

HOW FAR DID PĀṆINI'S FAME REALLY EXTEND  
IN PATAÑJALI'S VIEW?  
(Studies in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya-IV)

A WEZLER

0. The article which V.P. Limaye has contributed to the "Diamond Jubilee Volume" of the BORI<sup>1</sup> bears the title "*ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ* corrupt for *ākumāri yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ*?"<sup>2</sup> The question mark signals, it would seem, that what Limaye actually wants to do is to argue that *ākumāraṃ* is in fact corrupt and should therefore be emended to *ākumāri*. As this statement of Patañjali's about Pāṇini is not only widely known among Sanskrit scholars—not to speak of the many amateurs of this beautiful language—but evidently also of some importance in terms of an Indian History of Ideas, I should like to critically examine the reasons offered by Limaye in support of his thesis.

1. The first paragraph of his article reads thus:<sup>3</sup> "Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya* (MBh.) on Pāṇini ... 1.4.89 *ān maryaḍāvacane* says: *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ*,<sup>4</sup> that is to say, *eṣā asya* (*Pāṇineḥ*) *yaśaso maryaḍā* ('this' is the limit of Pāṇini's fame). What does 'this' mean? The *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa explains: *kumārān api yaśaḥ prāptam ity arthaḥ*. The *Udyota* (sic!) of Nāgeśa comments directly on the MBh.: *tad uktaṃ bhāṣye 'eṣā'sya yaśaso maryaḍā' / asya pāṇineḥ / eṣā kumārārūpā / maryaḍā paricchedahetur ity arthaḥ*."

In view of the fact that Limaye in subsequent parts of his article not only refers to Pāṇ. 2.1.13 *ān maryaḍābhividhyoḥ*, but also himself uses the terms *maryaḍā*, i.e. "exclusive limit" ( $\bar{a} + x =$  "up to and excluding x") and *abhividhi*, i.e. "inclusive limit" ( $\bar{a} + x =$  "up to and including x"), the degree to which he has abridged the discussion in the MBh. on Pāṇ. 1.4.89 seems problematic. It will in any case, I think, be useful to add the following information for those not familiar with Patañjali's work:

- a) The phrase at issue (*ākumāraṃ* ...) is adduced as an example meant to substantiate the objection that Pāṇ. 1.4.89 – one out of a series of sūtras in which the so-called *kamapravacanīyas* are taught – has to be reworded, i.e. that *ān maryaḍābhividhyoḥ* should be taught<sup>5</sup> in its stead.
- b) This objection is refuted by the argument:<sup>6</sup> *maryaḍāvacana ity eva siddham / eṣā'sya yaśaso maryaḍā* / "[such a rewording is not necessary; the formation of phrases such as *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ*] correctly results already from the sūtra [as it has been worded by Pāṇini himself]; [what is meant by phrases like this is that] this (i.e. what is denoted by the word governed by the preposition *ā*) forms the limit of his fame".
- c) This latter statement on its part is explained by Kaiyaṭa as follows:<sup>7</sup> *vacanagrahaṇa-syedaṃ prayojanam avāntarabhedaparihāreṇa paricchedahetur mātṛaṃ maryaḍā yathā*

*grhyeta* //, "the purpose of using the expression 'expressing' is that *maryādā* should be taken to mean 'cause of limitation as such' (i.e. in a general sense) [i.e.] by disregarding the subdivision [between 'exclusive' and 'inclusive limit']."

Whether Patañjali's solution of the problem posed by Pāṇ. 1.4.89 is acceptable, that is to say, whether Pāṇini should really be assumed to have—and with reference to one and the same preposition at that – at one point distinguished *maryādā* from *abhividdhi* and, at others,<sup>10</sup> used *maryādā* as a generic term<sup>11</sup> for both, is a question which I don't want to address myself to at present. What, however, is important for the question at issue here is that in the phrase *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ* the "boys" or "children" are according to Patañjali and others quite evidently included in the sphere of the extension of Pāṇini's fame: What is meant by this phrase is that even children have heard his name and of his outstanding achievements in grammar.

In addition to Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa Limaye could have also quoted, or at least also referred to, Annambhaṭṭa and Śivarāmeṇḍrasarasvatī;<sup>12</sup> for both of them equally confirm the reading *ākumāraṃ* as also the interpretation of this phrase. Particularly noteworthy is among others Annambhaṭṭa's remark on *kumārān* (of Kaiyaṭa's paraphrase *kumārān api yaśaḥ prāptam* quoted by Limaye), viz.<sup>13</sup> *tālparyakathanam etat / 'pañcamy apāṇparibhiḥ' (2.3.11) iti pañcamyantasya kumāraśabdasya 'ān maryādābhividdhyoḥ' (2.1.13) ity avyayībhāvapakṣe 'ākumāram' iti rūpam* /: Indeed, to render *ākumāraṃ* by the plural ("boys" or "children") instead of a singular is not only legitimate, but also fully meets the intention of Patañjali.

Similarly one wonders whether the phrase as found in the MBh. is not perhaps secondarily transmitted also in other works of the Pāṇiniyan tradition, or even outside of it in other systems of grammar; secondary transmission is after all important for all problems of textual criticism. Although I have not been able to carry out a systematic and comprehensive search, I may be so bold as to contend that, significantly, in most cases one looks for it in vain. One exception is Puruṣottamadeva who however in his Bhāṣāvṛtti on Pāṇ. 1.4.89 replaces the phrase in question by *ākumāraṃ yaśas tava*.

2. Another exception is, as has already been observed by Limaye himself, the Kāśikā on this Sūtra of Pāṇ.'s from which he quotes that part which immediately follows upon the mere paraphrase of the sūtra, viz.:<sup>14</sup> *avadhir maryādā / vacanaśabdāḥ<sup>15</sup> abhividdhir api grhyate / ā pāṭaliputrād vṛṣṭo devaḥ / ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ / ā sāṃkāśyāt / ā mathurāyāḥ* /. Limaye then adds the following remarks: "The example *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ* is merely taken down (sic!) from the MBh., and left unexplained. Pāṭaliputra, Sāṃkāśya, and Mathurā are all place-names. Naturally I began to wonder whether *kumāra* in that context might not be corrupt for *kumārī*, which also must (sic!) have been a place-name. If this surmise is right, the reading of the MBh. ought to have originally been *ākumārī* (an adverbial compound) where *kumārī* refers to Kanyākumārī or modern Cape Camorin (sic!)."

Now, this is only part of the truth, to put it politely. As the first example (*ā pāṭaliputrād vṛṣṭo devaḥ*) is found already in the MBh., viz. III 192.10 (on Pāṇ. 6.4.22), there can hardly be any doubt that it has likewise been taken over from it by Jayāditya, especially as it is also adduced in the Vṛtti on Candrasūtra 2.1.82.<sup>16</sup> And Sāṃkāśya and Mathurā are not just also place-names, but names of places which are among others relatively often mentioned already by Patañjali himself;<sup>17</sup> it is hence more than likely that the last two examples of the Kāśikā are, directly or indirectly, inspired by the MBh., i.e. simply modelled on *ā pāṭaliputrāt*.<sup>18</sup>

That is to say the 'context'—which plays such a fatal role in Limaye's argument—is first of all the result of assembling examples ultimately either taken from the MBh. or suggested by it. The question of their sequence apart, what one feels surprised at is that after *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ* two more examples are given, to the latter of which *vṛṣṭo devaḥ* should be added as has been stated both by Haradatta and Jinendrabuddhi. If one starts from the assumption, a little audacious though it is in view of the absence of a really critical edition of the Kāśikā, that both the latter examples form an original part of the text of the commentary on Pāṇ. 1.4.89, a plausible explanation for the fact that they, too, are adduced could be that given by Jinendrabuddhi, albeit with reference to the first and last example only, viz. that in one case the preposition *ā* means, or indicates, "up to and excluding" (*varjanakriyājanitam avadhyavadhimadbhāvalakṣaṇaṃ sambandham ān dyotayati*) and in the other "up to and including" (*vyāptikriyājanitam*).<sup>19</sup> But the main reason seems to be the wish to add to the *avyayibhāva* compounds an equal number of prepositional phrases.

However that may be, the 'context' of the Kāśikā does not by any means allow to draw the conclusion that in the second example again only a place-name is to be expected, and hence acceptable in terms of textual criticism. For even with reference to the Kāśikā itself there is no reason whatsoever that a series of four examples has to be parallel to such an extent that in all of them only place-names are used. After all it cannot be denied that, the problematic *ā sāmkaśyāt* apart, the first and last example, on the one hand, and the second, on the other, refer to entirely different facts, viz. raining and a person's fame. The assumption that the reading *ākumāraṃ* of the Kāśikā, which is for all that we know the only one attested in it, is corrupt is therefore nothing but purely arbitrary. But unfortunately Limaye does not stop here, but jumps to much more far-reaching conclusions; for he infers, as we have seen, that the reading of the MBh. (on Pāṇ. 1.4.89) "ought to have originally been *ākumārī*", but does not deem it necessary to enlighten his poor readers why an inference drawn from a particular 'context' of the Kāśikā that concerns only a Kāśikā reading warrants the assumption that it is valid also for the original source, i.e. the MBh., in spite of the fact that the context there is entirely different.

3. However, even if it is admitted that it is in fact possible that the character of being corrupt of a particular reading becomes evident only by its being secondarily placed in a different, but revealing context of later tradition, one cannot, of course, ignore the testimony of the transmission of the original source. This has also been realized by Limaye, for he continues:

"Kielhorn records no variant, e.g. *ākumāri* for *ākumāraṃ*. "Yet he is by no means at his wit's end, but tries to clear away this obstacle by arguing in the following manner: "Although the maxim 'the correct need not be the original' is generally true, sometimes corruptions do creep in texts, handed down through oral tradition from the hoary past." He then quotes Vākyapadīya 2.482,<sup>20</sup> i.e. refers to a report according to which "the South Indians maintained and retained the true text" of the MBh., "in a single manuscript". What Limaye says next is:<sup>21</sup> "It stands to reason that instead of Pāṇini's fame being extended up to even children, it should extend as far as Cape Camorin, the southernmost tip of India, from Śalātura" ... "Later on, India was described as having extended 'from the Himalayas to Cape Camorin', a phrase, which, as I shall presently show, is found in the *Śābarabhāṣya* on Jaimini's Sūtras and in the *Nyāyamañjarī* of Jayantabhaṭṭa."

Since Limaye mentions it in a concessive clause, I am not sure that he has really understood the 'maxim' he quotes. But what he ultimately must have had in mind is the rule of thumb of textual criticism that a reading which is grammatically, etc., correct, intelligible and meaningful in its context, need not for these reasons alone also be the original one, i.e. ought to be preferred to another reading which is deficient in these or one of these regards. The proposition that texts, and not only orally transmitted ones and not only extraordinarily old ones, suffer various kinds of corruptions is similarly not only true, but a truism. But just as this latter observation does not, of course, justify suspecting each and every word, or any word, of a text to be corrupt, so too the 'maxim' cannot simply be reversed so as to teach that every reading which is correct (in the sense explained in the foregoing) is therefore to be suspected of not being original!

And Bhartṛhari's testimony is of no help either in this regard; for even if it is correct and its interpretation should be regarded as clear, it does not do more than specify one of the many reasons for the well-known and certainly evident fact that Patañjali's MBh. has not come down to us in its original form, that is to say, that it contains corrupt readings, later additions, etc. But again this undoubtedly true observation cannot by any means be considered as justifying an approach to the transmitted text like that of Limaye. If we were to tolerate breaking such a hole in the well-founded rampart of philological methods, we could equally well raze it to the ground once and for all and start rewriting texts like the MBh. just as we fancy them to have been originally. I do not, of course, want to intimate that the fact that Kielhorn does not record any variant reading is a guarantee of *ākumāraṃ* being necessarily correct; but the 'reasons' adduced by Limaye (so far) are certainly not even sufficient to cast doubt on it. And, to be sure, the possibility that a new critical edition of the MBh.<sup>22</sup> might alter the picture in this case, would be but mere speculation that just should not be used as an argument.

4. In view of the nature of Limaye's arguments as quoted by me in the foregoing it doesn't come as a surprise that he pursues his aim further by trying to accumulate circumstantial evidence meant to show that Patañjali could have known Cape Comorin and

its earlier Sanskrit name *kumārī*. He admits that the name is not attested in Vedic texts,<sup>29</sup> but finds it, though in the plural, at Mahābhārata (Poona ed.) 3.86.11. He then returns to the MBh., i.e. draws attention to the fact that Patañjali mentions, in the context of teaching certain grammatical formations, names of regions (*janapadas*) in South India such as *pāṇḍa*, *coḍa* and *kerala*. What Limaye obviously wants to say is that since Patañjali demonstrably knows these names, we are justified in assuming that he also knew the name *kumārī*. Now, one could meet Limaye halfway and *argumenti causa* grant that this name was indeed known to Patañjali. Nevertheless one would still have to ask: So what? There is no modal logic according to which one could derive a proposition 'x is real' from the proposition 'x is possible'!

Limaye's true motive becomes apparent when he, after quoting Raghuvamśa 4.20, adds the following remarks:<sup>30</sup> "Here Kālidāsa seems to follow the current reading *ākumāram* of Patañjali. If we read *ākumārī* here also, it gives a good sense; unfortunately there is no variant *ākumārī* as in the MBh."<sup>31</sup> His frankness, even if it is not deliberate, is disarming; on the other hand one cannot but gather the firm impression that his main 'argument' is simply that he wants Patañjali, and Kālidāsa, and probably also Medhātithi,<sup>32</sup> to have conceived of Pāṇini's or Raghu's fame exclusively in terms of its extension up to Cape Comorin, and that this wish is quite clearly caused by nothing else than the 'context of the Kāśikā on Pāṇ. 1.4.89'. Indeed here the wish is father to the thought!

The 'evidence' of the Śabarabhāṣya and some other Mīmāṃsā texts<sup>33</sup> drawn upon by Limaye is such that the existence of the idiom, or saying, *ā himavata ā ca kumārībhyah* is proved beyond doubt. But firstly I don't know of anybody who would wish to deny this fact; secondly this idiom does not mean "from Himalayas to Cape Camorin", but "up to the Himālaya and up to Cape Comorin", i.e. it cannot but have been uttered by a person who lived somewhere in between these two geographical points and from this point looks towards the North, on the one hand, and then towards the South, on the other; and, thirdly, it is used in the Mīmāṃsā texts with reference to the area of usage of a particular Sanskrit word (viz. *caru*).

This latter observation is something Limaye could even have exploited for his own purpose: he could have argued that the geographical area limited and defined by the two boundaries 'Himālaya' and 'Kumāryah' is identical with the Sanskrit speaking area; and as the Aṣṭādhyāyī deals with this language, there is some likelihood that the fame of its author has also been regarded as extending over this whole area.

5. Limaye's cause has been defended by M.A. Mehendale in the first part of his "Mahābhārata Studies I".<sup>34</sup> Or to be more precise—because at that time nobody had already criticized Limaye—, he emphatically agrees with him in that he starts his article by saying "... Acharya Shri V.P. Limaye rightly draws attention to the fact that *ākumāram* ... cannot mean 'upto children', but that *kumāra* must refer to some place-name ('upto kumāra country')." This in

fact is not really an exact rendering of what Limaye has actually said; avoiding all trivial details let us see what Mehendale on his part considers as evidence supporting Limaye's argument. "It is perhaps possible", he states, "to say that the use of the expression *ākumāram* itself was the usual way, at least in epic times, for conveying the sense of long distances. This becomes clear from the following few passages in the *Mahābhārata*." Subsequently he quotes and discusses three verses,<sup>20</sup> viz. 2.43.14, 8.54.18 and 3.26.27. However, his interpretation is not only far from convincing, but also quite evidently a highly forced one. It will, I think, suffice to show this in just the first case, viz. 2.43.14:

*pārthān sumanaso dṛṣṭvā  
pārthivāṁś ca vaśānugān /  
kṛtsnaṁ cāpi hitaṁ lokaṁ  
ākumāraṁ kurūdvaha //*

Mehendale's comment on this verse reads thus: "Duryodhana began to become pale because, firstly, he saw the Pāṇḍavas well-pleased, secondly, the kings, assembled there, were obedient to the Pāṇḍavas, and, thirdly, the whole world was well disposed towards them. In order to convey the very wide extent of the world (*lokaṁ*), which in the present context would mean the Bhāratavarṣa, the author has used the expression *ākumāram* which must mean 'as far as the Kumāra (country)'. It is most unlikely that *ākumāram* here means 'down to the children' because Duryodhana could have impossibly noticed children in the gathering that had come together for the Rājasūya and hence could say that even children were well-disposed to the Pāṇḍavas. Moreover Duryodhana is not particularly likely to be jealous of the Pāṇḍavas on seeing children favourable to them, but certainly on noticing that the people upto the (very distant) land of Kumāra were so disposed towards the Pāṇḍavas."

This interpretation does not stand a critical examination for the following reasons: It is by no means certain that this verse refers at all, or only, to the "gathering that had come together for the Rājasūya". Most of the preceding verses of this *adhyāya* are devoted to the description of Duryodhana's falling a prey to the tricks of the magnificent *sabhā* built by Maya for Yudhiṣṭhira; they are followed by a number of verses (including 14) in which the jealousy of Duryodhana, and the feeling of depression resulting from it, is described, and this emotion is stated—not to arise from the sight of the sacrificial gathering, but—in the words of the Epic poet—*prekṣya tām adbhutām rddhiṁ* (12c where *tām* refers to the *sabhā*), *pāṇḍavaśrīprāptasya* (*Duryodhanasya*) (13a), *mahimānaṁ paraṁ cāpi pāṇḍavānām* (15a, also to be construed with *dṛṣṭvā* of 14), *sa tu gacchann ekāgraḥ sabhām anucintayan / śriyaṁ ca tām anupamāṁ dharmarājasya dhūmataḥ //* (16). There is hence no reason whatsoever not to take *loka*, of 2.23.14, to have the meaning "people" or "subjects": The support of other kings, as well as the popularity which Yudhiṣṭhira enjoys even with children or youngsters—and not only with grown-up people—is evidently considered here to be a part of his *śrī*, and hence it forms another most plausible object of Duryodhana's envy.

6. In reality the passages from the Mahābhārata pointed out by Mehendale are, on the contrary, clear and excellent evidence of the fact that there is a Skt.<sup>20</sup> *avyayībhāva* compound *ākumāraṃ* meaning "up to boys/children", and that it is comparatively old. That is to say, quite the reverse of what Mehendale and Limaye say is true. The Mahābhārata confirms the MBh. on Pāṇ. 1.4.89 and *vice versa*!

All that is necessary is not to deliberately close one's eyes, and thereafter even keep them tightly closed, to the fact that in ancient India there existed side by side—though they may very well have originated in different points of time—two different conceptions of the extension of fame or a particular kind of knowledge, a horizontal one and a vertical one, so to say. According to the first it is the size of the geographical area which counts, the distance covered by a name or a news travelling from one person to another. The second is based on an aspect of fame, or a kind of knowledge, which one can intuitively perceive to be no less plausible, viz. that of the type of people to which it extends: the greatness of somebody's fame or the banality of a particular kind of knowledge, etc., can equally well be emphasized by stating that it extends to such kinds of people who are either by their age, and hence lack of any erudition, or by their social rank, and/or dull-wittedness, or by their sex, not to be expected to know this person or are rather renowned for their utter ignorance. It is therefore only too understandable that expressions like *ākumāraṃ* imply the notion "even"—as is also made clear e.g. by Kaiyaṭa and Mallinātha by adding *api* in their respective paraphrases.

The simple truth is that there is a second strand in Sanskrit tradition, viz. the one I have just outlined, and that Limaye, and following him Mehendale, have ignored it much to their disadvantage. There is in fact no dearth of examples although expectedly not all of them are listed in the dictionaries, not to speak of a complete inventory of their occurrences. Suffice it to refer to the expressions *āgopālam* "down to (the) cowherds (s)"<sup>21</sup>, *āvigopālam*, "down to (the) shepherds and cowherds",<sup>22</sup> *ābālam* "down to children",<sup>23</sup> *ābālagopālam* "down to children and cowherds"<sup>24</sup> etc., etc., I remember to have come across compounds like these, and similar ones, especially in philosophical texts, but I did not note them down nor their references. However, I don't think that this affects my argument as most of my readers will, I trust, have come across similar instances. In any case, there cannot be the least doubt that this 'second strand', as I have called it, does exist.

Since it can be traced back to the Mahābhārata, Patañjali's *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ* is unobjectionable also in terms of chronology: it is one of the earliest examples available for a tradition which was alive I don't know for how many centuries, but certainly for quite a long time, and it quite evidently means exactly what Kaiyaṭa etc. take it to mean, viz. that "Pāṇini's fame extends even to boys/children."

7. Now this is clearly meant to characterize his fame as extraordinary in that it presupposes, as has just been indicated, the idea that *kumāras* are rather not to be expected to know the author of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. It is precisely this presupposition which has most probably created

a feeling of uneasiness among later inheritors of the Mahābhāṣya, and not only Vaiyākaraṇas. For, it is well-known that when Sanskrit did not any longer represent the mother, or rather father tongue of twice-born children, the importance of grammar, i.e. systematic language teaching with the help of grammar, grew correspondingly. Not only was the function of the study of grammar radically changed—from the theory of a fully known language to a means of acquiring linguistic competence in Sanskrit—but the place it held in the traditional 'syllabus' had also to be revised: *śabdānuśāsana* had to be shifted rather to the beginning of education. It is true that the Aṣṭādhyāyī is not the obvious choice as a means for language teaching, but there is nevertheless a great likelihood that the name of its author became known to children who were still busy learning Sanskrit albeit with the help of other teaching aids.

Yet, as far as Patañjali and his own times are concerned, there is clear evidence that the situation was still a different one: a *śiṣṭa* uses "correct words even without having studied grammar", as has been pointed out by P. Thieme,<sup>35</sup> "for his is 'a favour of fate or a particular nature': *daivānugrahaḥ svabhāvo vā*".<sup>36</sup> On the other hand, Patañjali is not at all prone to describe the study of grammar in his times as ideal; in a famous passage of the Paspasāhnika he complains about the brahmanical students' of his days rejection of the study of grammar as being *anarthaka*.<sup>37</sup> It is to be admitted that what he says by way of sketching the ideal background against which this lack of thirst for knowledge, or this neglect of duty, stands out as a problematic, nay deplorable decline, viz. that: *purākalpa etad āsit / saṃskārottara-kālaṃ brāhmaṇā vyākaraṇaṃ smādhiyate* /, that this his statement seems to contradict my own remark about the place of the study of grammar in the 'syllabus'. But, firstly, what I had in mind, was, of course, the situation in Patañjali's own times, and, secondly, it is evident that although he uses the same expression *vyākaraṇa* with reference to both periods, the *purākalpa* as also his own times, it is phonetics or rather instruction in the correct pronunciation, that is referred to in the first case,<sup>38</sup> and grammar as *śabdānuśāsana* in the second; and what matters for the problem under discussion is that the students of Patañjali's times are said by him to exhibit this wrong and stupid attitude towards *vyākaraṇa* "after having studied the Veda". Hence they cannot certainly have been still in their infancy.

On the other hand the question arises precisely which age-group is referred to by *kumāra*. The MBh. itself does not contain a definition, nor any indication which might help to answer this question, and definitions found in other texts, or other kinds of texts, are of little relevance for the MBh. It will, I think, hardly be possible with reference to the MBh. to go beyond Thieme's general remark<sup>39</sup> that the meaning "boy, lad" and "youth" is "the common one in the older language". Yet this is clearly sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the expression includes that age-group which Patañjali most probably had in mind when he stated that Pāṇini's fame extended even to them, namely boys who have not yet undergone the *upanayana* ceremony, or slightly older ones who are still busy learning the Veda by heart.

Yet, not only the change in the educational system seems to have exercised some influence on the reception of Patañjali's statement about the range of Pāṇini's fame—of



which I have stated above (end of § 1) that the cases in which the phrase *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāṇineḥ* occurs are significantly very rare. It is possible, if not probable, that semantics also had a part in it. For Thieme<sup>10</sup> rightly adds that the common meaning which *kumāra* has in the older language "has been replaced, in classical Sanskrit, by the meaning 'prince'." It is perhaps due to this semantical development that Bhaṭṭojīdīkṣita gives in his *Śabdakau-stubha*<sup>11</sup> on Pāṇ. 1.4.89 *āmukteḥ saṃsāraḥ* and *ā bālebhyaḥ haribhaktiḥ* as examples; but Puruṣottamadeva's *ākumāraṃ yaśas tava* (Bhāṣāvṛtti on 1.4.89) already quoted above may have been provoked directly or indirectly by the 'educational reform'.

Today, i.e. approximately two and a half millennia after the time of Pāṇini, Patañjali would have to make a different statement: For today the ingenious author of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is known, and renowned, far beyond the geographical area the boundaries of which are formed by the Himālaya in the North and Cape Comorin in the South; most unfortunately however his fame does not any longer extend even to children, not even in India herself, I am afraid. But this is clearly not Pāṇini's fault.

#### NOTES

1. Viz. Nos. LVIII and LIX (for the years 1977 and 1978), Poona 1978.
2. L.c., pp. 727-732.
3. L.c., pp. 727.
4. In the original this and the subsequent quotations are printed in Devanāgarī.
5. MBh. (ed. Kielhorn) I 347.23-24; note that Kaiyaṭa in his *Pradīpa* (NSP-ed. II 294 b 11) speaks of a "vārtika" here, viz. with reference to *ān maryādābhividyoh* (also found and marked as a vārtika in this edition), but that Kielhorn did not recognize it or know of it.
6. MBh. I 347.24-25.
7. II 294 b 20-22.
8. Cf. H. Scharfe, "vacana 'Numerus' bei Pāṇini ?", (Kuhns) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* ..., 79 (1965), pp. 239-46.
9. Cf. also Nāgeśa's *Uddyota* (NSP-ed.) II 294 b 23-25: *a vānta retī: maryādāviśeṣa evābhividyoh / maryādaiva yadā kāryeṇa yujyate tadābhividyoh, yadā tu na tadā maryādeti viśeṣāvivakṣaṇād iti bhāvaḥ //*
10. Cf. Pāṇ. 3.3.136 and 8.1.15!
11. Cf. Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara (ed. Śrī Sitārāmāśāstrī, Varanasi 1960), p. 912: *vacanagrahaṇā d iti: ayaṃ bhāvaḥ – maryādeti śabda ucyate yasmin sūtre tat maryādāvacanam; 'ān maryādābhividyoh' iti sūtram, tatra ya ān ity arthaḥ /; cf. also footnote 4 on p. 294 of the NSP-edition: p r a y o j a n a m i t i / maryādāyā vacanaṃ yatrārthayugale tad maryādāvacanam i t i bahuvrhiṇā 'ān maryādābhividyoh' i t i sūtropāṭīrthyayugalasyaiva grahaṇaṃ lakṣyānurodhād iti tattvam //*
12. *Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa Vyākhyānāni IV. Adhyāya 1 Pāda 2-4.* ed. M.S. Narasimhacharya, Pondichéry 1977.
13. Quoted from the edition mentioned in note 12, p. 349. 20-21.
14. L.c., p. 272.
15. Other editions read °grahaṇād. In quoting from Limaye I have standardized the sandhi.

16. On the relation between the Cāndravyākaraṇa and the Kāśikā, as also between the Candrasūtra and the Vṛti, see now Th. Oberlies, *Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV. 4.52-148 und V.2*, Stuttgart 1989.
17. *sāṃkāśya* I. 455.12/17/24; 456.5/5  
II. 297.24
- mathurā I. 8.12; 19.5/6; 144.11; 192.11; 244.19;  
II. 205.7/7  
III. 299.3.
18. Cf. also II 160.25: *yo 'yam adhvā gantavya ā pāṭaliputrād etasmin kūpo bhaviṣyati / pāṭaliputra* I. 144.11; 192.12; 154.19; 380.19; 455.10/22;  
II. 114.12; 160.25/25; 162.7/11; 311.23/25; 312.2  
III. 192.12 (*ā pāṭaliputrād vṛṣṭo deva (itī)*); 299.3; 417.9.
19. See also what Jinendrabuddhi says immediately afterwards, viz.: *kaḥ punar varjanasya maryādāyāś ca viśeṣaḥ*, yena pūrvasūtre (i.e. 1.4.89) *varjanam abhidhāyecha maryādāgrahaṇam karoti? ayam asti viśeṣaḥ—varjane hi tatparityāgenānyatra sūmānyena varṣaṇādina sambandho gamyate, yathā—ā triganebhyo vṛṣṭo deva iti; atra hi yasyām diśi vyavasthito vaktedaṃ vākyaṃ prayuṅkte, tasyām diśi yo deśo yas tathānyāsu diśu tatra sarvatraiva trigartān varjayitvā vṛṣṭa iti gamyate / maryādāyām tv idaṃ vākyaṃ prayuṅkte—ā pāṭaliputrād vṛṣṭo deva itī, tatsambandhinām eva diśi yo vyavasthito deśas tasya deśasya varṣaṇena sambandhaḥ pratiyata ity eṣa viśeṣaḥ /*
20. Which reads thus:  
*yah patañjaliśiṣyebhyo  
bhraṣṭo vyākaraṇāgamah /  
kāle sa dākṣiṇātyeṣu  
granthamātre vyavasthitaḥ //*
21. L.c., p. 728.
22. Kielhorn's edition is based on a small number of selected MSS. only.—On the text history of the MBh. see J. Bronkhorst, *Three Problems Pertaining to the Mahābhāṣya*, Poona 1987, pp. 14-42 (where further biographical references are given).
23. As for the mantra which Limaye quotes from TaiĀ 10.1.7 (= Mahānārāyaṇa Up. 3.12 = 82) (*kātyāyanāya vidmahe kanyakumārī (kumārī) dhīmahi / tan no durgīḥ (durgā) pracodayāt*), it is highly questionable whether *kanya* can be regarded as a vocative formed in analogy to *amba*. And *kanyakumārī* can because of the wider context hardly be taken not to mean "la jeune fille" as it is rendered by J. Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* ..., Paris 1960, p. 33.
24. L.c., p. 729.
25. Limaye's contention that "Mallinātha ... is also at pains in explaining *ākumāra*" equally fails to pass critical examination. Mallinātha simply offers two alternative interpretations of the compound *ākumārakathodghātam*, and most probably following an older tradition at that (cf. e.g. Hemādri's commentary on this verse); and he simply mentions a variant reading which he also explains in its turn!
26. From whose Bhāṣya on Manu 1.1 he quotes on p. 729.
27. Note that Limaye's emendation in the passage quoted by him from Jayanta's Nyāyamañjarī, viz. that one should read *ā himavataḥ* instead of *ā hi sarvata*, has been strikingly confirmed by the new and critical edition prepared by Pandit K.S. Varadacharya, Mysore 1983 (see part 2, p. 257)!

28. ABORI LXV (1984), pp. 245-247.
29. Although more can be found already with the help of the Pratīka-Index (cf. vol. I p. 297).
30. Note that the Pali texts in which the compound occurs are markedly younger; cf. Critical Pali Dictionary s.v. *ākomāraṃ*.
31. On *āgopālā* (*dvijātayaḥ*) (MBhārata 2 App. 4, 19 post.)—a passage which, by the way, strikingly confirms my own interpretation of MBhārata 2.43.14—see J. Wackernagel u. A. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik II, I*, Göttingen 1957, p. 312. *ākumāraḥ* of Mbhārata 8.30.12, which Mehendale (l.c., p. 246 fn. 6) styles as a “very peculiar expression”, could similarly be an adjectival compound, i.e. mean “I down to the boy”, i.e. “down to the time when I was a boy” = “from my childhood”.
32. Cf. also *āgopālāvipālebhyaḥ Mahābhārata* 2.58.35 etc. (see Pratīka-Index I p. 303).
33. *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 2.18.58.
34. Malliṣeṇa’s *Syādvādamatījari* on verse 15 (ed. A.B. Dhruva, Bombay 1933, p. 100)
35. “The Interpretation of the learned” in: Felicitation Volume presented to S.K. Belvalkar, Benares 1957, pp. 47-62 = *Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Buddruss, Wiesbaden 1971, pp. 596-611; the reference is to p. 61 = 610.
36. Quoted from MBh. III 174.13.
37. Cf. MBh. I 5.5-11.
38. Cf. MBh. I 5.7-8: *lebhyas tatra sthānakaraṇānupradānājñebhyo vaidikāḥ śabdā upadiśyante*; cf. also Bhartṛhari’s remark (*Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* of Bhartṛhari, Fasc. IV: *Āhnika I*, ed. by J. Bronkhorst, Poona 1987, p. 13): *purākalpe sthānakaraṇādīn vyākaraṇād eva pratipadyate* /.
39. The reference is to his article “Jungfrauengatte”. Sanskrit *kaumāraḥ patiḥ*... in: (Kuhns) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 78 (1983), p. 161 = *Kleine Schriften* (cf. note 35), p. 426.
40. L.c., *ibidem*.
41. *ChSS*-ed., Pt. 2, p. 180.