Abstract

India has illustrious traditions of Philosophy of language. Almost every system of Indian philosophy including the system grammar has something to say on the function of the language in the terms of human linguistic behavior. On one point every system believes that the language refers to the world with which human beings behave. But the systems differ so far as the identification of relationship between language and reality is concerned. This difference emerges because each system starts with certain presuppositions with which others do not agree in toto. Thus we find serious attempts in the traditions to identify the referents of each element of a linguistic expression. Although many ideas developed at the time of Patañjali and elaborated by Bhartṛhari very systematic and exhaustive account has been presented by Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa in his Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa and by Nāgeśa in his ‘Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamaṅgūṣa’. Needless to say these works are highly influenced by different philosophical systems. It is, therefore, necessary to study them in a broader perspective.

For the present thesis only ‘Tīnarthavicāra’ of ‘Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamaṅgūṣa’ in Sanskrit language have been taken as the base and it has been studied in comparison with the doctrines of other systems of thought like the Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā systems.

Scope:

Since, the scope of this thesis is limited to Nāgeśa’s writings of the early period, the central discussion has focused primarily on the meaning of
the personal suffixes. But, relevant references from his later writings especially from Parmalaghumañjusā and Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamañjusā have also been drawn upon as and when required.

The entire study has been presented in two parts: Part-I and Part-II.

Part-I. Presents the studies and part-II contains Sanskrit text, English translation and necessary notes.

**Part I**

**Chapter-I**

In this chapter we have stated the methodology we followed for the thesis. And a list of personal suffixes and their treatment by Pāṇini have been presented.

**Methodology:**

The methodology followed for this thesis can be broadly called 'comparative translational' method. By comparative we mean bringing out the similarities and distinction of thoughts regarding the meaning of the personal suffixes, among the grammarians, logicians and Mīmāṃsakas. And, by translational method we mean the translation of the Sanskrit text i.e. 'Tīnarthavicāra' of 'Vaiyākaraṇa Siddhānta Mañjusā', into English.

**Chapter-II.**

In this chapter we have discussed the issue of śābdabodha (verbal understanding) keeping up the earlier reference i.e. the personal
suffixes and their referent in our mind. Here we have projected three different significant theories i.e. 1. The meaning of the verbal root is the prime qualificand 2. Meaning of the nominative is the prime qualificand and 3. The meaning of the personal suffix is the prime qualificand, promulgate by the grammarians, the logicians and the Mīmāṁsakas respectively.

Chapter-III

Highlighting Nāgėśa’s viewpoint a brief summary has been prepared in this chapter. According to him every root has a group of two meanings (a) result (phala) and (b) volition (vyāpāra). Both of them remain associated with each other. And activity becomes the chief-qualificand in a sentence in the context of verbal cognition. The point here must be noted that the neo-grammarians like Nāgėśa etc. are of the view that in case of passive voice, the verbal understanding will have the result as the chief qualificand and in the case of active voice, activity will be the chief qualificand, because the result and the activity are prominent in the case of passive and active voice respectively. But, according to the older section of grammarians, in both cases i.e. active and passive voice prominent is volition (vyāpāra) only.

Chapter-IV:

This chapter deals with the issues identified in the previous chapters and these are compared with those of other systems like Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā and have been critically examined in the light of the development in the modern linguistics.
Chapter V:

In this chapter the conclusion of the entire study have been presented. We have drawn the following conclusion:

The grammarians accept ‘dhātvartha’ is prominent one in the case of verbal understanding. They make their viewpoint justified on the basis of the Nirukata statement i.e. ‘bhāvapradhānam ākhyātam’ of Yāska. They claim that this statement is to be supportive of their stand. Therefore the grammarians interpret ākhyāta means root. And the bhāva means action, which is conveyed by the root everywhere. But bhāva the meaning of the root always does not fix its meaning as in the case of ‘bhāve ghañ’ and in the case of ‘tad adhīte tad veda’ where the theory of the dhātvartha does not work.

If the ‘Naiyāyikas Prathamānta mukhya viśeṣyaka śābdabodha’ theory is taken into consideration it is seen that there is no uniformity. According to them if every sentence is interpreted according to its nature then one has to postulate innumerable cause and effect relationships. More over the grammarians point out the drawback in the sentence like ‘Paśya mṛgo dhāvati’ etc.

On the other hand the Mīmāṃsakas’ theory of ‘bhāvanā mukhya viśeṣyaka śābdabodha’ brings contingency for them. And the theory of implication (ākṣepa) of the agent suggested by them does not suit to their position also. Because, if it is accepted as in the case of ‘jāti’, which implies ‘vyakti’, so agent is obtained by the implication can be prominent and as such, the Mīmāṃsakas’ theory of prominence of ‘bhāvanā’ will be compromised.
And, if the activity is admitted as secondary, then, it will go against 'Yāska's statement i.e. 'bhāvapradhānamākhyātam'.

Part II.

This part contains the Sanskrit text and its translation. The text does not have any commentary. It has not yet been translated. Therefore, we have made an attempt to translate the Sanskrit text 'Tiṅarthavicāra' of Nāgeśa into English. For deciding the Sanskrit text two editions, one by Dr. Kalika Prasada Sukla, published from Sampurnananda Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, Varanasi, and another one is by Kapil Dev Sastri, from Kurukshetra University have been consulted. Cogency in arguments has been the most dependable criterion for accepting the reading of the text.
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