
This dictionary of Pāṇini is the second of Prof. Katre’s *Pāṇinian Studies*, the first of which (Poona, 1967) consisted of a transliterated text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The present work is to be followed by an English translation of Pāṇini’s grammar. This dictionary is intended to meet the needs of those scholars who deal with the interpretation of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with reference to modern linguistics (p. 9). It differs from previous works of similar nature in that the vocabulary in question has been dealt with on three levels. First, all the words used by Pāṇini in his sūtras are listed with translations and references. Secondly, Katre gives items which are derived by these rules and the constituent members of which are directly given therein. And thirdly he includes items used to illustrate the operations of these rules in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. Moreover, “... no specific reference is made in the dictionary to the operational side of the rules which will form part of the intended English translation”. (p. 8)


Prof. Katre places particular reliance on the *Kāśikā*, saying (p. 10) that it, “... seems to have preserved the original tradition from Patanjali downwards”. This is a very strong statement in view of what we know of the vicissitudes of Pāṇinian grammar before Bhartrhari (*Vākyapadīya* 2.478, cf. Kielhorn, *Indian Antiquary* 3.285-7 [1874] = *Kl. Schr.* 154-7) and of the *Kāśikā’s* modification of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* following Candra (see Kielhorn, *Ind. Ant.* 15.183-5 = *Kl. Schr.* 244-6). I think it would have been sufficient to express confidence in the need to use *vr̥tis*, the most commonly used one of which is the *Kāśikā*.

For example, *nīt* (p. 226) is merely glossed “containing *n* as an exponential marker” without saying for what operations items are so marked. But Prof. Katre does not always follow this convention. For example, on p. 261 the entry *qīt* is followed by “containing *q* as exponential marker; before an affix containing this marker, final vowel and following consonants are elided”.

---


2 Prof. Katre places particular reliance on the *Kāśikā*, saying (p. 10) that it, “... seems to have preserved the original tradition from Patanjali downwards”. This is a very strong statement in view of what we know of the vicissitudes of Pāṇinian grammar before Bhartrhari (*Vākyapadīya* 2.478, cf. Kielhorn, *Indian Antiquary* 3.285-7 [1874] = *Kl. Schr.* 154-7) and of the *Kāśikā’s* modification of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* following Candra (see Kielhorn, *Ind. Ant.* 15.183-5 = *Kl. Schr.* 244-6). I think it would have been sufficient to express confidence in the need to use *vr̥tis*, the most commonly used one of which is the *Kāśikā*.

3 For example, *nīt* (p. 226) is merely glossed “containing *n* as an exponential marker” without saying for what operations items are so marked. But Prof. Katre does not always follow this convention. For example, on p. 261 the entry *qīt* is followed by “containing *q* as exponential marker; before an affix containing this marker, final vowel and following consonants are elided”. 
I have no doubt that this dictionary will prove extremely useful to scholars interested in Indian grammarians. I offer the following comments on individual entries in the hope that they will enhance its usefulness.  

3: a-kartr - 'not an agent'. On the same page, a-karmadāraya- is glossed 'other than a karmadāraya compound'. The two compounds a-kartr- and a-karmadāraya- do not differ in formation; and they are commonly paraphrased in the same way (e.g., Kāś. 3.3.19: kartr-varjite kārake, 6.2.130: karmadāraya-varjite).

3: a-karma-ka 'intransitive'. Among the references given are 3.4.69 (lah karmanī ca bhāve cākarmakebhyaḥ) and 1.4.52 (gati-buddhi-pratyavasānārtha-sābda-karmākara-makāṇām a-ni-kartā sa nau). The first states that L-members (abstracts to be replaced by finite verb endings and participial affixes, see below re p. 486) are introduced after verb roots (3.1.92: dhātoḥ) when either an agent (kartr) or an object (karman) is to be denoted and also, after verbs which are a-karmaka, when the base meaning of the verb (bhāva) is to be denoted by the form derived. 3.4.69, on the other hand, provides that the agent of a noncausal verb (of an action denoted by a root not containing the causal marker ni) is classed as the object of a causal when the verbs in question are: those denoting movement (gati), thought (buddhi), eating (pratyavasana), whose object is a sound (sābda-karman), and those which are a-karmaka. Now, as far as rule 3.4.69 is concerned, a-karmaka refers to verbs which, in a given utterance being derived, are not accompanied by an object. For example, pāc 'cook' can be accompanied by an object or not; to denote that someone is cooking a rice gruel one may say either odanam pacati or odanah pacaye, with the verb endings (it, te as replacements of the L-member lat) denoting either an agent or an object. But one may also say 'cooking is taking place', in which case the impersonal pacaye is used, with the verb ending introduced to denote bhāva. But now consider the following causal sentences: pācayati devadattena 'he has Devadatta cook', āsāyati devadattam 'he has D. remain seated'. In the second sentence Devadatta, the agent of the noncausal action (āste devadattaḥ 'D. is seated') is classed as object of the causal action by 1.4.52, since ās 'be seated' is intransitive (a-karmaka). But for the derivation of a sentence such as pacyate devadattena 'D. is cooking' (lit. 'it is being cooked by D.') pac is equally a-karmaka, so that one might derive *pācayati devadattam. This is avoided if a-karmaka in 1.4.52 refers to verbs denoting actions which never are accompanied by a direct object. See SK 540 and, for further references, Lingua 25.221(1970). I may note here that on p. 543 Prof. Katre glosses sābda-karman as 'sound making; a sound or noise'. But in both rules given as references (1.4.52 and 1.3.34: veh śabda-karmanah) karman means not 'making' or 'action' but 'object'; cf. Kāś. 1.3.34: karma-sābda iha kārakābhidhāyī na kṛjā- vacanaḥ 'The item karman here denotes (a) kāraka (i.e., object), it does not denote an action (as it does in some sūtras).

Page references to the work under discussion are followed by Prof. Katre's glosses, in single quotation marks. I have modified the typographic conventions to the following extent: entries which appear in the work in bold face appear here in italics; neither bold face nor italic capitals, which Prof. Katre uses to indicate markers (its) and sounds used for ease of pronunciation, respectively, are here shown. In Sanskrit items other than Prof. Katre's entries, roman type is used to indicate markers. Three arabic numerals separated by full stops (e.g., 1.1.1.) refer to rules of Pāṇini's grammar. The following abbreviations are used: Bhāṣya or Bh.: Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya (references made to volume, page, and line of Kielhorn's edition), Kāś.: Kāśikā-ṛṣṭi (whose numerotation is also followed, page in referring to Pāṇinian rules), Nyāsa: Jñendrabuddhi's Kāśikā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā, PM: Haradatta's Pada-maṣṭāri, Pr.: Kāiyatā's Pradīpa (volume and page of the edition published by Motilal Banarsidass [Delhi, 1967], the only edition available to me when writing this), SK: Bhāṣajośī's Siddhānta-kaumudi (rules cited according to the serial numerotation).

See Katre, 422; for a discussion of the term bhāva see also Lingua 25.214-20 (1970).
6: agati-1 'absence of movement'. A reference is given to 7.3.42 (śader a-gatau tāh [nau 36, aṅgasya 6.4.1]). This rule states that the -a of the presuffixal base (aṅga) śad is replaced by t when the causal affix ni follows, provided śad is used in a meaning other than movement (a-gatau); e.g., sātayaṇi ‘crushes, destroys’ but sātayaṇi gāh ‘drives the cows’. Cf. Kāś.: śader aṅgasya-gatav arthe varramānasya takārādeṣo bhavati nāu parataḥ.

10: aṅga-1 'base, stem'. It would have been better and more precise to follow the definition given in 1.4.13 (yasmāt prayāya-vidhiṣ tadādi prayāyev'ṇgam); given a unit X after which (yasmāt) an affix is introduced (prayāya-vidhiṣ), the unit beginning with X and followed by the affix is called aṅga. For example, the ending mas (replacing the L-member ṛt) is introduced after kr ‘do’, then, between this ending and the root is introduced the affix sya augmented with ṛt (ṛṣya-): kar-ṛṣya-mas. Since the affix mas was introduced after kr, the unit beginning with that, is, karṣya-, is the aṅga relative to mas. Therefore, rule 7.3.101 (ato dirgho yaḥi [śārvadhātuke 95, aṅgasya 6.4.1]) applies, whereby the final vowel -a of an aṅga before such an affix is replaced by a long vowel: karṣyāmas (1st pl. fut.). I may note here also that on p. 390 under prayāya-vidhi prof. Katre glosses 'the operation or rule set up for applying the suffix'. This could be improved. For vidhi in prayāya-vidhi clearly means 'introduction by rule', so that the phrase yasmāt prayāya-vidhiṣ is equivalent to yasmāt prayāya vidhiṣate 'after which an affix is introduced (by rule)'. And this is indeed the way the rule is generally paraphrased; see, e.g., Kāś. 1.4.13.

14: a-ṛ-ṛt ‘other than the exponential marker ṛṇ, in the expression a-ṛ-ṛṇ-ṛt 1.2.1’. a-ṛ-ṛṇ-ṛt ‘other than the exponential markers ṛṇ and ṛ 1.2.1’. It would be useful to make clear that aṁṛnt is a bahuvrihi compound referring to affixes (prayāya). The rule in question (gāh-kutāṭhoḥ-yoḥ tinin nīt) states that after certain roots affixes which are not marked with ṛṇ or ṛ are treated as marked with ṛṇ.

15: aṭ2 'the augment a- prefixed to verbal stems in imperfect, pluperfect, aorist and conditional'. aṭ3 'the augment a before personal endings -s and -t of left'. On p. 109 there is an entry aṭ3 'the augment -a- added at the beginning of ārdhaḥṭukāta suffixes'. I think it would have been better to gloss aṭ2 and aṭ3 in a similar way. For, in the Pāñcini system such augmentations are indeed considered the initial of the resultant augmented sequence, not merely items prefixed to and occurring before items. This is provided by rule 1.1.46 (sādy-aṇṭau ta-k-ṭau), which states that affixes marked with ṛṇ and ṛ respectively are initial and final of the items to which they are added. Consider, for example, the derivation of the agent noun lav-ṛṭ (lā ‘cut’). The affix ṛṭ follows the root: lā-ṛṭ. Since ṛṭ is classed as an ārdhaḥṭukāta (3.4.113: ārdhaḥṭukātankam ṛṣaḥ) and begins with one of the sounds denoted by the term val, it receives the augment ṛt (7.2.35: ārdhaḥṭukāyasyaḥ valādeḥ): lā-ṛṭ-. Now, the -a of lā should be replaced by guṇa, that is, o (7.3.84: sārvadhāḥṭukārdhaḥṭukāyaḥ [guṇaḥ 82]) and then this o should be replaced by av (6.1.78: eco’y-av-āy-āvaḥ [aṭi 77]) in order to arrive at lav-ṛṭ. But, for 7.3.84 to apply, the root must occur immediately before the ārdhaḥṭukāta affix, unless the augment ṛt actually constitutes part of the affix, this is not true.

16: a-tad-artha- ‘not having the same meaning’. Two references are given, to rules 6.2.156 (yā-yatōsacatadarthe [naṇo guṇa-pratīṣṭhe 155, antaḥ 143]) and 6.3.53 (pad yati a-tad-arthe [pādsaye 52]). The first is a complex accentual rule which I will not discuss except to say that a-tad-arthe has the same value there as in 6.3.53. This rule states that pāda- 'feet' is replaced by pad- before the affix yat; a-tad-arthe states a condition under which this replacement does not take place. Now consider two other rules: 4.4.83: vidhyaty a-dhanusā (tad 76, yat 75), 5.4.25: pādārghābhīyām ca (tādārthe yat 24). These are rules for deriving secondary nominal bases by tadhiṣṭa affixation. 4.4.83 states that the affix yat occurs after a nominal + accusative ending (tad) to

* Nominal endings (sup) contained in derived nominal bases (and also in derived roots) are deleted by 2.4.71: suṇo dhātu-pratipadikayoḥ (luk 58).
derive a nominal meaning 'pierces X' (tad vidhyati). Hence, giving pāda- as the value of X, we obtain a taddhita derivative pāda-ya- which is equivalent in meaning to pādau vidhyanti (sarkarāḥ) 'pebbles' which cut the feet'. Rule 5.4.25 provides that yat is affixed to pāda- + dative ending to form a derivative meaning 'intended for ...' (tādarthe); thus pāda-ya- is equivalent to pādārtham (udakam) 'water' for the feet'.

6.3.53 applies to the result of 4.3.83 to yield padya- (padyōḥ sarkarāḥ), but it also forbids replacing pāda- by pad- in the derivative obtained by 5.4.25 (pādyam udakam). For 6.3.53 states that this replacement does not occur when the affix yat has been introduced in the meaning "intended for X"; a-tad-arte thus means 'except in the (meaning condition) 'intended for ...' Prof. Katre correctly translates tādarthya- on p. 274 as 'the being intended for that'.

16: a-taddhita-luk- 'an elision unconnected with a taddhita suffix'. This occurs in 5.4.92: gor a-taddhita-luki (jac 91), which states that the affix tāc occurs after a tatpuruṣa compound ending in go 'cow, bullock' and gives as an additional part of the rule a-taddhita-luki. Now, by 2.1.51 taddhitārthottarapatad samāhāre ca [dik-samkhaye] is derived the tatpuruṣa compound dāsa-go- 'conglomerate of ten cows', which, by 5.4.92, receives the affix tāc to yield dāsa-gava-. The unit dāsa-go- is further classed as a subtype of tatpuruṣa compound, namely the type called dvigu (2.1.52: samkhāyā-pūrvo dviguḥ). Consider now another derivation. Rule 5.1.37 (tena kṛttam [ṭhak 19]) provides for affixing ṭhak to a sequence X + instrumental (tena) to form a taddhita derivative meaning 'bought with X'. And 5.1.28 (adhyārthā-pūrva-dvīgu luṣa a-samjñayāṃ) states that a taddhita affix introduced by a rule under the section headed by 5.1.19 is deleted under certain conditions, among them that it occur after a dvīgu. Hence, with the deletion of ṭhak, we obtain dāsa-go- 'bought for ten cows'. And it is such a derivative which is referred to by a-taddhita-luki in 5.4.92: the compound is such as contains at one stage a taddhita replaced by zero (luk), so that tāc is not added to it. Thus dāsa-gu- contrasts with dāsa-gava-.

19: a-dārsana- 'non-appearance, dis-appearance'. Though this gloss is correct for three of the four rules given as references, it is not correct for 5.4.76 (misprinted as 5.4.96), where a-dārsana- means 'other than eye'. The rule in question (a-kṣoṇa-darśanāt [ac 75]) provides for adding a to a compound ending in the item aksī- when it is used in a meaning other than 'eye'. This is noted by commentators, e.g., Kāś. cakṣuh-paryāya-vacano dārṣana-sābdhaḥ 'The item dārṣana here is (used as) a synonym of caksus (eye)'.

20: ad-upadesa- 'an expression terminating in short a'. This gloss is more appropriate for the Skt. ad-anta and fails to take note of the term upadesa. ad-upadesa- should be 'which ends in short a at the stage of teaching (upadesa)', that is, before grammatical operations apply to an item.

21: a-dravya-prakarṣa- 'non-excellence or non-prominence of matter'. From this gloss it appears that Prof. Katre analyzes the compound as dravyasyā-prakarṣaḥ instead of a-dravyasya (= dravya-bhiṃsasya) prakarṣaḥ 'excellence of a non-thing (other than a thing)'. The latter alone is correct. The rule in question (5.4.11: kim-et-tīh-avyaya-ghād āṃv a-dravya-prakarṣe) states that the affix āṃ is introduced after certain items terminating in tarap, tamap (denoted by the term gha) and states a semantic condition. The items are: kim (interrogative pronoun), items ending in e-, verb forms (terminating in a finite verb ending, denoted by tīh), and indeclinables (avyaya, see below re p. 69).

7 The -a of pāda- is deleted before the taddhita affix -ya- by 6.4.148 (yasyeti ca [lopah 147, taddhithe 144]).

8 By 2.4.1 (dvīgu ekavacanam) a dvīgu compound such as dāsa-gava-, dāsa-go- is treated as singular; and by 2.4.17 (sa napumṣakam) it is also neuter. 1.2.47 (hrasvo napumṣake pratipadikasya) then states that the final vowel of a neuter nominal base is replaced by a short vowel: dāsa-go → dāsa-gu-.
Now consider two forms: *uccaistamām* 'very high up', *uccaistamāh* (parvataḥ) 'highest (mountain)'. The latter is an adjective here referring to a mountain, so that the excellence involved is relative to a thing (*dravya*). This is not true of *uccaistamām*, an adverb. The rule states *a-dravya-prakārse* to prevent the affixation of *ām* in cases like *uccaistamāh*. This is the way commentators have interpreted the rule. For example, Kāśī 5.4.11 asks *a-dravya-prakārṣa iti kīm 'To what end (does Pāṇini say) a-dravya-prakārṣa?* and answers by citing examples where *ām* is excluded by this: *uccaistaraḥ* ('a higher ...'), *uccaistamāh*. Similarly, *Nyāsa* on 5.4.11 introduces a possible objection to be explained away; the objection is: *nanu ca dravyasya na prakārṣi stītāh ca bhāṣya uktam na vai dravyasya prakārṣo stītāh atāḥ pratiṣedhā 'narthakaḥ 'But there is no excellence of a thing; thus it is said in the Bhāṣya (cf. ad 5.3.55: II.413.7), “Indeed, there is no excellence of a thing (only of properties of things);” hence the negation [*a-dravya prakārṣe*] is useless.'

22: *adhikaraṇa*-1 'government, case relationship'. *adhikaraṇa*-2 'sense of the locative case; receptacle; support'. *adhikaraṇa*-3 'substance, thing, object'. *adhikaraṇa*-vācīn 'indicating case relationship'. 'Locus' is the technical meaning of *adhikaraṇa*, as defined by 1.4.45: *adhārādhiṣṭhānaṃ A locus (substratum: *adhāra*) is (assigned the name) *adhikaraṇa*. This technical usage appears in rules such as 2.3.36 (saptamy *adhikaraṇe ca*), which states that the seventh triplet of nominal endings (saptamī) is introduced after a nominal base when a locus is to be denoted; e.g., *katā āste* 'he is seated on a mat', with the locative ending -i after *katā* (*kaṭe*). The term *adhikaraṇa* is also used by Pāṇini in a nontechnical meaning, 'thing' (*dravya*). Thus rule 2.4.13 (vipratisiddham cān-adhikaraṇa-vācī [ekāvacanam 1, dvandvaḥ 2]) provides that a dvandva compound consisting of items denoting opposites (vipratisiddham) is optionally treated as singular provided the items do not denote things (an-adhikaraṇa-vācī); e.g., *śīrṣyan 'hot and cold' (nt. sg.) but *śītyn (udake) ‘hot and cold (waters)' (nt. du.). In his commentary on 1.1.23, Patañjali (Bh. 1.81.11-15) directly contrasts these two usages using rules 2.3.36 and 2.4.13 as examples of the use of a term in both technical or artificial (kṛtrīma) and nontechnical or nonartificial (akṛtrīma) values: *tathādhiṭṭhā* - *dhikaraṇam iti kṛtrīmaḥ dhikaraṇa-sanjñāḥ adhikaraṇa-pradeśaḥ cobbaya-gatār bhavati: saptamy adhikaraṇe ceti kṛtrīmasya grahaṇam, vipratisiddham cān-adhikaraṇa-vācīty akṛtrīmasya. This eliminates one example for Katre's entry *adhikaraṇa*-vācīn; though on p. 22 he gives this as a case where *adhikaraṇa*- means 'case relationship', on p. 27 he correctly glosses an-adhikaraṇa-vācī - 'not signifying a substance' and refers to 2.4.13. The other two references for *adhikaraṇa*-vācīn are also to be eliminated. The rules in question are 2.2.13: *adhikaraṇa-vācīnā ca (saṣṭhī 8, na 10) and 2.3.68: *adhikaraṇa-vācīnās ca (saṣṭhī 50). In connection with these another rule has to be considered: 3.4.76: *kta dhikaraṇe ca dhrauvya-gaṭī-putrayasāṁrā̄ṭhēbyahā. This states that the affix kta īś introduced not only when agent or bhāva is to be denoted but also (ca) when a locus (*adhikaraṇa*) is to be denoted, kta being affixed to roots which are intrasitive (*dhrauvya* - 'fixedness') and those which denote movement (*gaṭi) or eating (*pratyavasāṇa*). Rule 2.3.68 then provides that, when a participial such as āsīta (ās be seated) derived by 3.4.76 is used, the sixth triplet of nominal endings (saṣṭhī) — the genitive endings — is introduced after a nominal to denote an agent: *idam esām āśītaṃ 'this is where they (gen. pl. esām) sit*. And 2.2.13 states that a genitive form by 2.3.68 does not form a compound with such a participial. These references clearly belong under the entry *adhikaraṇa*-3. For *adhikaraṇa*-1 'government, case relationship', in the compound *samānādhikaraṇa-, one reference is given on p. 22, rule 1.2.42. An additional six references appear in the addenda (p. 650): 2.1.49, 2.2.11, 3.2.124, 6.3.34 (misprinted as 6.1.34), 6.3.46, and 8.1.73. On p. 586 appear the entries *samānādhikaraṇa*-1 'grammatical agreement in case with', for which the references are 3.2.124 and 6.3.34 (the misprint 6.1.34 appears here again), and *samānādhikaraṇa*-2 'being in the same case relation with', for which the references are 1.4.105, 1.2.42, 2.1.49, 2.2.11,
6.3.46, and 8.1.73. There are thus eight rules in which the meanings 'government, case relationship' are attributed to adhikarana-. Rule 1.4.105 (yuṣmad upapade samāṇādhikarane sthānīny api madhyamahāḥ) is one of a series of rules stating cooccurrence restrictions whereby a proper set of endings is chosen among all the finite verb endings (see IJ 12.229 [1970]). The set of endings called madhyama (see below, re p. 122: uttama-) is selected if the kāraka (see below, re p. 173: kāraka-, kāraka-madhy-) denoted by the verb ending(s) is the same as that of a potentially used (sthānīny api) cooccurring (upapada 'subjoined item', see below, re p. 133) pronoun yuṣmad (2nd person pronoun). That is, if an agent (kara) or object (karan) denoted by verb endings in general is also denoted by yuṣmad the madhyama endings are selected; e.g., tvam gechasti 'you are going' contains the madhyama ending -si denoting the same agent as tvam (which replaces yuṣmad). Commentators are clear on this point: Bh. I.354.6: yuṣmadi śādhane 'when (if) yuṣmad is the śādhana (i.e., kāraka), Kā. 1.4.105: samāṇādhikarane samāṇābhidheye tulya-kārake (By) samāṇādhikarane (is meant) "when (the verb ending and the upapada) have the same denotation (samāṇābhidheye)", (that is), "when they (refer to) the same kāraka.' Clearly there is no question here of anything but coreference. If by 'case relationship' Prof. Katre here means the role played by a given thing with respect to an action this is acceptable. But it is not overly clear, since adhikarana- 'substance' is listed separately. Again, let us consider rule 1.2.42 (tatpurusah samāṇādhikaranaḥ karmadhārayah), which defines the class of compounds called karmadhāraya. A tatpurusa compound which is samāṇādhikarana is a karmadhāraya; e.g., nilotpala 'blue-lotus' equivalent to nilam utpalam 'blue lotus'. In this case one can speak of the same case: both the adjective nilam and the noun utpalam are nominative singular neuter. But now consider what is said in the Bhaṣya regarding rule 1.2.42. Kātyāyana here argues against the definition, claiming it is improper, and he argues on the basis of meaning. For the relation of samāṇādhikarana to obtain it is necessary to have two items with distinct meanings, which are then samāṇādhikarana with each other. But a tatpurusa compound has a single meaning. Therefore, if the rule states, 'a tatpurusa which is samāṇādhikarana is (termed) karmadhāraya' it is an improper definition; vt. 1: tatpurusas samāṇādhikaranaḥ karmadhāraya iti cet samāsaikārthatvād a-prasiddhiḥ. The second vārttika proposes to set things in order by stating: siddhiṃ tu pada-samāṇādhikaranyāt 'All is in order, since (we will state that) there is samāṇādhikaranya of padaś (syntactic items which enter into composition). In his commentary on the Bhaṣya ad 1.2.42 Kātyāja also clearly states what is at issue (Pr. I.2.37b): bhinnā-pravṛtti-nimittā-prayuktasyākeṣyasā sabdasyaikasmin arthe vṛttiḥ samāṇādhikaranyam ucyate.' (By) samāṇādhikaranya is meant the occurrence of more than one item referring to a single thing, each item having a distinct base meaning.69 In its comments on I.2.42 the Kā. also reflects the view that samāṇādhikarana means 'having the same denotatum (in a context); adhikarana-śabdo 'bhidheya-vācī samāṇādhikaranaḥ samāṇābhidheyaḥ; similarly, Nyāsa, PM ad 3.2.124. And in Kā. ad 2.1.49 we find a statement almost identical with that cited above from the Pradipa: bhinnā-pravṛtti-nimittāsā sabdasyaikasmin arthe vṛttiḥ samāṇādhikaranyam. Finally, consider a statement made by Patañjali in a discussion having nothing to do with case. In the discussion of I.3.1 it is suggested that a verb root (dhātu) be defined semantically as that which denotes an action (kriyā-vacana, Bh. I.254.13: kriyā-vacana dhātuḥ). Patañjali then asks how one knows that roots such as pac 'cook' denote actions (Bh. I.(254.20): katham punar jñāyate kriyā-vacanaḥ pac-udaya iti), to which the answer is: such items are samāṇādhihikaraṇa with kṛṛ ṛ
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‘do’ (whence kriyā); for example, if one asks, ‘What is he doing?’ one answer is, ‘He is cooking’; Bh. I.254.20-21: yad esām karotiṇā sāmāṇādhikaranyam kim karotī pacati. What is clearly meant is that all verb roots denote particular actions, while kr denotes activity in general, so that all roots can be said to have a denotation in common with kr. In effect, in all the instances of Prof. Katre’s adhikarana-1 ‘government, case relation’ it is proper to say that the gloss should be ‘thing denoted’ and that sāmāṇādhikarana refers to items which, in a given context, refer to the same thing. To be sure, in the case of adjectives and the nouns they qualify, sāmāṇādhikaranya entails an identity of endings. But this is more properly viewed as the linguistic expression of sāmāṇādhikaranya. This term is thus most closely comparable to abheda ‘identity’ of Nyāya grammatical works. For example, in his Vyuttapāvada Gādādhara notes that identity appears (bhāsate) to the cognition through a linguistic expression as obtaining between that which is brought to cognition (upasthāpitasya) by a syntactic item X (padena, e.g., nilaḥ ‘a blue . . .’) and the denotatum of a nominal base Y (pratipadikārtā, e.g., just, the denotatum of ghaṭa) on condition that X have the same ending as Y (sva-samāna-vibhaktikena) or that X immediately precede Y (svāvyavahita-pārva-vartinī)10 e.g., nilo ghaṭaḥ ‘(A) blue jug’, nila-ghaṭaḥ.

23: adhiṣṭa- = satkārapārvako vyāpāraḥ Kaś. ‘instruction given by a teacher solicited for it’. In rule 3.3.161 (vidhinmantraṇa-mantraṇadhista-samprastha-prārthanaḥ liti), misprinted as 3.3.61, the proper meaning for adhiṣṭa is ‘respectful command’, one of the meanings which condition the use of optative endings. That the term denotes a type of command is clear from the Bhāṣya, where Patañjali asks what is the distinction between adhiṣṭa and vidhi ‘injunction, command’; he notes that vidhi is a mere charging of someone to do something, while adhiṣṭa is a respectful command; Bh. II.165.10-11: vidhy-adhiṣṭayoḥ ko viśeṣaḥ/ vidhir nāma preṣaṇam/ adhiṣṭam nāma sat-kāra-pūrvikā vyāpāraḥ ‘. . . adhiṣṭa is a respectful causing to do.’ This is the meaning of adhiṣṭa also in 3.3.166 (adhiṣṭa ca [lof 165]), which provides for the use of imperative endings when adhiṣṭa is to be denoted and the particle sma is used. The Kaś. gives as one example for this rule anīga sma rājan māṇavacakam adhyāpaya ‘Do teach the lad, oh king’ and vyāpārah of the Kaś’s gloss ad 3.3.161 is properly interpreted as an action noun of the causative vyāparyat ‘has do . . . ’, as noted in PM ad loc. (ny-anād er ac). In rule 5.1.80 (tam adhiṣṭa . . . [kālī 78]) adhiṣṭa is a participle referring to one who has respectfully commanded, and Kaś. glosses accordingly: adhiṣṭah sat-kṛtya vyāpāraḥ.

28: an-abhyāsa- ‘lacking reduplication, non-reduplicated’. The term is thus taken as a bahuvrihi compound referring to a root (dhātu). Though this is possible, it should be noted that this is not the interpretation found in commentaries which give detailed explanations and paraphrases of rules. Kaś. ad 6.1.8 glosses anabhāyāsya dhātor avayavasya ‘of that part of a root which is other than a reduplicated syllable’; similarly SK 2177, commenting on which the Bālanamoramā explicitly says abhyāsa-bhinnasya.

33: an-udātta- ‘accentless’. There should actually be three entries in accord with Prof. Katre’s procedure in the rest of this book: anudātta-1 ‘a low-pitched vowel’, anudātta-2 (an item) which contains (a) low-pitched vowel(s) [anudātto (-ā) yasmin], and anudātta-3 (an item) which contains no high-pitched vowel [nodātto yasmin]. The first term is the technical term defined by 1.2.30: nīcār anudāttaḥ (ac 27). The second appears, for example, in 7.2.10: ekāca upadēśeṇa-nudāttāt (net 8), which con-
travenes 7.2.35 (see above, re p. 15). One of the provisions of the rule is that after a root which is taught as containing a low-pitched vowel an ārddhādātuka affix does not receive the augment ōt; e.g., from ḍukṛṇ the agent noun comparable to lav-īr is kar-īr.

An example of anudātta- ā is 6.1.190 (anudātte ca). This is an accentural rule stating that the first vowel of reduplicated forms of roots (abhyaśtanāma ādīth, 6.1.189) is high pitched (udātta, 6.1.159) before a verb ending replacing an L-member and which does not contain a high-pitched vowel; e.g., ādātī ‘gives’ (root ādī). As Patañjali notes (Bh. III.113.21-22) anudātta in 6.1.190 is to be interpreted as meaning ‘in which an udātta vowel does not occur’ (avidyamāndatet ādātī iti vaktavayām). Otherwise, in a form such as ādíaḥ (as in mā hi sma ādíaḥ ‘let him not put’) one could not get the proper accentuation by the rule, since -t does not contain a low-pitched vowel.

33: anudeśa- ‘one to one correspondence’. This gives the import of the rule in which the term occurs rather than an accurate gloss of the term itself. The rule in question is 1.3.10: yathā-prakhyam anudeśaḥ samāṇām. This states that, when two sequences of items are stated in connection with an operation and both contain the same number of items, the subsequent enumeration is related to the former both. For example, 6.1.78 (see above, re p. 15) uses the term ec to denote the vowels e, o, ai, au and states the substitutes ay, av, ā, āv; substituenda and substituentia are related in order, so that ay replaces e, etc. Anudeśa- means ‘subsequent enumeration’ with reference to items such as the substitutes of 6.1.78.

39: antādvāt ‘(simultaneously) serving as the word-final (of the preceding) and word-initial (of the following) expressions’. The term is used in 6.1.85 (antādvāc ca) and may do with rules which provide a single replacement for two contiguous items (6.1.84: ekāḥ pūrva-parayoḥ). But there is no limitation to word-final contexts. For example, given pā-a-anti (root pā ‘drink’, presentative affix šep and 3rd pl. ending -anti), rule 6.1.97 (ato guṇe [apadāntaḥ 96, para-rūpas 94]) applies so that -a₁-a₂ yields -a₂-pā-anti. At this stage, 7.3.78 (pā ... pība ... [šiti 75]) should apply to replace pā with pība: pība-anti → pībanti. But this rule applies when the root occurs before an affix marked with s (šiti) such as šep. By letting the single vowel -a₁- be treated as though it were the final (antavat) of the previous unit, -anti resulting from -a₁- is treated as marked with s. But there is no word final involved.

42: a-paścami- ‘other than the ablative (case)’. But on p. 346 paścami- is glossed ‘endings of the fifth or ablative case’. I think it would be preferable to give a single gloss which is strictly in accord with Pāṇini’s usage. The terms prathāmā ‘1st’, dvitiyā ‘2nd’, tretīyā ‘3rd’, caturthi ‘4th’, paścami ‘5th’, saṣṭhī ‘6th’, and saaptami ‘7th’ refer only to triplets (iriṇa) of nominal endings; e.g., prathamā refers to the endings su, au, jas, dvitiyā to am, aut, sas, etc. Some modification in this direction is desirable for all the entries of this nature.

47: a-pūrva-nīpāta- ‘other than occupying the first place’. Reference is made to 1.2.44. But on p. 336, sv. nīpāta ‘particle’, again 1.2.44 is referred to. This rule has nothing to do with particles. It provides that certain items are classed as upasarjana (see below, re p. 135) except with respect to occurring in prior position (a-pūrva-nīpāte), that is, though they are upasarjana, they do not, like others of this class, occur as prior members of compounds.

52: abhyāsa- ‘the first syllable of a reduplicated verbal base’. Though this is the technical meaning of abhyāsa, valid in most rules, the term has a nontechnical meaning in rule 1.3.71, which is given as a reference. Here it means ‘repetition’; cf. Kāś. ad loc.: abhyāsāḥ punāḥ punāḥ karaṇam āvṛtiḥ.

69: avayava- ‘an indeclinable word’. This gloss is in accord with the definition of an avayava as an item which does not undergo modification for gender, cases denoted by different endings, or number (Bh. 1.96.13: na vyetti avayavam, 1.96.16-17: saṅsāraṁ triṣṣu līṅgē sarvās ca vibhaktiśū vacaneṣu ca sarveṣu yan na vyetti tad avayavam). But this is not true in Pāṇini’s system. For the compound type called avayāvabhāva (Katre,
p. 70: 'an indeclinable compound') also belongs to the avayya class (1.1.41: avayybāvaś ca [avayyam 37]). After an avayybāva in -a, nominal endings of the fifth triplet of endings are not deleted or replaced by -am, as are other endings in this environment (2.4.83: nāvayybāvā ato m tv a-paścyamāḥ); and -am replaces the third and seventh triplets only optionally (2.4.84: triyā-saptamory bahulam); e.g., abl. upakumbhād ānaya 'bring (it) from near the pot', loc. upakumbe dēhi 'put (it) near the pot' from the avayybāvā upakumbe. I would accept the use of 'indeclinable' as a term sanctioned by usage, but some clarification is in order.

75: a-samdhi- 'want of euphonic union or connection'. However, in the rule referred to, 6.2.154, the meaning is rather 'contract; agreement'. Prof. Katre correctly glosses, p. 582, sam-dhi- 'agreement on oath'.

76: a-sūrya- 'sunless'. 77: asūryam-paśya- 'not seeing the sun'. The negative a- in a-sūryam-paśya is syntactically connected with the verb, the compound being an equivalent of na sūryam paśyanti 'do not see the sun'. a-sūrya- is an example of what is called an a-samartha-samāsa, a compound (samāsa) whose members are not (a-) syntactically and semantically connected (samartha); normally composition takes place only with items so related. I think it would have been better to leave a-sūrya- without a gloss, merely referring to the entry a-sūryam-paśya-.

77: a-stri- 'other than feminine'. In 3.3.94 (striyāṁ kīn) stri- means 'femininity' with respect to gender; the rule states that kīn is affixed to roots to form feminine action nouns, e.g., krti-. In 1.4.4, on the other hand, stri- is used to refer to the item 'stri-' (Kāś. stri-sabdāṃ varjayitvā 'excepting the item stri'). And in 3.1.94 stri- is used to refer to a section heading; see Pratidānam (Festschrift F. B. J. Kuiper), pp. 451-2. On p. 620 Prof. Katre does make two separate entries: stri1 'feminine gender' and stri2 'the expression stri'.

78: asmād- 'base of the first person pronoun plural'. Similarly, p. 470, yuṣmad- 'base of the second person pronoun in pl. number'. It is worth noting that in Pāṇini's system asmād- and yuṣmad- are simply the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which, after various replacements, yield the singular forms also. See below, re p. 148.

88. ātmane-pada- 'the middle voice', But on p. 335 the term parasmāt-pada is glossed 'the personal endings of the active voice'. The latter is correct; both these terms denote sets of verb endings.

91: ā-deśa- 'substitute morpheme'. This term should rather be glossed simply 'substitute' or 'replacement'. For example, the au which replaces the -v of div- 'heaven' (7.1.84: diva aut) is an ādeśa; see II 12.233 (1970).

92: ādyanta-vat- '1. (mfn.) having beginning and end; 2. ind. as if it were the beginning and end'. A single rule is given as reference, 1.1.21: ādy-anta-vad ekasmin. Consider rule 7.3.102: supi ca (ato dirgho yaḥ 101, aṅgasya 6.4.1). This states that a- is replaced by the long vowel (dirgha) -ā before one of the sounds denoted by yaḥ, among them y, these sounds being initials of nominal endings (sup). This rule comes under the heading of 6.4.1, so that it applies to a presuffixal base. Now, rule 1.1.72 (yena vidhis tad-antasya) provides that an item X used (as a qualifier) in stating an operation denotes both itself and the unit ending in it (tad-anta). Hence at of 7.3.102 denotes the presuffixal base ending in -a; e.g., puruṣa-yā → puruṣāya 'to the man'. Now consider the derivation of the inst.-dat.-abl. du. ābhyaṃ '... them'. At one stage of derivation we have a-bhyyām. In order for 7.3.102 to apply so that a- be replaced by ā- a special provision has to be made, since a- is not here the final of a larger unit. This provision is made by rule 1.1.21, which states that a single sound (eka) is treated as though it were the initial (ādi) or final (anta) of a larger unit. Prof. Katre's two glosses are incompatible. The first apparently takes var to be the possessive affix (matup, with replacement), the latter interprets var as the affix vari. Only the latter is correct; rule 5.1.116 (tatra tasyeva [vaiśī 115]) allows for introducing vari after a nominal + locative ending (tatra) to obtain a derivative meaning 'as there' (tatreva), and this is
the rule invoked to explain -vat of 1.1.21 by commentators; Kāś. saptamy-arthे vatiḥ. 96: ā-äremēdēta- ‘reduplication’. This is not strictly in accord with Pāṇini’s definition. Rule 8.1.1 (sarvasya dve) is a heading which provides that, under the conditions given in subsequent rules, an entire item (sarva) is doubled. 8.1.2 (tasya param āremēdētam) then states that the second (param ‘subsequent’) of the two items thus obtained is termed āremēdēta; e.g., in jālpati jālpati ‘constantly chatters’ and puruṣāḥ puruṣo nidhanam upatti ‘all men go unto death’ (see below, re p. 335) the second jālpati and puruṣāḥ are āremēdēta.

122: uttama-2 ‘the first person’. But prathama-2 (p. 391) is accompanied by the gloss ‘the endings of the first person’ and on p. 436 madhyama-2, is glossed ‘the endings of the second person’. The first entry should be modified to accord with the last two: these are all terms denoting sets of verb endings. See below, re p. 148.

123: upa-pada- ‘a word standing near or accompanying another to which it is subordinated’. Though ‘cooccurring item’ is a perfectly justifiable gloss for this item (cf., e.g., Kāś. 1.3.77: samipe śrīyamāṇo śabdāntaram upapadām) and is valid in rules such as 1.3.77, 1.4.105 (see above, re p. 22), it should be noted that it is also a technical term defined by Pāṇini. Rule 3.1.92 (tropapadām saptami-sthaṃ) provides that what is stated in the locative (saptami-stha) in rules of the section headed by 3.1.91 (dīhāḥ ‘after a root’) is termed upa-pada. For example, 3.2.1 (karmāṇi aṇ) contains the locative karmāṇi of kṛman ‘object’; it provides that aṇ is affixed to a root construed with an upa-pada denoting an object. And rule 2.2.19 (upa-padām a-tīti) then provides for compounding such a nominal upa-pada with the syntactically related verb derivative, the compound not alternating with a sentential expression containing the same items (2.2.17: nityam). Thus, by 3.2.1, aṇ is affixed to kṛ to yield kāra-’maker’, which forms a compound with, e.g., kumbhā + acc.: kumbhā-kāra- (with deleted acc., see fn. 6) ‘pot maker’; this is equivalent to kumbhān karoṭī ‘makes pots’ but does not have an alternate expression *kumbhān kāraḥ consisting of kumbhā + acc. and kāra.

135: upa-sarjana- ‘subordinate, secondary’. Here again, though this gloss is perfectly justified, it should be noted that Pāṇini both uses the term in this sense and defines a class of upa-sarjanas. The two such definition rules are 1.2.43 (prathamā-nirdiśtam samāsa upasarjanaṃ) and 1.2.44 (eka-vibhikti cāpurvanipāte). The first states that what is stated in the nominative (prathamā-nirdiśta ‘stated with the first triplet of nominal endings’) in the section of rules for compounds (samāsa) is upa-sarjana. The second rule provides for classing as upa-sarjana an item which, in the derivation of a compound, always has the same set of nominal endings (eka-vibhikti). This rule also has a qualification: such an item is upa-sarjana except with respect to occupying prior position (a-pūrva-nipāta). Now, by 2.2.30 (upasarjanam pāram) an upa-sarjana generally occurs as prior member of a compound. For example, 2.2.8 (ṣaṭṭhi) provides for a nominal + genitive (ṣaṭṭhi) to compound with a syntactically related item; further, ṣaṭṭhi is a nominative form, so that the nominal + genitive is upa-sarjana, hence occurs as prior member; thus, to tad- + gen. and puruṣa-s (tasya puruṣah) corresponds the compound tat-puruṣa-. 2.2.18 (ku-gati-prādayaḥ) provides for a compound from items such as nis and syntactically related items; e.g., nis-kauśāmbī- ‘gone from Kauśāmbī’ (kauśāmbīya nīśkṛtāḥ). Since kauśāmbī- is always followed by the ablative ending in whatever sentence corresponds to the compound, it is upa-sarjana- by 1.2.44. By the same rule it does not occupy prior position; this is preserved for nis, which is also upa-sarjana, since prādayaḥ ‘pra etc. (including nis)’ is stated in the nominative. The reason for classing kauśāmbī- is to allow -i to be replaced by the short vowel -i: nis-kauśāmbih; see Pratīdānam, p. 451. Now consider the derivation of compounds of the dvandva type. 2.2.29 (cārthe dvandvah [anekam 28]) provides that multiple syntactically related items may be compounded to form a derivative in the meaning ‘... and ...’, such a compound being termed dvandva. Thus is derived, for
example, āpišala-pāninīyāḥ 'students of Āpišali and students of Pāninī'. Accentual rules are formulated to show which of the vowels in a compound is high pitched. One such rule is 6.2.36 (ācāryopasarjanascāntevasī [prakṛtyā pūrva-padam 1]), which states that the prior syntactic item (pūrva-pada) of a dvanda retains its original accentuation (prakṛtyā) if the compound consists of items denoting antevasīs who are ācāryopasarjana. This can only mean (cf. Nyāsa ad loc.) that the principal meaning of a compound such as that cited above is a conjunction of antevasīs while the subordinate (upasarjana) meaning is certain teachers (ācārya), that is, the compound denotes antevasīs qualified as being students of certain teachers. The technical meaning of upa-sarjana by 1.2.43, 44 is not appropriate here.

148: eka-vacana- 'the singular number'. divi-vacana- (p. 315) is glossed 'the dual and its endings' and bahu-vacana- has the gloss (p. 409) 'the plural number'. Here again a distinction should have been made between the two distinct values of these terms. By 1.4.101 (tiṇas trīn trīni prathama-madhyamottamah) each set of three verb endings (tiṇ) within the parasmaipada and atmanepada sets of endings is called, in order, prathama, madhyama, and uttama. Thus, the first three endings, tip, tas, and jhi are thus termed both parasmaipada and prathama. Within such a triple the first, second, and third endings are respectively called ekavacana, dvivacana, and bahuvacana by 1.4.102 (tāṇy ekavacana-dvivacana-bahuvacanān ēkāśāh); thus, tip is ekavacana, tas is dvivacana, and jhi (which yields -anti, -ati by 7.1.3, 4) is bahuvacana. Rule 1.4.102 (supah) further states that within each of the seven triplets of nominal endings (denoted by sup) the first, second, and third are respectively termed ekavacana, dvivacana, and bahuvacana; thus the endings su, au, jas, which constitute the first triplet, bear these respective names. These terms are used in their technical value in various rules which need not be taken up here; see II 12.229 (1970) for examples. But now consider the following rules: 7.2.92: yuvāvau dvivacana, 7.2.97: tvam-māv ekavacana, 7.2.98: pratyayottara-pada-yos ca. The first rule pertains to the derivation of dual forms such as nom.-acc. yuvām, dvām (1st person, 2nd person); e.g., yuṣmad-au → yuṣmad-am (7.1.28) → yuva-ad-am (7.2.97) → yuva-a-am (7.2.87, 88) → yuvāām (6.1.97) → yuvām (6.1.101) → yuvām (6.1.107); similarly, dvām < asmad-au. The second rule pertains to the derivation of forms such as the acc. tvām, mām; e.g., yuṣmad-am → tvad-ad-am → tvad-a-am ... → tvām. In these rules one could say, possibly, that dviva-cana means 'before a dvivacana ending' and ekavacana means 'before an ekavacana ending'; the replacement of the yuṣm-, asm- of yuṣmad-, asmad- by yuva-, āva-, tvā-, ma- would then occur before such endings. But the third rule being considered speaks against this. For this rule states that the replacements provided in 7.2.97 also (ca) take effect when the items in question occur before an affix (prataya) or a subsequent member of a compound (uttara-pada); e.g., tvad-tva- 'yours', tvat-putra- 'your son'. Here the items yuṣmad-, asmad- do not occur before ekavacana endings, since these have been deleted within the derivative nominals (see above, fn. 6 and Journal of Indian Philosophy 1.72, fn. 65 (1970)). The term eka-vacana which carries into 7.2.98 from 7.2.97 is, then, to be analyzed as a compound (as shown) meaning 'expression of one'; similarly, divi-vacana in 7.2.92 means 'expression of two' and eka-vacana in 2.4.1 (see above, re p. 22) also has a value distinct from that assigned by 1.4.102, 103.

164: The reference to 3.1.17 belongs under the entry karana-2 'doing, making, effecting' rather than under karana-1 'idea expressed by the inst. case; instrumentality, the means or instrument by which an action is effected'.

165: kartr-1 'the agent of an action; subject of a sentence'. This is apt to lead to confusion, hence it would have been better to give only the first gloss.

173: kāra-3 'a suffix added after a phoneme'. No reference is given. In vt. 3 ad 3.3.108 (varatā kārāh) Kātyāyana states that the affix kāra is introduced after a sound (vara) to form a nominal which denotes that sound; e.g., a-kāra 'the sound a'. Similarly, vt. 2 (ik-stipāu dhātu-nirdese) states that ik and śtip are affixed to roots, yielding derivatives
which refer to the roots; e.g., ad-i (ad ‘eat’), as-ti (as ‘be’). Though Pāṇini does in
fact use ad-i (2.4.72), as-ti (2.4.52), and other such forms, he does not formulate a
rule to introduce the affixes ik, śip for such derivatives. Hence, these affixes are
properly not listed in Prof. Katre’s dictionary. But neither should kāra be listed.

173: kāraka-madhyya- ‘between two cases’. On the same page kāraka- is accompanied
by the gloss ‘instrumental in bringing about the action denoted by the verb; the notion
of a case’. Together these entries leave unclear exactly what is meant by kāraka-madhyya-
see III 12.238 (1970) for the rule in which the term occurs and an example of the usage
for which it accounts.

187: kṛtya-1 ‘the class of affixes forming the future passive participle’. Although
kṛtya affixes generally are introduced in derivative nominals denoting direct objects
(karman) or bhūya (3.4.70), it should be noted that such affixes occur in other types of
derivatives also. For example, yat occurs in vah-yā-, which denotes a means of trans-
portation (3.1.102: vahyam karanam); this item does not mean ‘fit to bear or to be
borne, fit to draw or to be drawn’ (thus Katre, p. 507).

216: gotra-1 ‘technical term for an affix used for forming patronyms or matro-
nymics; the grandson and his descendants’. I think it would have been useful to separate
the references for the two glosses. Strictly speaking, gotra- need be interpreted as
denoting affixes only in three rules, 4.1.94, 4.2.39, 4.3.80. 4.1.162 (aparyam pastra-
prabhiy gotram) defines gotra as denoting a descendant starting from the grandson.
And this usage applies in 2.4.63, 4.1.78, 89, 93, 98, 4.2.111. In 4.3.126, 5.1.134 gotra-
is used to denote nominal bases which are patronymics, and in 6.2.69 the term is used
with reference to a second member of a compound having this meaning. Moreover, in
4.2.39, 4.3.80, according to commentators, gotra does not have the meaning assigned
it by 4.1.162 but rather denotes any descendant.

245: jani-kart- ‘progenitor, procreator, bringing into being; the agent of jani’.
In the only rule given as reference (1.4.30) the appropriate meaning is ‘agent of coming into’.

246: jayya- ‘to be conquered or gained’. In the rule referred to (6.1.81, misprinted
as 6.1.87) and the one given in the addenda (5.1.93, p. 689) this item means ‘which
can be conquered’. On p. 199 kṣayya- is correctly glossed ‘(anything) that can be
destroyed or removed’ and reference is made to 6.1.81, where Pāṇini explicitly says
that jayya-, kṣayya- are used in the meaning ‘which can be ...’ (sakṣāthet).

270: ta-para- ‘followed or preceded by the phoneme t’. The twofold interpretation
of this term as ‘followed by t’ (tah para yasmāt) and ‘following t’ (tāt paraḥ) is, to be
sure, entertained in all the major commentaries. But it is equally clear that the only
interpretation which does not lead to great difficulties and overly subtle argumentation
to avoid these (e.g., claiming that what is taken to be t is really d) is the first.

335: nitya- ‘fixed, necessary, obligatory’. One of the references given is 8.1.4: nitya-
vipṣayoh, which provides for the doubling of items under the condition that the meanings
nitya and vipṣā are to be conveyed by the speaker. This rule serves for deriving such sequences as jaṭpati jaṭpati, puruṣah puruṣo niṇhanam upaiti, for which
see above, re p. 96. But here nitya does not mean ‘permanent, fixed’, as Patañjali notes
(ad 8.1.4, III.364.26) it means here ‘constant repetition’ (ābhikṣaṇya); the rule thus
refers to actions which an agent constantly performs (Kāś. ad 8.1.4: yām kṛyāṁ
kartā prādhāññenānuparam karoti tan nityam). Nor does vipṣā in 8.1.4 mean simply
‘repetition’ (thus Katre, p. 525). The term is used with reference to the total pervasion
(vi-āp) of objects by properties or actions, which pervasion the speaker wishes to
convey, as in the example ‘all men go unto death’; cf. Bh. ad 8.1.4 (II.365.2-6).

486: lañ ‘the personal endings of the imperfect’. lat ‘the personal endings of the
present tense’. Similarly, p. 488: lin ‘the personal endings of the Potential (Optative)
and Benedictive moods’. lij ‘the personal endings of the Perfect; the Perfect Tense’.
p. 490: luti ‘the personal endings of the Aorist’. lut ‘the personal endings of the Peri-
phrastic Future'. p. 491: \( \text{lṛṭ} \) 'personal endings of the Future'. \( \text{lṛt} \) 'the personal endings of the (Vedic) Subjunctive'. \( \text{lot} \) 'the personal endings of the Imperative'. On p. 491 should be added \( \text{lṛṭ} \) (3.3.139), the L-member introduced in deriving conditionals. All such L-members are replaced by personal endings, themselves subject to further substitutions depending on which L is at their origin (3.4.77-112). And Pāṇini does indeed use such L’s to denote endings which replace them. For example, 3.4.113 (\( \text{tiḥ} \) \( \text{ṣṝva-dhātukam} \)) assigns to the class of \( \text{sārvadhātuka} \) those post-radical affixes which are marked with \( \text{s} \) and the finite endings denoted by \( \text{tiḥ} \); 3.4.114 (see above, re p. 15) classes as \( \text{ārdhadhātuka} \) the remaining (\( \text{sēṣa} \)) post-radical affixes. And 3.4.115 (\( \text{liṭ ca} \)) is a particular rule contravening 3.4.113; it states that \( \text{liṭ also (ca) is ārdhadhātuka} \). Obviously, here \( \text{liṭ} \) must then denote the endings which replace it; cf. Kāś.: \( \text{līṭ-ādesas tiḥ ārdhadhātuka-saṃjñō bhavati} \). But this is certainly not always the case. Rule 3.2.124 (\( \text{laṭah satṛ-sānacau ...} \))\(^{11}\) states that \( \text{laṭ} \) is replaced by \( \text{satṛ} \) or \( \text{sānac} \), participial affixes. Now, these are marked with \( \text{s} \), which must have a purpose. And the only purpose possible is the classification of the affixes as \( \text{sārvadhātuka} \) by 3.4.113. But, if \( \text{satṛ} \), for example, were a replacement of a finite ending such as \( \text{ṛ} \), it would be marked with \( \text{s} \) merely by virtue of having replaced an ending so marked (1.1.56: \( \text{ṣhāṇivad ādesō'na-alvidhau} \)); it is for this reason, for example, that Pāṇini specifically states that the imperative ending \( \text{hi} \) replacing \( \text{ṣip} \) is not marked with \( \text{p} \) (3.4.87: \( \text{ṣer hy a-pīc ca} \)). Moreover, considering \( \text{satṛ} \) to be a replacement of endings such as \( \text{ṭip} \) raises insurmountable problems regarding accentual rules. In general, the first vowel of an affix (\( \text{pratyaya} \)) is high pitched (3.1.3: \( \text{aḍy-udāṭtasca} \)); thus, \( \text{-āt} \) (\( \text{ṣatṛ} \)). But nominal affixes (\( \text{spa} \)) and affixes marked with \( \text{p} \) (\( \text{piṭ} \)) have low pitched vowels (3.1.4: \( \text{anudāṭṭu sup-pita} \)); thus, \( \text{ṭ} \) (inst. sg. ending), \( \text{ṭip} \). Now consider the derivation of a participial form such as \( \text{lūnatā} \) ‘cutting’. If \( \text{ṣatṛ} \) replaces \( \text{laṭ} \) directly and not an ending such as \( \text{ṭip} \), \( \text{lūnāt} \)- is derived as follows: \( \text{lū-laṭ → lū-āt → lū-nā-āt} \) (3.1.81) → \( \text{lū-n-āt} \) (6.4.112). This base is then followed by the affix \( \text{ā} \), which is low pitched. Rule 6.1.173 (\( \text{ṣatur a-numo nady-aj-āḍi} \)) then applies to let the ending \( \text{ā} \) be high pitched: \( \text{lūnāt} \). This rule provides that such an ending is high pitched if it follows a unit ending in \( \text{ṣatṛ} \) which has not been augmented with \( \text{num} \) (\( \text{-ant} \)) and whose last vowel is high pitched (\( \text{antodāṭṭā 6.1.169} \)). \( \text{lu-n-āt-ā} \) meets these conditions. If, on the other hand, \( \text{ṣatṛ} \) replaces \( \text{ṭip} \) etc., we immediately run into a problem. Given \( \text{lū-laṭ → lū-ti} \), we have to decide whether \( \text{ṭi} \) should condition the introduction of \( \text{sna} \) (as in the 3rd sg. pres. \( \text{lūnāt} \)) or should be replaced by \( \text{ṣatṛ} \), which, since it is also \( \text{sārvadhātuka} \), will also condition the introduction of \( \text{sna} \). The decision to \( \text{ṭi} \) replaced by \( \text{ṣatṛ} \) first must be arbitrary. Further, once we progress to the stage \( \text{lū-nā-āt} \) (with low pitched \( \text{-at} \) replacing \( \text{ṭip} \)) → \( \text{lū-n-āt} \), we must invoke an additional rule to let \( \text{-āt} \) be accented as shown; 6.1.161 (\( \text{anudāṭtasya ca yatrodāṭtalopah} \)) provides for replacing an \( \text{anudāṭṭa} \) by an \( \text{udāṭta} \) if it conditions the deletion of a high pitched vowel. Though we can thus arrive at \( \text{lū-n-āt-} \), it is only at a cost; the alternative derivation involves an arbitrary decision and prolixity. But this is not all. For it is impossible to follow the alternative derivation if one is to correctly arrive at a form such as \( \text{sunvātā} \) ‘pressing’. Even making the arbitrary decision noted above, so that we can somehow arrive at \( \text{su-nā-āt} \), we cannot reach the required \( \text{su-m-āt} \). For here rule 6.1.161 cannot apply. The only rule which could possibly apply is 8.2.4 (\( \text{udāṭta-svarītayor yañah svarīto'nuudāṭtasya} \)); and this only provides for replacing, in the present instance, the low pitched vowel of \( \text{-a} \) by a circumflex vowel after the semivowel \( \text{-i} \) which has replaced \( \text{-i} \). From the above it follows necessarily that \( \text{laṭ} \) in 3.2.124 cannot denote finite verb endings.

532: \( \text{vipākaraṇa} \)- ‘relating to grammar, grammatical; (m) a grammarian’. In the only rule given as reference (6.3.7) the term means ‘grammarian’. It occurs as part of

\(^{11}\) See \( \text{Linca} 25.214 \) (1970), where I inadvertently left out a note stating that \( \text{ṣatṛ} \), \( \text{sānac} \) were there treated as replacements of finite forms only for purposes of presenta-
the compound vaiyākarānakhyā, which Prof. Katre glosses (p. 532) ‘a technical term in grammar’. A more precise gloss would be ‘a term which (only) grammarians use (normally)’; cf. Kāśi, ad loc.: yayā samījīhaya vaiyākarānā eva vyavaharanti. vaiyākarana is derived in the meaning ‘who studies (knows) grammar’ by 4.2.59: tad adhīte tad veda.

The task of a lexicographer dealing with a work such as Pāṇini’s is extremely difficult, for it is at times impossible to give a brief yet fully accurate gloss for terms which have no exact counterparts in Western grammatical traditions. I personally think what is needed is an encyclopedic kośa similar to the magnificent multivolume Mīmāṃsā-kośa and Dharma-kośa, tracing the history of terminology with full textual citations from all major grammarians and English paraphrases. Such a massive work is possibly without the reach of a single scholar. In the meantime, I personally am and I think the whole scholarly community should be thankful to Prof. Katre for his effort to make a bit easier entry into the Pāṇinian tradition.¹²

University of Pennsylvania

George Cardona


Wenn auch sicher scheint, dass in der Zeit nach Bharata die Grenze zwischen improvisiertem und gedichtetem Teil des pūrvaranga langsam zugunsten des Schauspielverfassers verrückt worden war, schweben wir betreffend der ersten, einleitenden und auch im klassischen Drama noch vom sūtradhāra produzierten Vorspielglieder – einer Reihe gröstenteils musikalischer Vorbereitungen – noch so gut wie im Dunklen.

¹² This was written while I was a fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California, to the director of which, O. Meredith Wilson, I express my sincere thanks.
¹ Im folgenden NS.
Während zu vermuten ist, dass Bhäsa, der viel Altes bewahrt hat, noch lange hinausgezogene technische Prälaminarien kennt (Einspringen der Sänger und Sängerinnen, Stimmen der Instrumente usw.; Feistel II, § 25), dürfen wir beim eigentlich klassischen Schauspiel mit einer Einleitung rechnen, die nicht ganz so umständlich war (Feistel II, § 26) Meines Erachtens sind viele Kürzungen und Abweichungen von der Praxis des NŚ u.a. daraus erklärbar, dass das "Theaterstück", die zu betrachtende Dichtung (drṣṭya), erst langsam und sicherlich erst nach Bharata in den Rang eines völlig selbstständigen, rein poetischen Genres aufgerückt war, was natürlich zur Eliminierung einer Reihe von alttümlichen, teils zeremoniellen, teils gesanglich-tänzerisch-musikalischen Elementen geführt hat. Von Bedeutung ist ferner, dass wir das klassische indische Schauspiel als grösstenteils höfische Dichtung einschätzen müssen. Es repräsentiert ein Theater, das zwar aus Volkstü, Posse, Tanzausführung, Schattenspiel u.a. hervorgegangen war, sich in seiner endgültigen Ausgestaltung aber doch stark von diesen in teilweise ganz anderen Gesellschaftsschichten verankerten, vielfach mehr volkstümlichen Formen entfernt hat.


Inhalt des Textes:

- beachte, dass uthāpayanti nicht jarjaram, sondern prayogam gebraucht wird, was nahelegt, dass uthāpama terminus technicus nicht für jarjaroṭṭhāpama, sondern prayogothāpama ist.
- In der Tat spricht m. E. vieles dafür, dass mit uthāpama jenes Glied des Versspiels gemeint ist, mit dessen Hilfe – nach allen voraufgegangenen weitschweifigen Prälaminarien – die Aufführung des Schauspiels endlich in Gang kommt. Dabei wird verständlich, dass die zeremonielle Handhabung des die Befreiung von Hindernissen symbolisierenden jarjara gerade im uthāpama, einem relativ spät eingeführten Vorspielglied, das als solches bereits in die Nähe des Spielfanfars (rangadhāra) gerückt ist, ihren rechten Platz finden musste.


- Die Übersetzung sowohl der NS-Strophen als auch zahlreicher Zitate aus Abhinavaguptas Abhinavabhārati ist so wortgetreu wie nur möglich. Allzu häufig überträgt der Autor “hyperkorrekt”, indem z.B. fast jedes skt. ti als deutsch ja oder allerdings, jedes skt. tu als aber (in V, 102a, 102b und 103a gar dreimal hintereinander), jedes skt. bhavet als dürfte sein/werden usw. mitübersetzt wird. Wiedergaben dieser Art entstehen den Sinn und werden selbst der Aussage des Sanskrittextes nur in vereinzelten Fällen gerecht. An Übersetzungsfehlern bzw. Fehlinterpretationen seien hier nur berichtet:

- hrṣṭamānasāh (V, 1)

- yathā nātyasya vai janna jarjarasya ca sambhavāh /
  viṅghānaṃ śamanam caiva devatānām ca pājanam //
  tad asmābhiḥ śrutaṃ sarvaṃ gṛhitā cāvadhārītam /
  nikhilena yathātattvam ičchāmo veditum paṇah //
  pārvarāṇgaṃ mahātejaḥ sarvalakṣanaśaṃyutam // (V, 2-4a)
  Feistel: Die Geburt des Schauspiels, und Statt: Wie die Geburt des Schauspiels, die Entstehung des Jarjara, ebenfalls die die Entstehung des jarjara, die Beruhigung

- Zu beachten ist, dass uthāpayati auch antreiben, in Gang bringen, beleben bedeutet.


- Hinsichtlich der Möglichkeit, diese termini eventuell aus der Praxis erklären zu können, s. Einleitung, S. 10f.

- tu bezeichnet z.B. an vielen Stellen allein den Wechsel des Themas, übt also keineswegs eine immer so stark adversative Funktion aus wie aber; vgl. hierzu u.a. J. S. Speijer, Sanskrit Syntax, § 441.
Beschwichtigung der Widerstände und die Verehrung der Gottheiten – wie wir in der Tat das alles gehört haben, und es (jetzt) verstehen, nachdem wir es ergriffen haben, (so) möchten wir weiter vollständig und wahrheitsgetreu kennenlernen – das Vorspiel (pūrvarānga) zusammen mit allen (seinen) Kennzeichen, o Glanzvoller.  

raudra* (V, 27 und 128)  
Feistel: furchterregender (27), schrecklicher (128) (Geschmack).  

upakṣepena ... siddhena (V, 29)  
Feistel: mittels einer auszügigen Anspielung.  

Statt: (Stimmung des) Zorns.  

Statt: mittels einer wirksamen (d.h. die Wirkung nicht verfehlenden) Anspielung.  

yā gaitr yac ca ceṣṭitam | lokālokasya jagataḥ (V, 57 B m u. K)  
Feistel: was die Gehbewegungen, was die (sonstigen) Bewegungen der irdischen und der nichtirdischen Welt sind.  

Statt: Lauf und Treiben der Welt und Nicht-Welt.  

yathā hy apaprayogas tu prayukto dahati kṣaṇāt (V, 168)  
Feistel: wie (ein Schauspiel, das als) falsche Aufführung aufgeführt wird, in einem Moment verbrennt.  

Statt: wie ein schlecht in Szene gesetztes Vorspiel, (wenn) aufgeführt, sofort verbrennt.  


Siegfried Lienhard

Stockholm

---


* Wohl nach Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dict., das s.v. auch the singing or twittering of birds, Kathās, anführt.
In unserem Jahrhundert hat sich die Zahl der durch Publikation zugänglich gewordenen altdindischen Texte erheblich vermehrt, während die Fähigkeit der Philologen zur Lektüre grosser Textmassen im Durchschnitt erheblich zurückgegangen ist. Jeder Versuch, einen umfangreichen Text durch Inhaltsangaben zu erschliessen, muss also als sehr verdienstlich betrachtet werden. Im vorliegenden Falle sind wir nicht nur dem Autor für seine Arbeit zu Dank verpflichtet, sondern auch dem Herausgeber H. Hoffmann dafür, dass er sie posthum veröffentlicht hat.

Die Inhaltsangaben sind verschiedenartig. Buch I (Brāhmaṇaparvan), Buch II (Madhyamaparvan) und Buch IV (Uttarapurvan) sind nur durch eine Liste von Ādhyāya-Überschriften erfasst, welche unter dem Titel 'Das Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa als Rechtsbuch' erscheint (pp. 107-125). Der Hauptakteur liegt auf dem später eingefügten überwiegend historischen Buch III (Pratisargaparvan), dessen Inhalt sehr ausführlich, teils in Form einer Prosabüersetzung, berichtet wird (pp. 9-106).


Die Argumente für Verwurzelung im iranischen Mithraismus scheinen mit des Iṣaputra, d.h. Jesu, Aufforderung pūjayed isam sūryamandale samsthitaṃ III 3,2,29 mit dem auf die Religion der britischen Seefahrer bezüglichen satyavratam ... sūryatattaram III 4,22,73 erschöpft zu sein. Das ist aber nicht die einzige Schwäche von Hoffmanns Darlegungen. Aus der Iṣaputramati, der Lehre des Iṣaputra 'Jesu' (III 4,22,73) wird p. IX irrtümlich eine "Lehre des Iṣa, welche Namensform auch... im Kālacakra Tantra als Transkription von Jesus benutzt wird". Einfaches Iṣa bedeutet im BhP nicht 'Jesu', sondern vielmehr 'Gott, der Herr'. Mit pūjayed Iṣam III 3,2,29 fordert Iṣaputra 'Jesu' den Menschen auf, Iṣa 'Gott' zu verehren. Das erkennt man leicht in III 3,3,24, wo sich der Geist Mohammeds bzw. Mahmūds auf den Befehl des Iṣa beruft, wonit ohne Zweifel nicht der Befehl Jesu, sondern derjenige Allahs gemeint ist. Vom rein indischen Iṣa 'Gott' (mit Iṣaputra 'Jesu') zu trennen ist das semitische Iṣa 'Jesu'. Es tritt nur im Kompositum Iṣāmāśīha 'Jesu Messiah' auf, das bei Hoffmann a.a.O., p. 70ff. wiederholt falsch mit a statt ḥ geschrieben erscheint, was sehr irreführend wirkt.


Helmut Humbach


Janert’s preface announces a fourth volume and comprehensive indices to the four volumes. One cannot but admire the energy and the scholarship of Janert and his co-workers, to whom all Indologists are greatly indebted. The Franz Steiner Verlag deserves high praise for the beautiful production of this volume.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong.


The first issue of the *Journal of Indian Philosophy* announces its program in an editorial, from which I quote the following paragraph: “The field of our contributions will be bound by the limits of rational inquiry; we will avoid questions that lie in the fields of theology and mystical experience. Our method will be, in a very general sense, analytical and comparative, and we will aim at a rigorous precision in the translation of terms and statements.” One may query the possibility of tracing the limits of rational inquiry without excluding what is perhaps the most valuable part of Indian thought. However, although the editors underline the importance of Indian analytical philosophy, they do not seem to be too exclusive, for the text on the flap of the journal declares that philosophy includes such subjects as the philosophy of language, ethics, religion and aesthetics as well as logic. Moreover, contributions in such fields as Jainism, Tantrism and Kashmir Śaivism are invited.

The issue contains three papers read at a symposium which discussed the problem of ‘empty’ subject terms in logic: Karl H. Potter, “Realism, Speech-Acts, and Truth-Gaps in Indian and Western Philosophy”, pp. 13-21; A. C. S. McDermott, “Empty Subject Terms in Late Buddhist Logic”, pp. 22-29; B. K. Matilal, “Reference and Existence in Nyāya and Buddhist Logic”, pp. 83-110. The last article gives a penetrating analysis of the controversy on this point between Udayana and his Buddhist opponent Jayanaśīrmita. George Cardona has contributed an article on “Some Principles of Pāṇini’s Grammar” (pp. 40-74) in which he studies four basic principles applied by Pāṇini. Although this article cannot be said to fall within the field of the philosophy of language, one must be glad to see it included in this journal. It is much more important to understand how Pāṇini proceeded than to make philosophical statements about his grammar.
A rather neglected text is studied by C. D. C. Priestley in his "Emptiness in the Satyasiddhi" which examines the section of nirodhasatya in Harivarman’s work. The exact title of this work is not known. Several scholars prefer Tattvasiddhi (cf. L. de La Vallée Poussin, MCB, V. 1937, p. 7).¹ Tuvia Gelblum contributes a review article of G. J. Larson’s Classical Sāṁkhya (Delhi, 1969) in which he draws attention to the meaning ‘whole, entire, perfect’ for kevala: “Sāṁkhya and Sartre” (pp. 75-82). A. K. Warder takes Rājaśekhara’s account of the divisions of vāc as starting point for his article on “The Description of Indian Philosophy” (pp. 4-12). Most articles in this issue are excellent; if this standard is maintained, one will look forward with great expectations to the future issues of this new journal.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong


Jean Przyluski (1885-1944) était un infatigable remueur d'idées. Ses premiers grands travaux portent sur le bouddhisme mais, en même temps il publiait une série d’articles sur les emprunts aux langues austro-asiatiques dans le vocabulaire indo-aryen. Le champ de ses recherches s’élargit ensuite de plus en plus: influences iraniennes dans la pensée indienne, la Grande Déesse, le symbolisme des monuments bouddhiques, l’hittite, etc. Son premier article parut en 1908. Son ouvrage posthume sur la Grande Déesse fut publié en 1950. La bibliographie analytique, compilée par M. A. A. Macdonald, comprend 185 numéros (pp. 1-68). Elle suit l’ordre chronologique de publication. Tous les livres et articles sont analysés dans des notices qui en résument le contenu. Beaucoup de travaux de Przyluski avaient déjà été analysés par M. C. Régamey dans sa Bibliographie analytique des travaux relatifs aux éléments anaryens dans la civilisation et les langues de l’Inde (BEFEO, 34, 1935, pp. 429-566). D’autre part, Marcelle Lalou avait consacré de nombreuses notices à ses publications, relatives au bouddhisme, dans la Bibliographie bouddhique. Toutefois, la tâche de M. Macdonald était loin d’être aisée. On doit lui savoir gré d’avoir consacré tant d’efforts à ce travail qui permet de s’orienter rapidement dans l’œuvre de Przyluski. La bibliographie analytique est suivie d’un index établi par Marcelle Lalou (pp. 69-133). On doit admirer une fois de plus la patience et la dévotion qui caractérisent les travaux bibliographiques de Marcelle Lalou. Son index est un répertoire complet de tous les thèmes étudiés par Przyluski. On ne peut qu’exprimer son regret que Marcelle Lalou n’ait pas pu voir la parution de cet ouvrage, consacré à la mémoire de son maître et ami.

Dans les abréviations il y a deux petites corrections à apporter: lire Orientalistische pour Orientalische, et Revue hittite et asiatique pour Revue hittite et asiatique.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong

¹ In some Tun-huang texts the title Ch’eng-shih lun is written with the radical 149 in ch’eng (cf. Lionel Giles, Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum, London, 1957, No. 4332; Fukuha Ryōgon, Jōjitsuron no kenkyū, Kyōto, 1969, p. 118).

Dr. Oskar von Hinüber’s study of the syntax of the cases in the Vinaya-piṭaka fills an important lacuna in the field of Pāli grammar. It is certainly the most important publication to appear since Hans Hendriksen’s Syntax of the infinite verb-forms of Pāli (Copenhagen, 1944). The studies by H. O. de A. Wijesekera and A. Faïs, mentioned by von Hinüber in his introduction, are not easily accessible. No use has been made by him of A. K. Warder’s Introduction to Pāli (London, 1963) which pays more attention to syntax than other grammars. The choice of the Vinaya with the exception of the Parivāra is an excellent one because it contains probably more ancient parts than other Tipiṭaka texts. Moreover, the interpretation of the Vinaya-piṭaka is often far from easy. Von Hinüber intended his work to be at the same time a syntactic commentary on the Vinaya and, as such, it is of great use for a better understanding of this often difficult text. Although it is mainly based upon the Vinaya, other Pāli texts are also taken into account especially with regard to more difficult problems of Pāli syntax. Von Hinüber critically examines the translations of the Vinaya by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg and by Miss Horner; in quite a few places he arrives at a better understanding of the text. His text emendations are generally convincing as for instance the emendation of papato and patti into papatā (3 p. sg.aor.) cf. pp. 45-46. Lexicographical problems are also studied by him, as for instance the meaning of citrācirom ‘rarely’ (p. 95).

In a few places von Hinüber refers to the Sanskrit fragments of other Vinayas but they have not been of much help to him. Apart from the Prātimokṣas of the Sarvāstivādin, the Mūlasarvāstivādin and the Mahāsāṃghika (badly edited by Pachow and Mishra), only some fragments of the Vihārīga of one school, the Sarvāstivādin, are available. However, the Chinese canon contains complete versions of the Vinayas of five schools. In many cases, the Vinaya texts of the different schools have much in common. It must have been of particular importance to transmit the Vinaya rules as faithfully as possible. In studying the Pāli Vinaya it is not possible to leave the other Vinayas entirely out of consideration. Of course, the Chinese versions can offer but little help in the study of the syntax of the Pāli Vinaya. However, in places which are difficult to understand because the text is evidently corrupt or the meaning of a word not very well known, it may be useful to compare the Pāli text with parallel passages in the Chinese versions of the Vinayas. An interpretation of a Pāli passage, which is not confirmed by parallel passages in other Vinayas cannot be accepted without reservations. One must of course be aware of the fact that the Chinese translations must be handled with extreme caution. Their usefulness resides in the fact that one can compare the texts of four Vinayas (Mahāsāṃghika, Mahāsāṃghika, Dharmaguptaka and Sarvāstivādin). The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin is of lesser importance in this respect. Moreover, the Chinese versions, by the fact that they are translations, offer an interpretation of the text, which is quite often of greater value than the one to be found in Buddhaghosa’s Samantapāsādikā.

In discussing the existence of an absolute nominative in Pāli, von Hinüber examines Vin. II.167.15ff. vihārāggaṇa gāhentā vihārā uṣādīyimṣu ... anujañāni bhikkhave anubhāgam pi dātum (pp. 28-30). Von Hinüber proposes to read uṣārayimṣu and to consider vihārā as a corruption for vihāre. His translation is as follows: “Nach der Zahl der Lager (die Mönche) ergreifen lassend, schicken sie (die Wohnplatzanweiser) (die Mönche) zu den Lagern weg.” According to him uṣāreṇī means ‘verteiben, wegen-schicken’ (Vin. I.276.8) or ‘auswerfen’ (Vin. II.237.32). He assumes the same meaning ‘wegschicken’ for Vin. IV.99.9 khaḍāniyam uṣādiyitthā “das Essen wurde wegeschickt”. Von Hinüber remarks that the manuscript tradition confuses uṣād- and uṣār- and
adds that, according to the lists of roots, both roots have the same meaning (gati, gamana). I do not think that the last argument is very strong because the dātupaṭhas have the habit of explaining many roots by gati. In Vin. II.237.29-30 (yam hoti mahāsamuddha mataṁ kūpasam ṭhēva ṭaraṁ vāheti thalam uṣāreṭi) uṣāreṭi seems preferable, cf. Thieme (ZDMG, 111, p. 116) who translates samuddavatiḥ thale uṣārītam by “was von den Wogen des Meers ans Festland geschwemmt (geworfen) ist”.

Von Hünüber’s translation of Vin. II.167.15ff. does not explain why, after the distribution of the vihāras, a supplementary portion (anubhāga) is distributed to the monks. As to his translation of Vin. IV.99.9 no Vinaya mentions the fact that the food is sent back. The food is being kept for Upananda and is not distributed to the other monks. In both places uṣāde- seems to have the meaning of ‘to put aside’ which corresponds quite well to Sanskrit utsādayati. Therefore I would like to suggest to read in Vin. II.167.18 viharē uṣādayinuḥ “they put aside vihāras (which were not distributed)” and to translate khādaniyam uṣādayītthi by “the food was put aside”, rejecting Buddhaghosa’s explanation, quoted by von Hünüber (p. 30, n.1).

Von Hünüber studies at length a difficult passage relating to the pātimokkhideśa: Vin. I.112.11-12 nidānam uddhisṭivā avasesam sutena sāvetabbaṁ (pp. 176-177). It is not possible to explain sutena. In order to solve this difficulty von Hünüber reads sute na “der Rest ist nicht zu rezipieren, da er (bei früheren Upasatha-Feiern) gehört ist”. The same passage occurs in the Posadhaavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya (Gilgit Manuscripts, III, 4, p. 94.10-11): nidānam uddhisya avaśītam śrutena śrāvayanit. I have not consulted the Tibetan version which probably would only give a literal translation. However, one would expect a negation to have left traces in the Chinese versions of the Vinaya. In three of them (Mahāśāsaka, Mahāśāmghika, Dharmaguptaka) the text has “the rest is always heard by the saṅgha”; the Sarvāstivādavinaya has “the rest was previously heard by the saṅgha”. I am afraid that the Chinese versions do not help us to understand the Pāli text but, in any case, one must draw attention to the fact that none of them contains a negation.

For tamkhaṇikā (Vin. III.139.9) von Hünüber proposes a new interpretation ‘Augenblick’ and rejects the traditional interpretation ‘harlot, temporary wife, Hure’ (pp. 194-196). Von Hünüber adds that probably already the Vibhaṅga commentary has misunderstood the word. The Pāli text mentions as the tenth of ten kinds of wives the mukhottikā (139.25) and explains mukhottikā nāma tamkhaṇikā vaccati (140.7). There seems therefore no doubt that the commentary has understood tamkhaṇikā to mean ‘a temporary wife’. This meaning certainly fits the context. In V.1 Udāyin acts as a go-between for two young girls. In V.2 he acts as go-between for a vēsiyā and the rule adds to jāyattane vā jārattane vā the words antamano tamkhaṇikāya pi. In this episode the monks say: kathāṁ hi nāmaayo Udāyī tamkhaṇikāṃ sahaś circa tamanām samāpajjissati (138.33). Von Hünüber translates: “Wie kann der Herr Udāy in eine zeitweilige Vermittlung geraten.” The word tamkhaṇikam is absent from the same formula in the previous episode: kathāṁ hi nāma āyasmā Udāyī sahaś circa tamanām samāpajjissati (137.29-30). There seems no reason for the addition of a word, meaning ‘temporary’, in 138.33. However, this difficulty does not arise if one translates as Miss Horner: “How can the venerable Udāyin act as a go-between for a temporary wife?” Etymologically the meaning ‘temporary wife’ for tamkhaṇikā ‘one for that moment’ is unobjectionable. Von Hünüber refers to tatkaṇa- in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit as meaning a shorter period than kṣaṇa. However, the text of the Divyāvadāna is certainly corrupt because, according to other Buddhist texts, 120 kṣaṇa make one tattkaṇa (cf. T. Watters, On Yung Chwung’s Travels in India, I, London, 1904, p. 143; L. de La Vallée Poussin, Seven kinds of wives are enumerated in the Vinayas of the Mūlasarvāstivādin and the Sarvāstivādin, cf. Mahāvīrayutpatti Nos. 9448-9454 and V. Rosen, Der Vinayavihāra zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣam der Sarvāstivādins (1959) p. 61, n. 5, where one must omit balena anupraskandyā and add tattkaṇikā.
L’Abhidharmakośa, III, Paris-Louvain, 1926, p. 179). Moreover tatkṣaṇa seems to occur only in enumerations of measures of time. The Chinese Vinayas render tatkṣaṇikā as ‘a single meeting’, ‘a momentary one’, etc. The text of the Sarvāstivādavinaya (antatas tatkṣaṇam api) is probably corrupt. In this case the Mālasarvāstivādavinaya has clearly preserved the true reading — (antatas tat)kṣaṇikāyām api.

A last remark concerning dassanāya (von Hinüber, p. 224). According to von Hinüber a gen.obj. is used in the case of a pl., an acc. in the case of a sg. This rule is not confirmed by the texts, cf. DN II.140.12-13 te mayam labhāma manobhāvanīye bhikkhū dassanāya; AN III.317-319 cha samayā manobhāvanīyassa bhikkhuno dassanāya upasān-kamitum. It would be possible to consider that, in the first example, the acc. depends on labhāma (cf. von Hinüber, p. 193), but it seems more probable to admit that the acc. depends on dassanāya as in other examples.

Von Hinüber’s book contains a wealth of information. The above remarks are only meant to show how it stimulates discussion with the author in the rare cases in which one cannot completely agree with him. It is to be hoped that von Hinüber will also undertake a study of the syntax of late Pāli, the desirability of which is mentioned in his introduction.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong


As the title shows, this short monograph of only seventy-two pages attempts to present a new system of Hindi syntax, which, as one might expect, would aim to fulfill theoretical as well as practical requirements. Although the present publication hardly can be considered to be more than a rough sketch drafted in a hurry, the author himself appears to be fully convinced that he has achieved a most extraordinary and revolutionary task. As a matter of fact, his theory of syntax was the product (or by-product, see p. 7) of merely three months of the hardships and pleasures which are unnecessarily depicted at large in the Preface. Here, and on numerous other places, the author exhibits a selfcomplacency which is both immature and painful.

Miltnner’s system of Hindi syntax pivots on the – in structural linguistics – well-known concept of the tagmeme (or sentence part). Interpreted as the Cartesian product of tagmemic function (F) and tagmemic functor (f), the tagmeme may according to Miltnner in theory be symbolized as Ff, in practice, however, by formulae like S 31, that is 31 = adjectival participle, intransitive or passive functioning as S = subject, or P 82, that is 82 = substitute, substantival-adjectival (i.e. demonstrative, interrogative or indefinite pronoun) functioning as P = predicate. Thus Miltnner’s symbols indicate not only the specific lexical class like noun, pronoun, adjective etc. used in a given context, but also its syntactic role as subject, predicate or object of a sentence or sentence-part. The author distinguishes altogether four tagmemic functions (F), namely P (predicate), S (subject), O (object) and M (modifier) – the last badly defined as “any other tagmemic function which is not identical with the functions just delimited” – and nine classes (including many sub-classes) of tagmemic functors (f) expressed by figures as for example 2 = non-participial verbal tenses and imperative, 21 = intransitive and passive, 22 = transitive or 4 = other nominal forms of verbs, 41 = verbal substantives (gerundia), 411 = intransitive and passive, 412 = transitive, 42 = agent nouns, 421 = intransitive and passive, 422 = transitive. In order to facilitate understanding, it would have been commendable to, at least at a later stage, rewrite the symbol Ff as
Miltner defines his syntactic devices as the "adequate interpretation and classification" of the syntactic units he recognizes, that is to say, tagmeme, syntagma and sentence. The syntagma, a doubtlessly very useful concept, consists of a pair of two tagmemes of one utterance, which, if related immediately, form an endosyntagma, or if related by means of one or more intermediary tagmemes, become an exosyntagma (not dealt with in this work). Much less convincing and, in fact, very vague is, however, the conception of sentence, the last and most complicated syntactic unit, which our author regards to be an interconcatenation of one tagmeme functioning as predicate (Pf) and at least one more tagmeme functioning differently.¹

A sentence like larkić hamsi, "the girl laughed", is according to Miltner's system to be rendered as P 321 : S 1 (that is, P = adjectival participle in a non-ergative construction, S = substantive), whilst commonly accepted transformational-generative grammar would derive the same utterance from S → NP + VP by the extension of VP into VP → MV + Aux which, when represented graphically, would yield the diagram:²

```
S
  NP  VP
    |    |
  N    MV
  |    |
```
larkić

The description of syntactic units as shown by the author benefits assuredly by the brevity of its tagmeme symbols, but suffers on many, in my estimation essential points. When adopting this system of sentence-analysis, generation and transformation, the student will have to be already aforehand wellversed in Hindi, and even then will find the method unwieldy, since the majority of operations requires the constant consultation of the list of tagmemic functors given on p. 20f. Though Miltner's monograph may, in a very general way, be of interest to linguists, the possibilities of using it practically for producing any possible and correct Hindi sentence appears to me utterly limited. A student conversant with Hindi and as such fully capable of distinguishing the lexical classes of the language and the syntactic functions performed by these classes, will scarcely deepen his insight by means of an interpretation of, for example, donom mitra hain, 'the two are friends', as the syntagma P 1.21 : S 533 (that is, P = substantive + non-participial verbal tense, intransitive, and S = collective numeral), nor will a beginner, still-unable to apply the rules of this system, profit from it.

It is, of course, far from my thoughts to deny that new approaches to language description are feasible as well as desirable. What seems to be absolutely requisite to me is, however, that any new theory of syntax also, or perhaps above all, includes heuristic values. It is deplorable to state that Miltner's discussions do not offer such values. Thus the research-worker on Hindi will derive very little advantage from it. Moreover, Miltner's theory of syntax, though highly abstract, is deficient in depth. No scope is given to deep structure analysis, nor are the order of words, which is of much greater importance in NIA than in OIA and MIA, or verb-compounds and

¹ This fact is also expressed in other words as: The set of sentences is the Cartesian product resulting from the interconcatenation of the set of Pf tagmemes and the set of Pf tagmemes or the syntagmas (both endosyntagmas and exosyntagmas) which do not contain Pf tagmemes, that is, any sentence = Pf (Pf)² (p.36).


irregular constructions like anacolouthon, contamination etc. taken into consideration. In addition to that one more surprising fact is to be noted. For good reasons descriptive and transformational grammar does make a point of selecting for its purposes an as homogeneous corpus as possible, a procedure which naturally requires much care and most often restricts itself to material taken from only one period or only one type of language usage (one of the most consequent examples being Ch. C. Fries’s analysis of Modern English* based exclusively on telephone-conversations between educated Americans). To this Miltner attaches no value at all. His corpus, altogether “7000 sentences selected at random from ten representative Hindi texts” (p. 33), mixes prose with versified sources, passages from modern writers in Standard Hindi (khariboli) with examples in bāzārī hindi and even quotations from works in (classical) brajbhāṣā. None of the sentences is translated, and no references are given as to verse number, page or edition.

To the more useful parts of the monograph belong the table showing the co-occurrence (Miltner: cocurrence) of tagmemic functions and functors (p. 50) and the doubtlessly well-elaborated catalogue of functors presented on p. 20f. The latter is, like many other statements in this book, purely prescriptive, since the author has waived the discussion of possible operations and criteria on the basis of which the list was built up.

Stockholm

Siegfried Lienhard


Dolpo in North-Western Nepal was first visited by D. L. Snellgrove in 1956 (cf. Himalayan Pilgrimage, 1961, pp. 70-162). He made a second visit to Dolpo during 1960 and 1961. It was part of Western Tibet until the end of the eighteenth century, but since its conquest by the Gurkhas it has become more isolated and religious life there has deteriorated. However, the four lamas, whose biographies are edited and translated by Snellgrove in these two volumes, lived during a period in which religious life in Dolpo must have been similar to that in other regions of Tibet. For this reason the interest of these biographies is not limited to the history of Tibetan Buddhism in Dolpo alone. Tibetan literature is rich in biographies, called rnam-thar ‘deliverance’ in Tibetan. W. Y. Evans-Wentz published in 1928 a translation of Milarepa’s biography (Tibet’s Great Yogi Milarepa, O.U.P.) and an abridged rendering of Bu-ston’s life, accompanied by a reproduction of the Tibetan text, was published in 1966 by D. Seyfort Ruegg (The Life of Bu ston rin po che, Roma, 1966). Both Milarepa and Bu-ston are prominent figures in the history of Tibetan Buddhism whereas the four Dolpo lamas are only of local significance. As such, however, they are probably more representative of the many lamas whose deeds have been recorded by pious pupils, than Milarepa and Bu-ston.

The first volume contains an introduction which describes the geography and history of Dolpo (The Land and its People, pp. 1-16), a sketch of Tibetan Buddhism as immediately relevant to the four biographies (Philosophy and Religion, pp. 17-34), an account of Snellgrove’s sojourn in Dolpo (Life in Dolpo 1960-61, pp. 34-68) and information on the four biographies (The Four Biographies, pp. 68-77). The introduction is followed by the translation of the four biographies (pp. 79-273), Tibetan indices of divinities (pp. 274-277), of texts and rituals (pp. 278-282), of personal names (pp. 282-
291) and a general index (pp. 292-302). Volume two contains a photographic reproduction of the Tibetan text in *du-bu-med* script (pp. 11-290),\(^4\) transliterated extracts without translation (pp. 291-295), transliterated extracts with translation (pp. 296-313), notes to the first volume (pp. 314-315), alphabet and system of transliteration (pp. 316-317), examples of abbreviated words (pp. 318-324) and a glossary (pp. 325-345).

The texts in volume two do not reproduce the original manuscripts used by Snellgrove, but are new manuscripts written by Tibetan scribes under his supervision. According to Snellgrove the original manuscripts contain many scribal errors which had to be corrected. A reproduction of a few pages of the original manuscripts would have been useful in showing the nature of these errors. However, it would have been impossible to reproduce completely the original manuscripts. Snellgrove's decision to reproduce rewritten manuscripts is undoubtedly the best solution even if sometimes one would like to compare the original manuscripts. In a few cases a correction seems required. To quote a few examples, taken from the first pages of the first biography: \(^4\)

1.3.10 *sgro-'dugs spyad* Read *sgro-*'dugs *bead*, cf. I.10.8, 10.17, 31.10 etc.

I.4.2 *dgra-ghen* *sogs-khyi* *chags-sdan* *spaus-nas* *ldum-bu* *mdzad-pa'i* *tshul* "so abandoning attachment to friends and aversion to enemies, I acted the same towards all." (Note: "I made it all of one piece.") (S.). Vol. II, p. 314 S. proposes the translation: "I acted humbly towards all." Read *ldom-bu*, cf. I.21.1-2 *dgra-ghen* *sogs-khyi* *chags-sdan* *spaus-te* *ldom-bu* *mdzad-pa'i* *tshul* "avoiding hatred to enemies and attachment to friends, he lived the life of a beggar." (S.).

I.7.1 *bka'-drin* la 'khor *mtha* 'med-pa'i "whose gracious kindness was unlimited." (S.). Read 'khor *thabs* med-pa'i, cf. II.17.12-13 *bka*-drin la 'khor-ba'i *thabs-med* "there can be no way of repaying his kindness." (S.). In I.36.14 the Ms has *thabs-med* but S. translates *mtha*-med: "The graciousness of my lama would be seen to be quite boundless." In I.37.5-6 *bka*-drin-la 'khor *mtha*-med-pa'i one must make the same correction.


In the notes to the first volume (vol. II, pp. 314-315), Snellgrove draws attention to words and phrases omitted in translation. One must add the following passages: I.3.2-3 *gdal-bya* *mchog* dan 'brin-nams la gsugs-sku nram-gnis dan/. I.5.18-19 bla-ma *grub-thob* *rnams-kyi* *kyan* *mtha*'-*gro* *dnos* *yin-par* *lun-bstan-par* gda'/I.12.3-4 ma-ni bka'-bum/. I.24.13 *grub rgyal-ma*. I.26.18-19 bla-ma rin-po-che *gu-ru* *drag-dmar* *dnos-su* *mtho-n-sni/|. I.36.2-3 *mgon-ser* *tshar* *bcu-gcig*/. I.63.3-4 *grub-thob* *man-po* *bzung-pa'i* *gnas* dpal mtha'-*dkar* gyi sgrub-gnas-su. II.11.3 *sna* *rte-ba*. II.28.17-18 lo-gsum son

1 I.62 (p. 72) and III.62 (p.234) must be interchanged.

2 Roman figures refer to the four biographies, Arabic figures to page and line of the Tibetan text. The following abbreviations have been used: C.G. = Chos-kyi grags-pa's *Tibetan-Tibetan-Chinese Dictionary* (Peking, 1957); Das = S. C. Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Calcutta, 1902); J. = Jäschke's *Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London, 1881); Myv. = Mahâyûtpatti; S. = Snellgrove; Sum. = Sumatrata's *Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary* (Ulaanbaatar, 1959).
In reading Tibetan texts it is not always easy to distinguish proper names. It seems to me that kha-rag, blo-ba and grol-mtshams must not be explained as place-names.

1.12.11 blo’o kha-rag bdad-kyi yul-der “in the devil’s own land, Kha-rag of Lo” (S.). Sum. translates kha-rag with aman kūrmūmī ‘to speak against, vilify’ (I, p. 163). Probably kha-rag is a variant of kha-drop, Skt. mukhara (Mvy., 2481). I propose to translate this phrase as follows: “In Lo, the land of the devil of slander”.

I.59.8-9 blo-ba’i snas-dus dan mig-ltos “the customs and conventions of Lo” (S.). Lo is never written blo-ba in the texts which have blo-bo or blo’o. Here blo-ba = blo. The text relates that the Khang-dkar officials were the cause of urging the thought of lama Merit Intellect to religion; “In the first place if they had not caused trouble, it would have been difficult to settle down to religion on account of the snas-dus and mig-ltos of my mind.” Both snas-dus and mig-ltos occur only in this place. S. explains snas-dus as ‘prevailing conditions, customs’ and mig-ltos as ‘conventions’ (cf. Glossary, pp. 336 and 339). Sum. translates mig-ltos with ụfemiti ‘aspect, judgment’ (II, p. 427). I do not know how to explain snas-dus.

IV.22.21-22 dus-su dpyid-chos gis-pa grol-mtshams drun-ram-pa bkra-sis “in the second spring term Doctor bKra-sis of sGrol-mtshams” (S.). IV.25.21-22 dbyar-chos gis-pa grol-mtshams ’or-rlon dpon-po don-grub “Then in the second summer term the nephew A’im-Winner of ’Or-rlon of sGrol-mtshams.” (S.). In both places the text has grol-mtshams and not sgrol-mtshams; After the second spring term”. “after the second summer term” (cf. 23.14 man-ja grol-mtshams: S. “at the end of the general tea-offering”).

The biographies quote a great number of texts. Identification of Tibetan texts is often difficult because they usually possess several titles, and are generally quoted only by an abridged title. Snellgrove has identified some of them in the notes to the translation and others in the index of texts and rituals. However, many have been left without identification. For instance, the biographies quote twice the “Sūtra of the Briny River” (Ba-tshwa-can chu-klu-n gi mdo). Snellgrove does not give any information on this text. One wonders whether he considered a note superfluous. Or is the absence of information due to the fact that this text was unknown to him and his informants? In several cases the information, given by Snellgrove, is incomplete or incorrect:

III.8.4. ‘dal-ba lub-sde bā’i “the ‘Four Āgamas’” (S.). (See also vol. I, p. 281, no. 205). For the ‘Four Āgamas of the Vinaya’ see Blue Annals, II, p. 490.

III.8.5-6 sār-i-bus mzdad-pa’i bstan-bcoschos-kyi phun-po la sogs-pa mno-pa sde-bdan “the ‘Treatise of Sāriputra’, the Seven Sections of the Abhidharma, the Elemental Components and so on” (S.). Sāriputra’s Dharmakṣaṇḍa is the first of the seven Abhidharma treatises, cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu “Introduction” (Paris-Louvain, 1931), p. XXIX.


IV. 17.18-19: the text mentions four chapters of the Abhidharmakośa: phun-po, khams, 'jig-rten and phra-rgyas; phun-po is probably a mistake for dbaṅ-po, the title of the second chapter. S. translates phra-rgyas as “the subtle and vast elements” but phra-rgyas renders Sanskrit anuśaya, the title of the fifth chapter.

IV. 25.3: myan-das “the state of nirvāṇa” (S.). Myan-das refers here to the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra (Sde-dge, No. 120).

One reads Snellgrove’s translation with great pleasure and profit. His rendering of religious terms is felicitous and his translation of complicated Tibetan phrases clear and precise. Snellgrove translates proper names and technical terms but the Tibetan terms are all listed in the indices. I have some doubts about the appropriateness of rendering bodhisattva as ‘would-be buddha’ and would have preferred ‘future buddha’ or ‘potential buddha’ but, usually, Snellgrove’s English equivalents are unobjectionable. The Glossary contains a very useful list of words which are not well explained in the existing dictionaries. Snellgrove notes in each case when an explanation has been given by a Tibetan informant and which words belong to the Dolpo dialect. Some information could have been found in Sumatiratna’s dictionary which he does not appear to have used. It is perhaps the most comprehensive of all Tibetan dictionaries and has the added merit of supplying Mongolalian translations. For instance the word kgeg (Glossary, p. 325) is explained by Sumatiratna as indicating the element ‘wood’ (modun maqabu). Chos-kyi grags-pa explains it as a technical term in astrology indicating a critical junction. Sku-gag (Glossary, p. 326) is given in Sumatiratna as equivalent to rin’gag (cf. J., p. 529). Perhaps Snellgrove could have supplied some additional information in his glossary. To quote one example: chos’brel = ‘sacrament’ (Glossary, p. 331). One wonders what is meant with the term ‘sacrament’ in the context of Tibetan Buddhism. I was puzzled by the meaning of this term in studying Sagaster’s translation of the Subud Erike (cf. III, XIII, 1971, p. 219). Snellgrove’s translation confirms the fact that this term has a religious meaning but it does not explain it sufficiently. However, one must be grateful to Snellgrove for a glossary which clearly makes a contribution to Tibetan lexicography.

One cannot but express the greatest admiration for Snellgrove’s excellent translation. I have compared the Tibetan text from beginning to end and learnt much from his rendering of difficult passages. In a few places one can perhaps suggest a different interpretation. The following remarks contain a discussion of some passages in the four biographies. Perhaps they may be of some use in preparing a second edition of the translation which will certainly be required in due course.

I.3.8 thun-mo gi rnams-thar che-lon tsam-zig snan-ba yi-ger bkod-na “If my ordinary doings, which are quite brief, are set down in writing” (S.). In the glossary S. explains che-lon as ‘briefly, in essence’. C.G. has che-lon tsam = rags-rim tsam ‘in outline’. Here che-lon refers to the writing of his life: “If my ordinary life-story is written out in outline”, cf. III.66.2 che-lon-zig yi-ger bkod-pa.


I.31.11-12 od-gsal snan-ba’i rin-mo “the clear light appeared as daylight” (S.) — “the day on which the clear light appeared”.
I.41.15 ces sri-thabs byas-tshe" "When I had reasoned thus." (S.) The preceding passage relates that lama Merit Intellect offers meat and chang to the chief men of the Khangdakar and makes a speech to them. According to C.G. sri-thabs = ser-sna'i sens-pas bza'-bstan hun-du gton-ba 'to offer little food and drink with an avaricious mind'. Perhaps one must correct sri-thabs to sri-btab which S. translates with 'commission, duty' (Glossary, p. 344).

I.42.20-21 lab-phyi'i phyogs no mi-ses-pa'i sa-phyogs gcig-tu 'gro-dgos "Shall I go to Lab-phyi? Or shall I go to some unknown place?" (S.) – "Shall I go to some unknown place in Lab-phyi?"


II.12.13 dar-cig 'jam 'dug "all was still for a moment." (S.). The same expression occurs in II.23.4 dar-tig 'jam; S. "for a moment I was united with them." I do not understand the exact meaning of 'jam in this context."

II.19.12-13 'di-ltar byas-na mi-grigs-pa' thabs-med "If one establishes ... in this way, it will not do." (S.) – "If one establishes ... in this way, it is not possible that it will not succeed."

II.22.5-6 shar-med-pa'i itad-mo yah cu-zad mtho| ni ies-kyi gnas-rnams la shar-bas mos-stis yid-ches-par byun-no "we saw sights unseen before. The people of Shey believed in us more devotedly than ever." (S.) – "we saw some sights unseen before. More than before we devotedly put our trust in the holy places of Shey."

II.22.14 bden-med-kyi thams-kysis thams-cad la thog-rdzis byed-pa tig byun-no "I had overwhelming confidence with regard to all states of non-substantial being." (S.) – "By means of the notion of non-substantiality I suppressed all (impressions of dread and fear)." See Sum., I., p. 943 thog-brdzis-degere-ede daruqu 'to suppress from above'. For S.'s explanation see Glossary, p. 333.

II.24.11-12 'gro-'dug spyod-lam yah bar-sna an la byed-pa 'dug-pas "They moved in their seated posture and their course went up to the heavens." (S.) – "They were moving around and sitting in the air."

II.38.10 'o-rgyal. S. translates here 'o-rgyal with 'inconvenient' (cf. also Glossary, p. 342). It is of course the same word as 'o-brgyal which is given in the dictionaries. In IV.26.2 S. translates 'o-rgyal accordingly with 'tiring'. It is rather misleading to list a word 'o-rgyal 'inconvenient' in a glossary without pointing out that this meaning is required in a special context and that 'o-rgyal is a variant of 'o-brgyal."

II.41.7 bsrtsen-bkur 'bul-ba'i spob-pa-med-kyi 'I have no ambition for the honour you do me." (S.) – "I have no courage (or eloquence) to offer respect.""

II.47.13-14 mi-yon-ba'i tshul-sna han phul-yah; "Although I submitted that there were too many people." (S.) – "Although I explained that it would not be possible."

II.61.2-5 chah da gnad med 'di-gzhi/ tshans-spyod 'phrog-pa'i jag-pa/ byams-kya' nig dug-bzin rin-du/ spob-ba'i go-cha skyed-mdzod "Wine and women, these two – Are the robbers who steal away your good conduct. – Keeping far off from loved ones like poison – Let this be your protective armour!" (S.) – "... your good conduct. Though they are dear to you – Keep far off from them as from poison – ..."

II.83.13-15 sor-ba'i tshul mdzad-nas thog-gsum yod-pa'i sar brag-la brdabs/ de-nas mar brag-rnon la bud "'[the pot] seemed to slip from his hand and striking on the cliffs (which descended) in three great steps, it went down to the gorge of the Red Crag." (S.) – "the pot slipped from his hand and hit the rock near the third storey; then it went down and fell in the gorge between the rocks."

II.84.2 skun-ma bstan-na ni mnnon-mtshan ches yon-bar 'dug "If the theft were revealed our shame would be very great." (S.) – "If the theft were revealed, it would come out in
the open." See Sum., I, p. 529: mngon-mtshan-can–ilerkei temdegtil ‘clearly marked’;
C.G.: mngon-mtshan-can–lkg-tu ma-yin-par mngon-sum gser-dhul sogs-kyi bya-ba
byed-pa-po ste rim ’byed las-so “It is said in the Vinayavibhanga: ‘Not secretly, but
openly do gold, silver, etc. fulfill their function.’”
II.84.7-8 kha-sa-ni dge-slo-ni ur-gnyan-la rgyod chen-po byun “Yesterday a great disaster
befell the monk Urgyan.” (S.) – “Yesterday the monk Urgyan suffered a great loss.”
Rgyod = god ’loss, damage’.
II.85.11 ltag-tshan chu-ni-ba (tshu-ni-ba in the text) “uncircumspect” (S.), cf. Glossary,
II.96.5 bzañ-drug la-sogs sman sna-tshogs “the six ’good things’, various medicaments”
(S.) – “various medicaments such as the six ’good things’, etc.” The six ’good ones’ are
listed by Sum., cf. II. p. 776.
II.32.12 sna-len byas-pa “gave me this escort” (S.). In III.49.16-17, IV.30.3 and
IV.44.12 S. translates sna-len in the same way. In IV.19.21 he translates sna-len bzañ-po
with “they looked after me very well.” In all passages sna-len has the meaning ’wel-
come, reception’ for which see Sum., I. p. 1228: sna-len – wityu-sa a ’reception’; C.G.,
II.25.18-19 de-nas bzañ-stel gzugs-sku chos-dbyins-su ma thim-bar “From then on his
manifestation faded away into universal space.” (S.) – “From then on until his body
passed away into the absolute sphere.”
II.31.2 dgon-pa’i che-ba brjod-pa mañ-po mzañ-dug-pa “and that many great things
had been told about these monasteries.” (S.) – “and he greatly extolled these mon-
asteries.”
II.35.17 rdo-che rdag-po gcig “a heap of stones” (S.) – “a single stone”, cf. III.44.9
nas rdog-gcig “a single grain of barley” (S.).
II.41.19 sras-po “your brother” (S.) – “your son”.
II.46.18-19 bṣaṅ-gsum la gces-spras-su mzañ-pa “who were the adornments of the
triple doctrine” (S.) – “who cherish the three teachings”, cf. C.G. p. 234: gces-spras
byed – sman-la phibs-par byed ‘to cherish in one’s mind’; Das, s.v. gces-spras; J., s.v.
spra-ba.
II.48.12-13 thugs-sin-tu ’phrañ-žiṅ ‘ga’-yan (MS. yar)-gyis kun-sloñ byed-pa byun “He
himself was very upset and some of the others became excited” (S.) – “He was very
worried but some (monks) reassured him”, cf. Sum., II, p. 158: sman-’phrañ – qarazun
‘to be chagrined’, emgenṅiṅ ’to worry’; kun-sloṅ means ’causing to rise, to get up’, here
’to encourage, reassure’.
II.50.6 sê-skyi khyuṅ-luṅ-ma “a woman of Khyung-lung” (S.) – “Khyuṅ-luṅ-ma
from Šes”.
II.50.13 grod-pa la tog-tsre brgyabs “He was struck in the stomach” (S.) – “He was
struck with a hoe in the stomach.”
IV.1.7 mtsam-med thub-dbaṅ ’gyur-med dad-pas rab-tu mchod “We worship you in
faith, O changeless Sage without peer!” (S.) – “We worship you, O Sage without peer,
with unchanging faith.”
IV.5.17 miṅ-la bsdod-nams miṅ-’dzoms “Her name was Sonam-djom.” (S.). The MS.
has miṅ-’dzoms. Perhaps this is a mistake for g.yan-’dzom, cf. IV.7.7.
IV.14.18-19 khyed-kyi char-ba de na-la ’bor-ba mkañ-yen-mkañyen “You have left your
rug with me. Now have mercy!” (S.) – “Have mercy and leave your rug with me,” cf.
IV.51.7 thugs-dam la bsugs-pa mkañ-yen-mkañyen “please let your thoughts rest.” (S.)
IV.31.17 skar-ma’i zo-ma rnaṅs “Some men and women from Karma” (S.) – “the
novices from Karma”, cf. 31.11.
siṅ-rus-te siṅ-stobsa ’energy’.

The Sogdian version of the ‘Sūtra of the Causes and Effects’ has been studied by many specialists. D. N. MacKenzie’s new edition and translation takes into account the work done by his predecessors. The vocabulary includes new materials and interpretations. It is very convenient to have in one volume text, translation and a vocabulary. For the translation of the Chinese text it will still be necessary to consult R. Gauthiot and P. Pelliot’s edition, Le Sūtra des causes et des effets (Paris, 1920, 1926, 1928). The Sogdian version is based upon the Chinese text, an apocryphal sūtra which was composed before 695 A. D. This sūtra must have been very popular. Several manuscripts of it have been found in Tun-huang. It has been translated not only in Sogdian but also in Tibetan by the famous Chos-grub who died about 865 A. D. (cf. P. Demiéville, “Récents travaux sur Touen-houang”, TP, 56, 1970, pp. 49-50). Fragments of this translation have also been found in Tun-huang (cf. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang, O.U.P., 1962, Nos. 220-221 and 335,2). The Kanjur contains a second translation entitled Dge-ba dañ mi dge-ba ’i las-kyi rnam-par smin-pa bstan-pa’i mdo. According to Pelliot this translation is independent from Chos-grub’s translation and adheres less closely to the Chinese text (op.cit., Tome second, premier fascicule, pp. X-XI). The editors of the Ōtani Kanjur Catalogue (Kyoto, 1930-1932) remark that it is written in a clumsy style. It is also much shorter than Chos-grub’s translation: eight folios as against twelve folios (in the Peking edition).

It must be left to Sogdian specialists to discuss the new interpretations proposed by MacKenzie. Several points have already been discussed by Martin Schwartz in his review (BSOAS, 34, 1971, pp. 411-415). There is still scope also for further study of the Chinese text and the two Tibetan versions. Pelliot has made use of the Chinese text in the Zoku zōkyō and of two manuscripts: MS. Pelliot 2922 and British Museum Stein 714 (cf. Lionel Giles, Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tun-huang, London, 1957, p. 161, no. 5403). Pelliot has reproduced the text, printed in the Zoku zōkyō. The same text has been reprinted in vol. 85 of the Taishō Daizōkyō (No. 2881) with the addition of a few variants taken from a Tun-huang manuscript. As far as I know, no Tun-huang manuscript has been published. A critical edition of the Tun-huang manuscripts would be very welcome. Also the two Tibetan translations have yet
to be edited on the basis of the Kanjur editions and the Tun-huang manuscripts mentioned above. A careful study of the manuscripts of the Chinese text and of the two Tibetan translations will probably be useful for an understanding of difficult passages in the Sogdian version.

Australian National University

J. W. de Jong
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K. V. Subbaiya and L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar are the two names of Indian scholars who, in the first half of our century, emerged as very outstanding contributors to comparative Dravidian studies and who, together with Western scholars – J. Vinson, J. Bloch, E. H. Tuttle, P. Mele, F. B. J. Kuiper, A. Master, and, above all, T. Burrow, and M. B. Emeneau – laid the foundations for solid comparative and historical scholarship in the field of Dravidian. This first stage of building up solid grounds reached its peak when Burrow and Emeneau published their _Dravidian Etymological Dictionary_ and its _Supplement_ (Oxford, 1961, 1968). The cornerstones and the main points of departure were set to indicate basic trends of and directions for further studies.1

In the late sixties, new names of a younger generation of Indian scholars emerged (many of them former students of Burrow, Emeneau, Bh. Krishnamurti and V. I. Subramoniam); most of them gathered round the Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics, Annamalai University. The collection under review represents the result of a seminar conducted under the auspices of the Centre in January 1968. As a whole, the collection is “most impressive and substantial”, as Emeneau says. However, it contains papers of different value and of varying impact. Some of them break new paths and represent lasting contributions to the field, like Krishnamurti’s “Dravidian Nasals in Brahui” or Subrahmanyam’s “The Central Dravidian Languages”; others are of more ephemeral nature, like Schiffman’s “Language Change and Language Distance” or Kameswari’s lexicostatistic approach to Dravidian.

_In toto_, there are eighteen papers in the collection. Five of them are dedicated exclusively to phonology (of Telugu, Yerukala, Ko'dagu and Brahui). Seven papers deal with grammar – problems of morphology and syntax. There is a phonological plus morphological treatment of Parij. One of the papers is of a dialectological character, one deals with the classificatory problems, one describes “new” Dravidian languages, and two papers deal with chronological questions.

Of the phonological papers, probably the most important is Krishnamurti’s treatement of the reflexes of Dravidian nasals in Brahui (pp. 65-74). Br. _d_ is established as the regular reflex of PDr. *n*- in six definitive etymologies (*neytVr*/*nettVr* ‘blood’, *ner*- *ner-V-nal* ‘yesterday’, *ner : *ner-V*- ‘to cut off’, *ner* ‘sun, time’, *ni:r* ‘water’, *ner* ‘who’). In seven items, PDr. *n- > Br. _n_. The development *n- > Br. _d_- is in

1 Apart from linguistics, there are other aspects of “Dravida” India which are at present being very actively studied (though undoubtedly linguistic interests are in the forefront), so that one may indeed speak nowadays of *Dravidology* as an important field of Oriental studies. Important “discoveries” were made and substantial contributions published in the fields of social anthropology, politology, history, but less interest has been shown so far in Dravidian textology, textual criticism and philology, not to speak of literary history and _Literaturwissenschaft_ which are almost totally lacking.
complementation with *n- > Br. n-: the former occurs before front vowels, the latter before non-front vowels. Thus these developments represent a split of the PDr. *n- into d- and n- in CD and Br. According to Krishnamurti, the exception to the above – the 2nd pers.sg.pron. ni: – may be probably explained as *di: > ni: by analogical restoration. PDr. *ni: > Br. n-, and, possibly, PDr. *m- front vowel > Br. b-, *m- non-front vowel > Br. m-. This second part of Krishnamurti’s paper is rather tentative, but the hypothesis is attractive.

The other very important phonological paper is N. Kumaraswami Raja’s “Post-Nasal Voiceless Plosives in Telugu” (pp. 75-84), which developed later into his extremely interesting monograph Post-Nasal Voiceless Plosives in Dravidian (Annamalainagar, 1969), and which contains his formula *NPP developing into NP in Tamil, Malayalam, and NB in Telugu, Kannada. Ta.-Ma. “drop the nasal before the plosive”, while Te. and Ka. “simplify the geminate plosive as a single voiceless plosive”. Though the formula as such is very tempting, I would – like P. S. Subrahmanyan – strongly object to the phonological pattern of the reconstructed sequence *NPP, and the whole seems to me to be too ‘neat’ and regular – rather a device to oblige than the reflection of the actual state of affairs.

On pp. 187-204, G. Srinivasavarmana gives a brief account of the phonology of Yerukalas, the basket weaving Koravas of Andhra, and P. Kothandaraman deals with Koḍagu vowels, specifically with the opposition centralized: non-centralized vowels (pp. 233-247). It is interesting to compare this good account of Koḍagu vowels with a more detailed and sophisticated treatment by Emeneau (JAOS, 90, 1, 1970, 145-158), and with a treatment of a similar feature in the Irula language by the present reviewer (IIJ, XII–II, 113-122). While both above-mentioned authors agree that there are two centralized vowels, a and e, both short and long, in Koḍagu, there seem to be four centralized vowel-phonemes, viz. a a e e, in Irula.

M. Kandappa Chetty traces the developments of PDr. *nr in Telugu to v, nd, mdr and r > r in a very accomplished and solid paper, giving both rich synchronic data and historical insights.

S. Agesthalingam approaches the passive in Dravidian from the positions of the “classical” Chomskian transformational grammar, explaining the relation between active and passive sentences. I believe that the contention of TG that active and passive have the same “meaning” and can be derived from the same underlying sentence is valid not for the analysis of grammar, but only for the analysis of the extralinguistic, objective reality; there, indeed, agents and patients have the same “meaning”; but this “sameness” exists only outside language proper, it is extragrammatical, “pre-linguistic”. It depends on the attitude of the speaker (and this belongs to the sphere of language) whether the outcome is an active or a passive construction; some language may prefer passive to active, and there may be languages which “permit” only “passive” (Basque)?

However, apart from this criticism of the basic theoretical assumptions, I quite agree with the conclusion of the author of this paper that there is a basic difference between paṭtita pāṭam which is not passive, and paṭikkappaṭṭa pāṭam, which is passive. Not even in terms of TG could these two be considered the same, as the author has demonstrated. I would say that in the phrase paṭtita pāṭam ‘the lesson which (someone) read’, the logical and the grammatical object are the same, while in the phrase paṭikkappaṭṭa pāṭam ‘the lesson that was read (by someone)’, the attitude of the speaker may be expressed by ‘patients —— agents’, that is, the logical (“pre-grammatical”, “pre-linguistic”) object is conceived as the grammatical subject. This may be demonstrated also by the grammatical agreement valid for the “underlying” sentences which according to Agesthalingam are different:

* Cf. E. Coseriu, Einführung in die Transformationelle Grammatik (Tübingen, 1970).
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(1) (yârâ) pâṭattaip paṭittârkal → paṭitta pâṭam
agens patients action ("logical" level)
Subject Object Verb.Pred. ("grammatical" level)

(2) (yârâlô) pâṭam paṭikkappaṭṭatu → paṭikkappaṭṭa pâṭam
agens patients action ("logical" level)
[agens] Subject Verb.Pred. ("grammatical" level)

It is of course another matter that both phrases can become grammatical subjects if embedded in a higher structure. What is important is the relevance for the translation of such constructions (cf. the excellent Note 13 in the reviewed paper). While e.g., nâng paṭitta pâṭam should be translated "correctly" as 'the lesson which I read', engâl paṭikkappaṭṭa pâṭam should be translated "passively", i.e. 'the lesson read by me'.

S. V. Shanmugam’s "Inflectional increments in Dravidian" is a good inventory, well documented, one of the first solid studies in Dravidian derivational morphology. What we miss is a general summary discussion of the whole problem of "inflectional increments" ("empty morphs", the câriyâl of native Tamil grammars). According to the author, it is necessary to reconstruct, for PDr, the 'augments' *-an-, *-If-, *-in-, *-a- and *-It-.

The other grammatical papers deal with "evidence for a locative case in Telugu" (Andrée Sjoberg), adjectives in Kurukh (G. Vijayavenugopal), gender in Dravidian (A. S. Kedilaya), the classification of Tamil and Malayalam verb (R. E. Asher) and Dravidian numeral constructions (G. K. Panikkar). Panikkar’s paper does not aim at a reconstruction of Proto-Dravidian numerals, but investigates the underlying structure of numeral phrases. The paper is interesting, though I fail to see a number of points; why, e.g., bring the Soviet linguist Marr into the discussion (totally irrelevant). Asher deals very carefully and most ably with the intricate problem of Tamil and Malayalam verb-classification. The paper has, indeed, broader significance – the relationship between formal and informal Tamil and Malayalam is discussed. If sufficiently complex rules are accepted, the verbal roots of formal Tamil can be reduced to three groups (Lisker, 1951), and those of certain types of colloquial Tamil to two (Asher, 1966). It is interesting that A. K. Ramanujan and E. Annamalai have reached an analogical conclusion, eliminating "middle" verbs and setting up two classes of "weak" and "strong" verbs for colloquial Tamil (personal communication).

I have not found H. Schiffman's short paper on "Language Change and Language Distance" very satisfactory. Most of it seems to me to be just a matter of using fashionable jargon for obvious truths (like the fact that Tamil and Malayalam are closer than Tamil and Kannada); and I find the last statement of the paper not only arrogant but untrue ("The task facing comparative Dravidianists is now to write generative grammars of the various languages, and compare them according to the above-mentioned criteria. All other methods of comparison are doomed to failure"). Generative grammars, i.e. transformational linguistics, has until now been far from demonstrating its usefulness in comparative and historical studies. On the contrary, all other methods of comparison (historical and genetic, typological) have at least produced some results. I do not think we are "doomed to fail" if we do not accept Schiffman’s criteria.

S. Bhattacharya deals somewhat vaguely and in very general terms with "new Dravidian languages" (pp. 139-161), i.e. newly "discovered" uncultivated Dravidian speeches. And T. M. Kameswari gives a lexicostatistic strategy for the chronology of Dravidian languages. One can hardly agree with some of the results: e.g. the approximate period of divergence of Tamil and Kannada must have been much earlier than 400-1000 A.D.
One of the most important papers in the whole lot is P. S. Subrahmanyan's "The Central Dravidian Languages", published simultaneously in *JAOS*, 89, 4 (1969), 739-750. The *JAOS* version is slightly more careful and detailed. Subrahmanyan comes to a very convincing conclusion setting up two major Central Dravidian groups, Proto-Telugu-Kui and Proto-Kolami-Parji, with a different and "higher" node assigned to Gondi than in Krishnamurti's Central Dravidian family tree diagram (in *Current Trends in Linguistics*, 5, 1969, p. 327). Telugu, according to Subrahmanyan, split off first from the proto-stage of the seven languages (Telugu, Gondi, Konḍa, Kui, Kuvi, Pengo, Manda), and the other six remained together for a considerable period of time. Telugu and Gondi share an important and exclusive innovation; this Subrahmanyan explains as a result of the operation of the "wave process" after the separation of Telugu and Gondi (the two languages being still geographically contiguous even after their separation).

As a whole the volume is a very valuable contribution to Dravidian linguistics and manifests the lively activities of the Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics at the Annamalai University. We do hope that this volume will soon be followed by another, which will contain the proceedings of the second seminar on Dravidian linguistics, held at Annamalai in 1969.

K. Zvelebil


In the First All India Conference of Dravidian linguists (University of Kerala, June, 1971) the need for an international journal for Dravidian linguistics was emphatically expressed, and less than a year afterwards, such journal actually appeared, a biannual expected to be published in January and June of each year.

The present reviewer had been among those who, as far back as in 1957, 1958, again in 1964, and in the subsequent years, raised their voice to express the need for a journal of this kind, for they rightly foresaw an unprecedented bloom of Dravidian studies in the second half of this century. It is therefore with great satisfaction that the first issue of this journal is reviewed, and in the hope that the energetic personality of the editor, with the support of an international editorial board and of the syndicate of Kerala University will guarantee smooth and regular publication of the journal and high quality of the contributions.

The first issue is promising enough. Apart from S. K. Chatterji's "Address to the Dravidian Linguists" (1-17), wise and rich in thought, there are nine research papers, two notes, and one review. The research papers deal with various aspects of linguistics, not only Dravidian. In fact, two of the papers have nothing at all to do with Dravidian directly: J. D. Singh's "Pañini's Theory of Language" (80-96), a paper which, I am afraid, does not belong to the best among the lot and contains a few doubtful statements (e.g. p. 84 bottom), and Ray S. Jackendoff's interesting "Speculations on Presentences and Determiners" (112-36), which attempts to explore the parallelisms between noun phrases and sentences. Zvelebil's paper (97-111) inspired by W. L. Chafe's semantic model, and Pike's and Gordon's paper developing further the tagme theory (56-79) are both theoretical papers but, unlike Singh and Jackendorf, the authors exemplify their statements with illustrations from Dravidian languages. For comparative Dravidians, the most thrilling statement of Pike and Gordon is the one in footnote 1, p. 78: "Dhangar is a Dravidian language, and is a dialect of the Kudux
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(i.e. Kûrux, Kuruṅh, K.Z.) of India, but is spoken by people living in the Dhanusa district of Southern Nepal. About 10,000 persons in Nepal speak the language (National Census report, Part II, p. 20, Table 8, 1961)." Unfortunately, one does not see much of it in the very meagre illustrations which occur in this highly theoretical paper. From what one can see, though, it indeed looks like a Kûrux dialect, cf. Kûr. ḍas: Dh. aas that man, Kûr. ḍasē (Hahn) dat.: Dh. aasge id., Kûr. kukōs (Hahn) boy: Dh. kukkos male child, Kûr. allā dog: Dh. allā (DED 2377), Kûr. mankhā, Malt. mangu buffalo: Dh. manxa, Kûr. kheḍd foot: Dh. xeDD (DED 165) id., Kûr. khekkhā hand: Dh. xekk (DED 1683) id., Kûr. kîrā, Malt. kîre (DED 1350): Dh. kiḷRa hunger, Kûr. mandar (Ta. maruntu, DED 3863): Dh. mandar medicine. Some of these items (e.g. DED 1350) occur only in Kûrux, Malto and Dhangar, i.e. only in Proto-North East Dravidian. Cf. also such correspondences as Dh. enghāi my: Kûr. enghai, and the agreement in verb-terminations, e.g. -d-an pres.1.m.s., -d-as pres.3.m.s.; and the plural marker — guTThi of Dh. and — guthi of Kûrux.

Zvelebil quotes a few Tamil and Telugu examples in his effort to show that Chafe’s ‘balanced view’ of language may be applied profitably to Dravidian structure.

T. Burrow (pp. 18-25) has discussed the Dravidian words for ‘horse’: kutirai (DED 1423), probably a South Dravidian item to be derived from kuti ‘to jump, leap’ (though Burrow does not discuss anywhere the derivational apparatus of this item; should we posit two derivative suffixes, -a and -ai?). DED 3268 Ta.Ma. pari is a verb-noun of pari ‘to run, gallop’. DED 3917 Ta. mā, Te. māvu are specialized meanings of ‘animal, beast’. Ta. puravi (classical poetry) has no cognates, and kīlai seems to be only lexical. Burrow then discusses at some length the Sanskrit ghōtaka- ‘horse’, and concludes that the word is of Prakrit origin (cf. its earliest form in the Jaïna texts, viz. ghōḍaga-), and that it has no connection with any of the above mentioned Dravidian items. While discussing the Te. gurramu, he suggests that this is likely to be a loanword from Indo-Aryan. However, I still believe that a Dravidian etymology of this Telugu word cannot be dismissed, particularly if we proceed to derive it by a series of ordered rules from kūtirai, i.e. *kutiray. By rule nu. 1, we would get *kutiray > *kutray on account of accent. The second rule would be a monophthongization rule resulting in *kutra. The third rule would account for the voicing (as in so many Te. words which manifest spontaneous voicing), resulting in *gudra. An assimilation rule would produce *gurra with an alternative *gurra, and finally the addition of the very productive Te. suffix -mu would result in the actual form gurrama. This is of course not so simple and straightforward as an Indo-Aryan borrowing, but a lot more probable, with each step accounted for by a rule.

Burrow finally shows that the “primitive” Dravidian word for horse is the one occurring only in Old Tamil and Brahuvi, viz. Ta. ĭvul, Br. ĭulli. The comparison of the two is not such “an obvious equation” as Burrow thinks (p. 24), but is indeed not ruled out. If he is right, two important conclusions may be drawn from his paper: first, it would once again show that we must regard ancient Tamil literary texts as an invaluable mine of linguistic information; second, it would support the North Western ‘origins’ of the Dravidians, for the horse is not native to South India, and if Dravidian had “originated” in the South we would expect it not have a word for ‘horse’.

Bright’s paper “The Enunciative Vowel” (26-55) sums up very ably one of the more complicated problems of Dravidian phonology. According to his conclusions, from an early period, a rule has operated in most languages which adds a vowel after “most consonants” when a consonant or pause follows. The quality of this vowel is “basically” non-front, non-low, and unrounded. It is usually not basic, but predictable by rule. In my book Comparative Dravidian Phonology (1970, 53, 1.13-1.41) I have characterised the final u as non-morphemic, obligatory “and therefore fully predictable”. Bright’s approach is, however, generative, while mine was traditionally structuralist. V. I. Subramaniam (137-43) has dealt with rules of nasal assimilation in Malayalam.
A minor detail which I may offer as comment: on p. 140, the author writes that he “could not locate any genuine instance for regressive assimilation of gt > nt in Ta”. I have found a few instances in Ta. dialects, e.g. in Dindigul Ta. cariyegru realized as [səɾiːnɪ].

In a lucid, excellent paper, L. Lisker again discusses the complicated question of stops and geminination in Tamil (144-50). Finally, there is a very interesting paper on “phonological formulae for verbal suffixes in Malayalam” by V. R. Prabodhacharan Nayar (151-59). S. M. Kamil Al-Quadri’s “All About Brahui”, reprinted obviously from the Pakistan Quarterly, is indeed rather curious. It contains some valuable (?) information mainly on modern Brahui literature and on the folk-poetry of the Brahui minstrels; on the other hand, it makes such very odd statements as “Brahui may or may not be descended from Dravidian” (161). It is as amusing as its title suggests. Its author quotes his own “voluminous research work on Brahui Language and Literature”, which is under print in Quetta. Let us wait and see.

Pity that there are so many misprints in this issue of the journal! They are almost countless. But we believe that Prof. V. I. Subramoniam, with the resoluteness which is so characteristic of him, will, with the help of the other editors and of the printers succeed in eliminating these shortcomings, as he has promised in the preface.
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