Pāṇini's Influence on Śābdabodha

(With special reference to Naiṣadhīyacarita - second canto selected verses only)

A dissertation submitted to the University of Hyderabad in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of degree of

Master of Philosophy

in

Shabdabodha Systems and Language Technologies

By

S V B K V Gupta
09HSHL02

Department of Sanskrit Studies
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad 500046
June 2010

Declaration

I, ***S V B K V Gupta*** hereby declare that the work embodied in this dissertation entitled ***``Pāṇini's Influence on Śābdabodha (With special reference to Naiṣadhīyacarita - second canto selected verses only)''*** is carried out by me under the supervision of ***Prof. K Subrahmanyam***, Department of Sanskrit Studies, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad and I also declare that it has not been submitted previously for any degree in part or in full to this university or any other university or Institution for the award of any degree.

Date: **S V B K V Gupta**

Place: Hyderabad 09HSHL02

Department of Sanskrit Studies
University of Hyderabad

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that this dissertation entitled ***``Pāṇini's Influence on Śābdabodha (With special reference to Naiṣadhīyacarita - second canto selected verses only)''*** is a record of bonafide work done by ***S V B K V Gupta*** a research scholar for M.Phil. programme in ***Shabdabodha Systems and Language Technologies***, Department of Sanskrit Studies, School of Humanities, University of Hyderabad under my guidance and supervision.

The dissertation has not been submitted previously in part or in full to this or any other University or Institution for the award of any degree or diploma.

Prof. K Subrahmanyam
Supervisor

Amba Kulkarni
Head
Department of Sanskrit Studies

Mohan G Ramanan
Dean
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Before I get thick of things I would like to add a few heartfelt words for the people who were apart of this dissertation in numerous ways and people who gave unending support right from the ideal was conceived. I am greatly indebted to ***Prof. K Subrahmanyam*** for his patience and cheerfulness to help me in my dissertation, and valuable guidance and co-operation which made me to see the silver line in every dark cloud. I wish to express my sense of gratitude to ***Amba Kulkarni***, ***J S R A Prasad*** for their precious and valuable advice and they enlightened me from the darkness. I extend my thanks to all of my friends, teaching and non teaching staff members of Dept. Of Sanskrit Studies for their co-operation during this dissertation work.

S V B K V Gupta

Contents

Chapters **Page No.**

1. Introduction..(1 to 5)
2. Analysis...(6 to 70)
3. Conclusion and Bibliography.....................................(71 to 77)

Chapter - I

INTRODUCTION

The great commentator मल्लिनाथ authored a commentary called 'जीवातु' on the famous work 'नैषधम्' of श्रीहर्ष. There is a popular remark, i.e. "नैषधं विद्वदौषधम्". Which means that the काव्य is just like a medicine, even to scholars. The implication is that it's very difficult even for scholars to understand the purport of श्रीहर्ष's poetry.

मल्लिनाथ in the introduction to 'जीवातु' offers the following two verses, which reflect the situation that was prevailing at that time -

श्रीमल्लिनाथविदुषा विदुषां मतेन
तेनैव नैषधकथामृतकाव्यबन्धः ।
व्याख्यास्यतेऽस्तु रसभावगुणार्थ–
दोषसध्वन्यलङ्कृतिरहस्यविदां मुदे तत् ।।

क्षुद्रव्याख्याविषार्तानां श्रीहर्षकविराङ्गिराम् ।
उज्जीवनाय जीवातुर्जीयादेष मया कृतः ।।

In the first verse मल्लिनाथ vows to comment श्रीहर्ष's नैषध which is a काव्य filled with nectar (अमृतं) and through श्लेष, he implies that due to the bad

commentaries नैषधम् was dead – i.e. नैषधकथा + अमृतकाव्यबन्ध and नैषधकथा मृतकाव्यबन्ध – he also asserts that he is doing the commentary to please those who know the secrets of रस, भाव, गुण, अर्थ, दोष, ध्वनि and अलङ्कार.

In the second verse मल्लिनाथ pledges that his 'जीवातु' which conforms to meaning - the one that injects life or life saving medicine, would revitalizes the words of great poet श्रीहर्ष that got fainted due to the poison of bad commentaries.

In Indian tradition the message is delivered in three patterns – the वेद preaches in a fashion that is similar to a king's order, whereas the same message is offered by पुराण just like a friend. On the other hand, a काव्य suggests the same in a way that suites a young wife. In order words, a poet would try his best to deliver the message in an attractive way with all the flowery descriptions.

The last one, i.e. the काव्य, is mostly meant for non-scholarly people who prefer beauty associated with the message.

On the other hand, different systems of Indian Philosophy are useful in extracting the intended meaning of the poet in terms of वाच्यार्थ, लक्ष्यार्थ and व्यङ्ग्यार्थ.

Since व्याकरणं is considered to be fundamental of any piece of literature, in terms of offering an exploded view of a शब्द and through that deducing the real meaning or intension of the poet, one should in the first place take the help of the system and there too preferably the one compiled by पाणिनि.

It is a well known fact that Paninian system analyses language levels i.e. पद, वर्ण, वाक्य and महावाक्य. The term शाब्दबोध has been popular throughout Indian tradition and is generally used to refer to the meaning of a sentence.

It was in 11th century A.D. that a neo-logician (नव्यनैयायिक) called गङ्गेशोपाध्याय who for the first time attributed three kinds of शाब्दबोध to वैयाकरणs, मीमांसकs and नव्यनैयायिकs.

It all started with the definitions of आख्यात & नाम by the author of निरुक्तं, i.e. यास्क, भावप्रधानमाख्यातम्। सत्वप्रधानानि नामानि। यत्रोभे भावप्रधाने भवतः।

The आख्यात (verb) is the one where the भाव (धात्वर्थ) is important whereas नाम would have द्रव्य as the important component. When there will be both then the धातु is important.

In गङ्गेश's words it is धात्वर्थमुख्यविशेष्यकशाब्दबोध for वैयाकरणs and it means the verb rather than the noun in a sentence is the predominant factor or the chief qualified in a sentence. वैयाकरणs do not accept a sentence without a verb. Under अनभिहिते (2-3-1) कात्यायन offers a वार्तिक which means the word अस्ति, which is in present tense, has to be supplemented even when it is not used – अस्तिर्भवन्तीपरः अप्रयुज्यमानोप्यस्ति. In other words when there is no verb in a sentence the word अस्ति has to be added. Under तदस्यास्त्यस्मिन्निति मतुप् (5-2-94) पतञ्जलि remarks that a thing cannot be there devoid of existence i.e. since existence is a

must the verb अस्ति (or भवति or विद्यते), denoting existence, will be there in a sentence even if it is not used. Further, the षड्भावविकारs enumerated by यास्क in his निरुक्त also vouch to the fact that there will be at least the verb अस्ति in every sentence.

For his part, पाणिनि compiled a सूत्र i.e. धातुसम्बन्धे प्रत्ययाः (3-4-1) suggesting that the धातु is the predominant factor compared to नाम, in a sentence. An example for the above सूत्र i.e. वसन्ददर्श, is available in the first verse itself in शिशुपालवध and it may be strange that मल्लिनाथ did not touch this aspect in his सर्वंकषा.

It is, भावनामुख्यविशेष्यकशाब्दबोध that is attributed to मीमांसकs as they think, as was ruled by जैमिनि – आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वात् (जै.सू.1.2.1.1), that the भावना or activity is the main factor of a sentence i.e. the verb which denotes भावनाs is important. Not much difference is there between वैयाकरणs and मीमांसकs with regard to the main factor of a sentence. As far as the नैयायिकs are concerned, it is प्रथमान्तार्थमुख्यविशेष्यकशाब्दबोध. The word ending in प्रथमाविभक्ति, hold नैयायिकs, is the predominant factor, this does not mean that नैयायिकs stick to the above norm. At times it can be धात्वर्थमुख्यविशेष्यक or निपातार्थमुख्यविशेष्यक etc. Rather, it means that they do not necessarily follow the guidelines set by निरुक्त.

However, in this dissertation it is not my aim to go into the details of शाब्दबोध on the lines stated above. Rather, I would like to take up some cases of पद, समास, वाक्य and other aspects that are there in certain verses of नैषधीयचरित and discuss the influence of पाणिनिव्याकरणं in terms of शाब्दबोध.

Chapter - II

ANALYSIS

1) **अधिगत्य जगत्यधीश्वरादथ मुक्तं पुरुषोत्तमात्ततः ।**

वचसामपि गोचरो न यस्स तमानंदमविंदत द्विजः ।। (2-1)

Summary :

After set free the bird, having attained freedom, enjoyed happiness that cannot be described in words.

Here in the above verse the verb अविन्दत demands the following explanation -

It is an 'आत्मनेपद' on 'विद्ल् लाभे' by the पाणिनिसूत्र - 'स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले' (1-3-72). तिङ् प्रत्यय denotes क्रिया. The 'क्रिया' expresses काल, पुरुष, उपग्रह and संख्या.

हरि in पदकाण्ड of वाक्यपदीय under the heading 'उपग्रह समुद्देश' explicates the concept of 'आत्मनेपद' and 'परस्मैपद'. He defines 'उपग्रह' as the meaning of 'लादेश' which denotes some differences in certain places –

य आत्मनेपदाद्भेदः क्वचिदर्थस्य गम्यते ।

अन्यतश्चापि लादेशान्मन्यन्ते तमुपग्रहम् ।।

If the result of a 'क्रिया' belongs to 'कर्ता' it is 'आत्मनेपद' and if it belongs to another person then it is 'परस्मैपद'. पाणिनि compiled the following 'सूत्र' to institute 'आत्मनेपद' – ''स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले'' (1-3-72) .

हरि further explains that in certain cases the 'क्रिया' differs and such a difference is expressed by 'परस्मैपद' and 'आत्मनेपद' in certain sentences also the same is denoted –

क्रियाविषयभेदेन जीविकादिषु भिद्यते।

लादेशैः स क्रियाभेदो वाक्येष्वपि नियम्यते।।

In activities meant for livelihood etc. the क्रिया differs following the person to whom the result belongs.

The root 'पच्' denotes the क्रिया cooking. This 'पाक क्रिया' is different for the cook as well as the person who consumes it. The 'परस्मैपद' and 'आत्मनेपद' that are 'लादेश' explain the difference.

One takes up the job of cooking for livelihood and another performs 'यज्ञ' etc. for the same cause and both the people might be receiving salary. Rather the 'क्रियाफल' doesn't go to both of them, but to the master. The master will enjoy the cooked food and the result of 'यज्ञ' etc.. i.e. 'पुण्य', goes to the master. This kind of specific meaning is expressed by परस्मैपद and आत्मनेपद. The purport is

that by employing परस्मैपद like पचति and यजति the results of पाक and याग do not belong to the person involved in the activities but someone else.

In certain cases the specific meaning of क्रिया is denoted by sentence itself – स्वं यज्ञं यजते – स्वं यज्ञं यजति. In both sentences the word स्वम् helps in deciding that the क्रियाफल belongs to कर्ता.

पाणिनि through a सूत्र i.e. विभाषोपपदेन प्रतीयमाने (1-3-77), rules that either पदं can be employed when it becomes clear as to weather the प्रधानफल is कर्तृगामि or अन्यगामि through an उपपद (The word pronounced in proximity).

Therefore, since in the above sentences the word स्वं makes it clear that the क्रियाफल is कर्त्रुगामि there can be either पदम्. Thus it is possible that the difference of क्रिया can be denoted through लादेश as well as वाक्य. This is called उपग्रह as the क्रियाविशेष is denoted by आत्मनेपद etc..

Further हरि clarifies that some scholars asserted स्वार्थत्वं and परार्थत्वं in terms of the behavior of a क्रिया. Rather it depends upon विवक्षा as to weather that 'परार्थत्व' is real or unreal.

क्रियाप्रवृत्तौ वाख्याता कैश्चित् स्वार्थपरार्थता ।

असती वा सती वाऽपि विवक्षितनिबन्धना ।।

As it is remarked by पतञ्जलि i.e. 'सर्व इमे स्वभूत्यर्थयतन्ते' – all these people try for their own uplift, everybody puts in efforts for his own benefit. Therefore स्वार्थप्रवृत्ति (behaving with selfishness) is real where as परार्थप्रवृत्ति (behaving for others' sake) is unreal. If anybody says that his behavior is 'पारमार्थिक' it is just for courtesy. One may say so due to 'विवक्षा'. In such cases since क्रियाफल is पदार्थ, आत्मनेपद will not take place. In order to avoid such a situation – i.e. although the result is considered as परार्थ since in truth it is स्वार्थ only, to get 'आत्मनेपदं' पाणिनि said - ''कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले'' (1-3-72)

हरि inserted the word ' कैश्चित्' (by some scholars). In the above verse in order to accommodate others' opinion that not only by 'विवक्षा' but also following the chief result the behavior can be स्वार्थ or परार्थ really.

देवदत्त expects स्वर्ग and अन्न for himself and gets यजना, पचना etc. activities done through यज्ञदत्त. He pays to यज्ञदत्त for the work done. For यज्ञदत्त salary is the only result. The chief results of स्वर्ग and ओदन belong to देवदत्त who got the activities done. Rather in order to get the result देवदत्त is arranging for याग and पाक and it is in this sense that the roots यज् and पच् receive आत्मनेपद and there can be the usage like देवदत्तः यजते, पचते. Here यजते means making arrangements for याग but not performing यज्ञ. Similarly 'पचते' means

making arrangements for पाक, but not 'cooking'. This is so because the chief results of याग and पाक are not reaching the यागकर्ता and पाककर्ता. On the other hand in the case of यज्ञदत्त there should be परस्मैपदप्रयोग like यज्ञदत्तः यजति.

हरि, in the following verse, registers the argument advocated by some वैयाकरणs that in certain cases such as देवदत्तः पचते, यजते. The आत्मनेपद denotes a meaning that is akin to the meaning of 'णिच्' प्रत्यय –

केषाञ्चित् कर्त्रभिप्राये णिचा सह विकल्पते।

आत्मनेपदमन्येषां तदर्था प्रकृतिर्यथा।।

Some scholars add 'णिच्' to a धातु whereas others, when the activity is meant for कर्ता, use आत्मनेपद optionally with 'णिच्'.

As has already been mentioned आत्मनेपद is instituted by the सूत्र – "स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले" (1-3-72) on धातुs which have स्वरित or ज्ञापक as ञित्, if the result of क्रिया belongs to कर्ता. Some scholars opine that आत्मनेपद by this सूत्र is applicable to धातुs which express संविधानार्थ. पचते (पाचयति = getting cooked by someone), यजते (याजयति = getting the scarifies performed by someone) etc. are examples.

The implication is that – since धातुs denote many meanings (धातूनां अनेकार्थत्वात्), the संविधानार्थ is denoted by धातु itself and therefore आत्मनेपद

comes as द्योतक (illuminator). When the प्रकृति does not denote संविधान then there will be णिच् प्रत्यय and it will be पाचयति, याजयति etc..

The व्यापार (activity) i.e. useful for the behavior of the total धात्वर्थ is called संविधान. The term प्रवर्तना is a synonym. In a क्रिया like यजेत, the activity of यजमान that is required for ऋत्विक् is धात्वर्थ. In other words, the activity i.e. required to fulfill all the sub-activities of क्रिया denoted by the धातु is called संविधान.

Therefore in the case of यजेत, unless and until the ऋत्विक्s complete their duties and until the related activities are completed it is not possible to claim that the धात्वर्थ is completed. In such a situation, although the अध्वर्यु urges the होता to do शासन of शास्त्र, since the धात्वर्थ doesn't apply until the यजनक्रिया is completed, it is not संविधान. Since the urge of यजमान penetrates through, from beginning to the end, the same is संविधान. Some other scholars think that the logistical support is संविधान.

In the above सूत्र the condition कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले (1-3-72) entails (उपलक्षण) a specific क्रिया called संविधान according to शिष्टप्रयोग the ण्यर्थ (प्रेरणार्थ) is implied in usages like क्रीणीष्व, वपते, धत्ते, चिनुते etc..

The above शब्दs do not denote the common meaning i.e. do buy, tonsuring, putting on, doing चयन, rather they expressed the following meanings arrange for

buying one for me, getting tonsured by, making one put on and making one perform चयनम्. शिष्टs accept these as meanings.

If we make a survey following the शब्दशक्ति, the धातुs which are with स्वरितेत् and ञित् only denote the meaning of संविधान but not others.

Although it is said in सूत्र like “कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले” it means there will be आत्मनेपदी if the meaning of संविधान is conveyed. Such संविधान can be expected with स्वरितेत् and ञित् only. Therefore, स्वरितञितः in the सूत्र is redundant – this is पतञ्जलि’s view.

Some scholars advance the following argument – if an activity is meant for self then there will be आत्मनेपद and if an activity is meant for others then there will be परस्मैपद. विवक्षा is the base of स्वार्थत्व and परार्थत्व. Both the phenomena will be accepted in लौकिकप्रयोग’s in the case of स्वरितेत् and ञित् only but not in the case of धातुs like ‘या’.

Even if we accept this argument the स्वरितञित् ग्रहणं in the सूत्र is redundant. The entire discussion depends upon both these opinions.

Some scholars opine that the meaning i.e. denoted by ‘णिच्’ is denoted by ‘आत्मनेपद’ also. Therefore आत्मनेपद gets विकल्प with णिच्. It means that instead of using a णिजन्तधातु one can use आत्मनेपद. For this they draw analogy with others’

opinion – in the examples like क्रीणीष्व etc., since the प्रेरणार्थ is expressed by the bare धातु, the same is used instead of णिजन्त. Similarly आत्मनेपद can be employed instead of णिजन्त.

According to these people संविधान only is णिजर्थ but not bare प्रैषा (to order\employ). देवदत्त gets the पाक cooked by यज्ञदत्त – in this sentence देवदत्त is प्रयोजककर्ता and यज्ञदत्त is प्रयोज्यकर्ता. प्रयोज्यकर्ता acts with स्वार्थापेक्षा, i.e. with a desire to get payment. देवदत्त makes arrangements for यज्ञदत्त's activity. The 'प्रयोज्य' doesn't act if he doesn't have a desire for money. Similarly if the 'प्रयोजक' doesn't make arrangements for the activity, evenif he orders the प्रयोज्य would not act. Therefore it is not possible to rule that only प्रैष is णिच्प्रत्ययार्थ. संविधान is णिजर्थ. Since आत्मनेपद also denotes the same संविधान, णिच् need not be added in case the आत्मनेपद is employed.

Rather, this argument doesn't hold water and the same is suggested by the word केषाश्चित् in the above verse - the सूत्र "हेतुमति च" (3-1-26) institutes णिच् प्रत्यय. धातु would receive णिच् प्रत्यय in the sense of प्रयोजकव्यापार such as प्रेषण - is the meaning of the सूत्र.

कुर्वन्तं कारयति, कुर्वन्तं प्रेरयति etc. are examples. Here there are two sides - प्रेषण is the meaning of the धातु itself and णिच् is द्योतक - is one side, प्रेषण etc.. is meaning of णिच् – is the second one. Following is the second one. Following

the first side प्रेषण also is inherent in the धात्वर्थ and when it is denoted following प्रकरणम् etc. the use of णिच् is redundant. That's why usages like क्रीणीष्व etc. are excepted by शिष्टs in प्रेरणार्थ. Following this argument the धातु which is the root with णिच् can be employed optionally. But in case it is accepted that प्रेरणा is णिच् only, the optionality doesn't hold water. Then शिष्टप्रयोगs have to be supported as अन्तर्भावितणिजर्थ etc. in the same fashion optionality to आत्मनेपद with णिच् is also not possible. The आत्मनेपद, which suggests that क्रियाफल is कर्तृगामि, can denote that the प्रधानफल belongs to कर्ता and in this case there is no प्रेषणस्पर्धा whatsoever. The 'प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकव्यापार's are vividly and clearly expressed by ण्यन्त-प्रयोग's such as याजयति but not by यजते etc. The word यजते denotes the meaning that this कर्ता, as a स्वतन्त्र is performing the याग. And the sense that the कर्ता is employing someone is not denoted by the word यजते. The meaning that the कर्ता is employing another person in यागक्रिया is clearly expressed by याजयति. Therefore the संविधान of आत्मनेपद is different. Optionality between both these things is not possible and the same is suggested by the word केषाश्चित्.

The धातु that can denote a क्रिया associated with संविधान would get आत्मनेपद. As a matter of fact, the धातु पच् denotes the प्रधानार्थ i.e. विक्लित्ति etc. only but not संविधान. Then how is it possible to assert that पचते, यजते etc. denote संविधान also. हरि offers an explanation by the following verses -

संविधानं पचादीनां क्वचिदर्थः प्रतीयते।

तन्निमित्ता यथान्यापि क्रियाधिश्रयणादिका।।

कर्त्रभिप्रायता सूत्रे क्रियाभेदोपलक्षणम्।

तथा भूता क्रियया हि तत्कर्ता फलभाग्यतः।।

The धातु such as पचति denotes not only विक्लित्ति but other अवान्तर-क्रियाs' like अधिश्रयण which are the causes of विक्लित्ति, also. Similarly पचते, यजते etc. denote संविधान also as the person causing संविधान is the receiver of the result of the क्रिया. On the other hand, कर्त्रभिप्राये in the सूत्र is an उपलक्षण of other क्रिया such as संविधान also.

भाष्यकार ruled that the व्यापार of प्रयोजक is also धात्वर्थ. Although the प्रयोजक keeps mum, since he makes the arrangements, is called कर्ता and कारक. By the आत्मनेपदी, पचते, such संविधानव्यापार is being denoted. Although the धातु पच् means mainly तण्डुलविक्लित्ति only the prerequisites of the same such as अधिश्रयण, उदकसेचन etc. also are taken as पच्यर्थs'. That's why by the sentence पचति देवदत्तः, other meanings such as अधिश्रयति, उदकसेचन etc., are also denoted and it is understood that प्रयोज्यकर्ता is also doing व्यापारs like अधिश्रयण, उदकसेचन etc. Similarly, 'पचते देवदत्तः' means देवदत्त is arranging various things required for पाकक्रिया. In case one wants to say that देवदत्त is employing a प्रयोज्य then णिच् has

to be added and the usage will be like पाचयति. संविधान can't be प्रेषण. The one who, while making arrangements, employs another only is called प्रयोजकः.

Although he does संविधान but fails in परप्रेषण he cannot be called प्रयोजक.

हरि draws analogy by the following verse in terms of उपलक्षणत्व –

यथोपलक्ष्यते कालस्तारकादर्शनादिभिः ।

तथा फलविशेषेण क्रियाभेदो निदर्श्यते ।।

'कर्त्रभिप्राये' denotes another क्रिया (संविधान) through उपलक्षण just like the time is denoted by sighting stars in the sky.

नक्षत्रं दृष्ट्वा वाचं विसृजेत् (one should break silence only after sighting the stars) – is a norm applicable to 'मौनव्रती' . Here since sighting stars can take place only after सन्ध्याकाल, नक्षत्रं दृष्ट्वा means after सन्ध्याकाल. That'swhy one can break silence after सन्ध्याकाल even if the stars are not sighted due to a cloudy sky. Similarly, here also, since it is prescribed 'कर्तृगामिनि क्रियाफले', it should be connoted through उपलक्षण that the क्रिया should be संविधानविशिष्टक्रिया. The purport of नक्षत्रं दृष्ट्वा is after सन्ध्याकाल and not is it serious about sighting the stars. On the same count, आत्मनेपद also mainly denotes संविधान rather than कर्तृगामि क्रियाफल.

2) **यदवादिषमप्रियं तव प्रियमादाय नुनुत्सुरस्मि तत् ।**

कृतमातपसंज्वरं तरोरभिवर्ष्यामृतमंशुमानिव ।। (2-11)

Summary :

The 'हंस' responds to the question - what is the purpose of your coming – I have come to do something good in order to wipe out whatever I said that you may dislike. It is just like the Sun cools down the heat he showered on the trees by raining water.

In the above verse the term नुनुत्सुः has to be analyzed - on the root नुद (प्रेरणे) - सन् प्रत्यय by "धातोः कर्मणः समानकर्तृकादिच्छायां वा" (3-1-7) is added and further 'उ' प्रत्यय by "सनाशंसभिक्ष उः" (3-2-168) is tagged.

In the sense 'नोत्तुम् इच्छुः'. Thus the above word falls under 'सनाद्यन्तधातु–वृत्ति'. In fact पाणिनि nowhere in अष्टाध्यायी used the term वृत्ति in the sense it is being used in later works.

Rather under the परिभाषासूत्र - "समर्थः पदविधिः" (2-1-1) पाणिनि red 2000 odd सूत्रs covering all the 4 or 5 kinds of वृत्तिs' viz. समासवृत्ति, एकशेषवृत्ति, कृद्वृत्ति, तद्धितवृत्ति and सनाद्यन्तधातुवृत्ति.

पतञ्जलि in समर्थसूत्र rakes up the question अथ ये वृत्तिं वर्तयन्ति किं त आहुः.

He provided the answer also 'परार्थाभिधानं वृत्तिरिति'. However this aspect will be discussed later.

Under ‘‘नमो वरिवश्चित्रङः क्यच्’’ (3-1-19) पतञ्जलि remarks – ‘आचार्यः चित्रयति क्वचित् अर्थान् आदिशति क्वचिन्नेति ’.

It means that पाणिनि at some places assigns the meaning and at some other places not. The सूत्र – ‘‘गुप्तिज्किद्भ्यस्सन्’’ (3-1-5) also falls under the first category. This aspect requires elaboration – ‘शब्दानुशासनं’ is a synonym of व्याकरणम्. शब्दाः अनुशिष्यन्ते प्रकृतिप्रत्ययरूपेण विविच्य बोध्यन्ते अनेनेति शब्दानुशासनम्. (करणे ल्युट्). निरुक्तं is called अर्थानुशासनम्. Meanings are not assigned by पाणिनि. Then what about ‘‘चार्थे द्वन्द्वः’’ (2-2-29), ‘‘अनेकमन्यपदार्थे’’ (2-2-24), अपत्यं, रक्तं etc. under ‘‘ समर्थः पदविधिः’’ (2-1-1). पतञ्जलि had had a full discussion on this aspect.

अथैतस्मिन्नेकार्थीभावकृते विशेषे किं स्वाभाविकं शब्दैः अर्थाभिधानम्।

आहोस्विद्वाचनिकम् ?

Then in this effect of एकार्थीभाव the expression of the meaning by शब्दs is स्वाभाविकं (natural) or वाचनिकम् (assigned) by शास्त्र.

‘स्वाभाविकमर्थानादेशनात्’ (वा), स्वाभाविकमित्याह। कुत एतत्?। अर्थानादेशनात्। नह्यर्था आदिश्यन्ते।

We say it is natural (स्वाभाविकं). How is it? Since meanings are not assigned. Obviously meanings are not being assigned.

कथं पुनरर्थानादिशन्नेवं ब्रूयात् – नार्था आदिश्यन्ते इति। यदाह भगवान् – "अनेकमन्य-पदार्थे", "चार्थे द्वन्द्वः" अपत्ये, रक्ते, निर्वृत्ते इति।

How come one says that meanings are not being assigned. While assigning meanings?

भगवान् पाणिनि reads – अनेकमन्यपदार्थे, चार्थे द्वन्द्वः, अपत्ये, रक्ते, निर्वृत्ते।

नैतान्यर्थादेशनानि। स्वभावतः एतेषां शब्दानामेतेष्वर्थेष्वभिनिविष्टानां निमित्तत्वेन अन्वा-ख्यानं क्रियते। तद्यथा – कूपे हस्तदक्षिणः पन्थाः, अभ्रे चन्द्रयसं पश्य इति स्वभावतस्तस्य तत्रस्थस्य पथश्चन्द्रमसश्च निमित्तत्वेनान्वाख्यानं क्रियते। एवमिहापि चार्थे यः स द्वन्द्वसमासः अन्यपदार्थे यः स बहुव्रीहिरिति।

These are not assignments of meanings. Naturally these शब्दs standardized in these meanings are taken up for analysis. It is how, right hand is the way in the well, look the moon in the cloud. Here naturally the way is there as well as the moon and the same are taken as a cause for analysis. Similarly in the present case also the one which is in 'चार्थे' is 'द्वन्द्व' and which is in अन्यपदार्थे is बहुव्रीहिः, किं पुनः कारणमर्थाः नादिश्यन्ते, what is the reason the meanings are not being assigned.

तच्च लघ्वर्थम्। लघ्वर्थं ह्यर्था नादिश्यन्ते। अवश्यं ह्यनेनार्थानादिशता केनचिच्छब्देन अर्थनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः स्यात्। तस्य च तावत्केन कृतः येन असौ क्रियते। अथ तस्य केनचित्

कृतः, तस्य (केन कृतः तस्य) केन कृतः इत्यनवस्था च स्यात्। असम्भवः खल्वप्यर्थादेशनस्य। को हि नाम समर्थो धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययनिपातानामर्थानादेष्टुम्।

It is for brevity. Obviously meanings are not being assigned for brevity. Certainly, while assigning meanings the meaning is to be exhibited by some शब्दs. Then it is to be shown as to by which शब्द the meaning is denoted, then the meaning of that शब्द is denoted by which शब्द – thus there will be 'अनवस्था' (chaos). It is also impossible to assign meanings, who is capable to assign the meanings of धातु, प्रातिपदिक, प्रत्यय and निपात.

Similarly under "सुपि स्थः" (3-2-4), पतञ्जलि says the following – अनिर्दिष्टार्थाश्च प्रत्ययाः स्वार्थे भवन्ति इति। तद्यथा – "गुप्तिज्किद्भ्यः सन्" (3-1-5), "यावादिभ्यः कन्" (5-4-29) the प्रत्ययs for which no meaning is assigned, the same have to be taken in the sense of the प्रकृति, it is how the सन् प्रत्यय on गुप् etc. and कन् on याव etc.

काशिकावृत्ति quotes वार्तिक – निन्दाक्षमाव्याधिप्रतीकारेषु सन् इष्यते। which means सन् would come in blaming, patience, remedy for a disease, respectively. This वार्तिक is not there in महाभाष्य. The author of न्यास, जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि goes one step further and remarks that a सन्नन्तगुप्धातु, i.e. जुगुप्सते, doesn't denote the meaning गुप् (गोपने = hiding) and following अन्वय and व्यतिरेक, i.e. when there is सन्, then the meaning (blaming) is expressed and not in its absence.

(यत् सत्वे यत् सत्वम् अन्वयः, यदभावे यदभावः व्यतिरेकः) – नहि इह सनः कश्चनार्थो निर्दिश्यते, न च अनिर्दिष्टार्थाः प्रत्ययाः स्वार्थे भविष्यन्तीति स्वार्थे एव सन् भविष्यति इति युक्तं परिकल्पयितुं, गोपनादेः स्वार्थस्य सन्नन्तादप्रतीतैः अस्त्येव सनोऽर्थः, कः पुनरसौ? निन्दादिः यदाह – निन्दाक्षमाव्याधिप्रतीकारेषु सनिष्यन्ते इति। कुतः पुनरेतदवसितं, सनोऽर्थाः प्रतीयन्ते, तस्मादर्थवानेव सन्।

दीक्षित mentioned the वार्तिक in three parts. नागेश in उद्योत held that in light of the usages it may be explained that सन् would come on धातुs having specific meaning.

पाणिनि used सन्नन्तकित्धातु in "क्षेत्रियच् परक्षेत्रे चिकित्स्यः" (5-2-92) विचिकित्सा तु संशयः - in अमरकोश. गुप् – गोपने and कित् निकेतने are roots. It seems that पाणिनि at times doesn't go into the semantic part – "अस्ति नास्ति दिष्टं मतिः" (4-4-60) आस्तिक and नास्तिक are popular in the sense of believer and non-believer in another world respectively. जुगुप्सा, चिकित्सा are popular in some sense and it is needless to mention the sense in such cases.

But in examples like जुगुप्सिषते and मीमांसिषते, where there are two सन्नन्तs one has to accept that the first सन् is in स्वार्थ as otherwise it goes against the norm "सन्नन्तान्न सनिष्यते" (3-1-17, पतञ्जलि), i.e. no सन् on सन्नन्त (in the same sense).

3) **उपनम्रमयाचितं हितं परिहर्तुं न तवापि साम्प्रतम्।**

करकल्पजनान्तराद्विधेश्शुचितः प्रापि स हि प्रतिग्रहः।। (2-12)

Summary :

हंस further says to नल – it is also not proper on your part to refuse something you got without asking for and whatever you got, you got it from ब्रह्म (destiny). I am just an instrument. Therefore you need not feel shy that you begged an inferior person.

In the above verse the word 'करकल्पम्' demands discussion – करकल्पं is a word pronounced by adding the suffix 'कल्पप्' on the word कर by the सूत्र – "ईषदसमाप्तौ कल्पब्देश्यदेशीयरः" (5-3-67). Here under this सूत्र, कात्यायन and पतञ्जलि carried out a lengthy discussion.

(वा) ईषदसमाप्तौ क्रियाप्रधानत्वात् लिङ्गवचनानुपपत्तिः। (भा) ईषदसमाप्तौ क्रिया-प्रधानत्वात् लिङ्गवचनयोः अनुपपत्तिः। पटुकल्पः पटुकल्पौ पटुकल्पाः इति। एकोयमर्थः ईषदसमाप्तिर्नाम, तस्य एकत्वात् एकवचनं प्राप्नोति।

Since the क्रिया is important in ईषदसमाप्ति there will be problem with लिङ्ग and वचन. The examples पटुकल्पः पटुकल्पौ पटुकल्पाः cannot be achieved. The ईषदसमाप्ति is a single thing and since it is a single thing there will be एकवचनं only.

In fact पतञ्जलि discusses the singleness of क्रिया under the earlier सूत्र i.e. प्रशंसायां रूपप् (5-3-66). This will be taken up for discussion in the next verse.

According to निरुक्तं the प्रकृति and प्रत्यय together denote the meaning, rather the meaning of प्रत्यय is important - प्रकृतिप्रत्ययौ सहार्थं ब्रूतः, प्रत्ययार्थस्तु तयोः प्रधानम्.

Since the प्रत्यय is being instituted i.e. प्रतीयते विधीयते इति प्रत्ययः, the same is considered as प्रधान vis-a-vis प्रकृतिः.

This aspect is discussed by कैयट under the same भाष्य – प्रकृत्यर्थविशेषणत्वात् सिद्धं (भा) सिद्धमेतत्। कथं नायं प्रत्ययार्थः। किं तर्हि प्रकृत्यर्थविशेषणमेतत् – ईषदसमाप्तौ यत्प्रातिपदिकं वर्तते तस्मात्कल्पबादयो भवन्ति। कस्मिन्नर्थे स्वर्थ इति। स्वार्थिकाश्च प्रकृतितो लिङ्गवचनान्यनुवर्तन्ते।

It will become possible due to प्रकृत्यर्थविशेषणत्व .

It is possible, how, this is not प्रत्ययार्थ. Then what? This is the qualifier of प्रकृत्यर्थ – which प्रातिपदिक is there in ईषदसमाप्ति upon that कल्पप् etc. are added. In which sense, in स्वार्थ, स्वार्थिकs take the लिङ्ग and वचन of प्रकृति.

प्रकृत्यर्थे चेल्लिङ्गवचनानुपपत्तिः।

प्रकृत्यर्थे चेल्लिङ्गवचनयोरनुपपत्तिः। गुडकल्पा द्राक्षा, तैलकल्पा प्रसन्ना, पयस्कल्पा

यवागूरिति। सिद्धं तु तत्सम्बन्ध उत्तरपदार्थे प्रत्ययवचनात्। सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्? तत्सम्बन्धे उत्तरपदार्थे प्रत्ययवचनात्। तत्सम्बन्धे (ईषदसमाप्तिसम्बन्धे) उत्तरपदार्थे प्रत्ययो भवतीति वक्तव्यम्।

सिध्यति, सूत्रं तर्हि भिद्यते। यथान्यासमेवास्तु। ननु चोक्तमीषदसमाप्तौ क्रियाप्रधानत्वा-ल्लिङ्गवचनानुपपत्तिरिति।

ननु चोक्तं - प्रकृत्यर्थे चेल्लिङ्गवचनानुपपत्तिरिति। नैष दोषः आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति - 'स्वार्थिका अतिवर्तन्तेऽपि लिङ्गवचनानी'ति यदयं 'णचः स्त्रियामि'ति स्त्रीग्रहणं करोति। यद्येत- ज्ज्ञाप्यते - बहुगुडो द्राक्षा, बहुतैलं प्रसन्ना, बहुपयो यवागूरित्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति।

If the प्रत्यय is in प्रकृत्यर्थ then there will be problem with लिङ्ग and वचन - गुडकल्पा द्राक्षा, तैलकल्पा प्रसन्ना, पयस्कल्पा यवागूः इति। It can be achieved by saying that the प्रत्यय is in the sense of उत्तरपद due to the relation with ईषदसमाप्ति. It can be achieved but the सूत्र will split. Let us not disturb the structure of सूत्र.

Then it is also said that in the sense of ईषदसमाप्ति there will be problem with लिङ्ग and वचन as the क्रिया is important. This problem will be solved by taking ईषदसमाप्ति as qualifier of प्रकृत्यर्थ. Then it is said if we take that kind of प्रकृत्यर्थ then there will be problem with लिङ्ग and वचन. This is not a defect as पाणिनि's behavior shows that स्वार्थिकs may defy लिङ्ग and वचन also णचः स्त्रियाम् अञ् (5-4-14) is a सूत्र that institutes अञ् प्रत्यय in स्त्रीलिङ्ग and भाव in the sense of कर्मव्यतिहार upon णिच् प्रत्ययान्त, (कर्मव्यतिहारे णच् स्त्रियाम्, 3-3-43). Here the णिजन्त

is in स्त्रीलिङ्ग and therefore अञ्, being a स्वार्थिक will be in स्त्रीलिङ्ग only. पाणिनि need not say स्त्रियां i.e. in स्त्रीलिङ्ग again. Since he added स्त्रियां in the present सूत्र it insinuates that स्वार्थिकs need not necessarily follow the लिङ्ग and वचन of the प्रकृति and at times they may defy. व्यावक्रोशी (mutual blaming) and व्यावहासी (mutual laughing) are the examples for अञ्.

Thus, in the present context the usage करकल्पः is substantiated.

4) **पतगेन मया जगत्पतेरुपकृत्यै तव किं प्रभूयते ।**

इति वेद्मि न तु त्यजन्ति मां तदपि प्रत्युपकर्तुमार्तयः ।। (2-13)

Summary :

After all I am a bird and am I capable to help an emperor like you? Nevertheless my difficulties, which you have obviated are not leaving me without offering something good and great.

Here in the above verse पतगेन मया उपकृत्यै किं प्रभूयते – is a usage called भावे लट्.

The भावे प्रयोग which will be in एकवचनं only requires elaboration. पाणिनि instituted आत्मनेपद and तिङ् by two सूत्रs – "अनुदात्तङितः आत्मनेपदम्" (1-3-12) and "भावकर्मणोः" (1-3-13) in भावार्थ and कर्मार्थ.

भाव means धात्वर्थः - भाव एव हि धात्वर्थः इत्यविच्छिन्न आगमः । (वा.प.3) says भर्तृहरि - भावः, भावना, उत्पादना and क्रिया are synonyms – व्यापारो भावना सैवोत्पादना।

सैव च क्रिया - says भूषणम् । The क्रिया being the meaning of every धातु is denoted by the भावार्थलकार and the same is called धातु. पाणिनि instituted मध्यमपुरुष when there is सामानाधिकरण्यं with युष्मत् and उत्तमपुरुष when there is सामानाधिकरण्यं with अस्मत् by two सूत्रs – "युष्मद्युपपदे समानाधिकरणे स्थानिन्यपि मध्यमः" (1-4-105) and "अस्मद्युत्तमः". In case there is सामानाधिकरण्य with any other शब्द there will be प्रथमपुरुष by "शेषे प्रथमः" (1-4-108)

The भावना is expressed by कृदन्त as well as तिङन्त. The कृदन्तभाव is in the form of सत्त्व (द्रव्यं), i.e. having अन्वय with लिङ्ग and संख्या. Whereas the तिङ् वाच्यभावना is in the form of असत्त्व, i.e. does not have connection with लिङ्ग and वचन. एकवचन can be there by default. Therefore, the भावार्थकधातु will be in एकवचन only. In भावलकार since कर्ता is not expressed by the verb there will be तृतीया following – "अनभिहिते" (2-3-1) by "कर्तुकरणयोस्तृतीया" (2-3-18).

Ex – त्वया मया अन्यैश्च भूयते ।

The following is the relevant text from कौमुदी -

भावो भावना उत्पादना क्रिया । सा च धातुत्वेन सकलधातुवाच्या भावार्थकलकारेणा– नूद्यते । युष्मदस्मद्भ्यां सामानधिकरण्याभावात्प्रथमपुरुषः । तिङ्वाच्यभावनाया असत्त्वरूपत्वेन

द्वित्वाद्यप्रतीतेर्न द्विवचनादि। किं त्वेकवचनमेव। तस्यौत्सर्गिकत्वेन संख्यानपेक्षत्वाद् अनभिहिते कर्तरि तृतीया।

The following is the commentary by नागेश in बृहच्छब्देन्दुशेखर – समानाधिकरण्येति। असत्त्वभूतक्रियायाः सत्त्वार्थकयुष्मदादिसामानाधिकरण्यसम्भव इति भावः। तिङ्वाच्येति। तिङनूद्येत्यर्थः। असत्त्वेति। लिङ्गाद्यनन्वयित्वं सर्वनामपरामर्शायोग्यत्वं वा असत्त्वम्। तिङ्वाच्येत्यनेन कृद्वाच्यायाः सत्वरूपतां बोधयति। तथा च यक्सूत्रे भाष्यम् – "कृदभिहितो भावो द्रव्यवत्, न क्रियावदि"ति। द्रव्यधर्मान् लिङ्गसंख्यादीन् गृह्णाति इत्यर्थः। एवं च घटादिपदप्रतिपाद्यघटादिद्रव्यवत् लिङ्गादियोगहेतुना घञन्तादिप्रतिपाद्ये सत्त्वमनुमीयते। अत एव "पाकं पाकेने"त्यादौ यथायथं द्वितीयादयः।

सामानाधिकरण्य between a क्रिया that is in the form of असत्त्व and युष्मदादि that is in the form of सत्त्व is not possible. तिङ्वाच्य means the one denoted by तिङ्. असत्त्वं is either not being eligible to take लिङ्ग and वचन or the ineligibility to be refereed to by a सर्वनाम. By तिङ्वाच्य it is suggested that the one i.e. denoted by a कृत् is सत्त्व. This is clearly stated in महाभाष्य under "सार्वधातुके यक्" (3-1-67) - the भाव expressed by a कृत् is like द्रव्य but not the one denoted by a क्रिया.

It means the सत्त्वरूप takes the properties of द्रव्य i.e. लिङ्ग, संख्य, वचन etc. The purport is that through लिङ्ग etc. the सत्त्वं is inferred in घञन्त etc., just

like घटादिद्रव्य denoted by घटादिपद. That'swhy there will be द्वितीया etc. like पाकं पाकेन।

नायं प्रत्ययार्थः। किं तर्हि? प्रकृत्यर्थविशेषणमेतत् – प्रशंसायां यत्प्रातिपदिकं वर्तते तस्माद्रूपप् भवति। कस्मिन्नर्थे?। स्वार्थ इति। स्वार्थिकाश्च प्रकृतितो लिङ्गवचनान्यनुवर्तन्ते। प्रकृतेः लिङ्गवचनाभावात्तिङ्प्रकृतेरम्भाववचनम्। प्रकृतेर्लिङ्गवचनाभावात्तिङ्प्रकृतेः रूपपोऽ–म्भावो वक्तव्यः। पचतिरूपं, पचतोरूपं, पचन्तिरूपमिति। सिद्धं तु क्रियाप्रधानत्वात्। सिद्धमेतत्। कथम् ? क्रियाप्रधानत्वात्। क्रियाप्रधानमाख्यातं भवति। एका च क्रिया। द्व्यप्रधानं नाम। कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते क्रियाप्रधानमाख्यातं (भवेत्) द्रव्यप्रधानं नामेति?। यत्क्रियां पृष्टस्तिङाऽऽचष्टे – किं देवदत्तः करोति – पचतीति। द्रव्यं पृष्टः कृताऽऽचष्टे – कतरो देवदत्तः?, यः कारको यो हारक इति यदि तर्ह्येका क्रिया द्विवचनबहुवचनानि न सिध्यन्ति – पचतः पचन्तीति। नैतानि क्रियापेक्षाणि। किं तर्हि ?। साधनापेक्षाणि। इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नुवन्ति – (पचतिरूपम्) पचतोरूपं पचन्तिरूपमिति। तिङोक्तत्वात्तस्याऽभिसम्बन्धस्य न भविष्यन्ति। एकवचनमपि तर्हि न प्राप्नोति। समयाद्भविष्यति। द्विवचनबहुवचनान्यपि पर्हि समायात्प्राप्नुवन्ति। एवं तर्ह्येकवचनमुत्सर्गतः करिष्यते – तस्य द्विबह्वोरर्थयोर्द्विवचनबहुवचने उपवादौ भविष्यतः एवमपि नपुंसकत्वं च वक्तव्यम्। न वक्तव्यम्। उक्तं वा। किमुक्तम्?। लिङ्गमशिष्यं लोकाश्रयत्वाल्लिङ्गस्येति।

Under the सूत्र – प्रशंसायां रूपप् (5-3-66) पतञ्जलि in महाभाष्य vividly discussed the above aspect – here this प्रशंसा is not प्रत्ययार्थ, then what? this is the qualifier of प्रकृत्यर्थ – रूपप् will be added to a प्रातिपदिक in the sense of प्रशंसा, in which sense? in स्वार्थ. स्वार्थिकs follow the लिङ्ग and वचन of प्रकृति.

Since the प्रकृति, which is a तिङ्, does not have either लिङ्ग or वचन, अम्भाव has to be instituted. Since the प्रकृति has got neither लिङ्ग nor वचन, अम्भाव has to be instituted on रूपप् having 'तिङ्' as प्रकृति – पचतिरूपं, पचतोरूपं, पचन्तिरूपम्. We got it since the क्रिया is important. अम्भाव is already there, how?

Since the क्रिया is important. An आख्याता would have the क्रिया as the important factor. क्रिया is only one. The नाम would have द्रव्यं as the important factor. How is it known that आख्यात would have क्रिया and नाम would have द्रव्य as the important factors? When क्रिया is asked the answer will be a तिङन्त – किं देवदत्तः करोति ? पचति. When asked about the द्रव्य the answer will be a कृदन्त – कतरो देवदत्तः यः कारको यो हारक इति । If क्रिया is only one then there can not be द्विवचन and बहुवचन – पचतः पचन्ति. These are not related to क्रिया but to साधन.

Then here also there will be – पचतोरूपम् पचन्तिरूपम्. Since the अभिसम्बन्ध is denoted by क्रिया there cannot be द्विवचन and बहुवचन. Then there also can not be एकवचनम्. It will be there following the norm – "परश्च" (3-1-2), then following the same norm there will be द्विवचन and बहुवचन as well. If that is the case then there will be एकवचनं following उत्सर्ग (default) – that will be checked by द्विवचन and बहुवचन in द्वित्व and बहुत्व. Even then नपुंसकत्व has to be instituted, that is needless. "It is already said", what is said ? Since लिङ्ग has got शिष्टलोकप्रयोग as the resort. The same need not be instituted.

5) स जयत्यरिसार्थसार्थकीकृतनामा किल भीमभूपतिः ।
यमवाप्य विदर्भभूः प्रभुं हसति द्यामपि शक्रभर्तृकाम् ।। (2-16)

Summary :

King भीम, whose name got conformed with meaning among enemy – lines is enjoying his full status. The land of विदर्भ, having had him as husband is laughing at स्वर्ग, who had इन्द्र as husband.

Here in the above verse the word सार्थकीकृत formed by applying 'च्वि'-प्रत्यय in the sense of अभूततद्भाव. This aspect requires elaboration – पाणिनि instituted 'च्वि प्रत्यय' by "कृभ्वस्तियोगे सम्पद्यकर्तरि च्विः" (5-4-50). कात्यायन offered an amendment in this regard – अभूततद्भाव इति वक्तव्यम्. During the course of time it became popular – as 'अभूततद्भावे च्विः'. The सूत्रार्थ is as follows – when the प्रकृति would get some विकार and when there is either कृ or भू or अस्ति, च्वि प्रत्यय in स्वार्थ will be optional on विकारशब्द.

Following "अस्य च्वौ" (7-4-32) 'अ' is replaced by 'इ' . 'व' disappears by "वेरपृक्तस्य" (6-1-67)' following "तद्धितश्चासर्वविभक्तिः" (1-1-37), it will be an अव्यय by "ऊर्यादिच्विडाचश्च" (1-4-60). अकृष्णः कृष्णः सम्पद्यते, तं करोति कृष्णीकरोति, अगङ्गा गङ्गा सम्पाद्यमाना भवति, गङ्गीभवति - are examples.

Here कैयट clarifies – यथा प्रकृतिरेव विकारात्मना सम्पद्यमाना विकारभेदेन

भवनक्रियायां कर्त्री विवक्ष्यते तदा च्विप्रत्ययः (when प्रकृति itself undergoes change and desired to become subject by the changed form in the भवनाक्रिया then there will be च्विप्रत्यय.)

On the other hand कैयट explains the वार्तिक i.e. अभूततद्भावे च्विः – the cause by which was not there from earlier, is taken by the same form and its भाव is called अभूततद्भाव.

(येन रूपेण प्रागभूतं कारणं तेन रूपेण तस्य अभावः अभूततद्भाव इति आश्रयणात् अतिप्रसङ्गाभावः ।)

Further कैयट elaborates - विकारशब्दश्च प्रकृतिविकारभेदविवक्षायां प्रकृतौ विकारावस्थायां प्राप्नुवत्यां वर्तमानात् स्वार्थे च्विप्रत्ययः । (When there is विवक्षा of प्रकृतिविकारभेद, when the प्रकृति gets विकारावस्था, upon a विकारशब्द that is there in such a situation च्वि will be there in स्वार्थ.)

पतञ्जलि further rakes up a question as to why should there be a वार्तिक – "समीपादिभ्यः उपसंख्यानम्". He responds that असमीप can't become समीप rather असमीपस्थ can become समीपस्थ and in that sense following the norm तात्स्थ्यात् ताच्छब्द्यं, च्विप्रत्यय is possible by the सूत्र itself and the वार्तिक is not required – समीपादिभ्य उपसंख्यानम् । समीपादिभ्य उपसंख्यानं कर्त्तव्यम् । समीपीभवति । अभ्यासी-भवति । अन्तिकीभवति । किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति । नह्यसमीपं समीपं भवति । किं तर्हि । असमीपस्थं समीपस्थं भवति । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । तात्स्थ्यात्ताच्छब्द्यं भविष्यति ।

हरि in वाक्यपदीय explains the परिणाम or प्रकृतिविकृतिभाव by the following verse -

जहद्धर्मान्तरं पूर्वमुपादत्ते यदा परम्।
तत्त्वादप्रच्युतो धर्मी परिणामः स उच्यते।।

कैयट, while quoting the above verse under आन् महतः समानाधिकरणजातीययोः (6-3-46) explains that the term परिणाम is used. When a single thing is considered as प्रकृतिविकारात्मक i.e. भूतप्रकृति as well as विकृति। (यदा च एकोर्थः प्रकृितविकारा-त्मकतया आश्रीयते तदा परिणामव्यवहारो भवति।)

नागेशः जहद्धर्मान्तरमिति। क्षीरावस्थायां विद्यमानं धर्मं द्रवत्वादिकं जहत् – न तु त्यक्तवान्, किञ्चिदन्वयात्। परं – दध्यवस्थायां अवस्थितं धर्मम्। एवं च धर्मस्यैव त्यागोपादाने, धर्मी त्ववस्थित एव इति भावः। (giving up the property like fluidity etc., that is there in the state of milk – but has not given up, since there is some connection. 'परं' means in the state of curd. Thus the sacrifices and reception are of धर्म only, the धर्मी doesn't undergo any change).

कैयट quotes another verse of भर्तृहरि from वाक्यपदीयम् –

पूर्वावस्थामविजहत्संस्पृशद्धर्ममुत्तरम्।
संमूर्च्छित इवार्थात्मा जायमानोऽभिधीयते।।

नागेश explains the verse as follows – पूर्वां कारणावस्थामविजहदुत्तरं धर्ममवस्था-

विशेषरूपमासादयन् संमूर्छित इवोभयरूपयाऽध्यवसीयमानो जायमानोऽर्थाऽऽत्मा च्व्यन्तेनाभि-धीयत इत्यर्थः । (the प्रकृति, without giving up the earlier state of cause and while receiving the specific state of the latter – is decided as having both the forms in a nutshell – such a thing is being denoted by 'च्वि प्रत्ययान्त')

नागेश further explains – thus कर्मत्व is possible to both the things i.e. प्रकृति and विकृति that are associated with the properties of earlier state as well as later state. It is due to the nature of शब्दशक्ति that evenif there is कर्तुत्व to both, the वचनं as well as पुरुष are that of प्रकिृत only.

(एवञ्चैकस्यैव वस्तुनः पूर्वोत्तरस्थोपाधिव्यवच्छिन्नप्रकृतिविकृत्योरुभयोरपि कर्मत्वमुप-पद्यत इति भावः । उभयोः कर्तुत्वेऽपि वचनं प्रकृतिसङ्ख्याश्रयं, पुरुषोऽपि प्रकृत्याश्रय एवेति बोध्यम् । शब्दशक्तिस्वभावात् ।)

In मल्लिनाथ's commentary the remark that 'भीमादयो अपादाने इति अपादानार्थे निपातनात् मप्प्रत्ययः औणादिकः – requires elaboration.

पाणिनि in third अध्याय compiled a सूत्र – उणादयो बहुलम् (3-3-1) and adapted the उणादिप्रत्ययs of शाकटायन. पतञ्जलि under the सूत्र discusses the significance of the term बहुलं quoting a couple of वार्तिकs –

Why बहुलं ? Since उणादिs are instituted upon less number of roots but not all. Similarly they are said generally and not all are said. The applications also not

completely given. What is the reason उणादिs are seen on less number of roots but not all. What is the reason they are generally said but not all. And also what is the reason there are left out applications and not all are completed. The शब्दs that are there in वेदs and are popular – are acceptable. In order to achieve the acceptability पाणिनि added बहुलम्.

नागेश in his उद्योत says that even the creator can't offer all प्रकृतिs with all प्रत्ययs.

In other words, the term बहुलं denotes four possibilities – प्रवृत्ति, अप्रवृत्ति, विभाषा and अन्यकार्यम्।

वा – बाहुलकं प्रकृतेस्तनुदृष्टेः।

भाष्यम् – तन्वीभ्यः प्रकृतिभ्यः उणादयो दृश्यन्ते न सर्वाभ्यो दृश्यन्ते।

वा – प्रायसमुच्चयनादपि तेषाम्।

भाष्यम् – प्रायेण खल्वपि ते समुच्चिता न सर्वे समुच्चिताः।

वा – कार्यसशेषविधेश्च तदुक्तम्।

भाष्यम् – कार्याणि खल्वपि सशेषाणि कृतानि न सर्वाणि लक्षणेन परिसमाप्तानि।

आक्षेपभाष्यम् –

किं पुनः कारणं पन्वीभ्यः प्रकृतिभ्य उणादयो दृश्यन्ते न सर्वाभ्यः, किं च कारणं प्रायेण

समुच्चिता न सर्वे समुच्चिताः, किं च कारणं कार्याणि सशेषाणि कृतानि न सर्वाणि लक्षणेन परिसमाप्तानि।

वा – नैगमरूढिभवं हि सुसाधु।

भाष्यम् – नैगमाश्च रूढिभवाश्चौणादिकाः सुसाधवः कथं स्युः। सर्वाभ्यः प्रकृतिभ्यः सर्वप्रत्ययानां तत्तद्रूपेण विधानं तु ब्रह्मणादि दुरूपपादमिति भावः।

Further पतञ्जलि under the same सूत्र suggests that पाणिनि prefers अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष to व्युत्पत्तिपक्ष – in निरुक्त it is said that all nouns are produced from verbal roots.

In व्याकरण also शाकटायन subscribed to the above view.

नाम च धातुजमाह निरुक्ते (वा)

भाष्यम् – नाम खल्वपि धातुजमेवमाहुर्नैरुक्ताः।

व्याकरणे शकटस्य चोक्तम् (वा)

भाष्यम् – वैयाकरणानां च शाकटायन आह धातुजं नामेति।

The aspect of व्युत्पत्तिपक्ष and अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष needs to be explained – under "आयनेयीनीयियः फढखछघां प्रत्ययादीनाम्" (7-1-2) पतञ्जलि quotes a वार्तिकं and comments thus –

प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च पाणिनेः सिद्धम्। प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च भगवतः पाणिनेराचार्यस्य सिद्धम्। उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि।

Since पाणिनि follows अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष in the case of उणादिs also. नागेश in his उद्योत offers the following comments – here since it is asserted – पाणिनेः, it is shown that in the case of other उणादिs like सर्पिषा, यजुषा etc. पाणिनि follows अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष. In fact the षत्व in सर्पिषा etc. also through 'बहुलं' only. It can be concluded that it is simply अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष only as for as पाणिनि is concerned –

अत्र पाणिनेरित्युक्त्या "सर्पिषा", "यजुषा" इत्यादिकतिपयातिरिक्तोणादिषु पाणिनेर-व्युत्पत्तिपक्ष एवाऽभिप्रेत इति दर्शयति। वस्तुतः "सर्पिषा" इत्यादौ षत्वमपि बहुलग्रहणादिति सर्वथाऽव्युत्पत्तिरेवैतेष्विति बोध्यम्।

नागेश in लघुशब्देन्दुशेखर puts fourth अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष of पाणिनि - but when सर्पि etc., is an अव्युत्पन्नप्रातिपदिक – since पतञ्जलिः under "आयनेयीनीयियः फढखछघां प्रत्ययादीनाम्" (7-1-3) clearly says that पाणिनि prefers अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष only. There it is said in शङ्क etc. the आदेश may be applied and in order to arrest the same there should be a प्रतिषेधसूत्र, but the प्रतिषेध is already there since पाणिनि follows अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष. However, "अयामन्ताल्वाय्येन्त्विष्णुषु" (6-4-55) is the सूत्र comes in support of पाणिनि for व्युत्पत्तिपक्ष also or that सूत्र may be following another व्याकरण, just like the महासंज्ञा सर्वनामस्थानम्. That'swhy in भाष्य it is only said – अव्युत्पन्नानि, but not अव्युत्पन्नानि इत्यपि, just like अनेकार्था अपि धातवः, then why नित्यषत्व is coming by "इदुदपधस्य चाऽप्रत्ययस्य" (8-3-41) this सूत्र makes it विकल्प

and since the प्रत्यय is not taken the relevant परिभाषा (प्रत्ययग्रहणे तदन्तस्यापिग्रहणम्) doesn't apply there will be षत्वविकल्प in cases like परमसर्पिष्करोति.

यदा तु सर्पिरादिकमव्युत्पन्नं प्रातिपदिकं पाणिनेरुणादिष्वव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष एवेति आयनेयी-नीति सूत्रे भाष्ये स्पष्टमुक्तेः। तत्र हि शंख इत्यादावादेशानाशङ्क्योणादीनां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च भगवतः पाणिनेः सिद्धमित्युक्तम्। अयामन्ताल्वाय्येन्त्विष्णुष्विति सूत्रं पाणिनेर्व्युत्पत्तिपक्षस्यापि स्वीकार इत्यस्य गमकं व्याकरणान्तररीत्यैव वा तत्सूत्रं सर्वनामस्थान-मिति महासंज्ञावत्। अत एव भाष्येऽव्युत्पन्नानीत्येवोक्तम्। न त्वनेकार्था अपि धातव इति वदव्युत्पन्नानीत्यप्युक्तं, तदा इदुदुपधस्येति नित्ये षत्वे प्राप्तेऽनेन विकल्पः प्रत्ययग्रहणाभावात्त-त्परिभाषानुपस्थितेः परमसर्पिष्करोतीत्यादौ षत्वविकल्पः सिद्धः।

6) **भुवनत्रयसुभ्रुवामसौ दमयन्ती कमनीयतामदम्।**
उदियाय यतस्तनुश्रिया दमयन्तीति ततोऽभिधां दधे।। (2-18)

Summary :

This lady, by her beauty put a check to the ego of the lovely ladies of all the three worlds and due to that reason she got the name दमयन्ती (i.e. the name conforms to the meanings).

Here in the above verse the poet श्रीहर्ष offers the derivative meaning of the term दमयन्ती. The word दमयन्ती is formed by adding शतृप्रत्यय on णिजन्त दम् धातु, i.e. दमु उपशमे (दिवादि).

The following is the प्रक्रिया that is useful in the formation of 'दमयन्ती' – upon the root दमि there will be 'णिच्' प्रत्यय by "तत्प्रयोजको हेतुश्च" (1-4-55) and "हेतुमति च" (3-1-26) and upon that – when the क्रियाफल is कर्त्रुगामि then आत्मनेपद will be there by "अनुदात्तङित आत्मनेपदम्" (1-3-12) and "स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले" (1-3-72) and "णिचश्च" (1-3-74) – but the same is checked by "अणावकर्मकात् चित्तवत्कर्त्रुकात्" (1-3-88.), which rules परस्मैपद and again the same is checked for आत्मनेपद by "न पादम्याङ्यमाङ्यसपरिमुहरुचिनृतिवदवसः" (1-3-89) – so that there will be आत्मनेपद only – दमयते .

Rather, when the क्रियाफल is not कर्त्रभिप्राय (अकर्त्रभिप्राये) then there will certainly be परस्मैपदं by "शेषात् कर्तरि परस्मैपदम्" (1-7-78).

Upon दमि i.e. the णिजन्त in लट् there will be शतृप्रत्यय by "लटः शतृशानचावप्रथमासमानाधिकरणे" (3-2-124) and then there will be ङीप् by "उगितश्च" (4-1-6) follwed by नुमागम by "शप्श्यनोर्नित्यम्" (7-1-81), सुप् etc. would follow – दमयन्ती.

The following text from सिद्धान्तकौमुदी is relevant in this regard –

"न पादम्याङ्यमाङ्यसपरिमुहरुचिनृतिवदवसः" (1-3-89) एभ्यो ण्यन्तेभ्यः परस्मैपदं न। पिबतिर्निगरणार्थः। इतरे चित्तवत्कर्तृकाकर्मकाः। नृतिश्चलनार्थोऽपि तेन सूत्रद्वयेन प्राप्तिः। पाययते। दमयते। आयामयते। आयासयते। परिमोहयते। रोचयते। नर्तयते। वादयते।

वासयते। "घटे उपसंख्यानम्" (वा.962)। घापयते शिशुमेकं समीची। अकर्त्रभिप्राये शेषात् इति परस्मैपदं स्यादेव वत्सान्पाययति पयः। दमयन्ती कमनीयतामदम्। भिक्षा वासयति।

The explanation given above was summarized by मल्लिनाथसूरि in his popular commentary 'जीवातु' in the following words – दमयन्ती अस्तंगमयन्ती सती दमेर्ण्वं तान्न पादमीत्यादिना कर्त्रभिप्राय आत्मनेपदापवादपरस्मैपदप्रतिषेधोऽप्यकर्त्रभिप्रायविवक्षायां परस्मैपदे लटश्शत्रादेशः।

Finally the following was the order of the verb आत्मनेपद –परस्मैपद – आत्मनेपद – परस्मैपद।

7) श्रियमेव परं धराधिपाद्गुणसिन्धो रुदिता मवेहिताम्।
व्यवधावपि वा विधोः कलां मृडचूडानिलयां न वेद कः।। (2-19)

Summary:

Oh king ! take दमयन्ती as लक्ष्मी that had her birth from the ocean of virtues called भीमनरेन्द्र. Although there is gap, who doesn't know that the face of moon that is on the head of शिव is certainly the face of moon only.

Here in the above verse the सन्धि in the word 'अवेहि' demands a full scale discussion as a different line of thinking is taken by मल्लिनाथ in जीवातु – on one hand the word is taken as a combination of अव + आ + इहि by पतञ्जलि, वामन, कैयट, हरदत्त, भट्टोजीदीक्षित and नागेश. On the other मल्लिनाथ takes it as अव इहि.

पाणिनि in प्रथमपाद of षष्ठाध्याय in his अष्टाध्यायी read the following सूत्रs in the order given below – आद्गुणः, वृद्धिरेचि, एत्येधत्यूठ्सु, एङि पररूपम् and ओमाङोश्च.

वृद्धिरेचि checks आद्गुणः. The वृद्धि by एत्येधत्यूठ्सु, checks पररूपं by एङि पररूपम् in case of एति and एधति and गुण in the case of ऊठ्.

In लोट् मध्यमपुरुषैकवचन upon the root इण् (गतौ) there will be सिप् प्रत्यय by तिप्तस्झिसिप्थस्थमिब्वस्मस्तातांझथासाथांध्वमिड्वहिमहिङ् (3-4-78) and the same is replaced by 'हि' by सेर्ह्यपिच्च (3-4-87) – इहि is the form. When two prefixes i.e. अव and आ are added before the धातु there will be अव + आ + इहि. When गुण by "आद्गुणः" (6-1-87) is effectd between आ and इहि then there will be अव + एहि. This, following the परिभाषा – "असिद्धं बहिरङ्गमन्तरङ्गे". In the present case गुण is अन्तरङ्ग and the connection with अव is बहिरङ्ग.

In the present context the following text is found in महाभाष्य followed by प्रदीप and उद्योत –

भाष्यम् – Does this refer to the form of एति and एधते or the धातु in general has to be taken? So what? if the रूप is taken we get उपैति and प्रैति, but we won't get उपैषि, प्रैषि, उपैमि and पैमि. And if the धातु is taken then we get all of them. What next (वा) वृद्धि should be arrested in case of इण् धातु starting with इकार. In the case of इण् starting with इकार वृद्धि should be arrested – उपेतः प्रेतः (वा). we

get it through splitting the सूत्र – योगविभाग will be carried out – वृद्धिरेचि, then एत्येधत्योः, in the case of एति and एधति, starting with इण्, वृद्धि will take place. Then "ऊठि" – वृद्धि will take place in the case of 'ऊठ्'.

Even then आ + इतः = एतः, उप + एतः = उपेतः, प्रेतः – in these cases also there will be वृद्धि, the पररूपं by ओमाङ्गोश्च will check this. It will not happen, this वृद्धि is being initiated when the पररूप is certain. That वृद्धि will check आङि पररूपं also, just like it checks एङि पररूपम्. It doesn't check. What is the reason? That will check the one which is certain. This वृद्धि is not being initiated when एङि पररूपम् doesn't act. Rather it is initiated when आङि पररूपम् would act and doesn't. Otherwise we may say that this वृद्धि would check एङि पररूपम् only, but not आङि पररूपम् following the परिभाषा the अपवादs before will check the विधिs that are immediately next but not the next ones.

प्रदीपम् –

The वृद्धि is being injuncted when there is एङि पररूपम् in the case of एति and एधति and गुण in the case of ऊठ्. Here एति only is being discussed. एधि is not taken as it is आत्मनेपदी and therefore the रूप can't be taken. Both are taken due to association. If एति is considered as तिङन्त then it will be the रूप. On the other hand if it is श्तिपानिर्देशः, following इक्श्तिपौ धातुनिर्देशे (वा) then the धातु has to be taken – the question is due to this doubt.

The योगविभाग is resorted to as in a single सूत्र 'एचि' can't have relation with ऊठ् and since a single द्वन्द्वार्थ cannot be supported for connecting a qualifier, as well. It means when it is generally taken (बाध्यसामान्यचिन्ता) then there will be checking of concerned विधिs. Since it is illegitimate to apply बाध्यसामान्यचिन्ता in the case of बाध्यविशेषचिन्ता. When the immediate next विधि to be checked is known then since the present सूत्र fulfilled its task, in case of competition with a latter विधि then the latter would prevail following - विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम् (1-4-2).

उद्योतम् –

It is improper to take the form as एधति is आत्मनेपदी – he says then the wording 'एत्येधत्योः' in the प्रश्नभाष्य he responds. He says in response to the question that the discussion is not proper since श्तिप् is there only in धातुनिर्देश. He gives the reason in resorting to योगविभाग. 'इण्' in the प्रतिषेधवार्तिक is inclusive of एधति. That'swhy the सूत्र is split into एत्येधत्योः and the qualifier एचि is said to be related to both. Otherwise there will be overapplication (व्यभिचार) in cases like मा भवान् प्रेदिधत् etc. There is no connection with ऊठ् due to असम्भव. In fact the purport of भाष्य is that in the case of एधति, following the वार्तिक, it is just a विशेषणम्. It is proper to say that there is no usage of things like मा भवान् प्रेदिधत्. It means the words 'येन नाप्राप्ते' mean by the one that is different from itself. Otherwise येन means by a कार्य associated with which धर्म. It means that "by the

one that has come by which शास्त्र" is the meaning of 'येन' it means strikes the अनन्तर strikes the mind first.

किमिदमेत्येधत्यो रूपग्रहणमाहोस्विद्धातुग्रहणम्। किं चातः? यदि रूपग्रहणं सिद्धम्। उपैति प्रैति, उपैषि प्रैषि, उपैमि प्रैमीति न सिध्यति। अथ धातुग्रहणम्? सिद्धमेतद्भवति। किं तर्हीति। इणीकारादौ वृद्धिप्रतिषेधः इणीकारादौ वृद्धेः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। उपेतः प्रेत इति। योगविभागासिद्धिम्। (योगविभागात्सिद्धमेतत्)। योगविभागः करिष्यते। "वृद्धिरेचि" (वृद्धिरेचि भवति)। तत "एत्येधत्योः"। एत्येधत्योश्चैति वृद्धिर्भवति। तत ऊठि (च)। ऊठि च वृद्धिर्भवतीति। एवमपि आ इत एतः – (उप एतः) उपेतः प्रेत इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति। आङि पररूपमत्र बाधकं भविष्यति। न भविष्यति, नाप्राप्ते पररूपे इयं वृद्धिरारभ्यते सा यथैङि पररूपं बाधते एवमाङि पररूपं बाधते। न बाधते। किं कारणम्। येन नाप्राप्ते तस्य बाधनं भवति। न चाऽप्राप्ते पररूपे इयं वृद्धिरारभ्यते। आङि पररूपे पुनः प्राप्ते चाऽप्राप्ते च। अथ वा पुरस्तादपवादा अनन्तरान्विधीन् बाधन्त इतीयं वृद्धिरेङि पररूपं बाधिष्यते नाऽऽङि पररूपम्।

प्रदीपम् –

एत्ये। एत्येधत्योरेङि पररूपमिति प्राप्ते, ऊठ्याद्गुणे च वृद्धिविधानात्। किमिदमिति। एतिरेवात्र विचार्यते। एधेस्त्वात्मनेपदित्वाद्रूपग्रहणाभावः। साहचर्यात्तु द्वयोर्निर्देशः। यद्येतीति तिङन्तानुकारणं ततो रूपग्रहणम्। अथेक्श्तिपाविति श्तिपानिर्देशस्ततो धातुग्रहणमिति संशयात्प्रश्नः। योगविभागादिति। एकस्मिन्योगे एचीत्यस्योठासम्बन्धाऽभावादेकस्य द्वन्द्वार्थस्य विशेषणसम्बन्धाय कर्तुमशक्यत्वद्योगविभागसंश्रयः। सा यथैवेति। बाध्यमात्रापेक्षायां सर्वत्र बाधाप्रसङ्ग इति भावः।

येन नाप्राप्त इति। कार्यविशेषचिन्तायां सर्वविषयव्यापिबाधस्याऽन्याय्यत्वात्। अथ वेति। अनन्तरे बाध्ये विज्ञाते तद्बाधया वचनस्य चरितार्थत्वादुत्तरेण सह स्पर्द्धायां परत्वादुत्तरं भवतीत्यर्थः।

उद्योतः –

एत्येध। नन्वेत्येधत्योर्वृद्धिरेचीत्येव सिद्धमत आह – एत्येधेति। नन्वेधतेरात्मानेपदित्वेन रूपग्रहणाऽसम्भवादुभयोर्ग्रहणमसङ्गतमत आह – एतिरेवेति। नन्वेवं प्रश्नभाष्ये एत्येधत्योरित्य–सङ्गतमत आह – साहचर्यादिति। श्तिपो धातुनिर्देश एव सत्वेन विचाराऽनुपपत्तेराह – यद्येतीति। योगविभागाश्रयणे बीजमाह – एकस्मिन्निति। प्रतिषेधवार्तिके इणीत्युपलक्षणमेधतेरपि। अत एवैत्येधत्योरिति योगं विभज्य तस्यैचीतिविशेषणमुक्तं भाष्ये, मा भवान् प्रेदिधदित्यादौ व्यभिचारसम्भवात्। ऊठा तु न सम्बन्धः, असम्भवात्। वस्तुतो वार्तिकानुरोधादेधत्यंशे उपरञ्जकतया विशेषणमित्येव भाष्यतात्पर्यम्। मा भवान् प्रेदिधदित्यादेरनभिधानमित्येवोचितम्। बाध्यमात्रेति। येन नाप्राप्ते इत्यस्य स्वेतरणेत्यर्थ इति भावः। यद्वा येनेत्यस्य यद्धर्मावच्छिन्नेन कार्येणेत्यर्थः। कार्यविशेषेति। 'येनेत्यस्य यच्छास्त्रेण प्राप्तेनेत्यर्थ' इति भावः। अनन्तरे इति। प्रथमोपस्थितत्वेनेति भावः।

In काशिका the following text is there under एत्येधत्यूठ्सु –

In the case of एति and एधति this is an अपवाद of एङि पररूपम्. The पररूपं by ओमाङोश्च is not being checked by the सूत्र in light of either परिभाषा. The वृद्धि that is started while a वृद्धि is certain then the former would check the latter or

the अपवादs before would check the विधिs that are immediately next to them. Therefore this सूत्रं doesn't effect वृद्धि in the following example – उप+आ+इतः – उपेतः.

एत्येधत्योः तु एङि पररूपापवादः। "ओमाङोश्च" (6-1-95) इत्येतत्तु पररूपं न बाध्यते, येन नाप्राप्ते यो विधिरारभ्यते स तस्य बाधको भवति (व्या.प.49) इति, पुरस्तादपवादाः अनन्तरान् विधीन् बाधन्ते (व्या.प.9) इति वा। तेनेह न भवति, उप आ इतः उपेतः इति।

हरदत्तमिश्र, the author of पदमञ्जरि offered the following commentary on the above काशिका – पररूपापवादः etc., वृद्धि is being injuncted – is the वाक्यशेष. Since this वृद्धि is being instituted when पररूप is certain it would check आङि पररूपम् also just like it checks एङि पररूपम् – answers this question – ओमाङोश्च इत्येतत्तु. How came – येन स तस्य बाधको भवति. It would check एङि पररूपम् only, since the बाध is certain and the वृद्धि gets its task fulfilled by that – this is the purport. One may question - this is not being initiated while एङि पररूपम् – it applies in cases like आ इतः एतः, प्रेतः, परेतः and doesn't in cases like उपैति and प्रैति, therefore it doesn't check.

He offers another solution – पुरस्तात्. When the immediate next विधि that is to be checked is known then the सूत्र became fruitful and when there is competition with the latter सूत्र the latter only would prevail following विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम् – this is the purport एत्येधत्योरेङि पररूपापवादः इति। वृद्धिर्विधीयत इत्यनुषङ्गः।

यथैव तर्हि "एङि पररूपम्" बाधते, एवमाङि पररूपमपि बाधते, नाप्राप्ते पररूपेऽस्या वृद्धेरारम्भात् इत्यत आह – "ओमाङोश्च" इत्येतत्तु इति। कुतः? इत्याह – "येन" इति। स तस्य बाधको भवति इति। तस्यैव बाधको भवतीति यावत्, तत् बाधस्यावश्यम्भावित्वात्, तावता च बाधनस्य चरितार्थत्वात्। न चाप्राप्ते एङि पररूपे इयं वृद्धिरारभ्यते, आङि पररूपेतु आ इतः एतः, प्रेतः परेत इत्यत्र प्राप्ते, उपैति, प्रैति इत्यत्र त्वप्राप्ते। तस्मान्न बाधते। परिहारान्तरमाह – "पुरस्तात्" इति। अनन्तरे बाध्ये ज्ञाते तद्बाधया वचनस्य चरितार्थत्वादुत्तरेण सह स्पर्धायां परत्वात्तदेव भवतीति भावः।

The author of न्यास जनेन्द्रबुद्धिः had expressed his views on the subject that are similar to पदमञ्जरी. In सिद्धान्तकौमुदी भट्टोजिदीक्षित says the following –

पुरस्तादपवादन्यायेनेयं वृद्धिः "एङि पररूपम्" इत्यस्यैव बाधिका न तु ओमाङोश्च इत्यस्य। तेन अवैति इति वृद्धिरसाधुरेव (by पुरस्तादपवादन्याय this वृद्धि would check एङि पररूपम् only but not ओमाङोश्च. Therefore the वृद्धि in 'अवैहि' is wrong.

In लघुशब्देन्दुशेखर – नागेशभट्ट offered the following clarification – पुरस्तादपवादाः अनन्तरान् विधीन् बाधन्ते नोत्तरान् – is the न्याय.

The origin of this न्याय is this – when an application that is certain has to be checked and when there is the expectancy of a qualifier, when by the checking of the one that strikes the mind first the same is put to rest. असाधुरेव since there

will be check by एङि पररूप as following "अन्तादिवच्च" (6-1-82), the एकादेश between आङ् and इण् is पूर्वान्त.

पुरस्तादिति। पुरस्तादपवादा अनन्तरान्विधीन् बाधन्ते नोत्तरानिति न्यायः। अवश्यं स्वपरस्मिन् बाधनीये भेदेनापेक्षायां प्रथमोपस्थितबाधेनाऽऽकाङ्क्षानिर्वृत्तिर्हि तद्बीजम्।

वासुदेवदीक्षित, the author of बालमनोरमा commentary, differs from भट्टोजि-दीक्षित in terms of पुरस्तादपवादन्याय – he holds that the वृद्धि by एत्येधत्यूठ्सु does not check ओमाङोश्च पररूपं at all. The reason is that although the पररूप does not come in cases like उपैति the वृद्धि by एत्येधति is initiated. Therefore this is not a subject of पुरस्तादपवादन्याय. Then it is legitimate to conclude that in a situation like अव + एहि – the ओमाङोश्च पररूपम् checks the वृद्धि by एत्येधति following विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम् (1-4-2) and there will be पररूपम्. That'swhy it is clearly stated in महाभाष्य that the वृद्धि by एत्येधति is an अपवाद to एङि पररूप which is certainly to come. Whereas it can not be an अपवाद to एङि पररूपम् which is both प्राप्त and अप्राप्त.

On the other hand, the other side that is offered in भाष्यं i.e. – otherwise following पुरस्तादपवादाः अनन्तरान् विधीन् बाधन्ते, the वृद्धि by एत्येधति would check एङि पररूपम् only but not ओमाङोश्च पररूपं also – this is said following बाध्यसामान्य-चिन्ता that the वृद्धि by एत्येधति is an अपवाद generally to both एङि पररूपम् and ओमाङोश्च.

ओमाङोश्च

वस्तुतस्तु एत्येधतीति वृद्धिः ओमाङोश्चेत्यस्यापवाद एव न भवति। उपैति इत्यादौ अप्राप्तेति तस्मिन् एत्येधतीति वृद्धेरारम्भात्। अतः पुरस्तादपवादा इति न्यायस्य नायं विषयः। ततश्च अव एहीत्यत्र एत्येधतीति बाधित्वा परत्वादोमाङोश्चेति पररूपं न्याय्यमित्येव वक्तुमुचितम्। अत एव भाष्ये – नाप्राप्ते एङि पररूपे एत्येधतीति वृद्धिरारभ्यमाणा भवति तस्यापवादः। आङि पररूपे तु प्राप्ते चाप्राप्ते च आरभ्यमाणा वृद्धिर्न तदपवादः इति स्पष्टमेवोक्तम्। यत्तु भाष्ये पक्षान्तरमुक्तम् – अथवा पुरस्तादपवादा अनन्तरान् विधीन् बाधन्त इत्येवमेत्येधतीति वृद्धिरेङि पररूपमेव बाधते। नत्वोमाङ्गोश्चेति पररूपमपि इति। तत्तु एत्येधतीति वृद्धिरेङि पररूप-मोमाङोश्चेति सूत्रद्वयापवादत्वाभ्युपगमवादमात्रमाश्रित्य बाध्यसामान्यचिन्तामाश्रित्य वेत्यलं बहुना।

The famous commentator मल्लिनाथ sharply differs from all the above with regard to the formation of the word अवेहि –

This is a form in लोट् on इण् धातु prefixed by अव. Since the replacement by 'हि' by सेर्ह्यपिच्च (3-4-87) is a ङित् there can not be सार्वधातुकगुण by सार्वधातु-कार्धधातुकयोः (7-3-84), but आद्गुणः (6-1-87) in संहिता (संहितायाम्, 6-3-114).

Here the प्रक्रिया of some people by prefixing आङ् to the verb and effecting पररूपं by ओमाङोश्च is a wasteful exercise like cleaning before throwing as the ज्ञानार्थ can be expressed only by अव + इञ् and by prefixing आङ् the ज्ञानार्थत्व cannot be achieved.

Since it is commented – गुण only is proper – the वामनसूत्र that the वृद्धि in अवैहि is wrong - amounts to the checking of वृद्धि that one may apply due to illusion in not prefixing आङ्. Otherwise it could have been said that the पररूपम् by ओमाङोश्च only is proper.

अवपूर्वादिणो लोटि – "सेर्हिरिति" ह्यादेशे ङित्वान्न सार्वधातुकगुणः संहितायामाद्गुणः। अत्र केवलावपूर्वस्यैवेणो ज्ञानार्थत्वादाङ् प्रश्नेषे तदलाभादाङं प्रश्लेष्य ओमाङोश्चेति पररूपमिति केषाञ्चित्प्रक्रियोपन्यासो वृथा – प्रक्षाल्यत्यागः अवैहीति वृद्धिरवद्येति वामनसूत्रमप्यनाङ् प्रश्लेषा–वेवभ्रान्तिप्राप्तवृद्धिप्रतिषेधपरं गुणावेव युक्त इति व्याख्यानात् अन्यथा ओमाङोश्चेति पररूपमेव युक्तमित्युच्यतेति।

In the above commentary मल्लिनाथ takes the धातु – इण् गतौ as ज्ञानार्थक following the norm 'सर्वे गत्यर्थकाः ज्ञानार्थकाः' (all the धातुs which have गति as the meaning can be used to mean ज्ञान also).

In रघुवंश (5-53) we come across the usage of the word अवेहि –

मतङ्गशापादवलेपमूलादवाप्तवानस्मि मतङ्गजत्वम्।
अवेहि गन्धर्वपतेस्तनूजं प्रियंवदं मां प्रियदर्शनस्य।।

But मल्लिनाथ in his commentary घण्ठापथ does not go into the details of the formation of the word अवेहि.

On the other hand another commentator, viz. नारायण had had the following in this regard –

In लोट् upon इण् गतौ since there is अपित्व to 'हि' there can not be गुण and since there is no एजादित्व there can not be वृद्धि by एत्येधत्यूठ्सु (6-1-89) there will be आद्गुणः. Even if आङ् is prefixed there will be पररूपं by ओमाङोश्च (6-1-95) and there will be the form अवेहि only.

इणो लिटि हेरपित्वाद्गुणाभावे एजादित्वाभावात् एत्येधति इति वृद्ध्यभावेन आद्गुणः। आङ्प्रश्लेषेऽपि ओमाङोश्च (6-1-95) इति पररूपप्राप्तेः अवेहि इत्येव रूपम्।

8) **अधरं किल बिम्बनामकं फलमस्मादिति भव्यमन्वयम्।**
लभतेऽधरबिम्बमित्यदः पदमस्या रदनच्छदं वदत्।। (2-)

Summary :

The word अधरबिम्बम् (that is used in the sense of अधरो बिम्बमिव – उपमितसमासः which means the lower lip of ladies is like broynia**)** denotes the lip of दमयन्ती and the बिम्ब is inferior to the lip of दमयन्ती and thus (following बहुव्रीहि) the संसर्ग will be impeccable.

The following is the purport of श्रीहर्ष in this verse – पाणिनि instituted the following सूत्र to analyze उपमितसमास – उपमितं व्याघ्रादिभिः सामान्याप्रयोगे (2-1-56),

पुरुषव्याघ्रः in the sense of पुरुषो व्याघ्र इव is the example. The उपमेय will get समास with उपमान when the सामान्यधर्म is not mentioned – is the meaning of the सूत्र. In the present case in the sense of अधरं बिम्बमिव अधरबिम्बम् – is an उपमितसमास i.e. a sub category of तत्पुरुष.

Rather in the present verse श्रीहर्ष, while exhibiting his profound knowledge of पाणिनि, wants to assert that the समास - अधरबिम्बं is a बहुव्रीहि rather than तत्पुरुष and in that case only the सामर्थ्य, imposed by पाणिनि by the सूत्र - समर्थः पदविधिः (2-1-1) is well applicable. The following is his argument. The fruit बिम्बं is inferior (अधरम्) from the lip of दमयन्ती and therefore अधरं बिम्बं यस्मात् तत् अधरबिम्बम् - बहुव्रीहिसमासः. Otherwise it will become an असमर्थसमास.

The following is the जीवातु of मल्लिनाथ on the above verse –

अधरमिति। अधरबिम्बमित्यदः पदम् अधरोबिम्बमिवेत्युपमितसमासाश्रयणेन स्त्रीणा-मधरेषु यत्पदं प्रयुज्यते तदित्यर्थः, अस्याः दमयन्त्याः रदनच्छदम् ओष्ठमभिदधत् तदभिधाना-प्रयुक्तं सदित्यर्थः - बिम्बनामकं फलं बिम्बमस्माद्दमयन्तीरदनच्छदादधरं किलापकृष्टं खल्वि-त्यधरशब्दस्यापकृष्टार्थत्वे अधरं बिम्बं यस्मात्तदिति बहुव्रीहिसमासे च सति भव्यमबाधित-मन्वयं वृत्तिपदार्थसंसर्गलक्षणं लभते, अन्यथा असमर्थसमासाश्रयणे समर्थः पदविधिरिति परिभाषा भज्येत। तर्हि नोपमा च स्यादिति भावः।

The commentary of मल्लिनाथ demands a detailed explanation of सामर्थ्य

imposed by पाणिनि on समासs etc., by the सूत्र – समर्थः पदविधिः. This सूत्र would have its influence on almost half of अष्टाध्यायी. Its spreads it tentacles into four or five वृत्तिs viz. कृत्, तद्धित,समास (एकशेष) and सनाद्यन्तधातु.

कात्यायन, पतञ्जलि, भर्तृहरि and other commentators took pains to explain the cryptic meaning of समर्थः पदविधिः -

Initially पतञ्जलि discusses the formation of the word विधि and rules that it is वि + धाञ् + कि in कर्मार्थ. विधीयते इति विधिः. समास etc. वृत्तिs, विभक्तिविधानं and पराङ्गवद्भाव are called पदविधिs.

विपूर्वाद्धाञः कर्मसाधन इकारः विधीयते विधिरिति। किं पुनर्विधीयते? समासो विभक्तिविधानं पराङ्गवद्भावश्च।

भट्टोजिदीक्षित in सिद्धान्तकौमुदी offers the following वृत्ति of this सूत्र – पदसम्बन्धी यो विधिः स समर्थाश्रितो बोध्यः, any विधि that is related to पद (directly or indirectly) would have समर्थ्यं as its resort.

As a result all the four or five वृत्तिs viz. कृत्, तद्धित,समास (एकशेष) and सनाद्यन्तधातुवृत्ति are covered.

In समासप्रकरण of सिद्धान्तकौमुदी, दीक्षित enumerates five वृत्तिs – तत्र कृत्तद्धित–समासैकशेषसनाद्यन्तधातुरूपाः पञ्च वृत्तयः. On the other hand, नागेशभट्ट in लघुमञ्जूषा asserts that there only four वृत्तिs – तत्र वृत्तिः चतुर्धाः. He argues that the सूत्र – द्वन्द्वे च

(1-1-30) goes as अनुवृत्ति into एकशेष and therefore एकशेष need not be considered as a separate वृत्ति. Further पतञ्जलि discusses the aspect of परिभाषा – he rakes up the question as the weather the सूत्र in question is an अधिकार or परिभाषा and then explains the difference between the two – अधिकार is one that is not said again and again but runs into each सूत्र. On the other hand परिभाषा is static in nature and being at a single point of place, just like a lamp, it illuminates the entire शास्त्र. It is how a well lit lamp illuminates the entire house from a single point. In this connection नागेश in his उद्योत quotes the following verse –

एकदेशस्थिता शास्त्रभवने याति दीपताम्।

परितो व्यापृतां भाषां परिभाषां प्रचक्षते ।।

किं पुनरयमधिकारः, आहोस्वित् परिभाषा? । कः पुनरधिकारपरिभाषयोर्विशेषः?

अधिकारः प्रतियोगं तस्यानिर्देशार्थ इति योगे योगे उपतिष्ठते। परिभाषा पुनरेकदेशस्था सती कृत्स्नं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति प्रदीपवत्। तद्यथा – प्रदीपः सुप्रज्वलित एकदेशस्थः सर्वं वेश्माभिज्वलयति।

पतञ्जलि raises another doubt as to weather the समर्थ that is denoted by the सूत्र – समर्थः पदविधिः is एकार्थीभाव or व्यपेक्षा.

तथेदमपरं द्वैतं भवति – एकार्थीभावो वा सामर्थ्यं स्यात्, व्यपेक्षा वेति?

कैयट in his प्रदीप explains the above terms – wherein the words have their meaning as unimportant or give up their meaning or become redundant by denoting the important meaning or denote a different meaning – that is called एकार्थीभाव. व्यपेक्षा is mutual expectancy.

यत्र पदान्युपसर्जनीभूतस्वार्थानि निवृत्तस्वार्थानि वा प्रधानार्थोपादानाद्यर्थानि, अर्थान्त–राभिधायीनि वा स एकार्थीभावः। परस्पराकाङ्क्षारूपा व्यपेक्षा। Then पतञ्जलि goes to the next step of deciding the pairs of एकार्थीभाव and व्यपेक्षा on one side and अधिकार and परिभाषा on the other. He also discusses the result –

If एकार्थीभाव and अधिकार are taken then समास only is covered but विभक्तिविधानं and पराङ्गवद्भाव are not.

If व्यपेक्षा and अधिकार are taken the विभक्तिविधान and पराङ्गवद्भाव are covered but समास is left out. Elsewhere the terms समर्थ and युक्त have to be taken up. Whereelse – इसुसोः सामर्थ्ये (8-3-44) न च वाहाहैवयुक्ते (8-1-24)

If व्यपेक्षा and परिभाषा are taken then whatever smell of पद is there in व्याकरण that will completely be taken except समास.

Therefore, the सूत्र will not split if एकार्थीभावसामर्थ्य and परिभाषा are taken.

तत्रैकार्थीभावे सामर्थ्येऽधिकारे च सति समास एकः संगृहीतो भवति। विभक्तिविधानं पराङ्गवद्भावश्चासंगृहीतः।

व्यपेक्षायां पुनः सामर्थ्येऽधिकारे च सति विभक्तिविधानं पराङ्गवद्भावश्च संगृहीतो भवति। समासस्त्वेकोऽसंगृहीतः। अन्यत्र खल्वपि समर्थग्रहणानि युक्तग्रहणानि च कर्तव्यानि भवन्ति। क्वान्यत्र?। "इसुसोः सामर्थ्ये" "न च वाहाहैवयुक्ते" इति। व्यपेक्षायां पुनः सामर्थ्ये परिभाषायां च सत्यां यावान् व्याकरणे पदगन्धो नाम स सर्वः संगृहीतो भवति। समासस्त्वे-कोऽसंगृहीतः। तत्रैकार्थीभावः सामर्थ्यं परिभाषा चेत्येवं सूत्रमभिन्नतरकं भवति।

Then पतञ्जलि discusses the purpose of the term समर्थ –

Then why the term समर्थ? आचार्य will be saying - द्वितीया will get समास with श्रित etc - कष्टश्रितः, नरकश्रितः, why समर्थ – पश्य देवदत्त कष्टम्, श्रितो विष्णुमित्रो गुरुकुलम्। तृतीया will get समास with गुणवचन that is तत्कृतार्थ – उपादानविकलः, शङ्कुलाखण्डः, किरिकाणः। why समर्थ – त्वं निष्ठ शङ्कुलया, खण्डो धावति मुसलेन। किं त्वं करिष्यसि शङ्कुलया खण्डो विष्णुमित्र उपलेन।

चतुर्थी will get समास with तदर्थ, अर्थ, बलि, हित and रक्षित – गोहितं, वृषभहितं, अश्वहितम्। Why समर्थ – सुखं गोभ्यः हितं देवदत्ताय।

पञ्चमी will get समास with भय. वृकभयं, दस्युभयं, चोरभयम्। Why समर्थ – गच्छ त्वं मा वृकेभ्यः, भयं देवदत्तात् यज्ञदत्तस्य.

षष्ठी will get समास with सुबन्त – राजपुरुषः, ब्राह्मणकम्बलः। Why समर्थ – भार्या राज्ञः पुरुषो देवदत्तस्य.

सप्तमी will get समास with शौण्ड etc. – अक्षशौण्डः, स्त्रीशौण्डः। Why समर्थ – कुशलो देवदत्तोऽक्षेषु शौण्डः पिबति पानागारे।

अथ समर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम् ?

भक्षयति – द्वितीया श्रितादिभिः समस्यते कष्टश्रितो नरकश्रित इति। समर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम्? पश्य देवदत्त कष्टं, श्रितो विष्णुमित्रो गुरुकुलम्।

"तृतीया तत्कृतार्थेन गुणवचनेन" उपादानविकलः, शङ्कुलाखण्डः, किरिकाणः। समर्थ-ग्रहणं किमर्थम्? त्वं तिष्ठ शङ्कुलया, खण्डो धावति मुसलेन। किं त्वं करिष्यसि शङ्कुलया, खण्डो विष्णुमित्र उपलेन।

"चतुर्थी तदर्थार्थबलिहितसुखरक्षितैः"। गोहितम्। वृषभहितम्। अश्वहितम्। समर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम्?। सुखं गोभ्यो, हितं देवदत्ताय।

"पञ्चमी भयेन"। वृकभयं, दस्युभयं, चोरभयम्। समर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम्?। गच्छ त्वं मा वृकेभ्यो भयं देवदत्ताद्यज्ञदत्तस्य।

"षष्ठी सुबन्तेन समस्यते"। राजपुरुषः। ब्राह्मणकम्बलः। समर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम्? भार्या राज्ञः, पुरुषो देवदत्तस्येति।

"सप्तमी शौण्डैः"। अक्षशौण्डः, स्त्रीशौण्डः। समर्थग्रहणं किमर्थम्?। कुशलो देवदत्तोऽक्षेषु, शौण्डः पिबति पानागारे।

Further पतञ्जलि goes on to discuss the problem of सामर्थ्यं in certain cases and this discussion leads to a couple of norms in terms of सामर्थ्यम् –

Then even if the term समर्थ is taken how come समास does not take place in this case – महत् कष्टं श्रितः.

Why does not it become महाकष्टश्रितः.

It will become when the following is the वाक्यं – महत् कष्टं, महाकष्टं, महाकष्टं श्रितः, महाकष्टश्रितः. When the following is the वाक्यं – महाकष्टश्रितः then समास will not take place. But then also the समास is coming.

Then why is it not taking place?

To which – why is it not taking place. Is it for two or many?

For many why is it not taking place?

सुप्सुपा is there (it is taken as a single सुबन्त will get समास with single सुबन्त).

But gentle man सूत्रs behave in जाति. This is how – behave in जाति? This is how when it is there like प्रातिपदिकात्? The प्रत्यय is produced on different प्रातिपदिकs.

This is really so. जाति would rest in each individual but not class. In the case of प्रत्यय but not in class and the प्रत्यय has to produce on these lines. Similarly here also there is परिसमाप्ति like सुप्सुपा and upon that only a समास should take place the परिसमाप्ति is in two but not in many.

Then why is it not happening to two?

Due to असामर्थ्य how असमामर्थ्यं सापेक्षम् असमर्थं भवति। (any word involved in समास but with आकांक्षा with an outside word would be असमर्थ).

अथ क्रियमाणेऽपि समर्थग्रहणे इह कस्मान्न भवति – महत्कष्टं श्रित इति?।

न वा भवति महाकष्टश्रित इति?।

भवति, यदैतद्वाक्यं भवति – महत्कष्टं, महाकष्टं, महाकष्टं श्रितो महाकष्टश्रित इति। यदा त्वेतद्वाक्यं भवति – महत्कष्टं श्रित इति, तदा न भवितव्यम्। तदा च प्राप्नोति।

तदा कस्मान्न भवति?

कस्य कस्मान्न भवति। किं द्वयोः, अहोस्विद्बहूनाम्?

बहूनां कस्मान्न भवति?

सुप्सुपेति वर्तते।

ननु च भो आकृतौ शास्त्राणि प्रवर्तन्ते। तद्यथा – "प्रातिपदिकाद्" इति वर्तमानेऽन्यस्मा-च्चान्यस्माच्च प्रातिपदिकादुत्पत्तिर्भवति।

सत्यमेवमेतत्। आकृतिस्तु प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्यते, न समुदाये। यावत्येतत् परिसमाप्यते प्रातिपदिकादिति, तावत् – उत्पत्या भवितव्यम्, प्रत्येकं चैतत्परिसमाप्यते, न समुदाये। एवमिहापि यावत्येतत्परिसमाप्यते सुप्सुपेति, तावतः समासेन भवितव्यम्। द्वयोश्चैत्परि-समाप्यते, न बहुषु।

द्वयोस्तर्हि कस्मान्न भवति ?

असामर्थ्यात्। कथमसामर्थ्यम् ?

In certain cases we come across असमर्थसमासs in शिष्टप्रयोग. Now पतञ्जलि vividly discusses this aspect quoting कात्यायन वार्तिकs – if it is ruled सापेक्षं असमर्थं भवति then – राजपुरुषोऽभिरूपः, राजपुरुषो दर्शनीयः here वृत्ति does not get.

This is not wrong. Here is प्रधान is सापेक्ष will be there to प्रधान even if it is सापेक्ष.

Then where अप्रधान is सापेक्ष there will not be वृत्ति – देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्, देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रः, देवदत्तस्य दासभार्या.

This is not a defect. Here the षष्ठी having समुदायापेक्षा expects the entire गुरुकुलम्.

In this context कैयट quotes वाक्यपदीयम् –

समुदायेन सम्बन्धो येषां गुरुकुलादिना ।
सम्पृश्यावयवांस्ते तु युज्यन्ते तद्वता सह ।।

Then where there is no समुदायापेक्षा षष्ठी there वृत्ति will not get for you – किमोदनः शालीनाम्, सक्त्वाढकमापणीयानाम्, कुतो भवान् पाटलिपुत्रकः। Here also – देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्, देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रः, देवदत्तस्य दासभार्या. If this षष्ठी in these examples

is समुदायापेक्षा then the following need not necessarily mean – which गुरु of देवदत्त, his son. Then what another person's गुरुकुलम्. Some relation to देवदत्त – this meaning is suggested. Since it is certainly understood – which गुरु of देवदत्त and which son of that गुरु – we think this षष्ठी is not समुदायापेक्षा. Elsewhere also there is कार्यं to सापेक्षा when there is समर्थग्रहण whereelse – इसुसोस्सामर्थ्ये – ब्राह्मणस्य सन्निष्करोतीति. Therefore, this is not possible to say – सापेक्षम् असमर्थं भवति ।

In this connection कैयट quotes वाक्यपदीयम् –

सम्बन्धिशब्दः सापेक्षो नित्यं सर्वः प्रयुज्यते।

वाक्यवत् सा व्यपेक्षा हि वृत्तावपि न हीयते इति ।।

यदि सापेक्षमसमर्थं भवतीत्युच्यते, राजपुरुषोऽभिरूपः राजपुरुषो दर्शनीयः । अत्र वृत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति ।

नैष दोषः । प्रधानमत्र सापेक्षम् । भवति च प्रधानस्य सापेक्षस्यापि समासः ।

यत्र तर्ह्यप्रधानं सापेक्षं भवति तत्र वृत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति – देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्, देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रः, देवदत्तस्य दासभार्येति । (अत्र वृत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति ।)

नैष दोषः । समुदायापेक्षात्र षष्ठी सर्वं गुरुकुलमपेक्षते ।

'समुदायेन सम्बन्धो येषां गुरुकुलादीना संस्पृश्यावयवांस्ते तु युज्यन्ते तद्वता सह' इति ।

यत्र तर्हि न समुदायापेक्षा षष्ठी तत्र ते वृत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति – 'किमोदनः शालीनाम्',

'सक्त्वाढकमापणीयानाम्' 'कुतो भवान्पाटलिपुत्रक' इति। इह चापि 'देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलं', 'देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रोः', 'देवदत्तस्य दासभार्ये'ति। यद्येषां समुदायापेक्षा षष्ठी स्यान्नैतन्नियोगतो गम्यते – देवदत्तस्य यो गुरुस्तस्य पुत्र इति। किं तर्हि ?

अन्यस्यापि गुरुपुत्रः, देवदत्तस्य किञ्चिदित्योषोऽर्थो गम्येत। यतस्तु खलु नियोगतो देवदत्तस्य यो गुरुस्तस्य यः पुत्र इत्येषोऽर्थो गम्यते, अतो मन्यामहे – नैषा समुदायापेक्षा षष्ठीति। अन्यत्र खल्वपि समर्थग्रहणे सापेक्षस्यापि कार्यं भवति। क्वान्यत्र? "इसुसोः सामर्थ्ये" ब्राह्मणस्य सर्पिष्करोतीति। तस्मान्नैतच्छक्यं वक्तुं – सापेक्षमसमर्थं भवतीति।

Having discussed the aspect of सामर्थ्य to that extent, पतञ्जलि now quotes कात्यायन वार्तिकs and पाणिनिसूत्रं to certify that certain असमर्थसमासs have to be accepted –

Then why वृत्ति is not getting in the case of महत् कष्ट श्रितः (वा) 'There will not be वृत्ति between words with qualifiers, nor can a word involved in वृत्ति have विशेषण'.

It should be ruled that there will be no वृत्ति between the words having qualifiers nor can a qualifiers be used to a word that is already involved in वृत्ति.

If the above norms are accepted then there will not be वृत्ति in the case of देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्, देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रः and देवदत्तस्य दासभार्या।

(वा) 'The norms do not apply in the case of गुरुपुत्र' etc.

It should be ruled 'not in the case of गुरुपुत्र etc.

Then it should be ruled – 'There will not be वृत्ति between words with qualifiers nor can any qualifier be used to a word that is already in वृत्ति, but for गुरुपुत्र' etc.

Need not be ruled. Why then वृत्ति is not happening? because there is no गमकत्वं (implication). Here both the वाक्य as well as समास should express the same meaning, in the present case the meaning which is understood by the वाक्य– महत् कष्टं श्रितः, is never understood by the समास – महत् कष्टश्रितः. Due to this reason we say – अगमकत्वात्, we won't say it will be an अपशब्द. Wherever there is गमक वृत्ति will happen there. It how - देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्, देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रः, देवदत्तस्य दासभार्या.

सविशेषणानां वृत्तिर्न, वृत्तस्य वा विशेषणयोगो न।

यदि सविशेषणानां वृत्तिर्न वृत्तस्य वा विशेषणं न प्रयुज्यत इत्युच्यते, 'देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्', 'देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रो', 'देवदत्तस्य दासभार्ये'त्यत्र वृत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति।

अगुरुपुत्रादीनाम्।

तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यं सविशेषणानां वृत्तिर्न वृत्तस्य वा विशेषणं न प्रयुज्यते, अगुरुपुत्रादीनामिति।

न वक्तव्यम्। वृत्तिस्तर्हि कस्मान्न भवति?। अगमकत्वात्। इह समानार्थेन वाक्येन भवितव्यं समासेन च। यश्चेहार्थो वाक्येन गम्यते 'महत्कष्टं श्रितः' इति, नासौ जातुचित्समासेन गम्यते 'महत्कष्टश्रितः' इति। एतस्माद्धेतोर्ब्रूमः – अगमकत्वादिति, न ब्रूमः अपशब्दः स्यादिति। यत्र च गमको भवति, भवति तत्र वृत्तिः। तद्यथा – 'देवदत्तस्य गुरुकुलम्', 'देवदत्तस्य गुरुपुत्रो', 'देवदत्तस्य दासभार्येति।

Now पतञ्जलि is back on the track – why समर्थ?

If अगमकत्व is the cause then there will be no use of the term समर्थ. In the case of भार्या राज्ञः पुरुषो देवदत्तस्य – the meaning which is understood by the sentence would never be understood by the समास – भार्या राजपुरुषो देवदत्तस्य. Therefore there is no use of the term समर्थ.

Then this will be the purpose – there is a समास that is असमर्थसमास but गमक, that should not become साधु (a right usage) – अकिञ्चित्कुर्वाणम्, अमाषं हरमाणम्, अगाधादुत्सृष्टम्, this is also not the purpose. Certainly साधुत्वं should be ruled in the case of some नञ् समासs which are असमर्थ but गमक – असूर्यंपश्यानि मुखानि, अपुनर्गेयाः श्लोकाः, अश्राद्धभोजी ब्राह्मणः. The पाणिनिसूत्रं – सुडनपुंसकस्य (1-1- 42) – will be a guideline – साधुत्वं will be there to such kind of नञ् समास only which is असमर्थ but गमक and not others. Therefore no use of the term समर्थ.

यद्यगमकत्वं हेतुः, नार्थः समर्थग्रहणेन। इहापि "भार्या राज्ञः पुरुषो देवदत्तस्य" इति

योर्थो वाक्येन गम्यते, नासौ जातु चित्समासेन गम्यते भार्या राजपुरुषो देवदत्तस्य इति। तस्मान्नार्थः समर्थग्रहणेन।

इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम्। अयमस्त्यसमर्थसमासो नञ्समासो गमकः, तस्य साधुत्वं माभूत्– "अकिञ्चित्कुर्वाणम्" "अमाषं हरमाणम्" "अगाधादुत्सृष्टम्" इति।

एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम्। अवश्यं कस्यचिन्नञ्समासस्यासमर्थस्य गमकस्य साधुत्वं वक्तव्यम्। असूर्यंपश्यानि मुखानि "अपुनर्गेयाः श्लोकाः" अश्राद्धभोजी ब्रह्मण इति। "सुडनपुंसकस्य" इत्येतन्नियमार्थं भविष्यति – एतत्यैवासमर्थसमासस्य नञ्समासस्य गमकस्य साधुत्वं भवति नान्यस्येति। तस्मान्नार्थः समर्थग्रहणेन।

Further पतञ्जलि ventures upon the task of explaining the actual meaning of the term समर्थ – Even if the term समर्थ is accepted – it is said समर्थम्. What does समर्थं mean?

(वा) – 'समर्थं means expression of a single meaning by words having different meaning'.

समर्थं means words having different meanings becoming a single unit to express a single unitary meaning.

Where the words have different meanings and where a single meaning ?

In a sentence they have different meanings – राज्ञः पुरुषः, in समास they have a single meaning – राजपुरुषः. Why is it being said – पृथगर्थानाम्. When it is said –

राज्ञः पुरुषः आनीयताम् the राजपुरुष is being fetched and when it is राजपुरुषः the same person is being fetched.

We won't say – somebodyelse will be brought.

Then what is the significance of एकार्थीभाव?

सुब्लोपः, व्यवधानं free relation between words and the difference in term of स्वर. In a sentence सुप् will not get लोपः – राज्ञः पुरुषः. In a समास there will be सुब्लोपः – राजपुरुषः.

In a sentence the words are used with gap in between whereas in a समास there will not be any gap.

In a sentence the mutual relation at will can be there (free word order) राज्ञः पुरुषः पुरुषो राज्ञः whereas in a समास it is absent – राजपुरुषः.

In a sentence there will be two स्वरs – राज्ञः पुरुषः, rather it is a single स्वर in a समास – राजपुरुषः.

There are not the significant aspects of एकार्थीभाव. They are said in अष्टाध्यायी. भगवान् पाणिनि says the following – सुपो धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः (2-2-30), उपसर्जनं पूर्वम् (2-2-30), समासस्य (6-1-217).

कस्तर्ह्येकार्थीभावकृतो विशेषः?

सुबलोपे व्यवधानं यथेष्टमन्यतरेणाभिसम्बन्धः स्वर इति।

सुबलोपो भवति वाक्ये – राज्ञः पुरुष इति। समासे तु न भवति – राजपुरुष इति।

व्यवधानं भवति वाक्ये – राज्ञः ऋद्धस्य पुरुष इति। समासे तु न भवति – राजपुरुष इति।

यथेष्टमन्यतरेणाभिसम्बन्धो भवति वाक्ये – "राज्ञः पुरुषः", पुरुषो राज्ञ इति। समासे न भवति – राजपुरुष इति।

द्वौ स्वरौ भवतो वाक्ये – राज्ञः पुरुष इति। समासे पुनरेक एव – राजपुरुष इति।

नैत एकार्थीभावकृता विशेषाः। किं तर्हि? वाचनिकान्येतानि। आह हि भगवान् – "सुपो धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः" "उपसर्जनं पूर्वम्"। समासस्यान्त उदात्तो भवतीति।

Then the following are the significant aspects of एकार्थीभाव – संख्याविशेष, व्यक्ताभिधानं, उपसर्जनविशेषणं and चयोग.

In a sentence there will be संख्याविशेष – राज्ञः पुरुषः, राज्ञो पुरुषः, राज्ञां पुरुषः.

Where as in a समास it will not be there.

At this juneture कैयट refers to वाक्यपदीयं wherein the aspect of अभेदैकत्व is discussed in वृत्तिसमुद्देश.

यथौषधिरसाः सर्वे मधुन्याहितशक्तयः।

अविभागेन वर्तन्ते तां संख्यां तादृशीं विदुरिति।।

भेदानां वा परित्यागात्संख्यात्मा न तथाविधः ।

व्यापाराज्जातिभागस्य भेदापोहेन वर्तते ।।

अगृहीतविशेषेण यथा रूपेण रूपवान् ।

प्रख्यायते न शुक्लादिभेदरूपस्तु गम्यते ।।

In fact, the concept of अभेदैकत्व is not discussed in महाभाष्य. Rather भर्तृहरि registered the same, may be prevalent during his time - Just like honey, in which many herbal secretions are there with capacity, in a समास also there will be the संख्या without any separation like एकत्व, द्वित्व and बहुत्व. Otherwise by giving up all the differences like एकत्व, the संख्या in the form of जाति will be there and the same would arrest the differences in a समास. It is just like a thing that is seen from a distance and would be taken by it's forms without any properties. And although there are properties like whiteness etc. they are not known. Same is the case with अभेदैकत्वसंख्या.

(भाष्यम्) There is reason by which it is happening so. What is the reason? Since the शब्द which denotes the aspect is not there. Then you batter pronounce that शब्द and the aspect will be understood.

No, it should not be like this – the अर्थ should not be शब्दकृत, rather the शब्द should be अर्थकृत.

In a sentence the meaning will be expressed clearly – ब्राह्मणस्य कम्बलस्तिष्ठति. In a समास the meaning is unclear ब्राह्मणकम्बलस्तिष्ठति there will be a doubt weather it is सम्बुद्धि or षष्ठीसमास.

In a sentence there can be an उपसर्जनविशेषणम् – क्रुद्धस्य राज्ञः पुरुषः, in a समास it will not be there – राजपुरुषः.

In a वाक्य there will be - स्वचयोगः स्वमिचयोग as well. स्वचयोगः – राज्ञो गौश्चाश्वश्च पुरुषश्च, in a समास it will not be there – राज्ञो गावाश्वपुरुषाः, स्वामि च योगः – देवदत्तस्य च, यज्ञदत्तस्य च, विष्णुमित्रस्य च गौः।

इमे तर्ह्येकार्थीभावकृता विशेषाः – संख्याविशेषो व्यक्ताभिधानमुपसर्जनविशेषणं चयोग इति।

संख्याविशेषो भवति वाक्ये – राज्ञः पुरुषः, 'राज्ञोः पुरुषः', राज्ञां पुरुष इति। समासे न भवति – राजपुरुषः इति।

अस्ति कारणं येनैतदैवं भवति। किं कारणम्?। योऽसौ विशेषवाची शब्दस्तदसांनिध्यात्। अङ्ग हि भवांस्तमुच्चारयतु गंस्यते स विशेषः।

ननु च नैतेनैवं भवितव्यम्। नहि शब्दकृतेन नामार्थेन भवितव्यम्। अर्थकृतेन नाम शब्देन भवितव्यम्।

व्यक्ताभिधानं भवति वाक्ये – 'ब्राह्मणस्य कम्बलस्तिष्ठति' इति। समासे पुनरव्यक्ता-भिधानं 'ब्राह्मणकम्बलस्तिष्ठति' इति सन्देहो भवति – सम्बुद्धिर्वा स्यात् षष्ठीसमासो वेति।

उपसर्जनविशेषणं भवति वाक्ये – ऋद्धस्य राज्ञः पुरुष इति। समासे न भवति – राजपुरुष इति।

चयोगो भवति वाक्ये स्वचयोगः स्वामिचयोगश्चेति। स्वचयोगः – राज्ञो गौश्चाश्वश्च पुरुषश्चेति। समासे न भवति – राज्ञो गवाश्वपुरुषा इति। स्वामिचयोगः देवदत्तस्य च यज्ञदत्तस्य च विष्णुमित्रस्य च गौरिति। समासे न भवति – देवदत्तयज्ञदत्तविष्णुमित्राणां गौरिति।

Infact, पाणिनि did not employ the word वृत्ति, rather he replaced the definition of वृत्ति by समर्थः पदविधिः (2-1-1). On the other hand, पतञ्जलि under the above सूत्र raked up the question of वृत्ति –

Further those who employ वृत्ति– what they said?

परार्थाभिधानम् is वृत्ति .

Here कैयट explans – the meaning of the predominant word is expressed by another शब्द and the same is called वृत्ति. It is just like in the case of राजपुरुष, the meaning of the word पुरुष, that is not expressed in a वाक्य, is being expressed by the word राज.

अथैतस्मिन्नेकार्थीभावकृते विशेषे किं स्वाभाविकं शब्दैरर्थाभिधानम् ? आहोस्वि-द्वाचनिकम्? स्वाभाविकमित्याह। कुत एतत्। अर्थानादेशनात्। न ह्यर्था आदिश्यन्ते।

कथं पुनरर्थानादिशन्नेवं ब्रूयात् – नार्था आदिश्यन्ते इति। यदाह भगवान् – "अनेकमन्य-पदार्थे", "चार्थे द्वन्द्वः", अपत्ये, रक्ते, निर्वृत्त इति।

नैतान्यर्थादेशनानि। स्वभावत एतेषां शब्दनामेतेष्वर्थेष्वभिनिविष्टानां निमित्तत्वेनान्वाख्यानं क्रियते। तद्यथा – 'कूपे हस्तदक्षिणः पन्थाः, अभ्रे चन्द्रमसं पश्य' इति स्वभावतस्तस्य तत्रस्थस्य पथश्चन्द्रमसश्च निमित्तत्वेनान्वाख्यानं क्रियते। एवमिहापि चार्थे यः स द्वन्द्वः, अन्यपदार्थे यः स बहुव्रीहिरिति।

किं पुनः कारणमर्था नादिश्यन्ते ?

तच्च लघ्वर्थम्। लघ्वर्थं ह्यर्था नादिश्यन्ते। अवश्यं ह्यनेनार्थानादिशता केनचिच्छब्देन अर्थनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः स्यात्। तस्य च तावत्केन कृतः येनासौ क्रियते। अथ तस्य केनचित्कृतः, तस्य (केन कृतः, तस्य) केन कृत इत्यनवस्था च स्यात्। असम्भवः खल्वप्यर्थादेशनस्य। को हि नाम समर्थो धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययनिपातानामर्थानादेष्टुम्।

अथ ये वृत्तिं वर्तयन्ति, किं त आहुः?

परार्थाभिधानं वृत्तिरित्याहुः।

परार्थाभिधानमिति। परस्य शब्दस्य योर्थस्तस्याभिधानं शब्दान्तरेण यत्र सा वृत्तिरित्यर्थः। यथा राजपुरुष इत्यत्र राजशब्देन वाक्यावस्थायामनुक्तः पुरुषार्थोऽभिधीयते।

A brief account of the concept of वृत्ति is provided above and this is what was meant by श्रीहर्ष by the words 'भव्यमन्वयम्' and by मल्लिनाथ by the words – वृत्तिपदार्थसंसर्गलक्षणं लभते। अन्यथा असमर्थसमासाश्रयणे समर्थः पदविधिरिति परिभाषा भज्येत।

Chapter - III

CONCLUSION

After the analysis of some selected verses of नैषधकाव्य the following conclusions can be drawn in terms of शाब्दबोध –

The तिङ् प्रत्यय denotes क्रिया and in turn the क्रिया expresses काल पुरुष, उपग्रह and संख्या.

According to पाणिनि i.e. स्वरितञितः कर्त्रभिप्राये क्रियाफले (1-3-72), and शेषात् कर्तरि परस्मैपदम् if the result of a क्रिया belongs to कर्ता it is आत्मनेपद and if the same belongs to another then it is परस्मैपद.

The root पच् denotes the क्रिया – 'cooking'. The पाक is different for the cook as well as the person who consumes it. The परस्मैपद and आत्मनेपद that are लादेश explain the difference. One may take up the job of cooking etc. for livelihood and receives salary. Rather the क्रियाफल does not reach the person but the master. The master will enjoy the cooked food. Such a specific meaning is expressed by आत्मनेपद and परस्मैपद. If परस्मैपद like पचति is used then the result of पाक belongs to a person other than the cook (शेषात् कर्तरि परस्मैपदम्) sometimes instead of परस्मैपद and आत्मनेपद words like स्वं expresses the specific meaning as to weather the क्रियाफल goes to कर्ता or someone else.

हरि clarifies that some scholars asserted स्वार्थत्व and परार्थत्व in terms of behavior of a क्रिया. Rather it depends upon विवक्षा as to weather the परार्थत्व is real or unreal.

नुनुत्सुः – is an example of सनाद्यन्तधातुवृत्ति – in the sense of नोत्तुम् इच्छुः there will be सन् प्रत्यय following the परिभाषा – समर्थः पदविधिः by सनाशंसभिक्ष उः उप्रत्यय is added to the सन्नन्त i.e. नुनुत्सु.

The term वृत्ति is not according to पाणिनि but of some other schools, may be pre - Paniniyan. Under समर्थः पदविधिः, पतञ्जलि discusses the important aspect of assigning meaning to शब्दs. He asserts that the शब्दs that are already there in a sense are being analyzed by शब्दानुशासनं or व्याकरणं and as such व्याकरणं doesn't assign any meaning, whatsoever, to any शब्द. पतञ्जलि also says that there will be chaos if meaning is to be assigned to any शब्द.

The word करकल्प is formed by adding the suffix कल्पप् in ईषदसमाप्ति by the पाणिनिसूत्र – ईषसदसमाप्तौ कल्पब्देश्यदेशीयरः, on the word 'कर'. Here पतञ्जलि, following कात्यायन's वार्तिक discusses the aspect – ईषदसमाप्तौ क्रियाप्रधानत्वात् लिङ्गवचनानुपपत्तिः, and finally rules that the सूत्र has to be split in that case and supports पाणिनि by quoting another सूत्र – णचः स्त्रियामञ्, in which पाणिनि deliberately employed the word स्त्रियां in order to suggest – स्वार्थिका अतिवर्तन्तेऽपि लिङ्गवचनानि ।

The word प्रभूयते in उपकृत्यै तव किं प्रभूयते, is लट् in भाव. भाव means धात्वर्थ. भाव or भावना is expressed by कृदन्त and तिङन्त. The one expressed by कृदन्त is in the form of सत्त्व (द्रव्यम्) and therefore it will have अन्वय with लिङ्ग and संख्या. On the other hand, तिङ्वाच्य is in the form of असत्त्व and doesn't have any connection with लिङ्ग and वचन. एकवचनं will be there by default. Since कर्ता is not expressed by verb, there will be तृतीय following अनभिहिते and कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया.

In the case of the word सार्थकीकृत it is च्विप्रत्यय that expresses अभूततद्भाव. However पाणिनि ruled च्विप्रत्यय in सम्पद्यकर्तरि when there is योग with कृ, भू and अस्ति. Rather अभूततद्भाव is mentioned by कात्यायन.

च्विप्रत्यय is to be added when प्रकृति itself gets some विकार and the विकार if विवक्षित as कर्त्री in भवनक्रिया. हरि in वाक्यपदीय explains that a प्रकृति while giving up its धर्म becomes विकार but doesn't give up its property then it is called परिणाम and च्विप्रत्यय is to be added in this condition. नागेश elaborates that the thing would have both the forms.

As far as the word भीम is concerned it is उणादिप्रत्ययान्त.

As far as the generation of शब्दs is concerned there are two पक्षs – व्युत्पत्तिपक्ष and अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष. The former advocates that all nouns are produced from verbs. And the latter contradicts this theory. पाणिनि, in spite of accepting उणादि and कृत्, believes in अव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष.

The word दमयन्ती, which is शतृप्रत्ययान्त on णिजन्त दम् is in परस्मैपद. पाणिनि compiled two सूत्रs to identify आत्मनेपद and परस्मैपद. In the result, if the क्रिया goes to the कर्ता then it is आत्मनेपद and the rest is परस्मैपद. But पाणिनि, under certain conditions, ruled that some verbs, in spite of the condition related to the result, would become परस्मैपद. In the present case since the कर्त्रभिप्राय is not विवक्षित it becames परस्मैपद and लट् got शत्रादेश. The following order is discussed in this regard – आत्मनेपद – परस्मैपद – आत्मनेपद – परस्मैपद.

So far as the सन्धि in the word अवेहि is concerned, there is difference of opinion between मल्लिनाथ on one side and the rest on the other. While others hold that it is अव आ इहि मल्लिनाथ argues that इण्धातु with अव becomes ज्ञानार्थक and by adding आङ् it cannot express the sense of ज्ञान. The latter thinks that simply आद्गुणः will do whereas others think that पररूपं by ओमाङोश्च is justifiable.

श्रीहर्ष, in order to exhibit his mastery over व्याकरण, offers a different analysis for the समास – अधरबिम्बम्. It is an उपमितसमास following the विग्रह – अधरं बिम्बमिव. Rather श्रीहर्ष takes a different meaning for the word अधर and resorts to बहुव्रीहि in the sense – बिम्बम् अधरं निकृष्टं यस्मात् तत्. He also defends that the अन्वय will be pretty nice in this way.

The परिभाष of पाणिनि, at the beginning of second अध्याय i.e. समर्थः पदविधिः is heavily loaded and the same would explain the समर्थ of different शब्दs

involved in the पदविधिs – समास, कृत्, तद्धित and सनाद्यन्तधातु. The profound analysis carried out taking some limited number of verses from नैषध of श्रीहर्ष vouches to the fact that नैषधं is really विद्वदौषधम्.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amarasiṃha – Amarakōśa, Asiatic Society, New Delhi, 1998.

Bhartṛhari – Vākyapadīyam, Poona, Bhandarkar, 1978.

– Vākyapadīyam, Telugu Translation,Telugu academi, Hyderabad, 2006.

Bhaṭṭōjidīkṣita – Prōḍhamanōramā, Chowkamba, Varanasi, 1980.

– Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī , Mylapore, Madras, Balamanorama press, 1929.

– Śabdakaustubha, Varanasi, Chokhamba, 1929.

Haradattamiśrā – Pādamañjarī, Sanskrit Academy, O.U, Hydrabad, 1989.

Jitēndrabuddhiḥ – Nyāsa, Sanskrit Academy, O.U, Hyderabad, 1989.

Kaiyaṭa – Mahābhāṣyapradīpa, Varansi, Chowkhamba, 1986.

Kālidāsa – Raghuvaṃśaṃ, Varanasi, Chowkamba, 1996.

Kātyāyana – Vārtikās, Mahābhāṣyam, Varanasi, Chowkhamba, 1981.

Nāgēśabhaṭṭa – Bṛhacchabdēnduśēkhara, Sampoornaananda University, Varanasi, 1996.

– Laghumañjūṣā, Varanasi, Chowkhamba, 1926.

– Laghuśabdēnduśēkhara, Varanasi, Chowkhamba, 1926.

– Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghumañjūṣā, Varanasi, Chowkhamba, 1973.

Pāṇini – Aṣṭādhyāyī, Satyanandavedavageesha Publications, New Delhi, 2006.

– Aṣṭādhyāyī, Gagana bharati publications, Delhi, 2009.

Patañjali – Mahābhāṣyam, Varanasi, Chowkhamba, 1986.

Śābarasvāmi – Śābarabhāṣyam, Poona, Anandasram, 1930.

Śrīharṣa – Naiṣadhīyacarita, Vavilla Ramaswamy & sons, Chennapuri, 1932

– Naiṣadhīyacarita, Maharchand, Laxmandas publications, New Delhi, 1986.

VāmanaJayaditya – Kāśikā, Sanskrit Academy, O.U., Hyderabad, 2008.

Yāska – Nirukta, Maheschandra lakshmandas, Varanasi, 2006.