CHAPTER-IV

GRAMMAR AND MEANING

There had been many grammarians and grammatical schools before and after Pāṇini. Also there are many interpretations of Pāṇinīyam or Aṣṭādhyāyi, interpretations of these interpretations and their interpretations and so on. The Aṣṭādhyāyi comprising around 4000 sūtras is divided into eight chapters as implied by its name. Each of these chapters are divided into four pādas. Later Kātyāyana wrote vārtikās to discuss the origin of additional words which were not covered by Pāṇini and Patañjali wrote Mahābhāṣya introducing a scientific formulation of Pāṇinīyam which could replace the vārtikās. Śūtrakāra, vārtikakāra and mahābhāṣyakāra are collectively referred to as munitraya among
grammarians. Based on the vākya, ‘Yathottaram munīnām prāmāṇyaṁ’, the grammarians says that Kātyāyana is higher authority than Pāṇini while Patañjali is higher to Kātyāyana. Before Pāṇini himself, Yāska the author of Nirukta had put forward the theory that the origin of all nāmās are from dhātūs. This was made the foundation of the Pāṇinīya programme. The topics discussed in Aṣṭādhyāyi are same as those of others works on grammar viz., nāma, sarvanāma, kriya, sandhi, samāsa, pratyaya etc. But the significance of Pāṇinīya is that they are not dealt with individually or in a particular order as in other works. The astounding minimisation achieved by Pāṇini in his Aṣṭādhyāyi is its speciality over other works. In order to achieve this, the important techniques that he has employed are pratyāhārās and anubandhās. The pratyāhāra is achieved with the help of fourteen sūtras. Though Pāṇini’s marks of identities are observable in his anubandhās, we cannot say that he was the first one to introduce these techniques. On the other hand
what we can say is that he has made the maximum use of these techniques. The formulation of gaṇās consisting of the collection of padās which are subject to similar processes was also motivated by this simplification. Some of the gaṇās are self contained (svayam sampūrṇa) while some others are ākṛtigaṇa. By ākṛtigaṇa is meant gaṇās containing only some important padās of the same class and not all of them. Pāṇini suggests only the first pada of each gaṇa in his sūtras. Another technique availed for minimisation in the use of some technical symbols (gha,luk,lup etc.) Some of them are adapted from his predecessors while others are his own creations. When he introduces a new sūtra, he has taken special care to discard all padās whose contextual meanings are clear or whose meanings are derived from pūrvasūtras. This technique is called anuvrtti. In order to achieve this anuvrtti he has made some sūtras authentic (adhikaraṇasaṣṭra). An adhikaraṇa sūtra is one which, while interpreting other sūtras coming under it, is to be repeated fully or
partially. The *upadeśa* that starting from the *adhikārasūtra* ‘pūrvatrāśidhan’ all *vidhīs* till the end of the *grantha* are *asidhās* before that *sūtra* might have been for the minimisation, was the application of *paribhāṣāsūtrās*. To understand the meaning given by Pāṇini for his techniques these *paribhāṣās* are imperative. It is the effort that Pāṇini has taken for the minimisation, precision and comprehension that makes the Pāṇinīyam different from other works.

In ancient times the authors were very cautious about four aspects of any scientific work namely *viśaya, saṃbandha*, *prayojana* and *adhikāri*. Among these the aspect *prayojana* changes with time. The Pāṇinīya grammar is considered as a part of Vedās. The Vedās have two parts, namely, *Mantra* and Brāhmaṇa. At the beginning only *Mantrās* were accepted as Vedās. Yāska in his *Nirukta* while discussing examples introduces only *vākyās* from mantra part as ‘*tadhaya mantravāną*’ and ‘*tadhaya nigama*’. 
Brähmaṇa vākyās are introduced only as 'itivijayate'. In Pāṇinīyavyākhyaṇa of Patañjali the viṣaya is introduced by 'atha śabdānuśāsanaḥ'. For the question 'keṣāṃ śabdānāḥ' he gives the answer 'laukikānāḥ vaidikānāḥ ca'. Thus Patañjali accepted Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini as the grammar of laukikabhāṣā and vaidikabhāṣā. But Pāṇini had defined Aṣṭādhyāyi mainly as grammar of laukikabhāṣā. Where ever the vaidikā language differs from laukikā language, he has only specified the difference. He has not given stress to vaidika bhāṣā. At different contexts with the use of sutrās like 'vā chandas', 'bahulam chandas' etc., he makes clear that he specifies rules which are not applicable to Vedās. 'sarve vīdhaya chandasī vikalpyante' is a premise of the Pāṇinīya school.

---

1 Mbh.1.1
2 Pāṇinīya, V.III.13
3 Ibid, VI.IV.75
Patañjali and śabdasūtra

Patañjali mentions five main prayojanas for śabdasūtra. Mahābhāṣya presents it as

‘rakṣohāgamalakhvasandeḥ’.

1) For the prevalence of Veda one should learn vyākaraṇa. That is the first prayojana means that one who knows lopa, āgama, and varṇavikāra the saviour of Veda.

2) ‘Ūha’ (assumption) also is a prayojana. In Vedās mantra is not proposed in all lingās and in all vibhaktis. While using in yagās they are to be chanted with necessary changes. This is not possible for one who does not know grammar. The second prayojana says that grammar is to be learned for this prayojana.

3) ‘Āgama’ is also prayojana. It is said that brāhmaṇa should
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4 Mbh.I.1
learn Vedās as *nīṣkāraṇa dharma* and with *ṣat anga*. Among
the *ṣat angās* the most important is *vyākaraṇa*.

4) Grammar is to be learned for simplification also. That is,
without a deep knowledge of grammar *śabdās* cannot be
understood by necessary simplification.

5) For clarity or doubtlessness also one should learn grammar.

Thus all these five *prayojanās* are stated by
Patañjali based on Vedās.

Pāṇini’s attempt was to systematise the form of
language of his time. One is not uttering words and sentences with
full consciousness of its intricacies. People use words and sentences
to communicate; the sum total of these is language. Because of this,
there is no uniformity in *padanispathy* and sentence structure in a
language. The role of grammarian is to accept the applications in
language as valid and explain its structure. He has no right to exclude
those applications in a language which may not be in agreement with its conventional style. When people use different words without full understanding of the grammar, aberrations slowly appear in language. This is the reason for the break in the relation between Sanskrit and Pāṇinīya vyākaraṇa that appeared over centuries. Generally we study the letters starting from ‘a, ā.’ and ending with ‘aḥ’ in our childhood. In Pāṇini’s sūtras these letters are included in a particular style. The dīrghasūtras like आ are not seen in it. Likewise the anuswāra and viṣaya like ‘aṃ,aḥ’ are also absent. The letters ‘e ē o au’ are given in the order ‘e o ai au’. After the swaras comes the last letter ha and it is followed by ya,ra,la and va. Here also there is change in order. After these come the vargākṣaras. They are given from ńa to ka instead of usual order ka to ńa. The first combine last letters of each varga (ńa,ma,ńa,ṇa,na,ma), then the forth letters of each varga; this is the way the vargākṣaras are made miśra. It is followed by the letters śa,ṣa and sa and ha appears once
again. Among these are also included some vyañjanās. This is the general form of the sequence of letters in the alphabet.

The first sūtra is vrddhiradaic. This is an apāśabda as ‘c’ is not used usually as the last letter in Sanskrit. The true lesson is vrddhirādaik. The sūtra would have been ‘vrddhi āt aik’ if Pāṇini had not applied sandhi. The letters ‘ai’ and ‘c’ are present in the Sanskrit alphabet. It is common sense to assume that Pāṇini had meant the letters from ‘ai’ to ‘c’ (that is ai and au) here. Also it can be understood that the letter ‘ā’ is coming before it. Perceiving what is understood and leaving what is not clear to the conception if one goes forward it can be observed that the letter ‘a’ is implied by ‘ā’ in the alphabet and that if one adds ‘t’ too, it implies only that what we obtain is the extension ‘ā’ of ‘a’. However we can’t find any hypothesis for the ending ‘vrddhiradaic’.

---

5 Pāṇinīya, I.I.1
We can find examples of *apaśabdās* in the Pāṇinīyam itself. For example in the fifth *sūtra*, *ādirījītudava* the *viśeṣana* ‘ādi’ is singular while the *viśeṣya* ‘niḥjītudava’ is plural. Same is the cases in *svādisvasarvanāmasthāne* sūtra, and *aniditam hala upadhayaḥ kingiti* sūtra. The *sūtra* 349 ṭhaloḥ is shown as *pañjamyarthā*. In some cases without any pratyaya the *prādipatika* is merely applied in *vibhaktyarthā*. In all these cases we are not certain what is done.

**Nāṭyaśāstra and Vyākaraṇa**

Pāṇini has dealt with *nāṭya* in his *Aṣṭādhyāyi*. He was aware of the nāṭyasūtra which is believed to be authored by Śilāli. Śilāli was a relative and disciple of Śailuṣana who is referred
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6 Pāṇinīya, I.3.5

7 Ibid, I.4.17

8 Ibid, VI.4.24

9 Ibid, III.1.124
to in *Yajurveda*. Pāṇini calls the actor *śailālina nāṭa*. He is referred to as *śailālika* in Nāṭyaśāstra. When Pāṇini refers to *Śobhānika* meaning *nāṭa* he implies actor and dancer. *Śobhānika* is the trainer of *abhinaṭa*. In Mahābhāṣya great importance is given to the training of the actor. According to the author of Arthaśāstra *gīta, vādya, nṛtya* and *nātya* are parts of music. Pāṇini and Patañjali also held the same view. Bharata says in Nāṭyaśāstra:

\[
\text{Chandohino na śabdosti na chandaḥ śabdavargitaṁ}
\]

\[
\text{Evaṁ tubhayasaṁyogo nātyasyodyotakaḥ smṛtaḥ}^{10}
\]

Like Pāṇini Bharata also describes swarasthāna and vyañjana as follows:

\[
\text{akuḥavisarjanīyāḥ kaṇḍhyāḥ. Icuyaśastālavyāḥ. rturāśā}
\text{mūrthanyāḥ. īrtulasā dandyāḥ. Upūpadhmānīyāḥ oṣḍhyāḥ. pa}
\text{ityupadhmānīyāḥ. Ka iti jihvāmūlīyaḥ. E ai kaṇḍhyatālavyau. O au}
\text{kaṇḍhoṣṭyau. Vakāro dandoṣthyaḥ. ṇaṇḍanaṇamā anunāṣikāḥ.}
\text{Visarjjianīyastaurasya ityeke. sarvamukhasthānamavarṇamityapare.}^{11}
\]

---

10 Ns,15.45

11 Ibid,15.11
But he differs from Pāṇini in the case of swarajanyās, i.e. not like pratyāhāra. Moreover he describes śabdāsvarūpa as follows:

tat prāhuḥ saptavidhanā śadkārakasaṃyutam pradhitasādhyām
nirdeśasampradānāpādāna prabhṛtisamjñābhiḥ\textsuperscript{12}

Śabdāsvarūpās have seven vibhaktis and they include six kārakās. It includes famous sādhvyakriyāpadās (verbs). It has got samjñās like nirdeśa sampradāna, apādāna etc. The famous sādhyakriyāpadās have the three tenses, past present and future. It assumes number (vacana) and gender according to subject and object respectively.

Among the five types of śabda classes comprising nāma, akhyāta, upasarga, nipāṭa and taddhitānta, only some are with prakṛtyarthā and lingavacana. This set of five types of śabdās have

\textsuperscript{12} Ns,15.27
500 dhātūs and five guṇās.

In grammar those śabdās are called upasargās which changes their own meaning along with that of dhātus when combined with their own prakṛtyarthās.

Nipātās - The role of nipātās are to combine nāmārthās to combine verbs to complete metres in ślokās, to help to bring out the inner meaning of śabdās.

Pratyaya - The role of pratyaya is to sublime the meaning of śabda.

Taddhita - These are used to complete the meaning by the addition of pratyaya, by separating prakṛti and pratyaya and by reduction.

Vibhakti - It has acquired this name by its meanings of dhātūs, genders and nāmapadās (nouns).

The vibhaktis prathama etc. show the gender differences and identifies the role as subject, object etc. in the noun.

The ātmanepadas which are vibhaktis in the dhātus differentiae
puruṣa vacanahedās. The word meaning of vibhakti is that which divides or distinguishes.

Sandhi :- The combining of separate vyañjanās (consonant) or swarās (vowel) is called sandhi. It is the mutual relation of varṇās as one over the other by the addition of words or syllables (padās and varṇās).

Samāsa - These show the unity or uniformity in meaning in a nutshell by reducing the vibhakti of nouns. They are six in number called tatpuruṣa, karmadhāraya, bahuvṛ̥hi, dvigu,dwandwan and avyayībhāva.

Choorna and nibaddha - The words are to be combined to form sentences as per rules. The sentences could be in metres or as choornās. The śabda with vibhakti is pada. There are two types of padabandhās namely vṛttanibaddham and choornam. Choornā pada is that which has only those letters essential to convey the meaning,
which may not strictly follow the laws of combining letters and which is given in metres. Nibaddhapada is that which has letters following some metre and broken at yati and which has some rule of combining letters. Chandas or vṛtta is that with comprises of four lines of nibaddha padās having different meanings and different varṇās.

Etairnnānārthasaṃyuktai padairvarṇavibhūṣitaiḥ
caturbhīstu bhavedyuktaiḥ chando vṛttābhidhānavat

The body of śabda is made of different vṛttās. After discussing those given above, Bharata describes śabdaswarūpa also in his Nātyaśāstra. For performing nātya one should know this śabdaswarūpa. The body of nātya is śabda. Bharata also says that the three types of nātyās, viz., āṅgika, āhārya and sātvika are conveying meanings of the words.

13 Ns,15.43
Vāci yatnastu kartavyo nātyasyaiśā tanuḥ smṛtaḥ
aṅganaipathyasatvāni vāgarthāṃ vyaṅjayanti hi

A word in vācika performance known also as pāddhyā is divided into two as Samskrēta or Prākṛta. Among these the Samskrēta word is depending on different dhātūs, comprising vyaṅjana or consonants swara or vowels sandhi, vibhakti, nāmapada, kriyāpada, upasarga, nipāta and taddhita and also samāsa. In other words, in the days of Bharata, to learn nātya one had to master both Sanskrit and Prākṛta and Sanskrit has got the above characteristics. There were 500 dhātūs known at that time.

Again Pāṇini

There is a series of texts associated with the Aṣṭādhyāyi, though not forming a part of it. They are briefly discussed one by one based on Panini-A Survey of Research by

14 Ns,15.2
George Cardona.  

a) Uṇ-ādi sūtra

These are rules for deriving nominal bases from verb roots. They are called uṇ-ādi because the first rule is about affix in ‘uṇ’ to verb roots. Examples are- kāru ‘artisan’ and ‘vāyu’ from the roots kṛ and vā respectively. These rules are contained in two versions of treatises, viz., pañcapādi and daśapādi. The names come from the fact that they are divided into five sections and ten sections respectively. There are evidences to show that the daśapādi is in fact based on the pañcapādi. The pañcapādi is the version usually commented on by Pāṇinīyās.

There is no general agreement regarding the authorship of these rules. Some scholars attribute them to Śākatāyana while some others to Kātyāyana. While still some others attribute

---

them to Pāṇini some others merely refer to them as the work of another school. The only certainty is that Pāṇini knew these affixes and accepted some of the derivations involving them.

b) Phiṭ-sūtrās

These sūtrās attributed to Śāntanava or Śantanu state rules for the accentuation of nominal bases according to their phonological shapes and meanings. For example the first rule — ‘phiso'nta udāttāḥ’ states that the final (anta) vowel of a nominal base (phis) is high pitched (udāttāḥ). These rules are called phiṭ sūtrās because they use the term phis to refer to nominal bases instead of the Pāṇinian term prātipadika.

The purposes of the phiṭ sūtra accentual rules and Pāṇini’s rules on accentuation are radically different. Therefore these sūtrās cannot be attributed to Pāṇini. Some commentators ascribed them also to Śantanu. There is dispute whether these sūtrās should be
considered pre or post Pāṇinīyam.

c) Lingānuśāsana

These are rules for fixing the gender (linga). For example: - the rule mi-ni-anta states that the suffixes mi,ni are feminine- bhoomi and glāni for example. Though Pāṇinī’s grammar contains rules regulating gender there is no proof that Patañjali himself is the originator of lingānuśāsanā.

d) Pāninīya śikṣā

These are texts on phonetics. Most of them deal with particular aspects of phonetics in connection with branches of Vedic texts. There are also treatises which deal with general aspects of Sanskrit phonetics. Among these there are two texts, one attributed to Āpiśali and the other to Pāṇini. There are also two texts which have been called Pāninīya śikṣās, one in verse and the other in sūtra form. It is the former which is usually refer to as Pāninīya śikṣā.
The Pāṇinīya śikṣā text begins with a verse stating that the author will set forth the śikṣā according to the Pāṇinīya doctrine and the work is attributed to Pingala.

Pāṇini and Phonetics

Pāṇini did not go deep into the details of phonetics discussion though he presupposed knowledge of such details. In spite of these, it is possible to extrapolate his views from his rules. For example, he made use of classification involving points of articulation (sthāna) and kinds of articulation at these points. It is generally agreed that there is only one Pāṇinian rule which directly deals with phonetic details. Thieme\textsuperscript{16} and Cardona have discussed these. A general work on this aspect is by Allen\textsuperscript{17}. In addition, there

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] Thiem, Paul, Pāṇini and the pronunciation of Sanskrit, Festschrift Whatmough, pp. 263-70.
\item[17] Review of W.S. Allen (1963), ZDMG 107: 664-66
\end{footnotes}
are survey articles by J.D.Singh\textsuperscript{18} and M.D.Pandit\textsuperscript{19}.

Pāninīyā-s starting with Kātyāyana generally accepted that rules \textit{tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇaṃ}\textsuperscript{20}, \textit{naṃchala}u\textsuperscript{21} apply within the context of a series of rules as follows:

first sounds are taught as given in the Śiva sūtrās, then the markers contained in the Śiva sūtrās are identified. Following these, abbreviations are formed by \textit{adirantena saheta}\textsuperscript{22} and \textit{tulyasyaprayatnam savarṇaṃ} applies with its exception. Finally \textit{anuditsavarṇasya cātyprataya}\textsuperscript{23} applies. As a result a sound such as ‘\textit{a}’ is made a term denoting all sounds homogeneous to it.


\textsuperscript{19} Pandit,M.D.,Pāṇini:a statistical picture of Sanskrit sounds,Festschrift R.N.Dandekar,pp 128-38

\textsuperscript{20} Pāninīya, I.1.9

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid, I.1.10

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, I.1.71

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid, I.1.69
A particular point discussed by K.C. Chatterjee, Thieme, Ojihara and K.V. Abhangar is whether r and l should be treated as homogeneous as suggested by Kātyāyana.

Pāṇini treats ‘a’ close (samvṛta) vowel, as though it were open (vivṛta) like ‘ā’. This amounts to treating them as homogeneous though in the context of grammatical operations. This is done to let ‘a’ and ‘ā’ undergo the same morpho-phonemic operations. The last rule of the grammar ‘a a iti’\(^{24}\) then restores ‘a’ to its normal value. But this rule has no effect on any preceding rules since it come under the heading of pūrvatrāśiddham.\(^{25}\)

**Morpho-phonemics**

Pāṇini’s own statements have made clear the principles he observed in stating morpho phonemic alterations. For

\(^{24}\) Pāṇinīya, VIII.4.68

\(^{25}\) Ibid, VIII.2.1
example a voiced pharyngeal spirant is replaced by a voiced
aspirated palatal stop as in the case of $h$ replaced by $jh$. This $jh$ is
subsequently replaced by $j$, a voiced un aspirated palatal stop.
Thus Pāṇini’s description does not replace an atomic sound $h$ directly
by an atomic sound $j$. Instead his rules provide for replacing features
which make up sounds. In the case of vowel replacements also he
extracts the external efforts ($bāhya prayatna$) like features of length,
accentuation and nasalization and formulates replacements in terms
of vowels and their points of articulations.

Śivasūtras

Śivasūtra gives only short vowels $a$, $i$, $u$, $r$ and $l$
which Staal calls Pāṇini’s sound catalogue. But rule 1.1.69 makes it
possible for such short vowel terms denote all sounds homogeneous
with them. For example $a$ denotes eighteen sounds, viz.,$a$, $ā$ extra
long $a$, nasalized and unnasalized, with three accentual varieties.
The Śivasūtras form the basis for Pāṇinīya system of morpho-phonemic. It is widely accepted that it served in formulating concisely euphonic and morphologic rules. Majority of scholars has stressed the economic achieved by the reorganisation of a traditional consonant list leading to Pānini’s list. But the major change occurred in the vowel listing as pointed out in the previous section.

Another point to be noted is the rationale behind the use of certain sounds as markers to close off sets of sounds in the Śivasūtra. For example, n closes off the first set (a i u n), k the second (f l k), ā, the third (e o ā) and l the fourteenth h l.

Syntax

In Pāṇinīya, sentences and their components are derived by introducing affixes. Evidently there is no sharp distinction between morphology and syntax in this system. Once affixes are
introduced to yield what we may call initial strings, rules apply to lead to final strings.

We shall first consider *kāraṇa* and *kāraka* rules. The notion of *kāraka* is basic to Pāṇini’s derivational system. A *kāraka* is a thing vied in relation to an action, in the accomplishment of which it plays a given role. There are six such *kāraṇa, apādaṇa, sampradāna, kraṇa, adhikraṇa, karman* and *kartṛ*. In addition, there is a sub-type of agents, *hetu* (causal agent). These are introduced in a series of *samjña sūtrās* (definition rules).

**Semantics:**

Starting from Liebich {26}(1886-87) there have been considerable discussions in modern linguistics regarding the precise status of *kāraka* categories. Many of them point to the extra-linguistic character of them. Among them an important contribution is due to
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Rocher\textsuperscript{27} (1964) who pointed out that \textit{P\=a\=ṇini}s grammar had a semantic component. Elaborating on this A.C.Sinha\textsuperscript{28} states that all grammatical relations are semantic relation in \textit{P\=a\=ṇini}. Cardona\textsuperscript{29}, Kiparsky and Staal\textsuperscript{30} partially agree with this.

\textbf{Cardona points out that ‘had he wished to, P\=a\=ṇini could have defined his \textit{kāraka} category in purely semantic terms. It can be asserted that semantics played a role in the formulation of \textit{P\=a\=ṇinian rules.’ Meanings serve as condition for the introduction of affixes and \textit{kāraka} classification rules serve to bridge the gap between semantic relation and grammatical expressions.}

\textit{P\=a\=ṇini} nowhere makes a provision to the effect that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[27] Rocher, Rosane“ ‘Agent’ et ‘object’ chez Panini”, JAOS 84: 44-54
\item[28] Sinha, A.C., “Generative semantics and \textit{P\=a\=ṇini}s Kāraka”, JOIB 23:27-39
\item[30] Kirparsky, Paul and J.F. Staal, Syntactic and semantic relations in \textit{P\=a\=ṇini}, FL 5: 83-117
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
a sentence which obeys his rules must be semantically appropriate. An example is ‘agninā sitātī puṣpāṇi devadathalḥ’. The sentence is grammatically correct but does not convey any meaning. According to some followers of Pāṇini, a sentence has to meet some additional conditions such that the denotata of elements in the sentence have to be semantically compatible.

**Mahābhāṣya**

The earliest extensive discussion of Pāṇini’s rules available to us is contained in the vārtikā-ś of Kātyāyana. But these are known to us only as cited and discussed in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya. This is not a true commentary on the grammar. Kātyāyana and Patañjali do not explain all rules with examples to show how they operate. They discuss the validity of rules, how they are stated, their relations to other rules, whether some rules or parts of them can be eliminated and whether additional rules are to be
introduced.

**Pāṇini and Metaphor**

Pāṇini was mainly concerned with the analysis of the structure of Sanskrit. In this also he was interested more in the derivation of the correct forms of words. The investigation of their semantic aspects found only a second place and even in this case this was a primary meaning that he dealt with. So the role of *lakṣaṇa* language did not find a place in his work though there is enough indications that he was not unaware of this aspect

*Prātipadikārthaliṅgaparimāṇavacanamātre prathamā.*

Rāja points out that though Pāṇini did not recognise *lakṣaṇa* as a distinct function in language later grammarians had to deal with it since it had become almost
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31 Pāṇinīya,II.3.46
universally accepted\textsuperscript{32}. Nāgojibhāṭṭa also has stressed this point in his Paramalaghumañjuṣa though he has discussed \textit{lakṣaṇā} extensively in the Mañjuṣā. \textit{Lakṣaṇā} became an accepted linguistic aspect mainly by the interpretations of Pāṇini and Patañjali by Mīmāmsaka-s and Naiyāyika-s. Rāja discusses different \textit{sūtrās} to show how though \textit{lakṣaṇā} is not a Pāṇinian concept it was derived by the later grammarians and given a status of a linguistic concept. He also points out that Bhartṛhary has discussed this various views regarding the distinction between the primary sense and the transferred sense of the words. He attributes this to their relative frequencies or (\textit{prasiddhi}). Thus \textit{laksanaṁ} is nothing but a superimposition of the \textit{sakti} or potentiality of the word on the actual \textit{saktyāropā} or referent the latter being an extension of the primary meaning.

\textsuperscript{32} K.Kunjunni Raja,ITM,The Adyar Library and Research Centre,1963
Non-Pāṇinian Grammar

Apart from Pāṇini there have been works on grammar by different scholars before and after Pāṇini. The works are broadly classified as non- Pāṇinian grammars. But Pāṇini was accepted as the sole authority on grammar by many. This has been countered by the great grammarian and poet Sri Melputhur Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭathiry. He strongly argues that the other grammars are also authoritative and discusses this extensively. He says:

“some say that what is said by Pāṇini is authoritative, not the treatises of Chāndra, Bhoja and others; this is most flimsy; for those who know much do not speak without base; that more people prefer a thing due to its merit; how was it before Pāṇini? Pāṇini himself quotes what was said by his predecessors; even if there be a conflict and option is to be presumed”\(^{33}\). This work is in the form of

\(^{33}\) Apāṇinīyaprāṃyāṣadhanā, Melputhur Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatīrī, compiled by Prof. K. P. Nārāyaṇapiśāroti, Guruvayur Devaswom, 1998.
arguments where the author puts forward justifications for the authority of *apānīnīya* grammar; he himself raises possible objections to which the answer is given. He points out different scholars like Vedavyāsa, Bharata, Śankarācārya etc. using many words which are not noticed by the trinity of sages. Even in his time there were scholars in northern region who regarded the Sāraswata grammar of Narendraśācārya or Anubhūtiswarūpācārya as authoritative. Likewise, the Prakriyākaumudi of Rāmacandra was accepted for study in all regions. Moreover the votaries of the Veda prior to Pāṇini should have necessarily accepted only other grammars. It may also be noted that the rules on Vedic usages given in the *Prātiśākhya*-s are different from those given by Pāṇini.

It is said that ‘after churning the eighteen Purāṇās, nine grammars and the four Vedās the Bhārata was composed by the sage Vyāsa’. We shall briefly discuss some of his arguements.

1. In order to justify the Vedic usages which are not mentioned by
the trinity of sages Vyāsa etc. should have resorted to other
grammars at least for the rules of Vedic words.

2. No verbal testimony of the Vedās or Manu and the like is
available showing the lack of authority of other grammars.
Moreover we cannot find any direct statement by the trinity or
their followers repudiating the authority of other grammars.

3. The acceptance by the majority of Pāṇinīya grammar can be
because of its merits like clarity, brevity etc. This alone is not
sufficient to prove the non-authority of others.

4. If Pāṇini is the only authority, how could the correct usage of
words exist before him? It cannot be maintain that at that time
people knew the correct words without a grammar because
there is the injunction of the śruti that ‘a brāhmaṇa should
study and understand the Veda including its six auxiliaries
without any motive’. And if there were no grammar it would
follow that there were no brāhmaṇa before Pāṇini.

5. If the authority of something rests on its being accepted by many it follows that the works prior to Pāṇini become superior because it was accepted by all at that time and even now by a section of people and Pāṇini was not accepted at that time, only now.

6. The non- Pāṇinian authors would have been aware of the extension of the science of language in future.

7. The authority of ancient teachers was accepted by Pāṇini himself. For eg: ‘āni cāpah, auna āpah’ etc. The technical names accepted by the ancient teachers were maintained by Pāṇini.

8. It is said that this tradition of grammar is without a beginning. So it is to be understood that Pāṇini only presented the science of grammar with a different type of technical precision and did
not himself invent it. Thus Pāṇini’s also become non-authoritative because it has non-Pāṇinian content also. Therefore the authority of the ancient treatises cannot be questioned.

**Sphoṭa and Dhvani**

The *sphoṭa* theory was developed in the present form by Bhartṛhary. It was introduced in his monumental work Vākyapadīya. Although the bhaṣyakāra Patañjali had mentioned *sphoṭa* in his Mahābhāṣya, there are marked differences between the *sphoṭa siddhāntas* of Patañjali and Bhartṛhari. It is to be noted that there is no mention of *sphoṭa* in the Astādhyāyi of Pāṇini and the only reference is to Sphoṭāyana in the *sūtra ‘Avaṅg sphoṭāyanasya*.\(^{34}\) It can only be imagined (hypothesis) that *sphoṭa siddhānta* was first proposed by Sphoṭāyana.

---

\(^{34}\) Pāṇiniya, VI.1.123
According to Gaurināthśāstri³⁵, Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapadīya was the most extensively read work in the medieval period which represents the most fruitful epoch of Indian thought. But he was not followed by an unbroken succession of expositors. There is a long gap between Bhartṛhari and his commentators Puṇyarāja, Helarāja and Phullarāja. This we further discussed in the last chapter.

**Sound, Meaning and its Relations**

Bhartṛhari says that there are two classes of śabdās and *arthas* and there are two types of relations between them. Based on his opinion that the Vaiyākaraṇa-s and Bhāṣyakāra-s are again and again establishing the *munivacana* that the śabdārtha relations are eternal, the two kinds of meaning are

---
³⁵ Śāstri,Gaurinatha,The Philosophy of Word and Meaning,Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1959,p.xxv
a) Etymologically grammatically derived ones

b) The fixed once, that is based on roots, etc.

Correspondingly there are two kinds of words as well-

a) Those which derived their meanings from grammar or etymology.

b) Those which have fixed meaning.

The two types of relations are

a) Based on the cause and effect factor.

b) Based on the natural capability.

These again may depend only on behaviour, or on the \textit{pratyaya} (suffix). This is equally true in the case of correct or incorrect words. The grammarians have also classified words into two in another sense.

a) Those used as the base words for the grammatical
constructions.

b) Those being invariably used to convey a definite sense or meaning. The śabda has the grāhya-grāhaka properties like light.

According to Dhvanyālokalocana of Abhinavagupta, dhvani is defined by grammarians as all audible sounds (śabda) and varṇas etc. It is accepted by śābdika-s that there is a minute śabdatatva called sphoṭa as cause for the dhvani. From the minute to the ear breaking sounds are the combined effect of minute space, the infinite minute sounds made by the waves in the atmosphere and the sphoṭa forms. These clear sounds are given the most appropriate name dhvani because they have dhvanitva, because they imply the extrasensory and fundamental sphoṭa, or in other words they are sphoṭavyaṅjaka. Based on their own interpretation of the vyaṅgya-vyaṅjakabhāvās of sphoṭa dhvani different theorists of aesthetics have given the name dhvani to śabda, artha, vyaṅgya and
even to the kāvyā.

The sense of meaning is not obtained without completely hearing the padās. The varṇās are evolving and vanishing very fast. One cannot express at a time a word which has a lot of varṇās. Because of this the grammarians have accepted sphoṭa as a śabdatatva. As an eternal and indivisible cause for śābdabodha the fundamental form of all śabdās is sphoṭa. Whether small or big the sphoṭa time is same for all śabdās.

\[\text{yaḥ saṁyogaviyogābhyāṁ kāraṇairupajāyate} \]
\[\text{sa sphoṭaḥ śabdajah śabdo dhvanirityucyate budhaiḥ.}^{36}\]

According to grammarians dhvani is vyañjaka. It is not the implied sphoṭa. But according to Kāvyamīmāṁsaka-s it is the implied, the evolved meaning. He again says:

---

\(^{36}\) VP,1.103
pratyayairanupākheyairgrahaṇānuguṇaistadhā
dhvaniprakāśitēsābde svarūpamavadhāryate. \(^{37}\)

When the śabda is expressed by dhvani the sphoṭa is formed by different means for its perception. The vaikṛta suffixes are lingās and hetūs of the naturally developed sphoṭa. In the language of alankāra they are the vyañjakās. Accordingly the Dhvanivādi-s give dhvanitva to the vyañjaka śabdārthās.

The meaning of a sentence is acquired from the meanings of its constituent words. In the same way it is from the vācyārtha that the implied meaning (vyaṅgyārtha) is acquired. Where meaningful word and sentential word together implied the meaning, that dhvani is kāvyaviśeṣa. The words and sentences (vācyā-vācaka) are adorned by this. The subject of dhvani is shown to be different from upamās and anuprāsās. It is wrong to say that there is no dhvani in famous kāvyās due to the lack of kāvyatva.

\(^{37}\) VP,1.88
Also it is wrong to say that *dhvani* is latent in *ṛiti* and *alankāra* because, in those properties which are dependent solely on *vācyā-vācakās*, the *dhvani* which is depending on *vyaṅgya-vyaṅjakabhāva*, cannot exist. The *alankārās* which beautify the *vācyā- vācakās* are only parts of *dhvani*, while *dhvani* is *angi*. *Dhvani* is there where a different meaning is implied by *artha* which makes itself trivial the *śabda*, which makes its meaning itself trivial.

The term *sphoṭa* is derived from the root *sphuṭ* which means ‘to burst’. It is that invariant sequences of integral linguistic symbols which is the unit of meaning and is defined in two ways. According to Nāgeśabhaṭṭa\(^\text{38}\),

\[‘sphuṭati prakāśater’tho’smād iti sphoṭah; vācaka iti yāvat.’\]

But in Sarvadarsanasaṅgraha, Mādhava defines it as

\(^{38}\) Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, Sphoṭavāda, p.5
Pāṇini mentions the name of Sphoṭāyana believed to be the original expounder of this theory and Nāgeśabhaṭṭa also ascribes to this view.

Avaṅg sphoṭāyanasya. \(^{40}\)

Though Pāṇini was followed by Kātyāyana and Patañjali, sphoṭa gained the status of a theory in Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapadīya only. According to Bhartṛhari speech and thought are only two aspects of the same speech principle:

\[ ekasyaivātmāno bhedau śabdārthav aprthak sthitau. \(^{41}\) 

---

\(^{39}\) Mādhava, Sarvadarśanasāṅggraha (ed. Abhyankar), p. 300

\(^{40}\) Pāṇinīya, VI.1.123

\(^{41}\) VP, 2.31
Patañjali’s View

Much before Bhartṛhari Patañjali had distinguished between two aspects of words, the *sphoṭa* and the *dhvani*, instead of speech and thought. While *sphoṭa* is the permanent element in the word which could be considered as the essential word, *dhvani* is the actualised and an ephemeral element, and attribute of the former.

\[ dhvani \textit{sphoṭas ca śabdānāṁ dhvanis tu khalu lakṣyate} \]
\[ alpo mahāmśca keśāmeid ubhayaṁ tat svabhāvataḥ.^{42} \]

The *sphoṭa* may be a single letter (*varṇa*) or fixed pattern of letters and is the norm in the sense that it remains constant. The linguistic value of the *sphoṭa* is the same even when pronounced by different speakers with different temper. On the other hand the absolute vowel length and the individual peculiarities of the particular instances are aspects of the *dhvanis* and depend on the

---

^{42} MBh,1,p.181
individuality of the speaker and the temper of the speaker involved in
the words uttered. The *sphoṭa* and *dhvani* are analogous to the
*prākṛtadhvani* and the *vaikṛtadhvani* of the later grammarians.

The distinction between *sphoṭa* and *dhvani* is
supposed to have been made first by Vyādi. Some commentators
consider the following views in Vākyapadīya

*varṇasya grahne hetuḥ prākṛto dhvani iṣyate.*

*vṛttibhede nimittatvaṃ vaikṛtāḥ pratipādyate.*

as a quotation from Vyādi’s famous work the
Samgraha. It is while discussing the Pāṇinīya *sūtra*
*‘taparastatkālasya’* that Patañjali gives term *sphoṭa* to the letter or
letters taken as a time series pattern and the term *dhvani* to the
actualised sound. He illustrated this with the analogy of a drum beat.

---

43 VPL.77

44 Pāṇinīya, I.1,70
bherīṃ āhatyā kaścid viṃśatipadāṇi gacchati, kaścit trīṃśat kaścic catvāriṃśat. Sphoṭaḥ ca tāvān eva bhavati, dhvanikṛta vṛddhīḥ.45

Thus it is clear that Patañjali’s sphoṭa has a normal and fixed size and is entirely different from the sphoṭa of the later grammarians which had no size or parts. To him the sphoṭa is not a single indivisible symbol considered as the meaning bearer, but only the unchanging sound unit, or a time series pattern of such unit46.

**Dhvanī**

There was different of opinions about the real nature of the sphoṭa among the ancient Indian grammarians who accepted this siddhānta. In the Vākyapadīya, Bhartṛhari refers to some of these earlier theories, one of them already discussed.

---

45 MBh,p.181
46 K.Kunjunni Rāja,ITM,Adyar Library and Research Centre,p.102
yaḥ samyogavibhāgābhyyāṁ kāraṇair upajāyate

sa sphoṭah,śabdajah śabdadhvanayo/nyair udāhrtah.\(^{47}\)

According to a second theory the *dhvanis* and the *sphoṭa* are produced simultaneously and there is no time interval between them. The *sphoṭa* is the central sound and may be compared to a flame and the *dhvanis* are like the light emitted by it in all directions.

*doorāt prabheve dīpasya dhvanimātram tu lakṣyate.*\(^{48}\)

Sometimes we hear the *dhvanis* without recognising the *sphoṭa* just as we see the light without seeing its source, the flame. Both these theories hold that the *sphoṭa* is produced by human efforts and is ephemeral.

According to a third theory mentioned in the

\(^{47}\) VP,1.103

\(^{48}\) Ibid,1.105
Vākyapadīya the *sphoṭa* is a class and the *dhvani* are its members.

\[\text{anekavyaktyabhivyāṅgya jātiḥ sphoṭa iti smṛta} \]

\[kaiścid vyaktaya evāsyā dhvanitvena prakalpitaḥ.\]

Many scholars attribute these theories to Bhārtṛhary himself. But Brough has pointed out that the identification of *sphoṭa* with the class of *dhvani* without any reference to the meaning bearing aspect is entirely against Bhārtṛhari’s concept of *sphoṭa*. Rāja points out that this third view about the *sphoṭa* is analogous to the view expressed by Bertrand Russel.\(^{50}\)

**Classification of Sphoṭa**

The later grammarians like Bhaṭṭojidikṣita and Nāgēśeṇṭṭa pointed out that the different subdivisions of the

\(^{49}\) VP,1.94

\(^{50}\) K.Kunjumni Raja,ITM,Adyar Library and Research Centre,p.115
sphoṭa could be classified into eight classes as follows:

a) varṇasphoṭa  
b) padasphoṭa

c) vākyasphoṭa  
d) akhaṇtapadasphoṭa

e) akhaṇtavākyasphoṭa  
f) varṇajāṭisphoṭa

g) padajāṭisphoṭa  
h) vākyajāṭisphoṭa

The basis of this classification is meaningfulness (vācakatva). We may consider either the letter, the word or the sentence itself as the meaning bearing unit and we get respectively the varṇasphoṭa, the padasphoṭa or the vākyasphoṭa. Bhartṛhari seems to have held the akhaṇtavākyasphoṭa, the indivisible sentence sphoṭa of the vyakti type, as the real sphoṭa. In actual speech situations, there are no letters in the word and no words in the sentence.
Semantics has an important role in the formulation of syntactic rules. In fact the purpose of communication is served by the semantic part and language takes a given syntactic form to this end. Thus Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian grammars are included in the discussion on meaning.

Pāṇinian grammar is constructive or algorithmic with stress on the construction of sūtras for the normative conduct of linguistic activities. Perhaps the excess stress given to grammar in the linguistic aspects foreshadowed the fact that the sphota theory for the first time threw light on the synthetic totality of the Pāṇinian structure. It is not the individual word meaning in a sentence, but rather the relations that lead to the sphota. Even the reality of lexical

51 VP,1.73
meaning is in question since there are linguists who insist that meaning is expressed only in action.