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I Sanskrit, Pāli and Prakrit-s are not three separate tongues but exhibit आत्मगत-मेद-स. i.e. internal differences

This book deals mainly with a) The Sanskrit Language, and b) its grammar(s). About the Sanskrit speech I state on one hand that according to me Sanskrit, Pāli and Prakrit(s) are not basically three different tongues but only different pronunciations of one and the same uniform, single larger language and paradoxical as it may appear-on the other hand I myself maintain that Sanskrit itself is not a unitery, uniform speech but exhibits diverse forms of speech. Vedic (Chandas) is different from classical Sanskrit or Bhāṣā. Bardic Sanskrit of the Mahābhārata is distinct from the classical, regular form of Sanskrit. Inscriptional Sanskrit is a variety by itself. The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit has its own characteristics much alike the Jain-cūrṇī Sanskrit variety. The spoken form of Sanskrit used by the family priests and preserved in the traditional pothī-s written for household worship and its related ritual is still another.

II संस्कृतम् and प्राकृतम् will only do

I insist that those who want to refer to the historical Sanskrit language have always to use strictly the form Sanskritam, a nominal singular of the neuter gender. संस्कृतावाक्, गैर्भाणी, सुभाषति, अमरभाषति and देववाणी are mere vague descriptions; not pointing out the Sanskrit language proper. Shakespear's Elezabethen English being a 'refined' or 'polished speech' can be fittingly referred to as संस्कृतावाक्. The same is the case with the Prakrit language, where too only the Nom. sing. neut. form प्राकृतम् is the only legitimate term. प्राकृतवच: or प्राकृतगी: would mean 'language of people' or 'popular tongue' and not the Prakrit language proper.
III Vākyapadiya a Brahmo-Buddhist Karmadhāraya Compound

I also endeavour to establish that the title of the treatise by our grammarian Bhartṛhari does not give us an ṭvaṃraṇa compound but a कर्मघाय compound. Not unlike the Gitāite ब्रह्मनिवर्ण (V.24.a & V.26.c) it is a Brāhma-Buddhist compound. vāky and pada being synonyms used in Brahmanical and Buddhist literary traditions, respectively. (धर्मवद means not ‘Dharma-word’, a धर्मवचन) but a धर्मवाक्य or “Religious Saying”. I justify this theory on the basis of the Vaibhāsika theory of meaning of one of the four main schools of Buddhist thought. wherein pada also means a vāky.

IV क्षेरेणोक्ता चतुष्टयी

As for the contribution of the Kashmirian writers on Sanskrit Grammar, the much known Kṣirasvāmin according to me is the only writer on grammar who has written on all the four categories of words in Skt. viz. Nāma (noun) ākhyāta (verb), upa-sarga (prefix) and Nīpāta (particle), mentioned first by Yāska in his Nirukta and subsequently by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya.

V The Principle of Lāghava:

I wish to present before the scholars my critique of the much esteemed word-economy-ideal of Pāṇinian school, the Lāghava or verbal-parsimony. I have grave doubts about the co-existence of the characteristics अल्पाक्षर (brevity of letters) and असंविद्ध (being free from doubts). Had Pāṇini’s aphorisms been really beyond doubtful interpretation why a person should boast that the meaning of the aphorism जेलणी (...I.3.67) is known only to Pāṇini, himself, the Bhāṣyakāra but can not be said whether
Vṛttikāra definitely knew it. This is the case with many other ideal aphorisms of Pāṇini also, who and his schoolmen would be overjoyous if they could save even half a mātra, for which act they would celebrate almost as they would do the birth of a newly born son. Had Pāṇini used a few more words to make his implication clear perhaps the vast literature consisting of Vṛtti, Cūrṇī, Bhāṣya, Vārttika-s (prose and versified), the Mahābhāṣya, its commentaries प्रदीप of कैयट and दीपिका of भतुहरि, the प्रकरणग्रन्थs like सिद्धान्तकोमुद्दी of भट्टोजी दीक्षित and its ज्ञान्यास बालमनोरम, प्रीतमनोरम, तत्त्वबोधिनी, the प्रक्रियाग्रन्थ-s such as रामचन्द्र’s प्रक्रियाकोमुद्दी, the further प्रक्रियासर्वस्व and short notes of the type of फकिका would not have been required. This would have saved so many Mātrā-s, letter-s, words, sentences and grantha-s. This would have really proved a great, grand, Lāghava. With all due deference to Bhagavān Pāṇini, I sincerely think that those indulging in such verbal parsimony perhaps belong to the category of those who are commonly known as ‘penny-wise and pound-fools’. Be wise do not save a मात्रा, a वर्ण, an अक्षर, a शब्द or even a वाक्य. Save in a whole-sale manner, manuals, compendiums, books and libraries. I pray the sympathetic readers not to advance the argument that the लघ्वक्षरसूत्रs were formed with a view to aiding the memory at a time when there were no printing presses. Our wonderful ancestors, could learn by heart the multitudinous Vedic literature, the extensive Prose Brāhmaṇa-s such as Śatapatha, Aitareya and Taittirīya, the epics, the Smṛti-s, the Purāṇa-s and it is quite plain that a few more words in the sūtra-s of Pāṇini would not have certainly proved to be beyond their mnemonic capacity. I highly admire the recent researches of Dr. Madhusudan Mishra who finds in the traditional Śivasūtra-s more meaning than merely serving as pratyāhāra-s for the sūtra-s of Pāṇini or their being mystical sounds as demonstrated by Nandikesvara in his kāśikā. I can point
out how a peculiar juxtaposition of the pratyāhāra-s Ak and haṭ becomes useful in clearing up the issue as to how two ha-kāra-s are mentioned in the Māheśvara-sūtra-s. One in hayavarat is a silent, unvoiced and, therefore, almost akin to de-aspirated a. The English parallels in honour > onour and humble > umble can be cited. Madhusudan Mishra, however, applies the Ur-Maheśvara-sūtra-s in deciphering the Indus-script. I highly appreciate his findings especially the divergence in Pāṇinian Māheśvarasūtra-s and the earlier Indus-Māheśvarasūtra-s. R and L were included in Pāṇinian sūtra-s while e and o were eliminated in their short values. Read in this context a very illuminating article by my revered teacher the late Dr. A.M. Ghatage.

VI Does व्याकरण mean exactly a Grammar?

I have also discussed as to what is the word for ‘grammar’ in Sanskrit and in its derived Indian languages. The word usually used is vyākaraṇa which according to Goldstücker means ‘un-doing’ i.e. ‘linguistic analysis’. The Buddhist tradition strangely uses the word to mean ‘foretelling of the future Buddha’. Since the word tetra-grammatic means ‘a word of four letters’ (tetra-four and gram-letter). The word for grammar, therefore, should be. वर्णसमाम्नाय or अ-क्षरसमाम्नाय or वर्णशाख (विज्ञान) or अक्षरशाख (विज्ञान.). Pāṇinian grammar begins with the माहेश्वरसूत्राणि, which introduce the Sanskrit alphabet. Any grammar usually begins with the introduction and discussion of alphabets, their classification into vowels and consonants and further phonetic and phonemic analytical sub-divisions. I also want to suggest that since व्याकरण originally means ‘un-doing’ or ‘analysis’ the word itself could be taken as a sure sign of believing in the early theory of अखण्डवाक्यस्फोट where the vākya is only for a theoretical and technical purpose subdivided by following the apoddhāra method.
blazed by भूवहरि in his वाक्यपदीय into पद, वर्ण and वर्णव्यवस.

I firmly assert that I have due deference towards Pāṇini, the world’s great grammarian, who is compared quite justifiably with Euclid in the point of perfection. I also believe in that Pāṇini is rightly raised to the position of Bhagavān. I admit that Pāṇini has shown superb subtlety (mahatī sūkṣmeṣaṭkā vidyate sūtrakārasy) in his aphorism Udak ca vipāṣaḥ (Pāṇ. VI.1.74). I admit that though Pāṇini’s field of linguistic survey was more limited than that of Grierson’s much later Linguistic Survey of India, Pāṇini has maintained exactitude, subtlety, dexterity, impecability and an over-all meticulousness on par with Grierson. But this acceptance should not make us ignore when Pāṇini too like Homer is seen nodding. He uses the term samarththa in a far more technical sense in his samarthāḥ padavidhiḥ II.1.1. which means that a grammatical operation (vidhi) on pada-s becomes effective (only) when they are semantically and syntactically connected. This is a paribhāṣā or a meta-rule. Samarththa in this sūtra means ‘semantical and syntactical connection’ but in II.3.57 Vyvahrpanoḥ samarthayoh in which sūtra the same word samarthha means ‘words having identical meaning’, in other words ‘synonyms’.

VII Cāndra and Jainendra-supplying Pāṇini:

In matibuddhi-pūjārthebhyaś ca (III.2.188) Pāṇini has provided for the synonymous words by saying not only pūjā but pūjārtha. But he fails to do it in his sūtra hastājātāu (V.2.133) which prescribes the possessive āt to hasta (and not hastārtha) when denoting a class of animals (i.e. elephants.). We can, therefore, have only hastāḥ asyāṣṭiḥi hasti but then what about danta (meaning a tooth)? Cāndra had to do the duty of a vārttika which supplies anukta and says हस्तद्वाताताती. But then what about kara the third synonym? And the Jainendra had to rush to supply the
deficiency by adding हस्ततन्त्रकराजाति. Now for a non-grammariam like me the singular in both हस्ततन्त्र and हस्ततन्त्रकराद proves intriguing. Normality speaking a dual number in the first amendment is necessary and plural in the case of the second one. Well, let us suppose that the numbers are implied in the compound construction. The fact that emerges from the discussion is that a most common sort of observation namely that the Great Bhagavān Pāṇini who had compassionately given us such a vast knowledge of भाषाव्याकरण was after all a human-being who can hardly be expected as immaculately perfect or infallible like a Vedavacana.

VIII How much Sanskrit can be learnt from Pāṇini?

I have also discussed the point that a lot of Sanskrit grammar is not covered by Pāṇini. Pāṇini positively described the Sanskrit; he did not prescribe it; his grammar is thus only descriptive, not normative and yet the post-Pāṇinian-s have followed Pāṇini as an exemplary grammarian and took his description as an ideal example to be followed.

IX शास्त्रू रूढिवर्तीयसि:

But I am happy also to note that people do not give up their linguistic habits Taddhītesvacāmādeḥ (VII.2.117) is o.k. but Kālidāsa’s Duḥṣanta kept on saying to his royal Purohita भवत्समेवाय गृहताचव पृच्छामि, गृहताचव having been a common established usage which for grammar’s sake he was not ready to rectify the form by गृहताचव. Let Pāṇini observe anything, people are not ready to give up the usages of their favourite poets and, therefore, it is said; “घुरतिभूत्यात्यादिन्त्रांद्रश्लेषणांकराति कः?” How much Sanskrit is reflected in Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī? A sober critic said as much “as the water contained in the cow’s foot-print” पाणिनिगोप्यदे. A more severe and bitter critic did dare to say that the grammar of
Mahesvara was like the sea and Panini gave us the infinitesimal particle of water as would exist on the top of the kuśa blade.

I also want to point out that *gacchati* can not be justified as being a form of present tense third person singular of the root *gam*, though Panini prescribes the ādea ṛ to the roots ṛṣ, ṛṣ, and ṛṣ in his īṣaṅgamāḥ. VII.3.77. (The substitute phoneme cha replaces the anīga (VI.4.1. final I.1.52 phoneme of the verbal stems īṣ ‘to desire’, *gam*, ‘to go’ and *yam* ‘to restrain’). I always feel that Paninian grammar goes far away from the historical linguistics of the Sanskrit language. According to me it is highly essential to understand that the original *gacchati* was not the present activity of ‘going’ but the ‘desire for going’ and that *gacchati* historically marked a desiderative form. To-day we read a root भक्त्र in the धातुपाठ as belonging to the sixth conjugation but basically it too is a desiderative form of भक्त्र ‘to share’ or ‘to divide’.

Tamaso mā jyotirgamaya is indeed a lofty thought and the present Sanskrit has accepted the vocable ज्योतिस्व and declines it in a paradigm as ज्योतिः, ज्योतिषी, ज्योतिषिः, but we should not forget the historical fact that ज्योतिस्व is a Prakritization of the Sanskrit ज्योतिस्व, ध in प्राकृत assumes the form ज्य / ज्य e.g. अज < अज, सत्य < सत्य, मद्य < मद्य.

X गीर्वण a German? Not quite Sure:

In a short note I have tried to show that गीर्वण or गीर्वणी far from meaning the Sanskrit language originally must have meant the German language. The Germans were supposed to be ‘talkative’ and ‘garrulous’ which latter word is connected with Skt. गी: or गी, the possessive suffix व्यौ when added to it the form will be गीर्वत्तृ. Now decline “गीर्वण,गीर्वणी,गीर्वणः”. To try to connect German with शर्मनू and to call Max Müller a शार्मण्यपाणित taking शर्मनू to
mean 'a bowman' and to interprete *śarman* as to mean one who shoots arrows from his bow is wrong.

**XI The stylistic and Peculiar Usages of the Skt. Prefixes:**

I have also critically reviewed the promiscuous usages of Sanskrit verbal prefixes (उपसर्गतः) and have demonstrated that there is no strict uniformity in their application. प्रस्मरति was once used 'normally' in the sense विस्मरति and only *exceptionally* in the sense of प्रकृतं स्मरति.

**XII अम्बुदय and लोकसंग्रह:**

I also want to show how प्रत्ययम् and अम्बुदय stand oppositionally. The case I have made for लोकसंग्रह being used in the sense of लोकानुग्रह on the background of its Pali usage in the form of जनसंग्रह used in महावास and Kālidāsa's attested लोकानुग्रह एवेको हेतुस्ते जनमकर्षणि. In the same way I want to point out specifically how अस्सास (आश्वास) and पस्सास (प्रश्वास) are interpreted exactly oppositely in two (Pali) Buddhist traditions.

To note that प्रपूर्वति should mean 'emptying' rather than 'filling to a brimming level' is also essential to understand.

**XIII Cāndra and Jainendra as special Compliments:**

I also want to show that the work of supplying deficiency is done not only by the Vārttikakāra(s?) through the अनुकूल variety but even by चान्द्र and जैनेन्द्र schools of Sanskrit grammar, which though not belong to the Pāñinian tradition are yet not against it and not averse to that tradition.
Chapter - First

The form *Gacchati* (Pān. VII.3.7) : Pandita-s and Professors.

Tha Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan (RSS) generously granted a sum of Rs Five Lakhs to Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (BORI) for organising a *śāstrārtha-saṁsad* in the pious memory of the late Prof. Dr. R.N. Dandekar (RND), who served BORI as its Hon. Secretary for a period of more-than half a century. To this date the Institute has existed gloriously for ninety-two years. A single person heading it for more than fifty years has naturally left his impression on the Institute which though was founded with a view to commemorating the work of the late Sir R.G. Bhandarkar (RGB) and, therefore, named Bhandarkar Inst. can equally be called a Dandekar Inst. I still remember the day on which the great Simhalese Buddhist scholar, G.P. Malalasekere paid visit to BORI along with his spouse. When he was taken towards the bust of RGB he was a bit confused and RND had to explain to him that he(RND) was *R.N. Dandekar* while the bust was that of *Bhandarkar*. I, therefore, in my humble namanaśloka purposely made a small but not insignificant pun on *tataḥ param*, which would mean not only sequentially or after him but also ‘more than him’ for the Bhandarkar Institute to-day exists almost as a Dandekar Institute. My namanaśloka reads

रामकृष्ण नमस्कृत्य, रामचन्द्रः ततः परम्।
वन्दित्वा भवत: सर्वनामेभः चतुर्मण्ड मम।।

With the amount received from RSS, I, M.G. Dhadphale held a session of a *śāstrārtha-saṁsad* while my successor Hon. Secy. Prof. Mrs. Saroja Bhate using the balance amount left over held the second session under the title *Vākyārtha-pariṣad* on Dec. 11 & 12, 2008. The main difference between these two organ-
ised sessions was that I had invited both Professors and traditional Pandita-s of Sanskrit-lore while Mrs. Bhat strictly restricted the second session to traditional Pandita-s alone. I was even criticised for having invited non-traditional Sanskrit Pandita-s especially by one who can be aptly referred to as both a scholar and a professor. I mean Prof. Dr. S.D. Joshi alias Shivarama-shastri, known also as Panditaji (SDJ).

It was he who criticised me for having invited lecturers and western-oriented scholars for the pandita-samstād. I could understand his criticism for he was for many years the general secretary of the All India Oriental Conference, which has a feature, Paṇḍita-sabhā which is formulated exclusively by and for traditional Paṇḍita-s.

The constitution of BORI is far different. In the application for the grant it was verbally quoted fully by the Hon. Secretary BORI, and as a response to which RSS granted the sum. The column of the BORI Rules and Regulations (Constitution Rule. 2 (c) is “To place the indigenous learning of the Shastri-s on a broader and sounder basis by making all the necessary and suitable arrangements for their guidance and training”. (Italics mine) Whatever may be the personal view of a scholar of the rank of SDJ, the aim and objective of the Institute is to supplement the traditional learning of the indigenous Pandita-s by training them further in modern critical ways of learning (It be remembered that on the day I first became the Hon. Secretary, the old constitution was modified and the General Body decided to drop the word Western retaining only the word ‘scientific’.). Thus it is clear that the aim and objective of the BORI right from its inception was to train a Paṇḍita in the manner of a Professor. Only a decade ago the subject ‘Paṇḍita-s and Professors’ was vigourously debated in
the West, more specifically in USA. Both types have their distinctive plus-points and I believe a profitable ‘blend’ will perhaps prove an ideal case.

In the second-session paṇḍita-s discussed in the traditional manner mostly Nyāya, Vyākaraṇa and Mīmāṃsā (Pūrva and Uttara) and may be due to time-limit could not cover Vaiśeṣika, Sāṁkhya and Yoga. The khaṇḍana (refutation or disapproval) of the six prominent heretical systems of Indian philosophy also was not done.

It was a pleasure to listen to the frank and fair observations made by Prof. SDJ who with his mature judgement could see and point out that many a paṇḍita-sabhā held so far has failed to reach, teach and benefit the scholars who were not present for those particular sessions. As an humble supplement to what SDJ rightly pointed out, I propose to do the following: To point out the writings of western scholars of the rank of the late Prof. Matilal (on the six meanings of Avacchedaka), Prof. George Cardona’s article on the Concept of Time (Vyākaraṇa), Stall’s mathematical representation of Nyāya, SDJ and Kiparsky’s “Pāṇini as a variationist” M.M. Deshpande’s writings on Taparakāṇa and Sāvarṇya (Vyākaraṇa), etc. All these writings are fully untraditional, rich and useful.

I shall also like to record my impression (a frank and sincere one for which I should not be misunderstood as having no regard for the indegenious traditional Sanskrit Paṇḍita-s.) but I am not quite satisfied myself with the way our learned Paṇḍita-s debated. I had for example specifically requested them to discuss certain subjects as for example प्रायेशेव हि मीमांसा लोके लोकायतीकृता (मीमांसा), वेदान्ता यदि शास्त्राणि बीथें (बौद्ध and Vedānta) मुखे व्याकरण स्मृते तत्त्र प्रमुखमिति परमाभुतमिति (Grammar), किं कर्म
The _Pāṇḍita-s_ talked profusely and profoundly on each and every topic they wanted to speak on, conveniently setting aside the prescribed topics. This appears to be the first and prominently glaring draw-back of these traditionalists. In comparison the followers of the modern-western orientology (these include Indians and other Esterners too) define the scope of their topic and try to confine to it as fairly as possible. The second session in the BORI was markedly regulated by the association of the renowned Naiyāyika of Pune Śrīmān Paṇḍitavareṇya Devadatta-śāstrī Patil. As a result in the presence of Prof. Dr. SDJ, the _Vyākaraṇa_-topics were also discussed and debated in the Nyāya-terminology of _avacchedaka-avacchinna_ and _anuyogi-pratiyogi_ dichotomy and their special term _atyantābhāva_. This terminology was not used by the traditional grammarians and even rhetoricians except a few persons like the late Jagannātha Paṇḍita (vide his Rasagaṅgādhara.). _Karma_ was not discussed according to its Pāṇiniyan definition i.e. _कर्म_ but from the Nyāya-point of view and _pada_ was also not taken as _घूमस्त्र_ but as _शक्त_ _घूमस्त्र_ in a Naiyāyika fassion To me it appeared almost as outrageous. I personally requested them to explain to me my question about the normally valid _व्यासित_ namely _यत्र यत्र_ _घूमस्त्र_ _वत्र_ वद्ध: I further explained that I know that in Sanskrit language a fire is called a _घूमकेतन_ or ‘one whose sign is smoke’. I added that in actuality smoke arises only in the absnce of the process of incessant, pure burring of the blue flame and cited the quotation from Kālidāsa _घूमपश्च_ _यज्ञ_ _घूमकेतन_: where when the great poet used the word _घूमकेतन_ for अधि, he used it as a normally established term or _रूढ_ _शब्द_ while his use of _घूमपश्च_ reveals
his keen and correct scientific observation. "I wanted these scholars not to respond to my query extemporally but to take their own time and answer. Not a single Pandita could answer my request. They are obviously not ready to think about old things afresh (in a new light). I, however, had a private talk with Pandita Devadattaśāstrī Patil who told me that there are more than mere six meanings of the term avacchedaka and even the anuyogi-pratiyogi pair is not used absolutely consistently in all the treatises on Nyāyasamaya but two/three different meanings are ascribed to the self-same pair. This probably is the case in all ancient traditions. In the Pali-Buddhist tradition in the case of ānāpāna-sati (āna and apāna smṛti) in certain traditions āna is equated with assā (Skt. āśvāsa or ‘inbreathing’ and apāna with passāsa (praśvāsa or uchvāsa, out-breathing) and our Buddhaghosa, the celebrated Pali commentator does record that in Suttanta commentaries (as opposed to Abhidhamma commentaries) the explanation is given exactly in reverse order or contrariwise where assāsa means out-breathing and passāsa, inbreathing (uppaṭipāṭiyā > ut-pratipāṭyā). A few things at least need more probing analysis as for example tarka being considered as an a-yathārtha anubhava or invalid experience and is defined as व्याप्तार्थ्यानुभवः (तर्कसंग्रह), the illustration being यदि बहि�र्न्यातात्त्विकं धूमोपपित्य न स्यात् “if there be no fire, there will be no smoke”. Nothing is, logically; invalid in this. What is said is that there is smoke on the mountain and, therefore, there is fire on the mountain. The opponent says “let there be smoke, why should we conclude that, therefore, there should be fire?”. ‘धूमोपपित्य, बहिः धूमोपपित्य’। To this stubborn opponent, not ready to accept the अन्तर्यावप्‍यासि namely यत्र यत्र धूमस्तत्र तत्र बहिर्न्यातात्त्विक, the नैपायिक wants to bring conviction by stating the नैपायिक्यावप्‍यासि namely यदि बहिर्न्यातात्त्विकं धूमोपपित्य न स्यात्. This reasoning is given the technical name तर्क, the अ-यथार्थ्यित्व or
of being an invalid experience. The so-called invalidity consists perhaps in the fact that the smoke actually exists which is a valid objective fact and, therefore, यथार्थ but which for the sake of तर्क reasoning alone is required to be denied. This imposition of what is not a fact on what actually is a fact makes तर्क an invalid experience or अ-यथार्थ-अनुभव. This assumption philosophically goes a long way to tell us to what degree of realism the sister-systems (समानतन्त्रे) न्यायवैशेषिकी have reached. They are not at all ready to call a ‘fact’ a ‘non-fact’ even for a moment.

I admire the way our Vaiśeṣika-s have stuck to their concept of realism. While giving instance of absolute negation or अत्यंतभाव leaving aside all the more convincing usual instances such as vandhyā-putra, śaśāśṛtga and khapuspa they have preferred to give a rather unconvincing-tame illustration in the form इह भूतले घटो नास्ति. Please understand that we are not expected to disprove the validity of the उदाहरण by arranging to put a pot on the spot about which they predicate “here on this surface of ground there is no earthen pot”. One has to be convinced that neither in the past there was any, nor in the present there is any and that never in future there will be any presence of a ghaṭa on a certain spot of the land. The illustrative sentence can be condensed to a single compound-expression अघटवद्वूतवलम्. In the same way the more widely popular illustrations of the अत्यन्ताभाव are really speaking to be put in a full-fledged vakya or propositional form and we have to rewrite वन्ध्यापुत्र and खुपुष्प in the subject-predicate logical propositional froms i.e. इह वन्ध्याया: पुत्रो नास्ति and इह खे पुष्पं नास्ति. Take the humorous Marathi story as an example. A certain girl called Thakī left her home in anger. Her maternal uncle went out to serch for her. She was found. He sent a tel-
egram to the family to console them with the happy news. Word-economy is as much a practical gain in telegraphing as in the lāghava ideal of Pāṇiniyan-s. So he put it in the shortest two-worded sentence propositional formula “thakī is” as this has to be expanded in a logical proposition such as “Thakī is one, who exists”. This in the case of खुप्प, शारशुष्क and मन्द्यापुत्र will give us another philosophical (psychological say) message that there can not be an absolute negation imaginable and what we call as अत्यन्ताभाव is a non-relation of two existing things. ख is there; पुष्प is there but not a खुप्प अधिकरण-आधेय-सम्बन्ध. The same is true with स्वारमेरु as gold is real; mountain is real but the existence of golden meru-mountain is unreal. One cannot in this world imagine anything that has no existence absolutely and imagination, therefore, is only constructive and not creative. Pandita-s can hardly reach this hight of analysis. Moreover unlike Aristotalian logic our Nyāyaśāstra has failed to distinguish between truth and validity, for to us whatever is valid must at the same time be true. In Aristotle’s Barbara reasoning a) “All men are immortals b) Socrates is a man and, therefore, c) Socrates is immortal. This is valid but not true. It is, therefore, that our logic can point out a material fallacy hetvābhāsa like viruddha for the sādhyavākya itself gets annulled by direct perception as is said.

The tactual perception gives a direct lie to the proposition of fire being cool. What I admire in the Nyāya-syatem is the superb concept of sat-pratipakṣa or their being an equal counter argument. Certain complicated issues, it seems, can not be finally decided in absence of any decisive proof or to put into the traditional jargon विनिगमनाविरहात्. (Note it is not विनिगमन + अ-विरहात् but विनिगमन-विरहात्.)

I sincerely think that it is high time now to decomplicate not the Nyāya-terminology but the Nyāya-phrasiology.
Long back in the year, 1930, the late professors A.B. Gajendragadkar and R.D. Karmarkar in their excellent edition of Tarkasamgraha presented certain scintillating critical comments on the unnecessarily odd, clumsy and intriguing Nyāya presentation. (Tarkasamgraha ed. 1930 pp. 78-79). Thus आद्द्वनसंयोग (contact with wet fuel) is an upādhi attached to the sādhanā, vahini (fire) in proving its invariable association with the sādhy, dhūma (smoke). An upādhi is defined as ‘साध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापकः’ ‘that which is co-extensive with साध्य but not with साधन’.

How Annambhatta explains clumsily in a typical Nyāya-jargan the definition of upādhi is humorously demonstrated by the joint authors. A. B. Gajendregadkar and R.D.Karmarkar. They say: (Tarkasamgraha ed. 1930 p. 79.) “Annambhāṭṭa defines साध्यव्यापकत्व as साध्यसमानाधिकरणयात्यत्तात्त्वाभावप्रतियोगित्वम्. This will give the student just a taste of how Indian logicians in their penchant to secure almost mathematical precision for their expressions make easy things difficult by weaving around them cob-webs of technical terms. साध्य…..प्रतियोगित्वात् means ‘nothing but the counter entity of absolute negation co-existing with the thing to be established’. अत्यन्तत्त्वाभावप्रतियोगित्वम् (not being the counter entity of absolute negation means nevar being absent or being always present and साध्यसमानाधिकरण means the same place as that of साध्य. So the entire bombastic expression signifies nothing more than the property of being co-extensive with the साध्य.- similarly साधनसमानाधिकरण is defined as ‘साधनव्यापकत्वात्यत्तात्त्वाभावप्रतियोगित्वम्’. This is equally pedantic and has the additional charm of clumsiness! Why Annambhaṭṭa should use the awkward expression साधन-बनिष्ठ instead of the simple साधनसमानाधिकरण is beyond our comprehension. If he wanted to avoid the same expression समानाधिकरण twice, as per Vāmana’s dictum नैंकं पदं द्वि: प्रयोजयं प्रायों थे
should have at least said साधननिभ्न. As it is, the expression should thus be explained; साधनवती (possessed of साधन i.e. accompanying साधन or residing in साधन) निभ्न यस्य, ईंदुश: य; अत्यन्ताभाव; तस्य प्रतियोगित्वम्, साधनवती निभ्न (presence) यस्य is practically for साधने निभ्न यस्य. The whole expression ultimately means the property of being absent from places where साधन is present i.e. being of less extent than the साधन.

The renowned professor-editors were certainly not disrespectful or uncharitable to the traditional Paṇḍita-s. Even though I shall not rush to suggest any phonetic affinity between Paṇḍita and Pedant, the fact remains that the word pedant means “one who makes a display of his knowledge”. I value the signification of the original Sanskrit word प्रज्ञा which by a process of Prakritization turned into प्रण्ड and as per तारकादिप्य इत्यच् we dissolve प्रण्डस्यस्यस्तीति पण्डित:-, the Prakritization itself suggests a de-gradation of original प्रज्ञा. I am sure with the additional training in scientific orientology our traditional Paṇḍita-s will soon become प्रज्ञावत्: प्राघ्यापकः: (Intelligent Professors), instead of remaining for centuries together पाल्परिष्कः पण्डित:-।

Now coming to my subject proper. I shall like to pose a simple question of Vyākaraṇa. The question is deceptively simple. What form is gacchati? We all know that it is the third-person singular of the present tense of the root gam meaning ‘to go’; it can equally be the locative singular of the present participle masculine of the same root. For the Paṇḍita-s it is easy to quote Pāṇ. īṣu-gami-yamāṁ chaḥ, thereby, indicating the ādeśa cha for the root, so that instead of gamati we get gacchati. The complecancy of the Paṇḍita-s will definitely make them happy. A professor like the present writer will hardly be satisfied with this. For him it is highly essential to go into Indo-European historical linguistics and point out the surmised
root *guem* (Greek) ‘I intend to go’ i.e. ‘I go’ with the following bases i) Future-present of the I.E. root *guemsketi* *gaścati* which in Sanskrit develops as gacchati and can be compared with its cognate.

The same is the case with *prs* > *prcchati* which really means not so much as *asks* but ‘wants to know’ (desiderative.); Latin *porsco*. The third instance is *iṣ* > *icchati* from a similar desiderative; *gacchati* thus originally does not mean He / she / it goes but “wishes to go”.

I do admit that traditional *Vyākaraṇa-pañṭa*-s can well explain the *prakriyā* in Sanskrit grammar but to go beyond grammar and reach the Indo-European prior stage is possible only in the case of a learned professor who has studied besides *vyākaraṇa*, a historical linguistics too in a scientific method. It is they who can tell us that the vowel-endings frequently met in Sanskrit (classical and Vedic) were represented in the proto-state with semi-vowels and not vowels, the words were *devah* or *devas* rather than *deva*, *mālā* rather than *mālā*, *pitar* rather than *pitr*, *agnay* rather then *agni* and *pāśav* rather than *pāśu*. Amidst the vowels, short, long and diphthongal on the one hand and the semi-vowels on the other, the last named were most probably the *ur*-forms. This is borne out by the *pratyāhāra*-s *hayavaraṭ* and the *sūtra, acca gheh* (VII.3.119). *h* developed into *a*, *y* into *i*, *v* into *u*, *r* into *ṛ* and *l* into *l̄*. The *haṭ* and *ak* have thus *a* one to one relation.

For the sake of the traditionalists let me conclude this first artical by derving the form *gacchati* (third person singular of the present tense of this root *gam* by following the *prakriyā*- involved.

Gam becomes first of all a root by the aphorism Bhuvādayo dhātavaḥ (Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini = AP) AP. I.3.1. Then by Dhātoḥ
(AP. III. 1.93) it becomes a root noun. Then by Krdatin (AP. III. 1.93) it becomes Krtsamjñaka. In present tense it becomes Gam+laṭ by Vartamāne laṭ (AP. III. 2.123). Then by Iṣugamiyamām chaḥ ((AP VII. 3.77) the last syllable m of Gam is changed into Cha it becomes Gaccha+laṭ. Then by Halantyam (AP. I. 3.3) t of laṭ it becomes itsamjñaka and by Tasya lopaḥ (AP. I. 3.9) it becomes lopa (Zero). Then the form remains Gaccha+la by Lasya (AP. III. 4.77) and by Tiptasjhi.......... (AP. III. 4.78) ta is replaced by tip and it becomes Gaccha+tip, by Laḥ Parasmaipadam (AP. I. 4.98) it becomes Parasmaipadsamjñaka and by (AP. I. 4.100) it becomes a third person and by (AP. I. 4.101) it becomes singular. After that (AP. III. 4.113) it becomes Sārvadhātukasamjñaka, and by (AP. III. 1.98) sap it interposes and becomes Gaccha+sap+tip. In this way both Ps are dropped by (AP. I. 3.3; I. 3.9) and becomes Gacch-Sa+ti, by (AP. I. 3.8) it (goes). It is thus a basic branch of linguistic science.

See in this context the summary of the paper ‘Linguistic explanation of Sanskrit verb Gacchati’ written by Pawankumar Hooda for the XIlth World Sankrit Conference held at Turin Italy in the year 2000. (Proceedings. p. 65)

There are certain extremely amazing things to be noted. For example the first grammar of Sanskrit was prepared in Latin (Italy) and published in Paris (France) and the book on Malyalam grammar was published first in Rome (Italy) and nowhere in South India. Is this not amazing?
A Squarely Treatment:

I INTENTIONALLY chose a Sanskrit title for this paper. The ‘octogrammatic’ title, according to me, sums up the main contribution of Kṣīrśvāmin (henceforth Kṣ). Amongst the later Sanskrit grammarians (in the sense of analysts of language-forms, not necessarily as authors of independent grammars), our author alone seems to be an exceptional grammarian (vaiyakarana), dealing with (all) the four grammatical categories namely nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga and nipāta.

The above fourfold division is recognized right from the time of Yāska. It is based on the kind of senses words convey.¹ Nouns convey the sense of substance (sattva, accomplished existence), and verbs (ākhyāta) denote bhāva (the process of being). The third group of words is that which conveys neither bhāva nor sattva but becomes meaningful only when associated with verbal activities. The group is known by the term upasarga (preposition).² The fourth group, called Niṣpata, defies any exact or single definition, because its constituents express 'high and low' (uccāvaca) that is, identifiable and not-so-identifiable or promiscuous and non-promiscuous senses. The group is divided into three subgroups: (a) upamārthiya, (b) karmopasamgrahārthiya and (c) pāda-purana.³

Kṣ has written about every type in the fourfold classification, based on the criterion of the general meanings of words, described above. In his celebrated commentary on Amara’s lexi-
con, *Amarakośodghātana*. He has marked in detail the grammatical formulations and senses of *nāman*-s (nouns). In his *Vṛtti* entitled *Kśirataraṅgini*, sometimes called *Amṛatataraṅgini*, on Pāṇini’s *Dhātupātha* he minutely notes the many differences in the *Dhātupātha*-text consisting of roots and their meanings and gives us a tool to understand the *ākhyāta*-s. Coming to the remaining two types, naturally containing lesser words than the first two, we should note that ks has written a small tract entitled *Nipātāvyayopasargavr̥tti*. (Manuscript available in BORI, Pune).

Kṣ’s *Nighañtu-vṛtti*, mentioned by Devarāja in his *Nirvacana* gloss on the Nighañtu, a part of Yāśka’s *Nirukta*, may be only another name of Kṣ’s commentary on the *Amarakośa*. Kṣ’s *Gaṇavr̥tti* is mentioned by Vardhamāna in his *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*. In his *Kśirataraṅgini*. Kṣ has dealt with the *gaṇa*-division in the commentaries on the *sūtra*-s of Pāṇini, its usefulness and the *set* and *anit* dichotomy pertaining to certain special usages of the roots. Therefore, the *Gaṇavr̥tti* known to Vardhamāna may not be a separate work.

The late Professor K. V. Abhyankar might have been confused when in his entry (*Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Baroda, 1986) on *Nipātāvyayopasargavr̥tti* he attributed the work to the Kashmirian grammarian Tilaka. Tilaka is not the author of the Vṛtti; he has only written a brief gloss on the Vṛtti. Abhyankar was for a very long time actively associated with the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune. But it seems that he did not refer to the manuscript of this tract in the Institute’s collection that mentions, at the beginning and at the end, that the original work is that of Kṣ and the writer of the gloss is Tilaka.

Besides his books exploring Sanskrit as a language, Kṣ is said to have written a drama named *Abhinavarāghava*. The
Nātyadarpana (Baroda, ed., p. 1550) says yathā kṣīrāsvāmi-viracite Abhinavarāghave sūtradhāraḥ. Another verse of the Nātyadarpana has the wording kṣīrasya nāṭakam ananya-samānasāram.

**Time, Place and Personality**

It has not yet been determined if the Kṣīra mentioned by Kalhana in his Rāja-taraṅgini (4.489) as a śabda-vidyopādhyāya i.e. a ‘teacher of language-science’ of king Jayāpiḍa is the same person as our Kṣ. The areas of their expertise agree. If this is taken as sufficient proof of identity, Kṣ should be placed in the eighth century CE. Most of the scholars who have studied the afore-mentioned works, however, express the view that he belonged to a period CE 115-65. Only K. V. Abhyankar (1961) and K. G. Oak (1913 p. 3), as far as I know, think that he existed in the eighth century CE. That he is quoted by Hemacandra (1089-1172) would speak against CE 115-65 as his period.

Oak (1913 p.3) believes that our author’s name and the title of his work (Kṣītratarāṅgini) suggest a relation to Kṣīreśvara Mahādeva of Kakupada near Kanoj and, therefore, he belonged to the Central India. I am inclined to believe that the reference is to the famous Kṣīrataravara (milky lake) in Kashmir.

Kṣ was a devotee of Śiva as is clear from the introductory verse(s) and other indications in his commentaries.

Kṣ offers a historically valuable testimony regarding the tradition of listing Sanskrit verbal roots. In this testimony we see a combination of confidence and admission of personal limits. On the one hand, he may be understood as suggesting that where his great predecessors like Candra failed to do justice to the Dhātupāṭha, he could do justice to the text. Authorities like Candra have also 'broken down' and 'become confused' (in this task),
says he. On the other hand, he also says, ‘The text of Pāṇini’s Dhatupāṭha, because of its loss of tradition, has confused even great authorities. Under such circumstances we do not know which readings are to be rejected and which are to be retained.’

**Two observations regarding the Amarakośodghāṭana**

In the case of only a few words Kṣ gives desi words for the Sanskrit vocables. Liṅgayya-sūrin, on the other hand, gives many Telugu words while explaining the medicinal plants. For kārpāsa (cotton) he gives pratti, patti, putti (Kannada: hatti). He clearly states *iha vrksalatāuṣadhīnām nāmāni Āndhra-bhāṣayā vakṣyāmah.* (p. 229)

The phenomenon of the blind leading the blind is not uncommon in lexical tradition. Kṣ (Amarakośa, Poona Edition, 1941, p. 104) remarks that Amarasimha was misled by Bhāguri who wrongly identified a class of prickly nightshade (*vidagdhikā*) with the plant *Brhatī,* when actually these two are quite distinct plants (*brhatī tu nidigdhiketi* (v.l. vidigdhiketi) bhāguri-vākyāt granthaḥ bhrāntaḥ). Again in the Vaiśya-varga (ibid. p. 148) he says Mālākāra was led astray by Bhāguri who equated *sara* (dental s) with śara (a palatal one) (*etac ca drapsam śaram*). The implication would be that the 'blind' Mālākāra misled Amara.

**Some observations regarding the Kṣīrataraṅgīṇī:**

Kṣ, at times, refers to a Vṛttikāra. Generally in Pāṇinian tradition the title refers to the Kāśikākāra. But it seems from Kṣ’s references that, at least for some authors in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, the epithet stood for a Dhatuvṛttikāra unknown to us at present. This comes out in the discussion of the root śrath. Kṣ states that the root śrath being *idit* does not admit
a loss of $n$ and, therefore, the Vṛttikāra noting the form śrethe is deluded (iditvād annāsikalopābhāvaḥ śrethe iti tūdāharan vṛttikṛd bhṛāntaḥ (Kṣīrāraṇaṅgīṇī 1.291). Śāyāna / Mādhava quotes Kṣ's view in the following remark: iditvād anunāsikalopābhāvād . . . vṛttikṛd bhṛāntaḥ and further explains that here the Vṛttikṛt is some Dhātuvṛttikṛt (atra vṛttikāro dhātuvṛttikṛd ucyate). See Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, p. 46.

Kṣ is respectfully followed by Hemacandra when the latter in his Dhātupātha (1.897) considers paribhāṣaṇa and yācanā as two meanings of the root reṭṭ. However, in my view, Kṣ has here misled Hemacandra; ca does not attract yācanā from the earlier cate cade ca yācane. In fact, cate cade ca yācane is only Kṣ's reading. Maitreyarakṣita does not mention ca, and Śāyāna / Mādhava does a good job by shifting the position of ca by reading yācane ca. This makes it clear that Śāyāna / Mādhava considers the cakara as being used to attract the meaning paribhāṣaṇa in the earlier Dhātupātha item.

A more glaring mistake of Kṣ may be the following. Under the svādīgāṇa, there are four consecutive entries: 1) śṭigha āskandane, 2) udāttānuddättāt tetau, 3) tika tiga ca, and 4) sadha himsāyām (Kṣīrāraṇaṅgīṇī 5.22-25). Now ca is in the third entry; āskandane occurs in the first entry. In between occurs the second entry, which prevents ca from operating as an ākarṣāka pada 'a word causing anuvṛtti or continuation'. But Kṣ has forcibly attracted āskandana from the first to the third. In this, Maitreyarakṣita has followed him, but Kāśkrtsna, Kātantra, Hemacandra and Sākaṭāyana have not done this mistake.

As a similar case we should note that Kṣ also mentions an attempt of someone who joined the ca in the third entry with the root mentioned in the fourth entry and contributed to Sanskrit a
novel root caṣagh. Kṣ must have noted this with a smile on his face as he writes tika tīga caṣagha, himsāyām ity eke. caṣaghnoti. (Kṣīratarāṅgini 5.25).

Further, it is interesting to note the menng given of the two roots śas and vaś. Patañjali says śasi-vaśi chāndasau (the roots śas and vaś are of Vedic usage). Kaiyata explains that Patañjali is voicing the opinion of those according to whom śas only mens 'to sleep' and vaś only 'to shine'. These scholars do not attach both the meanings to the root śas. Kṣ says śas svapne and vaś kāntau, while Maitreyarakṣita in his Dhātupradipa notes two meanings of śas (śas, sasti svapne).

In statements regarding the formation of nominal derivatives (nouns, adjectives, participles, etc.), the division between kṛdanta and taddhita is well known. But in certain cases of words like homī, vadhya, drādhima and nediṣṭha, the grammarians are not unanimous regarding the group to which these words should belong. According to Yāska, the form homī is a kṛdanta, but the Pāṇinian tradition explains it as homo ‘asyāstīti,’ which contains the possessive suffix in (homa + in), making homī a taddhitānta. Patañjali explain the noun vadhya as vadham arhati and considers it not as a kṛdanta but as a taddhitānta (hani vā vadhya ca, taddhito vā III.1.97). Kṣ observes that the nouns drādhima and nediṣṭha, which at present are considered as formed by applying taddhita suffixes, were in the past considered as kṛdanta (drādhimādayaḥ kasmimścid Vyākaraṇe dhātor eva sādhitāḥ, evam nediṣṭhādayo nedatyādeḥ (Kṣīratarāṅgini 1.80).

A provisional assessment

Kṣ’s successors in the field of verb- studies such as Hemacandra and Sāyaṇa/Mādhava have evidently followed him with trust. Fellow commentators of the Amarakośa such as
Lingayyasūrin (author of the *Amarapadavivṛtti*) speak respectfully about him. They duly consulted his works and spoke of him, along with some other scholars, as 'knowers of grammar, Mīmāṃsā and logic' (*padāvakāramāṇajñaiḥ kṣirasvāmyādisūribhiḥ kṛtān granthān samālocya...*) At present, I value him mainly for one thing: He is the only scholar who wrote about all the four cardinal categories of words, viz. *nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga* and *nipāta*. Sanskrit Grammar was for a long time known as *pada-śāstra*. Our Kṣ covered the whole *pada-śāstra*. Further, Amara's lexicon is the oldest available work of its kind, and Kṣ's commentary is the earliest available one on Amarakoṣa. In the extant lexicographical literature Amara's lexicon and Kṣ's commentary are the pioneering works. The same is true with his *Dhatuvṛtti*. It is the earliest extant *Vṛtti* on Pāṇini's *Dhātupātha*. While giving him credit for his *catuspadī vyākhyā*, I would also note that there is need to study his statements critically and to determine the extent of his maturity and depth.

**References**

*My young and enthusiastic friend Mrinal Kaul 'Martand' phoned me that I should contribute an article on the contribution of Kṣirasvamin to Sanskrit Grammar for his contemplated "Linguistic Traditions of Kashmir", to be dedicated to the memory of Pandit Dinanath Yaksha. Being impressed by the nobility of the cause, I agreed to the proposal without even thinking for a moment about my competence to do justice to the subject. If I still do not repent about my inadvertent acceptance of Mrinal's proposal, it is solely because I thereby get the rare opportunity to pay my respects to the pious memory of a great Kashimirian Pandit. I wish to say Kaśmirajasya Yakṣasya yajanīyā vidagdhatā.*
1. tad yāni catvāri padajātāni nāmākhyāte, copasarganipātās ca tānimāni bhavanti (Nirukta 1.1.8). The Paspaśāhnika of Mahābhāṣya also says catvāri padajātāni nāmākhyātopasarganipātās ca.

2. na nirbaddhā upasargā arthān nirāhur iti Śākaṭāyanaḥ (Nirukta 1.3.3-6)

3. (a) Aklujakar 1999 for details and especially for the discussion of karmopasaṅgrha-nipāta.

4. (a) The same is the case with the other two Dhātupātha-s namely those of Sāyaṇa/Mādhava and Maitreyarakṣita.

   (b) For the Kṣīratarāṅgil, see Bruno Liehich’s excellent edition of it. For the Dhātupātha of non-Pāṇinian schools like those of Candra, Śākaṭāyana, Hemacandra and the like, see Palsule (1957) and Palsule (1955) which stand as unique contributions.

5. In any natural language, the number of nouns and verbs is bound to exceed that of prepositions and particles.


   (b) Addition by Ashok Aklujkar: A Nipātavyayopasarga-vṛtti with Tilaka as the author, has been published in South India. It should be ascertained if it is a work based on Kṣ’s statements in these various works, particularly the Amarakośodghāṭana and the Kṣīratarāṅgil, are genuinely the work of Tilaka.
The milky-spring of the Goddess Kṣīrabhavānī is the most famous pilgrimage-place among the Panḍita-s of Kashmir. This shrine is situated towards the north-west in Ganderbal at a distance of 24 km from Śrinagar. The village in which the shrine is situated is locally known as Tūla-Mūla.

bhagnāḥ pārāyaṇikāś Candrādyā api ca yatra vibhrāntāḥ (Kṣīratarāṅgini verse 6ab in the prefatory section).

pāthe'rthe cāgamabhramśān mahatām api mohataḥ & na vidmaḥ kim nu jahnīmah kim vā 'trādadhmahe vayam & (at the end of the Curādīgana in Kṣīratarāṅgini).

Sāyaṇa / Mādhava in their Dhatuvṛtti indirectly support the observation of Kṣ saying, “Here some read the root dhṛ in the sense of dhāraṇa (to retain, to preserve, to hold) but this is not in keeping with the sage (ṛṣi, i.e. Pāṇini). We have, therefore, followed Maitreyarakṣṭa and others and noted it as being hr.” iha kecid dhṛ āḥḍhāraṇe iti athanti, so ‘nāṛṣaḥ . . . asmābhis tu Maitreyādyanurodhena harater anantaram pathitvā’ yam udāḥṛtaḥ (p. 184).

ṣas svapne iti ye na paṭhanti, kevalāṁ ṣas svapne, vaś kāntau iti, tanmatenaitad uktam.
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A lot has been written and is being written about the great Grammarian-philosopher Bhartrhari (hereafter abbrh. B) and his *Vākyapadiya* (abbrh. V)

The main questions discussed about the author are: 1) whether B belongs to the Tri-muni-Vyākaraṇa school or falls outside its lineal development?. 2) Is he to be identified with the poet Bhartṛhari, the author of *Śataka-trayī*? 3) Is *Śvopajñā* - gloss really written by B or is merely attributed to him as an auto-commentary, and is actually written by someone else? 4) Was B a Buddhist by faith or was merely influenced by Buddhist tenets or neither of the case?

As for the subject-matter of this paper I can afford to eschew the first three issues but the fourth one, I can’t afford to neglect.

Right from the scholars of the old generation like the late Mānavaḷḷī, the late Carudev Shastri, the late Prof. K. A. Subramania Iyer till those of the present generation like Prof. A. N. Aklujkar, Prof. George Cardona, Prof. Madhav Deshpande, Prof. Jan E. M. Houben and others have been writing profusely and critically on almost every aspect of the study of B. and V. Yet no one seems to have given a special attention to the title Vākyapadiya. The reason for this is not far to seek. These scholars perhaps find the title self-explaining and, therefore, not needing any further explanation. It consists of two words vākya and pada (a sentence and a word, respectively). This gives us the *Itaretara-dvandva* compound *Vākyapade*, to which the regular iyā (cha) suffix is added with a view to expressing the intended meaning i.e. a treatise dealing with vākya and pada.
The Śrṅgāraprakāśa of Bhoja (p. 50) says the same thing karmanah sambandhinā (yoga)-yathā-vākyapade adhikṛtya kṛto granthah vākyapadiyam. This passage was brought to light for the first time by Mānavallī, the first editor of the V.

When the renowned Mimāṃsaka Prabhākara in his Brhatī (part I. p. 389) says ta ete’nvitā padārthāh, eṣāmabhidhānāni padāni, tadidam vākyapadiyam- he is definitely not referring to a title of any book. His meticulous commentator Śālikānātha, has also purposely avoided a term like granthah or prakaraṇam.

B was a staunch adherent of sphota theory of meaning. For the sake of analysis (apoddhāra) only he assumed different partial sphota-s such as those of varṇa (letter), pada (word), etc. Yet the meaning, he always asserted firmly, is revealed only by the akhaṇḍa-vākyā-sphota. It is for this that the word vākya comes first and the word pada, later.

But for me the title is not that simple and straight-forward; it is intriguing. I, therefore, place my thoughts before the scholars for their consideration.

1) Grammatically, I propose to dissolve the compounded-title not as an itaretara dvandva but as a karmadhāraya, and 2) semantically, I shall like to describe this karmadhāraya as a ‘Brahmo-Buddhist’ compound, a term used by me teacher the late Dr. T. G. Mainkar in explaining the phrase Brahmānirvāṇa used in Bhagavadgītā (BG. V. 24&26) as a ‘Brahmo-Buddhist’ compound. ‘To make it still more easy to undersatnd, I say that the vākya (not exactly a sentence as defined in English grammar but a ‘unit of speech’) is a Brahmānical term while pada is a term used in Buddhist tradition meaning much the same as vākya. Thus the compounded title like Brahmānirvāṇa in the Gītā, though not a bi-lingual translation-compound is all the same a bitraditional
one or dvi-kula-ja-compound, a bikin (bringing the Brahmanical and Buddhist kula-s together.)

Perhaps even a single instance should suffice to carry home the point. In Pāli (and even in Sanskrit Buddhist tradition) 'Dhammapada' stands for Dhammavacana (Dhamma-statements- vākya-vacana, not dhamma-‘word’.). Śikṣāpada also means śikṣā-vākya not śikṣā-śabda.

The Vedic Brahmanical tradition deals with both the samhītā (a connected text) and its pada-s. Thus we have the samhītā-pāṭha as also the pada-pāṭha. The knower of the pada-s was known as padaka (just as the knower of Śikṣā, a śikṣaka; and that of Mīmāṁsā, a Mīmāṁsaka), Padaka occurs very often in the Pali Canon in a cliché describing a Vedic-Brāhmaṇa (tiṇṇam vedānam pāragū, sa-nighaṇḍu keṭubhānam, padako, veyyākaraṇo, lokāyata-mahāpurisa-lakṣhaṇesu anavayo. D. I. 88, etc. PTS. ed.)

Following the two above mentioned pāṭha-s in Vedic tradition, soon arose the two distinct schools in Sanskrit grammar known as pada-vādī and vākya-vādī (for which see. The philo¬phy of Word and Meaning, Gaurinath Shastri, Calcutta, 1959 p. 95)

The Sanskrit Grammatical tradition commenced with Pāṇini mostly as a Padaśāstra. It culminated as a Vākyasāstra at the hands of B, who may or may not be considered as belonging to the Pāṇinian tradition. Pāṇini defined pada as suptīṅgantam padam and though the concept of vākya was implied by him, he did not give a definition of it. It was Kātyāyana who supplied the anukta by placing before us a working definition such as ekatīn, vākyam. This roused a good deal of discussion about whether according to Pāṇini there could or could not be a purely nominal (and complete in itself) sentence such as Devadattaḥ pācakah odanasya.
Amongst others I shall refer only to the views expressed on this important aspect by Madhava Deshpande, Kiparsky and Johannes Bronkhorst. (For Bronkhorst see ABORI. LXXI part 4, 1990. pp. 301-304)

Bronkhorst disagreed with the view expressed by Kiparsky namely that Pāṇini did not have to provide deletion of the copula in a nominal sentence and, therefore, Devadattaḥ pācakah odanasya is a complete sentence without a finite verb. Bronkhorst maintained that for Kātyāyana and Patañjali not all the nominal sentences are complete in themselves and that according to Patañjali in a seemingly nominal sentence such as vrksah plaksah (The Fig. tree) a verb like asti or vidyate is supposed to be implied. Bronkhorst further remarked that the view of Pāṇini in this connection was not identical with Kātyāyana and Patañjali who firmly held that every sentence must have a finite verb. Thus Bronkhorst does not consider a nominal sentence to be complete in itself and finds out in the Paninian-sūtra III 4, 21 a support for his argument. The said sūtra points out two verbs in the context of the same agent. This serendipitical finding of Brokhorst also may lead to further controversy about the presence of nominally complete sentence in Sanskrit speech. I for one would like to be guided by Kātyāyana's view of a vākya. We all know that the cryptic sūtra-s like those of Bādarāyaṇa wherein the texts though often formed with nouns alone are invariably explained by the commentators with the word iti vākyasēṣaḥ. This vākyasēṣa is in most of the cases furnishes a finite verb. Thus the commentarial supplement tacitly admits the view of Kātyāyana that every sentence for its compliance needs a verb to be supplied. Prof Madhav Deshpande, however, maintains that it is not necessary to suppose that the views of Kātyāyana and Patañjāli regarding this matter should
agree with that of Pāṇini. Deshpande says that confining ourselves exclusively to Pāṇini we can safely maintain that there can be a complete and purely nominal sentence without any implication of verbal supplement. In fact Patañjali discussing Kātyāyan’s, definition of a vākya or sentence emphatically says apūrvaṁ kriyate (i.e. Kātyāyana has said something for which there is no earlier i.e. Pāṇinian support). Deshpande adds, “And thus Kātyāyana, according to his own ideas is supplying a deficiency in Pāṇini by his anukta type of Vārttika, namely ekatiṁ vākyam.”

Now we should concentrate on the fact that in Buddhist tradition the very word pada is seen used in the sense of a vākya and that B also uses the word pada synonymously with vākya with a view to bringing a compromise between the Brahmanical and Buddhist grammatico-semantic schools. B cleverly used what I shall prefer to name as a comprise-compound for the title of his treatise fusing Buddhist and Brahmanical thought and terminology.

One more striking instance showing such a compromising attitude according to me is a synonym compound used in Marathi namely guṇadharmā. Here guṇa is a Sāmkhya term and dharma, a Buddhist one based on the Sāmkhya tradition. We should never fail to read the revealing article, ‘The Guṇa-s of the Sāmkhya-s and the Dharm-s of the Buddhists’ written by Stecherbautsky long ago. (Indian Historical Quarterly, 1934, p. 751. et-seq.).

In the same way for knowing in all details the Vaibhāṣika theory of pada meaning a vākya we should carefully and sympathetically read an equally searching article by Dr. Padmanabha Jaini- ‘The Vaibhāṣika theory of Words’.

For the convenience of the readers I shall note here in brief only the outline of Jaini’s article. 1) The Sautrāntika and the Vaibhāṣika schools differ on many points, one of which is impor-
tant from the grammatical and linguistic point of view. It is about the *cittaviprayukta-saṃskāra*-s (translated by Stecherbatsky as ‘pure forces’ in his Central Conception of Buddhism. p. 23). The last three forces are *nāmakāya* (group of words). *Vyañjanakāya* (group of letters) and *padakāya* (group of sentences). (Read. P.S. Jaini. The Vaibhāṣika Theory of Words. BSOAS. Vol. 22. part I. 1959. pp. 730. et seq.)

Thus in the Pāli-Nikāya*-s and indeed in the Buddhist tradition as a whole, the word *pada* is used to denote a *vākya*, the whole statement and just not its words or terms. My friend in Japan Prof. Hajime Nakamura (Journal of the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Vidyapeeth, Allahabad. Vol. XXIX-Vol. 1-4, 1973. Centenary Vol. pp. 367-388) has successfully demonstrated that B had studied Buddhist thought and was influenced by its terminology such as *parikalpa, viparīta, vikalpita, a-vikalpita, adhyāsa, āropa, adhvan* and many more. The term *pada* itself meaning a *vākya* as Dhammapada for Dhamma statements must have triggered Bhārtṛhari’s imagination so as to use it synonymously with *vākya* in the title of his treatise so that his assertion *vākyāt padānāmātīyantam pravibhāgo na kaścana* is implicitly reflected in the title and the earlier controversy between *padavāda* and *vākyavāda* is dissolved once for all, the Buddhist term *pada* itself being considered as a *vākya*. We can now say that B thus established a *vākyapada-vāda* in his Vākyapadiya by implying a compound *vākyameva padam iti vākyapadam* (not *vākyapade*) *tadadikṛtya kṛto granthah.*

Along with B we know Chandragomin, a Buddhist grammarian of Sanskrit and Dharmakīrti also, who is said to have been a Buddhist philosopher, devoted some time to the study of Sanskrit grammar as per the authority of E. Obermiller. (History of Bud-
Buddhist tradition, established a trend of Grammarian-philosophers and thus anticipated centuries ago the trend of modern American philosophers who based their findings on linguistic analysis.

My preceptor the late Dr. T.G. Mainkar while teaching us the Kārikā-s of Gauḍapāda used to say that at a certain stage of the development of Indian philosophy it was not possible for any intellectual-true to his name-to keep himself unimpressed by Buddhist thought just as in recent past it was not possible for any thinker in socio-economic field to be uninfluenced by Marxism. It is a palpable fact that Gauḍapāda and Śaṁkara were influenced by Buddhist terminology and mode of thinking which they utilised to establish firmly the Advaya doctrine of Upaniṣad-s. The term Advaya is of predictive recurrence in Buddhist philosophy and the Buddha himself is called Advayavādin. B belonged to the same orthodox Brahmanical Vedānta tradition to which Gauḍapāda and Śaṁkara contributed richly.

One more distinguishing character of V is that it is thoroughly composed in Kārikā-s, a medium used by Nāgārjuna (Mūlamadhyama-kārikā), later by Gauḍapāda (Mañḍūkya-kārikā) and still later by Iśvarakṛṣṇa (Śaṁkhya-kārikā). The Grammar in verses distinguishes V from the Tri-muni tradition of Prose-Grammar. The sūtra-s, Vārttika-s (except ślokavārttika-s), the Vṛtti, the Bhāṣya and the later expositions are all in prose.

Here perhaps we should note the fact that Mammaṭa in his kāvyaprakāśa quotes from Vākyapadīya a prose sentence. Uktam hi Vākyapadiye, na hi gauḥ svarūpeṇa gauḥ, nāpyagauḥ, gotvābhisambandhāttu gauḥ | Can this be a prose summary of a lost-Kārikā which we on the model of the article ‘Lost Śaṁkhya-kārikā’ by the late B.G. Tilak restore in some such way as-
At this stage it will be meet to recapitulate our argument in favour of our finding that Vākyapadīya is a 'Brahmo-Buddhist' Karmadhāraya-compound where two words from two different traditions hinting at the same meaning are used to form the title Vākyapadīya 1) Vākyam (Brahmanical) is padam (Buddhist Vaibhāṣika) thus Vākyapadam, tadhikṛtya kṛto granthah. guṇah (a Sāṃkhya-term) and dharmaḥ is a Buddhist one. Guṇadharmah or Brahm (Upaniṣadic) eva Nirvāṇam (Buddhist) and hence Brahma-nirvāṇam ) or even the farce (prahasana) written by the Keralite dramatist Bodhāyana namely Bhagavadajju-kam or Bhagavadajjukāyām wherein the Bhagavān (Philosopher-ascetic) becomes ajjukā (a harlot) and of course also the vice-versa. Hence the statement nāyaṁ bhagavān, neyamajjukā, bhagavadajjukīyām samvṛttam which in the case of Vākyapadīya takes a positive form, where we should say yadeva vākyām tadeva padām, yadeva padām tadeva vākyām, much on the line of the Upaniṣadic style yadvāva kam tadeva kham, yadeva kham, tadeva kam, (Chāndogya. IV. 10.5)

As for the Nikāyic reference (Samyuttanikāya Pāli (Roman PTS ed. I. 38) the following gāthā is notably important. It speaks about the origin of a gāthā.

Chando nidānam gāthānam, akkharā tāsām viyañjanam 1
nāmasannissita gāthā, kavi gāthānamāsayo 11

(Metre is the origin of a verse, letters manifest the nouns which latter are taken recourse of in a gāthā, and a poet is a source of a verse.)

This verse has become a bone of contention between the
Vaibhāṣika-s and Sautrāntika-s. The Vaibhāṣika-s admit the existence of *nāma-samśakāra-s* which are not admitted by the Sautrāntika-s. Buddhaghosa, the commentator of the *gāthā* seems to be in favour of the Vaibhāṣika stand-point when he explains *nāma* as *samuddā-di paññatti* i.e. the nouns or names like *samudda* (the sea), *jar* (*gхаṭa*), etc. are conceptual words.

The *gāthā* says: letters give manifestation (creation) to *nāma-s* (= *pada-s*). The Vaibhāṣika-s explain *padam gātham janeti* as a *pada* creates *gāthā* and *pada* is a synonym for *vākya*. The *kārikā* (see Padmanabh Jaini. p.733.) clearly says *padaparyāyo vākyam*. In the Pali canon too, we find the word *pada* used in the sense of a *vākya*. Thus in Sānyuttanikāya it is said *ekena padena sabbo attho vutto* (by a single *pada* the whole meaning is expressed) and what is that single *pada? phassapaccayā dukkham 'ti iminā ekenā padena* (SA. I. 57 Roman. ed.) Thus a *vākya* is cited under the name of *pada*.

Here there is a sentence formed of two words. Here in this specific context it is extremely fruitful to read the following (which I am quoting from Pañcaskandha-prakaraṇa of Vasubandhu, critically edited by Shanti Bhikṣhu Shastri. First ed. 1969 Kelaniya, Ceylon. pp. 14, 33)

"nāmakāyāḥ katamah? dharmānāṁ svabhāvādhi-vacanam."
(What is a terminology? A designation of the very nature of things.)

"padakāyāḥ katamah? dharmānāṁ viśeṣādhivacanam."
(What is the definition of a *pada?* A designation of the speciality of things.)

"vyāñjanakāyāḥ katamah? akṣarāṇi. tadubhayavyānja-natāṁ upādāya."
(What is verbal expression? Letters; for, they express
both [viz. terminology and definition]).

'vākyam api tāni nāmapadāśrayeṇaṁ artha-vacanatāṁ upādāya.'

(They are also called vākya or sentence; for they convey a (complete) meaning by means of their dependence on terms and definitions.)

'aksaram punah paryāyāksaraṇatāṁ upādāya'.

(And aksara (=letter) is termed so, because it causes no characteristics.)

**What is a Pada ? :**

In classical Sanskrit too, pada or pāda (= carana, a foot) is at times used interchangeably (synonymously) with a vākya and the benedictory stanza of a drama (Nāndī) is said to be composed of eight or twelve pada-s (Nāndī padairdvādaśabhirāstābhirvāpyalamkṛtā). Then follows the wrangling over the meaning of pada or pāda. ‘Some say that it means a foot of a verse, others a pratipadika or a dhatu with nominal or verbal endings respectively, obviously the Pāninīanas. Yet some others hold that it means the main (principle) sentence along with its minor (subordinate) clauses’:

ślokapādam padaṁ kecit, suptisingantamathāpare
pare’ vāntaravākyaiṣvāsvarūpāṁ padamūcire

The Mīmāṁsā system defines prakaraṇam (a means of determining the sense of Vedic statements) as Vākyaiḥvākyatā and alternatively also as padaikavākyatā wherein pada is equated with vākya. In Buddhist hermeneutical grammer padakāya means vākyakāya.

**Pada (Śabda), Vākya and Kāvyalakṣaṇani :**

Coming to Sanskrit poetics we find Viśvanātha using the
word *vākya* in his definition of a poem where Jagannātha uses its synonym *śabda* i.e. *pada*. Thus Sāhityadarpana defines a poem as *Vākyam rasātmakam kāvyam* and the Rasagaṅgādhara says *Ramanlyārthapratipādakah śabdhaḥ kāvyam*. A single word cannot be a poem, nor even a single sentence for Viśvanātha rushes to explain in his gloss that by *vākya* he does not mean a 'sentence' (as is implied in English grammar) but a complete *vāngmaya* so that the great Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata are viewed as *mahāvākya*-s. Mahākāvya-s are Mahāvākya-s. Hence Abhinavagupta speaks about Mahā-bhārata being a *Prabandha* or a repository of *Śānta-rasa*, originating from Nirveda (an entirely resigned and detached sentiment) caused by reading the sad destruction of the great clan of the Kuru-s (and even that of the race of Yadu-s).

I am painfully conscious of the fact that I am not a competent student of Sanskrit Grammar. I, therefore, thought ten times before I set to write the present article. My interest in the Buddhist literature urged me publish the material and I shall most welcome any scathing criticism of what I have said herein for that will be in the service of critical scholarship.
Chapter - Fourth

Nirvāṇa and Pāṇ. VIII. 2.50

Nirvāṇa (Pali nibbāna) is the summum bonum of the Hinayānist Buddhist teaching; Mahāyāna stresses the Bodhisattva ideal and Altruism (sarvabhūtahītaratiḥ) being of more importance than individualistic liberation from the ill. What is the real nature of nibbāna is a question of highest interest and importance to those interested in the weal of all beings. The original word is Sanskrit and stands mostly for ‘coolness’ and, therefore, pleasure. Thus the saying nirvānāya tarucchāyā taptasya hi veśeṣataḥ (the shade of a tree offers a coolness and pleasure especially to one who is scorched by the heat of the sun). Seeing Śakuntalā with her two friends Duḥṣanta exclaims labdhāṁ netanirvāṇam (a pleasant coolness for eyes!). Many of the Buddhist brethren have preferred to say sitibhūto’mhi nibbuto ‘I have become cool and calm’. When twice the Bhagavad-gītā (V. 24-25) uses the compound term Brahma-nirvāṇam, the late Prof. Dr. T.G. Mainkar (Gītābhāṣya-prakāśa) has most accurately explained it as a ‘Brahmo-Buddhist’ compound’. The word though originally Sanskrit has a marked Buddhistic tinge so far as the philosophical meaning-aspect of it is concerned. The Buddhist Elders mean by sitibhūto’mhi nibbuto not the physical coolness but the mental calm, tranquility. I compare it with the Bhagavadgītā expression (III.30) Vigatajvaraḥ, a term rightly explained by Śaṅkara-s vigatasantāpah, vigatasokatāpah ‘devoid of Grief, free from pain.’

Happily there is many a peculiarly Buddhist term referred to in the aphorisms of Pāṇini. Kumārī-śramaṇā, Pāga, saṃgha, maskara-maskarinau, are only a few of these instances. Professors S.D. Joshi and Roodbergen in the introduction to their translation of Aṣṭādhyāyi (A Sāhitya-Academi Publication (p. 6) have
indicated B.C. 550 as the date of Pāṇini which exactly coincides with the probable date of Gautam the Buddha. The Buddhist term nirvāṇa is defined by Pāṇini in Aṣṭādhyāyi (VIII.2.50) as Nirvāṇaḥ avāte (nirvāṇo’vāte). The sūtra is explained traditionally as ‘the expression nirvāṇa is introduced with irregular substitute phoneme n replacing the regular phoneme t indicating niṣṭhā (kta) i.e. past passive participle (ta).

Now for understanding of Pāṇini’s implication of this sūtra we will have to go to the Rgvedic philosophical Rk which tells us about how the Highest Principle breathes even when the material great element ‘Wind’ was not till then created. Breathing ordinarily means in-breathing of the exterior wind or air (cp. The Saṃvargavidyā taught by Raikva to the king Jānaśruti. Chāndogya Upaniṣad IV.3.1.). The Rk says Āṇidavātam svadhayā tadekam. (That One, in the absence of vāta or air, breathed in its unique way.). Pāṇini picked up the word avata from this particular Rgvedic text. Nirvāṇa is not the extinction of life-wick which is accomplished by a strong gush of wind as is generally interpreted. acci yathā vātavegana khitto. Suttanipāta (verse 1074 ab). “Just as a flame is blown-out by a gush of wind”.

Nirvāṇa, suggests Pāṇini, is the natural dying out of the flame in absence of the oxygen which is essential for the process of burning. An elementary practical in physics for the school-boys where in they are shown how the burning candle when put under the glass soon dies out. Pāṇini had realised the Ur-Bhuddist notion of Nirvāṇa. In the absence of any decisive proof it is hard to assert his knowledge of the Pāli-scriptures, but what is fairly patent is that many an illustration of his grammatical rules he laid down in Aṣṭādhyāyi are found not in the extant Sanskrit literature but in Pāli canonical usages. The one handy illustration is
nadi, a brimming river and खलुपच्छाभस्तिक ‘one who denies eating after having taken once one’s meals’. Notable is the reference to the Eastern usage in the sutra III.4.18. अलं-खल्वो: प्रतिषेधार्थयो: प्राचा कल्पा।

Prof. Dr. M.M. Deshpande of Michigan even when he was only a post-graduate student of Skt. in the University of Pune wrote an article on काकपेय्या नदी and if I am not wrong the late Dr. Smt. Jayashree Gune also wrote on the same subject.

I have been asking such authorities as Prof. Dr. S.D. Joshi whom I esteem as a Pāṇini Bhagavān of the present day, whether there are signs of Pāṇini’s knowing something of the sort of Indo-European language. Why should he register a root like मस्त्रू–मज्जति, a root telling us about the name of the जलचर पक्षी ‘मद्गु’. स् becomes a विसर्नीय हट and ॠ too. Skt. masj, becomes transparent in English 'mearge'. Did Pāṇini had any inkling in this direction?

For the discussion of the meaning of Nirvāṇa the readers can read the article of Anand Coomarswamy published in the Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies. (vol. IV. issue 2. July, 1939. pp. 156-157) "SOME PALI WORDS". The article is good for a better understanding of many an unclear Buddhist term.
Chapter - Fifth
Ardhamātrālāghava

The Sanskrit tradition recognised ‘grammar’ (vyākaraṇa) as the most prominent amidst all the six auxiliary sciences of the Vedic studies (mukham vyākaraṇam smṛtam). Naturally the grammarians are also ‘regarded’ as the ‘foremost scholars’ (prathame vidvāṁsah. Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa Ullāsa II. under sphaṭa reference). The Sanskrit poetics (literary criticism) is deeply saturated with the grammatical pre-suppositions such as that of sphaṭa, the purely grammatical sub-divisions of the Upamā-alamkāra such as kyac-gā and kyaṅgā (Kāvyaprakāśa Ullāsa X.1.), gamedoh (Sāhityadarpana pariccheda. 2), etc. One can well understand and appreciate this valuation of the grammar and grammarians.

Pāṇinī, the foremost grammarian of the Sanskrit language is adored as not less than a ‘Blessed one’ Bhagavān and not unduly is praised for his great minute survey “mahatī sūkṣmekṣikā” when he notes in his sūtra “udaka ca vipāśah” the word “Dāttah (kūpah)” ‘(a certain well dug by one Mr. Dutta’, to refer to a typical Bengali surname) is pronounced on one bank of the modern river Bias as ādyodāṭṭa and on the other as antyodāṭta. Marvellous indeed ! Pāṇinī was the earliest predecessor of Grierson who after centuries later presented his “Lingutistic Survey of India”. Compared to the vast field of survey carried on by Grierson Pāṇinī has chosen for his studies a field much limltd like say the boundries of Āryāvarta but the accuracy was not at all less in perfection than is found in the Griersonian survey. The ‘grammar in Eight Chapters’. (Aṣṭādhyāyī) is fittingly compared with the immaculate geometry of Euclid 3rd Century B. C. the Alexandrian Geometrian presented to the world. But by far the most striking feature of Pāṇini is his extremely terse sūtra-style. The Vaiyākaraṇa-s are
applauded for their superb 'bravity', recognised by Shakespeare as the hall-mark of 'wit'. "Bravity is the soul of wit" says the great Elezabethan dramatist and the Buddha also at times used the technique of Minimization (Sāmkhītta). It is, I admit, my sheer misfortune not to be able to reconcile myself with this high-appraisal of 'bravity which is expressed wittily in the saying that grammarians- if they could save even half a māṭrā- are as happy as though they are blessed with a son. A grand gala party (utsava) at the birth of a son will be celebrated in their family. (Ardhamātrālāghavena putrotsavaṁ manyante vaiyākaraṇāḥ).

This long cherished and practised ideal of lāghava I sincerely think has done more harm than good to the tradition of Sanskrit grammar. The exact implication of many a sūtra of Pāṇini has become unclear, obscure, doubtful, controversial and interpretable (neyārtha; not nītārtha to use the Buddhist hermeneutical terms.). Usually the instance of the sūtra neraṇau is cited.

"NERAṆAVITI SŪṬARATHĀM BHAGAVĀṆ VETTI PĀṆINIṆH / AHAM CA, BHĀṢYAṆRD VETTI, VṛTTIKRD VETTI VĀ NA VĀ’ //

The same is true with most of the other sūtra-s Oh, if only our "Blessed one" would have added just a few more words to make his import crystal clear! A lot of gaurava in the form of many explanatory commentaries would have been saved.

Further I have not seen any other grammarian of any language of the world not giving his own examples in support of his rules. What guarantee is there that Pāṇini implied the illustrations such as ahinakulaṁ and śramaṇa-brāhmaṇam under the spell of his sūtra "yevāṁ ca virodhaḥ śāśvatiḥāh" (II.4.9.). Perhaps only a little later the Jain literature, by which I mean the illustrated manuscripts of the Āgama-s showed the pictures of "peaceful co-existence" of ahi and nakula and much later the
prose-writer *par excellence*, Bāṇa describing the hermitage of the ascetic Jābāli said *yatra ca śāśvatikāṃ virodhamapahāya* .......etc.

Vasudevasaraṇa Agraval attempted a highest jump in trying to present historically ‘India in times of Pāṇini’ and the only reaction of the cautious critics was that the learned author had tried to reconstruct the India in times of Pāṇini on the basis of the examples implied in his *sūtra*-s which were supplied by the commentators who were decidedly much later than Pāṇini, The whole superstructure of a sincere scholarly endeavour thus topplels down only because our revered Pāṇini himself had not explicitly given the illustrations he must have in his mind when he composed the relevant aphorisms.

Now I say again that I am not at all averse to admit that the term Pāṇini’ besides being a proper name also stands for the *uninterrupted* tradition of Pāṇinian school and that the living, continuous oral tradition must have reached in the classical Indian way (i.e. epigonically) down to the time of Kāśikākārau, For as they say व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिः संदेहादलक्षणम्! The tradition continued with Patañjali, Kātyāyana (Vararuci), Bhaṭṭoji and his successors too. But who can vouchsafe the historicity of the illustrations? I learnt from someone that Prof. George Cardona, Professor Emeritus University of Pensilvania (USA) once attempted to cull together from every source possible, the comments along with the illustrations on each and every *sūtra* of Pāṇini but he did this gigantic and thorough-going work all alone using the now out-dated computer Mackintosch. I admit I have not heard so far if he has committed to writing his observations on his findings. My point here is only that Pāṇini did not supply the examples of his own *sūtra*-s which further implies that he did not sufficiently made clear the meanings implied in his *sūtra*-s; This naturally
resulted in a rich harvest of diverse interpretations offered by world-known Pāṇinian scholars. National, International and provincial seminars, panel discussions and conferences were required to be held. Sharp debates pertaining to genuinness, of the sūtra-s, yogavibhāga-technique were rigourously carried on in these scholarly gatherings. Three words vā, vibhāṣā and anyatarasyāṁ were discussed. They were so far taken as perfect synonyms by Pawate and other traditionalists. Where as now Prof. S.D. Joshi and Dr. Paul Kiparsky in their thought-provoking (and “equally highly debatable) book” Pāṇini as a Vartationist” Pune argued that far from being exact and perfect synonyms the three are ‘homoionyms’ (they did not use this term which is fondly being used by Ulmann (vide. The Principles of Semantics. p. 109. the word is homoe = same + names, i.e. similar names)

The three according to them show nuances of meanings. The argument of these two modern Pāṇini-scholars can be upheld on the basis of (i) the, fact couched in the words sabdabhedādartha-bhedāḥ and (ii) also the modern linguistic finding that in any natural language there cannot exist totally and perfectly synonymous terms. If the rūpa-s (linguistic forms) differ there must be semantic nuances mooted and all that we mean by synonyms is merely words generally meaning the same but not the same. In fact (iii) we use the word same to mark-out according to A.R. White our recognition that the object or character familiar to us under one aspect is the same object or character which was familiar to us in a different aspect.”

Further if Pāṇini had meant merely ‘option’ (undifferentiated) by all these three terms, his lāghava should have constrained him to use only the shortest synonym vā and not vibhāṣa which is long and the still longer anyatarasyāṁ.
Well, this is how I can support Joshi and Kiparsky but to this extent only for what about, the traditional *Paribhāṣā*-s which will cut me short by instructing *paryāyaśbdānām gurulāghava-carca nādriyate* (In case of synonymous terms the discussion about long and short is not to be heeded). This *Paribhāṣā* will be effective in the context of the triad we are presently discussing.

Now I pray, please do not tell me that terseness was adhered to by Pāṇini only to facilitate the memorising of his *sūtra*-s because at that time there were no books and our ancestors preserved their ancient rich lore by cramming alone and hence the importance and praise of *svādhyāya*. I can understand such a type of justification in the case of the Greeks in Aristotle's era where recourse was taken to Mnemonic verses implying the A.E.I.O. (i.e. Universal Affirmative, Universal Negative, Perticular Affirmative and Perticular Negative propositions) in the form of “Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferio”, etc.

Our ancient Indian reciters and preservers of the vast Vedic, Epic and Purānic, in fact all the prose and versified vast literature could have definitely with utmost ease preserved Pāṇini's grammar in full-fledged prose sentences accompanied with a good number of illustrations. Perhaps the verse form of Rgveda, and Sāmaveda might have proved easier to them but they have with equal proficiency preserved the prose portion of many *kānda*-s of Ātharvaveda and the prose of Black Yajurveda along with the vast prose of Brāhmaṇa's like Aitareya and Śatapatha and prose in the Upaniṣad-s and Mahābhārata and what not? Moreover who preserved in their memory the prose of the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The Indianness in me forbids me to criticise Pāṇini for not having given his excellent and perfect grammar in full-fledged, sufficiently long drawn prose for after all the Master Grammarian is
adorable—for me and I dedicate this tiny, not much meaningful chapter to Him, Bhagavān, who opened the eyes of all of us with the eye-pencil of Wisdom (jñānānājanaśalākayaḥ).

Largely Pāṇini is rightly appreciated and praised by all except a few scholars who found certain points where they not merely differed from Pāṇini but could not help criticising him bitterly. Thus we find already in 1935. Pawate in his “The structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī” (Hubli) tried to show on the basis of Pāṇinian inconsistencies his main proposition that Aṣṭādhyāyī represents an amalgam of pre-Pāṇini and Pāṇinian sūtra-s. Although the late Dr. G.B. Palsule tried to disprove Pawate’s assertion namely that Pāṇini exhibits inconsistencies and even contradictions in his celebrated “The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭha : A Critical Study” (Pune 1967. pp.16-24) yet Pawate did not cease to influence the views of modern scholars like Robert Birwe “Studien tzu Adhyāya III der Aṣṭādhyāyī Pāniniz” (Wisbeden1966) who following the line blazed by Dr. Pawate brought to notice of the scholars the subtle inconsistencies in Pāṇinian grammar. After Birwe, Mrs. S. Bahulikar in her treatise published by Harvard University (1972). “Some criteria determining the inserssions in the Aṣṭādhyāyī)” and also in her article on the same line “Concerning the structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī” (Indian Linguistics. Vol. 34. 1973. pp. 75-99) tried to show that the commentators on Aṣṭādhyāyī have gone astray in trying to defend Pāṇini's flaws and, therefor, are not safe guides in understanding the aphorisms of Pāṇini. She, therefore, suggested an independent interpretation of these Pāṇinian sūtra-s.

All this only shows not any disrespect for Pāṇini but only a sober statement that Aṣṭādhyāyī is not a scripture, it is not ‘Apauruṣeya’ and, Pāṇini also is not infallible. He remains a great revered grammarian of an antique and important language of the world.
The articles and monographs discussing the Sanskrit prefixes have, strange to say, confined themselves, merely to the diacritical usage (i.e. how the upasarga-s become instrumental in differentiating the meaning in the inflexions of nouns and verbs) of the Sanskrit prefixes. This, of course, is a very significant aspect and the proportion of the treatment meted out to it is certainly justifiable. The Vedic and Sanskrit as well as the Pali and Prakrit literatures, however, display at many places a typical stylistic usage of the prefixes. They use different prepositions with the same verbal form in collocation. The examples are


(2) *Pali* - (kāme) vajjeyya, vivajjeyya, parivajjeyya, abhinivajjeyya (*Nd^1* p. 8)

(3) *Amg.* - santā, pasantā, uvasantā (*Aupapātika Sūtra* p. 190). BUDDHAGHOSA in his *Āṭṭhasālinī* (III. 270) calls this a ‘prefixal variation’ (*upasaggavaseṇa vibhattigamanam*) which he justifies on the grounds of (1) *Padatthuti* i.e. ornamentation or the embellishment of the term and (2) *Dalhīkamma* i.e. an emphatic device of intensifying the suggested beauty in variety. Along with this prefixal variation, we also find, many peculiar usages of the prefixes in these literatures. These two aspects have not received due treatment at the hands of the scholars and it is, therefore, that I propose to discuss in this chapter these rather unnoticed aspects of the prefixes.

It is true that as compared to Pali and Prakrit-s the Classi-
cal Sanskrit is more judicious and cautious in the usage of prefixes. The **upasarga** is considered as the specifier of the root-meaning (‘‘*upasargo visēṣakṛt’’ and *upasargena dhātvartho balādanyatanaṁyate, prahārharasamhāravihāra-parihāravat* S. K. p. 175). The Classical Sanskrit rarely uses the prefixes only to make the expressions more dignified. Such a tendency is seen prevailing in modern Marāṭhi and we find *vinaṭalele* used in many places where only *natalele* would have sufficed as also आमूर्ण for the bare भूण. In English too, some are more prone to use ‘preferred’ for the simpler ‘offered’. The *anarthaka prayoga-s* or *svārthe prayoga-s* with regard to prefixes (i.e. where the prefixes do not serve any special purpose are of course observable even in the Classical Sanskrit but the Sanskrit poetics treat them as blemishes. Stylistic usage of the prefixes is noted by the Sanskrit Poetics only in a very few cases. The examples of such a style. however, can be seen right from the R. V.. To quote from YĀSKA. Nir 11.11 has ‘*vidhātra dhātā vyaḫhyātaḥ*’ and it is said that there is no difference between *dhātā* and *vidhātā* (DURGA. *dhātaiva vidhātā*). PĀNINI records stylistic usage of prefixes in I.4.93. *adhiparī anarthakau*, which the Mahābhāṣya explains as *anarthantaravācinau dhātunoktāṁ kriyāmāhātah*. In fact, in his *do avakhandane*, PĀNINI himself resorts to the ornamental usage of the prefixes and the Tattvavabodhini on S. K. 2510 remarks *avetyupasaraga-prayoge vaicitryārthaḥ, khaṇḍane iti etavata uktenā ‘pi īṣtasiddheḥ*. The Chāṇḍogya-upaniṣad (v. 12.2) perplexes us for a while when it says *sandehaste vyāśīryat* where *sandeha* only means a *deha* or a ‘body’ and we have in the Dhamma-pada verse 148. *bhijjati pūtisandeho, maranantam hi jīvitaṁ*. Here the unusual pleonistic addition of the prefix has brought a certain confusion. Usually, however, the case is reverse. The commentators have to add the usual prefixes to the original bare verbal forms so that they ap-
pear in their more usual, familiar looks and, therefore, are easily grasped. The Sanskrit teacher has many times to explains in the class the word *ṛddham* by *samṛddham*, *accha* by *svaccha* and *ūna* by *nyūna*, the augmented forms being more familiar to the eares. In fact, it is interesting to find, HEMACANDRA glossing *ṛddham* by *samṛddham* in his Anekārthasaṁgraha- *ṛddham samṛddhaṁ, siddhānte*. In the Dhātupāṭha of PĀNINI also, we so many times come across references where the roots are given along with their prefixal augmentation i.g. *preṣṛ gatau* (1.620), the original root must have been certainly *iṣa* and not *preṣ*. Again the meanings of the roots are given with the changes brought in them, by the additions of the prefixes and so we read *ricir vi-recane* (7.4) and *prei sam-parke* where we only expect the bare forms *recane* and *parke* respectively. This means, that there are some roots which are almost alwas used along with certain usual prefixes. Sometimes the user of the language may also not be quite aware of the bare radical forms although he may correctly use the augmented form. An Englishman too may not be aware of the presence of *ply* although he correctly uses the words *supply, apply, reply, etc.*

Apart from the stylistic usages there are many peculiar usages of the prefixes, that is to say, deviations from the normally registered meanings of the prefixes, The Rāmāyaṇa (IV. 14.2) has *vicārya* used in the sense of *saṁcārya* and ŚANKARĀCĀRYA thinks that the Kaṭha upaniṣad (II. 3.11) really means *viyoga* when it actually uses the bare form *yoga* (see *tām yogamiti manyante sthīrāmindriyadhāranāṁ* and S.B. thereon. *tadavasthāṁ yogamiti manyante, viyogamapi santam.*

I must make clear what I mean by anomalous or unusual usages of the prefixes. The usual meanings of the prefixes are
registered by the grammatical and exegetical literatures of every language. But the literature does not always abide by these given senses and uses the prefixes in many more senses. Further, there are many linguistic traditions and these influence each other. So for example, the prefix *upa* in Pali has a special meaning *drdha* (Pali *dalha*) which is not recorded in the Sanskrit kośa-s, but the usage of *upa* in this sense may be found in some Sanskrit formations. Again, in the same linguistic tradition, there may be earlier and later usages with regard to the same prefixes while it is equally possible that to convey the same meaning different prefixes might have been used at different periods. The stylistic peculiarity of using the same verbal form in combination with the different prefixes may also become instrumental in blurring the fine shades of the different prefixes and thus the originally different prefixes may become synonymous with each other. So for example *prañāśa* and *vināśa* may become entirely synonymous for they are used in Pali in the same collocation very often (e.g. *mā'ham nassam*, *mā'ham panassam*, *mā'ham vinassam*). Actually this is a gradual prefixal hightening.

Let us note, now, some instances from the Vedic and Sanskrit literatures. It will be proper to start with the Rgveda.

**The Rgveda**

Āgadhitā, parigadhitā yā kaśikeva

Jangahe / R. V. I. 126

SĀYAṆA had the usual way of explaining

ā samantāt grhītā, svīkṛtā & tathā, parigadhitā, parito grhītā

Whatever may be the nice shades of differences between ā which menas ‘from all the sides’ and pari indicating ‘circularity’
or covering on all sides it is definite, that ā and pari are more or less synnoymous and they are used in a collocation, only to intensify the meaning. (Even the commentary of VEŃKATAMĀDHAVA does not add anything beyond ābhimukhyena śarīreṇa miśrītā, aṅgaiśca parito miśrītā.)

The Atharva-veda.

In the Atharvaveda where there is a predominance of magic and sorcery we get many more examples of ‘prefixal variation’. A. V. I. 3 has pra te bhinadmi mehanam while at I. 11 it has vi te bhindmi menanam where the context is almost the same and vi and pra are seen used only stylistically. SĀYANA, at both the places has, only, vi-dārayāmi.

At A. V. I. 25.3 we have śoka and abhiśoka used in the context of takman where SĀYANA explains the former as śarīrasya antah śočakah and the latter as abhitah kṛtṇasya śarīrasya śočakah. WHITNEY has 'heating' for śoka and 'scorching' for 'abhiśoka'.

At A. V. I. 19.1 we find mā no vidan vivyādhino, mā abhivyādhino vidan and SĀYANA comes out with višeṣeṇa astrābhāṣtādānaśīlāḥ śatravaḥ (vivyādhinaḥ) and abhimukha-māgaṭya vidhyanti, hiṁsanti pratyarthīnaḥ sanmniḥiḥ bhaṭāḥ for abhivyādhinaḥ.

It is doubtful whther the prepositions really point out the differences which SĀYANA has suggested.

At A. V. III.25.7. upohāśca samūhaśca. He distinguishes two differfnt deities with specific functions. upa samīpaṁ ūhati, prāpayati dhānyādikam iti upoḥaḥ, etatsamjñako devāh, samūhaḥ prāptaṁ dhanam samūhati, abhhivardhayati, iti samūhaḥ.

At A. V. IV.20.1. where we have ā paśyati, prati-
paśyati, para paśyati, paśyati addressed to the Ābhimāṇinī divinity of the Sadaṃpuṣpā oṣhadhi, SĀYANA merely relies on the dictionary meanings of these prefixes and supplies us with ā paśyati āgāmi bhayakāraṇam, pratimukham sthitam vartamānam api bhaya-kāraṇam (pratipaśyati), parāgataṁ dūrasthamapi bhayakāraṇam (para paśyati) and aviṣeṣena sarvamapi bhayakāraṇam (paśyati).

The instances can be multiplied to a large extent for we have

(a) ādānena, samdānena VI. 104.1.

(b) āligī ca viligī ca V. 13.7.

(c) ātodināu, nitodināu atho samtodināu uta. VI. 95.3.

(d) Stylistically we have a ‘speaking in full’ in ito jaya ito, vijaya ito, samjaya, jaya, svāhā.

(e) A gradual intensification is seen in nudasva kāma, praṇudasva kāma IX.2.4 which is stylistically on par with the Pali mā 'ham nassam, mā 'ham vinassam. (see above)

(f) At XII. 5.62 we have a veritable lesson in the prefixal variation in the form vrśca, pra vrśca, sam vrśca / daha, pra-daha, samdaha (Trans. Cut thou, cut off, cut up; burn thou, burn off, burn up).

The Yajur-Veda:

Coming to the Y. V. The Vājajaneyi-Samhitā gives us the following:

(1) namo vañcate, parivañcate. XVI. 21.

(2) āyāsāya svāhā, prāyāsāya svāhā, samyā sāya
svāha, viyāsāya svāhā, udyāsāya svāhā.

The Taittiriya Samhitā gives us the following:

(1) mā chandah, pramā chandah, pratimā chandah. MĀDHAVĀCĀRYA has only he iṣṭake tvam macchandorupā 'si, evam sarvatra yojyam. KEITH rightly observes (The Veda of the Black Yajus School, p. 331. f. n. 5.) ‘The other names are fanciful where there meaning is not plain.’

(2) At IV. 4.1 pravṛdasi, samvṛdasi, vivṛdasi and samroh' si, nīroho' si, praroho' si, anuroho' si, roho' si which MĀDHAVĀCĀRYA tries to distinguish on embroyological grounds such as garbhāśayavyāpnhī nīrohah, śārīrakah pariṇāmaḥ, putrādirūpeṇa prādurbhāvaḥ anurohah, etc.

The distinctions based on the various prefixes do not seem to be warranted. All that is to be found here is only ‘la varitation prefixal’.

3) At IV. 4.3. we get vibhūmatīm, prabhūmatīm, pari-bhūmatīm.

4) At V. 7.4. we have dhātā, vidhātā which VĀSKA and DURGA explain as synonyms. (supra. p. 55.)

5) At VII. 3.20 we get a very queer śiṣṭāya svāhā, atiśiṣṭāya svāhā. On this KEITH (ibid. p. 599 f. n. 2) observes. “The explanations of the comm. are useless for the fact is that all sorts of prefixes are used with the one idea.”

6) At VII 3.20 again we have riktiya svāhā, (ariktiya sāvhā,) prariktiya svāhā, samraktiya svāhā, udriktiya svāhā. It is unnecessary to remark that here too all the prepositions are brought into a play with a two fold consideration.

a) Emphasis and b) All-inclusion.
7) At VII. 4.22 we get *yuktāya svāhā, āyuktāya svāhā, suyuktāya svāhā, udyuktāya svāhā; vimuktāya svāhā, pramuktāya svāhā; vañcate svāhā, parivañcate, samvañcate, anuvañcate, udvañcate, etc.*

About *udyukta* etc. KEITH remarks (ibid. f.n.8) ‘*udyuktāya* is practically synonymous with *āyuktaya*’. indeed he translates both as ‘To the unyoked hail !’.

8) There are many more such examples as VII 5.11. *varsate svāhā, abhivarsate ...., parivarşate...., samvarşate...., anuvṛşate....* etc.

**The Sāmaveda**

The Sāmaveda gives only a few examples.

1) *Arcata, prārcatā narah* I. V. 8.3, which is merely a case of gradual intensification and MĀDHAVA rightly explains it as *arcata pūjayata, prārcata ca prakarṣena arcata.*

2) At VI. 7.11 we get *Aṅjate, vyaṅjate, samaṅjate* which though are only stylistic variations, are explained by the commentators semantically, of course, only, with the help of the usual devices. MĀDHAVA has *vyaṅjate* as *vividham anjate* and *samaṅjate* as *samyak aṅjate*. BHARATASVĀMIN gives *aṅjate as madhunā aṅjate* and *samaṅjate as dadhyādibhihi saha cāṅjate.*

The Sāmaveda, however, is more useful in illustrating how even when the prefixes are not used they are implied in the expressions and how a different prefix is used to convey the meaning usually conveyed by a regular prefix. It is all the more gratifying that the commentators on the S. V. have noted these facts in very clear words. The examples are

a) S. V. I. 3.5. *Agne yuṅkśva hi.....MĀDHAVA says*
'śuddho' pyayaṁ yunjih, nipūrvārthe draṣṭavyah, niyuṅkśva.

Again the 'Yoga' in the S. V. II. 7.9 he explains as niyoga.

b) On udīrate in S. V. I. 9.5 MĀDHAVA says 'uda iti eṣa saṁ ityetasya sthāne, saṁīrate.

c) Explaining upa yāhi in S. V. II. 6.6 he says 'upa iti ayaṁ upasargaḥ, ā ityetasya sthāne draṣṭavyah'.

Again explaining the ā viśantu in S. V. III. 1.4 he says ā ityeṣa, pra-ityetasya sthāne, praviśantu.

The distinction between usual and unusual prefixes is certainly relative but that such a distinction can be made is definite.

The Brāhmaṇa-s:

In the Brāhmaṇa literature we meet with such examples as varam dadāmi jityā (jityai), abhijityai, vijityai, samjityai. Ait. Bra. (Adhyāya. 37)

SĀYANA strives hard to deduce different meanings from these terms on the basis of the usual prepositional modifications. jitirjayamatram, abhitah sarveṣu devesu jitirabhijitiḥ, prabala-durbala-śatruṇāṁ tāratamyena vividho jayo, vijitiḥ, punah śatrutva-raḥityāya saṁyak jayah samjitiḥ.

KEITH in his translation (Ṛgveda Brāhmaṇaś, 1920 P. 326) merely supplies the synonyms.

'A boon I give you for conquest, for victory, for winning for success.' It is needless to remark that no material distinction seems to be intended in these terms and the prepositional variation in all probability is merely a very-petition i.e. a kind of repetition which BUDDHAGHOSA describes as upasaggavasena vibhatti-gamanam (supra p. 54.). It is gratifying to note that some such aesthetic and stylistic principle is enunciated by Ait. Bra.
itself, in a different context, and which, it chooses to call, as punarāvrutta and punarnirṛta i.e. Repetition and alliteration, both of which are found in Jiti, abhijiti, vijiti and samjiti. The same thing on a small scale we observe in Ārṣeya Bra. I. 1.5 as abhinanditaḥ pratinanditaḥ (mānītaḥ pūjitaḥ...). The prepositions abhi and prati are even according to the dictionary, are synonyms. It is notable, so many times, as for example, Udāna- Pali (p. 113) abhinandito paṭinandito, mānito, pūjito, apacito... etc.\(^3\)

As an unusual usage of the prefix can be quoted Śatapatha Bra. XI. 5.1.11 which uses hiranyavimitāni for the usual hiranyanirmitāni\(^4\) The antecedent of this can be traced to the R.V. yajnasya mātrā vimitāni utvah (X. 71.11)

**The Upaniṣad-s :**

Turning, now, to the last phase of the Vedic literature, namely the Upaniṣad-s, we read the following in the Ait. Up. V.2. saṃjñānam, ājñānam, vijñānam, prajñānam ....sarvānyetāni prajñānasya nāmadheyāni bhavnti. The Upaniṣad clearly says that inspite of the employment of these varied prefixes, the meaning of the expressions remains the same.

The ādea in Ādityo Brahmyādeśaḥ from Cha. Up. III. 19.19.1 is rightly interpreted by Ratnaprabhā on Brahma-Sūtra I. 1.4 as Upaśaḥ and Atmānameva lokamupāsita (Brh. Up. I. 4.15) as lokām jñānasvarūpaṁ. There is no doubt that the Upaniṣad means by loka only ā-loka (i.e. light and therefore knowledge.)

**Grammatical Tradition :**

The Grammatical literature, betrays, some unusual usages of the prefixes and we find the term prasāraṇa used for the normal Samprasāna (p. I. 4.4 Vārtt. 6) raki ṣyaḥ prasāraṇam. The Mahābhāṣya-Dipikā of BHARTRHARI ed. LIMAYE and
ABHYANKAR, p. 111) has also *prasārana* for *samprasārana*. The Mahābhāṣya of PATAÑJALI preserves two queer usages of *pra* namely *prācārya* and *prāntevasīn* which stand for the 'retired teacher' and 'Old Boy' respectively (vide-Bhāṣya on Pāṇ. II. 2.18 and I. 416). It will be shown below (infra p. 71.) how the privative usage of *pra* has a wider currency in the literature.

**The Classical Sanskrit Literature**

The Classical Sanskrit offers many examples.

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa has *pratapatra* for *ātapatra* (= umbrella) in X. 35.13. *chāyāyā ca vidadhat pratapatram; pralambha* for *vipralambha* (18.13) *vismaya* for *smaya* (17.31 and 25.17) where *vi* is only pleonistic. Mark also Svapnavāsavadattām I. 3. c. *bhāgyaiśchalair vismitaḥ*.

The classical Sanskrit seems to use the prefix *ud* also in a privative sense so that in the Mahābhārata *Udyoga* at times seems to stand for *viyoga* or departure.⁶ (See A. COOMERSWAMY. Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies Vol. IV. p. 134). The Dhammapada has *uyyogamukhe ca tiṭṭhasi, pātheyyampi ca te na vijjati* (verse 257 cd). The 'severance' sense of *udyoga* can be traced to Śatapatha Br. IV. 1.5.7.1.

To quote a few examples from poetry, KĀLIDĀSA used the expression *samnatagātri* in Kumāra. V. 30 and *avenataūgi* in V. 86. It seems, therefore, that *nata, avanata* and *samnata* were used in the same sense. The Kośa quoted by MALLINĀTHA under V. 39 runs as *ṇatam ca samnataṃ*. The farce Bhagavadajjukīya (Ed. ANNUIAN ACHAN, 1925) uses *vidrava* in the sense of *upadrava* in verse 35.

*asmin kṣane bahuvidhaiḥ khalu vidravaiasco /
ksiṃram kṛtā yamapurābhimukhāśca jīvāḥ //*
The commentary explains *vidravaiḥ* as *upadravaiḥ*. The Mudrārākṣasa IV. 12 cd has probably *abhicaraṇa* used for *aticaraṇa* in

\[ Kauṭilyah kopano’pi svayamabhicaraṇe jñātaduḥkhah pratijñāṁ daivāttirṇapratijñāḥ punarapi na karotāya yatiglānibhitah // \]

With this short survey, of the Vedic and the Classical Sanskrit Literature, we are now, in a position to tabulate the Sanskrit prefixes under two main heads:

1) **STYLISTIC or IDIOMATIC.**

2) **SEMANTIC,** under which shall be noted only the abnormal or unusual usages.

Under the Stylistic major caption, we can have, three subheadings, as,

a) **GRADUAL INTENSIFICATION** as in *nudasva kāma,* *praṇudasva kāma*

b) **IDIOMATIC Usage** as in

*vi te bhinadmi mehanam* and

*pri te bhinadmi mehanam* (supra pp. 58.)

When the prefixes are used idiomatically it matters little which one is of made use of

c) **PLEONISTIC,** as stated in Pāṇini’s aphorism *adhiparī anarthakau.* These and some others are specially noted by the grammar but in the literature we can have so many, why, almost all the *upasarga*-s are used at some places at least, pleonistically. They do not bring any marked change in the meaning. In the epics we so may times come across *Prabravīti* and *sambhāsate* which the commentaries merely paraphrase as *bravīti* and *bhāsate.* KSEMENDRA in his Aucityavicāra-carcā (Karika 24 ff) observes that the proper usage of the prepositions
enhances the beauty of the speech but the superabundance of these mars the propriety. He finds fault with the KUMĀRADĀSA'S `varatanu, sampravadanti kukkuṭāh' and remarks tatra sampropa-sargausūnyaśabd-pūraṇamātreṇa nirarthakatvādanucitameva.

d) FURNISHING THE FAMILIAR UPASARGA-S.

As against the above, we, sometimes find, the commentators adding in their glosses the upasarga-s to nouns, verbs and adjectives, just to make them read in a more usual way, thereby facilitating an easy understanding. So, we find, ŠAMKARA on B. G. II. 22 navāni grāhāti naro’parāni adding abhinavāni and explaining yukta in II. 26 as abhiyukta. We can also supply upasarga-s to some words to bring them to their familiar forms.

i) kāmakrodhodbhavāṁ vegaṁ ( = āvegam) B. G. V. 23 c.
ii) devatāṁ yogameva ca (viniyoga or the later upayoga)8
iii) The Śvet. Up. II. 8. Brahmodupena pratareta vidvān, NĀRĀYANA explains as uttaret (pratarana and uttarana as the epithets of Rudra occur in Vāj. Saṁ. XVI : 41 where SĀYANA and BHĀSKARA explain these with the usual dictionary meanings of the prefixes.).

(iv) The word nyāsa is also used so many times for samnyāsa not only because the B. G. says kāmyānām karmanām nyāsam samnyāsam kavayo viduḥ but because the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka uses the bare nyāsa to express the meaning of samnyāsa (vide-nyāsa eva atyarecatat X. 62 quoted by ŠRĪDHARA in his comm. on B. G. VI. 2). We have evaṁ vasan grhe kālam virakto nyāsamāsthitaḥ Bhāgavata Purāṇa 9.6153. ŚAṄKARA has a special linguistic observation on samnyāsa. He says sampūrvako nyāsaśabdah iha tyāgārtho, na nikśepārthah. (nidhāya in Skt. and Pali also seems to have undergone an analogous development for
Pali also seems to have undergone an analogous development for it also means not only ‘putting down’ but abandoning. See Dhammapada *nidhāya daṇḍam bhūtesu* Verse. 405)

**Prefixal Bandhutā**

Sometimes, two or more upasarga-s, might be given some quasi-magical, quasi-symbolical significance. This seems to be the idea in the Ait. Br. when it marks *pra* and *abhi* as equivalents. *(equus + valere* i.e. of equal potency or value). So on the sixth day (*śaṣṭhe’ hani*) while reciting the Āśvina-śastram the mantra-s containing either *pra* or *abhi* should be used, for ‘whatever is *pra* the same is *abhi*’ (*yadvāva preti tadabhīti*).

The style has a necessary reference to the period for it goes on changing from time to time. In this limited sense we can speak of earlier and later usages of the upasarga-s. To demonstrate a few:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Older Usage</th>
<th>Relatively Modern Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Viṣaya</em> (as in <em>viṣayo, viṣayaścaiva</em>)</td>
<td><em>Saṃśaya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viniyoga</td>
<td><em>Upayoga</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nyāsa</em></td>
<td><em>Saṃnyāsa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sandeha</em></td>
<td><em>deha</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Three observations On the Stylistic Usage:**

1) In Pali, we find, the upasarga-s used separately as well as jointly as for example, *kampati, saṃkampati, sampakampati* (D. II. p. 12). Here the last is merely the summing up of the first two. But the Sanskrit will choose to use the prefixes either separately or jointly but not both together. So we may have either *prasarati*, and *saṃsaratī* separately in a collocation or we may have *samprasarati*. So we find VARDHAMĀNA (vide- Kātantra-
vistara) pointing out that the maximum number that can be used with a single verb is generally not more than five.

\[ \text{ā pañcabhyah prayujyante prāyenaite prayoktrbhiḥ.} \]

He illustrates this as -

\[ \text{āharati; vyāharati; abhivyāharati; samabhivyāharati; prasamabhivyāharati.} \]

VARDHAMĀNA is perhaps not aware of the fact that the Pali and Sanskrit Buddhist works actually have such progressive series of prefixal additions.

The Lalitavistara (V. 1.5.2) has, for example

(a) \text{acalat, prācalat, samprācalat.}

(b) \text{akṣubhyat, prākṣubhyat, samprākṣubhyat.}

(c) \text{araṇat, praraṇat, sampraraṇat.....}

Where we have almost a figure V (=verb), pra-V, Sampra-V as we have in A. V. XII. 5.62 V, pra-V, saṁ-V.

2) The Substitution in the Prefixes

The paraphrasing of the prefixes is governed by some aesthetic principles bearing on music, acoustic, cadence, balance etc. which it is not always easy to analyse. ŚĀMKARA, for example, paraphrases \text{vihāya B. G. II 22.) by Parityajya.} Now, this is not merely a matter of putting synonyms for synonyms in a given context. ŚĀMKARA could have retained the original prefix only substituting the verbal form with its synonym. But he did not give vityjya but thought of Parityajya presumably because with \text{tyaj-, pari} suits well musically, as with \text{hā-, vi} suits well.\text{11} The same principle is discernible in the Sanskrit versions of the Pali orginals. The Sn. verse 521 \text{ninhāya sabbapāpakāni......} appears in Mvu. III. 397.3-6 as \text{visnāpiya sarvapāpakāni.} Certainly \text{visnāpiya} sounds
better than niṣṇāpiya while ni with niḥāya is alright.

3) **Combinatory Development in the Prefixes**

Sometimes by re-arranging some prefixes a new pattern is created as for example saṃpra is a most frequent combination in Pali. We have thousands of such forms as saṃpayoga, sampavañka, saṃpakaṁpa and so on.

Some prefixes like pra and saṁ may have some special aptitude to be united with the verbal forms in a qualified samavāya relation and therefore generally we have samṛddha and not ṭṛddha, samparka and not merely park. This explains, why, the kośa-s and the Dhatupatha-s, give us sometimes, the compounded verbs. The upasarga-s in these cases are almost indivisibaly united with the verbal forms so much so that they stand in need of the same or the same type of upasarga-s to get their meanings intensified. Such is the case of the susvāgatāṁ in Marathi where svāgata is not understood as already containing the prefix su and, therefore, another su is added to it to form su-svāgata in the sense ‘abundant’ or ‘profusion’ of ‘welcome’.

**Semantic Aspect**

(1) **The peculiar Usage.**

The word Pradhāna (Padhāna in Pali = meditation) is a striking case of an irregular usage of the prefixes. The pa is here used idiomatically for the normal sam + ā and the pradhāna is actually used for saṃādhāna or saṃādhi (= meditation). Pradhāna is equipoise. I think, this itself, explains why the Sāmkhya-s have two distinct words Pradhāna and Prakṛti for the primordial matter. Pradhāna stands for the static and equilibriatory aspect (satvarajastamasām sāmyāvasthā) while prakṛti stands for the
dynamic and creative aspect (*prakaroti* prakṛtiḥ) of the primordial matter. It is important to note that E. H. JOHNSTON (Early Sāmkhya, 1937, p. 26) specially points out that ‘Pradhāna is a regular term used by YS., and also in the two Upaniṣad-s which specifically teach yoga, the Śvet. Up. and the Maitrī’. It is otherwise difficult to interpret the term pradhāna standing for the primordial matter in the Sāmkhya.

(2) **Equivalency due to fluctuations of sounds.**

This is a historical phonetic aspect. The sounds va and pa are interchangeable and, therefore, we have a pair ava : apa
e.g. avamāṇa : apamāṇa
   avagati : apagati
   avadāṇa : apadāṇa.

Evan the Amarakośa gives apadāṇa as an equivalent form of avadāṇa. The dialectical variations in the usages of the prefixes are to be seen in the abhi : adhi : ati.

The Pali represents the Vedic abhi by adhi and ati and sometimes even by anu. So we get

   adhibrahmā : abhibrahmā
   adhivacana : ativacana : abhivacana
   muddhāvasitto for mūrdhābhīṣiktō.

Since all these prefixes share more or less the same meaning they are psychologically easily fused and confused. Some Sanskrit compounds may be atinava, abhitapta (say as in abhitaptamayo’pi mārdavam bhajate. Raghu. VIII. 43) only atitapta, abhirāma : atirāma (= exceedingly delightful); abhicāra in vyabhicāra may also be aticāra (i.e. transgressing the limits of the proper conduct) although in the A. V. it might have the sense
'intentional act' (abhi + cāra). A Dhātusāṅgraha, as quoted only in the Mālatimādhava-ṭīkā, reads abhisandhir vañcanārthaḥ which must only be atisandhi. GODE and KARVE record in their dictionary (s.v. abhisandhi) the variant ‘parābhisandhānamadhiyate yaiḥ’ (Śākuntala V. 25) which definitely stands for atisandhi.

In Prakrit-s, two or more Sanskrit upasarga-s, assume the same phonetic form. The difficulty arises in restoring in Sanskrit such ambiguous upasarga-s. This I think has happened with the Pali word palibodho (= impediment, obstacle). The derivation is a problem. ANDERSON (P. T. S. D. s.v. Paḷībodha) comes nearest the original but misses it narrowly. He constructs it as paribandha but which in reality is pratibandha, for both pari and prati turn into Pali as pali or pali. In Amg. we have padibandha.12

When the stylistic prepositional very-petition is not properly understood it gives rise to all sorts of jumbles. This, I believe, has happened with the first mantra of the Kena Up viz. ‘keneṣitatam patati, preṣitam manah’ ŚĀṆKARA and RĀMĀNUJA construe it as kena preṣitam manah iṣitaṃ patati i.e. sent forth by whose wish does the mind reach (its desired object ?). ŚĀṆKARA has an elaborate discussion on this justifying and explaining the form iṣita which he takes for iṣṭa. ‘Iṣitaṃ in the text is to be understood as derived from the same root with its third meaning of ‘desire’. Idāgama, (i.e. intermediate augment) is an instance of Vedic sanction (idāgamaḥ chāṇdasaḥ)’. Really speaking the desire of Parameśvara has no relevance in the context. It is only a stylistic kena iṣitaḥ, kena preṣtaḥ to complete which, we can even supply, kena sampreṣitam.13 YĀŚKĀČĀRYA’S favourite upekṣitavyam is also an instance of the archaic sense of the prefix upa. In the later usage upekṣā means ‘neglect’ or ‘paying no heed to’. YĀŚKA uses it in its original sense of ‘examining
VĀMĀNA supplies us with a fine example in his Kāvyālaṁkārasūtra, (1.11). Ṛūḍhichyutamanyārthāṁ ‘ye prasma-ranti priyasaṁgamānāṁ’. atra prasmaratirvismaraṇārthāḥ prakṛṣṭasmarāṇa iti.

This is very instructive to those who are too much addicted to the dictionary meanings of the prefixes. VĀMĀNA warns us. prasmarati in the then language meant ‘forgetting’ and not ‘remembering vividly or intensly’ although this meaning can also be derived analytically from pra+smr-. The same ‘severing’ or ‘privative’ meaning of pra, is exemplified by VARDHAMĀNA with the illustrations pravasati and prasmarati. Śākaṭāyanīya-Dhātupāṭha goes even further and points out that pra-pūrayati also means ‘emptying’ but the Mṛcchakaṭṭika uses it in the exactly opposite sense of ‘filling completely’ (kāmścit tucchayati, prapūryati ca....X.60a).

The proper understanding of the unusual usages of the Sanskrit prefixes would have saved a lot of labour the scholars have put in, determining, the exact shades of some pairs of words such as prāṇa, and apāna, jñāna and viṣṇāna and so on. The Sanskrit literature has used the prefixes at different periods in different senses and sometimes in diametrically opposite senses. It will be unhistorical, therefore, to try to insist on determinate senses of such words. In the case of prāṇa and apāna scholars like BÖHTLINGK and others affirm that prāṇa and apāna originally meant inbreathing and out-breathing respectively. On the other hand, scholars like DEUSSEN insist that originally prāṇa meant out-breathing and apāna inbreathing respectively. There is the same problem with the Pali words ānāpāna and even assāsapassāsa (Sk. āśvās-prāśvāsa). The Paṭīsambhidāmagga (vol. I. p. 172)
explains ānamū tī assāso, na passāso, apānamū tī passāso, na assāso. BUDDHA-GHOSA explains these terms exactly reversely, but takes care of mentioning the Vinaya tradition Assāso’ti bahinikkhamanavāto, passāso’ti antopavisanavāto’ti Vinyaṭṭhakathāyam vuttām, Suttanta’ṭhakathāsu pana uppaṭipāṭiyā āgatām). G. W. BROWN wrote a special article on ‘Prāṇa and Apāna’ (JAOS vol. 39, p. 104 ff.). But he did not make any mention of Pali tradition or the opposite meanings of pra which would have clarified much of the position.

EDGERTON wrote an article on ‘jñāna and Viññāna’ (WINTERNITZ Comm. Vol. p. 217 ff.). But he too was bent on pointing out exact differences in the usage of the two words as if the words are consistently used in these senses in all places. We have seen (supra, p. 63.) that the Ait. up. uses jñāna and viññāna in the same sense. In the Pali context SHWE ZAN AUNG writes (see Compendium, p. 234.) ‘Whatever may be the dictionary meanings of these words, vi in the viññāna, does not connote superiority-meaning of āṇa’. The vi is very often only pleonistic and we get in the A. V. yātudhāna as well as yātuvīdhanā. But because the word kriyākalpa in the Rāmāyaṇa which, Dr. V. RAGHAVAŅ conjectures as, an ancient name of poetics occurs, in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, also in the form kriyāvikalpa Dr. KANE, finds, this a sufficient reason to discard RAGHAVAŅ’s proposition. I have nothing to say about the other reasons brought forward by Dr. KANE to refute RAGHAVAŅ’s suggestion. But what does it matter if kriyākalpa is noted as kriyāvikalpa also? In fact all the three Pāli Aṭṭhakathākāra-s explain the word क्रियाक्रमविक्रमः कवीमुपक्रार्य सरथम्.

A. S. NATARAJA AIYAR wrote a paper on the ‘meaning of Abhipanna in the Arthaśāstra’ and came to the conclusion that it
meant only ‘prapanna’, a doctrine discussed and elaborated in the Yuddhakāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa, (Sargas 17 and 18). Are not prapanna and abhipanna mere prefixal variations?

Now only one illustration from Amg. Uttarājjhayaṇasutta III. 9 reads

\[
\text{sa punvamevaṁ, na labhejja pacchā esovamā (Skt. upamā) sāsayavaiyāṇam} / \text{visiyaī siḍhile āuyammi, kāluvaṇie sarirassa bhee //}
\]

H. JACOBI translates ‘If he does not get (victory over his will) early, he will get it afterwards, such reasoning (= esā upamā) presupposes the eternity of human life. But such a man despairs when his life draws to its close and the dissolution of his body approaches’. On esovamā he gives a special note (p. 19. n.2) ‘Literally translated this is the comparison of those who contend that life is eternal. The commentator gives a forced interpretation of the first part of the verse to bring about ‘a comparison’. But the meaning ‘comparison’ will not suit the context. The word must here mean ‘conclusion, reasoning.’ H. JACOBI is fully justified for here the word upamā does not stand for comparison but carries the sense of anumāna i.e. reasoning or conclusion. There is no doubt that the two means of knowledge namely upamā (na) and anumā (na) exist. Normally they are quite different but there is no guarantee that the literature will use these in strict conformity with the phrasiology. A. V. IX. 3.1 uses upa, prati and pari in much the same sense.

\[\text{Upamitam, pratimitamatho parimitam uta. Even the RV. I. 37.7 brings pratimāna much near the upamāna (vṛṣṇo vaddhriḥ pratimānam bubhūṣan): SĀYĀNA actually renders pratimānam with sāḍṛṣyaṁ bubhūṣan.}\]
Finally, I present my interpretation of the ideal of *lokasaṃgraha* as set forth in B. G. The word and the concept to me are deceptively simple. S. RADHAKRISNAN makes it stand for the ‘world maintenance, inter-connectedness of the society’ or the ‘unity of the world’. To many, it appears, as a proper and fruitful organisation of the people. It is noteworthy, that ŚĀṅKARA gives a negatively worded (though positively signified) explanation of the term saying *Lokasya unmaṅgapravṛtti-nivāraṇam* (III. 20). NĪLAKANTIṢHA says ‘*lokasya saṃgrahaḥ, svadharme pravartanaṃ*’ and MADHUSŪDANA and ŚRĪDHARA merely paraphrase ŚĀṅKARA’s explanation. RĀMĀNUJA explains it as *śiṣṭaḥ lokarakṣapārtham svācāreṇa śiṣṭalokānāṃ dharmaniścayam cikīrṣuḥ*. The following points need notice:

1. No commentator explains the idea clearly through the word. No one analyses *saṃgraha*; not even the usual *saṃgrāṅhātī’ti saṃgrahaḥ, pacādyac*, etc. is offered.

2. The word saṅgaha in Pali has such special meanings as a kind disposition, kindliness, sympathy, friendliness, favour, etc. s.v. P. T. S. D. *saṅgaha*). The word *janasaṅgaha* occurs in Pali in Mahāvaṃsa, XVI. 1. ‘where it means, as the commentator explains it ‘conferring grace on the people’ which makes it stand for *lokānugraha*, Mahāvaṃsa is a late book but it had before it a linguistic tradition which interpreted *saṃgraha* as *anugraha*.

3. Now if we look again into the commentaries on B. G. we find many commentators paraphrasing *saṃgraha* by *anugraha*.

So

(a) NīLAKANTIṢHA- *Parānugrāhārtham* (B. G. III. 25)

(b) ĀNANDAGIRI- *Parānugrāhārtham pravṛttiḥ iśvarasya ityuktam samprati lokasaṃgrahāya karma kurvāṇasya.*
(B. G. III. 25). Perhaps he had before him the Yogabhasya on YS. I. 25. \textit{tasya} ( = \textit{iśvarasya}) \textit{ātmānu-grahābhāve’pi bhūtānugraha-prayojanam}.

(c) ŚĀMKAARA at three different places distinctly uses the word anugraha while referring to the \textit{lokasaṃgraha}. In the \textit{Upodgāta} he has \textit{lōkānusamgrahām kurvan} and \textit{svapryojanābhāve’pi bhūtānujīghṛkṣayā}. Introducing II. 25. he says \textit{ātmanāḥ kartavyābhāve’pi parānugraha eva kartavyāḥ} and commenting on II. 24. he says \textit{prajānām anugrahāya pravṛttāḥ}.

The \textit{anugraha} meaning of the \textit{saṃgraha} fits well in the other contexts in epics where the word occurs. So in the Rāmaṇya I.6.1. \textit{tasyāṁ puryāṁ Ayodhyāyāṁ vedavit sarvasaṃgrahāḥ}. In the Mahābhārata we meet with the following :

(1) \textit{Ṛṣayo hyapi nirmuktāḥ pasyanto lokasaṃgrahām, sukhaṁbhavanti sukhistathā duḥkhena duḥkhitaḥ.}

(2) \textit{Āmnāyavacanām lokasaṃgrahāḥ}

(3) \textit{Śrṇu, rājan, yathā daṇḍāḥ saṁbhūto lokasaṃgrahāḥ}

(4) \textit{nigrahaṇa ca pāpāṇāṁ, sādhūnāṁ saṃgrhaṇa ca} (Śāntiparva 97.3) where \textit{saṃgraha} in contradistinction with \textit{nigraha} definitely means \textit{anugraha} and not merely ‘gathering together.’ The Paṅcadaśī also alluding to the \textit{lokasaṃgraha} ideal in B. G. uses the word \textit{lokānugraha}.

\textit{Athavā kṛtakṛtyo’pi, lokānugrahakāmyayā / śāstriyenaiva mārgena varte’ham, kā inama kṣatiḥ //} (trpti. 268)

We can even refer to Raghu. X. 31 where KĀLIDĀSA is echoing the B. G. verse \textit{nānavāptamavāptavyām}, etc. in the con-
text of the *lokasamgraha*. KĀLIDĀSA is clearly paraphrasing *samgraha* by *anugraha*:

\[
anavāptamavāptavyam na te kiñcana vidyate /
\]

\[
lokānugraha evaiko, hetuste janmakarmanī //
\]

**The Earlier Noteworthy Contribution**

There are two good monographs on upasarga-s. The first by KSHITISH CHANDRA CHATTERJI discussing the word *Upasarga* and the meanings of the various Upasarga-s mostly in the light of the Nirukta. This is very useful in understanding the specific functions of the upasarga-s.

The second is by BETTY HEIMANN 'Prefixes in Sanskrit philosophical terminology',\(^{16}\) where she has given the best of her wisdom on the subject of the upasarga. I, otherwise, a great admirer of her writings, am sorry to say, that here at many places, I, find it difficult, to agree with the learned author.

In a very idealistic manner she has tried to systemize the meanings of the prefixes. But conformity with the prescribed senses of the upasarga-s is not totally observed. Even in the philosophical systems the upasarga-s are not used consistently. Scholars complain that let alone the oher systems even the Nyāya school itself which is bent on the accuracy of expressions uses such important and 'decisive' words as *anuyogi* and *pratiyogi* interchangeably.

BETTY HEIMANN says (p.5-6) that the study of the prefixes "will throw into relief the epistemological ambiguity and supralogical elastic characteristic of the indian thought". True! But the ambiguity and elasticity are still not removed even by using prefixes.. for, the prefixes themselves are elastic and ambiguous. The literature does not use *anumāna* and *upamāna* in
specific senses and so yoga and viyoga, pradhāna and samādhi. She is happy to find (p.18) the specific functions of the prefixes sam and vi so that Samjñāna in Vedānta should mean supra-empirical (sam) union and vijñāna empirical dissection into pluralities. But the Ait. up. defiantly says samjñāna, ājñāna, prajñāna, vijñāna are all the names of prajñāna. She, welcomes, the prepositional specifications with regard to life-winds viz. prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna and, samāna. But our earlier discussion has shown that in literature these words are not used in any strict senses. It is alright that she appreciates the division of the hells (based on different prepositions into atala, sutala, vitala, etc. But, if, on the same lines, any one will seek to find, real differences, in sāmrājya, vairājya, adhirājya, etc. the Vedic Index (S.v. Rājya.) will oppose it by saying that ‘there is no reason to believe that these terms actually refer to essentially different types of kingdoms.’

In fine, I shall say that even the Indian philosophical terminology in matters of the usage of prepositions is also not without anomaly. The safe course, therefore, is always to follow YĀSKA’s maxim, arthanityah parīkṣeta’.

The 'Upasarga' is used in the Yoga tradition to mean 'obstacle' and in medical treatises the upasarga-s are the 'diseases introduced additionally'. The upasarga-s are thus troublesome. In view of the linguistic evidence presented in this chapter I for one, therefore, shall never accept any strait-jackating with the upasarga-s.

It is hoped that the above discussion, will go a long way, to prove, that the upasarga-s are, really, only dyotaka-s and not vācaka-s.
In the studies on Sanskrit prefixes carried on so far, a rather inordinate amount of attention seems to have been paid to the diacritical aspect of Skt. prefixes. Due to this concentration of interest, less close attention has been given to the Stylistic and Unusual usages of Skt. prefixes. It is for this reason alone, that this article will contain only a discussion of these two aspects, which, therefore, should not be construed to mean that the present writer altogether repudiates the view that the upasarga-s have some definite meanings. It will be seen, that after the advent of some Niruktic and grammatical disciplines, the upasarga-s were fairly regularised and were assigned specific functions. But in the Lit. that preceded this stage, the upasarga-s were used, more freely and at some places, at least, and in some literary traditions, the upasarga-s still continue to be used freely even in the post-regulation period. This is all that is meant by 'the unusual usages of the prefixes'. The prefixes are only the signs for expressing (or should we say suggesting?) grammatical relations. But the concepts of these relations are themselves not as clearly definable and distinguishable as the other, more or less, concrete concepts, are. This results, really speaking, in the interchangeability of the prefixes, Now, sometimes this fact itself invites, such comments as the one made by Dr. P. L. Vaidya (F. Y. Selections. p. 139.) 'BHĀRAVI', he remarks 'is rather careless in using appropriate prepositions'. BHĀRAVI has used apadiśya in the place of the usual uddiśya." This made Dr. Vaidya to express himself as above. The Ādiparva of the Mbh. also uses kṣiptam (= insulted) in place of the more usual adhikṣiptam. Even the Oxford Dict. complains (s. v. detaste) that de-test' (de + testari) is misused, at times, for 'attest' (ad + destari) and 'protest' (pro + testari)
For a detailed analysis of the view of BUDDHAGOSA see my paper 'Cognate Synonyms in Pali'. (Proceedings of the First All-India Conference of Linguists, Poona, December 1971. pp. 135-141).

Mark also that the Šatapatha Bra. II. 6.3.14 uses parivartayate as the technical term for 'shaving the head all around the šikhā'. But the Kāṇva recension gives nivartayate. In I.24.7 the adhivṛja is used much in the same sense as pravrja. Read atha purodāśamadhivṛṇakti.......yathā gharmaṁ pravṛjñādevam pravṛṇakti. see Pāli vuttasiro (shaven-headerd PTSD. s.v.).

It will be too much to say that here vi is used to mark the architectural monument and that vimitāṇi stands for vimāna constructions.

Sometimes the short-ending upasarga-s are lengthened either for musical or metrical purposes and so we have pari(I)vāda, pari(I)vāha, prati(I)kāra, prati(I)kāśa, ni(I)kāśa, etc.

The polysemic development of the upasarga-s i.e. one radical meaning developing into many secondary ones is, of course, instrumental in such cases. Thus, originally, pra may stand for 'further' and may further bring in two different shades such as 'departed' as in preta and 'advanced' as in pragata, where ita and gata give practically the same sense. But what a world of difference is there between pragata and preta !.

For nikāśa, saṃkāśa and pratikāśa as synonyma see Amarakośa

Mark the following examples also:

(a) Guruvaranakameva tamaḥ (Sāmkhyakārikā 13) and sūkṣmāḥ mātāpitṛjāḥ saha prabhūtaḥ (Sāmkhyakārikā 39) which MĀTHARA explains as āvaranātmkam.
and *pra ityupasargaḥ ... bhutāni cetyarthah* respectively.

(b) *dhikṛt vvāptirāṇjanam* (Kāvyaprakāśa. II. 19d.)

where *āṇjanam* stands only for *vyāṇjanam*.

9) see *Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra* II. 3.6 *viśaye praśyadarśanāt* which Śabara expains as *sāṃśaye*.

10) Where do we find the abundance of the polyprefixal expressions? Obviously in the Brāhmaṇa Lit. we have *upa-pra-jigyuh* (Śatapatha Bra. XI. 5.1.11), *abhīparovāda* (ibid. XI. 5.1.6), *anuprasasāra* (Jaiminiya Bra. II. 439), *anuprapapāta* (ibid. II. 438). etc.

11) Elsewhere Śaṅkara does not change the upasarga-s which give the synonyms of compounded words. See his commentary on I. i. 9. *apito bhavati, apigato bhavati ityarthah*. I shall, of cours, admit that such a stylistic analysis is bound to be subjective.

12) For *atideśa* (in Pali saṁghātideśa) and *avaśeṣa* (in Pali saṁghavasesa) used as synonyms see Winternitz Comm. Vol. p. 161. In the same volume we have the article of A. K. COOMERSWAMY noting *udgraha* and *atigraha* as synonyms in the Upaniṣad. Read also *jñāna* and *vijñāna* by F. Edgerton. Festschrif Morizwinternitv 1933. pp. 217-220.

13) The word *iṣita* occurs at A. V. IX. 535 and 9 where we find *ŚAYANA* also equating it with *iṣṭa*. But WHITNEY is not misled. He correctly translates it as ‘sent forth by it’ and ‘sent forth by time’ respectively. The stylistic peculiarity is also notable in Taitt. Up. II. 7. *Ko hyanyat, kaḥ prānyat*.

14) Mark also *tanna prasmartavyām* from the Śabarabhāṣya on the Mīmāṃsā-sūtra II. i.i. which is used in the sense of the later *vismartvyām*. 
15) In Pali also the DA. tries to distinguish *sañña* and *viññāna* only with *sañjānananalakkhana* and *vījānanalakkhana*. But see JAYATILAKE. ‘Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge’. p. 435.

16) (J) RAS Monographs vol XXV.

17) A. - Aṭṭhakathā
    Amg. - Ardhamāgadhī.
    Asln. - Aṭṭhasālini.
    A. V. - Atharva-Veda.
    B. G. - Bhagavadgītā
    D. - Dīghanikāya.
    Kumāra.- Kumārasambhava.
    Mvu. - Mahāvyutpatti.
    Nd.l - Mahānīdesa.
    Raghu.- Raghuvāṃśa.
    R. V. - Rgveda.
    S. B. - Sāmkara-bhāṣya.
    Sk./Skt. - Sanskrit.
    S.K. - Siddhāntakaumudi.
    Sn. - Suttanipāta.
    S.V. - Sāmaveda.
    Śvet-Up.- Śvetāsvatara-Upaniṣad.
    Y. S. - Yoga-Sūtra-s.
    Y. V.- Yajur-Veda.
Tatsama, Tadbhava and Desi is the recognised triple division of the vocables in NIA. Tat stands for Sanskrit and, therefore, the Kannada grammarians sometimes alternatively use the forms samskrtasama, and samskrtodbhava. Those words which fall in neither of these two categories are called Desi-words. They are generally taken as non-Sanskrit in the sense non-Aryan and, therefore, belonging to the Dravidian stock (but never to Austro-Asiatic or Tibeto-Burmese). While I, do not have any sort of objection to this three-fold theoretical division of words, in matters practical, I have an observational objection namely our failure to trace the word to its Tatsama class. We without doing much efforts put it into the third category. If only we exert ourselves a little bit, we can possibly go beyond (rather behind) the desi words and can trace them to the first category i.e. Tatsama. Now let us take an instance or two about our inability to go beyond the Desi word and indicate the Sanskrit lying behind it. The instance cited of Desi class is ghotaka, a cognate of Kannada kudure meaning a horse; the Marathi word ghoda (horse) is said to have descended from ghotaka, a Dravidian word while the Aryan-Sanskrit asva (especially Pali assa) being related to English ‘ass’ donkey for equine and assinaine species are extremely close. What I am interested in asserting is to express in an epigram “scratch the so called Desi to get the inner layer of Aryan Sanskrit”.

The word ghotaka when scratched methodically yields ghutraka > hutraka as in śālihotra (a science of horses). Thus ghutraka > ghotaka-ghoḍā. In the same way the Tamil arisi which is said to be the source of English ‘rice’ is originally the Vedic-
Aryan vṛihi. Marathi दाबी (a very small container) has its root in Brahmanical Sanskrit darvi, a particularly shaped big spoon used in Vedic sacrifices. In Mṛcchakaṭiṇa Śakāra himself suggests the viṭa to sit first in his bullock-cart and when the viṭa begins to do that pulls him rudely and asks “is it your father’s cart?” kim te pituh pravahānam? But the Sanskrit chāyā does not have that force which the Prakrit original किं ते बप्पकस्स has. Now बण्ण and बप्पक are considered as Desī forms when actually the fatherly पप्पक is only a ‘sower’ (of semen) in his wife’s womb (पुमान् रेत: सिंचति योषितायाम् Mundaka Upaniṣad). In this imagery the mother becomes the field ‘क्षेत्र’ where the बीज is sown and the father becomes a ‘sower, a cultivater’, a ‘वप्रक’. That is way when being doubtful of his being the क्षेत्रिन or a ‘sower, i.e. ‘farmer’ दुष्कन्त morally hesitates to accept that role in the case of one who was carrying a child in her womb तस्मि कथंमामभिव्यक्तसत्वलक्षणः प्रति क्षेत्रिणमाशुद्धमानः प्रतिपत्स्ये?’ Kannada dana is Vedic Dhana (mostly go-dhana) and when along with cattle later sheep also formed ‘an exchange’ the word धनिण came to mean a shepherd. The Sanskrit Paṇa becomes hana, ‘money’ in Kannada. Instead of the claim that Sanskrit has borrowed many a word from Tamil it can be proved to be exactly otherwise. Basuri, a word in Kannada meaning a pregnant women has its root in भस्रा, a ‘leather bag’ used in the sense of a puffed or swollen ‘uterus’. Uterus is the mark of a woman and the word strī, Pāli itthi are cognates of English ‘uterus’. Saddanīti gives the exact etymology गम्भीरो शीवति एतस्सा पर्यति इत्यथी’. A bit unsolved euphonic Junction in Skt. grammar.

Right from the first Veda, the Rgveda, the Vedic literature has been exhibiting what the Prātiśākhya-s named as anabhihita sandhi where there is elision of a and o after e ending. This is
not always stricly observed. My revered preceptor, the late Dr. A. M. Ghatage in his usual scholarly manner has dealt with this topic in his article in ABORI Vol. XXIX. parts. 1-4. 1948. pp. 1-20) TRACES OF SHORT E and O IN RGVEDA has dealt with this type of sandhi along with a critical survey of what the earlier eminent writers of the status of Whitney, Oldenberg, Wackernagel, Macdonnel, Bloomfield and Franklin Edgerton have theorised about it. He then gives his own opinion, cites illustrations from Vedic literature and says that the tendency is prominently perceptible in the Prakrit literature and still more in the Apabhrāṃśa.

As far as the Sanskrit grammar is concerned only Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya (I.1.1.) has to a certain extent spoken about the value of short vowel e and o. This he did under the comments on the sūtra-s e-o-ā and ai-au-c. Patañjali says that ardha-ekāra and ardha-okāra mean the hṛṣva or short values of this vowel. While I am happy to note that Patañjali and modern writers on Sanskrit grammar from Whitney down to A.M. Ghatage have taken ample notice of the phenomenon I am equaly unhappy that none of them thought it worth his while to search if this was due to the fact of an earliest influence of Dravidian pronunciational character.

The Dravidian languages exhibit not a bārākhaḍī (a group of 12 vowels but a caudākhaḍī i.e. a group of 14 vowels, with the inclusion of short e and short o). In fact I am of the opinion that whenever an uncharacteristic contraction is found in Sanskrit (i.e. Indo-Aryan) grammatical operation, anabhihita sandhi-s it is essential to examine whether it is due to Dravidian pronunciational manner. In other cases of such as the retroflex sounds like l in agnimile instead of ṭḍe, in the nominal forms such as īṁ as in ya īṁ cakāra, na so'sya veda Rgveda (cp. Kannada ī yāra magalī ?
This is whose daughter'? and *idamaḥ iś* (Pāṇ. III.2.3.). So far scholars took note of the fact of there having been a number of loan words in Vedic literature, beginning with the Rgveda. Scholars like Burrow, Emenue, Caldwell wrote on a lot of lexical borrowings from Dravidian into Indo-Aryan. They went to the length of demonstrating that *vṛṣākapi* is a translation-compound of Tamil Āṇ-mandī (Bull-monkey; Marāṭhī Hanumān.) . But somehow the same group of scholars did not attempt demonstrations of Dravidian grammatical influences.

Another point not at all connected with the above discussion is that it is quite urgent to widen the scope of Sanskrit grammatical field of observation and not to keep it confined to Indo-European or Dravidian but to stretch it to sources like Hittaite languages. Perhaps by taking into consideration the fact that 'wind-divinity* (vāta) in Hittaite is *anā* and from this name we can by adding pre-fixes such as *pra*, *apa*, *ud*, *sam* and *vi*, can get the forms Prāṇa, Apāṇa, Udāna, Vyāna and Samāṇa respectively.

When we are on the point of Dravidian-Aryan (Sanskrit) grammars let us discuss in the same strain the matter of *niś* and *tāp* feminine suffixes and their strictly regular usage in Dravidian speeches such as Kannāḍa and their rather promiscuous usage in Sanskrit. Sanskrit feminine of *nāyaka* is *nāyikā*, a *tāp* form while Kannāḍa maintains throughout a *niś*-form, *nāyakī* e.g.: heroine Raṅgānāyakī was the name of a Kannāḍa movie meaning 'Heroine on the stage'. *Kalla* in Kannāḍa is theif and *kalli* a female thief: *gāyaka* is 'a male singer' while *gāyakī* is a female singer. Sanskrit has for a male dancer the word *nartaka* and for the female one *nartakī* is quite right but on the analogy of *nāyikā* some use *nartikā* also. I began to learn Kannāḍa at the age of 58 and was conversant with Sanskrit roots and verbal forms, Pāṇini's *ādeśa*-s.
I looked through the same glass to Kannada verbs. The root *tā* means 'to bring'; it develops further in *taru*. So also *bā* means 'to come'; it too further develops into *baru*. I in Pāṇinian terminology call *taru* as ādeśa-s (cp. gam- gaccha) as also *baru*. In Pāṇinian terminology *tā* and *bā* will be called ārdha-dhatuka-s and *taru* and *baru*, sārvadhātuka-s.

Nirvāṇa and Pāṇ. VIII . 2.50

Roodbergen in his Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar translates *nirvāṇa* in avāte nirvāṇam as 'to blow out' not paying due attention to the fact that the prefix *nir* is in this case used privatively and, therefore, means exactly the opposite i.e. 'ceasing to blow' or 'absence of blowing', Bhagavān Pāṇini, however, has accurately caught the exact implication of *nirvāṇa* as meant by Bhagavān Bhuddha. Katre's rendering of *nirvāṇa* as extinguished is also incorrect. *nirvāṇa* means 'free from wind' much the same as the Bhagavad-gītā's *nivāta* (stho) dīpo (just as a lamp placed in a place free from wind does not flicker, that simile occurs to mind.)
Chapter - Eighth
Observations on Roodbergen’s Recent Book


This is a welcome attempt after the late K.V. Abhyankar’s A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar published by the Oriental Institute of Baroda in 1961. In a way Roodbergen has at places supplemented the earlier work of K.V. Abhyankar thus proving himself as a Vārttikakāra and yet I am sorry to say that neither of these two had the prefection of George Cardona’s Bibliography of Sanskrit Grammar. There are obvious omissions and irregularities. Both the dictionaries failed to mention a work called Kāśikā written by Nandikesvara on the Māheśvara sūtra-s. This work gives the mystical meanings of the Śivasūtra-s which Pāṇini has merely used for framing his pratyāhāra-s. Roodbergen while explaining the term karmadhārya (reckoned as a subvariety of the Tatpuruṣa-compound has drawn attention of the readers to the explanation of the name karmadhāraya by using an abbreviation, the full-form of which I failed to locate in his “Abbreviations used”. I know that in one single issue of ABORI Vol. XXXIII two eminent scholars of the sanskrit grammar (The late doctors K.V.Abhyankar and G.B.Palsule) have presented their masterly articles published in sequence on the name karmadhāraya.

I am not quite satisfied with the scheme of treating karmadhāraya not as an independent compound along with Dvandva and Tatpuruṣa but as a sub-class of the latter mentioned. The Pāṇinians offer justification which is solely technical. They say that the sūtra pertaining to karmadhāraya falls under
the Adhikara-sūtra of Tatpuruṣa, thus making it obligatory for us to treat it as a samāñadhikaraṇa-Tatpuruṣa. nīlāṃ ca tadutpalam ca nilotpalam. But the basic Tatpuruṣa is tasya puruṣah (‘his officer’ which in all probability means ‘an officer of the ruling king’). The clever hero of Kālidāsa-‘s Abhijñānaśākuntalam namely king Duḥṣanta finds the ambiguity handy to mislead Śakuntalā’s two friends Anasūyā and Priyārvadā by a mock clarification saying “अलमस्मानन्यथा संभावत्, राज: परियोढयमिति राजपुरुṣं मामवाग्चछध” (Act one after verse 27.) “Do not take us to be other than what we (actually) are. This (ring) is a property of king, therefore इति know me as a king’s officer (राजः: पुरुषः:).” Even the otherwise most clever king like दु:षन्त is seen fully confused when inadvertently he took his signet ring and offered it to the friends of शकुन्तला who read the king’s name carved on it and came to know about his identity when actually he wanted to keep himself incognito. दु:षन्त tried to play a double entendre meaning for विश्ववदा a पद्धा-तपुरुष and to satisfy his conscience a कर्मधार्य. Roodbergen does not explain whether the Kāśikāvṛtti is really having a joint authorship of Jayāditya and Vāmana, the co-authors or whether it is again a matter of one author completing the incomplete work of the earlier author. The first five chapters of Jayāditya were further completed by Vāman through his Vṛtti on chapters six to eight.

In fact I have grave doubts about the concept of co-authorship in ancient Sanskrit literature. The collaboration where more than one person after discussing, differing and ultimately agreeing to write a treatise either an independent work or a commentarial book was according to me never happened in India. Bāna because of his demise could not complete the story of Kādambarī which his worthy son completed in all humility and with a sense of duty. I do not know the exact case with the
Nāṭyadarpaṇa which is attributed to Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra. Even in modern times when the late professors R.D. Ranade and S.K. Belvalkar wrote their “Creative Period” they must have distributed within themselves the writing of specific chapters and thus also the late doctors S.K. De and Dasgupta in their “History of Classical Sanskrit Literature”. Macdonell and Keith have also not explained whether all the entries of their “Vedic Index” were written by them after mutual consideration and agreement though in the case of “Dravidian Etymological Dictionary” I am sure the late scholars T. Burrow and Emenue must have had a real collaboration.

Roodbergen’s explanation of चिब form also appears to me insufficient. The two essential points he has definitely given viz. सम्पदानकत्विरि and अभूततद्व्राव. What remains to be explained is what is discussed in लघुसद्ध्वेदद्वैखर by नागेश namely whether the original sense of चिब is only metaphorical as in पुत्रीकृत्वोदसौ वृषभव्यजेन (Raghuvarōs. Canto. II. 36) पुत्र इब आचरितः (the इब sense is obviously meant.) but in such other cases of चिब such as केन शुक्लीकृतः: हंसा:, मद्वा: केन चितिता: the forms शुक्लीकृत and चितित give ‘actual’ sense not merely rhetorical. Thus obviously there are these two subdivisions namely 1) metaphorical, and 2) actual but a third ‘interpretation’ (being ‘doubtful’) class also seems to exist. The Śākuntala starts with the opening hunting-scene. The king is chasing a hermitage - deer. He had come very near him and was about to shoot the arrow. Suddenly the speed of his chariot is slowed down. The charioteer explains “oh long-lived one, because this stretch of ground is uneven (humpy, having ups and downs), I have myself curbed the reigns of the horses for a short while ” and he actually uses a चिब “मन्दीकृतो वेगः” which has to be explained as अमन्द: मन्द इब कृतः: . The late prof. R.D.Karmarkar in his
backnotes says this is an actual sense; not metaphorical. I beg to
differ from the great scholar. What I think is that the humble
charioteer is ‘assuring’ the king that only for a short while he has
curbed the speed of the horses by pulling the reins and he is sure
to make up or even more than make up the time-loss and, there¬
fore, here too the sense is only prima-facie ‘actual’ but per se
metaphorical. But I admit such cases are highly subjective and
सहदयसंबंध (which can vary from सहदय to सहदय) is the only crite¬
rion.

But enough! Because I made the above observations I should
not be considered a छिपत्रनाथ (fault-finder). In fact because I know,
and I have met Dr. Roodbergen several times at prof. S.D. Joshi’s
residence that I eagerly went through his recent contribution. The
expectations uppermost in my mind I expressed or rather dared to
express frankly believing that I shall not be misunderstood. As the
learned author has rightly claimed he has decidedly supplied not
a few deficiencies in the earlier four works on much the same
subject and as for me not at all being an authority on Pāṇinian
grammer I too might have done injustice to the learned author
who has put all of us under heavy debt by placing in our hands
his excellent contribution teamed with new findings and supplying
every possible deficiency. I sincerely congratulate the erudite
Pāṇinian Grammarian Dr. J.A.F. Roodbergen.

I shall also in all sincerity request him to present in a
separate book the best of his wisdom on the subject ‘short-comings
in Sanskrit Grammar- a need for a grammatico-Linguistic treatise
for the Sanskritists and his experience with the traditional Sanskrit
expositions. If persons like Roodbergen, George Cardona, Madhav
Deshpande, Ashok Aklujkar, Houben and the like could not do
this much awaited work who else could do it?
Chapter - Ninth
Mādhava’s girl-student, Dr. Madhusudan Mishra and the third re-duplicative conjugation.

My earstwhile student Madhav Deshpande, now a worldwide acknowledged Sanskrit-grammar-scholar began his career by teaching in the Michigen University. His first lecture was delivered before a small group of boys and girls. He asked one of the girls to write on the black-board the spelling of the subject they had chosen for their higher studies. Not knowing the exact significance of the term Sanskrit (Samskrta) the innocent girl wrote ‘Sand-script’. Thus the teaching began. First began acquaintance with Devanāgarī characters, nouns and verbs. Within a period of fortnight they came to discuss pā-pibati (he/she/it drinks). Which gana and pada? asked the teacher. The same person (who wrote sand-script) quickly answered “Parasmaipada, third conjugation.” The teacher said, “Pada is O.K. but the gana is wrong. It is the first gana” The student was not ready to change her opinion. She argued “you told us that the third conjugation is reduplicative, in pibati which originally must have been pipati, don’t you find a reduplication?” For a while the teacher too fumbled but very soon came out successfully by rejoinding that in the case of the roots belonging to the third conjugation, the third person plural is never found in n ending, while in the case of pibati it was pibanti like gacchanti. The student gracefully allowed the teacher to proceed.

All through his grammatical operation Pāṇini made use of a short अ only and when the entire business was concluded ultimately he said अ अ “let the short अ assume its usual long value.”
The foreign students have an advantage over the native ones as most of them are already acquainted with Greek and Latin which for our students is really ‘a Greek and Latin’ (i.e. unintelligible.). Pebbo represents Skt. *pib* “to drink”. The cold-drink houses advertise “Livva little hott, pibba Gold-spott”.

Many distinguished scholars have gone to the extent of opining frankly that for any language its grammarian should be a foreigner rather than a native one. In case of Sanskrit we have Whitney, Wackernagal, Paul Thieme, George Cardona, Klparsky, Roodbergen, Houben, Johansen Bronchoest, and a great Maharashtrian Pāninian scholar they say is of the opinion that Bhagavān Pāṇini too must not have been a totally pure Indian. His name itself suggests that he belonged to a merchant class of Pāṇi-tribe. Pāṇi-s were ancient Phonecions. Paṇa means market value of the commodity; *hana* in Kannad, Āpaṇa is the market or selling place. पणः अस्यास्तीति पणिन् and Pāṇini is अपत्यं पुमान्. His parsimoniousness reflected in his ideal of लाघव is typically ‘a commercial economy’ and his beginning with not the गुण but वृद्धि also suggests a wish for बरक्त. वृद्धिरदैवित्व comes first and then follows अदेदःगुणः.
Philosophers of all ages have been persistently complaining about the inadequate nature of language in expressing some of their more subtle and deeper import. However, language is the only medium of communication they had to use inevitably till very recent times, when a few of them turned to symbols and mathematical signs.

Gautama, the Buddha, must have also experienced the shortcomings of language in explaining his Law (*Dhamma*), which was subtle (*anu*) and difficult to comprehend (*duddasa*). But instead of merely finding faults with the medium, he always chose to exhort his disciples to master the language to the best of their ability so that utmost precision could be attained in explaining the highest and the deepest truths. As would be the case with any worthy philosopher, he valued the ‘sense’ aspect of the language more than the ‘sound’ aspect and people like Sāriputta were also more interested in knowing the ‘meaning’ of his doctrine than the words in which they were clothed. Thus when Assaji told Sāriputta that it would not be possible for him to expound the doctrine in details, Sāriputta urged: “Well, friend, tell little or much; but tell me just the meaning. For it is that which I want to know. Why speak many words?”

Rightly did the author of *Cūlasaddanīti* observe that the Buddha wanted us to rely (*saraṇa*) more on his ‘meaning’ than on his ‘word’.
Atthāṁ hi nātho saraṇaṁ avoca,
na byañjanam, lokavidū mahesi,

Tasmā a-katvā ratimakkharesu,
atthe niveseyya matiṁ mutimā.

The cd. of this verse should not be construed to mean- as his been done unfortunately by R. C. Childers- that ‘therefore, let the wise man hold fast to the meaning and make light of letter’. No! the Buddha would never advise to ‘make light of letter’ for it is the letters which ultimately convey the meaning. As says the Buddha: "If the letters are not propely pronounced, they might create confusion about the meaning". Dunnikkhittehi padabyañjanehi attho'pi dunnīhito hoti." (A. 1.57.). Thus it is not only the meaning of the Buddha but his words also assume equal importance. Indeed the two are inseparable and this is what is hinted at in many places where the Dhamma is described as sāṭtha and sabyaṅjana (i.e. endowed with meanings expressed in words). Whosoever wants to understand the Dhamma adequately must, therefore, be able to comprehend both these aspects, with equal efficiency. Herein lies the origin of the doctrine of Paṭisambhidā-s (Abbr. Patisams). Just as the Vedāṅga-s of the linguistic nature such as Śiksā, Vyākarana and Nirukta had their origin in the necessity of understanding and expounding the Vedas, so also the Paṭisams sprung out of the necessity of knowing and explaining the Buddhavacana. It is, in a sense, a Buddhist counterpart of the Vedāṅga-Vyākarana, which must have been originally not a mere grammar of the later variety but as its name suggests ‘a proper un-doing’ or ‘analysis’, a gramatico-epistemological discipline.

The words which the philosophers have necessarily to use, present many an aspect (‘ākāra’, to use the Pali term). To avoid possible misconception, it is necessary to analyse and decide
which particular aspect of the word is meant in the context. Let us illustrate this with the instance of the word *ghaṭa*. Examine the following four questions to which the answer is *apparently* the same but when analysed reveals four different aspects of the self-same word.

1) “What have you broken?” - “A *ghaṭa*”.
2) “What does the word *kalaśa* mean?” - “A *ghaṭa*”.
3) “What did you say just now?” - “*g-h-a-t-a*.”
4) “What do you understand by this description?” - “A *ghaṭa*”.

The four aspects of the apparently same *ghaṭa* are respectively

1) an object
2) a meaning
3) an expression or sound and
4) a particular knowledge.

This is exactly what the Patisams are. They essentially aim at explaining the word by marking its exact mode which can be at a time any one of the four namely- (1) *dhamma-ākāra*; 2) *attha-ākāra*; 3) *nirutti-ātāra*; and 4) *patibhāna-ākāra*. By pointing out the exact ākāra (aspect) of the word used in the context, Patisms throw into relief the epistemological ambiguity likely to arise by the apparent sameness of the word. With the aid of the Patisambhidaic scheme, we can get at the exact modality of the words. The four Patisams combine linguistic and metalinguistic analysis. *Nirutti* is linguistic; *attha* is metalinguistic (being in the form of an explanation); *dhamma* is non-linguistic and *patibhāna* is of epistemological character, and, therefore, extra-linguistic.

Continuing with the same instance of *ghaṭa* the whole scheme can be briefly explained as follows: There is an object (*dhamma*) which is *ghaṭa* (1); a linguistic expression (*nirutti*) for it which is *ghaṭa* (2); a metalinguistic explanation (*attha*) of it in
the form ghaṭa (3) = ghaṭa (2) or kalaśa and lastly there is also an awareness (paṭibhāna) of it in the form ghaṭa (4).

To put it succinctly, again we may say that the scheme aims at pointing the four aspects of a word jointly as well as separately in some such way as: The knowledge (paṭibhāna) of the meaning (attha) of a word (niruttī) denoting a particular thing (dhamma).

Many an analogue to the scheme can be found in the later Sanskrit grammatical and philosophical books. Thus we read in the Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa about the adhyāsa-bhrama-


The Paramalaghumaṇjūṣa7, quotes Patanjali, the author of Yoga-sūtra-s who said (Yoga-sūtra III.17) that the samketa that a certain word means a certain thing has the nature of adhyāsa for words and their meanings are inseparable. The suggestion of course is that we in our analysis should not fail to mark their different aspects. (Read: "Samketaḥ padārthayoritaretarādhyāsa-rūpaḥ Smṛtyāt-makaḥ. Yo syāt śabdaḥ, so arthaḥ, yo arthaḥ, sa śabdaḥ"). The comm. Jyotsnā further elaborates this as: "Kah śabdaḥ ? ko arthaḥ ? iti dvividhe'pi Šabdārthaviśayake praśne ghaṭa iti śabdaḥ, ghaṭa itiyamartha ityākoṭtaradarśanāt tayoḥ adhyāsaḥ siddheḥ." Perhaps much the same truth is implied in Bhartṛhari’s Vākya. III.3.1 "Jñānam prayoktur-bāhyo’rthaḥ", etc. which means that when words are used we get the following:

(1) Sav-rūpa- "Sound-shape" ( = Nirutti).

(2) Bāhyo arthaḥ- ‘external object’ Here ‘external’ = extra-linguistic ( = dhamma).
(3) **Jñānam**—"The knowledge that a particular meaning is implied" ( = Patibhāna).

In a sense, Bhartṛhari has indirectly (for certainly it was not his purpose) summed up the whole scheme of Paṭīsams in his above kārikā.

Vyāsa also (under Yoga-sūtra : III.17) observes : "Gauriti śabdaḥ, Gaurityarthah, Gauriti jñānam, ya eśām pravibhāgajñāh, sa sarvavid". "One who understands analytically ‘the bull’ as a word’, as a ‘meaning’ and as a ‘knowledge’, is an all knower. This Sanskrit *pravibhāgajñā* in Pali is *pabhinna-paṭīsambhida*.

The knowledge of the four Paṭīsams is supposed to be an essential accompaniment (Milind. p. 18) of an Arhant (nay, co-natal of an Arhant), a fact which speaks of the high regard the original Buddhism had for hermeneutics. Only a few exceptional persons like Ānanda could possess the four Paṭīsams while yet they were only learners (sekkha-s). (Vide. Vibh. A. 383).

It is not difficult to imagine how the knowledge of Paṭīsams must have been keenly felt. In the Nikāya-s. We come across words which have diverse external shapes (‘Nirutti-s’, so to say) such as *appamāṇā cetovimutti, akincanā, suññatā, animitttātā*, etc. A question naturally arises whether these are different things having different expressions or just one and the same thing having different expressions (nirutti-s we might say)? (M.I.297; S. IV.296).

In other words do we have here mere different nirutti-s having the same attha and referring to the same dhamma or different nirutti-s having different attha-s and different dhamma-s? Only a *pabhinnapaṭīsambhida* can answer it properly by saying that there is a sense in which the meaning is identical, the words only being different and *vice versa*. (M.I.297).

This is just one of the many instances where one finds the
philosopher being involved in problems concerning linguistic analysis where in order to clarify the concepts one has also to clarify the words, their meanings and references. Incidentally, it should be noted that it is in the doctrine of Paṭisams that we for the first time in the Indian linguistics find a clear-cut distinction being drawn between the meaning and the reference, a distinction which is supposed to be an achievement of modern linguistics (c.p. “Semantics : a new outline,” F.R. Palmar, Cambridge, 1977, p. 30).

It may also be noted en passant that the Paṭibhānapatisambhid, carries the germs of the later developed principle of pratibhā which forms an integral part of the doctrine of sphoṭa.

The philosophical importance of the doctrine of Paṭisams can be best appreciated if we consider the metaphysical arguments that are advanced on the basis of linguistic usages. Let us assort at least three such different theories:

(i) The Vaiśeṣika doctrine of padārtha rests on reification. We are made to believe that because we have a name (and a significant one) for the concept there, must be a substantial existence corresponding to it. This is why they simply explain padārtha as padasya arthah, Given the Paṭisambhidāic mode of expression, it means that because a certain nirutti has a certain attha, it must have a certain dhamma corresponding to it.

(ii) Secondly, there are arguments of the Positivists who wish to show that nothing can be attached to the concept of ātman or self and, therefore, the concept should be dispensed with.

(iii) Thirdly, we have later exponents like Nāgasena, the
Philosopher in the Milindapañha, who gave a negativistic interpretation of the Buddha's silence over the existence of soul and asserted that all the terms in the language supposedly denoting the self are only empty terms, that when analysed they lead us nowhere and, therefore, there is nothing like a puggala or a vedagū. This if stated in Patismaiic terms, would assume some such form as "the nirutti-s puggala or vedagū have little attha corresponding to them and, therefore, have no connection with any dhamma."

In order to dispense a possible misconception, it should be made clear that I do not mean that the Patismaiic terminology has been actually used in such arguments. What I only mean to say is that the principle underlying the scheme is implicit in these arguments. This is just as one may say that even without applying the rasa-terminology\(^9\) in the aesthetic analysis of English poems, one actually gets the results which are virtually the same for, therein also the critic speaks of 'sustained emotion', 'passing phases' and 'circumstances' or 'surroundings' which almost stand for sthāyi-bhāva, vyabhicāri and vibhāva, respectively.

Corresponding to the two cardinal units of the language, namely attha and byañjana, the earliest form of the Patismams appears to have been binary, consisting of attha and nirutti aspects only. The inclusion of dhamma (object or reference) and paṭibhāna (wit or illumination) is due to further scholastic 'spinning'. Yet this also must have crept in at an early date.

But a real scholastic development in the present quadruplet scheme, we can find only in the commentaries (attha=kathā-s) not so even in the book Paṭisambhidā-magga, itself a late entrant in the Khuddaka-nikāya.

It is in Sammohavinodinī (= VibhA) that we find the term
attha invested 'with five meanings, the original 'word-meaning' being only one of the five. The five in order are:

(i) paccayasamuppanna - 'the effect'
(ii) nibbāna - 'The highest reach'
(iii) bhāsitattha - the meaning of the spoken word'
(iv) vipāka - 'the resultant'
(v) kiriyā - 'the inoperative'.

Corresponding to these five in yathāsāmkhyā relation we get the five meanings of dhamma which are:

(i) hetu - 'cause'
(ii) ariyamagga - 'the Noble Eightfold Path'
(iii) bhāsīta - 'utterance'
(iv) kusala - 'wholesome'
(v) a-kusala - 'un-wholesome'

The above is certainly a later Abhidhammic development of the scheme which in its original form was of purely linguistic (exegetical) character.

The term Paṭisam is generally translated as 'analysis' and that is not a wrong translation if the original nature of the scheme is considered. But the further scholastic development of the doctrine puts emphasis more on 'synthesis' than on 'analysis'. There is so to say an interlocking of four-fold: meanings of sentences and effects of causes, (etc.); statements of meanings and causes of effects (etc); linguistic expressions for all these, and an inspired awareness of all belonging to the first three categories. (For all this see Bhikkhu Ānāmoli's "Path of Purification. Colombo. 1964. P. 482 f. n. 4)
This is perhaps why we have two sets of renderings\(^\text{10}\) of the term paṭisam, the one presuming the existence of the root bhid- ‘to break’ and indicating its analytical character and the second one its synthetical and epistemological nature. (i.e. the root \(\text{vid}\))

According to me, the word is definitely to be derived from \(\text{vid}\) ‘to know’ as its Tibetan rendering clearly shows. For this reason again I strongly feel that it is the Pāli word which is a corrupted form of the Sanskrit original \(\text{pratisamvid}\) and not what the PTSD says that the Sanskrit form is ‘a new formation resting on a confusion between \(\text{bhid}\) and \(\text{vid}\)’ (PTSD. S. V. c). The PsA. I. 306 clearly says \(\text{paṭividitātī abhimukhabhāvena viditā, pākaṭā nāma honti, tena paṭisambhidāpadassa attho vutto}\). The constantly recurring explanations in the commentaries of the various Paṭisams unmistakably show that it contains the root \(\text{vid}\) (= ṇāpa- ‘knowledge) and not \(\text{bhid}\) (difference). The explanations are as follows: \(\text{hetumhi ṇāṇam dhamma-patī, hetuphale ṇāṇam attha-patī}\) (DhsA. P. 22) and \(\text{ṇāṇasseva pabheda}\) (PsA. I. 3).

The prefixes \(\text{prati}\) and \(\text{sam}\) are nicely juxtaposed, the first indicating ‘distinctness’ or ‘separatensess’ and the second meaning ‘completeness’. The compound, therefore, means complet (\(\text{sam}\)) knowledge (\(\text{vid}\)) pertaining to each (\(\text{prati}\)) individual viz. \(\text{dhamma, attha, nirutti}\) and \(\text{paṭibhāna}\). Analysis and synthesis are two opposite but complementary processes, the one always implying the other. In the original scheme the stress was on ‘analysis’, in the later developed version of the scheme it shifted to ‘synthesis’. The words \(\text{dhamma}\) and \(\text{attha}\) were freshly interpreted as ‘cause’ and ‘effect’ respectively and the scheme was made fit to be applied to Abhidhammic analysis of categories. A causal scheme was grafted on the original linguistic stem. The ‘fusion’ has per-
haps resulted into ‘confusion’ about the exact nature and function of the present scheme.

It is perhaps useful to note some of the more important points in our discussion:

(i) The Paṭisams aim at explaining the ākāra-s (modes) of the words of the Buddha. Their purpose is to throw into relief the verbal complexity and ambiguity and introduce precision in exegesis.

(ii) They combine linguistic and metalinguistic analysis.

(iii) They remove the epistemological ambiguity likely to arise by the sameness in the appearance of the word, which makes it liable to different interpretations about its function.

(iv) There are many an analogue to the scheme in Skt. Grammatical and philosophical books.

(v) The genesis of Paṭisama lies in the necessity of Hermeneutic explanation of the Buddhavacana.

(vi) The principle underlying the scheme can be discerned in many a diverse philosophical argument actually advanced in those days.

(vii) Originally, The scheme must have been of a binary character- consisting of attha and nirutti only. This was in keeping with the usual description of the Dhamma being sāttha and savyājana. The Atthakathā-s also present linguistic analysis under two heads attha-pātha and vyañjana-patha, where vyañjana stands for nirutti. The present four-fold form of the scheme is a later scholastic ‘working-out’ planned to meet Abhidhammic exigencies.

(viii) In the original version the emphasis was on ‘analysis’.
In the revised version it shifted to ‘synthesis’ when ‘inter-looking’ was sought as an additional aim.

(ix) The term originally meant ‘knowledge’ and is to be derived from *vid* and not *bhid*, though the ‘analysis’ which is the meaning of *bhid* is all the same implied in it. It is the suffix *prati* which serves to show the ‘particularity’ or ‘distinctness’ of the ‘knowledge’ and, thus makes it an ‘analytical knowledge’. The Tibetan rendering is quite literal and accurate “ so sor (*prati*) *yan-dig-par* (*sam*) *rig-pa* (knowledge.).

(x) The *Paṭībhāṇa* aspect carries in it the gems of the doctrine of *pratibhā* as understood by the later Sanskrit grammarians (vide. Vākyā. of Bhartṛhari. III. 3.1. pp. 148. 152. ed. by Abhyankar and Limaye, Poona. 1965.)

(xi) Ananda Coomarsvamy (vide. Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, Vol. IV. 1939, p. f.n. 4) wants us to compare the four members of Paṭīsams with the four meanings in Biblical Hermeneutics viz. literal, moral, allegorical and parabolic. Our attention is drawn to St. Thomas Aquinas’ *Sum. Theol.* I personally fail to find any appreciable similarity between the two. This item, therefore, was dropped out from our discussion.

(xii) Originally (the later development *ignored*) the four Paṭīsams meant the following:

(a) *dhamma*- ‘bearer of meaning’; may be an ‘object’ or a ‘concept’, a *signifie*.

(b) *attha*- ‘meaning’- ‘signification’.

(c) *nirutti*- ‘linguistic expression’, ‘significant’.

(d) *paṭībhāṇa*- ‘wit’, revelation, ‘a spontaneous knowledge’, ‘occurring’.
A Chart Explaining the Paṭisambhidā Scheme

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhamma</td>
<td>Attha</td>
<td>Nirutti</td>
<td>Paṭibhāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. saddhā</td>
<td>adhimokkha</td>
<td>1 AB</td>
<td>1 ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. viriya</td>
<td>paggaha</td>
<td>2 AB</td>
<td>2 ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sati</td>
<td>upaṭṭhāna</td>
<td>3 AB</td>
<td>3 ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. samādhī</td>
<td>avikkhepa</td>
<td>4 AB</td>
<td>4 ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. paññā</td>
<td>dassana</td>
<td>5 AB</td>
<td>5 ABC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The above example is taken from the Paṭisambhidāmagga (p. 88). Herein, we have five expressions (nirutti-s) for the five dhamma-s and also for the five attha-s. Thus in all ten niruttis, the knowledge (paṭibhāna) pertains to every one. ‘Hence there will be twenty ‘knowledge-s’

(b) In our discussion we spoke only of some Sanskrit parallels to the scheme. Certain similarities can be found in West also. Huseri (Ideen zu einer reinen Phenomenlogie. J. Geyser. p. 28) also holds that we must distinguish between Word. Meaning, and Object. See also “meaning of Meaning” Ogden and Richards. London. 1930 p. 270.

(c) The Paṭisambhidāmagga (p. 120) uses terms like jotana (‘throwing light’), Virocana (‘illuminating’), and pakāsana (manifesting) in the context of the Paṭisams, which show that the prime aim of them is ‘clarification’ (of the Buddhavacana).
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   to Shakespearean Dramas see T.G. Mainkar’s “ the Theory of
   the Samdhis and the Samdhyangas” Delhi 1978, pp.177-187.
10. For the various renderings of the four Paṭimas see
    “Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature” by Har
    [Abbreviations as in PTS Dictionary by Rhys Davids and W.
    [Reference to the Piṭaka and pages and Commentarial books of
    the volumes and pages of the Romanized texts published by
    PTS, London.]
Chapter - Eleventh

The Prominence of the roots in Chandas

Two ancient Sanskrit linguists namely Yāska, the author of the extant Nirukta and Śākaṭāyana, the grammarian hold that nouns are derived from the roots. \( (Nama ca dhātujaṁāha Nirukte Vyākaraṇe Śaṅkasya ca tokam) \). This shows the basic/original/radical nature of roots for which Sanskrit has a significantly appropriate term in \( dhā-tu \). The verb \( dhā \) means 'to put', 'to place', 'to lay' and \( tu \) is a nominal suffix. The Vedic language \( (Chandas) \) though not exclusively so- is predominantly based on roots. These roots and the verbal forms formulated from them are easily separable by analysis from its pre-fixes \( (upasarga-s) \) and other accretionary elements such as affixes and suffixes. Thus \( dhā \rightarrow da- dhā-ti \) (he or she puts it, lays it.) \( jān \) (‘to engender’ gives \( a-janaya(t) \) ‘he or she begot’. In other ancient languages like the Egyptian the roots are equally present but they are not as easily separable as the Vedic radical forms.

The presence of the manifold roots in the Vedic speech stands testimony to the fact that the mind of the Vedic speakers was fully capable of abstraction and the Vedic speakers could conceive pure mental concepts such as divinity, fitness, lordship before they could perceive concrete objects and gross movement in the material world. “It is extremely difficult to see words designating activity and its aspects (verbs, tenses, moods, attributes, functions, qualities, states (nouns, adjectives) and modes of action or degrees of quality (adverbs), starting off separately and accidently over a long period converging into specific roots. This could happen in one, two, ten cases but it is highly improbable for over eight hundred such roots in Sanskrit. The attrition of the \( dhātu \)
Chapter - Twelth

Panini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī and Mahābhārata

One of my student-friends Shri. Shreenand Bapat now working as an asst. curator of BORI and has now got the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth once wrote an informative artical in Marathi on an important topic namely “Whether Pāṇini knew Mahābhārata?” (Pāṇinilā Mahābhārata māhitī hote kā ?). Of course prior to him M. Winternitz of prague had duly discussed the matter in a concise form in his “History of Indian Literature” Vol. I. pp. 317-318 University of Calcutta, 1927.)

Our concern here is with the exact meaning of the title of India’s great epic namely Mahābhārata. This assumes importance in the face of the fact that many a scholar labours under a mistaken idea that the original name of the epic was Jaya. jayo nāmetihāsoyām and that this name is referred to in the first benedictory verse concluding with tato jayamudīrayet. The same band of scholars further believes that this original form of epic consisted of 24000 verses. It was elaborated and thus reached the number of verses to sixty thousand and become Bhārata. The Bhārata further added upākhyāna-s and it inflated up to a round figure of one lakh verses and came to be reckoned as Mahābhārata or a Śatasāhasṛi Saṃhitā. These scholars obviously think that Bhārata with its further expansion became Mahābhārata.

The history, however, tells us a different story. The Āśvalāyana Gṛhya-sūtra pays homage to both Bhāratācārya and Mahābhāratācārya and here Pāṇini’s two sūtra-s shed a searching light on the names Bhārata and Mahābhārata. Bharata-s, proclaims Pāṇini, were the warriors who fought the Kurukṣetra-battle. Bhārata thus is a name for the war fought by Bharata-soldiers. (Pān IV. 2.56. “संघ्रामे प्रयोजनयोदध्वम्” महाभारत thus means the “Great Epic of the Descendents of Bharata, the son of Duḥṣanta and Śakuntalā. The Kāśikā makes it further clear by explaining भारतो
This clearly shows that the epic was given the title of its main subject ‘the war of the descendents of Bharata-clan.’ It was ‘great’ and, theretore, the title Mahābhārata. Mahā is adjectival to Bhārata meaning a war. The title ultimately means a ‘Big War (epic).’ It is not because a Bhārata of sixty thousand verses was enlarged and became a Great ‘(Mahā) Bhārata’ consisting of a hundred thousand verses that the epic was called Mahābhārata.

Pāṇini’s two sūtra-s mentioned above give a direct lie to the wrong notion that initially the epic was called Jaya, in its mediary development it came to be known as Bhārata and that this Bhārata ultimately with its fullest development became Mahābhārata. ‘No Sirs’. Mahā is an adjective of the Bhārata-war. It thus became the ‘Great Bhārata-war’ and this principal subject matter of the epic was chosen as a fitting title for the Epic. Badayunee’s Farsi translation aptly corroborates this process. The title is Razma-Nāmā (A History of War). The eminent pioneer of the critical edition of the text, the late Dr. V.S. Sukathankar accurately preferred the Pātha to the other one which appeared to the late Dr. Maurice Wintenitz and in present time to Dr. M.A. Mehendale more fit as it contains the letter ta in the title Mahābhārata (‘Mahābhād Bhārata) Mahābhārata), VSS had his strong reasons to choose Bhārata. But the writer of this chapter humbly begs to differ from VSS also who takes the word भार to mean weight on the basis of the earlier verse (Mbh. I.). Pāṇini’s aphorism no. VI.2.38, I admit, consequentially enumerates भार and भारत as though he was conscious of the two variants in this context occuring in the Ādiparva. I have elsewhere shown that ‘Bhāra’, too, besides meaning a ‘burden’ also means a ‘war’ or ‘battle’ by pointing out Bhāsa’s usage in the title of his Karna-bhāra Karna’s battle with Arjuna and a reference to ‘भाराथ मृत्युमुच्छर्तैरेव हैः’ in his drama Pañcarātra.
The late Miss I. B. Horner, the erudite Hon. secy. of Pali Text Society London in one of her excellent articles on “Mahā and Cūla Vagga and Suttas in Majjhima-Nikāya” published in University of Ceylon Review Vol. XI. Nos 3 and 4 July-Oct. 1953 pp. 129-134 has shown how the larger and shorten versions of the sections and sermons are found in the Pali Canon. The same type of difference and distinction must have been prevalent at one time in the case of Sanskrit grammatical treatises. This is to say that if Patañjali-s, commentary on the aphorisms of Pāṇini is called Mahābhāṣya it must have a precursor in a simple and shorter version which perhaps was called a Cūrṇi instead of Bhāṣya. Not unlike Mahāvyutpatti a Tibetan lexicon which has three distinct stages the lesser, the medium and the maximum (Mahā), the Siddhānta-Kaumudī a prakaraṇa text on Pāṇini’s sutra-s exists in three forms as Laghu-siddānta-kaumudī, Madhyama-siddānta-kaumudī and Siddānta-kaumudī and in a like manner if we have Laghu śabdendu-śekhara there must have existed perhaps a śabdendu-śekhara and a laghu-mañjuśā and parama-laghu-mañjūṣā also. The three versions Mini-medi and Maxy were perhaps once quite a popular and vogue in literature. In Pali Canon we have satipaṭṭhāna-sutta and Mahāsatipatthāna-sutta and if we have in Dīghamikāya a Mahāparinibbāna-sutta perhaps a shorter version existing in Udāna text of the Khuddaka-nikāya was once called a mere Parinibbāna-sutta. Thus Bhārata consisting of 60,000 verses only became a Mahābhārata of one lakh verses. This aspect is note-worthy is all that I intend to point out in this short note.
Chapter - Fourteenth

Kāśikā and Trimunivyākaraṇaṃ

Sanskrit grammatical tradition is old, rich and varied. Six or even more schools are generally noted. The most well-known, world-acclaimed and comprehensive school is that of Pāṇini which is held as infallible as the geometry of Euclid.

This tradition is generally known as Trimunivyākaraṇa. A progressive and revised continuous tradition mainly authored by 1) Pāṇini, 2) Vārttika-writers Kātyāyana and /or Vararuci, and Patañjali. Bhartrhari the author of Vākyapadiya an excellent philosophico-grammatical treatise and an eminent author of Dīpikā, a unique commentary on the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali is generally not supposed to belong to the lineal tradition of the Trimuni-succession.

He is suspected by a few eminent scholars as influenced by Buddhist tradition and, therefore, kept outside the pale of Trimuni-tradition. Whatever that may be what baffles me is the fact that there exists an ancient Vṛtti called Kāśikā and is supposed to have been written by two successive authors Jayāditya and Vāmana. These two are also, it is maintained by a group of scholars, were Buddhists. Well, that may be or may not be a historical fact what amazes me is that Vārttika-s explain rṛti and the Tri-sage tradition while it includes the vārttika-kāra (singular or dual) does assign no place to Vṛttikāra-s. To me at least this is anamolous. It can perhaps be justified only by advancing an argument that when Vārttika-s are included in the triple scheme their basis is obviously implicitly included.

In India and abroad a lot of research is being done about the contribution of Kāśikā-vṛtti. Many candidates have earned their Ph.D. degrees by presenting researches on topics concerned with Kāśikā. In the last few decades the European counties like France have started
centres to bring out a critical edition of Kasika by collating various manuscripts and using the computer technology. A large amount of Euros has been spent on this project. But what is the net objective result commensurate with the money that is spent on it?

As far as I know, the work has not progressed beyond, collation of the Śiva-sūtra-s which Pāṇini has used to prepare his word-economy. Well this also can be appreciated if it has yielded any significant conclusion or observation. Would any scholar write at least a short-note about the project-contribution?

I read they explained the name Kāśikā as a commentary written in Benares (also called Kāśī). My next quarry is, is there any unimpeachable evidence that the text was written in Kāśī, though we may be able to derive the name Kāśikā from the place-name Kāśī. Nandi-keśvara’s kāśikā explains the Śiva-sūtras mystically. Was it also written in Benares?

I still think that the original word was prakāśikā i.e. a Vṛtti throwing light on Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī and the prefix pra is dropped (cp. Raki jyah prasāraṇām where from the usual form samprasāraṇām the upasarga sam is dropped. In fact there exist a commentary called Upahāra-prakāśikā written by Bhaṭṭaśrī Godavarmarāja. (Anontaśayane Prakāśitā)

Generally the commentarial literature is given the name for the work of glossing they do. Being of the nature of a gloss, elucidation shading light on meaning such works are known by some such names. Bhartṛhari wrote a Dīpikā on Mahābhāṣya and Annambhaṭṭa on his own Tarka-saṅgraha. Kaiyāṭa wrote on Mahābhāṣya his Pradīpa. Maitreyarakṣita has his Dhatu-pradīpa and Nāgeśa his Udyota.

There are vidyotini-s, vibhāvinī-s, sammohana-vinodinī-s, etc. I shall certainly appreciate the contribution of Kāśikā on Aṣṭādhyāyī. Let a Meaningful Dialogue or Discussion- Debate be arranged on this important subject.
Chapter - Fifteenth

New Avenues in Grammatical Studies

In Vol. 40 of the Journal of the American Oriental Studies (1920) pp. 194-198 Charles R. Lanman of the Harvard University wrote an article under the title 'Phrase-words and Phrase-Derivatives.'

The author observes that the true character of a linguistic phenomenon sometimes fails to be clearly recognized, for no deeper reason than the fact that no one has taken the trouble to describe it and propound a good name for the same. He further remarks that an apt designation, if it be clear and self-explanatory suggests at once a category in which many seemingly unrelated facts find unity.

He explains the above assumption by citing a few examples from Sanskrit and Pāli. Here in the course of his discussions he uses his neo-logisms namely 'phrase-words' and 'phrase derivatives.'

In the oldest Indian text Rgveda we find a good example of the genesis of a 'phrase-word' tuām dehā carāmasi tad id arthāṁ dive dive (unto thee, do we go for the very purpose, day by day). This one is from (RV. ix-1.5). But at viii. 2.16 we read vayaṁ tādīdārthāḥ which shows that the phrase is crystalised into a single word, a possessive compound, under one single accent, 'we, having this-vary purpose,' that in 'we intent on this.'

The phrase so-and-so is as truly a word as its precise Sanakrit equivalent asau. Hence it is quite proper to give it a genitive inflection and say "so-and-so’s oxen".

The author gives examples from Pāli where the Buddha’s Dhamma (Law) is called 'ehi-passiko' 'come and see'. When rules were not formulated for ordination to a person who desires
to be a monk the Buddha used to say ‘ehi-bhikkhu’ and it was called *ehi-bhikkhu upasampadā*.

Pāṇini calls non-vedic Sanskrit a *Bhāṣā*. It means that at Pāṇini’s time Udicya-brāhmaṇa-s were at least speaking with each other in Sanskrit. If Sanskrit was never a spoken language it is extremely difficult to account for expressions such as *daṇḍa-daṇḍī* (fighting with sticks) and *keśakesi* trying to pull one another’s hair and *khādata-modatā vartate*.

To expect a formative rule for every word in Sanskrit, every idiom and every sentence-construction is expecting too much. We must add more and more to the existing grammatical material following authors like Charles R. Lanman. Sanskrit is not a dead language. If Sanskrit literature is being still written, the changing nature of Sanskrit, the dialectical influence on it of the other Indian provincial languages and semantic changes in the old words must be duly registered. That Sanskrit is not dead is proved by the very fact that it has *prasava-kṣamatā*. It supplies coined words to modern Indian languages. A dead language cannot deliver.
Chapter - Sixteenth

English and Sanskrit

That from proto-Indo-European developed Indo-European and from Indo-European developed further Indo-Aryan—the old-Indo-Aryan being the Vedic (chandas and Sanskrit (Bhāṣā) languages.

From Indo-European also developed Indo-Germanic from which originated Anglo Saxon and English (Eng.)

The Sanskrit and English thus being ultimately from the same stem naturally exhibit family-likeness.

On this basis I delivered a series of three lectures on the subject of the English being transparent through the glass of Sanskrit.

I am soon launching a project “English and Sanskrit.” I only want to demonstrate here briefly a few instances.

The Sanskrit root \( kṛś \) appears in English as ‘to curse’. In Pāli we have in Dhammapada \( akkosi me, avadhi me, ajini mam, ahāsi me. \) (I. 3.).

In Hindi we get \( kosanā \) ‘reprimanding’. The English ‘auto’ is the same as Skt. \( ātman \) and Skt. \( sva \) is Eng. ‘sui’. Raymond shows ancient relation with Vedic \( rayi / rai \) (riches, wealth) and \( mant (< mat) \) is a possessive termination. Thus Raymond ultimately means “one who possesses wealth.”

Eng. ‘puddle’ is Skt. \( palvala \). The English-month names September, October, November and December show relation with \( Saptambhara, Aṣṭambhara, Navambhara \) and \( Desambhara \) respectively. Skt. \( dakṣa \) is related to Eng. dexter and \( candra \) ‘shining’ to \( cinder \) ‘burning charcoal.’ Skt. has a \( gauh \) and the Eng. its hardened form ‘cow’.

The Eng. numerical ‘one’ has its origin in Dravidian-Kannada
vandu ‘du’ being only a suffix. Kannada has a short o and a long o. The short turns to ऐ where from we get in Eng. ‘one’. Skt. tvam, (you), OE ‘thou’ and German ‘du’ are only varied pronunciations of the same word. Eng. God shows affinity with ghutra and ‘horse’, an animal name in Eng. shows relation to Skt. root hrṣ (to neigh). Eng. ‘best’ a superlative term represents Vedic vasiṣṭha ‘shining all the most. and Skt. pravāṇa, Pāli poṇa are transparent in Eng. ‘prone’ Skt. roots as and bhū are seen in Eng. ‘is’ and be. (Pāṇ. asterbhūḥ) respectively. Skt. root masj- in all probability is Eng. ‘merge’.

The Skt. word strī originally means ‘one who possessed a uterus’ for that is a hall-mark of a female. The Pāli Grammarian Aggavansa explains gabbho thīyatī etassamiti (the embryo swells in her). Eng. ‘Tragely’ is Skt. Trāgodya and ‘commedy’ is kāmodaya’. ‘Amour’ has something to do with Skt. Māra (the cupid) the Latin root being āmāre. The Skt. Sītāphala (custard fruit) is, however, Eng. ‘sweet apple’ here apple means a fruit in general.

Hearafter I shall only enumerate the Skt. and Eng. pairs of words. I am sure the erudite readers will easily grasp their phonetic affinity.

śveta > wheit - white, gharma- thermo, madhu > methu > mead, śarkarā > sugar, ahaṁ > aghaṁ > ego, daśama > decima(l), śṛnga > horn > corn, nāsā > nose, aksi > eye, pitṛ > father, mātṛ > mother, bhrāṭṛ > brother, svasṛ > sister, the root vid (to see) > vide (see) > vision > television, tirah - tele > across, sthāman > stamina, Vedic root grbh > grab, lubh- ‘to love’ ME luf, modern Eng. love. darbha (a kind of grass) > turf, maru (desert) > marine, nāma > name, sātāṁ (hundred) > centum, nava > new, abhinava > ab novo, starya > sterile, mṛ (to die) > mār causative ‘to kill’ >
mar (to destroy) e.g. It mars the beauty, etc.) kam (to be lovely) > comely, kaḥ > Latin quis > OE hvā > modern Eng. who, kuśa (a kind of grass) > cussion, old Indo-European base lāb-leb (slack, loose), Skt. root lambate (hangs down with burden).


The incidents can be easily multiplied. The gentle readers will kindly wait for my forth-coming full-fledged book on this subject.
In Pāli canon and Buddhist Sanskrit texts occurs a queer expression *ketubha*, the meaning of which is not at all clear. It is supposed to form a part of the learning of a Brahmin student (*mānavaka*). The cliche runs as follows: *Tiṇṇam vedānam pāragū, sanighṇdu-keṭubhānam, akkharappabhedānam, padako, veyyākaraṇo, Lokāyatamahāpurisalakkhāṇesu anavayo.*

"Has crossed the three Veda-s, along with the glossaries of words and *ketubha* (?), knowing the analysis of letters, knower of *padapātha*-s, a grammarian, well-versed in Lokāyata branch of knowledge and the thirty-two marks of Great Men."

Because it is mentioned along with *Nighaṇṭu*, a few scholars try to derive from the word the meaning *Nirukta*. All the three commentators (*atthakathākāra*-s) explain identically as *kriyākappavikappam kavinamupakārāya sattham.*

"The division (*kappa*) and sub-divisions of action, a science for the benefit of the poets."

Now the late Dr. V. Raghavan has in one of his essays said that ‘*kriyākalpa*’ was once an alternative name for ‘poetics’ or *Kāvyaśāstra* or *Alamkāraśāstra* and we do find the word *kriyā* for literary composition e.g. *kriyāmimāṃ Kālidāsasya* or *kṛtiriyam Kālidāsasya.*

Well that may be the case the question remains as to the etymology of the word.

I, for one think that the word is neither Sanskrit nor Pāli (Indo-Aryan) but is an old borrowing from Semetic family of languages.

The original word is *kethib*, also spelled as *ketib* (term of
the Masorah), *part. adj.* designating that which is written in the
text as opposed to the reading in the margin called *kere*; *n.* that
which is written into text. Aramic *kethib*, ‘he wrote’, whence also
*kethāba*, writting. Hebrew *kātabha*, ‘he wrote.’

*Keṭubha* is a Jewish marriage-contract. Mishnaic Heb.
*kethubha* literally, writting, writ, Arabic *katāba* ‘he wrote’, Urdu
and Hindi *kitāba*, a book.

Thus in our context the *Nighaṇṭu*-s, in all probability
represented the oral tradition of lists of words not used connectedly
in sentences to form paragraphs and books. While *keṭubha* stood
for a ‘written book’ (of whatever nature and whatever subject.).
The poets require many words and a science of poetics.
Meghadūta: A Khaṇḍa-kāvyā or Kand-kāvyā?

Kālidāsa’s celebrated Meghadūta is definitely a superb dūta-kāvyā. No doubt about it.

Being the first of its kind the Sanskrit commentators were a bit puzzled of its form. A few of them made a ludicrous attempt to treat it as a Mahākāvyā and naturally failed collossaly. To use Kālidāsa’s own dictum ke vā na syuḥ paribhavapadam nisphalāram-bhayatnāḥ? (Who will not reach a status of failure who put efforts which are bound to be fruitless?)

Others called it a Sandeśa-kāvyāṁ (A message-poem), a dūta-kāvyāṁ (a messenger-poem) and this is not wrong.

Some, however, proposed to name it as khaṇḍa-kāvyāṁ (A fractional poem) in contradistinction with Mahākāvyāṁ or great poem i.e. epic.

Well, this also is not totally wrong. But somehow I fail to appreciate a complete, unbroken poem (Akhaṇḍakāvyā) having also different form in khaṇḍa-kāvyā (a partial, broken kāvyā).

My sole reason is Meghadūta is not ‘incomplete’, it is ‘complete’ and it is not ‘broken’; it is ‘unbroken’.

So I think that it is a complete in itself ‘small poem’ Laghukāvyāṁ in contra distinction with Mahākāvyāṁ ‘Big kāvyāṁ’.

The origin is not in khaṇḍa (a fragment) but an unaspiricated kanda which in Dravidian tongues like Kannada means a ‘baby, a small one’. This Dravidian word has its cognate in Indo-European family in the word kind > kin - compare ‘kinder garten’, a ‘garden for children’.

I thus suggest that Meghadūta was conceived by Kavikulaguru, as a Baby-poem, not a ‘Grown-up poem’.
Chapter - Ninteenth

Pāṇini and Aggavaṃsa on Ekaśeṣa-dvandva

That a very impartial, neutral and cold discipline like grammar should also reveal hidden tendencies of male-female dominance-contravarsies is really amazing. But it is a fact. The Sanskrit grammar of Pāṇini shows traces of male-dominance.

This is palpable in the ekaśeṣa-dvandva compound treatment. For parents Pāṇini had the following dvandva-s mātāpitarau, pitarau, mātarapitaru. The first and third mention both the male and female parents. But the second one is only a masculine dual, dropping the feminine member.

Now Aggavaṃsa, a Pāli grammarian from Burma (Myanmar) belonging to the 12th century A.D. combated this male-dominant policy of Pāṇini extremely vehemently.

I shall not say that he wanted to go to the extreme of upholding, establishing and justifying female domination. No. This is not what is not implied even in the modern women-liberation movement too. We should bear in mind that the advocates of Women Lib are not only females but also males who think that the females who have suffered for a long time in the past need to get their own deserved rights. The pleaders of Women Lib. movement from a humanitarian point of view justly think that women should have in the society a place on par with men.

But when the paper is rolled in one direction and kept in the same state for a long time it becomes essential to role it in the apposite direction so that it would be, as is expected, straitened. For the same reason our Aggavaṃsa would choose the other extreme. It is for this reason that he says (I am Sanscritizing the original Pāli.) let the ekaśeṣa be mātarau for mātā ca pitā ca, svasārau for svasā ca bhrātā ca and migyau for migī ca migāśca.
I am sure had there been *dvandva*-s like *mātapitarau* or *mātarapitarau* only but not *pitarau* he would not have revolted so much rebellingly.

More over the Sanskrit grammar shows signs of male-dominance not only in the case of *ekaśeṣa-dvandva* compound but elsewhere also. *Pumvat* seems to be the cherished article. If *dvandva* compound is to be resorted it will never be *Rāmaśca sītā ca Rāmasite* but always *sītā ca Rāmaśca Sītārāmau*.

I have not come across so far in Sanskrit a neuter or feminine gender used for words meaning ‘husband’; they are all masculine. But coming to search words for ‘wife’ we have *kalatram* in neuter and *dārāh* in masculine plural gender. Would any linguist or grammarian supply any justification for this? It is because we are concerned with men and women who are sentient, sentimental and thinking animals that such problems crop up.

Look to instances where honour or dishonour are not at stake. Pāṇini’s grammar so far as tenses are concerned is prominently based on present tense i.e. *laṭ* or *vartamāṇa* while the Semetic (Arabic, Aramic, etc.) prominently mention the past tense *kath ab* ‘he wrote’, *k-t-l* ‘he killed. No problem.

Hinduism has given as much importance to *Devatā*-s or *Devī*-s as they have given to *Deva*-s. Thus besides Indra and Varuṇa we have *Vāc, Sarasvatī, Idā, Bharatī, Prthvī, Uṣas*, etc. In fact *Devatā*, a term of feminine gender is used for *Indra* and Varuṇa too.

But English uses for wife the honourific ‘better half.’) and not merely *ardhāṅgini* (*ardhīm ha vai jāyā pūruṣasya*). We in our Indian culture are not used to call us as being lucky (*bhāgyavān*) but our ‘wives’ are called ‘exceedingly fortunate’ (*saubhāgyavatī*). We speak Sanskrit and expect them to speak in Prakrit when a character like Ātreyī, an educated lady, (Uttararācarita Ind act) can speak flawless Sanskrit. A loyal wife is expected to burn herself with the corpse of
her husband but suppose the wife dies first will any loyal Indian husband prefer to burn alive on the funeral pyre of his wife?

But the Christian canon had to face the recent Women Lib. Movement by compulsorily amending some of their seemingly male-dominant words and concepts.

They were compelled to restore to inclusive language. Now instead of ‘son of God’ the Christiainity will speak of child of God, instead of ‘father in the Heaven’ we will hear about the ‘parent’ in the Heaven and so on.

Already in America a committee has been appointed to make necessary changes. The members of the committee sat and diligently carried out the work. The report they submitted is now under consideration of higher ecclesiatical authorities and soon we may find the new version of the scripture.

Jainism and Buddhism should also follow the suit and modify their traditional claims. In Digambara-s the women in this birth cannot attain emancipation. By practising penance (nirjarā) she should attempt to have a birth as a man who by following the precepts of Jainism can attain liberation.

In Hīnayāna Buddhism the Nidāna-kathā (the prefatory portion of the Jātaka-s) speaks of manussattāṁ liṅgasampattīṁ, etc. For being a Bodhisatta and further the Buddha one has to be a man and not a woman.

The Compassionate Buddha was not ready to form an order of Bhikkunī-ś and it is only after Ānanda’s intervention that He somehow gave His consent for the same and here too the nuns had to follow strictly the aṭṭha guru-dhamma-s (for which see PTSD. s.v.). It is my surmise that Aggavaṁsa had in his mind the unjust treatment meted out to the female sex that he indignantly said ‘enough with such ekaśeṣa-dvandva-s, partial to masculine gender.
Panini's grammar names the causative as *ni*. Generally it is quite easy to recognize causative forms—as they use the suffix *ya*. So for example, *pā-pibati* (to drink), *pāyayati-pāyaye*, *pā-pāti* (to protect), *pālayati-pālayate*, *gam* (to go) *gamayati*, *ram* (to please) *ramayati*. Causal-verbs are in both *pada-s (ubhayapadinaḥ)*.

So far it is all right for we were discussing causatives according to Sanskrit grammar. But what about the modern linguistics?

The modern linguists speak of 'surface structure' and 'deep-structure' of every language.

They argue that a particular verb may not show outward sign of being a causative but in its deep structure it proves itself to be a causative.

So far example 'to kill' is a causative of 'to die'. What happens when a murderer murders any person? He does to that man some thing by which he / she dies. He either suffocates him, stabs him with a sharp weapon or shoots him with a revolver.

Now 'to kill' may not from outside look like a causative form as we do not see in it a causal suffix used. But when we analyse the case as is shown above we detect that in its infra structure it is a causative form.

Now let us examine the Sanskrit grammar. Suppose we want to say in English that X teaches Y. Is it not that the simple looking verb 'to teach' is really a causative? Yes; it is. For if Mr. X only 'teaches' and Mr. Y does not 'learn' any thing from him the
'act of teaching' becomes utterly meaningless.

Here I appreciate the ancient Sanskrit grammar for it has anticipated the modern Linguistic theory of causative some 1500 years back. So we see in Pāñinian tradition that \textit{adhi + i} means 'to learn' but its causative form is \textit{adhya\text{\text{\textipa}}payati} which should not be wrongly rendered as 'teaches' simply because there cannot exist any such action as 'teaching'. English 'teacher' is not Sanskrit 'śikṣaka'.

A śikṣaka in Sanskrit means one who learns the \textit{Vedāṅga} called śikṣā, just as a \textit{mīmāṁsaka} means 'one who knows mīmāṁsā and likewise a \textit{padaka} means 'one who knows padapātha'.

The English 'teacher' shows an affinity with the Sanskrit root \textit{diś-} 'to direct', Sanskrit word for a teacher is \textit{desīka} (see \textit{Deśīkendramrgarādāyati}, etc.).

Thus \textit{adyhāpayati} being a \textit{ni} form of \textit{adhyeti} (he \textit{l}she learns) \textit{adyhāpayati} should be carefully rendered as some one makes someone else 'learn'. If the learner does not 'learn', the 'teaching' activity of the so-called 'teacher' is absolutely futile.
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