

**KÂTYÂYANA AND
PATANJALI: THEIR
RELATION TO EACH
OTHER, AND TO PÂNINI**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649334971

Kātyāyana and Patanjali: Their Relation to Each Other, and to Pānini by F. Kielhorn

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

F. KIELHORN

**KÂTYÂYANA AND
PATANJALI: THEIR
RELATION TO EACH
OTHER, AND TO PÂNINI**

KĀTYĀYANA AND PATANJALI:

THEIR

RELATION TO EACH OTHER,

AND TO

PĀṆINI.

BY

F. KIELHORN, PH. D.,

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES, DECCAN COLLEGE, POONA.

Bombay:

PRINTED AT THE

EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS, BYCULLA.

1876.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. Views hitherto entertained by European Scholars regarding the nature and object of the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana and the Mahābhāshya of Patanjali.	1
II. Attempt to ascertain a principle on which to reconstruct the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana from the Mahābhāshya.....	7
III. Application of the principle furnished in II.....	29
IV. The nature and object of the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana and the Mahābhāshya of Patanjali.....	46
APPENDIX: The first chapter of the so-called <i>Vārttika-pāṭha</i>	57

KĀTYĀYANA AND PATANJALI:

THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER AND TO PĀṆINI.

I.

AMONG all the European scholars who have been engaged in the study of the works of the Sanskrit grammarians, no one has more patiently, minutely, and thoroughly examined the Mahābhāṣya, than the late Prof. Goldstücker. His essay on Pāṇini betrays a familiarity with the work of Patanjali to which no other scholar has as yet attained, and which few are likely to acquire in the future. It is on this account that the views which have been expressed by Prof. Goldstücker regarding the Mahābhāṣya, are deserving of the highest consideration; but the very weight which justly attaches to that scholar's opinions, at the same time imposes on those who may devote themselves to grammatical studies after him, the duty of independently examining and testing their value, and of publicly discussing such doubts and objections as may occur to them in the course of their own reading. And the adoption of such a course appears to be the more called for, when we find that not only have some of the views held by Prof. Goldstücker been apparently widely adopted without such examination, but that views have even been ascribed to him which are at variance with those to which he has actually given expression in his 'Pāṇini.'

In an article on the Mahābhāṣya published in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. V., page 241, I ventured to express some doubts as to whether the nature and the object of the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana and of the Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali had been correctly described by other scholars. I would gladly have deferred discussion on this point to the time when I might

have been enabled to subject the whole of the Mahābhāṣya to a thorough and searching examination; but having been led publicly to question the accuracy of others, I feel bound to lay before the reader such objections to the current views regarding the works of Kātyāyana and Patanjali, as have led me to doubt their correctness.

On pp. 119—121 of his essay on Pāṇini, Prof. Goldstücker has described the nature and the object of the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana and of the work of Patanjali in the following paragraphs :—

“ The characteristic feature of a Vārttika,” says Nāgojibhaṭṭa, “ is criticism in regard to that which is omitted or imperfectly expressed in a Sūtra.” (*Note* : Nāgojibhaṭṭa on Kaiyaṣa वाचिकमिति । सूत्रेऽनुक्तपुरुषादिनाकारत्वं वाचिकत्वम्). A Vārttika of Kātyāyana is therefore not a commentary which explains, but an animadversion which completes. In proposing to himself to write Vārttikas on Pāṇini, Kātyāyana did not mean to justify and to defend the rules of Pāṇini, but to find fault with them; and whoever has gone through his work must avow that he has done so to his heart's content' ‘ Kātyāyana, in short, does not leave the impression of an admirer or friend of Pāṇini, but that of an antagonist,—often, too, of an unfair antagonist’

‘ The position of Patanjali is analogous, though not identical. Far from being a commentator on Pāṇini, he also could more properly be called an author of Vārttikas. But as he has two predecessors to deal with instead of one—and two predecessors, too, one of whom is an adversary of the other,—his Great Commentary undergoes, of necessity, the influence of the double task he has to perform, now of criticising Pāṇini and then of animadverting upon Kātyāyana. Therefore, in order to show where he coincided with, or where he differed from, the criticisms of Kātyāyana, he had to write a comment on the Vārttikas of this latter grammarian; and thus the Mahābhāṣya became not only a commentary in the ordinary sense of

the word, but also, as the case might be, a critical discussion, on the *Vārttikas of Kātyāyana*; while its *Iskṭis*, on the other hand, are original *Vārttikas* on such *Sūtras* of Pāṇini as called for his own remarks.'

'I have already mentioned that Patanjali often refutes the strictures of Kātyāyana and takes the part of Pāṇini'

'His object being, like that of Kātyāyana, merely a critical one, Patanjali comments upon the *Vārttikas* of Kātyāyana, because such a comment of his implies, of necessity, criticisms, either on Pāṇini or on Kātyāyana; and, in consequence, no *Vārttika* could be left unnoticed by him. Again, independently of Kātyāyana, he writes his own *Vārttikas* to *Sūtras* not sufficiently or not at all animadverted upon by the latter grammarian, because they, too, are criticisms, viz. on Pāṇini.'

Prof. Weber, in his article on the *Mahābhāshya* (*Indische Studien*, vol. XIII.) has adopted Prof. Goldstücker's view regarding the nature of Kātyāyana's *Vārttikas*, but to the same scholar's remarks on the work of Patanjali he appears to have given a meaning, against which Prof. Goldstücker would seem to have distinctly and repeatedly guarded himself. On page 297 Prof. Weber writes:—

'Through Goldstücker . . . we then learnt that Patanjali behaves much less like a commentator on Pāṇini than like a defender of the latter against the unjust attacks of Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vārttikas*. And this view is indeed fully borne out by appearances.'

On page 298 Prof. Weber speaks of Kātyāyana as attacking or combating the *Sūtras* of Pāṇini, and of Patanjali as refuting the *Vārttikas* of Kātyāyana.

On page 321 Prof. Weber says:—

'The red thread which runs through the work (*i.e.* the *Mahābhāshya*) is—and on this Goldstücker was the first to lay particular stress—the polemic against the *Vārttikakāra*;' and on the same page he speaks of the *Sūtras* as attacked by Kātyāyana.

On page 399 Prof. Weber writes: 'He (*i.e.* Kātyāyana) it is to combat whom is the special object of the Bhāshya;' and he tells us that the Bhāshya contains the Vārttikas 'together with their refutation' by Patanjali.

Finally, on page 502 Prof. Weber asks: 'What business have Kātyāyana's Vārttikas, whose object it surely is to attack Pāṇini's Sūtras, in the introduction of the Bhāshya?'

While, then, according to Prof. Goldstücker, Patanjali commented on the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana in order to show *where he coincided with, or where he differed from*, the criticisms of that grammarian, frequently attaching, at the same time, to quote another passage from the essay on Pāṇini, 'his own critical remarks to the emendations of Kātyāyana, *often in support of the views of the latter*,' Prof. Weber maintains, apparently on the authority of Prof. Goldstücker, that the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana have been *refuted* by Patanjali. And Prof. Weber is not the only scholar who has given this meaning to Prof. Goldstücker's words. For Dr. Burnell in his essay *On the Aindra School*, likewise describes the relation to each other of Kātyāyana and Patanjali in the following terms (page 91) 'Kātyāyana criticised Pāṇini, and Patanjali replied in justification of the latter,' (and on page 92) 'the Mahābhāshya is . . . a skilful compilation of the views of Pāṇini's critics and of their refutation by Patanjali.'

Setting aside for the present the work of Patanjali, it would appear from the above quotations, that Prof. Goldstücker and Prof. Weber are agreed in regarding Kātyāyana as an antagonist or, to speak more accurately, as an unfair antagonist of Pāṇini, and that both these scholars are of opinion that Kātyāyana had no other motive in composing the Vārttikas than to attack, or to find fault with, the Sūtras of his predecessor. If we try to examine how far this view of the literary activity of Kātyāyana may be correct, we meet at the very outset of our enquiry with the difficulty that neither Prof. Goldstücker nor Prof. Weber has furnished us with a test by which to recognise the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, that neither scholar has shown to us a way of reconstructing out of the Mahābhāshya, as we