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Chapter II

SOCIAL REFLECTION

In fact, history is a living story of the people. It unites a complete picture of its political, social and cultural patterns and desires. Literature and art are two main sources for our knowledge of the social and cultural texture of the past. These sources can bring us close to the life and thoughts of our ancestors. Patañjali quotes maxims, proverbs, illustrations and examples of contemporary men and matters, as a way to justify his views in grammar. These maxims present a picture of India in that time.

2.1. Structure of society

In ancient times, the whole system of Indian society was based on the varnāśramadharma. There were four principle castes as brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaiśya and śūdra. In the social organism they occupied the foremost place—loke ‘mīśām brāhmaṇānām pūrvamānayedī yah sarvapūrvvah sa ānīyate'. The qualities of brāhmaṇa hood are fair complexioned, pure in conduct, ruddy faced, and brown haired. tapas, learning and birth makes a brāhmaṇa. But without tapas and learning he is merely a brāhmaṇa by caste. As the smṛti has it, tapam śrutam ca yoniścetyetad brāhmaṇakārakam. Urinate while standing, eats while going were undignified actions for them.
– gacchan bhaksayati, abrāhmaṇo ‘yam tiṣṭan mūtrayati². The importance of brāhmaṇa lies in his attempt to study and enlighten the people by teaching them in the Veda³. ksatriya-s are the protector of the society, and the majority of soldiers of the king were from this community. vaisya-s and śūdra-s were enjoyed their usual position in society.

2.2. Social behaviours

The people were enriched with high thinking and were very cultured. They gave more importance to morality and religious practices. They were more intelligent, virtuous, perfect and strong willed. Their skillness of applying words while conversation and propriety in selecting words are illustrated. The answer to several questions like ko dhāvati (who runs), kīdrśo dhāvati (how runs), kim varṇo dhāvati (which colour) etc in single word śveto dhāvati, denotes the genius of the speaker. The word śveto dhāvati take into two meanings. ‘The dog runs’ (śvā ito dhāvati) and ‘the white one runs’ (śveto dhāvati). And the word ‘alambusānām yātā’ also denotes two meanings, ‘go to the country of Alambusa’ and ‘able to go to the waters’ (alam busānām yātā).

They did not do fruitless efforts and gained two results from one work. Mango trees are irrigated and ancestors are satisfied when conducting the pitṛtarpana ceremony under a tree⁴. na hi bhikṣukāh santīti
sthālyo nāḍhīśrīyante – men do not refrain from setting the cooking pots on the fire because there are beggars who may come to ask for some of the contents. na hi mṛgāḥ sanītī yavā nopyante⁵ - men abstain from sawing barley because there are wild animals, which may devour it, indicates theirs strong willness in doing their jobs while they were facing so many obstructions⁶. The vrddhakumārivaravākya nyāya⁷ explains, when Indra asked an old virgin, to choose a boon, she said- putrā me bahuksīraghrtamōdanam kāñcanapātryām bhūnjīrān. This one boon, if granted, would give her a husband, progeny, abundance of corn, cattle, gold etc. Here her cunningness in using words will cover all that she wishes to have. The scholars who attempt to establish their silly viewpoints blamed in the society. They do a great job for getting minor results is similar to take a small bird from the top of long bamboo – saisā mahatā vamśastambāḷāṭvāṅkuṛṣyate⁸. Some persons could not stick on the project for a long time is similar to the character of a mongoose is illustrated by the avatapte nakulastitanyāya⁹, which means a mongoose does not stay on hot place for a long time. A truly wise man who would watches his surroundings and would collect from it what essential to his welfare and reject the rest. This kind of human nature is explained by the maxim of fish and its bone (matsyakāntakanyāya)⁰. When a fish is caught, it is caught with its bone, but when eating, only its flesh is retained. The character of
laziness and alertness is expressed – ya āśu kartavyānarthāṁścireṇa karoṭi sa ucyate śītaka iti, yaḥ punarāśu kartavyānṛthānāśveva karoṭi sa ucyate uṣṇaka iti. One asking a question about one thing, but his answer is about another thing is a kind of human character is also mentioned through the āmrāṇ prṣṭah kovidānārācaṣte nyāya. mandākaplutinyāya, the frog’s movement of jumps denotes another character of man that the fickle natured men’s movement by fits and starts. Avoid one’s help after one complete his requirement is another character of a human being is denoted through the kāṁṭhārasārthanyāya – kaścit kāntāre samupasthite sārthamupādatte sa yadā niskrāntaāntāro bhavati tadā sārtham jahāti. One needs the help of the caravan when he is nearing a forest and the moment he has crossed it, he dismisses it.

There are so many universally accepted principles in the society. It is seen that the beggar will not refuse first offered after getting the second one – bhikṣuko’yam dvitiyām bhikṣām samāśādyā pūrvām na jahāti. Imitation of the actions never transform the qualities of the original one is a reference to indicate the delusions in human being – na khalvapyanyat prakṛtamanuvartanād anyadbhavati, na hi godhā sarpanṭi sarpanādaḥhirbhavatī. By imitating another, one will not become the imitated. A lizard cannot be called snake on the basis of creeping.
The people were keeping morality in their life. They were punished if they do immorality and honoured for their moral work. One who keeps his cows back from eating beans of another because of his virtue, If the cow went to the field and eats the beans, it is treated as immorality and were punished. In the society, there were no competition without rival, but had rivals between equal strength. All were cooperated with others while they were need of help. It can be seen in the naśṭāśvadādharathānayāya. Some people expect big profit from a small effort and they were selfishness in the matters related to them. People were take special attention in protecting forests, lakes, rivers, ponds etc.

2.3. Division of towns and villages

Cities were vast and prosperous with rivers. People were accustomed to measure the length of a city by that of a river. So there is a mention that Banaras extends along the Ganges and Pātaliputra extends along the Śoṇa. The people in the city were worthy and prosperous. The inhabitants of Pātaliputra were more worthy than the inhabitants of Sāmkaśya and the inhabitants of Māthura were more worthy than the inhabitants of both Sāmkaśya and Pātaliputra.

The cities and villages are very different in nature. A group of house is generally called a village and even when there is only one it is
called village. The word ‘grāma’ has many connotations, a group of house as in grāma is burnt, a garden which forms boundary as in he has entered the grāma, the inhabitants as in ‘grāma is gone, grāma is come’\textsuperscript{20}. A village having cows and plants is considered as a prosperous village \textsuperscript{21}. A village known in the name of majority caste of people and profession, in which the brāhmīns form the majority of dwellers, named a brāhmin village\textsuperscript{22} (brāhmanagrāma) and the village of wrestlers \textsuperscript{23} (mallagrāma), where the wrestlers are predominant.

\subsection*{2.4. Family}

The fundamental factor of the society was family, which is considered as the nucleus of society. Most of the families are joint family, which includes a number of other relations, and the grandfather who could enjoy the affection of his sons and grandsons \textsuperscript{24}. The family members looked after the collective interest rather than the individual one for the whole welfare. The members of the family constituted relationship by birth between person with varying status, the eldest, second and the youngest, when there was more than one son \textsuperscript{25}. The birth of a son was supposed to be removed the sorrows of the family, which was hailed with joy \textsuperscript{26}. They celebrated the 10\textsuperscript{th} day after the birth of child as nāmakarana ceremony\textsuperscript{27}. The families were residing in two storeyed building \textsuperscript{28}. The raised platform
and the sign of a lotus can be seen in front of the house and the latter is the sign of prosperity. The custom of giving food to a domestic servant is an obligatory nature.

2.5. Eating habits, dress and decoration

Boiled rice was the favourite food, which was sometimes cooked with meat. Patañjali compares the heap of rice served on a plate to the mountain Vindhya. Regarding the slaughter of animals, there were some restrictions imposed by custom in case of non-vegetarian. Five, five-nailed animals could be taken, but not others. There permitted to eat the boar and wild cock, but restricted to those from the village itself, and those from the town also enjoyed privilege of restriction. The flesh of a sheep and deer were used and removed scales and small bones of the fish before eating. Curd (takram) and buttermilk (dadhi) are used as the ingredients to improve the taste of food — brāhmanebhyo dadhi diyatām takram kaundinyāya. They gave more importance to maintain the health as steady, for that they have executed fast, during that time they lived on water and sometimes even without it (abbhakṣaḥ, vāyubhakṣaḥ). For maintaining dignity of social relations, certain conventional dinner rules were observed. The servers were not expected to partake while the guests
were eating – *brāhmaṇa bhojyantāṁ māṭharakaunḍīnyo pariveṣtāṁ iti na idānīṁ tau bhuñjate* ⁴⁰.

During the period, there were in use many household utensils. They were used a type of vessel for storing water named *kumbha*, which was enough to store grains. One, store grains in *kumbha* was known as *kumbīḍhāṇya* ⁴¹. Most of the vessels were made out of clay. Some of the vessels that used for storing water, oil, ghee etc were earthen, but copper or bronze ones were known to them and were used for taking rice, ghee as well as milk as mentioned in the story of an old virgin asking for a boon from Indra. Some of other vessels⁴² they were used are *sthāli*- a big earthen dish, *bhrāṣṭa* - kind of frying pan, *ghaṭa* – a pot. They were used cots and lamps in the rooms⁴³.

Cloths were used primarily to cover the body – *śākaṭānācchā- dayāmāsa*. The upper cloth for covering shoulders was called ‘*paṭah*’. The dyeing of cloths were common, by that they were used various colours like white, brown-red, blue, yellow, green and red. Red colour was very popular, turban cloth was dyed in that colour which was the common dress of a priest ⁴⁴. The white amidst the red reveals their taste of colour combination – *dvayoh raktayorvastrayormadye śuklam vastram tatguṇamupalabhyate* ⁴⁵. There are references to shaven headed persons
(munda), twisted hair (jati), and cropped head with a long bunch of hair (šikhi). Someone arranged their bunch of hair in a top-knot and someone in very thin tresses. That people as a part of the beautification of body used ornaments. Four kinds of ornaments such as rucaka (necklace), kataka (bracelet), svastika and kuñţala (ear rings) which are made out of a lump of gold.

2.6. Status of women

In some of the civilizations in the world, women got paramount prominence and they had more roles in society. But the rest do not give appreciable power or role for them. The Vedic tradition has held a greatest respect and high regard for the qualities of women. As far as the education and religion concerned, women and men were treated as equal in Vedic times. They studied the Vedas and performed the sacrifices along with the men.

Education for girls was considered as quite important while brāhmin girls were taught Vedic wisdom. This statement, ‘kāśakṛtni brāhmaṇī’ denotes that the brāhmin girls have the knowledge of mīmāṃsā philosophy. The girls from the kṣatriya community were taught the use of bow and arrow. These examples state the women education system in the time of
Patañjali. But according to Manu, ‘women are prohibited from reciting vedas, even if they are from anyone of the three higher castes 49.

The life of woman, she was called ‘kanyā’ in the first part up to her marriage, after that she was called ‘bhāryā’. Unmarried woman was called ‘kumārī’ and in the old age she was called ‘vṛddhakumārī’ (old virgin). It is the duty of the parents to give their daughter to a suitable person in marriage 50. Yajurveda also emphasis the marriage of a daughter should be with a person who is learned like her 51. Women were free to participate in performing arts like drama etc. – naṭānāṁ strīyo ranigagatā yo yah prcchati kasya yūyam kasya yūyam iti tam tam tava tava ityāhuḥ 52.

Pregnancy and child protection are treated as important duties of women. Motherhood is considered as the greatest glory of Hindu women. Taittirīyopaniṣat teaches, “mātṛdevo bhava”. Mothers provide the love, understanding and nurturing for the development of their children 53. According to Kauṭilya, the aim of having wife is to beget sons 54. During the period of Patañjali, there is concept that the birth of a boy will remove all sorrows of the family, which indirectly hinting at the fact that girl children only be get a secondary status. But in the family, mother was entitled to greater esteem than the father 55. It recalls the Manu’s view 56. According to Manusmṛti, the main duties of women were the management
of house and service to the husband. She had no freedom beyond that. Moreover, she permitted neither to recite vedas nor to perform rituals of sacrifices. He believed that the freedom to women would bring sorrow to family. But during the era of Patañjali, women had freedom of movement and they enjoyed the respect of their family members. They were permitted to study Vedas and allow performing rituals of sacrifices. The women enjoyed more rights and better position that what they came to have during the latter period.

2.7. Awareness of health

During this period, the people were more conscious about the good health. There is reference about various types of diseases and its treatment and they find out its causes. Unclean water causes the foot disease and impure curd is the reason for fever – natvālodakam pādarogah, dadhitrapusam pratyakṣo jvarah. They believed that the consumption of ghee would keep them alive for a long period- āyurghṛtam. A disease in connection with childbirth, sometimes, death of mother happens during the birth of first child and prolapsed child from womb also mentioned. Remedy for curing kidney trouble is the rice gruel, and barley water for excretion. The svātantryapāratantryavivakṣānyāya indicates the qualities of a healthy eyes and ears. *idam me aksi suṣṭu paśyati idam me*
2.8. Entertainments

During that period, the people spent their time for entertainments. There is a reference about the performance on the stage and in this performance; not only the show but also the speech of the narrator and the dialogues were equally enjoyed. The illustration of a peacock dancing towards his beloved indicates that women performed the dance. Instrumental music like drum beating was common. Other items of recreations are wrestling, walking and fire display. People were more attracted in wrestling in some villages and there they are the majority. There is habit of walking after meals and the people enjoyed the display of fireworks.

2.9. Dark aspects of social life

No society in any age could be free from bad customs and habits. Desire to grow rich with little efforts, denotes the laziness in that society. Beggary was common among the people as a part of religious custom. But at the same time beggary due to poverty existed. The beggar was not
satisfied with the first alms but was eager to gather more. The dining plates of the südras who were not banished from the residence of Áryāvarta are considered suitable for further use after cleaning and the südras, those banished from the residence of Áryāvarta are not considered acceptable for further use even after ceremonial cleaning. The *devadattahantrhata nyāya* indicates the crime of murder in that society. *āmiśraṇanyāya* or *nīrakṣīranyāya* indicates the presence of cheating. People take off their life while they facing difficult circumstances, consuming poison to put an end to life- *viśabhakṣanamapi kasyacidīpsitam bhavati*.

In short, the social organism referred above was an advanced society with full opportunities for entertainments, freedom and in general, the people were religious outlook.

2.10. Nyāyas on society

2.10.1. ABHIRŪPAKANYĀDĀNANYĀYA

'gave daughter to the most deserving'

'tadyatha loke-abhirūpāyodakamāneyam, abhirūpāya kanyā deyeti / na cānabhirūpe pravr̥ttirasti / tatrābhirūpatamāyeti gamyate / evemihāpi sādhakam karaṇamityucyate / sarvāni ca kārakāni sādhakāni / na cāsādhake pravr̥ttirasti / tatra sādhakatamamiti vijñāsyate'
While interpreting the sūtra ‘sādhakatamam karaṇam’ P.1.4.42, Patañjali discusses the purpose of the suffix *tamap*. To justify the addition of *tamap* he quotes the example *dhanuṣā vidhyati*-he pierces with a bow. Here the two designations *apādāna* and *karaṇa* become applicable to *dhanus*. If *tamap* is not added to *sādhaka*, the *karaṇa samjñā* being unspecific—any *kāraka* is *sādhaka*, would over ruled by *apādāna samjñā*. That is why the suffix *tamap* is required. But *sādhaka* means *sādhakatama*, even if *tamap* is not added. If all *kāraka*-s are *sādhaka*, the special mention of the word *sādhaka* will acquire an emphatic value. In support of this argument, Bhāṣyakāra explains this nyāya. In daily life we have the usages *abhirūpāyodakamāneyam*-water should be brought for the deserving one, and *abhirūpāya kanyā deyā*-the girl should be given to deserving one. But nobody thinks of giving water or his daughter to an undeserving candidate. Here the word *abhirūpa* is understood in the sense of *abhirūpatama* that is for the most deserving one. In the same way, since the *kāraka*-s are naturally effective means, the question of ineffective means does not arise. Therefore, the statement ‘*sādhaka* acquires an emphatic value’ will be understood in the sense of *sādhakatama*- the most effective means. To get this sense the use of *tamap* is not required.

But later Patañjali states that the suffix *tamap* is purposeful. Since Pāṇini uses the superlative suffix, he indicates that in the *kāraka*
designations words are not used to express a sense in a degree higher than normal.

2.10.2. ABHYARHITANYĀYA

‘the more worthy should come first’.

‘abhyaṛhitam ca pūrvam nipatati vaktavyam / mātāpitarau / śraddhāmedhe’

In order to illustrate the position of words in a dvandva compound, Patañjali uses this nyāya in the rule ‘alpactaram’ P 2.2.34. It means that in auspicious occasions or in functions, the priorities are given to some persons since they are noble. Like this nyāya in a dvandva compound, the word standing for the thing which is abyarhita, highly valued, in comparison with another thing takes the first place.

Using this nyāya Patañjali answered that, the words mātā and śraddhā comes first in the compound mātāpitarau and śraddhāmedhe. Mother is more regarded than the Father is, because she bears the foetus etc, and the belief is more valued than the intellect because when belief is found, intellect becomes operative for purposive action. So the valuable things come first in the dvandva compound. Śāyaṇa also uses this nyāya in the introduction of the commentary in the Rgveda is as follows;
“ṛgvedasya prādhānyena sarvartrāmnātattvād abhyarhitam pūrvamiti
nyāyenābhyarhitatvāt tatvyākhyānamādau yuktam”.

2.10.3. ADHVAGAMANANYĀYA

‘the maxim of travelling on the path’

‘tameva adhvānam kaścidāśu gacchati, kaścit ciratareṇa, kaścit
ciratamena / rathika āśu gacchati / āśvikaścireṇa padātiściratareṇa
śiśuściratamena74/’

Because of difference in the duration of pronunciation, if
taparakaṇa is done in drutāvṛtti, there is needed to read it in madhyamā
and vilambitā. If it is similarly done in madhyamā, there is need to read it
in drutā and vilambitā and if it is similarly done in vilambitā, there is need
to read it in drutā and madhyamā. The duration of the pronunciation of
varṇa-s in madhyamāvṛtti is one-third of that in drutāvṛtti and that in
vilambitāvṛtti is one and one-third of that in madhyamāvṛtti. But varṇa-s
are niyatakāla in drutā, madhyamā and vilambitā. vṛtti-s play an additional
part on account of the quick and slow pronunciation of the speaker.

Here Bhāṣyakāra uses the adhvaganmananyāya, and says that one
speaker is quick in speech, i.e. pronounces sounds quickly, another is slow,
and another is very slow. This is like one travelling in the same path, one
goes fast, one slowly, and one very slowly, the charioteer goes fast, equestrian slowly and foot soldier very slowly. Duration of time during the process of pronunciation depends upon the nature of the speaker. In the same way some utter the same akāra fastly, some utter slowly, and some utter very slowly.

2.10.4. ALPENA YATNENA BHUYO’RTHĀKĀNKŚĀ NYĀYA

‘the law of the biggest profit in return for a small effort’

‘iha hi sarve manusyā alpena yatnena mahato’rthānākānkśanti /
ekena māseṇa śatasaahasram / ekena kuddālakena khārīsahasram / tatra
karmadhārayaprayapṛtibhirvatvarthīyairabhidhānamastu bahuvrīhiṇeti,
bahuvrīhinā bhaviṣyati laghutvāt’

In the bhasya of the sūtra ‘varṇo varṇena’ P.2.1.69, Bhāsyakāra quotes an iṣṭi-sāmāṇādhikaranasamāsād bahuvrīhiriṣṭāḥ kadācit
karmadhārayah sarvadhanādyarthah, which means that a bahuvrīhi is desired instead of a sāmāṇādhikarana compound, but sometimes a
karmadhāraya is desired instead of a bahuvrīhi to account for the forms
sarvadhana etc. A bahuvrīhi conveys anyapadārtha, i.e. possession, in
addition to svapadārtha. To convey the combination of svapadārtha and
anyapadārtha, one way is a bahuvrīhi compound and the other is
Karmadhārāya compound (svapadārtha) + a taddhita suffix in the sense of possession (anyapadārtha). In viṟapurūṣako grāmaḥ- a village having heroic men, both the karmadhārāya compound and bahuvṛihi compound are simultaneously applicable. But sometimes a karmadhārāya is formed instead of a bahuvṛihi in order to account for the forms sarvadhanī-who possess all goods, sarvabjī-who possess all kinds of seeds etc. The meaning should be denoted by matvarthīya suffixes, whose stem is a karmadhārāya.

To establish the prevalence of the bahuvṛihi over the karmadhārāya, Patañjali illustrates this nyāya. In this world, all people expect big profits from a small effort. For instance, by investing one māṣa, they expect a profit of one lakh māṣa-s. From one stroke of the pickaxe, they expect a profit of one thousand khāri-s. In śāstra also it is easier to convey the meaning svapadārtha + anyapadārtha in one step by a bahuvṛihi, than in two steps, by a karmadhārāya and a subsequent taddhita formation for economy of expression.

2.10.5. ĀMĪṢRAṆANYĀYA

'maxim of mixture of milk and water cannot be distinguished'
While describing the sūtra ‘tasyādita udāttamardhahrasvam’ P.1.2.32, Patañjali says, the āmiśraṇanyāya that it is very difficult to distinguish which part is udāṭta and anudāṭta since the svarita accent is mixed with udāṭta and anudāṭta.

It is not known in a mixture of milk and water that how much is milk and how much is water and in which portion it is milk, and in which portion it is water. Likewise, in svarita it is not known how much is udāṭta, how much is anudāṭta, which portion is udāṭta and which portion is anudāṭta. To solve this doubt Ācārya Pāṇini has stated like a friend that in a svarita accent, the first half portion is to be understood to have the udāṭta accent and the remaining half will be anudāṭta. If a short vowel is svarita, its mātra being one, half will be udāṭta and the other half anudāṭta. If a long vowel, whose mātra-s will two be svarita, the half will be udāṭta, the remaining 1½ will be anudāṭta. If pluta vowel will be svarita, the first half measure will be udāṭta and the remaining 2½ will be anudāṭta.
2.10.6. ĀMRĀN PRĀṬAH KOVIDĀRĀṆĀCAŚTE NYĀVA

‘asking about the mango tree, answer is about kovidāra tree’.

‘anyādbhavān prāto’nyadācaśte/ āmrān prāṭah kovidārānācaśte/ arthavattā nopapadyate kevalenāvacanāditi bhavānāsmābhiścóditāh kevalasyāprayoge hetumāh’?

Bhāṣyakāra states this nyāya under the rule ‘arthavadaddhāturapratyayāḥ prātipadikam’ P.1.2.45. The pratyaya and the prakṛti alone have no meaning. The stem and suffix are related to each other having a meaning. Because of the incapacity to denote anything by itself, the bare stem vrksa have no meaning. Then, why the word arthavatvam in the sūtra? Since the stem is perpetually related to the pratyaya, the stem alone can never be used. Here Patañjali mentions the āmrān prāṭah kovidārānācaśte nyāya and says that, the question is about one thing but the answer is about another thing. Asking about the Mango tree, the reply is about the Kovidāra tree. Whatever the question, the answer should be accordingly. By asking the question that why the word arthavatva needed in the sūtra, his reply is the stem and suffix are used together alone.
2.10.7. ANDHAPARAMPARĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of continuous series of blind men’.

‘katham punaridamācāryena pāṇinināvagatamete sādhavaḥ iti?
āpiśalena pūrvavyākaranena / āpiśalinā tarhi kenāvagatam? tatah pūrvena
vyākaranena / yadyevam, andhaparamparāprasangah, tadyathā tathā
śuklam kṣīramityandhenokte, kenedamavagatamiti prṣṭo yadāndhāntaram
mūlam nirdiṣati, so’pyandhāntaram, tadā naitadvacaḥ šauklye pramāṇam
bhavati, tādrgetad’79/

Haradatta, the author of Padamājari, uses the andhapramparānyaya, while he interpreting the sūtra ‘atha śabdānuśāsanam’. While saying śabdānām anuśāsanam, the śabda means the anuśasana of correct words. How Pāṇini can understand the anuśāsana of each word? He learned the śabda-s from Āpiśali’s vyākaraṇa and Āpiśali learned it from his ancestor and so on. This is like the andhaparamparānyāya, i.e. one blind led another, he led another and so on, and it is string of blind. One blind says milk is white. How he gets it, who said it to him, another blind, he got it from another. If says, Pāṇini get the knowledge of correct words from his ancestor, it is same as the andhaparamparānyāya.
Haradatta cleared this doubts. Acārya says the correct words those that are seen and understood when they are in use in each era, understanding the word gau is different from gavi, goni etc. that is in use in his era, the word gau is treated as correct word. There are thousands of such words in use in Veda-s, Vedāṅga-s etc. Therefore, here is no defect of andhāparampara.

In Mundakopaniṣat, this nyāya is says like this;

\textit{\textquoteleft avidyāyāmantare vidyamānāḥ svayam dhīrāḥ panditammanyamānāḥ /}

\textit{janighanyamānāḥ pariyānti mūḍhāḥ andhenaiva niyamānāḥ yathāṃdhāḥ\textsuperscript{80} //}

This idea is expressed in Vākyapadiya\textsuperscript{81} and in other works also.

\textbf{2.10.8. ANUDARĀ KANYĀ NYĀYA}

\textit{\textquoteleft no belly girl\textquoteright}

\textit{\textquoteleft katham punah sato nāmāvivaksā syāt? sato\textquoteright pyavivaksā bhavati / tadhyathā-alomikaidakā, anudarā kanyeti / asataśca vivaksā bhavati / samudraḥ kuṇḍikā / vindhyo vardhitakam iti\textsuperscript{82}/}
The word *dhruva* in the sūtra ‘*dhruvamapāye apādānam*’ P.1.4.24, means a fixed point. So the designation *apādāna* cannot apply the objects which are in motion. But in the examples like *trastāt aśvāt patitah*, the designation *apādāna* is to be applied is itself in motion. It is justified by saying that the speaker does not intend the instability (*adhrauvya*) of the horse. The word *aśva* in its conventional meaning does not speak of movement. It denotes the generic feature, horiness in a horse that is quick movement. That is *dhruva* (fixed) what the speaker wants to express. So the ablative case suffix after the word *aśva* is not used to express the movement of the horse, but it is used to indicate stationary character of the horse with regard to another movement. But how to say that *adhrauvya* is not intended by the speaker when movement forms part of the lexical meaning itself in the case of *dāvatah patitah*. To remove this difficulty Patañjali explains the *anudarā kanyā nyāya*. It all depends on what the speaker wants to express. The objects referred to by him are one thing and his way of presenting them is something else. For example, it may say that *alomikā edakā* -a sheep has no wool, even if, it has some wool and *anudarā kanyā* - a no-belly girl, even if she has belly. Here the speaker does not intend the existence (*avivaksita*) of the wool and belly. Similarly in *dāvatah patitah* the speaker doesn’t want to express the object that referred to is in rapid motion, but wants to express is that the object is
relatively stationary, in relation to the action of falling. This he indicates by adding the ablative case ending after dhāvat.

### 2.10.9. AVIRAVIKANYĀYA / AVYAVIKANYĀYA

‘maxim of the words avi and avika’

‘dvayoḥ śabdayoḥ samanārthakayorekena vigraho’parasmdaduttpattirbhavisyatavyavika nyāyena / tadyathā avermāmsamiti vigrhyā avikaśabdāduttpattirbhavati āvikam iti / evam pāncasu kapāleşu samskṛtah iti vigrhyā pāncakapāḷah iti bhavisyati / pāncakapālyām samskṛtah iti vigrhyā vākyameva / ihāśmābhistraiśabdam sādhyam- pāncasu kapāleşu samskṛtah, pāncakapālyām samskṛtah, pāncakapāḷah iti’

This nyāya is used by Patañjali while he interpreting the sūtra ‘dvigor lukanapatye’ P.4.1.88. The two words avi and avika are equal meaning, i.e. sheep. The taddhita affix ka denotes svārtha (base meaning), occurs after nominal stem avi (sheep) forms the word avika (sheep). But the compound āvika has different analysis in the sense of the flesh of a sheep. The analysis from the word ‘avi’ is avermāmsam, and from the word ‘avika’ the analysis is avikasya māmsam, but the compound word from the two different analyses of the word avi and avika is one and same, i.e āvika. āvika formed from the word avika and not form the compound āvam from
avi. Here, analysis is formed from the one of the word avī of two words, which has equal meaning, and the compound is formed from the second one word avika. This is aviravika nyāya.

The compound pañcakapālāḥ-ritual oblation of food prepared in five bowels, has two analyses. pañcasu kapālesu samskṛtaḥ and pañcakapālyāṁ samskṛtaḥ. Here according to aviravika nyāya, we take the analysis pañcasu kapālesu samskṛtaḥ and the an occurs by the rule 'samskṛtam bhaksāḥ' P.4.2.16 and then the deletion occurs by the rule 'dvigorluganapatye' and gets the form pañcakapālāḥ. But the an does not occur in the other analysis pañcakapālyāṁ samskṛtaḥ. So we get the same compound pañcakapālāḥ from the two analyses, pañcasu kapālesu samskṛtaḥ and pañcakapālyāṁ samskṛtaḥ. To establish this Patañjali uses this nyāya.

2.10.10. BHERYĀGHĀTANYĀYA

'like the beater of a drum'

'evam tarhi spoṭah śabdah / dhvaniḥ Šabdagnah katham? bheryāghātavat / tad yathā bheryāghātah bherīmāhataḥ kaścit vimśati padāni gacchati, kaścit trimśat, kaścit catvārimsat / spoṭastāvāneva bhavati'\(^\text{84}\)
In the sūtra ‘taparastatkālasya’ P.1.1.70, it accepts tatkāla and differentiates the different kāla-s. If so, taparakarana being made in either drutāvṛtti, madhyamāvṛtti or in vilambitāvṛtti, it will accept only that vṛtti, not accept others. It is cleared by saying that varṇa-s are niyatakāla, but vṛtti-s are based upon the quick or slow pronunciation of the speaker. For example, someone goes fast, someone slowly and someone very slowly. Here the way is niyata. Likewise, the varṇa-s are also niyata. This argument is not correct, because the path is the adhikaranā to the act of travelling. There is no change to adhikaranā, change is only to kāla. But in the case of varṇa, drutā, madhyamā, vilambitā are the vṛtti-s of varṇa, not adhikaranā. Here Bhāsyakāra uses the bheryāghāta nyāya in reply to the statement of adhvagamana nyāya is not suitable.

He says that spota is the śabda and dhvani is the vyāñjaka of śabda, like the beater of a drum, that is if one beat a drum, the sound goes twenty steps, if another beat; it goes thirty steps, and another forty steps. Here the beat is same. The increase is due to the sound produced by beating. But the variations are its quality with reference to the śabda-s, there are dhvani and spota. Of these, dhvani alone is cognizable to the sense of hearing. It is short, it is long, and it is, by nature, both short and long at the hands of some. So drutā, madhyamā, vilambitā are the vṛtti-s, which are derived from dhvani, the guṇa of śabda.
In Vākyapadiya, it is read like this,

“spōtasyaabhinnakālasya dhvanikālānupātinaḥ /

grahaṇopādhibhedena vṛttibhedam pracaksate //

svabhāvānityatve hrasvadīrghaplutādiṣu /

prākrtyasya dhvaneh kālah śabdasyetyupacaryate //

śabdasyordhvamabhivyaktevṛttibhetam tu vaikṛtah /

dhvanayah samupohante spōtātmā tairna bhidyate //

2.10.11. BHIKṢUKABHIKṢĀNYĀYA /AJAHATSVĀRTHĀNYĀYA

‘The mendicant does not give up the second alms when he already gets the first one’.

‘yuktam punaridam yadajahatsvārthā nāma vṛttih syāt? bāḍham yuktam/ evam hi drṣyate loke – bhikṣuko’yam dvitiyām bhikṣām samāsādyā pūrvām na jahāti / samcayāyaiva pravartate’

In the compound rājapurusah (king-man), is it proper that integration should be called ajahatsvārthā-integration in which the constituents retain their own meaning. This doubt raised while interpreting the sūtra ‘samarthāḥ padavidih’ P.2.1.1. Patañjali answered this question by taking
the bhikṣukabhikṣā nyāya. It is proper, because, the mendicant does not give up previous alms when he gets alms for the second time. His mind is always thinking about storing foods. It is observed in daily life. If we take the vṛtti, ajahatsvārthā, the result would be duel number since both constituents retain their own meaning. Here the case-ending is to be employed after the word rājapurusah taken as a whole. And by the whole a special meaning, characterized by singular number is conveyed to which the constituents render assistance. Therefore, the singular is used based on the number of constituents, which are merely subordinate to the whole. Hence, there is no question of employing case-endings on account of the number of constituents.

2.10.12. BRĀHMAṆA ĀṆĪYANTĀM NYĀYA

‘The maxim of bring Brāhmiṇs to the dining hall of Devadatta’.

‘matubapi matvarthe vartate/ tadyathā-devadattaśālāyām brāhmaṇa āṇīyantāṁityukte yadi devadattopi brāhmaṇo bhavati, sopyāṇīyate’

The rule ‘tasau matvarthe’ P.1.4.19, means a form, which terminates in ‘t’ or ‘s’ is termed bham when an affix denoting the sense of matup follows. Patañjali uses this nyāya while he discussing the question, for what purpose the word artha used in the sūtra ‘tasau matvarthe’. If the
sūtra being ‘tasau matau’, affix matup will only apply to payasvān not to payasvī because in payasvī, according to the sūtra there must be the affix denoting matvarthe. Even though the word artha will mention in the sūtra, there will not get the affix matup, since matup is not equal to the meaning of matup. In reply to this statement “matup is not equal to the meaning of matup”, Bhāṣyakāra interprets the brāhmaṇa ānīyatām nyāya, i.e. if someone says ‘bring brāhmaṇa-s to the dining hall of Devadatta’, Devadatta must be brought to the dining hall since he is a brāhmaṇa. As such matup is also been mentioned when use the word matvarthe.

2.10.13. BRĀHMAṆAGRĀMANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the brāhmin village’

‘aicoscottarabhūyastvāt bhūyasa eva grahaṇāni bhavisyanti / tadyathā-brāhmaṇagrāma anīyatām ittyucyate / tatra cāvarataḥ paṇcakārurkī bhavati’

While refuting the sūtra ‘eca igghrasvādeśe’ P.1.1.48, Bhāṣyakāra used the brāhmaṇagrāmanyāya. In ai and au the second element, ‘i’ and ‘u’ have greater mātrā-s than the other element ‘a’. So the shortening may happened only to ‘i’ and ‘u’ respectively, the ‘a’ does not shortened, because ‘a’ has the lesser mātra- aicoscottarabhūyastvāt. So in the
example sunu (su + nau), due to the sūtra ‘hrasve napumsake prātipadikasya’ when shorten the aukāra in nau, ‘u’ will be shortened, not akāra. Similarly, in the word prarī (pra + rai) ikāra will be shortened, not akāra, when shorten the aikāra in rai, without the sūtra ‘eca igghrasvādeśe’ only ik (i, u) will be shortened. On supporting this view, Bhāṣyakāra quotes the brāhmaṇagrāmanāya. It is said, ‘let brāhmaṇa village come, only comes brāhmaṇas, though there exist five kinds of artisans in the locality, like potter, blacksmith, carpenter, barber and washer man, since there are brāhmaṇas are the majority. Naming is on the basis of majority-prādhānena vyapadeśāḥ bhavanti.

2.10.14. BRĀHMAṆAKŚAṬRIYABHOJANABHĀJANAPARYĀYA NYĀYA

‘brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya cannot eat from a pot at the same time, but in turn’

‘dravye padārthe tu prativyakti lakṣaṇam pravartate ityakṛtārthatvāllakṣaṇayoh paryāyena pravṛttih prāpnoti, yathā- brāhmaṇaṁ kṣatriyādīnāmasahbhujāmekasmin bhāhane bhujikriyāyāṃ paryāyāḥ syāt / tatra jātau padārthe kṛtārthatvād vṛttau prāptāyām vidhyarthamidamārabyate vipratiśedhe sati param kārya bhavatī’
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Jinendrabuddhi shows this nyāya in his nyāsa under the rule ‘vipratisedhe param kāryam’ P.1.4.2. It means that, as there is action, in turn, in the eating of Brāhmaṇa-s and Kṣatriya-s who do not eat from the same pot at the same time. Likewise, in śāstra, when two rules have application in a single context, concurrently, their application is in turn (paryāya). It is like the mentioning of the two masters who order their single servant to accomplish two different things at the same time. The servant of course obeys their commands in turn. If the servant is sent by them to perform some action in two different directions, then he does not perform either of those two actions. For, it will not be possible for him to perform those two actions, concurrently. This conflict will lead him to do actions are in turn. This nyāya is the instances in grammar where actions are performed in turn.

2.10.15. BRĀHMANĀNĀM PŪRVA ANĪYATĀMITYUKTE
SARVAPŪRVA ĀNĪYATE NYĀYA

‘maxim of bringing of first brāhmaṇa to the front’.

‘tadyathā- loke brāhmanānām pūrva āniyatāmityukte sarvapūrva āniyate / evamihāpi sarvapūrvvāyāh kriyāyāh prāpnoti / naiśa doṣaḥ / sarveśāmatra vrajikriyām prati paurvakālyam / snātvā, vrajati, pītvā
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vrajati, bhūktvā vrajatīti / evam ca kṛtvā prayogo'nīyato bhavati / snātvā, bhūktvā pūtvā vrajati / pūtvā, snātvā, bhūktvā vrajatīti 90/

While the word *samānakartrkayoh*, expressed in dual number in the sūtra ‘*samānakartrkayoh pūrvakāle*’ P.3.4.21, affix *ktvā* comes only for two actions; one to be located at a prior time relative to another located at a subsequent time. So the affix *ktvā* will not come to the sentence of more verbs like *snātvā pūtvā bhūktvā datvā vrajati*-having bathed, drunk, eaten, and given he goes. It is expressed here in dual number, since there is no other way. Mention has to be made through some case and some number—says Patañjali. It is as one who is desirous of fish obtains fish with fins and scales since there is no other way. He takes in whatever is necessary and throws away fins and scales. But mention is made in dual number because there is no other way, it cannot take according to the world’s experience. Here Patañjali uses this nyāya and says that, when we say “bring the first one among the brāhmaṇa-S, here bring the brāhmaṇa who is first in front of other brāhmaṇa-S, even if we others have also prior time compared to one among them. As the first brāhmaṇa has prior time, one among the five verbs has prior time i.e. *snātvā*.

But Bhāsyakāra here brings another opinion that the principle action *vrajati* is important than the other four verbs. So the *ktvā* affix is applicable
to all the verbs which are prior to the principle action vrajati in the example snātvā pūtvā bhuktvā datvā vrajati.

Bhartṛhari says about this that,

yathānekamapi ktvāntam tirantasya viśeṣakam /
tathā tirantam tatrāhustirantasya viśeṣakam91 //

2.10.16. BRĀHMANAVASIṢṬHANYĀYA

‘the maxim of brāhmaṇa and Vasiṣṭa’

‘vaidikānām laukikatve’pi prādhānyakhyāpanārtham prthag grahanam, yathā-brāhmaṇa āgatāḥ vasiṣṭopyāgata iti92 /

The maxim of brāhmaṇavasiṣṭa nyāya takes it origin from the fact that as Vasiṣṭa was a brāhmaṇa. The sentence “brāhmaṇa-s have come, Vasiṣṭa has also come”, here denotes, being Vasiṣṭa a brāhmaṇa, the name Vasiṣṭa is used to give importance to him among others.

While interpreting ‘keśāṁ śabdānām, laukikānām vaidikānām ca’ in the sūtra ‘atha śabdānuśāsanam’, Haradatta used the brāhmaṇavasiṣṭa nyāya. Vedic śabda-s are treated as laukika śabda-s, since it is used in the world93. Here the word ‘vaidikānām’ is used separately to denote the importance of ‘vaidika śabda’. It is sameas the brāhmaṇavasiṣṭa nyāya.
2.10.17. DADHITRAPUSAM PRATYAKSO JVARAH NYÅYA.

‘Curd and tin are fever’.

‘antareṇāpi nimittāsabdahā nimittārtho gamyate / tad yathā-dadhitrapusam pratyakso jvarah / jvaranimmittamiti gamyate / nadvalodakam pādarogah / pādaroganimmittamiti gamyate/ āyurgrtam/ āyuso nimittamiti gamyate’

The sūtra ‘dvirvacane ‘ci’ P.1.1.59 means that when an affix beginning with a vowel follows, that is a cause of reduplication, a substitute shall not take the place of preceding vowel, while the reduplication is yet to be made, but the reduplication having been made, the substitution may then take place. If so, this sūtra may be changed as dvirvacananimitte adding the word nimitta because, even without the word nimitta, the meaning of the nimitta is not acquired. Here Patañjali opposes this opinion by introducing the nyāya dadhitrapusam pratyakso jvarah and says that, the meaning of the word nimitta is acquired, even without the word nimitta. According to this, it is said that, curd and tin are immediate fever, which means the curd and tin together is cause of fever. As such water full of reeds is foot disease, it is suggested that it causes foot disease and ghee is longevity of life, it is suggested that it produces longevity of life. Here curd and tin are cause of fever, water full of reeds is cause of foot disease and ghee is cause
of longevity of life. In these examples, the usage of kārya (effect) in cause is expressed through the lakṣanāvṛtti. Therefore, here get the meaning of cause of doubling, without the word nimitta in the rule dvirvacane’ci.

2.10.18. DEVADATTAHANTRHATANYĀYA

‘killing the killer of Devadatta’

‘asiddhavacanāt siddhamiti cet nānyasyāsiddhavacanādanyasya bhāvah / na hyanyasyāsiddhavacanādanyasya prādurbhāvo bhavati / tadatā nahi devadattasya hantari hate devadattasya prādurbhāvo bhavati”\(^{95}\)’

There is a doubt arise in the bhashya of the sutra ‘acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau’ P.1.1.57, that vāyu+os→vāyvoh and adhvaryu+os→adhvaryoh, the ‘u’ of vāyu is replaced by ‘v’ by the rule ‘ikoyanaci’ P. 6.1.77 and hence it become val, the ‘y’ should be elided by the rule ‘lopo vyorvali’ P. 6.1.66. Then the desired form vāyvoh does not get. This undesired deletion of ‘y’ is blocked by resorting to the suspension proposal of asiddhatva as against the treatment of replacement. But this asiddhatva would create problems in conjunctions with the derivation of patu + nīṣ + tā → patvāyā and mṛdu + nīṣ + tā → mṛdvāyā. To clear this matter Patañjali uses this nyāya and says that, the existence of one is not
secured through the *asiddhatva* of another. That is, Devadatta does not come back to life, if one who killed him is killed. In the derivation of *patu* + ṭ + ṛ, the ‘ṛ’ is replaced by ‘y’ by the rule ‘iko *yaṇacī*’ and if the replacement of ‘y’ of ‘ṛ’ is considered suspended, cannot get back the ‘ṛ’ that the ‘y’ replaced, for it has already been killed by replacement in ‘y’. If this killer is killed by its suspension, the ‘ṛ’ cannot back to life. If it cannot come back to life, the ‘v’ replacement of ‘u’ of *patu* and *mrdu* could not be availed then. Since killing the killer of Devadatta does not bring Devadatta back to life, suspension is no answer to the problem. Treating the replacement of ‘ṛ’ in ‘y’ as ‘ṛ’ that it replaced is preferred so that the replacement in ‘v’ of *patu* and *mrdu* could be fulfilled.

2.10.19. DURBALABALAVATVIRODHANYĀYA

‘position of the weak and the strong’.

‘yadyapi vibhratisēdhasabdenedamapi labdhum śakyam tathāpi tādetadārthabodhane’samarthamiti bhāvah kadācilloke durbala-balavatorapi virodhadarśanāt’\(^{96/}\)

Nāgeśa observes this nyāya in the udyota of Mahābhāṣya under the rule ‘*vibhratisēdhe param kāryam*’ P.1.4.2. It has been stated that *vibhratisēdha* is a virodha or opposition of two equals in strength. It is
something different from *virodha*, since, the opposition is also seen between the weaker and stronger individuals. But in śāstra *vipratisedha* is to be interpreted as mutual opposition (*parasparavirodha*) between equals. In *virodha*, one is *antarāṅga* and the other is *bahirāṅga*. *antarāṅga* is stronger and *bahirāṅga* is weaker—*antarāṅgam ca bālīyo bhavati*. Here the *antarāṅga* and *bahirāṅga* are not in equal strength. Therefore, this subject is not come under the sūtra *vipratisedhe param kāryam*. So, the *nitya-anitya, antarāṅga-bahirāṅga, apavāda-utsarga* etc. are the examples of stronger and weaker. Hence, the *vipratisedha* is not come to these examples. But in śāstra, each one of the *nitya, antarāṅga, apavāda* rules are considered more powerful is accord with their order of enumeration here.

2.10.20. EKADEŚAVIKṛTANYĀYA

‘a thing that is changed in one part does not there by become something else’.

‘ekadeśavikrtamanyavad bhavatīti tinigrahaṇena grahaṇam bhaviṣyatī/ tad yadhā-śvā karṇe vā pucche vā chinne śvaiṇa bhavati, nāśvo na gardabha iti’
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Bhāsyakāra introduces this nyāya in the sūtra ‘stānivadādeepo’nalvidhau’ P. 1.1.56. It means that even when modification occurs to a part of an item, that item is treated as what it was. A dog continuous to be a dog, and is not transformed into an ass, though its tail may be cut off, or a man does not become a beast though he may lose one of his fingers. A form receives the same treatment even though it has lose part of itself or undergone some modifications. Consider pacati and pacatu, where pacati a form terminating in ‘ti’, has lost its final ‘i’, and pacatu, again a form terminating in ‘ti’, has had its final ‘i’ replaced by ‘u’.

Rule ‘suptināntam padam’ P.1.4.14 requires that the term pada should be assigned only to those items which end in a sup or tīni. However, pacati ends in ‘ti’ and pacatu ends in ‘tu’. The original ‘ti’ which qualified pacati and pacatu as pada-s has been modified. So the words pacati and pacatu may be taken as tinanta, by the nyāya ekadeśavikṛtmananyavat bhavati. That is the object is the same, though it has undergone slight modification.

2.10.21. KĀKĀDHIKARĀṆATVANYĀYA

‘the maxim of something on which a crow is perched’.

‘anubandho’nyatvakara iti cettanna / kim kāraṇam? lopāt /
lupyate’trānubandhah / lupte’trānubandhe nānyatvam bhavisyati/
tadyathā-kataraddevadattasya grham/ ado yatrāsau kāka iti / utpatite kāke
naṣṭam tadgrham bhavati / evamihāpi lupte’nubandhe naṣṭah pratyayo bhavati/ yadyapi lupyate, jānāti tvasau ‘sānubandhakasya samjñā kṛtā’ iti / tadyathā-itaratrāpi, kataraddevadattasya grham? ado yatрāsau kākaḥ iti, utpāte kāke yadyapi naṣṭam tadgrham bhavati antantaḥ tamuddeśam jānāti iti98/

In the sūtra ‘ktaktavatā niṣṭhā’ P.1.1.26, Bhāṣyakāra uses this nyāya.

After the elision of kakāra in kta stem the ‘ta’ is remained. The words like lotah and gartah are formed from the root ‘lū’ and ‘gr’ respectively, by tan suffix according to the sūtra ‘hasimrgrinā’midamilūdhumvibhyastan’99. From the union of kta stem with the roots ‘lū’ and ‘gr’, the words lūnah, gīrṇah are formed. anubandha is elided in the kta stem. After the anubandha is dropped, how the takāra in the kta is distinguished from another takāra. This is the doubt. In a reply to the enquiry about the house of Devadatta, one said it is this where the crow sits. After the crow is flown, it is not possible to distinguish his house from another. So also, the words cannot be distinguished from others after the anubandha is elided.

Here Bhāṣyakāra answered- though the anubandha is elided, he knows that the samjñā was given which had anubandha. Even the crow has flown, when the crow is there in the house, he recognizes his house. Even if, he is able to understand it, doubt is again arises that ‘ta’ is that
‘kta’ or the ‘na’ in lūnah is that ‘kta’. Likewise, doubt arises in his mind whether this is the house where the crow sits or the other. So a permanent distinguishing mark through the impermanent one is accepted. While the crow is sitting in the house, must be identified a raised platform or a lotus in the house. Likewise should understand the difference of two ‘ta’ śabda-s by accepting a particular k and particular kāla. The ‘ta’ denotes past tense and one of the three kāraka-s, kartr, karma, or bhāva. In lūnah, there is karma and past tense. In lotah there is no kāla and k. On seeing these we can understand that the ‘ta’ in lūnah has niṣṭāsamjñā.

Bhartrhari says this nyāya like this,

‘adhruvena nimittena devadattagṛham yathā /

grhītam grhaśabdena sūdhamevābhiddhīyate’

Sāyana says this nyāya making clearly as-

‘satyam vastu tadākārairāsatyairavadhāryate /

asatyopādhibhiḥ śabdaiḥ satyamevābhiddhīyate’

2.10.22. KANYĀBRAHMACĀRIŅĀU DAṆḍAKANDUKAHASTAU

NYĀYA

‘the girl, and the celibate, a stick and ball in hands’
The rule ‘yadhāsamkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām’ P.1.3.10, which means the equivalents of elements in two sets of equal numbers, is determined based on their order of enumeration. Here a question is raised that, for what purpose this rule formulated since equivalences between enumerated items could be easily determined from this world. For example, in the verse,

vahanti varṣanti nadanti bhānti dyāyanti nrtyanti samāsvasanti /

nadyo ghanā mattagajā vanāntā priyāvīhināḥ śikhināḥ
plavanīgāmāḥ

there are seven verbal forms and seven subjects. Here the verbal forms of the first line are related to their corresponding subjects, namely, vahanti (flow) with nadyāḥ (rivers), varṣanti (rain) with ghanā (clouds), nadanti (roar) with mattagajā (wild elephants), bhānti (glow) with vanāntā (forest-edges), dhāyanti (meditate) with priyāvīhināḥ (separated lovers), nrtyanti (dance) with śikhināḥ (peacocks), samāsvasanti (console) with plavanīgāmāḥ (monkeys) without any difficulty.
For answering this question, Haradatta uses this nyāya. In the world, the sentence *kanyābrahmacārīnau daṇḍakandukahastau*, the order of enumeration is not equivalent. If we use the equivalent enumeration, we will get words as *kanyā daṇḍahastau*-the girl with stick in hand and *brahmacārī kandukahastau*-the celibate with ball in hand. This meaning is not proper. Words such as *kanyā kandukahastau*-the girl with a ball in hand and *brahmacārī daṇḍahastau*-the celibate with a stick in hand would be considered proper. Here the meaning got not through the equivalent enumeration, but is against the rule. Since the equivalences of elements in two sets of equal numbers is determined based on their order of enumeration and just opposite of that can be find in the world, to emphasis the use of equivalent enumeration in śāstra, the rule ‘*yadhāsamkhyam anudeśāḥ samānām*’ is formatted.

2.10.23. KARANĀNUKARANĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of imitation of one’s work’

‘*viṣama upanyāsah / yaścaivam hanti, yaścānuhanti ubhau tau hataḥ/
yāścāpi pibati, yaścānupibati, ubhau tau pibataḥ / yastu khalvevamasau
brāhmaṇam hanti, evamasau surām pibati iti tasyānukurvan snātānulipto
mālyagunākanthaḥ kadalīstambham chindyāt payo vā pibet, na sa manye
patītaḥ syāt*’105 /
Bhāṣyakāra opposes the arguments of the Vārttikakāra regarding the enunciation of ‘I’ for the sake of imitating the word mispronounced on account of incapacity is meaningless, by ‘karaṇānukaraṇanyāya’- imitating one’s work.

‘A man who witnessing another in killing, and he imitates the killing in a particular way, both will incur the sin of killing. Similarly, if a man imitating in drinking wine both of them commit the fault of drinking. But if a man witnessing the killing of brāhmaṇa or drinks the wine, he simply imitating the action of killing or drinking by cutting down a plantain stump or drinks milk after his baths, anoints his body, puts on a garland round his neck, would not incur a downfall.’ But in the sentence brāhmaṇyltaka ityāha, a brāhmaṇa lady pronounced ltaka instead of rtaka and how the imitation of the word ltaka becomes fault? Here the Bhāṣyakāra mention the ‘karaṇānukaraṇanyāya’ and says that the man who only imitating the action of killing and drinking, i.e. Instead of killing the Brāhmaṇa he kills the plantain stump and instead of drinking the wine, he drinks milk. Imitation is only the actions.

Similarly, the imitation of the word that Brāhmaṇa lady says ltaka instead of rtaka by another person is not incorrect. The imitator is saying
same word only, but not uses the incorrect word himself. So the enunciation of ‘l’ is valid.

2.10.24. KUMBHAKĀRAVAIYĀKARANĀKULANYĀYA

‘the maxim of kumbhakāra and vaiyākaraṇa’.

‘tadyathā- ghaṭena kāryam kariṣyan kumbhakārakulam gatvāha – “kuru ghaṭam, kāryamanena kariṣyāmi iti”/ na tadvād śabdān prayuyukṣamāṇo vaiyākaraṇakulam gatvāha- “kuru śabdān, prayokṣya iti”/ tāvatyevārthamupādāya śabdān prayuñjate’

The nityatva of śabda, artha and their relationship is through the world. To strengthen this view, Bhāṣyakāra asks the question-“how is it understood that śabda, artha and sambandha are nitya? Generally, people use words to denote various objects and they never try to prepare them. Just opposite is in the case of anitya objects. There is an effort is made to create them.

For instance, a man who wishes to use a pot, go to the potter’s house and says ‘make a pot to me; I have many usages of it’. But a man who wants to use words, never go to the house of a grammarian and says ‘make some words for me, I shall use them’. Even without going to the house of a grammarian, he manages to convey the desired meaning with his limited
Hence, it is clear that what is made that is anitya, and what is not made that is nitya. Therefore, the sabda, artha and their relationship are nitya, since they cannot be made.

Bhartṛhari says like this;

‘nityāḥ sabdārthasambandhāḥ samāmnātā mahārsibhiḥ /
sūtrānāmanutantrānāṃ bhāsyānām ca pranetrbhiḥ’

2.10.25. LATṬVĀNUKARŚAṆANYĀYA

‘the maxim of catch a small bird from the top of a long bamboo’.

‘sā esa sūtrabhedenā ākāropadesaḥ plutyādyarthah san pratyākhyāyate sāiśā mahato vamśastambāllatṭvānukṛṣyate’

While discussing the purpose of the enunciation of ‘ś’, Patañjali explained the latṭvānukarśananyāya – catch a small bird from the top of a bamboo.

The ākāropadeśa is for the sake of pluta and other operations. pluta get in the word klptaśikha, by the sūtra ‘guroranrto’nantyasyāpye kaikasya prācām’ P.8.2.83. By the rule ‘krpo rolah’ P.7.2.18, krp is changes as klp. The change is brought about by means of the transformation of a phoneme. There is no originalisation taken place. But according to the
ekadeśavikrtanyāya, the klp is to be understood krp. Thus, it creates the difficulty of the prohibition of the pluta in the word klząptaśikhah. To avoid this difficulty the word aravatah should be used instead of anrtaḥ in the sūtra 'guroranrta'nanyasyāpyekaikasya prācām'. If doing so, there will be pluta in the word klząptaśikhah, but will not get pluta in the word hotrkāraḥ. It can be rectified by adding the word hrasvasya and read 'guroraravato hrasvasya instead of guroranrtaḥ. Making changes in the rule 'guroranrtao nanyasyāpyekaikasya prācām' for omitting the vowel 'l' which has already been mentioned in the pratyāhāra for the sake of pluta, is similar to take a small bird from a long bamboo. Thus, it is clear that Bhāṣyakāra accepts the view that the upadeśa of lkāra is not necessary.

2.10.26. MALLAGRĀMANYĀYA

'the maxim of a village of wrestlers'

'yadyapi tatra vrṣabhasyāpi sambhavastathāpi mallagrāmavad bhūyavastvāt strībhirvyapadeśo bhavati' /

While interpreting the sūtra 'grāmyapaśusamghēsvataranesu strī' P.1.2.73, Prātipakāra uses this nyāya. In a village there are many kinds of people living together, but this village is known as the village of wrestlers (mallagrāma), since they are more in number than others in the villages.
Likewise, the group of domesticated animals are going together which consists male animals like bull, buffalo etc. but this group is generally known in the same of female animals since they are more in number. In the world, which one is, more worthy that is known in that name. This factor is also indicates by Pāṇini through the word ‘āmravana’¹¹², i.e., in a mango grove, there may be some other trees, but still people call it a mango grove.

2.10.27. MĀṬHARAKAUNDINYANYĀYA

‘let brāhmaṇa-s be fed, let Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya serve them food’

‘dvirvacane’pi nemau rahau kāryinau dvirvacanasya / kimtarhi?
nimittamimau rahau dvirvacanasya / tadyathā-brāhmaṇā bhofyantām
māṭharakaundinyau pariveviṣṭāmiti / nedānīṁ tau bhuñjāte”¹¹³ /

During a sacrifice (yāga) conducting in a village, at the time of lunch, the sacrificer said, ‘all brāhmaṇa-s may be eaten, and Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya may be served. While he saying so, the Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya exempted from eating food, even if they were brāhmaṇa. They could be eaten with all other brāhmaṇa, if they were not restricted by the word of the priest. There never going on two works at the same time, eating and serving.
The question is that whether the letter ‘r’ is to be used between the letter ‘h’ and ‘y’ or same as in the sūtra ‘hayavaraṭ’. If the letter ‘r’ be mentioned in the sūtra ‘hayavaraṭ’, doubling the letter of ‘r’ will take place by the rule “acorahābhhyām dve” in the word ‘madra ḫrdah’, because the letter ‘r’ is included under the pratyāhāra, ‘yar’.

2.10.28. MĀṬRVATSANYĀYA

‘the maxim of calf and cow’.

‘yeṣāmeva pratyayānāṃ deso niyamyate ta eva niyatadesāḥ syuh / ya idānīmaniyatadesāḥ sa kadācit pūrvah kadācitaparaḥ, kadācinmadye syāt/
tadyatā-māṭurvatsah kadācidagrataḥ kadācitprṣṭataḥ, kadācitpārśvataḥ bhavati’¹¹⁴ /

During the interpretation of the sūtra ‘paraśca’ P.3.1.1, Patañjali remarks the necessity of the word para. The taddhita affix bahuc optionally occurs before a nominal stem by the sūtra ‘vibhāṣā supo bahuc purastātu’ P.5.3.68, and by the sūtra ‘avyayasaranāmnāmakac prākteḥ’ P.5.3.71, the affix akac occurs in the middle. Here it is clear that the remaining affixes are occurring in the end of a stem. Then why the word para mentioned in the sūtra paraśca? To clear this, Patañjali uses the māṭrvatsanyāya. A calf when it walks with its mother, it is sometimes in
front of its mother, sometimes at her back, sometimes at her sides. There is no permanent place or rule to the calf for walking with its mother. As such if the affix bahuc occurs before and affix akac in middle, the rest of the affixes may not be occurred at the end. It may come before, in middle, or at the end of a stem. Therefore, he read the word para in the rule paraśca, to apply the affixes at the end other than bahuc and akac.

2.10.29. NA CĀNTAREṇA PRATIYOGINAM SPARDDHĀ BHAVATI NYĀYA

‘there is no competition without a counterpart’

‘evamapi nāntaranīghaḥ / kathāḥ? sparaddhāyāmātīśāyiko bhavati / na cāntareṇa pratiyoginam sparaddhā bhavati’

In order to explain the priority of bahuvrīhi formation over the addition of ādiśāyika suffixes in the words like, sūkṣmavastarataḥ Patañjali brings this laukikanyāya under the rule ‘varṇo varṇena’ P.2.1.68.

To have the desired form sūkṣmavastarataḥ, the bahuvrīhi must be formed first and the suffix is added after bahuvrīhi. This cannot be established because of the paravipratisedha procedure, the addition of the ādiśāyika suffix should take place first. This would result in the undesired from sūkṣmavastarataḥ. But the word para has another meaning īṣṭa—which is
desired. So the desired thing takes place in case of a conflict and the formation of the bahuvrihi has priority over the addition of ādiśāyikā suffix by 'vipratisedhe param kāryam' P.1.4.2. If we take para means iṣṭa, the reference to paravipratisedha is incorrect because, the ādiśāyikā suffix is antaraniga and bahuvrihi is bahuranīga. ādiśāyikā suffix is antaranīga because, it is added after a prātipadika or feminine forms ending in 'nī' or 'āp' by the rule 'nyāpprātipadikāt' P.4.1.1. But the bahuvrihi formation requires case-inflected words. That is it requires case-suffixes in addition to a prātipadika. Both in the case of antaranīga and bahuranīga, antaranīga takes first. But the ādiśāyikā suffix is not antaranīga because, taddhita is added after a word which is samartha (semantically connected) and the sāmarthya have through a case-inflected word only. Even though the ādiśāyikā suffix is antaranīga, because it only requires the svapadārtha, but the bahuvrīhi is formed in the sense of anyapadārtha. This view is also rejected by saying that the ādiśāyikā suffix is added in the sense of competition, i.e. comparison. Comparison presupposes two items to be compared. No competition without a counterpart. So the bahuvrīhi is formed first and then the ādiśāyikā suffix.
2.10.30. NA HI BHIKSUKĀH SANTĪTI STHĀLOYO NĀDHĪŚRĪANTE
/NA HI MRGĀH SANTĪTI YAVĀ NOPYANTE

‘men do not refrain from setting the cooking pot on the fire because there are beggars, or do not abstain from sowing seed because there are wild animals’

‘na hi doṣāh santiti paribhāṣā na kartavyā lakṣāṇam vā na praneyam / na hi bhiksukāh santiti sthālayo nādhīśrīyante / na ca mṛgāh santiti yavā notyante / doṣāh khalvapi sākalyena pariganitāh prayojanānā- mudāharanamātram / kuta etat? na hi doṣānām lakṣāṇamasī / tasmād yanyetasyāh paribhāṣāyāh prayojanāni tadarthamesā paribhāṣā kartavyā / prativedheyam ca doseṣu’116 /

While the time of interpreting the sūtra ‘krnmejantah’ P.1.1.39, Bhāsyakāra says the merit and demerits of the paribhāṣa, ‘sannipātalakṣāno vidhiranimittam tadvighātasya’117. It means that the rule depending upon the combination of two things never allows another rule to destroy it. This paribhāṣa has more defects than merits, and then there arise a question for what this paribhāṣa is? In reply Patañjali quotes the nyāya – na hi bhiksukāh santīti sthāloyo nādhīśrīyante, na hi mṛgāh santīti yavā nopyante’.
By the sūtra ‘नियय’, rāma + ने became rāma + या by substituting ‘या’ to a stem ending in ‘आ’ in the place of ‘ने’. Here the ‘या’ being taken to be sthānivat to ‘े’ gets also the designation of sup and therefore the final ‘ा’ of the stem rāma is lengthened before ‘या’ by the rule supi ca. Here, there is substituted ‘या’ for the dative ending ‘े’, after a stem ending in ‘ा’. Then short अङ्ग is the cause of this substitute ‘या’. According to the paribhāṣa, it never destroys the short अङ्ग.

The paribhāṣa does not apply here. It is sometimes nitya, and sometimes anitya. Pāṇini himself indicates the anitya nature of this paribhāṣa, by forming the dative of कांता as कांतया in the sūtra कांतया kramaṇe. Even if this paribhāṣa more defects, Bhāṣyakāra emphasis the importance of this paribhāṣa through the nyāya ‘ना हि भिक्षुकाः सनुति sthālyo nādhiśrīyante, ना हि मर्गाः सनुति yavā nopyante’. He says, men do not refrain from cooking because there are beggars or do not abstain from sowing seed because there wild animals since the field is near the forest. There is the need of prevention to defects and accepts the merit. Therefore, according to this nyāya acceptance of the paribhāṣa is suitable.

The content of this nyāya can be seen in Hitopadesa;

‘doṣabhīteṇānārāmbhastatkāpurusalaksanam /

kairajīrṇabhayād bhṛātarbhajanam parihīyate //¹¹⁸
2.10.31. NA HI DVIPUTRA ĀNIYATĀMITYUKTE TRIPUTRA
ĀNIYATE NYĀYA

‘a man who has three sons could not be designated as a man with two
sons.’

‘adviprabṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam/ ihāpi pratiṣeto yathā syāt
samupābhicchādāḥ / tat tarhi adviprabṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam / na
vaktavyam / yatra triprabhṛtayaḥ santi dvāvapi tatra stāḥ/
tatrādvyaupasargasyeyevā siddham / na va esa loke sampratyayaḥ / na hi
dviputra āniyatāmityukte triputra āniyate / tasmāt adviprabṛtyu-
pasargasyeti vaktavyam’

Patañjali mentions this nyāya under the rule
‘chāderghe’dhyupasargasya’ P.6.4.96. The sūtra means that when the
affix gha follows, the root chādi is shortening to chada, when there are not
two upasarga-s for example- pracchada and dantacchada. However, in the
example, samupacchāda, it is not shortening because; there are two
upasarga-s. Nevertheless, the root vowel has not shortened in the example,
samupābhicchāda, since there were more than two upasarga-s like sam, ap,
and abhi. So the sūtra should read like this; chāderghe’dhyupra-
bhṛtyupasargasya using addhyuprabhṛtyupasargasya instead of
addhyupasargasya. But there is no need to change the sūtra as
addhyuprabhrtyupasargasya, because if we read addhyupasargasya, it means only that are not two upasarga-s, and not to intend that there were more than two upasarga-s, which means there is one upasarga or more than two upasarga-s. So the term addhyupasargasya means that when there is only one upasarga there occur the shortening of the root chad, and not occur shortening when there is two, three or more upasarga-s. Here Patañjali uses the nyāya and says that if an order were given to bring the father of two sons, it would not do to bring one who had three. Therefore, if we read the word addhyuprabhrtyupasargasya instead of addhyupasargasya in the rule chāderge'ddhyupasargasya, we will get the form samupābhicchādah.

2.10.32. NAṢṬĀŚVADAGDHARATHANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the lost horses and burnt chariot’.

‘athavā naṣṭāśvadagdharathavat sampratyayo bhavati / tadyathā-
tavāśvō naṣṭah, mamāpi ratho dagdhah, ubhau samprayujyāvahai iti, evamihāpi tavāpyantaratamā prakṛtirnāsti, mamāpyantaratama ādeśo nāsti, astu nau samprayoga iti’120 /

The ‘naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāya’ is based on a story that two persons in a village went out in their own respective chariots. On the way,
the horse of one person lost and another's chariot burnt accidently. By mutual agreement, the chariot is ready to move with other person's horse and they returned to their village. Bhāṣyakāra explains this nyāya while he interpreting the sūtra ‘sthāne’ntaratamah’ P.1.1.50. The close association of vowels can be seen in śāstra. ā, ai, au are vrddhisamjñā and a, e, o are guṇasamjñā. Here the place of the letter ‘e’ is gutturo-palatals (kaṇṭhatālu) and prayatna is vivṛta and the place of the letter ‘i’ is palatal (tālu) and vivṛta prayatna. So ‘i’ is the proximate sthānin of ‘e’ and ‘ai’. Similarly, ‘o’ and ‘au’ have the place at gutturo-labials (kaṇṭhoṣṭya) and the prayatna vivṛta and its proximate sthāni is ‘u’ because it has the place at labials and vivṛtaprayatna.

But the letters ‘a’ and ‘ā’ have place gutturals and the letter ‘r’ has the place at cerebrals. Here the sthānin and the ādeśa have no nearness in the organ of speech. There is no similar sthānin to ‘r’ and there is no similar ādeśa to ‘a’ and ‘ā’. So both associated together by the ‘naṣṭāśvadagdharaḥanyāya’. Then there comes ar and ār in place of ‘r’.

The ‘paṅgvandhanyāya’ of the Sānikhya Philosophy is same as this nyāya;

‘puruṣasya darśanārtham kaivalyārtham tathā pradhānasya /
paṅgvandhavadubhayorapi samyogastaktṛtah sargah’ //¹²¹
2.10.33. NĀṬABHĀRYĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of an actor and actress’.

‘vyanjanāni punarnāṭabhāryāvats bhavanti / tad yathā-nāṭanām striyo
gagatā yo yah prcchati kasya yīyam iti tam tava taveyāhuḥ / evam
vyanjanānyapi yasya yasyācāḥ kāryamucyate tam tam bhajante’

Patañjali uses this nyāya during he describes the state of consonants in
the rule ‘ajāderdvitiyasya’ P.6.1.2. Consonants are depending up on the
vowels. A consonant that relates to a particular vowel is like a heroine of
an actor. On a theoretical stage, actor asks the actress, whose wife she is,
and in reply she says that his wife. With whom she acts, she will become
his wife. If she acts with another person in another occasion, she will
become wife of that person. As such the consonants are associated with a
vowel that to which vowel the consonants are related. For example in the
words like āta, ātatuḥ, ātuh, when doubling the first one vowel akāra, the
word at will become doubling, due to the association of the consonant
takāra with akāra. Likewise in the example, atiṣatī, the word tis will
become doubling by the association of takāra of at with is, when the
doubling of the second one vowel ‘is’.
2.10.34. NIRLUṬHITAGARBHANYĀYA

‘a child that has gone out of the womb’

‘kā punah kriyā? īhā / kā punarihā? ceṣṭā / kā punaṣceṣṭā?
vyāpārah / sarvātha bhavān sabdaiheva sabdānācaṣte, na kinjitarthajātam
nidarśayati evamjātiyatā kriyeti / kriyā nāmeyatvāṃtāparidṛṣṭā’ṣakyā
pindibhūtā nidarśayitum, yathā-garbhā nirluṭhitah’¹²³ /

niruluṭhitagarbhanyāya is used to clear the meaning of the word kriyā
in the vārttika kriyāvacane dhātuḥ under the sūtra ‘bhuvādayo dhātavah’
P.1.3.1. dhātus is defined to be that which denotes kriyā, then what is kriyā,
the answer is īhā. Then what is īhā, ceṣṭā, then what is ceṣṭā, action. These
answers are not fair to the question what is kriyā. Because here explain
words and do not show any object telling kriyā is like this. kriyā cannot be
shown as a mass, because it is not cognizable through other pramāṇa-s.
Here Patañjali uses the niruluṭhitagarbhanyāya and says that, it is not like a
child that has gone out of the womb, kriyā can be understood only through
anumāṇa.

This anumāṇa is like this. When all the requisites are ready, there is
sometimes a chance to say pacati and sometimes not. That is, evidently the
kriyā, in the presence of which there is a chance to say pacati. Or it is
definitely the *kriyā* by which Devadatta having been here is now at Pāṭalīputra.

2.10.35. **PHALAVYATIREKANYĀYA**

‘discrepancy in getting the fruit will be the result’

‘vyatireko’pi vai *lakṣyate drṣyate hi kṛtaprayātnāścāpravīṇāḥ, akṛtaprayātnāśca pravīṇāḥ’¹²⁴)

This nyāya is used when arise a doubt that does merit accrue from the knowledge of correct words or from the use of correct words. If merit lies in the use of words, it seems that those who have worked in grammar and those who have not worked get merit. Therefore, the effort made by the grammarian for knowing correct words will be fruitless. Here Patañjali explains the *phalavyatirekanyāya*. Sometimes people who have made efforts are seen to be not clever in using words, while sometimes people are seen very clever in use of words without having made much effort for the study of words. In these cases, there is the reversal of the fruits. That is there will be fruit without effort and effort bearing no fruit.
2.10.36. PITĀPUTRAVATNYĀYA

‘same person is father and son’

‘yadi tārhi sāmānyamapi viśeṣo viśeṣo’pi sāmānyam, sāmānyaviśeṣau
na parkalpete / prakalpete ca / katham? vivakṣātah / pitā putravat /
tadyathā sa eva kañcit prati pitā bhavati, kañcitprati putro bhavati /
evamihāpi sa eva kañcitprati sāmānyam kañcitprati viśeṣah’¹²⁵ /

In the bhāṣya of the sūtras ‘tasminniti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya’ P.1.1.66, ‘tasmādityuttarasya’ P.1.1.67, while Patañjali describes the definition of sāmānya and viśeṣa, he asks, if sāmānya become viśeṣa and viśeṣa become sāmānya, will there come the irregularity? Cow is sāmānya and a black one is viśeṣa to one. Black is sāmānya and cow is viśeṣa to another. Then it is not possible to decide whether one denotes sāmānya or viśeṣa. But it is depended on the intention of the speaker, i.e., if it is his desire that cow should denote sāmānya and black should denote viśeṣa, cow is sāmānya and black is viśeṣa. On the other hand, if it is his intention that black should denote sāmānya and cow viśeṣa, black is sāmānya and cow is viśeṣa. He describes another interpretation to the above problem by using pitāputravatnyāya. The same person is father to one and son to another. So also the samething may be considered sāmānya with reference to one and viśeṣa with reference to another.
During the discussion of āgama (the study of Veda), which is one of the five advantages of learning grammar, Patañjali uses this nyāya. It is a meaningless effort that, an effort made for an unnecessary one. At the same time if topic is an important one, the effort made for that bears a desired fruit.

For knowing the actual meaning of the Vedic hymns it is essential to study the six auxiliaries of Veda-śikṣā (phonetics), vyākaraṇam (grammar), chandah (prosody), niruktam (Vedic interpretation), jyotisam (astronomy) and kalpaḥ (the made-easies for the performance of rituals). Of these six vedāṅgā-s, grammar is important. The grammar analyses the words in to prakṛti and pratyaya, and helps to study the knowledge of meaning. Without the grammar, there is no knowledge of meaning. So using this
nyāya Patañjali says that effort made for the important thing bears a good fruit.

2.10.38. PRADĪPANYĀYA

‘a bright shining lamp lighten the whole house’

‘adhiṅkāra nāma triprakārah / kaścidekadesaśasthāḥ sarvam
śāstramabhijvalayati / yathā pradīpah suprajvalithāḥ sarvam
veśmābhijvalayati’

While commenting the śūtra ‘śaṣṭhi sthāneyogā’ P.1.1.49, the three kinds of adhiṅkāra128 are viewed. In the yathoddeśapakṣa, the samjñāsūtra-s are standing in its own places of an implication. vidhisūtra-s will be associated with the samjñāsūtra-s. But how can one samjñāsūtra associated with many vidhisūtra-s? To answer this, Patañjali refers to the pradīpanyāya- just as a bright shining lamp illuminates the whole house, the samjñāsūtra associates with all vidhisūtra-s by standing in one place.

śāsah is avayavaśaṣṭi and upadhāyāḥ is sthānaśaṣṭi in the śūtra ‘śāsa idaṅg haloh’ P.6.4.34. It means antya and upadhā of śas will be replaced by ikāra. The root śas being the avayavaśaṣṭi, the ‘i’ will not come in the place of śas but in the place of upadhā of śas. But in the śūtra ‘śā hau’ P.6.4.35, śāsah is treated as sthānaśaṣṭi for ādeśa śa. The root ‘śā’ will be
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replaced by the ādeśa śā- this sūtra means. Then one and only the sixth case suffix, one place it is sthānaśaṣṭi and in other place it is avayavaśaṣṭi. It happens in the adhikāra because, where it is related to avayava there it is avayavaśaṣṭi adhikāra and where it is related to sthāna, there it is sthānaśaṣṭi.

2.10.39. PRĀŚĀDAVĀSINYĀYA

‘the maxim of a dweller in mansion’

‘mukhagrahaṇam śakyamakartum / kenedānimubhayavacanānāṁ bhavisyati / prāśādavāsinyāyena / tadyathā-kecit prāśādavāsinah, kecit bhūmivāsinah, kecidubhayavāsinah / tatra ye prāśādivāsino grhyante te prāśādavāsigrahaṇena / ye bhūmivāsino grhyante te bhūmivāsigrahaṇena / ye tūbhayavāsino grhyanta eva te prāśādavāsigrahaṇena bhūmivāsigrahaṇena ca/ evamihāpi kecinmukhavacanāh, kecinnāsikāvacanāh, kecitur bhayavacanāh'129/

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘mukhanāsikāvacano’nunāsikāh’ P.1.1.8, Patañjali used the prāśādavāsinyāya. This is a very famous nyāya. The sound whose place of articulation is mukha and nāsikā is called anunāsikāḥ. Therefore, in this sūtra, mukha and nāsikā are essential. If the sūtra is read without the word mukha, it is nāsikāvacano’nunāsikāḥ and the designation
will reach only \( yama \) and \( anusvāra \). If the sūtra is ‘\( mukhavacano'nunāsikah \)’, omitting the word \( nāsikā \), the designation will be liable to reach \( k, c, t, t, p \) etc. and not \( anusvāra \) and \( yama \). In this situation, Bhāṣyakāra says that, through the \( prāsādavāsinyāya \), it is possible to manage without the word \( mukha \) in the sūtra, though the designation \( anunāsikah \) is the place of articulation in both \( mukha \) and \( nāsikā \).

Some are residing in upper floor, some are residing in ground floor and some are in both. One who resides in upper floor is designated as \( prāsādavāsi \), and in ground floor as \( bhūvāsi \) and reside in both is called \( prāsādavāsi \) and \( bhūvāsi \). The resident of the upper floor is identified, if the word \( prāsādavāsi \) is mentioned. If the word \( bhūvāsi \) is mentioned, the resident of the ground floor will be identified. Those who reside in both will be identified, both when the word \( prāsādavāsi \) is mentioned and when the word \( bhūvāsi \) is mentioned. Similarly, in the Vyākaraṇaśāstra the mouth sounds come into operation when the word \( mukha \) is mentioned. The nasal sounds come into operation when the word \( nāsikā \) is mentioned and both come into operation either the word \( mukha \) or \( nāsikā \) is mentioned. Then we conclude that the word \( mukha \) is not essential in the sūtra ‘\( mukhanāsikāvacano'nunāsikah \)’.
2.10.40. PRATINIDHINYĀYA

‘the substitution of one material for another in a sacrifice’

‘yathā laukikeṣu vaidikeṣu ca kṛtānteṣu abhūtapūrve’pi sthānaśabdavo
vartate/ loke tāvat-upādhyāyasya sthāne śiṣya ityucyate, na ca
tatropādhyāyo bhūtapūrvo bhavati/ vede’pi somasya sthāne
pūtikatṛṇanyabhiṣuṇuyādityucyate ’130/

The Mahābhāṣya states this nyāya under the rule
’sthānivadādeo’nalvidhau’ P.1.1.56. sthānī is that which was and which is
not. ādeśa is that which was not and which is. The definitions of sthānī
and ādeśa are in appropriate with reference to the nityatva of śabdā-s that
the existent has disappeared and the non-existent has appeared. To clear
this, Patañjali explains this nyāya and says that, propriety is established
from the use of the word sthāna with reference to an object that has not
ceased to exist. It is said in the world that “let the pupil take the place of
the teacher”. Here the pupil is coming instead of the teacher not to remove
the teacher. If the teacher does not exist, the pupil could not be in place of
the teacher. In the vedā also- “let the juice be taken from pūṭika in place of
soma” and soma has not ceased to exist there. So the definitions of sthānī
and ādeśa are proper and the nityatva of śabdā-s have not any adverse.
2.10.41. SAMANDHAKāRE PRADĪPANIMITTAM DARŚANAM

‘lamp causes sight in darkness’

‘evam tarhi svābhāvikī nivṛttiḥ / nanu coktam kim naḥ
prayuṣyamānaḥ karotīti / naṁnimittattūpalabdhiḥ / tadyathā-
samandhakāre dravyāṇāṃ samavasthitānāṃ pradīpanimittam darśanam /
na ca teṣām dīpako nivartako bhavati’

In the rule ‘naḥ’ P.2.2.6, Pūrvapakṣin says that if the naḥ removes
the thing itself, then certainly Kings would not keep an army of elephants
and horses and Kings would simply utter the word ‘no’. Then Patañjali
accepted the svābhāvikī nivṛttiḥ. This view holds that removal or absence is
inherent in the nature of things. Thus, the absence of brāhminhood belongs
to the nature of a Kṣatriya. From the use of the word abṛāhmana, we
understood that this word is not a brāhmin, but a kṣatriya etc., who shares
some qualities with a brāhmin. The function of naḥ here is not to remove
brāhminhood as an entity in physical reality, but to bring absence of
brāhminhood, which is a fact of physical reality, to our knowledge. Here
Patañjali explains this nyāya and says that the function of naḥ is comparable
to that of a lamp. The lamp does not itself produce the objects, which it
illuminates, but it merely makes them perceptible. In the same way, naḥ
does not produce absence, but it reveals absence.
2.10.42. SAMBANDHIŚABDANYĀYA

‘relationship through the words’

‘sambandhiśabdairevā tulyametat / tadyathā- sambandhiśabdāh mātari vartitavyam pitari śuṣrūṣitavyam iti / na cocyate svasyām mātari,
vasmin pitari iti / sambandhācca gamyate-yā yasya mātā, yaśca pita iti /
evam ihāpi ātirantya iti sambandhaśabdāvetau / tatra sambandhāt etad gantavyam, yam prati yaḥ ādiḥ antya iti ca bhavati, tasya grahaṇam bhavati, svasya ca rūpasyeti’

On account of the non-mention of samjñi, the meaning of the sūtra ‘ādirantyena saheta’ P.1.1.71, is not understandable. The object samjñi is achieved by reading word tanmadyasya in the sūtra. But we can’t add anything to sūtra. To solve this ambiguity in settlement Bhāsyakāra explains the sambandhiśabdanyaya-it is similar to the words of relationship. sambandhiśabda-s are found in the expressions like, there is the necessity to behave properly towards mother, there is necessity to render service towards father. It is not said there towards one’s mother and towards one’s father. From sambandha it is understood who is whose mother and who is whose father. Here also in this sūtra, it should be understood that there is grahaṇa to that with reference to which one is taken as ādyāvayava and another is taken as antyāvayava and also to itself.
2.10.43. SĀRTHIKAPRATĪŚRAYASAMBANDHANYĀYA

‘There is no mutual relation between travellers who stay over in a lodge and leave early in the morning’.

‘astu tarhyayameva vigraho’rdham tritiyamanayoriti / nanu coktam şaṣṭyartho nopapadyate iti / naiṣa doṣah / idam tāvadayam praṣṭavyah - atheha devadattasya bhrāteti kah şaṣṭyarthah iti ? tatraitat syātekasmāt prādurbhāva iti / etacca vārtam / tad yathā - sārthikānāmekapratīśraye uṣitānām prātarutthāya pratiṣṭhamānānām na kaścit parasparam sambandho bhavati / evanjātīyakam bhrātrvyam nāma / atra ced yuktāḥ şaṣṭyartho drṣyate ihāpi yukto drṣyatām¹³³/.

The Mahābhāṣya mentions this nyāya in connection with the rule ‘ānekamanyapadārthe’ P.2.2.24. What is the meaning and derivation of the compound ardhatrīyāh? The compound is bahuvrīhi and the analysis ardham trīyam eśām- the third of them is half- says Bhāṣyakāra. But this compound meaning is not correct because it is not anyapadārtha. anyapadārtha is one which is not denoted by the parts which form the compound. Then Patañjali gives another analysis ardham trīyam anayoh (the third of these two is half). In this analysis, the anyapadārtha refers to the two items in which the half of the third item is no longer included. But in this analysis, what is the meaning suggested by genitive case? Instead of
answering this question, Patañjali asked another question, what is the meaning of genitive in the expression devadattasya bhrātā (devadatta’s brother)? It is possible to state that the meaning there, is the origin from the same source, which is not valid. Here Patañjali introduces the sārthikapratīṣṭrayasambandha nyāya, and says that, there is absolutely no relationship among travellers who stay at a certain places for the night and go away in different directions at sunrise. The relationship between brothers is of the same nature. He says the genitive has 101 meanings. If the relation in the example, devadattasya bhrātā is sufficient then it will equally justify the genitive in ardham triyam anayoh.

2.10.44. SARVA IME SVABHŪTYARTHAM YATANTE NYĀYA

‘all are working for their own sake’

‘neha kaścit paro’nugrahātavyā iti pravartate / sarva ime svabhūtyartham yatante / ye tāvadete guruśuṣrūṣavo nāma, te’pi svabhūtyarthameva pravartante / pāralaukikam ca no bhaviṣyati / iha ca nah prīto gururadhyāpayisyati iti’134/

In the event of saying, the hetu samjñā is need for the instigator, Patañjali says that, the prayojya-prayojaka bhāva is meaningless by using this nyāya in the bhāṣya of the rule ‘hetumati ca’ P.3.1.26. In this world, no
one is worked for another, but only for the sake of self, which happened not by the inspiration of others. A student who serving his teacher has also selfishness, because he serves his teacher with thought of he will get salvation (mokṣa) through this way of service and the guru will teach him very well. Similar servants are also serving their masters with the thought that, the masters will give them good food, clothes and will not be contempt. Likewise, architect, carpenter etc. also doing their work in the perception that they will get more money and the people will become their friends. In this world, all are working only for their selfishness and not by the inspiration of others. In this sense, it is meaningless that the teacher is treated as an instigator. Hence, the prayojya-prayojaka bhāva is worthless due to the selfishness of whole.

Bhartrhari says about this nyāya like this,

‘nimittēbhHyāḥ pravartante sarva eva svabhūtaye /

abhiprāyānurodhe ’pi svārthasyaiva prasiddhaye’ //

In Tantravārtika it read like this,

“na hi vidhiṣatenāpi tathā puruṣāḥ pravartate yathā lobhena”\(^{136}\).
2.10.45. SIMHO MĀṆAVAKAḤ NYĀYA

‘boy is lion’

‘yathā hi simho māṇavaka iti simhagunā māṇavake āropyante, naivamatra sambhavah prayojanam vāsti, ataḥ pāriśesyāt samjñāsamjñīsambandha eva’¹³⁷/ 

Haradatta mentions this nyāya in the interpretation of the sūtra ‘vrddhirādaic’ P.1.1.1. In the sentence simho māṇavakah, the boy is characterized as lion by lakṣaṇāvṛtti (indication). Here the similarity between the lion and the boy has been reflected or established to propound that the boy is as strong and intelligent as the lion. This nyāya is used here to denote the non-indication of the qualities of vrddhi to ādaic and vice versa in the rule vrddhirādaic. Here the vrddhi is introduced as samjñā (name) and ādaic as samjñī (name bearers). Therefore, there is a relation of samjñāsamjñī between vrddhi and ādaic.

2.10.46. ŚIṢṬĀNUKARAṆANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the imitation of śiṣṭa’.

‘aśiṣṭāpratisiddham ya evamasau hikkati, ya evamasau hasati, ya evamasau kaṇṭhyati it tasyānukurvan hikkecca, hasecca, kaṇṭhyecca naiva tad doṣāya syānābhhyayadyāya / yastu khalvevamasau brāhmaṇam hanti,
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evamasau surām pibati iti tasyānukurvan brāhmaṇam hanyāt surām vā pibati so 'pi manye patitaḥ syāt'138 /

Bhāṣyakāra while discussing the sūtra ‘ṛ/k’ uses the śistānukaranaṇyāya. The vowel ‘l’ is enunciated for the sake of imitating the mispronounced utterance of ‘ṛ’ as ‘l’. The context is the refutation of this second purpose of Ikārōpadeśa.

In the world if a man who imitating another gives away in charity, performs sacrifice and studying in a specific way, both will get merit. In the Vedas, one who imitating the sattrās of visvasṛt sacrifice, he too gets prosperity. One who seeing another is laughing, scratching and hiccupping, and imitating in the same way, his activities is neither advantageous nor harmful. But a man who imitating another, who kills a Brāhmaṇa or drinks wine, he will sure to have his fall due to gross sin.

Vārttikakāra says that, because of incapacity, ṛtaka was mispronounced as ltaka by brāhminwoman and the imitating the mispronounced ltaka by another is improper. One who incurs the sin by killing a brāhmaṇa by imitating another, likewise the imitation of corrupt words will lead them to the sin. Therefore, the enunciation of ‘l’ for the sake of imitating the word mispronounced because of incapacity is in vain.
2.10.47. STHĀLĪPULĀKANYĀYA

‘a single grain of cooked rice is sufficient to judge the pot as a whole’.

‘paryāptam karanādhikaraṇayoh kartṛtvam nidaraśitamapādā-nādīnām kartṛtvantarśanāya / paryāpto hyekaḥ pulākaḥ sthālya
nidarśanāya’\(^{139}\) /

A verb can be used to express the action of the main agent, the adhikaraṇa and karana. For example, devadattah pacati, dronam pacati, edhāh paksyanti. In these examples karma can be added, odanah svayameva pacyate—the rice cooks of itself. Here the karma functions as the agent.

But no examples to show that the apādāna and sampradāna are presented as the agent of an action. We cannot use grāmāh āgacchati in the sense of grāmāt āgacchati (he comes from the village). Since the apādāna and sampradāna cannot be the main agent, we cannot call them ‘k’-s in the literal sense of the word. According to Patañjali each ‘k’ is independent as far as its own, minor action is concerned, and depended on the main agent, in so far the main action is concerned. It all depends how the speaker wants to put it. Therefore, even if we take the term ‘k’ in its literal sense, it remains applicable to any item, which takes part in bringing about the main
action. Then the question arise, why do you say the agent hood of the apādāna etc. is not known to exist-apādānādīnāṃ tu aprasiddhiḥ. To answer this, Patañjali introduces this nyāya and says that, in a cooking pot all the grains being equally moistened by the hot water, when one grain is found to be well cooked, the same may be inferred with regard to other grains. In the same way, the agent hood of the karana and adhikarana, for which an illustration has been given is sufficient to demonstrate the agent hood of the apādāna etc.

2.10.48. SVĀTANTRYAPĀRATANTRYAVIVAKŚANYĀYA

‘organs of sense are sometimes given prominence and sometimes not given prominence’

‘aham bravīmi, āvām brūvaḥ vayam brūmah, imānīndriyāṇi kadācit svātantryena vivakṣitāni bhavanti, tadyathā – idam me aksi suṣṭhu paśyati / ayam me karnaḥ suṣṭhu śrṇoītī / kadācit paratantryena vivakṣitāni bhavanti, tadyathā – anenākśnā suṣṭhu paśyāmi / anena karṇena suṣṭhu śrṇomītī / tadyadā svātantryena vivksā tadā bahuvacanam bhaviṣyati / yadā pāratantryena tadaikavacanadvivacane bhaviṣyataḥ’

While refuting the sūtra ‘asmadoḥ dvayośca’ P.1.2.59, Bhāṣyakāra says that the usages aham bravīmi, āvām brūvaḥ, vayam brūmah be
sanctioned without this sūtra. To explain this, he introduces this nyāya with an example in daily life. The organs of sense are sometimes given prominence, then the usage is ‘my eye sees well’, ‘my ear hears well’ and sometimes they are not given prominence, but at the same time intended as instruments then the usage is ‘i see well with this eye’, ‘i hear well with this ear’. Similarly, when one speaker or two intend prominence to them there is the use of the plural number, since the organs of sense are considered as more, like vyam paśyāmah in the place of aham paśyāmi and āvām paśyāvah and prominence is not intended, there is the use of the singular and duel numbers. When the organs of sense and mind is considered as two, there is duel number and the speaker intend prominence to soul, then there is singular number, due to oneness of soul.

2.10.49. TAKRAKAUNḌINYANYĀYA

‘let curd be offered to the brāhmaṇa-s, buttermilk to Kauṇḍinya’

‘loke hi satyapi sambhave bādhanam bhavati / tadyathā- dadhi brāhmaṇebhyo diyatām takram kauṇḍinyāya iti / satyapi sambhave dadhīnasya takradānam nivartakam bhavati / evamihapi satyapi sambhave’cāmantaṭparatvam saṣṭhīsthāneyogatvam bādhisyate’141/
takrakaundinyanyāya is used in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘mitaco ‘ntyāt parah’ P.1.1.47. One says-let ghee be served to all brāhmaṇa-s and buttermilk to Kaundinya. Even though being a brāhmaṇa, Kaundinya is eligible for getting both ghee and buttermilk as per the statement. But he is possible to get only buttermilk because of the special remarks, ‘buttermilk to Kaundinya’ which superseded the general rule, ‘let ghee be served to all brāhmaṇa-s’.

In the word yasāmsi, the stem yaśas get the suffix num by the sūtra ‘napumsakasya jhalacah’ P.7.1.72. The suffix num can come after the last vowel and also in the place of the final letter ‘s’. Then both the sūtra-s mitaco ‘ntyāt parah and saṣṭhī sthāneyoga may operate here. But according to the takrakaundinyanyāya the suffix num comes after the last vowel by the sūtra ‘mitaco ‘ntyāt parah’ which supersede the final letter ‘s’. Likewise, in the examples, kundāni and vanāni, the suffix num to follow the last vowel and the final letter at the same time is not possible. Therefore, the suffix num will come after the last vowel superseding the final letter by the sūtra ‘mitaco ‘ntyāt parah’.

Bhartrhari says this nyāya through this kārīka;

‘brāhmaṇānāṁ śrutirdaghni prakāntā mātharam vinā /

māṭharastakrasambhandhāttatṛacaste yathārthatām’ /\(^142\)

137
2.10.50. TAPTABHRĀŚṬAPRAKŚIPTATILANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the sesamum seed thrown on a frying pan does not stand steadily in one place’.

‘api ca iṣṭavyavastā na prakalpate / tadyathā-tapte bhrāṣṭe tilāḥ prakṣiptāḥ muhūrtamapi nāvatiṣṭhante evamime varṇāḥ muhūrtamapi nāvatiṣṭheran’¹⁴³/

This nyāya is used in the sūtra ‘stāne antaratamaḥ’ P.1.1.50. If the sūtra ‘stāne antaratamaḥ’ is taken as a svatantravidhi, there is chance for nirvṛtti of all sthānin-s. The nirvṛtti of dadhi and madhu also will happen. dadhi becomes the ādeśa of dadhi and madhu becomes the ādeśa of madhu through close similarity, if so, there is no other ādeśa is mentioned. If so, there will be difficulty. By the sūtra ‘ādeśapratyayayoh’ which follows the sūtra ‘in koḥ’, the ‘s’ in bisam and musalam will be changed to ‘ś’. If the word bisa is considered as the ādeśa of bisa, there is no chance for satva, if ‘s’ is considered as the ādeśa of ‘ś’, there is a chance for satva. If so happen, there is no designed decision about the correctness of words. Just like the sesamum seed thrown on a frying pan does not stand steadily in one place, so also these letters cannot stand steadily even for a moment¹⁴⁴.
2.10.51. TULYABALAVIRODHANYĀYA

‘conflict of equal strength’

‘tulyabale hyubhe śāstra / tad yathā-dvayostulyabalayorekah presyo bhavati / sa tayoh paryāyena kāryam karoti / yadā tamubhau yugapat presayato nānādikṣu ca kārye bhavatastadā yadyasāvavirodhārthī bhavati ubhayorna karoti / yaugapadhyāsambhavāt / nāsti yougapadhyena sambhavāḥ’

The term vipratisedha in the rule ‘vipratisedhe param kāryam’ P.1.4.2 is explained as tulyabalavirodhā. It is a conflict between two rules of equal strength, where the two rules formulated for application, elsewhere, become applicable in a single context, concurrently. Patañjali explains here the equal strength of two rules through this nyāya. Two masters have only one servant, and he is serving them in different occasions in different times. But when two masters ordered him to do a job in a particular time, he will not be able to do the work simultaneously. He is helpless. This type of context is called tulyabala. It also happens in śāstra. In the derivation of vrkṣebhyāḥ, where vrkṣa + bhyas, the rule ‘supi ca’ P.7.3.102 requires that, the final ‘a’ of vrkṣa is lengthened. Rule ‘bahuvacane jhalyet’ P.7.3.103 requires that, the ‘e’ is substituted for the final ‘a’ of vrkṣa. Here the two rules become applicable. These rules are equal in strength. By invoking
vipratisedhe param kāryam, the ‘a’ is substituted by ‘e’ of the stem vrksa and get the form vrkṣebhyah.

2.10.52. TUSYATU DURJANA NYĀYA

‘the principle of satisfying the evil people’

tusyatu durjana iti nyāyena apśabdajñānasya viparītatvamātrenādharmanādhanatvamabhuyagamyāpi bhāsyē samādhyantara-māha athavā kūpeti\(^{146}\)

While using the sentence ‘atha bhuyāpi evaśabdajñānam śabdajñāne’, during the bhāṣya on the introductory passage, ‘atha śabdānusāsanam’, Uddhyotakāra uses the ‘tusyatu durjana nyāya’. It is used in the cases in which it is thought advisable to satisfy a mischievous man. To state the true things, sometimes people accept untruth things for supporting is called tusyatu durjana nyāya. In nyāyasūtra, this nyāya is known as ‘abhyupagamasiddhanta’ or ‘abhyupagamvāda’. By thinking the knowledge of the corrupt words is treated as an instrument to the knowledge of the correct words, Patañjali accepts the knowledge of corrupt words as a mean of gain dharma for a while.

2.10.53. VARDHAMĀNAGARBHANYĀYA

‘maxim of growing embryo in the womb’
Patañjali offers this maxim in the rule ‘plugāica idutau’ P.8.2.106—when the pluta of diphthongs happened, the prolation of the last element of these diphthongs namely; ‘i’ and ‘u’ get the pluta. This pluta of ‘ai’ and ‘au’ has four mātra-s. Thus, a+i and a+u each have one mātra. But the pluta has only three mātra-s. So the increase is only to the second part of ‘ai’ and ‘au’ i.e. the ‘i’ and ‘u’. Though the sound is eternal, there will not have any increase. When changes have occurred to the sound, will it affect the principle of nityatva of śabda? Here Bhāsyakāra clears this doubt by using this nyāya. As the changes have occurred in the inside of the diphthongs ‘ai’ and ‘au’, the sound has no change. It is like a growth of foetus in the womb. When the foetus is growing, all parts of it are also increasing simultaneously. Likewise, in the case of śabda, there is no change occurred due to the increase of its elements, i.e. there is no change to the utterance of the sound, but only to the mode of utterance.

2.10.54. VIṢABHAKṢAṆAMAPI KASYACIDĪPSITAM BHAVATI

NYĀYA

‘sometimes eating poison is desired’.
'karturīpsitatamam karmetyucyate / kasya ca nāma 
viṣabhakṣaṇamīpsitam syāt? viṣabhakṣaṇamapi kasyacidīpsitam bhavati / 
katham-īha ya esa manusyo dukhārito bhavati so 'nyāni 
dukhānyanuniśamya viṣabhakṣaṇameva jyāyo manyate / ātaścopsitam 
yattad bhākṣayati148/

Bhāsyakāra raises the question, ‘what is the purpose of the rule 'tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitaṃ’ P.1.4.50. Example of this rule is viṣam 
bhākṣayati and it can be justified by the previous rule ‘karturīpsitatamam 
karma’ P.1.4.49. It cannot be justified because, viṣa is anīpsita, in the sense 
that nobody desires to take poison. But the rule ‘karturīpsitatamam karma’ 
says that “which is the most desired by the agent is called karma’. Here 
Patañjali introduces this nyāya and says that, the eating of poison becomes 
sometimes desired. A person who is afflicted with misery in daily life, 
seeing other miseries in store for him, he thinks that the best thing for him 
to do is to take poison only and put an end to misery.

Since even poison can be a positively desired thing to a person who 
wants to escape from misery, the designation karma can assigned to the 
poison by the rule karturīpsitatamam karma. Therefore, the examples of 
the rule tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitaṃ are grāmāntaram ayam gacchan caurān 
pasyati-while going from one village to another village he sees thieves,
ahim laṅghayati—he steps over a snake, kaṇṭakāṁ mrṇāti—he crushes some thorns.

### 2.10.55. VIṢAVRKGŚANYĀYA

‘a poison tree ought not to be cut down by the planter himself’

‘ṇa hi svakṛtameva svayam pratyācaṣte iti yuktam, viṣavṛkṣo’pi
samvardhyā svayam chettumasāmpratam iti nyāyādi ti bhāvaḥ’

This nyāya introduces by Haradatta while he interpreting the sūtra ‘lupi yuktavat vyaktivacane’ P.1.2.51. It means that one who has watered and nurtured a poisonous tree, which he himself cannot cut. Likewise, in śāstra also one will not refute his own words. The rule ‘lupi yuktavat vyaktivacane’ allows the retention of the original number (vacana) and gender (vyakti) of a form whose taddhita affix has been deleted by lup. This rule may not be created by Pāṇini, because, through the rule ‘tadaśisyam samjñāpramāṇatvāt’ P.1.2.53, he refutes this sūtra, which means if the retention of the original number and gender of a word ought not to be taught (aśisyā) since it is depended upon usage. If Pāṇini create the former rule, he cannot refute it. To clear this matter Haradatta uses this viṣavṛkṣanyāya. This nyāya is used as a verse in the Kumārasambhava and Pañcatantra.
2.10.56. VṚŚCIKABHIYĀNYĀYA

‘running away through fear of a scorpion he falls in front of a poisonous snake’.

‘apāṇinīyamiti / varṇsamāmnāyasamarthanāya pravṛttasya ekadosaparihārāya sakalaśastrasya vyākhyaśaspeksaguruprakārenānya-thākarne vrścikabhiyetyādīnāya āpatataātī bhāvah’

Nāgeśa in the uddyota of the Paśpaśāhnika uses the vrścikabhiyānyāya. If the enunciation of the letters is for the knowledge of the desired letters, there will have defect due to the non-enunciation of the letters like udātta, anudātta, svarita etc. It should be solved. It is accomplished by taking that the genus of the letters is mentioned. If it is said that it is accomplished by taking the genus, the exclusion of the defects samvrta etc. is necessary. The defects samvrta and other are avoided by gargādipātha and bidādipātha. There is another reason for the enunciation of the garga and bida groups. The continuous interpretations of Vyākaraṇa become serious and it goes against Pāṇini’s sūtra-s; because Pāṇini did not do anything to the defects samvrta and others. To interpret the whole śāstra to solve the defects, which happen to enunciate the varṇasamāmnāya, make serious is equal to reach before a snake after running away through fear of scorpion. This nyāya can be seen in other works also.
While discussing the topic what is the meaning of the word 'vyākaraṇa', in the paśpaśānihāka of Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali says that 'rule is grammar'. If the word vyākaraṇa means sūtra, then the meaning of genitive doesn't suit in the expression vyākaraṇasya sūtram (rule of grammer). Then Vārttikakāra gives another definition that the term vyākaraṇa stands for the totality of laksya (word) and laksanam (rule). But there is a defect that the word vyākaraṇa which denotes a whole cannot denote its part. However, one who studies sūtra-s alone is taken to be a vaiyākaraṇa. Then Patañjali accepts the first view, that the grammar is rule and justifies the use of vyākaraṇasya sūtram by vyapadeśivatnyāya. If a person has only one son he could say this is my eldest as well as my youngest son. Here for certain purposes an only son is being treated as both eldest and youngest. It is noticed among people who used the expression rahoh śirah (the head of rāhu), although as a matter of fact that rāhu and head are one the same, where mind takes rāhu to be a whole and śiras to be a part. So also the
vyākaraṇa and sūtra are identical, yet in the expression vyākaranasya sūtram the former is taken to be the whole and the later a part. So there is no defect in the meaning of relation.
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