Kaumudi; or, Book of Letters [in Bengali]. ... Compiled by the Hon'ble W. S. Seton-Karr and the same. Calcutta: 1863. 12mo.

From the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.
Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. New Series, i. 2; ii. 1, 2. London: 1865—7. 8vo.

From the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences.
Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Classe der etc. iv. 5—7; v. 1, 2. Leipzig: 1865—6. roy. 8vo.

From the Sanskrit Text Society, of London.

From Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.
The Aitareya Brahmânam of the Rig-Veda ... Edited, translated, and explained by Martin Haug ... Bombay: 1863. 2 vols. 12mo.

From the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg.
Mémoires de l'Ac. Imp. etc. v. 1; vii. 10; vii—ix; x. 1, 2. St. Petersbourg: 1862—6. 4to.
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From Rev. M. A. Sherring, of Benares.
The Transactions of the Benares Institute, for the Session 1864–5. Benares: 1865. 8vo.


From the Smithsonian Institution.

Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections. vi. viii. Washington: 1867. 8vo.

Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. xiv. Washington: 1865. 4to.


From Prof. C. J. Tornberg, of Lund.


From the Tübingen University Library.


From the U. S. Sanitary Commission.


From the Imperial Royal Geographical Society of Vienna.

Mittheilungen der Kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft. vii; viii. 1, 2; ix. Vienna: 1863–5. roy. 8vo.

From M. F. Wallmass, of Cairo.
Paleologia Copta de Felice Wallmass del Cairo di Egitto. Pisa: 1865. 8vo.

From Prof. Albrecht Weber, of Berlin.

Indexes, Latin and German, of lectures delivered at the University of Berlin, during the years 1858–65. 4to.


From Dr. M. C. White, of New Haven.


From Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.
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From Mr. C. W. Zaremba, of St. Joseph, Mich.

A Calendar for 1836, in the Church Slavic, elegantly illuminated; one sheet, 8½ by 22 inches, folded.

Manuscript copy of a papyrus, inscribed with hieratic characters, in the Imperial library at St. Petersburg; one sheet, 10 by 30 inches.—Also, a description and translation of the same, by Dr. C. W. Zaremba.


The gospels of Matthew and John, in Chinese. 8vo size.

Die Atlantis nach Griechischen und Arabischen Quellen von A. S. von Noroff....

St. Petersburg: 1854. 8vo.


Bemerkungen über die Phönizischen und Punischen Münzen. Erstes Stück.... von Johann Joachim Bollermann. Berlin: 1812. 12mo. (The last two stitched together in one volume.)

From an unknown donor.

A Hebrew Grammar. no title, place, or date. 8vo.

By exchange.

Seven Tamil works, printed on native presses, for native use, viz.: Pansa Perakaranam. On Saiva philosophy.—Agastya's Science of Divination by Birds.—Nanul, a grammar by Pavananti, text and commentary; edited by Versaka Perumal.—A work in praise of Krishna.—A comedy entitled Arosettura.—Tiruvala or Puranam: a local Purana.—Nana Vettiyam, by Tiruvalluvar.
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Proceedings at New Haven, October 16th and 17th, 1867.

The Society was convened by notification, on the day appointed at the last meeting, and in the same place as last year—namely, the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale College. The President took the chair and called the meeting to order at 3 o'clock.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read by the Recording Secretary and accepted, the Committee of Arrangements gave notice that the Treasurer of the Society, Prof. D. C. Gilman, invited the members to come together at his house in the evening, for a social gathering, at which, however, it was arranged that a single paper, that of Rev. Dr. Thompson, should be read. The invitation was accepted, with thanks, and the meeting so ordered.

The Directors announced that the Annual meeting for 1868 would be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 20th, and that Mr. Joseph S. Ropes, of Boston, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, had been designated as Committee of Arrangements for it.

The following gentlemen, proposed and recommended by the Directors, were chosen Corporate Members of the Society:

Prof. Edward B. Coe, of New Haven.
" D. Stuart Dodge, of New York.
" E. P. Evans, of Ann Arbor, Mich.
Mr. Michael Heilprin, of New York.
Prof. Ammi B. Hyde, of Meadville, Pa.

The Corresponding Secretary presented the correspondence of the past six months, extracts from which are given below.

Among the numerous letters of excuse from members unable to be present was one from Rev. J. G. Auer, dated from the Mission House of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at West Philadelphia, saying that his time of service in this country was now ended, and he was just leaving for his mission-field in West Africa, where he hoped to arrive about Christmas. He sent with the letter copies of the Grebo prayer-book and the Grebo-English dictionary of Bishop Payne, just published.

Another, of similar tenor, from Rev. G. W. Wood, of New York, was accompanied by an Armenian prayer-book, of which Mr. Wood writes—

"The book is in the Modern Armenian language, and is the revised prayer-book issued by that party in the Armenian church which desires a reform in that church. It is put forth by those who reject the Protestant name; yet, by its omissions and positive teachings, it is a decided approach toward the Protestant faith."
Dr. S. Wells Williams, under date of Pekin, March 12th, 1867, says—

"You will be interested to learn that the Nestorian monument at Si-ngan-fu in Shensi has been recently visited by two foreigners, English missionaries, who found it in a good state of preservation, on the whole; the building in which it formerly stood, or in whose wall it was embedded, was in utter ruin, and the tablet remained upright, exposed to the weather. Mr. Lees and Mr. Williamson were quickly directed to the place, for the people knew the character of the inscription, and had no trouble in getting impressions of the engraving. It is a great and thick slab of black marble, and shows signs of the effects of the weather.

"The region around Si-ngan is now almost destitute of population, its inhabitants having fled to escape the horrible cruelties and executions of the insurgents and Mohammedans during the last three years, who are still ravaging the country south of the mountains toward Hankau. Another Bible agent, Mr. Wylie, has just reached Peking from a journey across from Hankau through Kaifung, and narrowly escaped the hands of these marauding bands.

"I have just received the Society's Proceedings for 1865, which are very interesting. The notice of Mr. C. W. Bradley contains a just tribute to a very energetic and liberal promoter of Oriental studies. It was, however, Mr. Reed, our minister, who induced him to come up to the Po-ho; I do not remember that Mr. Bradley had much intercourse at that time with Lord Elgin. Mr. Reed, too, sent him to Washington in July 1866, and the return mission to China. The expedition was not in the winter, at which time ice covers the stream. Mr. Reed was also the means of getting him placed on the Commission of Claims, which were all settled in six weeks; it was the refusal of the government at Washington to pay what all regarded as his just salary for this work as Commissioner that led him to resign.

"My spare time is all employed in the revision of my dictionary, or I would try to send something for the Society."

Dr. J. Muir, of Edinburgh, writes under date of July 10th, 1867—

"I sent you some time ago Prof. Goldstücker's summary in the Examiner of his reply read in the winter to my paper on the interpretation of the Veda. Lately I wrote to Dr. Roest to find out if the article in extenso was yet in type, as I was naturally desirous to read the author's propositions in detail. But I was informed that Prof. Goldstücker was reserving the paper till he should be able to complete it by the addition of his proofs. When, then, if ever, the article is to see the light, must be left for the future to clear up; but I really wish he would let us have it, and show how he is going to demolish all his adversaries.

"Prof. Aufrecht is working steadily at his vocabulary—or concordance, as he calls it—of the Rig-Veda, having already sent his vocabulary of the Atharva-Veda to the press. Max Müller, as you will have become aware, is about to bring out a new translation of the Rig-Veda. He has been in rather weak health, but, I am glad to learn, is better now.

"I have been working all winter at a new edition of the first volume of my Sanskrit Texts, on Caste: it is partly printed, but will not be ready for at least another six months. It is very much enlarged."

Dr. W. F. A. Behrauer, of Dresden, writes from Leipzig, June 12th, 1867—

"I send you my programme of the Oriental Photolithographic Album, destined to be printed in Leipzig, Paris, and Beyroot; with a proof. Have the kindness to print it in your Journal."

The Corresponding Secretary read the chief parts of the detailed (manuscript) prospectus, as follows:

"This great collection will contain in the first part fourteen Arabic works, in the second part six Persian works, in the third part four Turkish works, and in the fourth part the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions of the Royal Museum of Antiquities of Dresden; namely,
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Section I. No. 1. Al-Ghazzâli's ethical treatise entitled Bcedyayt ul-Hidâya, 'The Beginning of the Right Way,' with an account of the philosophical systems of the Arab schools of the Middle Ages.——2. Plato's metaphysical treatise on the science of the divinity (tim irdhiyâ) and the sciences relating to the substance of the matter of the world (al-ilm al-hak'iyya).——3. A zoological treatise extracted from the Nohâ of the Sheikh Ústâd Daud al-Bâghîr, collated with an extract from the Kharidât al-'Aja'ib of Ibn al-Wardî; with an introduction to the study of the Arab zoologists and botanists, given in the 'Aja'ib al-Makhluqât of Kazwîni.——4. A specimen from the Arabic work of Abû 'Ali Yahyâ Ben 'Isa Ben Jazîla, known as the Minhâj ul-Beyân, 'Methodical Exposition' of all that man wants for his life: with a special account of the author and his position among the Arab physicians.——5. The denominations of the medicaments (al-adâwiyâ al-mufrida), ascribed to Ibn Sína (Avicenna), in the Arabic, Greek, Persian, and Turkish languages.——6. Two physiological extracts, one Arabic and one Turkish.——7. The little-known medical treatise, Al-Râfâyâ al-Hâribiya, by Mešîh Ben Hakam; and an important physiological essay, of unknown authorship.——8. The well-known work entitled Tudhâriyat al-Kahhdidiyân, 'Memorial of the Oculists,' by 'Ali Ben 'Isa, with additions and various readings; also, an extract from the celebrated pharmacopoeia entitled Minhâj ud-Dukhân, of the Jewish apothecary Kuhen al-‘Attâr.——9. An important extract, of twenty-six pages, from the noted work called Beisâdâ, a treatise on the diseases which can be treated in an hour, by the famous Abû Bakr Shamsâddîn Ben Zakâriya ar-Rasî.——10. An extract of twenty pages from the Kâlid ul-Fishâk fî 'Imr al-Nikâh, 'Exposition of the Science of Copulation,' of Abûfaraj Abâdarrâhman Ben Naâr, sah-Shîrzu; with a biography of the author, and a short notice of the oneromancy of the eastern peoples.

Section II. No. 1. A musical treatise of the poet Jâmî, with the latter's biography, being an account of the relation of the Persian musical system to the Arab, the names of instruments from the dictionary Haft Kulzam, etc.——2. The mystical work, Râhîb-Nâmâ, 'Book of the Violin, Râhîb-Sultân Wâlah, son of the great poet Jollâledîn Rûmî, with biographical account and notes.——3. A Persian work on astronomy by the astronomer 'Alâeddîn 'Ali Kuehji (son of the first Turkish mathematician, Kâdi Zade), named Morkes-i-akem, 'Middle of the World,' with commentary.——4. Molla 'Abdu'll-Allî's astronomical treatise on the division of time; with biography of the author.——5. An arithmetical treatise by the epitomizer of the Persian work Hall-i-takwisân.——6. The remainder of Wâzar Râzî's scientific work, Jâmî al-Tawirîkh, of which the first volume was published by Quatremère, together with the forty pages on the Chinese kings, with their portraits.

Section III. The four Turkish works composing this section are of a historical and scientific character, with appendices, translations, and biographies. Their special description, as well as that of the Nineveh slabs whose photolithographic representation constitutes the IVth section, is omitted here.

From Rev. D. D. Green, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board at Hang-chau, China, comes a finely executed impression of a Chinese monument, with accompanying letter (dated May 7th, 1887), and translations:

"Enclosed please find a rubbing from a tablet in one of the monasteries near this city. It is a representation of the Goddess of Mercy, with her hundred hands, ready to do good to all. The inscription above the image is a Buddhistic chant, and contains so many foreign words that but few Chinese scholars can read it. Of the inscriptions under the image I send you a version. It is very unsatisfactory, but the best I can do with my present knowledge of the Chinese, in connection with the manifest ignorance of Chinese teachers as to the doctrines of the Buddhists. I send you this as an acknowledgment of the receipt of a copy of the Proceedings of the American Oriental Society for 1885, read about Jan. 1st, 1887."
The commemorative part of the inscription reads as follows:

"In the reign of the emperor Gyu-long, in the fiftieth cycle, during the spring, in [the city of] Wu-ling [i.e. Hang-chau], one having a good and believing heart sculptured this image of the Goddess of Mercy, and the sacred chant over it, and erected the tablet in the Dzin-s monastery, which is situated in the plain south [of the lake to the west of Hang-chau], in the hall of the god of longevity, by the favor of the Goddess of Mercy, the god presiding over the great present, and Buddha, whose ages cannot be numbered—to whom belong blessedness of community, in hope of the original unity without the least diversity. For the purpose of celebrating the praises of the pure perfection, these three chants were most carefully prepared. On examination, it is found that these three chants were anciently handed down from their author Wang, of the district city of Kyiading. His honorary title was Dzao-an, and his name was Zwun-yiao."

Mr. Green adds a note or two:

"The monastery was first built during the Tain dynasty, a few years before the beginning of the Song. The buildings have been repeatedly burned down, and again built up sometimes by imperial patronage, but more often from funds collected by the priests. The place is now in ruins, like most of the temples in this vicinity, destroyed by the Tai-ping rebels. The tablet, however, is still standing."

"The date given in the inscription as that of the erection of the tablet is about A.D. 1795. The author of the verses lived about eight centuries later, and the exact date could be ascertained, if access were had to the hyzen-ts of his native place. The chants show that during the Song dynasty (A.D. 960-1280) scholars of no mean pretension were Buddhists."

The following communications were presented at the different sessions of the Meeting:

1. On the Routes and the Chief Articles of Commerce from the East to Europe during the Middle Ages, by Pres't T. D. Woolsey, of New Haven.

President Woolsey spoke of the route which led from India, by the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates, to Babylon, and so to the Mediterranean, and by the Red Sea to Egypt, and especially to Alexandria. These were ancient routes, and the trade passing through them was principally in the hands of Constantinople, although Venice and Genoa had an early day share in it. Venice dealt even in Christian slaves with the Mohammedans. The Pope long tried in vain to prevent commercial intercourse with these enemies of the faith. From Constantinople the route of trade lay especially up the Danube, by Vienna and Ratisbon, and thus penetrated into the regions of northern Europe.

During the crusades, as long as the avenue by the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea were controlled by hostile Mohammedan powers, it became necessary to adopt another more expensive and circuitous route, requiring much land-carriage and several transfers of freight. This route led up the Indus, across the mountains on beasts of burden, thence by the Oxus, and so to the Caspian Sea. This, which was an ancient route, was now adopted by Venice and Genoa. From the Caspian it took especially the direction of the Volga, to a place called Zarizyn, thence across the country to the Don, where, at the river's mouth, in the town of Tana, now Azov, both Venice and Genoa had commercial privileges, and the former had a consul from the end of the 12th century. Afterwards an important entrepôt for Genoa was Theodosia, now Kaffa, in the Crimea.

When, in 1258, the Mongols under Hulagu Khan overthrew the Caliphate of Baghdad, Egypt being still hostile, it became possible to take the path by the Persian Gulf and the Tigris to Baghdad, and so through the Mongol dominions to the west. Two subordinate routes—one across the country to Taurus (Tábris) and the Black Sea, the other via Tábris to the north-eastern corner of the Levant—sent the productions of the Orient into Europe. The important parts of the Italian on the Black Sea and the coast of Cilicia were noticed. The trade also of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem was illustrated by reference to a chapter of the "Assises"
of the Burgesses' court of the kingdom of Jerusalem," in which the tariff on eastern products is carried out into a multitude of particulars.

After the crusades were over, the Popes having now softened down their prohibitions of commercial intercourse with Musulmans, the Venetians made arrangements with the rulers of Egypt, by which they were enabled to engross the trade with the east along its most convenient path through the Red Sea, and this continued until towards the end of the Middle Ages, when the Portuguese found out a cheaper and better way of communication.

The principal products of the east imported into Europe were then spoken of, especially silk, until its manufacture was introduced into the Byzantine empire under Justinian, and from thence into Sicily and Italy. Of sugar also, and of the sugar refineries on the Tigris, whence the knowledge spread, not only westward with the cultivation of the cane, but eastward to India and China, an account was given, which was based on Ritter's valuable illustration of that subject in his great geographical work.

2. Translation of the Siamese Work entitled Bre-Teniya-Jātak, a life of Buddha in one of his previous existences, by Dr. A. Bastian, of Bremen; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

The Buddhists, Dr. Bastian says, distinguish five hundred and fifty lesser Jātakas, and ten principal ones, treating of the life of Buddha in his various existences anterior to the historical one. The whole, collected together, form the Nikāya, thirty books of which have been translated out of Pali into Siamese by Bana Dhammadhat. The Temi Jātaka is the first of the ten principal ones; the last, which relates the saint's life next preceding his being re-born as Gautama Čakryamuni, in Kapilavatstu, being entitled the Vesantara, or the Mahā-Jātak, 'great Jātaka.'

This, like so many other Indian biographies, begins with telling of a king (sovereign of Vārānasī, 'Benares'), who lives long childless, until the merits and prayers of one of his numerous wives move Indra to come to the relief of the royal pair. The god's regard falls upon Bre-Borom-Bodhisatr, who, since his previous existence as a king of Benares, had spent 10,000 years in hell in expiation of his misdeeds committed in that capacity, and then had lived long in heaven in reward of his good deeds, and now, his debt and credit being both cancelled, was just ready to be born once more. Indra proposes that he choose for his next life the condition of son to the present king and queen of Benares, and promises that it shall tend to the further perfection of his merits. He assents; and then, newly born, he finds himself in the company of other inhabitants of heaven, whose timidity and fear of the perils of existence despatched below to be born as his contemporaries and playmates. Sixteen wet-nurses are provided for him by the delighted king; the good points which led to their selection are fully detailed. The Brahman prophecies all manner of good-fortune for him, and give him the name Temiyā.

When a month old, he chances to be sitting in his father's lap when the latter pronounces sentence of torture and death on four malefactors. This offense against mercy, which the king will have to expiate hereafter by the torments of hell, startles and alarms him. He reflects on his own past history, and perceives that for such acts during his previous reign he had suffered almost endlessly in hell-fire, and that, if he allows himself to grow up a prince, and become again a king, the same or a worse fate awaits him anew. He resolves, therefore, for the purpose of evading the royal dignity, to feign himself lame, deaf and dumb, and stupid; and he rigidly carries out his vows, emaciating his body by abstinence from his natural food. Now commences a series of severe tests, in which his unfortunate five hundred comrades have to share, intended to try whether he cannot be made to act like them, and to exhibit the desires and capacities suited to his age. But the prince, reflecting on the torments of hell, so much greater, bears all the tests unflinchingly, and shows an utter impassiveness. Deprivation of food, temptation by cakes, sweetmeats, fruits, playthings, and other sensual pleasures, alarms of fire, of wild elephants, of arms, of terrible noises, of darkness, disease by flies, by stench, by heat—all are fruitless. When he has thus reached the age of sixteen, his father again consults the Brahman, who confesses that their former prognostications were lies, and now advises that he be
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sent away and buried in the recesses of spectres. But the queen interceded and
by influence and the prayers made her at the time of the child's birth, erotica
a present to the royal birth, to him for the space of seven days, and, during
that time, all wish upon him, and were her instructions that she will have play on
her given, that she is sure he is acting and show the powers he possesses.
For, the hand he is carried not, in accordance with the directions of the
namesake to be killed, and hidden away, but while the king's character,
shall be with him to amount to anything, but to aggravate his grave, he was and made himself
an instrument of superstition. Powers receive consideration, because, from India,
and to those, he has no right. She, the monster, more powerful, all the matter is fully considered,
and in all. But the present is not in a serious life. In the present.
And in the present, and in all, that he may be seen, the power and in all, that he may be seen,
not to see him in the present, or seize with any strength. I may be seen, the
power of the present, and in all, that he may be seen, or seize with any strength.

The same that retails the present, is that with which the present, or seize with any strength.
The same that retails the present, is that with which the present, or seize with any strength.

In the American Mission of the Future by Rev.

D. B. Philippus, M. D., of New York.

This last was addressed with great animation and of leading manners.

The subject of the address was the power, and the leading manners.

The subject of the address was the power, and the leading manners.
The Book teaches that the souls of all men, good and bad alike, continue to exist after death; that they all pass immediately into Hades, a doleful region, full of enemies and terrors, from whose ordeal the righteous cannot escape; here the wicked may be arrested and delivered to some devouring monster, or remanded to earth, for the discipline of animal transmigration, such being the Egyptian idea of metempsychosis. The righteous pass through a form of justification, and then, emerging at the gates of the West, follow the sun-bark in its bright career; they pass through various transformations, each advancing to a higher plane of existence, by the elimination of the mortal and the evil; then follows a solemn judgment-scene, in the Hall of Two Truths, where the heart of the deceased is weighed in the balance against the image of righteousness, and he is compelled to clear himself of each of the forty-two deadly sins, against as many accusers, who dispute his passage. Being acquitted, he enters the Elysian fields, and partakes of the food of the gods; after which he rises by a succession of grand halls and stairways to the Empyrean, the luminous presence-chamber of Osiris.

The consummation of blessedness, however, is not absorption into the divinity, for the soul retains throughout its consciousness and personal identity; and moreover, the soul visits the body, which has been so carefully preserved, and this is revived. The book clearly recognizes moral distinctions as the basis of divine judgment in the Hereafter, and the personal accountability of man to a supreme tribunal beyond the grave. There is not only a purgatory for the wicked, but a hell for the finally incorrigible.

Such, in general, is the theology of this remarkable book. The researches of scholars will eventually bring out its minuter shades of meaning, and perhaps reduce its doctrines to a well-ordered system.

4. A Plan for a Universal History, by Prof. Joseph W. Jenks, of Boston; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Prof. Jenks states that he has been long engaged upon a work which he proposes to call “History re-read, or an attempt at a simple and instructive philosophy of history,” of which he presents the fundamental outline. He claims that man is of necessity the universal type; that humanity in the complex resembles, in nature, progress, and destiny, humanity in the individual; and that, accordingly, the periods of human history correspond with the successive stages in the life of the individual. He hopes to be able to present, in a year or two, a true historic view of the “childhood” of the race, extending from the end of the period of mythology and fable to the time of Abraham, or about 2000 B.C.


This grammar was issued last year from the press of J. A. Barth, in Leipzig. It is as yet unfinished, there being a second volume still to appear, which will be furnished with complete indexes to the whole work. The present volume is of six hundred and fifty-four royal octavo pages. Prof. Day recognized and commended the fidelity and care exhibited by the editor, Dr. Ferdinand Mühlau, a pupil of the deceased author, and characterized the work itself as deserving the attention of Hebrew scholars on account of its scientific treatment of Hebrew grammar, and the large number of methodized facts brought together in it. Dr. Böttcher has aimed to produce an exhaustive work, in which all the phenomena of the language should be subjected to the modern rational treatment. His divisions and subdivisions, although sometimes excessive and tedious, exhibit great thoroughness, and an evident mastery of the subject. After speaking favorably of the historical introduction, Prof. Day criticised the plan of the grammar. This volume is divided into two books, the former of which treats of the phonology, the other of the etymology of the language. The syntax is to follow in the second volume. In developing the sound-relations of the Hebrew, the author makes a constant distinction between what he calls “sonitals” and “spiritals,” the latter class embracing the semi-vowels, as Vow and Yodh, and the gutturals, the former the vowels and most of the consonants. On the ground of this distinction, he
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treats all the inflected words, whether nouns, verbs, or even particles, as either sonantal, guttural, or semi-vocal. The treatment of the verb is quite general, while that of the substantive, which occupies two hundred and fifty pages, is unnecessarily long, in consequence of being burdened with an excessive citation of particulars. The paper dwelt upon a number of special points, in which the views of the author were either accepted or criticised, and closed with an appreciative estimate of the work, as in reality a thesaurus of materials for Hebrew grammar, and a valuable contribution to Semitic philology and to comparative philology in general. *


One of the leading philological problems of the present day, Prof. Whitney remarked, is to make a translation of the Veda, the Hindu Bible, both on account of its importance as exhibiting the ground-work of Hindu history, and because it is the most ancient existing Indo-European record, and the one that shows us the most primitive attainable phase of Indo-European life and institutions. By the Veda, we mean especially the Rig-Veda, the earliest and most extensive of the four hymn-collections which constitute the kernel of the sacred literature of India—together with such parts of the other collections as are akin with this in character. It has been handed down to us accompanied with a great body of accessory and explanatory works, of which the latest and fullest is the elaborate commentary of Siyana, made in southern India, in the fourteenth century; in which he summed up the whole learning of the Hindu pandits, as gathered and transmitted by a long succession of generations. By the aid of this, especially, were made the first researches of European scholars into the Vedic language and antiquities. A question, now, has arisen as to the absolute value and authority of the commentary and its more ancient sources; the one side maintaining that it represents an immemorial tradition, and is to be, in the main, implicitly followed by us; the other, that it is the final product of a long-continued course of learned inquiry, and must be freely and searchingly criticised in every item, before acceptance. A number of important articles bearing on the controversy have been published within no long time, and of these Prof. Whitney's paper was mainly an abstract and review.

The first article is by Prof. Roth, of Tübingen, and is published in Vol. xxi. (for 1867) of the German Oriental Society's Journal. It sets forth the general principles bearing upon the point under discussion, the conditions under which a so-called "traditional" interpretation grows up, and the impossibility that it should ever be wholly claimed for it; and points out that historical circumstances which should make the case otherwise in India are wholly wanting, and that an examination of the interpretation itself shows it to be of the ordinary character—namely, founded only on a grammatical and etymological basis.

Into such an examination of Siyana's commentary and its chief predecessor, Yaska's Nirukta, the next article reviewed enters in detail. It is by Dr. Muir of Edinburgh, and published in Vol. ii., Part 2 (1867), of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. With unimpeachable fairness, with great industry and learning, with clear statement and logical method, it goes over the whole ground, with great fulness of illustration; reaching the conclusion that "there is no unusual or difficult word or obscure text in the hymns in regard to which the authority of the Indian scholiast should be received as final [his interpretation accepted], unless it be supported by probability, by the context, or by parallel passages;" and that hence, "no translation of the Rig-Veda which is based exclusively on Siyana's commentary can possibly be satisfactory."

* At the moment that this abstract of Prof. Day's notice is passing through the press, the first half of the second volume has come to hand. Its first ninety-five pages are occupied with the pronouns and pronominal suffixes, the remaining two hundred and twenty-four pages with the verb. The conclusion of the work is expected to be ready early in 1868.
Proceedings at New Haven, October, 1867.

Of the principles of Vedic interpretation thus established in the abstract by Prof. Roth, and in the concrete by Dr. Muir, a striking exemplification is furnished by Prof. Max Muller in his article on the "Hymns of this article on the Rig-Veda, and the Legend of King Asamati" (published in the same volume with the one last spoken of). He selects a set of four hymns from the concluding book of the Rig-Veda, to which the tradition has attached an explanatory legend: he shows how this legend has grown up by degrees, by misapprehension and distortion of epithets and phrases of the hymns themselves, and that neither it nor the version made in conformity with it (and which he gives in full) really belongs to them; ending by giving a true version, founded upon independent study, and a determination of the relations of the parts of the text to one another.

In these three papers, we have the case of the anti-comment party presented from every point of view and with all desirable fulness.

The first European scholar of note to set forth and defend the contrary view was Prof. H. H. Wilson. He, however, had long passed the prime of his scholarly activity when the Veda began to attract attention in Europe, and, though his influence and patronage were freely given to the new study, and were of great importance to its progress, he was never in sympathy with its votaries, nor ever won a right to be called a Vedic scholar. The arguments by which he defends the commentaries show the prejudice naturally engendered by an Indian education, and sometimes involves gross transfers to the old Vedic time of the conditions of modern Hindu literature.

Since Wilson's death, his mantle has fallen upon Prof. Goldstücker of London, author of the fourth and last paper reviewed. This is entitled "On the Veda of the Hindus and the Veda of the German School," and was read before the Royal Asiatic Society early this year, but is not yet published otherwise than in a full and careful abstract (evidently made by the author himself) in the London "Examiner" for February 2, 1867. The title of the paper is in two respects open to criticism. In the first place, it seems to involve a petio principi—the "Veda of the Hindus" being the object of all parties, and the point in dispute being whether this is to be arrived at by the methods of the modern Hindu schools, or of the modern European. In the second place, the name "German school," upon which the author dwells, and which he claims to borrow from Dr. Muir, is not found in the latter's paper, and is to be avoided, as seeming to appeal to whatever of prejudice may exist in English minds against foreign scholars and methods. At the same time, Dr. Goldstücker endeavors to disprove the existence of any such school, alleging that those who are claimed to belong to it are discordant in their methods and results. He overlooks, however, the fact that they refer to one common doctrine—i.e., the paramount authority of the commentator's interpretation—that they are ranked together as a school at all; and that they all in the fullest manner acknowledge the true interpretation to be attainable only as the final result of more or less discordant individual effort. Indeed, it may with much more truth be claimed that there is but one school of Vedic study in Europe, with Prof. Goldstücker as its opponent; since it is not known that any other Vedic scholar of eminence shares his views. And whether even he is his opponent on principle has been made doubtful by Dr. Muir, who shows that in his Dictionary he not infrequently criticizes unfavorably and rejects Sāyaṇa's version. It becomes, then, merely a question of personal capacity between the one side and the other; whether the right to deviate from the native authorities is to be confined to any person or persons, or restricted within the limits which these shall prescribe. Of course, each scholar must exercise his independence under responsibility, and he who, on a foundation of insufficient learning and judgment, attempts to translate the Veda, will render himself liable to be contemptu and laughed at; there is doubtless temptation to over-confidence on the one side, as to a comfortable and labor-saving submissiveness on the other; yet all hope of progress is bound up with the former method. Prof. Goldstücker, in justification of the alternative versions so often given by the commentary, proposes to recognize them as originating in and held by different native schools: but, in so doing, he distinctly asserts the transcendental doctrine of his opponents—that these versions are the products of learned study, not of authoritative tradition. He declares that the determination of the grammatical cogyness of Vedic passages (upon which,
assumes the independent interpretations of the other party to be founded) is a peculiarly difficult problem, which has not yet been broached, much less settled. This claim requires farther explanation to make it intelligible: but, meantime, we are justified in going on to interpret simply by aid of the comparison of parallel passages—about which, certainly, there is no mystery, as it is the method successfully employed in every other language and literature besides the Vedic; not only as between authors of the same age, but through all the periods of every literature.

The principles of the "German school" are the only ones which can ever guide us to a true understanding of the Veda. We have within our reach precisely the same means of research which the Hindu schools had—namely, a knowledge of the classical Sanskrit and of modern Hindu institutions, and if our command of such knowledge is in some respects inferior to theirs, the deficiency is much more than made up by the superiority of our methods of research, and by our possession of a critical and historical spirit which was denied to them.


Prof. Gilman gave an abstract of the results of several works which have appeared within no long time past, treating of this interesting region, especially of the alleged wanderings and observations of an anonymous writer, brought to light by the Russian traveller, M. Veniukoff, and recently printed in the London Geographical Society's Journal—the authenticity of the original document having been called in serious question by English geographers. He exhibited maps of the region, and pointed out how it was being approached from more than one side by geographical exploration and discovery.

Rev. Cyrus Byington, for nearly fifty years a missionary among the Choctaw Indians, being present, gave, by request, some account of the progress of civilization and religion in that community during his presence with them, and described, partly in answer to questions, some of the striking peculiarities of their language.

The Society then adjourned, to meet again in Boston, on the 20th of May, 1868.
The Annual meeting of the American Oriental Society was held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 20th, at the usual hour and place. The President being absent, the chair was taken by Rev. Dr. R. Anderson, Vice-President. The day was very stormy, and the attendance of members unusually small.

The minutes of the preceding meeting (at New Haven, Oct. 1867) were read by the Recording Secretary and approved. Reports from the retiring officers were then called for.

The Treasurer’s report was presented, in his absence, by the Recording Secretary. It showed the income and expenses of the year to have been as follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 22d, 1867</td>
<td>$1,049.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Assessments</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of the Journal</td>
<td>149.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on deposit in Savings Bank</td>
<td>107.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts of the year</strong></td>
<td>332.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Proceedings, etc.</td>
<td>$92.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Library and Correspondence</td>
<td>29.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures of the year</strong></td>
<td>$122.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 20th, 1868</td>
<td>1,258.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$1,382.13**

The accounts, having been audited by a committee of two, appointed for that purpose, were accepted.

The Librarian presented a list of donors during the year to the Society’s collections, and gave oral explanations of the character and value of the donations made. To the catalogue of the Library have been added 41 new titles, besides one manuscript title.

In behalf of the Committee of Publication, a report was made by the Corresponding Secretary. There has been no issue of the Journal during the past year, owing mainly to the lack of suitable material. Preparation of the edition of the Tūttīrtīya-Prtītīcākhyā and its commentary, the Tribhūṣyaratna, which work has been intended and expected to occupy a part of the next volume, has been delayed by unforeseen and unavoidable circumstances. The delay, however, was to turn out greatly for the advantage of the work, since new and very important manuscript material has been
recently secured. Besides a collation of the (imperfect) Oxford MS., obtained through the kind offices of Prof. Müller, a copy and collation of two other manuscripts, recently discovered in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London, has been secured. Information of these was sent to Prof. Whitney by Dr. R. Rost, Secretary of the Roy. As. Soc., last autumn; and the copy and collation has been made, with his kind cooperation and aid, by Dr. Julius Eggeling, a German scholar now residing in England, to whose generous and friendly devotion the work will be greatly indebted for its completeness. The manuscripts referred to have been for many years in the possession of the London Society, but, being written in the southern Indian characters (one in Malayalam, the other, on strips of palm leaf, in Grantham), they have until now escaped identification and notice. Their assistance will render it possible to furnish a satisfactory text of the commentary, which it is accordingly proposed to add in full to the treatise and notes. There is no reason to believe that a half-volume will not be ready for delivery to the members by the next annual meeting, and the other half-volume in the course of 1869.

The Board of Directors announced that the autumn meeting would be held in New Haven, October 14th, and that Mr. Cothiel of New York, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, would act as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

They also gave notice that they had appointed Prof. Salisbury and Rev. Dr. Clark to aid the Corresponding Secretary in endeavoring to secure a more extended and active participation of American Missionaries in the work of the Society; and had committed the list of members for revival to Professors Salisbury, Hadley, and Whitney, with directions to report at the next annual meeting.

Two gentlemen, recommended by the Board for election to membership, were balloted upon, and duly elected, namely:

as Corporate Member,

Prof. John B. Feuling, Madison, Wis.

as Corresponding Member,

Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, of Dresden.

The Corresponding Secretary called the attention of the meeting to the unusual loss it had suffered during the past year in the death of four of its Honorary Members—namely, Prof. F. Bopp of Berlin, the Duc de Luynes and M. Reinaud of Paris, and Raja Rādhākānta Deva of Calcutta. He gave a brief statement of the claims of each of these gentlemen to the respectful and grateful remembrance of Orientalists, entering into more detail respecting the brilliant achievements of Bopp in the department of comparative philology.

Notice was also taken of the death of Prof. C. C. Jewett of Boston, a Corporate Member, Prof. Peabody of Cambridge giving some account of his life and literary labors.
Messrs. Ropes of Boston, Sanborn of Springfield, and Brigham of Taunton, were appointed a Nominating Committee to propose a board of officers for the next year. They presented the following ticket (the same with last year's), which was elected without dissent:


**Vice-Presidents**
- Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., "Washington.
- Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, "New Haven.

**Corresp. Secretary**—Prof. W. D. Whitney, Ph.D., "New Haven.

**Secr. of Classical Section**—Prof. James Hadley, "New Haven.

**Recording Secretary**—Mr. Ezra Abbot, "Cambridge.

**Treasurer**—Prof. D. C. Gilman, "New Haven.

**Librarian**—Prof. W. D. Whitney, "New Haven.

**Directors**
- Mr. A. I. Cothale, "New York.
- Prof. W. W. Goodwin, Ph.D., "Cambridge.
- Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., "Princeton.
- Dr. Charles Pickering, "Boston.

A few extracts were read from letters received since the last meeting. Among them was the following, from Mr. John P. Brown of Constantinople, dated Jan. 24, 1868:

"I see in Trübner's catalogue that my little work on "The Dervishes" is out and for sale, although I have not yet received a copy of it. I have just had printed, also, in London, a small work, called "Ancient and Modern Constantinople," which will soon be for sale. I shall try and send you a copy of each. During the spring and summer months I have been absent, and have done but little in the literary line. I am collecting materials for a "Life and Times of A'lí, the 4th Caliph," which I hope sometime to publish. This will have a religious rather than a historical character—or rather, will partake of both.

"Dr. Paspati is employed on a large work on 'the Gypsies and their Language, with their Tales and Ballads.' This will interest you, as the roots of their language are Sanskrit. The secret religion of the Gypsies would be of much interest, and may be found in their tales and ballads; but, as yet, no one has taken it up. Dr. Mordtmann of this city has promised to do so, but has not as yet accomplished anything, so far as I am aware."

Only one communication was presented at this meeting, namely On Bell's "Visible Speech," by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

The work in which this new system of phonetic writing is laid before the public is entitled "Visible Speech: the Science of Universal Alphabetica; or, Self-interpreting Physiological Letters, for the writing of all Languages in one Alphabet. Illustrated by Tables, Diagrams, and Examples. By Alex. Melville Bell, etc. etc. Inaugural Edition. London, 1867." (4to, pp. 126.) It begins with an account of the circumstances attending the origin and development of the system, of the attempt made by its author to get it taken up and propagated through the community by the British Government, and the failure of this attempt, of the tests through which it had triumphantly passed, and of the testimony given in its favor by practised phonetists like Mr. A. J. Ellis. The system is one which cuts loose from all alphabets in present use, and sets up a new scheme of signs, of
which every element is intended to be directly symbolic of a physical act, so that each letter represents the whole method of production of the sound it stands for, and is, after the symbolism is learned, self-interpreting. Not only articulate sounds, but almost all audible utterances of which human organs are capable, are claimed to be representable by it: it aims at, and fairly accomplishes, more than any other system ever invented. Prof. Whitney gave an account of the contents of the work, and an analysis and criticism of its signs for sounds. He showed that, while these are exceedingly ingenious, and in the main sufficiently exact, they nevertheless are far from being entitled to all the credit claimed for them. Even in the consonantal part of the alphabet, Mr. Bell's analysis of not a few sounds is faulty, and his designation false; for example, in s, z, th, he either introduces symbols of unreal acts, or omits to symbolize other real acts of articulation, or both. With his treatment of the far more difficult matter of vowel utterance much more fault was found: his whole scheme of classification and description of the vowels was rejected, as being a step backward rather than forward, when compared with the labors of his predecessors. On the whole, it was asserted that Mr. Bell has not in a single point sensibly advanced the science of alphabetics, although he has shown superior skill in the art of alphabetic notation. He is disposed also to overrate the value and usefulness of his invention, imagining that it is going to do away with the difficulties of learning to read, of learning to pronounce a foreign language, of analyzing and representing the sounds of unwritten tongues, and the like. Whereas, a scheme of alphabetic symbols is like a scheme of chemical symbols, or a nomenclature in any branch of science; a good nomenclature efficiently facilitates the mastery of a science, as a bad one throws obstacles in the way of it; but the nomenclature is of secondary consequence, and to acquire it is not to master the science. It is to phonetists that Mr. Bell's system must be chiefly valuable, and there seems no good reason why the task of spreading the knowledge and use of it should have been assumed by Government.

The construction of the volume presenting the system was criticised as being far too obscure and difficult. By first giving the physical descriptions of sounds complete, and putting off all illustration to another part of the work, the author has doubtless repelled many who might otherwise have learned to understand and favor the new alphabet.

After some discussion of the subject of this communication, the Society adjourned.
Proceedings at New Haven, October 14th and 15th, 1868.

The Society met, as adjourned, at New Haven, in the Library-room of the Sheffield Scientific School, the President in the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read, the Committee of Arrangements presented their plan for the conduct of the present session, which was, on motion, adopted. The Society would adjourn at about 6 o'clock, in order to accept an invitation from the President, Dr. Woolsey, to take tea at his house. After tea, it would receive a communication from Dr. Martin, and would assemble again at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning, to hear further communications.

The Directors gave notice that the next Annual meeting would be holden in Boston, on Wednesday, May 19th, 1869, and that they had appointed for it the same Committee of Arrangements as last year—namely, Mr. Joseph S. Ropes of Boston, and the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries.

They also recommended the election, as Corporate Members, of the following gentlemen:

Mr. John W. Barrow, of New York.
Prof. Albert S. Bickmore, of Hamilton, N. Y.
Rev. Edward L. Clark, of New Haven.
Mr. Albert F. Heard, of Boston.
Rev. William W. Hicks, of Williamsburg, N. Y.
Hon. Elisha R. Potter, of South Kingston, R. I.

Ballot being had, these gentlemen were declared duly elected.

Prof. Whitney, for the Committee of Publication, stated that still another manuscript of the Tāttiriya-Prātiṣākhya and its commentary had been furnished for the benefit of the publication to be made of those works in the Journal. It was a copy, made by Dr. S. Goldschmidt, of a manuscript recently sent to Prof. Weber, at Berlin, by Prof. Bühler of Bombay. The Directors had suitably acknowledged the kindness of Dr. Goldschmidt in making the transcription. The work, it was further mentioned, was already in part prepared for the press, and its printing would be soon commenced.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and extracts from it were read, by the Corresponding Secretary.

Babu Ramachandra Ghosh, under date of Calcutta, Jan. 4, 1868, writes:

"The cultivation of Sanskrit in Europe and America excites a general interest; it has formed a new era in philology, it has opened the dark vistas of antiquity, and contributed to the establishment of great ethnographical facts. It is highly delightful to see a taste for the study of Sanskrit reviving in Bengal. Seven hun-
dread and ninety-five years ago, the Brahmins of Bengal were so ignorant in the higher branches of the Hindu Śastras, that King Adhiraj had to request the Raja of Kanij to send down five Brahmins well known for their erudition. Schools of an elementary character may have existed at this time, but no institutions of a higher order were then to be found in Bengal. Now, many schools are found in Hālišahar, Bāḥiṣṭārī, and Nuddea, where the higher branches of the Hindu Śastras are carefully studied. Celebrated schools, especially of the Nyāya philosophy, however, had been established long before in Mithila. This prevalence of the Nyāya Philosophy in Mithila can be accounted for by the fact that Gotama established a school at a place not far distant from that renowned city, and the study was kept up by his pupils for a considerable time. The first regular school of philosophy established in Bengal was that of Bashudeva Sarvobhauma. Of the numerous students of that Pandit, the names of three have become known throughout the land. This constellation of bright names is composed of Raghunandana, Chalitārya, and Raghunātha Siromani. The first compiled the Smriti, whose dictum is now law; the second was the famous Vaishnava reformer; and the third, the genius whose philosophical acumen Bengal, nay India, may well be proud of. Raghunātha wrote a work exposing the fallacies of the several expositions of the Chintamani, a book written by Gangeshopādhyāya, who had graduated at Mithila. This treatise is a full development of the abstruser parts of the science, as laid down in miniaturo by Gotama. Nuddea is still regarded as the focus of philosophical learning. A number of geniuses appeared one after another, and the profound works of these mighty minds have shed a glory on India itself. The number of the Pandits in Calcutta who have written treatises on different branches of learning in Sanskrit is very small. Here we have a very small number of men who take any interest at all in the labors of an antiquarian. Babu Rājendralāla has already written several papers on different subjects appertaining to the primeval history of India, but has only reproduced the facts which have long since been brought to light by Lassen and others, in a different garb. Babu Rājendralāla has now engaged in composing a Prakrit Dictionary. Prof. Bühler of Punja College has finished his very learned essay on the Aṣvins, and is now busy with an edition of Gobhila's Grihya Sūtra, with Narāyana's commentary.

"Having lately had occasion to refer to the Ganeshā Purāṇa, I found that the author of this has artfully blended Buddhism with the other subjects of his work. The Ganeshā Purāṇa comprises two Kandas. Both the Kandas sanction the worship of Ganeshā. An account of Grītāmata forms a part of this Purāṇa. Grītāmata was the grandson of Raja Bhera of Vidarbha."

"My work on the Vedas is now in the press. When it is published, I shall be very happy to send you a copy of it. My essay on the Aryans is out of print ...."

Rev. A. P. Happer, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa., June 17, 1868:

"I have been quite interested in looking at the Proceedings of the two meetings as published, which you have kindly sent me with your circular. I have been especially interested in reading the summary of the contents of the paper read by Pres. Woolsey, of Yale College, on the word for 'God,' in Chinese. That is a subject which has engaged great attention in China. The discussion has all been conducted during the twenty-four years of my residence in China and connection with Chinese missions. The question is not, what word or compound term would be free from difficulties? That question could be easily settled. But the question is connected with the translation of the Sacred Scriptures, and it is very definite and precise. What Chinese word is the best to translate Elohim of the Hebrew and Theos of the Greek Testament? When answering the question, no philologist can say that Tien-chu, which is not a simple word, but a compound term, made by the Jesuit missionaries, and which means 'Heaven's Lord,' can in any way be regarded as a translation of Elohim, or Theos, or God.

"As a title of the true God, it may and it is very properly used; but it is so used very sparingly by Protestants, for this reason. By general usage of the Chinese, Roman Catholicism is designated 'The religion of the Lord of Heaven,' i.e. Tien-kung; the general usage of the word, by a like generalness, Protestantism is called 'The religion of Jesus,' Yeu kiu. This usage originated from the Romanists' using that term to designate the true God; while, of course,
Protestants in their preaching have principally spoken of Jesus as the Savior of sinners. Protestants here used Ye-wo-woh to represent the proper name "Jehovah" of the true God, as they use Ye-su to represent the name of Jesus. It appears very undesirable that Protestants should be confounded by the Chinese with Romanists. This would be the case if they used Ten-chi. This, however, is a subordinate reason, the chief reason is that that compound term is not a translation of the words in the original languages. Neither is the term Shang-ti a translation of the words in the original; this is also a compound term, originally meaning "Ruler above," or "Supreme Ruler" among gods, as Hwang-ti is the highest ruler among men, and is the name of the Emperor in China. Shang-ti is now also used as the title of an idol—the proper and distinctive name of an idol, as much as Jupiter was.

"While shin may be admitted to be "vague and general," yet were not Elohim and Theos vague and general words? Are they not applied in the Scriptures to false gods, to many gods, to male and female gods, to gods of the hills and of the valleys, gods of great dignity and of small dignity, to gods of many divine qualities and gods who had qualities which are not divine—in a word, to all that class of beings which by polytheists were worshipped? And yet, by usage, they are very properly applied, without any derogation to his character or dignity, to designating the only living and true God, "whose name is above every name." The use of these words, thus applied to the true and the false, to the one only God and to the multitude that are false gods, does not produce any confusion, either in Hebrew, Greek, or English.

"Now shin is such a "general and vague" word. It is applied by the Chinese to all the objects of their idolatrous worship, which are represented by idols of wood and stone and paper, and for the worship of which they erect temples, and to worship which they have shrines in every family residence, store, and workshop. There are shin of the hills and valleys, a shin of fecundity, a shin, a goddess, "the hearer of prayer and the most compassionate one who saves from suffering and misery," shin in Heaven, shin on the Earth. The Chinese go to their temples to worship shin. They pray to shin to restore their health. They return thanks to shin for prosperity. There is a shin called the shin of wealth. Now what word in English would translate shin in all these cases? Why, manifestly, 'god, gods, goddess'—and if that is the word that represents all the various objects of shin or idolatrous worship, what should be done when we wish to teach that idolatrous people to worship the true God, but to tell them there is a true shin, whose name is Jehovah, and who is "the Maker of the Heavens and the Earth." Is there any vagueness in such a statement? Does not the Bible tell them the knowledge which they have of God in general from the light of nature and tradition, and tell them that the Bible teaches there is only one object of proper divine worship?—that Jehovah is therefore the only and the true shin, while all others which they worshipped are false shin, and they must at all times cease to worship them? Will any other word so definitely state to them the only true object of worship, and so distinctly cut them off from all worship of false gods? Can any person preach to a polytheistic people, without having a word which, like Elohim and Theos and "god," will admit of being applied to one only and to many, to the true and the false, to male and female, etc., etc.? I think not. Can Ten-chi be so used? No, there is only one "Heaven's Lord." It is a title, and cannot be used to translate Elohim or Theos. Try it in the passage "The great goddess Diana" (Acts xix. 35). It would read, "Great Heaven's Lord Diana," which is an absurdity; but "great shin Diana" is as idiomatic in Chinese as "great goddess Diana" is in English. When the teaching of the Bible has driven away idolatry, the now "vague" word shin will be as definite, meaning the one true God, as "God" is in English, or Theos is in Greek.

The arguments that shin is the true, the proper, and the only word to use in translating Elohim and Theos, are, in my opinion, unanswerable. At the same time, I think that such titles as Ten-chi, Shang-ti, Maker of Heaven, etc., etc., may be properly and wisely applied to Jehovah, to assist in conveying to the Chinese mind the character and power of Jehovah, the true shin.

"Excuse me for writing so much; I had no such purpose when I commenced."
Upon the subject of this letter, Dr. Martin, of Peking, at the invitation of the President, remarked somewhat as follows:

"The common objection that Ten-chu was coined by Europeans, and therefore is no Chinese word, is founded on an error. That term is found in the works of See Ma-k'ien, the great historian of the Han dynasty, B.C. 122. It is there applied to one of eight deities, who is called Ten-chu, the Lord of Heaven, in distinction from Ti-chu, the Lord of Earth, Hai-chu, the Lord of the Sea, etc. The composition of the term is therefore not original with the Roman Catholic missionaries. Nor was its application to the supreme and only God altogether so.

"On a mountain in the vicinity of Peking, a stone gateway, bearing the inscription Ten-chu-kung, 'Palace of the Lord of Heaven,' marks the site of a ruined temple. This might have been taken for the ruins of a Christian church, but for a more extended inscription on an adjacent pillar, which describes the temple as erected in honor of Shang-ti, the Jupiter of the Chinese Pantheon, who is there represented as the God of Nature. The term, in its later as well as its earlier sense, had become obsolete, and to the Roman Catholic missionaries belongs the credit of reviving it in its later and purer signification.

"In the recent movement towards the adoption of Ten-chu, those Protestant missionaries who favored it were influenced by four considerations: 1st, a desire to escape the difficulties besetting the use of the rival terms Shinn and Shang-ti; 2d, to find a common ground on which all Christians, Catholic and Protestant, might unite; 3d, to profit by the experience of their Roman Catholic predecessors; 4th, to avail themselves of the advantage derived from the currency which has been given to Ten-chu by the Roman Catholics. and to Chu by the Mohammedans.

"Dr. Happer was wrong in supposing that Ten-chu was to be taken promiscuously for God, god, and gods. It was only used in a special signification, shin being retained for idol gods, and divinity in general. Nor does this use of shin preclude its use in the formula Sheng-shin, for 'Holy Ghost'; shin in the one case not departing more widely from its popular sense, than ghost does in the other."

Dr. John Muir, Edinburgh, July 17, 1868:

"... In preparing the new edition of the third volume of my 'Sanskrit Texts,' I have had my attention drawn again to the Vedanta Sutras, and to 'Sankara's account of the use made by the rival schools of Indian philosophy of the Vedic texts to support their own views—interpreting them as variously as Christian divines do the Bible. I have had the desire, expressed before, renewed in me of seeing a complete English version of Sankara produced; as I think that these Indian speculations, even if they should be found to contribute little or nothing to the true theory of Being and the relation of the Finite and the Infinite (which I should be slow to affirm), are at least deserving of notice, more notice than they have yet received, in the history of human thought. I have recently written to K. M. Banerjee, to see if he can be induced to translate 'Sankara. I also wrote not long ago to my brother (the author of the life of Mahomet), who has lately been appointed lieutenant-governor of the North-West Provinces of India, and has the Benares College under his control, to ask if he could get any one to complete the late Dr. Ballantyne's translations of the Sutras, of which only the Sankhya and most of the Nyaya were finished. ..."

Rev. William Tracy, Norwich, Conn., Sept. 3, 1868:

"Just before leaving India last year, I procured a number of small copper coins, most of them apparently of considerable antiquity. There were also among them two small ancient gold coins, and a few silver ones, the latter mostly recent.

"These coins, of which I send you specimens, are dug up from the ruins of ancient towns and villages in the South of India, and their devices indicate the different dynasties under which they were coined; and in some cases also, the religion dominant at the time. Some appear to be Buddhist, some Brahmanic, of the Vaishnava sect, and others of the Shiva sect. A few are Mohammedan. I
regret that I am unable to give a more definite description of these coins, but since obtaining them I have had neither time nor facilities for making a satisfactory examination of them. If you think they are of enough interest to warrant their being placed in the Cabinet of the Society, please make such a disposal of them.

I take the liberty, also, of sending a few specimens of pottery, from what I suppose to be ancient Buddhist sepulchres, such as are found in various parts of India. Some of the best specimens I had procured were entirely destroyed by the carelessness of the native coolies in India. Those which I send have been restored as far as possible; in one instance only a few fragments remain to show the original form of the vessel.

The only metallic remains found in these sepulchres in Southern India, so far as I know, are in the form of daggers, or sacrificial knives. The oxidized fragments of an instrument of this kind, apparently a dagger, accompany the vessels sent. Similar remains are found in all parts of Southern India, and closely resemble those found in the Buddhist Topes of the Penjab.

These ancient burial places as found in Southern India, are of two kinds. The first is simply a large funereal urn, of coarse pottery, from three to four feet in height, pointed at the bottom, and covered with a closely fitting top, within which are deposited various earthen utensils, such as those I send you. These contain the ashes of the deceased and his family, and various objects of value; and, in another instance, I have seen in them the husks of rice, in a state of preservation. A large slab of stone, five or six feet square, is sometimes placed above the urn, one or two feet below the ground, and the place of burial is indicated by a large circle of stones on the surface. The places of burial were usually selected in a hard and dry gravelly soil.

The second class of these ancient sepulchres is less common than the first. They are formed of slabs of stone, enclosing a small chamber, and covered by another slab, generally on a level with the surface of the ground. Quite a large collection of these is found about twenty-five miles from Madura, and a few rods to the east of the Trichinopoly road. Some of these are covered with heaps of stones, but most are surrounded with a circle of stones similar to those mentioned above. Some, I found on visiting them, had been opened, probably by some one in search of treasure. One or two, of better workmanship than the rest, were encircled by a carefully built and well preserved platform of stone. The sides were formed of slabs from six to eight feet square, and three or four inches thick; and a similar slab divided the room into two equal compartments. Three or four feet from the top, a shelf of stone, twenty inches wide and three inches thick, ran across the whole length of the tomb. Near the bottom of each compartment, a hole, fifteen to eighteen inches in diameter, was cut through the stone, forming a passage into the tomb, which was closed by a flat stone placed against it on the outside. Through this passage, probably, the remains of the dead were conveyed to their final resting place.

One or two of the tombs were almost entirely above ground, and, having one of the sides partially broken out, were used as an occasional place of rest and shelter by the shepherds of the neighborhood.

"From the form of these tombs, I should judge that the bodies were deposited in them without having been burned. No signs of funeral utensils were seen, and my limited time would not allow me to make any fresh excavations.

"Tombs of this description are found in several places in the Madura district—in the mountains as well as in the plains, and also in the districts north of Madras. The present inhabitants have no knowledge of the people who constructed them. One tradition regards them as a race of men who never died, and who were placed in these tombs with a little rice and water in cups for their sustenance. Another tradition is, that in ancient times there lived here a race who were the enemies of the gods, and whose great wickedness led the latter to determine upon their destruction. They first attempted to accomplish this by a shower of fire, which they constructed these stone dwellings, and thus proved themselves from the fiery storm. Afterwards, the gods poured out a flood of mud and water, which filled their dwellings and destroyed the wicked race."
American Oriental Society:

"This tradition possibly refers to the destruction of the Buddhists, who were always regarded as the enemies of the Brahmanical deities, and who, if other local traditions are true, were persecuted, and finally exterminated, by the Brahmans and their adherents, a few scattered remnants alone having continued in existence till the eleventh or twelfth century."

"Regretting that the remains I send are so scanty, and my information respecting them so meager, I remain, etc."

Annexed to Mr. Tracy's letter is a list of the coins sent, numbering about one hundred and fifty, among them a dozen silver coins and two gold ones. The coins and the remains from the tombs were laid upon the table, for the inspection of the members present.

Mr. Hyde Clarke, London, Sept. 13, 1868:

After giving a statement of the various ethnographical inquiries which he is engaged in pursuing, Mr. Clarke concludes:

"Next season I lay the foundations of a new subject by a course of lectures at the London institutions on Comparative History, or the phenomenon common to the history of many nations."

After the reading of the correspondence, communications were called for.


After tracing briefly the connection between alchemy and chemistry, the paper proceeded to its main object, viz.: to demonstrate that the origin of European alchemy was to be sought in China.

In support of this view the following considerations were adduced, and illustrated by citations from Chinese and other works:

1. The study of alchemy had been in full vigor in China for at least six centuries, before it made its appearance in Europe. It did not appear in Europe until the fourth century, when intercourse with the far East had become somewhat frequent. It appeared first at Byzantium and Alexandria, where the commerce of the East chiefly centered, and was subsequently revived in Europe by the Saracens, whose most famous school of alchemy was at Bagdad, where intercourse with Eastern Asia was frequent.

2. The objects of pursuit in both schools were identical, and in either case twofold—immortality and gold. In Europe the former was the less prominent, because the people, being in possession of Christianity, had a vivid faith in a future life, to satisfy their longings on that head.

3. In either school there were two elixirs, the greater and the less, and the properties ascribed to them closely correspond.

4. The principles underlying both systems are identical—the composite nature of the metals, and their vegetation from a seminal germ. Indeed, the char-acters being for the germ, and 8 and for the matrix, which constantly occur in the writings of Chinese alchemists, might be taken for the translation of terms in the vocabulary of the Western school, if their higher antiquity did not forbid the hypothesis.

5. The ends in view being the same, the means by which they were pursued were nearly identical—mercury and lead being as conspicuous in the laboratories of the East, as mercury and sulphur were in those of the West. It is of less significance to add that many other substances were common to both schools, than to note the remarkable coincidence that, in Chinese as in European alchemy, the names of the two principal reagents are used in a mystical sense.

6. Both schools, or at least individuals in both schools, held the doctrine of a cycle of changes, in the course of which the precious metals revert to their baser elements.

7. Both are closely interwoven with astrology.

8. Both led to the practice of magical arts, and unbounded charlatanism.
3. Both deal in language of equal extravagance; and the style of European alchemists, so unlike the sobriety of thought characteristic of the Western mind, would, if considered alone, give us no very uncertain indication of its origin in the servile fancy of the Orient.


Mr. Leonard gave a brief description of Amasia in northern Asia Minor, where he has resided for several years as a missionary. It was the birth-place of the geographer Strabo, and at an earlier period had been the royal residence of the princes of Pontus. He spoke of the remains of ancient constructions found in and about it. Greek inscriptions were occasionally met with; several of them were given by Hamilton in his "Researches in Asia Minor." Mr. Leonard himself had copied seven or eight others, which he presented to the Society. Three were from a place called Vezir-Keopren, in the pashalic of Amasia: one was from Ak-Tepe, and two from Avdan-Keoy, villages (each of them) about three miles distant from Vezir-Keopren. He entered into some details as to the places where the inscriptions were found, the size and shape of the stones, the size of the letters, etc.

Professor Hadley, after stating that he had had only a few minutes to look at the inscriptions, proceeded to make some remarks on their appearance. They seemed to be wholly of a sepulchral character. They were all more or less imperfect, having suffered losses, either by the breaking of the stone, or by defacement of its surface, making many letters illegible. One or two inscriptions could hardly be made to yield any continuous sense. The most legible was that inscribed on the face of the rock at the entrance of a tomb in Amasia. It was also the most interesting in its contents, being in verse, and consisting of four elegiac distichs, which, however, were obviously rude and faulty in their metrical structure.

Some further account of these inscriptions will probably be given in the Journal of the Society.

3. On Onomatopoeia in the Algonkin Languages, by Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn.

In Dr. Wilson's "Prehistoric Man" (2d edition, p. 56) is given a list of twenty-six names of animals which he regards as of onomatopoeic origin, and as illustrating the fact that "primitives originating directly from the observation of natural sounds have been borrowed among the native root-words of the New World." This list has been used by Mr. Farrar (Chapters on Language, pp. 24-5) in support of his averment that, in savage vocabularies, "almost every name for an animal is a striking and obvious onomatopoeia." Hence the inquiry raised in this paper as to the actual derivation of the names in question.

Mr. Trumbull premised by saying that, considering our imperfect comprehension of the Algonkin dialects, we could not be expected to refute every assumed and doubtful onomatopoea by a true etymology. Of a part of the words in the list, it can only be said that their origin is not prima facie mimetic. Respecting others, the fact can be proved. Thus koo-kooah, 'sow,' is demonstrably derived, by an adaptation of the name for 'porcupine,' from a root signifying 'sharp,' and it designates 'a bad bristly or prickly animal.' As to pe-shew, 'wild cat,' forms of which are widely distributed, and used to denote various of the feline animals, there is a bare possibility that it may be imitative, but no more. These are the only names of quadrupeds in the list. Of the nineteen names of birds, four or five are presumably mimetic (including those of the owl and crow), six or seven possibly so, and the rest obviously derivative and significant. Shi-sheeb, 'duck,' like duck itself, comes from a root signifying 'dive.' Pau-pauw-say, 'the common spotted woodpecker,' means 'a spotted bird.' Mooch-kah-oos, 'bittern,' denotes a frequenter of marshes. No-no-no-caw-ee, 'humming-bird'—a strange enough onomatopoea—means 'the exceedingly delicate creature.' Of the asserted mi-
motic names for 'frog,' one signifies 'diver,' and the other, as it belongs also to the toad, is not likely to be truly imitative. And so on. If only one-fourth of a list carefully gleaned from three dialects can be fairly set down as onomatopoetic, how much less is likely to be the proportion of such names to the whole vocabulary of any one tribe?

Mr. Trumbull affirmed that most Algonkin names of animals are descriptive derivatives, and that the few apparent exceptions belong to species which are more often heard than seen, while it is doubtful if any name of a quadruped is purely mimetic. To illustrate this, he gave a brief list of names, with their derivations. He further drew attention to certain curious features of Indian nomenclature, especially to the combination of a generic characteristic with specific names; as, for example, certain swimming animals have a common suffix of derivation coming from a root that means 'put the head above water;' others, one that means 'bite;' others, 'scratch,' or 'tear;' of plants, some are thus marked as to be eaten green, as nut-bearing, as having eatable roots, and so on. Such a suffix, in the Chippeway and allied tongues, is gun, the formative of the instrumentative participle; the occurrence of which at the end of the name for 'shooting-instrument' has misled Mr. Farrar into affirming (p. 34) that "in some cases the onomatopoetic instinct is so strong that it asserts itself side by side with the adoption of a name" from a foreign language.

At the evening gathering, at Pres. Woolsey's, the Society was called to order, after tea, at about 8 o'clock, and listened to a lecture by Dr. Martin, on the present and prospective relations of China to the Western world. Some of the topics which he treated of and illustrated, may be briefly stated as follows:

It was a mistake to suppose that the Chinese mind is utterly immobile and incapable of change.

China had passed through no fewer than twenty-two dynastic revolutions. Most of these had indeed originated in no better motive than the lust of power, and had left the wheels of the government to run on in their old ruts. But some of them had involved high political principles; as, for instance, that which led to the overthrow of the feudal system, and the establishment of a centralized government, B.C. 240.

The whole mass of the population had more than once been profoundly agitated by what may be called a religious movement; especially when the three prevailing systems rose from small beginnings, and successively made their way to the throne of the empire and a place in the heart of the nation.

Periods of intellectual awakening had also occurred, distinct from these great systems of morals and religion; such, for example, as that which followed the restoration of the ancient classics, after their destruction by the tyrant of Tsin; such as that occasioned by the invention of paper in the dynasty of Han; the discovery of the art of printing in the dynasty of Tang, and the rise of speculative philosophy in that of Sung.

The movement now in progress involved all three of those elements—politics, letters, and religion.

The political change was exhibited in the foreign relations of China, not in her domestic administration, and the Embassy that had recently arrived in the West was its proper exponent. The liberal policy they had adopted, the Chinese learned in the school of adversity. War, the great civilizer, had been their teacher. The unequal conflict they had waged with the nations of the West had taught them that knowledge is power, and set them on the career of improvement on which they have now entered.

At two places might be seen bodies of troops training in foreign tactics. At four places they had established arsenals, for the manufacture of foreign arms; and at two places they had commenced navy yards, for the building of war vessels.

They were not, however, limiting themselves to learning the art of war. In three of the provinces, schools had been opened, under the auspices of the pro-
vical viceroys, for instruction in the languages and science of the West; and at the capital, a College had been established, under the patronage of the Emperor, which it was intended to expand into the proportions of a University.

The concluding session of the Society was held in the Sheffield Library at 9 o'clock on Thursday morning.

Prof. Salisbury first gave the meeting an account of a volume of Arabic manuscript written by a slave at the south, which had a few months ago been placed in his hands for examination.

Rev. Hyman A. Wilder, missionary to the Zulus in South Africa, presented, in an off-hand way, some interesting details respecting the language, character, and manners and customs of that people.

Dr. Martin exhibited a roll of the law from the Jewish congregations at Kai-fung-fu in China. It was written on kid skins, neatly sewed together, and measured over one hundred feet in length, by two feet in breadth. He proposed at a future time to say something with regard to its character. The circumstance was mentioned that a much older roll from the same locality had been recently presented to the library of the American Bible Society in New York, by Dr. S. Wells Williams.

The following additional communications were presented:

5. On the Ancient Chinese, and its Connection with the Aryan Languages, by Rev. Joseph Edkins, of Peking; presented by Dr. Martin.

Mr. Edkins complains that comparative philologists have paid less attention to the Chinese than its merits deserve, while those who have treated it have taken generally without question the modern forms of the Mandarin dialect, disregarding the secular changes which the language has undergone. These are to be traced out by the aid of the phonetic elements in the written characters, as interpreted especially by the dialects of the south-eastern part of the country. The phonetic re-spelling used in Chinese native dictionaries of 1200 years ago shows the initials and finals in a very different condition from the present, and gives at least 700 separate words instead of the 532 now in use. The odes of the Shi-King, in part from before 1100 B.C., are written in rhyme, which renders possible the restoration in many cases of the pronunciation then usual. The beginnings of Chinese writing were explained by Mr. Edkins, in order to show how the phonetic elements were used to determine earlier pronunciation, and many examples were given in illustration. The application of evidence from the existing dialects was in like manner illustrated. A summary of general results teaches us that the early vocabulary of the language may have contained from twelve to sixteen hundred words, with few or none of the distinctions of tone now prevalent, which have gradually grown up to supplement the deficient resources of expression, the p’ing and fu appearing first, then, after B.C. 1000, the shang, and about the time of Christ the chü; the modern Mandarin, with a fifth tone, since A.D. 700.

Through the whole paper, abundant comparisons are made between words of the Chinese language and words of similar sound in the Mongol and Manchu, and also in various western tongues, including the English.

Prof. Whitney remarked, in criticism of this paper, that, while its attempts at restoration of an earlier phase of the Chinese were highly important and interesting, and the successful prosecution of such researches would bring that language under the consideration of comparative philologists in quite a different way from hitherto, the same value could not be attributed to the author’s comparisons of
words. Mr. Edkins estimated the difficulties of comparison between tongues of
different family far too lightly, neglecting for the western languages the historical
inquiries whose necessity he very properly insisted on for the Chinese, and
calling attention to verbal resemblances which could in many cases be clearly
proved valueless, and in the rest were presumably so. The way was not yet
cleared for fruitful comparisons of the kind here essayed.

6. On Recent Explorations in Jerusalem, by Rev. Edward L.
Clark, of New Haven.

Mr. Clark pointed out how the investigations of the Palestine Exploration So-
ciety have confirmed many of the statements of Josephus which were once held
in doubt, and proved the truth of the conjectures of later writers, such as Dr.
Gustav Schultz, T. Tobler, and Dr. Edward Robinson. The site of the sepulchre
of David on Mt. Zion is shown to be that claimed by the Moslem, but a lower
cave contains the actual burial place; and the former approach is found on the
western side of Mt. Zion, through a large vestibule of native rock, with the re-
mains of steps, piers, and doors.

The strength of the ancient fortress of the Jebusites is attested by stairs cut on
the western face of the hill upon which it stood.

The valley of the Tyropoeon is found to be filled with rubbish nearly ninety feet
depth, near the south-west angle of the temple walls; and, at that place, the massive
pavement is laid bare. At the same time, piers decreasing in size as they are
found successively on the west toward Mt. Zion, and opposite the wall whence
spring the arches of Dr. Robinson’s “bridge,” suggest that this so-called bridge
may have been a steep, broad stairway, an “ascent” to the holy house from the
ancient Xystus. A corresponding break in the wall is noticed by Tobler on the
south-eastern side, over against the Kidron.

Beneath the temple area, the substructions of walls, piers, and massive arches,
many of them as old as the days of Solomon, are found in perfect preservation.
The subterranean passages, the stables of the Knights Templars, bearing the
marks of the horses’ hoofs, and the stairways from the south gate, now closed,
were described.

The supply of water from Eutham and the “upper pool” were alluded to, and
the system of conduits and sewers in the ancient temple, with their cisterns, were
illustrated as they are given by Ermets Pierotti, architect-engineer to Surraya,
Pasha of Jerusalem.

The water supplies for the district of Ophel, the towers over the “Virgin’s
pool” and Siloam, and the proofs that Mt. Ophel, rather than Mt. Zion, was the
site of Solomon’s palace, were other points touched upon. Some facts were added
which may have weight in deciding as to the course of the first and second walls
of the city.

No further papers being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet
again in Boston on the 19th of May, 1869.
Proceedings at Boston, May 19th, 1869.

The Society met at the usual time and place. In the absence of the President, the chair was taken by Prof. E. E. Salisbury, one of the Vice-Presidents.

After the reading of the minutes of the preceding meeting, reports of the retiring officers were called for. The Treasurer's Report showed the transactions of the past year to have been as follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 20th, 1868</td>
<td>$1,259.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual assessments paid in</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of the Journal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,557.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of Journal (ix. 1), Proceedings, etc</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses of Library and Correspondence</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid for binding of books</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,200.07</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,557.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accounts were audited by a Committee appointed for the purpose, and accepted.

The Librarian made a verbal report, mentioning the principal donors to the library during the past year, and describing their contributions.

The Committee of Publication announced that the first half of vol. ix. of the Journal was out of the hands of the printer, and ready for delivery to the Members. It was hoped that the other half-volume would be published by the time of the next annual meeting.

The Directors gave notice that they had appointed the autumn meeting to be held in New Haven, on the 20th of October next, unless the Committee of Arrangements should see reason for changing the day:* that committee was composed of Prof. Chas. Short of New York, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries.

Further, they recommended to the Society the Election as Corporate Members of

---

* The day was in fact changed, and the meeting took place on Thursday, the 31st.
and the transfer, from the list of Corresponding to that of Honorary Members, of the names of Hermann Brockhaus, Gustav Flügel, Adalbert Kuhn, Max Müller, John Muir, Adolphe Regnier, Ernest Renan, Rudolf Roth, Friedrich Spiegel, Constantin Tischendorf, and Albrecht Weber. These recommendations were, by ballot and vote, duly accepted and adopted by the Society.

The Corresponding Secretary called attention to the decease within the year of two of the Corporate Members, Rev. Swan L. Pomroy, D.D., of Portland, Me., and Prof. John J. Owen, D.D., of New York, for many years a Director of the Society. Dr. Proud- fit, being called upon, paid an appropriate tribute to the character of Dr. Owen.

The correspondence of the past six months was laid upon the table, and extracts from it were read. Of most interest were a letter from Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, of London, in reference to Bell's system of "Visible Speech" (criticised in a communication presented to the Society at the preceding annual meeting; see the Proceedings of that meeting), expressing and explaining his high opinion of the system; and a letter from Prof. B. Jaulg, of Innsbruck (in the Tyrol), from which the following is an extract:

"In 1866 I published (at Brockhaus's in Leipzig) the Tales of the Siddhi-Kür in the Kalmuck language, and, in 1868 (at Wagner's, Innsbruck) the supplementary tales to the Siddhi-Kür and the History of Arji-Borgi-Chain in Mongolian. Although I received from the Vienna Academy a subsidy toward the expense of publication, I was obliged to add a very considerable sum out of my own pocket, which can only be covered by sale of the volumes. Of scholars interested in this special department there are but few, and the sale is almost exclusively to the larger libraries, so that I am very far from being reimbursed as yet. Hardly a copy has hitherto gone to America; and I beg that you will use your influence to have at least the original edition in Kalmuck and Mongolian procured by one and another College or University or other public library, where philological studies are pursued."

The Corresponding Secretary commended the works in question to the attention of the members present, as contributions of great and acknowledged importance to an interesting and little cultivated branch of linguistics.

The following gentlemen were next chosen by ballot, upon nomination of a special committee appointed for the purpose, as officers of the Society for the ensuing year:

Vice-Presidents—I Hon. Peter Parker, M.D., "Washington.
Corresp. Secretary—Prof. W. D. Whitney, Ph.D., "New Haven.
Proceedings at Boston, May, 1869.

Sec. of Class, Section—Prof. James Hadley, LL.D., "New Haven.
Recording Secretary—Ezra Abbot, LL.D., "Cambridge.
Treasurer—Prof. D. C. Gilman, "New Haven.
Librarian—Prof. W. D. Whitney,

Mr. A. I. Cotheal,
Prof. W. W. Goodwin, Ph.D., "Cambridge.
Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., "Princeton.
Dr. Charles Pickering, "Boston.
Prof. Charles Short, LL.D., "New York.

The following communications were then presented:

Dr. Martin spoke of the various inventions, or discoveries, or applications of the resources of nature, in which China has exceeded the rest of mankind, and the knowledge of which has, either demonstrably or probably, found its way to the western world from China. He first referred to tea, as an important contribution to human comfort, and the chief staple of commerce which has led to important political results. Porcelain and silk were made only in China, until Europe learned to rival or surpass its teachers in these arts. Gunpowder is probably Chinese. The discovery of America is in a double sense owing to China, as the wealth of Cathay attracted Columbus westward, and the magnetic needle, which had been used in China for more than two thousand years, directed his course. Paper-making the Chinese invented in the first century of our era, and printing at least eight hundred years before its reinvention in Germany. Inoculation for the small-pox they had long practised before Europe learned it from the Turks, to whom it had probably found its way from the extreme East. And alchemy, the forerunner of chemistry, was pursued in China, before the Christian era, for the same objects which the early alchemists learned from the Arabs to seek after. The Chinese of the present day have ceased to invent; and while, a few centuries ago, they were in advance of all the rest of the world in the arts of civilized life, they are now, simply by having ceased to progress, as far behind the most civilized nations. Their stagnation is to be in the main attributed to their reverence for ancient times, their absorption in the study of language, literature, and antiquity, with consequent neglect of physical science, and the absence of Christianity.

2. On a Hebrew MS. of the Pentateuch, from the Jewish Congregation at Kai-fung-fu in China, by Mr. John W. Barrow of New York; presented by Dr. Martin.

This is a synagogue roll, written on 112 skins of white leather, in 237 columns, of 49 lines each; it measures 143 feet in length. The skins are in two or three places put together in the wrong order, and one passage, from Exodus xxxviii. 18 to Leviticus i. 6, is wanting. They are generally in good condition, but a little water-stained. The character is clear and legible, though not elegant, and approaches the Spanish type. The text is the Masoretic, and the deviations from the received text are almost entirely mere errors in spelling. The original of which this is a representation must evidently have been of European and comparatively modern origin.

In the 26th chapter of Davidson's "Biblical Criticism" (ed. 1866, pp. 366-70), reference is made to the collation of another synagogue roll from the same source, with similar results. Dr. Lee, in the "Prolegomena in Biblia Polyglotta Lodziensia Minora," gives extracts from Koehler's "Notitia S.S. Bibliorum Judaicorum in Imperio Sinensi" (Halle, 1805), in which the Kai-fung-fu manuscripts are discussed.

Appended to Mr. Barrow's paper was a detailed conspectus of the various readings of the MS. In question, as compared with the received text.
American Oriental Society:

After reading this paper, Dr. Martin gave, by request, an account of his journey to Kai-fung-fu, his intercourse with the remnants of the Jewish colony there (from whom he obtained the roll forming the subject of the paper), and the conditions in which they now exist.


Prof. Jenks detailed the instances of occurrence in the Bible of the word Ophir, with their different orthography, and with their varying representation in the Septuagint. He briefly stated the views which had been put forward respecting the position of the country; and he proposed to harmonize their discordance by assuming that the Hebrew-Syrian fleet of Hiram and Solomon sailed through the Red Sea to rendezvous at some port of southern Arabia; that it there separated, a part going eastward to India, and a part southward to Zanzibar and Mozambique; and that, re-assembling in due time, and adding the valuable articles of traffic of Arabia itself, it returned to Eziongeber laden with the products of three countries. Sheba was claimed to be the region on both sides of the straits of Babelmandeb.


This communication was mainly a defense of the current views of ancient history and chronology, founded on the Bible. It opposed especially the opinions of Mr. J. D. Baldwin, as set forth in his recent work entitled "Prehistoric Nations" (New York, 1869).

5. On the Hill-People of Kamaon, India, by Rev. J. T. Gracey, Missionary of the Methodist Board in Central India.

Mr. Gracey explained that what he had to say referred to the general population of the province of Kamaon, not to the Bhotiyas of the mountain passes, nor to such exceptional tribes as the Nathas. These people appeared to be destitute of legends or traditions accounting for their origin. They acknowledge but three castes, Brahmana, Rajputa, and a low degraded class called Doma. Among their peculiar customs is a game called pathar-sid, 'stoning,' in which two parties, of about two hundred each, pelt one another with stones, in a valley between hills, which are crowded with spectators; the players defending their heads by aid of a brass-studded skin shield. Polyandry is said to have prevailed formerly, but is now replaced by polygamy, and the marriage-tie is a very loose one. Among the divinities worshipped in the hills are Goél and Sétm, and the goddess Naini. Mr. Gracey gave some details respecting their worship, and related legends told of them. The people have an excessive dread of ghosts; those residing in the mountain passes are propitiated by the sacrifice of a bit of the clothing of each one who goes by.

A vocabulary of about two hundred words from the language of the hill-people of Kamaon, with their equivalents in Hindustani, was subjoined to the paper.


After briefly referring to the practical importance of his subject, and its bearing upon the question of an improved civil service in the United States, Dr. Martin began with speaking of the completeness and elaboration of the Chinese system, of the success with which it attained its object, the drawing in of the ablest minds of the empire to the service of the State, of the general capacity and culture of the mandarins class, and of the essential democracy of a constitution which neither recognized a hereditary aristocracy, nor left offices to be filled by the favorites of the Emperor or his representatives. The origin of the system is referred to the time of Shun (about B. C. 2200), who examined his officers every third year, for promotion or degradation. Under the Chau dynasty (about B.C. 1100), candidates for office, as well as officers, were examined in the six arts of music, archery, horsemanship, writing, arithmetic, and social and public etiquette. About the beginning
of our era, under the Han candidates selected in the provinces for filial piety and integrity were examined at the capital in the arts above specified, and in civil and military affairs, agriculture, and geography. A thousand years later, under the Tang, the present classification of candidates and of officers was already established. Now, the subjects for examination are the same as of old, but, in accordance with the circumstances and spirit of modern times, the mode is prevailingly literary rather than practical. The three grades of candidates are called shu-t'ai, ch'i-jin, and sin-shi, or 'budding genius,' 'promoted scholar,' and 'ready for office.' The trial for the first degree is held in the chief city of each district or hien; about two thousand competitors are present, of every age, and each produces a poem and essays on assigned themes, during a night and a day of close confinement; and the authors of the few best, about one in a hundred, receive the degree of shu-t'ai. The holders of this title assemble once in three years at the capital of a province, and, after examination on a much wider range of subjects, in three sessions of near three days each, about one in a hundred is again advanced to the dignity of ch'i-jin. Each ch'i-jin is authorized to repair the next spring to Peking, to compete with his peers for the first degree, which is won by about three in a hundred. The successful sin-shi has now open to him the highest offices in the empire, but begins usually as mayor, or sub-prefect, or sub-chancellor, to which place he is appointable by lot —if not first admitted, upon an examination presided over by the Emperor in person, into the highest literary body in the empire, the Han-tsin ('Forest of Pencils'), or Imperial Institute. Once in three years the Emperor designates a chuang-yuen, or laureate scholar of the empire.

This system amounts to the most powerful incitement possible to study—more efficient, in fact, than common schools, colleges, and universities; and it makes the most persistent and energetic labor, continued as long as the powers last. Of a certain list of ninety-nine successful competitors for the second degree, the average was above thirty years of age, while one was sixty-two, and one eighty-three. Nearly all who enter the first examination (many millions) devote their lives to education; and for readiness with the pen and retentiveness of memory are hard to parallel elsewhere. That their education is one-sided, devoted to words rather than things, exclusively literary and not scientific, the fault is not in the system, but in the national standard of knowledge. And the system affords the most powerful lever by which the standard might be raised and changed, under an enlightened central board.

In its political aspects, the system operates as a safety-valve, giving to those who are able and ambitious of distinction the means of receiving it legitimately; it affords a counterpoise to the authority of an absolute monarch; it makes administrators who understand the people whom they have to rule; and it furnishes an immense educated class who are interested in the permanence of existing institutions.

The strict standard of the examination has sometimes been lowered by allowing a greater number of successful competitors, and even, in times of special need, by selling the right to compete in a higher examination without having passed the lower; but, on the other hand, the purity of the system is carefully guarded, and a few years since the first president of the examining board at Peking was put to death for granting two or three fraudulent degrees.

In illustration of the style of the examinations, Dr. Martin gave translations of several examination-papers, or lists of questions given to the candidates to write upon.

After the reading of this paper, the Society adjourned, to meet again in October, at New Haven.
Proceedings at New Haven, October 21st and 22d, 1869.

The Society assembled for its autumn meeting on Thursday, October 21st, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair.

After the reading of the minutes, the Committee of Arrangements gave notice that they had accepted on behalf of the Society an invitation from the Secretary of the Classical Section, Prof. Hadley, to take tea and hold the evening session at his house. On motion, their action in the matter was approved.

The Directors announced that they had appointed the next Annual Meeting to be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 18th, 1870, and had designated Mr. J. S. Ropes, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, as Committee of Arrangements for the meeting.

They also recommended for election as members of the Society:

to Corporate membership,

Rev. Myron Maury, of Cold Spring, N. Y.
Mr. Nathaniel Paine, of Worcester, Mass.
Rev. Joseph K. Wight, of New Hamburg, N. Y.

to Corresponding membership,

Rev. John T. Gracey, Missionary in Central India.

The gentlemen thus recommended were elected without dissent.

The Directors also informed the Society that, by a disastrous fire which occurred in the printing office of Messrs. Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, on the 21st September last, all the undistributed part of the edition of the half-volume of Journal just published (vol. ix. No. 1), along with the extra copies of the Taïtirïya-Prātiṣākhyya, had been destroyed. The Committee of Publication was now authorized by them to proceed to reprint the work and replace the loss, as soon as should be found convenient: the expense would be, it was expected, not far from two-thirds covered by an insurance of five hundred dollars which had been taken upon the Society's property in the building burnt.

Extracts from the correspondence of the past half-year were read by the Corresponding Secretary; among others, the following:

From Prof. G. Seyffarth, Dansville, N. Y., June 26th, 1869:

"... I am about to publish a work entitled "Clavis Aegyptiacae: collection of all bilingual and some other hieroglyphic inscriptions, translated and explained. With the syllabic alphabet in hieroglyphic, hieratic, and demotic characters, and with glossaries and indexes." This volume will contain thirty-four inscriptions, of which the famous one found in the ruins of Pompeii, on the altar in the temple of Isis, will interest the Italians."
From the Rev. J. Perkins, D.D., Chicopee, Mass, Oct. 9th, 1869:

"... I am sorry to be obliged to report myself as confined to my room by protracted sickness, and not even able to use a pen. ... By another hand I send you two manuscripts, which I beg you to present to the Society's attention at your convenience. They are a brief grammar and vocabulary of the Kurdish language, prepared by the late lamented Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, one of your corresponding members. He had commenced copying the grammar for you before his death. Of Mr. Rhea you already know something. He was one of the most gifted men of all our missionaries. He resided eight years in Kurdistan, a much longer time than any other civilized man ever lived in the country; and, while he made the Nestorians and their language the objects of his special attention, he yet freely mingled with the Kurds also during the whole period. Yet it is to be presumed that Mr. Rhea would not claim for his grammar and vocabulary any merits beyond those of the briefest epitome of the language. I would present these manuscripts to the Oriental Society in the name of his widow. ... I hope in a few weeks to send you a copy of an admirable memoir of Mr. Rhea [by Rev. D. W. Marsh]."

Mr. Rhea's manuscripts here spoken of were laid before the Society later in the meeting.

From Mr. William Gamble, Superintendent of the Presbyterian Mission Press at Shanghai, dated May 18th, 1869:

"I shipped by the American Mail of March 20th two boxes of type for you, being the Chinese font ordered some time since for the American Oriental Society. Of the fund collected by Dr. Bradley there will still remain in your hands a considerable balance after paying for what are now sent. If you wish still to expend it in Chinese type, I would advise that, instead of having a larger font, you purchase the matrices for the more common sorts. In this way your font would be much more serviceable, if you wished to use it in printing. The great difficulty in printing Chinese with moveable type comes from our constantly running out of sorts. The total number of different characters in the font is 6000 full body, and 1500 primitives and radicals, which will by combination make a total of nearly 25,000 different characters. The type are in the cases, which are well packed in the boxes, and all you will have to do is to get a small cabinet made for the cases, and slip them into it according as they are numbered. ... The Chinese and Japanese are commencing to use our method of printing to some extent."

The Secretary explained that the font procured was one of small pica size, recently cut at Shanghai under the direction of Mr. Gamble himself, and highly approved both by Chinese and foreigners for the beauty and delicacy of its style, and its convenience of practical use with English type.*

He was obliged to add that the packing had proved insufficient, and that the boxes had come to hand with most of the cases broken, and their contents in a state of pi, so that the font was not for the moment in condition to be used. The Directors have authorized such expenditure as should be required in order to restore its serviceableness.

From Dr. W. F. A. Behrnauer, dated Dresden, April 7th, 1869:

"I communicate herewith an account of the Arabic inscription found on the hippocriff of the Campo Santo at Pisa, with a rubbing made by my friend Dr. Delafsen, during his studies, made in Italy at the end of 1859 and the beginning of 1860." Dr. Behrnauer refers to the interpretation of this inscription given by M. Marcel

* The following is a specimen of it: 入之初性本善
in 1839, in the Journal asiatique, and characterizes it as hardly satisfactory. Lan-
ci's plate, in his "Trattato delle simboliche rappresentanze Arabiche" (Paris, 1845,
4to, vol. ii, pp. 54, 164), is more accurate than Marcel's, but his explanation is also
not to be approved: such is the opinion of Mr. Michel Amari, who gives a new
reading of the inscription, copied by Dr. Behrnauer and translated as follows: "ex-
cellent benediction and high favor, perfect prosperity without envy, and perpetual
wealth and unalterable health and happiness, and revenue not diminished for its
possessor." Dr. Behrnauer quotes from De Morrons ("Pisa illustrata," Pisa, 1787,
vol. i, p. 190-195) some account of the monument. It is 1¼ metres (about five
feet) high, and 1½ metres (a little over three feet) broad. It is said to have been
found under ground while the foundations of the cathedral of Pisa were laid; and
was placed as an ornament upon the point of the gable of the cathedral, where it
remained until the beginning of the present century. It was somewhat damaged
by musket-balls, fired at it while in that position.

The inscription of this monument has a great resemblance to the other legendary
texts which are to be found on monuments of metal, on bowls and on vases, and
the like.

The Corresponding Secretary also exhibited a copper fac-simile
(electrotyped) of a supposed block-tin coin, stated to have been
found, a foot and a half below the surface, at a place in Vermillion
Co., Indiana, surrounded by forests but in the neighborhood
of so-called "Aztec" mounds; and supposed to be a relic of the
"mound-builders." It belongs at present to Mr. John Collett, of
Eugene, Vermillion Co., Ind., who is desirous of having its true
character determined. The characters on the coin were evidently
Arabic, and several gentlemen present, practically familiar with
Eastern coins, had no doubt of its being a quite modern Arabic
coin, although no one was able to make out the legend. It was
generally pronounced to belong to a class of spurious relics of
which the West has been somewhat prolific of late.

Communications were now called for, and the following were
presented:

1. On a Set of Ancient Chinese Scrolls, containing representa-
tions of early Emperors and other distinguished characters, by Dr.
Peter Parker, of Washington, D. C.

These scrolls purport to be fac-similes of stones engraved during the Han dy-
nasty (ended A. D. 260). They represent Hwang-ti (alleged date, B. C. 2596),
Chuen-hueh Kaou-yang, son of Chang-i and grandson of Hwang-ti (B. C. 2400),
Fuh-hi, the inventor of writing, and Tsang-ting (B. C. 2254), Chu-hoong,
Shin-
nung the Divine husbandman (B. C. 3114), Te-yasou (B. C. 2330), the illustrious,
"benevolent as heaven, wise as god, whom the people approached as the sun, and
looked up to as the clouds," and various other worthies celebrated in the annals of
China.

Dr. Parker gave a partial explanation of the contents of the scrolls. The fac-
similes are highly valued by the Chinese, and their treatment serves to illustrate
the zeal and cleverness of Chinese antiquarians. Scores of the latter have expended
study upon them, with results which are recorded on the scrolls, each comment
being dated, and having the signature and the seal of its author affixed. The original
inscriptions are in part so effaced by time that only portions of the characters
remain; but from these the reading has been restored and the sense determined.
A set of the scrolls was presented to the Society by Dr. Parker, who proposed
to furnish later a complete translation of their contents, with notes.

2. On the Algonkin name Manit or Mominou, sometimes trans-
lated 'Great Spirit' and 'God,' by Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of
Hartford, Conn.
Proceedings at New Haven, October, 1869.

This paper was introduced by remarks on the difficulty of distinguishing, in the present habits and opinions of the Indians of North America, that which they have inherited from remote ancestors and that which they have derived from foreign sources. In the absence of historical records and reliable traditions, traces of primitive beliefs must be sought in language; and such evidence as language supplies is the more valuable because it cannot be suspected of a European origin, or as of modern invention.

An analysis was given of the name Manit or Manitou, by which various Algonkin nations expressed their highest conception of an existence and a power superior to man's. Manitou (otherwise written Manntiou, Manito, Munedo, etc.) was shown to be formed from Manit, by affixing the representative of the verb-substantive. It means 'Manit is,' or 'it is Manit.' The next step in analysis separates the initial M, which is an indefinite and impersonal prefix, from an-it, a participle of the verb an-eu, meaning 'to be more than, to exceed, to surpass.' The adverbial form, an-ud (in the Massachusetts language), is the sign of the comparative degree, and means 'more, beyond.' An-it does not connote life, spiritual existence, or any moral attributes. One of its uses is in the sense of 'corrupt,' 'rotten,' or 'decayed,' that is, 'gone beyond' or 'more than' the natural and proper state. In this sense the Mass. an-it and an-euk (from the same verb) are used by Eliot; the Abnaki anaken by Rale, and the corresponding ak-e, in the Delaware, by Zeisberger.

The primary meaning of Manit was thus found to be, 'Somebody who or something which goes beyond, exceeds, or is more than' the common or the normal; something extra-ordinary or preter-natural—not, necessarily, supernatural. And thus it was shown to agree with the explanation of the word given by several early writers.

Other Algonkin words were mentioned, having similar meaning but no etymological affinity to Manit; such as the Abnaki Nweesk and Micmac Nezkom. The Dakota wakan', which has been translated 'God, a spirit, something consecrated; medicine,' etc., was derived from the preposition and adverb aka, 'above, superior.' Hence, wakan is as appropriately used to characterize a bad spirit as a good one, or any extra-ordinary natural phenomenon as either.

In a paper printed with the Proceedings of the Am. Philosophical Society for September, 1864, was pointed out the resemblance between the Algonkin Manitou and certain old-world names or titles of the Supreme Being, such as the Chinese ming tsou, Egyptian ma nfr, Latin magnum deus, Greek μυθεος, and Sanskrit makri deva.' Mr. Trumbull remarked that, with the reduction of manitous to its root as, this resemblance disappears, and with it the mathematical probability, which had been computed as not far from "a hundred million to one," of the derivation of these names from the same original source. This analysis also deprives of all special significance what Dr. Schoolcraft regarded "as the remarkable fact, that the -do or -lo of the Algonkin name of God is in sound both the Greek [Latin] DEO and the Azteck TEO transposed." More verbal resemblance was proved (as Mr. Trumbull believed) in this instance, as it has been in many others, to be valueless as evidence of the genetic relationship of languages.

3. Brief Grammar and Vocabulary of the Kurdish Language, by the late Rev. Samuel A. Rhea, Missionary among the Nestorians of Kurdistan; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

The letter of Dr. Perkins accompanying this paper has been given above.

In his grammatical sketch, Mr. Rhea goes through with the different parts of speech, explaining their inflections and modes of use; spending by far the most space upon the classification and conjugation of verbs. His vocabulary contains not far from fifteen hundred words, with very brief indication of their meaning, usually limited to a single synonym.

The Secretary read some extracts from the grammar, pointing out the very close accordance between the facts detailed and those of the Persian language. He remarked that the question of publication of the manuscript would of course remain to be determined by careful comparison with the already published data for the Kurdish, which alone could show how much that was new, and an addition to knowledge, was brought to light in it. There could hardly fail to be matter of de-
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cided value here; and the collection and working up of it, in the leisure of a laborious life, was an evidence of scholarly taste and devotedness on the part of Mr. Rhea which was highly creditable to him, and could not but add to our sorrow for his early death.


Dr. Van Lennep gave a summary account of some of the results of his own explorations in Asia Minor, mentioning at the same time that most of them would be found more fully described and illustrated in a forthcoming work of his entitled "Travels in Asia Minor," now in process of publication (by Murray, London).

He spoke first of the remains of a very ancient fort on the top of a mountain which is called Star mountain (Yildiz Dağlı). Strabo describes a mountain by this same name, asserting that the most valuable treasures of King Mithridates were kept in the castle at its summit, and that it was taken by the Romans. Dr. Van Lennep pronounced Strabo's description to apply closely to this mountain, as regards both its situation and its character. Two streams gush forth high upon its side and flow not far apart; when they reach the base, they turn in opposite directions, pass completely around the mountain, and, uniting on the other side, form what is still called the Star river. The mountain lies between Tocat and Sivas, and the fort is more than eight thousand feet above the level of the Black Sea. It commands a view as far as that sea on the north, and Mt. Argens on the south.

Referring to the sculptures on Yazılı Kayah (near the ancient Pterium, one day's journey north of Yuzghat), Dr. Van Lennep assented to Texier's explanation of them, as representing the introduction of the worship of Astarte into Phrygia; but claimed that the youth behind the goddess, whom Texier calls simply a prince, must be recognized as the Cupid of the Greeks. Mr. Layard had equally failed to recognize the child-god in the procession he copies from the carvings at Nineveh. Dr. Van Lennep supported his view by a gem recently obtained by him in Asia Minor, on which is cut an intaglio figure of the Assyrian Astarte, with the three-pointed crown on her head and the star and crescent moon on either side; while behind her, on a chair, sits a child, who is none other than Cupid. This gem was pronounced to be of Assyrian subject and Greek workmanship, pure Greek and Assyrian intaglios being exhibited to illustrate its character.

Next were described the remains of an unfinished Egyptian building at Euyuk, a day's journey north of Yazılı Kayah. Its material is black granite, while Grecian monuments are usually of marble. Egyptian sphinxes stand on either side of the entrance, from which a line of sculptured stones extends to the right and left, as in other ancient monuments, both Assyrian and Egyptian. The sculptures seem to represent the erection of the building, and the festivities and ceremonies observed on the occasion. The bull Apis stands on a platform, and sacrifices of goats and oxen are offered to him by the king and queen. The figures and hair of nearly all the figures are African.

Farther, the figure of Sesostris was spoken of, found carved on a ledge near the mouth of a pass through Mt. Tmolus, not far from the ancient road from Smyrna to Sardis. This is one of the two figures of the conqueror described by Herodotus.

Finally, Dr. Van Lennep described the interesting remains that lie around Smyrna; especially the old rubbish-heaps of ancient Smyrna, where valuable remains are often brought to light by the rains. He spoke of the opening of several tombs of a very ancient date. He also exhibited to the Society various figures or fragments of figures in terra cotta, of the highest artistic merit, which had been found in those tombs or in the soil, and which appear to him to have been originally gilded, and to have represented the household divinities of the ancient Smyrniotes.

5. On a Chinese Tablet illustrating the religious opinions of the literary class, by Dr. D. B. McCarter, Missionary of the Presbyterian Board at Ningpo, China.

Dr. McCarter said that the scroll which he exhibited was interesting both as a very favorable specimen of Chinese calligraphy, and as showing the views held by
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a large proportion of the literary men of China with reference to the popular religion. He went on to set forth briefly the peculiar religious condition of China, explaining that the Chinese as a nation, instead of being divided between the Confucian faith, Buddhism, and the doctrines of Lao-tze, really accept them all, having recourse always to the particular divinity or rite which is reputed to be serviceable in such matters as they happen to have in hand. It has been stated that the literati, or so-called Confucianists, do not worship idols; but this is an error, for the stellar gods Win-chang (Ursa major) and Kwei-sing (polar star) are worshipped by the literary class as such, and by them alone, as the speaker could testify from personal observation, having lived in a temple with these idols for more than a year.

The scroll exhibited was an impression or rubbing from a stone tablet erected in the Cheng-Hwang Miao, or 'Temple of the Tutelar Deity' of the Wei-hien or 'district city of Wei,' in the province of Shan-tung, China; and the inscription was in the handwriting of Cheu Pan-k'au, the Chi-hien or magistrate of the district—a literary gentleman celebrated as a poet, a calligrapher, and a wit, whose "Remains," consisting of poems, pencil drawings, and epitaphs, have gone through many editions in China. The sentiments expressed in this document clearly mark Mr. Cheu as a disciple of the school of Chu-hsi, who may be said to have been the Comte of China. The inscription bears the date of the 17th year of Kien-lung, the 9th of the then current cycle (of 60 years), and the 5th moon (about June, A.D. 1752). Mr. Cheu commences by referring to the Ku-lin, the feng or phoenix, the serpent, and the dragon; to each of which are ascribed bodily members, and distinct personal characteristics. He then speaks of the heavens, as an azure vault, and the earth as a massive clod, and man as the being who, dwelling between heaven and earth, is characterized by certain bodily organs, the faculty of speech, a sense of propriety, etc. But, he asks, how can we suppose Heaven to possess bodily organs like man's, and ascribe to it a personal existence? He says that from the time of the Duke of Chou (B.C. 1130) the name "Supreme Ruler" (Shang-ti) has been applied to Heaven, and that the vulgar have styled it the "Gemmaeous Emperor" (Yu-Huang), and invested it with bodily organs, clothing, regalia, and a personal existence; have made images of it, and accompanied them with retinues of followers; and that subsequent ages have regarded it with awe and reverence. He then speaks of the Cheng, or wall which surrounds every city, and of the Hwang, or moat which encircles it, and asks why people have personified these as a god, and attributed to this god power over life and death, and jurisdiction over happiness and misery, surrounding (its images) with awe-inspiring objects, so that not only the common people are struck with awe, but even he himself confesses that, on entering the dark recess of its temple, his hair stands on end, the hair of his shoulders, as though he stood in the presence of a demon. He quotes an ancient sage who says "these things are what make the people seek to conciliate them" (i.e., the gods), and adds that, unless the ignorant populace have a desire to conciliate the gods, the officers could not trust them (nor control them). After describing the repairs that had been made necessary, and the expense incurred in making them, and in suitably furnishing the temple, he adds that some might be disposed to question the necessity, or propriety, of expending several thousand ounces of silver in erecting a pavilion and stage for theatrical exhibitions; and asks "Can it be that there are gods who delight in theatrical exhibitions?" He quotes from an ancient tablet an account of a female musician who "delighted the gods" with her performances, and cites from the Book of Odes the following passage: "With lyres and harps and strokes of the drum, welcome the Lord of the Fields;" and then asks, "Is there really a Lord of the Fields? and does he really delight in lyres and harps? If so, who ever heard of him?" He then explains it as being simply the natural way in which people give expression to their gratitude to the gods. He expresses his approbation of this system of instructing (and ruling) the people, devised by the ancients; and says that, since people have sacrificed to the Cheng-Hwang (literally 'City Wall and Moat') as though it had a personal existence, why not please it with songs and dances? And as to theatrical representations, he thinks the theatre, as a school of morals, has conferred great benefit on mankind. All that he would stipulate is that indecent and otherwise unsuitable plays should be prohibited. In summing up, he says that Fu-hi, Shen-nung, Hwang-ti, Yau, Shun, Yu, Tang, Wen-wang, Wu-wang, the duke of Chou, and Confucius,
really did exist personally before they were deified, and there seems to be a propriety in sacrificing to them as though they (still) had a personal existence. But Heaven, earth, the sun, moon, wind, thunder, hills and streams, rivers and mountains, soil and grain, the wall and moat, the corners of the house, the well, and the fire-place, although they have been deified, have really no personal existence, and should not (properly or per se) be sacrificed to as though they had. Yet even the sages from the ancient times have all sacrificed to them, as though they really and personally existed; and he asks, do the deities of heaven enjoy the viands or make use of the utensils used in sacrificing to them? And he replies that, although the sounds, the colors, and the odors and tastes of things in heaven cannot be imitated, yet all these devices are but the modes of giving expression to the feelings of reverence and veneration which naturally arise in the human heart. Hence he concludes that the erection of a tablet to perpetuate the memory of the repairs made upon the Ch'eng-Hwang temple is not an affair of mere local or temporary interest, but is inseparably connected with the doctrines and ceremonial observances of remote antiquity; and since others (whose names he mentions) had liberally contributed funds to defray the expenses, he (the writer) could not be so parsimonious as to grudge a contribution of penmanship to the same object.

Dr. McCartee remarked in conclusion that he had often heard similar sentiments advanced by officers and literati in China, and it was interesting to observe that the wisest of that ancient nation gave such unequivocal assent to the doctrine that belief in a personal God, who will render to every man according to his work, is both a natural acting-out of the human heart, and absolutely requisite in order to secure good government.

Dr. McCartee further exhibited a set of very fine rubbings, taken from stone tablets set up in a Buddhist temple at Hangchow, and representing, nearly in life size, sixteen of the eighteen Lo-han (Sanskrit arhat), or personal attendants of Buddha. These rubbings he presented to the Society's collection.


The Greeks distinguished one syllable in each word by sounding its vowel on a higher key: this higher key was represented by the acute accent. The ordinary lower key was not represented in writing. But when it followed the higher key on another syllable it was represented by the grave accent, which then united with the acute to form the circumflex. And when a high-tone ultima, followed by other words in close connection, dropped down to a lower key, it was written with a grave accent instead of the acute. The melodic character of the Greek accent Prof. Hadley illustrated from Dionysius Halic. (De Comp. Verb., 12), who calls the interval between the higher and lower keys a fifth (three tones and a semitone). That there was any difference in stress (or force of utterance) between accented and unaccented syllables, is not intimated by the ancient writers: that such difference, if it existed, cannot have been great, is made probable by the total disregard of accent in ancient verse. The question has been raised whether any distinction was made among the lower tones; whether there was any middle tone, intermediate between the highest and the lowest. Some ancient writers speak of a middle tone; but the statements are not so definite as could be wished. G. Hermann (de emend. rat. gramm. Graec.) recognized a middle tone in the grave accent where it takes the place of an acute on the ultima. G. Curtius (Jahn's Jahrb., vol. 72) recognized it also in the grave accent where it forms part of the circumflex. Recently, F. Misteli (Kuhn's Zeitisch., vol. 17), founding on the analogies of the Sanskrit accent, holds that the high tone (acute accent), where it was not final, was always followed by a middle tone. Prof. Hadley set forth a theory based on that of Misteli, but with additions and modifications of his own. In the undivided Indo-European, as in Sanskrit, there was no restriction on the place of the accent; it might fall on any syllable of the longest word. Hence the high tone with the following middle tone might be separated from the end of the word by a succession of low-tone syllables. If now there came to be a prevailing dislike for such a succession, an unwillingness to hear more than one low-tone syllable at the end of a word, the result would be to confine the accent to the last three syllables. This
result; as it is found both in Greek and in Latin, may be referred to the time of Graeco-Italic unity. But for the Greek we have to assume also a subsequent restriction; the final low tone must not occupy the whole of a long syllable; if it came upon a long vowel, the first half of that vowel must be sounded with middle tone. Thus "high tone, middle tone, short low tone," became a prevailing cadence for Greek words, and was brought in wherever it could be attained without throwing back the accent. The leading rules of Greek accentuation—no accent allowed before the antepenult; only the acute used on that syllable, and not even this if the ultima is long; an accented penult must take the circumflex if it has a long vowel and the ultima a short one; an accented penult must take the acute in any other case; —all these are explained by this cadence, being all necessary to secure it. As for throwing back the accent to obtain this cadence (or as much of it as possible), one branch of the Greeks, the Aeolians of Asia Minor, did so; whence Aeolic forms like χαλέπος, χαλέπως, λεύκως, for which the common Greek has χαλέτος, χαλέπως, λευκώς, with the primitive accent.

The Latin took a different, though analogous course. It allowed the final low tone to have either quantity, but would not allow the middle tone before it to occupy the whole of a long syllable, whether long by nature or position. Hence the cadence, "high tone, short middle tone, low tone," which the Latin procured, or as much of it as possible, in all words, even by throwing back the accent like the Aeolic Greek. In this way all the varieties of Latin accent—tēgera, tēgeret, mo-nāra, monētā, legēs, ridēs—may be easily accounted for.

In conclusion, Prof. Hadley referred to the hypothetical character of this theory, pointing out the unproved assumptions contained in it; but remarked that these assumptions are so natural in themselves and furnish so simple an explanation for so many seemingly unconnected facts, that it is difficult to believe them wholly unfounded.

7. On the Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose, by Prof. Charles Short, of Columbia College, New York.

This communication was a verbal account of an Essay which Prof. Short was about to publish. The immediate occasion of the Essay is the republication in this country of Mr. Yonge's English-Greek Dictionary. That work being intended chiefly as an aid to students in Greek Composition, it seemed well to prefix to it something on the order of the words.

Prof. Short stated that, while there were several monographs on this subject by European scholars relating to single authors or to single points, as by Darpe, Braun, and Engelhardt, and while several commentators on Greek authors had here and there touched the matter, as Stalbaum, Weber, and Rehdantz, yet he was not aware that any systematic treatise upon the subject had anywhere appeared, and that he had therefore undertaken to supply such a one as he could. The general subject being large, he had confined himself to the usages of prose, and to one form of that, the Attic.

Taking Xenophon as a basis, he had then carefully examined Thucydides, next the Attic Orators, and lastly Plato. His method had been to gather under each head a very large number of examples from these writers in the order just mentioned, and then to deduce the general law, noting the exceptions, and giving them in classes where this was practicable. When the reason for a particular order appeared, he had in many instances stated it, but his main purpose in the present Essay was rather to develop the laws of order than to discuss them, and by adding the exceptions to show the range within which diversity of order might take place.

Some of the general laws were specified: that the adjective follows the word it qualifies; that the genitive follows the noun it limits, with the curious exception that when the limited noun has the article, the genitive in general relations may stand between the article and the noun, but the partitive genitive, as a law, may not; that the predicate noun, pronoun, or adjective, stands directly before the verb finite, or an infinitive, or a participle either with or without the article; that the Greeks in respect to collocation made no distinction between the objective and the subjective infinitive, putting both alike after the leading word; that the modification of a word having the article intervenes between the article and the word, and
that it sometimes follows both wholly or in part, but only in the rarest instances (except a limiting genitive) precedes them, and that he had observed only one case in which an adverb modifying an infinitive with the article stood before the article, and that in a suspected piece of Xenophon, the Apologia.

In his treatment of the prepositions, he had first given their position with reference to their regimen and then added an elaborate section on a perplexing subject, the omission and repetition of the preposition under various circumstances; and after setting forth the prevailing usage in simple cases, he had considered the complex cases, and shown that the latter could be resolved into the former. He has perhaps discovered a law here not previously observed.

Where various readings existed affecting the matter of order, he had given the variation under its appropriate head and subjoined the name of the Editor who adopted it, and the examples in connection with which such reading was given might be regarded as so much testimony on its behalf.


Prof. Whitney said that not more than two or three other Sanskritists had studied the Veda so long and so deeply as Prof. Max Müller, or were in position to furnish so authoritative a version of it. Hence, scholars had been looking forward with eager expectation to his translation, promised many years ago, and of which the first volume has left the press this season. The work as published would not be found in all respects to fulfill the expectations they had formed. Though advertised as one of a series of eight volumes, it actually contains only one seventy-fifth of the Vedic text (12 hymns out of 1017). The bulk of the volume is filled with a variety of material, which, though much of it valuable in itself, would gladly have been spared. The author has taken as his model Burnouf's work on the Avesta. But the circumstances of the two cases are so different that the model is an ill-chosen one. Burnouf was breaking a path in an entirely new subject. His work was left a fragment, and never could have been made any thing else. Müller has undertaken an impracticable task, that of accounting for and establishing his version of every passage. How incomplete, and open to criticism in regard to proportion, it is, appears from the circumstance that to the first verse translated there is a note of eleven pages on an adjective meaning 'ruddy,' while the making of an accusative plural (or gen. or abl. sing.) the subject of a verb, and the assumption that the sun could be regarded as Indra's horse, were let pass without any remark—and so in other cases, which were pointed out in a detailed criticism of a few verses. To the extension of the work by including a romanized text of the original, translation of the detailed versions of others, and the detailed criticism of a few verses. To the extension of the work by including a romanized text of the original, translation of the detailed versions of others, and the detailed criticism of a few verses, is added an index of almost 2000 pages of notes and an average of 400 pages of introduction and preface.

The selection of this particular body of hymns (those to the Maruts, or storm-gods) for inclusion in the first volume is unfortunate, since they are among the most obscure and tedious of the collection, and may repel from a study of the Veda some who would have been attracted by a more pleasing first taste.

On the score of his over-abundant introductory and expository matter, Müller claims that his is the "first translation" of the Veda: a claim which few will be ready to admit. Burnouf called his work a "commentary," not a translation, though he had no real predecessor; while Müller, has to quote several, one of whom (Benfey) has worked upon the same basis and with the same principles as himself, although doubtless with less thorough preparation. To Müller's method no exceptions can be taken: he utterly discards the native commentators as authority, and finds his interpretation upon grammar, etymology, and the comparison of parallel passages. He is also perfectly fair and modest in estimating the value of the results reached by him; putting forward his version as only a provisional solution of its very difficult problem, and as sure to be superseded by and by, when longer study shall have brought a better comprehension of the whole Vedic antiquity.
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9. Notes on a Surveying Trip from the Phenician Coast to the Euphrates River, by Mr. Henry M. Canfield, of South Britain, Conn.

Mr. Canfield had expected to be present at the meeting, and to give an oral account of his trip; but, being unavoidably kept away, he sent instead a brief paper, which was read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Canfield joined Col. Romer’s party, engaged to survey a route for a railroad from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, in April, 1868. The line surveyed started at the mouth of El Kebir, and followed the road to Hamath nearly to the Nassariyah range. With some difficulty, a practicable route was found through the pass between the Nassariyah and the Lebanon, then across the beautiful fertile plain of the Bekya, through the Jebel Homs to Homs, and north-easterly over the desert to Selamiyah, the farthest outpost of civilization; then, after extensive exploration reaching as far as Aleppo and Palmyra, through the great Wady in Jebel Assouet nearly to the Euphrates at Sheik Omar or Balia; when difficulties with the Arab tribes put an end, for the time, to the enterprise.

Mr. Canfield describes the Nasimi inhabitants of the mountains and desert as a large-framed race, usually with light hair and brown eyes, laborious, but treacherous and inhospitable; and speaks of their semi-subterranean dwellings, of their customs and religion. He was unable to discover or learn how they dispose of their dead. He calls attention to the square towers, called by the Arabs bawryh, scattered across the whole country to the Euphrates; also to the numerous castles of the middle ages, of which the finest he saw is Kalat el Hoom, at the north-western edge of the Bekya. This is so immense a structure that it is now inhabited by 5000 people. The desert country beyond Selamiyah is marked in places by groups of broken columns and heaps of ruins; at one point, west of the Orontes and east of Sherbt el-Humun, forming regular streets and squares over a space three miles long and two wide; deserted villages, in various styles of building, are also numerous.

A chief of the Ismaeliyah was met with who had just returned from a trip to India; showing that the old Assassins have and maintain correspondence with some Indian sect.

Rev. Mr. Bledget, missionary at Peking, addressed the meeting briefly respecting the religion of the Chinese, and respecting the translation into Chinese of the word God.

After this (at one o’clock, Friday noon) the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston, on Wednesday, May 18th, 1870.
American Oriental Society:

List of Members.

October, 1869.

1. Corporate Members.

Names marked with † are those of Life Members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Abbot</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. Charles A. Aiken</td>
<td>Schenectady, N. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. William F. Allen</td>
<td>Madison, Wis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Rufus Anderson</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. William P. Atkinson</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. George B. Bacon</td>
<td>Orange, N. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†John W. Barrow</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Elijah P. Barrows</td>
<td>Middletown, Conn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Bartlett</td>
<td>Providence, R. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Albert S. Buckmore</td>
<td>Hamilton, N. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles L. Brace</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Carson Brevoort</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Fisk P. Brewer</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, N. C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Astor Bristed</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†J. Carter Brown</td>
<td>Providence, R. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Nathan Brown</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William C. Bryant</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Henry C. Cameron</td>
<td>Princeton, N. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres. William H. Campbell</td>
<td>New Brunswick, N. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. George L. Cary</td>
<td>Meadville, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny E. Chase</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Thomas Chase</td>
<td>West Haverford, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Edson L. Clark</td>
<td>North Branford, Conn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Edward L. Clark</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Clark</td>
<td>Northampton, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Nathaniel G. Clark</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Edward B. Cole</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Joseph G. Cogswell</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Colt</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Henry M. Colton</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander I. Cothaleal</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinton Cox</td>
<td>Carbondale, Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Oliver Crane</td>
<td>Salem, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Alpheus Crosby</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Howard Crosby</td>
<td>Shanghai, China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†Edward Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Members.

Pres. Edwin A. Dalrymple, Baltimore
Prof. George E. Day, New Haven.
John W. DeForest, New Haven.
Rev. James T. Dickinson, Middlefield, Conn.
Dr. George L. Ditson, Albany, N. Y.
Epes S. Dixwell, Cambridge.
†Epes B. Dixwell, Shanghai, China.
Prof. Henry Disbrow, New York.
Samuel F. Dunlap, New York.
Prof. Timothy Dwight, New Haven.
Prof. Charles Elliott, Chicago, Ill.
Ralph W. Emerson, Concord, Mass.
†William Endicott, New York.
Rev. George R. Entler, Franklin, N. Y.
Richard S. Fellowes, New Haven.
Rev. William H. Penn, Portland, Me.
Chas. Isaac Ferris, New York.
Prof. John B. Feuling, Madison, Wis.
Prof. George P. Fishler, New Haven.
John Fiske, Cambridge.
Charles Folson, Cambridge.
†Frank B. Forbes, Shanghai, China.
†John M. Forbes, Boston.
Prof. William C. Fowler, Durham Centre, Conn.
Prof. Frederic' Gardiner, Middletown, Conn.
J. Willard Gibbs, New Haven.
Prof. Daniel C. Gilman, New Haven.
Prof. William W. Goodwin, Cambridge.
Prof. W. Henry Green, Princeton, N. J.
Rev. Lewis Groot, West Brattleboro', Vt.
Prof. Arnold Guyot, Princeton, N. J.
Prof. James Hadley, New Haven.
Prof. S. Stehman Haldeman, Columbia, Pa.
William H. Hale, Albany, N. Y.
†John Heard, Boston.
Prof. Frederick H. Hedge, Brookline, Mass.
Thomas W. Higgins, Newport, R. I.
Rev. Thomas Hill, Waltham, Mass.
Prof. C. Wistar Hodge, Princeton, N. J.
Henry A. Homes, Albany, N. Y.
Prof. James M. Hoppin, New Haven.
Fisher Howe, New York.

VOL. IX.
American Oriental Society:

Joseph Howland, Fishkill, N. Y.
Rev. William Hutchinson, Norwich, Conn.
Rev. William Irwin, Troy, N. Y.
Prof. Melancthon W. Jacobus, Allegheny City, Pa.
†Prof. Joseph W. Jenks, Newtonville, Mass.
Henry C. Kingsley, New Haven.
William L. Kingsley, New Haven.
Rev. Edward N. Kirk, Boston.
†Henry Lighthorn, Shanghai, China.
†James Lenox, New York.
J. Peter Lesley, Philadelphia.
Prof. Taylor Lewis, Schenectady, N. Y.
Prof. James R. Lowell, Cambridge.
Rev. Dwight W. Marsh, Whitney Point, N. Y.
Rev. Myron Maury, Cold Spring, N. Y.
Prof. Charles M. Mead, Andover, Mass.
Prof. James C. Moffat, Princeton, N. J.
†Robert M. Olyphant, New York.
Prof. Lewis R. Packard, New Haven.
Dr. Peter Parker, Washington.
Prof. Thaddeus Parsons, Cambridge.
Prof. Andrew P. Peabody, Cambridge.
†Gregory A. Perdicaris, Trenton, N. J.
Dr. Charles Pickering, Boston.
Prof. Henry M. Pierce, New York.
Elisha R. Potter, South Kingston, R. I.
Prof. John Proudfit, New York.
Joseph S. Ropes, Boston.
D. Waldo Salisbury, Boston.
†Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, New Haven.
Frank B. Sanborn, Springfield, Mass.
Prof. M. Schule de Vere, University of Virginia.
Dr. Ernst Schmid, White Plains, N. Y.
Rev. Henry M. Scudder, San Francisco, Cal.
Prof. Gustav Seyffarth, Dansville, N. Y.
Prof. Charles Short, New York.
Dr. John H. Slack, Philadelphia.
Rev. E. Bailey Smith, Middletown, Conn.
†E. M. Smith, Shanghai, China.
†Thomas C. Smith, Hongkong, China.
Prof. Austin Stickney, Hartford, Conn.
Rev. Lyman Stilson, Nunda, N. Y.
List of Members.

†William W. Stone, New York.
Leonard Tapel, St. Louis, Mo.
Prof. Rudolph L. Tapel, St. Louis, Mo.
†George W. Talbot, Shanghai, China.
John Tappan, Boston.
Byard Taylor, New York.
Prof. Thomas A. Thacher, New Haven.
Charles Tracy, New York.
Rev. Selah B. Treat, Boston.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
†J. T. Twombly, Shanghai, China.
Addison Van Name, New Haven.
Rev. Thomas E. Vermilye, Hartford, Conn.
†Thomas Walsh, Shanghai, China.
Rev. Ferdinand DeW. Ward, Rochester, N. Y.
Albert B. Watkins, Fairfield, N. Y.
Francis Wayland, New Haven.
Charles E. West, Brooklyn, N. Y.
William A. Wheeler, Boston.
Pres. Andrew D. White, Ithaca, N. Y.
Dr. Moses C. White, New Haven.
Prof. William D. Whitney, New Haven.
Rev. Joseph E. Wight, New Hamburgh, N. Y.
Lyman R. Williston, Cambridge.
Dr. Joseph Wilson, U. S. N. Allegheny City, Pa.
Prof. Samuel J. Wilson, New York.
Charles W. Zaremba,
2. CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Rev. John C. Adamson,
Prof. Graziano I. Abott,
Rev. John G. Aube,
Adolf Bastian,
Rev. Ephraim Bennett,
Rev. William A. Benton,
Otto Blau,
William H. I. Blake,
Rev. Daniel Bliss,
Rev. Henry Blodgett,
John P. Brown,
Rev. Samuel R. Brown,
Prof. Heinrich Brugsch,
Rev. Albert Bushnell,
Rev. Simon H. Calhoun,
Rev. William Clark,
Hyde Clarke,
Prof. Edward B. Cowell,
Dr. Bhaud Daji,
Rev. Charles H. A. Dall,
Prof. August Dillmann,
Prof. D. Stuart Dodge,
Rev. Jacob L. Dornhe,
Rev. Joseph Edkins,
Rev. Rombo Elton,
Prof. Philippe Ed. Foucaux,
Dr. S. Fransenki,
Rev. John T. Grady,
Rev. Cyrus Hamlin,
Prof. Christian A. Holmboe,
Dr. Samuel R. House,
Rev. Henry H. Jessup,
Rev. J. W. Johnson,
Prof. Mirea Karam Beg,
Nicholas von Khanikoff,
L. Leon de Rosny,
Dr. Daniel J. McGowan,
Prof. William A. P. Martin,
Rev. Francis Mason,
Prof. Cotton Mather,
Dr. D. R. McCartney,
Thomas T. Meadows,
Dr. A. D. Nordmann,
Dr. A. G. Pasfati,
Bishop John Payne,
Dr. Andrew T. Pratt,
List of Members.

Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta.
James W. Redhouse, London.
Rev. Elias Riego, Missionary at Constantinople.
Dr. G. Rosen, Belgrade.
Rev. William G. Schauffler, Missionary at Constantinople.
Rev. William W. Scudder, Missionary in Southern India.
Henry Stevens, London.
Rev. William Tracy, Missionary in S. India.
Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, Missionary at Beirut.
Rev. Henry J. Van Lennep, Missionary in Eastern Turkey.
Rev. Daniel Vrooman, Missionary.
Rev. George T. Washburn, Missionary at Battalagundu, S. India.
Prof. Gustav Weil, Heidelberg.
Dr. S. Wells Williams, Peking.
Rev. W. Frederick Williams, Missionary at Mardin, E. Turkey.
William Winthrop, Malta.
Rev. Charles H. H. Wright, Havre, France.
3. **HONORARY MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raja Apurva Krishna Bahadur</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bird</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Otto Boehmig</td>
<td>Jena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Bowring</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Hermann Brockhaus</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Clarke</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Heinrich von Ewald</td>
<td>Gottingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Champollion Fihag</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Gustav Flunckel</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Julius Fuerst</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Houghton Hodgson</td>
<td>Dursley, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Stanislaus Julian</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Adalbert Kuhn</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. John Dunmore Lang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Christian Lassen</td>
<td>Bonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. C. Richard Lepsius</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Jules Mohl</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Muir</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Max Mueller</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Julius Heinrich Petermann</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. August Friedrich Pott</td>
<td>Halle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolphe Regnier</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Reman</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Emil Rodiger</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Rudolf Roth</td>
<td>Tubingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safvet Pasha</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Friedrich Spiegel</td>
<td>Erlangen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Garcin de Tassy</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Constantin Tischendorf</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Carl J. Tornberg</td>
<td>Lund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Albrecht Weber</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His Majesty Phra-Paramendr Maha Mongkut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King of Siam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proceedings at Boston, May, 1870.

Proceedings at Boston, May 18th, 1870.

The Society assembled at 10 o'clock A.M., at the rooms of the American Academy. President Woolsey being absent, the chair was occupied alternately by Dr. Anderson and Dr. Parker, Vice-Presidents.

The record of the preceding meeting was read by the Recording Secretary. It was arranged that there should be a recess of only one hour at noon, that the business of the meeting might be finished before evening.

The Treasurer's Report was read, audited, and accepted. It was as follows:

RECEIPTS.
Balance on hand, May 19th, 1869, - - - - - - $357.53
Annual assessments paid in, - - - - - - $515.00
Life-membership, - - - - - - 75.00
Sale of the Journal, - - - - - - 18.15

Total receipts of the year, - - - - - - 608.75

$966.28

EXPENDITURES.
Printing of Proceedings, etc., - - - - - - $43.24
Expenses of Library and Correspondence, - - - - - - 40.64
Paid for binding of books, - - - - - - 1.25

Total expenditures of the year, - - - - - - $95.13
Balance on hand, May 18th, 1870, - - - - - - 818.15

$966.28

The Treasurer also made a statement respecting the condition of the fund for the purchase of Chinese type, provided by the kind offices of the late Hon. Charles W. Bradley. The arrival of the font ordered from Shanghai was reported at the last meeting. Its cost was as follows:

For type (180 lbs, small pica), - - - - - $324.00
Type-cases, - - - - - - - - 12.00
Packing, freight, and insurance, - - - - - 22.00
Premium on $358 in Mexican dollars, - - - - 136.79
Expenses in New York, duty, cartage, etc., - - - - 75.00

Total expense, - - - - - - - - $569.79

To meet this, the Treasurer had drawn on Messrs. Baring, Brothers, & Co., of London, with whom the fund was deposited by Mr. Bradley, for £100, which yielded in currency $670.08. The balance, about $100, is deposited in the Townsend Savings Bank at New Haven to the credit of the fund, and about £92 still remains in the hands of Messrs. Barings.
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The Librarian excused himself, on the score of other pressing occupations, for having come unprepared with a full Report of the condition of the Library, and gave a brief oral statement respecting the additions made to it during the year. The most important donations had come from the Vienna Academy of Sciences, and from Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall of London.

The Committee of Publication reported that, as authorized by the Directors last fall, they had commenced the reprinting of Vol. ix., Part 1, of the Journal, as soon as the printing office had been restored to working order after the fire; and that the work had since gone on without interruption, but was not yet quite finished. It was intended to proceed with the printing of Part 2, as soon as the other should be out of the way.

The Directors notified the next meeting, as to be held in New Haven on the nineteenth of October, unless the Committee of Arrangements (Prof. Hadley of New Haven, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries) should alter the appointment—which they were authorized to do, if it appeared desirable.

The following persons, on recommendation of the Directors, were elected members of the Society: namely,

as Corporate Members,

Mr. Erastus B. Bigelow, of Boston.
Prof. Ferdinand Bocher, of Boston.
Prof. J. Lewis Diman, of Providence, R. I.
Mr. James B. Greenough, of Cambridge, Mass.
Mr. Thomas S. Perry, of Cambridge, Mass.
Mr. Charles T. Russell, of Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. J. Herbert Senter, of Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Peter H. Steenstra, of Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. Francis Wharton, D.D., of Brookline, Mass.
Rev. Henry A. Yardley, of Middletown, Conn.

as Corresponding Members,

Rev. Hyman A. Wilder, Missionary in South Africa.

Mr. J. S. Ropes of Boston, Rev. W. H. Ward of New York, and Hon. J. D. Baldwin of Worcester, were appointed by the chair a Nominating Committee, to propose a ticket for officers for the ensuing year; and the following gentlemen, nominated by them, were elected without dissent:

Recording Secretary—Mr. Ezra Abbott, LL.D., “ Cambridge.
While the committee were deliberating, an interesting series of photographs from India and Farther India were exhibited to the members, and briefly commented on, by Rev. J. T. Gracey.

The Corresponding Secretary then announced the losses which the Society had suffered by death during the year; namely, two Corporate Members, Rev. E. Burgess and Rev. Dr. Proudfit (the latter during some years past a Director); and three Corresponding Members, Prof. Romeo Elton, late of Exeter, England, Rev. Dr. Justin Perkins, during many years a missionary in Orumiah, and Mr. William Winthrop, American consul at Malta. He said a few words with regard to each of these gentlemen, briefly setting forth the claims that they had upon the respectful and affectionate remembrance of the Society, as well as of scholars in America and through the world. He spoke especially of Mr. Burgess, who would be remembered in connection with the translation of the Sūrya-Siddhānta published some years since in the Society’s Journal, and with whom he had himself for some time been thrown into intimate relations while that work was in preparation and passing through the press. Mr. Burgess returned to this country in 1854, after more than fourteen years of service as a missionary in western India. He died of pneumonia, near Boston, on the first day of this year.

Prof. Hadley gave a somewhat detailed account of the life and literary labors of Dr. Proudfit, and a view of his character as a scholar and as a man.

The eminent services of the venerable Dr. Perkins in the cause of Christian philanthropy and of learning were set forth by Rev. Mr. Treat, Dr. Parker, and others.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and read in part. The following are extracts:

From Mr. Freeman A. Smith, Treasurer of the American Baptist Missionary Union, dated Boston, Nov. 9th, 1869:

"Knowing you to be interested in such things, I send herewith a copy from an ancient metallic plate found by Mr. Bunker, one of our missionaries, among the Red Karens, together with a copy of our magazine, where you will see what he writes respecting it."

Mr. Bunker says:

"It has been long known that an ancient metal plate, having strange characters engraved on it, existed among the Red Karens. While at Kinta’s village, we succeeded, after much difficulty, in obtaining a sight of the famous plate, and were also allowed to copy it. The plate is composed of copper, brass, and probably some gold. They regard it as very sacred, and guard it with most zealous care. It is supposed by them to possess life, and they say it requires to be “fed with metal.” I fed it with a piece of silver of the value of about fifty cents, but did not..."
see it eat while I was near. The common people fear its power greatly, and dare not look at it, as they say it has power to blind their eyes. The traditions of most of the Karen tribes point to this tablet. I think, and it may be of very ancient origin. The character in which it is written is quite different from any of the characters in which the languages of the East are written, so far as I have been able to learn."

A copy of the inscription was exhibited to the members present, but no one could cast any light upon its strange characters. The Secretary said that he was hoping to obtain additional information upon the matter from Farther India, to be laid before the Society hereafter. The plate is one referred to in Mr. Cross's paper on the Karens and their language, read at the meeting in October, 1866, and reported in the Proceedings of that meeting (Journal, vol. ix., p. xii.).

From Rev. C. H. A. Dall, dated Calcutta, Nov. 27th, 1869:

"In Bombay, lately, I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Bhaub Daji at the monthly meeting of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and was surprised to hear him say that within a year or so, or as soon as his practice (as a physician) would permit, he expected to visit England and America. I am not very sorry that you are likely to see, yet sooner, Babu Keshub Chunder Sen; of whom you have heard as the eloquent leader of the partly christianized Hindus, the Brahmos. He does not feel settled as to the American part of his visit; but, when calls reach him, as they are sure to do, he will yield to the pressure, and accomplish a visit which I am very desirous that he should make. The presence of these two cultured Oriental gentlemen will, I am sure, make Orientalism dawn on America as never before."

From Mrs. S. J. Rhea, dated Jonesboro, Tennessee, Dec. 5th, 1869; respecting her late husband's Kurlish papers, presented at the previous meeting, giving some explanations as to their character, and expressing her desire to be helpful in any way toward their publication.

From Dr. A. T. Pratt, dated Constantinople, March 16th, 1870:

"... I procured a fine copy of a Cufic inscription some time since and sent it to you; but, together with a valuable lot of coins, it was lost on the way. I am now hoping to send you the stone itself in the course of the summer. ... I have a grammar of the Turkish language of my own, which I hope to forward as soon as I can get an English translation to go with it. During nearly two years past I have been here, engaged on the revision of the version of the Bible made by Dr. Goodell. Dr. Paspati is getting out a large work on the Gypsy language, of which I presume you will receive a copy."

Communications being now in order, the following were presented:

1. On the Glagolitic Alphabet, by Rev. A. L. Long, of Constantinople; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

This was an inquiry into the origin of the Glagolitic character, in which a part of the oldest Slavic literature is preserved, and into its relation to the more usual character, the Cyrillic. Of the two, the Cyrillic is usually ascribed to the Slavic apostle Cyril, who used it for his translation of the Scriptures (about A.D. 862); respecting the other, opinions have been much divided, some attributing its invention to Methodius, Cyril's brother, others to Clement, archbishop of Velitza in Bulgaria, and pupil of Cyril and Methodius; while yet others regard it as some centuries older than Cyril, and many accept the Dalmatian traditions which would make St. Jerome its inventor. Dr. Long now, differing from all these, maintains that
the Glagolitic was the alphabet devised by Cyril, and was exclusively used in his time, while the so-called Cyrillic, which is no independent invention, but only an adaptation of the Greek alphabet to the Slavic language, was the work of Clement (who died A.D. 916). The various considerations which appear to support this view are detailed in the paper. At the end, the author acknowledges his obligations to P. J. Schaffarič’s work “On the Origin and Home of Glagolism” (Prague, 1858).

Remarks upon this paper, approving its conclusions, were made by Mr. J. S. Ropes.


Mr. Ward first detailed the history of the securing of the inscription by M. Ganneau, from the first discovery of the monument by the German Klein. After showing that it was undoubtedly genuine, and dated back to nearly nine hundred years before Christ, Mr. Ward laid before the meeting a transcribed copy of it in Hebrew characters, and the following translation:

1 I am Mesha son of Chemosh [madah] King of Moab [the D.] 2 of the tribes. [My father reigned over Moab thirty years and I reigned after my father,] 3 and I made this high place to Chemosh in Karlah and [this House of Sel-] 4 jation because he has saved me from all the attacks and because he has caused me to look on all my enemies. 5 If [it] was King of Israel, and he afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his [land]. 6 And his son succeeded him, and he also said, “I will afflict Moab.” 7 In my days he spake thus, and I looked on him and on his house, and Israel kept continually---perishing. And Omri held possession of the land (?) of “Medeba. And there dwelt in it [Otni and his son and his grand-] son forty years. 8 I built Chemosh [restored] it in my days. 9 And I built Baal-Meon and I made in it 10 and I [besieged] (?) 11 Kirjathaim. 12 And the men of Gad had dwelt of old in the land of Kirjathaim. And the King of Israel built 13 for him [Kirjathaim]. 14 And I fought against the city and took it. 15 And I slew all the men of it 16 the city, a spectacle, to Chemosh and to Moab. 17 And I brought back from thence the [altar of Jehovah, and 18 put] it before Chemosh in Kerioth. 19 And I caused to dwell therein the men of Shiran; and the men of 20 Shemesh. 21 And Chemosh said to me, “Go and take Necho from Israel.” 22 [And I ——] 23 went in the night and I fought against it from the overspreading of the dawn till noon. And I 24 [took it and I] 25 [utterly destroyed] it, and I slew all of it seven thousand—

17 for to Ashur Chemosh had [?] devoted [them]; and I took from thence 18 the vessels of Jehovah, and I presented them before Chemosh. 19 And the King of Israel built 20 Jahaz and dwelt in it while he was fighting against me. 21 And Chemosh drove him from [before me. 22 And] I took from Moab 200 men, all told; 23 and I attacked (?) Jahaz and took it, 24 adding it to Dibon. 25 I built Karlah, the wall of the forests and the wall of 26 the hill (Ophel). 27 And I built its gates and I built its towers. 28 And I made a royal palace, and I made reservoirs for the collection of the waters in the midst of the city. 29 And there was no city in the midst of the city in Karlah; and I said to all the people, “Make 30 for you each a city in his house.” And I dug ditches (?) for Karlah in [the road to] 31 Israel. I 32 built [A]roer, and I made the high way to Arnon. I built 33 Beth-Bamoth, for it was ruined, 34 and I built Bozrah, for it was deserted. And I 35 set in Dibon garrisons (?); for all Dibon was submissive. 36 And I filled (?) 37 in the cities which I added to the land. 38 And I built —— and 39 the temple of Diblahaim, and I raised up there 40 the land. And there dwelt in Honoraim— 41 Chemosh said to me, “Go, fight against Honoraim.” And I 42 Chemosh in my days . . . . 43

Mr. Ward explained that in most points he agrees with either Ganneau, Scholzmann, Durenbourg, Nöldeke, or Neuhauer in their versions and corrections of the defective text. He drew, however, more especial attention to certain matters with regard to which he differed from previous commentators. The latter have made the perpendicular stroke near the end of the third line a mark of division between the sentences. This it cannot be, as the dot which divides the words also appears
here, and in no other case are both found together. The stroke can be either י or פ, and is no doubt the former. This puts a repetition of רב out of the question. The reading suggested, י ש ר נ, seems plausible. The doubtful character at the beginning of the eight line must be either י or פ. The feminine form רבק is often used for 'plain, which is just what we want. The masculine is put in the text. Still in Capt. Warren's impression the letter looks more like פ, which would allow רבק. The suggested emendations for the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth line, and for the seventeenth line, are new. The facsimile of Gannean seems to show in line twenty-three a flaw in the stone. The fact that the letters as they stand hardly make sense is an indication that the flaw did not exist when the inscription was made, in which case the scribe would have continued the unfinished word on the other side of the flaw, as is the case in the ninth line of the great Sidonian inscription of king Eshmunazer. But the letters which we have, יפנפ ת, cannot be translated, the last word being neither plural of יפ, 'man,' nor anything else imaginable. Schlotmann and others have suggested [רבע, "pouring". This word and its masculine form are only used in the Bible in connection with the geography of the region of Moab, and יפנפ ת of the old song of which we have a fragment in Num. xxi. 15 compares well with the יפנפ ת or יפנפ ת, which even may be preferable, which I would suggest. Such expressions as "trenches of the waters," Gen. xxx. 38, "brook of the waters," 2 Sam. xvii. 20, "well of the waters," or "well," or "fountain of waters," 1 Kings, iii. 16, are frequent in the Bible. The third word in the eighteenth line I read תמק as Capt. Warren's photograph, which he has misread. The first word in the twenty-second line is read from the photographs as יפנפ ת, giving us exactly the biblical phrase "wall of Ophel."

The language of the inscription is almost pure Hebrew, but with an approach toward the southern Semitic tongues. This appears in the comparative scarcity of quiescent letters, in the plural in יפנ, and especially in the Hiphil conjunction, יפנ נ. The emendations in Arabic, Ethiopic, and even in Aramaic, another evident example of this is the use of verbs יפנ instead of יפנ. Thus we have יפנ and יפנ for יפנ and יפנ. In these cases Nöldeke assumes that the final י is a personal suffix, and that thus a double object is expressed, as is common in Syriac. But the language shows little assimilation to Aramaic peculiarities, and it is more probable that the root is preserved in these forms in a more archaic shape than in Hebrew.

The form of the characters proves the correctness of de Vogüé's assertion that the oldest Canaanite alphabet was distinguished by its sharp angles. Among the more interesting forms are the י, which is for the first time found as a simple triangle, like the Greek Δ; מ, which we first find here as a perpendicular crossed by three horizontal lines, which suggest the Greek Ε; ל, which suggests the Greek Υ; ק, which is precisely the Greek Kappa; and יפנ, which is an oblique cross, or X.

The separation of words is found in some other very ancient inscriptions, as in the inscription of Ciltium, that of Tuen, and two others.

The lacuna in the eighth line is very unfortunate, as it leaves the chronology in some doubt. Schlotmann is certainly wrong in supposing it possible to make forty years out of the Bible chronology of the reign of Omri, Ahab, and Ahaziah, which occupied only thirty-one years. If these scriptural figures are correct, and they appear to be, it must be supposed either that Omri began to afflict Moab before he became king, while general of Baasha's army, or that the successes of Mesha occurred after the campaigns mentioned in Scripture, and during the latter years of Jehoram. The "round number," which Nöldeke, Schlotmann, and others have suggested, would have been thirty instead of forty, if this campaign be referred to the first rebellion of Mesha—even if a round number is assumable on such a monument.


In this very brief paper, Mr. Baldwin called attention once more to the inscription of Tanis, brought to light by Lepsius in 1866, and published as a "bilingual decree" in the same year. The existence of its third, or Demotic, text being not then known. He states from a letter received by him from Lepsius, to the effect that "the original is now in the Museum of Bulaq. Its complete decipherment,
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After referring to an example of the golden rule in a negative form in the Book of Tobit (iv.15), and to the story of the great Jewish Rabbi Hillel—who, when asked by a Gentile to teach him the whole Law while he stood on one foot, replied, "What thou hastest thyself, do not thou to another: this is the whole Law; all the rest is only commentary"—Mr. Abbott remarked that it was well known that the golden rule occurs in this negative form among the maxims of Confucius, but that it had been often asserted that it was nowhere given by him as a positive precept. As the result, however, of such an investigation of this point as he had been able to make without a knowledge of the Chinese language, he had been led to a different conclusion. The principal passages bearing on this subject are to be found in the Lun Yu (a sort of Memorabilia of Confucius—designated as "Confucian Analecta" in Legge's translation), Book iv., c. 15, §2; v.11; xii.2; xv.23; the Chung Yung ("Doctrine of the Mean," i.e. the golden mean), ch. xiii., §3; and the Works of Mencius, Book vii., c. 4, §3. With these passages may be also compared ch. ix., §4 and ch. x. of the Ta Hsia, or "Great Study," where the duties of rulers are spoken of. In the Lun Yu v.11 and xii.2 the maxim appears only in the negative form, "not to do to others what you would not wish done to yourself"—in the latter passage as one of the characteristics of "perfect virtue." But the point to which Mr. Abbott called special attention was that the Chinese appear to have in their language a single word which distinctly expresses the duty of doing to others as we would have them do to us; involving the notion, not merely of abstaining from injury to our fellow-men, but of active sympathy and benevolence. This word occurs in a remarkable passage in the Lun Yu (iv.15, §2), in which the whole moral doctrine of Confucius is summed up in two terms—chung and shi, translated by Pauthier (Confucius et Mencius, Paris, 1858, p. 122) 'a voir la droiture du cœur' (chung), and 'aimer son prochain comme soi-même' (shi). He remarks in a note, "On croira difficilement que notre traduction soit exacte; cependant nous ne pensons pas que l'on puisse en faire une plus fidèle." Legge renders the words somewhat more vaguely—"to be true to the principles of our nature and the benevolence of them, to others" (Chinese Classics, i. 333). Colledge the Four Books, Malacca, 1828 translates them 'consummate faithfulness and benevolence,' observing in a note, apparently by way of fuller explanation of the force of the Chinese words, "To perform our duty to the utmost, is faithfulness—to do to others as we wish them to do to us, is benevolence." The character for the second word here used, shi, is compounded of the 61st radical, sin, 'heart,' and ju, 'as, like,' and it would seem from the Lexicons that a kind regard for the feelings of others, a practical recognition of the fact that their hearts are like our own, belongs to the primary and essential meaning of the term. Thus it is defined by De Guignes, or rather Glemona (Dict. chinois, No. 2829), 'misericors, alias sicut se ipsumtractare;'-by Morrison (Chinese Dict., No. 9343), 'benevolent; . . . considerate; . . . to treat others as one would like one's self,'—by Medhurst, ' to excuse, to feel for others as we do for ourselves, to do as we would be done by, to be kind, sympathetic, indulgent' (Chinese Dict., Batavia, 1842; and similarly in his Dict. of the Hok-hoe Dialect, p. 569);—by S. Wells Williams, 'benevolent; . . . considerate, to treat others as one wishes to be treated, as one would wish others to act toward one;' (Tone's Dict. of the Chin. Lang. in the Canton Dialect, 1856, pp. 453, 454);—by Legge, 'the principle of reciprocity, making our own feelings the rule for dealings with others' (Glossary in his Chinese Classics, i. 336, col. 2, and similarly ii. 434, col. 2); 'the judging of others by ourselves and acting accordingly' (Note on Mencius vii. 4, §5, Chin. Classics, ii. 327). The translation of Pauthier in one passage has already been given; in another (Chung Yung, xii. 3) he renders the word, 'qui
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porte aux autres les mêmes sentiments qu'il a pour lui-même,' and again, 'agir envers les autres comme on voudrait les voir agir envers nous' (Mencius, vii. 4). Further, according to Pauthier, 'Le Chou-i-wen [the oldest Chinese dictionary, belonging to the first century] définit ce caractère par celui de jin, 'humanité, amour du prochain.' Le Commentaire de cet ancien Dictionnaire ajoute: 'Celui qui est humain, bienveillant envers les autres, doit être à leurs regards comme il voudrait que l'on fût envers lui, et agir ensuite conformément à ces principes.' (Le Ta Hsia, Paris, 1837; pp. 66, 67, note.)

From these statements and definitions Mr. Abbot drew the inference that the word shâ, which in four of the passages of the Chinese Classics referred to above is used either alone (Lun Yu, xx.23; Mencius, vii.4, §3) or with chung, 'faithfulness, sincerity, uprightness' (Lun Yu, iv.15, §2; Chang Yu, xiii.3), to express the sum of moral duty in reference to others, must be regarded as not merely a precept to abstain from acts of wrong-doing, but as enjoining the exercise of active benevolence, according to the measure of the golden rule.

To the objection to this view, that in two of these examples (Lun Yu, xx.23; and Chang Yu, xiii.3) the word shâ is explained and restricted by the negative precept which immediately follows, "Do not to others," etc., it was replied that this negative precept may be regarded merely as an application of the principle expressed by the word shâ, put in the form of a prohibition because so often violated by positive acts of injury to others; but that such an application afforded no ground for supposing that Confucius intended to confine the duty signified by this word to mere abstinence from wrong-doing; on the contrary, we find in the Chang Yu, xiii.4, immediately after the negative precept, four distinctly positive applications of the principle, so that even Legge admits that here we have the rule virtually in its positive form—that Confucius "rises for a moment to the full apprehension of it, and recognizes the duty of taking the initiative" (Chinese Classics, Prolegom. to vol. i, p. 49; to vol. ii, p. 123).

It was remarked, however, by Mr. Abbot, that, though we appear to have found the golden rule in Confucius in something more than a merely negative form, he did not rise to the sublime height of the Christian principle of returning good for evil. According to the Lun Yu (Book xiv., c. 36), some one asked Confucius, "What do you say concerning the principle that injury should be recompensed with kindness?" The Master said, 'With what then will you recompense kindness? Recompense injury with justice, and recompense kindness with kindness.' (Legge's Chinese Classics, i.152)

5. On the Byzantine Pronunciation of Greek in the Tenth Century, as illustrated by a MS. in the Bodleian Library, by Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven.

The manuscript referred to consists of a few leaves, containing passages from the Greek text of the Septuagint, written in Anglo-Saxon characters. They are found in a codex made up of various pieces, which was described by II. Wanley in the second volume of Hicken's Thesaurus, published in 1705. Hicken himself in his preface called attention to the transliterations of the Septuagint, and gave some specimens, twenty-five verses in all. These specimens have been reprinted in a corrected form by Mr. A. J. Ellis, in the first volume of his "Early English Pronunciation" (pp. 516–527), where they are used to throw light on the sounds of the Anglo-Saxon. They throw light also on the current Greek pronunciation of the time when they were written. Mr. G. Waring, writing to Mr. Ellis, refers them to the latter part of the tenth century: they arose, he thinks, from the communication of Greeks and English at the court of Otto II. of Germany, whose wife was Greek and whose mother English. The proof is not strong; but the manuscript is probably not more recent than that date.

That the scribe aimed to represent the pronunciation, is shown especially by his treatment of α, of the rough breathing, of α, and of ϕ. He is generally independent of the Latin transliteration, though occasionally influenced by it: thus α is never represented by a; the rough breathing is represented (by h) only six times out of seventy-nine; α by a only eleven times out of eighty-eight; ϕ by ph only twice out of fifteen times. Inconsistencies and inaccuracies are frequent; but the scribe has his system, which he generally adheres to. Only as to η, he vacillates...
between e and i, using i fifty-five times and e sixty-two: the same word is written now with e and again with i; variations are sometimes found in the same line. To account for this vacillation by the influence of the Latin orthography is contrary to the analogy of the manuscript. It shows that y had a sound intermediate between Anglo-Saxon e and i, closer than the first, but less close than the second, nearly the same as (or perhaps a little closer than) the vowel-sound of Eng. they, aid.

That the scribe always writes v as y, never confounding it with i, shows that v still retained its old (not oldest) sound, that of French u and German ü. The diphthong ou he regularly gives in the same way, as y. That ou had this sound as far back as the fourth century has been shown by R. F. A. Schmidt (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grammatik, pp. 73 ff.), who explains the name ε ψιλόν as meaning 'simple v' in distinction from the diphthong (ou) of the same sound. The similar name ε ψιλόν is opposed to the diphthong au, which in this manuscript is regularly confounded with e, both being written as e.

The diphthongs au, eu (sounded in modern Greek as af, ef, before surds, and au, ev, before sonants) are written here as au, eu, which shows at least that they did not then have the sounds af, ef. The modern Greek sounds of μτ as mb, ντ as nd, γκ as ng, find no support here, where these combinations are written mp, nt, nc, respectively. The middle mutes (β, γ, δ) are written b, g, d; but there is room to doubt whether the scribe would have written differently, even if he heard the spirant sounds which the modern Greek gives to these letters.

In conclusion, Prof. Hadley remarked how widely the pronunciation indicated in this manuscript was still removed from that of the modern Greeks. The leading peculiarity of the modern pronunciation, the itacism which confounds u, v, η, ε, γ, α, w, in one vowel sound, extends as yet only to the ε; the other five (v, η, γ, α, w) were still more or less different in sound from i.

It was observed also that the codex in which this manuscript is found contains three other pieces remarkable for the Welsh glosses which they show; glosses which Zeus, in his Grammatica Celtica, regards as the oldest monuments of the Welsh language, referring them to the close of the eighth or opening of the ninth century. Possibly, these transliterations of the Septuagint may have been written by a Welsh hand. But that supposition would require little change in the inferences before drawn from the manuscript.

In remarking upon this paper, Dr. Abbot referred to another transliterated Greek text, the Codex Veronensis, published by Bianchini as an appendix to his Vindiciae Canoniciarum Scripturarum, Rome, 1740, fol. It contains the Greek text of the Psalms written in Latin characters, with the Old Latin version, in parallel columns. He spoke also of the confusion of ai and e in manuscripts of the New Testament.

Prof. Goodwin observed that critics had been ready to assume a confusion of ei and y in the manuscripts of classical authors. Accordingly they had given indicative or subjunctives in many places according to their ideas of Greek idiom, with little regard to manuscript authority. He had himself inspected the two Venetian MSS. of Aristophanes and ten Paris MSS. of that author, to obtain data for deciding the question of oi μη in prohibition with the future indicative or the subjunctive. In all the passages of the Clouds and the Frogs which show this construction, he had found a great preponderance of manuscript authority for the subjunctive. That the copyists did not in these cases confound ei and y was evident from the fact that they rarely confound them where only one can be right. He regarded this as a further proof that the two diphthongs were not sounded alike until a pretty late period.


Prof. Gilman had gathered, and laid before the Society, from private letters to himself and others, newspaper notices, published reports, and so on, the most recent intelligence obtainable respecting the Robert College near Constantinople, the Syrian College at Beirut, a proposed institution of a like character at Jaffa in Ceylon, and the school of western science and literature in Peking. The first has been temporarily established for some time at Bebek, but is about removing to its own grounds at Roumelie Hassar, on the Bosphorus, where the corner-stone of its-
new building was laid last July. Its buildings, apparatus, etc., being finished, it is intended to meet its own running expenses by the income from students.

The Beirut College has five or six professors, and about seventy-five students. Its funds and property are near $150,000; it has recently succeeded in securing an eligible location in the western part of the city. To its medical department, to which belong about a half of the students, are attached a hospital and ophthalmic institution, which are crowded with interesting cases, and in every way exceedingly successful.

The plan for a College at Jaffna is set on foot by the native community there, who propose to raise in Ceylon a sum sufficient to endow the native professorships and meet the ordinary expenses, appealing to America for a further sum of $50,000, to support an American head and manager for the institution, procure apparatus, and the like.

Respecting the Peking College, the most interesting information was contained in a private letter from Dr. Martin to Prof. Gilman, from which extracts are here given:

"... Our embryo University, launched three years ago under the patronage of Prince Kung, and favored with something like an imperial charter, created a panic in the ranks of the orthodox Confucianists, who assailed it with every available weapon. The call issued by imperial command for graduates of the native schools to come forward as candidates for scholarships was denounced as a national humiliation; and one of the Censors, in an address to the throne, charged the prevalence of a severe dearth in the northern provinces on the heresy of establishing such a school, and prayed that it might be abolished without delay. These are but specimens of the multifarious opposition which it has had to encounter from Chinese conservatism. Then came the ignorance of the Chinese language on the part of the new professors, and the unfortunate attempt to compel the students to acquire all their science through the medium of English and French. Some of the students, possessing high degrees and finished scholarship according to the native standard, were not less than forty or fifty years of age. As might have been anticipated, they failed utterly to acquire the first rudiments of a foreign tongue, and twenty of them were dismissed at one time. The mandarins were disheartened at the prospect, and threatened to disband the institution altogether, or rather to degrade it from the position of a seminary of science, the future pharos of the empire, to the condition of a small school, for the training of interpreters in foreign languages.

"This was the posture of affairs which hastened last year my return from America to China by the shortest route. On arriving, I found the newspapers filled with accounts of the "failure of the Peking college;" and almost abandoned the hopes of a success. I had cherished of doing something for China."

"Contrary to my expectations, the mandarins met me with great cordiality, and assured me that they were now ready to take in fresh scholars and to prosecute the enterprise with renewed energy. At the instance of Mr. Hart, inspector-general of maritime customs (the original projector and hitherto de facto director of the institution), its conduct was formally committed to my hands by Prince Kung and his counsellors. I enclose an extract from their despatch."

Dr. Martin goes on to describe the ceremony of his installation, consisting of a public dinner at the Board of Foreign Affairs, the salutation of their new head on the part of the students (forty in number, and divided into four classes—English, French, Russian, and mathematical), and an inaugural address; and continues,

"Our externals are little like those of a western institution of learning. Our grounds are unadorned by a single tree; and our buildings, six in number, though next, and altogether acceptable to Chinese taste, are only one story in height. There are three professors of foreign languages, three of Chinese, one of chemistry, and one of mathematics; while the chair of political economy and international law belongs to me, as heretofore. Our faculty, you perceive, is very incomplete; and it is not unlikely that, as soon as we get our machinery into running order, we shall apply to America for more experts in science.

"Our students are few, and not likely for a long time to count more than a hundred, even if they reach that number. But their selection from the ranks of the native scholars, the fact that they are all in training for the service of the government, and especially that they are the first students in modern times who have
been appointed by the emperor to pursue the study of science, conspire to give them something more than their numerical value.

"Unlike the University of Cairo, we are free to teach modern science without restraint; but we are not at liberty to introduce any form of religion. Still, the institution must prove auxiliary to the cause of religious reform, by helping to undermine the foundations of superstition in high places.

This embryo University, as I call it, is certainly very inadequate to the wants of the country, but it shows that the Chinese themselves are beginning to feel those wants. They are not chafing with impatience to enter into competition with western nations, but they are beginning to be ashamed at finding themselves in the rear of other countries."

The Rev. Mr. Sanders, of Ceylon, charged with presenting in this country the cause of the Jaffna College, being present, made some additional statements respecting its needs and plans, which were approved and urged by the Secretaries of the American Board, and other members of the Society, who heard them.


This communication was a summary description and criticism of the works on Indo-European comparative grammar which lay now before the English public, and especially of two or three which had been recently published. He first referred very briefly to Bopp's master work, the editions it had gone through and the translations that had been made of it, speaking especially of the one now appearing (and nearly completed) in French under the care of M. Breal, and enriched by him with valuable prefaces; also to Schleicher's "Compendium," of which a properly executed translation into English is much to be desired. These two great and comprehensive works, along with such more special treatises as Leo Meyer's comparative grammar of Greek and Latin, Curtius's Greek Etymologies, and Corssen's Latin Pronunciation, are the storehouses whence have been recently drawn several works of a lighter character, intended as introductions to the study. A Rev. Mr Clark put forth in London, as long ago as 1862, a brief volume (12mo) on the comparison of the two Aryan, the two classical, and some of the more important Germanic tongues. It repels the student at the outset by a great blunder—the separation of the High-German from the rest of the Germanic, as an independent primary branch of the Indo-European family; while, as if to preserve the old number of seven branches, the Greek and Latin are run together into one—and, though it may be found by some a convenient manual, it has no independent authority or value. More pretentious is a comparative grammar of Sanscrit, Greek and Latin, begun last year by Mr. W. H. Ferrar, of Trinity College, Dublin, and of which the second and concluding volume is promised at the beginning of 1872. This work was pronounced defective in its plan, as not including the Germanic branch; untrue to its plan, as introducing without apology an account of the phenomena falling under "Grimm's Law," and other irrelevant matter; inconvenient to use, having neither table of contents, index, nor running headings; and put together by its author without that full mastery of its subject which we have a right to expect and demand. A French work of somewhat similar scope has been begun by M. Baudry (Paris, 1869), and is to comprise three volumes, of which only the first, on Phonetics, has appeared. It is less open to unfavorable criticism than Mr. Ferrar's, but does not exhibit any striking ability, or real penetrating insight into its subject. Of decidedly higher character is Mr. J ohn Pelle's Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology, in a series of fourteen lectures. Than this, nothing better has been produced in the English language upon its special subject. It is confessedly founded upon the labors of the great German masters of the science, but they have been studied in a free and independent spirit, and assimilated; and Mr. Pelle's exposition of the subject is not put together out of their works, but produced from within himself, by a proper and organic process. It is excellently well adapted to its purpose, the introduction of classical scholars to the methods and results of modern scientific etymology. The author is less strong in phonetic theory than in the exhibition of phonetic phenomena—as is shown, for example,
by his treatment of surd and sonant letters, which he styles "hards" and "softs," and then lets those names determine his view of the historical relation of the two classes. His admission of the increment of vowels, as being a primary or organic process of word-formation in Indo-European speech, and having a "symbolic" significance, was objected to; the tendency, it was claimed, of the best linguistic science is to the clearer recognition of those processes of vowel-variation as at first euphonic merely, though afterwards more or less converted to the uses of radical or grammatical distinction.

8. How are the Traditions of the Earliest Ages of our Race to be studied? by Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass.

Prof. Jenks claimed that we needed to sympathize with the condition and character of childhood, in order to understand the formation of language, and the other features of the development of mankind, in the earliest ages of human history.

After the reading of this paper, a vote of thanks was passed to the American Academy for the use of its rooms for the meeting, and the Society adjourned, to meet in New Haven in October next.
Proceedings at New Haven, October 20th and 21st, 1870.

The Society assembled, as notified, at New Haven, on Thursday, Oct. 20th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair. The minutes of the annual meeting in May last were read by the Recording Secretary. The Committee of Arrangements communicated an invitation from Mr. Van Name, Librarian of Yale College, to a social gathering at his house in the evening; which was, upon motion, accepted with thanks.

From the Directors, notice was given that the next meeting would be held in Boston, on the 17th of May, 1871, and that Rev. Dr. Anderson, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, was appointed a Committee of Arrangements for it. Also the names of the following gentlemen were reported, with the recommendation that they be elected as Corporate Members:

Rev. John Anderson, of Waterbury, Conn.
Prof. John Avery, of Grinnell, Iowa.
Prof. George F. Comfort, of New York.
Mr. Alexander Meyrowitz, do.
Mr. Frederick Stengel, do.
Mr. Edward C. Taintor, of China.

The recommendation was adopted, and the gentlemen elected.

The Corresponding Secretary read extracts from the correspondence of the half-year. In presenting notes of excuse from several gentlemen, variously prevented from being present at the meeting, he also took occasion to refer to the unwonted absence of Prof. Salisbury, who had recently gone to spend the winter, and perhaps a longer time, in Europe. It was added, as a fact interesting and important to all students in this department in America, that Prof. Salisbury had, before leaving, presented to the library of Yale College in New Haven his whole collection of Oriental and philological books and manuscripts, comprising several thousand volumes, many of them of great cost and value, and had made liberal provision for completing the collection by further purchase. So large and generous a gift had rarely been made to an American library, or so rich a body of material for study in this department been thrown open at once to the public.

A letter from Rev. James Summers, dated London, August 5th, 1870, speaks of a magazine for Chinese and Japanese literature, which he was about commencing to publish in London, and expresses the hope that both encouragement and assistance may be obtained for it from America, whose interest in the affairs of that part of the world is so great, and which has done so much, by literature and diplomacy, to open it to the knowledge of the West. Mr. Summers is cataloguing the Chinese and Tibetan treasures of the India Office library in London, brought forth to light by the
energy of the late librarian, Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall. The first
two numbers of the magazine referred to, the "Phœnic," more
recently received, were exhibited to the members present and ex-
amined by them.

Letters from Rev. Mr. Ward, of New York, announce a dona-
tion made through him to the Society's collections, by the Pales-
tine Exploration Fund Society of London, of a set of the full-size
photographs of the impressions in soft paper taken from the Moa-
bite inscription-stone of King Mesha, and of plaster casts of a
number of the smaller fragments of the stone, colored in close imi-
tation of the original. The photographs and casts were shown
and described by Mr. Ward, who was present; besides clearing
up one and another point, of greater or less consequence, in the
reading, they proved in a striking manner the faithfulness and skill
with which M. Ganneau's first copies of the inscription had been
made.

Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass., sent a copy of an en-
graving, just made, of a Japanese "symbolical seal, or armorial
bearing, whose lines are legally established symbols, to be inter-
preted, like those of our heraldic escutcheons, according to fixed
rules, guarded from infringement by severe laws."

Prof. Weber, of Berlin, under date of Sept. 29th, 1870, writes
of the then approaching celebration (Oct. 2d) of the 25-year anni-
versary of the German Oriental Society, and of the medal which
was to be presented, struck in gold, to the first four managers of
the Society's affairs, Professors Brockhaus, Fleischer, Pott, and
Rodiger (of whom three are Honorary Members of our own Soci-
ety). A copy of the medal in bronze was shown to the members
present; the obverse represents "a powerful male figure, as em-
blem of the ancient Orient, resting upon a lion under a palm-tree,
and raising himself as if awaking. His face, unveiled by a Genius,
he turns toward the light, with which German science, as a Ger-
mania crowned with oak-leaves, approaches him." The following
distich gives the simple meaning of the symbol:

Licht und lebendiges Wort kam einst den Deutschen vom Aufgang;
Dankend erstatten sie heut', was sie empfangen, zurück.

Prof. Weber is occupied with a (transliterated) edition of the
Taïtirïya-Sûhité, of which a considerable part is ready for the
press.

Dr. John Muir, under date of Edinburgh, June 1st, 1870, writes:

"The fifth volume of my Original Sanskrit Texts ["Contributions to a knowl-
edge of the cosmogony, mythology, religious ideas, life and manners of the Indians
in the Vedic Age"] is ready, and may, I hope, reach you about the time this let-
ter does.

"Müller is reprinting his Sanskrit grammar, and printing his lectures preliminary
to the study of the science of religions, in successive numbers of Fraser's Magazine.
He says his second volume of the translation of the Rig-Veda will be on
the same plan as the first—much annotation, and few whole hymns translated:
when it is to come out, I do not know. Auprecht hopes to begin to print his glos-
sary to the Rig-Veda in August or September. Monier Williams has advanced as
far as the letter ṛ with his Sanskrit-English dictionary."
Communications were then presented, as follows:

Mr. Bunker describes his visit, in company with Rev. Mr. Vinton, to the village of Ka-pho-gyee, chief of Western Kareee, on the Salwen river, twelve days' journey east from Toungoo. One of the main objects of his expedition was to obtain a sight, and if possible a copy, of the celebrated Plate (see these Proceedings for Oct., 1866, p. xii., and for May, 1870, pp. lxxii–lxxv). This however, he found it very difficult to accomplish, as the possession of the Plate is the chief's main title to authority and source of revenue, and the article is kept as sacred, and invested with great mystery and formidable power. A few days of careful diplomacy, however, secured the consent of the chief and head-men to its being examined and even copied, although the taking of an impression in wax, for which preparation had been made, was forbidden. Mr. Bunker encloses his original copy, which it is proposed to reproduce in lithograph in the forthcoming Part of the Society's Journal. The chief denied having any ivory plates, but there is no doubt that he possesses such, and Mr. Bunker hopes on a future visit to obtain sight of them.

2. On the Talmud, by Dr. Alexander Meyrowitz, of New York.

Dr. Meyrowitz gave a brief statement of the principal facts in the history of the Talmud, and described its character, reading by way of illustration a number of passages, in translation.


There are three principal theories of Greek pronunciation: that we should pronounce the language as the ancients did, or each nation according to the rules of its own language, or as the modern Greeks do.

The main objection to the first is that it is practically impossible to discover what the sounds of the language at any given period in antiquity were, with certainty and precision. In attempting to do so, we must rely chiefly on written testimony, which cannot accurately convey an idea of sound.

The objections to the second system are that it produces confusion and variety where uniformity is desirable, that it applies modern sounds to an ancient language in disregard of the effects of time and of difference of race upon sounds, and, for the speakers of English, that it forces upon Greek the laws of a language abnormally irregular in its pronunciation. It also increases the difficulty of teaching the principles of etymology, and deprives the student of the benefit of learning a pronunciation different from that of his own language and having in itself a historical and scientific value.

For the third system there are no valid arguments to be urged. The fact that the modern Greeks give a certain sound to a given character by no means proves that the ancient Greeks did the same, or that modern scholars need do so. The increased facility of communicating with the modern Greeks is of no weight as an argument, because there is so little occasion for such communication, and because so much besides the pronunciation must be learned to make it possible. When we examine the particular features of this pronunciation, we find no early authority for it, and no support in the structure of the language. The modern sound of η, for instance, as η, has no early evidence for itself, and the facts of the language testify against it.

When we wish to decide how we should pronounce the language, we should consider first the use we make of it. We use it purely for scientific and educational purposes. Hence we should settle upon a system upon scientific grounds alone, not laying too much stress upon an exact determination of precisely how the ancient Greeks at any given time pronounced their words. Such a system could be settled with substantial agreement by philological scholars. It would give to the vowels the Italian sounds, distinguishing quantity by the time used in utterance. In the diphthongs it would give effect to each of the two elements, combining them as nearly as possible into one sound. It would give to the conson-
nants the sounds which the corresponding characters in English have, regarding \( \phi \) as the equivalent of \( f, \theta \) or th sound. Only \( \chi \) would have the sound of the German \( ch \). This system would be less objectionable and more useful in a scientific and educational point of view than any other.

A brief discussion followed the reading of this paper, after which the Society adjourned for the day, and the remaining communications were presented at the session of Friday forenoon.

4. Thirteen inedited Letters from Sir William Jones to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Charles Wilkins, communicated by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, D. C. L.; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Dr. Hall's introductory note accompanying these letters is as follows:

"The venerated memory of Sir William Jones must abundantly suffice to justify the publication of the following letters; and I have only to say, by way of introducing them, that I am indebted for the favor of being allowed to make them public, to Charles H. Moore, Esq., who possesses the originals."

The letters range in date from Jan. 6, 1784, to Jan. 14, 1793, and are interesting as illustrating the progress of the writer's plans of study and their accomplishment, and casting additional light upon the small beginnings of a department of learning which has now assumed a great and unlooked-for importance. A few sentences are extracted here.

"... Happy should I be to follow you in the same track [of Hindu learning]; but life is too short and my necessary business too long for me to think of acquiring a new language. All my hopes, therefore, of being acquainted with the poetry, philosophy, and arts of the Hindoo, are grounded on the expectation of living to see the fruits of your learned labors." (April 24th, 1784.)

"... I have just received from Benares a Sanscrit book, which puzzled me at first, and will, I hope, continue to puzzle, until it enlightens me. It is called ... the Dharm Shastr Menas Sastry. A version of this curious work is promised, and, when it comes, I will set about learning the original, if I can procure assistance from a good Pendit." (March 1st, 1785.)

"... I have found a pleasant old man of the medical caste, who teaches me all he knows of the Grammar, and I hope to read the Hit Upades, or some other story-book, with him. My great object is the Dherne S'astr, to which I shall arrive by degrees." (Sept. 17th, 1785.)

"... You are the first European that ever understood Sanscrit, and will, possibly, be the last." (Oct. 6th, 1787.)

"I devised, my dear Sir, your Bhagavat-Gita, and have made an hearty a meal of your Hitopadesa, for which I thank you most sincerely. The ships of this season will carry home seven hundred copies of our first volume of Transactions; and the second will be ready. I hope, next year: but unless the impression should be sold in London, Harrobing & Morris (who print the book at their hazard) will be losers, and we must dissolve the Society. You have already done us capital service, and will continue to serve us by spreading over Europe your discoveries in Indian literature. You have the honor of being the first European in the world, and the only man, probably, that ever saw Europe, who possessed a knowledge of Sanscrit." (Feb. 27th, 1789.)

"I am so busy at this season, that I have only time to request your acceptance of a little Sanscrit poem, which Morris has printed, and which you are the only man in Europe who can read and understand." (Jan. 14th, 1793.)

5. On two Inscriptions in Sanskrit characters from Buddhist temples in China, by Mr. E. C. Taintor, of the Chinese Foreign Customs Service.

Mr. Taintor exhibited to the meeting an inscription, in mixed Chinese and Sanskrit characters, covering eight sheets, and explained that it was an impression taken from the faces of an octagonal marble column in the Hwa Yen T'an, a tem-
people in the Chinese city (the southern section) of Peking, and that the inscription was first brought to light by Rev. Joseph Edkins, of the London Missionary Society. The date of its erection, A. D. 1491, is given in the last line of the eighth sheet. The first face of the column bears an inscription, in Chinese only, commemorating the rebuilding or repairing of the temple, and detailing the circumstances attending it, in the style usual in monumental records of this character, which are to be met with very commonly in temples in all parts of China. The second to the seventh faces, inclusive, contain Sanskrit characters, written after the Chinese style in vertical columns, and forming an inscription as yet untranslated. The eighth face comprises both Sanskrit and Chinese text. Considerable portions of the characters on several of the faces of the column, as given in the copied sheets, are nearly obliterated or quite indistinct, but can probably be restored on a careful examination of the original.

But one other inscription of this character, containing Sanskrit text, has, so far as I am aware, been observed in China. This was found by me in February, 1897, at the city of Ichow, which lies about seventy miles southwest of Peking, at the entrance to the beautiful valley in which are situated the Si Ling, or Western Tombs, the burial places of three of the seven deceased emperors of the present dynasty.

Outside the western gate of Ichow stands a neat little three storied pagoda; the temple attached is called Pai Ta Sz, or the ‘White Pagoda Temple.’ In front of the pagoda stand two octagonal white marble pillars, about a foot in diameter and six feet high. The upper one bears only Chinese inscription, but the consequence of the soft and perishable nature of the stone, they are either obliterated or very indistinct. Seven of the eight sides are covered with characters, evidently used phonetically, without regard to their meaning. No date or emperor’s name could be found. A block of marble, with sculptured figures, originally the capital of the pillar, lies a few feet from it. The easterly pillar is in better preservation. The S. face has eight columns of Chinese characters. On the E. face are one column of Sanskrit and two of Chinese characters; on the E. face two Sanskrit and two Chinese; on the N. E. face three columns of Chinese, representing phonetically Sanskrit (?) sounds; on the N. face, four columns of the same character; on the N. W. face three columns, and W. face three and one-half columns of Chinese, all evidently used phonetically. The S. W. face, the most important of all, as giving the date of erection, has four and one-half columns of Chinese, from which we learn that the column was placed in position on the fifteenth day of the eighth month of the fifth year of Shien Ho, of the Sung dynasty, corresponding to 1123 A. D.

As my own limited time prevented my copying the inscription (which was of about the same length as the one from Peking), I endeavored by the offer of a reward to induce some native to make a copy during my absence at the Tombs; but regretted to find on my return the following day that no one had ventured to undertake the task, on account of the great difficulty of making out many of the characters.

Prof. Whitney remarked that the Sanskrit characters were in an older form of Devanagari, quite different from that now in use, and that the hasty examination which he had yet been able to give to the inscription had not enabled him to make out any part of it, save the common Buddhist formula at the end, om mañi padma hum.

6. On the System of Duplication in consonant groups, as taught by the ancient Hindu grammarians, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Our means of knowledge of the pronunciation of the ancient Sanskrit are its pronunciation by the modern Hindus, the teachings of the old Hindu writers on grammar, the euphonic laws of the language, and the comparison of the spoken alphabets of other related languages. Each of these, in its order, checks and corrects the others, and their combined effect is to give us a confident and satisfactory understanding of the phonetic form of the language—excepting, of course, that tone and coloring which no description can impart. The second source is worth more in India than elsewhere, since the ancient Hindu phonetists were
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gifted with rare powers of observation and analysis, and carried the science of phonology further than it has been carried by any but the latest generation even of European scholars. Their results are laid down especially in the Prātiśākhyaas, and constitute one main department of the interest attaching to that little body of works. But the characteristic defects of the Hindu character appear also in their phonetic science—their tendency to over-refinement of analysis, and to the setting up of arbitrary and artificial rules in place of simple natural laws, determined by pure observation. A striking example of this is their system of duplication in consonant groups; this forms a feature in all the Prātiśākhyaas, and is found even in Pāñini’s great grammatical text-book, which has been the rule of correct Sanskrit speech for probably more than two thousand years. The system involves two chief rules: 1, that the first consonant in a group of two or more is to be pronounced double after a vowel; thus, pra after a is āypra, abba is ābbā, aaya is āaya, and so on; 2, that an r thus situated is not doubled, but the consonant following is so treated instead, as in arkkā for arka, uryy vīr for ury vīr, urygybhaya for urygybhaya, and so on. In case the letter to be doubled is an aspirate mute, the corresponding non-aspirate is substituted for it in duplication: thus, addhāvāra from addhāvara, addhāvā from addhāva. To these rules there are certain extensions and restrictions, of minor importance, and variously given by the different authorities. They are combined, also, with a number of other insertions and modifications, which not infrequently produce very intricate and formidable results: turning tōm, for example, into thōppa, and so on. In the case of some of these insertions and changes, we can seem to see the physical processes whose undue appreciation or gross exaggeration are their foundation: but the physical ground of the system of duplication itself no one yet has succeeded in tracing out and setting forth.

7. On Westphal’s new Greek grammar, by Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven.

Prof. Hadley referred briefly to the series of works on Greek rhythm, metre, and music, by which Westphal has gained a high, and, on the whole, a deserved reputation. Since Hermann and Boeckh, no scholar has done so much for the progress of these studies. His merits are undeniably great, though marred by some faults—by haste, self-assertion, want of ingenuity, and intemperance in controversy. In 1869, Westphal appeared in a new field, with a Philologisch-historische Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. Here he gives, in general, the results arrived at by Bopp, Grimm, and their successors; but lays much stress on a theory of the origin of inflections, in which he differs from nearly all comparative philologists. He holds that most inflections were, at the outset, not words, previously separate, which losing their own accent became appendages of other words, but mere sounds, without independent existence, and without significance, until by the users of language they were employed as inflections. In his Greek Grammar, just published, the same theory is adhered to; though much less prominence is given to it. The author at first intended only to write a Greek Syntax, in which the syntactical categories of Hermann should at length be superseded by more appropriate norms, derived partly from comparison of other Indo-European languages, and partly from an intelligent examination of the Greek literature. But he was led to include the etymology, as without it his treatment of the syntax would often be unintelligible. Though subordinate in the plan of his work, it is treated on a large scale, receiving 447 pages, without including the verb, which will probably require as many pages more.

This great length may be partly the result of hasty composition, which shows itself in other ways. Thus, on p. xvii., the verb ēikō is spoken of as if it were a contraction of αἰκώ (instead of αἰκώ). On p. 58, the noun πίτως—a masculine of the second decl.—is set down as having its genitive in αἰκ. On p. 17, τυγω is given as the future of τυτυσσω, whereas the classic writers have τυτυσσω, and τυγω does not appear until some five centuries after the Christian era. Still worse is it with καίκω, on p. 24, which does not occur until late in the middle ages, which Plassow describes as unused, and Liddell and Scott omit altogether. On p. 55, a form τετω (or τετω) is mentioned and explained at length; under pronouns, it re-appears, in connection with τετω, pp. 377–8, where special attention is called to the latter form;—all this without an intimation that τετω is confined to one line (twice re-
peated) in Homer, and that reio is a mere conjectural variation for reio in that line.

Cases of self-contradiction were also pointed out. Thus on p. 30, the author explains ἱκρειος as being for ἱκερειος; on p. 70, he explains it as being for ἱκερειος; while on p. 207, he pointedly rejects the second explanation and returns to the first. The two derivations proposed for ἱλιος—the one formerly received from a root meaning 'to shine,' and the one suggested by G. Curtius from ακρ. 'to burn'—are both found here, the first on p. 180, the second on p. 198, each without reference to the other.

Several points in the Lautehre were made subjects of special criticism: particularly, the failure to recognize the true difference between sonants and surds, consisting not in softness or harshness, but in the presence or absence of tone. So, the sounding of γ before υ as μψίγ; the assertion that Doric ἱδίον was an earlier form of ἱλιον; the assumption that the Homeric ἱερειος in the dative plural was made from ετυ by doubling the τ; the statement that the Greek had no objection to a final λ, supported only by the form ἵλος (= ἵλος) in a late epic poet; etc.

Among other cases of venturous etymologising, was mentioned Westphal's suggestion that the Indo-European numeral 'four' contained the word 'three' under the form ἱερειος, with a prefix to express unity, which prefix had from the outset three forms πε, ἵα, ἵα. That the first speakers of the Indo-European, while agreed on the five sounds in ἵερειος, and agreed that a surd mute must precede them, were hopelessly divided into three parties on the question which surd mute should be taken, and that this division was propagated to the first speakers of the Graeco-Latin, and down to the first speakers of the Greek itself—is a strange hypothesis, and an unnecessary one, as a primitive ᾦ might by explicable euphonic processes pass into a π or a τ.

Finally, it was remarked that Westphal deserves credit for his attempt to treat the Greek grammar in the light of comparative philology. The difficulty of the attempt might be admitted as an excuse for many imperfections. The work would certainly be useful in overcoming the prejudices, still strong in Germany, against any application of comparative philology to Greek or Latin grammar.

8. On two recently discovered Greek monuments, by Pres't Woolsey, of New Haven.

Pres't Woolsey showed to the Society a photograph of a beautiful monument found at Athens several years ago, and rendered more interesting by a more recent discovery. The monument presents to us the figure of a young horseman over a fallen foe, and the inscription on the base is this: "Dexiplus, son of Lyssias, of Thorikus, was born when Teisander was archon, died when Eubulides was archon, in Corinth, one of the five horsemen." The dates are, of his birth, 414 B.C., the archon being called Teisander by Diod. Sic., xii. 7; and of his death, 394 B.C., when the great battle in the territory of Corinth and near the city took place, described in Xenophon's Hellenica, iv. 2, 9-23, which is assigned to the year of Eubulides by Diod. Sic., xiv. 85-86. In the inscription there is nothing deserving notice except—1, that Teisander is either a mistake of the lapidary for Peisander, or else an early instance of Τις for Τι, common enough afterwards, especially on marbles of Asia Minor, in words from the root Τι; 2, that one of "the five horsemen" naturally seems to mean one of the five who died in that "great battle," as it was called by Demosthenes.

Another inscription lately found (in March last), and published from the copy of Mr. Robert P. Keep, our consul at Peirauce, in the Yale Courant of April 30 last, records that

"These horsemen died in Corinth:
Meliasia, Onocordes, Lysitheus, Pandias, Nicomachus,
Theangelus, Phanes, Demeoclés, Dexilaus, Ecdelus;
In Coronae, Nepodeides."

Mr. Keep's copy gives Ecdelus, but there can have been no such name.

This inscription, on the cap or frieze of a monument of Pentelic marble, occurs on the way taken by Pausanias from the city to the Academy (Attica 29, 2, which Mr. Keep cites). He says "those who fell around (or near) Corinth lie here."
This inscription, it will be perceived, names ten horsemen who died in Corinth, one of whom is Dexilaus, and the other inscription says that he belonged to "the five horsemen." What then can this expression in the first inscription, "the five horsemen," mean?


After excusing the incompleteness and want of elaboration of his criticism of Mr. Cox's work, Prof. Whitney began with referring to the new era made in the study of classic mythology, as of classical language, by the wider Indo-European studies. The foundation of both is the same: the formation of certain religious views and mythical conceptions, as of certain ideas and expressions, in the period of Indo-European unity, and their transmission down to historical times. To find the traceable relics of these, is to make the nearest possible approach to the beginnings of religious thought in our branch of the human race. The comparison of Greek and Hindu mythology began as soon as the Veda was opened to study, and has ever since yielded more and more fruit. Max Müller has lately done the service of setting it forth in an attractive manner; and has also given such prominence to the elements of the sun and the dawn in the earliest mythology as almost to put a new aspect upon the whole subject of mythologic interpretation. His views are very attractive and plausible, as well as novel, but their soundness is yet to be established by careful criticism. To such criticism they are not subjected by Mr. Cox, who is, rather, their implicit acceptor and their enthusiastic advocate, and who carries them to an extreme which, even their originator, perhaps, would fail to approve. Mr. Cox's work (in two stout 8vo volumes, London, 1870) is eloquent and graceful, but wanting in scientific tone, as in soberness and coherence of reasoning; it is somewhat diffuse and repetitious; the author is so dominated by his theory as to be made often partial in his judgments, loose in his interpretations, and uncritical in his etymologies.

The main features of the solar interpretation—which Mr. Cox applies to the story of the Odyssey as well as of the Iliad, to the Nibelungen-Lied, the legends of Arthur and Charlemagne, the nursery-tales of Boots and Jack the giant-killer, and so on—were stated, and illustrated by extracts and comments.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston on the seventeenth of May next.