CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
The Sutra literature represents the later phase of the Vedic tradition in respect of exegesis. Unlike the Saptihitas, Brahmanas, Aranyakas and Upanisads which are believed to be revelations, Sutra works are hailed to be the product of literary activity in the school of teachers of Vedic study called "caranjavyūha". As the Vedas were orally studied, interpretations in respect of the Veda and the Vedic rituals necessitated a short and easy method of instruction. Accordingly the teachers of the different schools began to compose sutras or strings of aphorisms dealing with rituals and various other aspects of Vedic tradition. In course of time, there evolved six branches of such sutras works designated as Vedāṇga or ancillary sciences in respect of Vedic study. These are phonetics (Silsā), rituals (Kalpa), grammar (Vyākarana), etymology ( śīrputa), metrics (Chandas) and astronomy (Jyotis). Some other forms of sutra works also made their appearance embodying studies on words, accentuation and on the traditions of philosophy. In this list are included the Pratīsākhya works and philosophical sutras which are distinguished as upāṇgas.

Of the Vedāṇgas, the Vyākarana which is otherwise called the sābdāmasāsana (science of words, Vedic and classical) is of prime importance in the field of Vedic study. The Vedic texts (1) themselves bear marks of linguistic studies. These were systematised and developed in grammatical sutras as a distinct
discipline. A tradition however points out that Vṛhaspatī spent a period of thousands of divine years to teach grammar to Indra by reference to individual words and therefore failed to reach the end. The tradition though wrapped in myth is clear admission of the fact that study of grammar is not effective without introducing scientific method of generalisation in respect of roots, stems and suffixes which constitute the basic morphology of grammar. Pro-Pāṇinian grammatical schools are known to us mostly by name. It is not possible to determine the exact form and the whole content of the grammatical texts prevalent in those schools. But at the same time it is to be borne in mind that Pāṇini's rules in sūtra form represent a very highly developed and condensed sūtra style in the discipline of grammar. A number of rules of his predecessors is recognised in his Aṅgārākhya. Moreover, a good deal of old technical terms and canons of interpretation as adopted by Pāṇini in his work make the point abundantly clear that the sūtra tradition of grammar had relative antiquity and Pāṇini made epoch-making contributions in his work with also the resources of the past at his disposal.

(3) Nāgasa has collected available old canons taking them to be pre-Pāṇinian in the form of sūtra and it is also suggested that these were incorporated in the rules of Pāṇini to serve the purpose of indicatory canons.

---

(1) (I) Yajñēna yajñām ayajanta devah (Ṛv 1.164.50).
   (II) Ye sahānsi sahāsā sahante (Ṛv 6.66.3).
   (III) Tīrthasa taranti (Ādhy 18.4.8).

(2) Vṛhaspatīr Indraya divyam versasaahasam pratipadosdīnān
    sabdāhan sabdapārayanam pravacā, naṁ tam jagām.
    (Nakhaʾā, Pācasaʾ).
Rules are of six kinds viz. definition (sañjñā), interpretative canon (paribhāṣā), injunction (vidhi), restriction (niyama), extension (atiśedha) and governance (adhiśekāra). Some add four more categories to this list. These are prohibition (pratisādha), repetition (anuvāda), option (vibhāṣa) and irregularity (nipātana). Of these different varieties of rules, an injunction directly enjoins a suffix, an ending, an augment or a substitute. The term niyama stands for both niyama (restriction) and parināmāryā (exclusive specification). Atiśedha means extended application of an injunction or prohibition.

Governing rules (adhiśekāras) take within the scope of their jurisdiction a number of subsequent rules. A rule of definition is intended to define new coinage of technical terms in respect of the discipline concerned. How far sañjñā partakes of the nature of vidhi or niyama there is controversy as we gather from Nāgāraja. A paribhāṣā assumes the character of niyama with this difference that unlike niyama its scope is wider. Accordingly, it pertains to the phenomena of the injunctive rule, its structure or the principle underlying. It is evident that the injunctive rule attain integrity of completeness with the help of the relevant canon. Paribhāṣā by itself is however a general

---

(3) Prāśina-vaiśevakarana-tantre vacikānystra Paśinīyatantra janapaka-puṣya-siddhāni bhāṣyavārttikāyog upaniśadādhiśi yāni paribhāṣārūpāni te nānābhāṣyantante (Ps, introductory sentence).

(4) Sañjñā ca paribhāṣā ca vidhir niyama eva ca atiśedha dhiśkāraścā sañjñādhiś kāman sutralākṣaṇam (Goyiccandra).

(5) Sañjñāsūtraśeṣājñātyākṣātyāvādābhāṣyantyā viddhitven. Kīcch ...anyarthāgrāṇaḥ aruṇāpyaḥ ...Sa of Nāgāraja on P.1.1.1.
interpretative statement of theoretical nature as it appears
to be. Yet it is related to particular rules or a set of rules
with which it has relevance. In fact it illumines the rules and
makes the matter clear and categorical.

The word paribhāṣā has been used in different meanings
in the early texts. For example, in a vārttika on P. 1.1.69 the
(6) root pari-bhāṣā means 'to formulate'. In two other vārttikas
(7) on P. 1.1.69 and P. 1.3.11 however, the term paribhāṣā
conveys the notion of an interpretative canon. The Mahābhāṣya
(8) frequently refers to this sense of the term though on P. 1.2.61
and P. 1.2.64, the word paribhāṣākīya is taken to connote what is
technical. Paribhāṣā bearing technical sense has been emphasised
also in Nyāsa on P. 3.1.92. In Buddhist Sanskrit it means
remonstration. In the Mitākṣeravā commentary on the Yājñavalkya
smṛti paribhāṣā means 'stipulation of contract' (2.61, 64) as
well as 'what is designated in the technical sense' (2.143).

Patañjali gives no definition of paribhāṣā (interpretative
canon). He has given indication of some of its characteristics.
In his commentary on the Pāṇinian rule P. 2.1.1. he observes
that as a lamp located in a particular corner of a room illumines
(9) the room in entirety, so does a paribhāṣā illuminate the

(6) Savaṇe 'ngraham aprabhāṣyam... (va)
(7) (i) ...paribhāṣāvā upadesah. (va)
(ii) ...teṣātmāt paribhāṣā. (va)
(8) (i) Nedaṃ paribhāṣākīya vačānaya grahanam (on P. 1.2.61).
(ii) Nedaṃ paribhāṣākīya vibhakṣer grahanam (on P. 1.2.64).
apparment of the grammatical discipline. For example, while the fifth case-ending in a rule does not afford to give any decisive guidance as to whether the locus of operation refers to what either precedes or follows, the canon Tasmād ityuttarasya (P. 1.1.67) settles the issue in favour of the latter.

A paribhāṣā may be deemed as a kind of adhikāra, of course, with certain reservations as pointed out by Patanjali. An adhikāra proper according to him is endowed with a svārata index and it covers within the orbit of its jurisdiction a set of subsequent rules in the order of enumeration. But a paribhāṣā has its scope with reference to a set of rules having similar implications irrespective of their order of enumeration in the Astādhyāyī. A governing word or rule is taken as a cue to (10) connect itself with each of the subsequent rules. As a device, it serves economy of efforts in the sūtras by doing away with formal repetitions. This has been indispensable for the sake of brevity which is a notable feature of a sūtra text. But paribhāṣā as a device has no such purpose of tagging it to each of the subsequent set of rules giving it an appearance of formal sūtra. But on the other hand, its purpose is to apply the force of the maxim to the identical circumstances as can reasonably be comprised within the range of its purview, without caring

(9) (1) Paribhāṣā punar okadosastē satī krtanen śāstraṇ abhijñasyati prādipingat (on P. 2.1.1.).

(10) Adhikāraḥ pratīyogam tasyānirdeśarthah... adhikāra satī svāravyatavyam (on P. 2.1.1.).
for the proximity or sequence of the sutras. It may be mentioned
however that some rules of either definition or analogical
extension also partake of the characteristics of paribhāṣā, as

(11) hold by Patañjali. Kaiyāṭa justifies it on the ground that
(12) such rules more or less play the interpretative role just as a
paribhāṣā.

With this short foreword about paribhāṣā and its signifi-
cance, let us now trace the antiquity of the traditions of
paribhāṣā in its reference to the prātiṣākhya.

(11) ...avyayōv paribhāṣayōv ... ādyatayo 'viśeṣaṁ
yena vidhiś tadantasya iti ca... (Mahābh. on P. 1.1.14).

(12) Pārārthyaśāntyātm samjñātideśau paribhāṣāśabdenoktau
(Pradīpa on P. 1.1.14).