The illustrations cited in the M.Bh. have got their importance from different viewpoints. As the M.Bh. is a grammatical work, its main purpose is to teach grammar first by explaining the sūtras of Pāṇini in the light of the Vārtikas of the different Vārtikakāras and at the time of explaining the sūtras and the Vārtikas, it is absolutely necessary to give their examples and counter-examples. As Patañjali himself has observed: "The mere repetition of the words comprising the sūtra like vṛddhi, āt, aic, does not form an exposition (Vyākhyāna), but example, counter-example and supplying of what is wanting in the sentence - all these put together form the exposition."  

Patañjali, like Kātyāyana, generally explains grammatical points by an analogy of what is found in the world and what is mentioned in the Vedas with a

1

न केवलानि कर्ष्यवादानि ध्यात्स्यानि। किं तर्थं, इवणां न धात्वात्, प्रविष्टवादानि, धात्ताध्यायां इन्द्रेदु सुरक्षितं ध्यात्स्यानि भविष्य।

M.Bh. 1st Ahnika.
view to make those points clearer. He gives examples for the sūtras and the Vārtikas, generally from the actual life of the people of his time or from the works of his predecessors. In doing so, Patañjali's work has supplied not only a faithful exposition of the sūtras and the Vārtikas, but has incidentally presented a true picture of the culture of ancient India, especially of his time. His M.Bh. offers many points concerning the history of social, religious and economic life of the people as also, technical knowledge in ancient India in his days. A good deal of information about the geography of India of his time, is also supplied by his work. The field of his personal knowledge of geography of India extends beyond Kāśmīr in the North-West, Pataliputra in the East and Ujjain in the South. He has also mentioned several important cities, villages, rivers and other miscellaneous places. Several distinguished writers have carefully scrutinized the examples and quotations given in the M.Bh. and have
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केशोरान गविष्णवः | M.Bh. on P.III.2.114.

अनुक्रोण पाटिक्यवर्ग | on P.II.1.16.

उज्जिल्ल: प्रस्तुत: माहिच्छल्या चुल्लोंवर्गम

संभावनेचे।

on P.III.1.26.
discussed their importance. Although it is possible to supply a good deal of information on all these varied points, it is proposed here to concentrate attention on two topics only viz. (1) The importance of the examples cited in the M.Bh. from the view point of grammar and (2) their transmission from one work to another.

(1) The examples of the M.Bh. have been regarded as those of the highest authority in judging the validity of almost all sorts of grammatical matters in the Pāṇinian system of grammar. Scholars of grammar have always judged the correctness or otherwise of a word on the basis of facts supplied by the M.Bh. and the examples stated in the same. A word, which is not sanctioned by the sūtras or by the Vārtikas stated in the M.Bh., is considered unauthoritative. For instance, Kaiyata, in his Pradīpa on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.11, has expressly said that the Vārtika "क्योऽ्पादायित्वम्" which is found in the Kāśikā-vṛtti on P.I.1.11, is unauthoritative. Similarly Bhaṭṭoji

1 "क्योऽ्पादायित्वम् प्रतिषेधो वस्तुः" हरि मायकार-वार्तिकाराम् सत्यमेव अवलोकिते॥

Pradīpa on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.11.
Dīkṣita, in his 'Siddhāntakaumudi', has expressly stated with regard to the Vārtika 'वाङ्गपञ्चकृत्व्य हाति वक्तृत्वम्' with its examples स्वाङ्गो, स्वाङ्गो etc. found in the Kasika-vṛtti under P.IV.1.55, that since this Vārtika and its examples are not given in the M.Bh. therefore genuine scholars of grammar (prāmāṇikas) consider that they are unauthoritative. Nāgadeśa Bhaṭṭa has also expressed the same opinion with regard to the words ending with ṣt and ṣt in the locative case, on the authority of the M.Bh. on P.I.1.19.

On the other hand, even though a word, which is not sanctioned either by the sūtras or by the Vārtikas or even by the istis of Patanjali, is found in the M.Bh. the later grammarians accept the correctness of it and other similar words. For example Bhaṭṭoṣa Dīkṣita in the SK on P.II.3.29 has stated that though the ablative suffix is not sanctioned either by the sūtras or by the

1 "वाङ्गपञ्चकृत्व्य हाति वक्तृत्वम्" स्वाङ्गो, स्वाङ्गो- स्वाङ्गो। पतञ्जलिकृतस्य वार्त्तमाय विवरणं संग्राहितम् केवल। गाण्याध्यक्षत्वम् प्रमाणार्थिः प्रामाणिकः।

SK on P.IV.1.55.

2 तत्स्यायेतु वाच्य प्रामाण्यायेतु वस्मियायेतु।

Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.19.
Vārtikas from a Prātipadika in relation to the sense of the word 'prabhṛtī', yet in the M.Bh. on P.II.3.28 because Patanjali has used it in the phrase "कार्यक्या: प्रभृति " the ablative suffixes would take place from the Prātipadika in relation to the sense of prabhṛtī.

Again on the authority of the examples given in the M.Bh. Bhāṭṭoji Dīkṣita has derived the rule that the nañ compound becomes optional with the avyayabhāva compound, when the nañ denotes the sense of abhāva.

Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa says in the Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.II.1.1 that although the compound takes place only in those words where there is ekārthībhāvasāarthya yet because the Bhāṣyakāra has used the compound word 'kimodanāḥ' even in the absence of ekārthībhāvasāarthya, the

1 "श्रापायने प्रभृतिः" तिस सुने कार्यक्या: प्रभृतिवर्गायणे प्रभृतिप्रयोगवा प्रभृतिवर्गवा प्रभृतिप्रयोगवा प्रभृतिवर्ग वा तेहन्तो है।

SK. on P.II.3.29.

2 बह्यस्तमस्य व्ययोगायेन सहायं विलोक्यमेत्। रसं ह्रास्यांचष्व संवेदनः प्रवर्धनान्तरते। बह्यस्तमस्तथांसंप्रक्षिप्तते व मन्त्रप्रयोगान।

तेन, अनुपस्तिं, अविनयं, अभिध्यत्यायं सिद्धात।

SK. on P.II.26.
compound would be taken as sanctioned in grammar on his authority. In the Uddyota on the M.Bh. in the first Āhnika, Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa states that because Patañjali has used "तापक्रति प्राप्तेः भवतः" in the case, where there is no suffix एव but only its sense, the Vikṛti (and not prakṛti) would be regarded as the subject of the verb on his authority.

Sometimes the meaning of words is also determined on the authority of the examples given in the M.Bh. Patañjali states in the M.Bh. on P.I.4.23 that if the effort (yatna) connected with the sthālī is denoted by the root pacc the example would be "स्वाभी पर्यायत". On this authority Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa thinks that the effort is also one of the vyāpāras denoted by the root itself.

---

1 कियोंन्न इत्यावस्तु अत्यावस्तिप भावार्थ्यथानायेन सावधः।
Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.II.1.1.

2 माण्ये "तापक्रति प्राप्तेः भवतः" हति प्रयोगाश्च वद्यवन्ते निकोः! कर्तव्यमध्ये वर्धयम।
Uddyota on the M.Bh. 1st Āhnika.

3 फिर व सात्तोषप त्यागारसाभ्यामुः, बाहुल एव कर्मम्, स्वाभीस्वकृतार्थे पर्यायं कर्माणि स्वाभी पर्यायोः इत्यावः कारकर्त्यायां नानास्वाभ्यास्योऽथ।
PL. M. P. धे 2
Similarly Vāsudeva Vājapeyī in the commentary Bālamanorāmā on the SK. states that although the words खोट and विसरण do not convey the sense of youth by their nature, yet they are considered to convey that sense because Patañjali has used those words in that sense. Sometimes genders in the examples used by Patañjali are also considered significant from the viewpoint of grammatical application. Commentators have tried to show the hidden meaning of such usage. For example, Patañjali has given an example of the Vārtika योत्थोष्णयोः समासे वा' on P.VI.1.94 putting the word विम्वोष्णि in the feminine gender although there is no necessity to use the word in the feminine gender. The commentator thereon considers that by giving the example in the feminine gender for the above-mentioned Vārtika, Patañjali has indicated his view that that Vārtika would operate, only when the compound is used in the feminine gender.

Sometimes the actual scope of the sūtras is determined on the authority of the examples given in the M.Bh.

---

1. खोटचिरणक्षो योत्थोष्णस्या शायाप्रयोगादात।

2. विम्वोष्णोऽस्मि तस्य प्रयोगमविप्रयोगेतवात्।

Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.VI.1.94.
In such cases, the examples indicate the import of the śūtras, which was originally left unexpressed by Pāṇini. For example Pāṇini has prohibited the genitive compound with an indeclinable by the śūtra II.2.11 but the word सर्वपल्लवः used in the M.Bh. on P.II.2.24, indicates that this prohibition applies only to क्रदायस्या. Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa has also expressed the same view in the Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.I.2.44. He favours the restriction of the śūtra on the authority of the example given in the M.Bh. Such interpretations of the śūtras accepted by the later grammarians show that examples given in the M.Bh. have sometimes limited the scope of the śūtras.

Sometimes the actual meaning of a term in the śūtras can be ascertained by means of the examples cited in the M.Bh. For instance, in the śūtra I.4.30 Pāṇini has used the word prakṛti which is explained by the Vṛttikāras in the sense of 'general cause (hetu).

---

1 वृद्धयंस्पष्टिः - 'बोधन्वचये' हि सुभे 'सर्वपल्लवः' हति चार्यप्रवृत्तस्विति नातः।

Tatvabodhini of Jhānendra Sarasvati on the Sk. on P.II.2.11.

2 एवेक्षत सार्वपल्लवः तथा मात्रे तथोपाखर्षार्थः।

Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.I.2.44.
But Kaiyata on the authority of the examples given in the M.Bh. for this sūtra, viz.

\[ \text{गोभवाश शृंकरो जायंते, गोशोनायिकोस्मियो दृष्टयो जायंते} \]

maintains that the word prakṛti in Pāṇini I.4.30 has the sense of material cause (upādāna kāraṇa). Similarly Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa holds the view that the word subanta in the M.Bh. on P.V.3.71 would mean yuṣmad and asmad only and not other subantas because Patañjali has cited examples there, which are derived from only the words yuṣmad and asmad.

Sometimes an absence of examples in the M.Bh. also indicates some hidden purpose. In the Pratyāhārānhika of the M.Bh. on Ś.S. 5, while showing the necessity of the letter,'h' in the at Pratyāhāra, Patañjali has quoted the sūtra VIII.4.63, but has not given any example for the sūtra. Kaiyata and Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa maintain that there is no example of ś, after 'h'; hence Patañjali has not given any example in this connection.

1 इह प्रकृतिग्रंथम् एकनात्मारु हृति प्रतिक्रियाम्। ‘प्रत्याय

प्रकृतको जायंते’ दलावाहरणारु उपाधानामानामपरिमिति व युम्तय

केंद्रस्थः।

Tattvabodhīnī on the SK. on P.I.4.30.

2 तत्र दुबुधात्रस्तोतिः, प्रकृतस्मातु दक्षकामेव, अध्ययनं दु ग्राहिति-

पतिकर्त्स्य टारिति शोभम्, तदाधरणवर्त्सक्य प्रामाण्यवादः।

Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.V.3.71.

Footnote continued on next page.
(2) Stock examples in the Pāṇinian school:—The illustrations given in the explanations of Pāṇini's rules are very common in several works of grammar written by scholars right from the time of Patañjali, up to the present day. One of the reasons for this is that it was the practice of subsequent writers to take examples from their predecessors in explaining the rules of grammar with occasional omission of and addition to these stock examples. A comparison of the examples given in the M.Bh. with those found in later grammatical works, particularly in the Kāśikā-वṛtti, sufficiently shows the existence and unbroken continuity of the traditional examples. A close study of both the works viz. the Kāśikā-वṛtti and the M.Bh. shows that more than eighty per cent of the examples given in these two works are the same. Although Patañjali directly comments on only one third or slightly more of the sūtras in the Aṣṭā-dhyāyī, yet whenever he incidentally refers to the sūtras in the Ṣhāṣya in the course of his exposition, he refers to them generally along with their examples.

Footnote continued from previous page.

3 कङ्कारपरश्य कारस्यायापतेऽकारस्यायायितमेतत॥

Pradīpa

बश च चाच्ये ताकादारसायायामेव माननु॥

Uddyota thereon.
Thus most of the śūtras along with their examples directly or indirectly occur in the M.Bh. A comparison of the examples in the M.Bh. with those in the 'Prākriyā-kaumudi' of Rāmcandra Śeṣa and the SK of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita confirms the view of the existence of the stock examples. Although these writers have substituted new examples at some places, in doing so, they have not left the traditional basis. The table given on page 292 proves the above-mentioned view beyond question i.e. from the Bhāṣyakāra to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita it was the fashion to use the same examples in explaining the rules of grammar.

It should also be noted here that in later works like the P.K. and the SK. the writers have substituted comparatively more new examples in place of stock examples. The reason for this addition to stock examples in some works is due to their having come into prominence in the intervening period. While taking over a large body of examples from their predecessors' work, they also substituted in a number of cases new examples drawn from the literature of their times. For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sutra</th>
<th>Ex. in the M.Bh.</th>
<th>Ex. in the Kāśīka</th>
<th>Ex. in the P.K.</th>
<th>Ex. in the S.K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1.16</td>
<td>बुनामणं हस्तिन-पुरुषं, बुनामणं वाराणसी, बुनामणं पाटील-पुरुषं</td>
<td>बुनामणं वाराणसी, बुनामणं पाटील-पुरुषं</td>
<td>बुनामणं कायी</td>
<td>बुनामणं वाराणसी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.17</td>
<td>तिच्छु, वच्छु, सनाय, सनायस, वृत्तवय, पूर्वनय, पूर्वमायनय</td>
<td>तिच्छु, वच्छु, सनाय, सनायस, वृत्तवय, पूर्वनय, पूर्वमायनय</td>
<td>तिच्छु, वच्छु, सनाय, सनायस, वृत्तवय, पूर्वनय, पूर्वमायनय</td>
<td>तिच्छु, वच्छु, सनाय, सनायस, वृत्तवय, पूर्वनय, पूर्वमायनय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.18</td>
<td>वारेनक्षणं, गहनाय, पारं गहनाया</td>
<td>वारेनक्षणं, गहनाय, पारं गहनाया</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>वारेनक्षणायाराय, गहनायाराय, पारेक्षणाय, गहनायाराय, पारेक्षणाय, गहनायाराय, पारेक्षणाय, गहनायाराय, पारेक्षणाय, गहनायाराय, पारेक्षणाय, गहनायाराय, पारेक्षणाय, गहनायाराय</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita has given several examples from the later literature viz. Bhāravi, Māgha, Bhaṭṭi etc. which could not be known to Patañjali. Similarly omission of certain traditional examples in the later works by subsequent writers is also due to the fact that those examples had become obsolete and therefore of no practical value.

It may be supposed that the Bhāṣyakāra also may have used the examples which came down to him by tradition. The reason for this supposition is that Pāṇini must have collected examples, as ordinarily it would not have been possible for him to have composed the sūtras without numerous collections of examples. Secondly it is said that Pāṇini taught the Aṣṭādhyāyī to his pupils several times. For instance Kautsa is famous among his pupils. In explaining the meaning of the sūtras, he must have used the examples for the sūtras, without which the explanation of the sūtras is not complete.

1 “बाहच्छे विषयविषयचन्दनस्य कश केति भारविचः”
   “बाहवच्च मा प्रबुद्धत्त्वतृमुक्तिः”

in the SK. on P.I.3.28 and नित्यानं व: संपूर्णेन स फले प्रूषः” भारविच ibid. on P.VII.1.7 and दैव मुरुपोवस्तुद्ध जनिता नन्देन युवान रत्नावन हरामराघनम्। विष्णु यथे नृपिष्किष्मा कही ज चत्वर-स्वास्त्यवर्धिन्यं विवः हस्ति व्याख्यातम् माय।

ibid. on P.III.4.5.
Those examples must have formed part of the traditional grammatical literature and must have reached the Bhāṣya-kāra through Kātyāyana. Considered in this light it is quite possible that the examples given in the M.Bh. had their origin in ancient works or possibly in a work of Pāṇini himself.

The authors of the Kāśikā-vṛtti expressly say that Pāṇini undertook a profound investigation of the spoken language and literature of his time and he collected almost all words in the language of his days, on the basis of which he composed the Astādhyāyī. The same authors again say that words sanctioned by Pāṇini are well known and taken as authoritative as shown by the sentences as ॥

Haradatta in his Padamañjari, a commentary on the Kāśikā-vṛtti, goes a step further and expressly says

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{काश्यप: संस्कृतास्तास्ताग्‌पालन स्पर्शितम्यनिष्ठम्}.

Kāśikā on P.IV.1.141.

\item \textit{श्यामप्राक्षा: प्रकाशा: पारिवर्ण: तोके प्रकाशे "हलि पारिवर्णिनि: " मत्यैः।}

ibid. on P.II.1.6.
\end{enumerate}
that Pāṇini knows the correct words from his predeces­
sors viz. Āpiśali and others and they too, know them in the same way from their predecessors and so on and so forth. Considered in this light, it is quite possible that Pāṇini might have used the stock examples, which came to him through other grammarians viz. Āpiśali, Gārgya, Gālava etc. whom he has respectfully mentioned in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. But it is difficult or rather impossible to say with certainty how far Pāṇini is indebted to his predecessors in composing the Aṣṭā-
dhyāyī, because not even a single work on grammar composed before Pāṇini is available to-day in its com­plete form. Only the names of those grammarians and a few quotations from their works are found in later works. A close comparison of the examples given in the M.Bh. with those occurring in the pre-Pāṇinian

\[1\] Padamanjari Vol. I, pp. 6-7 and also ibid. on P.IV.1.93.
works like the Nirukta, however, discloses the fact that the examples were very common in those days. A few examples from the M. Bh. and the Nirukta are given below to prove that some examples given in the M. Bh. were in existence in the same form or with a slightly changed one even at the time of Yāska, who was the predecessor of Pāṇini.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. in the Nirukta</th>
<th>Ex. in the M. Bh.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) गोरखः पुञ्जो हस्ति।</td>
<td>गोरखः पुञ्जो, हस्ति, खुनिः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 1</td>
<td>1st अभिना।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) बख्शस्मन घावः। डिपरि-</td>
<td>बख्शस्मनहरू बन्धेधः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हतो नामस्यम्।</td>
<td>-V. 3.2।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) मंतिरमनलकरण:।</td>
<td>मंतिरमनलकरण:।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 7</td>
<td>VI. 1.12।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) दक्षिणा बक्ते। समर्पित।</td>
<td>दक्षिणा समुदद्वा हति, को।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कर्म्। व्युङ्ये समर्पित।</td>
<td>दक्षिणा। V. 1.3.9।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) बिसा बद्धे। अनन्तरित्या-</td>
<td>अभिन्ने अनन्त्याचः।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आकाः।</td>
<td>III 2।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (6) बुधापुषपान्त भवति। | उपाधोपस्वाखाः, बभस्वः, बप्पः, |
| बचनाः। बल्ल। | वज्ञः। V. 1.7। |
| (7) बुधापुषपान्त भवति। | कुटेत्तूः। को। सिक्षा। |
| स्तोतारः। | I. 1.2। Vol I। |
| सिक्षाः। | |
Ex. in the Nirukta

(8) वर्तितकार क्षमार क्षमोक्ष्ये- 
वा चाप्पते, विकारस्यायांशु 
पास्नन: वा: [II. 2]

(9) दानिकनार्य घाप्णै, वाज्य 
पुरोपुष्य [II. 2]

(10) सौरास्त्रादनार्याः: [II. 8]

(11) मेहत्तवति सत, उपरता 
बाप हित वा [II. 21]

(12) श्रप्तमं क्षमान्, नागने 
पतनीति: त्र [III. 11]

(13) ध्ननं ग्रामान्, विनासवति 
सत: [III. 9]

(14) वर्षिकोऽध्वर वाप्पते, 
राजेश्वरिनः: [IV. 16]

(15) सिंहः सहानात्, सिंहेवर- 
स्याम्यमपरास्त: [IV. 18]

(16) दिस्याः स्त्यापते: [IV. 2]

(17) क्षमाय क्षमोय नवति, [V. 15]

(18) रघो रघ्ये: रमापेश: 
श्रीपुर निन्त्यति। [IX. 9]

(19) बालिकर्म स्वेते: परिभेद- 
विन्ति बाहु [IX. 15]

Ex. in the M.Bh.

(8) वर्तितकार क्षमार क्षमोक्ष्ये- 
वा चाप्पते, विकारस्यायांशु 
पास्नन: वा: [II. 2]

(9) दानिकनार्य घाप्णै, वाज्य 
पुरोपुष्य [II. 2]

(10) सौरास्त्रादनार्याः: [II. 8]

(11) मेहत्तवति सत, उपरता 
बाप हित वा [II. 21]

(12) श्रप्तमं क्षमान्, नागने 
पतनीति: त्र [III. 11]

(13) ध्ननं ग्रामान्, विनासवति 
सत: [III. 9]

(14) वर्षिकोऽध्वर वाप्पते, 
राजेश्वरिनः: [IV. 16]

(15) सिंहः सहानात्, सिंहेवर- 
स्याम्यमपरास्त: [IV. 18]

(16) दिस्याः स्त्यापते: [IV. 2]

(17) क्षमाय क्षमोय नवति, [V. 15]

(18) रघो रघ्ये: रमापेश: 
श्रीपुर निन्त्यति। [IX. 9]

(19) बालिकर्म स्वेते: परिभेद- 
विन्ति बाहु [IX. 15]
The comparison of the examples given in the M.Bh. with some of those occurring in the Nirukta sufficiently proves the existence and continuity of traditional examples in the Sanskrit grammatical literature. It is also fairly obvious that in these examples of both the works viz. the M.Bh. and the Nirukta, there is not only the similarity of forms but also a close agreement in their derivation from the same root. This comparison throws light on the main point at issue, hence a large number of examples from both works has been given here. It deserves to be noted that the examples given in the M.Bh. are found not only in the Nirukta but also in the Ait. Br. IV.1 with a slight change in order.

A study of the textual matter of the M.Bh. supplies some further proofs for determining the previous existence and unbroken continuity of the illustrations. Some arguments are given below in support of this view:

\[\text{तस्मात् पञ्चौ वधे च नोधिमना परिवर्त्त महानात्-परिवर्त्ते। तस्मादक्षरो वा गुल्लो वा नोधिमने हस्ताः वा परिवर्त प्रवः।}\]

Ait. Br. IV.1.
(1) In the first Āhnikā of the M. Bh., a Vārtika states that words and rules (for the formation of words) jointly constitute grammar. The word is called laksya and the rule is called laksana. This statement of the Vārtikakāra clearly shows that the laksyas (traditional examples) are as valuable as the sūtras themselves. It may be said that the sūtras are incomplete in themselves unless they are supplemented by expositions. This is why Patañjali has expressly said that people do not learn words from the rules alone, but from the exposition, comprising examples, counter-examples and supplying what is wanting in a sentence. Such statements of Patañjali clearly indicate the existence of the traditional examples.

(2) From the M. Bh. on P.I.1.57, it may be proved that Patañjali has always tried to include traditional examples in the M. Bh. He states that when the word pūrva of P.I.1.57, is taken in relation to the word nimitta the 'mūrdhābhāṣīkta udāharaṇa' (traditional

\[\text{"मूर्धाभ्योगकोर्णं"
(Vart. 14).}\\
\text{क्यों क्यायं कैत्तिकुविं म्याकारणं मनात।}\\
\text{कि प्राइम्यं क्ययं मन्ये यस्मृ।}\\
\text{M. Bh. in the 1st Āhnikā.} \]
examples) of this sūtra, are also included. By the use of the particle api in that statement, Patanjali wants to convey the idea that by including traditional examples in his commentary in this way there is the further advantage of having preserved them. Kayāta comments on the term mūrdhābhisikta and says that an example is called so (mūrdhābhisikta) because it is unanimously given in all vṛttis (commentary) on the Aṣṭādhhyāyī. This indicates that at the time of Patanjali there existed some ancient vṛttis on the sūtras of Pāṇini which explained the sūtras by giving traditional examples, which Patanjali has named mūrdhābhisikta in the M.Bh. Similarly Nāgāraja Bhaṭṭa in his Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.IV.3.39 has referred to the examples given in the Saṅgraha of Vyādi and says that in this way the example given in the Saṅgraha and in other works would be inconsistent. Again on the M.Bh. on P.VI.4.163

1 अथ निमित्तेऽपि सन्थिनुष्ठानम् पदार्थविहीन-पितामहार्य तत्राष्टि वै गुर्द्धोत्तमाः पर्यति।
M.Bh. on P.I.1.57.

2 प्रदेशस्य परिपक्वमिथि सर्वत्र चिन्तां वर्धातुत्तमाः।
Pradīpa thereon.

3 "एवं च संग्राहितु तुप्रावरप्रायं नागार्जुनस्य स्मायूः
Uddyota on the M.Bh. on P.IV.3.39."
is not to refute the sūtra, but to show that the examples of the sūtra given in the vṛttis can be explained even without this sūtra. The statements of Kāiyaṭa and Nāgęśa Bhāṭṭa quoted above clearly show that the examples of the sūtras of Pāṇini given in the ancient vṛttis and also in the Saṅgraha were available to Pataṅjali and that he utilized those examples in writing the M.Bh.

(3) It is also found in the M.Bh. that sometimes Pataṅjali has stated some examples which are actually not needed for those rules. For instance in the M.Bh. on P.VI.1.174 he has stated two examples for that sūtra viz. bahutitavā and bahutitave, where the real example is only bahutitavā and not bahutitave, as Nāgęśa Bhāṭṭa has expressly said in his Uddyota thereon and added that Pataṅjali has stated the word bahutitave in his usual way of citing examples.

1 वे गच्छति न प्रत्याल्पमानं किन्नु त्सपालकतःसुरु्भर्येऽपि भविष्यासिद्धैत्रिया धर्मानि।

Uddyota on P.VI.4.163.

2 चद्रसितव वदिति प्रत्याबोधितिविव तस्म हि "प्राधिति" वदिति युपेन माथ्यम्।

Uddyota on P.VI.1.174.
(4) It is also seen that in the M.Bh. when Patanjali in his explanation of a particular sūtra finds it necessary to quote some other sūtras, he frequently is not satisfied with merely quoting the sūtras but he quotes them with their traditional examples.

(5) Similarly whenever Patanjali refers to the examples of the same sūtras on different occasions, he generally repeats the same examples without even changing the order.

Such method of citing examples in the M.Bh. clearly shows that at the time of Patanjali, those examples were probably very common among grammarians and Patanjali

1 M.Bh. 1st Āhnika, and

2 M.Bh. 1st Āhnika. These examples in the same order also occur in the M.Bh. on P.1.1.3, VI.1.12, VI.4.42.
therefore, in his usual way did not want to impose an un-necessary burden on his readers by substituting new examples in place of traditional examples. Therefore, it is reasonable to think in the light of above discussion that in most cases, Patanjali has cited the examples, which were very common in his days.

(6) Moreover, a comparison of some passages of the M.Bh. with similar ones in other branches of the Sanskrit literature proves their transmission from one work to another. For instance, Patanjali has stated the following passage in the M.Bh. on P.I.2.64:

\[
\text{नक्षत्रपूर्णिक पदार्थकर्म प्रयोग न पदार्थः, श्रवणपदार्थकर्म वा आर्थिक न पदार्थः। दर्श्योत्थम पदार्थः। कस्यर्थत फिन च न प्रपातानुपलः फिन च गुप्तस्मृतः।}
\]

Śabaravāmi has also referred to this passage in the Bhāṣya on the Mīmāṃsā sūtra I.1.15 with only a slight change in the following words:

\[
\text{अस्तु विशेषणस्तेनारुकिति शरणरि, विशेषणस्तेन व्यापायतुः। नक्षत्रपूर्णिक पदार्थकर्म श्रवण न पदार्थः। श्रवणपदार्थकर्म वा आर्थिकः। दर्श्योत्थम पदार्थः।}
\]

The same is the case with Vācaspati Miśra; for instance Patanjali has illustrated in the M.Bh. on
P.I.1.41. IV.1.1 and VI.1.13 the following passage:

"नहि वृद्धाः सम्बोधिते परिलोकणा न कर्त्तव्या ज्ञानं च न प्रधोपयूः। नहि बिद्वेश्य: सम्बोधिते स्वात्माना नाबिद्वेश्योऽवाच नहि युगा: सम्बोधिते वा नात्मकः।"

Cf. Bhāmagī on the Śāṅkara Bhāṣya on V.S.I.1.1.

नु कर्त्तव्येऽवाच दोषकृत्तेन तत्तथायो घटते। नहि युगा: सम्बोधिते ज्ञानं नात्मकः। नहि विद्वेश्य: सम्बोधिते स्वात्मानं नाबिद्वेश्योऽवाच। नहि बयोजयं शाहारपरित्यागः। किं प्रभावमात्रं परित्यागं गुणाप्रभमयं मय्यति।

Such a striking similarity of the illustrations in the M.Bh. with those of the Śābara Bhāṣya on the M.S. and the Bhāmatī on the Śāṅkara Bhāṣya shows that the examples and illustrations were very common in Sanskrit literature in ancient times. The examples do not go from one Ācārya to another only in a particular system of knowledge, but they represent a common heritage.