CONCLUSION
7.1 *Samāsa* is a very special feature of the sanskrit language. According to Dr. A.A. Macdonell[1], the vedic language has inherited this style of combining words from the Indo-European speech. Naturally, in the early stages of such an import, the frequency of their occurrence was very small and the cp.s formed were simple and consisting mostly of two, or rarely, of three words. Indeed, such simple cp.s are found in the *samhitā* literature. This tendency of forming two or three membered cp.s slowly developed with the progress and prosperity of the ancient Indian civilization and a consequent development and maturity of the sanskrit language.

*Up.s* form a particular class of literary activity. The *Up.s*, referred to as *vedānta*, 'end of *vedas*', form the concluding portion of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Hindus have traditionally revered the *Up.s* as the final authority in the knowledge of the ultimate reality. From the language point of view, the *Up.s* lie on the borderline of vedic language and the classical sanskrit language. Among themselves, however, they display a considerable change in style and expression.

*Samāsa* which was simple in form and more natural in expression in the early phase of the language, changed towards complexity of form and artificiality of expression in the later phase. Statistical analysis of the frequency of occurrence of the cp.s can serve as a tool in quantitatively
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1. *Vedic Grammar* by A.A. Macdonell pp. 143
measuring this change and is used for redefining the probable chronological order of the Up.

The attempts at chronologically placing the texts of the major Up.s chronologically are made by Dr. Winternitz[1], and by Dr. P. Deussen[2], though on a different basis. Both have conjectured three periods. Their argument for distributing the Up.s in different periods is as follows:

The texts of the Up.s, such as, the Br., Chān., Tai., Ai., Kau., and the Ke., clearly forming the final portion of the Āramyakas belong to the oldest period. The texts of the Up.s, such as, the Ka., Ī., Śve., and the Mun., which are mainly in a verse form and are shown to be connected to the different vedic śākhās, but display distinct signs of advanced thoughts and secterian approach, belong to the second period. A few Up.s, such as, the Pra., Mai., and the Mā., which, though written in the archaic prose style, but betray the marks of the later classical language, belong to the last period. These scholars have not considered the four small Bā., Chā., Ā., and Śau. Up.s, as well as the largest Jai.Up.
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The study of cp.s in the texts of the eighteen major Up.s is made on two lines. Statistical analysis is used as one method. One 'unit' is one complete sentence if the text is in a prose style, and one line of a verse if the text consists of verses. A percentage is drawn by comparing the number of units with the number of occurrences of the cp.s. An attempt is then made to fix and propose a probable chronological order of the eighteen major Up.s by comparing the percentages; the more the percentage of occurrence of cp.s, the later is the period of the Up.

The first period ranges between 10% and 40%, the second between 41% and 90%, and the third between 91% and 134%. Thus, a new chronological order of the Up.s is suggested as follows.


The chronological placement of the Up.s suggested by me on the statistical approach, is almost identical to that suggested by Dr. Deussen, with the following exceptions: Dr. Deussen suggests the the Br. is the oldest of all Up.s and that the Ke. Up. lies on the borderline of the first and the second period. Both of his observations are not supported by the statistical observations, according to which the Ke. Up. has the lowest percentage of cp.s and therefore, is to be regarded as the oldest.
The new order of sequence based on these statistical findings may prepare the ground for the conceptual study of these Up.ic texts. Brahman, for example, is a very central and immensely important concept in the Up.ś. The Ke. Up.[1] introduces its superpowerful nature by narrating a story in the Brāhmaṇa style, whereas, the same Brahman is described by the Kau. Up.[2] as an emperor sitting on a throne wearing ornaments and welcoming the newly arrived Brahma-vid. The Br. Up.[3] defines Brahman in the world famous formula, neti, neti. In this approach, it tries to define the highest reality by a method of elimination of things which are known through perception.

We, thus find that, the description of Brahman offered by the Ke. and the Kau. Up.ś is more mundane than that offered by the Br. Up. Generally, the human mind in the pursuit of knowledge always travels from concrete to abstract. The definition in the Br. Up. seems to be more matured and therefore, later in time. This qualitative study corroborates the statistical findings.

The exhaustive study of the cp.ś in the light of the Pāṇinian rules and framework reveals some peculiarities. The following is the percentage of occurrence of cp.ś of the various classes in the Up.ic language.

1. Ke. 3.1.12
2. Kau. 1.4
3. Br. 4.4.22
The attestations of **tp.** and **bv.** cp.s are far more in number than those of **avv.** and **dv.** cp.s. The cases of the **vibhakti** **tp.** are the maximum in the various **tp.** cp.s. The **tritvi** and the **sasthi** **tp.** are more often used than the rest of the **vibhakties.** It is more natural to use **sasthi** **tp.**, as the relation between two things is easily understood even when expressed in a cp. form. A conjecture may be therefore, presented that the **tp.** and the **bv.** cp.s preceded all other types in the history of language. **dv.** appears to be less perfected to its corresponding expression in a sentence.

Normally, from all classes, two membered cp.s are found. However, about a hundred multimembered cp.s are observed in the text. The tendency of forming multimembered cp.s is clearly enhanced in the **Up.**s belonging to the third period.

**cps in the light of Pāninian grammar:**

Out of the 110 P. rules from the first two **pādas** of the second **adhyāya,** attestations are available in the **Up.**s for which only about 44 rules can be applied. All the **Up.**ic cp.s are found to be formed by adhering to the general principle of compounding, namely, **samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ** P. 2.1.1. A semantic and syntactic propriety between the members of the cp.s always exists, though, a few cases of **asamartha** **samāsa** are noted and discussed specially at
opportune time. Only one glaring example of the *asamartha samāsa* from the Ā. Up. may be repeated here. The *upapada* tp. cp. *ahīghnam* 'slayer of a serpent', occurs in the following sentence.

*ahīghnam tamārnamā savānam ...* 'The serpent lies in the ocean and Indra kills that serpent and so he is called *ahīghnah*'.

Generally speaking, the cp.s of each class are explainable by the general rule of each class. Not a single attestation illustrating the rule which professes specific examples is found. To give an example, the *kdh.* cp.s are explained by the general rule P. 2.1.57, and several attestations illustrating this rule could be found. However, not a single attestation illustrating the rules P. 2.1.53, or 2.1.67 is found. The rules P. 2.1.15, 2.1.40, 2.1.59, or 2.1.72, which give the list of readymade forms are not, it is observed, substantiated by any attestation from the bulk of literature studied.

Majority of the *Up.* ic cp.s are Pāṇinian. Some of the non-Pāṇinian forms could be made Pāṇinian, if the scope of some rules were extended, or addition of some particular word-forms were made to some particular rules, for example, as already observed, the addition of the words, such as *upeta*, *maheta* etc. to P. 2.1.24, would make the cp.s, such as, *samvṛddhyupetam* or *brahmapetah* regular.

A few *trīyā*, *pañcamī*, and *saptamī* tp. cp.s cannot be explained by the available Pāṇinian rules. For
example, the **tritiya** cp. formed with **krtvanta** word do not express the idea of exaggeration as prescribed by P. 2.1.33. Consider the cp.s such as, **bhavagrayam** or **sankhyayogadhigamyam**, in which the idea of **karana** is predominant. The cp., **brahmaikata**, 'unity with Brahman' has the sense of **saha** which is not taken into consideration by Pāṇini. The **hetu tritiya** in several cases forms cp.s such as, **aj纳devaḥ**, **karmadevaḥ**, or **kamacaraka**.

The **pancamī** **tp.**, such as, **indrajyesthaḥ**, or **sarvaparam**, which are based on implied comparison, or such as, **vākprabhūtam** or **amrtajātam**, which are based on the cause of creation, are not recorded by Pāṇini.

All the cases of the **saptamī** **tp.** cp.s, such as, **purayacakaḥ**, **brahmāpyayaḥ**, or **kayagnih**, are to be explained on the principle of **sāmartya** caused by **kāraka** relation.

The generous use of **nān** **tp.**, **upapada** **tp.**, and **nān** **by.** cp.s is another distinct aspect of the **Up. ic** language. The negation of action implied by **krdanta** words is more frequent than the negation of either noun or adjective. It implies the natural tendency in which a negation of an action is easily comprehended by a human mind than the negation of a noun or a quality. One finds the negative adjectives, such as, **ayukta, anashnan, avirataḥ**, **aśāntah**, in which an abstract action or an action in process is negated more often than the negative adjectives, such as, **abrāhmaṇa, amānava**, or **aghorā** in which a thing or a quality is negated.

All the **Up.**s make an ample use of **upapada** **tp.**
displaying a peculiar linguistic tendency. The use of such cp.s make any expression precise and clear. For example, instead of saying, *yah sarvam jānāti*, a single word *sarvajñaḥ* serves as a better expression. This Up.ic tendency has framed some of the famous terms such as, *brahmaṇid, ātmajña, sarvaga*, which have become stock vocabulary in the later philosophical literature.

Pāṇini has given a very casual treatment to the dv. cp.s. Only a formal definition, *cārthe dvandvah* is given without any thought to its semantic background. The study of the dv. cp.s in the Up.s throws light on different feelings, thoughts, aspirations, and expectations working in the mind of the speaker. Things of contrast, things of venerations, as well as the other things which are conjoined in a dv. cp. make these cp.s more meaningful. The relevant P. rules and the supplementary vt.s fall short to cover the range of the samāhāra dv. cp.s occurring in the text of the Up.s. Several examples in which, the concept of prosperity displayed by cp.s such as, *gośvam, hastyaśabham, dāśabhāryam*, or the fivefold yogic quality arising from the five elements displayed by cp.s such as, *prthivyaptejo-nilakhe* are found in the Up.s.

cp.s, such as, *khaṭvārūḍhah, taptenakulah*, or kākapeyā, having a proverbial, conventional, or customary meaning are absent in the entire bulk of the Up.ic literature. The word *kim* is always used in a simple interrogative sense in the Up.s and never in a derogatory
sense as found in the cp., *kīmsakhā* in the later literature. The usage of the cp.s, such as *kīmdevataḥ, kīmiyotih* in a simple interrogative sense is perhaps due to the subject matter of these texts, which deal with the *parāvidyā* and are thus, not concerned with the metaphorical or colloquial usage of the expression.

The cp.s, *brahmagandhah, brahmarasaḥ,* or *brahmayaśād* are derived by *kvt.* 2.2.8.2, which insists upon the relation of a substance and its quality. Thus, *Brahman* should be considered as a substance to which these qualities are attributed. Such a solution of the cp.s do create problem in the interpretation of the text to the followers of Advaita school, who believe that the ultimate reality is above any relation.

The two cp.s, *rājanyabandhu,* and *brahmbandhu* imply insult in the mind of a speaker, while *P.* 6.3.21, *sasthyā ākrośe* prohibits compounding when such an insult is implied. Such cp.s are against the Pāṇinian rules.

*Up.s* deal with the problems of life, death, world creation and reality. It is a *parāvidyā* - a deeper, speculative, intuitive branch of knowledge. The *Up.s* have their own language, style, phrases, and stock expressions. Several of the *Up.ic* compounds have acquired special connotation. As examples one may consider the cp.s, such as, *ekahamsa* meaning self, *ekapundarīka* meaning the sun, or *ekarsi* meaning fire. An exclusive vocabulary of words such as, *antarvāmi, aja, sarvaga,* or *puriśaya* is also formed. The
process of petrifaction is also visible here; **khaçara** means bird, **apsucarīn** means fish, **gūhāṣaya** means individual self, **madhukṛt** means honeybee, or **ūrdhvācchāsīnam** means a dying man.

Some times the **Up.** s offer their own solutions for the words or the cp. s used in them, for example, the word **satrāyanā** should really be solved as **sattrāṇām ayanam** - a **sasthi** tp., but the **Chān. Up.** solves it as **satah ātmanah trāyanam**. In a similar fashion, the word, **aśanāryā** is treated as a cp. on the lines of **gonāya, aśvanāya** etc.

The exhaustive study of these **Up.** ic cp. s is useful in giving a new approach to their study. A cp. deals more with the underlying concept than the individual meanings of the compounded words, the study of cp. s is very much vital in the process of understanding the texts.

A given problem can be tackled directly by a straightforward definition or indirectly by a process of negation and elimination. One finds that the **Br.** and the **Mai. Up.** s prefer the indirect approach and thus, use **nañ bh.** or **nañ tp.** more frequently. This approach also throws light on their thought process.

A slow development from a qualitative and descriptive approach to a quantitative and definite approach is found in the frequency of occurrence of the cp. s with numerals. The **Śve. Up.**, for example, uses such cp. s with a very high frequency.

The study cp. s also throws light on the cultural and social life during the period of the particular **Up.** lt.
reveals the world of the symbols and convictions, hopes and aspirations, and acceptabilities and detestations of the society. A close acquaintance with horses, chariots and archery is revealed by op.s such as manahpraghavat, sadasvā, rathacakra, rathanemi, ujjvam adhuyam mahādhānurdhara or tamolakṣaṇā. The art of sailing and the knowledge of ocean is revealed in op.s such as, brahmodupa, tasyābhīghātīna, oṃkārapiṛava, or samudravelā. The cp.s, anuloma and pratiloma suggest their pastoral side of life. Their idea of wealth consists of elephants, horses, slaves, cows, goat, etc. and is clearly expressed in the cp.s such as, ajāvavahā, goaśvam, dāsabhāryam and so on. pitṛhā, mātrhā, ācāryahā, bhrṇahā, madyapah and others such cp.s show their crime world and social norms. The extraordinary importance of a male child in the basically agricultural society is vividly seen through by expressions such as, putra rodām rodīty.

Thus, I may conclude that samāsa is not (only) an artificial linguistic activity but a very spontaneous expression used in communication of thought and the exhaustive study of the op.s from the eighteen major Up.ś is helpful and instructive in a more thorough comprehension of the Up.ś.