CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

From what has been discussed above, it follows that paribhāṣās (i.e. canons of interpretation) have got due attention of authoritative scholars in the Pāṇinian system of grammar. From Pāṇini down to Sesādri, grammarians of repute have contributed to the formulation and interpretation of interpretative canons. Besides prārthīyā and arthavicāra, paribhāṣā has got the status of a dignified branch of study in grammatical circles. The very brief aphorisms of Pāṇini has developed a vast literature one can master with unabated zeal and tenacious perseverance of at least a decade or more. The aid of interpretative canons in the attainment of mastery over this prestigious system of grammar is immeasurable. A paribhāṣā is indeed a beacon in the niceties and intricacies of interpretation of rules.

Antiquity of the canons which we have examined above is proved beyond doubt. It is certain that these are not the formulations of a particular grammarian. Scholars of different allegiance and identical approach have had their tributaries confluenced in the swelling stream of canons. Each and every school had its own paribhāṣā rules to guide suitable and proper interpretation of its injunctions or prohibitions. Pāṇini himself was conversant with certain paribhāṣās which the scholars of his time were familiar with. Many a time has he indicated his acquaintance with certain such interpretative rules. His paribhāṣā rules along with the other paribhāṣās formulated or referred to by Kātyāyana and Patañjali constitute the bulk of canons of
interpretation in the Paninion school.

A bird's eye view of the sub-titles given by us at the top of each and every discussion of the import and utility of paribhāṣās suffices, we hope, to explain the diversity of roles paribhāṣās play. Generally speaking, an interpretative canon may either direct proper reconstruction of rules through reconstruction of words within or otherwise, or decide the priority in conflicts or restore original utility of words in rules, which have undergone certain changes by augmentation, affixation, loss and the like or so. (1) Interpretation of rules, (2) decision of priority of application, (3) determination of the locus of a grammatical operation, (4) role of indicatory letters, (5) augmentation, (6) affixation, (7) role and scope of a governing rule or word, (8) homogeneity between the original and its substitute, (9) treatment of a substitute as its original, (10) analogy of popular experiences, (11) significance of number and gender, (12) variety of operations in respect of complete words, (13) irregularity in formation of words and (14) accentuation are some of the most important points which interpretative canons illuminate. Of them, interpretation of rules is the most important. The canon Vyākhyanato viśeṣapratipattir-na hi sandeḥād alakṣanam is itself the guiding canon of all canons. According to it, (proper and suitable) explanation and explanation alone affords particular knowledge of a rule. It is to reiterate in this connection that indicated canons are not obligatory (cp. Jāpakasiddhaḥ ma sarvatra). Verily, a canon which is not formulated by the
founder of the system of grammar should be resorted to if all other available resources fail to explain a rule or an instance (cp. Agatyā khali paribhāṣārīyato). Still their utility is not minimised. The zealous studies of the paribhāgas in the Paninian system of grammar themselves prove their worth.