

The Notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam

A thesis submitted to the University of Hyderabad in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the award of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics

By

V.M. SUBRAMANYA SHARMA



Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies

School of Humanities,
University of Hyderabad,
Hyderabad-500046,
April 2012.

The Notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam

A thesis submitted to the University of Hyderabad in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the award of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics

By

V.M. SUBRAMANYA SHARMA



Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies

School of Humanities,
University of Hyderabad,
Hyderabad-500046,
April 2012.

DECLARATION

This is to certify that I V.M. Subramanya Sharma, have carried out this research work embodied in the present thesis entitled ‘The Notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam’ during the full period prescribed under the Ph.D. ordinances of University of Hyderabad.

I declare to the best of my knowledge that no part of the thesis was earlier submitted for the award of any research degree of any University or Institution.

(V.M.Subramanya Sharma)

Candidate

Reg. No. 07HAPH02

(Prof. K. Subrahmanyam)

Supervisor,
Centre for Applied Linguistics and
Translation Studies
University of Hyderabad

(Prof. N. Krupanadam)
Head,
Centre for Applied Linguistics and
Translation Studies,
University of Hyderabad

(Prof. Mohan G. Ramanan)
Dean,
Humanities,
University of Hyderabad

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that Sri. V.M. Subramanya Sharma worked under my supervision for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics at the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies, School of Humanities, University of Hyderabad. His thesis entitled ‘The Notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam’ is the outcome of his independent research, which has not been submitted to any other institution for the award of any degree.

(Prof. K. Subrahmanyam)
Supervisor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Korada Subrahmanyam. I am thankful to his support and constant guidance throughout this study. His modesty and willingness to support would remain forever in my memory.

I am deeply grateful to the members of Doctoral Committee, Dr. K. Rajya Rama, Prof. P. Dadeगाonkar and Prof. R.V.R.K. Shastry, for their support and helpful suggestions.

I wish to express my thanks to Prof. N. Krupanandam, Head, CALTS, for his encouragement.

I would like to express my warm and sincere thanks to Prof. Panchanan Mohanty, Prof. G. Uma Maheshwara Rao for their suggestions and comments.

I thank Prof. K. Ramesh Kumar for his encouragement.

Special thanks to my friends V. Muralidhar, M. Srikanth, Anjaneyulu, Praveen, Bindu Madhavi and others for their encouragement.

I would also like to thank the staff of CALTS for their help through out my Ph.D program.

The Notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam

Ph.D. SYNOPSIS

Submitted

By
V.M. SUBRAMANYA SHARMA

Research Supervisor

Prof. Korada Subrahmanyam



Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies

School of Humanities,
University of Hyderabad,
Hyderabad-500046,
April, 2012.

Indian intelligentsia had subjected language to both micro- analysis and macro-analysis right from phoneme down to discourse, both at syntactic and semantic levels. There is gulf of difference between the Indian sages on one side and others on the other. As far as the linguistic analysis is concerned, the former laid stress on both spiritualistic and mundane purpose of a language, whereas, the latter was concerned about the mundane purposes of the language only.

Bharṭṛhari's magnum opus, Vākyapadīyam, is a comprehensive treatise on language analysis and Philosophy of language. And the insightful analysis of the concept of Language of Bharṭṛhari can stand up to the challenges faced by the modern philosophers.

The aim of the thesis is to study the notion of Word in Vākyapadīya, elaborately, under ten headings- Nityaśabdavāda and Kāryaśabdavāda, Vyutpattipakṣa and Avyutpattipakṣa, Nāmākhyātopasarganipātāśca, Subantam and Tiñantam, Trayī or Catuṣṭayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ, Siddhaḥ-Sādhyah, Pañcakamprātipadikārthaḥ, Strīpratyah, Sphoṭah, Vṛttipakṣa and Avṛttipakṣa.

There are two groups among vaiyākaraṇas: those who hold that śabda is nitya (immutable) and others who argue that the same is kārya (mutable). This aspect is discussed right from Samgraha of Vyāḍi down to the latest works on vyākaraṇa. Since it is difficult to exclusively support either side, Pāṇini resorted to both the sides while compiling his Aṣṭādhyāyī.

Close on the heels of nityaśabdavāda and kāryaśabdavāda, some vaiyākaraṇas hold that there cannot be any production of śabdas whatsoever. On the other hand, the opposite side strongly supports the view that all nouns are produced from a verbal root and suffix combination. Between the two, the former is called avyutpattipakṣa whereas the latter is vyutpattipakṣa.

Earlier to Pāṇini, the gamut of words was divided into four groups viz. nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga, nipāta, whereas Pāṇini preferred further brevity and put the words under two headings viz. subantam and tiñantam, only.

Depending upon the cause of behaviour of a particular word, Patañjali offered two guidelines- catuṣṭayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ and trayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ. The former refers to the four-fold division following jāti, guṇa, kriyā and samjñā whereas in the latter the last category is omitted.

In vyākaraṇa the term siddha refers to subanta, whereas sādhya is tiñanta.

Under the Pāṇinisūtra ‘kutsite’, Patañjali enumerates the five meanings expressed by a noun- jāti, vyakti, liṅga, samkhyā and kāraka.

Pāṇini instituted seven strīpratyayas that are to be added to words for expressing strītvā.

According to vyākaraṇadarśana, the prakriyā (application part) is just a device that would be helpful in realizing the śabdabrahman or attaining mokṣa, the ultimate goal. Śabda has got four stages, viz. parā, paśyantī, madhyamā (sphoṭa) and vaikharī, parā is Brahman only.

The concept of vṛtti in terms of kṛdanta, taddhita, samāsa and sanādyantadhātu is elaborated by Patañjali in Mahābhāṣya under ‘samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-1-1)’ etc.

Pāṇini earmarked roughly 2000 sūtras in Aṣṭādhyāyī to describe vṛtti. Patañjali declares that there are two sides vṛttipakṣa and avṛttipakṣa.

I focused chiefly on both prakriyā and ārthika. The concepts covered the structure of other units of Sanskrit as well.

This study consists of seven chapters: The first chapter introduces the study and its background. Relevance of the study is emphasized by reviewing the earlier work and organization of the thesis is specified.

Four-fold categorization of Word, which has been prevalent in the ancient Indian grammars, i.e., right from Pre- pāṇinian period down to Vākyapadīyam, is discussed in the second chapter.

Two-fold categorization of Pāṇini, i.e. subanta and tiṇantam, is discussed in the third chapter. The concept of kāla is also touched.

The concept of vṛtti i.e. kṛd, taddhitā, samāsa and sanādyanta are elaborately discussed in the fourth chapter.

The five meanings of a Word i.e. jāti, vyakti, liṅgam, vacanam and kārakam are discussed in the fifth chapter.

The philosophy of word, Viz. nityaśabdavāda and kāryaśabdavāda; the concept of sphoṭa in comparison with Modern linguistics is discussed in the sixth chapter.

The conclusions of my research work are given in the seventh chapter.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Language in Indian grammatical tradition	2
1.2	Bhartrhari's vākyapadīyam	6
1.3	The Relevance of study	10
1.4	Earlier work	12
1.5	The Aim and Scope	13
1.6	Organisation of Thesis	16
2	FOUR - FOLD CATEGORIZATION OF WORD	17
2.1	Ṛgveda	17
2.2	Niruktam	17
2.3	Tantravārtika	19
2.4	Vākyapadīyam	19
2.5	Pāṇini	22
2.6	Aṣṭādhyāyī	22
2.7	Catuṣṭayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ and Trayī śabdanāmpravṛttiḥ	24
2.8	Modern Linguistics	24
2.8.1	What does a Word mean?	24
2.8.2	Types of Words	25
3	TWO-FOLD CATEGORIZATION OF PĀṆINI	28
3.1	Tiṇanta	28
3.1.1	Definitions of Kriyā	29
3.1.2	Vākyapadīyam	29
3.1.3	Mahābhāṣyam	30
3.1.4	Nāgeśa	31
3.1.5	Kālasamuddeśa	36
3.1.6	Types of Kāla	37
3.2	Vyutpattipakṣa and Avyutpattipakṣa	44
4	THE CONCEPT OF VṚTTI	48
4.1	Definition of vṛtti	48
4.2	Purpose of vṛtti	48
4.3	Types of vṛttis	48
4.3.1	Samāsavṛtti	49
4.3.2	Kṛdvṛtti	49
4.3.3	Taddhitavṛtti	49
4.3.4	Sanadyantadhātuvṛtti	49
4.4	The chief characteristics of vṛtti	49
4.5	Samāsavṛtti	50
4.5.1	What is Optional	51
4.5.2	Common principles	53
4.5.3	Tiṇantasamāsa	55

4.5.4	Nityasamāsa	55
4.5.5	Samjñāyām nityasamāsaḥ	56
4.5.6	Types of samāsas:	56
4.5.7	Avyayībhāva	56
4.5.8	Pāre madhye ṣaṣṭhyā vā (2-1-18):	57
4.5.9	Samāsāntāḥ (5-4-68)	57
4.5.10	Tatpuruṣa	57
4.5.11	Dvigu	58
4.5.12	Karmadhāraya	58
4.5.13	Nañ (2-2-6)	58
4.5.14	Uttarapadārthapradhānaḥ:	58
4.5.15	Anyapadārthapradhānaḥ:	59
4.5.16	Pūrvapadārthapradhānaḥ:	59
4.5.17	Śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ (2-2-23):	61
4.5.18	Cārthe dvandvaḥ (2-2-29):	64
4.5.19	Ekaśeṣaḥ:	65
4.5.20	Aluk:	66
4.5.21	Vaiyākaraṇākhyāyām caturthyāḥ (6-3-7):	66
4.5.22	Gaviyudhibhyām sthiraḥ (8-3-95):	66
4.5.23	Tatpuruṣe kṛti bahulam (6-3-14):	66
4.5.24	Ṣaṣṭhya ākrośe (6-3-21):	67
4.6	Kṛdvṛtti:	67
4.6.1	Ekārthībhāva:	67
4.6.2	Kṛtyāḥ (3-1-95):	68
4.6.3	Vā sarupo'striyām (3-1-94):	69
4.6.4	Karmaṇyaṇ (3-2-1):	69
4.6.5	Niṣṭhā (3-2-102):	70
4.6.6	Radābhyām niṣṭhāto naḥ purvasya ca daḥ (8-2-42):	70
4.6.7	Chandasi liṭ, liṭaḥ kānajvā, kvasuśca (3-2-105, 106, 107):	70
4.6.8	Laṭaśśatṛṣānacāvāprathamāsamānādhikaraṇe (3-2-124):	72
4.6.9	Uṇādayo bahulam (3-3-1):	72
4.6.10	Bhāve (3-3-18):	72
4.7	Taddhitavṛttiḥ:	75
4.7.1	Avivakṣā in taddhitas:	77
4.7.2	Gotra-yuva-samjñas and kinship terms:	77
4.7.3	Regulations:	78
4.7.4	Gotram:	78
4.7.5	Kānīna:	78
4.7.6	Tadadhīte tadveda (4-2-59):	79
4.7.7	Cāturarthikas:	79
4.7.8	Tiṇanta:	80

4.7.9	Pakṣimatsyamrgān hanti (4-4-35):	80
4.7.10	Paripantham ca tiṣṭhati (4-4-36):	81
4.7.11	Dharmam carati (4-4-41):	81
4.7.12	Asti nāstidiṣṭam matiḥ (4-4-60):	81
4.7.13	Vati:	81
4.7.14	Tasya bhāvastvatalau (5-1-119):	83
4.7.15	Goṣṭham- gogoṣṭham:	84
4.7.16	Śītaka / uṣṇaka:	84
4.7.17	Adhikam (5-2-73):	85
4.7.18	Pārśvakah:	85
4.7.19	Āyaśśūlikah:	85
4.7.20	Śrotriyah:	85
4.7.21	Sākṣī:	85
4.7.22	Kṣetriyah:	86
4.7.23	Matup:	86
4.7.24	Ālu & Elu:	88
4.7.25	Vāgmī-Vācālah / Vācāṭah:	89
4.7.26	Prāgdiśo vibhaktiḥ (5-3-1):	89
4.7.27	Adhunā (5-3-17):	89
4.7.28	Atiśāyane tamabiṣṭhanau (5-3-55):	90
4.7.29	Tiṇāśca (5-3-56):	92
4.7.30	Dvivacanavibhajyopapade tarabīyasunau (5-3-57):	92
4.7.31	Praśamsāyām rūpap (5-3-66):	92
4.7.32	Bahuc:	93
4.7.33	Kutsite (5-3-74):	93
4.7.34	Ḍatarac /Ḍatamac:	93
4.7.35	Avakṣepaṇe kan (5-3-95):	94
4.7.36	Samāsācca tadviśayāt (5-3-106):	94
4.7.37	Ivārtha in samāsa:	96
4.7.38	Ivārtha by pratyaya:	96
4.7.39	Vigrahapūrvikā taddhitotpattiḥ:	99
4.7.40	Samāsāntāḥ (5-4-68):	99
4.7.41	Exceptions:	100
4.7.42	Na pūjanāt (5-4-69):	100
4.7.43	Kimah kṣepe (5-4-70):	100
4.7.44	Nañastatpuruṣāt (5-4-71):	100
4.7.45	Patho vibhāṣā (5-4-72):	100
4.8	Sanādyantadhātuvṛttiḥ:	103
4.8.1	Ekārthībhāva:	103
4.8.2	Vṛttipakṣa and Avṛttipakṣa:	104
4.8.3	Guptikidbhyah san (3-1-5):	104

4.8.4	Dhātoḥ karmaṇaḥ samānakartṛkādicchāyām vā (3-1-7):	107
4.8.5	Śaiṣikāt śaiṣikāḥ:	107
4.8.6	Matvarthāt:	108
4.8.7	Supa ātmanaḥ kyac (3-1-8):	108
4.8.8	Aśanāyodanyadhanāyā bubhukṣāpipāsāgardheṣu (7-4-34):	108
4.8.9	Kāmyacca (3-1-9):	109
4.8.10	Upamānādācāre (3-1-10):	109
4.8.11	Kartuḥ kyaṁ salopaśca (3-1-11):	109
4.8.12	Lohitādiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ (3-1-13):	109
4.8.13	Kaṣṭāya kramaṇe (3-1-14):	110
4.8.14	Sukhādibhyaḥ kartṛvedanāyām (3-1-18):	110
4.8.15	Namovarivaścitraṇaḥ kyac (3-1-19):	110
4.8.16	Muṇḍamiśraślakṣṇalavaṇavratavastrahalakalakṛtatūstebhyo ṇic (3-1-21):	111
4.8.17	Satyāpapāsarūpavīṇātūlaślokaśenāloamatvacavarmavarnācūrṇacurādibh yo ṇic (3-1-25):	111
4.8.18	Hetumati ca (3-1-26):	111
4.8.19	Dhātorekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yaṁ (3-1-22):	114
4.8.20	Kaṇḍvādibhyo yak (3-1-27):	115
4.8.21	Gupūdhūpavicchipaṇipānibhya āyaḥ (3-1-28):	116
4.8.22	Ṛterīyaṁ (3-1-29):	116
4.8.23	Kamerṇiṁ (3-1-30):	117
5	THE FIVE MEANINGS OF A WORD	119
5.1	Svārthaḥ / jāti (class):	119
5.1.1	Nyāya:	119
5.1.2	Mīmāṃsa:	120
5.1.3	Bhartrhari:	121
5.2	Dravyam (individual):	126
5.3	Liṅgam (gender):	129
5.3.1	Strīpratyayas:	130
5.4	Vacanam (number):	136
5.5	Kāraṇam (case):	138
5.5.1	Siddha and Sādhya:	139
5.5.2	Karmakāraṇam:	144
5.5.3	Karaṇam:	148
5.5.4	Kartṛkāraṇam:	149
5.5.5	Sampradānakāraṇam:	153
5.5.6	Apādānakāraṇam:	154
5.5.7	Adhikaraṇam:	157
5.5.8	Śeṣaḥ:	159
6	THE FLAVOUR OF PHILOSOPHY AND WORD	160

6.1	Nitya and kārya:	160
6.2	Sphoṭa:	168
6.2.1	Yogānuśāsana:	169
6.2.2	Mahābhāṣya:	170
6.2.3	Bhartṛhari- Sphoṭa:	170
6.2.4	The process of communicability:	171
6.2.5	Bhartṛhari on speaker's communication of meaning:	172
6.2.6	Pratibhā:	172
6.2.7	Sphoṭa- Others:	173
6.3	Types of Sphoṭa:	176
6.3.1	Varṇa- Sphoṭa:	177
6.3.2	Pada-Sphoṭa:	177
6.3.3	Vākya- Sphoṭa:	177
6.3.4	Jāti- Sphoṭa:	177
6.3.5	Akhaṇḍa- Sphoṭa:	178
7	CONCLUSIONS	182
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	189

1 INTRODUCTION

In Indian grammatical tradition, the origin for the analysis is traced back to Vedas. In fact, Veda is the highest authority for different śāstras like nyāya, vaiśeṣika, etc. Here is the evidence, which shows that the terminology used for language analysis has had its origin in Vedas.

Here is the evidence from Gopathabrāhmaṇa- “omkāram pṛcchāmaḥ, ko dhātuḥ, kim prātipadikam, kim nāmākhyātam, kim liṅgam, kā vibhaktiḥ, kaḥ pratyayaḥ, kaḥ svara upasargo nipātaḥ, kim vaiyākaraṇam, ko vikāraḥ, ko vikārī, kati mātraḥ, kati varṇaḥ, katyakṣaraḥ, katipadaḥ, kaḥ samyogaḥ, kim sthānanādānupradānānukaraṇam.”

Let us analyse omkāra, what is dhātu?, what is prātipadika?, what is ākhyāta?, what is liṅgam?, what is vibhakti?, what is pratyaya?, what is svara, upasarga and nipāta?, what is vikāra?, what is vikārī?, how many mātras has it got?, how many words has it got?, what is samyoga?, what is sthāna-nāda-anupradāna and anukaranam?. There is a discussion about different vibhaktis in Maitrāyaṇīyasamhitā and Aitareyabrāhmaṇa.

In Ṛktantra, it is clearly mentioned-

“brahmā bṛhaspataye provāca, bṛhaspatirindrāya, indrobhāradvājāya, bhāradvāja ṛṣibhyaḥ, ṛṣayo brāhmaṇebhyaḥ.”

Brahmā was the first author of vyākaraṇa then he transmitted science to Bṛhaspati, who taught the same to Indra, who in turn gave it to the Bhāradvāja. The ṛṣis got it from the latter and from them it reached brāhmaṇs.

There are innumerable references to language elements, structure and nature in classical literature. Vedic literature itself contains many references to language-

It talks about its nature, its constituent elements, and its relationship with the mind and the reality.

In Ṛgveda (also in atharvaveda taittiriyaṛanyaka and śatapathabrāhmaṇa), the following ṛk is seen and there is a clear reference to the four-fold division of words.

catvāri vākparimitāpadāni tāni vidurbrāhmaṇā ye manīṣiṇaḥ|
guhā trīṇi nihitā neṅgayanti turīyam vāco manuṣyāvadanti||

Patañjali picked up five hymns from ṛgveda and commented them in relation to vyākaraṇa in paspaśā introductory part of Mahābhāṣya-

1. catvāri śṛṅgā..... (4-58-3).
2. catvāri vākparimitā padāni..... (1-164-45).
3. utatvaḥ paśyan..... (10-71-4).
4. saktu miva titaunā (10-71-2).
5. sudevoasi (8-69-12).

1.1 Language in Indian grammatical tradition

Language had been subjected to both microanalysis and macro-analysis right from phoneme down to discourse, both at syntactic and semantic levels, by Indian intelligentsia. There is gulf of difference between the Indian sages on one side and others on the other, as far as the linguistic analysis is concerned. The former laid stress on both spiritualistic and mundane purposes of a language whereas the latter, was concerned about the mundane purpose of the language only.

The uninterrupted culture of Indian sub-continent stands on four pillars, i.e. dharma, artha, kāma, mokṣa. The scriptures preach that the last puruṣārtha that is mokṣa should be the chief goal of every human being and the dharma is an instrument in achieving the same. Needless to say, artha and kāma coupled with dharma only would also be useful in attaining mokṣa.

It is the unique phenomenon of Indian linguistic inquiry that the sages were of the view that one should employ śabdās that are acceptable to vyākaraṇa and this would fetch dharma to accumulate. Therefore, it can be asserted that use and abuse of language is the subject matter of vyākaraṇa.

While it is possible to transform the meaning from the speaker to the listener through both śabdās and apaśabdās. Vyākaraṇam prescribes that one should employ śabdās only. Here the term śabdās refers to sādhuśabdās (perfect śabdās that are acceptable to vyākaraṇa).

It is natural, that for a single śabda there can be many apaśabdās. For example, in the sense of cow, gauḥ is the śabda while gāvī, gotā, gopotalikā (registered by patañjali in paspaśā of his magnum opus, mahābhāṣya) etc., were being used in the same sense.

Patañjali offered the example of restricted dishes- it is possible to kill the appetite by any kind of dish, and the restriction is for attaining dharma.

There has not been a separate discipline called Linguistics on Indian subcontinent. Rather, mostly it is vyākaraṇam, which is referred to for any linguistic analysis. In fact, such an analysis is abundantly available across the treatises related to śikṣa, niruktam, nyāya, vaiśeṣikam, pūrvamīmāṃsa, vedānta, yoga, sāmkhya, āyurveda etc. also.

The derivative meaning of word vyākaraṇam is-“vyākṛīyante apaśabdebhyaḥ sādhuśabdāḥ pṛthak krīyante anena’ (the śabdas are separated from apaśabdas by this). It may be noted that vyākaraṇam includes grammar but not vice versa and the term grammar for vyākaraṇam is used as a rough translation.

The term śabdānuśāsanam is a synonym of vyākaraṇam and the derivation is as follows- “śabdāḥ anuśiṣyante vivicya bodhyante anena” (śabdas are being vividly taught i.e. in the form of root and suffix).

As far as the Sanskrit language is concerned, śabdas are put under two headings viz. vaidikaśabdas and laukikaśabdas. The śabdas that are available in four vedas (roughly 1137 branches) are called vaidikaśabdas. “Prātiśākhya” are the works that deal with the grammar of vaidikaśabdas. Each veda has got a separate prātiśākhya.

Vyākaraṇam is the system that deals with the grammatical analysis of laukikaśabdas. Indra, Candra, Kāśakṛtsna, Śākaṭāyana etc., were the authors of different vyākaraṇas, earlier to Pāṇini, some of them might have been his contemporaries. Upavedas, purāṇas, vedāṅgas, kāvyas etc., fall under the range of laukikaśabdas. This was the situation prior to Pāṇini.

Aṣṭādhyāyī is an exclusive and popular treatise authored by Pāṇini, considered to be the most genius on the earth.

Brevity and perfection are the hallmarks of Aṣṭādhyāyī. With his unsurpassed intellect, Pāṇini compiled Aṣṭādhyāyī in such a way so that both, vaidikaśabdas and laukikaśabdas are analyzed. The form of some śabdas in veda

differs from loka. Svāra (accent) is an important factor in deciding the meaning of śabdas in veda. Pāṇini's work registers the difference in the form of vaidikaśabdas as may be applicable and svaras, viz. udātta, anudātta, svarita etc., are also dealt with.

In fact, Pāṇini nowhere said that svāra is exclusively for vaidikaśabdas. Another factor that requires attention is the free word order in laukikavākyas and the fixed word order in vedic passages.

The term śabda is pregnant with meaning and it is employed to denote the following things- varṇaḥ (phoneme), prakṛtiḥ and pratyayaḥ (morpheme), padam (word), vākyam (sentence), avāntaravākyam or khaṇḍavākyam (sub-sentence), mahāvākyam (discourse), parā, paśyantī, madhyamā (sphoṭa), vaikhari, dhvaniḥ (sound), śabdapramāṇam (statement as a means of knowledge) etc. Therefore, the term śabda is untranslatable.

Some scholars have offered "Word" as an equivalent of śabda. Rather, in light of the above discussion, it is better to adopt the term rather than try for rendering. It is due to this reason that vyākaraṇam is aptly called śabdānuśāsanam.

It may be noted that all the said items are discussed in pāṇinīyavyākaraṇam. It is due to illusion that some people remarked that Pāṇini deals with morphology only.

According to tradition, one should study the three main systems of Indian philosophy, viz. vyākaraṇa, nyāya, and pūrvamīmāṃsa, popularly known as padavākyapramāṇaśāstrāṇi, in order to have a perfect knowledge of any piece of literature. Here vyākaraṇam is styled padaśāstram as it chiefly deals with Word. The same is the case with nyāya and mīmāṃsa also. Rather, each one of them

discusses all the major aspects of language, like varṇa, pada, vākya and mahāvākya.

1.2 Bhartṛhari's vākyapadīyam

Bhartṛhari's view is a completely new way of looking at the concept of language and his interest is not confined to the rules and forms of language. Rather, he aims at a depth- analysis of the concepts of language and meaning. In short, Bhartṛhari's vākyapadīyam is a comprehensive treatise on language analysis and philosophy of language.

Bhartṛhari's magnum opus, Vākyapadīyam, deals with sentence and word and there are three kāṇḍas.

In verses 24, 25 and 26 of brahmākāṇḍa, the author gives the gamut of things that are going to be discussed in the entire work. They are:

1. Prakṛtipratyayas
2. Padavākyas
3. Prakṛtipratyayārthas
4. Padavākhyārthas
5. Kāryakāraṇabhāva
6. Yogyatā
7. Arthajñāna
8. Dharma.

All said eight things are described in three kāṇḍas.

The first part of treatise is called 'brahmākāṇḍa' or āgamakāṇḍa /āgama samuccaya: It consists of 165 verses. The identity of śabda and brahman, the authority of Vedas, attaining mokṣa are chiefly discussed in this chapter.

Sphoṭa is the real śabda and it is different from vaikharī, which is born out of the movement of speech organs, has got sequence and is unreal. These aspects will be elaborated under sphoṭa.

The second part of the treatise is called ‘vākyakāṇḍa’. Sentence and its related matters- only vākyārtha is real, padas and padārthas are artificial, the definition of a sentence and their evolution establishing the vyākaraṇa- viewpoint- are discussed in this chapter. In case one argues that the padas (words) attained through apoddhāra (extraction) of a sentence are meaningful then the varṇas (phonemes) attained through splitting of pada must also be meaningful. It is not happening- some words can’t be split, some others, when split, the parts there of won’t express the meaning that is there in the word and therefore they are dyotakas (illuminators) and not vācakas (expressers\tellers). Thus, the entire chapter is earmarked for the discussions related to sentence.

The third part of vākyapadīya is called ‘padakāṇḍa’; there are 14 samuddeśas (sub-chapters) in this kāṇḍa. Each samuddeśa deals with a different subject and the total number of verses is 1323. Here under is a breakup-

1. Jāṭisamuddeśa (106 Verses)
2. Dravyasamuddeśa (18)
3. Sambandhasamuddeśa (28)
4. Bhūyodravyasamuddeśa (3)
5. Guṇasamuddeśa (9)
6. Diksamuddeśa (28)
7. Sādhanaśamuddeśa (167)
8. Kriyāśamuddeśa (64)
9. Kālasamuddeśa (114)
10. Puruṣasamuddeśa (9)

11. Samkhyāsamuddeśa (32)
12. Upagrahasamuddeśa (27)
13. Liṅgasamuddeśa (31)
14. Vṛttisamuddeśa (627).

The words extracted from a sentence, different types of words, their relations with meaning are the subject matter of this kāṇḍa. In the beginning it is stated that there is different opinion about the number of types of words- two, three, four, and five. Among the words, nāma (noun) and ākhyāta (verb) are important. So before he ventured upon the explanation of meaning of nāmas and their place in a sentence, the author elaborated six things, Viz. jāti, dravya, sambandha, bhūyodravya, guṇa and dik.

In seventh samuddeśa, the author elucidates the instrumentality of nāmas. Which is the creation in generation of kriyā (action) and which is originated from the power that the nāmas posses. Since vākyārtha (the indivisible sentence meaning) is the real factor and its base is the kriyārthavyāpāra (the activity/processes, which is the meaning of a verb), the instruments of vyāpāra, called kāraṅgas have been detailed. The description of the form of kriyā follows.

The difference between nāma and dhātu, nature of kriyā and the definition of kriyā that- the parts having sequence would turn into a single unit without any differences in the mind and the same is called kriyā- are elaborated.

Next comes the kālasamuddeśa, in which the form time (kāla) is elucidated. The present, past, future tenses along with the eleven sub-forms are explained. Puruṣasamuddeśa consists of prathamamadhyamottamapuruṣa in detail.

In samkhyāsamuddeśa, the question related to samkhyā (number), such as what is samkhyā? Where does it exist? How the separation of difference and non-difference (bhedābhedāvibhāga) is regulated by samkhyā? - are discussed.

Ātmanepada etc., are dealt at length in twelfth chapter called upagrahasamuddeśa.

Liṅgasamuddeśa, chiefly deals with difference between laukikaliṅga (the gender in the world) and śāstriyaliṅga (the gender in vyākaraṇa).

The last chapter is vṛttisamuddeśa. It consists of 627 verses- the kṛt, samāsa etc. vṛttis are discussed from different angles.

Patañjali, who was an erudite scholar in all the systems of Indian philosophy, had put the gems of vyākaraṇa- theories in a nutshell, called Mahābhāṣya. In the course of time, the people couldn't keep and protect the tradition of Mahābhāṣya. Candrācārya somehow secured a copy from south and taught to his disciple, Vasurāta and Bhartṛhari got it from the latter. Vākyapadīya is the gist of the theories of Mahābhāṣya.

Bhartṛhari's contribution can be summarized as follows:

1. The sphoṭasiddhānta, which is there in Mahābhāṣya, in the form of a seed is elaborated in many ways by him.
2. Darśanas like vedānta were advocating ways of attaining mokṣa etc., during his lifetime, whereas vyākaraṇa was considered as a tool in knowing the form of śabdas. In such a situation, he ventured upon the task of providing that vyākaraṇa too is a darśana and it is verily useful for mokṣa, rather it is like a royal path (ajimhā rājapaddhati).

3. He advocated the identity of śabda with brahman and argued that the entire universe is in śabdabrahman.
4. He elucidated the concept of Patañjali that through the employment of sādhu-śabdā one would know the real form of Veda and then get on the track, attaining dharma.
5. Taking the idea that omkāra emerged first at the beginning of creation from upaniṣads, he propagated that vāk is anādi (beginning less) and is the origin of the creation.
6. He refuted the theories of other systemists, which were in vogue during his lifetime.
7. He established the vaiyākaraṇas' akhaṇḍavākyaārtha, after having refuted vehemently the concepts of Naiyāyikas and Mīmamsakas.
8. He construed the vaiyākaraṇasiddhantas along with advaitavedānta and vedapramāṇikatva (authority of vedas). He brought sphoṭa on par with apūrva of Mīmāmsakas, īśvara of Naiyāyikas, pīlu of Kaṇādas, śūnya of Bauddhas and brahman of Vedāntins. (Source: Brahmakāṇḍa. English Translation by K.Subrahmanyam)

1.3 The Relevance of study

Bhartrhari's treatise vākyapadīyam stands out as unique attempt at a comprehensive philosophy of language. Though he belonged to the grammarian tradition of Pāṇini and Patañjali, he transcended the limits of grammar and language analysis set by his predecessors to develop a very original philosophy of language. Bhartrhari's insightful analysis of the concept of language can stand up to the challenges faced by the modern philosophers.

In Philosophy, we don't discover new truths with advancement of time, as it happens in the case of natural sciences.

kuto vā nūtanam vastu vayam utprekṣitum kṣamāḥ|

vāco viṣayavaicitryāmātram atra vicāryatām || (nyāyamañjari: āhnika- 1-8).

It is the remark of Jayantabhaṭṭa, an ancient Indian philosopher.

“We don’t discover any new truth in philosophy. But we can do something novel by presenting the old truth propounded by ancients in modern terminology”.

Tandra patnaik says, the issues handled by Bhartṛhari still continue to hunt the modern philosophers. We get new approaches to solve them. Therefore, an understanding of Bhartṛhari’s philosophy certainly proved rewarding.

As Bhartṛhari himself remarks, “the present is always enriched the wisdom of the past”.

tattadutprekṣamāṇānām purāṇairāgamairvinā|

anupāsitaṣṭhānām vidyā nāti prasīdati|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 485)

By serving the gurus and searching the śāstras only one can be able to explore new dimensions in a particular area. The goddess of learning doesn’t shower mercy on those who neglect the past.

There are two opposing views regarding the nature of sentence meaning, one group of philosophers like Davidson and others conceive sentence meaning in terms of truth conditions contributed by each element in a sentence. The other group of philosophers like Grice and his followers doesn’t bother about syntactic and linguistic elements or about their truth conditions. For them the communication of intended meaning of the speaker by an utterance is all that matters.

The debate of the two diverse outlooks is still alive and hot. In this context, the ancient theory of Bhartṛhari acquires more importance and requires deep study of his work on philosophy of language i.e. Vākyapadīyam.

1.4 Earlier work

Since few decades, linguists have been paying attention to semantics having dealt with some issues of the modern semantic issues. They turned their attention towards Indian tradition. They began to discern and work in some details on Indian theory (of meaning).

Indian tradition maybe set to be superior to the tradition of western especially the Greeks, which is its main source.

In the light of the contributions by Pāṇini, Vararuci, Patañjali, and Bhartṛhari only, the acquaintance of method of analysis that furnished the means for the west has come to perfection.

Many national and international scholars have done noteworthy study for the recent four to five decades giving due importance to the views and theories proposed and set forth by Bhartṛhari.

Some of the translations of vākyapadīyam (partly) by eminent scholars like:

K.A.Subrahmania Iyer, Satyakamvarma, Munshimmanoharlal, Kamadev Jha, T. Patanaik, Ramakishoratripathi, Gangadharashastri, Bishnupada Bhattacharya, Korada Subrahmanyam and others.

The main source of the study of classical Indian philosophy and traditions are the work of K.A.S. Iyer. By translating Vākyapadīyam with ancient scholars' vṛttis (and commentary of punyaraaja and ancient vṛttis) created an enthusiasm and a revival of ancient Indian knowledge. The total disjunction between classical Indian philosophical traditions and modern theories of language are abridged by these works.

Korada Subrahmanyam's brahmākāṇḍa translation focuses new light on Vākyapadīyam. Having profound knowledge on all systems of Indian grammatical tradition, it gives a right path to reach the Bhartṛhari's theory.

T. Patnaik has published some critical essays in Journals like Prajñya, Indian Philosophical Quarterly and Vishwabharati journal of philosophy. Bhartṛhari's notion of sentence meaning is viewed. It is an effort to re understanding Bhartṛhari's theory of sphoṭa.

In "Śabda", by Tandra Patnaik, many important dimensions of Bhartṛhari's work are explored. The sphoṭa theory of language, The Word and the meaning, language and communication, thought and language etc. are discussed.

Kapil Kapoor, in his "Dimensions of Pāṇini" discussed- nature of the linguistic sign, Bhartṛhari's sphoṭavāda, the concept of padārtha in language and philosophy; and linguistic issues in classical India.

1.5 The Aim and Scope

In my thesis, I would like to discuss the concept of Word with reference to the following concepts.

1. Nityaśabdavāda and Kāryaśabdavāda.
2. Vyutpattipakṣa and Avyutpattipakṣa.
3. Nāmākhyātopasarganipātāśca.
4. Subantam and Tiñantam.
5. Trayī or Catuṣṭayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ.
6. Siddhaḥ-Sādhyah.
7. Pañcakamprātipadikārthaḥ.
8. Strīpratyah

9. Sphoṭah.

10. Vṛttipakṣa and Avṛttipakṣa.

During the course of my research, I chiefly focus on both prakriyā and ārthika as it is detailed in Vākyapadīyam of Bhartṛhari. Although the title is ‘The notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam’, the concepts mentioned above will give the structure of other units of Sanskrit as well.

At this juncture, I made an attempt to put the scattered data, which is explained in 1966 terse verses in an order, limiting myself to ‘The Notion of Word in Vākyapadīyam’. At times, I may touch other systems such as nyāya and mīmāṃsa as well.

An attempt to correlate Modern theories of Linguistics to the possible extent is made.

There are two groups among vaiyākaraṇas: those who hold that śabda is nitya (immutable) and others who argue that the same is kārya (mutable). This aspect is discussed right from Samgraha of Vyāḍi down to the latest works on vyākaraṇa. Since it is difficult to exclusively support either side, Pāṇini resorted to both the sides while compiling his Aṣṭādhyāyī.

Close on the heels of nityaśabdavāda and kāryaśabdavāda, some vaiyākaraṇas hold that the words are partless and there cannot be any production of śabdas whatsoever. On the other hand, the opposite side strongly supports the view that all nouns are produced from a verbal root and suffix combination. Between the two, the former is called avyutpattipakṣa whereas the latter is vyutpattipakṣa.

Earlier to Pāṇini, the gamut of words was divided into four groups viz. nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga, nipāta, whereas Pāṇini preferred further brevity and put the words under two headings viz. subāntam and tīnantam, only.

Depending upon the cause of behaviour of a particular word, Patañjali offered two guidelines- catuṣṭayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ and trayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ. The former refers to the four-fold division following jāti, guṇa, kriyā and samjñā whereas in the latter the last category is omitted.

In vyākaraṇa the term siddha refers to subānta, whereas sādhyā is tīnānta.

Under the Pāṇinisūtra ‘kutsite’, Patañjali enumerates the five meanings expressed by a noun- jāti, vyakti, liṅga, samkhyā and kāraka.

Pāṇini instituted seven strīpratyayas that are to be added to words for expressing strītvā (femininity).

According to vyākaraṇadarśana, the prakriyā (application part) is just a device that would be helpful in realizing the śabdabrahman or attaining mokṣa the ultimate goal. Śabda has got four stages, viz. parā, paśyantī, madhyamā (sphoṭa) and vaikharī, parā is brahman only.

The concept of vṛtti in terms of kṛdanta, taddhita, samāsa and sanādyantadhātu is elaborated by Patañjali in Mahābhāṣya under ‘samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-1-1)’ etc.

Pāṇini earmarked roughly 2000 sūtras in Aṣṭādhyāyī to describe vṛtti. Patañjali declares that there are two sides vṛttipakṣa and avṛttipakṣa.

1.6 Organisation of Thesis

In pre-pāṇinian view, Word is of four types i.e. nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga, and nipāta are discussed right from Ṛgveda down to Vākyapadīyam. Four-fold categorization of word is discussed in second chapter.

In the third chapter, Two-fold categorization of Pāṇini i.e. subantam and tinantam, the concept of tinantam is discussed in detail. The concept of kāla is also touched.

Fourth chapter deals with the concept of vṛtti, kridvṛtti, taddhitavṛtti, samāsavṛtti, ekaśeṣavṛtti and sanādyantavṛtti, which explain more than half of Pāṇinisūtras with regard to morphological analysis, are discussed.

In Fifth chapter, the five meanings of a Word i.e. jāti, vyakti, liṅgam, vacanam and kārakam, the concept of siddha and sādhya are discussed.

The philosophy of Word Viz. nityaśabdavāda and kāryaśabdavāda, the concept of sphoṭa are discussed in the sixth chapter.

The conclusions of my research are given in the last chapter.

2 FOUR - FOLD CATEGORIZATION OF WORD

2.1 Ṛgveda

In Ṛgveda (also in atharvaveda-taittirīyāranyaka and śatapadabrāhmaṇa) the following ṛk is seen and there is a clear reference to the four-fold division of words-

catvāri vākparimitā padāni tāni vidurbrahmaṇā ye manīṣiṇaḥ|

guhā trīṇi nihitā neṅgayanti turīyam vāco manuṣyā vadanti|| (ṛgveda-1-164-45)

As is obvious the four-fold division of “nāmākhyātopasarganipātāśca” had had its roots in Vedic literature itself.

Earlier to Pāṇini there were four-fold divisions of śabdas in “Vājasaneyaprātiśākhya” of ‘Śākaṭāyana’ and ‘Nirukta’ of Yāska.

2.2 Nirukta

Yāska in first chapter mentions the four groups of words- nāma (noun), ākhyāta (verb), upasarga (prefix) and nipāta (filler).

He defines ākhyāta and nāma thus- the word wherein the meaning of verb (bhāva) is considered to be predominant such as vrajati (walks), pacati (cooks) etc. is ākhyāta.

On the other hand, the word wherein the concrete form of a thing or sattva is considered to be important such as gauḥ (cow), aśvaḥ (horse), puruṣaḥ (man), hasti (an elephant), is nāma.

Further, Yāska also shows the contrast between ākhyāta and nāma- by which the bhāva (meaning of verb or dhātvartha) in the form of starting and ending is expressed is called ākhyāta, and vrajati, pacati are examples. Whereas a

thing i.e. in concrete form is expressed by a word is called a nāma, the examples are vrajya (walk), and pakti (cooking).

Yāska also quotes Śākaṭāyana by saying that the upasargas viz., pra, para, apa, sam etc., if not pre-fixed, can't express any meaning and when they added before nāma and ākhyāta would effect the meaning of the root. He also refers to Gārgeya's statement that the upasargas express the meaning of more and less. Yāska concludes that the upasargas would effect change in the meaning of nāma and ākhyāta. This aspect will be dealt with at latter stage.

So far as nipātas are concerned, Yāska says that since words belonging to this category are employed in the sense of more or less, they are called nipātas. Śākaṭāyana says 'nipātaḥ pādapūraṇaḥ' (nipāta means filler used for the adjustment of meter in prosody). Yāska offers some examples for nipātas- api in the sense of similar, api as filler, na in the sense of negation etc.

“tad yāni catvāri padajātāni nāmākhyātecōpasarganipātāsca tānīmāni bhavanti.tatrai tannāmākhyātayorlakṣaṇam pradiśanti. bhāvapradhānamākhyātam. sattva pradhānāni nāmāni, tad yatrobhe, bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ pūrvāparī bhūtam bhāvamākhyātenācaṣṭe. vrajati pacatīti. upakrama prabhṛtyapavarga paryantam mūrtim sattvabhūtam sattvanāmabhiḥ. vrajyāpaktiriti. ada iti sattvānāmupadeśaḥ. gaurasvaḥpuruṣohastīti.bhavatīti bhāvasya. āste śete vrajati tiṣṭhatīti”.

“indriyanityam vacanmaudumbarāyaṇaḥ”.

“na nirbaddhā upasargā arthānnirāhuriti śākaṭāyanaḥ. nāmākhyātayostu karmopasamyogadyotakā bhavanti. uccāvacāḥ padārthā bhavantīti gārgyaḥ. Tad ya eṣu padārthaḥ prāhurime tam nāmākhyātayorarthavikaraṇam”.

“atha nipātā uccāvaceṣvartheṣu nipatanti. apyupamārthe. api karmopasangrahārthe. api pada pūraṇāḥ. teṣāmete catvāra upamārthe bhavanti.

‘neti pratiṣedhārthīyo bhāṣāyām’ (niruktam of yāska, vol I, ch: 1).

2.3 Tantravārtika

Kumārila in his popular work ‘Tantravārtika’, summarized the opinion of Yāska in the following verses-

caturvidhe pade cātra dvividhasyārthanirṇayaḥ|

kriyate samśayotpatternopasarganipātayoḥ|| (1-3-33)

tayorarthābhīdhānehi vyāpāro naiva vidyate|

yadarthadyotakau tau tu vācakaḥ sa vicāryate || (1-3-34)

Among the four types of words the meanings of two i.e. nāma and ākhyāta are being discussed. Since there will be confusion in meanings of nipāta and upasarga, they are not taken up. Rather, the nāma and ākhyāta, which are the agents of the expression, are discussed along with the upasarga and nipāta that are suggestive of the meaning of their qualified. The base of the above comments made by Kumārila is there in Vākyapadīyam.

2.4 Vākyapadīyam

Following the dictum- “arthabhedāt śabdabhedah” (difference in śabda due to difference in meaning), it evolves that the upasarga is different and the dhātu is different. At this juncture, Hari in vākyakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam clarifies that for effecting aḍāgama, āḍāgama, dvirvacana etc. a procedure has been established in the śāstra that such and such a part is called upasarga and the rest is dhātu.

As a matter of fact, the dhātu united with upasarga is to be called a dhātu. For example the aḍāgama and āḍāgama are instituted on the dhātu ‘sangrāma’ i.e.

the dhātu is prefixed with the upasarga ‘sam-’ and the same that the clusters of upasarga and dhātu expresses the meaning i.e. ‘yuddha’ (war)-

aḍādīnām vyavasthārtham pṛthaktvena prakalpanam |

dhātūpasargayoḥ śāstre dhātu reva tu tādrśaḥ|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 180)

tathāhi sangrāmayateḥ sopasargā dvidhiḥ smṛtaḥ|

kriyāviśeṣāḥ sanghataiḥ prakramyante tathāvidhāḥ|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 181)

Further Hari, supports his ruling by exhibiting the purpose of the above procedure-

karyāṇāmantaraṅgatva mevam dhātūpasargayoḥ|

sādhanairyāti sambandham tathā bhūtaiva sā kriyā|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 182)

Thus, in the first place, the dhātu and upasarga unite to become a kriyā and then the same would get connection with kārakas. The origin of the above conclusion is there in Mahābhāṣya-

“pūrvam dhātuḥ upasargena yujyate paścāt sādhanena”.

A quite opposite concept i.e. also registered by Patañjali-

‘pūrvam dhātuḥ sādhanena yujyate paścādupasargena’, is also explained by Hari while suggesting that the first concept only is authoritative-

prayogārheṣu siddhaḥ san bhattavyo’rthoviśiṣyate |

prāk ca sādhanā sambandhāt kriyā naivopajāyate || (vākyakāṇḍa- 183)

Hari mentions three kinds of arguments that were prevalent-

1. Upasargas are expressing agents of the special meaning in kriyā (vācaka).
2. They may indicate (dyotaka) or suggest the specific meaning of a dhātu.
3. They may be helpful in denoting specific meaning by the dhātu (sahakāri)-

sa vācako viśeṣāṇām sambhavā ddyotako’pi vā |

śaktyādhānāya dhātorvā sahakārī prayujyate|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 188)

The root ‘stha’ (ṣṭhā- gatinivṛttau) means ‘to stand’, when the upasarga ‘pra’ is prefixed i.e. pratiṣṭhate. It means ‘to go on a journey’, here the upasarga ‘pra’ is vācaka. Pacati means it can be said preparing a good dish also. Rather, without the upasarga ‘pra’, i.e. prapacati, the above meaning is not clearly denoted. Here the upasarga ‘pra’ is dyotaka.

In examples like adhyāgacchati (oncoming), pariyāgacchati (coming from all directions) etc. the upasargas ‘adhi’ and ‘pari’ are not meaningful i.e. even without the upasargas, following the context etc. the meaning can be achieved.

So far as the nipātas are concerned, ācaryas felt that the same just like upasargas, can be dyotakas, may denote a different meaning and like āgamas express meaning by uniting with other words. Hari summarizes the different concepts and elaborates-

nipātāḥ dyotakāḥ kecit prthagarthābhidhāyinaḥ |

āgamā iva ke’pisyuḥ sambhūyārthasya vācakāḥ|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 192)

Hari further, clarifies that although the nipātas such as ‘ca’ etc. are considered to be words- “cādayo’ sattve (1-4-57)”, “svarādinipātamavyayam (1-137)”, “avyayādāp supaḥ (2-4-82)”. They are not employed independently. It is just like a pratyaya, which is meaningful but can’t be used independently (apadam na prayuñjīta, na kevalā prakṛtiḥ prayoktavyā, nāpi pratyayaḥ- mahābhāṣyam).

cādayo na prayujyante padatve sati kevalāḥ|

pratyayo vācakatve’pi kevalo na prayujyate|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 194)

Hari in vākyakāṇḍa rules that the fifth category of words (according to some scholars) viz. karmaṇyavacanīyas are dyotakas and not vācakas. It does not have expectancy of a kriyā but denotes the sambandha (relation).

kriyāyā dyotako nāyam sambandhasya na vācakaḥ|

nāpi kriyāpadākṣe'pī sambandhasya tu bhedaḥ|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 204)

‘śākalyasya samhitāmanu prāvarṣat’- is the example for the karmaṇyavacanīya ‘anu’ (it rained while śākalya recited the samhitā). Here the recitation of samhitā by śākalya is a sign to indicate as to when it rained. Here rain is lakṣya (example) and the relation is lakṣaṇa (sign). The karmaṇyavacanīya ‘anu’ denotes the relation between the above lakṣya and lakṣaṇa. The following sūtras are relevant- ‘anurlakṣaṇe (1-8-84)’, ‘karmaṇyavacanīyayukte dvitīya (2-3-8)’.

2.5 Pāṇini

On the other hand, Pāṇini preferred a two-fold categorization of padas- subantam (nouns) and tiṇantam (verbs) (suptiṇantam padam 1-4-14). Pāṇini did not fail to explain the other categories, i.e. upasarga and nipāta, which are included in subanta. Pāṇini included avyayas (indeclinables) also in subanta- tatra (there), svar (heaven), kadā (when) etc. By this Pāṇini could achieve a lot of brevity (lāghavam).

2.6 Aṣṭādhyāyī

A survey across Aṣṭādhyāyī makes us believe that Pāṇini looked at the gamut of śabdās from four angles-

1. Jātiśabdaḥ: The unique, inherent, single and perennial phenomenon that is there in a thing and it is useful in separating a thing from the rest of the things in the universe- gotvam (cowness). A cow is separated by jāti, cowness, from the

rest of the things in the universe. Similarly, vṛkṣatvam (treeness), strītvam (womanhood) etc.

2. Guṇaśabdaḥ: The word that denotes a quality- sthūlaḥ (stout), kṛśaḥ (lean) etc.
3. Kriyāśabdaḥ: The word that denotes an action- pacati (cooking), paṭhati (reading) etc. It may be noted that kriyā denotes the kāraka and samkhyā (besides tense and mood).

In fact, kriyā is only one- caitramaitraviṣṇumitrāḥ gacchanti (caitra, maitra and viṣṇumitra are going). Here, although the verb gacchanti is in plural it is a single ‘gamanakriyā’ (a single act of going). Rather, the number suggests that the noun or kāraka is in dual/plural. The kāraka and kriyā are bound by mutual expectancy (parasparākāṅkṣā).

4. Samjñāśabdaḥ: Name or designation- caitra, padmā etc. In terms of Translation, although it is possible some times, one should not try to translate the śabdas denoting samjñā- viṣṇu (all-pervading), pārvatī (the daughter of parvata) etc. On the other hand, the samjñas have to be transliterated and the derivative or literary (basic/simple) meaning may be provided in parenthesis or footnotes or endnotes.

All the four entities, Viz. jāti, guṇa, kriyā and samjñā have got dravya or vyakti as their resort. The dravya can be concrete or abstract.

The word Hari has got many meanings- frog, lion, serpent, parrot, viṣṇu, indra, vāyu etc.

In Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali (under ṛluk) discusses the categorization of śabdas following their behaviour.

2.7 Catuṣṭayī śabdānāmpravṛttiḥ and Trayī śabdanāmpravṛttiḥ

The first one refers to jāti, guṇa, kriyā and samjñā, whereas the latter is limited to the first three. Nāgeśa in Udyota and Laghumañjūṣa asserts that the trayīpakṣa is authoritative. As has already been exhibited, the origin for this line of thinking is in Aṣṭādhyāyī.

2.8 Modern Linguistics

2.8.1 What does a Word mean?

Right from Ṛgveda down to Modern linguistics, Scholars have been defining Word from different angles. Though, to precise word is a difficult task. The following are some of the definitions given by various scholars.

To a non-professional, Word is a written or a printed form between spaces (Orthographical word).

To a common speaker or listener, a word is a segment of sentence bounded by successive points at which a pause is possible (Utterance).

For some, a word can be defined as a sequence of sounds with stress on its initial syllable (Phonological word).

Morphemes (phonemic shapes with meaning as fundamental units), whose meanings can't be recognised with the grammatical pattern of Language are known as Lexical words.

A word may be viewed as a sequence of sounds, as grammatical element and as a unit of meaning.

Bloomfield defines a word as “a minimal free form”.

The word has a semantic autonomy, and which has complex sounds in itself possessing a meaning fixed and accepted by convention. The meaning

denoted may be concrete or abstract actually existing or imaginary or as Ogden and Richards point out, 'whatever we may be thinking of or referring to'.

Palmer defines; a word is 'the smallest speech unit (constantly recurring sound pattern) capable of functioning as a complete utterance.

Thrax defined a 'Word' formally based on syntax, 'as the minimal unit of a sentence'. But he defined 'sentence' as a complete thought. Sentences are complete if thoughts are complete.

Semantic definition of a Word:

A word maybe defined as the union of a particular meaning with a particular complex of sounds capable of a particular grammatical employment. This means the word should be simultaneously a semantic, a phonological, and a grammatical unit. This definition is further improved by some linguists saying that words are the smallest segments of utterances, which fulfil the three conditions.

John Lyons opined that semantic considerations are irrelevant in definition of word and concentrates upon defining the word in purely grammatical terms.

These definitions help to define the word, up to some extent only.

2.8.2 Types of Words

A word can be said to be of two types according to meaning: Functional and Lexical.

Functional meaning is the meaning of a word in actual speech.

Lexical meaning is the mental content attaching to an isolated word. Lexical meaning belongs to the language system and in ordinary speech isolated words, donot occur. We have to note that the language is social and speech is individual. (Ferdinand de Saussure)

Mark aronoff and Fudeman (what is morphology; 32-44) summarised that there are various ways to define a word but no definition is entirely satisfactory. He rightly opines that syntactical (words are the smallest unit of syntax) and

phonological definitions of words have their own limitations and proves it by further elaborative definition. In order to come up with a definition that tells us that whether some thing is a word, he puts forth three empirical tests-fixed order of elements, non-separability and integrity, stress.

In view of some scholars, the word requires definition separately for each language and presumes that there are probably some languages in which the concept of word may not be applicable at all.

Naiyāyikas hold that prakṛti and pratyaya (root and suffix) are called padam. Meaning is understood through this “padyate gamyate anena iti padam”. Infact, it was Patañjali who employed the word in the sense of prakṛti and pratyaya (dadhā ghvadāp, 1-1-20), and (uraṇ raparaḥ, 1-1-51).

Akṣapāda, the author of nyāyasūtras defines the pada as vibhaktyantaḥ: this is a different version of “suptiñantam padam (1-4-14)” of Pāṇini.

Navyanaiyāyikas offered a different definition “śaktam padam”. This apparently extends the jurisdiction to prakṛti and pratyaya.

According to Mīmamsakas a word is the aggregate of the letters into which it could be analysed.

Directly or indirectly all the systems have accepted Pāṇin’s definition “suptiñantam padam (1-4-14)”.

The part of speech conventionally followed by the western grammarians is based on the Graceo-Roman classification of parts of speech. Among the Greek grammarians, Dionysius Thrax (second century B.C.) is the foremost to establish the tradition of this type of classification.

In Alexandria, about the first century B.C., the first comprehensive grammar in the Western World was compiled; this was the grammar of Dionysius Thrax, and it consisted of only twenty-five short paragraphs.

Dionysius Thrax defined grammar as ‘The technical knowledge of the language generally employed by poets and writers’. He isolated eight parts of speech: Noun, Verb, Conjunction, Article, Adverb, Participle, Pronoun and Preposition; and he recognised case, gender, number, person, tense, voice and mood. He defines Noun, as “The noun is a part of a sentence having case inflections, signifying a person or a thing”; “The sentence is a combination of words that have complete meaning in themselves”. One lack in Dionysius Thrax was treatment of syntax i.e. how the various parts of speech combine and how sentences may be analysed. (Source: 1981, simpson)

3 TWO-FOLD CATEGORIZATION OF PĀṆINI

Pāṇini preferred the term subantam to nāma. There are twenty-one suffixes that are to be added to roots in order to make a ‘nāma’ and the same are called ‘sup’, whereas, the words such as rāmaḥ, hariḥ i.e. ending in ‘sup’ pratyayas are called subantas.

Pāṇini preferred the term tiñantam to ākhyāta that was employed by earlier grammarians such as Śākaṭāyana, Yāska, etc. In the Gaṇasūtra-‘ākhyātamākhyātena kriyāsādhātye (2-1-72)’: Pāṇini employed the term ākhyāta in the sense of kriyā. Pūrvamīmāsakas call the pratyaya ‘ta’ (in yajeta) by the name ‘ākhyāta’.

3.1 Tiñanta

There are 18 suffixes that are to be added to roots in order to make a kriyāpada and the same are called ‘tiñ’, whereas the words such as pacati, pacāmi etc., i.e. ending in tiñpratyaya are called tiñantas.

In dhātupāṭha there are 2000 odd verbal roots catalogued by Pāṇini. There are a few more sūtradhātus, which are found in Pāṇinisūtras only.

As has already been discussed the kriyā is denoted by a tiñanta and the same is called sādhyā, its counterpart being subanta or siddha.

Pāṇini by his sūtra ‘dhātusambandhe pratyayāḥ (3-4-1)’, suggested that the verb rather than a noun, in a sentence is the predominant factor i.e. qualified (viśeṣyam). Needless to say that, the noun or nāma would become the qualifier (viśeṣaṇam). This is, what is meant by Nairuktas, when they offered the derivation i.e. ‘namati akhyātārtham prati viśeṣaṇāni bhavātīti nāma’.

The above concept is styled- ‘dhatvarthamukhyaviśeṣyaka śābdabodha’ by Gangeśopādhyāya of ninth century.

3.1.1 Definitions of Kriyā

A tiṇanta expresses kriyā (activity/ action) and the same, as was explained by Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa, author of Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇam, is called vyāpāra, bhāvana and utpādanā-‘vyāpāro bhāvanā saivotpādanā saiva ca kriyā’ (dhātvarthanirṇayaḥ-5).

The term dhātu is commonly used for a root and a verb, as well as a tiṇanta. According to Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa, phala and vyāpāra are expressed by a dhātu, whereas Nāgeśa says that ‘phalāvacchinnavyāpāra or vyāpāravacchinna-phala’ is the meaning of a dhātu-‘phalavyāpārayordhātuḥ’ (vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇam, dhātunirṇayaḥ-2), ‘phalāvacchinnavyāpāro vā, vyāpārāvacchinna-phalam vā dhātvarthaḥ’, (laghumañjūṣa- dhatvarthanirūpaṇam).

3.1.2 Vākyapadīyam

Hari, in Vākyapadīya expounded the concept of kriyā and kāla in two chapters viz. kriyāsamuddeśa and kālasamuddeśa. At the outset of kriyāsamuddeśa, Hari defines a kriyā by the following verse-

yāvatsiddhamasiddham vā sādhyatvenā’bhidhīyate|

āśritakramarūpatvāt sā kriyetyabhidhīyate|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 1)

Whether completed or not completed i.e. happening or going to happen, the total entity, which is treated as sādhyā (to be achieved) the same, as it has a particular sequence, is called kriyā.

The term kriyā generally means a vyāpāra (process/activity). The one, which we propose to do or happen, is kriyā in its entirety. It means, when there is a question kim karoti? (what are you doing?), the answer like gacchati (going), pacati (cooking)etc. is called kriyā. It can be said to have

happened, happening or going to happen i.e. past, present and future tenses caused by kāla (time).

Hari in kālasamuddeśa says that kāla causes difference in kriyā-

“kriyābhedāya kālāstu samkhyā sarvasya bhedikā” (kālasamuddeśa- 2).

In fact, it is very difficult to offer a clear definition of kriyā. Rather, every kriyā would have phala (a result), which is perceptible (pratyakṣa) and through that, the kriyā can be inferred (anumāna). It is just like inferring fire by smoke.

Similarly, every kriyā would have a sequence of avāntarakriyas (sub-activities) and by taking the minute details of kāla, if one looks at the sub-activities then the form of kriyā can be understood.

Nāgeśa asserted that kriyā is dependent upon kṣaṇas (movements)- ‘kṣaṇādhārā kriyā’.

3.1.3 Mahābhāṣyam

Patañjali under “bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ (1-3-1)” offers the following comments-

“yadi punaḥ, kriyāvacano dhātuḥ. ityetallakṣaṇam kriyeta. kā punaḥ kriyā?.

ihā. kā punarīhā?. ceṣṭā. kā punaśceṣṭā?. vyāpāraḥ. sarvathā bhavān śabdaireva śabdānāchaṣṭe. na kimcidarthajātam nidarśayatyevamjātīyikā krīyate. nāmeyamatyantāparidrṣṭatā aśakyā kriyā piṇḍībhūyā nidarśayitum. yathā garbho nirluṭhitaḥ. sāsāvanumānagamyā.

ko’sāvanumānaḥ?

iha sarveṣu sādhanēṣu sannihiteṣu kadācit pacatītyetatbhavati kadācinna bhavati. yasmin sādhanē sannihite pacatītyetatbhavati sā nūnam kriyā. athavā yayā devadatta iha bhūtvā pāṭalīputre bhavati sā nūnam kriyā.”(mahābhāṣyam- 3)

If, on the other hand, a definition like- dhātu is the one, which denotes an activity- is offered then what is kriyā, activity (īha), what is activity? Movement of body, what is movement of body? Activity.

By all means you are explaining śabdās by śabdās only, but you won't exhibit any form of a thing and say this type of thing is kriyā.

This so called kriyā can totally be not perceived. It is impossible to exhibit in a concrete form like an aborted pregnancy (or like a pregnancy that cannot be perceived but inferred), that this kriyā is to be known through inference. What is this inference? Here when all the kārakas are handy, sometimes this happens- cooking, some times it does not happen, when some kāraka is handy the cooking happens, that certainly is kriyā. How is it known that 'pac' (ḍupacaṣ pāke) etc. are expressing agents of kriyā?, because they have sāmānādhikarāṇya with the verb karoti.

What is (he/she/it) doing?- cooking, what will be doing?- will be cooking, what had done?- cooked.

3.1.4 Nāgeśa

Nāgeśa summarized the above bhāṣyam and said 'phalānumeyā kriyā' (a kriyā has to be inferred through the result), elsewhere Patañjali offered another definition- 'kārakāṇām pravṛttiviśeṣaḥ kriyā'- it means that the activity of dravyas (things) which are in the form of kārakas is kriyā. Even though the kāraka is there, no result can be generated without its activity. Therefore, the activity (vyāpāra) is kriyā.

By and large apart from the dravya which is sādhana, the kriyā i.e. Sādhyā is different- is the conclusion and the same can be understood through intellectual capacity.

Some people generally think kriyā involves movement rather it is not correct, whether it involves movement or not (mere existence i.e. to be) it can be a kriyā. Similarly, the vyāpāra of kartā and karma only can't be taken as kriyā. Following vivakṣā, the vyāpāra of all the kārakas can be kriyā.

Here is the essence-

Anything i.e. different from sādhana and considered as sādhya is totally kriyā and dravya is siddha. kriyā is sādhya is the siddhānta.

The kriyas are innumerable. For each kriyā, there will be a number of avāntarakriyas (sub-activity). The avāntaraphala (sub-result) and the pradhānaphala (main result) can be different. Rather right from the movement of the commencement till the movement of achieving the result, there will be a sequence for the avāntarakriyas.

If the sequence is disturbed the expected result can't be achieved and these aspects can be explained by taking up kriyas like cooking, going, eating (pac, gum, bhuj) etc.

Dhātu denotes a kriyā- pac, gam, bhuj etc. tiñ suffixes are added to dhātu and the same indicate special aspects like kartā, karma, samkhyā, kāla etc.

‘Pacati’ is the verb. Here cooking is the kriyā, the one who cooks is the kartā. He is one only (single), the time is present tense, due to the relation with kāla. Three states of kriyas are mentioned bhūta (past), vartamāna (present) and bhaviṣyat (future). Kāraka is the candidate which generates a kriyā, it depends upon vivakṣā (a desire to say), and anything can be shown as kāraka.

There may be a doubt in terms of the definition of a kriyā- there will be some avāntarakriyas in every kriyā. Kriyā depends upon time. Time is in the form of movements, and not all the avāntarakriyas that happened at different

movements can be had at a single point of time. Therefore, how can one consider kriyā as an entity? Hari answers this question-

guṇabhūtairavayavaiḥ samūhaḥ kramajanmanām|

buddhyā prakalpitābhedaḥ kriyeti vyapadiśyate|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 4)

Kriyā is the amalgam of unimportant and sequential parts that are channelized into one by the intellect. Every kriyā would certainly have a result and through the result only the kriyā is inferred. Right from the beginning till the result there will be so many movements in a specific sequence. The avāntarakriyas happen at different movements and at the last movement the result emerges. There ends the kriyā. Taking the group of the movements as one, the kriyā that caused the result is also considered as one. Following the sub-activities and the sequence, the singleness of kriyā is mentioned. This is simply a mental imagination.

Cooking can be taken as an example- here the softening of the raw rice is the result. Placing the vessel on the hearth is the first movement and replacing the vessel from the hearth is the last movement in cooking. In such a situation there will be innumerable movements in between at different movements, some small sub-activities take place and the gamut of such sub-activities is called cooking. Singleness following the sub-activities flashes in the mind.

Following this procedure, it is said that kriyā is only one and each kriyā is denoted by a dhātu like gam, pac and bhuj.

In truth, an avayavī can't be different from the avayavas but the result is achieved only through the gamut of things and not through the parts. Therefore, one should consider both the complete and the complements. Moreover, it is also necessary that the sequence of the parts of a kriyā should be causative. Otherwise, the result would not emerge. The line of thinking that the complete is important and the complements are unimportant is also artificial.

The sequence of sub-activities of a kriyā and the sādhyasvabhāva of a kriyā is asserted by Hari, by the following verse-

sa cā' pūrvāparībhūta ekatvādakramātmakaḥ|

pūrvāparāṇām dharmaṇa tadarthenānugamyate|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 18)

Since it is single and doesn't have anything like back and forth as well as the sequence, the kriyā, by the nature of the sub-activities that are useful, is imaginary.

Further, having exhibited the definition of a kriyā following vyaktivāda, Hari by the following verse defined a kriyā following jativāda-

jātimanye kriyāmāhuranekevaktivartinīm|

asādhyā vyaktirūpeṇa sā sādhyevopalabhyate|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 20)

The common feature i.e. seen across all the kriyas, according to some scholars is kriyā. Infact, such a dharma is nitya and asādhyā. Rather, following vyaktis the sādhyasvabhāva is to be superimposed on jāti.

Whoever may cook, whatever may be cooked, the common feature, i.e. cooking, is there across all the cooking activities and the same may be termed as pākajāti. According to śāstra the jāti is nitya (immutable) and asādhyā (that can't be acted upon). Nevertheless, following the vyaktis that bear jāti as concomitant. The features like sādhyatva etc., have to be applied to jāti too.

Hari also says that according to tradition sattā is dhātvarthaḥ, according to some scholars-

antyevātmani yā sattā sā kriyā kaiścidiṣyate|

bhāva eva hi dhātvartha ityavicchinna āgamaḥ|| (kriyāsamuddeśa-23)

Vaiyākaraṇas believe that the meaning (artha) expressed by śabda is bauddha (imaginary) only and by considering the bauddhārtha and the (real) artha as non-different, the designations are employed and the prakriyā is run.

Hari, explains bauddhārtha in terms of kriyā-

buddhim tajjātimanyetu buddhisattāmathāpare|

pratyaṣṭa rūpām bhāveṣu kriyati prati jānate || (kriyāsamuddeśa- 24)

Some scholars take the mental image of the thing, correlate the same with the real thing and the same is applied to kriyā, be it jāti or vyakti. Some others hold that the mahāsatta of buddhi is kriyā. The kriyas such as cooking, going etc. would generate some sort of images in the mind. Non-difference has to be effected between the images and the outside real activities. Therefore kriyā is a mental process and it can be jāti, vyakti or mahāsatta.

Hari explains that not only the tinpratyayas but also the dhātu that is followed by laṭ-kṛtya-kta-khalartha- avyayakṛt-rūḍhi-niṣṭhā- ghañādi, denotes sādhyā.

The kriyā in the form of sādhyā can be known through dhātu, it is not known in the absence of dhātu, and the same is experienced. Therefore following anvaya and vyatireka (yatsatve, yatsatvam, anvayaḥ) (yadabhāve, yadabhāvaḥ, vyatirekaḥ). It can be decided in all the places dhātu denotes sādhyāvastha only. In the case of pacati etc. also (lakāras) the dhātu part denotes sādhyā only.

1. la: This means laṭ, liṭ i.e. lakāras. tinpratyayas replace the same.

E.g. pacati, pacataḥ, pacanti etc.

2. kṛtya: tavyā, tavyat, anīyar etc. kartavya, karanīyam are examples.

3. kta: The ktapratyaya in bhāva by ‘napumsake bhāve ktaḥ’ (3-3-114).

E.g. hasitam, jalpitam etc. This pratyaya is in bhāva.

4. khalartha: The pratyayas that are there in the sense of khalpratyaya.

E.g. sulabhah, durlabhah.

5. avyayakṛt: ktvā, tumun etc., which, when added to a dhātu the śabda would become an avyaya.

E.g. kṛtvā, gantum.

6. rūḍhi: This indicates the suffix tiṅ in bhāva by striyāmkṛtin (3-3-94).

E.g. kṛtiḥ, gatiḥ and matiḥ.

7. niṣṭhā: This includes ktavatu also and the pair is styled niṣṭhā in Pāṇini.

E.g. paṭitam, paṭitavān, dr̥ṣṭam, dr̥ṣṭavān.

8. ghañādi: It means ghañ, lyuṭ, and a, etc.

E.g. pākaḥ, pacanam, icchā.

In all the above examples, the dhātu denotes sādhya only. In certain cases, the kṛtpratyayas totally denote siddhāvastha. In some places, kriyā only is important.

3.1.5 Kālasamuddeśa

Hari in kālasamuddeśa asserts that kāla is considered by scholars as a sūtradhāra of lokayantra, the kāla divides the world. Sūtradhāra means a driver and he runs the machine called universe-

tamasya lokayantrasya sūtradhāram pracakṣate|

pratibandhābhyānugñābhyām tena viśvam vibhajyate|| (kālasamuddeśa- 4)

Hari in the same chapter explains that the kāla having kriyā as upādhi (abode) gets the form of bhūta (past), bhaviṣyat (future) and vartamāna (present) and there too it is of eleven forms —

kriyopādhiśca san bhūtabhaviṣyadvartamānatāḥ|

ekādaśabhirākārairvibhaktāḥ pratipadyate|| (kālasamuddeśa-37)

When a kriyā is produced and perished, the kāla which has got such kriyā as upādhi is called bhūta.

When all the instruments are ready and the situation promises a kriyā to happen, the kāla which has got such a kriyā as upādhi is called bhaviṣyat.

Having commenced but not yet completed- the kāla which has got such a kriyā as upādhi is vartamāna.

3.1.6 Types of Kāla

Hari enumerates the eleven types of kāla i.e. bhūta is of five types, bhaviṣyat is of four types, and vartamāna is of two types-

bhūtaḥ pañcvidhastatra bhaviṣyamśca caturvidhaḥ|

vartamāno dvidhākhyāta ityekādaśakalpanāḥ || (kālasamuddeśa-38)

As far as the vartamāna is concerned, the top order of the grammarians such as Kātyāyana, Patañjali and Bhartṛhari took pains to defend the very existence of vartamāna against the stiff resistance by some scholars.

The following is the crux of the problem-

If the action is completed, it falls under bhūta and in case it is not yet completed, it will be bhaviṣyat, as such, there can't be any entity called vartamāna. It may also be noted that vartamāna is pratidvandvi (opposite) of bhūta and bhaviṣyat.

Another significant aspect is- examples like tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ, pravahanti nadyaḥ etc. are not possible as the mountains and the rivers are nitya, i.e. they were there in the past and will be in future and therefore the opposite vartamāna can't be employed. It is against this background that Kātyāyana and Patañjali

under ‘vartamāne laṭ’ (3-2-123) strived their best to defend Pāṇini’s sūtram-
(vartamāne laṭ (3-2-123)).

pravṛttasyāvirāme śiṣyā bhavantī vartamānatvāt|| (vārtikam)

pravṛttasya virāme śāsitavyā bhavantī, ihādhīmahe, iha vasāmaḥ, iha
puṣyamitram yājayāma iti, kim punaḥ kāraṇam na sidhyati? avartamānatvāt||
(bhāṣyam)

When there is no pause in the activity after it is started, it can be termed
vartamāna and for such an exigency laṭ should be instituted (by the śāstra).

Laṭ has to be instituted in the case of an activity that has started but running
without a pause. Here we recite, here we live, and here we perform sacrifices by
Puṣyamitra. What is the reason for not getting laṭ, due to avartamānatva.

nityapravṛtte ca kālavibhāgāt| (vārtikam)

nityapravṛtte ca śāsitavyā bhavantī, tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ, sravanti nadyā iti.

kim punaḥ kāraṇam na sidhyati, kālavibhāgāt, iha
bhūtabhaviṣyatpratidvandvī vartamānaḥ kālāḥ nacātra bhūtabhaviṣyantau
kālau staḥ.(bhāṣyam)

Since in the case of things that are immutable/imperishable, there can’t be
any difference in terms of kāla (time/tense).

Laṭ has to be instituted in the case of things that are immutable. Mountains
are there, rivers are flowing. What is the reason for not getting the laṭ, since time

can't be divided. Here the vartamānakāla is the opposite of bhūta and bhaviṣyat. Moreover, here there is neither bhūtakāla nor bhaviṣyatkāla.

Hari in kālasamuddeśa clearly states that kāla creates difference in a kriyā whereas samkhyā separates every thing.

“nyāyyā tvārambhānapavargāt.”(vārtikam)

“nyāyyātveṣā vartamānakālatā, krutaḥ?, ārambhānapavargāt, ārambho'trānapavṛktāḥ, eṣa eva ca nāma nyāyyo vartamānakālo yatrārambho' napavṛktaḥ”. (bhāṣyam)

Vartamānakāla is justified, as the activity has commenced but not yet complete, is this vartamānakālatā vindicated? How? As it has commenced but not complete. Here there is commencement but not completion. This only is justified as vartamānakāla where the commenced activity is not complete.

“asti ca muktasamśaye virāmaḥ.” (vārtikam)

“yam khalvapi bhavānmuktasamśayam vartamānakālam nyāyyam manyate, bhuñkte devadatta iti, tenaitattulyam, so'pi hyavaśyam bhuñjāno hasati vā jalpati vā pānīyam vā pibati, yadyatra yuktā vartamānakālatā dṛṣyate, ihāpi yuktā dṛṣyatām”. (bhāṣyam)

In the case of an activity that is in vartamānakāla, beyond the shadow of doubt there also some pause will be there. This is on a par with the vartamānakāla like 'bhuñkte devadattaḥ', which you think the vartamānakāla is justified. He also while having food laughs, speaks, or may drink water. If vartamānakāla is acceptable here, then here also let it be considered as acceptable.

Hari in kālasamuddeśa summarized the above discussion in the following verses-

vyavadhānamivopaiti nivṛtta iva dṛṣyate|

kriyāsamūho bhujiyādirantarālapravṛttibhiḥ|| (kālasamuddeśa- 82)

na ca vicchinna rūpo’pi so’virāmānnivartate|

sarvaiva hi kriyānyena saṅkīrṇevopa labhyate|| (kālasamuddeśa- 83)

tadantarāladṛṣṭā vā sarvaivāvayava kriyā|

sādṛśyāt sati bhede tu tadaṅgatvena gṛhyate|| (kālasamuddeśa- 84)

The group of activities of consumption of food etc. look like having pauses in between and completed due to the sub-activities. Although the same seems to be having pauses it doesn’t, due to its continuity it is not complete. Each activity seems to be clubbed with a different activity.

Hari wants to elaborate the concept of vartamānatva that was meant by both Pāṇini and Kātyāyana and subsequently Patañjali ‘iha adhīmahe’ is an example. The adhyayana might be stopped and resumed at different intervals to facilitate food, sleep etc. As such, the activity of adhyayana is considered as a group of some sub- activities. The founders and propagators of vyākaraṇasmṛti are of the opinion that the intermittent sub-activities would in no way affect the overall continuity of activity. And it is also natural that the main activity seems to be intertwined with other activities and this phenomenon is simply common.

“santi ca kālavibhāgāḥ,

santi ca khalvapi kālavibhāgāḥ tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ, sthāsyanti parvatāḥ,
tasthuḥ parvatā iti.

kim śakyanta ete śabdāḥ prayoktumityataḥ santi kālavibhāgāḥ?.

nāvaśyam prayogādeva. ihahi bhūtabhaviṣyadvartamānānām rājñām yāḥ
kriyāstāḥ tiṣṭhateradhikaraṇam. iha tāvat tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ iti, samprati ye
rājānasteṣām yāḥ kriyāstāsu vartamānāsu. ‘sthāsyanti parvatāḥ’ iti. ita
uttaram ye rājāno bhaviṣyanti teṣām yāḥ kriyāstāsu bhaviṣhyantīṣu. ‘tasthuḥ
parvatāḥ’ iti, iha hi ye rājāno babhūvusteṣām yāḥ kriyāḥ tāsū atikrāntāsu”.
(bhāṣyam)

There are divisions of time also. Certainly, there are divisions of time; mountains are there, mountains will be there and mountains were there. Do you mean to say that divisions of time are there as such usages can be employed?, not necessarily by usage only. Here the activities of the kings of bhūta, bhaviṣyat and vartamāna are the base of existence. Here ‘tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ’ means the kings who are there now, and which are their activities during the existence of those activities. “sthāsyanti parvatāḥ” means here after the kings who are going to be there and whichever their activities are, and during the existence of the activities that will be- “tasthuḥ parvatāḥ” means here which kings were there, whatever were their activities and after completion of their activities.

Hari in kālasamuddeśa offered the gist of the above discussion in two verses-

parato bhidyate sarvamātmā tu na vikalpate |

parvatādi sthitistasmāt pararūpeṇa bhidyate || (kalasamuddeśa- 80)

prasiddhabhedā vyāpāra virūpāvayavakriyāḥ|

sāhacaryeṇa bhidyante sarūpāvayavakriyā|| (kalasamuddeśa- 81)

Every thing differs from the other. Its form can't be different; therefore, the existence of mountain etc. differs from the form of other things. The activities consisting of sub- activities of different nature have got the well-known difference of time. Whereas the activities consisting of similar parts get the difference due to the association of other activities.

Cooking is a kriyā. Cleaning the raw rice, placing the vessel on the hearth, lighting the fire etc. sub-activities are there as limbs. Since the sub-activities are dissimilar the difference of time like bhūta, bhaviṣyat clearly known. In activities like sthiti (existence), there are limbs in the form of sub-activities.

The existence of yesterday, today and tomorrow are different. But since these sub- activities are similar to the main activity 'sthiti', it is not possible to know through the activities of kings etc.

Further Patañjali records the arguments advanced by some scholars on the refutation of the same.

apara āha, nāsti vartamānaḥ kāla iti. apicātra ślokānudāharanti-

na vartate cakramiṣurna pātyate na syandante saritaḥ sāgarāya|

kūṭastho'yam loko na viceṣṭitāsti yohyevam paśyati s'opyanandhaḥ||

mīmāmsako manyamāno yuvā medhāvisammataḥ|

kākam smehānupṛcchati kim te patitalakṣaṇam||

anāgate na patasi atikrānte ca kāka na|

yadi samprati patasi sarvo lokaḥ patatyayam||

himavānapi gacchati.

anāgatamatikrāntam vartamānamiti trayam|

sarvatra ca gatiṛnāsti gacchatīti kimucyate || (bhāṣyam)

Some others held- there is no vartamānakāla, also they quote verses in this regard- “the wheel is not there, the arrow is not sped, the rivers are not flowing to the ocean, the universe is as static as anvil”.

There is no any kartā (doer), the one who knows this also non-blind. A young person who is genius investigative enquires with a crow- what the definition of your flying is. If it hasn’t happened, o! Crow! You are not flying nor if you have not already flown, if you are flying now, this entire universe also flies, even Himalaya goes.

Future, past and present- there are three things and a single movement that is available and no activity such as movement is available to the same and then how come the vartamāna like gacchati is being employed.

Hari in kālasamuddeśa (85) offered the gist of the above argument in the following verse-

sadasadvāpi vastu syāt tṛtīyam nāsti kiñcana|

tena bhūtabhaviṣyantau muktvā madhyam na vidyate|| (kālasamuddeśa- 85)

Patañjali refutes the above argument by the following verse-

kriyāpravṛttau yo hetuḥ tadartham yadvicēṣitam|

tadapekṣya prayuñjīta gacchatītyavicārayan|| (bhāṣyam)

The one which is the cause of the behaviour of an activity, and what is performed for that purpose, having pondered over all that one should employ a word like gacchati without further discussion.

He also advances a counter argument of certain scholars in support of his argument.

Another scholar says so- there is vartamānakāla just like the transit of sun it is not available. Also they quote the following verses—

apara āha- asti vartamānakāla iti, ādityagativannopalabhyate, api cātra ślokamudāharanti-

bisasya bālā iva dahyamānā nalakṣyate vikṛtiḥ sannipāte|

astīti tām vedayante'tribhāvāḥ sūkṣmo hi bhāvo'n anumitena gamyaḥ ||iti||

Just as a tender innercore of lotus that is being burned is not perceptible, the kriyā having a moment as resort is not perceptible. The yogins who can perceive all the three states i.e. past, future and present through yogipratyakṣa knew that vartamānakāla is there. It is so minute that it can be known only through inference.

On the other hand, Thrax defines, a verb is a part of a sentence without case inflection, susceptible of tenses, person, number, activity and passivity in it's meaning.

The verb has eight simultaneous features: Moods, kinds, types, forms, numbers, person, tense, and conjugation. Thrax first criterion for identifying the verb is formal: absence of the typical noun endings and presence of the typical verbal endings. After this the important class meaning is (name of an action) assigned. (Francis p. Dinneen: An introduction to General Linguistics)

3.2 Vyutpattipakṣa and Avyutpattipakṣa

As far as the form (svarūpam) of nouns is concerned, there are two sides-

Vyutpattipakṣa and avyutpattipakṣa, the former which is supported by nairuktas and Śākaṭāyana holds that the nouns are formed by adding some pratyaya (suffix) or the other to a root of a verb. Whereas the latter holds that ready-made śabdās are used.

Patañjali under “uṇādayo bahulam” (3-3-1) offers two vārtikas and commented-

“nāma ca dhātujaṁ māha nirukte. (vārtikam)

nāma khalvapi dhatujamev māhu nairuktāḥ. (bhāṣyam)

vyākaraṇe śakaṭasya ca tokam. (vārtikam)

vaiākaraṇānām ca śākaṭāyana āha- dhatujam nāme ti”. (bhāṣyam)

(in nirukta, yāska said that the nouns are formed from dhātus, nairuktas said that nāma is certainly formed out of dhātus. In vyākaraṇa, śākaṭāyana also said the same; śākaṭāyana who was a vaiyākaraṇa said that noun is produced out of dhātu.)

Under “āyaneyīnīyiaḥ phaḍhakhachaghām pratyayādīnām (7-1-2)”. Patañjali offers the following statement-

“prātipadikavigñānā cca pāṇineḥ siddham.” (vārtikam)

“prātipadika vigñānācca bhagavataḥ pāṇinerācāryasya siddham, uṇādayo avyutpannāni prātipadikāni.” (bhāṣyam)

Since Pāṇini took the side of prātipadikas, since ācārya bhagavān Pāṇini took them as prātipadikas, it became possible. Uṇādis are avyutpannaprātipadikas:

considered to be a good authority in vyākaraṇa, Nāgeśa tried his best to prove that Pāṇini favours avyutpattipakṣa, quoting Patañjali and Pāṇini in Udyota (7-1-2) and Śabdenduśekhara. Another proof Nāgeśa offers in support of Pāṇini's avyutpattipakṣa is-

“ataḥ kṛkamikamsakumbhapātrakuśākarnīṣvanavyayasya”. (Pāṇini, 8-3-46)

In the above sūtra, Pāṇini read both the root kami and a noun kamsa that is produced from the root kami, this has to be taken as the proof of Pāṇini's avyutpattipakṣa as otherwise kami only will do.

Nāgeśa in visargasandhi of Laghuśabdenduśekhara also states that it is also possible to argue that Pāṇini is not against to vyutpattipakṣa and his sūtra “ayāmantalvāyyetnviṣṇuṣu (6-4-55)”.

Rather, he also adds that it may be, just like the “mahāsamjña sarvanāma”, simply to follow the sūtra i.e. already there in another vyākaraṇa. He also points out that since it is also very much acceptable to Patañjali he remarked avyutpannāni only but not as in the case of “anekārthā api dhātavaḥ”, avyutpannanītyapi-

“prātipadikavijñanācca bhagavataḥ pāṇiṇeḥ siddhamityuktam, ayāmantalvāyyetnviṣṇuṣviti sūtram pāṇīnervyutpattipakṣasyāpi svīkāra ityasya gamakam. vyākaraṇāntarārītyaiva vā tatsūtram, sarvanāmasthānamiti mahāsamjñāvat, ata eva bhāṣye vyutpannānītyevoktam. natvanekārthā api dhātava iti vadavyutpannānītyapyuktam”. (laghuśabdenduśekharaḥ-svādisandhi).

On the other hand, Hari in vākyakāṇḍa (2-238), declares that the so-called prakriyā is not an established procedure that should be followed. Rather, it may vary from vyākaraṇa to vyākaraṇa i.e. it may be rama+su or rama+si etc. it may vary from vaiyākaraṇa to vaiyākaraṇa, but the final product rāmaḥ, bhavati etc. should be the same. All these analyses are hypothetical and as such, they are unreal ways to reach the real things i.e. śabdabrahman or achieve mokṣa-

upāyāḥ śikṣamaṇānām bālānāmapalālanāḥ|

asatye vartmani sthitvā tataḥ satyam samīhate|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 238)

4 THE CONCEPT OF VṚTTI

The concept of vṛtti is discussed at length by Patañjali while commenting on the Pāṇini sutra “samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-1-1)”. Earlier to Patañjali, the aspect was covered under ‘padavidhi’. In fact, both the padavidhi and vṛtti are synonyms. Hari elaborated the concept of vṛtti in 624 verses in vṛttisamuddeśa in padakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam. Later grammarians preferred the term vṛtti to padavidhi.

4.1 Definition of vṛtti

‘parāarthābhidānam vṛtṭiḥ’ is the definition quoted by Patañjali. The words involved in a vākya would get a different form. Expression of meaning by the important word: supported by the meaning of the unimportant meaning: taking in to account the meaning of the group of words, the meaning of the group of the prakṛiti and pratyaya- is parārtha.

The words have different individual meaning. When they unite to form a samāsa or vākya, in the process of technical frame, they are modified to mean some thing special and it is called vṛtti.

4.2 Purpose of vṛtti

The main purpose of vṛtti is to achieve brevity of expression.

4.3 Types of vṛttis

Vṛtti is of four types- samāsa, kṛt, taddhita and sanādyantadhātuvṛttis. On the other side, the number is added by one ekaśeṣa. Since ekaśeṣa is seen in the place of dvandva, it is not separately counted (by vaiyākaraṇas like nāgeśa).

4.3.1 Samāsavṛtti

Words unite to form samāśas and while uniting they give up their meaning (not completely) to qualify the other word of samāśa which is termed as jahat svārtha. On the other side, the words united in the samāśa won't give up their meaning but combines with other word as a qualifier and a unified meaning is expressed which is termed as ajahat svārtha.

4.3.2 Kṛdvṛtti

kṛt is the name of non-tiñ pratyayas instituted on a dhātu. It will come as para and will have ādyudāttasvara. These pratyayas are instituted in the sense of different kārakas i.e. kartṛ, karma, karaṇa, sampradāna, apādāna, adhikaraṇa, and bhāva.

4.3.3 Taddhitavṛtti

Taddhitas are pratyayas, which are instituted on subantas. These pratyayas are meant to prepare padas.

4.3.4 Sanadyantadhātuvṛtti

These are twelve pratyayas beginning with san, in order to add kṛts and tiñs for required śabdas, sanādyantas are given the name dhātu. They can't be called kṛts and ārdhadhātukas and therefore as a result they won't get iḍāgama and guṇa.

4.4 The chief characteristics of vṛtti

1. These are all padavidhis. They are meant to make a pada.
2. They are applied to śabdas having sāmārthya only.
3. They acquire ekārthībhāva, eikapadyam (single word), eikasvaram (single svaram), eikavibhaktikam (single vibhakti) are the signs of ekārthībhāva and the same is meant by sāmārthya becoming a single entity is ekārthībhāva.

4. Vṛtti is not instituted on the śabdas with adjectives in general: as it becomes sāpekṣam. On the other side, a sambandhiśabda even if sāpekṣa would get united with another śabda to become a samāsa.
5. The first word of vṛtti denotes the ‘abhedaikatvasamkhyā’. It is how different rasas with different capacities are there in honey, all the samkhyas are in abhedaikatva. And this term is put forth by Hari.
6. To explain the meaning of the united śabdas having vṛtti, laukikavākyas are required. Alaukikavākyas show the different stages that the śabdas have undergone vṛtti and they have no practical value in usage of day-to-day life.
7. After imposition of vṛtti, united form becomes prātipadika or dhātu and it will be ready to accept process of necessary prakriyā.
8. Though ekārthībhāvasamarthya enables the processes of vṛtti efficiently, there is another sāmāthyā called vyapekṣābhāva, which is the main characteristic of vākya. Vyapekṣābhāva is the fastening capacity of padas with each other to get mutual expectancy coupled with ākāṅkṣā coupled with yogyatā and āsatti. No doubt that at sometimes, vṛtti also has vyapekṣābhāvasāmāthyā.

4.5 Samāsavṛtti

Pāṇini took up samāsavṛtti initially. Samāsa literally means samudāya/group (of words). Most of the samāsas are covered under four headings- avyayībhāva, tatpuruṣa, dvandva and bahuvrīhi. Any samāsa that is not covered by the sūtras under these four headings has to be processed by “supsupā”. This is stated by Patañjali under “saha supā” (2-1-4). Sup is brought as anuvṛtti from “subāmantrite parnavatsvare” (2-1-2) and combined with supā in “saha supā”. Punarutsyūtam, punarṇiṣkṛtaḥ, pūrvam bhūtaḥ, bhūtapūrvāḥ are examples. Samāsas are of two types- nityasamāsa and anityasamāsa. Following vibhāṣā (or

mahāvibhāṣādhikāra), which is gotten through carving out the sūtra “vibhāṣā paparibahirañcavaḥpañcamyā” (2-1-11), all the samāśas that follow this sūtra are optional. Moreover, it is implied that the samāśas preceding the above sūtra are nitya, supsupā is not a nityasamāśa.

4.5.1 What is Optional

The term samarthaḥ (in 2-1-1) means ekārthībhāvasāmarthyam. Vibhāṣā is a qualifier of samarthaḥ. Therefore, the ekārthībhāva that is being superimposed in regard to padavidhi (vṛtti) is optional. So much so that in case there is ekārthībhāva the samāśa (vṛtti) will take place and in its absence there will be vākya (with vyapekṣa)- rājapuruṣaḥ-rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ. Vibhāṣā should not be taken as a qualifier of samāśasamjñā as the same would be a mere waste.

Under ‘samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ’ kātyāyana offered two important vārtikas- ‘saviśeṣaṇānām vṛttirna’ (the words followed by qualifiers can’t become samāśa), vṛttasya vā viśeṣaṇayogo na (no qualifier can be appended to a word i.e. already involved in vṛtti).

‘kṛddhasya rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ’ is an example for the first vārtika. Here, the word ‘rājñāḥ’ is preceded by a qualifier i.e. kṛddhasya. And therefore, it can’t combine with rājñāḥ to make a samāśa.

Similarly, the word rāja in the samāśa rājapuruṣaḥ can’t have a qualifier like kṛddhasya.

On the other hand, there are certain usages like ‘dēvadattasya gurukulam’, where in the word involved in a samāsa such as ‘guru’ has got a qualifier like ‘dēvadattasya’.

In order to certify that such usages are acceptable, in spite of the fact, that they go against the above said vārtika. Patañjali offered a guideline- ‘gamakatvāt samāsaḥ’ (samāsa takes place if the intended meaning is certainly denoted).

Hari in vṛttisamuddēśa summarizes the discussion that is there in Mahābhāṣya, in two verses-

sambandhi śabdassāpekṣo nityam sarvaḥ prayujyate |

svārtha vatsāvyapekṣāsyā vṛttāvapi na hīyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 47)

samudāyena sambandho yeṣām gurukulādinā|

samsprṣyāvayavāmsteca yujyante tadvatā saha|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 48)

The terms which denote relation, whether in a samāsa or vākya, are always there with ākāṅkṣā or expectancy and such usages i.e. in the present case a word involved in a samāsa having a qualifier, just like in the case of ‘dēvadattasya gurukulam’, are common.

In conclusion, the usage- ‘dēvadattasya gurukulam’ denotes the sense- ‘dēvadattasya guroḥ kulam’ without a hitch.

The system of vyākaraṇa is based on the usage of the śabdas (prayoga śaraṇam vyākaraṇam). In fact, both the usages i.e. a vākya like ‘rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ’ and a samāsa like ‘rājapuruṣaḥ’ are seen in common parlance as separate entities.

Rather, in order to teach vyākaraṇam to non-scholarly people, sages like Pāṇini etc. took up certain devices, which are unreal.

The mahāvibhāṣa, which says that the samāsa is optional, is also such a device. Hari explains the concept by the following verse-

abudhān pratyupāyāśca vicitrāḥ pratipattaye|

śabdāntaratvādyanta bhedo vākya samāsayoḥ|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 49)

Nāgēśa suggests (2-1-17) that initially the sāmārthya (coupled with optionality) has to be imposed and students are to be taught in the following manner for easy understanding subantam “śritādibhiḥ sahocāryamāṇam vā samartham bhavati, samartham ca samāsasamjñam bhavati” (a noun pronounced along with śrita etc. would become optionally capable, and the same would have the name samāsa). Even in niṣedhasūtras, sāmārthya will be optional (nāgēśa in this regard differs with bhaṭṭōji who says samasyate, rather, Patañjali, under 2-1-6 (avyayam...) says- “eteṣvartheṣu yadavyayam vartate, tatsubantena saha samasyate iti”).

4.5.2 Common principles

The vighravākya (like rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ) is a statement which explains the samāsa. It is similar to vākya (rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ). Vighraha (vibhinnatvena grahaḥ jñānam- the meaning of the words involved in a samāsa is shown separately by this) is not fit for usage whereas a vākya is fit for usage. Rājan ṇas puruṣa su is called alaukikavighravākya, exclusively useful for prakriyā. Both vṛtti and vākya

(also called vyasta) should express the same meaning (vṛttivākyaḥ samānāarthakatvaniyamah).

Further Hari clarifies that the resemblances of vṛtti and vākya is not there in every case. He offers examples in this regard-

Vasiṣṭhasya-ayam vāsiṣṭaḥ, gargasya-apatyam gārgyaḥ, in both the cases it is taddhitavṛtti and you will find resemblances between vṛtti and vākya. Rather, in case like śrotriyaḥ and kṣetriyaḥ, there is no resemblance between (taddhita) vṛtti and vākya. Pāṇini offered the words śrotriya and kṣetriya as nipātas (readymade words)-

śrotriyaśchando'dhīte (5-2-8), kṣetriyac parakṣetre cikitsyaḥ (5-2-92).

In the first case, it is śrotriyaḥ in vṛtti but 'chandaḥ adhīte' is the vākya. Where as, in the second one, it is kṣetriyaḥ in vṛtti 'parakṣetre cikitsyaḥ' is the vākya.

śrotriya kṣetriyādīnām na ca vāsiṣṭhagārgyavat|

bhedena pratyayo loke tulya rūpā samanvayāt|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 54)

The following steps in the given sequence are to be taught to pupils- and inject samudāyaśakti (supsupā etc.)-

Rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ- gives an exploded view (alaukikavigraha) rājan nas puruṣa su.

Inject ekārthībhāva (samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ) give samāśasamjñā and viśesasamjñas (prākkaḍārātsamāsaḥ, avyayībhāvaḥ, tatpuruṣaḥ etc.)

Apply prātipadikātva to the group (kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca).

lopa of suppratyayas (and nalopa) (supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ).

purvanipāta to upasarjana (prathamānirdiṣṭam samāsa upasarjanam and upasarjanam pūrvam).

Making the samāsa a subanta by adding sups (su au jas am aut...).

Rājapuruṣaḥ- samāsānta, aluk, svāra, etc. may follow.

4.5.3 Tiñantasamāsa

Samāsa, according to Pāṇini, is not confined to subantas (nouns) only- ākhyātamākhyātena kriyāsātatyē (gaṇasūtram 20, quoted under mayūrvyamsakādayaśca (2-1-72 in Kaumudī)- a tiñanta (verb) will get united with another verb to form into a samāsa if continuity of a kriyā (activity) is there- cook and fry- if this is mentioned time and again then the kriyā is called pacatabhr̥jjatā (in feminine gender- ṭāp). Similarly khādatamodatā (eat and enjoy).

4.5.4 Nityasamāsa

Rājapuruṣaḥ- is a vaikalpikasamāsa, since it has got a vīgrahavākya (made of its own words). Gireḥ samīpam (near the hill) is the explanation offered for the nityasamāsa upagīram, i.e. it does not have a vīgraha (like a vaikalpikasamāsa). nyāyaḥ, vyākaraṇam, sūpapratī, adhihari, kumbhakāraḥ etc. are popular as nityasamāsas. Alaukikavīgraha is as follows: giri + ŋas, upa; kumbha + ŋas, kāra.

Pāṇini said 56 sūtras before vibhāṣādhikāra (2-1-11) and the samāsas produced by these sūtras are nityasamāsas. Supsupā- is not a nityasamāsa

(patañjali offered- vispaṣṭam paṭuḥ, vispaṣṭapaṭuḥ- as example) although it precedes vibhāṣā.

Following Kaiyaṭa (iko ‘savarṇe śākalyasya hrasvaśca 6-1-127) it seems, Bhaṭṭoji ruled in Kaumudī that a samāsa either having no vigraha at all or having a vigraha not made of its own words is a nityasamāsa. While the first one can be taken as a definition the second one can be a sign to identify a nityasamāsa. Under caturthī tadarthāṛthabalihitasukharakṣitaiḥ (2-1-35) and aṣaḍakṣa... (5-4-7) Patañjali says- “bhavati vai kaścidasvapadavigraho bahuvrīhiḥ, tadyathā śobhanam mukham asyāḥ sumukhīti”. It is difficult to support Kaiyaṭa's (under 6-1-127) statement that nityasamāsa is that which is under nityādhikāra for obvious reasons. Patañjali's statements in support of a vigraha are there under 2-1-36, 2-2-19, 5-1-64 and 5-4-7.

4.5.5 Samjñāyām nityasamāsaḥ

A sentence cannot be considered as a name. Therefore, in spite of vibhāṣā, the samāsa like unmattagaṅgam, lohitaṅgam (anyapadārthe ca samjñāyām 2-1-21), which are names of countries, are nityasamāsas.

4.5.6 Types of samāsas:

There are four major samāsas analysed by Pāṇini.

4.5.7 Avyayībhāva

The common rule for avyayībhāva offered by grammarians earlier to Pāṇini was-pūrvapadārthapradhānaḥ (wherein meaning of the first word would be important). Since this phenomenon is observed in many examples, this definition became popular. In examples like sūpapraṭi (less sūpa- boiled gram), and unmattagaṅgam (name of a country) where uttarapadārtha (the meaning of the

latter word) and anyapadārtha (the meaning of another word) are important respectively.

There are two sūtras read- avyayībhāvaśca (1-1-41 & 2-4-18). The former says that all avyayībhāvasamāsa are avyayas (having a single form which does not undergo any vyaya- change due to līṅga, vacana and vibhakti- also called indeclinable). The latter says that avyayībhāvasamāsa is napumsaka (neuter gender)- the term napumsakam from ‘sa napumsakam’ (2-4-17) is brought down to this sūtra- called anuvṛtti. The benefit is hrasva through “hrasvo napumsake prātipadikasya” (1-2-47)- gopāyati (one who protects) or gāḥ pāti (one who protects the cows)- gopāḥ- tasmin (in gopa) iti adhigopam. Here the ā in gopāḥ became hrasva due to napumsakatva through the above sūtra.

4.5.8 Pāre madhye ṣaṣṭhyā vā (2-1-18):

While there exists the mahāvibhāṣādhikāra, Pāṇini again adds vā (optionally) here. Mahāvibhāṣā says that ekārthībhāva is optional. The result is that there will be samāsa and vākya- pāreṅgāt, madhyeṅgāt, gaṅgāyāḥ pārāt, gaṅgāyāḥ madhyāt. The vā in the above sūtra says that there will be ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa as well- gaṅgāpārāt, gaṅgāmadhyāt.

4.5.9 Samāsāntāḥ (5-4-68)

The avyayībhāvasamjñā gets samāsāntapratyayas as well- ṭac- upaśaradam, pratyakṣam etc.

4.5.10 Tatpuruṣa

Earlier grammarians defined tatpuruṣa as uttarapadārthapradhāna. Since the meaning of the latter word is important in most of the examples the same became popular.

4.5.11 Dvigu

In order to get samāsāntas (ṭac and ac only), Pāṇini (dviguśca 2-1-23) extended tatpuruṣasamjñā to dvigusamāsa also. In strīṭva nīp (dvigoḥ 4-1-21) and in samāhāra (group) napumsakatva (dvigurekavacanam 2-4-1, sa napumsakam 2-4-17) are other benefits- trilokī, pañcarājam etc.

4.5.12 Karmadhāraya

When both the words express the same thing (samānam ekam adhikaraṇam vācyam yayoh padayoh) the tatpuruṣa is called karmadhāraya.

In examples like mahānavamī, pumvattvapumvatkarmadhāraya-jātīyadeśīyeṣu 6-3-42) and the subsequent āttva (ānmahataḥ-samānādhikaraṇajātīyayoh 6-3-46) are the benefits.

4.5.13 Nañ (2-2-6)

Nañ, an avyaya would get samāsa with a samartha-subanta, and it is called (nañ) tatpuruṣa- na + brāhmaṇaḥ- abrāhmaṇaḥ, i.e. a person, kṣatriya etc. who is like a brāhmaṇa but different from a brāhmaṇa.

Patañjali analyses the samāsa chiefly from three angles.

4.5.14 Uttarapadārthapradhānaḥ:

Here nañ indicates illusion or bhrānti, i.e. a person who is certainly not brāhmaṇa but is a subject of the feeling- brāhmaṇa. If this is accepted then the samāsa means only brāhmaṇa- a viśeṣaṇa (here it is nañ) adds something without spoiling the viśeṣya. Nañ denotes abhāva (non-existence) and it is viśeṣaṇa, then abhāva of uttarapadārtha (brāhmaṇa) would be the result. This is not what is required and the implication is that it is redundant in the samāsa. Then the remaining brāhmaṇaśabda means brāhmaṇa only. Therefore abrāhmaṇamānaya means fetch a brāhmaṇa. This is the purport, of Patañjali's statement-

brāhmaṇamātrsyānayanam prāpnoti. On the other hand, if it is held that nañ denotes the absence of same qualities (of a brāhmaṇa) then also the same is the situation as there cannot be a single brāhmaṇa with all the qualities.

4.5.15 Anyapadārthapradhānaḥ:

Here abrāhmaṇaḥ means a person like a kṣatriya, who is not a brāhmaṇa, i.e. both the words denote the meaning of another (not involved in samāsa) word like kṣatriya- na brāhmaṇaḥ asyām, i.e. a jāti with brāhmaṇavyakti.

But if this is accepted there will be problem with usages like- avarṣā hemantaḥ (the hemanta season is like varṣāḥ). Here, as per anyapadārtha the vighraha would be na varṣāḥ yasmin saḥ (bahuvrīhi-anekamanyapadārthe, 2-2-24) and then following gostrīyorupasarjanasya (1-2-48), hrasva will be effected and it will be avarṣāḥ. Avarṣāḥ is the usage and the same only is acceptable. Therefore anyapadārtha will not do.

ekārthe vartamānābhyāmasatā brāhmaṇena ca|

yadā jātyantaram bāhyam kṣatriyādyapadiśyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa-296)

avṛṣṭyo yathā varṣā nīhārābhrasamāvṛtāḥ|

tadrūpatvāt sa hemantaityabhinnāḥ pratīyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 301)

4.5.16 Pūrvapadārthapradhānaḥ:

If the meaning of the first word is predominant then, since nañ is an avyaya the samāsa would become an avyaya (abrāhmaṇam). Bhāṣyakāra had offered a clarification to this doubt /objection- nañ in a vākya denotes niṣedha (restriction)

only whereas in a samāsa the same denotes a dravya (thing) and this is a natural phenomenon.

sāmānyadravya vṛttitvānnimittānu vidhāyinaḥ|

ayogo liṅgasamkhyābhyām syādvā sāmānyadharmatā||

(vṛttisamuddeśa- 307)

prāgasattvābhidhāyitvam samāse dravyavācitā|

nimittāuvidhānam ca na sarvatra svabhāvataḥ|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 308)

Finally, after a lengthy discussion, Patañjali ruled that uttarapadārthapradhāna is legitimate. Moreover, instead of using a word like kṣatriya why is it that a term like abrāhmaṇa is used bhāṣyakāra responds to this question- jātihīne samdehāt durupadeśācca brāhmaṇaśabdo vartate... tataśca paścadupalabhate nāyam brāhmaṇah abrāhmaṇoyamiti- due to wrong information, initially one thinks that someone is a brāhmaṇa and later he realizes and employs the word- abrāhmaṇa.

The fact is that vākya and samāsa, which have already been in usage, are quite different and vyākaraṇam is śabdānuśāsana (and not arthānuśāsana). Rather as remarked by Kaiyaṭa, Patañjali wants to discuss the intricacies of prakriyā through apoddhāra (artificial separation of samāsa).

śāstrapravṛttibhede'pi laukikārtho na bhidyate|

nañsamāse yatastatra trayḥ pakṣā vicāritāḥ|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 248)

Depending on the connection of nañ with the verb and the latter word (uttarapada), two processes, viz. Prasajyapraṭiṣedha and Paryudāsa, take place- prasajyapraṭiṣedhaḥ syāt kriyayā saha yatra nañ

paryudāsaḥ sa vijñeyo yatrottarapadena nañ

If the sentence- *anekam bhojaya* means do not feed a single person (i.e. feed many persons), i.e. if it is construed as- *ekam na bhojaya*, it is prasajyapraṭiṣedha (having referred, restriction).

On the other hand, if the same sentence is interpreted as different but similar to one (i.e. two or more), i.e. if it is construed as *ekabhinnam ekasadrśam bhojaya* (following the norm- *nañivayuktamanyasadrśe tathāhyarthagatiḥ*), then it is paryudāsa.

In the first process the kāraka is restricted directly whereas in the latter one it results ultimately.

4.5.17 Śeṣo bahuvṛthiḥ (2-2-23):

Literally, śeṣaḥ means remaining. All the other vibhaktis, i.e. dvitīyā, tṛtīyā etc. are taken by Pāṇini for samāśas and prathamā is left behind. Therefore, the samāśa of prathamāntas or samānādhikaraṇas is called bahuvṛthi.

4.5.17.1 Anekamanyapadārthe (2-2-24):

Many a subanta would get samāśa if it (the samāśa) denotes the meaning of another word, i.e. a word other than the ones involved in samāśa- *pitam ambaram yasya saḥ / pītāmbaraḥ- viṣṇuḥ* (one who has got a yellow dress).

pradhānamanyārthatayā bhinnam svairupasarjanaiḥ|

nimittamabhidheyam vā sarvapaścādapekṣyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 235)

Bhāṣyakāra advanced two sides to the aspect-padārthābhīdhāna and vibhaktyarthābhīdhāna and took the latter side. In bahuvrīhi anyapadārtha is pradhāna. If sambandha is mentioned the pravṛttinimitta and sambandhi as samāsārtha then it is padārthābhīdhāna. On the other hand, if sambandhi is mentioned as pravṛttinimitta and sambandha as samāsārtha then it is vibhaktyarthābhīdhāna. In the case of latter, due to abhedabhāvana, the sambandhi would completely be known. First the śaṣṭhī is shown- citrāḥ gāvaḥ asya and in the same sense the samāsa- citraguḥ is used and therefore this is sensible. Rather, since Pāṇini asserts anyapadārtha, finally the padārtha having sambandha would be denoted.

Further Patañjali discusses the aspect of dravya, liṅga and samkhyā and rules that in vibhaktyarthābhīdhānapakṣa only, since Pāṇini employed a term arthe instead of anekamanyapade, whereby it would automatically be known anyapadārthe as vṛtti cannot be applied in a pada, the complete padārtha having dravya liṅga and samkhyā is taken, i.e. since the viśeṣya devadattaḥ is used as anuprayoga it will be citraguḥ only.

svāmīni vyatirekaśca vākye yadyapi dṛśyate|

prādhānya eva tasyeṣṭo bahuvrīhirvivakṣite|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 236)

In the case of bahuvrīhi, there is some conspicuous difference between vākya and vṛtti- a vākya shows the svāmī as unimportant whereas vṛtti shows the same as important- citrā gāvaḥ asya devadattasya/citraguḥ devadattaḥ. Bhāṣyakāra remarks that both vākya and vṛtti would never be used simultaneously.

Tadguṇasamvijñānabahuvrīhi is that where the meaning of the guṇa is also taken- śuklavāsasam ānaya (fetch the man in white dress)- the person with white dress is brought. On the other hand, citragum ānaya (fetch citragu, a person who has got cows in different colours)- the person only is brought, i.e. not along with the cows. This is called atadguṇasamvijñānabahuvrīhi. Thus bahuvrīhi is of two types- explains Nāgeśa in Mañjūṣa.

4.5.17.2 Saptamīviśeṣaṇe bahuvrīhau (2-2-35):

Saptamyanta as well as viśeṣaṇaśabda, in a bahuvrīhisamāsa, are to be placed first (upasarjanam pūrvam 2-2-30)- kaṇṭhe kālaḥ yasya saḥ kaṇṭhekālaḥ citrāḥ gāvaḥ yasya saḥ citraguḥ.

4.5.17.3 Vyadhikaraṇabahuvrīhiḥ :

Bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇānām says Kātyāyana under anekamanyapadārthe. So in cases like pañcabhiḥ bhuktamasya there cannot be a samāsa. For examples like kaṇṭhekālaḥ (in kaṇṭhesthaḥ kālaḥ yasya saḥ) Kātyāyana composed a vārtika- saptamyupamānapurvapadasyottarapadalopaśca. On the other hand, Pāṇini insinuates that there can be a vyadhikaraṇabahuvrīhi- in 2-2-35 the word saptamī is not required as viśeṣaṇa includes saptamī also. Thus the word saptamī, having become redundant, suggests that there can be a vyadhikaraṇabahuvrīhi- kaṇṭhekālaḥ, sthāneyogā etc. This is clarified in Kaumudī and Śekhara. Bhāṣyakāra under vṛddhirādaic (1-1-1) resorts to vyadhikaraṇabahuvrīhi-vṛddhirnimittam yasmin so' yam vṛddhinimittāḥ. Kaiyaṭa comments- nimitta-śabdopādānasāmarthyāt vyadhikaraṇapado bahuvrīhirāśrīyate. In Udyota, Nāgeśa sustains the concept. Jinendrabuddhi explains it is beneficial to prefer bahuvrīhi to tatpuruṣa (vṛddhinimittasya ca taddhitasyāraktavikāre 6-3-39).

Abhidhānalakṣaṇā kṛttaddhita-samāsāḥ (kṛdantas, taddhitāntas and samāsas are acceptable if there is the usage)- is the guideline.

4.5.18 Cārthe dvandvaḥ (2-2-29):

The avyaya, ca is used in four contexts:

4.5.18.1 Samuccayaḥ:

Īśvaram gurum ca bhajasva- in this example both the words, Īśvaram and gurum, do not have any mutual expectancy (or they are parasparanirapekṣa) and have individual connection with the kriyāpada, bhajasva. Here ca is used in samuccaya.

4.5.18.2 Anvācayaḥ:

If things are said as pradhāna and apradhāna and if there is ākāṅkṣā (mutual expectancy) between them the cakāra is said to be in anvācaya-bhikṣāmaṭa, gāmcānaya- here moving for bhikṣā is important and fetching the cow (it is to be fetched if found on the way) is unimportant and obviously both are with ākāṅkṣā (or apekṣā).

4.5.18.3 Itaretarayogaḥ:

When mixed things have connection with a verb and compatibility (sāhacaryam) is there then the cakāra is said to be in itaretarayoga-dhāvakhadira- dhāvaśca khadiraśca- here the two cakāras express compatibility.

4.5.18.4 Samāhāraḥ:

The term means a group (samūha)- a group of samjñas and paribhāṣas is samjñāparibhāṣam- samjñānām paribhāṣānām ca samāhāraḥ. Here unlike itaretarayoga, samāhāraḥ is viśeṣya. In itaretarayoga the parts are separately known/felt whereas in samāhāra opposite is the case. In samuccaya (there is no prādhānya to cārtha) and anvācaya (both have got

connection with different verbs) due to lack of sāmārthya and anabhidhāna (no usage) samāsa does not take place. In itaretarayoga and samāhāra, Nāgeśa asserts (contrast with kaiyaṭa) that the ca in the first and second is dyotaka (i.e. simply an indicator/illuminator of the already existing property), whereas in the third and fourth it is vācaka (expressing agent).

4.5.19 Ekaśeṣaḥ:

4.5.19.1 Sarūpāṇāmekāśeṣa ekavibhaktau (1-2-64):

If one wants one cow he would pay five thousand rupees and for ten cows he would pay ten times. Similarly, if one wants to express one meaning he has to use one śabda and as many śabdas for as many meanings- but rules Pāṇini, only one śabda remains and the pratyaya denotes the number of things- i.e. brevity and economy in śabdas. This is called ekaśeṣa. Ekaśeṣa is considered as a vṛtti by some (bhaṭṭojidīkṣita etc.) and Nāgeśa opposes the idea. He clarifies that the popularity is secondary (gauṇa) as ekaśeṣa replaces (apavāda) dvandva, and ekārthībhāva in the form of pṛthagarthānāmekārthībhāva (two separate meanings becoming a single meaning) is not there in ekaśeṣa (tatra vṛttīścaturdhā-mañjūṣā).

In this sūtra, the bahuvacana in sarupāṇām is not vivakṣita, i.e. the sūtra applies in dvivacana as well- vṛkṣaśca vṛkṣaśca vṛkṣau.

There are ten sūtras, which regulate the ekaśeṣa at the end of second pāda of first adhyāya.

Ekaśeṣa is applicable in itaretarayogadvandva only and not in samāhāra. Bhāṣyakāra is of the view that ekaśeṣaprakaraṇa is not necessary (pratyākhyānam)- if ākṛti is meant then ekavacana and if dravya is meant then dvivacana and bahuvacana will take place.

ākṛtissarva śabdānām yadā vācyā pratīyate|

ekatvādekaśabdatvam nyāyāyā tasyāmca varṇyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 316)

abhedetvekaśabdatvāt śāstrācca vacane sati|

ekaśeṣo na vaktavyaḥvacanānām ca sambhavaḥ|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 332)

4.5.20 Aluk:

4.5.20.1 Alguttarapade (6-3-1):

These two words will run as adhikāra until ānañṛto dvandve (6-3-25). In certain samāsas the vibhakti on the first word does not disappear and all such examples are covered. This sūtra checks supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ (2-4-71).

4.5.21 Vaiyākaraṇākhyāyām caturthyāḥ (6-3-7):

In ātmanepadam, ātmanebhāṣā etc. the caturthi stands. The latter is a pre-Pāṇinian equivalent of ātmanepadam.

4.5.22 Gaviyudhibhyām sthiraḥ (8-3-95):

This sūtra actually institutes ṣatva to sakāra of uttarapada. Rather in the example gaviṣṭhiraḥ, the saptamī in gavi stands (aluk) as it is read so in the sūtra. In the case of yudhiṣṭhiraḥ (dharmarāja of mahābhārata), the saptamī in yudhi stands due to haladantāt saptamyāḥ samjñāyām (6-3-9).

4.5.23 Tatpuruṣe kṛti bahulam (6-3-14):

Bahulam is significant-stamberamaḥ/stambaramaḥ, karṇajapaḥ/karṇajapaḥ. And in some cases luk applies- kurucaraḥ. In all the examples the uttarapada is a kṛdanta.

4.5.24 Ṣaṣṭhī ākrośe (6-3-21):

If nindā (scolding) is implied then the ṣaṣṭhī stands- caurasyakulam. paśyato haraḥ (pickpocket), vācayuktiḥ etc. are analysed through the vārtika- vākdikpasyadbhyo yuktidaṇḍahareṣu. Devānāmpriya means a mūrkhā (fool) and is a nipāta through the vārtika- devānāmpriya iti ca mūrkhē.

4.6 Kṛdvṛtti:

Kṛt is the name of pratyayas instituted under the adhikāra- dhātoḥ (3-1-91) by a sūtra-kṛdatiḥ (3-1-93). Pratyayaḥ, paraśca, ādyudāttaśca (3-1-1, 2, 3) are adhikāras. Therefore, kṛt is a non-tiṅ-pratyaya instituted on a dhātu and it will come as para and will have ādyudāttasvara- is the meaning. Kṛt-pratyayas are instituted in the sense of different kārakas, i.e. kartr, karma, karaṇa, sampradāna, apādāna, adhikaraṇa, and bhāva.

4.6.1 Ekārthībhāva:

Kātyāyana and Patañjali discuss this aspect under tatropapadam saptamīstham (3-1-92). Bhāṣyakāra rules that kṛdvidhi is padavidhi as there is padagandha and padavidhi will be in the case of samarthas. Nāgēśa says that the word gandha means sambandha (gandho gandhaka āmode leśe sambandhagarvayoḥ- amarakośa). Patañjali refutes the amendment by Kātyāyana-upapadasamjñāyām samarthavacanam. The latter opined that the term samartha has to be added. Under samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-2-1) also Bhāṣyakāra touched this aspect. Kaiyaṭa clearly says (pradīpa 2-2-1) that a mahatīsamjñā, i.e. upapadam, is exclusively for bringing the kṛdanta in to the ambit of samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-2-1) as the pratyaya has got pada as its resort. Nāgēśa further clarifies and adds that the word tatra in the samjñāsūtra (tatropapadam

saptamīstham 3-1-92) is also a sign and it means somehow or the other padasambandhividhi should be brought under 2-2-1.

The problem is this- in kṛdanta the pratyaya is applied on a dhātu, i.e. after applying the kṛtpratyaya the unit would be eligible to receive suppratyayas, whereas in the case of samāsa, taddhita and subdhātu the padas (subantas) are taken and it is fit to call them padavidhis. Therefore, somehow or the other, kṛdanta should be certified as a padavidhi. A big name (mahatī samjñā) like upapadam is given by Pāṇini-argues Patañjali, in order to accommodate kṛdanta as a padavidhi. Since there is ekārthībhāva in nagarakāra, kumbhakāra etc., all other kṛdvidhis have to be justified as having vṛtti- so padoddeśyakavidhi is padavidhi is the connotation. Patañjali under 3-1-92 clarifies that due to asāmarthya, karmanyaṇ (3-2-1) does not apply in case of- mahāntam kumbham karoti but it applies in case of- mahān kumbho mahākumbhaḥ, mahākumbham karotīti mahākumbhakāraḥ (in the former the word kumbham. is sākāṅkṣa with mahāntam and therefore saviśeṣaṇānām vṛttirna).

4.6.2 Kṛtyāḥ (3-1-95):

This is an adhikārasūtra before ṇvultṛcau (3-1-133). A group of seven kṛtpratyayas, i.e. tavyat, tavya, anīyar, yat, ṇyat, kyap and kelimar (by kātyāyana) are given an additional name- kṛtya for brevity while instituting certain applications- tayoreva kṛtyaktakhalarthāḥ (3-4-70), kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam (3-3-113), arhe kṛtyatrcaśca (3-3-169) etc. All the kṛtyapratyayas come in the sense of bhāva and karma following tayoreva kṛtyaktakhalarthāḥ (3-4-70). On sakarmakadhātus in karmārtha and on akarmakadhātus in bhāvārtha- are they applied? This rule replaces the general rule kartari kṛt (3-4-67).

4.6.3 Vā sarupo'striyām (3-1-94):

This is a Paribhāṣa and does not apply to pratyayas under the adhikāra-
striyām (4-1-3). Under the adhikāra, dhātoḥ (3-1-91) a dissimilar pratyaya
replaces the original pratyaya optionally. Dissimilarity has to be considered after
stripping off the anubandhas (nānubandhakṛtam asārūpyam)- gām dadāti iti
godah. Here ka-pratyaya by āto'nupasarge kaḥ (3-2-3) totally replaces the original
aṇ by karmaṇyaṇ (3-2-1) due to similarity (after stripping)- here aṇ is called
utsarga whereas ka is apavāda. Both vikṣipah and vikṣepakah will be there as a
result of this paribhāṣa-two dissimilar pratyayas, viz. ka by igupadhajñāpṛkirah
kaḥ (3-1-135) and ṇvul by ṇvulṛcau (3-1-133) are applied. Therefore, the
dissimilarity has to be decided depending on prayoga (usage). So far as the
astrīyām- regulation is concerned, Kaiyaṭa (nyāsa also) clarifies that vāsarupavidhi
applies even beyond striyām (4-1-3), rather it is anitya (uncertain- not
compulsory) beyond 4-1-3 as Pāṇini takes kṛtya and ṛc in arhe kṛtyatṛcaśca (3-3-
169). And further, kṛtyas, in addition to bhāvārtha and karmārtha, are applicable in
arhārtha also.

4.6.4 Karmaṇyaṇ (3-2-1):

When a karmvācaka is upapada the dhātu would get aṇ-pratyaya.
Upapadamatiṇ (2-2-19) - upapadasamāsa- kumbham karotīti kumbhakārah
(potter), nagarakārah (town- planner). Here karmaṇi refers to nirvartya and
vikārya- asserts Kātyāyana- the karma defined by karturīpsitatamam karma (1-4-
49) is of three types as explained by Hari- nirvartyaṃ, vikāryam and prāpyam. A
thing, which does not have the cause or wherein the cause is not, mentioned
(avivakṣita)- both are called nirvartya- samyogam karoti, ghaṭam karoti. If the
prakṛti (cause) is mentioned then it is vikāryakarma- mṛdam ghaṭam karoti
(making a pot with clay). Prāpyakarma is that wherein no change is noticed
through either pratyakṣa or anumāna (perception /inference)- ādityampaśyati,

grāmam gacchati. In both the examples no change has taken place- by looking no change has taken place in the sun and by going, the village did not undergo any change. Prāpyakarma is not the subject of this sūtra (i.e. karmaṇi). Further, Kātyāyana says that since there is no usage (of anpratyayantaśabda) in the case of prāpyakarma there is no anpratyaya. Rather in the sense of niyukta (employed) anpratyaya is seen (yatra ca niyuktaḥ- kātyāyana)-

chatradhāraḥ (umbrella-holder), dvārapālaḥ (gatekeeper)- these examples fall under prāpyakarma.

4.6.5 Niṣṭhā (3-2-102):

Kta and ktavatu- both the pratyayas are called-niṣṭhā (ktaktavatū niṣṭhā, 1-1-26). In bhūtakāla these pratyayas are applied. Kta is in the sense of bhāva and karma (following tayoreva kṛtyaktakhalarthāḥ, 3-4-70) whereas ktavatu is in kartrārtha (following kartari kṛt, 3-4-67)- kṛtaḥ-kṛtavān. There are a number of applications involving both these pratyayas. Therefore, Pāṇini had given a separate name to these two pratyayas for brevity-niṣṭhāyāmaṇyadarthe (6-4-60), radābhyām niṣṭhāto naḥ pūrvasya ca daḥ (8-2-42), niṣṭhā ca (6-1-105) etc.

4.6.6 Radābhyām niṣṭhāto naḥ purvasya ca daḥ (8-2-42):

Two sentences (sūtras) are combined into one. Niṣṭhātakāra on ra and da would become nakāra and the preceding dakāra also becomes nakāra- chid+ ta chinnaḥ, bhid+ ta bhinnaḥ.

4.6.7 Chandasi liṭ, liṭaḥ kānajvā, kvasuśca (3-2-105, 106, 107):

All the three munis, viz. Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali agree that both kānac and kvasu are exclusively vedic, i.e. they cannot be used in loka- bandhe vṛtrasya yadvadbaddhānasya rodasī, tvamaṇavān badbadhānām aramṇāḥ.

Kātyāyana and Patañjali had a useful discussion about the kittva in kānāc- initially it is proposed by the former that for samyogāntas kittva is needed, i.e. asamyogāntas are taken care of by asamyogālliṭ kit (1-2-5)- the purpose of ñittva or kittva is to arrest guṇa and vṛddhi and here ñittva effects upadhālopa. Patañjali dismisses this proposition- both kānāc and kvasu are vedic. In veda liṭ becomes sārvaadhātukam and ñit as well (chandasyubhayathā, 3-4-117); sārvaadhātukamapit 1-2-4, apitsārvaadhātukam ñidvat syāt) and therefore upadhālopa will take place. Kātyāyana offers another benefit-to arrest guṇa in ṛkārantadhātus. Patañjali (save for his usage papuṣaḥ, a kvasupratyayānta under 4-3-24), seems to be forwarding this view.

Jinendrabuddhi, the author of Nyāsa had slightly different argument- kitkaraṇa is useful in cases that are samyogāntas like-bandha (bandhane). As far as asamyogāntas are concerned there is one sūtra- asamyogālliṭ kit (1-2-5). In fact, kittva to samyogāntas is useful in loka and not veda as there is- chandasyubhayathā (3-4-117). There is no any specific benefit in veda due to kittva or ñittva. On the other hand, kittva is useful in loka- nipapurāṇa iti (ni + pṛ+ kānāc). Therefore, this is a sign (jñāpaka) to decide that kānāc can be used in loka.

Patañjali under vibhāṣā pūrvāhṇāparāhṇābhyām (4-3-24) used a kvasupratyayānta- papuṣa āgatam papivadrupyam and this indicates that kvasu can be used in loka also- śreyāmsi sarvāṇyadhijagmuṣaste (Raghuvamsa 5-34).

While Dīkṣita says that poets have crossed the boundaryline (kaumudī) Nāgēśa in Udyota under vibhāṣā pūrvāhṇāparāhṇābhyām (4-3-24) remarks that the usage- papuṣaḥ by Patañjali insinuates the fact (advanced by some) that in loka also kvasu is used occasionally.

4.6.8 Laṭaśśatṛśānacāvāprathamāsāmānādhikaraṇe (3-2-124):

Pacan and pacamāna are examples. Vartamāne laṭ (3-2-123) is the earlier sūtra. While laṭ is coming to this sūtra, the use of the word laṭaḥ suggests that śatṛ and śānac- both the pratyayas are seen in prathamāsāmānādhikaraṇya also occasionally- san brāhmaṇaḥ. Kātyāyana adds an amendment- māñiākrośe iti vācyam (vārtikam 2109) - mājīvanyaḥ parāvajñāduḥkhadagdh'o'pi jīvati (śiśupālavadha 2-45)- a person who is burnt by the insult of enemies but is still alive- damn it- this is used blaming a person. In sambodhana (addressing) also śatṛ and śānac are employed (sambodhane ca, 3-2-125)- he pacan, he pacamāna. Both the pratyayas are used optionally in the place of lṛṭ (future tense)- tau sat, lṛṭaḥ sadvā (3-2-127, 3-3-14)- kariṣyantam, kariṣyamāṇam paśya, he kariṣyan.

4.6.9 Uṇādayo bahulam (3-3-1):

Kṛvāpājimisvadisādhyasubhya uṇ- is the first of uṇādisūtras composed by another grammarian, Śākaṭāyana. Since the first pratyaya is uṇ they are called uṇādi, kārūḥ, vāyuḥ, jāyuḥ etc. are the nouns that have emerged through this sūtra by adding uṇ-pratyaya on kṛ etc. roots in vartamānakāla. Pāṇini through the present sūtra wants to certify these grammatical applications and the resulting śabdas as fit for usage. Rather, since Śākaṭāyana's uṇādisūtras are not exhaustive, Pāṇini employed the term bahulam which, as was already explained, is useful in accommodating the unsaid but required further grammatical applications. Nāgeśa remarks that even Brahman (the creator) cannot offer the complete list of roots and suffixes.

4.6.10 Bhāve (3-3-18):

Ghañ from padarujaviśasprśo ghañ (3-3-16) is coming as anuvṛtti. The word bhāva itself is ghañ-pratyayānta. What about strīlinga and napumsakalinga?

(bhūtau and bhavane)-Patañjali says that the pumliṅga is to be ignored- i.e. since one should exhibit by some liṅga or the other, pumliṅga is taken, same is the case with ekavacana also. Nāntarīyakatvam- is a term used to express the concept- na + antarā + cha- is the prakīryā. It means inevitability, i.e. since one has to use a pada, and not either a prakṛti or pratyaya, to express an idea, there should necessarily be some liṅga and some vacana- one cannot get rice without chaff, it is first paddy and after removing the husk rice is attained.

Patañjali offers another solution- rather both sāmānya and viśeṣa are being expressed. Sāmānya is that which penetrates into all viśeṣas but viśeṣa cannot penetrate into all sāmānyas. Bhāva is sāmānya, it means the dhātvartha in the form of siddha (visible / tangible or having a concrete form). For example- pac (to cook) is the dhātu- ghañ bhāve- pākaḥ. Here there is sāmānya in the form of siddhatva (expressed by the term bhāva) and the viśeṣa- cooking. Similarly- tyaj (to give up)- bhāve ghañ- tyāgaḥ. The liṅga and vacana depend upon the pratyaya- ktiṅ- pakṭiḥ, lyut-pacanam.

sāmānye bhāva ityatra yallīṅgamupalabhyate|

bhedānāmanumeyatvānnatatteṣu vivakṣyate|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 59)

bhavatau yatpacādīnām tāvadatropadiśyate|

na ca liṅgam pacādīnām bhavatau samavasthitam|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 61)

ekaśca so'rthaḥ sattākhyah kathañcit kaiściducyate|

liṅgānicāsyā bhidyante pacirūpādibhedavat|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 62)

Hari tried to explain the concept in a different way- bhāve means bhāve iva (like in the case of bhāva), i.e. on bhu-dhātu it will be bhāva in bhāvārtha. Similarly, on pac it will be pāka (cooking)- i.e. the sūtra is like a simile (upamāna). Therefore, since the liṅga served its purpose in (upamāna) nirdeśa it is to be ignored (atantram).

nirdeśe caritārthatvāt liṅgam bhāve vivakṣitam|

upamānavidhatvācca bhāvādanyaḥ pacādiṣu|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 60)

Patañjali, while explaining as to how a single śabda (bhāve) can serve two purposes, i.e. denoting sāmānya and viśeṣa offered a simile- a teacher has got two disciples and one of them is his nephew, i.e. the teacher is maternal uncle to one of them. The first of them asked the second to salute the teacher. He saluted his uncle. The second one asked the first one to salute his uncle. He saluted the teacher. The point to note is that the same person can be a teacher (sāmānya) and uncle (viśeṣa) at a time. Hari also explicated the simile.

ācāryo mātulaśceti yathaiko vyapadiśyate|

sambandhibhedādarthātmā sa vidhiḥ paktibhāvayoḥ|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 63)

The literal meaning of the term bhāva is dhātvartha (the meaning of the verb).

‘bhāva eva hi dhātvrtha ityaviccchinna āgamaḥ’ (kriyāsamuddeśa- 23)

Under sārvaadhātuke yak (3-1-67) Patañjali explains (and clarifies) the difference between two types of bhāvas, i.e. the one expressed by a tiṅanta (verb) and a kṛdanta (noun)- the kṛdabhihitabhāva is like dravya, it gets connection with a verb or in other words, it becomes a sādhana (kāraṇa)- pāko vartate. On the other hand, a kriyā does not get connection with a kriyā- pacati, paṭhati (the

siddhānta is that kṛdanta expresses siddha whereas tiṇanta expresses sādhyā and sattva and dravya are synonyms of siddha), tiṇabhihitabhāva will have kāla, puruṣa and upagrahas and kṛdabhihitabhāva does not have these things, tiṇanta vācyā would certainly have karṭrākāṅkṣā and kṛdantavācyā as well as kṛdantavācyabhāva only would have liṅga and samkhyā and not the other.

Hari explained these lines in Vākyapadīya. He also adds that in words like pāka, the dhātu (pac) expresses sādhyā and ghañ (pratyaya) expresses the siddha. The same is the case with la-kṛtya-ka-khalartha-avyayakṛt- rūḍhi- niṣṭhā- ghañ etc.

sādhyatvena kriyā tatra dhāturūpanibandhanā|

sattva bhāgastu yastasyāḥ sa ghañādīnibandhanah|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 47)

lakṛtyaktakhalarthānām tathā'vyayakṛtāmapi|

rūḍhiniṣṭhāghaṇādīnām dhātuḥ sādhyasya vācakah|| (kriyāsamuddeśa- 52)

4.7 Taddhitavṛttiḥ:

Taddhitāḥ (4-1-76) is an adhikāra sūtra that gives the name taddhita to hundreds of pratyayas which are instituted on subantas. The plural number (unlike kṛdatiṅ 3-1-93 which is in singular number) in the above sūtra suggests that there can be some taddhitas which are not said in Aṣṭādhyāyī.

Taddhitamūḍho vaiyākaraṇah! taddhitamūḍho'vaiyākaraṇah- is a saying which is popularly used by grammarians to suggest that the knowledge of taddhitas is essential to be called a vaiyākaraṇa (grammarian). The first sentence (in verbal usage there is only one sentence) means that one who is burdened

(taddhitam + ūḍhaḥ) is fit to be called a vaiyākaraṇa. The latter one implies that one who is ignorant of taddhitas (taddhita + mūḍhaḥ) is a non-vaiyākaraṇa.

Patañjali in paspaśā comments that the southerners (like kātyāyana) are fond of taddhitas.

Pāṇini wanted the name taddhita for a couple of strīpratyayas and therefore read this sūtra in strīpratyayaprakaraṇa. Since taddhitapratyayas are meant to prepare padas (words) the paribhāṣā, samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-1-1) applies here. When there is ekārthībhāva, then there will be vṛtti and in its absence vākya will be there- aupagavaḥ / upagoḥ apatyam.

After effecting a Taddhitapratyaya, the stem, like aupagava would become a prātipadika and consequently gets sup in order to become a subanta as per the sūtra- kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca (1-2-46).

Taddhita Vṛtti is started with samarthānām prathamādvā (4-1-82) by Pāṇini. While discussing the utility of each word in the above sūtra, Patañjali, quoting Kātyāyana, suggests that, the sūtra (as well as samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ 2-1-1) is not required-vyākaraṇaśāstra is an instrument which analyses (through grammatical applications) the śabdas that are already used in veda and loka. A śabda which is samartha (capable) in rendering the meaning only is taken up for analysis. Therefore, the term samarthānām (and samarthaḥ) is not necessary. If a pratyaya is generated on a non-prathama that won't be capable to render the meaning. So the term prathamāt is not required. Vā says vṛtti is optional. In fact,

both vṛtti and vākya will be there in usage. Neither is going to replace the other. In such a case vā is not required.

4.7.1 Avivakṣā in taddhitas:

Tasyāpatyam (4-1-92) is a sūtra which says that aṇ, iñ etc. pratyayas will be there in the sense- his progeny. This is called arthanirdeśa (instructing the meaning) and this sūtra goes into other sūtras like- ata iñ (4-1-95) as anuvṛtti- the son of Daśaratha is called Dāśarathi (daśarathasya apatyam pumān- is the vigraha). Since tasya is preferably in pumliṅga, the pratyaya instituted by the above sūtra on sumātā etc. cannot be effected. Similarly if the progeny is in plural this sūtra cannot be effected. Rather since in some liṅga or the other and in some vacana or the other the instruction should be given, Pumliṅga and ekavacana are preferred. As such they are not to be taken as expressed- which is technically called atantra or avivakṣita.

In fact, in many places across vyākaraṇaśāstra, the samkhyā and liṅga are not expressed. In case of samkhyā there are exceptions like supsupā (only one subanta will get samāsa with one subanta).

4.7.2 Gotra-yuva-samjñas and kinship terms:

The treatment of kinship terms in Taddhitas is very interesting to note. From the third generation (pautra) onwards progeny would get the name gotram (vṛddha is the corresponding name of pre-pāṇinian grammarians). Rather, if any one of the persons related to the clan, like father, etc. is alive then the generation after pautra (i.e. fourth one etc.) would get the name yuva. Similarly, if the elder brother is alive (in case the father etc. are dead), the younger ones starting with the fourth one would get the name yuva. On the other hand, if another sapiṇḍa (including self up to seven generations on both sides, i.e. father and mother, the term sapiṇḍa applies) of the brother, who is better/elder in terms of place and age

(sthaviratare) is alive, then the progeny starting with pauṭra, if alive, would get the name yuva optionally. The tarap in sthaviratara suggests that if a person more respectable and elder in age, like father's brother (pitṛvya), mother's father (mātāmaha), and brother (of pitṛvya or mātāmaha) is alive. Ex. The progeny of gārgya can be gārgyāyaṇa or gārgya (gārgyasyāpatyam gārgyāyaṇaḥ gārgyo vā). If the conditions are not met then there will be only gotrasamjñā and as a result, only one term, i.e. gārgya, will be there.

4.7.3 Regulations:

If one goes by the above said procedure then there will be ninety-nine pratyayas in case one wants to mention, the one hundredth man. In order to avoid such a situation Pāṇini said eko gotre- there will be only one pratyaya in gotra. Another similar sūtra, i.e. gotrādyūnyastriyām says that if one wants to effect a pratyaya in yuvāpatya it should be on a gotrapratyayānta (i.e. only one gotrapratyaya will be there in case of female)- gārgasyāpatyam strī gārgī.

4.7.4 Gotram:

The term gotram is used by Pāṇini in many sūtras. There is one gotra that is popular with people (pravarādhyāya-prasiddha) and the other (is the one said above) that is there in apatyādhikāraprakaraṇa (i.e. technical). Patañjali under yūni luk (4-1-77), strīpumsābhyām nañsnañau bhavanāt (4-1-87) etc. ruled that outside the apatyādhikāra the gotra referred to by people or the so-called pravarādhyāyaprasiddhagotra has to be taken. This is much useful in the interpretation of sūtras like yaskādibhyo gotre (2-4-63).

4.7.5 Kānīna:

The son of a virgin is called kānīna- kanyāyāḥ kanīna ca (4-1-116). Patañjali in this context had a beautiful discussion- the sūtra seems to be inappropriate as a kanyā cannot have progeny and one who has progeny cannot be a kanyā. Therefore, kanyā and apatyam are incompatible. Then he clarifies that simply by having a physical relation with a man, kanyā does not forfeit kanyātva (virginity), rather it is possible if she is married through vedic

rituals. Thus if a kanyā gives birth to a child, before she under went the marriage as per scriptures, then the child is called kānīna (male), ex. Vyāsa and Karṇa (of mahābhārata fame).

4.7.6 Tadadhīte tadveda (4-2-59):

One who studies it or knows it in both the senses aṇ-pratyaya would be applied. One who studies vyākaraṇa or one who knows vyākaraṇa is called vaiyākaraṇa. nyāya-naiyāyikaḥ etc. Here under this sūtra, Patañjali rakes up a point- a person who studies, knows it too and vice versa, then why to say adhīte veda, either will do? He further clarifies that a person who studies (or recites) need not necessarily know it, he simply recites and one who knows need not certainly recite it. Therefore, ācārya mentioned both.

4.7.7 Cāturarthikas:

A different style of Pāṇini- he read out four sūtras (tadasmīnnastīti deśetannāmni, tena nirvṛttam, tasyanivāsaḥ, adūrabhavaśca 4-2-67 to 70) and in any one of these senses aṇ etc. pratyayas would be applied. Hence these pratyayas are called cāturarthikas. If the sense- this is there in this country- is expressed and the word would be the name of a country, it is performed / built etc. by him, it is his abode and it is nearby- these are the four senses in which aṇ-pratyaya has to be applied.

Ex: udumbaras (a kind of tree- *ficus glomerata*) are there in this country and hence the country is called Audumbara, Kuśāmba built the city and therefore, Kausāmbī, Śībī (people who descended from the famous emperor śībī) are living in this country, therefore the name of the country is Śaiba, the city, which is there in the vicinity of river Vidiśā is Vaidīśam. Sometimes the pratyaya is not seen (it disappears), especially in the case, of Janapada (an empire)- Pañcālas are living here and the name of the country is Pañcālāḥ, Kurus are living here and the name of the country is Kuravaḥ. Pāṇini, while injecting lup to cāturarthika in case of

janapada, ruled that the liṅga and vacana of the paradigm would be like that of the prakṛti.

4.7.8 Tiñanta:

Ṭhak-pratyaya is instituted through sūtras like- tena dīvyati khanati jayati jitam (4-4-2)- if one is either playing/winning with dice is called ākṣikaḥ (akṣaiḥ divyati/jayati), something that is won through dice is called ākṣikam (akṣaiḥ jitam), one who is digging with a crowbar is called kauddālikaḥ (kuddalena khanati kauddālikaḥ).

The peculiarity is that Pāṇini expresses the sense, in which a pratyaya has to be effected, either through subantas or tiñantas.

One who is living with salary etc. is called vaitanikaḥ (vetanādibhyo jīvati 4-4-12, ṭhak). One who is living with a weapon is called āyudhīyaḥ or āyudhikaḥ (āyudhāccha ca 4-4-14, ṭhan.).

One who has got the knowledge of prakṛti and pratyaya (of śabdās) is called śābdikaḥ (śabdam karoti śābdikaḥ- śabdadarduram karoti, 4-4-34).

4.7.9 Pakṣimatsyamṛgān hanti (4-4-35):

Kātyāyana says that in this sūtra the form, synonyms and other kinds are to be taken (svarupasya paryāyāṇām viśeṣāṇām ca grahaṇam- 523). Only mīna among the synonyms of matsya has to be taken. Ṭhakpratyaya is being instituted. One who is killing birds is pākṣikaḥ (pakṣiṇo hanti), śakuna-śākunikaḥ, mayūra-

māyūrikah, matsya-mātsyikah, mīna-mainikah, mṛga-mārgikah, sāraṅga-sāraṅgikah.

4.7.10 Paripantham ca tiṣṭhati (4-4-36):

A dacoit who is around the (high) way- may be just away from the road or in the vicinity of the road, or a dacoit who kills around the road is pāripanthikah, ṭhak pratyaya.

4.7.11 Dharmam carati (4-4-41):

One who is following dharma is dhārmika (ṭhak), adhārmika is in negative. Kātyāyana reads an amendment- adharmācceti vaktavyam (2966), therefore one who is following adharma can be called ādharmika (as well).

4.7.12 Asti nāstidiṣṭam matiḥ (4-4-60):

This is a sūtra which institutes a taddhita (ṭhak) on verbs (tiñantas). One who believes that another world is there-is called āstikah, one who does not believe in the existence of the same is called nāstikah, one who attributes everything to destiny is called daiṣṭikah.

4.7.13 Vati:

There are four sūtras for instituting vati (like)- tena tulyam kriyā cedvatih, tatra tasyeva, tadarham and upasargācchandasi dhātvarthe (5-1-115 to 118). The first three deal with laukikaśabdas and the last one is for vaidikaśabdas. The first sūtra says that if one is doing/performing some activity like another (who is naturally expected to do) then there will be vati-pratyaya on tṛtīyānta- kṣatriya is reciting (veda) like a brāhmaṇa (brāhmaṇena tulyam adhīte kṣatriyah) then the usage will be brāhmaṇavadadhīte kṣatriyah (compare with brāhmaṇa iva adhīte kṣatriyah, brāhmaṇena tulyam adhīte kṣatriyah). The sūtra is exclusively for kriyā. Therefore, if either guṇa or dravya is referred to there won't be the pratyaya-

putreṇa tulyaḥ sthūlaḥ (he is stout on a par with his son), caitreṇa tulyam dhanī maitraḥ (maitra is wealthy on a par with caitra).

The second sūtra says that if there is something (in / of a place / person etc.) like the one in / of another place /person etc. then vati will take place. The boundaries in srughna are like the ones in mathurā so mathurāvat srughne prākārāḥ (mathurāyāmiva mathurāvat srughne prākārāḥ), caitrasyeva caitravat maitrasya-bhāvaḥ (the thinking/ feeling of maitra is like that of caitra). So this sūtra is for guṇa and dravya.

The third sūtra deals with examples where one is doing something (kriyā) that fits him- vidhimarhati (he is fit to be treated as per the scriptures) vidhivat pūjyate. The word kriyā from 5-1-115 would jump into this sūtra (maṇḍūkapluti /frog-leap).

The last sūtra, as is evident, deals with vedic usages where vati, in svārthayadudvato nivataḥ (udgatāt, nirgatāt).

Hari, while discussing the third sūtra, i.e. tadarham, opines that in other vyākaraṇas like āpiśala and kāśakṛtsna, such a sūtra is not there. The discussion of Patañjali, under this sūtra did not say anything against the absence of such a sūtra in other vyākaraṇas. Therefore, following the norm, apratiṣiddham anumatam bhavati (it is accepted which is not refuted), it can be deduced that tadarham is not required as through creating bheda in the examples covered by this sūtra, upamānopameyabhāva is possible and then the earlier sūtra would take care of these examples as well. Rather, finally Hari asserts that this is not the case- the sense tadarham can never be included in tena tulyam or tatra tasyeva. There is no vivakṣā of upamānopameyabhāva here. Therefore, Pāṇini was observing the phenomenon keenly and since it was not covered /dealt with by earlier vyākaraṇas

he made a sūtra which is essential and this is the meaning of Patañjali's silence on the question of refutation of this sūtra.

tadarhamitinārabdham sūtramvyākaraṇāntare|

sambhavatyupamātrāpi bhedasya parikalpanāt|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 561)

yuktamaupayikam rājñā ityarthasya nidarśane|

upamānāvivakṣāyām tadarhamiti paṭhyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 577)

4.7.14 Tasya bhāvastvatalau (5-1-119):

The term bhāva is the indicator of jāti or sāmānyam. Hari in Vākyapadiya clarifies that pratyayas like tva, tal, imanic, yat etc. express jāti which is eternal (nitya) and the so called sattā or ātmā or mahān (according to sāmkhya) and the same is described as prātipadikārtha and dhātvartha in pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa. Therefore, since all śabdās express jāti, the bhāvapratyaya can be added as per the usage. jāti is the unique quality / property within, that separates one thing from the rest of the things in the universe. In vyākaraṇa, guṇa is used as a synonym to jāti (see kātyāyana in the present sūtra and patañjali under samarthaḥpadavidhiḥ 2-1-1).

sambandhibhedātsattaiva bhidyamānā gavādiṣu|

jātirityucyate tasyām sarve śabdā vyavasthitāḥ|| (jātisamuddeśa- 33)

tām prātipadikārtham ca dhātvartham ca pracakṣate|

sā nityā sā mahānātmā tāmāhuḥ tvatalādayaḥ|| (jātisamuddeśa- 34)

There are two lingānuśāsanāsūtras- tvāntam klībam, talantam striyām-gotvam / gotā. The word ending in tva will be in neuter gender and the one ending in tal will be in feminine gender.

4.7.15 Goṣṭham- gogoṣṭham:

Go + sthā + ka (ghañarthe kavidhānam) = goṣṭham- the place where cows stay (pen). This is a kṛtpratyayānta. Subsequently due to comparison (upamāna) the place where birds stay is called avigoṣṭham and so on. Before compiling his vārtika (upamānādvā siddham) to this effect, Kātyāyana (under samprodaśca kaṭac, 5-2-29) offered a vārtika- i.e. goṣṭhādayaḥ sthānādiṣu paśunāmabhyaḥ, which says goṣṭha- pratyaya in the sense of place should be instituted on words denoting animals etc. Then the pen of cows has to be called gogoṣṭham and there will be avigoṣṭham, uṣṭragoṣṭham (stable of camels) etc.

Similarly tailam is a taddhitānta- tilānām vikāraḥ- aṇ pratyaya by tasya vikāraḥ 4-3-134, in the sense a changed form of sesame- i.e. sesame-oil. Rather this śabda is popular in the sense of oil, i.e. any oil and therefore for sesame-oil it would be tilatailam.

In case the tailac-pratyaya is accepted, the popular word tailam is not covered. Same is the case with goṣṭhac-pratyaya, i.e. the popular word goṣṭham (pen) is affected. Therefore upamānādvā siddham stands. The earlier vārtika was, probably, to register the opinions of other vaiyākaraṇas.

4.7.16 Śītaka / uṣṇaka:

Both the words, śīta and uṣṇa, are used in secondary sense or lakṣyārtha- one who does the job to be completed quickly, in a slow manner is called śītaka, the one who does the same job-quickly is called uṣṇaka. The term kāriṇi in the sūtra denotes the sense- one with such a nature (ṇini-pratyaya is tacchīla)-

śītoṣṇābhyām kāriṇi (5-2-72). Patañjali explains- uttarapadalopo'tra draṣṭavyaḥ, śītamiva śītam, uṣṇamiva uṣṇam.

4.7.17 Adhikam (5-2-73):

This is a nipāta. adhyāruḍha, kan, uttarapadalopa- adhikam (more).

4.7.18 Pārśvakaḥ:

The word pārśva is in the sense of pretext. Patañjali explains- pārśvamiva pārśvam, uttarapadalopo'tra draṣṭavyaḥ, yaḥ rjunopāyena anveṣṭavyānarthān anrjunopāyena anvicchatī sa ucyate- pārśvaka iti (one who wants to investigate things through pretexts rather than reasons is called pārśvaka).

4.7.19 Āyaśśūlikaḥ:

The word ayaśśūla (iron dart) denotes hard means. One who wants to probe things (to be probed through easy means) through-hard means is called āyaśśūlikaḥ- ayaśśūladaṇḍābhyām ṭhakṭhaṇau 5-2-76.

4.7.20 Śrotriyaḥ:

This is a nipāta. A word śrotriyaḥ is read in the sense of a sentence- one who recites chandas (veda)-śrotriyamśchando'dhīte 5-2-84- chandas + ghañ- śrotra + ghañ = śrotriyaḥ, there will be aṇ (tadadhīte tadveda 4-2-59) optional- chāndasaḥ.

4.7.21 Sākṣī:

One who witnesses the transaction / incident is called sākṣhī-a nipāta by sākṣāddraṣṭari samjñāyām 5-2-91. There will be three people- one who gives, one who receives and the one who witnesses. The third person is called sākṣī and he is naturally not involved in the transaction- sākṣāt is an avyaya, upon that ini is the

pratyaya (avyayānām bhamātre ṭilopaḥ). Patañjali clarifies that samjñāyām is needed because all the three persons naturally witness the event and without that term (in case sāksāt draṣṭari is the sūtra) all the three would become sāksīs.

4.7.22 Kṣettriyah:

This is a nipāta (often seen in atharvaveda)- kṣettriyac parakṣetre cikitsyaḥ 5-2-92. This is on a par with śrotriyamschando'dhite (5-2-84) says Kātyāyana, i.e. in the sense of a sentence- this disease has to be treated in a different body (i.e. incurable) the word kṣettriyah is prescribed. Kṣetra means body. The cakāra at the end is for antodādtasvara. Kātyāyana also comments that it can be paralopa (disappearance of the word para) and ghac-pratyaya in the sense to be treated there- parakṣetra- kṣetra + ghac- kṣettriyah.

4.7.23 Matup:

In the senses- that is there to this and in this, matup-pratyaya is instituted by Pāṇini- tadasyāstyasminniti matup 5-2-94. Here asti in the sūtra is important, i.e. Pāṇini wants to convey that the thing should be possessed by one (place, person etc.) presently and the pratyaya cannot be applied in past and future tenses. A person has got cows at present is called gomān. Similarly a place /country where there are cows at present is called gomān. If the person or place had cows earlier or will be having the same in future cannot be referred to as gomān- gāvah santyasya asminvā gomān devadattaḥ deśovā gāvo'sya āsan, gāvo sya bhavitārah iti vākyameva. Patañjali had a beautiful discussion (hari summarised the same) in this context- why asti? In order to convey existence, this is not the purpose, existence is concomitant with every thing, then this is the purpose- in present existence only pratyaya will take place, in past & future existence no pratyaya, cows were there to him, cows will be there to him. The present existence is called sampratisattā or bāhyasattā.

etām sattām padārtho hi na kaścidativartate|

sā ca sampratisattāyāḥ ṛthak bhāṣye nidarśitā|| (sambandhasamuddeśa- 51)

The vārtika of Kātyāyana says that asti (a verb conveying existence) has to be added to a sentence without a verb (astirbhavantīparaḥ aprayujyamāno pyasti) has to be read in this context.

In usages like gāvo'sya santyanantarāḥ, gāvo'sya santi samīpe there won't be the pratyaya as the word gāvaḥ has got the apekṣā with anantarāḥ and samīpa and thus it became asamartha (sāpekṣamasamartham bhavati 2-1-1).

A matubanta cannot have another matup- one who has got cows is gomān. A country which has got many a gomān (gomamtaḥ santi asmin deśe)-in such a situation, Patañjali clarifies, there cannot be another matup as the sense is already expressed, i.e. a deśa which has got many a gomān has also got many a cow, therefore gomān deśaḥ itself will do.

Kātyāyana offered an amendment to this sūtra saying that simple ownership of something should not entitle one to receive the pratyaya as there will be ativyāpti in cases like vrīhirasya (this person has got paddy) yavo'sya (this person has got yavas).

matuprabhṛtayaḥ sanmātre iti cedatiprasaṅgaḥ,

bhūmanindāpraśamsāsu nityayoge tiśāyane|

sambandhe' stivivakṣāyām bhavanti matubādayaḥ||

He rather enumerated the specific senses in which pratyayas starting with matup are to be applied-

1. bhūmni (in abundance)- gomān, yavamān.

2. nindāyām (in cursing)- kakudāvartī, samkhādakī.
3. praśamsāyām (in praising)- rūpavān, varṇavān.
4. nityayoga (eternal association)- kṣīriṇo vṛkṣāḥ, kantakino vṛkṣāḥ.
5. atīśāyane (having too much)- udariṇī kanyā
6. samsarga (in having)- daṇḍī, chatrī

Kātyāyana himself says (uktam vā) that the above vārtika is not required as it is already implied by Pāṇinisūtra. Comments Patañjali that when the word iti is used in the sūtra (like tadasya tadasmin syāditi 5-1-16) it suggests that if there is vivakṣā (if such a word denotes such a meaning in the common parlance), therefore if there is vivakṣā of bhūma etc. then only the pratyaya would come.

Rather in another vārtika (sanmātre carṣidarśanāt), Kātyāyana says that in simple existence there is usage of matup in veda-yavamatībhīradbhiḥ yūpam prokṣati. Further the matup would disappear on words denoting guṇa (quality etc.) says Kātyāyana- a thing which is white is- śuklaḥ (vāsaḥ-cloth), a sari- suklā (śāṭī), a cloth- śuklam (vastram), similarly kṛṣṇaḥ ,nīlaḥ, other numbers also- śuklau, śuklāḥ. The last vārtika, tathā ca liṅgavacanasiddhiḥ, is about liṅga and vacana. This is the origin of the statement of Amarasimha in Amarakośa- guṇe śuklādayaḥ pumsī guṇilingāstu tadvati.

4.7.24 Ālu & Elu:

Kātyāyana under ‘bahulam chandasi 5-2-122’ offers vārtikas in the sense- one cannot endure- one who cannot endure cold is called- śītāluḥ, uṣṇa (heat) uṣṇāluḥ, trupra (puroḍāśa; misery- according to mādharma)- truprāluḥ- ālu is the

pratyaya- hima + elu- himeluḥ, bala + ūla- balūlaḥ, but on vātaśabda in both the senses- one cannot endure and a mass of wind (gale)- there will be - ūla-pratyaya- vātūlaḥ.

4.7.25 Vāgmī-Vācālaḥ / Vācāṭaḥ:

Vāco gminiḥ, ālajāṭajau bahubhāṣiṇi (5-2-124, 125) are the sūtras. Patañjali (rather than kātyāyana as is stated in kaumudī) clarifies that one who speaks too much but good and useful is called vāgmī and one who speaks too much that is wind is called vācālaḥ / vācāṭaḥ. Since Pāṇini made two sūtras instead of one, the style (technically called sāmārthya) implies that bahubhāṣiṇi is applicable to earlier sūtra also and as a result one need not amend the latter sūtra by kutsita iti vaktavyam (in the sense of speaking too much but useless).

4.7.26 Prāgdiśo vibhaktiḥ (5-3-1):

The Taddhita-pratyayas under this adhikāra are given an additional samjñā-vibhakti. There are three benefits for this samjñā- the itsamjñā is arrested through na vibhaktau tasmāḥ (1-3-4), atva through tyadādīnāmaḥ (7-2-102) and udāttasvara (to idam through sāvekācastrīyādirvibhaktiḥ (6-1-168)).

And since no specific sense is mentioned by Pāṇini, these pratyayas are called svārthikas, i.e. the pratyayas express the meaning of prakṛti only. Therefore, both the terms, samarthānām and prathamāt won't apply to these pratyayas. Vā would continue.

4.7.27 Adhunā (5-3-17):

In the sense asmin kāle (now/at present) idam-śabda (saptamyanta) would get adhunā-pratyaya- idam + adhunā (idama iś 5-3-3) i + adhunā (yasyeti ca 6-4-148)- adhunā. Bhāṣyakāra explains that it can be either a- ādeśa to idam and dhunā is the pratyaya or lopa to idam and adhunā is the pratyaya. When vatup is

applied on idam (kimidambhyām vo ghaḥ 5-2-40) then also the same would be the situation- idam + vatup, idam- iyat (idamkimoriṣkī 6-3-90) ī + iyat (yasyeti ca 6-4-148) iyat (num etc.) iyān.

4.7.28 Atiśāyane tamabiṣṭhanau (5-3-55):

In the sense qualitatively the best or in expressing superlative degree, tamap and iṣṭhan are instituted on subantas. Since there cannot be any degree of comparison in terms of dravya, and jāti, Patañjali concluded, after a prolonged discussion, that these pratyayas denote degree of guṇa and therefore on prātipadikas (i.e. subantas) denoting guṇa only the pratyayas are to be added. Nāgēśa under ākaḍārādekā samjñā says that the śabdas other than jāti- samjñā- avyaya- kṛdanta- taddhitānta- samasta,- sarvanāma- samkhyā- śabdas are to be taken as guṇavacana.

Hari in guṇasamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa defined guṇa in order to avoid confusion between the guṇas enumerated by naiyāyikas and popular in common parlance vis-a-vis the guṇa intended in certain pāṇinīyasūtras- having connected with the resort, able to separate the resort from other things, due to its resorting to other things identified as paratantra (guṇānām ca parārthatvāt- jaimini)- such a padārtha is called guṇa in vyākaraṇa. Śukla (white), kṛṣṇa (black) can be seen with the resort, ghaṭa, paṭa etc. only, they cannot be perceived separately. They separate their resort from other things- a white vessel is differing from a black vessel due to its guṇa (colour). There is ghaṭatva in a ghaṭa and it is referred to as guṇa (as well as jāti) by vaiyākaraṇas (see vārtika, yasya guṇasya bhāvāt dravye śabdaniveśaḥ, under tasyabhāvastvatalau 5-1-119). And naiyāyikas take it as jāti and not as guṇa. Under samarthah padavidhiḥ (2-1-1) Patañjali also says vīratvam guṇaḥ, puruṣatvam guṇaḥ. Rather the guṇa that is acceptable to naiyāyikas and

popular in common parlance has to be taken in certain sūtras and vārtikas- voto guṇavacanāt 4-1-44, samkhyāyāḥ guṇasya nimāne mayaḥ 5-2-47, tṛtīyā tatkr̥tārthena guṇavacanena 2-1-30, prakāre guṇavacanasya 8-1-12, pūrṇaguṇasuhitārthasadvayavatasamānādhikaraṇena 2-2-11, īśadguṇavacanena 2-2-7, ajādi guṇavacanādeva 5-3-58 and guṇavacanebhyo matupo luk, vārtika under 5-2-94.

samsargi bhedakam yadyatsavyāpāram pratīvyate|

guṇatvam paratantratvāttasya śāstre udāṛtam|| (guṇasamuddeśam- 1)

Hari asserts that, keeping aside jāti, guṇa, kriyā etc. upādhis, it is not possible to exhibit pure dravya. Therefore the guṇa which is used as a dividing factor is also taken up for measuring degrees of comparison. In brahmākāṇḍa (also) he says that although the guṇa (śukla etc.) is referred to (śuklataram rūpam etc.) it indirectly refers to the dravya with which it is associated- i.e. the pure dravya cannot be expressed by a śabda.

dravyasyā'vyapadeśyasya ya upādīyate guṇah|

bhedako vyapadeśāya tatprakarṣo'bhīdīyate|| (guṇasamuddeśa- 2)

sarvasyaiva pradhānasya na vinā bhedaHetunā|

prakarṣo vidyate nāpi śabdasyopaiti vācyatām|| (guṇasamuddeśa- 3)

guṇaḥ prakarṣaheturyaḥ svātantantrenopadiśyate|

tasyāśrita guṇādeva prakṛṣṭatvam pratīyate|| (brahmākāṇḍa-64)

Ex: ādhyā- ādhyatamaḥ, laghu-laghiṣṭhaḥ

4.7.29 Tīnaśca (5-3-56):

Tamap-pratyaya is added on tiñanta in the sense of excellence- pacatitamām (ām by kimettiñavyayaghādāmva-dravyaprakarṣe 5-4-11). Āyasun does not apply here following the regulation- ajādī guṇavacanādeva 5-3-58.

Patañjali under aṣaḍakṣāśitañvalamkarmālampuruṣā-dhyuttarapadātkhaḥ 5-4-7 says that tamap etc. are nityapratyayas.

Kātyāyana observed that the pratyaya is seen in svārtha in veda- devo vaḥ savita prārpayatu śreṣṭhatamāya karmaṇe. Here, in the word śreṣṭhatamāya, iṣṭhañ is the first pratyaya in the sense of excellence and another pratyaya in the same sense cannot be added.

4.7.30 Dvivacanavibhajyopapade tarabīyasunau (5-3-57):

Both the pratyayas would be added to subantas and only tarap on tiñantas in the sense of comparison between two- laghu- laghutarah (this one is smaller) / laghīyān, pacati- pacatitarām (this one cooks better).

In examples like alpāctaram 2-2-34 and lopaśca balavattarah (kātyāyana under hayavarat) the tarap is atyantasvārthika. This is deduced from the fact that instead of pitau ghaḥ or tādī ghaḥ, Pāṇini read it taraptamapau ghaḥ (1-1-22). His style insinuates the fact.

4.7.31 Praśamsāyām rūpap (5-3-66):

This is also a pratyaya which is added to both subantas and tiñantas in the sense of admiration- praśastah paṭuḥ paṭurūpah, praśastam pacati pacatirūpam.

4.7.32 Bahuc:

All the pratyayas are added as suffixes (pratyayaḥ, paraśca 3-1-1 & 2) but bahuc is the only pratyaya that is prefixed- vibhāṣā supo bahuc purastāttu 5-3-68. Bahuc is instituted in the sense-īśadasamāptau (just less)- bahupaṭuḥ. The tu in the sūtra denotes that the pratyaya comes as a prefix only.

4.7.33 Kutsite (5-3-74):

In the sense of wicked, ka-pratyaya is added (prāgivaṭkaḥ 5-3-70)- a wicked aśva is called aśvakaḥ. Raising an objection that when kutsita itself is the prātipadika then, since the sense wicked (kutsita) is already expressed, there cannot be the pratyaya- how come kutsitakaḥ, anukampitakaḥ etc., Patañjali asserts that each śabda expresses five meanings-jāti, dravya, liṅga vacana and vibhakti. This is what is referred to by later vaiyākaraṇas as pañcakam prātipadikārthaḥ .

4.7.34 Ḍatarac /Ḍatamac:

Both these pratyayas are instituted on kim, yat and tat while separating one from two and many respectively- anayoḥ kataro devadattaḥ? (who is devadatta between these two?), bhavatām katamo devadattaḥ? (who is devadatta among you people?)

Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali opine that the upādhis (conditions) are not very much useful- dvayoḥ is not needed as ḍatarac is used when one is separated from many and katamaśabda is seen in ajātiparipraśna. Under pratyayaḥ (3-1-1) Patañjali's usage-bahuṣvāsīneṣu kaścit kamcit prcchati kataro devadattaḥ (where many people are sitting, one is enquiring another- who is devadatta?) and his another usage- katamā esām āḍhyatamā (who among these ladies is wealthiest?) Under prakāre guṇavacanasya (8-1-12) following Kātyāyana's vārtika.

4.7.35 Avakṣepaṇe kaṇ (5-3-95):

Ka-pratyaya was instituted through kutsite (5-3-74). There will be difference in svara between kaṇ and ka. Rather, avakṣepaṇa and kutsana are synonyms. Paṭañjali under the above sūtra clarifies that where a thing is considered to be wicked due to the reasons within (svakutsārtham upādīyate) that are an example for ka-pratyaya- devadattakaḥ. devadatta due to his bad conduct etc. is considered to be wicked and therefore is called devadattakaḥ. Whereas in the present context a thing, that is taken up for projecting some other thing as wicked, is the example- vyākaraṇakaḥ devadattaḥ. Here in this example vyākaraṇa is good (not bad by itself). Rather devadatta became proud due to the study of vyākaraṇa.

4.7.36 Samāsacca tadviṣayāt (5-3-106):

A very terse sūtra. Kākatālīyaḥ (coreṇa caitrasya vadhah)- is the example. There are two ivārthas (meanings of comparison) here- like the flying of crow and like the fall of the palm- fruit (when something happened incidentally- the thief had accidentally seen caitra and killed- this is compared with another incident- a crow came flying under a palm-tree and just then a palm-fruit fell upon and killed it). Ajākṛpānīyam is another example. A goat has come under the tree while the sword has just slipped from the hands of the wood-cutter and killed the goat. Any such coincidence is compared with this (explained through this usage).

Hari earmarked nine verses to explain the meaning of this sūtra. First Paṭañjali's Bhāṣyam- what is referred to by (the pronoun) tat? (i.e. ivārtha is the context and cha-pratyaya as well, following sarvanāmnām pradhānaparāmarśitvāt both are equally pradhāna and hence the doubt), cha-pratyaya, how come samāsa becomes subject of cha? Then it is ivārtha, if samāsa is in ivārtha and pratyaya as well, since the sense is already expressed by samāsa the pratyaya won't come (i.e. following uktārthānāmaprayogaḥ- nothing to be used to express the already

expressed meaning), then there are two ivārthas, how? kākāgamanamiva tālapatanamiva kākātālam, kākātālamiva kākātālīyam (i.e. the samāsa which is subject to ivārtha is the prakṛti and it would get cha-pratyaya in ivārtha).

Here is Hari-

chāpekṣā tadviṣayatā vidheyatvānna gamyate|

kākātālīyamityatra prasiddham hyupalakṣaṇam|| (vṛttisamuddeśa-606)

Since cha-pratyaya is (for the first time) being instituted it is not appropriate to say that the pratyaya would come on a samāsa that is the subject (viṣaya means which is not seen elsewhere, i.e. the samāsa connected forever with cha- vi + ṣiñ (bandhane) + ac- viṣayaḥ) of cha. In examples like kākātālīyam it is well-known that it is the present sūtra that effects the samāsa (i.e. since there is no any vidhisūtra which can effect samāsa through imposing sāmārthya in such a situation, the present sūtra itself or pratyayavidhāna itself is a jñāpaka (sign) in deducing that such a samāsa is possible, jñāpaka is preferred to supsupā . If it is argued that chaviṣaya means a samāsa which is going to become the subject of cha in future would get cha-pratyaya- then it would be rendered unmeaningful.

Hari further clarifies that the condition if the samāsa is the subject of cha is not feasible as it is not decided as to whether it is rājāśva etc. or another samāsa that will be the subject of cha. Therefore, before the chapratyaya is instituted, chapratyayaviṣaya cannot be there. The result is that although it is pradhāna (important as it is being instituted) chapratyaya cannot be the candidate that is being referred to by the pronoun tat in tadviṣayāt, rather although unimportant the ivārtha is the candidate.

Thus, explains Hari, it is suggested that both the ivārthas are the cause of the meaning of samāsa and pratyaya- one ivārtha is connected with a word that is part of the samāsa whereas the other is connected with chapratyaya.

dvayorivārthayorarthanimittatvam pratīyate|

ekenāvayavo yuktaḥ pratyayo'nyena yujyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa-608)

caitrasya tatrāgamanam kākasyāgamanam yathā|

dasyorabhinipātaṣṭu tālasya patanam yathā|| (vṛttisamuddeśa-609)

In contrast, in examples like śastrī śyāmā (the girl is like a knife) the knife has already had the quality of śyāmatva (medium complexion) and a lady, devadattā is being compared with a knife which is of medium complexion. Here since nothing else is being compared with the upameya, devadattā, there is only one ivārtha.

4.7.37 Ivārtha in samāsa:

There are two upameyas and two upamānas-caitra's coming is like the coming of the crow, the thief's pouncing on caitra is like the falling of palm-fruit on the crow. The samānadharmā (common property) is coincidence.

4.7.38 Ivārtha by pratyaya:

The different kriyā (activity) like vadha (killing) etc. which is happening due to the collision of crow and palm-fruit, becomes upamāna and in the sense of upameya vis-a-vis the said upamāna the chapratyaya is being instituted. Therefore the upamānopameyabhāva that is there between both the activities is the meaning of chapratyaya.

sannipāte tayoryānyā kriyā tatropa jāyate|

vadhādirupameye'rthe tayā chavidhīṣyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa-610)

Having explained both the ivārthas Hari addresses the question of sāmārthya- the coming of crow is the upamāna of the coming of caitra and therefore kākāgamana is apradhāna (unimportant). The falling of palm-fruit is the upamāna of the coming of the thief. And there is no relation between kākāśabda and tālaśabda which are pradhāna and apradhāna, respectively. As such both these śabdas are asamartha. Then how come the samāsa takes place. Further when it is said that the chapratyayavidhi is the sign (jñāpaka) of samāsa then also it is indicated in Bhāṣya that supsupā is the vidhisūtra of samāsa. Therefore, it is difficult to have a samāsa out of two asamartha śabdas. On the other hand, although the samāsa is achieved somehow or the other, how two words which do not construe with each other express a unitary meaning? Then which is the prakṛtyartha that would be a viśēṣaṇa (qualifier) of pratyayārtha (viśēṣya)?- responds Hari- dravyaśabda exists in the activity with which it is connected, in the present example the dravyaśabdas, i.e. kākā and tāla are there connected with pāta (falling) and āgamana (coming). Dravya is siddha and kriyā is sādhyā. In examples like dadhyodanaḥ, both are dravyas and hence there cannot be any connection between them. At the same time, samāsa cannot be effected between asamarthaśabdas (samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ 2-1-1). Therefore, in order to make a samāsa possible a kriyā like upaseka (soaking) is taken- the odanam (rice) that is soaked in dadhi (curd) is dadhyodana. Same is the case with kākā and tāla which denote āgamana and patana. Kākāgamana and tālapatana both are coincidental and are upamāna to each other. Thus both the śabdas are construed due to parasparopamānopameyabhāva and pratyayārthaviśēṣaṇatva is possible. Further, the comparison between both the above kriyas on the one side, the coming of caitra and pouncing of the thief on the other becomes possible. Such a meaning is expressed by samāsa. caitra-vadha is upameya of kākavadha and the same is expressed by chapratyaya.

kriyāyām samavetāyām dravya śabdo'vatiṣṭhate|

pātāgamanayoḥ kākātāla śabdau tathā sthitau|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 611)

Why to resort to the secondary meaning (gaunārtha) in case of kākā and tāla? Why not directly compare coincidental corakṛta-caitravadha with tālakṛta-kākavadha?- Hari clarifies that the sentence that expresses the meaning of vṛtti is being created and the one that is popularly used is not similar to this. The purport is that kākātāliyam and ajākṛpāṇīyam are the words that are used in common parlance. The author of vyākaraṇa ought to analyze these śabdās. The words in prakriyāvākya or laukikavigrahavākya are construed through anvākhyāna (analysis). Therefore, such a vākya is created in accordance with anvākhyāna. The result is that vṛtti is being advocated on samāsa-prakṛti when the combination of the two coincidences, i.e. that of kākā-tāla and caitra-cora is ivārtha. Upamāna is kākātālasambandhaviśiṣṭa and upameya is vadha etc. Chapratyaya denotes upameya only. The prakṛti, kākātāla is chapratyayaviṣaya (tadviṣaya) eternally and therefore without chapratyaya the prakṛti would be rendered unfit for usage.

kriyāyām samavetāyām dravya śabdo'vatiṣṭhate|

prayogavākyam yallope tadevam na prayujyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 612)

yayoratarkitā prāptiḥ dṛśyate kākātālavat|

tayoḥ samāsaprakṛteḥ vṛttirabhyupagamyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa- 613)

kākasya tālena yathāvadho yasya tu dasyunā|

tatra citṛikṛte'nyasminnupameye cha iṣyate|| (vṛttisamuddeśa-614)

In the above verse (613) it is said that vṛtti is being advocated but in what sense?- kākā by tāla and devadatta by cora are killed in a fashion that is surprising and in another upameya, which is similar to that, the chapratyaya is instituted, i.e. The activities should be similar- coincidental.

4.7.39 Vigrahapūrvikā taddhitotpattiḥ:

Vigrahapūrvikā taddhitotpattiḥ says Patañjali under aṣaḍak-
ṣāsitaṅgvalamkarmālampuruṣādhyuttarapadātkhaḥ (5-4-7).

Every taddhitapratyaya has to be applied after exhibiting the vigraha. At the same time Patañjali clarifies that a nityapratyayānta does not have a vigraha. The observation is that Pāṇini leaves it to the commentators to decide as to which one is nityapratyaya. In spite of the fact that in certain cases he clearly mentions-
termum nityam (4-4-20). Bhāṣyakāra enumerates the nityapratyayas among taddhitas. Tamādayaḥ prākkanah- is a general statement-comments Nāgēśa. Patañjali also says that there is bahuvrīhi with asvapadavigraha- śobhanam mukham asyāḥ sumukhī iti. Dīkṣita in Kaumudī declares that-
avigraho'svapadavigraho vā nityasamāsaḥ.

4.7.40 Samāsāntāḥ (5-4-68):

Samāsāntapratyayas (there are some ādeśas also) are given the name taddhita- nastaddhite (6-4-144, ṭilopa), gorataddhitaluki (5-4-92, ṭacniṣedha), laśakvataddhite (1-3-8, itsamjñāniṣedha in kap etc.) etc. are the purposes.

Here the word anta means the last part and it is clearly stated in Mahābhāṣya under gostriyorupasarjanasya (1-2-48) and antaḥ (8-4-20). And the Mahābhāṣya under 1-2-48, i.e. tādathyāt tēcchabdyam, clearly indicates that the term samāsa in samāsāntāḥ refers to (alaukika) vigrahavākya (through lakṣaṇā). Nāgēśa under the same sūtra dwells at the cryptic meaning that is there in the words of Bhāṣyakāra and Kaiyaṭa. The conclusion is that simultaneously the

samāsāntapratyaya as well as the samāśasamjñā are to be applied at the stage of alaukikavigrahavākya itself.

4.7.41 Exceptions:

The samāsāntas can't be applied under certain conditions-

4.7.42 Na pūjanāt (5-4-69):

If the prātipadika is preceded by a śabda that denotes respect there cannot be a samāsānta- surājā, atirājā (ṭac does not apply- rājāhassakhibhyaḥ ṭac 5-4-91). This applies to su and ati only (svatibhyāmeva- vārtikam 3346)- paramarājāḥ, and before bahuvrīhau sakthyakṣṇoḥ svāṅgātṣac 5-4-113)- susakthaḥ, svakṣaḥ.

4.7.43 Kimaḥ kṣepe (5-4-70):

In the sense of cursing, a prātipadika on kim does not receive samāsānta- kimrājā, kimsakhā (no ṭac).

4.7.44 Nañstatpuruṣāt (5-4-71):

On nañtatpuruṣa no samāsānta- arājā, asakhā.

4.7.45 Patho vibhāṣā (5-4-72):

On the word panthāḥ in nañtatpuruṣa it is optional (a- pratyaya by ṛkpūrabdhūḥ pathāmānakṣe 5-4-74)- apatham- apanthāḥ.

There are eleven pratyayas:

4.7.45.1 Bahuvrīhau samkhyeye ḍajabahugaṇāt (5-4-73):

If the bahuvrīhi denotes a thing that refers to a number, on that ḍac applies- upadaśāḥ (around ten- i.e. nine or eleven).

4.7.45.2 ṛkpūrabdhūḥpathāmānakṣe (5-4-74):

A + ānakṣe. A- pratyaya on samāsa ending in ṛk etc. except dhū in the sense of load of an axle- ardharcaḥ, viṣṇupuram, vimalāpam, rājadhurā, ramyapathaḥ (deśaḥ).

4.7.45.3 Acpratyanyavapūrvāt sāmāloṃnaḥ (5-4-75):

Samāsas like pratisāma, anuloma etc. would get ac-pratyaya- pratisāmam, pratilomam, anulomam.

Further brahmavarcasam (brahmahastibhyām varcasah (5-4-78), śvaḥśreyasam (śvaso vaśīyah śreyasah (5-4-80), dvistāvā, tristāvā (dvistāva tristāvā vediḥ 5-4-84) etc. are also covered under ac .

4.7.45.4 Rājāhassakhibhyaḥ ṭac (5-4-91):

The tatpuruṣa ending in these words would get ṭac- paramarājam, uttamāhaḥ, kṛṣṇasakhaḥ, upaśaradam (avyayībhāve śaratprabhṛtibhyaḥ (5-4-uparājam, adhyātmam (anaśca 5-4-108) etc. are also covered.

4.7.45.5 Bahuvrīhau sakthyakṣṇoḥ svāṅgāt ṣac (5-4-113):

Where words śakthi and akṣi denote the limb of a body, the bahuvrīhi, ending in these words would get ṣac. The difference between ac and ṣac is that the latter effects anantodātta. Dīrghasakthaḥ, jalajākṣī are examples. Nīṣ is the purpose for śakāra (ṣidgaurādibhyaśca 4-1-41).

4.7.45.6 Dvtribhyām ṣa mūrdhnaḥ (5-4-115):

In Bahuvrīhi, mūrdhā preceded by dvi and tri would get ṣa- dvimūrdhaḥ, trimūrdhaḥ. If ṣac itself is applied here also then antodāttatva (by citaḥ 6-1-157) by cittva would affect totally the pūrvapadaprakṛtisvara (by dvtribhyām

pāddanmūrdhasu bahuvrīhau 6-2-196), which is optional when samāsānta is not applied- dvimurdhā. Rather in case of ṣa, since samāsāntāḥ (5-4-68) is anitya (not compulsory- contrast with patañjali under aṣadakṣa 5-4-7, samāsāntas are, nityapratyayas) when the samāsānta is applied then also there will be two svaras- antodāttatva pūrvapadaprakṛtisvara (ādyudāttatva). Nāgeśa asserts that the ṣa- pratyaya (apart from ṣac) is the sign (jñāpaka) in ruling that samāsāntavidhi is anitya (not compulsory).

4.7.45.7 Appūraṇīpramāṇyoḥ (5-4-116):

A śabda in feminine gender, ending in pūraṇapratyaya and the one ending with pramāṇī would get ap in bahuvrīhi- kalyāṇīpañcamāḥ (rātrayaḥ), strīpramāṇaḥ.

4.7.45.8 Nityamasic prajāmedhayoḥ (5-4-122):

Asic would come (in bahuvrīhi) on prajā and medhā- preceded by nañ, duḥ and su- aprajāḥ / amedhāḥ, suprajāḥ / sumedhāḥ.

4.7.45.9 Dharmādanic kevalāt (5-4-124):

In bahuvrīhi dharmāśabda, if preceded by only one pūrvapada, would get anic- kalyāṇadharmā.

4.7.45.10 Ic karmavyatihāre (5-4-127):

A bahuvrīhi which denotes a duel would get ic- keśākeśi, muṣṭāmuṣṭi, musalāmusali.

4.7.45.11 Uraḥ prabhṛtibhyaḥ kap (5-4-151):

Bahuvrīhi, ending in uras, sarpiḥ, pumān etc. (singular number only) would get kap vyūḍhoraskaḥ, priyasarpīṣkaḥ etc. In dvivacana bahuvacana

optional kap by śeṣādvibhāṣā (5-4-154)- dvipumān/dvipumskah etc. Arthānnañah (gaṇasūtram 149)- anarthakam, otherwise apārtham / apārthakam.

There are certain nipātas and ādeśas among samāsāntas :-

Acatuṛa, naktamdiva, niśśreyasa, vṛddhokṣa (5-4-77), bahuprajāḥ (5-4-123), suhṛt, durhṛt (5-4-150), niṣpravāṇiḥ (5-4-160) etc. are nipātas with or without samāsānta.

Sarvāhṇaḥ (ahan replaced by ahṇa 5-4-88), yuvajāṇiḥ (jāyāyā niḥ 5-4-134), sudan/sudatī (vayasi dantasya datṛ 5-4-141) etc. are ādeśas included in samāsāntas.

4.8 Sanādyantadhātuvṛttiḥ:

San etc. are twelve pratyayas called sanādi. Sanādyantas are given the name dhātu by sanādyantā dhātavaḥ (3-1-32) so that kṛts as well as tiṅs can be added for required śabdas. Since sanādi pratyayas are not read under the adhikāra-dhātoḥ (3-1-91) they cannot be called kṛts. And for the same reason they do not get the samjñā- ārdhadhātuka by ārdhadhātukam śeṣaḥ (3-4-114) and as a result iḍāgama by ārdhadhātukasyeḍvalādeḥ (7-2-35) and guṇa by sārva dhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ (7-3-84) won't apply.

4.8.1 Ekārthībhāva:

Patañjali discussed this aspect under dhātoḥ samānakartṛkādicchāyām vā (3-1-7) and supa ātmanaḥ kyac (3-1-8)- kyac-pratyaya does not come in cases like- mahāntam putram icchati (putram icchati-putrīyati is the example) due to asāmarthya and asāmarthya is due to sāpekṣatva, i.e. the word putram, which is involved, is tied with a viśeṣaṇa (qualifier)- mahāntam and hence became

sāpekṣa. Following Kātyāyana, Patañjali remarks that the term vā in 3-1-7 is not required/useful as san is a nityapratyaya.

4.8.2 Vṛttipakṣa and Avṛttipakṣa:

Here (in sanādyantadhātuprakriyā) there are two sides- vṛttipakṣa and avṛttipakṣa. It is natural that both vākya and pratyaya would be there (in common parlance). In such a situation when there is the nityapratyaya (no vākya) then what else than samjñā can be targeted? And optionality to pratyayasamjñā is not desirable. Therefore vā is not useful. Under supa ātmanaḥ kyac (3-1-8) Patañjali discusses the strange situation wherein one has to conclude that sāpekṣatve na vṛttiḥ but make an exception that sāpekṣatve'pi gamakatve vṛttiḥ (i.e. repetition of what was said under samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ, 2-1-1, no samāsa in the case of mahat kaṣṭam śṛitaḥ, but it is there in the case of devadattasya gurukulam)-sanādyantadhātuvṛtti does not apply (here it is kyac) in the case of mahāntam putram icchati due to sāpekṣatva but even if it is sāpekṣa, kyac will come on muṇḍayati māṇavakam due to gamakatva (here it is ṇic by muṇḍamiśra , 3-1-20). Therefore, it is clear that the adhikāra-samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-1-1) applies in this vṛtti as well.

The peculiarity of sanādi is that some of these pratyayas apply on dhātus whereas others on prātipadikas but both of them ultimately become dhātus and thus become eligible to receive both kṛts and tiṅs. While tiṅantas are used directly, the kṛdantas, following kṛtaddhitasamāsāśca (1-2-46) get sups and endup as subantas.

4.8.3 Guptijkidbhyaḥ san (3-1-5):

Gup-tij-kit- these dhātus get san-pratyaya. In what sense? As per the paribhāṣā- anirdiṣṭārthāḥ pratyayāḥ svārthe bhavanti- it should be svārtha, i.e.

prakṛtyartha (or as remarked by kaiyaṭa and nāgeśa under pratyayaḥ, 3-1-1, svārtha is a kalpanā and it means meaninglessness/artharāhitya). It seems there is deep controversy in this aspect- Patañjali under-supi sthaḥ, 3-2-4, tumarthe sesen ..., 3-4-9, kartari kṛt, 3-4-67 etc. quotes the above paribhāṣā and mentions-guptijkidbhyaḥ san and yāvādibhyaḥ kan (5-4-29) as examples.

Kāśikāvṛtti quotes a vārtika (it is not there in mahābhāṣya)-nindākṣamāvyādhipratīkāreṣu sanīṣyate, which means san would come in blaming, patience and remedy for a disease respectively. Jinendrabuddhi goes one step further and remarks that a sannantagup-dhātu, i.e. jugupsate, does not denote the meaning of gup (hiding) and following anvaya and vyatireka, i.e. when there is san then the meaning (blaming) is expressed and not in its absence, it is decided that this is the meaning of san.

Bhāṭtojjidikṣita mentioned the vārtika in three pieces. Nāgeśa in Udyota held that in light of the usages it may be explained that san would come on dhātus having specific meaning.

Pāṇini used sannantakit-dhātu in kṣetiriyac parakṣetre cikitsyaḥ (5-2-92). Vicikitsā tu samśayaḥ is Amarakośa. Gup gopane and kita niketane- are usages.

It seems that Pāṇini at times does not go into the semantic part- asti nāsti diṣṭam matiḥ (4-4-60). Āstika and nāstika are popular in the sense of believer in another world and non-believer in another world respectively. Jugupsā, cikitsā etc. are popular in some sense and it is needless to mention the sense in such cases.

Namovarivaścitraṇaḥ kyac, (3-1-19), it is another sanādi where Pāṇini does not mention the meaning and Patañjali says that ācārya surprises- at some places he mentions the meanings and at some other places he does not. Samāsāntas can also be an example. Under 3-1-21, (dhātorekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yañ) Kātyāyana remarks- kriyāviśeṣe svārthe yañ, i.e. yañ-pratyaya is instituted in a specific meaning which is svārtha. This remark insinuates that Kātyāyana (and patañjali) considers even the specific meaning kriyāsamabhihāra as the meaning of dhātu (prakṛti) itself and therefore it is svārtha.

Apparently, Nāgēśa is trying to defend Patañjali. Haradatta of Padamañjari seems to have given the clue to Nāgēśa.

But in examples like jugupsīṣate and mīmāmsīṣate, where there are two sannantas one has to accept that the first san is in svārtha as otherwise it goes against the norm- sannantānna saniṣyate (3-1-7 patañjali), i.e. no san on san (in the same sense).

Since dhātus have got several meanings (dhātūnām anekārthatvāt) Patañjali must have thought that the popular meaning of the dhātu in relation to the pratyaya (san-jugupsā, ṇic-gopāyati) will be taken and it may not be wise to mention the sense in cases like- cikitsā and viciktsā by reason of brevity. It is in this context that one should recall the statement of Patañjali under samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ 2-1-1 (nahyarthā ādiśyante) and this is śabdānuśāsanam and not arthānuśāsanam.

Dvitva by sanyañoḥ (6-1-9) and ātmanepada by pūrvavatsanaḥ (1-3-62)- jugupsate, jugupsāmcakre, titikṣate, cikitsati, cikitsāmcakāra- in the sense of

nivāsa (dwelling) ketayati and guptijmān-dhātus are, according to Patañjali, anudāttets (anudāttanīta ātmanepadam, 1-3-12).

Since jugupsa is a dhātu akārapratyaya by a pratyayāt (3-3-102) in strīlinga is added- jugupsā.

4.8.4 Dhātoḥ karmaṇaḥ samānakartṛkādicchāyām vā (3-1-7):

Sanpratyaya on dhātus so that ārdhadhātukatva and iḍāgama would follow.

A dhātu, which has got iṣi as karma and having the same kartā as iṣi, would receive sanpratyaya optionally in icchā (desire). So there will be both vṛtti and vākya- caitraḥ paṭhitum icchati / pipāṭhiṣati. Here caitra is kartā in both icchā and paṭhana and hence paṭh is samānakartṛka. If guru desires that pupils should study then there won't be san- śiṣyaḥ paṭhantu iti icchati guruḥ (vākya only).

Kṛt is added- sanāśamsabhikṣa uḥ (3-2-168)-pipāṭhiṣuḥ, jīgamiṣuḥ, cikīrṣuḥ etc. are subantas. Patañjali raises a question- what about having a san on sannanta- cikīrṣitum icchati, jīhīrṣitum icchati?-

śaiṣikānmatubarthīyāt śaiṣiko matubarthikaḥ

sarūpaḥ pratyayo neṣṭaḥ sannantānna saniṣyate

4.8.5 Śaiṣikāt śaiṣikaḥ:

Śālāyām bhavaḥ- śālīyaḥ-cha, śāliye bhavaḥ-vākya only, there cannot be another cha. Sarūpapratyaya only is restricted, virūpapratyaya will come- ahiccatre bhavaḥ- aṇ-āhicchatraḥ, āhicchatre bhavaḥ- cha- āhicchatrīyaḥ.

4.8.6 Matvarthāt:

Dhanam asya asti- matup- dhanavān, dhanavān asya asti- no another matup, but there can be a virūpa- daṇḍaḥ asya asti- ini- daṇḍī, daṇḍinaḥ asyām santi daṇḍimatī śālā (matup).

Sarūpa means similiarity in meaning. Therefore, there can be an icchāsan on svārthika san-jugupsiṣate, mīmāmsiṣate.

Kātyāyana adds a vārtika- āśamsāyām san vaktavyaḥ- śvā mumūrṣati (the dog wants to die), kūlam pipatiṣati (the bank wants to fall by itself).

4.8.7 Supa ātmanaḥ kyac (3-1-8):

Karmanaḥ, icchāyām, vā- follow. If one wants for himself then kyac will come on subanta. Sup will disappear following supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ (2-4-71). Caitra wants a son for himself- caitraḥ putram ātmanaḥ icchati- putrīyati. If caitra wants a son to the king then there won't be vṛtti but vākya only- caitraḥ, rājñāḥ putram icchati. Mahāputramicchati-mahāputrīyati, but mahāntam putram icchati- vākya only as the meaning expressed by vākya can never be expressed by vṛtti if effected. The aspect is already explained earlier. The dhātus formed on subantas are called nāmadhātus. The ikāra is by kyaci ca (7-4-33). Kātyāyana imposes restriction on māntāvyayas- kyaci māntāvyayapraṭiṣedhaḥ- idam icchati, kim icchati, uccairicchati, nīcairicchati (māntaprakṛtikasubanta and avyaya are meant).

4.8.8 Aśanāyodanyadhanāyā bubhuḥṣāpipāsāgardheṣu (7-4-34):

Three kyajantas are nipātas- aśanāyati, udanyati, dhanāyati in the sense of- desire to eat, desire to drink and desire respectively.

4.8.9 Kāmyacca (3-1-9):

In the sense of 3-1-8 kāmīyac- putram ātmanah icchati- putrakāmyati. A pratyayāt (3-3-102) - putrakāmyā.

4.8.10 Upamānādācāre (3-1-10):

Ācāra is treatment, upon a subanta which is upamāna and karma- kyac will come- putramivācarati putrīyati chātram (the teacher treats the disciple on a par with his son). Adhikaraṇācceti vaktavyam (vārtikam)- kuṭīyati prāsāde, prāsādīyati kuṭyām- a sannyāsī treats a palace as a hut and vice versa.

4.8.11 Kartuḥ kyañ salopaśca (3-1-11):

A subanta, which is upamāna and kartā, will optionally get kyañ in ācārārtha and salopa also optionally. Kātyāyana adds two significant vārtikas- salopo vā, ojasopsarasornityam- kṛṣṇa ivācarati kṛṣṇāyate, oḷāyate, apsarāyate, yaśāyate/yaśasyate. Kātyāyana amends- sarvaprātipadikebhyaḥ ācāre kvibvā vaktavyaḥ. Therefore kvip (this kvip is different from the one that is kṛt) can be added on any prātipadika. Kaiyaṭa explains the idea behind the assertion- prātipadika (and not subanta)- so that there will not be padatva and ato guṇe (6-1-97). Kvip is a sarvalopipratyaya, i.e. nothing remains to show that such a word is kvibanta. But here in sanādis a kvibanta would become dhātu and there will be tiñantas (in kṛdantas also kvip would disappear and a kṛdanta would become prātipadika to receive sups-kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca, 1-2-46)- he looks like kṛṣṇa- kṛṣṇati, malā iva ācarati mālāti.

4.8.12 Lohitādiḍājibhyaḥ kyaḥ (3-1-13):

On lohitādis and ḍājantas kyaḥ will come in the sense of bhavati. Here acveḥ comes from earlier sūtra and becomes a qualifier of lohitādi and not ḍāj as it does not exist. Alohitāḥ lohitāḥ bhavati (a non-reddish thing becomes reddish)-

lohitāyati/lohitāyate. Paṭapaṭāyati/paṭapaṭāyate- vā kyaṣaḥ (1-3-90)- optionally parasmaipada.

4.8.13 Kaṣṭāya kramaṇe (3-1-14):

Kyaṇ on kaṣṭāya in the sense of interested- kaṣṭāya kramate kaṣṭāyate. It means that one is interested in committing sin (here kaṣṭa means sin).

4.8.14 Sukhādibhyaḥ kartṛvedanāyām (3-1-18):

Sukha etc. which are karmas will get kyaṇ if the person who feels only is the subject of sukha etc.- sukhām vedayate sukhāyate.

4.8.15 Namovarivaścitraṇaḥ kyac (3-1-19):

While Kātyāyana insists that the meaning should be mentioned, Patañjali remarks that ācārya surprisingly mentions the meanings at some places and does not mention at some other places but for the sake of non-scholars the meaning should be mentioned. He concludes that since karaṇe from śabdavairakalahābhakraṇvameghebhyaḥ karaṇe (3-1-17) follows and as it means karoti which is kriyāsāmānya it need not be (insisted that the meaning should be) mentioned. Rather, Patañjali gives the /meanings for the dhātus in this sūtra and the following one, i.e. pucchabhāṇḍacīvarāṇṇiṇ (3-1-20)- namasyati devān (saluting), varivasyati gurūn (serving), citṛīyate (surprising), utpucchayate, vipucchayate, paripucchayate, the animal is shaking the tail (upwards, at random, around), sambhāṇḍayate (collecting), sameīvarayate (earning or putting on).

Namasyā, varivasyā are nouns by a pratyayāt (3-3-102)- pūjā namasyāpacitiḥ saparyārcārhaṇāssamāḥ, varivasyā tu śuśrūṣā paricaryāpyupāsana- Amarakośa.

4.8.16

Muṇḍamiśraślakṣṇalavaṇavratavastrahalakalakṛtatūstebhyo ṇic

(3-1-21):

Karaṇe from 3-1-17 follows. Muṇḍa etc. will get ṇic-pratyaya in the sense of karoti. As has already been explained under- supa ātmanah kyac (3-1-8) there will be vṛtti even in sāpekṣatva-muṇḍam karoti māṇavakam muṇḍayati (he is getting the boy, i.e. boy's head, clean-shaven). Kaiyaṭa remarks that while the curādigaṇasūtra- prātipadikāddhātvarthe bahulam iṣṭhavacca is there this sūtra is an elaboration or it is for vṛtti in sāpekṣatva.

There are ten categories of dhātus and curādi is also a gaṇa (group). Pāṇini instituted ṇic on these dhātus in order to get dhātutva through sanādi.

4.8.17 Satyāpapāśarūpavīṇātūlaślokaśenāloamatvacavarmava

rṇacūrṇacurādibhyo ṇic (3-1-25):

Satyam karoti satyāpayati (he is pledging that this is true), corayati/corayate. While all the twelve roots get ṇic in the sense of tatkaroti tadācaṣṭe (doing/saying), the curādīs get it in svārtha.

4.8.18 Hetumati ca (3-1-26):

preṣaṇādhyeṣaṇe kurvamstatsamarthāni cācaran|

kartaiva vihitam śāstre hetusamjñām prapadyate|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-125)

Here the term hetu is technical, i.e. the one who/which employs / urges / makes it convenient. Tatprayojako hetuśca (1-4-55) is the definition. The ṇic by this sūtra upon a dhātu expresses the activity or behaviour (vyāpāra or pravartanā). And ṇic is applicable only when prayojya (employer) and prayojaka (employee)

are interacting and the function by the latter takes place. Devadattaḥ yajñadattena pācayati (devadatta arranged cooking by yajñadatta or devadatta making cooking by yajñadatta)- this is for preṣaṇā. When the śiṣya (disciple) requests the guru (teacher)- pāṭhaya (teach me), it is adhyeṣaṇā.

anantaram phalam yasyāḥ kalpate tām kriyām viduḥ|

pradhānabhūtam tādarthyaḍanyāsām tu tadākhyatā|| (kriyāsamuddeśa-15)

Tatsamarthācarana needs elaboration- in the above examples for preṣaṇā and adhyeṣaṇā there are two kartas, prayojyakartā (who employs/ requests) and prayojakakartā (who acts). The activity of the former is dhātvartha and that of the latter is ṇijartha. Dhātvartha is the qualifier of ṇijartha, i.e. dhātvartha is unimportant and ṇijartha is important. While things stand thus there are usages like- bhikṣā vāsayate, kārīṣo'gniradhyāpayati, where no living person is there to cause preṣaṇā and adhyeṣaṇā (both the activities can be performed by a living thing only). Alms (or support) are making the mendicant stay put- is the answer to the question- why is he staying in the village?

Similarly, the fire of dry dung (dung is dried and used as firewood) is making him study- is the answer to the question- how is the student continuing the study in such a cold weather. Kātyāyana raised an issue- here hetu should be taken as nimitta (cause), i.e. not the technical one by tatprayojako hetuśca (1-4-55) in order to cover examples like the above. Patañjali explicates the idea behind the statement- Kātyāyana thinks that preṣaṇa and adhyeṣaṇa are possible only to beings and bhikṣā is a non-being. Then he offers the solution- it won't be amiss, a person who offers- you can stay here-only need not be considered as providing for the stay; rather the person who keeps mum but arranges (samarthācarana) for the

stay is also to be considered as a provider. Even available alms (bhikṣas) which are abundant and coupled with mouth-watering sauces also facilitate the stay (of the student). Similarly, the fire of dry-dung well-lit at a windless and secluded place facilitates the study.

In fact, there are a number of vārtikas offered by Kātyāyana for analysing and certifying certain examples but Patañjali brushed aside all of them as Pāṇini's sūtra will suffice to cover all the usages under three headings- preṣaṇa, adhyeṣaṇa and tatsamarthācaraṇa- pathikaḥ māhiṣmatyām sūryamudgamayati (the wayfarer raises sun in the city of māhiṣmatī, i.e. he would arrive in the city by sunrise), kamsam ghātayati (the story teller is making kamsa's killing, i.e. the act or activity is being enacted and treated as if it is happening now, this sentence is offered as an answer when people who are late to the drama enquire) etc. are analysed by the sūtra itself.

śabdopahitarūpāmśca buddherviṣayatām gatān|

pratyakṣamiva kamsādīn sādhanvena manyate|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-5)

Patañjali analyses the aspect of independence in case of prayojaka (employee) in light of the observations made by Kātyāyana (i.e. since a person who employs only can have independence and not the one who is employed and thus the employee cannot be called hetu as he is not svatantra / independent- svatantraḥ kartā, tatprayojako hetuśca, 1-4-54, 55)- nobody in the world is behaving out of kindness towards others, rather all the people are trying for their selfish ends. The disciples are serving the guru in order to attain pāralaukika (good result in the other world) and for teaching by guru. The workers are also working with a view of getting the daily payment, oil etc. and also not to get reprimanded. The experts also are doing things for their own good- we will get salary and friends as well. Therefore, there is kartṛtva in prayojaka.

nimittebhyah pravartante sarva eva svabhūtaye|

abhiprāyānurodho'pi svārthasyaiva prasiddhaye|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-124)

4.8.19 Dhātorekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yañ (3-1-22):

Recurrence and abundance are referred to by the term kriyāsamabhihāra. Yañ-pratyaya would come on a halādi dhātu having a single ac suggesting (dyotyā) and not expressing (vācyā) kriyāsamabhihāra. Abhyāsa will get guṇa by guṇo yañlukoh (7-4-82) and ātmanepadam by anudātta nīta ātmanepadam (1-3-12). As it was in the case of sannantas the dhātu will get dvitva (reduplication) by sanyañoh (6-1-9)- pāpacyate caitraḥ (caitra is cooking time? and again or plenty). Sosūcyate (sūca paśūnye- to vilify) etc.

Ekārthībhāva has to be imposed in the prakṛti- pratyaya combination as this is a padavidhi. Since the meaning to be expressed, i.e. kriyāsamabhihāra cannot be conveyed through a vākya, yañ-pratyaya is nitya, rather ekārthībhāva is nitya. This is suggested by Kātyāyana under 3-1-23, i.e. nityam kauṭīlye gatau- since the specific meaning is not conveyed by vighraha the term nityam (it runs into 3-1-24 as anuvṛtti) is not required. Hari compares this with nityam in nityam krīḍājīvikayoḥ (2-2-17). Rather since vā follows from dhātoḥ. samānakartṛkādicchāyām vā (3-1-7), yañ will be optional- there will be loṭ by kriyāsamabhihāre dve bhavataḥ (vārtika under 8-1-12)- sa bhavān lunīhilunīhi tyevāyam lunāti, punīhi punīhītyevāyam punāti. Kaiyaṭa while commenting on the above vārtika says that since in the case of loṭ only is this dvitva applicable (significant is the fact that the context as to whether dvitva will be there in loṭ or yañ- is not mentioned in the vārtika) and not in yañ as loṭ (even in samuccaya, dvitva is instituted by samuccaye sāmānyavacanasya 3-4-5) does not have the sāmārthya (capacity) to express samabhihāra, rather yañ does not need dvitva

as it per se denotes (dyotana) kriyāsamabhihāra. The word dhātoḥ in sūtra is for ārdhadhātukatva and the ākāra in yañ is for ātmanepada.

kṛīḍāyām jīvikāyām ca vākyenā'vacanāttathā|

na nityagrahaṇam yuktam kauṭīlye yañvidhau yathā||(vṛttisamuddeśa-40)

Nyāsakāra, Jinendrabuddhi, explains that kriyā will be two-fold-pradhānā and apradhānā. The softening of raw rice is the former whereas putting the pot on hearth etc. is the latter. If the cook completes cooking and again starts the same activity it is paunaḥpunyam (recurrence) and if he is involved only in apradhānakriyas completely then it is bhṛśārthatā (abundance) jājvalyate, dedīpyate- guṇa by guṇo yañlukoh (7-4-82). Dedīpyamāna, jājvalyamāna etc. by adding śānac-pratyaya. Yañantas and yañlugantas are rarely used and a person with the knowledge of these paradigms is considered highly.

4.8.20 Kaṇḍvādibhyo yak (3-1-27):

Kaṇḍvādis are both dhātus and prātipadikas. Here since there won't be any use by yak and the kittva therein it is decided that dhātus are to be taken and not prātipadikas. From dhātorekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yañ (3-1-22) the word dhātoḥ follows. How to decide that there are kaṇḍvādiprātipadikas? Kaṇḍūñ, hṛññ, mahñ etc. are pronounced by Pāṇini as dīrghāntas. If they are dhātus then only will they get dīrgha by akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ dīrghaḥ (7-4-25) in case yak is applied. The yak-pratyaya is nitya since vā is read in the next sūtra and in case this pratyaya is optional, vā comes as anuvṛtti from earlier sūtra and goes further. Since the sense is not mentioned in the sūtra yak comes in svārtha. Kaṇḍūyati/kaṇḍūyate (it is itching), kaṇḍūḥ (itch). Hṛñīyate, mahīyate, sukhīyati, duḥkhyati (ato lopaḥ, 6-4-48), asūyati / asūyate, asūyā (a pratyayāt, 3-3-102).

4.8.21 Gupūdhūpavicchīpanīpanibhya āyaḥ (3-1-28):

Dhātoḥ from dhātorekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yañ (3-1-22) follows. The result is ārdhadhātukatva and guṇa by pugantalaghūpadhasya ca (7-3-86). Since no sense is mentioned in the sūtra, āya-pratyaya is in svārtha- gopāyati. Pāṇini by another sūtra, i.e. āyādaya ārdhadātuke vā (3-1-31) made āyādi (āya, īyañ and ñiñ) optional in ārdhadhātukavivakṣā. Ām will be added (kāspratyayādāmamantre liṭi, 3-1-35) in case āya is applied (in liṭ), ato lopah (6-4-48 under ārdhadhātuke, 6-4-46)- gopāyāmcaḥ /gopāyāmbabhūva /gopāyāmāsa. In case āya is not applied it will be jugopa. Dhūpāyati, dhūpāyāmcaḥ/ dudhūpa.

4.8.22 Rterīyañ (3-1-29):

Rti is a sutradhātu, i.e. is not there in dhātupāṭha. It is in svārtha apparently. This sūtra has got its own significance as instead of making it rteschañ and getting īyādeśa by āyaneyīñīyaḥ phadḥhachaghām pratyayādīnām (7-1-2) Pāṇini made it īyañ to suggest that āyan etc. won't apply to dhātupratyayas. This results in the conclusion that Pāṇini does not believe in vyutpattipakṣa (i.e. prātipadikas are formed by adding pratyayas like uñādi on dhātus) like his predecessor Śākaṭāyana and nairuktas, rather he supports avyutpattipakṣa. Īyasun in dvivacanavibhajyopapade tarabīyasunau (5-3-57) is not replaced by chasun, but this cannot be taken as a proof on a par with īyañ as in that case āyan etc. will have no place at all- asserts Nāgēśa in Udyota. The dhātu, according to some, is used in the sense of jugupsā (hate) and others kṛpā (mercy) also. Prakriyā is like in case of āya- ṛtīyate, ṛtīyāmcaḥ.

4.8.23 Kameṛṇiṁ (3-1-30):

Ṇiṁ-pratyaya on kamidhātu in svārtha. Prakriyā as in the case of āya and īyaṁ- kāmāyate caitraḥ (caitra desires), ceto nalam kāmāyate madīyam (says damayanti in naiṣadhīyacarita of śrīharṣa- my mind desires nala), Kāmāyāmcakre (ṇi has got ayādeśa by ayāmantālvayyetnviṣṇuṣu, 6-4-55) /cakame. By adding śānac- kāmāyamāna-kanye kāmāyamānam mām na tvam kāmāyase katham?- Daṇḍī in Kāvyaḍarśa (o! virgin I love you how come you do not reciprocate?).

Among the twelve sanādipratyayas eleven are said by Pāṇini and ācārakvip is said by Kātyāyana.

The major source of this chapter is ‘Four vṛttis in Pāṇini’.

In modern linguistics (source: PGDCAIL material, University of Hyderabad), a proto typical compound is defined as a word made up of at least two bases, often identical to their phrasal counterparts. Compounds are syntactic atoms like other words.

Accent sub-ordination, lexical integrity are the characteristics of a compound.

Compound words, however, are considered to be both similar to and different from simple words and phrases in the sense that compounds have an internal structure but it is invisible to syntax.

Endo-centric (sub-ordinative): There exists a discernible head; usually the compound has the properties of its head. The generic sense of the head is often reduced to specific one (hyponymic). Ex: Cage-bird.

Exo-centric (co-ordinative): there is no discernible head often constituents retain their status. Less transparent. Sub-varieties include bahuvrīhi (non-hyponymic). Ex: Lazybone, loudmouth, redskin.

5 THE FIVE MEANINGS OF A WORD

Under the Pāṇinisūtra “kutsite (5-3-74)”, Patañjali discusses the concept of ‘pañcakam prātipadikārthaḥ’ i.e. a prātipadika expresses five meanings;

- 1) Svārthaḥ (jāti)
- 2) Dravyam (vyakti)
- 3) Liṅgam (gender)
- 4) Vacanam (samkhyā)
- 5) Kārakam (case)

5.1 Svārthaḥ / jāti (class):

The svārtha can be of many types i.e. jāti (class), guṇa (property), kriyā, sambandha, svarūpa, the following one are the examples respectively-

Gauḥ (cow), śukla (white), pācakaḥ (cook), rājapuruṣaḥ (king’s servant), and dīthaḥ (name of a person). Example for dravyam is gauḥ, it may be noted that the jāti and dravya (vyakti) are inseparable and depending on the context either has to be taken as important and the other as unimportant. The aspect of inseparability is expressed by Patañjali by the term ‘nāntarīyaka’. Under the Pāṇinisūtra ‘bhāve (3-3-18)’ also Patañjali says that there is nāntarīyakata between jāti and dravya (or vyakti).

Under the Pāṇini sūtra ‘samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ (2-1-1)’, Patañjali discusses the importance of jāti and vyakti.

5.1.1 Nyāya:

The nyāyasūtra “jātyākṛtivyaktayastu padārthāḥ (2-2-67)” says that a noun expresses one of the three meanings i.e. jāti (class), ākṛti (form), and vyakti (individual). In the sentence “gaurna hantavyā” a cow should not be killed. Here

the word gauḥ means jāti i.e. all the cow individuals on the earth and not a govyakti (a single cow).

The example for ākṛti is mṛṇmayī gauḥ (the cow made of clay) here the ākṛti (form) of the cow only is known.

In the sentence ‘gāmānaya’ (fetch a cow), the word gām means a govyakti (a single cow) rather than jāti (all the cows on the earth).

As the time passed, systemists of Indian philosophy had concluded that, since ākṛti can be included in jāti, there can be only two meanings- jāti and vyakti.

“jātimevākṛtim prāhurvyaktirākriyate yayā”

(kumārilabhaṭṭa in śloka-vārtika- ākritivāda-3 says that the jāti itself that has got so many vyaktis as its resort is called ākṛti).

Patañjali at the outset of Mahābhāṣya (in paspaśā) employed the word ākṛti in the sense of jāti also.

5.1.2 Mīmāṃsa:

Mīmāṃsakas hold that jāti is expressed by the word ‘paśunā’ in the sentence ‘paśunā yajeta’ but since it is not possible to have jāti in a concrete form, the inseparable vyakti is taken up for the sacrifices, some other systemists accept vyakti as the primary meaning, jāti as the secondary meaning.

Patañjali in paspaśā takes up the question of whether Pāṇini followed the jātivāda or the vyaktivāda and answers that both are taken up in the construction of Aṣṭādhyāyī as the following sūtras vouch-

“jātyākhyāyām ekasmin bahuvacanam anyatarasyāyām (1-2-58)”

5.1.3 Bhartṛhari:

On the other hand, Bhartṛhari in jātisamuddeśa & dravyasamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa widely discusses the concept of jāti and dravya and here are some important aspects-

At the beginning of jātisamuddeśa, Hari says that the words are separated from sentences just like prakṛti, pratyaya etc., are divided from a pada.

Hari was referring to Pāṇini, when he said words are divided into two, i.e. the sūtra- “suptiñantam padam” (1-4-14). Nipātas qualify the meaning of nāma and therefore are included in subantas. Whereas upasargas like pra, para, apa, etc. and karmapravacanīyas qualify the verb and therefore they are included in tiñantas.

Some people argue that the nipātas and upasargas no doubt qualify the nāma and ākhyāta respectively and simply for this reason one can't include them in subanta and tiñanta therefore it is proper to say that words are of four types- nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga and nipāta. Rather, they also hold that karmapravacanīyas are connected with ākhyāta in one way or the other; they need not be considered as separately.

Still some others opine that the four-fold division of words, nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga, nipāta, no doubt stands as it is but the karmapravacanīyas can't directly qualify the ākhyāta and therefore instead of including them in ākhyātas, better be considered as the fifth category.

dvidhā kaiścit padam bhinnam caturdhā pañcadhāpi vā|

apoddhṛtyaiva vākyebhyaḥ prakṛtipratyayādivat|| (jātisamuddeśa- 1)

Vyāḍi, an ācārya said that all the śabdās express dravya only whereas Vajapyāyana, another ācārya felt that all the śabdās express jāti only.

Rather, Pāṇini followed the siddhānta (theory) that a śabda expresses both jāti as well as dravya and he constructed Aṣṭādhyāyī on these lines- (mahābhāṣyam- paspaśā).

Further, Hari summarizes jāti, vyaktivada in the following verse-

padārthānāmapoddhāre jātirvā dravyameva vā|

padārthau sarvaśabdānām nityāvevopavarṇitau|| (jātisamuddeśa- 2)

After apoddhāra (artificial separation) of padārthas from a vākyārtha, it is described that either jāti or dravya or both will be the meaning of all śabdās.

Vājapyāyana felt that jāti would be the meaning of all the śabdās. As has already been mentioned the gamut of śabdās can be put under four headings jāti, guṇa, kriyā, and samjñā. Here according to Vājapyāyana, words like ghaṭa, paṭa, denote the jāti i.e. ghaṭatva and paṭatva, śukla etc. express jāti like śuklatva that is there in kriyā such as pāka and samjñas like ḍittha etc. denote the jāti like ḍithatva, it may be noted that the jāti requires a resort i.e. dravya but dravya per se is not denoted.

Contrary to this, Vyāḍi a renowned scholar strongly felt that all the śabdās denote dravya only. Here dravya means ‘nirguṇādvayabrahma’, rather, things like ghaṭa and paṭa. Hari discusses both these dravyas in dravyasamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa.

On the other hand, the system of Pāṇini accepts that both jāti and dravya can be denoted by a śabda and the relation between both of them is viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāva or the relation of qualifier and qualified. Kātyāyana and Patañjali described both jāti and dravya as immutable-

“siddhe śabdārthasambandhe lokato'rthaprayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharma niyamaḥ”

It may be noted that all the systems and schools of Indian philosophy, except vedānta had conceded the immutability (nityatva) of jāti.

Upaniṣads preach that in case brahman is considered as dravya it will be nitya. If vyakti is considered as dravya then vyaktis would have nityata following pravāhanityata (the immutability of a stream). These aspects are widely discussed in the introductory part of Mahābhāṣya- paspaśā by Kātyāyana and Patañjali.

When all the upādhis are considered as the forms of parabrahma, how come there is difference of jāti and vyakti-
Hari responds to this question-

satyāsatyau tu yau bhāgau pratibhāvam vyavasthitau|

satyam yattatra sā jātirasatyā vyaktayaḥ smṛtāḥ|| (jātisamuddeśa- 32)

In every ‘thing’ there are two parts, the real and unreal. Between the two, the real part is jāti and the unreal part is vyakti.

Hari suggests that unless and until the advaitasiddhānta is digested the concept of satya and asatya or jāti and vyakti can't be understood.

Different kinds of ornaments are made out of gold. The ornaments may lose their form, as they are vyaktis that are unreal. Whereas the gold per se i.e. jāti, which is real doesn't undergo any change or decay.

Further Hari elaborates the concepts of jāti in connection with vyākaraṇa-

sambandhibhedāt sattaiva bhidyamānā gavādiṣu|

jātirityucyate tasyām sarve śabdāvyavasthitāḥ|| (jātisamuddeśa- 33)

According to advaitasiddhānta the real thing is jāti and the same is called mahāsattā. It is in the form of Parabrahman and the same transforms into gotva, ghaṭatva, paṭatva etc. following this only the transaction takes place. The same mahāsattā, depending on the difference in the resort, differs and called jāti, such as gotva, ghaṭatva etc. All the śabdās express the jāti positively.

Hari further clarifies the concept by the following verse-

tām prātipadikārtham ca dhātvartham ca pracakṣate|

sā nityā sā mahānātmā tāmāhustvatalādayaḥ|| (jātisamuddeśa- 34).

Pāṇini compiled the following sūtra for prātipadika and dhātu, in line with his two-fold division of padam i.e. subanta and tiṇanta (“suptiṇantam padam” (1-4-14)).

arthavadadhāturapratyaḥ prātipadikam (1-2-45),

kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca (1-2-46), dhātoḥ (3-1-91).

Prātipadikam is the root of subantas or nouns. Whereas dhātu is the root of kriyā or tiṇanta. Hari asserts that the meaning of prātipadika and dhātu is

described by scholars as sattā or jāti, the same is nityā (immutable) and the same is called mahān and the same is ātmā- this is expressed by suffixes like-tva,-tal etc.

Scholars say “prātipadikārthaḥ sattā” which means the primary meaning of prātipadika is sattā only and the same sattā is also considered as the primary meaning of dhātu. Following the derivation “kriyājanakatvam kārakatvam”, all the kārakas generate kriyā and in all the kriyas there is jāti and therefore such a jāti is expressed by dhātus.

Such a sattā is nityā i.e. it doesn't possess two properties i.e. generation and destruction.

Such a sattā is all-pervading paramātmā and the six bhāvavikāras viz. jāyate (is born), asti (does exist), vardhate (develops), vipariṇamate (transforms), apakṣīyate (degenerates), vinaśyati (perishes), enumerated in Niruktam (1st chapter) of Yāska are nothing but the different forms of paramātmā only. The same sattā is expressed by suffixes like- tva,- tal,- ghañ, etc.

Under the adhikārasūtra- taddhitāḥ (4-1-76), Pāṇini instituted-tva and-tal pratyayas in the sense of bhāva by the sūtra-“tasya bhāvastvatalau (5-1-119)”. Here the term bhāva means pravṛttinimitta (the cause of behaviour) and it is nothing but sattā- gotvam, gotā, are examples.

Under “kartari kṛt (3-4-67), Pāṇini instituted the suffix ‘ghañ’ on dhātu (dhātoḥ, 3-1-91)) in the sense of bhāva (pākaḥ is an example).

Here the term bhāva refers to the meaning of a dhātu. This is clearly mentioned by Hari in kriyāsamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam (verse- 23)-

antyevā'tmani yā sattā sā kriyā kaiścidiṣyate |

bhāva eva hi dhātvartha ityavicchinna āgamaḥ || (kriyāsamuddeśa- 23).

(The sattā that is there in the final part of vyāpāra is considered as a kriyā by some people, rather the uninterrupted tradition says that bhāva or sattā only is the meaning of dhātu).

The word nitya can be taken as a reference to nyāya and vaiśeṣika, while mahān to sāmkhya, and ātmā to vedānta.

Helarāja a commentator on Vākyapadīyam, explained the case of mahān only. Rather, it may be taken that Hari was trying to explore chemistry of all the darśanas in proposing jāti or mahāsattā or sattā or mahāsāmānyam.

5.2 Dravyam (individual):

Dravyam is the second factor that is expressed by a nāma.

In dravyasamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa (verse- 4) Hari explains the concept of dravya by offering analogy-

suvarṇādi yathā bhinnam svairākāirapāyibhiḥ|

rucakādyabhidhānānām śuddhamevaiti vācyatām|| (dravyasamuddeśa- 4)

Bangles, rings etc. ornaments are made of gold. Rather, the form is neither invariable nor has got anything to do with gold.

Rather, the pure dravya is being denoted by śabdās like rucaka, kaṭaka, kamkaṇa, kuṇḍala, etc.

Having established that all the words like ghaṭa denote dravya and the same is seen all-pervading (sārvartrikam). Hari responds the question as to how can dravya be certified as sārvartrika, when there are certain śabdās like samsthāna and sanniveśa; which denote a dharma called assembly of different parts and also the same won't denote dravya-

teṣvākāreṣu yaśśabdastathābhūteṣu vartate|

tattvātmakatvātenāpi nityamevābhidhīyate|| (dravyasamuddeśa- 6)

In such forms, i.e. assemblies of different parts, wherein upādhi only is the svabhāva (nature). The śabdās like samsthāna and sanniveśa are there, there also the immutable dravya only is expressed as the form is nothing but dravya only.

Since upādhis are artificial they are mutable (just like a ghaṭa) rather their actual form is nothing other than dravya. Dravya is never seen in the form of an upādhi.

On the other hand, since upādhis got amalgamated in dravya, which is the root, they can't be considered separately; rather it is due to brahmasattā that the upādhis have attained a concrete form.

Hari further clarifies the following doubt-

Scholars have decided that the ākāram (form) is mutable and dravya is immutable. In such a situation if it is accepted that even dharmas, in a different state or seen in the form of dharmi only, it amounts to accepting that the dharmas are also immutable. And this contradicts the above said decision of scholars (ākṛtiranityā, dravyam tu nityam- paspaśā)- (siddhe śabdārthasambandhe).

na tattvātattvayorbheda iti vṛddhebhya āgamaḥ|

atattvamiti manyante tattvamevā'vicāritam|| (dravyasamuddeśa- 7)

The uninterrupted tradition inherited from the elders is that there is no, as a matter of fact, any difference, what so ever, between tattva and atattva.

Rather, since the matter is not thoroughly discussed the tattva itself is misunderstood as atatva.

As far as the Indian philosophy is concerned, there are no two things-

Satya (real one), asatya (the one that is illusory). There is, in conclusion, only one ‘pāramāthikatattva’ and it is nothing but parabrahman.

The thing that is satya only seems to be asatya having different forms due to avidya that has been there since time immemorial. Rather, the asatyapadārtha can’t stand forever separately from satyapadārtha. As long as the avidya is there, the difference is felt. Once the avidya perishes there will be satyapadārtha only that remains.

Hari at the outset of his work, in bramhakāṇḍa (verse- 9) declared the very thesis in the following words-

satyā viśuddhistatroktā vidyaivaikapadāgamā|

yuktā praṇavarūpeṇa sarvavādāvirodhinī|| (brahmakāṇḍa- 9)

On the other hand, in modern linguistics the concept of types and token (introduced by C.S.Peirce) is comparable to jāti and vyakti.

“C.S. Peirce (1839-1914) referred to the distinction between words as tokens and words as types.

Example: He who laughs last laughs longer.

From one point of view, it can be said to contain six words: it is six words long. From another point of view, however, it can be said to contain only five words, since two of the words-the third and the fifth (laughs)- identical: they are

different tokens (or instances) of the same type”. (John Lyons, Linguistic Semantics; An introduction. Part-2, p.49)

Types are word forms and tokens are occurrences (instances). (types are abstract and tokens are concrete.)

5.3 Liṅgam (gender):

Liṅga is the third factor that is expressed by a nāma. As far as the concept of liṅga in vyākaraṇa is concerned there is a great debate recorded by Patañjali under “sarūpāṇām eka śeṣa eka vibhaktau” (1-2-64). Patañjali concludes thus-

“tasmānna vaiyākaraṇaiḥ śakyam laukikam liṅgamāsthātum, avaśyam kaścit svakṛtānta āstheyah”

Therefore it is not feasible for vaiyākaraṇas to bank on the laukikaliṅga. By all means, they should resort to a thesis of their own. Here is a panorama of the picture- a single thing is expressed by different words associated with different genders- puśyaḥ, tārakā, nakṣatram are in pumliṅga, strīliṅga, napunsakaliṅga, respectively but denote the same meaning (star). Similarly, the sense of a ‘thing’ is expressed by the following words-

Padārthaḥ, vyaktiḥ, dravyam, having genders of the same sequence. The thesis of vaiyākaraṇas as far as the liṅga is concerned is that it is the śabda rather than artha that is the resort of liṅga. A detailed discussion in this regard can be had from “vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghumañjūṣā” of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa.

Patañjali, having observed that the laukikaliṅga which is defined by “stanakeśavatī nārī lomaṣaḥ puruṣassmṛtāḥ” etc. has got difficulty in terms of

non- living things, arrived at the above said conclusion that a technical liṅga that is exclusively useful to vyākaraṇa is quite necessary.

In fact, Patañjali borrowed the ideology of Sāmkhyadarśana and adopted the same in toto.

Hari in liṅgasamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam tried his best to explicate the nuances of the concept of liṅga from a vaiyākaraṇa's point of view as is depicted in Mahābhāṣya-

āvirbhāvastirobhāvaḥ sthitiścetyanapāyinaḥ|

dharmā mūr̥tiṣu sarvāsu liṅgatvenānudarśitāḥ|| (liṅgasamuddeśa-13)

In all Padārthas there will be three dharmas (properties) viz. āvirbhāva (the birth of guṇas), tirobhāva (gradual decrease of guṇas) and sthiti (the state of balance), and the same which are inherent are shown as pumliṅga, strīliṅga, napumsakaliṅga.

5.3.1 Strīpratyayas:

In vyākaraṇa 'bauddhārtha (imaginary thing)' rather than the vastu (real thing) has to be taken in terms of kriyā, kārakam, liṅgam etc. The liṅgam is in śabda rather than in artha according to Patañjali-

‘ekārthe śabdānyatvāt dr̥ṣṭam liṅgānyatvam avayavānyatvācca’ is bhāṣya.

A single thing can be expressed in all liṅgas-

ayam padārthaḥ (pumliṅgam), iyam vyaktiḥ (strīliṅgam), idam vastu (napumsakaliṅgam) is an example. Similarly dārāḥ (pumliṅgam), bhāryā

(strīliṅgam), kalatram (napumsakaliṅgam)- all these words mean wife although they have different liṅgas.

Under “sarūpānām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau (1-2-64)” Patañjali widely discusses the aspect of liṅga, he rules that the general definition offered for identifying liṅga i.e. “stanakeśavati nārī lomaṣaḥ puruṣassmṛtāḥ” etc. can’t be taken by vaiyākaraṇas and quite different theory i.e. exclusive to vyākaraṇa has to be resorted to-

“tasmānna vaiyākaraṇaiḥ śakyam laukikamliṅgam āsthātum, kaścana svakṛtānta āstheyah”.

Then Patañjali borrows the triṅgas i.e. satva, rajas, and tamas from sāmkyā and rules that when there is an increase of these guṇas then it will be pumliṅga, decrease of the same would cause strīliṅga and the balance of the trio would cause napumsakaliṅga. The dictum “sāmānye napumsakam” reflects the last of the three.

“liṅgaparihāraścapī nopapadyate, kim kāraṇam?, āviṣṭaliṅgā jātiryalīṅgam upādāya pravartate utpatti prabhṛutyāvināśam talliṅgam na jahāti. tasmānna vaiyakaraṇaiḥ śakyam loukikam liṅgamāsthātum, avaśyam kaścana svakṛtānta āstheyah. ko’sau svakṛtāntaḥ?, samstyāne styāyate’rḍraḥ strī sūteḥ sap- prasave pumān. nanuca loke’pi styāyatereva strī, sūteśca pumān? adhikaraṇasādhanā loke strī, styāyatyasyām garbha iti, kartusādhanasāca pumān- sūte pumāniti. ihapunarubhayam bhāvasādhanam- styānam pravṛttiśca. kasyapunah styānamastrī, pravṛttirvāpumān? guṇānām, keṣām? śabda sparśarasagandhanām. sarvāścha punarmūrtaya evamātmikāḥ- samstyāna

prasavaguṇāḥ śabdasparśarasagandhavatyah. yatrālpīyamśo guṇāstatra-
varatastrayaḥ-śabdaḥ sparśorūpamiti. rasagandhou na sarvatra, pravṛtitiḥ
khalvapi nityā. nahīdam kaśchidapi svasminnātmani muhūrtamapyavatiṣṭhate,
vardhate yāvanena vardhitavyamapacayena, vā yujyate. tachchobhayam
sarvatra, yadyubhayam sarvatra, kṛtovyavasthā?, vivakṣātaḥ.

In spite of the fact, that Pāṇini appended Aṣṭādhyāyī with
liṅgānuśāsanam, i.e. ghañjabantaḥ pumsi etc. Kātyāyana offered a vārtika i.e.-
‘liṅgamaśiṣyam lokāśrayatvālliṅgasya’ (the genders for śabdas need not
necessarily be prescribed as the gender should be known through the usages of
the śiṣṭaloka).

In the above vārtika, loka means not only the usages of śiṣṭas but also
thesauri such as ‘Nāmaṅgānuśāsanam’ of Amarasimha, which prescribe the
genders of different śabdas.

In Sanskrit language, a śabda can have one, two, or three liṅgas and
apparently, there is a separate category called avyayas, which don’t have any
liṅga, vibhakti, vacana- ca, na, va, atra, yathā, naktam etc.

sadrśam triṣu liṅgeṣu sarvāsuca vibhaktiṣu |

vacaneṣu ca sarveṣu yanna vyeti tadavyayam|| (atharvaveda)

Finally as was ruled by Patañjali i.e. vivakṣātaḥ (from the desire to say)
there is no other go but one has to resort to the vivakṣā of yogins.

In Aṣṭādhyāyī, in the first leg of fourth chapter Pāṇini earmarked some
sūtras under the adhikāra “striyām (4-1-3)” the pratyayas instituted to suggest the
strītvā, such as ṭāp, ḍāp, cāp, ṇīṣ, ṇīp, ṇīn and ti (ṇac and tiṇ are also related to

strīṭva but in Kaumudī they are covered elsewhere are not in strīpratyayaprakaraṇa) have to be added to prātipadikas.

1. ṭāp: The sūtra “ajādyataṣṭāp (4-1-4)” means that the words read in ajādigāṇa and those ending in short ‘a’ would receive the suffix ‘ṭāp’ to suggest ‘strīṭva’. The ajādigāṇa is provided by Pāṇini in order to check nīṣ and nīn to certain śabdās, ajā, eḍakā, aśva, caṭakā, mūṣikā etc. will get nīṣ by “jāterastrīviṣayādayopadhāt 4-1-63”. bālā, vatsā, voḍha, vilātā are saved from getting nīp by “vayasi prathame 4-1-20”.
2. ḍāp: The sūtra “ḍābubhābhyāmanyatarasyām (4-1-13)”, upon the words covered by the sūtras, manah (4-1-11) and ano bahuvrīheḥ (4-1-12) would receive the suffix ḍāp to suggest strīṭva. sīma, dāma are examples.
3. cāp: The sūtra “yañścāp (4-1-74)” on a word ending with ‘yañ’ the suffix ‘cāp’ would come to suggest strīṭva. Here yañ means ñyan and śyañ. āmbhaṣṭyā and kāriṣagandhyā are examples, respectively.
4. nīṣ: The sūtra “ṣidgaurādibhyaśca (4-1-41) is one of the sūtras that institutes ‘nīṣ’ on the prātipadikas which are ‘ṣit’ and words that are read in ‘gaurādigāṇa’, ‘nṛtī’ is the root and ‘ṣvun’ is the pratyaya by ‘śilpini ṣvun (3-1-145)” and nartaka is the form since there is ‘ṣitva’, the strīpratyaya ‘nīṣ’ is applied and will get the form ‘nartakī’. Gaurī is another example.
5. nīp: ‘ṛunnebhyo nīp (4-1-5)’, the words ending in ṛ and na would receive the suffix nīp to express strīṭva, kroṣṭi, kartrī, daṇḍinī are examples.
6. nīn: ‘śārṅgaravādyaño nīn (4-1-73)’ is the sūtra that effects the suffix nīn to suggest strīṭva. The words enumerated in ‘śārṅgaravādigāṇa’ and the words ending in ‘añ’ pratyaya will get the suffix ‘nīn’, śārṅgaravī and baidī are examples.

7. ti: ‘yūnastiḥ (4-1-77)’ is the sūtra that effects the suffix ‘ti’ to suggest strīṭva on the word ‘yuvan’, yuvatī is the example.

It may be noted that ‘ā’ is the remaining form in all the three i.e. ṭāp, ḍāp and cāp whereas ‘ṛ’ is the remaining form in all the three nīp, nīṣ and nīn. Such a variety of pratyayas is required for variety of svara.

Hari in liṅgasamuddeśa explains that there are seven alternatives in terms of liṅga that are described by scholars-

upādānavikalpāśca liṅgānām sapta varṇitāḥ||

vikalpasanniyogābhyām ye śabdeṣu vyavasthitāḥ|| (liṅgasamuddeśa-3)

The following are seven types-

1. śankhaḥ- śankham, padmaḥ- padmam etc. have got both pumliṅga and napumsakaliṅga.
2. bhāgadheyam- bhāgadheyī, bheṣajam- bheṣajī etc. have got strīliṅga and napumsaka.
3. iṣuḥ, aśaniḥ etc. have got strīliṅga and pumliṅga.
4. taṭaḥ, taṭī, taṭam etc. have got all the three liṅgas.

There will be three more types following sanniyoga and niyamam (ruling).

5. vṛkṣa etc. will be there in pumliṅga only.
6. khātvā etc. can be seen in strīliṅga only.
7. dadhi etc. are in napumsakaliṅga only.

When some words have got more than one liṅga, how to decide as to where this liṅga only.

Patañjali answered this question by vivakṣātaḥ, which means that the following desire to say a specific liṅga has to be taken in a particular example. This concept is elaborated by Hari-

sthiteṣu sarvaliṅgeṣu vivakṣāniyamāṣrayaḥ|

kasyacicchabdasamskāre vyāpāraḥ kvacidiṣyate|| (liṅgasamuddeśa-19)

On the other hand, when a question irrespective of gender has to be put then it is napumsakaliṅga, which is described as common to all the liṅgas, just like sarvanāma is for all the nāmavācakas.

Hari says this in liṅgasamuddeśa following Mahābhāṣya (dāṇḍināyana- 6-4-174)-

guṇā ityeva buddhervā nimittatvam sthitirmatā|

sthiteṣca sarvaliṅgānām sarvanāmatvamucyate|| (liṅgasamuddeśa-18)

Sthiti which means napumsakaliṅga, is the cause of the buddhi, is in the form of guṇas and the same is considered as sarvanāma of the all the liṅgas.

Hari takes up the jātipakṣa and he explains that the three jātis i.e. pumstva, strīṭva and napumsakatva, which are in fact compatible, are there with the jātis like gotva, mahiṣatva, etc. which are incompatible, as the argument put forward by some scholars-

tisro jātaya evaitāḥ keṣāmcit samavasthitāḥ|

aviruddhā viruddhābhīrgomahiṣyādijātibhiḥ|| (liṅgasamuddeśa- 4)

Finally, Hari clarifies that the śiṣṭas who could discern the noumenon of different things had said as to which liṅga that is constantly available in śabda and artha would be the constituent of dharma-

bhāvatattvadr̥śaḥ śiṣṭāḥ śabdārtheṣu vyavasthitam|

yadyaddharme'ṅgatāmeti liṅgam tattat pracakṣate|| (liṅgasamuddeśa-21)

It may be noted that it is a nāma only that is associated with liṅga; kriyā does not have a liṅga.

5.4 Vacanam (number):

The fourth factor that is expressed by a word (nāma) is vacanam. Both the words vacanam and samkhyā are synonyms. If one wants to purchase a cow, he takes some amount along with him. In case, he wants five cows he has to take an amount five times the cost of the cow.

“sakṛduccaritaḥ śabdaḥ sakṛdevārtham gamayati” (a śabda pronounced once would express meaning once only) is the norm. Therefore, following this norm, if one wants to express the sense of 10 trees he has to employ 10 vṛkṣaśabdas like vṛkṣaḥ, vṛkṣah... etc. In such a situation, Pāṇini instituted ‘ekaśeṣa’ by “sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau (1-2-64)”, in order to effect brevity without loss of meaning i.e. one can take vṛkṣaśabda and add the suffix ‘au’ for two trees (i.e. vṛksau) and if he wants to express three or more vṛkṣas then it will be vṛkṣa+jas=vṛkṣāḥ.

“Ucyate iti vacanam, samcaṣṭe iti samkhyā (the one that is being expressed) are the etymologies of both the terms i.e. vacanam and samkhyā.

Hari in samkhyāsamuddeśa of padakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīya asserts that every padārtha, which is in the form of dravya is used along with samkhyā only. The difference and non-difference of things in the world has got samkhyā as its base. The number ‘one’ expresses abheda (non-difference or singleness of the thing) and other numbers like 2, 3, 4 etc. express bheda (difference).

At the outset of kriyāsamuddeśa, Hari declares that the aspect of kāla (tense) is for the separating the kriyā (present, past, future) whereas samkhyā is for separating anything from anything-

“kriyābhedaḥ kālastu samkhyā sarvasya bhedaḥ” (kālasamuddeśa- 2)

samkhyāvān sattvabhūto’rthaḥ sarva evābhidyate|

bhedaḥbhedaḥvibhāgo hi loke samkhyānibandhanaḥ|| (samkhyāsamuddeśa-1)

On the other hand, the things that can be referred to by the pronouns such as this and that are called dravyas and the difference among dravyas is expressed by samkhyā such as two and three. Rather, the abheda or non-difference is expressed by number ‘one’.

In the case of vimśati, trimśat, catvārimśat, etc. There is a peculiar aspect as far as the samkhyā in Sanskrit is concerned-

Vimśati etc. can be employed to denote both the number of things i.e. samkhyā as well as the things themselves to be numbered denoted by the samkhyā- “gavām vimśatiḥ” (20 of cows) is an example of the word wherein the word vimśati is samkhyāvācaka and the usage ‘vimśatirgāvaḥ’ (20 cows) is an example of the word vimśati being samkhyeya.

Hari in samkhyāsamuddeśa verse (19) explains the situation-

samkhyeyasangha samkhyānasanghaḥ samkhyeti kathyate |

vimśatyādiṣu sānyasya dravyasamghasya bhedikā||

By words like vimśati, trimśat etc. the group of things to be counted and the group of the one which we count are denoted as samkhyā.

As such, vimśati etc. would be instruments in separation of other groups of things.

“ekā kriyā kriyāgatadvitvabahutve” (mahābhāṣyam).

5.5 Kārakam (case):

The fifth factor that is expressed by a word is kāraka. The word ‘kāraka’ means the one, which produces a verb. If a word like rāmaḥ is pronounced, the listener immediately asks- what is he doing? Then the answer would be a verb- eating/going/coming etc. There are six kārakas- kartṛ, karma, karaṇa, sampradāna, apādāna and adhikaraṇa. Each kāraka is represented by a vibhakti- prathamā, dvitīyā, tṛtīyā, caturthī, pañcamī and saptamī (respectively). Each vibhakti got three pratyayas to denote three numbers. Kārakas are absolutely dependent on vivakṣā (a desire to say) of the speaker.

1. Kartṛkārakam: A person or thing who is considered to be (in the sentence used) independent is called kartā (agent)-‘devadattaḥ pacati’ (devadatta is cooking), ‘sthālī pacati’ (the vessel/cooker is cooking) etc. Kartā is in prathama in the above examples.
2. Karmakārakam: The thing that is mostly desired by kartā is called karma. ‘caitraḥ grāmam gacchati’. Grāmam, rather going to grāma is mostly desired by caitra and therefore, it is karma and got dvitīyāvibhakti.
3. Karaṇakārakam: the most useful instrument in an activity gets the name- karaṇam- ‘maitraḥ paraśunā chinatti’ (maitra is cutting with an axe). In this

sentence, paraśu is the instrument that is mostly useful in the action- cutting. Therefore, it has got karaṇasamjña and subsequently tṛtiyāvibhakti.

4. Sampradānakāraṇam: The person/thing at the receiving end is called sampradānam- ‘padmā sītāyai pustakam dadāti’ (padma is giving a book to sita)- in this example since Sita is at the receiving end it is called sampradāna and got caturthīvibhakti.
5. Apādānakāraṇam: The thing that is stable during separation is called apādāna. ‘vṛkṣāt paṇam patati/dhāvataḥ aśvāt bhaṭaḥ patati’ (the leaf is falling from the tree, the police is falling from the running horse) in both the instances, the tree and the running horse are stable during the separation of leaf and police respectively and hence they are apādānas and got pañcamīvibhakti.
6. Adhikaraṇakāraṇam: Adhikaraṇam here in vyākaraṇa means ādhāra (base /aim). The word that denotes a base/aim in a sentence is called adhikaraṇa. ‘Kūpe jalamasti/mokṣe icchā asti’ (there is water in the well/he has got desire in salvation)- in both the instances the well and mokṣa are the base and aim and hence they being adhikaraṇas got saptamīvibhakti.

During the above course of discussion it is conspicuous that ṣaṣṭhīvibhakti is left behind. Ṣaṣṭhīvibhakti denotes sambandha (relation): rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ (king’s servant)- here in this example the word rājñāḥ is in ṣaṣṭhī. When someone utters the word- rājñāḥ (of the king) the listener would ask- what is that? Here the answer would be something concrete and certainly not a verb. That is why ṣaṣṭhi is not considered as a kāraṇa. Rather it indicates the relation between two things.

5.5.1 Siddha and Sādhya:

The padārthas, as has been detailed above, are been divided into two

1. Siddha 2. Sādhya

Sādhya is in the form of a kriyā, like pāka, yāga, gamana, adhyayana etc. and it is done/ performed at specific times, i.e. like ghaṭa and paṭa are not seen in an immovable form. If it is to be produced, then some entity is required and the same is siddha. The same is kāraka and the same is sādhana. Between the kriyā which is sādhyā and the sādhana which is siddha there will be the relation of “kriyākārakabhāva”.

Thus, a kriyā is generated through sādhana / kāraka. Here sādhana is not, in fact, the tangible thing. Rather, it is the śakti (capacity) of the thing.

Hari, following Patañjali, in the seventh part of padakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam called sādhanasamuddeśa, explains the gamut of things that are associated with sādhana or kāraka in 167 terse verses-

svāśraye samavetānām tadvadevā’śrayāntare |

kriyāṇāmabhiniṣpattau sāmartyam sādhanam viduḥ||

(sādhanasamuddeśa-1)

Bhāṣyakāra etc. identified the śakti (capacity) that is required in the generation of a kriyā like pāka, gamana etc., i.e. concomitant with the resorts of its own such as kartā and karma and similarly the other resorts as sādhanam.

Hari is going to discuss the six kārakās viz. karma, karaṇam, kartā, sampradānam, apādānam, along with śeṣa and hetu.

The terms kāraka and sādhanam are synonyms- “karoti kriyām niṣpādayati iti kārakam”, “sādhyate kriyā anena iti sādhanam”.

Following both these derivations, it can be asserted that kriyājanakatvam rather than kriyānvayitvam is kārakatvam (bhaṭṭoji). Patañjali employed both these words as synonyms.

Under “parokṣe liṭ (3-2-115), anabhihite (2-3-1)”etc. Patañjali says- “guṇaḥ sādhanam”. Here the term guṇa means śakti whereas sādhanam means kārakam. In the sūtra- ‘saptamīpañcamyau kārakamadhye (2-3-7)’, the term kāraka is employed in the sense of śakti.

In the following sūtras, Patañjali said dravya is kāraka. It is possible when one would have the vivakṣā (a desire to say) of abheda (non-difference) between śakti (capacity) and śaktimat (the thing having the capacity).

“dravyam kriyābhinirvṛttim prati sādhanam” (sārvadhātuke yak (3-1-67)), “sādhanam vai dravyam” (kimettiṇavyaya (5-3-55)), “sādhane’yam bhavan liṅga samkyābhyām yokṣyate” (upasargācchandasī dhātvarthe (5-1-118)).

In the sentence “caitraḥ kāṣṭhaiḥ sthālyām taṇḍulān pacati”, (caitra is cooking rice in the vessel with firewood), the word pacati denotes a kriyā (activity), it may be noted that kriyā will be there in either kartā or karma (phalāvacchinnavyāpāraḥ, vyāpārāvacchinnaḥ phalam vā dhāthvarthaḥ) the former is for kartariprayoga and the latter is for karmaniprayoga).

Kriyā will not be there in karaṇa, sampradānam etc. Rather, kārakas like karaṇa etc. are also generating kriyā like pāka.

In other words, caitra, taṇḍula etc. are generating the kriyas that are within and hence the nomenclature kartṛkāraka and karmakāraka, all this is explained by “svāśraye samavetānām”.

In fact, pākādikriyas are not there in kāṣṭha etc. by ‘samavāyasambandha’. Nonetheless, kāṣṭha etc. are generating the kriyas that are there in kartā and karma and as such became sādhanas. In light of this the term ‘āśrayāntare’ should be interpreted as in ādhāra i.e. different from karaṇa etc. but in the form of kartā and karma.

In the term svāśraye, the term ‘sva’ means kriyā and the same which is denoted by dhātu will be there in kartā and karma only and not in other kārakas, that’s why the thing is generated in kartā and karma only.

Rather than kārakas such as karaṇa etc., this is the decision of Bhāṣyakāra and following him, Hari employed two words ‘āśraye’ and ‘āśrayāntare’.

A careful analysis in to the gamut of things take us to the conclusion that as a matter of fact things like caitraḥ, rice, etc. in the sentence ‘caitraḥ taṇḍulān kāṣṭaiḥ sthālyām pacati’ are not kārakas.

Kāraka is the one, which generates kriyā and obviously, in its own form the things can’t generate a kriyā. Rather the capacity i.e. sāmāthyam or śakti i.e. there in the kāraka generates a kriyā.

Therefore, the conclusion will be “śaktiḥ kārakam”. On the other hand, since śakti can’t exist devoid of resort, the things (rather than śakti) are referred to as kārakas in common parlance. Here it is possible to say ‘śaktimat kārakam’.

Under “hetumati ca (3-1-26)” Patañjali establishes the concept of bauddhārtha in terms of kāraka.

‘Kamsam ghātayati’ is a sentence in the sense of relating the purāṇa of kamsavadha and the analysis will be kamsa vadha+ṇic. The pratyaya ṇic is instituted in the sense of preraṇa (causative) by “hetumati ca”. Here Kātyāyana raised an objection that since at the time of relating the purāṇa the concerned persons, i.e. kamsa, krishna etc. are not available; there cannot be the said usage by the said sūtra. He offered a vārtika-

‘ākhyānāt kṛtastadācaṣṭe’ (on the kṛdanta that denotes a story popular in purāṇas there will be ṇic pratyaya in the sense of relating).

At this juncture, Patañjali refuted the need of the vārtika and said that the sūtra itself can fulfil the task—

While the purāṇika relates the story, śabdas like Kamsa, Krishna etc. are employed. Such śabdas would create the images of respective persons having some form, behavior, mannerism etc., in the minds of the audience and as such by taking the bauddhārtha (imaginary meaning) of the sādhanas the sūtra ‘hetumati ca’ can generate ‘ṇic’, in spite of the fact that the real persons are not present.

Hari, in his terse verse summarized the Mahābhāṣya-

śabdopahitarūpāmśca buddherviṣayatām gatān|

pratyakṣamiva kamsādīn sādhanatvena manyate|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-5)

Hari in sādhanaśamuddeśa enumerates seven kārakas viz. karma, karaṇa, karṭṛ, sampradānam, apādānam, adhikaraṇam and sambandha.

It may be noted that generally sambandha is not considered as kāraka. In that case, there will be six kārakas only. Rather Hari, considers sambandha also as a kāraka.

5.5.2 Karmakārakam:

sāmānyam kārakam tasya saptādyā bhedayonayaḥ|

ṣaṭ karmākhyādi bhedena śeṣabhedastu saptamī|| (sādhānasamuddeśa- 44)

Further, Hari ventures upon the task of offering different forms of each kāraka through keen observation. At the outset, he says that there are seven varieties of karma that is exhibited by Pāṇini. Hari says that the karma defined by the sūtra-

‘karturīpsitatamam karma (1-4-49)’ is of three types viz. nirvartyam, vikāryam and prāpyam.

On the other hand, the karma shown by other sūtras such as ‘tathāyuktam cā nīpsitam (1-4-50)’ etc. is of four types-

nirvartyam ca vikāryam ca prāpyam ceti tridhā matam|

tatrepsitatamam karma caturthānyattu kalpitam|| (sādhānāsamuddeśa- 45)

Hari explains ‘nirvartyakarma’ by the following verse-

satīvā’vidyamānā vā prakṛtiḥ pariṇāminī|

yasya nāśrīyate tasya nirvartyatvam pracakṣate || (sādhānāsamuddeśa- 47)

To which karma, the main cause, be it that exists or under goes some variation, is not resorted to or the one, which is, without, ‘prakṛti’ is called nirvartyam.

In the sentence ‘ghaṭam karoti’, ‘ghaṭa’ is karma. Here, the very cause of ‘ghaṭa’, i.e. ‘clay’ (mṛttikā), is not desired to be expressed and therefore ‘ghaṭa’ became ‘nirvartyakarma’. In the example ‘samyogam karoti’ there is no any cause of ‘samyoga’ and therefore the same became karma.

In case, the cause is desired to be expressed then it will be ‘vikāryakarma’. In the example ‘mṛdam ghaṭam karoti’, ghaṭa is ‘vikāryakarma’—

prakṛtestu vivakṣāyām vikāryam kaiścidanyathā|

nirvartyam ca vikāryam ca karma śāstre pradarśitam||

(sāadhanāsamuddeśa- 48)

Hari defines ‘prāpyakarma’ by the following verse-

kriyākṛtaviśeṣāṇām siddhiryatra na gamyate|

darśanādanumānādvā tatprāpyamiti kathyate|| (sāadhanāsamuddeśa-51)

The change of the form related to the different processes of ‘kartā’ in a karma can’t be known then either ‘pratyakṣa’ or ‘anumāna’- is called ‘prāpyakarma’.

The examples for prāpyakarma are- ādityam paśyati, ghaṭam jñāti.

While looking at the sun we won’t get anything special and while knowing that this is a ghaṭa nothing specific is known, therefore ādityam and ghaṭam are ‘prāpyakarmas’.

Some people hold that prāpyakarma need not separately be accepted but Hari believes that ‘prāpyakarma’ is there.

Hari explains the other four types of karmas by the following verse-

audāsīnyena yatprāpyam yacca karturanīpsitam|
samjñāntarairanākhyātam yat yaccāpyanyapūrvakam||

(sādhanaśamuddeśa- 46)

While doing some activity something else, which is not desired, is also obtained. The same is not undesirable at the same time- “grāmam gacchan tṛṇam sprśati” is the example. Here ‘grāma’ is desirable and became karma following “karturīpsitatamam karma”. Whereas ‘tṛṇa’ (touching tṛṇa) is incidental and not desired. Rather, it is not undesirable. Therefore following the Pāṇinisūtra-“tathāyuktam cānīpsitam (1-4-50)” the tṛṇa became karma and the same is called audāsīnyakarma”.

Under the same category, the one which is not desired by kartā also becomes karma and the example is ‘corān paśyati’. Here the encounter with the thieves is undesired by kartā and therefore ‘cora’ became ‘anīpsitatamam’ and the same is also called audāsīnyakarma.

The sixth category is the one that is attained by the sūtra ‘akathitam ca (1-4-51)’: this happens in such a situation wherein karma is ‘vivakṣita’ (desired), in spite of the fact that kārakas such as apādāna, adhikaraṇa etc. have to take place.

‘gām dogdhi payaḥ’ is the example. Here the cow is apādāna as milk is extracted from the cow. Rather, since apādānatva is not vivakṣita and karma is vivakṣita the word gau became karma.

The last karma is the one that is instituted in the place of another kāraka such as sampradānam.

‘krūramabhikṛdhyati’- is the example, here in the case of ‘kṛdhadhātvarthayoga sampradānasamjñā’ happens by-

“kṛdhadṛherṣyāsūyārthānām yam prati kopah (1-4-37)” and caturthīvibhakti should come but, as an apavāda (replacement) by “kṛdhadṛhorupasṛṣṭayoḥ karma (1-4-38), “karmasamjñā” is instituted.

Hari in the following verse enumerates four guidelines that are useful to identify an ‘akarmakakriyā’-

dhātorarthāntarevṛtterdhatvarthenopasamgrahāt|

prasiddheravivakṣātaḥ karmaṇo’karmikā kriyā || (sādhanaśamuddeśa- 88)

When the dhātu is there in another sense, when the karma is included in the ‘dhātvartha’, when there is popularity, when the karma is not desired to express- the dhātu can be decided as akarmaka.

‘bhāram vahati’ (he is carrying the load) originally the root ‘vah’ is employed in the sense of transforming a thing one place to the other. Here since the verb vahati doesn’t express the said meaning but different one the same became akarmaka in the following example- ‘nadī vahati’ (the river is flowing).

The thing that is considered as ‘karma’ is there inherently in ‘dhātvartha’-

“caitraḥ jīvati” (caitra is alive). Here the root ‘jīva’ means holding the life. Since the same meaning is there embedded in the verb jīvati, it became “akarmaka”.

For the third category ‘varṣati’ (it is raining) is an example. Since it is popularly known that in the activity of raining, the kartā will be megha (cloud) at the same time ‘varṣati’ means ‘varṣati udakam’ (raining water) again one need not employ the word udakam, which is karma.

It may be noted that in ‘atmanepadaprakaraṇam’ of “Laghuśabdenduśekhara” Nāgeśa refuted the guideline “prasiddheḥ” as unlike, the other three, it is not mentioned in Mahābhāṣya.

For the fourth guideline-‘nasamśṛuṇute’ (doesn’t listen), i.e. doesn’t listen to good counselling by well-wishers is an example. In the above sentence even if the relation of “kriyākārahāva”, in the form of “hitāt hitam na samśṛuṇute”, is available it is not shown and hence the verb ‘samśṛuṇute’ became ‘akarmaka’ due to ‘avivakṣā’ (not desired to express).

5.5.3 Karaṇam:

Hari by the following verse explains the very meaning of the Pāṇinisūtra, i.e. ‘sādhakatamam karaṇam (1-4-42)’-

kriyāyāḥ pariniṣpattiradvyaḥpārādanantaram|

vivakṣyate yadā yatra karaṇam tattadā smṛtam|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa- 90)

In the generation of an activity, generally all the kārakas play their respective roles. In such a situation the one, which is considered (vivakṣā- desired to express) as the one that is useful in the generation of the activity immediately after the vyāpāra, is styled as karaṇam, in that particular activity.

In the sentence- ‘caitraḥ asinā cchinatti’ (caitra is chopping with a sword), the activity of chopping is completed in the immediate movement following the fall of the sword and therefore ‘asi- (rather the caitra)- is considered as karaṇa. The same is said by-

“kriyasiddhau prakṛṣṭopakāraṇakaraṇasamjñakamsyāt”

(kaumudī-kāraprakaraṇam)

On the other hand, there can’t be any clash between kartā and the rest of the kārakas and karaṇa, when compared with other kārakas, is superior.

5.5.4 Kartṛkārakam:

Pāṇini compiled a sūtra, ‘svatantraḥ kartā’ (1-4-54), which means the one that is important among the kārakas is called kartā. Hari in “sādhanaśamuddeśa” offered six devices that are useful in deciding ‘kartā’, by the following two verses-

prāganyataḥ śaktilābhāt nyagbhāvāpādanādapi|

tadadhīnapravṛttitvāt pravṛttānām nivartanāt|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-101)

adrṣṭatvāt pratinidheḥ praviveke ca darśanāt|

ārādayupakāritve svātantryam karturucyate || (sādhanaśamuddeśa-102)

By getting ‘śakti’ ahead of the other ‘kāraṅkas’, by attributing ‘parādhīnatā’ (being under the control of others)’ to other kāraṅkas, by the behavior of other kāraṅkas i.e. within its control, by rerouting the ones that have already acted by the absence of a delegate to kartā, by the presence of kartā while other kāraṅkas are absent and even then it helps from a distance- independence to kartā is imposed.

The theme of the above two verses is available in Mahābhāṣya under kāraṅka (1-3-23).

Six causes to exhibit that ‘kartā’ is “svatantra”, are given in the above two verses.

‘Kartā’ gets involved in different activities expecting the result. That kind of ‘śakti’ is available to ‘kartā’ ahead of other kāraṅkas. This is the first cause.

Kartā attributes ‘nyagbhāva’ to other kāraṅkas such as karaṇam. It means he pulls them under his control. This is the second reason.

Other kāraṅkas such as karaṇa or under the control of ‘kartā’ and as such only they take part in their respective activities and therefore are not independent. This is the third reason.

Since ‘kartā’ behaves for a result, he would cease from the activity as soon as the result is achieved. He also would see to it that the karaṇa etc. also cease to act further. This is the fourth cause.

In case, the sword or axe doesn’t function properly then a representative in its place can be attained by kartā. But he can’t have representative. This is the fifth cause.

Even in the absence of other kārakas, kartā can be there- asti, vidyate, bhavati (does exist).

Here it means someone or the other, who is a ‘kartā’, i.e. the resort of the activity is necessary. There are no other kārakas and this is the sixth cause.

It is due to the above reasons that the importance certainly goes to ‘kartā’ is far away in terms of fruition of activity (kriyasiddhi), since he is the person who can turn the wheel of the kārakas (kārakacakram), the independence should go to him .

Further, once it is accepted that the ‘svātantryam’ (independence) depends upon “vivakṣā” (a desire to say), usages like “ātmā ātmānam ātmanā hanti” (he is killing himself by himself) are possible- declares Hari-

ekasya buddhyavasthābhiḥ bhede ca parikalpite|

karmatvam karaṇatvam vā kartṛtvam vopajāyate|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-104)

By creating difference through the state of intellect to a single thing it is possible to have karmatva, karaṇatva, and kartṛtva.

In the above usage a single thing, i.e. ‘ātmā’ is employed as three kārakas. A single thing can’t have different forms simultaneously. Therefore, through vivakṣā one should create different forms and make it possible. Further, ‘ātmā’ is not a thing that has got some form, i.e. a non-concrete thing (abstract) and as such it is not possible to achieve killing which is possible with a weapon etc. The same also should be made possible to vivakṣā. Here one thing will act, another thing would get the result of the activity and still another thing is useful in achieving the result.

In such a way, in the world, all the three things are seen separately. Whereas in śāstra, the thing denoted by a śabda is the only artha. It need not be available in a real form (tangible). Therefore, to ātmā only the activity of killing, its result and the instrumentality in achieving the result of the activity have become possible due to vivakṣā only.

5.5.4.1 Hetvadhikāra:

Kartā himself if causes something, is called ‘hetu’, Hari in sādhanasamuddeśa elaborates the concept of ‘hetu’ in Pāṇini-

preṣaṇādhyeṣaṇe kurvamstatsamarthāni cācaran|

kartaiva vihitām śāstre hetusamjñām prapadyate|| (sādhanasamuddeśa-125)

The one who issues orders, who requests for something, who does something that is helpful to the worker and the one who does the work / activity is kartā and the same will get the designation ‘hetu’ that is instituted in ‘vyākaraṇaśāstra’.

Entrusting a task to someone who is inferior is called ‘preṣanam’. Getting the things done through appeal to superiors is called ‘adhyeṣanā’. ‘tatsamardhācaraṇa’ means extending logistical support to the one who is involved in a task, the same is the real activity (vyāpāra) of ‘prayojaka’ (the person who causes something to happen).

By asserting that kartā himself would get ‘hetusamjñā’, it is possible to have both the samjñas i.e. kartā and hetu to a single thing which otherwise wouldn’t have become possible due to ‘ekasamjñādhikāra’. In that adhikāra there would have been replacement of ‘kartṛsamjñā’ by ‘hetusamjñā’.

In fact, Pāṇini suggested the above arrangement by the word ‘ca’ in ‘tatprajayako hetuśca” (1-4-55). This hetusaṃjñā is instituted by śāstra and the same has to be taken by the word hetu in all the vidhisūtras.

In the world, hetu can be a hetu of dravya and guṇa also. But here it is applicable to kriyā only and this is kāraṇa. Preṣaṇādhyeṣaṇa etc. are activities. The same hetu is referred to by the word hetu in sūtras like ‘hetumati ca (3-1-26), ‘bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuk (7-3-40)’ etc.

In sūtras like ‘hetau (2-3-23)’, ‘lakṣaṇahetvoḥ kriyāyāḥ (3-2-126)’, ‘hetuhetumatorliṇ (3-3-156)’, ‘kṛṇo hetutācchīlyānulomyeṣu (3-2-20)’ etc. the laukikahetu has to be taken.

5.5.5 Sampradānakāraṇam:

“karmaṇā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam”(1-4-82) is the Pāṇinisūtra. Hari in the following verse elaborates the sampradānakāraṇa which is the meaning of caturthīvibhakti-

anirākaraṇāt kartuḥ tyāgāṅgam karmaṇepsitam|

preraṇānumatibhyām vā labhate sampradānatām|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-129)

The one, which is a part of dāna (donation/giving) of kartā and by not refusing the kāraṇa that is meant to be related to karma and by encouraging or accepting the designation, sampradāna is attained.

Here is a sentence “upādhyāyāya gām dadāti devadattaḥ”.

Here ‘gām’ is karma, dadāti is kriyā, śiṣya i.e. devadatta is kartā. In the activity of tyāga by devadatta upādhyāya is a part (āṅgam). Here the donor’s hand

can also become a part of the activity. Therefore, it won't become 'sampradānam' and further the condition 'karmanepsitam' is added. Such sampradāna should become a kāraka. Kāraka means the one, which generates an activity. Here any one of the following can become a kriyā- not refusing, encouraging or accepting, upādhyāya didn't refuse the cow that was offered by his disciple and the same is his vyāpāra. In the sentence 'devatābhyo balim dadāti', the bali (oblation) that is offered is accepted and the same is the sampradānavyāpāra.

Receiving something after begging / requesting is preraṇa and the same is sampradānavyāpāra. Thus, since sampradāna has become helpful to "tyāga" it became 'tyāgāṅgam'.

5.5.6 Apādānakārakam:

Pāṇini instituted 'apādānakāraka' by 'dhruvamāpāye apādānam (1-4-2)'; apādānam is also called 'avadhi'. Hari elaborates this concept-

nirdiṣṭaviṣayam kiñcidupāttaviṣayam tathā|

apekṣitakriyamceti tridhāpādānamucyate|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-136)

The apādāna is of three types-

The first one would have a specific subject. The second one is the one in which a subject is taken, whereas the third one requires a kriyā. In the example "gramādāgacchati devadattaḥ" (devadatta is coming from the village) devadatta has got separation (viśleṣa) from the village, the resort of such a viśleṣa is the village. The one who affected viśleṣa is devadatta. As such, the one which is the resort of vivakṣā and the non-resort of the kriyā that is the cause of viśleṣa is apādānam.

Here there are two sādhanas for the viśleṣa.

The first one is kartā who is called “samrabdhakāraka/sādhana” (the starting agent) which performed the kriyā that caused the viśleṣa. In such a case, the viśleṣa/ vibhāga/ apāya which can be achieved through two sādhanas, i.e. samrabdha and udāsīna, has to be shown in a particular case and the same is the first category, i.e. ‘nirdiṣṭaviṣaya’. In the above example ‘grāma’ is the apādāna of the first type.

“valāhakāt vidyotate vidyut” (the lightening is shining from the cloud) is an example for the second category. Here valāhaka is an apādāna that is upāttaviṣaya. Here there are two kriyas- nissaraṇam (to come out), and vidyotanam (shining) between both the kriyas either will be ‘aṅgī (constitute) and the other is aṅga (constituent), the vidyotana having ‘nissaraṇa’ as a constituent or vice versa is the meaning of vidyotate.

Upāttaviṣaya is the apādānakāraka that is found where one kriyā is described either as an aṅga or as aṅgī to the other.

When it is said that the lightening is shining from the cloud, it strikes to the mind that the cloud is different and the lightening is different. In fact, a cloud is nothing but a conglomeration of smoke, light, water and air (dhūmajyotissalila maruṭhām sannipḥātaḥ kva meghaḥ- meghasandeśam). It means that the light is part and parcel of a cloud.

In such a situation by considering the difference between megha and jyoti (vidyut) a vibhāga is created and its avadhi is ‘valāhaka’.

The third apādāna is “apekṣitakriyā”. In a sentence, the kriyā is not pronounced but rather inferred. In addition, the resort of such an inferred kriyā gets apādānasamjñā and the same is called apekṣitakriyā.

“māthurāḥ pāṭaliputrakebhyaḥ ādhyatarāḥ”-

In this sentence ‘pāṭaliputrakebhyaḥ’ is the example, the people living in the city of mathurā are wealthier than that of pāṭaliputra. In the word ādhyatarāḥ, the suffix ‘tarap’ denotes ‘prakarṣa’ (superiority). Due to that, the separation of māthuras is suggested. The inferred ‘apakarṣaṇa’ (separation), as the māthuras separated from pāṭaliputrakas, is an apādāna that requires a kriyā. apakarṣaṇa means vibhāga.

The term dhruvam in the said Pāṇinisūtra is illustrated by Hari—

dravyasvabhāvo na dhrauvyamiti sūtre pratīyate|

apāyaviṣayam dhrauvyam yattu tāvat vivakṣitam|| (sādhanaśāstra-138)

In the sūtra ‘dhruvam apāye apādānam’, the term ‘dhruvam’ doesn’t mean stationary. Rather Pāṇini meant when there is separation the thing, which is ‘avadhi’, is to be considered as dhruvam.

In day-to-day transaction, the word dhruvam means static/stationary/fast. Therefore in the example- dhāvataḥ aśvāt patitaḥ (The person fell from a galloping horse). Although the horse continues to gallop while the person falls, aśva became apādānam, as it is the avadhi. Therefore, the udāsīne sādhanā only is meant by the term ‘dhruvam’. Hari explained the same by the following verse-

saraṇe devadattasya dhrauvyam pāte tu vājinaḥ|

āviṣṭam yadapāyena tasyā dhrauvyam pracakṣate||(sādhanaśamuddeśa-139)

During the state of galloping when devadatta falls from the horse and here the horse is dhruvam. Whereas the one i.e. ‘devadatta’ who is associated with the kriyā that caused apāya, is adhruvam.

‘dhāvataḥ aśvāt patitaḥ devadattaḥ’ is a sentence. Here galloping is the act of the horse and since it is galloping, the horse is dhruva. Whereas, since he can’t run, devadatta who fell is adhruva. Falling means getting associated with another place. Devadatta is the one is involved /working towards that end. Since he fell from the horse, even if the horse is galloping, it is dhruvam in the activity of devadatta.

Therefore, it is against the above background that one can decide that when there is separation, the entity, from which some thing gets separated is called dhruvam.

(calam vā yadivācalam, vākyapadīyam- sādhanāśamuddeśa-138)

5.5.7 Adhikaraṇam:

“ādhāro’dhikaraṇam (1-4-45)” is the Pāṇinisūtra, which defines adhikaraṇa, and it is nothing but “the base”. Hari further discusses adhikaraṇa-

kartṛkarmavyavahitāmasākṣāddhārayat kriyām|

upakurvāt kriyāsiddhau śāstre’dhikaraṇam smṛtam||(sādhanaśamuddeśa-148)

The one which indirectly holding the kriyā separated by kartā and karma, is useful in the generation of kriyā is called adhikaraṇam in the śāstra.

Adhikaraṇa means ādhāra (the base). In the world, it can be a base to dravya or guṇa or kriyā. However, in the śāstra the one, i.e. the ādhāra of kriyā only is called adhikaraṇa. Kartā and karma are directly the ādhāra of kriyā and adhikaraṇam is the ādhāra of both of them. Therefore, the kāraka, which is the ādhāra of the kriyā through kartā and karma is called adhikaraṇa.

In the sentence “devadattaḥ kaṭe āste (devadatta is sitting on the mat)”, the mat is holding devadatta and thus became useful in the activity of sitting.

Kāraka means kriyājanakatva (the one which generates a verb) rather, a kāraka need not necessarily generate a verb and it can be indirectly also.

Further, Hari by the following verse, summarizes three kinds of adhikaraṇas described in Mahābhāṣya under “samhitāyām (6-1-72)”-

upaśleṣasya ca bhedaṣṭilākāśakaṭādiṣu|

upakārastu bhidyante samyogisamavāyinām|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-149)

Among the things like tila (sesame), ākāśam (sky), kaṭa (mat) etc. the sambandha is abhedha (non-difference) only. The things that are helpful in the activity of the ādhāras that have got samyogasambandha and samavāya with ādheya (The thing that is placed on something) are different.

The adhikaraṇa is of three types aupāśleṣika, abhivyāpaka and vaiṣayika. Caitraḥ kaṭe āste, kūpe jalamasti, and mokṣe icchāsti- are the examples respectively. The relation between ādhara and ādheya is upāśleṣa and it is in the same form in all the three adhikaraṇas.

5.5.8 Śeṣaḥ:

‘ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe (2-3-50)’ is the sūtra which institutes ṣaṣṭhī in the sense of śeṣa, i.e. sambandha such as ‘svasvāmibhāva’, Hari explains sambandha-

sambandhaḥ kārakebhyo’nyaḥ kriyākārapūrvakaḥ|

śrutāyāmaśrutāyām vā kriyāyām so’bhidhīyate|| (sādhanaśamuddeśa-156)

Sambandha is the one that is different from kārakas and it is backed by a kāraka that has got a kriyā as the cause. Whether the kriyā is there or not in a sentence, the relation is denoted by ṣaṣṭhī.

Rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ is the example. Since the word rajñāḥ does not generate a kriyā, it is not covered by any kāraka and therefore it is called śeṣa and ṣaṣṭhī denotes such a sambandha. It may be noted that if the kāraka is denoted by another word, such as tiṇanta, kṛdanta, taddhitānta, nipāta, samāsa etc. then there will be prathamāviabhakti, which expresses prātipadikārtha, liṅga, parimāṇa, vacana and sambandha- prātipadikārthaliṅgaparimāṇavacanamātre prathamā (2-3-46)

In modern linguistics, cases are inflected forms of nouns, which fit them for participation in key constructions related to verbs.

6 THE FLAVOUR OF PHILOSOPHY AND WORD

6.1 Nitya and kārya:

Under ‘sthānivādādeśo’nalvidhau (1-1-56)’, Patañjali widely discusses the ‘śabdanityatva’. He takes up the following vārtika in the first place-

‘anityavijñānam tu’ and comments thus-

“anityavijñānam tu bhavati. nityāḥ śabdāḥ. nityeṣu nāma śabdeṣu kūṭasthai ravicālibhirvarṇairbhavitavyam, anapāyopajanavikāribhiḥ. tatra sa evāyam vikṛtaścetyetan nityeṣuśabdeṣu nopapadyate”. (it means that the śabdās are mutable).

In case we accept the norm ‘ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat, chinnapucche śuni śvatvavyavahārah’ (slight deformation doesn’t cause change of nomenclature, although the tail is cut the dog is a dog). It insinuates that śabdās are anitya and this is acceptable in kāryaśabdavāda but the śāstra (system) is started on the premise that śabdās are nitya (siddhe śabdārthasambandhe).

If we claim that śabdās are nitya then the varṇas are supposed to be kūṭastha, i.e. immutable like an anvil and should not move away nor should there be any loss, production or change in the form. In such a case, having a different form is against the norm of immutability.

Further, Patañjali elaborates another vārtika-

‘anupapannam sthānyādeśatvam nityatvāt- sthānī ādeśa ityetannityeṣu śabdeṣu nopapadyate. kim kāraṇam? nityatvāt, sthānīhi nāma yo bhūtvā na bhavati. ādeśo hi nāma yo’bhūtvā bhavati. etacca nityeṣu śabdeṣu nopapadyate yatsato nāma vināśaḥ syāt, asato vā prādurbhāva iti’.

The arrangement of sthānī and ādeśa (replacement) is insensible.

Sthānī- ādeśa, such a thing is not reasonable while the śabdas are immutable. What is the reason?, due to immutability, sthānī means which was not there but going to be, this is not possible in terms of śabdas, which are immutable, which also means the existing will perish and a new thing happens.

Further Patañjali endeavours to justify the concept of ‘sthānī- ādeśa’ with in the terms of ‘śabdanityavāda’.

Here is another vārtika-

“siddham tu yathā laukikavaidikeṣvabhūtapūrve’pi sthānaśabdaprayogāt”.
“siddhametat. katham?, yathā laukikavaidikeṣu kṛtānteṣu abhūtapūrve’pi sthānaśabda prayogo vartate. loke tāvad-‘ upādhyāyasya sthāne śiṣyaḥ’ ityucyate, na ca tatra upādhyāyo bhūtapūrvo bhavati. vede’pi- ‘somasya sthāne pūṭikatṛṇānyabhiṣuṇuyād’ ityucyate. na ca tatra somo bhūtapūrvo bhavati””.

It is possible just like in loka and veda, the term sthāna is employed even in the case of a thing that was not there earlier, it is possible how?, just like in the process pertaining to loka and veda, the usage of the term sthāna is there. Firstly, in loka, it is said that the disciple will be in the place of the teacher but no teacher is found earlier.

In veda too pūṭikatṛṇa (a kind of grass) has to be ground in the place of soma- is the statement, but soma is not there earlier.

Patañjali quotes another vārtika, which finally puts all the doubts to rest.

‘kāryavipariṇāmādvā siddham’-

“athavā kāryavipariṇāmātsiddhametat. kimidam kāryavipariṇāmāditi?, kāryā buddhiḥ sā vipariṇamyate. nanu ca kāryāvipariṇāmāditi bhavitavyam. santi

caiva hyauttarapadikāni hrasvatvāni. api ca ‘buddhiḥ sampratyaya ityanarthāntaram’. kāryā buddhiḥ, kāryaḥ sampratyayaḥ. kāryasya sampratyayasya vipariṇāmaḥ kāryavipariṇāmaḥ kāryavipariṇāditī. parihārāntaramevedam matvā paṭhitam. katham vedam parihārāntaram syāt? yadi bhūtapūrve sthānaśabdo vartate. bhūtapūrve cāpi sthāno vartate. katham? buddhyā. tadyathā kaścitkasmaicidupadiśati-

“prācīnam grāmādāmrāḥ” iti. tasya sarvatrāmrbuddhiḥ prasaktā. tath paścādāha- “ye kṣīrino’varohavantaḥ pṛthuparṇāste nyagrodhāḥ” iti. sa tatrāmrbudhyā nyagrodhabuddhim pratipadyate. sa tataḥ paśyati- budhyā āmrāmścāprakṣyamāṇān. nyagrodhāmścopadhīyamāṇān. nityā eva ca svasmin viṣaye āmrāḥ, nityāśca nyagrodhāḥ. buddhistasya vipariṇamyate. evamihāpyastirasmāyaviśeṣeṇopadiṣṭaḥ. tasya sarvatrāstibuddhiḥ prasaktā. saḥ “asterbhūḥ” ityanenāstibuddhyā bhavatibuddhim pratipadyate. sa tataḥ paśyati- buddhyā astim cāpakṣyamāṇam, bhavatim copadhīyamāṇam. nitya eva ca svasminviṣaye’stirnityo bhavatiśca. buddhistvasya vipariṇamyate.”

On the other hand, it is possible due to the change in the mind. Otherwise, this is possible due to change in the mind. What is kāryavipariṇāmāt?, kārya means buddhi (intellect), that is undergoing change. But it should be due to no change in the mind. Certainly there are shortening etc. that one effected in the latter word, also buddhi and sampratyaya are synonyms, kāryābuddhiḥ means kāryaḥ sampratyayaḥ, that means change of buddhi i.e. it is said kāryavipariṇāma. This is stated as a different solutions, when the term sthāna is employed in the sense of bhūtapūrva also, katham, through mind/intellect i.e. how, certain person preaches someone there are mango trees east of the village, then his mind takes it that there are mango trees everywhere. Again the former says- those with milk downward roots and big leaves are banyans, then the latter would get the image of

mango trees first banyan trees next, then he looks that some mango trees are replaced by banyans through intellect. As a matter of fact, both mango trees as well as banyans themselves are immutable like this- ‘asti’ is preached without any exception and for the disciple’s intellect, ‘asti’ is there everywhere, thereby the sūtra “asterbhūḥ”- he would get ‘bhavati’ after ‘asti’ in his intellect, then he looks through intellect ‘asti’ being replaced by ‘bhavati’. Rather, the fact is that, both ‘asti’ and ‘bhavati’ are immutable by themselves only the intellect is mutable.

Therefore, one has to understand the śabdanityatva as follows:

Pāṇini came across a word asti and also another word bhavati which is quite different in other words both are independent, immutable and there is no any relation whatsoever between the two. Rather he instituted a sūtra “asterbhūḥ”, which means asti is replaced by bhavati. The sūtra insinuates that śabda is kāryā and not nitya. This process apparently looks to be self-contradictory, i.e. the system of vyākaraṇa built on the premises of śabdanityatva. Whereas the sūtras such as the one quoted above imply “śabdānityatva”. It is against this background, that Patañjali illuminated the concept of śabdanityatva.

The thesis is that, there will be change that is intellectual rather than real and therefore the theory of śabdanityatva is not at stake.

In Paspasāhnikā, Patañjali rakes up the question as to whether śabda is nitya or kārya?.

“kim punarnityaḥ śabdaḥ, āhosvit kāryaḥ?”-

The question employed is that in case śabda is nitya, the system of vyākaraṇa is in vain. Mīmāṃsakas opine that varṇas suggested by the articulated sounds is śabda and it is immutable. Vaiyākaraṇas hold that padasphoṭa, which is

different from varṇa is acceptable still some vaiyākaraṇas advocate vākyasphoṭa as the real candidate. Vaiśeṣikas hold that the sound itself is śabda and it is kāryā as nothing else, other than the same is available. Patañjali shows the way out of the impasse by the following paragraph.

Under the first sūtra ‘vṛddhirādaic’, Patañjali substantiates the theory of ‘śabdanityatva’ by the following paragraph.

The following is the context-

The samjñā (designation), vṛddhi is given to the three letters ā, ai and au. The samjñā can be given to the existing varṇas, if varṇas do exist then only the samjñā can be given. Thus, both the things are interdependent (itaretarāśrayatva).

Then Vararuci offers the following vārtika as a solution;

“Siddhantu nityaśabdatvāt” (since the śabdas are immutable, there will not be interdependency), following is Patañjali’s bhāṣyam-

“Siddhametat katham? nityaśabdatvāt. nityāḥ śabdāḥ, nityeṣu śabdeṣu satāmādaicām samjñā krīyate. na ca samjñayā adaico bhāvyante.”

It is possible how? as śabdas are immutable the samjñā is being given to ā, ai and au, which are already there, but the letters are not being named (injected).

Then Patañjali quoting another vārtika, replies the question as what is the purpose of śāstra? while śabdanityatva is being advocated.

“yadi tarhi nityāḥ śabdāḥ, kimartham śāstram?. kimartham śāstramiti cen-nivartakatvātsiddham. nivartakam śāstram. katham?, mṛjirasmāyaviśeṣeṇopadiṣṭaḥ. tasya sarvatra mṛjibuddhiḥ prasaktā. tatrānena nivṛttiḥ krīyate. mṛjerakinitsu pratyayeṣu mṛji prasaṅge mārjiḥ sādurbhavaṭīti”.

If śabdas are immutable, what is the purpose of śāstra? It is required for exemption, exempting, how? The root mṛji is taught to this man without any exception, his intellect spreads everywhere in the form of mṛji, then by this, it is being exempted when mṛji is taken up, mārji will be the perfect one, if not followed by suffixes that are kit, git, ñit.

Bhartrhari's statement 'nityāśśabdārthasambandhaḥ tatrāmnātā maharṣibhiḥ' is made keeping the quoted lengthy discussion in mind.

At this juncture, it may be of some interest to compare the Indian dichotomy between name/śabda, and sense/artha with the western concept of meaning.

Writing on the concept of meaning in linguistics, Stephen Ullmann says, "Among the definitions of meaning evolved outside linguistics proper, two lines of thought have proved particularly fruitful in their application to language; the analytical and the operational approach to the problem". The best-known modern attempt for the analytical type of definition of meaning is the basic triangle designed by 'Ogden and Richards' basic triangle.

The author lay down a tripartite relationship between three terms, 'symbol', 'referent' and 'reference'. In simple terminology we shall call the symbol the 'name' which is the phonetic word; thought or reference, the 'sense' which corresponds to the name, referent, 'the thing' thing or 'object' to which the word refers. These three terms stand at the three apices of the triangle, but the symbol (the name) and the referent (the thing) are connected by a dotted line. It means, there is no direct relationship between the symbol and the referent and the relation is imputed.

On the other hand, Saussure says "the combination of a concept and a sound image", is a sign.

In Saussure's terminology, the word 'sign' means the whole, concept and sound image.

He replaces these two words, concept and sound image by the term 'signified' (signifié) and 'signifier' (signifiant). And thus by 'sign', Saussure means the whole the result from the association of the signifier with the signified. The bond between signifier (sound-image) and the signified (concept) is arbitrary. In other words the relationship of word and it's meaning is arbitrary (the word has no natural connection with the object it denotes). Thus, the artha or sense is signifié in Saussure, thought or reference is Ogden- Richards and apoha according to Buddhists.

Hari defines in vākyakāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam the deciding factors of a meaning in the following verses-

vākyātpakaraṇādarthādaucityāddeśakālataḥ|

śabdārtah pravibhajyante na rūpādeva kevalāt|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 314)

samsargo viprayogaśca sāhacaryam virodhitā|

arthaḥ prakaraṇam liṅgam śabdasyānyasya sannidhiḥ| (vākyakāṇḍa- 315)

sāmarthyamaucitī deśaḥ kālo vyaktiḥ svarādayaḥ|

śabdārtasyānavacchede viśeṣasmṛtihetavaḥ|| (vākyakāṇḍa- 316)

1. Samyoga (association): 'saśankhacakro hariḥ'- Hari with śankha and cakra.

Due to the association with conch and disc, here Hari means viṣṇu. The word Hari has got many meanings- frog, lion, serpent, parrot, indra, vāyu etc.

2. Viprayoga (dissociation): ‘saḥ rājā aśankhacakro hariḥ’- The king is Hari without śankha and cakra. Due to dissociation with conch and disc, here Hari means viṣṇu. Association precedes dissociation.
3. Sāhacaryam (company): ‘tau rāmalakṣmaṇau iva dṛśyete’- They look like Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. Rāma may mean Śrīrāma or Balarāma or Paruṣurāma. Since Śrīrāma only can have company with Lakṣmaṇa, here Rāma refers to Śrīrāma.
4. Virodhitā (hostility): ‘rāmārjunagatiḥ tayoh’- their behaviour is akin to that of Rāma and Arjuna. Here, following hostility, Rāma means Paraśurāma and Arjuna means Kārtavīryārjuna.
5. Artha (purpose): the word ‘sthāṇu’ means Śiva or a block of wood. ‘sthāṇum bhaja bhavacchide’- pray to ‘sthāṇu’ for mokṣa. Since Śiva only can help in attaining mokṣa, here sthāṇu means Śiva.
6. Prakaraṇam (context): Saindhava means a kind of salt as well as a kind of horse (from the land of sindhu). If one pronounces a sentence like ‘saindhavamānaya’ (fetch saindhavam) at the time of dinner it means ‘salt’ and if pronounced when one is about to start on a journey it means a ‘horse’.
7. Liṅgam (sign): it means a specific phenomenon that will be there with a person or thing. Makaradhvaḥ means Manmatha or Samudra. ‘kupito makaradhvaḥ’ (makaradhva is angry) is a sentence wherein Makaradhva means Manmatha rather than Samudra as ‘being angry’ is possible only with Manmatha. ‘ocean is angry’- is a figurative usage.
8. Śabdāntarasannidhi (proximity of another word): Kara means hand or tusk. Nāga means serpent or elephant or a person belonging to the clan of nāgas. ‘kareṇa rājate nāgaḥ’ (the nāga is shining with kara)- is a sentence wherein kara, due to the proximity of the word nāga, means tusk and nāga, due to the proximity of the word ‘kara’, means elephant.

9. Sāmarthyam (capacity): Madhu means honey, the month of caitra and liquor. In the sentence ‘madhunā mattaḥ kokilaḥ’ (the cuckoo is excited due to macho) the word macho means ‘the month of caitra’ (spring) as the cuckoo gets excited during caitra.
10. Aucityam (propriety): ‘pātu vo dayitāmukham’ (may the dayitāmukham protect you). Here ‘dayitāmukham’ means ‘the face of love’ (lady). But since the same can’t do the needful, the word has to be taken in the sense of ‘the positive behaviour of the love’, following propriety.
11. Deśaḥ (place): In the sentence- ‘vaikuṇṭhe hariḥ vasati’ (hari lives in vaikuṇṭha), the word ‘Hari’ means Viṣṇu, as vaikuṇṭham is the abode of the latter.
12. Kālaḥ (time): in the sentence ‘divā citrabhānuḥ vibhāti’ (citrabhānu is shining during daytime), the word citrabhānu means ‘sun’, whereas in the sentence ‘rātrau citrabhānuḥ vibhāti’ (citrabhānu is shining during night) the same means ‘moon’.
13. Vyaktiḥ (gender): The word ‘mitram’ is in neuter gender and it means ‘friend’. ‘mitraḥ’ is in masculine gender and it means ‘sun’. Nabhas (neuter) means ‘sky’ whereas ‘nabhaḥ’(masculine) means the month of śrāvaṇa.
14. Svaraḥ (accent): In Vedic literature, the svara (udātta, anudātta, svarita etc.) causes change of meaning. vṛtrāsura was a demon, who threw a missile targeted at indra. Due to wrong pronunciation of the mantra, i.e. svāhendraśatrurvardhasva, in terms of svara (ādyudātta instead of antodātta), the weapon fired back killing the demon.

6.2 Sphoṭa:

Sphoṭa is the ultimate ground of the linguistic communicability. It contributes to the central problem of general linguistics and to the philosophy of language. It is the co-ordinating factor amongst the varying aspect of ‘language-in-use’.

Sphoṭa theory is not invented by Bhartṛhari but he used it as the fundamental concept of the study of language. To review briefly the concept of sphoṭa, we have to go back to the Vedic period.

Vāk was considered to be a manifestation of all-pervading Brahman. All forms of vāk have evolved from the primordial speech i.e. praṇava.

Pāṇini had mentioned the sage Sphoṭāyana in his rule (avañ sphoṭāyanasya, 6-1-123) sphoṭa theory is identified with the sage.

Bhartṛhari seems to have considered Audumbarāyana mentioned by Yāska as having a similar view of the theory.

Patañjali opines that sphoṭa signifies speech/language and the audible sound is it's speech quality. The audible noise may be variable depending upon the speaker's mode of utterance, whereas sphoṭa is a unit of speech and is not subject to such variation.

He concludes that eventhough the sound can't coexist at the time of utterance, they can do so in the mind of the speaker as well as the mind of hearer. According to him sphoṭa is the permanent and unchanging element in the śabda.

The term sphoṭa stands for both śabda as well as artha. “sphuṭati arthaḥ asmāt iti śabdaḥ. Sphoṭaḥ- since it emerges out of this and therefore sphoṭa means śabda. ‘sphuṭyate iti arthaḥ api sphoṭaḥ’”. Since it emerges, meaning is also sphoṭa.

6.2.1 Yogānuśāsana:

Patañjali in yogānuśāsana rules that the trio of śabda, artha and jñāna are identical as each of them is superimposed upon the other i.e. śabda is artha, artha

is jñāna and jñāna is śabda (yoga sutram, 3-17)- śabdārtha pratyāyanām itaretarādhyāsāt saṅkaraḥ tatpravibhāgasamyamāt sarvabhūtarutajñānam.

6.2.2 Mahābhāṣya:

In Paspasāhnikā of Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali while discussing the form of śabda says that, by the pronunciation of which the jñāna (cognition) of dewlap, tail, hump and horns is attained, is śabda-

“yenoccāritena sāsnaṅgūlakakudakhuraviṣāṇinām sampratyayo bhavati sa śabdaḥ” i.e. it is nothing but sphoṭa.

6.2.3 Bhartṛhari- Sphoṭa:

Hari develops the sphoṭa theory, which is the anchor sheet of inquiry about how language functions at different levels of our conscious activity. He visualises it in a different way. For him sphoṭa is neither a meaning bearing unit nor a linguistic sign. It is something more than that. Sphoṭa is indivisible, changeless. It is a two faceted coin; the sound pattern on one side meaning bearing on the other side.

Bhartṛhari compares sphoṭa with ‘fire’ in the araṇi-

araṇistham yathā jyotiḥ prakāśāntarakāraṇam|

tadvacchabdo’pi buddhisthaḥ śṛtīnām kāraṇam pṛthak|| (brahmākāṇḍa-46)

Sphoṭa resides in the mind. Being manifested becomes separately the cause for manifesting itself as well as the meaning.

In verse (1-44), Hari says about the elements of the language ‘nimitta’ (root cause of manifestation) and the other the applied (prayujyate) when

manifested to convey the meaning. One is nāda or dhvani and the other is sphoṭa. Dhvani is the audible sound pattern having the potency of meaning and its expressibility. Sphoṭa is the real basis of language. It is linguistic potency and it is manifested by dhvani.

dvāvupādānaśabdeṣu śabdau śabdavidō viduḥ|

eko nimittam śabdānām aparo'rthe prayujyate|| (brahmakāṇḍa- 44)

Hari deeply inquires into the limitless ways of language function. He thinks that the rules of grammar like syntax and vocabulary are used to articulate expression, sense and meaning. But it itself is not useful to act as the basic ground of linguistic expressibility. There is the power of words to express the meaning in innumerable ways and contexts. Besides it there is a power deep rooted in the dispositional linguistic ability present within each human being; irrespective of the language limitations. He proposes that the real linguistic potency is present in buddhi (intellect).

In his view, there are two abilities in human beings- one is to express in speech form and the other is to discern meaning. Sphoṭa is inclusive of the two.

6.2.4 The process of communicability:

How the meaning is transferred from one person to another? In the light of sphoṭa, we can describe the process. The speaker utters a meaningful statement which he intends to say, taking its origin from the non- sequential and undifferentiated form which is already present there in buddhi.

In reverse, the hearer through the uttered sounds refers the potency to understand meaning which is also already residing in his mind. In this way, they share the same sphoṭa in the process of communicability.

āṇḍabhāvamivāpanno yaḥ kratuḥ śabdasaṃjñakaḥ|

vṛttistasya kriyārūpā bhāgaśo bhajate kramam|| (brahmakāṇḍa- 51)

Madhyamā, which dwells in the buddhi of speaker, is nimitta of the speakers 'vāk' whereas vaikharī the utterance of the speaker is nimitta for the madhyamā of the hearer. As it is exemplified in the above verse just like all the colors of a fully grown pea-hen are potentially there in the egg and the same is manifested when it comes out of it; the linguistic forms along with its potency of meaning are already present there in the sphoṭa. It functions identically both in the speaker and the hearer causing the transferability in speaking.

6.2.5 Bhartṛhari on speaker's communication of meaning:

According to Hari, there are three stages of linguistic expressibility in the speaker viz. paśyantī, madhyamā and vaikharī.

At paśyantī level, yogins would have the prakṛitipratyayavibhāga. Madhyamā is sphoṭa that is there in mind. All the three, i.e. śabda, artha and jñāna are there in the mind in the form of an amalgam.

The utterances awaken the hearer's linguistic potency and thereby he draws the comprehension of meaning. The utterances are expressed sequentially syllable by syllable. This utterance or acoustic sounds are called vaikharī.

They are of the merging and emerging natured sequency. The memory impressions of preceding sound units along with the last syllable gives the hearer the total unit of meaning. In this way, the non-sequential and unitary meaning out of particularised series of sound patterns is conveyed.

6.2.6 Pratibhā:

Hari puts forth the concept of pratibhā, in order to explain the problem of linguistic communication without which the gap in communication between the speaker and hearer is not answered. The concept is drawn from 'yoga' to explain the nature of linguistic meaning. Sometimes the hearer fails to understand what is

said by the speaker in spite of listening to the whole statement. It is but for lack of intuitive power i.e. pratibhā.

Pratibhā is the significant intuitive linguistic disposition of the hearer. It can be experienced but can't be defined clearly. It will be appropriate to call pratibhā as the instinctive power of mind. It is the basis of understanding and linguistic experience.

6.2.7 Sphoṭa- Others:

There is no unanimity of opinion regarding the exact significance of sphoṭa amongst the ancient as well as modern scholars. There has been difference of opinion among different systems and schools of Indian Philosophy, such as vyākaraṇam, nyāya, mīmāṃsa, sāmkhya, yoga etc. regarding the candidate that expresses the meaning.

6.2.7.1 Śābarasvamy:

Śābarasvamy in his commentary viz. Śābarabhāṣya, takes up the question of the form of śabda and says that the varṇas-‘ ga-au-ḥ ’ are śabda, i.e. varṇa is śabda. Further Śābarasvamy asserts that the last varṇa coupled with the samskāras of the earlier varṇas will be the candidate that renders the meaning and therefore there won't be any problem even if the varṇas perish as soon as they are pronounced-

“pūrvavarṇajanitasamskārasahitato’ntyo varṇaḥ pratyāyakaḥ”
(śābarabhāṣyam,1-1-1-1).

6.2.7.2 Kumārilabhaṭṭa:

Kumārilabhaṭṭa, in his famous work Ślokaṁvārtikam, earmarked a chapter called sphoṭavāda simply to refute the sphoṭa of vaiyākaraṇas. He naturally

supports Śabarasvamy's argument in this regard. According to pūrvamīmamsakas, a group of varṇas is a word and that of words is a sentence.

6.2.7.3 Naiyāyikas:

As far as the naiyāyikas are concerned, the varṇas and padas are real. There cannot be any entity such as sphoṭa. Here is nyāyabhāṣya-

“śrutam varṇamekamanekam vā padabhāvena pratisandhatte”
(nyāyasūtrabhāṣyam).

“pratītyapratītibhyām na sphoṭātmakaḥ śabdaḥ”- this sāmkyāsūtra refutes the sphoṭa theory as there is no understanding of the meaning through sphoṭa and it is a burden to accept sphoṭa, when the meaning is understood through śabda.

So far as the vedantins are concerned, they follow in the footsteps of pūrvamīmāṃsakas in most of the cases. In devatādhikaraṇam, Śaṅkarācārya vehemently refutes the sphoṭa and says just like a group of ants makes a row a group of varṇas makes a word-

“yatha kramānurodhinya eva pipīlikāḥ pañktibuddhimārohani evam kramānurodhina eva varṇāḥ padabuddhimāroksyanti”. (devatādhikaraṇam, 1-3-28)

Vaiyākaraṇas advocate the theory of sphoṭa which holds that the sentence is the real candidate and padam and varṇa are unreal. Yogins and ālankārikas subscribed to sphoṭa theory. On the other hand, mīmamsakas, naiyāyikas, vedantins, sāmkyas, and vaiśeṣikas refute this theory of sphoṭa.

6.2.7.4 Modern scholars:

John Brough and K.Kunjunni Raja treat sphoṭa as the linguistic sign in view of it's meaning bearing aspect.

Joshi and Cardona opine that sphoṭa is sound-unit of language system.

Iyer refutes the concept of sound-unit of language system and argues that sphoṭa should include the meaning- bearing speech unit.

Matilal follows Hari's theory of sphoṭa in the following way;

“ sphoṭa is the real sub-stratum prior linguistic unit which is identical also with its meaning. Language is not the vehicle of meaning or the conveyor belt of thought.

Śabdanā (linguaging) is thinking; and thought vibrates through language- sphoṭa refers to this non-differentiated language principle.” (Word and the World, p.85)

Korada answers the question ‘why sphoṭa?’ in this way;

The varṇas perish as soon as they are pronounced. As such all the earlier varṇas are gone by the time the last one is pronounced. Nevertheless, the listener claims to have understood the meaning without a hitch. Therefore, vaiyākaraṇas argue that a candidate called sphoṭa is very much required for the transformation of meaning from the speaker to the listener.

6.2.7.5 Wittgenstein:

Hari's concept of sphoṭa and communicative meaning are put to a quite different interpretation by Wittgenstein.

In the beginning, he was a formalist but later on became a communication-intention theorist. He refutes the concept of pratibhā, saying that there are no such mental states occurring privately in speakers or hearers mind. He dismisses the role of any such intermediary step between the actual level of utterance and the hearer's understanding.

To explain the hearer's understanding problem, he says that... "there are certain definite mental processes bound up with the working of the language, processes through which above language can function. I mean the process of understanding and meaning. The signs of our language seen dead without those mental processes; and it might seem that the only function of sign is to induce such processes, and these are the things we ought to really to be interested in." (philosophical investigations-section 358).

6.3 Types of Sphoṭa:

The literary meaning of the term sphoṭa is 'vācaka' (the expressing agent). According to vaiyākaraṇas there are eight sphoṭa.

1. Varṇasphoṭa
2. Padasphoṭa
3. Vākyasphoṭa
4. Akhaṇḍapadasphoṭa
5. Akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa
6. Varṇajātisphoṭa
7. Padajātisphoṭa
8. Vākyajātisphoṭa

First five are vyakti sphaṭas and remaining are jāti sphaṭas. They can be summarised in the following way;

6.3.1 Varṇa- Sphaṭa:

Here varṇa means prakṛiti and pratyaya and not phoneme. Both, in some sequence constitute a word. When we are asked to explain how the sense in a word is expressed, it is reasonable to say that the sequence of prakṛiti and pratyaya is endowed with the power of expressing import, i.e. varṇa- sphaṭa.

6.3.2 Pada-Sphaṭa:

The distinction between the stem and the suffix can't be understood in some places. So it is desirable that besides varṇa- sphaṭa we are required to admit pada- sphaṭa too.

6.3.3 Vākya- Sphaṭa:

The sentence is the unit of thought and expression. It is difficult to distinguish one pada and another in certain cases of assimilation (sandhi). Hence, we should recognise vākya- sphaṭa.

In case of compound words also, it is accepted, ekārthībhāvaśakti is there to express the required sense. And compounds are regarded as sentences (samastavākyas) endowed with the power of expressing sense, it is reasonable to hold that sentences are expressive of sense.

6.3.4 Jāti- Sphaṭa:

It is of three types namely varṇa, pada, and vākya sphaṭas. pada- jāti sphaṭa is explained first.

According to Bopadeva, the denoter (vācaka) like the denoted (vācya) should be of the nature of universal (jāti) which is present in each one of the individuals within the universals; and this universal is denoted by a word.

The exponents of jāti- sphoṭa argue that when the import that is denoted is universal, it is reasonable to admit that what expresses sense is also of the nature of universal. Hence it is not the individual word that is expressive of sense, but the universal which finds its expression through the different use of the said word is significant.

Similarly, varṇajāti- sphoṭa and vākya-jāti sphoṭa are supported.

6.3.5 Akhaṇḍa- Sphoṭa:

It is of two types- akhaṇḍa- pada- sphoṭa and akhaṇḍa-vākya- sphoṭa.

The grammarians say that neither the sentence nor the word admits of any divisions and letters. The divisions have no meta-physical existence.

Hari declares that words do not comprise letters but the division of word into stems and suffixes has been resonated for practical purposes alone.

The devices employed in course of treatment of linguistic problems are of a pragmatic value only. They are devised to inculcate the final truth; they themselves are not supposed to possess any metaphysical value. Thus, the exponents of akhaṇḍa-pada- sphoṭa maintain that it is the one indivisible that undergoes various formal transformations and this one indivisible word is expressive of sense.

The exponents of akhaṇḍa-vākya- sphoṭa establish that it is the indivisible sentence, which is expressive of sense as the sentence being the unit of thought and expression. It assumes a plurality of forms by undergoing formal transformations and this expresses the import.

However, the concept of all the eight divisions is not appreciable as it diminishes the glory of the theory i.e. sphoṭa. And it is wise to accept the division in the terms of akhaṇḍa-pada- sphoṭa which in turn merges in the concept of akhaṇḍa-vākya- sphoṭa.

Scholars later to Bhartṛhari, like Kaṇḍubhaṭṭa etc., beautifully analysed the above views.

In siddhānta, it is the vākyasphoṭa or vākya-jāti-sphoṭa i.e. acceptable. Rather, in order to carry out the application part of the system of vyākaraṇa, the rest of the sphoṭas are required. Since the number of sentences that are used, being used and going to be used, is innumerable. The authors of vyākaraṇa system had come down to words and even the number of words is innumerable, they came down to prakṛti and pratyaya. In fact, there are neither varṇas in a word nor words in a sentence. This is clearly stated by Bhartṛhari in brahmākāṇḍa of Vākyapadīyam.

pade na varṇā vidyante varṇeṣvavayavā na ca|

vākyātpadānāmatyantam praviveko na kaścana|| (vākyapadīyam- 1-73)

The term varṇa in ‘varṇasphoṭa’ means either a prakṛti or pratyaya. So the prakṛti or pratyaya expresses some meaning. Similarly, padasphoṭa means pada is the vācaka. Vākya sphoṭa follows. Since the system of vyākaraṇa exhibits a word into two parts, i.e. prakṛti and pratyaya. It is sakhaṇḍapakṣa.

On the other hand, the word has been there in the same form and it doesn’t have any parts whatsoever and the same is called akhaṇḍapakṣa. Same is the case

with vākya also- a vākya is an indivisible unit and the separation of the same as words is artificial, i.e. apoddhāra.

The jātipakṣa, wherein three sphoṭas are enumerated, is required because of the plurality of the entities.

Ṛkprātiśākhya defines a sentence thus- “padaprakṛtiḥ samhitā”. Here the compound ‘padaprakṛti’ can be either a tatpuruṣa or bahuvrīhi. The former, which means (sentence is) the base of words, supports the vākyasphoṭapakṣa, whereas the latter, which means, the one that has got words as the base (is the sentence), goes against sphoṭa. Keeping this in mind Hari, in his magnum opus, Vākyapadiyam, offered the following clarification-

There can be two derivations of the compound but tatpuruṣa prevails upon bahuvrīhi-

“padānām samhitā yoniḥ samhitā vā padāśrayā” (vākyapadīyam- 2-58)

Among the four kinds of vāk, described in Indian philosophical texts, it is madhyamā that is called sphoṭa and the same is situated in the mind-

parā vañ mūlacakrasthā paśyantī nābhisamsthitā|

hṛdisthā madhyamā jñeyā vaikharī kaṇṭhadeśagā|| (tantraśāstra)

The four-fold vāk has got its origin in ṛgveda itself-

catvāri vākparimitā padāni tāni vidurbrāhmaṇā ye manīṣiṇaḥ|

guhā trīṇi nihitā neṅgayanti turīyam vāco manuṣyā vadanti||

(ṛgveda-1-164-45)

Out of the four types of vāk the first three are available only to vaiyākaraṇas. And the fourth one, i.e. vaikhārī, is the one that is spoken by the common people.

In conclusion, sphoṭa is required for the understanding of a śabda and following the usage “śabdāt artham avagacchāmi” (and not śabdebhyaḥ) the singleness of the candidate for expression of the meaning is suggested.

7 CONCLUSIONS

Nāma is a word whereby the form of a thing or sattva is considered to be important. In spite of their abstract nature, words like ātman, buddhi etc., are also included.

Ākhyāta is a word, wherein the meaning of a verb is considered to be predominant and by which the bhāva (meaning of verb or dhātvartha) in the form of starting and ending is expressed.

Upasarga is a word, which effects the meaning of nāma and ākhyāta. Vācaka, dyotaka and sahakāri are the types of upasargas.

Nipāta is a word, such as ‘ca’ etc. that is not employed independently.

Karmapravacanīyas are dyotakas and not vācakas. They don’t have expectancy of a kriyā but denote the sambandha (relation).

Thus, the four-fold categorization of Word is accepted. But the parts of speech proposed by Thrax are applicable to all languages.

Words (śabdas), following their behaviour, refer to catuṣṭayī śabdānām pravṛttiḥ (jāti, guṇa, kriyā and samjñā). Whereas trayīpakṣa refers to jāti, guṇa and kriyā only.

The two-fold categorization of Word i.e. subantam and tiñantam is accepted by all systems of Indian tradition. And Pāṇini made such a division by putting nipātas and upasargas under subanta only. By this he could achieve a lot of brevity. But we can’t apply this to all languages.

Pāṇini preferred the term *subanta* to *nāma* and *tiṇanta* to *ākhyāta*. The *kriyā* is denoted by *tiṇanta* and the same is called *sādhya*, its counterpart being *siddha*.

A *tiṇanta* expresses *kriyā* (action/activity) and the same is called *vyāpārā*, *bhāvanā* and *utpādanā*.

The term *dhātu* is commonly used for a root and a verb, as well as a *tiṇanta*.

The definition of *kriyā*: Whether completed or not i.e. happened, happening or going to happen, the total entity, which is treated as *sādhya* (to be achieved), as it has a particular sequence is *kriyā*. This can be applied to any language.

Therefore, *kriyā* is a mental process and it can be *jāti* or *vyakti*. The mental image of the thing is correlated with the real thing and the same is applied to *kriyā*, be it *jāti* or *vyakti*.

Vṛtti or *padavidhi* is a unique concept of Indian grammatical tradition. Different word formation processes are covered under *vṛtti*.

‘*Parārthābhidānam vṛtṭiḥ*’ is the definition. The words involved in a *vākya* would get a different single form. Expression of meaning by the important word: supported by the meaning of the unimportant word: taking in to account the meaning of the group of words; the meaning of the group of the *prakṛti* and *pratyaya*- is *parārtha*. This is the essence of the above norm.

The words have different individual meanings. When they unite to form a *samāsa* or *vākya*, in the process of technical framework, they are modified to mean some thing special and it is called *vṛtti*.

Words unite to form samāsas and while uniting they give up their meaning (not completely) to qualify the other word of samāsa, which is termed as jahat-svārtha. On the other side, the words united in the samāsa won't give up their meaning but combine with other word as a qualifier and a unified meaning is expressed which is termed as ajahatsvārtha.

Kṛt is the name of non-tiṅ pratyayas instituted on a dhātu. It will come as para and will have ādyudāttasvara. These pratyayas are instituted in the sense of different kārakas i.e. karṭṛ, karma, karaṇa, sampradāna, apādāna, and adhikaraṇa.

Taddhitas are pratyayas, which are instituted on subantas. These pratyayas are meant to analyse padas of a different category.

Sanādyantas are twelve pratyayas beginning with san. In order to add kṛts and tiṅs for required śabdas. Sanādyantas are given the name dhātu. They can't be called kṛts and ārdhadhātukas and therefore as a result they won't get iḍāgama and guṇa.

The peculiarity of sanādi is that some of these pratyayas apply on dhātus whereas others on prātipadikas but both of them ultimately become dhātus and thus become eligible to receive both kṛts and tiṅs. While tiṅantas are used directly, the kṛdantas, following kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca (1-2-46) get sups and endup as subantas.

A prātipadika expresses five meanings i.e. jāti, vyakti, liṅgam, samkhyā and kārakam.

After apoddhāra (artificial separation) of padārthas from a vākyārtha, it is described that either jāti or dravya or both will be the meaning of all śabdas.

In the sentence ‘gāmānaya’ (fetch a cow), the word gām means a govyakti (a single cow) rather than jāti (all the cows on the earth).

In every ‘thing’ there are two parts, the real and unreal. Between the two, the real part is dravyam and the unreal part is jāti. Unless and until the advaitasiddhānta is digested the concept of satya and asatya or dravyam and jāti can’t be understood.

The ākāram (form) is mutable and dravya is immutable is the purport.

The thesis of vaiyākaraṇas as far as the liṅga is concerned is that it is the śabda rather than artha that is the resort of liṅga.

In all padārthas there will be three dharmas (properties) viz. āvirbhāva (the birth of guṇas), tirobhāva (gradual decrease of guṇas) and sthiti (the state of balance), and the same which are inherent are shown as pumliṅga, strīliṅga and napumsakaliṅga.

In vyākaraṇa ‘bauddhārtha (imaginary thing)’ rather than the vastu (real thing) has to be taken in terms of kriyā, kārakam, liṅgam etc. The liṅgam is in śabda rather than in artha.

Finally, there is no other go but one has to resort to the vivakṣā of guṇas by yogins. But it is not possible practically to identify guṇas. We have to depend on usage of śabdas and kośas like nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam to know the liṅga of any śabda.

Vacanam and samkhyā are synonyms. The things that can be referred to by the pronouns such as this and that are called dravyas and the difference among

dravyas is expressed by samkhyā such as two and three. Rather, the abheda or non-difference is expressed by number ‘one’.

The word ‘kāraṇa’ means the one, which produces a verb. There are six kāraṇas- karma, karaṇa, karṇa, sampradāna, apādāna, adhikaraṇa. It is a universal concept.

The Padārthas can be divided into two: siddha and sādhyā. Sādhyā is kriyā, like pāka, yāga, gamana, adhyayana etc. If it is to be produced, then some entity is required and the same is siddha. The same is kāraṇa and sādhanā. Between the kriyā, which is sādhyā, and the sādhanā, which is siddha, there will be the relation of “kriyākāraṇabhāva”.

Thus, a kriyā is generated through sādhanā / kāraṇa. Here sādhanā is not, in fact, the tangible thing. Rather, it is the śakti (capacity) of the thing.

According to Indian grammatical tradition, the relation between śabda and artha is immutable. When it is said that the relation between śabda and artha is immutable, it is needless to say that śabda, artha are also immutable.

In examples like ‘dadhyatra’, the thesis is that, there will be change that is intellectual rather than real. Modern linguists’ purport is that Language is not static. It is dynamic. Rather the system of vyākaraṇa is built on the premise of śabdanityatva. Here it is pravāhanityatā.

Sphoṭa is the unique Indian concept. The literary meaning of sphoṭa is vācaka (the expressing agent) that is śabda or vācya (expressed meaning) that is artha. There are three stages of linguistic expressibility in the speaker viz. paśyanti, madhyamā and vaikhari. Madhyamā is sphoṭa that is there in the mind. All the three i.e. śabda, artha and jñāna are there in the mind in the form of an amalgom.

Among eight types of sphoṭa, akhaṇḍavākyasphoṭa is the real candidate. In conclusion, sphoṭa is required for the understanding of a śabda and following the usage “śabdāt artham avagacchāmi” (and not śabdebhyaḥ) the singleness of the candidate for expression of the meaning is suggested.

The definition of Word by western scholars is partly correct in case of Sanskrit language. Rather, ‘suptiñantam padam’ is the appropriate definition.

It is difficult to offer a universal definition to a ‘Word’.

The native speaker, with the help of intuition can easily grasp what is a Word and what is not. These definitions are rather scholastic and academic.

The four-fold categorization of word is accepted. But the parts of speech proposed by Thrax are applicable to all languages.

The concept of subanta and tiñanta may have universal application. The Indian languages in view of their indebtedness to Sanskrit have the feasibility of being analyzed. The subanta is noun and tiñanta is verb.

Some Indian languages, like Telugu etc., have borrowed some of the concepts from vṛtti. There is a striking similarity between the concept of vṛtti and the exocentric and endocentric division of compounds in modern linguistics.

The concept ‘pañcakam prātipadikārthaḥ’ can be applied to all languages.

Śabdanityatva seems to be a philosophical concept of Indian scholars. In modern linguistics word is a concept of ever changing form as a unit and Language as a whole. But to correlate the two different aspects, it is essential to accept that they are complementary. The different meaning of a word evolved due to semantic changes is an evidence of śabdanityatva only.

The sphaṭavāda is a boon to linguistics, a unique but age-old concept of Indian scholars, narrates the mechanism of Language processes and its communicability between the speaker and listener. It is an Indian cognitive approach of analysing the language.

Finally, efforts to correlate the language theories of Bharṭṛhari and others will be a good contribution to the science of linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1970. *R̥gvedaprātiśākhya*. Varanasi: Kāśī Hindūviśvavidyālaya.
1996. *R̥gveda*. New Delhi: Nagaprakasan.
- Akṣapāda. 1925. *Nyāyasūtram (with Vātsayana's Bhāṣyam)* Varanasi: Chowkamba.
- Aronoff, Mark and Fudeman, Kirsten. 2005. *What is Morphology?* U.S.A : Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Atharvaveda. 1986. *Nāgaprakaśan*. New Delhi.
- Bhartrhari. 1947. *Vākyapadīyam* (kaṇḍas 1&2 Telugu trns.). Hyderabad: Telugu Academy.
- Bhartrhari. 1974. *Vākyapadīyam* (kaṇḍas 1&2 Telugu trns.). Hyderabad: Telugu Academy, Hyderabad.
- Bhartrhari. 1980. *Vākyapadīyam* (Padakāṇḍa Telugu trns.). Hyderabad: Telugu Academy.
- Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita. 1929. *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhānta Kaumudī*. Madras: Bālamānorama Press, Mylapure, Madras.
- Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita. 1996. *Siddhantakaumudī*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita. 1929. *Śabdakaustubha*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita. 1934. *Praudhāmanoramā*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Bist, U.S., 1990. *The Concept of Language*. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1963. *Language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (Indian edition).
- Coward, G Harold. 1980. *The Sphoṭa theory of Language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.
- Dvivedi, H.P. 1978. *Studies in Pāṇini*. M.C. Mittal. Delhi.
- Francis, P. Dinneen, S.J. 1967. *An Introduction to General linguistics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, United States of America.
- Gleason, H.A. 1961. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. Winston: Holt, Rinehart.

- Harris. Roy and Taylor. Talbot. J. 1997. *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought I, The Western Tradition from Socrates to Saussure* (2nd edi.). New York: Routledge..
- Herndon. Jeanne H. 1976. *A Survey of Modern Grammars*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, United States of America.
- Hockett. C. F., 1976. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH Publishing co.
- Iyer. K.A.S. 1966. *Brahma kāṇḍa (Vṛtti of Bhartṛhari)*. Pune: Deccan College.
- , 1977. *The Vākyapadiya: English Translation with Exegetical Notes*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.
- , 1969. *Bhartṛhari; A Study of Vākyapadiya in Light of Ancient Commentaries*. Poona: Deccan College.
- , 1971. *The Vākyapadiya, Ch. III, Part I, English Translation*. Poona: Deccan College.
- Jackson, Howard. 1988. *Words and Their Meaning*. London: Longman.
- Jaimini. 1930. *Mīmāṃsādarśanam*. Pune: Anandasram.
- Jaimini. 1930. *Pūrvamīmāṃsādarśanam*. Poona: Anandasram.
- Jha. B.N. 1990. *A Glimpse of the History of Sanskrit Grammar*. Varanasi: Kishor Vidyāniketan.
- Junnarkar, P.B. 1980. *An Introduction to Pāṇini*. Baroda: Shanti S. Dighe.
- Kapoor. Kapil. 2005. *Dimensions of Pāṇini Grammar- The Indian Grammatical System*. New Delhi: D.K.Print World(p)Ltd.
- Katre. S.M. 1965. *Some Problems of Historical Linguistics in Indo-Aryan*. Poona: Deccan College.
- Kātyāyana. 1934. *Vājasaneyaprātiśākhya*. (Ed.) V V Sharma. Madras.
- Kātyāyana. 1981. *Vārtikas*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.,
- Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa. 1989. *Bhuṣaṇasāra*. Delhi: Chowkhamba.
- Kumārīlabhaṭṭa. 1930. *Ślokavārtikam*. Poona: Anandasram.
- Kumārīlabhaṭṭa. 1930. *Tantravārtikam*. Poona: Anandasram.
- Lepschy. Giulio. 1970. *A Survey of Structural Linguistics*. Faber and Faber, London.

- Mahavir. 1978. *Pāṇini as Grammarian (with special reference to Compound formations)*. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.
- Matilal. Bimal Krishna. 2001. *The Word and the World (India's Contribution to the Study of Language)*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews. P.H. 1991. *Morphology* (2nd. Edn.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Misra. Kamal. K. 2000. *Text book of Anthropological Linguistics*. New Delhi: Ashok Kumar Mittal Concept Publishing Company.
- Mohanty. Panchanan (Ed.). 2006. *Natural Language Structures (PGDCAIL-412)*. Hyderabad: Centre for Distance Education, University of Hyderabad.
- Nāgeśabhaṭṭa. 1926. *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Nāgeśabhaṭṭa. 1973. *Mahābhāṣya pradīpa, Mahābhāṣya*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Nāgeśabhaṭṭa. 1973. *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Palmer. F.R. 1981. *Semantics*. (2nd Ed.). London: CUP.
- Pāṇini. 1986. *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Patañjali. 1981. *Mahābhāṣyam with pradīpa and udyota*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Praśastapāda. *Praśastapādabhāṣyam*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba.
- Radford. Andrew, Atkinson. Martin. et al. 2008. *Linguistics: An Introduction*. London: CUP.
- Reddy, G.N., 1966. *A Study of Telugu Semantics*. Tirupathi: S.V. University.
- Robins, R.H., 1964. *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. Longman.
- Śabarasvāmī, 1930. *Śābarabhāṣyam*. Poona: Anandasram.
- Śankarācārya, 1938. *Śāṅkarabhāṣyam on Brahmasūtras*. Panduranga Jawaji: Bombay.
- Śākaṭāyana, 1931. *Ṛkprātiśākhya*. (Ed. & Translation) M.D.Shastri, Allahabad.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959. (Tr. Of 1916 work). *Course in General Linguistics*. New York: Philosophical library.

- Shastri. Gaurinath. 1980. *A Study in the Dialectics of Sphoṭa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.
- Simpson. J. M.Y., 1979. *A First Course in Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Srimannarayana Murti.M. 1984. *An Introduction to Sanskrit Linguistics (Comparative and Historical)*. D.K.Publications, Delhi.
- Staal. Frits. 1988. *Universals (Studies in Indian Logic and Linguistics)*. London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Subrahmanyam. Korada. 2008. *Theories of Language (Oriental and occidental)*. New Delhi: D K Publishers.
- , 2001. *Four Vṛttis in Pāṇini*.
- , 1992. *Brahmākāṇḍa* (Eng. Transl.). Delhi. Indian Books Centre.
- Subrahmanyam.P.S. 2001. *Pāṇinīyam- Śāstra Lakṣaṇālu*. Hyderabad: Potti Sreeramulu Telugu Viswavidyalayam.
- Tandra Patnaik, 1994. *Śabda, A Study of Bhartṛhari's Philosophy of Language*. D.K.Print world (P) Ltd. New Delhi.
- Ullmann. Stephen. 1977. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. London: Oxford. Basil Black well.
- Vāmana & Jayāditya. 1970. *Kāśikā*. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University.
- Varshney, Radhey. L. 1994. *An Introductory Text Book of Linguistics & Phonetics*. Bareilly: Studentstore, Rampur Bagh.
- Verma, S.k. 1974. *Linguistics*. Delhi: OUP.
- Vijayanarayana. B and Rama Rao.C. (Ed.). 1998. *The Word Formation in Indian Languages*. Hyderabad: Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics, Osmania University. Book links corporation.
- Yāska, Lakshman Sarup. 1920. *The Nighantu and the Nirukta: The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology*. Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass.
- Yule. George. 2006. *The Study of Language* (3rd Ed.). New Delhi: Cambridge University Press.