As it is already observed that the PP is a very small prakaraṇa in comparison to the other chapters of the VSK of Bhaṭṭoji. It is also notified that Bhaṭṭoji has arranged all the sūtra-s of Pāṇini in his VSK following his own placement mechanism. The process of categorizing the sūtra-s of Pāṇini, though not a new one, has received brilliance in the hands of Bhaṭṭoji. However, all the chapters of the VSK can not be said to have reached the same level of perfection and comprehensiveness. The PP is one amongst them. Though in the AST, there are about fifty paribhāṣā rules of divergent mode which are treated in various sections\(^1\), the PP deals with only 13 paribhāṣā rules of Pāṇini. According to K. Das, the interpretative canons found in the AST are thirty (30) in number.\(^2\) Besides these rules of Pāṇini, a huge field of paribhāṣāpāṭha-s are available in the area of Paninian Grammar. These paribhāṣāpāṭha-s are either suggested by the rules of Pāṇini, or derived from the popular nyāya-s or extracted from the statements of grammarians like Katyaṇyana and Pataṇjali.\(^3\) Nāgesa has dealt with one hundred and thirty three such paribhāṣā-s in his PBSS. Thus the field of Paninian paribhāṣā-s is definitely a vast one and each of these paribhāṣā-s has its own area of operation. It can be said more clearly that all the paribhāṣā-s are connected with a
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grammatical operation someway or other. Bhaṭṭoji, while categorizing the rules of Panini, has drawn the line of demarcation between the *paribhāṣā* rules and other types of *sūtra*-s by creating a separate chapter for the interpretative canons. But he has not maintained the conceptual uniformity of the *meta* rules of the Grammar of Panini. It is evident from the fact that the famous interpretative canon *ādyantavad ekasmin* (1.1.21) has not been taken into consideration by Bhaṭṭoji while accommodating the *PP* in the *VSK*. In case of the *paribhāṣāpātha*-s also, it is seen that Bhaṭṭoji is too selective because he has taken into account only four such interpretative canons of which one is adjusted in the *vṛtti* of the rule *sthāne ‘ntaratamaḥ* (1.1.50). This curtailment on the part of Bhaṭṭoji can not be judged in any way. When he made up his mind to categorize all the Paninian rules under specific heads, he could have followed the principle of including all the rules of the same nature under a single head. It can not be proposed that Bhaṭṭoji has included in the *PP* of the *VSK* only those *paribhāṣā* *sūtra*-s of Panini which are related to the process of word construction, the most important grammatical arena chosen by Panini in his *AST*. It is because Bhaṭṭoji has left out a good number of important interpretative canons of Paninian Grammar which are regarded as almost indispensable in many places to judge the process of word-formation. As for example, the *paribhāṣā - laksanapratipadotayoḥ pratipadotasyatva grahanam* which has been taken resort to in order to judge the construction process of the word like *bhavisnuḥ*, is not mentioned in the *PP* for reason so far unearthed. Moreover, Bhaṭṭoji has enlisted the *paribhāṣā – asiddham bairārangamantaramange* in the *PP* but he has left another important canon *purastādapaavādā anantarāṁ vidhīṁ bādhante nottarāṁ*, which proves
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its importance in the grammatical process involved in many *sūtra*-s. Similarly, Bhaṭṭoji
has not taken into account, in the *PP*, the important interpretative canons like
*sannipātalaksanō vidhiranimittam tadvighātasyā* which is employed in the formation
process of the words *rāmāya, śrīpāya* etc. This is clearly mentioned by S. Bali in the
fifth chapter of his book *BDHG*. It can neither be said that Bhaṭṭoji has accumulated
in this *prakaraṇa* those *paribhāṣā* *sūtra*-s of *Pāṇini* only which are placed in the very
first chapter of the *AST*. It is because, in that case, the interpretative canons of *Pāṇini*
like *eca ighrasvādēśe* (1.1.48), *uranraparāḥ* (1.1.51) etc. would also demand their
inclusion in the *PP* which Bhaṭṭoji has not done. Again Bhaṭṭoji has treated the famous
*paribhāṣā - paranityāntaraṅgāpavāddānāmutturottarān baliyāḥ* in the *PP* of the *VSΚ*,
but he has avoided the inclusion of the famous *paribhāṣā* rule *vipratisedhē param
kāryān* (1.4.2) here, which deals with the establishment of priority of the subsequent rule
over the previous one when both are of equal strength. Thus, in the *PP* of the *VSΚ*,
Bhaṭṭoji while delineating the interpretative canons related to the priority of rules of
unequal strength, he has avoided the grammatical convention regarding the priority of
certain Paninian rules of equal strength. The topic of conventional priority of one *sūtra*
over another can not be considered as exhaustive in the *PP* of the *VSΚ*. Bhaṭṭoji has
explained the Paninian rules *tasminniti nirdiṣte pūrvasya* (1.1.66) and *tasmādītyuttarasya
(1.1.67 )* in the *PP* of the *VSΚ*. Both of these rules deal with the positional importance
of the words with the seventh case-ending and fifth case-endings respectively in
the aphorisms of *Pāṇini* by establishing the convention that the proposed grammatical
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operation will take place before the element specified with the seventh case-ending and the concerned grammatical function will take place after the lexical unit specified with the help of the fifth case-ending. Many of the Paninian rules show the simultaneous use of the words with locative and ablative in a single rule. The probable solution to such a problem is not discussed by Bhaṭṭoṭi in the PP. The paribhāṣā adopted in this case is ubhayaniṅdeśe pāncamiṁdeśo baiyiṇ which is conspicuously avoided by Bhaṭṭoṭi in the PP of the VSK. But without the knowledge of this paribhāṣā the interpretation process of many Paninian aphorisms gets interrupted. So this can be regarded as a lacuna of the concerned prakaraṇa of the VSK—a fact that leads us to believe that the procedure followed by Bhaṭṭoṭi is not comprehensive enough. Again it can not be said that only important paribhāṣā-ś of Paninian Grammar have been taken up by Bhaṭṭoṭi in the PP. It is because none of the Paninian aphorisms of interpretative nature, nor the paribhāṣāpāṭha-ś of this school can be regarded as devoid of grammatical importance as each of the paribhāṣā-ś has connection with a particular grammatical operation involved in some stages of the grammatical process of Paninian school. Again, the important paribhāṣā-ś like yathoddeśaṁ sanjñāparibhāṣaṁ¹¹ and kāryakālāṁ saṁjñāparibhāṣaṁ¹² are not taken into account by Bhaṭṭoṭi in the PP of the VSK. Thus in comparison to the huge number of interpretative canons floating in the field of Grammar of Paninian school, the PP of the VSK appears to be very small and incomplete. In our humble opinion, Bhaṭṭoṭi in his great endeavour of explaining the sutra-ś of Panini, could have at least included all the interpretative canons of the AST altogether in the PP. Such an arrangement would have appeared to be much comprehensive and self sustaining in connection with the re-shuffling process adopted by Bhaṭṭoṭi through out the whole VSK.
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