Chapter 3

LINGUISTIC OBSERVATIONS OF YĀSKA

3.1 Introduction

Yāska's methodology in dealing with the etymology of Vedic words is based on some linguistic principles. He has discussed some of them in the first two chapters of the Nirukta. In the first chapter, Yāska deals with the general theories and stand points of etymologists; and the nature and scope of Etymology are also discussed. In the second chapter he illustrates the methodology used in Nirukta in detail.
3.2 The *Nighaṇṭu* of Kaśyapa

As mentioned above, Yāska’s *Nirukta* etymologically derives the words of the *Nighaṇṭu* of Kaśyapa. The *Nighaṇṭu* contains five chapters, the first three chapters are called the *Naighaṇṭuka kāṇḍa*, the fourth chapter the *Naigama kāṇḍa*, and the fifth chapter the *Daivata kāṇḍa*.

The *Naighaṇṭuka kāṇḍa* deals with synonyms; the *Naigama kāṇḍa* homonyms; and the *Daivata kāṇḍa*, deities in general.

The first chapter of the *Naighaṇṭuka kāṇḍa* deals with physical things like *prthivi* (earth), *antarikṣam* (air), *jalam* (water), and objects of nature like *meha* (cloud), *uṣas* (dawn), *ahas* (day) and *rātri* (night). The second chapter deals with *manuṣya* (man), his limbs, like *bāhū* (arm), *āṅgulayah* (finger), objects and qualities associated with man, such as *dhanam* (wealth), *aiśvarya* (prosperity), *krodha* (anger), *saṅgrāma* (battle) and the like. The third chapter deals with abstract qualities such as *mahat* (heaviness), *laghu* (lightness)
and the like. Lakshman Sarup comments on this:

'The arrangement, of course, is not scientific, nor, in many cases, even systematic, but it shows at least an attempt to group the words methodically. The compilation of *Nighantu* is the earliest known attempt in lexicography. In India it marks the beginning of the *Kośa* literature, and later *Kośas* have sometimes been called *Nighantavas*. The *Nighantu* contains only a small number of the words of the *Rgveda*, and as it does not contain any explanation of the words collected, in Sanskrit or any other language, the modern term 'dictionary' cannot be applied to it, although the *Kośa* can be so called. It should rather be called a vocabulary, which is a book 'containing a collection of words of a language, dialect, or subject'—when 'the words are few in number, being only a small part of those belonging to the subject, or when they are given without explanation, or some only are explained, or explanations are partial'.

According to Sāyana, the enlisted group of words \((Nigha\text{\-}\text{antu})\) has been known as \textit{Nirukta}. Similarly Sāmastrami following Sāyana refers to it \textit{Nirukta}, by name. Sometimes he uses the term \textit{Nigha\text{\-}\text{antu}}. But various interpretations of the text \textit{Nirukta} and all manuscripts of \textit{Nigha\text{\-}\text{antu}} is not in acceptance with this title given by Sāyana and Sāmastrami.

The authorship of the text \textit{Nigha\text{\-}\text{antu}} is attributed to Kaśyapa. There is a reference to the time of its compilation in the \textit{Nirukta} (1.20), which attributes the compilation of the \textit{Nigha\text{\-}\text{antu}} along with other \textit{Veda\n\text{-}\text{āngās}} to the later generations of the sages who had no direct perception of \textit{dharma}. The \textit{Mokṣadharmaparva} (342.88,89) of \textit{Śāntiparva} from \textit{Mahābhārata} mentions about the text \textit{Nigha\text{\-}\text{antu}} and its author as Kaśyapa

\begin{quote}
\textit{vṛṣo hi bhagavān dharmāḥ khyāto lokeṣu bhārata.}
\textit{nighaṇṭukapadākhyāne viddhi māṁ vṛṣamuttamam.}
\textit{kapirvarāhaśreṣṭhaśca dharmaśca vṛṣa ucyate.}
\textit{tasmād vṛṣākapim prāha kaśyapo māṁ prajāpatiḥ}
\end{quote}

\textit{(Mahābhārata vol.III, p.716).}
There is no other reference about the author of \textit{Nighantu}. According to the above mentioned verse, Kaśyapa is the author of the work and the name \textit{vṛṣākapi} is a synonym of Kaśyapa. According to Lakshman Sarup -

‘The \textit{Nighantu} is probably not the production of a single individual, but the result of united efforts of a whole generation, or perhaps of several generations’.

Listing the Vedic words in three \textit{kāndas} for the later generations might have done by sage Kaśyapa by name or somebody who belonged to that clan. At that time such a listing was sufficient for the learners of Vedic texts. When it became not sufficient for readers, Yāska attempted to comment the words listed by Kaśyapa, which was known as \textit{samāmnātah} or \textit{Nighantuḥ} in his time.

\section*{3.3 Division of the \textit{Nirukta}}

Yāska divided his work \textit{Nirukta} as in \textit{Nighantu}-Naighantu\textit{kānda}, Naigama \textit{kānda}, and Daivata \textit{kānda}. 
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A striking factor in Yāska’s explanation is that he deals with synonyms in a selective manner. He gives derivations for one or two words from each group of synonyms and then presents a detailed discussion on its different dimensions of meanings as seen in Vedic hymns. In the first three chapters of Nirukta, including introductory chapter, Yāska deals with synonyms given in the Naighaṇṭuka kāṇḍa. From the fourth chapter, there are discussions of homonyms. Further, in Naigama kāṇḍa each and every word has been discussed by Yāska. The pūrvārdha (first session) of Nirukta ends with the Naigama kāṇḍa. From the seventh chapter to the thirteenth chapter it deals with the deities; hence the name Daivatakāṇḍa also known as uttarāṣṭṭaka or uttarārdha.

3.4 Nature and Scope of Etymology

In the introductory chapter of Nirukta Yāska discusses about the linguistic citations and observations existed at that time. Similarly Yāska illustrates the general standpoints of
etymologists and gives forth the purpose of studying *Nirukta*. Yāska’s concept of word analysis is clearly provided with in this chapter. Earliest concepts and speculations on language theories, and the importance of semantics, which considered as a branch of philology also, are discussed in *Nirukta*. Yāska’s theory about noun and verb illustrates the view of earliest linguists on the pertinence of language in day to day life.

Indian linguistic theories had discussed the importance of language and its subdivisions like sentence, word and so on. There are various observations on word analysis like the views of Vaiyākaraṇas, Naiyāyikas and Mīmāṁsakas. Slight deviations are seen in these observations about word and sentences. According to Mīmāṁsā tradition, words or sentences are of important position in day-to-day life of man. Creativity of man has been flourished by language and the inspiration for the desire of existence was developed by language. This idea was developed by Mīmāṁsā tradition from the Brāhmaṇa texts onwards. According to them, Brāhmaṇa texts are
the instructions and orders connected with various sacrifices. (vidhāyakam vākyam brāhmaṇam). So the Vedic passages in Brāhmaṇa texts had a power to inspire man for a desirable result. This inspiration comes from an action, which is considered as the meaning of any word or sentence.

According to Mimamsā tradition verb is the most important factor in a sentence. The intended meaning of the verb is creativity. The origin of this theory can be traced from Yāska's Nirukta. His theory about noun and verb exemplifies this idea. His concept on bhāva, which means verb, illustrates the creative energy of language. Language has the power to inspire man for doing action. This inspiration comes from the creativity or creative energy of verb. This theory on bhāva discussed by Yāska depicts an aesthetic vision also. Yāska illustrates each and every minute stages of an action which may be the most enormous action of the creativity of the universal. It may be the simplest mode of action of man's day to day life. According to Yāska, there are six stages for each and every bhāva. This illustration
of Yāska about bhāva exemplifies the divergent nature of action and its infinite possibilities in each and every minute point of an action.

3.5 Eternity of sounds

In the first chapter Yāska has discussed the view of Audumbarāyaṇa on the discussion of the words in the language. At first, Yāska mentions the four parts of speech -

nāma, akhyāta, upasarga and nipāta

(noun, verb, prepositions and particles).

Then he proceeds on to the permanency of speech. According to Audumbarāyaṇa,

indriyanityam vacanam audumbarayaṇah

(Nirukta I.1).

('speech is permanent in the organs only').

Later on the concept of words explained by Audumbarāyaṇa had an influence on the theory of sentence established by the great grammarian Bhartṛhari, in his Vākyapadiya.
Kunjunni Raja comments on the concept of Bhartrhari known as *akhaṇḍapakṣa* with the discussion of its fundamental linguistic notions. Dr. Kunjunni Raja says-

‘According to the *akhaṇḍapakṣa* advocated by Bhartrhari the fundamental linguistic fact is the sentence. He defines the sentence as ‘a single integral symbol’ (*eko nāvayavah śabdaḥ*) which is revealed by the individual letters and the words that comprise it. Divested of all metaphysical elements, the *sphoṭa* doctrine advocated by Bhartrhari emphasizes the importance of considering the sentence (which is only a complete utterance) as an indivisible, integral language symbol.

*(Indian Theories of Meaning, 1963, p.9,p.15).*

The observation of Audumbarāyaṇa on the concept of words has been mentioned by John Brough (1951). According to Brough, the translation of Audumbarāyaṇa’s statement ‘speech is permanent in the organs only’ is irrelevant or misinterpreting.
He defines the word *nitya* which means present and he translates the statement as follows -

‘According to Audumbarāyaṇa, it is the ‘statement’ which is regularly present in the perceptive faculty (of the hearer). This being so, the fourfold classification of the parts of speech does not hold good, nor the reciprocal reference of words which are uttered at different times, nor the relationship postulated by grammar’.

Yāska criticizes this explanation of Audumbarāyaṇa as follows-

‘*vyāptimatvāttu śabdasya*’ (*Nirukta* I.1) which means ‘pervasiveness of words’. Yāska introduces the importance of words in a language is in accordance with the concept of semantic possibilities. According to this pervasiveness of sounds Yāska tries to establish the importance of the syntactic structure in a language. Later scholars like Bhartṛhari and Prabhākara obviously state the importance of sentence. According to Bhartṛhari, there is no meaning for words apart from the sentence and sentence is the basic unit
of language. Words are meaningful only contextually and sentences are the main feature of any language. His theory of vākyaspхоṭa emphasizes the idea of sentence analysis. It was followed by Mīmāṃśa tradition to some extent, even though the Mīmāṃsakas ardently criticized the sphоṭa theory. A detailed discussion of the theory provides a concept of mahāvākya which is a combination of sentences. Because, if we are dealing with a whole text, then the perception of the reader from that statement takes place as a whole. The concept of mahāvākya was accepted by the Grammarians and some Mīmāṃsakas. Audumbarāyaṇa, may be criticizing the four-fold division of words in Nirukta on the basis of this concept of speech. ‘Speech is permanent in the speech organs only’ is not a complete denial of words and particles; but it is an acceptance of speech in the perceptive faculty of the hearer. It is a process of continuation. Rather it is recognition of hearer’s intellect power of holding matters as a whole.
Yāśka opposes Audumbarāyaṇa's theory on the basis of the comprehensiveness of words. Later on, the critics of sphoṭa doctrine argued the synthesizing activity of the mind. Śaṅkarācārya was the profounder of this concept. He says that -

\[ \text{samastapratyāvamaṁśini} \ \text{budhiḥ} \]

quoted by Kunjunni Raja (1963, p.133). Commentary of Yāśka's Nirukta explains this power of sound in a detailed manner. According to the commentary of Durga for the statement - vyāptimatvāt tu śabdasya explicitly states the stages of speech starts from the speaker's mind and ends at the hearer's mind. Speech has the power to introduce the ideas of man and words starts from the speaker's mind and flies over the imagination power of man and come back to the hearer's mind for an another different world of imagination.

So the theory of Yāśka, which illustrates the comprehensiveness and minuteness of words enunciates the unavoidable stand of language in human being's life.
3.6 Theory of bhāva

With the three statements given below, Yāska explains the concept of bhāva-

1. bhāvapradhānamākhyātam
2. bhavatīti bhāvasya
3. pūrvāparībhūtam bhāvamākhyātenācaṣṭe
   vrajati pacatītyupakramaprabhrtyapavarga
   paryantam (Nirukta I.1).

'The verb has becoming as its fundamental notion; 'to be' is a reference to becoming; a becoming arising from a beginning to a later state is denoted by a verb, as ‘he goes’, ‘he cooks’, etc’.

Among these, the first one explains the fundamental notion of bhāva (where it is considered as the essential item). In the second one two factors of bhāva have been analyzed; i.e. the explanation of bhāva from a former to a later state and its divergent entities in various types of verbal forms. The third one explicit the general nature of bhāva. Further these three statements elucidate the two states of bhāva - i.e. the
common nature which is embodied through the beingness and the specific entities which explicit through the various actions like cooking, walking, eating and so on. Exploring the concept of bhāva, its main strategy in appearance, is verb (which stands for performing an action); through this strategy, it shows the general and specific entities as mentioned above. Here, Yāska shapes out a hypothesis that the core element of a language is the concept of bhāva. Highlighting this notion of bhāva, Yāska introduces the thesis that all nouns are derived from some verbal root or stem, and ascribes this theory to an earlier scholar Śākaṭāyana and Nairuktas (etymologists) -

sarvāṇi nāmānyākhyātajanīti
śākatāyano nairuktasamayaśca (Nirukta.I.1).

This theory of root origin of all nouns of etymologists may be anticipated from the Vedic literature. There are some suggestions of verbal derivations for nouns in Vedas and Brāhmaṇa texts, such as arkebhirarkiṇah (Ṛgveda I.7.1) and tajjāyā jāyā bhavati yadasyāṁ jāyate punah (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII.13).
Yāska introduces the concept of bhāva for deriving the verbal form through its two states. Entity or beingness is the common factor in each and very verbal forms. All the verbal forms like cooking, walking, eating etc. are accompanied with the phenomenon of ‘beingness’. All these verbal forms are different varieties of ‘beingness’. These all verbal forms are different varieties of ‘beingness’. Grammarians are employing with the suffixes of verbs to explain the bhāva. Vākyapadīya explains the notion of bhāva as follows -

\[ \text{dhātvartho bhāvanā saivotpādanā saiva ca kriyā.} \]
\[ \text{asatyabhūto bhāvaśca tiṃpadairabidhiyāte. iti ca.} \]

(Nirukta I.1).

Yāska’s interpretation of bhāva, i.e. the meanings of roots are the specific nature of bhāva and suffixed meanings of verbal forms are the common nature of it-has been developed by the tradition of Vaiyākaraṇas.

The concept of bhāva has been analyzed by Durga as -

\[ \text{sādhyatvenābhidhiyāyamānā iyameva kriyetyucyate.} \]

(Nirukta I.1).
This illustration of Durga about the concept of bhāva, accords with Bhartṛhari. Bhartṛhari denotes this as-

\[
yāvatāndhāmasiddham ca sādhyaṃvēnābhidhiyate.
\]
\[
āśritakramarūpatvāt sā kriyetyabhidhiyate.
\]

\(\text{Nirukta I.1).}\)

3.7 Concept of Bhāvanā

Later on, Mīmāṃsā philosophy has influenced by the notion of bhāva. According to them, the concept of 'bhāvanā' (which may be translated as creative energy) deals with the nature of bhāva. Mīmāṃsā tradition clearly states the prominence of verb in a sentence. According to them, each and every word satisfies its real meaning or interest through the verbal form which ends in an action. The sentence - vāyavyena yajeta paśukāmah is capable to inform the hearer that, one who wants wealth of cows, should engage with the vāyavya sacrifice. For gaining the aim the verbal form yajeta occupies the center piece of the sentence. It promotes the action of sacrificial intentions.
According to *Mīmāṃsā* tradition, this statement of *Brāhmaṇa* texts, illustrates the concept of śābdi bhāvanā. The sentence vāyavyena yajeta paśuṃaḥ has a power to create energy for action in the hearer who wants cattle wealth. According to *Mīmāṃsā* tradition, this power of sound, which able to create an energy or urge has been interpreted as śābdi bhāvanā.

How this creative urge is conceded to sound. The enquiries based on the power of sound or word or sentence, are far-stretching to the inner problems of language and linguistics. Yāska’s explanation about the power of sound to express the meaning is as follows -

vyāptimatvāt tu śabdasya (*Nirukta* I.1).

That is ‘the comprehensiveness of the sound’ explicit the nature of above mentioned creativity. Durga comments on this statement of Yāska, which reveals the insight of creativity of sound and the extending and expanding nature of it. According to the *Mīmāṃsā* tradition, sound persuades the hearer to engage in sacrificial actions, which may be interpreted as ārthī bhāvanā.

According to *Mīmāṃsā* tradition, these two phenomena of
sound happen through the verbal usage which can persuade the action. The power of sound (both provocative and creative) has been explicitly stated through the action. That means each and every verbal form has the power to establish the notion of bhāva. Yāska’s insight on this concept of bhāva admits the verbal forms as an essential part of each and every sentence in language.

Function of language, which enables the creative energy of man, has been recognized by literary critics and later on, Sanskrit literary criticism has been highly influenced by this phenomenon. Ancient Indian poets and rhetoricians conceded the four puruṣārthas as the essential outcome of poetry, by means of the function of language, which has been renowned as ‘imagination’. Ānandavardhana the progressive rhetorician of India, shaped out the theory of dhvani in poetry, through the function of imagination power of language. He explained this as-

\[pratiyamānam punaranyadeva\]
\[vastvasti vānīśu mahākaviṇām.\]
\[yattatprasiddhvāvavātiriktam\]
vibhāti lāvāṇyamivāṅganāsu. (*Dhvanyāloka* I.)
(The suggestive sense meaning of the writings of great poets is like the sum total charm of women, which is different from the beauty of the various limbs of her body.)

The great commentator Abhinavagupta, paved out the theory of *pratyabhijñā*, and asserted its notions in literary criticism. Later on, Jagannātha Panḍita also exercised this principle of creativity and implied it to elucidate the fundamental norms of poetry, i.e. *pratibhā* - (instantaneous flash of insight).

Moreover, the great poet Kālidāsa has interpreted the word ‘bāva’ as a mental state or ‘sensitivity of man’ (*ratihsthyāyibhāvaḥ*). This aesthetic insight of Kālidāsa may be traced out from the illustration of Bharata’s concept on *rati*.

*yastāvaduḥvalaveṣh sa śṛṅgārāvāṇityucyate*.

(*Nāṭyaśāstra* vol.I, p.299)
Here the word *uṭvalaveṣah* intended the meaning of creativity or activity. This immense power of language, sow the seeds of aesthetic sense with liveliness of the world.
The function of sound, which encourages the creativity of man, has been applied by Yāska, in the field of linguistic studies, especially on etymology. Etymological interpretations experienced by Yāska, are connected with Vedic words; but these are always producing the heterogeneity of meaning and multiple possibilities of word analysis. These are coming from the divergent usages of language features, which comprehend the competence of language. Siddheshwar Varma analyzes the etymologies of Yāska based on their phonetic and grammatical fundamentals and principles; by means of each reveals that most of them are primitive in nature, false etymologies, or poor imaginary. This hypothesis on the derivations of Yāska came from the view of comparative philology of early ages. Modern linguistics prefers all the semantic possibilities of words and based on the synchronic method of language analysis; Yāska’s etymologies are illuminations of the epoch of Vedic age.

While explaining the concept of bhāva the second statement of Yāska pūrvāparībhūtam bhāva... is an indepth analysis of the
theory of language. This statement instruct the six modifications of \textit{bhāva}. Yāska here analysis the entire structure of the concept of \textit{bhāva}, and its perspectives in the divergent area of living organism. The universal allotropy of properties may be exegesis through the concept of \textit{bhāva} from the micro to the level of universal actions which are applicable to these modifications of \textit{bhāva}.

\section*{3.8 Modifications of \textit{Bhāva}}

Vārṣāyaṇi's theory of \textit{bhāva} connecting with these six modifications introduced by Yāska, establishes a methodology of hermeneutics. This stylistic approach of Yāska in the interpretation of \textit{bhāva} concedes an elegance and exactness. \textit{Mīmāṁsā} philosophy elaborated this stylistic approach in interpreting Vedic passages. According to them, each and every action should be arranged in the same particular order (\textit{krama}). Ritualistic treatments should strictly follow this order as instructed in \textit{Brāhmaṇa} texts. Orderless actions never produce
the intended result. Ritualistic and sacrificial performances are bent in the order based arrangement. *Brāhmaṇa* texts introduce various types of order, which function methodologically.

Yāska's exegesis on the concept of *bhāva*, is with a scientific and methodological observation. Vārṣāyaṇi illustrates the six modifications of *bhāva* as-

\[ jāyatesti vipariṇamate vardhatepakṣīyate vinasyatīti \]

(Nirukta I.2).

They are - genesis, existence, attraction, growth decay and destruction.

\[ jāyate-(genesis):-\] The first modification of *bhāva* is explained as -

\[ jāyata iti pūrvabhāvasyādimācaṣte, \]

\[ nāparabhāvamacaṣte, na pratiśedhati \] (Nirukta I.3).

That means 'genesis denotes only the commencement of the first state, but neither affirms nor denies the later'. Here the word *pūrvabhāva* has been interpreted by Durga as *prādurbhāva* that means; 'commencement'. There is no reference to an entity; or it
never denies the entity. This illustration behaves the exactness on the exceeding limitations of the first state of modification.

asti-(existence):- The second one explained as -

astītyutpannasya satvasyāvadhāraṇam (Nirukta I.3).

That means existence affirms a being that has been produced.

vipariṇamate- (alteration):- This modification explained as:-

vipariṇamata ityapracyavamānasya tattvādvikāram.

(Nirukta I.3).

Alteration is explained as - 'It connotes the modification of elements of a non-decaying being'. The state 'alteration' is only denoting the changing condition; there is no reference of any other state like entity, growth or decay.

vardhate -(growth) :- vardhata iti svāṅgābhhyuccayam

sāmyaugikānām vā bhāvānām (Nirukta I.3).

The next modification, growth denotes the increase of one's own limbs or of objects which are associated (with one's self) as he grows by means of victory, or he grows with body.
The above mentioned explanation of growth indicated the two types of its existence; i.e. by means of victory and through the growth of body. Moreover, this implies the mental and physical growth. These two phases of growth always accompanied with each other.

*apakṣīyate*- (decay): *apakṣīyata iti prātilomyam* (Nirukta I.3).

The term 'decay' denotes its antithesis; i.e. opposite state of growth.

*vinaśyati* (destruction): - It is explained as -

*vinaśyatītyaparabhāvasyādimaçaṣṭe na pūrvabhāvamācaṣṭe na pratisedhāti* (Nirukta I.3).

That means, destruction denotes the commencement of the later state, but neither affirms nor denies the former. Those last two modifications of bhāva expose, two distinguish phases of it. There is a clear distinction between decay and destruction. This observation Yāska gives an account of knowledge about, all the minute details in every action which are not observed by a peripheral approach and the slight differences of an action.
Yāska’s explanation about these six modifications of bhāva, elucidate a psychological and at the same time philosophical treatment in the function of language. This observation establishes the idea that language functions acquire the position of essential part of living organism. According to an ontological approach on language, the theory of bhāva, offers a distinguish and unique status. Through the notions of bhāva, Yāska tries to elucidate the Universal programme, in its micro to macro stage of alteration. The cyclic motion of this universe may explicit through the modifications of bhāva; at the same time, each and every simple action in this Universe is also exposed through this. This striking factor in the interpretation of bhāva is that it is purely scientific and research oriented.

Later disciplines like Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya philosophy were influenced by the scientific treatment and methodology of Yāska. Nyāya philosophy’s approaches on various topics like abhāva and so on are highly indebted to the views presented by Yāska. Even though, modern research methodology with experiments of the
scientific illustration of hypothesis, may accept the methodology of Yāska holds in *Nirukta*.

3.9 *Nipātas* and *Upasargas*

In the beginning of *Nirukta*, Yāska introduces a fourfold divisions of words - *nāma, ākhyāta, upasarga* and *nipāta*. Among these *‘upasarga’* (prepositions) and *‘nipāta’* (particles) are not conveying any particular meaning when they are not connected with nouns and verbs according to Grammarians and Śākaṭāyana. Pāṇini listed this category as *‘cādayah’* and defined as signifying non-things (*cādayosatve*). According to Śākaṭāyana, prepositions have no particular meaning, but only express a subordinate sense of nouns and verbs (*Nirukta* I.3).

According to Gārgya, prepositions have a variety of meaning and Yāska supports this view of Gārgya. Yāska gives a number of examples to demonstrate the importance of prepositions. He also deals the particles and their various meanings. Grammarians and some scholars on language studies introduce these two categories
as subordinates of nouns and verbs. But Yāśka and other etymologists like Gārgya accepted these two types as words; because they have even the power to change the meanings of nouns and verbs. Yāśka had to interact with a language which was in a stage of archaic knowledge. But he had to explain the meaning of words of that language, which was recorded in Vedic texts.

Discussions on meaning are relevant in a living language. Yāśka, introduces the nature of a living language at his age, and that language is a continuation of Yāśka’s treatise (Vedic and classical). For a living language, prepositions and particles avail a considerable position. Language is only flourished with these two categories of words. More than, they had a suggestive power to interact with human mind. Yāśka quotes some examples from Vedic texts and some from local usages. Both these are explaining the expressive nature of language. So for an etymologist, these two types of words are undetachable from his observations. Yāśka understood about the practical phase of
language, which interacts with a psychological level of mind also. So he has given importance for particles and prepositions, as well as nouns and verbs availed. In the present study the observations of Yāska on these two categories of words are important for a linguistic and semantic possibilities of language analysis.

Yāska’s discussion and analysis of upasargas and nipātas obviously exhibit the possibilities of the spoken language. Various instances from the Sanskrit language and its divergent usages in day to day discourses such as -

ācāryaścididam brūyat (Will the teacher kindly explain it?)

dadhicidaudanaḥ (like curd give rice),

kulmāśāmścidāhara (bring even the spoiled one)

idam nu kariṣyati (therefore he will do it),

katham nu kariṣyati (how will he do?), and

na nvetadakārṣīt (has he really done it?) (Nirukta.I.4)

are quoted by Yāska in this discussion. These are some self explanatory extensive examples of the semantic deliberations of both Vedic and classical Sanskrit.
3.9.1 *Upasargas*

Yāśka introduces the view of Śākaṭāyana while discussing the nature and scope of *upasargas*. According to Śākaṭāyana, the *upasargas* are of subordinate nature to noun and verb. He says-

\[ \text{na nirbaddhā upasargā arthānirāhuriti śākaṭayanaḥ.} \]

\[ \text{nāmākhyātayōstu karmōpasamyogadyotakā bhavanti.} \]

 (*Nirukta* I.3).

That means, ‘prepositions which are not connected with roots etc. have no individual meaning, but only express the subordinate sense of nouns and verbs’. *Ṛkākāra* on *Nirukta* says that, according to Śakaṭāyana, how the light’s illumination distinguishes the various qualities of particles, like that *upasargas* distinguish the differences of meanings in nouns and verbs. The qualities are the particularities of particles not that of light’s; similarly *upasargas* serve the differences in meanings for nouns and verbs. The differences are not the qualities of *upasargas*. Pāṇini also supports this view of Śakaṭāyana (*upasṛgāḥ kriyāyoge*) (I.4.58).
Yāska opposes this view of Śākaṭāyana, with the support of the view of Gārgya who says:-

uccāvacāḥ padārthā bhavantīti gārgyaḥ.

tadya eṣu padārthah prāhurime tam. (Nirukta.1.3)

That means, 'they have a variety of meanings even when they are not connected with nouns and verbs. Moreover, they are used to denote different areas of meanings of nouns and verbs'—

nāmākhyātayorathavikaraṇam (Nirukta.1.3).

Yāska declares that there are divergent meanings in the upasargas, then how one can say that they (upasargas) are used to denote the distinguished meanings of nouns and verbs? Here Durga remarks that uccāvacāḥ means -

naikabhedāḥ or bahuprakārāḥ. i.e heterogeneous in nature.

Further Yāska gives various examples to substantiate his view:

ā ityarvāgarthe (ā is used in the sense of ‘up to’) pra paretyetasya prātilomyam (pra and parā are its antitheses)

abhityābhimukhyam (abhi, ‘towards’)
pratītyetasya prātilomyam (prati is its antithesis)
ati, su ityabhipūjitārthe (ati and su are used in the sense of ‘approval’) (Nirukta I.3).

Here the word ā means arvāk. Durga defines that -

arvāk prāgiti maryādeha gamyate. arvāk means prāk i.e. up to. For instance, ā parvatāt implies that up to the mountain.

pra and parā are its antithesis. That is ā means upto; its opposite meaning beyond is attributed to pra and parā. For instance, pragatah, parāgatah means get over the mountain or exceeding the mountain. The word ‘abhi’ means towards. The usage ‘abhigatah’ means coming towards. ‘prati’ is used in the opposite sense. The words ‘ati’ and ‘su’ are used in the sense of approval, like ‘atidhanah’, ‘subrāhmanah’. All these examples elucidate the various meanings of upasargs. Durga explains their divergent usages in nouns and verbs. Yāska gives single instances of meanings of upasargs. Ṭīkākāra mentions the divergent meanings of them through examples- pra means
Moreover, Tikākāra gives an exhaustive observation on this topic. As the mud being a raw material, various types of pots are prepared and all these products contain mud-subsidence, like syllables (varṇāḥ) have a meaning consistency in general. This primary significative power of syllables is used in words for denoting their own meanings and the sentences which are further developments of words, explain an idea. Otherwise, meaningless syllables or mere sounds never produce any meaning to the words, because syllables shape out the words. Like that, all the syntactical existences and their advancements such scientific treatises, literary compositions etc. may be meaningless. The action of light is applied to upasargās according to Śākaṭāyana. Someway, it is a complimentary to the view of Gārgya. Because, light has the power to expose its own qualities; more over it will assist in exposing the qualities of other things. Similarly upasargās have their own entity and are expressive of meaning
to a great extent. The meaningful syllables viz. *upasargas* will help in illuminating the manifoldness or multiplicity of meanings of nouns and verbs. Hence, the nouns and verbs used with *upasargas* for their own meaning specialization. That means the *upasargas* are furnish the specific nature of meaning (*kriyāviśeṣaḥ*) and verbs are express the general nature of meaning (*kriyāsaṁāṇyam*). The simple or mere syllables like ā, *pra*, *sam*, *ut* and *abhi* are differentiate the areas of meanings and proceed the spectator to the world of language possibilities.

This view on *upasargas* introduces a linguistic phenomenon of language usages, which stresses on the practical approach in languages. Further, it discloses the simple and more or less colloquial form of Vedic language, which may be considered as the former stage of classical Sanskrit. Human beings always try to use language to convey ideas in a simple and direct way in the earlier stages. Language is the only tool to express the ideas and practical realities of the world in a simple way. Simplicity provides the pleasant and gentle nature of language.
Vedic language exhibits this simplicity through its analytical structure. The poetic nature of Vedic Sanskrit supplies the in-depth existence of it.

According to Vedic Sanskrit, *upasargas* are always not connected with verbs. Later on, this analytical structure of Vedic language changed into synthetic structure. In connection with the Indo-European language structure, prefixes and suffixes (*upasargas* and *pratyayas*) are an integral part of the word and it forms a grammatical unit. But in Vedic language, *upasargas* or corresponding verbal prefixes could be separated from the roots, and this is not a tendency of insignificance or omission; but the expression of self existence or entity.

The compound structure of classical Sanskrit is unusual in consistent with Vedic Sanskrit. There are only some simple dual forms like ‘*indrāgni*', ‘*mitrāvaruṇau*' or compounds such as *ratnadhātamam, vacoyujā*. Some cases (*vibhaktipratyayāḥ*) behave like compound words as in ‘*vipre-bhiḥ*’. This is because of the poetic nature of language, which mostly serve simple,
tender and gentle words. It furnishes the poetic beauty of language as mentioned by Ānandavardhana. Later on, Paññjali deviating from Pāṇini, exposed this idea on the debate of upasargas. According to him- ‘a preposition is the distinguishing mark of an action’ (I.3.1. vol.I.p-256). Again - ‘individual prepositions express the distinction of actions, when ever a word which denotes the same action is used’ (II.1.1.vol.I.p-365). Sanskrit linguistics had defined the multiplicity of roots in connection with upasargas-

‘uparsargena dhātvartho balādanyatra nīyate.

vihārāhārasamḥāra prahāraparīhāravat.

As the root hr is used in various forms like āhara, vihāra, samhāra and upasamḥāra in connection with various upasargas. They provide divergent meanings like collect, shine, deny, finish and so on.

3.9.2 Nipātas

Yāska introduces the meaning of the word nipātāḥ -
That means prepositions are distributed in various meanings. Their root origin or formal analysis is impossible. They are formulate in the course of the development of language and meaning achieved in their form accidentally.

Yāśka generally categorizes the meanings of nipātas in to three forms. They are-

apyupamārthepi karmopasamgrahārthepi padapūraṇāh

(Nirukta-1.4)

(They are 1.comparative sense, 2.conjugative sense, and 3.as expletives). The discussions on nipātas are always in keeping with contextual mentioning. For instance, Yāśka illustrates the conjugative sense of nipātas and defines the meaning of conjugation as-

yasyāgamādarthapṛthaktvamaha viṁśāyate
natvauddesīkamiva vigraheṇa pṛthaktvātṣa
karmopasaṅgrahah. (Nirukta I.5).

That means, ‘a conjugative particle is that by whose addition separateness of notions is indeed recognized, but not like an
enumerative one, i.e. because of a separation by isolation’. For example, the word *ca* is used in the sense of aggregation, *vā* is used in the sense of deliberation and aggregation. Four *nipātas na, iva, nu* and *cid* are explained in the sense of comparison. These are sometimes used in the sense of comparison and sometimes they have various meanings like negation, respect, contempt and so on. *Nipātas* is used in a variety of meaning are also explained.

The word *na* is used in the sense of comparison and negation in Vedic language. When it is placed immediately before the noun or verb, it makes negation; for e.g.:- *nendram devamamamsata* (*Nirukta I.2*) (they didn’t recognise Indra as a god). While in the hymn- *durmadāso na surāyām* (*Nirukta I.2*) (like hard drinkers of wine), it is used in the sense of comparison. In comparison, the established use is to place it immediately after that with which it compares.

*nu* is used in the sense of comparison, as in- *vrkṣasya nu te puruhūtavayāḥ* (*Nirukta I.3*). That means - ‘Of thee like
the branches of a tree, o widely invoked one’. Here vrksasya nu means ‘like the tree’s’.

ca is used in the sense of aggregation, and is joined together with both, as- aham ca tvam ca vrtrahan (Nirukta I.4). That means ‘I and you, O slayer of Vṛtra’.

vā is used in the sense of deliberation as in-

hantāham prthivīmimām nidahdāni have havā (Nirukta I.4).

‘shall I put this earth here or there’.

All these references from Vedic passages are explaining the meaning of nipātas in various contexts. Subordinately these passages are illustrating various stages of God Indra. These may be connected as a story. The first passage says- ‘They didn’t recognized Indra as a god’. In the next one, ‘Oh Indra, they are fighting like hard drinkers of wine’. In the third one, ‘of thee, like the branches of a tree, oh widely invoked one’. In the fourth one, ‘I and you, O slayer of Vṛtra. In the fifth one, Indra himself says with drinking soma- ‘Shall I put this earth here or there’.
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In the *Nirukta* Indra has been depicted as a highly powerful god by some hymns; but some consider these examples are quoted to express the demerits of Indra. The illustration of *nipātas* introduced by Yāska substantially demonstrates the various usages of Vedic language. They explore the status of highly poetic narrations.

According to grammarians and logicians *nipātas* are of great emphasis. Pāṇini elucidates the concept of *nipāta* with two statements-

\[ svarādinipātamavyayam, cādayosatve. \]

Then Pāṇini provides a list of words which are illustrated as *nipātas*. And according to him, they are not considered as words because, these are only fallen into the language (*nipatanāt nipātāḥ*) which are not sufficient to explain a clear idea, as in the case of nouns and verbs. Hence these are not considered as words by Pāṇini.

Yāska gives great emphasis for the discussion of *nipātas*. The importance of *nipātas* in the study of semantics is also
exposed. According to Yāśka, all nouns are derived from verbal forms, introducing divergent dimensions of actions. This view about nouns explains the technical or scientifically approach of Yāśka on word analysis. Further the discussion on nipātas and upasargas establishes the idea of oral varieties or dialects of a language, as they are considered in the position of words. These two observations on word analysis announce the two divergent forms of a language—i.e. textual or formal and colloquial or informal.

The maxims of nouns and verbs introduced by Yāśka elaborately discuss the technological deviations and formal approaches of a language, and through this the creativity of language has been explored. Practical analysis of language approach needs the discussions on upasargas and nipātas and this paved out the way for introducing them as words. These single syllabic words occupied a consequential position in language communities from the origin of language phenomenon. They contribute liveliness of the language spectrum in its every
state of growth and alteration. It may further be interpreted that the deliberations on these two categories are the creative analysis about the theories on origin of the language system.

The remarkable criteria on the discussion of nipātas is the positional change of meaning of sentences. Sanskrit language is considered as an inflectional language. And the characteristic features of Indo-Aryan language communities are their declensions and conjugation of nouns and verbs, or suffixes or prefixes which are amalgamated with roots or stems. Hence the position of nouns and verbs are not depending on the cognition of meaning. They may be said as synthetical structure of languages. But in the case of nipātas, the changes occurred in the position differentiate the meanings also. For instance, these two sentences ‘rāmaḥ samartha eva’, (Rama is indeed clever) ‘rāma eva samarthah’ (only Rama is clever) are providing two different meanings. Yāska also mentions this phenomenon in the case of nipātas like, na, nu and nūnam. The Vedic passages, nendram devamamamsata and durmadāso na surāyām are
illustrating various meanings of nipātas according to their position. In the former it means negation and in the latter, comparison. So both Vedic and classical Sanskrit are influenced by the positional change of nipātas in syntactical cognition or meaning explanation. Modern linguistic perspectives on language analysis are comparable to this view on upasargas. Yāśka’s approaches are revealing the lively nature of Sanskrit language to a great extent. Thus both nipātas and upasargas regulate the meaning structure as a whole.

3.10 Purposes of Nirukta

Yāśka discusses the nature and scope of ‘Etymology’ in the first chapter of Nirukta. According to him, there are four purposes for Nirukta, as its main feature. These four purposes are-

1) athāpīdāmantareṇa mantreṣvarthapratyayo na vidyate

(Nirukta I.15).

2) athāpīdāmantareṇa padavibhāgo na vidyate.
‘More over, without it (etymology) the precise meaning of Vedic stanzas cannot be understood. More over, without this the word-division is not possible. Moreover, in the sacrificial act, there are many injunctions with regard to the characteristics of deities. It is to be established with the help of this (Nirukta). More over, there is praise of knowledge and censure of ignorance’.

Among these four purposes, praise of knowledge (that means the fourth one) is the important. Yāska, emphasizes on the fourth purpose, because of the concept of knowledge is very much appreciable than anything in this world. For the actual knowledge of Vedic texts, studying of Niruktasastra is an important factor. The other three objects of Niruktasastra, stated by Yāska are only complimentary to the fourth one.
3.11 *Nirvacanavyavasthā*

In the second chapter Yāska discusses about the application of principles and conditions of Etymology i.e. *nirvacanavyavasthā*. Here Yāska illustrates two categories of words:

1. *tadyeṣu padeṣu svarasamskārau samarthau prādeśikena guṇenānvitau syātām tathā tāni nirbrūyāt* (*Nirukta.II.1*).

‘One which are regular in their grammatical form and accent system and are accompanied by an explanatory radical modification’

2. *athānānviterthe aprādeśike vikāre arthanityaḥ parīkṣeta kenacidvṛttisāmānyena* (*Nirukta.II.1*).

The other, irregular in grammatical forms, irrelevant in meaning and the explanatory radical modification being non-existent.

In the first category derivations of words are rather simple and in second category one should always examine them with
regard to their meaning, by the analogy of some (common) course of action. The next explanation for word derivation given by Yāśka is - ‘If there is no (such) analogy, one should explain them even by the community of single syllable or letter; but one should not attach (too much) importance to the grammatical form, for these complex formations are (often) subject to exceptions’.

These three conditions given by Yāśka obviously state the standpoint of etymologists. Among these the second and third are more important. For an etymologist, the derivation of words is the main problem and in any condition they should derive the word from any root. They always give much importance for the derivation of word meaning. According to Durga the word meaning of arthanitya is arthapradhāna (giving more importance for meaning). If there are no such similarities or radical modifications, etymologists never stress on the grammatical structure of the word; they should stress only in the meaning. Yāśka’s view on language is clear in the observation i.e. if there is no such similarity in action, one should
explain them even by community of a single syllable or letter.

This is one of the main object of Etymologists. Ancient Greek scholars also illustrated words in a similar manner. This tendency of making words from any root or action was criticized by later philologists. But according to Yāśka, this method is coming from the practical usages of language. The words like kāraka, hāraka etc. are never considered as the subject matter of etymology. They are easily derivable and are present in their root and action. But the words which are not so easily derivable from roots, are to be considered as the subject matter of etymology (parokṣātiparokṣavr̥ttayah). But Etymologists never stress on grammatical explanations like suffix addition and so on. They always concern with the root origin of word; they should derive the words from some root anyhow. So the main question of etymologists about a word is not how the word formed and why the word is derived or from where the word is derived. This is the main deviation of etymologists from grammarians. They differ from grammarians in questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’.
So according to etymologists, there are a number of actions which may be derived from a single word. Etymologists deal with the popular usage and their meanings in a language. But grammarians stress on its theoretical side. The etymologists deal only with the conversations of a living language. So they can explicit all the possibilities of any word through the derivation process. Because of this reason Yāska says that - *viśayavatyo hi vṛttayah* (*Nirukta* II.1). He again explains the rules and regulations of grammar, which stresses on meaning process with a number of examples

\[
\text{āthāpyaṣṭernivṛttisthāneśvādilopo} \text{ bhavati stāḥ}
\]

\[
\text{sanṭīti} \quad (*\text{Nirukta} \text{II.2}).
\]

These statements of Yāska describe the phonetic conditions and discussions on grammar. The technical terms like *ādilopa*, *antalopa*, *ādviparyaya*, *antaviparyaya*, *antavyāpatti*, and *vārṇopajana* are comparable to modern linguistic terms like prothesis, aphaeresis, metathesis, assimilation and anaptyxis and so on. Further these descriptions on phonetic changes signify the indepth knowledge of Yāska in linguistic phenomena.
Yāska’s concern is to introduce the importance of meaning in grammar also. There are no pure grammatical discussions conducted for discussing the sound features only. Even in phonetic explanations which are mainly considered as the part of grammar stresses the importance of meaning. Ancient Indian grammarians also stated and recognized the prominence of meaning. Even Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyi* which was considered by the later scholars as ‘purely phonetic discussion on Sanskrit words’ always stresses on the importance of meaning. The first chapter of *Aṣṭādhyāyi* has mainly discussed pure phonetic elements. But in the discussions of word analysis Pāṇini considers the meaning factor also from the kāraka and so on. Patañjali has stated the consideration of meaning in grammar. Patañjali’s *Mahābāṣya*, which is a commentary on Pāṇini’s work, begins with a statement -atha śabdānuśāsanam. Then he illustrates the word śabda. What do you mean by śabda?. There he introduces an interesting conversation about śabda. According to him in Vedic or classical language, there are words
like \textit{gau}, \textit{aśva}, and so on. These are the words or \textit{sabdas}. But what do you mean by the word \textit{gau}. The word, which expresses the meaning \textit{gau}, (object) it will be the word \textit{gau}. The explanation states the importance of meaning.

The question from \textit{Mahābhāṣya} about the concept of word and its meaning expresses the idea of word meaning relationship. Each and every word will be worthy when it is used to denote some meaning. The acceptance of correctness in meaning is an important factor in any language. What is the reason for the acceptance of meaning? Which one can state the real meaning?. Is there any importance for the correct usage of sound and its meaning?. These kinds of questions are discussed by Patañjali and this is a strong background for linguistic and semantic discussions.

Language is a tool for man to shape his ideas. The production of sound will be varying according to the divergent environmental, geographical and other conditions. The insight of this idea can be found in Yāśka’s \textit{Nirukta} in this regard.
Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* generally follows the views of Yāśka’s *Nirukta*. Yāśka discussed these types of linguistic discussions in the second chapter of *Nirukta*. According to modern linguistics human characteristic features can be traced out from his language usages. Language is a tool for studying human nature and behaviour. There is a branch of modern linguistic, socio linguistics by name. Yāśka’s *Nirukta* tries to discuss the linguistic features in a socio cultural background.

### 3.12 Root theory of Yāśka

Yāśka has divided the root into three types - *samprasāraṇaprakṛtaya*, *asamprasāraṇaprakṛtaya* and *ubhayaprakṛtaya* (*Nirukta* II.3).

Yāśka then gives a detailed discussion on the third category of roots. According to him the third category is the origin of the other two categories of words. With reference to this classification, it may be pointed out that when a root contains a semi-vowel contiguous to a vowel it becomes the origin of two
primary bases. For e.g.: - **yaj devapūjādau** had two types of word formations. i.e. in the **samprasāraṇa** form it becomes *iṣṭi*, and in the **asamprasāraṇa** form it will be *yaṣṭvā, yaṣṭum* and so on. Yāśka says -

```
avidyamāne sāmānyepyakṣaravarṇasāmānyānnirbrūyāt
natveva na nirbrūyāt na samskāramādriyeta
```

(*Nirukta* II.2).

‘There, if an accomplished form is not derivable from one base, one should try to derive it from the other’.

According to this statement meaning provides a prominent place in word formation. Yāśka tried to illustrate that if the meaning of word couldn’t derived from one rule, etymologists apply many rules which are helpful to define etymological sense through the science of semantics. According to the **samprasāraṇa pakṣa** some words may be derived. For e.g.: - **ūtiḥ, mṛduḥ, prthuḥ, prṣataḥ, kunārum**. All the words could not be explained with this way of derivation. Etymologists should know all rules and regulations of grammar and linguistics, and they should be keen
observers of all types of words and to be derived its meaning from some root. So all the possible derivation of roots are seriously attempted by etymologists.

Actually here Yāska, discusses the divergent forms and characteristic features of roots through its various aspects and usages. The statement - *viśayavatyo hī vṛttayō bhavanti* had explained in its various usages. Roots had infinite forms and they differ in each and every noun forms. Even the root *kṛṇī* is used in various forms like *kṛtam, kṛtvā, karaṇam, kurvan, kuruṇāḥ* etc. The *samprasāraṇa, asamprasāraṇa* and *ubhayapraṇa* categories of roots are the examples for the vividness of roots and verbs. Yāska’s illustrations like *mṛad mardane* derive *samprasāraṇa* form like *mṛduḥ*. These types of words (*ūtiḥ, mṛduḥ, pṛthuḥ, pṛṣataḥ, kunārum*) are analyzed with a keen observation by etymologists. They should aware about the manifoldness of roots and verbs.

In the next statement-

*atha pi bhāṣikebhyo dhāṭubhyo naigamaḥ kṛto bhāṣyante*  
(Nirukta II.3).
Yāska defines the characteristic features of primary nouns. An etymologist should know about the Vedic roots and classical Sanskrit roots. That means, some roots and verbs are common and popular in Vedic language, some are regular in classical language. So an etymologist may derive the words of primary nouns from the roots which are regular in classical language. For e.g.: - the word *damūnā* is in popular usage in Vedic language. It means ‘Fire’ in Vedic language. But *dam upaśame* is a familiar root in classical language and it occurs the forms like *dāmyati anaḍvān, damayatyanaḍvān, dānto’naḍvān* and so on. So the word *damūnāḥ* in Vedic language may be derived from the root *dam upaśame* as *damamanāḥ*.

Etymology is a science of word derivation and the etymologists interpret the roots of classical language to derive the Vedic words. Verse wise it may be accepted by an etymologist - that is *athāpi naigamebhyo bhāṣikāḥ*. The roots which are popular in Vedic language with verbal forms may be applicable to explain the words of classical language. The word *uṣṇam* has
a regular usage in classical language. It may be derived from the Vedic root \( uṣa dāhe \), which occurs forms like - \( pratyuṣṭam rakṣah \), \( pratyuṣṭā arātayah \) (Nirukta II.4). So the meaning \( uṣṇam \) may be derived from the root \( uṣa dāhe \).

The next statement of Yāska about the scientific approaches of etymology is more interesting. According to him the word meanings and derivations are confirmed with the help of local usages. The illustration of Yāska is very much contributory to modern linguistics - especially for a synchronic method of language analysis. Here Yāska says - 'Further primary forms alone are employed (in speech) among some people; secondary forms among others'. Among the Kāmbojas, the verb \( śavati \), has been used with the meaning ‘to go’. It’s modified form \( śava \) is used by Aryans.

There is another comparison of usages of east and north. People of east, are using the root \( dāti \) in the sense ‘to cut’, but the people of north uses it as \( dātra \) which means sickle.
The above mentioned observations of Yāska about the local usages of Sanskrit language are really important in linguistic studies. Yāska had the awareness about the people of various places and about their local usages, which is helpful to study the language in the modern linguistic perspectives. Most of the linguists of modern times have noted the statement of Yāska, which explains the variations in local usages and commented that the living modes of Sanskrit language had illustrated through this observation.

There is another important factor on this observation. This is an explanation of various types of roots and its various verbal forms. So he categorizes the verbs and roots into several types. All these types of words should be analyzed by an etymologist. So there is a living language which flourished with its different usages, rather than its different forms, before an etymologist. These different usages of divergent meanings are more valuable for an etymologist. So according to him, there should be no incorrect form of any word. All words and its various usages in
forms and in meanings are always acceptable to an etymologist; and are derivable. If a grammarian is to formulate the correct form of a word, etymologist is to explain all the possible forms and meanings of a word. This opens the possibilities of an etymologist and denies all the limitations in studying a language. This insight about language was known to Yāśka and he tried to define etymology through this method of breaking all limitations of rule based (stereotyped) grammar.

Yāśka deals with Vedic words and its derivations. This is an important factor. Vedic language was unfamiliar to Yāśka. So the usages of that language may be not familiar to his society. Hence a study and analysis of that language with the help of available materials and knowledge were the need of that time. Yāśka tried to analyze it with the insight of an etymologist, who must always concentrate with meaning and its variations.

While explaining the conditions of etymology, Yāśka defines the taddhītās and samāsas. He says:

\[
 \textit{atha taddhitās\ˌsamāš\ˌvēka\ˌpar\ˌvas\ˌu cāne\ˌkap\ˌpar\ˌvas\ˌu ca}
\]
pūrvam pūrvamaparamaparam pravibhajya
nirbrāyāt (Nirukta II.4).

‘Now with regard to derivatives and compounds, whether of one or more than one member, one should explain their component parts in their perspective order, having first divided (the word) into them’.

Lakshman Sarup quotes that there is a similar passage in dialogues of Plato (3rd vol.I.pp.368, 370)

Soc.[Socrates]. But the secondary as I conceive, derive their significance from primary’

Soc ‘ Ought we not, there fore, first to separate the letters, just as those who are beginning rhythm first distinguish the powers of elementary, and then of compound sounds’?

Soc. ‘Must we not begin in the same way with letters, first separating the vowels, and then the consonants and the mutes into classes, according to the received distinctions of the learned?’ (Ct. Br.D.ii.106).
These conversations of Plato and Socrates are comparable to Yāska's explanations, because there is proximity in the age of Yāska and Plato. The similar discussions of east and west at an approximate age are very important for historical analysis. Further the discussions of Yāska about the derivatives and compounds are valuable in the linguistic studies. Between an etymologist and a grammarian there is a notable difference in the analysis of words. The difference in analysis is very clear in *Nirukta*. Etymological observations should stress on its meaning and derivational process. There are no discussions about its formal conditions and changes.

For instance, Yāska mentions the word *daṇḍyaḥ puruṣah*. Here Yāska's explanations are interesting like a story reading -

\[
\text{daṇḍamarhatiti vā daṇḍena sampadyata iti vā, daṇḍo dadaterdhārayatikarmanāḥ, akrūro dadate maṇiṁityaḥbhīhāśante. (Nirukta II.4)}.
\]

Here the first explanation of the word *daṇḍyaḥ* is in its derivational attitude. Then he gives explanation for the word
Continuation to this, he quotes an example of its verbal usage. Then another etymology of *dandah* has been quoted. Addition to this, the root *dam upaśame* has been explained with an example- *daṇḍamasyākarṣateti garhāyām*.

According to Yāska, the above mentioned style of etymology is favorable in *Nirukta* as a whole. Yāska was very familiar with Indian grammatical features. This is obviously clear from his discussions on *taddhita* and *samāsa*. More over, glimpses of modern linguistic phenomena like aphaeresis, dissimilation, assimilation etc. are seen in Yāska’s aproach. His mentions like *ādīviparyayah ādyantarāviparyayah*, *varṇalopaḥ* etc. are examples for modern linguistic features.

The next example for *taddhita* is interesting. The word *kakṣyā* has been quoted by him. Yāska firstly gives the word meaning of *kakṣyā*, then the meaning of *taddhita kakṣyā rajasvasya*, *kakṣam sevate* (*Nirukta* II.4). After the explanation for the word *kakṣa*, he provides its linguistic features from where the syllable *kṣa* came and so on. Then its other...
possibilities on derivations in meaning are discussed.

These discussions on each and every word, are done as in a conversation of two persons. Yāska explains the compounds and their meanings in the above method. In these discussions, Yāska explains the meaning of \textit{samāsa} and then the word meaning, its derivational forms, possibilities and so on. Then he quotes a stanza from Vedas to exemplify that meaning. Yāska had approached \textit{taddhitas} and \textit{samāsas} in detail.

He also mentions about the words which are not based on the contextual reading, and are not derived by Yāska (\textit{naikapadāni nirbrūyat}). This statement of Yāska, states the importance of contextual reading in \textit{Niruktaśāstra}. The Vedic words from \textit{Nighaṇṭu} are always discussed within the context. This method of Yāska may be acceptable to modern linguistic features, especially in the synchronic method. Language is most useful faculty of man, which deviates its contexts through the social changes and the study of it should be based on the ground of its usages. Yāska was aware of this fact about language.