PART ONE

GENERAL
CHAPTER I

THE AUTHOR AND HIS WORKS

Next to the Munitraya and Bhartrhari,

Nagesabhatta is the most prominent luminary in the galaxy of Sanskrit grammarians. Though chronologically he comes last in the list of illustrious grammarians relating to different systems of Sanskrit Grammar, he is one of the most eminent scholars of whom Indian scholastic learning can be proud of. His literary activity is of an encyclopaedic character and Vyakarana is his special forte. He flourished towards the end of the seventeenth century A.D. and the first half of the eighteenth century A.D.

The study of Sanskrit grammar, especially Paninian Grammar, has been prosecuted on two lines, viz. morphological and philosophical. The works of Nagesabhatta bear testimony to his supremacy in both these fields. The important predecessors of Nagesabhatta in the Paninian

1. Vide J. F. Staal, A Reader on Sanskrit Grammarians, p. xxiv.
system of grammar are Vāmana and Jayāditya of the 7th century A.D., the authors of Kālikārvrtti, Jinendrabuddhi of the 8th century A.D., the author of the commentary Nyasa on Kālikā, Kayyata of the 11th century A.D., the author of Mahābhāsyapradīpa, Purusottama and Saranadeva of the 12th century A.D., the authors of Bhasārvrtti and Durghatavrtti respectively, Haradatta of 13th century A.D. the author of the commentary on Kālikā, Padamānjari, Narāyanabhatta and Bhattojīdīksita of the 17th century A.D. the authors of Prakriyāsarvasva and Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntakau-mudi respectively. But unlike his predecessors, he has won greater recognition.

LIFE

The details of the life history of Nagesabhatta are not much in oblivion. Having flourished at a time which is chronologically very near to us, unlike that of Pānini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, we are able to know more about him through traditional reports, although no historical records on the matter is available. From his works and the numerous traditional accounts, something about his life can be drawn.
Nāgeseṇabhaṭṭa is also known as Nāgojibhaṭṭa, and is also referred to as Nāgoji and Nāgoji. He refers to himself as Nāgesa in the introductory verse of his work Paribhāṣendusekharā;

"nātvā, sāmbam śivam brahma
nāgeseṇah kurute sudhind "/

The word 'Nāgesa' is given an interesting derivation by a commentator of this verse. It is, "nāgah Patanjalih
isah pravartako yasya". Here Nāga denotes Patanjali who is spoken of as the guiding spirit of Nāgeseṇabhaṭṭa. However this interpretation appears to be far-fetched.

Nāgeseṇabhaṭṭa had the surnames 'Kāla' and 'Upādhyāya' as is clear from the colophones at the end of his works Uddyota

Vide Aufrecht, Catalogus Catalogorum, Vol. I

3. The commentator is one Nārāyaṇaśāstrī who has written a commentary by name Nāgeseṇāśayantarāyana on the Paribhāṣendusekharā.

4. This is in keeping with Nāgeseṇabhaṭṭa's renown as a grammarian since Patanjali is considered Ādiśeṣa in human form.
and Bhaccabhanda. The latter was originally a distinction conferred on him by the learned men of Kasi and later on, it became a surname.

Nagesabhatta, was a Rg Vedi Desastha Brahmin of Maharastra. He hailed from Tasagon in the Satara District. He was the son of Sivabhatta and Satī and in almost all his works he has mentioned this fact. In the beginning of Laghusabdusekharha, he says,

"sivabhattachasuto dhīmān
satidevyatasu garbhajah"

He was patronised by Ramasimha of the Bisena family, a local prince of Srīngiverapura (now Singarour) a few miles north of Allahabad. He glorifies him in his Uddyota and in many of his other works, in the following terms;

"yācakānāṃ kalpatarorarikaksahutāsanād
srīngaverapurādhisād rāmato labhajīvikāh /

5. Vide the colophons - "iti kālopānāmakaśivabhattachastasatarīgarbhajanāgesabhattakṛte bhāsyapradipoddyote prathamādhīyasya prathame pāde divitiyamāhnikam" at the end of the second āhikā of Udy. and "iti srīmadupādhyāyopanāmakāśivabhattachastasatarīgarbhajanāgesabhattakṛte śabdendusekharākhye siddhāntakaumudīvyākhyaṇe uttarārdham" at the end of Br. Śab. Śekh.


7. Sitaramaśastrī in his introduction to Brhacchabendusekharha edited by himself says that Nāgesebhātta obtained from the king, about hundred rupees per year, an amount which was quite necessary for his livelihood.
Nāgесabhatta's spiritual descent from illustrious teachers is noteworthy. He was a pupil of Haridīksita, who was the son of Vīresvara, pupil of Ramāśrāma and the grandson of the great grammarian Bhaṭṭojidīksita. Haridīksita was his preceptor in the science of grammar. He studied Nyaya Sāstra from Ramāśrāma.

He refers to these two preceptors at the end of his work Sphoṭavāda:

```
adītya phaṇibhāṣyābdhim sudhindraharidīksitād
nyayatantram rāmarāmād vādiraksoghnaramatah /
..............................
dṛḍhastarkesyā nābhyaśa iti cintyam na dhīyunaih
dṛṣadōpiha samtiṁnaḥ payodhau rāmayogatah /
```

In the introductory verse to Udy Nāgесabhatta refers to Haridīksita in glorifying terms:

"haridīksitapadābjaśevanāvāptasammatiḥ"


9. According to S.K. Belvarkar, Ramāśrāma is another name of Bhaṭṭojidīksita's son Vīresvāra who also had the name Bhānujiḍīksita. Yudhisthira Mīmāṃsaka in his work Sanskrit Vyākaraṇa Sāstrā Kā Itihās, says that Rāmaśrāma was the son of Bhaṭṭojidīksita and Haridīksita was the son of Ramāśrāma. Aufrecht also refers to Rāmaśrāma as the son of Bhaṭṭojidīksita (Catalogus Catalogorum, Vol. I). But P.V. Kane says that Bhaṭṭojidīksita had two sons Vīresvāra and Bhānujiḍīksita and the latter was named Rāmaśrāma.
Tradition says that he composed the grammatical work Śabdaratna, a commentary on Praudhamanorama of Bhatto-jidikṣita and ascribed it to his teacher Haridīkṣita in gratitude. But in Laghusabdaratna Haridīkṣita refers to the Śabdaratna as his own work and to the Śabdenduśekhara as that of his pupil.

Sitārāma Śāstri refers to the view of some scholars that Nāgeśabhaṭṭa had Jagannāṭha Pandita, as his preceptor in poetics. This view is based on the fact that Nāgeśabhaṭṭa composed the commentary, by name Gurumarmaparakāśikā, on the famous work Rasagangādharava of Jagannāṭha Pandita. The word 'guru' in the name of the gloss is taken as referring to the teacher. Sitārāma Śāstri does not favour this view. He points out that

10. Vide the statement "vistarastu asmatkrte śabdaratne madantevāsikṛta śabdendusekharādvā dṛśāstavyah" at the end of the Pūrvārdha of Lagh. Śab. Śekh and also the second introductory verse to the Brhacchabdendusekharā.

the views of Jagannatha Pandita expressed in his works like Manoramākucamardini and Rasagangādhara have been refuted by Nāgesabhaṭṭa in his works Sabdendusekhara and the commentary Gurumarmaprapakṣa on Rasagangādhara.

Therefore Sītārāma Śāstri says that there is no probability of much truth in the assumption that Jagannātha Pandita was the preceptor of Nāgesabhaṭṭa. Certain scholars are of opinion that the word 'guru' in the name of the commentary is to be understood as denoting the comprehensiveness of the commentary, just as word 'guru' seen in the name of his another work 'Gurumāñjūṣā' and that the name Gurumarmaprapakṣikā implies that he might have composed another commentary by name 'Laghumarmaprapakṣikā' on the same work.

Vaidyanātha Payagunde was the most renowned among the disciples of Nāgesabhaṭṭa. Bālaśrama, the son of Vaidyanātha Payagunde, also was the disciple of Nāgesabhaṭṭa. Payagunde had an intelligent student Mannudeva also named Manyudeva who composed a commentary by name Mannudevi on the Par. Šekh. and an original work by name Laghusabdendusekharadūṣanoddhāra.
Aufrecht says that Nagesabhatta was the preceptor of Gaṅgārāma the great-grandfather of Maṇirāma (1804 A.D.) who wrote the works Kāḍambaryarthasāra and Bhāmatī-vilāsatika. Pandit Sadashiva Sharma Sāstri names three as the disciples of Nagesabhatta. They are Vaidyanātha Pāyagunde, Narāyanadeva and Gurubhārīmisra.

Several traditional accounts are current regarding Nagesabhatta. He is reported to have been a very naughty boy when quite young. He was very much interested in boxing and up to the age of 16 he was engaged in showing his skill in boxing and was not educated. He was sent by his relatives who were tired of his imprudent behaviour, to Varanasi to study Sanskrit. There too, following his nature, he occupied in his prank, the seat of the head preceptor for which he was scolded bitterly. Unable to bear the bitter taunts, he took a vow of becoming a devoted student and aimed at


obtaining scholarship. He got himself initiated into the Sārasvata Mantra by a learned man in Tantra and began austerity and meditation without caring for his body. In due course he was blessed with high intellectual abilities and he acquired vast learning from competent teachers. It is said that within a period of two decades, he actually occupied by merit, the very seat of honour for occupying which he had been previously scolded bitterly. Eventually he secured an unequalled place of his own in the scholarly world.

Nagesabhaṭṭa never cared for money and he never got it. He was very poor and it is said that, he along with his wife, found it very difficult to have their daily food even. His wife persuaded him to go to distant places for acquiring wealth. Nagesabhaṭṭa desirous of getting the means for his livelihood, reached the shore of the river Ganges and requested the boatman to take him to the other side of the river in his boat without charging any travelling fare considering that he was a learned man. It is reported that the boatman replied arrogantly: "I do not consider as a learned man, any one other than Nagesabhaṭṭa of whom India is proud and in whose presence the so-called scholars like
you shiver in assemblies where scholarly discussions are conducted. Though naturally happy of this, Nāgesabhatta did not wish to disclose his identity. He returned home and endured the suffering caused by the clutches of poverty.

It is also heard that once Rāmasimha, king of Srīngiverapura came to Banaras to worship God Visvanātha and with great zeal and interest came to the house of Nāgesabhatta to meet him. On seeing the conditions of his house and household, the king was very much moved and quite desirous of averting the poverty of the great scholar, informed him politely that he is willing to remove the difficulty of the scholar and thus make himself feel satisfied. On hearing the words of the king, Nāgesabhatta, showing a particular passage in a text-book replied, "From the very morning up to noon, I am speculating over this particular passage in this text. Yet I feel great difficulty in understanding the idea of this passage. Now I suffer from this difficulty alone and I shall be very glad if you can help me in this respect." On
hearing the reply of the learned man, the king felt ashamed. Bowing his head politely the king begged his pardon. He accepted him as his preceptor and made provisions for his livelihood and well-being.

According to an account current in Banaras, Nagesabhatta who was long-lived became hunch-backed owing to old age and up to the time of his death he was engaged in writing works after resting himself near a wall in which a suitable depression was made to hold his hump.

A known historical fact about the life-history of Nagesabhatta is that he observed ksetrasanyasa.

There is a tradition, current at Jaipur and mentioned by Pandit Durgaprasad Sastri, the learned editor of the Kavyamala series, in his introduction to Rasagangadhara, which refers to an invitation for a horse sacrifice received in 1714 A.D. by Nagesabhatta from Savai Jeysimha, ruler of Jaipur (1688 to 1728 A.D.) an invitation which Nagesabhatta courteously declined on the ground that he had taken ksetrasanyasa and could not therefore leave Benares to attend the ceremony.
There is a view that Nāgāsaṃbhava had no progeny. This view is based on the verse, found in his book Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghumānjūṣā, which runs as follows:

\[ sabdendusekharam putram maṅjūṣām caiva kanyakam \\
svamatau samyagutpādyā śivayorarpita-mayā// \]

In this verse Nāgāsaṃbhava says that he had dedicated to God Śiva his two children viz. Sabdendusekhara, the son and Maṅjūṣā, the daughter after producing them in a fitting manner by his own intellect. The fact that Nāgāsaṃbhava depicts his works as his children is pointed out as indicating that he was issueless. But Sitārāma Śāstri argues that this view is quite incorrect since even now there exist the descendants of the family of Nāgāsaṃbhava's daughter. He points out that though Nāgāsaṃbhava had no sons, he had of course a daughter and that was why owing to the absence of a son who is the legal heir, he gave his house to his

daughter whom he gave in marriage to a person belonging to the family of Rg Vedi Deśastha Brahmins titled 'Deva'.
It is reported that this house was occupied by the family of Nāgesabhaṭṭa's daughter and their further generations for a long time and later on it was brought by a non-Brahmin-resident of Benares. Therefore, Sāstry points out, that the view that Nāgesabhaṭṭa had no progeny should be understood in the sense that he had no son. It is the practice of scholars to dedicate their books and Nāgesabhaṭṭa too has followed the same. Hence the fact that he spoke of the work 'Mañjūsā' as his daughter. That need not necessarily mean that he had no daughter. Again, Sāstri continues, on the basis of the line "svamatau samyagutpādyā......" wherein intelligence is treated as his wife, one can argue that Nāgesabhaṭṭa was a bachelor while it is quite clear that he was married. Therefore Sītārāma Sāstri concludes that the verse found in Lagh. Mañj. cannot lead one to the conclusion that Nāgesabhaṭṭa had no progeny.

Date

Unlike in the case of the most celebrities in Sanskrit literature, sufficient data are available
to fix the date of Nāgēsabhāṭṭa fairly accurately
Nāgēsabhāṭṭa's spiritual descent from illustrious pre-
decessors helps us roughly to determine his time.
Nāgēsabhāṭṭa was a pupil of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita's grandson.
Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita was a pupil of the Mīmāṃsaka Saṅkarabhaṭṭa
and of Sesakṛṣṇa and almost a contemporary of Jagannātha
Pandita. He flourished in the first half of the
seventeenth century and his date is accepted to be
about 1630 A.D. as Jagannātha Pandita himself was the
pupil of the son of this Sesakṛṣṇa. This is also
confirmed by the fact that a pupil of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita,
by name Nilakantha Śukla wrote a work in Saṃvat 169315.
Nāgēsabhāṭṭa being the disciple of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita's
grandson, must have therefore flourished towards the end
of the seventeenth century and the first half of the
eighteenth century16.

P.K. Gode points out that in his work
Āśaucanīrṇaya Nāgēsabhāṭṭa mentions Nīrṇayasindhu
(A.D. 1612)17. In his Sapindya-pradīpa Nāgēsabhāṭṭa

15. Vide S.K. Belvalkar, Systems of Sanskrit Grammar,
p.47.
mentions Śaṅkarabhaṭṭa (between A.D. 1560 and 1600) Anantadeva (between A.D. 1645 and 1675) and Nandapandita (between A.D. 1595 and 1630). Therefore, Gode opines that Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa must be later than A.D. 1670.

He adds that the Ujjain Manuscript of Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa’s Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamanjūsa is dated A.D. 1708.

In his Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamanjūsa, Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa mentions Udy which in its turn mentions Manj. This cross reference proves that both these works were being composed simultaneously sometime before A.D. 1708 which is the date of the Ujjain Manuscript of Manj. These voluminous works are the products of Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa’s mature intellect and scholarship. Gode points out that presuming that Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa was about 30 years at the time of their composition sometime before A.D. 1708, the date of a copy of one of these works, it may be easily inferred that Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa was born, say, between A.D. 1670 and 1680.

This reference is in harmony with his reference to Anantadeva (A.D. 1645 to 1675).

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka points out that Nāgeseśabhaṭṭa has written a commentary on the Rasamanjari.
of Bhanudatta. A manuscript of this commentary is available at the Indian Office Library at London and the time of its writing is Samvat 1769 i.e., A.D. 1773. Balāśarma, son of Vaidyanātha Payagunde and disciple of Nagesabhaṭṭa, has, with the help of Mannudeva composed a work by name Dharmaśāstrasāṅgraha at the request of Henry Theodor Colebroke. Colebroke lived in India during the period 1783-1815. Therefore Yudhīṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka concludes that Nagesabhaṭṭa must have flourished during the period from 1673 to 1753 A.D. This view is confirmed by the tradition current at Jaipur, about the invitation for horse sacrifice received in 1714 A.D. by Nagesabhaṭṭa, referred to earlier.

Sitārāma Śaṣtri points out that in 1657 A.D. (i.e., Vikrama era 1714) the assembly of learned men well-versed in all sāstras arrived at a decision, in Benares, settling on an age-long controversy that among the Maharashtra

19. Vide Supra p.16
Brahmins, those titled 'Devarukhe' were eligible for matrimonial alliance with the other Brahmins. Among the 72 learned men who signed the judgement letter in the capacity as judges of the controversial problem, there is one Rāmarāma who is the preceptor of Nāgesabhatta. Sītārāma Śāstri says that this judgement letter has been published by Sadāśivapimpūṭakara in a work by name Citalebhaṭṭapraṇakaraṇam. On the basis of this judgement letter and taking into consideration the fact that Nāgesabhatta refers to Rāmarāma as his preceptor in Nyāya, one can assume the existence of Nāgesabhatta in Vikrama Era 1731 which corresponds to 1674 A.D. and this too confirms the date pointed out previously.

Mahamahopādhyāya Haraprasād śāstri says that Nāgesabhatta died in 1775. P.V. Kane argues that

21. Vide Supra. p.10

22. Vide Indian Antiquary Vol.41, p.12 - "The great supporter of Bhattoji Dixit, however was Nāgoji Bhāṭṭ, a pupil of Haridīxīt who commented upon all his works and the works of his school.

He had a long life and lived more than hundred years and died in 1775 on the day when Hasting's life was in jeopardy on account of the Benares revolt".
this appears rather improbable. If one of his works was copied in 1713 A.D., he could hardly have lived up to 1775 A.D. unless he was about 100 years old at that time. The story about his being hunchbacked due to old age, only shows that he lived long and does not show that he lived beyond hundred years. Śitārāmaśāstri says that the author of Jñānakosa had remarked that Nāgajī was long-lived. This is quite contradictory to the previous assumption that Nāgajī was long-lived. Though, we have thus no historical record as to when exactly Nāgajī passed away, yet on the basis of the vast number of the works produced by his master-mind, it seems quite reasonable to assume that Nāgajī was long-lived.

Works

Nāgajī, the epoch-making Vaiyākarana of the eighteenth century is credited with the authorship of a number of works which bear testimony to his vast

erudition and deep knowledge. Apart from Vyākarana, he wrote standard works on Yoga, Poetics, Dharmaśāstra, Mimamsa, Purānas and other Śastras. Even though a correct knowledge of all the works of Nāgasaṃbhaṭṭa is not even now obtained, we yet find that those which are undoubtedly taken to be his, are themselves numerous.

46 works are assigned to Nāgasaṃbhaṭṭa by Aufrrecht in Catalogus Catalogorum Vol. I.

1. Alamkārasudhā (Kuvalayanandatīkā)
2. Astādhyāyipāṭha (Grammar)
3. Ācārendusēkhara
4. Āsaucaṇīrṇayā
5. Iṣṭikālanirṇaya
6. Kātyāyanītāntāra
7. Kāvyapradīpoddīyota
8. Gurumarmapraṇakasikā (Rasagāṅgādharaṭīkā)
9. Candrika (Devimāhātmyatīkā)
10. Candīstettraprayogavidhi
11. Tarkabhāṣāṭīkā Yuktimuktāvalī
12. Tatparyadīpika
13. Thiñanta Saṅgraha (Gr.)
14. Tirthenduśekhara
15. Tristhalīsetu
16. Dhatupāthavṛtti (Gr.)
17. Nerāṇivādartha (Gr.)
18. Prabhākaracandratatvadīpikātīka
19. Prayogasara
20. Prāyascittenduśekhara
21. Mahābhāṣyapradīpodyota (Gr.)
22. Rasatarāṅginītīka
23. Rasamanjariprakasa
24. Rāmāyanaṇatīka
25. Laksanaratnamālikā
26. Viṣamapadi (Sabdakaustubhavākhyā) (Gr.)
27. Vedasūktabhaṣya
28. Vaiyākaraṇānakārika (Gr.)
29. Vaiyākaranabhūsana (Gr.)
30. Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamānjūsa (Gr.)
31. Nyāsaśūtrenduśekhara
32. Śabdaratna (Gr.)
33. Sabdānantasāgarasamuccaya (Gr.)
34. Suptinantasāgarasamuccaya (Gr.)
35. Sabdenduśekhara (Gr.)
36. Samskāraratnamalā
37. Laghusāṅkhyasūtravṛtti
38. Sāpindimaṇjari
39. Sāpindyadīpikā
40. Sphoṭavāda (Gr.)
41. Nāgojibhaṭṭīya (Gr.)
42. Prāyaścittendusekharaśārasaṅgraha
43. Padarthaḍīpikā
44. Paribhāṣenduśekhara (Gr.)
45. Pātanājalaśūtravṛtti and
46. Pātanājalaśūtravṛttibhaṣyacchāyāvyākhyā

In Catalogus Catalogorum Vol. II he adds two other works of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa viz. 1. Udāharanapradīpa (Kāvya-prakāśatīkā) and 2. Hemavati (Paribhāṣenduśekharaṭīkā).

S.K. Belvalkar remarks that Nāgesabhaṭṭa, ascribed his work Ramāyaṇatīkā, a commentary on Adhyātmarāmāyana to his patron. We have already referred to the tradition that Nāgesabhaṭṭa ascribed

the grammatical work Šabdaratna to his teacher Haridīksita. Sitārama Šāstri refers to 56 works of Nāgēsabhatta. He mentions about the two versions of Šabdendusekhara, viz.

1. Brhacchabdendusekhara and 2. Laghušabdendusekhara,

the three versions of Vaiyākaranaśiddhānta manjūsa viz.

1. Vaiyākaranaśiddhānta gu rumanjūsa 2. Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntalaghumanjūsa and 3. Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntaparamalaghumanjūsa, the two versions of Kavyapradīpoddyota viz.

1. Gurukāvyapradīpoddyota and Laghukāvyapradīpoddyota.

The other works mentioned by him in addition to those referred to by Aufrecht are:

1. Vṛttivāda
2. Dhātu vṛttti
3. Tihindusekhar a
4. Candīpāthatīka
5. Pratyākhyanasaṅgraha
6. Paramarthasaravivarana
7. Vṛttisangraha
8. Sudhālaharītikā and
9. Kālendusekhar a

25. Vide Supra p. 11
Sitarama Sastri however does not mention the works Vaiyākaranaabhūsanā and Sapindyadīpikā noted by Aufrecht. P.V. Kane remarks that it is not unlikely that Nagesabhaṭṭa first composed his commentaries on the comparatively easy sastra of poetics and that he then worked upon Dharmaśāstra and Vyākarana. P.K. Gode examines the relative chronology of the works of Nagesabhaṭṭa and substantiates the views of Kane that Nagesabhaṭṭa's literary activity was between 1700 A.D. and 1750 A.D. According to him, the following is the period of composition of some of his works:

1. Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntamaṇjūsa and Mahā-bhaṣyapradīpodyota composed between 1700 - 1708 A.D.

2. Śabdendusekhara composed between 1700 and 1715 A.D.

3. Laghumāṇjūsa composed after the composition Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntamaṇjūsa and Śabdendusekhara.

4. Laghusabdendusekhara composed after the composition of Sabdendusekhara and before 1721 A.D.

5. Paribhasendusekhara composed after the composition of Mahabhāsyapradipoddyota, Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamānjūṣā and Sabdendusekhara.

6. Rasamanjariprakāśa composed between 1700 and 1713 A.D.

7. Rasagaṅgādhararammaprakāśikā composed after the composition of Rasamanjariprakāśa.

8. Āsaucanirñaya composed between 1700 and 1722 A.D.

9. Kāvyapradipoddyota composed between 1700 and 1754 A.D.

Main Grammatical Works

The most celebrated grammatical works of Nageśabhatta viz. Sabdendusekhara, Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamānjūṣā, Sphoṭavāda and Paribhāṣendusekhara which had won for him high renown from all quarters, are now dealt with here briefly.
Sabendusekhara:- This is one famous work of Nagesabhatta and it has got two recensions viz. Brhacchabdendusekhara and Laghusabendusekhara.

This work is in the form of the commentary of Vaiyakarana-siddhāntakaumudi of Bhaṭṭojoḍikṣita. Br. Šab. Šekh.

is not only great by name, but also great by its contents. In this work the rules of Panini are dealt with in all detail. Just like Siddhāntakaumudi, this work too has two parts viz. Purvardha and Uttarārdha.

The former is constituted of 47 prakaraṇas while the latter is provided with 26 prakaraṇas. Nagesabhatta has in this work established the views of Bhaṭṭojoḍikṣita, by clearly refuting the views of the opponents. He has, however, noted the omissions of Bhaṭṭojoḍikṣita. He has also referred to the views of other grammarians on the Paniniya system. He has criticized Kaiyata in this work too. The high intellectual ability of Nagesabhatta is discernable in this work. Some scholars are of opinion that since in the introductory 27 and the concluding 28

27. Vide the verse:-

natvā phañiṣām īśānam kaumudyarthaprakāśakam manoramōmārdhadeham tanve sabendusekharām //

28. Vide the verses :-

1. Sabendusekharaḥ putro manjūsa caiva kanyaka svamataū samyagupādyā sivayorarpitāmayā //

2. sabendusekharāḥ soyam phañibhāṣyoktibhūṣitāḥ satāṁ hṛtkamalesvāstāṁ ṛavaccandradivākaraḥ //
verses of this work, Nāgasebhata refers to this work merely as Sabdendusekhara, this work is to be named Sabdendusekhara and not Brhaacchabdendusekhara.

But this view is not tenable, since Nāgasebhata himself refers to this work as Brhaacchabdendusekhara in sentences like "Vistarastu Brhaacchabdendusekhare draṣṭayyah"

"Vistarastu Brhaacchabdendusekhare bodhyah" etc. at the end of the Purvārdha, Lakārarthaprakriyā, Kṛtprakaraṇa, etc. of Laghusabdendusekhara.

Laghusabdendusekhara is one of the most popularly studied grammatical works of Nāgasebhata. It is accepted as a good text book for getting proficiency in the science of grammar. Though an abridgement of Brhaacchabdendusekhara, the treatment of the subject is comprehensive in this work also. It is to be pointed out here that the study of Sabdendusekhara grew in popularity and caused every other study of to fall into the background. Even the study of Mbh. as well as the philosophical study of grammar in general, suffered a long set-back in consequence, though it is only recently that attempts are again being made to give
these subjects the importance which really attaches to them.

**Sphotavāda:** The doctrine of *Sphota* has been dealt with by many grammarians beginning with Patañjali, in their own works incidentally. Nāgasebhāṭṭa composed the work *Sphotavāda* as if he was not satisfied by these attempts. He has again dealt with the same topic in his *Vaiyākaranasiddhāntamāṇḍūrā.* In *Sphotavāda,* the eight varieties of *Sphota* for eg. *Varnasphota,* *Padasphota,* etc., the conception of *Sakti,* etc. are dealt with elaborately in the grammarian's way. Many points which are not discussed in other works find their place here and are being established. Though as pointed out earlier, there are many grammatical works dealing with the doctrine of *Sphota,* this work surpasses all of them by the comprehensiveness of discussions found in it, and the modern critical treatment of the subject matter.

**Paribhāṣenduśekhara:** Nāgasebhāṭṭa made a thorough study of all the works on *Vyākaraṇa* available in his time and then began as a scholar of ripe age to write on the
Vyākaraṇa paribhāsās after 1710 A.D. From the internal evidence supplied by the Paribhāsenduśekhara and other works, it is obvious that all his important works of outstanding merit like the two Šekharas, the Mahābhāṣya-pradipoddyota and the three Manjūsas had been written by Nāgēsabhāṭṭa before he took up the work of writing the Paribhāsenduśekhara. He has treated in his work 133 paribhāsās to which the Benares School adds the statement "yena nāprāpte yo vidhirārabhyate sa tasya bādhako bhavati", as a separate paribhāsā. It is a difficult yet interesting problem to see how Nāgēsabhāṭṭa had arranged the paribhāsās in his work, as also how far the nature of paribhāsās given by him agrees with the statement at the beginning of his work which runs as follows:

"Prācīnavaiyākaranatantre vācānīkānyatra pāṇinīyatantre jñāpaktīyayasiddhāni bhāṣyāvārtīkayor-upanibaddhāni yāni paribhāsārūpāni tāni vyākhyāyante"

The explanation of this line in a suitable manner has been a puzzle to the commentators, as some of the paribhāsās given by Nāgēsabhāṭṭa are not at all found in Mahābhāṣya, while many others are neither derived from any sūtra of Pāṇī which can be taken as including them, nor based
on any common maxims. However Paribhaṣenduśekhara is a widely studied grammatical work of Nagesabhaṭṭa.

Vyaiyākaranaśiddhāntamanjūsa: This is an original work of Nagesabhaṭṭa and is of great merit, dealing with the philosophy of the grammatical school. In this work, Nagesabhaṭṭa takes upon himself the task of reclaiming the well-nigh forgotten system of the philosophy of Vyākarana. Three works of Nagesabhaṭṭa are named Maṇjūsa. They are 1. Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntabrhaṇamanjūsa or Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntagurumāṇjūsa, 2. Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntalaghumaṇjūsa and 3. Vaiyākaranaśiddhāntaparamalaghumaṇjūsa. The first and the third are treated as the two redactions, the longer one and the shorter one respectively, of Laghumāṇjūsa. With regard to the Paramalaghumaṇjūsa, there is a doubt whether the redaction was made by the author himself, since certain assertions found in Paramalaghumaṇjūsa are quite contradictory to his assertions in Uddyota, Sabdendushekha, etc. But this doubt can easily be

removed when it is pointed out that his assertions in Brhanmanjusa and Laghumanjusa are in accordance with the original texts on which his works form commentaries whereby it is quite probable that he had adhered to the original text; but in Paramalaghumanjusa which is an independent work with full scope for expressing his own views, it may be that the assertions are in accordance with his individual opinion.

The various topics relating to the philosophy of the grammatical school like Sakti, Laksana, Vyanjana Sphota, Akanksa, Yogyata, Asatti, Tatparya, Dhativartha, Nipatarth, Lakarartha, Karaka, Namarth, Vrttyartha are dealt with comprehensively in Nagesabhatta's Manjusa.
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CHAPTER II

THE MAHĀBHAŚYA, PRADĪPA, AND UDDYOTA

Nāgāsabhāṭṭa's work, the Mahābhaśyapradīpodyota is a supercommentary on Kaiyata's gloss on the Mahābhaśya of Patañjali. To understand the true nature of Uddyota, a knowledge of the Mahābhaśya and the Pradīpa on it is also, therefore necessary.

The Mahābhaśya

Mahābhaśya or 'The Great Commentary' is the work of Patañjali who with Pāṇini and Kātyāyana constitutes the Trinity of Sanskrit Grammar. Pat's work deals with the Astādhyāyī of Pāṇi and Vārttikas of Kāṭ. The sūtras of Pāṇi distributed in eight adhyāyas of four pādas each, deals with the grammar of Vedic and classical Sanskrit. To be more precise, Pāṇi's Astādhyāyī deals with the language of his time which he does not define to be exactly Vedic or classical, but from analytical speculations, we may consider 'Ārya Speech'.

With the help of about four thousand sūtras, Pāṇini has given the grammatical network of this speech quite wonderfully. Kāt subjected Astādhyāyī to his criticism. All his criticisms are in the form of vārttikas. He points out what has been omitted or oversaid or what has been said not sufficiently clear by Pāṇini. His vārttikas, thus, correct modify or supplement the rules of Pāṇini wherever they were or had become partially or totally inapplicable. It may also be pointed out that the object of Kāt was not to explain Pāṇini but to find fault in his grammar and as such he has left unnoticed many sūtras that to him appeared valid. Of the nearly 4000 sūtras of Pāṇini, Kāt has noticed over 1500 in about 4000 vārttikas. Mahābhāṣya the voluminous treatise of Pat deals with both the Astādhyāyī and vārttikas. Since unlike the other Bāhyā works Pat's bāhyā deals with vārttikas also in addition to speculating over the sūtras, there is a saying prevalent among Pandits:- "Mahatvam aaya bhāṣyasya vārttikopari cintanād".

2. The traditional definition of vārttika is given in the commentary Chāya of Vaidyanātha Pāyagunde, on Udā "uktānuktaduruktānām cintā yatra pravartate, tam grantham vārtikam prāhurvārtikajñā manisināh".

3. Goldstucker and S. K. Belyalkar opine that Kāt's object was to find fault with Pāṇini but K. Madhava Krishna Sarma maintains that this view is untenable. For details see K. Madhava Krishna Sarma, Panini Kātyāyana and Patanjali, pp. 47-52.
Nature and Contents

Among the commentaries on Ast, none excels Pat's effort in the sureness of the critical touch and in the unimpeachability of the authority. Written in a language which is rendered almost unique by the combination of simplicity and vigour and consisting mainly of dialogues which impart to it an absorbing interest saving it from the dryness that usually characterises a śastraic commentary, the Mahābhāṣya stands out from the rest of its kind, deserving richly the esteem in which it has always been held as the great commentary. An important feature of the work is that it explains many rigid and recondite sastraic rules in terms of maxims derived from everyday life, which makes it higher and wider than a sastraic commentary and enables it to throw a flood of light on the religious social and other aspects of contemporary life. All these excellences entitle it to the first place in the Hindu Grammatical literature, as bringing out best their analytical

---

4. This fact is expressed in the statement: 
"yathottaram muninām prāmāṇyam".
acumen. NBh adduces another reason to account for the greatness of MBh. He points out that the distinctive feature of MBh is that in this work, the author has given his own 'Istis' which add to the importance of the work. Rightly goes the saying "Mahābhāṣyaṃ vā pāthaniyam mahārājyaṃ vā pālanīyam"

Pat's genius overshadowed that of Kāt and attracted a greater measure of reverence from all the later commentators. The classical language since his days has witnessed the palmy days of the beautiful Sanskrit poetry, has passed through the wearisome labyrinth of the later sastraic discourses especially in Nyāya works, and is approaching a stage at which its structure is in danger of being vernacularised. In spite of all this, Pat is even today the authority par excellence on grammatical questions.

The contents of the MBh are the discussions on the sūtras of Pān and vārttikas of Kāt. Goldstucker,

5. Vide Ud p.2.

"Mahābhāṣyetāḥ vyākhyātṛtvepyasyaṣṭādi-kathānanān-vākhyātṛtvāditarabhaśyavallaksanāṇena mahatvam"
Keilhorn and others consider that the Mbh is a commentary on Kat's vařttikas. But the author of Śabdakalpadruma maintains that it is a commentary on the sūtras of Pāṇī and vařttikas of Kat. Of about 4000 sūtras found in the Āst, about 1700 came to the purview of the Mbh. Of them 1200 have under them the vařttikas of one vařttikāra, about 25 have under them the vařttikas of two or more vařttikāras and about 425 have no vařttikas but only bhāṣya, i.e. about one fourth of the book form the interpretation of Pat on the sūtras. Among 1200 sūtras which have vařttikas the vařttikas under about 700 are simply explanatory.

Pat begins with a lucid commentary on the vařttikas more than half of which is in the form of Pūrvapakṣavārttikas and siddhāntavārttikas. Whenever he differs from the opinion of the vařttikakāra or vařttikakāras, he appends his view at the end. Pat almost always agrees with vařttikakāras wherever they deal with the change of words morphologically and semantically. He sometimes

6. "Mahābhāṣya ...... a critical discussion on the vaṛṭṭikas of Kātyāyana, while its istīś on the other hand, are original vaṛṭṭikas on such sūtras of Pāṇini as called for his own remarks." (Pāṇini His place in Sanskrit literature, p.92) "The Mahābhāṣya is, in the first instance a commentary on Kāt's vaṛṭṭikas" (Kātyāyana and Patañjali, p.51)

7. "Param patañjaliḥ sutrapāṭhasya vaṛṭṭikasya ca mahābhāṣyam vidhāya sarvataḥ pramādāpariśunyāyam pāṇiniyaḥstādhyāyī- grantha iti pradarsayan Kātyāyanativrāḍstheḥ raraṅkṣainam samadaraṇiḥyam grantham uttamaṁ"
refutes the amendment of Kāt, through the instrument of yogavibhāga introduced by Kāt himself. The use of a good many paribhasas and nyayas, some of which are his own, enables Pat not only to reject a large number of Kāt's vārttikas but also to widen the scope of the Ast further. He gives his own īstis and makes very good use of the devices discovered by Kāt. The spirit of independent thought combined with keen critical acumen and consummate scholarship pervades the whole of the Mbh.

Commentaries

The Mbh was commented upon by many later commentators. The earliest among the commentators on the Mbh, which is available now is that of Bhar and it is named Mahābhāṣyadīpīkā. On the basis of the references made in this work by Bhar to a number of views of other grammarians, Yudhistira Mīmāṃsaka points out


that there must have been at least 13 commentaries that are earlier to the commentary of Bhar, on *Mbh*.

Skandasvāmin, writer of *Bhāṣya* on *Rg Veda* quotes in his commentary on *Nirukta*, a passage of the *Mbh*, with a commentary on the same. This commentary quoted by Skandasvāmin who is earlier than A.D. 523 is the one that comes next in chronological order after the *Dīpīkā* of Bhar on the *Mbh*. *Kaiyata* of the 11th century A.D. has written a commentary by name *Mahābhāṣya* *Pradīpa*. *Krishnamācārya* refers to a commentary on *Mbh*, written by *Jyeṣṭhakalāśa* of the 11th century A.D. 10 *Maitreyaraksita* of the 11th century A.D., who is a Buddhist grammarian has written a commentary on the *Mbh*. This is known from the quotations from his commentary made by *Sīradeva* in his work *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, *Purusottamaśeṣa* of the 12th century A.D. has written a commentary on the *Mbh* known as *Laghuvṛtti* also named *Pranāpanā*.

The commentary on

the *Mbh* written by Dhānesvara of the 13th century A.D. is named Cintāmani. Suktiratnakara is a commentary on the *Mbh* written by Sesānārayāna of 13th A.D.

Other commentaries on *Mbh* are Kṣirodara written by Viśṇumītra of the 16th century, Bhāsyatattvaviveka of Nilakaṇṭhavājapeyi of the 16th century A.D., Mahābhāṣyaprakaśikā of Sesāvīṣṇu of the 17th century A.D., Mahābhāṣyaratnākara of Sivarāmendrasarasvatī of the 17th century A.D., Anupāda of Tirumalayāvjā of the 17th century A.D. and Vidvamukhabhūṣana of Prayogavenkatādri of unknown date. Kumaratātaya of unknown date is also understood to have written a commentary on the *Mbh*.

Nothing is known about Rajansinha who has written a commentary by name Sabdaprhatī, a manuscript of which is available at Mysore. A commentary by name Mahābhāṣyavivaraṇa written by one Narāyana is also available in Nepal. A commentary on the *Mbh* by name Mahābhāṣyasphūrti written by Sarvesvara Dīkṣita is available at Mysore. Sabdikacintāmani is a commentary on *Mbh* written by Gopāla-krishnaśāstri of the 18th century A.D. Yudhisṭhira Mimāṁsaka points out that there is also another commentary on the *Mbh* by name Mahābhāṣyavyākhyā of unknown authorship and date. Of these commentaries on the *Mbh*, the

11. There is a doubt regarding whether this is a commentary on the *Mbh* or the Pradīpa since in the index of the Adyar Sanskrit Library, this work is referred to by the name Mahābhāṣyapradīpasphūrti.
Mahābhāṣyapradīpa of Kaiyata has got a unique place and it is the most popular one among the commentaries on the Mahabharata.

The Mahābhāṣyapradīpa

The Mahābhāṣyapradīpa, written by Kaiyata of the 11th century A.D., is a voluminous commentary on the Mahabharata of Patanjala. As the name itself suggests, it correctly illuminates the ideas of the Mahabharata and among the commentaries on the Mahabharata, it occupies an unequaled place.

A brief survey:

In the introductory verse of his work, Kaiyata expresses his opinion about his own work. He says:

"mahābhāṣyār̥ṇavaṇa-vāraparīṇam vivṛtti-plavam  
yathāgamam vidhāsyeyah kaiyato jaiyatātmajah  //
bhāṣyābdhīla kvātigambhirah kvāhām mandamati-statah  //
chātrānām upahāsyatvam yāsyāmi piśunātmanām  //
tathāpi haribaddhena sāreṇa granthasetunā  //
kramānāh śanaiḥ pāram tasya prāptasmi paṅguvat  //
Kaiyata points out that his aim is to produce, according to the Sastras, an explanatory work which will act as a boat to cross over the ocean of the Mbh. Quite humbly, he remarks that he is possessed of an intellect which is slow in grasping, whereas the Mbh. is an unfathomable ocean of knowledge. He may even be ridiculed in his attempt by narrow minded students. Even then he has ventured to cross over that ocean moving slowly like a lame, crippled man to the other shore of that ocean by virtue of the sound bridge provided by Bhar, in the form of his best work. 

Nbh remarks that the expression 'sanaih kramamānah' indicated that Kt's commentary is not too short and the simile expressed by the word 'Paṅguvat' implies that while commenting on the Mbh, Kaiyata has omitted nothing worthy of being commented upon and also that his work is not an elaborate one. 12

While commenting on the Mbh, Kaiyata closely followed the views of Bhar. It is to the Vākyapadīya particularly to the Prakīrnakānda, of Bhar, that Kaiyata refers in his introductory verse. In the whole of

his commentary, Kaiyata has only once referred to the Mahabhasyadipika of Bhar. and he has never quoted Mahabhasyadipika anywhere in his commentary. We meet with more than a hundred quotations from Vâk in Pradipâ. The great scholarship of Kaiyata is well exhibited in Pradipâ. It is definitely a good asset to one who is intent on studying a profound text like the Mbh. Hence his commentary has got a great status in the system of Pâniniyan Grammar. His commentary pervades the whole of the Mbh. He has elucidated the meaning of words, expressions and passages in the Mbh and has cited the different views held by scholars in regard to the meaning of particular passages in the Mbh. His approach to Mbh is that of an elucidation and he does not seem an to make an attempt to criticise it.

Commentaries:

Owing to the greatness of Pradipâ among the commentaries on Mbh, many a later commentator has resorted

13. "Vistareṇa bharthṛhariṇā pradarsita uhaḥ" (Prdp. p. 14)

to commenting on Pradīpa instead of commenting upon
the Mahābhāṣya. The commentaries on Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa,
which are available now number 15. They are Mahābhāṣya-
prakāśa of Cintāmaṇi of the 16th century A.D., a small
work by name vivarana of Rāmachandra Sarasvathy of the
16th century A.D., the long commentary Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa-
vivarana of Iśvarānanda Sarasvathy of the 16th century
A.D., Mahābhāṣya-pradīpoddyotana of Nāganātha of the 17th
century A.D., the commentary written by Mallaya Yajva
of the 17th century A.D., Mahābhāṣya-pradīpoddyotana of
Nāgesabhaṭṭa who flourished towards the end of the 17th
century and the first half of the 18th century A.D.,
Mahābhāṣya-pradīpoddyotana of Annambhaṭṭa of the 18th
century A.D., the commentary on Pradīpa written by Nārāyana
Śāstri of the 18th century A.D., Mahābhāṣya-pradīpavyākhyā of
Rāmasevaka of 18th century A.D., Mahābhāṣya-pradīpapraṅgāsika
of Pravartakopādhyāya of unknown date, Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa-
sphūrti of Ādenna of unknown date, Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa-
vivarana of Nārāyana of unknown date, Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa-
sphūrti of Sarveśvara Somayāji, Mahābhāṣya-pradīpavyākhyā
of Harirāma and lastly the commentary by name Pradīpa-
vyākhyā of unknown authorship and date, available at the
Lalcan Library of the Dayānanda Anglo-Vedic College
at Lahore. Of these, the Mahābhāṣyapradīpodyota of
NBh is the most popular one.

The Mahābhāṣyapradīpodyota

Now that we have noticed the Mbh and the
Prdp on it, we may turn to the Mahābhāṣyapradīpodyota
of NBh.

The name 'Uddyota':

NBh has named his gloss on Mahābhāṣyapradīpā as Uddyota. This appears to be a favourite term of
NBh, since he has used this term to name another
commentary namely Kāvyapradīpodyota written by him. The word 'Uddyota' derived from the root 'dyut'
 prefixed with 'ud', conveys the idea, "that which enlightens" and it is quite appropriate in regard to his commentaries.

This word is to be distinguished from the name 'Uddyotana' of the commentaries written by Nāganātha and Annambhāṭṭa.

**Aim and Scope of the work:**

NBh, himself has given the nature aim and scope of his work in the introductory verses of the work. He says:-

\[ \text{nāvistirnām na vistirnām madhyānāmapi boddhakrd} \]
\[ \text{bhāsyapradīpavyākhyānam kurve'ham tu yathāmati} \]

NBh's proclamation is "bhāsyapradīpavyākhyānam kurve". His work, therefore, has got the nature of a commentary. It is not an independent one if separated from the text of the Mbh and the Prdp. It is not merely explanatory and descriptive but also critical.

16. Vide Supra p.47.

17. Śitārāma Sāstri's remark is noteworthy here.

\[ \text{"bhāsyam panaṭanjaleryattu sutrānām pāñiner mahat} \]
\[ \text{marmajñastasya nāgēśh pradīpodyotakrd yatah} \]
\[ \text{pratnanūtanamārgau dvau dṛṣyete pāñiner maye} \]
\[ \text{tayoḥ samanvyayah sādhur nāgeśena mudā kṛtah} \]

(Mangalśloka in his edition of Br.Sab.Sekh)
He refers to himself as "Nageshabhasitarthavicaksanah" in the introductory verse, i.e., one adept in understanding the ideas expressed by Pat. He is quite confident that he fully knows the ideas favoured by Pat. The aim of his work is, therefore, to bring home to the mind of the reader the ideas and theories favoured by Pat, by rendering a comprehensive, but at the same time, not too elongated, elucidation. His work is intended to be comprehensive and is calculated to educate even an average student. It is not too elongated to feel bored. While Kţ says that he has closely followed the lines of Bhar while commenting on Mbh, NBh points out that he has given priority to his own intelligence. He follows what his intellect dictates to him and that is the factor which makes his work distinctive in its nature. It is clear from the introductory verses that the scope of his work is the whole of Mbh and Prdp on it.

Characteristics of the work:

As a commentary endeavouring to make the study of the Mbh and the Prdp easy and comprehensive, the Udy can be seen to have certain characteristics and these are noticed below:-
A work commenting on two works simultaneously.

A characteristic feature of the work is that it serves as a commentary for both the Mbh and the Prdp. The author has stated, "Bhāṣyapradīpavyākhyānam kurve". Here the expression bhāṣyapradīpavyākhyānam if treated as a saṣṭhītātpuruṣa compound by splitting it as bhāṣyasya pradīpam bhāṣyapradīpam tasya vyākhyānam bhāṣya ..............nam, his work is prone to be understood as a commentary on Pradīpa which happens to be a gloss on the Mbh. But when one goes through his work it is clearly understood that his work is a commentary on the Mbh also. The work therefore, is really an explanatory and critical study of both the Mbh and the Prdp. The part 'bhāṣyapradīpam' is to be split up as bhāṣyam ca pradīpam ca bhāṣyapradīpam and then it gets compounded with the word vyākhyānam (i.e., tayoh vyākhyānam). The

19. Vide "Bhāṣyeti dvandvottaram saṣṭhītātpurusaḥ" (Vaidyanaṭha Pāyangunde's commentary, Chāya on Udy p.2.)
reason for the fact that the Udy is generally referred to as a commentary of Prdp may probably be that it abounds more in the elucidative and critical assertions on Kṛ than those on Pat, which again may be due to the fact that NBh does not feel the necessity of commenting on all the passages in the Mbh where Kṛ has already rendered satisfactory explanations and hence has commented upon such parts of the Mbh where Kṛ remains silent and NBh has thereby found scope for further elucidation. Wherever he entertains difference of opinion with Kṛ in regard to the interpretation of the Mbh and the like he has given his own criticism on the Mbh.

2. Abundance of lucid explanations:-

Quite befitting his remark about his work "madhyānāmapi bodhakrd" in the introductory verse, it can be seen that the Udy abounds in explanations which are characterised by lucidity. The meanings given in the Udy of very short questions found in the Mbh like "kassabda iti kassabdasabdābhidheya ityarthah" can be seen in the Udy p.8.
give clarity of the idea of the context. The meaning of words are always noted down for eg. "atmaśabdo dravyavāci bhāsyena". Sentences of elumsy structure are provided with the 'anvaya' which facilitates easy comprehension. So also ideas referred to by the phrase 'tata eva', those to be comprehended by the word 'ādi' used by Pat or Kṣ, and those referred to by pronouns like 'tad', 'tena', 'tatra', 'iha', etc. are always pointed out. Many passages are elucidated citing suitable nyāyas. The derivation of compounds and inflected forms are always given to make the idea of the sentence clearer. The word 'athavā' used by Pat or Kṣ for introducing a view, after citing a view already, is explained significantly. So also words which occur in the Mbh or the Prdp and function as indicators (upalaksana) are pointed out. The author always supplies the predicate, subject or other suitable words that are missing in a sentences so that the idea is clarified.

22. Vide infra p.479-484.
Again sūtras and vārttikas are cited when the operations enjoined by them are referred to by Pat or Kt. The usages which come outside the scope of the rules of Pan are pointed out, for example the author says "paranipātobhāsyaprāmāṇyād"\textsuperscript{23}. The passages in the Mbh or statements in the Prdp are introduced by giving the viewpoint viz. Jātipaksa, Kāryākālapaksa, Vyaktipaksa, Yathoddesapaksa, etc. on which the particular passage or statement is based. Again wherever Kt expresses his dissent by the word āhuh, the arucibiṣṭa is given in the Udy. The Mbh being a work in the form of dialogues, the specification of the conversant is quite welcome to the average student and the reader and we find that Udy abounds in statements wherein the passage is specified to be coming from the mouth of ekadesin, siddhāntin, pūrvapaksin siddhāntyekadesin, ācāryadesīya, sūtrārambhavādin, pratyākhyānavādin, etc.

\textsuperscript{23} Vide Udy p.80.
3. **Originality of the author discernable in spite of the work being a commentary:**

In a work of the nature of a gloss, the commentator has scope only for the elucidation and justification of the assertions on the text on which he comments. The intellectual ability of the commentator can be discerned only when intricate passages are explained or apparent anomalies if any, in the text are justified suitably. A commentator has always thus, to adhere to what has been favoured by the author of the text on which the commentary is framed. Uddyota, though a commentary does not confine its scope in elucidating and justifying the statements in the Mbh and the Prdp. The text of the Mbh and the Prdp can find a critic in NBh. To the intelligent reader having an objective point of view, the work of NBh presents the picture of a lawyer intent on justifying facts from the logical point of view only.

4. **Citations:**

Another noteworthy characteristic of the work is the citation of different views found in it. The different views related to a particular passage or assertion are always cited. The individual view of the author is given by the phrases like Pare tu, Pare tu āhuh, Pare tu vadanti vastutastu, etc. The views of others are cited with phrases like ityanye 'anye tu āhuh' 'kecitu vadanti' 'iti kecit' etc. The author does not as a rule mention the name of any grammarian whose view he cites. In addition, the different readings of the text of the Mbh and the Prdp are also cited in this work.

Commentaries:

Vaidyanātha Pāyagūnde, disciple of NBh, has written a commentary by name Chāya on Udy. But it is

---

25. Vide Infra Chapter V pp. 226-235

26. In the second āhnika, while commenting the first sentence in the bhāṣya under the rule "Vṛddhirādaic" NBh refers to Haradatta by name in order to cite his view regarding the interpretations of the rule "Vṛddhirādaic" (vide Mbh p. 103). So also, commenting on the bhāṣya passage 'naitad asti asiddho dhalopah tasyāsiddhatvāṇṇaitadantyam bhavati' under the rule "iko gunavrddhi" (1.1.3), he refers to Mādhava by name to cite a view held by the latter which he refutes totally (vide Mbh p. 126)

27. Vide Supra p. 12.
not complete and extends only up to that part of the first āhnika, wherein the first vārttika "śiddhe .... kriyate" is introduced. Pandit Rudradharajha Sarma has recently written a commentary mainly explanatory, by name Tatvāloka wherein the elucidation the text of Mbh, the Prdū and the Udy is made.