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KUNJUNNI RAJA AS A LINGUIST

Raja is an outstanding model of the modern Kerala Sanskrit research system. His research works testifies the significant development of the effort made by C.Kunhan Raja on Oriental Studies. He has deep knowledge on the multidisciplinary possibilities of Sanskrit. The linguistic value of Sanskrit has already proven by the Western Indologists. (The discussion on this topic is included in Chapter 4). Raja’s constant interventions in Linguistics are noteworthy and inspiring. ITM is the fine specimen for his aptitude in Linguistics. The works The Language of Poetry, Mīmāṃsā Contribution to Language Studies and Malayalam works like Bhāṣācintakal, Bhāṣāgaveśanam and Bhaṣādarsānanavum Caritavum belongs to this discipline. Almost half of the research articles of Raja come under this head. This chapter assesses the contributions of Raja as a Linguist by analyzing his five linguistic works and twenty nine articles.

The Works on Linguistics

1. The Language of Poetry

Meaning is the nucleus of communication whether it is verbal or non-verbal. It can be said that bearing some noble meaning is the discriminating factor of literature from absurd writings. Even absurdity produces significant meaning in post-modern context. Analyzing the
layers of meaning or the shades of meaning is also one of the devices of understanding of the linguistic peculiarities of that language.

Raja, one of the eminent Indologist wrote a lot on Indian Semantics. In the book *The Language of Poetry*, Raja discusses the nature of poetic language in general and the problem of communication in particular. For this the author utilizes the tools of modern Stylistics and examines the prominent concepts of Indian Poetics. The discussion put forth the salient linguistic features of Sanskrit, which make Sanskrit poetically possible.

Some observations of Raja, on the aesthetic experience that reflects the shades of meaning are examined here.

**Metaphoric Expression**

Metaphor is not only limited to poetic language, but also pervades in day-to-day discourses. Raja observes that, all metaphors are syntactically normal, but semantically deviant. The examples given by him are ‘Rāma is an ass’ and Cleopatra’s statement – ‘I was a morsel for a monarch’. To quote Raja ‘In all cases of Metaphorical sentences there is a semantic obstruction based on the violence to the co-occurrence restrictions for one of the lexical items. The word ‘ass’
referring to the animal donkey is syntactically identified with Rama who from the context is known to be a human being; semantically this identification is impossible. So also the word *morsel* standing for a small, delicious food is identified syntactically with Cleopatra who is a woman, which is apparently absurd. Thus in all case of Metaphors, there is an apparent anomaly, which can be resolved only by interpreting it properly in the context of utterance. Such intentional deviance is resorted to as a communicative device by poets everywhere.

**Problem of Communication — In poetry and Drama**

Manifesting his own aesthetic experience through the medium of language, in an effective manner is the real challenge of a poet. Raja views it is as almost similar with that of the religious experience of a mystic. To quote ‘The intuitive vision, an instantaneous flash of insight, when the self is completely effaced, is a unique experience when all other mental activities are suppressed by the intensity and concentration involved in the vision, and this is accompanied by pure bliss’. To the poet, language is the one and only medium before him. The communication too depends on the imaginative faculty of the cultured sensitive reader. The author compares the communication and enjoyment of an aesthetic experience of a drama to that of poetry. In a drama the poet receives great support from well-trained actors,
well equipped theatre, and the arrangement of dance and music. The text is only a raw material to an actor. The enjoyment of drama also differs from poetry, because it depends on various elements. Raja thus discards the anonymous popular saying ‘nāṭakāntaṁ kavitvaṁ’. To quote 'this statement does not do full justice to the delicate work of the poet, unless we interpret the statement in an artificial way and say that poetry ends with drama or that in drama there is little scope for the full play of the poet’s genius.’³. But Raja admits that the Indian plays like Śākuntala and Uttarāmacarita produces the dramatic experience through the medium of language itself.

Selective Description

By exemplifying the ‘Dynamic picture of the running deer’ from Śākuntala, Raja stresses two significant features in effective communication, selective description and suppression of irrelevant features. The verse is

श्रीवाम्रेगामिरासं मुहुर्नपतती स्तुनन्दने दत्तदृष्टि:  
पश्चार्धेष्ट्रिष्ट: शरपतनशिया भूयसा पूर्वकायम्।  
दम्भसर्वावलीः श्रमवृत्तमुखश्रिष्टिः कीर्णवर्माः  
पश्योदग्राप्ततत्वाद् वियति वहदाते स्तोकमुख्योऽप्रयति।।

(Śākuntala,1,7)⁴
Like in a cartoon or caricature the poet exaggerates some of the features of the deer suggesting its fright and takes care to avoid irrelevant description.

**Socio — Cultural Meaning**

While explaining the *Dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana, Raja denotes the suggested meaning as socio-cultural meaning. He says ‘Ānandavardhana’s basic postulate is that utterances posses a literal meaning and can also convey a further meaning in the suggested sense. This suggested meaning includes everything other than the primary and metaphoric senses; and under the term meaning is included not only the information conveyed but also the emotion evoked as well as the figure of speech implied. This naturally necessitates the assumption of the suggestive power for language, for nobody can say that the emotion evoked by language is included in the primary, or the secondary power of the words. Again Ānandavardhana does not confine himself to the works and sentences as indicators of meaning; he includes all the contextual factors, the intonation, stress, gestures and even the pure sounds used in the utterance, as well as the literal and metaphorical senses, as indicators of the full meaning of an utterance.”
The utilization of images and symbols is another medium in manifesting the shades of meaning. But the acceptability of a symbol simply depends on the cultural context of the linguistic community. This view has been illustrated by interesting examples. The sentence ‘you are the cream of my coffee’ conveys nothing to a group that use only black coffee. In another way, the atmosphere produced by the terms *Haṃsa* and *Garuḍa* will be never substituted by the English terms ‘goose’ and ‘vulture’. The famous metaphor गडगायां घोषः suggests sanctity and coolness to an Indian. But to a foreigner the statement gives the notion of bathing facilities and the availability of cheap fish.

**Nuances and Linguistic Elements**

There is a long discussion on the semantic load in poetry, which differs from ordinary statements. Ānandavardhana observes the suggestive nature of subtle elements in poetry. To quote Raja ‘Ānandavardhana says that not only the words and phrases, but the stem and suffixes, the number and gender, exclamatory words and even the text taken as a whole will be helpful in shedding added luster to the ideas and emotions; and it is left to the poet to be cautious and discriminative in his selection’.⁶
a. Gender and number

A verse from *Niranunāsika Prabandha* of Melputtur Narayanaabhatta is

हा हा राक्षसराज दुष्परिभवग्रस्तस्य विक्र ते भुजा:  7

Here Śūrpanākhā laments on her pathetic condition to his brave brother Rāvaṇa. The feminine gender and the plural number in ‘bhujāḥ’ are very suggestive of the uselessness of Rāvaṇa’s arms that are twenty in number.

b. The order of words

The verse from Kālidāsa’s *Meghadūta*:

महत्मिमित्र प्रियमविधवे विद्धं माममुबाहम्।

(*Meghadūta* — II, 99) 8

Here the slight change in the order of words affects a lot in creating the emotion.

c. Preference of feminine gender

Among words having same meaning, feminine gender of a word preferred in the place of masculine. For Example:

*mādhurya* and *madhumī* than *madhumātva*

*taṭi* is prefer to *taṭa.*
d. Structure of words.

The long compounds are capable of suggesting viṣa and raudra. The words of Bhīma from Veṇīsamhāra, to prove, is cited as under:

चर्मदुभुग्निमित्तवण्डगदांशिदात-
सङ्कूर्णितसुगलस्य सुयोधनस्य।
स्त्रयावब्द्धनशोणितशोणपाण्य-
रूतसधिष्ठति कचार्तव देवि भीमः। ॥ ९

e. Rhythm

The rhythmic nature of poetry depends on the metre and the arrangement of suitable words. Raja observes that composing a hymn is often compared to the construction of a Chariot.

The dance of Kṛṣṇa in the context of Kāliyamardana from Nārāyaṇīya is quoted here to exemplify the effect of using rhythmic metre.

अधिरूह्व तत्रः फणिराजकण्यान्
नन्यते भवतां गृहपादरूचः।
कञ्चिनितनमुपज्ञुभिलाते-
करकडकणसंकुलसंकणितम् ॥

(Nārāyaṇīya 55,9)¹⁰

In Raja’s point of view, even our prose literature is not completely devoid of rhythm.
f. Repetition of same terms.

The repetition of the same terms for sharpening the poetic effect is common

त्वया जगति पुण्यानि त्वय्यपुण्या जनोकयाः।

नाधवन्तस्तच्या लोकाः त्वमनाथा विपत्त्यते॥

(Uttarāramacarita, 1.43)\(^{11}\)

It is notable that, there is no pun or ambiguity of expression. The repetition gives a special effect to the theme.

g. Repetition of similar ideas.

In order to stress the intended meaning repetition of similar ideas occurs in poetry. To quote Bhavabhūti:

इन गेहे लक्ष्मीरियमृतवर्तिन्यनयोः

असावस्या: स्पर्शं बुधिः बहुलशंबंधनसः।

(Uttararamacarita, 1.38)\(^{12}\)

h. Synonym

The vocabulary in Sanskrit language is evident from the tradition of lexicons. The selection of appropriate synonym to a particular context is observed as a himalayan task. The terms of poets like śayyā, pākaṃ and avekṣāṇa denotes this effort.

Raja says ‘The moon may be referred to kalāvān, doṣākara or kaḷarńki, but the suggested meanings are obviously different.’\(^{13}\)
i. Etymology

Some poets like Kālidāsa have created their own etymology to some words. They are accepted more than the real ones. The word ‘rājan’ is considered as derived from the root ‘rāj’ — ‘to shine’. But Kālidāsa seems to prefer it as derived from ‘rañj’ — ‘to please’. To quote:-

\[
\text{रक्षाकारणां अपनायते} \quad \text{वर्णावलिकृताः भूतानां} \quad \text{राजा} \quad \text{प्रकृतिरज्ञानाः}
\]

\[
\text{(Raghuvaṃśa, 4,12)}^{14}
\]

Finally Raja presents remarkable quoting of Q.F.Wiseman and Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Both of them point out the aesthetic experience caused by the nuances or shades of meanings in poetry and its relation with the character of the language.

Q.F.Wiseman says ‘We seem at times to glimpse behind a word another sense, deeper and half hidden, and to hear faintly the entry of another meaning, in and with which others begin to sound and all accompany the original meaning of the word like the sympathetic chimes of a bell. Hence that deep and sonorous ring in words which is lacking in artificial and invented languages, and hence also the
multiplicity, the indefiniteness, the strange suggestiveness of so much
poetry’.

Hugo von Hofmannsthal says that, this is the peculiarity of
oriental poetry. To quote his words: ‘It leads us in to the innermost
nature of oriental poetry, into the very mystery and being of language.
For this mysteriousness is the deepest element in the eastern language
and poetry alike, in so far as everything in it is metaphorical, everything
remotely descended from ancient roots. The original root is sensuous,
primitive, concise and strong, but the word moves away from it by
subtle transitions to new related meanings and then meanings only
remotely related; yet in the remotest meaning, there is still some echo
of the original sound of the word, still some darkly mirrored image of
the first sensuous impression.’

The discussion on shades of meaning in literature points out the
range of poetry and the range of language together. By this book
author intends to summarize the Indian response to the problems, in
the field of communication of the poet’s creative vision to the sensitive
readers. To this Raja considers even the poets like Vidyādhara. The
stylistic approach of the author to this subject is remarkable. The
exhibition of analogues from western literature makes his perspective
wider and brighter. It can be seen that in some context, the connoisseur in Raja dominates the linguist in him. Anyway his observation put forth some of the live linguistic elements in Sanskrit. He concludes his work by reminding the dynamic nature of the language.

2. Mīmāṃsā Contribution to Language Studies

This is a monograph published by Department of Sanskrit, University of Calicut in 1988. Indian systems of Philosophies bear live linguistic thoughts. In this work Raja put forth the concepts of language behavior in Mīmāṃsā. At first the word ‘Mīmāṃsā’ is discussed in detail. The important works and theories in Mīmāṃsā are also examined here.

The word ‘Mīmāṃsā’ itself means discussion or investigation. Raja considers this school of philosophy as of a methodology full of live positive notions on language. To quote his words ‘as a school which has developed the methodology for interpreting rules, and made intimate investigation into the various problems in the philosophy of speech’ 17
One of the methodologies in *Mīmāṁsāsūtra* is given below.

Accordingly to *Mīmāṁsakas* every argument has five parts.

1. Presentation of subject under discussion (*viśaya*)
2. Expression of the existing doubt (*samśaya*)
3. The prima facie view of the opponent (*pūrvapakṣa*)
4. The reply to it and final view (*siddhānta*)
5. Consistency in all related sentences (*samgati*)

It can be seen that this method is adapted to other schools of thought also.

The six principles advocated by *Mīmāṁsakas* to comprehend the intended substance of a passage is another example.

उपक्रमोपसांहारावध्यासो पूर्वता फलम्
अर्थवादोपपत्ती च लिङ्गं तात्पर्यनिर्णये १८

They are:

1. consistency in the meaning between the introduction and the conclusion
2. repetition of the main topic.
3. the novelty of the subject matter.
4. the result intended
5. corroborative and eulogistic remarks as distinguished from the main theme.
6. arguments in favour of the main topic.
Raja opines that according to the discussion on foreign loan words, the approach of *Mīmāṃsakas* is very unconventional. Kumārila even attack ridiculous attempts at arbitrary derivation of foreign words from Sanskrit roots on the basis of some similarity of sound and farfetched meaning association.  

*Mīmāṃsakas* used the rules of interpretation considering the utterance in their situational contexts. Raja records that such rules were accepted in legal interpretations also.  

3. *Bhāṣācintakaḥ*

*Bhāṣācintakaḥ* was published in the year 1960. As the title of the work indicates it comprises of Raja’s thoughts on language. The *Bhāṣācintakaḥ* consists of eight essays as under:

1. *Dhvani*
2. The guide of *dhvanivāda*
3. The relation between the *śabda* and *artha*
4. The *vivakṣā* and *tātparya*
5. The language and reality
6. The doctrine of *sphoṭa*
7. *Apohavāda*
8. The poet and the reader
The significance of this work lies in the matter that, such linguistic approach was new to the readers of Malayalam. The deep erudition and critical viewpoint of the author is evident in those essays. More than that, the work has presented in such a way that even the common readers can easily understand it.

4. Bhāṣāgaveṣaṇam

_Bhāṣāgaveṣaṇam_ is another Malayalam work containing fourteen articles on research in language. In the introduction of this work, N.V.Krishnawarrier assesses on the linguistic studies in Malayalam until then.

The topics those are linguistically relevant depicted in this work are:

1. Language
2. Study of Language
3. The Magic of Language
4. The Origin of Malayalam Language
5. Malayalam and Sanskrit
6. The Sanskrit words which have different meaning in Malayalam
7. Borrowed words
8. Language of Children
9. The article of F.W. Ellis on Malayalam Language
10. The Language of Custom
11. The Historical Document Written in the Sheet of Gold
12. The Work of Pākkanār
13. The bits of Dravidian Language in Oxyrhynchus records.
14. Research on Dravidian Languages

The first article Bhāṣa (language) deals with general views on language like duality, productivity, arbitrariness, interchangeability, specialization and cultural transmission.

The technical terms related to learning of language and Linguistics both in Malayalam and English are presented in this work. Raja has also introduces some of the language-recreations prevailed in Kerala. The article on the derivation of Malayalam language is remarkable one. In this article, written in a period full of discussions and disputes on the origin of Malayalam, Raja sums up the standpoints of several linguists on this topic.

5. Bhāṣādārśanavuṃ Caritavuṃ

Discussions on the development of Linguistics were alive in Malayalam. Raja is one among the prominent linguists who paved
foundation for it. His earlier books like *Bhāṣāgaveṣaṇam* and *Bhāṣācintakaḷ* prove this. The present work, *Bhāṣādarśanavuṃ Caritravuṃ* also comes under the same category.

This work is published in the year 2000 by Kerala Bhasha Institute. It provides innovations on language, Linguistics and Literary Criticism. The relevance of Indian linguistic thoughts in this century is focused by the author. The role of language in the total development of humanity is very big and the same also taken for detailed discussion.

Following topics are especially discussed in each article:

1. Language
2. Modern Linguistics
3. The comprehension of sentence meaning
4. The theories of *sphoṭa* and *śabdabrahma*
5. The language of poetry
6. Linguistics and the language of poetry
7. The language of poetry and the Literary Criticism.
8. *Kavi* and *saḥṛdaya*
One of the major attraction of Raja’s analysis is the plurality of quotations those are relevant in all aspects. The detailed bibliography of this work is a fine directive to a student interested in Linguistics.

**Articles on Linguistics**

Raja has penned more than 200 research articles. Twenty nine articles with linguistic observations are considered here for analysis.

1. **Indian Influence on Linguistics**

   India is called as the original home of scientific Linguistics. Yāska’s *Nirukta*, prātiśākhyas and Pāṇini’s *Astādhyaśi* which is considered as the final product of generation of scholarship are support this view. In this article Raja quotes various Western Linguists like L.Bloomfield, M.B.Emeneau, Friedrich von Schlegel, Franz Bopp, Jespersen, F.W.Ellis and the like. Raja examines their view point on Sanskrit and Linguistics and even corrects the misconceptions of them.

   This paper can be seen as a foreword to Raja’s study on Indian systems of meaning. To quote ‘The discussion on the problem of meaning by the ancient Indian thinkers like Bhartrhari, Kumārila bhaṭṭa and Ānandavardhana show extraordinary linguistic acumen and will
be of much help in clarifying many of the complicated issues that are baffling the contemporary linguists.\textsuperscript{22}

2. \textit{Kerala Pronunciation of Sanskrit}\textsuperscript{23}

\textit{Kerala Pronunciation of Sanskrit} is one of the most discussed papers of Raja. The peculiarities in the pronunciation of Sanskrit words of Keralites are discussed.

At first the pronunciation of ‘\textit{a}’ is examined. Raja opines that ‘\textit{it} varies with position it occupies in the word. The short ‘\textit{a}’ at the end of a word is pronounced as an open sound having the same quality as that of the long ‘\textit{ā}’:

\begin{align*}
na, ca, eva, (bata), paśya
\end{align*}

When preceded by an unaspirated voiced stop or a semi vowel except ‘\textit{v}’, the short ‘\textit{a}’ is pronounced almost like the short ‘\textit{e}’ which exists as a separate phoneme in Malayalam and other Dravidian Languages; though not in Sanskrit.

\begin{align*}
gajaḥ & (gejaḥ) \\
jayaḥ & (Jeyaḥ) \\
balam & (belam)
\end{align*}
Another significant observation of Raja is the disphthongal vowel ‘ai’ is in most cases pronounced in Kerala as (ei), eg.,

\[(thateiva),\ (sarveiŋ),\ (angeiŋ)\]

The tendency to nasalization is also pointed out by Raja. Voiced unaspirated plosives \((g\ j\ d\ d\ b)\) when preceded by nasal consonants become assimilated to the nasal of the same class in pronunciation. This tendency is found in the early stage in the evolution of Malayalam. In the pronunciation of Sanskrit words the same tendency is found.

When the voiced homorganic clusters of Sanskrit \(\dot{r}g,\ ŋj,\ nd,\ ŋḍ\) and \(mb\) are pronounced as geminated nasals \(\dot{r}n,\ ŋn,\ nn,\ ŋn,\ \) and \(mm\) respectively. The vowel following the nasal is pronounced with a slight nasality which can be detected by a sharp listener.

\[gaṅgā\quad (gaṅṇa)\]

\[bhaṅgi\quad (bhaṅṇi)\]

\[aṅjanam\quad (aṅṅanam)\]

\[mandam\quad (mannam)\]

This article contains various observations on the pronunciation of various factors like visarga, kṣa etc. T.B.Venugopalapanikkar has reviewed this research article of Raja in detail. He supports and adds some notions on this topic. ²⁴
3. **Nasal Phonemes of Malayalam**

In this interesting article, Raja keenly observes the phonetic aspects of Malayalam. Six Nasals are found in the Malayalam orthography: \( m, n, \tilde{n}, \tilde{n}, \tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\eta} \) and the \textit{anusvāra}. One of the special features of this language is that the letter for ‘\( n \)’ represents two distinct phones, the dental ‘\( n \)’ and the blade-alveolar ‘\( \tilde{n} \)’.

For example Raja cites:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{‘enna:l} & \quad \text{but} \quad \text{ennal} \quad \text{–} \quad \text{by me} \\
\text{ninna:l} & \quad \text{if (one) stood;} \quad \text{ninna:l} \quad \text{‘by you’}
\end{align*}
\]

Raja also observes that ‘Malayalam is generally considered to be a nasal language like French and American English. In certain colloquial dialects certain nasal vowels are heard distinctly.’

4. **Alternation \( m/v \) in Malayalam**

The interchange of the phonemes ‘\( m \)’ and ‘\( v \)’ in Malayalam is depicted in this article. In Raja’s word ‘Two distinct sound units, which are different phonemes in the language, might in certain words be used indiscriminately. The phonemes lose their substitution value in such cases, as otherwise the two sound units cease to be distinct phonemes in the language.’
The interchange between ‘r’ and ‘l’, and between ‘b’ and ‘v’ is accepted in Classical Sanskrit. (ralayor abhedaḥ / bavayor abhedaḥ - No distinction between ‘r’ and ‘l’; No distinction between ‘b’ and ‘v’).

It is observed that the interchange between ‘m’ and ‘v’ is seen in Prakrit and Kannada also. The word Kamala in Sanskrit corresponds to Kavala in Prakrit. Similarly the word kumkumam in Sanskrit corresponds to kunkuvam in Kannada.

Such illustration in Malayalam are:

- cumar - cuvar (wall)
- cumanna - cuvanna (red colour)
- ammāman - ammāvan (uncle) 29

The three articles above said are sharing a common aspect. They are the result of Raja’s keen observation on Malayalam.

5. **Language of Social Hierarchy** 30

Sociological approach is common in every disciplines of Indology. This article is a socio-linguistic analysis, in which the modern approach of Linguistics is applied. Raja makes it clear, ‘In this paper, I propose to discuss only one minor aspect of the intimate interconnection between linguistic behavior and the social background,
an aspect which has not yet received adequate attention from linguist or anthropologists, namely the language of social hierarchy or the reflections of the class-distinctions of society in its linguistic behavior.  

Different usages of personal pronouns denote some social implications. Raja examines the second person pronoun of various languages like English, French, Tamil, Hindi, German and Malayalam. In Malayalam several words for addressing a person: ni or niyya, tân, niññal, añña, iviţunna, tirumanassukoñṭa, etc, in the increasing order of importance.

Raja also observes the interesting resemblance of Malayalam and Sanskrit with Japanese. In Japanese one of the paraphrase of the word ‘you’ is ‘that side’. The Sanskrit terms like atrabhāvan and atrabhavati and the Malayalam term like añña and iviţunna used as respectful forms of address also mean ‘this side’ or ‘the one who is here’.

This article of Raja also thrown light on important topics like women’s dialect in Sanskrit.
6. **The Contribution of Kerala to Linguistic Theory of Meaning**

Raja presents some of the significant semantic observation in *Līlātilaka* a fourteenth century Sanskrit work on the Maṇipravāḷa language and literature in Malayalam. The importance of semantic consideration in the identification of phonemes in language has pointed out by the unknown author. The author of *Līlātilaka* says that the Malayalam language contains seven phonemes which are absent in Sanskrit.

7. **Linguistic Competence and Performance – At Different Levels.**

Indian thinkers had stressed the dichotomy and interrelation between competence and performance. They believed *jñāna* (competence) and *prayoga* (performance) constitute the speech act. Noam Chomsky’s point was that Linguistics was really concerned with competence and not to performance. This paper elaborately discusses the different levels of Linguistic competence and performance along with socio–cultural and aesthetic aspects.

8. **Language and Culture**

The present paper discusses the basic problems of language and its cultural contexts. For it Raja examines the vedic literature and various notions presented by thinkers like Bhartṛhari and
Ānandavardhana along with Malayalam poems. While quoting a verse from Kumaranasan’s Naṉinī, it is cited as from the book Cintā visṭayāya sītā. ³⁶

9. Philosophy of Language in India ³⁷

Indian thinkers were very much aware of the power of language and communication. The grammarian philosopher Bhartṛhari has pointed out that the whole phenomenon of material existence is only an illusory appearance of the speech principle. Sphoṭa theory and the views of Mīmāmsakas are relevant in this context. Four different stages in manifestation of languages – parā, paśyantī, madhyamā and vaikharī – also dealt within it. It is one of the excellent papers of Raja.

10. On the Meaning of the expression cauṟāṇ na didṛkṣate ³⁸

cauṟāṇ na didṛkṣate is a counter example given by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita while discussing Pāṇini’s sūtra 1.4.28, antardhau yenādarśanam icchatī. Raja discusses the significance of it by examining the views of other grammarians.
11. *Is a structural Approach to Vyañjanā feasible?* \(^\text{39}\)

This paper is meant to answer some questions aroused by Saroja Bhate in her thought provoking paper *Vyañjanā* as reflected in the formal structure of language published in *Pāñinian Studies*.

Raja clear the various aspects of Vyañjanā by citing Indian and Non-Indian poems. Raja suggests that it is Ānandavardhana and his followers rather than Pāñini, to whom we should look up, for getting objective canons of literary application.

12. *Indian Theories of śābdabodha* \(^\text{40}\)

The technique of śābdabhoda was developed in the school of *Navya – Nyāya*. It was adopted by later writers in the various schools of thought. Raja observes that the śābdabodha approach of analyzing the exact meaning of a sentence is analogues to Chomsky’s distinction between the surface structure and the deep structure of sentence.

13. *Prārthayanti – A Ghost word discussed by the Grammarians* \(^\text{41}\)

In *Siddhāntakaumudī*, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita discusses the parasmaipada usage of the term prārthayanti in the line ‘prārthayanti śayanottthitām priyah’. Grammarians have discussed this work as quoted from *Māgha*. Raja makes it clear that, it is a misquotation from
Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa (XIX.29) and point out that prārthayanti is an example of a ghost word being discussed by the grammarians.

14. Malayalam and Maṇipravālam

According to Līlātilaka, Maṇipravāla is the harmonious combination of Malayalam and Sanskrit words. There was also Tamil Maṇipravāla, Telugu Maṇipravāla etc. This paper provides a remarkable account on rich Maṇipravāla literature in Malayalam.

15. On the Interpretation of Vā Padāntasya

Venkatesh Sastri Joshi, a well known authority on Sanskrit grammar opined that the option in vā padāntasya (8.4.57) should be applied in the case of real words and not to upasargas (prepositions). Raja points out that observation of Pandit Joshi are against to Pāṇini’s views on the interpretation of padāntasya.

16. A so-called Vārttika : Māturmātacputrārkharhate

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, while discussing the various forms of the vocative singular of bahuvrīhi compounds ending in māta, quotes the rule māturmātacputrārkharhate. Raja takes the rule for discussion which is not considered as a vārttika by Patañjali. According to Raja
the present rule only gives the semantic condition restricting the use of mātac.

17. **Auxiliaries in Sanskrit**

Auxiliary words are formerly independent words which do not carry their independent meaning. Raja records his opinion that, in Sanskrit the auxiliaries play a minor role, since special suffixes are added to the words themselves to indicate the modal or aspectual nature of the action.

18. **Muṣṭimdhaya**

The present paper of Raja is meant to solve the problems aroused by Venkatacharya regarding the significance of the term muṣṭimdhaya. Raja delivers various examples to prove that the word is not a unique usage. To quote Raja ‘...since we have already seen that in all cases it is the literal meaning and it’s figurative extensions that are found for the word muṣṭimdhaya (‘sucking the fist’ referring to infant, and ‘drinking in one handful’ sometimes figuratively extended in the sense of ‘one who has easily mastered’, or ‘one who has made to disappear’, as Agastya did the ocean’, etc).
19. **Language – Its Limitations and Potentialities**  

The present paper of Raja is one of the excellent papers of him. Raja brings forward some significant questions on the language and communication those have been agitating the minds of thinkers, poets and philosophers. Raja makes a relevant observation that ‘However imperfect our language may be, it is still a very powerful and useful means – perhaps the only handy means we have approaching reality, though not of actually realizing it.’

20. **The Closed /â/ in Colloquial Malayalam**  

Raja has already proved his deep interest in socio-linguistic areas of Indology. The paper *Kerala Pronunciation of Sanskrit* is a good example. The present paper is meant to point out that in the standard colloquial Malayalam of Central Kerala the closed vowel /â/ exists as a separate phoneme distinct from both the open vowel /â/ and the neutral vowel /ə/.

21. **The Word and the Sentence: Two Perspectives: Bhartṛhari and Wittgenstein.**  

In this paper Raja compares the observations of Bhartṛhari and Ludwig Wittgenstein – the English philosopher. Raja sees some similarities between the works of Wittgenstein and Bhartṛhari.
22. *Bhartṛharinodṛtāni Vākyalakṣaṇāni* &

23. *Bhartṛhari’s list of Sentence Definitions*  
Raja discusses same views in both papers on the sentence definitions of Bhartṛhari, given in *Vākyapadīya*. It has various versions and various interpretations according to each tradition of thought. Raja delivers the interpretations of grammarians, *jainas* and *mīmāmsakas*.

24. *Bhartṛhariṇīdīṅnāgaśca*  
The present paper is a comparison between the view of Bhartṛhari and Dīṅnāga, the Buddhist philosopher. Raja analyses the similarities and dissimilarities in their doctrines. It is clear that, the period of Dīṅnāga’s was later to the period of Bhartṛhari.

25. *Diachronistic Linguistics in Ancient India*  
Ferdinand de Saussure has made a clear distinction between two different methods of approach – synchronistic or descriptive and diachronistic or historical. Ancient Indian scholars were only concerned with the synchronistic approach. Raja opines that this approach is quite apparent in the case of Semantics.
26.  *Pāṇini’s concept of a Sentence* ⁵⁶

The present paper shows there was a difference in the views of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana regarding the nature of a sentence. This topic is well discussed by traditional scholars and modern scholars.

27.  *Allophones of the Dental Nasal in Sanskrit* ⁵⁷

The present paper is on a significant reference in *Līlātilaka*. It discusses the allophonic variation in the articulation of the Sanskrit dental nasal in Kerala.

28.  *Kumārilabhaṭṭa on the Dravidian Languages* ⁵⁸

In *Tantravārttika* Kumārilabhaṭṭa has presented some observations on Dravidian languages. Many scholars discussed it but they could not get the viewpoint put forth by Kumārilabhaṭṭa. In this paper Raja clarifies and brings out the real significance of the passage.

29.  *Pāṇini’s Attitude Towards Lakṣaṇā* ⁵⁹

The role of *lakṣaṇā* in language is not discussed at all in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. But Pāṇini was aware of the existence of faded metaphors and transferred uses in Sanskrit. Even in the case of faded metaphors the Pāṇinīya tradition is not to treat them as metaphors,
but to consider them as due to elision of some word assumed to have existed along with them.

**Some sections of ITM**

*ITM*, the masterpiece work of Raja examines Indian theories of meaning through the semantic perceptive, which has analyzed earlier. Nine research papers, originally formed as section of *ITM* are published by Raja. Seven of them published in Brahmavidyā and they are:


All of these articles are significant with Raja’s keen observation and authoritative approach in Linguistics. In the present thesis fourth
chapter is dedicated to ITM. Hence details of the above articles are not included here.

As a linguist Raja touches almost all areas of Linguistics. Sometimes he shows more passion towards Semantics. Socio-cultural approach also made prominent in his articles. The most important thing is that, he is equally well versed in traditional Sanskrit scriptures and modern theories on language anvcommunication. Raja’s discourse on Linguistics reveals the different aspects of this discipline. They depict the new developments in this area of research and focus on the facts that should be noted by the students of Linguistics. His works and articles will definitely satisfy the readers who approach language seriously.
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