CHAPTER I

(1) Text of the Astādhyāyī
(2) Pāṇini's date
(3) Language analysed by Pāṇini
(4) Taddhita forms and their attestation
The text of the Astādhyāyī

The text of the Astādhyāyī which consists of nearly 4000 aphorisms, is divided into eight Adhyāyas "Books". Each book is further divided into four sections called pādas "quarters". Probably the original text was written down, but transmitted orally, because of sacredness of the work and scarcity of writing materials. The manuscript tradition gives practically no variations in the readings. Yet we cannot say that the text of Pāṇini's grammar has been handed down to us altogether in original form.

F. Keilhorn has shown that the present text of the Astādhyāyī contains some 50 rules which are different from the text as known to Kātyāyana and to Patañjali.

It has been accepted by scholars that the basic text of the Astādhyāyī has undergone a change at the hands of later commentators who revised the text by way of deleting, adding or reformulating rules. Thus the existing form of the Astādhyāyī contains successive additions or expressions

1. F. Keilhorn, Notes on the Mahābhāṣya 6 :
   "The text of Pāṇini's sūtras as given in the KāśikāVṛtti, compared with the text known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali",
   Indian Antiquary (16), 1887, pp. 178-184
at the hands of later commentators. These commentators also point out that certain rules have different readings, certain rules or parts of rules have been interpolated in the text. These additions coming from the Vārttikas and Bhāṣya, etc. have been accepted as interpolations by scholars.

But even the pre-Kātyāyana text of Pāṇini's rules appear to contain interpolations. Principles for determining the non-Pāṇinian character of rules are led down by scholars like I.S. Pawate, Yudhishthira Mīmāṃsaka, Rama Shankar Bhattācarya, Roberts Birve, Saudamini

2. The Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, Hubli, 1935, pp. 46-49
Bahulikar, S.D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen, and S.D. Joshi and Saroja Bhate. These scholars have raised doubts as to the authenticity of the present text of the Astādhāyī because it contains conflicting and incompatible elements. S.D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen in their article on "The Structure of the Astādhāyī in Historical Perspective" noted inconsistencies which arise from the disturbance of the anuvṛtti-procedure due to the introduction of rules dealing with taddhita- and samāsa-formations in sections which are not confirmed to

---

6. Some criteria for determining the insertions in the Astādhāyī,


taddhita- and samāsa-formations only. They further pointed out discrepancy regarding phrasing of rules in the taddhita- and samāsa-sections, discrepancy regarding the way in which taddhita-derivatives are analysed into stems and suffixes, discrepancy regarding the way meaning is indicated in the taddhita-section, discrepancy regarding the distribution of nipātāna and chandas rules in the taddhita section. Joshi and Roodbergen further noted the apparent conflicts and anomalies which arise due to the introduction of samāsa- and taddhita-sections in the original body of rules. Some of Joshi's and Roodbergen's arguments for discovering later additions are based on style and method that are adopted in the taddhita- and samāsa-sections. For instance, Pāṇini normally uses the genitive case to indicate sthānyadesābhāva. However, in the samāsa-section we find that the nominative
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11. Ibid., pp.73-74.
12. Ibid., pp.74-75.
13. Ibid., pp.75-76.
is used very often in the sense of the genitive. So the
samāsa-section in which the nominative is used instead of
the genitive appears to be composed by the different author
than the one who framed the original text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. On the basis of the abovementioned arguments Joshi and
Roodbergen conclude: "the hypothesis (that the
taddhita- and samāsa-sections stem from an author different
from the one who phramed the original Aṣṭādhyāyī) is
ultimately based on the assumption that Pāṇini, being a
system-builder, could not allow major inconsistencies at
any rate to arise in his grammar. It is generally assumed
that he has borrowed individual rules from his predecessors,
but not to the extent that they clashed with the system
he had in mind, or with particular rules in that system.
There is some evidence to say that in such a case Pāṇini
reworded the rule in question, so as to make it fit in.
Keeping rules, or sequences of rules which show or imply
major inconsistencies with the rest of the grammar, or
which betray an altogether different approach to grammar,
would be out of character with Pāṇini’s accuracy and
consistency shown elsewhere. It would, in fact, make him
a bad theoratician and a destroyer of his own system.

15. Ibid., pp.70-71.
Therefore, when we come across such major inconsistencies which allow no good solution within the system on the basis of the present text of the Astādhyāyī, we are justified in assuming a different and later source. Our claim in the present article is that we have found a number of such major inconsistencies, and that they can be traced to a single cause namely, the additions at a later date, of taddhīta- and samāsa-sections. This is our hypothesis which involves major surgery in the present text of the Astādhyāyī.\(^{16}\)

From this it appears that even the pre-Kātyāyana text of the Astādhyāyī contains interpolations. It is hard to accept that the text of the Astādhyāyī received by Kātyāyana and Patañjali was the work of one person. The text of the Astādhyāyī which mentions a number of predecessors, can be viewed as the final redaction of earlier grammatical tradition which has started some centuries before the finalisation of the text. Thus the Astādhyāyī represents the whole grammatical literature composed up to 200 B.C.

Pāṇini might have composed the original text consisting of karaka-section, a vibhakti-section, \(^{16}\) Ibid., pp.92-93.
a section dealing with verbal derivation, a krt-section, an aṅga-section, the sandhi-section including the division into a siddhakānda and an asiddhakānda. Pāṇini's text had left out the essential sections samāsa and taddhita. Further the original text did not take into account an older stage of Sanskrit. Pāṇini's successors found that original text composed by Pāṇini had become a well-known grammar and tried to make their own possession. They found it to be a convenient hand-book in which they could insert their own corrections, additions or modifications to supplement this prestigious text. To these later scholars the problem of constructing a grammar was not present. They were simply interested in introducing the sections which had been left out in the original text. The Vedic rules which give a somewhat crude analysis of Vedic facts appear to be patched up and added at the end of rules dealing with classical language. The characteristic of Vedic rules is that they make loose and overgeneralised statement. Similarly the nipātana rules which represent a diverse technique of description belong to different sources. These nipātana rules simply list the ready-made forms and are added at the end of rules dealing with the same suffix from which

17. Ibid., fn. 37.
the ready-made forms mentioned in the nipātana rules are derived. If the nipātana rules and Vedic rules are removed from the Aṣṭādhyāyī the remaining text would continue smoothly. In fact no one would notice that the text is missing in some rules. Similarly, the taddhita- and samāsa-sections which were lacking in original text and which Pāṇini may not have been able to complete during his life time have been added later on.

The final editor of the Aṣṭādhyāyī was a clever compiler. While re-editing the different layers of the text, he carefully tried to maintain a high degree of consistancy with regard to the terminology, the basic pratyāhāra and anubandha systems, and grammatical theory as assumed by the basic layer. He was also cautious in adding these rules at the appropriate context looking carefully that the new additions would not disturb the basic structure much. Yet traces of his skillful reworking of the original text remain and it is which gives us a hint of what happened behind the curtain.

Thus the effect of these additions was that the style and method of description in the Astādhyāyī did not appear to be homogeneous and uniform.

The contribution of later grammarians consists in bringing the grammar to perfection. Later layers improve on the earlier text by adding new cases which are not available in the basic text. Therefore, it becomes difficult to correctly evaluate the different stages in the development of Sanskrit. It becomes often difficult to answer whether these added cases are overlooked by Panini or new developments have taken place in the period between the original layer and subsequent layers.
Panini's date

Max Müller and Bühlingk regard Panini to have flourished not earlier than 350 B.C. Macdonell in his History of Sanskrit Literature fixes the date of Panini about 300 B.C. Keith in his work on Sanskrit Literature put Panini in 350 B.C. Later on Macdonell in his work India's Past regards it a good working hypothesis to assign Panini to 450 B.C. It is generally agreed that Patañjali has lived around 140 B.C. Panini must have lived in the fourth Century presupposing that two centuries must have passed between Patañjali and Panini. This period of two centuries leaves room for other grammarians, notably Kātyāyana, Vyādi and others, who are known to have lived between Patañjali and Panini. This date assigned to Panini is only a working hypothesis. Renau has decided Panini's date without absolute certainty, as the fourth or fifth centuries B.C. Liebich thinks

19. p.431
20. p.426
21. p.138
that the language described by Panini comes near to that of the Aitareya Brähmana. A member of conjugational forms derived according to Panini's rules are far more akin to Vedic prose than to that of classical literature. The analysis of Sanskrit in the main body resembles close to that of later Vedic prose and that of Sūtra literature. Thieme holds that Panini should not be dated later than 500 B.C. It appears that the basic layer of the Astadhyāyī belongs to the pre-Buddhistic period. All these scholars assume that the Astadhyāyī as we have it is a single work written by one author named Panini. Further, scholars believe that Panini in his grammar treated the language which must have been in use in Panini's days. However, the Astadhyāyī represents side by side the old as well as new layers. Therefore it is difficult to assign a single date to the Astadhyāyī as a whole. The basic layer of the Astadhyāyī which deals with verbal derivation belongs to the pre-Buddhistic period. On the other hand, a considerable amount of taddhita words dealing with everyday life, terms in commerce, agriculture, words for plants and animals


25. Ibid., p.93
which are derived by the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* cannot be traced in the old pre-Pāṇinian literature. Some of these words are attested in post-Pāṇinian literature. The *taddhita* forms are attested in early Vedic literature, later Vedic literature and classical literature. However, some *taddhita* forms are not attested at all in any literature. From this one may claim that the layer dealing with *taddhita* formations belongs to the later layers. In this connection Joshi and Roodbergen state: "It is obvious that the hypothesis of the later addition of the *taddhita*- and *samāsa*-sections by an author different from Pāṇini has some implications for the dating of Pāṇini. One implication is that the whole question of the date has been wrongly posed from the very outset, precisely because it started from the assumption that the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as we have it is a single work coming from a single author named Pāṇini. Another implication is that word-derivations prescribed by rules in the present text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and involving words or names which can be historically identified, or which give us some point of reference in history, should be carefully shifted according to the section of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in which they are prescribed. Some examples one of the two major pieces of evidence for assigning a rather late date to Pāṇini, mentioned by Cardona, is the compound *kumārīśramanā*, prescribed by P.2.1.70. But this is a *samāsa*-rule and
therefore, belongs to a later added section, according to our hypothesis. Another example is the word nirvana mentioned in P.8.2.50. This is a nipatana-rule (see under 3.4.1), which also may have been inserted later on. Therefore these two rules cannot serve to assign a post-Buddha date for Pāṇini, but only for his later editor. In this respect, a great deal of work remains yet to be done, especially in correlating words derived with the help of rules in the different sections of the Astādhyāyī with words preserved in literature.

On the basis of examples arunād yavanaḥ sāketam 'the yavana besieged Saketa', arunād yavano mādhyamikām 'the yavana besieged Mādhyamiku', pusyamitro yajate vājaka vājayanti 'Puṣyamitra sacrifices and the sacrificing priests cause him to sacrifice', and iha pusyamitram vājayāmah 'here we cause Puṣyamitra to sacrifice', R.G. Bhandarkar comes to the conclusion that Patañjali must have written his commentary around 140 B.C. and Patañjali must have lived at the court of

26. Ibid., p.94
Pusyamitra. F. Kielhorn points out that dating a grammarian on the strength of the examples cannot always lead to a safe result, because we do not know whether he himself phrased the examples or just took them from tradition. Joshi and Roodbergen come to the conclusion: "We can either date Kātyāyana or Patañjali around 150 B.C. However, if we assign this date to Patañjali, it seems rather improbable that he could have written the Bhāṣya on P.2.4.10 which presupposes—with some probability—a much later date. In the present state of our knowledge the simple hypothesis to assume that Kātyāyana lived somewhere around 150 B.C." It is nearly unanimously agreed that Patañjali has lived


29. Ibid., p. XXVIII.
around 140 B.C. But, as stated by Winternitz, we are not in a position to confirm that this is the correct date. The question largely depends on the other question, namely, whether Patanjali was the author of the examples he quotes. According to Tarn, there is nothing conclusive in Patanjali's assumed date, precisely because his grammatical examples are, or in any particular case may be not necessarily his own composition but traditional examples.\textsuperscript{30}

A tentative but not wholly unreasonable date of the basic layer of the Astādhyāyī is cir. 550 B.C., for the last layer of the Astādhyāyī cir. 250 B.C. and for Katyāyana cir. 150 B.C.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p. 1
Language analysed by Panini

Panini does not mention any name of the language analysed by him. Most of the rules do not make a clear-cut distinction between written and spoken forms of a language (excluding the cases coming under chandasi, bhāṣyāṃ, prācāṃ and udīcāṃ). The Aṣṭādhīyāī mentions at least eight predecessors by their names. The Vedic and non-Vedic texts undoubtedly referred to in the Aṣṭādhīyāī include the Rgveda, the (Kṛṣṇa-) Yajurveda, the Kathaka-Saṃhitā, the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, the Atharvaveda, and most probably the Saṃavedā. The other Vedic and non-Vedic texts undoubtedly referred to in the Aṣṭādhīyāī include some Brāhmaṇas, some Śrautasūtras, the Vedic Caranas "branches", the Kalpa-works, the
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Sakalya's Padapatha, the grammatical works Nirukta and Ākhyatikā, the Bhikṣusūtra and the Naṭasūtra, the Krama text of Vedic recitation, the Śloka and Gāthā Literature, literary works like Ākhyānas "stories", Śiśukranda, Yamasabha, Indrajanana. The Astādhyāyī also classifies literature by referring to its characters under such heads as drṣṭa "revealed", prokta "promulgated", upajñāta "expounded for the first time", grantha "any text".

40. P.1.1.16-17.

41. P.4.3.72

42. P.4.3.110

43. P.4.2.61
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49. P.4.3.115.

50. P.4.3.87.
The word bhāsa 'non-Vedic speech' or 'colloquial dialect' occurs seven times in the text, and these rules sometimes follow up the zone of chandas. The word indicates a distinct preference to stylistic forms used in the non-Vedic speech, although only seven times. The Āstādhyāyī also uses three words, va, vibhāsa and anyatarasyaṁ to denote different preferences among optional variants va 'preferably' vibhāsa 'preferably not (i.e. marginally, rarely), anyatarasyaṁ 'both ways'. Through these words the Āstādhyāyī registrates stylistic or linguistic preferences. The Āstādhyāyī also records regional variations of speech community. For instance, prācām 'in the speech of the northerness'53 These can be taken as regional variations. Apart from this, the Āstādhyāyī mentions linguistic variations in speech restricted to particular societies or areas. For instance, sauvīra 'a region of modern Sindh', vahīka 'name of a people in Punjab', usīnara 'name of a people in

52. P.1.1.75, 2.4.60, 4.2.120, etc.
53. P.3.4.91, 4.1.130, etc.
54. P.4.1.148, 4.2.72.
55. P.5.3.114.
56. P.2.4.20, 4.2.118.
Central India', prācyabharata 'inhabitants of the eastern country' and bharata regions.

Thus, we have no evidence to say that Pāṇini has described his own language only. Better supposition would be that the Astādhyāyī records usages (spoken as well as written) current in different regions and at different periods of time. This body of grammar deals with usages in the whole of the recorded language as well as with spoken forms current in different periods of time. However, the analysis of Sanskrit in the basic text which deals with kāraka-section, a vibhakti-section, a section dealing with verbal derivation, a kṛt-section and aṅga-section resembles very much the language of the later Vedic prose and that of the sūtra literature. The taddhita-formations with which the present thesis deals are closely related to the spoken language also and can be taken to reflect, in their own way, the social set-up of the time when Sanskrit was probably used as the language of religion, scholarship and administration, Prakṛt vernaculars being preferred in private intimate talk as well as in market. We have the variety of taddhita forms

57. P.4.1.178.

58. P.2.4.66, 4.2.113, 8.3.75.
and their meanings described in the taddhita-section. It is the largest single class of suffixes described in the Astadhyayi for which it devotes more than a thousand sūtras. The style that is adopted in describing these formations is somewhat different from the style the Astadhyayi adopts elsewhere. The lexical meanings are stated in the taddhita section by means of varied phrases. The meaning is stated by the nominative word (tasyāpatyam, P.4.1.92), or by a locative word (adhiṣṭṛya krte granthe, P.4.3.87), or by a finite verb (tad adhīte tad veda, P.4.2.59; tad arhati, P.4.4.137). The taddhita-section shows one more peculiarity as far as the analysis of meaning is concerned. The kernel phrases above referred indicate deep level structure of taddhita-formations. There can be wide variations in the meanings expressed through the samarthavibhaktis tasya 'of x', tena 'by x', tasmai 'to x', tasmin 'in x', etc. where x stands for any individual name or object. In the taddhita section the sūtrakāra gives due importance to semantic concepts and makes no distinction between semantic and deep structural level. In the taddhita-section semantic structure is directly converted into the surface structure.

without involving the karaka titles. The syntactic meanings like kartr, karman, etc. are not directly stated in the taddhita-section. In the krt-section the grammatical meanings are indicated by the words kartari, karmani, bhāve, adhikarane, etc. The conventional meaning is indicated by the term saujñāyām in the krt-section. Specific lexical meanings are only stated in the nipātana rules of the krt-section which belong to the later layer. But in the taddhita-section we see an incursion into the realm of lexical meaning which lies outside the scope of grammar. The taddhita-section shows one more peculiarity as far as the meaning is concerned. Normally suffixes must denote some meaning which is not denoted by a stem to which they are added. In the taddhita-section the suffixes denote special meanings, apatya 'progeny' (P.4.1.92), tena raktam 'coloured thereby' (P.4.2.1), naksatrena yuktah kalah 'a time connected with the asterism' (P.4.2.3), tena drstam sama 'the saman seen by him' (P.4.2.7), tena parivrtaḥ rathah

60. See P.3.4.67, P.3.4.70, P.3.4.76.
61. See P.3.2.179,185; 3.3.99,109,118; 3.4.43.
63. For instance, P.4.4.88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95,97, etc.
'a chariot surrounded by' (P.4.2.10). Thus the taddhita suffixes are prescribed to denote special meanings which are indicated often by kernel phrases like nakṣatrena yuktah kālaḥ, tena raktam, etc. According to the Kāśiṇīrtti, the suffixes prescribed by P.5.3.70, etc. are classified into svārthika and atyantasvārthika categories. The svārthika taddhitas do not denote any special meaning but are added to a stem to highlight a particular aspect of meaning of the stem. The atyantasvārthika suffixes have neither an independent meaning nor do they highlight any special characteristic of the stem to which they are added. For instance, devatā and deva (P.5.4.27), ausadham and osadhi (P.5.4.37), etc. The Aṣṭādhyāyī does not use the term svārthika and the atyantasvārthika. The later grammatical tradition only introduces this classification. In the kṛt-section, however, there is no suffix without a definite syntactic meaning of its own.

The vocabulary derived by the taddhita suffixes is indeed very rich and vast. Almost all conceivable topics of the world are represented here. Words of sacrificial science and religious literature, literary and scientific words, words indicating various relations, words of domestic use, botanical words indicating trees, creepers, flowers and medicines, words of geographical and historical importance such as rivers, villages,
countries, royal dynastic castes, tribes, etc. are derived by means of taddhita suffixes.

The aim of the present thesis is to check each rule in the fourth Adhyāya of the Astādhyāyī against the usage in literature up to 250 B.C. I admit the possibility that for many rules attestation may not be obtainable at all. However, on the basis of our findings we will be able to pinpoint the period in which the literature is closer to the language described in the fourth Adhyāya in the Astādhyāyī. If we are not able to pinpoint any specific period then our hypothesis should be that the fourth Adhyāya records usages spoken as well as written current in different periods of time. As regards the composition of the taddhita-section the question is whether it is a single author's work, or whether it is a single author's compilation or whether it is a work of several grammarians. It appears that the text of the taddhita section is not a work of one person. In this section also we find additions at the hands of later grammarians, because we find a variety of ways in phrasing the rules which are inconsistent with each other. In some cases we find that the oblate which represents the stem is not used at all, but it is
inferred from the meaning condition. The meaning phrases have also different forms. The meaning is stated either in the nominative or in the locative or in the form of a sentence.

A close examination of the character, style and method of description leads us to conclude that considerable rules are inserted in the taddhita-section later on. The proper research on the style of rules and method of description should help us to reconstruct the original layer of the taddhita section and in tracing the interpolations which have crept into the basic structure of the taddhita-section. Thus, my claim is that the taddhita-section in the Astādhyāyī handles a spoken as well as a written vast classical literature belonging to different periods of time. To account the vast and rich vocabulary derived by the taddhita-section we have to assume a fairly long period of interval between the original layer (550 B.C. ?) and the last layer (250 B.C. ?) of the Astādhyāyī.

64. For instance, P.4.4.34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41,42,43 etc.
65. For instance, P.4.1.92, etc.
66. For instance, P.4.3.87.
67. For instance, P.4.2.59, 5.1.36, etc.
The taddhita forms and their attestation

The Āṣṭādhyāyī is the first hand document of great importance to obtain the picture of the Sanskrit language up to Kātyāyana. The taddhita section is the largest section in the Āṣṭādhyāyī. According to my count this section contains 1115 rules which form slightly more than one fourth of the whole text. The fourth Adhyāya which has been undertaken for the present study contains 635 rules among which 75 rules in the first pāda are devoted for describing strī-pratyayas. The remaining 560 rules deal with the taddhita formations which form about one seventh of the Āṣṭādhyāyī. The main task of this thesis is to institute a systematic comparison of the rules in the fourth Adhyāya of the Āṣṭādhyāyī with attested facts of Sanskrit usage. It presents the actual coverage of taddhita rules in pre-Pāṇinian and post-Pāṇinian literature. Accordingly the whole of Sanskrit literature is divided into two periods, namely, the pre-Pāṇinian and post-Pāṇinian period. Early Vedic literature, post-Vedic prose, Sūtra-literature and early Upaniṣadas - though not necessarily in the present redaction of the works belonging to the latter two genres - have been regarded as belonging to the pre-Pāṇinian period.
The remaining literature is regarded as belonging to the post-Pāṇinian period. The division into a pre-Pāṇinian and a post-Pāṇinian period—the dividing line being put around 500 B.C. is, obviously, weak on two accounts. We can only guess at Pāṇini's date, and as regards the dates of the works mentioned we rely on guesswork also. The question is further complicated by the fact that the assumedly early works are often the products of authors living in different periods. The study is based on the following presupposition.

As already pointed out the Astādhyāyī contains earlier and later layers which belong to two different periods of time. The later Vedic prose, Sūtra-literature and the early Upaniṣads are probably contemporary with the original layer of the Astādhyāyī. The literature abovementioned appears to be closer to the language described in the original layer of the Astādhyāyī. The rules dealing with the classical literature composed after 500 B.C. belong to the subsequent layers. The literature composed after 500 B.C. will be closer to the language described in the subsequent layers.
The authors or compiler of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* phrase the rules but do not offer examples. Patañjali's *Mahabhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* are helpful in so far they offer examples or counter-examples for a particular interpretation of rules. These examples are no doubt valuable tools in understanding the import of a specific rule. But all such examples given in the *Maha Bhāṣya* and the *Kāśikāvṛtti* are not convincing. These commentators hardly take into account the factual coverage of Pāṇini's rules, but mainly explain and illustrate the application of rules. When these commentaries do not find factual examples, they artificially invent them. Hence examples given in them cannot be considered as attested examples. In order to examine the real intention of Pāṇini's statements we must try to investigate whether there is a close agreement between rules and usage. Therefore, the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have to be illustrated by examples which have been used in well-known works.
written up to 250 B.C. Of course, comparing Panini's rules with the attested examples will not be an easy job because the attestation may not be obtainable at all.

We are not justified in drawing a conclusion from the non-attestation of forms that they were not current in the time of the author/authors of the Astādhyāyī. W.D. Whitney started a serious attack against the role of the Sanskrit grammarians claiming that they do not faithfully and objectively present the genuine record of the Sanskrit usage. Bohtlingk and Liebich refuted the claims of factful errors in the Astādhyāyī and with Buiskool and Paddegon later admirably defended Panini's grammar. Wackernagel, Debrunner and Renou gave cross references to Panini's grammar in their works and described classical facts according to Panini. While discussing the non-availability of some

verbal forms in the current language Pāñjalī refuses to draw the conclusion that the forms derived by the Aṣṭādhyāyī do not exist. The words owe their very existence to their usage. The grammar is based on the language


mahan hi sabdasya prayogavissayah saptadvipa
vasumati, trayo lokah, catvāro vedah sāṅgah
sarahasyāḥ bahudhā bhinnāḥ, ekaśatam adhvaryuśākham
sahasravartmā sāmaveda ekavimsatidham bāhuvrcyam
navadhātharvano vedo vakovākyam, itihasāḥ, purāṇam,
vaidyakam ity ētavān śabdasya prayogavissayah
ētavantaṁ śabdasya prayogavissayam ananunīśamya
santi aprayuktā iti vacanāṁ sāhasamātram eva:

'Wide is the extent in regard to the use of words. The earth with seven islands, the three worlds, the four Vedas with their ancilliary branches (aṅga) and the mystical treatises (Upanisads) in all their varieties, the one hundred branches of the Yajurveda, the Śāmaveda with its thousand paths, the Rgveda with twentyone branches, the Atharvaveda with nine branches, treatises on dialogue, the itihasa, the Purāṇas and the science of medicine. This much is the range in regard to the use of words. Without knowing this extent of the use of words to say that there are words which are not used is nothing but boldness only.'
spoken by people. Patanjali argues that grammar does not invent word-forms or meanings, but analyses words which are used in speech. The language is not a creation of grammarians. Patanjali states that grammar also takes into account obsolete words (aprayukta 'not used now-a-days'). Patanjali says that although the words usā 'you have dwelt', tera 'you have crossed', cakra 'you have done' do not occur in the current language. They occur in the Vedic language. In the current language people use participle forms.


ghaṭena kāryaṁ kariṣyam kumbhakārakulaṁ
gatvā'ha kuru ghaṭaṁ kāryam anena
kariṣyāmīti na tadvac chadbān prayokṣyamano
vaiyākaraṇakulaṁ gatvā'ha kuru śabdān prayokṣya iti:

'for instance, one who needs a pot for some purpose goes to the house of a potter and says, you make a pot for some purpose. (But) one who wants to use words does not go to the house of a grammarian and say, you make words I want to use them'.

See also R.G. Bhandarkar, Wilson Philosophical Lectures, JBBRAS 16, 1877, pp.245-74.

71. See the Vārttikas I, III, IV and V (Paspasāhnika) and the Bhāṣya on them.
usitāḥ, tīrṇāḥ and kṛtavantāḥ. Patanjali further states
that what is current in one region may not be current in a
different region. One should not doubt the existence of
forms which are analysed by the grammar. Katyayana and
Patanjali have noted three points, which are basic,
for any description of language:

72. MahāBh. Vol.I, p.9, lines 24-27:

etasmin atimahati śabdasya prayogavisaye te te
śabdās tatra niyatavisayā drṣyante tad yathā
śavatir gatikarmā kāmbojēśv eva bhāsito
bhavati, viṅga aśrā bhāṣante śava iti.
hammatih surāṣṭreśu, raṁhatih prācyamadhyamesu
gamim eva tv āśrā prayuṣṣate dātir lavanaṁrthe
prācyēśu dātram udīcyēśu

In this exceedingly wide extent of the use of words,
certain words are found to have their meaning fixed
(ristricted) in some places. Thus, for example, the
form śavatī meaning ‘to move’ is only used by kambojas,
the Āryans use in the sense of transformation as
śava ‘dead body’, raṁhati among the easterners and
central countries, but the Āryans use only gam.
Dāti is used by the easternness in the sense of cutting
and dātra by northerners.
(1) loka 'people'.

(2) aprayukta 'the use of certain expressions which are not current now-a-days' i.e. obsolete words.

(3) desa 'currency of words over the vast geographical area'.

Thus we assume the language the Sanskrit grammarians deal with was a real living spoken language. The grammar does not account for the forms which were imaginary and created by it. The Astādhyāyi handled the spoken as well as written language. We have so many obscure words derived by the Astādhyāyi which are now non-existant. Therefore, we are led to presume that the words used in ordinary conversation at that time are lost to us and the existance of a vast classical literature


Also: S.D. Laddu, Evolution of the Sanskrit Language, University of Poona, 1974, pp. 8-9
contemporary to the **Aṣṭādhyāyī** is no longer available to us.

Some taddhita forms belong fully to the language used throughout the whole history. Some forms belong to the earlier (i.e. pre-classical period) only. Some other forms make their first appearance in the classical language only. Some of the words derived by the **Aṣṭādhyāyī** are not available in the extent literature. It appears that the facts of the Sanskrit language belonging to the different periods of time had been gathered first by different grammarians and subsequently they inserted their own additions to supplement the pre-existing text. During the centuries that follow the Vedic prose, many forms became obsolete and new expressions arose. The change might have occurred in many ways, accentuation, wordforms, meaning, etc.

During the centuries that followed the **Aṣṭādhyāyī** the same thing happened. Many forms became obsolete, new expressions arose, some forms which were current in the pre-classical period are left out in the **Aṣṭādhyāyī**. To account such forms Kātyāyana wrote the first commentary on the **Aṣṭādhyāyī** which is known as the
Vārttikās 'short critical notes'. The main aim of Kātyāyana's Vārttikās is to improve on Pañini's Astādhyaśī where it falls short of achieving its goal. In connection with main aim of the Vārttikās, R. G. Bhandarkar thinks that Pañini's Sanskrit was more ancient than Kātyāyana's. Further he points out that Kātyāyana found it necessary to supplement Pañini's text in view of the changes that the Sanskrit language has undergone during his time. In Pañini's time many words and expressions were current which afterwards became obsolete. Verbal forms which were used in Pañini's time ceased to be used in Kātyāyana's time. Some forms were developed later which did not exist in Pañini's days. Thus, the primary object of Kātyāyana's work was to account for the linguistic change and to explain the Sanskrit of his day. But it appears that what counts for Kātyāyana is to make Pañini's system complete and consistent. The contribution of Kātyāyana consists in bringing the system to perfection. Kātyāyana and Patanjali

74. R.G. Bhandarkar, "Development of language and of Sanskrit", JBBRAS, 16, 1883, p.91
used the interpretative devices to extend the scope of Panini's rules so as to cover the later developed usage.

No one denies that the Sanskrit language might have undergone a change in respect of accentuation, word-forms, meaning, etc. in the course of some hundred years that might have passed between Panini and Katyayana. But it is wrong to suppose that the evolution of language is what prompted Katyayana and Patanjali to make their statements. In this connection S.D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen observe: "Patanjali never states or gives the impression that the instances provided by him were unknown to Panini. Nor does Patanjali say that in Panini's time the rule was sufficient to take care of the examples, but that now-a-days, it has become necessary to introduce additions and deletions, because the rule cannot account any more for the usage of

Kātyayana's or Patañjali's time. What counts for Patañjali is to make the system complete and perfect. This can be achieved either by reinterpreting Pāṇini's rules or by accepting Kātyayana's Vārttikas. Thus, the examples do not help us in deciding that a reinterpretation or the acceptance of a correction was prompted by the evolution of language, because we can never prove that the form to be covered by reinterpretation or by correction in the Pāṇinian rule was a post-Pāṇinian form only. It might be a case of oversight on the part of Pāṇini. Therefore, on purely theoretical grounds, the question, whether we can infer an evolution of Sanskrit from the examples, must be answered in the negative. Therefore Kātyayana's Vārttikas and Patañjali's āśṭṭīs cannot be considered as a historical product of a particular period in Sanskrit literature. This holds true of the Āstādhyāyī also. The Āstādhyāyī represents the whole grammatical literature and records usages current in different regions and different periods of time. But the primary aim of the subsequent layers is not to accommodate new usage only and to indicate new development. The subsequent layers may include some old forms which were not noticed by the author of the basic layer.

76. Ibid., p. X.
That is to say the subsequent layers may record the linguistic material which may be already prevalent earlier. The subsequent layers often give the impression that they tried to analyse the same Sanskrit language although occasionally we may get the new linguistic picture from added rules. The activity of the later grammarians consists in inserting their own correction, additions or modifications to supplement the prestigious text.

With regard to faithful and objective records of the facts by the Sanskrit grammarians Kielhorn says, "the time has arrived when their teaching should be subjected by a comparison with the actual usage of the language, to a thorough and searching examination". We must try to investigate whether there is a close agreement between rules and usage. We stand in need of a work which correlates words derived with the help of rules in the different section of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with words attested in literature. In the present thesis I wish to establish a systematic comparison of Pāṇini's rules in the fourth *Adhyāya* with the attested facts of Sanskrit usage. I admit that for many words derived

with the help of rules in the fourth Adhyāya attestations may not be obtainable at all. All the taddhita-formations analysed in the Aṣṭādhyāyī are not found in extent literature. Still it would be extremely fascinating to find out the variety and extent of their use as available in the existing literature. No one can deny that taddhita forms represent one of the most important aspect of the Sanskrit language and the study of the Sanskrit language without the knowledge of taddhita-formations can never be complete.

Here we have purposely avoided the inclusion of the words enumerated in the Gānapātha because the Gānapātha is post-Pāṇinian in its form. Many words are introduced in the Gānapātha later on to account for linguistic changes emerging at later stage. Hence, only such words which are directly derived by the rules in the Aṣṭādhyāyī are taken into account.

The following list (pp.607-655) takes into account the words used in pre-Pāṇinian literature (upto 500 B.C.), in the post-Pāṇinian (after 500 B.C.) literature and words not found in extent literature. The fourth Book deals with 990 forms in total. Among these 330 forms are attested throughout the literature in pre-P. and post-P., whereas 63 are used in pre-P.texts only. Thus, attestation of 393 forms out of 990 is available in early texts. Further, 300 forms are found in post-P. literature only while 297 are recorded in grammatical works only. Accordingly the ratio of attested forms is 39.69%, whereas that of non-attested forms is 60.30%. The ratio of words attested in post-P. texts is 30.30%, while ratio of words recorded grammatical texts is 30%. 
For data on Sanskrit usage I have relied upon the Deccan College Sanskrit Dictionary on Historical Principles, Böhtlingk-Roth (PW) and Monier William (MW) dictionaries. Further Visva Bandhu’s Vedic word concordance has been consulted often to obtain more complete information on some points of usage. I have excluded from the literary evidence the commentaries on Pāṇini’s grammar and such works as the Bhāṭṭikāvya, Dvārāśrayakāvya, Rāvaṇārjunīya and Vāsudevavijaya which are composed specially to illustrate the application of rules and lexical works as the Amarakoṣa. I have completely relied on the chronological facts as given in the Introduction of the Deccan College Sanskrit Dictionary on Historical Principles.

The terms like 'later' and 'classical' are used in this thesis to indicate literature belonging to the post-P. (= post-Pāṇinian) period, whereas the terms 'early' and 'earlier' stand for the texts belonging to the pre-P. (= pre-Pāṇinian) period. The Sanskrit texts, mode of reference to them and the abbreviations followed here are those given in the Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles, Deccan College, Pune. The abbreviations are given along with bibliography in order to avoid repetition.