CHAPTER VI

A DISCOURSE ON INTERPRETATIVE CANONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE AUTHORITIES.
VYÁDI, PURUSOTTAMADEVA, ŚĪRĀDEVĀ, NIKARANTHA, NAGESA AND DHOJA
We have discussed so far the interpretative rules of Pāṇini and other paribhāṣās formulated or referred to either in the vṛttikas or in the Mahābhāṣā. Paribhāṣās in the Prātisākhya too have been examined. It is evident that a systematic discipline of learning must have certain interpretative canons for the proper and suitable explanation of the rules it contains. The sūtra form of discourses in particular necessitates elaborate systems of explanation. Under such circumstances, it is a logical assumption that commentaries and annotations would formulate necessary interpretative canons by way of deduction. Mr. K. V. Abhyankar is correct when he opines that 'those vṛttikas which laid down general (1) principles, useful in arriving at the right and proper explanation of the sūtras as also in the formation of such words as could not be easily explained without any difficulty came to be known as paribhāṣās'. The learned scholar thinks that paribhāṣā works too made their appearance 'simultaneously with the vṛtti and (2) vṛttika works within a century or two after the sūtras had been written'. Such a work necessarily compiles the deductions of rules. It is a positive augmentation to the study of a branch of learning.

Mr. K. V. Abhyankar has claimed the Paribhāṣāsāṅgraha, attributed to Vyādi as 'the oldest original work of vyākaraṇa paribhāṣā'.

(2) Ibid.
It deals with ninety-three canons of interpretation. Each and every canon is given due consideration in the vr̥tti portion of this text. A Vyādiparibhāṣāpātha also which compiles one hundred forty canons goes by the name of Vyādī. Both these works begin with the canon Artha-adgacāhāna etc. but while the former ends in Kriyagrāhāna gati etc. the latter ends in Jñāpaka-siddhāna na sarvatra. As his family name suggests, Vyādī was a relative and a junior contemporary of Pāṇini. From this it follows that both Katyāyana and Patañjali are likely to be indebted to him. It is a logical assumption that the early text of paribhāṣās from which they quote is Vyādī's.

A survey of the interpretative canons in Vyādī's Paribhāṣā-sucāna would reveal that of the ninety-three canons (I) twenty-two give direction for proper construction of rules, (II) thirteen for proper interpretation of words, (III) eleven deal with the nature of augments, substitutes and changes, (IV) forty discuss relative priority between conflicting rules while (V) seven examine relation of words to their senses. It is interesting to know that Patañjali quotes as many as sixty-eight of these canons and has left only twenty-five, presumably for their less importance. Below is given a list of the interesting canons of Vyādī which we had no occasion to discuss or refer to in the previous chapters.

(1) Ucāritā-praśahansasucānāmbandhāh (P-sū 11).
An ambandha is characterised by its loss instantly after its pronunciation.

(2) Itareteśvarayāmyapi kāryāni śastraśu prakalpante (P-sū 24/Pu 26/Sū 3).
Mutually dependent operations too are admitted in the science of grammar.

(3) Varnākadesā vannagratāhena gṛhyante (P-sū 26).
By a letter its ingredient too is comprehended.
(4) समानस्रयह्यम् सिद्धम् व्यास्रयं सिद्धम् भवति (P-sū 36).
An operation of identical ēṣraya (i.e. locus and conditional cause) is inefficient but that of different ēṣraya is efficient (in the wake of another operation).

(5) उक्तार्थानेन अप्रयोज्य (P-sū 51).
A meaning already denoted need not be repeated otherwise.

(6) उदित स्वार्गम् एव ग्रन्थति, ना सावर्गनःत्र (P-sū 56/Pu 89/Si 17).
A mute with indicatory u is inclusive of its homogeneous mutes only and not of other homogeneous letters.

(7) आर्थवस्म विबध्वि-विधर्माहे भवति (P-sū 63).
A case-ending is subject to change in consideration of the meaning to be denoted by it.

(8) आपतत्वायहः पापनिण्य (P-sū 65/Pu 104/Si 51).
Paninian scholars do not encourage an operation which becomes ineffective in the next phase of certain formation.

(9) आतार्थ्यम् तरांसिद्धेत (P-sū 66).
The comparative suffix -tara is insignificant.

(10) समुदाययुतं साधुनञ प्रवृत्तिः स्वयंस्वप्रस्व वर्तमान (P-sū 85).
A word which denotes a group refers to its ingredients too.

(11) अय्यक्तगुप्तसंवेश्यो नमुनास्वातम् प्रवृत्तयते (P-sū 97/Pu 60).
In respect of indistinct guna, neuter shall be the gender of the word.

(12) द्वितीयप्रतिवेशु वाचनवप्रतिवेश पवित्रेय (P-sū 98).
Between particular references to an indicatory letter and a verbal root the former predominates over the latter.

(13) द्वितःचक्कुण सुवर्णम् भवति (P-sū 92).
Repetition emphasis.

Haradatta names himself as the author of a text, named Paribhāṣāprakaraṇa (cp. ओत्तप्तसम्बोध Paribhāṣāprakaraṇakhyāgraṇthe upapāditam Padamanjari on P. 6.1.37). But it is known only by name.

Next comes the name of Puruṣottamadeva, the famous Buddhist grammarian of Bengal of the twelfth century A.D. S.C. Chelavarty informs that this scholar is later than Kāśyapa (1050 A.D.) when
he refers to but prior to the Durghatavṛtti (1172 A.D.) of Sarana where he is referred to. According to Srstidhara (appr. 1660 A.D.), an annotator of Purusottama’s Bhāṣāvṛtti it was written at the inspiration of prince Lakṣmanasena of Bengal (Lakṣmanasenaṃya rājñāḥ ājñeyo...). The Bhāṣāvṛtti is a vṛtti type of commentary of such rules of Pāṇini as are concerned with classical Sanskrit alone. Consciously has he left the rules which pertain to the language of the Vedas. In this vṛtti, the author has followed the Kāśika to some extent. For example we may refer to the explanation of the rule P. 1.2.56. He has also utilised the Bhāṣāvṛtti. In the introduction of his Jñāpakasamuccaya, a collection of indications in the rules of Pāṇini, Purusottama informs that he presented earlier a vṛtti of the paribhāṣās which was highly appreciated by the senior grammarians (op. Vasālako; paribhāṣānāṃ vṛttim vṛddhasamsarastūm). In his Paribhāṣāvṛtti, he has followed the arrangement of canons as it is in the Paribhāṣāsūcāna of Vyādi. It comprises one hundred twenty canons in all, begins with the canon Arthavyad etc. and ends in Vyākyānto visesapratipattih etc. The last is the fifty eighth canon in Vyādi’s Paribhāṣāsūcāna and is the first canon to be deduced in the Mahābhārata on the rule Lāṅ. It is generally believed that the Paribhāṣāvṛtti of Purusottama is a commentary upon Vyādi’s work. But number of canons treated by these two scholars being different, such a claim should be accommodated with a grain of caution.

Śrīdeva is the renowned author of a Paribhāṣāvṛtti. He is later than Purusottama but earlier than Śāyāna. His work is conspicuous by the classification of canons into indicated and logical canons, arrangement of the earlier in order of the Pāṇinian rules.
which indicate them and simple but comprehensive analysis. It
deals with one hundred thirty-three canons of which one hundred two
are indicated and the rest are based on popular logic. Purusottama
did not classify his canons nor did he arrange them according to
the sequence of rules of Panini. Both have an elegant and simple
style of expression. Sīrādeva accommodates almost all the canons
which have found their place in Purusottama's work. In addition to
them, Sīrādeva reviews fifteen canons viz. Si 43(Ps 129), 92(Ps 102),
96 (Ps 65), 97 (Ps 64), 105(Ps 106), 112(Ps 109), 128(Ps 122),
57, 64, 111, 125, 130, 131, 132 and 133. The last eight are absent
from the Ps as well.

(1) Kriyāvisēṣaṁgānāṁ karmatvam napuṣṣakalingatā ca (Si 57).
An adverb which modifies a verb is treated as the accusative
case in neuter.

(2) Varnārāye vidhau nāṃśādvattvam (Si 64, nāṃśādvat -
Mīl 123).
The euphonic substitute of two letters is treated as the
original neither in the earlier element nor in the latter
in the face of an operation which is conditioned by letter.
For example, (kṣatva + a) + bhis = kṣatvābhish (with no
replacement of -bhis by -ais which is conditioned by an
a-ending stem — P. 7.1.3).

(3) Pitsvarat citsvaro valīyān (Si 111/Mīl 130).
Acute accent conditioned by the indicatory letter v
(P. 6.1.166) prevails over sandote conditioned by the
indicatory letter p (P. 3.1.4). For example vībhajya:
(āvṛtta + yed, by the rule Vṛddhot etc. P. 4.1.166,
according to Sk + dāp), is acutely accented in the last
close.

(4) Paryāyadāṃśe gurulāghavacarca nādiyata (Si 125).
In respect of synonyms, number of letters is not counted.

(5) Yuga pad adhikaratvacaś ca dvandvā (Si 130).
A co-ordinate compound has its members related to a verb
and the like at a time.

(6) Pūrva dhatuḥ sāhāmane yujyate, pascād upasṛṣyata (Si 131).
A verbal root is related to a suffix first and then to a
prefix.
(7) Anye tu pūrvam dhātur upasargena yujyate pāṇēt sadhanenestyāhuh (Śi 132).
Others opine that a verbal root is related to a prefix first and then to a suffix.

(8) Saṃsaṃkṛtaddhitas gu sanghābhāhīhānam puṣṭra rūghya-bhinnartāpyabhāhīcāritasambandhohbhah (Śi 133).
In words which are either formed in compound or derived from nouns with secondary suffixes or from verbal roots with primary suffixes the element of relationship is an additional feature.....

In this context, we furnish a list of the major interpretative canons which are discussed by both Purusottama and Śīrṣedva but ignored by Nāgasa.

(1) Na vṛgyaagrahameṣu (Pu 2/Śi 10).
The predominance of the meaningful over the meaningless is useless in respect of letters.

(2) Viḍhi-viṣṭamma-viṣṭibhājana trayāṇām senändhāno tadante viḍhān bhavyati (Pu 11/Śi 13).
Verbal or inferential presence of subject (viṣṭibhājā), object (viḍhi) and instrument (viṣṭama) are essential for tadanta.

(3) Asti ca sambhavo yād udbhayam syāt (Pu 22/Śi 37).
Some conflicting operations co-exist (e.g. yathājātiya with both the suffixes - thāl and -jātiya).

(4) Kṛtam api sastraṁ nivartayanti (Pu 104/Śi 52/Hī 65).
Sometimes Paninian Scholars withdraw a rule which has already taken effect.

(5) Ekamābhandhahkagrahane na duṣyambhandhakaṁya (Pu 37/Śi 54).
The form of two suffixes being same after the loss of one indicatory letter in one and two such letters in the others, the former is not inclusive of the latter.

(6) Antara-ga-bhāhāmpayorantara-gaṁ valavat (Pu 43/Śi 22/Hī 27).
A rule of internal affinity prevails over that of the external.
(7) So hyanadistad acaḥ pūrvastasya vīdhīṃ prati sthānivat (Pu 34/Si 70).
A substitute or so of a vowel which is conditioned by a subsequent conditioning cause is treated as its original in case another operation is ensuing in the locus which is followed by the aforesaid original vowel (e.g., patayati (patu + nic + tip), the elided u being treated as restored in the face of ensuing vṛddhi of the preceding 'a' by Ata upadāhyāḥ P. 7.2.116).

(8) Abhākāmyaṃ nipātanaḥ bhavanti (Pu 99/Si 70/Hī 110).
The overriding force of nipātana (irregularity) may halt (to justify certain regular forms viz. puratana beside the irregular viz. purāpa).

(9) Vartsyaprayātyaḥ kārtyāḥ kriyante (Pu 16/Si 37).
Sometimes grammatical operations take place in respect of a root or so of which the future nature is taken into consideration. (For example in ninyutuḥ, nimyutuḥ etc., replacement of ī in ni in ni is not by iyāḥ but by ī in the consideration of ensuing reduplication which will make the stem multisyllabic).

(10) Garbhavatāvādaḥyo bhavanti (Pu 116/Si 91).
The suffixes viz. tap (and the like affixed to a stem) resemble a child in the womb.

(11) Nau kartam sthānivat (Pu 33/Si 98).
In the face of reduplication of a verbal root, before the causative suffix-piṣṭ, the substitute of a vowel in the root (by way of vṛddhi, etc.) is treated as the original. (For example in rīṇavyāṣati, the substitute of the vowel u in the root before -piṣṭ is treated as its original in respect of the reduplication of the root and subsequent replacement of this vowel in the abhyāsa element).

(12) Nīnāttapāye naimittikasyāṇāh (Pu 113/Si 102).
With the disappearance of the conditioning cause, the effect conditioned by it disappears (e.g., paṭabhārya in the earlier member of which the vowel u is restored with the loss of the feminine suffix).

Nilakanṭha Vājapeyī is known to have written a Paribhāṣa-vṛtti dealing with 149 canons the last ten of which he thinks are without any root. As the editor T. Ganapati Sastri (1915), notes, Nilakanṭha refers to the Manorāśi of Bhāṭṭoji and the Gūḍhārtha-dīpikā on the Tattva-bodhini etc., and has written Bhāgya-tattva-viveka, Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhāntarabhasyan and Paniniya-dīpikā. According
to Yudhishtira Mināmsaka he should be placed between the Viśvama
dra 1600-1650 i.e. between 1543-1893 A.D. The Paribhāṣā-vṛtti of
Nīlakantha is a short re-edition of Śrīdāva's work though the
arrangements of canons in the two works is not the same. Nīlakantha
adopts derivation of unādi words (cp. Upādayo vyutpamānāyapi-Nīl 21)
and gives a canon which is conspicuous by its absence in the other
paribhāṣā works. The ten canons which Nīlakantha thinks are rootless
are given below:

1) Udīt savarnam grhyāti.
2) Kvacid vikṛtir api prakṛtin grhyāti.
3) Samprasāram tadāśraya-kāryaṁca valavat.
4) Kriyā-visesancānāṁ karma-tvam, oktvan, kliṣṭvaṁca.
5) Aupadesīka-prāyogikaye aupadesīkasyaiva grhaṇam.
6) Sarva-vidhībhya 1ḍ-vidhīr valiyan.
7) Sarva-vidhībhya lope-vidhīr valiyan.
8) Pratipada-vidhānād yogo-vidhāgo garīyān.
9) Garbhavat tōvaḍaya bhavanti.
10) Vartṣyat-pravṛtttyāṁ kāryanti kriyante.

Of course these are not redundant altogether. Moreover, grammarians
are not against their citations in grammatical discourses.
Of the later works on paribhāṣās belonging to the grammatical school of Pāṇini, the Parībhāṣendusēkhara of Nāgacā has a very distinguished position. It is looked upon as a crest jewel of all paribhāṣā works and is widely known and studied all over the country. The author belongs to the 12th century A.D. He is perhaps the last grammarian to represent independent thinking in the tradition of Pāṇini's school of grammar. He is famous for his:

(I) Uddyota which is an annotation on Kaṇḍaṭa's Pradīpa on the Mahābhārata,
(II) the Saḍbheruṣṭuṣṭa on Bhāṭṭoḷi's Siddhāntakumādi, (III) the Maṇḍūṣya, (IV) the Sphotavāda and (V) the Parībhāṣendusēkhara, the last being an independent work on the paribhāṣās. From this it follows that this great Pandit went through principles and practices, phenomena and philosophy of the Pāṇinian grammar and incorporated up-to-date grammatical speculations with a critical outlook.

The Ps deals with 133 paribhāṣās in three chapters (tandras) viz. the śāstra-vāsamādakya consisting of 37 canons, the bādhābīja of 34 and the śāstra-scana of 62 canons. It is a collection of the canons of interpretation formulated in older grammatical schools but indicated in the Pāṇinian text and referred to either in the vārttikas and or in the Mahābhārata. It critically studies the import and scope of application of the paribhāṣās. It declines to accept a canon which has no place whatsoever in the Mahābhārata. As a result of this review a lot of canons (Ps 93-102 and 129-132) is mentioned only to prove the futility of the same. Some other canons viz. Purvottṛasiddhe na sthanivat and Tasya dosahasangogadilopakalavantyo sąy are not even mentioned in the Ps.
A list of the canons which are ignored by Nāgārjuna is given below:

1. **Angavṛttavāpyāvyavahiṣṭa (Ps 83/Pu 7/Sl 94)**
   An operation by a rule within the jurisdiction of 'āśya' does not occur if another operation under the same governing rule has already taken place. Purusottama and Siśodiva have cited certain instances to prove its utility.

2. **Agniḥṣāraśāyikāvṛtvāvidhiḥ (Ps 74/Pu 83)**
   An operation by an operation within the jurisdiction of 'ābhāśya' does not occur if another operation under the same governing rule has already taken place. Purusottama and Siśodiva have cited certain instances to prove its utility.

3. **Āgamaśāstraśāyikāvṛtvāvidhiḥ (Ps 75/Pu 84)**
   A rule of augmentation is non-obligatory (e.g. tortūkona with non-appearence of the augment it).

4. **Ganakānyānaśāyikāvṛtvāvidhiḥ (Ps 76/Pu 109/SI 121)**
   Operations enjoined with reference to particular groups of roots (e.g. viśvāsāya) are non-obligatory (e.g. viśvāsāya instead of viśvāsāya from viśvāsāya in potential mood).

5. **Amdūṭaśāstraśāyikāvṛtvāvidhiḥ (Ps 77)**
   Middle conjugation conditioned by the loss of an indicatory amdūṭa (e.g. sphāya from sphāya with satr in active, in spite of the indicatory amdūṭa in the root).

6. **Nāgadhātitaśāyikāvṛtvāvidhiḥ (Ps 78)**
   A prohibition with the negative particle māḥ is non-obligatory. For example, in 'subhru' (subhru + vocative su), the final vowel ū is shortened in spite of the prohibition of 'māḥ' character for the stem by the rule Nāgārjuna.

7. **Āddidēṣāyaśāyikāvṛtvāvidhiḥ (Ps 79)**
   An operation by way of extended application is non-obligatory.
A rule of elision prevails over other rules (e.g., kānī antti with loss of the initial vowel 'a' of the verb and absence of euphonic combination). A rule of augmentation by it too is predominant (e.g., svayitvā with the augment it, which precedes samprasarāṇa).

A verbal stem is (generally) inclusive of its variant conditioned by the frequentative suffix -yaṁ which is however lost (e.g., vevetti along with the vetti and vedā by P. 3.4.28).

A canon is effective in respect of an injunction only and not a repetition. For example, both 'guna' and 'vṛddhi' (which are defined earlier) are prohibited by Kāśi cā (P. 1.1.5) in spite of the seventh case-ending in 'Kāśi' (P. 1.1.66).

Sometimes a modified form represents its original. For example, the word kvaḥ in P. 1.3.30 stands for the verbal root kvaḥ.

An aupadosika (which is enjoined in a rule) is preferred to a prayogika (which is in use). For example, the term gha in the rule Gharupakalpa etc. (P. 6.3.43) stands not for the word tara (tr + ap) but for the suffix -tarāp.

Operations formulated by rules with stip (the index attached to a verbal root), sap (the conjunctional sign), amambha (an indicatory letter), gana (a group of roots) or elāc (which has a lone vowel) are ineffective in a stem conditioned by the suffix -yaṁ which is lost. For example, n is not cerbra- realise in pranyajagahenot (pra-ni-han + yaṁ + lahi tip) by the rule P. 3.4.17 wherein the root han- is referred to with stip added to it (e.g., with hanti).

Bifurcation of a rule is more cumbersome than a greater length of the rule.
Against those canons, Hagesa puts forth his view that these are not recognised in the Mahābh. He discourages a search for their indication in Pāṇini’s rules. To him, the Mahābh. is the sole authority in respect of deciding the utility of a canon of interpretation. Initially, it appears that the aforesaid canons which are absent from the Mahābh. are non-Pāṇinian. But the paribhāṣāsucāna of Vyādī includes some of these canons (e.g. Pratipadāvibhānaṁ yogavibhāgo gairīyāṁ — P-sū 74). Moreover, Bhattoji has liberally accepted as many canons as possible if interpretation of rules and formation of words are facilitated. For example, he refers to the canon Āptaṃ sāpanībindhāmo etc., in his Sk on the rule Ekacā, upadesa etc. (P. 7.2.10). All we can say in this regard is that a paribhāsa is acceptable when it helps in the proper and suitable explanation of a rule or the formation of a word. But it should be duly approved by proper authorities. Verily, a paribhāsa is appealed to only when all other resources fail to explain a rule or a formation (cp. Agatyā khali paribhāṣācasūryante — Sū 126; paribhāṣāsūryate — Pu 119).

The Saravatīkanthābhārana deserves special mention in this discourse. It consists of some six thousand sūtras arranged in eight books each of which is divided in four pādas. With all probability this work of Bhoja belongs to the 11th century A.D. Its peculiarity lies in absorption of improvements and modifications of Pāṇini by Katyāyana, Patañjali, Vāmana, Jayāditya etc., and accommodation of vārttikas, umādi rules, phit rules, Ganapatha, Paribhāsa etc. It is an enlarged edition of Pāṇini’s work in as much as its basis
lies in Paninī's text which it largely borrows from.

The second chapter of the first book of Bhoja's grammar affords a large collection of interpretative canons of grammar of those days. It has 134 rules which barring a few are paribhāṣās. The paribhāṣā rules of Paninī viz. 1.1.66 (Bh 1.2.18), 1.1.72 (Bh 1.2.19), 1.1.66 (Bh 1.2.23), 1.1.67 (Bh 1.2.23), 1.1.53 (Bh 1.2.31), 1.1.54 (Bh 1.2.33), 1.1.55 (Bh 1.2.34), 1.1.46 (Bh 1.2.35), 1.1.47 (Bh 1.2.36), 1.1.50 (Bh 1.2.33), 1.1.48 (Bh 1.2.40), 1.1.50 (Bh 1.2.41), 1.3.28 (Bh 1.2.42), 1.1.21 (Bh 1.2.52), 1.1.56 (Bh 1.2.43), 1.3.10 (Bh 1.2.62), 2.1.1. (Bh 1.2.72), 1.4.2. (Bh 1.2.119), 1.1.69 (Bh 1.2.3), 1.2.4), 1.1.52 and 49 (Bh 1.2.30), 1.1.51 (Bh 1.2.37), 3.1.1. and 2 recur in the grammar of Bhoja, the last four being rewritten in the light of subsequent experiences. Moreover, a large number of the canons generally recognised in grammatical circles, finds place in this work. Of them, (1) Bh. 1.2.24 - 1.2.26 (Ps 22, 23, 31) uphold tadante-vidhi, (2) Bh. 1.2.27 treats tadādividhi, (3) Bh. 1.2.33 (Ps 12) and 1.2.32 (Ps 104) determine sthāṇī while (4) Bh. 1.2.66 (Ps 18) and 1.2.67 (Ps 79) deal with anuvṛtti. Other paribhāṣās which deserve mention are 1.2.53 (Ps 36), 1.2.54 (Ps 37), 1.2.55 (Ps 77), 1.2.64 (Ps 74), 1.2.69 (Ps 62), 1.2.73 (Ps 14), 1.2.74 (Ps 16), 1.2.75 (Ps 114), 1.2.76 (Ps 72), 1.2.77 (Ps 106), 1.2.79 (Ps 11), 1.2.80 (Ps 30), 1.2.81 (Ps 86), 1.2.84 (Ps 50), 1.2.85 (Ps 51), 1.2.86 (Ps 15), 1.2.87 (Ps 112), 1.2.89 (Ps 9), 1.2.91 (Ps 99), 1.2.92 (Ps 75), 1.2.95 (Ps 87), 1.2.97 (Ps 82), 1.2.99 (Ps 6.7.8), 1.2.100 (Ps 85, 95, 94, 125, 96, 98), 1.2.101 (Ps 57), 1.2.102 (Ps 59),
Some of the canons in Bhoja are however absent from Ps, but appearing in the works of Purusottama and Sīrādeva. The rules Bh. 1.2.49 (Pu 34/Sī 70), 1.2.56 (Pu 16/Sī 87), 1.2.71 (Pu 38/Sī 123), 1.2.88 (Pu 7/Sī 104), 1.2.94 (Pu 113/Sī 102), 1.2.98 (Pu 37/Sī 54), 1.2.109 (Pu 42/Sī 22), may be cited in this context. Reasons behind their absence from the Ps are not far off. For example, Bh. 1.2.49 is a clarification of 'sthānivada-bhāva' envisaged in P. 1.1.54, the next two rules are minor statements, Bh 1.2.88 is referred to with exceptions in Ps 9, Bh. 1.2.94 is solved with reference to Akṣṛayūha canon viz. Ps 56, Bh. 1.2.98 can be solved with a liberal interpretation of Ps 22 and 83 and the canon of predominance of antaraṅga over bhūraṅga viz. Bh. 1.2.109 is declared redundant by Nāgosa more than once. Along with them, Bhoja accommodates Bh. 1.2.77(Ps 101), 1.2.85 (Ps 51), 1.2.100 (Ps 94, 95, 96, 98), 1.2.115 (Ps 100) and 1.2.124 (Ps 93), which were later discarded in the work of Nāgosa. The most interesting paribhāṣā rules of Bhoja however are those which appear in none of the aforesaid paribhāṣā works. Those are as follows:

(1) Avayave'pyavayavivad upacāraḥ (Sh. 1.2.57) proposes recognition of a part as the whole and makes for example, cerebralisation of s in abhi-ṣūnti after the ultimate i of the prefix which is originally enjoined after a prefix.
(2) Vivaksātṛḥ kāraṇī (Bh. 1.2.63).
Cases are determined according to the intent of the speaker.

The concept of vivakṣā with reference to a case appears first in a vārttika viz. Na vā' pāvasyāvivakṣātavāt under P. 1.4.28.
It is an improvement upon Panini. Originally, Panini's rules from 1.4.24 to 1.4.55 pertain to cases viz. Ablative (8 rules), Dative (10 rules), Instrumental (3 rules), Locative (1 rule), Accusative (8 rules), Nominative (1 rule) and Causative Nominative (1 rule).

Where there is simultaneous claim for two cases in an instance, the latter case in the sequence of rules prevails over the other. In that case, between 'Asis chintatti' and 'Asinā chintatti' the former alone should be the correct expression. Vivakṣā reigning, supreme, both are permissible with the vivakṣā of agency and instrumentality, according as the case may be. With this in view, valahakād vidyotata, valahakevidyotata and valahakah vidyotato are all admissible. Similarly, vīkṣa patati and vīkṣasya patati are both in vogue.

Beautifully has Dāḍanātha, Bhoja's commentator, brought out that vivakṣā as a newly-wedded Indian lady does not transgress the limit of popular usage. In other words, a substantive may have as many cases as its role may be judged in relation to a verb from different perspectives. The cook, rice, pot, fuel etc. are all agents of particular actions in cooking and are all nominatives i.e. kāraṇas. Predominance (i.e. svātantra) however goes to what a speaker chooses as such. As a result Devadatta, fuel, pot and rice cook. In a sentence, however, after one is chosen to be
svatantra, other cases are subservient and are named as ablative, locative etc. as their role suits. For example, the pot is a locative or an instrumental or a nominative. Between two cases of which one is dependent upon the other, the latter in the sequence of rules of Pāṇini predominates. For example, Dhanusā vidhyati is preferable to Dhanusah (ablative) vidhyati because instrumentality of dhanus depends upon its ablative nature. Of course, here too vivekṣā is the deciding factor. According to Dandānātha upon Bhōja’s grammatical rule 1.2.63, vivekṣā is disciplined and not wild. So dhanusā (vidhyati) and pātryān (bhunāte) are preferable to dhanusah and pātṛyā.

(3) Apekṣato dhikāraḥ (Bh. 1.2.65).
The jurisdiction of governance is decided according to necessity. For example, Vināying uttarapade (P. 6.3.1) the earlier part recurs up to P. 6.3.25 whereas the latter part follows up to the adhikāra of prakūti (P. 6.3.139), as needed.

(4) Kvacid anuvattatas (Bh. 1.2.68).
Somehow an element from a rule recurs (in subsequent two rules of which the earlier incorporates the conjunctive particle da). For example, nip which recurs by da from an earlier rule recurs in the rule Tidhānaḥ etc. as well. It is a supplement to the canon ‘cāṇukṛṣṭam nottātratra’.

(5) Viṣeṣatidistān prakṛtaṃ na bādhate (Bh. 1.2.70).
An operation specifically enjoined or prohibited does not oppose continuation of an relevant element in the next rule. For example, the relevant nip in Rāj hip reappears in Vaisṇava-carama etc. even though there is the intervening rule viz. Servātah spho va.

(6) Na tib-anubandha-ganākāj-graheneṣu (Bh. 1.2.73) is identical with the canon Stīpā sapānubandhena etc.
It classifies exceptions to the canon Sanskipa etc. As it is noted here, (1) a suffix enjoined with reference to a vowel (e.g. Daksl=55aksa) effects elision of its nimitta viz. a; (2) in krapayati (kri ♦ #ld lot tip), replacement of i by a facilitates the augment puk which intervenes between the root and the causative suffix -nic; (3) in adadapet (dā + nāc + jīn tip) puk conditioned by a in the root does not oppose shortening of its condition; (4) in yā, sā etc., the substituto's while replacing the last letter viz. d in yad, tad etc. facilitates tap, the feminine suffix, (5) in papivas (pā + ivasy) the augment it concerned with the stem which ends in a causes the loss of this a and (6) in ho kumori shortening of the ultimate vowel in the stem before the vocative singular ending causes elision of this ending.

Acute accent in either the suffix -matup or on ending which is dependent upon udāta in the previous vowel makes the conditioning udāta fall into amudatta (in agnimā, perenavācē etc.).

Reiteration has the restrictive force. For example, the rule Inhanpāsaryamānān āsan āna which reiterates lengthening in pāsana and 'aryanān and in a stem which ends in either -an or -an before ā and su restricts this operation to these stems before ā and su alone. Thus there is lengthening in dandini and dandi and not in dāndinā, dāndi etc.

A meaning already denoted need not be reiterated otherwise. For example, when a case is denoted by either a conjugational ending or a primary suffix or a secondary suffix or a compound it is the first ending which is attached to the word to denote the meaning of the same.

A rule of operation is opposed to the other which would otherwise leave no room for it. But it is not opposed to an operation to which it is a conditioning cause. For example, from ka + an we get kāya where the last vowel of the stem is replaced by i(t) instead of being lost altogether. Subsequently, this 'i' undergoes vṛddhi. The replacement prevents a from loss. Otherwise, the letter could have no scope here. But the replacement effects and does not obstruct vṛddhi.
Replacement of a vowel is preferable to elision.
For example, in adhyaiṣṭa (adhi-ṛt-ii + sīc + ta) between elision of sīc and euphonic replacement of ā and ē the latter prevails.

Augmentation is preferable to replacement.
For example, in āṭṭu, āsit, ārodit etc. augmentation by at & ēt prevails.

Total replacement predominates over augmentation.
For example, in jaraśa, jaraśā, jarasā etc. total replacement of the stem viz. jara by jaras is preferred to the possibility of augmenta viz. yāt and nūt.

Sometimes, a former rule predominates. For example, between -rya and -dhak the former, though enjoined in an earlier rule, is affixed to the stem diti in preference to the latter.

A discipline of learning does not make appearance for unintended job.

An operation may be repeated in different elements of the same word. For example, in cikṛṣṇati, putriyanti etc. pararupa (euphonic replacement of two letters by the latter letter) by Ato gune operates more than once.

Sometimes a rule operates only where it has the scope of application. For example, lengthening of long vowels being unnecessary in līyate, niyate etc. the rule of lengthening operates in respect of short vowels only.

Formation of words with either primary or secondary suffixes or in compounds depends upon the power of denotation. As a result, there is no -en in ādiyena pasyati; no secondary suffix in vṛksamalaḥ āgataḥ, sonayā jayati etc. and no compound in Bānah Jāmadagnyāḥ.
Of the other paribhāṣā works in Pāṇinī's school (1) the Paribhāṣa-sārāṇājā of Bhīma, (2) Paribhāṣārthasaṅgṛaha of Vāidyānātha, with Svayam-prakāśāmanaṇanda's Candrikā and Appaya's Saṁrāddhinī upon it, (3) Paribhāṣābhāskara of Saṣādri, (4) Sārtha-paribhāṣāpātha of Rāmāprasāda and (5) Paribhāṣārthopadipā of Govindācaryya deserve mention. Saṣādri's work is a critical commentary upon Nāgōṣa's Ps. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka has dealt with them in his History of Sanskrit Grammar (in Hindi) Vol II. All these works belong to the Pāṇinīan school.

Among the paribhāṣā works in non-Pāṇinīan schools, Mr. K. V. Abhyankar has compiled (1) Sākṣātya-paribhāṣāsūtra, (2) Candra-paribhāṣāsūtra, (3) Kāṭañcāparibhāṣāsūtra, (4) Kāla-paribhāṣāsūtra, (5) Dhoja-dvākṛta paribhāṣāsūtra, (6) Kāṭañcāparibhāṣāsūtra-vṛtti of Durgāśīla, (7) Bhoja-vyākaraṇasya nyāyasaṅgraha, (8) Kāṭañcāparibhāṣāsūtra-vṛtti of Bhāvadāra and (9) a Jainendra-paribhāṣāvṛtti written by Mr. Abhyankar himself. Mr. Mīmāṃsaka has put to record in addition to them Rāmacandra's paribhāṣāvṛtti, Padmaṇābha's paribhāṣā rules with amplifications, Dharmasūri's Paribhāṣārthasaṅgṛaha and so on. All this shows how earnestly the Vyākaraṇa paribhāṣā were studied by our ancient grammarians.