CONCLUSION
In the foregoing pages, the *upa* was treated in all its aspects as it appeared in the Sanskrit grammar. A brief resume of the observations made so far is given below.

*Upa*. appears as a part of speech in the most ancient available division of speech found in the *Nir.* of Yaska. It therefore basically enjoys the status of a separate *pada*. In the earliest literature i.e. the Vedas, the *upa* occurred freely in the sentence, which means that it was not necessarily connected with the verb. It had the power to convey its meaning independently without the help of the verb. However, during the course of time, *upa* lost its status and independence and was always dependant upon the verb. A stage came in the history of Sanskrit language when the *upa* necessarily preceded the verb. It could not convey an independent meaning but was used to modify the root-meaning. Its function was to manifest the hidden meaning of a root\(^1\). Still at a further stage, it was often reduced to a mere phonemic entity with no meaning. In classical Sanskrit

\(^1\) See Foot note No. 28, Chapter I
literature often we find one or two upa.s added to a verb, serving no semantic function at all. Thus gradually the significance and importance of upa. as a separate pada was lost. Pāṇini wrote his grammar at this juncture, when the position of upa. was fixed as prior to a verb. In other words, it was already looked upon as subservient to the verb. However, the linguistic structure still maintained some traces of its status as an independent pada. For instance, a complete verb form existed without an upa. and upa. came to be externally attached to a verb rather than being treated an intrinsic part of the verb. This double personality of the upa. is reflected in the grammar. Thus Pāṇini, Patañjali and their followers were required to treat upa. separately at two separate levels, viz., structural and semantic. This gave rise to the two pbh.s. They are:–

(i) (anye tu) purvaṃ dhaturupasargena yuyjate
    pascāt ādhanenetyāhuḥ /

(ii) pūrvam dhatuḥ ādhanena yuyjate pascād
    Upasargena iti añuḥ //

Although from the point of view of grammatical structure, the second pbh. is correct and given as
a siddhānta, the first pbh. is also rejected by Patanjali. On the contrary, he draws attention of his students to this pbh. and tells them not to shut their eyes to the reality that the upa. cannot be semantically separated from a root.

Many examples discussed in the second chapter clearly show that the connection between the root and the upa. is responsible even for some basic morphological operations like addition of a suffix, augment, guna and vrddhi etc. In order to explain these rules and derivations, it is necessary to accept the pbh. 'pūrvam dhaturupasargena yujvate...'. But this pbh. goes against the Paninian concept of upa. For Panini, upa. is a separate pada. Indeed, many formations in Panini's grammar imply that first dhatu must be connected with its suffix and then a finished verb form can be connected with the upa. which is a separate pada. The antaranga pbh. also implies the connection of the root with the kāraṇa prior to upa. Thus, the pbh. 'pūrvam dhatuḥ sadhanena yujvate ....' is logically more acceptable. However, it is pointed out earlier that there

2. This is, illustrated with the help of the example vyāghri on page no. 59, Chapter II
are some operations in which the connection between the *upa.* and the root is presupposed. For example, the form *nivisate* (in the rule P 1. 3.17) cannot be derived without the connection of the root *viśe* with the *upa.* *ni* first. Thus apparently both the *pbh.*s are required to derive different verbal forms. Moreover, there is also the *pbh.* 'dhatūpasargayoh kāryamantarangam' which is often referred to by the traditional commentators while deriving certain forms.

A closer study of the illustrations given by the grammarians from Patañjali to Nāgeśa reveals that we have to accept both the *pbh.*s on different levels. If we accept the *pbh.* 'pūrvam dhatūrūpasargena ....' it does not support the *ni* Panṣṭaka view. If we accept the other *pbh.* to support the concept, it cannot justify a number of rules in which the *upa.* is mentioned as a condition for a certain grammatical operation. The problems arising out of acceptance of either of these two *pbh.*s and their solutions in different kinds of operations have been already discussed.

The illustrations discussed in the second chapter show that the grammatical operations are
based on semantic connection at deep structural level. For instance, in the rule P 1.3.31 spardhā-
āmaṇaḥ, the upa. ān and the root hve together convey a certain meaning 'to challenge' although in the surface syntax, they are two separate pādas.

This close semantic connection affects the morphology of the root hve. So the root hve is conjugated with an āṭm. affix. Thus, in the rules like P 1.3.31, P 1.3.17 etc. presuppose vibhajyānākhyāna view and semantic connection between the upa. and the root in the deep syntactic level. In all these rules in the āṭm. section, it is implied that in view of the fact that a certain upa. is going to be connected with the root and both together are going to convey a certain meaning, a certain grammatical operation like āṭm. takes place before the actual surface connection.

The close unity of the upa. and the verb which is a distinct feature of the post Vedic Sanskrit has been thus recognised by Pāṇini. However, due to the constraints of verb-morphology, it is not possible to regard this unity of a verb and upa. as a compound. The unity of compound implies three features³.

³. Joshi, S.D. , Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya , contd...
They are (i) Aikapadya (ii) Vyavadhanabhava and (iii) Aikasvarya

(i) Aikapadya leads to the addition of one case-ending after the last word. Thus when rājan and puruṣa are united into ekapada, the case-ending is added only after puruṣa and not after rājan.

(ii) Vyavadhanabhava or absence of intervening unit implies that between the two components of a compound any other unit cannot stand. For instance, when rājñāḥ puruṣāḥ is compounded into rājapuruṣāḥ is the adjective, such as ṛddha cannot come in between rāja and puruṣa.

(iii) Aikasvarya means having only one principal accent (udatta or svarita) for the whole compound word which is made up of two or more individual words.

It is found that upa. always retains its accent when either it immediately precedes a verb or is away from the verb in the Vedic texts. It thus maintains a separate identity as far as its relation

contd. 3

samarthāhnikā (Translation and explanatory notes) on P 2.1.1.

var. on Mbh. P 1.1.29, ayam khalvapi bahyārihastyeva prathamakalpikah yaslinaikapadyamaikasvaryaekavibhaktitvam ca
to a finite verb is concerned. Therefore, Aikasvarya is not found in the unity of upa and the verb. This accentual feature did not allow Panini to accept compound of the upa with the finite verb.

It is thus clear that out of the three conditions required for treating a unity as a compound, the first two aikapadya and vyavadhanabhava are fulfilled. However, the third one, namely, aikasvarya is not fulfilled in case of the unity of an upa and a finite verb. Therefore, grammatically the unity is not looked upon as a compound. In classical sanskrit the feature of accent has been lost. Even in vedic sanskrit, a few exceptions like paryabhusat and anuvyacalat where the single accent has forced the later grammarians to accept the unity as a compound.

---

supām supā tiṇā nāma dhātunā'tha tiṇām tiṇā / suvanteneti ca viśñeyāḥ amāsaḥ sadvidho budhaiḥ //

It enlists among other compounds, a compound of a word (i.e. upa.) with a verb and these verb forms appear as examples in the commentary by Kṇḍabhaṭṭa.
are attested. In post-vedic literature, we have no traces of accent playing any role in the language structure. The close unity of the upa. with the verb which thus fulfilled two conditions of compounding resulted in the treatment of the upa. and the following verb form together as a single unit.

The treatment of upa. in Pañini's grammar raises a few problems. For instance, in some rules Pañini speaks of compounding of upa. with a noun. Since by its very definition, the upa. is connected with a verb, such rules are inconsistent with Pañini's own concept of upa. For example, P 5.4.85, P 6.2.177 etc. teach the compound of upa. with the words. The rule P 2.2.18 kugati-prādayāḥ teaches compounding of prādayāṃ with a kṛdanta. Then how to account for such statements? In order to solve these problems we have to refer to the concept of deep structure syntax. We have to assume the theory of ellipsis and state that at the deep structure syntax, the upa.s are connected with the verbal forms while the verbal forms disappear in surface structure. For example, prācaryāḥ (pragataḥ acaryāḥ). In this case, Kātyāyana adds a special vār. 'prādayāḥ kṛtāthe' stating that the
words listed in the prādīgaṇa are all of them compounded if they can be explained as having the sense of a Ktāṇa word. The same has also been hinted by Saunaga in his var. atyādayaḥ krāntādyarthe dvitiyaya quoted by Patañjali⁵.

So the upa has a very important role to play in the derivational system of Pāṇini. It influences grammatical operations on various levels and it retains its status of an independent pada.

Since upa is a separate pada and since a word building rule (āngavidhi) has to be given priority over an operation concerning padas (padavidhi) upa, cannot be connected to a root before the root is connected with a suffix.

Although both Patañjali and Nāgęśa have upheld the ṛb. 'pūrvam dhātuḥ sādhanena yuṣyate...' for the purpose of grammatical derivation of some forms, Patañjali is aware of the intrinsic unity of upa and the root. However, sometimes the very addition of a certain suffix to a certain root is conditioned by the connection of the root with a certain upa. Illustrations have been already

---

⁵. var. 4,10 on P 2.2.18
discussed (in the foregoing pages). In such cases Patanjali solves the dilemma by establishing a mental rather than actual connection with the upa. Thus he says in the commentary on the rules P 6.1, 135 and P 8.1.70..... satyametat / yastvasau dhatupasargyorabhisambandhastamabhyantaram krtv dhatuh sadhanena yuyvate / avasyam caitadeva vijnayam / yo hi manyate purvam dhatuh sadhanena yuyvate pascadupasargeneti tasyasyate gurunetyakarmaka upasyate gururiti kena sakarmah syat / evam ca ru va su t sarvatoantarangataro bhavati katpurvagrahanam capi sakyamakartram /

Patanjali thus accepts the pbh. 'purvam dhaturupasargena .....' on semantic level. The connection of the root with the preceding upa must be considered on conceptual level. This connection cannot be neglected says Patanjali.

The two pbh.s are discussed throughout grammatical literature. In order to derive the correct forms, the pbh. 'purvam dhatuh sadhanena .....' is accepted mainly by extending the argument of anantarangabahirangabhava. The connection of a root with a following suffix is more internal than its connection with an upa. which is a separate pada.
Thus from the point of view of the grammatical structure of the constituent elements, a root must be first connected with the subsequent suffix and then with the preceding upa.

However, there are certain derivations like anubhuyate, upasyte etc. which require the connection of the root with the upa, to be established prior to the suffix. Here Patañjali solves the issue by arguing that the connection does not actually take place in the structure, it is mentally conceived and on that basis the passive suffix is added.

Similar argument is also offered by Någesa. He accepts the view of Patañjali.

The inconsistency between the two pbh.s is only apparent. If we know the rationale behind their formation and if we apply them on two different levels the inconsistency vanishes. It is indeed the double personality of the upa. reflected in the post-vedic sanskrit language which prompted Pāñinian grammarians to treat upa. on two levels. For Pāñini however, the upa. never loses its identity as a separate entity in the speech. It has a very significant role to play in the derivational system of Pāñini.