Chapter IV

PARIBHĀṢĀ

GENERAL REMARKS

There is a very important class of grammatical statements in the M.Bh. called Paribhāṣā. The word Paribhāṣā does not occur in the Aṣṭādhyāyī in the sense of general rule for the interpretation of the sutras, although some rules of Pāṇini are placed by Patañjali in the category of Paribhāṣā. It appears that some time after Pāṇini wrote his Aṣṭādhyāyī, some short commentaries or vṛttis were written to explain and illustrate the sutras. However, with a view to help in the correct interpretation of the sutras, it became necessary to lay down some fundamental principles, to give certain maxims, and to state certain guiding rules derived directly or indirectly from the sutras themselves. All such maxims and guiding rules are included in the term Paribhāṣā. It seems that, for the first time, Katyāyana has used the word Paribhāṣā twice in its technical sense in the Vārtikas,

1 "विभाष उपदेश इति वैवर्तकालथाल परिभाषात्मान् अवुपदेश:"
Vārt. 4 in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.69 and "अयः विभाषितं इत्यक्षक्षत्वपरिभाषाः"
Vārt. 3 in the M.Bh. on P.I.3.11.
while Patanjali has used the term frequently in the M. Bh. with reference to some sūtras or to some of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana as also to some general statements useful for the right interpretation of the grammatical rules.

It deserves to be noted that the Paribhāṣā statements are from their very nature different from the Vārtikas, since the latter correct, reject and add to the sūtras; while the former simply help in the proper interpretation and right application of the sūtras.

THE DEFINITION OF THE TERM PARIBHĀṢĀ

The term Paribhāṣā is very commonly defined as "विनयमेन नियमवारिषणो परिभाषा". This definition is found to be current at the Pāṭhasālā, where Sanskrit grammar is taught by traditional method. It is also found in several commentaries of the Paribhāgenduśekhara. The definition shows that Paribhāṣā is such a statement, as makes definite whatever is indefinite in the sūtras. In other words, Paribhāṣā removes the uncertainty, which occurs either in the interpretation of the grammatical rules or in their application. For instance the sūtra of Pāṇini VI.1.77 substitutes yaṇ in the place of ik, when it is followed by ac. But there is
no certainty as to whether the sutra mentioned above becomes applicable or not in case there is an intervention of one or more letters between ik and ac. This uncertainty is removed only when the sutra VI.1.77 is interpreted with the help of the Paribhasa-sutra I.1.66, which teaches that the rule in which a word is used in the Locative case gives its meaning with the addition of the terms (avyayahita) and (pūrva) and hence it becomes definite that the sutra VI.1.77, is to be applied only when there is no intervention of any letter between ik and ac. Although this definition of the term Paribhasa is applicable to almost all the Paribhasas of this system of grammar, yet it is not a faultless one, since it becomes applicable to the niyama-sutras, teo and hence this definition is open to the fault called ativyapta.

The derivation of the term Paribhasa throws light on its definition; the term is derived from the root bhās with the prefix pari and is explained as "परिति: नाम्यति या ता परिमाप्ता" (that which is used in all rules, that which is explained as...)

---

1 वर्णमालाभिः परिमाप्तेः नाम्यति या ता परिमाप्ता।

Bhairava Mishra in his commentary on the P.S. p. II 2.
where it is applicable). This definition has also the same fault viz. ativāpti because both the Sanjña and the Paribhāṣā are used in all sūtras, wherever their objects are found.

Hence the term Paribhāṣā in grammar is taken neither in its conventional sense (ṛūgha) nor in its pure derivative sense (yogaṛūgha) but in the sense: yogarūgha, which includes both the conventional and derivative senses. The term Paribhāṣā, therefore means an axiom, which is helpful in the proper interpretation and right application of all the rules. Thus "परिभाषा यथा माना परिभाषा प्रकाशिते" given by an old grammarian, is considered as a faultless definition of the term and hence it is accepted by almost all later grammarians.

Vaidyanātha Payagunde in his Gāḍā on the P.S.
Although Patanjali has not specifically defined the term Paribhāṣā in the M.Bh. yet while discussing the sūtra II.1.1 he has stated the distinction between the Adhikāra rules and the Paribhāṣā rules, which makes very clear the true nature of the Paribhāṣā. The pur­port of the M.Bh. with regard to Paribhāṣā is as follows:—

The function of both the Adhikāra-sūtra and the Paribhāṣā-sūtra is the same, as neither of them prescribes anything independently, but as they are connected either with the Vidhi-rule or the Nīṣedha-rule, both of them are helpful in the Vidhi and the Nīṣedha sūtras for their proper interpretation with a view to arriving at correct forms. There is, however, a marked difference between the Adhikāra rules and the Paribhāṣā rules, namely that the former is connected with every following rule only up to a given limit,

1  

M.Bh. on P.II.1.1.
while the Paribhāṣā rule *castśs a glance* at all those rules, which come under its purview. Patanjali has compared the Paribhāṣās with a lamp and has shown that just as a bright shining lamp illuminates the whole room, so the Paribhāṣā elucidates all the sūtras which come under its purview. Now it is clear that the definition of Paribhāṣā which is given in the verse quoted above and cited in several commentaries of the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* is completely based upon the M.Bh. passage mentioned above.

Similarly a very simple definition in the words -परि - सर्वः ग्राम्यः उपयुक्तः ग्राम्यः परिभाषा - is given in the Laghu-Paribhāṣā-vṛtti of *Puruṣottamadeva*, literally means a statement which elucidates all those rules which come under its purview. It is also obviously based upon the passage of the M.Bh. mentioned above. Thus it may be said that Patanjali's description of the nature and function of the Paribhāṣā forms the model and standard for the definition proposed by later scholars of grammar.

**THE NECESSITY OF THE PARIBHAṢĀ RULES**

Like other groups of grammatical rules, the Paribhāṣā rules have their own special importance. They are absolutely necessary for the proper interpretation
and right application of the sūtras. In other words, Paribhāṣās teach the general principles according to which certain sūtras have to be interpreted or applied for, without them, generally a proper interpretation of those sūtras becomes almost impossible. In fact the Paribhāṣās serve the following three important purposes i.e. (1) they are helpful in the interpretation of the sūtras, (2) they decide the priority of the application of the sūtras when the latter are in conflict, (3) they modify the sūtras in such a way that certain correct forms are arrived at. That is why the position of Paribhāṣā rules is analogous to that of the other class of the sūtras in grammatical literature.

The necessity and importance of the Paribhāṣās can also be proved by their popularity among grammarians. They are considered so useful and essential for the study of grammar, that after the composition of the M.Bh. more than a dozen eminent scholars have collected the Paribhāṣās and have written independent treatises on them. These scholars have generally judged the validity of the Paribhāṣās on the authority of the M.Bh. Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, whose independent work on the Paribhāṣās viz. the Paribhāṣenduśekhara which has attained the most eminent position in the Pāṇinian
system of grammar, has expressly stated in the introduction that he would discuss in his work only such Paribhāṣās as have been recorded in the Vārtikas and in the M.Bh. In his work, however, there occur sixteen Paribhāṣās, whose validity cannot be proved on the strength of the M.Bh. In such cases, he has generally remarked that those Paribhāṣās not only do not occur in the M.Bh., but they are actually contrary to it.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE PARIBHĀṢĀS

The sūtras of Pāṇini are generally divided into six categories, according to their functions and the Paribhāṣā sūtras form one of the categories. Bhaṭṭoṇi Dīkṣita in his S.K. has given a separate chapter called Paribhāṣāprakāraṇa in which he has discussed thirteen sūtras, which are found in the first chapter of the Aṣṭādhyāyī and which are referred to as such in the

1 प्राचीन कैयाकरण-श्रेणि वाचनिकारिनि, अन पाशिनीय- ज्ञ भापक-वाचसिद्धार्थिनि माध्यवार्तिकारित्यांविवरणार्थिनि वाचनि परिभाषापारिनि तार्ण व्यास्वावनें।

2 Cf. पदगोरवान योगिकामयो गरीवान।
Paribhāṣā 131, परलू माध्यवास्मिलितन।
दार्करित श्रुत्य माध्य विदय च।
PS thereon and also see Paribhāṣā 98, 99 etc.
M.Bh. The purpose of the Paribhāṣā sūtras is the same as that of the other Paribhāṣas viz. to be helpful for the right interpretation and the application of the sūtras. The Paribhāṣā-sūtras, however, have not been included in their collection of Paribhāṣas by the authors of the independent treatises on the Paribhāṣas. Grammarians of non-Paninian schools, however, have mentioned several of Pāṇini's sūtras under the name Paribhāṣas or Paribhāṣa-sūtras.

The Paribhāṣas, which are recorded in the independent treatises on the Paribhāṣā are divided into three classes: (1) Jñāpakasiddha (as deduced from the interpretations of Pāṇini's rules) (2) Nyāyasiddha (referring to the axioms either taken from the experience of ordinary life or established by logical inferences). (3) Vācanikī (mentioned in the M.Bh. without any reference to their sources.) Nāgęśa Bhaṭṭa in the introduction of his Paribhāṣenduśekhara, has however given only two kinds of Paribhāṣas as 'तापक-वाचनिसिद्धानि'.

Footnote continued from previous page.

3. संतोष परिमार्जा विकिरितयम प्रव च। अतिदेशोपिवकारस्तव छन्दिन्म सुमज्जयम॥
But seeing the nature of his work, commentators have interpreted that sentence by adding some words so as to include there the Paribhāṣā of the third category also.

It would not be out of place here to explain the terms Jñāpakasiddha, Nyāyasiddha and Vācānaka, which are frequently used in later works in connection with Paribhāṣā mentioned in the M.Bh. Jñāpakasiddha - the terms Jñāpakam, Jñāpayati etc. are very commonly used in the M.Bh. in the sense of an indicatory statement. Patanjali holds Pāṇini as an unquestioned authority and hence he considers that not even a single letter of his sūtras is devoid of any purpose. It is claimed that if a particular term or terms in a sūtra seem to be without any purpose they are not to be considered as altogether useless but they can be taken to indicate or point out something, which reveals the hidden significance of the word or words, which seem useless in

1 सन्तान ज्यामिक ज्यामि संग्रह ज्यामि परिमाणां वाक्य- 
निकल्य गीतिः न्यायोपारिपूर्ण वाच्यं प्राप्तेत् वाक्यं परिमाणां परिभाषाः।

Bhairavi on P.S. p. 2.

2 "परिमाणं परिभाषा न भज्ज्यम्"

M.Bh. on P.I.1.1.
the sūtra. Such a word or words or sometimes the whole sūtra is called Jñāpaka (indicator) of a particular thing and that thing, which is indicated is called Jñāpakasiddha. It is, however, absolutely necessary that after the indication the indicative term or terms of the sūtras, which before indication seem to have been without a purpose should be found essential and serving some purpose; for instance the word 'lekha' in P.VI.3.50 seems to be without a purpose, since the affix 'an' in that sūtra with the help of the Paribhāṣā "प्रत्ययाध्यायकों प्रत्यय-ग्रहणे न तद्वत्ता-सहभागम्" would denote all words ending with the suffix 'an' including the word 'lekha' which is formed with the suffix 'an', hence the mention of the word 'lekha' in that sūtra, would be superfluous. In this way the word 'lekha' of P.VI.3.50, becomes Jñāpaka of the Paribhāṣā :-

This means "an affix, when

1. M.Bh. on P.VI.3.50.
employed in a rule in which the word 'uttarapada' is valid, does not denote a word ending with the affix."
When this Paribhasa, however, is indicated the affix 'an' in P.VI.3.50 does not include words ending with 'an' and hence the mention of the term 'lekha' in that sutra becomes absolutely necessary. Besides this, the other purpose of the indication 'jnapana' of this Paribhasa, which is considered to be necessary is that the suffix 'rupa' in P.VI.3.43, does not denote a word-form, ending with 'rupa' like 'brahmanirupa'. Hence it is that in the phrase 'kumaribrahmanirupa', the short 'i' cannot be substituted for the long 'i' of the word Kumari by P.VI.3.43.

A study of the M.Bh. shows that a word or more of a sutra cannot be indicative (jnapaka) unless the following four conditions are fulfilled: viz. (1) Vaiyarthya - the purpose of that term should be completely served in some other way without adopting a

1 सिद्धे विधिरार्थनासि तापासि भवितः

M.Bh. on P.I.1.3, VII.2.102.
particular dictum. (2) **Jnāpana** - it should indicate some dictum. (3) **SvāNSECArtārtya** - the term looked upon as useless, should be found necessary, when that dictum has been indicated. (4) **Anyatrapāla** - it must have some other purpose or purposes of that indication.

Nāgāraja Bhāṭṭa maintains that a dictum as stated above, although established by a word of the sūtras, cannot be considered as a valid one, unless that dictum is given in the M.Bh. He suggests that the words of the sūtras, whose purpose is not discussed in the M.Bh. cannot be indicative (**jnāpaka**) even though the words of the sūtras can be shown to be without a purpose (**vyartha**).

**Nyāyasiddha :-** The Paribhāśās, the existence and authority of which, are established by the general practice of mankind, are called Nyāyasiddha. The term Nyāya is also used in grammar as a synonym of the word

1. पिं क्षामव [M.Bh. on P.I.4.14; VI.1.108.]
2. किंभेलिस्या: शास्त्रने प्रबोधनव [M.Bh. on P.I.1.11.]
3. मान्यानुमक्तानिदित्वस्तव साहुताया: निमात्मकत्वे माना-भावाया। मान्यानुमक्तानिदित्वस्तव साहुताया सोवानताया पारायण-दार्शनिकान्त्वकल्पनाया पवोशिल्याय। [P.S. on the Paribhāśā 97 p. 195.]
Paribhāṣ. Nāgēśa Bhaṭṭa in his Paribhāṣenduśekhara has occasionally used that term to refer to the Paribhāṣas of three groups, viz. Jñāpakasiddha, Nyāyasiddha and Vācanikī. The word Nyāya of the term Nyāyasiddha, however, may either be taken in the sense of the lokanyāya (a maxim from ordinary life), and in that case, the Paribhāṣas, which are based on such maxims, are called lokanyāyasiddhā or, the word Nyāya may denote the sense of reasoning in general and the Paribhāṣas, which are based upon it are called simply Nyāyasiddha. For example, Patañjali has established the authority of the Paribhāṣa "नायक्यात्मकसंस्कृताधिकरणे कथार्थार्थी:"

1

on the maxim from ordinary life. He has stated there, that when somebody has been told  "आयुर्वेदमानन्य" (bring a non-Brahmana) it is supposed that he would bring one who

M.Bh. on P.III.1.12.
although not a Brāhmaṇa, is similar to a Brāhmaṇa. In such a case, if he brings a lump of earth, he is not considered to have done, what he ought to have done. Accordingly, in grammar too, when an expression is connected with the negative 'na' or the participle of comparison 'iva' it denotes something, which is different from and yet similar to what is denoted by its co-related word. Therefore, Patañjali has suggested that the term (उपस्थ) in P.III.1.12 indicates that the suffix 'kya' is added to the stem 'bhrśa' etc. when it does not end with the suffix 'cvi' although the sense of 'cvi (abhūtatadbhāva) is found therein. Several such Paribhāṣās, mentioned in the M.Bh. are called 'Laukikanyāyasiddhā' by later grammarians. Other Paribhāṣās of this class, which are based on pure reasoning are called simply 'Nyāyasiddhā'. The Paribhāṣās like अब्धवतमलोक नान्वकर्त्य 1 'साभ्यप्रतिकायमेव पुनर्वैत्यथा' 2 etc. belong to this class.

1 Cf. The M.Bh. on P.V.1.22 and रििेन्द्रसिस्थापतिस्य प्रिभ्रोवत्य विशेषणतयां स=वक्तम्येव ल्यागे मानामायेत्या पुलञ्ज

PS. on the Paribhāṣā - 14.

2 Cf. The M.Bh. on P.VI.4.3 and तद्शन्याय-सिस्मेिज्ञमि।

PS. on the Paribhāṣā - 76.
(3) Vācanikī - The Paribhāṣās, the existence and authority of which can be determined only by the authoritative statement of Patañjali given in the M.Bh. are called 'Vācanikī'. In other words, in the M.Bh. neither the existence of this class of Paribhāṣās, is established by a word or words of the sūtras, nor is their validity proved by the general practice of mankind. Such Paribhāṣās are given in the M.Bh. either in the form of Vārtikas or in the form of original statements of Patañjali. Such Paribhāṣās are regarded as Vācanikī and they are equally necessary for the proper interpretation and right application of certain sūtras. For instance, the Paribhāṣā is regarded as Vācanikī, since it is given verbatim in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.72, as an independent rule, where Patañjali has stated that in case that Paribhāṣā did not exist, the sūtra of Pāṇini VI.4.77 would be applicable only to the examples śriyau, bhruvav, etc. where the suffix 'au' is a pure vowel, but it would not be applicable to the forms like śriyāḥ, bhruvāḥ, etc. where the suffix, 'as' contains a vowel at the beginning. If, however, this Paribhāṣā is adopted and applied, the word 'aci' in the sūtra VI.4.77 would mean 'ājādau pratyaye' (a suffix, which begins with a vowel).

1 "वास्त्वर खिचितत्ववाचाराम्र"  
Vart. 29. Footnote continued on next page.
Several scholars have tried to classify Paribhāṣās in the Pāṇinian school of grammar on divergent bases. Puruṣottamadeva in his ‘Laghubāṣa-vṛtti’ has divided the Paribhāṣās into three groups: (1) lingavatī, (2) vidhyāṅgabhūtā, and (3) vidhiśeṣabhūtā. A Paribhāṣā, which contains a special mark or significatory word is called ‘Lingavatī’. In other words, such a Paribhāṣā cannot be applied to a sūtra, unless the latter possesses a significatory word. For instance, the Paribhāṣā-sūtra of Pāṇini, I.1.3 would not be helpful for the interpretation of a rule, unless that rule enjoins either a Guṇa or a Vṛddhi substitute. Again that Paribhāṣā, which when connected with the Vidhi-sūtra, supplies its essential part, is called ‘vidhyāṅgabhūtā’. Such Paribhāṣās are helpful for the proper interpretation of rules to arrive at the correct forms. For instance, the sūtra VII.2.83 cannot have its proper meaning without the help of the Paribhāṣā-sūtra.

M.Bh. on P.I.1.72.

Puruṣottama in Vṛttītīka on P.I.1.3.
1.1.54. Hence the latter is called vidhyāgabhūtā. Again such Paribhāsās, as decide the priority of the application of rules, which appear to be in conflict are called 'vidhiṣeṣabhūtā', such as the Paribhāsā-
śūtra I.4.2 etc. By having a recourse to a more de-
tailed principle of division, Prof. K. V. Abhyankar
has arranged the Vārtika-Paribhāsās into six groups
in his Marāthī-translation of the M.Bh.

The authorship of Paribhāsā :- There is no suf-
ficient evidence available to ascertain specifically
the authorship of the Paribhāsās, which are not in-
cluded by Pāṇini in his śūtras. They are sometimes
presupposed by the rules of Pāṇini and sometimes dedu-
cible from the rules of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. It is possible
that some of the Paribhāsās were in existence either
in the form of Paribhāsā śūtras in the works of ancient

1

(1) सुभाष व्यक्तिवापक परिभाषा वाचिक (2) सूक्ष-
भित्तिव्यक्तिवाचिक (3) नित्यविभिन्नत्व आचार्य
अन्तर्ग्रामवाचिक (4) अपवादविभिन्नत्व आचार्य अनुवाध्याय
(5) सुभाषितप्रत्येक व्यक्तिवाचिक परिभाषा वाचिक (6) लघु-
लिपित्व व्यक्तिवाचिक परिभाषा वाचिक।

प्रस्तावणा-संद - सातवा भाग - माराठी.
grammarians or in the shape of general maxims current among the people at that time. It is also possible that Pāṇini had them in his mind when he composed the rules of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, since, in their absence several terms in the sūtras or sometimes the whole sūtra would be superfluous and would not be intelligible.

This supposition gets further support from the statement of Nāgęśa Bhaṭṭa in the Paribhāṣenduśekhara and the commentary thereupon by Vaidyanātha Pāyagunde. Nāgęśa Bhaṭṭa (who has collected these Paribhāṣas - 132, in number and explained them) has stated that some of these Paribhāṣas were mentioned in the works of older grammarians, and later recorded in the Bhāṣya and the Vārtikas. Vaidyanātha in his comments on it, observes that by older grammarians are meant Indra and others, who used these Paribhāṣas in their works in the form of the sūtras, but in the Pāṇinian system of

1 प्राणीनवविभकरकतःं शास्त्रिनिर्मिति, वा शास्त्रिनीतिनः
   हापक-वाणिज्यविशेषनां भाष्यपार्श्वविविधाः
   यहां परिश्रमाः पाणिनां व्याख्यायनै।

P.S. p. 1.

प्राणीनति - ह-प्राणीनतयः, शास्त्रिनिर्मिति चुज्जोपेश
   पाणिनां।

Gadā thereon by Vaidyanātha Pāyagunde.
grammar, they came to be considered as Paribhāṣās either indicated by the words of the sūtras, or based upon the general practice of mankind.

It may be argued here, if most of the Paribhāṣās, which are available to-day, were in existence at the time of Pāṇini, why he should have incorporated some of these Paribhāṣās in his Aṣṭādhyāyī and why he should have left out others. Either he should have included all the Paribhāṣās in his work or he should have used none. But a close study of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, can remove this difficulty very easily. Brevity is considered as the chief virtue of a sūtra work, although the field which the sūtras cover is very wide and extensive. Pāṇini has tried to use as few words as possible in dealing with a vast subject matter. That is why Patañjali observes that not even a single letter of his sūtras is devoid of purpose. It is quite obvious from his method of the presentation of technical terms. Pāṇini has explained certain technical terms, while has used others without giving any explanation of those technicalities. ¹

¹ युक्तवच, द्रिपित, वद्यवच, प्रथम, मध्यम, घर्षन, बाल्मीक, भूत, भाष्चर्य -- etc. are used in the sūtra, but they are not defined therein.
It shows that when he has used a new technical term, he has given its explanation, but when he has taken those terms from his predecessors' works, he has kept silence, since they were quite well known to scholars at that time. Similarly it can be inferred that he was compelled to incorporate such Paribhāṣā rules in his Aṣṭādhyāyī, as did not occur in the writings of his predecessors. This may be the reason why he has incorporated some of those Paribhāṣās in his work and omitted others, which were already in existence in his predecessors' works and in current usage among scholars.

Most of the Paribhāṣās, which are mentioned in the M.Bh. either in the form of the Vārtikas or independent statements, are taken by the Vārtikakāra and the Bhāṣyakāra from their predecessors' works, some of which may have been in existence even at the time of Pāṇini. It is also likely that some Paribhāṣā statements were made by Kātyāyaṇa and Patañjali with a view to arriving at certain correct forms, which were not in use at the time of Pāṇini and which came in use later or in some cases even to shorten or simplify some rules of Pāṇini. A close study of the M.Bh. shows that the Paribhāṣā-Vārtikas like "भिन्नार्थाः प्रत्ययाः " (Vart. 15) on P.VI.1.85 and "न वा भिन्नार्थाः " (Vart. 7) on P.I.1.47 which are the source of/Paribhāṣā "असःपरिप्र":[विद्याः प्रत्ययाः] and the Vārtika "नित्यप्रत्ययाः"
(Vart. 4 on P. III. 1. 7) which is the basis of the Paribhāṣā etc. were in existence before Katyāyana, who quoted them at those places, where he felt their necessity in the course of his discussion. He has sometimes quoted them only in part. The Paribhāṣās like “उपपदीविषयके: कारकविबिधस्त्रोतिः” (Vārt. I) on P. II. 3. 19 and “प्रारम्भिकमध्रेः िििण-विशिष्टस्थानि प्रक्रम” (Vārt. 4) on P. IV. 1. 1 etc. which form parts of Katyāyana’s Vārtikas and wherein the superfluity of the words: aprādhāne of Panini II. 3. 19 and nyāp of Panini IV. 1. 1 is stated respectively are evidently Katyāyana’s own invention as is clear from the discussion of Patanjali thereon. In the case of the former he agrees with the view of Katyāyana without raising any objection and gives another use of that Paribhāṣā, while in the latter case, he not only agrees with Katyāyana but also supports his view by saying that this Paribhāṣā should inevitably be adopted, since there are several uses of this Paribhāṣā. The use of the word kartavyā

1 वाचयानि कारकविबिधविशिष्टस्थानि प्रक्रम यस्य एवम्। क्षणं ? नात्वम् अपकृतत्वम्।
M. Bh. on P. I. 3. 19.

2 कः पुनर्र किष्टेभति ? प्रव्यत्वत विरामशः किष्टेभ श्रमं वा। वर्णयक्षेत्वा परिभाषनं कर्तव्यं। वहन्तेत्वा: परिभाषानि: प्रवर्णनानि।
M. Bh. on P. IV. 1. 1.
in his statements and the nature of his discussion thereon, clearly indicate that Patañjali holds the view that those Paribhāṣās were laid down by Kātyāyana. Again the Paribhāṣā Vartikas "वर्णन किरिण्यद्वारात्मकः प्रथमः" (Vārt. 29) on P.I.1.72 and "उभयनिर्देशे विद्वत्तेनाय अन्वयाद्विविद्वतः" (Vārt. 3) on P.I.1.67 which is the source of the Paribhāṣās "उभय-निर्देशे परस्माििनिर्देशे वल्लभानि" are the original statements of Kātyāyana because they form an essential part of his discussion.

Similarly there is evidence in the M.Bh. to prove that some of the Paribhāṣās, which are found in the later Paribhāṣā works belong to the authorship of Patañjali. For instance, the Paribhāṣās like "चङ्ग्रीहो तदुःशास्त्रवाचारमिपि" and "शास्त्रकानेच निपततनार्थ मर्यादा" etc. which are the result of his discussion on P.I.1.27 and form an inseparable part of his arguments, are Patañjali's original statements.

M.Bh. on P.I.1.27 and कर्तव्योऽस्मि यत्वः: शाश्वकानेच निपततनार्थ मर्यादा।

M.Bh. on P.I.1.27.
It can be concluded from the above that some of the Paribhāṣā statements which occur in the M.Bh. are taken by Kātyāyana and Patanjali from older grammarians, while others are independent statements made by them.

YATHODDEŚA AND KĀRYAKĀLA

In the Pāṇinian system of grammar, two alternative views are held about the application of the Paribhāṣās, viz. the Yathoddeśapakṣa and the Kāryakālapakṣa. Patanjali, on P.I.1.11 has given a general rule: “वचोदेशं संहारपरिमायम्” । which of course, later on, is regarded as a Paribhāṣā. It literally means that the Paribhāṣā and Saṁjñā rules help in the interpretation of the śūtras, which come under their purview, while remaining at their own place. In other words, Paribhāṣās 'cast their glance' at all the sūtras of grammar without leaving their place, where they are mentioned. According to Kaiyāṭa this alternative refers to those students, who blindly follow their precceptors and merely serves the convenience of beginners. They

1 पुर्व ताहि किं न वतन् - कार्यकालं संहारपरिमाययः, चचोदेशंैव संहारपरिमाययः। च चासावसिद्धः, तस्माः सिद्धदल्ल्वात् तत्काला एव वर्ष्णः।

M.Bh. on P.I.1.11.
learn the meanings of Paribhāṣās in their places, although they are not useful at those places, where they are taught. The pupils consider that whatever they are taught by their teachers, will be of some use on future occasions, when they will feel their necessity for the right interpretation of the injunctive rules leading to the formation of correct words. This is the technical reason why a sutra in the last three quarters of Pāṇini’s Astādhyāyī cannot be interpreted with the help of a Paribhāṣā, which is mentioned in the first seven chapters and also in the first quarter of the last chapter of the Astādhyāyī, since the former is invalid in the eyes of the latter.

In this connection other scholars hold the view that in the Yathodeśapakṣa, when one learns the meaning of a Paribhāṣā, he searches the whole of the Astādhyāyī and keeps in his mind all those sutras, in

Pradīpa on the M.Bh. on P.I.1.11.
which that Paribhāṣā is applicable and the Paribhāṣā is to be repeated as many times as there are rules, which come under its purview.

The other alternative view viz. the Kāryakālāpakaṣa also occurs frequently in the M.Bh. Patañjali on P.I.1.11, has stated a general dictum about the Saṅjaṇa and the Paribhāṣā rules in the words \"कार्यकाळ संंज्ञापरिप्रेषणम्\" which has also received the designation of Paribhāṣā. The term kāryakāla of that Paribhāṣā is derived in the sense: \"कार्येन कालस्य स्पष्टायांगवत् प्राप्ते श्रेप्त कार्यकाळव\" (that which is attracted by a vidhi or niṣedha rule, which teaches grammatical operation). Hence the literal meaning of the above mentioned Paribhāṣā is that a Paribhāṣā-rule is attracted by a vidhi or niṣedha rule for the interpretation of the latter. In this alternative the meaning of the Paribhāṣā is not to be learnt in the place, where it occurs, but at the place

1 कै च चु परिप्रेषणोपक तार च तय परिप्रेषणोपक रथों सप्तमोनितिः। कै च चु परिप्रेषणोपक तार च तय परिप्रेषणोपक रथों सप्तमोनितिः।

P.S. on Paribhāṣā 2.
of the vidhi or nisedha rule. Therefore it is said
in the M.Bh. on P.VIII.2.1 that although the Paribhāṣā sūtra of Pāṇini 1.1.66 is 'sapadasaptādyayāstha'
and the vidhi-rule VIII.2.26, is tripādīstha by their
actual mention in the Aṣṭādhyāyī, the latter is not
valid in the eyes of the former. Yet a 'sapadasaptādyayā'
Paribhāṣā can be applicable even in a tripādī rule in
the kāryakāla view, since in this view, the Paribhāṣā
sūtra adopts the place of the vidhi or nisedha rule,
with which it is connected.

1

"वपसर्दं हरसिद्धम्" हरिकेन्ह सिद्धम्। कषम?
"कार्यादां संतपरिमारेश्मु" तव कार्यं तत्रीपित्वः
स्थापत्यम् ।

M.Bh. on P.VIII.2.1.

"कार्यादां संतपरिमारेश्मु" सत्यासनु वस्त्रे संपतापरिमारेश्मु भवतु-परार्थायणस्तय्येव कार्याकर्मसे
हेतु-वृत्तम। रे कर्मकार्यरुपं ताहयासनेऽप्रवाहानाम। तत्रिपित्वे
पुच्छिपदेखः कषमः।

Pradīpa thereon.
SOME GENERAL METHODS ADOPTED IN THE M.Bh.
TO INTERPRET THE RULES OF GRAMMAR

It is very interesting to note that besides Pari-
bhāṣās and Nyāyās, there are several general methods
adopted in the M.Bh. with a view to arriving at the
right interpretation of the sūtras of Pāṇini. In fact
they are very important and sometimes unavoidable for
knowing the hidden meanings of the sūtras. Grammarians
after Pāṇini, especially Kātyāyana and Patañjali,
have generally adopted these methods in order to arrive
at the right interpretation of the sūtras and their
proper application in the case of forms, in which
they at first sight seemed to be inapplicable. The
eventual purpose of employing such devices is to arrive
at the correct forms in language by the right inter-
pretation of the sūtras without resorting to unneces-
sary additional rules. Sometimes these devices have
also been adopted in the M.Bh. for the purpose of brevity
while at others, they are accepted for refuting the
objections raised by the Vārtikākāras against the sūtras.
Generally, however, they are adopted to secure the
formation of certain grammatical forms, which could not
be explained, in the ordinary way by the sūtras of
Pāṇini. Some of these will be discussed here in order
to show their utility in grammar.
In the M.Bh. this word very frequently occurs in the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana as well as in the statements of Patanājali. The meaning of the word 'Yogavibhāga' is "the splitting up of a śūtra, which is traditionally given as one single śūtra, into two or more śūtras!" The general purpose of adopting the method of 'yogavibhāga' is to explain certain forms, which appear to be ungrammatical. The main advantage in accepting this method is to arrive at certain correct forms, without giving any additional rule or even without changing the wording of a rule.

It deserves to be noted here that the M.Bh. on P.I.1.50 and commentaries thereon by Kaiyāta and Nāgāsaṇa

1 यथा पुनरियमन्तःप्राचेरात्वः, सा किं प्रकटितो मयोऽ । स्यान्वयन्तरररो च वग्निति। बाहोविन्यासः। स्याने प्राच्यमाणायन्तरतम बाहेवऽ मयोऽ। कुः पुनरियम । विचारणाः। उभयार्थी दुल्ला संहिता। "स्यानेन्तरतम दर्षिपर:। हि।"

M.Bh. on P.I.1.50.

1 वेन प्रकारेण संहितापाठालथाभनेतरः। प्रतिचुस्त्र उ विचारवाणाः संवपराः।

Pradīpa

अतने संहितापाठ एव दूर्योर स्थित इत्यतः।

Uddyota.
Bhâṣṭā clearly indicate that the Āṣṭādhyāyī was composed by Pāṇini in a continuous recitation (Saṃhitāpātha). It was divided by him into eight adhyāyas or chapters with four subdivisions (pādas) in which students learnt it by way of continuous recitation (Saṃhitāpātha) and they were taught how to split it into sūtra form by their teachers. The ancient Vṛtti-kāras, who flourished before Kātyāyana divided the Āṣṭādhyāyī into sūtra-forms. But the traditional division of the Āṣṭādhyāyī into sūtra-forms perhaps was not strictly fixed even up to the time of Kātyāyana, because some new divisions of the sūtras, finally suggested by him have been taken in later works like the Kāśikā-vṛtti, the P.K. the S.K. and other works. A few examples are sufficient for the present purpose. They are as follows:- Kātyāyana on P.I.1.17 has given a Vṛtti

"उ त्रैति योगविभागः"

which means that the sūtra

Vṛttī 1 "उ त्रैति योगविभागः"

(Vṛttī I)

उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। "उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः।

(Vṛttī 2)

Vṛttī 3: "उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः।

M.Bh. on P.I.1.17. "उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः। उ त्रैति योगविभागः कल्लिप्तः।

Pradīpa thereon.
of Panini "उपं यो" I.1.17 which was originally the one single sutra, should be split up into two as "उपं: I.1.17 and "उपं" I.1.18. The purpose of this 'yogavibhaga' given in the next Vartika and in the Bhasya thereon is the formation of the form 'viti' which is accepted by all grammarians except Sākalya. This 'yogavibhaga' suggested by Katyāyana has been followed by all later grammarians and the sutra "उपं" has been recognised as divided into the sūtrapātha, although it has increased the number of the sūtras in their works. Similarly he has given a Vartika "हूः: संप्रारणे योगविभागः" (Vart. I) on P.VI.1.32 which means that the sutra "हूः: संप्रारणे मप्यतत्वस्य च" which was originally one single sutra, should be divided into two as "हूः: संप्रारणम्" VI.1.32 and "मप्यतत्वस्य च" VI.1.33. The purpose of this division is given in the next Vartika and in the M.Bh. thereon as the formation of the forms कमयति and बनयति by the first sutra i.e. "हूः: संप्रारणम्" Had the original sutra been taken as a compound sutra it would not have been applicable, since there the root is हावाचिक (a causative stem) and not the pure root 1 and not the pure root as "हूः"

1 It should be noted here that Katyāyana, in his Vartikas, has suggested Yogavibhāgas (new division of the sūtras) about 26 times, out of which the following Yogavibhāgas in the sūtras are adopted in the later work:- I.1.17 + 18, I.4.58 + 59.IV.3.116 + 117. VI.1.32 + 33, VII.2.115 + 116. VII.3.116.117.VII.3.118 + 119 cf. I.A. Vol. XVI.p.180. The Yogavibhāgas, suggested by him in the following sūtras are not adopted in the later works:- I.2.58 (suggested in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.61) II.4.2.III.1.46. III.1.67. III.2.4. III.4.2. IV.3.1. V.3.5.VI.1.1.VI.1.89.VI.1.102. VI.1.195. VI.3.10. VII.2.63. VII.2.115 (suggested on P.I.1.3) VIII.2.23. VIII.3.58, VIII.3.59. VIII.4.3.
It is worth-while to note in this connection that not only new divisions of the sūtras made by Kātyāyana have partially been taken by later grammarians, but also the latter have sometimes inserted some additional rules of Kātyāyana in the body of the sūtras. It clearly indicates that up to the time of Kātyāyana, the Aṣṭādhyāyī did not have a strictly fixed sūtra-form. For instance; Kātyāyana has suggested the additional rule "स्त्रिया" under P.IV.1.15 and the later grammarians like the authors of the Kāśīkā-vṛtti have included the word 'Khum' in the body of the sūtra IV.1.15.

Several such examples are found in the Kāśīkā-vṛtti.

At the time of Patañjali, probably the 'sūtrapātha' had become more or less rigid, since in the M.Bh. on several occasions, the method of the 'Yogavibhāga' (splitting up of a sūtra into two or more) is adopted by Patañjali to arrive at the correct forms. Although his decision is regarded as of supreme authority in the Paninian system of grammar, yet only a few Yogavibhāgas

1 IV.1.15, VI.1.115, VI.1.124, VI.1.150 in the Kāśīkā-vṛtti.

2 Patañjali has suggested new division of the sūtras more than 70 times, out of which the following Yogavibhāgas are recognised in the later works :- II.1.11 × 12. VI.1.164 × 165. The latter Yogavibhāga is suggested by Patañjali on P.IV.1.98.
suggested by him are recognised as a number of different sūtras in the later works. For instance, Patañjali has suggested that the sūtra "विभाषणपरिवहितविषय: प्रधानम् II.1.11" which was originally given as one single sūtra, be split up into two as "विभाषण" II.1.11 and "अपपरिवहितविषय: प्रधानम् II.1.12." The purpose of this Yogavibhāga is to make it clear that Vibhāga is an adhikāra and it is valid in every succeeding sūtra. Kātyāyana has expressly said that if there be no Yogavibhāga, the word 'vibhāga' would be connected only with this sūtra and not with the following sūtras and hence this 'yogavibhāga' is necessary. Again, Patañjali has suggested that the sūtra "तत्त्वस्तत्वत्वजितः" VI.1.164 which was originally a single sūtra be split up into two as "तत्त्वस्तत्व" and "जितः" to account for the accent of words like कौँ-जाना? This yogavibhāga, suggested by Patañjali has been accepted by later grammarians and this sūtra is given as two in their works. Several other yogavibhāgas, however,

---

1 अन्यथा इत्यादियोणयो: वाचकस्तेत, योगविभषाः तु अधिकारो गम्यते। Pradīpa on the M. Bh. on P.II.1.11.

2 एवं तत्त्वस्तत्वत्वजितः करिपस्ते। इवमतिः "जितः" VI.1.163. फिलोक्तस्तत्वैव उवाचो भवति। तत: "तत्त्वस्तत्वतः"

VI.1.164. तत्त्वस्तत्वत्वजितः उवाचो भवति।...तत: "जितः" VI.1.165 फिलोक्तस्तत्वस्तत्वैव उवाचो भवति। M. Bh. on P.IV.1.98.
although suggested by Patanjali have not been recognized as different sūtras by later grammarians and they have mentioned those sūtras as a single one.

Anabhidhāna :- The expression 'anabhidhānā' frequently occurs in the M.Bh. referring to such words or phrases, as can be formed by rules of grammar or can be used according to those rules, but which are not found in the compositions of learned scholars. It is expressly said in the M.Bh. that grammar is not meant to coin new words or new meanings, but to explain the formation of words, which already exist in the language. Moreover, it is also stated in the M.Bh. that a man who wishes to use words, does not go to the house of a grammarian and say "Make some words; I shall use them". Even without going to the house of a grammarian, he takes the object he needs and uses words. This clearly shows that grammar explains the words which are in existence and in usage.

1 ... सदन्वास्त्रिक्ष्यति [Vārt.I.

सदन्वास्त्रिक्ष्यति सदन्वास्त्रिक्ष्यति 

M.Bh. on P.I.1.62 and न लक्षणम् चारेव वज्रे 

M.Bh. 1st Ahnika.
In the M.Bh. both Kātyāyana and Patañjali have very commonly taken recourse to this method of anabhidhāna to show that if a particular form of a word or words in a particular sense is not used, such a word would mean nothing or would not convey the requisite meaning and therefore it would be useless to forbid its use or its employment in that particular sense by sanctioning any additional rule. Hence by adopting the method of anabhidhāna, both Kātyāyana and Patañjali refute such objections as are raised against the sūtras of Pāṇini, that either his sūtras are too broad and teach more than what is necessary or that the sūtras teach less than what they ought to teach. For instance, Kātyāyana has stated a Vārtika, which teaches that the word Saññyām should not be read in the sūtra III.3.19, since the suffix ghan, which is taught by that rule, is seen in both senses viz. a technical sense and a non-technical sense. The omission of the term Saññyām, however, is open to the objection that in the absence of the word Saññyām, that sūtra would be applied also to expressions like kṛtaḥ kātaḥ and then it would be kāraḥ but Kātyāyana has refuted that objection by adopting the device of 'anabhidhāna'. Patañjali in the M.Eh.

1 "संसाधकमन्नववयं च सर्वसा च कृती च चर्चनाव।

Vart. 2. Footnote continued on next page.
has supported this view and has emphasized it by saying that kṛt affixes, Taddhita-affixes and compounds, take place only in those examples which are current and as nobody uses kāraḥ kaṭaḥ in the sense of kṛtaḥ kaṭaḥ, the affix ṛhaḥ therefore cannot be added here to the root kṛ and the word saṁjñāyam in P.III.3.19 is not necessary.

Again Kātyāyana has adopted the method of anābhidhāna on P.IV.2.1 and found the word rāgāt, to be unnecessary in that sūtra. The sūtra IV.2.1 teaches that the suffix an would be added to a word, which denotes 'colour' in order to convey the sense 'coloured' by it. The purpose of the word rāgāt in P.IV.2.1 is stated in the M.Bh. there-on to be the prevention of the application of the suffix an to the word Devadatta in the expression 'Devadattena raktam vastram' (a cloth coloured by Devadatta). Kātyāyana however, has found the word rāgāt

Footnote continued from previous page.

Vart. 3.

M.Bh. on P.III.3.19.
in P.IV.2.1 to be superfluous. He has stated that the suffix an should be added by P.IV.2.1, to denote the sense 'coloured by that' (tena raktam) and this meaning would not be denoted by the word Devadatta, in the expression (Daivadattam vastram). Hence the suffix an would not be added to the word Devadatta due to anabhiddhana.

This would become more clear from the pradīpa of Kaiyāṭa. Kaiyāṭa has stated thereon that the science of grammar has been composed in order to explain the formation of words, which exist in the language and to show the use of correct forms and the exclusion of the corrupt ones. Hence a particular suffix can be added to a word, only when the word is current in that sense in the language. In the expression 'Devadattena raktam vastram' the suffix, an by P.IV.2.1 cannot be added to the word 'Devadatta', since the meaning 'a cloth coloured by Devadatta' which is understood from the above expression cannot be understood from the expression like Daivaddattam

Pradīpa on the M.Bh. on P.IV.2.1.
vastram. This expression is always used to denote the sense of "a cloth belonging to Devadatta". Similar is the case with expressions like 'Kopena raktam mukham' rūpeṇa kāntāyaṁ raktah, where the suffix an by P.IV.2.1, cannot be added to the words, kopa and rūpa, because such forms are not current in the language in those senses.

Similarly according to Patañjali, the words, halādi and ekāś, in the sūtra III.1.22 are not necessary because the words formed with the addition of the suffix yaḥ from the roots having two or more vowels or from the roots beginning with vowels are not used in the language. Hence the suffix 'yaḥ' cannot be added to those roots due to anabhidhāna. Not only has Patañjali advocated anabhidhāna but he has stated that this device must be recognized here, even though the words halādi and ekāś are retained in P.III.1.22, because roots like śubh, ruṣ, etc. which have a single vowel in them and which begin with a consonant, come under the application of the sūtra III.1.22 in the sense of 'bhṛṣam rocate' and

1 Kātyāyana has adopted the method of anabhidhāna in following sūtras:—

On II.2.24, Vārtika 16, III.1.7 Vārtika 5 and Vārtika 7. III.2.1 Vārtika 5. III.3.19 Vārtika 3. IV.1.82, Vārtika 1 and 2. IV.2.1 Vārtika 1. IV.3.155 Vārtika 3 etc.
"bhrṣam  śrobhate" but the forms derived from the roots, rue and subh ending the suffix yaj, are not used in the language.

It should also be noted here that although both Kātyāyana and Patanjali have taken recourse to the method of anabhidhāna to remove certain objections raised against certain sūtras of Pāṇini, yet this device is not regarded as a happy one. Commenting on the sūtra III.1.7, Patanjali has expressly said that the methods of anabhidhāna become practically inevitable where recourse to other is not possible, e.g. अनवत्ता गति:। In other words, this device should be adopted only when there is no other way to arrive at the correct forms of the language. Haradatta in his Padamañjari, has stated

1 Patanjali on several occasions, has adopted the device of anabhidhāna as :— On P.I.1.69. III.1.15. IV.1.93, IV.2.10, IV.3.25, IV.3.39, IV.3.42, IV.3.120. IV.4.89, V.1.9, V.1.37, V.1.72, V.2.46, V.2.65, V.2.96, V.2.115, V.2.118 etc.

2 तत्त्वानिश्चितं यथाप्रि:क्तं तत्सं। अन्वेष हु यथाक्षरं प्रत्ययं। तथा च पञ्चिति “यथाक्षरप्रत्ययं”।

Padamañjari on the Kaśikā on P.III.2.1 and also न लघुने पदकारा: अनुवत्ताः, पदकारेनाय लक्षण- युग्मप:।

M.Bh. on P.III.1.9.
that the method of 'anabhidhāna' should be adopted only in those cases, where the authorities (āptaih) have asked to do so and that elsewhere simply the rules of grammar should be followed. As has been said, the forms, which are not current in the language should be derived according to the rules of grammar. Moreover, it has also been stated in the M.Bh. on P.III.1.109, that 'Pada-kāras should not be followed by rules, but rules should be followed by padakāras.'

Nipātanātsiddham:—The expression 'Nipātanātsiddham' is very frequently used in the M.Bh. The term Nipātana is traditionally defined as सिद्धन्तात्मालोक 'a form, which cannot be derived according to the rules of Pāṇini and which is too important to be passed over by a grammarian without notice.' The characteristics of these forms are such that they cannot be generalized and it is very difficult to group them under any special mark. It is assumed in their case that they stand as they are uttered. The traditional definition of the term Nipātana is probably based on the statement of Patanjali in the M.Bh. on P.VI.1.157, as अविभित्तक्षण: चुद पारसकारग्रुप्तिपूर्वक 'Here the word 'avihita-lakṣaṇaḥ' recognizes the fact of definition as founded on common properties (sādharmya) not being accomplished.

1 M.M. Kunte in 'Vicissitude of Aryan Civilization', p. 274.
Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, on the other hand, has defined the term Nipāta in the 'Paribhāṣenduṣṭekhara' as "a form, which is different from that derived according to usual rules of grammar" while showing the similarity between 'pratiṣedha' (prohibitory rule) and Nipāta. Patanjali has revealed the real nature of Nipāta in the M.Bh. on P.I.1.27. He has stated there that in the case of 'pratiṣedha' (prohibitory rule), Pāṇini first composed a general rule and then he composed another prohibitory rule, which teaches that the former rule cannot be applied in particular cases. In such cases, the readers learn that the view of the Ācārya is that the general rule becomes applicable only to what does not come under the purview of the prohibitory rule. Nipāta too is of the same nature, i.e. if a word is employed in the sūtra of Pāṇini and is contrary to any one of his general rules, in such cases, the view of the Ācārya is that the general rule does not apply there. For instance, a question has been raised in the M.Bh. concerning the word 'sarvanāṃnāni' in Pāṇini's sūtra I.1.27; should the initial 'n' be changed into 'ṅ' by the sūtra VIII.4.3?

1 "नवादुहोऽन्वयाः प्रयोगं प्राप्ते अवादुहोऽन्वयोगकरणः"

P.S.
Kātyāyana has answered this question by taking recourse to Nipātana. Commenting on this Vārtika, Patañjali has stated that since Pāṇini has used the word 'sarvanāmāni' in I.1.27 with a dental 'n' therefore, it is learnt that his view is that the general rule for 'natva' should not be applied here. Similar is the case with the sūtra I.1.49 in which Pāṇini has used the word, 'sthāneyogā' which is a compound word as 'स्थाने योगोऽयः अस्यः लेयम् स्थानेयोगा' According to the general rule of the compound the Locative suffix after the word sthāna should be dropped, but Patañjali has adopted the device of Nipātana to justify the correctness of that word.

1 Vivakṣā:— This device is also commonly adopted in the M.Bh. by both Kātyāyana and Patañjali. The word 'Vivakṣā' is derived from the desiderative root 'vivakṣa' with the affix 'a' in the sense 'vaktum iccha' (a desire to speak) and this word is generally taken in grammar to mean the desire of speakers, who use certain words

2 Kātyāyana on P.IV.2.52 Vārtika 5. Patañjali IV.2.21. V.1.16. V.2.34, etc. This device is frequently adopted in the later works like Kāśikā-vṛttī and Siddhānta-kaumudi.
to convey certain senses. This device is very frequently employed in connection with case-terminations. That is why there is a maxim common among grammarians that case-terminations take place according to the desire of speakers. cf. “प्रकाशण: कारकाणि चरणिनां”.

The sutra I.2.59 (which teaches that the plural case termination should be added optionally to the Prātipadīma asmad, even though the speaker is one or two) is found to be unnecessary. It is said that the purpose of the sutra could be served by the device of vivakṣā and avivakṣā. He has further argued that in the world also the organs of senses are sometimes given prominence and such a use as this my eye sees well, and this my ear hears well, is correct. At other times when they are not given prominence but are intended as mere instruments the use such as I see well with this eye and I hear well with this ear, is also correct.

1 अधर्मां योगः ख्यातेऽवक्तम्। कथम् वहै प्रशोधिति, काव्यां शुचः, वहं शुचः। इनातीयं-प्रशोधितं कविक्षितः स्वातं-श्रव्येण विचित्रताति चरणिना। तद्वषयः इवं मे शिक्षा शुचः परम्परेत, वहं मे कर्णः; शुचते शुचौपौर्विति, कविक्षितं परातं-श्रव्येण | अनेनार्थाय शुचते परातते शुचयेन, अनेन कर्णेः शुच्ये शुचोपौर्विति, तदु च चार्थं-श्रव्येण विचित्रता सहितक्षणं पवित्रिताः, चददं परातं-श्रव्यं विचित्रा तदेक्षणं तदेक्षणं पवित्रिताः।

M. Bh. on P.I.2.59.
Similarly when one speaker or two desire to give prominence to themselves, there would be the use of the plural and when no such prominence is intended, the singular or the dual number would be employed. Again Patanjali has stated in the M.Bh. on P.I.4.23 that a root denotes an action (kriyā) which consists of several successive vyāpāras e.g. the root pac denotes the sense of pāka which consists of putting the pot on fire, pouring water into it, throwing rice into it, removing the fuel, etc. It is also stated there that if the speaker intends to give prominence to the action of the agent the expression would be but if he intends to give prominence to the action of sāhāli, the expression would be and so on. Thus it is clear that the use of the case-termination fully depends on the intention of the speaker. Moreover, Patanjali has clearly stated that there is avivakṣā, even for that

In the M.Bh. on P.I.2.64 Patanjali has stated that the decision of the gender of a word is to be made according to the desire of the speaker. When there is the vivakṣā of saṁstya, the word would be placed in the feminine gender. When there is the vivakṣā of

Continued on next page.
which exists as 'alomikā edakā' (Rāma has no wool) and 'anudarā kanyā' (The girl has no stomach). Similarly there is vivakṣā which does not exist as in 'Samudrā Kunḍikā' (Ocean is a small pitcher) and 'Vindūro vardhitakam'.

It should be noted here that the words 'vivakṣā and avivakṣā' are contradictory. Thus when a speaker intends to use the accusative case and no other in a certain example, then the former would be vivakṣita (intended to be expressed) and the latter would be avivakṣita (not intended to be expressed) but it is not possible that in the same example a sense would be regarded as both vivakṣita and avivakṣita at the same time. Hence, when the sense of the Ablative is intended, the expression would be 'वच्चोऽयायं वाच्चोऽयायं' and if the Accusative is intended the expression would be 'वच्चोऽयायं वाच्चोऽयायं'.

Vyavasthita-vibhāgā :- This device is very rarely adopted in the M.Bh. Kātyāyana has never used this.

Footnote continued from previous page.

'prasava' the word would be in the masculine gender. When there is the absence of vivākṣā of both, the word would be neuter.

Cf. नामकं सर्वं कुतो व्यवस्था। विक्षात्। संस्थान-विक्षायां स्त्री, प्रत्यविक्षायां पुमान्। उपयोर-विक्षायां नव-सक्र।

M.Bh. on P.I.2.64.
device in his Vārtika. Patanjali has taken recourse to this device only thrice. The etymological explanation of this word is (vyavasthā sahjātā asyāḥ iti vyavasthitā sācāsau vibhāṣā - vyavasthita-vibhāṣā) which means that an optional rule need not be optional in every case, but may be taken to teach either that an operation in a particular instance must take place, while in another, it does not take place at all, or that the operation is really optional in a limited number of instances only, while in others it must necessarily take place or in still others it may not take place. For instance, the sūtra II.4.56 teaches that 'vī' would be substituted in the place of 'aj' when it is not followed by the suffixes 'ghan' and 'ap'. Kātyāyana has written a Vārtika on P.II.4.56 to prohibit its application in the case of the suffix 'kyap'. Patanjali, on the other hand, has brought the word 'vā' from the preceding sūtra, II.4.55 to II.4.56 and has accepted it as 'vyavasthita-vibhāṣā'. Thus he has rejected the Vārtika of Kātyāyana as well as the word 'aghaṇāpoh' of the sūtra II.4.56.

1 In the M.Bh. on P.II.4.56. III.2.124. VII.1.56.
He has stated that because it is 'vyavasthitavibhāṣā'

it would operate in the examples like pravetā, pravetum,

etc. and would not operate at all in examples like

samājāh, udajāh, etc. In the later grammatical works

like Kāśikā-वṛत्ति this device is very frequently adopted.

Pratyāhāragrahaṇa :- In the M.Bh. on several

occasions, Patañjali has explained certain words of

Pāṇini's sūtras to be collective words (Pratyāhāra) which

however, at the first sight appear like mere a single

suffixed, or a root, etc. The purpose of this device is

to avoid unnecessary additional rules and to secure

correct forms of the language simply by interpreting the

sūtras. For instance Kātyāyana has given a supple­

mentary rule on P.II.3.69 to prohibit the Genitive

suffix in connection with words ending with śānan,
cānaṇā and śatṛ which do not come under the purview

of the sutra II.3.69. Patañjali has found this Vārtika
to be unnecessary, as he has explained the word, trn,

______________________________

1

केदवतानो गलोऽश्च हर्ति योगे च संवाहितः

भिक्षुकृत् विभववने गयाक्षः उन्तिदेवसः
which is mentioned in that sūtra with a mute letter (anubandha) (n) to be a collective word, so that the word tṛṇ, would denote not only the suffix, tṛṇ, but could also include other suffixes, which stand between sūtra and tṛṇ both inclusive. Hence the purpose of the Vārtika would be served by the sūtra II.3.69 and any additional rule for this would not be necessary.

Praśliṣṭa-nirdeśa:—This expression occurs in the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana as well as in the M.Bh. on several occasions. The meaning of the expression, praśliṣṭa-nirdeśa is understood as the mention of two or more phonetic elements by their coalescence, which when split up shows a phonetic element or letter, which was not known before the components were separated. For instance Kātyāyana has stated on P.II.4.85 that in this sūtra the substitute 'dā' should be regarded as a combination of two vowels and one consonant viz. dā, where the vowel ā in dā, is considered to be united with the following ā, so that it would be substituted in the place of the whole termination ti, and ta by the rule I.1.55. Similarly Patañjali has stated in

\[\text{Patañjali on P.I.1.44, I.I.56 (twice) I.3.63. II.3.69. II.4.56. III.1.40. III.2.127. IV.1.10.}\]
the M.Śh. on P.I.1.56 that the word 'li' in P.VI.1.51
and bhī in P.VI.1.56 are prāśiṣṭa-nirdeśa, the vowel
i in each case contains two vowels viz. i + i. On
the same sūtra Patanjali has stated that the words ṇī
and āp of P.VI.1.68 should be considered prāśiṣṭa-
nirdeśa as ṇī + ā, and ā + āp and hence the word
'dīrghāt' of P.VI.1.68 is not necessary.

Ekāśeṣanirdeśa :- The phrase Ekāśeṣa nirdeśa is
very commonly used in the M.Śh., where it is said that
Pāṇini has employed one single word in his sūtras by
adopting the method of 'Ekāśeṣa'. Both Kātyāyana and
Patañjali have explained such words of the sūtras
by saying that the expression used by Pāṇini is a com­posite one including the omitted thing along with the thing
already expressed. For instance, Kātyāyana has raised a
question on P.I.4.101, whether the word 'ātmanepāda'
should be put in that sūtra, for, if the word 'ātmanepāda'
were not in that sūtra, the number of saṁjñā would be
only three and that of the saṁjñin would be six and hence
the sūtra I.3.30 would not operate on account of the
dissimilarity in number of saṁjñā and saṁjñin. Here

1 Kātyāyana on P.II.4.85 Vārtika 9.
Patañjali on P.I.1, 3.I.1.27. I.1.56 (twice).
II.3.69. II.4.32, III.1.36. III.1.44. III.4.82.
V.3.5. VI.3.34. VI.4.89. VII.1.27. VII.1.96.
VII.2.107.
Kātyāyana himself has stated that there is no of mentioning the word ātmanepada in P.I.4.101 the phrase 'prthama-madhyamottamah' is mention in that sūtra by Ekaśeṣa, which would also den sañjñās and therefore, there is no dissimilarity number. Patañjali has also explained the word dīni in P.I.1.27 by accepting it as Ekaśeṣanir as sarvādīniḥca sarvādīniḥca = sarvādīni.

Avibhaktikonirdesah:—Sometimes certain the sūtras of Pāṇini have been interpreted in as words without a case-termination. For inst the M.Eh. on P.I.1.3, Patañjali has said that VII.3.82 should be regarded as consisting of the (words) viz. mid, ēḥ and guṇah. The stem which is regarded as without any case-termination, yet stands for the Genitive case, midah, mean part of mid (madhayava). Similarly, the word in the sūtra VIII.2.18 is considered as having


2 M.Eh. on Śiva Sūtra 2, 3, 4 and on P.I.I.36, VII.1.3 VII.3.83, VIII.2.80.
mentioned without any case-termination. It is split up as 'krpa', 'uh', 'raḥ', 'lah', in which the word Krpa would stand for Krpaḥ as the Genitive case.

Maṇḍūkapluti:—Pataṇjali has also resorted to the device of Maṇḍūkapluti on several occasions in the M.Bh. This is a device, whereby a word, like the jump of a frog, may be connected with the following, though not necessarily continuous sūtras. In other words, just as a frog goes from place to place by hopping and jumping, so certain words of preceding sūtras are connected with some following sūtras without regard to intervening ones.

The word Maṇḍūkapluti is also used in later works in the same sense. Similarly, Pataṇjali has sometimes explained certain technical terms of the sūtras, by saying that they are mentioned by Pāṇini in accordance with their literal sense (anvarthasaṁjña).

1 मण्डुकपलुतः सूतराणां ध्वनिः च श्रवका उत्पज्ज्योपपत्तिः गच्छित्वा तत्वदविकाराः।

M.Bh. on P.I.1.3, and also on P.II.3.32, III4.34. V.2.4. VI.1.17. VI.3.49. VII.2.117.

On other occasions, the word (para) of Pāṇini's sūtra I.4.2, is interpreted to convey the sense of desired rules, and therefore according to Patanjali, the sūtra I.4.2 means that, out of the two conflicting rules, it is the desired rule, that should take effect in order to arrive at the correct forms of the language.

On some other occasions, the method of Bhūtapūrvagati, has also been adopted in the M.Bh. to make certain sūtras applicable to those examples, where the wording required by the sūtra is not present at the time but it was there before.

The other device, using the word Bahula, is found in the sūtra of Pāṇini himself. This device is only explained in the M.Bh. Patanjali himself, has rarely adopted it in interpreting the sūtras. This device is

1 एष्टवाची परवाहः । निप्रतिपदे परं चार्यं तद्यथार्थः।
   M.Bh. on P.I.1.3 and also I.2.5. I.4.2. V.1.69. IV.1.85. IV.2.39. V.1.2. VI.1.12. VI.1.138. VI.2.130. VI.4.48. VII.1.1. VII.1.96.

2 एष्टवाची तदन्त्य पतं तर्क्याये साधुः नक्षमेव भयुपर्यं गति-र्विष्णावते।
   M.Bh. on P.I.1.20 and also I.1.56. VI.1.77. VI.3.66. VI.4.3. VI.4.14. VII.2.37. VII.2.67. VII.3.83.
used in connection with some rules, which are necessarily applicable in some cases and not so in other cases, while they are optionally applicable in still other cases.

There are still some other devices like Ekayogah kariṣyate, Sambandhamanuvartisyate, Yogāṅgam vijnāsyate, Luptanirdesah, etc. which are occasionally adopted in the M.Ś. in interpreting the sūtras. These devices do not play a very important part in the interpretation of the sūtras. Patañjali has mentioned these devices during his discussion of certain points and generally the purpose of these devices can be served in other ways.

1