Chapter II

VĀRTIKAS

GENERAL REMARKS

The M.Bh. is a critical commentary on the Aṣṭā-dhyāyī of Pāṇini and also on the Vārtikas of different writers on the Aṣṭādhyāyī. It has been stated above that Patañjali in his M.Bh. has collected and embodied all the important grammatical theories and doctrines, which were developed before his time. He has explained them generally on the analogy of incidents either found in the world as also mentioned in the Vedas. Consequently, he has given several Nyāyas and Paribhāṣas in the M.Bh. The M.Bh. is thus a store-house of the grammatical doctrines of the Pāṇinian system. The vārtikas in the M.Bh., which are found in prose as well as in verse, appear to be the production of several writers. To the Vārtikas of those scholars, Patañjali has added his own Vārtikas, which are equally important and which are commonly known as īṣṭi.

THE VĀRTIKAKĀRAS BEFORE KĀTYĀYĀNA

It appears very probable from the M.Bh. that besides the writers on Vārtikas, there were several writers on the Aṣṭādhyāyī between Pāṇini and Patañjali,
who tried to improve and supplement the śūtras by making several additions and improvements with a view to bring the Aṣṭādhyāyī up-to-date. Among these grammarians Kātyāyana is regarded as the principal one. It is said that Patanjali has made Kātyāyana’s Vārtikas the main object of his discussion in the M.Bh.

It is also clear from the M.Bh. that Kātyāyana had several predecessors and it is likely that he had utilized their works in composing his own Vārtikas. In his Vārtikas, Kātyāyana has referred to the names of such scholars as Vyādi, Vājapyāyana and Pauṣkarasādi, who are not mentioned in the Aṣṭādhyāyī. At places, he has introduced opinions of other gram-

1  "श्रव्याशिवाय व्याहितः" 
Vart. 45 in the M.Bh. on P.I.2.64.

2  "शाक्त्यपिपाणातैं वैहिं विमक्षोऽव्याहयानः" 
Vart. 35 under M.Bh. I.2.64.

3  "चयो फङ्केया: चरि पौप्पकसाहे:"
Vart. 3, in the M.Bh. on P.VIII.4.48.
marians by such vague expressions as eke, apare, etc. without mentioning their names. Some of them might have written their commentaries on the Aṣṭādhyāyī known as Vārtikas. This view gets an additional support from a Vārtika of Kātyāyana on P.II.1.1 and the commentary thereon of Nāgesa Bhaṭṭa, which clearly prove the existence of Vārtikas on the Aṣṭādhyāyī before Kātyāyana. On that sūtra, Kātyāyana has accepted a statement (Vacana or Vārtikavacana) as an authority. Nāgesa, in his commentary thereon, has raised the question as to how the Vārtikakāra can take his own Vārtikas as an authority and in answer, he has expressly said that the Vārtikakāra here referred

1

‘देव-प्राक्यपोरुवाच स्म’

Vart. I in the M.Bh. I.2.38 and Vart. 4, M.Bh.II.1.1.

1a

‘न वा वचनप्रामाण्यात्’ or ‘वार्तिकवचनप्रामाण्यात्’

Vart. 22, M.Bh. II.1.1.

न च वचनप्रामाण्यापि वार्तिकवचनप्रामाण्यात् वार्तिककृताः स्वीकार्यः
कथं प्रमाणत्वेनाः प्रकृत्यम्, इति मायेव वार्तिक्वचनप्रामाण्यात् इति
वाच्यमु वाच्योद्वेपं वार्तिककारो वार्तिकान्तत्त्रेनरत् वचनम्
प्रमाणतत्त्वेनां वार्तिकान्तत्त्वेनां वार्तिकान्तत्त्वेनां वार्तिकान्तत्त्वेनां

Uddyota thereon.
to is different from Kātyāyana. It is thus clear that Kātyāyana has quoted the view of the former Vārtikakāra as an authority. Unfortunately the works of that grammarian and others are now completely lost and only quotations from and references to them are found here and there.

It deserves to be noted that Kātyāyana has mentioned in his Vārtika that Vyādi held the view that all words denote substance (dravya) alone. Nāgęśa Bhaṭṭa in his Uddyota has stated that Vyādi was the author of an elaborate treatise consisting of a lac of verses and that it was named Saṅgraha. Patanjali has also referred to this Saṅgraha as a work of Dūkṣayāṇa, who is identified with Vyādi by the later grammarians. Kātyāyana on P.I.2,64 has referred to Vājapyāyana in his Vārtika as one, who maintained

1 संग्रह-व्याकित्वतो अनन्तकों संख्या श्रम्य हृत प्रतिष्ठितः।

Uddyota on the M.Bh. 1st Āhnika.

2 दोगना संघ वाक्यार्थस्य संग्रहस्य कृतः।

M.Bh. on P.II.3.66.
that all words denoted class notion alone. The name of Pauṣkarasādi also occurs in the Vārtika on P.VIII.4.48 which refers to his view that the consonants c, ṭ, t, k and ṁ belonging to 'cayat-patyahāra', when followed by the sibilants š, ą or s, belonging to the sar pratyahāra are changed into their corresponding aspirates.

The quotations given above, which refer to the views expressed by ancient grammarians, evidently show that Kātyāyana was indebted to them for his own work viz. the Vārtikas.

THE VĀRTIKAKĀRAS AFTER KĀTYĀYANA

A number of writers followed Kātyāyana, among whom, only a few are mentioned in the M. Bh. by family names such as Bhāradvājīya, Saunāga, Kṛṣṭrīya and Vāḍava, while many other grammarians are referred to by words like eke, apare, anye, etc. It is clear from the quotations taken from the works of these writers by the Bhāṣyakāra, that they have not only imitated the method of Kātyāyana and contributed their rules to this system of grammar, but at some places, they have amended and improved the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana also. Their statements are also commonly known as Vārtikas.
The Vārtikas of the Bhāradvājīya school are quoted on several occasions in the M.Bh. A study of these Vārtikas shows that the main object of the Bhāradvājīya was to improve and amend the Vārtikas of Katyāyana. For instance, Katyāyana has suggested that in the sūtra of P.I.1.20, mention of the word prakṛti is needed for the sake of aṣṭ, as the substitution of a by P.VI.1.45 is prohibited before a termination, which is aṣṭ. The school of Bhāradvāja, on the other hand, has suggested that the mention of the word prakṛti is necessary in P.I.1.20, for the sake of aṣṭ as well as vikṛta.

Similarly in connection with P.III.1.89, which prohibits the suffix yāk and the substitution of cī in

\[1\]

\[2\]
'प्रकृतिग्रहणं विद्यमानं'  Vart. on P.I.1.20.

\[3\]
'प्रकृतिग्रहणं सिद्ध-विकृतार्थम्'  Vart. 2 on P.I.1.20.
the place of cli after the roots: duh, snu, and nam.  
Kātyāyana has suggested that the mention of hetumat - ni, ēri, and brūn is also necessary in this rule. The school of Bhāradvāja, however, has proposed the addition of ni, ēranthi, granthi, brūn ātmanepada and akarmaka in the rule (III.1.89) laying down the prohibition of yak and cīn. It is thus obvious that the school of Bhāradvāja has improved and amended the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana.

The Vārtikas of Saunāgas are also mentioned in the M.Bh. at several places.  

1. Vart. I on P.III, 1.89.
2. Bhāradvāja: pariṣṭh-. "व्यक्तिकृतलिङ्गप्रति भाराधव अत्मनेपदकारणः असंज्ञानस्य "  
on P.III.1.89.
3. Cf. M.Bh. on P.II.2.18, III.2.56, IV.1.74,87. IV.3, 155, VI,1,95, VI,3, 43.
Kaiyata on the M.Bh. on P.II.2.18, it is clear that the Saunagas are the successors of Katyayana. They have sometimes interpreted the Vartikas of Katyayana, while on other occasions, they have improved and amended his Vartikas. A Vartika of Saunagas, which does not occur in the M.Bh., is mentioned in the Kasika-Vrtti on P.VII.2.17. Haradatta in his Padamanjari, on that Vartika, has explained the term Saunaga as 'Saunagasya Acaryasya sisyah'. It shows that the real name of the Acarya was Sunaga. It is also remarkable, that Patanjali has cited the Saunagas generally in its place.

1. "प्रवेश च सौनागर्विष्टसङ्गरक्षण पञ्चप्रव" M.Bh. on P.II. 2,18
   काशिकानारिकासारमेव दस्यिकम् सौनागर्विष्टसर्व अविचित्तेश्वरः.
   Pradipa thereon.

2. "सौनागा: कशिकानिन्द्रायां क्रमरितिनिष्ठानि विक्षिप्तेन, बस्त्येश्वरि".
   Kasika on P.VII.2.17.

3. "सौनागात्मकार्यायक्ष्मया शिष्या: सौनागा:"
   Padamanjari, part II, p. 761.
support of his own view without any specific reference to Kātyāyana's Vārtikas. The Vārtikas of the Saunāgas are, therefore, generally introduced by the sentence 

"एवं इह सौनागा: पाठम्" which is usually preceded by the sentence "इष्टेनेत्तत सौनागोत्तमः".

It should be also noted in this connection, that whenever Patañjali quotes the Vārtikas of the Sau­nāgas, he always gives the following remark first: "अत्यल्पग्रन्थवृद्धिः" or अतदेव च सौनागो- 

"विस्तारतर्केण पाठम्" (This is very little what has been said, the Saunāgas, however, have given it in more detail). In fact the Vārtikas of the Sau­nāgas, which are cited in that connection, are actually more detailed than the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana. From such repeated statements of Patañjali it may be concluded that the Vārtikapātha of the Saunāgas must have been longer than that of Kātyāyana.

---

1 इष्टेनेत्तत सौनागोत्तमः....

एवं इह सौनागा: पाठम्।

Cf. IV.1,74,87, IV.3, 155, VI.3.43.

2 अतदेव च सौनागोविस्तारतर्केण पाठम्। M.Bh.II.2.18

अत्यल्पग्रन्थवृद्धिः।

M.Bh. IV.1.15.
The Kroṣṭrīyas are mentioned only once in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.3. They have maintained that the rules I.1.3, and I.1.52, are quite independent of each other. Kuṇāravāḍava is distinctly mentioned twice in the M.Bh. His view is stated directly against, that of Kātyāyana. It is just possible that this Kuṇāravāḍava is the same as Vādava, who is mentioned in the M.Bh. on P.VIII.2.106.

Saurya-bhāgavata is only once mentioned in the M.Bh. According to Kaiyata, he was an inhabitant of the city named Saurya. Patañjali has used the epithet Bhagavān in connection with this Ācārya, which indicates that Patañjali had great respect for this Ācārya.

---

1.  

2.  

3.  

Pradīpa thereon.
The views of Gonikāputra and Gonarddiya are mentioned on several occasions in connection with grammatical operations. Nāgeśa Bhata has stated that Gonikāputra is no other than Patañjali himself. Kaiyata has mentioned that the epithet Gonarddiya refers to the Bhāṣyakāra himself. But it is doubtful whether these two epithets viz. Gonikāputra and Gonarddiya refer to Patañjali. Some modern scholars like Rajendralāla Mitra, Dr. Kielhorn etc. hold the view that Gonikāputra and Gonarddiya should be taken to refer to Vārtikākāras other than Kātyāyana and not to the Bhāṣyakāra.

On many occasions, Patañjali has introduced the views of other grammarians by such vague expressions as Kascidahā, kecidāhuh, anye āhuḥ, apare āhuḥ, etc. Such expressions are very common in the M.Bh. It is

1 उद्द्योता गोष्टिकाराः ।
M.Bh. on P.I.4.51.

गोष्टिकाराः माध्यकार इत्यादिः ।
Uddyota thereon.

2 मोनकौरित्याहः
M.Bh. on P.I.1.21 माध्यकारस्त्यायः

Pradīpa thereon

गोनकौरित्याहं व्याकरण-माध्यकार इति Uddyota.

3 See I.A. Vol. XV, p. 80.
obvious that Patanjali was acquainted with the views of those grammarians, who had tried to improve and amend the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana as well as the sūtras of Pāṇini.

THE PURPOSE OF THE VĀRTIKAS

The Vārtikas written by different Vārtikakāras on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, are regarded as an inseparable part of the sūtras of Pāṇini. The purpose of many of them is to give the proper interpretation of the sūtras. In doing so, they have suggested not only corrections and additions to the sūtras, but also omissions of words from them. Sanskrit was a spoken language in ancient India, at least up to the time of Patanjali. Hence it was just possible that many new words were coming into use, which were not in existence in the Sanskrit language at the time of Pāṇini, while some other words, which were in use in Pāṇini’s time had become obsolete. Thus the sūtras of Pāṇini, later on, had become inadequate to meet the growing needs of the Sanskrit language. Naturally some corrections of and additions to Pāṇini’s sūtras were needed for bridging the gulf between the Pāṇinian language and the language, which had come into use in the intervening period. The necessary additions
were made by different Vārtikakāras by framing new rules at some places, by modifying the existing rules at other places, and by adding explanatory rules at still other places.

THE DIFFICULTY IN DETERMINING THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE VĀRTIKAS

It is really very difficult to distinguish between the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana and those of the later grammarians as the Bhāradvājīya, the Saunāga, and others and the additional rules laid down by Patañjali himself, which are commonly known by the term istance. The main reasons causing this difficulty may be stated as follows:

1. The main object of the several writers of the Vārtikas being identical (viz. to make the system of grammar as perfect as possible) the Vārtikas of almost all writers on the Aṣṭādhyāyī are of the same nature.

2. A faithful collection of these Vārtikas is found only in the M.Bh., where the names of the authors are not given except at a few places. There is the manuscript of Kātyāyana's Vārtikas in the Bhandarkar

Oriental Research Institute, Poona. It contains in

---

1 See No. 315 of 1875-76.
its colophon the words

A close examination of it reveals the fact that it is not a copy of any original manuscript of the Vārtikapāṭha, but it is compiled by somebody from the M.Bh. itself at a considerably later date. It is, therefore, not useful in anyway distinguishing the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana from those of Patañjali and others.

3. In connection with only a few Vārtikas, Patañjali has made such remarks, as 'Bhāradvājīyāḥ paṭhanti' 'Saunāgāḥ paṭhanti', etc. and 'apare śhuh', 'kecidāhuh' etc. while at other places Vārtikas are mentioned without any explicit remark. This method of Patañjali in stating the Vārtikas in the M.Bh., leads one to infer that the Vārtikas, about which no such remarks as to authorship, are made, do not, of course, belong to those writers, but it is likely that they belong to Kātyāyana or even to Patañjali himself. But a close examination of the M.Bh. shows that such an inference is not entirely correct. It is just possible that Patañjali is stating therein the views of those very Vārtikakāras, but without any mention of their names. A comparison of a passage of the M.Bh. on P.IV.1.15, with those
of the M.Bh. on P.III.2.56, and IV.1.87, as also a comparison of another passage of the M.Bh. on P.VI.1.144 with that of the M.Bh. on P.I.1.27 can well testify to this. In the case of the former, it can be stated that Patanjali has stated a Vārtika in the M.Bh. on P.IV.1.15, without any introductory remark and that Vārtika is meant to amend the preceding Vārtika on that sūtra. But in the M.Bh. on P.III.2.56 and IV.1.87, he has expressly stated that that Vārtika belongs to the Saunāgas. Similarly in the case of the passage in the M.Bh. on P.VI.1.144, which is given without any introductory remark, Patanjali has made an express remark in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.27, that the Vārtika No.1 in the M.Bh. VI.1.144, belongs

1 "स्मृत उपसंस्करणम्" वार्त. 6. अत्यपिनिर्गुणस्ते स्मृत हिति। न नर्स्त्रशीश्चेक्षणसागतनांमुपसंस्करणाम्।
M.Bh. on P.IV.1.15.

2 "पत्रिन्त - नर्स्त्रशीश्चेक्षणसागतनांमुपसंस्करणाम्।"
M.Bh. on P.III.2.56 and IV.1.87.

3 "समो हिततपौराण लोप:"
Vart. M.Bh. on P.VI.1.144.
The Pradīpa of Kaiyāṭa on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.75, confirms the view. Patanjali has given there an additional rule to that sūtra of Pāṇini and has added an example to it, which looks like his original remark. Kaiyāṭa, however, has made a remark that Patanjali has followed there the opinion of Kuṇi, who is said to be the writer of a Vṛtti on the Aṣṭādhyāyī.

On account of the difficulties stated above, some scholars hold the view that it is very difficult to determine the authorship of the many Vārtikas occurring in the M.Bh. and sometimes almost impossible to attribute a particular Vārtika to Kātyāyana, another to the Bharadvājīya, Saunāga, etc. and still others to Patanjali himself.

1 शास्त्र-ये कैवायरा: समस्तसे विकापायोपमारमसे।
"समधे विहासार्योतात्"
M.Bh. on P.I.1.27.

2 ‘एह प्राणां देहे असिकोष्यत्वात्कवस्त्वाद्यम्’ सेवरको, सेवरका।
M.Bh. on P.I.1.75

कुणिना प्राण प्रमोदार्यं निवेदयायम् व्यण्यस्याप्तिः 
च, इति व्यास्यातम् ....गाजनकारस्व कुणिन्दस्यान्देशेनिभिन्नः।

Pradīpa thereon. Footnote continued on next page.
THREE DIFFERENT WAYS ADOPTED BY PATANJALI TO
EXPLAIN THE THREE CATEGORIES OF THE VARTIKAS

Although it is true that Patanjali in the M.Bh., has included the Vārtikas of Katyāyana and also of many other writers, along with his own Vārtikas, and has mentioned the names of their authors on a few occasions and although, it is equally true that those Vārtikas are recorded in no other work than the M.Bh. where the commentators have cited their authorship at a few places only, yet it is not altogether impossible to ascertain the authorship of those Vārtikas.

In the M.Bh. itself, there is sufficient evidence, which is helpful to us in determining their authorship.

A critical examination of the M.Bh., discloses the fact that Patanjali has employed three different methods in his explanation of and comment upon the

Footnote continued from previous page.

3

परन्तु कात्यायनस्य कार्ति भार्तिकार्ति, कार्ति या
भार्तिकार्ति: पतरणे: तथेऽ कार्ति सौनागमारः जायावेनाः पञ्चशानि,
पतरीपैं नाथाभ्यल्प्यो ज्ञानिपि तर्कात्तराय नित्यः प्रथं साधनं
इति

Siddhesvara Sastri - Preface to 'Word Index of Pāṇini's Sūtrapāṭha'.
the Vārtikas, according to which the Vārtikas in the entire M. Bh. can be divided into three following categories:-

1. Out of the Vārtikas found in the M. Bh. a large majority can be placed in the first category. The method employed here in explaining and commenting upon such Vārtikas is very interesting. In these cases, Patañjali usually repeats almost all the words of the Vārtikas in his explanation and adds such observations as are required for a better understanding of them, citing also examples and counter-examples and occasionally adding his own rules. He continues the discussion and at the end either he agrees with the view expressed at the beginning or refutes it. A few instances are enough to illustrate this.

"क्रूरा"  
S. S. 2

The purpose of putting the vowel ज in the alphabet is given at the beginning.

"क्लारुपदेवी यथार्थर्थबत्तवनुचनङ अङ्गोत्तरधर्मः
क्लारुपदेवी: श्रव्यते यथार्थर्थ: समार्थकशिष्ठानुचनङ: प्रक्षण: (मधु)

After that some examples are given and the discussion continues.
Then explanation of the Vārtika according to another is given and the discussion is further continued.

Further on a few examples and counter-examples of the Vārtikas are given with critical explanation.

Later on an objection to this Vārtika is raised and is subsequently refuted.

Lastly the Vārtikakāra has established that it is not necessary to put the letter \( l \) in the second Śiva sutra. The concluding sentence of the M.B. however,

\[ ^1 \text{त एवं हृद्येन तुकारोपितेः पूज्याद्यं सत्त्वात्माणां सैपा नहनो मेंद्रस्वाभाविकाः धृत्रत।} \]
clearly shows that Patañjali holds the view that the upadeśa of the letter ṣ is necessary in that sūtra.

A similar case can be given below where Patañjali agrees with the objector in the end.

\[ \text{"Vārtikakāra"} \quad \text{P.I.1.6} \]

\[ \text{"Vārtikakāra"} \quad \text{P.I.1.6} \]

Here examples are given first, then a discussion is held in which some objections are raised and refuted

\[ \text{"चार्य तहर् अवं बोगो नारम्भे कथं दोष्यविदिति ? भा."
"रूट्यविदिते च इत्यु भ्यवेये" (वा.२)
रूट्यविदिते व्यवेये व्यवेये मात्यविदिति" भा.} \]

In this way the Vārtikakāra rejects the words दोषी
and वेयी of P.I.1.6 and Patañjali does not only

\[ \text{1 The additional word च=दसिस is given in}
\text{certain editions and in its explanation, the order}
\text{of sentences varies, but here the Vārtika and the}
\text{order of sentences are given according to Kielhornâs}
\text{edition of the M.Bh.} \]
agree with his view, but also suggests that the whole sūtra of Pāṇini I.1.6, is superfluous.

2. The Vārtikas, which carry special remarks concerning their authorship, may be placed in the second category. Patañjali has given such remarks, before he cites the Vārtikas in the M.Bh. as 'Bhāradvājīyāḥ paṭḥanti', 'Saunāgāḥ paṭḥanti' etc. or 'apara āha', 'anye āhuḥ' etc. It is also clear from the M.Bh. that Patañjali states these Vārtikas only on those occasions, when they differ from the other Vārtikas commonly attributed to Kātyāyana. It is on rare occasions only that Patañjali quotes the explanation of the Vārtikakāras under such general appellation as 'apara āha' etc. Where their explanations differ from his own, the method adopted by Patañjali in explaining and commenting upon the Vārtikas of this category is almost the same as of the first category. He explains them by repeating their words and giving examples, but he does not continue his discussion on this class of Vārtikas. A few examples of this category may be cited here in illustration:

---

1

M.Bh. on P.I.1.6.
An examination of the context here, shows that Kśtyāyana has raised the objection that the mention of the word prakṛti is necessary in P.I.1.20, so that the term ghu can be applied to both dā and dhā as also to roots such as de, dhe and others, which are their original forms (prakṛtyāḥ). If the word prakṛti were not put in that sūtra, the term ghu cannot be applied to the original forms of dā and dhā, since according to P.I.1.20 the term ghu is prescribed for only those that end in ā. The ātva by P.VI.1.45 is prohibited before a termination, which is āt. Hence in order that ātva should take place in prāṇidayate and other places there is no dā form of the root de, the word prakṛti must be put in rule P.I.1.20.

The school of Bharadvāja however, holds the view that the word prakṛti is needed in the above-mentioned sūtra, not only for the sake of prāṇidayate, where the root is followed by the termination, which is āt, but...
also in cases, where the wording da is 'ekadesāvikṛta'.

Patanjali here has quoted the Vārtika of the school of Bhāradvāja, only for the purpose of showing the difference of opinion between the Vārtikakārās.

Again in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.56, Patanjali quotes:

मारणवीणिः पश्चिम।
“पते किं किलेकृपाम्यं सुनिधानम्” मारणवीणि। (वा. १) पन्नश्च विद्वेदिकाधिकारवास्तवान सङ्क्षेपसाधिते। वस्तुं न पते स्वातः। किं च कारणं न स्वातः। या।
“जनाविनाल्लेख” मारणवीणि। (वा. २) भाष्येः स्थानिकता, इत्युच्चते, नैनम् भाष्येः।
“सूतान्यक्षरायति” मारणवीणि। (वा. ३) अन्यत् तत् श्रुतं पत्तिनिति, अन्यत् च परिगतिः। या।

An examination of the context here shows that according to Kātyāyana, that, which has its form slightly different from the original, should also be looked upon as the original by the sūtra I.1.56, so that, it may also be like the original to take the grammatical operation (kārya) such as a substitute (ādesa).

Patanjali has given in support of the Vārtika the popular maxim 'ekadesāvikṛtamananyavat' but therein he has expressed a fear that the maxim would lead to the idea that śabda is non-eternal and has held that the upasākhya (additional rule) is necessary. ¹
The school of Bhāradvāja, however, favours the additional rule, but the word in the plural number viz. ekadeśavikṛteṣu is put in the place of ekadeśavikṛta, used by Kātyāyana. The followers of that school give two different reasons to support their views: (1) 'anādeśatvāt' (on account of their not being ādeśa, (2) 'rūpānyatvāt' (on account of the variation in form). This difference in the views of the two Vārtika-kāras is clearly pointed out by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa in his Uddyota. Similarly the Vārtikas of the Saunāgas and others are quoted in the M. Bh. in order to show the difference between the views held by Kātyāyana and those held by the other Vārtikakāras.

3. Those Vārtikas, which do not possess the characteristics given above belong to the third category. Patanjāli has adopted an entirely different method in explaining and commenting upon these Vārtikas. He does not explain them by repeating all their words as he does in regard to the other classes of the Vārtikas. He sometimes explains certain doubtful or

---

1 कात्यायनीयादमारकाजीवपाठेहेत्यथिथांनावपर्यन्त

विशेष:

Uddyota on the M. Bh. on P.I.1.56.
important words but avoids the actual repetition of their words. He gives examples or counter-examples of this class of the Vārtikas too, whenever he feels that they are necessary.

On the basis of what has been observed above, the authorship of the Vārtikas in the entire M.Bh. can be determined in the following way:

There is no question about the authorship of the Vārtikas, which are placed in the second category, because Patanjali himself has directly or indirectly mentioned the names of their authors in his introductory remarks. The argument as stated above that Patanjali, sometimes, quotes the Vārtikas of scholars other than the Bhāradvājiyas, Saunāgas, etc. and Katyāyana the general author of the Vārtikas, as also other grammarians mentioned indirectly by the words pare, apare, etc. without any mention of their names, is not correct. Patanjali has always tried to recognize the services of critical commentators on Pāṇini, by mentioning their names directly or indirectly,

1 The examples of this class of the Vārtikas will be given later on in connection with the īṣṭi.
when he quotes their views. Even when he quotes the same Vārtika again, he generally mentions the name of its author. There are, no doubt, a few cases in the M.Bh. in which the Vārtikas are repeated without repeating the names of their authors. The Bhāgyakāra there does not want to hide their authorship, but the names are not given there because they have already been mentioned on previous occasions. Thus it can be concluded without any hesitation that only such Vārtikas which Patañjali has mentioned with the names of their authors belong to those scholars (viz. Bhāradvājiya, Saunāga etc. and pare, ape, etc.) and other Vārtikas which have no such remarks, do not belong to those authors.

The Vārtikas, which are placed in the first category belong to Kātyāyana. Patañjali has explained them by repeating their very words. In doing so, he is evidently commenting on the works of other grammarians, although he has not mentioned their names. As those Vārtikas are not written by Patañjali, it must be presumed that they come from Kātyāyana. A remark of this kind has, in fact, been made by many reputed grammarians, who followed Patañjali. A manuscript

---

1 See the Vārtikapātha of Kātyāyana No. 316 of 1875-76 Bhandarkar Institute, Poona.
of the Vārtikapātha of Katyāyana also justifies this remark. The Manuscript may not be the copy of the original text, but it shows, at least, that those Vārtikas which it has given were traditionally believed to have been written by Katyāyana, at the time, when the Manuscript was written, or copied. Kaiyata the well-known commentator on the M.Bh., while commenting on the first Vārtika in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.1 expressly states that it is a Vārtika and implies that such statements which follow in large numbers afterwards are also Vārtikas. Again, under the same sūtra, commenting on the next Vārtika he compares the view of the Vārtikakāra, with that of the Bhāṣyakāra and mentions the name of the Vārtikakāra as Katyāyana. From the statements of Kaiyata quoted above, it is clear that in the M.Bh. such statements, which are explained while repeating their words are given the name Vārtika and they are assigned to Katyāyana.

A close examination of the M.Bh. also supports this view. Patañjali quotes a statement under the

1

Prādīpaka on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.1

Cont.
name of the Vārtikakāra in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.34 as "वार्तिककारकाम पठाति - अज्ञातवाचितायिन्तः उत्क्षणावाः
वपवाव-सल्लुः हृति" and the same statement is found in the M.Bh. on P.VIII.3.13, where the Bhāṣyakāra has expounded it in his usual way of explaining the Vārtikas of the first category. In the M.Bh. on P.III.2.118, the Bhāṣyakāra has mentioned Katyāyana as the author of that Vārtika which is explained by repeating its words. It shows that Patanjali calls such statements Vārtikas and their author Vārtikakāra who is no other grammarian than Katyāyana.

The Vārtikas, which are placed in the third category, are by Patanjali himself. In the explanation of the Vārtikas of this category, the words of the Vārtikas are not repeated and no mention is made of their author directly or indirectly. These Vārtikas, which tradition styles as Iṣṭi, appear to have.

2 काल्पनेन अंतःत्वेऽव लोको दुष्टान्तस्यनीपातः।
मान्यकार्त्तू वायुवाचकारणपर्वत्येऽव लोके दुष्टान्तस्यनीपाते
योगस्यति।

3 न रूप पुराखन्ते हृतिः कुष्ठा काल्पनेनेह।
M.Bh. on P.III.2.118.
been written by the Bhāṣyakāra himself.

In this respect a passage from the Uddyota of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa gives a very important clue for determining the authorship of the Vārtikas in general and the iṣṭīs in particular. Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, while commenting on the verses under P.IV.1.78 has made the following observations:

Here the word 'sampatikarana' means commenting upon a statement by repeating it wholly or in part and adding a word like 'vaktavyam' or 'vācyam' or the like. It obviously shows that Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa holds the view that only such statements in the M.Bh. belong to the Vārtikāra which are explained by Patañjali by means of the sampatikarana or repetition, while the remaining statements in it, which are not explained by means of the 'sampatikana' are made by Patañjali himself.

It deserves to be noted in this connection that by adopting three different methods in explaining the Vārtikas written by various writers, Patañjali has not only indicated their special characteristics, but in doing so, he has followed the general method adopted by other commentators. The commentators generally do not mention at every place the name of the author on whose work they are commenting, while they generally mention the names of
other writers, whenever, they quote their views in their comments. Similarly Patanéjali has not mentioned except at one or two places the name of Kátyáyana on whose Vártikas, he was mainly commenting but, he refers by name to other writers, indirectly or directly when their views are quoted. He has also in a way indicated the characteristics of his own original rules or iśtis, which he explains without repeating their words obviously with a view to avoid the fault of repetition or punarukti.

It would not be out of place here to state the views of other scholars in regard to the authorship of the Vártikas embodied in the M. Bh. Dr. Kielhorn has examined the Vártikas of Kátyáyana and the way in which they are introduced into and discussed in the text of the M. Bh. The result of his scrutiny is as follows :-

"The conclusion then at which we have arrived

\[ \text{M. Bh. on P. III. 2.3, and} \]
\[ \text{M. Bh. on P. III. 2.118.} \]

"Kátyáyana and Patañjali" by Dr. Kielhorn, p. 86
is this, that the paraphrased sentences, which we meet with in the M.Bh., belong to Kātyāyana, the author of the Vārtikas, and this conclusion furnishes us with a means, in my opinion, the only means of reconstructing from the text of the M.Bh... on the other hand, we shall not allow ourselves to regard as a Vārtika of Kātyāyana any statement, unless it be accompanied by a paraphrase." It appears from the study of his book and the quotation given above that Dr. Kielhorn claims to have discovered for the first time, a method for determining the genuine Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, but it has to be observed in this connection that this method was known and was in use among the grammarians of Pāṇini's school. The statement of Dr. Kielhorn is merely a paraphrase of Nāgeśa Bhāṭṭa's remark: 'samputīkaraṇa'.

Bhārgava Śāstrī, who has edited the 'Nirṇayasāgara edition' edition of the Mahābhāṣya has used the word 'kunḍalana' for 'samputikaraṇa' of Nāgeśa.

1 In attempting then to determine, which are the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, we are mainly left to our own resources, etc. Kātyāyana and Patañjali, p. 7.

2 काल्पाक्रण वार्तिक नमूने माध्याकात्रे चर्चितां व न दिलयायामवन्तु. प्रयोजन च नृणामायार्यांगगौच्छयते।

Bhārgava Śāstrī - in the preface to the M.Bh. Nirṇayasāgara edition, Vol. I.
Bhaṭṭā. As has been already stated, Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭā has expressly said on the M.Bh. under P.IV.1.78, that in the M.Bh. such statements, as are not sampūṭikṛta, do not belong to the Vārtikakāra and by implication, the statement of Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭā suggests that such statements as are sampūṭikṛta belong to the Vārtikakāra.

KĀTYĀYANA COMMONLY KNOWN AS VĀRTIKAKĀRA

Although there are several writers of Vārtikas on the grammar of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana is the most renowned of them all. Whenever the general word Vārtikakāra or Vārtikakṛt is used in various treatises on the system of Pāṇini's grammar, it refers to Kātyāyana. He is also popularly known as one of the three sages (Munitraya) who codified the science

1 Patanjali, in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.34, has stated वार्तिककारं परिच्छ - जस्माचार्थिति बेचकुतामासायापवाद प्रस्तुत्व इति'

This Vārtika is read in the M.Bh. on P.VIII.3.13 and bears the characteristic of kātyāyana's Vārtika. Again in the M.Bh. on P.III.2.118, Kātyāyana is referred to by the term Vārtikakāra, cf.

'किं वार्तिककारः प्रतिष्ठेतेन करोति'
of Sanskrit grammar. He subjected the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, to a searching examination. He wrote his Vārtikas in critical and scientific spirit. The printed Vārtikapātha of Kātyāyana's Vārtika contains 5066 Vārtikas. Among them in the M.Bh. edited by Dr. Kielhorn, only 4200, Vārtikas bear the sign of Kātyāyana's Vārtikas. According to tradition, Pāṇini wrote 3996 sūtras in his Aṣṭādhyāyī. There are Vārtikas of Kātyāyana only on 1245 sūtras out of them, while Patanjali has, independently of Kātyāyana made remarks of his own to 468 other sūtras. The remaining sūtras of Pāṇini are not directly treated in the M.Bh. The Vārtikas of Kātyāyana are

1. वाक्यारं वर्णों मात्स्यकारं भूतनिर्देशं पारितः सुकारं च प्राचीनोऽर्थस्मु युनियमः


4. Introduction to the Kāśikāvivaraṇaṇājanī, p. 4.
generally in prose. There are in the M. Bh. some Vārtikas in metrical form. Some of these are also assigned to Kātyāyana, by some scholars. The question of the authorship of them will be discussed later on. The question, whether the remaining sutras of Pāṇini were likewise noticed by Kātyāyana or not, is really a very complicated one. In this connection two views were usually found: (1) Some hold the view that the object of Kātyāyana in writing his Vārtikas on the sutras was not to explain the sūtras, but to find fault in them and hence it is that he has left unnoticed many sūtras, which appeared satisfactory to him. (2) Others consider that the object of Kātyāyana, in composing his Vārtikas was to explain and complete the grammar of Pāṇini and hence he wrote his Vārtikas on only such sūtras as he considered incomplete or in need of improvement. Following the latter view, Dr. Kielhorn thinks that Patañjali has recorded all the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana in his M. Bh., because whenever Kātyāyana

---

1 Since here his object was not to explain Pāṇini but find fault in his grammar he has left unnoticed many sūtras that to him appeared valid.

Dr. S. K. Belvalkar - Systems of Sanskrit Grammar and also Prof. Goldstuck - Pāṇini, His place in Sanskrit Literature, pages 29 and 98 respectively.

2 See Kātyāyana and Patañjali, footnote, p. 45.
refers to one of his other Vārtikas in such terms as uktam or uktamvā, the Vārtika so referred to is found in the M.Bh. The acceptance in toto, of this view, however, presents the following difficulty. In the M.Bh. on P.I.1.13 there is a Vārtika 'aticoktam' which refers by the sense of the past passive participle (uktam) to another Vārtika and the Vārtika so referred to is found in the M.Bh. in the sixth chapter on P.VI.1.13. There are several examples like this in the M.Bh. This is a matter for serious consideration as the writer himself has used the past passive participle uktam or uktamvā with reference to his own subsequent expression in the same work. If he wanted to refer to a statement which was to be made later on by him in such cases he should have used the verb in the future tense as 'vaksyāmi' or 'vaksye' etc. Such statements in the M.Bh. bring two alternate views before the readers. The first is that, such Vārtikas, which contain references to other Vārtikas by the use of past passive participle, but which latter are actually found later on do not belong to Kātyāyana, but that they belong to Patanjali and the subject of the word uktam is to be supplied as Vārtikakāreṇa etc. the expression 'aticoktam' being equivalent to 'atica, Vārtikakāreṇa uktam'. The second alternative is that the Vārtikas stated
above belong to Kātyāyana, but those Vārtikas which are referred to by the word 'uktam' were actually in existence before such references in some treatises like the 'Vārtikapātha' at the time of Patañjali, although they are not mentioned in the M.Bh. beforehand.

It may be supposed that Kātyāyana wrote a considerable number of Vārtikas on the Āstādhyāyī of Pāṇini and that out of them Patañjali has selected and incorporated in the M.Bh. only such Vārtikas, as he considered necessary to complete and improve the sūtras, while the remaining Vārtikas were lost in the course of time. This supposition is supported by the Uddyota in which the author has clearly stated ¹ that there are some scholars, who consider that the original Vārtikapātha of Kātyāyana is lost.

THE MEANING OF THE TERM VĀRTIKA

The derivation of the term Vārtika as given by Kaiyaṭa in his Prādīpa on the M.Bh. under P.IV.2.60 is 'Vṛttamśeṣu Vārtikam'. The word Vārtika,

¹ उद्धोत - 'उक्तस्याः' इत्यत्स्य वार्तिकस्य स्थव्य कोणे वार्तिकपाथो अष्ट: इत्यत:।

Uddyota under P.I.1.12.
therefore, means a work composed on the basis of the Vṛtti. Such an explanation of the term 'Vārtika' justifies the fact that there existed some Vṛttis or glosses on the sūtras of Pāṇini, written by grammarians from time to time, and the gist of these glosses was summed up briefly in the Vārtikas. Hence the term Vārtika is significant from the point of its derivation.

The term Vārtika is defined in the 'Parāśaropapurāṇa' in the following way: "A Vārtika is that which considers (1) what is stated in the sūtras (uktacintana) or (2) what has been left unsaid in the sūtras (anuktacintana) or (3) considers what is imperfectly expressed in the sūtras (duruktacintana). This definition of the term Vārtika is very appropriately applicable to the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana. In most cases they explain and support the sūtras of Pāṇini, sometimes by raising objections to them and then answering them. Sometimes, they complement and add to the sūtras wherever the latter are found inadequate to cover the

1

and also Hemcandra

वार्तिकायां चिन्तना का प्रकाश

तं अन्यच्याचारिकं प्राणं: वार्तिकायः: मनोपिणः: ||

वार्तिकायां चिन्तनां चिन्तना का प्रकाश
growing needs of the language and thought up to his time while on other occasions, they reject or correct the whole or parts of the sūtras, which are found unnecessary by him.

Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa has given the definition of the term Vārtika in his Uddyota as follows:

"मुख्यं अवस्थितं वार्तिकां चक्राः - वार्तिकत्वम्" He has omitted the term उक्तिष्ठितायांकरत्वम् from the definition of the Vārtika. Probably he has included among the Vārtikas, such statements only as are possessed of these two characteristics. Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa’s definition of the Vārtika is explained by Prof. Goldstücker in the following words:

"The characteristic feature of a Vārtika," says Nāgojibhaṭṭa "is criticism in regard to that which is omitted or imperfectly expressed in a sūtra. A Vārtika of Kātyāyana is, therefore, not a commentary which explains, but an animadversion which completes." On the other hand, Dr. Kielhorn has explained the definition of the Vārtika given by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa as follows:

1 See - Uddyota on the M.Bh. under P.I.1.1.

2 Pāṇini - His place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 91.
"The Vārtikas consider whether anything has been omitted in the sūtras that should have been stated, and whether there is in them anything that is superfluous, faulty or objectionable. Keeping the characteristic of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana in mind, Dr. Kielhorn has rightly interpreted the definition of the Vārtika given by Nāgęśa Bhaṭṭa.

THE NATURE OF KĀTYĀYANA'S VĀRTIKA

The object of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, as observed above, is to explain and justify the sūtras of Pāṇini by raising objections about them and answering them, as also to correct, reject and add to the sūtras, whenever they are found partly or totally inadequate to cover the growing number of the forms in Sanskrit, which was the spoken language at that time.

But there are unfortunately some Eastern and Western writers who consider that Kātyāyana was an unjust critic of Pāṇini. Among the Eastern writers, Śabaraṉāi says in his Mīmāṃsā Bhaṣya: “सद वाचित्वाच्य परिष्नेत्तक-प्रमाणम्, असद वाचित्वाच्या कार्त्त्वाध्यन्त्” Among Western

1 Kātyāyana and Patañjali, p. 48.

2 Mīmāṃsā Bhaṣya on the M. Bh. X.8.1.
scholars, Prof. Goldstücker considers that Katyāyana has unjustly attacked the śūtras of Pāṇini, by twisting their words into a sense, which they did not convey. He writes "In proposing to himself to write Vārtikas on Pāṇini, Katyāyana did not mean to justify and to defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them and whoever has gone through his work must avow that he has done so to his heart's content... Katyāyana, in short, does not leave the impression of an admirer or friend of Pāṇini, but that of an antagonist often, too, of an unfair antagonist."

Supporting the view of Prof. Goldstücker, Prof. Weber considers that Katyāyana wrote his Vārtikas not to defend and justify the śūtras of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them and that the former has unjustly attacked the śūtras of the latter. A careful student of Katyāyana and Patanjali, however, will find it difficult totally to agree with the views of these scholars called Eastern and Western. A critical study of the M.Bh. shows that the main object of the Vārtikas of

---

1 Paijini - His place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 91.

Kātyāyana is to explain and justify the sūtras and not to find fault with them as some old and modern writers think. A glance at the tabular statement of the Vārtikas given by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanyan confirms the above stated view. According to that chart Kātyāyana's Vārtikas in the M.Bh. are found on 1228 sūtras of Pāṇini, out of which 709 sūtras are very well explained and justified by Kātyāyana without finding any fault with them. He has rejected only eight sūtras, which are found to be unnecessary. He has corrected and added to the remaining sūtras, only when no other way was possible.

Moreover, the Vārtika work is not a mere explanation of the sūtras, as Prof. Goldstücker himself has stated while explaining the definition of the Vārtikas given by Nāgęśa Bhaṭṭa. The Vārtikas form a kind of critical commentary on the sūtras of Pāṇini. Kātyāyana, as is evident from the nature of his work, has very critically examined the sūtras and has added sometimes a large number of Vārtikas on some sūtras with a view

---

2 Pāṇini - His place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 90.
to discuss fully such objections as could possibly be raised against them. It is true that generally Kātyāyana has raised objections against the whole sutra or one or two words in it and unjustifiably suggested corrections or additions to them. It is equally true that he has raised a doubt about the sense of a particular word or of the whole sutra. But generally in the case of a number of sutras, he himself has refuted those objections and doubts and has proved that those sutras are faultless. Hence it would be reasonable to say that adopting the method of disputation in composing the Vārtikas on Pāṇini's sutras, Kātyāyana has not unjustly levelled any attack on the sutras, but in doing so, he has justified and defended the sutras of Pāṇini against his critics. This is why the Astādhyāyī of Pāṇini, instead of being weakened by Kātyāyana, has rather become stronger and consequently more popular among scholars of grammar.

The other statement of Prof. Goldstücker and others, that Kātyāyana was not an admirer of Pāṇini but an unfair antagonist, does not stand any examination. Kātyāyana has shown his high regard for Pāṇini in his Vārtikas, as seen by the use of the term Bhagavān.

1 एक्षेप निर्देशार्थ या स्वर उपायानांि भक्ति: पार्शने
रिज्यवन्
Vart. in the M. Bh. on P.VIII.4.68.
with reference to him. He has applied the epithet 'Sukrt' and 'Acarya' with reference to Panini. From the way in which Kātyāyana is referred to in the M. Bh. it becomes also clear that Patanjali had a high regard for Kātyāyana, who was rightly believed to have given a kind of perfection to the Astādhyāyī of Panini. Kātyāyana has placed the Vārtikakāra even above the sūtrakāra and tradition goes to the length of regarding him more authoritative than Panini cf. the statement quoted, viz. "यथोत्तरतः मुत्तोत्तरः प्रामाण्यम्" (the later the kuni, the greater his authority.) Kātyāyana is a higher authority than Panini, and Patanjali a still higher authority than Kātyāyana and Panini.

Dr. Kielhorn has drawn a true picture of the object of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana. He has stated that "The object of the Vārtikas is no other than this

1 "कहौऽखिलं सृष्टि समावासम् चिथे: चारुः"

Vart. in the M. Bh. on P.VI.2.1.

2 "आचार्य्याचारात् संसारसिद्धः"

Vart. in the M. Bh. on P.I.1.1.

3 "वार्तिकारस्य सृष्टिकारात् प्रमाणवत्स्यात्"

Pradīpa on the M. Bh. on P.VII.3.59.
without bias or prejudice to discuss such objections as might be raised to the rules of Pāṇini's grammar, and on the one hand to justify Pāṇini by defending him against unfounded criticism, and on the other hand to correct, reject, and add to the rules laid down by him, where defence and justification were considered impossible."

In fact, Katyāyana was a scientific critic and follower of Pāṇini and his work is a sort of complement to Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī. Indian tradition obviously justifies this view. In the M.Bh. the work of Katyāyana is regarded as an anvākhyāna, and Patañjali has referred to the work generally by the terms anvākhyāyate, anvācaṣṭe, etc. The meaning of the term anvākhyāna is an explanation keeping close to the text. According to Indian commentators, the word means a repetition to emphasize what has been stated. Bhartṛhari has applied the term anutantra to refer to the work of

1 Katyāyana and Patañjali, p. 48.
2 Sanskrit English Dictionary of Monier Williams.
3 नित्य: भवार्थ सम्बन्ध: समानाता: महार्षिः। दुर्गमां सागुत्वा वापर्चा मात्रवाप्रा च प्रेमनुष्यः॥ "अनुन:स्य चार्यकथे" V.P. I.23

Puṣyāraṇāja thereon.
Kātyāyana. The significance of the word anutantra is to show that the work is such as has been developed in accordance with the ancient text. Mādhava, the author of the Dhātuvṛtti, has referred to the work of Kātyāyana by the epithet (anusmṛti) which denotes that Pāṇini composed his Aṣṭādhyāyī and Kātyāyana has respectfully remembered it. The epithets used by the distinguished writers quoted above, clearly show the high respect they had for Kātyāyana, the author of the Vārtikas.

It can be concluded here on the basis of the facts mentioned above that Kātyāyana’s object in writing his Vārtikas on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, was to teach grammar first and to bring the Aṣṭādhyāyī up-to-date by supplementing it. The nature of his Vārtikas, hence is no other than explaining, developing and justifying the sūtras of Pāṇini. It can never be supposed that Kātyāyana examined or explained the sūtras with a view to find fault with them. It is rightly said that Kātyāyana

1 अनुस्त्रीते कार्यशयनस्य स्थाने कर-शब्दः पत्रोऽस्मे। पारसुप्रति -

p. 30.

2 सुकार निम्नवायं वर्तित कार्यायनां सुनि।

Tradition.
really understands the hidden significance of the sūtras, that Patanjali understands them through Kātyāyana’s Vārtikas and that others understand the Aṣṭā-dhyāyī through the M.Bh. of Patanjali.

**THE VĀRTIKAS SUPPLY THE LINK BETWEEN PĀNINIAN SANSKRIT AND THAT OF KĀTYĀYANA**

There was probably a long interval of approximately two hundred years between the time of Pāṇini and that of Kātyāyana. The date of Pāṇini is commonly determined to be about 550 B.C. at the latest, while tradition places Kātyāyana in the days of the Nandas i.e. in the middle of the fourth century B.C. Although the 1 Kathāsarit-sāgara and the Patanjalicarita make Kātyāyana the contemporary of Pāṇini and Prof. Maxmiller has also followed the same view, yet this view is refuted by several reputed scholars and it needs no further discussion. A critical examination of the M.Bh. in

---

1. प्रकृते चात्मयोवर्त्ते प्रवालाजः सत्त्वासरः।

अष्टेद्धायिन मया तत्स्मन विकृतां समन्दर्मस।

कथा स-सागर ५, २५, ५४

वाक्यवधिः स चिक्षा द्वै-नन्द। कात्यायनोपरिप्रतिक श्रवणम्

प. वरिष्ठ १, ७४

1/78 by Ramabhadra Dīkṣita

2. Ancient History of Sanskrit Literature by Maxmiller, p. 127
which the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana are substantially recorded, proves that a pretty long time must have elapsed between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, as the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana refer by names or by general terms, to several predecessors, who have tried to improve Pāṇini's grammar. This could not have been the case, if a sufficiently long interval of time had not passed between the two grammarians.

Secondly, there are some Vārtikas, which teach such forms as are not taught by Pāṇini. There are others, which restrict or reject Pāṇini's sutras, while there are some, which refer to the forms, that had gone out of use at his time. These changes in the forms of the Sanskrit language require reasonably a long interval between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana.

It may be argued here that the forms taught by Kātyāyana did not come newly into usage at the time of Kātyāyana, but they existed already in the language and might have escaped Pāṇini's notice. A close consideration of the forms taught by Kātyāyana, however, compels one to think that it is impossible to believe that Pāṇini did not know them, if they were in existence in the language at his time, as Pāṇini has very carefully noticed almost all the facts about the Sanskrit language.
of his time. Prof. Goldstücker has rightly remarked about Pāṇini in the following words:

"It is not necessary to exaggerate this view by assuming that Pāṇini was an infallible author, who committed no mistakes, omitted no linguistic fact, and gave complete perfection to a system already in use: We need take no other view of the causes of his great success than we should take of those which produce the fame of a living man."

The only reasonable supposition, therefore, is that most of those forms which are taught by Kātyāyana did not exist in the language at the time of Pāṇini.

It is the fundamental characteristic of the language or specially of the spoken language that in the course of time several new words come into usage to express new ideas and some old forms go out of use. So it is just possible that in the period intervening between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, when Sanskrit was a living language, several new forms came into usage and several others went out of usage. Such changes in Sanskrit forms necessitated the re-examination of the

1 Pāṇini - His Place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 94.
Aṣṭādhyāyī and then some additions and corrections were needed. It is the master mind of Kātyāyana that saved the Aṣṭādhyāyī by supplying missing words and forms which escaped the attention of Pāṇini. A few words are given to illustrate the development in Sanskrit forms from Pāṇini to Kātyāyana:

The sutra VII.3.115 sanctions the augment syāt and shortening in the case of the noun stems (Pratipadikas) dviṭiya and trtiṭiya, only when they are in the feminine gender. Kātyāyana, however, has given a Vārtika on P.I.1.36, as \( "अनुवर्तके साध्यव श्रवणः साध्यानु" \) Vart.3, which sanctions 'Sarvanāma-sahjña' in the stem ending with the suffix 'tIya' without any distinction of the gender and the sutra VII.3.115 is found unnecessary. Thus according to Pāṇini the forms of the stem dviṭiya in the Dat.Abl. and Loc.singular in Masculine gender will be only dviṭīyā, dviṭīyāt and dviṭīye, respectively. Similar is the case with the stem trtiṭiya. Similarly, Pāṇini has sanctioned the ekāsēsa by the sutra I.2.64 in the words, which are similar in forms, but he is silent about the words, which have similar sense but no similar forms. Kātyāyana has given a rule on P.I.2.64 as \( "एकासेसा निरूपणाः" \) (Vārt. 23) which sanctions ekāsēsa in the words which have similar meanings, though the forms are different. Thus according

\[1\]

(Aṣṭādhyāyī)
to him the words Vakradanda, or Kutiladanda, in the sense of Vakradandaśca Kutiladandaśca, are correct.

Changes in Sanskrit forms noticed by Kātyāyana are so many that it is not possible to mention all of them here. Yet for illustration some words are given below:

According to Pāṇini

I.4.52 has not noticed

According to Kātyāyana

The Vartika 3 thereon teaches the form

Also Vartika 4

The Vartika 5th thereon prohibits the sūtra

According to P.I.4.52

The Vartika thereon gives

P.IV.1.49

only मालुङ्गानी and मालुङ्गी both as the feminine of मालुङ्ग

Unnoticed

only आरण्, कृष्णम in the sense of a female ārya and a female kṣatriya.

According to Pāṇini

only उपाघ्यायी both in the sense of the wife of the Upādhyāya.

Unnoticed

only उपाध्यायानाथी and उपाध्यायो both in the same sense. In Chandās

Continued............
With regard to the change in the sense of words, it may be said that, at the time of Kātyāyana, certain words came to possess a sense which they did not have at the time of Pāṇini. For instance according to Pāṇini’s sūtra VI.1.150 the word Viśkāra or Viṅkāra could be used only in the sense of birds, but Kātyāyana, who has modified the rule, states that both forms are optional in the sense of a bird, while in other senses the form Viśkāra only is correct. Similarly Pāṇini has laid down the rule VI.1.147, which teaches the form aścārya in the sense of anitya i.e. non-eternal but Kātyāyana amends this sūtra by substituting the word adbhuta.

Footnote continued from previous page.

According to Pāṇini

P.IV.1.48 in the sense of the wife of the sun.

P.VIII.2.8. In the Vocative only ब्रजन, नामन, वर्ण

According to Kātyāyana

But according to the Vārtika if the wife of the sun is Goddess, otherwise ब्रजन.

According to the Vārtika 2 thereon ब्रज and ब्रजन नाम and नामन, वर्ण and वर्णन, चर्म and चर्मन etc.

"विशिष्क: खुःनौ विशिष्कवा" Vart. I.

"विशिष्क: खुःनौ विशिष्कवा वैत वक्तव्यम्। खुःनौ वैत हुःथमाने खुःनौ वा स्वाध्यायिनि निल्यम्।"

N.Eh. on P.VI.1.150.
Panini has derived the word bhojya in the sense of bhaksya by the sutra VII.3.69 but Katyayana has corrected this sense by substituting the word abhyavaharya for bhojya. There is evidently a difference in the senses of bhojya and abhyavaharya. The former means what is fit to be eaten and applies to solid food only while the latter denotes 'what is fit for consumption' and applies to all kinds of eatables.

According to the natural process of the development of the language, not only several new forms and expressions (some of which have been stated above) came into usage in Sanskrit language after Panini,
but a good many forms and expressions, which were current in his time were not usually found in later Sanskrit. The occurrence (in the sūtras) of a large number of words, that became obsolete in later Sanskrit literature, supports the statements made above. A few words from the sūtras, for instance, will be enough to illustrate this:-

The word utsaṁjana in P.I.3.36 means throwing up,
Anvavasarga is used in the sense of allowing a man his own way in P.I.4.96. Abhresa in P.III.3.37 means propriety and avaklpti in P.III.3.145 means imagining.

1 समान्यतः कार्याकर्षणम् वानश्रीतिकिवनायत्वेऽनिः
P.I.3.36

2 उपास्यम् कल्पितम्, P.I.3.56.

3 कषेत्रसः क्रण्वप्रतिपत्ति। P.I.4.66

4 श्रीपः पदार्थसंमाधानान्-वक्ष्यं गद्यं समुद्भो। P.I.4.96

5 परिन्यो-नौर्णवः ऊर्तासेऽसः। P.III.3.37

6 अन्वक्षुद्ध-वर्ष्यम्योरिकं बुद्धार्थपि।
1 \textsc{qi} in P.IV.4.96 is used in the sense of Veda or Vedic hymn. From the examples given above, it is clear, that those forms in those very senses must have been in usage in \textsc{panini}'s time as he has composed s\textsc{utra}s to explain them. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar considers that Sanskrit language was rich in verbal forms up to the time of \textsc{panini} and at the time of \textsc{katyayana} and \textsc{pata}\textsc{n}\textsc{jali} the place of verbal forms was more or less taken by participles. Dr. Bhandarkar observes: "In \textsc{panini}'s time a good many forms and expressions were current, which afterwards became obsolete; verbal forms were commonly used, which ceased to be used in \textsc{katyayana}'s time and some grammatical forms were developed in the time of the latter, which did not exist in \textsc{panini}'s."

CONTRIBUTION OF \textsc{katyayana} TO THE \textsc{paninian} SYSTEM OF GRAMMAR

It is clear from the above, that \textsc{katyayana} has paid keen attention to the new stock of forms which

1 \text{cf. e.g. p. IV: 4, 96.}

2 For detail, see \textsc{panini} - His place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 98.

had gradually become current in his time in the course of linguistic development. Katyāyana has also tried his best to find out the principles underlying the aphorisms of Pāṇini as also to furnish his grammar with new principles and theories, unnoticed by Pāṇini. Some of them are stated below:

1. The first Vārtika of Katyāyana teaches us that śabda and its meaning and the relation between the two are eternal.

2. Katyāyana has also distinguished between dhvani and śabda: dhvani is considered to be short, medium, long, etc. but śabda is not affected in any way by these considerations of length. He has given the instance of the beating of a drum on which Patanjali

1: Vart. in the M.Bh. 1st Āhnikā.

2: Vart. 5.

M.Bh. on P.I.1.70.
has pointed out that sounds produced by the beating of a drum are not of equal intensity, one beater of a drum goes twenty steps at the time when the sound by beating the drum lasts, another thirty steps and another forty steps. Beating is the same. Really speaking although Kātyāyana has not used the word Sphoṭa as such, yet he has stated the fundamental principle underlying the doctrine of the eternal word which was to be designated Sphoṭa by Patañjali.

3. Kātyāyana has maintained that a single letter, when it is uttered on different occasions or by different speakers, is different. Thus a single letter like 'a' is many and not one, as the Māṁskas hold.

4. It is also stated by Kātyāyana in his Vārtakas that letters have no significance since meaning is not found for every letter, and since the meaning of a

1. श्राय-भावः दु काल्यणवयायात्
   युगपच्छ वेदपुरस्ववर्षनात
M. Bh. on S. S. I.

2. "अन्यकर्तनात् प्रतियोगवांतात्!
   "कण्टक्यायापागपन्वनिकारेः
   अर्थवर्तनात्"
Vart. 14.

Vart. 15.

मन्यामहे
M. Bh. on S. S.
word does not change on account of the changes in letters such as elision, augment or substitution of letters. If letters were significant, then with changes of letters the meaning would have changed. Patanjali has stated thereon that with regard to letters that they have meaning and that they have not. He has given an example of those persons, who study with the same object and some get the desired object and others do not. Similarly a single letter, which forms a root, or a suffix, or a stem or a particle is possessed of sense and the rest have no meaning.

5. Katyāyana has also discussed whether or not the parts of diphthongs (e, o, ai and au) which are similar to independent letters, can be considered independent letters for grammatical operations and has

1 तः यथा - समानमीहमानानामप्रोपानानां च कौशिकेन वैञ्ज्यन्ते ॥परे न। न चेवानां कौशिकेयांनिन्त कृत्य समृद्ध-वर्धिं: उकूं वाचिकु, कौशिकु वानंक हि कृत्य संवैरनके। ...

M.Bh. on ३.३.५

2 नाइपुत्तस्तुक्तक्षये तद्वृत्तिवर्त्यथा प्रवेष्य।

Vart. 9.

M.Bh. on ३.३.४.
stated that rules of grammar would not operate in the case of those as the parts are not heard as distinct and separate, just as milk and water when mixed cannot be seen separately.

6. He has examined the Śiva sūtras and arrived at the conclusion that the mention of the letter ṭ in the second Śiva sūtra is not necessary. Since the vowel ṭ is found in proper nouns like ṭakā, which is merely a corruption of ītaka and it is considered that only the correct forms should be used thus - he is ṭakā and not ṭakā. He has stated that there are only three kinds of śabdas viz. jātiśabda, guṇāśabda and kriyāśabda. There are no yadṛcchāśabdas like ḷphida, ḷphidda etc.

7. Kātyāyana has supplied a rule for savarṇa-

\[
\text{"व्याक्यभावान् कल्पनं संपारिकं" Vart. 2.}
\]

\[
\text{व्याक्यभावं कतं आदयतौ पावात् कल्पनं संपारिकं साधु मन्यते। कतं प्रवाचो न कतं होति। M. Bh. on स. S. 2.}
\]

\[
\text{कक्षारङ्गकारणोऽऽ सस्तनिविधी। Vart. 5.}
\]

\[
\text{कक्षारङ्गकारणोऽऽ सस्तनः संतोषितवेत्। होतुः कक्षाः होवृत्तकारः।}
\]

\[
\text{M. Bh. on P. I. 1. 9.}
\]
-sañjña (Cognateness) between the letters r and l with a view to have coalesced forms tavalkāraḥ, hotākāraḥ, etc.

8. Kātyāyana has maintained that although the ayogavāha letters viz. anusvāra, visarga, jihvāmūliya and upadhmāniya are not read in the Śivasūtras, yet they should be included in the at and ēr letters for grammatical purposes.

9. With regard to phonetic laws there is a notable change noticed in the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, viz. that before Kātyāyana grammarians probably did not notice any difference in the Ābhyanatara-prayatna (internal effort) of the sonants and the fricatives. According to the old grammarians both sonants and fricatives had the same internal effort as have openness (vivl^a) Pāṇini's Sīkṣā expressly says sva-ansāmām na lan niyataṁ kṣaṇे sāntvam | which is based on the tāunaka

1. "अयोग वाहानां मद लुमशः ज्ञात्वा" Vart. 6
   अयोग-वाहानां मद सूपवेशः कर्तव्यः। किं प्रयोजनाम । ज्ञात्वम्।
   M.Bh.

2. "वर्षु भर्मायते" Vart. 7
   अयोगवेशः कर्तव्यः। किं प्रयोजनाम । भर्मायते।
   M.Bh. on S.S. 5.
Prātiṣākhya'. According to this view, the vowels:  
\( a, i, r \) and \( \bar{i} \) and the fricatives:  
\( h, s, s \) and \( s \), have  
the same organ of articulation and the same internal  
effort respectively. Thus by P.I.1.9 they should be  
taken as Savarṇa of each other, but as it was not  
desirable, Pāṇini composed the sūtra I.1.10, prohibiting  
the Savarṇasahṛjña (Cognateness) of vowels and  
fricatives.

Kātyāyana, on the other hand, has found a difference in the internal effort of the vowels and fricatives. He has stated that fricatives have a slightly open effort (Isad-vivṛta). This view is derived by Kātyāyana from the same 'Prātiṣākhya' by giving a different interpretation of its last sentence. In this interpretation, there is no possibility of the Savarṇasahṛjña (Cognateness) between a vowel and a fricative.

\[ Vart. 3 \]

M.Bh. on P.I.1.10

fricative since they cannot have a similar internal effort. Hence the sūtra of Pāṇini I.1.10 is found unnecessary by Kātyāyana.

10. With regard to the organ of articulation, there is also a notable difference between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. The former takes (e) (े) as a guttural as well as a palatal vowel and 'o' (ओ) as a guttural as well as a labial vowel. Thus Pāṇini has found it necessary to lay down the sūtra I.1.48, so that, there should be no possibility of the substitution of (a) as a short vowel for diphthongs (e) and (o).

Kātyāyana, however, has stated that (e) and (o) are only palatal and labial vowels respectively and hence according to him, there is no possibility of the guttural (a) being substituted for the palatal (e) or

```
"सिद्धवेदः सत्वान्त्याः"  
Wart. 3 in the  
M.Bh. I.1.48.

सिद्धवेदः इति - प्रकारस्य ताल्लुकस्य ताल्लुकस्य पक्षः।  
शौकारस्य च शौकारस्य शौकारस्य दकारो मित्यातीत्यथः।

Pradīpa thereon, and also

इति प्रातिविधात्वकृतमुद्गुरुभेमन सत्वान्त्यं भाष्यं उक्तम्।  
(ibid. I.70)

हर्ष प्रातिविधात्वकृतमुद्गुरुभेमन सत्वान्त्यं भाष्यं उक्तम्।

हात्या thereon.
```
the labial (o). The sūtra I.1.48 is, as a consequence, found unnecessary by Kātyāyana.

11. Kātyāyana has maintained that there are certain particles, which convey neither any denoted senses nor any indicated senses and they, therefore, cannot be treated as Pratipadika as held by Pāṇini I.2.45. Hence he has laid down an additional rule that they should be regarded as noun stems (Pratipadika).

THE LANGUAGE AND THE STYLE OF KĀTYĀYANA'S VARTIKAS.

The Vartikas of Kātyāyana on a majority of Pāṇini's sūtras are written in a disputatious tone. According to this style Kātyāyana does not give his final answer in the beginning of his discussion. He, however, goes on raising objections and giving reasons in support of them, which form a set of Pūrvapakṣa Vartikas. Generally in the end of his discussion, he gives his final answer in such Vartikas, as are called Siddhānta Vartikas. But sometimes his final answers do not

1

"निपातस्तव्यर्थकल्प प्रातिपदिकत्वम्"
Vart. 12.

"निपातस्तव्यर्थकल्प प्रातिपदिकत्वम् वक्तव्यतः"

M. Bh. on P.I.2.45.
complete the discussion, which is further prolonged. It is, therefore, not easy many times to decide, on account of mere arguments, which of the Vārtikas form the pūrvapakṣa and which of them, the siddhānta. Moreover, like Pāṇini, Kātyāyana is fond of utmost brevity, so much so, that sometimes, the meanings of the Vārtikas can hardly be known without the help of the M.Bh. written thereon.

The general style of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, is that the first Vārtika on a sūtra, of a set of Vārtikas, either repeats the whole sūtra or a word or two in it.

There are some other peculiarities also in the general style of the Vārtikas that are summed up below:-

1. Whenever Kātyāyana has raised objections to Pāṇini's sūtras, generally the participle 'cet' or 'itijcet' is used in his Vārtikas, sometimes in such cases the participle 'yadi' is also employed generally followed by the participle 'atha'.

2. When Kātyāyana has refuted the objection immediately after it has been raised, his Vārtikas generally commence with the words 'Vā or siddhanta', generally followed by a noun in the ablative case.
3. In the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana verbal forms are rarely found while nouns or participles are used in their place.

Prof. Goldstücker and Prof. Weber have remarked that Kātyāyana has always put the words Kartavyam, vaktavyam, etc. at the end of his Vārtikas in the senses that Pāṇini should have to say or should have to do. But their view does not stand a close examination. The study of the M.Bh. shows that such remarks are generally seen either in the original rules of Patanjali or in the explanations given by him of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana.

---

1. See for detail - Dr. Kielhorn - Kātyāyana and Patanjali, p. 22.

2. Ibid., p. 5.
THE VERIFIED VARTIKAS IN THE M.Bh.

In his M.Bh. Patanjali has discussed and explained the Vārtikas of different writers, which are mostly written in prose. Besides these, a number of verses, which teach grammatical matters, are also embodied in the M.Bh., which are scattered throughout the text. They generally occur in a single stanza of four lines, but sometimes two or more stanzas even up to twelve are grouped together. Similarly a number of half or even quarter verses also occur in the M.Bh.

The total number of complete stanzas in the M.Bh. according to Dr. Kielhorn, is about 260. These stanzas have been composed in different metres. Prof. Keith has stated that the metres used in these stanzas of the M.Bh. are the Mālatī, the Praharṣīṇī, the Pramitā-

---

1 Twelve stanzas are grouped together in the M.Bh. on P.IV.1.78.


3 Dr. Keith - History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 47. Dr. Kielhorn in 'Indian Antiquary' Vol. XV, p. 229, has given a specific account of the metres used in the verses of the M.Bh. The metres given there are as follows:

(I) The ordinary Ārya about 40, verses; (II) Portion of an Ārya - 2; (III) Gīti one verse and a half; (IV) ordinary śloka about 165 verses; (V) Three quarters of a verse (VI) Half verses 16; (VII) quarter verses 12; (VIII) Vaktra 2. Half a verse (IX) Vidyāmāla 3.

Continued on next page.
Besides these, there occur stanzas in the common metres viz. Tristubh and Vaktra, Indravajra, Upajati, Salini, Vamhsastha, Samam, Vidyunmalai, Tojaka and Dodhaka. Many of these are in the style of the Vedic Jagati and Tristubh. According to Dr. Keith many of the Kārikās have been composed by the predecessors of Patanjali and they deal with disputed points of grammar.

THE KĀRIKĀS OF THE M.Bh. ARE TRADITIONALLY KNOWN AS VĀRTIKAS

The Kārikās, scattered here and there in the M.Bh. are called by the name Vārtika by the commentators. Although Patanjali, while presenting these Kārikās, has not specifically named them as Vārtikas. Sometimes they are called by their full name of slokavārtikā.

A quarter verse (I) Samam 2; (II) Indravajra 3; (III) Upajati 4; (IV) Dodhaka 12; (V) Salini 4 verses; (VI) Vamhsastha - half a verse (VII) Tojaka 2 (VIII) Jagati 1. Besides these there are a few verses, whose metres are not given there.

Prajīpa on the M.Bh. on P.IV.4.9 and

Prajīpa on the M.Bh. on P.VII.1.49.
and their authors are called ślokavārtikakāra by commentators. Kaiyāṭa and Nāgeśa Bhatṭa have applied the epithet ślokavārtikakāra to the authors of the Kārikās.

It deserves to be noted here that Patañjali has adopted different methods on different occasions in explaining and commenting upon the Kārikās. Sometimes he has stated the whole Kārikā and then fully commented on it, while on the other occasions, he has explained a Kārikā taking it part by part and when all the parts of the Kārikā have been explained, he has recited the whole Kārikā. Some of the Kārikās are partly commented on by Patañjali. That is to say, some portions only which require explanations are fully commented on, while other portions are left entirely without any commentary. The remaining Kārikās,

1 Cf. the Kārikā etc. M.Bh. on I.1.57 and P. I.2.51.

2 etc. M.Bh. on F.I.1.19 and P. I.2.50.

3 Cf. the M.Bh. on P.I.1.38, III.2.118. III.2.123 etc.
which are neither fully nor partly commented on in the M. Bh. also give a good deal of information on grammatical matters.

THE OBJECT OF THE KĀRIKĀS

The main object of the writers of the several Kārikās quoted in the M. Bh. is to teach the Pāṇinian system of grammar by giving the gist of the explanation of a sūtra or group of sūtras in verses. The verses are meant generally to explain and to modify the sūtras, but sometimes they explain the Vārtikas written in prose. At other times, they present a summary of the preceding Vārtikas. Such Kārikās generally occur at the end of Patañjali's commentary on the individual sūtras. Some other Kārikās discuss Pāṇini's sūtras independently, where there is not even a single Vārtika in prose. They either suggest corrections in the sūtras or refute objections raised against the sūtras and give proper explanations of them. Besides these, the terms

---

1. See the M. Bh. on P.I.1.14, I.1.38, I.1.57, I.1.70 etc.
2. The M. Bh. on P.III.1.22, V.2.115, etc.
3. Cf. the M. Bh. III.2.3 etc.
4. I.1.19, I.2.50, etc.
avyaya, (indeclinable), jāti (class), guṇa (quality),
liṅga (gender) etc. are nicely defined in the Kārikās.

1  संहृतं चिन्त चिन्तितः सर्वत्र च चिन्तितः।
      चचनेतु च सर्वत्र वनः व्येष्टि तद्वस्त्यपम्॥
       M.Bh. on P.I.1.38.

2  बाकृतिः प्रभावांगति चिन्तिताः च न सर्वभाषा।
      सकुदात्मां निःशर्मा गोकुः च चरणे: सह॥
   अपांगिकं विवायस्यां सर्वस्तु वज्रपदु गुणः।।
      असर्वा चिन्ताः सहस्याः तद् जाति कावयो चिन्िः॥
       M.Bh. on P.IV.1.63.

3  सर्वे निविष्टे अर्पिते पुष्कर गार्तिः हुक्ते।
      बालेष्कला कृतं कवितां सोऽस्यन प्रश्चित्तिः॥
      उपलक्ष्यान्वकाल्यां सुदृढने प्रभावानवेदयं॥
   वाचकः सर्व चिन्तानां प्रव्यादनं गुणः: स्मृतः॥
       M.Bh. on P.IV.1.44.

4  स्तनकेतुर्वा स्त्रीलक्ष्यानां: पुल्ल: स्मृतः॥
   हणघोरान्तर चचन्ति तद्वस्त्राये नयंकरः॥
      संस्थानाः असों चिन्तामयायो लक्ष्यानित्वः।।
   संस्थाने स्तनकेतुर्वा स्त्री, गुणः: सप मर्त्ये गुणानु॥
      तस्येको लोको नाम गुणो वा दृष्टिमुक्तः॥
       M.Bh. on P.IV.1.3.
They also present etymological explanation of the term aksara (letter) and distinguish between dhvani (sound) and sabda. An examination of the Kārikās quoted in the M.Bh. clearly shows that they do not belong to a single author. In short it may be stated that before Patañjali several grammarians had tried to explain and to supplement the Pāṇinian system of grammar. They had written their commentaries both in prose and in verse and had given the summary of their arguments in verses. Out of these some are found quoted in the M.Bh.

**THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE KĀRIKĀS IN THE MAHĀBHĀṣYA**

It is not easy to ascertain distinctly the authorship of the Kārikās in the M.Bh. as Patañjali has stated them without mentioning the names of their authors. Only on a few occasions has he introduced the Kārikās by general terms such as 'apara ēha' and once only

1. वक्ता न हि द्वारा विवाहित अवस्ये वा सरोकारः।
   वर्णम बाहुः पूर्वकृते किम्यथुपविद्यते ॥
   M.Bh. on Ś.S.8

2. द्वानि: लक्ष्यतेष संज्ञानानां द्व्यविनितो लक्ष्यते।
   अस्तो मदानुसंध्यात्म-चक्षुमयं तत् स्वभावतः ॥
   M.Bh. on P.I.1.70.

3. Cf. in the M.Bh. on P.III.1.112, III.2.109, 1.4.51 etc.
as 'Bhāradvājīyaḥ paṭhanti'. Kaiyāṭa, the well-known commentator on the M. Bh. has done the same thing as Patanjali in this respect. Probably in Kaiyāṭa’s time also, the information regarding the authorship of the Kārikās, was available, being traditionally handed down from teacher to pupil and as the authors were known by tradition, Kaiyāṭa did not think it necessary to make any specific mention of the authors of the Kārikās. Only in one case has he made a clear reference to the author of the Kārikās, whose name he has given as vyāghrabhūti. In other places, his remarks are vague. Sometimes he has referred to the Kārikās by the terms ślokavārtika, vārtika etc. from which no satisfactory conclusion can be drawn about their authorship. A critical examination of the particular terms used by Kaiyāṭa, while referring to the Kārikās in the M. Bh., shows that he held the view that some of the Kārikās belonged to Kātyāyana, some others to Patanjali himself and still others to other writers. A few examples from the Mahābhāṣya will be enough to explain this view.

1 In the M. Bh. on P. VI. 4. 47.

2 अब्देवार्थ: व्याग्रज्ञविन्वयत्र इत्याह - वार्तव-चिन्तितोऽवधिति।
Pradīpa on the M. Bh. on P. II. 4. 36.
Patañjali has stated in the M.Bh. that the purpose of the sūtra I.1.21 is in the case of the augment ā which is prefixed to a root commencing with a vowel. Kaiyāṭa while commenting on this portion of the M.Bh., states that the purpose referred to in the above statement is according to the sūtrapāṭha and not in accordance with the Vārtikakāra who has found the sūtra P.VI.4.72 to be unnecessary. It may be mentioned in this connection that the Vārtika, which rejects the above sūtra, is in verse in the M.Bh. on P.VI.4.74. It is seen frequently that Kaiyāṭa generally uses the term Vārtikakāra to refer to Kātyāyana. The use of the word Vārtikakāra by Kaiyāṭa therefore indicates that the verse in the M.Bh. on P.VI.4.74 belongs to Kātyāyana.

1

अचारादन्तेप्रयोजनम्
M.Bh. on P.I.1.21.

चुणपाते अचारादन्तेप्रयोजनोऽध्वालः, चारित्कारस्तु अचारादन्तसि स्रियत्वं नित्यतः ।
Pradīpa thereon.

2

अचारादन्तरस्तु स्रियत्वं बुध्ययच्यां नापि सेवतः ।
अस्तवयोऽल्लोचनाय सातो मुद्रितपम् स्वरेव ॥
M.Bh. on P.VI.4.74.

2a

Cf. चारित्कारस्तु चाराप्रत्याख्यानं नित्यप्रयोजनम्
on the Bhāṣya on Śivasūtra 2, and also चारित्कारस्येवेतरस्य-
श्लोक: श्लोकम्यथो च श्लोकोऽश्लेषप्रदर्शनार्थः ।
Pradīpa on the M.Bh. p.I.1.38.
who is commonly known as the Vārtikakāra in this system of grammar. This supposition gets further support from the statement of Patañjali, who on P.I.1.46 has introduced the same verse with the remark 'Vakṣyatyatat'. In the M.Bh. on several occasions whenever the expression 'vaksyatat' is used to refer to the prose Vārtikas, they are generally assigned to Kātyāyana. 

Patañjali has also introduced the verses with 'ata uttaram paṭhati' that is applicable only to Kātyāyana's Vārtikas. Such remarks made in the M.Bh. with reference to the verified Vārtikas show that Patañjali indicated that such Kārikas belong to Kātyāyana.

Kaiyaṭa has remarked in connection with the Kārika on the M.Bh. on P.II.1.60, as "पुर्वोक्त पवार्य शार्मा संग्रहिते" (what has been said before is summed up in this Ārya verse) and in connection with the Kārika in

\[\text{M.Bh. on P.I.3.1.}\

| \begin{tabular}{l}
| कठ तत्रं पर्‌तिः - मुक्तीविनं काररोवं मुक्तिधर्य: \text{प्रणुप्ये} | \end{tabular} | \]
\[\text{M.Bh. on P.VI.4.3 and also see the M.Bh. VII.1.40 VIII.2.58.}\

\[\text{M.Bh. on P.VI.4.3 and also see the M.Bh. VII.1.40 VIII.2.58.}\

\[\text{M.Bh. on P.VI.4.3 and also see the M.Bh. VII.1.40 VIII.2.58.}\]
the M.Bh. on P.II.4.85, as "पण पवार्य आर्ध्या वर्णितः" (The same thing is shown in the आर्या verse). So also in connection with the कार्तिकेयa under P.V.2.48, Kāliyātā has made the remark (प्रबोधकार्य संभव लोकः) (Verses, which present the summary of the preceding discussion).

Although in his statements Kāliyātā has not distinctly mentioned the names of their authorship, yet as his commentary is a work on the M.Bh., it is likely that Kāliyātā by such words as 'सार्व्वज्ञविद्याः', 'दासिताः' etc. has referred to Patañjalī the author himself and hence the subject of the above mentioned verbs could be no other than Patañjalī, and then the expressions 'सार्व्वज्ञविद्याः' and 'दासिताः' would be equivalent to 'Patañjalina सार्व्वज्ञविद्याः or दासिताः'. This view is further strengthened by the fact that such कार्तिक्यs have generally presented the summary of Patañjalī's discussions.

1 Cf. अवयार्थम् नस्ता केतुं बिन्ध चिन्तकम् न प्रकर्षेत।
     अव वेदांकिलिक्वक्ष्या कार्येऽन्त्य प्रकर्षितकेषां ि।

M.Bh. on P.II.1.60, and also see

कार्तिक्यस्त: केत्रे यथा दासितम् प्रकर्षेन;
     सम्मान्तेन नायाबोधिता चिन्त्य: स्वानं स्थानन्तरस्त:;
     बालाकर्ताको व्यवस्था अय पयः सवन्य स्वैस्यांच।
     देवस्य च परस्परां भूलेष्यो तर्कम् हंसे सन्यु।

M.Bh. on P.II.485, etc.
On the other hand, sometimes, Kaiyata has used the word slokāvārtikakāra to refer to the author of the versified Vārtikas. Nāgėsa Bhaṭṭa has commented on Kaiyata’s view that Vārtikakāra is Kātyāyana and slokāvārtikakāra is here different from him. It becomes evident from the statements made above that Kaiyata has maintained that Kārikās in the M.Bh. belong to Kātyāyana, Patañjali as well as other writers too.

The study of the Uddyota shows that probably at the time of Nāgėsa Bhaṭṭa the traditional information about the authorship of the Kārikās had become obscure, or faint. For example, under the M.Bh. on P.VI.4.36, Patañjali has made a remark while introducing a Kārikā, which runs as “पुष्प एणार्थः” on which Nāgėsa Bhaṭṭa has stated “ननेन निबध्द हति श्वः, मना निबध्दो हति वा” It is clear from the above statement that Nāgėsa Bhaṭṭa is not definite whether this particular Kārikā belongs to Patañjali himself or another. On a few occasions he has specifically named the author

1 वार्तिककारोबद्धं प्रशोभेनुरु प्रत्यात्मालेदु स्योक्तार्थकारकं प्रयोगाक्षेपः।
Pradīpa on the M.Bh. on P.VI.4.22.

वार्तिककारः कार्त्त्यायनः स्योक्तार्थकारकस्त्यस्य पूषः।
Uddyota thereon.
of the Kārikās. Under the M. B. on P. IV. 1. 78, he has remarked about some verses that they definitely belong to the Bhāsyakāra, and not to the Vārtikakāra. This remark also suggests that Nāgęśa Bhāṭṭa holds the view that some Kārikās in the M. B. belong to the Vārtikakāra also. This conjecture gets further support from his own statements on several occasions wherever he has used the simple term Vārtika to refer to the versified Vārtikas. A comparison of this statement with the statement made by Nāgęśa Bhāṭṭa in the Uddyota under P. VI. 4. 22, viz. that the Vārtikakāra is Kātyāyana and

1) यत् श्लोकः पाण्डवम् पव न वार्तिकः: संप्रदायिकः

Uddyota on the M. B. on P. IV. 1. 78 and also see

परं च श्लोकः: कस्यचित्यास्त्येति बोधवः

Uddyota on M. B. on P. V. 2. 94.

2) See the term Vārtika, is used in the Uddyota on the following sutras:–

प्रकृत्वार्तिकप्रयोजनानां
on P. IV. 3. 60

तदनेकार्य वार्तिकेऽप्रयोजन्य स्वपन्नानां महत्येऽ
on P. VI. 3. 56

वार्तिकेऽयत्तीति नित्यायसंविषयं भवे सह

प्रकृत्वार्तिकप्रयोजनानां
on P. VI. 4. 13

“स्वपन्नानां समाप्तिः “ इत्येष

प्रकृत्वार्तिकप्रयोजनानां
on P. IV. 3. 60 etc.
ślokaśrītikākāra is another person, obviously proves that whenever, Nāgēśa Bhāṭṭa has used the term Vārtika to refer to the statement of the M.Bh. whether it be in prose or in verse, he means to say that the Vārtikas, so referred to, belong to no other person than Kātyāyana.

Prof. Goldstücker has tried to find out the authorship of the Kārikās in the M.Bh. For this purpose, he has classified the Kārikās on the basis of Patañjali’s remarks and comments. His conclusion about the authorship is as follows: „Where the authorship of another or ślokaśrītikākāra is distinctly mentioned by Patañjali or Kālayaṭa, the Kārikās to which this remark applies, are neither Patañjali’s nor Kātyāyana’s. When the Kārikās are part of the arguments of the Bhāṣya itself, it seems certain, as in the case of the analogous Kārikās without comment, that their author is Patañjali; but when they have entirely the character of Vārtikas, they are undoubtedly the composition of Kātyāyana.“ He has stated further that his conclusion is based on the view of Kālayaṭa and Nāgēśa Bhāṭṭa. He rightly observes that later grammarians consider both Kātyāyana and

1 Prof. Goldstücker - Pāṇini - His place in Sanskrit Literature, p. 78.
Patanjali to be the authors of some of the Kārikās in the M.Bh. But the general conclusion of the Professor, that all such Kārikās, which have entirely the character of Vārtikas, belong to Kātyāyana, is not fully acceptable. There are some Kārikās in the M.Bh., which have the character of Vārtikas, i.e. they modify the sutras of Pāṇini by improving the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana and their authorship is not distinctly mentioned either by Patanjali or by Kātyā. It is evident that such Kārikās are written after the Vārtikas and they therefore cannot be assigned to Kātyāyana.

Dr. Kielhorn, on the other hand, thinks that the Kārikās in the M.Bh. belong to grammarians other than Kātyāyana and Patanjali. He holds that the Kārikās have been borrowed or quoted by Patanjali from some other ancient works on grammar. Although he admits that both Kātyā and Nāgasa Bhaṭṭa and even Haradatta the commentator on the Kāśikāvṛtti, consider Kātyāyana as the author not only of the prose Vārtikas, but also of some of the Vārtikas in verse and although he is also acquainted with the view of the commentators, who

1 Cf. the M.Bh. III.1, 22, V.2.115, VII.4.48.
assigned some Kārikās to Patañjali himself, yet he remarks as follows:— "My opinion of the verses, which have been explained in the M.Bh., is that they do not belong to Kātyāyana at all ... excepting perhaps the so-called Saṁgraha-ślokas or summary verses, there is really no valid reason, why any of the verses in the M.Bh. should have been composed either by Kātyāyana or by Patañjali. ... But it may appear doubtful, if even the so-called summary should be assigned to Patañjali. To me, it seems at least possible that the commentators may have misunderstood the nature of the verse."

Dr. Kielhorn has rightly observed, in arriving at the above conclusion, that it is an essential condition of a work, which is written partly in prose and partly in verse, that the former should not contradict the latter. He finds that in the M.Bh. sometimes there is a contradiction between the prose Vārtikas and the Vārtikas in verse, the latter contradict the former. He, therefore, comes to the conclusion that the verses do not belong to Kātyāyana at all. The following are some of the examples mentioned by Dr. Kielhorn, to show the contradiction between the prose Vārtikas and the Vārtikas in verse:

1 I.A. Vol. XV, pp. 332,333.
1. The Kārikās in the M.Bh. on P.VI.4.74 which show that the sūtra of Pāṇini VI.4.72 is superfluous, contradict the prose Vārtika on Pāṇini I.1.21 and VI.1.95.

2. The prose Vārtika on P.V.1.57, 58 teaches the form pañcadaśa, with the suffix 'da' and the same form is taught in a Vārtika in verse on P.V.2.37 by means of the suffix 'daḥ'.

3. The form 'madhyamīya' is derived according to the prose Vārtika, on P.IV.2.136 with the suffix 'oḥ' and the same form is taught by a ślokavārtika with the suffix 'miya' on P.IV.3.60.

The contradictions stated by Dr. Kielhorn in the above examples are however, only apparent. A critical study of the Pradīpa of Kaiyata is sufficient to show that there is no contradiction between the prose Vārtika and the Vārtika in verse. In regard to the first example, Kaiyata on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.21 states that the purpose of the sūtra stated in the prose Vārtika is according to the sūtrapatha, and not in accordance with the

\[1\] "अश्ववादत्वे" (Vārt. 10) "अश्ववादत्वे प्रयोजनम्" M.Bh. on P.I.1.21.

शुचिप्राप्ति प्रयोजनोपयात्, पारिक्षारस्तु अश्ववोनान्तर् सिद्धस्मित्वाह।

Pradīpa thereon.
Vārtikakāra, because Vārtikakāra has refuted the sūtra VI.4.72. Again with regard to the M. Bh. on P. VI.4.74, Kaiyata says that the Vārtika "स्योमांग्राहः प्रतिपेधः" was read on P. VI.1.95 to prohibit 'pararūpa' in the example "अौक्षेपकः अौडोकः" etc., but when the Vārtikakāra reads the Vārtika in verse as "परारूपं उष्णनाटः" etc. on P. VI.4.74 then the former Vārtika does not appear necessary. With regard to the second example Kaiyata states in his commentary on the Bhāṣya on P. V.2.37 that the form 'pañcadasā' is taught with the suffix 'da' so that, in the feminine gender the suffix 'tūp' should be added to it. The same form 'pañcadasā' is taught by

1

श्रोतकारोपत्, श्रोदीपत्, श्रोतापत्, इत्यवं नधिं वापिल्वा परत्वाद् "अौमालोमभ, इत्यवांताल" हैं परारूपं प्राप्तिस्यति, तत्त्व प्रतिलेखे वत्तवं इत्यकान, यद्व परारूपाय: "नातः" इत्यक्ते तत्त्वालोमाङ्ग्राहः परारूपप्रतिलेखे व वक्तव्य हैं उस्मेत् मण्डित न हृ गौरवसंहुः।

Pradipa on the M. Bh. on P. VI.4.74.

2

"तत्त्वो प्रतिपाद भव्यायः सातृ:" -- इत्यवः स्ट्रोते श्रविष्य: पुनःवा भव्यायः स्ट्रोतेन श्रविष्य: श्रविष्य: पुनः प्राप्तिस्य तत्त्वमात्राय: श्रविष्य: प्राप्तिस्य:। श्रविष्य: पुनः प्राप्तिस्य भव्यायः स्ट्रोतेन। स्ट्रोतदेश्वर्याय: श्रविष्य: प्राप्तिस्य:।

Pradipa on the M. Bh. on P. V.2.37.
means of the suffix 'da' in a verse on P.V.2.37, in order to derive the form 'pañcadasťātrihi' in the feminine gender by adding the suffix 'ā']p as caused by the mute letter 't'.

In regard to the third example, again Kaiyāta has written that the form madhyamīya, is taught by the prose Vārtika on P.IV.2.138 with the suffix 'cha' added to the stem madhya, but the suffix, cha, would be added to the stem madhya only when it denotes the sense of 'पुर्विकालिक' (the middle of the earth) and the same form is taught in the versified Vārtika with the suffix, mīya, in order to derive the form madhyamīya when the stem madhya denotes other senses than 'पुर्विकालिकाभाग'.

Thus it is clear that Kaiyāta has not only removed the contradiction between the prose Vārtika and the

Pradīpa on the M. Bh. on P.IV.3.60.
Vārtikas in verse, but he has also proved the purpose of the suffixes taught in both viz. in prose Vārtika and in verse. The method which Kaiyaṭa has adopted in harmonizing the prose Vārtikas and the Vārtikas in verse, in the examples stated above clearly shows that he holds the view that these verses and prose Vārtikas belong to the same author i.e. Kātyāyana.

It is worth noting that Dr. Kielhorn in an article in I.A. has tried to prove that neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali is the author of a single verse in the M.Bh. But the Doctor in his essay 'Kātyāyana and Patañjali' has stated as follows:— "And since the same Patañjali, after having on P.III.2.118, in his usual manner paraphrased a sentence, has in the sequel informed us that that sentence is Kātyāyana's, it is equally clear that the name of the Vārtikakāra was Kātyāyana." In the M.Bh. on P.III.2.118 the word Kātyāyana occurs only in a verse and the same verse assigned the paraphrased sentence to Kātyāyana. It shows that Dr. Kielhorn has admitted that that verse belongs to Patañjali. It

1 Indian Antiq. Vol. XV, p. 229.
may be stated here that at the time of Kātyāyana and Patanjali, it was the custom that a writer, while composing his work mainly in prose, wrote occasionally a few verses therein. There is evidence in the M.Bh. to show that in the school of Bharadvāja, the Vārtikas were written both in prose and in verse. Patanjali has quoted a few Vārtikas in the M.Bh. under the name of Bhāradvājīyaḥ, among which one Vārtika is in Verse. Similarly, it is quite possible that Kātyāyana also may have written some of his Vārtikas in verse. Similar is the case with Patanjali. Moreover, there is no other strong evidence in determining the authorship of the literary works embodied in the M.Bh. than traditional information given by the commentators. The long continuing tradition assigns all the four thousand and odd prose Vārtikas to Kātyāyana. Similarly, as observed above, there is sufficient proof to determine that some Kārikās belong to Kātyāyana, others to Patanjali and still a few others to other grammarians. Not only Kaiyata and Nāgasa Bhatta hold such a view but

1 शार्क्षानीय (शार्क) - 'अल्पवर्णपदवोऽधूम बागमो रूप विके करि।

M.Bh. on P.VI.4.47.
It is difficult or rather impossible to find out the general principles, which would be applicable in every case without exception for determining the authorship of the Kārikās in the M.Bh. yet the following principles are applicable in a majority of cases:

The Kārikās, whose authorship is mentioned either by Patañjali or by the commentators, definitely belong to those authors named by them. The Kārikās, which present the summary of Patañjali's discussion, or form a part of his discussion or improve the sūtras of Pāṇini by improving the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana, belong to Patañjali. The Kārikās, which improve or explain the sūtras of Pāṇini and have been commented upon by Patañjali in his usual manner, belong to Kātyāyana.

Bhattoji Dikṣita in P.M. on P.1.4.52 and Bhairava Miśra in his commentary thereon; and also, Vaidyanātha Pāyagunde in his commentary thereon.
THE İSTİS OF PATAŅJALI

The word isti is traditionally applied to those statements found in the M.Bh., which are believed to be Patanjali's own additions to the work of his predecessors viz. the Vārtikas of the several Vārtikakāras. The name isti applied to them is significant in as much as they lay down something, which is necessary and desirable, but which is not given by either the sūtrakāra or by the Vārtikakāras. It is quite reasonable to think that the name isti is given to the independent statements of Patanjali in order to differentiate them from the sūtras of Pāṇini and the Vārtikas of the different Vārtikakāras. Although the word isti occurs

1 "इष्टव्यो भाव्यकारस्य"

See the introduction of Padacandrikāvṛtti and quoted by Goldstücker - Pāṇini, p. 70 in the footnote 101.

2 It may be noted here that Dr. Boehltingk, in the edition of Pāṇini, has rendered the word isti by Kārikā and has tried to justify his version in the following note (Vol. II, p. XXXVII). "I take as a dvandva and as synonymous with Kārikā, because I should not like to miss these (Kārikās) on the title." But the study of the Pradīpa and the Uddyota clearly shows that the view of Dr. Boehltingk goes against the traditional interpretation of the term, since Kaiyāṭa has applied the term isti to refer to the Vārtikas which are in prose in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.1 and I.1.68 and Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa has expressly said thereon that they belong to Patanjali.
in the M.Bh. at several places, it is not used in the restricted sense of Patañjali's statements correcting the sūtras or the Vārtikas. In the M.Bh. on P.II.4.56 the word is used in the sense of a desired word as different from a word, which could be derived by the sūtras and the Vārtikas. In this connection Patañjali has given an imaginary dialogue between a grammarian and a charioteer. The former used the word pravetā, which of course is correct according to P.II.4.56 and the latter corrected it by substituting the word prajitā. The grammarian replied that the word prajitā was not correct (apaśābda). In answer, the charioteer pointed out that the grammarian knew only the correctness of a word according to the sūtras but not according to that which is desired. Hence probably the word isti, later on, was commonly applied to the independent statements of Patañjali, since they taught a desired thing.

1 फिं तहि! कृष्टिरिथ्य पाणिता। समानाभिकरणसमासात् बहुआय्नी हिरिित: क्वार्तिकि कम्यायरः सर्वव्यायः।
M.Bh. on P.II.1.69.

2 एवं हि कृष्टिम् कैयाकरण आह - कोशस्य रचस्य प्रवेदेति? सूत आह - 'असुश्रुष्म वह' प्राष्टिती। कैयाकरण आह - अपवक्ख्य हिित। प्राप्तिसत्तै वैयानां प्रियो नास्नासिष्टथा इष्टत् प्रतं - दूरायतित।
M.Bh. on P.II.4.56.
The name ṭiṣṭi given to the statements of Patañjali can be traced back at least to the time of the Kāśiṅa, as in the benedictory verse of that work, the authors claim that their work contains statements called by the names ṭiṣṭi and upasaṅkhyaṇa. So also by the use of the two different terms ṭiṣṭi and upasaṅkhyaṇa, the authors of the Kāśiṅa indicate that the ṭiṣṭis are different from the upasaṅkhyaṇas, although similar to them. The study of the Pradīpa of Kālyaṭa and the Uddyota of Nāgeśa sufficiently supports the view mentioned above. For example, on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.1 Kālyaṭa introduces a statement of the M.Bh. as an ṭiṣṭi while Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa explains it that it belongs to Patañjali.

1. ṭiṣṭu-paṁsāntvam kṣāntaṁ uṇāyāṇaḥ āniyaṁ
   ṭiṣṭu-paṁsāntaḥ pūpaiṇṇāṁ kṣāntiram kāśiṅam

   śrūya-saṅgahāṁ loke bheṣa gṛhaṇe tajjapalāpaṁ tajjapalāpaṁ, tēn vāyavāyādīnaṁ paṁ ca bhāhāṁ bhavaṁ.

   Haradatta - Padamaṇjari thereon.

2. "ṭhā-ṛoḵuḥ sūrgaṇaṁ vivaṁśaṁ" M.Bh. on P.I.1.1
   "ṭhā-ṛoḵuḥ sūrgaṇaṁ vivaṁśaṁ" Pradīpa thereon and

   ṭhā-ṛoḵuḥ - ṭhā-ṛoḵuḥ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśaṁ ca vivaṁśa \n
   Uddyota.
It should be noted here that while composing the M.Bh. on Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī and the Vārtikās of the different Vārtikakāras, Patañjali does not rest satisfied with merely commenting on them. He examines the sūtras and the Vārtikas written thereon and whenever he finds that the purpose of the sūtras and the Vārtikas can be served in other suitable devices as Yogavibhāga, Jñāpaka etc. he adopts them and shows that the particular sūtra or the Vārtika is not necessary. Whenever he slightly differs from the Vārtikakāra, he corrects that Vārtika or rejects it or makes additions to it. In statements, which came to be termed īṣṭi, Patañjali gives his own independent rules especially at such places, where he finds that his predecessors' rules are not sufficient to meet the growing need of the Sanskrit language or grammatical ideas at his time. As stated above, Sanskrit was a spoken language at the time of three Munis (Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali) and according to the usual processes of a spoken language, certain new words had gained currency and others had become obsolete. Each of the three sages took for his study the whole field of the Sanskrit language of his time and laid down some independent rules with a view to bringing the sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī upto-date.

It is also clear from the study of the M.Bh. that the development of the Sanskrit language was very rapid.
between the time of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. Therefore Kātyāyana had to explain a good many forms, which were not taught by Pāṇini. This process of the development of the Sanskrit language appears to be rather slow between the time of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, as Patañjali has made an addition of comparatively very few words. Probably at the time of Patañjali, Sanskrit language was fast losing its popularity due to the growth and influence of provincial dialects. Patañjali has stated that correct words are smaller in number than corrupt ones, since for every correct word, there are many corrupt forms, for example, gāvī, goṇī, gotā, gorō̄tā, gorō̄tikā etc. are the corrupt forms of one single correct word go.

CRITERIA FOR RECOGNIZING THE IŚTIS OF PATAÑJALI

There appears to be no specific feature, which distinguishes the iśtis of Patañjali, from the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana. Both of them are recorded in the M.Bh. itself. As the object and the nature of the statements of both the grammarians are the same, it is very difficult
or rather impossible to distinguish the statements of one from those of the other. A critical reading of the M.Bh. however, shows that Patanjali has adopted a special method of explaining and commenting upon the statements of the Vārtikas. This method differs from the method adopted by him in making his own statements. He has tried to avoid the repetition of the statements or parts of them at the time of explaining his own statements. A few examples of the ēśtis from the M.Bh. are sufficient to illustrate the remark made above. They are as follows:

1. "इन्योक्तं सुस्त्राणि मन्नति" M.Bh. on P.I.1.1. Not commented upon. Kaiyāṭa states thereon that it is an ēšṭi.

2. "अत्यौक्त्यो पर्यायवक्त्येवव्यँते" M.Bh. on P.I.1.68. Not commented upon. The same remark is made by Kaiyāṭa thereon too.

3. "पर्यायव्यँत्य विहार भीष्ट्यति द्वितीय वक्तव्यः" M.Bh. on P.IV.2.129. Not commented upon.

Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita in his S.K. writes that "सर्वनाम्ने इत्यित्वेषे दुःकुलशः" is the Bhāṣyēṣṭi. See S.K. on P.VI.3.35.
These statements in the M.Bh. are not explained by a repetition of their words. Kaiyata remarks that the first two statements are istis and about the sixth he states that the view is held by Patanjali. The third improves Panini's sutra IV.2.129. The fourth and the fifth improve the Vartikas of Katyayana on P.VI.4.84 and III.1.138 respectively. The method adopted by Patanjali in explaining them clearly proves that these statements belong to himself (Patanjali).

Dr. Kielhorn considers that all such statements in the M.Bh., as contained at their end itivaktavyam,

Turning to incidental notices, we find that in a note on page 29, Prof. Goldstücker speaks of the usual addition of Katyayana iti Vartikam. In reality this phrase appears to be entirely foreign to the style of Katyayana and occurs either in the original remarks of Patanjali or in the explanations given by him of Katyayana's Vartikas.

Dr. Kielhorn - Katyayana and Patanjali, p. 5.
or Vaktavyam do not belong to Katyayana, since such a phrase is foreign to the style of Katyayana and occurs either in the original remarks of Patanjali or in the explanations given by him of Katyayana’s Vartikas. This view gets further support from the method adopted by Patanjali in his explanation, in which he has also avoided the repetition by the same words. It proves that such Vartikas belong to Patanjali himself.

(1) ‘सेवकत्त्वातु कृष्णभेदित वक्तव्यम्’
M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.

(2) ‘अपरीक्ष वक्तव्यम्’
M.Bh. on P.I.1.36

(3) ‘अपरानियान्वित वक्तव्यम्’
M.Bh. on P.I.1.57.

(4) ‘बल्लानन्दक्षेत्र नानागतेनेनेति वक्तव्यम्’
M.Bh. on P.I.1.72 etc.

It should be noted in this connection that there is an unavoidable difficulty that some statements in the M.Bh., which contain at their end iti Vaktavyam or Vaktavyam are mentioned as original remarks of Patanjali according to some editions of the M.Bh. and the same statements are taken as explanations of the Vartikas in other editions. For example:-
These and some other statements are given as original remarks of Patanjali in the edition of Dr. Kielhorn, while in the Bombay Nirñayasāgara edition of the M.Bh. these are given as the explanation of the following Vārtikas respectively:

1. "वर्णांस्व इति वस्तुचित्रम्"
   M.Bh. on P.II.4.3.

2. "वस्तुचित्रं वर्णं इति चाचित्रम्"
   M.Bh. on IV.1.20.

3. "ग्रंथाकालस्तूर्तं चैति वस्तुचित्रम्"
   M.Bh. on P.V.2.43, etc.

Similarly according to the Nirñayasāgara edition of the M.Bh. all statements, which contain the word siddhā at the end are given as Bhāṣya Vārtikas. For example:

1. "किंस्यं वाताग्रामाति वेदे-नर्तक-चारावत सिद्धम्"
   M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.

2. "मुख्यवैमति बेलोगार्यमागाव सिद्धम्"
   M.Bh. on P.I.1.3.
Thus in the Nirṇayasaṅgara edition of the M.Bh. in the first Pāda of the first Adhyāya alone, 152 Vārtikas are marked as Bhāṣya Vārtikas. Dr. Kielhorn's edition however does not give them in that way.