According to the Vaiyākaraṇas and the Ālāmīkāris, Abhidhā has three different varieties, viz. i) Rudhi, ii) Yoga and iii) Yogarūḍhi. The Rudhi type of Abhidhā is determined by convention, the Yoga type by only etymology and the Yogarūḍhi type by both convention and etymology. In consonance with these three types of Abhidhā, the denotative words also come to be classified as i) Rudha (conventional), ii) Yaugika (etymological) and Yogarūḍha (etymological conventional). The Naiyāyikas, however, recognise one more variety of denotative word, i.e. Yaugikarūḍha (etymological-cum-conventional), although they do not make any explicit reference to a probable corresponding variety of Sakti i.e. Yaugikarūḍhi.

1. sa ca saktistridhā, rūḍhir yogo yogarūḍhīśca.
   PLM, p. 30

2. sa tridhā rūḍhiryogo yogarūḍhīśca.
   VRV, p. 29, Vide VRS

3. saktām padam. taccaturvidham. kvacid yaugikaṃ kvacid rūḍham, kvacid yogarūḍham, kvacid yaugikarūḍham.
   SMU, p. 338
The classification of the denotative words into these four types appears to be originally made by the Naiyāyikas and the same is based on their very concept of Yoga (etymology) and Rūdhi (convention), as is evident from their exhaustive treatment of the issue in the works like Tattvacintāmaṇi and the Bhāṣāpariccheda. Gargesa in his TC divides Padas on the basis of the concept of Rūdhi and Yoga and also in their separation and combination. These four varieties of Padas, however, hold good only in the case of Nāmapadas (Nouns). Jagadīśa, a later Naiyāyika, comes to classify Padas first into Nāman and Dhatu and then classifies the former into five varieties viz. i) Rūdha, ii) Lakṣaka, iii) Yaugika, iv) Yogarūdha and v) Rūdhayaugika. In his opinion, of these five types of Nāmapadas, only the first four are genuine, the fifth type is referred to by him as being admitted only by 'others'. Amongst the Naiyāyikas also, Annambhaṭṭa does not seem to have recognised the Yaugikarūdha variety of Pada, as he refers to only three varieties of Sakti viz. Yogarūḍhi, Yoga and Rūḍhi. Of the Vaiyākaraṇas also

4. op.cit, pp. 591-641
5. rūdhahānca lakṣakaḥ caiva
   yogarūdhahānca yaugikam /
   taccaturdhā'parai rūdhah-
   yaugikam manyatādhikam// op.cit.,1.16,p.162
6. pankajādipadesu yogarūḍhī. avayavāsaktiryogah.
   samudāyasyakti rūḍhī. TD,vide TS,pp. 334-36
Nāgēśa refers to the aforesaid three varieties of Sakti (i.e. Abhidhā) and their corresponding varieties of Vācaka words; he leaves out the Yauguikaruḍha variety of the Naiyāyikas. The aforesaid four divisions of denotative words have been accepted by some later Mīmāṃsakas also.7

Appayadīksita in his Vṛttivārtika elaborately deals with the aforesaid three varieties of Abhidhā.

Jagannātha in his Rasagāyadhara refers to them as Kevalaṃkudāyasakti (denotative potency pertaining to the word as a whole), Kevalāveyaavasakti (denotative potency pertaining to the component parts alone) and Samudāyāveyaavasakti (denotative potency pertaining to the word as a whole and the component parts as well).8

In the following passages, we propose to examine these different varieties of Abhidhā as treated by the Naiyāyikas, Vaiyākaraṇas and the Ālamkārikas. with a special reference to Appayadīksita. We shall also take

7. tacca padām caturvidham. rūḍham, yauguikam yogarūḍham yauguikaruḍham ca. TP, vide HIC, p. 59
8. seyamabhidhā trividhā. kevalaṃkudāyasaktiḥ kevalāveyaavasaktiḥ samudāyāveyaavasaktisamkarasāceti.
op.cit. , p. 178.
into account simultaneously the aforesaid four types of denotative words as treated by these scholars.

RUDHI ABHIDHA AND RUDHA WORD:

The Rudhi type of Abhidha is defined by the Veiyākaraṇas as that which conveys a unified meaning by the significative potency pertaining to the word as a whole. It is thus not concerned with the individual meanings of the component parts of a word as directed in the Grammar. A Pada (word), indeed, is a combination of parts which may be described as Prakṛti and Pratyaya, the Prakṛti being either a nominal stem or a verbal root and the Pratyaya being the suffixes attached to either. The Grammar while laying down the specific rules concerning the formation of a certain pada states the specific meanings of the parts with which it is constituted. The Rudhi type of Śakti never presents these individual meanings of the parts. In other words, it does not give the etymological meaning of a word, but conveys only that meaning with reference to which a

9. सैंस्त्राकेल्पितायावार्ताथथानभावे समुदायार्थानिरूपितास्यक्तिः रुढ़ीह। PLM. p. 30

also,

समुदायमात्रे बोधकस्याम्बम् ताद्गहातकावायावाचः प्रथङ्क स्वार्थानुष्ठापकस्याम् यथामानिनीपरादाः.

TP, BHC, p. 59
convention stands attached. The Śakti, involved in such words as Go, Mani, Nūpūra etc. has been illustrated as Rūḍhi type,¹⁰ and thus such words come to be instances of Rūḍha words. Thus when a word conveys its meaning only on the strength of convention, without a reference to its etymology, it is called a Rūḍha word.¹¹ The word Go, for instance, is derived from the root Gam and suffix ṭo.¹² Thus etymologically the word should mean 'a moving being.' But actually the word is used to signify any cow-individual whether engaged in the act of grazing or sitting idle. Thus the word's 'popular signification' as a cow-individual is not affected in any way by the derivative meaning referred to above.¹³ The total capacity of the word being able to bring the intended meaning to light, the etymology of the word is altogether ignored.

This total capacity (samudāyaśakti) or Rūḍhi involved in a Rūḍha word is nothing but the popularly known Samketa (convention). Hence, the Nyāyaśīka Jagadīśa in his Sabdaśaktiprakāśika equates Rūḍhi with Samketa, and

10. yathā meninūpūrādau. - PLM, p. 30
11. samudāyaśāktyārthapratyāyakatvaṁ rūḍhatvam. TP, BHC, p. 59
also, yatrāvavayaśaktinirapekṣayā samudāyaśāktyā grhyate tadrūḍham, yathā ganaṃdalādipadam. SMU, p. 339
12. op.cit., p.163
13. LCAI, p.122.
refers to its celebrity as Saṃjñā. He classifies the Saṃjñā Padas into three types, viz. (i) Naimittikī, (ii) Pāribhāṣikī and (iii) Aupādhikī on the basis of the convention involved. The first type of word connotes the individual (Vyakti) as qualified by the Universal (Jāti), while the second and third connote the Universal and the individual respectively. The words like go (cow), Ghaṭa (pitcher) etc. are illustrated as Naimittikī Saṃjñā. The various technical terms such as Nadi, Vṛddhi etc. are illustrated as Pāribhāṣikī Saṃjñā. Jagadīśa refers to a section of thinkers including Daṇḍin, according to whom, the Rudhi variety of denotative word comes to be of four types, viz. Jāti (Universal), Dravya (Individual), Guṇa (Quality) and Spanda, i.e. Kriyā (action). These scholars contend that words alone are capable signifying

14. rudhān samketavannāma saiva saṃjñeti kīrtyat e
   naimittikī pāribhāṣīkyaupādhīyāpi tadbhidā //
   op. cit., K. 17

15. ubhayāvriddharmena saṃjñā syat pāribhāṣikī /
   aupādhikī tvanugatopādhinā yā pravartate // ibid, K. 22
   jātyavacchinnasaṃketavatī naimittikī mata //
   jātimātre hi saṃketādyakter bhānam suduṣkaram //
   ibid., K. 19

16. ye tu rudhanāmnaścaturvidhatvam āhustarṇetamupan-
   yasyati -
   jātyāvagunaspandadharmānī samketavatraya //
   jātiśabdādibhedena caturvidhyam pare jagu //
   ibid., K. 16.
these four entities and accordingly, they come to be of four types, viz. Jātiśabda, Guṇasabda, Kriyāśabda and Dravyasabda.

Of the Ālāmārikas, Appayadīkṣita defines Rūḍhi as the expressiveness that signifies a single unitary meaning of a word through its undivided potency. The comprehension of such a meaning, he contends, takes place either (i) by non-apprehension of the meaning conveyed by the component parts or by (ii) non-suitability of the meaning brought about by the component parts to the meaning signified by the word as a whole. To illustrate the Rūḍhi type of Abhidhā, Appayadīkṣita cites the following verse:

yatte padāmburuham amburuhasāsanedyaṁ
dhanyah prapadya sakṛdīśa bhavanti muktāṁ /
nityaṁ tadeva bhajatāmatimuktaṁskir
yuktaiṁ deva! maṇiṁpurāmauktikānāṁ //

17. akhaṇḍaśaktimātreṇaikkaṁkarthapratipādakatvan rūḍhiṁ.
VRV, p. 29 vide VRS

18. tanmātreṇa......... badhādvā.
VRV, vide also CAIP, p. 23
Here the words Mani and Nūpura are instances of Rūḍha variety of words, since in both the cases, the meaning is conveyed by the expressive potency pertaining to the word as a whole and not by that pertaining to the component parts.19 According to the Grammarians, the word Mani is derived from the root Man (to make sound) and as such, etymologically the word signifies an object that makes a sound.20 But in the verse cited above, the word is used in the sense of a jewel. Similarly, the word Nūpura is derived from the root Nū which means 'to praise' by the addition of the word Pure, meaning 'in front'. Thus etymologically the word should mean 'one who praises in front'.21 But actually and in the verse cited above, the word signifies an 'anklet' which has no relation at all with praise. Thus both the words, viz. Mani and Nūpura involve the Rūḍhi Abhidhā of that type where the etymological meaning is not apprehended at all and the unitary sense is understood through the

19. atra maṇinūpurādiśābdāṇām nāvavārthapratibhāsah,
atimuktaśābdasyāvavārthapratibhāsāpi vasantīlaṇane
pratipādyetasya bādhaḥ (rūḍhito yauṅikārthasya bādhaḥ)
ityeṣāṁ rūḍhīḥ. VRV, p. 30, vide VRS

20. maṇyate iti maṇhi maṇśabda iti.

Kuṇḍīkē under VSM, p. 106

21. nuvati stuvati purāṁ nūpuraḥ. ibid.
denotative potency pertaining to the term as a whole.\textsuperscript{22}

Appaya further shows that although the word Atimukta occurring in the verse presents the meaning of the component parts, yet this meaning is not apprehended along with the meaning conveyed by the word as a whole. The denotative potency pertaining to the word as a whole gives the idea of Spring and that pertaining to its component members refers to 'one who has excelled the pearl'. In the verse cited above, the derivative meaning though invariably apprehended, is not found to be associated with the idea conveyed by the word as a whole.\textsuperscript{23} Thus Appaya maintains that the word Atimukta exemplifies the second case of Rūḍhi Abhidhā, where the meaning brought about by the component members of a word is not suitable to the unified meaning signified by the word as a whole.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22} CAIP, p. 24
\textsuperscript{23} yadyapi'atimuktalaksāmīr vāsantīmukulaśobhaiva muktātiśayinī sampad' ityabhedaḥyavasāyārthamuktāṣabadasyāvayavārtho'pi vivakṣītaḥ tathāpi tasya vāsantaḥgatatvenāc pratipādanaḥ tatra rūḍhīreva.
\end{flushright}

VRV, p. 30, vide VRS
YOGA ABHIDHĀ AND YOGASAKTI WORD:

The Yoga type of Abhidhā or Yogasakti is by the Vaiyakaranas as the denotative potency which presents the meaning of the several component parts of word as fixed by Grammar.24 The term Yoga signifies etymology and as such the Yoga type of Abhidhā brings light a meaning which is the same as is signified by individual etymological constituents like the stem, prefixes and the suffixes.

The Naiyāyikas agree with the Vaiyakaranas in this concept of Yogasakti also and thus define the word as that which conveys only its etymological meaning.25 As for instance, the word Pācaka is This word is derived from the root Fac (to cook) and the suffix ṅvul. Thus etymologically the word means 'person who cooks'. According to the Madhavyadhātuvādins and Paṇiniyadhātuvātha, the root Fac signifies the sense 'cooking' and signifies the agent (i.e. the person who cooks), by the rule 'kartari krt.'27 Thus a Yoga

24. sastrakalpiyatavayavarthanirūpita śaktir yogā. ML, p. 506 also, avayavasaktyārthaprayātāyaṇavādhyājītam. ML, vide III, p. 479
25. yatavayavārthēva budhyate, tad yaujikam yaujya pācakādipadam.
26. Bhvādīgniṭiya, p. 718
conveys the meaning of only the component parts and nothing more or nothing less. Some other instances of Yaugika word are Hāraka, Kāraka and Pāṭhaka, since all these signify a meaning which is same as is denoted by their respective verbal roots and the termination Nvul (i.e. Ak).

Of the Naiyāyikas, Jagadīśa classifies the Yaugika variety of words into three types, viz. Samāśānta, Taddhitānta and Kṛdanta. The Samāśānta or compound word is etymological, because the meaning is determined by the respective meanings of the component parts.

The Taddhitānta words are secondary derivatives where the meaning is derived from the nouns and suffixes added to them. The Kṛdanta words are the primary derivatives formed by addition of suffixes to the verbal roots.

According to the Vṛhaddevatā, as observed by Dr. K.K. Raja, a word can be explained in five different ways, viz. as derived from a root, as derived from a derivative of a root, as derived from a sentence, as

28. yogalābhya-ārtham-ātrasya bodhakām nāma yaugikām / samāśāntām taddhitāntām kṛdantāceti tatpridhā /

SSP, p. 187
derived from a compound meaning and as being of confused
derivation.\textsuperscript{29}

The Ālāmkārika Appayadīkṣita defines the Yoga
type of Abhidhā as the potency that signifies a meaning
through the expressiveness belonging only to the
component members of a word.\textsuperscript{30} According to him, the
presentation of a meaning by the Yogāṣekti is discerni-
ble under two circumstances, viz. (i) when the meaning
conveyed by the word as a whole is not apprehended at all
and (ii) when the idea signified by the whole word
though cognised, does not get associated with the
meaning conveyed by the expressive potency belon-
ing to the component members.\textsuperscript{31} The first case is exemplified

\begin{verbatim}
29. dhātujāṁ dhātujājjaṁ samastārthajāṁ eva vā /
vākyajāṁ vyatikīrṇām ca nirvācyāṁ pañcadhā padam /
vide ITM, p. 60
30. avayavaśaktisāpekaṁ padasyaikārthapratiṣṭhān
yogah.
VRV, p. 30, vide VRC
31. avayavaśaktimātreṇa pratiṣṭhānaktvamapi samudayaṝṭha-
pratibhāsādvā, tatpratibhāse'pi tasyāvaśaktiṣṭhā-
tipādyenānveyyād vetti dvedhā. ibid.
\end{verbatim}
by the following verse:

 наблюда́ва́рмабхавани́навабхи́памад
 ро́мавалла́ пада́жу́шастамаш пера́стат /
 муктаугха́ма̀нди́тамура́пста́ламу́нмай́кхам
 па́сйами дева па́рамам пада́ме ва са́ка́т//\(^32\)

Here the words Virīncibhavana (abode of Brahmā), Nabhipadma (Navel-lotus), Romāvalī (a line of hair above the abdomen), etc. signify their corresponding meanings through the expressive potency pertaining to the component members alone and the meanings presented by these words through the denotative potency belonging to the word as a whole are not cognised at all.

The second case of operation of Yogasākti is illustrated in the following verse:

асту тра́йма́ятаму́стева́ ламба́нала́
 ра́тнаиста́та́па́ пари́бху́йата́ эва́ ба́хну́
 содха́х сата́м бата ни́шантамупа́гата́намева́м
 тираскрти́кдисвра́ ках су́вртта́й //\(^33\)

32. ibid.
33. ibid.
Appyaya shows that the term Nisanta occurring in this verse signifies its meaning through Yogasakti. What is peculiar about the term is that though it is capable of presenting the meaning as a whole, i.e., home, which is actually recollected also, yet this meaning does not get itself associated with the idea conveyed by the component members. Thus the term Nisanta signifies the meaning 'the end of the night' alone through its Yogasakti.34

YOGRARUDHI ABHIDHA AND YOGRARUDHA WORDS:

The Yogarudhi variety of Abhidha is the combination of the aforesaid two varieties of denotive potency, viz. Rudhi and Yoga. Gagabhaṭṭa defines Yogarudhi as the combination of Rudhisakti with Yogasakti in order to convey one single idea.35 According to Nāgese, Yogarudhi involves a mutual relation between a specially conveyed (i.e., conventional) meaning and a meaning allowed by Grammar on the basis of the component members of a word.36 Here the meaning signified by the word as a

34. atra nisantaśabdasya niketanorūpasamudāyārthaḥpratibhāse 'niśāntam'  ....... śriyāmavasāne yoga eva. VRV, p. 31, vide Vī.

35. samudāyāsaktīyā avayāvasāktyā caikārthāpratīyaktatvam yogarudhatvam. TP, vide BHC, p. 58

36. śaśtrakalpitēvayavārthāninvitaviśeyabhūtārthāninvita śaktir yogarudhīḥ. PLM, p. 30.
whole is normally qualified by the meaning conveyed by its constituents. The convention works in such a way that the meaning which fully agrees with the derivation, appears as being determined irrespective of its etymology.

The expressive word that involves this Yogarūḍhi Sakti is called Yogarūḍha. A stock example of Yogarūḍha words is Paṅkaja. Etymologically the word signifies an agent that grows on mud (paṅke jāyata iti paṅkajam, the derivation being paṅka-jen + ṣa), but popularly it signifies a 'lotus'. The word Paṅkaja, so far its derivation is concerned, should mean any object that grows on mud, but the convention involved here is so strong that it restricts the use of the word to the sense of a lotus only, which also grows on mud. Here, though both the meanings are applicable to the word, it is the etymological meaning that comes to our mind immediately after hearing the word. Otherwise the word Paṅkaja would

37. yatra tvavayavasāktivissye samudāyvasāktirpyastī, tathā yogarūḍham, yathā paṅkajādipadam.

SMU, p. 441

38. tathā hi paṅkajapadamavayavasāktī paṅkajanikartṛru-pamartham bodhayati. samudāyvasāktī ca padmatvenā rupena padmaṁ bodhayati.

ibid., p. 441-4.
mean a lily (Kumuda) which also grows on mud. Another instance of Yogarūḍha word is the term Kṛṣnasarpe. The term etymologically denotes a black serpent, but through convention, its use is restricted to the particular breed of serpents called Cobra, which is also black. Thus in the case of a Yogarūḍha word, we find the working of the established maxim of the ancient Indian thinkers that 'the etymology is stronger than convention'. The issue will be discussed at length later on in this chapter itself.

We come across an interesting debate between the Mīmāṁsakas and the Naiyāyikas on the question as to why the word Paṅkaja should be restricted to a lotus only and not to a lily also. The word Paṅkaja, as we find, etymologically signifies an agent of the action of growing on mud. But since a lily also grows on mud, a pertinent question arises as to why the idea of a lily should not be apprehended from the word Paṅkaja. The Mīmāṁsakas try to meet this question by saying that

39. niyatapadamvatvajñānārthām samudāyāsaktih, anyathā kumude'pi prayogaprasāṅgaḥ.  
    TS, p. 51

40. ACS, p. 150

41. parantu rūḍhyarthabhinne yogarthasya bodhāṁ prati rūḍhidhiyāṁ pratibandhakatvam..... mīmāṁsakānāṁ matam.  
    SSP, pp. 172-173
the knowledge of Rūḍhi or convention concerning the word Paṅkaja comes in the way of apprehending only the derivative meaning of the word, and thus the use of the word comes to be restricted to a lotus only. But the Naiyāyikas controvert this view by saying, that on hearing the word Paṅkaja, the meaning 'lotus' occurs first in one's mind on the strength of the Samudāyāsakti or convention. Afterwards, the etymological meaning, i.e. an object that grows on mud, is connected with the already apprehended conventional sense, i.e. lotus. The conventional meaning comes to one's mind first because of immediacy of knowledge inasmuch as it is already determined by convention concerning the word. Thus according to the Naiyāyikas, the knowledge of Rūḍhi does not necessarily serve as the obstacle to the knowledge of Yogasakti of a word. In the case of the word Paṅkaja also, the 'lotus' recollected on the strength of the conventional knowledge, is apprehended as one that grows on mud because of the knowledge of the component parts.

42. vastutastu samudāyāsaktyupasthitapadme'vavārthapaṅkajani kartturavayo bhavati, sānnidhyāt. MUL, p. 443
43. tasmānna pratibandhakatvena rūḍhisidhir na vā tasya yogapratibandha iti...... TC, pp. 629-630
44. ... atrocyate, niyamataḥ padmaśmrtyartham eva rūḍhirīḍhyā' ca niyamataḥ smṛtam padmaśmrtyavyavaih paṅkajani kartṛtvānubhāvyate.......... ibid.
The Mīmāṃsakas, Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas, however, are one in admitting the utility of both Yogaśakti and Rūḍhīśakti in words like Paṅkaja in the matter of conveying the corresponding meaning in the event of the failure of the other.

It is interesting to note that of the Naiyāyikas, Jayantabhaṭṭa does not recognise the Yogarūḍha type of word. He opines that the so-called Yogarūḍha words actually signify the conventional meanings. It is only in the context of determining the Sakti of such words that a reference is made to Yoga (etymology). But so far as verbal comprehension is concerned, the meaning derived through etymology never figures here.

Appayadīkṣita defines Yogarūḍhi as the potency that signifies a meaning through the expressiveness pertaining to the word as a whole and that pertaining to the component members as well. As an

45. paṅkajapadāt paṅkajaniṁkartṛtvapadmatvobhayapraṇarakaropas-
thiterānuḥbhāvikatvāt......ato yogarūḍhirāvasyakī.
TP, vide BHC, p. 59

46. nanvevaṁ rūḍhīrevāstu tata evobhayeśabhāt, kiṁ yogarūḍhyāṇa, avayasakteḥ klptatvāt yaugikārthānuḥbhā-
vācca.
TC, p. 593

47. PIM, p. 31, Vide ACS, pp. 151
48. NM, ed., by Tarkavāgīśa, P, pp. 113-114
49. avayavasamudāyobhayasaktisāpekṣamekārthāpratipādetvām yogarūḍhiḥ. VRV, p.31, Vide VRS.
illustration of Yogarūḍhi Abhidhā, Appaya cites the following verse:

\[
\text{pakṣedvayakṛśimapośavibhāvyamāna-}
\text{cāndrayaṅavrataniṣevaṇa eva nityam /}
\text{kurvan pradaksīnāmūpendra surālayām te}
\text{lipsur mukhābjarucimesa tapasyatīnduh}/*50
\]

In this verse, the term Surālaya etymologically means the abode of gods (surāṇām ālāyāḥ), but through convention it signifies the Mount Meru. But these two ideas are apprehended not in isolation, but in the term of an identical relation, inasmuch as it is the Mount Meru which constitutes the very abode of gods.51 Thus the term Surālaya combines in itself both Yoga and Rūḍhi varieties of Abhidhā.

In his treatment of Yogarūḍhi type of Abhidhā, Appayadīkṣita introduces a very interesting discussion on the defect of tautology that might occur in the event of simultaneous use of two such words as Rūḍha and Yogarūḍha.

50. VRV, p. 31, Vide VRS.
51. ibid.
As an illustration of the defect, he cites the following verse:

bhadraya bhavatu bhavatēm
bhagavān bhave manadainyātimiravēhi /
divasārambha visve
nirajanalinābhirāmataranayaneh //\(^{52}\)

Here the terms Niraja and Nalina refer to the same object, i.e. a lotus, and hence there is tautology. In the first case, the meaning is apprehended through etymology and in the second, it is understood through convention.

Appaya, however, maintains that in some cases of Yogarūdhha words, a tautology can be explained away justifiably. Thus sometimes a Yogarūdhha word conveys an idea signified by the component parts and the expressive potency pertaining to these parts conveys a deeper meaning. To illustrate the idea, Appaya cites the following verse from Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava:

tava prasādāt kusumāyudho'pi
sahāyemekām madhumāva labdhvā /
kuryām harasyāpi pinākapāner-
dhairyacyutīṁ ke māma dhvenino'nye//\(^{53}\)

---

52. VRV, p. 32, vide VRS
53. KUM, III.10.
Here we find two terms, viz. Hara and Pinākāpāṇi referring to the same person, i.e. Lord Śiva. The term Pinākāpāṇi as a Yogarūḍha word usually signifies the Lord Śiva who is the holder of the bow of that name (pinākāḥ pāṇau yasya saḥ). But in the present instance, the term refers to the holder of that particular bow alone, and thus the word behaves like a Yaugika word. Now, according to Appaya, the use of both these terms (viz. Hara and Pinākāpāṇi) is necessary, inasmuch as the intention of the poet is to depict here the uncommon valour of the Lord, and the same is conveyed by the fact that He holds the bow. Hence the tautology involved here, is only apparent and not real.

Thus Appaya examines the whole issue from the standpoint of aesthetic realisation. For after all, according to Ālaṃkārikas, a poetic defect is that which stands in the way of aesthetic relish. In the verse cited above, the two terms referring to the same person i.e. Lord Śiva, come to be only conducive to the realisation of a

---

54. atra pinākāpāṇiśabdasya śivanāmo' vayavaṁrthaśaktyā
tadāyudhasāratvaprātītestatraiva tasya viśrāntiriti
punāḥ harapadaprayogāḥ. VRV, p.33, vide VRS
also vide, CAIP, pp.26-27

55. KP, VII.1.
deeper meaning quite befitting the context, and hence it is wrong to maintain that their simultaneous use leads to the fault of tautology.

Appaya then dwells at length on the problem of operation of the Yogarūḍhisakti under different circumstances. As the issue has been very transparently treated by Dr. A. Gangopadhyay in his CAIP, we do not feel it necessary to deliberate on the same. It will be however, proper on our part to record at this stage the unique approach of Jagannātha to the whole problem of signification in general and to Appaya's concept concerning the three aforesaid varieties of Abhidhā in particular.

Although Jagannātha accepts the three varieties of Abhidhā as recognised by his predecessors including Appaya, he is not ready to accept at all the definitions of the same as furnished by him (Appaya). According to him, since Appaya's general definition of Abhidhā is vitiated by the defects of impossibility, inconsistency and self-reliance (as we have earlier shown), his special definitions of the three varieties of Abhidhā are bound to suffer from the same faults.

56. VRV, pp.33-36
57. op.cit.,pp.27-29
58. yattu'akhaṇḍa.... yogarūḍhiḥ iti vṛttivārtike?
    appayadīkṣitairuktam,tanna, abhidhālakṣaṇoḥkatadūṣ-
    anāṇamihāpi durvāratvāt. RG,II,p.178.
    also vide Gurumarmaprakāṣa on above
After discarding Appaya's definitions of all the three varieties of Abhidhā, Jagannātha introduces a pertinent discussion concerning the signification of certain words, viz. Aśvagandhā, Aśvakarna, Maṇḍapa, Nīsānte, Kuvalaya etc. He raises the pertinent question as to which of the aforesaid three varieties of Abhidhā actually involves in these words. It may be noted here that each of these words has two meanings - one being conventional and the other etymological. Hence the question arises as to whether these words involve Kevalasamudāyaśakti (i.e. Rūdhī) or Kevalavayavasaktī (i.e. Yoga) or a mixture of both (i.e. Yogarūḍhī). Jagannātha here refers to some divergent views on the issue.

According to one section of scholars, the word Aśvagandhā signifies the sense of an elixir made of the Aśvagandhā plant (Phasalis Flexuosa) through its Kevalasamudāyaśaktī in the context of such expressions as 'aśvagandhārasām pibet' (one should drink the elixir

---

59. RG, II, p.139
60. atra kecit - 'aśvagandhārasām pibet' ityādiṣu viśaye viśe kevalasamudāyaśaktīḥ, aśvagandhā vājiśālā ityādiṣu tu kevalayogaśaktīḥ. ibid, p.140
of Āśvagandhā). But the word signifies through its Kevalāvayavasakti the meaning 'smelling a horse' in such expressions as 'āśvagandhā vājīśālā' (a horse-smelling stable). Hence the word Āśvagandhā can not be exclusively termed as a Rūḍha word, nor can it be described exclusively as a Yaugika word also. Now, some opponents may raise the objection that the adjective Kevala used in the definitions of Rūḍhi and Yoga types of Abhidhā with a view to restricting the scope of these two potencies to their corresponding Rūḍhyartha (conventional meaning) and Yogārtha (etymological meaning) is redundant, inasmuch as the words like Āśvagandhā not only signify their meanings by samudāyaśakti, but through Yogaśakti also on different occasions. To this, it is replied that the adjective Kevala is not used here to emphasise that a Rūḍha word should not signify an etymological meaning or that a Yaugika word also should not convey a conventional sense. In fact, the adjective Kevala is used here to emphasise

62. 'samudāyāvavasyasaktyo rubhayorekāśrayatve katham kevalatvaviśeṣitayorādyadvitīyabhedyoḥ prasaktiriti tu na śaṅkyam.' RG. II, p. 140

63. 'samudāyāvavyasyaśaktivedyatorathyayorantaravayena tādṛśaśaktayoh kaivalyasya sāmrājyāt idameva hi kevalatvamīha vivakṣitam, yadānva-yogārthabodha- katvam.' ibid.
that whenever a Samudāyārtha is apprehended, it is not apprehended as being syntactically related with an Avayavārtha, or an Avayavārtha is also not apprehended as being syntactically connected with the Samudāyārtha. Thus the word Asvagandhō, though signifies two meanings through two different Saktis, they are not apprehended as being syntactically related to each other. According to these scholars, however, a syntactical relation between such two meanings is capable of being established in the case of Yogarūḍhi, the third variety of Abhīdā, which is exemplified by the term Paṅkajā.

Jagannātha then refers to another group of scholars who deals with the problem of signification concerning such terms as Asvākarna (vatical Kobusta). The term Asvākarna signifies a tree of that name whose leaves resemble the ears of a horse. Now, these scholars (referred to by Jagannātha) maintain that in the word

64. sāmkarastu anvayaogyārthabodhakayoreve iti na tanyatra prasaktih' ityāhuh. ibid.
66. anye tu 'asvākaraṇḍisabdesu nābhīdhyāyāḥ prathamāḥ iti-yayor vidhayāḥ prasaktih, kaivalya virahaḥ. paraś classified sāmkarasya dvau bhedau yogarūḍhīn yaugikarūḍhiḥ, yati. tatrādyaṣyo yodhāramām paṇkajāliśabdeḥ, dvitīyaḥ te asvākaraṇṇādayāḥ' ityāhuh.

ibid., ii. p. 11.
Asvakarna the first and second variety of Abhidhā, viz. Rūḍhi and Yoga, are not operative at all. In this context, they refer to two sub-varieties of the samudāyavaśvācśek-tisāmkara: (i.e. mixture of both Rūḍhi and Yoga) itself and they are namely, Yogarūḍhi and Yaugikarūḍhi. While the word Paṅkaja exemplifies the former, the word Asvakarna illustrates the latter.

Jagannātha, however, alludes to another section of scholars who treats Yaugikarūḍhi not as a sub-variety of Śaṅkara type of Abhidhā, but as an independent variety thereof. Thus according to these scholars, Yaugikarūḍhi is the fourth variety of Abhidhā in addition to Rūḍhi, Yoga and Yogarūḍhi already accepted by them. 67

After recording these divergent views on the issue, Jagannātha alludes to the opinion of the Viśyākaraṇas in the manner of a conclusive proposition. 68

67. catūrtha evāyamabhidhāya bheda ityanye.
68. Siddhāntamāha -

ibid., p. 141

ibid.
According to Vaiyākaraṇas, a word is essentially an indivisible unit of expression and as such its division into such various parts as roots, stems, prefixes and suffixes is only imaginary. Under the circumstances, the Vaiyākaraṇas do not accept even the Yoga variety of Abhidhā, whereby a meaning is said to be apprehended through etymological analysis of a word, and accept Rūghi as the single variety of it. 69

Now, while we humbly express over inability to identify the other groups of scholars as referred to by Jagannātha, holding divergent views on the significance of words like Āśvagandhā, Āśvakārṇa etc., we are surely in a position to attribute the last view mentioned by him to the Vaiyākaraṇas in general and to the advocates of the Sphoṭa theory in particular. For, Dhartrhari asserts that there are no letters in a word and no words in a sentence in actual speech-situation. The analysis into letters and the distribution of meanings between stem and suffix, or between words in the

69. abhidhāyā rūghiākhya eka eva bheda iti tātparyam.
    Candrikā under HG above, vide RG,II, p.147
70. pade na varṇā vidyanto varṇa-varṇa-vavavyayā na ca
    vākyat padeṇāmatyantām pratīvēko na kaścam
    VP, 1.73, vide ITM, p. 140.
sentence - these proceedings, as Nāgęśa says,\textsuperscript{71} are the occupation of the grammarians.\textsuperscript{72}

But yet Jagamātha himself admits the classification of Abhidhā into the aforesaid three types, showing thereby his affiliation to the popular trend of the Alamkārośāstra.

Yaugikarūḍha words:

when the meaning of a word is determined either by etymology of the constituent parts or by the convention concerning the word as a whole, it is called Yaugikarūḍha or Rūḍhayaugika.\textsuperscript{73} Here both the etymological and conventional meanings remain intact. Both are determined independently of each other, and are apprehended separately. As for instance, the word Udbhid is cited.\textsuperscript{74} The word Udbhid etymologically means

\textsuperscript{71} tād tadārthavibhāgarim sāstrāmātraviśayām. \textit{LM}, p.46
\textsuperscript{72} Vide J. Brough, '\textit{A-Udumbarāyaṇa}' s Theory of Language' \textit{BSOAS}, XIV, Pt.1, p. 43f
\textsuperscript{73} yatra tu yaugikārtha-rūḍhārthayaḥ svētantryena bodhastad yaugikarūḍham. \textit{SMU}, p.443
\textsuperscript{74} yathodbhīdādipadam,tatra hyudbhedanakartā taruvumē- dir budhyate yagaviśeṣo'piḥti. \textit{ibid}, pp.443-446.
'a tree' and conventionally signifies a particular type of sacrifice. Another instance is the word Mandapa. Etymologically the word means 'one who takes gruel', but conventionally signifies 'an open hall'. Thus a Yaugikarūḍha word can be considered well as an instance of two words with two different meanings having the same form, one being Yaugika and the other Rūḍha.

An examination of Yaugikarūḍha words shows that they are nothing more than homonyms (Anekārthakaśaṅdasa). Nāgėśa while dealing with the classification of Abhidhā leaves out this Yaugikarūḍha variety of words, as in the opinion of the Grammarians, the Anekārthaka pada does not present itself as a single word-unit, but as different word varying according to variegated senses. In this context, the Grammarians have advanced their well-known maxim 'arthabhede śabdabhedah' (words vary according to their meanings). Hence the term Mandapa should be recognised as a Yaugika word when it means 'a person who takes gruel' on the strength of etymology; but when the word signifies 'an open hall' on the strength of convention, it is to be taken as a Rūḍha word. Thus Nāgėśa tries to justify his recognition of only three

75. ITM, p.63
types of words, viz. Yaugika, Rūḍha and Yogarūḍha.

It is here interesting to note that the words Mandala and Maṇḍapa which are cited as instances of Rūḍha words are not taken as such by some of the Naiyāyikas. Thus Pañcānana Śāstri objects to Visvanātha's citation of these two words as Rūḍha ones. Śāstri's contention is that the terms Maṇḍala and Maṇḍapa can obviously be Yaugikarūḍha words where both the derivative and conventional meanings are comprehended separately. The word Maṇḍala etymologically means 'one who takes scum of rice' and conventionally signifies 'a circle'. Both these meanings are considered as the primary meanings of the word 'Maṇḍala'. Likewise, the word Maṇḍapa etymologically means 'one who drinks the scum of rice' and conventionally conveys the idea of 'a pavilion'. Here also both the meanings are apprehended as the primary meanings and are understood separately. Pañcānana Śāstri points out that Visvanātha's recognition of these two words as Rūḍha ones goes against his own definition of Rūḍha variety.

76. saktistridhā rūḍhir yogo yogarūḍhisca.  
LM, p. 105

77. maṇḍapamandalayor yaugikarūḍhatvēt rūḍhodharaṇatvām  
na yuktamiti vibhāvanīyam.  
MUS, p. 439, vide 84'
Of the Ālāmārikas, Kavikārṇapūra deals with the issue almost in the same line of the Naiyāyikas. He, however, refers to only three varieties of words, leaving out the Yaugikarūḍha type. Here he might be influenced by Nāgęśa who has also done the same. While the Naiyāyikas have cited the word Mandapa as an instance of Yaugikarūḍha word, Kavikārṇapūra illustrates it as an instance of Rūḍha word.

The Yaugikarūḍha words as noted by Dr. R. Mukherji, can not be compared with those of Yogarūḍha variety, as there is a considerable difference between the two. In the case of a Yogarūḍha word, we comprehend the conventional and the etymological meanings simultaneously, while in the case of a Yaugika word, they come to be understood in a sequence. Moreover, the two meanings denoted by the former, correspond with each other, while the two ideas signify by

78. yogarūḍhaśca rūḍhaśca yaugikascteti te tridha.

Vide also vṛtti on above

79. rūḍhā maṇḍapādayah. yathā padme padmajanikarttvam vartate, tathā maṇḍape gṛhaviśeṣe maṇḍapānakarttvam nāsti, tena kevalam gṛhaviśeṣo yogarthaṃ vināpi vartata iti rūḍha eva. ibid., P.3

80. LCAI, p.123

81. idam yaugikarūḍhamityucyate caturdha. FLM, p.14
the latter are quite distinct. To put it in other words, the meaning conveyed by the Samudāyasakti appears to be altogether distinct from the one conveyed by the Avayavaśakti. 82

'RUDHIR YOGAD BALIYASI' (CONVENTION IS STRONGER THAN ETYMOLOGY):

From an analysis of the concept and nature of Abhidhā in all its aforesaid varieties, the predominance of Kūdhi or popular usage over etymology can be asserted beyond the least of doubt. This proposition is warranted more particularly by the fact that in the event of the operation of both convention and etymology, the preference is always given to the former, and consequently conventional meaning comes to be stronger than the etymological one.

The relative predominance or otherwise of convention and etymology was, in fact, an interesting subject of discussion even in the Vedic period. Yāska in his Nirukta records a number of controversial views on the issue. Thus Sākātāyana, a great etymologist and a Grammarian himself, tries to derive all nouns from verbal

82. LCAI, p.123.
roots. This clearly points to his emphasis on the etymological aspect of a meaning. Gārgya and some Vaivākaraṇas, on the other hand, do not favour this view, as according to them, there are some original nouns which can not be traced to a verb. Thus these scholars emphasise more on convention in determining the meaning of a word. Yāska, though a supporter of Gārgya, however, usually accepts the view that the nouns are derived from verbs.

Coming to the sphere of Grammar, we find, Pāṇini includes in the Kṛdanta section of his Aṣṭādhyāyī, the nouns having regular verbal derivations, but those not capable of beings derived from a verb, are treated by him separately under the Unādi class. Thus though Pāṇini recognises both etymological and popular usage as the factors determining the primary meaning of a word, yet ho

83. namānyākhyātajātanī śrkatāy: no niruktasemayasca. 
NIR, I,12

84. na sarvāṇīti gārgyo vaiyākaraṇānām caike. 
lbid.

85. Vide, ITM, pp.64-65

86. pratipadikavijnānāc ca pāṇineḥ siddham. 
unādayo'vyutpannāni pratipadikāni. 
concludes 'that the authority of the Samjña or popular usage always supersedes the authority of the meaning dependent on derivation. Katyāyana and Patanjali also emphasise time and again on the popular usage being the final authority on the meaning of a word. According to Patanjali, the relation between a word and its corresponding meaning is established by popular usage.

Of the Mīmāṃsakas, Jaimini himself asserts that the meaning of a word determined by convention is to be preferred to the one apprehended through etymology. This is illustrated in the context of interpretation of the Vedic text 'In the rainy season, the Kethakēra ought to install the sacred fire'. Here the question arises, what is meant by the word Kethakēra? The word has two

87. tad aśiṣyam 'samjñāpramāṇatvāt.
     P, I.2.53, vide ITM, p.65
88. derśanām hetuḥ. Vārtika on P, I.2.71
89. lokavijñānāt siddham,
     MB on P, I.1.21; I.1.65
90. MB, I, p.6
91. MS, VI.1.50
meanings - etymologically it means a chariot-maker (rathakāraḥ) and conventionally signifies an out-caste (the member of the caste produced by the marriage of a Māhiṣya (the offspring of a kṣatriya and a vaiṣya woman) with a Kāraṇī (the offspring of a vaiṣya and a Śūdra woman).22. Jaimini decides in favour of the latter meaning, giving thereby the chance of installing the sacred fire even to an out-caste. Madhava in his Jaimini-yanyāvamālāvistara explains very faithfully the convention of Jaimini in favour of the meaning determined by popular usage.23. Apadeva, the author of Mīmāṃsāśāstra, also subscribes to this view.24. The Mīmāṃsákas' proposition that convention is stronger than etymology is usually known as Rathakāraṇya, i.e., the maxim of Rathakāra. Nāgasaṅkhyā in his Paribhasendusekharo refers to this maxim.25. Another similar maxim in this regard is 'ruṣṭhīn ṛṣṭhāṇārāṣṭhārati'.26. The Ālāmkārikas fully accepted the spirit

22. Laukikanyāyānajāli, p. 77
23. adhīya śūyate. varṣaśu rathakāra ādādhiteti. tatra rathām karotīti vyutpattiyā traipārṇikō rathakāraṃ iṣ uvat naivam, saṁkīrṇajātiviśeṣe ruṣṭhāvatvā.
   Op. cit., quoted in Laukikanyāyānajāli, p. 77
24. MNP, pp. 212-213
25. Under Paribhasā, 116
26. Vide Laukikanyāyānajāli, p. 77
of this maxim as is evident from Visvanātha Kavirāja’s criticism of the view of Mammatā who accepts Rūḍhi type of Lakṣaṇa in the word Kuśāla in the expression ‘karmanī kuśālaḥ’. Here Visvanātha emphasises that the etymological meaning should not necessarily be accepted as the primary meaning of a word. The reason of etymology concerning a word is different from the reason of its use in a particular language. The etymology is the concern of the Vaiyākaraṇas who derive the meaning of a word on the basis of its component parts, but the meaning of a word current in the society depends primarily on popular usage (Rūḍhi).

From the foregoing discussion, we may conclude that the primary meaning of a word depends on two factors, viz. convention and etymology, and of these, the former supersedes the latter. The importance of popular usage is admitted even by the Vaiyākaraṇas, although their insistence on etymology is a well-known fact. Thus Patañjali while dwelling on the eternal relationship between a word and its corresponding meaning, maintains

97. anyad hi śabdānām pravṛttinimittam anyacca
vyutpattinimittam. SD,11, pp. 37-38

98. Vide our discussion on 'Abhidhā and Nirūḍhā Lakṣaṇā' in chapter V of the present work.
that such a relationship is known from use by people of specific words in their specific meanings. He further points out that 'it is not necessary for us whenever we have occasion to use words to go to the house of a grammarian and order some words, just as when in need of pots we go to a potter and order them'. In fact, we acquire all knowledge that is necessary for us to communicate our ideas and thoughts to others from the conversation of our elders and from our intercourse with the world around. Patanjali while admitting such paramount importance of popular usage, maintains that the Science of Grammar enjoins restrictions in respect of use of correct words to the exclusion of corrupt forms for religious merit. Thus convention is considered stronger than etymology even by the Grammarians.

99. lokataḥ.yel loke artham upādēya śabdān prayuñjate. MBP, p. 70

100. yathā ghaṭena kāryam kariṣyaṁ kumbhakārakulaṁ gatvā āha - kuru ghaṭaṁ kāryam anena kariṣyāmi iti ne tadvac chabdān prayoṣyaṁāno vaiyākaraṇakulaṁ gatvā āha - kuru śabdān prayoṣya iti. ibid.

101. Vide ibid, p. 71