CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATIVE CANONS IN THE Vārttikas
THE VÁRTTIKAS AND THE INTERPRETATIVE CANONS.

All that we know about the várttikas of Kátyáyana is from the Mahábha. of Patañjali, where they are quoted and put to test. The great commentary is practically a critical analysis of those várttikas some of which are accepted while others are rejected. Kátyáyana proposed a large number of supplements, permutations and rejections of the Páñinian rules. This has led some scholars to think that Kátyáyana belonged to a grammatical school different from Páñini's and that the former criticised the formulations of the latter to prove their incomplete and fallacious character. A few prima facie evidences are at their disposal. As Goldstücker says, more than 1500 rules of Páñini may be modified with some 4000 várttikas, (I) dealing with at least 10000 'inaccuracies,' 'omissions' and 'mistakes' in Páñini. Secondly, the Rájatarāngini of Káhlaṇa and the Kathásaritságara of Somadevabhaṭṭa both written in Kashmir, contain some legends on Páñini. In the latter work, a story runs that Páñini and Kátyáyana fought a grammatical duel in which Páñini, though defeated, won at last at the grace of the Lord Siva. It squarely places these two scholars thus in the same age of history and refers to their antagonism. According to Max Müller, both of them flourished around 350 B.C. and Kátyáyana was the editor of Páñini. It is said that as an antagonist, often unfair antagonist, Kátyáyana formulated his supplementary rules with a view to finding faults with his

(1) The várttika-sūtra-pátha edited by Bhínasanaśármā reads only 1030 várttikas including those of Sauśa school. The list is incomplete for many famous várttikas are excluded therefrom.

(1) (a) Mahábha. under P. 1.2.6; 4.2.29; 6.1.144; 8.4.55 etc. contains some such várttikas. Vide Páñini by Goldstücker, Choukhamba series 1965, Page 134.
antagonist; he commented on Panini only when a sutra has ambiguity or abstruseness.

A close analysis of the vārttikas of Kātyāyana would however reveal the other side of their role. The story of grammatical duel is fictitious because it is now proved beyond doubt that the two scholars did not flourish in the same era. Goldstücker has very successfully established this point. Panini’s universal fame as the father of a most scientific grammatical system could not stand unabated if a contemporary scholar of Kātyāyana’s stature proposed so large a number of emendations upon his system. Moreover, the words and their meanings employed such by Kātyāyana are/as we meet in the scientific works in classical Sanskrit whereas Panini used many words that became older in classical Sanskrit. Thus the word ‘āranyaka’ to mean āranyaka literature was unknown to Panini but Kātyāyana derived it to mean a path, a chapter of a book, a logic, a walking and an elephant besides a man all pertaining to forest. Such a prominent (2) incompleteness and glaring ignorance on Panini’s part cannot be explained without admitting that Panini belonged to an earlier period and that he did not the meanings of ‘āranyaka’ which are stated in the vārttika, evidently composed in a later ago. Numerous instances can be cited in favour of this decision. Kātyāyana enumerated thirty three new gānas to incorporate new linguistic changes in Sanskrit. So the suggestion of antagonism between these two grammarians falls flat. Moreover, a supplement need not be necessarily construed as a destructive criticism. The

(2) Bengal’s contribution to Sanskrit Grammar (Part I) by K.C. Shastri Page 145.
spirit of the supplementary rules of Kātyāyana is constructive in as much as they pose possible apprehensions, and offer his solution, preferably by interpretation of sūtra or by its modification, combination or rejection, if unavoidable. The well known saying that of the three grammarians, namely Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, the latter is more reliable than the former decisively accepts the linguistic pronouncements of the trio with due respect and quite reasonably admits relatively higher accuracy of the pronouncements of a later grammarian.

We must admit now, as Mr. Kielhorn has successfully established in his 'Kātyāyana and Patañjali', that Kātyāyana justified his claim as an author of the vārttikas which technically profess to proclaim facts already uttered, supplement the cases unattended to and clarify what can judiciously be deduced from the sūtras. The word 'siddham' as a mark of acceptance of many rules appears for numerous times in the vārttikas. And the last of such proclamations quoted in the Mahābhārata expressly reads 'bhagavataḥ Pāṇineḥ siddham'. Therein the word 'bhagavat' pays high tributes to Pāṇini. Moreover the vārttika Siddhe etc. quoted in the Mahābhārata justifies the grammatical science as a necessary branch of learning and thereby protects Pāṇini from the first possible opposition.

In fact, Kātyāyana's role as a teacher and exponent of the Pāṇinian school is commendable. We are tempted here to quote

(3) Yathottaram hi muni-trayasya pramāṇam (Kalyāṇa on P. 1.1.29).
(4) On P. 8.4.68.
(5) Siddhe śabdārthasambandhe etc. quoted in the Mahābhārata Paspaśā.
Kielhorn's long observation: Kātyāyana did not propose to himself the task of finding fault with Pāṇini, for he justifies the rules of his predecessor as often as he finds faults with them. So far from calling Kātyāyana an unfair antagonist of Pāṇini, I would rather claim for him the title of a follower and judicious admirer of Pāṇini, who dispassionately examines the rules laid down by his master, considers the objections which have actually been or which might be raised to them, is ever ready to defend and justify Pāṇini and corrects, adds to or abandons the rules propounded by him only when no other course is left open... He states the objections to which the possible interpretations of a particular rule would be liable but he also shows that those interpretations are nevertheless admissible or suggests himself a correct interpretation... in many instances he also refutes the objections advanced... shows the correct way of applying a rule.... And if it is true on the one hand that some of Pāṇini's rules are declared by him unnecessary, it is on the other hand equally true that other rules which at first sight might seem to be unnecessary are upheld by him and justified. 'Pāṇini has suffered more at his (Patañjali's) hands than at those of the vārttikakāra.'

As tradition goes, a bhāṣya is entitled to explain its own statements. According to Kielhorn, such proclamations are rare in the Mahābhārah. For this it is not very difficult to pick up the vārttikas in the Mahābhārah. Kielhorn discerns two different styles in this great commentary and makes a distinction between vārttikas and Patañjali's own statements. According to him, the former
contain the words *vīta ēt*; *ēt* etc. usually followed by a word in the fifth case-ending when a discussion is open on both sides; sentences which aim at refuting something begin here with *na vā*; *siddhasaṃtur* etc. Patañjali on the other hand begins a sentence with *naiva dosaḥ*; *tāt tarhi vaktavyam*; *na vaktavyam* etc. and uses conjugated verbs in his own sentences. In the vārttikas, however, words, namely *vidhi*, *prasanga*, *anupapatti*, *avaśānam* etc. i.e. verbal nouns appears in lieu of conjugated verbs. The number of vārttikas in the Mahābhārata can thus be more or less ascertained and the grammatical philosophy of Kātyāyana reconstructed. It is to see whether the vārttikas belong to Kātyāyana or not. Patañjali quotes on P. 2.2.18 nine supplementary rules of the Saṃmava school on *pradiś* compounds; under P. 1.1.66, P. 1.1.20 etc. vārttikas of Bhaavadvāja school are mentioned. Vārttikas in verse are not rare in the Mahābhārata, and their (6) author is believed to be a scholar other than Kātyāyana. All this points out that the vārttika type of formulations was in vogue in the early years, that Kātyāyana is not the pioneer of such compositions and that his vārttikas may have been enriched by traditional heritage from some earlier scholars. We see that Vyādi and Vājapeyayana are referred to in the vārttikas of (7) Kātyāyana. His is a comprehensive work on Sanskrit language and (8) is based on the Pāṇinian model. Naturally some canons of

(6) Vide Uddyota on P. 6.4.20 and Pāṇini by Goldstickor; Chowkhamba Edition 1965, Page 102-117. The latter divides these verses under certain heads and reasonably proves that they were composed not by one grammarian but by a number of them.

(7) Dravyabhidhānam Vyādiḥ (on P. 1.2.64); Ākṛtyabhidhānād vaikām vibhaṅgatā Vājapeyayānāh (on P. 1.2.64).

(8) Endowed with many sterling excellences, combined with his reflective mind, logical acumen and consummate scholarship Kātyāyana has been assigned a very high place of esteem and reverence by the then literary India, particularly in the sphere of Sanskrit Grammar. Bengal’s Contribution to Skt.Gr.Pt.1, P.127.
interpretation are referred to either as familiar maxims or as original pronouncements in these vārttikas some of which we have already treated in the previous chapter on Pāṇini. We are going to concentrate our discussion in this chapter on the major canons either referred to or formulated in the vārttikas.

(9) According to P.S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Kātyāyana is the author and propounder of the following canons:

(I) Prātipadikagrahane lingavīśistasyāpi grahaṇam (Ps 72/Pu 23/Si 28),

(II) Ananubandhakagrahane hi na sānubandhakasya (Ps 82 with a bit change/Pu 36/Si 53),

(III) Ekadesāvikrtam anyavat (Ps 37/Pu 14/Si 42),

(IV) Upapadavibhaktah kāraṇavibhāhikān /valyasi (Ps 103/Pu 48/Si 103),

(V) Sannipātalaksano vidhūr animittaṁ tad-vighātasya (Ps 86/Pu 10/Si 67),

(VI) Yassāṁ vidhis tadādāvalgrahane (Ps 33/Pu 75/Si 12),

and (VII) Vyapadeśīvadvacanam (Ps 30 with a bit change).

References to many other grammatical canons are however found in his vārttikas. We cite a few of such vārttikas:

(VIII) Na va nirdisyaśaṁnasyādeśatvāt (P. 6.4.130),

(IX) Anantyaviṅkāre 'antyasyaśeśatvāt (P. 6.1.13),

(X) Sāmānyatidose hi viśeśeśatidēśe (P. 1.1.66),

(XI) Na va anavayavasyaśeśatvāt (P. 3.3.65),

(XII) Na va bahirāṅgalaksanaṁatvāt (P. 8.3.15),

(XIII) Na va nityatvādētaḥ (P. 7.1.6),

(9) Lectures on Paññjali, Introduction Page XII.
It is difficult to discern which of the aforesaid canons are Kātyāyana's own formulations. In plain statements (as in IV, VI, IX, X, XV, XVII, XVIII, XXI, XXII) there may be no confusion regarding his authorship. But canons that are referred to with the fifth-ending as an inseparable part (i.e. the hetu which refers to a well established fact) of a logical syllogism seem to be widely accepted in his era and so may reasonably be the formulations of earlier grammarians. Of course, their inclusion in this chapter is highly needed for the sake of completeness.
As stated earlier, the Paninian rules Tasmin etc. (P.1.1.66) and Tasmāt etc. (P. 1.1.67) refer to in rules the condition subsequent and the condition precedent respectively in way of the determination of the locus of a grammatical operation.

Where there is the possibility of the employment of both these rules a confusion creeps up as to whether the former should prevail or the latter. A word in the seventh case-ending in a rule invoke the former but another word in the fifth-ending in the same rule invokes the latter. Vārttika Ubhayānirdesē etc. (10) is formulated by Katyāyana to point out that on account of the Paninian rule viz. Vipratisedhe param kāryam P. 1.4.2., between two conflicting rules the latter in the order of enumeration triumphs over the former, if not prevented otherwise. Rightly do Puruṣottama (No.63) and Siradeva (No.23) observe that this paribhāṣā vārttika is a mere clarification on P. 1.4.2. The rule of P. 1.1.67 would naturally triumph over P. 1.1.66. Regarding the location of defined technical terms and interpretative canons (11) two canons are prevalent in the grammatical system of Panini. According to the first of these two, a defined technical term or a canon stands in its own place and helps a rule. A canon is assigned the location of the rule it is derived from. Thus a canon deduced from Vāha úth (P. 6.4.132) belonging to the 'ābhīya'.

(10) Ubhayānirdesē vipratisedhāt pāncamīnirdesēh. (11) (a) Yathoddesāṃ samāṇāparibhāṣām and (b) Kāryakālam samāṇāparibhāṣām. For details vide Kielhorn (translation of the Ps) and Charu Deva Shastri (Vyakaranacandrodaya).
chapter is treated as ābhisya. The second canon however, assigns to a technical term or a paribhāṣā the places of the rules which benefit from it. According to this view, even in the last three chapters (pādās) of the eight book of the Asthādhyāyī by Pāṇini, a canon from earlier chapters is concerned with a phenomenon formulated therein. As a result, in the rule, Namō hrasvāt etc. (P. 8.3.32) both P. 1.1.66 and P. 1.1.67 may have free access. There the word 'ācī' is in the seventh case-ending and nanāḥ in the 5th ending. Of course, in these last three chapters of the 8th book a latter rule is relatively inefficient with reference to an earlier rule. Still these two paribhāṣā rules by their presence herein will retain their order. In other words P. 1.1.67 prevails over P. 1.1.66. This is what the Pradīpa says by 'sūtrapāthāpeksaṇa parasya vyavasthapakatvam'. Patañjali endorses this view when he quotes P. 8.3.32 to cite an instance of conflict between these two paribhāṣā rules. This is the intent of the vārttika viz. Ubbayamirdeṣe etc.

Nine instances are cited in the Mahābhāṣā to explain the utility of this vārttika. In the first case, with the proposed locative case-ending in the word 'la-sārvadhatuka' the rule P. 6.1.186 presents the scope of both P. 1.1.66 and P. 1.1.67. Subsequently the latter canon is honoured with marking tāśi (the conjugational sign between a verbal root and conjugational endings in periphrastic future i.e. lut) etc. as the condition precedent for absence of acute accent (anudāttta) in the vowel of an ending e.g. kartā etc. In P. 6.4.162 with the word 'isthemeyahsu' in locative plural reappearing from P. 6.4.154, the stem 'bahu' is
the condition precedent for the loss of the initial vowel of
-saman(īc) and -iyas(un) e.g. bhūman, bhūyas. As for the super-
lative suffix -isthan, the elision of the initial vowel i.e. 'i' is compensated by the augment yi(ṭ) e.g. bhūyīsthā (P. 6.4.159).

The word 'sarvanāmasthāne' in locative reappears in P. 7.1.90 from P. 7.1.86 to pave the way of ēṣṭ character for three nominative endings with accusative singular and dual after their condition precedent viz. the stem 'go'. Consequently, the vowel in the stem undergoes vṛddhi in the words gau, gāvau, gāvah etc. With the word 'āne' in locative from P. 7.2.22, the rule Ṛdāṣā (P. 7.2.23) enjoins loss of the initial ā of the suffix āna (i.e. ānaā) after the verbal root ās- 'to sit' down in the formation of the word āsīna (< ās-yāna < ās-yāna). In nādi + ē (dative sing.), the augment ā (P. 7.3.112) forms the initial part of the ending after the precedent conditioning cause viz. the stem, nādi. With joint euphonic replacement of both ā and ē by the vṛddhi vowel 'ai' and the consequent change of ā into y, the form is nadyai (nādi + ē > nādi + [ā + ē] > nādi + ai > nadyai).

In the rule Nāmo hrasvādi aśi etc. (P. 8.3.32), the precedent conditioning cause being marked by the ablative case-ending (ānamah), the locus of augmentation is a vowel originally inflected in the locative (aśi) e.g.

sugan + ēsah > sugaṇ- nīsah > sugaṇnīsah,
pratyān + ātmā > pratyāṇ-ḥātmā pratyāṇḥāṭmā,
ṣan + acyutah > sana-acyutah > sne-acyutah.

The rule Rudādibhyāśīrṣavadhātuke (P. 7.2.76) enjoins the augment ēt as the initial element of an ending after the verbal roots viz. rud-, svap-śvas-etc. (e.g. rud-īhi, svap-iti, śvas-iti etc.).
In all these rules, the condition precedent being represented by an inflected word in the ablative, the word in locative is construed in the genitive as a mark of the locus of a grammatical operation.

Some might argue, that since in the rules cited above, words in the seventh case-endings have a scope elsewhere but words in the 5th endings excepting in P. 7.1.52 are yet to be exhausted by application, it is natural that the rule P. 1.1.67 has a more reasonable basis. The Uddyota of Nāgaseṇa has prepared a list of the scope of these words in the seventh case-endings. In that case, even without thinking in terms of conflict between two rules, the interpretative rule P. 1.1.67 should be preferred to P. 1.1.66. The existence of the vārttika under review is then at stake. Some retort this argument by saying that each locus of operation should be given only in the genitive case-ending. This is of course for arguments sake only. Because it involves modification of a number of Pāṇini's rules. It is far easier to accept the vārttika which decides triumph of P. 1.1.67 over P. 1.1.66 and to construe the word in locative possessive. Moreover, both the words in the seventh and the fifth endings in P. 7.1.52 having their scope elsewhere, conflict is certain and nothing but the consequent application of the paribhāṣa P. 1.1.67 can succeed in proper interpretation of the rule P. 7.1.52. The words in the fifth and the seventh endings in P. 8.3.29 have however no scope elsewhere. It is the vārttika Ubhayanirdeśo etc. which alone can help in explaining the rule with the canon P. 1.1.67.
It need not be apprehended that the rule, Gup-tij-kidbhyah san (P. 3.1.5) aided by the canon Tasmāt etc. (P. 1.1.67) would mean the suffix -san as a locus of certain grammatical operation after the verbal roots viz. gup-, tij- and kit. For argument's sake, the suffix -san as the locus of replacement by -san could well be defended. In fact, the utility of the ablative case-termination in this rule is exhausted by determining the position of the desiderative suffix -san, after the aforesaid verbal roots. As for rules which determine the locus of an operation with a possessive case-ending, the help of the canons viz. Tasmāt etc. (P. 1.1.66) and Tasmāt etc. (P. 1.1.67) is not solicited. Moreover, both ablative and locative case-endings cannot determine a locus. It is indicated in the rule Ekah pūrvaparayoh (P. 6.1.84) by incorporation of both the words, pūrva and parā in possessive. The cases of joint euphonic replacements are enjoined in the rules, P. 6.1.87, 6.1.88, 6.1.89 etc. The rule Dirghāt (P. 6.1.75), according to the Prāṇīya, is an individual exception to the canon P. 1.1.67. The words 'ṝ̥cha' and tuṅk reappear there from P. 6.1.73 and P. 6.1.71, respectively. Normally, the rule P. 6.1.75 would mean that after a long vowel (the condition precedent) tuṅk would be augmented to 'ṝ̥cha' as its final element. But with the indication of suraṅgchāyā in the rule P. 2.4.25, tuṅk comes before ṛ āya as the final member of the preceding long vowel. If the augment tuṅk formed the final part of ṛ āya, it would cause de- aspiration of āya to get the form suraṅgchāyā which is not intended. With this in view, the ablative case-ending in the word Dirghāt (P. 6.1.75) is changed into the possessive case-ending which is an indicator of the locus of augmentation.
Interestingly, Siradeva refers to the Nyāsa on P. 6.1.75 which proposed a bifurcation of the rule P. 1.1.67. In that case, the first part of the bifurcated rule viz. Tasmāt assisted by the word pūrvasya (P. 1.1.66) would solve the abovementioned problem.

Of the vārttikas referring to grammatical canons of interpretation, 'Na vā nirdīyamāṇasyādesātātvat' is quoted in the Mahābhārata under P. 6.4.130 and commented upon under P. 1.1.49.

(12) According to the canon contained in it, a substitute (ādesā) replaces no more than the particular former occupant which is either the whole or the part of what is pronounced in a rule with possessive case-ending. It defies potential tadantavidhi in respect of replacement and offers help in discerning the locus of operation. In dvi-padaḥ (dvi-pād + śas), pād alone is replaced by 'padaḥ' by the rule P. 6.4.130 even in a compound word of which pād forms a component part. In other words, the rule on replacement of pād by padaḥ (P. 6.4.130) is excluded from the scope of tadantavidhi. The Mahābhārata fairly exemplifies to show that in atī-ṭīrṣaḥ, atī-yūyam, atī-syāḥ etc., it is not the whole of the compound word but the bare stem, pronounced as a 'sthānin' in the rules which is substituted. Furthermore, as we have pointed out earlier, jaraḥ in nirjara etc. is optionally replaced by jarāḥ under particular circumstances e.g. nirjarasaḥ (nirjara - an) beside nirjarasaḥ. In karīṣagandhi + an, not the whole word formed with an but the suffix (P. 4.1.78) alone is replaced by syāḥ. With feminine suffix ēp (P. 4.1.74) we get karīṣagandhyā. In yasyai (yad - dat, sing. feminine), tasyai (tad - dative sing. feminine) etc. the augment syāṭ appears between the stem and the ending to break the

(12) Sasthyā nirājaṁstasya samudāyasya tadakadesasya va ādesā bhavanti (Siradeva 5).
juxtaposition. For this replacement of the ending just after a pronominal stem does not take place. In ud-a-sthät, due to the intervention of the augment 'aṭ' there is no replacement of s by th, as it is in utthita etc. 'Samprasarana' by P. 6.1.13 affects gyañ alone and hence does not occur in vārahiputra. -Täm, and -tam (P. 3.4.101) replace -tas and -thas alone e.g. kriyāstām, kriyāstam etc.

The intent of this paribhāṣā, we know, is identical with that rule of Pāṇini's Sāsthi etc. May be, the canon Nirdīśayamānasya etc. was formulated by Kātyāyana himself as a simple elaboration of the Pāṇinian rule (P. 1.1.49). Its pre-Pāṇinian origin need not be postulated. For in that case, the rule of Pāṇini will be a case of unnecessary repetition. The utility of the rule being admitted by Kātyāyana in his Vāj-pr. (1.136) our proposition stands correct. Again Patañjali's statement that this canon need not be separately formulated is also a pointer to Kātyāyana's authorship of the canon. So far as the Pāṇinian system of grammar is concerned, either the paribhāṣā rule of Pāṇini or its elaboration by Kātyāyana will do. Of course, the latter can have a broader scope and is applicable even where a locus of operations is referred to with something other than the sixth case-ending. We know that both the Rk-pr. and the (13) Tait-pr refer to a locus with the first case-ending.

The canon 'Anantyavikāre' ntyasadesasya is quoted in the Mahābh. under P. 6.1.63 with a view to opposing the samprasarana (change of semi-vowels into corresponding short-vowels) of all

(13) Asavamumiti... (Rk-pr. 1.53); A-kāra āgamavikārilopinān... (Tait-pr. 1.23).
semi-vowels present in a word which primarily ends with the suffix यान and is followed by the word पुत्र or पति in tatpurusa compound. According to this canon viz. अनंत्या etc., a change of the non-ultimate letter would affect the letter which precedes the last. The महाभ. quotes seven वार्तिकas referring to the rules viz. P. 6.1.37, 6.4.10, 6.4.134, 7.2.114, 6.4.131, 6.3.133 and 3.2.75 respectively to discuss the scope of this canon and shows that in none of these instances the canon is indispensable. For example, of the two semi-vowels viz. व and य in the verbal root व्याध- the latter which precedes the final letter is changed into the corresponding short-vowel i.e. 'i' in विद्ध (व्याध + क्ता) etc. Change of the other semi-vowel is prohibited by the rule P.6.1.37 (ना सम्प्रसारणे etc.). The canon अनंत्या etc. would serve the purpose in absence of the rule for it would choose the penultimate letter 'y' in preference to v. But the rule P. 6.1.37 would do as well in absence of the canon. The change of latter semi-vowel into the corresponding short-vowel in विद्वान (विद्वान + अस, नास, नास), युना (युवन + ताः) etc. is more or less justified by the same rule. Intervention of i or u between the two semi-vowels in a stem is negligibleindeed. The restriction of lengthening to the penultimate letter of the nominal stems पयास, यास etc. in nominative and accusative plural (पयासी, यासी) is effective due to either the rule P. 6.4.10 with the words नोपाध्याय (P. 6.4.7) and सर्वामानासद्वार (P. 6.4.8) reappearing therein or the canon अनंत्या etc. The elision of 'a' is restricted to the penultimate vowel of the nominal stem (which ends in 'n') before certain endings e.g. तक्षन (तक्षन + ताः), अनसतक्ष्याने etc. by the rule P. 6.4.134 or by the canon. Similar is the case with
the following instances. The vyādhi of the penultimate vowel alone in the root mrj-(P. 7.2.114) in nyamūrt (ni-mrj + lan tip) etc. is justifiable in absence of the canon Anantya etc. by the rule Iko etc. (P. 1.1.3) which admits guṇa and vyādhi exclusively for īk vowels (ī, ū, ū, ığ). As for the lengthening in pipāṭhī (pipāṭhis - su) etc. the rule Rvor upadhāyā etc. (P. 8.2.76) suffices to restrict the operation to the penultimate vowel. In all these cases, employment of the relevant rules is tantamount to the rejection of the canon Anantya etc. Moreover, as a vārttika presents, there are certain cases where this canon may yield (14) results which are not intended. Thus if it be allowed to function (1) the initial ą and ṅ of verbal roots will be dentalised by P. 6.1.64 and 6.1.65 in sotā, sotā etc. only and not in śiśāti, namāti etc., (II) tad - su will result in saḥ but syah from ten - su will not be justified, (III) the loss of an initial member of conjuncts (sanyoga) will take place in māṅktavā, not in māṅktavya, (IV) gutturalisation of palatal mutes will take place in paktavā (pae + kta), not in paktavya, (V) in leghā etc. gh from n will be allowed, but not in leghavya, (VI) ḍṛṣṭa not ḍṛṣṭavya will have ą, (VII) there will be cerebral ṅ in māṅavāpeṇa, but not in māṅavāpāṇē and so on.

Still the Māhābh. favours retention of this canon and observes that its weaknesses being exhaustively piled and positive instances being illustrative only, the canon must not be discarded at once. More presence of beggars does not affect cooking, nor

(14) Aṭi-tyādvidhi-sanyogādilopa-kutva-dhatva-bhashhāva-
satva-nātvevyatiprasahgal (Vā).
(15) does presence of animals totally discourage sowing of barley, so while defects should be pointed out with possible solution, it is still judicious to acknowledge the canon. A device of marking the places of this canon with udatta (acute accent) is proposed in a vārttika. The Mahābh. however finds out another pointer. Thus in all instances of this canon, excepting in P. 6.2.76, there is the tendency to simultaneous transformation of both letters viz. (16) one nearing the ultimate and the non-ultimate in a word. In faulty cases however, it is not so. Nāgēśa in the Uddyota pleads for the help of this canon in interpreting the word adaduyān (17) (adas-añē + keśa + ā up adādri-añē > adaduyānē > adaduyān) and prefers its retention to the strained interpretation of P. 6.1.10, 6.1.13¼ etc. Both Purusottama (107) and Śīradova (116) observe in favour of this canon but Nīlakaṇṭha disfavours it (94). The Pā of Nāgēśa is however conspicuous by its silence on it. If the rules of Pāṇini be an indication, the canon is of post-Pāṇini origin, may be an original formulation of Kātyāyana himself.

2. NOMINAL STEM INCLUSIVE OF GENDER VARIANTS.

The canon 'Pratipadikagrahena lingavisistasyāpi grahanam' (Ps'72) is referred to in the vārttikas more than once. The Mahābh. on P. 4.1.1 critically studies its scope, counts its merits and

(15) Na hi bhiksukah santiti sthālyo nādhiśāyante, na ca mrgah santiti yāvā nōpyante (Mahābh. on P.6.1.13).

(16) Yatraivāntyasadēśāntyanthyasadośāśa yugapat sanavasthitam tatraiṣa paribhāṣā bhavati... (Mahābh. on P.6.1.13).

(17) Adamuyaniti aiddhyortham...paribhāṣā'vaśyaki (Uddyota under P. 6.1.13).
denominite and favours its retention. According to this canon, a
(18) nominal stem which appears or is referred to in a rule is
inclusive of its gender variants. In view of this, Paninijali
shows, (I) that both bhavatahhotel and bhavatyahhotel are
justified by P. 2.3.27, (II) that kasula-vilam and kasuli-vilam
have the same accentuation by P. 6.2.102, (III) that pitra
dsadrashi and pitt sadrapi have the same type of compound by P.2.1.31,
(IV) that li o hastinimatram, hastinimatram too is justified by
P. 5.2.37, (V) that both sthacilasayi and sthacilasayinir occur
according to P. 6.2.19 and (VI) that both grane-vaid and grane-
vasinir have the same non-elision of the case-ending in earlier
member of the compounds by P. 6.3.19. Similarly der sustain and
der sustaininir by P. 6.3.36 and dirghanukosanir and dirghanukosanin-
rinir by P. 6.3.40 are justifiable. Thus again in P. 2.2.15
(Trijaka etc.) and P. 8.3.46 (Atah Kr. etc.) words in all genders
are meant for. The denominative kmurayati may mean both kmara +
kyac- and kmari + kyac-. Prohibition of samasanta by P. 5.4.36
is effective in bahuroyani and bahuroyana. Hastikan from both
hastin and hastini may be another instance according to Purusottama-
(No.26) but Siradeva (No.28) admits loss of the feminine suffix
even before the advent of the secondary suffix viz. -sha.

The canon is however not without exceptions. The writer of
the vorttikas himself reads eight formulations to point out some
undesirable results due to this canon. Thus,

(18) The reading of 'unu' beside 'jarati' etc. in P. 3.1.67 is
an indication to Panini's knowledge of the canon. Nagesa in
Ps 72 cites co-existence of 'Kumara' and sramanir (in feminine)
also in P.3.1.70 as the jhpika incorporation of both ghatir
and ghatari in a vorttika on P. 3.2.9 for justifying ghatagraha
and ghatagraha shows its optional character. (vido Pu 28/Si 28).
(I) The augment num by P. 6.3.67 occurs in dvīṣantapa not in dvīṣatītapa.

(II) Gārgya + phak (P. 4.1.101) = Gārgyāyana, but from Gārgi, we get Gārgya with -phak (P. 4.1.120).

(III) In Madra-Rāja etc. -tāc (P. 5.4.91) is added but in Madra-rājini there is no such samāsānta suffix in the compound stem.

(IV) In mahāpriya, mahat becomes māhā (P. 6.3.46) but in mahāti-priya, no such operation occurs.

(V) Accentuation of the first vowel by P. 6.1.197 takes place in Dākṣi (Dākṣa + in), not in Dākṣi.

(VI) The rule Rājā ā (P. 6.2.59) is restricted to rājabrāhmaṇa etc. and cannot be extended upto rājabrāhmaṇī.

(VII) Bahugomān and bahugomatī are not equally treated by P. 6.2.175.

(VIII) In gomān, num (P. 7.1.70) is the augment but in gomati, it has no scope.

Of all these undeniable facts, the third case is solved on the plea, based on another canon that no samāsānta suffixes have compulsory occurrence. This canon, namely, 'Samāsantavidhiranityah' is generally accepted by grammarians, but Nāgeśa in his Pā refuses to admit it in absence of authoritative approval of the Mahābhāṣya. Of course, its acceptance by later scholars proves that it might be in vogue in some other grammatical school. Nāgeśa promised to take up the case of such canons at the beginning of his Pā and still rejects the present canon viz. Samāsantavidhir etc.

It is to note that occurrence or prohibition of samāsānta suffixes somewhere may be valid with reference to both masculine and corresponding feminine stems. Thus is bahuvrihi compound of 'a' and 'aṭiśreyasi' resulting in aṭiśreyasi and of 'a' and aṭibhrātri resulting in aṭibhrātri, -kap in prohibited by P. 5.4.156 and P. 5.4.157 respectively. Similarly in compound of ā and upakīyatī (the latter member being from upakīyata + nič + krip + ṇīp) forming upakīyatām, -tāc occurs by P. 5.4.107. (vide footnote(6) in Ss on P. 4.1.1. Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 27).
Regarding the eighth charge against the canon Prātipadikagrahaṇe etc., both the vārttika and the Mahābh. are categorical (19) in their view. The latter quotes a vārttika under P.7.1.1 which refers to prohibition of this canon in cases concerned with case-endings. This prohibitory formulation is accepted by Kāliyaṭa, Puruṣottama (No.27), Siradeva (No.29) and Nāgėśa. The author of the vārttikas presents eight supplementary rules to show the utility of this restriction. As noticed therein,

(I) accentuation is different in ṣūna and ṣunyā,
(II) sampṛṣāraṇa caused by a case-ending occurs in ṣunā (yuvan + ṣas) not in yuvatīḥ (yuvati + ṣas),
(III) num is augmented not in gomātī but in gomān (go-mat + masc. nom. sing.),
(IV) ān appears in anadvān but is absent from anaduḥī,
(V) āt is there in panthāḥ etc. but is absent from (su-) patīḥ etc.
(VI) asūn which appears in pūmān is absent from pūmaś,
(VII) niḥit and anān which are in sakāh, sakhyau etc. are absent from sakhi, sakhyau etc., and
(VIII) ot does not appear in bhavatī, aghavatī etc.

Thus the eighth charge too does not hold good because instances cited therein are explained by the prohibitory maxim on the linga-viśiṣṭa canon. As for the rest, no remedy is suggested in the Mahābh. The Pradīpa on P. 4.1.1. has however correctly referred to the vārttika viz. āc-prakāraṇe śakti-lāṅgalāṅkuṣa etc. on P. 3.2.9 and has interpreted the incorporation of both the words ghaṭa and its feminine variant viz. ghaṭī in that vārttika as an indication of the optional utilisation of the canon Prātipadikagrahaṇe etc. With this indication of option, exceptions to the canon shall be interpreted as cases of non-employment of the canon.

(19) Na vā, vibhaktau, lingavisistagrahamāt (vā).
3. A PRECEPT WHICH ENJOIN AN OPERATION WITH REFERENCE TO THE BARE FORM OF A VERBAL ROOT MUST APPLY TO THE OPERATION CONDITIONED BY A PRIMARY SUFFIX.

According to the canon Dhātoḥ svarūpagrahane va tatpratya-
ysvijānāt siddham when a verbal root in its bare form is incorp-
orated in a rule, that which is enjoined regarding it in that rule must be taking place before a primary suffix and not anything else. It is quoted in the Mahābh. on P. 7.2.114. For example in the words viz. kāṃsaperimādyām, kāṃsaperimādhiḥ etc. there is no vṛddhi of the vowel ṛ by this rule. For -bhām and -bhis are case-endings and not verbal suffixes. Besides mṛj-, the verbal (21) roots viz. srj- drā-, maśj-, naś-, han- and gṛ- have the same forms. In words viz. rajjusrādyām, devadṛghbhām, uḍakamapṛbhām, pranāśbhām, vārtraghnaḥ, devagiran etc. the verbal roots undergo no changes in their vowels. Because the endings are nominal and not verbal.

The Mahābh. however, questions the role of the vārttika. For in praśrghbhām etc. the vārttika would fail to stop the advent (22) of 'am' which is due to P. 6.1.59. In view of this Patañjali proposes a modified canon viz. Dhātoḥ kāryam ucyamānam tatpratyaśe bhavati (P. 89) which explicitly pronounces that what is enjoined with reference to a verbal root must take place before a verbal suffix. This is admitted by Sīrādeva(No.77). Purusottama (No.55) however retains the original form in the vārttika and merely refers to the modification suggested in the Mahābh.

(20) Mrjarvṛddhiḥ (P. 7.2.114).
(21) Prayojanam srjiddainasjināśihantigiretyarthām (va.) on P.7.3.114.
(22) Anudāttasya ēarduḍahāsasyānyatetāsām (P. 6.1.59).
The modified canon will stop the augmentation by 'am,' a purely verbal augment in praśṛgbyāṃ etc. before the case-ending. This canon is indicated by Pāṇini himself who has formulated the augmentation of 't' in bhraṃṣhatya even though the rule Hanasto' cinnaloḥ formulates the same. With the existence of the canon, the rule deals with verbal operations only and another formulation is essential for 't' in bhraṃṣhatya. Since change of the final consonant into a guttural consonant has nothing to do with a suffix in the word pranaḥbhyaṃ, this change is conceded by the rule Naśervā (P. 3.2.63). Correctly does the Ps of Nāgesea observe (23) that this canon concerns only an operation conditioned by a suffix. With regard to replacements by iyaṇ, uvaṇ etc., the canon has nothing to do. The prohibition viz. Na bhūṣudhiyoh (P. 6.4.85), says Nāgesea. In, Ps 63 is the indication of such option. Purusottama cites the word 'ksiyah' (<ksī- + sixth ending singular) in P. 6.4.59 to justify such replacements in niyaṇ, niyaḥ, bhuvau, bhuvah etc. before non-primary suffixes too.

4. IDENTITY OF FORM IN SPITE OF PARTIAL MODIFICATION.

The canon, Ekadesāvikṛtasyānanyatvat (Ps 37/Pu 14/ Si 42) is referred to in the Mahābh. in two vārttikas under the Mahēśvara (24) rule, R 1 k and the Pāṇinian rule P. 3.3.25. It upholds the identity of a form in spite of partial modifications in case it is cognisable. In its first reference, the vārttika intends on rejecting 1 in the rule R 1 k and argues that even after the change of r element of

(23) Yatkāryaṃ pratyayanimittaṃ tatreyaṃ vyavasthāpikā. (Ps on the canon)

(24) Ekadesāvikṛtasyānanyatvat plutādavaḥ... ekadesāvikṛtasyānanyatvat.
p into l,p is cognisable. The Mahābh is however against this

cumbrous process of rejection and comments that is is analogous

to fetching a fruit or catching a little bird with a large bamboo.
The validity of the canon is fully admitted in the second case
where the Mahābh. supports a vārttika which declares the -has
clement i.e. ending in nātuh and pītuh redundant.

The canon has popular analogy too. A hound with his tail cut
changes neither into a horse nor into an ass but is cognised as a
(hound). The present paribhāṣā has popular analogy. But as the
Ps points out, Patanjali deduces it from the word dāvyat in
P. 4.1.83, a word which is a partially modified form of dīvyati in
P. 4.4.2. From this, it is clear that even without pronouncing it
(27) Pāṇini himself acknowledged the utility of this paribhāṣā. Thus
corroboration of n of himu- and mīnā by P. 8.4.15 occurs in
prahīnatī, pramīnatī, jāras replaces -jara of atijara by P.7.2.101
in atijarasaṇāḥ and so on. According to Pu 14, replacement of endings
by -snaĩ, -snaī, -smaũ etc. in pronominal stems in
taṇaĩ (tad - de) etc. as a proof to the recognition of the canon
by Pāṇini himself. The word ‘ādava’ in P. 3.2.53 is an indication
too to this effect.

It is to note that omission and transformation, both partial
should be meant by ‘vikāra’ in this canon. The Pradīpa exemplifies
it with ‘pācatu’, (tip being changed into tu) and apacat (omission
of the final vowel i in the suffix). In case half or more than half

(25) Saiga mahato banaśastambīl laṭāvā-nukṛpyate (Mahābh. on R 1 k).
(26) Śva karne va pućche va chinne śvaiva bhavati (Mahābh. on R.1.50)
(27) Prāgādīvyaṭaṇ (P.4.1.83). Tena dīvyati khanati jayati jītān.
(P. 4.4.2).
of the original form is dropped or modified, says Nāgęsa in Ps 37, it is impossible to recognise the original. In that case, there is no way but relying upon sthānivadbhāva, if permissible, for the purpose of recalling it.

The Bhāradvāja school of grammar has got the vārttika, 'Ekadesāvikṛteśūpasāmdhīyānam'. According to it, the phenomenon of sthānivadbhāva (i.e. treating a substitute as its original) should have extended application in these cases also. The Uddyota rightly opines that this vārttika of the Bhāradvāja school excels that of (23) Kātyāyana. For it cites the reason behind treating a modified form as the original and refers to elision, transformation etc. by plural number in the word 'vikṛtesu'. The conclusion would certainly fall upon 'sthānivadbhāva' which can easily solve many such cases. Some however think that another maxim viz. Tadekadesa-vijñānāt siddham which is admitted for interpreting many other cases, can be employed in absence of the canon Ekadesāvikṛta etc.

Nāgęsa (Ps 37) admits Ekadesa etc. but disfavours obligatory employment of the same and cites the Pradīpa on P. 6.1.102 in his favour.

According to the Tadekadesabhūtanam tadgrahaṣana gṛhyate, road in the Mahābh. on P. 1.1.72, minor additions in a word being regarded as its component parts, the original and the modified form will be representing each other. As it is seen, the line of demarkation

---

(23) Kātyāyaniyaś Bhāradvājapāthe hetvabhidhānam bahuvacānam ca visesaḥ... bahuvacāna lopasyāpi saṃgrahāt 'apaśat' ityādāvāpi sthānivattvam iti bodhyam — Uddyota on P.1.1.56.
between this canon and the previous one is this that a change with 
augments, suffixes etc. i.e. addition to the original form (as
in the case of affixing, 'akā', 'ka' etc.) is dealt with in the
present canon whereas mere transformations, elisions etc. are dealt
with in the earlier. Thus the instance of Devadatta with shaved
head would belong to the canon Ekades'vivākṣā etc. whereas a
Devadatta with long hārya' comes under the purview of the canon,
Tadokadeśa etc. In fact, the term vikāra can denote transformation
elision, augmentation etc. and neither of the two canons can be
dispensed with. As a result of either of these canons, both the
words sarva and sarvaka (sarva + aksa) are treated as pronouns
(sarvanāman) by the rule P. 1.1.27. The Mahābh. cites the analogy
that the Ganges or the Yamuna does not differ with the confluence
of the tributaries nor does Devadatta differ at the stage of her
(29) pregnancy.

Of course, any discussion on the modification of a word
would go against the thesis that a word is unchangeable (nitya)
and that a word with modification cannot be treated as the original.
Still the Mahābh. points out Pāṇini's acquaintance with and
approval of the present canon the influence of which is counter-
acted in the rule Nedamadasarakoh (P. 7.1.11). According to this
rule, a grammatical operation/admissible with the stems 'iddam'
and 'adhas' is prohibited when the suffix-ka is inserted in them.
Thus akta-parimāna-grahaṇa i.e. accepting the word in its original
form, is not generally encouraged by Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and
Patanjali follow the footsteps of their great master. Nāgeśa too

(29) Aneka nādi Gāngām Yamunācā prabha Gāṅgā-Yamunāgrahānena
grhyate (Mahābh. on P.1.1.72).
in his Uddyota accepts their opinion when he comments that the 
(30) idea of akta-parimānaka-grahaṇa here would endanger the very 
existence of the twin canons under review. Identical should be the 
intent of his statement in the Ps under 'Ekadesavikṛtam ananyavat'
(31) where he warns against the anticipated uselessness of the canon 
if 'akta-parimāna' is agreed to. Since partial modification does 
not affect the identity of a word, the theory of unchangeable words 
still holds good.

The vṛttika Na vā'vayavasyānanyatvāt appears under P.8.3.65 
to justify the cerebralisation of the dental s even when the 
causative suffix is added to the pronounced verbal root and brings 
some changes in the original root (e.g. abhīṣāvayati). The observ-
vation Tadekadesā-vijñāna vā sādhānam under P. 1.1.72 which is 
further simplified in Tadekadesabhūtan tad-grahaṇaṇa gṛhyate under 
the same rule is a logical simplification of the idea contained 
in the above-mentioned vṛttika quoted under P. 8.3.65. Thus the 
three great scholars of the Pāṇinian grammar expressly accept and 
utilise the two canons reviewed here. The Ps of Nāgṣaṇa mentions 
the second canon, with the reading Tanmādyya-patitastadgraḥanena 
gṛhyate (Ps'90) to justify 'savrka' and uccakaḥ as pronoun and 
indeclinable respectively. Pu 19 and Si 73 have the same reading. 
The former exemplifies bhināti (bhid-śnam-tip) to mean by dhatu 
(i.e. verbal stem) the root along with the conjugational sign 
(vikarana). In abhinat (at-bhid-śnam-loḥ tip) at is augmented 
to the verbal root with adjunct. Since the Mahābh. is found

(30) Vastuteh pericchīṇa-parimānaka-grahaṇa ekadesa-vikṛtasyāya-
syāpyapraṇvīttir iti bhāṣyāsayaḥ-Uddyota on P. 1.1.72).
(31) Evaṃ akta-parimāṇa-grahaṇe'pi nāyam uktayuktēḥ- (Ps).

rejecting the prohibitions in P. 7.1.11 Purushottama questions
(32) the propriety of citing the word viz. akoh in P. 7.1.11 as
the indication to the canon Tadakadesa etc. and cites the word
akoh in P. 6.1.132 for the purpose. The practice of treating a
modified word as non-different from the original is analogous to
the practice of referring to a group of persons as possessed of
umbrella even if someone may not have it. The word bhatta-grāma
(village of Bhattas) is used, says Siradeva (No.78), even some
non-bhattas reside therein. Treatment of the word viz. vaiyakaraṇa
which is derived from an augmented nominal stem, as a prātipadika
is an instance in his discourse.

5. INDICATORY LETTERS HOW FAR CONSTRUED AS COMPONENTS.

The vārttika Ananubandha-grahaṇe hi na sānubandakaṣya (Ps 82/8
Pu 36/ Śī 53) is quoted in the Mahābh. on P. 4.1.15 with a view to
pointing out that similar suffixes or stems differing from one
another with presence of indicatory latter in one place and its
absence in the other cannot be treated as identical. For example,
-tavya and -tavyat are two different kratya suffixes (potential
passive participles). The compound is prohibited by P. 2.2.11
in brāhmaṇasya kartavyam when the word Kartavya is derived from the
verbal root kr with the suffix -tavya. But when the suffix is
-tavyat, no such prohibition is there. By div in P. 6.1.131 and
P. 7.1.84 we mean the nominal stem div and not the verbal root
divu. The Mahābh. on P. 4.1.15 refers to another maxim according
to which suffixes etc. having identical remnants and different
(33) indicatory letters must not be identical. Thus -yat and -nyat,

(33) |īdām-adasoh kādeva niyamena siddhim vyākhyaṇa nigeshadvayam
pratyākhyātavām......Etat-tador ityatra tvakor iti padaṃ
jñāpakan.....(Pu 19) |
an (apusat) and cân (apūpujat), -ad and -nae are all different yielding different results and having different scope. e.g. gam + yat > gamya, grah + nyat > grāhya. The particle 'hi' in the first of the two canons indicates its wide acceptance. The Mahābh. seems to refer to the second canon from some other source than the vārttikas. It deduces both these canons from the Pāṇinian rule P. 4.2.9 which enjoins both the suffixes, -dya and -dyat after the stem Vāmadeva (Mahābh. on P. 4.1.15). While the indicatory letter ṇ in both -dya and -dyat causes elision of the final vowel (technically ț element) of the stem Vāmadeva, the additional anubandha 't' added to in the suffix -dyat causes svartla accent in the final vowel of the word Vāmadevya (P. 6.1.185). On account of ṇ as the instrument of differentiation of -dya and -dyat from -ya and -yat, the rule Yayatos etc. (P. 6.2.156) is not applicable with reference to a word which has -dya or -dyat as the suffix. As a result, in the word avāmadevya there is no acute accent (udātta) in the final vowel.

Of course, indicatory letters are not admitted as effective instruments of differentiation everywhere. For example, dissimilarity of suffixes counts little if it solely counts upon the difference (34) of indicatory letters. This alone justifies the rule on 'option (35) for either of the suffix -ṣa (e.g. dā + ṣa > dada, dhā + ṣa > dadha) and -ṇa (dā + ṇa > dāya, dhā + ṇa > dhāya) after dā- and dhā-. These two suffixes differ from each other only in indicatory

(33) Tadānumabandhaka-grahane 'tadānum-bandhakagrahanam na (Pu 32/Si 55).

(34) Nātadenu-bandhakaśya (Ps 23). Both Pu (No. 37) and Si (No. 54) discuss the canon of ekānumāndhaka and dvēnumāndhaka but Nāgāsa ignores it.

(35) Dadāti-dadhātyor vibhāṣa (P. 3.1.139).
letters. If the two were admitted as dissimilar suffixes, the interpretative rule Vadarūpo etc. (P. 3.1.94) would suffice to uphold their alternative affix vṛja. In fact, the rule P. 3.1.94 upholds optional use of two totally dissimilar suffixes, one general and the other particular, if they fall within the jurisdiction of the governing rule Dhatok (P. 3.1.94 - P. 3.4.117) minus that of the governing rule Strīyām (P. 3.3.94 - P. 3.3.112). In other words, of the two similar suffixes, (dissimilar only in respect of indicatory letters) the particular unseats the general. The one does not stand for the other in an operation. They have their own scope of employment. The twin canons viz. Anamubandhaka etc. and Tadanubandhaka etc. too treat suffixes etc. which are differentiated by indicatory letters as different from each other with a different scope of application. In view of this, the possessive suffix -matup (P. 5.2.94) is not inclusive of -omatup (P. 4.2.87). As for 'van' in the rule Vano ra ca (P. 4.1.7), no indicatory letter is attached to it. It is not the form of a suffix but the remnant of three suffixes viz. -kvanip, -vanip and -hvanip. So 'van' stands for all the three suffixes the resulting forms with which are replaced in their final n by r before the feminine suffix nip (e.g. dhivan + nip > dhīvari, šarvan + nip > šarvari, sutvan + nip > sutvari).

It is further to note that the twin canons examined above do not operate with reference to 'varṇa'. Nāgasa (Pá 82-83) endorses it on the suggestion of the Mahābh. in P. 7.1.18. For instance, n in amañ̄ is a mere associate letter of au and has nothing to differentiate between the nominative and accusative dual endings. The letters i and ū in Xu stryākhyau nadī (P. 1.4.3) accommodate
the feminine suffixes (viz. īp, īn, īs, ī) too of which the
remnant after elision of indicatory letters is either I or ī.

Whether the anubandhas (indicatory letters) from a part and
parcel of the root, suffix etc. to which they are attached in
pronouncements is a perplexing question. Patanjali, the great
commentator examined the possibilities of answering this question
in his commentary on the sutra 'Tasya lopah' (P. 1.3.9). He posed
to answer at first in the negative and then established that an
anubandha is a component part of a root, suffix etc. In favour of
the first case that anubandhas cannot be treated as parts of roots
and suffixes etc., with which they are read in the original
aphorisms and statements (Anekāntā anubandhāḥ - Ps. 4), two infer-
ences can be put forward: (a) an anubandha is not the part of a
root etc., with which it is read in original for it is not under-
stood as such; (b) an anubandha is not understood as a part of a
root etc., in its original reading for it is not seen to be present
along with the prominent portion of a root etc. Information of
words. Thus finally the inference will be as follows: an anubandha
is not a part of the root etc. in its original reading for it is
not understood to be a part of the word constituted from the root
or with the suffix concerned. For example, to mean frequent crying,
we add the suffix -yan to the root rud-. Here the indicatory
consonant ī attached to ya is lost. As it is not present in the
formation of the root 'rorudya' from which the word rorudyate will
be formed, it need not be counted as a part of the suffix in its
original reading in the sutra 'Dātoranakāco etc. (P. 3.1.22).
The ī influences the conjugation of the root in the middle forms.
Some confusions would however creep in if we support this view. When an anubandha is not accepted as a component part of the root etc., the word 'sat' in the sūtra 'Anekālāt sarvasya' (P. 1.1.55) cannot be construed as 'śakāra it yasya' for in that case, a relationship between an anubandha and the original root, suffix etc. must be recognised against the commitment. The exponents of the idea would however explain away the confusion by saying that as in a compound word 'a well of a village' (grūnākūpa) a sense of proximity (saṃpya) prevails even though a village denotes a group of homes and houses, so is in the case of 'sat' also. In the words viz. 'sit', 'kit', etc. what is proximate is assumed by indication (lākṣaṇa) as a component part and hence the compound between 's' and 'it' and so on is possible. In the sūtra 'Hālantyān' (P. 1.3.3) the word 'antya' would be construed in this view to mean something which is proximate and which is posterior to something else (Parasānipabodhakah). Some may accept indicatory letters as proximate letters. To avoid confusion that the anubandhas viz. 'n', 'n' etc. in that case may be related to any of the suffixes in a rule viz. 'vṛnchā' etc. (P. 4.2.30) every suffix should be regarded as separate in its existence within the rule. Thus the rule Pramāṇa dvayasajdaṁmātracetaḥ (P. 5.2.37) reads three anubandhas of identical implications. Furthermore, accentuation regularised by indicatory letters in the vowels of a constituted word would support separate reading of the suffixes in a rule (cp Vṛttadvā-yārttika on P. 1.3.9).

The correct view would be to accept an indicatory letter (anubandha) as a component part of a root, suffix etc. in the original reading. This view is supported by the fact that suffixes and roots etc. with anubandhas as adjuncts are taken up for
declension in rules (as in Jñārasūsandrdham sanah P. 1.3.57). A
twig until it is cut off from the parent tree forms its limb
with a special relationship between the part and the whole. An
anubandha in the same way would be a part of a suffix etc. by a
definite relationship. This view would naturally recognise a
relationship between a part and the whole which maintains the
compounds in the words viz. sit, kit, etc. justified in normal
way. By way of criticism of the earlier views, it is pointed out
that to superimpose the features of a component part on a merely
proximate letter by the power of indication (laksana) is not a
sound solution. Moreover in those views the sūtras defining
indicatory character of some letters come first — thus elision
of these letters is enjoined. Subsequently, the anubandha seems
not to be related to a root suffix etc. as it is not present in
the constituted word. At last one understands that the word
'antya' should mean subsequent proximate letter (parasemīpa)
which would secondarily mean a component part. But this long
chain of dependence (Cakrakāpattidoga) cannot be escaped by
dependence upon the power of indication, which is invoked only
when complexity arises due to some incongruity in the primary
meaning. Of course, if we decline to recognise an indicatory letter
as a part of a suffix etc., we may avoid the complexity of recognising
three interpretative canons of Sanskrit grammar viz.
Nānubandhakṛtam anekālakto, Nānubandhakṛtam anejantatvam and
Nānubandhakṛtam asarūpyam. This may not be of less importance in
the eyes of a grammarian, who, as a proverb says, derives joy of
having a son from brevity by a single syllable in a statement.
Still the great commentator propounds the view that an indicatory letter (anubandha) is a part of the root etc., to which it is attached and recognises this trio of paribhāṣās for this view is more logical than the former. In support of this decision an inference can be put forth: an anubandha is a part and parcel of a root suffix etc., even in formations for it is known to exist (36) in the sūtra, as in the case of n which is read along with s in the suffix -san in the sūtra and hence is a part of ‘san’ when we get the root jijnās etc. So an indicatory letter will be elided in application, not in a pronouncement. That the sūtra “Kāśyādibhyasṭhānītānu” (P. 4.2.116) possesses two ň letters of identical implication is a clear indication to the fact that an indicatory letter can be the part of a single suffix etc. Through proper interpretation the rule Vunčhankatha etc. (P.4.2.89) will set ‘vu’ with ň, ोha with ň and so on.

To side with this view necessitates the recognition of three canons of Pāṇinian grammar that we have already mentioned.

The first paribhāṣā viz. Nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam (Ps 6) implies that in counting the number of letters in a suffix etc., an anubandha must be left aside. For example, by the rule ‘Arvanasāvavāṇāh’ (P. 6.4.127) the nominal stem arvan, not preceded by the negative particle naṁ, is substituted in the final letter by tr before all suffixes excepting nominative singular ending su. An ādesā (substitute) of a stem or a suffix, when consisting of more than one syllable generally replaces the stem or the suffix altogether. Here in the ādesā tr, r as an anubandha drops and the ādesā is treated as having a single

(36) Ekāṅtastatrāpalabāhe (vārttika on P. 1.3.9).
letter which replaces the ultimate letter only of the stem arvan. The paribhāṣā is derived from the word sit in the sūtra 'ānekāśīt sarvasya'. It is critically discussed in some details during our study on the rule ānekā etc. (P. 1.1.55).

The canon Nānubandhakṛtam anejanatavam (P. 7) is indicated in the rule 'Udīcam māno vyatihāre' (P. 3.4.19). In this rule mān is men which in spite of the indicatory consonant ā reads the vowel ā in place of e. The very modified pronunciation of the root in the sūtra itself suggests that in change of the vowels e, ai, or au into some other vowels in verbal roots etc. an anubandha in the ultimate syllable will be silent to offer the ultimate position to the changing vowels. For example, in the rule Dādhāghvadāp (P.1.2.20) dāp- means dāip- where ignoring the existence of p, the vowel ai is changed into ā as the ultimate letter. Of course, it may be said that dāp is a root of the divādi class and in Udīcam māno vyatihāre ā is included even after its elision only with a view to uttering the verb more explicitly.

The third of the canons viz. 'Nānubandhakṛtam asārūpyam' (P. 8) is attached to the rule Vāsarūpāsthiyām (P. 3.1.94). Dissimilarity of suffixes may be either created by anubandhas or constant even after anubandhas are elided. The first type of difference will be dispelled by mere elision of anubandhas. According to the canon Nānubandhakṛtam asārūpyam this dissimilarity is negligible. With this in view the aforesaid rule will have its application when there is total difference between two suffixes.
one particular and the other general. The suffixes -tavya and -anīyar as general suffixes and -yat as the exceptional have alternative applications yielding cetavya, cóya etc. But -an and -ka are differentiated only by ṅ and k and hence the exclusive suffix -ka here invariably opposes the application of the general suffix -an. Of course, the necessity of this paribhāṣā is exhausted by the term asarūpa in the rule Vāsarūpo etc.

6. THE DOMINANCE OF THE RULE OF INTERNAL AFFINITY.

The canon related to internal and external operations explains a large number of cases where the Paninian rule Vipratiṣedhe etc. (P. 1.4.2) fails. Every grammatical operation, we know, is subject to certain conditions, internal and external. It is quite logical that the less dependent of the two conflicting operations is in a sound position in comparison with what awaits more and remoter conditions. This is what the canon of predominance of an internal operation formulates. Siv + na = siū na syūna - syona. Here between gумation of 'i' in siūna and its change into y the latter prevails because it awaits the subsequent vowel ṅ, an integral part of the verbal root whereas gумation of 'i' depends upon the suffix, an external condition. In dyaukāmi (div + kāma + i = diukāma + i = dyukāma + i = dyaukāmi) vṛddhi affects 'u' in dyukāma with the suffix as the condition. But the change of 'i' into 'y' depends upon the next vowel 'u' and is internal. In div-san + tip ( = dīū sati = dyū sati = dyū dyū sati = dūdyūṣati), 'y' replaces 'u' before ā and reduplication is

(37) Both the terms viz. antareṅga and bahirāṅga are results of bahuvrīhi compound, the word aṅga being generally construed as denoting a nīmitta (conditioning cause). Antareṅga and
bahirangā nature may be obtained from various points. It is however certain as Kielhorn observes that "meaning does not make an operation bahirangā... nor does dependence on technical terms make an operation bahirangā... Antarāṅga and bahirangā are not equivalent to ālpāpekṣa and bahvāpekṣa". (Foot note 1, page 221, Translation of the Ps by Kielhorn). The learned translator finds that 'Kaiyāta enumerates the dependence on technical terms among the causes which make an operation Antarāṅga or bahirangā. For the substitution of guṇa (in śiv + na) he adduces five causes, for that of u four and he then maintains that the substitution of u is Antarāṅga' (Foot note 1, Page 222, ibid.). But 'if dependence on technical terms did make an operation bahirangā in the formation of up + Vṛtrahānḥbhairām (Vṛtrahān + kvip + bhai) the addition of the augment tuk would be Antarāṅga as caused by kvip and the elision of n bahirangā because caused by circumstance that Vṛtrahān is termed a pada. The elision of n would then already by the present paribhāṣā be asiddha as regards the addition of tuk and 'Kṛtā tuk in P. 8.2.2. would be superfluous'. (Foot note 2, Page 232-33, ibid.). Moreover 'in the Bhāṣya on P. 8.2.2. the expression tuk of that rule has been rejected by means of Par 85 (quoted in the Bhāṣya on P. 1.1.39) but not... by means of the Antarāṅga paribhāṣā. Therefore even if dependence on technical terms be admitted to make an operation bahirangā, it has, at any rate, not been admitted in the Bhāṣya on P. 8.2.2.' (Foot note 1, Page 233 ibid).

Again in tyād + su (ṣyaḥ), replacement of 'd' by 'a' (P. 7.2.102) a case-suffix and that of 't' or 'a' by 's' (P. 7.2.106) before nominative singular ending have occasion. If Antarāṅga and bahirangā meant sāmānyāpekṣa and visēṣāpekṣa, the former rule would take effect first and the latter rule would substitute initial 't' by 's' even if Panini had not said 'anantyaḥ' in P. 7.2.106. The fact that Panini has thought it necessary to say anantyaḥ shows that Antarāṅga and bahirangā are not equivalent to sāmānyāpekṣa and visēṣāpekṣa". (Foot note 3, Page 258 ibid).

(37 contd.)
there due to -sen. From Kadru + ūṇ + dhak we got through Kadru + dhak (eya) the form Kadraweya. Here between ganation of ū and combination of ū with ū the latter as internal takes place first. Subsequently the euphonic substitute ū is ganated. In sautthiti (su utthita - 1) combination of two ū’s precedes vrddhhi. These are very few of the instances which derive benefit from the maxim of predominance of internal operations. The Mahābh. on the basis of certain vārttikas on P. 1.4.2 refers to a large number of grammatical operations namely changes of vowel, augmentation, replacement of vowels with iyah, uvā etc., accentuation, euphonic combination etc. which owe their interpretation to this maxim. But for it many operations could not be explained. It seems that Panini’s familiarity with this paribhäsā might have barred him from formulating a sutra on this important principle.

The instances cited above are discussed in the Mahābh. to prove the utility of the vārttika ‘Antarāṅgaṇa’ which means ‘Antarāṅgaṇa paliyo bhavatītī vaktavyam’ as Patanjali explains under P. 1.4.2. There are two more vārttikas, one under P. 6.1.85 the (33) and/or other under P. 6.1.108, which expressly propound that a rule on internal operation is more powerful than/rule on external operation. According to the last vārttika, the canon is indicated by Panini in P. 6.1.95. In ava-ā-ihī = ava-chi-avehi the euphonic combination between elements of a verb and a prefix occurs first. The utility of the canon is thoroughly discussed on P. 6.1.108 with reference to certain grammatical operations, not referred to under P. 1.4.2. For example,
(I) in vāyu + au + atra (vāyu atra), the contraction of u and au into ā (P. 6.1.102) is antaranga in comparison with the change of au into āv before 'atra'.

(II) in здравā-artham, the contraction of ā and ā into ā as antaranga prevails over the contraction of ā and ā into ā.

(III) in akāri ta atra, elision of the conjugational ending -ta triumphs over contraction of a and a(trā) into ā; in paça hi idam, -hi is elided and no contraction of i and i(dam) into ā is possible.

(IV) in brkṣa tā atra (brkṣa-ina atra) -ina as the antaranga triumphs over contraction of 'a' and 'a' into ā.

(V) in brkṣa ṇe atra (brksa ya atra), replacement of ṇe by -ya as antaranga triumphs over contraction of e and a into ā.

(VI) in tad āi idam (tad-smin idam), replacement of āi by -smin is antaranga in relation to i and i being contracted into ā etc.

So the canon of predominance of a rule on an operation of antaranga in comparison with internal affinity is not wide application. The Pradāpa under P. 1.4.2. opines that this principle is a formulation of a logical statement, pointed out as the Uddyota says, in the Mahābhārata under P. 1.1.57. Therein while explaining the words patvya, mrdvyā [patu, mrcu +(ā)ā(ś) + (t) ā] etc. with the help of the canon 'Asiddham bahirangalaksanam antarangalaksanam' Patañjali shows that the change of 'u' into 'v' is antaranga in comparison with the change of 'ī' into 'y' and hence occurs first. The logic behind it is corroborated by popular practice. A man rising in the morning looks after his own health first, and then entertains his friends and relatives according to their relative importance. So in comprehending the meaning of a word, class concept (sāmānya) appears first, then comes the individuality, gender

(39) Etaṇḍa nyāyasiddham-evamūditam.

(40) Sā cāpyesā lokatah siddha (Mahābhārata, under P. 1.1.57).
number and case, one after another. This is the logical order postulated by the authoritative scholars in case of grammatical operations. The internal nature of the change of u into v in patu-i-ā lies in its having an earlier subsequent conditional cause viz. ।. If however two combinations resulting in v and y are taken one by one, the change of u into v is internal as the earlier operation and the external operation is inefficient in the sense that its condition i.e. (†)ā being yet to be suffixed, 'y' from 'i' is totally out of place. The canon is indispensable, (42) the Mahābh. says, for the sake of accentuation in Kartryā, hartryā etc. by the rule P. 6.1.174.

We have noticed that the logic which is the soul of the vārttika 'antarāṅgāṇa', quoted under P. 1.4.2 is discussed in the Mahābh. while explaining the paribhāṣā, viz. 'Asiddhām bahirāṅgalaksanam antarāṅgalaksanam'. Thus a confusion may creep up regarding the relative importance of these two observations. As we have referred to above, the Mahābh. explains a number of instances given in vārttikas in support of the proposition 'antarāṅgāṇa' according to which a rule on internal operation is stronger than a rule of external operation. It has again decisively referred to the second observation the maxm on relative inefficiency (asiddāha) of a rule on external operation in relation to an antarāṅga for more than thirty times. At least nine of such cases are elucidations of a vārttika 'Na vā bahirāṅgalaksanatvāt'. Every-

(43) where in these nine elucidations, along with a few independent

(41) Yena kramaṇa śabdopasthitistenaiva kramaṇa kāryān (Uddyota on P. 1.1.57).

(42) Purvapravṛttikatvarūpaṃ antarāṅgatvam... asiddhatvam aprāptatvarūpaṃ... (Uddyota on P. 1.1.57).
discussions, Patanjali concludes with 'Asiddham bahirangam antarange', a compact formulation on the 'asiddha' nature of a 'bahiranga' rule. Both sides have blessings of the vārttikas, the first in way of proposition and the other by reference. Patanjali under P. 1.4.2, establishes that the latter is extensively powerful to solve all cases which the first canon is supposed to explain. The discussion runs thus:

If we accept the first canon in the vārttika in paśāvedam etc. after guna, ai would be inevitable. But by the second canon guna(e) is inefficient to 'ai' i.e. no ai is possible and the formation stands intact. In aksadyuḥ etc., however, if 'ūth' as external be inefficient to the change of 'i' into 'y' (-diu = diū = dyū) the latter would have no scope of occurrence here at all i.e. to say we would not have the form aksadyuḥ. To solve this problem a restrictive maxim may be adopted. It would obstruct the second canon vis. Asiddham etc. in places where an operation between consecutive vowels is concerned. It can be deduced from the word 'asiddha' in P. 6.1.86. But this restrictive maxim would challenge the stand of the Mahābhūta itself in explaining paṭyvā, mṛdvyā etc. under P. 1.1.57 and obstruct the maxim on the relative importance of an internal operation over the external. Fortunately however the Mahābhūta excepting the present instance, nowhere refers to this restriction. Nāgasa is fully justified when he brands it (45) as an alien utterance. From the rule P. 6.1.86 he deduces

(43) P. 1.1.47; 3.1.7; 6.1.66; 6.1.85; 6.1.83; 7.1.14; 8.1.91; 8.3.13; 41.

(44) Nājēnantarye bahiṣṭvapraeklptih (Ps. 51/ Pu 42/ Ś 73/Sū 1.59).

(45) Anyatra kvāpyavyavahārad iyan ekadosyuktihantarangaparibhāṣāyā anityatvanova jñāpyam. (Uddyota on P. 1.4.2).
that the canon on the relative importance of an internal operation is not obligatory. In that case the absence of this canon is admissible in aśādyuh. Nāgęśa reacts to Patańjali's silence on the restriction in P. 1.1.57 with the comment that it is either (46) voluntary or totally disregarded. The canon on the relative (47) inefficiency of an external vidhi can again be deduced from the rule P. 6.4.132. According to Kāiśyaṇa all instances related to the vṛttika Antaraṅga can be satisfactorily explained with this indicated canon. Under P. 6.4.132 he makes a distinction between the cases of simultaneous possibility of both internal and external operations on the one hand and the cases of the earlier occurrence of an external operation as a condition (nimitta) of an internal operation on the other hand. His decision is this that in the first cases the logic corroborated by popular practice which is referred to under P. 1.1.57 decides in favour of an internal operation (antarāṅga) whereas in the last cases the indication of P. 6.4.132, is to be relied upon. This opinion of (48) Kāiśyaṇa is supported by Nāgęśa under P. 1.1.57. According to Puruṣottama, in the first cases the canon of the predominance of 'antarāṅga' is invoked while for the second cases inefficiency of 'bahiraṅga' is cited. It has been decided that the prohibition by Nājēnāntarāye etc. pertains to the first cases alone.

Relationship between dhātu (verbal root) and upasarga (prefix) is believed to be internal (antarāṅga) in the Mahābhāṣa.

(46) Viśedhastu anītya nāstyeva vēti Bhāsyāsyah (Uddyota on P. 1.4.2).
(47) Yad bāha utham sāsti taj māpyatyaācāryo bhavatyesa paribhāsā — (Mahābhāṣa on P. 6.4.132).
Under P. 1.1.4 however, while explaining upedāha (upa-inda + kta) and preddha (pra-inda + kta), Patañjali discerns gunation between elements of prefix and verbal root as external in comparison with its prohibition which is treated as 'internal'. The Pradīpa sets forth two possible ways viz. affixation of a suffix after the verbal root and subsequent addition of the prefix to it and addition of the prefix to be followed by affixation. According to it, in the first case (inda + kta = iddhā; upa + iddha) the euphonic substitute viz. 'e' is external whereas in the second case (upa + inda = upendh; upendh + kta) it is internal. In the latter case the prohibition along with its conditioning cause viz. the suffix is absent at the time of the euphonic substitute and it is inefficient as the external operation. This proves, says Nāgęa, that even when an internal operation takes place at first, the external operation which is to occur subsequently may be inefficient. Under P. 6.1.135 the Mahābhārata critically discusses the relationship between the prefix and the verbal root. It is argued therein that if a prefix be added to a verbal form, conjugated or suffixed, discrepancies are unavoidable. First, such a proposition is opposed to the widely accepted view that a prefix makes an intransitive verbal root transitive and favours consequential suffixes etc. in passive voice (karmavācya). For example, the verbal root āsā- (to sit) when assisted by 'upa-' is transitive and denotes 'to worship'. But for prior assistance of the prefix, the root cannot have a suffix in passive voice here (karmavācya). Secondly it denies that verbal roots in numerous places, when assisted by a prefix are

(43) Sīrādeva, Purusottamadeva and Nilakantha in their Paribhāṣāvyottis discuss both the canons envisaging the predominance of antarānga and relative inefficiency of bahirānga respectively. They adduce reasons in favour of retention of the former even being conscious of Patañjali's disapproval.
eligible to get middle or active endings. So the Mahābh. admits internal affinity between a prefix and a verbal root. The Pradīpa (49) extends powerful support to this view.

Let us examine the position. Since a suffix or an ending completes a verb and a prefix may be added to a verb it is but logical, says Nāgara in his Pā that affixation should be followed (50) by the addition of a prefix and not vice versa. Prefixes indicate some senses already in the verbal roots, traditionally believed to be pregnant of various senses. In that case a suffix in passive (karmavācyā) after a so-called intransitive verbal root cannot be ruled out. The case of active and middle endings before the addition of prefixes may be solved in the same way. Historically speaking adoption of a particular sense in a verbal root is necessarily a deduction from popular uses. In view of this transitive or intransitive nature need not be static in respect of a (51) verbal root, the essence of such nature being lying in the sense. So 'vah-' to carry is transitive but vah- 'to flow' is intransitive. According to the traditional view of the grammarians, prefixes have no independent meaning of their own. The indeclinables which govern case-endings too are of indicatory nature. As Yāska reports, Śaṅkara, the older linguist, opined in favour of (52) such indicatory nature (dyotaka) of prefixes. But both Gārgya and

(49) Anutpamasparyya tīṅkṣu dhātupasargasambandhe suṣṭā bhāvyam (Pradīpa on P. C.1.133).

(50) Pā under Asiddham bahirangam antarāṅga.

(51) Dhātorarthāntare vṛtye...karmapo'karmikā kriyā.

(52) Na nirbadhā upasarga arthaṁnirāhuriti Śaṅkaram... učāvācāṁ padarthā bhavantiti Gārgyā... evam učāvācāṁ arthaṁ prāhus te upakṣitavyāḥ (Nirukta 1.1.).
Yāśka himself recognize various senses of these indeclinables. The Paninian school follows Śakatayana in this regard. Thus while discussing the technical term 'pratipadika' under P. 1.2.45 and again under P. 1.4.92 the Mahābhārah resolves that indeclinables have no meaning of their own and that they are treated as nominal stems (pratipadika) on account of an indication in P. 1.4.92. According to Kaiyaṭa on P. 1.2.45, 'meaninglessness' of indeclinables lies in the fact that both dhātu and nipāta express something jointly (53) and as such the latter has nothing of its own. A clearer observation of the Mahābhārah is there under P. 1.4.92. As stated therein, by 'anarthaka' in connection with adhi- and pari- Panini means to pronounce that they indicate the meaning of the verbal (54) root and nothing more. Nāgāsa upholds this viewpoint under P. 1.2.45.

From what is stated above, it follows that the prefixes which allegedly impart new senses to verbal roots, in fact, indicate one of the meanings already in these roots. So the relationship between a verbal root and a suffix is more intimate than that between a verbal root and a prefix. A moderner may not however be inclined to this theory of indication. Rabindramath, as Yāśka did, enumerates different meanings of prefixes with a comparative study of some prefixes in Greek, Latin, German, Sanskrit etc. and opines in (55) favour of their expressing different senses. In that case, we go

(53) Ānarthakyaṇēca...adhi-kadyotyārthābhāvāt...
(54) Ānarthantaravācināvanarthakam.
(55) 'Upanartha-saṃalocanā' in the 'Sabdatattva' (supplement), Rabindra Račānāvali, Viśvabhārati 1960, Vol XII, Page 551.
back to face the old dilemma. It is however decided that irrespec-
tive of the necessity of the first occurrence of suffixes, a
grammatical operation conditioned by prefix and concerned with its
meaning would be internal in comparison with anything else and
when it is not so any operation conditioned by a suffix etc. would
be internal. It is an improvement upon two alternatives proposed
(56) by the Pradīpa on P. 1.1.4. In khaṭvā-a-ūḍha (khaṭvā-ogha -
khātvoḍha), euphonic combination between elements of the prefix
and the verb is internal. As we have already mentioned Indrehi
(Indra ā ihi = Indra ihi) is justified by Rk-pr. 2.7 and bhakṣehi
(bhakṣa ā ihi = 'bhakṣā ihi) justified by Tait-pr. 5.3. Both the
texts have ignored the canons on internal operation.

The question of the fate of the canon in the last three
chapters of the eighth book of the Aṣṭādhyāyī deserves thorough
analysis. The Mahābhā. observes under P. 2.3.15 that since internal
and external operations are conflicting and require simultaneous
occasion, here in the chapter of 'asiddha' the paribhāṣā cannot have
any footing in the rules governed by 'asiddha'. Because a rule on
an internal operation within the scope of the governing word
'asiddha' is already inefficient in comparison with a rule on
external operation in a previous book of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. We have
already noticed the same fate of the canon Vipratisēdha etc. in
a case where either of the conflicting rules belongs to the
jurisdiction of the governing word 'asiddha'. It is not a logical
suggestion that the canon Aṣiddham etc. will ignore the rule

(56) Both Siradeva (No. 131 and No. 132) and Nīlakanṭha (No. 29
and No. 28) read these two alternatives as two canons. The
latter summarises that either of the two is employed in
accordance with the instances concerned.
Purvatāsiddham (P. 8.2.1) and treat a 'bahirānga' as inefficient before this rule makes the 'antarānga' inefficient. On the contrary, the rule by virtue of its nature as a pronouncement of Panini himself, will invalidate the canon which is merely inferred.

Against this view some however put forth the argument that both the vārttikas and the Mahābh. with a view to prohibiting elision of the last member of conjuncts at the end of a pada (P. 8.3.23) (e.g. dadhyatra, madhyatra etc.) take recourse to the canon Asiddham bahirāngam etc. Moreover, to supersede a statement with an inferred principle is indicated in P. 1.1.67, 4.1.2, 8.3.46 etc. In view of this, it is believed that an interpretative rule goes to the place of an injunctive precept to assist it and that the canon Asiddham bahirāngam etc. is valid even in the chapters under the jurisdiction of the word 'asidha'.

Of course, under P. 8.2.1 it is more than evident in the Mahābh. that the canon Vipratisēdhe etc. can have no access to this captor. Even the fate of the paribhāṣā of apavāda is not different here. So the antarānga paribhāṣā need not be granted special accommodation in this chapter. Under P. 6.4.22 the opinion of the Mahābh. along with that of the Pradīpa is interesting in this connection. According to the Mahābh., the so-called 'antarānga' and 'bahirānga', cannot appear simultaneously on account of inefficiency of the either of the two under the influence of P. 6.4.22. In that case, the canon Asiddham bahirāngam etc. is irrelevant in the chapter within the jurisdiction of P. 6.4.22 too. Someone may treat this canon as a member of this chapter (P. 6.4.22 - 6.4.175) for it is deduced from P. 6.4.132 a rule.

(57) Kāryakālam samjñāparibhāṣam (a maxim in the Mahābh. Ps 3/ Pu 103/ Si 120).
(58) Within the same. Moreover as its help is solicited here it will (59) directly come under P. 6.4.22 and will be inefficient in comparison with any rules of this chapter. Here, too, it will be illogical to make this canon supersede the Paninian rule 6.4.22. Neither Patañjali nor Kātyāṇa suggests here anything regarding the predominance of the canon upon this rule. In view of this in the last three chapters of the eighth book (P. 8.2.1 - 8.4.68) too the canon Asiddham etc. should be treated as irrelevant without hesitation.

One thing more. In śu nā, sune (śvaṇ - tā, ho) etc. between elision of a (P. 6.4.1.34) and euphonic replacement of 'u' and 'a' by 'u' (P.6.1.103) the latter is desirable as the internal, though P. 6.4.22 goes against it if the jurisdiction of this rule extends as it is now up to the jurisdiction of 'bha' (P. 6.4.129). The exclusion of the adhikāra of 'bha' from that of P. 6.4.22 may be a solution. Nāgēśa comments that since the maxim in the vārttika 'Antaraṅgaṇa' is not affected by P. 6.4.22, the internal operation viz. combination of 'u' and 'a' into 'u' stands correct. But it is an argument for argument's sake. First, the vārttika is rejected altogether in the Mahābh. in favour of the canon Asiddham bahiraṅgam etc. Secondly, even if its retention be admitted its role will be eclipsed in the chapters under the governing rules P. 6.4.22 and P. 8.2.1. In that case the problem will remain the same. Under such circumstances, retention of the vārttika 'Antaraṅgaṇa' under P. 1.4.2 and its assistance to the present instance from its original place might be the only solution.

(58) Yathoddeśam samīkāparibhāsam (Pā 2/ Pu 105/ Śī 119).
(59) Kāryakālam etc.
The canon on the predominance of the krtrima (technical) over an aktrtrima (popular) is referred to in a varttika on the (60) rule P. 1.1.23 in connection with apprehended incompleteness in this sutra. The term 'Samkhyā', popularly known to be denoting numerals vis. eka, dvi, tri etc. is sought to be defined in this rule and should mean according to the canon under review technical numerals only vis. bāhu, gana, yāvat etc. In that case, according to the varttika, another word i.e. samkhyā should be incorporated in the Pāṇinian rule to cover the popularly known numerals. This second 'samkhyā' will immensely help the next rule P. 1.1.24.

The varttika may support its intention even with the analogy of popular practice. In popular life, when somebody is requested to call on Gopālaka or Kaṭajaka, the person Gopālaka or Kaṭajaka by name is approached, not one who preserves the cattle (go-pālaka) nor one who is born on a mat (kaṭa-jaka).

The essence and role of the aforesaid canon are favourably brought out in the Mahābh. and the subsequent commentaries. When a word which is capable of denoting more than one thing or idea is to mean a particular thing or idea in a scientific discourse (śāstra) it is natural that it will unfailingly serve there to mean that particular thing or idea. According to Kaiyāta, this is a restrictive formulation in a śāstra but the Uddyota of Nageśa treats it as a fresh enjoining for a word which is in use in a

(60) Bahuganavatudati samkhyā (P. 1.1.23).
sense in popular life but is competent to mean what a sūtra expects. The latter further states that rules defining the terms abhyāsa, āṃreṣṭta etc. seek to mean some popularly unknown sense by these words. Similarly the word 'gotra' in P. 4.1.23 etc. has a technical sense (P. 4.1.162) in Pāṇini. We have already seen that each of his definition rules has to say something new and that a term is left undefined only when it is in a popularly familiar sense or defined in some earlier treatises in the same sense as accepted here. Thus the Pāṇinian rule, 'kāraka' (P.1.4.23) is interpreted to define a case (kāraka) because here in the Pāṇinian school the term kāraka denotes something that is neither familiar to the populace nor enjoined in some pre-Pāṇinian school of grammar. Taken in this light the role of the canon under review is important in rules on definition of terms.

The help of this canon is however not desired in the Mahābh. on the rules P. 5.4.110 and P. 2.1.20. In the first rule the word nādi is not a technical term defined in P. 1.4.3. because (61) it is here associated with two other simple nouns. Even it is not here to stand for different names of rivers. For the word vipās which is the name of a river in the Punjab is read separately in another rule in a group of words led by sarat, with a view to adding the samāsānta suffix tāc to those words in avyayābhāva compounds. Had this word nādi been competent to refer to all names of rivers, the word Vipās' would not have been read in the group of sarat. Of course, the suffix tāc is optional after nādi etc. (as in upanadām, upanadā) whereas it is compulsory after sarat, vipās

(61) Nādi-paurnamāsyāygrahāyaṁibhyah (P. 5.4.110), Nādiḥbhīśa (P. 2.1.20), Vā stryākhyau nādi (P. 1.4.3)
etc. (upasāradām etc.). Still the word nādi represents nothing but itself in this rule. In the second rule, 'Nādhīṣṭā' however, neither the nominal stem nādi nor the technical term is aimed at because the plural number in the word, according to the Mahābh., points out the fact that here names of rivers are desired by this word. Nāgasa too clarifies this that circumstances favour the meaning of names of rivers in this rule.

The cause behind the invocation of the canon under review is clearly formulated in the Mahābh. It is either necessity (artha) or relevance (prakaraṇa) that invokes it. For instances, the Pradīpa exemplifies, when a man is requested to call on a Gopālaka who will be taught something, he will approach one Gopālaka by name and not one who protects cattle. Because a cowherd will not follow the lesson. Similarly the word 'saindhava' means salt/the dining hall and a horse in the battle field. But when a commoner, bereft of argumentative faculties and ignorant of relevance is directed to call on a Gopālaka, he may approach both, one Gopālaka by name and a cowherd and may even prefer the latter. In other words, preference of the technical meaning to the popular meaning in popular practices is not undisputed.

Exceptions to the aforesaid canon are regularised in the Mahābh. by the pronouncement 'Udbhayagatīr iha bhavati' on P.1.1.23. It is an 'īṭi' of Patañjali. In P. 1.1.23, the word saṃkhyā is authorised to represent both popular numerals viz. eka, dvi, tri etc. and the technical numerals viz. bahu, gana, yāvat etc. on the strength of this paribhāṣā, that is to say, the definition of saṃkhyā aims not at excluding popularly known numerals in favour
of the technical but accommodating bahu, ganà etc. beside eka, dvi etc. in this grammatical system. In the same way, the Uddyota opines, all definitions should be interpreted as primarily asserting something positive. The sole aim (viz. brevity) of adopting a technical term is best served in this way. For both technical and popular denotations are acknowledged. Moreover, the derivation of the term samkhyà (sam-khyà + añ + āp), says the Mahàbhàha, would mean what helps counting. It may be familiar or technical. For arguments sake Patànjali examines the possibility that bahu, ganà etc. are similar to popular numerals at the instance of but prefers the earlier view to the extended operation (atidesà). Co-existence of kàtrima and akròtrima denotations in the term samkhyà is however admitted by Pàñini himself in the rule Pà.5.1.22 where the secondary suffix -kan is prohibited after such samkhyà words (in sápatatika, cátvàrimàtaka etc.) as have either -ti or -sat in the end. It is however sanctioned after the rest (in pañcaka, bahuka etc.). Now -ti and -sat are found in the end of some popularly known numerals only (e.g. vimàti, trimàsat etc.). The words kati, yati, tati which are formed with -gati and are technical samkhýàs cannot be desired by -ti in Pà. 5.1.22. For on account of the canon 'Arthavadagrahañe nànarthakasyà' the words saptati etc. would be preferred to kati etc. In kati etc. 'ti' is but a part of the suffix and has no independent meaning of its own. From this it follows that the canon 'ubhayagatiriha bhavati' can be deduced from the Pàñatorial rule Pà. 5.1.22. It is interesting to note that Patànjali cites a few other instances

(62) Samkhýayà atisādagantayàh kan (Pà. 5.1.22).
where either a popular notion or a technical sense is denoted according to circumstances. For example, the term karman in
P. 2.3.2. denotes accusative case which is its technical sense but in P. 1.3.14. karman means action, its popular sense; karana by P. 1.4.42 has a definite technical meaning viz. instrumental case in P. 2.3.18 but in P. 3.1.17 it denotes a popular notion; adhikarana in P. 2.3.36 means locative case, a technical meaning codified by P. 1.4.45 but in P. 2.4.13 it means a thing (dravya) just as a commoner can think of. Thus convenient interpretation determines the scope of a canon of interpretation to some extent.

8. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRINCIPAL AND THE SUBSIDIARY.

The word 'apradhana' appears in the Paninian rule Sahayukte pradhâne (P. 2.3.19). This rule seeks to enjoin non-verbal third case-ending after a word which is subsidiary in respect of relationship with a verb or attribute and which is associated with the conjunctive indeclinable 'saha' either in word or in spirit. For example, in the sentence 'Putrena saha pitā-gatah' (the father came with the son) etc. 'pitā' is the principal agent, the verb (i.e. participle) verb being directly related to him. The role of putra as the agent is not direct but inferable. This absence of verbal relationship with the verb results in the subsidiary role of putra in the sentence. In 'putrena saha pitur āgamanam' (father's arrival with the son) and putrena saha sthūlāh (father is fatty along with the son) too. relationship of pitā with the verbal noun 'āgamaṇa' and the attribute of fatness (sthūlatva)

(63) Karmani dvitiyā (P. 2.3.2).Kartari karmavyatihāre (P. 1.3.14).
(64) Bhasye apradhâna ityasya pratīyamānakriyākartāri (Uddyota on P. 2.3.19).
is verbal (sābda) and direct while that of putra is inferable (pratīyamāna) and indirect. The rule would enjoin the non-verbal third case-ending after putra. From this it follows that verbal and inferable relationships with a verb or an attribute lie at the root of distinction between pradhāna (principal and apradhāna (subsidiary). The word apradhāna is however redundant in the rule P. 2.3.19 because the pradhana being the case of verbal case-ending (even in putreṇa saha sthūlaḥ; astī or tiṣṭhati being the elliptical verb), the non-verbal case-ending enjoined in the rule P. 2.3.19 necessarily falls upon the apradhāna which is related to a verb only remotely. The Prātipa of Kaiyāta and the Pm of (66) of Bhattoji would justify in the last instance, the first case-ending after the principal (viz. pītā) as a case of internal affinity. But the Sabdaratna of Hari Dīksita and the Uddyota of Nageśa admit it as a verbal case-ending related to the elliptical (66) verb, astī or so on. It may be noted here that in the first two instances cited above, the subsidiary too has a verbal case-ending by the rule Kārtyākaraṇayos etc. (P. 2.3.13) and that in the last instance alone the subsidiary is believed to have got a non-verbal case-ending. Here in this instance, the subsidiary is left as a case of non-verbal third case-ending even in absence of the word 'apradhāna' in the rule P. 2.3.19. Because predominance of a verbal case-ending upon a non-verbal is assured in

(66) (I) Tisthatyādī-kriyānusāṅgat sthūla ityāderapī kartrtvam astī (Uddyota on P. 2.3.15).

(II) Astir-bhavantīparah prathamapurūṣo' prayujāyamānō'prākṣastī (referred to in a varttika on the rule Anabhihite P.2.3.1).)

(III) Prathamāyāścā kāraka-vibhaktītvam...bhāṣye bahuṣah spuṣṭam...prapāндītaṇḍa (Sabdratna on P. 2.3.19).
the canon Upapada-vibhakteh etc. In the sentence 'Sisyena saha ācāryasya gauh' (there is a cow of the preceptor along with the disciple's), however, both principal and subsidiary have got non-verbal case-endings, possessive in the former and the third one in the latter and the canon has got nothing to do. The relationship between the principal and 'gauh' is direct but that between the subsidiary and gauh is inferable.

The question of predominance of the principal over the subsidiary is dealt with in the Mahābhārata, on the rule Svādumi namul (P. 3.4.26). It is decided that the case-ending after a stem will be in accordance with the principal verb and not the subsidiary. For example, in the sentence Pakvam odanam bhūmkte (he is eating boiled rice), 'odana' is object to both the verbal roots pac- and bhuj-. While the past passive participle suffix -kta after pac-demands nominative case-ending after 'odana', the middle conjugational ending in active voice causes accusative ending. Between the two, the choice falls upon the latter because bhūmkte is the principal verb in the sentence. In 'Paktvā odono bhūjyate', there is nominative case-ending after 'odana' in accordance with the passive conjugational ending in the principal verbal root. In 'Prāsāde āste' (he lives in a palace), both the verbal roots prā-sa- and ās- have 'prāśāda' as the locative. While the former with the primary suffix ghan which signifies locative would demand nominative case-ending the latter as the principal verb causes locative case-ending after prāśāda. Similar is the case with Bhoktum odanah paciyate etc. From above, it follows that when a case (accusative

(67) Pradhāna-saktyaḥ bhīdāne gunakriyasaktir abhīhitavit prakāsate. (Pradipa on P. 3.4.26).
locative etc.) is denoted by a verbal ending or suffix in the principal verb, the case even, if undenoted by a suffix in the (68) subsidiary verb should appear as denoted. Furthermore, when an ending in the principal verb fails to denote a case, it would appear as undenoted even if denoted by the subsidiary verb. The predominance of the principal lies in the fact that the subsidiary (68) is dependent upon it and cannot initiate a different operation. In case neither of the verbs denote a case the case-ending to denote the same may be according to both the verbs (e.g. Grāmam gantum icchati and grāmaya...). In Kṣudham pratihantum śakyam, some argue, 'śakyam', the potential passive participle form is not the principal verb in the technical sense. This justifies accusative case-ending after the stem kṣudh. This explanation is not however (69) universally accepted. Otherwise the use of nominative case-ending in kṣudh in the sentence kṣudh upahantum śakyam could not be justified. From this it appears that a principal verb can be (70) formed either with conjunctival endings or with verbal suffixes.

The canon of relative importance between the principal and the subsidiary is invoked twice more on the rules viz. Bhrātṛputrau etc. (P. 1.2.68) and Napumsakam etc. (P. 1.2.69) with reference to certain formations of words by the device of ekaśeṣa (retention of only one member in the case of a potential co-ordinate compound).

---

(68) Pradhānānurodhād, gunānām tannukha-prekṣitvāt, prthaktvād viruddhasvakāryārambhābhavāt (Pradipa on P. 3.4.26).

(69) Kṣudham pratihantum śakyam ityapayasādhvēva (Śabdaratna on Pm on P. 2.3.2).

(70) Ākhyaṭādi-pada-vācyā kriyā viśesyatvāt pradhānam. Viśeṣanābhūta tvapradhānam (Pradipa on P. 3.4.26).
In the first case, the question of ekāsāsa between the words brahmanavatsa and brahmanivatsa vis-a-vis the import of the rule Strī purvaśca (P. 1.2.67) is dealt with. It is found that between the words viz. kāraka and kārikā, the distinction of gender is predominantly formal while it is based on denotation between gojān and gomati. Between paṭu and paṭvī however, neither of the two alternatives is predominant. To enjoin ekāsāsa in all these three pairs of words, three possibilities are admitted in the Mahābh. It must be noted that the principal genders (i.e. genders in the principal members of a pair of compound words) alone are (71) expected as distinguishing features between two words which are otherwise identical. In the pair viz. brahmanavatsa and brahmanivatsa, the latter members which are principal in their respective compounds are different from each other by a feminine suffix. But the earlier members which are in a subsidiary position in their respective compounds are different from each other by the same criterion. As a result, na ekāsāsa between these two compound words is found possible.

In the second case the rule P. 1.2.69 ratifies retention among śukī, śuklā and śuklam the word in the neuter gender with optional singular number. The vārttika viz. Pradhāne kāryasampratyayācchēgaḥ serves the same purpose with the help of the paribhāṣā cited in it. Since neuter gender is regarded as the principal (pradhāna) even in popular practice, it is logical that it will be retained in ekāsāsa at the cost of the rest. As for singular number it is perfectly logical in cases where some

(71) Yatra pradhānastripumsakrto viśesastatraikasāgaḥ
(Fradipa on P. 1.2.68).
collective concept is denoted. To add to the list, the accusative case to the principal verb in the word 'śatru' in Śatrūn agamayat svargam prevails over the nominative case to the earlier non-causative form of the verb. Such being the situation, the rule Cati-buddhi etc. (P. 1.4.52) formulating accusative case in connection with certain causative verbs is of restrictive nature (niyama), observed Patanjali and Kātyāṭa on Hetumati ēā (P.3.1.26).

The Paribhāśā-ṛṣṭti of Sīrādeva (No.105) points out the predominance of the principal upon the subsidiary in popular usage. For example, when the king comes with his retinue we say that the king comes. We refer to a government by the name of the person who heads it. It is interesting to know that this canon has its parallel in the Mīmāṃsa which reads 'Aṅga-guna-virodhe ēā tūdarthyāt'.

Of course, sometimes the pradhāna may not be predominant. For example, a man first takes up morning toileting before going to the royal court, so sometimes an antarāṅga may oppose a pradhāna phenomenon in grammar. In P. 1.1.53 etc., atidesā of an operation which is principal is aimed at but in P. 1.2.1. atidesā of the antarāṅga rule is resorted to. Thus in the word uccukutiṣati no middle endings due to extension of īt character to -san are allowed by the Nyāsa. In adhyāgaṛṣṭa however, īt character of in is extended to its ādesā viz. gā and there is middle formation.

One point more, Sīrādeva thinks that the canon Avayavaprasyāddheḥ etc. (Śi 107) is based upon the predominance of the principal.

(72) Nyarthasya pradhānyāt...prayoṣya-vyāparasya apradhānyāt... pradhānanimittasya kāryasya yuktatvāt... (Pradīpa on P.3.1726).
The paribhāṣā of preferring pratipadokta (a word individually pronounced in an injunction) to laksana i.e. laksanika (a word chosen indirectly) is referred to in a vārttika on P.6.2.2 as well as in a vārttika in verse, quoted (71.4) in the Mahābh. on P.6.3.16. In the latter case it is in connection with the apprehension of a(t) as a substitute of the final t in mahāt in the word mahāt-bhūtah which means 'mahān mahān bhūtah' (a non-great has become great). It may be argued that in this expression 'mahān' does not mean the same thing as meant by amahān and bhūta, both related to each other (samādhihikaraṇa) and that a(t) cannot replace t in the compound word. According to this view, amahān is prakṛti (original) but mahān is vikṛti (modified). With reference to the suffix -īvi the earlier is said to have the principal role. Of course, vikṛti too is often found as principal in many cases. For example, when we say that a piece of gold becomes two ornaments, (Suvarnakhandah kundale bhavatāh) it is the vikṛti which is followed by the verb in Sanskrit. In the sentence Bhaktih jñāneya bhavati we add the fourth inflectional ending in vikṛti.

(71.4) Yastu mahātāh pratipadoktaḥ samāsa uktas-tadārayam hyāttvam, kartavyam mahāyante na lakṣanam. Lakṣanoktārthāyam, Siddham tu lakṣana-pratipadoktārthāḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahanāt (va) on P. 6.2.2.
Similarly in 'individual brahmins form a group now' (Asaṅghah brahmāṇaḥ saṅghaḥ sarpeḍyate) number in the ending of the verb is determined by viṃśi. If prakṛti be principal in mahād-bhūtā it will be the same in mahād-bhūta (mahaḥī mahaṭī bhūta) and there shall be no loss of the feminine suffix. Considering all these points it is decided that in mahād-bhūtā, mahād-bhūta etc. mchat represents the same thing as meant by amahat and bhūta. Consequently, loss of the feminine suffix is possible. Now with the same reason, a(t) should replace the final t of mahat in both the compound words. It is found that whereas compound with individual reference alone is concerned replacement by a(t) takes place. In mahād-bhūtaḥ and mahād-bhūtā, the compound of two words is ratified by Ku-gatipradayaḥ (P. 2.2.18). whereas from mahat (mahat + óvi) earns secondary reference only and no replacement by a(t) is there. In the bahuvrīhi compound of mahat and bāhu, however, the rule is Anekaṁ aṁyapādārtha (P. 2.2.34), a clear repetition (728) in spite of Seśo bahuvrīhiḥ (P. 2.2.23). This makes, according to both the vaṭṭīka in verso and the relevant Mahābhāṣya, the compound a case of pratipada (individual reference) to effect a(t) in maḥābāhu. Another explanation is sought in the canon of predominance of mukhya (primary meaning) over gaṇa (secondary meaning). In mahād-bhūtaḥ etc. as we see, mahat is gaṇa for with -óvi it indicates the sense of amahat and so a(m)ā(t) is possible. In maḥābāhu however, mahat stands for mahat (great) and is mukhya. In other words, replacement of the final t by a(t) takes place in

(728) Yasmāt seṣo bahuvrīhir iti siddha Anekaṁ aṁyapādārtha ityāha, tēna pratipadākhāṃ tatra bhavati (Mahābhāṣya P.6.3.46).
The superiority of a pratipadokta lies in its comprehension being antaraṅga as the Pradīpa observes on P. 1.1.20 in comparison with that of a lākṣaṇika which awaits interpretation of a general rule and is bahirāṅga. Furthermore, comprehension of the former is prompter than that of the latter. It is on this ground that in mahābāhu it is treated as a case of pratipadokta. Because repetition of one idea in two rules facilitates an early grasping, Nāgoaṇa in his Uddyota, however, thinks that pratipadokta should be strictly confined to individual references in rules, In his opinion more repetition of an idea in two rules does in no way refer individually to the word ‘mahat’ in bahuvrīhi compound. Moreover, while taking recourse to the canon of mukhya and gauna, Patanjali and the author of the vartṭitiṣa in verse disapprove pratipadokta here. It goes to the extent that these two early authorities perhaps do not like employment of the canon of pratipadokta here simply because it is non-obligatory. According to the Sk of Bhattoji Diksita, the bahuvrīhi compound of mahat and bāhu in a case of lākṣaṇika for it is not enjoined with special reference to ‘mahat’ as a member of the compound word. Still due to the presence of the word samānāhākaraṇa in the rule P. 6.3.46, the canon of the predominance of pratipadokta is not operative and the final t of mahat is replaced by ā(t). In other words, ā(t) may occur irrespective of lākṣaṇika and pratipadokta if only both

(72c) Lākṣaṇika hi lākṣaṇārāmsaṃbhāṅgavarga pratipattīrbaḥirāṅga, pratipadokte tvantārāṅga (Pradīpa on P. 1.1.20).

(72b) Vide the Uddyota on P. 6.3.46.

(72f) Sk on P. 6.3.46.
the words (one of which is mahat) refer to the same thing (samānadhikarana). But even then it will be inconvenient to explain absence of ā(t) in mahād-bhūtaḥ. Either mahat and bhūta will have to be understood as referring not to the same thing (a-samānadhikarana) or gauna-mukhya-nyāya will be the last resort.

The canon so seriously discussed by Patañjali is not with Pāṇini's approval. Thus the reading of the suffix-khisne in P. 3.2.57 with initial i vowel without looking forward for augmentation of it is a proof to preference of pratipadokta-ismc in P. 6.2.160 for facilitating udātta accent in the last vowel of anādhyaabhavisrau etc. Ismīc as the combination of suffix and augment being lākṣānika could not claim this accentuation by P. 6.2.160. The canon is effective in adhyāya (adhi-in+nič+lyap) where ā as the replacement of i in the root by P. 6.1.48 being lākṣānika followed by puk does not undergo the change of nič to oṣṭ. But from pra-āp (to get) + nič + lyap we have prāpaya due to pratipadokta nature of the root.

In the rule 'gātī-sthā-ghu-pā-bhūbhyah sic parasmaipadocu' (P. 2.4.47) the words gātī, ghu and pā need clarification. The verbal root ghu(n) means to make sound; but ghu as a technical term represents the verbal roots viz. (du)āhi (adati), āpi(yaccha- de) (āpi) (7o), (du)āhi (adati) and dhet (dhayati). By the canon P. 1.1.68 the choice will fall upon the technical term representing these verbal roots. As regards gātī, it is neither (7o) gāh(gate) nor gat (gāyati) but 'ini'-(and -ik-) replaced by gā.in
iran conjugation. According to the Mahābhārata it is known from the very use of ‘gāṭī’ with āṭip which accompanies a verbal root. Those who think that appearance of āṭip is not followed by that of a conjugational sign (vikarana) should admit that the word ‘gāṭī’ should be employed to represent the root gā-. It must not be argued that with ā(t) in place of ‘əi’ by Ādeśa upadeśe, āṭi (P. 6.1.45) gāṭī may well represent gai- too. Because gāṭi of gai- is laksanika (of delayed comprehension) in comparison with gāṭī, the representative of in (and -ik-) in gān. A moderner will however find here the form of the root gā in a-gā-t. The root gān (gāṭo) cannot be acceptable here, says the Uddyota. For it undergoes middle conjugation of which gāṭī has no indication whatsoever. If the sūtra were gā-sthā-ghu etc. gā- from gai- would be acceptable. Even then gān- has nothing to do with this rule which concerns active verbs. All this is summarised in the statement, quoted in (7.2) the Mahābhārata, that by ‘gāṭī’ is meant that ‘gā’ which loses conjugational sign (vikarana). It follows that gā in place of the verbal root in (and -ik-) is aimed at. By pā, however, is meant that pā which loses no vikarana i.e. to say between pā (pibati) (7.21) and pā (pāṭi) the earlier is acceptable here in the sūtra. The verbal root pāi (pāyati) which becomes pā with ā(t) in place of ‘əi’ is however, laksanika and cannot be accepted in Gāṭī-sthā etc.


(7.26) Ino gā luiti (P. 2.4.45), Invad ikah(iti vikaravam) (Varttika on P. 2.4.45).

(7.24) Lug-vikaranasya graham (quoted in the Mahābhārata, on P.2.4.77).

(7.21) Sarvastraiva pāgraḥorno alug-vikaranasya graham (Quoted in the Mahābhārata, on P.2.4.77).
In Ghu-mā-sthā-gā-pā-jahāti-sām hall (P. 6.4.66) gā in
gān, the substitute of the verbal root -in-, compulsory in lit
conjugation (P. 2.4.49) and optional in both luni and lūn
(P. 2.4.50). So it of ā takes place in adhyāstā (adhi-in-
lūn ta) etc., not in āgāsta (gān + luni ta) etc. The Kāśyapa
comments that gān, the replacement of -in- differs from gā of
both in and -ik- by virtue of ā and that ā does not occur in
āgāstām (in passive luni ātām). Similarly pā- from pā- as
lakṣanika is not acceptable by pā and in passive present -ād-
āśānt is pāyate (pā + lāt ta, passive), not pāyate. By sā
in P. 6.4.66 and P. 2.4.78 we mean sā (sayati having the vikāraṇa
āśānt) and not sāi (sāyati). Though both are lakṣanika in sā,
still with the association of two other divādi roots viz. sā
and āch in P. 2.4.78 the choice falls upon sā, a divādi root.
Mā (māti, adādi), mān (mānīte ṣvādi), mān (māyate, divādi) and
mān (pranidhāyate) might be meant by mā. But in P. 6.4.66 the
root mā (māti) only is intended. For the other three are
lakṣanika. In Nār-gada-nada-ghu-mā etc. (P. 8.4.17) however,
mān and mān are accepted, and not mā, by convenient interpreta-
tion based on necessity. It is the opinion in the Mahābhāṣya
on P. 1.1.20 that for cerebralisation by P. 8.4.17 and so on, the
word 'prakṛti' should be read with ghu-mā in P. 8.4.17 and that
mā with indicatory ā alone should be entertained. Thus Kātyāyana
and the school of Bharadvāja propose under P. 1.1.20 that
'prakṛti' should be inserted in P. 1.1.20 to counteract the
paribhāśā of the predominance of a pratipadokta and to admit
both absence of ā(t) before it in pranidhāyate, pranidhāyate
and occurrence of cerebralisation in pranidhāta (' do, don'),
pranidhātā (dhōṭ) i.e. to allow all primary and secondary dā (क) and dha (excepting dāp and daip) within the fold of ghu.

Inheriting reappearance of ortho from P. 1.1.19 even when without it the paribhāṣa Arthavadgṛhaṇe etc. could exclude secondary dā and dhā and admission of dā-prakṛti and dhā-prakṛti roots too is another possible explanation in favour of countering the paribhāṣa of the predominance of pratipadokta. But this will admit any roots which are identical with dā- or dhā- in meaning.

So insertion of the word 'prakṛti' in P. 1.1.20 is preferable.

The best way is however the insertion of this word in P. 8.4.17 between ghu and mā to make it assist both of them. Thus both (क) pranidayate and pranimayate shall have cerebral n by that rule. In pranimiti (dūmin) and pranimiti (mīn) there shall be no n even though dūmin and mīn too have a(t) by P. 6.1.30.

Moreover pranimātā from mā (mātī) has no cerebral n. It is on this observation that the Mahābh. means mān and menī by mā in P. 8.4.17.

Correctly has the observation quoted in the Mahābh. on (क) P. 1.1.20 noted that so far as gā, mā and dā are concerned, the paribhāṣa of the predominance of pratipadokta is most irregular. The Pradīpa offers an elaborate explanation of this

(क) Dā-dha ghusamjānabhavanti, prakṛtayaścānāṁ iti
(Mahābh. on P. 1.1.20).

(क) Avasyam tatra mārtham prakṛti-graham kartavyam
(Mahābh. on P. 1.1.20).

(क) Gā-mā-dā-grahasvavīśeṣeh (प 115/पु 68/स 102). As Purusottama shows, it is an apavāda to the canons of niramabhāndhaka, ekāmbhandhaka, lug-vikarana and pratipadokta canons. According to Śrīdeva however, the canons of sāhasarya, lug-vikarana and arthavat are exempted from its influence.
observation. It is noticed that exclusion of dāp (dāti) and dālp (dāyati) from ghu in P. 1.1.20 is an indication to this irregularity. Moreover exclusion of dhet from Do dodghoh (P. 7.4.46) is another indication to the fact that dhet (which is secondarily dhā) is acceptable as dha in ghu. By the canon of pratipadokta however, dāp, dālp or dhet could be avoided. The canons of preference of a root without an indicatory element to one which loses an indicatory element and of preference of a root which does not lose its vikarana to that which loses it too are ineffective here. So Nāgāsa admits the aforesaid observation as a prohibition of these three canons.

The Mahābhārata on P. 1.1.20 shows that the paribhāṣā of the predominance of a pratipadokta is pre-Patanjali. Because it is quoted and critically examined there by Patanjali. It is referred to under P. 1.1.13 and P. 1.1.15 too. In harisē, babhurē etc., ē is lākṣanika and meaningless. From the standpoint of both the canons of pratipadokta and orthovat, ē (P. 1.1.13) which enjoins pragrhyam in asme, yusme etc. will not accept the meaningless syllable. In adōbhavat (adas + ēvi + abhavat) there is no prohibition of euphonic combination conditioned by pragrhyam by the rule of (P. 1.1.15). For though ’ado’ derived from adas + ēvi is an indeclinable which is ending in o, it is lākṣanika in comparison with o in ’o āyatam’ etc. In go bhavat (go + ēvi + a-bhav-a-t) however, ’o’ of ’go’ is derived from gam + do by the sutra 'Ganerdoh' with individual reference to
(72M) gam and is pratipadokta. But by the canon of superiority of mukhya (primary) to sauna (secondary) there is neither pragryya here nor the subsequent absence of euphonic combination. As Nāgeśa observes, reference to the canon here proves that there is nothing objectionable in referring to the canon where letters (72N) are concerned. But the Manoreśa followed by the Tattvabodhinī etc. construes the word 'upadesà' in P. 6.1.45 to indicate that pratipadokta is ineffective where letters are concerned. But

That the canon Laksanapratipadokta etc. is optional is indicated by Pāṇini himself in the rule, Bhuvasca mahāvyāhṛtye (P. 3.2.71). The 'bhuvah' may be either an indeclinable which means the aerial regim (antarikṣa) or nominative plural from of bhū (bhū + kvip) or a verbal form in the Vedic (bhū + lān-sap + sip). Since the first one is pratipadokta and the other two are laksanika we could simply prefer the first to the rest. Even then incorporation of the word 'mahāvyāhṛti' in the rule for preferring the first is a clear indication to optional nature of the canon. Nāgeśa in the Uddyota does not find any reason in construing the word upadesa for this purpose. Because its utility is exhausted according to him, with the exclusion of 'go' in go-bhyām etc. (vide Uddyota on P. 6.1.45). The Sā and the Pāś also hold the same view. In the Uddyota on P. 1.1.15 however, the rule Hvāmāsca (P. 3.2.2) which enjoins -an after lveū-, vēn, mān and mēn as

(72M) ...mukhyārthaka-nipatānām eva grahaṇam (Uddyota on P.1.1.15).
(72N) Varnagrahaṇe sarvatra tad-apravṛttau māṇabhaṅvat (Uddyota on P. 1.1.15).
an apavāda of -ka enjoined in P. 3.2.3 is admitted as an indication of optional nature of the canon of predominance of a pratipadokta. The roots āven, veṇ and meṇ secondarily end in ā and are lākṣonika; still -ka was apprehended after them and then prohibited by P. 3.2.2. simply because the canon is ineffective here. Purugoottama and Siradova cite Yāvat-pūrā-nipātayor lat (P. 3.3.4) as the indication. Thus even though by the canon of pratipadokta, by yāvat and purā we should mean the indeclinables, not yād-vatup and pur-ṭāp, the word nipāta is inserted only with the apprehension of the optional nature of the canon. This according to them is the cause behind admission of dhet by dhā in P. 1.1.20.
The canon Upapada-vibhaktekā kāraka-vibhaktir vallīyā is referred to in a vārttika on the Pāīnian rule Sahayukte etc. (P. 2.3.39). It is with reference to the futility of the word 'apradhāna' which is incorporated in this rule. It is argued in the Mahābh. thereupon that in the sentences 'Putreṇa saha pita-gataḥ' putreṇa saha pitur āgamanam, Putreṇa saha sthūlāḥ etc. the principal (pradhāna) agent being the case of verbal case-ending, the non-verbal case-ending enjoined by the rule Sahayukte etc. necessarily falls upon the apradhāna. In other words a verbal case-ending is preferred to the non-verbal in the case of the principal agent. It is due to the interpretative canon under review. Of course, in the first two instances cited above, the subsidiary too is the case of verbal case-ending. As a result the question of the canon Upapadavibhaktekā etc. does not arise there. In the third instance there is the elliptical verb 'asti' or 'tiṣṭhati' to which the principal is the nominative. The third case-ending after the subsidiary therein may be treated as non-verbal. Even in absence of the word 'apradhāna' in the rule Sahayukte etc. the nominative case-ending after the principal is preferred to the non-verbal third case-ending in Putreṇa saha sthūlāḥ and so on. As for the sentence, Sisyena saha ācāryasya gah, neither the principal nor the subsidiary has a verbal case-ending. As such, the canon Upapadavibhaktekā has nothing to do.

Predominance of a verbal case-ending upon a non-verbal is discernible in the sentence Gāh svāmī brajati (the owner approaches
the cows). On account of proximity of the word svāmī there would be either the possessive or the locative non-verbal case-ending after the stem 'go' by the rule Svāmīśvāra etc. (P. 2.3.39). The verb brajati would however cause accusative verbal case-ending after 'go'. Between the verbal case-ending and the non-verbal, the former is preferred to the latter on account of the canon Upapadavibhaktaḥ etc.

Another instance is cited in the Mahābh. in connection with the interpretation of the rule Yasmād adhikam etc. (P. 2.3.9). In the sentence 'Adhi Brahmadatte Paṇcālaḥ', Patañjali apprehends the second case-ending after the stem 'Paṇcāla' on account of the post-position 'adhi'. The word Brahmadatte in the locative singular has nothing to do with this post-position. Between the non-verbal second case-ending and the verbal first case-ending, the latter prevails over the former after the stem 'Paṇcāla'. For it is the nominative case-ending related to the verb 'tiṣṭhanti' or 'santi' which is understood. The role of 'adhi' as a karmapra-vaśātiya (post-position) is to be found exhausted in the sentences viz. 'Adhi Paṇcāleṣu Brahmadattaḥ' etc. in that case. With the help of the same canon, the verbal first case-ending related to an elliptical verb is preferred to the non-verbal possessive ending after 'puruṣa' in rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ.

Purusottamadeva in his Paribhāsāvṛtti (No. 48) cites the sentences viz. devān namaskaroti, hā pitah kvāsi.... etc. to exemplify predominance of a verbal case-ending over a non-verbal. The case of the first instance is undisputed. Between the non-verbal fourth case-ending on account of the word, names and the verbal
second case-ending related to the verb namas-karoti, the latter is prevalent there. But in 'ha pitah etc. the vocative first case-ending is not universally accepted as the verbal. Bhaṭṭoja in the Pa on his Sk on the verse Ubhasarvatasoha etc. refuses to accept such uses as the cases of the canon Upapadavibhakteḥ etc. The Pa of Nāgeśa has correctly defined a verbal case-ending. According to him, not by mere relationship with a verb but by administering the action denoted by a verb, a case-ending justifies itself as predominant upon a non-verbal case-ending (cp...kriyājanakārthakavibhaktitvan). With this in view, the seventh case-ending enjoined by the rule Yasya ća bhāvena etc. (P. 2.3.37) would be ignored in the wake of the locative case-ending enjoined by Saptamadhihikarane ća (P. 2.3.36).

11. CASES OF COMPOUNDS OF WHICH THE FINAL MEMBER IS AN INCOMPLETE WORD.

The canon in the form of the vārttika Satikārakopapadānāṃ krābbhiḥ saha samāsavaśānam (Ps'76) quoted in the Mahābh. under P.4.1.43 offers a liberal interpretation of the Pāṇinian rule Saḥa supā (P. 2.1.4). With the word sup reappearing from the previous rule, the rule Saḥa supā would strictly mean that the phenomenon of compound occurs between two (or among many) inflected words. According to the canon, when in a compound the latter member is a verbal noun to be derived with a primary (kṛt) suffix and the earlier member is either an adverbial prefix (gati) including pra-, para- etc. or a case-word related to the verb inherent in the subsequent verbal noun or a nominal prefix (upapada), compound takes place
early before the latter member is inflected. The Mahabh., while explaining four vārttikas, which formulate the utility of this canon cites as instances eight words, viz. abhra-vilipti, sūpa-vilipti, vyāghri, kaćchhapī, māsavāpiṇī, vrāhivāpiṇī sāmkūtinam and vyārakrosī.

In the first two words ‘abhra’ and ‘sūpa’ are instrumental cases of the action of vilopa i.e. painting and should have instrumental case-ending. The word lipta is derived (lip - kta) with the primary suffix-kta. The compound between abhra and (vi-) lipta or between sūpa and (vi-) lipta takes place by the rule Kartārakane kṛtā bahulam (P. 2.1.32). The intervening ‘vi-’ is admitted at the instance of the canon that a verbal noun which is derived with a primary suffix is inclusive of its form when it is preceded by either a prefix or a case-word. The word vilipta is uninflected at the time of the compound. Subsequently the compound word abhravilipta or sūpa-vilipta is affixed with the feminine suffix-nīś by the rule P. 4.1.51. If at the time of the compound the latter member were inflected, the affixation of the feminine suffix -tāp which is an operation of internal affinity would precede the ending and the compound word would become abhravilipta or sūpa-vilipta. The Pradīpa has correctly argued that it is not very prudent to explain that in favour of the rule Kīḍālpa-khyāyām (P. 4.1.51), the feminine suffix -nīś can be affixed to abhravilipta or supavilipta. In that case the feminine suffix -nīś would appear

---

(73) What is upapada (nominal prefix) is pointed out by Panini in the rule Tatropagadam saptamistham (P. 3.1.22). It means that a word inflected with the seventh case-ending in a rule which is concerned with suffixes is an 'upapada'. If it be a technical term, the words it represents or signifies will be treated as upapadas. Vide rules viz. Karmana (P. 3.2.1), Svādūmī namul (P. 3.4.26), Aavyaye' yathābhāpṛtākhyāne etc., (P. 3.4.59).
with the stems ending in the long vowel. It would go against the intent of the rule. The influence of the canon Gātikāraka etc. would be averted here but several instances would uphold the canon. Moreover, employment of the canon here seems far more reasonable than a twisted interpretation of the rule Ktāpāpā etc.

In the word vyāghra, there are two compounds, between ā(ā) and ghra (ghrā + ka) at the outset and subsequently between vi- and āghra. The compound word is affixed with -āṣ by the rule P. 4.1.63. The word 'ghra' is uninflected at the time of the compounds. Otherwise, the case-ending would be preceded by the feminine suffix -ṭāp and the compound word would be vyāghrā which is not intended. The word kačchapa which is a compound between kačcha (in the instrumental case related to the action of drinking) and pa(pā + ka) has got its latter member uninflected. Subsequently the suffix -āṣ comes after the compound word.

The compound between vṛīhi and vāpin or between māṣa and vāpin is admitted by the rule Upapadām atāī (P. 2.2.19). The final n in the compound words is eligible for cerebralisation by the rule Prātipadikānta etc. (P. 8.4.11). The feminine suffix -āpī is added to the compound words by Ṛṃebhya etc. (P. 4.1.5). Had the latter member i.e. vāpin been inflected at the time of compound, it would have had the feminine suffix -āpī first. In that case of a compound between vṛīhi and vāpinī, there would be no final n and naturally no scope of cerebralisation by the rule P. 8.4.11.

The word sāmkūṭina is derived with the secondary suffix -a(ā) from the stem sāmkūṭina which is a compound word between 'sam' and kūṭina. Since the compound takes place when the second member
is uninflected the compound is treated as an operation of internal affinity in comparison with the suffix -a(ः). Otherwise the suffix -ः would be added to the word कुटिना and the compound word would be समकुटिना. Similarly in the word व्यावक्रोऽि (व्यावक्रोऽा + निप) the stem is derived with the suffix -ा(ः) from व्यावक्रोऽा which is a compound word between 'वि' and the uninflected याक्रोऽा (या + क्रोऽा). This derivation facilitates acute accent in the first vowel in व्यावक्रोऽि. Otherwise the last vowel would be acutely accented.

Patañjali warns against the temptation of invoking the canon Pratyaya-grahaṇa etc. (Ps 23) in this case. With that canon, the suffixes viz. -ा(ः), -ा(ः) etc. would be added to the words viz. कुटिना, याक्रोऽा etc. even though they form a part of the compound words. With the canon क्रृद्रग्रहाणे etc. (Ps 23) which prevails over the former canon, the aforesaid suffixes are affixed to the compound words. In other words, the word सामकुटिना derives benefit from both the canons viz. क्रृद्रग्रहाणे etc. (Ps 23) and ग्रहिकारकपपादानम etc. (Ps 76).

It follows that the utility of the canon ग्रहिकारक etc. is unquestionable. The Mahābhāṣya on P. 2.3.19 records its recognition even by Pāṇini in the word 'आतिह'. Since the two words सुप and सुपा� reappear in every rule which enjoins a compound a conjugated word (as in कारको ब्रजाति) cannot be a member of a compound. It appears that no prohibition of a compound with a conjugated word is necessary. However, two वार्त्तिकas are there to justify the incorporation of the word 'आति' in the rule with a view to prohibiting compound in कारको गताह, कारको याताह etc. But as the Mahābhāṣya opines, the words गताह याताह etc. prominently denote a
thing and are substantives with the subjugation of the sense of
a verb. So prohibition of the compound in their case by the word
'atin' does not appear sound. Similar is the fate with the words
gatiḥ brajyā etc. in Kārakasya gatiḥ kārakasya brajyā etc. Because
a verbal root with a primary suffix prominently denotes a thing and
not the action inherent in the verbal root. From this it follows
that the incorporation of the word atiṅ in the rule P. 2.2.19 is
to be justified otherwise. According to Patañjali, the word atiṅ,
indicates that 'sup' and 'supā' will not be inherited in both
the rules P. 2.2.18 and P. 2.2.19. Consequently, at the time of
a compound where either an adverbial prefix or a nominal prefix
forms the earlier part, the latter member must not be inflected.
With this explanation, a large part of the canon Gatikāraka etc.
found indicated by the word 'atiṅ' in P. 2.2.19. The Pradīpa
suggests that bifurcation of the sūtra into Upapadā and atiṅ
and subsequent association of the word 'atiṅ' with both Kugati-
prādāyāḥ (P. 2.2.18) and 'upapadā' may be a better interpretation.
In that case, the earlier member in such compounds being inflected
the prohibition of reappearance of the word 'supā' only (from
P. 2.1.4) is to be sought with the word 'atiṅ'. According to the
Uddyota, however, a nominal prefix (upapada) or an adverbial
prefix (gati) being essentially a pada (inflected word) the word
'sup' too need not be reappearing in the two rules P. 2.2.18 -
2.2.19. So the statement of the Mahābh. that both 'sup' and 'supā'
are discontinued here stands scrutiny.

All this is said about 'gati' and 'upapada'. A compound with
an adverbial prefix is enjoined in Pāṇini's work by the rule
Kugatiprādāyāḥ (P. 2.2.18) whereas a compound with a nominal prefix
(upapada) is enjoined by the rules P. 2.2.19 - 2.2.22. Compounds involving a case-word as the earlier member, related to the verb inherent in the latter member, are enjoined by P. 2.1.32. According to the Uddyota of Nāgasa, the term 'bahulam' in this rule is competent to prohibit a compound where the latter member is derived either with -sat, -sain, etc., or with a conjugational ending followed by the comparative or superlative suffix (e.g. kāśṭhalaḥ pacatitarāṃ). According to the Pradīpa, since a case-word cannot form a compound with a conjugated word and consequently a verbal noun derived with a kṛt suffix only is permissible as the latter member, the incorporation of the word kṛt in the rule P. 2.1.32 aims at indicating that the compound will take place when the latter member is not inflected.

From the above discussion it follows that the compounds with 'gati', 'kāraka' or 'upapada' as the earlier member and an uninflected verbal noun as the latter member are permissible even in the rules of Pāṇini. As such the import of the canon in the form of the vārttika Gātikāraka etc. is not an innovation of its author but a mere formulation of an agreed canon. Puruṣottama (No. 47) refers to the novel interpretation of the present canon as suggested in the Nyāsa on P. 8.1.71. Śrīdeva (No. 32) with reference to P. 8.3.38 shows that if the canon were universal in 'bhāskara' would occur by P. 8.3.38 the latter member being non-pada in absence of ending and nipātana for the purpose of would be futile.
It is to mention in this connection that the general rule Saha supā (P. 2.1.4) which generally notes formation of compound words, is bifurcated with a view to deriving two pronouncements from it. The second part 'supā' which is enlarged as 'sup saha supā' (an inflected word forms a compound with another inflected word) enjoins all general compounds between inflected words. The first part 'saha' with the words sup from P. 2.1.2 and 'samarthaḥ' from P. 2.1.1. enjoins compounds between an inflected word and any competent member, even a conjugated verb in the veda e.g. vi-tanvate (Rv 1.115.2) etc.

Exceptions to the injunctive precept, 'Sup saha supā' are numerous in Sanskrit. According to the Nābhāh it is both a governing rule and an injunctive precept. For where all other rules fail to explain a compound this second part of the bifurcated rule 'saha supā' enjoins the same e.g. punar-utsyūta, punar-niśkṛta etc. As the Sk of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣītā refers to, six regular and (74) irregular types of compounds are possible in Sanskrit. For example,

(I) in the word rājapuṇa, the compound is between two inflected words, (II) in paryabhūṣaya, pari-, an adverbial prefix and abhūṣaya, a verb form the compound, (III) in kumbha-kāra, there is compound between the inflected kumbha and the uninflected kāra, (IV) kaṭa-prū, ajasra etc. result from the compound between an inflected word and a verbal root, (V) in pibatā-khādatā etc. two conjugated verbs are united and (VI) in kṣntaviśekṣana etc. there is the compound between a conjugated verb and an inflected word.

(74) Supām supā, tiṇā, nāmā, dhātunātha tiṇām tiṇā, subaṇ tenet i vaṇeyah saṃasah aṇvadiḥ aṇvadiḥ.
Of all these six types of compounds, the first type is the most regular. It is ratified by the second part of the rule Saha supā (P. 2.1.4). While the first part of the rule seeks to regularise the second type, the canon under review deals with the third. The words kataprū and ajasra are somehow accepted as cases of irregular compounds in the vārttikas. Instances of the fifth and the sixth types of compounds are discussed in two ganaśūtras and enlisted en bloc in the group of mayūravyāmsaka and similar words in the Paninian rule P. 2.1.72. The author of the vārttikas admits a compound where the latter member is 'iva', the comparative inelincible and where the case-ending with the earlier member remains intact e.g. vāsasī-iva, kanye-iva etc. Of course, technically speaking the word 'iva' is inflected and such compounds are included in the first type.

12. ANALOGICAL APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE FROM POPULAR EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD OF GRAMMAR.

As stated earlier, popular practice has a definite bearing upon definitions, interpretative canons etc. in grammar. The three vārttikas viz. Lokavijñānat siddham (on P. 7.2.117), Avaśaṇal lokavijñānat siddham (on P. 1.1.21) and Samhitāvasānayor lokaviditaṭvat siddham (on P. 1.4.109) have noted this with all seriousness. In the third vārttika, its author and Patañjali, its commentator admit that since the terms samhitā and avasāna have nothing new to denote in grammar it is superfluous to devote two rules P.1.4.109 and P. 1.4.110 for their definition in a grammatical treatise.

(75) Ākhyātan ākhyātena kriyasātatyae; Ehīdayon'nyapadaṁrthe.
(76) Mayūravyāmsakādayasića. (77) Parah saṃnikarṣass saṃhitā (P. 1.4.109). Vīrāmo'vasānam (P. 1.4.110).
This is in conformity with Pāṇini’s promise that since many names (78) of lands viz. Áṅga, Kalinga etc. have popularly well-known the number and gender and maxims on predominance of/principal meaning of suffixes etc. are popular, it is superfluous to devote rules to them. Patañjali acknowledges this gesture on the part of Pāṇini under the rule Kāraka (P. I.4.23) and comments that along with such words of well-known denotation, some other words and terms with some technical meaning are utilised in grammatical rules and that of the latter the relatively big terms primarily convey the meaning their bases and suffixes allow. It appears from this that (79) when technical terms, conveying some meaning, well known in neither popular usage nor a scientific discourse are employed here, rules are arranged to define them. The word Kāraka, the Mahābh. observes is popularly known as denoting the agent of an action. But in Pāṇini, it is employed in connection with all the seven cases i.e. to say to mean dhruva (a fixed or movable abode from which something physical or mental, pours forth or falls), location etc. which are not accepted elsewhere as denoted by the word viz. ‘Kāraka’. This inspires the formulation: Kāraka construed as defining the term in the grammar of Pāṇini. It follows thus, from the Mahābh. that concept of cases in this grammatical school is Pāṇini’s innovation. Patañjali does not rule out the existence of the term in some pre-Pāṇinian grammar. All he intends on saying is this that Pāṇini proposed to use this term with greater perspective.

Goldstücker prepares an exhaustive list of the technical terms utilised in Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī. For example,

(78) Tadasisyam samjñapramāmatvāt (P. I.2.53).
(79) Mahābh. on Kāraka (P. I.4.23).
Panini used the following terms without defining them:
pratyaya, prathama etc. samāsa, tatpurusa, avayibhāva, kṛt,
taddhita, ātmanepada, parasmaipada etc.

Karmadhāraya, bahuvrihi, dvandva, sanyoga, anumāsilka, savarna,
pragṛhya, lopa, hrasva, dirgha, pluta, udātta, anudātta, svarita,
vṛddhi, guṇa, abhyāsa, avyaya, upadhā, upasarga, pada, samprasāraṇa,
kāraṇa, pṛatipadika etc. are defined by Panini.

Terms belonging to the first list are certainly pre-Pāñinian
in their denotation. According to Goldsucker, the terms bahuvrihi
and dvandva were used before Pāñini who extends and clarifies their
meaning. His rule on 'upasarjana' aims not at defining the term, but
at pointing out the clue to recognise it. Others seem to be
evolved and utilised by Pāñini. If these groups of technical terms
classified on the strength of their familiarity or their definition
in the Aṣṭādhyāyī be any guide, we can assess the originality of
Pāñini as well as reconstruct grammatical notions prevalent in the
pre-Pāñinian era. Moreover the relative priority and posterity of
old linguistic treatises in Sanskrit can be ascertained.

A note of discord may easily creep up here. The term guṇa
which is defined by Pāñini and should be his own innovation is
used in the Nirukta in the same sense by Yāska. Will it prove that
Yāska flourished after Pāñini? Of course, Pāñini's sūtra on guṇa
merely reads guṇa vowels and is not a definition. So it need not
be a factor in deciding relative priority between Pāñini and Yāska.

Panini does not define technical terms only when they have
become well-established in his neighbourhood or in the system
he follows, otherwise he defines terms even though they may
have been used by his predecessors. Technical terms and
Technique of Sanskrit grammar, Part I ed. 1948 page 7 by
Dr. K.C. Chatterjee.
Whatever it may be it is certain that Panini lived in a very early period of our history. He inherited some terms, principles and notions pertaining to the science of language, accepted or modified them and made them his own.

Like technical terms, many maxims were based upon the analogy of popular experiences. The first two of the above quoted vārttikas are a clear admission of this fact. For example, in the sentence 'give sour milk to the brahmins and takra (whey) to Kaundinya', even though it was possible to give sour milk to Kaundinya, a brahmin, reference to whey is meant for opposing the gift of sour milk in his case. In this way an epavada (exceptional rule) takes place where an utsarga (general rule) was inevitable. Under P. 1.1.21, instance of a single son is cited. A few of such popular practices which have bearing upon the formulation of grammatical principles are discussed below, as Patanjali sees them. It may be mentioned here that in Mimamsa works Chatri-nyāya (Sāngha on 1.4.23), Andha-parāparā-nyāya (ibid on 1.3.27 and 3.3.14) etc. are mentioned.

Panini utilised some forty short technical names i.e. pratyāhāras assigned to various groups of letters and formed on the basis of fourteen Śūtras traditionally believed to be composed by Maheśvara. Terms like sup, tin etc. have grouped some endings that are exhaustively read at least once in the Śūtras (P. 4.1.2; P. 3.4.78). Katyāyana has some technical terms of his own, under P. 1.1.68 he points out some discrepancies resulting from the rule and arranges the disputes words under such technical names as sit, pit, jīt and jīhit. These terms have found no recognition in the later works in this grammatical school. They have no apparent meaning to denote. Even then, he need not be branded as a scholar of some non-Paninian school. May be inherits these terms from some alien school or forms them at his own risks. Katyāyana's fame as a grammarian cannot be minimised at any rate. As stated earlier, the Vaij. Pr. refers to these terms.
A train moves from one place to another, ignoring the intervening objects. Similarly, a governing element (adhikāra) may jump from one rule to another, jumping over the intervening rules, as it were.

By the sentence 'bring Gopālaka, I shall teach the boy' it is not a cowherd (ga-pālaka) but a boy named Gopālaka whom we intend on calling on; by the word saṁdhava at the time of supper we mean salt, whereas at the time of going anywhere, a horse.

Unlike these popular comprehensions, the rule P. 1.1.28 promises, to take popular as well as technical numerals by the word saṁkhya.

Under P. 1.1.49, three possible kinds of governing words are enumerated with the help of some familiar usages. An adhikāra rule, seated in its own position, can illuminate the whole discourse just as a dazzling lamp illuminates the whole room.

Moreover, as a thing tied with a piece of rope or with a chain can be pulled away so a word from a rule can be drawn to another rule with the help of the particle 'ca'. In certain cases, as a common element in the subsequent rules, a word or a sūtra can be placed at the top.

The phenomenon laid down by P. 1.1.50 is in consonance with popular behaviour. It is not the fact that a fat man sits among the fat or a slim man among the slim or a yellowish man among the yellowish in congregations, dinner parties or meetings. Some inner affinity is necessary for their flocking together. Birds of the same feather flock together. Similarly, even though
many cows graze in the fields all day long, each cow sleeps with her calf. Moreover, a cow belonging to a particular group shouts when some of her companions have gone far away. Even in inanimate elements viz. soil, water, fire, wind and the sky, objects of the same element are found to be related to each other. With the analogy of these popular experiences, the rule on intimate relationship among homogeneous letters can be spared. The analogy of a burnt chariot and a dead horse is also referred to under this rule.

Two persons, one of whom has lost the chariot and the other his horse, may make a contract to form a new conveyance with the remaining chariot under one's possession and the living horse of the other. This probability may be extended to the sphere of grammar.

(V) Another principle is borrowed from public behaviour in the Mahabharata under P. 1.1.49. When a person directs someone the way to a certain place the desirable paths only in the confusing cross-roads are mentioned. Where there is no such confusing cross-road no particular directions are necessary. Similarly, restrictive rules are formulated to decide the desirable operations in allegedly confusing instances. Thus the possessive case-ending to relationship between the whole and the part need not be mentioned. But the same case-ending after a base would necessitate a restrictive formulation to determine the locus of a grammatical operation.

(VI) The extension of the feature of the original to its substitute is formulated in P. 1.1.56 and P. 1.1.57 but is prohibited by P. 1.1.58. According to the author of the varittikas, this extension is analogous to extending honour befitting the preceptor to his son.
It has been argued that even though it is natural on the part of a representative to receive honour of the preceptor he represents, from a householder, here in this grammatical school we cannot extend an operation from the original to its substitute for the rule Svam etc. (P. 1.1.68) stands in its way. So the twin rules on 'sthāni-vadbhāva' are necessary. The Mahābhā, however favours the retention of neither P. 1.1.68 nor P. 1.1.56-57.

(VII) The paribhāṣā of identity of form in spite of partial modifications is proposed under the same sutra. Here the analogy is this that a hound with his cut tail or cut ear changes into neither a horse nor an ass.

(VIII) The Prāḍīpa under P. 1.1.57 clarifies that a substitute when inheriting some features of its original does not lose its own features just as a kṣatriya (a man of warrior cast) enjoying the honour of a brahmin never loses his qualities as a warrior.

(IX) Under the same rule the canon śuddhaḥ bhiṃraṅga-lakṣaṇaṁ antaraṅga-lakṣaṇyaṁ is proposed and justified with the popular logic that like a man who rising in the morning serves his own physique first, then friends and then relatives, component parts of a word reunite themselves one by one in accordance with the affinity among them.

(X) In the chapters of relative inefficiency of rules it is not the operations but the rules ratifying them which are concerned with. As the revival of Devadatta after assignation of his assaign is impossible, so an inefficient operation can not take place any more even when the other operation disappears. It is with this in view that inefficiency of rules is sought.
(XI) The Mahābhāraṭa proposes under P. 1.3.11 that with the help of this rule an earlier rule may triumph over a later rule. It is analogous to the fact that a weak person with a mighty follow is able to bear a great burden.

(XII) Regarding the role of a grammarian it has been stated that unlike a potter whom we can approach with a request for preparing a new earthen pot, a grammarian utilises the words prevalent in the society and analyses them with some reasonable principles. It does not behove him to prepare new words with existing stems and suffixes.

(XIII) A grammatical rule is supposed to function in unexplained words or letters, but sometimes it applies to the words or letters which hardly need the rule. The analogy of fire and cloud is cited. For fire guts only uncutted articles but clouds pour water upon the ground as well as upon waters. This is discussed under P. 1.2.9.

(XIV) Just as various parts of a chariot, namely wheels yoke etc. can serve no useful purpose when disunited, so also the component syllables cannot denote anything separately. Like the chariot as a whole capable of running, a word comprising its syllables denotes a definite sense. A bunch of fibres makes either a blanket of useful purpose or a string which can tie something up; a certain amount of foodgrains can satisfy hunger. These analogies are referred to under P. 1.2.45.
(XV) Under P. 3.3.18, it is stated that masculine gender and singular number have virtually nothing to do with the grammatical operation ratified there and that they are given for the sake of formulation only. It is analogous to procuring of rice with chaffs etc., even when rice only is necessary or of flesh with bones etc., even though meat alone will be devoured.

(XVI) The fallacious logic namely post hoc ergo propter hoc (kākatāliyam) is referred to in the Mahābhārata under P. 5.3.106.

(XVII) The whole is the sum total of its component parts, says Patañjali. A thing, he sees, is the sum total of its qualities. So a tree when moving, moves with its branches.

(XVIII) By the order that persons should be invited from villages but up to the Anga land brahmins alone should be invited one cannot bring a non-brahmin from a village situated on the way to the Anga, even if no brahmin lives there. Thus the existence of some brahmins in some villages obstructs invitation to non-brahmins. Similarly the existence of consonants at the beginning of some words stands in the way of these words which begin with no consonant.

(XIX) Under P. 6.1.35, on the occasion of showing that a letter is neither 'anta' nor ādi when it is claimed as both, simultaneously in a word, the Mahābhārata gives an analogy from popular practice. When a single servant serves two equally influential masters, he will either serve them one by one or will have to defy both of them at a time when they simultaneously order him to discharge two duties involving his departure in two opposite directions.
(XX) To illustrate that between primary and secondary meanings in a word the former is more desirable, it is said that even though 'go' may mean secondarily a vāhi (ploughman), we must not mean by 'go' a vāhi in your ambadhyah etc. under P. 3.3.32. The word 'go' however undergoes vṛddhi, etc. in declension even when a secondary meaning is indicated. For these grammatical operations solely concern a word, not its meaning.

Borrowing from popular usages and their influence upon the Pāṇinian system of grammar are thus immense.

13. THE EFFECT CONDITIONED BY JUXTAPOSITION MUST NOT AFFECT THE JUXTAPOSITION ITSELF.

According to the interpretative canon Sannipatalekṣaṇo vidhir animittaḥ tadvighatasya (Pā 36/ Pu 10/ Śī 67) which is referred to in two vārttikas on P. 1.1.39 and P. 7.3.116, a grammatical operation which occurs in the condition of juxtaposition cannot mar its own condition itself. In other words, the proximity between two words or between the stem and the suffix must not cause anything viz. augmentation, affixation, replacement etc. which would threaten the very proximity. Of a number of instances cited in the Mahābhārata to show the utility of this canon words viz. sātāni, sahasrāpi, sakeṭau, paddhatau, iyasa and uvoga stand scrutiny and deserve analysis.

(I) In satā + (j)as or (ā)as the augment mm appears after the last vowel of the stem. This n(um) must not include the stem

(82) Vasyānantaṁya yo vihitā-stadānantaṁ asau na virunaddhi (vide Pu 10 and Śī 67).
in the list of 'ṣat' (P. 1.1.24) for it would then demand elision of the case-ending which is the conditioning cause of २०२ु (um).

(II) Similarly, in padhatau (< padhati + ē) the final ē in the stem is replaced by ० (t) due to the juxtaposition of the ending, ० ē, this ० must not cause ० े (t) the feminine suffix which would mar the juxtaposition between the stem and the ending. Of course, the ० with indicatory ० indicates that े cannot have any scope here.

(III) In ० ( ० + tip in lit) when the vowel in the verbal root is gunated it becomes ० . It may cause augmentation by ०. But this ० elides the lit ending, the cause of this gunation. Under such circumstances, the augment itself is ignored.

(IV) In the words viz. ēadhya (० + ē), ēdheh (० + ē) etc., after gunation of the ultimate vowel 'i' in the stem before endings (P. 7.3.111), the stem cannot be an indeclinable (P. 1.1.39) for it would then lose the ending which causes this gunation. But for the canon under review, the feature of an indeclinable being antaraṅga (with internal affinity), the change of 'e' into 'aye' etc. would be superseded by the feature of an indeclinable. Even if it be argued that 'e' and 'aye' are 'antaraṅga' due to their dependence upon letters alone, the dictum 'Antaraṅgān api vidhīn bahireṅgo lug bādhate' would cause the elision of the case-ending. By the canon Sannipata etc. however, all anomalies are solved. Both the feature of the modified stem as an 'avyaya' and the consequent elision of the ending are opposed to by scholars. From this it
follows that even the apprehension of the condition of internal affinity being affected by a remote operation is treated as the scope of this canon.

(V) In grāmani-kulan, grāmani-putraḥ etc., shortening of i before the latter member of compounds (P. 6.3.61) must not admit the advent of t(uk) after the short vowel. Otherwise, this t(uk) would mar the juxtaposition between two words. Kāiyāta thinks that it might be so if only t(uk) is treated as an augment of the vowel concerned, and if this part of the vowel in a word is not accepted as the part of the whole word. The Udyota of Nāgęša however, does not see eye to eye with this opinion. In its opinion, as fingers which are directly attached to hands and feet are treated as the parts of the body the view of Kāiyāta stands on slender legs. The prohibition of conjunction of 'it' which primarily belongs to the ending -tās and then forms a part of the stem with adjuncts is a clear indication by Pāṇini himself, which goes in favour of Nāgęša's opinion. The decision of the Nāhābh, however, goes against the acceptance of the canon here. Because by the canon relative inefficiency of an external operation with reference to an operation of internal affinity we can derive the intended form. The shortening of the vowel i is external in connection with t(uk) which virtually finds no scope here for it always finds its condition sealed. Kāiyāta joins this discussion by saying that the canon might undesirably oppose the appearance of t(uk) in grāmani-śatram etc. The augment t(uk) is assured by the rule Čhe 6a (P. 6.1.73). The Udyota however favours the employment of
the canon in the expression kulam grāmanī where the final 'k' is shortened and where nothing but the canon under review can stop the augmentation t(uk). In the Pāñjābī, uses the utility of the canon/inefficient external operation in tuk affairs on the strength of the rule 'Satvatukorasesidhāsā' (P. 6.1.36). According to him, reference to the canon Samnipāta etc. in connection with grāmanī-kulam etc. in the Mahābhārata may be ascribed to 'Ekapadesin' (a section of scholars).

(VI) In words viz. Vṛtrabhāsī, etc. too after the elision of n before the ending -bhīs, tuk might appear in absence of the canon. It is however concluded that either by the rule Nalopasupasvara etc. (P. 8.2.2.) or by the canon of an inefficient external operation the elision of n is relatively inefficient in connection with tuk. Tuk is independent of a case-ending but elision of n is not so.

(VII) In the word nimiśita (ni-kuś + kta), the nasal element in the root disappears by the rule P. 6.4.24. Then by the rule Vasanādēd etc. (P. 1.2.21) the suffix is treated as 'skit' (which does not lose an indicative k) even though the fact is the reverse. Consequently, the prohibition of gupation of the vowel in the root by P. 1.1.5 fades away. But on account of the canon Samnipāta etc., the vowel u cannot treat the suffix as skit. For in that case the vowel u must be gupated. Pāṇini himself, however, has formulated the rule P. 1.1.4 with a view to prohibiting gupation in those instances where a certain part of the root is elided. Thus so far as the present formation is concerned, the canon Samnipāta etc. is unnecessary.

(83) As on P. 1.1.48.
The word amuna (ados + ta) is also a prime instance of this canon. Here the ending ta (i.e. an of the earlier grammarians) changes into na as the stem with 'u' in its end is technically treated as ghi. Panini has categorically commented that this 'mu' can under no circumstances become inefficient in relation to this na (P. 8.2.3). The substitute na conditioned by u cannot lengthen it by 'Supi ca' (P. 7.3.102). For the canon Samnipata would not allow it. But here too, the formulation 'Na mu taode' can easily allay apprehensions, the Mahabha says.

In the word upadasta (upa-din + luna ta), the vowel i in the root is changed into a(t) by the rule P. 6.1.50. It happens before -lyap or any suffixes which do not lose s and which are conditioned by e, o, ai or au. But for the canon Samnipata etc., a can be replaced by i and the ending can be treated as kit by the rule P. 1.2.27. According to the canon however, since replacement by a takes place before an a-kit ending, it cannot make the ending kit. So this a is not replaced by i. Of course, this paribhasa is not indispensable here for a varttika on P.1.1.20 has excluded the root din from the scope of P. 1.2.27.

The words tri and catur are substituted by tisra and catasr in feminine gender by the rule P. 7.2.99 before caso-endings. But for the paribhasa the feminine suffix nip could appear after these substitutes. The paribhasa being vigilant, nip cannot intervene the stems and endings. The rule 'Na tisra catasr' (P.6.4.4) prohibits lengthening of y before -min however, indicates that nip does not intervene here. So even if the paribhasa be non-existent
we face no inconvenience here. Puruṣottama (No.10) and Śīrōdeva (No.69) however cite this prohibitory rule as the indication of the canon under review in absence of which the prohibition would be useless.

A close study however, shows that in certain cases the canon, if employed, would effect some forms which are not intended. A few of such cases are analysed below:

(I) In words like dākṣi (dakaśa + in), plākṣi (plakṣa + in) etc., where the suffix is conditioned by the ultimate 'a' of the stem, it occurs and effects the loss of its condition. With the loss of the ultimate 'a' juxtaposition between the stem and the suffix is disturbed.

(III) In the word kṛāpayati (kri + nić + tip), the vowel 'i' in the root is changed into 'ai' which becomes a before nić by the rule Kṛūjīśāni mā (P. 6.1.48). Then the augment p(uk) intervenes and disturbs the juxtaposition.

(III) In the word adidēpat (dā + nić + luń tip), p(uk) is augmented after ā and before nić. Thereafter, there is shortening of ā before p(uk). Of course, shortening of the vowel conditioned by śaṅ (P. 7.4.1) is an operation of internal affinity in comparison with p(uk) which depends upon nić and is external.

(IV) In the words ya and sa derived from the pronominal stems yad and tad in the feminine nominative, 'a' replaces the ultimate syllable 'ad' by the rule Tyādādīnemah (P. 7.2.102) before the
ending. The feminine suffix tap intervenes between the stem and the case-ending.

(V) In the words papivan (pā + kvasu), tāsthivān (sthā + kvasu) etc., the final a in the roots drops before the suffix in favour of the augment 'it' which is conditioned by a in the root (P. 7.2.67).

(VI) In the words viz. agnimān (agni + matup), vāyumān (vāyu + matup), paramavācā, paramavācē etc. There is acute accent in the last vowel. Before affixation and compound the words viz. agni, vāyu, para etc. had their own acute accent. In the changed circumstances they all lose their accent in favour of the accented last vowels.

(VII) The words viz. nadi, kumārī, brāhmaṇī, kīṣori etc. in the vocative singular get their final vowel shortened before the case-ending by the rule Ambārtha etc. (P. 7.3.107). Consequently the ending s(u) after the short vowel is elided.

Under such circumstances the existence of the canon Sannipāta etc. is at stake and its utility is not beyond question. The Mahābh. however, opines that a few unintended forms must not stand in the way of the canon. In the formulations involving numerous instances, exceptions are not quite unexpected. Notwithstanding existence of beggars we cook our meals; in spite of apprehension of intruding deer we sow barley. Similarly the canon shall be admitted even if exceptions to it are there. Moreover an illustrative list of the proper instances of the paribhāṣā is given in the Mahābh. whereas faults are exhaustively enlisted.
All that one is supposed to do is to utilise the canon in as many grammatical operations as possible and practicable and to arrange for preventive measures in inconvenient places. The Pradīpa reads out such preventions on the strength of the Paninian rules. For example, (I) the rule Atāṁ (P. 4.1.95) would object to the paribhāṣā in dākṣīṇ, plākṣīṇ etc., (II) Na yāsayoh (P. 7.3.45) containing yā and sā indicates that feminine suffix after yad, tad etc. before case-endings is allowed, (III) Vasvekājāghasam (P. 7.2.67) as a restrictive rule allows the elision of ǎ in the root, (IV) in krāpayati, the augment puk belongs to the whole root, not to ǎ alone and there is no technical intervention, (V) in adīdapat the shortening of ǎ is indicated by the provision of shortening of the penultimate vowel (P. 6.4.92) of jūṇa (cp. mārapatosaṇa etc. Sk Vol III, Page 160), (VI) Amudattam padam ekavājam as a paribhāṣā rule (P. 6.1.158) on accentuation effects loss of acute accent in the stem (in vāyumāṇ etc.) and (VII) the term hrasva in Bāhrasvat etc. (P. 6.1.69), indicates its opposition to the canon of juxtaposition (Sampatā etc.) in the formation of words viz. kumārī etc. Nāgośa however holds a different view on some points. According to him the word kāṣṭāya in Kāṣṭāya etc. (P. 3.1.14) indicates that the canon is optional. The rule Na yāsayoh (P. 7.3.45) is said to be indicating the same idea. Bhaṭṭoja holds the non-obligatory nature of this canon on the strength of the same word i.e. kāṣṭāya in P. 3.1.14 and justifies the assistance of Supi ēa (P. 7.3.102) in rāmābyān (ṛāma + bhiyām) etc. While explaining rāmānā (ṛāma + ēm = ṛāma + mūt + ēm), however Bhaṭṭoja finds a conflict of the rule Supi ēa
with the canon Samnipāta etc., which results in invalidation of the sūtra and proposed obstruction of the maxim by the special rule Nāmi (P. 6.4.3). All this is nothing but an attempt at retention of the rule 'Nāmi' because the paribhāsa being optional, the rule Supi ca can justify lengthening of the final vowel of the stem before the augmented ending in rāmānām etc. Thus the rule 'Nāmi' is a simple rule of lengthening before the sixth case-ending plural when mū is augmented. It is opined in the Śī of Nāgēśa on P. 7.3.103 that the term 'jhalī' therein stands as an opposition to the canon Samnipāta etc. in sarvesām (sava + ām = savva suṭ ŋām = serva sām = servēgān) etc. It follows that the rules P. 6.4.3, P. 7.3.102 and P. 7.3.103 ignore the canon Samnipāta etc.

14. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO THE COMPONENTS AND NOT THE WHOLE.

The vārttika Pratyayayavānā vākyaparisaṃśptah is quoted in the Mahābhāṣya under P. 1.1.1. With the help of the canon contained in it the rule means that each of the vowels ā, ai and au is called vṛddhi in the grammatical system of Pāṇini. If the group as a whole was meant for, words viz. saha etc. would incorporated. For example, to signify that the whole of a reduplicated verbal stem is 'abhyaṣta', Pāṇini incorporates the word 'ubhe' (both) in its definition (P. 6.1.3). The term 'samyoga' however signifies conjunct consonants taken as a group without any indication to this effect in the sūtra (P. 1.1.7).

(84) Besides P. 3.1.14 Nāgēśa in Pa refers to P. 7.3.45 to establish non-obligatory nature of the canon. Purusottama and Siradeva cite the former rule but construe the latter to indicate the canon viz. Garbhavat tābādayo bhavanti (Pu 116/Si 31).
In popular life too we mean by dramatic performance the sum total of acting, singing and beating of drums etc. Still construction relating to the individual is in vogue in popular practice. For example, when we say that Devadatta, Yañnadatta and Vigranidtra should be entertained with food, we mean to entertain them individually. Popular behaviour in the opposite direction is not however rare. For instance, in the sentence 'let the Gargas give one hundred rupees' we mean to realise the amount from the group of Gargas as a whole. Under such circumstances, it will be convenient to construe the words in the rules in accordance with necessity. It is for this that the Pāṇini accommodates another canon which upholds the other side and comments that either of the alternatives be accepted according to circumstances. Thus the paribhāṣā under review is found not to be universally accepted. Puruṣottama (No. 29 & 30) however cites the word 'prathamayoh' in Pāṇini 6.1.102 as an indication in favour of the second canon and analyses that it primarily takes the dual number in it. Another observation i.e. Ubhayathā vākyaprāsāptih which some say is a third canon is the recognition of both the earlier ones.

15. INSIGNIFICANCE OF THE ROLE OF CONSONANTS IN ACCENTUATION.

The paribhāṣā Hālsvaraprāptau vyañjanam avidyamānavat put forth by Katyayana in connection with the interpretation of the rule Pāṇini 6.1.223 is concerned with the accentuation of the vedic language. Classical Sanskrit has lost this phenomenon in favour of the growth of stress accent and has littling to do with the present dictum. Still dedication of a large number of sūtras to linguistic
phenomena of Vedic words has placed the Paninian grammar among the important Vedic expositions which form the 'limbs' of the Vedas. Goldstücker in his work on Panini proved that in the field of linguistic studies on the Vedas Panini's work is preceded by a very few works, viz. the Śākhā of Śaṅkara, probably the Atharvavedaprātiśākhya, the Mirukta of Vāsaka etc. So Panini's claim as a Vedic scholar is undisputed and the reference to the present canon on accentuation is not unwarranted.

The canon Bṛṣvaraprabhakṣa etc. is necessitated, the author of the Vārttika thinks, by the fact that acute accent being enjoined by the rule Saṁsasya (P. 6.1.223) in the ultimate vowel of a compound word, difficulty arises for the last vowel followed by the ultimate consonant in the compound words viz. rājadrśat, brahmānasamit etc. In that case, either a special accommodation within the rule or the invocation of this canon is indispensable. According to this canon, when there is the possibility of accentuation in a consonant it will be branded as silent for the time being. Katyāyana has formulated a vārttika to show the utility of this canon. Thus along with bhauvirikvidham, bhauvlikvidham etc. having accentuation in 'ī' before the suffix -vidhal (P. 6.1.193) the words viz. ākāraśakaḥ, jīhīraśakaḥ etc. have accentuation in 'ī' even though r and s intervene between 'ī' and the initial vowel of the suffix. Similarly along with ahīvāmaśāyandhiḥ, āgniyośyaḥ etc. which are accented in the initial vowel; gārgyaḥ, kṛtiḥ etc. have their first vowel accentuated by the rule (P. 6.1.197). Moreover, verbal roots in paśati etc. have their last vowel accentuated by the rule Dhūtoḥ (P. 6.1.162). But for
the canon, consonants would have barred this phenomenon of accentuation in case of intervention of consonants.

Some however like to put forth the canon with modifications (85) in the original canon. Their objections to the original canon are three. First, both the words 'hali' and 'Vyanjana' which denote the same thing are employed therein and it is conceded that a consonant might be accentuated even though the fact is the reverse. Secondly, in the word 'dadih' with the accented first vowel, the ultimate vowel is *continued* to be changed into a svarita on account of the acute accent in the preceding vowel. The consonant dh between two vowels cannot stop it. Since accentuation primarily concerns an acute accent (udāṭṭa) only, a special arrangement for the svarita is necessitated within the canon. Lastly, ratification of 'amudāṭṭa' in the initial vowel and of 'udāṭṭa' in the ultimate vowel may not be extended to the words which begin with or end in a consonant even at the instance of the paribhāṣā. The modified canon, they say, is in the better position. For it denotes that in any kind of accentuation a consonant is silent. Consequently the above apprehensions regarding the original canon are out of place in the modified canon. Moreover, flexibility in the latter is ensured by all possible tatpurusa compounds in the word 'svaravidhi' for the sake of every kind of accentuation. Purusottama (No.32) cites P. 4.3.136 which takes up the word 'bilva' as beginning with amudāṭṭa and admits the silence of a consonant in accent.

(85) Svaravidhau vyanjanam avidyamāṇavat. Yudhīsthīra Miśrasa in his History of Sanskrit Grammar (Vol II) wonders at the existence of this canon in the Paribhāṣa-patha of Pulya-kirti in Sakatayana school.
Of course, Patañjali shows, the modified canon is too wide and can wrongly influence accentuation in words viz. udāsvitvān, vidyutvān etc. by the rule P. 6.1.176. Conversely, the original canon can repulse all objections hurled at it and explain accentuation in these words as well. For example, against the first objection, the Māhābhārata says that the word acah in the sixth case-ending does not reappear in the sūtras P. 1.2.29 and P. 1.2.30. In that case the possibility of accentuation in a consonant is open. As for the svarita in the word dadhi it is said that amudātta would denote non-acute accent and that the group consisting of both the consonant and the vowel would have svarita in the vowel element. As for extension of 'udātta' or 'amudātta' in initial or ultimate vowels to the words which begin with or end in consonants, Panini himself indicated it in the prohibition in the rule Nottacarapade etc. (P. 6.2.142). But for the extension of the operation in the words, viz. prthivī, rudra, rūṣan and māthin, all beginning with or ending in consonants, a prohibition would be out of place. Nāgārjuna in his Uddyota construes this prohibition as indicating that in a formulation any way concerned with accentuation a consonant must be treated as silent.

The Mahābhārata itself justifies the canon viz. Halsvaraprāptau etc. with the indication available in the rule Yato'nāvaḥ (P. 6.1.213). The rule notes acute accent in the first vowel e.g. kāmyā but prohibits it in the word nāvya. The initial letter in 'nau' is a consonant. But for the possibility of the acute accent in the first vowel, the prohibition would be useless. From this it follows that silence of consonants in accentuation was noted even in Panini's era.
According to the interpretative canon, Sāmānyātidese hi vidaśānātideseḥ (Ps 110/Pu 64/Sī 109), an application is extended in respect of general features only and not the particular. It is quoted in the Mahābh. on P.1.1.56 and P. 6.3.68. In both these cases, the analogical experience of popular behaviour is cited to explain the significance of this canon. When we say that this man of the warrior caste (ksatriya) should be treated as a brahmin, to him are extended the general reception and awards generally accorded to a brahmin. But some special treatment accorded to a particular (86) brahmin or a school of brahmins cannot be extended to this man of the warrior caste. In the Mīmāṃsā, details of prakṛti are not extended to the vikṛti. In grammar too, the general features only of a suffix are extended to the substitute which replaces the suffix. For example, the verbal suffix -ktvā causes augmentation by ṭi in pathitvā, by yak in datvaya and so on. But its feature extensible to its substitute viz. lyap is this that it is a verbal suffix. As a result, the augment 'it' which finds a place before any initial consonant other than h and y of an ārdhahātuka suffix (P. 7.2.36) finds no scope before -lyap in pra-pathya etc. The Uddyota clarifies further and comments that 'ai' from the rule Sah syārdhahātuka (P. 7.4.49) is to be reappearing in the rule Sani mīyagha etc. (87) (P. 7.4.54) because by simple extension it is impossible to have it

(86) Sāmānyam ād brāhmanakāryam tat ksatriye tātīśyate. Yad vidistam Māthare Kumbinyā vā na tad atīśyate (Mahābh. on P. 1.1.56).
(87) Sani mītyatram Sah sītyataḥ sītyamuvrttam (Uddyota on P.1.1.56).
in Sānini etc. But to -lyap are extended the general features from 
-kṛvā and the question of extension of the provision of it in 
(88) -lyap does not arise. In 'Goto niit' (P. 7.1.90) however,
extension of the particular feature is admitted in the rule itself to 
explain gauḥ from go + su. Similarly under P. 6.3.68 it has been 
made sufficiently clear in both vārttika and the Mahābhā, that by 
'am' either the second case-ending singular or an ekasega form of 
'am' the ending and 'am' the augment should be understood. As such 
the rule Icā ekācāḥ etc. explains the words viz. gātmānaya, strīma-
rāya, nārammānya, śriyammānya, bhuvammānya etc. of which the first 
three are beneficiaries of special extension.

As the vārttika shows, the canon was popularly known in its 
age. The indication in the Pāṇinian rule Na lyapī (P. 6.4.69) which 
prohibits extension of an operation concerned with kṛvā etc. replace-
ment of ā with ī in dā, dhā, mā, sthā etc. by P. 6.4.66/the optional 
employment of the paribhasā and extension of particular features 
possible by the Pāṇinian rule P. 1.1.56. It shows that Pāṇini was 
not quite unacquainted with this paribhasā.

17. A SUBSTITUTE NOT TO BE TREATED AS ITS ORIGINAL IN THE 
CONTEXT OF RELATIVE INEFFICIENCY OF A RULE.

The vārttika Purvatraśīdhe ā (Pu 112/81 85) on P. 1.1.58 
ordains as Patañjali explains, that a substitute is not to be

(88) Viśeṣasābhdāsrayaṇa tu atīdēṣe kṛ iyāṃya... sāmānya-nibandhanam
viśeṣānibandhanam ca tat sarvam atiḍīsyate. Pradīpa on P. 6.3.6
treated as its original in respect of an operation which is enjoined in a rule within the jurisdiction of the governing word 'asiddha'. As commentators observe, this prohibition is honoured when the treatment of a substitute as its original would effect or oppose either directly or consequentially an operation formulated in a relatively inefficient rule. According to the Uddyota, this proposition is a mere repetition. For a grammatical operation enjoined under the governing word 'asiddha' is relatively inefficient in relation to the operations enjoined in the rules of Panini which are earlier in order of enumeration. The varntika is however significant because it implies efficiency of other rules of extension (atidesa) viz. Antādivacēca etc. in the wake of a relatively inefficient rule. For example, in the words amā $\bar{\text{d}}\acute{\text{a}}\acute{s} + j\acute{\text{a}}s = \acute{\text{a}}\acute{\text{d}}\acute{\text{a}}-\acute{\text{i}}$ (P. 7.1.17) = ada-ī (P. 7.2.102) = śa (P. 6.1.87) = ad ī (P.8.2.81)= amī (P.8.2.80) and ksīrapena (ksīra-pāṇa instrumental sing.) the euphonic substitute is treated as the original either as the earlier part or as the latter before ensuing replacement and cerebralisation.

In kīṃ-saṃti however the elided 'a' (p. 6.4.111) if treated as restored would directly effect non-obligatory replacement of 'u' by v (P. 8.3.33). Conversely, in rājñāh (rājjan+sas, īasi, īas) the elided 'a' (P. 6.4.134) if restored would directly oppose palatalisation of the subsequent n (P. 8.4.40). In pipathistatra and pipathīr iti, restoration of the elided 'a' $\underline{\text{p}}\acute{\text{a}}\acute{\text{t}}\acute{\text{h}}\acute{\text{a}} + \text{san}(P.3.1.7) = \text{path} \text{ path sa (P. 6.1.9) = pipathśa (P. 7.4.60; P.7.4.79) = pipath śa (P. 7.2.35; P. 8.3.59); pipathśa+kṣā+śu = pipath śhi+p = pipath śi+p = pipath śi+p (P. 8.2.76) would favour cerebralisation of s in the first case and disfavour replacement of s with r(u) (P. 8.2.66) in the second.}
The utility of the canon under review is noted in the Mahābh.
in five vārttikas. (I) In adugāha, adugdāhā (duh+luṅ -ta, -thās) the
conjugational sign of aorist viz. ēlī is replaced by (k)sa
(P. 3.1.45) of which the final 'a' is optionally dropped before an
ending which has a dental letter as the initial (P. 7.3.73). Then
s is elided by Jhalo jhall (P. 8.2.26). The elided 'a' if restored
would oppose the loss of s which is enjoined within the jurisdic-
tion of 'asiddha'. In case, a or (k)sa is not lost, the forms are
adhukṣeta and adhukṣetthā with -ta and-thās. (II) In the words,
dhatse (dhā + laṭ -thās), dhad-dhve (dhā + laṭ -dhvam), dhad-dhvar
(dhā + loṭ -dhvam), dhattah (dhā + laṭ -tas) etc. the root dhā-
belonging to the reduplicative class is reduplicated before the
conjugational sign ātu (P. 6.1.10). The final ā of the reduplicated
stem is elided by the rule Snābyastayor ātāh (P. 6.4.112). Then by
P. 8.2.36 the initial 'd' (as in dadh-tas) is aspirated (bhāṣ)
before t, th, s and dhva. The latter dh is replaced by t and the
form of the stem is dhat- (e.g. dhatse, dhat-taḥ etc.). The
aspiration of d is possible only because the elided ā is not treated
as restored. As Bhāttoji informs in his Sk, Vāmana and Madhava
explain the formulation Dadhastathośa (P. 8.2.36) as an indication
of the negation of restoration of the elided ā. Bhāttoji himself
however resorts to the canon in the form of the vārttika which is
under review (vide Sk on P. 8.2.36). (III) In aditya (aditya + yya
P. 4.1.85) there is loss of the ultimate 'a' of the stem by the rule
P. 6.4.148. With the suffix the resultant is adityya of which the
earlier y is elided by P. 8.4.65. This is possible only if, there
is no restoration of the elided 'a'. (IV) In pūpakti (pāc + yāṅ +
ktiḍ) etc. the elided 'a' of -yāṅ (P. 6.4.48) being decisive, there
is gutturalisation of ċ (P. 8.2.30). In pakti (pač + nić + ktić), the elided i (nić) if restored would stop gutturalisation of ċ (P. 8.2.30).

In addition to the aforesaid cases, the words skan (skand + nić + kvip), kāsthatak (kātha-taks + nić + kvip), dhok (duh + nić + kvip) and let (lih + nić + kvip) may be cited as instances where the canon Pūrvaṭrāśiddhe ca should be the deciding maxim. Kaiyata's contention that in such cases restoration of the loss of i is prohibited by the word padānta (P. 1.1.58) is disputed. For as Nāgasa opines, the word 'padānta' therein refers to the composition of the ultimate part of a 'pada' and not to its elision.

With all these instances, the necessity of the canon is proved. Moreover, if this canon be admitted, the size of the rule Nā padānta (P. 1.1.58) can be minimised. For prohibition in cases of all operations cited in the rule, excepting those related to the suffix -varac, elision of ū accentuation and as some would admit, lengthening would be justified by the canon under review. In absence of the canon, elision of the aorist sign sic would be restored in the wake of ś which is to be changed into k (P. 8.2.41) in akraśṭām. In ādhyatra (ādhi + atra) however ū is treated as its original i.e. i to oppose elision of the last member of conjuncts (Vide Mahābh. on P. 1.1.57).

The implication of the rule Nāglopi śasvāritām (P. 7.4.2) should be studied in this context. This rule prohibits shortening of the penultimate vowel, of the stem before the causative suffix
-nió followed by oan (i.e. the conjugational sign of 'aorist of either a causative verbal root or the roots śri, dru and srú) in case the root loses any of the vowels ā, ō, ū, śū and indicatory r or is śás. The word alulokat (lokṛ + nió + lun tip) may be cited to illustrate the contained in this rule. Here the root lokṛ has the indicatory r. It is argued that in case a root drops an 'ak' vowel the prohibition by the rule is redundant. Because the short vowel would be treated as its original i.e. the long vowel by 'sthānivādhāvā'. In amamālet (mālā + nió + lun tip) etc. if the elided ā is treated as restored the earlier ā of the stem mālā would not be the penultimate vowel and prohibition of its shortening would be out of place. The prohibition is therefore meant for those cases where treatment of a substitute as its original is not possible (as in atyararājat). As decided in the Mahābhārata on P. 1.1.57, a substitute is not treated as its original if the latter is a combination of vowel and consonant. Of course, to accept an 'ak' vowel along with the subsequent consonant by 'ak' in the word nāglopi does not prove a happy interpretation. (Still prohibition in case of an 'ak' vowel along with the consequent consonant is accommodated in the rule Nāglopi etc.). Moreover, the elision being treated as ineffective due to sthānivādhāvā, there is no chance of shortening even in absence of the prohibition. In view of this, the word aglopin in the rule is redundant and is interpreted as an indication to the fact that no sthānivādhāvā is entertained in the last five chapters (P. 7.4.2 - P. 8.4.68) of the Astadhyāyī. This indication exhausts the utility of the vārttika Purvatsrāiddhe ā. Kaiyeta however, takes this indication for a
mere help to the mediocre students. In other words, the canon Pūrvatrasiddha ēa is preferred to the aforesaid indication. Strange indeed it is that Māgeśa does not even refer to this canon in his Pr. Bhaṭṭoḷa has however utilised it and both Puruṣottama and Śīraḍeva have explained this canon with usual seriousness.

Exceptions to the canon may be referred to here. As it is enlisted in matters of elision of the first member of a conjunct consonant, change into 1 and cerebralisation of n the canon has nothing to do (cp Tasya duṣñār samyogādiłopa-latva-ñatvesu - in the Mahābh. on P. 1.1.58). For example, in Kākyarthaṃ, vēsyarthaṃ etc. elision of k and s respectively by P. 3.2.29 was inevitable in absence of sthānivadbhāva of y, the second member of conjunct consonant and the substitute of i vowel. In nīgrāyaṃ and nīgāryaṃ (ni-gṛ + passive lat ta), optional 1 in place of r by P. 3.2.31 would not be there in absence of sthānivadbhāva of y. In māṣavapenī, vṛihivapenī etc. n would be cerebralised by P. 3.4.11 (māṣavapana +  nip) in absence of sthānivadbhāva of the loss of 'a' (P.6.4.148) before  nip.

According to Śīraḍeva, the canon Pūrvatrasiddha etc. (Śi 95) is optional. It is indicated by the word dvirvacana in P.1.1.58. In the word, vētaśvāṃ, sthānivadbhāva of the ultimate vowel of the stem is upheld. Otherwise, r and consequent  1 in place of s was inevitable. The Mahābh. however explained these cases otherwise. According to it, by padēnta in P. 1.1.58 we should mean that in the face of an operation to reconstruct the ultimate part of an
inflected word etc. (pada), there shall be no treatment of the substitute as the former occupant in the initial part of the subsequent word. For example, in 'eso yam hasati' y in the second word is not treated as a vowel in the wake of reconstructing the ultimate part viz. 'o' (a-u) in esas through replacement of s by r and of r by u. If elision (not reconstruction) of s in esas be envisaged, y in the next word would oppose it as a substitute of a vowel. As for vetavë́n, the suffix vet (matup) is not a pada at all.