CHAPTER - II

INTERPRETATIVE CANONS IN THE MAJOR PRĀTIŚĀKHYA WORKS IN COMPARISON WITH THE PARĪBHAŚAS OF PAHISHI
The Prātiśākhyas and Interpretative Canons in Them.

The prātiśākhyas works are connected with different branches of the vedic texts. Their claim as a sort of commendable works on linguistics is not obviously accommodated in the list of six vedanagas. Still their role is not negligible. The Rk-pr. referring to an antagonistic view that the treatment of letters is useless, retorts that like all other branches of learning, the whole of the ancillary śāstras is composed by sages and hence welcome. (1) We need not mind if among the six ancilliary sciences (vedāṅgas) a prātiśākhyas does not find a place beside Śikṣā (phonetics), Vyākaraṇa (grammar) and Nirukta (Etymology) because traditional scholars viz. the author of the Tribhāṣyaratna etc. accept it as an upāṅga.

A Śikṣā work discusses place, vocal organ and effort of articulation of letters, methods of pronunciation and rules to be adopted for the oratorial study of the vedic texts whereas a prātiśākhyas work aims at readymade words appearing in a particular vedic text it intends to analyse and teachers the changes they undergo as parts in a spoken sentence or a spoken hymn i.e. to say it deals with accentuation as well as word-formation that includes āgama (augmentation), ādeśa (substitute), lopa (elision), vikāra (change in form) and prakṛtibhāva (maintaining status quo) of letters. (2) A vyākaraṇa proper

(1) Kṛṣṇaṇa Vedāṅgam anindyam ārgam (Rk-pr. 14.68-69).

(2) The first two rules of the Caturadhyāyī (i.e.) discern the scope of a pr. work in general. "Of the four kinds of words viz. noun, verb, proposition and particle - the qualities exhibited in euphonic combination and in the state of disconnected vocables are here made the subject of treatment" (Catur. 1.1., translated by Whitney). "An essential part of such a treatise is also its analysis, description and classification of sounds of the spoken alphabet as leading to correctness of utterance and as underlying and explaining the complicated system of phonetic changes which
as its nomenclature indicates solely, carries on linguistic analysis of words and sentences and their component parts with properties of base and suffix etc., all linguistic phenomena concerned with them and relationship between words in a sentence. As an auxiliary science of the Vedic lore, it would deal with accentuation etc. too. Thus the aim of pr. and grammar is not of much difference even though the latter has a vast land to furrow (sarva-veda-parisadan — Mahabha. on P. 6,3,14) by taking into consideration all linguistic aspects of the language as a whole. A pratisakhya has the particular opportunity to confine its observation and analysis, more or less, to a particular

the treatise has to inculcate. These two subjects — a theoretical system of phonetics and the rules general and particular by which pada text is converted into samhita — are the only ones which are fully treated in the pratisakhyas: although none of the treatises confines itself to them alone." (Whitney on the same).

The learned scholar mentions that the Vāj-pr. and the Catur. deal with some rules for construction of the pada text itself and that the latter has comments in Krama text too. Study of the Veda is discussed in the Rk-pr. 15.1-16, the Vāj-pr. 7.32-32 and 1.20-26, and the Catur. 4.101-103. List of prepositions occur in the Rk-pr. 126-7, the Vāj-pr. 6,24 and the Tait pr. 1.15. The Rk-pr. deals with metres in three chapters (Ch. 16-18). The Rk 10.12 and 11.12 as well as the Vaj-pr. 3.143, 4.73, 165-173 treat omission of verses and phrases that once occurred in texts. The Vaj-pr. (3.17, 137, 138) comments briefly and imperfectly on the omission of certain terminations in the Vedic dialect. Thus in spite of few transgressions a pr. work does not "restrict itself within those limits to matters respecting which general usage is allowed to vary." According to Whitney "it does not at all imply or base itself upon the general science of grammar and its text book but it is an independent and a complete treatise as regards its own subject." (on the Catur 1.2. Chowkamba Edition 1982). Still he does not deny them of a common platform to some extent. According to M.D. Shastri in his introduction to the Rk-pr. (1922), the three concluding chapters dealing with metres are later additions.
Vedic school to which it belongs. Studying Grammar is advocated by Patanjali as an indispensable precondition of the proper comprehension of the Veda in general and the pr. renders worthwhile partial assistance in this direction. According to Ubbata on the Vaj-pr. 1.169, contents of phonetics and Vyakarana find a place in pr. works. So it may not be impertinent to take pr. works as a species of Grammatical text. The pre-pañinian Grammatical works, we know, are survived only by stray references to some of their ancient technical terms and maxims or mere names in later works. Any reconstruction of those Grammars is liable to intolerable incompleteness. Thus the character and scope of a pre-pañinian Grammar being indiscernible, it may not be very prudent to deny the appellation of Vyakarana for pr. works simply because they deal with one text and leave certain phenomena beyond. The Grammar of Pāṇini is however the best possible Vyakarana text in the sense that it administers a practicable linguistic study of both the Vedic (in 603 rules) and the popular Sanskrit of his time in detail. And we need not expect in every work of this species a masterpiece. Of course different pr. texts do not differ in spirit and character and it may be a pointer to their extra-vyakarana tradition. In spite of ignoring their claim as complete grammatical treatises Whitney admits that since they imply a vastly more complete grammatical science than they actually present it is not to be denied that any one of them might include more or less of the form and the material of that science as its compilers chose (3) or as the traditional usage of their school required.

The question of priority or posteriority of the pr. works in comparison with the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini is however a vexed one.

Without going into the details of controversy it may be mentioned that while Max Müller and Roth supported pre-पापिनिनian position of the प्र. works, a number of scholars opposed it. According to Goldstücker "In पाणिनि there is organism and life. In the प्रतिसाध्यास (4) there is mechanism and death." May be the प्र. works were composed in later age in the priestly circles as practical manuals to assist their members in grasping particular recensions of the वैदिक texts. But archaic technical terms in them and reference to pre-पापिनिनian linguists are evidently a stumbling block to this hypothesis. The RK-pr. mentions Gārgya (RK-pr. 1.15, 6.36, 11.26), Śakaṭāyana (1.16, 13.39), Vedanittra (1.61), Śākalas (1.64), Śākala (1.75, 6.14, 6.20, 6.24, 6.27, 11.19, 11.21, 11.61) Śākalyasthavira (1.81), Śākalya (2.13, 2.22, 4.13), Śākalyapitā (4.4), Māndūkaya (2.14), Vyādi (2.23, 2.28, 6.43, 13.37) and Vyādi, Śākalya and Gārgya (13.31). Here पाणिनि's name is absent while पाणिनि himself refers to Śaunaka, known as the author of this प्र. as well as Śākalya, Śakaṭāyana and Gārgya (P 4.3, 106, 8.3.19, 8.4.50, 4.1.106). This goes in favour of the pre-पापिनिनian origin of the said प्र.

The Vāj-pr. of Katyāyana refers to Śaunaka (4.112), Śakaṭāyana, Kāśyapa (4.5), Śākalya (3.10), Jātukārnya (4.125), Dālbiya (4.16), Kānya (1.149), Aupāsāvī (3.131) etc. of whom the last is mentioned nowhere else. The Tait-pr. refers to Agnivesya (9.4), Āgnivesyāyana (14.32), Plāksāyana (9.6, 10.11) Ścītyāyana (5.40, 17.1, 17.7, 18.2), Śāmkhyāyana (15.7), Kāndmāyana (9.1, 15.7), Kaṇḍinya (5.38, 18.3, 19.2), Mācākiya (10.22), Ātreya (5.31, 17.3), Bhāradvāja (17.3), Gautama (5.36), Sāmkṛtya (8.21, 10.21), Hārika (14.13), Vatsapra (10.23), Vālmiki (5.36, 9.4, 18.6), Bādabhikāra (14.13), Uttamottariya (8.20), Ukhyā (8.22), 10.20), Plāksi (5.38, 9.6, 14.10, 14.17, 18.5),
Gautama (5.38), Kohalīputra (17.2) etc. Of the two pr. texts of the Atharvaveda, the Catur names only Śākātyāna (2.24) and Saunaka (1.3), whereas the Ath.pr. edited by Dr. Suryakanta refers to no authority by name. These pr. works have again lots of (5) technical terms unknown in other circles. Thus the extant pr. works represent a great tradition behind them and many of their contents and concepts are legacy of the past. Of course they need not be called pre-Pāṇinian simply because they refer to ancient authorities and old technical terms. Kātyāyana the author of the vārttikas on Pāṇini and of the text the Vāj-pr. being the same person by consensus of opinions, it is certain that the writing of the pr. works was not confined to the older age. Such works possibly accommodated ancient norms and views that were adopted in ancient schools of the linguists and gradually paved the way for the advent of a full-fledged grammatical work as Pāṇini's. Dr. Haraprasad Sastri went to the extent to state that the pr. works flourished under various grammatical schools. Mr. V. M. Apte did not rule out the possibility of close relationship between the pr. (3) and grammar.

(5) Upācāra, śuddha, nāmyupadha, abhinidhāna, samāpatti, samāpādyya, vināma etc. are common to the Rk-pr. and the Catur; garōḍā, parvan, anāmātra etc. appear in the Vāj-pr. and the Catur; the first being in the Rk-pr. too; pānāpadi, bhūṣakarana, parihāra, parihihāra, padya, asthāpita, abhinīsthāna, tāmānānī, jaraṭparvan and karaṇa are peculiar to the Catur. The Tait pr. has pravāna (1.47), upābandha (1.59) etc. while the Ath.pr. edited by Dr. Suryakanta has amṛdita (3.5, 3.6) etc.

The prātiśākhyaśas and the semi-prātiśākhyaśas are seventeen in number as reports J. Mīmāṁsaka in his History of Sanskrit Grammar (Vol II). Of them the Rk-pr. the Vāj-pr. the Puspasūtra, the Ath.pr. the Tait-pr. the Maitrayaniya-pr. the Āśvalāyana-pr. the Vāskala-pr. the Śāṅkhāyana-pr. and the Āryāyana-pr. - these ten are purely pr. works whereas the Rk-tantra, the Laghu Rk-tantra, the Ātṛcudhyāyi, the Pratijñāsūtra the Bhāṣīkā-sūtra, the Sāmatantra and the Aksara-tantra are semi-pr. ones according to the aforesaid historian. In our study in the paribhāṣāśas in the pr. works, we have however taken up the well-known texts as representative of the series. According to Dr. Suryakanta Whitney (1862) erroneously published the āṭur as the only Ath.pr. The Ath. pr. edited by Dr. Suryakanta in 1939 is however admitted as posterior in its present form to the āṭur. Notably, the learned Doctor thinks it "more reasonable to place all the available prātiśākhyaśas as a class after Pāṇini."

SOME PARIBHĀṢĀŚS IN THE PRĀTIŚĀKHYAŚAS - A COMPARATIVE STUDY.

1. INTERPRETATION OF CASE-ENDING IN RULES:

As regards the Rk-pr. in a rule on some grammatical operation, the first and the second inflectional endings indicate the former occupant (sthānīn) and its substitute (ādeśā) respectively (Rk-pr. 1.56). It is advocated that the replacement should be between intimate letters as far as possible (Yathāntaram). In Rk-pr. 2.15, the word, dirgha appears in the second inflectional ending while 'sasthāna' and 'ubha' in the first ending. So, tava+ayam = tavā yam,

madhu+udakam = madhū dakam, and so on.
Homogeneity between a former occupant and its substitute lies in their similarity of the place, instrument and effort of utterance.

Pāṇini’s Astādhyāyī and Kātyāyana’s Vāj-pr. contain the same (7) interpretative canon that the sixth case-ending indicates the former occupant (sthānin). Its bearing on Pāṇini’s work will be dealt with in the next chapter. In the Vāj-pr. 4.125, while formulating elision of y and v at the end of a pada between vowels, the word ‘yavayoh’ with the sixth ending indicates y and v as sthanins. Though silent, it is obvious that Pāṇini indicates a substitute with the first ending (e.g. Jarāyā jaras — P. 7.2.101). He however employs the same ending with reference to definition rules in both the subject and the predicate (e.g. Svatantraḥ kartā, P. 1.4.54). Moreover in the chapter on compounds, its role is in marking the first position of a member of a compound word (P. 1.2.43 and P. 2.2.30). In the Vāj-pr. as in the Rk-pr. a substitute is marked with the second ending (Vāj-pr. 1.33) (e.g. Anusvāram.... makārah Vāj-pr. 4.1. ‘m changes into anusvāra’). In the Tait-pr. 1.23) 1.28) the first ending marks augment (14.5) and the object of both change (vikāra) (7.5) and elision (lopa) (5.19) whereas the second ending stands for vikāra (i.e. substitute etc.) idide Tait-pr. 5.9; 5.22; 5.23; 5.24; 5.25, 9.11; 9.12, 9.13; 9.14; 9.15)

Utilisation of the fifth and the seventh endings to mark precedent conditioning cause (pūrvanimitta) and subsequent conditioning cause (paranimitta) respectively, of an operation is not formulated in the Rk-pr. but both Pāṇini and Kātyāyana have identical canons in this regard (P. 1.1.67; Vāj-pr. 1.135; P. 1.1.66; Vāj-pr. 1.134). The Vāj-pr. 1.135 is a development on

(7) P. 1.1.49. Vāj-pr. 1.136.
Panini's 1.1.67 for Panini requires another rule viz. Adah parasya (P. 1.1.54) to pronounce that an operation in the following word after the precedent conditioning cause would be in its initial part. The Tait-pr. instead of formulating any maxim on conditioning causes employs the words, para and pūrva as the case may be for the purpose (vide Tait-pr. 5.22, 5.23, 5.25 that incorporate 'para' and Tait-pr. 5.9, 13.6, 5.33 etc. that incorporate pūrva). It is interesting that in Tait-pr. 5.24, the word 'etaśu' in the seventh ending stands for the subsequent conditioning cause.

The Ath.pr. edited by Dr. Suryakanta refers to a paranimitta with the seventh ending, a pūrvanimitta with the fifth ending, a substitute with the first and a former occupant with the sixth. The Čatur. in addition has the third ending for an augment (Ath. pr. 3.9, 3.12, 3.57, 3.61, 3.62 etc. Čatur. 1.99, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.13, 3.42, 3.44). Use of the third ending to mark an augment is found in the Vāj-pra too (4.15), the formulation being there in 1.137. It is found that the authors of the Ath.pr. and the Čatur. are indebted to Panini and his school in many ways. Without misusing their Zeal, these two works use interpretative canons at their hand. For further details, vide K.C. Chatterjee's 'Technical Terms and Technique of Sanskrit Grammar, Part I, First Edition, 1948, pages 257-272.

2. LOCUS OF A GRAMMATICAL OPERATION.

The Rk-pr. enjoins an important rule that a vikāra will take place in a word (pada) either in its initial part or in the
ultimate (Rk-pr. 2.5). Pāṇini's 'Ādeḥ parasya' (P. 1.1.34) and 'Ādṛtyasya' (P. 1.1.52) taken together are of the same import. In this context it may be mentioned that Pāṇini's 1.1.52 is echoed in the rule Anvādesōntyasya in the Tait-pr. 1.59. The Tait pr. 1.57 and the Vāj-pr. 1.140 formulate their result of observation in the following way:-

\[\text{ā+idam = edam}\\ \text{mo+su+nah = mo su nah,}\\ \text{su+sāva = su sāva and so on}\]

According to the Vāj-pr. an euphonic combination takes place and affects either the initial or the ultimate letter of a word (Vāj-pr. 3.3) e.g.

\[\text{ise+tvā = ise ttvā,}\\ \text{Varuṇa+iha = Varuṇa+ha etc. The case of the word,}\\ \text{anadvān is a special one. By Vāj-pr. 3.45, anas+vāh = anād+vāh,}\\ \text{the final s being replaced with d. Generally, if nothing is}\\ \text{mentioned specifically, the letter liable to change will be the}\\ \text{immediate, (Vāj-pr. 1.142). Ubbata mentions tryambaka (tri+sambaka) as its instance.}\]

The Tait-pr. has some other rules to ascertain a former occupant (sthānin) and a conditioning cause (nimitta) beside Anvādeśo'ntyasya (Tait-pr. 1.59), according to which, the last letter of the prefix viz. nir-before the words, hanyāt and upyamānam (Tait-pr. 7.3) in nir-hanyāt and nir-upyamānam stands as the nimitta of cerebralisation of n. Similarly the last vowel viz. a undergoes nasalisation in suśīkā (Tait-pr. 5.8). By 'Anekasyaśi' (Tait-pr. 1.26), however, due to Tait-pr. 5.19 in tīsthantyekayā the last vowel along with the preceding y is
elided before another 'ekaya' but in Karotyekayaikayā etc. no such elision takes place. By Laparsu lakāram, t and n are changed into ṭ before ṭ whereas by 'Nakāra eteṣu nakāram (Tait-pr. 5.24), n is changed into ṇ before ś, ċ, ē and ā. Here the number, singular, dual or plural, decides the actual number of the possible former occupant or the conditioning cause according as the case may be. Injunctions with the word viz. pūrva (Tait-pr. 1.29) or para (Tait-pr. 1.30) necessarily mean the exact antecedent or subsequent to what is enjoined in previous rules. Thus the rule, 'Dyāvā-prthivi (Tait-pr. 4.12) having ordained 'pragraha' of the compound word the next rule Purvasaṇā (Tair-pr. 4.13) enjoins pragraha of a word e.g. yāvati before the word dyāvā-prthivi; the rule Parasācā (Tait-pr. 4.50) preceded by Dve (Tait-pr. 4.49) enjoins 'pragraha' of a word e.g. jaye just after dve. The precedent and subsequent conditioning causes are thus well-defined therein. As for the Tait-pr. 1.61, a conditioning cause may belong to some other word than what present the locus for 'pragraha' etc. both in the Samhitā and the Pada texts. Thus ghni and cakre before p, the initial of the next unit (pada) are 'pragraha' in both forms of texts but the cerebralisation of n or s crops up in the Samhitā alone (e.g. śucisat: śucisat) and disappears in the pada text.

3. AUGMENTATION:

Regarding augmentation, the Rk-pr. has no directive canon, but Kātyāyana has it in the Vāj-pr. 1.139 according to which an augment appears between two words e.g. prāṇ+soma = prāṇ k Soma. In the Vāj-pr. 1.139 it is stated that an augment to a single word comes after it. Thus 'iti' as an augment appears after a
pragṛhya (e.g. dve iti, śīrṣe iti etc.) in the Padapātha.
Panini's formulations (P. 1.1.46-47) on this phenomenon will be
dealt with in the next chapter.

4. OPERATION INVOLVED IN A WORD, HAVING A SINGLE LETTER:

According to the Rk-pr. 2.6, a word having a single vowel
is deemed to partake of the facilities of both the initial and
the ultimate element of the word. Panini's l.1.21, the vārttika
of Vyapadesivad -bhāva upon it, the Vāj-pr. 1.152 and the Tait-pr.
1.56 are all of identical import. According to the Vāj-pr. 1.151
such words are called 'apṛkta'. In Panini, however, apṛkta means
a suffix having a single letter (P. 1.2.41).

In 'Indrehī matsyaandhasah (Rk. l.9.1.), Indrā/ā/ihi/matsi/
andhasah/ is the pada text. Here ā, an independent monovocal word
is treated first as the initial element, and then as the ultimate
element. If it be treated as the ultimate at first and then as
the initial, we would have got by the Rk-pr 2.6 (Indra+a+ihi =
Indra+ihi = ) Indraihi which is not however, intended. So the
Rk-pr. 2.7 is formulated as a special rule (i.e. apavāda) permit­
ing euphonic combinations in the gradual order of the position of
the words. So,

Indra+ā+ihi = Indrā+ihi = Indrehi.

The Tait-pr. 5.3. giving the same dictum as the Rk-pr. 2.7
justifies 'bhakṣehi' from bhakṣa ā+ihi ( bhakṣā+ihi). Panini
would, however, admit combination of the prefix with the verb as
the earlier operation and then justify Indrehi, bhakṣehi etc. by
P. 6.1.95. According to this Paninian rule, in Indra-ehi 'a' and
'e' are combined into 'e' by the very principle of earlier merger
of 'ā' and 'i' (ihi) into 'e' in 'ehi.'
The Bk-pr. 1.55 observes that in rules (1.38-1.48) concerned with determination of the places of utterance of sounds and in those ones (2.5-2.19) dealing with prāśleṣa i.e. contraction in sandhi, a short vowel will represent both short and long and as ubbaṭa sees, its praṭaṭṭed stage too. Thus the short, long or prolated 'a' is known to be articulated from throat (Rk-pr. 1.38), or in adhāḥ avidāṣīt, the last īg must be from āde. Likewise,

\[
\begin{align*}
    a+a &= ā \\
    a+i &= ē \\
    a+u &= 0 \\
    a+e &= ai \\
    a+0 &= au \\
    a+ā &= ā \\
    a+ī &= ē \\
    a+u &= 0 \\
    a+e &= ai \\
    a+0 &= au \\
    ā+a &= ā \\
    ā+i &= ē \\
    a+u &= 0 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Panini’s 1.1.69 refers to a, i, u, r, l, e, o, ai, au as well as h, y, v, r, l and ku, ēu, tu, tu, pu as competent for representing letters of homogeneous character in injunctions. Thus 'a', 'i' and 'u' represent their eighteen varieties for each, r and l have thirty varieties conjointly while e, o, ai and au have twelve varieties each. It is interesting to note that Panini does not rule out the possibility of distinguishing short vowels from the long ones for the sake of which he has given his specific rule. The rule is that a vowel, short or long, with 't' added as anubandha (e.g. at, āt etc.) stands for either short or long according as the case may be, including its respective sixfold varieties (P. 1.1.70). The Vāj-pr. 1.63 and the Tāit-pr. 1.20 seek to make room for short, long and prolated vowels by short ones. The Catur, however uses the word varṇa after a short vowel to represent short, long etc. of that vowel (vide Catur. 3, 44, 3, 45, 3, 46).
As for consonants, the semi-vowels viz. y, v and l represent,
(8) in the Paninian rules, both their nasalised and free forms while k, č, t, t and p each with u as anubandha (i.e. ku, ču, ťu, tu and pu) represent the guttural, palatal, cerebral, dental and labial vargas (groups) of plosives respectively. According to Dr. K. C. Chatterjee, this 'u' is the samprasarana form of v which is the first letter of the word 'varga' and Panini uses it for the sake of abbreviation. The Vaj-pr. in 1.84 formulates that by the first letter of a varga (group) of mutes, all the five letters of that varga are to be included as such in a rule. The Tait-pr. however mentions that the word 'varga' added to the first mute of a group includes all the five mutes of that varga (Tait-pr. 1.27), The Čatur. 1.7. follows the Tait-pr. without having any canon.

With reference to individual letters, the Vaj-pr. 1.36 proposes the help of the word 'iti' added to them. Thus it reads guttural mutes with five iti's in 8.4. In the Tait-pr. 'Kāra' is (10) added to individual letters, a consonant being immediately assisted by the vowel 'a' while r is followed by 'epha'. The Čatur. uses 'kāra' after letters, though not universally and refers (11) to r with 'epha'. In the Ath-pr. edited by Dr. Suryakanta, 'kāra' appears after a letter in 3, 14, 3.60, 3.61 etc. In the last rule of Panini's Astadhyaśāyī (P. 8.4.68) two a's unaided by t,

(8) Anumāsikānunmāsikā-bhedena yavatā dvidhā. Thus h and r have no nasalised forms. (Sk on P. 1,1.69)
(10) Tait-pr. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19.
(11) Čatur. 1.34, 1.35, 1.36, 1.41, etc. 1.28.
stand for open 'a' (vivṛta) and covered 'a' (samvṛta) respectively.

(12) Moreover s, ś, s, l, h, ch etc. are referred to with or without 'a' added to them in this work.

As for grouping of letters, the Rk-pr. calls the twelve (13) vowels by the name aksara, the first eight being samanāksara (monophthong) and the last four being sandhyāksara (diphthong) and consonants by vyanjana. All letters, vowel or consonant are varṇas according to this pr. work. These terms are more or less common in the pr. texts. Thus the Catur employs aksara (1.93), samanāksara (3.43), sandhyāksara (1.40), sparsa (1.99), Yama (1.99), varṇa (3.44, 45, 46) etc. Such terms and particulars are conspicuous by their absence from Pāṇini's rules due to existence of celebrated discourses on this point in his time. It may be that in Pāṇini's time, the old prātiśākhya tradition was too well known and he did not like to reiterate it. He has however made provision (14) for grouping letters in fortyfour prospective pratyāhāras (groupings) viz. aē, hal, al, an etc. upon fourteen rules of Mahēśvara with his two rules viz. 1.1.71 and 1.2.3.

6. CONFLICT BETWEEN TWO RULES.

Regarding conflict between two rules, the Vāj-pr. of Kātyāyana (1.150) observes that the latter one in the scheme of arrangement prevails over the former excepting the case of elision the operation of which claims priority irrespective of

(12) P. 8.4.40, 41, 43, 60, 62, 63 etc.
(13) Rk-pr. 1.19, 1.1, 1.2, 14.68.
(14) Mahēśvara's rules are exhaustively utilised by Pāṇini and explained in the Introductory Part (Paspasā) of Pāṇijnāli's Mahābhāṣya. Excepting the pratyāhāra viz. bhaṣ' found in Apiśali's Y. Mimāṃsaka informs in his History of Skt. Grammar the bearing of Mahēśvara's rules upon other old grammatical schools is unknown.
the position of the rule in the scheme of order. In a sandhi between svarita and udatta vowels, udatta character prevails e.g. supvēti (<Supvē-iti). But when elision is concerned, between the rule on elision of h in esah and syah before consonants (Vāj-pr. 9.14) on the one hand and a rule formulating elision of h before r and consequent lengthening of the penultimate vowel on the other hand, the earlier rule prevails in 'esah syah rāthyah' resulting in 'esa sya rāthyah'. The first part of the dictum Viprāṅgode etc. of Vāj-pr. 1.159 is analogous to Panini's canon 1.4.2 (Viprāṅgode paray kāryan). The proviso 'alopec' in the Vāj-pr. 1.159 is however not echoed in Panini's rule. To fill up this lacuna a similar maxim seems to have emerged as found in the Paribhāṣāvṛttīs (15) of Śīladeva and Puruṣottamadeva. The Vāj-pr. has two (16) other canons on the question of conflict according to the earlier of which between the remote and the adjacent, the latter undergoes the operation. For example, the word 'asi' in Sukṣmā cāsi sīvā cāsi syomā cāsi susadā has the acutely accented first vowel on account of the juxtaposition of the words enjoined in the rule Asi sīvā susadā etc. (Vāj-pr. 2.40).

(15) Sarva-vidhibhyo lopavidhir yālevan (Śi. 114/Pu 91).
(16) Vāj-pr. 1.144 and 1.145.
The Tait-pr. 1.25 also recognizes the same principle. According to the second maxim (Vāj-pr. 1.145) in an operation which has its scope simultaneously in the preceding as well as in the following cases, it is the latter one which will have its benefit. In the opinion of Umbaṭa, it is related to accentuation only as in 'ā ca śāsvā ca'. Here by euphonic combination of svarīta and udātta vowels, the result is udātta in the last vowel i.e. ā in śāsvā. The difference between Vāj-pr. 1.159 (Viprati-śedhe etc.) and Vāj-pr. 1.145 (Pūrvottarayoh etc.) is this that while the former relies on the relative strength of a later rule, the latter relies on the prominence of the latter member of the euphonic combination. In the former case between a svarīta that swallows a non-svarīta partner and an udātta that swallows a non-udātta irrespective of their position, the latter one is preferred in the case of simultaneous claim of both only because the latter is formulated in a later rule. In Vāj-pr. 1.145 the later member is prominent irrespective of the position of the formulation prescribed therein. But since the maxim Vāj-pr. 1.145 is of rare scope and the only instance given by Umbaṭa to illustrate it can well be explained by Vāj-pr. 1.159, it may be declared redundant.

7. PRINCIPLE OF EXCEPTION:-

The Ṛk-pr. is well aware of the principle of exception denoted by the term apavāda. The term for a general rule here is 'nyāya' and not 'utsarga' as in the Pāṇinian school. The Pradīpa on the Mahābh. on P. 2.3.1, pertinently observes that 'nyāya' was a pre-pāṇinian term for general rule. Thus the Ṛk-pr. seems
to testify to the older tradition. It is enjoined in the text of
the Rk-pr. 1.53 that nyāya (general rule) together with apavāda
(exceptional rule) limit the whole scope of a grammatical
operation. According to Ubbata's interpretation, it means that
exception is applicable only to a few cases as against a large
number of cases within the coverage of the general rule. Thus in
śraik panthān (Rk samhitā 1.123.16), vāṣṭe (ibid 7.99.7), yat
patye (ibid 10.85.9), ajānan putraḥ (ibid 10.85.14) etc. there is
the 'avaśāṅgama' type of euphonic combination where two consonants
are closely related, without the slightest change in them, by the
rule Rk-pr. 4.1. This is by general rule. The exceptional rule is
this (Rk-pr. 4.2) that the first consonants of the five vargas
of mutes before voiced consonants are changed into their respective
third ones in euphonic combination e.g. yad-vāg-vadanti (Rk
samhitā 8.100.10), sadbhī (ibid 2.18.4) etc. Similarly, in esāh
syāh, sah or any vowels followed by consonants the anvaksara type
of combination, the result of a general rule (Rk-pr. 28) finds
its scope. Thus,

\[
\text{esāh-devah} = \text{eṣa devah} \quad (\text{Rk-samhitā 9.3.1}),
\]
\[
\text{syāh-vājī} = \text{syā vājī} \quad (\text{ibid 4.40.4}),
\]
\[
\text{sah-sutaḥ} = \text{sa sutaḥ} \quad (\text{ibid 9.37.1}),
\]
\[
\text{na ni misati surana} \quad (\text{ibid 3.29.14}) \text{ etc.}
\]

The sāmavasa type of combination (Rk-pr. 1.60) which helps metres
by shortening and lengthening in words is an exception to the
aforesaid general rule. Thus in Maksu maksu kṛmuhi gojito nāh
(Rk samhitā 3.31.20), lengthening of u is there for the sake of
metre.
Pāṇini nowhere employs the word 'apavāda' but application of the canon of predominance of an exceptional rule is not lesser in his Āṣṭādhyāyī. Moreover, he seems to give a positive indication of such principle when he formulates the provision of modified application with reference to certain exceptional rules. Thus by P. 3.1.94, suffixes treated as special ones under the adhikāra of dhatoh (P. 3.1.91 — P. 3.4.117), excepting those which are enjoined under the adhikāra of strīyām (P. 3.3.94 — P. 3.3.112), while colliding with some general suffixes of prominently different appearance share the operation i.e. affixation with the latter ones in possible cases e.g. āyā, ātavya, āyānya and so on.

8. THE PRINCIPLE OF PRATIKANTHA (i.e. NIPĀTANA):

The term for nipātana (irregular operation) in the Rk-pr. is pratikāntha which literally means 'throat by throat'. It owes (17) its significance to the fact that each and every irregular operation is taken, as it were, by throat to be individually enumerated so that each is reckoned. It is an exception to all grammatical operations which it ignores. In mū itthā (Rk. samhitā 1.132.4) both the absence of the Kṣaipra type of euphonic combination (i.e. change of u into v in nu-itthā) and lengthening of u are irregular. Similarly, in 'ito śiṅcataḥ' (Rk. samhitā 9.107.1), both the replacement of 'a' along with h by 'o' in 'itah śiṅcataḥ' and cerebralisation of s are irregular. Regular operations have been deduced to the rank of utsarga which the nipātana ones have ignored. Patañjali's maxim viz. bādhakāneva hi nipātanāni

(17) Taddhi Kantham Kantham iva prati-samgrhyah ekaikasyaiva pradarsyate — tībbata on Rk-pr. 1.54.
The Vāj-pr. has no such canon but it admits cerebralisation of s by nipātana in 'dussvappnyam' (Vaj-pr. 6.73), 'prtanā sāhyāna ca' (Vāj-pr. 3.75) etc. It also employs the device of 'bahula' which, somehow or other, makes room for irregular operation (Vāj-pr. 3.18). The word 'bahula' appears also in the Ath.pr. (edited by Dr. Surya-kanta) 3.14 to convey the notion of irregularity.

By way of incidental reference, we may point out here that a clue to the question of preference in the case of conflict has claimed in course of time the space of one complete chapter in the Ārībhāṣeṇda-śekhara covering as many as 33 canons over and above a part of the last chapter of that work. We shall deal with all these cases conveniently at a later place.

9. THE ORDER OF ENUMERATION (YATHĀSAMKYA-PĀTHA).

The Vāj-pr. 1.143 (samkhyaṭānām etc.) has close affinity with Pāṇini's 1.3.10 (Yathāsamkhyaṃ etc.). Thus in the Vāj-pr. 3.34, 'sadas' joins 'kṛta', dyauḥ joins 'pita', and namaṣ joins 'patha' respectively in the words viz. sadaskṛtam, dyauṣpita and namaṣpathe. The Tait-pr. recognises this scheme of arrangement in 2.44 where k, s, s, s and p are respectively five spirants (uṣman) related to guttural, palatal, cerebral, dental and labial groups of mutes. The Ātika. 1.99 incorporates the Pāṇiniāna word viz. yathāsamkhyaṃ and follows this scheme in 2.9 etc.
10. **THE FORCING OF THE GOVERNING RULE (ADHIKĀRA):**

The acquaintance of the Yāj-pr. with the principle of governing rule (adhihāra) relating to the subsequent rules concerned therewith is borne out in the Yāj-pr. 1.92 where the word 'pragṛhyā' governs the subsequent rules i.e. up to 1.98.

11. **ON ACCENTUATION:**

The Yāj-pr. reads Svaritavarjam ekodattam padam (Yāj-pr. 2.1) which slightly varies from Pāṇini's 6.1.152 (Anudāttam padam ekavarjam) in form, the former being a development upon the latter, and which conveys the same principle of accentuation as Pāṇini's rule. The import of these maxims will be dealt with in the next chapter.

12. **ON PADAVIDHI:**

The Ath. Pr. edited by Dr. Suryakanta reads the Pāṇinian canon viz. Samarthah padavidhiḥ (P. 2.1.1) with the word 'iti' following it in the Ath. Pr. 1.3.

From what has been set forth above, it is evident that the pr. works represent a good tradition of interpretative canons. Ubbata, however, does not expressly mention all such canons in terms of paribhāṣā. He has chosen only a few to be called paribhāṣāś. From such discrimination, it appears that these canons which were widely known in Vyākaraṇa and other connected works were passed over by Ubbata without seeking their affiliation to the pr. tradition. But the canons which were not recognised in
the tradition of grammar but were of considerable importance in
the tradition of pr. were well acknowledged by Ubbata as
paribhasas. In our treatise we have accepted such rules too as
interpretative canons as are helpful to the interpretation of
other rules and as stand up to the nature and standard of recog-
nised paribhasas. The same will be our point of view with regard
to the rules of Pаниni.

(18) Perhaps Ubbata might have considered only those which are
not familiar (as paribhasas) in Vyakaraṇa and other connected
works. - Mr. V.V. Sarma with reference to his critical
studies in the Vaj-pr. Madras University edition, 1935,
page 214-218.