

## CHAPTER I

### An Introduction to *Prātisākhya* Literature with Special Reference to *Vājasaneyi Prātisākhya*

Vedas are the earliest literary treatises of mankind, representing the earliest recorded form of speech. As these literary works represent one of the earliest form of languages these are of immense importance for the study of history and evolution of language and culture of the world. Although extensive studies have been carried out about the Vedas, these texts have enough materials in <sup>store</sup> for further studies. That makes them ever-relevant as a subject of study.

Mantras and Brāhmaṇas are the principal constituents of each of the Vedas.<sup>1</sup> While Saṁhitās are collections of Mantras and liturgies, Brāhmaṇas primarily contain explanations of the Saṁhitās i.e, they contain injunctions for the rituals and present discussions on various aspects of the rites which are by rule performed to the accompaniment of chanting of Mantras.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. a. *mantrabrāhmaṇayorvedanāmadheyam, Āpaṣṭamba paribhāṣāsūtra*, 1.33,

b. *mantrabrāhmaṇātmake sādārāśirvedaḥ, Śāyana in RBBh*, p.8 .

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *brāhmaṇam nāma karmaṇastanmantrāṇām ca vyākhyānagranthaḥ, Śāyanabhāṣya*  
on *TS*, 1.5.1.

From Purāṇic accounts one comes to know that at a certain point of time Mantrasamhitās of the *Veda* existed as a single whole. For the convenience of sacrificial rituals and easy comprehension of these texts<sup>for</sup> the people of limited intellect, sage Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana Vyāsa, made four divisions of the Veda.<sup>3</sup> The four divisions became four separate Samhitās, viz., *R̥k*, *Sāma*, *Yajus* and *Atharva*.<sup>4</sup> Vyāsa entrusted the responsibility of teaching and expanding the knowledge of respective Vedasamhitās to his four disciples. Paila was entrusted with the responsibility of *R̥gveda*, Jaimini with the *Sāmaveda*, Vaisāmpāyana with the *Yajurveda* and finally Sumantu with the *Atharvaveda*.<sup>5</sup> The above-stated four sages taught the Samhitās to their respective students and these students again taught their own disciples and others. For centuries such a teaching learning process continued completely on oral basis. In the process, Vedic knowledge expanded in a large scale and with the expansion certain deviations occurred in relation to the arrangement of Mantras and their appropriate pronunciation. Certain groups followed particular schemes of arrangement and mode of pronunciation of Mantras.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *asminnāpyantare brahmanbhagavāḥ lokabhāvanah|*

*paraśarātsatyavatyāmānsāsakalayā vibhuh|*

*avatīrṇo mahābhāgo vedam cakre caturvidham|, BhP, 12.6.48-49 .*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *rgatharvayajuḥsāmnām rāśinuddhṛtya vargasāh|*

*catasraḥsamhitāścakre mantrairmanigāṇā iva ||, BP, 12.6.50 .*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *tatrargvedadharah pailah sāmagō jaiminiḥ kaviḥ|*

*vaisāmpāyana evaiko niṣṇāto yajuṣāmuta |*

*atharvāṅgirasāmāsīt sumanturdārūno muniḥ||, BP, 1.4.21 .*

These led to the development of the various Vedic schools called Śākhās.<sup>6</sup> Patanjali, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya* knew twenty one Śākhās of the *Ṛgveda*, one thousand Śākhās of the *Sāmaveda*, one hundred Śākhās of the *Yajurveda* and nine Śākhās of the *Atharvaveda*.<sup>7</sup>

### Importance of *Yajurveda*

From the ritualistic point of view, *Yajurveda* comes next to the *Ṛgveda* in importance. From literary perspective also *Ṛgveda* owes greater appreciation and attention and that is why the other Vedic Samhitās very often borrow and quote Mantras belonging to the *Ṛgveda* for various ritualistic purposes. However, so far as performances of sacrificial rituals are concerned, *Yajurveda* becomes prominent. The importance of *Yajurveda* is acknowledged by the *Ṛgveda* itself.<sup>8</sup> Vedic religion has become significant due to the sacrificial rituals and the *Yajurveda* deals with the bulk of the rituals. Thus, Sāyanācārya says: *yajurvede niṣpannam yajñasārīramupajīvyā tadapekṣitau stotra śāstrarupau avayavau itareṇa vedadvayena puryete*.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *ta eva ṛṣayo vedāṁ svām svām vyasyannanekadhā | śiṣyair praśiṣyaistat śiṣyair vedāste śākhino bhavan ||*, *BhP*, I.4.23 .

<sup>7</sup> *Cf. ekaviṁśatidhā bāhyṛcyam/ sahasravartmā sāmaveda | ekaśatam adhvaryuśākhā navadhā ātharvaṇaḥ ||*, *MBh*, *Paspasahnika*

<sup>8</sup> *Cf. ṛcam tvah poṣamāste pupusvān/ gāyatram tvo gāyati śakvarīsu | brahmā tvo vadati jātavidyām / yajñasya mātrām vimīmita u tvah ||*, *RV*, X.71.11 .

<sup>9</sup> *RBBh*, p.7 .

According to Yāska, the term *yajus* is derived from the root *yaj* denoting performing rituals.<sup>10</sup> Following this view of Yāska, Verma adds that *yajus* are the Mantras, which are used in worshiping deities and offering oblations.<sup>11</sup> Hence, from the spiritual point of view of Vedic religion *Yajurveda* enjoys prominence.

### **Different schools of *Yajurveda***

As per ancient Indian tradition, just like the other Vedas, *Yajurveda* also sprung from *Brahmā*, the first propounder of the Vedas. From *Brahmā* through generations of scholars and through Kṛṣṇadvaipayana Vyāsa, knowledge of *yajus* was attained by Vaiśampāyana. The Yajurvedic school, expanded by the followers of Vaiśampāyana is known as *Brāhma* school and is represented by the *Taittirīya* or the Black *Yajurveda*.

The other school of the *Yajurveda* is the *Āditya* School, represented by the *Sūkla Yajurveda* or the White *Yajurveda*. From the Purāṇic accounts, one comes to know that Yājñavalkya, a disciple of Vaiśampāyana, for certain reasons had to return, whatever he learned from Vaiśampāyana. By the grace of the Sun god (Viṣṇu in disguise), Yājñavalkya attained the knowledge of *yajus* from the god in the guise of a *Vāji* (horse). Hence, this *Veda* came to be known as *Vājasaneyi* otherwise called *Sūkla* or White *Yajurveda*<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *yajuryajateḥ*, *Nir*, 7.12 .

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Introduction on VP*, p.3 .

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *evam stutaḥ sa bhagavān vājirūpadharo hariḥ* .

Scholars say that the *Taittirīya saṁhitā* is called *kṛṣṇa* or Black *Yajurveda*, because of absence of a clear division of *mantra* and *brāhmaṇa* texts contained in it and due to unsystematic arrangement of duties of the priests belonging to the *Yajurveda* and *Ṛgveda*.

On the other hand, in the *Śukla Yajurveda*, there is a clear division of Mantras and Brāhmaṇas. It is a collection of verses only and hence it is named *Śukla*.

### **Different branches of white *Yajurveda*:**

*Bhāgavata purāṇa* mentions fifteen Śākhās of the white *Yajurveda*, which Yājñavalkya himself taught to his fifteen disciples. With the passage of time, the fifteen Śākhās were named after the disciples of Yājñavalkya. The names of the Śākhās of the White *Yajurveda* are-

1. Kāṇva, 2. Mādhyandina, 3. Sāpeya, 4. Tāpāyanīya, 5. Kāpāla,
6. Paundra vatsa, 7. Āvatika, 8. Paramāvatika, 9. Pārāsārya, 10. Vaidheya,
11. Vaineya, 12. Audheya, 13. Gālabā, 14. Baijabā, 15. Kātyāyanīya.

Out of these fifteen Śākhās only the Saṁhitās belonging to *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyandina śākhā* are extant at present. *Kāṇva Śākhā* is that recension of white *Yajurveda*, which is followed and expanded by the followers of *Kāṇva*, the first disciple of Yājñavalka. This recension contains 40 chapters, 328 Anuvākas and 2086 Mantras.

---

*yajumsyayātayāmāni munaye 'dāt prasāditaḥ*||, *BhP*, XII-6.73 .

The recension of the *Yajurveda*, disseminated by sage Mādhyandina is known as *Mādhyandina Śākhā*. This *śākhā* also contains 40 chapters but 303 Anuvākas and 1975 Mantras. Thus, it has a lesser number of Mantras than that of the *Kāṇva* recension. The celebrated commentators Uvaṭa and Mahīdāra prepared commentaries on the *Mādhyandina* recension of the White *Yajurveda*.

### The Prātiśākhya:

The Prātiśākhya primarily denote a range of literary works associated with particular Śākhās of the Vedas. Anantabhaṭṭa, while commenting on the first *sūtra* of the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* says:

*śākhāyām śākhāyām prati pratisākhāṃ|*

*pratisākhāṃ bhavam iti prātiśākhyaṃ||*

Following the Pāṇinian *sūtra*: *avyayībhāvācca*<sup>13</sup>, the suffix *ñya* is added to the word *pratisākhā* and the word *prātiśākhya* is formed. Again, following the Pāṇinian *sūtra*: *śākhādibhyo yat*<sup>14</sup>, the suffix *yat* is added to the stem *śākhā* in the same sense. That makes the word *śākhya* and *śākhyaṃ śākhyaṃ prati prātiśākhyaṃ* and following the *sūtra*: *adhikṛtya kṛtegranthe*<sup>15</sup> suffix *aṅ* is added to the word *prātiśākhya* and ultimately the word *prātiśākhya* is formed.

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Aṣṭ*, 4.3.59.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, 5.3.103.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Ibid*, 4.3.87.

With the expansion of Vedic knowledge at a large scale and in a wider geographical range, scholars started apprehending adulterations of the sacred texts caused by incomprehensive and limited knowledge of a large section of readers which might lead to further application of Mantras corrupt with reading in sacrificial rituals. In order to prevent this apprehended problem, scholars composed the six Vedāṅgas and Upāṅgas of the Vedas to keep the Vedic texts free from corrupt readings, easy comprehension of holy texts and appropriate performance of sacrificial rituals. The Prātiśākhya, also called Pārṣadas are considered as Upāṅgas and are associated with the Śikṣā Vedāṅga. The use of the term *pārṣada* for three texts is found in Yāska's Nirukta.<sup>16</sup> There are enough grounds to think that the word *pārṣada* or *pāriṣada* are synonyms and may have been derived respectively from *parṣad* and *pariṣad* (council of scholars). Viṣṇumitra in the introductory verses of his *Vargadvayavṛtti* on *R̥gvedaprātiśākhya*, has referred to his father as the most knowledgeable person in the *Pāriṣada* i.e., the *Prātiśākhya* text.<sup>17</sup> Durgācārya also makes reference to Pārṣadas i.e., councils of scholars, where phonetic and grammatical discourses used to take place which paved the ways of Prātiśākhya.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Nir*, 1.17.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *sa bai pāriṣade śreṣṭhaḥ*, *Vargadvayavṛtti*, v.6 .

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *svacaraṇa parṣadyeva yaiḥ pratiśākhāniyatameva* .

*padāvagrahapragrhyakramasamhitāsvara- lakṣaṇamucyate tanīmani prātiśākhāni*,  
*Durgabhāṣya* on *Nir*, 1.17.

Though the Prātiśākhya are said to be the Upāṅgas of the Śikṣā texts, yet these texts are in no way of lesser importance than the Śikṣās. Rather, in the gravity of their contents and volume Prātiśākhya enjoy a higher status and that makes one think that the prefix *upa* in the word *upāṅga* is used in the sense of superiority, following the Pāṇinian *sūtra upo'dhike ca*.<sup>19</sup> However, *R̥gveda Prātiśākhya* claims that the Prātiśākhya, which represent the science of phonemes are comprehensive Vedāṅgas.<sup>20</sup>

As associates of Śikṣā Vedāṅga, the Prātiśākhya too deal with the subjects of śikṣā. The scope of śikṣā, as told by Sāyana is- alphabets, accent and mode of pronunciation of letters.<sup>21</sup>

The Sūtras: (a). *varṇadoṣa vivekārtham*, (b). *tiṅkṛttaddhitacatuṣṭayasamāsāḥ śābdamayam* and (c). *atha śikṣā vihitā*, found in the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* prove that the scope of the treatise is phonetics and grammar.<sup>22</sup> Uvāṭa also says that in comparison to other subjects, Prātiśākhya are superior, because these deal with both śikṣā and *vyākaraṇa* as well.<sup>23</sup> In his introduction to the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya*, Rangacarya observes that though śikṣā and *vyākaraṇa* are the subjects of

<sup>19</sup> *Ast*, 1.4.87.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *kṛtsnam ca vedāṅgamānindyamārṣam*, *RP*, 14.69.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *varṇasvarādyuccāraṇaprakāro yatropadisīyate sā śikṣā*, *RBBh*, p.98.

<sup>22</sup> *VP*, 1.26; 27 & 29.

<sup>23</sup> *vṛddhamidam śāstramanyāni śāstrānyapekṣya, śikṣāvihitam vyākaraṇavihitam cāsmiṅ . śāstre ubhayam yataḥ prakriyate*, *Uvāṭabhāṣya* on *VP*, 1.169.

Prātiśākhyas, still Prātiśākhyas are primarily concerned with grammar.<sup>24</sup> The scope of *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhyā* is even an extensive one. It includes prosody also. Thus in an introductory verse on the *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhyā*, Uvāṭa says-

*śikṣā cchanda vyākaraṇaiḥ sāmānyenokta lakṣaṇam|*  
*tadevamiha śākhāyāmiti śāstraprayojanam||*

The *Vargadvayavṛtti* of Viṣṇumitra on the *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhyā* gives a list of the topics which a reader of Vedas should know and those topics are thoroughly discussed in the Prātiśākhyas and there lies the significance of the study of Prātiśākhyas.<sup>25</sup> To state the importance of studying the Prātiśākhyas, Uvāṭa says that one cannot claim his right to recite holy scriptures unless he acquires the skill of recitation fully. For a fulfilling recitation of scriptures one should have the knowledge of respective Prātiśākhyas.<sup>26</sup>

### The Age of Prātiśākhyā:

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *asya śātrasya mūlabhutāni vyākaraṇāni pūrvasāstramityucyate| tasmin kalpo na vidhīyate/sākṣāt śikṣāyām tu vidhīyate/ vyākaraṇapradhānam hyetacchāstram,* Introduction on TP, p.3 .

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *gurutvaṁ laghutā sāmānyam hrasvadīrghaplutāni ca |*

*lopāgamavikārāśca prakṛtirvikramah kramah||*  
*svaritodāttanīcatvaṁ svāso nādastathobhayam|, Vargadvayavṛtti, vv.5-6 .*

<sup>26</sup> *japādau nādhikaro 'sti samyak pāṭhamajānataḥ|*

*prātiśākhāyamato jñeyam samyak pāṭhasya siddhaye||, Uvāṭabhāṣya on VP, 1.1 .*

The age of the Prātiśākhyā is very difficult to ascertain and as such Goldstucker remarks-“there is no work of Hindu antiquity which has caused more uncertainty, as respects the question of date, than these Prātiśākhyā works”.<sup>27</sup> Many oriental as well as foreign scholars tried to ascertain the dates of Prātiśākhyas.

The mention of Pārṣada<sup>28</sup> in the Nirukta of Yāska proves that the Prātiśākhyā existed before Yāska. By establishing a relative chronology of Yāska’s Nirukta and Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, the approximate age of the Prātiśākhyā texts can be ascertained.

Maxmuller considers the Prātiśākhyas as basically phonetical works and that Pāṇini borrowed phonetic topics from the Prātiśākhyas. In his words – “the Prātiśākhyas are never called Vyākaraṇas , grammars, and it only incidentally that they allude to strictly grammatical questions. The perfect phonetic system on which Pāṇini’s grammar is built is no doubt taken from the Prātiśākhyas.”<sup>29</sup> Thus, according to him Prātiśākhyas preceded Pāṇini. Roth too considers the Prātiśākhyas as pre-Pāṇinian. Goldstucker has also stated that the Prātiśākhyas are pre-Pāṇinian. He has further stated that some of the Pāṇinian rules are borrowed immediately

---

<sup>27</sup> Goldstucker ,Theodor. *Pāṇini-His Place In Sanskrit Literature*, Chowkhamba, Varanasi, 2005, p.202 .

<sup>28</sup> *padapraṅgīni sarvacaraṇānām pārṣadāni*, Nir, 1.17 .

<sup>29</sup> Goldstucker, *loc. cit.*

from the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*<sup>30</sup>. Some scholars however try to identify Kātyāyana, the author of *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* with Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vārttikas*. If that is considered to be correct then at least the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* has to be considered as post-Pāṇinian. Unlike the pāṇinian system the treatment of *visarjanīya* as a distinct phoneme and thorough discussion of *visarjanīya sandhi* in the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* proves that it is as old as other *Prātiśākhyas*. Moreover a person who has worked on a perfect *sūtra* work like that of Pāṇini' Aṣṭādhyāyī, cannot just simply produce a *sūtra* work like *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*, which lacks in economy so far as the use of words are concerned. But mere identical names cannot prove the identity of a person.

### **The *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*:**

The *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*, as the name indicates, belongs to the *Vājasaneyi Saṁhitā* or the White *Yajurveda*. It is the only extant *Prātiśākhya* of the white *Yajurveda*, hence it is considered as the representative work of not only the *Mādhyandina Śākhā* of white *Yajurveda*, but also of all the fifteen *Śākhās* of white *Yajurveda* stated above.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. but in our present case I should myself indeed, rather ( in der tat eher) prefer deciding for Panini's having borrowed (them) immediately (from the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*), on account of great speciality of some of these rules, *Ibid*, p.205.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Anantabhaṭṭa on *VP*, 1.1 .

The work is written in *sūtra* style with few exceptions and is divided into eight chapters. Total number of *sūtra* is seven hundred and thirty-four. This *Prātiśākhya* lays the rules for the proper pronunciation of the white Yajurvedic language. The various topics dealt with in it have been presented in a scattered way. For example the rules of accentuation are found in the first, second, fourth and the sixth chapter. The definitions of accents, like *uccairudāttaḥ*<sup>32</sup>, *nīcairanudāttaḥ*<sup>33</sup> etc are found in the first chapter. The entire second chapter is though dedicated to Svaras only, there also intrudes the definitions of *anudeśa*<sup>34</sup> etc. From Sūtras 133 to 134 of the fourth chapter also discuss *svara*. The sixth chapter again deals with the accentuation of verbs and prefixes. It also records the peculiarities in recitation of the holy text by certain teachers. This treatise refers to ten early grammarians as mentioned below and some other grammarians without naming them.

1. Kāṇva. 2. Śākaṭāyana, 3. Śākalya, 4. Aupaśavi, 5. Kāśyapa,
6. Dālbhya, 7. Śaunaka, 8. Jātukarṇya. 9. Gārgya, 10. Mādhyandina.

This *Prātiśākhya* puts forward a thorough account of alphabets and the mode of pronunciation of each and every phoneme of the listed alphabets. It uses a number of technical terms, defines them and also justifies the use of such technical

---

<sup>32</sup> *VP*, 1.108.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid*, 1.109.

<sup>34</sup> *pūrvavānanudeśah*, *Ibid*, 2.7 .

terms. Among other topics, it presents important discussions on accents, juxtaposition, parts of speech, cerebralisation of different speech sounds, *padapāṭha*, *kramapāṭha* and the rules pertaining to *vedādhyayana*.

In volume, though it comes next to the *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, but the phonetical discussions and clear enumeration of alphabets and thorough discussion on *sandhi* make this *Prātiśākhya* an invaluable work. One of the striking features of this *Prātiśākhya* is that the concluding *sūtra* of all the chapters is *ṛddham ṛddhiḥ*. This *sūtra*, according to both Uvaṭa and Anantabhaṭṭa has been thus incorporated into the text to indicate the importance of the work.<sup>35</sup>

### **The Authorship of *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*:**

It is beyond doubt that the propounder of *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* is Kātyāyana. The work itself refers to his name in the penultimate *sūtra* of this *Prātiśākhya* as its author: *ityāha svarasamśkārapraṭiṣṭhāpayitā bhagavān kātyāyanaḥ*.<sup>36</sup> It is however interesting to note that in this sentence Kātyāyana has been called *bhagavān* Kātyāyana. This seems to raise a question as to whether the *Sūtras* were actually composed by Kātyāyana himself. This is because, it is improbable that a person would refer to himself as *bhagavān*.<sup>37</sup> There may be two

<sup>35</sup> *ṛddhamidam śāstramanyāni śāstrānyapekṣya, śikṣāvihitam vyākaraṇavihitam cāsmiṇ śāstre yataḥ prakriyate | ata eva hetoḥ siṣyānāmetacchāstraśrāvinām ṛddhirbhavati, Uvaṭabhāṣya on VP, 1.1 .*

<sup>36</sup> *VP, 8.61 .*

<sup>37</sup> The significance of the word *bhagavān* when used as an epithet has been stated by Anantabhaṭṭa as follows-

possibilities – first possibility may be that the Sūtras were composed by some followers of Kātyāyana as per the rules and regulations of Vedic phonetics and grammar laid down by Kātyāyana. A second possibility may be that the last chapter of the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* may be composed by someone other than Kātyāyana. Anantabhaṭṭa also refers to the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* as *Kātyāyana sūtra* in the introduction to his *bhāṣya*<sup>38</sup>.

But the name Kātyāyana occurs in Sanskrit literature as the author of several other treatises like *Sarvānukramaṇī*, *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra* and the Vārttikas on *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Sources say that Kātyāyana composed one *Svargārohanakāvya* and 18 *Pariśiṣṭas*. These are-

1. Yūpalakṣaṇa, 2. Chāgalakṣaṇa, 3. Pratijñā, 4. Anuvākasamkhyā, 5. Caranavyūha, 6. Śrāddhakalpa, 7. Śūlvaka, 8. Pārṣada, 9. Ṛgyajumṣi, 10. Iṣṭakapurāṇam, 11. Pavarādhyāya, 12. Ukthvastra, 13. Kratusamkhyā, 14. Nigama, 15. Yajñapārśvam, 16. Hotraka, 17. Pūtavotthāna, 18. Karmalakṣaṇa.

Maha Mahopadhyay Kashinath Vasudev Abhyankar considered the author of the Vārttikas on Pāṇini and the author of *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya*, as one and the

---

*utpattim ca vināśam ca bhūtānāmagatim gatim|*

*vetti vidyāmaavidyām ca sa vācya bhagavāniti||, Anantabhāṣya on VP, 8.61 .*

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Anantabhaṭṭa on *VP*, 1.1 .

same person<sup>39</sup>. But according to him, the Prākṛt grammarian Vararuci is a different person from *Vārttikakāra* Vararuci Kātyāyana.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *kātyāyan*, the well known author of the Vārttikas on the sūtras of Pāṇini. He also believed to be the author of the *Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya* and many *sūtra* works named after him, *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Oriental Institute, Baroda, p.109 .

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*