classification.

It may be pointed out that tradition, particularly as recorded in the Epics and Purāṇas ascribes the foundation of cities to particular kings, who are often believed to have given their name to the respective cities but sometimes it remains inconsistent with the original statements. This may indicate that sometimes it was thought that cities could be founded only by kings ; no other factor was envisaged to be responsible for the expansion of urbanism——a belief which ignores the interplay of variables that went into the making of cities.[11]

"The analysis which Pāṇini gives of the underlying meanings which relate place-names to human society, shows conclusively that place-names do not originate by mere accident, but are the outcome of social and historical conditions with which a community is intimately connected. An etymological approach to the place-names of a country, therefore, introduces us to many a forgotten chapter of history and ethnography."[12]

But Pāṇini[13] also cautions his readers that the etymological meaning of place-names should not be held authoritative since the name should vanish when the people leave the place who gave their name to it.

Pāṇini[14] gives the following ending of place-names :

1. Nagara    (IV. 2.142)
2. Pura      (IV. 2.122)
3. Grāma     (IV. 2.142)
4. Kheṭa     (VI. 2.126)
5. Ghoṣa     (VI. 2.85)
(6-9) Kūla, Sūda, Sthala, Karṣa    (VI. 2.129)
(10-11) Tīra, Rūpya    (VI. 1.135)
(12-15) Kaccha, Agni, Vaktra, Garta    (VI. 2.126)
(16) Palada    (IV. 2.142)
(17) Arma      (VI. 2.90)
(18) Vaha      (IV. 2.122)
(19) Hrada     (IV. 2.142)
(20) Prastha   (IV. 2.122, IV. 2.110)
(21) Kanthā    (IV. 2.142)

Pāṇini gives the interesting information that the ending kanthā was in use in Uśīnara (II.4.20) and Varṇu (Bannu) (IV. 2.103). Kanthā was a Śaka word for a town as in expression