

The *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā* of Viśvarūpa,
the first *adhyāya* and a detailed examination

Dissertation
zur Erlangung der Würde des
Doktors der Philosophie
der Universität Hamburg

vorgelegt von

Małgorzata Wielńska-Soltwedel
aus Warschau

Hamburg 2006

1. Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Lambert Schmithausen

2. Gutachterin: Prof. Dr. Tatiana Oranskaia

Datum der Disputation: 03. Februar 2005

Contents

Foreword	v
Abbreviations and literature referred to	ix

Volume I

Introduction to volume I	i
Age of manuscripts	ii
The present edition	v
Symbols and abbreviations used in volume I	vi

The *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā: adhyāya 1*

<i>Pāda</i> 1	1
<i>Pāda</i> 2	45
<i>Pāda</i> 3	73
<i>Pāda</i> 4	100
Index of names and titles	139

Volume II

Introduction to volume II	1
I The Bengali tradition	3
I.1 Jayāditya and Vāmana	5
I.1.1 The <i>Kāśikā</i>	6
I.1.2 Jayāditya and Vāmana	8
I.2 Jinendrabuddhi	9

I.2.1	The <i>Nyāsa</i>	10
I.2.2	Other works	11
I.2.3	Jinendrabuddhi	11
I.2.3.1	Creed of Jinendrabuddhi	11
I.2.3.2	His place of activity	12
I.2.3.3	Jinendrabuddhi's date	12
I.3	The <i>Bhāgavṛttikāra</i>	17
I.3.1	Characterization of the <i>Bhāgavṛtti</i>	17
I.3.2	The authorship of the <i>Bhāgavṛtti</i>	18
I.3.3	The date of the <i>Bhāgavṛtti</i>	25
I.3.4	The commentaries of the <i>Bhāgavṛtti</i>	26
I.4	The <i>Anunyāsakāra</i>	27
I.4.1	The character of the <i>Anunyāsa</i>	27
I.4.2	The authorship of the <i>Anunyāsa</i>	27
I.4.3	The date of the <i>Anunyāsa</i>	30
I.4.4	The commentaries	31
I.5	Govardhana	32
I.6	Maitreyarakṣita	33
I.6.1	The <i>Tantrapradīpa</i>	34
I.6.2	The <i>Dhātupradīpa</i>	35
I.6.3	Other works	36
I.6.4	Maitreyarakṣita	36
I.7	Puruṣottamadeva	38
I.7.1	The <i>Bhāṣāvṛtti</i>	39
I.7.2	The <i>Paribhāṣāvṛtti</i>	40
I.7.3	The <i>Jñāpakasamuccaya</i>	41
I.7.4	The <i>Kārakacakra</i>	42

I.7.5	Other grammatical works	43
I.7.5.1	The <i>Prāṇapanā</i>	43
I.7.5.2	The <i>Durghaṭavṛtti</i>	43
I.7.5.3	The <i>Uṇādivṛtti</i>	44
I.7.5.4	The <i>Gaṇavṛtti</i>	44
I.7.5.5	The <i>Daśabalakārikā</i>	45
I.7.5.6	The <i>Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna</i>	45
I.7.5.7	The <i>Kārakakārikā</i>	45
I.7.5.8	The <i>Prākṛtānuśāsana</i>	45
I.7.6	The grammarian Puruṣottama	46
I.7.7	The lexicographer Puruṣottama	49
I.7.8	The poet Puruṣottama	50
I.8	Śaraṇadeva	51
I.8.1	The <i>Durghaṭavṛtti</i>	51
I.8.2	Śaraṇadeva	52
I.9	Sīradeva	53
I.9.1	The <i>Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti</i>	53
I.9.2	Sīradeva	54
I.10	Ujjvaladatta	55
I.10.1	The <i>Uṇādivṛtti</i>	55
I.10.2	Ujjvaladatta	55
I.11	Other scholars	58
I.11.1	Nandanamiśra	58
I.11.2	Narapati Mahāmiśra	58
I.11.3	Puṇḍarikākṣa Vidyāsāgara	59
I.11.4	Sanātana Tarkācārya	59
I.11.5	Śrīmānaśarman	59
I.11.6	Sṛṣṭidhara	60
I.12	Decline of the Bengali tradition	61

II The <i>Pañjikā</i>	63
II.1 Some terminological problems	63
II.1.1 Style and stylistics	63
II.1.2 Literary and non-literary texts	65
II.1.3 Form and content	66
II.2 Critical analysis of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	67
II.3 The <i>Pañjikā</i> as discourse	69
II.3.1 The <i>Pañjikā</i> as (an example of) literary discourse?	71
II.3.2 Three discursal aspects of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	74
II.3.2.1 The participants	75
II.3.2.2 The action	81
II.3.2.3 The context	83
II.4 Basic form of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	88
II.5 Style of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	90
II.5.1 Linguistic style	90
II.5.2 The method of analysis	94
II.5.3 Nominal style in the <i>Pañjikā</i>	95
II.5.4 Vocabulary	96
II.5.5 Sentence	99
II.5.6 Textual features: cohesion in the <i>Pañjikā</i>	102
II.5.6.1 Reference	103
II.5.6.2 Substitution	105
II.5.6.3 Ellipsis	106
II.5.6.4 Conjunction	108
II.5.6.5 Lexical cohesion	110
II.5.7 Evaluation of the <i>Pañjikā</i> 's style	112
II.6 Analysis of the content of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	113

II.6.1	Preliminary remarks	113
II.6.2	Names and titles mentioned and quoted in the <i>Pañjikā</i>	114
II.6.3	Examples discussed in the <i>Pañjikā</i>	115
II.6.4	The influence of the <i>Nyāsa</i> on the <i>Pañjikā</i>	119
II.6.5	Influence of other grammatical treatises on the <i>Pañjikā</i>	124
II.6.5.1	The <i>Mahābhāṣya</i>	125
II.6.5.2	The <i>Kāśikā</i>	127
II.6.5.3	Works of Puruṣottamadeva	131
II.6.5.4	The <i>Durghaṭavṛtti</i>	141
II.6.5.5	The <i>Padamañjarī</i>	156
II.6.5.6	The <i>Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti</i>	167
II.6.5.7	Other works	169
II.6.6	Original ideas of Viśvarūpa	172
II.6.6.1	Opinions different from those found in the <i>Nyāsa</i>	173
II.6.6.2	Opinions which are not found anywhere	178
II.6.7	Evaluation of the content of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	191
II.7	Evaluation of the <i>Pañjikā</i>	192

APPENDICES

A	Variant readings of the <i>Bhāṣāvṛtti</i>	195
B	Examples not found in the <i>Nyāsa</i>	197
B.1	Examples found in other works of Puruṣottama	197
B.2	Examples found in the <i>Durghaṭavṛtti</i> of Śaraṇadeva	198
B.3	Examples found in the <i>Padamañjarī</i>	199
C	Śaṅkara's commentary on the <i>Mahābhāṣya</i>	200
D	Two passages from the <i>Kāraṅcakāra</i>	201

Foreword

The present work is devoted to Viśvarūpa's *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*, a commentary on Puruṣottamadeva's famous *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Although Puruṣottamadeva's treatise – being in turn a commentary on Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and dated 12th century – was most probably written in Bengal, it found a great acceptance in the whole of India as one providing an easy access to Pāṇini's system. Strangely enough, none of the commentaries on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, to some extent with the exception of Sṛṣṭidhara's *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛtti*, seems to have won popularity comparable to that of the Puruṣottamadeva's work. Nevertheless, it might be enriching to study these commentaries, if not for their outstanding grammatical discussions, then for the insight they give us into the late grammatical tradition.

One of the reasons why I have chosen Viśvarūpa's *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*, later referred to as the *Pañjikā*, was the fact that when I began my research no edition of Viśvarūpa's commentary was available. Meanwhile, the situation has changed and in 2001 an edition of the first four *adhyāyas* of the *Pañjikā* prepared by Shashinath Jha was published. Still, the critical edition of the *Pañjikā*, or rather of its extant portion, remains a desideratum. However, such an edition is not what I have aimed at in this survey, which concentrates rather on the examination and the evaluation of the *Pañjikā*. For that reason, only one part of the *Pañjikā* has been studied here in detail. In choosing that part two criteria have been decisive. Firstly, the selected portion should be long enough to allow thorough analysis and secondly if possible it should form a fairly closed section. For these reasons the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* has been chosen here and its edition is given in the first volume of the present dissertation. The second volume deals, roughly speaking, with the investigation of the *Pañjikā* and it can be divided into two parts. The first one outlines the history of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar and can be read independently from the rest of the study; in the second part the *Pañjikā* is scrutinised.

The analysis of the *Pañjikā*, as undertaken here, cannot be called a pure indological one. What I have intended in my research is to unite methods applied in indology, linguistics and especially in discourse analysis. This attempt originated in my belief that such a synthesis can prove very stimulating and thought-provoking and that one should try to combine achievements of various branches of learning to avoid their isolation and also – hopefully – to obtain better results. It might also be instructive to see whether methods of analysis worked out by one discipline are really as universal as they are claimed to be.

Out of many theories of discourse analysis I have found two especially inspiring. The first one comes from Roger Fowler (see *Linguistic Criticism*) and the second is elaborated by Mary Louise Pratt in her book *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. In any case I have not completely taken over their ideas but I have slightly, and for different reasons – which I hope will become clear for the Reader – modified them. Furthermore, one of the most important principles applied in the examination of the *Pañjikā*, i.e. its grounding on the dichotomy between form and content, is taken neither from Fowler nor from Pratt. That this form/content division has proven useful in the present investigation is mostly due to the character of the *Pañjikā*, which is a scientific treatise. As will be shown later, this would not be so desirable nor possible in the case of so called literary works.

A terminological digression

In the present work I mostly use the word ‘phone’ instead of ‘phoneme’ or a ‘speech sound’, which are much more frequent in English linguistic texts. This practice calls for some explanation. Although the term ‘phone’ was already used at the end of the 19th century* and then also applied by Hockett (1942: 97-108), it has never found such an acceptance in English-language literature as its German counterpart ‘Phon’. However, the concept of phone is a very useful one and it differs essentially from that of phoneme. The latter is an element of the phonological system of a certain language and as such can be used only after the phonological analysis has taken place. On the other hand, when we speak of phones, it is not important whether this analysis has been carried out or not. Consequently, it is crucial to keep these two terms apart. Let us consider one example, namely, that of the consonant \tilde{n} ([ɲ] in the *International Phonetic Alphabet*), which is a phone but not a phoneme of Sanskrit language.

There are two situations where I use the term phone: in translations and in other mostly explanatory portions of the text. As far as the second context is concerned, I think the justification for my usage as given above should be sufficient. From the perspective of the *Pañjikā*, the difference between Sanskrit phonetics and Sanskrit phonology is unimportant; therefore, it is much more appropriate to use the term phone, which does not presuppose a phonological analysis. I could also have spoken of speech sounds, but since grammatical treatises are rather technical and far from being easy, I prefer to use technical vocabulary for their translation and examination. The situation, however, is much more complicated in cases when a phone is employed

* See Trask (1996: 264) for details.

as a translation of Sanskrit *-kāra* and in some contexts also of *varṇa*. Strictly speaking Sanskrit phonetic concepts – and here I understand phonetics as comprising also phonology – differ considerably from Western ones. How could it be otherwise? There is not enough room here to point out these differences and at this point their nature is not so important. In practice, there are two methods of coping with such terminological problems. Either we do not translate Sanskrit terms at all, or we use those Western concepts which are as near to Sanskrit ones as possible. In the present survey, which does not deal with Sanskrit phonetics, I have decided to use the second possibility. Translating *-kāra* as a phone is perhaps not worth discussing, as *-kāra* corresponds fairly well to the concept of phone, especially if we understand it as a type. In contrast, the Indian concept of *varṇa* is much more complicated and sophisticated. On the one hand, *varṇa* is very similar to the concept of phoneme, especially when it refers to vowels. On the other hand, Indian grammarians apply this term to phones which are certainly not phonemes of Sanskrit, e.g. to *ñ* or *h*.^{*} For these reasons, I translate *varṇa* mostly as a phone and occasionally, when it denotes a vowel, as a phoneme.[†]

Acknowledgements

First of all, I am deeply indebted and grateful to Professor Albrecht Wezler for the help, advice and patience he offered me while I was struggling with the text. Furthermore, I would like to thank Professor Ashok Aklujkar for the very inspiring comments he made on an early draft of one part of the present work. Dr Diwakar Acharya was kind enough to copy the beginning of one of the *Pañjikā*'s manuscripts for me. And last but not least, my special thanks go to Ms. Ann Roche B.Sc. (Hons.) CELTA for correcting my English.

Needless to say, I alone am responsible for any shortcomings this study might prove to have.

* * *

This work was typeset with the L^AT_EX 2_ε program, together with the following packages: *footmisc*, *perpage*, *manyfoot*, *fancyhdr*, *lineno*, *ulem* and *ipa*. In addition, the package *skt*, written by Charles Wikner, was used for transliteration of Sanskrit passages. The dvi file was converted into PDF with the help of *dvips* and *ps2pdf*.

^{*} See also Deshpande (1997: 47-50) for some remarks on this topic.

[†] Thus, *ṛvarṇa* is rendered as 'the phoneme *r*'.

Abbreviations and literature referred to

Abbreviations of grammatical terms

Ā. = <i>ātmanepada</i>	Par. = <i>parasmaipada</i>
aor. = aorist	pl. = plural
ben. = benedictive	sing. = singular

Other abbreviations

Amarakośa = Amarasimha's *Nāmaṅgānuśāsana*, ed.: Paṇḍit Śivadatta: *The Nāmaṅgānuśāsana (Amarakośa) of Amarasimha with the Commentary (Vyākhyāsudhā or Rāmāśramī) of Bhanuji Dīkṣit (son of the Grammarian Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣit)*, 6th ed. revised by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya "Kāvya-tīrtha", Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, Bombay 1944.

Bhaṭṭ. = *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, ed.: 1) Shāstrī Bāpata, Govinda Shankara: *The Bhaṭṭikāvyaṃ of Bhaṭṭi with the commentary (Jayamaṅgalā) of Jayamaṅgala*, The Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay 1887; 2) Vināyak Nārāyaṇ Shāstrī Joshi and Wāsudev Laxman Shāstrī Paṅṣīkar: *The Bhaṭṭikāvya of Bhaṭṭi with the Commentary (Jayamaṅgalā) of Jayamaṅgala*, Pāndurang Jāwājī, Bombay 1928.

Bhv. = *Bhāṣāvṛtti*; the edition of Chakravarti (1918) was used, except where stated otherwise; for other consulted editions, see: Dwarikadas Shastri (1971), Mishra (1989), Vedāntatīrtha (1912).

Daiva = Deva's *Daiva*, see Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1905).

Dhātupradīpa = *Dhātupradīpa* of Maitreya Rakṣita, see Chakravarti (1919).

Dhp. = *Dhātupāṭha*, see Böhtlingk (1887).

Durghaṭa = *Durghaṭavṛtti*; ed.: 1) Renou, Louis: *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva traité grammatical en sanskrit du XIIe siècle*, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", Paris 1940-56 (when not otherwise stated this is the edition quoted in the present work); 2) T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī: *The Durghaṭavṛtti of Śaraṇadeva (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series VI)*, Travancore Government Press, Trivandrum 1909.

ELL = *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. by R. E. Asher and J. M. Y. Simpson, Pergamon Press, Oxford – New York – Seoul – Tokyo 1994.

Gītāgovinda = Jayadeva's *Gītāgovinda*, ed.: 1) Mangesh Rāmkrishṇa Telang and Vāsudev Laxman Shāstrī Paṅṣīkar: *The Gīta-Govinda of Jayadeva with the commentaries*

Rasikapriyā of King Kumbha and Rasamañjarī of Mahāmahopādhyāya Shankara Mishra, 3rd edition, Tukarām Jāvajī, Bombay 1910 (when not otherwise stated this is the edition quoted in the present work); 2) V. M. Kulkarni: *Jayadeva's Gītāgovinda with King Mānānka's commentary*, Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Bharatiya Sanskriti Vidya-mandira, Ahmedabad 1965.

Gop. Br. = *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, ed.: 1) Gaastra, Dieuke: *Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, Leiden 1919; 2) Rājendralāla Mitra and Harachandra Vidyābhushaṇa: *The Gopatha Brāhmaṇa of the Atharva Veda*, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta 1872.

GP = *Gaṇapāṭha*, see Böhtlingk (1887).

Jñ.S. = *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, see Bhattacharya (1946).

Kāś. = *Kāśikā*, see: 1) Sharma, Deshpande and Padhye (1969-70), 2) Dwarikadas Shastri and Shukla (1965-67), 3) Tripathi and Malaviya (1986-94).

Kirātārjunīya = Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*, ed.: Durgāprasād and Kāsīnāth Pāndurang Parab, *The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi with the Commentary (Ghaṇṭāpāṭha) of Mallinātha*, 5th edition, Tukārām Jāvajī, Bombay 1903.

Kumāra = Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*: ed. Suryakanta, *The Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa*, with a general introduction by S. Radhakrishnan, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi 1962.

Mahābhārata = *Mahābhārata*, ed.: Vishnu S. Sukthankar, S. K. Belvalkar, P. L. Vaidya: *The Mahābhārata*; vol. 1-19; Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1933-66.

Manusmṛti = *Manusmṛti*, ed.: J. Jolly: *Mānava Dharma-śāstra. The Code of Manu*, Trübner, London 1887.

Mbh. = *Mahābhāṣya*, see Kielhorn (1880-85).

M.Dhv. = Sāyaṇa's *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*, ed.: Dwarikadas Shastri (1964).

Medinī = *Medinīkośa*, ed.: Hoshing, Jagannāth Śāstri: *Nānārthaśabdakośa by Śrī Medinīkāra (The Kāshi Sanskrit Series 41)*, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Benares 1940.

Meghadūta = Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*, ed. Kale, M. R.: *The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*, 8th edition, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1974.

NCC = *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*, University of Madras, Madras 1949-78.

Nirukta = Yaska's *Nirukta*, ed.: Sarup, Lakshman: *The Nighaṅṭu and the Nirukta. The oldest indian treatise on etymology, philology, and semantics*; University of the Panjab, Lahore 1927.

NP = Nāgojībhaṭṭa's *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, ed.: Kielhorn, Lorenz Franz: *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa, Part I: The Sanskrit Text and Various Readings*; "Indu-Prakash" Press, Bombay 1868.

Nyāsa = *Nyāsa*, ed.: 1) Dwarikadas Shastri and Shukla (1965-67), 2) Tripathi and Malaviya (1986-94).

P. = Pāṇini, see Böhtlingk (1887).

Pad. = *Padamañjarī*, ed.: 1) Dwarikadas Shastri and Shukla (1965-67), 2) Tripathi and Malaviya (1986-94).

Padacandrikā = Rāyamukūṭa's *Padacandrikā*, see K. K. Dutta (1966-78).

Padyāvalī = Rūpa Gosvāmin's *Padyāvalī*, see S. K. De (1990).

Pañj. = Viśvarūpa's *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*.

Pat. = Patañjali.

PP = Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, ed.: 1) Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946), 2) Abhyankar (1967).

PP² = Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāpāṭha*, ed.: Abhyankar (1967).

Pradīpa = Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*, ed.: *The Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali with the commentary Bhāṣyapradīpa of Kaiyaṭa Upādhyāya and the supercommentary Bhāṣyapradīpodyota of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa (The Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 23)*, (vol. I: *Navāhnikā*, ed.: Bhargava Sastri Bhikaji Josi, 1992; vol. II: *Vidhiśeṣarūpam*, ed.: Shivdatta Sharma, 1991), Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, Delhi.

Pramāṇasamuccaya = Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, ed., transl.: Hattori, Masaaki: *Dignāga, On Perception, being the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya from the Sanskrit fragments and the Tibetan version*; Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass. 1968.

Prasāda = Viṭṭhala's *Prasāda*, see Trivedi (1925-31).

Puruṣakāra = Kṛṣṇahīlāśuka's *Puruṣakāra*, see Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1905).

Raghu = Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa*, ed.: Pāndurang Parab, Kāśīnāth: *The Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa with the Commentary of Mallinātha*, The Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay 1892.

Rasavatī = Jumarānandin's *Rasavatīvr̥tti*, see Saini (1995).

RV = *R̥gveda*, ed.: Müller, F. M.: *Rig-Veda-Sam̥hitā. The Sacred Hymns of the Brāhmins together with the commentary of Sāyanācārya*, Henry Frowde, London 1890 (vol. I-II), 1892 (vol. III-IV).

Śabdakaustubha = Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita's *Śabdakaustubha*, ed.: Vindhyeśwarī Prasād Dvivedī and Gaṇapati Śāstrī Mokāte: *Śabdakaustubha of Śrī Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita* (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 2), 2 vols., 2nd edition, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi 1991.

Saduktikarṇāmṛta = Śrīdharadāsa's *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*; ed.: Banerji, Sures Chandra: *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa*, K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta 1965.

Śatapathabrāhmaṇa = ed.: Weber, Albrecht: *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā with extracts from the Commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedaganga*, Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig 1924 (reprint of the edition: Berlin, 1855).

Śīśu = Māgha's *Śīśupālavadha*, ed.: Paṇḍit Durgāprasād and Paṇḍit Śivadatta of Jeypore: *The Śīśupālavadha of Māgha with the commentary (Sarvaṃkashā) of Mallinātha*, 3rd edition revised by Vāsudev Laksmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇṣīkar; Tukārām Jāvajī, Bombay 1902.

SJ = Jha (2001).

SP = Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvr̥tti*, see Abhyankar (1967).

Ś.sū. = *Śivasūtra*, see Böhlingk (1887).

Subhāṣitaratnakośa = Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*, see Kosambi and Gokhale (1957).

Ṭikāsarvasva = Sarvānanda's *Amarakośaṭikāsarvasva*, see Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1914, 1915-1917, 1917).

Uṇ. = *Uṇādisūtra*, ed.: 1) Śrīśa Chandra Vasu: *The Siddhānta Kaumudī of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita edited and translated into English by*, vol. II, reprint of the 2nd edition: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi – Varanasi – Patna 1982; 2) Jibananda Vidyasagara: *Ujjala Datta's Commentary on the Unadisutras*, Ganesa Press, Calcutta 1873.

Uṇ.-vr̥tti = Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādisūtravr̥tti*, ed.: Jibananda Vidyasagara: *Ujjala Datta's Commentary on the Unadisutras*, Ganesa Press, Calcutta 1873.

vārtt. = Kātyāyana's *vārttikas*, see Kielhorn (1880-85).

Veṇī = Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's *Veṇīsaṃhāra*, ed.: Kale, M. R.: *Veṇīsaṃhāra of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa*, Bombay 1936 (reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1977).

Vijayā = Śrīmān Śarma's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛttitippaṇī*, see Abhyankar (1967).

Vivaraṇī = Goyīcandra's *Vivaraṇīṭikā*; see Saini (1995).

VP = Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*; see Rau (1977).

Journals

ABORI = *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Poona.

CASS-St. = *Studies of Center of Advanced Study in Sanskrit*, Poona.

IA = *Indian Antiquary*, Bombay.

IHQ = *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta.

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven.

JBBRAS = *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Bombay – London.

JIBS = *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Tokyo.

JLS = *Journal of Literary Semantics*, The Hague – Paris.

JRAS = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, London.

JOR = *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras.

Language = *Language. Journal of the Linguistic Society of America*, Baltimore.

NGGW = *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*.

OH = *Our Heritage, Bulletin of the Department of Post-Graduate Training and Research*, Calcutta.

STZ = *Sprache im technischen Zeitalter*, Stuttgart.

StII = *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, Reinbek.

VIJ = *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal*, Hoshiarpur.

ZII = *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*, Leipzig.

Literature

- Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev 1961: *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Oriental Institute, Baroda.
- 1962-72: *The Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, edited by F. Kielhorn, 3rd edition revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes by K. V. Abhyankar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- 1967: *Paribhāṣa-saṃgraha (a collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās)*; Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- 1985: *The Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, edited by F. Kielhorn, revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes by K. V. Abhyankar, 4th edition, vol. I; Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- Allen, W. S. 1953: *Phonetics in ancient India*, (London Oriental Series, vol. 1), Geoffrey Cumberlege Oxford University Press, London – New York – Toronto.
- Aufrecht, Theodor 1891: *Catalogus Catalogorum, an alphabetical register of Sanskrit works and authors*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig.
- Austin, J. L. 1962: *How to do things with words*. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955; Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Banerjee, Satya Ranjan 1977: *The Eastern School of Prakrit Grammarians. A linguistic study*, Vidyasagar Pustak Mandir, Calcutta.
- Barthes, Roland 1971: 'Style and its Image' in Chatman (1971: 3-15).
- Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna 1915: *An account of the different existing systems of sanskrit grammar* being the Vishwanath Narayan Mandlik Gold Medal Prize-Essay for 1909, the author, Poona.
- 1938: *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vol. II (Grammar), part I (Vedic & Pāṇinīya), Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- Bhandarkar, Shridhar R. 1888: *A Catalogue of the Collections of Manuscripts deposited in the Deccan College, with an Index*, Bombay.

- Bhattacharya, Dinesh Chandra 1922: 'Pāṇinian Studies in Bengal' in Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Vol. III: Orientalia, part 1 (Calcutta University Press, Calcutta), pp. 189-208.
- 1941: 'Date and Works of Rāyamukṣa', *IHQ* 17: 456-471.
- 1943: 'Puruṣottamadeva's Commentary on the Mahābhāṣya', *IHQ* 19: 201-213.
- 1946: *Paribhāṣāvṛtti, Jñāpakasamuccaya, Kārakacakra by Puruṣottamadeva*, Edited with Introduction, Appendix &c. by ...; Varendra Research Museum, Rajshahi.
- 1958: *History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā*, Mithilā Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, Darbhanga.
- Bhattacharya, S. P. 1946: 'The *Bhāgavṛtti* and its Author', *Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference, twelfth session, Benares Hindu University 1943-46*, vol. II (published by A. S. Altekar, Benares Hindu University), pp. 273-287.
- Bloch, Bernard 1953: 'Linguistic Structure and Linguistic Analysis' in *Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 4: Report of the Fourth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching* edited by Archibald A. Hill (The Institute of Languages and Linguistics School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University), pp. 40-44.
- Bloomfield, Leonard 1933: *Language*, Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Böhtlingk, Otto 1887: *Pāṇini's Grammatik, herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen*, Leipzig; 3. reprint: Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim – New York 1977.
- Brewer, William F. and Edward H. Lichtenstein 1982: 'Stories are to entertain: a structural-affect theory of stories', *Journal of Pragmatics* 6: 473-86.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes 1983: 'On the history of Pāṇinian Grammar in the early centuries following Patañjali', *JIP* 11: 357-412.
- 1986: *Tradition and Argument in Classical Indian Linguistics: The Bahiraṅga-Paribhāṣā in the Paribhāṣenduśekhara*; D. Reidel Publishing Company; Dordrecht – Boston – Lancaster – Tokyo.
- 1990 'Pāṇini and the Nominal Sentence', *ABORI* 71: 301-304.

- Bühler, G. 1877: *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Kāsmīr, Rajputana, and Central India*, The Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Society's Library (Bombay) and Trübner (London).
- Cardona, George 1968: 'Pāṇini's definition, description, and use of *svarita*', in *Pratidānam. Indian and Indo-European Studies presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jakobus Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*, ed. by J. C. Heesterman, G. H. Schokker, V. I. Subramoniam; Mouton, The Hague – Paris 1968; pp. 448-461.
- 1976: *Pāṇini. A survey of research*, Mouton & Co. B.V. Publishers, The Hague.
- Chakravarti, Srish Chandra 1913-16: *The Kāśīkāvivarāṇapañjikā (The Nyāsa), a commentary on Vāmana-Jayāditya's Kāśīkā by Jinendrabuddhi*, edited with introduction and occasional notes; vol. I. (adhyāyas 1-4), The Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi (The date 1913-16 appears on the cover of the book, but the introduction is dated 1925.).
- 1918: *The Bhasha-vritti by Purushottamadeva. A commentary on Panini's Grammatical Aphorisms excepting those which exclusively pertain to the Vedas*, The Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi.
- 1919: *The Dhatu-Pradeepa by Maitreya-Rakshita, edited with annotations*, Bimala Charan Maitra, Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi.
- Chakravarti, Chintaharan 1930: 'Bengal's contribution to Sanskrit literature (A chronological framework)', *ABORI* 11: 235-58.
- Chatman, Seymour 1971: (ed.) *Literary Style: A Symposium*, Oxford University Press, London – New York.
- Chatman, Seymour and Samuel R. Levin 1967: *Essays on the language of literature*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
- Chatterji, Kshitis Chandra 1931a: 'The Bhāgavṛtti', *IHQ* 7: 413-418.
- 1931b: 'The Authorship of the Anunṛtāsa', *IHQ* 7: 418-19.
- Chatterji, Suniti Kumar 1970: *The origin and development of the Bengali language*, part I: *Introduction, Phonology*; George Allen & Unwin, London (1st edition: 1926, Calcutta).
- Chintamani, T. R. 1934: 'Subhūticandra's Commentary on the *Amarakośa*', *JOR* 8: 372-80.

- Coulthard, Malcolm 1977: *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Longman, London.
- Crystal, David and Derek Davy 1969: *Investing English Style*, Longmans, London.
- Dash, Narendra Kumar 1987: ‘The lexicographer Puruṣottamadeva’, *VIJ* 25: 115-120.
- 1991: *Purusottamadeva as Grammarian*, Agam Kala Prakashan, Delhi.
- De, Sushil Kumar ²1960a: *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 2nd revised edition, K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta.
- ²1960b: ‘Bengal’s Contribution to Sanskrit Literature’ in *Bengal’s Contribution to Sanskrit Literature & Studies in Bengal Vaisnavism* by S. K. De, Indian Studies Past & Present, Calcutta (being a reprint of S. K. De’s articles in the *History of Bengal*, edited by R. C. Majumdar, Dacca 1943).
- ²1990 *The Padyāvalī. An Anthology of Vaiṣṇava Verses in Sanskrit compiled by Rūpa Gosvāmin, A Disciple of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya of Bengal*, (first published in 1934), Navrang, New Delhi.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. 1973: *Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature*, part of vol. IV of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1975: *Critical Studies in Indian Grammarians I: The Theory of Homogeneity [Sāvarṇya]*, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan, Michigan.
- 1979: *Sociolinguistic Attitudes in India. A Historical Reconstruction*, Karoma Publishers, Ann Arbor.
- 1986: ‘From *Uttarapadalopa* to *Madhyamapadalopa*: Implications for theoretical Change’, *ABORI* 67: 251-7.
- 1987: ‘Pāṇinian Syntax and the Changing Notion of Sentence’, *ABORI* 68: 55-98.
- 1997: *Śaunakīyā Caturādhyāyikā. A Prātiśākhya of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda with the commentaries Caturādhyāyībhāṣya, Bhārgava-Bhāskara-Vṛtti and Pañcasandhi*, critically edited, translated & annotated; Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University; Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- DiBona, Joseph 1983: *One Teacher, one School. The Adam Reports on Indigenous Education in 19th Century India*, Biblia Impex Private Ltd, New Delhi.

- Dimitrov, Dragomir 2002: ‘Tables of the Old Bengali Script (on the basis of a Nepalese manuscript of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa*)’, in *Śikhisamuccayaḥ. Indian and Tibetan Studies*, ed. D. Dimitrov, U. Roesler and R. Steiner, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, Wien 2002; pp. 27-78.
- Dutta, Kali Kumar 1966-78: *Padacandrikā. A commentary on the Nāmalingānuśāsanam of Amara by Rāyamukūṭa*, 3 vols., Sanskrit College, Calcutta.
- Dwarikadas Shastri 1964: *The Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti (A treatise on Sanskrit Roots based on the Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini) by Sāyaṇācārya*, with a foreword by Raghunath Sharma (*Prāchya Bhāratī Series 1*), Prāchya Bhāratī Prakāshana, Varanasi.
- 1971: *Bhāṣāvṛtti [A Commentary on Pāṇini’s Grammar]* by Purushottamadeva, Tara Publications, Varanasi.
- Dwarikadas Shastri and Kalikaprasad Shukla 1965-67: *Nyāsa or Pañcikā Commentary of Ācārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśīkāvṛtti [Commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini] of Vāmana – Jayāditya (Prachya Bharati Series 5)*, 6 vols.; (vol. 1-2: Prachya Bharati Prakashan, 1965; vol. 3: Tara Publications, 1966; vol. 4-6: Tara Publications, 1967); Varanasi.
- Eggeling, Julius 1889: *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, Part II: Saṃskṛit Literature: A. Scientific and Technical Literature. I. Grammar, Lexicography, Prosody, Music*; London.
- Fowler, Roger 1971: *The languages of literature. Some linguistic contributions to criticism*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- 1972: ‘Style and the Concept of Deep Structure’, *JLS* 1: 5-24.
- 1986: *Linguistic Criticism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford – New York.
- Freeman, Donald C. 1970: (ed.) *Linguistics and Literary Style*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Gaṇapati Śāstrī, T. 1905: *The Daiva of Deva with the commentary Puruṣakāra of Kṛṣṇabīlāśukamuni*, edited with notes (*The Trivandrum Sanskrit Series I*), Travancore Government Press, Trivandrum.
- 1914: *The Nāmalingānusāsana of Amarasimha with the commentary Tikāsarvasva of Vandyaghatīya-Sarvānanda*, part I: 1st Kānda (*Trivandrum Sanskrit Series XXXVIII*), Travancore Government Press, Trivandrum.

- 1915-17: *The Nāmaṅgānusāsana of Amarasimha with the two commentaries, Amarakosodghāṭana of Kshīrasvāmin and Tikāsarvasva of Vandyaghatīya-Sarvānanda*, part II: 2nd Kanda, 1-6 Vargas (*Trivandrum Sanskrit Series XLIII*) 1915, part III: 2nd Kanda, 7-10 Vargas (*Trivandrum Sanskrit Series LI*) 1917, Travancore Government Press, Trivandrum.
- 1917: *The Nāmaṅgānusāsana of Amarasimha with the commentary Tikāsarvasva of Vandyaghatīya-Sarvānanda*, part IV: 3rd Kanda (*Trivandrum Sanskrit Series LII*), Superintendent Government Press, Trivandrum.
- Gerow, Edwin 1977: *Indian Poetics*, vol. V, fasc. 3 of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Grice, H. Paul 1975: 'Logic and Conversation' in *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, Academic Press, New York – San Francisco – London.
- Hāldār, Gurupad 1943-44: *Vyākaraṇa Darśanera Itihāsa*, Being An Historical Study of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in all its philosophical bearings from critical and comparative points of view, vol. 1, Bhāratīvikāś Hāldār, Calcutta.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1967: 'The Linguistic Study of Literary Texts' in Chatman and Levin (1967: 217-223) [a revised version of a paper printed in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, ed. by H. Lunt].
- Halliday, Michael A. K. and Ruqaiya Hasan ²1977: *Cohesion in English*, Longman, London [1st published in 1976].
- Hartmann, Peter 1955: *Nominale Ausdrucksformen im wissenschaftlichen Sanskrit*, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg.
- Hayes, Curtis W. 1970: 'A Study in Prose Styles: Edward Gibbon and Ernest Hemingway' in Freeman (1970: 279-296).
- Hayes, Richard P. 1983: 'Jinendrabudhi', *JAOS* 103: 709-717.
- Hendricks, William O. 1976: *Grammars of Style and Styles of Grammar*, (*North-Holland Studies in Theoretical Poetics*, vol. 3), North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam – New York – Oxford.
- Hill, Archibald A. 1958: *Introduction to Linguistic Structures from Sound to Sentence in English*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York.

- Hirsch, David H. 1972: 'Linguistic structure and literary meaning', *JLS* 1: 80-88.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1942: 'A system of descriptive phonology', *Language* 18: 3-21.
- Iyer, K.A. Subramania 1963: *Vākya-padīya of Bhartṛhari with the commentary of Helārāja*, III.1; Deccan College, Poona.
- Jakobson, Roman 1960: 'Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics' in Sebeok (1960: 350-377).
- Jakobson, Roman and Claude Lévi-Strauss 1969: '«Les Chats» von Charles Baudelaire', *STZ* 29: 2-19. [1st time published in *L'Homme. Revue française d'anthropologie* II/1 (1962).]
- Jha, Shashinath 2001: *Bhāṣāvṛtti-Pañjikā (A Commentary on Puruṣhottamadeva's Bhāṣāvṛtti, Vivaraṇam of Pāṇiniyāṣṭadhyaī) (Pūrvārdham) of M.M. Viśvarūpopādhyāya*, Mithila Research Institute, Darbhanga.
- Juilland, Alphonse G. 1967: 'Review of L'époque réaliste; Première partie: Fin du romantisme et parnasse, by Charles Bruneau' in Chatman and Levin (1967: 374-384).
- Kane, P. V. 1914: 'Bhāmaha, the *Nyāsa* and *Māgha*', *JBBRAS* 23: 91-95.
- ³1961: *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, 3rd edition, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi – Varanasi – Patna.
- Katre, S. M. 1954: *Introduction to Indian Textual Criticism*, Deccan College, Poona.
- Kielhorn, F. 1880-1885: *The Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, (*The Department of Public Instruction*) 3 vols., Bombay (reprint: Otto Zeller Verlag, Osnabrück 1970).
- 1883: 'On the Grammarian Bhartṛhari', *IA* 12: 226-7.
- 1886: 'The Chandra-Vyakarana and the Kasika-Vritti', *IA* 15: 183-185.
- 1887: 'Notes on the Mahabhashya 6: The text of Panini's Sutras, as given in the Kasika-Vritti, compared with the text known to Katyayana and Patanjali', *IA* 16: 178-184.
- 1906: 'Epigraphic Notes 19: Vasantgaḍh inscription of Varmalāta of the [Vikrama] year 682; and the age of the poet Māgha', *NGGW* 1906: 143-46. [reprint: Rau (1969: 428-31)].

— 1908: ‘On Śiśupālavadhā, II, 112’, *JRAS* 1908: 499-502.

Kosambi, D. D. and V. V. Gokhale 1957: (ed.) *The Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa compiled by Vidyākara*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Massachusetts).

Kulke, Hermann 1985: ‘Mahārājas, mahants and historians. Reflections on the historiography of early Vijayanagara and Sringeri’ in *Vijayanagara – city and empire. New currents of research*, vol. I, (ed.: Anna Libera Dallapiccola in collaboration with Stephanie Zingel-Avé Lallemand; Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, Stuttgart), pp. 120-143.

Labov, William 1972: *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black Vernacular*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Liebich, Bruno 1930: *Kṣīrataranṅiṇī, Kṣīrasvāmin’s Kommentar zu Panini’s Dhātupāṭha*, Verlag von M. & H. Marcus, Breslau.

Lienhard, Siegfried 1984: *A History of Classical Poetry Sanskrit – Pali – Prakrit*, vol. III, fasc. 1 of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Majumdar, R.C. 1971: *History of Ancient Bengal*, G. Bharadwaj & Co., Calcutta.

— 1973: *History of Mediaeval Bengal*, G. Bharadwaj & Co., Calcutta.

— 1985: *Champā. History & Culture of an Indian Colonial Kingdom in the Far East 2nd.-16th century A.D.* (reprint of 1927), Gian Publishing House, Delhi.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna 1977: *Nyāya-vaiśeṣika*, vol. VI, fasc. 2 of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Mishra, Shiva Kumar 1998: *Educational Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India (from the earliest times to 1206 A.D. with special reference to Mithilā)*, Ramanand Vidya Bhavan, New Delhi.

Mishra, Shrinarayan 1989: *Bhāṣāvṛtti [A Commentary on Pāṇini’s Grammar] by Puruṣottamadeva*, edited by, Ratna Publications, Varanasi.

Mitra, Rājendralāla 1874: *Notices of Sanskrit MSS*, vol. II, Calcutta.

Mukařovský, Jan 1970: ‘Standard Language and Poetic Language’ in Freeman (1970: 40-56), being a reprint of the translation by Paul L. Garvin which was printed in *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*, edited by P. L. Garvin, Georgetown University Press, 1964, pages 17-30.

- Nitti-Dolci, Luigia 1938a: *Le Prākṛtānuśāsana de Puruṣottama*, Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris, Paris.
- 1938b: *Les grammairiens prakrits*, Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris.
- Oberlies, Thomas 1989: *Studie zum Cāndravvyākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2*, Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, Stuttgart.
- Ohmann, Richard 1970: 'Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style' in Freeman (1970: 258-278).
- Ojihara, Yutaka 1961: 'Causerie Vyākaraṇique (III¹): Incohérence interne chez la Kāśikā', *JIBS* 9: (11)-(15) [753-749].
- 1962: 'Causerie Vyākaraṇique (III²): Incohérence interne chez la Kāśikā', *JIBS* 10: (7)-(17) [776-766].
- 1964 'Causerie Vyākaraṇique (III³): Incohérence interne chez la Kāśikā', *JIBS* 12: (13)-(15) [847-845].
- Pathak, K. B. 1902: 'On the date of the poet Māgha', *JBBRAS* 20: 303-306.
- 1912: 'Dandin, the Nyasakara, and Bhamaha', *IA* 41: 232-237.
- 1914: 'Bhāmaha's Attacks on the Buddhist Grammarian Jinendrabuddhi', *JBBRAS* 23: 18-31.
- 1915: 'The Nyasakara and the Jaina Sakatayana', *IA* 44: 275-79.
- 1931: 'Jinendrabuddhi, Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta', *ABORI* 12: 246-51.
- Peterson, Peter and Durgāprasāda 1886: *The Subhāshitāvali of Vallabhadeva*, Education Society's Press, Byculla; Bombay.
- Pischel, Richard 1893: *Die Hofdichter des Lakṣmaṇasena*, Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung, Göttingen.
- Posner, Roland 1969: 'Strukturalismus in der Gedichtinterpretation', *STZ* 29: 27-58.
- Raghavan, V. 1945: 'Indu, the author of the *Anunyāsa*', *JOR* 15: 78.
- Rau, Wilhelm 1969: *Franz Kielhorn, Kleine Schriften, mit einer Auswahl der epigraphischen Aufsätze*, 2 vols. (Glasenapp-Stiftung 3,1-3,2), Steiner, Wiesbaden.

- 1977: *Vākyapadīya. Die Mūlakārikās nach den Handschriften herausgegeben und mit einem Pāda-Index versehen*, Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden.
- 1993: *Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti* nach Vorarbeiten Dr. S. Sharma Peris zusammengestellt, (*Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jahrgang 1993 Nummer 5, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz), Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.
- Renou, Louis 1940: *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva traité grammatical en sanskrit du XIIIe siècle*, Volume I, Fascicule I: Introduction, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", Paris.
- 1941: *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva traité grammatical en sanskrit du XIIIe siècle*, Volume I, Fascicule 2: Adhyāya I, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", Paris.
- Riffaterre, Michael 1966: 'Describing Poetic Structures: Two approaches to Baudelaire's les Chats', *Yale French Studies* 36/37: 200-42.
- 1967: 'Criteria for style analysis' in Chatman and Levin (1967: 414-30).
- Saini, R. S. 1995: *Samkṣiptasāra-vyākaraṇa of Vādīndracakracūdāmaṇimahāpaṇḍita Kramadīśvara with Rasavatī-vṛtti by Mahārājādhirāja Jumarānandī and Vivanāṇī-ṭikā by Autthāsanika Pt. Goyācandra*, vol. I, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi – Varanasi.
- Scharfe, Hartmut 1977: *Grammatical Literature*, vol. V, fasc. 2 of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Scharpé, A. 1964: *Kālidāsa-lexicon*, vol. I, part IV; "De Tempel", Brugge.
- Searle, John R. 1969: *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1979: *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. 1960: (ed.) *Style in Language*, The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley & Sons, New York – London.
- Sen, Malati 1934: 'The Kāśikā and the Kāvyaḷamkārasūtravṛtti', *Calcutta Oriental Journal* 6: 229-240.

- Sharma, Aryendra; Deshpande, Kshanderao and D. G. Padhye 1969-70: *Kāśikā. A commentary on Pāṇini's grammar by Vāmana and Jayāditya*, 2 vols. (*Sanskrit Academy Series* 17), Sanskrit Academy, Hyderabad.
- Shastri, Haraprasāda 1931: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. VI: Vyākaraṇa Manuscripts, The Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
- Shastri, Kali Charan 1947: 'Maitreya-Rakṣita (A Bengali Grammarian of The Pāṇinian System)', *Bhārata-Kaumudī (Studies in Indology in honour of Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji)*, part II: The Indian Press, Allahabad; pp. 887-903.
- 1956: 'Maitreya-Rakṣita', *OH* 4: 89-98.
- 1957: 'Sīradeva', *OH* 5: 103-117.
- 1972: *Bengal's Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar in the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems*, part I: *General Introduction (Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series LXIII)*, Sanskrit College, Calcutta.
- Shrivatsa, S. P. 1981: 'Tradition of Grammar in Kāśmir', *CASS-St.* 6: 27-35.
- Sircar, D. C. 1970: *A grammar of the Prakrit language based mainly on Vararuchi, Hemachandra and Purushottama*, 2nd enlarged edition, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi – Patna – Varanasi.
- Sowinski, Bernhard 1999: *Stilistik. Stiltheorien und Stilanalysen*, 2nd improved edition, J.B. Metzler, Weimar.
- Spillner, Bernd 1974: *Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft. Stilforschung, Rhetorik, Textlinguistik*, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln – Mainz.
- Sternbach, Ludwik 1974: *Subhāṣita, Gnostic and Didactic Literature*, vol. IV of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Stoler Miller, Barbara 1977: *Love Song of the Dark Lord. Jayadeva's Gītagovinda*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Takakusu, J. 1896: (transl.) *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695) by I-Tsing*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Thakur, Upendra 1956: *History of Mithilā*, Mithila Research Institute, Darbhanga.
- Thieme, Paul 1956: 'Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas', *JAOS* 76: 1-23.

- Todorov, Tzvetan 1971: ‘The Place of Style in the Structure of the Text’ in Chatman (1971: 29-39).
- Trask, R. L. 1996: *A Dictionary of Phonetics and Phonology*, Routledge, London – New York.
- Tripathi, Jaya Shankar Lal and Sudhakar Malaviya 1986-94: *Kāśikā (A commentary on Pāṇini’s Grammar) of Vāmana & Jayāditya with Nyāsa or Vivaraṇapañjikā of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra with Bhāvabodhinī Hindi Exposition (Prācyabhāratīgranthamālā 17-20; 25-26; 29-30; 34); vol. I-IV: Tara Printing Works; vol. V-IX: Tara Book Agency; Varanasi.*
- Trivedi, Kamalashankar Pranashankar 1925-31: *The Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmachandra (in two parts) with the commentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 78, 82), Bombay, vol. I: 1925, vol. II: 1931.*
- Vedāntatirtha, Giriśacandra 1912: *The Bhāṣāvṛtti of Puruṣottamadeva with the Commentary of Śrī Sriṣṭidharācārya*, vol. I fasc. 1, Bibliotheca Indica No. 1318, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
- Vogel, Claus 1979: *Indian Lexicography*, vol. V, fasc. 4 of *A History of Indian Literature*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Wells, Rulon 1960: ‘Nominal and Verbal Style’ in Sebeok (1960: 213-220).
- Wezler, Albrecht 1977: ‘Zum Problem der “negativen Appositionen” bei Pāṇini [Marginalien zu Pāṇinis Aṣṭādhyāyī III]’, *StII* 3: 35-70.
- 1992: ‘How far Did Pāṇini’s fame really extend in Patañjali’s View’, *Corpus of Indological Studies. Professor Ramaranjan Mukherji Felicitation Volume*, ed.: Anantalal Thakur; Sharada Publishing House, Delhi; pp. 468-78.
- 1994: ‘Credo, Quia Occidentale: A Note on Sanskrit Varṇa and its Misinterpretation in Literature on Mīmāṃsā and Vyākaraṇa’, *Studies in Mīmāṃsā. Dr. Mandan Mishra Felicitation Volume*, ed.: R. C. Dvivedi; Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi; pp. 221-241.
- Wujastyk, Dominik 1993: *Metarules of Pāṇinian Grammar, The Vyāḍīyaparibhāṣāvṛtti Critically Edited with Translation and Commentary*, vol. I, Egbert Forsten, Groningen.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka 1964-5: *Bhāgavṛtti-saṃkalanam: bhartṛharyupanāmake-
na vimalamatinā viracitāyā aprāpyamāṇāyā bhāgavṛttyākhyāyā aṣṭādhyāyī-vṛttyā
uddharaṇānāṃ saṃkalanam*, Bhāratīya-prācyavidyā-pratiṣṭhāna, Ajmer (saṃvat
2021).

— ²1973: *Samskṛt vyākaraṇ-śāstr kā itihās*, bhāg 2; 2nd edition, Rāmalāl Kapūr
Ṭraṣṭ, Sonīpat.

— ⁴1984: *Samskṛt vyākaraṇ-śāstr kā itihās*, bhāg 1; 4th edition, Rāmalāl Kapūr
Ṭraṣṭ, Sonīpat.

Zachariae, Th. 1933: 'Zitate aus buddhistischen Sanskritwerken' in *ZII* 9: 1-16.

The
Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā
of Viśvarūpa

Volume I

The first *adhyāya*

Introduction to volume I

Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā* is a very little known grammatical treatise; consequently, only few manuscripts are still extant. None of them covers the whole text and not all of them preserve the entire *Pañjikā*.

For the present edition two manuscripts have been used:

A

Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project A 52/7; National Archives Nepal, Catalogue No. I.425, *vyākaraṇa* 93.

Physical description: palm leaf, 98 folios, size: 32.5 x 5 cm, 7 (occasionally 6 or 8) lines per page, ca. 80-92 *akṣaras* in the first and the last line, ca. 70-80 *akṣaras* in other lines; numbered 1-85; numbers 31-39 appear twice.

The manuscript is not dated. The script is said to be Maithili, but for the dilemma of distinction between Maithili and Bengali scripts, see volume II, II.3.2.1.1 of the present work.

The manuscript covers the two first *adhyāyas* (complete), the beginning of the third *adhyāya* (up to ca. P.3.1.10) and fragments of the fourth *pāda* of the third *adhyāya*. The three last leaves (partly unintelligible) are not numbered and in addition, written in a different hand. Corrections and insertions, made on margins or above a line, are frequent and mostly written in the same hand. Rules are separated by a double *daṇḍa*. To separate sentences, dots put in the middle of the line are used; *daṇḍas* are seldom. Occasionally *devanāgarī* characters (e.g. *visarga*) are employed.

B

Asiatic Society, Calcutta, Government Collection Manuscripts, number: D.53, Row 2, Bundle 525. Collection number: G-3798.

Described by Shastri (1931: 26-27) as number 4250. The manuscript is said to contain two batches of leaves; however, the second one (with 63 folios) is now lacking.

Physical description of the first batch: locally-made paper, 11 folios, size: 39 x 7,5 cm; 6-9 lines per leaf, ca. 50-60 *akṣaras* per line; numbered 1-9, the last two are not numbered. All leaves have *śrīḥ* written on their right margins. The condition of the manuscript is very poor and the text is partly unintelligible.

The manuscript is not dated. Its script is Bengali, according to Shastri (1931: 26), from the sixteenth century.

The manuscript covers the beginning of the first *pāda* of the first *adhyāya* (up to P.1.1.20). As in A, rules are separated by a double *daṇḍa*. To separate sentences single *daṇḍas* are used.

Other manuscripts of the *Pañjikā* have either not been accessible to me or do not contain the first *adhyāya*.

Apart from manuscripts A and B I have also consulted the edition of the *Pañjikā* by Shashinath Jha, referred to as SJ. The reason for this is that Shashinath Jha has had access to manuscripts which I have not been able to examine. However, since his edition is not, strictly speaking, critical, and especially because he does not mark off his emendations from the text as given in manuscripts, one has to be wary whilst using this source. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that many readings of manuscript B agree with SJ. Furthermore, where the text in neither A nor B is legible, I have mostly accepted the text in SJ.

Age of manuscripts

Neither manuscript A nor B is dated, but according to Shastri (1931: 26) B is written in Bengali of the sixteenth century.*

My opinion differs only slightly from his. I would, namely, assign the second half of the 15th century to manuscript A and since B seems to be a little bit more recent than A, the end of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century to manuscript B. In

* For the difference, or rather its lack, between Bengali and Maithili scripts, see volume II, II.3.2.1.1.

reaching this conclusion, the forms of the letters *u*, *ū*, *ai*, *au*, *ca*, *ja*, *ṭa*, *ṛa* and *ha* have been crucial.

- The letter *u*.

The most characteristic trait of this letter as written in manuscripts A and B is the lack of the curved stroke above the top line – this is present in the modern Bengali character. According to Dimitrov (2002: 39), the letter *u* with a curved stroke appeared in the first half of the 15th century and the whole 15th century can be seen as a transition period when both forms with and without the stroke were in use.

- The letter *ū*.

Similarly to *u* and in contrast to the modern Bengali character, *ū* in A and B is written without the curved stroke above the top line.

- The letter *ai*.

The form of this letter is based on the letter *e*. In manuscript A, a vertical line is added to the right side of *e*, with which it is connected by a horizontal or slightly cursive line. On the top of this vertical line a curved stroke is added. While in manuscript A, the vertical line takes the whole height of *e*, it is much shorter in B. According to Dimitrov (2002: 41), the variant with the long vertical line was in use around the middle of the 15th century at the latest and the form as seen in B could have its origin in the reduction of this vertical line and consequently, must be more recent than the other variant.

- The letter *au*.

Similarly to *ai*, the letter *au* is based on *o*. In manuscript A, a vertical line with a curved stroke above the top line is added to *o*, the vertical line being connected to *o* by a horizontal line. This form is already seen in the 12th century. In B this horizontal line is considerably reduced.

The letters *ai* and *au* without a vertical, i.e. similar to their modern Bengali counterparts, first appeared in the second half of the 15th century or at the beginning of the 16th century. Thus, the forms of these letters as found in A and B must be earlier than that.

- The letter *ca*.

There are two varieties of *ca* in manuscript A. Both are similar to the modern form of this letter, but in both of them the left limb is not vertical but diagonal (running left

from the top line to the bottom). In one form of this letter the main body (triangular-like) begins directly at the top line. In the second form there is a short vertical line between the top line and the main body of *ca*. The form of *ca* in B is similar to the second variety of this letter in manuscript A, but it is much more rounded. What is important is the fact that its left limb is never vertical. The variety with a vertical left limb is said to have come into use after the 15th century. Furthermore, the variant with a short connecting vertical line seems to be older than the one without it.

- The letter *ja*.

According to Dimitrov (2002: 45) there are two forms of *ja*: an extended and an unextended one. The first one has an extended right limb, similar to that of the modern Bengali *ja*; however, it does not commence at the top line, but at the vertical line beneath it. The second form has a short horizontal line instead of this extended limb. This is also a variant met with in A and B.

- The letter *ṭa*.

Manuscript A has what Dimitrov (2002: 46) calls ‘a transitional premodern form’, B has a variant which is very like the modern letter *ṭa*. The straightening of this letter resulting in the form of manuscript A and afterwards, in the form used in B had already begun in the 15th century.

- The letter *ṇa*.

There are two varieties of this letter in A: the older one which is similar to the modern letter *la* without the top stroke and which seems to have been in use till at least the 15th century and the form which resembles the modern Bengali *ṇa*. Around the middle of 15th century both varieties were still in use. Manuscript B has only the second, modern form of *ṇa*.

- The letter *ha*.

This letter, as it appears in manuscripts A and B, is very similar to the modern Bengali letter *ha*, i.e. its lower stroke is not detached from the main body, in contrast to the older variety, whose lower stroke is detached. This modern form of *ha* has been testified in documents from the second half of the 15th century.

To sum up; the shape of the letters *ai*, *au*, *ṭa* and *ṇa* indicates that manuscript A is slightly older than B. Furthermore, most varieties of the letters discussed above were probably in use till the end of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century. On the other hand, the modern form of the letter *ha* implies that both of these manuscripts

cannot be much older than the beginning of the 16th century. Therefore – taking this evidence into account – the most probable dating of manuscripts A and B, as already mentioned, is the second half of the 15th century for A and the end of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century for B. However, since what we know about the late development of Bengali script and indeed about scribal practices per se at all is far from being comprehensive, these dates are only a proposition, which may have to be changed if new evidence is found.

The present edition

To start with, please note that since manuscript B covers a very little portion of the *Pañjikā*, the whole edition is virtually based on one manuscript. Under such circumstances it is almost impossible to establish the text as written by Viśvarūpa. Consequently, it is rather the text of manuscript A, or better said, of its ancestor, that is restored here.

Furthermore, the form of the following edition needs some explanation. Its left-hand pages contain the text of the *Pañjikā* as given in manuscript A, with all its specific features, such as sandhi, punctuation etc. These are characteristics which are more often than not normalised and consequently, neglected in critical editions. They are, however, important and might even be helpful – for example in determining the age or geographical affiliations of manuscripts. The need for the study of scribal practices has already been pointed out by Wujastyk (1993: xxi). The variant readings, including also sandhi variations, of manuscript B as well as the variant readings of SJ are to be found in footnotes. However, in the latter case sandhi variants and obvious corrections have not been taken into account. The right-hand pages, whose lines correspond to those on the left-hand pages, include the edition proper with emendations and various comments. In the footnotes the passages from other treatises concurring with the text of the *Pañjikā* are quoted. These are important for supplementary discussions carried out in volume II of the present dissertation.

As far as the conjectures introduced here are concerned, I would characterise my attitude as a very cautious one. This is because on the one hand, I do not expect any grammarian to be necessarily infallible and on the other because the estimates of correct emendations, which lie somewhere between 0,1 and 5 per cent,* do not really invite the proposition of any improvements.

* As quoted by Wujastyk (1993: xvi).

Symbols and abbreviations used in volume I

- .. an illegible *akṣara*
. an illegible part of *akṣara*
[] barely legible characters
[[x]] illegibility of x characters or an editorial proposition of filling it in
⟨x⟩ a lacuna of x characters or an editorial proposition of filling in a lacuna
{ } scribe's deletions (in manuscripts it is marked by two dots above the *akṣara*, which should be deleted; rarely is the *akṣara* crossed through)
() ordinary parentheses or scribe's insertions written in the margin
(()) scribe's insertions written above or below a line
⟨ ⟩ editorial additions
_____ editorial emendations
_____ the reading of manuscript B has been chosen
----- the footnote comments on the whole passage marked with a dotted line
.....
om. omits
rev. reverses, i.e. the order of two words is reversed in a manuscript.

om̐ namo kṛṣṇāya¹ ||

harim̐ girām̐ patim̐ natvā kṛtvā vṛtyādīsamstutim̐² |
bhāṣāvṛtteḥ samārambhi viśvarūpeṇa pañjikā ||

yadi suvimalavācaḥ santi³ ṭikāvidhijñās
tad api jaḍadhiyo me nodiyamo⁴ vismayāya |
kimu na viditam̐ etat⁵ sarvalokaprasiddha[m̐]
[ru]..ti⁶ śukapikādau ṭiṭṭibhaḥ ṭikate yat⁷ ||

svāntevāsatparitoṣahetave puruṣakriyā· |
mameyan tu mahāvīdyahāsāvarj[j]anaketanam̐⁸· ||

nirvighnena (prāripsita)granthaparīsamāptim̐⁹ icchan granthakṛd iṣṭadevatān¹⁰
namasyann āha¹¹· namo buddhāyeti· padasamudāyasya kriyāpekṣatvād namo 'stv ity
arthah· buddhi(s tatva)jñānam· tad yasminn¹² asti praśastam̐¹³· sa buddhaḥ
arśa āditvād¹⁴ ac· yady api vividhavedavyavasthitavibudhā-
numodavidhāyivahnivakravītīryamānavastuvirodhitāvihitabuddhavigrahe viṣṇau
vi..[te]¹⁵ buddhaśabdā¹⁶ tathāpi nikhiladakṣiṇapakṣarakṣākakṣāni[v]iṣṭaiḥ¹⁷ śistair
nnodāsitavyam̐· yataḥ sa bhagavān viṣṇuḥ¹⁸ kutukī māhendra jālika iva¹⁹ tiraścām̐ api
vapur grhītvā yathāvasaram̐ kāryyam²⁰ ārabhate tad ayam arthaḥ²¹· buddharūpiṇe viṣṇave
nama iti²² kṛṣṇāyeti noktam̐ tat kālī.a(..)tvabuddhiprā.ī[nyā]t· tat pakṣāvibodhāya²³· ||
bhāṣāyām̐ iti²⁴· śrīpuruṣottamadevena vṛttir vidhīyate· śrīmatpāṇinīyādisūtrāṇām̐²⁵
vivarāṇam̐ kriyata ity arthaḥ· kutra bhāṣāyām̐ laukikapadaprayoge· vṛtṭiḥ kim̐
bhūtā²⁶· laghvī· alpā²⁷· sarvvaviṣayinī jāyādityādivṛttim̐ apekṣya²⁸· tad uktam̐²⁹·

¹B: gaṇapataye. ²B: na.. ..tvā vṛ.yādīsamstutim̐. ³B: sa[[1]]. ⁴B: .enodya[[1]]. ⁵B: tam etat.
⁶B: ruvati. ⁷B: ṭi..bhas tikate [[1-2]]. SJ: ṭiṭṭibhaḥ kim̐ na rauti. ⁸SJ: -dyāhāsāvājñāna-. ⁹B:
prāripsitaparīsamāptim̐. ¹⁰B: istadevatān. ¹¹In SJ the whole passage beginning with nirvighne-
na reads as follows: nirvighnena prāripsitagranthaparīsamāptikāmanayā śiṣṭācāra pariprāptatvena
kṛtam̐ paramēśvaranamaskārārūpam̐ maṅgalaṁ śiṣyān śikṣayitum ādau nibadhnāti. ¹²B: [tatv]. ..
.. .. sminn. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴B: arśāditvād. ¹⁵B: da.idhā.ivahni..kra.itīr. [vastu]virodhitā-
[[3]]buddhav.[gra].e viṣṇau vartate. SJ as A, but it has : -vidhāyitvam vahni- and vidyate at the
end. ¹⁶B and SJ om. ¹⁷B: -staiḥ. ¹⁸B om. SJ has viṣṇuḥ after kutukī. ¹⁹B and SJ om. ²⁰B:
kāryyavaicitryam. SJ : karmavaicitryam. ²¹SJ adds: buddhāya. ²²B and SJ: namaḥ. ²³B and
SJ om. ²⁴B: api. SJ: ityādi. ²⁵SJ om. -ādi-. ²⁶B: ..śistā. SJ: viśiṣṭā. ²⁷SJ: svalpā. ²⁸B:
jāyādityādivṛtṭi [[3]]. ²⁹B om.

(prathamādhyāyasya prathamah pādah)

(*Bhv.:*) **namo buddhāya bhāṣāyām yathātrimunilakṣaṇam |**
puruṣottamadevena laghvī vṛttir vidhīyate ||.

(*Pañj.:*) om namaḥ kṛṣṇāya ||

harim girāṃ patiṃ natvā kṛtvā vṛttyādisamstutim | 5
 bhāṣāvṛtteḥ samārambhi viśvarūpeṇa pañjikā ||.

yadi suvimalavācaḥ santi tīkāvidhijñās

tad api jaḍadhiyo me nodiyamo vismayāya |

kimu na viditam etat sarvalokaprasiddham

ruvati śukapikādau tītibhaṣ tīkate yat ||. 10

svāntevasadparitoṣahetave puruṣakriyā |

mameyaṃ tu mahāvidyahāsāvarjanaketanam ||.

nirvighnena prāripsitagranthaparisaṃmāptim icchan granthakṛd iṣṭadevatām nama-

syann āha **namo buddhāyeti.** padasamudāyasya kriyāpekṣatvān namo 'stv ity

arthah. buddhis tattvajñānam. tad yasminn asti praśastam sa buddhaḥ (cf. 15

P.5.2.94). arśāditvād ac (cf. P.5.2.127). yady api vividhavedavyavasthitavibudhā-

numodavidhāyivahnivaktravitīryamāṇavastu virodhitāvihitabuddhavigrahe viṣṇau

vidyate buddhaśabdāḥ tathāpi nikhiladakṣiṇapakṣarakṣākakṣāniviṣṭaiḥ śiṣṭair

nodāsitavyam. yataḥ sa bhagavān viṣṇuḥ kutukī māhendrajālika iva tiraścām api

vapur grhītvā yathāvasaram kāryam ārabhate tad ayam arthaḥ: buddharūpiṇe viṣṇave 20

nama iti kṛṣṇāyeti noktaṃ tatkālīnatattvabuddhiprāvīṇyāt (?). tat pakṣāvibodhāya.

bhāṣāyām iti śrīpuruṣottamadevena vṛttir vidhīyate. śrīmatpāṇinyādisūtrāṇām

vivaraṇam kriyata ity arthaḥ. kutra **bhāṣāyām?** laukikapadaprayoge. **vṛtṭiḥ** kim

bhūtā? **laghvī** alpā sarvaviṣayiṇī jayādityādivṛttim apekṣya. tad uktam:

nābhaviṣyad yadā vṛttir jayādityasya dhīmataḥ |
nājñāsyata³⁰ kvacit kaścit sūtrārtham api pāṇineḥ ||

kena prakāreṇa vidhīyata ity āha yathātrimu(ni)lakṣaṇam iti | trayo munayo yeṣu
lakṣaṇeṣu tāni trimu[ni]ni³¹ lakṣaṇāni ceti trimunilakṣaṇāni athavā trayāṇām³² lakṣaṇāni·
5 samkhyāpūrvapadas tripado 'pi tatpuruṣo vidyate· yathā³³ dvya[ha]jāta iti· dve aha-
nī jā[tasye]ti vākye· [jā]taśabda uttarapade pūrvatra taci· ahnādeśaḥ³⁴·
yathā³⁵ trimunilakṣaṇānīti padārthānavṛtt{0} āv avyayībhāvaḥ³⁶· munayaś ca³⁷
pāṇinikātyāyanabhāṣyakārāḥ³⁸· etena svagranthe lokapravṛttir³⁹ dārsitā |

10

15 atha śabdānuśāsanam iti· athaśabdo⁴⁰ maṅgale· ārambhe ca· śabdā-
nuśāsanam maṅgalapūrvakam⁴¹ ārabhyata ity arthaḥ· anuśīyante vyutpādyante
śabdā⁴² anenety anuśāsanam· karaṇe lyuṭ śabdānām anu-
śāsanam śabdānuśāsanam i[ti]⁴³ kartṛkarmmaṇoḥ kṛtīti (karmmaṇi) ṣaṣṭhī
(prathamataḥ)⁴⁴ prādisamāsam kṛtvā tataḥ kṛdyogalakṣaṇā⁴⁵ ṣaṣṭhī samasyata iti samāsaḥ
20 karmmaṇi ceti prati(ṣedho⁴⁶ ')tra na pravarttate· yatra sāmartyaprāptam
ubhayor upādānam asti· tatrobhayaprāptau karmmaṇīty asyāḥ ṣaṣṭhyāḥ
samāse 'yam pratishedhaḥ⁴⁷ karttari ceti punaḥpratishedhāt· karmmaṇi ceti
cakārasyāvadhāraṇārthatvāc ca· śeśalakṣanayā vā ṣaṣṭhyā
samāsaḥ⁴⁸ vistaras⁴⁹ tu granthavistarabhayān na likhitāḥ⁵⁰ śabdānuśāsanam iti·
25 vyākaraṇa([śāstra])syedam⁵¹ anvarthan nāma śāstraṅ ca śīṣyān śāstī viśīṣṭe viṣaye·
avasthāpayatīti kṛtvā śabdāś ca⁵² kecit bherīdaṇḍādisamyogajāḥ kecit kaṅṭha-
tālvādisamghaṭṭajāḥ te pi ke[cit] svararūpāḥ⁵³ kecid varṇātmakāḥ⁵⁴ kecid apabhraṃsa-

³⁰B: nājñāsyat. ³¹SJ adds: ca. ³²SJ adds: muninām. ³³B adds: dvayor ahno jātaḥ. ³⁴B and SJ om. ³⁵B and SJ: tathā. ³⁶SJ adds: tṛtīyāsaptamyor bahulam iti tṛtīyaikavacane 'yam. ³⁷B: munayas tu. ³⁸B: pāṇikātyāyanabhāṣyakārāḥ. ³⁹B: lokavṛttir. SJ: pravṛttir. ⁴⁰B and SJ: athaśabdo yaṃ. ⁴¹B: maṅgalapūrvakam. ⁴²SJ om. ⁴³B om. ⁴⁴B and SJ om. ⁴⁵B: kṛdyogā. SJ: kṛdyogā ca. ⁴⁶SJ: niṣedho. ⁴⁷B: tatrāyaṃ pratishedhaḥ [[5]]prāptau karmmaṇīty asyāḥ ṣaṣṭhyāḥ samāse. SJ: tatrāyaṃ pratishedhaḥ. ⁴⁸SJ: athavā śeśalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhī. ⁴⁹SJ: aparas. ⁵⁰B: -.ā.annyā.. | .āno.aktaḥ. SJ: -vistarabhayān na likhyate. ⁵¹B: vyākaraṇaśāstrasyed. ⁵²SJ inserts iti after śāstī. B: śāstīti viśīṣṭaviṣaye sthāpayatīti | k.ci .śabdāḥ. ⁵³B and SJ: svararūpāḥ. ⁵⁴B reads twice. SJ: varṇātmakāś ca, te 'pi dvidividhāḥ.

nābhaviṣyad yadā vṛttir jayādityasya dhīmataḥ |
nājñāsyata kvacit kaścit sūtrārtham api pāṇineḥ ||.

kena prakāreṇa vidhīyata ity āha **yathātrimunilakṣaṇam** iti. trayo munayo yeṣu lakṣaṇeṣu tāni trimunīni lakṣaṇāni ceti trimunilakṣaṇāni. athavā trayāṇām lakṣaṇāni. samkhyāpūrvapadas tripado 'pi tatpuruṣo vidyate. yathā dvyahajāta iti dve aha- 5
 nī jātasyeti vākye jātaśabda uttarapade pūrvatra ṭacy ahnādeśaḥ (cf. P.5.4.91, 6.4.145¹). yathā trimunilakṣaṇānīti padārthānativṛttāv avyayībhāvaḥ.² munayaś ca pāṇinikātyāyanabhāṣyakārāḥ. etena svagranthe lokapravṛttir dārsītā.

(*Bhv.:*) **atha śabdānuśāsanam laukikānām. prakṛtipratyayavibhāga-**
parikalpanayā sāmānyaviśeṣavatā ca lakṣaṇena.³ **gatyantarābhāvāt.** 10
varṇānām upadeśaḥ kramasanniveśānubandhāsañjanārthaḥ. tad
ubhayaṃ samjñārtham. samjñā ca lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthā.⁴
akārasya vivṛtopadeśa akāragrahaṇārthaḥ (vārtt. 1 on Ś.sū. 1,
Mbh. I 15.2).

(*Pañj.:*) **atha śabdānuśāsanam** ity athaśabdo maṅgala ārambhe ca. śabdā- 15
 nuśāsanam maṅgalapūrvakam ārabhyata ity arthaḥ. anuśīsyante vyutpādyante śabdā anenety **anuśāsanam.**⁵ karaṇe lyuṭ (cf. P.3.3.117). śabdānām anu-
 śāsanam **śabdānuśāsanam** iti *kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛtīti* (P.2.3.65) karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī. prathamataḥ prādisamāsaṃ kṛtvā tataḥ kṛdyogalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhī samasyata iti samāsaḥ. *karmaṇi ceti* (P.2.2.14) pratiśedho 'tra na pravartate. yatra sāmartyaprāptam 20
 ubhayor upādānam asti *tatrobhayaprāptau karmaṇīty* (P.2.3.66) asyāḥ ṣaṣṭhyāḥ samāse 'yaṃ pratiśedhaḥ *kartari ceti* (P.2.2.16) punaḥpratiśedhāt *karmaṇi ceti* (P.2.2.14) cakārasya vadhāraṇārthatvāc ca. śeṣalakṣaṇayā vā ṣaṣṭhyā (cf. P.2.3.50) samāsaḥ. vistaras tu granthavistarabhayān na likhitaḥ. **śabdānuśāsanam** iti vyākaraṇaśāstrasyedam anvarthaṃ nāma: śāstraṃ ca śīṣyāñ śāsti viśiṣṭe viṣaye 25
 'vasthāpayatīti kṛtvā. śabdāś ca kecit bherīdaṇḍādisaṃyogajāḥ kecit kaṇṭha-
 tālvādisaṃghaṭṭajāḥ. te 'pi kecit svarūpāḥ kecid varṇātmakāḥ kecid apabhraṃśa-

¹ The *sūtra* teaches the elision of *an* in *ahan*.

² Cf. *Kāś.* on P.2.1.6: *yogyatā vīpsā padārthānativṛtīḥ sādṛśyaṃ ca iti yathārthāḥ.*

³ Cf. *Kāś.* on *atha śabdānuśāsanam: katham anuśāsanam? prakṛtyādivibhāgakalpanayā sāmānyaviśeṣavatā lakṣaṇena.*

⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* on *atha śabdānuśāsanam: atha kimarthaḥ varṇānām upadeśaḥ? pratyāhārārthaḥ. pratyāhāro lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthāḥ.*

⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* on *atha śabdānuśāsanam: anuśīsyante samskriyante vyutpādyante 'nena śabdā ity anuśāsanam.*

svabhāvāḥ¹ kecid vācakā² iti· tatra keṣām anuśāsanam ity a(ā)ha· laukikānām iti·
 loke viditā³ laukikāḥ· lokasarvalokāṭ ṭhañ· śiṣṭalokair arthakriyā-
 rtham brā[hmaṇam āna]yetyādya[rthakā]⁴ ye sam nte⁵ brāhmaṇādayaḥ⁶ śabdās
 te⁷ vyavahāriṇaḥ· na tu pāmaralokaprayuktās teṣām vyutpādanāya⁸ yady api
 5 śabdānām ānantyād anuśāsanam aśakyakaraṇam tathāpi samkṣepeṇa tad upāyam
 āha· prakṛtyāditi pratyayāt pūrvam⁹ kriyata iti prakṛtiḥ pratiya[nte] nenārthā
 ṭi¹⁰ pratyayaḥ tayor vibhā.. (vibha[janam] tasya) parikalpanā¹¹· vyavasthā tayety¹²
 arthaḥ· prakṛtipratyayayor upalakṣaṇārthatvād āgamavikārādīnām api grahaṇam·
 parikalpanāśabdena· etad¹³ darśayati nityaśabde¹⁴ paramārthato vibhāgābhāvāt
 10 samudāya evārthavān parikalpanayeti hetāv¹⁵ iyaṃ tṛtīyā·
 parikalpanā¹⁶ punar īdṛśī kumbhakāraśabde kumbha upapadam kṛ prakṛtiḥ¹⁷ aṅ
 pratyayaḥ· vṛddhiraparaprātīpadikasamjñā¹⁸
 samāsādirūpā prakārāntaram āha· sāmānyāviśeṣavatā ceti¹⁹
 sāmānyalakṣaṇam²⁰ karmmaṇy aṅ· viśeṣalakṣaṇam āto 'nupasarge kaḥ
 15 tābhyām api²¹ karaṇabhūtābhyām apy²² anuśāsanam kriyata ity arthaḥ²³ kim iyaṅta eva
 prakārā²⁴ ity ata āha· gatyantarābhāvād iti na paśyāmaḥ śabdānuśāsane kimapy
 upāyāntaram iti bhāvaḥ· nanu akārādayaḥ svarāḥ kakārādīni varṇāni²⁵ vyañjanāni pūrvam
 evopadiṣṭāni²⁶· punar iha gauravamātranimitam kimartham²⁷ upadiśyanta ity āha²⁸·
 varṇānām iti²⁹ kramo 'nukramaḥ sanniveśo 'rpaṇam· (krame[ṇa] sanniveśaḥ
 20 kramasanniveśaḥ)³⁰ anubandhā nakārādayaḥ³¹ teṣām āsañjanaṃ vidhānam·
 kramasanniveśāś ca anubandhāsañjanañ ca kramasanniveśānubandhāsañjanaṃ·
 tad³² arthaḥ prayojanam· yasya³³· upadeśo³⁴ 'nyapadārthaḥ·
 nanv etāvātā³⁵ prastute kim anu[kra]ṇam bhavatīty ata āha· tad³⁶ ubhayam
 ityādi samjñā aṅādikā artho³⁷ yasya³⁸ tat tathoktam³⁹ ubhayam a[nya]padārthaḥ·
 25 samjñāiva prastute kimartham⁴⁰ prārthyata ity⁴¹ āha (sā cetyādi)⁴² lāghaveneti·
 hetau tṛtīyā· śāstram sūtram tasya lāghavena pravṛttiḥ

¹B: apabhraṃśasvabhāvāḥ. SJ: vācakāḥ ²SJ: apabhraṃśasvabhāvā. ³SJ: vihita. ⁴B:
 -artham. SJ: -arthādyāḥ. ⁵B: samyujyante. SJ: samyojyante ⁶SJ: brāhmaṇādyāḥ. ⁷SJ inserts
 ca. ⁸B: pāmaralokato samvyutpādanāya. SJ: pāmaraloke prayuktāḥ te teṣām vyutpādanāyeti.
⁹B: purvvaṃ. ¹⁰B: pratiyanty anenārthān iti. SJ: pratiyanty anenārthān iti. ¹¹B and SJ:
 vibhāgaparikalpanā. ¹²SJ: yathā syāt tathety. ¹³B: -śabdenaitad. ¹⁴B: nityaśabdo. ¹⁵SJ: hetor.
¹⁶B: parikalpanayā. ¹⁷SJ: upapadaprakṛteḥ. ¹⁸B: vṛddhiraparaprātīpadikasamjñā. SJ: vṛddhiḥ
 raparaḥ prātīpadikasamjñā. ¹⁹B om. ²⁰B: sāmānyalakṣaṇam. ²¹SJ om. ²²B and SJ om. ²³B
 om. ²⁴B: kiyante va prakāra. SJ: kim ayaṃ ta eva prakārā. ²⁵B and SJ om. ²⁶B: pūrvopadiṣṭāni.
²⁷B: kim. ²⁸B om. SJ: ity ata āha. ²⁹SJ ityādi. ³⁰B and SJ om. ³¹B and SJ: ṅakārādayaḥ. ³²SJ
 adds eva. ³³B om. ³⁴B: upadeśe. ³⁵B: etavā. ³⁶B om. ³⁷B om. ³⁸SJ om.: upadeśo 'nyapadārthaḥ
 nanv etāvātā prastute kim anu[kra]ṇam bhavatīty ata āha· tad ubhayam ityādi samjñā aṅādikā artho
 yasya. ³⁹B: tatroktam. ⁴⁰B adds: vā. ⁴¹SJ adds ataḥ. ⁴²B om.

svabhāvāḥ kecid vācakā iti. tatra keṣāṃ anuśāsanam ity āha **laukikānām** iti. loke viditā **laukikāḥ**.⁶ *lokasarvalokāt thañ* (P.5.1.44). śiṣṭalokair arthakriyārtham brāhmaṇam ānetyādyarthakā ye samyujyante brāhmaṇādayaḥ śabdās te vyavahāriṇaḥ na tu pāmaralokaprayuktāḥ. teṣāṃ vyutpādanāya yady api śabdānām ānentyād anuśāsanam aśakyakaraṇam tathāpi saṃkṣepeṇa tad upāyam 5 āha. **prakṛtyādīti** pratyayāt pūrvam kriyata iti **prakṛtiḥ**. pratīyante 'nenārthā iti **pratyayaḥ**. tayor **vibhāgo** vibhajanaṃ tasya **parikalpanā** vyavasthā tayety arthaḥ.⁷ prakṛtipratyayayor upalakṣaṇārthatvād āgamavikārādīnām api grahaṇam.⁸ parikalpanāśabdena etad darśayati: nityaśabde paramārthato vibhāgābhāvāt samudāya evārthavān. **parikalpanayeti** hetāv iyaṃ tṛtīyā (cf. P.2.3.23). 10 parikalpanā punar īdṛśī: kumbhakāraśabde kumbha upapadam kṛ prakṛtir aṅ pratyayaḥ. vṛddhiraparatve (cf. P.7.2.115 and P.1.1.51). prātipadikasamjñā samāsādirūpā (cf. P.1.2.46). prakārāntaram āha **sāmānyāvīśeṣavatā** ceti sāmānyalakṣaṇam *karmaṇy aṅ* (P.3.2.1). viśeṣalakṣaṇam *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (P.3.2.3). tābhyām api karaṇabhūtābhyām anuśāsanam kriyata ity arthaḥ. kim iyanta eva 15 prakārā ity ata āha **gatyantarābhāvād** iti: na paśyāmaḥ śabdānuśāsane kimapy upāyāntaram iti bhāvaḥ. nanu akārādayaḥ svarāḥ kakārādīni vyañjanāni pūrvam evopadiṣṭāni punar iha gauravamātranimittam kimartham upadiśyanta ity āha **varṇānām** iti. **kramo** 'nukramaḥ **saṃniveśo** 'rpaṇam. krameṇa saṃniveśaḥ **kramasaṃniveśaḥ**. **anubandhā** nakārādayaḥ. teṣāṃ **āsañjanaṃ** vidhānam. 20 kramasaṃniveśaś cānubandhāsañjanaṃ ca **kramasaṃniveśānubandhāsañjanam**. tad **arthaḥ** prayojanaṃ yasya. **upadeśo** 'nyapadārthaḥ (cf. P.2.2.24). nanv etāvātā prastute kim anukramaṇam bhavatīty ata āha **tad ubhayam** ityādi. **saṃjñā** aṅādikā **artho** yasya tat tathoktam **ubhayam** anyapadārthaḥ. saṃjñāiva prastutā. kimartham prārthyata ity āha **sāmjñetyādi**. **lāghaveneti** 25 hetau tṛtīyā (cf. P.2.3.23). **śāstram** sūtram. tasya lāghavena **pravṛtṭiḥ**

⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *loke viditā laukikāḥ... atha vā loke bhavā laukikāḥ*.

⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* on *prakṛtyādivibhāgaparikalpanayā* (*Kās.*): *pratyayāt prathamam kriyata iti prakṛtiḥ, prakṛtir ādir yeṣāṃ te prakṛtyādayaḥ, ādiśabdaḥ pratyayādīnām parigrahāya, teṣāṃ vibhāgo 'saṃkīrṇarūpatā, tasya kalpanā parikalpikayā buddhyā parikalpanam, tayā parikalpanayā śabdānām anuśāsanam vyākaraṇam anuśiṣṭir vā*.

⁸ Cf. *Pad.* on *prakṛtyādivibhāgaparikalpanayā* (*Kās.*): *ādiśabdena pratyayavikārāgamānām grahaṇam*.

pravarttanam arthaḥ prayojanam yasyāḥ¹ sā tathoktā² etad uktaṁ bhavati
 kramasanniveśānubandhāsañjane³ sati ādir antyena sahetety⁴ aṇādikāḥ
 sañjñāḥ sampadyante akārādayo varṇāḥ pratyāhriyante samkṣipyante atreti⁵ kṛtvā
 pratyāhāraḥ tatrāṇ aṭ ak⁶ ityādikayā sañjñayā bahavo varṇāḥ saṁgrhyanta
 5 iti śāstrasya⁷ lāghavam bhavati anyathā⁸ dhralope pūrvasya⁹ dīrgho 'ṇa¹⁰ ityādau
 bahavo varṇā¹¹ nirddeṣṭavyāḥ syuḥ anudit savarnasya cāpratyaya
 iti vaksyamānam mandadhiyām sukhapratipattiyartham vispastikarttum
 āha¹² akārasya vivṛtopadeśa ākāragrahaṇārtha iti akārasya saṁvṛtasya
 vivṛtopadeśaḥ pratijñāyate ākāragrahaṇārthaḥ a i uṇ ity atra yo 'kāras
 10 tena khaṭvāgram mālikarotīty ākāragrahaṇam bhavati nanu¹³ vivṛtatvapratijñāne pi¹⁴
 vivṛtatama[syā](kārasya grahaṇam¹⁵ na prāpnoti pratijñānasāmartyād bhaviṣyati[ty
 a]doṣaḥ¹⁶ athavā vivṛtamaḥ¹⁷) pratijñāyata¹⁸ iti boddhavyam ||

¹B: prayojanam asyāḥ. ²SJ: tathā uktasañjñā. ³B and SJ: kramasanniveśe 'nubandhāsañjane ca. ⁴SJ: antyenyādinā. ⁵B: ākārādayo varṇā pratyāhriyante 'treti. ⁶SJ: ak aṭ. ⁷B: śāstram. ⁸SJ adds hi. ⁹B: pūrvasya. ¹⁰B: 'ṇ. ¹¹B: varṇāḥ. ¹²B om. ¹³SJ adds tathāpi. ¹⁴SJ: -pratijñā nopapadyate. ¹⁵B: vivṛtasyākārasya. SJ: vivṛtatarasyākārasya grahaṇam ¹⁶B: [[3]]sāmartyād bhaviṣyati. SJ om. ity adosaḥ. ¹⁷B: vivṛtamaḥ. SJ: vivṛtatarāḥ. ¹⁸B: pratijñāya.

pravartanam **arthah** prayojanam yasyāḥ sā tathoktā. etad uktam bhavati: kramasam̐niveśānubandhāsāñjane saty *ādir antyena sahetety* (P.1.1.71) aṇādikāḥ sam̐jñāḥ sampadyante. akārādayo varṇāḥ pratyāhriyante sam̐kṣipyante 'treti kṛtvā pratyāhārah.⁹ tatrāṇ aṭ ak ityādikayā sam̐jñayā bahavo varṇāḥ sam̐grhyanta iti śāstrasya lāghavam bhavati.¹⁰ anyathā *ḍhralope pūrvasya dīrgho 'ṇa* ity- 5 (P.6.3.111)-ādaḥ bahavo varṇā nirdeṣṭavyāḥ syuḥ.¹¹ *aṇudit savarṇasya cāpratyaya* iti (P.1.1.69) vakṣyamāṇam mandadhiyām sukhapratipattiyartham vispaṣṭikartum āha. **akārasya vivṛtopadeśa akāragrahaṇārtha** ity akārasya sam̐vṛtasya vivṛtopadeśaḥ pratijñāyata akāragrahaṇārthaḥ. *a i uṇ* ity (Ś.sū. 1) atra yo 'kāras tena khaṭvāgram mālīkarotīty akāragrahaṇam bhavati. nanu vivṛtatvapratijñāne 'pi 10 vivṛtatamasyākārasya grahaṇam na prāpnoti. pratijñānasāmarthyād bhaviṣyatīty adoṣaḥ. athavā vivṛtatamaḥ pratijñāyata iti boddhavyam.¹²

(*Bhv.*:) 1. a i uṇ. 2. ṛ ḷk. 3. e oñ. 4. ai auc. 5. ha ya va raṭ. 6. laṇ. 7. ña ma ṇa ṇa nam. 8. jha bhañ. 9. gha ḍha dhaṣ. 10. ja ba ga ḍa daś. 11. kha pha cha ṭha tha ca ṭa tav. 12. ka pay. 13. śa ṣa sar. 14. hal. 15
iti pratyāhārāḥ.

akārādīn etān varṇān krameṇopadiśyānte ṇakārādīn itsam̐jñakān anubadhnāti. pratyāhārārtham. tatra ṇakārādyaiś caturdaśabhir anubandhair yathākramam.

ekaṃ trīṇi punaś caikaṃ catvāry ekaṃ trayam trayam | 20
ekaṃ dve tathaivaikaṃ catuḥ pañca ṣad eva ca || iti.

aṇ. ak ik uk. eñ. ac ic ec aic. aṭ. aṇ iṇ yaṇ. am yam ṇam. yañ. jhaṣ bhaṣ. aś haś vaś jhaś jaś punar baś. chav. yay may jhay khay. yar jhar khar car śar. al hal val ral jhal śal ity ekacatvāriṃśat pratyahārā bhavanti. 25

ur aṇ raparah (P.1.1.51). **cayo dvitīyāḥ śari pauṣkarasādeḥ** (vārtt. 3 on P.8.4.48). **ñamantād ḍah** (*Uṇ*. I.114) ity etaiś catuścatvāriṃśad iti.

⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* on *pratyāhāro lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ* (*Kāś.*): *pratyāhārah 'a i uṇ' ityevamādiko* (Ś.sū. 1) *viśiṣṭānupūrviko viśiṣṭānubandhakaś cākṣarasamāmnāyah, pratyāhriyante sam̐kṣipyante varṇā asmīn iti kṛtvā.*

¹⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* on *pratyāhāro lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ* (*Kāś.*): *tataś ca yatrākārādīnām grahaṇam iṣṭam tatrāṇ ityevamādikayaiva sam̐jñayā bahavo 'pi te nirdiśyanta iti lāghavena śāstrasābhinirvṛttir bhavati.*

¹¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* on *pratyāhāro lāghavena śāstrapravṛttyarthaḥ* (*Kāś.*): *tena lāghavena śāstrasya 'ḍhralope pūrvasya dīrgho 'ṇaḥ' ityevamādeḥ* (P.6.3.111) *pravṛttyartha 'bhinirvṛtyartha ity arthaḥ.*

¹² Cf. *Nyāsa* on Ś.sū. 1: *atra ca yady api 'vivṛtaḥ pratijñāyate' ity uktam, tathāpi teṣāṃ sāvārṇya-prasiddhyartham iti vacanād vivṛtatara iti gamyate. na hi vivṛtasya vivṛtatareṇa sāvārṇyam upapadyate; prayatnabhedāt, vivṛtatvapratijñānasāmarthyād vā.*

||idānīm a i uṅ ityādikāṃ caturddaśasūtrīm māheśvarīm pratyāhārārtham¹
 upanyasya pratyāhārakramam² āha· akārādīn ityādi ādau akārādīn uccāryyānte³
 ṅakārādīn anubandhān ādir antyena sahetety aṅ ityādikāḥ⁴ pratyāhārā
 ūhitavyāḥ | tatra ṅakārādyaiś caturddaśabhir⁵ ityādinā ekaṃ trīṅityādinā ca⁶
 5 pratyāhārakramam saṅkhyāñ ca darśayati· ekaṃ ityādi ekaṃ akṣaram akāram
 uccār[yyā]nte· nakāram itam karoti· evaṃ trīṅy akārādīni uccāryyānte⁷· kakāram itam
 karotīti⁸ boddhavyam || catuḥ pañca⁹ ṣaḍ eva ceti samastam evaitat¹⁰ catvārīti
 pṛthak kṛtvā yojanīyam ekaṃ pratyāhārarūpaṃ trīṅi pratyāhārarūpāṅīti eṣā¹¹ yo-
 janā¹²· aparam¹³ api pratyāhāran¹⁴ darśayati¹⁵· ur aṅ rapara¹⁶ ityādi¹⁷ ha ya
 10 va raṭ¹⁸ rephēṇa· laṅ ity asyākāreṇa itsaṅjñakena ra¹⁹ iti pratyāhārāntaram· anye
 pi suṭsuptīntrṅkrṅprabhṛtayo²⁰ boddhavyāḥ· vṛttau tu²¹ catuṣcatvārīṃśad²² iti yad
 uktaṃ tad vargeṇa kramānusāreṇeti· a i uṅ ityādiṣv²³ ādguṇādi saṃhitākāryyam
 na bhavati nirddeśād eva saṃ[hi]tākāryye vivakṣite varnavilopaprasaṅgāc²⁴
 ca | athavā cādipāthāt nipātate²⁵ nipāta ekāj anān iti
 15 praḅhyatve prakṛtibhāvah²⁶· ata eva vibhakter aśravaṇam²⁷ pratyāhāre
 hakāradvayasyopādānam²⁸ pūrvasya²⁹ bhobhago-aghō 'pūrvasya³⁰ yo 'śīty aśī
 hali vidhānārtham³¹ aparasya tu³² śala igupadhād aṅiṭaḥ ksa³³ iti lihā-
 dīnām ksārtham· yaralavīyavakārasya ned vaśīty³⁴ atra grahaṇam·
 vargīyavakārasya³⁵ ekāco ba[śa] ity³⁶ atra· dvābhyām ṣa iti³⁷ ekāco³⁸ baśo bhaṣ
 20 jhaṣantasyeti dvayor api grahaṇam· [pa?]rantasya³⁹ jhalām ṅjaś jhaṣīti
 jakārajhakārābhyām⁴⁰ grahaṇam⁴¹ ||

¹B: pratyāhārārtham. ²B: pratyāhāram. ³B: uccāryante. SJ adds ṅam. ⁴B: aṅādik[ā]ḥ.
⁵B: caturbhir. ⁶SJ om. ca. ⁷B: ekaṃ akṣaram uccāryante ṅakārādīn anubandhān ādir antye-
 na sahetety aṅādikāḥ (?) pratyāhārā [ū]hitavyāḥ. tatra ṅakāra[[17]] ekaṃ trīṅikārādīni. SJ is
 identical with A, but it has ekaṃ instead of evaṃ and the last phrase uccāryyānte is omitted.
⁸SJ adds evaṃ. ⁹B: pa. ¹⁰B: evaitac. ¹¹SJ om. B: vā. ¹²B: yojanam. ¹³B: akām. ¹⁴B:
 pratyākārām. SJ: pratyāhārāntaram. ¹⁵B: darśayitum āha. SJ: āha. ¹⁶B: para. ¹⁷SJ: iti. ¹⁸B
 om. ya (or va). ¹⁹B om. ²⁰B om.: suṭ-. ²¹B: ca. ²²B: catuṣcatvārīśad. ²³B: ityādāv. ²⁴B:
 saṃhitākāryavivakṣitavarṅavilopaprasaṅgāc. ²⁵B om. ²⁶B: praḅhye prakṛtivadbhāvah. ²⁷SJ om.
 the passage beginning with vṛttau tu catuṣcatvārīṃśad iti, and ending with: vibhakter aśravaṇam.
²⁸B: pratyāhāradvayopādānam. SJ: pratyāhāre hakāradvayopādānam. ²⁹SJ: kimartham. ³⁰B:
 -apūrvvasya. SJ: -pūrvayeti. ³¹SJ: aśī yatvavidhānārtham. ³²B om. tu and SJ: aparasya tu. ³³B
 om. ³⁴B and SJ: ned vaśī kṛtīty. ³⁵B: vargīyavakārasya. ³⁶B: baśīty. ³⁷B adds: asya. ³⁸B: ekācau.
³⁹B and SJ: savarṅasya. ⁴⁰B: ..tra ..kāro akārābhyām. ⁴¹The passage after vargīyavakārasya dif-
 fers in SJ, which has: ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaṣantasya sdhvor ity atra pratyāhāragrahaṇam. vaś ity
 atra dvayor api grahaṇam. vṛttau tu catuṣcatvārīṃśad iti yad uktaṃ tad uddeśakramānusāreṇeti
 lāghavārtham pratyāhāragrahaṇe tu ḍhralope pūrvasya dīrgho 'ṅaḥ akaḥ savarṅe dīrghaḥ aco yad
 ityādau bahavo varṅā na nirdīśyante. a i uṅ ityādau ādguṇādisaṃhitākāryyam katham na bhavati?
 nirddeśād eva saṃhitākārye vivakṣitavarṅavilopaprasaṅgād va. cādipāthān nipātate. ata eva vibha-
 kter aśravaṇam ca. praḅhyasaṅjñāyām prakṛtivadbhāvāś ceti.

(*Pañj.*:) idānīm **a i uṇ** ityādīkāṃ caturdaśasūtrīm māheśvarīm pratyāhārārtham upanyasya pratyāhāarakramam āha. **akārādīn** ityādy ādāv akārādīn uccāryānte ṅakārādīn anubandhān ādir antyena sahetety (P.1.1.71) aṇ ityādīkāḥ pratyāhārā ūhitavyāḥ. **tatra ṅakārādyaiś caturdaśabhir** ityādinā **ekam trīṇī**tyādinā ca pratyāhāarakramam saṃkhyāṃ ca darśayati. **ekam** ityādy ekam akṣaram akāram 5 uccāryānte ṅakāram itaṃ karoti. evaṃ trīṇy akārādīny uccāryānte kakāram itaṃ karotīti boddhavyam. **catuḥ pañca ṣaḍ eva ceti** samastam evaitat. **catvārīti** pṛthak kṛtvā yojanīyam. ekam pratyāhārarūpaṃ trīṇi pratyāhārarūpāṇīty eṣā yojanā. aparam api pratyāhāraṃ darśayati. **ur aṇ rapara** ity-(P.1.1.51)-ādi **ha ya va raṭ** (iti) repheṇa **laṇ** ity asyākāreṇa itsaṃjñakena ra iti pratyāhārāntaram. anye 10 'pi suṭsupṭīnṛṅkrṅprabhṛtayo boddhavyāḥ.¹³ vṛttau tu **catuṣcatvārīmśad** iti yad uktam tad vargeṇa kramānusāreṇeti. **a i uṇ** ityādiṣv ādguṇādi saṃhitākāryam (cf. P.6.1.87 etc.) na bhavati nirdeśād eva saṃhitākārye vivakṣite varṇavilopaprasaṅgā ca. athavā cādīpāṭhāt nipātatve (cf. P.1.4.57) *nipāta ekāj anān* iti (P.1.1.14) pragṛhyatve prakṛtibhāvaḥ (cf. P.6.1.125). ata eva vibhakter aśravaṇam.¹⁴ pratyāhāre 15 hakāradvayasyopādānam. pūrvasya *bhobhago-gho-apūrvasya yo 'śīty* (P.8.3.17) aśī hali vidhānārtham. aparasya tu *śala igupadhād anīṭaḥ ksa* iti (P.3.1.45) lihādīnām ksārtham.¹⁵ yaralavīyavakārasya *neḍ vaśīty* (cf. P.7.2.8) atra grahaṇam. vargīyavakārasya *ekāco baśa* ity (P.8.2.37) atra. *dvābhyāṃ ṣa* ity¹⁶ *ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaśantasyeti* (P.8.2.37) dvayor api grahaṇam. śakārasya *jhalām jaś jhaśīti* (P.8.4.53) 20 jakārajhakārābhyāṃ grahaṇam.

¹³ The *pratyāhāras suṭ, sup* and *tiṇ* are used in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, e.g. *suṭ* in P.1.1.43; *sup* in P.1.4.103; 6.4.83 and *tiṇ* in P.3.4.113 etc. Pat. used *trṇ* and *krṅ* as *pratyāhāras*. Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 6 on P.3.2.127 (*trṇ iti nedaṃ pratyayagrahaṇam. kiṃ tarhi. pratyāhāragrahaṇam. kva saṃniviṣṭānām pratyāhāraḥ. laṭaḥ śatr ity ata ārabhyā trṇo nakārāt* [Mbh. II 130.14–15]) and on vārtt. 3 on P.3.1.40 (*krṅ iti naitad dhātugrahaṇam. kiṃ tarhi. pratyāhāragrahaṇam. kva saṃniviṣṭānām pratyāhāraḥ. krḥbhvastiyoga ity* (cf. P.5.4.50) *ataḥ prabhṛtyā krṅno ṅakārāt* [Mbh. II 47.15–17].)

¹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* on Ś.sū. 1: *pragṛhyatvaṃ tu teṣām 'nipāta ekāj anān' iti* (P.1.1.14) *pragṛhyasamjñāvidhānāt. nipātatvaṃ tu cādiṣu pāṭhāt. ata eva nipātatvād arthavattve 'narthavattve copannāyā vibhakteḥ śravaṇam na bhavati.*

¹⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* on Ś.sū. 14: *atha kimartham upadiṣṭo 'pi hakārah punar upadiśyate?... liher alikṣad iti 'śala igupadhād anīṭaḥ ksaḥ' iti* (P.3.1.45) *kso yathā syāt... yady evam, hayavaraṭ ity atra tarhi kimartham upadiśyate? mahāñ hi saḥ, devā hasantīty atrādgrahaṇeṣu* (P.8.3.3) *cāśgrahaṇeṣu* (P.8.3.22) *ca hakārasya grahaṇam.*

¹⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* on Ś.sū. 14:

ekasmān nānaṇavaṭā dvābhyāṃ ṣaḥ tribhya eva kaṇamāḥ syuḥ | jñeyau cayau caturbhyo raḥ pañcabhyaḥ śalau ṣadbhyaḥ ||.

||śrīvṛddhiḥ || vṛddhir iti vṛdhu vṛddhau ktickṛtau¹ ca
 samjñāyām iti kticpratyayaḥ² āt aij iti pratyekaṃ³ pra[thamā]ntam
 5 samāhāradvandve· samastam ekapadam vā⁴· aij iti pratyāhāreṇa aikārā·ukārau⁵
 gṛhyete· kutvañ ca nipātanān na bhavati· ayasmayādipāṭhād bhatvād⁶
 vā· samāsapakṣe dvandvāc cud iti⁷ samāsānto na bhavati
 anityatvāt tadvidheḥ⁸· vṛddhiḥ⁹ samjñā ādaicaḥ samjñīnaḥ· viparītan tu na bha-
 vati pradeśeṣu¹⁰ vṛddhiśabdasyaivāvartyamānātvāt¹¹ na tv ādaicām¹²· avṛttidharmmāṇāś
 10 ca samjñāśabdā bhavanti yathā brāhmaṇam āśritya brahmatvam iti¹³· nanu sa-
 rvatra pūrvam¹⁴ samjñī nirddiśyate¹⁵ yathād¹⁶ eṇ guṇaḥ bhūvādayo dhātava iti¹⁷·
 tat katham iha¹⁸ na tathā kṛtam¹⁹· ucyate²⁰· vṛddhiśabdasya maṅgalārthatām
 sūcayitum· nanu kim iyam²¹ samudāyasya samjñā uta²² pratyekaṃ²³ tatra· nādyah·
 yatra samudāyasya kāryyam icchati· tatrobhegrahaṇam karoti· yathā ubhe 'bhyastam²⁴
 15 iti mahatīm vā samjñām²⁵ yathā²⁶ halo 'nantarāḥ²⁷ samyoga iti²⁸·
 iha tu²⁹ ubhegrahaṇan nāsti (nāpi)³⁰ mahatī samjñā³¹ vṛddhiśabdasya maṅgalārthatvāt·
 ataḥ pratyekaṃ ity eṣa pakṣaḥ sthiraḥ³² tadbhāvitānām atadbhāvitānām· ādaicām³³
 iyam samjñā· tatra a(ta)dbhāvitānām śālārīnauprabhṛtīnām³⁴· tadbhāvitānām·
 dākṣi-aitikāyana-aupagavādīnām³⁵· ād iti taparakaraṇam aijartham·
 20 tathā hi na tāvad ākārasya³⁶ (guṇāntara)tulyakālasya (bhinnasya)³⁷ [ni]vṛtyartham³⁸ abhe-
 dakā iha śāstre guṇā iti kṛtvā nāpi³⁹ bhinnakālasya nivṛtyartham⁴⁰· pra-

¹SJ: kticprakṛtau. ²B and SJ: ktic. ³B reads twice. ⁴B and SJ: ekavacanam vā. ⁵B: ai au. ⁶B and SJ: ayasmādipaṭhe bhasamjñakatvād. ⁷SJ om. ⁸B: 'nityatvād veti. SJ: anityatvāt samāsāntavidheḥ. ⁹B and SJ: vṛddhir iti. ¹⁰SJ: pradeśe. ¹¹B: -syaivāvarttamānātvān. SJ: -syāvartanāt. ¹²B and SJ: ādaicaḥ. ¹³B and SJ om. ¹⁴B: sarvvatra purvvaṃ. ¹⁵B: nirddiśyante. ¹⁶SJ: yathāha ād. ¹⁷B: ityādau. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹B: nikṛtam. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹B adds: ādaicaḥ. SJ adds: ādaicām. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ adds: vā. ²⁴B: yathobhe abhyastam. ²⁵SJ: mahatī samjñām vā. ²⁶SJ inserts cā. ²⁷B: halo 'ntarāḥ. ²⁸SJ om. ²⁹B om. ³⁰SJ om. ³¹SJ adds nāsti. ³²SJ om. ³³B: -ñ cādaicām. ³⁴SJ has vai instead of rai. ³⁵SJ has dāśarathiḥ instead of dākṣi and -prabhṛtīnām instead of -ādīnām. ³⁶SJ om. ³⁷B and SJ: guṇāntarabhinnasya tulyakālasya. ³⁸SJ adds: na bhavati. ³⁹SJ om. ⁴⁰B and SJ: bhinnakālanivṛtyartham. SJ adds also: api na bhavati, ākārasya.

1. *vrddhir ād aic.* (P.1.1.1)

(*Bhv.*:) *ād aikāra aukāras ca vrddhisamjñakāḥ syuḥ.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||śrīvrddhiḥ||. *vrddhir* iti *vr̥dhu vr̥ddhau* (*Dhp.* 1.796). *ktickṛtau ca samjñāyām* iti (P.3.3.174) *kticpratyayaḥ*.¹⁷ *āt aij* iti *pratyekaṃ prathamāntam samāhāradvandve samastam ekapadam vā*.¹⁸ *aij* iti *pratyāhāreṇa aikāra-aukārau* 5
gr̥hyete. kutvaṃ ca nipātanān na bhavaty ayasmayādipāṭhād bhatvād (cf. P.1.4.20; P.8.2.30) *vā*.¹⁹ *samāsapakṣe dvandvāc cud* iti (cf. P.5.4.106) *samāsānto na bhavaty anityatvāt tadvidheḥ*.²⁰ *vr̥ddhiḥ samjñā ādaicāḥ samjñīnaḥ. viparītaṃ tu na bhavati pradeśeṣu vr̥ddhiśabdasyaivāvartamānatvān na tv ādaicām. āvṛttidharmāṇas ca samjñāśabdā bhavanti yathā brāhmaṇam āsṛitya brahmatvam iti*.²¹ *nanu sa-* 10
rvatra pūrvam samjñī nirdiśyate yathād eni guṇaḥ (P.1.1.2) *bhūvādayo dhātava* iti (P.1.3.1) *tat katham iha na tathā kṛtam? ucyate: vr̥ddhiśabdasya maṅgalārthatām sūcayitum*.²² *nanu kim iyaṃ samudāyasya samjñā uta pratyekaṃ? tatra nādyah. yatra samudāyasya kāryam icchati tatrobhegrahaṇam karoti yathā ubhe 'bhyastam* 15
iti (P.6.1.5) *mahatīm vā samjñām yathā halo 'nantarāḥ samyoga* iti (P.1.1.7).²³ *iha tūbhegrahaṇam nāsti nāpi mahatī samjñā vr̥ddhiśabdasya maṅgalārthatvāt*.²³ *ataḥ pratyekaṃ ity eṣa pakṣaḥ sthiraḥ. tadbhāvitānām atadbhāvitānām ādaicām iyaṃ samjñā*.²⁴ *tatra atadbhāvitānām śālārīnauprabhṛtīnām. tadbhāvitānām dākṣyaitikāyanaupagavādīnām. ād* iti *taparakaraṇam* (cf. P.1.1.70) *aijartham. tathā hi na tāvad ākārasya guṇāntarabhinnasya tulyakālasya nivṛttyartham abhe-* 20
dakā iha śāstre guṇā iti (*PP* 57) *kṛtvā nāpi bhinnakālasya nivṛttyartham pra-*

¹⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tathā hi vr̥ddhiśabdo 'yam aviśeṣeṇa copadiṣṭaḥ – 'vr̥dhu vr̥ddhau' iti* (*Dhp.* 1.796), *ataḥ ktinpratyayaḥ – 'stṛiyām ktin' iti* (P.3.3.94).

¹⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vr̥ddhiḥ, āt, aic – iti kecit tripadam idaṃ sūtram varṇayanti. anye tu – āc ca, aic ca iti ādaij iti samāhāre dvandvo 'yam iti matvā vr̥ddhiḥ ādaic – iti dvipadam.*

¹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha 'coḥ kuḥ' iti* (P.8.2.30) *kutvaṃ kasmān na bhavati? 'ayasmayādīni cchandasi' iti* (P.1.4.20) *bhasamjñakatvāt... nanu tatra cchandasiṭy ucyate, na cedam chandaḥ, tat kuto bhasamjñā? 'chandovat sūtrāni bhavanti' ity* (Pat on P.1.1.1 [*Mbh.* I 37.4] and on P.1.4.3 [*Mbh.* I 313.5]) *adoṣaḥ.*

²⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca samāhāre 'pi 'dvandvāc cudaṣahāntāt samāhāre' iti* (P.5.4.106) *ṭac samāsāntaḥ syāt; samāsāntavidher anityatvān na bhaviṣyati.*

²¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *etat kuto labhyate – 'vr̥ddhiśabdaḥ samjñā, ādaicāḥ samjñīnaḥ' iti? viparyayaḥ kasmān na bhavati – 'ādaicāḥ samjñā, vr̥ddhiśabdaḥ samjñī' iti? nārhati viparyayo bhavitum. tathā hi – laghvarthatvāt samjñākarāṇasya, yasmīnn uccāryamāṇe pradeśeṣu lāghavaṃ bhavati, tasya samjñārthatvena bhāvyaṃ. vr̥ddhiśabde ca savibhaktike 'py uccāryamāṇe lāghavaṃ bhavati, nādaikṣu; yasmād vr̥ddhiśabda uccāryamāṇe catasro mātrā bhavanti, ādaikṣu tu pañca... kim cāvartinyah samjñā bhavanti. vr̥ddhiśabdaś cāvartate, nādaicchabdaḥ, tasmān na bhavati viparyayaḥ.*

²² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *maṅgalārthatvād asyāḥ samjñāyāḥ. ata evāsyāḥ prāguccāraṇam, anyathā samjñāyāḥ sataḥ kāryīnaḥ kāryeṇa bhavitavyam iti, yathā 'ad eni guṇaḥ' ityādau* (P.1.1.2 etc.) *pūrvam samjñī nirdiṣṭaḥ, tathehāpi nirdiśet.*

²³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yatra samudāyasya kāryam icchati tatra 'ubhe' padagrahaṇam karoti, yathā – 'ubhe abhyastam' iti* (P.6.1.5). *anvartham vā mahatīm samjñām – 'halo 'nantarāḥ samyogaḥ' iti* (P.1.1.7)... *naitad asti; maṅgalārthatvād asyāḥ samjñāyāḥ.*

²⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *vr̥ddhiśabdaḥ samjñātvena vidhīyate pratyekaṃ ādaicām varṇānām sāmānyena tadbhāvitānām, atadbhāvitānām ca.*

tyāhāre ākārasypāṭhenav¹ grāhakatvānupapatteḥ tasmād aijartham eva². tād
 api³ paras tapara iti pakṣam āśritya⁴. tena vṛkṣaiḍakā· khaṭvaupagava⁵ ityādau
 trimātrikacaturmātrikayor⁶ dvimātri(ka) evādeśo bhavati· vṛddhisamjñāpradeśas tv⁷ iko
 guṇavṛddhī ityādih ||

5

||(ad e||)⁸ atrāpi⁹ pratyekaṃ padaṃ¹⁰ samudāyena vā¹¹. taparakaraṇaṃ¹²
 sarvārthaṃ¹³. anyathā taratītyādāv āntaratamyād ākāraḥ syāt nanu¹⁴ vṛddhisamjñā
 bādhikā¹⁵ syāt· na ekāsamjñādhikārābhāve samāveśo pi sambhāvya· bhinna-
 10 kālānāṃ khaṭvenduḥ¹⁶ khaṭvorvī¹⁷ ityādau· trimātri[ko¹⁸ gu]ṇaḥ syāt· khaṭveśa ityādau
 caturmātrikaś ca¹⁹ tasmāt sarvārthaṃ²⁰ taparakaraṇaṃ ||

15

||iko|| paribhāṣeyaṃ liṅgavatī· liṅgañ cāsyā guṇavṛddhiśabdau·
 ṣaṣṭhīnirddeśād eva ṣaṣṭhī sthāne 'yogety²¹ anayā sthānasambandhe²² labdhe
 20 niyamārtheyaṃ paribhāṣety ata āha· anuktasthāna ityādi· anuktam anirddiṣṭaṃ²³
 sthānaṃ yayos te tathokte· ika eveti niyamāt ātsandhyakṣaravyañjanānām²⁴ na
 bhavati· tena pānaṃ glāyati umbhitetyādau guṇābhāvo bhavati· yady atra guṇaḥ
 syāt· tadā²⁵ panaṃ glayati²⁶ u[ma]vitety aniṣṭarūpāṇi²⁷ syuḥ· nanv āto 'nupasarge ka ity
 āto²⁸ lopārthaṃ²⁹ kitkaraṇaṃ jñāpayiṣyaty³⁰ ākārasya guṇo na

25

¹B: ākārasya pāthēna. SJ: apāṭhād. ²SJ: taparakaraṇaṃ. ³B: tāpari. ⁴SJ: ārabhya. ⁵B:
 khaṭvau upagava. SJ: khaṭvaiḍakā. ⁶B: -caturmmātrikayor. ⁷B om. ⁸B: ad eḥ. ⁹B: atra.
¹⁰SJ adds vā. ¹¹B and SJ: samudāyo vā. ¹²B: -n tu. SJ: iha tu taparakaraṇe. ¹³B: sarvvārthaṃ.
¹⁴B adds: tasya. ¹⁵SJ: vārikā. ¹⁶SJ: khaṭvendra-. ¹⁷B: khaṭvorvvī. ¹⁸SJ adds: 'pi. ¹⁹SJ om.
 ca. B has: caturmātraḥ. ²⁰B: sarvvārthaṃ. ²¹B om. avagraha. ²²SJ: -ndhena sambandhe. ²³B:
 anirddiṣṭaṃ. ²⁴B om. āṭ-. ²⁵SJ: tataś ca. ²⁶B: galayati. ²⁷B: anistarūpāṇi. SJ: aniṣṭāni rūpāṇi.
²⁸B: ityādau to. ²⁹SJ adds: kriyamānaṃ. ³⁰B and SJ: jñāpayati.

tyāhāra ākāraṣyāpāṭhena grāhakatvānupapatteḥ.²⁵ tasmād aijartham eva. tād api paras tapara iti pakṣam āśritya tena vṛkṣaidakā khaṭvaupagava ityādau trimātrikacaturmātrikayor dvimātrika evādeśo bhavati. vṛddhisamjñāpradeśas tv *iko guṇavṛddhī* ity-(P.1.1.3)-ādih.

2. *ad eṇi guṇaḥ.* (P.1.1.2)

(*Bhv.*:) **ad ekāra okāraś ca guṇasamjñakāḥ syuḥ.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**ad e**||. atrāpi pratyekaṃ padaṃ samudāyena vā. taparakaraṇaṃ sarvārtham. anyathā taratītyādāv āntaratamyād ākāraḥ syāt. nanu vṛddhisamjñā bādhikā syāt? na. ekāsamjñādhikārābhāve samāveśo 'pi saṃbhāvyeta.²⁶ bhinnakālānām khaṭvenduḥ khaṭvorvī ityādau trimātriko guṇaḥ syāt khaṭveśa ityādau caturmātrikaś ca. tasmāt sarvārtham taparakaraṇam.²⁷

3. *iko guṇavṛddhī.* (P.1.1.3)

(*Bhv.*:) **anuktasthāne ye guṇavṛddhī te ika eva sthāne veditavye. sārvaadhātukārdhadhātukayor ity (P.7.3.84) aṅgasya guṇo bhavati. cetā. hotā. stotā. bhavitā. taritā. sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu (P.7.2.1). acaīṣīt. ahausīt. astāvīt. alāvīt. akārṣīt. katham dyauḥ panthāḥ saḥ? guṇavṛddhiśabdenānabhidhānāt.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**iko**||. paribhāṣeyaṃ liṅgavatī. liṅgaṃ cāsyā guṇavṛddhiśabdau.²⁸ ṣaṣṭhīrdeśād eva *ṣaṣṭhī sthāne 'yogety* (P.1.1.49) anayā sthānasambandhe labdhe niyamārtheyaṃ paribhāṣety ata āha **anuktasthāna** ityādi. **anuktam** anirdiṣṭam sthānaṃ yayos te tathokte. **ika** eveti niyamād ātsaṃdhyakṣaravyaṅjanānām na bhavati.²⁹ tena pānaṃ glāyati umbhityādau guṇābhāvo bhavati. yady atra guṇaḥ syāt tadā panaṃ glyati umavitety aniṣṭarūpāṇi syuḥ. nanv *āto 'nupasarge ka* ity (P.3.2.3) āto lopārtham kitkaraṇam (cf. P.6.4.64) jñāpayiṣyaty: *ākārasya guṇo na*

²⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ād iti taparakaraṇam – 'taparas tatkālasya' iti (P.1.1.70) guṇāntarabhinnānām api tulyakālānām grahaṇārtham vā syād? bhinnakālānām grahaṇanivṛttyartham vā? tatra pūrvaḥ pakṣas tāvan nopapadyate; abhedakatvād ihodāttādīnām śāstre guṇānām... dvitīyo 'pi nopapadyate, yadi hy ākāraḥ savarṇānām grāhakaḥ syāt; tatas tena bhinnakālasyaḥ avarṇasya grahaṇe sati tasyāpi samjñā mā bhūd iti bhinnakālānām grahaṇanivṛttyartham taparakaraṇam upapadyate. na cāsau savarṇānām grāhakaḥ; anaṅtvāt tasya punar akṣarasamāmnāye 'sanniveśāt.*

²⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tataś ca taritā ity atrāntaratamyād dīrghasya dīrgha eva guṇaḥ syāt. nanu ca vṛddhisamjñā guṇasamjñāyā bādhikā bhaviṣyati, tat kuto 'yaṃ prasaṅgaḥ? naitad asti; ekasamjñādhikāre hi samjñāyā samjñāntaram bādhyate, na cātraikasamjñādhikārah.*

²⁷ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc. (*taparakaraṇam tv iha sarvārtham*) and *Nyāsa* on it: *kiṃ ca yadi bhinnakālānām api guṇasamjñā syāt, khaṭvā indraḥ khaṭvendraḥ, khaṭvā urvī khaṭvorvīty atra trimātravāt pūrvottarasamudāyatmanah sthānīnah 'ād guṇaḥ' iti (P.6.1.87) trimātro guṇaḥ syāt. khaṭvā iṣā khaṭveśā, khaṭvā ūdhā khaṭvodhety atra caturmātravāt caturmātraḥ. tasmāt sarvārtham taparakaraṇam kartavyam.*

²⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *liṅgavatī ceyaṃ paribhāṣā, liṅgaṃ cāsyā guṇavṛddhigrahaṇam.*

²⁹ Cf. vārtt. 1 ad loc.: *iggrahaṇam ātsaṃdhyakṣaravyaṅjananivṛttyartham (Mbh. I 42.27).*

bhaviṣyatī¹ anyathā² guṇe³ pararūpatve ca goda ityādaḥ siddhe⁴ kitvaṃ
 vyartham⁵ [[ca. 9]]⁶ aikārasya⁷ guṇo na bhaviṣyati⁸. anyathā hy
 ekāram eva kuryyāt⁹. vyañjanavṛtyartham apy¹⁰ etan na bhavati yataḥ saptamyāṃ
 janer ḍa iti ḍitkaraṇam karoti. anyathā hy akāram eva kuryāt¹¹ akāre pi¹²
 5 guṇe kṛte trayāṇām akārāṇām ato guṇe pararūpatve¹³ upasaraja¹⁴ ity asya¹⁵
 siddheḥ¹⁶. tasmād guṇam prati mandadhiyāṃ sukhapratipattaye¹⁷ kṛtam idaṃ vṛddhiṃ
 prati tu kartavyam eva anyathā ācāravibantāl luṇi¹⁸. agavīd ity okārasya vṛddhiḥ
 syāt. ceteti. cinotes tṛc guṇenāntaratamyād ekārah¹⁹ acaśīd iti
 luṇ. vṛddhyāntaratamyād aikārah. ekāca upadeśa itīnnisedhah it.²⁰
 10 ṣatvaṃ evaṃ sarvatrāntaratamyād²¹ guṇavṛddhī bhavataḥ.
 guṇavṛddhiśabdenāvīdhānād iti ayam arthaḥ²². svaritatvād eva guṇavṛddhī
 anuvarttiṣyete.²³ ikas te iti nā(vā)cye²⁴ yad guṇavṛddhīgrahaṇam. tat samjñāvidhāne
 niyamam²⁵ sūcayitum²⁶. yatra guṇa(vṛddhi)śabdāv²⁷ uccāryya vidhīyete²⁸. tatreka eveti²⁹.
 tena yatra guṇavṛddhisamśabdanam³⁰ nāsti. tatra³¹ vyañjane pi guṇavṛddhisamjñakā
 15 bhavanti. dyaur iti. divśabdāt suḥ³². diva aut.³³ alvidhitvāt³⁴ sthānivatvābhāve³⁵
 halnyādilopam³⁶ akṛtvā rutvavisargau.
 panthā iti.³⁷ pathimathyādinā nakārasyaākārah ito 'd ityādinā
 ikārasyaākārah³⁸ tho nthah³⁹. sa iti⁴⁰. tyadādyatvaṃ. tadoḥ saḥ
 sāv iti sakārah⁴¹ ||

20

¹B and SJ: bhavati. ²SJ adds hi. ³SJ adds kṛte. ⁴B: ity asya siddhau. SJ: ity asya
 siddhatvāt. ⁵SJ om. ⁶B: syāt glāyatīty atropadeśād eva. SJ om. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: bhavati.
⁹B: akāram evocārayeta. SJ: ekāram evocārayet. ¹⁰B om. ¹¹B and SJ: vidadhyāt. ¹²B and SJ:
 nakārasya. ¹³SJ adds ca. ¹⁴SJ: uparajasam. ¹⁵B and SJ om. ¹⁶SJ: siddham iti. ¹⁷SJ om. sukha-
¹⁸SJ: -bantagośabdād. ¹⁹SJ adds: ce tṛ iti sthite kṛttvāt prātipadikatve suḥ, anubandhalopaḥ
 'rduśana' ityādinā anaṇ nakāro 'ntyādeśārthaḥ halanyādilopaḥ sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhāv iti
 dīrghaḥ 'nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasyeti' nalopaḥ. ²⁰SJ: cinoter luṇ aḍāgamaḥ tip itaś ceti lopaḥ sic.
 anubandhalopaḥ ekāc ityādinā iḍabhāvaḥ it sicvṛddhiḥ āntaratamyād aikārah 'ādeśapratyayor iti'.
²¹B: sarvvāntaratamyād. ²²B: āśrayaḥ. SJ: āśayaḥ. ²³SJ adds: athavā. ²⁴B: vācye. SJ: vaktavye.
²⁵B: niyamārtham. ²⁶SJ: sūcayati. ²⁷SJ: -bdam. ²⁸B: uccāryate vidhīyate. ²⁹B adds: niyamo
 yathā syāt. ³⁰B: yatraitat samśabdanam. SJ: yatrekṣamśabdanam. ³¹B: tena. ³²B: su. ³³SJ adds
 ity aukārah. ³⁴B: analvidhitvāt. ³⁵SJ: -vadbhāve. ³⁶SJ: halnyādinā lopam. ³⁷SJ adds: pathin
 śabdāt prathamaikavacanaḥ suḥ. ³⁸B: ityādinekārah. ³⁹B om. SJ: tho 'nthā iti thakārasyaāntādeśaḥ
 pūrveṇa pararūpaṃ paratra savarṇadīrghaḥ. padasamjñāyāṃ rutvasirgau (sic). ⁴⁰B adds: tadaḥ
 svaḥ, and SJ: tadaḥ suḥ. ⁴¹B: tadoḥ saḥ sāv anantayor iti takārasya sakārah. SJ: pararūpatvaṃ ca
 'tadoḥ saḥ sāv iti' takārasya sakārah vibhaktau visargah.

bhaviṣyatīti.³⁰ anyathā guṇe pararūpatve (cf. P.6.1.97) ca goda ityādaḥ siddhe kittvam vyartham syāt. glāyatīty atropadeśād eva aikārasya guṇo na bhaviṣyati. anyathā hy ekāram eva kuryāt. vyañjananivṛttyartham apy etan na bhavati yataḥ *saptamyām janer da* iti (P.3.2.97) ḍitkaraṇam karoti.³¹ anyathā hy akāram eva kuryān nakārasya guṇe kṛte trayāṇām akārāṇām ato guṇe pararūpatve (cf. P.6.1.97) upasaraḥ ity asya 5 siddheḥ. tasmād guṇam prati mandadhīyam sukhapratipattaye kṛtam idaṃ vṛddhiṃ prati tu kartavyam eva. anyathā ācāravibantāl³² luṇi agavīd ity okārasya vṛddhiḥ syāt. **ceteti** cinotes tṛc (cf. P.3.1.133). guṇenāntaratamyād ekārah. **acaiṣīd** iti luṇ. vṛddhyāntaratamyād aikārah. *ekāca upadeśa* iti (P.7.2.10) iṇṇiṣedhaḥ. **iṭ** (cf. P.7.3.96). ṣatvam (cf. P.8.3.59). evaṃ sarvatrāntaratamyād guṇavṛddhī bhavataḥ. 10 **guṇavṛddhiśabdenāvidhānād** ity³³ ayam arthaḥ. svaritatvād eva guṇavṛddhī anuvartisyete. ikas te iti vācyē yad guṇavṛddhīgrahaṇam tat samjñāvidhāne niyamārtham sūcayitum. yatra guṇavṛddhiśabdāv uccārya vidhīyete tatreka eveti. tena yatra guṇavṛddhisamśabdanam nāsti tatra vyañjane 'pi guṇavṛddhisamjñakā bhavanti. **dyaur** iti divśabdāt su. *diva aut* (P.7.1.84). alvidhitvāt sthānivattvābhāve 15 (cf. P.1.1.56) halīyādilopam (cf. P.6.1.68) akṛtvā rutvavisargau (cf. P.8.2.66, 8.3.15). **panthā** iti pathimathyādinā nakārasyaḥkārah (cf. P.7.1.85). *ito 'd* ityādinā (P.7.1.86) ikārasyaḥkārah. *tho nthah* (P.7.1.87). **sa** iti tyadādyattvam (cf. P.7.2.102). *tadoḥ sah sāv* iti (cf. P.7.2.106) sakārah.

4. na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke. (P.1.1.4)

20

(*Bhv.*) dhātvekadeśo dhātuḥ. dhātulopanimitta ārdhadhātuke ye guṇavṛddhī prāpnutas te na staḥ. loluvaḥ. popuvaḥ. marīmṛjaḥ. pacādyaci yaṇo luk. ika ity eva. abhāji. rāgaḥ.

³⁰ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 1 ad loc.: ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati nākārasya guṇo bhavatīti (*Mbh.* I 43.5).

³¹ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 1 ad loc.: ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati na vyañjanasya guṇo bhavatīti yad ayam janer daṃ śāsti (*Mbh.* I 43.11–12).

³² Cf. vārtt. 3 on P.3.1.11: ācāre galbhakṛtibahodebhyah klib vā (*Mbh.* II 21.8).

³³ *Bhv.*: guṇavṛddhiśabdenānabhīdhānāt.

||na dhā|| sarvadhātor lope¹ ārdhdhadhātukanimitte² guṇavṛddhibhāgapi
 nāsti· kim pratiṣedhenety³ āha· dhātvekadeśo dhātur iti· dhātulopa iti dhātor
 lopo⁴ yatrepī⁵· vaiyadhikaraṇye pi⁶ gamakatvād⁷ bahuvrīhiḥ· ārdhdhadhātukam anya-
 padārthaḥ· yadi dhātor lopo dhātulopa iti tatpuruṣaḥ syāt· tadāyaṃ⁸ sūtrārthaḥ
 5 ārdhdhadhātuke guṇavṛddhī ye· te⁹ dhātulope na bhavata¹⁰ iti· tataḥ¹¹ knopayatītyādau
 (yalopo) dhātvekadeśo lopa¹² iti guṇo na syād ata āha¹³· dhātulopanimitta iti knopayatī-
 tyādau na ārdhdhadhātukanimitto yalopaḥ¹⁴· kin tarhi dhātvavayavapakāranimittāḥ¹⁵·
 loluva iti lu[n]āter dhdhātor ekāca iti¹⁶ yañ¹⁷ dvirvacanam¹⁸
 abhyāsasya¹⁹ guṇaḥ pacādyac²⁰· yaño [ci] (ce)ti
 10 yaño luk· anena guṇaniṣedhe²¹ aci śnv ityādinā uvañ· marīmṛja
 iti mṛjū²² śuddhau· pūrvavad²³ yañ²⁴ dvirvacanam· ur ad ity²⁵ atvaṃ·
 raparatvaṃ· halādiśeṣaḥ rīg ṛdupadhasyeti
 rīgāgamah²⁶· nanu cāto lopa ity akāre²⁷ lupte yaño ci ceti yakāre
 ca· acaḥ parasminn²⁸ iti sthānivadbhāvād yañā²⁹ vyavadhāne guṇābhāvāc³⁰
 15 covāni loluva ityādi siddham· kim anena sūtreṇa· yathā yāyāvāra ity atrā(to lopa-
 sya) sthānivatvaṃ prāptaṃ na padānteti³¹ niṣidhyate³²· naitad asti· yady
 asmin viṣaye sthānivatvaṃ syāt tataś ca [yāyāter aci] yāyā ity atrākāralopaḥ³³ dīn
 kṣaye detya ity atra dīno yuḍ aci kñitīti³⁴ yuḍ jaṅgama ity
 atra gamahanetyādino(padhā)lopaḥ³⁵ syāt· tasmād asmin viviṣaye³⁶ aci ya-
 20 ño 'ci ceti samudāyasya lopaś tenājñhalsamudāyasya sthānivatvaṃ nāsti³⁷·
 dhātugrahaṇaṃ kim anubandhalope mā bhūt· lavitā ārdhdhadhātukagrahaṇaṃ³⁸ kim
 roravīti· ika ity eva abhāji rāgaḥ· abhājīti bhañješ ciñ ity³⁹ anu-
 nāsikalopaḥ· ([rāga]) iti ghañi⁴⁰ ca bhāvakaraṇayor iti⁴¹ dhātvekadeśalope py
 ubhayatra⁴² vṛddhiḥ ||

¹B: sarvvasya dhātor llope. ²SJ: -ttam. ³B and SJ add: ata. ⁴B: llopo. ⁵B: ya-
 treti. SJ: yasminn iti. ⁶SJ om. pi. ⁷B om. ⁸SJ: tad ayaṃ. ⁹B and SJ: ye guṇavṛddhī
 te. ¹⁰B: syātām. ¹¹SJ adds ca. ¹²B om. SJ: dhātvekadeśalopa. ¹³B: atā āha. ¹⁴B:
 dhātulopanimitte ārdhdhadhātuka ityādi | na hi knopayatītyādau ārdhdhadhātukanimittayalopo bha-
 vati. SJ: dhātulopanimitte ārdhdhadhātuka iti | nahi knopayatītyādau ārdhdhadhātukanimitto yalopaḥ.
¹⁵B: -prakāranimittāḥ. ¹⁶SJ adds -ādinā. ¹⁷SJ adds anubandhalopaḥ. ¹⁸B: dvirvacanam. ¹⁹SJ:
 abhyāse. ²⁰B: abhyāsaṅapacādyac. ²¹B and SJ om. ²²SJ: mṛjūṣ. ²³B: pūrvavad. ²⁴SJ:
 yañi. ²⁵B: dvirvacanādi. ²⁶B: ṛdupadhasya ceti rīk. SJ as A, but it has rīk at the end. ²⁷SJ:
 ākāre. ²⁸SJ adds: pūrvavidhāv. ²⁹B: sthānivatvā yaño. ³⁰SJ: -bhāve nittvāc. ³¹B: padāntasyeti.
 SJ: padāntetyādinā. ³²SJ: pratiśiddham. ³³B, SJ: yāyāter aci akāralopaḥ. ³⁴B: kñi. SJ om.
 kñitī. ³⁵SJ adds ca. B has: gamahanetyādi lopaḥ. ³⁶B and SJ: viṣaye. ³⁷B and SJ om. ³⁸B, SJ:
 ārdhdhadhātuke. ³⁹B and SJ: ciñity. ⁴⁰SJ: rañješ. ⁴¹SJ om. ⁴²SJ adds ca. B has: ubhayāyatra.

(*Pañj.*) ||**na dhā**||. sarvadhātor lopa ārdhadhātukanimitte guṇavṛddhibhāgo 'pi nāsti. kiṃ pratiśedhenety āha **dhātvekadeśo dhātur** iti.³⁴ **dhātulopa** iti dhātor lopo yatreti vaiyadhikaraṇye 'pi gamakatvād bahuvrīhiḥ. ārdhadhātukam anyapadārthaḥ. yadi dhātor lopo **dhātulopa** iti tatpuruṣaḥ syāt tadāyam sūtrārthaḥ: ārdhadhātuke guṇavṛddhī ye te dhātulope na bhavata iti. tataḥ knopayatītyādau 5 yalopo dhātvekadeśalopa iti guṇo na syād. ata āha **dhātulopanimitta** iti knopayatītyādau nārdhadhātukanimitto yalopaḥ. kiṃ tarhi? dhātvavayavapakāranimittaḥ (cf. P.6.1.66). **loluva** iti lunāter *dhātor ekāca* iti (cf. P.3.1.22) yañ. dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.9) abhyāsasya guṇaḥ (cf. P.7.4.82). pacādyac (cf. P.3.1.134). *yaño 'ci ceti* (P.2.4.74) yaño luk. anena guṇaniśedhe *aci śnv* ityādinā (P.6.4.77) uvañ. **marīmṛja** 10 iti *mṛjū śuddhau* (*Dhp.* 2.57). pūrvavad yañ dvirvacanam. *ur ad* ity (P.7.4.66) attvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). halādiśeṣaḥ (cf. P.7.4.60). *rīg ṛdupadhasyeti* (cf. P.7.4.90) rīgāgamaḥ. nanu *cāto lopa* ity (P.6.4.48) akāre lupte *yaño 'ci ceti* (P.2.4.74) yakāre ca *acaḥ parasminn* iti (cf. P.1.1.57) sthānivadbhāvād yañā vyavadhāne guṇābhāvāc covāni **loluva** ityādi siddham kim anena sūtreṇa? yathā yāyāvara ity atrāto lopa- 15 sya sthānivattvam prāptam *na padānteti* (cf. P.1.1.58) niśidhyate. naitad asti. yady asmin viṣaye sthānivattvam syāt tataś ca yāyāter aci yāyā ity atrākāralopaḥ. *dñi kṣaye* (*Dhp.* 4.26). detya ity atra *dño yuḍ aci knīti* (P.6.4.63) yuḥ jaṅgama ity atra *gamahanetyādinā* (P.6.4.98) upadhālopaḥ syāt. tasmād asmin viṣaye aci *yaño 'ci ceti* (P.2.4.74) samudāyasya lopaś tenājñhalsamudāyasya sthānivattvam nāsti.³⁵ 20 dhātugrahaṇam kim? anubandhalope mā bhūt. lavitā. ārdhadhātukagrahaṇam kim? roravīti. **ika ity eva abhāji rāgaḥ**. **abhājīti bhañjes** <ca> cināty (P.6.4.33) anu-nāsikalopaḥ. **rāga** iti *ghāni ca bhāvakaraṇayor* iti (P.6.4.27) dhātvekadeśalope 'py ubhayatra vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.116).

5. *knīti ca.* (P.1.1.5)

25

(*Bhv.*) kiti nīti ca nimitte ye guṇavṛddhī prāpnutas te na staḥ. kiti citam. stutam. bhuktam. kṛtam. sṛṣṭaḥ. nīti cinutaḥ. cinvanti. kurutaḥ. kurvanti. mṛṣṭaḥ. mṛjanti. mamṛjuḥ. katham mārjanti mamārjuḥ? *mṛjer ajādau samkrame vibhāṣā vṛddhir iṣyate* (*Kāś.* on P.1.1.5).³⁶ **vyavasthitavibhāṣayā nityam tundaparimṛjaḥ**. 30

³⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tasya [i.e. dhātoḥ] sarvasya lope kṛte yatra guṇavṛddhī prāpnutas tad ārdhadhātuke na sambhavaty eva, tat kiṃ pratiśedhena?*

³⁵ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *kiṃ ca yady ato lopaḥ kriyeta, jaṅgama ity atra 'gamahana' ity (P.6.4.98) upadhālopaḥ syāt. athātrānānīti pratiśedhas tarhi darīdrśa ity atra 'drśoh' iti (P.7.4.16) guṇaḥ syād; detya ity atra 'dño yuḍ aci' iti (P.6.4.63) yuḥ syāt... yadā punar yogavibhāgam akṛtvā viśeṣavihitaḥ samudāyaluk kriyate, tadā halacor ādeśasya sthānivattvābhāvād upadhālopādayo na bhavantīty avāśyam samudāyasya lug eṣitavyaḥ.*

³⁶ Cf. also *Pat.* on vārtt. 10 on P.1.1.3: *evam tarhīhānye vaiyādhikaraṇā mṛjer ajādau samkrame vibhāṣā vṛddhim ārabhante (Mbh. I 48.9).*

||kñiti· || ka ca ña ca kañau¹. kañāv itau yasya sa kñit· pratyayo
 'nyapadārthaḥ· nimittasaptamīyaṃ· na parasaptamī· anyathā² bhinna³ ityādau nirddiṣṭa-
 grahaṇasyānantaryyārthatvāt· pratiṣedho na syāt· tasmāt kñitīty anenānyārtham
 upāṭṭenāpradhāne⁴ guṇavṛddhī viśiṣyete⁵. na⁶ pradhānabhūto niṣedhaḥ· tena tasminn
 5 ityādikāyā vidhyaṅgaśeṣabhūtāyā atrāpravṛtṭih⁷ pradhāne sati guṇasya
 katham⁸ viśeṣaṇam i[ty ādeśānīyaṃ·] yatra [hi guṇo viśeṣa]ṇena sambandham anubhavan
 pradhānasya mahāntam upakāraṃ karoti· tatra guṇo pi viśiṣyata eva tad uktaṃ
 guṇaḥ kṛtā[tma]saṃskāraḥ pradhānaṃ pratipadyate |
 pradhānasyopakāre hi ta[thā] bhūyasi varttate⁹ ||

10 nimittasaptamīve halantāc ceti sūtrārambhaḥ· prakārāntaram citam stu-
 tam¹⁰ ityādau sārvaadhātukārddhadhātukayor iti guṇo niṣidhyate· bhuktam
 ityādau puḡantalaghūpadhaguṇaḥ¹¹. cinutaḥ cinvantīti· śnoḥ¹²
 sārvaadhātukam apid iti nīve dhāto[r gu]ṇaniṣedhaḥ· taso jheś ca nīve¹³
 śnupratyayasya bahuvacanasya¹⁴ huśnuvor iti¹⁵ yañādeśaḥ· mṛṣṭaḥ
 15 mṛjantīti¹⁶. mṛjer vṛddhir niṣidhyate¹⁷. mṛjer ajādāv iti· saṃkramo
 guṇavṛddhinīṣedhaviṣayaḥ¹⁸. vyavasthitavibhāṣayā (nītyam)¹⁹ tundaparimṛja iti
 kecit²⁰ bhāṣye (tu)²¹ tundaparimṛjaḥ tundaparimārja ity ubhayaṃ· darśitaṃ· yathā-
 saṃkhyam atra neṣyate²². ṛdṛśo 'ñiti²³ sūtrārambhāt²⁴ ||

20

||dīdhī || akaṇiṣam araṇiṣam iti· kaṇa nimīlane· raṇir
 gatau ca· kāṇaḥ śabdārtho vā tābhyām²⁵ luñ.²⁶ mipam āśritya

¹B: kñau. SJ: tāv. ²SJ adds hi. ³B, SJ: bhinnam. ⁴B: upāṭṭenāpradhānena. SJ: upāṭṭe
 'pradhāne. ⁵B: viśiṣyate. ⁶B and SJ add: tu. ⁷SJ: atra pravṛtṭi. ⁸SJ rev. ⁹SJ: bhūya
 nivarttate. ¹⁰B: stum. ¹¹B, SJ: laghūpadhaguṇaḥ. ¹²SJ: śnupratyayasya. ¹³B: tasoḥ nī. ¹⁴SJ:
 śnupratyaye bahuvacane. B: śnupratyayasya bahuvacane. ¹⁵B: huśnuvo ti. ¹⁶SJ adds -ādau. ¹⁷SJ:
 pratiṣiddhyate. ¹⁸B, SJ: guṇavṛddhipratiṣedhaviṣayo. ¹⁹B, SJ om. ²⁰SJ: keṣāñcin mataṃ. ²¹B,
 SJ om. ²²B, SJ: na bhavati. ²³B: ṛdṛśo iti guṇa iti. SJ: ṛdṛśoñi guṇa iti. ²⁴SJ: guṇārambhāt.
²⁵B: kaṇa raṇeti śabdārtho vā dvābhyām. SJ: daṇḍake ābhyām. ²⁶SJ adds: mip aḍāgamaḥ
 tasthetyādinā mipo 'm cleḥ sic iḍāgamaḥṣatvam | atra.

(*Pañj.*) ||**knīti**||. ka ca ña ca kañau. kañāv itau yasya sa knīti pratyayo 'nyapadārthaḥ. nimittasaptamīyaṃ na parasaptamī. anyathā bhinna ityādau nirdiṣṭa-grahaṇasyānantaryārthatvāt pratiśedho na syāt.³⁷ tasmāt **knīti**ty anenānyārtham upāṭṭenāpradhāne guṇavṛddhī viśiṣyete. na pradhānabhūto niśedhaḥ. tena *tasminn* ityādikāyā (P.1.1.66) vidhyaṅgaśeṣabhūtāyā atrāpravṛtṭiḥ. pradhāne sati guṇasya 5 katham viśeṣaṇam ity ādeśanīyam. yatra hi guṇo viśeṣaṇena saṃbandham anubhavan pradhānasya mahāntam upakāraṃ karoti tatra guṇo 'pi viśiṣyata eva.³⁸ tad uktam:

*guṇaḥ kṛtātmasaṃskāraḥ pradhānaṃ pratipadyate |
pradhānasyopakāre hi tathā bhūyasi vartate ||.*³⁹

nimittasaptamīve *halantāc ceti* (P.1.2.10) sūtrārambhaḥ prakārāntaram. **citam stutam** ityādau *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayor* iti (P.7.3.84) guṇo niśidhyate. **bhuktam** ityādau pugantalaghūpadhaguṇaḥ (cf. P.7.3.86). **cinutaḥ cinvantīti** śnoḥ *sārvadhātukam apid* iti (P.1.2.4) nīttve dhātor guṇaniśedhaḥ. taso jheś ca nīttve śnupratyayasya bahuvacane *huśnuvor* iti (cf. P.6.4.87) yañādeśaḥ. **mṛṣṭaḥ mṛjantīti** mṛjer vṛddhir niśidhyate (cf. P.7.2.114). **mṛjer ajādāv** iti **saṃkramo** 15 guṇavṛddhinīśedhaviśayaḥ. **vyavasthitavibhāṣayā nityaṃ tundaparimṛja** iti kecit.⁴⁰ bhāṣye tu tundaparimṛjaḥ tundaparimārja ity ubhayaṃ darśitam.⁴¹ yathā-saṃkhyam (cf. P.1.3.10) atra neṣyate *ṛdṛśo 'nīti* (cf. P.7.4.16) sūtrārambhāt.

6. *dīdhīvevīṭām.* (P.1.1.6)

(*Bhv.*) **dīdhīvevyau chāndasau. iṭo guṇo na syāt. akaṇiṣam. araṇiṣam.** 20 **luṇi mipi laghūpadhaguṇo 'tra** (cf. P.7.3.86) **niśiddhaḥ.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**dīdhī**||. **akaṇiṣam araṇiṣam** iti *kaṇa nimīlane* (*Dhp.* 10.175) *raṇa gatau* (*Dhp.* 1.832)⁴² ca. *kaṇaḥ śabdārtho vā.*⁴³ *tābhyāṃ luṇi. mipam āśritya*

³⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *knīti*ty *yadyāyaṃ parasaptamī syād anantarasyaivekaḥ pratiśedhaḥ syāt, citāḥ citavān ityādau, vyavahitasya bhinnno bhinnavān ityādau na syāt, 'tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya' ity (P.1.1.66) atra nirdiṣṭagrāhaṇasyānantaryārthatvāt.*

³⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **knīnnimīte ye guṇavṛddhī** *iti. knīnnimītam yayos te tathokte. te punar ye knīnnimīte sati prāpnutas te vijñeye. etena guṇavṛddhiviśeṣaṇaṃ knīdgrāhaṇam iti darśayati. nanu ca vidhīyamānatayā prādhānyāt pratiśedhasyaivaitat viśeṣaṇaṃ yuktam, naitad asti, yatra hi guṇaḥ kṛtātmasaṃskāraḥ pradhānopakārāya mahate prabhavati, tatra pradhānasyaiva bhūyāṃsam upakāraṃ kartum ātmanaḥ saṃskāram anubhūya pradhānena saṃbandham anubhavati.*

³⁹ This verse is quoted in *Nyāsa* ad loc.

⁴⁰ This opinion is stated by Puruṣottamadeva and Śaraṇadeva. Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham nityaṃ tundaparimṛjaḥ. 'tundaśokayoḥ parimṛjāpanudor' iti (P.3.2.5) kapratyaye mṛjer ajādau saṃkrame vibhāṣā vṛddhir iṣyata iti vṛddhiprasaṅgāt. ucyate: vyavasthitavibhāṣayā na vṛddhiḥ.*

⁴¹ Cf. *Pat.* on P.3.2.5 vārtt. 1: *tundaśokayoḥ parimṛjāpanudor ity atrālasyasukhāharaṇayor iti vaktavyam. tundaparimṛjo 'lasaḥ... yo hi tundaṃ parimārṣṭi tundaparimārjaḥ sa bhavati. (Mbh. II 98.15–17).*

⁴² Cf. *Dhp.* 1.831–2: *kaṇa raṇa gatau.*

⁴³ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.472 and 476: *raṇa (472) kaṇa (476)... śabdārthāḥ. Nyāsa* ad loc.: *'aṇa raṇa kaṇa' ityādau śabdārthe. Pad.: 'kaṇiraṇi śabdārthau'.*

sijantasyāṅgatve laghūpadhaguṇaḥ prāpnoti· atah sa niṣidhyate· ata
 evāha¹ laghūpadhaguṇo tra niṣidhyata iti²· āgamasyeṭo grahaṇam na³ dhātor
 iṭa kaṭa⁴ gatāv ity asya⁵ dhātusāhacaryyāt prāptasya⁶· pūrvanipātavyabhicārena⁷
 sāhacaryyasya nirastatvāt⁸ ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valāder ity atreḍ
 5 iti varttamāne⁹ yat¹⁰ punar iṭgrahaṇam¹¹ karoti¹² tasyedaṃ prayojanam·
 svarūpeṇāvasthānam¹³ iṭo yathā syāt anyad¹⁴ aṅgakāryyam mā bhūd iti· anenaiva¹⁵
 guṇābhāve siddhe· iṭo pi grahaṇam vispaṣṭārtham¹⁶· kiñcaivam sati pipathīṃsi
 brāhmaṇakulānīty atra sāntamahata ityādinā dīrghatvam na syāt¹⁷ ||

10

||halo || saṃlagnā i(ti) saṃśliṣṭāḥ ajbhir avyavahitā iti yāvat· agnir ityādi
 rūpodāharaṇam· kāryyodāharaṇan tu¹⁸ gleyād iti· vānyasya saṃyogāder ity
 etvam¹⁹· hala iti bahuvacanam atantram tena dvayor bahūnāñ
 15 ca²⁰ bhavati· samudāyasyaiṣā saṃjñā mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇāt²¹· hala iti
 kiṃ tita-u cchatram· saṃyogasaṃjñāyām saṃyogāntalopaḥ²² syāt·
 anantarā iti kiṃ pacati panasam skor ityādinā salopaḥ syāt·
 (saṃyogasaṃjñā)pradeśas²³ tu saṃyoge gurv²⁴ iti· ||

20

||mukha || mukhasahitayety²⁵ anena²⁶ śākapārthivāditvāt madhyapadalopī
 samāsaḥ sūtra iti darśayati²⁷ uccāryata

¹B, SJ: prāpnotīty āha. ²B, SJ: laghūpadhaguṇo 'treti. ³SJ adds tu. ⁴SJ: iṭ kiṭ. ⁵B adds: dhātor. ⁶SJ om. ⁷B: pūrvva-. SJ: pūrvanipāte vyabhicāreṇa. ⁸B: sāhacaryanirastatvād. ⁹B: atra iḍ ity atvavarttamāne. ¹⁰B, SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds yat. ¹²B om. ¹³B, SJ: svena rūpeṇāvasthānam. ¹⁴B, SJ om. ¹⁵B, SJ om. ¹⁶B: spaṣṭārtham. ¹⁷SJ om. B has: kiñca evam sati pipa..si kulānīty atra sāntamahataḥ saṃyogāntasyeti dīrgho na syāt. ¹⁸SJ adds mleyād. ¹⁹B: añ. ²⁰SJ: saṃjñā. ²¹SJ: mahatīsaṃjñākaraṇāt | tena niryāyād ity atra na bhavati|. ²²SJ: saṃyogalopaḥ. ²³B: savasana.. aḥ saṃyogādyor ityā..dinā salopaḥ | pradeśāt. SJ like A, but it omits: saṃyogasaṃjñā-. ²⁴B: gurv. SJ: gurur. ²⁵SJ: -hitety. ²⁶SJ adds: sūtre. ²⁷SJ om.

sijantasyāṅgatve laghūpadhagūṇaḥ (cf. P.7.3.86) prāpnoti. ataḥ sa niṣidhyate. ata evāha **laghūpadhagūṇo 'tra niṣidhyata** iti. āgamasyeṭo grahaṇam na dhātor *īta kṛta gatāv* ity⁴⁴ asya dhātusāhacaryāt prāptasya pūrvanipātavyabhicāreṇa (cf. P.2.2.34) sāhacaryasya nirastatvāt.⁴⁵ *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valāder* ity (P.7.2.35) atreḍ iti vartamāne (cf. P.7.2.8) yat punar iḍgrahaṇam karoti tasyedaṃ prayojanam: svarūpeṇāvasthānam iṭo yathā syāt anyad aṅgakāryam mā bhūd ity⁴⁶ anenaiva guṇābhāve siddhe iṭo 'pi grahaṇam vispaṣṭārtham. kiṃ caivam sati pipaṭhīṃṣi brāhmaṇakulānīty⁴⁷ atra *sāntamahata* ityādinā (P.6.4.10) dīrghatvam na syāt.

7. halo 'nantarāḥ saṃyogaḥ. (P.1.1.7)

(*Bhv.*) **saṃlagnā halaḥ saṃyogaḥ ity ucyante. agnir iti ganau. strīti satarāḥ.** 10

(*Pañj.*) ||**halo**||. **saṃlagnā** iti saṃśliṣṭā ajbhir avyavahitā iti yāvat. **agnir** ityādi rūpodāharaṇam. kāryodāharaṇam tu gleyād iti *vānyasya saṃyogāder* ity (P.6.4.68) ettvam. **hala** iti bahuvacanam atantram (cf. *PP* 117, *NP* 73). tena dvayor bahūnām ca bhavati.⁴⁸ samudāyasyaisā saṃjñā mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇāt.⁴⁹ **hala** iti kim? tita-u cchatram.⁵⁰ saṃyogasamjñāyām saṃyogāntalopaḥ syāt (cf. P.8.2.23). **anantarā** iti kim? pacati panasam.⁵¹ *skor* ityādinā (P.8.2.29) salopaḥ syāt. saṃyogasamjñāpradeśas tu *saṃyoge gurv* iti (P.1.4.11). 15

8. mukhanāsikāvacano 'nunāsikaḥ. (P.1.1.8)

(*Bhv.*) **mukhasahitayā nāsikayā yo varṇa uccāryate so 'nunāsika-samjñakaḥ syāt. aṃ. āṃ. oṃ. nāṇaṇanamāḥ. dadhiṃ.** 20

(*Pañj.*) ||**mukha**||. **mukhasahitayety** anena śākapārthivādītvan madhyapadalopī samāsaḥ (cf. vārtt. 8 on P.2.1.69, *Mbh.* I 406.5) sūtra iti darśayati.⁵² **uccāryata**

⁴⁴ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.340–2 and *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *īta kṛta kṛtī gatau. Pad.* has: *īta kṛta gatau.*

⁴⁵ *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha 'īta kṛta kṛtī gatau' ity asya grahaṇam kasmān na bhavati, yuktaṃ caitat, dhātusāhacaryāt? naitad asti; iha 'alpāctaram' iti (P.2.2.34) iṭaḥ pūrvanipāte kartavye tad-viparyāsam kurvataitat sūcitam – 'anyo 'py atra kaṃcid viparyāso vijñēyah' iti. tena dhātusāhacaryād dhātugrahaṇe prāpte tadviparītasyaivāgamasya grahaṇam vijñāyate.*

⁴⁶ Cf. *Pat.* ad loc.: *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ ity (P.7.2.35) atreḍ iti vartamāne punar iḍgrahaṇasya prayojanam id eva yathā syād yad anyat prāpnoti tan mā bhūd iti. kiṃ cānyat prāpnoti. guṇaḥ. [Mbh. I 56.12–13] Cf. also Pad. ad loc.: nanu ca 'neḍ vaśī kṛtī' ity (P.7.2.8) ata id ity anuvartamāne 'ārdhadhātukasyeṭ' ity (P.7.2.35) punar iḍgrahaṇam 'id eva yathā syād, vikāro mā bhūd' ityevamartham bhaviṣyati.*

⁴⁷ This example is explained in *Mbh.* and *Pad.*

⁴⁸ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc. (*jātau cedam bahuvacanam, tena dvayor bahūnām ca saṃyogasamjñā siddhā bhavati*) and *Nyāsa* on it (*jātau cetyādi. caśabdo yasmādarthe. yasmāj jātau bahuvacanam tena dvayor bahūnām ca saṃyogasamjñā siddhā bhavati*).

⁴⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **samudāyah saṃjñāti** (*Kās.* ad loc.)... mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇam.

⁵⁰ *Kās.* ad loc. Cf. *Nirukta* 4.9: *tita-u paripavanaḥ bhavati.*

⁵¹ *Kās.* ad loc.

⁵² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **mukhasahitā nāsikā mukhanāsikā** ity anena mukhanāsikāśabdo 'yam tatpuruṣaḥ... tatpuruṣas tu mayūravayamsakādītvaḍ (cf. P.2.1.72) veditavyaḥ.

ity anena vacana iti karmmaṇi lyuṭ anvarthasaṃjñeyaṃ· nāsikām
 anugato 'nunāsika iti¹· nāsikāyāḥ paścāt vyāpriyate yatra varṇavibhāge² (mukham
 iti) āṃ āṃṇiti³ rūpodāharaṇaṃ⁴ kāryyodāharaṇan tu vānmayam·
 mukhagrahaṇam kim· anusvārasyaiva⁵ syāt⁶· nāsikāgrahaṇam kim⁷· kacaṭatapanām⁸
 5 mā bhūt saṃjñāpradeśas tu yaro '[nuka] ityādikah⁹ ||

10

||tulyā || tulayā sammitam tulyam· nauvayodharma¹⁰ ityādinā
 yat· asyate kṣipyate annādikam¹¹ asminn iti· āsyam mukham bahulava-
 15 canād a(dhi)karaṇe ṇyat· āsyē bhavam āsyam
 tālvādisthānam¹²· śarīrāvayavād yat· halo yamām yami lopa
 iti yakārasya lopaḥ¹³· prayatanam prayatnaḥ prāṇādivāyor jāto
 va[rṇa]dharmmas¹⁴ prstatā· īsatprstatā vivrtatā· samvrtatā¹⁵ ceti· tulya āsyē tālvādau
 prayatnaḥ prstatādivarṇaṅo¹⁶ yasya tat tathokta[m] varṇam anyapadārthaḥ
 20 gamakatvād bahuvrīhiḥ· samānañ ca tad varṇaṅ ceti savarṇam jyotir
 janapadeti¹⁷ samānasya¹⁸ sabhāvaḥ āsyaviśiṣṭasya¹⁹ tulyatvād āsyasyāpi
 tulyatvam yathā devadattayaḥjñadattayo[s tulyam] kāmasyapā[tryām bho]janam i[ty
 u]kte kāmasyapātry api tulyeti²⁰ gamyate etad evālokya²¹ sūtrārtham āha tulyam
 āsyam ityādi· anyonyam²² iti sambandhiśabdavyāt yo yasya tulyāsyā(prayatna)h²³ sa
 25 tasya savarṇasaṃjñaka iti gamyate ko sau ([kasya])²⁴ savarṇa ity [āśaṅkyāha]²⁵· vargyo

¹SJ om. ²SJ: varṇabhāge. ³B: 'rthe āṃṇiti. SJ: mukham iti. ⁴SJ adds: darśitam. ⁵SJ adds
 hi. ⁶B: anusvāravati yathā syāt. ⁷SJ: tu. ⁸SJ: -tapām. ⁹B: yaro 'nunāsika ityādi. SJ: yaro
 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vetyādi. ¹⁰B: nauvadhā. SJ: nauvaya. ¹¹B: annanā.kam. SJ: annapānādikam.
¹²B: tālva..nādisthānam. ¹³B, SJ om. ¹⁴B and SJ add: spr̥ṣṭatādih. ¹⁵B: īsatvivrtā saṃvivrtā.
¹⁶B: spr̥ṣṭatādi. ¹⁷SJ adds -ādinā. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹B: āsyaviśiṣṭe. ²⁰SJ om. iti. ²¹SJ: evālocya.
²²B: anonyam. ²³SJ: samitiśabdād yena samāno ya 'sya prayatnaḥ. ²⁴B, SJ: kena. ²⁵B: āha. SJ:
 ata āha.

ity anena **vacana** iti karmaṇi lyuṭ (cf. P.3.3.113). anvarthasaṃjñeyam: nāsikām anugato '**nunāsika** iti nāsikāyāḥ paścāt vyāpriyate yatra varṇavibhāge mukham iti.⁵³ **am̃ am̃** iti rūpodāharaṇam. kāryodāharaṇam tu vānmayam (cf. P.8.4.45). mukhagrahaṇam kim? anusvārasyaiva syāt. nāsikāgrahaṇam kim? kacatātapānām mā bhūt.⁵⁴ saṃjñāpradeśas tu *yaro* '**nunāsika** ityādi (P.8.4.45). 5

9. tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇam. (P.1.1.9)

(*Bhv.*) tulyam āsyam tālvādisthānam prayatnaḥ spr̥ṣṭatādīś ca yeṣāṃ te 'nyonyam savarṇasaṃjñakāḥ syuḥ. vargyo vargyeṇa savarṇaḥ. acaḥ sasthānāḥ. *anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇaḥ* (P.8.4.58). śaṅkitā. kuṇḍitā. *akāḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P.6.1.101). daṇḍāgram. khaṭvāgram. 10
*ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ savarṇasaṃjñā vaktavyā.*⁵⁵ hotṛ ḷkāro hotṛkārah. ḷkāro dīrgho nāstīti ṛkārah.

(*Pañj.*) ||**tulyā**||. tulayā sammitam **tulyam.**⁵⁶ *nauvayodharma* ityādinā (P.4.4.91) yat.⁵⁷ asyate kṣipyate 'nnādikam asminn ity āsyam mukham.⁵⁸ bahulava- canād adhikaraṇe ṇyat (cf. P.3.3.113).⁵⁹ āsyē bhavam (cf. P.4.3.53) **āsyam** 15 tālvādisthānam. śarīrāvayavād yat (cf. P.4.3.55).⁶⁰ *halo yamāṃ yami lopa* iti (P.8.4.64) yakārasya lopaḥ. prayatanam **prayatnaḥ**⁶¹ prānādivāyor jāto varṇadharmāḥ spr̥ṣṭatā īṣatspr̥ṣṭatā vivṛtatā samvṛtatā ceti. tulya āsyē tālvādu prayatnaḥ spr̥ṣṭatādivarṇaguṇo yasya tat tathoktam varṇam anyapadārthaḥ. gamakatvād bahuvrīhiḥ. samānam ca tad varṇam ceti **savarṇam.**⁶² *jyotir* 20 *janapadeti* (cf. P.6.3.85) samānasya sabhāvaḥ. āsyaviśiṣṭasya tulyatvād āsyasyāpi tulyatvam. yathā devadattayaḥjñadattayos tulyam kāṃsyapātryām bhojanam ity ukte kāṃsyapātry api tulyeti gamyate. etad evālokya sūtrārtham āha **tulyam āsyam** ityādi. **anyonyam** iti saṃbandhiśabdatvād yo yasya tulyāsyaprayatnaḥ sa tasya **savarṇasaṃjñaka** iti gamyate. ko 'sau kasya savarṇa ity āśaṅkyāha **vargyo** 25

⁵³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc: *anu paścān nāsikā vyāpriyate yasmīn, atha vā – anu paścān nāsikāyā vyāpriyate [mukham] yasmīn asau 'anunāsikah' ity anvarthasaṃjñā yathā vijñāyety evamartham.*

⁵⁴ *Kās.* ad loc.

⁵⁵ Cf. vārtt. 5 ad loc. (*ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ savarṇavidhiḥ, Mbh. I 62.27*) and Pat. on it (*ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ savarṇasaṃjñā vidheyā, Mbh. I 62.28*).

⁵⁶ Cf. Pat. ad loc.: *tulayā sammitam tulyam [Mbh. I 61.2].*

⁵⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tulayā sammitam tulyam iti 'nauvayodharma' ityādinā (P.4.4.91) yatam utpādyā tulyaśabdo vyutpādyate.*

⁵⁸ Cf. Pat. ad loc.: *asyanty anena varṇān ity āsyam. annam etad āsyandata iti vāsyam (Mbh. I 61.4).*

⁵⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *asyate kṣipyate 'nnam aneneti 'kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam' iti (P.3.3.113) karaṇe ṇyat.*

⁶⁰ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc. (*āsyē bhavam āsyam tālvādisthānam*) and Pat. on vārtt. 2 ad loc. (*āsyē bhavam āsyam. śarīrāvayavād [P.5.1.6] yat; Mbh. I 61.25*).

⁶¹ The same *Kās.* and Pat. (*Mbh. I 61.5*) ad loc.

⁶² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha vā samāno varṇaḥ 'savarṇaḥ' ity anvarthasaṃjñeyam.*

vargyeṇeti· varge bhavo vargyaḥ digāditvād yat· acaḥ sasthanā¹

iti pratyāhāragrhitāḥ² samānasthānā acaḥ³ samānaprayatnās ca⁴ savarṇasamjñakā bha-
vantīty arthaḥ· śaṅkiteti· śaki śaṅkāyām num

trc· iṭ naś cāpadāntasye[ty]⁵

5 anusvāraḥ· anena savarṇasamjñāyām anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇatvam śakārah⁶
daṇḍāgram khaṭvāgram iti· akuhavisarjanīyāḥ kaṅṭhyā iti·
vivṛtam karanam ūsmanām svarānām ca⁷· akārākārayoḥ sāvṛṇyam· āsyagrahaṇam kiṃ·
kacātatapānām⁸ tulyaprayatnānām bhinnasthānānām mā⁹ bhūt· kiñ ca syāt¹⁰ prāptety
atra¹¹ takāre pare¹² pakārasya lopaḥ syāt prayatnagrahaṇam (kiṃ)¹³

10 icuyaśānām tulyasthānānām¹⁴ bhinnaprayatnānām nivṛtyartham· (anyathā)¹⁵ aruś cyo-
tatīty atra cakāre parataḥ śakārasya lopaḥ syāt¹⁶· ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ
savarṇasamjñā vaktavyeti prāyeṇeti boddhavyam· tena prakḷpyamāna ity atra
rvarṇāc¹⁷ ceti· aṭkuvādinā ṇatvam na bhavati· jñāpakañ cātra ṛ ḷg
ity atra ḷkārasypādānam¹⁸ ḷvarṇasya dīrgho nāstīti prayogādarśanāt· ||

15

||nājjha || daṇḍahastam dadhi śītam ity atra akārahakārayor ikāra-

20 śakārayoś ca tulyasthānaprayatnatvāt pūrveṇa prāptā¹⁹ pratiśidhyate· tenākāḥ
savarṇe dīrghatvam²⁰ na bhavati· yady api dīrghavidhāv acīty anuvṛttau
hakāraśakārayor actvābhāvād dīrghatvābhāvasiddhau²¹ dandahasta
ityādi siddham²²· tathāpi vaipāśīsiddhaye kriyamāṇam etadartham api²³ bhavati· (vai-
pāśā iti²⁴·) vipāśī²⁵ bhava ity²⁶ 'aṇ· ādivṛddhiḥ· ikāraśakārayoḥ
25 savarṇasamjñāpratiśedhād yasyeti²⁷ lopo na bhavati· ānaduham

¹B: samsthānā. ²SJ: pratyāhārasamgrhitāḥ. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ om. ⁵B, SJ: naś cāpadāntasya jhalīty. ⁶B: anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇa iti śakārah. SJ: anusvārasyetyādinā parasavarṇe śakārah kriyate. ⁷B: kaṅṭhyāḥ vivṛtakaṇam svarānām iti. SJ: kaṅṭhyāḥ vivṛtam karanam svarānām iti. ⁸SJ: -tapām. B om. ⁹SJ: asamānasthānānām. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds: jharo jhari savarṇa iti. ¹²SJ om. ¹³B, SJ om. ¹⁴B om. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶B: ..kārasya cakāre parato lopo mā bhūt. SJ: śakārasya cakāre parato lopo mā bhūt. ¹⁷SJ: kḷpyamāna ivārṇās. ¹⁸B, SJ: ḷkāropādānam. ¹⁹B: pūrveṇa prāptau. ²⁰SJ: iti dīrghaḥ. ²¹B: dīrghatvam na bhavati. SJ: dīrghatvam na bhaviṣyati. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ om. ²⁴SJ: vaipāśīti. ²⁵SJ: vipāśē. ²⁶SJ adds arthe. ²⁷B: savarṇapratīśedhā.. ..ti ceti. SJ: sāvṛṇyapratīśedhāt yasyeti ceti.

vargyeṇeti. varge bhavo **vargyaḥ.** digāditvād yat (cf. P.4.3.54). **acaḥ sasthanā** iti pratyāhāragṛhītāḥ samānasthanā acaḥ samānaprayatnās ca savarṇasamjñakā bhavāntīty arthaḥ. **śaṅkiteti śaki śaṅkāyām** (*Dhp.* 1.86). num (cf. P.7.1.58). tṛc (cf. P.3.1.133). iṭ (cf. P.7.2.35). **naś cāpadāntasyety** (cf. P.8.3.24) anusvārah. anena savarṇasamjñāyām anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇatvaṃ ākārah 5 (cf. P.8.4.58). **daṇḍāgram khaṭvāgram** iti. akuhavisarjanīyāḥ kaṇṭhyā iti vivṛtaṃ karaṇam ūṣmaṇam svarāṇam cākārākārayoḥ sāvarṇyam. āsyagrahaṇam kim? kacaṭatapānām tulyaprayatnānām bhinnasthanānām mā bhūt. kim ca syāt? prāptety atra takāre pare pakārasya lopaḥ syāt (cf. P.8.4.65).⁶³ prayatnagrahaṇam kim? icuyasānām tulyasthanānām bhinnaprayatnānām nivṛttyartham. anyathā aruś cyo- 10 tatīty atra cakāre parataḥ śakārasya lopaḥ syāt (cf. P.8.4.65).⁶⁴ **ṛkāra·ḷkārayoḥ savarṇasamjñā vaktavyeti** prāyeṇeti boddhavyam. tena prakḷpyamāna ity atra *ṛvarṇāc ceti*⁶⁵ atkūpvādinā ṇatvaṃ na bhavati (cf. P.8.4.2). jñāpakaṃ cātra *ṛ lg* ity (Ś.sū. 2) atra ḷkārasypādānam.⁶⁶ **ḷvarṇasya**⁶⁷ **dīrgho nāstīti** prayogādarśanāt.

10. *nājjhalau.* (P.1.1.10) 15

(*Bhv.:*) **aj-halau parasparaṃ savarṇasamjñakau na staḥ. daṇḍahastaḥ. dadhi śītam. vaipāśo**⁶⁸ **matsyaḥ. ānaḍuham carma. yasyeti ceti** (P.6.4.148) **lopo na bhavati.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**nājjha**||. **daṇḍahasto dadhi śītam** ity atra akārahakārayor ikāraśakārayoś ca tulyasthanaprayatnatvāt pūrveṇa prāptaṃ pratiśidhyate. tenākaḥ 20 savarṇe dīrghatvaṃ na bhavati (cf. P.6.1.101). yady api dīrghavidhāv *acīty* anuvṛttau (cf. P.6.1.77) hakāraśakārayor actvābhāvād dīrghatvābhāvasiddhau **daṇḍahasta** ityādi siddham tathāpi vaipāśādisiddhaye kriyamāṇam etadartham api bhavati. **vai-pāśa** iti vipāśi bhava ity aṅ (cf. P.4.3.53). ādivṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.117). ikāraśakārayoḥ savarṇasamjñāpratiśedhād **yasyeti** (cf. P.6.4.148) lopo na bhavati. **ānaḍuham** 25

⁶³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *āsyagrahaṇam? kacaṭatapānām bhinnasthanānām tulyaprayatnānām mā bhūt. kim ca syāt? tarptā tarptum ity atra 'jharo jhari savarṇe' iti* (P.8.4.65) *pakārasya takāre lopaḥ syāt.* The example *tarptā* is found also in *Bhv.* on P.8.4.65.

⁶⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *prayatnagrahaṇam kim? icuyasānām tulyasthanānām bhinnajātīyānām mā bhūt. kim ca syāt? aruś cyotatīty atra 'jharo jhari savarṇe' iti* (P.8.4.65) *śakārasya cakāre lopaḥ syāt.*

⁶⁵ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 1 on P.8.4.1: *raśābhyām no ṇaḥ samānapada ṛkāraḥ ceti vaktavyam* (*Mbh.* III 452.3–4). Śaraṇadeva in his *Durghaṭavṛtti* used the same wording as in *Pañj.* Cf. fn. 66.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *kathaṃ prakḷpyamānaḥ. ṛkāra·ḷkārayoḥ savarṇasamjñā vaktavyety ṛvarṇāc ceti ṇatvaprasaṅgāt. ucyate ur iti vaktavye varṇagrahaṇam asyānityatvārtham. tena. yad vā 'ṛ lg' ity (Ś.sū. 2) atra pratyāhāra lgrahaṇam śakyam akartum. yathā sāvarṇyād ṛkāra ṛkāraṃ gṛhṇāti tathā ḷkāram api grāhayiṣyati. kim ḷkāreṇa. taj jñāpayaty ṛkāra·ḷkārayoḥ sāvarṇyam anityam iti. tena yathā kḷṣptaśikheti 'guror anṛta' iti* (cf. P.8.2.86) *pluto bhavati na tv anṛta iti pratiśedhas tathā prakḷpyamāna iti ṇatvābhāvaḥ.*

⁶⁷ *Bhv.:* **ḷkāro.**

⁶⁸ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971) and Mishra (1989): **vai-pāśī.** Chakravarti (1918) and Vedāntatīrtha (1912): **vai-pāśo.**

iti anaduhō vikāra ity arthe prāṇirajatādibhyo 'ñ atrāpi
 (ha)kāralopo na bhavati· iha pūrvam varṇānām upadeśaḥ tata
 itsamjñā tata ādir antyenetī¹ pratyāhāraḥ tato 'ñ ity²
 aj iti nirjñāte³ savarṇasamjñā na hy anirjñāte⁴ apavāde utsargapravṛttir⁵ iti· tena
 5 savarṇasamjñā (pratyāhārasamjñā)m apekṣata iti⁶· savarṇasamjñāyām abhinirvṛttāyām
 aṇ ud ityādīnā aṇ savarṇasya grāhako⁷ bhavati· evañ ca samjñāvidhāne
 grahaṇakaśāstra[syā]nabhinirvṛttatvāt⁸ nājñhalāv ity atrājgrahaṇenāgrhītasavarṇam⁹
 evopāttam iti dīrghānām apratisiddhā¹⁰ savarṇasamjñā tenāgrhītasavarṇānām ayaṃ
 pratiśedhaḥ grhītasavarṇānām¹¹ tu¹² kumārī śeta ityādaḥ savarṇadīrghābhāvārtham¹³
 10 iko yaṇ acīty ato 'cīty¹⁴ anuvarttanīyaṃ· ||

15 ||īdū ||· agnī vāyū iti prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇa (iti)¹⁵
 dīrghaḥ atra param praty ādivac¹⁶ ceti dvivacanavyapa-
 deśaḥ¹⁷ īdūdantatā cādyantavad¹⁸ ekasmīn iti· pragṛhyatve sati¹⁹ dīrghayaṇau
 na bhavataḥ khaṭve ihety atrāyādeśaḥ²⁰·
 mañivādīnām ityādi²¹· matabhedā[d va] sādrśye cāvyaṃ²² iti viśvaḥ tathā
 20 ca raghuḥ· śātravam va papur yaśaḥ²³ taparakaraṇam asandehārtham²⁴· ||

||ada²⁵ || īdūded iti prakaraṇāt grhyate· edgraha[[2-3]]nam atra na²⁶ sambhavati²⁷·
 25 amī atreti· adaso jas tyadādyatvam· pararūpatvam·
 jasaḥ śibhāvaḥ· ād guṇaḥ eta īd bahuvacana²⁸
 itītvamatve krte atraśabde parato²⁹ yaṇ na bhavati· amū ānayeti adasa au

¹B: antena saheteti. SJ: antyena saheteti. ²SJ om. ³SJ: hal iti nirjāte. ⁴SJ: atinirjāte. ⁵SJ: utsargasya pravṛttir. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: savarṇagrāhako. ⁸SJ: -śāstrasya anatinirvṛttatvāt. ⁹SJ om. atra. ¹⁰SJ: pratiśiddhā. ¹¹B, SJ: grhītasavarṇānām. ¹²B om. ¹³B, SJ: savarṇadīrghatvābhāvārtham. ¹⁴B, SJ: ato 'jgrahaṇam. ¹⁵B: pūrvasavarṇe. ¹⁶SJ: para-pratyayādivac. ¹⁷B: dvirvvacanaṃ vyapadeśa. SJ: dvivacanam. ¹⁸B: inta{tvā}bhāvādyantavad. ¹⁹SJ om. ²⁰SJ: iha pragṛhyatve ayādeśo na. ²¹SJ: iti. ²²B, SJ: sādrśyārtham avyaṃ. ²³SJ om. B: tathā ca raghuvākyam śātravam va yaśaḥ papuḥ. ²⁴B: aśandehārtham. SJ adds iti. ²⁵B: adaso. ²⁶B: prakaraṇādigrahaṇam na [ta]trāsau. ²⁷SJ om. the whole sentence. ²⁸B: bahubahuvacana. ²⁹B: itītvam matvam atra. SJ: itītvam matvam ca | atra śabde.

iti anaduho vikāra ity arthe (cf. P.4.3.134) *prāṇirajatādibhyo 'ñ* (P.4.3.154). atrāpi hakāralopo na bhavati (cf. P.6.4.148). iha pūrvam varṇānām upadeśaḥ tata itsamjñā tata *ādir antyenetī* (cf. P.1.1.71) pratyāhāraḥ tato 'ṇ ity (cf. P.1.1.69) **aj** iti nirjñāte savarṇasamjñā. na hy anirjñāte 'pavāda utsargapravṛttir iti tena savarṇasamjñā pratyāhārasamjñām apekṣata iti savarṇasamjñāyām abhinirvṛttāyām 5
aṇ ud ityādinā (P.1.1.69) aṇ savarṇasya grāhako bhavati. evaṃ ca samjñāvidhāne grahaṇakaśāstrasyānabhinirvṛttatvān **nāj̄jhalāv** ity atrājgrahaṇenāgr̄hītasavarṇam evopāttam iti dīrghānām apratiśiddhā savarṇasamjñā. tenāgr̄hītasavarṇānām ayaṃ pratiśedhaḥ. gr̄hītasavarṇānām tu kumārī śeta ityādaḥ savarṇadīrghābhāvārtham (cf. P.6.1.101) *iko yaṇ acīty* (P.6.1.77) ato 'cīty anuvartanīyam.⁶⁹ 10

11. *īdūded dvivacanam pragṛhyam.* (P.1.1.11)

(*Bhv.*:) *īdūdekārāntam dvivacanam pragṛhyam syāt. agnī imau. vāyū atra. khaṭve iha. pacete iha. maṇivādīnām pratiśedho vaktavya ity eke.*⁷⁰ *ivārthe vakāro 'yam ity anye. maṇīva. dampatīva.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||**īdū**||. **agnī** <**imau**> **vāyū** <**atra**> iti *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇa* iti 15
(P.6.1.102) dīrghaḥ. atra param praty <*ant*> *ādivac ceti* (P.6.1.85) dvivacanavyapadeśaḥ. *īdūdantatā cādyantavad ekasmīn* iti (P.1.1.21). pragṛhyatve sati dīrghayaṇau (cf. P.6.1.101, 6.1.77) na bhavataḥ (cf. P.6.1.125). **khaṭve ihety** atrāyādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.78). **maṇivādīnām** ityādi matabhedād. *va sādṛśye cāvyayam* iti viśvaḥ. tathā ca raghuḥ: *śātravam va papur yaśaḥ.*⁷¹ taparakaraṇam asaṃdehārtham. 20

12. *adaso māt.* (P.1.1.12)

(*Bhv.*:) *adaso makārāt param īd ūd et pragṛhyasamjñam syāt. amī atra. amū āsāte. mād iti kim? amuke 'tra. adasaḥ kim? śamy atra.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||**ada**||. **īdūded** iti prakaraṇād gr̄hyate. edgrahaṇam atra na saṃbhavati. **amī atrety** adaso jas. tyadādyattvam (cf. P.7.2.102). pararūpatvam (cf. P.6.1.97). 25
jasaḥ śībhāvaḥ (cf. P.7.1.17). *ād guṇaḥ* (P.6.1.87). *eta īd bahuvacana* iti (P.8.2.81) ittvamatve kṛte 'traśabde parato yaṇ na bhavati. **amū ānayeti**⁷² *adasa au*

⁶⁹ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: 'nāj̄jhalau' ity agr̄hītasavarṇānām acām grahaṇam iti siddham... ato 'gr̄hītasavarṇānām acām grahaṇādīkāśakārayor apratiśiddham savarṇatvam iti 'kumārī śete' ity atra mā bhūd iti dīrghavidhau 'aci' ity anuvartya tadanuvṛttisāmarthyāc cāj eva.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *īdādīnām pragṛhyatve maṇivādīnām pratiśedho vaktavyaḥ.*

⁷¹ *Raghu* 4.42d: *śātravam ca papur yaśaḥ.* Scharpé (1964: 65) has a variant reading with *va* for *ca*.

⁷² *Bhv.*: **amū āsāte.**

tyadādyatvaṃ· vṛddhiḥ·

adaso 'ser ityādināntaratamyād¹ aukārasya² ūkāraḥ· dasya ca matvaṃ·
atrāsiddhatvaṃ· samjñāvidhānasāmarthyān³ na bhavati⁴ amuke treti⁵
ak ca pragrhya{tvā} ([[3-4]])d atra pūrvarūpatvaṃ⁶· ||

5

10

||nipāta || a· apakarṣetyādi akārādayo⁷ 'tra cādayo 'satva iti·

nipātāḥ pragrhyatvāt savarnadīrghatvādir⁸ nna bhavati· nipātāḥ kiṃ

15 cakārātra· bhavaty ayaṃ ṇala ['kāra⁹ ekāc· na tu nipātāḥ¹⁰· ekāc kiṃ prāgnayaḥ¹¹
praśabdo yaṃ [nipā]to na tv ekāc¹²· yasmād ekāḥ iti tatpuruṣo¹³ na bahuvrīhiḥ· atra¹⁴ ca¹⁵
liṅgaṃ¹⁶· propābhyām iti sūtranirddeśaḥ¹⁷ anān¹⁸ iti pratiśedhaś ca¹⁹·
(paryudāsāśrayanād ekāḥ iti spaṣṭārtham·)²⁰ ākārasya kutra nitvaṃ· kutra
cānitvaṃ²¹ iti· samśayanirāsāya²² iṣadārtha ityādikam āha²³ ||

20

||[ot] || anekājartho yaṃ²⁴ ārambhaḥ· aho aham ity etad udāharanaṃ· (...tra)
pragrhyatve eṇaḥ padāntād ity akārāpūrvarūpatvan na bhavati· śeṣas
tu prayogaikadeśaḥ²⁵ ||

¹B: ity āntaratamyād. SJ: ityādinā matvaṃ | āntaratamyād. ²B adds: ca. ³SJ adds: samdigdhaṃ. ⁴SJ adds: mād iti kim. ⁵B and SJ: amuke 'treti. ⁶B: ak ca pragrhyatvābhāvāt parapūrvaḥ. SJ: adasaḥ avyayasarvanāmnām akacaprākṛter akac tato jaśaḥ śī tyadādyatvaṃ ād guṇaḥ dakārākārayoḥ uttvamatve pragrhyatvābhāvāt parapūrvaḥ. ⁷SJ adds hi. ⁸SJ: -dīrghādir. ⁹B: ṇalakāra. SJ: ṇalakārāv. ¹⁰SJ: ekācau iti nipātāpattiḥ. ¹¹SJ: prāg anaṇaḥ. ¹²SJ adds ca. ¹³SJ adds ayaṃ. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵B, SJ om. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷B, SJ: nirdeśaḥ. ¹⁸SJ: anānām. ¹⁹B: pratiśedhāc ca. SJ like A, but om. ca. ²⁰This phrase is written on the margin and taken in brackets. B, SJ om. ²¹SJ om. ca. ²²SJ: sandehānirdeśāyāha. ²³B: ityādi vārttikaślokaṃ āhuḥ. SJ: ityādi vārttikaślokaṃ. ²⁴SJ om. ²⁵B, SJ om.

(P.7.2.107). *tyadādyattvaṃ* (cf. P.7.2.102) ⟨na⟩.⁷³ *vṛddhiḥ* (cf. P.6.1.88). *adaso* 'ser ityādinā (P.8.2.80) *āntaratamyād aukārasya ūkāraḥ dasya ca matvam.* *atrāsiddhatvaṃ* (cf. P.8.2.1) *saṃjñāvidhānasāmarthyān na bhavati.*⁷⁴ amuke 'trety akac pragṛhyatvābhāvād atra pūrvarūpatvam (cf. P.6.1.109).

13. śe. (P.1.1.13)

(*Bhv.*:) *śe iti sūtraṃ chandobhāgaḥ supām ādeśaḥ.*

14. nipāta ekāj anāñ. (P.1.1.14)

(*Bhv.*:) *eko yo 'j nipātaḥ sa pragṛhyasamjñakaḥ syāt. a apakarṣa. u uttiṣṭha. ā evaṃ manyase. ā evaṃ kilaitat. anāñ kim? ā uṣṇam oṣṇam.*

*īṣadathe kriyāyoge maryādābhividhau*⁷⁵ *ca yaḥ | etam ātaṃ nītaṃ vidyād vākya-smaraṇayor anit ||*⁷⁶

(*Pañj.*:) ||*nipāta*||. **a apakarṣetyādi.** *akārādayo 'tra cādayo 'sattva* iti (P.1.4.57) *nipātāḥ. pragṛhyatvāt savarṇadīrghatvādir na bhavati* (cf. P.6.1.102). *nipātaḥ* kim? *cakārātra. bhavaty ayaṃ nalo* 'kāra ekāc na tu *nipātaḥ. ekāc* kim? *prāgnaye.*⁷⁷ *praśabdo 'yaṃ nipāto na tv ekāc. yasmād ekāj iti tatpuruṣo na bahuvrīhiḥ. atra ca liṅgaṃ propābhyām* iti (P.1.3.64) *sūtranirdeśaḥ.*⁷⁸ *anāñ* iti pratiṣedhāc ca ākārasya kutra nīttvaṃ kutra cānīttvam iti *saṃśayanirāsāya īṣadārtha* ityādikam āha.

15. ot. (P.1.1.15)

(*Bhv.*:) *odanto yo nipātaḥ sa pragṛhyasamjñakaḥ syāt. aho aham. utāho* *iti.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||*ot*||. *anekājārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ. aho aham* ity etad udāharaṇam. *atra pragṛhyatva eṇaḥ padāntād* ity (cf. P.6.1.109) *akārapūrvarūpatvaṃ na bhavati. śeṣas tu prayogaikadeśaḥ.*

⁷³ The application of P.7.2.102 at this stage does not make good sense, because P.7.2.107, used by Viśvarūpa earlier, is an exception to P.7.2.102. Consequently, the particle *na* has been added to the text. However, it is also possible that *tyadādyattvaṃ* is a scribal mistake as this compound is used in the derivation of the previous example.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *adaso divacanam au. tyadādyattvam, 'vṛddhir eci' iti* (P.6.1.88) *vṛddhiḥ, 'adaso 'ser dād udo maḥ' ity* (P.8.2.80) *aukārasya dīrghasya sthāne tādrśa evāntaratamyād ūkāraḥ... kathaṃ punaḥ 'pūrvarāsiddham' ity* (P.8.2.1) *etac chakyaṃ bādhitum? vacanasāmarthyāt.*

⁷⁵ Cf. P.1.4.89 and P.2.1.13.

⁷⁶ Pat. ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 71.6–7).

⁷⁷ Cf. *RV* 10.187.1a: *prāgnāye vācam īraya*, which is cited in *Kās.* Viśvarūpa had most probably this example in mind and the reading in the manuscripts (*prāgnayaḥ*) has arisen from the false interpretation of sandhi. Cf. *Nyāsa* citing *Kās.*: *prāgnaya iti.*

⁷⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tataś ca 'propābhyām' iti* (P.1.3.64) *nirdeśo nopapadyeta, prāgnaya iti ca pratyudāharaṇam.*

5 ||sambu¹ || bhāno itīti sambuddhau² hrasvasya guṇaḥ·
 sambuddhau kim gav ity ayam āheti· atrānukāryyānukaraṇayor bhedavivakṣi-
 tatvāt³ vibhaktyabhāvaḥ⁴ ||

10

||ūṃ || uñ ity anuvartya⁵ prathamāyāḥ· arthād vibhaktivipariṇāmen{e}a saṣṭhīve
 15 ūm ity ayam ādeśo vidhīyate⁶· śākalyasya⁷ matena· tena⁸ trīṇi rūpāṇi bhavanti· ||

20

||[dādhā || ḍu]dāñ dāne· dāñ dāne⁹ do 'va-
 khaṇḍane deñ praṇidāne¹⁰ caturṇām ekaśeṣaḥ dudhāñ
 dhāranaposanayoh dhet pāne¹¹ ubhayor¹² ekaśeṣaḥ¹³ dās
 25 ca dhau ceti¹⁴ dādhāḥ dvandvaḥ¹⁵· praṇidadāti¹⁶ praṇidadhātīti | atra¹⁷ ghusaṃjñāyāṃ
 nergadādisūtrena¹⁸ ṇatvaṃ· dāpdaipor mā¹⁹ bhūd iti· dāp lavane·
 daip śodhan{e}a iti²⁰· dātaṃ dhānyam avadātaṃ vastram iti

¹B, SJ: sambuddhau. ²B, SJ: bhāno iti. ³B, SJ: āha anukāryyānukaraṇayor bhedasyāvivakṣitatvāt. ⁴SJ adds: ekavṛttāv iti bhāṣāvṛttau anyā hi vṛttir laukikavaidikobhayoḥ. ⁵B: anuvarttya. SJ: anuvartate. ⁶B: vibhaktivipariṇāme uñ ādi[śya]te. SJ: vibhaktivipariṇāmena uñ cādiśyate. ⁷SJ: śākalya-. ⁸B om. ⁹B reads dāñ dāne before caturṇām. ¹⁰B: deñ rakṣaṇe. ¹¹B om. ¹²SJ: dvayor. B om. ¹³B om. ¹⁴SJ om. iti. ¹⁵SJ rev. ¹⁶B: praṇidadāti. SJ om. ¹⁷B om. ¹⁸B: ner gadetyādīnā. ¹⁹B: pāpdaipor mmā. ²⁰B, SJ: śodhane.

16. sambuddhau śākalyasyetāv anārṣe. (P.1.1.16)

(*Bhv.*) sambuddhāv odantaṃ śākalyasya matena pragṛhyasaṃjñam syād itau pare. bhāno iti. anyeṣāṃ bhānav iti. sambuddhau kim? gav ity ayam āha. anārṣa ity ekavṛttāv upayuktam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**sambu**||. bhāno itīti sambuddhau *hrasvasya guṇaḥ* (P.7.3.108). 5
sambuddhau kim? gav ity ayam āheti atrānukāryānukaraṇayor bhedāvivakṣi-
tatvād vibhaktyabhāvaḥ.⁷⁹

17. uñāḥ. (P.1.1.17)

(*Bhv.*) uñ itau śākalyasya matena pragṛhyasaṃjñāḥ syāt. u iti. anyeṣāṃ v iti. 10

18. ūñ. (P.1.1.18)

(*Bhv.*) uñ itau ūñ iti cādiśyate śākalyasya matena. ūñ iti. u iti. anyeṣāṃ – v iti.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ūñ**||. uñ ity anuvartya prathamāyā arthād vibhaktivipariṇāmena ṣaṣṭhīve 15
ūñ ity ayam ādeśo vidhīyate. śākalyasya matena. tena trīṇi rūpāṇi bhavanti.

19. īdūtau ca saptamyarthe. (P.1.1.19)

(*Bhv.*) īdūtau ceti sūtraṃ chandobhāgaḥ. uktam pragṛhyam.

20. dādhā ghv adāp. (P.1.1.20)

(*Bhv.*) dāñdāñdodeṇo dhāñdheṭau ca ghusaṃjñakāḥ syuḥ. 20
prañidādāti. prañidadhāti. adāb iti kim? dābdaipor mā bhūt.
dātaṃ dhānyam. avadātaṃ vastram.

(*Pañj.*) ||**dādhā**||. *ḍudāñ dāne* (*Dhp.* 3.9) *dāñ dāne* (*Dhp.* 1.977) *do 'va-*
khaṇḍane (*Dhp.* 4.40) *deñ rakṣane* (*Dhp.* 1.1011) <iti> caturṇām ekaśeṣaḥ. *ḍudhāñ*
dhāraṇapoṣaṇayoh (cf. *Dhp.* 3.10) *dheṭ pāne* (*Dhp.* 1.951) <ity> ubhayor ekaśeṣaḥ. dās 25
ca dhau ceti **dādhāḥ** dvandvaḥ. **prañidādāti prañidadhātīty** atra ghusaṃjñāyām
nergadādisūtreṇa (cf. P.8.4.17) ṇatvam. **dāpdaipor mā bhūd** iti *dāp lavane*
(*Dhp.* 2.50) *daip śodhana* iti (*Dhp.* 1.971). **dātaṃ dhānyam avadātaṃ vastram** iti

⁷⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *atrānukāryānukaraṇayor bhedasyāvivakṣitatvāt. asaty arthavattve vibhaktir na bhavati.*

dadadghor¹ aca² upasargāt ta iti³ datvatatve na· bhavataḥ⁴ daipaḥ
 pakārānubandhasāmārthyāt⁵· lakṣaṇapratipadoktaparibhāṣātra⁶ na pravarttate·
 tena deṇprabhṛtīnām dāgrahaṇe⁷ grahaṇam bhavati· gāmādāgrahaṇeṣv avi-
 śeṣa⁸ iti· dīn kṣaye· minātiminotidīnām lyapi cety
 5 ātvaṃ praṇidāyati⁹· ghutvāṇ natvaṃ arthavatparibhāṣayā
 praṇidāsayatīty¹⁰ atra na bhavati· nanu dheṭa ātvaṃ nopapadyate·
 anejantatvāt· ucyate nānubandhakṛtam anejantatvam iti jñāpitatvāt¹¹·
 udīcāṃ māṇo vyatīhāra ity atra meṇaḥ kṛtātvanirddeṣena· na hi mān māna
 ity asya karmavyatīhāravṛtīḥ sambhavati¹²· dādḥā ghv apid iti na kṛtam
 10 vaicitryārtham· ||

15

||ādyanta || ekasmīn iti saptamīnirddeṣāt saptamyarthe vatīḥ·
 alāviṣur iti· (lunāte)r luṇi¹³· jhi· at¹⁴ sic·
 20 sijabhyaś ceti¹⁵ jher jus sici vṛddhiḥ· ādivadbhāvād¹⁶
 valādīlakṣaṇa it¹⁷ sakāramātrasya· śriyau bhruvāv iti· aukāramātrasya¹⁸
 iyaṇuvaṇau bhavataḥ· adhyeyam iti adhipūrvād¹⁹ in ity asmād
 antavadbhāvād²⁰ ajantalakṣaṇo yat vyapadeśivad ityādi vārttikam·
 anekahalsvarasamkhyāvachchinnahetudyotako vyapadeśaḥ²¹· ekāco dve
 25 ity atra (ekāca)²² bahuvrīhiṃ vakṣyati²³· sa²⁴ inprabhṛtau dhātau²⁵ na
 sambhavatīti²⁶ vyapadeśivadbhāva ārabhyate²⁷· iyāyati in gatau· ṇal
 vṛddhiḥ āyādeśaḥ²⁸· dvirvane²⁹ 'cīti
 sthānivadbhād³⁰ ikārasya (dviruktiḥ· abhyāsasyāsavarṇa itīyaṇ | āreti·

¹B: do dad ghor. SJ: do dad ghor iti. ²B: ata. ³B adds: yathākramam. ⁴SJ: dadbhāvas tatvaṃ ca yathākramam na bhavati. ⁵B: daipa pakānubandhakaraṇa{mā}sāmārthyāl. SJ: pakārānubandhakaraṇasāmārthyāt. ⁶B: -paribhā. ⁷B, SJ om. ⁸B: -grahaṇamṣv avi..sa. ⁹SJ: praṇidāyati. ¹⁰SJ: praṇidārayatīty. ¹¹B: jñāpanāt. SJ: jñāpitam caitad. ¹²B: iti vyatīhāre kar.te. SJ: iti vyatīhāre vartate. ¹³SJ: luṇi. ¹⁴B rev. ¹⁵B: sijabhyasteti. SJ: sijabhyastetyādinā. ¹⁶B: vṛddhir [jher ju]s ādivatvād. ¹⁷B adds: ca. ¹⁸B: aukāramātre. SJ: aukārasyādivadbhāvād ajāditvād. ¹⁹B: adhipūrvvād. ²⁰B om. ²¹B, SJ om. ²²B, SJ: sūtre ekāca iti. ²³B: bahuvrīhi lakṣate. ²⁴B, SJ om. ²⁵SJ adds sa. ²⁶SJ om. iti. ²⁷B, SJ: -bhāvād bhavati. ²⁸SJ: ayādeśaḥ. ²⁹B: dvirvvacane. ³⁰B and SJ: sthānivadbhāvād.

do dad ghor (P.7.4.46) *aca upasargāt ta* iti (P.7.4.47) dattvatatve na bhavataḥ. daipaḥ pakārānubandhasāmarthyāl lakṣaṇapratipadoktaparibhāṣātra na pravartate (cf. *PP* 3, *NP* 105). tena deṇprabhṛtīnām dāgrahaṇe grahaṇam bhavati. *gāmādāgrahaṇeṣu aviśeṣa* iti (*PP* 69, *NP* 106). *dīn kṣaye* (*Dhp.* 4.26). *mīnātīminotidīnām lyapi cety* (P.6.1.50) āttvaṃ: praṇidāyati ghutvān ṇatvam (cf. P.8.4.17). arthavatparibhāṣayā (cf. *PP* 1, *NP* 14) praṇidāsayatīty atra na bhavati. nanu dheṭa āttvaṃ nopapadyate anejantatvāt. ucyate: *nānubandhakṛtam anejantatvam* iti (*PP* 13, *NP* 7) jñāpītatvād *udīcām māno vyatīhāra* ity (P.3.4.19) atra meṇaḥ kṛtāttvanirdeśena. na hi *mān māna* ity (*Dhp.* 4.34) asya karmavyatīhāravṛttiḥ saṃbhavati.⁸⁰ dādā ghv apid iti na kṛtam vaicitryārtham.

21. *ādyantavad ekasmin.* (P.1.1.21)

(*Bhv.:*) *asahāye ādyantavat kāryam atidiśyate. valāder iṭ* (cf. P.7.2.35). *alāviṣuḥ. ajādāv iyaṇuvaṇau. śriyau. bhruvau. antavattve jantād yat. adhyeyam. vyapadeśivad ekasminn iti vaktavyam.*⁸¹ *ekāco dve prathamasyeti* (P.6.1.1) *bahuvrīhiṃ vakṣyati.* sa yatheha jajāgāra tathā *iyāya. āra. ādeśapratyayayor* iti (P.8.3.59) *ṣatvaṃ vakṣyati. yatheha pakṣyati tathā apākṣīt.*

(*Pañj.:*) ||*ādyanta*||. *ekasminn* iti saptamīnirdeśāt saptamyarthe vatiḥ (cf. P.5.1.116). *alāviṣur* iti lunāter lun. jhi. aṭ (cf. P.6.4.71). sic (cf. P.3.1.44). *sijabhyasteti* (cf. P.3.4.109) jher jus. sici vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.1). *ādivadbhāvād valādīlakṣaṇa iṭ* (cf. P.7.2.35) sakāramātrasya. *śriyau bhruvāv* ity *aūkāramātra* iyaṇuvaṇau bhavataḥ (cf. P.6.4.77). *adhyeyam* ity adhipūrvād in ity asmād antavadbhāvād ajantalakṣaṇo yat (cf. P.3.1.97). *vyapadeśivad* ityādi vārttikam (cf. fn. 81). anekahalsvarasamkhyāvachchinnahetudyotako vyapadeśaḥ. *ekāco dve* ity (cf. P.6.1.1) atra ekāca *bahuvrīhiṃ vakṣyati.* sa inprabhṛtau dhātau na saṃbhavatīti vyapadeśivadbhāva ārabhyate. *iyāyeti in gatau* (*Dhp.* 2.36). ṇal (cf. P.3.4.82). vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.115). āyādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.78). *dvīrvacane 'cīti* (P.1.1.59) *sthānivadbhāvād ikārasya dvīruktiḥ. abhyāsasyāsavarṇa* iti (P.6.4.78) iyaṇ. *āreti*

⁸⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca lākṣaṇīkam api dārūpaṃ dhārūpaṃ ca dheṭo nopapadyata eva, sānubandhakasya hy anejantatvād āttvānupapatteḥ, naiṣa doṣaḥ yad ayam 'udīcām māno vyatīhāre' iti* (P.3.4.19) *meṇaḥ sānubandhakasyāttvabhūtasya nirdeśam karoti, taj jñāpayati – 'nānubandhakṛtam anejantatvam' iti. nanu ca 'mān māne' ity* (*Dhp.* 4.34) *asyāpy asau nirdeśaḥ syāt, tat katham jñāpakam? naitad asti; 'meṇ praṇidāne' ity* (*Dhp.* 1.1010) *ayam eva vyatīhāre vartate, na 'mān māne' iti.*

⁸¹ Cf. vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.21 (*tatra vyapadeśivadvacanam, Mbh.* I 76.23) and Pat. on it (*tatra vyapadeśivadbhāvo vaktavyaḥ. vyapadeśivad ekasmin kāryam bhavatīti vaktavyam.* [line 23–25]). See also *NP* 30.

r̥gatau.¹ r̥kārasya² vṛddhiḥ³ sthānivadbhāvād⁴ r̥kārasya dviruktiḥ
 ur ad ity atvaṃ raparatvaṃ halādi[śeṣa]ḥ
 ata āder ity abhyāsasya dīrghatvaṃ kṛtvā⁵ savarṇadīrghaḥ
 pakṣyatīti pacer lṛt̥ sya[pratyaya]ḥ [co kur iti⁶ kutvaṃ u]bhayathā⁷ pratyā-
 5 yā[vayava][[4]] ādeśapratya((ya))yor iti⁸ ṣatvaṃ tathāpākṣīd ity atrāpi
 sakāramātrasya⁹ pacer luṅ aṭ¹⁰ sic cleh¹¹ vadavrajeti¹²
 vṛddhiḥ¹³ ekāca itīpratisedhaḥ¹⁴ asti sico 'pṛkta itī
 pūrvavat ṣatvakutve¹⁵ ||

10

||tarap|| kumāritareti tarapo ghasaṃjñakatvāt gharūpetyādinā
 hrasvaḥ evaṃ kumāritameti taraptamabvi[dhau] tau sad itivat
 tau gha iti¹⁶ karttavye prakaraṇavyatikrameṇa saṃjñāvidhānaṃ jñāpayati kvacit
 15 svārthe¹⁷ tarap¹⁸ tena lopaś ca balavattara iti ||

20

||bahu¹⁹|| pracurārthā²⁰ iti vacanāt vaipulyasaṃghavacanau nivarttitau
 etac cānvarthasaṃjñāvijñānāl²¹ labhyate saṃkhyāyate ganyate²² anayeti saṃkhyā-
 bahu(kṛ)tva iti saṃkhyāyāḥ kriyābhyāvṛttiganane²³ kṛtvasuc ghaśa iti
 saṃkhyāikavacanāc ca²⁴ vīpsāyām iti śas tāvatkṛtva iti tat parimāṇam
 25 asyeti²⁵ tadśabdād vatup |²⁶ ā sarvanāmna²⁷ iti dakārasyaṭvaṃ
 tataḥ kṛtvasuc katidheti kimaḥ saṃkhyāparimāṇe ḍatīḥ²⁸
 ṭilopaḥ tataḥ saṃkhyāyā vidhārthe²⁹ dhāpratyayaḥ sa-
 rvatra taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktir ity avyayaṃjñā avyayatvād vibhaktīluk³⁰ ||

¹B om. ²SJ: ṇal. B om. ³B om. SJ adds raparatvaṃ. ⁴B, SJ om. ⁵SJ: dīrghaḥ abhyāsasya tataḥ. ⁶SJ: vakṣyatīti | vacer lṛt̥ syapratyayaḥ. ⁷SJ: atra yathā. ⁸B: pratyayāvayavatve [[1]]. SJ: pratyayāvayavatve. ⁹B, SJ: -mātre. ¹⁰SJ: aḍāgamaḥ ¹¹SJ rev. ¹²SJ adds ādinā. ¹³B: dīrghaḥ. ¹⁴B: itīniśedhaḥ. ¹⁵B: pūrvavat kutvaṣatve. ¹⁶B: tau ghas tādi{r} ghaḥ pitau ghaḥ pid gha iti vā karttavye. ¹⁷B, SJ add: pi. ¹⁸B adds: asti. ¹⁹B: bahuga. ²⁰SJ: -rthād. ²¹B: -vidhānāl. ²²B, SJ om. ²³B: saṃkhyāyāḥ kriyetyādinā. SJ: saṃkhyāyā ityādinā. ²⁴SJ om. ²⁵B adds: yad ityādinā. ²⁶SJ adds: yattadetyādinā. ²⁷B: sarvvanāmna. ²⁸SJ adds: iti ḍatipratyayaḥ. ²⁹SJ adds: dhā iti. ³⁰SJ: -lopaḥ.

ṛ gatau.⁸² ṛkārasya vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.115). sthānivadbhāvād ṛkārasya dviruktiḥ. *ur ad* ity (P.7.4.66) attvaṃ raparatvaṃ (cf. P.1.1.51). halādiśeṣaḥ (cf. P.7.4.60). *ata āder* ity (P.7.4.70) abhyāsasya dīrghatvaṃ kṛtvā savarṇadīrghaḥ (cf. P.6.1.101). **pakṣyatīti** pacer lṛṭ syapratyayaḥ. *coḥ kur* iti (P.8.2.30) kutvam. ubhayathā pratyayāvayavasakārasya **ādeśapratyayayor** iti (P.8.3.59) ṣatvaṃ tathāpākṣīd ity atrāpi sakāramātrasya. pacer luṅ. aṭ (cf. P.6.4.71). sic cleḥ (cf. P.3.1.44). *vadavrajeti* (cf. P.7.2.3) vṛddhiḥ. *ekāca* iti (cf. P.7.2.10) iṭpratiṣedhaḥ. *asti sico 'pṛkta* iti (P.7.3.96) īṭ. pūrvavat ṣatvakutve (cf. P.8.3.59; 8.2.30).

22. taraptamapau ghaḥ. (P.1.1.22)

(*Bhv.*) etau ghasaṃjñakau syātām. kumāritarā. kumāritamā. gauritamā. **gharūpeti** (cf. P.6.3.43) hrasvaḥ. 10

(*Pañj.*) ||**tarap**||. kumāritareti tarapo ghasaṃjñakatvād **gharūpetyādinā** (P.6.3.43) hrasvaḥ. evaṃ kumāritameti. taraptamabvidhau *tau sad* iti-(P.3.2.127)-vat tau gha iti kartavye prakaraṇavyatikrameṇa saṃjñāvidhānaṃ jñāpayati: kvacit svārthe tarap. tena *lopaś ca balavattara* iti (*pāda* d of *śloka-vārttika* on Ś.sū. 5, *Mbh.* I 32.24).⁸³ 15

23. bahugaṇavatudati saṃkhyā. (P.1.1.23)

(*Bhv.*) bahugaṇau pracurārthau. vatudatī pratyayau. ete saṃkhyāsaṃjñāḥ syuḥ. bahukṛtvaḥ. gaṇakṛtvaḥ. gaṇaśaḥ. tāvatkṛtvaḥ. katidhā. 20

(*Pañj.*) ||**bahu**||. pracurārthāv iti vacanād vaipulyasaṃghavacanau nivartitau.⁸⁴ etac cānvarthasaṃjñāvijñānāl labhyate. saṃkhyāyate gaṇyate anayeti **saṃkhyā**. **bahukṛtva** iti *saṃkhyāyāḥ kriyābhyāvṛttigaṇane kṛtvasuc* (P.5.4.17). **gaṇaśa** iti *saṃkhyāikavacanāc ca vīpsāyām* iti (P.5.4.43) śas. **tāvatkṛtva** iti tat parimāṇam asyeti tadśabdād vatup (cf. P.5.2.39). *ā sarvanāmna* iti (P.6.3.91) dakārasyāttvam. tataḥ kṛtvasuc (cf. P.5.4.17). **katidheti** kimaḥ saṃkhyāparimāṇe ḍatiḥ (cf. P.5.2.41). ṭilopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.143). tataḥ saṃkhyāyā vidhārthe dhāpratyayaḥ (cf. P.5.3.42). sarvatra *taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktir* ity (P.1.1.38) avyayasamjñā. avyayatvād vibhaktiḥ (cf. P.2.4.82). 25

⁸² *Dhp.* 1.983: *ṛ gatiprāpaṇayoḥ*. *Dhp.* 3.16–17: *ṛ. sṛ gatau*.

⁸³ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *ātīśāyanikaprakaraṇa eva tādī ghaḥ, pītau gha iti vā kartavye prakaraṇo- tkarṣeṇa saṃjñākarāṇam anyo 'pi tarab astīti sūcanārtham, tena 'alpāctaram' (P.2.2.34) 'lopaś ca balavattaraḥ' ityātau svārthe tarap siddho bhavati.*

⁸⁴ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: *bahugaṇaśabdayor vaipulye saṅghe ca vartamānayor iha grahaṇam nāsti, saṃkhyāvācinor eva.*

5

||ṣṇāntā || ṣaś¹ ca naś² ca ṣṇau tāv ante yasyāḥ prakṛtāyāḥ³ sā tatheti
 ṣaṭsaṃjñā saṃkhyā saṃjñinī· ṣaṭ paśyetyādi ṣaṣṣabdāt śas· ṣaḍbhyo ḥlug
 iti luk· jhalāñ jaśo 'nta iti ṣakārasya ḍakārah· v((ā))vasāna iti
 ṭakārah pañcetyādau nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasyeti nakāralopaḥ⁴
 10 kati paśyāmītyādi⁵ atra⁶ ṣaṭsaṃjñāyām śaso luk· śatāni sahasraṇīty
 atra na bhavati· vibhaktisannipātatvāt numaḥ sannipātaparibhāṣayā⁷ |
 antagrahaṇam upadeśe nāntasya⁸ grahaṇārtham iti vā ||

15 ||ktakta || bhinno bhinnavān iti bhideḥ ktaktavatū niṣṭhāsaṃjñāyām
 radābhyām niṣṭhāto na i(ti) natvam· pūrvasya ca· dah⁹· prātipadikāt¹⁰ suḥ·
 ugidacām iti· num salopasaṃyogāntalopau¹¹· nanu
 niṣṭhāsaṃjñām uccāryya ktaktavatū vidhīyete vihitayoś ca tayor niṣṭhāsaṃjñeti¹² spaṣṭa¹³
 eva itaretarāśrayadosaḥ¹⁴· naitat bhāvinī saṃjñā vidhānāt· tau bhūte bhavato yayor
 20 utpannayor niṣṭhāsaṃjñā bhaviṣyati¹⁵· ||

25

¹SJ: ṣ. ²SJ: na. ³SJ adds: saṃkhyāyāḥ. ⁴SJ: nalopaḥ. ⁵SJ om. -ādi. ⁶SJ adds api.
⁷SJ: sannipātalakṣaṇaparibhāṣayā. ⁸SJ: nānta-. ⁹SJ: datvam. ¹⁰SJ: prātipadikasaṃjñā. ¹¹SJ:
 sulopasaṃyogalopau. ¹²SJ om. niṣṭhā-. ¹³SJ: spaṣṭam. ¹⁴SJ: -śrayaḥ. ¹⁵SJ adds iti.

24. *ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ.* (P.1.1.24)**25. *ḍati ca.*** (P.1.1.25)

(*Bhv.*) ṣakāranakārāntā samkhyā ḍatipratyayāntā ca ṣaṣsamjñā syāt. ṣaṣ santi paśya vā. pañca sapta nava daśa puruṣāḥ. ekādaśa. aṣṭādaśa. kati santi. kati paśya. *ṣaḍbhyo lug* iti (P.7.1.22) jaśśasor luk. 5

(*Pañj.*) ||*ṣṇāntā*||. ṣaś ca naś ca *ṣṇau*. tāv ante yasyāḥ prakṛtāyāḥ sā tatheti *ṣaṣsamjñā*. samkhyā samjñinī. *ṣaṣ* ⟨*santi*⟩ *paśyetyādi* ṣaśśabdāt śas *ṣaḍbhyo 'lug* iti (P.7.1.22) luk. *jhalāṃ jaśo 'nta* iti (P.8.2.39) ṣakārasya ḍakāraḥ. *vāvasāna* iti (P.8.4.56) ṭakāraḥ. *pañcetyāda*u *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasyeti* (P.8.2.7) nakāralopaḥ. **kati paśyāmītyādy**⁸⁵ atra ṣaṣsamjñāyāṃ śaso luk (cf. P.7.1.22). śatāni sahasrāṇīty 10
atra na bhavati vibhaktisaṃnipātātvan numāḥ (cf. P.7.1.72) saṃnipātaparibhāṣayā (cf. *PP* 10, *NP* 85)⁸⁶ antagrahaṇam upadeśe nāntasya grahaṇārtham iti vā.⁸⁷

26. *ktaktavatū niṣṭhā.* (P.1.1.26)

(*Bhv.*) etau niṣṭhety ucyete. bhinnaḥ. bhinnavān.

(*Pañj.*) ||*ktakta*||. **bhinno bhinnavān** iti bhideḥ ktaktavatū. niṣṭhāsamjñāyāṃ 15
radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto na iti (cf. P.8.2.42) natvaṃ pūrvasya ca daḥ. prātipadikāt suḥ. *ugidacām* iti (cf. P.7.1.70) num. salopasaṃyogāntalopau (cf. P.6.1.68, 8.2.23). nanu niṣṭhāsamjñāṃ uccārya ktaktavatū vidhiyete vihitayoś ca tayor niṣṭhāsamjñeti spaṣṭa eva itaretarāśrayadoṣaḥ. naitat. bhāvinī samjñā vijñāyate.⁸⁸ tau bhūte bhavato yayor utpannayor niṣṭhāsamjñā bhaviṣyati.⁸⁹ 20

27. *sarvādīni sarvanāmāni.* (P.1.1.27)

(*Bhv.*) sarvaprabhṛtīni sarvanāmasamjñakāni syuḥ. sarvasmai sarvasmāt. viśvasmai viśvasmāt. ubhaśabdo nityadvivacanaṭābviṣayaḥ.⁹⁰ *ubhayo 'nyatra* (vārtt. 9 on P.1.1.27, *Mbh.* I 89.12). **ḍatara ḍatama itara anya anyatara. anyaparyāyas tvat tva. nema** 25

⁸⁵ *Bhv.*: **kati paśya.**

⁸⁶ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 3 on P.1.1.24: *iha tāvac chatāni sahasrāṇīti saṃnipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasyeti* (*Mbh.* I 83.18–19).

⁸⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.1.1.24: *upadeśāvasthāyāṃ yā ṣṇāntā sā ṣaṣsamjñā yathā syād ityevamarthatvād antagrahanasya. asati tasmin śatāni sahasrāṇīti numi kṛte ṣaṣsamjñā syāt.*

⁸⁸ Cf. *Pad.* (*bhāvinī samjñā vijñāyate sūtrasāṭakavat*) and *Nyāsa* ad loc. (see fn. 89).

⁸⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yady evam, niṣṭhāsamjñāyā ktaktavatū bhāvīyete, tāv evāśritya niṣṭhāsamjñeti, itaretarāśrayo doṣo bhavati, itaretarāśrayāni kāryāni śāstre na prakalpyante, naiṣa doṣaḥ, bhāvinī hi samjñā vijñāsyate, yathā – 'asya sūtrasya ṣāṭakaṃ vāya' iti. tau bhūte kāle bhavataḥ, yayor vihitayor niṣṭhety eṣā samjñā bhavatīti.*

⁹⁰ Cf. vārtt. 8 on P.1.1.27 (*anyābhāvo dvivacanaṭābviṣayatvāt*, *Mbh.* I 89.8), *Pat.* on it (*anyeṣāṃ sarvanāmakāryāṇāṃ abhāvaḥ. kiṃ kāraṇam. dvivacanaṭābviṣayatvāt. ubhaśabdo 'yaṃ dvivacanaṭābviṣayo 'nyāni ca sarvanāmakāryāṇy ekavacanabahuvacaneṣūcyante. [line 8–11] and Nyāsa* on P.1.1.27 (*ubhaśabdo 'yaṃ dvivacanaṭābviṣaya eva prayujyate*).

||sarvā || sarva ādir yeṣām iti tadguṇo yaṃ¹ bahuvrīhiḥ· atra ca
 5 pramānam adah sarveṣām iti nirddeśah² sarvasmai iti saṃjñākāryyaṃ
 smaibhāvaḥ· viśvasmād iti smādādeśah³ ubha-
 śabdo nityadvi(vaca)natāvisaya⁴ iti tena saṃjñākāryyaṃ sarvanāmnaḥ tṛtīyā ceti
 ubhayo 'nyatrete ekavacane bahuvacane [co]bhayaśabdasyaiva prayogaḥ
 tena ubhayasmin ubhayeṣām iti· sminsuṭau saṃjñākāryyaṃ·
 10 ḍatara⁵ iti kiṃyattado nirddhāraṇe dvayor ekasya ḍatarac· anubandha-
 loṭaṭilopau katarasmai iti⁶ ḍatama⁷ iti vā bahūnām
 jātiparipraśne ḍatamac⁸· tadantāt smai katamasmai⁹ anya-
 paryyāya iti¹⁰ itaraśabdaḥ¹¹· bṛhatsaṃjñākaraṇam¹² anvarthatārtham¹³· sarveṣām nāmāni
 sarvanāmānīti· tena saṃjñōpasarjanībhūtānām saṃjñā nirvarttitā bhavati· tena
 15 sarvo nāma kaścit tasmai sarvāya atikrāntaḥ sarvam iti· atisarvāya tasmai iti¹⁴ ||

||vibhāṣā || uttarapūrvasyai iti uttarasyāś ca¹⁵· pūrvasyāś ca diśor
 20 yad antarāla¹⁶ iti· dignāmānīti¹⁷ samāsaḥ sarvanāmno vṛttimātre
 puṃvadbhāvaḥ vibhakter luk· punaḥ ṭāp· saṃjñāpakṣe
 sarvanāmnaḥ syāt hrasvaś ceti· diggrahaṇam viṣayavibhāgārtham·
 diśām anyatra bahuvrīhau na bahuvrīhāv i pratiśedho¹⁸ yathā syāt·
 samāsagrahaṇam samāsādhikāre yo bahuvrīhis tatra yathā syāt· atideśabahuvrīhau
 25 mā bhūt dakṣiṇadakṣiṇasyai· iti¹⁹ ābādhe ceti²⁰ dviruktiḥ· bahuvrīhivatvañ²¹
 ca· bahuvrīhigrahaṇam²² dvandve mā bhūt dakṣiṇapūrvottaraṇām²³ iti suṭo '[bhā]vān
 nuṭ'·²⁴ yadi punar ddiśām yaḥ²⁵ pratipadoktaḥ²⁶ samāso dignāmāny antarāla
 ity anena tasya²⁷ grahaṇam tadā bahuvrīhigrahaṇam śakyam akarttum· ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ om. ³SJ om. -ādeśah. ⁴SJ: ubha ityādi dvivacanaṭabviṣaya. ⁵SJ: katara.
⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: katama. ⁸SJ adds: iti ḍatamac. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: itaraḥ. ¹²SJ om.
 bṛhat-. ¹³SJ: anvartham. ¹⁴SJ: sarvam atikrāntaḥ atisarvaḥ tasmai atisarvāya. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ:
 antarālam. ¹⁷SJ: -nāmāny antarāla ity anena. ¹⁸SJ: iti niṣedho. ¹⁹SJ adds tena. ²⁰SJ adds
 sūtreṇa. ²¹SJ: bahuvrīhivadbhāvaś. ²²SJ: bahuvrīhau kiṃ. ²³SJ: dakṣiṇottaraṇām. ²⁴SJ
 om. ²⁵SJ om. ²⁶SJ adds ya. ²⁷SJ adds eva.

ardhaparyāyaḥ nemabhinnah. sama sima pūrva para avara dakṣiṇa
uttara apara adhara sva antara⁹¹ tyad tad yad etad idam adas eka dvi
yuṣmad asmad bhavatu kim.

(*Pañj.*) ||**sarvā**||. sarva ādir yeṣām iti tadguṇo 'yaṃ bahuvrīhiḥ.⁹² atra ca
pramāṇam *adaḥ sarveṣām* iti (P.7.3.100) nirdeśaḥ. **sarvasmai** iti saṃjñākāryam 5
smaibhāvaḥ (cf. P.7.1.14). **viśvasmād** iti smādādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.15). **ubha-**
śabdo nityadvivacanaṭā(b)viṣaya iti. tena saṃjñākāryam *sarvanāmnas tṛtīyā ceti*
(P.2.3.27). **ubhayo 'nyatrety** ekavacane bahuvacane cobhayaśabdasyaiva prayogaḥ.
tenobhayasminn ubhayeṣām iti sminsuṭau (cf. P.7.1.15, 7.1.52) saṃjñākāryam.
ḍatara iti *kiṃyattado nirdhāraṇe dvayor ekasya ḍatarac* (P.5.3.92) anubandha- 10
lopaṭilopau (cf. P.1.3.9, 6.4.143): katarasmai iti. **ḍatama** iti *vā bahūnāṃ*
jātiparipraśne ḍatamac (P.5.3.93). *tadantāt smai* (cf. P.7.1.14): katamasmai. **anya-**
paryāya itītaraśabdaḥ. brhatsaṃjñākaraṇam anvarthatārtham. sarveṣām nāmāni
sarvanāmānīti tena saṃjñopasarjanībhūtānām saṃjñā nivartitā bhavati.⁹³ tena
sarvo nāma kaścīt tasmai sarvāya atikrāntaḥ sarvam ity atisarvāya tasmai iti.⁹⁴ 15

28. vibhāṣā dksamāse bahuvrīhau. (P.1.1.28)

(*Bhv.*) **digbahuvrīhau sarvanāmasaṃjñā vā syāt. uttarapūrvasyai.**
uttarapūrvāyai.

(*Pañj.*) ||**vibhāṣā**||. **uttarapūrvasyai** ity uttarasyās ca pūrvasyās ca diśor
yad antarāla iti *dignāmānīti* (cf. P.2.2.26) samāsaḥ. *sarvanāmno vṛttimātre* 20
puṃvadbhāvaḥ.⁹⁵ vibhakter luk (cf. P.2.4.71). punaṣ ṭāp (cf. P.4.1.4). saṃjñāpakṣe
sarvanāmnaḥ syād dhrasvas ceti (P.7.3.114). diggrahaṇam viṣayavibhāgārtham:
diśām anyatra bahuvrīhau *na bahuvrīhāv i(ti)* (P.1.1.29) pratiśedho yathā syāt.
samāsagrahaṇam samāsādhikāre yo bahuvrīhis tatra yathā syād atideśabahuvrīhau
mā bhūt. dakṣiṇadakṣiṇasyai ity⁹⁶ *ābādhe ceti* (P.8.1.10) dviruktiḥ bahuvrīhivattvam 25
ca. bahuvrīhigrahaṇam dvandve mā bhūt. dakṣiṇapūrvottarāṇām iti⁹⁷ suṭo 'bhāvān
nuṭ (cf. P.7.1.54). yadi punar diśām yaḥ pratipadoktaḥ samāso *dignāmāny antarāla*
ity (P.2.2.26) anena tasya grahaṇam tadā bahuvrīhigrahaṇam śakyam akartum.⁹⁸

⁹¹ Only Vedāntirtha (1912) has the correct reading: **antara**. Others read: **antar**.

⁹² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *eṣa tadguṇasaṃvijñāno bahuvrīhiḥ*.

⁹³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ata eva cānvarthasaṃjñākaraṇāt saṃjñopasarjanībhūtānām saṃjñā na bhavati*. Cf. also vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.27 (*saṃjñopasarjanapraṭiśedhaḥ*, *Mbh.* I 87.7) and Pat. on it (*saṃjñopasarjanībhūtānām sarvādīnām pratiśedho vaktavyaḥ*, line 8).

⁹⁴ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.27: *sarvo nāma kaścīt tasmai sarvāya dehi. atisarvāya dehi* (*Mbh.* I 87.8–9). *Nyāsa* ad loc. has the same example: *sarvo nāma kaścīt, tasmai sarvāya dehi. atikrāntaḥ sarvam atisarvaḥ, tasmā atisarvāya dehīti*.

⁹⁵ Pat. on vārtt. 1 on P.2.2.26, 28 (*Mbh.* I 429.9) and on P.5.3.28 (*Mbh.* II 408.19).

⁹⁶ Cf. Pat. ad loc.: *dakṣiṇadakṣiṇasyai dehīti* (*Mbh.* I 90.8–9). *Kāś.* has the same example.

⁹⁷ Cf. *Mbh.* I 90.9–10 and *Kāś.* ad loc.: *dakṣiṇottarapūrvāṇām iti*.

⁹⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tasmād bahuvrīhigrahaṇam kartavyam? na kartavyam. kasmān na bhavati? dakṣiṇottarapūrvāṇām ity atra pratipadoktasamāsasyeha grahaṇāt*.

5 ||na bahu || tvatkapitṛka iti tvam kutsitaḥ pitā asya¹ iti na[dyṛ]ttaś ceti
 kap yady api priyaviśvāyety atra· anvarthasaṃjñāvijñānād eva saṃjñā² na
 bhaviṣyati· yathā atisarvāyety tathāpi tvatkapitṛkādyartham·³ tadantavidhisūcanārthañ
 ca sūtram⁴ karaṇīyam· anyathā hi grahaṇavatā prātipadikena
 tadantavidhiniśedhe⁵ paramasarvasmai ityādi⁶ (na) sidhyet· bahuvrīhāv iti
 10 prakṛte punar bahuvrīhigrahaṇam bhūtapūrvabahuvrīhiniśedhārtham· vastrānta-
 ravasanāntarā iti· vastram antaram yeṣām⁷ vasanam antaram yeṣām· te tathā⁸·
 vastrāntarās ca⁹ vasanāntarās ceti dvandvaḥ vastrāntaravasanāntarā iti· atra bahu-
 vrīhyāśrayo nityo niśedhaḥ· na tu¹⁰ vibhāṣā jasīti vikalpaḥ· vasana-
 śabdaś cātra vasanty asminn ity adhikaraṇe lyuṭā grhavr̥ttir¹¹ nna
 15 tu vastravr̥tṭiḥ tena paryyāyābhāvāt dvandvo bhavaty eva· na tv ekaśeṣaḥ· nanu
 cāntaraśabdaḥ sarvādiṣu paṭhyate· vastrāntaravasanāntarā ity atra upasarjanatvāt
 vibhāṣā jasīti prāptir eva nāstīti kiṃ bahuvrīhigrahaṇānuvarttanena· tasmāt
 vispaṣṭārtham· bahuvrīhyānuvarttanam¹²· ||

20

||ṛtīyā || māsapūrvāyetyi pūrvasadr̥śetyādinā samāsaḥ
 vākye pi māsenā pūrvāyetyi vibhāṣā diksamāsa ity atah
 samāśagrahaṇānuvṛtttau punaḥsamāśagrahaṇam vākārthyam· pratipadoktasya
 25 ṛtīyāśāmā(sa)sya¹³ grahaṇāt kartṛkaraṇe kṛtā bahulam iti ṛtīyāsamāsavākye
 pi pratiśedhābhāvāt tvayakā kṛtam ityādāv akaj bhavaty eva· ||

¹SJ: yasya iti. ²SJ adds: sarvanāma-. ³SJ adds sarvanāmasaṃjñāyām. ⁴SJ adds idam. ⁵SJ:
 tadantavidhir nāstīti. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: lyuṭ ādhārvṛtṭiḥ.
¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: pratipadoktasamāśasya.

29. na bahuvrīhau. (P.1.1.29)

(*Bhv.*:) bahuvrīhau sā samjñā nāsti. priyaviśvāya dehi. smaibhāvo na bhavati. tvatkapitrko matkapitrkaḥ.⁹⁹ kutsādyarthe prāk ṭer akaj na bhavati (cf. P.5.3.71). prāgivat ka (cf. P.5.3.70) eva bhavati.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**na bahu**||. tvatkapitrka iti tvam kutsitaḥ pitā asya iti nadyrtaś ceti 5
(P.5.4.153) kap. yady api priyaviśvāyety atra anvarthasamjñāvijñānād eva samjñā na bhaviṣyati yathā atisarvāyety tathāpi tvatkapitrkādyartham tadantavidhisūcanārtham ca sūtram karaṇīyam. anyathā hi grahaṇavatā prātipadikena (cf. *PP* 78, *NP* 31) tadantavidhiniṣedhe paramasarvasmai ityādi na sidhyet. bahuvrīhāv iti (cf. P.1.1.28) prakṛte punar bahuvrīhigrahaṇam bhūtapūrvabahuvrīhiniṣedhārtham.¹⁰⁰ vastrānta- 10
ravasanāntarā iti¹⁰¹ vastram antaram yeṣāṃ vasanam antaram yeṣāṃ te tathā vastrāntarāś ca vasanāntarāś ceti dvandvaḥ. vastrāntaravasanāntarā ity atra bahuvrīhyāśrayo nityo niṣedhaḥ. na tu vibhāṣā jasīti (P.1.1.32) vikalpaḥ. vasanaśabdaś cātra vasanty asmim ity adhikaraṇe lyuṭā (cf. P.3.3.117) gṛhavṛttir na tu vastravṛtṭiḥ. tena paryāyābhāvād dvandvo bhavaty eva na tv ekaśeṣaḥ. nanu 15
cāntaraśabdaḥ sarvādiṣu paṭhyate vastrāntaravasanāntarā ity atra upasarjanatvād vibhāṣā jasīti (P.1.1.32) prāptir eva nāstīti kiṃ bahuvrīhigrahaṇānuvartanena? tasmād vispaṣṭārtham bahuvrīhyanuvartanam.

30. tṛtīyāsamāse. (P.1.1.30)

(*Bhv.*:) atra sarvanāmasamjñā nāsti. māsapūrvāya dehi. punaḥsamāsa- 20
grahaṇād vākye 'pi. māsenā pūrvāya.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**tṛtīyā**||. māsapūrvāyetyi pūrvasadṛśetyādinā (P.2.1.31) samāsaḥ. vākye 'pi māsenā pūrvāyetyi vibhāṣā diksamāsa ity (cf. P.1.1.28) ataḥ samāsagrahaṇānuvṛttau punaḥsamāsagrahaṇam vāk्यārtham.¹⁰² pratipadoktasya tṛtīyāsamāsasya grahaṇāt karṭṛkaraṇe kṛtā bahulam iti (P.2.1.32) tṛtīyāsamāsavākye 25
'pi pratiṣedhābhāvāt tvayakā kṛtam ityādāv akaj bhavaty eva (cf. P.5.3.71).¹⁰³

31. dvandve ca. (P.1.1.31)

(*Bhv.*:) dvandve sā samjñā nāsti. pūrvāparāṇām. katarakatamānām.

⁹⁹ *Mbh.* I 91.11–12 and *Kās.* on P.1.1.29 have these both examples.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: bahuvrīhāv iti vartamāne punar bahuvrīhigrahaṇam bhūtapūrvamātre 'pi pratiṣedho yathā syāt.

¹⁰¹ *Pat.* on P.1.1.28 (*Mbh.* I 90.25–26) and *Kās.* on P.1.1.29 give this example.

¹⁰² Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: 'samāse' iti vartamāne punaḥsamāsagrahaṇam tṛtīyāsamāsārthavākye 'pi pratiṣedho yathā syāt – māsenā pūrvāya.

¹⁰³ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: 'pūrvasadṛśasamonārthakalahānīpuṇāmiśraślakṣṇaiḥ' iti (P.2.1.31) tṛtīyāsamāsam pratipadam vakṣyati, tasyedam grahaṇam. na yasya kasyacit tṛtīyāsamāsasya – 'karṭṛkaraṇe kṛtā bahulam' iti (P.2.1.32). tvayakā kṛtam, mayakā kṛtam.

||dvandve|| pūrvāparāṇām iti· pūrve ca· apare ceti vigrhya dvandvaḥ· suṭo
 bhāvān¹ nuṭ· ||

5 ||vibhāṣā|| katarakatame· katarakatamā iti· katara ca katame ceti
 (vighrahaḥ)² samjñāpakṣe śībhāvaḥ (ja)sīti jasaḥ kāryyaṃ prati vibhāṣā·
 tena śībhāvo vikalpyate· akaci tu karttavye dvandve ceti
 pratiṣedhaḥ· tena ka eva bhavati· tato³ vyavadhānan na śībhāvaḥ·
 katarakatamakā iti· ||

10

||prathamā|| dvitaya iti dviśabdāt samkhyāyā avayave tayap·
 dvaya iti⁴ dviṭribhyāṃ tayasyāyaj veti⁵ tayapo 'yac⁶· ityādīti
 15 arddhe arddhāḥ neme nemāḥ⁷ ubhayaśabdasya tu tayabantasya gaṇapāṭhasāmarthyāt
 pūrvavipratiṣedhād vā jasi nityaṃ· samjñā ubhaya iti· atrāpi jasaḥ kāryyaṃ prati·
 vikalpāt śībhāva eva· vikalpyate· tena⁸ dvitayakā iti· ka eva bhavati· ||

¹SJ: -vad. ²SJ om. ³SJ: ato. ⁴SJ: iti tayapi kṛte. ⁵SJ om. vā. ⁶SJ adds: -ādeśaḥ. ⁸SJ
 adds hi.

(*Pañj.*:) || ***dvandve*** ||. **pūrvāparāṇām** iti pūrve cāpare ceti vigṛhya dvandvaḥ. suṭo bhāvān nuṭ (cf. P.7.1.54).

32. vibhāṣā jasi. (P.1.1.32)

(*Bhv.*:) **dvandve jasi sā saṃjñā vā syāt. katarakatame katarakatamāḥ.**

(*Pañj.*:) || ***vibhāṣā*** ||. **katarakatame katarakatamā** iti katara ca katame ceti 5
vighrahaḥ. saṃjñāpakṣe śībhāvaḥ (cf. P.7.1.17). ***jasṭi*** jasaḥ kāryaṃ prati vibhāṣā.¹⁰⁴
tena śībhāvo vikalpyate. akaci tu kartavye (cf. P.5.3.71) *dvandve ceti* (P.1.1.31)
pratiṣedhaḥ. tena ka eva bhavati (cf. P.5.3.70). tato vyavadhānān na śībhāvaḥ:
katarakatamakā iti.

33. prathamacaramatayālpārdhakatipayanemāś ca. (P.1.1.33) 10

(*Bhv.*:) **ete jasi vā sarvanāmāni syuḥ. prathame prathamāḥ. carame
caramāḥ. tayap. dvitaye dvitayāḥ. dvaye dvayāḥ. alpe alpā ityādi.**

(*Pañj.*:) || ***prathama*** ||. **dvitaya** iti dviśabdāt *saṃkhyāyā avayave tayap* (cf.
P.5.2.42). **dvaya** iti *dvitribhyāṃ tayasyāyaj veti* (P.5.2.43) tayapo 'yac. **ityādity**
ardhe ardhāḥ neme nemāḥ. ubhayaśabdasya tu tayabantasya gaṇapāṭhasāmarthyāt 15
pūrvavipratīṣedhād vā jasi nityaṃ saṃjñā: ubhaya iti.¹⁰⁵ atrāpi jasaḥ kāryaṃ prati
vikalpāt śībhāva eva vikalpyate. tena dvitayakā iti ka eva bhavati (cf. P.5.3.70).

**34. pūrvaparāvaradakṣiṇottarāparādharāṇi vyavasthāyām
asaṃjñāyām.** (P.1.1.34)

(*Bhv.*:) **imāni jasi vā sarvanāmāni syuḥ. pūrve pūrvāḥ. pare 20
parāḥ. vyavasthāyām kim? dakṣiṇāś chātrāḥ. pravīṇā ity arthaḥ.
asaṃjñāyām kim? uttarāḥ kuravaḥ.**

35. svam ajñātidhanākhyāyām. (P.1.1.35)

(*Bhv.*:) **jasi svam vā sarvanāma syāt. sve gāvaḥ. svā gāvaḥ.
ajñātidhanākhyāyām kim? svā jñātayaḥ. prabhūtāḥ svā dīyante.** 25

36. antaram bahiryogopasaṃvyānayoḥ. (P.1.1.36)

(*Bhv.*:) **antaram jasi vā sarvanāmasaṃjñam syāt. bahiryoge. antare
antarā vā gṛhāḥ. grāmabāhyā ity arthaḥ. upasaṃvyānam adhova-
stram. antare antarā vā śāṭakāḥ. paridheyā ity arthaḥ. apurīti vakta-
vyam. antarāyām puri vasati.¹⁰⁶ sarvāditvāt prāpteḥ. *vāprakaraṇe* 30**

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Pat. ad loc.: *jasaḥ kāryaṃ prati vibhāṣākaj jhi na bhavati* (*Mbh.* I 92.15). *Kāś.* has the same.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* (*ubhayaśabdasya tayapratyayāntasya gaṇe pāṭhān nityā sarvanāmasaṃjñā ihāpi jaskāryaṃ prati vibhāṣā*) and *Pad.* ad loc. (*tathāpi gaṇe pāṭhād nityaiva saṃjñā bhavati. nanu gaṇe pāṭhasyobhayasmīn ubhayeṣāṃ ityādir avakāśaḥ, iha tayabgrahaṇasya dvitaye dvitayā iti, ubhayaśābdāj jasy ubhayaprasaṅge paratvād iyam eva vibhāṣā prāpnoti, naiṣa doṣaḥ, antaraṅgā nityā saṃjñā vibhaktyanapekṣatvād iti saiva pravartate.*)

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *Mbh.* I 93.18: *apurīti vaktavyam. iha mā bhūt. antarāyām puri vasatīti.*

5

10

||svarādi· || svar ityādi avyayasamjñāyāṃ avyayād āpsupa iti
 subluk¹· akajādy anyad api kāryyaṃ atha nipātāḥ svarādiṣu²
 katham na paṭhitāḥ· evaṃ sati bhedanopādānaṃ³ kṛtaṃ na⁴ bhavatīti· ata⁵ āha·
 svarādayo vācakā ityādi· etenānayoḥ pṛthagupādānasya phalaṃ darśayati· kiñ
 15 ca svarādayo dravyādravyavṛttayaḥ nipātāḥ punar adravyavṛttaya eva· avyaya⁶
 ity anvarthasamjñeyam mahatī⁷ na vyety⁸ avyayam iti· tathā coktaṃ·

sadrśaṃ triṣu liṣu sarvāsu ca vibhattiṣu

vacaneṣu ca sarveṣu yan na vyeti tad avyam

iti· tena samjñopasarjanībhūtānāṃ na bhavati· atikrāntāv atikrāntās coccair iti·

20 atyuccaisau atyuccaisa⁹ iti· ||

25

||taddhita || sarvā niravaśeṣā¹⁰ vibhaktir dvivacanādikā¹¹ yato nopapadyate¹²
 so 'sarvavibhaktiḥ· yata iti· yatsabdāt pañcamyās¹³ tasil· prātīpa-

¹SJ: luk. ²SJ rev. ³SJ adds na. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: avyayam. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ adds
 iti. ⁹SJ: atikrāntam uccaiḥ atyuccaisa. ¹⁰SJ adds: dvivacanādikā. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: notpadyate.
¹³SJ: pañcamyantāt.

tīyasya nītsūpasamkhyānaṃ kartavyam (Pat. on vārtt. 3 on P.1.36, *Mbh.* I 93.20). *dvitīyasmai dvitīyāya.*

37. svarādinipātam avyayam. (P.1.1.37)

(*Bhv.:*) svarādayo nipātāś cāvyaṃ ity ucyante. svar. prātar. antar. uccais. nīcais. divā. bahis. svayam. mṛṣā. he. hai. svāhā. svadhā. addhā. kam. śam. sārddham. samam. saha. śubham. svasti. asti. ābhikṣṇye nipātāḥ. ca. vā. iva. vai. eva. iha. iti. iha svarādayo vācakāś cādayo dyotakā iti bhedaḥ. 5

sadrśaṃ triṣu liṅgeṣu sarvāsu ca vibhaktiṣu |

*vacaneṣu ca sarveṣu yan na vyeti tad avyayam ||.*¹⁰⁷ 10

(*Pañj.:*) ||**svarādi**||. svar ityādy avyayasamjñāyām avyayād āpsupa iti (P.2.4.82) subluk. akajādy (cf. P.5.3.71) anyad api kāryam. atha nipātāḥ svarādiṣu katham na paṭhitāḥ? evaṃ sati bhedenopādānaṃ kṛtam na bhavatīty ata āha svarādayo vācakā ityādi. etenānayoḥ pṛthagupādānasya phalaṃ darśayati. kiṃ ca svarādayo dravyādravyavṛttayaḥ nipātāḥ punar adravyavṛttaya eva.¹⁰⁸ **avyaya** ity anvarthasamjñeyam mahatī: na vyety avyayam iti. tathā coktam: 15

sadrśaṃ triṣu li(ṅge)ṣu sarvāsu ca vibhaktiṣu |

vacaneṣu ca sarveṣu yan na vyeti tad avya(ya)m ||

iti tena samjñopasarjanībhūtānām na bhavati.¹⁰⁹ atikrāntāv atikrāntāś coccair iti atyuccaisau atyuccaisa iti.¹¹⁰ 20

38. taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ. (P.1.1.38)

(*Bhv.:*) sarvā vibhaktir yato notpadyate sa taddhito 'vyayam syāt. tataḥ. yatra. vinā. nānā. tasilādir edhācpariyantaḥ. kṛtvasucsuṭau. śastasi. ḍāc. thamuthālau. dārhilau. cvyarthāḥ. *kimettiṅvyayaghād āmv adravyaprakarṣe* (P.5.4.11). kintarām. vatiḥ. brāhmaṇavat. 25

(*Pañj.:*) ||**taddhita**||. sarvā niravaśeṣā vibhaktir dvivacanādikā yato nopapadyate so 'sarvavibhaktiḥ.¹¹¹ yata iti¹¹² yatśabdāt pañcamyās tasil (cf. P.5.3.7). prātipa-

¹⁰⁷ *Gop. Br.* I 1.26. This verse is quoted by Pat. on P.1.1.38 (*Mbh.* I 96.16–17) and in *Kāś.* ad loc.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Pat. on P.1.1.37 (*kimarthaṃ pṛthaggrahaṇam svarādīnām kriyate na cādiṣv eva paṭhyeran. cādīnām vā asattvavacanānām nipātasamjñā svarādīnām punaḥ sattvavacanānām asattvavacanānām ca; Mbh.* I 94.2–3) and *Nyāsa* ad loc. (*cādīnām asattvavacanānām evāvyaṃ samjñeyate, svarādīnām tu sattvavacanānām asattvavacanānām ca*).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. fn. 93.

¹¹⁰ Cf. *Mbh.* I 96.7–8 on P.1.1.38: *atyuccaiḥ atyuccaisau atyuccaisa iti. upasarjanasya neti pratīśedho bhaviṣyati.*

¹¹¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sarvā niravaśeṣā yeṣāṃ trayānām vacanānām vibhaktir iti samjñā kṛtā. tāni sarvāṇi yato notpadyanta ity arthaḥ.*

¹¹² *Bhv.:* tataḥ.

dikasamjñā¹ prāg diśo vibhaktir iti tasilo vibhaktitve tyadā-
 dyatvaṃ· ato guṇe pararūpatvaṃ· tataḥ suḥ· anenā-
 vyayatvād² avyayād āpsupa iti subluk³· tatreti saptamīsamarthāt tral-
 śeṣaṃ pūrvavat vinā nāneti· vinañbhyāṃ nānāñau na saha iti
 5 nānāñau pratyayau ādivṛddhiḥ⁴· sarva ete yataḥprabhṛtayo
 vibhaktiyarthapadhānāḥ sa ca vibhaktiyarthāḥ sampanna[h] prātipadikārtha⁵ iti
 tatra ca⁶ prathamai(va) bhavatīty atra⁷ ca⁸ samkhyāviśeṣābhāvād ekava-
 cana(m eva) bhavati[ty⁹ a]sarvavibhaktitvaṃ¹⁰· taddhita iti¹¹ kiṃ
 eko dvau bahava iti¹²· yady evaṃ godau nāma hradau¹³ tayor adūrabhavaś ceti
 10 aṅ tasya varaṇādītīvāt lupi kṛte¹⁴ lupi yukteti¹⁵
 dvivacanatā¹⁶ yuktavadbhāvāt nityam asarvavibhaktikatvaṃ· pratyayalakṣaṇena¹⁷
 taddhitāntatvāc cāvvyayasamjñā syāt· naitat¹⁸ gaṇapāṭh((ā))bhyupagamāt·
 tad uktam siddham gaṇapāṭhābhyupagamād¹⁹ iti· evañ cet²⁰ prapañcārtham idam²¹·
 asarvavibhaktiḥ kiṃ aupagavaḥ²² ||

15

||kṛṇmeja || karttum iti karotes tumun
 guṇa²³ svādumkāram iti· svādumi ṇamul· upapadasamāsaḥ
 20 nipātanād upapadasya māntatvaṃ· svapoṣam iti sve puṣa iti· ṇamul·
 kaśādiṣu yathāvidhy anuprayoga iti· puṣer²⁴ anuprayogaḥ²⁵ īhāñ cakra
 iti·²⁶ ijādeś ca²⁷ ity ām· āma iti ler luk· pratyayalakṣaṇena²⁸
 kṛdantatvāt prātipadikatve suḥ avyayatvāt luk·
 kṛñ cānuprayujyate liṭīti liṭparasya kṛño anuprayogaḥ·
 25 āmpratyayavad ityādinātmanepadaṃ eśādikāryaṃ· kṛtā
 makāraviśeṣaṇena²⁹ pratāmau pratāma iti dhātumakārasya na bhavati· kṛtsamjñako
 yo makāras tadantasyeti· ayan dhātumakāra iti· varnagrahaṇād eva tadantatve

¹SJ adds suluk. ²SJ: -tve. ³SJ: suluk. ⁴SJ: ādipada-. ⁵SJ rev. ⁶SJ: prātipadikārthe.
⁷SJ: tatra. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. bhavati. ¹⁰SJ: -katvam. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: kradau. ¹⁴SJ:
 lup. ¹⁵SJ adds -ādinā. ¹⁶SJ puts it before nityam. ¹⁷SJ: pratyayalopa-. ¹⁸SJ adds asti. ¹⁹SJ
 om. ²⁰SJ: ca. ²¹SJ adds sūtram iti. ²²SJ: aupagavau aupagavaḥ. ²³SJ: guṇādi. ²⁴SJ adds eva.
²⁵SJ adds: puṣa iti. ²⁶SJ adds: īha ceṣṭāyām. ²⁷SJ adds gurumata. ²⁸SJ: pratyayalakṣaṇena
 (sic). ²⁹SJ: -ṣane.

dikasamjñā (cf. P.1.2.46). *prāg diśo vibhaktir* iti (P.5.3.1) tasilo vibhaktitve tyadādyattvam (cf. P.7.2.102). *ato guṇe* (P.6.1.97) pararūpatvam. *tataḥ suḥ. anēnavyayatvād avyayād āpsupa* iti (P.2.4.82) subluk.¹¹³ **tatreṭi**¹¹⁴ saptamīsamarthāt tral (cf. P.5.3.10). śeṣam pūrvavat. **vinā nāneti** *vināñbhyāṃ nānāñau na saha* iti (P.5.2.27) nānāñau pratyayāv ādivṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.115). *sarva ete yataḥprabhṛtayo* 5 *vibhaktyarthapradhānāḥ. sa ca vibhaktyarthaḥ sampannaḥ prātipadikārtha* iti tatra ca prathamaiva (cf. P.2.3.46) bhavatīty atra ca samkhyāviśeṣābhāvād ekavacanam (cf. P.1.4.22) eva bhavatīty asarvavibhaktitvam.¹¹⁵ **taddhita** iti kim? eko dvau bahava iti.¹¹⁶ *yady evaṃ godau nāma hradau tayor adūrabhavaś ceti* (P.4.2.70) aṇ. *tasya varaṇādītvāl lupi kṛte* (cf. P.4.2.82) *lupi yukteti* (cf. P.1.2.51) 10 *dvivacanatā yuktavadbhāvān nityam asarvavibhaktikātvam.*¹¹⁷ *pratyayalakṣaṇena* (cf. P.1.1.62) *taddhitāntatvāc cāvyaayasamjñā syāt. naitat. gaṇapāṭhābhyupagamāt tad uktam. siddham gaṇapāṭhābhyupagamād ity evaṃ cet prapañcārtham idam. asarvavibhaktiḥ* kim? aupagavaḥ.¹¹⁸

39. *kṛnmejantaḥ.* (P.1.1.39)

(*Bhv.:*) **māntaḥ kṛd avyayaṃ syāt. kartum. svādumkāram. svapoṣaṃ puṣṭaḥ. ihāṃ cakre. ejantaḥ kṛc chāndasaḥ.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**kṛnmeja**||. **kartum** iti karotes tumun (cf. P.3.3.10, 158, 167; 3.4.65 ff.) guṇa(h) (cf. P.7.3.84). **svādumkāram** iti *svādumi ṇamul* (P.3.4.26) upapadasamāsaḥ. nipātanād upapadasya māntatvam. **svapoṣam** iti *sve puṣa* iti (P.3.4.40) ṇamul. 20 *kaśādiṣu yathāvidhy anuprayoga* iti (P.3.4.46) puṣer anuprayogaḥ. **ihāṃ cakra** iti *ijādeś ca* ity (cf. P.3.1.36) ām. *āma* iti (P.2.4.81) ler luk. *pratyayalakṣaṇena* (cf. P.1.1.62) *kṛdantatvāt prātipadikatve* (cf. P.1.2.46) *suḥ. avyayatvāl luk* (cf. P.2.4.82). *kṛñ cānuprayujyate liṭīti* (P.3.1.40) liṭparasya kṛño *ṇuprayogaḥ. āmpratyayavad* ityādinā (P.1.3.63) ātmanepadam. eśādikāryam (cf. P.3.4.81). *kṛtā* 25 *makāraviśeṣaṇena pratāmau pratāma* iti dhātumakārasya na bhavati. *kṛtsamjñako* yo makāras tadantasyetye ayaṃ dhātumakāra iti. *varṇagrahaṇād eva tadantatve*

¹¹³ Cf. the derivation of *tataḥ* and *yataḥ* in the *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **tataḥ, yata iti.** *tadyacchabdāt pañcamīsamarthāt ‘pañcamyās tasil’ iti* (P.5.3.7) *tasil, ‘supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ’ iti* (P.5.3.1) *subluk, ‘prāg diśo vibhaktiḥ’ iti* (P.5.3.1) *vibhaktitvāt tyadādyattvam, ‘ato guṇe’* (P.6.1.97), *pararūpatvam.*

¹¹⁴ *Bhv.:* **yatra.**

¹¹⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sarva ete tataḥ prabhṛtayaḥ vibhaktyarthapradhānāḥ. sa ca vibhaktyarthaḥ prātipadikārthaḥ sampanna iti prātipadikārthe prathamaiva bhavati. sāpi samkhyāviśeṣābhāvān na sarvā. kim tarhi? ekavacanam eva, tasyotsargatvāt.*

¹¹⁶ *Kāś.* ad loc.

¹¹⁷ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *evam api godayor adūrabhavo grāmaḥ ‘adūrabhavaś ca’ ity* (P.4.2.70) *aṇaḥ ‘varaṇādībhyāś ca’ iti* (P.4.2.82) *lupi yuktavadbhāvād sarvāsu vibhaktiṣu dvivacanasyotpatter asty atiprasaṅgaḥ.*

¹¹⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *asarvavibhaktir iti kim? aupagavaḥ, aupagavau, aupagavāḥ.*

labdhe 'ntagrahanam spaṣṭārtham.¹ ||

5 ||ktvā || prakṛtyeti kṛñṇaḥ ktvā prapūrvaḥ kugatiprādaya
iti samāsaḥ samāse 'nañpūrve iti ktvāpratyayasya² lyap tuk
atrāpy uttarapadārthapradhānatvād³ avyayatvaṃ. ||

10

||avyayī || upāgnīti· agneḥ samīpam ity⁴ avyayaṃ· vibhaktītyādinā
samāsaḥ pratyagnīti· agner abhimukham iti lakṣaṇenābhipratī⁵ ābhimukhya
iti samāse⁶ 'syāvyaībhāvasamjñā⁷· ihetyādi ayam a[pi]· yah⁸ svarādāv
api taddhitas cetyādy⁹ asya kāṇḍasya paṭhitatvād¹⁰ avyayībhāvasyāpy
15 avyayatve labdhe punar¹¹ avyayībhāvas cety avyayasamjñāprakalpanam asyā-
sarvaviṣayatvasūcanāya tena sarvam avyayībhāvasamjñānibandhanam kāryyaṃ na
bhavati | api tu· kiyaḍ eveti¹² tenā[kaj]ādir nna bhavatīty ata āha· nākajādir
iti¹³· atrādigrahaṇāt upakumbhaṃmanya ity atrāvyaayatvābhāvāt mum¹⁴ bhavaty eva· ||

20

25 ||śi || ||suḥ || kuṇḍānīti· jaśīśasoḥ śiḥ napuṃsakasya jhalaca iti
num· sarvanāmasthān((e)) ceti¹⁵ dīrghaḥ· rājeti rājanśabdāt suḥ
halnyādinā sulopaḥ¹⁶ sīmeti striyāṃ nīb na bhavati· mana iti
niṣedhāt· sāmanī dhāmanī iti¹⁷ sarvanāmasthānasamjñāyā abhāvād dīrghatvaṃ na
bhavati· ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: ityādinā. ³SJ om. -artha-. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om. lakṣaṇena. ⁶SJ: samāso.
⁷SJ om. asya and has: -samjñakaḥ at the end. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: ity. ¹⁰SJ: pāṭhād. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ:
asya prāyikatvam. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: num. ¹⁵SJ: ityādinā. ¹⁶SJ om. su-. ¹⁷SJ adds śi.

(cf. P.1.1.72) labdhe 'ntagrahaṇaṃ spaṣṭārtham.¹¹⁹

40. ktvātosunkasunaḥ. (P.1.1.40)

(*Bhv.*:) ktvāntam avyayaṃ syāt. kṛtvā. prakṛtya. tosunkasunau chāndasau.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**ktvā**||. prakṛtyeti kṛñāḥ ktvā (cf. P.3.4.21). prapūrvaḥ *kugatiprādaya* 5
iti (P.2.2.18) samāsaḥ. samāse 'nañpūrva iti (cf. P.7.1.37) ktvāpratyayasya lyap. tuk
(cf. P.6.1.71). atrāpy uttarapadārthapradhānatvād avyayatvam.

41. avyayībhāvaś ca. (P.1.1.41)

(*Bhv.*:) avyayībhāvo nāma samāso 'vyayaṃ syāt. upāgni pratyagni. iha 10
lug eva saṃjñāprajānam. nākajādir iti smṛtiḥ. uktam avyayaṃ.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**avyayī**||. upāgnī ty agneḥ samīpam ity *avyayaṃ vibhaktīyādīnā*
(P.2.1.6) samāsaḥ. pratyagnīty agner abhimukham iti *lakṣaṇenābhīpratī abhimukhya*
iti (P.2.1.14) samāse 'syāvvyayībhāvasaṃjñā. ihetyādy ayam api. yaḥ svarādāv
api *taddhitaś cetyādy* (P.1.1.38 ff.) asya kāṇḍasya paṭhitatvād avyayībhāvasyāpy 15
avyayatve labdhe punar **avyayībhāvaś cety** avyayasamjñāprakalpanam asyā-
sarvaviṣayatvasūcanāya. tena sarvam avyayībhāvasaṃjñānibandhanam kāryam na
bhavati.¹²⁰ api tu kiyad? **eveti**. tenākajādir na bhavatīty ata āha **nākajādir**
iti. atrādigrahaṇād upakumbhaṃmanya ity¹²¹ atrāvvyayatvābhāvān mum bhavaty eva
(cf. P.6.3.67).

42. śī sarvanāmasthānam. (P.1.1.42) 20

43. suḍ anapuṃsakasya. (P.1.1.43)

(*Bhv.*:) **jaśśasoḥ śīr** (P.7.1.20) anapuṃsakasya suḥ ca sarvanāmasthānam
ucyate. śī. kuṇḍāni. dadhīni. suḥ. rājā. rājānau. rājānaḥ. rājānam.
rājānau. sīmā. sīmānau. anapuṃsakasya kim? sāmanī. dhāmanī.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**śī**||. ||**suḥ**||. **kuṇḍānī**ti *jaśśasoḥ śīḥ* (P.7.1.20). *napuṃsakasya jhalaca* iti 25
(P.7.1.72) num. *sarvanāmasthāne ceti* (cf. P.6.4.8) dīrghaḥ. **rājeti** rājanābdāt suḥ
halīyādīnā sulopaḥ (cf. P.6.1.68). **sīmeti** striyāṃ nīb na bhavati *mana* iti (P.4.1.11)
niṣedhāt. **sāmanī dhāmanī** iti sarvanāmasthānasamjñāyā abhāvād dīrghatvam na
bhavati.

¹¹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* (*evaṃ manyate – vināpy antagrahaṇena 'yena vidhis tadantasya' iti* [P.1.1.72] *sāmarthyād vā kṛtas tadantavidhau siddhe yad antagrahaṇaṃ kriyate tasyaitat prajānam – niyogato yasyaijantatvam upadeśāvasthāyām eva bhavati tasyaiva pratītir yathā syād iti*) and *Pad.* ad loc. ('yena vidhis tadantasya' ity eva siddher apārthakam antagrahaṇam).

¹²⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *sarvam idaṃ kāṇḍam svarādāv api paṭhyate. punarvacanam anityatva-jñāpanārtham.*

¹²¹ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 1 ad loc.: *upakumbhaṃmanyaḥ upamaṇikaṃmanyaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 100.18). *Nyāsa* explains only the first example.

5

||na ve || navāśabdayor artha iti· etenetikaraṇād arthasyeyaṃ
 ([saṃjñe])¹ darśayati· niṣedhena samīkṛta ityādi· vibhāṣā śver ity atra
 naśabdena kiti niṣedhe kṛte piti pr((ā))ptyabhāvāt samīkṛto² viśayaḥ· tatra vikalpaḥ
 pravarttamāna ubhayatrāpi bhavati kiti pity³ api· śuśāveti ṭu-ośvi gativṛddhyoḥ

10 liṭ ṇal· vibhāṣā śver iti saṃprasāraṇaṃ

saṃprasāraṇāc ceti parapūrvatvaṃ· aco ṇñitīti vṛddhir

aukāraḥ· āvādeśaḥ· dvirvacane 'cīti sthānivadbhāvāt·

śuśabdena⁴ dviruktiḥ· śuśuvatur iti⁵ asaṃyogetyādinā⁶ kitvaṃ·

pūrvavat· samprasāraṇādi⁷· kitvāt guṇe nisiddhe⁸· aci śnv⁹ ityādinovaḥ·

15 sthānivadbhāvāt dvirvacanaṃ· ||

20 ||ig ya || yaṇaḥ sthāna ityādi· yansthāne bhūtasya¹⁰ ikaḥ saṃprasā-
 raṇatve· saṃprasāraṇāc cety evamādāv anuvāde prayojanaṃ bhāvinaḥ
 saṃprasāraṇatve śyaṇaḥ saṃprasāraṇam ityādau vidhivākye prayojanaṃ·
 ig yaṇa iti yo yaṃ· vākyaṛthas tasya saṃjñitve vasoḥ saṃprasāraṇam iti
 liṅgaṃ· varṇasyāpi saṃjñitve saṃprasāraṇasyeti sūtram hetus tatha

25 coktaṃ vidhau (vākyaṛtha upati[ṣṭha]te 'nuvāde varṇa [iti])¹¹ iṣṭam iti yajeh

ктаḥ vacisvapītyādinā saṃprasāraṇaṃ¹² iṭpratiśedhas tu ekāca ityādinā·

vraścādisūtreṇa¹³ ṣatvaṃ¹⁴· gṛhītam iti grahyādisūtreṇa¹⁵

saṃprasāraṇaṃ graho [liṭi] dīrghaḥ ||

¹SJ: saṃjñitvaṃ. ²SJ: samībhūto. ³SJ rev. ⁴SJ: śuśabdasya. ⁵SJ adds: dvivacanam atus. ⁶SJ: asaṃyogādinā. ⁷SJ: saṃprasāraṇam. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ adds -dhātv. ¹⁰SJ: yaṇaḥ sthānibhūtasya. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: saṃprasāraṇaparapūrvatvaṃ. ¹³SJ: vraścādinā. ¹⁴SJ adds ṣṭutvaṃ. ¹⁵SJ: grahijyādinā.

44. na veti vibhāṣā. (P.1.1.44)

(*Bhv.*) navāśabdayor artho vibhāṣāsamjñah syāt. niṣedhena samīkṛte viṣaye vikalpaḥ pravartate. ubhayatra vibhāṣāprayojanam. yathā *vibhāṣā śveḥ* (P.6.1.30) samprasāraṇam. śusāva śisvāya. śuśuvatuh śisviyatuh.

5

(*Pañj.*) ||*na ve*||. navāśabdayor artha ity etenetikaraṇād arthasyeyam samjñe<ti> darśayati. niṣedhena samīkṛta ityādi *vibhāṣā śver* ity (P.6.1.30) atra naśabdena kiti niṣedhe kṛte piti prāptyabhāvāt samīkṛto viṣayaḥ. tatra vikalpaḥ pravartamāna ubhayatrāpi bhavati kiti pity api. *śuśāveti tu-ośvi gativrddhyoḥ* (*Dhp.* 1.1059). liṭ. ṇal (cf. P.4.3.82). *vibhāṣā śver* iti (P.6.1.30) samprasāraṇam. *saṃprasāraṇāc ceti* (P.6.1.108) parapūrvatvam. *aco nñitīti* (P.7.2.115) vṛddhir aukāraḥ. āvādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.78). *dvirvacane 'cīti* (P.1.1.59) sthānivadbhāvāc śuśabdena dviruktiḥ (cf. P.6.1.8). *śuśuvatur* iti *asaṃyogetyādinā* (P.1.2.5) kittvam. pūrvavat samprasāraṇādi. kittvād guṇe niṣiddhe (cf. P.1.1.5) *aci śnv* ityādinā (P.6.4.77) uvañ. sthānivadbhāvād dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.8).

10

15

45. ig yaṇaḥ samprasāraṇam. (P.1.1.45)

(*Bhv.*) yaṇaḥ sthāne bhūto bhāvī vā ya ik sa samprasāraṇam ucyate. iṣṭam. uptam. grhītam. auhyata. auyata. atha ṣaṣṭhīnirdeśam adhikṛtyāha.

(*Pañj.*) ||*ig ya*||. yaṇaḥ sthāna ityādi. yaṇsthāne bhūtasya ikaḥ samprasāraṇatve *saṃprasāraṇāc cetyevamādāv* (P.6.1.108) anuvāde prayojanam. bhāvinaḥ samprasāraṇatve *ṣyaṇaḥ samprasāraṇam* ityādau (P.6.1.13) vidhivākye prayojanam. *ig yaṇa* iti yo 'yaṃ vākyārthas tasya samjñitve *vasoḥ samprasāraṇam* iti (P.6.4.131) liṅgam. varṇasyāpi samjñitve *saṃprasāraṇasyeti* (P.6.3.139) sūtram hetuḥ. tathā coktam: *vidhau vākyārtha upatiṣṭhate 'nuvāde varṇa* iti.¹²² **iṣṭam** iti yajeḥ ktaḥ. *vacisvapṛityādinā* (P.6.1.15) samprasāraṇam. iṭpratiśedhas tv *ekāca* ityādinā (P.7.2.10). vrascādisūtrena (P.8.2.36) ṣatvam. **grhītam** iti grahyādisūtrena (P.6.1.16) samprasāraṇam. *graho 'liṭi dīrghaḥ* (P.7.2.37).

20

25

46. ādyantau takitau. (P.1.1.46)

(*Bhv.*) ṣaṣṭhīnirdiṣṭasya ādiṣ ṭid bhavati. antaḥ kid bhavati. lavitā. bhīṣayate.

30

¹²² Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: *tatra vidhau vākyārtha upatiṣṭhate* – ‘*ṣyaṇaḥ samprasāraṇam putrapatyos tatpuruṣe*’ (P.6.1.13), ‘*vasoḥ samprasāraṇam*’ (P.6.4.131) *iti. anuvāde varṇaḥ* – ‘*saṃprasāraṇāc ca*’ (P.6.1.108) *iti.*

||[ā]dyantau || ādir iti¹ ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogety asyāpavādaḥ²
 bhīṣayata iti hetumaṇ nic³· bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuk⁴· bhīsmiyor
 hetubhaya ity ātmanepadam· ||

5

||mid || acām ityādi⁵· sthāneyogasya pratyayapara(tva)sya
 cāyam apavādaḥ· payāmsīti jasiśasoḥ śiḥ napuṃsakasya
 10 jhalaca iti num· antyād acaḥ paro bhavati sātetyādinā dīrghaḥ
 atra sthānasambandhasya bādhaḥ⁶ ruṇaddhīti· rudhir āvaraṇe (śnam)
 anubandhalopaḥ aṭkupvādinā ṇatvaṃ śnamo nakārasya
 atra pratyayaparatvasya bādhaḥ⁷ maṅkteti· ṭumaśjo śuddhau ṭc
 jakārāt pūrvam majjinaśor jhalīti⁸ num anusvāraparasavarṇau
 15 skor ityādinā salopaḥ⁹ magna iti ktaḥ salopaḥ¹⁰ anid ityādinā-
 nusikalopaḥ¹¹· oditaś¹² ceti niṣṭhātakārasya¹³ natvaṃ· tasyā-
 siddhatvāt coḥ kur iti kutvaṃ· ||

20

||eca || ig eva bhavatīti· ārambhasāmarthyāt· tathā hi samāhāraṇā ecaḥ
 avarṇasya mātrā ivarṇovarṇayoś ca· (tatrā)ntaratamyād avarṇo pi hrasvādeśena (pra-
 sakto 'nena) nivartyata iti¹⁴· ig eva bhavati· atirītyādi· rāyam atikrāntam brāhmaṇa-
 kulam iti prādisamāsaḥ· āntaratamyād aikārasya hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasyetī-
 25 kāraḥ¹⁵· upagv iti· goḥ samīpam ity¹⁶ avyayaṃ vibhaktītyādinā
 samāsaḥ avyayībhāvaś ceti·¹⁷ avyayatvaṃ· avyayād āpsupa iti
 luk· paratvād gostriyor upasarjanasyeti hrasvaḥ¹⁸ ||

¹SJ adds -ādi. ²SJ: -vādāyoktam. ³SJ: hetumati ca. ⁴SJ adds ca. ⁵SJ adds -ādinā. ⁶SJ:
 bādhaḥ. ⁷SJ: bādhaḥ. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: sakāralopaḥ. ¹⁰SJ adds pūrvavad. ¹¹SJ: aniditām
 ity anunāsikalopaḥ. ¹²SJ: uditaś. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ: ikāraḥ aukārasya ukāraḥ. ¹⁶SJ om.
¹⁷SJ adds: napuṃsakatvam avyayībhāvaś cety. ¹⁸SJ om.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**ādyantau**||. **ādir** iti *ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogety* (P.1.1.49) asyāpavādaḥ. **bhīṣayata** iti hetumaṅ ṇic (cf. P.3.1.26). *bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuk* (P.7.3.40). *bhīsmiyor hetubhaya* ity (P.1.3.68) ātmanepadam.

47. mid aco 'ntyāt paraḥ. (P.1.1.47)

(*Bhv.*:) **acām madhye 'ntyād acaḥ paro mid bhavati. payāṃsi. 5**
siñcati. ruṇaddhi. masjer antyāt pūrvaṃ numam icchanti. anuṣaṅga-
samyogādilopārtham.¹²³ mañktā. magnaḥ.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**mid**||. **acām** ityādi sthāneyogasya (cf. P.1.1.49) pratyayaparvatvasya (cf. P.3.1.2) cāyam apavādaḥ.¹²⁴ **payāṃsīti jahśasoḥ śih** (P.7.1.20). *napuṃsakasya jhalaca* iti (P.7.1.72) num antyād acaḥ paro bhavati. *sāntetyādinā* (P.6.4.10) dīrghaḥ. 10
atra sthānasambandhasya bādhaḥ. **ruṇaddhīti rudhir āvaraṇe** (*Dhp.* 7.1). śnam (cf. P.3.1.78). anubandhalopaḥ. aṭkupvādinā (cf. P.8.4.2) ṇatvaṃ śnamo nakārasya. atra pratyayaparvatvasya bādhaḥ. **mañkteti ṭumasjo śuddhau** (*Dhp.* 6.122). ṭṛc. jakārāt pūrvaṃ *maṣjinaśor jhalīti* (P.7.1.60) num. anusvāraparasavarṇau (cf. P.8.3.24, 8.4.58). *skor* ityādinā (P.8.2.29) salopaḥ. **magna** iti ktaḥ salopaḥ. *anid* ityādinā 15
(P.6.4.24) anu(nā)sikalopaḥ. *oditaś ceti* (P.8.2.45) niṣṭhātakārasya natvam. tasyā-siddhatvāc *coḥ kur* iti (P.8.2.30) kutvam.

48. eca ig ghrasvādeśe. (P.1.1.48)

(*Bhv.*:) **ecaḥ sthāne hrasvādeśa ig eva bhavati. atiri kulam. atinu 20**
kulam. upagu.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**eca**||. **ig eva bhavatīti** ārambhasāmarthyāt. tathā hi samāhāravarnā ecaḥ avarṇasya mātrā ivarṇovarṇayoś ca. tatrāntaratamyād avarṇo 'pi hrasvādeśena pra-sakto 'nena nivartyata iti **ig eva bhavati. atirītyādi** rāyam atikrāntaṃ brāhmaṇa-kulam iti prādisamāsaḥ. āntaratamyād aikārasya *hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasyeti* (P.1.2.47) ikāraḥ. **upagv** iti goḥ samīpam ity *avyayam vibhaktītyādinā* (P.2.1.6) 25
samāsaḥ. *avyayībhāvaś cety* (P.1.1.41) avyayatvam. *avyayād āpsupa* iti (P.2.4.82) luk. paratvād *gostrīyor upasarjanasyeti* (P.1.2.48) hrasvaḥ.

49. ṣaṣṭhī sthāne 'yogā. (P.1.1.49)

(*Bhv.*:) **ayogā avyaktasambandhā ṣaṣṭhī sthāne veditavyā.¹²⁵ aster bhūḥ 30**
(P.2.4.52). **bhavitā. bruvo vaciḥ** (P.2.4.53). **vaktā. ayogā kim? ud**
upadhāyā gohaḥ (P.6.4.89). **upagūhayati. nigūhayati.**

¹²³ Cf. vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.47: *antyāt pūrvo masjer anuṣaṅgasamyogādilopārtham* (*Mbh.* I 115.5).

¹²⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *sthāneyogapratyayaparvatvasya ayam apavādaḥ.*

¹²⁵ Cf. the explanation of this *sūtra* given by Puruṣottamadeva in his *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* on *PP* 35: *ayam api ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogā (1.1.48) ity asyāivārthaḥ paribhāṣārūpeṇa paṭhyate. tathā hi tatra bhāṣye uktam. sthāne yogo yasyāḥ sā sthāneyogā. nipātanāt saptamyā aluk. ṣaṣṭhy eva sthāneyogā nānyā śrutih, ṣaṣṭhyantaṃ sthāneyogena prayujyate, yata uccāritā ṣaṣṭhī tatkāryayoginī bhavatīti nirdiśya mānasyādeśā bhavanti arthaḥ.*

||ṣaṣṭhī|| avyaktasambandheti avyakto 'nirddiṣṭaḥ¹ sambandho asye-
 daṃ bhāvalakṣaṇo² yasyāḥ sā tathā³ avyaktasambandhā sthāne veditavyā⁴
 sthānaśabdaḥ prasaṅgavācī arthakṛtaś ca śabdānāṃ prasaṅgaḥ evam aster
 bhūr ity asyāyam arthaḥ asteḥ prasaṅge tadarthābhidhānāya bhūr bha-
 5 vati· bhaviteti⁵ ṭṛ· bhūbhāvaḥ⁶· vakteti brūñ vyaktāyāṃ vāci· ṭṛ· vacir
 ādeśaḥ⁷ coḥ kur iti kutvaṃ· vacer ikāra uccāraṇārthaḥ⁸ ūd
 upadhāyā goha iti atropadhāsambandhasya⁹ vyaktatvāt ṣaṣṭhī sthāne
 yogety asyānupasthā[ne] (?) [[2]]¹⁰· nigūhaṣatīty¹¹ okārasya¹² ūkāro na tu samudāyasya
 dhātor antyasya vā¹³· ṣaṣṭhyām uccāritāyām sthānasambandhasya sannikṛṣṭatvāt
 10 nirddiṣyamānasyādeśā bhavantīti sambandhā[nta].a(..hā[[1-2]])¹⁴ siddhe
 sūtram idaṃ prapa[ñcā] [[3]]¹⁵ ||

15

20

||sthāne|| sthāne prāpyamāṇānām ity anena lakṣaṇena¹⁶ vidhīya-
 mānānām kāryyāṇām niyamārtheyaṃ paribhāṣā | sthānārthagunaṇapramāṇair
 āntaratamyam uktaṃ¹⁷ tatra sthānāntaratamyasyodāharaṇam (latāgram
 25 iti) ekaḥ pūrvaparayor ity adhikāre kaṇṭhyayor akārayor¹⁸ ddirghaḥ·
 arthāntaratamyasya taruṇayuvati¹⁹ taruṇī cāsau yuvati²⁰ ceti
 viśeṣaṇasamāsaḥ· puṃvvat karmmadhāraya²¹ iti puṃvadbhāvaḥ·
 taruṇīśabdasyārtha(antarātama)s²² taruṇaśabdo bhavati· guṇāntaratamyasya pāka iti·

¹SJ om. ²SJ om. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds iti. ⁵SJ adds asa bhūvi. ⁶SJ om. bhū-. ⁷SJ adds ikāra uccāraṇārthaḥ. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. atra. ¹⁰SJ: sati. ¹¹SJ: nigūhayatīty atra. ¹²SJ: aukārasya. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: sambandhāntaraparīhāre. ¹⁵SJ: prapañcaphalam iti. ¹⁶SJ: lakṣaṇāntareṇa. ¹⁷SJ: yuktam. ¹⁸SJ: ākāro. ¹⁹SJ: taruṇayuvatiḥ. ²⁰SJ: yuvatiś. ²¹SJ om. ²²SJ: -rthataḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ṣaṣṭhī**||. **avyaktasambandhety avyakto** 'nirdiṣṭaḥ saṃbandho 'syedam bhāvalakṣaṇo yasyāḥ sā tathā **avyaktasambandhā**.¹²⁶ **sthāne veditavyā**: sthānaśabdaḥ prasaṅgavācī.¹²⁷ arthakṛtaś ca śabdānām prasaṅgaḥ. evam **aster bhūr** ity (P.2.4.52) asyāyam arthaḥ: asteḥ prasaṅge tadarthābhīdhanāya bhūr bhavati. **bhaviteti** ṭṛc bhūbhāvaḥ. **vakteti** *brūñ vyaktāyām vāci* (*Dhp.* 2.35). ṭṛc. vacir ādeśaḥ (cf. P.2.4.53). *coḥ kur* iti (P.8.2.30) kutvam. vacer ikāra uccāraṇārthaḥ. **ūd upadhāyā goha** iti (P.6.4.89) atropadhāsasambandhasya vyaktatvāt **ṣaṣṭhī sthāne 'yogety** asyānupasthāne [[sati]] **nigūhayatīty** okārasya ūkāro na tu samudāyasya dhātor antyasya vā. ṣaṣṭhyām uccāritāyām sthānasambandhasya samnikṛṣṭatvān *nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavantīti* (*PP* 35, *NP* 12) saṃbandhāntaraparīhāre siddhe sūtram idaṃ prapañcārtham iti.¹²⁸

50. **sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ.** (P.1.1.50)

(*Bhv.*) **sthāne prāpyamāṇānām sadṛśatama ādeśaḥ syāt. akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ** (P.6.1.101). **latāgram. kaṇṭhyayoḥ kaṇṭhya eva dīrghaḥ. arthataḥ. taruṇayuvatīḥ. taruṇārtha eva puṃvad ucyate. guṇataḥ pākas tyāgo rogaḥ. alpaprāṇayor aghoṣaghoṣavatos tādr̥g eva kutvam. pramāṇataḥ. amuṣmai. amūbhyām. hrasvadīrghayos tatpramāṇa evokāra ūkāraś ca syāt. sthānagrahaṇam sthānārthaguṇapramāṇeṣu sthānāntaryam baliyo yathā syāt.**¹²⁹ **cetā stotā. pramāṇāntaryād akāro mā bhūt. tamabgrahaṇam bahuşv antareṣv antaratamo yathā syāt. vāg ghasati. triṣṭub bhasati.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**sthāne**||. **sthāne prāpyamāṇānām** ity anena lakṣaṇena vidhīyamānānām kāryāṇām niyamārtheyam paribhāṣā. sthānārthaguṇapramāṇair āntaratamyam uktam.¹³⁰ tatra sthānāntaratamyasyodāharaṇam: **latāgram** ity *ekaḥ pūrvaparayor* ity (P.6.1.84) adhikāre kaṇṭhyayor akārayor dīrghaḥ (cf. P.6.1.101). arthāntaratamyasya **taruṇayuvatī**: taruṇī cāsau yuvatī ceti viśeṣaṇasamāsaḥ. *puṃvat karmadhāraya* iti (cf. P.6.3.42) puṃvadbhāvaḥ. taruṇīśabdasyārthāntaratamas taruṇāśabdo bhavati. guṇāntaratamyasya **pāka** iti

¹²⁶ Cf. Pat. ad loc.: *kim idaṃ sthāneyogeti. sthāne yogo 'syāḥ seyaṃ sthāneyogā. ... ṭṛṭiyāyā vaiṭvam. sthānena yogo 'syāḥ seyaṃ sthāneyogā. (Mbh. I 118.6–7). athavā sthāne 'yogā sthāneyogā. kim idaṃ ayogeti. avyaktayogāyogā. athavā yogavatī yogā. (119.1–2). Similar Pad. Nyāsa ad loc. mentions only the first of these alternatives.*

¹²⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *sthānaśabdaś ca prasaṅgavācī.*

¹²⁸ Cf. Pat. ad loc.: *na tarhīdānīm ayaṃ yogo vaktavyaḥ. vaktavyaś ca. kiṃ prayojanam. ṣaṣṭhyantaṃ sthānena yathā yujeta yataḥ ṣaṣṭhy uccāritā. kiṃ kṛtaṃ bhavati. nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavantīty eṣā paribhāṣā na kartavyā bhavati. (Mbh. I 119.25–28). Cf. also Pad. ad loc. and Puruṣottamadeva's commentary on *PP* 35 (see fn. 125).*

¹²⁹ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 3 on Ś.sū. 1 (*Mbh.* I 16.18) and Pat. on P.1.1.50 (*Mbh.* I 120.8–9): *yatrānekavidham āntaryam tatra sthānata evāntaryam baliyo yathā syāt.*

¹³⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *kutaś ca śabdasyāntaryam? sthānārthaguṇapramāṇataḥ.*

pacar ghañ upadhāvṛddhiḥ cajoḥ ku gñiya-
tor iti kutvaṃ alpaprāmāṇasya cāghoṣavataḥ cakarasya tādrśaḥ kakāraḥ¹
pramāṇāntaratamyasya amuṣmai· adasśabdāt· ne· smai matvaṃ²·
atrākārasyaikamātrikasya³ tādrśa⁴ ukāraḥ amūbhyām ity atra supi
5 ceti dīrghatve kṛte dvimātrikasya⁵ dvimātrika ukāraḥ sthānagrahaṇā-
nuvarttamāne⁶ punaḥsthānagrahaṇam⁷ kimartham ity⁸ āha· sthānāntaryyaṃ baliyo
yathā syāt⁹· cetā stoteti pramāṇāntaryyād akāro mā bhūt¹⁰· vāg ghasatīti· jhalāñ
jaśo 'nta (iti) kakārasya gakāraḥ¹¹ jhayo ho 'nyatarasyām iti¹²
pūrvasavarṇe kriyamāṇe soṣmāṇam¹³ soṣmāṇa iti dvitīyāḥ sasthanāḥ praśaktāḥ |
10 nādavato nādavanta iti tṛtīyāḥ soṣmāṇo nādavantaś caturthā¹⁴ iti· tamagrahaṇāt
hakārasya tādrśo ghakāraḥ¹⁵ ||

15 ||uḥ || raparo bhūtvā prasajjata iti· etena lakṣaṇāntareṇa
saha samhatyādiśyamāno aṇ raparo bhavati· vidhānakāla eva guṇor bhavatīti¹⁶
ṛkārasya (ra)śrutimataḥ sādṛśyāt pūrveṇa ṇakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇāt· anye
guṇavṛddhisamjñakā nivarttitā bhavanti anekāltve pi¹⁷ sarvādeśo na [bha]vati¹⁸·
taratīti nirddeśāt· dvaimātura iti dvayor mātṛor apatyam iti mātṛ
20 ut samkhyāsambhadrapūrvāyā iti aṇ ṛkārasya ukāraḥ· raparatvaṃ
ādivṛddhiḥ· khaṭvarṣyata iti khaṭvā ṛṣya iti sthite· ād guṇaḥ¹⁹·
yady apy atra ṛkārākārayor ayam aṇ tathāpi²⁰ yo hy ubhayoḥ sthāne niṣpadyate
labhate sāv²¹ anyataravyapadeśam iti jñāpakam cā(trā)rdha.āḥ puṃsīti·

¹SJ: alpaprāṇayoḥ cakārakakārayor aghoṣavator jakāragakārayor ghoṣavatoś ca āntaryam. ²SJ: śatvam. ³SJ om. atrākārasya. ⁴SJ: ekamātrika. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: sthānagrahaṇe 'nuvarttamāne. ⁷SJ: -sthānagrahaṇam. ⁸SJ adds ata. ⁹SJ adds iti. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds tamagrahaṇād. ¹²SJ adds hakārasya ghakāro bhavati | hakārasya. ¹³SJ: soṣmāṇam. ¹⁴SJ: ghoṣavantaś ca vargacaturthā. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ adds: ar bhavati. ¹⁷SJ: anekāltvāt. ¹⁸SJ: bhaviṣyatīti. ¹⁹SJ adds raparatvam. ²⁰SJ: ādeśaḥ. ²¹SJ: cāsāv.

pacer ghañ (cf. P.3.3.18 ff., 121). upadhāvṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.116). *cajoḥ ku ghinnyator* iti (P.7.3.52) kutvam. alpapramāṇasya cāghoṣavataḥ cakārasya tādṛśaḥ kakāraḥ. pramāṇāntaratamyasya **amuṣmai**: adassābdāt ne. smai (cf. P.7.1.15). matvam (cf. P.8.2.80). atrākārasyaikamātrikasya tādṛśa ukāraḥ. **amūbhyām** ity atra *supi* ceti (P.7.3.102) dīrghatve kṛte dvimātrikasya dvimātrika ūkāraḥ. sthānagrahaṇā-
 nuvartamāne punaḥsthānagrahaṇam kimartham ity āha: **sthānāntaryam baliyo**
yathā syāt.¹³¹ **cetā stoteti** pramāṇāntaryād akāro mā bhūt. **vāg ghasatīti jhalām**
jaśo 'nta iti (P.8.2.39) kakārasya gakāraḥ. *jhayo ho 'nyatarasyām* iti (P.8.4.62)
 pūrvasavarṇe kriyamāṇe soṣmāṇam soṣmāṇa iti dvitīyāḥ sasthanāḥ prasaktāḥ.
 nādavato nādavanta iti tṛtīyāḥ. soṣmāṇo nādavantaś caturthā iti tamagrahaṇāt
 hakārasya tādṛśo ghakāraḥ.¹³²

51. *ur aṇ raparaḥ*. (P.1.1.51)

(*Bhv.*:) ṛvarṇasya sthāne 'ṇ raparo bhūtvā prasajati. kartā. kirati.
 dvaimāturaḥ. kāraḥ. khaṭvarśyaḥ. tavalkāraḥ.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**uḥ**||. **raparo bhūtvā prasajata**¹³³ ity etena lakṣaṇāntareṇa
 saha saṃhatyādiśyamāno 'ṇ raparo bhavati vidhānakāla eva guṇo bhavatīti.¹³⁴
 ṛkārasya raśrutimataḥ sādṛśyāt pūrveṇa ṇakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇād anye
 guṇavṛddhisamjñakā nivartitā bhavanti.¹³⁵ anekāltve 'pi sarvādeśo na bhavati
taratīti (P.4.4.5) nirdeśāt.¹³⁶ **dvaimātura** iti dvayor mātṛor apatyam iti *mātur*
ut saṃkhyāsaṃbhadrapūrvāyā ity (P.4.1.115) aṇ ṛkārasya ukāraḥ. raparatvam.
 ādivṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.117). **khaṭvarśya** iti khaṭvā ṛśya iti sthita *ād guṇaḥ* (P.6.1.87).
 yady apy atra ṛkāṛākārayor ayam aṇ tathāpi.¹³⁷ *yo hy ubhayoḥ sthāne niṣpadyate*
labhate 'sāv anyataravyapadeśam iti¹³⁸ jñāpakam cātrārdharcāḥ puṃsīti (cf. P.2.4.31).

¹³¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'sthāne' iti vartamāne punaḥ sthānagrahaṇam kim? yatrānekam āntaryam saṃbhavati tatra sthānata evāntaryam baliyo yathā syāt – cetā, stotā.

¹³² Cf. *Pat.* on P.1.1.50: *atha tamagrahaṇam kimartham. jhayo ho 'nyatarasyām ity atra soṣmāṇaḥ soṣmāṇa iti dvitīyāḥ prasaktā nādavato nādavanta iti tṛtīyāḥ. tamagrahaṇād ye soṣmāṇo nādavantaś ca te bhavanti caturthāḥ. vāg ghasati triṣṭub bhasatīti* (*Mbh.* I 120.11–13). Similar *Kāś.* ad loc.

¹³³ *Bhv.*: **prasajati**.

¹³⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **uḥ sthāne 'ṇ prasajyamāna evetyādi**. *etena lakṣaṇāntareṇa vidhīyamānasyāṇo vidhānakāla eva tena saha saṃhatya raparatvaviśiṣṭasya vidhāv iyam paribhāṣā vyāpriyata iti darśayati*.

¹³⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *prasajyamānasyaiva hi raparatvavidhau yathā ṛvarṇo raśrutimān, evam ādeśo 'pi raśrutimān eva bhavati. tataś cāntaratamyād ṛkārasya raśrutimatas tādṛśa eva raśrutimān ādeśo bhavati. anye guṇavṛddhisamjñakā vyāvartitā bhavanti*.

¹³⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yadi tarhi prasajyamāna eva raparo bhavati, anekāltvāt sarvādeśaḥ prasajyeta, naiṣa doṣaḥ, yad ayam 'tarati' iti nirdeśam karoti, tato jñāyate – sarvādeśo na bhavatīti*.

¹³⁷ i.e. aṇ raparo bhavati.

¹³⁸ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 7 ad loc.: *iha yo dvayoh ṣaṣṭhīnirdiṣṭayoh prasaṅge bhavati labhate 'sāv anyatarato vyapadeśam* (*Mbh.* I 127.17–18). Similar in *Nyāsa* (*yo hi dvayoh ṣaṣṭhīnirdiṣṭayoh sthāne bhavati, labhate so 'nyataravyapadeśam*) and *Pad.* ad loc. (*tad idam ucyate – yo hy ubhayoḥ sthāne bhavati labhate so 'nyataravyapadeśam iti*).

tavalkāra iti· savarṇasaṃjñāyām rapratyāhārasya ([ca]) phalābhivyaktaye· ur iti kiṃ·
deyaṃ dheyaṃ· aṇ iti kiṃ· saudhātakiḥ sudhātur akaṇ ceti¹ ṛkārasya((ā))kaṇ
aṇana(ṇ)² samudāyaḥ ||

5

||alo '|| pañcagoṇir iti· pañcabhir goṇībhiḥ krītaḥ paṭaḥ taddhitārthe
samāsaḥ· krītārthe ārhīyaṣ³ ṭhak· tasya⁴ adhyarddheti⁵

10 luk· luk taddhitalukīti strīpratyayasya lukaṃ bādhitvā ikāraḥ·
brahmahatyeti· brahmaṇo hananam iti· hanas ta ceti kyap·
nakārasya takāraḥ rājakīya⁶ iti·⁷ rājñah ka ceti chaḥ⁸ nakārasya kakāraḥ
ropayatīti· ruher ṇic ruhaḥ po 'nyatarasyām iti hakārasya pakāraḥ ||

15

||nic ca|| sakheti· sakhiśabdāt suḥ· anṇ sāv iti· anṇ
dīrghaḥ sulopanalopau⁹· (tātaṇ tu nodāhṛtaḥ

20 guṇavṛddhiniṣedhārtha .ā .. .itvasya) tena paratvāt sarvādeśaḥ ||

25

||ādeḥ|| āsīna iti āsa upaveśane· laṭ śānac·
adāditvāc chapo luk īd āsa ity ākārasya((e))tvam· ||

¹SJ adds iṇ. ²SJ: anaṇ. ³SJ: prāgvahateṣ. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ adds -ādinā. ⁶SJ: -yam. ⁷SJ
adds rājña idam. ⁸SJ: chapratyayaḥ. ⁹SJ: -lopāḥ.

tavalkāra iti savarṇasaṃjñāyāṃ rapratyāhārasya ca phalābhivyaktaye. **ur** iti kim? deyaṃ dheyam. **aṅ** iti kim? saudhātakiḥ: *sudhātur akan ceti* (P.4.1.97) ṛkārasyaḥkaṇaṇanaṇsamudāyaḥ.

52. alo 'ntyasya. (P.1.1.52)

(*Bhv.*) ādeśo 'ntyasyālah¹³⁹ sthāne veditavyaḥ. **id goṇyāḥ** (P.1.2.50). 5
pañcagoṇiḥ. hanas ta ca (P.3.1.108). **brahmahatyā. rājñāḥ ka ca**
(P.4.2.140). **rājakīyaḥ. ruhaḥ paḥ** (cf. P.7.3.43). **ropayati.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**alo '||. pañcagoṇir** iti pañcabhir goṇibhiḥ krītaḥ paṭaḥ (iti) taddhitārthe samāsaḥ (cf. P.2.1.51). krītārtha ārhīyaḥ ṭhak (cf. P.5.1.37). tasya *adhyardheti* (cf. P.5.1.28) luk. *luk taddhitlukīti* (P.1.2.49) strīpratyayasya lukaṃ bādhitvā ikāraḥ 10
(cf. P.1.2.50). **brahmahatyeti** brahmaṇo hananam iti **hanas ta ceti** (P.3.1.108) kyap nakārasya takāraḥ. **rājakīya** iti **rājñāḥ ka ceti** (P.4.2.140) chaḥ nakārasya kakāraḥ. **ropayatīti** ruher ṇic. *ruhaḥ po 'nyatarasyām* iti (P.7.3.43) hakārasya pakāraḥ.

53. ṇic ca. (P.1.1.53)

(*Bhv.*) ṇic cādeśo 'ntyasyālah sthāne syāt. **ānaṇ ṛto dvandve** 15
(P.6.3.25). **mātāpitarau. anaṇ sau** (P.7.1.93). **sakhā. kartā. tātaṇo**
nīttvasāmarthyān nāyam antyavidhiḥ smṛtaḥ.¹⁴⁰ **kurutāt.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**ṇic ca**||. sakheti sakhiśabdāt suḥ **anaṇ sāv** iti (P.7.1.93) **anaṇ.** 20
dīrghaḥ (cf. P.6.4.8) sulopanalopau (cf. P.6.1.68, 8.2.7). tātaṇ tu nodāhṛtaḥ
guṇavrddhiniṣedhārthatvāt **nīttvasya.** tena paratvāt sarvādeśaḥ.¹⁴¹

54. ādeḥ parasya. (P.1.1.54)

(*Bhv.*) parasya kāryam ucyamānam āder alaḥ pratyetavyaṃ yatra 25
pañcamīrdeśaḥ. īd āsaḥ (P.7.2.83). **āsīnaḥ. alo 'ntyasyā-**(P.1.1.52)-
pavādo 'yaṃ yogaḥ paratvād anekāl śid ity (P.1.1.55) **anena bādhyate.**
ato bhisa ais (P.7.1.9). **vṛkṣaiḥ.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**ādeḥ**||. **āsīna** ity *āsa upaveśane* (*Dhp.* 2.11). laṭ. śānac (cf. P.3.2.124).
adāditvāc chapo luk (cf. P.2.4.72). **īd āsa** ity (P.7.2.83) ākārasyettvam.

55. anekāl śit sarvasya. (P.1.1.55)

(*Bhv.*) **anekāl ādeśaḥ śic ca sarvasyaiva sthāne syāt. aster bhūḥ**

30

¹³⁹ Mishra (1989) and Vedāntatīrtha (1912: 79): **ādeśo 'ntyasyālah.** Chakravarti (1918) and Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 10): **ādeśo 'ntasyālah.**

¹⁴⁰ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.1.1.53: *tātaṇi nītkaraṇasya sāvakāśatvād vipratīṣedhāt sarvādeśaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 131.1). See also *Kāś.* ad loc.

¹⁴¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tad evaṃ guṇavrddhipratīṣedhe caritārthatvāt tātaṇo nītkaraṇasya sāvakāśatve sati tasmin paratvād 'anekāl śit sarvasya' ity* (P.1.1.55) *anena tātaṇi sarvādeśo bhavati.* See also fn. 140.

||ane|| aster bhūr iti bhavit{o}ā¹ tṛc jaśśasoḥ śir iti kuṇḍāni

napuṃsakasya jhalaca iti num sarvanāmetyādinā dīrghaḥ

- 5 śidgrahaṇam nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam iti sūcanārtham tena
diva ud iti na sarvādeśaḥ² ||

10

||sthānivat|| sthānyādeśayoḥ pṛthaktvāt³ sthānikāryyam ādeśe na

- 15 pṛpnotīti kṛtvā⁴. atideśo yaṃ pṛadhānyāt kāryasya· āvadhīṣṭeti· āha((n))ter luṇi⁵
ātmanepadeṣv anyatarasyām iti taṇām viṣaye⁶ vadhādeśaḥ tasya⁷ sthāni-
vatvāt· āño yamahana ity ātmanepadam· sica⁸ ṣatvam
ṣṭutvam· vatkarāṇam sthānyādeśayoḥ samjñāsamjñibhāvanivṛtya-
rtham· anyathā⁹ sthāny ādeśa ity ucyamāne sthānī ādeśasya samjñā syāt·
20 tathā¹⁰ sthānyuccāraṇe· ādeśasyaiva sampratyayaḥ¹¹ āño yamahana itī-
haiva taṇ syāt· luṇi¹² āvadhīṣṭa iti· sthāninas tu· kevalān na syāt· āhateti·
vatkarāṇe (tu) svāśrayam api kāryam bhavati· sambandhīśabdatvād evādeśe¹³ labdhe·
ādeśagrahaṇam ānumānikā ādeśasyāpi pratipatyartham· tena pacatv ity atra nitya-
śabdābhyupagamāt¹⁴ ekadeśavikṛtatvābhāve¹⁵ er ur iti¹⁶

¹SJ adds iti. ²SJ om. ³SJ: pṛthag rūpatvāt. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: luṇiṣaye. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ om.
⁸SJ adds iṭ. ⁹SJ adds hi. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: -ye. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ om. eva. ¹⁴SJ: nityatvopagamād.
¹⁵SJ: -vikṛtasyā sambhāve. ¹⁶SJ om.

(P.2.4.52). **bhavitā. liṭas tajhayor eśirec** (P.3.4.81). **pece pecire. jaśśasoḥ śiḥ** (P.7.1.20) **kuṇḍāni. uktāḥ ṣaṣṭhīrdeśāḥ.**

(Pañj.): ||**ane**||. **aster bhūr** iti **bhavitā**: tṛc. **jaśśasoḥ śir** iti **kuṇḍāni**: *napuṃsakasya jhalaca* iti (P.7.1.72) num. *sarvanāmetyādinā* (P.6.4.8) dīrghaḥ. śidgrahaṇam *nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam* iti (PP 11, NP 6) sūcanārtham. tena 5
diva ud iti (P.6.1.131) na sarvādeśāḥ.¹⁴²

56. sthānivad ādeśo 'nalvidhau. (P.1.1.56)

(Bhv.): ādeśāḥ sthānivad bhavanti. brūñ vaktā vaktum vaktavyam. **dhātor** iti (P.3.1.91) tavyadādayaḥ. āvadhīṣṭa. **āño yamahana** ity (P.1.3.28) ātmanepadam. **analvidhau kim? varṇavidhau mā bhūt.** 10
dyauḥ panthāḥ saḥ. hal iti¹⁴³ (cf. P.6.1.68) na sulopaḥ. **āhibhuvor iṭpratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ.**¹⁴⁴ āttha. **abhūt. bruva īḍ** iti (P.7.3.93) **astisico 'prkta** iti (P.7.3.96) ca mā bhūt.

(Pañj.): ||**sthānivat**||. sthānyādeśayoḥ pṛthaktvāt sthānikāryam ādeśe na prāpnotīti¹⁴⁵ kṛtvā atideśo 'yaṃ¹⁴⁶ prādhānyāt kāryasya.¹⁴⁷ **āvadhīṣṭe**ty āhanter luṅy 15
ātmanepadeṣv anyatarasyām iti (P.2.4.44) tañām viṣaye vadhādeśāḥ. tasya sthānivatvād **āño yamahana** ity (P.1.3.28) ātmanepadam. sica ṣatvam (cf. P.8.3.59). ṣṭutvam (cf. P.8.4.41). vatkarāṇam sthānyādeśayoḥ saṃjñāsaṃjñībhāvanivṛttyartham. anyathā sthāny ādeśa ity ucyamāne sthāny ādeśasya saṃjñā syāt.¹⁴⁸ tathā sthānyuccāraṇa ādeśasyaiva saṃpratyayaḥ. **āño yamahana** iti (P.1.3.28) 20
ihaiiva tañ syāt: luṅ **āvadhīṣṭa** iti. sthāninas tu kevalān na syāt: āhateti. vatkarāṇe tu svāśrayam api kāryam bhavati.¹⁴⁹ sambandhīśabdatvād evādeśe labdha ādeśagrahaṇam ānumānikādeśasyāpi pratipattiyartham.¹⁵⁰ tena pacatv ity atra nityaśabdābhyupagamād¹⁵¹ ekadeśavikṛtatvābhāve (cf. PP 14, NP 37) *er ur* iti (P.3.4.86)

¹⁴² Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: *śitaḥ sakārānubandhenānekāltve 'pi śid iti pṛthakkaraṇam 'nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam' iti jñāpanārtham. tasya tu prayojanam – 'diva ut' ityādiṣu* (P.6.1.131 etc.) *sarvādeśābhāvaḥ.*

¹⁴³ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 11) and Mishra (1989): **halnyāb iti.** Vedāntatīrtha (1912: 81) and Chakravarti (1918: 11): **hal iti.**

¹⁴⁴ Pat. on vārtt. 21 ad loc. (Mbh. I 139.10–11).

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 1 ad loc.: *sthānyādeśapṛthaktvād etasmāt kāraṇāt sthānikāryam ādeśe na prāpnoti* (Mbh. I 133.19–20).

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Kās. ad loc.: *sthānyādeśayoḥ pṛthaktvāt sthānyāśrayam kāryam ādeśe na prāpnoti atideśa ārabhyate.*

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: *atideśo 'nekaprakāraḥ – nimittātideśāḥ, vyapadeśātideśāḥ, śāstrātideśāḥ, rūpātideśāḥ, kāryātideśāś ceti ... tasmād atideśāntarāśrayaṇasyāyuktatvāt kāryātideśa āśrīyate.*

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Pat. on P.1.1.56: *vatkarāṇam kimartham. sthānyādeśo 'nalvidhāv itīyaty ucyamāne 'yaṃ tatra sthānyādeśasya saṃjñā syāt* (Mbh. I 133.2–3). See also fn. 149.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Kās. ad loc.: *vatkarāṇam kim? sthāni ādeśasya saṃjñā mā vijñāyīti. svāśrayam api yathā syāt.*

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Kās. ad loc.: *ādeśagrahaṇam kim? ānumānikasyāpy ādeśasya sthānivadbhāvo yathā syāt – pacatu.*

¹⁵¹ Cf. Jñ.S. p. 58: *prakriyārūpe 'pi vyākaraṇe kvacīn nityaśabdābhyupagamaḥ svīkriyate.*

ter evāyaṃ tu vidhīyate¹. tiṅvadbhāvāt² padatvaṃ prakriyādaśāpakṣe
tu ekādeśavikṛtaparibhāṣayā anityatvā(rtha)m eva.³ vidhigrahaṇam alāśrayo vi-
dhir alvidhir⁴ iti uttarapadalopisamāsārtham. tenāgrahīd ity atra graho 'līṭīti
dīrghatve kṛte. sthānivadbhāvād i[.ipa(?)]tve iṭa īṭīti. sico lopah.

- 5 tatra dīrghagrahaṇam hy evamartham kriyate. alvidhitve pi sthānivadbhāvo yathā
syāt. ayaṃ tv alāśrayo vidhiḥ. na tv alvidhir iti. kiñcānalvidhau⁵ bhāvāśrayo⁶
niṣedhaḥ tena prastutya pracitya iti⁷. kṛti ceti pratiṣedhe. anubandham ki-
tam abhāvasvarūpam⁸ āśritya. analvidhāv iti pratiṣedhā(bhāvāt)t guṇaniṣedho bha-
vaty eva nāyam alāśrayo vidhir anubandhasyā{pi} tyantāsambhavāt⁹. iha sthāghvor ic ceti.
10 adita. adhitety¹⁰ atra. iko 'lāśrayatve saty asthāniva{dbhā}(tvābhā)vād¹¹ evānaṅgatvāt¹²
guṇo nāstīti. kiṃ kitvena. tat kṛtam jñāpayati. sthānigatakāryyam¹³ analvidhāv
iti pratiṣidhyate. yathā dyaur iti¹⁴. na¹⁵ (su)lopaḥ tenālāśrayam¹⁶ na
vyāvartyata¹⁷ iti. tena¹⁸ vṛkṣāyety atrā{pi}deśālāśrayam¹⁹. yañam āśritya supi ceti
dīrghatvam sidhyati²⁰. ||

15

- 20 ||acaḥ || alvidhyartha ārambha iti. pūrvam analvidhāv iti
vacanāt niyamārtho veti²¹. ajādeśa eva (paranimittaka eva) pūrvavidhāv
eva iti. paṭayatītyādi²² paṭum ācaṣṭa iti²³ tat karoti tad ācaṣṭa²⁴ iti ṇic ṇāv iṣṭavad
iti. iṣṭavatve²⁵ ṭilopaḥ. tasya sthānivatvād²⁶ ata upadhāyā iti vṛddhir nna
bhavati. etac ca kvilugupadhetyādinā²⁷ na sidhya-
25 ti. tasya pratyayavidhi.ena viśeṣatvam²⁸. bhāṣye vyākhyātātāt arvākālīnatvāt²⁹
kātyāyanavacanasya. avadhīd iti hanter luṅi³⁰. tip aṭ sic
luṅi³¹ ceti vadhādeśo 'dantaḥ³². aprkta³³ iṭ iha³⁴ īṭīti

¹SJ adds iti. ²SJ: tiṅnantatvāt. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: kin tv alvidhau. ⁶SJ: bhāvābhāvāśrayo. ⁷SJ adds atra. ⁸SJ: anubandhābhāvāt kṛitam abhāvasvabhāvam. ⁹SJ: anubandhasyātyantāsattvāt. ¹⁰SJ: adhita aditety. ¹¹SJ: sthānivattvābhāvād. ¹²SJ: aṅgatvād eva. ¹³SJ: -gataṃ kāryam. ¹⁴SJ adds -āda. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ: tenādeśālāśrayam. ¹⁷SJ: naścāvartyate. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ: atrālādeśāśrayam. ²⁰SJ: dīrghatvasiddhiḥ. ²¹SJ: niṣedhāt niyamārthe ceti. ²²SJ om. -ādi. ²³SJ om. iti. ²⁴SJ om. ²⁵SJ om. ²⁶SJ: sthānivadbhāvād. ²⁷SJ: -padhād vetyādinā. ²⁸SJ om. ²⁹SJ adds ca. ³⁰SJ: luṅi. ³¹SJ: luṅi. ³²SJ adds iṭ. ³³SJ adds iti. ³⁴SJ: iṭa.

ter evāyaṃ tu vidhīyate. tiṅvadbhāvāt padatvam (cf. P.1.4.14). prakriyādaśāpakṣe tv ekādeśavikṛtaparibhāṣayā anityatvārtham eva.¹⁵² vidhigrahaṇam alāśrayo vidhir **alvidhir** ity uttarapadalopisamāsārtham.¹⁵³ tenāgrahīd ity atra *graho* 'līṭīti (cf. P.7.2.37) dīrghatve kṛte sthānivadbhāvād idrūpatva *īṭa* 'īṭīti (P.8.2.28) sico lopah. tatra dīrghagrahaṇam hy evamarthaṃ kriyate: alvidhitve 'pi sthānivadbhāvo yathā 5 syāt.¹⁵⁴ ayaṃ tv alāśrayo vidhiḥ. na tv alvidhir iti. kiṃ cānalvidhau bhāvāśrayo niṣedhaḥ. tena prastutya pracitya iti *knīti ceti* (P.1.1.5) pratiśedhe 'nubandhaṃ kitam abhāvasvarūpam āśritya **analvidhāv** iti pratiśedhābhāvād guṇaniṣedho bhavaty eva. nāyam alāśrayo vidhir anubandhasyātyantāsaṃbhavāt. iha *sthāghvor ic cety* (P.1.2.17) adita adhitety atra iko 'lāśrayatve sati sthānivattvābhāvād evāngatvād 10 guṇo nāstīti kiṃ kittvena? tat kṛtaṃ jñāpayati: sthānigatakāryam **analvidhāv** iti pratiśidhyate.¹⁵⁵ yathā **dyaur** iti na sulopah (cf. P.6.1.68) tenālāśrayaṃ na vyāvartyata iti. tena vṛkṣāyety atrādeśālāśrayaṃ yañam āśritya *supi ceti* (P.7.3.102) dīrghatvaṃ sidhyati.

57. acaḥ parasmīn pūrvavidhau. (P.1.1.57) 15

(*Bhv.:*) alvidhyartha 'yam ārambhaḥ, niyamārtha vā. ajādeśaḥ paranimittakaḥ pūrvasmin vidhau kartavye sthānivat syāt. paṭayati. laghayati. avadhīt. ṭilopasyāto lopasya ca sthānivadbhāvād vṛddhir na bhavati.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**acaḥ**||. alvidhyartha 'yam ārambha iti pūrvam *analvidhāv* iti 20 (cf. P.1.1.56) vacanāt. **niyamārtha vety** ajādeśa eva paranimittaka eva pūrvavidhāv eva iti. **paṭayatī**tyādi paṭum ācaṣṭa iti tat karoti tad ācaṣṭa iti ṇic.¹⁵⁶ *ṇāv iṣṭavad* iti iṣṭavattve ṭilopah.¹⁵⁷ tasya sthānivattvād *ata upadhāyā* iti (P.7.2.116) vṛddhir na bhavati. etac ca *kvilugupadhetyādinā* (vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.58, *Mbh.* I 153.4) na sidhyati tasya pratyayavidhitvena viśeṣatvaṃ bhāṣye vyākhyātavād¹⁵⁸ arvā⟨k⟩kālīnatvāt 25 kātīyānavacanasya. **avadhīd** iti hanter luṇi tip. aṭ (cf. P.6.4.71). sic (cf. P.3.1.43, 44). *luṇi⟨i⟩ ceti* (P.2.4.43) vadhādeśo 'dantaḥ. aprkta ṭ (cf. P.7.3.96). iha ⟨*īṭa*⟩ 'īṭīti

¹⁵² Cf. vārtt. 9 (*ekādeśavikṛtasyopasaṃkhyānam*, *Mbh.* I 136.5) and 11 (*anityaviññānaṃ tu tasmād upasaṃkhyānam*, line 11) on P.1.1.56.

¹⁵³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *so 'lāśrayo vidhir alvidhir ity uttarapadalopī samāsa iti darśayati*. Similar *Pad.*

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Puruṣottamadeva in *Jñ.S.* p. 59: *phalaṃ ca jñāpakasyāgrahīd ity atra graho 'līṭi dīrgha iti (P.7.2.37) dīrghagrahaṇāt yatnataḥ sthānivad ity atideśāt idrūpatve īṭa 'īṭīti (P.8.2.28) sijlopasiddhir iti. atra dīrghagrahaṇam hi evamarthaṃ kriyate iti alvidhitve 'pi sthānivadbhāvo yathā syāt.*

¹⁵⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sthānyalāśrayāñītyādi. sthāni al āśrayo yeṣāṃ tāni tathoktāni.*

¹⁵⁶ Cf. vārtt. 5 (*tat karotīty upasaṃkhyānaṃ sūtrayatyādyartham*; *Mbh.* II 34.8) and 6 (*ākhyānāt kṛtas tad ācaṣṭa iti kṛllukpraktipratyāpattiḥ praktivac ca kārakam*; *Mbh.* II 34.14–15) on P.3.1.26.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.6.4.155: *ṇāv iṣṭavat prātipadikasya puṇvadbhāvarabhāvāṭilopayañādi-parārtham (Mbh. III 230.2, 4).*

¹⁵⁸ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.58: *nanu caitat apy upadhātavidhiṃ prati na sthānivad ity eva siddham. viśeṣa etad vaktavyam. kva. pratyayavidhāv iti. iha mā bhūt. paṭayati laghayatīti. (Mbh. I 154.2–4).*

seco lopaḥ· ato lopaḥ· tasya sthānivatvāt¹ halantalakṣaṇā na
 vṛddhiḥ· acaḥ kiṃ· akraṣṭām² iti· kṛṣer luṅ³ tasas tām
 sic· anudāttasyetyādinā am· vadavrajeti
 vṛddhiḥ· jhalo jhalīti sico lopaḥ· tasya sthānivadbhāvāt ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ
 5 sīti katvaṃ· na bhavati· parasminn iti⁴ kiṃ· yuvajānir iti⁵ yuvatir⁶ jāyā
 asyeti⁷ bahuvrīhiḥ striyām⁸ ityādinā puṃvvatvaṃ⁹· jāyāyā niṅ¹⁰·
 yalopaḥ¹¹· sthānivan na bhavati· aparanimittāt¹² pūrvavidhau kiṃ·
 he gauḥ goto ṇiti¹³· ṇitvād¹⁴ vṛddhiḥ· sambuddhilope
 na sthāniva{dbhā}t· vidhigrahaṇaṃ pūrvasmād vidhir¹⁵ iti samāveśārthaṃ¹⁶·
 10 tena mathi paṇyam asyeti mātithikaḥ· tad asya paṇyam iti· ṭhak
 vṛddhiḥ ṭhasyekaḥ yasyeti ceti¹⁷ lopaḥ ta-
 sya sthāniva{dbhā}tvāt¹⁸ tāntalakṣaṇaḥ kādeśo na bhavati· vaiyākaraṇa
 i{ti}tya¹⁹ aici karttavye yaṇaḥ sthānivatvaṃ na bhavati· yo hy anādiṣṭād
 acaḥ pūrvas tasya vidhiṃ prati sthānivad iti vacanāt· ayādeś((e)) cāntaraṅ((e)) kartta-
 15 vye· asiddhatvaparibhāṣayā bahiraṅgasyaico 'siddham²⁰ iti
 nimittāpekṣapūrvatvaṃ²¹ āśritya tanvantīty atreḍabhāvaḥ iti yat²² kena[c]id uktaṃ²³ tad
 ayuktaṃ asiddhaparibhāṣayā caiva²⁴ siddhatvāt ||

¹SJ: sthānivadbhāvāt. ²SJ: akraṣṭām. ³SJ adds aṭ. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: yuvatī. ⁷SJ:
 yasya iti. ⁸SJ: striyā. ⁹SJ: puṃvadbhāvaḥ. ¹⁰SJ adds iti niṅ. ¹¹SJ: yalope. ¹²SJ: niṅ paranimitto
 na bhavatīti kṛtvā. ¹³SJ: ṇid iti. ¹⁴SJ: ṇidbhāvo. ¹⁵SJ: vidhāv. ¹⁶SJ: samāsāntarārthaṃ. ¹⁷SJ
 om. ¹⁸SJ: sthānivadbhāvāt. ¹⁹SJ: ity atra. ²⁰SJ: 'siddhatvād. ²¹SJ: -pūrvam. ²²SJ: uktaḥ.
²³SJ om. ²⁴SJ om. ca.

(P.8.2.28) *sico lopah. ato lopah* (cf. P.6.4.48). *tasya sthānivattvāt halantalakṣaṇā na vṛddhiḥ* (cf. P.7.2.7). **acah** kim? *akrāṣṭām iti kṛṣer luṇ. tāsas tām* (cf. P.3.4.101). sic (cf. P.3.1.43, 44). *anudāttasyetyādinā* (P.6.1.59) am. *vadavrajeti* (cf. P.7.2.3) vṛddhiḥ. *jhalo jhalīti* (P.8.2.26) *sico lopah. tasya sthānivad(a)bhāvāt ṣadhoh kaḥ sīti* (P.8.2.41) *katvaṃ na bhavati. parasminn* iti kim? *yuvaḥjanir iti yuvatir jāyā asyeti bahuvrīhiḥ. striyā ityādinā* (P.6.3.34) *pumvattvam. jāyāyā nin* (P.5.4.134) *yalopah* (cf. P.6.1.66). *sthānivan na bhavati aparanimittāt. pūrvavidhau* kim? *he gauḥ (iti) goto ṇiti* (cf. P.7.1.90) *ṇittvād vṛddhiḥ* (cf. P.7.2.115). *saṃbuddhilope* (cf. P.6.1.69) *na sthānivat. vidhigrahaṇam: pūrvasmād vidhir iti samāveśārtham.*¹⁵⁹ *tena mathi<taṃ> paṇyam asyeti māthitikaḥ. tad asya paṇyam* iti (P.4.4.51) *ṭhak. vṛddhiḥ* (cf. P.7.2.118). *ṭhasyekaḥ* (P.7.3.50). *yasyeti ceti* (P.6.4.148) *lopah. tasya sthānivattvāt tāntalakṣaṇaḥ kādeśo na bhavati* (cf. P.7.3.51). *vaiyākaraṇa ity aici kartavye* (cf. P.7.3.3) *yaṇaḥ sthānivattvaṃ na bhavati yo hy anādiṣṭād acaḥ pūrvas tasya vidhiṃ prati sthānivad* iti¹⁶⁰ *vacanāt. āyādeśe cāntaraṅge kartavye 'siddhatvapariḥṣāyā* (cf. *PP* 41, *NP* 50) *bahiraṅgasyaico 'siddham* iti.¹⁶¹ *nimittāpekṣapūrvatvam āśritya*¹⁶² *tanvantīty atreḍabhāva* iti *yat kenacid uktaṃ tad ayuktam asiddhaparibhāṣayā caiva siddhatvāt.*¹⁶³

58. *na padāntadvirvacanavareyalopasvarasavarṇānusrā-dīrghajaścarvidhiṣu.* (P.1.1.58)

(*Bhv.*:) *eṣu vidhiṣv ajādeśo na sthānivat. padānte kau staḥ. āvādeśaḥ syāt. dvirvacane daddhy atra maddhv atra.*¹⁶⁴ *anaci ceti* (P.8.4.47) *dvirvacanaṃ na syāt. vare varacy ato lope* (cf. P.6.4.48) *yāyāvaraḥ. āto lopa iṭi ceti* (P.6.4.64) *syāt. savarṇavidhau śnasor allopah* (P.6.4.111). *ṣiṇḍhi piṇḍhi. anusvārasya yayi parasavarṇo* (P.8.4.58) *na syāt. anu-*

¹⁵⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha vidhigrahaṇam kimartham, yāvatā pūrvasyety evaṃ siddham? tathā hi, kāryāpekṣayā ṣaṣṭhī bhaviṣyati – pūrvasya vidhau kartavya iti, naitad asti, asati hi vidhigrahaṇe yadi pūrvasyety ucyeta, pūrvasmād vidhau sthānivadbhāvo na syāt. atha pūrvasmād ity ucyeta, pūrvasya vidhau na syāt. vidhigrahaṇe sati ṣaṣṭhisamāsaḥ pañcamīsamāsaś ca labhyata iti sarvatra sidhyati. tasmāt samāsadvayārtham vidhigrahaṇam kartavyam.*

¹⁶⁰ *PP* 34. Cf. also *Pat.* on vārtt. 1 on P.1.1.57 (*Mbh.* I 146.9) and *Jñ.S.* p.87.

¹⁶¹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *kathaṃ vaiyākaraṇaḥ. 'na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyāṃ pūrvau tu tābhyāṃ aiḥ' ity* (P.7.3.3) *aici kartavye yaṇaḥ sthānivattvād yakārapūrvatvābhāvād aiḥ na syāt. ucyate yo hy anādiṣṭād acaḥ pūrvas tasya vidhiṃ prati sthānivattvam iti vacanān na sthānivattvam. iddha-paribhāṣayāntaraṅga āyādeśe kartavye bahiraṅgasyaico 'siddhatvād iti nyāsaḥ.*

¹⁶² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *pūrvatvaṃ punar ihādeśāpekṣam, ajapekṣam, nimittāpekṣam vā, eṣām evādeśādānām iha sannidhānāt.*

¹⁶³ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *kathaṃ bhavātīti. nimittāpekṣapūrvatva okārasya sthānivattvād avādeśā-prasaṅgād yathā tanvantīty atreḍabhāvaḥ. ucyate: nimittāpekṣam pūrvatvaṃ lakṣyavaśāt kvacid eva. tanvantīty atrāsiddhaparibhāṣayā veḍabhāvaḥ. Cf. also Nyāsa ad loc.: ṭṛṭīye tu pakṣe (cf. fn. 161) yaṇādeśa eva nimittāt pūrvāḥ. tasya vyavasthitasyeti vidhātavye sthānivadbhāvo labhyata iti na bhavati tanvantīty atreḍprasaṅgaḥ. ... dvividho hi vidhiśabdaḥ prāg darśitaḥ – karmasādhanaḥ, bhāvasādhanaś ca. tatra karmasādhane sarvam iṣṭam na sidhyatīti bhāvasādhano 'py āśrīyate. tena tanvantīty atreḍa evāpariniṣpannasyācaḥ pūrvasya vidhāne kartavye sthānivadbhāvaḥ siddho bhavati.*

¹⁶⁴ *Dwarikadas Shastri* (1971) and *Mishra* (1989) have: **dadhy atra, madhv atra.**

5

10

15

20

||na padānta || eṣu vidhiṣv iti· padāntādividhiṣu etenātra vidhiśabdah¹
 pratyekam abhisambaddha iti darśayati²· kau sta iti kimśabdād au³· sta iti· aster
 laṭ śap· tasyāditvāc⁴ chapo luk· śnasor allopa
 ity akāralopaḥ aukārasyāvādeśe karttavye na sthānivat
 25 da[ddh]y atreti· yaṇādeśo 'naci ceti dvitve karttavye na sthānivat
 dvitve kṛte jhalām jaś jhaṣīti dhakārasya dakāraḥ· yāyāvāra iti yāter
 yaṇantāt yaś ca yaṇa⁵· iti varac neḍ vaśi kṛti⁶·
 iḍabhāvaḥ· āto⁷ lopasya sthānivatvaniṣedhāt· āto lopa
 iṭi cety⁸ akāralopo na syāt⁹· śiṅdhīti śiṣṭ visaraṇe¹⁰ (loṭ) sip śnam
 30 her ddi¹¹ ṣṭutvaṃ¹² jhalām jhaś jhaṣīti
 śakārasya dakāraḥ¹³ jharo jharīti lopaḥ¹⁴ śnasor allopaḥ
 naś cāpadāntasyety¹⁵ anusvāraḥ sthānivatvaniṣedhāt

¹SJ: padāntādiṣu vidhiśabdasya. ²SJ: sambandhāt. ³SJ: prathamādvivacanāt. ⁴SJ: laṭi tas
 adāditvāt. ⁵SJ: yasya yaṇ. ⁶SJ adds iti. ⁷SJ: ato. ⁸SJ adds -ādinā. ⁹SJ: bhavati. ¹⁰SJ:
 viśeṣaṇe. ¹¹SJ: num hiḥ tasya dhirādeśaḥ. ¹²SJ adds: dhakārasya ḍhakāraḥ. ¹³SJ: ṣasya ḍhaḥ.
¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ: cety.

svāre śiṃṣanti. piṃṣanti. *naś cāpadāntasya jhalīty* (P.8.3.24) anu-
svāro na syāt. jaśvidhau. abhyastasyākāralopaḥ. dhaddhve.¹⁶⁵
dhaddhvam. jaśtvam na syāt. carvidhau. *gamahanety* (cf. P.6.4.98)
upadhālopaḥ. jakṣatuḥ jakṣuḥ. *khari ceti* (P.8.4.55) cartvam na syāt.
ataḥ sthānivattvam niṣidhyate. svaradīrghayalopeṣu lopājādeśo na
sthānivat.¹⁶⁶ tatreha svaro nodāhriyate. dīrghavidhau. *allopo 'naḥ*
(P.6.4.134). *pratidīvnā*.¹⁶⁷ *hali ceti* (P.8.2.77) dīrgho na syāt. yalope
kticy *ato lopaḥ* (P.6.4.48). kaṇḍūtiḥ. vali yalopo na syāt. lopaḥ kim?
vāyvoḥ. yaṇādeśaḥ sthānivad eva, ato vali yalopo na bhavati. kvilugu-
padhātvacanparanirhrāsakutvaṣatveṣu na sthānivat.¹⁶⁸ lāvayateḥ
pāvayateś ca kvip. lauḥ. pauḥ. *kvau luptam na sthānivad iti*¹⁶⁹
ṇilopasya sthānivattvaniṣedhād ūṭh. luki. āmalakam phalam. mayat.
phale luk (P.4.3.163). *luk taddhitalukīti* (P.1.2.49) strīpratyayanivr̥ttau
tasya sthānivattvaniṣedhād *yasyeti ceti* (P.6.4.148) lopo na bhavati.
upadhātve. pārikhīyam. cāturarthikāṇantād *yasyeti ceti* (P.6.4.148)
lopasya sthānivattvāt khopadhāc chaḥ. caṇparahrasvatve. avīvadad
vīṇām parivādakena. prathamasya ṇico 'sthānivattvāṇ *ṇau caṇīti*
(cf. P.7.4.1) hrasvatvam. evam pāpacyateḥ pāpaktiḥ. pācayateḥ
pāktiḥ. yāyayateḥ yāyaṣṭiḥ. yājayateḥ yāṣṭir iti. allopanīlopayoḥ
sthānivattvaniṣedhāj jhalīti kutvaṣatve bhavataḥ.

(*Pañj.:*) ||*na padānta*||. eṣu vidhiṣv iti padāntādividhiṣu. etenātra vidhiśabdah
pratyekam abhisam̐baddha iti darśayati. *kau sta* iti kimśabdād au. *sta* iti aster
laṭ. śap (cf. P.3.1.68). tasyād(ād)itvāc chapo luk (cf. P.2.4.72). *śnasor allopa*
ity (P.6.4.111) akāralopa aukārasyāvādeśe (cf. P.6.1.78) kartavye na sthānivat.
daddhy atreti yaṇādeśo '*naci ceti* (P.8.4.47) dvitve kartavye na sthānivat.
dvitve kṛte *jhalām jaś jhaśīti* (P.8.4.53) dhakārasya dakāraḥ. *yāyāvāra* iti yāter
yaṇantād (cf. P.3.1.22) *yaś ca yaṇa* iti (P.3.2.176) varac. *neḍ vaśi kṛti* (iti)
(P.7.2.8) iḍabhāvaḥ. *ato* lopasya (cf. P.6.4.48) sthānivattvaniṣedhād *āto lopa*
īti cety (P.6.4.64) akāralopo na syāt. *śiṇḍhīti śiṣṭ visaraṇe*.¹⁷⁰ loṭ sip. śnam
(cf. P.3.1.78). her dhi (cf. P.6.4.101). ṣṭutvam (cf. P.8.4.41). *jhalām jaś jhaśīti*
(P.8.4.53) śakārasya ḍakāraḥ. *jharo jharīti* (cf. P.8.4.65) lopaḥ. *śnasor allopaḥ*
(P.6.4.111) *naś cāpadāntasyety* (cf. P.8.3.24) anusvāraḥ. sthānivattvaniṣedhāt

¹⁶⁵ Mishra (1989) omits.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.1.1.58: *pratiṣedhe svaradīrghayalopeṣu lopājādeśo na sthānivat* (*Mbh.* I 152.16).

¹⁶⁷ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971): *pratidīvnā*. Mishra (1989): *pratidīvnā*.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.58: *kvilugupadhātvacanparanirhrāsakutveṣūpasam̐khyānam* (*Mbh.* I 153.4).

¹⁶⁹ Pat. on vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.58 (*Mbh.* I 153.10).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Dhṛ. 7.14: *śiṣṭ viśeṣaṇe*.

- parasavarṇo ṇakāraḥ· (nanu cātra sthānivadbhāvaprasaṅga eva [nāsti]·
 [[5]] iti vacanāt (ca. 4 akṣaras are erased) [anusvārasyākāralopā.uttara?] vidhānāt
 tat kiṃ niṣedhena· ta[t] sthāninaḥkārasyādīṣṭājāpekṣapūrvava[tva] [[3]]
 .āde[śo] pi sthānivadbhāvāt anādiṣṭāc ca .. va iti)¹ śiṃsantīti laṭ jher
 5 antaḥ² śnam śnasor allopaḥ³· tasya
 sthānivatvābhāvād⁴ anusvāraḥ· (kimartham punar asyopādānam· yāvata [ś]indhīti
 savarnānusvārayor udāharanam bhaviṣyati· evam manyate yadi [śindhi]mātram
 udāhriyeta tadā parasavarnasyānusvārāvinābhāvitvāt parasavarnavidhau
 sthāniva[dbh]āvapratiśedhenānusvāravidhāv api sthāniva[dbh]āvapratiśedhaḥ kṛta
 10 eva tataḥ [sūtr]e pṛthaganusvāragrahaṇam vyartha[m] iti bhrāntasya [bhrama]nirāsāya
 parasavarnavyatirekenānusvārasya pṛthagudāharanam·)⁵ dhaddhvam iti dhāṅyo⁶
 loṭ śapaḥ śluḥ⁷ dvirvacanam hrasvaḥ
 jaṣṭvam⁸ dakāraḥ dadhas tathoś ceti⁹ {dha} dakārasya¹⁰ dha-
 tvam· śnābhyastayor āt ity akāralopaḥ tasya sthānivatvaniṣedhāt
 15 prakṛtidhakārasya dakāraḥ¹¹ jakṣatur jakṣur iti ader liṭ atususau
 liṭy anyatarasyām [gha]sḥ ādeśaḥ upadhālopaḥ¹²
 tasya sthānivatvaniṣedhāt ghakārasya khari ceti kakāraḥ
 śāśivasighasīnāñ ceti¹³ śatvam· sthānivatvāt¹⁴ ghaso dviruktir
 abhyāsakāryyam· pratidivneti·¹⁵ tṛtīyaikavacanam· ṭā allopo
 20 'na ity akāralopaḥ tasya sthānivatvāt¹⁶ hali ceti
 dīrghaḥ kaṇḍūtir iti· kaṇḍvādibhyo yak· tataḥ ktickṛtau ca saṃjñāyām¹⁷ iti·
 ktic· ktin nāsti· aḥ pratyayād ity¹⁸ akārabādhitvāt¹⁹· ato lopaḥ·
 tasya sthānivatvaniṣedhāt· vali lopaḥ kvilug ityādi· lau
 paur iti· lūpūbhyām hetumaṅnic· tataḥ {.ā}sampadādītāt kvip·
 25 ṇilopaḥ· tasya sthānivatvāt²⁰
 chvoḥ śūḍ anunāsike ca ūṭh²¹· etyedhetyūṭsv iti vṛddhiḥ·
 āmalaka²² iti· āmalakyāḥ phalam· vikāra iti²³· nityam vṛddhiśaretyādinā
 mayat²⁴ pārikkhīyam iti parikhāśabdāt caturarthikāṇantāt
 śaiṣikavivakṣāyām khopadhāc cha iti karttavye ya-
 30 syeti ceti²⁵ lopapūrvasya²⁶ pūrvasmāt vidhau sthānivatvam· niṣidhyate·

¹SJ om. ²SJ: jhi jhontaḥ. ³SJ adds: ity akāralopaḥ. ⁴SJ: -tvanīṣedhāt. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: dhāṅyo. ⁷SJ: dhvam. ⁸SJ: jaṣṭvena. ⁹SJ adds asya. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: jaṣṭvam. ¹²SJ: -lopasya. ¹³SJ: śāśivasīti. ¹⁴SJ: sthānivadbhāvāt. ¹⁵SJ adds pratidiveḥ kanin. ¹⁶SJ: sthānivatvaniṣedhāt. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ adds anena. ¹⁹SJ om. akāra-. ²⁰SJ: sthānivatvaniṣedhāt. ²¹SJ: cchvor ityādinā vakārasyoṭh. ²²SJ: -kam. ²³SJ adds mayat. ²⁴SJ: vṛddhaśarādibhya ity anena tasya phale luk luk taddhitalukīti strīpratyayanivṛtṭiḥ tasya sthānivatvaniṣedhāt yasyetilopo na bhavati. ²⁵SJ om. ca. ²⁶SJ: lopasya.

parasavarṇo ṅakāraḥ (cf. P.8.4.58). nanu cātra sthānivadbhāvaprasaṅga eva nāsti yo hy anādiṣṭād iti (cf. fn. 160) vacanād anusvāryākāralopād uttara[[kāla]]vidhānāt tat kim niṣedhena? tat sthānīnakāryā(nā)diṣṭājāpekṣapūrvatvasambhāvād ādeśo 'pi sthānivadbhāvād anādiṣṭāc ca (acaḥ) pūrva iti.¹⁷¹ **śimṣantī**ti laṭ. jher antaḥ (cf. P.7.1.3). śnam (cf. P.3.1.78). **śnasor allopaḥ** (P.6.4.111). tasya 5 sthānivattvābhāvād anusvāraḥ. kimarthaṃ punar asyopādānaṃ yāvata **śiṅdhī**ti savarṇānusvārayor udāharaṇaṃ bhaviṣyati? evaṃ manyate: yadi śiṅdhimātram udāhriyeta tadā parasavarṇasyānusvārāvinābhāvitvāt parasavarṇavidhau sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhenānusvāravidhāv api sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhaḥ kṛta eva tataḥ sūtre pṛthaganusvāragrahaṇaṃ vyartham iti bhrāntasya bhramanirāsāya 10 parasavarṇavyatirekenānusvāryasya pṛthagudāharaṇam.¹⁷² **dhaddhvam** iti dhāñyo¹⁷³ loṭ. śapaḥ śluḥ (cf. P.2.4.75). dvirvacanaṃ (cf. P.6.1.10) *hrasvaḥ* (P.7.4.59) jaṣṭvaṃ (cf. P.8.4.54) dakāraḥ. *dadhas tathos ceti* (P.8.2.38) dakāryasya dha-tvam. *śnābhyastayor āt ity* (P.6.4.112) ākāralopaḥ. tasya sthānivattvaniṣedhāt prakṛtidhakāryasya dakāraḥ (cf. P.8.4.53). **jakṣatur jakṣur** ity ader liṭ. atususau 15 (cf. P.3.4.82). *liṭy anyatarasyām* (iti) (P.2.4.40) ghasl ādeśaḥ. upadhālopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.98). tasya sthānivattvaniṣedhād ghakāryasya **khari ceti** (P.8.4.55) kakāraḥ. *śāsivasighasīnām ceti* (P.8.3.60) ṣatvam. sthānivattvād ghaso dviruktir (cf. P.6.1.8; 1.1.59) abhyāsakāryam (cf. P.7.4.60, 62). **pratidīvneti** tṛtīyaikavacanaṃ ṭā. **allopo 'na** ity (P.6.4.134) akāralopaḥ. tasya sthānivattvā(bhāvā)t *hali ceti* (P.8.2.77) 20 dīrghaḥ. **kaṇḍūtir** iti *kaṇḍvādibhyo yak* (P.3.1.27). tataḥ *kticktau ca samjñāyām* iti (P.3.3.174) ktic. ktin nāsti *aḥ pratyayād* ity (P.3.3.102) akārabādhitvāt. **ato lopaḥ** (P.6.4.48). tasya sthānivattvaniṣedhād vali lopaḥ (cf. P.6.1.66). **kvilug** ityādi: **lau(h)** **paur** iti lūpūbhyām hetumaṅṅic (cf. P.3.1.26). tataḥ sampadādītṭvāt kvip (cf. vārtt. 9 on P.3.3.108; *Mbh.* II 155.9). ṅilopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.51). tasya sthānivattvā(bhāvā)c 25 *chvoḥ śūd anunāsike ca* (ity) (P.6.4.19) ūṭh. *etyedhatyūthsv* iti (P.6.1.89) vṛddhiḥ. **āmalaka** ity āmalakyāḥ phalam. vikāra ity *nityam vṛddhiśaretyādinā* (P.4.3.144) mayat. **pārikhīyam** iti parikhāśabdāc cāturarthikāṅantāc (cf. P.4.2.67–70) śaiṣikavivakṣāyām (cf. P.4.2.92) khopadhāc cha iti kartavye (cf. P.4.2.141) **ya-syeti ceti** (P.6.4.148) lopapūrvasya pūrvasmād vidhau sthānivattvaṃ niṣidhyate. 30

¹⁷¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu cātra sthānivadbhāvasya prāptir eva nāsti, yo hy anādiṣṭād acaḥ pūrvasya vidhau sthānivad bhavatiṭy ucyate, na cāyam anādiṣṭād acaḥ pūrvāḥ, tat kim pratiṣedhena? naiṣa doṣaḥ, sthānīno nakāryānādiṣṭājāpekṣaṃ pūrvatvam astīti tadādeśo 'py anusvāraḥ sthānivadbhāvād anādiṣṭād acaḥ pūrva iti labhyate.*

¹⁷² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *kimarthaṃ punar udāharaṇāntaropanyāsaḥ, yāvata śiṅdhītyādyantaroktam evedam yuktam udāharaṇam? evaṃ manyate – yadi tad evodāhriyate tadā yatra parasavarṇas tatrānusvāreṇa bhavitavyam, tatraiva hi sa vidhīyate, tataś ca nāntarīyakatvāt parasavarṇavidhau sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhe 'nusvāravidhāv api sthānivadbhāvapratiṣedhaḥ kṛta eva tato 'nusvāragrahaṇaṃ pṛthān na kartavyam iti kasyacid bhrāntiḥ syāt. tasmād yatra parasavarṇo na sambhavati, tad evodāharaṇaṃ yuktam iti.*

¹⁷³ Cf. *Dhp.* 3.10: *dudhāñ dhāraṇapoṣaṇayoḥ (dāne ca).*

avīvadad iti· vadater¹ hetumaṇṇicau² luṅ{aṭṭ}ādi prathamānico³ ṇer aniṭīti
 ṇilopaḥ⁴ tasya sthānivatvābhāvāt caṅpare nau hrasvaḥ⁵ sidhyati.⁶
 pāpaktir iti· pacer yaṅantāt ktic· alopaya⁷
 sthānivatvaniṣedhā kutvaṃ bhavati· yāyaṣṭir iti ya⁸jer yaṅantāt ktic· pāktir
 5 iti pacer ṇijantāt⁸ ktic· ṣatvakutvayoḥ karttavayayor alopanilopayoh⁹
 sthānivatvābhāvāt¹⁰· jhali vidhīyamāne ṣatvakutve (bhavataḥ· varacy¹¹ ato lopasya
 sthānivatvaniṣedho jñāpakaḥ samudāyeṣv api¹² pravṛttāḥ śabdā avayaveṣv
 api varttanta iti· anyathā hi yaṅo akārasya sthānivatve py akṅitvāt
 kṅiti vidhīyamāne ((ā))to lopo na syāt kiṃ kitvaniṣedhena· ||

10

15

||dvirvacane || atra dvirvacanagrahaṇaṃ tantreṇa dvir āvarttayitavyaṃ·
 tatraikena dvirvacananimitte 'cīti viśeṣaḥ apareṇa dvirvacana eva karttavya
 20 ity ata āha dvirvacananimitta¹³ ityādi· sthānirūpeṇa dvirvacanaṃ¹⁴ bhavātīti
 rūpātideśaṃ pratipadayati· ajgrahaṇaṃ¹⁵ jñāpakaṃ· yadi kāryyātideśaḥ syāt· tadā¹⁶
 jeghrīyata ity atra itve kṛte ekāco dve prathamasye
 ekācanibandhanaṃ¹⁷ kāryyaṃ¹⁸ labhyata eva kim ajgrahaṇena· dvirvacana eva
 karttavya iti· anyathā ādeśaḥ svarūpenāvatiṣṭhata iti·¹⁹ papatur iti· pā pāne²⁰
 25 atus· asaṃyogetyādinā²¹ kitvaṃ ato lopasya²²
 sthānirūpātideśāt pāśabdasya dviruktiḥ²³ jaghnatur iti
 hanter atususau²⁴· gamahanety upadhālopaḥ· dvirva-

¹SJ: vader. ²SJ: hetumaṇṇic tato. ³SJ: prathamasya ṇico. ⁴SJ: lope kṛte. ⁵SJ: caṅparanirhrāsaḥ. ⁶SJ adds nirhrāsa iti upadhāhrasvasya pūrvācāryasamjñā. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: ṇyantāt. ⁹SJ: atolopa-. ¹⁰SJ: sthānivatvaniṣedhāt. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: hi. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ adds: ca atra. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ: ekāj-. ¹⁸SJ adds: dvirvacana-. ¹⁹SJ om. ²⁰SJ adds liṭ. ²¹SJ: asaṃyogādinā. ²²SJ: lopaḥ tasya. ²³SJ: pārūpadviruktiḥ. ²⁴SJ: atus.

avīvadad iti vadater hetumaṇṇico luṇādi. prathamāṇico *ner anīṭṭi* (P.6.4.51) ṇilopaḥ. tasya sthānivattvābhāvāc caṇpare ṇau hrasvaḥ sidhyati (cf. P.7.4.1). **pāpaktir** iti pacer yaṇantāt ktic. alopayalopau (cf. P.6.4.48; 6.1.66). tasya sthānivattvaniṣedhā<t> kutvaṃ bhavati. **yāyaṣṭir** iti yajer yaṇantāt ktic. **pāktir** iti pacer ṇijantāt ktic. ṣatvakutvayoḥ kartavyayor (cf. P.8.2.36, 30) alopaṇilopayoḥ 5 sthānivattvābhāvāj jhali vidhīyamāne ṣatvakutve bhavataḥ. varacy ato lopasya (cf. P.6.4.48) sthānivattvaniṣedho jñāpakāḥ: *samudāyeṣv api pravṛttāḥ śabdā avayaveṣv api vartanta* iti (*Jñ.S.* p. 60). anyathā hi yaṇo kārasya sthānivattve 'py akñittvāt kñiti vidhīyamāna āto lopo na syāt kiṃ kittvaniṣedhena?¹⁷⁴

59. dvirvacane 'ci. (P.1.1.59)

(*Bhv.:*) **dvirvacananimitte 'cy ajādeśaḥ sthānivad bhavati. sthānirūpe-
ṇāvatiṣṭhate. kva? dvirvacana eva kartavye. kṛte dvirvacane punar
ādeśarūpaṃ naṭavad gṛhṇāti. papatuḥ papuḥ. jaghnatuḥ jaghnuḥ.
jakṣatuḥ jakṣuḥ. ato lopasya** (P.6.4.148) **gamahanety** (cf. P.6.4.98) 10
upadhālopasya ca sthānivattvād ekāco dvirvacanaṃ sidhyati. nināya 15
**lulāva. āyāvoh sthānivattvāt nailausābdau dvir ucyete. acīti kim?
jeghrīyate. yaṇīttvaṃ na sthānivat. uktaḥ sthānivadbhāvāḥ.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**dvirvacane**||. atra dvirvacanagrahaṇaṃ tantreṇa dvir āvartayitavyam. tatraikena **dvirvacananimitte 'cīti** viśeṣaḥ. apareṇa **dvirvacana eva kartavya** ity ata āha **dvirvacananimitta** ityādi.¹⁷⁵ sthānirūpeṇa dvirvacanaṃ bhavātīti 20 rūpātideśaṃ pratipādayati.¹⁷⁶ ajgrahaṇaṃ jñāpakam. yadi kāryātideśaḥ syāt tadā **jeghrīyata** ity atra ittve kṛta (cf. P.7.4.31) *ekāco dve prathamasye<ty>* (P.6.1.1) ekācanibandhanaṃ kāryaṃ labhyata eva kim ajgrahaṇena?¹⁷⁷ **dvirvacana eva kartavya** iti. anyathā ādeśaḥ svarūpeṇāvatiṣṭhata iti. **papatur** iti *pā pāne* (*Dhp.* 1.972). atus (cf. P.3.4.82). *asamyogetyādinā* (P.1.2.5) kittvam. āto lopasya 25 (cf. P.6.4.64) sthānirūpātidesāt pāsābdasya dviruktiḥ. **jaghnatur <jaghnur>** iti hanter atususau (cf. P.3.4.82). **gamahanety** (cf. P.6.4.98) upadhālopaḥ. dvirva-

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Puruṣottamadeva in *Jñ.S.* p. 60: *na padāntasūtre vare ajādeśasya sthānivanniṣedhavacanaṃ jñāpakam: samudāyeṣu hi pravṛttāḥ śabdāḥ avayaveṣv api vartante it. anyathā yāyāvāra ity atra varaci ato lopasya sthānivattve 'pi yāter āto lopa itī ceti* (P.6.4.64) *na prāpnoti kñiti tadvidhānāt yaṇo 'kāramātrasyañīttvāt.*

¹⁷⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha vā – dvirvacanaṃ ca dvirvacanaṃ cety ekaśeṣaṃ kṛtvā 'dvirvacane' iti nirdeśaḥ kṛtaḥ. tatraikena dvirvacanagrahaṇena 'dvirvacananimitte 'ci' ity eṣo 'rtho labhyate. dvitīyena tu 'dvirvacana eva kartavye' iti.*

¹⁷⁶ Cf. vārtt. 3 on P.1.1.59 (*ajgrahaṇaṃ tu jñāpakam rūpasthānivadbhāvasya; Mbh.* I 155.14) and *Jñ.S.* p. 60 (*dvirvacane 'cīty atra ajgrahaṇaṃ jñāpakam rūpasthānivattvasya*).

¹⁷⁷ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 60 (*yato 'cīty asya prayojanaṃ yaṇi mā bhūt jeghrīyata iti. yadi cātra kāryātideśaḥ syāt ittve kṛte ekāctvāt bhaved dvirvacanaṃ kim atra sthānivattvaniṣedhārthenājgrahaṇena.*) and *Nyāsa* on P.1.1.59 (*kutaḥ punar eṣa niścayaḥ – rūpātideśaś cāyam iti? ajgrahaṇāt. tasya hy etat prayojanam – jeghrīyate dedhmīyata ity atra mā bhūd iti. yadi cāyaṃ dvirvacanakāryātideśaḥ syān na rūpātideśaḥ, ajgrahaṇam anarthakam syāt.*).

cane¹ halādiśeṣaḥ kāryyaḥ² abhyāsāc ce kutvaṃ· jeghrīyata
 iti ghrā gandho 'pādāne yañ ī ghrādhvor iti
 itvaṃ tasyāsthānivatvāt³ ghrīśabdo (..) dviruktiḥ⁴ dvirvacane kiṃ· jagle·
 mamle· glāmlābhyāṃ liṭ bhāvakarmanāṇor ity ātmanepadam· tasya⁵
 5 eṣ· āto lopaḥ· anyathā⁶ asati kālāvadhāraṇārthe
 dvirvacanagrahaṇe godaḥ kambalada ity atra sāvakāśo lopaḥ dvirvacananimitte 'ci
 bādhyate⁷· tataś cāniṣṭam⁸ prasajjeta dvirvacane karttavya iti vacanād bādḥā na bha-
 vati· dvirvacananimitte kiṃ· dudyūṣati⁹· diveḥ¹⁰ sanīvantardheti¹¹·
 iḍabhāvapakṣe¹² halantāc ceti kitvaṃ· chvor ity¹³ ūṭh sa ca
 10 dvirvacananimittam na bhavati· yañādeśasy((ā))sthānivatvāt dyūśabdena
 dyūśabdena¹⁴ dvir ucyate· ||

||adarśanaṃ· || śaprasāktasyeti· sthānigrahaṇānuvṛttau¹⁵ lopa ity
 15 arthasyeyam saṃjñā itikaraṇānuvṛtteḥ· athavā lopa i(ty¹⁶ a)nvartha-
 saṃjñāvijñānāt lopaṇam lopa ity anupalabdhir ity arthaḥ· na cādarśanam
 ity etat śabdarūpam evārthasādhakam¹⁷ iti na śabdasya· rājeti sulopanalopau·
 bhavān iti· ug((i))d acām iti num· atvasanteti¹⁸
 dīrghaḥ saṃyogāntalopaḥ· paceran iti pacer liṅ jhasya
 20 ran śap sīyutḥ vali lopaḥ¹⁹ ād
 guṇaḥ ||

¹SJ: -naṃ. ²SJ: halādiśeṣādikāryam. ³SJ: sthānivadbhāvāt. ⁴SJ: dvir ucyate. ⁵SJ:
 ta. ⁶SJ: itarathā hi. ⁷SJ: bādhyeta. ⁸SJ: cākārāntatve 'niṣṭam. ⁹SJ adds iti. ¹⁰SJ:
 dīvyateḥ san. ¹¹SJ adds -ādinā. ¹²SJ: yasmin pakṣe iṅ nāsti tatra. ¹³SJ adds -ādinā. ¹⁴SJ:
 dyūśabdād. ¹⁵SJ: pravṛtṭyunmukhasya na tu pravṛtṭasya nahi pravṛtṭam cacanaśatair api bādhyate |
 sthānegrahaṇānuvṛtteḥ. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ: eveti vācyam lopapradeśeṣu asaṃbhavāt tato 'rthātmakam.
¹⁸SJ: atvasantasyeti. ¹⁹SJ adds ya-

cane halādiśeṣaḥ kāryaḥ (cf. P.7.4.60). *abhyāsāc ce(ti)* (P.7.3.55) kutvam. **jeghrīyata** iti *ghrā gandhopādāne* (*Dhp.* 1.973). yañ (cf. P.3.1.22). *ī ghrādhmor* iti (P.7.4.31) ittvam. tasyāsthānivattvād ghrīśabdasya dviruktiḥ. **dvirvacane** kim? jagle mamle.¹⁷⁸ glāmlābhyāṃ liḥ. *bhāvakarmanor* ity (P.1.3.13) ātmanepadam. tasya eś (cf. P.3.4.81). āto lopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.64). anyathā asati kālāvadhāraṇārthe 5 dvirvacanagrahaṇe godaḥ kambalada ity atra sāvakāśo lopaḥ dvirvacananimitte 'ci bādhyate. tataś cāniṣṭaṃ prasajjeta. dvirvacane kartavya iti vacanād bādḥā na bhavati.¹⁷⁹ **dvirvacananimitte** kim? dudyūṣati.¹⁸⁰ diveḥ *sanīvantardheti* (cf. P.7.2.49) iḍabhāvapakṣe *halantāc ceti* (P.1.2.10) kittvam. *chvor* ity (cf. P.6.4.19) ūḥ. sa ca dvirvacananimittaṃ na bhavati. yañādeśasyāsthānivattvād dyūśabdena dvir ucyate. 10

60. *adarśanaṃ lopaḥ.* (P.1.1.60)

(*Bhv.:*) **prasaktasyādarśanaṃ lopasaṃjñāṃ syāt.**¹⁸¹ **rājā. bhavān. paceran.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**adarśanaṃ**||. **prasaktasyeti** sthānigrahaṇānuvṛttau¹⁸² **lopa** ity arthasyeyaṃ saṃjñā itikaraṇānuvṛtteḥ (cf. P.1.1.44).¹⁸³ athavā **lopa** ity anvartha- 15 saṃjñāvijñānāl lopanaṃ lopa ity anupalabdhir ity arthaḥ.¹⁸⁴ na **cādarśanam** ity etat śabdarūpam evārthasādhakam iti na śabdasya.¹⁸⁵ **rājeti** sulopanalopau (cf. P.6.1.68; 8.2.7). **bhavān** ity *ugid acām* iti (cf. P.7.1.70) num. *atvasanteti* (cf. P.6.4.14) dīrghaḥ. saṃyogāntalopaḥ (cf. P.8.2.23). **paceran** iti pacer liḥ. *jhasya ran* (P.3.4.105). śap (cf. P.3.1.68). sīyut (cf. P.3.4.102). vali lopaḥ (cf. P.6.1.76). *ād* 20 *guṇaḥ* (P.6.1.87).

61. *pratyayasya lukślulupaḥ.* (P.1.1.61)

(*Bhv.:*) **pratyayādarśanasya tadbhāvitasya saṃjñātrayaṃ syāt.** **adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ** (P.2.4.72). **atti. juhotyādibhyaḥ śluḥ** (P.2.4.75).

25

¹⁷⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *dvirvacana iti kim? jagle. mamle.*

¹⁷⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yadā kālāvadhīparigrahārthaṃ dvirvacanagrahaṇaṃ na kriyate, tadottara-kālam api sthānirūpaṃ prasajyeta, tataś cākārasya śravaṇam eva syāt. āto lopasya tu goda ityevamādyavakāśaḥ. śrūyamāṇe cākāre pareṇa saha vṛddhiḥ syāt.*

¹⁸⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *dvirvacananimitta iti kim? dudyūṣati.*

¹⁸¹ Cf. vārtt. 4 on P.1.1.60: *siddhaṃ tu prasaktādarśanasya lopasaṃjñūtāt* (*Mbh.* I 158.21).

¹⁸² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *evaṃ manyate – 'sthānivat' ity atāḥ sthānigrahaṇam ihāpy anuvartate sthānī prasaṅgavān prasaktaḥ – iti paryāyā hy ete. tenāyam artho labhyate – prasaktasya yad adarśanaṃ tasyeyaṃ saṃjñāti.*

¹⁸³ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 1 ad loc. (*itikaraṇo 'rthanirdeśārtha iti; Mbh.* I 158.6) and *Nyāsa* on P.1.1.60 (*evaṃ manyate – 'na veti vibhāṣā' ity [P.1.1.44] ata itikaraṇo 'rthanirdeśārtho 'nuvartate. tena yathā tatrārthasya saṃjñā bhavati, tathehāpīti.*).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *etac ca 'na veti vibhāṣā' ity (P.1.1.44) ata itikaraṇānuvṛtter labhyate. atha vā – mahatī saṃjñā kriyate, anvarthā yathā vijñāyeta – lopanaṃ lopa iti.*

¹⁸⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *kiṃ ca 'lopaḥ' iti mahatī saṃjñā kriyate yathānvarthasaṃjñā vijñāyeta. lopanaṃ lopaḥ anupalabdhir anuccāraṇam ity arthaḥ. na cādarśanam ity etac chabdarūpam evābhāvātmakam, kiṃ tarhi? tadarthaḥ. tasmād anvarthasaṃjñāvijñānād arthasyaivaśā saṃjñā.*

||pratyayasya || tadbhāvitasyeti· lugādisaṃjñayā vihitasyety arthaḥ·
 anekasaṃjñākaraṇāt saṃjñāsamāveśo nāsti· (attīty etad udāhara[nam] upalakṣanam·
 5 anayā diśā stautītyādau· uto vṛddhir luki halīti lukprayojanam vedyam·)¹
 attīti· ader laṭ śap tasya luk· juhotīti· hu dāne²
 śapaḥ śluḥ ślāv iti dvirvacanam· abhyāsakāryyam·
 aṅga iti aṅgānām nivāso janapada ity arthe 'ṅ
 tasya janapade lub iti lup· lupi yuktavad vyaktivacana³ ityādinā⁴ bahu-
 10 vacanam· lopasaṃjñā ..⁵ sāmānyam sarvaviśeṣasaṃjñābhiḥ⁶ samāviśati· tathā ca na
 lumatāṅgasy((e))ti pratyayanīṣedhalakṣanaḥ phala iti⁷ ||

15

20

||pratyayalope || lakṣate 'neneti lakṣaṇam nimittam⁸· taddhetukam
 iti pratyayahetukam· kāryyam anyapadārthaḥ· gomān iti· matup⁹
 25 sarvanāmasthānety¹⁰ upalakṣaṇam· atvasanteti
 dīrghaḥ· agnicid ityādi¹¹· agnau ceḥ kvip sarvāpahārī lopaḥ
 pratyayalakṣaṇena tuk· ahann iti· hanter luṅ· tip śap
 tasya luk· halnyādinā tip¹² luk¹²·
 atrneṭ iti tṛnaha¹³ hiṃsāyām· laṅ¹⁴ tip· śnam halnyādilopaḥ¹⁵
 30 pratyayalakṣaṇena halādau sāravadhātuke tṛnaha im¹⁶ ād
 guṇaḥ dha[tva]jāstvacartvāni· aghnīteti·

¹SJ om. ²SJ adds laṭ. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: iti. ⁵SJ: tu. ⁶SJ adds saha. ⁷SJ:
 pratyayalopalakṣaṇapratīṣedhaḥ. ⁸SJ: -mātram. ⁹SJ adds: sulopanalopau. ¹⁰SJ: ne num ity.
¹¹SJ: iti. ¹²SJ: talopaḥ. ¹³SJ: tṛha hisi. ¹⁴SJ: laṭ. ¹⁵SJ: halnyādinā. ¹⁶SJ adds iti im.

juhoti. janapade lup (P.4.2.81). **aṅgā vaṅgāḥ. dvyañmagadhety**
(cf. P.4.1.170) **aṅ.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**pratyayasya**||. **tadbhāvitasyeti** lugādisaṃjñayā vihitasyety arthaḥ. anekasaṃjñākaraṇāt saṃjñāsamāveśo nāsti.¹⁸⁶ **attīty** etad udāharaṇam upalakṣaṇam anayā diśā stautītyādau *uto vṛddhir luki halīti* (P.7.3.89) lukprayojanam vedyam. 5
attīty ader laṭ. śap (cf. P.3.1.68). tasya luk (cf. P.2.4.72). **juhotīti hu dāne** (*Dhp.* 3.1). śapaḥ śluḥ (cf. P.2.4.75). *ślāv* iti (P.6.1.10) dvirvacanam. abhyāsakāryam (cf. P.7.4.62). **aṅga** ity aṅgānām nivāso janapada ity arthe 'ṅ (cf. P.4.1.170; 4.2.69). tasya **janapade lub** iti (P.4.2.81) lup. *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacana ity* (P.1.2.51) bahu-
vacanam. lopasaṃjñā *tu sāmānyam sarvaviśeṣasaṃjñābhiḥ samāviśati.*¹⁸⁷ *tathā ca na* 10
lumātāṅgasyeti (P.1.1.63) pratyayanīṣedhalakṣaṇaḥ phala iti.

62. **pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam.** (P.1.1.62)

(*Bhv.:*) **lupte 'pi** pratyaye taddhetukam kāryam syāt. **gomān. sarva-**
nāmasthāne num. ahan. agnicit. adhok. suptiñantam padam
(P.1.4.14). **atrṇeṭ.** *halādau trṇaha im itīm* (P.7.3.92). **iha pratyaya-** 15
syety anuvṛttau punaḥpratyayagrahaṇam kṛtsnapratyayalope yathā
syāt. pratyayaikadeśalope mā bhūt. āghnīyety atra sīyuṣsakāralope
pratyayalakṣaṇābhāvāj jhalāditvam nāstīty anunāsikalopo (cf. P.6.4.37)
na syāt. tallakṣaṇam iti ca vācye punaḥpratyayagrahaṇam varṇāśraya-
nivṛttyartham. tena gave hitam gohitam. rāyaḥ kulaḥ raikulam iti. 20
acīti (cf. P.6.1.77–78) **pratyayalakṣaṇābhāvād varṇāśrayā avādayo na**
bhavanti.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**pratyayalope**||. lakṣate 'neneti **lakṣaṇam** nimittam. **taddhetukam**
iti pratyayahetukam kāryam. anyapadārthaḥ (cf. P.2.2.24). **gomān** iti matup
(cf. P.5.2.94). *sarvanāmasthānety* (cf. P.6.4.8) upalakṣaṇam. *atvasanteti* (cf. P.6.4.14) 25
dīrghaḥ. agnicid ityādy *agnau ceḥ* (P.3.2.91) kvip. *sarvāpahārī* lopaḥ (cf. P.1.3.9
and P.6.1.67). pratyayalakṣaṇena tuk (cf. P.6.1.71). **ahann** iti hanter luṅ. tip. śap
(cf. P.3.1.68). tasya luk (cf. P.2.4.72). *halīnyādinā* tipo lopaḥ (cf. P.3.4.100 and
P.6.1.68). **atrṇeṭ** iti *trṇa hiṃsāyām.*¹⁸⁸ laṅ. tip. śnam (cf. P.3.1.78). *halīnyādilopaḥ*
(cf. P.6.1.68). pratyayalakṣaṇena *halādau sārvaadhātuke trṇaha im* (P.7.3.92). *ād* 30
guṇaḥ (P.6.1.87). *dhatvajaśtvacartvāni* (cf. P.8.2.31, 39 and P.8.4.56). āghnīyety

¹⁸⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* (*anekasaṃjñāvidhānāc ca tadbhāvitagrahaṇam iha vijñāyate*) and *Nyāsa* ad loc. (*yady atadbhāvitasyāpy etāḥ saṃjñāḥ syuḥ, anekasaṃjñākaraṇam anarthakam syāt, ekayaiva sarva-kāryasiddheḥ*).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.1.1.62: *lopaśabdo 'pi sāmānyena tadbhāvitasyātadbhāvitasya cādarśanasya saṃjñā. tasmāl lug api lopo bhavaty eva.*

¹⁸⁸ Cf. *Dhp.* 7.18: *trṇa (trṇi)*; 19: *hisi hiṃsāyām.*

āhanter liñ¹. sīyut. liña salopo 'nantyasyeti² salopaḥ³ gama-
hanety⁴ upadhākāralopaḥ⁵. ho hante ñinneṣu iti hakārasya⁶
ghatvaṃ. gohitam iti. caturthī tadartheti samāsaḥ. raikulam iti.
ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ⁷ sthānivatsūtrena nisidhyat[i]⁸. alvidhāv
5 iti pratyayalakṣaṇa[niṣedhā(?)]⁹ [[1-2]] tathā{pi}gnicidity atrālāśrayatve¹⁰ tuk.

10

15

||na lumatā || lumateti. lukslulupām anubandham utsrjya¹¹ luśabdo¹²
grhyate. tasmān matupkaraṇe tṛtīyā. ata evāha. lukslulupśabdair
lupte {pratyaye} iti. mṛṣṭaḥ juhutaḥ¹³ tas laṭ¹⁴ śap adā-
20 ditvāl luk. itaratra¹⁵ juhotyādītvāt¹⁶ śluḥ dvirvacanam¹⁷
abhyāsakāryyaṃ. gargā iti. yañantāt¹⁸.
yañiñoś ceti. luk. atra yathākramaṃ śabāśrayo vṛddhiguṇau. yañāśrayā¹⁹
vṛddhiḥ. pratyayalakṣaṇaniṣedhārtha²⁰ bhavati lup udāharaṇaṃ. aṅgā iti aṅgānām
nivāso janapada iti tasya nivāsa ity aṇo²¹ janapade lup.
25 atrāñāśrayā²² vṛddhir nna bhavati rājapuraṣa iti.²³ antarvarttinīm vibhaktim
āśritya pratyayalakṣeṇa prāptā bhasaṃjñā pratiṣidhyate. ahar dadātīti
ahan ity asmāt suḥ. tasya svamor iti²⁴ luk. (ro 'pīti
pratyayalakṣaṇaniṣedhāt²⁵ repḥādeśo bhavaty eva. nanu²⁶ supi ahann iti [ru]r²⁷
vidhīyate ahobhyām ityādau. yatra sup[śabdo na śrū]yate tatra sāmartyād repḥeṇa²⁸
30 bha[vita]vyam tat kim etannivṛtyarthena pratyayalakṣaṇaniṣedheṇa naitad asti.)

¹SJ adds: śap tasya luk. ²SJ: ityādinā. ³SJ: sakāralopaḥ. ⁴SJ adds -ādinā. ⁵SJ om. -kāra-. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: na sidhyati. ⁹SJ: pratyayalakṣaṇāt. ¹⁰SJ: tathā ca agnicid ity atrālāśrayas. ¹¹SJ: -viśeṣānutsrjya. ¹²SJ: luśabdeti. ¹³SJ adds iti mṛjūṣ śuddhau hu dāne. ¹⁴SJ rev. ¹⁵SJ: ekatra. ¹⁶SJ: adādītvāt śapo luk aparatra juhotyādinā śapaḥ. ¹⁷SJ: -na. ¹⁸SJ adds: jas tasya. ¹⁹SJ adds ca. ²⁰SJ: -ṇān na. ²¹SJ: aṇ tasya. ²²SJ: atrālāśrayā. ²³SJ adds atra. ²⁴SJ adds -ādinā. ²⁵SJ: pratyayalopa-. ²⁶SJ om. ²⁷SJ: rutvaṃ. ²⁸SJ: tataś ca tatra supśabdo na śrūyate | tatraiva repḥeṇa sāmartyād.

āhanter liñ. sīyut (cf. P.3.4.102). *liña*⟨h⟩ *salopo* 'nantyasyeti (P.7.2.79) salopaḥ. *gama-*
hanety (cf. P.6.4.98) upadhākāralopaḥ. *ho hanter* *ññinneṣv* iti (P.7.3.54) hakārasya
 ghatvam. **gohitam** iti *caturthī tadartheti* (cf. P.2.1.36) samāsaḥ. **raikulam** iti
 ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ (cf. P.2.2.8). sthānivatsūtreṇa (cf. P.1.1.56) na sidhyati. alvidhāv
 iti pratyayalakṣaṇam iṣyate. tathāgnicid ity atrālāśrayatve tuk (cf. P.6.1.71).¹⁸⁹

5

63. *na lumatāṅgasya*. (P.1.1.63)

(*Bhv.*:) lukślulupśabdair lupte 'ṅgasya tatkāryam na syāt. **mṛṣṭaḥ**.
juhutaḥ. **gargāḥ**. śapi yañi ca guṇavṛddhī na bhavataḥ. rājapurusaḥ.
 ṅaso bhatvam na bhavati. ahar dadāti. ahar bhunkte. *ro* 'supīti
 (P.8.2.69) pratiṣedho na bhavati. aṅgasya kim? pañca. sāma. payaḥ. 10
 samudāyasya padatvam bhavaty eva. *uttarapadatve cāpadādividhau*
pratyayalakṣaṇam nāstīti.¹⁹⁰ paramavācau paramaśvalihau paramago-
 duhau paramadaṇḍinau. samāse 'ntarvartinīm vibhaktim āśritya pa-
 datve kutvaḍhatvaghātvanalopāḥ prāptā na syuḥ. apadādividhau kim?
 dadhisecau. madhusecau. *sātpadādyor* iti (P.8.3.111) ṣatvaniṣedho bha- 15
 vaty eva. secayatīti sek.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**na lumatā**||. *lumate*ti lukślulupām anubandham utsṛjya luśabdo
 gṛhyate. tasmān matupkarane (cf. P.5.2.94) ṛṭṭiyā. ata evāha: **lukślulupśabdair**
lupte pratyaye iti.¹⁹¹ **mṛṣṭaḥ juhutaḥ** ⟨iti⟩ laṭ. tas. śap (cf. P.3.1.68). adā-
 ditvāl luk (cf. P.2.4.72). itaratra juhōtītyādītvāc śluḥ (cf. P.2.4.75). divṛvacanam 20
 (cf. P.6.1.10). abhyāsakāryam (cf. P.8.4.54). **gargā** iti yañantād (cf. P.4.1.105)
yañāñōś ceti (P.2.4.64) luk. atra yathākramaṃ śabāśrayau vṛddhiguṇau yañāśrayā
 vṛddhiḥ. pratyayalakṣaṇaniṣedho bhavati. lupa udāharaṇam: aṅgā ity aṅgānām
 nivāso janapada iti *tasya nivāsa* ity (P.4.2.69) aṅo *janapade lup* (cf. P.4.2.81).
 atrāñāśrayā vṛddhir na bhavati. **rājapurusa** ity antarvartinīm vibhaktim 25
 āśritya pratyayalakṣaṇeṇa prāptā bhasamjñā pratiṣidhyate. **ahar dadātī**ty
 ahan ity asmāt suḥ. tasya *svamor* iti (cf. P.7.1.23) luk. **ro** '⟨su⟩pīti (P.8.2.69)
 pratyayalakṣaṇaniṣedhād rephādeśo bhavaty eva. nanu supy *ahann* iti (P.8.2.68) rur
 vidhīyate: ahobhyām ityādau. yatra supśabdo na śrūyate tatra sāmartyād rephēṇa
 bhavitavyam tat kim etannivṛṭtyarthena pratyayalakṣaṇaniṣedheṇa? naitad asti. 30

¹⁸⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca sthānivadbhāvenāpy etat sidhyati, naitad asti; alāśrayam api hi pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam kāryam iṣyate. tathā hy agnicid ity atra 'hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk' ity (P.6.1.71) alāśrayo 'pi tug bhavaty eva.*

¹⁹⁰ Cf. vārtt. 6 on P.1.1.63: *uttarapadatve cāpadādividhau (Mbh. I 166.9).*

¹⁹¹ *Bhv.*: **lupślulupśabdair lupte**.

evaṃ dīrghāhā nidāgha iti he dīrghāho (nidāgha i)ty atra¹ halnyādilop((e))
 supo 'śravaṇād² rephaḥ prasajjeta· tasmāt³ pratyayalakṣaṇaṇiṣedho⁴ vaktavyaḥ·
 prāptā iti pratyayalakṣaṇaṇiṣedhāt⁵ padanibandhanā⁶ na⁷ bhavantīti⁸ śeṣaḥ· lumateti⁹
 kiṃ kāryate ṇilopasya pratyayalakṣaṇenāco¹⁰ ṇṇitīti

5 vṛddhiḥ¹¹ ||

10 ||aco 'ntyā || acām ity anena sūtre nirddhāra[ṇe j]ātāv ekavacanam iti
 darśayati¹²· tadādīti· antyo 'c ādir yasyety arthaḥ· ācchabda iti· ṭisaṃjñaka
 iti śeṣaḥ· saṃjñāphalaṃ paṭapaṭā(yata) ity atra ṭilopaḥ pac((e))te
 ityādau ṭer etvaṃ pacete pace ity atra sanniviṣṭānām anekācām
 abhāvāt katham saṃjñ((e))ty ata āha āntādivad ityādi· ||

15

||alo 'ntyāt || upānto¹³ varṇa upadhety¹⁴ ucyata (iti) alām sanniviṣṭānām
 iti śeṣaḥ¹⁵ pācaka ity atra upadhāsaṃjñāyām upadhāvṛddhiḥ¹⁶ śiṣṭam

20 iti śāser loṭ¹⁷ thas taṃ· śapo luk· (ūd) upadhāyā goha

ity anuvṛttau śāsa id aṃhalor itītvam ṣṭutvam·

bhettety atra laghūpadhagaṇaḥ¹⁸ ||

25

||tasmin || itisabda adhārādheyayor arthaḥ¹⁹ vyavasthārthaḥ tena

¹SJ: dīrghāho nidāghaḥ he dīrghāha ity atrāpi. ²SJ: -ṇe. ³SJ adds asupīti. ⁴SJ: pratyayalopa-.
⁵SJ: pratyayalopa-. ⁶SJ: padatva-. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: bhavatīti. ⁹SJ om. iti. ¹⁰SJ: pratyayalopa-.
¹¹SJ adds bhavaty eva. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: upāntyo. ¹⁴SJ om. iti. ¹⁵SJ: payaḥ. ¹⁶SJ: ata upadhāyā
 iti vṛddhiḥ. ¹⁷SJ: loṭi. ¹⁸SJ: śāsisvasīti ghatvam. ¹⁹SJ: ātmani.

evaṃ dīrghāhā nidāgha iti he dīrghāho nidāgha ity atra halnyādiloṇe (cf. P.6.1.68) supo 'śravaṇād rephaḥ prasajjeta.¹⁹² tasmāt pratyayalakṣaṇaṇiṣedho vaktavyaḥ. **prāptā** iti pratyayalakṣaṇaṇiṣedhāt padanibandhanā bhavantīti śeṣaḥ. **lumate**ti kim? kāryate (iti)¹⁹³ ṇilopasya (cf. P.6.4.51) pratyayalakṣaṇenāco ṇṇitīti (P.7.2.115) vṛddhiḥ.

5

64. aco 'ntyādi ti. (P.1.1.64)

(Bhv.): acāṃ sanniviṣṭānām madhye 'ntyō yo 'c tadādi ṭisaṃjñāṃ syāt. ātām. āthām. āmsabdaḥ. paṭat. damat. acchabdaḥ. pace pacete ity atrāntādivattvaṃ vyapadeśivadbhāvāt.

(Pañj.): ||**aco 'ntyā**||. acām ity anena sūtre nirdhāraṇe *jātāv ekavacanam* iti (Kās. 10 ad loc.) darśayati.¹⁹⁴ tadādīty antyo 'j ādir yasyety arthaḥ. **acchabda** iti ṭisaṃjñāka iti śeṣaḥ. saṃjñāphalaṃ: paṭapaṭayata ity atra ṭilopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.143). **pacete** ityādaḥ ṭer ettvam (cf. P.3.4.79). **pacete pace** ity atra saṃniviṣṭānām anekācām abhāvāt kathaṃ saṃjñety ata āha **antādivad** ityādi.

65. alo 'ntyāt pūrva upadhā. (P.1.1.65)

(Bhv.): upāntyo varṇa upadhocyate. pācakaḥ. śiṣṭaḥ. bhettā. nartakaḥ.

15

(Pañj.): ||**alo 'ntyāt**||. upānto¹⁹⁵ varṇa upadhety ucyata ity alāṃ saṃniviṣṭānām iti śeṣaḥ. **pācaka** ity atra upadhāsaṃjñāyām upadhāvṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.116). **śiṣṭam** iti¹⁹⁶ śāser loṭ. thas. taṃ (cf. P.3.4.101). śapo luk (cf. P.2.4.72). *ūd upadhāyā goha* 20 ity (P.6.4.89) anuvṛttau *śāsa id aṅhalor* iti (P.6.4.34) ittvam. ṣṭutvam (cf. P.8.3.60; 8.4.41). **bhettety** atra laghūpadhāguṇaḥ (cf. P.7.3.86).

66. tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya. (P.1.1.66)

(Bhv.): saptamyā nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya kāryaṃ syāt. dadhy udakam. madhv idam.

25

(Pañj.): ||**tasminn**||. itisabda ādhārādheyayor arthaḥ vyavasthārthaḥ.¹⁹⁷ tena

¹⁹² Cf. Kās. on P.8.2.69: *ahar dadāti. ... asupīti kim. ahobhyām. ahobhiḥ. nanu cātrāpi pratyayalakṣaṇena sub asti. ahar dadāti. ... naitad asti. uktam etat. ahno ravidhau lumatā lupte pratyayalakṣaṇaṃ na bhavatīti nāyam ahaśabdaḥ supparo bhavati. yatra tu lopaśabdena lupyate tatra pratyayalakṣaṇaṃ bhavaty eva. yathā he dīrghāho 'tra dīrghāha nidāgha iti. atra hi halnyāb iti lopena pratyayasya nivṛttih.*

¹⁹³ Cf. Kās. ad loc.: *lumate*ti kim? kāryate. hāryate.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: *bahutvād bahuvacanena bhavitavyam ity ata āha – jātāv ekavacanam iti. jāter ekatvād iti bhavaḥ.*

¹⁹⁵ Bhv.: **upāntyo**.

¹⁹⁶ Bhv.: **śiṣṭaḥ**.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: *'iko yaṅ aci' ityevamādāv* (P.6.1.77 etc.) *acītyevamāder ādhārādheyabhāvaḥ pratyāsattinibandhanah.*

tasminn iti yo 'rthaḥ sa yatra¹ upādīyate tatra pūrvasya kāryyaṃ bhavati· na parasya·
 asminn² asati iko yaṅ acītyādau³ aupas̄leṣikam adhikaraṇaṃ syāt⁴· upas̄leṣāś
 ca pūrvaparayor iti śiṣṭa⁵ iti parasyāpi syāt· dadhy udakam iti⁶ tasmān niyamārtham
 idaṃ⁷· nirddiṣṭagrahaṇaṃ⁸ antareṇāpi siddhe nirddiṣṭagrahaṇaṃ ānantaryārthaṃ⁹·
 5 tenāgnicid atreti cakāreṇa¹⁰ vyavadhāne ikārasya yaṅ na bhavati¹¹· ||

||tasmāt || nirddiṣṭagrahaṇaṃ¹² anuvarttate tasmād iti yatra pañcamyartho
 10 nirddiṣyate· tatrottaryānantaryasya¹³ kāryyaṃ vidhīyate¹⁴· na pūrvasyety ata āha·
 pañcamyā ityādi· grāmo va iti yuṣmacchabdāt ṣaṣṭhībahuvacanaṃ· grāma
 ity asmāt pañcamīnirddiṣṭāt padāt padasya¹⁵ yuṣmākam iti
 ṣaṣṭhībahuvacanāntasya padasya¹⁶ bahuvacanasya vasnasāv iti vas· viparīte
 (tu) na bhavati· [[3-5]]¹⁷ [yuṣmākam] grāma iti· pañcamyā parasyeti na kṛtam
 15 vaicitryartham¹⁸ ||

20

||svaṃ rūpaṃ || śāstra ityādi[nā] [[3]][ṇas̄āstre] prakriyārūpe 'rthe
 [pra]tya[ya].. ..kāryyāsambhavād iha svarūpamātram¹⁹ grāhyam· loke punar artha
 25 eva gr̥hyate· śabdasye[ti] grā[hyam?] [padā] [[10]]²⁰
 śabdaḥ svaṃ rūpaṃ grāhayati bodhayatīti yāvat etena saṃjñāśūtratvam²¹
 upanyasati²² śabdasya saṃjñīnaḥ svaṃ rūpaṃ ity eṣā saṃjñā a(ti)prasakta-
 syāpavādam āha· aśabdasaṃjñeti śabdasaṃjñāyām ṭi[ghv]ādaḥ svarūpa[m] na
 gr̥ [[2]] [agner .. .iti] sūtre²³ agnir ddevatā asyeti agneya ity udāharaṇaṃ·
 ḍhaki²⁴ kiti ceti vṛddhiḥ· eyādeśaḥ· rājñāḥ ka ceti·

¹SJ: cātra. ²SJ: anyathā yasminn. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: iko yaṅ acītyādaḥ. ⁵SJ: aviśiṣṭa. ⁶SJ om.
⁷SJ adds: grahaṇaṃ iti. ⁸SJ: nirddiṣṭam. ⁹SJ: āntaryārtham. ¹⁰SJ: ity atra takāreṇa. ¹¹SJ adds:
 dadhy udakam ity atra paratra yaṅprāptinivṛttaye. ¹²SJ adds ca. ¹³SJ: rasya. ¹⁴SJ: vijñāyate.
¹⁵SJ: parasya. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ: ata evāha. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ: pratyaṅgamādikāryyāsambhavāt
 śabdasya svaṃ rūpaṃ eva. ²⁰SJ: grāhyapadāpekṣayā karttari ṣaṣṭhī | tad ayam arthaḥ. ²¹SJ: sūtram.
²²SJ: upanyasya. ²³SJ: sūtram. ²⁴SJ: ḍhak.

tasminn iti yo 'rthaḥ sa yatra upādīyate tatra pūrvasya kāryaṃ bhavati na parasya. asminn asati *iko yaṇ acīty*-(P.6.1.77)-ādāv upaśleṣikam adhikaraṇaṃ syāt. upaśleṣaś ca pūrvaparayor iti śiṣṭa iti parasyāpi syāt. **dadhy udakam** iti tasmān niyamārtham idam. nirdiṣṭagrahaṇam antareṇāpi siddhe nirdiṣṭagrahaṇam ānantaryārtham.¹⁹⁸ tenāgnicid atreti cakāreṇa vyavadhāna ikārasya yaṇ na bhavati. 5

67. tasmād ity uttarasya. (P.1.1.67)

(*Bhv.*:) **pañcamyā nirdiṣṭe parasya kāryaṃ syāt. padāt parasya. grāmo vaḥ. putro naḥ. na pūrvasya. yuṣmākaṃ grāmaḥ. asmākaṃ putraḥ.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**tasmāt**||. nirdiṣṭagrahaṇam anuvartate. **tasmād** iti yatra pañcamyartho nirdiṣyate tatrottarasyānantarasya kāryaṃ vidhīyate. **na pūrvasyety** ata āha. 10 **pañcamyā** ityādi. **grāmo va** iti yuṣmacchabdāt ṣaṣṭhībahuvacanam. **grāma** ity asmāt pañcamīnirdiṣṭāt padāt padasya (cf. P.8.1.16, 17) yuṣmākaṃ iti ṣaṣṭhībahuvacanāntasya padasya *bahuvacanasya vasnasāv* iti (P.8.1.21) vas. viparīte tu na bhavati. [[ata evāha]]: **yuṣmākaṃ grāma** iti. pañcamyā parasyeti na kṛtaṃ vaicitryartham. 15

68. svam rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā. (P.1.1.68)

(*Bhv.*:) **śāstre śabdasya svam rūpaṃ grāhyam. nārthaḥ. agner dhak** (P.4.2.33) **āgneyam. pāvakāder na bhavati. rājñah ka ca** (P.4.2.140). **rājakīyah. nṛpāder na bhavati. aśabdasaṃjñā kim? ṭi ghu ghaḥ. artha eva gr̥hyate. iha tu vibhāṣā vṛkṣamṛgeti** 20 (cf. P.2.4.12) **plakṣanyagrodham rurupṣataṃ sve puṣaḥ** (P.3.4.40) **svapoṣaṃ raipoṣaṃ gopoṣaṃ ityādaḥ viśeṣagrahaṇe ca yatna āstheyah.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**svam rūpaṃ**||. śāstra ityādinā [[vyākara]]ṇaśāstre prakriyārūpe 'rthe pratyayā[[gamādi]]kāryāsaṃbhavād iha svarūpamātraṃ grāhyam.¹⁹⁹ loke punar artha eva gr̥hyate.²⁰⁰ **śabdasyeti** grāhyam. padā[[pekṣayā ṣaṣṭhī <kartari>. tad ayam 25 arthaḥ]]: śabdaḥ svam rūpaṃ grāhayati bodhayatīti yāvat.²⁰¹ etena saṃjñāsūtratvam upanyasati śabdasya saṃjñīnaḥ. **svam rūpaṃ** ity eṣā saṃjñā atiprasakta-syāpavādam āha. **aśabdasaṃjñeti** śabdasaṃjñāyām ṭighvādaḥ svarūpaṃ na gr̥hyate. **agner dhag** iti (P.4.2.33) sūtre agnir devatā asyety **āgneya** ity udāharaṇam. dhaki *kīti ceti* (P.7.2.118) vṛddhiḥ. eyādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.2). **rājñah ka ceti** (P.4.2.140) 30

¹⁹⁸ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.1.1.66–67: *nirdiṣṭagrahaṇam ānantaryārtham* (*Mbh.* I 172.15), which is also cited in *Kāś.* on P.1.1.66.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa*: *vyākaraṇe tu pratyayavidhānādīkāryam arthasya na sambhavati.*

²⁰⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *śāstragrahaṇam loke 'rthasyaiva grāhyatvāt.*

²⁰¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *śabdasyeti 'kṛtyānām kartari vā' iti* (P.2.3.71) *kartari ṣaṣṭhī, śabdaḥ svam eva rūpaṃ grāhayati bodhayati pratyāyayatīti arthaḥ.*

rājanśabdāt śaiṣikah (cha[h]) kaś cāntādeśah¹ chasyeyādeśah rājakiyah²
ya[tna] āstheya iti [[6]] [vrkṣa i]ti sūtre viśeṣagrahane³
śitpratijñānaṃ· sve puṣa ityādau⁴ paryyāyagrahane jitpratijñānaṃ· kiñ
ca śabdānuśāsanaprastāvād eva śabdasyeti labdhe⁵· śabdagrahaṇaṃ jñāpayati yatra
5 śabdaparo [nir..śa]ḥ tatra⁶ svarūpaṃ gr̥hyate· na tv arthapara iti· tena sve puṣa
ityādau na⁷ svarūpagrahaṇaṃ⁸· asannatvād⁹ āha· yatvāc¹⁰ chabdasya rūpam¹¹
eva grāhyam nārthaḥ tatra¹² kiṃ svarūpagrahaṇena¹³ tad apī¹⁴ jñāpayati kvaci[d
artho] ..yate¹⁵ arthavatparibhāṣopapadyate· aśabdasaṃjñeti
pratiśedhaḥ spaṣṭārthaḥ¹⁶· saṃjñāvidhānasāmarthyād eva svarūpagrahaṇaṃ¹⁷ na
10 bhaviṣyati· anyathā¹⁸ ṣṇāntā ṣaḍ iti śakāranakārāntāyāḥ¹⁹ saṃkhyāyāḥ²⁰
saṃjñāvi[dhā]nam anarthakaṃ syāt [svarū]peṇaiva siddhatvāt· ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ adds iti. ³SJ: sa cāyamaṃ yatnaḥ vibhāṣā vrkṣaṃgr̥gādi sūtre viśeṣeṇa. ⁴SJ: ity
atra. ⁵SJ: siddhe punaḥ. ⁶SJ adds eva. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ adds: na bhavati. ⁹SJ: āsannād eva.
¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds sva-. ¹²SJ: tat. ¹³SJ om. sva-. ¹⁴SJ: kṛtaṃ tu. ¹⁵SJ: gr̥hyata iti | tena.
¹⁶SJ: vispaṣṭārthaḥ. ¹⁷SJ: svarūpasya grahaṇaṃ. ¹⁸SJ adds hi. ¹⁹SJ: śakārāntāyāḥ. ²⁰SJ om.

rājanśabdāc śaiśikaḥ chaḥ kaś cāntādeśaḥ. chasyeyādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.2): **rājakiyaḥ. yatna āstheya** iti [[3]] [[*vibhāṣā*]] **vrkṣa** iti (cf. P.2.4.12) sūtre viśeṣagrahaṇe sitpratijñānam.²⁰² **sve puṣa** iti (P.3.4.40) paryāyagrahaṇe pitpratijñānam.²⁰³ kiṃ ca śabdānuśāsanaprastāvād eva **śabdasyeti** labdhe śabdagrahaṇaṃ jñāpayati: *yatra śabdaparo nirdeśaḥ tatra svarūpaṃ grhyate na tv arthapara* iti.²⁰⁴ tena **sve puṣa** ityādau na svarūpagrahaṇaṃ.²⁰⁵ āsannatvād āha: nityatvāc²⁰⁶ chabdasya rūpam eva grāhyaṃ nārthaḥ tatra kiṃ svarūpagrahaṇena?²⁰⁷ tad api jñāpayati: kvacid artho grhyate arthavatparibhāṣopapadyate (cf. *PP* 1, *NP* 14).²⁰⁸ **aśabdasaṃjñeti** pratiśedhaḥ spaṣṭārthaḥ. saṃjñāvidhānasāmarthyād eva svarūpagrahaṇaṃ na bhaviṣyati. anyathā *ṣṇāntā ṣaḍ* iti (P.1.1.24) śakāranakārāntāyāḥ saṃkhyāyāḥ saṃjñāvidhānam anarthakaṃ syāt svarūpeṇaiva siddhatvāt.²⁰⁹

69. *aṇudit savarṇasya cāpratyayaḥ.* (P.1.1.69)

(*Bhv.*:) **aṇ** udic ca grāhyamāṇaḥ savarṇasya svarūpasya ca grāhakaḥ syāt. *asya cvau* (P.7.4.32). khaṭvīsyāt. *yasyeti ca* (P.6.4.148). cauḍiḥ. svarūpasya ca. śuklikaroti. dākṣiḥ. udit ku cu ṭu tu pu. apratyayaḥ kim? *sanāśaṃsabhikṣa uḥ* (P.3.2.168). *a sāmpratike* (P.4.3.9). iha pratīyate vidhīyate bhāvyaṭa iti pratyayaḥ. tanniśedhād *bhāvyaṃāno 'ṇ savarṇān na grhṇātīty* (*PP* 31, cf. *NP* 19) ayam artha ity āhuḥ. tena *idama is* (P.5.3.3) *am sambuddhau* (P.7.1.99) *valāder*²¹⁰ ityādau ca savarṇāgrahaṇam.

²⁰² Cf. vārtt. 5 on P.1.1.68 (*sit tadviśeṣāṇāṃ vrkṣādyartham, Mbh.* I 176.25) and *Kāś.* ad loc. (*sinnirdeśaḥ kartavyaḥ. tato vaktavyam – tadviśeṣāṇāṃ grahaṇaṃ bhavatīti.*)

²⁰³ Cf. vārtt. 5 on P.1.1.68 (*pitparyāyavacanasya ca svādyartham, Mbh.* I 177.3), Pat. on it (*tato vaktavyaṃ paryāyavacanasya tadviśeṣāṇāṃ ca grahaṇaṃ bhavati svasya ca rūpasyeti*, line 4–5) and *Kāś.* on P.1.1.68 (*pin nirdeśaḥ kartavyaḥ. tato vaktavyam – paryāyavacanasya grahaṇaṃ bhavati, cakārāt svasya rūpasya tadviśeṣāṇāṃ ceti.*)

²⁰⁴ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 60: *yatra śabdaparo nirdeśas tatra svarūpaṃ grhyata iti. nārthaparanirdeśa iti.*

²⁰⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc. (*śabdānuśāsanaprastāvād eva ca śabdasyeti siddhe śabdegrahaṇam – yatra śabdaparo nirdeśas tatra svarūpaṃ grhyate, nārthaparo nirdeśa iti jñāpanārtham. tena 'sve puṣaḥ' ity [P.3.4.40] atra svarūpasya grahaṇaṃ na bhavati.*) and *Jñ.S.* p. 60 (*śabdānuśāsanaprastāvād eva śabdasyeti siddhe svarūpasūtre śabdagrahaṇaṃ jñāpayati yatra śabdaparo nirdeśas tatra svarūpaṃ grhyata iti. nārthaparanirdeśa iti. tena sve puṣa (P.3.4.40) ityādau svarūpagrahaṇaṃ na bhavatīti svarūpasūtre nyāsaḥ.*)

²⁰⁶ Another possible emendation would be: *nityasaṃbandhitvāc*. Cf. fn. 207.

²⁰⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tad evam āsannatvān nityasaṃbandhitvād asādhāraṇatvāc ca rūpam eva śabdasya svam, nārthaḥ.*

²⁰⁸ Cf. Puruṣottama on *PP* 1: *rūpavadartha 'py aṅṅikriyata iti arthavān śabdo grhyate iti arthavadgrahaṇaparibhāṣāyā evāyam arthaḥ saṃpadyate.*

²⁰⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca saṃjñāvidhānasāmarthyāt saṃjñāyāḥ svarūpagrahaṇaṃ na bhavati, saṃjñā hi saṃjñīnaḥ pratyāyanārthā kriyate; yadi saṃjñāśabdō 'pi svarūpaṃ pratyāyayet saṃjñāvidhānam anarthakaṃ syāt, naitad asti; saṃjñāvidhānasāmarthyād dhi saṃjñīnaṃ pratyāyayet, paribhāṣāvidhānasāmarthyāc ca svarūpam. tasmāt pratiśedhaḥ kartavyaḥ? na kartavyaḥ, jñāpakāt saṃjñāśabdā rūpasya grāhako na bhaviṣyati. yad ayaṃ 'ṣṇāntā ṣaṭ' iti (P.1.1.24) śakārāntāyāḥ saṃkhyāyāḥ ṣaṭsaṃjñāṃ vidadhāti, taj jñāpayati – saṃjñāśabdaḥ svarūpasya grāhako na bhavatīti; anyathā hi 'ṣaḍbhyo luk' ity (P.7.1.22) atra ṣaṭśabdena svarūpasya pratyāyitatvāt tato 'pi lug bhavatīti śakārāntāyāḥ saṃkhyāyāḥ ṣaḍ iti saṃjñāṃ na kuryāt.*

²¹⁰ Cf. P.7.2.35: *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ.*

||aṇudit || aṇ iti pareṇa ṅakār((e))ṅa pratyāhāragrahaṇaṃ svarūpasya
ceti pūrvasūtrād anuvṛttasya¹ ṣaṣṭhyantatayā (vi)pariṇāmāt· gr̥hyamāna iti
grāhakatvena² paribhāṣātvam³ asya sūca[yati] | caudīr iti cūḍāśabdāt bāhvādīñ⁴
savarnagrahaṇād yasyeti cety ākāralopaḥ· khatvī-

- 5 bhava(tī)ti abhūtatadbhāve kṛbhvastiyoge⁵ ityādinā cviḥ sarvāpahārī
lopaḥ savarnagrahaṇād ākārasyāsyā cvāv
itītvaṃ⁶· ut id yasya sa udit· kucūṭutupv iti rūpodāharaṇaṃ· prayojana tu
laśakv ataddhita iti kavargasya grahaṇaṃ· evaṃ cuṭū iti⁷· na vi-
bhaktau tasmā ityādi⁸ boddhavyaṃ· sanāśaṃsabhikṣa ur iti
10 sūtraṃ udāharaṇaṃ⁹· cikīṣuḥ aḥ sāmpratika iti sūtraṃ madhyama¹⁰ ity
udāharaṇaṃ apratyaya iti pratiṣedhād¹¹ ūkāra ākāraś ca¹² yathākramaṃ na bha-
vati· pratīyate vidhīyate¹³ bhāvīyate¹⁴ iti pratyayaḥ na pratyayo 'pratyaya iti
vyutpatya¹⁵ bhāvīyamāno 'ṅ savarnān na gr̥hṇāti ity ayam¹⁶ artho jāyate¹⁷· tena
idama is ityādaṃ na¹⁸ savarnagrahaṇaṃ¹⁹ ||

15

||taparaḥ || taḥ paro yasmād iti bahuvrīhiḥ varṇo 'nyapadārthaḥ

- 20 tād api²⁰ paras tapara iti tatpuruṣaś ca tantreṇa śabdadvayam²¹
āśritaṃ· ekaśeṣeṇa vā²²· tatpuruṣasya phalaṃ vṛddhir ādaij ity²³ uktaṃ
bahuvrīhes tv ato bhisa ais ity atrātmanā tulyakālaṃ grāhayati·
anena vidhitvam asya sūtrasya²⁴ khatvābhir ity atrāntādivadbhāvena·
aisprāptir ity adeśyam²⁵· varṇāśraye²⁶ 'ntādivadbhāvaniṣedhāt²⁷ na ca
25 taparakaraṇasāmarthyāt bhaviṣyati antādivadbhāvo pi²⁸ kīlālapābhiḥ śrutam²⁹ yābhir
i([ty a]tra nāsti³⁰· [gi]ratīti gṛ nigaraṇe laṭ tudādibhyaḥ³¹ śaḥ

¹SJ: pūrvasūtrānuvṛttasya. ²SJ: tvam. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: -tvād iñ. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: asya cvāv
iti ākārasya ikāraḥ. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: ityādiṣu. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: madhyam. ¹¹SJ: niṣedhāt. ¹²SJ
om. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ adds utpādyate. ¹⁵SJ: vyutpādyā. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ: artham āhuḥ. ¹⁸SJ
om. ¹⁹SJ adds: na bhavati. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹SJ adds idam. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ adds: sūtra. ²⁴SJ om.
²⁵SJ: ais prāpnotīti na deśanīyaṃ. ²⁶SJ: -śrayavidhau. ²⁷SJ: -pratiṣedhāt. ²⁸SJ om. ²⁹SJ: śubhā
³⁰SJ: sāvakāśaṃ ca taparakaraṇam. ³¹SJ: tip tudādītāt.

(*Pañj.*) ||**anudit**||. **an** iti pareṇa ṅakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇam.²¹¹ **svarūpasya ceti** pūrvasūtrād anuvṛttasya ṣaṣṭhyantatayā vipariṇāmāt.²¹² **grhyamāna** iti grāhakatve na paribhāṣātvam asya sūcayati.²¹³ **caudir** iti cūḍāśabdād bāhvādīṅ (cf. P.4.1.96). savarṇagrahaṇād **yasyeti cety** (P.6.4.148) ākāralopaḥ. **khaṭvībhavatīty**²¹⁴ *abhūtatadbhāve kṛbhvastiyoge* ityādinā²¹⁵ (P.5.4.50) cviḥ. sarvāpahārī 5
lopaḥ (cf. P.1.3.9 and P.6.1.67). savarṇagrahaṇād ākārasyā**sya cvāv** iti (P.7.4.32) ittvam. ut id yasya sa **udit**. **kucuṭutupv** iti rūpodāharaṇam. prayojanaṃ tu *laśakv ataddhita* iti (P.1.3.8) kavargasya grahaṇam. evaṃ *cutū* iti (P.1.3.7) *na vibhaktau tasmā* ity-(P.1.3.4)-ādi boddhavyam. **sanāśaṃsabhikṣa ur** iti (P.3.2.168) sūtram udāharaṇam: cikīrṣuḥ. **a sāmpratika** iti (P.4.3.9) sūtram madhya ity 10
udāharaṇam. **apratyaya** iti pratiśedhād ūkāra ākāraś ca yathākramaṃ na bhavati. **pratyate vidhīyate bhāvyaite** iti **pratyayaḥ**. na pratyayo '**pratyaya** ity vyutpattyā **bhāvya māno 'ṅ savarṇān na grhṇātīty** ayam artho jāyate.²¹⁶ **tena idama iś** ity-(P.5.3.3)-ādaḥ na savarṇagrahaṇam.

70. **taparas tatkālasya.** (P.1.1.70)

15

(*Bhv.*) **taparo varṇa ātmanā tulyakālaṃ grāhayati. ato bhisa ais** (P.7.1.9). **vṛkṣaiḥ. neha. khaṭvābhiḥ. ṛta id dhātoḥ** (P.7.1.100). **kirati. girati.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**taparah**||. taḥ paro yasmād iti bahuvrīhiḥ. varṇo 'nyapadārthaḥ (cf. P.2.2.24). tād api paras **tapara** iti tatpuruṣaś ca.²¹⁷ tantreṇa śabdadvayam 20
āśritam ekaśeṣeṇa vā. tatpuruṣasya phalaṃ *vṛddhir ādaij* ity (P.1.1.1) uktam. bahuvrīhes tv **ato bhisa ais** ity (P.7.1.9) atrātmanā **tulyakālaṃ grāhayati**. anena vidhitvam asya sūtrasya. **khaṭvābhir** ity atrāntādivadbhāvena (cf. P.6.1.85) aisprāptir ity adeśyaṃ varṇāśraye 'ntādivadbhāvaniśedhāt (cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 83). na ca taparakaraṇasāmarthyād bhaviṣyati. antādivadbhāvo 'pi kilālapābhiḥ śrutam yābhir 25
ity atra nāsti.²¹⁸ **giratīti** gṛ nigaraṇe (*Dhp.* 6.117). laṅ *tudādibhyaḥ śaḥ* (P.3.1.77).

²¹¹ Cf. *Kāś.*: *pareṇa ṅakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇam.*

²¹² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *pūrvasūtrāt 'svaṃ rūpaṃ' ity (P.1.1.68) etad ihānuvartate. tac cārthād vibhaktivipariṇāmo bhavatīti ṣaṣṭhyantaṃ sampadyate.*

²¹³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *saṃjñāsūtram idam, na paribhāṣā. sā hi nīyamārthā bhavati.* Similar *Pad.*

²¹⁴ *Bhv.*: **khaṭvīsyāt.**

²¹⁵ The phrase *abhūtatadbhāve* is a part of vārtt. 1 on P.5.4.50. It appears as part of the rule in *Kāś.* and this reading is repeated in *Bhv.*

²¹⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *anye tv āhuḥ - 'apratyaya' iti neha saṃjñāgrahaṇam, kiṃ tarhi? anvarthagrahaṇam. pratyate vidhīyate utpādyata ity pratyayaḥ. tenāpratyaya ity asyāyam artho bhavati - bhāvya māno 'ṅ savarṇān na grhṇātīti.*

²¹⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *taḥ paro yasmād so 'yaṃ taparah, tād api paras taparah.*

²¹⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *kathaṃ punar etat pratyudāharaṇam, yāvata 'antādivac ca' ity (P.6.1.85) antādivadbhāve bhavitavyam evātraishbhāvena, taparakaraṇasya tu yatraikādeśo nāsti tad vyavacchedyaṃ bhaviṣyati - kilālapābhiḥ, somapābhir ityādi? naiśa doṣaḥ, 'antādivac ca' ity (P.6.1.85) atra vakṣyati - 'varṇāśrayavidhāv antādivadbhāvo neṣyate' iti, tathā hi - khaṭvābhir ity atrāntādivadbhāvābhāvād 'ato bhisa ais' (P.7.1.9) na bhavatīti. atha vā - 'ataḥ' ity atrākāradvayaprasāḥ kṛtaḥ, śrūyamāṇād ato yathā syāt.*

ṛta id dhātor itītvam¹. dīrgho na bhavati ||

5

||ādir antyena || ādivarṇa ityādinā saṃjñātvam asya darśayati·
madhyapātinām iti bāhulyād idam uktaṃ eṅ ity atra aukārasya² madhyapātitasya³
grahaṇāt· ādir⁴ antyenetī kiṃ⁵ suṭ itī tṛ)tiyaikavacane mā bhūt ||

10

15 ||yena vidhi || yenetī karaṇe tṛtīyā vidhīyata itī vidhiḥ⁶
karmmasādhanāḥ er aj itīkāreṇa dhātau viśiṣyamāne ikārāntasya dhātoḥ
saṃjñā bhavatīti saṃjñāsūtraṃ idam· ikārāntād dhātor aj vidhīyate· cayo jaya
itī cījibhyām⁷ er ac⁸ guṇāyādeśau· yasmin vidhis
tadādāv algrahaṇe itī tadantavidhiḥ⁹ ||

20

25

||vṛddhir yasya || yasyeti samudāyāpekṣayā ṣaṣṭhī acām itī bahu-
vacanam atātraṃ· tena dvayor api¹⁰ ādibhūto vṛddhisamjñakaḥ¹¹

¹SJ: iti. ²SJ: ekasyaiva. ³SJ: madhyapatitasya. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ adds: vidhiśabdo
'yaṃ. ⁷SJ: cīñji-. ⁸SJ adds ity ac. ⁹SJ: -dhyapavādaḥ. ¹⁰SJ adds: madhye. ¹¹SJ:
ādivṛddhisamjñakaḥ.

ṛta id dhātor iti (P.7.1.100) ittvam. dīrgho na bhavati.

71. ādir antyena sahetā. (P.1.1.71)

(*Bhv.*) ādir varṇo 'ntyenetā itsamjñakena saha milito madhyapatitānām varṇānām grāhakaḥ syāt svarūpasya ca. aṅ. ak. hal. ac. sup. tiṅ. suṭ. āp. ṭṛn. kṛñ.

5

(*Pañj.*) ||*ādir antyena*||. ādivarṇa ityādinā²¹⁹ samjñātvam asya darśayati.²²⁰ madhyapāti(tā)nām iti bāhulyād idam uktam eṅ ity atra okārasya madhyapātitasya grahaṇāt.²²¹ *ādir antyenet*i kim? suṭ iti ṭṛṭīyaikavacane mā bhūt.²²²

72. yena vidhis tadantasya. (P.1.1.72)

(*Bhv.*) yena viśeṣaṇena vidhir ucyate sa tadantasya grāhakaḥ syāt. *er ac* (P.3.3.56). ikāreṇa dhātor ajvidhir itīkāras tadantaṃ grāhayati. caya jayaḥ. *yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe* (vārtt. 29 on P.1.1.72, *Mbh.* I 188.24). *acīty* (cf. P.6.4.77) ajādāv iyaṅvau. śriyau. bhruvaḥ. uktaṃ grahaṇakaśāstram.

10

(*Pañj.*) ||*yena vidhi*||. *yeneti* karaṇe ṭṛṭīyā (cf. P.2.3.18). vidhīyata iti *vidhiḥ* karmasādhanāḥ. *er aj* iti (P.3.3.56) ikāreṇa dhātau viśiṣyamāna ikārāntasya dhātoḥ samjñā bhavatīti samjñāsūtraṃ idam. ikārāntād dhātor aj vidhīyate. cayo jaya iti cijibhyām *er ac* (P.3.3.56). guṇāyādeśau (cf. P.7.3.84; 6.1.78). *yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe* iti tadantavidhi(pratiśedha)ḥ.

15

73. vṛddhir yasyācām ādis tad vṛddham. (P.1.1.73)

20

(*Bhv.*) acām madhye yasyādir vṛddhis tad vṛddhasamjñam syāt. *vṛddhāc chaḥ* (P.4.2.114). pāṇinīyam. śaivīyam. bauddhīyam matam. *vā nāmadheyasya vṛddhasamjñā vaktavyā* (Pat. on vārtt. 5 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 189.24). devadattīyāś chātrāḥ daivadattā vā. *gotrāntād asamastavat pratyayo vaktavyaḥ*.²²³ vṛddhabhāradvājīyāḥ. vṛddhakāśyapīyāḥ. ajātaulvalīyāḥ.

25

(*Pañj.*) ||*vṛddhir yasya*||. *yasyeti* samudāyāpekṣayā ṣaṣṭhī.²²⁴ *acām* iti bahuvacanam atantram (cf. *PP* 117, *NP* 73).²²⁵ tena dvayor api ādibhūto vṛddhisamjñakaḥ

²¹⁹ *Bhv.*: ādir varṇaḥ.

²²⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: idam api samjñāsūtraṃ.

²²¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: tanmadhyapatitānām iti. jātāv idam bahuvacanam; anyathā hy eṅśabda okārasya samjñā na syāt.

²²² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: antyenet i kim? suṭ iti ṭṛṭīyaikavacanena 'ṭā' ity anena grahaṇam mā bhūt.

²²³ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 7 ad loc. (gotrāntād vāsamastavat pratyayo bhavatīti vaktavyam; *Mbh.* I 190.5) and *Kāś.* on P.1.1.73 (gotrāntād asamastavat pratyayo bhavatīti vaktavyam).

²²⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: yasyeti samudāya ucyate.

²²⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'acām' iti jātau bahuvacanam.

tasyāpi samjñā¹ vidhīyate· pāṇinīyam iti paṇo 'syāstīti paṇī· ata inih·
 tataḥ paṇino 'patyam iti· aṇ tatra² gāthividathīyādinā
 prakṛtivadbhāvaḥ pāṇinasyāpatyam iti ata iñ pāṇiniḥ tasyedam³
 vṛddhāc chaḥ· īyādeśaḥ· śaivīyam·

- 5 bauddhīyam· iti· śivo bhaktir asya buddho bhaktir asya so 'sya bhaktīty-
 ādinā aṇ⁴· tadantāt chaḥ gotrā(ntā)d asamastavad iti yathā kāśyapaśabdād bhavati
 tathā vṛddhakaśyapād⁵ api· ||

10

- 15 ||eñ· || pracām iti deśaviśeṣaṇam etat· pūrvasminn avastito deśāḥ
 prāgdeśaḥ⁶· eñ ekārokārau⁷ ācām ādī yadi bhavataḥ tadā vṛddhisamjñā· eñī-
 pacanīya iti· eñīpacane bhavo vṛddhāc cha īyādeśaḥ
 ākāralopah⁸ ||

- 20 mahopādhyāyaśrīviśvarūpaviracitāyām bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyām
 prathamo dhyāyasya prathamapādaḥ⁹· ||

25

- 30 ||gāṅkuṭā ||· kuṭa ādir yeśām iti te kuṭādayaḥ
 jaśtvam na kṛtam sūtre¹⁰ kuṭa bālya sya dhātoḥ¹¹

¹SJ adds vṛddha-. ²SJ: tasya. ³SJ: tasyāpatyam. ⁴SJ: bhaktir ity aṇ. ⁵SJ:
 -paśabdād. ⁶SJ: prāgdeśābhidhāyino grāmasya. ⁷SJ: ekārukārau. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: iti
 sadupādhyāyaśrīviśvarūpakṛtau bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyām prathamādhyāyasya prathamah pādah. ¹⁰SJ
 om. ¹¹SJ om.

tasyāpi saṃjñā vidhīyate. **pāṇinīyam** iti paṇo 'syāstīti paṇī: ata inih (cf. P.5.2.115). tataḥ paṇino 'patyam ity aṇ (cf. P.4.1.92). tatra *gāthividathītyādinā* (P.6.4.165) prakṛtivadbhāvaḥ. pāṇinasyāpatyam ity *ata in* (P.4.1.95): pāṇiniḥ. *tasyedam* (P.4.3.120). **vṛddhāc chaḥ** (P.4.2.114). īyādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.2). **śaivīyam bauddhīyam** iti śivo bhaktir asya buddho bhaktir asya so 'sya *bhaktīty-*(P.4.3.95)-
ādinā aṇ. tadantāc chaḥ. **gotrāntād asamastavad** iti yathā kāśyapaśabdād bhavati tathā vṛddhakāśyapād api. 5

74. *tyadādīni ca.* (P.1.1.74)

(*Bhv.:*) **tyadādīni vṛddhasaṃjñakāni syuḥ. tadīyam. idamīyam. adasīyam. yuṣmadīyam. madīyam. asmadīyam. kimīyam.** 10

75. *eṇi prācām deśe.* (P.1.1.75)

(*Bhv.:*) **eṇi yasyācām ādis tad vṛddhasaṃjñam syāt prāgdeśe. eṇīpacanīyo grāmaḥ. bhojakaṭīyo deśaḥ. deśe kim? gomatyāṃ bhavā gaumatā matsyāḥ.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**eṇi**||. **prācām** iti deśaviśeṣaṇam etat.²²⁶ pūrvasminn avasthito deśaḥ 15
prāgdeśaḥ. eṇi ekārokārāv acām ādī yadi bhavataḥ tadā vṛddhasaṃjñā. **eṇīpacanīya** ity eṇīpacane bhavo (cf. P.4.3.53). *vṛddhāc cha* (cf. P.4.2.114). īyādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.2). akāralopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.148).

mahopādhyāyaśrīviśvarūpaviracitāyām bhāṣāvṛttipaṅjikāyām
prathamasyādhyāyasya²²⁷ prathamapādaḥ. 20

(prathamādhyāyasya dvitīyaḥ pādaḥ)

1. *gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'ñṇin nit.* (P.1.2.1)

(*Bhv.:*) ebhyo 'ñṇitaḥ pratyayā nidvad bhavanti. inādeśo gāṅ. adhyagīṣṭa. adhyagīṣṭaḥ. **nādhyagīdhvaṃ dhruvaṃ smṛtīḥ** (*Bhatt.* 7.91b²²⁸).
kuṭādeḥ. kuṭitā. puṭitā. kuṭitum. puṭitum. saṃkuṭitavyam. aṅṇit 25
kim? ṇic. koṭayati. ghañ. koṭaḥ. vyaceḥ kuṭāditvam anasīti vaktavyam (Pat. on vārtt. 4 on P.6.1.17, *Mbh.* III 27.5). **vicitā vicitum. anasi kim? asun. uruvyacāḥ** (*RV* 1.104.9c).

(*Pañj.:*) ||**gāṅkuṭā**||. kuṭa (cf. *Dhp.* 6.73) ādir yeṣām iti te kuṭādayaḥ. 30
jaśtvam (cf. P.8.2.39) na kṛtam sūtre kuṭa bālya ⟨ity⟩ (*Dhp.* 6.89) asya dhātoḥ

²²⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* (*eṇi yasyācām ādis tat prācām deśābhidhāne vṛddhasaṃjñam bhavati*) and *Nyāsa* ad loc. (*etena prācām iti deśaviśeṣaṇam na vikalpārtham iti darśayati*).

²²⁷ Cf. the end of *pādas* 1.2 and 1.3.

²²⁸ *Bhatt.* has *smṛtim* instead of *smṛtīḥ*.

śaṅkānivṛttaye [ku]ṭa ity akāra uccāraṇārtho vā¹. sthānivadbhāvo pi nāsti.
 pūrvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivad iti². ekādeśasyādivadbhāvāt
 nn?āstvam. akāra³ uccāraṇasāmarthyāt.⁴ dvandvam kṛtvā na bahuvrīhiḥ. yadi
 syād evam ādiśabdasya pratyekasambandhād⁵ gāṇādīnām ādeśānām grahaṇam⁶. tato
 5 lyudādiḥpratyaye⁷ ato lope guṇābhāve [ca]⁸ upasamkhyānam
 pravayanādyasiddhiḥ⁹. tasmāt gāṅkutādayaś¹⁰ ce(ti) dvandvaḥ gāṅ((h)) parasya nītaḥ
 pratyayasyāsambhavāt aṅiti gāṅo 'ṅiti kuṭāder iti yathāsamkhyam na bhavati¹¹.
 sūtre 'ṅid ity¹² akārasya pūrvārūpatve¹³ kiṃ nītipratyayasya¹⁴ nītvam
 uta nīta ity¹⁵ sandehaḥ. vyaceḥ kuṭāditvam anasīti asuni pratiśedhāt gā āṅ kuṭa
 10 ādir nyantaḥ ku kavargo vā tādīśabdena takārāder ddhātor iti eṣām grahaṇam na
 syāt¹⁶. avayavaprasiddheḥ samudāyaprasiddhir balīyasīti nyāyāt
 nītvad bhavantīti¹⁷ nītkāryyāṅy atidiśyante. tena kāryyātideśe¹⁸ yaṃ. iṅādeśo gāṅ
 iti nīkārasyaṅā(nyā)rthatvāt sthānivadbhāvād ātmanepadasiddheḥ¹⁹. gāṅ gatāv ity
 asya dhātoḥ nīkārasyaātmanepadārtha([tvā])d agrahaṇam. bhāṣye tu
 15 vṛddhir yasyācām ādis tad²⁰ ity ato ajgrahaṇam anuva[rtya] acā gāṅ
 vīśīyate. ajādeśo gāṅ ity²¹ prakārāntaram. adhyagīṣṭeti. adhipūrvād iṅo vibhāṣā
 luṅṅnōr ity gāṅ ādeśaḥ tato luṅ aṅ²². anena²³ nītve
 ghumādinētvam sic²⁴ ṣṭutvam.
 nādhyagī[dhva]m ity. luṅ²⁵ sic. dhi ceti sakāralopah²⁶.
 20 iṅaḥ śīdhvamluṅṅitām dho ṅgād ity dhasya dhaḥ.²⁷ vyaceḥ kuṭāditvam
 anasīti vyaca vyājīkaraṇa ity ((e))tasya²⁸ viciteti. nītvāt samprasāraṇam.
 uruvyacā ity sarva[dhā]tubhyo 'sun. atvasant((e))ti²⁹
 dīrghaḥ. kuṭa ādiḥ. kuṭādiḥ³⁰ kuṭ ādir yasyeti sa³¹ kuṭādiḥ. tatraikaśeṣena likher
 api³² nītve likhanam likhīyatītyādisiddhiḥ bhaṅjabhāsādisūtrā(na)ntaram
 25 vibhidibhidachideḥ kid ity³³ kitvād atideśena siddhau kurajvidhānam

¹SJ om. ²SJ adds: kuṭaś ceti akāra uccāraṇārtho vā. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds: gāṅaḥ parasya nītaḥ
 pratyayasyāsambhavāt yathāsamkhyam na bhavati. ⁵SJ: pratyekam sambandhaḥ | tataś ca. ⁶SJ:
 -ne. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: upasamkhyānapravacanādyasiddhiḥ. ¹⁰SJ: gāṅ ca kuṭādayaś. ¹¹SJ
 om. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: parapūrvatve. ¹⁴SJ: kiṅcit pratyayasya. ¹⁵SJ: utāṅnītipratyayasyeti na. ¹⁶SJ:
 iti eṣā vyutpattir nāśaṅkānyā. ¹⁷SJ: bhavatīti. ¹⁸SJ: -śo. ¹⁹SJ: ātmanepadasya sthānivadbhāvena
 siddhatvāt. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹SJ adds api. ²²SJ: aḍāgamaḥ. ²³SJ adds sico. ²⁴SJ: ghumāsthetyādinā
 ittvam sicaḥ ṣatvam. ²⁵SJ adds dhvam. ²⁶SJ: ṣatvam. ²⁷SJ adds: jhalām jaś jhaśītit śakārasya
 ḍakāraḥ. ²⁸SJ: asya. ²⁹SJ: atvasantasya cādhdātor iti. ³⁰SJ om. ³¹SJ om. ³²SJ: tataś caikaśeṣeṇa
 likha akṣaravinyāsa ity asya kuṭādāv antarbhāvāt. ³³SJ adds ghuracaḥ.

śaṅkānivṛttaye kuṭa ity akāra uccāraṇārtho vā.²²⁹ sthānivadbhāvo 'pi nāsti pūrvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivad iti (PP 112). ekādeśasyādivadbhāvān (cf. P.6.1.85) na jaṣṭvam akārasyoccarāṇasāmarthyāt. dvandvaṃ kṛtvā na bahuvrīhiḥ. yadi syād evam ādiśabdasya pratyekasaṃbandhād gāṇādīnām ādeśānām grahaṇaṃ tato lyudādipratyaye āto lope (cf. P.6.4.64) guṇābhāve (cf. P.1.1.5) copasaṃkhyāna-
 pravayaṇādyasiddhiḥ. tasmād gāṅkuṭādayaś ceti dvandvaḥ.²³⁰ gāṇaḥ parasya nītaḥ
 pratyayasyāsaṃbhavād aṅiti gāṅo 'ṅiti kuṭāder iti yathāsaṃkhyāṃ na bhavati.
 sūtre '**ṅnid**' ity akārasya pūrvarūpatve (cf. P.6.1.109) kiṃ ṅitpratyayasya nīttvam
 utāṅṅita iti saṃdehaḥ. **vyaceḥ kuṭāditvam anasī**ty asuni pratiśedhāt. gā āṅ kuṭa
 ādir ṅyantaḥ ku kavargo vā ṭādiśabdena ṭakārāder dhātor ity eṣāṃ grahaṇaṃ na
 syād *avayavaprasiddheḥ samudāyaprasiddhir balīyasī*ti (PP 101²³¹, NP 98) nyāyāt.
ṅidvad bhavantīti nītkāryāṅy atidiśyante. tena kāryātideśe 'yam. **inādeśo gāṅ**
 iti nīkārasyaṅanyārthatvāt sthānivadbhāvād ātmanepadasiddheḥ. *gāṅ gatāv* ity
 (Dhp. 1.998) asya dhātoḥ nīkārasyaātmanepadārthatvād agraḥaṇaṃ.²³² bhāṣye tu
vṛddhir yasyācām ādis tad ity (cf. P.1.1.73) ato ajgraḥaṇaṃ anuvartya acā gāṅ
 viśiṣyate. ajādeśo gāṅ iti prakārāntaram. **adhyagiṣṭety** adhipūrvād iṅo *vibhāṣā*
luṅlṅnor iti (P.2.4.50) gāṅ ādeśaḥ. tato luṅ. aṭ (cf. P.6.4.71). anena nīttve
 ghumādinettvam (cf. P.6.4.66). sic (cf. P.3.1.43–44). ṣṭutvam (cf. P.8.3.59).
nādhyagīdhvam iti luṅ. sic (cf. P.3.1.43–44). *dhi ceti* (P.8.2.25) sakāralopaḥ.
iṅaḥ ṣṭdhvamluṅliṭām dho 'ṅgād iti (P.8.3.78) dhasya dhaḥ. **vyaceḥ kuṭāditvam**
anasīti *vyaca vyājīkaraṇa* ity (Dhp. 6.12) etasya **viciteti** nīttvāt saṃprasāraṇaṃ
 (cf. P.6.1.16). **uruvyacā** iti *sarvadhātubhyo 'sun* (Uṅ. 631) *atvasanteti* (P.6.4.14)
 dīrghaḥ. kuṭa ādiḥ kuṭādiḥ kuṭ ādir yasyeti sa kuṭādiḥ. tatraikaśeṣeṇa likher (cf.
 Dhp. 6.72) api nīttve likhanaṃ likhiṣyatītyādisiddhiḥ.²³³ bhaṅjabhāsādisūtrānantaram
vidibhidicchideḥ kid iti kittvād (cf. P.3.2.161–2) atideśeṇa siddhau kurajvidhānaṃ

²²⁹ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *kuṭa ādir yeṣāṃ iti bahuvrīhāv antarvartinyā vibhaktiyā padatve 'pi jaṣṭvam na bhavati, anukriyamāṇarūpavināśaprasaṅgāt. atha vā – 'kuṭa kauṭīlye' iti dhātupāṭhe yo 'kāras tena saha sānubandhānukaraṇaṃ draṣṭavyam.*

²³⁰ Cf. Śiradeva on SP 127: *gāṅkuṭādirbhyāḥ iti bahuvrīhigarbho dvandvo na tu dvandvagarbho bahuvrīhiḥ. anyathā nīttvāt 'āto lopa iṅi ca' (P.6.4.64) ity ākāralopena 'gaṇa saṃkhyāne' iti nīrdeśo nopapadyate.*

²³¹ The reading of the *paribhāṣā* quoted by Viśvarūpa agrees with this contained in Bhattacharya (1946: 48). Abhyankar (1967: 154) has decided in favour of the variant: *avayavasiddheḥ samudāyasiddhir balīyasī.*

²³² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *'gāṅ' iti inādeśo gṛhyate, na 'gāṅ gatau' iti nīkārasyaṅanyārthatvāt.*

²³³ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *kathaṃ likhitum, svayam eva likhiṣyate, yāvatā kuṭeḥ pūrvam likhiḥ paṭhyate? kaścid āha – 'kuṭasyādiḥ, kuṭa ādir yeṣāṃ te kuṭādayaḥ, kuṭādiś ca kuṭādayaś ceti bahuvrīhitatpuruṣayoḥ saḥavivakṣāyām "svarabhinnānām yasyottarasvaravidhiḥ sa śiṣyate" iti bahuvrīheḥ śeṣaḥ. tatra tatpuruṣavṛtīyā saṃgṛhīto likhir api nīttvasya nimittam' iti. evaṃ tu likhitvā lekhitvā lilikhiṣati lilekhiṣati 'śakuniṣv ālekhane' ity anupapannaṃ syāt. tasmād yady avāśyam upapādanīyam – 'saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ' iti guṇo na bhaviṣyati.*

jñāpayati atideśe¹ kāryyam anityam iti· tena lekhanī
 masiprasūr ityādisiddhiḥ²· uccukuṭṣatīty atra upadeśādhikārān nātmanepadam· ||

5

||vija· || ovijī bhayaca[la]naylor ity asya taudādikasya grahaṇam·
 10 kuṭādisāhacaryyāt· vyāpter nnyāyāc³ ca· na tu settvāt· vijir pṛthagbhāva ity
 asyāpi krādiniyamāt· iṭ⁴ vivejitheti⁵ {na} sambhavāt· idādir iti⁶
 vṛddhir yasyācām ādir ity a[ta] ādigrahaṇanuvṛtṭyā a[tra] eva na pratyaya-
 sya grahaṇam· iha prakṛtigrhaṇe ṇyadhikasyāpi grahaṇam
 na bhavati· aññidgrahaṇānuvṛtṭeḥ pañcamyā vipariṇāmāt⁷ ṇyantānām bhādīnām⁸
 15 upasaṃkhyānāt paribhāṣā anityā⁹ jñāpakasiddham na sarvatrety
 anena vā ity ata āha· ṇyantād udvejiteti· niṣṭhāyām seṭīti ṇilopah¹⁰· ||

20

25

||sārvva || kuruta iti nītvād ata ut sārva dhātuka ity utvam
 (ra)paratvam vikaraṇokārasya guṇabhāvo nītvāt sārva dhātukasya

¹SJ: jñāpakam ātideśikam. ²SJ: ityādi siddhyati. ³SJ: vyākhyānāc. ⁴SJ: iṭi. ⁵SJ:
 vivejatheti. ⁶SJ: idādāv api. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: idānīm. ⁹SJ: anityatve. ¹⁰SJ om.

jñāpayati: *atideśe kāryam anityam* iti (cf. *NP* 93.6 and *Jñ.S.* p. 74).²³⁴ tena *lekhanī masiprasūr* ityādisiddhiḥ.²³⁵ uccukuṭṣatīty atra upadeśādhikārān nātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.2 and P.1.3.12).²³⁶

2. *vija it.* (P.1.2.2)

(*Bhv.*:) *vijer idādipratyayo nīt syāt. udvijitā. udvijitum. nāyam udvijitum kālāḥ* (*Bhaṭṭ.* 7.92a). *udvijitavyam. puruṣād udvijitavyam idrśaḥ* (*Śiśu* 16.19d²³⁷). *katham udvejitā vṛṣṭibhir āśrayante* (*Kumāra* 1.5c)? *nyantāt.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||*vija*||. *ovijī bhayacalanayor* ity (*Dhp.* 6.9) asya taudādikasya grahaṇam kuṭādisāhacaryād vyāpter nyāyāc ca. na tu seṭṭvād *vijir pṛthagbhāva* ity (*Dhp.* 3.12) asyāpi krādinīyamād iṭ (cf. P.7.2.13, 35) vivejitheti sambhavāt. *idādir* iti *vṛddhir yasyācām ādir* ity (P.1.1.73) ata ādigrahaṇānuvṛtṭyā atra eva na pratyaya-sya grahaṇam. iha *prakṛtigrahaṇe nyadhikasyāpi grahaṇam* <iti> (*PP* 73, *NP* 91) na bhavati. añnidgrahaṇānuvṛtteḥ pañcamyā vipariṇāmāt nyantānām bhādīnām upasaṃkhyānāt²³⁸ paribhāṣā anityā *jñāpakasiddham na sarvatrey* (*PP* 118, *NP* 116) anena vā ity ata āha *nyantād. udvejiteti niṣṭhāyām seṭṭi* (P.6.4.52) nilopaḥ.

3. *vibhāṣorṇoḥ.* (P.1.2.3)

(*Bhv.*:) *ūrṇoter idādipratyayo vā nīt syāt. prorṇavitā prorṇuvitā. prorṇavitum prorṇuvitum.*

4. *sārvadhātukam apit.* (P.1.2.4)

(*Bhv.*:) *apit sārvadhātukam nīt syāt. kurutaḥ. kurvanti. cinutaḥ. cinvanti. apid iti kim? karoti. karoṣi. cinoti. iha pūrvam apid iti yogam vibhajya nic ca pin na bhavatīty*²³⁹ *artham āhuḥ. tena stuyād ity atra yāsuṭo nittvena pittvaniṣedhāt stautīty etadvad uto vṛddhir luki halīti* (P.7.3.89) *piti na vṛddhiḥ. brūtād bhavān ity atra bruva iṇ* (P.7.3.93) *na bhavati.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||*sārva*||. *kuruta* iti nittvād *ata ut sārvadhātuka* ity (P.6.4.110) uttvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). *vikaraṇokārasya guṇābhāvo nittvāt sārvadhātukasya*

²³⁴ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *atha vā 'bhañjabhāsamido ghurac'* (P.3.2.161) '*vidibhidicchider nīd*' (cf. P.3.2.162) *iti vaktavye pratyayāntarakaraṇam jñāpakam – ātidesīkam nittvam anityam iti.* Similarly, *Jñ.S.* p. 74: *bhañjadīsūtrā-(3.2.161)-nantaram vidibhidichideḥ kittve 'pi kittvatidesena siddhau kuracvidhānam (3.2.162) jñāpakam ātidesīkam kāryam anityam iti na padāntasūtre (1.1.58) nyāsaḥ.*

²³⁵ The example *masiprasūr lekhanī* is also discussed in *Durghaṭa* ad loc.

²³⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *athehoccukuṭṣatīti sano nittvād ātmanepadam kasmān na bhavati? upadeśādhikārāt.*

²³⁷ *Bhaṭṭ.* has *idrśāt* instead of *idrśaḥ*.

²³⁸ Cf. vārtt. 2 on P.8.4.34 (*nyantasya copasaṃkhyānam, Mbh.* III 462.10) and *Kāś.* on the same sūtra: *nyantānām bhādīnām upasaṃkhyānam kartavyam.*

²³⁹ *Pat.* on vārtt. 7 on P.3.1.83 (*Mbh.* II 64.10). Cf. also *Mbh.* II 64.8–11.

cinuta{h} iti śnupratyayasya nītvād dhātor nna guṇaḥ· tiṅas
 tu nītvād vikaraṇasya· ihetyādi pūrvam prathamam· apid iti vyavasthāpya¹· nīd
 ity anuvarttanīyam tena nīc ca² pin na bhavati· ity artho vyākhyātaḥ· tena yāsuṭo
 nītvēna³ pitvaniṣedhāt⁴ yathā stautīty atra pitvād vṛddhir bhavati·

5 tathā s[tu]yād⁵ ityādaḥ na bhavati· brūtād ity atra tātaṇo nītvēna pittvaniṣedhād īṇ⁶
 na bhavati ||

10

||asaṃyogā· || liṭā dhātuḥ karttā⁷ sannidhāpitaḥ so 'saṃyogagrahaṇena
 viśiṣyata iti viśeṣaṇena ca tadantavidhir bhavatīty ata⁸ āha· a⁹
 asaṃyogā(ntā)d dhātor iti cakratur iti¹⁰ liṭ atus· yaṇādeśaḥ

15 dvirvacane 'cīti sthānivadbhāvāt kṛśabdo dvir ucyate· abhyā-
 sakāryyam· prasajyapratīṣedhāśrayaṇād idam uktaṃ atha

kimarthaṃ kidgrahaṇam na¹¹ prakṛto nīd vidhīyatām¹² evam saty ūcatur ūcur¹³ ity
 atra kiti vidhīyamānam¹⁴ samprasāraṇam na prasajyeta¹⁵· evam¹⁶ kuṭādisūtre
 kid vidhīyatām¹⁷ naivam· svapita¹⁸ ity atra kitve samprasāraṇam· jāgrta

20 ity atra¹⁹ guṇaḥ syāt²⁰· tasmād yathānyāsam evāstu²¹ ||

25

||indhi || ikāra uccāraṇārtho na tv ikā nirddeśaḥ tathā ca satī²² nalopaḥ
 syāt· bhavatīty atrākartṛvāciny api śtipnirddeśāt²³ śap· samīdha iti

¹SJ: vyavasthārtham. ²SJ: nīti. ³SJ: nīttve. ⁴SJ: pittvābhāvād. ⁵SJ: stūyād. ⁶SJ: īṇ.
⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ adds kṛṇo. ¹¹SJ: kriyate. ¹²SJ adds na. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ
 om. ¹⁵SJ: syāt tasya kiti vidhānāt | ¹⁶SJ adds tarhi. ¹⁷SJ: eva kidgrahaṇam kriyatām. ¹⁸SJ:
 pita. ¹⁹SJ: ityādaḥ. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹SJ: eva sādhiyaḥ. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ: śtipi nirdeśāt.

(cf. P.1.1.5). **cinuta** iti śnupratyayasya (cf. P.3.1.73) nittvād dhātor na guṇaḥ tiṅas tu nittvād vikaraṇasya. **ihetyādi pūrvam** prathamam. **apid** iti vyavasthāpya nid ity anuvartanīyam. tena **nic ca pin na bhavatī**ty artho vyākhyātaḥ. tena **yāsuṭo nittvena pittvaniṣedhād** yathā stautīty atra pittvād vṛddhir bhavati (cf. P.7.3.89) tathā **stuyād** ityādaḥ na bhavati. **brūtād** ity atra tātaṅo nittvena pittvaniṣedhād ī 5 (cf. P.7.3.93) na bhavati.

5. *asaṃyogāl liṭ kit.* (P.1.2.5)

(*Bhv.*) **asaṃyogāntād dhātor liṭ kit syāt. cakratuś cakruḥ. bibhidatur bibhiduḥ. dudruvatur dudruvuḥ. juhuvatur juhuvuḥ. ūcatur ūcuḥ. asaṃyogāt kim? valir babandhe jaladhir mamanthe. apid ity eva. bibheda.** 10

(*Pañj.*) ||**asaṃyogā**||. liṭā dhātuḥ kartrā samnidhāpitaḥ. so 'saṃyogagrahaṇena viśiṣyata iti viśeṣaṇena ca tadantavidhir (cf. P.1.1.72) bhavatīty ata āha asaṃyogāntād dhātor iti.²⁴⁰ **cakratur** iti liṭ. atus (cf. P.3.4.82). yaṇādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.77). *dvirvacane 'cīti* (P.1.1.59) sthānivadbhāvāt kṛśabdo dvir ucyate. abhyā- 15 sakāryam (cf. P.7.4.66, 60, 62). prasajyapratīṣedhāśrayaṇād idam uktam.²⁴¹ atha kimartham kidgrahaṇam? na prakṛte nid vidhīyatām. evaṃ saty **ūcatur ūcur** ity atra kiti vidhīyamānaṃ samprasāraṇam (cf. P.6.1.15) na prasajyeta. evaṃ kuṭādisūtre kid vidhīyatām. naivam. svapita ity atra kittve samprasāraṇam (cf. P.6.1.15) jāgrta ity atra guṇaḥ syāt (cf. P.7.3.85).²⁴² tasmād yathānyāsam evāstu. 20

6. *indhibhavatibhyām ca.* (P.1.2.6)

(*Bhv.*) **ābhyām liṭ kit syāt. samīdhe. babhūva. atrendheś chando- viṣayatvād bhuvo vuko nityatvād ābhyām kidvacanānarthakyam** 25 **iti²⁴³ bhāṣyam. bhāṣyām tv indher liṭy ām. samindhām cakre. atreṣṭiḥ – granthīśranthidambhisvañjñām** iti jayādityaḥ (*Kāś.* ad loc.). **grethatuḥ. grethuḥ. śrethatuḥ. śrethuḥ. debhatatur debhuḥ. pariṣasvaje.**²⁴⁴

(*Pañj.*) ||**indhi**||. ikāra uccāraṇārtho na tv itā nirdeśaḥ. tathā ca sati nalopaḥ syāt (cf. P.6.4.24). **bhavatī**ty atrākartṛvāciny api śtipnirdeśāt śap. **samīdha** iti

²⁴⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *dhātor eva liṅ vidhīyate, nānyasmād iti liṭā sāmartyād dhātuḥ sannidhāpitaḥ, sa cāsaṃyogagrahaṇena viśiṣyate, viśeṣaṇena ca tadantavidhir bhavatīty āha asaṃyogāntād dhātor iti.*

²⁴¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atra ca yadi 'asaṃyogāt' iti paryudāsa āśrīyate, tadā saṃyogād anyasmin grhyamāne nañvayuktanyāyena (cf. PP 97) sadṛśasyaiva grahaṇam syāt – saṃyogasya sadṛśo yo 'nyo 'sahāyo hal iti halantād eva kittvaṃ bhaviṣyati, nājantāt, tataś cakratuś cakrur iti na sidhyati. tasmāt prasajyapratīṣedho 'yam, na paryudāsah.*

²⁴² Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *yadi punar gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'pi kittvam evātidiśyeta? naivam śakyam.*

²⁴³ Vārtt. 1 on P.1.2.6 (*Mbh.* I 194.20). The only difference is that *Bhv.* reads *ābhyām* for *tābhyām*.

²⁴⁴ Mishra (1989) adds: **pariṣasvajāte**. Viśvarūpa seems to have known the text of *Bhv.* with the example: **sasvaje**.

ñi-indhī dīptau liṭ ta eś kitvād anunāsikalopaḥ
 dvirvacanaṃ halādiśeṣaḥ savarṇadīrghaḥ
 babhūveti¹ uttamapurusaikaivacanama². ṇal. ṇal
 uttameti³ ñidvābhāvah pakṣe⁴ guṇaṇiśedhaḥ. anyatra tu⁵ vṛddhyabhāvah
 5 atrendheś chandoviśayatvāt⁶ chandasy ubhayatheti sārvaadhātukatvāt
 nīṭve saty anunāsikālope siddheḥ⁷ chāndaso varṇalopa
iti vā⁸ bhuvo vuko nityatvād iti ekadeśavikṛtanyāyāt⁹
 kṛtāyām akṛtāyām api vṛddhau tasya prāpter iti bhāṣyakāramatena pratyākhyātamaḥ.
 sūtrakārasya tv ayam abhiprāyaḥ. jñāpakārtham¹⁰ indhigrahaṇamaḥ. anityam¹¹ ām iti.
 10 nitye hy ((ā))mi liṭparatvama¹² nāstīti kitvam¹³ anarthakamaḥ. āmaś
 cām¹⁴ amantre vidhānaṃ. tena bhāṣāyām api samīdha
 iti prayogaḥ siddho bhavatīti. bhavatigrahaṇamaḥ api pratyākhyātum aśakyamaḥ.
 yato guṇavṛddhyoḥ kṛtaylor vuk na prāpnoti. vukvidhāv or ity
 anuvṛttau¹⁵ ruvarṇāntasya vuk vidhīyate. yaṇluki bobhava bobhāveti atra¹⁶
 15 pratiśedhārthamaḥ. tasmāt uko nityatvama nāsti. iha tu śtibante bhavatigrahaṇe
kriyamāne yaṇluki kitvābhāvāt. paratvād
guṇavṛddhyoḥ kṛtaylor uvarṇā[nta].. nāstīti. pratyudāhāraṇamaḥ upapadyate tasmād
bhavatigrahaṇamaḥ karttavayama. atha babhūveti¹⁷ atrāco ṇīṭīti vṛddheḥ
katham¹⁸ pratiśedhaḥ yāvata kṛti cety atra ika ity¹⁹ anuvarttate. na ceyam
 20 iglakṣaṇā nirddiṣṭasthānikatvāt. na ca kitvavidhānasāmarthyād vācyamaḥ. tasya thaly
uttamapuruse ṇali²⁰ caritārthatvāt. evan tarhi nīdgraḥaṇamaḥ anu-
 vartya tasya prayoṇābhāvād aniglakṣaṇāyā api vṛddheḥ pratiśedhaḥ karttavayaḥ.

¹SJ adds liṭ. ²SJ: uttamapurusaikaivacanama. ³SJ: uttamo veti. ⁴SJ: ñittvābhāvapakṣe. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ adds: iti ñi indhī dīptāv ity asya chāndasatvāt. ⁷SJ: -lopasiddheḥ. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavad iti nyāyāt. ¹⁰SJ: jñāpanārtham. ¹¹SJ: anitya. ¹²SJ: liṭaḥ paratvama. ¹³SJ: kittvavidhānam. ¹⁴SJ: ca. ¹⁵SJ: -tteḥ. ¹⁶SJ adds: buk. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ rev. ¹⁹SJ: ig. ²⁰SJ: uttame.

ñi-indhī dīptau (*Dhp.* 7.11). liṭ ta eś (cf. P.3.4.81). kittvād anunāsikalopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.24). dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.8). halādiśeṣaḥ (cf. P.7.4.60). savarṇadīrghaḥ (cf. P.6.1.101). **babhūveti** uttamapurūṣasyaikavacanam ṇal (cf. P.3.4.82). *ṇal uttameti* (P.7.1.91) ṇidvābhāvaḥ. pakṣe guṇaṇiśedhaḥ. anyatra tu vṛddhyabhāvaḥ. **atrendheś chandoviśayatvāt** *chandasy ubhayatheti* (P.3.4.117) sārvaadhātukatvāt 5
 nīttve saty (cf. P.1.2.4) anunāsikalope siddheḥ (cf. P.6.4.24) *chāndaso varṇalopa* ity vā.²⁴⁵ **bhuvo vuko nityatvād** ity ekadeśavikṛtanyāyāt (cf. *PP* 14, *NP* 37) kṛtāyām akṛtāyām api vṛddhau tasya prāpter iti bhāṣyakāramatena pratyākhyātam.²⁴⁶ sūtrakārasya tv ayam abhiprāyaḥ: jñāpakārtham indhigrahaṇam: *anityam ām* iti (cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 61). nitye hy āmi liṭparatvaṃ nāstīti kittvam anarthakam. āmaś 10
 (cf. P.2.4.81) cām amantre vidhānam (cf. P.3.1.35). tena bhāṣyām api **samīdha** ity prayogaḥ siddho bhavatīti.²⁴⁷ bhavatigrahaṇam api pratyākhyātum aśakyam yato guṇavṛddhyoḥ kṛtaylor vuk na prāpnoti. vukvidhāv (cf. P.6.4.88) *or* ity (cf. P.6.4.83) anuvṛttau uvarṇāntasya vuk vidhīyate yaṅluki bobhava bobhāveti atra pratiśedhārtham.²⁴⁸ tasmād vuko nityatvaṃ nāsti. iha tu śtibante bhavatigrahaṇe 15
 kriyamāṇe yaṅluki kittvābhāvāt (cf. *PP*² 94, *NP* 120.3) paratvād (cf. P.1.4.2) guṇavṛddhyoḥ kṛtaylor uvarṇāntatvaṃ nāstīti pratyudāhāraṇam upapadyate. tasmād bhavatigrahaṇam kartavyam.²⁴⁹ atha **babhūvety atrāco ṇṇitīti** (P.7.2.115) vṛddheḥ katham pratiśedhaḥ yāvata *knīti cety* (P.1.1.5) atra ika ity anuvartate? na ceyam iglakṣaṇā nirdiśasthānikatvāt. na ca kittvavidhānasāmārthyād vācyam tasya thaly 20
 uttamapurūṣe ṇali caritārthatvāt (cf. P.7.3.84). evaṃ tarhi nīdgrahaṇam anuvartya tasya prayojanābhāvād aniglakṣaṇāyā api vṛddheḥ pratiśedhaḥ kartavyaḥ.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *evaṃ tarhi mantraś chanda eveti 'chandasy ubhayathā' iti* (P.3.4.117) *sārvadhātukatvam, tataś ca 'sārvadhātukam apit' iti* (P.1.2.4) *nīttvam, ata eva nīttvād anunāsikalopo bhaviṣyati tat kimartham indheḥ parasya liṭaḥ kittvaṃ vidhīyate? jñāpanārtham. etad anena jñāpyate – anityo 'yam ām iti. nitye hy āmi tena vyavadhānād evendheḥ paro liṭ na sambhavatīti kittvavidhānam nopapadyate, tasmād anityo 'yam ām iti. tena bhāṣyām api samīdha ity prayoga upapanno bhavati.*

²⁴⁶ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. on P.1.2.6: *bhuvo vuko nityatvāt. bhavater api nityo vuk. kṛte 'pi prāpnoty akṛte 'pi.* (*Mbh.* I 194.22–195.1).

²⁴⁷ Cf. fn. 245.

²⁴⁸ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *bhavater api vug anityaḥ, kiṃ kāraṇam? ur iti vartate, na ca guṇavṛddhyoḥ kṛtaylor uvarṇānto bhavati bhavati, ur iti nivartīyate? yadi nivartate, bobhāva, ahaṃ kila bobhava – yaṅluky api nityatvād vuk prāpnoti.*

²⁴⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca kṛtaylor api guṇavṛddhyor vukā bhavitavyam akṛtaylor apīti nityo vuk kṛtākṛtaprasaṅgitvāt, tatra nityatvād vuki kṛte guṇavṛddhyoḥ prāptir eva nāsti, bhavater alaghūpadhatvāt, anajantatvāc ceti bhavatigrahaṇam anarthakam? naitad asti, 'śabdāntarasya prāpnuvan vidhir anityo bhavati' iti vug apy anityaḥ. tataś ca paratvāt guṇavṛddhyoḥ kṛtaylor vuṅ na syāt. tasmād bhavatigrahaṇam kartavyam. atha kṛtaylor api guṇavṛddhyor ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavatīti nāsti śabdāntaratvam. evaṃ sati śakyam bhavatigrahaṇam akartum. tat kriyate viśpaṣṭārtham.*

²⁵⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha babhūvety atra 'aco ṇṇitī' iti* (P.7.2.115) *vṛddheḥ katham pratiśedhaḥ, yāvateka ity anuvartate? 'knīti ca' ity* (P.1.1.5) *aneglakṣaṇā vṛddhiḥ pratiśedhyate, na ceyam iglakṣaṇā vṛddhiḥ, nirdiśasthānikatvāt. atra kittvavidhānasāmārthyād aniglakṣaṇāyā api vṛddher bhaviṣyati pratiśedhaḥ, anyathā kittvavidhānam anarthakam syād iti cet, na, tasya thaly uttamaṇali ca guṇapraśedhārthatvāt. evaṃ tarhi nīdgrahaṇam apy anuvartate, tad anuvartamāṇe na vidyamānam anyat prayojanam, tenāniglakṣaṇāyā api vṛddheḥ pratiśedho bhaviṣyati.*

śrethatur ityādi¹ śrantha grantha saṁdarbhe liṭi² atus
 kitvād anunāsikalopaḥ ṭṛphalabhajatrapaś ceti
 cakārasyaṅuktasamuccayārthatvād etvābhyāsalopau-
 sasvaja iti· svanja parisāṅge· ātmanepadi ||

5

||mṛḍa || na ktvā seḍ iti pratiṣedhaṁ vaksyati tasyāyam
 apakarṣaḥ ata eva seḍ apīty apiśabdam· prayuktavān³· mṛḍitveti⁴· mṛḍa sukhane-
 10 mṛḍa kṣode· gudha pariveṣṭane· kuṣa niṣkarṣe
 kliśū⁵ vibādhane· vada vyaktāyām vāci·
 vasa nivāse· kliśitveti· kliśaḥ ktvāniṣṭhayor itīṭ uṣitveti·
 vasatikṣudhor itīṭ śāsivasighasīti⁶ ṣatvaṁ· atra kitve⁷ yathā-
 sambhavaṁ saṁprasāraṇaṁ guṇaṇiṣedhaḥ ||

15

||rudavida || rudir aśruvimocane· vida jñāne·
 20 muṣa steye· graha upādāne ṅisvapa śāye·
 pracha jñīpsāyām· ḡṛhītveti· saṁprasāraṇaṁ·
 pūrvarūpatvaṁ⁸· graho ṭiṭi dīrghaḥ· jighṛkṣatīti san·
 ho ḍha iti ḍhatvaṁ· ṣadhoh kah sīti katvaṁ⁹·
 sanaḥ sakārasyaḍeśapratyayayor iti ṣatvaṁ· ekāco baso bhaṣ jhaṣantasya
 25 ṣdhvor¹⁰ iti¹¹· gākārasya ghakāraḥ· sani grahaguhoś ceti· iṭ na bha-
 vati¹²· pipṛcchiṣatīti· kiraś ca pañcabhya itīṭ kitvāt saṁprasāraṇaṁ ||

30

||iko jhalaḥ || sangrahaṇena¹³ dhātur upasthāpita· ikpratyāhāreṇa dhātur¹⁴

¹SJ: ity atra. ²SJ: liṭ. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds -ādi. ⁵SJ: kliśa. ⁶SJ: śāsītyādinā. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: pararūpatvañ ceti. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds -ādinā. ¹²SJ: iṭpratiṣedhaḥ. ¹³SJ: sanpratyayena. ¹⁴SJ om.

śrethatur ityādi śrantha grantha saṃdarbhe (Dhp. 9.41; 10.294). liṭy atus (cf. P.3.4.82). kittvād anunāsikalopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.24). *tṛphalabhajatrapaś ceti* (P.6.4.122) cakārasyānuktasamuccayārthatvād ettvābhyāsalopau (cf. P.6.4.120).²⁵¹ sasvaja iti *svanja pariṣaṅge* <ity> (Dhp. 1.1025) ātmanepadī (cf. P.1.3.12).

7. mṛḍamṛdagudhakuṣakliśavadavasah ktvā. (P.1.2.7)

5

(Bhv.): ebhyaḥ seḍ api ktvā kit syāt. mṛḍitvā. mṛḍitvā. gudhitvā. kuṣitvā. kliśitvā. uditvā. uṣitvā.

(Pañj.): ||**mṛḍa**||. na ktvā seḍ iti (P.1.2.18) pratiṣedham vakṣyati. tasyāyam apakarṣaḥ.²⁵² ata eva seḍ apīty apiśabdāṃ prayuktavān. mṛḍitveti mṛḍa sukhane (Dhp. 6.38). mṛḍa kṣode (Dhp. 9.43). gudha pariveṣṭane (Dhp. 4.13). kuṣa niṣkarṣe (Dhp. 9.46). kliśū vibādhane (Dhp. 9.50). vada vyaktāyām vāci (Dhp. 1.1058). vasa nivāse (Dhp. 1.1054). kliśitveti kliśaḥ ktvāniṣṭhayor iti (P.7.2.50) iṭ. uṣitveti vasatikṣudhor iti (P.7.2.52) iṭ. śāsivasighasṭi (P.8.3.60) ṣatvam. atra kittve yathā-sambhavaṃ saṃprasāraṇaṃ (cf. P.6.1.15) guṇaṇiṣedhaḥ (cf. P.1.1.5).

8. rudavidamuṣagrahisvapipracchaḥ saṃś ca. (P.1.2.8)

15

(Bhv.): ebhyaḥ seḍ api ktvā kit syāt. saṃś ca. ruditvā rurudiṣati. viditvā vividiṣati. muṣitvā mumuṣiṣati. gṛhītva jighṛkṣati. svapipracchyoḥ sannarthaṃ vacanam. suṣupsati. piprcchiṣati.

(Pañj.): ||**rudavida**||. rudir aśruvimocane (Dhp. 2.58). vida jñāne (Dhp. 2.55). muṣa steye (Dhp. 1.707; 9.58). graha upādāne (Dhp. 9.61). nīsvapa śāye (Dhp. 2.59). pracha jñūpsāyām (Dhp. 6.120). gṛhītveti saṃprasāraṇaṃ (cf. P.6.1.16). pūrvarūpatvam (cf. P.6.1.108). graho 'liṭi dīrghaḥ (P.7.2.37). jighṛkṣatīti san (cf. P.3.1.7). ho ḍha iti (P.8.2.31) ḍhatvam. ṣaḍhoḥ kaḥ ṣṭi (P.8.2.41) katvam. sanaḥ sakārasyādeśapratyayayor iti (P.8.3.59) ṣatvam. ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaṣantasya sdhvor iti (P.8.2.37) gakārasya ghakāraḥ. sani grahaguhoś ceti (P.7.2.12) iṭ na bhavati. piprcchiṣatīti kiraś ca pañcabhya iti (P.7.2.75) iṭ. kittvāt saṃprasāraṇaṃ (cf. P.6.1.16).

9. iko jhal. (P.1.2.9)

(Bhv.): igantād dhātor jhalādiḥ san kit syāt. cikīrṣati. cicīṣati. jhal iti kim? śiśayiṣate. ikaḥ kim? pipāsati. jhalāder vidhir navasūtryām.

30

(Pañj.): ||**iko jhal**||. saṃgrahaṇena dhātur upasthāpitaḥ. ikpratyāhāreṇa dhātur

²⁵¹ Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: 'tṛphalabhajatrapaś ca' iti (P.6.4.122) cakārasyānuktasamuccayārthatvād anekahalmadhyastasyāpy etvābhyāsalopau.

²⁵² Cf. Kās. ad loc.: 'na ktvā seḍ' iti (P.1.2.18) kittvapraṭiṣedham vakṣyati, tasyāyam purastād apakarṣaḥ.

viśiṣyate¹. ity ata² āha. igantād dhātor iti. vṛddhisūtrād ādigrahaṇam
 anuvarttya jhalā³ sano viśeṣaṇam ity ata⁴ āha. jhalādiḥ sann iti. ig iti pratyā-
 hāragrahaṇam. na tv⁵ ik smarāṇa ity etasya jhalāditvāvyabhicārāt jhalā
 pratyāhāreṇa⁶ sāhacaryyāc ca. cikīrṣatīti. kṛñāḥ⁷ san⁸. ajjhanagamāṃ
 5 sanīti dīrghaḥ ṛta id dhātor itittvaṃ raparatvaṃ
 hali ceti dīrghaḥ⁹ kīrṣaśabdena¹⁰ dvirvacanaṃ. s¹¹ iko ([i]ti) jhal ika
 (iti)¹² iko 'nit iti na¹³ kṛtaṃ vaicitryārtham. ||

10

||halantāc ca || ik san¹⁴ jhal ity eva. antaḥ śabdaḥ samīpavācī hal
 cāsāv antaś ceti halantaḥ. sandhātau¹⁵ sannidhāpīte ikas samīpagatena¹⁶ halā
 tasya viśeṣaṇāt sūtrārtham āha. hala(ntā)d igupadhād ityādi. bubhutsata iti.
 15 budha avagamane ekāco baso bhas jhasantasy((e))tyādinā
 bakārabhakārah¹⁷ haljāter āśrayaṇāt danbhu dambha ity asmāt parasya
 sanaḥ kitve dhīpsati dhīpsatīti sidhyati. sanīvantardheti iḍabhāvapakṣe
 dambha ic ceti itve (cettve) kṛtve¹⁸. atra lopo 'bhyāsasya abhyāsa-
 lopah¹⁹ kitvād anunāsikalopah. dakārasya bhaṣbhāvena dhakārah.
 20 ika ity eva yiyakṣati²⁰. kittve samprasāraṇam syāt.
 jhal²¹ ity eva vivarttiṣate guṇo na syāt ||

25 ||liṅ || ātmanepadaparo liṅ na sambhavatīty ata āha. ātmanepadaviśayāv
 ityādi. bhitsiṣṭa iti āśiṣi liṅ. svaritetvād²² ātmanepadam.
 sīyūṣṭau. khari ceti²³ dakārasya
 takārah bhitsiṣṭeti budha avagamane budher anudāttatvād²⁴

¹SJ: viśeṣyata. ²SJ om. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: dhātor. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: kṛñ. ⁸SJ om.
⁹SJ adds ṣatvaṃ. ¹⁰SJ: kīr-. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: 'niḍvidhānaṃ. ¹⁴SJ: ikaḥ sani. ¹⁵SJ:
 sanā dhātau. ¹⁶SJ: ikasamīpagatena. ¹⁷SJ: jhaśantasya sdhvor iti bakārasya bhakārah khari ceti
 dhakārasya takārah. ¹⁸SJ: ittvam ittve kṛte. ¹⁹SJ: abhyāsalopec ca. ²⁰SJ: yiyakṣate. ²¹SJ: jhali.
²²SJ: svaritatvād. ²³SJ adds cartvaṃ. ²⁴SJ: anudāttettvād.

viśiṣyata ity ata āha **igantād dhātor** iti. vṛddhisūtrād (cf. P.1.1.73) ādigrahaṇam anuvartya jhalā sano viśeṣaṇam ity ata āha **jhalādiḥ sann** iti.²⁵³ **ig** iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam na tv *ik smarāṇa* ity (*Dhp.* 2.38) etasya jhalāditvāvyabhicārāt jhalā pratyāhāreṇa sāhacaryāc ca.²⁵⁴ **cikīrṣatīti** kṛṇaḥ san (cf. P.3.1.7). *ajjhanagamāṇ sanīti* (P.6.4.16) dīrghaḥ. *ṛta id dhātor* iti (P.7.1.100) ittvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). *hali ceti* (P.8.2.77) dīrghaḥ. kīrṣaśabdena dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.9). s ika iti jhal ika iti iko 'niḍ iti na kṛtaṃ vaicitryārtham.

10. **halantāc ca.** (P.1.2.10)

(*Bhv.*) **halantād igupadhāj jhalādiḥ san kit syāt. bibhitsati. bubhutsate. dambher halgrahaṇasya jātivācakatvāt siddham** (vārtt. 1 on P.1.2.10, *Mbh.* I 197.21). **dhīpsati. dhīpsati.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**halantāc ca**||. ikaḥ san jhal ity eva. antaśabdaḥ samīpavācī. hal cāsāv antaś ceti **halantaḥ**.²⁵⁵ sanā dhātau sannidhāpita ikaḥ samīpagatena halā tasya viśeṣaṇāt sūtrārtham āha **halantād igupadhād** ityādi. **bubhutsata** iti *budha avagamane* (*Dhp.* 1.911; 4.63). *ekāco baśo bhaś jhaśantasyetyādinā* (P.8.2.37) bakārabhakāraḥ. haljāter āśrayaṇād *danbhu dambha* ity (*Dhp.* 5.23) asmāt parasya sanaḥ kittve **dhīpsati dhīpsatīti** sidhyati. *sanīvantardheti* (P.7.2.49) idabhāvapakṣe *dambha ic ceti* (P.7.4.56) ittve cettve kṛte atra lopo 'bhyāsasya ⟨ity⟩ (P.7.4.58) abhyāsalopaḥ. kittvād anunāsikalopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.24). dakārasya bhaṣbhāvena dhakāraḥ (cf. P.8.2.37). ika ity eva yiyakṣati.²⁵⁶ kittve samprasāraṇam syāt (cf. P.6.1.15). jhal ity eva vivartīṣate.²⁵⁷ guṇo na syāt (cf. P.1.1.5).

11. **liṅsicāv ātmanepadeṣu.** (P.1.2.11)

(*Bhv.*) **halantād igupadhād ātmanepadaviṣayau liṅsicau kitau syātām. bhitsīṣṭa. bhutsīṣṭa. abhitta. abuddha. taṇanuvṛtṭiḥ ṣaṭsūtryām.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**liṅ**||. ātmanepadaparo liṅ na saṃbhavatīty ata āha **ātmanepadaviṣayāv** ityādi. **bhitsīṣṭa** ity āśīṣi liṅ (cf. P.3.3.173). svaritettvād ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.72). sīyuṣṣṭau (cf. P.3.4.102, 107). *khari ceti* (P.8.4.55) dakārasya takāraḥ. **bhutsīṣṭeti** *budha avagamane* (*Dhp.* 1.911; 4.63). budher anudāttatvād

²⁵³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha tadantavidhiḥ kasmān na bhavati – jhalantaḥ sann iti? evaṃ manyate – vṛddhasaṃjñāsūtrād ihādigrāhaṇam anuvartate, tena jhal viśiṣyate, tasmāt tadādividhir eva vijñāyate, na tadantavidhir iti.*

²⁵⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atheka iti 'ik smarāṇe' ity asya dhātor grahaṇam kasmān na bhavati? jhal iti pratyāhārasāhacaryāt pratyāhārasyaiva yuktatvāt... kim ca – dhātugrahaṇe hi satīko dhātoḥ samīpagato hal na sambhavatīti 'halantāc ca' ity (P.1.2.10) etad apy aghaṭamānaṃ syāt.*

²⁵⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ikaḥ san jhal kit iti vartate. samīpavacano 'ntaśabdaḥ. hal cāsāv antaś ca halantaḥ.*

²⁵⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ikaḥ ity eva – yiyakṣate.*

²⁵⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *jhal ity eva – vivartīṣate.*

ātmanepadam· ekāco baś ityādinā bhaṣbhāvaḥ¹· abhitteti·
 jhalo jhalīti² sico lopaḥ· abuddheti jhaṣas tathor ddho dha iti
 takārasya dhakāraḥ³ jhalāñ jaś jhaṣīti dhakārasya dakāraḥ ika ity eva
 yakṣīṣṭa· ayaṣṭa samprasāraṇam syāt· ātmanepadeṣv iti⁴ kim·
 5 asrākṣīt· amāgamo na syāt halantād ity eva ceṣīṣṭa⁵· guṇo na
 syāt· jhalīty eva· varttiṣīṣṭa guṇo na syāt yadi k((i))tvaṃ syāt⁶·
 sarvatrānusañjanīyaṃ⁷ ||

10

||úś ca || liṅsicānuvṛttau dhātum upasthāyataḥ· yena vidhir
 ity anena ṛkāreṇa⁸ tadantavidhir vijñāyata ity āha⁹ ṛkārantāc cetyādi·
 kr̥ṣīṣṭa· sīyuṣṣuṭau kitvād aguṇaḥ¹⁰ akṛteti·
 hrasvād aṅgād iti¹¹ sico lopa((ḥ)) tīr̥ṣīṣṭeti· tṛ plavanatarāṇayoḥ·
 15 āśisi liñ· karmmany ātmanepadam¹²· ṛta id dhātor itītvaṃ·
 raparatvaṃ hali ceti dīrghaḥ āstīr̥ṣṭeti¹³
 str̥ñ¹⁴ āchādane· luñ āñpūrvaḥ liṅsicor¹⁵ ātmanepadeṣv iti·
 idabhāvapakṣe udāharaṇam¹⁶· prāyeṇa pustakeṣu¹⁷ tīr̥ṣīṣṭa nadīm iti paṭhyate¹⁸· tac
 ca tarateḥ parasmaipaditvān na sambhavatīti stīr̥ṣīṣṭa nadīm¹⁹ iti pāṭhaḥ atīr̥ṣṭeti
 20 karmmakataryy acaḥ karmmakarttarīti cīna(bhā)vapakṣe²⁰· jhal ity eva variṣīṣṭa·
 avariṣṭa· vṛñvṛñor anyatarasyām iti²¹ liṅsicāv ātmanepadeṣv iti
 it̥pakṣe ṛ gatāv ity asya grahaṇan na bhavati· śailīyam ācāryasya ya-
 trāsya dhātor²² grahaṇam icchati· tatra śtipā nirddeśam karoti· sandehāvacchedāya²³
 yathārttipartyoś ca sartin̄stīr̥ṣṭeti²⁴ ceti ||

¹SJ: bhaṣbhāvena bhakāraḥ. ²SJ om. iti. ³SJ: dhatvaṃ takārasya. ⁴SJ: ātmanepade. ⁵SJ: aceṣṭa. ⁶SJ adds iti. ⁷SJ: sarvatra sambandhanīyam. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: guṇaṇīṣedhaḥ. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: atīr̥ṣṭeti. ¹⁴SJ: str̥ñ. ¹⁵SJ: -cāv. ¹⁶SJ: ṇe. ¹⁷SJ: pustake. ¹⁸SJ: dṛṣyate. ¹⁹SJ: tīr̥ṣīṣṭeti. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹SJ: -sya. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ om. ²⁴SJ om.

ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.12). *ekāco baś* ityādinā (P.8.2.37) bhaṣbhāvaḥ. **abhitteti jhalo jhalīti** (P.8.2.26) sico lopaḥ. **abuddheti jhaśas tathor dho 'dha** iti (P.8.2.40) takārasya dhakāraḥ. *jhalām jaś jhaśīti* (P.8.4.53) dhakārasya dakāraḥ. ika ity eva yakṣīṣṭa ayaṣṭa. samprasāraṇam syāt (cf. P.6.1.15).²⁵⁸ **ātmanepadeśv** iti kim? asrākṣīt. amāgamo na syāt (cf. P.6.1.58).²⁵⁹ **halantād** ity eva ceṣīṣṭa. guṇo na syāt (cf. P.1.1.5).²⁶⁰ **jhal ity** eva vartiṣīṣṭa. guṇo na syāt.²⁶¹ yadi kittvam syāt sarvatrānuṣaṅjanīyam.

12. uś ca. (P.1.2.12)

(*Bhv.:*) **ṛvarṇāntāt tau kitau syātām. kṛṣīṣṭa. hrṣīṣṭa. akṛta. ahrta. tīrṣīṣṭa nadī. atīrṣṭa nadī svayam eva.**

(*Pañj.:*) || **uś ca** ||. liṅsicā⟨v a⟩nuvṛttau dhātum upasthāpayataḥ.²⁶² *yena vidhir* ity (P.1.1.72) anena ṛkāreṇa tadantavidhir vijñāyata ity²⁶³ āha **ṛkārantāc cetyādi**.²⁶⁴ **kṛṣīṣṭa** ⟨iti⟩ sīyutsuṭau (cf. P.3.4.102, 107). kittvād aguṇaḥ (cf. P.1.15). **akṛteti hrasvād aṅgād** iti (P.8.2.27) sico lopaḥ. **tīrṣīṣṭeti tṛ plavanataranayoḥ** (*Dhp.* 1.1018). āśīṣi liṅ (cf. P.3.3.173). karmaṇy ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.13). *ṛta id dhātor* iti (P.7.1.100) ittvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). *hali ceti* (P.8.2.77) dīrghaḥ. āstīrṣṭeti *stṛñ ācchādane* (*Dhp.* 9.14). luṅ ānpūrvāḥ. *liṅsīcor ātmanepadeśv* iti (P.7.2.42) idabhāvapakṣa udāharaṇam. prāyeṇa pustakeṣu **tīrṣīṣṭa nadīm** iti paṭhyate. tac ca tarateḥ parasmaipaditvān na sambhavatīti stīrṣīṣṭa nadīm iti pāṭhaḥ. **atīrṣṭeti** karmaka⟨r⟩tary *acaḥ karmakartarīti* (P.3.1.62) cinabhāvapakṣe. jhal ity eva variṣīṣṭa avariṣṭa ⟨iti⟩²⁶⁵ vṛṇvṛñor²⁶⁶ anyatarasyām iti liṅsīcor ātmanepadeśv iti (P.7.2.42) itpakṣe. *ṛ gatāv* ity (*Dhp.* 9.27) asya grahaṇam na bhavati. śailīyam ācāryasya yatraṣya dhātor grahaṇam icchati tatra śtipā nirdeśam karoti²⁶⁷ samdehāvacchedāya yathārtipartyoś ca (P.7.4.77) *sartisāstyartibhyaś ceti* (P.3.1.56).²⁶⁸

13. vā gamaḥ. (P.1.2.13)

(*Bhv.:*) **games tau vā kitau syātām. kittvād anunāsikalopaḥ. samgasīṣṭa**

²⁵⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ikaḥ ity eva – yakṣīṣṭa, ayaṣṭa. samprasāraṇam hi syāt.*

²⁵⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ātmanepadeśv iti kim? asrākṣīt, adrākṣīt. 'sṛjīdṛśor jhalo am akiti' ity (P.6.1.58) amāgamo na syāt.*

²⁶⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *halantād ity eva – ceṣīṣṭa, aceṣṭa. guṇo na syāt.*

²⁶¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *jhal ity eva – vartiṣīṣṭa, avartiṣṭa. guṇo na syāt.*

²⁶² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *liṅsicāv ihānuvartamānau dhātum sannidhāpayataḥ.*

²⁶³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *'yena vidhis tadantasya' iti (P.1.1.72) ṛkāreṇa tadantavidhir vijñāyate.*

²⁶⁴ *Bhv.:* **ṛvarṇāntāt.**

²⁶⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *jhal ity eva – variṣīṣṭa, avariṣṭa.*

²⁶⁶ Cf. *Dhp.* 5.8 (*vṛñ varaṇe*) und 9.38 (*vṛñ sambhaktau*).

²⁶⁷ Cf. vārtt. 2 on P.3.3.108: *ikṣtipau dhātunirdeśe (Mbh. II 154.18).*

²⁶⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha 'ṛ gatau' ity asya dhātor grahaṇam kasmān na bhavati? śailī hīyam ācāryasya yatra yasya dhātor grahaṇam icchati tatra tasya śtipā nirdeśam karoti, yathā – 'artipartyoś ca' (P.7.4.77), 'sartisāstyartibhyaś ca' (P.3.1.56) iti.*

||vā gamah|| samagateti sampūrvād gamer luṅ· samo gamyṛcchi-
 pracchītyādinātmanepadam· kitvapakṣe anudāttopadeśeti anu-
 5 nāsikalopah¹· hrasvād aṅgād iti sico lopah||

||hanah|| āhateti āno yamahana ity ātmanepadam· nalope² kṛte
 hrasvād aṅgād iti jhali sico lopah· jhalīty eva³· aghāniṣātām·
 10 syasicetyādinā⁴ ciṅuvad it⁵ ca sārvaḥātukani[ta]m⁶ āśritya sijanta-
 syānunāsikalopo na bhavatīty atrārthe idam eva jñāpakam· nanu sicy eva nalopo⁷
 yathā syāt sārvaḥātuke mā bhūd ity evamarthaṃ kitvaṃ syād iti tat⁸ kathaṃ
 jñāpakam· viśeṣas tu⁹ sici samānāśraye¹⁰ nalop{e}asyāsiddhatvād ato lopābhāvaḥ
 ucyate· asiddham bahiraṅgam antara¹¹ ity ato lope
 15 karttavye nalopasyāsiddhatvāt upadeśādhikārād vā aviśeṣeṇa¹² jñāpakam¹³
 iti tenāyamstetyādisiddhiḥ¹⁴||

¹SJ: anudāttetyādinānunāsikalope ca kṛte. ²SJ: anunāsikalope. ³SJ: jha. ⁴SJ: syasicsīyud
 ityādinā. ⁵SJ: ciṅvadiṭau. ⁶SJ: -kaṃ nittvam. ⁷SJ: hanter lopo. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ adds ayaṃ.
¹⁰SJ: -śaye nalopo 'to lope. ¹¹SJ: -ṅga. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ adds eva. ¹⁴SJ om.

saṃgaṃsīṣṭa vā. tvam̐ yuddhe vijayena saṅgasīṣṭhāḥ saṅgaṃsīṣṭhā vā.
samagata samagaṃsta vā bhramaraḥ saroruheṇa.

(Pañj.:) ||**vā gamah**||. samagateti saṃpūrvād gamer luṃ *samo gamyrccchi-
pracchātyādinā* (P.1.3.29) ātmanepadam. kittvapakṣe *anudāttopadeśety* (P.6.4.37) anu-
nāsikalopaḥ. *hrasvād aṅgād* iti (P.8.2.27) sico lopaḥ.

5

14. **hanaḥ sic.** (P.1.2.14)

(Bhv.:) **hantes taṇi sic kit syāt. āhata. āhasātām.**

(Pañj.:) ||**hanaḥ**||. āhateti āṇo yamahana ity (P.1.3.28) ātmanepadam. nalope kṛte
(cf. P.6.4.37) *hrasvād aṅgād* iti (P.8.2.27) jhali sico lopaḥ. jhali ity eva aghāṇisātām
<iti> *syasicetyādinā* (P.6.4.62) ciṇvad iṭ ca. sārvadhātuka(m) nītam āśritya *sijanta-
syānūnāsikalopo na bhavatīty*²⁶⁹ atrārtha idam eva jñāpakam.²⁷⁰ nanu sicy eva nalopo
yathā syāt sārvadhātuke mā bhūd ity evamarthaṃ kittvaṃ syād iti²⁷¹ tat kathaṃ
jñāpakam?²⁷² viśeṣas tu sici samānāśraye nalopasyāsiddhatvād²⁷³ ato lopābhāvaḥ
(cf. P.6.4.48). ucyate: *asiddhaṃ bahiraṅgaṃ antaraṅga* ity (PP 41, NP 50) ato lope
kartavyenalopasyāsiddhatvād upadeśādhikārād (cf. P.6.4.22) vā aviśeṣeṇa jñāpakam
iti tenāyamstetyādisiddhiḥ.²⁷⁴

10

15

15. **yamo gandhane.** (P.1.2.15)

(Bhv.:) **yamas taṇi sic kit syāt. udāyata sūcitavān ity arthaḥ.
nopāyadhvaṃ bhayaṃ sītām** (Bhatt. 7.101c). **gandhane kim? āyamsta
pādam.**

20

²⁶⁹ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 62: *sijantasya nalopo na bhavati.*

²⁷⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *evam̐ tarhi siddhe nīttve sati yat punar iha hanaḥ sij iti sicaḥ kittvaṃ vi-
dadhāti taj jñāpayati – bāhyasārvadhātukam āśritya sijantasya ‘aniditām’ ity* (P.6.4.24) *anūnāsikalopo
na bhavatīti, tenāraṃsta amaṃsta āyamsta pādam iti siddhaṃ bhavati.* Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.:
kimarthaṃ punar idam, yāvata ātmanepade nīti sijantasyāṅgasya ‘aniditām’ ity (P.6.4.24) *eva nalopaḥ
siddhaḥ, uccāraṅarthaḥ hi sica ikāraḥ nānubandhaḥ? jñāpanārtham. etaj jñāpayati – ‘na sijantasyo-
padhālopo bhavati’ iti. tenāyamsteti siddhaṃ bhavati.*

²⁷¹ If the elision of *n* of *han* (as in *āhata*) is caused by *sic*, rule P.6.4.37 applies and when it is
caused by the *sārvadhātuka* suffix *ta*, rule P.6.4.24 operates.

²⁷² Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 61: *naitat jñāpakam̐ sicy eva lope yathā syāt parasmin̐ nīttve mā bhūd ity
evamarthavāt.* Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *nanu ca sici ‘anudāttopadeśa’ iti* (P.6.4.37) *lopo yathā syād,
ātmanepade upadhālopo mā bhūd ity evamartham̐ idam̐ syāt, kaḥ punar atra viśeṣaḥ – sici vā lopo
bhavatu, ātmanepade vā?*

²⁷³ Because P.6.4.37 and P.6.4.48 belong to block P.6.4.22–129 and both operations, i.e. the elision
of *n* by P.6.4.37 and the elision of *a* by P.6.4.48, depend on the suffix *sic*.

²⁷⁴ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *ayam̐ asti viśeṣaḥ – ātmanepade lope sati ato lopaḥ prāpnoti, sici tu
na, ābhīyasyānūnāsikalopasyāsiddhatvāt. yady api upadhālopo ‘py ābhīyas tathāpi vyāśrayatvād
asiddhatvaṃ na prāpnoti – ātmanepade upadhālopaḥ, sicy ato lopaḥ. yady evam̐, bahiraṅga
upadhālopaḥ, bahirbhūtātmanepadāpekṣatvād, antaraṅgo ‘llopaḥ antarbhūtasijapekṣatvāt’ asiddhaṃ
bahiraṅgam̐ antaraṅge’. Cf. also *Jñ.S.* p. 61: *asti cātra viśeṣaḥ. sijnīttve nakāralope asiddha-
vat atrā bhād iti* (P.6.4.22) *asiddhatvāt ato lopo na bhavati. parasmin̐ punar nīttve nalope sati
akāralopaḥ syāt. yatas tatra antagrahaṇāt samānāśrayam̐ asiddhaṃ vyāśrayam̐ tu siddham̐ eva. atha
parasmin̐ api nīttve nalopasyāsiddhaṃ bahiraṅga ity antaraṅgatvād akāralopo nāsti tadā hanaḥ sij
iti kittvaṃ jñāpakam̐ eva sijantasya nalopo na bhavatīti.**

||yamo || udāya(te)ti anunāsikasiclopau¹. āyamsta
 pādam iti sakarmmakatve samudāñbhyo yamo 'grantha ity ātmanepadam
 ātmanepada ity eva ayamsīd iti². ||

5

||vibhāṣā || upāyateti upād yamaḥ svakaraṇa ity ātmanepadam ||

10

||sthā || upāsthiteti akarmmakāc ca³ tañ. prāsthiteti
 samavaprabhaya stha ity ātmanepadam⁴. itve kṛte hrasvād aṅgād iti
 sico lopaḥ taparakaraṇam dūrāddhūtādiviṣaye dīrghatvena
 15 plutabādhā⁵ mā bhūd ity evamarthaḥ. anyathā hi plutabādhanārtho⁶ dīrghaḥ syāt ||

||na ktvā ||. devitveti⁷ divu krīḍāyām⁸. varttitveti⁹ vṛtu
 20 varttane udito vetīṭ syanditveti syandū śravaṇe¹⁰
 kitvaniṣedhe¹¹ nalopābhāvaḥ. ktvā kiṃ nigṛhītiḥ ||

25

||niṣṭhā || śīn svapne niṣvidā gātraprakṣepane¹²
 30 nīmidā snehane. nīkṣidā¹³ snehanamocanayoḥ |

¹SJ: anunāsikalopa-. ²SJ om. ³SJ adds iti. ⁴SJ: tañ. ⁵SJ: pluto. ⁶SJ: -rthaḥ. ⁷SJ adds
 -ādi. ⁸SJ: krīḍāda. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: prasravaṇe. ¹¹SJ: kittve niṣiddhe guṇo. ¹²SJ: -prakṣaraṇe.
¹³SJ om.

(*Pañj.*) ||**yamo**||. udāyateti anunāsikasiclopau (cf. P.6.4.37; 8.2.27). āyaṃsta pādām iti sakarmakatve *samudān̄bhya yamo 'grantha* ity (P.1.3.75) ātmanepadam. ātmanepada ity eva ayamsīd iti.

16. vibhāṣopayamane. (P.1.2.16)

(*Bhv.*) svikāre yamas tañi sic kid vā syāt. upāyata kanyām. **upāyaṃsta mahāstrāṇi** (*Bhatt.* 15.21c). **saumitre mām upāyaṃsthāḥ** (*Bhatt.* 4.20a).

(*Pañj.*) ||**vibhāṣā**||. upāyatety upād yamaḥ svakaraṇa ity (P.1.3.56) ātmanepadam.

17. sthāghvor ic ca. (P.1.2.17)

(*Bhv.*) sthāghvos tañi sic kit syāt, ikāraś cāntādeśaḥ. sthā. upāsthita kareṇuḥ. prāsthitanekaḥ. ghu. adita. adithāḥ. adhita. adhithāḥ. **adhiṣātām gāvau vatsena.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**sthā**||. upāsthitety *akarmakāc ca* ⟨iti⟩ (P.1.3.26) tañi. prāsthiteti *samavaprabhaya stha* ity (P.1.3.22) ātmanepadam. ittve kṛte *hrasvād aṅgād* iti (P.8.2.27) sico lopaḥ. taparakaraṇam dūrāddhūtādiviṣaye (cf. P.8.2.84) dīrghatvena plutabādḥā mā bhūd ity evamartham. anyathā hi plutabādhanārtho dīrghaḥ syāt.²⁷⁵

18. na ktvā seṭ. (P.1.2.18)

(*Bhv.*) seṭ ktvā kin na syāt. devitvā. vartitvā. mṛditvādau kittvam uktam. seṭ anuvṛttir navasūtryām.

(*Pañj.*) ||**na ktvā**||. devitveti *divu krīḍāyām* (cf. *Dhp.* 4.1).²⁷⁶ vartitveti *vṛtu vartane* (*Dhp.* 1.795). *udito veti* (P.7.2.56) iṭ. syanditveti *syandū sṛavaṇe* (*Dhp.* 1.798).²⁷⁷ kittvanīṣedhe nalopābhāvaḥ (cf. P.6.4.24). **ktvā** kim? niḡhītiḥ (cf. P.6.1.16).

19. niṣṭhā śīn̄svidimidikṣvididhṛṣaḥ. (P.1.2.19)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyaḥ seṇ niṣṭhā kin na syāt. śayitaḥ śayitavān. prasveditaḥ prasveditavān. prakṣveditaḥ prakṣveditavān. prameditaḥ prameditavān. pradharṣitaḥ pradharṣitavān. svidāder **vibhāṣā bhāvādī-karmaṇor** (P.7.2.17) iṭ. dhātupārāyaṇe tu bhāvādīkasya ḍīno 'pi niṣṭhāyām akittvam uktam. uḍḍayita uḍḍayitavān.

(*Pañj.*) ||**niṣṭhā**||. *śīn̄ svapne* (*Dhp.* 2.22). *ñiṣvidā gātraprakṣeṇe* (*Dhp.* 4.79).²⁷⁸ *ñimidā snehane* (*Dhp.* 1.779, 4.133). ñikṣvidā *snehanamocanayoḥ* (*Dhp.* 1.780, 4.134).

²⁷⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *iṣyate ca pluto dūrāddhūtādiviṣaye. tasmāt tasya bādḥako dīrgho mā bhūd iti taparatvaṃ kartavyam.*

²⁷⁶ *Dhp.* 4.1: *divu krīḍāvijigīṣāvyaḥāradhyutimodamadasvapnakāntigatiṣu.*

²⁷⁷ *Dhp.* 1.798: *syandū prasravaṇe.*

²⁷⁸ *Dhp.* 4.79: *ñiṣvidā (ṣvidā) gātraprakṣaraṇe.*

ñidhr̥ṣā prāgalbhye· śayita iti gatyarthetyādinā¹ [ka]rttari ktaḥ
 prasvedita² ityādāv ādikarmmaṇi³ karttari ceti ktaḥ⁴ śiñ ity anu-
 bandhena nirddeś((o)) yañluki⁵ nivṛtyarthaḥ· tena śeśy((i))ta ity
 atra kitve⁶ pratiśedhābhāvāt guṇo na bhavati er anekāca iti⁷ yañādeśaḥ
 5 niṣṭhāyām akitvam⁸ iti yogavibhāt uddayita iti stutvam⁹· ||

10

||udupa || dyotitam iti· dyuta ādīptau ktaḥ
 15 vibhāṣā bhāvādikarmmaṇor iti pakṣe iṭ kitvābhāvapakṣe (guṇaḥ) muda-
 prabhṛte(r i)ti muda harṣa ityādeḥ· aśabvikaraṇānām neṣyate
 (iti) vyavasthitavibhāṣayā nigudhitam iti gudha pariveṣṭane divādiḥ¹⁰
 bhāvādikarmmaṇoḥ kiṃ· rucitaṃ kārṣāpaṇaṃ karttari ktaḥ·
 udupadhāt kiṃ· sidhitam¹¹ anena· ||

20

||pūñaḥ || nityo yaṃ¹² niṣedhaḥ uttarasūtre vāvacanāt· na ktvā seḍ iti
 siddheḥ¹³ ktvāgrahaṇaṃ uttarārthaṃ· pūñ ity anubandhanirddeśo
 25 yaṃ¹⁴ yañluki¹⁵ nivṛtyarthaḥ popuvitaḥ popuvitavān¹⁶·
 pū[ñ]nivṛtyarthas tu na bhavati tasya śryukaḥ kitīti seṭtvābhāvāt ||

¹SJ: gatyarthākarmaketyādinā. ²SJ: prakṣvedita. ³SJ adds ktaḥ. ⁴SJ: anena. ⁵SJ: yañlug-. ⁶SJ: kittva-. ⁷SJ adds -ādinā. ⁸SJ adds uktam. ⁹SJ: er anekāca iti na yañ kvacid apavādaparibhāṣayā. ¹⁰SJ: daivādikāḥ. ¹¹SJ: midhitam. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: siddhe. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ: yañlug-. ¹⁶SJ: popuvitveti.

ñidhr̥ṣā prāgalbhye (*Dhp.* 5.22). **śayita** iti *gatyarthyādinā* (P.3.4.72) kartari ktaḥ. **prasvedita** ityādāv *ādikarmaṇi* *<ktaḥ>* kartari ceti (P.3.4.71) ktaḥ. **śīn̄** ity anubandhena nirdeśo yañluki nivṛttyarthaḥ (cf. *PP*² 94, *NP* 120.3). tena śeśyita ity atra kittve pratiśedhābhāvād guṇo na bhavati.²⁷⁹ *er anekāca* iti (P.6.4.82) yañādeśaḥ. **niṣṭhāyām akittvam** iti yogavibhā(gā)t. **udḍayita** iti ṣṭutvam (cf. P.8.4.41). 5

20. mṛṣas titikṣāyām. (P.1.2.20)

(*Bhv.*) mṛṣeḥ kṣamāyām niṣṭhā kin na syāt. marṣitaḥ. marṣitavān. titikṣāyām kim? apamṛṣitaṃ vākyam āha.

21. udupadhād bhāvādikarmaṇor anyatarasyām. (P.1.2.21)

(*Bhv.*) udupadhād dhātor bhāvārambhayor niṣṭhā kin na syād 10
vā. dyotitaṃ dyutitaṃ vānena. *pradyotitaṃ tāvad udupratānair divākaraḥ pradyutito na yāvat.* evaṃ mudaprabhr̥teḥ. aśabvikara-
nānām tu neṣyate.²⁸⁰ nigudhitam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**udupa**||. **dyotitam** iti *dyuta dīptau* (*Dhp.* 1.77). ktaḥ (cf. P.3.4.70 ff.).
vibhāṣā bhāvādikarmaṇor iti (P.7.2.17) pakṣa iṭ. kittvābhāvapakṣe guṇaḥ. **muda-** 15
prabhr̥ter iti *muda harṣa* (*Dhp.* 1.16) ityādeḥ. **aśabvikaraṇānām** *<tu>* neṣyata
iti vyavasthitavibhāṣayā **nigudhitam** iti *gudha pariveṣṭane* (*Dhp.* 4.13) divādiḥ.
bhāvādikarmaṇoḥ kim? rucitaṃ kārṣāpaṇam *<iti>*²⁸¹ kartari ktaḥ (cf. P.3.4.71).
udupadhāt kim? sidhitam anena.²⁸²

22. pūñah ktvā ca. (P.1.2.22)

(*Bhv.*) pūñah ktvā niṣṭhā ca kin na syāt. pavitaḥ pavitavān. pavitvā.
pūñas cetiṭ (P.7.2.51). ktvāgrahaṇam uttarārtham. 20

(*Pañj.*) ||**pūñah**||. nityo 'yaṃ niṣedha uttarasūtre vāvacanāt. *na ktvā seḍ* iti
(P.1.2.18) siddheḥ **ktvāgrahaṇam uttarārtham**. pūñ²⁸³ ity anubandhanirdeśo
'yaṃ yañluki nivṛttyarthaḥ (cf. *PP*² 94, *NP* 120.3). popuvitaḥ popuvitavān.²⁸⁴ 25
pūñnivṛttyarthas²⁸⁵ tu na bhavati tasya *śryukaḥ kitīti* (P.7.2.11) seṭtvābhāvāt.²⁸⁶

²⁷⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *prakṛtigrhaṇe yañluko grahaṇam smarati. ato yañluko grahaṇam mā bhūd iti śīno 'nubandhanirdeśaḥ. tena śeśyitaḥ śeśyitavān ity atra kittvapratīśedhābhāvād guṇo na bhavati.*

²⁸⁰ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.1.2.21: *udupadhāc chapaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 201.3).

²⁸¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *bhāvādikarmaṇor iti kim? rucitaṃ kārṣāpaṇam dadāti.*

²⁸² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *udupadhād iti kim? likhitam anena.*

²⁸³ *Dhp.* 1.1015: *pūñ pavane.*

²⁸⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *'pūñah' iti sānubandhakasyoccāraṇam kimartham? popuvitaḥ, popuvitavān, popuvitveti yañlugantāt kittvapratīśedho mā bhūd iti.*

²⁸⁵ *Dhp.* 9.12: *pūñ pavane.*

²⁸⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *pūñnivṛttyarthaṃ [sic!] sānubandhakasyoccāraṇam nopapadyate, 'śryukaḥ kitī' (P.7.2.11) itīṭpratiśedhāt. pūñah parayoḥ ktvāniṣṭhayaḥ seṭor abhāvāt.*

5 ||nopadhāt || śrathitveti¹ śrantha sandarbhe
 guphitveti gupha gunpha granthe nopadhāt² kiṃ rephitvā ripha
 rinpha³ hiṃsāyām· nopadhagrahaṇasāmarthyāt ralo vyupadheti⁴
 vikalpo na bhavati⁵· ||

10

||vañcīlu || va[ñc]itveti vancu gatau⁶· luncu apanayane·
 ṛta iti sautro dhātuḥ ghrṇārthaḥ· ||

15

||trṣimṛṣi || nītrṣā pipāsāyām⁷· mṛṣas titikṣāyām
 kṛśa tanūkaṇe ||

20

25 ||ralo || halādidhāto ralitasya kitvavikalpabhājo⁸ vakāro yakāraś co-
 padhā na saṃbhavatīty ata āha· u i⁹ vī iti dvandvasamāse prathamādvirvacanaṃ·
 evaṃ dyutādir iti· vididyotiṣate vididyutiṣata iti abhyāsasya dyutisvāpyoḥ
 saṃprasāraṇam iti saṃprasāraṇaṃ· eṣiṣiṣatīti· iṣu¹⁰ icchāyām·

¹SJ: grathitveti grantha. ²SJ adds iti. ³SJ: bebhittvā bebhṛ. ⁴SJ: balo py upadheti. ⁵SJ:
 vartate. ⁶SJ: pralambhane. ⁷SJ: īpsāyām. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: ī. ¹⁰SJ: iṣa.

23. nopadhāt thaphāntād vā. (P.1.2.23)

(*Bhv.*) thakārāntān nopadhād dhātoḥ phakārāntāc ca ktvā kid vā syāt. śrathitvā śranthitvā. grathitvā granthitvā. guphitvā gumphitvā. nopadhāt kim? rephitvā. thaphāntāt kim? sramsitvā.

(*Pañj.*) ||**nopadhāt**||. śrathitveti śrantha saṃdarbhe (*Dhp.* 9.41, 10.294). 5
guphitveti gupha gunpha granthe (*Dhp.* 6.31). **nopadhāt** kim? rephitvā <iti> riphā
rinpha hiṃsāyāṃ (*Dhp.* 6.30). nopadhagrahaṇasāmarthyād ralo vyupadheti (P.1.2.26)
vikalpo na bhavati.²⁸⁷

24. vañciluñcyṛtaś ca. (P.1.2.24)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyaḥ ktvā kid vā syāt. vacitvā vañcitvā. lucitvā luñcitvā. 10
ṛtitvā artitvā.

(*Pañj.*) ||**vañcilu**||. vañcitveti vancu gatau (cf. *Dhp.* 1.204²⁸⁸). luncu apanayane
(*Dhp.* 1.202). **ṛta** iti sautro dhātuḥ ghrṇārthaḥ.²⁸⁹

25. tṛṣimṛṣikṛśeḥ kāśyapasya. (P.1.2.25)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyaḥ ktvā kid vā syāt. tṛṣitvā tarṣitvā. mṛṣitvā marṣitvā. 15
kṛṣitvā karṣitvā. kāśyapagrahaṇaṃ pūjārtham.

(*Pañj.*) ||**tṛṣimṛṣi**||. ṅitṛṣā pipāsāyāṃ (*Dhp.* 4.118). mṛṣa titikṣāyāṃ (*Dhp.* 4.55,
10.305). kṛśa tanūkarāṇe (*Dhp.* 4.117).

26. ralo vyupadhād dhalādeḥ saṃś ca. (P.1.2.26)

(*Bhv.*) u i vī. tadupadhād ralantād halādeḥ dhātoḥ ktvā saṃś ca 20
kitau vā syātām. likhitvā lekhitvā. lilikhiṣati lilekhiṣati. evaṃ dyuta-
mudādeḥ. dyutitvā dyotitvā. didyutiṣate didyotiṣate. ralantāt kim?
devitvā dideviṣati. halādeḥ kim? eṣitvā eṣiṣati. seḍ ity eva. bhuktvā
bubhuḥṣate. uktam kittvam.²⁹⁰

(*Pañj.*) ||**ralo**||. halādīdhāto ralantasya kittvavikalpabhājo vakāro yakāraś co- 25
padhā na saṃbhavatīty ata āha u i vī iti dvandvasamāse prathamādvivacanam.
evaṃ dyutādir iti²⁹¹ **vididyotiṣate vididyutiṣata** ity²⁹² abhyāsasya *dyutisvāpyoḥ*
saṃprasāraṇam iti (P.7.4.67) saṃprasāraṇam. eṣiṣatīti *iṣu icchāyāṃ* (*Dhp.* 6.59).

²⁸⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu caitadvikalpābhāve 'pi 'ralo vyupadhād' ityādinavātra* (cf. P.1.2.26)
vikalpena bhavitavyam, na cānayoḥ vikalpayoḥ kaścid viśeṣo 'py asti? evaṃ tarhi nopadhagrahaṇa-
sāmarthyād yogāntarakṛto 'pi vikalpo 'nena bādhyate.

²⁸⁸ *Dhp.* 1.204–211: *vancu, cancu, tancu, tvancu, mruncu, mluncu, mrcu, mlucu gatyarthāḥ.*

²⁸⁹ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *ṛtiḥ sautro dhātuḥ 'ṛter ṛyañ' iti* (P.3.1.29), *sa ca ghrṇāyāṃ vartate.*

²⁹⁰ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 19) and Mishra (1989: 17) omit.

²⁹¹ *Bhv.*: **dyutamudādeḥ.**

²⁹² *Bhv.*: **didyutiṣate didyotiṣate.**

san iṭ guṇaḥ¹. oṇer ṛditikaraṇaṃ

jñāpakam². nityam api dvirvacanaṃ upadhākāryeṇa bādhyate sāmānyajñāpakāt³

laghūpadhagaṇaṃ kṛtvā dvirvacanaṃ. vyupadhāt kiṃ.

vivarttiṣate. kuṭitvety atra kuṭādīnitvaṃ pūrvavipratiṣedhena

5 iṇupadhād iti na kṛtaṃ iṇpratyāhārasya pareṇa ṇakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇam api⁴
sūcayituṃ. ||

10

||ūkālo|| ukāla⁵ ekamātrika ityādinā ukāla⁶ iti (ekamātrika)dvimātrika-

trimātrikāṇām⁷ dvandvaṃ kṛtvā bahuvrīhiṃ darśayati ūḥ kālo yasyeti. aj anya-

padārthaḥ na ca anyasya sambandhinī [śa(?)].. kriyā sā nānyācaḥ⁸

sambhavatī([[3-4]] [ād iti] boddhyaṃ)ty artho⁹ gamyate tad ayam

15 arthaḥ¹⁰ u¹¹ ity etatsahacaritayā uccāraṇakriyā tulyocāraṇakriyā kālākhyā yasyeti¹².

sa ukālah evaṃ¹³ ukālah ukālaś ca kālaśabdaparimāṇārthatvāt¹⁴ taparavat ukāreṇa

dvimātrikatriṃśatikayo hrarsvasaṃjñā na bhavati. agnicid iti ciñ cayane.

agnau c iti¹⁵ kvip hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk.

hrīcchatīti hrīcha lajjāyāṃ dīrghasaṃjñāyāṃ dīrghād iti

20 tuk. aci¹⁶ kiṃ pracakṣya vyañjanadvayasya hrasvasaṃjñāyāṃ tuk syāt ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: jñāpayati. ³SJ: -kam | tena. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: ukāla. ⁶SJ: ū. ⁷SJ adds trayāṇām. ⁸SJ: -nīyā nānyasyācaḥ. ⁹SJ: -tīti vatyartho. ¹⁰SJ adds ca. ¹¹SJ: ū. ¹²SJ: yasyācaḥ. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: kālaśabdasya. ¹⁵SJ: ceḥ. ¹⁶SJ: acaḥ.

san (cf. P.3.1.7). iṭ (cf. P.7.2.35). guṇaḥ (cf. P.7.3.86). oṇer²⁹³ rditkaraṇam jñāpakam: nityam api dvirvacanam upadhākāryeṇa bādhyate sāmānyajñāpakāt (cf. *PP* 64, *NP* 101). laghūpadhāguṇam kṛtvā dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.9). **vyupadhāt** kim? vivartiṣate.²⁹⁴ kuṭitvety (cf. P.1.2.1) atra kuṭādinittvaṃ pūrvavipratīṣedhena. iṇupadhād iti na kṛtam iṇpratyāhārasya pareṇa ṇakāreṇa pratyāhāragrahaṇam api sūcayitum.²⁹⁵

27. **ūkālo 'j jhrasvadīrghaplutaḥ.** (P.1.2.27)

(*Bhv.*:) ukāla ekamātrika ūkālo dvimātrika ū3kālas trimātriko 'c kramaṇa hrasvadīrghaplutasamjñakaḥ syāt. agnicit. hrīcchati. pluto nodāhriyate. bhāṣāyām vyavahārādarśanāt.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**ūkālo**||. **ukāla ekamātrika** ityādinā **ūkāla** ity ekamātrikadvimātrika-trimātrikāṇām dvandvaṃ kṛtvā bahuvrīhiṃ darśayati: ūḥ kālo yasyeti. **aj** anyapadārthaḥ (cf. P.2.2.24). na ca anyasya sambandhinī [[śabda]]kriyā (?) sā nānyācaḥ sambhavati. [[kālatulyatvād]] iti boddhavyam ity artho gamyate.²⁹⁶ tad ayam arthaḥ: u ity etatsahacaritayā uccāraṇakriyayā tulyocāraṇakriyā kālākhyā yasyeti sa ukālaḥ.²⁹⁷ evam ūkāla ū3kālaś ca. kālaśabdaparimāṇārthatvāt taparavat. ukāreṇa dvimātrikatriamātrikayor hrasvasamjñā na bhavati.²⁹⁸ **agnicid** iti *ciñ cayane* (*Dhp.* 5.5, 10.86). *agnau cer* iti (P.3.2.91) kvip. *hrasvasya piti kṛti* <iti> (P.6.1.71) tuk. **hrīcchatī**ti *hrīcha lajjāyām* (*Dhp.* 1.225). dīrghasamjñāyām *dīrghād* iti (P.6.1.75) tuk. **aj** ity kim? pracakṣya. vyañjanadvayasya hrasvasamjñāyām tuk syāt.

28. **acaś ca.** (P.1.2.28)

(*Bhv.*:) tadbhāvitā hrasvādayo 'ca eva sthāne veditavyāḥ. hrasvaḥ. atiri. atikhaṭvam. dīrghaḥ. stūyate. paṭūbhavati. atra cchandaḥsūtrāṇi dvādaśa. iha bhāṣārhaṇy api svarasūtrāṇi na nibadhyanate. svarasya bhāṣāyām apracārād anarthitvāc ca lokasya. veda evāvaśyakaḥ svaraprayogaḥ. visvare 'niṣṭāpātabhayāt.

²⁹³ *Dhp.* 1.482: oṇr apanayane.

²⁹⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: vyupadhād iti kim? vartitvā vivartiṣate.

²⁹⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: lāghavārtham 'iṇupadhāt' iti vācye, iṇgrahaṇāni sarvāṇi pareṇa ṇakāreṇeti jñāpanārtham 'vyupadhāt' ity uktam.

²⁹⁶ Cf. *Pat.* ad loc.: evam ūkālakāla ūkāla iti. athavā sāhacaryāt tēcchabdyam bhaviṣyati. kālasahacarito varṇaḥ. (*Mbh.* I 202.14–15). Cf. also *Nyāsa* ad loc.: yataḥ ū ity etatsahacaritam yad uccāraṇam tad ūkārasyaiva, nānyasyācaḥ. tat katham so 'nyasambandhinīyā kriyayā ūkālāḥ syāt, na hi yajñadattasambandhinībhiś citragaviḥhir devadattāś citragur bhavati? ayam apy adoṣaḥ vatyarthasyeha vivakṣitatvāt, tasya ca vināpi vatīnā gamyamānatvāt. parapadārtheṣu hi prayujyamānāḥ śabdā vatim antareṇāpi vatyartham gamyantīty uktam etat.

²⁹⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: ū ity etatsahacaritayocāraṇakriyayā tulyocāraṇakriyā kālākhyā yasyācaḥ sa ūkāla iti.

²⁹⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: kālagrahaṇam parimāṇārtham, dīrghaplutaḥ hrasvasamjñā mā bhūt. Cf. also *Pad.*: ūkālo yasya sa ūkālāḥ 'taparas tatkālasya' itivannirdeśaḥ samarthanīyaḥ.

||acaś ca || paribheyaṃ liṅgavatī liṅgañ cāsyā hrasvādiśabdah¹· aj
 iti varttate· hrasvādiśabdā iha aca upasthānaṃ· prati na vyāpriyante· tasya svayam
 evopasthitatvāt tataś ca svarūpapadārthakāḥ santo vidhīyamānasyāco viśeṣaṇam²
 upayānti ta[d aya]m arthaḥ· acaḥ sthāne aj bhavati hrasvādisaṃjñāyā³ vidhīyamāna
 5 ity⁴ āha· tadbhāvitā⁵ ityādi hrasvādiśabdabhāvitā⁶ ity arthaḥ· atirīti rāyam
 atikrāntaṃ kulam⁷ iti prādisamāsaḥ hrasvo napuṃsake prātipādikasyety
 atrācaś cety asyopasthitau ajantasya hrasvo bhavati· stūyata iti
 akṛtsārvadhātukayor iti dīrghaḥ· paṭubhavatīti cviḥ⁸
 sarvāpahārī lopaḥ cvau ceti dīrghaḥ ||

10

||apṛkta || ekaś⁹ cāsāv al ceti ekāl iti¹⁰· āsīd iti asa bhuvi
 lañ· tip itaś ceti ikāralopaḥ¹¹ takāraṣyāpṛktasaṃjñāyām· astisico 'pṛkta itī¹²
 15 dīrghaḥ· ardhabhāg ity bhajo ṇviḥ· ṇitvād upadhāvṛddhiḥ
 upapadasamāsaḥ ekāl kiṃ· vṛḍṛbhyām¹³ vin
 darviḥ algrahaṇe¹⁴ varṇagrahaṇam¹⁵ iti samudāyanivṛttau siddhāyām ekagrahaṇa[m]
 {asa bhuvi ... }¹⁶ jñāpakam¹⁷ anyatra varṇagrahaṇa¹⁸ jātigrahaṇam iti· tena
 dambher halgrahaṇasya jātivācakatvāt siddham¹⁹ ity upapadyate²⁰· ihaikāl ity apa-
 20 nīya ekahal ity kṛte yady api halnyādisūtre halgrahaṇam na karttavyam
 yāyate· tathāpi (na) kṛtam eko hal yasyeti bahuvrīhiśaṅkānirāsārtham²¹ pratyayaḥ
 kiṃ surāḥ²² surām sunotīti sunoteḥ kvip tuk surāsut²³

¹SJ: -bdāḥ. ²SJ: -ṇabhāvam. ³SJ: -saṃjñām uccārya. ⁴SJ adds ata. ⁵SJ: tadbhāvitānām.
⁶SJ adds -nām. ⁷SJ: brāhmaṇakulam. ⁸SJ: cvipratyayaḥ. ⁹SJ: apṛktaś. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds
 śapo luk. ¹²SJ adds: ād ajādīnām ity āṭ. ¹³SJ: dṛṭṛbhyām. ¹⁴SJ: -ṇena. ¹⁵SJ: ekavarṇa-. ¹⁶SJ:
 mandaprayojanam | nyāsaḥ tu. ¹⁷SJ adds uktam. ¹⁸SJ: algrahaṇe. ¹⁹SJ om. ²⁰SJ: upapannaṃ
 bhavati. ²¹SJ om. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ om.

(*Pañj.*) ||**acaś ca**||. paribhāṣeyam liṅgavatī. liṅgaṃ cāsyā hrasvādisabdah. aj iti vartate. hrasvādisabdā iha aca upasthānaṃ prati na vyāpriyante tasya svayam evopasthitatvāt. tataś ca svarūpapadārthakāḥ santo vidhīyamānasyāco viśeṣaṇam upayānti. tad ayam arthaḥ: acaḥ sthāne 'j bhavati hrasvādisamjñayā vidhīyamāna ity āha **tadbhāvitā** ityādi.²⁹⁹ hrasvādisabdabhāvitā ity arthaḥ. **atirīti** rāyam 5 atikrāntaṃ kulam iti prādisamāsaḥ.³⁰⁰ *hrasvo napuṃsake prātipādikasyety* (P.1.2.47) atr**ācaś cety** (P.1.2.28) asyopasthitāv ajantasya hrasvo bhavati. **stūyata** ity *akṛtsārvadhātukayor* iti (P.7.4.25) dīrghaḥ. **paṭubhavatīti** cviḥ (cf. P.5.4.50). sarvāpahārī lopaḥ (cf. P.1.3.9; 6.1.67). *cvau ceti* (P.7.4.26) dīrghaḥ.

41. *apṛkta ekāl pratyayaḥ.* (P.1.2.41)

10

(*Bhv.*) eko yo 'l pratyayaḥ so 'pṛkta ucyate. āsīt. apṛkta īṭ. ardhabhāk. **bhajo ṇviḥ** (P.3.2.62). *ver apṛktasya* (P.6.1.67) lopaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**apṛkta**||. ekaś cāsāv al cety **ekāl** iti. āsīd ity *asa bhuvi* (*Dhp.* 2.56). lañ. tip. *itaś ceti* (P.3.4.100) ikāralopaḥ. takārasyāpṛktasamjñāyām *astisico 'pṛkta* iti (P.7.3.96) īṭ dīrghaḥ. **ardhabhāg** iti **bhajo ṇviḥ** (P.3.2.62). ṇittvād upadhāvṛddhiḥ 15 (cf. P.7.2.116). upapadasamāsaḥ (cf. P.2.2.19).³⁰¹ **ekāl** kim? *vṛdṛbhyaṃ vin* (*Uṇ.* 496). darviḥ (cf. P.6.1.67).³⁰² algrahaṇe varṇagrahaṇam iti samudāyanivṛttau siddhāyām ekagrahaṇam jñāpakam: *anyatra varṇagrahaṇe jātigrahaṇam* iti.³⁰³ *tena dambher halgrahaṇasya jātivācakatvāt siddham* ity³⁰⁴ upapadyate.³⁰⁵ **ihaiikāl** ity apānīya ekahal iti kṛte yady api halnyādisūtre (cf. P.6.1.68) halgrahaṇam na kartavyam 20 jāyate tathāpi na kṛtam eko hal yasyeti bahuvrīhiśaṅkānirāsārtham. **pratyayaḥ** kim? surāḥ.³⁰⁶ surāṃ sunotīti sunoteḥ kvip (cf. P.3.2.76). tuk (cf. P.6.1.72). surāsut.

²⁹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ajgrahaṇe hy anuvartamāne hrasvādisabdā anuvartamānā aca evopasthānaṃ prati na vyāpriyante, tasya svayam evopasthitatvāt. tataś ca svarūpamātrapadārthakāḥ santo vidhīyamānasyāco viśeṣaṇatām upayānti. tatraivam abhisambandhaḥ kriyate – acaḥ sthāne 'j bhavati 'hrasvadīrghapluta' ity evaṃ samjñayā vidhīyamāna iti.*

³⁰⁰ The compound is prescribed by P.2.2.18, but neither Pāṇini nor Patañjali used the term *prādisamāsa*. The term appears in *Kāś.*, e.g. *Kāś.* on P.3.3.24. Gaṇa *prādi* (cf. P.1.4.58) = *GP* 154.

³⁰¹ The term *upapadasamāsa* was already used by Kātyāyana and Patañjali. See vārtt. 3 and 4 on P.2.2.19 (*Mbh.* I 418.1,5) and Pat. on them (*Mbh.* I 418.2–4,6,8,10), as well as Pat. on vārtt. 1 on P.3.2.56 (*Mbh.* II 105.9).

³⁰² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ekāl iti kim? darviḥ. jāgrviḥ.*

³⁰³ *Jñ.S.* p. 62, Pat. on P.1.1.14 (*Mbh.* I 71.1) and on vārtt. 4 on P.1.2.41 (*Mbh.* I 213.22–23).

³⁰⁴ Cf. *Bhv.* on P.1.2.10 and *Pañj.* on it.

³⁰⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *athaikagrahaṇam kimartham? asamudāyasya mā bhūd iti, naitad asti, algrahaṇasāmarthyān na bhaviṣyati, anyathā hy algrahaṇam anarthakaṃ syād – yadi hal-samudāyasyāpi samjñā syāt. evaṃ tarhy algrahaṇenātra jātigrahaṇam bhavatīti jñāpanārtham ekagrahaṇam. tena 'halantāc ca' ity (P.1.2.10) atra yad uktam – 'dambher halgrahaṇasya jātivācakatvāt siddham' iti tad upapannaṃ bhavati.*

³⁰⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pratyaya iti kim? surāḥ.*

surāsutam ācaṣṭe iti ñic ṭilopaḥ¹ surāsayate² kvip³ ṇilopa· atra dhātusakārasya
 halñyādisulopo⁴ na bhavati halñyādisūtre⁵ vihitaviśeṣaṇapakṣasya⁶ pratyā-
 yāpratyayaparibhāṣāyā vāśrayaṇān⁷ na kiñcid etat uhyeta
 pratyayagrahanam vispaṣṭārtham⁸ ||

5

||tatpuruṣaḥ || tulyābhidheyeti⁹ tulyābhidheyāni padāni āśrayabhūtāni
 yasya (tatpuruṣasya) sa tathoktaḥ· adhikaraṇaśabdo 'bhidheyavācī· etena
 10 tatpuruṣārthānām tulyābhidheyatvāt upacāreṇa tatpuruṣas tulyābhidheya ity
 uktaḥ· yato 'nekapadasya¹⁰ bhinnapravṛttinimittasya¹¹ ekasminn arthe vṛttih
 tat¹² samānādhikaraṇyaṁ na ca¹³ tatpuruṣasyaikapadasya¹⁴ tat¹⁵ sambhavatīti
 gaṇaparigrahaḥ yady api rājapuruṣaḥ śobhana¹⁶ iti mukhyo sti¹⁷ tathāpi mahatyā[h
 samjñāy]āḥ karaṇāt¹⁸ gaṇamukhyaparibhāṣā nāṅgīkriyate¹⁹.
 15 pācakavṛndāriketi²⁰· na kopadhāyā iti pratiṣedhe prāpte karmmadhārayatvāt²¹
 puṁvadbhāvaḥ· tatpuruṣaḥ kiṁ· pācīkābhāryaḥ samānādhikaraṇ((e))am²² kiṁ
 brāhmaṇarājyaṁ svaraprayojanam atra pūrvakāleti
 sūtrāt prāk karmmadhārayaś ceti krte śakyam pratyākhyātum idaṁ vaicitrāya
 sampadyate²³· ||

¹SJ: tat karotīyādinā ñic iṣṭhavadbhāvāt ṇilopaḥ. ²SJ: -teḥ. ³SJ: kvi-. ⁴SJ: halñyādinā
 lopo. ⁵SJ: -tra-. ⁶SJ: -ṇasyāśrayaṇāt. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: tulyābhidheyapadas tatpuruṣa
 iti. ¹⁰SJ: 'nekasya. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: -śabdasya. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ: śobhata.
¹⁷SJ: py asti. ¹⁸SJ: mahatīsamjñākaraṇād. ¹⁹SJ: na svīkriyate. ²⁰SJ: yā-. ²¹SJ adds: puṁvat
 karmadhāraya ityādinā. ²²SJ: -ṇaḥ. ²³SJ om.

surāsutam ācaṣṭa iti nic.³⁰⁷ ṭilopaḥ.³⁰⁸ surāsayate. kvip. ṇilopa atra dhātusakārasya halñyādilopo na bhavati halñyādisūtre (cf. P.6.1.68) vihitaviśeṣaṇapakṣasya pratyayāpratyayaparibhāṣāyā (cf. PP 92, NP 102) vāśrayaṇān na kiṃcid etat uhyeta pratyayagrahaṇam vispaṣṭārtham.³⁰⁹

42. tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ. (P.1.2.42) 5
(Bhv.:) tulyābhidheyapadas tatpuruṣaḥ karmadhārayasaṃjñāḥ syāt.
pācakavṛndārikā.³¹⁰ karmadhāraye puṃvat (cf. P.6.3.42).

(Pañj.:) ||**tatpuruṣaḥ**||. tulyābhidheyeti tulyābhidheyāni padāny āśrayabhūtāni yasya tatpuruṣasya sa tathoktaḥ. adhikaraṇaśabdo 'bhidheyavācī.³¹¹ etena tatpuruṣārthānām tulyābhidheyatvād upacāreṇa tatpuruṣas **tulyābhidheya** ity 10
uktam.³¹² yato 'nekapadasya bhinnapravṛttinimittasya ekasminn arthe vṛttih tat sāmānādhikaraṇyam.³¹³ na ca tatpuruṣasyaikapadasya tat sambhavatī gaṇaparigrahaḥ. yady api rājapuruṣaḥ śobhana iti mukhyo 'sti tathāpi mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇād gaṇamukhyaparibhāṣā (cf. PP 5, NP 15) nāṅgīkriyate.³¹⁴
pācakavṛndāriketi na kopadhāyā iti (P.6.3.37) pratisedhe prāpte karmadhārayatvāt 15
puṃvadbhāvaḥ. tatpuruṣaḥ kim? pācīkābhāryaḥ. **samānādhikaraṇaḥ** kim? brāhmaṇarājyam (iti)³¹⁵ svaraprayojanam (cf. P.6.2.130). atra *pūrvakāleti* (P.2.1.49) sūtrāt prāk karmadhārayaś ceti kṛte śakyam pratyākhyātum idam. vaicitrāya sampadyate.

43. prathamānirdiṣṭam samāsa upasarjanam. (P.1.2.43) 20
(Bhv.:) samāsaśūtre prathamānirdiṣṭam upasarjanasaṃjñam syāt.
yathā *pañcamī bhayena* (P.2.1.37). vṛkabhayam. *saptamī śauṇḍaiḥ*

³⁰⁷ Cf. vārtt. 6 on P.3.1.26: *ākhyānāt kṛtas tad ācaṣṭa iti kṛllukprakṛtipratyāpattiḥ prakṛtivac ca kārakam (Mbh. II 34.14–15).*

³⁰⁸ Cf. P.6.4.155 and vārtt. 1 on it (*ṇāv iṣṭavat prātipadikasya, Mbh. III 230.2–3*).

³⁰⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atrāpi ṇilope kṛte 'sati pratyayagrahaṇe dhātusakārasyaṅpṛkṭasaṃjñā syāt. tasyām ca satyām 'halñyābbhyaḥ' iti (cf. P.6.1.68) dhātusakāralopaḥ syāt. nanu cāsaty api pratyayagrahaṇe 'pratyayāpratyayoḥ pratyayasyaiva grahaṇam' iti saṃjñā vijñāsyate, tat kimartham pratyayagrahaṇam? tat kriyate vispaṣṭārtham. Cf. Pad. ad loc.: tipā sāhacaryāc caikavacanasya grahaṇam siddham iti pratyayagrahaṇam api cintyaprayojanam eva.*

³¹⁰ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 20) and Mishra (1989: 17) have **yācakavṛndārikā**.

³¹¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *adhikaraṇaśabdo 'bhidheyavācī*.

³¹² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *samānam abhinnam, ekam adhikaraṇam vācyam yeṣām padānām tāni samānādhikaraṇāni padāni, tāny āśrayabhūtāni yasya tatpuruṣasya sa samānādhikaraṇapadas tatpuruṣaḥ etena tatpuruṣārthānām padānām samānādhikaraṇatvād upacāreṇa tatpuruṣo 'tra sūtre samānādhikaraṇaśabdenokta iti darśayati.*

³¹³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *anekasya ca śabdasya bhinnapravṛttinimittasyaikasminn arthe vṛttih sāmānādhikaraṇyam.*

³¹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *katham punar bāhyānyapadāpekṣayā tatpuruṣasya mukhye sāmānādhikaraṇye sambhavati saty aupacārikasya grahaṇam upapadyate? 'karmadhāraya' iti mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇāt. ... tena 'gaṇamukhyayor mukhye kāryasaṃpratyayaḥ' iti mukhyasya samānādhikaraṇasya grahaṇam na vijñāyate.*

³¹⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *samānādhikaraṇa iti kim? brāhmaṇarājyam.*

||prathamāni || samāsa ity adhikaraṇanirddesaḥ· samāse kaṣṭaśritādau
prathamānirddiṣṭasya¹ samjñino bhāvāt samāsagrahaṇena samāsavidhāyakam sūtram
gṛhyate ity āha samāsasūtra ityādi·² vṛkabhayam ity atropasarjanasamjñāyām³·

- 5 vṛkaśabdasya pūrvanipātaḥ⁴ upasarjanam ity anvarthasamjñā
apradhānam upasarjanam iti· tena rājakumārīputra ity((ā))dāv āpekṣika(m
a)pradhānyam iti· nāniyamo bhavati ||

10

||ekava || samāsagrahaṇam ihānuvṛttaṃ samāsavākye pravarttate⁵ na

- 15 samāsasūtre ekavibhaktigrahaṇāt samāsasūtre sarvam evaikavibhaktikam⁶ ity āha·
vākye niyatavibhaktikam ityādi· niṣkauśāmbir ityādi gostriyor upasarjana-
syeti hrasvatvaṃ· atra⁷ nirgataśabde nā([nā])vibhaktike⁸ prayujyamāne⁹ pi
kauśāmbīśabda āvirbhūtāpādānaśaktikaḥ pañcamyanta eva· apūrvanipāte¹⁰ kiṃ·
iha na hi bhavati¹¹ kauśāmbīnir iti· pradhānasya nisa upasarjanatvaṃ cakārāt¹²·
20 kaṣṭaśritādāv¹³ ekavibhaktikatve py antarā prāptir¹⁴ nniṣidhyate· pūrvasūtreṇa
upasarjanasamjñā¹⁵ bhavaty eva· ||

¹SJ: -ṣṭa- · ²SJ adds upasarjanasamjñāyām · ³SJ: atra · ⁴SJ adds: evam anyatrāpi · ⁵SJ:
varttate · ⁶SJ om. eva · ⁷SJ om · ⁸SJ: -bhir · ⁹SJ: yujyamāno · ¹⁰SJ: -teti · ¹¹SJ om · ¹²SJ:
kakārāt · ¹³SJ: kaṣṭaśrita ityādau · ¹⁴SJ: anantarāprāptir · ¹⁵SJ has it after bhavaty eva ·

(P.2.1.40). **akṣaśauṇḍaḥ.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**prathamāni**||. **samāsa** ity adhikaraṇanirdeśaḥ. samāse kaṣṭaśritādau prathamānirdiṣṭasya samjñino 'bhāvāt samāśagrahaṇena samāśavidhāyakam sūtram gṛhyata ity āha **samāsasūtra** ityādi.³¹⁶ **vṛkabhayam** ity atropasarjanasamjñāyām vṛkaśabdasya pūrvanipātaḥ (cf. P.2.2.30). **upasarjanam** ity anvarthasamjñā: 5
apradhānam **upasarjanam** iti. tena rājakumārīputra ityādāv āpekṣikam apradhānyam iti na pūrvanipātaniyamo bhavati.³¹⁷

44. ekavibhakti cāpūrvanipāte. (P.1.2.44)

(*Bhv.*) **vākye niyatavibhaktikam upasarjanasamjñam syāt pūrvanipātam vinā. nirgataḥ kauśāmbiyā niṣkauśāmbiḥ. nirgataḥ tasyā 10**
niṣkauśāmbiḥ paśyetyādi. ekavibhaktāv aśaṣṭhyantavacanam iti (vārtt. 1 on P.1.2.44, *Mbh.* I 216.6) **kātyayānaḥ. ardhapippalī. upasarjana-**
hrasvo na bhavati.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ekavi**||. samāśagrahaṇam ihānuvṛttam samāśavākye pravartate na samāsasūtra ekavibhaktigrahaṇāt. samāsasūtre sarvam evaikavibhaktikam ity āha 15
vākye niyatavibhaktikam ityādi.³¹⁸ **niṣkauśāmbir** ityādi *gostriyor upasarjanas-*
syeti (P.1.2.48) hrasvatvam. atra nirgataśabde nānāvibhaktike prayujyamāne 'pi kauśāmbiśabda āvirbhūtāpādānaśaktikaḥ pañcamyanta eva.³¹⁹ **apūrvanipāte** kim? iha na hi bhavati kauśāmbīnir iti pradhānasya nisa upasarjanatvam.³²⁰ cakārāt kaṣṭaśritādāv ekavibhaktikatve 'py anantarā prāptir niṣidhyate.³²¹ pūrvasūtreṇa 20
upasarjanasamjñā bhavaty eva.³²²

³¹⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *samāsa ity adhikaraṇanirdeśo 'yam. kaṣṭaśritādayaḥ samāśaḥ teṣu na kiṃcīt prathamānirdiṣṭam śabdarūpam asti.* Cf. also *Kāś.* ad loc.: *prathamayā vibhaktiyā yan nirdiṣyate samāśaśāstre tad upasarjanasamjñam bhavati.*

³¹⁷ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 5 on P.1.2.43: *tatra mahatyāḥ samjñāyāḥ karaṇa etat prayojanam anvarthasamjñā yathā vijñāyeta. apradhānam upasarjanam iti. pradhānam upasarjanam iti ca sambandhiśabdāv etau. tatra sambandhād etad gantavyam yaṃ prati yad apradhānam tam prati tad upasarjanasamjñam bhavatīti.* (*Mbh.* I 215.9–11).

³¹⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *etena samāśagrahaṇam anuvartamānam samāśārthe vākye vartate, na samāśaśāstra iti darśayati. samāśaśāstre hi sarvam eva śabdarūpam ekavibhaktikam eva bhavatīti ekavibhaktigrahaṇam anarthakam syād iti bhāvāḥ.*

³¹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **uttarapadam tu pañcamyantam eva bhavatīti.** *niṣkramaṇakriyā-pekṣayāvīrbhūtāpādānaśaktikatvāt.*

³²⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *apūrvanipāta iti kim? na hi bhavati kauśāmbīnir iti.*

³²¹ Cf. *Pat.* on P.1.2.44: *athavānantarā yā prāptiḥ sā pratiṣidhyate* (*Mbh.* I 216.3). Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *kaṣṭādaya ekavibhaktikāḥ prathamānirdiṣṭāś cety ubhayaprasaṅge paratvād anenaiva prāpnoti, tataś ca 'apūrvanipāte' iti pratiṣedhaprasaṅgaḥ, na, apratiṣedhāt. nāyam prasajyapratīṣedhaḥ – pūrvanipāte neti, kiṃ tarhi? paryudāso 'yam, pūrvanipāte na vidhir na pratiṣedhaḥ. prasajyapratīṣedhe 'py anantarapṛāptiḥ pratiṣidhyate, kuta etat? anantarasya vidhir vā bhavati pratiṣedho vā bhavati, pūrvā prāptir apratiṣiddhā tayā bhaviṣyati. na ceyam prāptiḥ pūrvam prāptiḥ bādhatē, pratiṣiddhatvāt.*

³²² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha niso 'tra kenopasarjanasamjñā vidhīyate, yato 'sya pūrvanipātaḥ? pūrvasūtreṇeti cet, naitad asti, tenāpradhānasyopasarjanasamjñāvidhānāt, nisaś cātra prādhānyāt. evaṃ tarhi cakārasyānuktasamuccayārthatvād bhaviṣyati.*

5

||arthavad || arthavad iti· arthaśabdo yady api nivṛttiprayojana-
 10 ja.ñāda¹ varṭtate tathā² śabdānuśāsane prastūyamāne· dhanādivacanasyārthasya³
 grahaṇam ayuktam⁴ iti abhidheyavacano 'rthaśabdo⁵ gṛhyata iti tat punar
 avidheyam jātiguṇakriyādravyabhedena caturvidham⁶· vṛkṣa iti jātyatirikte
 'bhidheye prātipadikatvāt prātipadikā⁷ ity evam⁸ siddhā⁹ prathamā· evam
 śukla ity atra guṇātirikt((e)) (pācaka iti kriyātirikte)¹⁰ ḍithe iti dravyātirikte· kuṇḍam
 15 iti līṅgatvātirikte¹¹ sarva¹² iti sādharmaṇe 'bhidheye· uccair iti līṅgasamkhyārahite¹³· vanam
 iti vyutpattipakṣe vaner ddhātutvād eva nivṛtṭiḥ śakyā· arthavatparibhāsayai¹⁴
 siddhe arthavatgrahaṇam jñāpakam· svarūpaviṣaye 'rthavatpari-
 bhāṣā· tena pralambata ityādāv anarthakād api praśabdāt subutpattih¹⁴· ahann
 iti hanter lañ¹⁵ śapo luk tipo halīyādinā lopaḥ
 20 aṭ sa ca hanter¹⁶ grahaṇena gṛhyate¹⁷ asaty adhātugrahaṇe¹⁸
 ([.. ..padikam { asyā}jñāsyati¹⁹· nanu])²⁰ yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes
 tadantasyeti²¹ pratyayalopalakṣaṇenāpratyaya iti pratiṣedhaḥ
 siddhaḥ· naitad asti na nisambuddhyor iti (sambuddhi.. .i)
 grahanāt²² ([jñā]pakāt) nalopaviṣaye pratyayalopalakṣaṇenāpratyaya iti

25

¹SJ adds ādheya-· ²SJ adds api· ³SJ: -rthaśabdasya· ⁴SJ: anarthakam· ⁵SJ adds iha·
⁶SJ: trividham· ⁷SJ: -kārtha· ⁸SJ: eva· ⁹SJ om· ¹⁰SJ has it after dravyātirikte· ¹¹SJ: līṅgā·
¹²SJ: sarvam· ¹³SJ: -khyātirikte· ¹⁴SJ has it later, see p. 62*, fn. 12· ¹⁵SJ adds: adāditvāc·
¹⁶SJ: hanti-· ¹⁷SJ adds iti· ¹⁸SJ: dhātu-· ¹⁹SJ: prātipadikasamjñā syāt | ²⁰SJ adds ca· ²¹SJ om·
²²SJ: sambuddhigrahaṇād·

45. arthavad adhātur apratyayah prātipadikam. (P.1.2.45)

(*Bhv.*) arthavac chabdarūpaṃ prātipadikam ucyate. vṛkṣaḥ. śuklaḥ. dītthaḥ. kuṇḍam. vipraḥ. sarvaḥ. uccaiḥ. arthavat kim? vanam. dhanam. nāntāvadher mā bhūt. adhātuḥ kim? hanter laṇi ahan. nalopo hi syāt. apratyayah kim? kāṇḍe. kuṇḍe. trapuṇī. *hrasvo* 5
napuṃsaka iti (cf. P.1.2.47) hrasvaḥ syāt. *nipātasyanarthakasya*
prātipadikasamjñā vaktavyā (Pat. on vārtt. 12 on P.1.2.45, *Mbh.* I 220.26).
 adhyāgacchati. pralambate.

(*Pañj.*) ||**arthavad**||. **arthavad** ity arthaśabdo yady api nivṛttiprayojana-
 yācñādau³²³ vartate tathā śabdānuśāsane prastūyamāne dhanādivacanasyārthasya 10
 grahaṇam ayuktam ity³²⁴ abhidheyavacano 'rthaśabdo gṛhyata iti.³²⁵ tat punar
 abhidheyam jātiguṇakriyādravyabhedena caturvidham.³²⁶ **vṛkṣa** iti jātyatirikte
 'bhidheye prātipadikatvāt *prātipadikā* ity (cf. P.4.1.1) evaṃ siddhā prathamā. evaṃ
śukla ity atra guṇātirikte pācaka iti kriyātirikte **dīttha** ity dravyātirikte **kuṇḍam**
 ity liṅgātirikte **sarva** iti sādharāṇe 'bhidheye **uccair** iti liṅgasamkhyārahite. **vanam** 15
 ity vyutpattipakṣe vaner dhātutvād³²⁷ eva nivṛttiliṅgasyā. ³²⁸ arthavatparibhāṣayaiva
 (cf. *PP* 1, *NP* 14) siddhe 'rthavatgrahaṇam jñāpakam: svarūpaviśaye 'rthavatpari-
 bhāṣā. tena **pralambata** ityādāv anarthakād api praśabdāt subutpattilī. ³²⁹ **ahann**
 ity hanter laṇi. śapo luk (cf. P.2.4.72). tipo halīyādinā lopaḥ (cf. P.6.1.68).
 aṭ (cf. P.6.4.71). sa ca hanter grahaṇena gṛhyate. asaty adhātugrahaṇe 20
 prātipadikam jñāsyati.³³⁰ nanu ⟨*pratyayagrahaṇe*⟩ *yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes*
tadantasyeti (cf. *PP* 44, *NP* 23) pratyayalopalakṣaṇenā*pratyaya* ity pratiśedhaḥ
 siddhaḥ (cf. P.1.1.62)? naitad asti. *na nisambuddhyor* ity (P.8.2.8) sambuddhir *iti*
 grahaṇāj jñāpakāt: nalopaviśaye (cf. P.8.2.7) pratyayalopalakṣaṇenā*pratyaya* ity

25

³²³ Cf. *Amarakośa* 3.3.86 (*artho 'bhidheyaravastuprayojananivṛttiṣu*) and *Medinī* 17.2:
artho viśayārthanayor dhanakāraṇavastuṣu |
abhidheye ca śabdānām nivṛttau ca prayojane ||.

For *yācñā* cf. the meaning of *arthanā* in the *Amarakośa* 2.7.32 (*yācñābhiśastir yācanārthanā*) and *Dhp.* 10.357 (*artha upayācñāyām*).

³²⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *etena prayojanādivacanād vyavacchinatti.*

³²⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *abhidheyavacano 'rthaśabdaḥ.*

³²⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tat punar abhidheyam jātiguṇakriyādravyabhedena caturvidham.*

³²⁷ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.491: *vana* 492. *ṣana sambhaktau.*

³²⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu cādhatūr iti pratiśedho bhaviṣyati, tathā hi 'vana sambhaktau' 'dhana dhānye' ity etayoḥ dhātvor ete rūpe, naitad asti, avyutpannāv api vanadhanaśabdau staḥ, tayor evāyam prayogaḥ.*

³²⁹ Cf. *Puruṣottamadeva* on *PP* 1: *svarūpavidhiviśayā ceyam arthavad ityādau (1.2.45) arthavadgrahaṇāt. tena pralambata ity anarthakād apy avyayāt luk siddho bhavati.*

³³⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **ahann** ity. *adādītūvāc chapo luk, tipo halīyādinā lopaḥ, aṭ. sa ca hantigrāhaṇena gṛhyata iti kṛte 'pi tasmin hantir dhātūr eva. atra vinā dhātugrahaṇena prāg eva pratyayotpatteḥ prātipadikasamjñā syāt.*

pratishedho na bhavati· kāṇḍe kuḍye¹ iti prathamādvivacanāntau² napuṃsakāc
 ceti śībhāva ād guṇaḥ pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa vihitas
 tadādes tadantasyeti³ pratyayāntasy((ā))pratyaya iti pratishedho na⁴
 pratyayamātrasya anyatra samjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe⁵ tadantavidhir nnāstīty
 5 etad iha lopatiṣṭhate· pratishedhavidhitvāt⁶· nanv asaty⁷ apratyaya-
 grahaṇe ekādeśasya pūrva[m] praty antavatve hrasvah⁸ prāpnoti·
 na ca vācyam⁹ apratyayagrahaṇasāmārthyān¹⁰ na bhaviṣyati¹¹· trapuñī-
 tyādau sāvakaśatvāt¹² na ca vācyam trapuñīty atra ś.ti
 dīrghādeśasāmārthyāt· hrasv((o)) na bhaviṣyati· na tadartham apratyayagrahaṇam
 10 dīrghavidhānasya¹³ sarve cchatrīṇo yāntīty atra śatvatukor asiddha ity
 ekādeśasya siddhatve¹⁴· dīrghāt padāntād veti tukvikalpārthatvāt¹⁵·
 tasmāt¹⁶ kāṇḍ((e)) sya kuḍye ityādāv¹⁷ antavadbhāvena hrasvatvaṃ syād eva· naitad
 evaṃ hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasyety atra prātipadikagrahaṇānuvṛtyā
 śuddhaprātipadikasyāntādivadbhāvarahitasya hrasvatvaṃ¹⁸ vidhīyate· anabhihita iti·
 15 nirddeśād vā¹⁹· kiñ ca kāṇḍe ity atra kṛttaddhitāntasyaiveti niyamā..[m]²⁰
 bhaviṣyati na ca kṛdgraṇam bhīt²¹ chid ity atrādhātur²² iti pratishedhe viddhyartham
 iti²³ vācyam· yata²⁴ ācāryyapravṛttir jñāpayati· adhātur²⁵ iti pratishedho²⁶ na²⁷
 kṛdantadhātoḥ²⁸ yad ayam oḥ supīti dhātoḥ param supam nimittam āśrayati· tato²⁹
 'pratyaya iti pratipattigauravavāraṇāya³⁰ adhātupratyaya iti dviprati-
 20 ṣedhaḥ³¹ tatpuruṣāsāṅkānivṛtyarthaḥ· adhātupratyaya ity ucyamāne dhātoḥ pratyay((o))
 dhātupratyaya iti vijñāyeta· ||

¹SJ: kuṇḍe. ²SJ: -naṃ. ³SJ: iti. ⁴SJ: pratyayāntasya pratishedhena. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: na
 cāyam samjñāvidhiḥ. ⁷SJ: saty apy. ⁸SJ: pūrvapraty antare hrasvatvaṃ. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: -rthyam.
¹¹SJ: vācyam. ¹²SJ adds: nanv arthavatparibhāṣayaiva siddhe arthavatgraṇam jñāpakam artha-
 vatparibhāṣā svarūpaviṣayā tena pralambata ityādāv praśabdānarthakād api subutpattiḥ. Cf. p. 61*,
 fn. 14. ¹³SJ: jasaḥ śī ity uttaratra grahaṇārthaṃ dīrghagrahaṇam na bhavati | asati prayojane utta-
 rārtham bhavati | asti ccha prayojanaṃ. ¹⁴SJ: tukaivāsya siddhatvāt. ¹⁵SJ: -lpaḥ. ¹⁶SJ: tataś
 ca. ¹⁷SJ: ityevamādau. ¹⁸SJ: śuke prātipadike 'ntādivadbhāvarahitahrasvatvaṃ. ¹⁹SJ adds:
 hrasvatvaṃ na bhaviṣyati. ²⁰SJ: niyamān na. ²¹SJ: jit. ²²SJ om. atra. ²³SJ: idaṃ. ²⁴SJ om.
²⁵SJ: na dhātur. ²⁶SJ: niṣedhaḥ. ²⁷SJ om. ²⁸SJ: kṛdantasya. ²⁹SJ: tasmād. ³⁰SJ: -parihārārtham.
³¹SJ om. dvi-.

pratiṣedho na bhavati.³³¹ **kāṇḍe kuḍye** iti³³² prathamādvivacanāntau *napuṃsakāc* ceti (P.7.1.19) śībhāva ād *guṇaḥ* (P.6.1.87). *pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes tadantasyeti* (PP 44, NP 23) pratyayāntasyā**pratyaya** iti pratiṣedho na pratyayamātrasya.³³³ *anyatra saṃjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nāstīty* (PP 81, NP 27)³³⁴ etad iha nopatiṣṭhate pratiṣedhavidhitvāt.³³⁵ nanu saty apratyaya- 5
 grahaṇa ekādeśasya pūrvam praty antavattve (cf. P.6.1.85) hrasvaḥ prāpnoti (cf. P.1.2.47). na ca vācyam. apratyayagrahaṇasāmartyān na bhaviṣyati.³³⁶ **trapuṇī** ityādau sāvakāśatvān na ca vācyam.³³⁷ **trapuṇī ity** atra śī iti (cf. P.7.1.19) dīrghādeśasāmartyādhā dhrasvo na bhaviṣyati. na tadartham apratyayagrahaṇam dīrghavidhānasya sarve cchatrīṇo yāntīty atra *ṣatvatukor asiddha* ity (P.6.1.86) 10
 ekādeśasyāsiddhatve *dīrghāt* (P.6.1.75) *padāntād veti* (P.6.1.76) tukvikalpārthatvāt. tasmāt **kāṇḍe kuḍye** ityādāv³³⁸ antavadbhāvena hrasvatvaṃ syād eva. naitad evam. *hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasyety* (P.1.2.47) atra prātipadikagrahaṇānuvṛtṭyā śuddhaprātipadikasyāntādivadbhāvarahitasya hrasvatvaṃ vidhīyate *anabhihita* iti (P.2.3.1) nirdeśād vā. kiṃ ca **kāṇḍe** ity atra kṛttaddhitāntasyaiveti niyamārtham 15
 bhaviṣyati. na ca kṛdgrahaṇam bhit chid ity atrā**adhātur** iti pratiṣedhe vidhyartham iti vācyam. yata ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati: adhātur iti pratiṣedho na kṛdantadhātor yad ayam *oḥ supīti* (P.6.4.83) dhātoḥ param supam nimittam āśrayati. tato '**pratyaya** iti pratipattigauravavāraṇāya. **adhātur apratyaya** iti dvi(ṣ)prati- 20
 ṣedhaḥ tatpuruṣāśaṅkānivrṭtyarthāḥ. adhātupratyaya ity ucyamāne dhātoḥ pratyayo dhātupratyaya iti vijñāyeta.³³⁹

³³¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu cātra pratyayalakṣaṇena 'apratyayaḥ' iti pratiṣedhena bhavitavyam, tat kim adhātugrahaṇena? naitad asti, prātipadikasamjñāyām nalopaḥ kāryaḥ, nalope ca 'na nisambuddhyoḥ' iti* (P.8.2.8) *pratiṣedho jñāpakāḥ – pratyayalakṣaṇena 'apratyayaḥ' iti pratiṣedho na pravartata iti.*

³³² *Bhv.*: **kāṇḍe kuḍye**. The examples *kāṇḍe kuḍye* appear also in *Mbh.*, *Kāś.* and *Nyāsa* ad loc.

³³³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **kāṇḍe kuḍye** iti. *prathamādvivacanānte ete rūpe. 'napuṃsakāc ca' iti* (P.7.1.19) *śībhāvaḥ. atra ca 'pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes tadantasya' iti tadantasya pratiṣedho bhaviṣyati, na pratyayamātrasya.*

³³⁴ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 64: *anyatra saṃjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe nāvāśyaṃ tadantavidhir bhavatīti.*

³³⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca 'suptiṇantaṃ padam' ity* (P.1.4.14) *atrāntagrahaṇena 'anyatra saṃjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nāsti' iti jñāpitavāt 'apratyayaḥ' iti pratyayāntasya pratiṣedho na labhyate, naiṣa doṣaḥ, saṃjñāvidhau sa pratiṣedhaḥ, na cāyaṃ saṃjñāvidhiḥ. kiṃ tarhi? pratiṣedhavidhiḥ.*

³³⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca kāṇḍe kuḍye ity etayoḥ pūrvam eva prakṛteḥ prātipadikasamjñā pravṛttā vibhaktiyā ca sahaikādeśe kṛte 'ntādivadbhāvād asty eva prātipadikatvam iti saty apy apratyayagrahaṇe hrasvatvaṃ prāpnoty eva. naitad asti, apratyayagrahaṇasāmartyān na bhaviṣyati, anyathā hy apratyayagrahaṇam anarthakaṃ syāt.*

³³⁷ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *na cāpratyaya ity asya vaiyarthyaṃ, trapuṇī ityādau yatraikādeśatvaṃ nāsti tatrārthavattvāt.*

³³⁸ *Bhv.*: **kāṇḍe kuḍye**.

³³⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *'adhātur apratyayaḥ' iti dviṣṭipratiṣedhaḥ ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣāśaṅkānirāsārthaḥ, 'adhātupratyayaḥ' ity ucyamāne ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣo 'py āśaṅkyeta – dhātor yaḥ pratyayas tasya na bhavatīti.*

5

||kṛttaddhita || apratyaya ity asyāpavādatvāt¹· anyatra
 samjñāvidhāv ity asyānupasthānād arthavadgrahaṇānuvṛtyā vā² kṛdantataddhitā-
 ntayor idam grahaṇam³· kartteti śrūyamānasya kṛta udāharaṇam⁴· śrīr iti· śrīñ
 sevāyām⁵· kvip vacītyādinā kvip dīrghaḥ idam aśrūyamānasya⁶·
 10 dākṣir iti· ata iñ varaṇā iti varaṇānām⁷ adūrabh{ā}avo grāma ity⁸ adūrabhavaś
 ceti kṛtasyāṇo⁹ varaṇādibhyaś ce luk¹⁰· yuktavadbhāvād bahu-
 vacanaṃ· rājapuruṣa iti ṣaṣṭhīsamāse prātipadikatvād {bhid} vi-
 bhaktiropanalop((au))· kumbhākāra iti· kumbhaṃ karotīti karmmaṇy
 aṇ nityam upadasamāsaḥ ||

15

||hrasvo || klība ityādi hrasvaśrutyā aca[ś] ca¹¹ [ta]syopasthānād¹²
 20 acā prātipadikasya viśeṣaṇād ajantasya prātipadikasya hrasva iti vyavasthite suvā(k)
 brāhmaṇakulam ity atra na bhavati· atirītyādy eca· ig ghra[sv]ādeśa ity atra
 vyutpāditam· grāmaṇi kulam iti grāmaṇ nayatīti satsūdviṣa ityādinā
 kvip· upapadasamāsaḥ· agragrāmā(bhyā)ñ ceti ṇatvam· pūrvapadāt samjñāyām aga¹³
 iti vā¹⁴· samjñātva([n tu]) rū[ḍh]itvāt hrasvatve kṛte tug na
 25 bhavaty asiddhapāribhāṣayā antaraṅgatuki kāryye¹⁵ bahiraṅgasya {sva} hra-
 svasyāsiddhatvāt¹⁶ ramate kulam ity atra katham hrasvatvam āśaṅkitam yāvata
 kriyāpadasyāsattvavācītvāt napuṃsakaliṅgena yogo nāsti· nāpi prātipadikatvam
 apratyaya iti pratiṣedhāt· atrocyate kulam ity etasya¹⁷ viśeṣyasya
 napuṃsakatvena ramata ity asya viśeṣaṇasya napuṃsakatvāt· tathā coktam·

¹SJ om. ²SJ: tasmāt. ³SJ: iyaṃ samjñā | nanv ārabdhe 'py asmin anyatra
 samjñāvidhāv ityādinā tadantapratīṣedhe pratyayamātrasya samjñā syāt na pratyayāntasya | naitad
 iti arthavadgrahaṇānuvṛtyā laukikī arthavattā loke ca tadantasyārthavattvam na kevalayoḥ
 kṛttaddhitayoḥ. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: śrīnaḥ. ⁶SJ: śrūyamānasya kṛta udāharaṇam. ⁷SJ: varaṇā
 nāma. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: vihitasyāṇo. ¹⁰SJ: lup. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: a-. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ:
 antaraṅge tuki karttavye. ¹⁶SJ adds nanu. ¹⁷SJ: asya.

46. kṛttaddhitasamāsāś ca. (P.1.2.46)

(*Bhv.*:) ete prātipadikasamjñākāḥ syuḥ. kartā. śrīḥ. dākṣiḥ. varañāḥ. rājapurusaḥ. kumbhakārah. *arthavatsamudāyānām samāsasyaiveti*³⁴⁰ niyamād vākyasya prātipadikatvābhāvaḥ. rājñāḥ purusaḥ.

5

(*Pañj.*:) ||**kṛttaddhita**||. *apratyaya* ity (cf. P.1.2.45) asyāpavādatvād *anyatra samjñāvidhāv* ity³⁴¹ asyānupasthānād arthavadgrahaṇānūvṛtṭyā vā kṛdantataddhitāntayor idam grahaṇam.³⁴² **karteti** śrūyamānasya kṛta udāharaṇam. **śrīr** iti *śrīñ sevāyām* (*Dhp.* 1.945). *kvib vacītyādinā*³⁴³ kvip dīrghaḥ. idam aśrūyamānasya. **dākṣir** iti *ata in* (P.4.1.95). **varañā** iti varañānām adūrabhavo grāma ity *adūrabhavaś ceti* (P.4.2.70) kṛtasyāṇo *varañādibhyaś ce*(ti) (P.4.2.82) luk. yuktavadbhāvād bahuvacanam (cf. P.1.2.51). **rājapurusa** iti ṣaṣṭhīsamāse (cf. P.2.2.8) prātipadikatvād vibhakti-lopanalopau (cf. P.2.4.71; 8.2.7). **kumbhakāra** iti kumbham karotīti *karmaṇy an* (P.3.2.1) nityam upa(pa)dasamāsaḥ.

47. hrasvo napuṃsake prātipadikasya. (P.1.2.47)

15

(*Bhv.*:) klībe prātipadikasya hrasvaḥ syāt. atiri. atinu. grāmaṇi kulam. neha. ramate kulam. kāṇḍībhūtaṃ kulam. tiṇavyayayor aliṅgatvāt. neha. vanāgram. vanāyēti. bahiraṅgatvād dīrghasya.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**hrasvo**||. **klība** ityādi hrasvaśrutyā *acaś ca* (cf. P.1.2.28). tasyopasthānād acā prātipadikasya viśeṣaṇād ajantasya prātipadikasya hrasva ity vyavasthite suvāk brāhmaṇakulam ity atra na bhavati. **atirītyādy eca ig ghrasvādeśa** ity (P.1.1.48) atra vyutpāditam. **grāmaṇi kulam** iti grāmaṃ nayatīti *satsūdviṣa* ityādinā (P.3.2.61) kvip. upapadasamāsaḥ. *agragrāmābhīyām ceti* ṇatvaṃ *pūrvapadāt samjñāyām aga* ity (P.8.4.3) vā. samjñātvaṃ tu rūḍhitvāt. hrasvatve kṛte tug (cf. P.6.1.71) na bhavaty asiddhapāribhāṣayā (*PP* 41, *NP* 50) antaraṅgatuki kārye bahiraṅgasya hrasvasyāsiddhatvāt. **ramate kulam** ity atra katham hrasvatvam āsaṅkitam yāvata kriyāpadasyāsattvavācītvān napuṃsakaliṅgena yogo nāsti nāpi prātipadikatvam *apratyaya* ity (cf. P.1.2.45) pratiśedhāt? atrocyate **kulam** ity etasya viśeṣyasya napuṃsakatvena **ramata** ity asya viśeṣaṇasya napuṃsakatvam. tathā coktaṃ:

³⁴⁰ Cf. vārtt. 6 on P.1.2.45: *arthavatsamudāyānām samāsagrahaṇam niyamārtham* (*Mbh.* I 218.13).

³⁴¹ *PP* 81, *NP* 27. Cf. also fn. 334.

³⁴² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: ‘*apratyayaḥ*’ ity *pūrvasūtre paryudāsāt kṛdantasya taddhitāntasya cānena prātipadikasamjñā vidhīyate*. Cf. also *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atrānyatra samjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nāstīty etan nopatiṣṭhate, yasmād apratyaya ity pratiśedhe prāpte vacanam idam. ‘apratyayaḥ’ ity pratyayāntasya pratiśedha uktaḥ*.

³⁴³ *Kāś.* on P.3.2.178. Cf. also vārtt. 2 on the same *sūtra* (*Mbh.* II 136.4).

viśeṣyasya hi¹ yal liṅgaṃ vibhaktivacane ca ye

tāni sarvvāni yoḥyāni viśeṣanapade pi² ceti³.

aśrayato⁴ liṅgavacanāni bhavanti vā⁵ prātipadikatvaṃ punas teśabdāni āśrītya

bhaviṣyati. apratyaya iti pratiśedhaś ca⁶ pratyayāntasya. na pratyaya-

5 mātrasya teśabdasyārthavatvaṃ tu karttari varttamāne vidhānāt | kiñ cādātur iti

pratiśedho jñāpakah. dhātuvihitapratyayāntasyāpratyaya⁷ iti pratiśedho

na bhavati. kin tarhy adhātuvihitapratyayāntasya⁸. anyathā hi apratyaya ity anena naiva⁹

dhātuvihitapratyayāntasyāpi¹⁰ niśedhasya¹¹ siddhatvāt. adhātur iti¹² pratiśedhan

na kuryāt. kṛtaś cāto 'vasīyate¹³ adhātur iti pratiśedho dhātumātrasya na dhātuvihita-

10 syeti¹⁴. tataś cobhayaviśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭatvāt¹⁵ prāptim āśaṅkya yuktam uktam¹⁶. tinavya-

yor aliṅgatvād iti¹⁷ kāṇḍībhūtam iti¹⁸ cvyantatvād avyayatvaṃ.

vanāgram iti bahiraṅgatvād iti asiddham bahiraṅgam antaraṅge. |

ekapadāśraye 'ntaraṅgahrasvatve karttavye padadvayāśrayasya

dirghasyāsiddhatvād iti¹⁹. nājānantarye bahirprakṛtir²⁰ iti

15 cātra nāsti. saṃhitākāryam²¹ prati tasyopasthānāt. vanāyety atra²² nājānantaryya ity

asyānupasthānāt | asiddhaparibhāṣā²³ labdha-

prasaraiva. ||

20

||gostriyo || strīti svaritvāt stryadhikāravihitāḥ ṭābādayo grhyante.

25 upasarjanagrahaṇaṃ gostriyor viśeṣaṇaṃ. tābhyāṃ prātipadikasya viśeṣaṇāt

tadantagrahaṇam ity āha²⁴. gośabdāntasyeti. citragur iti. citrā gaur ya-

sya²⁵ bahuvrīhiḥ prathamānirddiṣṭam ityādinā gośabdasyopasarjanatvaṃ.

niṣkauśāmbir ity atra²⁶ ekavibhakti cety²⁷ anena rājakumārīti kumārī-

śabdasy((o))pasarjanatvaṃ nāsti viśeṣyatvāt. atitantrītyādi tatri kuṭumbadhāraṇe

30 lakṣa darśanāṅkayoḥ. avitṛstṛtantribhya īr iti

¹SJ om. ²SJ om. ³SJ: ityādi. ⁴SJ: svāśrayatvāl. ⁵SJ: ca. ⁶SJ: tu. ⁷SJ: dhātur iti apra-. ⁸SJ: dhātumātrasya. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: dhātuvihitasya pratyayasyāpi. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: adhātu-. ¹³SJ: 'numīyate. ¹⁴SJ: dhātuvihitapratyayāntasyeti. ¹⁵SJ: -tvaṃ viśiṣṭatvāt. ¹⁶SJ: yuktivyuktam. ¹⁷SJ adds yat. ¹⁸SJ adds: asya tu. ¹⁹SJ: hrasve karttavye padatvāśrayasya dirghatvasyāsiddhatvāt | ²⁰SJ: bahiṣṭva-. ²¹SJ: na vācye saṃhitādhikāriyakāryam. ²²SJ adds tu. ²³SJ: -ṣayā. ²⁴SJ: tadantavidhir ityādi. ²⁵SJ: asyeti. ²⁶SJ om. ²⁷SJ: -ktir ity.

*viśeṣyasya hi yal liṅgaṃ vibhaktivacane ca ye |
tāni sarvāṇi yojyāni viśeṣaṇapade 'pi ca ||* iti.

āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti vā prātipadikatvam. punas teśabdānāni āśritya bhaviṣyati. *apratyaya* iti (cf. P.1.2.45) pratiṣedhaś ca pratyayāntasya na pratyaya-
mātrasya. teśabdasyārthavattvaṃ tu kartari vartamāne vidhānāt. kiṃ *cādhātur* iti 5
(cf. P.1.2.45) pratiṣedho jñāpakāḥ: dhātuvihitapratyayāntasyā*apratyaya* iti pratiṣedho
na bhavati. kiṃ tarhi? adhātuvihitapratyayāntasya. anyathā hi *apratya*⟨*ya*⟩ ity
anenaiva dhātuvihitapratyayāntasyāpi niśedhasya siddhatvād *adhātur* iti pratiṣedham
na kuryāt. kṛtaś cāto 'vasīyate: *adhātur* iti pratiṣedho dhātumātrasya na dhātuvihita-
syeti. tatas cobhaya viśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭatvāt prāptim āśaṅkya yuktam uktam. **tiṅavya-** 10
⟨**ya**⟩**yor aliṅgatvād** iti **kāṇḍībhūtam** iti cvyantatvād avyayatvam (cf. P.1.4.56, 61
and P.1.1.37). **vanāgram** iti **bahiraṅgatvād** ity *asiddham bahiraṅgam antaraṅge*
(*PP* 41, *NP* 50). ekapadāśraye 'ntaraṅgahrasvatve kartavye padadvayāśrayasya
dirghasyāsiddhatvād iti *nājānantarye bahir*⟨*aṅga*⟩*prakṛptir* iti (cf. *PP* 42, *NP* 51)³⁴⁴
cātra nāsti saṃhitakāryaṃ prati tasyopasthānāt. **vanāyety** atra *nājānantarya* ity 15
(cf. *PP* 42, *NP* 51) asyānupasthānād asiddhaparibhāṣā (cf. *PP* 41, *NP* 50) labdha-
prasaraiva.

48. *gostriyor upasarjanasya.* (P.1.2.48)

(*Bhv.*:) gośabdāntasya strīpratyayāntasya copasarjanasya hrasvaḥ syāt.
citraguḥ. strī. niṣkauśāmbiḥ. atikhaṭvaḥ. upasarjanasya kim? 20
rājakumārī. strīti stryadhikāravihitasya grahaṇān neha. atitantrīḥ.
atiśrīḥ. atilakṣmīḥ. *īyaso bahuvrīhau pratiṣedhaḥ.*³⁴⁵ bahuśreyasī rājā
kulaṃ vā. *īyasaś ceti* (P.5.4.156) kapo niśedhaḥ.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**gostriyo**||. strīti svaritatvāt stryadhikāravihitāḥ ṭābādayo gṛhyante.³⁴⁶
upasarjanagrahaṇaṃ gostriyor viśeṣaṇam.³⁴⁷ tābhyāṃ prātipadikasya viśeṣaṇāt 25
tadantagrahaṇam ity āha gośabdāntasyeti.³⁴⁸ **citragur** iti citrā gaur ya-
sya bahuvrīhiḥ *prathamānirdiṣṭam* ityādinā (P.1.2.43) gośabdasyopasarjanatvam.
niṣkauśāmbir ity atra *ekavibhakti cety* anena (cf. P.1.2.44). **rājakumārī**ti kumārī-
śabdasyopasarjanatvaṃ nāsti viśeṣyatvāt. **atitantrīr** ityādi *tatri kuṭumbadhāraṇe*
(*Dhp.* 10.139) *lakṣa darśanāṅkayoḥ* (*Dhp.* 10.5). *avitṛstṛtantribhya īr* iti (*Uṇ.* 441 = 30

³⁴⁴ *PP* 42: *nājānantarye bahiraṅgaprakṛptiḥ. NP* 51: *nājānantarye bahiṣṭvaprakṛptiḥ.*

³⁴⁵ Cf. vārtt. 3 on P.1.2.48 (*īyaso bahuvrīhau puṃvadvacanam, Mbh.* I 224.7) and *Kāś.* on the same *sūtra* (*īyaso bahuvrīheḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*).

³⁴⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *strīgrahaṇasyeḥ svaritatvaṃ kriyā ity svaritenādhikārād avagatir bhavati. tena 'striyām' ity adhikṛtya ye pratyayā vihitaḥ ṭābādayas teṣāṃ grahaṇaṃ bhavati.*

³⁴⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *upasarjanagrahaṇaṃ dvayor viśeṣaṇam.*

³⁴⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *tābhyāṃ prātipadikasya tadantavidhiḥ.*

īh¹ lakṣer muṭ ceti muṭ² atisrīr³ iti· śrīñ sevāyām
 kvib vacītyādinā⁴ kvipdīrghau⁵
 sarvatra prādisamāsaḥ· atyādayaḥ krāntādyarthe dvitīyayeti⁶· bahupreyasī rājā⁷
 kulam veti priyaśabdād iyasuni priyasthiretyādinā prādeśaḥ prakṛtyaikāj
 5 iti prakṛtivadbhāvāt ṭilopābhāvaḥ⁸ ugitaś ceti nīp· bahvyaḥ
 preyasyo⁹ yasyeti bahuvrīhiḥ¹⁰ prakaraṇāpekṣayā niṣedhād anantarasyeti paribhās((ā))yā
 [a]pravṛttau pūrvasūtraprāpter api pratisedhaḥ¹¹· ata eva kulam vety
 uktaṃ ||

10

||luk ta || luko 'bhāvarūpatvāt paratvaṃ na sambhavatīti luki sati
 sūtrārthaḥ sampadyate¹² pañcaśaṣkula iti pañcabhiḥ śaṣkulībhiḥ krīta itī
 15 kṛtārthe¹³ ṭhak· tasyādhyarddheti¹⁴ luk· āmalakam
 iti āmalakyāḥ phalaṃ vikāra iti nityaṃ vṛddheti¹⁵
 mayat phale luk śaṣkulyāmalakīśabdāv atra¹⁶ gaurādī·
 taddhitagrahaṇaṃ kiṃ¹⁷ gārgīkulaṃ subluki mā bhūt¹⁸ luki¹⁹
 kiṃ gārgītvam upasarjana²⁰ ity eva· avantī avanter apatyam strīti
 20 vṛddhetkośalājā([dā])d itī nīyañ²¹· striyām avantikuntikurubhyaś ceti
 luk ito manuṣyajāter iti nīṣ atra taddhitārtho gotraṃ
 strīpradhānaṃ ity upasarjanatvam nāsti²² ||

25

||id go || pañcagonīr iti pūrvavat²³ taddhitārthe samāsaḥ

¹SJ: anuvarttamāne. ²SJ: īpratyayaḥ. ³SJ: suśrīr. ⁴SJ: vacipracchītyādinā. ⁵SJ: kvip
 dīrghaś ca. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: bahavaḥ śreyasyo. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: anantara-
 paribhāṣā na pravarttate | tena pūrvasūtrasyāpi prāpter niṣedhaḥ. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: krīta ity atrārthe
 tena kṛtam iti. ¹⁴SJ: adhyardhapūrvād dvigor lug asaṃjñāyām iti. ¹⁵SJ: vṛddhaśarādibhya iti.
¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ adds iti. ²⁰SJ adds -sya. ²¹SJ: nīyañ. ²²SJ: abhidhīyate
 nāsty upasarjanatvam. ²³SJ om.

III.158) ṅ. *lakṣer muṭ ceti* (cf. *Uṅ.* 443 = III.160) muṭ. **atiśrīr** iti *śrīñ sevāyām* (*Dhp.* 1.945). *kvib vacītyādinā* (*Kāś.* on P.3.2.178, cf. also fn. 343) kvipdīrghau. sarvatra prādisamāsaḥ *atyādayaḥ krāntādyarthe dvitīyayeti*.³⁴⁹ **bahupreyasi**³⁵⁰ **rājā kulam veti** priyaśabdād īyasuni *priyasthiretyādinā* (P.6.4.157) prādeśaḥ. *prakṛtyaikāj* iti (P.6.4.163) prakṛtivadbhāvāt ṭilopābhāvaḥ. *ugitaś ceti* (P.4.1.6) nīp. bahvyaḥ 5
preyasyo yasyeti bahuvrīhiḥ. prakaraṇāpekṣayā niṣedhād *anantarasyeti* paribhāṣāyā (*PP* 17, *NP* 61) apravṛttau pūrvasūtraprāpter api pratiṣedhaḥ. ata eva **kulam vety** uktam.

49. *luk taddhitaluki.* (P.1.2.49)

(*Bhv.*:) **strīpratyayasya luk syāt taddhitaluki sati. pañcaśaṣkuliḥ.** 10
krītārthe ṭhako 'dhyardheti (cf. P.5.1.28) **luk. āmalakam phalam.**
nityam vṛddheti (cf. P.4.3.144) **mayat. phale luk** (P.4.3.163).

(*Pañj.*:) ||**luk ta**||. luko 'bhāvarūpatvāt paratvaṃ na sambhavatīti luki sati sūtrārthaḥ saṃpadyate.³⁵¹ **pañcaśaṣkula** iti³⁵² pañcabhiḥ śaṣkulībhiḥ krīta iti krītārthe ṭhak (cf. P.5.1.37). *tasyādhyardheti* (cf. P.5.1.28) **luk. āmalakam** 15
ity āmalakyāḥ phalam vikāra (cf. P.4.3.134) iti **nityam vṛddheti** (cf. P.4.3.144) **mayat phale luk** (P.4.3.163). śaṣkulyāmalakīśabdāv atra gaurādī (cf. P.4.1.41). taddhitagrahaṇam kim? gārgīkulam ⟨iti⟩ subluki (cf. P.2.4.71) mā bhūt.³⁵³ luki kim? gārgītvam.³⁵⁴ upasarjana ity eva. *avantī* ⟨iti⟩³⁵⁵ *avanter apatyam strīti vṛddhetkośalājādād* iti (cf. P.4.1.171) *ñyañ. striyām avantikuntikurubhyaś ceti* 20
(P.4.1.176) **luk. ito manuṣyajāter** iti (P.4.1.65) nīṣ. atra taddhitārtho gotram strīpradhānam ity upasarjanatvaṃ nāsti.³⁵⁶

50. *id goṇyāḥ.*³⁵⁷ (P.1.2.50)

(*Bhv.*:) **taddhitaluki sati goṇyā it syāt. pañcagoṇiḥ paṭaḥ. yogavi-**
bhāgāt pañcasūciḥ. 25

(*Pañj.*:) ||**id go**||. **pañcagoṇir** iti pūrvavat taddhitārthe samāsaḥ (cf. P.2.1.51).

³⁴⁹ Pat. on vārtt. 4 on P.2.2.18 (*Mbh.* I 416.20–21).

³⁵⁰ *Bhv.*: **bahuśreyasī**. However, *Bhv.* on P.1.4.3 has the example *bahupreyasyām rājani*.

³⁵¹ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 2 ad loc.: *lukīti naiṣā parasaptamī śakyā vijñātum na hi lukā paurvāparyam asti. kā tarhi? satsaptamī.* (*Mbh.* I 225.20–21). Cf. also *Nyāsa* on the sūtra: *adarśanam luk, tac cābhāvaḥ. abhāve paurvāparyam nopapadyate.*

³⁵² *Bhv.*: **pañcaśaṣkuliḥ**. Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pañcabhiḥ śaṣkulībhiḥ krītaḥ pañcaśaṣkulaḥ.* *Nyāsa* and *Pad.* have also the example *pañcaśaṣkulaḥ*.

³⁵³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *taddhitagrahaṇam kim? gārgyāḥ kulam gārgīkulam.*

³⁵⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *lukīti kim? gārgītvam.*

³⁵⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *upasarjanasyety eva avantī kuntī kurūḥ.*

³⁵⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atra nīṣā ūnā ca taddhitārtho gotrapatyam strīpradhānam evābhidhīyata ity upasarjanatvaṃ nāsti laukikam. śāstriyam api nāsti aprathamānirdiṣṭatvāt samāsaśāstra iti.*

³⁵⁷ Cf. *Mbh.* I 2.24: *gaur ity asya śabdasya gāvī goṇī gotā gopotaliketeyevamādayo 'pabhramśāḥ.*

ārhiyasya {ca} ṭhako pi luk pūrvavad eva¹. yogavibhāgāt
 pañcasūcir iti yogavibhāgasya idgrahaṇam eva liṅgaṃ. anyathā² goṇyā ity api kṛte
 hrasvagrahaṇānuvṛtyā siddham pañcagonir iti tan na kuryyāt³ luk ca nānuvarttisyate
 tasya pūrveṇaiva⁴ siddhatvāt. taparakaraṇam dīrghanivṛtyartham. na ca⁵ dīrghasya
 5 dīrghavidhānānarthakyaṃ⁶ lugghrasvabādhanārthatvena sārthakatvāt⁷ ||

10

15

20 ||lupi || abhidheyalīṅgasamkhyayoḥ prāptayo{ḥ}r idam vacanaṃ lupō 'bhāva-
 rūpatvāt vyaktivacane⁸ 'tideṣṭum⁹ na śakyate¹⁰ lupśabdena sāhacaryyāt lupsamjñ{ā}ayā
 luptasya pratyayasyārtha ucyate. ity¹¹ ata āha. lupi lubartha ityādi¹²
 dviṣṭhatvāt sambandhasya yuktaśabdena yady api prakṛtipratyayārthau¹³ sambaddhau
 tathāpi lubarthe atideṣāt¹⁴ yuktaśabdena prakṛtyartho grhyata ity āha yuktavat
 25 prakṛtyarthavad iti. vaṅgā janapada iti. vaṅgasyāpatyāni bahūnītyarthe
 dvyāñmagadhety¹⁵ aṅ tasya tadrājasyeti¹⁶ luk vaṅgā iti ne-

¹SJ: samāse kṛte kṛtārthe ārhīyaṣ ṭhak tasya pūrvavat luk. ²SJ om. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: tu nānuvarttanīyaḥ pūrveṇa tasya. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: -nam anarthakam iti cet na. ⁷SJ: -tvāt. ⁸SJ adds -ṣu. ⁹SJ: tad eṣṭum. ¹⁰SJ adds iti. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ om. -ādi. ¹³SJ: prakṛtyartha-. ¹⁴SJ: śābhāvāt. ¹⁵SJ adds -ādinā. ¹⁶SJ adds -ādinā.

ārḥīyasya³⁵⁸ *ṭhako 'pi* (cf. P.5.1.37) luk (cf. P.5.1.28) pūrvavad eva. **yogavibhāgāt pañcasūcir** iti yogavibhāgasya idgrahaṇam eva liṅgam. anyathā goṇyā ity api kṛte hrasvagrahaṇānuvṛtṭyā siddham pañcagoṇir iti tan na kuryāt.³⁵⁹ luk ca nānuvartīṣyate tasya pūrveṇaiva siddhatvāt.³⁶⁰ taparakaraṇam dīrghanivṛtṭyartham. na ca dīrghasya dīrghavidhānānarthakyaṃ lugghrasvabādhanārthatvena sārthakatvāt.³⁶¹

5

51. *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane.* (P.1.2.51)

(*Bhv.:*) lupi lubarthe yuktavat prakṛtyarthavad vyaktivacane liṅgasamkhye syātām. vaṅgasyāpatyāni bahūni vaṅgāḥ. *teṣāṃ nivāsa* ity³⁶² aṇo *janapade lup* (P.4.2.81). vaṅgāḥ janapadaḥ. pañcālāḥ. kuravaḥ. puṇḍrāḥ. lupi kim? *lavaṇāl luk* (P.4.4.24). lavaṇaḥ sūpaḥ. 10
lavaṇā yavāgūḥ. abhidheyasyaiva liṅgasamkhye syātām. *harītakyaḍiṣu vyaktiḥ* (vārtt. 3 on P.1.2.52; *Mbh.* I 228.22). na vacanam. harītakyaḍiṣu vikārāḥ phalāni harītakyaḥ phalāni. vikārāṇo *harītakyaḍibhyaś ceti* (P.4.3.167) lup. *khalatikāḍiṣu vacanam* (vārtt. 4 on P.1.2.52; *Mbh.* I 229.1) na vyaktiḥ. khalatikasya girer adūrabhavāni khalatikaṃ vanāni. 15
adūrabhavaś cety (P.4.2.70) aṇo *varaṇāḍibhyaś ceti* (P.4.2.82) lup. *samāsa uttarapadasyaiva bahuvacanaviṣayasya yuktavadbhāva* iti bhāṣyam.³⁶³ mathurā ca pañcālāś ca mathurāpañcālāḥ. uttarapada-
syaiveti kim? pañcālamathure.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**lupi**||. abhidheyalingasamkhyayoḥ prāptayor idam vacanam. lupō 'bhāva- 20
rūpatvād vyaktivacane 'tidesṭum na śakyate. lupśabdena sāhacaryāl *lupsamjñayā luptasya pratyayasyārtha ucyata* ity (*Kās.* ad loc.) ata āha **lupi lubartha** ityādi.³⁶⁴
dviṣṭhatvāt sambandhasya yuktaśabdena yady api prakṛtipratyayārthau sambaddhau
tathāpi lubarthe 'tidesād yuktaśabdena prakṛtyartho gṛhyata ity āha **yuktavat prakṛtyarthavad** 25
iti. vaṅgā janapada iti vaṅgasyāpatyāni bahūnītyarthe
dvyañmagadhety (cf. P.4.1.170) aṇ. tasya *tadrājasyeti* (cf. P.2.4.62) luk: vaṅgā iti ne-

³⁵⁸ This is the term used for the *taddhita* affixes *ṭhak*, *ṭhañ* etc. (as also for the senses in which these affixes are applied) as given in the section of P.5.1.18–63. Cf. P.5.1.63.

³⁵⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *id iti yogavibhāga* iti. *etasyedgrahaṇam eva liṅgam. tathā hi goṇī ity etāvati sūtre hrasvagrahaṇānuvṛtṭtau hrasvatve kṛte pañcagoṇir iti siddhyaty eva, kim idgrahaṇena?*

³⁶⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu cānantarāsūtrāl luka evānuvṛtṭiḥ syāt, na hrasvasya, naitad asti; lukanuvṛtṭtau hi sūtram idam anarthakaṃ syāt; luko 'nantarasūtreṇaiva siddhatvāt. tasmād dhrasvagrahaṇam evānuvartate, na luggrahaṇam.*

³⁶¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *taparakaraṇam dīrghanivṛtṭyartham. dīrghasya dīrghakaraṇam anarthakaṃ syāt. ato vinā taparakaraṇena dīrgho na bhaviṣyatīti cet, na, lugghrasvabādhanārthatvād dīrghakaraṇasya.*

³⁶² Cf. P.4.2.69: *tasya nivāsaḥ.*

³⁶³ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 5 on P.1.2.51 (*Mbh.* I 228.2): *samāsa uttarapadasya bahuvacanasya lupō yuktavadbhāvo vaktavyaḥ.*

³⁶⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *abhidheyasya liṅgasamkhyayoḥ prāptayor ayam ārambhaḥ. lub iti pratyayasyādarśanam tac cābhāvātmakam. na cābhāve vyaktivacanayoḥ śakyate 'tidesaḥ kartum. tasmāl lupsamjñayā luptasya pratyayasyārtho lupśabdena vivakṣita iti matvāha lupīti lupsamjñayetyādi.*

dam udāharanam kintu bahutvapradarśanaparam prakṛteh· teṣām nivāso janapada¹
i{ti}ty aṇo janapade lup² vaṅgā ity atra yathā bahuvacanam
tathā lupte pi³ pratyaye yuktavadbhāvena bhavati | pañcālā iti pañcālānām apatyāni
bahūniti⁴ janapadaśabdāt kṣatriyād añ ity añ⁵· pūrvava luk·
5 pañcālāḥ· idam api pūrvavat bahutvapradarśanaparam⁶· teṣām nivāsa iti pūrvavad
an janapade lup atrāpi pūrvavad bahutvam⁷ kurava
iti kuruśabdād apatyārthe kurvādibhyo ṇyaḥ· bahuṣu lugādi pūrvavat
lavaṇaḥ sūpa iti lavaṇena saṃśṛṣṭaḥ⁸ sūpa⁹ iti prāgvatīyaḥ ṭhak¹⁰
harītakyaḥ phalānīti harītakīśabdo gaurādiḥ· tataḥ phale
10 vikāre¹¹ anudāttāder aṅo¹² harītakyādibhyaś ceti lup atra
yuktavadbhāvena liṅgam atidiśyate¹³ saṃkhyā cābhidheyasyaiva¹⁴ | khalatikaṃ
vanānīti· khalatikasya girer adūrabhavaṇī¹⁵ vanānīti adūrabhavaś cety
aṇo¹⁶ varaṇādibhyaś ceti lup atra yuktavadbhāvena saṃkhyā-
tidiśyate¹⁷ liṅgam tv abhidheyasyaiva | pañcālamathure iti pūrvapadasya yukta-
15 vadbhāvaniṣedhāt dvivacanam samudāy((ā)rthasya dvandvenābhidhānān na¹⁸ ba{kta}hu-
tvam ||

20

||viśe || viśeṣyasyādhīnatvād viśeṣaṇānām vyaktivacane siddhe jātiprati-
ṣedhārtham vacanam¹⁹ jātyarthasya yuktavadbhāvaniṣedhāt jātyarthaviśeṣaṇānām api
25 yuktavadbhāvaniṣedhaḥ²⁰ tena²¹ vaṅgā janapado ramaṇīya iti²² bhavati ||

30

¹SJ: baṅgānām nivāso janapada iti tasya nivāsa. ²SJ adds: iti lup. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: bahūni.
⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: saṃśṛṣṭa. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: tasya lavaṇāl luk. ¹¹SJ: phaleṣu
vikārādiṣu. ¹²SJ: añ ity añ tasya. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: tv a-. ¹⁵SJ: -va-. ¹⁶SJ: aṇ tasya. ¹⁷SJ om.
atidiśyate. ¹⁸SJ: -dhāne niyamārtham. ¹⁹SJ adds bahu-. ²⁰SJ: -dhe. ²¹SJ om. ²²SJ adds na.

dam udāharaṇaṃ kintu bahutvapradarśanaparam. prakṛteḥ **teṣāṃ nivāso** janapada ity aṇo (cf. P.4.2.69) **janapade lup** (P.4.2.81). **vaṅgā** ity atra yathā bahuvacanaṃ tathā lupte 'pi pratyaye yuktavadbhāvena bhavati. **pañcālā** iti pañcālānām apatyāni bahūnīti *janapadaśabdāt kṣatriyād añ* ity (P.4.1.168) añ pūrvava(l) luk (cf. P.2.4.62): pañcālāḥ. idam api pūrvavad bahutvapradarśanaparam. **teṣāṃ nivāsa** iti pūrvavad 5 aṇ (cf. P.4.2.69). **janapade lup** (P.4.2.81). atrāpi pūrvavad bahutvam. **kurava** iti kuruśabdād apatyārthe *kurvādibhyo ṇyaḥ* (P.4.1.51). bahuṣu lugādi pūrvavat. **lavaṇaḥ sūpa** iti lavaṇena saṃsṛṣṭaḥ sūpa iti prāgva(ha)tīyaṣ ṭhak (cf. P.4.4.1, 22). **harītakyah phalānīti** harītakīśabdo gaurādiḥ (*GP* 81.141; cf. P.4.1.41). tataḥ phale vikāre anudāttāder aṅo (cf. P.4.2.44) **harītakyādibhyaś ceti** (P.4.3.167) lup. atra 10 yuktavadbhāvena liṅgam atidiśyate saṃkhyā cābhidheyasyaiva. **khalatikaṃ vanānīti** khalatikasya girer adūrabhavāni **vanānīti adūrabhavaś cety** (P.4.2.70) **aṇo varaṇādibhyaś ceti** (P.4.2.82) **lup**. atra yuktavadbhāvena saṃkhyā-tidiśyate liṅgam tv abhidheyasyaiva. **pañcālamathure** iti pūrvapadasya yukta-vadbhāvaniṣedhāt. dvivacanam. samudāyārthasya dvandvenābhidhānān na bahu- 15 tvam.

52. *viśeṣaṇānāṃ cājāteḥ.* (P.1.2.52)

(*Bhv.*) lubarthasya viśeṣaṇānāṃ ca tathā syāt. aṅgāḥ sampannā bahukṣīraghṛtāḥ. ajāteḥ kim? vaṅgā janapado ramaṇīyaḥ. *manuṣya-lupi pratiṣedhaḥ* (vārtt. 5 on P.1.2.52; *Mbh.* I 229.4). cañcā manuṣyo 20 darśanīyaḥ. cañcā darśanīyeti mā bhūt. *ive pratikṛtau* (P.5.3.96) **kan.** tasya *lum manuṣya* iti (P.5.3.98) **lup**.

(*Pañj.*) ||**viśe**||. viśeṣyasyādhīnatvād viśeṣaṇānāṃ vyaktivacane siddhe jātiprati-ṣedhārthaṃ vacanam. jātyarthasya yuktavadbhāvaniṣedhāj jātyarthaviśeṣaṇānāṃ api yuktavadbhāvaniṣedhaḥ.³⁶⁵ tena **vaṅgā janapado ramaṇīya** iti bhavati. 25

53. *tad aśiṣyaṃ saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt.* (P.1.2.53)

(*Bhv.*) tad iti vyaktivacanalakṣaṇaṃ na kartavyam. saṃjñā-pramāṇatvāt. saṃjñāśabdā ete 'ṅgā vaṅgā varaṇā iti. nānāliṅga-saṃkhyā eva pramāṇaṃ yathāpo dārā grhā varṣāḥ.

54. *lub yogāprakhyānāt.* (P.1.2.54)

(*Bhv.*) **janapade lup** (P.4.2.81) **varaṇādibhyaś ceti** (P.4.2.82) **lub apy** 30

³⁶⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *jātyarthasya cāyaṃ yuktavadbhāvapratiṣedhaḥ. tena jātidvāreṇa yāni viśeṣaṇāni teṣāṃ api yuktavadbhāvo na bhavati.*

||lub yo || yogasya sambandhasyāpratītir¹ ityādinā taddhitapratya-
yasyābhāvāt kiṃ lupō vidhāne sati² aśiṣyatve³ hetuḥ ||

5

||yoga || caśabdo hetau⁴ yogaḥ sambandhaḥ pravṛttinimittam sa [yadā]⁵
10 daṇḍi{va}śabdavat kṣatriyavṛkṣau yadā vidyete tadaivam samjñā syāt dṛṣyate ca vinā⁶
kṣatriyavṛkṣayogaḥ⁷ pañcālavāraṇayoḥ⁸ prayogaḥ tasmād yogo na nimittam ||

15

20

25 ||kālo || tulyaśabdo hetutvanukarṣaṇārthaḥ⁹ tad ayaṃ arthaḥ¹⁰ etat
pratyākhyānaśāstram¹¹ pūrveṇa pratyākhyānaśāstreṇa¹² tulyam katham artha-
syānyapramāṇatvāt tulyatvañ ca śāstrāpekṣyam¹³ śāstrād anyo lokaḥ
tata evārthasyāvagater ityādinā ||

30

¹SJ: -ter. ²SJ: vidhānena iti. ³SJ: -tva-. ⁴SJ adds yadi. ⁵SJ: tadā. ⁶SJ adds api. ⁷SJ
adds nagare. ⁸SJ: -varuṇaśabdayoḥ. ⁹SJ: hetu-. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: -naṃ. ¹²SJ: -nena. ¹³SJ om.

asīṣyaḥ. yogasya sambandhasyānupalabdheḥ. na hi pañcālānām svāmitvāt pañcālā janapadaḥ. vṛkṣayogād varaṇā grāmaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**lub yo**||. yogasya saṃbandhasyāpratīter³⁶⁶ ityādinā taddhitapratyasyābhāvāt kiṃ lupō vidhāne saty asīṣyatve hetuḥ?

55. yogapramāṇe ca tadabhāve 'darśanam syāt. (P.1.2.55) 5

(*Bhv.*) yadi hi vṛkṣādiyogaḥ pramāṇam syāt tadā vṛkṣādyabhāve varaṇapañcālāder aprayogaḥ syād. yathā daṇḍasambandhābhāve daṇḍinaḥ. tasmād rūḍhir iyam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**yoga**||. caśabdo hetau. **yogaḥ** saṃbandhaḥ. pravṛttinimittam sa yadā daṇḍīśabdavat kṣatriyavṛkṣau yadā vidyete tadaivam saṃjñā syāt. dṛśyate ca vinā 10 kṣatriyavṛkṣayogaṃ pañcālavarāṇayoḥ prayogaḥ. tasmād yogo na nimittam.³⁶⁷

56. pradhānapratyayārthavacanam arthasyānyapramāṇatvāt. (P.1.2.56)

(*Bhv.*) **pradhānopasarjane pradhānārtham saha brūtaḥ, kriyā-pradhānam ākhyātam, sādhanapradhānaḥ kṛdanta, uttarapadārtha-** 15 **pradhānas tatpuruṣa** ityādivacanam, **prakṛtipratyayau pratyayārtham saha brūta** iti ca pūrvācāryaparibhāṣitam na vaktavyam. kutaḥ? arthasya śāstrād anyo lokas tatpramāṇatvāt. anadhītavyākaraṇo 'pi **rājapurūṣam aupagavam cānayety** ukte rājaviśiṣṭam puruṣam upa- 20 guviśiṣṭam cāpatyam ānayati.

57. kālopasarjane ca tulyam. (P.1.2.57)

(*Bhv.*) kāla upasarjanam ca na paribhāṣyam. yataḥ pūrveṇa tulyam. lokata evāvagater iti pratyākhyānam. māthuryām tu vṛttāv asīṣyagrahaṇam āpādam anuvartate.

(*Pañj.*) ||**kālo**||. tulyaśabdo hetvanukarṣaṇārthaḥ.³⁶⁸ tad ayam arthaḥ: etat 25 pratyākhyānaśāstram **pūrveṇa** pratyākhyānaśāstreṇa **tulyam**. katham? **arthasyānyapramāṇatvāt** (cf. P.1.2.56). tulyatvam ca śāstrāpeksyam. **śāstrād anyo lokaḥ** (*Bhv.* on P.1.2.56). tata evārthasyāvagater ityādinā.

58. jātyākhyāyām ekasmin bahuvacanam anyatarasyām. (P.1.2.58) 30

(*Bhv.*) jātyartha eko bahuvad vā syāt. sampanno yavaḥ sampannā

³⁶⁶ Cf. *Bhv.*: yogasya sambandhasyānupalabdheḥ.

³⁶⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: dṛśyate ca saṃprati vinaiva kṣatriyasambandhena janapadeṣu pañcālādīśabdaḥ tato 'vasīyate – nāyam yoganimittakaḥ.

³⁶⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: tulyaśabdo hetvanukarṣaṇārthaḥ.

||jātyā || jātyarthe bahutvātideśāt tadviśeṣanām ajātīnām api sampannā-
dīnām bahutvam¹ ||

5

10

||asma || asmadśabdasyā[tma]viṣayatvād² ātmanaś caikatvāt dvitvā-
sambhave³ katham dritvam iti na deśanīyam⁴. tva[ñ c]āha.eti ekaśeṣeṇa tyadādīnām
yad yat param tac chiṣyata iti asmacchabdah śiṣyamāṇo yu[ṣma]cchabdasyārtham⁵
āheti ayaṁ me⁶ dvitīya⁷ ātmety upacarād⁸ vā. atrāpy arthasyātideśāt tiṅas te pi⁹
15 bahuvacanam ||

¹SJ: jātyarthasya bahutvātideśāt jātyarthaviśeṣaṇānām ajātīśabdānām api sampannādīnām bahuvacanam. ²SJ: -sya. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: -bdam apy. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: advitīya. ⁸SJ: upacārād. ⁹SJ: tiṅante.

yavā vā. ekasmin kim? sampannau vrīhiyavau. samkhyāprayoge
pratiṣedhaḥ. eko vrīhiḥ sampannaḥ subhikṣakaraḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**jātyā**||. jātyarthe bahutvātidesāt tadviśeṣaṇānām ajātīnām api sampannā-
dīnām bahutvam.³⁶⁹

59. asmado dvayoś ca. (P.1.2.59)

(*Bhv.*) asmada ekatve dvitve ca bahuvacanam vā syāt. ahaṃ karomi
vayaṃ kurmo vā. āvāṃ kurvo vayaṃ kurmo vā. vyavasthitavibhāṣayā
saviśeṣaṇānām pratiṣedhaḥ. ahaṃ paṭur bravīmi. āvāṃ paṭutarau
chātrau brūvaḥ. *yuṣmadi gurāv ekeṣām* iti³⁷⁰ jayādityaḥ. tvaṃ gurur
yūyaṃ guravaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**asma**||. asmadsābdasyātmaviśayatvād ātmanaś caikatvād dvitvā-
samḥhave katham dritvam iti na deśanīyam. tvaṃ cāham cety ekaśeṣeṇa *tyadādīnām*
yad yat paraṃ tac chiṣyata ity³⁷¹ *asmacchabdaḥ śiṣyamāṇo yuṣmacchabdasyārtham*
āhety ayaṃ me dritīya ātmety upacarād vā.³⁷² atrāpy arthasyātidesāt tīnas te 'pi
bahuvacanam.³⁷³

60. phalgunīproṣṭhapadānām ca nakṣatre. (P.1.2.60)

(*Bhv.*) phalgunyor dvayoḥ proṣṭhapadayoś ca nakṣatre bahuvacanam
vā syāt. pūrve phalgunyau pūrvāḥ phalgunyo vā. pūrve proṣṭhapade
pūrvāḥ proṣṭhapadā vā. nakṣatre kim? phalgunyau māṇavike.

61. chandasi punarvasvor ekavacanam. (P.1.2.61)

62. viśākhayoś ca. (P.1.2.62)

(*Bhv.*) chandaḥsūtradvayam.

**63. tiṣyapunarvasvor nakṣatradvandve bahuvacanasya dvi-
vacanam nityam.** (P.1.2.63)

(*Bhv.*) tiṣya ekaḥ punarvasū dvau. teṣāṃ nakṣatradvandve bahuvacane
prāpte dvivacanam vidhīyate. uditau tiṣyapunarvasū. arthagrahaṇāt

³⁶⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *tena tadviśeṣaṇānām ajātīśabdānām api sampannādīnām bahuvacanam upa-
padyate.*

³⁷⁰ *Kāś.* on P.1.2.59.

³⁷¹ Cf. *Bhv.* on P.1.2.72: *tyadādīnām ca yad yat paraṃ tat tac chiṣyata ity eke.* Cf. also *Kāś.* on
the same *sūtra* (*tyadādīnām mitho yad yat paraṃ tat tac chiṣyate*) and *Nyāsa* on P.1.2.59 (*tyadādīnām
mitho yad yat paraṃ tac chiṣyate*).

³⁷² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yuktaṃ yad ekatve bhavati, dritve tu katham? na hi dritvam asmada-
rthasya sambhavati smacchabdasyātmaviśayatvāt ātmanaś caikatvāt; naiśa doṣaḥ; ātmavāṃ paratra
yadopacaryate 'ayaṃ me dritīya ātmā' iti tadā smacchabdasya tatrāpi vṛtter dvyarthaviśayatvaṃ
sambhavati. atha vā – tyadādīnām mitho yad yat paraṃ tac chiṣyata ity smac chabda eva śiṣyamāṇo
yuṣmadartham apy āheti dvyarthatopapadyata iti yujyate dvyarthatā.*

³⁷³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atrāpy arthasya bahutvātidesaḥ. ... tena tīnantasyāpi tatra vartamānasya
bahuvacanāntatvaṃ bhavati.*

||tiṣya|| etad eva jñāpakam iti tiṣya ekaḥ punarvasū dvau teṣāṃ

- 5 bahutvād bahuvacane siddhe bahuvacanagrahaṇam uddhṛtam¹ jñāpakam
jñāpakasya tu phalaṃ pūrvāparādharottaram pūrvāparādharottarānīti² ||

10

15

||sarūpā|| ekavibhaktāv ity ekaśabdaḥ samānārthaḥ yathā ekabuddhaya

iti vibhaktiśabdena kārakam abhidhīyate vibhajyate prātipadiko³ 'nayeti kṛtvā

- 20 tenaitad⁴ uktaṃ⁵ ekasmin samāne kārake yāni rūpāṇi⁶ teṣāṃ ekaśeṣo bhavatīti
ṣavibhaktikā(nā)m⁷ ayam⁸ ekadeśaḥ⁹ pūrvotpannāyā vibhakter nimittakāraṇādarśanāt.¹⁰
ekaśeṣa ity¹¹ atrekaśabdaḥ¹² samkhyāvācī śeṣaśabdo nivṛtṭyā viśiṣṭam avasthānam
āha eko 'vā(sthā)pyate 'pare nivartyante¹³. sarūpāṇām iti bahuvacanam atantram
tena dvayor apy ekaśeṣaḥ. ata evāha vrkṣāv iti¹⁴ dravyapadārthapakṣe pratyartham
25 śabdani[veś]āt¹⁵ anekaśabdaprayoge prāpte lāghavārtham ekaśeṣaḥ. tatpaksāstitve
cedam eva jñāpakam¹⁶ anyathā jātipakṣe pratyartham śabdaprayogābhāvād
ekenaiva śabdena jagad va[kt]i dravyapratīteḥ. anekaprayogābhāvāl lāghavakṛtam

¹SJ: adhiḥkaṃ sūtre. ²SJ: -rāṇīti. ³SJ: kārkartho. ⁴SJ: etenaitad. ⁵SJ adds bhavati. ⁶SJ adds sa-. ⁷SJ: eka-. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: ekaśeṣaḥ. ¹⁰The underlined phrase is put in the manuscript in brackets and is not found in SJ. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ om. atra. ¹³SJ: itaro nivarttate. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ: śabdābhi-. ¹⁶SJ om.

sidhyapunarvasū. bahuvacanasya kim? idam tiṣyapunarvasu. etad eva jñāpakam *sarvo dvandvo vibhāṣaikavad bhavatīti*.³⁷⁴ uktaḥ samkhyātideśaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) || **tiṣya** ||. etad eva jñāpakam iti tiṣya ekaḥ punarvasū dvau teṣāṃ bahutvād bahuvacane (cf. P.1.4.21) siddhe bahuvacanagrahaṇam uddhṛtaṃ jñāpakam. 5 jñāpakasya tu phalaṃ pūrvāparādharottaraṃ pūrvāparādharottarāṇīti.

64. sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau. (P.1.2.64)

(*Bhv.*) tulyarūpāṇām eko 'vaśiṣyate. vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣau. vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣāḥ.

sarūpasamudāyād dhi vibhaktir yā vidhīyate | 10
ekas tatrārthavān siddhaḥ samudāyasya vācakaḥ ||.

rūpagrahaṇād arthabhede 'pi bhavati. vrīhiś ca māśaḥ. mānaṃ ca māśaḥ. mūrkhāś ca māśaḥ. māśaḥ. *pādā raśmyamghrituryāṃśāḥ* (*Amarakośa* 3.3.89). ekavibhaktau kim? viprābhyāṃ kṛtaṃ viprābhyāṃ dehi. *samānārthānām ca bhinnarūpāṇām kvacid ekaśeṣo vaktavyaḥ*.³⁷⁵ vakradaṇḍaś ca kuṭiladaṇḍaś ca vakradaṇḍau kuṭiladaṇḍau vā. 15

(*Pañj.*) || **sarūpā** ||. **ekavibhaktāv** ity ekaśabdaḥ samānārthaḥ yathā ekabuddhaya iti. vibhaktiśabdena kārakam abhidhīyate: vibhajyate prātipadiko 'nayeti kṛtvā. tenaitad uktam: ekasmin samāne kārake yāni ⟨sa⟩rūpāṇi teṣāṃ ekaśeṣo bhavatīti³⁷⁶ 20 savibhaktikānām ayam ekaśeṣaḥ³⁷⁷ pūrvotpannāyā vibhakter nimittakāraṇādarśanāt. **ekaśeṣa** ity atraikaśabdaḥ samkhyāvācī śeṣaśabdo nivṛtṭyā viśiṣṭam avasthānam āha. eko 'vāsthāpyate 'pare nivartyante. **sarūpāṇām** iti bahuvacanam atantram. tena dvayor apy ekaśeṣaḥ. ata evāha **vṛkṣāv** iti. dravyapadārthapakṣe pratyartham śabdāniveśād anekāśabdaprayoge prāpte lāghavartham ekaśeṣaḥ. tatpakṣāstitve 25 cedam eva jñāpakam.³⁷⁸ anyathā jātipakṣe pratyartham ⟨aneka⟩śabdaprayogābhāvād ekenaiva śabdena jagad vakti (?) dravyapratīteḥ. anekaprayogābhāvāl lāghavakṛtam

³⁷⁴ Pat. ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 232.4–5). *PP* 50, *NP* 34.

³⁷⁵ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 23 on P.1.2.64: *ekārthānām api virūpāṇām ekaśeṣo vaktavyaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 239.7).

³⁷⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ekasmin samāne 'bhinne kārake yāni sarūpāṇi teṣāṃ evaikakārakānām ekaśeṣo bhavati*.

³⁷⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vibhaktau prātipadikānām ekaśeṣo bhavati. tataḥ kṛta ekaśeṣe vibhaktir utpadyate. atha vā savibhaktikānām evaikaśeṣaḥ*.

³⁷⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *pratyartham ekaikasmīn arthe yasmāc chabdānām niveśapravṛttis tato 'nekārthasyābhidhānam. tatra itaddarśane 'nekeṣāṃ arthābhidhāne pratyekenaiva kartavye 'nekaśabdatvaṃ prasajyata iti yāvantaḥ te 'rthāś tāvatāṃ śabdānām prayogaḥ prāpnoti, iṣyate caikaśabdatā. tasmād ekaśeṣa ārabhyate*.

ekaśeṣam na kuryyāt¹ pratipattigauravalāghavārtham² s{ā}amānām iti vaktavye
 sarūpānām iti³ rūpagrahaṇam⁴ ity āha rūpagrahaṇād⁵ ityādi ||

5

||vṛddho || vṛddhayuvaśabdāv ihāpatyavṛttī grhyete gārgyaś cetyādi
 gargasyāpatyam gārgyah yañyantah⁶ tasmād yūny apatyē yañiñś ceti

10 phak gārgyāv ity atra prakaraṇād yuvārtho gamyate⁷. ||

15

||strī || pradhānād⁸ arthasyedaṃ grahaṇam ity āha stryarthah puṃvvaḍ
 bhavatīti. gārgīti gārgyaśabdād yañś ceti nīp yasyeti cety
 ākārālopaḥ halas taddhitasyeti⁹ yakārasya ca¹⁰ ḡ((ā))rgī ca gārgyāyanaś ceti
 gārgyāyanāv iti. atra hi gārgīśabdasyaikaśeṣe dvivacane yanādeśe ca kṛte
 20 dvivacanāntapumliṅgam gārgyaśabdarūpabhedābhāvād udāharaṇāntaram iñantam
 āha¹¹ dākṣī iti prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇa ity āha. prakaraṇam atra
 śaraṇam ||

¹The underlined phrase is put in the manuscript in brackets and is not found in SJ. ²SJ om.
³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds kimartham. ⁵SJ adds: arthabhede 'pi. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: 'vagamyate. ⁸SJ:
 -nyād. ⁹SJ: yasya hala iti. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹The underlined phrase is put in the manuscript in brackets
 and is not found in SJ.

ekaśeṣaṃ na kuryāt.³⁷⁹ pratipattigauravalāghavarthaṃ samānām iti vaktavye *sarūpāṇām* iti rūpagrahaṇam ity āha rūpagrahaṇād ityādi.

65. vṛddho yūnā tallakṣaṇas ced eva viśeṣaḥ. (P.1.2.65)

(*Bhv.*) yūnā saha vacane vṛddhaḥ śiṣyate. yuvā nivartate. vṛddhayuvapratyayalakṣaṇa eva ced viśeṣaḥ. gārgyaś ca gārgyāyaṇas ca gārgyau. neha. gārgyavātsyāyanau. *apatyam antarhitam vṛddham ucyate.*³⁸⁰ 5

(*Pañj.*) ||**vṛddho**||. vṛddhayuvaśabdāv ihāpatyavṛttī gṛhyete. gārgyaś cetyādi gargasyāpatyam gārgyaḥ yañantaḥ (cf. P.4.1.105). tasmād yūny apatyē yañiñś ceti (P.4.1.101) phak. gārgyāv ity atra prakaraṇād yuvārtho gamyate.³⁸¹ 10

66. strī puṃvac ca. (P.1.2.66)

(*Bhv.*) yūnā saha vacane vṛddhā strī śiṣyate puṃvac ca stryārthaḥ syāt. gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇas ca gārgyau. dākṣī ca dākṣāyaṇas ca dākṣī. vātsī ca vātsyāyaṇas ca vātsyau. neha. gārgīvātsyāyanau. dākṣīvātsyāyanau. 15

(*Pañj.*) ||**strī**||. pradhānād arthasyedaṃ grahaṇam ity āha stryārthaḥ puṃvad bhavatīti.³⁸² gārgīti gārgyaśabdād yañas ceti (P.4.1.16) nīp. *yasyeti cety* (P.6.4.148) akāralopaḥ halas taddhitasyeti (P.6.4.150) yakārasya ca. gārgī ca gārgyāyaṇas ceti gārgyāv ity atra hi gārgīśabdasyaikaśeṣe dvivacane yañādeśe (cf. P.6.1.77) ca kṛte dvivacanāntapuṃliṅgam. gārgyaśabdārūpabhedābhāvād udāharaṇāntaram iñantam āha dākṣī iti *prathamayoḥ pūrvasavarṇa* iti (P.6.1.102) dīrghaḥ. prakaraṇam atra śaraṇam. 20

67. pumān striyā. (P.1.2.67)

(*Bhv.*) striyā sahoktau pumāñ śiṣyate. devaś ca devī ca devau. asurau. brāhmaṇau. kukkuṭau. mayūrau. gaur ayaṃ gaur iyam etau gāvau. śivaś ca śivā ca śivau. *kathayati śivayoḥ śarīrayogam* (*Kirātārjunīya* 5.40c). *tallakṣaṇam ced* ity (cf. P.1.2.65) eva. kukkuṭamayūryau. 25

68. bhrātrputrau svasṛduhitṛbhyām. (P.1.2.68)

(*Bhv.*) svasrā bhrātā duhitṛ putraś ca śiṣyate. bhrātā ca svasā ca bhrātarau. putraś ca duhitā ca putrau. 30

³⁷⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca jātiḥ padārthaḥ jātiś caikaiva tatraikatvāj jāter bahūnām śabdānām prasaṅga eva nāsti, tat kim ekaśeṣārambheṇa iti codyāvasare 'dravyam padārthaḥ' ity etad darśanam āśṛityāha pratyartham ityādi.*

³⁸⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *vṛddhaśabdaḥ pūrvacāryasamjñā gotrasya. apatyam antarhitam vṛddham iti.*

³⁸¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *prakaraṇādīnātra yuvārtho gamyate.*

³⁸² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *pradhānaguṇasannipāte tu pradhānasya grahaṇam nyāyayam atah stryārtha eva gṛhyate.*

5

||napuṃsakam anapuṃsakam || ekavan na bhavatīti anena
sūtreṇa ekaśeṣas tu sarūpānām ity anena bhavaty eva ||¹

10

15

||tyadā || sarvagrahaṇam sākalyārtham anyathā hi anapuṃsaka-
20 grahaṇānuvṛtter nnapuṃsakena syāt tallakṣaṇas cety anuvṛttau
tyadādibhir yatra viśeṣas tatraiva syāt. sa ca yaś ca yau anyaiś ca na syāt sa ca
devadattaś ceti tāv iti etadbhrāntinirāsāyāha anyaiś ceti ||²

25

||grāmya || puṃnān striyety asyāpavādaḥ gāva imā iti
anuprayogaḥ strītvābhivyaktaye gāva imāḥ gāva ima iti vaktavyam etau gāvāv

¹SJ om. ²SJ om.

69. napuṃsakam anapuṃsakenaikavac cāsyānyatarasyām.

(P.1.2.69)

(*Bhv.:*) anapuṃsakaiś ca sahoḥtau napuṃsakam śiṣyate. ekavac cāsyā vā syāl liṅgalakṣaṇa eva ced viśeṣaḥ. śuklaḥ prāvāraḥ śuklā śāṭī śuklam vastram tad idaṃ śuklam tānīmāni śuklāni vā. anapuṃsakena kim? 5
śuklam ca śuklam ca śuklam ca śuklāni. ekavan na bhavati.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**napuṃsakam anapuṃsakena**||. ekavan na bhavatīty anena sūtreṇa. ekaśeṣas tu *sarūpāṇām* ity anena (cf. P.1.2.64) bhavaty eva.

70. pitā mātrā. (P.1.2.70)**71. śvaśuraḥ śvaśrvā.** (P.1.2.71)

(*Bhv.:*) mātrśvaśrūbhyāṃ sahoḥtau pitrśvaśurau vā śiṣyate. *jagataḥ pitarau vande pārvatīparameśvarau* (*Raghu* 1.1cd). mātāpitarau ca. 10
śvaśurau śvaśrūśvaśurau ca.

72. tyadādīni sarvair nityam. (P.1.2.72)

(*Bhv.:*) sarvair iti tyadādibhir anyaiś ca sahoḥtau tyadādīni śiṣyante. 15
sa ca devadattaś ca tau. yaś ca vipraś ca yau. *tyadādīnām ca yad yat param tat tac chiṣyata* ity³⁸³ eke. sa ca yaś ca yau. yaś ca kaś ca kau. sa ca tvaṃ ca yuvām. sa ca tvaṃ cāhaṃ ca vayam.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**tyadā**||. sarvagrahaṇam sākalyārtham.³⁸⁴ anyathā hy anapuṃsaka-
grahaṇānuvṛtter napuṃsakena ⟨na⟩ syāt *tallakṣaṇaś ced ity* (cf. P.1.2.65) anuvṛttau 20
tyadādibhir yatra viśeṣas tatraiva syāt. **sa ca yaś ca yau:** anyaiś ca na syāt. **sa ca devadattaś ceti tāv** ity etadbhrāntinirāsāyāha **anyaiś ceti.**³⁸⁵

73. grāmyapaśusaṅgheṣv ataruṇeṣu strī. (P.1.2.73)

(*Bhv.:*) grāmyāṇām ataruṇapaśūnām saṅgheṣu sahoḥtau strī śiṣyate. 25
gāva imāḥ. ajā imāḥ. saṅgheṣu kim? etau gāvau. ataruṇeṣu kim? vatsā ime. anekāśapheṣv abhidhānān neha³⁸⁶ aśvā ime. gardabhā ime.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**grāmya**||. *pumān striyety* (P.1.2.67) asyāpavādaḥ. **gāva imā** ity anuprayogaḥ strītvābhivyaktaye gāva imāḥ gāva ima iti vaktavyam.³⁸⁷ **etau gāvāv**

³⁸³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *tyadādīnām mitho yad yat param tat tac chiṣyate.*

³⁸⁴ The same is found in *Kāś.* ad loc.

³⁸⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vinā tenānapuṃsakenety asyānuvṛttir āśaṅkyeta, tataś ca napuṃsakena saha na syāt. atha vā – tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣa ity etad ihānuvartata ity āśaṅkyeta, tataś ca yatra tyadādīkṛta eva viśeṣas tatraiva syāt – sa ca yaś ca yāv ityādi, iha tu na syāt – sa ca devadattaś ca tāv iti.*

³⁸⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* and *Pat.* ad loc.: *anekāśapheṣv iti vaktavyam* (*Mbh.* I 252.23).

³⁸⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *gāva imā iti. imā ity anuprayogaḥ strītvābhivyaktaye.*

iti gaur iyam gaur ayam iti vākyam pumān striyeti bhavaty eva· aneka-
śaphesv iti śapham khurah· aśvā iti ekakhandakhurā(nā)m ekaśaphā iti pratyudā-
haranam.¹

iti śrīviśvarūpaviracitāyām bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyām

5 prathamasyādhyāyasya dvitīyah pādah² ||

10 ||bhūvā || bhūvādayo dhātusaṃjñakāḥ syur ity anena bhūvādīnām
dhātusaṃjñ[ā āsraya]ta³ iti vidhisūtram idaṃ· bhūvādaya iti bhūr ādir⁴ yeṣām
iti bahuvrīhiḥ tadgunasamvijñān((o))⁵ madhye maṅgalārtho vakārah⁶ athavā vā
gatigavandhanayor ity asmāt parasyādiśabdasya prayogaḥ ādiśabdaḥ
prakāre prakāraś ca sādṛśyaṃ tat punaḥ kriyātmakatayā⁷ ata eva bhvarthā⁸ iti
15 viśeṣaṇam bhūvo vādaya⁹ iti vācyavācakasambandhe ṣaṣṭhī kiñca bhavanaṃ bhūḥ
kriyāsāmānyam tasya sarvadhātusu satvāt¹⁰ sampadāditvā[t] k[v]ip
vādir auṇādikaḥ tathā
cāyam arthaḥ bhūvo vādayo vācakā bhūvādayaḥ· bhūva iti¹¹ karman[i] ṣaṣṭhī
kṛdyogeti¹² samāsaḥ· yad vā¹³ ikāṃ yaṇabhir¹⁴ vyavadhānaṃ vyāḍigālavayor¹⁵
20 iti madhye vakāra[h] kriyate | kriyāsāmānyavācivāt bhū sattāyām ity
asya grahaṇam na tu¹⁶ bhū prāptāv ity asya vyāpter nnyāyāc
ca¹⁷ dhātur iti pūrvācāryyasamjñā¹⁸ mahatī tadāśrayaṇāt¹⁹ kriyāvacaṇānām eva
dhātusaṃjñā vidhīyate²⁰ na tu²¹ dravyavācinām yāvādiḥprabhṛtīnām²² gaṇapāṭhena
saṃjñāvidhānād gaṇabahirbhūtānām anapayatītyādīnām²³ saṃjñā na bhavati | bha-

25

¹SJ om. ²SJ: iti sadupādhyāyaśrīviśvarūpakṛtau bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyām kuṭā dipādah. ³SJ: vidhīyata. ⁴SJ: bhūvādiḥ. ⁵SJ rev. ⁶SJ: madhyavakāro maṅgalārthaḥ. ⁷SJ: kriyām ekatayā. ⁸SJ: bhū-vā. ⁹SJ: śreṣṭhāvṛtttau bhūvor ādayo bhūvādaya. ¹⁰SJ: sarvadhātvarthatvāt. ¹¹SJ: iha. ¹²SJ: kṛdyogā ceti. ¹³SJ: athavā. ¹⁴SJ: yaṇāntar-. ¹⁵SJ adds matena. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ: pūrvācāryyasya. ¹⁹SJ: -tvāt. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹SJ om. ²²SJ: diva-. ²³SJ: āṇavayatīty evam-.

iti gaur iyaṃ gaur ayam iti vākyam. *pumān striyete* (P.1.2.67) bhavaty eva. **anekaśapheṣv** iti śaphaṃ khuraḥ. **aśvā** iti ekakhaṇḍakhurāṇām ekaśaphā iti pratyudāharaṇam.

iti śrīviśvarūpaviracitāyām bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyām
prathamasyādhyāyasya dvitīyaḥ pādaḥ.

5

(prathamādhyāyasya tṛtīyaḥ pādaḥ)

1. **bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ.** (P.1.3.1)

(*Bhv.*:) **bhūvādayo dhātusaṃjñakāḥ syuḥ. bhū. bhavati. edhaṃ. edhate.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**bhūvā**||. **bhūvādayo dhātusaṃjñakāḥ syur** ity anena bhūvādīnām 10
dhātusaṃjñā āśrayata iti vidhisūtram idam. **bhūvādaya** iti bhūr ādir yeṣāṃ
iti bahuvrīhiḥ tadguṇasaṃvijñāno madhye maṅgalārtho vakāraḥ. athavā *vā*
gatiḡandhanayor ity (*Dhp.* 2.41) asmāt parasyādiśabdasya prayogaḥ. ādiśabdaḥ
prakāre. prakāraś ca sādrśyaṃ tat punaḥ kriyātmakatayā.³⁸⁸ ata eva bhvarthā iti
viśeṣaṇam. bhuvo vādaya iti vācyavācakaśaṃbandhe ṣaṣṭhī. kiṃ ca bhavanaṃ **bhūḥ** 15
kriyāsāmānyam tasya sarvadhātuṣu sattvāt sampadāditvāt kvip (cf. vārtt. 9 on
P.3.3.108; *Mbh.* II 155.9).³⁸⁹ **vādīr** auṇādikaḥ (cf. *Uṇ.* 567 = IV.124). tathā
cāyam arthaḥ: bhuvo vādayo vācakā **bhūvādayaḥ**.³⁹⁰ bhuva iti karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī
kṛdyogeti (cf. P.2.3.66) samāsaḥ. yad vā *ikāṃ yaṅbhir vyavadhānaṃ vyāḡigālavayor*
iti³⁹¹ madhye vakāraḥ kriyate. kriyāsāmānyavācītvād *bhū sattāyām* ity (*Dhp.* 1.1) 20
asya grahaṇam na tu *bhū prāptāv* ity (cf. *Dhp.* 10.300) asya vyāpter nyāyāc
ca. **dhātur** iti pūrvācāryasaṃjñā mahatī. tadāśrayaṇāt kriyāvācanānām eva
dhātusaṃjñā vidhīyate na tu dravyavācīnām yāvādi(v)prabhṛtīnām.³⁹² gaṇapāṭhena
saṃjñāvidhānād gaṇabahirbhūtānām aṇapayatīyādīnām saṃjñā na bhavati.³⁹³ **bha-**

³⁸⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha vā – ādiśabdasyaivātra ‘vā gatiḡandhanayoḥ’ ity asmāt parasya prayogaḥ. vā ādir yeṣāṃ te vādayaḥ. ādiśabdaḥ prakāravācī vāprakārā ity arthaḥ prakāras tu sādrśyam, tat punaḥ kriyātmakatayā.*

³⁸⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **bhvarthā** iti. *teṣāṃ vādīnām idaṃ viśeṣaṇam, bhavanaṃ bhūḥ, sampadāditvād bhāve kvip. bhavater arthaḥ kriyāsāmānyam. bhūr artho yeṣāṃ te bhvarthāḥ.*

³⁹⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha vā bhūvādaya nirdeśe nāyam ādiśabdasya prayogaḥ nāpi maṅgalārthasya vakārasya. kiṃ tarhi? vādiśabdasyauṇādikasya. vadantīti vādayaḥ vācakā ity arthaḥ.*

³⁹¹ This is an opinion cited in *Bhv.* on P.6.1.77.

³⁹² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *dhātuśabdaḥ pūrvācāryasaṃjñā. te ca kriyāvācanānām saṃjñāṃ kṛtavantaḥ. tad ihāpi pūrvācāryasaṃjñāśrayaṇāt kriyāvācīnām eva bhūvādīnām dhātusaṃjñā vidhīyate.* Cf. also *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tad ihāpi pūrvācāryasaṃjñāśrayaṇāt kriyāvācanānām eva dhātusaṃjñā vidhīyate. tena yā vā div ityevamādīnām dhātusaṃjñāśabdānām akriyāvācanānā na bhavatīti bhāvah.* Among these three nouns two are mentioned in the *Gaṇapāṭha*: *vā* (*GP* 85.2), *div* (*GP* 222.7). Cf. also *GP* 186 *yāvādi*, which is probably responsible for the scribal mistake.

³⁹³ *Pat.* on vārtt. 12 ad loc. mentions 3 examples: *āṇapayati, vaṭṭati, vadḡhati* (*Mbh.* I 259.6–7), *Nyāsa* gives *aṇapayati* and *kaḡḡapayati* (**bhū ityevamādayaḥ śabdā dhātusaṃjñakā bhavantīty** anena gaṇapāṭhenaiveyaṃ dhātusaṃjñā vidhīyata iti darśayati. tena aṇapayati kaḡḡapayati ity evamādīnām dhātusaṃjñā na bhavatīty uktam bhavati.).

vatīti dhātusaṃjñāyāṃ satyāṃ dhātor iti varttamāne laṭ

la[[2]]sthāyām in da bhavati nityatvāt tibādyādeśair bādhitatvāt |¹

atraiva sanādyantāś ceti na kṛtaṃ sandehā[t]² kiṃ sannādayaḥ pratyayā

uta sanotyādaya iti³ kāryaviśeṣārtham upādīyanta iti sanotyādayo hi⁴ .icapratyayāntāḥ⁵

5 saṃjñina iti kāryaviśeṣaḥ punaḥ pratyayānta dhātun .ādāmādiḥ⁶

evan tarhi sanādyantā dhātava ity asyāna[nt]aram bhūvādayaś ceti kriyatām . tataś

ca pratyāsatyā sannādīn pratyayān prati bhūvādīnāṃ dhātusaṃjñā syāt tasmād

yathānyāsam evāstu . bhūvādaya ity atra⁷ jasi ceti guṇe kṛte ejaṅtatve

vyayatvam nāsti lākṣanikatvāt kṛnmejanta ity atr((ā))ntagrahanasyaupadeśikā-

10 rthatvād aupadeśikapṛāyugikasya (pa)ribhāṣayā vā . āyādeśe

karttavye 'siddhaparibhāṣā nāsti nājanantaryya iti

niṣedhāt⁸ ||

15

||upa || upadīśyata ity upadeśa iti etena karmasādhanatām darśayati .

20 akarttari ca kāraka iti karmani ghañ⁹ upaśabdaḥ prāthamye diśir

u[cc]āraṇe prathamata uccāryata ity arthaḥ dhātvādir iti . dhātu.ivprabhṛti{ya}ḥ¹⁰ .

ādīśabdena sūtraprātīpadikāder grahaṇam¹¹ . tatreti upadeśe dhātvādu¹² itsaṃjñako

bhavatīti id ity¹³ eṣā saṃjñā bhavatīty arthaḥ id itīdhātoḥ¹⁴ karttari kvip¹⁵

eti gacchati palāyata ity anvarthasaṃjñāvijñānam kṛtvā . tasya lopa

25 ity anena¹⁶ (na) pratyākhyāyate . prastutasthānād¹⁷ apagam((e)) sthānāntare

pi prayogaḥ sambhāvyate . edham sparddham iti . edham vṛddhau

sparddha saṃharṣe¹⁸ . atrānunāsikaviśiṣṭasyāca¹⁹ itsaṃjñakatvād attadāttānita

¹SJ om. ²SJ: -habhayāt. ³SJ: dhātava eva. ⁴SJ: sanādayo. ⁵SJ: vic-. ⁶SJ: -dhātutvād āyādiḥ. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: śiddham bahiraṅgam iti avādeśo na prāpnotīti na deśyan nājanantaryyapratīsedhāt. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: dhātur divuprabhṛtiḥ. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ adds anunāsikaviśiṣṭo 'c. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: iti iṅo dhātoḥ. ¹⁵SJ adds: sarvāpahārī lopaḥ. ¹⁶SJ: sūtram. ¹⁷SJ: -sthāna-. ¹⁸SJ: saṃharṣe. ¹⁹SJ om. atra.

vatīti dhātusamjñāyām satyām *dhātor* iti (P.3.1.91) *vartamāne laṭ* (P.3.2.123) [[*laśetyādinā* (P.1.3.8) *la in na* (?)]] bhavati nityatvāt tibādyādeśair bādhitatvāt. atraiva sanādyantās ceti na kṛtam saṁdehāt: kiṁ sanādayaḥ pratyayā (cf. P.3.1.32) uta sanotyādaya iti kāryaviśeṣārtham upādīyanta iti. sanādayo hi niṁpratyayāntāḥ samjñina iti kāryaviśeṣaḥ. punaḥ pratyayāntadhātutvād āmādiḥ (cf. P.3.1.35).³⁹⁴ 5
 evaṁ tarhi sanādyantā dhātava ity asyānantaram bhūvādayaś ceti kriyatām. tataś ca pratyāsattyā sanādīn pratyayān prati bhūvādīnām dhātusamjñā syāt.³⁹⁵ tasmād yathānyāsam evāstu. **bhūvādaya** ity atra *jasi ceti* (P.7.3.109) guṇe kṛta ejantatve 'vyayatvaṁ nāsti lākṣaṇikatvāt *kṛnmejanta* ity (P.1.1.39) atrāntagrahaṇasyaupadeśikārthatvād aupadeśikapṛāyogikasya paribhāṣayā (cf. *PP* 4, *NP* 120.2) vā. ayādeśe 10
 kartavye (cf. P.6.1.78) 'siddhaparibhāṣā (cf. *PP* 41, *NP* 50) nāsti *nājānantarya* iti (cf. *PP* 42, *NP* 51) niṣedhāt.

2. upadeśe 'j anunāsika it. (P.1.3.2)

(*Bhv.*:) upadiśyata ity upadeśo dhātvādiḥ. tatrānunāsikaviśiṣṭo 'j
 itsamjñakaḥ syāt. edhaṁ. sparddhaṁ. *pratiñānunāsikyāḥ pāṇinīyāḥ* 15
 (*Kāś.* ad loc.). tenehāpi syāt. rageṁ. lageṁ. *ira upasamkhyānaṁ*
kartavyam (Pat. on vārtt. 4 on P.1.3.7; *Mbh.* I 263.20). **bhidir. abhidat.**
irito veti (P.3.1.57) **cler añ.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**upa**||. **upadiśyata ity upadeśa** ity etena karmasādhanatām darśayati. *akartari ca kāraka* iti (cf. P.3.3.19) karmaṇi ghañ. upaśabdaḥ prāthamye diśir 20
 uccāraṇe³⁹⁶ prathamata uccāryata ity arthaḥ. **dhātvādir** iti dhātur divprabhṛtiḥ.
 ādiśabdena sūtraprātīpadikāder grahaṇam.³⁹⁷ **tatrety** upadeśe dhātvādāv itsamjñako
 bhavatīti. **id** ity eṣā samjñā bhavatīty arthaḥ. **id** itīndhātoḥ³⁹⁸ kartari kvip
 (cf. P.3.2.178): eti gacchati palāyata ity anvarthasamjñāvijñānaṁ kṛtvā *tasya lopa*
 ity (P.1.3.9) anena na pratyākhyāyate. prastutasthānād apagame sthānāntare 25
 'pi prayogaḥ sambhāvyate. **edhaṁ sparddham** ity *edhaṁ vṛddhau* (*Dhp.* 1.2)
sparddha samharṣe (*Dhp.* 1.3). atrānunāsikaviśiṣṭasyāca itsamjñakatvād anudāttaṇita

³⁹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.3.1.32: *atha 'bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ' ity asyānantaram 'sanādyantās ca' iti kasmān noktam, evaṁ hi dhātugrahaṇam dvir na kartavyam? naivam śakyam, evaṁ hi kriyamāṇe sanādīnām iyattāparicchedo na syāt. iha tu kriyamāṇe niṁ paryantānām grahaṇam vijñāyate.*

³⁹⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.3.1.32: *tarhi 'sanādyantā dhātavaḥ' ity asyānantaram 'bhūvādayaś ca' iti kasmān noktam? etad api na, evaṁ hi kriyamāṇe sanādyantasyānukrāntāpekṣitvād bhūvādīnām apy anukrāntāpekṣitvaṁ syāt, tataś cānukrāntānām eva gupādīnām dhātusamjñā syāt, nānyeṣāṁ bhūvādīnām.*

³⁹⁶ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 15 (*āhnika* 1): *diśir uccāraṇakriyāḥ* (*Mbh.* I 13.7). Cf. also *Nyāsa* (*diśeś coccāraṇakriyatvāt*) and *Pad.* (*diśir uccāraṇakriye*) on P.1.3.10. *Dhp.* 6.3 provides another meaning of this verb: *diśa atisarjane.*

³⁹⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.1.3.3: **dhātvāder** ityādi. *ādiśabdena sūtraprātīpadikapratyayāgamādeśānām grahaṇam.*

³⁹⁸ Cf. *Dhp.* 2.36: *iṅ gatau.*

ity ātmanepadam bhavati | atha rageprabhṛtīnām niranunāsikānām
 katham¹ itsamjñety ata āha pratijñeti² upadeśe³ kiṃ dadhiṃ brāhmaṇakulam
 iti⁴. dadhi {ccha} icchatīti kyajantāt⁵ kvip atolopavalilopau⁶
 ver aprktasyeti vakārasya ca napumsakatve hrasvatvam⁷
 5 kvau lupte na sthānivad iti
 akāralopasya sthānivatvābhāvāt yaṇādeśo na bhavati. yalope tu na padānteti⁸
 pratiśedhaḥ kvibantā dhātutvam na jahatīti⁹ dhātutvam
 aṇo 'pragr̥hyasyety¹⁰ anunāsika¹¹ ihetsamjñāyām¹² num syāt
 uttarārtham copadeśagrahaṇam anunāsikagrahaṇam¹³ daridrāprabhṛter¹⁴ mā bhūt
 10 aj iti na kutvam asandehārthatvāt nirdeśād vā¹⁵ ||

||hal antyaṃ || hal iti hayavaratḥ hakārād ārabhya hal
 15 iti lakāreṇa antaśabdo¹⁶ yaṃ¹⁷ samīpavacanaḥ halśabdaś cāyaṃ hasya
 samīpavartī l hasya¹⁸ hal iti saṣṭhīsamāsaḥ¹⁹ siddho bhavati²⁰ hal ca hal ceti. napumsakam
 anapumsakenaikavac cāsyānyatarasyām ityādinā²¹ ekaśeṣaikavatvābhyām²² hal iti
 dvau²³ halśabdau halśabdasya puṃstvam halo 'nantarāḥ saṃyoga²⁴ ity atra
 dr̥ṣṭam klībatvañ²⁵ ca²⁶ sutisy aprktam hal iti sāmānyaliṅgatvāt²⁷.
 20 tena pratyāhāre gr̥hyamāṇe²⁸ itaretarāśrayadoṣo na bhavati keci.. śveto
 dhāvātītivad ekenaiva halgrahaṇena²⁹ tantreṇa bhinnārtham halśabdadvayaṃ gr̥hītvā
 itaretarāśrayadoṣam prakṛtavantaḥ³⁰ a i uṇ ityādi rūpodāharaṇam
 kāryyodāharan tv ādir antyena sahetetyādi³¹ pratyāhāragrahaṇam
 evam anyatrāpi kāryyodāharaṇam ūhanīyaṃ puṣaprabhṛtīnām itsamjñāparitrānārtho³²
 25 'kāraḥ anyathā³³ puṣṭir iti ktinviṣaye 'ñ syāt niṣ ca³⁴ ||

¹SJ adds ekārasya. ²SJ: pratijñānūnāsikyā iti. ³SJ adds iti. ⁴SJ: asya vyutpattiḥ. ⁵SJ: kyac dadhīyateḥ. ⁶SJ: ato lopaḥ valilopaḥ. ⁷SJ: napumsakahrasvam. ⁸SJ adds -ādinā. ⁹SJ: kvibantatvad. ¹⁰SJ om. iti. ¹¹SJ adds: ity uttarakālam anunāsikaḥ. ¹²SJ om. iha. ¹³SJ: -kaḥ. ¹⁴SJ: kiṃ daridrābhūprabhṛter. ¹⁵SJ: kutvam na bhavati nirdeśāt sandehanirāsārthatvāt. ¹⁶SJ: antya-. ¹⁷SJ: dhi. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ: -sa-. ²⁰SJ: 'pi | tato. ²¹SJ: -neti. ²²SJ: -katarābhyām. ²³SJ: siddhau. ²⁴SJ om. ²⁵SJ om. ²⁶SJ adds: atraiva. ²⁷SJ om. ²⁸SJ adds api. ²⁹SJ om. ³⁰SJ: parihṛtavantaḥ. ³¹SJ adds: al iti. ³²SJ: -paribhrānto. ³³SJ adds api. ³⁴SJ: ityādao niṣ syāt.

ity (cf. P.1.3.12) ātmanepadam bhavati. atha rageprabhṛtīnām³⁹⁹ niranunāsikānām katham itsamjñety ata āha **pratiñjñeti**.⁴⁰⁰ **upadeśe** kim? dadhim brāhmaṇakulam iti dadhi icchatīti kyajantāt (cf. P.3.1.8) kvip (cf. P.3.2.76). atolopavalilopau⁴⁰¹ *ver aprktasyeti* (P.6.1.67) vakārasya ca. napuṃsakatve hrasvatvam (cf. P.1.2.47). *kvau luptam na sthānivad* ity (Pat. on vārtt. 2 on P.1.1.58; *Mbh.* I 153.10) 5 akāralopasya sthānivattvābhāvād yañādeśo na bhavati. yalope tu *na padānteti* (cf. P.1.1.58) pratisēdhaḥ. *kvibantā dhātutvam na jahatīti* (*Jñ.S.* p. 86) dhātutvam. *aṇo 'praḡhyasyety* (cf. P.8.4.57) anunāsika ihetsamjñāyām num syāt (cf. P.7.1.58). uttarārtham copadeśagrahaṇam. anunāsikagrahaṇam: daridrāprabhṛter mā bhūt.⁴⁰² **aj** ity na kutvam asaṃdehārthatvān nirdeśād vā. 10

3. *hal antyam.* (P.1.3.3)

(*Bhv.:*) **upadeśe 'ntyam hal itsamjñam syāt. a i uṇ. ḍukṛñ. nadaḥ. san. puk. anañ.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**hal antyam**||. **hal** ity *hayavaraḥ* <iti> (Ś.sū. 5) hakārād ārabhya *hal* ity (Ś.sū. 14) lakāreṇa. antaśabdo 'yam samīpavacanaḥ.⁴⁰³ halśabdaś cāyam: hasya 15 samīpavartī l hasya l hal ity saṣṭhīsamāsaḥ siddho bhavati. hal ca hal ceti *napuṃsakam anapuṃsakenaikavac cāsyānyatarasyām ity* (P.1.2.69) ekaśeṣaikavattvābhyām **hal** ity dvau halśabdau. halśabdasya puṃstvam *halo 'nantarāḥ saṃyoga* ity (P.1.1.7) atra dṛṣṭam klībatvam ca *sutisy aprktaḥ hal* ity (cf. P.6.1.68⁴⁰⁴) sāmānyalingatvāt. tena pratyāhāre ḡḥyamāṇa itaretarāśrayadoṣo na bhavati.⁴⁰⁵ **kecit tu** śveto 20 dhāvatītivad ekenaiva halgrahaṇena tantreṇa bhinnārtham halśabdadvayam ḡḥitvā itaretarāśrayadoṣam prakṛtavantaḥ.⁴⁰⁶ **a i uṇ** ityādi (Ś.sū. 1 etc.) rūpodāharaṇam. kāryodāharam tv *ādir antyena sahetetyādi* (P.1.1.71 etc.) pratyāhāragrahaṇam. evam anyatrāpi kāryodāharaṇam ūhanīyam. puṣaprabhṛtīnām itsamjñāparitrāṇārtho 'kārah. anyathā puṣṭir ity ktinviṣaye 'ñ syāt (cf. P.3.3.104) nīṣ ca (cf. P.4.1.41). 25

³⁹⁹ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.822: *rage śāṅkāyām*, and 1,823: *lage saṅge (ca)*.

⁴⁰⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha ragelageprabhṛtīnām katham ānunāsikyam, na hi teṣām ānunāsikyam gaṇe paṭhyate? athāparipaṭhitānām api bhavati. tadā 'bhū' ityevamādinām kasmān na bhavatīty āha – pratiññānunāsikyāḥ pāñinīyā ityādi.*

⁴⁰¹ Cf. P.6.4.48 (*ato lopaḥ*) and P.6.1.66 (*lopo vyor vali*).

⁴⁰² The root *daridrā* appears in the *Dhātupāṭha* (2.64), so it is an *upadeśa*. Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc. (*anunāsika iti kim? sarvasyāco mā bhūt.*) and *Nyāsa* on it (*daridrāprabhṛtisambandhino 'pi*).

⁴⁰³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *antaśabdo 'yam samāptau vartate.*

⁴⁰⁴ P.6.1.68: *halniyābbhyo dīrghāt sutisy aprktaḥ hal.*

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *hasya l – hal ity dvitīyam atra halgrahaṇam tantreṇopāttaḥ draṣṭavyam, tena pratyāhārapāṭhe 'hal' ity atra lakārasya itsamjñā kriyate. tathā ca sati 'hal antyam' ity atra pratyāhāre netaretarāśrayadoṣo bhavati.*

⁴⁰⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *iha tu prayatnaviśeṣas tantraśabdena vivakṣitaḥ. tena tantreṇa dvitīyam atra halgrahaṇam upāttaḥ parigrhītaḥ veditavyam. yathā śveto dhāvatīty ekena prayatnena dve vākye uccārite bhavataḥ tathehāpy ekenaiva prayatnena dvau halśabdāv uccāritāv ity abhiprāyaḥ.*

||na vi || pacerann iti pacer l((i))ni svaritetvād ātmanepadam

5 jhasya ran· sīyuṭ salopaḥ śap¹

ād guṇaḥ idamas thamur ity atresamjñāparitrānā-

rthenokārenāsyānityatvajñāpanāt² paceya ity atra³ takārasyetsamjñā ||

10

||ādiḥ || minna iti nīmidā snehane nītaḥ ktaḥ

āditaś cetīnīṣedhaḥ⁴ radābhyām ity ubhayor

nnatvaṃ⁵ nandathur iti ṭunadi samrddhau ṭvito 'thuc pa-

[ktr]imam iti ḍupacaṃṣ pāke ḍvitaḥ ktrir⁶ iti ktriḥ⁷ pākēna

15 nivṛttam ity arthe trer⁸ map· ādiḥ kiṃ paṭūyati· upadeśa

ity eva nīkārīyati ikāravato nīśabdopādānaṃ⁹ medyatīty¹⁰ atra kartrabhiprāye¹¹

ātmanepadābhāvārthaṃ kṛñāder¹² varttamāne ktasy{e}a

nivṛtyarthaṃ ca evaṃ ṭuḍuśabdāyor¹³ api kāryaviśeṣapratipattir bodhyā¹⁴ ||

20

||ṣaḥ || narttakīti śīlpini ṣvun¹⁵ pratyasya kiṃ¹⁶ ṣaṇu dāne·

nāmantāḍ dah ṣandah¹⁷ | ādir ity eva avimahiyoṣ ṭisac¹⁸

aviṣo mahiṣaḥ atra ṣo ngād¹⁹ ity uktvā pratyayasyeti²⁰ na pratyākhyeya

25 uttaratra pañcamo ruṇaddhīty a(nva)rthatvāt²¹ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ om. ³SJ adds vibhaktau. ⁴SJ: cetīṭpratiṣedhaḥ. ⁵SJ: ityādinā takāradakārayoḥ nakārau. ⁶SJ: ktir. ⁷SJ: ktiḥ. ⁸SJ: kter mab nityam iti. ⁹SJ: nīkārasyo. ¹⁰SJ: minātīty. ¹¹SJ adds tv. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: ca śabdayor. ¹⁴SJ: boddhavyā. ¹⁵SJ adds ṣaḥ. ¹⁶SJ: ṣaṣṭha iti. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ has it after mahiṣaḥ. ¹⁹SJ: hrād. ²⁰SJ: pratyayagrahaṇam. ²¹SJ: pratyākhyeyam uttarārthatvāt.

4. na vibhaktau tasmāḥ. (P.1.3.4)

(*Bhv.*) vibhaktes tavargasakāramakārā itsamjñā na syuḥ. vṛkṣāt. paceran. yasmin. pacataḥ. apacam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**na vi**||. pacerann iti pacer liṅ. svaritettvād ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.72). *jhasya ran* (P.3.4.105). *sīyut* (cf. P.3.4.102) *salopaḥ* (cf. P.7.2.79) *śap* (cf. P.3.1.68). *ād guṇaḥ* (P.6.1.87). *idamas thamur* ity (P.5.3.24) *atretsamjñāparitrāṇārthenokāreṇāsyānityatvajñāpanāt paceya* ity atra *takārasyetsamjñā* (cf. P.3.4.106).⁴⁰⁷

5. ādir nītuḍavaḥ. (P.1.3.5)

(*Bhv.*) id ity eva. ādibhūtā nītuḍukārā itsamjñakāḥ syuḥ. nīmidā minnaḥ. ṭunadi nandathuḥ. ḍupacaṃṣ paktrimam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ādih**||. minna iti *nīmidā snehane* (*Dhp.* 1.779, 4.133). *nītaḥ ktaḥ* (cf. P.3.4.70). *āditaś ceti* (P.7.2.16) *innīṣedhaḥ*. *radābhyām* ity (cf. P.8.2.42) *ubhayor natvam*. **nandathur** iti *ṭunadi samṛddhau* (*Dhp.* 1.67). *ṭvito 'thuc* (P.3.3.89). **paktrimam** iti *ḍupacaṃṣ pāke* (*Dhp.* 1.1045). *ḍvitaḥ ktrir* ity (P.3.3.88) *ktrih*. *pākena nirvṛttam* ity arthe *trer map* (cf. P.4.4.20). **ādih** kim? *paṭūyati*.⁴⁰⁸ *upadeśa* ity eva *nikāriyati*.⁴⁰⁹ *ikāravato nīśabdopādānaṃ medyatīty atra kartrabhiprāya ātmanepadābhāvārthaṃ* (cf. P.1.3.72) *kṛñāder vartamāne ktasya* (cf. P.3.2.187) *nirvṛttyarthaṃ ca*. *evaṃ tuḍuśabdāyori api kāryaviśeṣapratipattir bodhya*.

6. śaḥ pratyayasya. (P.1.3.6)

(*Bhv.*) pratyayasyādiḥ śakāra itsamjñakaḥ syāt. ṣvun. nartakī. khanakī. rajakī.

(*Pañj.*) ||**śaḥ**||. **nartakī**ti *śilpini ṣvun* (P.3.1.145). **pratyayasya** kim? *śaṇu dāne* (*Dhp.* 8.2⁴¹⁰). *ñamantād daḥ* (*Uṇ.* I.114). *śaṇḍaḥ*. **ādir** ity eva. *avimahyoṣ ṭiṣac* (*Uṇ.* I.45). *aviṣo mahiṣaḥ*. *atra ṣo 'ngād ity uktvā pratyayasyeti na pratyākhyeya uttaratra pañcamo ruṇaddhīty anvarthatvāt*.

7. cuṭū. (P.1.3.7)

(*Bhv.*) cavargaṭavargau pratyayasyādibhūtāv itsamjñakau syātām. cphañ. kauñjāyanyaḥ. jas. brāhmaṇāḥ. vṛkṣāḥ. cyah. śāṇḍikyaḥ.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'kimo 't' (P.5.3.12) 'iṭo 't' (P.3.4.106) *ity atra pratiṣedho na bhavati anityatvād asya pratiṣedhasya*. 'idamas thamuh' ity (P.5.3.24) *ukārānubandhanirdeśād anityatvam upalakṣyate*. Cf. also *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *anityatvam asya vidheḥ 'idamas thamuh' ity* (P.5.3.24) *asya makārasyetsamjñāparitrāṇārthād ukārānubandhād vijñāyāte*. *nityatve hi saty etasmād eva pratiṣedhān makārasyetsamjñā na bhaviṣyatīty ukārānubandhagrahaṇam anarthakaṃ syāt*.

⁴⁰⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ādir iti kim? paṭūyati kaṇḍūyati*. The word *paṭu* is mentioned in *GP* 147.4, so it is an *upadeśa*.

⁴⁰⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *upadeśe ity eva – nikāriyati*.

⁴¹⁰ Böhtlingk (1887): *śaṇu dāne*.

||cuṭū || kauñjāyanya iti· [ku]ñjasyāpatyaṃ gotre¹ kuñjādibhyaś cphañ²
 5 ādivṛddhiḥ phasyāyanādeśaḥ· tadantāt
 vrātacphañor astriyām iti ñyaḥ [ch]asyetsamjñāpavādam³ īyādeśaṃ [va]kṣyati⁴·
 śāṇḍikya iti śāṇḍikādibhyo⁵ ñyaḥ kurucarīti careṣ ṭaḥ
 upasara[ja]⁶ iti saptamyāñ janer daḥ· dity a[bhasy]āpy anubandha-
 sāmārthyāt⁷ ṭilopaḥ āna⁸ dhanagaṇaṃ labdhā ity
 10 anuvṛttāv annān ṇa iti napratyayaḥ⁹· yādī cuñcupcaṇapāv iti yakāra-
 syāsravaṇam¹⁰ vali yalo[pe]ti¹¹ cuṭuṣaḥ pratyayasyety¹² ekayoge karttavye
 pṛthagyogakaraṇād asyānityatvaṃ¹³ tenāvātītāder api siddhiḥ¹⁴ ||

15

||laśa || priyamvada iti priyavaśe vadaḥ khac khitvād¹⁵
 arurviśadajantasyeti¹⁶ mum bhaṅguraṃ iti bhañjabhāṣamido ghu-
 20 rac cajoḥ ku gñiyator iti jakārasya gakāraḥ¹⁷ anusvāra-
 para{sya}savarṇau avika iti aveḥ kaḥ¹⁸· ||

||tasya || id iti¹⁹ prakṛte tasyagrahaṇaṃ sarvalopārthaṃ· anyathā ñiṭuḍūnām
 25 antyalopaḥ²⁰ syāt nānarth{e}ake 'lo 'ntyavidhir iti tu
 na sarvam as.atam²¹ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: ca phañ. ³SJ: chakārasya. ⁴SJ adds itsamjñāpavādaḥ. ⁵SJ: śāṇḍakādibhyo.
⁶SJ: uparajasam. ⁷SJ: abhasamjñakasyāpy anubandhakaraṇasāmārthyāt. ⁸SJ: ānnaṃ iti. ⁹SJ
 om. ¹⁰SJ: -rāśrayaṇaṃ tu. ¹¹SJ: lopāt. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: asya vidher anityatvād. ¹⁴SJ:
 avātītādisiddhiḥ. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ adds pūrvapadasya. ¹⁷SJ: kakāraḥ. ¹⁸SJ adds: iti ka pratyayaḥ.
¹⁹SJ: itsamjñake. ²⁰SJ: asati hi tasyagrahaṇe ñiṭuḍavaḥ santy asyeti antyasya lopaḥ. ²¹SJ:
 bhāṣyakārasyañabhimatam.

ṭaḥ. kurucarī. ḍaḥ. upasarajaḥ. *annāṇ ṇaḥ* (P.4.4.85). ānaḥ. katham keśacuñcuḥ keśacaṇaḥ? citkāryābhāvāt. *yādī cuñcupcaṇapau luptanirdiṣṭayakārāv* iti bhāṣyam.⁴¹¹

(*Pañj.*) ||**cutū**||. **kauñjāyanya** iti kuñjasyāpatyam. *gotre kuñjādibhyaś cphañ* (P.4.1.98). ādivṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.117). phasyāyanādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.2). tadantād 5
vrātacphañor astriyām iti (P.5.3.113) ñyaḥ. chasyetsamjñāpavādam īyādeśam vakṣyati (cf. P.7.1.2). **śāṇḍikya** iti *śāṇḍikādibhyo ñyaḥ* (P.4.3.92). **kurucarīti careṣ ṭaḥ** (P.3.2.16). **upasaraja** iti *saptamyāñ janer ḍaḥ* (P.3.2.97). ḍity abhasyāpy anubandha-sāmarthyāṭ ṭilopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.143). **āna** <iti> *dhanagaṇam labdhā* ity (P.4.4.84) anuvṛttāv **annāṇ ṇa** iti (P.4.4.85) ṇapratyayaḥ. **yādī cuñcupcaṇapāv** iti yakāra- 10
syāśraṇam vali yalopeti (cf. P.6.1.66). **cuṭuṣāḥ** pratyayasyety ekayoge kartavye pṛthaggyogakaraṇād asyānityatvam tenāvaṭīṭāder api siddhiḥ (cf. P.5.2.31).⁴¹²

8. *laśakv ataddhite.* (P.1.3.8)

(*Bhv.*) **lakāraśakārakavargās taddhitavarjitāḥ pratyayasyādibhūtā** 15
itsamjñakāḥ syuḥ. lyap. vijitya. lyuṭ. cayanam. śap. bhavati. ktaḥ.
bhūtam. khac. priyaṃvadaḥ. ghurac. bhāsuram. bhaṅguram. ñe.
paṭave. ataddhite kim? aveḥ kaḥ (P.5.4.28). **avikaḥ.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**laśa**||. **priyamvada** iti *priyavaśe vadaḥ khac* (P.3.2.38). khittvād
arurdiviṣadajantasyeti (cf. P.6.3.67) mum. **bhaṅguram** iti *bhañjabhāsamido ghu-*
rac (P.3.2.161). *cajoḥ ku gñiṇnyator* iti (P.7.3.52) jakārasya gakāraḥ. anusvāra- 20
parasavarṇau (cf. P.8.3.24 and P.8.4.58). **avika** iti **aveḥ kaḥ** (P.5.4.28).

9. *tasya lopah.* (P.1.3.9)

(*Bhv.*) **yasyetsamjñā vihitā tasya lopah syāt. tathaivodāhṛtam.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**tasya**||. id iti prakṛte tasyagrahaṇam sarvalopārtham. anyathā ñiṭuḍūnām
antyalopaḥ syāt (cf. P.1.1.52).⁴¹³ *nānarthake 'lo 'ntyavidhir* iti (PP 93, cf. NP 96) tu 20
na. sarvam amatam (?).⁴¹⁴

⁴¹¹ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 3 ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 263.17–18): *evaṃ tarhi yakārādī cuñcupcaṇapau. kiṃ yakāro na śrūyate. luptanirdiṣṭo yakāraḥ.*

⁴¹² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pṛthaggyogakaraṇam asya vidher anityatvañāpanārtham.* Cf. also *Nyāsa* on it: *atha kimarthaṃ pṛthaggyogaḥ kriyate, 'caṭuṣāḥ pratyayasya' ity eka eva yogaḥ kriyatām ity ata āha pṛthaggyogakaraṇam ityādi.*

⁴¹³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *tasyagrahaṇam sarvalopārtham. 'alo 'ntyasya' (P.1.1.52) mā bhūt – 'ādir ñiṭuḍavaḥ' (P.1.3.5) iti.*

⁴¹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yadi tu 'nānarthake 'lo 'ntyavidhiḥ' ity eṣā paribhāṣāśrīyate, tadā tasyagrahaṇam akartuṃ śakyate. tat kriyate vispaṣṭārtham.*

- 5 ||yathā|| vīpsāyām avyayībhāvaṃ kṛtvā tṛtīyāntam
 yathāsamkhyam iti¹ [tṛ]tīyā[sa]ptamyor bahulam ity am samkhyāśabdaś²
 cātra sāha[ca]ryyāt kramam āha yato yatra samkhyā tatra niyatabhāvī kra-
 ma iti samkhyā hi gananam kramata eva bhavati kramaś ca paripāthī³ pratyā[s]atyā (?)⁴
 samkhyāpeksayā sa[m]ā[[4-5]] ta⁵ ity āha samasamkhyānām ityādi⁶.
- 10 anudeśa⁷ iti⁸ karmaṇi [gha]ñ· arthaśabdasya⁹ paścādanuvṛttivād¹⁰
 anupadeśinaḥ¹¹ syur iti uddeśibhiḥ saheti¹² śeṣaḥ anudeśinaḥ paścād u[cya]mānāḥ te ca
 prathamoccāryyamānam apeksya bhavanti¹³ svaritena liṅgena yathāsamkhyam¹⁴ boddha-
 vyaṃ kvacid upāttaśabdāpeksayā¹⁵ yathā nandigrahipacādaḥ kvacid
 upāttaśabdābhidheyadvāreṇa yatheko yaṅ acītyādaḥ samaśabdasya
- 15 sarvanāmatvābhāvaḥ samānaśabda.. [ryyā]..tvāt¹⁶ tena samānām iti na suṭ ||

20

- ||svari|| svarita iti tārakādiḥ¹⁷ nāmaśabdaḥ prasiddho¹⁸
 varṇa[dha]rma iti varṇamātradharmā ity arthaḥ· tena hal api svaritatvena¹⁹ grhyate
 nāj eva²⁰· dharmmo ikāraḥ sa·varṇagataḥ²¹ svaritatvan tu pratijñānabodhitam²²·
 lakṣānubodhāt²³ kvacid avadhīś²⁴ tv asyaiva spaṣṭārthaḥ²⁵ atra ca svariteneti
- 25 yogavibhāgaḥ karanīyaḥ· tena pūrvasūtrenāpy asya [sa]mbandhatvāt yathāsamkhyam
 api svari[t]. .. [p.a]varta[te] .odyam prak²⁶ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: samkhyā. ³SJ: samānatvaṃ vijñāyata. ⁴SJ om. -ādi. ⁵SJ: anudeśina. ⁶SJ adds: anudīśyata iti. ⁷SJ: anu-. ⁸SJ: -vṛttivād. ⁹SJ: anudeśinaḥ. ¹⁰SJ: prathamoccāritair iti. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: cihnaena yathāyatham yathākramaṃ. ¹³SJ: -śabdāmātrāpeksayā. ¹⁴SJ: samānaparyāyatvāt. ¹⁵SJ: pratijñā vikārādiḥ. ¹⁶SJ: -ddhau. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ om. ²⁰SJ om. ²¹SJ: dharmo vikāraḥ | varṇaḥ svagataḥ. ²²SJ: -vibhāvitam. ²³SJ: lakṣyasiddhyanurodhāt. ²⁴SJ: bādhanirddeśas. ²⁵SJ: sūcanāya. ²⁶SJ om.

10. yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām. (P.1.3.10)

(*Bhv.*:) samānām samasaṃkhyānām uddeśinām anudeśinām cānukramenānudeśaḥ syāt. *nandigrahipacādibhyo lyuṇinyacaḥ* (P.3.1.134). *nandanah. grāhī. pacah.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||**yathā**||. vīpsāyām avyayībhāvaṃ kṛtvā⁴¹⁵ tṛtīyāntam (cf. P.2.1.7). **yathāsaṃkhyam** iti *tṛtīyāsaptamyoḥ bahulam* ity (P.2.4.84) am. saṃkhyāśabdaś cātra sāhacaryāt kramam āha.⁴¹⁶ yato yatra saṃkhyā(bhedas) tatra niyatabhāvī krama iti.⁴¹⁷ saṃkhyā hi gaṇanam kramata eva bhavati. kramaś ca paripāṭhī pratyāsattiyā saṃkhyāpekṣayā samā[[natvaṃ vijñāya]]ta⁴¹⁸ ity āha **samasaṃkhyānām** ityādi. **anudeśa** iti karmani ghañ (cf. P.3.3.19). anusaṃkhyānām paścādarthavṛttitvād⁴¹⁹ anudeśinaḥ syur iti uddeśibhiḥ saheti śeṣaḥ. anudeśinaḥ paścād ucyamānāḥ. te ca prathamoccāryamānam apekṣya bhavanti. svaritena liṅgena yathāsaṃkhyam boddhavyam.⁴²⁰ kvacid upāttaśabdāpekṣayā yathā nandigrahipacādaḥ (cf. P.3.1.134) kvacid upāttaśabdābhidheyadvāreṇa yatheko *yaṇ acītyādaḥ* (P.6.1.77 etc.). samaśabdasya sarvanāmatvābhāvaḥ samānaśabdaparyāyatvāt. tena **samānām** iti na suṭ (cf. P.7.1.52). 5 10 15

11. svaritenādhikāraḥ. (P.1.3.11)

(*Bhv.*:) svarito nāma varṇadharmah kaścit. tena cihnenādhikāro jñeyah. *yathātmanepadam* (cf. P.1.3.12). *pratyayah* (P.3.1.1). *aṅgasya* (P.6.4.1). 20

(*Pañj.*:) ||**svari**||. svarita iti tārakādiḥ (cf. P.5.2.36)⁴²¹ nāmaśabdaḥ prasiddho varṇadharmā iti varṇamātradharmā ity arthaḥ. tena hal api svaritatvena gṛhyate nāj eva.⁴²² dharmo yikāraḥ sa ca varṇagataḥ. svaritatvaṃ tu pratijñānabodhitam lakṣyānubodhāt. kvacid avadhīś tv asyaiva spaṣṭārthaḥ. atra ca **svariteneti** yogavibhāgaḥ karaṇīyah. tena pūrvasūtrenāpy asya saṃbandhatvād *yathāsaṃkhyam* (cf. P.1.3.10) api svaritena pravartate bodhyam prāk. 25

⁴¹⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* on P.2.1.6: *yogyatā vīpsā padārthānativṛttih sādṛśyam ca iti yathārthāḥ*. Cf. also *Nyāsa* on P.1.2.10: *yathāsādṛśye iti* (P.2.1.7) *vīpsāyām avyayībhāvaḥ*.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *saṃkhyāśabdenātra kramo lakṣyate*.

⁴¹⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yatra ca saṃkhyābhedaḥ tatra niyatabhāvī kramah saṃkhyābhedavatām yugapad uccārayitum aśakyatvāt. atah sāhacaryāt saṃkhyāśabdena kramo lakṣyate*.

⁴¹⁸ See SJ. Cf. also *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *samasaṃkhyatayā samānatvaṃ darśayati*.

⁴¹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **paścād uccāryata** iti. *anusaṃkhyānām paścādarthavṛttitvād diśeś coccāraṇakriyatvāt*.

⁴²⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *svaritena liṅgena yathāsaṃkhyam. yatra neṣyate tatra svaritatvaṃ na pratijñāyate*.

⁴²¹ *GP* 101 (*tārakādi*) is an *ākṛtīgaṇa*.

⁴²² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sarveṣāṃ varṇānām acām halām ca svaritākhyo yo varṇadharmo guṇas tasyedaṃ grahaṇam*.

- 5 ||anudā || tibādīnām tiptasjhītyādisūtrena sāmānyena vidhānāt
 vidhisiddhau niyamārtham¹ [sa] ca niyamaḥ pratyayasyaiva na prakṛteḥ | iha²
 vikaraṇebhyo niyamo baliyān iti ath{ā}a³ [hy] edhiṣyata ityādāv⁴
 ātmanepa[da]ṃ labhyate⁵. tathā hi nityatvād [vi]karaṇena [syē]na
 vyavadhānād anudātānīta evātmanepadam iti niyamābhāvāt⁶ niyamas tv āste
 10 śeta ityādau caritārthaḥ. jñāpakañ cātra vṛdbhyaḥ syasanor iti
 parasmaipadavidhānam vikālpena⁷ anyathānityatvād vikaraṇe⁸ kṛte sāmānya-
 vihitatvād ubhayasiddhiḥ.⁹ śāyāna iti śīn svapne śānac
 śapo luk śīnaḥ sārvaadhāduke guṇaḥ
 pāpacyata ity atrāvayavānubandhenārambhāt samudāyād evātmanepadam¹⁰ bhavaty
 15 eva śāyatīty atra tu¹¹ nivṛ{[sa]}ttānubandhatārabdhaḥ¹² samudāya iti na bhava[ti]
 ātmanepadam anudātānīta((m a))ñānābhyām yathāsamkhyam nāsty asvaritatvāt ihed
 iti pratyekaṃ sambandhaḥ. anya(thā) hy abhiṣṭe 'sandehārtham nīdanudāttebhya iti
 kuryyāt. tena hantītyādau nātmanepadam¹³ cakṣiṇo ..jātmanepadā-
 rtham ekānubandhe¹⁴ karttavye dvyanubandhakagrahaṇam¹⁵ jñāpayaty ātmanepadām
 20 anityam iti tena siñcatvalayasubhagair iṭi
 siddhyati¹⁶ ||

¹SJ: tibādisūtrena sāmānyavihitānām tibādīnām vidhānāt niyamoya 'm. ²SJ om. ³SJ: anyathā. ⁴SJ adds: syena vyavadhānād. ⁵SJ: tasya na syāt. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ rev. ⁸SJ: anyathā hi vidhinirūpaṇe. ⁹SJ adds: anudātānīto tañānābhyām yathāsamkhyam nāsty asvaritatvāt. ¹⁰SJ om. eva. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: nivṛttāvayavāvayavānubandhenārabdhaḥ. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: cakṣiṇa ātmanepadārtham akārānubandhe. ¹⁵SJ: hy anubandhakaraṇam. ¹⁶SJ: ityādisiddhiḥ.

12. anudāttañīta ātmanepadam. (P.1.3.12)

(*Bhv.*:) anudātteto dhātor ñītaś cātmanepadam syāt. āste. vardhate. ñītaḥ. plavate. śete. haṃsāyate. plavamānaḥ. pacamānaḥ. śayānaḥ. upadeśa ity eva. nīttvātideśe mā bhūt. uccukuṭiṣati.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**anudā**||. tibādīnām *tiptasj*hṭyādisūtrena (P.3.4.78) sāmānyena vidhānād 5
vidhisiddhau niyamārtham. sa ca niyamaḥ pratyayasyaiva na prakṛteḥ.⁴²³ iha
vikaraṇebhyo niyamo balīyān iti (*PP* 53, *NP* 41⁴²⁴). atha hy edhiṣyata ityādāv
ātmanepadam labhyate. tathā (anyathā ?) hi nityatvād vikaraṇena syena
vyavadhānād anudāttañīta evātmanepadam iti niyamābhāvāḥ. niyamas tv **āste**
śeta ityādau caritārthaḥ. jñāpakam cātra *vṛdbhyaḥ syasanor* iti (P.1.3.92) 10
parasmaipadavidhānam vikalpena. anyathānityatvād vikaraṇe kṛte sāmānya-
vihitatvād ubhayaśiddhiḥ.⁴²⁵ **śayāna** iti *śīnī svapne* (*Dhp.* 2.22). śānac
(cf. P.3.2.124 ff.). śapo luk (cf. P.2.4.72). *śīnaḥ sārva*dhātuke *guṇaḥ* (P.7.4.21).
pāpacyata ity atrāvayavānubandhenārambhāt samudāyād evātmanepadam bhavaty
eva. śāya(ya)tīty atra tu nīrttānubandhatārabdhaḥ samudāya iti na bhavaty 15
ātmanepadam. anudāttañītas tañānābhyām yathāsamkhyam nāsty asvaritatvāt. ihed
iti pratyekam sambandhaḥ. anyathā hy abhiṣṭe ‘samdehārtham nīdanudāttebhya iti
kuryāt. tena hantītyādau nātmanepadam. cakṣiṇo (cf. *Dhp.* 2.7) yujātmanepadā-
rtham ekānubandhe kartavye dvyanubandhakagrahaṇam jñāpayaty: ātmanepadam
anityam iti (cf. *PP*² 78 and *NP* 93.4) tena śīñjadvalayasubhagair iti (*Meghadūta* 20
II.19)⁴²⁶ sidhyati.⁴²⁷

13. bhāvakarmanoh. (P.1.3.13)

(*Bhv.*:) sarvadhātubhyo bhāve karmaṇi cātmanepadam syāt. bhāve.

⁴²³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vidhīyamānatvāt pradhānasya pratyayasya na tu prakṛter iti vijñāyate*. Cf. also *PP* 92: *pratyayāpratyayayoḥ pratyasyaiva grahaṇam*.

⁴²⁴ This *paribhāṣā* is mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya*, see Pat. on vārtt. 2 ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 275.11). Cf. also *Jñ.S.* p. 63: *vikaraṇebhyo niyamo garīyān*.

⁴²⁵ Cf. *Puruṣottama* on *PP* 53: *tena edhiṣyate edhitāse aidhiṣṭa kariṣyatītyādi sidhyati. anyathā hi paratvān nityatvāc ca vikaraṇeṣu syādiṣu kṛteṣu tair vyavadhānād atrānudāttañīta ātmanepadam śeṣād eva parasmaipadam iti vyavasthā na syāt. sāmānyenaiva tibādayaḥ syuḥ. niyamasya luvikaraṇebhyaḥ śnamvikaraṇebhyaḥ āste śete ātti bhīnatti ityādau caritārthatvam. ayaṃ cārtho ‘vṛdbhyaḥ syasanoḥ’ ity (P.1.3.92) ātmanepadavikalpena jñāpitaḥ. anyathā hi vṛtu vartane ityevamādīnām anudāttetaṃ vikaraṇena syena vyavadhānād anudāttañīta evātmanepadam iti niyamo nāstīti sāmānyavīhiteṣu tibādiṣu kṛteṣu siddham ubhayaṃ vartisyati vartisyate iti kim anena vikalpena. tat kṛtam uktārthasya jñāpakam iti. Cf. also *Jñ.S.* p. 63: *tena edhiṣyate ityādāv ātmanepadaniyamasiddhiḥ. anyathānityatvād vikaraṇena syena vyavadhānāt anudāttañīdbhya evātmanepadaniyamāsambhavāt sāmānyena ta-sya tibādaya iti sarvatibādīprasaṅgaḥ*.*

⁴²⁶ *Kale*’s edition has: *śīñjāvalayasubhagair* with the variant reading *śīñcat-*, which is the one present in the manuscript of the *Pañjikā*. However, this reading does not make good sense in a compound with *valaya*; on the other hand, the variant *śīñjā-* cannot be used to illustrate the maxim *ātmanepadam anityam*. The emendation *śīñjad-* has been made on the grounds of the *Durghaṭavṛtti* (on P.1.3.12), which also discusses the same citation. See *Renou* (1941: 42).

⁴²⁷ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *samudāyabandhe tu cakṣiṇa eva syāt, sa hy anudāttet paṭhyate, vicakṣaṇa ity atra yuj yathā syāt. nīkāras tv anudāttettvanibandhanasyātmanepadasyānityatvājñāpanārthaḥ, tena ‘sa evāyam nāgaḥ sahati kalabhebhyaḥ paribhavam’, ‘na sahāmi sāhasam asāhasiki’ ityādi siddham*.

||bhāva || sarvadhātubhya iti viśeṣānupādānāt ||

5

||karttari ||¹ karttarīti bhāvakarmanoh pūrveṇa vihitatvāt vyatibha-
vamānā² iti vyatibhavate³ laṭ śānac śap ane muk
pāriśeṣyāt kartṛgrahaṇe labdhe kar[ṭṛ]grahaṇam uttarārtham ||

10

||na gati || vyatihimsantīti hisi himsāyām num

15 laṭ jher antādeśaḥ⁴ śnam śnān nalopaḥ
śnamo nalopaḥ⁵ śnasor allopa ity akāralopaḥ ||

20 ||itare || itaretarasya vyatilunantīti itaraśabdasya vyatīhāre⁶ dve
bhavataḥ samāsavac ca bahulam iti dvitva[m] vibhakti⁷
samāsavatvāt prātipadikatvam śeṣavivakṣāyām ṣaṣṭhī
lunantīti śnābhyas tayor āta ity akāralopaḥ | evam anyonyasya itare-
tarārthopapadād ity ukte yady api parasparopapadāc ceti vaktavyam na jāyate
25 tathāpi na kṛtam mithopapadān mā bhūd ity evamartham⁸ ||

¹SJ adds: kriyāvinimaya iti anyonyakriyākaraṇam paraspara iti yāvat. ²SJ: -na. ³SJ: -te.
⁴SJ: jhontādeśaḥ. ⁵SJ: iti nakāralopaḥ. ⁶SJ adds karma-. ⁷SJ: dvirvacanam vibhakter luk.
⁸SJ om.

sthīyate tvayā. vismīyate mayā. karmaṇi. kriyate kaṭaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**bhāva**||. sarvadhātubhya iti viśeṣānupādānāt.

14. kartari karmavyatihāre. (P.1.3.14)

(*Bhv.*) kriyāvinimaye dhātor ātmanepadam syāt kartari. vyatibhavate śrīḥ padmānām. vyatibhavamānāḥ puruṣāḥ. vyatilunante vīrāḥ. 5

(*Pañj.*) ||**kartari**||. **kartarī**ti bhāvakarmaṇoḥ pūrveṇa vihitatvāt. **vyatibhavamānā** iti vyatibhavater laṭ śānac (cf. P.3.2.124 ff.) śap (cf. P.3.1.68). *āne muk* (P.7.2.82). pāriśeṣyāt kartṛgrahaṇe labdhe kartṛgrahaṇam uttarārtham.⁴²⁸

15. na gatihimsārthebhyaḥ. (P.1.3.15)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyaḥ kriyāvinimaye dhātor nāsti tat. vyatigacchanti. 10
vyatihimsanti. *hasādīnām ca*.⁴²⁹ vyatihāsanti. vyatijalpeyuḥ. kartarīty eva. vyatigamyante grāmāḥ. *harater apratiṣedhaḥ* (*Kāś.* ad loc.⁴³⁰). sampraharante yodhāḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**na gati**||. **vyatihimsantī**ti *hisi himsāyām* (*Dhp.* 7.19). num (cf. P.7.1.58). laṭ. jher antādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.1.3). śnam (cf. P.3.1.78). *śnān nalopaḥ* <iti> (P.6.4.23) 15
śnamo nalopaḥ. *śnasor allopa* ity (P.6.4.111) akāralopaḥ.

16. itaretarānyonyopapadāc ca. (P.1.3.16)

(*Bhv.*) ābhyām yuktād dhātor nāsti tat. itaretarasya vyatilunanti. anyonyasya vyatipibanti jalam. cakārāt parasparasya vyatilunanti.

(*Pañj.*) ||**itare**||. **itaretarasya vyatilunantī**ti itaraśabdasya vyatīhāre dve 20
bhavataḥ samāsavac ca bahulam iti⁴³¹ dvitvaṃ vibhaktiluk (cf. P.2.4.71). samāsavattvāt prātipadikatvaṃ (cf. P.1.2.46). śeṣavivakṣāyām ṣaṣṭhī (cf. P.2.3.50). **lunantī**ti⁴³² *śnābhyas tayor āta* ity (P.6.4.112) ākāralopaḥ. evam anyonyasya. itaretarārthopapadād ity ukte yady api *parasparopapadāc ceti vaktavyaṃ*⁴³³ na jāyate tathāpi na kṛtaṃ mithopapadān mā bhūd ity evamartham. 25

17. ner viśaḥ. (P.1.3.17)

(*Bhv.*) nipūrvād viśater ātmanepadam syāt. niviśate. kathaṃ madhuni viśanti bhramarāḥ? lākṣaṇikatvāt.

⁴²⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *kartṛgrahaṇam uttarārtham* – ‘śeṣāt kartari parasmaipadam’ iti (P.1.3.78).

⁴²⁹ Cf. vārtt. 1 ad loc.: *pratiṣedhe hasādīnām upasaṃkhyānam* (*Mbh.* I 278.23), which is also cited in *Kāś.* ad loc.

⁴³⁰ Cf. also vārtt. 2 ad loc.: *harivahyor apratiṣedhaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 279.1).

⁴³¹ Cf. vārtt. 11 on P.8.1.12: *karmavyatihāre sarvanāmnaḥ samāsavac ca bahulam yadā na samāsavat prathamai kavacanam tadā pūrvapadasya* (*Mbh.* III 370.11–12) and Pat. on it: *karmavyatihāre sarvanāmno dve bhavata iti vaktavyaṃ samāsavac ca bahulam* (*Mbh.* III 370.13).

⁴³² *Bhv.*: **vyatilunanti**.

⁴³³ Pat. on vārtt. 1 ad loc. (= *parasparopapadāc ca*), *Mbh.* I 279.6.

||neh|| niviśata iti viśdhāto{h} r nir upasargaḥ madhuni viśanti bhra-
marā iti ner upa[sa]rgasya grahanāt arthavatparibhāṣā nāsti
madhuśabdasya saptamyekavacane num¹ ||

5

||pari|| akartabhīprāyārtho² yam ārambhaḥ parikrīṇīta iti dukrīṇ
dravyavinimaye. śnā ī haly aghor itītvam |
kriya iti anukāryyānukaraṇayor bheda[v]ivakṣitatvād³ iyaṅ ||

10

||vipa|| jer iti bhedaivakṣāyām⁴ neyaṅ upasargagrahaṇān neha parā
jayati senā⁵ ||

15

||āno|| ādatta iti ḍudāñ dāne laṭ⁶ śapśluḥ⁷
ślāv iti dvirvacanam śnābhyas tayor āta ity ākārālopaḥ⁸ khari
20 ceti cartvaṃ kartṛgrahaṇānuvṛtyā svāṅgakarmakāc ceti⁹
pratiśedhaḥ tena parāṅgakarmakān na bhavati | vyādatte
pipīlikā pataṅgasya mukham iti viharāṇagrahaṇād āsyaviharaṇasamānakriyād
api pratiśedhaḥ¹⁰ vipādikāṃ vyādadāti āno do 'nāsyavikāśa iti na kṛtaṃ vaici-
tryārtham¹¹ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: akartabhīprārtho. ³SJ adds dhātutvād. ⁴SJ: anukāryānukaraṇayor
bhedasyāvivakṣitatvāt. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ adds te. ⁷SJ: śapaḥ. ⁸SJ: a-. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ adds tena.
¹¹SJ om.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**neh**||. **niviśata** iti viśdhātor nir upasargaḥ. **madhuni viśanti bhramarā** iti ner upasargasya grahaṇād arthavatparibhāṣā (cf. *PP* 1, *NP* 14) nāsti.⁴³⁴ madhuśabdasya saptamyekavacane num (cf. P.7.1.73).

18. parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ. (P.1.3.18)

(*Bhv.*:) ebhyaḥ kriyas tat syāt. parikrīṇīte. vikrīṇīte. avakrīṇīte. 5

(*Pañj.*:) ||**pari**||. akartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ. **parikrīṇīta** iti *dukrīṇī dravyavinimaye* (*Dhp.* 9.1). śnā (cf. P.3.1.81). *ī haly aghor* iti (P.6.4.113) ittvam. **kriya** iti anukāryānukaraṇayor bhedāvivaḥṣitatvād iyaṅ (cf. P.6.4.77 and *PP* 114 [*NP* 36]).⁴³⁵

19. viparābhyām jeḥ.⁴³⁶ (P.1.3.19)

(*Bhv.*:) ābhyām jes tat syāt. vijayate. parājayate. 10

(*Pañj.*:) ||**vipa**||. **jer** iti bhedavivaḥṣyāyām neyaṅ. upasargagrahaṇān neha: parā jayati senā.

20. āño do 'nāsyaviharaṇe. (P.1.3.20)

(*Bhv.*:) āño dāñas tat syāt. ādatte dhanam. anāsyaviharaṇe 15
kim? vyādadāti mukham. katham kim vyādatse vihaga vadanam?
kartrabhiprāye bhaviṣyati.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**āño**||. ādatta iti *dudāñ dāne* (*Dhp.* 3.9). laṭ. śapśluḥ (cf. P.2.4.72). ślāv iti (P.6.1.10) dvirvacanam. śnābhyas taylor āta ity (P.6.4.112) ākārālopaḥ. *khari ceti* (P.8.4.55) cartvam. kartragrahaṇānuvṛtṭyā *svāṅgakarmakāc ceti* (vārtt. 2 ad 20
loc., *Mbh.* I 279.21) pratiṣedhaḥ. tena parāṅgakarmakān na bhavati: vyādatte pipīlikā pataṅgasya mukham iti.⁴³⁷ viharāṅagrahaṇād āsyaviharaṇasamānakriyād api pratiṣedhaḥ.⁴³⁸ vipādikāṃ vyādadāti. āño do 'nāsyavikāsa iti na kṛtam vaicirtryārtham.

21. krīḍo 'nusaṃparibhyaś ca. (P.1.3.21)

(*Bhv.*:) ebhya āñaś ca krīḍates tat syāt. anukrīḍate. saṃkrīḍate. 25

⁴³⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: ner upasargasya grahaṇam – 'arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya grahaṇam' iti tasmād iha na bhavati – madhuni viśanti bhramarāḥ.

⁴³⁵ Cf. Puruṣottama on *PP* 114: jñāpakam cātrārthe 'parivyavebhyaḥ kriyaḥ' (P.1.3.18) ityādau nirdeśe krītyāder anukaraṇaśabdasya vibhaktiyutpattiyartham prātipadikatvābhyupagame 'pi dhātutvāśrayam iyañādeśakaraṇam iti.

⁴³⁶ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 28) and Abhyankar (1985: 279.7) have *je* instead of *jeḥ*. Kielhorn (1880-85: I 279.7) has *jeḥ*.

⁴³⁷ Pat. on vārtt. 2 ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 267.22–23) and *Kāś.* have the example: vyādadate pipīlikāḥ pataṅgasya mukham.

⁴³⁸ Cf. vārtt. 1 ad loc. (*āño do 'vyasanakriyasya*, *Mbh.* I 279.15) and Pat. on it (*so 'yam evaṃ siddhe sati yad viharāṅagrahaṇam karoti tasyaitat prayojanam āsyaviharaṇasamānakriyād api yathā syāt*, *Mbh.* I 279.18–19).

5

10

15 ||krīḍo|| āgamayasveti ānpūrvād gamer ṇyantāl loṭ madhyamapurūṣai-
 kavacanaṃ thāsaḥ se svābhyāṃ vāmau· mitāṃ hrasvaḥ
 śapaḥ gunāyādeśaḥ¹ vidyāsu śikṣata
 iti śakḷ śaktau san sani mīmetī[s] skor iti²
 salopaḥ³· atra lopa ity⁴ abhyāsalopaḥ⁵ vidyāṃ jijñāśitum
 20 ghaṭata ity arthaḥ⁶ āśiṣy eti⁷ niyamād yā[cñ]ādau⁸ na bhavati apaskirata iti
 kī viksepe apapūrvah⁹ apāc catuṣpād iti¹⁰ suṭ tudāditvāc
 chaḥ ṛṭa¹¹ id dhātor itītvaṃ raparatvaṃ
 harṣādayo na kiratyarthāḥ kin tarhi kiratyarthaviṣayāḥ¹² priyāyai¹³ śapata iti śapa
 ākrośe ślāghannu¹⁴ ityādinā sampradānatvaṃ caturthī¹⁵ ||

¹SJ: -śāḥ mā tvariṣṭhā iti pratīkṣasvety arthaḥ. ²SJ: mīmetryādinā aca is skoḥ saṃyogādyor ante ceti. ³SJ adds: sanaḥ kakārasya śatvam. ⁴SJ: lopo ḷbhyasasyeti. ⁵SJ adds: anena sannantād ātmanepadam. ⁶SJ adds: sarpiṣo nāthata iti. ⁷SJ: āśiṣyeva. ⁸SJ adds niyamo. ⁹SJ: apa pūrvāt kirateḥ. ¹⁰SJ adds -ādinā. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: tadartha-. ¹³SJ: priyāya. ¹⁴SJ adds: -sthāśapām. ¹⁵SJ: evam uttaratra.

parikrīḍate. ākrīḍate. *samo 'kūjane* (vārtt. 1 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.3) 'bhidhānān neha. samkrīḍanti rathāḥ. *āgameḥ kṣamāyām ātmanepadam.*⁴³⁹ āgamayasva tāvan māṇavaka. mā tvariṣṭhā ity arthaḥ. *śikṣer jijñāsāyām* (vārtt. 3 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.7⁴⁴⁰). kalāsu śikṣate. vidyāsu śikṣate. śakeḥ sani rūpam. *āśiṣy eva nāthaḥ.*⁴⁴¹ sarpiṣo nāthate gr̥dhnuḥ. *harater gatatācchīlye* (vārtt. 5 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.12). *gatavidhaprakārās tulyārthā* iti bhartṛhariḥ. sādṛśyaśilane hr̥nas tat syāt. jaladhim anuharate saraḥ. paitṛkam aśvā anuharante. *gatitācchīlya* iti tu nyāsaḥ.⁴⁴² *kirater harṣajñvikākulāyakaraṇeṣu* (vārtt. 4 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.9). apaskirate vṛṣabho hr̥ṣṭaḥ. apaskirate kukkuṭo bhakṣārthī. apaskirate śvāśrayārthī. *āñi nupracchyoḥ* (vārtt. 6 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.15). ānute śivā. ākrośatīty arthaḥ. āpṛcchate. *āpṛcchasva priyasakham amuṃ tuṅgam āliṅgya śailam* (*Meghadūta* 1.12a). *śapa upalambhane* (vārtt. 8 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.19). priyāyai śapate kāmukaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**krīḍo**||. āgamayasvety ānpūrvād gamer nyantāl loṭ. madhyamapurūṣaikavacanam. *thāsaḥ se* (P.3.4.80). *savābhyām vāmau* (P.3.4.91). *mitām hrasvaḥ* (P.6.4.92).⁴⁴³ śap (cf. P.3.1.68). guṇāyādeśaḥ (cf. P.7.3.84; 6.1.78). vidyāsu śikṣata iti śakḷ śaktau (*Dhp.* 5.15). san (cf. P.3.1.5 ff.). *sani mīmeti* (cf. P.7.4.54) is. *skor* iti (cf. P.8.2.29) salopaḥ. *atra lopa* ity (cf. P.7.4.58) abhyāsalopaḥ. vidyām jijñāsituṃ ghaṭata ity arthaḥ. *āśiṣy e<ve>*ti niyamād yācñādaḥ na bhavati.⁴⁴⁴ apaskirata iti *kṛ vikṣepe* (*Dhp.* 6.116). apapūrvāḥ. *apāc catuṣpād* iti (cf. P.6.1.142) suṭ. tudādītvaḥ chaḥ (cf. P.3.1.77). *ṛta id dhātor* iti (P.7.1.100) ittvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). harṣādayo na kiratyarthāḥ. kiṃ tarhi? kiratyarthaviṣayāḥ. priyāyai śapata iti *śapa ākrośe* (*Dhp.* 1.1049, 4.59). *ślāghahnun* ityādinā (P.1.4.34) sampradānatvam caturthī (cf. P.2.3.13).

22. samavaprabhīḥ sthāḥ. (P.1.3.22)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyas tiṣṭhates tat syāt. santiṣṭhate. avatiṣṭhate. pratiṣṭhate. vitiṣṭhamānaḥ. *āñāḥ sthāḥ pratijñāne* (vārtt. 1 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 280.22). vastu kṣaṇikam ātiṣṭhante bauddhāḥ.

⁴³⁹ Cf. vārtt. 2 ad loc. (*āgameḥ kṣamāyām*; *Mbh.* I 280.5), Pat. on it (*āgameḥ kṣamāyām upasamkhyānaṃ kartavyam*; *Mbh.* I 280.6) and *Kāś.* on P.1.3.21 (*āgameḥ kṣamāyām ātmanepadam vaktavyam*).

⁴⁴⁰ In Abhyankar's (1985) edition wrongly: *sikṣer jijñāsām*. Kielhorn (1880-85) has *śikṣer jijñāsāyām*.

⁴⁴¹ Cf. vārtt. 7 ad loc.: *āśiṣi nāthaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 280.17).

⁴⁴² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *harater gatitācchīlya* iti. *gates tācchīlyam gatitācchīlyam*.

⁴⁴³ The root *gam* is *mit* according to the *dhātusūtra*: *janījṛṣknasurañjo 'mantās ca* (see *Nyāsa* on P.1.3.21). In Böhtlingk's edition it is *Dhp.* 1.862–66: (862) *janī*, (863) *jṛy* (*jṛ*), (864) *knasu* (*śnasu*), (865) *rañjo*, (866) *'mantās ca*.

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.7: *nāthṛ yācñopatāpaiśvaryāśiṣṣu*.

5 ||prakā || svābhiprāyakathanam prakāśanam tiṣṭhanty atra janā
 ity adhikarane krtyalyuto bahulam iti yat | stheyo vivāda(pada)nirnetā
 ucyate tasyākhyā stheyākhyā¹ dhanibhya iti ślāghahnūṁ ityādinā
 sampradāne caturthi² ||

10

||udo || anūrdhvakarma anūrdhvakriyā ||³

15

20

||upāt || saṅgatakarānam apa([ri])citayor⁴ anyonyasaṁśleṣaḥ tena
 bharttāram upatiṣṭhātīty atrāprāptih rājā⁵ rājānam upatiṣṭhata ity⁶ [atrā]pi
 nāparicitayoh⁷ saṁśleṣo⁸ vivakṣitah kintūpakramaṇamātram⁹ ||

25

||akarma || yāvadbhojanam iti vīpsāyām avyayībhāvaḥ
 bhōjane bhōjane sannidhīyata ity arthaḥ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: tiṣṭhata iti atrāpi priyaṁ bodhayituṁ śapatham karotīty arthaḥ. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ:
 saṅgatakarānaparicitayor. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: -tīty. ⁷SJ adds paricayāya. ⁸SJ: -ṣatve. ⁹SJ: kintva-

23. prakāśanastheyākhyayoś ca. (P.1.3.23)

(*Bhv.*) atra sthas tat syāt. dhanibhyas tiṣṭhate veśyā. svam prakāśayatīty arthaḥ. nṛpatau tiṣṭhate janaḥ. taṃ stheyam karotīty arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**prakā**||. svābhiprāyakathanam **prakāśanam**.⁴⁴⁵ tiṣṭhanty atra janā 5
ity adhikaraṇe *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam* iti (P.3.3.113) yat: **stheyo** vivādapadanirṇetā
ucyate. tasyākhyā **stheyākhyā**.⁴⁴⁶ dhanibhya iti *ślāghahnunī* ityādinā (P.1.4.34)
saṃpradāne caturthī (cf. P.2.3.13).

24. udo 'nūrdhvakarmaṇi. (P.1.3.24)

(*Bhv.*) udasthas tat syād anūrdhvaceṣṭāyām. svārtheṣūttiṣṭhate. 10
muktāv uttiṣṭhate janaḥ, tatrotsahata ity arthaḥ. anūrdhvagrahaṇam
kim? javena pīṭhād udatiṣṭhad acyutaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**udo**||. **anūrdhvakarma** anūrdhvakriyā.

25. upān mantrakaraṇe. (P.1.3.25)

(*Bhv.*) upāt sthas tat syān mantraś cet karaṇam. gāyatrīyā sūryam 15
upatiṣṭhate brāhmaṇaḥ. **upād devapūjāsaṅgatakarāṇamitrakarāṇa-**
pathiṣv iti vaktavyam.⁴⁴⁷ vipro 'rkam upatiṣṭhate. gaṅgā samudram
upatiṣṭhate. rājā rājānam upatiṣṭhate. ayaṃ panthāḥ kapitthīm
upatiṣṭhate. **vā lipsāyām** (vārtt. 2 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 281.15). arthī dātāram
upatiṣṭhate upatiṣṭhati vā. 20

(*Pañj.*) ||**upāt**||. **saṅgatakarāṇam** aparicitayor anyonyasaṃśleṣaḥ. tena
bhartāram upatiṣṭhatīty atrāprāptiḥ. **rājā rājānam upatiṣṭhata** ity atrāpi
nāparicitayoḥ saṃśleṣo vivakṣitaḥ kiṃ tūpakramaṇamātram.

26. akarmakāc ca. (P.1.3.26)

(*Bhv.*) upāt sthas tat syāt. yāvadbhojanam upatiṣṭhate. akarmakād 25
vidhiś catuḥsūtryām.

(*Pañj.*) ||**akarma**||. **yāvadbhojanam** iti vīpsāyām avyayībhāvaḥ (cf. P.2.1.6).
bhojane bhojane saṃnidhīyata ity arthaḥ.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁵ Also found in *Kāś.* ad loc.

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *tiṣṭhanty asminn iti stheyaḥ vivādapadanirṇetā loke stheya iti prasiddhaḥ. tasya pratipattiyartham ākhyāgrahaṇam.*

⁴⁴⁷ Pat. on vārtt. 1 ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 281.12). He quotes the opinion of other grammarians.

⁴⁴⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **yāvadbhuktam** iti. *yāvaccabdo nipāto 'vyayam, tasya yathārthe vīpsāyām avyayībhāvaḥ, saptamyantaṃ caitat. ata evāha bhojane bhojane saṃnidhīyata iti.*

5

||āñ|| āyacchata iti isugamiyamām chaḥ che ceti
 tuk· stor iti ścutvaṃ· āhata iti anudāttopadeśa ityādinā
 10 nalopah ||¹

15

||samah|| samjagma iti lit ta eś gamahanety
 upadhālopaḥ sthānivadbhāvā dvirvacanam
 abhyāsakāryam recheḥ anādeśasya grahaṇam artyādeśasya
 tv arttīty evam siddhatvād ata evāśīti lṛd udāharanam āha
 20 samrechiyata iti samprechata iti praccha jñīpsāyām tudāditvāc
 chaḥ grahyādinā samprasāraṇam samsvarata iti svṛ
 śabdopatāpayoḥ samrechata iti artteḥ śīpi pāghrādinā
 rchādeśaḥ samśrūta iti śru vane· śruvaḥ śṛ ceti śnuḥ
 śṛbhāvaś ca{h} ||²

25

||nisa|| na vyo liṭīty ātvanīṣe[dh]āt jñāpakāt kvacid vikṛtir api

30

¹SJ om. ²SJ om.

27. udvibhyāṃ tapaḥ. (P.1.3.27)

(*Bhv.*) ābhyāṃ tapas tat syāt. uttapate vitapate raviḥ. akarmakād ity eva. uttapati suvarṇaṃ suvarṇakāraḥ. *svāṅgakarmakāc ca* (vārtt. 1 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 281.20). vitapate svam prṣṭham.

28. āṅo yamahanaḥ. (P.1.3.28)

(*Bhv.*) tat syāt. āyacchate. vyāyacchamānaḥ. āhate. *svāṅgakarmakāc ca* (vārtt. 1 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 282.8). āhate svam vakṣaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**āṅ**||. āyacchata iti *iṣugamiyamām chaḥ* (P.7.3.77). *che ceti* (P.6.1.73) tuk. *stor* iti (cf. P.8.4.40) ścutvam. āhata ity *anudāttopadeśa* ityādinā (P.6.4.37) nalopaḥ.

29. samo gamyṛcchīpracchisvaratyartiśruvidibhyaḥ.⁴⁴⁹ (P.1.3.29)

(*Bhv.*) saṃpūrvād gamādes tat syāt. saṅgacchate. saṅjagme. samṛcchate. samṛcchiṣyate. samṛcchate. saṃsvarate. ṛ. samṛcchate. samiyṛte.⁴⁵⁰ saṃśṛṇute. vida jñāne. saṃvitte. akarmakād ity eva. bādham saṅgacchati. *drśeś ceti vaktavyam* (*Kāś.* ad loc.). sampaśyate.

(*Pañj.*) ||**samaḥ**||. saṃjagma iti liṭ ta eś (cf. P.3.4.81). *gamahanety* (cf. P.6.4.98) upadhālopaḥ. sthānivadbhāvā⟨d⟩ dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.8 and P.1.1.59). abhyāsakāryam (cf. P.8.4.54; 7.4.60). ṛcher anādeśasya grahaṇam⁴⁵¹ artyādeśasya tv **artī**ty evam siddhatvāt.⁴⁵² ata evāṣiti (cf. P.7.3.78) lṛḍ udāharaṇam āha **samṛcchiṣyata** iti. **samṛcchata** iti *praccha jñāpsāyām* (*Dhp.* 6.120). tudādītīvāc chaḥ (cf. P.3.1.77). grahyādinā saṃprasāraṇam (cf. P.6.1.16). **saṃsvarata** iti *svṛ śabdopatāpayoḥ* (*Dhp.* 1.979). **samṛcchata** ity arteḥ **śīti** pāghrādinā (cf. P.7.3.78) ṛchādeśaḥ. **saṃśṛṇuta** iti *śru* ⟨*śra*⟩*vaṇe* (*Dhp.* 1.989). *śruvaḥ śṛ ceti* (P.3.1.74) śnuḥ śṛbhāvaś ca.

30. nisamupavibhyo hvaḥ. (P.1.3.30)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyo hveṇas tat syāt. nihvayate tvām. saṃhvayate sakhīm. upahvayate. vihvayate. *upasargād asyatyūhyor vāvacanam* (vārtt. 3 on P.1.3.29, *Mbh.* I 282.17). nirasyati nirasyate. samūhan samūhamānaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**nisa**||. *na vyo liṭīty* (P.6.1.46) āttvanīṣedhāj jñāpakāt *kvacid vikṛtir api*

⁴⁴⁹ This *sūtra* encloses the original *sūtra* of Pāṇini (*samo gamyṛcchībhyaṃ*, cf. *Mbh.* I 282.10) and two *vārttikas* of Kātyāyana on it. Cf. vārtt. 1 (*samo gamādiṣu vidhīpracchisvaratīnām upasaṃkhyānam*, *Mbh.* I 282.11) and 2 (*artiśrudrśībhyaś ca*, line 14) ad loc.

⁴⁵⁰ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971) and Mishra (1989) add: **śru**.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. *Dhp.* 6.15: *ṛcha gatīndriyapralayamūrtibhāveṣu*.

⁴⁵² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ṛcher anādeśasya grahaṇam – samṛcchiṣyate. artyādeśasya tv artīty evam siddham ātmanepadam*.

prakṛtiṃ gr̥hṇātīty ekāravato pi tañ bhavatīty ata āha nihvayata iti śap
 ayādeśaḥ nirasyata iti asu kṣepaṇe
 divāditvāt śyan· samūhamāna iti ūha vitarke laṭaḥ
 śānac śap āne muk ||¹

5

||sparddhā || sparddhā parābhibhavecchā ||²

10

15 ||gandha || udākuruta iti laṭ ta ṭer etvaṃ· ata ut
 sārvadhātuka ity utvaṃ· sevanam anuvṛtṭiḥ paracittāvādhanam
 sāhasikyam sahasā yatra karma nivṛtyateya tat | sato guṇāntarādhānam
 pratiyatnaḥ kr̥ṇaḥ pratiyatna iti śaṣṭhī sud ity upāt pratiyatna
 ityādinā prakathanam prakarṣeṇa kathanam ||³

20

||adheḥ || tam adhikakra iti karoter liṭ ta eś⁴ yaṇādeśaḥ
 sthānivatvā dvirvacanam⁵ adhikurva-
 25 ta iti laṭ prathamapurūṣabahuvacanam⁶ dhātor guṇaḥ raparatvaṃ
 ata ut sārvadhātuka ity utvaṃ· vikareṇokārasya⁷ yaṇādeśaḥ
 ātmanepadeṣv anata ity atādeśaḥ upekṣanta ity arthaḥ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ om. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: tatra. ⁵SJ: dvirvacanam sthānivadbhāvāt. ⁶SJ adds:
 jha pratyayaḥ. ⁷SJ: ṛkārokārasya.

*prakṛtiṃ grhṇātīty*⁴⁵³ ekāravato 'pi tañ bhavatīty⁴⁵⁴ ata āha **nihvayata** iti śap (cf. P.3.1.68). ayādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.78). **nirasyata** ity *asu kṣepaṇe* (*Dhp.* 4.100). divāditvāt śyan (cf. P.3.1.69). **samūhamāna** ity *ūha vitarke* (*Dhp.* 1.679). laṭaḥ śānac (cf. P.3.2.124 ff.). śap (cf. P.3.1.68). *āne muk* (P.7.2.82).

31. *spardhāyām āñah.* (P.1.3.31)

(*Bhv.:*) āño hveñas tat syāt spardhā cet. mallo mallam āhvayate.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**spardhā**||. *spardhā* parābhibhavecchā.

32. *gandhanāvakṣepaṇasevanasāhasikyapratiyatnaprakathano- payogeṣu kṛñah.* (P.1.3.32)

(*Bhv.:*) eṣv artheṣu kṛñas tat syāt. **hiṃsāsūcanam** gandhanam. **udākurute.** **bhartsanam** avakṣepaṇam. **utkurute śatrūn.** **sevane nṛpaṃ prakurute.** **sāhase parastrīm prakurute.** **dharmādyupayoge śataṃ prakurute.** **pratiyatne ṣaṣṭhī suṭ ca.** **guṇānām upaskurute.** **prakathane saddharmam prakurute.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**gandha**||. **udākuruta** iti laṭ. ta. ṭer etvam (cf. P.3.4.79). *ata ut* **sārvadhātuka** ity (P.6.4.110) uttvam. **sevanam** anuvṛttiḥ paracittāvadhāraṇam.⁴⁵⁵ **sāhasikyam** sahasā yatra karma nirvṛtyate tat.⁴⁵⁶ sato guṇāntarādhānam **pratiyatnaḥ.**⁴⁵⁷ *kṛñah pratiyatna* iti (P.2.3.53) ṣaṣṭhī. **suḍ** ity *upāt pratiyatna* ityādinā (P.6.1.139). **prakathanam** prakarṣeṇa kathanam.⁴⁵⁸

33. *adheḥ prasahane.* (P.1.3.33)

(*Bhv.:*) prasahanam abhibhavaḥ. upekṣā vā. tatrādheḥ kṛñas tat syāt. tam adhikakre. *bhavādṛśās ced adhikurvate ratim* (*Kirātārjunīya* 1.43c).

(*Pañj.:*) ||**adheḥ**||. **tam adhikakra** iti karoter liṭ. ta. eś (cf. P.3.4.81). yañādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.77). sthānivattvā⟨d⟩ dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.8 and P.1.1.59). **adhikurva-
ta** iti laṭ. prathamapurūṣabhuvacanam. dhātor guṇaḥ (cf. P.7.3.84). raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). *ata ut sārvadhātuka* ity (P.6.4.110) uttvam. vikareṇokārasya yañādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.77). *ātmanepadeṣv anata* ity (P.7.1.5) atādeśaḥ. upekṣanta ity arthaḥ.

⁴⁵³ *Nyāsa* ad loc. (see the next fn.). Cf. also *Jñ.S.* p. 81: *vikṛtir api prakṛtiṃ grhṇāti*.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca kṛtāttvasya nirdeśād atrātmanepadena na bhavitavyam, na hi vikṛtiḥ prakṛtiṃ grhṇāti, anyatvāt. naiṣa doṣaḥ, kvacid vikṛtir api prakṛtiṃ grhṇāty eva. katham jñāyate? yad ayam 'na vyo liṭi' iti (P.6.1.46) kṛtāttvasya vyeṇo nirdeśenāttvapratīṣedham śasti, tato jñāyate – vikṛtir api prakṛtiṃ grhṇātīti, anyathā 'vyah' iti (cf. P.6.1.46) nirdeśena vyeṇā grahaṇābhāvāt kasyāyam pratīṣedhaḥ syāt.*

⁴⁵⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc. (*sevanam anuvṛttiḥ*) and *Nyāsa* on it (*anuvṛttiḥ paracittāvadhāraṇam*).

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *sāhasikyam sāhasikam karma*.

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pratiyatnaḥ sato guṇāntarādhānam*.

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *prakathanam prakarṣeṇa kathanam*.

||veḥ śabda || karmaśabdaḥ kriyāvācī na bhavati vipūrvasya karoteḥ
 śabdanakriyāyām vṛtyasambhavāt· dhātvarthasya śabdakarmakatvāt¹ dhātur apy
 5 upacāreṇa śabdakarmā² ||

||aka || avidyamānaṃ karma yasyeti³ so 'karmmakāḥ karoteḥ sakarmakāḥ
 10 iti⁴ viśeṣaṇaṃ jñāpayati sakarmakasyāpi {kartṛstho bhavaty eva}⁵ dhātoḥ
 karmāvivakṣāyām kvacid akarmakatvaṃ ||

15

20

25 ||kartṛ || kāyagrahaṇe kāryye⁶ śarīragrahaṇāc⁷ charīraikadeśe⁸ śarīraśabdo⁹
 varttate¹⁰ sthagrahaṇāc ca nahi kartṛstho buddhīndriyādih¹¹ sambhavati tadekadeśo
 pi¹² kartṛstho bhavaty eva paryāyaśabdānāṃ gurulāghavaçarcā¹³ nāndriyata iti
 vaicitryārthaṃ¹⁴ [a]śarīre kiṃ gaḍuṃ vinayati ||

¹SJ: sambhavāt. ²SJ: śabdakarma upacāreṇa. ³SJ: yasmin. ⁴SJ: sakarmakasya akarmakād
 api. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: karttavaye yac. ⁷SJ: -ṇaṃ. ⁸SJ: -śaḥ. ⁹SJ: -grahaṇena. ¹⁰SJ: gṛhyate.
¹¹SJ: buddhīndriyadehasamudāyaḥ. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: cintā. ¹⁴SJ: vaicitryaphalam.

34. veḥ śabdakarmanāḥ. (P.1.3.34)*(Bhv.):* veḥ kṛñāḥ śabdakarmakāt tat syāt. kroṣṭā vikurute svarān.*(Pañj.):* ||**veḥ śabda**||. karmaśabdaḥ kriyāvācī na bhavati vipūrvasya karoteḥ śabdanakriyāyāṃ vṛttiyasambhavāt.⁴⁵⁹ dhātvarthasya śabdakarmakatvād dhātur apy upacāreṇa śabdakarmā.⁴⁶⁰

5

35. akarmakāc ca. (P.1.3.35)*(Bhv.):* akarmakād veḥ kṛñas tat syāt. vikurvate cchātrāḥ. yatheṣṭaṃ ceṣṭanta ity arthaḥ.*(Pañj.):* ||**aka**||. avidyamānaṃ karma yasyeti so '**karmakaḥ**. karoter akarmakād iti viśeṣaṇaṃ jñāpayati: sakarmakasyāpi dhātoḥ karmāvivakṣāyāṃ kvacid akarmaka-
tvam.

10

**36. sammānanotsañjanācāryakaraṇajñānabhṛtavigaṇana-
vyayeṣu niyaḥ.** (P.1.3.36)*(Bhv.):* eṣv artheṣu viśeṣaṇeṣu nīnas tat syāt. śāstrārthaṃ nayate. upapattibhiḥ sammānayati. bālakaṃ upanayate. utsañjayaty
utkṣipati. śiṣyaṃ upanayate. ātmavad ācāryīkaroti. nayate 'rthān
dhīraḥ. jñānaviṣayīkaroti. karmakarān upanayate. bhṛtyā samīpī-
karoti. vigaṇanam ṛṇādipariśodhanam. madrāḥ kāraṃ vinayante.
vyaye. śataṃ vinayate dharmādau.

15

37. kartṛsthe cāsarīre karmaṇi. (P.1.3.37)*(Bhv.):* aśarīre karmaṇi sati nīnas tat syāt. krodhaṃ vinayate. manyuṃ
vinayate. **kartṛsthe** kim? guroḥ kopaṃ vinayati. **aśarīre** kim? gaḍuṃ
vinayati. maṇḍūkaplutyā *ver* ity (cf. P.1.3.34) eva. krodhaṃ samunna-
yati. *apanaya mānini mānam*.

20

(Pañj.): ||**kartṛ**||. kāyagrahaṇe kārye śarīragrahaṇāc charīraikadeśe śarīraśabdo
vartate sthagrahaṇāc ca.⁴⁶¹ na hi kartṛstho buddhīndriyādih sambhavati. tadekadeśo
'pi kartṛstho bhavaty eva. *paryāyaśabdānām gurulāghavacarcā nādriyata* iti (*SP* 122,
NP 115) vaicitryārtham. **aśarīre kim? gaḍuṃ vinayati.**

25

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *karmaśabda iha kārakābhīdhāyī na kriyāvācanaḥ*. Cf. also *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha kriyābhīdhāyī kasmān na bhavati? vipūrvasya karoteḥ śabdanakriyāyāṃ vṛttiyasambhavāt*.

⁴⁶⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *dhātor arthadvāraṃ cedam viśeṣaṇaṃ – śabdaḥ karmāsyeti śabdakarmā dhātvarthaḥ. tadarthasya śabdakarmatvāt tadvāreṇa dhātur api śabdakarmeti, anyathā hi kriyāvācītvād dhātoḥ kathaṃ śabdaḥ karmāsyeti sambandha upapadyate*.

⁴⁶¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *iha laghutvāt kāyagrahaṇe kartavye yac charīragrahaṇaṃ karoti tac charīraikadeśo 'pi śarīraśrutya nāma gṛhyetetyevamartham*.

||vṛtti|| yuddhāya kramata¹ iti kriyāgrahaṇam api (karttavyam iti)

5 saṃpradāna(tve) caturthī||

||upa|| ābhyām evety² avadhāranena³ vṛtyādi[śū]pasargāntayoge

10 nātmanepadam⁴||

15

20

25

||aka|| anupasargāt jñā iti kartrabhiprāye siddhe tad itaratrāyam
 ārambhaḥ | karaṇe śaṣṭhī jñō 'vidarthasya karaṇa ity anena sarpīṣo
 jānīta iti sarpīṣopāyena pravarttata ity arthaḥ (pra)vṛttau sarpīḥ karaṇam na karmety
 akarmakatvam ||⁵

¹SJ adds bhāṭa. ²SJ om. eva. ³SJ: -ṇam. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om.

38. vṛttisargatāyaneṣu kramaḥ. (P.1.3.38)

(*Bhv.*) apratighātotsāhasphītatveṣu krames tat syāt. manre 'sya kramate buddhiḥ. yuddhāya kramate bhaṭaḥ. prājñe śāstrāṇi kramante.

(*Pañj.*) ||**vṛtti**||. yuddhāya kramata iti *kriyāgrahaṇam api kartavyam* iti (Pat. on P.1.4.32, *Mbh.* I 330.18) sampradānatve caturthī (cf. P.2.3.13). 5

39. upaparābhyām. (P.1.3.39)

(*Bhv.*) ābhyām evopasṛṣṭāt kramer anantarasūtreṇātmanepadaṃ syāt. manre 'syopakramate buddhiḥ. yuddhāya parākramate bhaṭa ityādi.

(*Pañj.*) ||**upa**||. ābhyām evety avadhāraṇena vṛttyādiṣūpasargānta(ṛa)yoge nātmanepadam. 10

40. āṇa udgamane. (P.1.3.40)

(*Bhv.*) āṇaḥ krames tat syāt. ākramate bhānuḥ. *jyotirudgamane abhidhānān neha. ākrāmāti dhūmo harmyatalam.*⁴⁶² udgamane kim? ākrāmāti giriṃ raviḥ. avaṣṭabhnātīty arthaḥ.

41. veḥ pādaviharaṇe. (P.1.3.41) 15

(*Bhv.*) veḥ krameḥ pādavikṣepe tat syāt. suṣṭhu vikramate 'śvaḥ.

42. propābhyāṃ samarthābhyām. (P.1.3.42)

(*Bhv.*) ādikarmaṇi samarthābhyāṃ propābhyāṃ krames tat syāt. prakramate bhoktum. upakramate śrotum.

43. anupasargād vā. (P.1.3.43) 20

(*Bhv.*) aprādeḥ krames tad vā syāt. kramate krāmāti vā.

44. apahnave jñāḥ. (P.1.3.44)

(*Bhv.*) nihnutau jñātes tat syāt. śatam apajānīte.

45. akarmakāc ca. (P.1.3.45)

(*Bhv.*) jño 'karmakāt tat syāt. sarpiṣo jānīte. karaṇe ṣaṣṭhī. 25

(*Pañj.*) ||**aka**||. *anupasargāj jñā* iti (P.1.3.76) kartrabhiprāye siddhe tad itaratrāyam ārambhaḥ.⁴⁶³ **karaṇe ṣaṣṭhī jño** 'vidarthasya karaṇa ity (P.2.3.51) anena.⁴⁶⁴ **sarpiṣo jānīta** iti sarpiṣopāyena pravartata ity arthaḥ. pravṛttau sarpiḥ karaṇaṃ na karmety akarmakatvam.⁴⁶⁵

⁴⁶² Cf. vārtt. ad loc.: *jyotiṣām udgamane* (*Mbh.* I 282.20) and Pat. on it: *jyotirudgamana iti vaktavyam. iha mā bhūt. ākrāmāti dhūmo harmyatalam iti* (*Mbh.* I 282.21).

⁴⁶³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *akartrabhiprāyārtham idam, kartrabhiprāye hi 'anupasargāj jñāḥ' iti* (P.1.3.76) *jñāter akarmakād akarmakakriyāvacanād ātmanepadaṃ bhavati.*

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *tathā ca – 'jño 'vidarthasya karaṇe' iti* (P.2.3.51) *ṣaṣṭhī vidhīyate.*

⁴⁶⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *sarpiṣo jānīte madhuno jānīte. katham cāyam akarmakaḥ? nātra sarpirādi jñeyatvena vivakṣitam. kiṃ tarhi? jñānapūrvikāyāṃ pravṛttau karaṇatvena.*

5

10

15

||ano || anuvadate kaṭhaḥ kālāpasyeti anu¹ sādrśye kalāpa² iva
 20 kaṭho vadatīty arthaḥ kaṭhena proktaḥ kaṭhaḥ³ tena proktam ity
 aṅ tasya {ṭha} kaṭhacarakāl⁴ luk taṃ grantham adhīte vetti vā⁵ ity aṅ
 tasya proktāl luk chandobrāhmaṇāni ca tadviśayānīti
 adhyetrveditrviśayatā kaṭhaḥ kaṭhamuniproktasyādhyetā veditā vā
 kālāpa iti kalāpinā proktaḥ kālāpaḥ kalāpino 'ṅ sabrahmacārītyādinā
 25 ṭilopaḥ tad adhīte tad vedety aṅ pūrvaval luk⁶ tadviśayatā ca
 śeṣavivakṣāyāṃ ṣaṣṭhī ||

¹SJ: anuśabdaḥ. ²SJ: kālāpa. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds lug iti. ⁵SJ adds: tad adhīta. ⁶SJ om.
 Cf. also p. 89* fn. 2.

46. sampratibhyām anādhyāne. (P.1.3.43)

(*Bhv.*) ābhyām jñas tat syāt. gām sañjānīte. kanyām dātum pratijānīte. anādhyāne kim? smṛtau mā bhūt. mātuh samjānāti. smaratīty arthaḥ.

47. bhāsanopasambhāṣājñānayatnavimatyupamantraṇeṣu vadaḥ. (P.1.3.47) 5

(*Bhv.*) eṣv artheṣu viśeṣaṇeṣu vades tat syāt. bhāsanam śobhā. vadate cārīvī lokāyate. vadamānaḥ. upasambhāṣopasāntvanam. bālakam upavadate. jñāne. ayam eko vadate. yatne. gehe vadate. vividhamatau. kṣetre vivadante kṛṣakāḥ. upamantraṇam rahaḥpṛcchā. parastrīm upavadate. 10

48. vyaktavācāṃ samuccāraṇe. (P.1.3.48)

(*Bhv.*) manuṣyāṇām sahoktau vades tat syāt. sampravadante viprāḥ. vyaktavācām iti kim? varatanu sampravadanti kukkuṭāḥ. sahoktau kim? krameṇa vadanti cchātrāḥ. 15

49. anor akarmakāt. (P.1.3.49)

(*Bhv.*) anor vades tat syāt. anuvadate kaṭhaḥ kalāpasya. tadvad vadatīty arthaḥ. akarmakāt kim? pūrvoktam anuvadati.

(*Pañj.*) || **ano** ||. anuvadate kaṭhaḥ kalāpasyety anu sādṛṣye. kalāpa iva kaṭho vadatīty arthaḥ. kaṭhena proktaḥ kaṭhaḥ. tena proktam ity (P.4.3.101) aṇ. tasya kaṭhacarakāl luk (P.4.3.107). taṃ grantham adhīte vetti vā ity aṇ (cf. P.4.2.59). tasya proktāl luk (P.4.2.64) chandobrāhmaṇāni ca tadviśayāṇīty (P.4.2.66) adhyeṭṛveditṛviśayatā.⁴⁶⁶ kaṭhaḥ kaṭhamuniproktasyādhyetā veditā vā. **kalāpa** iti kalāpinā proktaḥ kālāpaḥ. kalāpino 'ṇ (P.4.3.108). sabrahmacārītyādinā⁴⁶⁷ ṭilopaḥ. tad adhīte tad vedety (P.4.2.59) aṇ. pūrvaval luk tadviśayatā ca. śeṣavivakṣāyām ṣaṣṭhī (cf. P.2.3.50). 25

50. vibhāṣā vipralāpe. (P.1.3.50)

(*Bhv.*) vipralāpātmake sahoccāraṇe vades tad vā syāt. vipravadante gaṇakā vipravadanti vā. sahoktau kim? krameṇa vadanti cchātrāḥ.

51. avād graḥ. (P.1.3.51) 30

(*Bhv.*) avād girates tat syāt. avagirate māṃsam avagirante māṃsam.

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.4.2.66: **kaṭhena proktam** iti. 'kalāpivaiśampāyanāntevāsibhyaś ca' (P.4.3.104) iti *ṇiniḥ*, tasya 'kaṭhacarakāl luk' (P.4.3.107), tataḥ kaṭhena proktam (cf. P.4.3.101) adhīte tad vedeti (cf. P.4.2.59) *punar aṇ*, tasyāpi 'proktāl luk' (P.4.2.64) iti luk.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.6.4.144: *nakārāntasya ṭilope sabrahmacāri-pūṭhasarpi-kalāpi-kuthumi-taitilī-jājali-lāṅgali-śilālī-śikhāṇḍi-sūkarasadma-supaṛvaṇām upasaṃkhyānam* (*Mbh.* II 225.18–19). This vārttika appears in the *Kāśikā* on P.4.3.108. Cf. also *Bhv.* on P.4.3.108: 'sabhmacāri' iti ṭilopaḥ.

||avāt || avapūrvasya gṛśabdasya¹ prayogo nāstīti²
 gṛ nigaraṇa ity asya grahaṇam· avagirata iti tudāditvāc chaḥ
 rta īd dhātor itītvam raparatvam abhyava-
 haratīty arthaḥ ||

5

10

15

||dāṇaḥ || samprayacchata iti dāṇa dāne paghrādisūtrena³
 yacchādeśaḥ· sama ity etasya viśeṣanaśaṣṭhyām⁴ pra-
 śabdena vyavadhāne py ātmanepadam ||

20

||upāt || svakaraṇam iha pānigrahaṇam vivahanam ucyate tenāuro
 25 munibharyyām upayacchatīty atra na bhavati upāyaṃsata nāsavaṃ
 śāstrāṇy upāyaṃsa⁵ ityādāv upacārād ātmanepadam ||

¹SJ: gṛṇaḥ. ²SJ adds: chandobrāhmaṇāni ca tadviśayāṇīti adhyetṛveditṛviśayatā kaṭhaḥ
 kaṭhamuniproktasyādhyetā veditā vā | kālāpasyeti kalāpinā proktaḥ kālāpaḥ kalāpino 'ṇ sabrah-
 macārītyādinā ṭilopaḥ tad adhīta ity aṇ. Cf. also p. 88* fn. 6. ³SJ: pāghrādinā. ⁴SJ: asya
 śeṣaśaṣṭhyā. ⁵SJ: śāstrāṇy upāyaṃsata jitvarāṇītyādau.

(*Pañj.*) ||**avāt**||. avapūrvasya gṛ śabda ity (*Dhp.* 9.28) asya prayogo nāstīti gṛ nigaraṇa ity (*Dhp.* 6.117) asya grahaṇam.⁴⁶⁸ **avagirata** iti tudādītṛvāc chaḥ (cf. P.3.1.77). ṛta īd dhātor iti (P.7.1.100) ittvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). abhyava-
haratīty arthaḥ.

52. samaḥ pratijñāte. (P.1.3.52)

5

(*Bhv.*) saṅgirateḥ pratijñānārthāt tat syāt. kāryam śabdaṃ saṅgirate.

53. udaś caraḥ sakarmakāt. (P.1.3.53)

(*Bhv.*) uccarates tat syāt. ghanān uccarate rajaḥ. utkramya gacchatīty arthaḥ. sakarmakāt kim? śaṅkhadhvanir udacarat. nāda uccarati.

54. samas ṛtīyāyuktāt. (P.1.3.54)

10

(*Bhv.*) ṛtīyāntena yoge saṃcarates tat syāt. rathena saṃcarate vidyā-
dharah.

55. dāṇas ca sā cec caturthyarthe. (P.1.3.55)

(*Bhv.*) aśiṣṭavyavahāre caturthyarthe ṛtīyā vācyā. tadyuktāt sampra-
dāṇas tat syāt. dāsyā mālām samprayacchate kāmukaḥ. dāsyai mālām
dadātīty arthaḥ.

15

(*Pañj.*) ||**dāṇaḥ**||. samprayacchata iti dāṇa dāne (*Dhp.* 1.977). pāghrādisūtrena (cf. P.7.3.78) yacchādeśaḥ. sama ity (cf. P.1.3.54) etasya viśeṣaṇaṣṭhyām pra-
śabdena vyavadhāne 'py ātmanepadam.⁴⁶⁹

56. upād yamaḥ svakaraṇe. (P.1.3.56)

20

(*Bhv.*) upapūrvād yameḥ svīkāre tat syāt. kanyām upayacchate. **upāyaṃsata mahāstrāṇi** (*Bhaṭṭ.* 15.21c). **upāyaṃsata nāsavam** (*Bhaṭṭ.* 8.33b). na svīcakrur ity arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**upāt**||. **svakaraṇam** iha pānigrahaṇam vivahanam ucyate tenāsure munibhāryām upayacchatīty atra na bhavati. **upāyaṃsata nāsavam** (*Bhaṭṭ.* 8.33b) 25
śastrāṇy upāyaṃsata ityādāv (*Bhaṭṭ.* 1.16b) upacārād ātmanepadam.

57. jñāśrusmṛdṛśām sanah. (P.1.3.57)

(*Bhv.*) sannantānām eṣām tat syāt. dharmam jijñāsate. guruṃ
śuśrūṣate. susmūrṣate. didṛkṣate.

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'gṛ nigaraṇe' iti tudādau paṭhyate. tasyedaṃ grahaṇam. na tu 'gṛ śabde' iti kryādīpaṭhitasya. tasya hy avapūrvasya prayoga eva nāsti.

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: samaḥ praśabdena vyavadhāne katham ātmanepadam bhavati? 'samaḥ' iti viśeṣaṇe ṣaṣṭhī na pañcamī.

||jñāśru || sūtre 'vayavāvayavisambandham¹ ṣaṣṭhī tad ayam arthaḥ eṣām
 avayavānām yo 'vayavī samudāyaḥ sannantas tasmād ātmanepadam syāt² jijñāsata
 iti jñāteḥ san dvirvacanam abhyāsakāryyahrasvatvam³
 śuśrūṣata iti śr̥noteḥ san⁴ iko jhal iti kitvād⁵ adguṇaḥ⁶.
 5 ajjhanagamām sanīti dīrghatvam⁷ ṣatvam halādiśeṣaḥ⁸ |
 susmūrṣata iti smṛ cintāyām sanīti⁹ dīrghaḥ
 udoṣṭhyapūrvasyety utvaṃ rapa{ra}ratvam¹⁰ hali ceti
 dīrghaḥ smṛṣaśabdena¹¹ dvirvacanam¹² didṛkṣata iti halaṭantāc ceti
 kitvam ato guṇāmau¹³ na bhavataḥ¹⁴ yatra viṣaye
 10 mūlaprakṛter ātmanepadam vihitam samo gamīti¹⁵ apahnave jña ity-
 ādinā [ta]tra¹⁶ pūrvat sana ity anenaiva siddham ātmanepadam
 yatrārthena tu¹⁷ vihitam tadartham idaṃ smarateḥ punaḥ kenāpi na¹⁸ vihitam iti
 tasya sarvathāprāptam¹⁹ ||

15

||nāno || sakarmakasyāyam pratiśedhaḥ anantarasya²⁰ vidhir vā²¹ bhavati
 pratiśedho veti vacanāt yatra tv²² akarmmakāc cety anena
 na²³ vihitam tatra pūrvavat sana ity ātmanepadam²⁴ ||

20

||pratyā || pratyāñāv upasargāv iha gr̥hyete dhātvarthasambandhena tena
 karmpravacanīyayoge na bhavati tena²⁵ devadattam prati śuśrūṣata iti ||

25

||śadeḥ || śinnimittād iti etena kāraṇe kāryyopacārāt śitpratyayanimittāḥ
 śadiḥ śad²⁶ ity uktaḥ tasya²⁷ bhaviṣyataḥ śitpratyayasyāpi śadir²⁸ nimittam bhavaty

¹SJ: -ndhe avayavāt tu. ²SJ: iti. ³SJ: hrasvaḥ sany ata itītvam. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: kittvam.
⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: dīrghaḥ. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: san. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: smara-. ¹²SJ: dvirvacanakāryyam.
¹³SJ: kittvād guṇo 'māgamaś ca. ¹⁴SJ: bhavati. ¹⁵SJ: samogamṛcchi. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ:
 kevalād api tad. ¹⁹SJ: -ptiḥ. ²⁰SJ: -rantasya. ²¹SJ om. ²²SJ: yad. ²³SJ: evaṃ. ²⁴SJ adds:
 bhavaty eva auśadhasyārtham jijñāsata iti. ²⁵SJ om. ²⁶SJ: śid. ²⁷SJ om. ²⁸SJ: śadin.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**jñāśru**||. sūtre 'vayavāvayavisambandhe ṣaṣṭhī. tad ayam arthaḥ: eṣām avayavānām yo 'vayavī samudāyaḥ sannantas tasmād ātmanepadam syāt. **jijñāsata** iti jānāteḥ san. dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.9). abhyāsakāryahrasvatvam (cf. P.7.4.60 and P.7.4.59, 79). **śuśrūṣata** iti śṛnoteḥ san. *iko jhal* iti (P.1.2.9) kittvād agunaḥ. *ajjhanagamām sanāti* (P.6.4.16) dīrghatvam. ṣatvam (cf. P.8.3.59). halādiśeṣaḥ (cf. P.7.4.60). **susmūrṣata** iti *smṛ cintāyām* (*Dhp.* 1.980). *sanāti* (cf. P.6.4.16) dīrghaḥ. *udoṣṭhyapūrvasyety* (P.7.1.102) uttvam raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). *hali ceti* (P.8.2.77) dīrghaḥ. smṛṣaśabdena dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.2, 9). **didṛkṣata** iti halantāc ceti (P.1.2.10) kittvam. ato guṇāmau (cf. P.7.3.84; 6.1.58) na bhavataḥ. yatra viṣaye mūlaprakṛter ātmanepadam vihitam *samo gamīty* (cf. P.1.3.29) *apahnave jñā* ity- (P.1.3.44)–ādinā tatra *pūrvavāt sana* ity (P.1.3.62) anenaiva siddham ātmanepadam. anyatrānena tu vihitam iti tadartham idam. smarateḥ punaḥ kenāpi na vihitam iti tasya sarvathāprāptam.⁴⁷⁰

58. **nānor jñāḥ.** (P.1.3.58)

(*Bhv.*:) **anor jñas tan nāsti. putram anujijñāsati.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**nāno**||. sakarmakasyāyam pratiṣedho 'nantarasya vidhir vā bhavati pratiṣedho veti (*PP* 17, *NP* 61) vacanāt.⁴⁷¹ yatra tv *akarmakāc cety* (P.1.3.45) anena na vihitam tatra *pūrvavat sana* ity (P.1.3.62) ātmanepadam.⁴⁷²

59. **pratyāñbhyaṃ śruvaḥ.** (P.1.3.59)

(*Bhv.*:) **sannantād ābhyāṃ śruvas tan nāsti. pratiśuśrūṣati. āśuśrūṣati.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**pratyā**||. pratyāñāv upasargāv iha gṛhyete dhātvarthasambandhena. tena karmapravacanīyayoge na bhavati. tena devadattam prati śuśrūṣata iti.⁴⁷³

60. **śadeḥ śitaḥ.** (P.1.3.60)

(*Bhv.*:) **śadeḥ śinnimittād ātmanepadam syāt. śīyate. śitaḥ kim? śatsyati.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**śadeḥ**||. **śinnimittād** ity etena kāraṇe kāryopacārāt śitpratyayanimittāḥ śadiḥ. śad ity uktaḥ. tasya bhaviṣyataḥ śitpratyayasyāpi śadir nimittam bhavaty

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: tatra jānāteḥ 'apahnave jñāḥ' iti (P.1.3.44) tribhiḥ sūtrair ātmanepadam vihitam. śrudṣor api 'samo gamyrcchi' ity (cf. P.1.3.29) atra vihitam. tasmīn viṣaye 'pūrvavat sanaḥ' ity (P.1.3.62) eva siddham ātmanepadam. tato 'nyatrānena vidhīyate. smarateḥ punar aprāpta eva vidhānam.

⁴⁷¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: anantarasūtraprāptam yat tat pratiṣidhyate – 'anantarasya vidhir vā bhavati pratiṣedho vā' iti kṛtvā.

⁴⁷² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: tenākarmakāt 'pūrvavat sanaḥ' ity (P.1.3.62) ātmanepadam bhavaty eva.

⁴⁷³ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: upasargagrahaṇam cedam. tasmād iha pratiṣedho na bhavati: devadattam prati śuśrūṣate.

eva śitprakṛter ātmanepadam bhavatīti yāvat ||

5

||mriya || amṛteti uś ceti sicaḥ kitvaṃ hrasvād aṅgād iti
sico lopaḥ mṛṣiṣṭeti āśirliṅ pūrvavat kitvād guṇābhāvaḥ
mriyata iti laṭ tudāditvāc chaḥ riṅ śayaglimkṣv iti riṅ¹
niyamād ātmanepadasiddhau² nītkaraṇaṃ hrasvārthaṃ³ ||

10

||pūrvavat || asannantavad iti etena nimittātideśatām⁴ darśayati
sanaḥ pūrvasmād dhātor yena⁵ nimittenānu{nā}dāttanītvēna ner viśa ity
15 upasargasambandhena kartrapripabhiprāya ity arthaviśeṣaṇena ca⁶ tenaiva
sannantād ātmanepadam bhavati. āsta ityāder upanyāsaḥ sanaḥ⁷ pūrvasya dhātor
ātmanepaditvam ākhyātum⁸ asisṣata iti ajāder dvitīyasyeti sisabdo dvir
ucyate vijigīṣata iti⁹ ajjhaneti¹⁰ dīrghaḥ sanliṭor¹¹ iti
jasya gatvam¹² pipakṣata iti śatva{tu}katve¹³ yathākramam
20 udāharaṇatraye pi anudāttatvem upasa[rga]sambandhaḥ
kartrāprabhiprāyo nimittaṃ. atha jugupsata iti¹⁴ katham ātmanepadaṃ.
na hi sanaḥ pūrvasya guper ātmanepadaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ ucyate nātrātmanepadaṃ¹⁵
kin tarhy anudāttanīty anena¹⁶ gupādāv avayave kṛtaṃ
samudāyasya¹⁷ viśeṣakaṃ bhavatīti kṛtvā sannantasamudāyasyātmanepaditvāt¹⁸
25 na caivaṃ gopayatītyādāv api prāpnoti nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaś ceti
cakārasyaṅnuktasamuccayārthenātmanepadāpavādasya¹⁹ parasmaipadavidhānāt²⁰ |

¹SJ: riṅādeśaḥ | iyaṅ. ²SJ adds mṛno. ³SJ: svarārtham. ⁴SJ: -tvaṃ. ⁵SJ adds yena.
⁶SJ adds tena. ⁷SJ: san. ⁸SJ: -tam. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: ajjhanagamāṃ sanīti. ¹¹SJ adds jjeḥ.
¹²SJ: jakārasya gakāraḥ. ¹³SJ: kutvaśatve. ¹⁴SJ adds atra. ¹⁵SJ: nātrānenā-. ¹⁶SJ: anudātaṅita
ātmanepadaṃ. ¹⁷SJ adds liṅga-. ¹⁸SJ: samudāyasyānudāttatvāt. ¹⁹SJ: cakāreṇānu-. ²⁰SJ: para-
smaipadasya vidhānāt.

eva.⁴⁷⁴ śitprakṛter ātmanepadam bhavatīti yāvat.

61. mriyater luṅliṅś ca. (P.1.3.61)

(*Bhv.:*) luṅliṅś eva mriyateḥ śitaś ca tat syāt. amṛta. mṛṣīṣṭa. mriyate. niyamaḥ kim? mriṣyati. mamāra. kartari niyamān mamre pataṅgavad vīraiḥ (*Bhatt.* 14.42c). 5

(*Pañj.:*) ||**mriya**||. amṛtety uś ceti (P.1.2.12) sicaḥ kittvam. hrasvād aṅgād iti (P.8.2.27) sico lopaḥ. mṛṣīṣṭety āśīrlīṅ. pūrvavat kittvād guṇābhāvaḥ (cf. P.1.1.5). **mriyata** iti laṭ. tudādītṛvāc chaḥ (cf. P.3.1.77). *riṅ śayaglimkṣv* iti (P.7.4.28) riṅ. niyamād ātmanepadasiddhau nītkaraṇam svarārtham.⁴⁷⁵

62. pūrvavat sanaḥ. (P.1.3.62) 10

(*Bhv.:*) asannantavat sannantād ātmanepadam syāt. āste āsisiṣate. vijayate vijigīṣate. pacati pacate. pipakṣati pipakṣate.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**pūrvavat**||. asannantavad ity etena nimittātidēśatām darśayati.⁴⁷⁶ sanaḥ pūrvasmād dhātor yena nimittenānudāttanīttvena *ner viśa* ity (P.1.3.17) upasargasambandhena kartrabhiprāya ity (cf. P.1.3.72) arthaviśeṣaṇena ca tenaiva 15 **sannantād ātmanepadam** bhavati. āsta ityāder upanyāsaḥ sanaḥ pūrvasya dhātor ātmanepaditvam ākhyātum. āsisiṣata ity *ajāder dvitīyasyeti* (P.6.1.2) sīśabdo dvir ucyate. **vijigīṣata** ity *ajjhaneti* (cf. P.6.4.16) dīrghaḥ. *sanliṭor* iti (cf. P.7.3.57) jasya gatvam. **pipakṣata** iti ṣatvakatve (cf. P.8.3.59; 8.2.30). yathākramam udāharanātraye 'py anudāttetvam (cf. P.1.3.12) upasargasambandhaḥ (cf. P.1.3.19) 20 kartrabhiprāyo (cf. P.1.3.72) nimittam. atha jugupsata iti katham ātmanepadam? na hi sanaḥ pūrvasya guper ātmanepadam dṛṣṭam. ucyate nātrātmanepadam kim tarhy anudāttanīta ity (cf. P.1.3.12) anena gupādāv *avayave kṛtam samudāyasya viśeṣakam bhavatīti*⁴⁷⁷ kṛtvā sannantasamudāyasyātmanepaditvāt. na caivam gopayatītyādāv api prāpnoti *nigaraṇacalanārthebhyas ceti* (P.1.3.87) 25 cakārasyānuktasamuccayārthenātmanepadāpavādasya parasmaipadavidhānāt.⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *katham punaḥ śadiḥ śid bhavati, yāvatā vikaraṇasya śakāra itsamjñāka itsamjñāsambandhī na tu śadeḥ? ity ata āha śidbhāvīti. bhāvīśabdo 'yam bhaviṣyati gamyādayaḥ' iti bhaviṣyatkālaviṣayaḥ. śidbhāvīti yataḥ śid bhaviṣyati sa śidbhāvī. etad uktam bhavati – śinnimittatvād upacāreṇa śadiḥ śid ity uktam iti. bhavati hi kāraṇe kāryopacārāt tathā vyapadeśaḥ yathā nadvalodakam pādaroga iti.*

⁴⁷⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yady evam nīdgrahaṇam kimartham? yāvatānyatrātmanepadena na bhavitavyam iti? ucyate; svarārtham upadiśyate – mā hi mṛteti luṅi 'tāsyānudāttennīdadupadeśāl lasarvadhātukasya'* (cf. P.6.1.186) *anudāttatve kṛte dhātor antodāttatvam bhavati.*

⁴⁷⁶ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *nimittātidēśārayaṇasya phalam āha.*

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. *Pat.* on vārtt. 5 (*Mbh.* I 289.2–3) and 7 ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 289.16–17): *athavāvayave kṛtam liṅgam samudāyasya viśeṣakam bhavati.* Similarly, *Kās.* ad loc.: *iha jugupsate, mīmāṃsate iti? 'anudāttetaḥ' (P.1.3.12) ity eva siddham ātmanepadam avayave kṛtam liṅgam samudāyasya viśeṣakam bhavati iti.*

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *evam tarhi 'nigaraṇacalanārthebhyas ca' ity (P.1.3.87) atra cakāro 'nuktasamuccayārthaḥ kriyate. tena gupādibhyo nyantebhyas parasmaipadam ātmanepadāpavādo bhaviṣyati.*

athavā gupādāv ayave sansanniyogenātmanepadārtham anudāttatvam āsa{ā}dya-
mānam¹ sannantasamudāyāder² ātmanepadam vidhatte na³ gopayatītyādau ||

5

||ām|| āmpratyayo yasmād vihitah sa tathoktah anuprayuktasya kṛṇa

ity anena ṣaṣṭhyarthe vatin darśayati ihāñ cakra iti iha ceṣṭāyām

liṭ ijādeś ca gurumato 'nrcha⁴ ity ām āma iti

ler luk kṛdantāt⁵ prātipādikatve⁶ suḥ⁷ svarādipāṭhād⁸

10 avyayatvam avyayād ityādinā sulopah⁹ [kr]ñ cānuprayujyata¹⁰

iti liṭparasya kṛṇo 'nuprayogaḥ ta¹¹ eś yaṇādeśaḥ

dvirvacane 'cīti sthānivadbhāv{o}āt kṛśabdasya dviruktih¹²

abhyāsakāryaṃ parasavarṇaḥ akartra-

bhiprāyārtho yam ārambhaḥ kṛṇaḥ kiṃ ihāmāsa karttari.yinuvṛtyā

15 karttari¹³ niyamād bhāvakarmaṇos tu bhavaty evātmanepadam vādayāñ

cakrire dhakkā iti ||

20

25 ||samaḥ|| samkṣṇuta śāstram iti dvitīyāntā(rtha)m¹⁴ kṣṇugrahaṇam samo
gamyādisūtre na¹⁵ kṛtam tatrākarmakagrahaṇam anuvarttata iti¹⁶ ||

¹SJ: -dārthasamudyamānaḥ. ²SJ: -dev-. ³SJ: tena. ⁴SJ: -mat. ⁵SJ: -ntatvāt. ⁶SJ: -tvaṃ. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: tasya svarādiṣu pāṭhād. ⁹SJ: avyayādinā lopah. ¹⁰SJ adds liṭi. ¹¹SJ: tatra. ¹²SJ: kṛśabdena dvirvacanam. ¹³SJ: akarttariṭy anuvṛtter akarttari. ¹⁴SJ: -yānta-. ¹⁵SJ: samogamādisūtreṇa. ¹⁶SJ om.

athavā gupādāv a⟨va⟩yave sansamniyogenātmanepadārtham anudāttatvam āsadya-
mānam. sannantasamudāyāder ātmanepadaṃ vidhatte na gopayatītyādu.

63. āmpratyayavat kṛṅṅo 'nuprayogasya. (P.1.3.63)

(*Bhv.*:) āmpratyayāntadhātuvad anuprayuktasya kṛṅṅas tat syāt. ihate
ihāṃ cakre.

5

(*Pañj.*:) ||ām||. āmpratyayo yasmād vihitāḥ sa tathoktaḥ. **anuprayuktasya kṛṅṅa**
ity anena ṣaṣṭhyarthe vatin (cf. P.5.1.116) darśayati. **ihāṃ cakra** iti *īha ceṣṭāyām*
(*Dhp.* 1.663). liṭ. *ijādeś ca gurumato 'nṛcha* ity (P.3.1.36) ām. *āma* iti (P.2.4.81)
ler luk. kṛdantāt prātipādikatve (cf. P.1.2.46) suḥ (cf. P.4.1.1–2). svarādipāṭhād
avyayatvam (cf. P.1.1.39). *avyayād* ityādinā (P.2.4.82) sulopaḥ. *kṛṅṅ cānuprayujyata* 10
iti (P.3.1.40) liṭparasya kṛṅṅo 'nuprayogaḥ.⁴⁷⁹ ta. eś (cf. P.3.4.81). yaṇādeśaḥ
(cf. P.6.1.77). *divrivacane 'cīti* (P.1.1.59) sthānivadbhāvāt kṛṣabdasya divruktiḥ
(cf. P.6.1.8). abhyāsakāryam (cf. P.7.4.62, 66). parasavarṇaḥ (cf. P.8.4.58). akartra-
bhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ.⁴⁸⁰ **kṛṅṅaḥ** kim? ihāṃ āsa. kartarūty (cf. P.1.3.14)
anuvṛtṭyā kartari niyamād bhāvakarmanos tu bhavaty evātmanepadaṃ *vādayāṃ* 15
cakrīre dhakkā iti (*Bhatt.* 14.3a).

64. propābhyām yujer ayajñapātreṣu. (P.1.3.64)

(*Bhv.*:) propābhyām yujes tat syāt. prayuṅkte. upayuṅkte. neha.
yajñapātrāṇi prayunakti dhīraḥ. *svarādyantopasṛṣṭād yujer iti*
vaktavyam.⁴⁸¹ udyuṅkte. niyuṅkte. upayuṅkte. katham kevalāt 20
prajāsu vṛtṭiṃ yam ayuṅkta veditum iti (*Kirātārjunīya* 1.1b)? kartrabhi-
prāye bhaviṣyati.

65. samaḥ kṣṇuvaḥ. (P.1.3.65)

(*Bhv.*:) samkṣṇute tat syāt. samkṣṇute śāstram.

(*Pañj.*:) ||samaḥ||. samkṣṇute śāstram iti dvitīyāntārtham. kṣṇugrahaṇaṃ *samo* 25
gamyādisūtre (cf. P.1.3.29) na kṛtaṃ tatrākarmakagrahaṇaṃ anuvartata iti.⁴⁸²

66. bhujō 'navane. (P.1.3.66)

(*Bhv.*:) tat syāt. bhūṅkte. bhūṅjāte. anavane kim? bhunakti rājā
pṛthvīm. pālayatīty arthaḥ. *bhujō bhakṣa* iti noktam. anubhave 'pi
yathā syāt. sukham anubhuṅkte.

30

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: 'kṛṅṅ ca' ityādinā (P.3.1.40) kṛṅṅo liṭparasyānuprayogaḥ.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: akartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ.

⁴⁸¹ Cf. *Pat.* ad loc.: *svarādyantopasṛṣṭād iti vaktavyam* (*Mbh.* I 290.9).

⁴⁸² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'samo gamyṛcchi' ity (cf. P.1.3.29) atraiva kasmān na paṭhitāḥ? akarmakād
iti tatra vartate.

5

||ner || akartrabhiprāyārtho yam ārambha iti¹ kartrabhiprāye ṇicaś
 cety evaṃ siddheḥ hetumannyantānām na² cu{cā}raudinicaḥ³ curāḍinico
 10 hi⁴ ṇicaś ceti nās[t]i lakṣa darśanāṅkayor⁵ ity asya⁶ curāḍau
 [sva].i.tvā..⁷ [a]nyathā⁸ ṇicaś cety evaṃ siddheḥ⁹ tad apārthaṃ syāt
 bhāṣye pi¹⁰ ner iti hetuma[ṇnic]o grahaṇād aṅāv iti tasyaiva pratiśedhaḥ
 gaṇayati gaṇaṅ gopālakhaḥ gaṇayate gaṇaḥ¹¹ svayam eveti udāharaṇam eva kṛtaṃ
 [a]tha ka... ..[d]¹² ity atideśāv¹³ ātmanepadaṃ [ka]smān na bhavati
 15 karṭṛsthabhāvakatvāt· tatroktaṃ karmasthabhāvakānām¹⁴ karmasthakriyāṅāñ ca
 karmavadbhāva iti· ārohati¹⁵ kareṇuṃ niṣādītyādi¹⁶ aṅau karmapradarśanārthaṃ¹⁷
 kareṇu ārohayate niṣādinam iti tv¹⁸ asyodāharaṇam¹⁹ [ka]reṇu[h] suśi[kṣ]ita-
 tvāt suvidheyatvāc²⁰ ca nyagbhāvanakriyām²¹ atyantam ānukūlyam yadā bha-
 jate tadā prayojakatvān niṣādi[naṃ] prayojyam prayojayati mām āroheti²² tataś
 20 ca prayojyaprayojavivakṣāyām ṇic etena nau²³ karmaṇo ṇyante karṭṛtvam
 darśayate bhṛtyān nṛpa ity atrāpi dṛṣyamānasya rājño darśanakriyām praty
 atiśayenānukūlyopagamāt prayojanakarṭṛtvam²⁴ bhṛtyānān tu prayojyatvāt karma-
 tvam aṅau yat karma tasya nau karṭṛtve vijñāyamāne pratyāsatyā ṇyantād
 ātmanepadaṃ bhaviṣyati tasmān ner iti spaṣṭārtham uttarārthañ ca pratyudā-
 25 haraṇaprapaṅcas²⁵ tu śreṣṭhāvṛttāv²⁶ anusandheyah ||

¹SJ: yogaḥ. ²SJ: ṇic prety ātmanepade siddhe tac ca hetumannyantāt. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ om.
⁵SJ: lakṣyamdarśanāṅkayor. ⁶SJ adds svaritavāc. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ adds hi. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ
 adds hetu. ¹¹SJ: gaṇam. ¹²SJ: karmavad. ¹³SJ: -śād. ¹⁴SJ om. -stha- ¹⁵SJ: āhanti. ¹⁶SJ
 om. -ādi. ¹⁷SJ: karmatvapratipādanārtham. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ adds: tasyāyam arthaḥ. ²⁰SJ:
 abhi-. ²¹SJ: nyagbhāvakriyāyām. ²²SJ: nāmārohayati. ²³SJ: etenāṅau. ²⁴SJ: prayojakatve. ²⁵SJ:
 pratyudāharaṇam | prapaṅcas. ²⁶SJ: śreṣṭhāvṛttāv.

67. *ṇer aṇau yat karma ṇau cet sa kartānādhyāne.* (P.1.3.67)

(*Bhv.:*) akartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ. ṇyantād ātmanepadam syād anyante yat karma ṇau cet sa kartā bhavati. ārohati kareṇum niṣādī. *kareṇur ārohayate niṣādinam* (*Śiśu* 12.5d). paśyanti bhṛtyā nṛpam. darśayate bhṛtyān nṛpaḥ. anādhyāne kim? smṛtau mā bhūt. 5
smarati vanagulmaṃ kokilaḥ. smarayaty enaṃ vanagulmaḥ svayam eva.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**ṇer**||. akartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambha iti kartrabhiprāye *ṇicas* cety (P.1.3.74) evaṃ siddheḥ. hetumaṇṇyantānām na curādiṇicaḥ. curādiṇico hi *ṇicas* ceti (P.1.3.74) nāsti *lakṣa darśanānīkayor* ity (*Dhp.* 10.5) asya curādu 10
svaritatvāt. anyathā *ṇicas* cety (P.1.3.74) evaṃ siddheḥ tad apārtham syāt. bhāṣye 'pi **ṇer** iti hetumaṇṇico grahaṇād **añāv** iti tasyaiva pratiśedhaḥ. *gaṇayati gaṇam gopālakah gaṇayati gaṇah svayam evety* udāharaṇam eva kṛtam.⁴⁸³ atha karmavad ity (cf. P.3.1.87) atideśād ātmanepadam kasmān na bhavati? 15
kartrsthabhāvakatvāt.⁴⁸⁴ tatroktam: karmasthabhāvakānām karmasthakriyāṇām ca 15
karmavadbhāva iti.⁴⁸⁵ **ārohati kareṇum niṣādī**tyādy aṇau karmapradarśanārtham. **kareṇur ārohayate niṣādinam** iti tv asyodāharaṇam. kareṇuḥ suśikṣita-
tvāt suvidheyatvāc ca nyagbhāvanakriyā(yā)m atyantam ānukūlyam yadā bha-
jate tadā prayojakatvān niṣādinam prayojyam prayojayati: mām āroheti. tataś 20
ca prayojyaprayojakavivakṣyām *ṇic*.⁴⁸⁶ etena ṇau karmaṇo ṇyante kartrtvam. 20
darśayate bhṛtyān nṛpa ity atrāpi dṛśyamānasya rājño darśanakriyām praty
atiśayenānukūlyopagamāt prayojakakartrtvam. bhṛtyānām tu prayojyatvāt karma-
tvam.⁴⁸⁷ aṇau yat karma tasya ṇau kartrtve vijñāyamāne pratyāsattiyā ṇyantād
ātmanepadam bhaviṣyati. tasmān **ṇer** iti spaṣṭārtham uttarārtham ca. pratyudā-
haraṇaprapañcas tu śreṣṭhavṛttāv anusandheyaḥ.⁴⁸⁸ 25

68. *bhīsmiyor hetubhaye.* (P.1.3.68)

(*Bhv.:*) ṇyantayor bhīsmiṇos tat syāt. muṇḍo bhīṣayate. jaṭilo

⁴⁸³ Both examples are mentioned by Pat. on vārtt. 5 ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 291.21). Cf. also vārtt. 6 and 7 and Patañjali's commentary on them (*Mbh.* I 291.22–292.2).

⁴⁸⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha gaṇayati gogaṇah svayam evety atra 'karmavat karmaṇā tulyakriyah'* ity (P.3.1.87) *atideśāt kasmād ātmanepadam na bhavati? kartrsthabhāvakatvāt*.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *nanu cātra karmakartari mūlodāharaṇāni tatra karmavadbhāvenaiva siddham ātmanepadam kimartham idam ucyate? karmasthabhāvakānām karmasthakriyāṇām ca karmavada-
datideśo vijñāyate*.

⁴⁸⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sa yadā tu suśikṣitatvāt suvidheyatvāc ca nyagbhāvanakriyāyām atyantam ānukūlyam pratipadyate hasti svayam eva tadāsau hasti hastipakān prati prayojakatvena vivakṣyate hastipakās tu prayojyatvena. hasti hastipakān prayunkte – mām ārohateti, tataś ca prayojyaprayojaka-
bhāve vivakṣite hetumaṇṇic*.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atrāpi dṛśyamānasya rājñah darśanakriyāyām atiśayenānukūlyabhāvopagamanāt prayojakatve vivakṣite bhṛtyānām ca prayojyatve ṇic*.

⁴⁸⁸ According to Jha (2001: 283) *śreṣṭhavṛtti* refers to the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

||bhī[smyo]ḥ || nyantayor iṅyav ity anuvṛtteḥ nicaś¹ cety
 evaṃ² siddhe akartrabhiprāyārtho³ yam ārambhaḥ bhayagrahaṇam upalakṣaṇa⁴
 5 vismayo pi hetor avagrāhyaḥ⁵ bhīṣayata iti bhiyo hetubhaye śuk
 vismāpayata iti nic⁶ vṛddhau [n]ityaṃ smayater ity ātvam
 puk kāṣṭikayeti⁷ karaṇād bhayam iha ||

10

||gṛdhi || visamvādana iti mithyā[phalākhyāne] ahiṃ vañcayatīti
 pariha[ra]tīty arthaḥ ||

15

||liyaḥ || nyante samānatvāt līṅnor ubhayor api
 grahaṇam⁸ ullāpayata⁹ iti vibhāṣā līyater ity ātva[m] tor lir ity
 upasargasya latvam¹⁰ ||

20

||mithyo ||¹¹ mithyākārayata iti sadoṣaṃ punaḥ punar uccārayatīty
 arthaḥ ||

¹SJ: iti ṇer ity anuvṛtte nicaś. ²SJ om. ³SJ: ka-. ⁴SJ: -ṇam. ⁵SJ: eva grāhyaḥ. ⁶SJ: naca. ⁷SJ: kāṣṭhakāṣṭeti. ⁸SJ: līṅśleṣaṇe līśleṣaṇe dvayor api grahaṇam | nyante viśeṣābhāvāt. ⁹SJ: ālāpayat. ¹⁰SJ: asmin viṣaye vyavasthitavibhāṣayā nityam ātvam jarābhiḥ hetubhiḥ pūjām adhigacchatīty arthe. ¹¹SJ adds padaṃ.

vismāpayate. hetubhaye kim? kāṣṭhikayā bhāyayati. karaṇād atra bhayam.

(*Pañj.*) || **bhāsmyoḥ** ||. **ṇyantayor** *ity ner* ity anuvṛtter *ṇicas cety* (P.1.3.74) evaṃ siddhe 'kartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ.⁴⁸⁹ bhayagrahaṇam upalakṣaṇa(m): vismayo 'pi hetor avagrāhyaḥ.⁴⁹⁰ **bhāṣayata** iti *bhiyo hetubhaye ṣuk* (P.7.3.40). **vismāpayata** iti ṇic (cf. P.3.1.26). vṛddhau *nityaṃ smayater* ity (P.6.1.57) āttvam. puk (cf. P.7.3.36). **kāṣṭhikayeti** karaṇād bhayam iha.

69. gr̥dhivañcyoḥ pralambhane. (P.1.3.69)

(*Bhv.*) **ṇyantayor gr̥dhivañcyor viṣaṃvādane tat syāt. śiśuṃ gardhayate. śiśuṃ vañcayate. pralambhane kim? ahim vañcayati bālah.** 10

(*Pañj.*) || **gr̥dhi** ||. **viṣaṃvādana** iti mithyāphalākhyāne.⁴⁹¹ **ahim vañcayatīti** pariharatīty arthaḥ.

70. liyaḥ sammānanaśālīnīkaraṇayoś ca. (P.1.3.70)

(*Bhv.*) **liyo ṇyantāt pūjāparibhavayoḥ pralambhane ca tathā syāt. jaṭābhir ālāpayate. śyeno vartikām ullāpayate. śiśuṃ ullāpayate. anyatra kanyām ullāpayati.** 15

(*Pañj.*) || **liyaḥ** ||. ṇyante samānatvāl līlīnor (cf. *Dhp.* 4.31 and 9.31) ubhayor api grahaṇam.⁴⁹² **ullāpayata** iti *vibhāṣā līyater* ity (P.6.1.51) āttvam. *tor līty* (P.8.4.60) upasargasya latvam.

71. mithyopapadāt kṛṅṅo 'bhyāse. (P.1.3.71)

(*Bhv.*) **ṇyantāt kṛṅṅas tat syāt. abhyāse punaḥ punar āvṛttau. padaṃ mithyākārayate.** 20

(*Pañj.*) || **mithyo** ||. **mithyākārayata** iti sadoṣaṃ punaḥ punar uccārayatīty arthaḥ.

72. svaritañītaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale. (P.1.3.72)

(*Bhv.*) **svariteto dhātor ñītaś cātmanepadaṃ syāt kartāraṃ cet kriyāphalam abhipraiti. pacate. yajate. ñītaḥ. kurute. kaṇḍūyate. kartrabhiprāye kim? parārthe mā bhūt. pacati. karoti. yajati. kathaṃ parārthe vikrīṇīte prayuṅkta ityādi? ḍukrīṇdāñhveñkṛṅṅhṛṅṅñīnyujāṃ viśeṣavidhānāt.** 25 30

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'ṇeḥ' iti vartate. akartrabhiprāyārtho 'yam ārambhaḥ.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: bhayagrahaṇam upalakṣaṇārtham, vismayo 'pi tata eva.

⁴⁹¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: pralambhanaṃ viṣaṃvādanaṃ mithyāphalākhyānam.

⁴⁹² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'līñ śleṣaṇe' iti divādau paṭhyate, 'lī śleṣaṇe' iti ca kryādau. viśeṣābhāvād dvayor api grahaṇam.

||svara|| karttāra[ñ ce]t kriyāphalam abhipraitīti nanu¹ yājakā ya-
 jantītyādau kriyāphalam dakṣiṇā yājakān api kartṛ[n a]bhipraitīti². naitad asti. phalād³
 iha pradhānam⁴ svargādi gr̥hyate yad uddīśya yāgādikriyārabhya tena tv apra-
 dhānam⁵ dakṣiṇā etac ca pradhāne kāryyasampratyayāl labhyate
 5 phalagrahanasāmārthyā... ..bhipragrahanam⁶ viprakṛṣṭaphalārtham anyathā⁷
 pratyāsatyā prādhānyāt pacata⁸ ityādāv eva syāt na yajata ityādau ||

10 ||apāt || kartrabhiprāya ity eva apavada[ti] ||

15

||sa[mudā] || ānviṣaye sakarmakārtham akarmake tv āno yamahana
 ity anenaiva siddham cikitsām u{jja}dyacchatīti adhigantum udyamam
 20 karotīty arthaḥ⁹ ||

¹SJ adds ca. ²SJ om. iti. ³SJ: phalam. ⁴SJ: pradhānabhūtam. ⁵SJ: yāgādikriyārabhyate
 na tu pradhānam phalam. ⁶SJ: phalagrahaṇasāmārthyāc ca abhigrahaṇam. ⁷SJ adds hi. ⁸SJ:
 paṭhyata. ⁹SJ om. ity arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**svarīta**||. **kartāraṃ cet kriyāphalam abhipraitīti.** nanu yājakā yajantītyādau kriyāphalaṃ dakṣiṇā yājakān api kartṛn abhipraitīti. naitad asti. phalād iha pradhānaṃ svargādi gr̥hyate yad uddīśya yāgādikriyārabhya(te). tena tv apradhānaṃ dakṣiṇā.⁴⁹³ etac ca pradhāne kāryasaṃpratyayāl labhyate (cf. *PP* 5, *NP* 19) phalagrahaṇasāmārthyād vā.⁴⁹⁴ abhipragrahaṇaṃ viprakṛṣṭaphalārtham. anyathā 5
pratyāsattiyā pradhānyāt **pacata** ityādāv eva syāt na **yajata** ityādau.⁴⁹⁵

73. apād vadaḥ. (P.1.3.73)

(*Bhv.*) **tat syāt. dhānyārthī nyāyam apavadate. dhanārthī nyāyam apavadate.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**apāt**||. kartrabhiprāya ity eva. apavadati. 10

74. ṇicas ca. (P.1.3.74)

(*Bhv.*) **ṇijantāt tathā syāt. kārayate. pācayate. parārthe kārayati. pācayati.**

75. samudān̄bhyo yamo 'granthe. (P.1.3.75)

(*Bhv.*) **ebhyo yamas tat syāt. indriyāṇi saṃyacchate. bhāram udyacchate. vastram āyacchate. āyaṃsta pādama. agranthaviṣaye kim? cikitsām udyacchati vaidyaḥ.** 15

(*Pañj.*) ||**samudā**||. ān̄viṣaye sakarmakārtham. akarmake tv *āno yamahana* ity (P.1.3.28) anenaiva siddham.⁴⁹⁶ **cikitsām udyacchatīty** adhigantum udyamaṃ karotīty arthaḥ. 20

76. anupasargāj jñah. (P.1.3.76)

(*Bhv.*) **tathaiva syāt. gāṃ jānīte. parārthe gāṃ jānāti. kathaṃ sarpiṣo jānīta iti? akarmakāc ceti** (P.1.3.45) **parārthe vidhānāt.**

77. vibhāṣopapadena pratīyamāne. (P.1.3.77)

(*Bhv.*) **samīpapadāvagate kartrabhiprāye tad vā syāt. svaṃ kaṭaṃ ku-** 25

⁴⁹³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yadi sāmānyena yatra kriyāphalaṃ kartāraṃ abhipraitī tatrātmanepadaṃ tadehāpi syāt – pacanti pācakāḥ yajanti yājakā iti. tathā hy atra kriyāphalaṃ dakṣiṇā yājakān kartṛn abhipraitī bhṛtīś ca pācakān ity ata āha – kriyāyāḥ phalam ityādi. pradhānabhūtaṃ yat phalaṃ kriyāyās tad iha gr̥hyate. na ca dakṣiṇādikaṃ kriyāphalaṃ pradhānabhūtaṃ tato na bhavaty atiprasaṅgaḥ. kim punas tat pradhānabhūtaṃ ity ata āha – yad artham ityādi. etena yad uddīśyāsau yāgādikriyārabhyate tat pradhānabhūtaṃ iti darśayati.*

⁴⁹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tasmāt phalagrahaṇasāmārthyāt pradhānaṃ phalaṃ gr̥hyate. atha vā – pradhānatvād eva pradhānaṃ phalaṃ gr̥hyate. tathā cokaṭaṃ – ‘pradhāne kāryasaṃpratyayāt siddham’ iti.*

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *athābhipragrahaṇaṃ kimartham? viprakṛṣṭe ‘pi phale yathā syāt. ... tatra yady abhipragrahaṇaṃ na kriyeta tadā lunīta punīta ityādāv eva syād – yatrāvīprakṛṣṭaṃ kriyāphalam. yajate ityādau tu na syād – yatra viprakṛṣṭaṃ svargādikaṃ kriyāphalaṃ pradhāne kāryasaṃpratyayāt.*

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ān̄pūrvād akarmakād ‘āno yamahanaḥ’ iti* (P.1.3.28) *siddham evātmanepadam. sakarmakārtham idaṃ punar grahaṇam.*

||vibhāṣā|| upapadena kartṛbhiprāye dyotite na prāpnotīty aprāpti-
vibhāṣeyam¹ svaśabdasya laukikam upapadatvaṃ upocāri padam upa-
5 padam iti pañcasūtryām iti svaritañita ityādau ||

||śeṣāt|| ātmanepadahīnād dhātor iti ātmanepadalakṣaṇabahirsūtād ity
10 arthaḥ yātīty anubandhaviśeṣasya² gandhanādyarthaviśeṣasya karotītyādi
bodhyam³ karttarīty anuvṛtyā śuddhe⁴ karttari parasmaipadam na karmakarttarīti⁵ ||

15

||anu|| svārthe pīti apīśabdād akartṛbhiprāye kriyāphale gandhanādau
etac ca gandhanādisūtrād anantaram nānuparābhyām⁶
iti vaktavye atra karaṇād⁷ avasiyate ||

¹SJ: aprāpta-. ²SJ adds: praviśatīti upapadaśeṣasya. ³SJ: boddhavyam. ⁴SJ: śuddha-. ⁵SJ: parasmaipadavidhānāt karmakarttari na bhavati. ⁶SJ: -sūtrānantaram nānupaparābhyām. ⁷SJ: grahaṇād.

rute karoti vā. evaṃ pañcasūtryām unneyam. uktaṃ kartrabhiprāye.
atha parasmaipadam ekādaśabhiḥ sūtraiḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**vibhāṣā**||. upapadena kartrabhiprāye dyotite na prāpnotīty aprāpta-
vibhāṣeyam.⁴⁹⁷ svaśabdasya laukikam upapadatvam. upocāri(ṭam) padam **upa-**
padam iti.⁴⁹⁸ pañcasūtryām iti *svaritañīta* ityādau (P.1.3.72 ff.).

5

78. śeṣāt kartari parasmaipadam. (P.1.3.78)

(*Bhv.*) ātmanepadahīnād dhātoḥ kartari parasmaipadam syāt. yāti.
vāti. praviśati. śeṣāt kim? rocate.

(*Pañj.*) ||**śeṣāt**||. ātmanepadahīnād dhātor ity ātmanepadalakṣaṇabahirbhūtād ity
arthaḥ. **yātīty** anubandhaśeṣasya **gandhanādyarthaśeṣasya** (cf. P.1.3.32) karotītyādi 10
bodhyam.⁴⁹⁹ **kartarīty** anuvṛtītyā śuddhe kartari parasmaipadam na karmakartarīti
(cf. P.1.3.14).⁵⁰⁰

79. anuparābhyāṃ kṛñah. (P.1.3.79)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyaḥ kṛñah svārthe 'pi parasmaipadam syāt. anukaroti.
parākaroti.

15

(*Pañj.*) ||**anu**||. svārthe 'pīty apīśabdāt **kartrabhiprāye** kriyāphale gandhanādau
(cf. P.1.3.32).⁵⁰¹ etac ca gandhanādisūtrād (i.e. P.1.3.32) anantaraṃ nānuparābhyām
iti vaktavye 'tra karaṇād avasīyate.

80. abhipratyatibhyaḥ kṣipah. (P.1.3.80)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyaḥ kṣipas tat syāt. abhikṣipati. pratikṣipati. atikṣipati.

20

81. prād vahah. (P.1.3.81)

(*Bhv.*) pravahates tathā syāt. pravahati.

82. parer mṛṣah. (P.1.3.82)

(*Bhv.*) tat syāt. parimṛṣyati.

83. vyāñparibhyo ramah. (P.1.3.83)

(*Bhv.*) ebhyo rames tat syāt. viramati. vyaramsīt. āramati. parira-
mati. ebhyaḥ kim? abhiramate.

25

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: 'svaritañītaḥ' iti (P.1.3.72) pañcabhiḥ sūtrair ātmanepadam kartrabhiprāye
kriyāphale dyotite vihītam. tad upapadena dyotite na prāpnotīti vacanam ārabhyate.

⁴⁹⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: etenopocāritaṃ padam upapadam ity anvarthasyopapadasya grahaṇaṃ na
pāribhāṣikasyeti darśayati.

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **yāti vātīty** anubandhaśeṣasyodāharaṇam. **āviśati praviśatīty** upasarga-
śeṣasyārthaśeṣasyāpi. evaṃ gandhanādibhyo 'nyatra karotīty evamādikam udāharaṇaṃ veditavyam.

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: karmakartari kasmāt parasmaipadam na bhavati – pacyate odanaḥ svayam
eva? 'kartari karmavyatīhāre' iti (P.1.3.14) dvitīyaṃ karṭṛgrahaṇam anuvartate, tena kartāiva yaḥ
kartā tatra parasmaipadam bhavati karmakartari na bhavati.

⁵⁰¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale gandhanādiṣu ca karoter ātmanepadam vihītam
tadapavādaḥ parasmaipadam vidhīyate.

||vyāñ || vyaramsīd iti ramu krīḍāyām vipūrvah¹ lui²
 aḍāgamaḥ cleḥ sic yamarametyādinā³ sag iṭena⁴{ ||}
 iṭa iṭīti sico lopaḥ hmyanteti⁵ vṛddhiniṣedhaḥ ||

5

||upā || devadattam uparamatīti nanūparv{au}o⁶ ramir akarmakaḥ tat
 kathaṁ devadattasya karmatvam ity⁷ āha nyartho 'tretyādi pṛthaggyogakaraṇam
 uttarārthaṁ ||

10

15

||budha || ye trākarmakās teṣām aṇāv akarmakād ityādinā
 siddhe acittavatkartṛkārtha ārambha iti kṛdi kṛtvāha yodhayati kāṣṭham iti⁸ ye
 20 calanārthās teṣām⁹ acalanārthaḥ¹⁰.
 adhyāpayatīti. in adhyayane adhipūrvah nic
 vṛddhiḥ. krīñjīnāṇ nāv ity ātvaṁ puk ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: lai. ³SJ: yamaramanamātām sak ceti. ⁴SJ: iṭ. ⁵SJ: hmyantakṣaṇetyādinā.
⁶SJ: nanu ca upapūrvo. ⁷SJ adds ata. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ adds: nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaś cety eva
 siddhe. ¹⁰SJ adds vacanam.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**vyāñ**||. **vyaramṣīd** iti *ramu krīḍāyāṃ* (*Dhp.* 1.906) vipūrvaḥ. luñ. aḍāgamaḥ (cf. P.6.4.71). *cleḥ sic* (P.3.1.44). *yamarametyādinā* (P.7.2.73) sag iṭena. *iṭa iṭīti* (P.8.2.28) sico lopaḥ. *hmyanteti* (cf. P.7.2.5) vṛddhiniṣedhaḥ.

84. upāc ca. (P.1.3.84)

(*Bhv.*:) **upād rames tat syāt. devadattam uparamati. nyartho 'tra** 5
gamyate.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**upā**||. **devadattam uparamatīti nanūpapūrvo** ramir akarmakaḥ tat katham devadattasya karmatvam ity āha **nyartho 'tretyādi.**⁵⁰² pṛthaggyogakaraṇam uttarārtham.⁵⁰³

85. vibhāṣākarmakāt. (P.1.3.85)

(*Bhv.*:) akarmakād uparamates tad vā syāt. bhojanād uparamati upa- 10
ramate vā. atha **ñicaś ceti** (P.1.3.74) prāpte bādhakatrayam āha.

86. budhayudhanaśajaneṅprudrusrubhyo ṇeḥ. (P.1.3.86)

(*Bhv.*:) budhāder nyantāt parasmaipadaṃ syāt. bodhayati padmam. 15
yodhayati kāṣṭham. nāśayati pāpam. janayati sukham. adhyāpayati
śiṣyam. prāvayaty arthān dhīraḥ. drāvayati lauham. srāvayati
kuṇḍīm.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**budha**||. ye 'trākarmakās teṣām aṇāv akarmakād ityādinā (P.1.3.88) 20
siddha acittavatkartṛkārtha ārambha iti kṛtvāha: yodhayati kāṣṭham iti.⁵⁰⁴ ye
calanārthās teṣām ⟨*nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaś ceti* (P.1.3.87) siddhe yadā⟩ acalanārthaḥ
⟨tadarthaṃ vacanam⟩.⁵⁰⁵ **adhyāpayatīti in adhyayane** (*Dhp.* 2.37) adhipūrvaḥ. ṇic
(cf. P.3.1.26). vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.115). *krīñjīñāṇ ṇāv* ity (P.6.1.48) āttvam. puk
(cf. P.7.3.36).

87. nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaś ca. (P.1.3.87)

(*Bhv.*:) bhakṣaṇakampanārthebhyo nyantebhyas tat syāt. āśayati. bho- 25
jayati. calayati. kampayati śākhāṃ vātaḥ. **adeḥ pratiṣedhaḥ** (*Kāś.* ad
loc.).⁵⁰⁶ ādayate 'nnaṃ putreṇa pitā.

⁵⁰² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *na cāsmīn arthe vartamānasya sakarmakatvam upapadyate tat katham sakarmakasyodāharaṇaṃ yujyate ity āha uparamayatīti yāvad iti. etena nyarthavṛttitām uparamater darśayan sakarmakatām upapādayatīti. akarmako hi dhātur nyarthe vartamānaḥ sakarmako bhavati.*

⁵⁰³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pṛthaggyogakaraṇam uttarārtham.*

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *ye 'trākarmakās teṣām 'aṇāv akarmakāc cittavatkartṛkāt' ity (P.1.3.88) evaṃ siddhe vacanam idam acittavatkartṛkārtham.*

⁵⁰⁵ This sentence in the form given in the manuscript is certainly corrupt. The emendation proposed here is based on the commentary of *Kāś.* on the *sūtra* discussed: *ye 'tra calanārthā api teṣām 'nigaraṇacalanārthebhyaś ca' iti (P.1.3.87) siddhe yadā na calanārthās tadarthaṃ vacanam.*

⁵⁰⁶ Cf. also *Pat.* on vārtt. 5 on P.1.4.52: *sarvam eva pratyavasānakāryam ader na bhavatīti vaktavyaṃ parasmaipadam api (Mbh. I 337.16).*

||niga || calayatīti cala kampane ghaṭādisiddhe hrasvaḥ¹· ādayate
 annaṃ putreṇeti² putreṇa³ karttari ṭṭīyā gatibuddhyādinā⁴
 karmatvaṃ nāsti⁵· ādikhādyoḥ pratiṣedha iti vacanāt ||

5

||aṇā || āsayati mitram⁶ iti gatibuddhīti⁷ karmatvaṃ evaṃ
 10 sāyayati mitram⁸ ityādāv api⁹ ||

15

||na [pā] || pāyayata iti pā pāne¹⁰ na¹¹ pā rakṣaṇe¹²
 20 lugvikaraṇatvāt¹³ ṇic [y]uk śāchetyādinā¹⁴ damayata
 iti damu tapasi khede¹⁵ mitāṃ hrasvaḥ āyāmayata iti yamu¹⁶ upa-
 rame yamo 'pariśoṣaṇa iti mitsaṃjñāpratiṣedhāt na
 hrasvaḥ āyāsayata¹⁷ iti¹⁸ yasu tāḍane parimohayata iti muha vaicitye·
 vāsayata iti vasa nivāse na¹⁹ vasa ācchādane²⁰ lukvikaraṇatvāt²¹ ||

25

¹SJ: aṅgāditvāt siddham | mitāṃ hrasvaḥ. ²SJ: putreṇa piteti. ³SJ adds iti. ⁴SJ: gati-
 buddhīyādinā. ⁵SJ: na bhavati | khādayate annaṃ putreṇa. ⁶SJ: ānayati devadattam. ⁷SJ
 adds -ādinā. ⁸SJ: putram. ⁹SJ: ityādi. ¹⁰SJ adds: ity asya grahaṇam. ¹¹SJ adds tu. ¹²SJ adds
 ity asya. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: śācchāsāhvā iti yuk. ¹⁵SJ: dam upaśame. ¹⁶SJ: yam. ¹⁷SJ: āyāsat.
¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ om. ²⁰SJ adds: ity asya grahaṇam na bhavati. ²¹SJ: num-.

(*Pañj.*) ||**nīga**||. **calayatīti** *cala kampane*.⁵⁰⁷ ghaṭādisiddhe hrasvaḥ.⁵⁰⁸ **ādayate annam putreṇeti** putreṇa kartari tṛtīyā (cf. P.2.3.18). gatibuddhyādinā (cf. P.1.4.52) karmatvam nāsti *ādikhādyoḥ pratiṣedha* iti⁵⁰⁹ vacanāt.

88. aṇāv akarmakāc cittavatkartṛkāt. (P.1.3.88)

(*Bhv.*) aṇyante yo dhātur akarmakaś cittavatkartṛkaś ca tato ṇyantāt 5
parasmaipadaṃ syāt. āste vipraḥ. āsayati vipram. śāyayati mitram.
cittavatkartṛkāt kim? śoṣayate vrīhīnātapah. kartarīty eva. śāyate
vipro bhavatā.

(*Pañj.*) ||**aṇā**||. āsayati mitram iti⁵¹⁰ *gatibuddhīti* (cf. P.1.4.52) karmatvam. evaṃ
śāyayati mitram ityādāv api. 10

89. na pādamyānyamānyasaparimuharucinṛtivadavasah.
(P.1.3.89)

(*Bhv.*) eṣām anantarasūtrābhyām parasmaipadaṃ nāsti. tatas tañānāv
eva syātām. pāyayate gṛtam. damayate śatrūn. āyāmayate.
āyāsayate. āyāsayamānaḥ. parimohayate. rocayate. nartayate. 15
vādayate. vāsayate. akartrabhiprāye tu damayati gajam. nartaya-
ti bhujam. bhikṣā vāsayati. *dheṭa upasaṃkhyānam kartavyam*.⁵¹¹
dhāpayate śīsum.

(*Pañj.*) ||**na pā**||. pāyayata iti *pā pāne* (*Dhp.* 1.972) na *pā rakṣaṇe* (*Dhp.* 2.47)
lugvikaraṇatvāt.⁵¹² ṇic (cf. P.3.1.26). yuk *śāchetyādinā* (cf. P.7.3.37). **damayata** 20
iti *damu tapasi khede*.⁵¹³ *mitām hrasvaḥ* (cf. P.6.4.92). **āyāmayata** iti *yamu upa-*
rame (*Dhp.* 1.1033).⁵¹⁴ *yamo 'pariveṣaṇa* iti (*Dhp.* 1.871) mitsamjñāpratiṣedhān na
hrasvaḥ. **āyāsayata** iti *yasu tāḍane*.⁵¹⁵ **parimohayata** iti *muha vaicittye* (*Dhp.* 4.89).
vāsayata iti *vasa nivāse* (*Dhp.* 1.1054) na *vasa ācchādane* (*Dhp.* 2.13) lugvikaraṇatvāt
(cf. fn. 512). 25

⁵⁰⁷ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.850: *kampane caliḥ* belonging to *ghaṭādigāṇa* (*Dhp.* 1.800–872[873]). Cf. also *Dhp.* 1.885: *cala kampane* mentioned among the roots *jvalādi*. *Nyāsa* on P.1.3.87: *cala kampane ghaṭāditvān mittvam*.

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. P.6.4.92 and *Dhp.*, Sūtra 1,t): *ghaṭādayo mitaḥ*.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. vārtt. 5 on P.1.4.52: *ādikhādinīvīhīnām pratiṣedhaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 337.14) and *Kās.* on the same sūtra: *ādikhādyoḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ*.

⁵¹⁰ *Bhv.*: **āsayati vipram**.

⁵¹¹ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 1 ad loc.: *pādiṣu dheṭa upasaṃkhyānam* (*Mbh.* I 295.13).

⁵¹² Cf. *PP* 67: *lugvikaraṇālugvikaraṇayor alugvikaraṇasyaiva grahaṇam bhavati* (similar *NP* 90).

⁵¹³ Cf. Böhtlingk (1887: 74*): *Dhp.* 4.94: *damu upaśame*, 95: *śramu tapasi khede ca*. *Nyāsa* ad loc. has *damu upaśame*.

⁵¹⁴ Böhtlingk (1887: 70*): *yama (yamu) uparame*.

⁵¹⁵ Cf. *Dhp.* 4.101: *yasu prayatne*. The meaning *tāḍane* appears in 4,72: *vyadha tāḍane*.

||vā kyaṣaḥ || kyaṣvidhau cakāreṇa kyañ¹ anuvartya
 kyaṣkyañbhyām² ubhayapadasiddhau vā kyaṣa iti vacanam̄ jñāpayati vyavasthita-
 5 vibhāṣayāpīha³ kvacit kāryyāṇi kriyanta iti na ca⁴
 vācyam̄ kyañpakṣe [lo]hinīyata ity asya⁵ kyañmāninoś ceti puṁvanniṣedhaḥ⁶. na
 kopadhāyā ity atra neti yogavibhāgāt siddhatvāt⁷ vyavasthitavibhāṣayā
 tu lohitādipaṭhitebhyo⁸ nīlādibhyo nityam ātmanepadam̄ bhavati tena lohita[d]ājbhyaḥ
 kyaṣ ity vacanam̄ bhr̥śādiṣv itarāñīti vaktavyam̄
 10 na⁹ bhavati lohitāyata iti akr̥tsāravadhātukayor iti dīrghaḥ ||

||dyudbhyaḥ || bahuvacananirdeśād ādyartha¹⁰ gamyata ity āha dyutāder
 15 itī¹¹ vyadyutad i[ti] puṣādinā 'ñ nītvād aguṇaḥ¹²
 vyadyotiṣṭeti¹³. ṣatvam̄ ṣtutam̄ ||

20 ||vṛdbhyaḥ || luñīty anuvṛttau syanvikalyo¹⁴ luñvikasalyam̄¹⁵ na bād hate | vi-
 vṛtsatīti. sanaḥ¹⁶ kitvād aguṇaḥ¹⁷ na vṛdbhyaś ca[turbhya]
 itīnniṣedhaḥ¹⁸ dvirvacanam̄ halādiṣeṣaḥ
 vṛdhudhātor¹⁹ vakārasya dantyauşṭhatvād bhaṣbhāvo na bhavati ||

¹SJ: kyañam. ²SJ: kyañkyaṣām. ³SJ om. apīha. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: atra. ⁶SJ: puṁvadbhāvaḥ.
⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ adds api. ⁹SJ: lohitādibhyaś ca vacanam̄ ityādi na vaktavyam̄. ¹⁰SJ: ādārtha.
¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: guṇapratīṣedhaḥ. ¹³SJ: dyotiṣṭeti sic guṇaḥ i. ¹⁴SJ: syasanor vikalpo. ¹⁵SJ: luñi
 vikalpam̄. ¹⁶SJ: san-. ¹⁷SJ: guṇābhāvaḥ. ¹⁸SJ: iti pratīṣedhaḥ. ¹⁹SJ om.

90. vā kyaṣaḥ. (P.1.3.90)

(Bhv.): kyaṣantād ātmanepadam vā syāt. lohitāyati lohitāyate vā.

(Pañj.): ||**vā kyaṣaḥ**||. kyaṣavidhau cakāreṇa (cf. P.3.1.12) kyaṇ anuvartya kyaṣkyaṇbhyām ubhayapadasiddhau **vā kyaṣa** iti vacanam jñāpayati: *vyavasthita-vibhāṣayāpīha kvacit kāryāṇi kriyanta* iti (cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 63, *PP* 62 and *NP* 99).⁵¹⁶ na ca vācyam kyaṇpakṣe lohinīyata ity asya *kyaṇmāninoś ceti* (P.6.3.36) *pumvanniṣedhaḥ na kopadhāyā* ity (P.6.3.37) atra neti yogavibhāgāt siddhatvāt.⁵¹⁷ *vyavasthitavibhāṣayā* tu lohitādipaṭhitebhyo nīlādibhyo nityam ātmanepadam bhavati. tena lohitādājbhyaḥ kyaṣ ity vacanam⁵¹⁸ *bhṛśādiṣv itarāṇīti* (vārtt. 2 on P.3.1.13, *Mbh.* II 24.23) vaktavyam na bhavati.⁵¹⁹ **lohitāyata** ity *akṛtsāravadhātukayor* iti (cf. P.7.4.25) dīrghaḥ. 10

91. dyudbhyo luṇi. (P.1.3.91)

(Bhv.): dyutāder luṇy ātmanepadam vā syāt. vyadyutad vyadyotiṣṭa vā. dyutādayo dvāvimśatiḥ.

(Pañj.): ||**dyudbhyah**||. bahuvacananirdeśād ādyartha gamyata ity āha **dyutāder** iti.⁵²⁰ **vyadyutad** iti puṣādinā 'ṇ (cf. P.3.1.55). nīttvād aguṇaḥ (cf. P.1.1.5). **vyadyotiṣṭeti** ṣatvam (cf. P.8.3.59) ṣṭutvam (cf. P.8.4.41). 15

92. vṛdbhyaḥ syasanoḥ. (P.1.3.92)

(Bhv.): vṛtuvṛdhuśṛdhusyandūbhyaḥ sye sani ca tad vā syāt. vartsyati vartiṣyate vā. avartsyat avartiṣyata vā. vivṛtsati vivartiṣate vā.

(Pañj.): ||**vṛdbhyaḥ**||. luṇīty anuvṛttau syasanvikalpo luṇvikalpaḥ na bādhte. **vi-vṛtsatīti** sanaḥ kittvād (cf. P.1.2.10) aguṇaḥ (cf. P.1.1.5). *na vṛdbhyaś caturbhya* ity (P.7.2.59) inṇiṣedhaḥ. dvirvacanam (cf. P.6.1.9). halādiṣeṣaḥ (cf. P.7.4.60). vṛdhudhātor vakārasya dantyauṣṭhatvād bhaṣbhāvo (cf. P.8.2.37) na bhavati. 20

93. luṭi ca kḷpaḥ. (P.1.3.93)

(Bhv.): kḷper luṭi syasanoś ca tad vā syāt. kalptāsi kalpitāse vā. kalpsyati kalpiṣyate vā. akalpsyat. akalpiṣyata vā. cikḷpsati cikalpiṣate vā. 25

⁵¹⁶ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 63: *lohitādājbhyaḥ kyaṣavidhau* (cf. P.3.1.13) *yogavibhāgena cakāreṇa vā kyaṇam anuvartya kyaṣkyaṇbhyām lohitāyati lohitāyate ityātau ātmanepadaparasmaipadasiddhau parasmaipadātmanepadavidhau vā kyaṣa iti* (P.1.3.90) *vacanam jñāpayati vyavasthitavibhāṣayāpīha kāryāṇi kriyante iti*.

⁵¹⁷ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 63: *na ca vācyam asati vā kyaṣa ity asmīn kyaṇpakṣe lohinīyata ity atra kyaṇmāninoś ceti* (P.6.3.36) *pumvadbhāvaḥ prāpnoti. yato na kopadhāyā ity* (P.6.3.37) *atra na iti yogavibhāgena pumvadbhāvaniṣedho bhaviṣyatīti*.

⁵¹⁸ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.3.1.13: *lohitādājbhyaḥ kyaṣvacanam* (*Mbh.* II 24.20).

⁵¹⁹ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 63: *tasmād vā kyaṣa ity vyavasthitatvāt vibhāṣayāḥ lohitādājbhya evātmanepadavikalpaḥ sidhyatīti. nīlādibhyas tu lohitādiparipaṭhitebhyo 'pi nityam ātmanepadam bhavati. tena lohitādājbhyaḥ kyaṣvacanam bhṛśādiṣv itarāṇīti na vaktavyam bhavati*.

⁵²⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *bahuvacananirdeśād ādyartha bhavati*.

||luṭi ca || kalptās[i] kalpi[tāsa] iti· klpū sāmārthye¹ madhya-
mapuruṣaikavacanam̐ parasmaipadapakṣe tāsī ca klpā it̐niṣedhaḥ² ||

iti śrīviśvarūpaviracitāyām bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapanājikāyām
prathamasyādhyāyasya tr̥tīyaḥ pādah || śrīh³

5

10

||ā ka || ā kaḍārād ity asamāso yaṁ⁴ avadheḥ spaṣṭapratītaye·

15 vaicitryāya⁵ vā tatrāvadhinirddeśo pi svaritatvād evādhikarāvadheḥ prāptatvāt
sukhapratipattaye⁶ ekā⁷ samjñety asamāsa eva samāse sati uttarapadārtha-
prādhānyā[d ek].śabdasyāprādhānyam̐ syād viśeṣaṇatvāt vyāpter⁸ nnyāyāt prādhānyāt
sa{jñā}māsavidhau samjñāsamāveśārthapragādigrahaṇāc⁹ ca kaḍārāḥ karma-
dhārāya ity¹⁰ avadhiḥ na tu prak kaḍārāt samāsa [i]ty ata āha·

20 [ka]dārāḥ karmadhārāya ityādi· vakṣamaṇānām̐ samjñānām̐ ekatvād¹¹ ekasmin
samjñiny¹² ekā¹³ samjñety¹⁴ adhyāhāryyam̐ tenāyam̐ arthah¹⁵ ekasmin sajniny¹⁶ ekā¹⁷
samjñā bhavatīti¹⁸ uttaratra samjñāyā anyasya [viśeṣasy]ābhāvāt samjñāgrahana
spaṣṭārtham¹⁹ kvacid anavakāśetyādi· yady²⁰ evam̐ anavakāśā nyāyasiddhā vacana-
sāmārthyād eva tatsiddheḥ²¹ parāpi vipratīṣedhe param ity anaiva siddhe-
25 ti²²· naikāsamjñādhikārasya²³ prayojanam̐ | naitad eva²⁴[·] virodhe²⁵ sati paratvam̐ sambha-
vati²⁶ sa ca virodha²⁷· ekāsamjñādhikāre²⁸ sati bhavati ([nāsati])· tasmād virodhārtha²⁹

¹SJ: klpū sāmārthye kalpitāse kalptāsīti. ²SJ: it̐pratiṣedhaḥ. ³SJ: sadupādhyāyaśrīviśvarūpakṛtau bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyām̐ prathamādhyāye bhūpādah tr̥tīyah. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: -tryārtham̐. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: eka-. ⁸SJ: prāpter. ⁹SJ: -rtham̐ prā-. ¹⁰SJ adds ayam̐. ¹¹SJ: anekatvād. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: eka-. ¹⁴SJ adds: vacanāt ekasmin samjñinīty. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ adds: ekaikasamjñini ¹⁷SJ adds eva. ¹⁸SJ om. iti. ¹⁹SJ: samjñā 'nyadvidheyam̐ nāstīti samjñāgrahaṇam̐ vispaṣṭārtham̐ avadhinirddeśo 'pi sukhapratipattaye svaritatvād evāvadher labdhatvāt. ²⁰SJ adds apy. ²¹SJ om. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ om. na, but adds nedam̐ before prayojanam̐. ²⁴SJ: evam̐. ²⁵SJ adds hi. ²⁶SJ: apavādatvam̐ bhavati. ²⁷SJ om. ²⁸SJ: ekādhikasamjñādhikāre. ²⁹SJ: -rtham̐.

(*Pañj.*) ||**luṭi ca**||. kalptāsi kalpitāsa iti *kṛpū sāmāthyē* (*Dhp.* 1.799). madhyamapurūṣaikavacanam. parasmaipadapakṣe *tāsi ca kṛpa* iti (P.7.2.60) inniṣedhaḥ.

iti śrīviśvarūpaviracitāyāṃ bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikāyāṃ
prathamasyādhyāyasya tṛtīyaḥ pādaḥ.

(prathamādhyāyasya caturthaḥ pādaḥ)

5

1. ā kaḍārād ekā saṃjñā. (P.1.4.1)

(*Bhv.*) **kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraye** ity (P.2.2.38) ataḥ prāg ekaiva saṃjñā boddhavyā. sā ca kvacid anavakāśā yathā bhasaṃjñā rājabhyāṃ ityādau sāvakāśāṃ padasaṃjñāṃ bādgate rājā rājñe. kvacit parā yathā bahuvrīhisamjñā bādgate vīrapuruṣako grāma 10
iti. ihāṅgasamjñāyā bhapadasamjñāyoḥ samāveśo vaktavyaḥ.⁵²¹ tena bābhavya ity aṅgatvād ādivṛddhiḥ. bhatvād *or guṇaḥ* (P.6.4.146). dhānuṣka ity atrāṅgatvād ādivṛddhiḥ. padatvād iṇaḥ ṣatvaṃ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ā ka**|| **ā kaḍārād** ity asamāso 'yam⁵²² avadheḥ spaṣṭapratītaye vaicitryāya vā. tatrāvadhinirdeśo 'pi svaritatvād evādhikārāvadheḥ prāptatvāt 15
sukhapratipattaye.⁵²³ **ekā saṃjñety** asamāsa eva. samāse saty uttarapadārthapṛadhānyād ekāśabdasyāpṛadhānyāṃ syād viśeṣaṇatvāt. vyāpter nyāyāt pṛadhānyāt samāsaividhau (cf. P.2.1.3) saṃjñāsamāveśārthapṛāgādigrāhaṇāc ca **kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraya** ity (P.2.2.38) avadhiḥ. na tu *prāk kaḍārāt samāsa* ity (P.2.1.3) ata āha: **kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraya** ityādi. vakṣyamāṇānām saṃjñānām ekatvād ekasmin 20
saṃjñīny ekā saṃjñety adhyāhāryam. tenāyam arthaḥ: ekasmin saṃjñīny ekā saṃjñā bhavati. uttaratra saṃjñāyā anyasya viśeṣasyābhāvāt saṃjñāgrāhaṇaṃ spaṣṭārtham. kvacid anavakāśetyādi yady evam anavakāśā nyāyasiddhā vacana-sāmāthyād eva tatsiddheḥ parāpi *vipratīṣedhe param* ity (P.1.4.2) anenaiva siddheti naikāsaṃjñādhikārasya prayojanam. naitad eva. virodhe sati paratvaṃ saṃbhavati. sa ca virodha ekāsaṃjñādhikāre sati bhavati nāsati.⁵²⁴ tasmād virodhārtha 25

⁵²¹ Cf. vārtt. 3 ad loc.: *aṅgasamjñāyā bhapadasamjñāyor asamāveśaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 296.21).

⁵²² Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *ānī māyādābhividhyor iti* (P.2.1.13) *samāsasya vikalpītatvād ā kaḍārāt iti nirdeśaḥ, samāse tv ākaḍārām iti syāt.*

⁵²³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ā kaḍārād itīyato 'vadher grahaṇaṃ vaicitryartham, anyathā hi 'ā dvandvāt' ity evaṃ brūyat. na hi dvandvasamśabdānāt pareṇākaḍārād ekasamjñāvidhānasya prayojanam asti, yata etāvato 'vadher grahaṇam arthavad bhavati.*

⁵²⁴ The same in *Nyāsa* ad loc.

ekāsaṃjñādhikārah [kvacit] pareti¹ bahuvrīhisamjñā susūkṣmajaṭakeśādu² sāvakāśā
tatpuruṣasaṃjñā ca rājapuruṣādu vīrah puruṣo yasmin grāme sa vīrapuruṣako³
grāma ity atra vyaktipadārthapakṣe viśeṣyatvāt⁴. tatpuruṣasaṃjñāpi⁵
prāpnoti paratvād bahuvrīhir bhavati. tenātra⁶ kap⁷

- 5 bābhavya iti babhror apatyam madhubabhror brāhmaṇakauśikayor iti
yañ uḡaṇaḥ⁸ vānto yi pratyaya ity avādeśaḥ dhānuṣka
iti dhanuḥ praharaṇam asyeti⁹ tad asya praharaṇam iti ṭhak
iṣuṣukatāntāt ka iti ṭhasya kaḥ ||

10

- 15 ||vipra|| tulyabalayor virodha iti tulyabalayor virodhe¹⁰ virodhaviṣaya
ity arthaḥ yasmān na vidhir¹¹ virodho nāpi vidhyādhārah tulyabalayor
ity anena nityānityādīnām bahirbhāve siddhe nityānityayor ityādigranthaḥ
prapañcaphala¹² eva. paribhāṣāsūtram idaṃ. yatra vidhyor virodhavi(sa)yas
tatreyam svayam upatiṣṭhate¹³. atha kāryyagrahaṇam¹⁴ kimarthaṃ yat param¹⁵
20 vidhīyamānaṃ tat kāryyād anyat kiṃ syāt | naitat¹⁶ kāryyam bhavati karaṇārhaṃ
bhavati arhe kṛtyatṛcaś ceti a[r]hārthe karoter lyat¹⁷. tena
lakṣyasthityā¹⁸ kvacit pūrvavipratīṣedho 'pi bhavatīti. iha¹⁹ jātipakṣe²⁰ vidhyoḥ
kṛtārthatvāt apravṛttau prāptāyām²¹ vidhānaṃ vipratīṣedhe param bhavati.
tatra kṛte²² yadi pūrvam prāpnoti tadā²³ tad api bhavati tatredam ucyate
25 punaḥprasaṅgavijñānāt siddham iti. tena bhindhakīty atra pa-

¹SJ adds -ādi. ²SJ: svasūkṣmajaṭakeśādu. ³SJ: -ṣo. ⁴SJ: viśeṣaṇatvāc ca. ⁵SJ om. -saṃjñā. ⁶SJ om. atra. ⁷SJ adds bhavati. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. iti. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds na. ¹²SJ: -prayojana. ¹³SJ: upagacchati. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ rev. ¹⁶SJ adds asti. ¹⁷SJ: ṇyat. ¹⁸SJ adds: kvacij jātipakṣaḥ kvacid vyaktipakṣaḥ. ¹⁹SJ: iti siddhyati | tatra. ²⁰SJ: -kṣa-. ²¹SJ: pravṛttāyām. ²²SJ: prakṛte. ²³SJ om.

ekāsaṃjñādhikāraḥ. **kvacit paretī** bahuvrīhisamjñā susūkṣmajaṭakesādaḥ sāvakāśā tatpuruṣasaṃjñā ca rājapuruṣādaḥ. vīraḥ puruṣo yasmin grāme sa **vīrapuruṣako grāma** ity atra vyaktipadārthapakṣe viśeṣyatvāt tatpuruṣasaṃjñāpi (cf. P.2.1.58) prāpnoti. paratvād bahuvrīhir (cf. P.2.2.23) bhavati. tenātra kap (cf. P.5.4.154). **bābhavya** iti babhror apatyam. *madhubabhror brāhmaṇakauśikayor* iti (P.4.1.106) 5
yañ. uḡaḥ (cf. P.6.4.146). *vānto yi pratyaya* ity (P.6.1.79) avādeśaḥ. **dhānuṣka** ity dhanuḥ praharaṇam asyeti *tad asya* (cf. P.4.4.51) *praharaṇam* ity (P.4.4.57) ṭhak. *isusuktāntāt ka* ity (P.7.3.51) ṭhasya kaḥ.

2. *vipratīṣedhe paraṃ kāryam.* (P.1.4.2)

(*Bhv.:*) **tulyabalayor virodhe paraṃ yat tat kāryam syāt. *supī cetī*** 10
(P.7.3.102) **dirghaḥ. vṛkṣābhyām. bahuvacane jhaly et** (P.7.3.103).
vṛkṣeṣu. virodhe param. vṛkṣebhyaḥ. nityānityayos tu nityam balav-
vat.⁵²⁵ *antaraṅgabahiraṅgayor antaraṅgaṃ balavat* (PP 43, NP 50).
*utsargāpavādayoś cāpavādaḥ.*⁵²⁶

(*Pañj.:*) ||***vīpra***|| **tulyabalayor virodha** ity tulyabalayor virodhe virodhaviṣaya 15
ity arthaḥ. yasmān na vidhir virodho nāpi vidhyādhāraḥ.⁵²⁷ **tulyabalayor**
ity anena nityānityādīnām bahirbhāve siddhe ***nityānityayor*** ityādigranthaḥ
prapañcaphala eva. paribhāṣāsūtram idam. yatra vidhyor virodhaviṣayas
tatreyam svayam upatiṣṭhate. atha kāryagrahaṇam kimartham? yat paraṃ
vidhīyamānam tat kāryād anyat kiṃ syāt? naitat. kāryam bhavati karaṇārham 20
bhavati.⁵²⁸ *arhe kṛtyatṛcaś cety* (P.3.3.169) arhārthe karoter yat. tena
lakṣyasthityā kvacit pūrvavipratīṣedho 'pi bhavatīti. iha jātipakṣe vidhyoḥ
kṛtārthatvād apravṛttau prāptāyām vidhānam vipratīṣedhe paraṃ bhavati.
tatra kṛte yadi pūrvam prāpnoti tadā tad api bhavati. tatredam ucyate
punaḥprasaṅgavijñānāt siddham (PP 40, NP 39) iti.⁵²⁹ tena bhindhakīty atra pa- 25

⁵²⁵ Cf. Abhyankar (1967): *nityānityayor nityo vidhir balavān* in *Vyāḍipāṭha* 118, *nityānityayor nityavidhir balavān* in *Śākaṭayanaparibhāṣāsūtra* 93 and *Kātantrapāṭha* 83, *nityānityayor madhye nityo vidhir balavān* in *Kātantrabhāvamiśra* 49 and *nityānityayor nityaḥ* in *Kālāpapāṭha* 54.

⁵²⁶ Cf. Abhyankar (1967): *utsargāpavādayor apavādavidhir balavān* in *Kātantradurgasiṃha* 63, *Kātantrabhāvamiśra* 52, *Kātantrapāṭha* 96 and *Kālāpapāṭha* 48, *utsargāpavādayor apavādo vidhir balavān* in *Bhojasūtra* 85 and *utsargād apavādaḥ* in *Jainendravr̥tti* 90 and *Haimapāṭha* 55.

⁵²⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sa vipratīṣedho vipratīṣiddhaḥ vipratīṣedhasya viṣaya ity arthaḥ. vipratīṣedha-viṣayatvād vipratīṣedhaviṣayo hy atra vipratīṣedhaśabdenokto viṣayīṇā viṣayam darśayitum. yasmān na prasaṅgo vipratīṣedha upapadyate, nāpi tadādhāraḥ.*

⁵²⁸ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *yat kāryam kṛtyarham paraṃ tad bhavatīti vacanavyaktiḥ.*

⁵²⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tatra jātau padārthe kṛtārthatvād vr̥ttau prāptāyām vidhyartham idam ārabhyate – vipratīṣedhe sati paraṃ kāryam bhavatīti. tatra kṛte yadi pūrvam api prāpnoti tad api bhavaty eva tatredam ucyate – punaḥprasaṅgavijñānāt siddham iti.*

ratvāt¹ dhibhāve kṛte punar² akac³ kriyate⁴ vyaktipakṣe
 pratilakṣe lakṣaṇapravṛttir⁵ iti paryyāye prāpte anena niyamaḥ kriyate⁶ param eva
 bhavati· na pūrvam iti⁷· tatredam ucyate sakṛdgato vipratīṣedho⁸ yad bādhitam tad
 bādhitam eveti⁹ tena stād ity atra paratvāt tuhyos tātāni
 5 kṛte ghvasor ed dhāv iti punar¹⁰ na bhavati· pūrvavipratīṣedhe¹¹
 udāharaṇam numaciratṛjvadbhāvebhyo nuḍ iti¹² ||

10

15 ||yū stryā || tatra¹³ na jñāyate kiṃ stryākhyāḥ śabdaḥ saṃjñī yūsabdo
 vā kā vā vyutpattir etayor ity ata āha striyam ācaṣṭa ityādi¹⁴ mūlavibhujāditvāt
 kaḥ¹⁵ ī ū yū iti īdūdantam iti anyatra
 saṃjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nnāstīti¹⁶ na
 pravarttate vakṣyamāṇaṇiṣedhāt na hīkāramātram ūkāramātram iyaṇuvaṇsthānam
 20 stryākhyam asti kiñca yvor¹⁷ varṇamātrayoḥ pratyayāpratyayoḥ sāmānyena
 grahaṇāt pratyayagrahaṇa ity etad api nāsti¹⁸· ata āha·
 tadviśeṣaṇam iti | īdūtor eveyam¹⁹ ityādi bhāṣyamataṃ etat yuktañ ca
 anyathāc²⁰ chīnadyor²¹ ity atra²² śīnadyoḥ parataḥ²³ yad uktaṃ²⁴ tan nopa-

¹SJ om. ²SJ om. ³SJ adds api. ⁴SJ: bhavati. ⁵SJ: vyaktipadārthapakṣe tu pratilakṣyam lakṣaṇam pravartata. ⁶SJ adds iti. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: -dhe. ⁹SJ om. iti ¹⁰SJ: udāharaṇaṇ cāsyā asa bhuvī loṭas tātāni paratvāt kṛte punardhvasor eddhāv abhyāsalopāś ceti. ¹¹SJ: dhasya tu. ¹²SJ: bhavati pūrvavipratīṣedheneti iṣṭam virodha iti na kṛtam vaicitryārtham. ¹³SJ: atra. ¹⁴SJ adds stryākhyā iti. ¹⁵SJ: kapratyayaḥ. ¹⁶SJ om. iha. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ adds iti. ¹⁹SJ om. iyam. ²⁰SJ adds hi after anyathā. ²¹SJ adds num. ²²SJ adds: yad uktaṃ. ²³SJ adds iti. ²⁴SJ om.

ratvād dhibhāve (cf. P.6.4.101) kṛte punar akac (cf. P.5.3.71) kriyate.⁵³⁰ vyaktipakṣe pratilakṣyam lakṣaṇapravṛttir iti paryāye prāpte 'nena niyamaḥ kriyate. param eva bhavati na pūrvam iti. tatedam ucyate *sakṛdgatau vipratīṣedhe yad bādhitam tad bādhitam eveti* (PP 39, NP 40).⁵³¹ tena stād ity atra paratvāt tuhyos tātaṇi (cf. P.7.1.35) kṛte *ghvasor ed dhāv* iti (P.6.4.119) punar na bhavati.⁵³² pūrvavipratīṣedha 5 udāharaṇam *numaciratṛjvadbhāvebhyo nuḍ* iti (vārtt. 11 on P.7.1.96, Mbh. III 276.6).

3. *yū stryākhyau nadī.* (P.1.4.3)

(*Bhv.:*) iha striyam ācaṣṭa iti stryākhyaḥ śabdaḥ saṃjñī. ī ū yū iti ca tadviśeṣaṇam iti tadantavidhiḥ. īdūdantam strīliṅgam nadīsaṃjñam 10 syāt. *īdūtor eveyam saṃjñeti bhāgavṛttiḥ. kumāryai. lakṣmyai. dhībandhvai. yavāgvai. ākhyāgrahaṇam kim? padāntaradyotye strītve mā bhūt. senānyai striyai. katham atilakṣmyai viprāya? bahupreya-syām rājani? avayavastrīviśayatvāt siddham* iti (Mbh. I 314.6–7)⁵³³ bhāṣyam.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**yū stryā**|| tatra na jñāyate: kiṃ stryākhyaḥ śabdaḥ saṃjñī yūsabdo 15 vā kā vā vyutpattir etayor ity ata āha **striyam ācaṣṭa** ityādi. mūlavibhujādītvāt kaḥ (cf. vārtt. 2 on P.3.2.5, Mbh. II 98.18).⁵³⁴ ī ū yū iti **īdūdantam** ity *anyatra saṃjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nāstīti* (PP 81, cf. NP 27) iha na pravartate vakṣyamāṇaniśedhāt. na hīkāramātram ūkāramātram iyaṇuvaṅsthānam stryākhyam asti.⁵³⁵ kiṃ ca yvor varṇamātrayoḥ *pratyayāpratyayoḥ sāmānyena* 20 *grahaṇāt pratyayagrahaṇa* ity (cf. PP 92 and NP 102) etad api nāsti. ata āha **tadviśeṣaṇam** iti. **īdūtor eveyam** ityādi bhāṣyamataṃ etad yuktaṃ ca.⁵³⁶ anyathāc *chīnadyor* ity (cf. P.7.1.80) atra śīnadyoḥ parataḥ yad uktaṃ tan nopa-

⁵³⁰ Cf. Puruṣottamadeva on PP 39–40: *jātau tu padārthe sakṛd eva lakṣye lakṣaṇam pravartate viśayāntare cobhayaṃ caritārtham iti vipratīṣedhaviśaye 'pravṛttir evobhayoḥ prāptā. tatra param kāryam ity asya paravidhau vyāpārāt pūrvanivṛttāv avyāpāra iti sati saṃbhave pūrvam api bhavati. tad idam ucyate punaḥprasaṅgaviññānāt siddham iti. tena bhider loṭi hau bhindhakīty atra tīnaś ca (P.5.3.56) ity anena ajñātādyarthavivakṣāyām akacdhībhāvayoḥ prāptayoḥ paratvāt dhibhāve kṛte punar akac bhavati. The example bhindhakī is also explained Pad. ad loc. and in Durghaṭa on P.6.4.101.*

⁵³¹ Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: *vyaktau tu padārthe 'kṛtārthatvāt śāstrayoḥ paryāyeṇa pravṛttau prāptāyām niyamārtham idam – vipratīṣedhe param eva bhavati na pūrvam iti. tatedam ucyate sakṛdgatau vipratīṣedhe yad bādhitam tad bādhitam eveti.*

⁵³² Cf. Puruṣottamadeva on PP 39–40: *stād ityādau ca tātaṇaḥ sthānivadbhāve dhibhāvo na bhavati.*

⁵³³ In some editions it is marked as a *vārttika*. Cf. Abhyankar (1962–72) on the passage and Kudāla and Raghunāthśāstrī (1935: 221).

⁵³⁴ Cf. Kāś. ad loc.: *striyam ācaṣṭe stryākhyau. mūlavibhujādīdarśanāt kapratyayaḥ.*

⁵³⁵ Cf. Nyāsa ad loc.: *'suptiṅantaṃ padam' ity (P.1.4.14) atrāntagrahaṇād anyatra saṃjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir na labhyate. naiśa doṣaḥ. yad ayam 'neyaṇuvaṅsthānau' iti (P.1.4.4) pratīṣedham śāsti taj jñāpayati – bhavatiha prakaraṇe tadantavidhir iti. anyathā pratīṣedho 'narthakaḥ syāt. na hīkārokāramātram stryākhyam iyaṇuvaṅsthānam asti. kiṃ tarhi? tadantam.*

⁵³⁶ It is not directly stated in Mbh. Note, however, that according to Puruṣottamadeva, it is an opinion of the Bhāgavṛttikāra.

padyate na hi tadantastryākhyāśabdasya¹ samjñāyām tadekadeśayor ikārokārayoḥ
 samjñā yuktā· asmin darśane² lakṣmīyavāgūprabhṛtīnām samudāyagatastrītvam³ ava-
 yava⁴ upacaryya nadīsamjñety āhuḥ anyathā⁵ lakṣmīyavāgūprabhṛtīnām⁶ ikārākārayor⁷
 astryākhyatvāt nadīsamjñā⁸ na syāt pūrvatra vyākhyāne⁹ āc chīnadyor ity
 5 atra nadyavayavo gr̥hyate· kumāryyai iti kumāraśabdād vayasi prathame
 nīp caturthyaikavacanam nadītvāt ān nadyā ity āt ātaś ceti
 vṛddhiḥ· yanādeśaḥ· lakṣyai iti· avitṛstṛtantribhya īr
 ity anuvarttamāne lakṣer [mu]ṭ cati īpratyayo mudāgamaś
 ca¹⁰ dhībandhvai iti dhīr bandhur asyā iti bahuvrīhau¹¹ ūñ uta ity ūñ
 10 nākāro na nodhātvor iti viśeṣaṇārthaḥ savarṇadīrghaḥ·
 ne āt· yaṇ vṛddhiḥ¹² yavāgvai iti
 yauteḥ [s]ryu[va]tīyādinā āgūcpratyayaḥ¹³· guṇa· āvādeśaḥ
 atilakṣmai¹⁴ iti¹⁵ atyādayaḥ krāntādyarthe dvitīyeti
 samāsaḥ gostriyor upasarjjanasyeti hrasvatvaṃ nāsti¹⁶ strīti
 15 stryadhikāravihitasya pratyayasya tatra¹⁷ grahaṇāt ne āt yaṇ
 vṛddhiḥ· bahupreyasyām¹⁸ iti· bahva[h] preyasyo asyeti·
 bahupreyasīti¹⁹ īyasaś ceti kapo bhāvaḥ īyaso bahuvrīhau pratiśedho
 vaktavya²⁰ iti hrasvatvābhāvaḥ²¹ saptamyekavacanam²² ner ām nadyā iti
 ner ām· āt· yaṇ vṛddhiḥ²³
 20 avayavastrīviṣayatvāt siddham iti bhāṣyam tatra²⁴ bhāṣyapadopanyāsāt²⁵ tad
 vacanam eva pramāṇam ity arthaḥ· yady evaṃ nīti hrasvaś ceti anena
 suśriye sudhiye subhruve· sudhenave viprāyeti²⁶· katham nāvayavāśrayā nadīsamjñā²⁷
 ucyate vā kyāṣa ity ato vāgrahaṇam maṇḍūkaplutinyāyenānuvarttate· sā
 ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā tena pākṣikī nadīsamjñā strīvacana eveṣyate ata²⁸ eva kvacid
 25 iyaṇuvaṅsthānāyor api yvoḥ²⁹ nītsu avayavā³⁰ nadīsamjñā tena ma[n̄ju]śriyām
 śāstarītyādi³¹ siddhiḥ³² padāntaradyotyē strītve³³ mā bhūd iti bahiraṅgatvād eva
 na bhaviṣyatīti spastārtham ākhyāgrahaṇam³⁴ ||

¹SJ: tadantasya. ²SJ om. ³SJ: -stha-. ⁴SJ: ekadeśa. ⁵SJ adds hi. ⁶SJ om. -yavāgū-.
⁷SJ adds ekadeśayor. ⁸SJ om. nadī-. ⁹SJ: pūrvadravyākhyāne. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ:
 vṛddhiḥ yanādeśaḥ. ¹³SJ: āgūc. ¹⁴SJ adds viprāya. ¹⁵SJ adds lakṣmīm atikrāntaḥ. ¹⁶SJ: na
 bhavati. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ: bahuśreyasyām. ¹⁹SJ: bahavyaḥ śreyasyo yasyeti bahuśreyasī. ²⁰SJ om.
²¹SJ: drasvābhāvaḥ (sic). ²²SJ: -ne. ²³SJ rev. ²⁴SJ: iti. ²⁵SJ: -śabdo-. ²⁶SJ: atīśriye ādhaye
 svamataye svadhenave brāhmaṇāyeti. ²⁷SJ adds iti. ²⁸SJ: tata. ²⁹SJ om. ³⁰SJ adds -śrayā. ³¹SJ
 adds api. ³²SJ: siddhyati. ³³SJ om. ³⁴SJ rev.

padyate. na hi tadantastryākhyāśabdasya saṃjñāyām tadekādeśayor ikārokārayoḥ saṃjñā yuktā. asmin darśane lakṣmīyavāgūprabhṛtīnām samudāyagatastrītvam avayava upacarya nadīsaṃjñety āhuḥ. anyathā lakṣmīyavāgūprabhṛtīnām ikārākārayor astryākhyatvād nadīsaṃjñā na syāt pūrvatra vyākhyāna *āc chīnadyor* ity (cf. P.7.1.80) atra nadyavayavo gṛhyate.⁵³⁷ **kumāryai** iti kumāraśabdād *vayasi prathamē* (P.4.1.20) 5 nīp. caturthyekavacanam. nadītvād *āṇ nadyā* ity (P.7.3.112) āṭ. *āṭas ceti* (P.6.1.90) vṛddhiḥ. yaṇādeśaḥ (cf. P.6.1.77). **lakṣmyai** iti *avitṛstṛtantribhya īr* ity (*Uṇ.* III.158) anuvartamāne *lakṣer muṭ ceti* (*Uṇ.* III.160) īpratyayo muḍāgamaś ca. **dhībandhvai** iti dhīr bandhur asyā iti bahuvrīhau *ūn uta* ity (P.4.1.66) ūn. nākāro na *noṇdhātvor* ity (P.6.1.175) viśeṣaṇārthaḥ. savarṇadīrghaḥ (cf. P.6.1.101). 10 nē. āṭ (cf. P.7.3.112). yaṇ (cf. P.6.1.77). vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.6.1.90). **yavāgvai** iti yauteḥ *sṛyuvatītyādinā* (*Uṇ.* III.81) āgūcpratyayaḥ. *guṇo 'vādeśaḥ* (cf. P.7.3.84 and P.6.1.78). **atilakṣmyai** ity *atyādayaḥ krāntādyarthe dvitīyayeti* (*Mbh.* I 416.20–21)⁵³⁸ samāsaḥ. *gostriyōr upasarjanasyeti* (P.1.2.48) hrasvatvaṃ nāsti *strīti* (cf. P.1.2.48) stryadhikāravihitasya pratyayasya tatra grahaṇāt. nē. āṭ (cf. P.7.3.112). yaṇ 15 (cf. P.6.1.77). vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.6.1.90). **bahupreyasyām** iti bahvaḥ preyasyo 'syeti bahupreyasīti. *īyasaś ceti* (P.5.4.156) kapo 'bhāvaḥ. *īyaso bahuvrīhau pratiśedho vaktavya* ity⁵³⁹ hrasvatvābhāvaḥ. saptamyekavacanam *ner ām nadyā* (mnībhya) ity (P.7.3.116) ner ām. āṭ (cf. P.7.3.112) yaṇ (cf. P.6.1.77) vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.6.1.90). **avayavastrīviśayatvāt siddham iti bhāṣyam.** tatra bhāṣyapadopanyāsāt tad 20 vacanam eva pramāṇam ity arthaḥ. yady evaṃ *nīti hrasvaś cety* (P.1.4.6) anena suśriye sudhiye subhruve sudhenave viprāyēti katham nāvayavāśrayā nadīsaṃjñā ucyate? *vā kyaśa* ity (P.1.3.90) ato vāgrahaṇam maṇḍūkaplutinyāyenānuvartate. sā ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā. tena pākṣikī nadīsaṃjñā strīvacana eveṣyate.⁵⁴⁰ ata eva kvacid iyaṇuvaṇsthānāyōr (cf. P.1.4.4) api yvoḥ nītsv avayavā nadīsaṃjñā tena mañjuśriyām 25 śāstarītyādi siddhiḥ.⁵⁴¹ **padāntaradyotyē strītve mā bhūd** iti bahiraṅgatvād eva na bhaviṣyatīti spaṣṭārtham ākhyāgrahaṇam.

4. *neyaṇuvaṇsthānāv astrī.* (P.1.4.4)

(*Bhv.*:) **iyaṇuvaṇādhārau yū nadīsaṃjñakau na staḥ. he śrīḥ. he dhīḥ.**

⁵³⁷ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *katham punar jñāyate varṇayor evedaṃ grahaṇam na pratyayayor iti, iyaṇuvaṇsthānapratiśedhāt. yadi tadantasya saṃjñā katham vakṣyati – śīnadyoḥ parataḥ nadyantād aṅgād uttarasya iti? samudāyasya nadītvāt tadavayavabhūtāv idūtāv api tathoktau.*

⁵³⁸ In some editions it is marked as a *vārttika* on P.2.2.18. Cf. Abhyankar (1962–72) on the passage and Kudāla and Raghunāthśāstrī (1935: 437).

⁵³⁹ Cf. *vārtt.* 3 on P.1.2.48: *īyaso bahuvrīhau puṃvadvacanam* (*Mbh.* I 224.7) and *Pat.* on it: *īyaso bahuvrīhau puṃvadbhāvo vaktavyaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 224.8).

⁵⁴⁰ Cf. *Bhv.* on P.1.4.6: *ihāmi nīti ca hrasvayor iyaṇuvaṇsthānāyōś ca yvoḥ pākṣikī nadīsaṃjñā. sā strīvacana eveṣyate.* A similar opinion is also expressed in the *Durghaṭa*.

⁵⁴¹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.1–3: *evaṃ mañjuśriyām śāstarīti ratnaśrīprayogaḥ. kāladuṣṭo 'yam apaśabdo 'vayavāśrayanadītvābhāvāt.* See also *Bhv.* on P.1.4.6: *mañjuśriyī sudhiyī vipra iti bhavati.*

||neyaṇu || sthānagrahaṇād iyaṇuvaṇoḥ sthānam iti nirvrttir¹ yayoḥ tāv
 iyaṇuvaṇsthānāv² ity ata āha iyaṇuvaṇ[ādhārā]v³ ityādi· he śrītyādi· atra⁴
 nadīsamjñāyā abhāvād ambārthanadyor iti hrasvo⁵ na bhavati

5 sthānagrahaṇād apavādaviṣayatyāgena niṣedhaṇidvikalpapratikṣepāt⁶ varṣābhvai⁷ ity
 atra nadīsamjñānibandhanām nityam āt⁸ | vimānanā subhru kutaḥ pitur gr̥ha
 ityādisiddhaye⁹· vāmīty ato vāgrahaṇam anuvarta{nīyam}mānam¹⁰
 simhāvalokitanyāyena¹¹ vyavasthitavibhāṣātvena samāśrayaṇīyam¹² ||

10

||vāmi || śrīṇām iti· nadīsamjñāpakṣe hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ· astrīty
 eva strīṇām ||

15

20

||ñiti || śrīyai iti nadīsamjñāpakṣe· āt· astrīty
 eva striyai¹³ || ||hrasva || ihāmi ñiti cetyādi sumataye viprāyeti
 śobhanā matir yasyeti sumatiḥ suśriyām viprāṇām iti śobhanā śrīr yasyeti·

25 atrāvayavāśrayanadītvābhāvān nadīnibandhanāv ātṇuṭau na
 bhavataḥ¹⁴· nāvayavāśrayeti· vibhaktisambandheneha sryākhyasyeva nadīsamjñā-
 vidhānāt avayavastryākhyasya nadīsamjñā¹⁵ na bhavati¹⁶· na hi avayavastryākhyād vi-
 bhaktir asti vihitā· kin tarhi samudāyād eva tadvidhānāt¹⁷ parihārāntaram api prāg
 uktam¹⁸ ||

¹SJ: sthītir abhinirvrttir. ²SJ om. ³SJ: iyaṇuvaṇāv. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ rev. ⁶SJ: niṣedhe.
⁷SJ: varṣābhūr. ⁸SJ: nadīnibandhano nitya āha. ⁹SJ: asya siddhaye. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ adds: vā
 grahaṇam anvartham. ¹²SJ: sā ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā. ¹³SJ: āṭṣuṭau na bhavataḥ. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ
 om. nadī-. ¹⁶SJ adds iti. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ: pūrvavatparihārāntaram uktam.

he bhrūḥ. astrīti kim? he stri.

(*Pañj.*) ||**neyaṇu**|| sthānagrahaṇād iyaṇuvaṇoḥ sthānam iti nirvṛttir⁵⁴² yayoḥ tāv
iyaṇuvaṇsthānāv ity ata āha **iyaṇuvaṇādhārāv** ityādi. **he śrir** ityādi. atra
 nadīsaṃjñāyā abhāvād *ambārthanadyor* iti (cf. P.7.3.107) hrasvo na bhavati.⁵⁴³
 sthānagrahaṇād apavādaviṣayatyāgena niṣedhaṇidvikalpapratikṣepād varṣābhvai ity 5
 atra nadīsaṃjñānibandhanam nityam āṭ.⁵⁴⁴ *vimānanā subhru kutaḥ pitur grha*
 ityādisiddhaye (*Kumāra* 5.44b) *vāmīty* (P.1.4.5) ato vāgrahaṇam anuvartamānam
 simhāvalokitanyāyena vyavasthitavibhāṣātvena samāśrayaṇīyam.⁵⁴⁵

5. vāmi. (P.1.4.5)

(*Bhv.*) **pratiṣedho 'yam āmi vā syāt. śriyām śrīṇām. bhruvām** 10
bhrūṇām.

(*Pañj.*) ||**vāmi**|| **śrīṇām** iti nadīsaṃjñāpakṣe *hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ* (P.7.1.54). *astrīty*
 (cf. P.1.4.4) eva strīṇām.

6. ṇiti hrasvaś ca. (P.1.4.6)

(*Bhv.*) **ṇiti cāsau pratiṣedho vā syāt. śriyai śriye. bhruvai bhruve.** 15
bhuvām śete bhuvi śete. hrasvaś ca. ṇiti hrasvau yū vā nadīsaṃjñakau
syātām. matyai mataye. dhenvai dhenave. stryākhyāv ity eva. agnaye.
vāyave. ihāmi ṇiti ca hrasvayor iyaṇuvaṇsthānayoś ca yvoḥ pākṣikī
nadīsaṃjñā. sā strīvacana eveṣyate. nāvayavāśrayeti smṛtiḥ. tena
sumataye 'tisriye sudhiye viprāya. sudhiyām viprāṇām. maṅjuśriyi 20
sudhiyi vipra iti bhavati.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ṇiti**|| **śriyai** iti nadīsaṃjñāpakṣa āṭ (cf. P.7.3.112). *astrīty*
 (cf. P.1.4.4) eva strīyai. ||**hrasva**|| **ihāmi ṇiti cetyādi. sumataye viprāyeti**
 śobhanā matir yasyeti **sumatiḥ. suśriyām viprāṇām** iti śobhanā śrīr yasyeti.
 atrāvayavāśrayanadītvābhāvān nadīnibandhanāv āṭnuṭau (cf. P.7.3.112; 7.1.54) na 25
 bhavataḥ. **nāvayavāśrayeti** vibhaktisaṃbandheneha stryākhyasyaiva nadīsaṃjñā-
 vidhānād avayavastryākhyasya nadīsaṃjñā na bhavati. na hy avayavastryākhyād vi-
 bhaktir asti vihitā. kiṃ tarhi? samudāyād eva. tadvidhānāt parihārāntaram api prāg
 uktam.

⁵⁴² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sthitir abhinivṛttih.*

⁵⁴³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **he śrīḥ. he bhrūr iti.** atra nadīsaṃjñāyā abhāvāt tannibandhanah
 'ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ' iti (P.7.3.107) hrasvo na bhavati.

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yatra tv apavādena tayor bādhas tatra mā bhūd iti – ādhvai varṣābhvai*
iti. Cf. also *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *varṣābhvā ity atra tu sthānagrahaṇād apavādaviṣayatvān nadīva-*
niṣedhavikalpayoḥ pratikṣepān nityam nadīvanibandhana āṭ.

⁵⁴⁵ Cf. *Durghaṭa* on *Kumāra* 5.44b explained in the commentary on P.1.4.4: *vāmīty ato vāgrahaṇam*
apakṣya vyavasthitavibhāṣātvād iti śrīkaṇṭhaḥ.

5

- 10 ||śeṣo || iha yvoḥ sambandhī hrasva ikāra ukāraś¹ ca tābhyāṃ
 śábdarūpasya viśeṣaṇam² āha· hrasvedudantam anadītyādi prathamam bhāṣya-
 matam likhitvā tato nyāsamatam asakhir iti prathamānirdeśāt avayavasya na
 [ghi]tvam· tena grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nnāstīti·
 susakher āgacchatīti· asakhi alpārthe nañ tena³ sakhinā vānarendreṇa iti⁴·
- 15 bhāṣyakāramatena⁵ tu idu[n]mātram ghisamjñakam⁶ asakhir iti śaṣṭhyarthe subvya-
 tyayena⁷ prathamā· tathā cāsakhir⁸ iti sakhiśabdasyekārasya⁹ ghitvaniṣedhāt
 bahusakhyā bahusakhyur iti¹⁰ sidhyati¹¹ evañ ca dvandve ghīty
 atra ghyantam pūrvam nipapat{ī}atīty upapadyate· nyāsakā[ra]matena¹² ghyantayoh
 samudāyagatayoh samudāyavṛttinyāyena avayava¹³ upacārāt· sakhyur iti yañādeśe
- 20 kṛte· khyatyāt parasyeti¹⁴ akārasyokārah sakhyāv
 iti saptamyekavacanam¹⁵ ghitvābhāvāt ac ca gher ity asyābhāve¹⁶ yañ
 idubhyām ity autvam¹⁷· asakhir iti atrā(na)n¹⁸
 nāsti· sautratvāt ||

¹SJ: iva yukāraś. ²SJ adds: ity ata. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds: asakhir iti alavaṇā vai yavāgūr iti vad alpārthe nañ. ⁵SJ om. -kāra-. ⁶SJ: -ṃ. ⁷SJ: avayavārthe. ⁸SJ: ca sakhir. ⁹SJ: -śabde-. ¹⁰SJ adds -ādi. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ adds tu. ¹³SJ: ghyantatāyāḥ samudāyavṛtter avayavavṛttiś ca. ¹⁴SJ om. iti. ¹⁵SJ: -ne. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ adds: ñer ikārasya. ¹⁸SJ: atra ṭaj.

7. *śeṣo ghy asakhi.* (P.1.4.7)

(*Bhv.*) hrasvedudantam anadī śeṣo ghisamjñah syāt. *gher nitīti* (P.7.3.111) *guṇah. agnaye. viṣṇave. vāyave. mataye. dhenave.* asakhi kim? sakhyā. sakhye. sakhyuḥ. sakhyau. iha hrasvedudnātram ghisamjñam. tathā ca *dvandve ghīty* (P.2.2.32) atra 5
ghyantam pūrvam nipatatīty (Pat. on vārtt. 3 on P.1.2.27, *Mbh.* I 203.5,9)⁵⁴⁶ *ucyate. tenāsakhīty atra sakhiśabdekārasya ghitvaniṣedhāt sakhiśabdāvayavatve 'pi bahusakhyā kṛtam bahusakhyuḥ svam ity āhuḥ. susakher āgacchatīti tu nyāsaḥ.*⁵⁴⁷

(*Pañj.*) ||*śeṣo*|| iha yvoḥ saṃbandhī hrasva ikāra ukāraś ca.⁵⁴⁸ *tābhyām* 10
śabdarūpasya viśeṣaṇam āha hrasvedudantam anadītyādi. prathamam bhāṣyamataṃ likhitvā tato nyāsamatam. *asakhir* iti prathamānirdeśād avayavasya na ghitvam. tena *grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti* (*PP* 78, *NP* 31) *susakher āgacchatīti.*⁵⁴⁹ *asakhi* alpārthe nañ.⁵⁵⁰ tena *sakhinā vānarendreṇeti.*⁵⁵¹ bhāṣyakāramatena tu idunmātram ghisamjñakam. *asakhir* iti ṣaṣṭhyarthe subvya- 15
tyayena prathamā. tathā *cāsakhir* iti sakhiśabdasyekārasya ghitvaniṣedhād *bahusakhyā bahusakhyur* iti sidhyati. evaṃ ca *dvandve ghīty* (P.2.2.32) *atra ghyantam pūrvam nipatatīty* upapadyate.⁵⁵² nyāsakāramatena ghyantayoḥ samudāyagatayoḥ samudāyavṛttinyāyenāvayava upacārāt.⁵⁵³ *sakhyur* iti yañādeśe kṛte (cf. P.6.1.77). *khyatyāt parasyety* (P.6.1.112) akārasyokāraḥ. *sakhyāv* 20
iti saptamyekavacanam ghitvābhāvād *ac ca gher* ity (P.7.3.119) asyābhāve yañ (cf. P.6.1.77). *idudbhyām* ⟨*aud*⟩ ity (P.7.3.117, 118) auttvam. *asakhir* ity atrānañ (cf. P.7.1.93) nāsti sautratvāt.

8. *patih samāsa eva.* (P.1.4.8)

(*Bhv.*) samāse patiśabdo ghisamjñah syāt. śrīpatinā. śrīpataye. 25
śrīpateḥ. śrīpatau. nānyatra. patyā. patye. patyuḥ. patyau.

⁵⁴⁶ Cf. P.2.2.32 and *Kās.* on it.

⁵⁴⁷ Cf. also Pat. on P.6.4.148 (*Mbh.* III 226.24): *atisakher āgacchatī.*

⁵⁴⁸ Cf. Pat. on P.1.4.3 (*Mbh.* I 313.5–9).

⁵⁴⁹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham atisakher āgacchatīti. asakhīti pratiṣedhāt. asakhīti prathamānirdeśād ivarṇovarṇāntasya ghitvam. pratiṣedhaś ca sakhiśabdasyaiva na varṇamātrasya. tadantavidhinā prāpnotīti cen na. tatra hi grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti kevalasyaiva niṣedho na tadantasya.*

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. *Medinī* (avyayāni 1ab): *aśabdaḥ syād abhāve 'pi svalpārthapratīṣedhayoḥ.*

⁵⁵¹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham sakhinā vānarendreṇa. ucyate: alavaṇā yavāgūr itivad alpārthe nañō vidhānād ity anunyāsaḥ.*

⁵⁵² Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *yady evaṃ katham bahusakhyā kṛtam, bahusakhyur iti. ucyate: asakhīti vyatyaena ṣaṣṭhyarthe prathameti varṇamātrasya ghitvam. pratiṣedho 'pi tasyaiva. tathā ca 'dvandve ghī'-ty (P.2.2.32) atra ghyantam pūrvam nipatatīty ucyate iti vṛttih. evaṃ ca sakhiśabdāvayavasyekārasya ghitvapratīṣedhād bahusakhyā, bahusakhyur iti bhāṣyānugato rakṣitaḥ.*

⁵⁵³ Cf. the maxim *samudāyeṣu hi śabdāḥ pravṛttā avayaveṣu api vartante*, which is often repeated by Pat. (*Mbh.* I 12.20–21; 411.19, 412.28, 427.3–4; II 363.17).

||patiḥ || śeṣo ghy asakhipatī iti niṣedhe siddhe yad etan niyamārtham¹
vacanaṃ tad asyānityatvajñāpanārtham tena patinā nīyamānāyā ityādi sidhyati ||

5

10 ||saṃyoge || śikṣeti atra gurusamjñāyām² guroś ca hala ity
akārapratyayaḥ atha katham na³ bhettety atra⁴ gurutvam bhides tv aci⁵ vihite
prakṛtipratyayāvayavayor⁶ haloh saṃyukta⁷ naitad asti hal{ā}antāc ceti
kitvam jñāpakam prakṛtipratyayayor haloh⁸ saṃyogasaṃjñāyām na gurutvam ity
asyārthasya iti. etac ca halantāc cety asya dhīpsatīty atra dambheḥ ki.ārthatvam
15 ..apeksya⁹ ||

||dīrgha[ñ ca] || ihāncakra iti gurusamjñāyām satyām¹⁰ ijādeś ca gurumato
'ṅrcca ity ām sādhanan tu kṛnmejanta ity atra vyutpāditam¹¹ ||

¹SJ: -yama-. ²SJ om. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds na. ⁵SJ: bhīndes tṛci. ⁶SJ: prakṛtipratyayayor avyavayor. ⁷SJ: saṃyogasaṃjñāyām na gurutvam. ⁸SJ: prakṛtipratyayāvayavayoh. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: vibhakteḥ kṛnmejanta ity avyayatvād avyayād āpsupa iti luk kṛñ cānuprayujyate liṭīti liṭparasyā'nuprayogaḥ ām pratyayavat kṛño 'nuprayogasyety ātmanepadan tatra yaṇaḥ dvirvacane 'cīti sthānivadbhāvāt kṛṣabdo dvirucyate.

(*Pañj.*) ||**patih**|| śeṣo ghy asakhipatī iti niṣedhe siddhe yad etan niyamārtham vacanam tad asyānityatvajñāpanārtham.⁵⁵⁴ tena *patinā nīyamānāyā* ityādi sidhyati.⁵⁵⁵

9. ṣaṣṭhīyuktaś chandasi vā. (P.1.4.9)

(*Bhv.*) chandaḥsūtram.

10. hrasvaṃ laghu. (P.1.4.10)

(*Bhv.*) hrasvam akṣaram laghūcyate. bhedanam. gardhanam. vardhanam.⁵⁵⁶

11. saṃyoge guru. (P.1.4.11)

(*Bhv.*) saṃyoge pare hrasvam akṣaram gurūcyate. śikṣā. bhikṣā.

(*Pañj.*) ||**saṃyoge**|| śikṣety atra gurusamjñāyām *guroś ca hala* ity (P.3.3.103) 10
akārapratyayaḥ. atha katham na bhettety atra gurutvam? bhides tv acāvvyavahitoḥ
prakṛtipratyayāvayavayor haloḥ saṃyogaḥ. naitad asti. *halantāc ceti* (P.1.2.10)
kittvam jñāpakam prakṛtipratyayayor haloḥ saṃyogasaṃjñāyām na gurutvam ity
asyārtha iti.⁵⁵⁷ etac ca *halantāc cety* (P.1.2.10) asya dhīpsatīty atra dambheḥ kittvam
apekṣya. 15

12. dīrgham ca. (P.1.4.12)

(*Bhv.*) dīrgham akṣaram gurūcyate. īhām cakre. ūhām cakre.

(*Pañj.*) ||**dīrgham ca**|| īhām cakra iti gurusamjñāyām satyām *ijādeś ca gurumato*
'nr̥ccha ity (P.3.1.36) ām. sādhanam tu *kṛnmejanta* ity (P.1.1.39) atra vyutpāditam.⁵⁵⁸

13. yasmāt pratyayavidhis tadādi pratyaye 'ṅgam. (P.1.4.13) 20

(*Bhv.*) yasmāt pratyayo vidhīyate tadādy aṅgasamjñam syāt. kartā
kāraḥ. lavitā lāvakaḥ. tadādīti kim? kariṣyamāṇaḥ. pacāmaḥ.
syādyantasyāpy aṅgatve mugdīrghau. punaḥpratyayagrahaṇam kim?
lupte 'pi pratyaye 'nyasmin pare mā bhūt. śryartham. iyaṅ prāptaḥ.

⁵⁵⁴ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *kiṃ ca asakhipatī ity ucyamāne patīśabdasya samāse 'pi na syāt – patigr̥he*
iti. tathā ca sakhiśabdasya samāsāvayavasyāpi ghisamjñāyā abhāvāt – sakhiḡr̥he, ḡr̥hasakhāyāv it
cānīyamaḥ pūrvanipātasya.

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham patinā nīyamānāyāḥ puraḥ śukro na duṣyati. tathā gate mṛte*
pravrajīte klībe ca patite patau. tathā patau jīvati yā nārī upoṣya vratacārīnī āyuṣyam harate
bhartuḥ sā nārī narakaṃ vrajet. ucyate: śeṣo ghy asakhipatīti vaktavye pṛthakkarāṇam hy asyā-
nityatvajñāpanārtham.

⁵⁵⁶ Cf. P.7.3.86.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham bhettā. prakṛtipratyayāvayavasam̐yoge gurutvād guṇābhāvāt.*
ucyate: 'trasigr̥dhidḡṣikṣipeḥ knur' iti (P.3.2.140) knoḥ kittvam dhṛṣṇur, jiṣṇur ityādau guṇābhāvā-
rtham kṛtam jñāpayati naivam̐vidhagurutvād guṇābhāvāḥ. ato guṇaprasaṅge kittvam guṇābhāvārtham.
na ca kakāras tatra śravaṇārtho nityaśabdadarśanād vyāptēś ca. tad uktam: knusanor yat kṛtam
kittvam jñāpakam syāl laghor guṇe. aparaṃ bahutvān noktam.

⁵⁵⁸ Cf. *Pañj.* on P.1.1.39.

||yasmāt || yasmād iti dhātoḥ prātipadikāt subantāt tinantāt pratyaya
 iti trjādih svādih kyajādih tarabādih¹ karttā kāraka iti a{sa}ṅgasamjñāyām guṇavṛddhī-
 laviteti guṇa iṭ. tadādi²

kim³. asati tu⁴ tadādīty etasmin. yasmāt pratyayo⁵ vidhīyate tad evāṅgasamjñā⁶ syāt⁷.

5 na samudāyaḥ samudāyāt pratyayasyāvihitatvāt. tataś ca kariṣyamāṇaḥ

pacāma ity atra mukdīrghau⁸ aṅgasamjñānibandhanau⁹

na syātām tasmāt tadādīti vaktavyaṃ. kariṣyamāṇa iti. kṛṇo lṛṭ

lṛṭaḥ sad veti¹⁰ śānac syatāsī lṛluṭor iti syapratyayaḥ ṛddhanaḥ

syē itīḍāgamaḥ¹¹ āne mukaḥ¹² pacāva¹³ iti¹⁴ ato dīrgho yañīti

10 dīrghaḥ punaḥpratyayagrahaṇaṃ kim iti śrīyamāṇe pratyaye yathā

syāt śryartham iti śrīśabdāt tādarthye caturthī śrīya iti dam¹⁵ iti caturthī tadarthye-
 tyādinā¹⁶ samāsaḥ vibhakter luk¹⁷. śrīśabdasyārthaśabde¹⁸

iyāñ na bhavati (alya.[o/ā] 'sati punaḥpratyayagrahaṇe vibhakter luk

pratyayalakṣaṇābhāvād api aṅgasamjñā syāt | tataś ca tannibandhana

15 iyaña 'pi syāt)¹⁹ vidhigrahaṇaṃ kim strī iyatī. asati²⁰ vidhigrahaṇe yasmāt pratyayo

na vihitāḥ pratyaya[s] tu parator ity ata eva²¹ tatrāpy aṅgasamjñā syāt (vidhigrahaṇe

sati yasmā[d yah] pratyay[o] vidhīyate pratyāsatyā ta[smi]n pare [aṅgasamjñā] vidhīyate

iha yah strīśabdād vihitāḥ pratyayo nāsau paro bhavati luptatvāt)²² iyatīti²³ idamaḥ

kimidaṃbhyām vo gha iti. ādeśavidhānārtham anena vatup²⁴ vakārasya ca²⁵

20 ghaḥ tasyāyannādisūtrena²⁶ iyādeśaḥ²⁷. idamkimer īskī itīs

yasyeti cetikāralopaḥ iyaccha śabdād ugitaś ceti nīp atra

strīśabdād avihite pi²⁸ pratyaye aṅgatve strīśabdasyekārasya²⁹ yasyeti ceti

lopaḥ syāt. nanu cāsiddhavad³⁰ atrā bhād iti. idam ikāralopasyāsiddhatvād

eva na bhaviṣyati [ya]syeti ceti lopaḥ evan tarhi vidhigrahaṇaṃ jñāpakam³¹

25 bhādhikārīyāsiddhatvam anityam iti. tena śrethatur³² ity atra etve

karttavye anunāsikalopasyāsiddhatvaṃ na syāt³³. nuvatīti³⁴ ṇu³⁵ stavane

tudāditvā(t) še³⁶ kṛteti pi sāravadhātuke vikaraṇasyāṅgatve puganta-

¹SJ om. ²SJ: tadādih. ³SJ adds iti. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: -jñam. ⁷SJ: bhavati. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: aṅganibandhanau mugdīrghau. ¹⁰SJ om. iti. ¹¹SJ: itīṣatvam. ¹²SJ: muk. ¹³SJ: pacāma. ¹⁴SJ adds: pacer mas śap. ¹⁵Possibly, faint dots above ti could be interpreted as the emendation of the scribe: śrīya i{ti}dam, which gives the correct reading. ¹⁶SJ: tadarthetyādinā. ¹⁷SJ: luki. ¹⁸SJ: tadarthakaśrīśabdāt arthaśabde. ¹⁹SJ om. ²⁰SJ adds hi. ²¹SJ: paras. ²²SJ om. ²³SJ: strī iyatīti. ²⁴SJ: ghādeśānumānena vatupi. ²⁵SJ om. ²⁶SJ om. tasya. ²⁷SJ: ghasyeyah. ²⁸SJ: avihito 'piyatīśabde. ²⁹SJ: strīśabde-. ³⁰SJ om. ca. ³¹SJ rev. ³²SJ: bhede 'gradattam. ³³SJ: bhavati. ³⁴SJ adds atra. ³⁵SJ: ṇu. ³⁶SJ adds vikaraṇe.

(*Pañj.*:) || **yasmāt** || **yasmād** iti dhātoḥ prātipadikāt subantāt tiñantāt. **pratyaya** iti trjādih svādih kyajādih tarabādih. **kartā kāraka** ity aṅgasamjñāyāṃ guṇavṛddhī (cf. P.7.3.84; 7.2.115). **laviteti** guṇa (cf. P.7.3.84) iṭ (cf. P.7.2.35). **tadādi** kim? asati tu tadādīty etasmin yasmāt pratyayo vidhīyate tasyaivāṅgasamjñā syān na samudāyasya⁵⁵⁹ samudāyāt pratyayasyāvihitavāt.⁵⁶⁰ tataś ca **kariṣyamāṇaḥ** 5 **pacāma** ity atra mukdīrghau (cf. P.7.2.82; P.7.3.101) aṅgasamjñānibandhanau (cf. P.6.4.1) na syātām. tasmāt **tadādī**ti vaktavyam. **kariṣyamāṇa** iti kṛño lṛṭ. *lṛṭaḥ sad veti* (P.3.3.14) śānac. *syatāsī lṛluṭor* iti (P.3.1.33) syapratyayaḥ. *ṛddhanoh sye* iti (P.7.2.70) iḍāgamaḥ. *āne muk* (P.7.2.82). **pacāma** ity *ato dīrgho yañṅti* (P.7.3.101) dīrghaḥ. **punaḥpratyayagrahaṇam kim** iti śrūyamāṇe pratyaye yathā 10 syāt. **śryartham** iti śrīśabdāt tādarthye caturthī śriya idam iti *caturthī tadarthyetyādinā* (P.2.1.36) samāsaḥ.⁵⁶¹ vibhakter luk (cf. P.2.4.71). śrīśabdasyārthaśabda iyañ (cf. P.6.4.77) na bhavati. anyathāsati punaḥpratyayagrahaṇe vibhakter luk. pratyayalakṣaṇābhāvād (cf. P.1.1.62) apy aṅgasamjñā syāt. tataś ca tannibandhana iyañ api syāt. vidhigrahaṇam kim? strī iyaṭī. asati vidhigrahaṇe yasmāt pratyayo 15 na vihitāḥ pratyayas tu parata ity ata eva tatrāpy aṅgasamjñā syāt. vidhigrahaṇe sati yasmād yaḥ pratyayo vidhīyate pratyāsattiyā tasmin pare 'ṅgasamjñā vidhīyate. iha yaḥ strīśabdād vihitāḥ pratyayo nāsau paro bhavati luptavāt.⁵⁶² iyaṭītidamaḥ *kimidambhyāṃ vo gha* ity (P.5.2.40) ādeśavidhānārtham anena vatup. akārasya ca ghaḥ. tasyāyannādisūtreṇa (cf. P.7.1.2) iyādeśaḥ. *idamkimor īskī* itīś (P.6.3.90). 20 *yasyeti ceti* (P.6.4.148) ikāralopaḥ. iyacchabdād ugitaś ceti (P.4.1.6) iṅp. atra strīśabdād avihite 'pi pratyaye 'ṅgatve strīśabdasyekārasya *yasyeti ceti* (P.6.4.148) lopaḥ syāt. nanu *cāsiddhavad atrā bhād* iti (P.6.4.22) idama ikāralopasyāsiddhatvād eva na bhaviṣyati *yasyeti ceti* (P.6.4.148) lopaḥ. evaṃ tarhi vidhigrahaṇam jñāpakam *bhādhikārīyāsiddhatvam anityam* iti.⁵⁶³ tena śrethatur ity atra ettve (cf. P.6.4.120) 25 kartavye 'nunāsikalopasyāsiddhatvam (cf. P.6.4.24) na syāt. nuvatīti *ṇu stavane* (*Dhp.* 6.104). tudādītvāt še krte piti sāravadhātuke vikaraṇasyāṅgatve *puganta-*

⁵⁵⁹ Another possible emendation would be: ... *tad evāṅgasamjñāṃ syāt na samudāyāḥ*... The reason why another emendation has been chosen here is its similarity to the text of the *Nyāsa* (see below).

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa*: *asati tadādīty etasmin yasmād eva pratyayo vidhīyate tasyaivāṅgatvaṃ syāt na tu sarvasya sahasyādeḥ nāpi sanumkasya samudāyasya tataḥ pratyayasyāvihitavāt*.

⁵⁶¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *śriya idam bhruva idam iti 'caturthī tadarthārtha' ityādinā* (cf. P.2.1.36) *samāsaḥ*.

⁵⁶² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vidhigrahaṇe sati yasmāt pratyayo vidhīyate pratyāsattes tasmin parato 'ṅgasamjñā vidhīyate. iha tu yaḥ strīśabdād vihitāḥ pratyayo nāsau paraḥ luptavāt, yaś ca para iyacchabdo vihitāḥ nāsau tato vihitāḥ*.

⁵⁶³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *bhādhikārīyam asiddhatvam anityam*, and *Jñ.S.* p. 64: *ābhācchāstrīyam asiddhatvam anityam*.

laghūpadhasyeti gunah¹ prāpnoti na² antaraṅgatvād vikaraṇāśraya ṇavaṇ
kriyate ||

5

||supti|| sub iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam· tiṇā sāhacaryyāt sup ca tiṇ [ca]
suptiṇau tāv ante yasya tat takhoktam sūtranirddeśād āgamānityatvād
vā na ṇamo hrasvād iti [ṇu]t³· chātrāḥ paṭhanti me iti
atra padatvāt padatvāśrayam rutvam pūrvatra tiṇantasya padatvāt

10 padāt padasyety adhikāre temayāv ekavacana iti·

asmado⁴ [m]e ādeśaḥ pratyayagrahaṇaparibhāsayā yena vi-
dhir ity ane vā tadantatve labdhe antagrahaṇam anyatra samjñāvidhau
pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nnāstīti jñāpanārtham· tena
gaurī brāhmanitareti taraptamapoḥ kevalayo{h}r ghasamjñakatvāt tadante hrasvo

15 na bhavati tasmims tu bhavaty eva⁵ ||

20 ||naḥ|| kya iti kyackyaṅkyaṣām⁶ sāmānyena grahaṇam nāntam eveti
subantatvāt kyaṇādayo vidhīyante⁷· tatra pratyayalakṣaṇena⁸ padatvasiddher⁹ nniya-
mārtham viparītanīyamo nāśaṅkānyāḥ kya eva nāntam iti¹⁰· brahmahastibhyām
varccasa¹¹ iti nirddeśāt¹² rājīyatīti¹³ dvitīyāntāt supa ātmanaḥ kyac

¹SJ: kṛte vikaraṇāntasya laghūpadhagunaḥ. ²SJ om. ³SJ: eva ṇuṭ na bhavati | antagrahaṇam anyatra samjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidher abhāvārtham tena dṛṣattīrṇam ity atra niṣṭhānatvam na bhavati. ⁴SJ: padasamjñāyām chātrā ity atra rutvādividhiḥ paṭhantīty asya padatve padād uttarasyāsmacchabdasya. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: kyackyaṣkyaṇām. ⁷SJ: subantāt kyaṇādayo gṛhyante. ⁸SJ: pratyayalopa-. ⁹SJ: -ddhau. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ adds: anyathā hi parato nakāralopo na syāt padatvābhāvāt. ¹³SJ adds: ātmano rājānam icchatīti.

laghūpadhasyeti (P.7.3.86) guṇaḥ prāpnoti. na. antaraṅgatvād vikaraṇāśraya uvañ kriyate.⁵⁶⁴

14. *suptiñantam padam.* (P.1.4.14)

(*Bhv.:*) **subantam tiñantam ca padasamjñam syāt. chātrāḥ paṭhanti me.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||**supti**|| **sub** iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam tiñā sāhacaryāt.⁵⁶⁵ sup ca tiñ ca suptiñau tāv ante yasya tat tathoktam. sūtranirdeśād āgamānityatvād (cf. *PP* 84, *NP* 93.2) vā na *ñamo hrasvād* iti (cf. P.8.3.32) nuṭ.⁵⁶⁶ **chātrāḥ paṭhanti ma** ity atra padatvāt padatvāśrayam rutvam (cf. P.8.2.66). pūrvatra tiñantasya padatvāt *padāt* (P.8.1.17) *padasyety* (P.8.1.16) *adhikāre temayāv ekavacana*⟨*sye*⟩*ty* (P.8.1.22) 10
asmado me ādeśaḥ. pratyayagrahaṇaparibhāṣayā (cf. *PP* 44 and *NP* 23) *yena vidhir* ity (P.1.1.72) *ane*⟨*na*⟩ vā tadantatve labdhe 'ntagrahaṇam *anyatra samjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhir nāstīti* (cf. *PP* 81 and *NP* 27) jñāpanārtham.⁵⁶⁷
tena gaurī brāhmaṇitareti taraptamapoḥ kevalayoḥ ghasamjñakatvāt tadante hrasvo (cf. P.6.3.43) na bhavati. tasmimṣ tu bhavaty eva. 15

15. *naḥ kye.* (P.1.4.15)

(*Bhv.:*) **kye pare nāntam eva padaṃ syāt. rājīyati. rājāyate. niyamaḥ kim? vācyati. tapasyati. padāśraye kutvarutve na bhavataḥ** (cf. P.8.2.30, 66).

(*Pañj.:*) ||**naḥ**|| **kya** iti kyackyañkyaṣām sāmānyena grahaṇam.⁵⁶⁸ **nāntam eveti** 20
subantatvāt kyāñādayo vidhīyante. tatra pratyayalakṣaṇena padatvasiddher niyamārtham.⁵⁶⁹ viparītanīyamō nāsañkanīyaḥ kya eva nāntam iti *brahmahastibhyām varcasa* iti (P.5.4.78) nirdeśāt.⁵⁷⁰ **rājīyatīti** dvitīyāntāt *supa ātmanaḥ kyac* (P.3.1.8).

⁵⁶⁴ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham nu stavane 'tas tudādītīvāc chapratyaye kṛte nuvatīti. tadādi-grahaṇād vikaraṇāntasyāṅgatve sāvadhātukāśrayaguṇaprasaṅgāt. ucyate: antaraṅgatvād uvañ vikaraṇāśrayaḥ.*

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yuktaṃ hi tiñ iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam anyasya tiñśabdasyābhāvāt. katham sub iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam saptamībahuvacanasya vidyamānatvāt tasya grahaṇam kasmān na bhavatīti? naiṣa doṣaḥ 'na nisambuddhyoḥ' iti (P.8.2.8) pratiśedhāt.*

⁵⁶⁶ The *pratyāhāra nām* comprises the consonants *ñ*, *ṇ* and *n* and consequently *ñamuṭ* used in P.8.3.32 *ñamo hrasvād aci ñamuṭ nītyam* means the augments *ñuṭ*, *ṇuṭ* and *nuṭ*.

⁵⁶⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *padasamjñāyām antagrahaṇam anyatra samjñāvidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidheḥ pratiśedhārtham. gaurī brāhmaṇitarā.* Cf. also *Nyāsa* on it: *nanu ca 'pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes tadantasya' ity (PP 44, cf. NP 23) anena 'yena vidhis tadantasya' ity (P.1.1.72) anena vāntareṇāpy antagrahaṇam tadantasyaiva samjñā bhaviṣyati tat kimartham antagrahaṇam ity ata āha – padasamjñāyām ityādi.*

⁵⁶⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *kye iti kyackyañkyaṣām sāmānyagrahaṇam.*

⁵⁶⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu caite kyajādayaḥ subantād eva vidhīyante pratyayalakṣaṇena tataś ca 'suptiñantam padam' ity (P.1.4.14) anenaivātra padasamjñā siddhā.*

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nāntam kya eva ity eṣa viparītanīyamō nāsañkanīyaḥ 'na nisambuddhyoḥ' ity (P.8.2.8) pratiśedhāt.*

anubandhalopaḥ sanādyantā dhātava iti dhātusaṃjñāyāṃ supo
 dhātu ityādinā sumor¹ luk nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasyeti nalopaḥ²
 rājāyata iti karttuḥ kyañ salopaś ceti kyañ nalopaḥ

- akṛtsārvadhātukayor³ ddirghaḥ kyaño nitvād ātmanepadam
 5 kyaṣ apy udāhāryyam⁴ varmāyati varmāyata iti vā kyaṣa ity ātmanepadam⁵.
 tapasyatīti tapasaḥ parasmaipadañ ceti para-
 smaipadam ||

10

||siti|| bhavadīya iti padatvāt tasya daḥ ūṇāyur iti
 bhasaṃjñābādadhād yasyeti⁶ lopo na bhavati ||

15

- ||svādi|| svādi[s]v⁷ iti suśabdād ekavacanād ārabhya ā kapah⁸ na tu
 saptamībahuvacanāt asarvanāmasthāna iti niṣedhāt⁹ kapparyyanteṣv iti uraḥ
 20 prabhṛtibhyaḥ kab ity evamantāḥ svādaya¹⁰ ete rājatama iti atīśāyane
 tamap padatvān¹¹ nalopaḥ śasādisv aśāv iti na kṛtam śyām
 bhasaṃjñāpratisiddhyartham sāmñī (i)ti¹² ||

¹SJ: dhātuprātipadikayor iti. ²SJ adds: kyaci cetītvam. ³SJ adds iti. ⁴SJ: -ryyaḥ. ⁵SJ:
 parasmaipadam. ⁶SJ adds ceti. ⁷SJ: svādir. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: pratiṣedhāt. ¹⁰SJ: mahāsvādaya.
¹¹SJ: padasaṃjñāyāṃ. ¹²SJ om.

anubandhalopaḥ (cf. P.1.3.9). *sanādyantā dhātava* iti (P.3.1.32) dhātusaṃjñāyāṃ *supo dhātv* ityādinā (P.2.4.71) *supo* luk. *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasyeti* (P.8.2.7) nalopaḥ. **rājāyata** iti *kartuḥ kyañ salopas ceti* (P.3.1.11) kyañ. nalopaḥ (cf. P.8.2.7). *akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ* (P.7.4.25). kyaño niittvād ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.12). kyaṣ apy udāhāryam. varmayati varmayata iti *vā kyaṣa* ity (P.1.3.90) ātmanepadam. 5
tapasyatīti tapasaḥ parasmaipadam ceti (vārtt. 1 on P.3.1.15, *Mbh.* II 25.17) parasmaipadam.

16. siti ca. (P.1.4.16)

(*Bhv.:*) **siti pūrvaṃ padaṃ syāt. chas. bhavadīyam. yus. ūrñāyuh. bhasaṃjñāṃ bād hate.** 10

(*Pañj.:*) ||**siti**|| **bhavadīya** iti padatvāt tasya daḥ (cf. P.8.2.39). **ūrñāyur** iti bhasaṃjñābād hād *yasyeti* (cf. P.6.4.148) lopo na bhavati.

17. svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne. (P.1.4.17)

(*Bhv.:*) **kapparyanteṣu** (cf. P.5.4.151) **svādiṣu pūrvaṃ padaṃ syāt. rājabhyām. rājasu. rājatvam. rājatamaḥ. asarvanāmasthāne kim? rājānau. rājānaḥ. katham sau? padatvaṃ rājeti. na nisambuddhyor iti** (P.8.2.8) **jñāpakāt.** 15

(*Pañj.:*) ||**svādi**|| **svādiṣv** iti suśabdād ekavacanād ārabhya ā kapaḥ.⁵⁷¹ na tu saptamībahuvacanād **asarvanāmasthāna** iti niṣedhāt.⁵⁷² **kapparyanteṣv** ity *urah prabhṛtibhyaḥ kab* ity (P.5.4.151) evamantāḥ svādaya ete. **rājatama** ity atisāyane 20 tamap (cf. P.5.3.55). padatvān nalopaḥ (cf. P.8.2.7). śasādiṣv aśāv iti na kṛtaṃ śyām bhasaṃjñāpratiṣiddhyartham sāmni iti.⁵⁷³

18. yaci bham. (P.1.4.18)

(*Bhv.:*) **yādāv ajādu ca svādu pūrvaṃ bhasaṃjñāṃ syāt. yi. gārgyaḥ. aci. rājñāḥ paśya. asarvanāmasthāna ity eva. rājānau. sāmāni. nabho'ngiromanuṣāṃ vaty upasaṃkhyānam** (vārtt. 3 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 320.10). **bhasaṃjñā syāt. nabhasvat. aṅgirasvat. manuṣvat.** 25

⁵⁷¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: ‘*svādiṣu*’ iti suśabdād ekavacanād ārabhya ā kapaḥ pratyayā grhyante.

⁵⁷² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atra yadi saptamībahuvacanād ārabhya ā kapaḥ pratyayā grhyeran tadā ‘asarvanāmasthāne’ iti pratiṣedham na kuryāt prāptyabhāvāt.*

⁵⁷³ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *atha kasmāc chasādiṣv iti nocyate, evaṃ hi asarvanāmasthāne iti na vaktavyaṃ bhavati? uttarārtham suṭy api napuṃsake bhasaṃjñā yathā syāt sāmni ity atra mā bhūt. bhasaṃjñā ‘vibhāṣā niśyoh’ iti (P.6.4.136) vacanasāmarthyād evābhasyāpy allopo bhaviṣyati. tatrāyam apy artho ‘yasyety ādu śyām pratiṣedhaḥ’ iti (vārtt. 1 on P.6.4.148, *Mbh.* III 227.1) na vaktavyaṃ bhavati abhatvād eva siddham. iha tarhi supadī brāhmaṇakule iti padbhāvo na syād abhatvāt iha ca sāmāni paśyetyi bhatvād allopaḥ syād iti yathānyāsam evāstu.*

||yaci|| yacīti varṇagrahaṇaṃ tato¹ yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇa
iti² tadādividhi[r] vijñāyata iti· ata³ āha yādāv ajādāv ityādi·

- 5 gargya iti· apatyārthe⁴ gargādibhyo yañ bhatvād yasyeti cetity
akāralopaḥ rājñāḥ iti atrāpy⁵ allopo 'na ity akāralopaḥ rājñānau
sāmānīti atra padatvābhāvān na nalopaḥ⁶ | nabho 'ngiromanuṣām
ity atra bhasaṃjñā padasaṃjñābādhanarthā· tena nabhasvad ity atra⁷ rutvaṃ
na bhavati vṛṣaṇvasur i[ty] itra natvasyāsiddhatvān
10 nalopo na bhavati⁸ padāntasyeti padanibandha-
no natvaṃ pratiṣedhaś⁹ ca vṛṣaṇvaśvo vṛṣaṇvasur ity atra bhatve py allopo
nāsti | aṅgādhikāre¹⁰ bhādhikārāt vasvaśvayor
aṅganimittatvābhāvāt tad api apratyayatvāt¹¹ ||

15

||tasau|| tasāv iti¹² varṇagrahaṇaṃ na ca tābhyām¹³ paro matvarthīyaḥ
pratyayaḥ¹⁴ sambhavati· ataḥ¹⁵ sāmartyāt tadantavidhir vijñāyata¹⁶ ity āha tāntaṃ
sāntaṃ iti vidyutvān iti matupo bhatvāt padatvābhāve jaśtvam
20 na bhavatīti¹⁷ jhaya iti matupo makārasya vakā(ra)tvam¹⁸· payaḥsvīti·
atrāpi bhatvāt padanibandhanaṃ na rutvam¹⁹ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ adds tat. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: apatyē. ⁵SJ om. api. ⁶SJ: rājāno rājanīti
bhatvābhāvān nalopo na bhavati. ⁷SJ: -āda. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: ṇatvaniṣedhaś. ¹⁰SJ: aṅgādhikāre.
¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: tasā. ¹³SJ: tasmāt. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ: tadantagrahaṇaṃ. ¹⁷SJ om. iti.
¹⁸SJ: vatvaṃ. ¹⁹SJ: rutvaṃ na bhavati.

padāśrayaṃ rutvaṃ na bhavati. *vṛṣaṇ vasvaśvayor bhasaṃjñā vaktavyā*.⁵⁷⁴ *vṛṣaṇvasuḥ. vṛṣaṇaśvaḥ. nakāralopo na bhavati.*

(*Pañj.*:) ||**yaci**|| **yac**ṭi varṇagrahaṇam. tato *yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇa* iti (*PP* 75, *NP* 33) tadādividhir vijñāyata ity ata āha **yādāv ajādāv** ityādi.⁵⁷⁵ **gārgya** ity apatyārthe *gargādibhyo yañ* (P.4.1.105). bhatvād *yasyeti cety* (P.6.4.148) akāralopaḥ. **rājñā** ity atrāpy *allopō 'na* ity (P.6.4.134) akāralopaḥ. **rājānau sāmānī**ty atra padatvābhāvān na nalopaḥ (cf. P.8.2.7). **nabho 'ngiromanuṣām** ity atra bhasaṃjñā padasaṃjñābādhanārthā. tena **nabhasvad** ity atra rutvaṃ (cf. P.8.2.66) na bhavati. **vṛṣaṇvasur** ity *atra* ṇatvasyāsiddhatvān (cf. P.8.4.1 and P.8.2.1) nalopo (cf. P.8.2.7) na bhavati. *padāntasyeti* (P.8.4.37) padanibandhana-
no *ṇatvapratishedhaś* ca.⁵⁷⁶ **vṛṣanaśvo vṛṣaṇvasur** ity atra bhatve 'py allopō (cf. P.6.4.134) nāsti aṅgādhikāre (cf. P.6.4.1) bhādhikārād (cf. P.6.4.129) vasvaśvayor aṅganimittatvābhāvāt. tad apy apratyayatvāt.

19. *tasau matvarthe.* (P.1.4.19)

(*Bhv.*:) **matvarthīye pare tāntaṃ sāntaṃ ca bhasaṃjñam syāt. vidyutvān. marutvān. payasvī. tapasvī. yaśasvī.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**tasau**|| **tasāv** iti varṇagrahaṇam. na ca tābhyāṃ paro matvarthīyaḥ pratyayaḥ sambhavati. ataḥ sāmārthyāt tadantavidhir vijñāyata ity āha **tāntaṃ sāntam** iti.⁵⁷⁷ **vidyutvān** iti matup (cf. P.5.2.94). bhatvāt padatvābhāve jaśtvam (P.8.2.39) na bhavatīti. *jhaya* iti (P.8.2.10) matupo makārasya vakāratvam. **payasvī**ty atrāpi bhatvāt padanibandhanaṃ na rutvam (cf. P.8.2.66).

20. *ayasmayādīni cchandasi.* (P.1.4.20)

(*Bhv.*:) **idaṃ chandaḥsūtram ekam.**

21. *bahuṣu bahuvacanam.* (P.1.4.21)

(*Bhv.*:) **suptiṇām aviśeṣeṇa vidhānād akṣiṇi te raktānītyādilokopacāra- darśanāc ca niyamo 'yam. bahuṣv evārtheṣu bahuvacanam syāt. bhikṣavaḥ saddharmān paṭhanti. vipraiḥ sāmāni gīyante.**

⁵⁷⁴ Cf. vārtt. 4 ad loc.: *vṛṣaṇvasvaśvayor* (*Mbh.* I 320.12) and Pat. on this vārtt.: *vṛṣaṇ ity etasya vasvaśvayor bhasaṃjñā vaktavyā* (*Mbh.* I 320.13).

⁵⁷⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **yac**ṭi varṇagrahaṇam saptamānīrdiṣṭam. ataḥ 'yasmīn vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe' iti (*PP* 75, *NP* 33) tadādividhinātra bhavitavyam ity ata āha – **yakārādāv** ityādi.

⁵⁷⁶ Another possible emendation would be: **vṛṣaṇvasur** ity atra ṇatvasyāsiddhatvān nalopo padanibandhanaṃ na bhavati. *padāntasyeti ṇatvapratishedhaś* ca. Cf. *Nyāsa*: *vṛṣṇo 'śvaḥ vṛṣaṇaśvaḥ. atra bhatve sati yady api ṇatvasyāsiddhatvaṃ tathāpi nalopaḥ padanibandhanaṃ na bhavati padāntasya iti ṇatvapratishedhaś* ca.

⁵⁷⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **tasāv** iti varṇagrahaṇam. na ca varṇamātrān matvarthīyaḥ sambhavati. ataḥ sāmārthyāt tadantavidhir vijñāyata ity āha – **takārāntam** ityādi.

||śrī bahuṣu || svādisūtreṇa jasādi bahuvacanam tibādisūtreṇa
 jhiprabhṛti bahuvacanam ca sāmānyena vihitam na ca tatrārtha-
 viśeṣa¹ ity ata² āha supti[n]ām aviśeṣavidhānād³ iti etac ca ekavākyatā abhāva-
 pakṣe ekavākyatāyām sāmānyavihitatvān⁴ nāsti niyamo yam iti niyamasya
 5 svarūpaṃ darśayati bahuṣv evārtheṣv iti bahuvacanam e[v]eti viparītanīyamō nā-
 śaṅkanīyaḥ jātyākhyāyām⁵ iti sūtrārambhāt anyathā hy arthasya ni-
 yatatvād bahuvacanam svata eva bhaviṣyatīty eke tan na (?) ubhayasyāpi niyama-
 syānuvṛttivāt iha tu nāntarīyakatvāt eko niyama uktaḥ⁶ niyamārtha[s]⁷ tu pañca-
 kaprātipadikārtha⁸ eva svārthadravyalingasamkhyākarm{o}ādyātmake⁹ triprātipadikā-
 10 rthe¹⁰ [sv]ārthadravyalingātmake¹¹ niyamo nopapadyate samkhyāyāḥ prātipadikenānu-
 ktatvāt yatra ca¹² samkhyābhedo vidyate¹³ tatrāyam niyamaḥ avyayebhyas tu
 niḥsamkhyebhya[h] sāmānyavihitaiḥ svādibhir bhavitavyam¹⁴ evam¹⁵ anyathā teṣāṃ
 avyayānām padatvam na syāt | avyayānām subutpattau nāvyaībhāvād ato 'm tv
 apañcamyā iti vacanam jñāpakam sublukniṣedhyāmbhāvārtham¹⁶ bahuṣv
 15 iti bahunacanani[rdeśād vai]pulya[vāci]no¹⁷ jasā[d]ir nna bhavati | bahur odano bahuḥ
 sūpa iti bahuvacanaikadvivacanānām anvarthakatvena bahūn dve ekam
 vaktī di niruktyā siddhau sūtradvayam idaṃ mandabuddhigrhītapalaṃ vaici-
 tryārtham vā¹⁸ | nyāsakārasya niḥsr[ta]sara[sva].ī[tā].[se]yaḥ¹⁹ prapañcaḥ²⁰ bhikṣava iti
 bhikṣadhātoḥ sanāśaṃsabhikṣa ur iti upratyayaḥ²¹ sāmāni gīyanta iti
 20 anena²² kārake kriyāyā[n ca] bahutvam uktaṃ karmaṇi lakāraḥ gai śabde
 ghumādinetaṃ²³ ||

¹SJ: tatrārthe viśeṣopātta. ²SJ om. ³SJ: aviśeṣeṇa vidhānād. ⁴SJ: -tvam. ⁵SJ adds eka-
 sminn. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: -n. ⁸SJ: pañcake. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: trike. ¹¹SJ: svārthalingadravyātmake.
¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ: varttate. ¹⁴SJ: bhāvyaṃ. ¹⁵SJ: eva. ¹⁶SJ: sujluḥkaṃ niṣidhyāmbhāvārtham. ¹⁷SJ:
 vaiguṇya-. ¹⁸SJ: bahuvacanaadvivacanaikavacanānām matvarthe bahūn vaktītyādike sūtram idaṃ
 mandabuddhyā svagrhītipalaṃ nairijyam prapañcaś ca. ¹⁹SJ: niḥsrtasarasvatīto 'vaseyaḥ. ²⁰SJ
 om. ²¹SJ adds: jasi ceti guṇaḥ. ²²SJ: etena. ²³SJ om.

(*Pañj.*) ||śrī **bahuṣu**|| svādisūtreṇa (cf. P.4.1.2) jasādi bahuvacanam tibādisūtreṇa (cf. P.3.4.78) jhiprabhṛti bahuvacanam ca sāmānyena vihitam.⁵⁷⁸ na ca tatrārthaviśeṣa ity ata āha **suptiṇām aviśeṣavidhānād** iti.⁵⁷⁹ etac ca ekavākyatābhāvapakṣe. ekavākyatāyām sāmānyavihitatvam nāsti.⁵⁸⁰ **niyamo 'yam** iti niyamasya svarūpaṃ darśayati **bahuṣv evārtheṣv** iti. bahuvacanam eveti viparītanīyamō nā- 5
śaṅkanīyaḥ *jātyākhyāyām* iti (cf. P.1.2.58) sūtrārambhāt. anyathā hy arthasyānīyatatvād bahuvacanam svata eva bhaviṣyatīty eke. tan na ubhayasyāpi niyamasānuvṛttitvāt. iha tu nāntarīyakatvād eko niyama uktaḥ. niyamārthas tu pañcakaprātipadikārtha eva svārthadravyalingasaṃkhyākarmādyātmake. triprātipadikārthe svārthadravyalingātmake niyamo nopapadyate saṃkhyāyāḥ prātipadikenānu- 10
ktatvāt.⁵⁸¹ yatra ca saṃkhyābhedo vidyate tatrāyam niyamaḥ. avyayebhyas tu niḥsaṃkhyebhyaḥ sāmānyavihitaiḥ svādibhir bhavitavyam evam.⁵⁸² anyathā teṣāṃ avyayānām padatvam na syāt. avyayānām subutpattau *nāvyaḥ bhāvād ato 'm tvapañcamyā* iti (P.2.4.83) vacanam jñāpakam sublukniṣedhyāmbhāvārtham. **bahuṣv** iti bahuvacananirdeśād vaipulyavācino jasādir na bhavati. bahur odano bahuḥ 15
sūpa iti.⁵⁸³ bahuvacanaika(vacana)dvivacanānām anvarthakatvena **bahūni** dve ekam vaktītyādi niruktyā siddhau sūtradvayam idaṃ mandabuddhiḥrhitaphalam vaicitryārtham vā. nyāsakārasya niḥṣṭasarasvatīto 'vaseyaḥ prapañcaḥ. **bhikṣava** iti bhikṣadhātoḥ⁵⁸⁴ *sanāśamsabhikṣa ur* ity (P.3.2.168) upratyayaḥ. **sāmāni gīyanta** ity anena kārake kriyāyām ca bahutvam uktam. karmaṇi lakāraḥ. *gai śabde* (*Dhp.* 1.965). 20
ghumādinettvam (cf. P.6.4.66).

22. *dvyekayor dvivacanaikavacane.* (P.1.4.22)

(*Bhv.*) arthayor dvitvaikatvayor eva dvivacanaikavacane syātām. mātāpitarau janayataḥ. **dharmo rakṣati rakṣitaḥ** (*Mahābhārata* 3.31.7b; *Manusmṛti* 8.15b). 25

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *nyāpprātipadikāt svādayaḥ lasya tibādaya iti sāmānyena bahuvacanam vihitam.*

⁵⁷⁹ *Bhv.*: **aviśeṣeṇa vidhānād.**

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.4.1.2: *yadi tarhi tena sahāsyāikavākyatā, tadā yad uktam 'bahuṣu bahuvacanam' ity atra – 'yatra ca saṃkhyā sambhavati tatrāyam upadeśaḥ, avyayebhyas tu niḥsaṃkhyebhyaḥ sāmānyavihitāḥ svādayo vidyanta eva' iti, tad virudhyate; ekavākyatāyām hi viśiṣṭa evārthe karmādisambandhinī ekatvādau svādīnām vidhānāt sāmānyavihitatvam nopapadyate. Similar Pad. on the same sūtra.*

⁵⁸¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yeṣāṃ ca pañcakam prātipadikārtha iti matam teṣāṃ prātipadikasyaiva pañcāpy arthā vācyāḥ. vibhaktayaś ca taddyotikā bhavanti. tatrānirdiṣṭārthāḥ pratyayāḥ svārthe bhavanti vināpi vacanenānena prātipadikād bahuvacanam jasādi bahutve siddham eva. tatra tv aniyamenānyatrāpy ekatvādau prāptam anena niyamyata iti niyamārtham etad bhavati. kasmāt **punar vṛttikāreṇa** trikam prātipadikārtha iti darśanam āśritam? yuktatvāt. ... tathā hi yataḥ sa vibhaktiviśeṣa utpannas tata evāsāv arthaviśeṣaḥ pratīyate nānyasmād iti trika eva prātipadikārtho yuktaḥ.*

⁵⁸² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *avyayebhyas tu niḥsaṃkhyebhyaḥ sāmānyavihitāḥ svādayo vidyanta eva.*

⁵⁸³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tena vaipulyam bahuvacanasya vācyam na bhavati bahur odanaḥ bahuḥ sūpa iti vaipulyavācino bahuśabdād ekavacanam eva bhavati na bahuvacanam.*

⁵⁸⁴ Cf. *Dhp.* 1.637: *bhikṣa bhikṣāyām alābhe lābhe ca.*

||dvekeyo[h]|| dvitv[ai]kayor ityādinātrāpi pratyayaniyaḥ |
 dvekeyor iti bhāvapradhāno 'yaṃ¹ nirdeśaḥ anyathā bahuvacanaṃ syāt
 nirdeśāt samkhyāyā alpīyasa iti na pravarttate
 kramavyatikramo² vaicitryāya³ ||

5

||kārake|| kārake.. madhya ity anena kāraka iti nirddhāraṇasaptamī⁴.
 ekavacanan tu subvyatyayena kārakaśabdo nimittaparyyāyo 'vyutpanno
 10 viśeṣaṇam ap((ā))dānādiviṣayaḥ⁵. tena kriyāyā⁶ nimittasya kārakavi[śe]ṣaṇaviśiṣṭasyā-
 pādānādisaṃjñā bhavati | evañ ca⁷ vṛkṣasya patraṃ⁸ pataty⁹ atrākārasyāpādāna-
 saṃjñā na bhavati. kārakavyavasthitau ca¹⁰ vivakṣaiva .ūlaṃ. tena sambandhasya¹¹
 vivakṣāyām avadhibhāve vivakṣite¹². vṛkṣā[t] patraṃ¹³ patatīty api siddhyati¹⁴ ||

15

20

||dhruvaṃ|| viśeṣa iti apāyaśabdasyārthaḥ dhruvaṃ ity avadhi-
 bhūtaṃ gamanakriyām¹⁵ udāsīnam nirddiṣṭaviṣayam iti sāksādūktāvadhikam¹⁶.
 25 up[āta]viṣam iti vākyārthasaṅgatyādhyāhṛtakriyaṃ apekṣitakriyaṃ iti.
 ādhyataratvādinotkṛṣṭakriyaṃ. asmin vyākhyāne pañcamīvibhaktam¹⁷ iti prapañcā-
 rtham¹⁸. athāpasarato meṣād apasarati meṣa iti tra katham apādānatvaṃ. yāvātā
 dvayor apy¹⁹ apasaraṇena yogāt. ekasya dhruvatvāyogāt | naitad asti. āśrayabhedenā-

¹SJ om. ²SJ adds ca. ³SJ: vaicitryārthaḥ. ⁴SJ: nirddhāraṇe. ⁵SJ: ādānā-. ⁶SJ: kriyā-.
⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: parṇam. ⁹SJ adds iti. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ: sambandhā-. ¹²SJ: -taṃ. ¹³SJ: parṇam.
¹⁴SJ: bhavati. ¹⁵SJ: grāmādi kriyāyām. ¹⁶SJ: -uktābodhakam. ¹⁷SJ: -ktim. ¹⁸SJ: spaṣṭārtham.
¹⁹SJ adds meṣayor.

(*Pañj.:*) ||***dvyekeyoh***|| ***dvitvaikatvayor*** ityādinātrāpi pratyayaniyamah. ***dvyekeyor*** iti bhāvapradhāno 'yam nirdeśah. anyathā bahuvacanam syāt.⁵⁸⁵ nirdeśāt *saṃkhyāyā alpīyasa* iti (vārtt. 8 on P.2.2.34, *Mbh.* I 437.3) na pravartate. kramavyatikramo vaicitryāya.

23. *kārake.* (P.1.4.23)

(*Bhv.:*) ***adhikāro 'yam. ataḥ param yad vakṣyati tat kārakeṣu madhye boddhavyam. tad yathā.***

(*Pañj.:*) ||***kārake***|| ***kārakeṣu madhya*** ity anena ***kāraka*** iti nirdhāraṇasaptamī. ekavacanam tu subvyatyayena.⁵⁸⁶ *kārakaśabdo* nimittaparyāyo 'vyutpanno'⁵⁸⁷ viśeṣaṇam apādānādiviśayaḥ.⁵⁸⁸ tena kriyāyā nimittasya *kāravīśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭasyā-* 10 *pādānādisaṃjñā* bhavati. evaṃ ca vṛkṣasya patraṃ *patatīty* atrākāra(ka)syāpādāna-saṃjñā na bhavati. *kāravīśeṣaṇaviśiṣṭasyā* ca vivakṣaiva *mūlam*. tena saṃbandhasyā-vivakṣāyām avadhibhāve vivakṣite vṛkṣāt patraṃ *patatīty* api sidhyati.

24. *dhruvam apāye 'pādānam.* (P.1.4.24)

(*Bhv.:*) ***viśeṣe dhruvam kārakam apādānam syāt. tac ca nirdiṣṭa-*** 15 ***viśayam kiñcit. vṛkṣāt patraṃ patati. jalād utthitaḥ. upāttaviśayam tathā. balāhakād vidyotate vidyut. niḥsrītyety adhyāhāryam. adharmād viramati. adharmāj jugupsate. viramaṃ jugupsamānas tato nivartata ity arthaḥ. apekṣitakriyam ceti tridhāpādānam iṣyate.***⁵⁸⁹ *māthurāḥ sraughnebhya ādhyatarāḥ. niyamenotkarṣakriyā* 20 *gamyata iti. kāraka ity eva. vṛkṣasya parṇam patati. bahubhyo 'nyaḥ. kārakād* iti (cf. P.5.4.42) na śas.

(*Pañj.:*) ||***dhruvam***|| ***viśeṣa*** ity apāyaśabdasyārthaḥ. ***dhruvam*** ity avadhibhūtam gamanakriyā(yā)m udāsīnam. ***nirdiṣṭaviśayam*** iti sāksāduktāvadhikam. ***upāttaviśa(ya)m*** ity vākyārthasaṅgatyādhyāhṛtakriyam. ***apekṣitakriyam*** ity 25 *ādhyataratvādinotkrṣṭakriyam. asmin vyākhyāne pañcamīvibhaktam iti prapañcārtham. athāpasarato meṣād apasarati meṣa ity atra katham apādānatvaṃ yāvata dvayor apy apasaraṇena yogād ekasya dhruvatvāyogāt? naitad asty āśrayabhedenā-*

⁵⁸⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ayam api bhāvapradhāno nirdeśah. anyathā hi bahutvāt bahuvacanam syāt.*

⁵⁸⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: '*kārake*' iti nirdhāraṇe saptamī. *nirdhāraṇam tu bahūnām sambhavati tat katham ekavacanena nirdeśah? sāmānyapekṣayā tv ekavacanam. athavā – 'chandovat sūtrāṇi bhavanti'* (Pat on P.1.1.1 [*Mbh.* I 37.4] and on P.1.4.3 [*Mbh.* I 313.5]) *tato 'vyatyayo bahulam' iti* (P.3.1.85) *bahuvacane prāpta ekavacanam.*

⁵⁸⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *kārakaśabdo 'yam asty eva vyutpannaḥ ṇvulantaḥ kartrparyāya iti, asti ca saṃjñāśabdah avyutpanno nimittaparyāya iti.*

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *kārake iti viśeṣaṇam apādānādisaṃjñāviśayam adhikriyate. ... kārakaśabdaś ca nimittaparyāyah.*

⁵⁸⁹ The text in italics is *VP* 3.7.136 (3.392).

pasaraṇakriyābhedāt· tatra yad ekasyāpasaraṇam· tatr((ā))parasyānanupraveśād¹ dhru-
vatvaṃ yadi hy anupraveśaḥ syān meṣāv asarata iti prayogaḥ syāt tasmāc
calatvāvadhibhūtam² kriyāyām anupraviṣtam³ dhruvam iti· bahubhyo 'nya iti·
anyārād ityādinā pañcamī· ata āha kārakād iti na śas iti⁴ ||

5

||bhītrā|| bhayanaṃ bhīḥ trāṇam trāḥ bhāvarthau⁵ yeṣāṃ te tathoktāḥ⁶·
vyāghrāt trasta⁷ iti trasī udvege⁸ ||

10

||parā|| parāpūrvo jih parājih śākapārthiyādih⁹· adhyayanāt parā-
jayata iti adhyayanaṃ soḍhuṃ na śaknotīty arthaḥ ||

15

||vāra|| yavebhyo gāṃ vārayatīti gośabdāt dvitīyaikavacanaṃ auto
20 'maśasor ity ātvaṃ kūpād andhaṃ vārayatīti· andhasya gamyatvena¹⁰
īpsitaḥ kūpaḥ bauddhāpādānena pūrveṇa siddhe prapañcārtham idaṃ ||

¹SJ: tatretara-· ²SJ: calatvācalatvāvadhibhūta-· ³SJ: aṇal-· ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: bhītrāvartho.
⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: apatrasta. ⁸SJ adds: śvīditoniṣṭhāyām itīṭpratiṣedhaḥ. ⁹SJ: -vatvān madhya-
padalopī samāsaḥ. ¹⁰SJ: puṃso 'gamyatvena.

pasaraṇakriyābhedāt. tatra yad ekasyāpasaraṇam tatrāparasyānanupraveśād dhruvatvam. yadi hy anupraveśaḥ syān meṣāv a(pa)sarata iti prayogaḥ syāt.⁵⁹⁰ *tasmāc calatvāvadhībhūtaṃ kriyāyām* ⟨an⟩anupraviṣṭaṃ **dhruvam** iti. **bahubhyo 'nya** iti *anyārād* ityādinā (P.2.3.29) pañcamī. ata āha **kārakād iti na śas** iti.⁵⁹¹

25. bhītrārthānām bhayahetuḥ. (P.1.4.25)

(*Bhv.*:) **bhayatrāṇārthadhātuprayoge bhayahetur apādānaṃ syāt. caurād bhītaḥ. vyāghrād apatrastaḥ. dasyubhyo rakṣitaḥ.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**bhītrā**|| bhayanaṃ **bhīh** trāṇaṃ **trāh** bhāvārthau yeṣāṃ te tathoktāḥ. **vyāghrāt trasta** iti *trasī udvege* (*Dhp.* 4.10).

26. parājer asodhaḥ. (P.1.4.26)

(*Bhv.*:) **parājeḥ prayoge soḍhum aśakyam apādānaṃ syāt. adhyayanāt parājayate mandabuddhiḥ. bhojanāt parājayate.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**parā**|| parāpūrvo jiḥ **parājih** śākapārthivādiḥ.⁵⁹² **adhyayanāt parājayata** ity adhyayanaṃ soḍhum na śaknotīty arthaḥ.

27. vāraṇārthānām īpsitaḥ. (P.1.4.27)

(*Bhv.*:) **eṣāṃ prayoga īpsitam apādānaṃ syāt. yavebhyo gāṃ vārayati. kathaṃ kūpād andhaṃ vārayati? buddhyā prāpya tato nivartayatīty arthaḥ.**⁵⁹³

(*Pañj.*:) ||**vāra**|| **yavebhyo gāṃ vārayatīti** gośabdād dvitīyaikavacanam. *auto 'mśasor* ity (P.6.1.93) āttvam. **kūpād andhaṃ vārayatīty** andhasya gamyatvenepsitaḥ kūpaḥ.⁵⁹⁴ **bauddhāpādānena pūrveṇa siddhe prapañcārtham idam.**

28. antardhau yenādarśanam icchati. (P.1.4.28)

(*Bhv.*:) **antardhātum yena hetunā ātmano 'darśanam icchati tad apādānām syāt. upādhyāyād antardhatte chātraḥ. upādhyāyān nilīyate śiṣyaḥ.**

⁵⁹⁰ Cf. *Kārakacakra* p. 111: *yady evam apasarato meṣād apasarati meṣa ity atra dvayor apasaraṇena katham ekasya dhruvatvam. ucyate. āśrayabhedanāpasaraṇakriyābhedāt. tatra yady ekasyāpasaraṇam tatreтарыānanupraveśāt dhruvatvam. yadi hy anupraveśaḥ syāt tadā meṣāv apasarata iti syāt.* Cf. also Helārāja on *VP* 3.3.92: *apasarato meṣān meṣo 'pasarpātīty atrāpy ubhayakarmaje vibhāge yady apy ubhāv api meṣāv apāyāveśād adhruvau tathāpītarāpāthenetarasyanāveśāt kartṛbhedād bhinne evāpāyalakṣaṇe kriye.*

⁵⁹¹ Cf. P.5.4.42: *bahvalpārthāc chas kārakād anyatarasyām.*

⁵⁹² Cf. vārtt. 8 on P.2.1.69 (*Mbh.* I 406.7) on *Pat.* on it (line 6–8).

⁵⁹³ Cf. *Mbh.* I 328.23: *sa buddhyā samprāpya nivartayati.*

⁵⁹⁴ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *kathaṃ kūpād andhaṃ vārayaty, agner māṇavakaṃ vārayatīti. kūpa-syāgner karmaṇo 'nīpsitatvāt. ucyate: andhasya gamyatvenepsitaḥ kūpaḥ. māṇavakasya jyotīrūpo 'rthaḥ sprhaṇīyatvenepsita iti rakṣitaḥ.* Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *iha tarhi na syād agner māṇavakaṃ vārayati kūpād andham iti, na hy agnikūpau vārayitur vāryamāṇasya vābhipretau? kriyāśabdasya tu grahaṇe vāryamāṇasyāndhāder gamanādikriyayā kūpāder āpyamānatvāt siddhyati, andhas cāpaśyann api gantavyaṃ jīgamīṣyati, anyathā na kvacit tasya pravṛtīḥ syāt.*

||antarddhau|| antarddhāv iti nimittasaptamī¹ asti hy atrātmanā
karmaṇo² darśanasya prayogaḥ³ ubhayaprāptāv ity atra⁴ prayogagrahaṇā-
nuvṛttau sākṣād ubhayoḥ kartṛkarmaṇoḥ prayogo⁵ niyamāt yeneṭi hetāv
iyam tṛtīy((e))ty ata āha yena hetuneti svādarśanam icchati svād
5 anyasyādantaraṅgasyābhāvāt (?) niliyata iti līn śleṣaṇe divāditvāt śyan
nītvād ātmanepadam ||

10 ||ākhyā|| niyamād vākyagrahaṇe⁶ ity anenādhyayanavyatirekenāpi
niyamam darśayati ata eva rāmād adhītasandesa iti upayoge kiṃ naṭasya
śṛṇoti ||

15

||janikartuḥ|| sāhacaryyāt janiśabdena janyartha ucyate janyarthasya
karttā utpadyamānas tasya yā prakṛtir utpādan((ā))ya⁷ kāraṇam iti sāmagrītaḥ
phalam jāyata iti apādānasamjñāyām apādāne cāhīyaruḥor iti tasiḥ
jāyata iti janeḥ śyan jñājanor jeti jābhāvah ||

20

||bhuvah|| bhavanam bhūḥ prabhavaty asmād iti ṛdor ap
25 apādānārthe⁸ himavato gaṅgā prabhavatīti prathamata upalabhyata⁹ iti na tu
jāyata iti pūrvasūtrasyāviśayaḥ ||

¹SJ adds iyam. ²SJ: -ṇā. ³SJ: yogah. ⁴SJ: asya. ⁵SJ: -ge. ⁶SJ: -ṇam. ⁷SJ: upādāna-
⁸SJ: -ne 'rthe. ⁹SJ: dṛśyate.

(*Pañj.*) || **antardhau** || **antardhāv** iti nimittasaptamī.⁵⁹⁵ asti hy atrātmanah karmaṇo 'darśanasya prayogaḥ.⁵⁹⁶ ubhayaprāptāv ity (P.2.3.66) atra prayogagrahaṇā-nuvṛttau (cf. P.2.3.64) sāksād ubhayoḥ kartṛkarmaṇoḥ prayoge niyamād **yeneti** hetāv iyaṃ tṛtīyety (cf. P.2.3.23) ata āha **yena hetuneti**.⁵⁹⁷ svādarśanam icchati svād anyasyāntaraṅgasyābhāvāt. **niliyata** iti *līn śleṣaṇe* (*Dhp.* 4.31). divāditvāt śyan 5 (cf. P.3.1.69). nittvād ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.12).

29. ākhyātopayoge. (P.1.4.29)

(*Bhv.*) niyamād vākyaagrahaṇe ākhyātā pratipādayitā apādānaṃ syāt. paṇḍitāt purāṇaṃ śṛṇoti. **rāmād adhītasandeśaḥ** (*Bhaṭṭ.* 8.72a).

(*Pañj.*) || **ākhyā** || niyamād vākyaagrahaṇa ity anenādhyayanavyatirekenāpi 10 niyamaṃ darśayati. ata eva **rāmād adhītasamdeśa** iti. **upayoge** kim? naṭasya śṛṇoti.⁵⁹⁸

30. janikartuḥ prakṛtiḥ. (P.1.4.30)

(*Bhv.*) jāyamānasya prakṛtiḥ kāraṇam apādānaṃ syāt. sāmagrītaḥ phalaṃ jāyate. 15

(*Pañj.*) || **janikartuḥ** || sāhacaryāj janiśabdena janyartha ucyate.⁵⁹⁹ janyarthasya kartotpadyamānas tasya yā **prakṛtir** utpādanāya **kāraṇam** iti.⁶⁰⁰ **sāmagrītaḥ phalaṃ jāyata** ity apādānasamjñāyām *apādāne cāhīyaruhor* iti (P.5.4.45) tasiḥ. **jāyata** iti janeḥ śyan (cf. P.3.1.69). *jñājanor jeti* (P.7.3.80) jābhāvaḥ.

31. bhuvah prabhavaḥ. (P.1.4.31)

(*Bhv.*) bhuvah kartuḥ prabhavo 'pādānaṃ syāt. himavato gaṅgā prabhavati. **valmīkāgrāt prabhavati dhanuṣkhaṇḍam ākhaṇḍalasya** (*Meghadūta* 1.15b). 20

(*Pañj.*) || **bhuvah** || bhavanaṃ **bhūh**. prabhavaty asmād ity *ṛdor ap* (P.3.3.57). apādānārthe **himavato gaṅgā prabhavatīti** prathamata upalabhyata iti. na tu 25 jāyata iti pūrvasūtrasyāviśayaḥ.

⁵⁹⁵ Cf. vārtt. 6 on P.2.3.36: *nimittāt karmasamyoge* (*Mbh.* I 458.16) and also *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.28: **antardhāv** iti *nimittasaptamīyam*. 'nimittāt karmayoge' iti *saptamī*.

⁵⁹⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *asti hy atrādarśanena karmanā samyogaḥ*.

⁵⁹⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: **yeneti** kartari tṛtīyā. *nanu ca kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti iti* (P.2.3.65) *śaṣṭhyā bhavitavyam iti? naitad asti ubhayaprāptau karmani iti* (P.2.3.66) *niyamāt karmaṇy eva na kartari*. Similar *Pad*.

⁵⁹⁸ This is the example given by Patañjali ad loc. (*Mbh.* I 329.6), *Kāś.* (as well as *Nyāsa* and *Pad*.) gives the example *naṭasya gāthāṃ śṛṇoti*.

⁵⁹⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *janiśabdo 'tra sāhacaryāj janyarthe vartate*.

⁶⁰⁰ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *janyarthasya janmanah kartā jāyamānaḥ tasya yā prakṛtiḥ kāraṇam hetuḥ tat kārakam apādānasamjñam bhavati*.

5

10

15 ||karmaṇā || karmaṇā karaṇabhūteneti kriyābhede sati
dānakriyām¹ prati² karmatvaṃ abhiprayanakriyām³ prati karaṇatvaṃ gavādīnām |
abhisambadhnātīty anenābhīpraityartham ācaṣṭe yady evaṃ⁴ sūtrārthaḥ· ajām
grāman nayatīty atrāpi prāpnoti· naitat anvarthasamjñāvijñānāt⁵ samyak prakarṣeṇa
yasmai dīyate tat sampradānam iti· tena dadātikarmaṇeti vijñāyate· dānaṃ hi
20 nāma pūjānugrahakāmyayā svīyadravyaparitvāgapūrvakaparasvatvāpādanam⁶ ||
gurudevadvijādīnām⁷ bhāva..ddhyā ..tan tu yat |
dhyānāvana[t]idā[n]ai.. mānaṃ pūjābhīdh[ī]yate ||
[ku]rūponmattanīsvānām akutsāpūrvakaṃ hi yat |
pūraṇaṃ dānanāmābhyām anugraha udāhṛtaḥ ||
25 yat kiñcit phalam uddīśya dānayaññajapādikaṃ |
kriyate kāmikaṃ yac ca kāmyam āhur manīṣiṇaḥ ||

¹SJ: -yāyām. ²SJ om. ³SJ: -yeṇa. ⁴SJ: ayam. ⁵SJ: -vidhānāt. ⁶SJ:
ātmiyadravyaparitvāgapūrvakaṃ parasvatvotpādanam. ⁷SJ: -tīnām.

32. karmaṇā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam. (P.1.4.32)

(*Bhv.:*) karmaṇā karaṇabhūtena yam abhisambadhnāti tat kārakaṃ sampradānaṃ syāt. brāhmaṇāya gāṃ dadāti dhārmikaḥ. gurave dhanam niryātayati ruṣṭaḥ. paṭṭikopādhyāyaḥ śiṣyāya karṇacapeṭām adāt.⁶⁰¹ śatrave bhayaṃ dadāti. *bhayāni datta sītāyai* (*Bhatt.* 8.96c).⁵ katham *rajakasya vastraṃ dadāti. ghnataḥ pṛṣṭham dadātīti?*⁶⁰² abhipraityarthasyāvivakṣitatvād yathā *samam abrahmaṇe dānam iti* (*Manusmṛti* 7.85a). iha prārthanādhyavasānādikriyābhiḥ⁶⁰³ kartur īpsitatamatvāt kriyāpi karma bhavati. tatkriyayā yad abhisambadhya- te tat sampradānaṃ sūtreṇaiva. yuddhāya sannahyate. patye śete.¹⁰ nivedyatām sugrīvāya. *praṇamya śāstre sugatāya tāyine* (*Pramāṇa- samuccaya* 1b). iha ca *paśunā rudraṃ yajata* iti (*Mbh.* I 331.3) paśunā deyena rudraṃ prīṇayati. paśuṃ rudrāya dadātīti vastvarthaḥ.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**karmaṇā**|| karmaṇā karaṇabhūteneti kriyābhede sati dānakriyāṃ prati karmatvam abhiprāyaṇakriyāṃ prati karaṇatvam gavādīnām.⁶⁰⁴¹⁵ **abhisambadhnātīty** anenābhipraityartham ācaṣṭe. yady evaṃ sūtrārtho 'jāṃ grāmaṃ nayatīty atrāpi prāpnoti. naitat. anvarthasaṃjñāvijñānāt samyak prakarṣeṇa yasmai dīyate tat sampradānam iti.⁶⁰⁵ tena dadātikarmaṇeti vijñāyate. dānaṃ hi nāma pūjānugrahakāmyayā svīyadravyaparitāgāpūrvakaparasvatvāpādanam.⁶⁰⁶

*gurudevadvijādīnāṃ bhāvaśuddhyā kṛtaṃ tu yat |*²⁰
dhyānāvanatidānaiś ca mānaṃ pūjābhidhīyate ||
kurūponmattaniḥsvānām akutsāpūrvakaṃ hi yat |
pūraṇaṃ dānamānābhyām anugraha udāhṛtaḥ ||
yat kiṃcit phalam uddīśya dānaya jñāpādikaṃ |
*kriyate kāmikaṃ yac ca kāmīyam āhur manīṣiṇaḥ ||*⁶⁰⁷²⁵

⁶⁰¹ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 13 on P.1.1.1: *ya udāte kartavye 'nudāttaṃ karoti khaṇḍikopādhyāyas tasmai capeṭām dadāty anyat tvaṃ karoṣīti* (*Mbh.* I 41.24–25). See also Chakravarti (1918: 48 fn. 35).

⁶⁰² *Nyāsa* ad loc.

⁶⁰³ Cf. *Mbh.* I 330.24: *saṃdarśanakriyayā vā prārthayatikriyayā vādhyavasyatikriyayā vā.*

⁶⁰⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tathā hi – dadātikriyayāptum iṣṭatamatvāt tasyāḥ karmatvam, abhiprāyaṇakriyāṃ prati tasya sādhanatamatvāt karaṇatvam.*

⁶⁰⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sampradānam iti mahatyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ karaṇasyaitat prayojanam anvarthasaṃjñā yathā vijñāyeta – samyak prakarṣeṇa dīyate yasmai tat sampradānam iti* and *Kāraṇacakra: anvarthasaṃjñāvijñānāt samyak prakarṣeṇa yasmai dīyate tat sampradānam* [see Bhattacharya (1946: 110)].

⁶⁰⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *dānaṃ hi nāma pūjānugrahakāmyayā svakīyadravyaparitāgāḥ parasvatvāpattiḥ* and *Kāraṇacakra: tathāhi dānaṃ hi nāma pūjānugrahakāmyayā svasvatvaparitāgāpūrvakaṃ parasvatvāpādanalakṣaṇam* [Bhattacharya (1946: 110)].

⁶⁰⁷ These *śloka*s are cited by Puruṣottamadeva in his *Kāraṇacakra*. Bhattacharya (1946: 110) reads in the first one *vidhīyate* for *abhidhīyate* and in the third one *kāyikaṃ* for *kāmikaṃ*.

tena¹ rajakasya vastraṃ dadātītyāda² na bhavati· bhāgavṛttikṛt³ tu svarthatvā-
 parityāge⁴ 'pi abhipraityarthamātrasaṃjñām⁵ āha· ata eva⁶ bhayāni datta⁷ sītāyāy
 ityādi prayogaḥ | karmaneti kiṃ asati⁸ karmagrahaṇe karmaṇa eva sampradāna-
 5 tvam syāt karmasaṃ[jñ]ā tu dadātikarmaṇo 'nyatra sāvakāśā | abhipragrahaṇāt
 prāthamye etad⁹ ubhayaṃ bhūte py asti | sūtre liṅgavacanam atantraṃ
 tena brahmaṇībhyo dadur vastr{o}ānītyādi¹⁰ sidhyati· yuddhā[ya] sannahyata
 iti ṇaha bandhane svaritet karttari śyan
 niścayaṃ karotīty arthaḥ nivedyatām iti vida vedanāyāṃ caurādikaḥ¹¹
 10 loṭ· praṇamya śāstre sugatāya tāyine iti śāstrśabdāc caturthyekavacanam· tāyine
 dayālave | vastvartha iti paramārthaḥ¹² sūtrenaiyeti [n]opasamkhyān((e))na¹³· kriyāyāḥ
 karmatve sūtrārthāvabhā.āt¹⁴ ||

15

20 ||ślāgha || ślāgha¹⁵ iti ślāghṛ kathane anudāttet
 apahnuta iti hnuṃ apanayane· ādādikaḥ· nittvād
 ātmanepadam tiṣṭhata iti prakāśanastheyākhyāś ceti
 ātmanepadam¹⁶· ||

25

||dhāre || ṛṇe uttama uttamaraṇa iti nipātanāt samāsaḥ· dhārayatīti
 dhṛṇ dhāraṇe caurādikaḥ¹⁷ ||

¹SJ: etena. ²SJ: atra. ³SJ: -kāras. ⁴SJ: sva-. ⁵SJ: -tre. ⁶SJ: tena. ⁷SJ: adatta. ⁸SJ
 adds hi. ⁹SJ adds ca. ¹⁰SJ: brāhmaṇebhyo vastraṃ dadāti ityādi. ¹¹SJ adds karmaṇi. ¹²SJ
 adds ity arthaḥ. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: -vatārāt kriyāgrahaṇam apīti nopasamkhyeyam ity arthaḥ. ¹⁵SJ:
 ślāghata. ¹⁶SJ adds: śapata iti śapa ākrośe śapa upalambhana ity ātmanepadam. ¹⁷SJ: ṇic.

tena **rajakasya vastraṃ dadātī**tyādau na bhavati. bhāgavṛttikṛt tu svārthatvā-
 parityāge 'py abhipraityarthamātrasaṃjñām āha. ata eva **bhayāni datta sītāyāy**
 ityādi prayogaḥ. **karmaṇeti** kim? asati karmagrahaṇe karmaṇa eva saṃpradāna-
 tvaṃ syāt. karmasaṃjñā tu dadātikarmaṇo 'nyatra sāvakaśā.⁶⁰⁸ abhipragrahaṇāt
 kālavivakṣā na bhavati.⁶⁰⁹ tathā hy abhir ābhimukhye (cf. P.2.1.14) praśabdaḥ
 prāthamyē.⁶¹⁰ etad ubhayaṃ bhūte 'py asti. *sūtre liṅgavacanam atantram* (PP 117,
 NP 73). tena brahmaṇībhyo dadur vastraṇītyādi sidhyati. **yuddhāya saṃnahyata**
 iti *ṇaha bandhane* (Dhp. 4.57). svaritet (cf. P.1.3.72). kartari śyan (cf. P.3.1.69).
 niścayaṃ karotīty arthaḥ. **nivedyatām** iti *vida vedanāyāṃ* (Dhp. 10.168) caurādikaḥ.
 loṭ. **praṇamyā śāstre sugatāya tāyine** iti śāstrīśabdāc caturthyekavacanam tāyine
 dayālave. **vastvartha** iti paramārthaḥ. **sūtreṇaiveti** nopasaṃkhyānena kriyāyāḥ
 karmatve sūtrārthabhāvāt.⁶¹¹

33. **rucyarthānām prīyamāṇaḥ.** (P.1.4.33)

(Bhv.): rucyarthadhātūnām prayoge prīyamāṇaḥ saṃpradānam syāt.
 nāradāya rocate kalahāḥ. nāradasya ruciviṣayībhavati.

34. **ślāghahnūsthāśapāṃ jñīpsyamānaḥ.** (P.1.4.34)

(Bhv.): eṣāṃ prayoge bodhayitum iṣṭaḥ saṃpradānam syāt. nṛpāya
 ślāghate vandī. **ślāghamānaḥ parastrībhyaḥ** (Bhaṭṭ. 8.73c). **putrāyā-**
pahnute vaṇik. chātrāya tiṣṭhate kanyā. priyāyai śapate kāmukaḥ.

(Pañj.): ||**ślāgha**|| **ślāgha**(ta) iti *ślāghṛ katthane* (Dhp. 1.118). anudāttet
 (cf. P.1.3.12). **apahnuta** iti *hnūi apanayane* (Dhp. 2.72). **adādikaḥ.** nīttvād
 ātmanepadam (cf. P.1.3.12). **tiṣṭhata** iti *prakāśanastheyākhyayoś cety* (P.1.3.23)
 ātmanepadam.

35. **dhārer uttamarṇaḥ.** (P.1.4. 35)

(Bhv.): dhāreḥ prayoge dhanikaḥ saṃpradānam syāt. viprāya śataṃ
 dhārayati.

(Pañj.): ||**dhāre**|| ṛṇa uttama **uttamarṇa** iti nipātanāt samāsaḥ.⁶¹² **dhārayatī**
*dhṛṇi dhāraṇe.*⁶¹³ caurādikaḥ.

⁶⁰⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *karmasaṃjñāyās tu dadātikarmaṇo 'nyatrāvakaśaḥ syāt – odanam pacati.*

⁶⁰⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *karmaṇā yam eti sa saṃpradānam ity ucyamāne kālavivakṣā syāt.*

⁶¹⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *abhir ābhimukhye vartate tac cāpy atīte 'py asti. praśabda ādikarmaṇi, prārambhe.*

⁶¹¹ This sentence would be better suited before **yuddhāya saṃnahyate.**

⁶¹² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ṛṇe uttama uttamarṇaḥ. ata eva nipātanāt samāsaḥ saptamīsamāse ṛṇasya pūrvanipātāt.*

⁶¹³ In Böhtlingk's edition: *Dhp.* 1.948. *Nyāsa* treats *dhārayati* as a causative form from the root *dhṛṇi avasthāne* (*Dhp.* 6,119). Similar *Pad.*

||spr̥he || dhanāya spr̥hayatī{ty}ti· spr̥ha īpsāyāṃ caurādiko¹

- 5 'dantaḥ² akāralopasya sthānivatvāl³ laghūpadhagūṇo
na bhavati· yadā dhanasya⁴ īpsitatamatvaṃ vivakṣyate tadā paratvāt
karmasaṃjñai[v]a bhavati⁵ dhanam spr̥hayatīti· viśeṣavivakṣāyāṃ⁶ ṣaṣṭhy
api dhanasya spr̥hayati ||

10

||krudha || krudhadruḥī⁷ akarmakau divādī tataḥ⁸ ṣaṣṭhī prāptā
īrṣya īṣyārthaḥ· asūyaśabdaḥ kaṇḍvādiyagantaḥ·

- 15 anayor yoge dvitīyā prāptā· tatra caturthī⁹
vidhīyate· kopasthānam iti sāmānyaviśeṣaṇam etat drohādayo 'pi kopaprabhāvā
eva striyam īrṣyatīti· na hi tām prati kopaḥ kin tarhi parair dṛśyamānān tām¹⁰
na sahata ity arthaḥ yaṃ prati kopa iti nirdeśāt tvāṃ prati kruddho nṛpa ityādy¹¹
api ||

¹SJ: curādāv. ²SJ adds paṭhyate. ³SJ: -dbhāvāt. ⁴SJ: tu. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: śeṣa-. ⁷SJ:
-hāv. ⁸SJ: tatra. ⁹SJ: sampradānasaṃjñā. ¹⁰SJ om. ¹¹SJ om. -ādy.

36. spr̥her īpsitaḥ. (P.1.4.36)

(*Bhv.*) spr̥heḥ prayoge 'bhīṣṭaḥ sampradānaṃ syāt. dhanāya spr̥hayati.

(*Pañj.*) ||**spr̥he**|| dhanāya spr̥hayatīti spr̥ha īpsāyām (*Dhp.* 10.325). caurādiko 'dantaḥ. akāralopasya (cf. P.6.4.48) sthānivattvāl (cf. P.1.1.57) laghūpadhaguṇo 5 (cf. P.7.3.86) na bhavati. yadā dhanasya īpsitatamatvaṃ vivakṣyate tadā paratvāt karmasaṃjñaiḥ (cf. P.1.4.49) bhavati: dhanam spr̥hayatīti.⁶¹⁴ śeṣavivakṣāyām ṣaṣṭhy (cf. P.2.3.50) api: dhanasya spr̥hayati.⁶¹⁵

37. krudhadruherṣyāsūyārthānām yaṃ prati kopāḥ. (P.1.4.37)

(*Bhv.*) krudhādyarthānām prayoge kopasthānaṃ sampradānaṃ syāt. 10 putrāya krudhyati. śatrave druhyati. ekasmai īrṣyati. anyasmai asūyati. neha. striyam īrṣyati kāmukaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**krudha**|| krudhadruhī akarmakau divādī. tataḥ ṣaṣṭhī prāptā (cf. P.2.3.50). īrṣya īrṣyārthaḥ (cf. *Dhp.* 1.544⁶¹⁶). asūyaśabdaḥ kaṇḍvādiyagantaḥ (GP 37.3). anayor yoge dvitīyā prāptā (cf. P.2.3.2).⁶¹⁷ tatra caturthī (cf. P.2.3.13) 15 vidhīyate. **kopasthānam** iti sāmānyaviśeṣaṇam etat. drohādayo 'pi kopaprabhavā eva.⁶¹⁸ **striyam īrṣyatīti** na hi tām prati kopāḥ. kiṃ tarhi? parair dṛṣyamānām tām na sahata ity arthaḥ. **yaṃ prati kopa** iti nirdeśāt *tvām prati krudho nṛpa* ityādy api.⁶¹⁹

38. krudhadruhor upasṛṣṭayoḥ karma. (P.1.4.38)

(*Bhv.*) sopasargayoḥ krudhadruhor yaṃ prati kopas tat karmasaṃjñam 20 syāt. putram abhikrudhyati. śatrum anudruhyati.

39. rādhīkṣyor yasya vipraśnaḥ. (P.1.4.39)

(*Bhv.*) rādhīkṣyoḥ prayoge yasya vividham pṛcchati tat sampradānaṃ 25 syāt. putrāya rādhyati. kim ayam karoti kiṃ na veti. strībhyā īkṣate. kā kīdṛśī bhavatīti. **īkṣitavyaṃ parastrībhyaḥ svadharmo rakṣasām ayam** iti bhaṭṭiḥ (*Bhaṭṭ.* 8.76cd).

⁶¹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* on **puṣpebhyo vane spr̥hayati** (*Kāś.* on the present *sūtra*): *yadā tu puṣpādīnām īpsitatamatvaṃ vivakṣyate tadā paratvāt karmasaṃjñaiḥ bhavati.*

⁶¹⁵ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *yadā tv īpsitam īpsitatamaṃ vā śeṣatvena vivakṣyate tadā ṣaṣṭhī bhavati.*

⁶¹⁶ *Dhp.* 1.542–544: *śūrksya īrkṣya īrṣya īrṣyārthāḥ.*

⁶¹⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *krudhadruhāv akarmakau tatra ṣaṣṭhyām prāptāyām ayam ārambhaḥ, itarau sakarmakau. tatra dvitīyāyām prāptāyām. ... asūyaśabdaḥ kaṇḍvādiyagantaḥ.*

⁶¹⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *drohādayo 'pi kopaprabhavā eva gṛhyante.*

⁶¹⁹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham tām prati krudho nṛpaḥ. ucyate: yaṃ prati kopa iti nirdeśāt pūrvavipratīṣedhena caturthīm bādhitvā karmapravacanīyād vibhaktir dvitīyā.*

||rādhī|| yasyeti praśnakriyānimittasya vividham iti bhadrābhadranirupa-
 ṇam¹. rā[dhya](tī)ti rādha sādha saṃsiddhau śyan· īkṣata iti īkṣa
 darśane². anudāttet³ ||

5

||pratyā|| pūrvasyetyādinā hetusaṃjñāyāṃ prāptāyāṃ vacanam idam
 āha⁴. saṃpradānasamjñāyā hetusaṃjñābādha.ijabhāvaḥ⁵ abhyupagantari lakāraḥ
 10 pratyānpūrvāḥ śr̥ṇotir abhyupagame varttata ity āha· aṅḱkarotīti ||

15 ||anu|| hotre 'nugr̥ṇotīti gr̥⁶ śabde śnāpratyayaḥ pvādīnām⁷
 hrasvaḥ· anupūrvō gr̥ṇātīḥ protsāhane varttate ity āha taṃ⁸ śamsantam
 ityādi· ||

20

||sādha|| kriyāsiddhau prakṛṣṭam kārakam⁹ ityādi· sāmagrya-
 dhīnatve 'pi avyavadhāne na kriyānivarttakatvaṃ prakṛṣṭam karakatvaṃ¹⁰.
 kartradhīnavṛ{tri}tvād¹¹ asvatantṛaṃ karaṇam nāsty eva hi tat¹² karaṇam¹³ yat kartradhī-
 ṣṭhānan nāpeksate· vyavahito pi karttā 'nyanirapekṣa eva kriyāsiddhau vyāpāraṃ
 25 karotīti pradhānaṃ· ata eva karttur anyat karaṇam· tathā coktaṃ
 karaṇam nāma sarvatra kartrvyāpāragocaraṃ¹⁴ |
 tirodadhāti karttāraṃ¹⁵ pradhānan tannibandhanam

¹SJ: bhadravirūpaṃ. ²SJ: darśanāśaṅkanayoḥ. ³SJ adds śap. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: hetusaṃjñāyā
 bādhitatvāt ṇico 'bhāvaḥ. ⁶SJ: gr̥. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ: prakṛṣṭopakārakam. ¹⁰SJ:
 prakṛṣṭopakārakatvaṃ. ¹¹SJ: kartradhīnaṃ vṛttitvād. ¹²SJ om. ¹³SJ adds tat. ¹⁴SJ: -raḥ. ¹⁵SJ
 om.

(*Pañj.*) || **rādhī** || **yasyeti** praśnakriyānimittasya **vividham** iti bhadrābhadranirūpanam. **rādhyatīti** *rādha sādha saṃsiddhau*.⁶²⁰ śyan (cf. P.3.1.69). **īkṣata** iti *īkṣa darśane* (*Dhp.* 1.641). anudāttet (cf. P.1.3.12).

40. **pratyāñbhyāṃ śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā.** (P.1.4.40)

(*Bhv.*) **pratyāñpūrvasya śṛnoteḥ prayoge pūrvasya prārthanādeḥ kartā** 5
sampradānaṃ syāt. tubhyaṃ gāṃ pratiśṛnoti. mahyaṃ gāṃ āśṛnoti.
aṅgīkarotīty arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) || **pratyā** || **pūrvasyetyādinā** hetusaṃjñāyāṃ prāptāyāṃ vacanam idam āha.⁶²¹ sampradānasamjñāyā hetusaṃjñābādhanijabhāvaḥ. abhyupagantari lakāraḥ. pratyāñpūrvāḥ śṛnotir abhyupagame vartata ity āha: **aṅgīkarotīti.** 10

41. **anupratigṛṇāś ca.** (P.1.4.41)

(*Bhv.*) **asya ca prayoge pūrvasyāḥ kriyāyāḥ kartā sampradānaṃ**
syāt. hotre 'nugṛṇāti. potre pratigṛṇāti. taṃ śamsantaṃ śabdenā-
nugacchati. protsāhayatīty arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) || **anu** || **hotre 'nugṛṇātīti** *gṛ śabde* (*Dhp.* 9.28). śnāpratyayaḥ. *pvādīnām* 15
hrasvaḥ (P.7.3.80). anupūrvō gṛṇātīḥ. protsāhane vartata ity āha **taṃ śamsantaṃ**
ityādi.

42. **sādhakatamaṃ karaṇam.** (P.1.4.42)

(*Bhv.*) **kriyāsiddhau prakṛṣṭopakāraṃ karaṇam ucyate. paraśunā**
vṛkṣaṃ chinatti. buddhyā jānāti. vivakṣāvaśāt paraśuś chinatti. 20

(*Pañj.*) || **sādha** || **kriyāsiddhau prakṛṣṭaṃ kāraṃ ityādi.**⁶²² sāmagrya-
dhīnatve 'py avyavadhānena kriyāni⟨r⟩vartakatvaṃ prakṛṣṭaṃ kāraṃkatvam.⁶²³
kartradhīnatvād asvatantraṃ karaṇam. nāsty eva hi tat karaṇam yat kartradhī-
ṣṭhānaṃ nāpekṣate. vyavahito 'pi kartānyanirapekṣa eva kriyāsiddhau vyāpāraṃ
karotīti pradhānam.⁶²⁴ ata eva kartur anyat karaṇam. tathā coktaṃ: 25

karaṇam nāma sarvatra kartrvyāpāragocaram |
tirodadhāti kartāraṃ pradhānaṃ tannibandhanam ||

⁶²⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa: rādha sādha saṃsiddhau. daivādikaḥ.* In Böhtlingk's edition it is *Dhp.* 5.16–17. *Pad.* has *rādho 'karmakād vṛddhāv eva.* Cf. *Dhp.* 4.71: *rādha akarmakād vṛddhāv eva.*

⁶²¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yaś cāsau pūrvasyāḥ kriyāyāḥ kartā bhavati sa pratijñātuḥ prayojako bhavatīti hetusaṃjñāyāṃ prāptāyāṃ idam vacanam.*

⁶²² *Bhv.*: **kriyāsiddhau prakṛṣṭopakāraṃ.**

⁶²³ Cf. *Kāraṃcakra: karaṇam punar avyavadhānena kriyāṃ nirvartayatīti avyavadhānena kriyā-nirvartakatvāt atīśayatvaṃ karaṇasya.* [Bhattacharya (1946: 109)].

⁶²⁴ Cf. *Kāraṃcakra: nanu yadi karaṇavyavahitaḥ kartā kriyāyāṃ vyāpṛiyate tadā katham asya kartuḥ pradhānyam. ucyate. tadadhīnapravṛttivāt karaṇasya, nāsty eva hi tat karaṇam, yat kartradhīṣṭhānaṃ nāpekṣate.* [Bhattacharya (1946: 109)].

iti· dhātūktakriyātvāc ca karttuḥ prādhānyam· na
 hi karaṇam dhātūktakriyābhidhīyate· yadā tu sādhatamam api svatantram
 bhavati pradhānam¹ dhātūktakriyam vivakṣyate² tadā karttur³ bhavati ata evāha·
 paśuś china[tt]īti iha kārakādhikāre sādhasya samjñā nāstīty antareṇāpi tamap-
 5 grahaṇam sādhaagrahaṇāt sādhatamasya samjñā{vidhau} siddhau tamagrahaṇam
 jñāpakam· anyatra kārakādhikāre prakarsārthapratyayam vinā⁴ 'tisayo nāsti
 tenādhāro 'dhikaraṇam ity atra gaṇe 'pi⁵ dhāre 'dhikaraṇ{e}asamjñā siddhā⁶
 bhavati gaṅgāyā ghoṣa iti ||

10

15 ||pari || parikrītiḥ parikrayaṇam· vetanādineti· ādiśabdena bandhakā-
 dīnām grahaṇam atyantikakrayaṇe⁷ karaṇasamjñāiva bhavati⁸ ||

||ādhāro || āśrayo 'dhikaraṇam ucyata iti sa cāśrayaḥ kartṛkaraṇoḥ
 20 kriyāśrayayo{ḥ}r veditavyaḥ· yadi punaḥ kriyāyā āśrayo gr̥hyate⁹ tadā kartṛkarmanor
 evādhikaraṇasamjñā syāt tathā ca paryāyena samjñāpravṛttiḥ syāt | ekāsamjñā-
 dhikāre samjñāsamāveśo¹⁰ nāsti | gr̥he tiṣṭhatīti kartṛsthakriyāyā¹¹
 udāharaṇam sthālyam pacatīti karmasthāyam¹² trividham cādihikaraṇam

¹SJ om. ²SJ: -kriyāvivakṣātas. ³SJ: kartṛ. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ: siddhir. ⁷SJ: ātyantike
 krayaṇe. ⁸SJ adds nityam. ⁹SJ: gr̥hyeta. ¹⁰SJ: samjñāyoh. ¹¹SJ: kartṛsthāyāḥ. ¹²SJ: -yāḥ
 kriyāyā udāharaṇam |

iti (*Bhāvanāviveka* XXXV.3⁶²⁵). dhātūktakriyātvāc ca kartuḥ prādhānyam. na hi karaṇam dhātūktakriyayābhidhīyate. yadā tu sādihakatatamam api svatantram bhavati pradhānam dhātūktakriyam vivakṣyate tadā kartā bhavati.⁶²⁶ ata evāha pa(ra)śuś chinattīti. iha kārakādhikāre 'sādihakasya samjñā nāstīty antareṇāpi tamapgrahaṇam. sādihakagrahaṇāt sādihakatatamasya samjñāsiddhau tamapgrahaṇam 5 jñāpakam: anyatra kārakādhikāre prakarṣārthapratyayaṃ vinātiśayo nāsti.⁶²⁷ tenādhāro 'dhikaraṇam ity (P.1.4.45) atra gaṇe 'py <ā>dhāre 'dhikaraṇasamjñā siddhā bhavati gaṅgāyā<ṃ> ghoṣa iti.⁶²⁸

43. divaḥ karma ca. (P.1.4.43)

(*Bhv.*) divaḥ sādihakatatamam karma karaṇam vā syat. durakṣān dīvyatā 10 rājñā (*Kirātārjunīya* 11.47a). durakṣair vā.

44. parikrayaṇe sampradānam anyatarasyām. (P.1.4.44)

(*Bhv.*) vetanādisvīkāre karaṇam sampradānam syād vā. śatāya parikrītaḥ śatena vā.⁶²⁹

(*Pañj.*) ||pari|| parikrītiḥ parikrayaṇam. vetanādinety⁶³⁰ ādiśabdena bandhakā- 15 dīnām grahaṇam. ātyantikakrayaṇe karaṇasamjñāiva bhavati.⁶³¹

45. ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam. (P.1.4.45)

(*Bhv.*) āśrayo 'dhikaraṇam ucyate. gr̥he tiṣṭhati. sthālyām pacati.

(*Pañj.*) ||ādhāro|| āśrayo 'dhikaraṇam ucyata iti sa cāśrayaḥ kartṛkarmaṇoḥ 20 kriyāśrayayor veditavyaḥ. yadi punaḥ kriyāyā āśrayo gr̥hyate tadā kartṛkarmaṇor evādhikaraṇasamjñā syāt.⁶³² tathā ca paryāyeṇa samjñāpravṛttiḥ syāt. ekāsamjñādhikāre (cf. P.1.4.1) samjñāsamāveśo nāsti. gr̥he tiṣṭhatīti kartṛsthakriyāyā udāharaṇam. sthālyām pacatīti karmasthāyāḥ. trividham cādihikaraṇam.⁶³³

⁶²⁵ V. P. Bhatta (1994: 289) reads *khalu* for *nāma*.

⁶²⁶ Cf. *Kārakacakra*: dhātūktakriyātvāc ca kartuḥ prādhānyam, na hi karaṇakriyā dhātunābhidhīyate. yadā tv abhidhīyate tadā karaṇam api kartā bhavati. [Bhattacharya (1946: 109)]. Cf. also *Nyāsa* on the *sūtra* under discussion: vivakṣāvasād yad eva kadācit karaṇam bhavati. ... tad eva kadācit svātantryavivakṣāyāṃ kartṛtvam anubhavati.

⁶²⁷ Cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 64–5: ihānyatra kārakāṇām samjñāvidhau yatra taraptamapoḥ prayogo nāstīti tatra prakarṣāvagatir nāsti and the *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.42: iha kārakādhikāre itaḥ sūtrād anyatra vinā tamapgrahaṇena prakarṣo nāśrīyate.

⁶²⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: tad etat tamapgrahaṇam jñāpanārtham kṛtam. etad anena jñāpyate – iha kārakādhikāre itaḥ sūtrād anyatra vinā tamapgrahaṇena prakarṣo nāśrīyate – iti. tena 'ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam' ity anena 'gaṅgāyāṃ ghoṣaḥ' ityādāv amukhyasyāpi gaṅgāder ādhārasyādhikaraṇasamjñā siddhā bhavati.

⁶²⁹ Mishra (1989) omits the underlined phrase.

⁶³⁰ Cf. *Kāś.*: vetanādinā svikaraṇam. *Bhv.* has: vetanādisvīkāre.

⁶³¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: parikrayaṇam niyatakalām svikaraṇam nātyantikāḥ krayaḥ.

⁶³² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: yady ādhīyante kriyā yasmīn sa ādhāraḥ iti, evaṃ hi sati kartṛkarmaṇor evādhikaraṇasamjñā prasajyeta tayor eva hi kriyā ādhīyante.

⁶³³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: tat punar adhikaraṇam triprakāram – aupaslesīkam vaiśayikam abhivyāpakam ca.

aupaśleṣikaṃ kaṭe āste· vaiṣayikaṃ ākāśe śakunayaḥ· abhivyāpakaṃ tileṣu [tai]lam
ta[th]ā coktaṃ

aupaśleṣikavaiṣayikāv abhivyāpaka eva ca |
ādharas trividho jñeyaḥ kaṭākāśatilādiṣu ||

5

||adhi || śīnaḥ sānu.akasyoccāraṇaṃ¹ yaṇluknivr̥ttiyartham sthālyām
adhiśeṣayīti² ||

10

15

||upā || lugvikaraṇaparibhāṣayā vasa nivāsa ity

20 asya grahaṇaṃ vaser asyarthasya³ pratiṣedha⁴ iti vārttikam
anaṅgīkurovatā grāma⁵ upavasatīty asyārtho vyākhyātaḥ | upa-
pūrvasya⁶ vases trirātr{e}śābdena yogo grāmasya tu vasatineti yeṣāṃ bādhikaṃ⁷ [teṣāṃ
upoṣya rajanīm] ekām iti kā[la]dhvanor atyantasaṃyoga iti dvitīyā ||

¹SJ: sānubandhaka-. ²SJ om. ³SJ: arthasya. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: -mam. ⁶SJ: upapūrvaka-.
⁷SJ: tu vārttikam.

aupaśleşikam: kaṭa āste. vaiṣayikam: ākāśe śakunayaḥ. abhivyāpakam: tileṣu tailam. tathā caktam:

aupaśleşikavaiṣayikāv abhivyāpaka eva ca |
ādhāras trividho jñeyah kaṭākāśatilādiṣu ||.⁶³⁴

46. adhiśīṅsthāsāṃ karma. (P.1.4.46)

5

(*Bhv.*:) eṣām ādhāraḥ karma syāt. śayyām adhiśete. girim adhiṣṭhati. grāmam adhyāste. sthalīm adhiśete.

(*Pañj.*:) || **adhi** || śīnaḥ sānubandhasyocāraṇam yaṅluknivrṭtyartham: sthālyām adhiśeśayīti.

47. abhiniviśāś ca. (P.1.4.47)

10

(*Bhv.*:) asyāpy ādhāraḥ karma syāt. grāmam abhiniviśate.

48. upānvadhyāñvasaḥ. (P.1.4.48)

(*Bhv.*:) asyāpy ādhāraḥ karma syāt. grāmam upavasati. nadīm anuvasati. girim adhivasati. pallīm āvasati. iha grāma upavasatīti? grāme vasan saṃs trirātram upavasatīty evamprakārārthaḥ. yad uktam

15

vasatāv aprayukte 'pi deśo 'dhikaraṇam matam |
*aprayuktaṃ trirātrādi karma copavaseḥ smṛtam || iti (VP 3.7.155 = 3.411).*⁶³⁵

(*Pañj.*:) || **upā** || lugvikaraṇaparibhāṣayā (cf. *PP* 67, *NP* 90) *vasa nivāsa* ity (*Dhp.* 1.1054) asya grahaṇam.⁶³⁶ *vaser aśyarthasya pratiṣedha* iti vārttikam (vārtt. 1 ad loc., *Mbh.* I 332.5) anaṅgīkurvatā **grāma upavasatīty** asyārtho vyākhyātaḥ. upa-pūrvasya vases trirātraśabdena yogo grāmasya tu vasatineti. yeṣām bādhiḥ teṣām *upoṣya rajanīm ekām* iti *kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoga* iti (P.2.3.5) dvitīyā.⁶³⁷

49. kartur īpsitatamaṃ karma. (P.1.4.49)

(*Bhv.*:) kartuḥ kriyayā vyāptum iṣṭatamaṃ karma syāt. saṃyogaṃ janayati. taṇḍulān odanaṃ pacati. vedam adhīte.

25

⁶³⁴ This verse is quoted by Puruṣottamadeva in his *Kāraṅgacakra*. See Bhattacharya (1946: 116). The possible correction of *pādas* ab would be: *aupaśleşikavaiṣayikābhivyāpakā eva ca* (16 syllables).

⁶³⁵ Iyer (1963) and Rau (1977) have *tataḥ* instead of *matam* and *copavasau* instead of *copavaseḥ*.

⁶³⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *lugvikaraṇālugvikaraṇaparibhāṣayā 'vasa nivāse' ity asya bhavādīkasya grahaṇam, na 'vasa ācchādane' ity asyādādīkasya*.

⁶³⁷ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *'upoṣya rajanīm ekām' iti trirātram upavasatīty atra ca 'kālādhvanoh' ity (P.2.3.5) dvitīyā*. Cf. also *Durghata* ad loc.: *katham upoṣya rajanīm ekām pañcagavyena śudhyati. tathaikādaśīm upavasanti nirābubhukṣāḥ saṃvatsaraṃ ca kusumair harim arcayanti. vaser aśyarthasya pratiṣedho vaktavya iti vacanāt karmatvābhāvāt. ucyate: 'kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoga' iti (P.2.3.5) dvitīyā*.

||karttuḥ || samyoga[m] jana[ya]tīti nivartyakarmmaṇaḥ nirvartyaṃ yad
 asad utpādyate¹ taṇḍulān odanaṃ pacatīti vikāryyakarmmaṇaḥ· vikāryyan tu² sad
 eva³ vasthavikā[ram⁴ ā]padyate yat | vedam a[dhī]ta iti prāpyakarmmaṇaḥ prāpyakarmma⁵
 yatra kriyāprāptimātraṃ nānyat kiñcit· nanu katham karmaṇaḥ kārakatvaṃ
 5 kārakatvaṃ⁶ hi kriyāsādhanatvaṃ⁷ kriyāsādhyam hi karmma sādhyatvāt sādha ..
⁸ [nai]tad as[t]i sarva..⁹ karmmaṇi anugatavyāpāro¹⁰ 'sti· tasyāpe-
 kṣayā¹¹ karmmaṇaḥ kārakatvaṃ bhaviṣyati tathā hi yat tāvad utpadyate tat tasyotpatti-
 kriyākartṛbhūtasya karmabhāvaḥ | tathā cokaṭam

svavyāpāre hi¹² kartṛ[tva]ṃ sarvas traivā.ti¹³ kārake |

10 [vy]āpārabhedāpekṣayāṃ karaṇa[tv]ādisambhavaḥ ||

kaṭam karotīty ayam asyārthaḥ¹⁴ kaṭam utpadyamānam utpādayatīty arthaḥ yady
 ayam kaṭe¹⁵ 'nutpattidharmā syāt devadattas taṃ¹⁶ karttuṃ na śaknuyāt· karttuḥ
 kim māṣeṣv aśvam badhnāti· atra karmaṇa ī[psi]tā māṣā [ta]mapgrahaṇam (kim)
 payas[au]danaṃ bhūikte paya īpsitam atra na hīpsitatamaṃ¹⁷ ||

15

||tathā || dveṣyam anyac ceti paryyudāsasyānīpsitaśabdasya phalan
 darśayati karttuḥ kriyayā vyāpyamānam¹⁸ karmeti siddhau sūtradvayam idaṃ¹⁹ pra-
 20 pañcārthaṃ ||

¹SJ: utpadyate. ²SJ om. ³SJ adds tu. ⁴SJ om. vastha- ⁵SJ: prāpyan tu. ⁶SJ: kārakaṃ.
⁷SJ: -naṃ. ⁸SJ: sādhanam nahīti. ⁹SJ: sarvatra. ¹⁰SJ: sva-. ¹¹SJ: tadapekṣayā. ¹²SJ: ca.
¹³SJ: sarvatraivāsti. ¹⁴SJ: asyāyam arthaḥ. ¹⁵SJ: kaṭo. ¹⁶SJ: tu. ¹⁷SJ: tv ī-. ¹⁸SJ: vyāptum
 āpannam. ¹⁹SJ om.

(*Pañj.:*) ||***kartuḥ***|| **samyogaṃ janayatīti** ni⟨r⟩vartyakarmaṇaḥ. nirvartyaṃ yad asad utpādyate.⁶³⁸ **taṇḍulān odanaṃ pacatīti** vikāryakarmaṇaḥ. vikāryaṃ tu sad evāvasthāvikāram āpadyate yat.⁶³⁹ **vedam adhīta** iti prāpyakarmaṇaḥ. prāpyakarma yatra kriyāprāptimātraṃ nānyat kiñcit.⁶⁴⁰ nanu kathaṃ karmaṇaḥ kārakatvam? kārakatvaṃ hi kriyāsādhanatvam. kriyāsādhyam hi karma. sādhyatvāt sādha⟨na- 5
tvam na saṃbhavati⟩). naitad asti. sarvatra karmaṇy anugatavyāpāro 'sti. tasyāpekṣayā karmaṇaḥ kārakatvaṃ bhaviṣyati. tathā hi yat tāvad utpadyate tat tasyotpatti-
kriyākartṛbhūtasya karmabhāvaḥ.⁶⁴¹ tathā coktaṃ:

svavyāpāre hi kartṛtvam sarvatraivāsti kārake |

vyāpārabhedāpekṣāyām karaṇatvādisaṃbhavaḥ || (VP 3.7.18 = 3.274).⁶⁴²

10

kaṭam karotīty ayam asyārthaḥ: kaṭam utpadyamānam utpādayatīty arthaḥ. yady ayam kaṭo 'nutpattidharmā syāt devadattas taṃ kartuṃ na śaknuyāt.⁶⁴³ ***kartuḥ*** kim? māṣeṣv aśvam badhnāti. atra karmaṇa īpsitā māṣā.⁶⁴⁴ **tamapgrahaṇam kim?** payasaudanaṃ bhunkte.⁶⁴⁵ paya īpsitam atra na hīpsitatamam.

50. *tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam.* (P.1.4.50)

15

(*Bhv.:*) **īpsitavat kartuḥ kriyayā yuktaṃ dveṣyam anyac ca karma syāt.** **odanaṃ bubhukṣur viṣaṃ bhakṣayati. putraṃ paśyan sūryaṃ paśyati.**

(*Pañj.:*) ||***tathā***|| **dveṣyam anyac ceti** paryudāsasyānīpsitaśabdasya phalaṃ darśayati. kartuḥ kriyayā vyāpyamānaṃ karmeti siddhau sūtradvayam idaṃ prapañcārtham.

20

51. *akathitam ca.* (P.1.4.51)

(*Bhv.:*) **apādānādisaṃjñābhir yan noktaṃ tat karma syāt. gāṃ dogdhi payaḥ. kāraka ity eva. gavāṃ dogdhi payaḥ. vivakṣāvaśād**

⁶³⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tatra nirvartyaṃ yad asad evotpādyate, yasya janma kriyate tan nirvartyaṃ, yathā kaṭam karoti, kaṭo hy asann eva kriyate.*

⁶³⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vikāryaṃ yal labdhasattākam avasthāntaram āpadyate, yathā kāṣṭhāni bhasmīkaroti.*

⁶⁴⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *prāpyaṃ yatra vyāptivyatirekeṇa kriyākṛtā viśeṣā na vibhāvyanate, yathā ādityaṃ paśyatīti.*

⁶⁴¹ Cf. *Kāraḥcakra* p. 105–6: *nanu kathaṃ karma kārakam. kārakaṃ hi kriyānimittaṃ bhavati. iha ca kriyāsādhyam karma. tat kathaṃ tatsādhyam karma tasyāḥ sādhanam bhavitum arhati... kartuḥ kriyayā yad āptum utpādayitum vikārayitum prāptum vā iṣṭatamaṃ tat karmeti trividhe 'pi karmaṇi svagato vyāpāro 'stīti tadapekṣayā karmaṇaḥ kārakatvam aviruddham.*

⁶⁴² Rau (1977) and Iyer (1963) have *niṣpattimātre* instead of *svavyāpāre hi*. Iyer (1963) reports the reading *karaṇāditva-* instead of *karaṇatvādi-*. This verse, in the reading known to Viśvarūpa, is quoted in the *Kāraḥcakra* (p. 106). The only difference is *ca* for *hi*.

⁶⁴³ Cf. *Kāraḥcakra* p. 107: *kaṭam karoti kaṭam utpadyamānam utpādayatīty arthaḥ. tena bhavaty arthasya kartuḥ karmatā. yady ayam kaṭo 'nutpattidharmā bhavet tadā devadattas taṃ kartuṃ na śaknuyāt.*

⁶⁴⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *kartur iti kim? māṣeṣv aśvam badhnāti. karmaṇa īpsitā māṣāḥ na kartuḥ.*

⁶⁴⁵ *Kāś.* ad loc.

5

10

||akathitañ ca || apādānādisaṃjñābhir¹ ity anena kārakeṣv iti darśa-
 yati· ata² āha kāraka ity eva gavāṃ dogdhi paya iti akathitam iti kathana-
 15 nivṛtti{ḥ}parāyāṃ³ deśanāyāṃ bhūtakālo na vivakṣate· tena ye 'pi kathayi[ṣya]māṇe
 kartṛ[hetu]saṃjñe tayoh karmasaṃjñā nivarttitā bhavati· parigaṇana
 matam⁴ duhiyācīti⁵ ślokaḥ [vivara]ṇam asya duhādīnāṃ dhātūnāṃ⁶ prayoge upa-
 yoganimittam upayujyata ity upayogaḥ⁷ paya-ādis⁸ tasya nimittam gavādi [.uviś]āsyor
 guṇaḥ bruviśāsiguṇaḥ⁹ pradhānaṃ karma dharmādi¹⁰· tena¹¹ yat sacate samupaiti¹²
 20 tat kārakam akathitam uktaṃ kavinā· yady evaṃ pāṇinā kāmśyapātryāṃ gāṃ dogdhi
 payo¹³ gopālaka ity atra paṇyādikaṃ¹⁴ apy¹⁵ upayoganimittam tasyāpi karmasaṃjñā syāt
 ity ata āha apūrvavidhāv iti· vihitā tatra karaṇādisaṃjñā· parigaṇanaśloke cakārān
 nīḥṛvahīnāṃ¹⁶ grahaṇam¹⁷ | tathā coktam¹⁸ kālabhāvādhvadeśānāṃ karmmasaṃjñā
 hy akarmmakāṇāṃ¹⁹ | udāharaṇāny api māsam āste māsam²⁰ svapiti godoham āste·
 25 godoham svapiti· krośam āste· krośam svapiti kurūn āste kurūn svapiti ||

¹SJ: -ṣv. ²SJ adds eva. ³SJ: katham vṛttiparāyāṃ. ⁴SJ: parigaṇanam atra. ⁵SJ adds -ādi.
⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: payaḥprabhṛti. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ adds -kam. ¹¹SJ adds ca. ¹²SJ: samban-
 ndham upaiti. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: pātryādikaṃ. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ: nīḥṛprabhṛtīnāṃ. ¹⁷SJ: yathoktam.
¹⁸SJ adds: nīvahyor harateś cāpi gatyarthānāṃ tathaiḥ ca | dvikarmakeṣu grahaṇam nyante karttuś
 ca karmaṇa iti || atrāpi ca śloke cakārāj jayatiprabhṛtīnāṃ grahaṇam | ¹⁹SJ: akarmanāṃ. ²⁰SJ:
 sāyam.

gobhyo dogdhi payaḥ. evam *yācamānaḥ śivaṃ surān* (*Bhatt.* 6.8b).
 so 'pṛcchal lakṣmaṇaṃ sītām (*Bhatt.* 6.8a). śiṣyaṃ dharmam brūte.
 viprān śatam jayati. gargān śatam daṇḍayati. ajāṃ grāmaṃ naya-
 ti. bhāram grāmaṃ harati. iha ca *pradhāne karmaṇy abhidheye*
lādīn āhur dvikarmaṇām.⁶⁴⁶ nīyate 'jā grāmam. voḍhavyo bhāro
 grāmam. hriyate kāṣṭham ḡḥam. ākrṣyate śākhā⁶⁴⁷ grāmam. *apra-*
dhāne duhādīnām (*Mbh.* I 335.14). duhyate gauḥ kṣīram. ucyate śiṣyo
 dharmam. gargāḥ śatam daṇḍyantām. jīyate vipraḥ śatam. *nyante*
kartuś ca karmaṇaḥ (*Mbh.* I 335.16). ṇici karmatām prāptasya kartur
 vācakā lādayaḥ. prāpyate vipro grāmam. pitrā gamayitavyaḥ pu-
 tro grāmam. bodhyate śiṣyo dharmam. bhojyate vipro bhaktam.
 pāṭhyate putraḥ sūtram. āsyate vipro māsam iti.

(*Pañj.*) || **akathitam ca** || apādānādisaṃjñābhir ity anena kārakeṣv iti darśa-
 yati. ata āha kāraka ity eva gavāṃ dogdhi paya iti. **akathitam** iti kathana-
 nivṛttiparāyāṃ deśanāyāṃ bhūtakālo na vivakṣyate. tena ye 'pi kathayiṣyamāṇe karṭṛ-
 hetusaṃjñe (cf. P.1.4.54–55) tayoḥ karmasaṃjñā nivartitā bhavati.⁶⁴⁸ parigaṇana(m)
 mataṃ: *duhiyācīti* ślokaḥ.⁶⁴⁹ vivaraṇam asya: duhādīnām dhātūnām prayoga *upa-*
yoganimittaṃ upayujyata ity upayogaḥ paya-ādis. tasya nimittaṃ gavādi. bruvīśāsya
 guṇaḥ *bruvīśāsiguṇaḥ*. pradhānaṃ karma dharmādi. tena *yat sacate* samupaiti tat
 kārakam akathitam uktaṃ kavinā. yady evaṃ pāṇinā kāmasyapātryāṃ gāṃ dogdhi
 payo gopālaka ity atra paṇyādikam apy upayoganimittaṃ tasyāpi karmasaṃjñā syād
 ity ata āha *apūrvavidhāv* iti vihitā tatra karaṇādisaṃjñā. parigaṇanaśloke cakārān
 nīhrvahīnām grahaṇam.⁶⁵⁰ tathā coktaṃ: *kālabhāvādhvadeśānām karmasaṃjñā hy*
akarmakāṇām.⁶⁵¹ udāharaṇāny api: māsam āste māsam svapiti godoham āste
 godoham svapiti krośam āste krośam svapiti kurūn āste kurūn svapiti.

⁶⁴⁶ Cf. *Mbh.* I 335.11: *pradhānakarmaṇy ākhyeye lādīn āhur dvikarmaṇām*.

⁶⁴⁷ Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 46) and Mishra (1989: 40): **śobhā**.

⁶⁴⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tena yatrāpi vakṣyamāṇe hetukarṭṛsaṃjñe iti tatrāpy eṣā saṃjñā na bhavatīti... sūtre 'pi 'akathitam' iti kathananivṛttiparāyāṃ codanāyāṃ bhūtakālo na vivakṣyate; upalakṣaṇatvāt. tena yo 'pi kathayiṣyamāṇo hetukarṭṛsaṃjñābhyām, tasyāpi karmasaṃjñā na bhavatīti uktaṃ bhavati.*

⁶⁴⁹ In the next sentences the meaning of the following *śloka* will be explained.

duhiyācirudhipracchihikṣicīnām upayoganimittam apūrvavidhau |
bruvīśāsiguṇena ca yat sacate tad akūrtitam ācaritaṃ kavinā ||. *Mbh.* I 334.1–2, quoted also in *Kāś.*
 on P.1.4.51.

⁶⁵⁰ Cf. *Mbh.* I 335.19–20:

nīvahyor harateś cāpi gatyarthānām tathaiḥ ca |
dvikarmakeṣu grahaṇam draṣṭavyam iti niścayaḥ ||
 This is also quoted in the *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.51.

⁶⁵¹ Cf. *Mbh.* I 336.1 (*kālabhāvādhvaganavyāḥ karmasaṃjñā hy akarmaṇām*) and lines 4–5 (*deśas cākarmaṇām karmasaṃjñāo bhavatīti vaktavyam*), both quoted in the *Nyāsa* ad loc.

5

10

15

20

25

||gati|| śabdakarmmeti karmmaśabdaḥ kārakābhidhāyī sādhanam vedādi
 gṛhyate· na tu kriyāvācī anyathā hi karmagrahaṇam anarthakaṃ· kārakādhikārād eva
 śabdanakriyāyā¹ labdhatvāt | nīvahītyādi gatir upasarjanam apradhānam ya-
 30 smin prāpaṇe tat tathā² etena gatyarthatā³ nāstīti sūtrasyāviśayaḥ⁴ | bodhayatīti
 budha avagamane⁵ budhayudhetyādinā parasmaipada[m]
 āśayati bhojayatīty atra nigaraṇetyādinā⁶ adhyāpayatīti· in adhyayane·

¹SJ: śabdane. ²SJ om. ³SJ: -nām. ⁴SJ: sūtrasya viśayaḥ. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ:
 nigaraṇacalanetyādi.

52. *gatibuddhipratyavasānārthaśabdakarmākarmakāṇām aṇi-
kartā sa ṇau.* (P.1.4.52)

(*Bhv.:*) eṣām aṇici yaḥ kartā sa ṇici karma syāt. yāti vipro
grāmam. yāpayati vipraṃ grāmam. *rāvaṇaṃ gamaya prītim*
(*Bhatt.* 8.82c). nīvahī tu gatyupasarjanaprāpaṇavacanau. na gatyā- 5
rthau.⁶⁵² nāyayati vāhayati bhāraṃ dāseneti. budhyarthe bodha-
yati śiṣyaṃ śāstram. jñāpayati nṛpaṃ hitāhitam. upalambhaya-
ti vipraṃ gandham. pratyavasānaṃ bhakṣaṇam. āśayati bhojayati
vipram odanam. śabdakarma. adhyāpayati vaṭuṃ vedam. pāṭhayati 10
putraṃ sūtram. śrāvayati śiṣyaṃ śabdā. akarmakāt. āśayati 10
putram. śāyayati mitram. gatyarthādibhyo 'nyatra. pācayaty
odanaṃ sahāyena. iha kilāṇau yaḥ kartā tasya ṇau karmatvam
api prayojakavyāpāreṇa kartṛtvam ca svavyāpāreṇa svatantratvād ity
ubhayasaṃjñāsiddhau niyamo 'yaṃ gatyarthādīnām aṇau yaḥ kartā 15
sa ṇau karmaiva na karteti. tataś ca gatyarthādivyatiriktānām aṇau 15
kartur ṇāv ubhayaṃ bhavati kartṛtvam karmatvam ceti vadantaḥ
kecit pācayaty odanaṃ devadattaṃ devadattenetyādy api bhavatīty
āhuḥ. evaṃ ca *hṛkror vā* iti (cf. P.1.4.53) prapañcārthaṃ vedi-
tavyam. *jalpatyādīnām upasaṃkhyānam.*⁶⁵³ aśabdakarmakatvāt.
jalpayati mitraṃ putram. ālāpayati putraṃ mitram. sambhāṣayati 20
devadattaṃ bhāryām. *ādikhādyaḥ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ.*⁶⁵⁴ ādayate
khādayati vipreṇaudanam. bhakṣaṇārthatvāt. *bhakṣer ahimsāyām.*⁶⁵⁵
bhakṣayati piṇḍiṃ devadattena yajñadattaḥ. hiṃsāyām tu bhakṣayati
yavaṃ vṛṣabhān. *vaher aniyantṛkartṛkasyeti* (vārtt. 6 ad loc., *Mbh.* I
337.20) kātyāyanaḥ. vāhayati bhāraṃ manuṣyairḥ. saniyantṛkartṛkasya 25
tu vāhayati vṛṣabhān bhāram.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**gati**|| *śabdakarmeti* karmaśabdaḥ kārakābhidhāyī sādhanam vedādi
grhyate na tu kriyāvācī. anyathā hi karmagrahaṇam anarthakaṃ kārakādhikārād eva
śabdanakriyāyā labdhatvāt.⁶⁵⁶ nīvahītyādi gatiḥ **upasarjanam** apradhānam. ya-
smin prāpaṇe tat tathā. etena gatyarthatā nāstīti sūtrasyāviṣayaḥ. **bodhayatīti** 30
budha avagamane (*Dhp.* 1.911, 4.63). *budhayudhetyādinā* (P.1.3.86) parasmaipadam.
āśayati bhojayatīty atra *nigaraṇetyādinā* (P.1.3.87). **adhyāpayatīti** *in adhyayane*

⁶⁵² Cf. vārtt. 5 ad loc.: *ādikhādīnīvahīnām pratiṣedhaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 337.14).

⁶⁵³ Cf. vārtt. 3 ad loc.: *śabdakarmanā iti cej jalpatiprabhṛtīnām upasaṃkhyānam* (*Mbh.* I 337.7).

⁶⁵⁴ Cf. Pat. on vārtt. 5 ad loc.: *ādikhādīnīvahīnām pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ* (*Mbh.* I 337.15).

⁶⁵⁵ Cf. vārtt. 7 ad loc.: *bhakṣer ahimsārthasya* (*Mbh.* I 337.24).

⁶⁵⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *kriyāgrahaṇe hi karmagrahaṇam anarthakaṃ syāt. kārakādhikārād eva kārakasya kriyāpekṣatvāt śabdātīkāyām kriyāyām vartamānā dhātavo grahīṣyanta iti, tat kim karmagrahaṇena?*

adhipūrvaḥ ṇic vṛddhiḥ kr̥ñjīnāṅ ṇāv ity

ātvaṃ arttihr̥ityādinā puk· āśayati śāyayatīti aṅāv akarmmakād ityādinā¹

parasmaipadaṃ ādayata itī² nigaraṇetyādinā³ parasmaipadaṃ

na bhavati adeḥ pratiśedho vaktavya itī vacanāt· gamayati grāmam̄ putram̄ ity atra

5 grāmādeḥ⁴ karmatvaṃ na prāpnoti karttuḥ kriyayā hi⁵ vyāpyamānasya karmatvaṃ na
karmakriyayā⁶ | ucyate· kartṛgrahaṇan tatra⁷ svatantrapalakṣaṇārtham̄⁸ karmatve 'pi
putrādeḥ⁹ svātantryasyānupahataṭvāt ||

10

15

||svatantra || kriyāsiddhāv itī kriyānispatāv¹⁰ ity arthaḥ aḡuṇa[bh]ūta itī

pradhānabhūta ity arthaḥ vivakṣāgrahaṇād vivakṣā[dhī]nam̄ svātantryam̄ itī darśayati

tenāśīś chinatti sthālī pacati pacyate¹¹ vipreṇeti karttari tṛtīyā¹²

jāyate¹³ abhihite karttari prathamā prādhānyād¹⁴ aḡuṇabhāva ucyate¹⁵

20 yasya aḡuṇabhāvo nāsti sa kartteti tena kārakāntarāprayoge pi kartṛsaṃjñā bhavaty
eva¹⁶ āste devadatta ityādaḥ | tathā coktam̄¹⁷

apravṛttau¹⁸ nivṛttau ca kārakāṇām̄ ya īśvaraḥ |

aprayuktaḥ prayuktā¹⁹ vā sa karttā nāma kārakam̄ itī ||

¹SJ: itī. ²SJ: ādayatīti. ³SJ: nigaraṇacalanārthebhya itī ⁴SJ: vipram ityādeḥ. ⁵SJ om.
⁶SJ: tu karmaṇaḥ. ⁷SJ om. ⁸SJ: -ṇam. ⁹SJ: viprādeḥ. ¹⁰SJ om. kriyā-. ¹¹SJ: odanaṃ
pacatīti | ¹²SJ adds kriyā. ¹³SJ adds itī. ¹⁴SJ: -nyena. ¹⁵SJ adds: nipātanāt karttari ceti
na niśedhaḥ | kurvantaṃ ityādinā svavyāpāre svātantryam̄ darśayitvā hetusaṃjñāyāñ ca. Cf. also
p. 125* fn. 1. ¹⁶SJ om. ¹⁷SJ om. ¹⁸SJ: pravṛttau ca. ¹⁹SJ: prayukto.

(*Dhp.* 2.37). adhipūrvaḥ. ṇic. vṛddhiḥ (cf. P.7.2.115). *krññjīmāṇ ṇāv* ity (P.6.1.48) āttvam. *artihṛtyādinā* (P.7.3.36) puk. **āsayati śāyayatīty aṇāv akarmakād** ityādinā (P.1.3.86) parasmaipadam. **ādayata** iti *nigaraṇetyādinā* (P.1.3.87) parasmaipadam na bhavaty *adeḥ pratiṣedho vaktavya* iti⁶⁵⁷ vacanāt. gamayati grāmaṃ putram ity atra grāmādeḥ karmatvaṃ na prāpnoti. kartuḥ kriyayā hi vyāpyamānasya karmatvaṃ na karmakriyayā. ucyate: kartṛgrahaṇaṃ tatra svatantrapalakṣaṇārthaṃ karmatve 'pi putrādeḥ svāntryasyānupahatatvāt.⁶⁵⁸

53. *hṛkror anyatarasyām.* (P.1.4.53)

(*Bhv.:*) **hṛñkṛñor aṇici yaḥ kartā sa ṇici karma vā syāt. hārayati bhāraṃ dāsaṃ dāsenā vā. kārayati kaṭaṃ putraṃ putreṇa vā. abhivādidṛśor ātmanepade vā.**⁶⁵⁹ gurum abhivādayate putram putreṇa vā. darśayate nṛpaṃ bhrtyān bhrtyair vā.

54. *svatantraḥ kartā.* (P.1.4.54)

(*Bhv.:*) **kriyāsiddhāv aguṇatvena vivakṣito yaḥ sa kartā syāt. vipreṇa pacyate. kriyā jāyate. odanaḥ sidhyati.**

(*Pañj.:*) || **svatantra** || **kriyāsiddhāv** iti kriyāniṣpattāv ity arthaḥ. *aguṇabhūta* iti⁶⁶⁰ pradhānabhūta ity arthaḥ. vivakṣāgrahaṇād vivakṣādhīnaṃ svāntryam iti darśayati. tenāsīś chinatti sthālī pacati. **pacyate vipreṇeti**⁶⁶¹ kartari tṛtīyā (cf. P.2.3.18). **jāyata** (ity) abhihite kartari prathamā (cf. P.2.3.46). prādhānyād aguṇabhāva ucyate. yasya guṇabhāvo nāsti sa karteti. tena kārakāntarāprayoge 'pi kartṛsaṃjñā bhavaty eva: āste devadatta ityādau.⁶⁶² tathā coktam:

*apavrṛttau ni(r)vṛttau ca kārakāṇāṃ ya īśvaraḥ |
aprayuktaḥ prayukto vā sa kartā nāma kārakam || iti.*⁶⁶³

⁶⁵⁷ Cf. vārtt. 5 ad loc. (see fn. 652) and Pat. on it: *sarvam eva pratyavasānakāryam ader na bhavatīti vaktavyaṃ parasmaipadam api* (*Mbh.* I 337.16).

⁶⁵⁸ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *kathaṃ gamayati grāmaṃ vipram iti. aṇikartuḥ karmatve tatkriyāvīpyasya grāmasya karmatvaṃ na syāt. karmasaṃjñāvidhau kartṛgrahaṇāt. ucyate: tat kartṛgrahaṇaṃ svatantrapalakṣaṇaṃ karmatve 'pi svavyāpāre svāntryasyānupahatatvād iti rakṣitaḥ. Cf. also Pād. on gamayati māṇavakaṃ grāmam (Kās. on the present sūtra): katham atra grāmasya karmatvam, yāvatā kartur īpsitatamaṃ karmety ucyate... ato yasyām avasthāyāṃ grāmasya karmatvaṃ na tasyām māṇavakasya karmatvam; yasyām ca nyantāvasthāyāṃ māṇavakasya karmatvaṃ na tasyām grāmasya karmatvam; pūrvapavrṛttatvād.*

⁶⁵⁹ Cf. vārtt. 1 ad loc.: *hṛkor vāvacane 'bhivādidṛśor ātmanepada upasaṃkhyānam* (*Mbh.* I 338.11).

⁶⁶⁰ Cf. *Kās.* ad loc.: *aguṇabhūto yaḥ kriyāsiddhau svāntryeṇa vivakṣyate tat kārakam kartṛsaṃjñam bhavati. Bhv.: aguṇatvena.*

⁶⁶¹ *Bhv.:* **vipreṇa pacyate.**

⁶⁶² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *guṇabhāvo yatra nāsti sa karteti. kārakāntarāvivakṣāyām apy aguṇabhāvo 'sty eveti sarvatra bhavati.*

⁶⁶³ This *śloka* is cited in the *Kārakacakra*. Bhatttacharya (1946: 107) has in *pāda a*: *pavrṛttau ca nivṛttau ca* (with a variant: *apavrṛttau pavrṛttau vā*). Puruṣottamadeva ascribes this verse to Bhartṛhari.

||tatpra || tatprayojaka iti nipātanāt ka[r̥tta]ri ceti na nisedhah

- 5 kurvantam ityādinā svavyāpāreṇa svātantryam darśayitvā hetusaṃjñāviṣayo¹ yam
ity uktam hetusaṃjñāyām² hetumati ceti ṇic· cakārāt kartṛsaṃjñāyām³
 karttari lakārah ||

- 10 ||prāg rī || a[dhi]r īśvara ity anena tatrasthasya śarīraśabdasyānukaraṇa-
sya prāgyoge⁴ 'pi⁵ pañcamyantasya grahaṇam ity ācaṣṭe⁶ ||

15

||cāda || yāti ca vāti ceti· anenodāharaṇe 'dravyavṛttitān darśayati

svāhā agnāyīti· agnīśabdā vṛṣākapyītyādinā nībaikārau⁷ svāhā⁸ huta-

- 20 bhukprietī dravyatvaṃ svāh[ā]śabdasya nipātavābhāvāt svāh[ām] paśyety⁹ atra vi-
bhaktīśraṇaṃ granthagauravabhayāt kiyanto¹⁰ nipātā darśitāḥ | upasarga-
vibhaktisvarapratiṛūpakaś ceti pratiṛūpaśabdo 'tra pratimūrttau varttate· upa-
sargapratiṛūpakatve avaśabdasyāvadattam ity atrā ca upasargāt ta iti
 tatvan na bhavati vibhaktipratiṛūpakatve¹¹ nāstīśabdasya grahaṇ((e)) nāstidoṣa¹² ity atra
 25 subantatve¹³ samāsaḥ svarapratiṛūpakatve¹⁴ ṛti ṛrvāvacanam¹⁵ ṛti ṛrvāvacanam¹⁶ ity
ackāryyapraṭiṣedhārtham ādeśāntaram na karaṇīyam ||

¹SJ om. the underlined passage. Cf. also p. 124* fn. 15. ²SJ: tena. ³SJ: karttari. ⁴SJ: adhir
 īśvara ity atra sthitasya rīśvaraśabdasyānukaraṇasya prayoge. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ: agīśabdāt
 vṛṣākapy agnītyādinā nīp | ekārah prakṛter ikārasya | ⁸SJ adds tu. ⁹SJ: svāhā paśyety. ¹⁰SJ
 om. ¹¹SJ: -sya. ¹²SJ om. nāsti-. ¹³SJ: subantasya. ¹⁴SJ: -kāṇām. ¹⁵SJ: vā vacanam. ¹⁶SJ:
 evaṃjātiyakānām itsaṃjñādvāreṇa sādhutvam.

55. tatprayo jako hetuś ca. (P.1.4.55)

(*Bhv.*) svatantrasya prayojako 'rthaḥ kartā hetuś cocyate. kurvantam prayunkte kārayati devadattaḥ. uktāni kārakāṇi.

(*Pañj.*) ||**tatpra**|| **tatprayo jako** iti nipātanāt *kartari ceti* (P.2.2.16) na niṣedhaḥ.⁶⁶⁴
kurvantam ityādinā svavyāpāreṇa svātantryam darśayitvā hetusaṃjñāviṣayo 'yam
 ity uktam. hetusaṃjñāyām *hetumati ceti* (P.3.1.26) ṇic. cakārāt kartṛsaṃjñāyām
 kartari lakāraḥ.⁶⁶⁵

56. prāg rīśvarān nipātāḥ. (P.1.4.56)

(*Bhv.*) **adhir īśvara ity** (1.4.97) **ataḥ prañ nipātā veditavyāḥ.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**prāg rī**|| **adhir īśvara** ity anena tatrasthasya rīśvaraśabdasyānukaraṇa-
 sya prāgyoge 'pi pañcamyantasya grahaṇam ity ācaṣṭe.⁶⁶⁶

57. cādayo 'sattve. (P.1.4.57)

(*Bhv.*) adravyavṛttayaś cādayo nipātā ucyante. yāti ca vāti ca. ghaṭam
 vā paṭam vā paśya. ca. vā. vai. svāhā. svadhā. om. ām. paśu.⁶⁶⁷ tu.
 manye. asti. brūhi. vibhāṣā. anyatarasyām. nañ. no. na ityādi. **upa-**
sargavibhaktisvarapratirūpakāś ca nipātāḥ (*GP* 85.146). **asattve kim?**
 svāhā agnāyī.

(*Pañj.*) ||**cāda**|| **yāti ca vāti cety** anenodāharaṇenādravyavṛttitām darśayati.
svāhā agnāyīty agniśabdasya vṛṣākapyādinā (P.4.1.37) nībaikārau. svāhā huta-
 bhukpriyeti dravyatvaṃ svāhāśabdasya nipātātvaḥbhāvāt svāhām paśyety atra vi-
 bhaktisraṇam. granthagauravabhayāt kiyanto nipātā darśitāḥ. **upasarga-**
vibhaktisvarapratirūpakāś ceti pratirūpaśabdo 'tra pratimūrtau vartate. upa-
 sargapratirūpakatve 'vaśabdasyāvadattam ity atrā *ca upasargāt ta* iti (P.7.4.47)
 tatvaṃ na bhavati. vibhaktipratirūpakatve nāstīśabdasya grahaṇe nāstidoṣa ity atra
 subantatve samāsaḥ. svarapratirūpakatve *ṛti ṛvāvacanam* *ḷti ḷvāvacanam* ity⁶⁶⁸
 ackāryapraṭiṣedhārtham ādeśāntaram na karaṇīyam.⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *nanu ca 'kartari ca' ity anena ṣaṣṭhīsamāsapraṭiṣedhenātra bhavitavyam ity āha nipātanāt samāsa iti.*

⁶⁶⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *svatantrasya prayojako yo 'rthaḥ tat kārakam hetusaṃjñam bhavati cakārāt kartṛsaṃjñam ca.*

⁶⁶⁶ Cf. *Pad.* ad loc.: *īśvaraprakṛtibhāgasya pūrvapadāntena rephēṇa sahānukaraṇam draṣṭavyam. anukāryeṇārthenārthavattvāt vibhaktiyutpattiḥ ca vā ity atra nipātātve sati svarādinipātam avyayam ity (P.1.1.37) avyayasamjñā bhavati.*

⁶⁶⁷ Mishra (1989): **om paśu.**

⁶⁶⁸ Cf. vārtt. 1 (*savarṇadīrghatva ṛti ṛvāvacanam*, *Mbh.* III 77.16) and 2 (*ḷti ḷvāvacanam*, *Mbh.* III 77.18) on P.6.1.101.

⁶⁶⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vibhaktipratirūpakāś ca nipātā upāje 'nvāje ity (P.1.4.73) evamādayaḥ. svarapratirūpakā aco ye na bhavanty acsadrśāḥ. tathā ca vakṣyati 'ṛtir ṛvāvacanam kartavyam. ḷtil ḷvāvacanam' iti evañjātyakānām nipātasamjñādvāreṇa sattvam evākhyāyate. Cf. also Pad. ad loc.: svarapratirūpakā iti. ṛti ṛvāvacanam ityādayaḥ teṣām nipātasamjñāvidhānadvāreṇa sadbhāva eva pratipādyate na punar eṣām nipātātve kiṃcit prayojanam astīti.*

5 ||prāda || pratanu praviralam iti praśabdasya¹ nipātatvān nipātasyā-
 narthakasya² prātipadikatve subutpattiḥ kugatiprādaya iti samāsaḥ |
 asattva ity eva parā senā pṛthaggyogakaraṇam uttarārtham ||

10

15 ||upasa || prāgvacanena samjñāsamāveśārthena gatyupasarga-
 karmpravacanīyasamjñābhir nipātasamjñā samāviśatīty ata³ āha prādayo nipātā
 iti⁴. praṇamati pariṣiñcatīti⁵ upasargasamjñāyām ṇatva[s]atve·
 pranāyako deśa iti pragatā nāyakā yasmād iti⁶ gamikriyām prati praśabdasyo-
 pasargatvaṃ na nayatiṃ prati prādīnām kriyāyogāvyabhicārād⁷ iti kriyāyoga-
 20 grahaṇasāmarthyāt yaṃ prati kriyāyuktāḥ prādayas taṃ prati gatyupasargasamjñākā
 bhavantīti⁸. tenātropasargatvābhāvāṇ⁹ ṇatvan na bhavati· upasamkhyānam atra na
 likhitam· marucchabdasya bhāṣāyām prayogadarśanāt śracchabdasya tūdāharaṇam
 prajñāśraddheti nipātanād¹⁰ eva siddham iti¹¹ ||

25

¹SJ: pravi-. ²SJ adds iti tasyānarthakasyāpi. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ adds -ādi. ⁵SJ adds -ādi. ⁶SJ:
 asmād deśāt pranāyaka ity atra. ⁷SJ: -yogād. ⁸SJ: upasargā iti vidhānāt. ⁹SJ: tena. ¹⁰SJ:
 nirddeśād. ¹¹SJ om.

58. prādayaḥ. (P.1.4.58)

(*Bhv.*) pra. parā. apa. sam. anu. ava. nir. dur. nis. dus. abhi. vi. adhi. su. ud. ati. ni. prati. pari. api. upa. āñ. ete nipātāḥ syuḥ. pratanu. praviralam. abhinavo ḥhilīnaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**prāda**|| pratanu praviralam iti praśabdasya nipātatvān nipātasyā- 5
narthakasya prātipadikatve⁶⁷⁰ subutpattiḥ. *kugatiprādaya* iti (P.2.2.18) samāsaḥ.
asattva ity (cf. P.1.4.57) eva parā senā. pṛthaggyogakaraṇam uttarārtham.⁶⁷¹

59. upasargāḥ kriyāyoge. (P.1.4.59)

(*Bhv.*) prādayo nipātāḥ kriyāyoge upasargāḥ syuḥ. praṇamati. pariṣiñcati. kriyāyoge kim? pranāyako deśaḥ. iha durnītam 10
avadattam ityādāv upasargapratiṛupakanipātāśrayaṇaṇ ṇatvatatve
(cf. P.8.4.14; 7.4.47) na bhavataḥ.

praparāpasamanvavanirdurabhivyadhīsūdatinipratiparyapayaḥ |
upa āñ iti viṃśatir eṣa sakhe upasargavidhiḥ kathitaḥ kavinaḥ || iti.

(*Pañj.*) ||**upasa**|| prāgvacanena (cf. P.1.4.56) samjñāsamāveśārthena gatyupasarga- 15
karmpravacanīyasamjñābhir nipātasamjñā samāviśatīty ata āha **prādayo nipātā**
iti. **praṇamati pariṣiñcatīty** upasargasamjñāyāṃ ṇatvaṣatve (cf. P.8.4.14; 8.3.65).
pranāyako deśa iti pragatā nāyakā yasmād iti gamikriyāṃ prati praśabdasyo-
pasargatvaṃ na nayatiṃ prati. prādīnāṃ kriyāyogāvyabhicārād iti kriyāyoga-
grahaṇasāmāthyād yaṃ prati kriyāyuktāḥ prādayas taṃ prati gatyupasargasamjñakā 20
bhavanti.⁶⁷² tenātropasargatvābhāvāṇ ṇatvaṃ na bhavati. upasamkhyānam atra na
likhitam⁶⁷³ marucchabdasya bhāṣāyāṃ prayogādarśanāt. śracchabdasya tūdhāraṇam
prajñāśraddheti (cf. P.5.2.101) nipātanād eva siddham iti.⁶⁷⁴

60. gatiś ca. (P.1.4.60)

(*Bhv.*) prādaya upasargā gatisamjñakāś ca syuḥ. praṇamya. abhiṣicya. 25

⁶⁷⁰ Cf. vārtt. 12 on P.1.2.45: *nipātasyānarthakasya prātipadikatvam* (*Mbh.* I 220.25).

⁶⁷¹ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pṛthaggyogakaraṇam uttarasamjñāviśeṣaṇārtham.*

⁶⁷² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atra nayanakriyayā praśabdasya yogo nāstīty upasargasamjñā na bhavati. nanu cātrāpi gamikriyayā yogo 'sty eveti syād eva tasyopasargasamjñā; naitad asti; kriyāyogagrahaṇaṃ hy evam anarthakaṃ syāt. katham? prādīnāṃ kriyāyogāvyabhicārāt; tasmāt kriyāyogagrahaṇasāmāthyād yaṃ prati kriyāyuktāḥ prādayas taṃ prati gatyupasargasamjñakā bhavanti, nānyaṃ prati.*

⁶⁷³ Cf. vārtt. 4 (*marucchabdasyopasamkhyānam*, *Mbh.* I 341.19) and 5 (*śracchabdasyopasamkhyānam*, *Mbh.* I 341.22) ad loc.

⁶⁷⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *śracchabdasyopasamkhyānam iti. atrāpy upasamkhyānaśabdasya sa evārthaḥ. pratipādanam api tad eva. nanu ca bhīdādīpāthād eva hi śraddheti siddham, tat katham tatsiddhaye śracchabdasyopasargasamjñā kriyate? evaṃ manyate anārṣas tatra pāthah iti. Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *bhīdādīpāthāt prajñāśraddhārcā iti nipātanād vā siddham.**

||gatiḥ || praṇāmya abhiṣicyeti¹ gatisamjñāyāṃ kugatiprādāya iti
 samāsaḥ² lyap cakāraḥ samjñāsamāveśārthaḥ [ten]o-
 pasargasamjñākāryyam³ natvam ṣatvam⁴ ca⁵ bhavati. anyathā hy ekāsamjñādhikārāt
 paryyāyāḥ syāt kārīkāśabdasyopasamkhyānam⁶ atra na likhitam bhāṣāyāṃ
 5 tatprayogadarśanāt⁷. yogavibhāga uttarārthaḥ uttaratra gatisamjñā yathā syāt⁸
 nopasargasamjñeti⁹. ||

10 ||ūryyādi || ūrīkṛtyeti karoteḥ ktvā¹⁰ gatisamāse¹¹ lyap tuk-
 śuklīkṛtyeti¹² abhūtetyādīnā¹³ cviḥ tasya sarvāpahārī
 lopah asya cvāv itītvam¹⁴ śucībhūyēti bhavater lyap cvau
 ceti dīrghaḥ. paṭapaṭākṛtyeti paṭatśabdasya¹⁵ avyaktānukaraṇetyādīnā¹⁶
 ḍāciviṣayabhūte ḍāci bahulam dve¹⁷ iti dvitvam nityam āmreḍite ḍācīti
 15 takārasya¹⁸ pararūpatā¹⁹ ḍāci²⁰ ṭilopah pūrvavat samāsādi
 cvidācoḥ sāhacaryyāt ūryyādīnām api kṛbhvastiyoga eva gatisam²¹. ||

¹SJ: ābhiviṣicyeti. ²SJ: -se. ³SJ om. -samjñā-. ⁴SJ: ṣatvaṇatvam. ⁵SJ om. ⁶SJ:
 -śabdasyety u-. ⁷SJ: prayogasya duḥśakatvāt. ⁸SJ om. ⁹SJ om. iti. ¹⁰SJ: ku-. ¹¹SJ: -saḥ.
¹²SJ adds śuklakṛśabdāt. ¹³SJ: abhūtataadbhāva iti. ¹⁴SJ om. ¹⁵SJ: -śabdād. ¹⁶SJ: -ṇād ityādīnā.
¹⁷SJ adds bhavata. ¹⁸SJ om. ¹⁹SJ: -tve pūrvatakārādarśanam. ²⁰SJ adds tu. ²¹SJ: gatitvam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**gatih**|| **praṇamya abhiṣicyeti** gatisamjñāyāṃ *kugatiprādaya* iti (P.2.2.18) samāsaḥ. lyap (cf. P.7.1.37). cakāraḥ samjñāsamāveśārthaḥ.⁶⁷⁵ tenopasargasamjñākāryaṃ ṇatvaṃ ṣatvaṃ ca bhavati. anyathā hy ekāsamjñādhikārāt paryāyaḥ syāt.⁶⁷⁶ kārikāśabdasyopasamkhyānam⁶⁷⁷ atra na likhitaṃ bhāṣāyāṃ tatprayogādarśanāt. yogavibhāga uttarārthaḥ. uttaratra gatisamjñā yathā syāt 5 nopasargasamjñeti.⁶⁷⁸

61. ūryādicvidācaś ca. (P.1.4.61)

(*Bhv.*) ete gatisamjñakāḥ syuḥ. ūrīkṛtya. cviḥ. śuklīkṛtya. śuklībhūya. ḍāc. paṭapaṭākṛtya. damadamākṛtya.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ūryādi**|| ūrīkṛtyeti karoteḥ ktvā. gatisamāse lyap (cf. P.7.1.37). tuk 10 (cf. P.6.1.71). śuklīkṛtyety *abhūtetyādinā* (cf. P.5.4.50⁶⁷⁹) cviḥ. tasya sarvāpahārī lopaḥ (cf. P.6.1.67). *asya cvāv* iti (P.7.4.32) ittvam. śucībhūyetyi bhavater lyap. *cvau ceti* (P.7.4.26) dīrghaḥ. **paṭapaṭākṛtyeti** paṭatsābdasya *avyaktānukaraṇetyādinā* (P.5.4.57) ḍāciviṣayabhūte *ḍāci bahulaṃ dve* iti⁶⁸⁰ dvitvam. *nityam āmreḍite ḍācīti* (P.6.1.100) takārasya pararūpatā. ḍāci ṭilopaḥ (cf. P.6.4.143). pūrvavat samāsādi. 15 cvidācoḥ sāhacaryād ūryādīnām api kṛbhvastiyoga eva gatisam(jñā).

62. anukaraṇaṃ cānitiparam. (P.1.4.62)

(*Bhv.*) avyaktānukaraṇaṃ gatiḥ syāt. khaṭatkṛtya bhagnaḥ. anitiparaṃ kim? khaṭad iti kṛtvā bhagnaḥ.

63. ādarānādarayoḥ sadasatī. (P.1.4.63)

(*Bhv.*) anayor ete gatī syātām. gurūn satkṛtya gataḥ. khalān asatkṛtya gataḥ. 20

64. bhūṣaṇe 'lam. (P.1.4.64)

(*Bhv.*) atredaṃ gatiḥ syāt. kanyām alaṃkṛtya gataḥ.

65. antar aparigrahe. (P.1.4.65)

(*Bhv.*) antaḥśabdo gatiḥ syāt. antarhatya sthitaḥ khalāḥ. madhye 25

⁶⁷⁵ *Kāś.* ad loc.

⁶⁷⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *asati cakāra ekasamjñādhikārād ekatra samjñādvayasya vidhānāt paryāyaḥ syāt, na samāveśaḥ*. Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *anyathaikasamjñādhikārād ekatra samjñādvayavidhānāc ca paryāyaḥ syād iti bhāvah*.

⁶⁷⁷ Cf. vārtt. 1 (*kārikāśabdasya*, *Mbh.* I 342.2) ad loc and Pat. on it (*Mbh.* I 342.3).

⁶⁷⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *yogavibhāga uttarārthaḥ. uttaratra gatisamjñāiva yathā syāt upasargasamjñā mā bhūt*.

⁶⁷⁹ Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.5.4.50: *cvividhāv abhūtatadbhāvagrahaṇam* (*Mbh.* II 436.14). The part of this vārttika is in *Kāś.* incorporated into the text of P.5.4.50: *abhūtatadbhāve kṛbhvastiyoge sampadya-kartari cviḥ*. The same reading appears in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. vārtt. 8 on P.8.1.12: *ḍāci ca* (*Mbh.* III 370.3) and Pat. on it: *ḍāci ca dve bhavata ity vaktavyam* (line 4).

||antar a || antarhatyeti hanteḥ ktvā¹ kugatiḥprādaya iti samāse²

5 lyap vā lyapīti anunāsikalopaḥ antaḥśabdasyetyādi³

vārttikam⁴ antaḥśabdānurodhenātroktaṃ antar[dhe]tyādiṣūdāharaṇeṣu⁵ yathā-
kramam upasargatve⁶ aṅkiṇatvāni prayojanāni⁷ ||

10

||kaṇe || kaṇeśabdaḥ saptamyantaprati{pāda}rūpako nipātaḥ· abhilāsātīsaye varttate-
tatsāhacaryān manaḥśabdo 'py abhilāsavṛttir eva· ||

15

||puro || puraskṛtyeti pūrvasmād deśād āgata iti pūrvāparetyādinā⁸

asipratyayaḥ pūrvaśabdasya purādeśaḥ taddhitaś cetyādinā-

vyayatvaṃ avyayam iti kiṃ puras kṛtvā kāṇḍaṃ gataḥ pṛ pālanapūraṇayoḥ

bhrājabhāsetyādinā kvip· udo ṣṭhyapūrvasyeti

20 utvaṃ· raparatvaṃ· tato⁹ dvitīyābahuvacanaṃ ||

||astañ ca || astaṅatyeti gamaḥ¹⁰ ktvā samāse¹¹ lyap

25 vā lyapīti salopaḥ¹²· tuk mṛtvety anenāstaṃśabdasya¹³ ni-

dhanārthatām¹⁴ āha¹⁵· avyayam ity eva· astaṃ kṛtvā kāṇḍaṃ gataḥ· asu¹⁶ kṣepaṇe
niṣṭhā yasya vibhāsetīniṣedhaḥ¹⁷ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: kugatisamāsaḥ | ³SJ adds -kam. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: -dinā. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ:
upasargasamjñāyām. ⁸SJ: pūrvāparādharetyādinā. ⁹SJ: ca. ¹⁰SJ: gameḥ. ¹¹SJ: -saḥ. ¹²SJ:
anunāsikalopaḥ. ¹³SJ: -śabdo. ¹⁴SJ: nidhanavacanaḥ. ¹⁵SJ om. ¹⁶SJ: asū. ¹⁷SJ: -ṭpratiṣedhaḥ
cakāro 'vyayārthaḥ.

hatvety arthaḥ. aparigrahe kim? antarhatvā mūṣikāṃ gataḥ śyenaḥ. parigrhyety arthaḥ. *antaḥśabdasyāñkividhiṇatveṣūpasargasamjñā vaktavyā.*⁶⁸¹ antardhā. antardhiḥ. antarnayati.

(*Pañj.*) ||**antar a**|| antarhatyeti hanteḥ ktvā. *kugatiprādaya* iti (P.2.2.18) samāse lyap (cf. P.7.1.37). *vā lyapīti* (P.6.4.38) anunāsikalopaḥ. *antaḥśabdasyetyādi* 5
vārttikam antaḥśabdānurodhenātroktam. **antardhetyādiṣūdāharaṇeṣu** yathā-
kramam. upasargatve 'ñkiṇatvāni prayojanāni (cf. P.3.3.106; 3.3.92; 8.4.14).

66. kaṇemanaṣī śraddhāpratighāte. (P.1.4.66)

(*Bhv.*) kaṇemanaḥśabdau tṛṣṇāvigame gatī syātām. kaṇehatya 10
manohatya payaḥ pibati. ātṛṣṇam ity arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**kaṇe**|| kaṇeśabdaḥ saptamyantapratirūpako nipāto 'bhilāṣātīśaye vartate. tatsāhacaryān manaḥśabdo 'py abhilāṣavṛttir eva.⁶⁸²

67. puro 'vyayam. (P.1.4.67)

(*Bhv.*) gatiḥ syāt. *puraskṛtya śikhaṇḍīnam* (*Veṇī* 2.4b). *namaspurasor* 15
gatyor iti (P.8.3.40) satvam.

(*Pañj.*) ||**puro**|| puraskṛtyeti pūrvasmād deśād āgata iti.⁶⁸³ *pūrvādhāretyādinā* (P.5.3.39) asipratyayaḥ pūrvaśabdasya purādeśaḥ. *taddhitaś cetyādinā* (P.1.1.38) avyayatvam. **avyayam** iti kim? puras kṛtvā kāṇḍaṃ gataḥ.⁶⁸⁴ *pṛ pālanapūraṇayoḥ* (*Dhp.* 3.4, 9.19). *bhrājabhāsetyādinā* (P.3.2.177) kvip. *udo śthyapūrvasyety* (P.7.1.102) uttvam. raparatvam (cf. P.1.1.51). tato dvitīyābahuvacanam. 20

68. astam ca. (P.1.4.68)

(*Bhv.*) astam avyayaṃ gatiḥ syāt. astaṅgatya ka āgataḥ. mṛtvety 25
arthaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**astam ca**|| astaṅgatyeti gamaḥ ktvā. samāse lyap (cf. P.7.1.37). *vā lyapīti* (P.6.4.38) salopaḥ. tuk (cf. P.6.1.71). **mṛtvety** anenāstamaśabdasya ni- 25
dhanārthatām āha. **avyayam** ity eva: astam kṛtvā kāṇḍaṃ gataḥ.⁶⁸⁵ *asu kṣepaṇe* (*Dhp.* 4.100). niṣṭhā (cf. P.1.1.26). *yasya vibhāṣeti* (P.7.2.15) iṅṅiṣedhaḥ.

⁶⁸¹ Cf. vārtt. 1 ad loc (*Mbh.* I 344.12): *antaḥśabdasyāñkividhisamāsaṇatveṣūpasamkhyānam.*

⁶⁸² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *kaṇeśabdaḥ saptamyantapratirūpako nipātaḥ. sa cehābhilāṣātīśaye vartamāno grhyate... manaḥśabdo 'pi tatsāhacaryād abhilāṣavṛttir eva vijñāyate.*

⁶⁸³ *Nyāsa* gives the same explanation. *Pad.* has: *pūrvasmīn deśe kṛtvā.*

⁶⁸⁴ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pūḥ purau puraḥ kṛtvā kāṇḍaṃ gataḥ.*

⁶⁸⁵ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *astam kāṇḍam* with the variant reading: *astam kṛtvā gataḥ.* Cf. Sharma, Deshpande and Padhye (1969–70).

||accha || acchodyeti vadeḥ ktvā lyap yajāditvāt

5 samprasāraṇaṃ punaḥ punar u.ety arthaḥ· avyayam ity eva
udaka(..)ccha[m¹ ga]cchati· ||

10 ||ado || tyadādir ity² anenāvyayasamjñāṃ nirasyati adaskṛtyeti atah
kṛkamītyādīnā satvaṃ svayam eva parāmṛṣatīty anupadeśaḥ ||

15 ||tiro || tira[h][[4]]tvāā [[3]] m³ iti viśeṣaṇaṃ
svarūpākhyānāya⁴· ||

||vibhāṣā || tiraskṛtyeti tiraso 'nyatarasyām iti pakṣe visarjanī-
20 yasya saḥ ||

||upā || upājekṛtyeti gatisamjñāyāṃ samāsaḥ balam
25 apa.itvety arthaḥ ||

¹SJ adds gatvā. ²SJ: tyadādīty. ³SJ: tiraḥśabdasyāvyayatvāvyabhicārāt avyayam. ⁴SJ:
-namātram.

69. accha gatyarthavadeṣu. (P.1.4.69)

(*Bhv.*) *acchety* avyayam ābhikṣṇyavr̥ttir⁶⁸⁶ gatyarthe vadatau ca gatiḥ syāt. *acchagatya*. *acchodya*.

(*Pañj.*) || *accha* || *acchodyeti* vadeḥ ktvā. lyap (cf. P.7.1.37). yajāditvāt samprasāraṇam (cf. P.6.1.15). punaḥ punar uktvety arthaḥ. *avyayam* ity eva udakam accham gacchati. 5

70. ado 'nupadeṣe. (P.1.4.70)

(*Bhv.*) *tyadādir* adahśabdo gatiḥ syāt. *adahkṛtya* sthitaḥ. *anupadeṣe* kim? *adah* kṛtvā gaccha.

(*Pañj.*) || *ado* || *tyadādir* ity anenāvyayasamjñāṃ nirasyati. *adaskṛtyety* *ataḥ* *kṛkamṛtyādinā* (P.8.3.46) satvam. *svayam* eva parāmṛśatīty *anupadeśaḥ*.⁶⁸⁷ 10

71. tiro 'ntardhau. (P.1.4.71)

(*Bhv.*) *tiro* 'vyayaṃ gatiḥ syāt. *tirobhūya* sthitaś cauraḥ. *antardhau* kim? *tiro* bhūtvā sthitaṃ kāṇḍam.

(*Pañj.*) || *tiro* || *tiraḥ* [[śabdāvyaya]]tvā [[vyabhic]]ā [[rād avyaya]]m iti viśeṣaṇam *svarūpākhyānāya*. 15

72. vibhāṣā kṛñi. (P.1.4.72)

(*Bhv.*) *antardhau* kṛñi *tiro* vā gatiḥ syāt. *tiraskṛtya* *tiraḥ* kṛtvā.

(*Pañj.*) || *vibhāṣā* || *tiraskṛtyeti* *tiraso* 'nyatarasyām iti (P.8.3.42) pakṣe visarjanīyasya saḥ. 20

73. upāje 'nvāje. (P.1.4.73)

(*Bhv.*) *balādhānavṛttī* nipātāv etau kṛñi vā gatī syātām. *upājekṛtya* *upāje* kṛtvā vā. *anvājekṛtya* *anvāje* kṛtvā vā.

(*Pañj.*) || *upā* || *upājekṛtyeti* gatisamjñāyām samāsaḥ (cf. P.2.2.18). *balam* arpayitvety arthaḥ. 25

74. sāksātprabhṛtīni ca. (P.1.4.74)

(*Bhv.*) *sāksādādīni* kṛñi *gatisamjñākāni* vā syuḥ. *sāksātkṛtya* *sāksāt* kṛtvā vā. *mithyā*. *lavaṇam*. *vaśe*. *prādus*. *āvis*. *namas*.

⁶⁸⁶ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc. (*acchaśabdo* 'vyayam abhiśabdasyārthe vartate) and the *Nyāsa* on it (*abhir ābhimukhye*).

⁶⁸⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *svayam eva tu yadā buddhyā parāmṛśati tadā nāsty upadeśa iti so 'sya viśayaḥ*.

||sākṣāt || aviḥśabda ūryyādiṣv eva¹ pāṭhata² iti· atra³ karatau
 vikalpārthaḥ pāṭhaḥ⁴ vyava[sth]itavibhāṣayā cvyartha evābhidhānaṃ cvyante tu
 cvidācaś cety enainaiva siddhaṃ ||

5

||ana || urasimanasīta iti saptamyantapratirūpakau⁵ ||

10

15

20 ||prādhvaṃ || prādhvaṃkṛtya kuṭumbaṃ gata iti· bandhanena ni-
 mittenānukūlyaṃ kṛtvā gata ity arthaḥ· bandhane kiṃ prādhvaṃ kṛtvā sakāṭaṃ
 gataḥ adhvābhimukhaṃ kṛtvā gata ity arthaḥ ||

25

||jīvi || jīvikā jīvanopāyah⁶· upaṇiṣad rahasyaṃ upa.maivaupamyam·
 cāturvarṇādītāt⁷ svārthe śyañ jīvikā-
 kṛtyeti⁸ jīvikām iva kṛtvety arthaḥ ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: pāṭhita eva. ³SJ adds tu. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ adds nipātau. ⁶SJ: -yaviśeṣaḥ.
⁷SJ: -varṇyā-. ⁸SJ: -tvā iti.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**sākṣāt**|| āviḥśabda ūryādiṣv eva pāṭhata (*GP* 31.31) iti. atra karotau vikalpārthaḥ pāṭhaḥ. vyavasthitavibhāṣayā cvyartha evābhidhānam.⁶⁸⁸ cvyante tu *cviḍācaś cety* (cf. P.1.4.61⁶⁸⁹) anenaiva siddham.

75. anatyādhāna urasimanasī. (P.1.4.75)

(*Bhv.*:) etāv anupaśleṣe kṛñi vā gatī syātām. urasikṛtya urasi kṛtvā 5
vā japen mantram. manasikṛtya manasi kṛtvā vā. neha. urasi kṛtvā
hastam śete.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**ana**|| urasimanasī iti saptamyantapratirūpakau.

76. madhye pade nivacane ca. (P.1.4.76)

(*Bhv.*:) ete kṛñi vā gatayaḥ syuḥ. madhyekṛtya madhye kṛtvā 10
vā. padekṛtya pade kṛtvā vā. nivacane kṛtya nivacane kṛtvā vā.
tūṣṇīmbhūyety arthaḥ. anatyādhāne ity eva. hastinaḥ pade kṛtvā
śiraḥ śete.

77. nityaṃ haste pāṇāv upayamane. (P.1.4.77)

(*Bhv.*:) etau svīkāre kṛñi nityaṃ gatī syātām. taṃ hastekṛtya mā 15
śvasīh. pāṇaukṛtya bhūṅkte.

78. prādhvaṃ bandhane. (P.1.4.78)

(*Bhv.*:) prādhvaṃ kṛñi nityaṃ gatiḥ syād bandhanagatau.
prādhvaṅkṛtya kuṭumbaṃ sthitaḥ.

(*Pañj.*:) ||**prādhvaṃ**|| prādhvaṅkṛtya kuṭumbaṃ gata⁶⁹⁰ iti bandhanena ni- 20
mittenānukūlyam kṛtvā gata ity arthaḥ.⁶⁹¹ **bandhane** kim? prādhvaṃ kṛtvā śakaṭam
gataḥ. adhvābhimukhaṃ kṛtvā gata ity arthaḥ.⁶⁹²

79. jīvikopaniṣadāv aupamyē. (P.1.4.79)

(*Bhv.*:) etau sādrśye kṛñi gatī syātām. jīvikākṛtya vyācaṣṭe.
upaniṣatkṛtya kathayati. 25

(*Pañj.*:) ||**jīvi**|| **jīvikā** jīvanopāyaḥ. **upaniṣad** rahasyam. upamaivaupamyam.
cāturvarṇādītīvāt svārthe ṣyañ (cf. vārtt. 1 on P.5.1.124, *Mbh.* II 370.21). **jīvikā-**
kṛtyeti jīvikām iva kṛtvety arthaḥ.

⁶⁸⁸ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vyavasthitavibhāṣāvijñānād vā cvyartha eva vartamānānām teṣāṃ samjñā bhaviṣyatīti.*

⁶⁸⁹ P.1.4.61: *ūryādicviḍācaś ca.*

⁶⁹⁰ *Bhv.*: **prādhvaṅkṛtya kuṭumbaṃ sthitaḥ.**

⁶⁹¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *bandhanena nīmittenānukūlyam kṛtvety arthaḥ.*

⁶⁹² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc. (*bandhana iti kim? prādhvaṃ kṛtvā śakaṭam gataḥ*) and *Nyāsa* on iti: *samartham adhvagamane śakaṭam adhvābhimukhaṃ kṛtvety gamyate.*

||te prā || [a]..yamena niyame¹ prāpte niyamārtham idaṃ². ata āha. te
 5 gatyupasargasamjñakā ityādi. tegrahaṇaṃ vyavahitāyā apy upasargasamjñāyā
 grahaṇārtham ||

10

||karma || anvarthasamjñāvijñānāt karma proktavantaḥ karmaprava-
 canīyāḥ karṃmaśabdaḥ kriyāvacaṇaḥ tena ye kriyām uktvā kriyām dyotayitvā
 samprati sambandhaviśeṣaṃ dyotayanti te karmapravacanīyasamjñakā bhavanti³ ||

15

||anu || lakṣaṇethaṃbhūtetyādinā siddhe lakṣaṇaśabdeneha
 karakaṃ hetur gr̥hyate⁴ ata evāha⁵ lakṣaṇe kārake hetāv ityāhadi homam anu
 20 vṛṣṭa iti. homaṃ niśamya dṛṣṭvā vṛṣṭa ity arthaḥ karmapravacanīyasamjñāyāṃ
 karmapravacanīyayukte dvitīyā asaty asmin hetāv iti tṛtīyā syāt⁶ ||

25 ||tṛtīyā || sahārthe⁷ tṛtīyāvidhānāt tṛtīyārthena sahārtha ucyaṭe. ata āha
 sahārtha iti⁸ anuvasiteti siṃ bandhane. a[nva]vapūrvān⁹ niṣṭhā
avaśabdākārasya¹⁰

¹SJ: prayoge. ²SJ adds ity. ³SJ: iti. ⁴SJ adds ity. ⁵SJ om. eva. ⁶SJ: anyathā hi
 hetau tṛtīyā yadidaṃ sūtraṃ nārabyeta. ⁷SJ: sahārthena. ⁸SJ adds -ādi. ⁹SJ: anu-. ¹⁰SJ:
 avaśabdasyā-.

80. te prāg dhātoḥ. (P.1.4.80)

(*Bhv.*:) **te gatyupasargasamjñakā dhātoḥ prāk prayoktavyāḥ. tathaivodāhrtam.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**te prā**|| aniyamenāniyame prāpte niyamārtham idam. ata āha **te gatyupasargasamjñakā** ityādi. tegrahaṇam vyavahitāyā apy upasargasamjñāyā grahaṇārtham. 5

81. chandasi pare 'pi. (P.1.4.81)**82. vyavahitāś ca.** (P.1.4.82)

(*Bhv.*:) **chandaḥsūtradvayam.**

83. karmapravacanīyāḥ. (P.1.4.83)

(*Bhv.*:) **adhikāro 'yam.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**karma**|| anvarthasamjñāvijñānāt karma proktavantaḥ **karmapravacanīyāḥ.** karmaśabdaḥ kriyāvacaṇaḥ. tena ye kriyām uktvā kriyām dyotayitvā samprati sambandhaviśeṣam dyotayanti te karmapravacanīyasamjñakā bhavanti.⁶⁹³

84. anur lakṣaṇe. (P.1.4.84)

(*Bhv.*:) **lakṣaṇe kārake hetau dyotyē 'nuḥ karmapravacanīyanāmā syāt. homam anu vṛṣṭo devaḥ.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**anu**|| **lakṣaṇetthaṃbhūtetyādīnā** (P.1.4.90) siddhe lakṣaṇaśabdeneha kārakaṃ hetur gr̥hyate ata evāha **lakṣaṇe kārake hetāv ityādi.**⁶⁹⁴ **homam anu vṛṣṭa** iti homam niśamya dr̥ṣṭvā vṛṣṭa ity arthaḥ. karmapravacanīyasamjñāyām **karmapravacanīyayukte dvitīyā** (P.2.3.8). asaty asmin **hetāv** iti (P.2.3.23) tṛtīyā syāt. 20

85. tṛtīyārthe. (P.1.4.85)

(*Bhv.*:) **sahārthe 'nus tannāmā syāt. gaṅgām anv avasitā purī. tayā saha baddhety arthaḥ.**

(*Pañj.*:) ||**tṛtīyā**|| sahārthe tṛtīyāvidhānāt tṛtīyārthena sahārtha ucyate. ata āha **sahārtha** iti.⁶⁹⁵ **anuvāsiteti śiṅ bandhane** (*Dhp.* 5.2, 9.5). anvavapūrvān niṣṭhā. avasābdākārasya

⁶⁹³ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *mahatyāḥ samjñāyāḥ karaṇasyaitat prayojanam anvarthasamjñā yathā vijñāyeta – karma proktavantaḥ karmapravacanīya iti. ... karmaśabdaḥ kriyāvacaṇaḥ. ... ye kriyām dyotitavantaḥ na tu samprati dyotayanti, te karmapravacanīyasamjñā bhavantīty uktam bhavati. yadi samprati na kriyām dyotayanti, kiṃ tarhi dyotayanti? sambandhaviśeṣam.*

⁶⁹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *hetuśabdo 'tra kārahakhetuvacaṇaḥ na jñāpakahetuvacaṇaḥ.*

⁶⁹⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *sahārtho 'tra tṛtīyārthaḥ 'sahayukte 'pradhāne' iti (P.2.3.19) sahārthayoge tṛtīyāvidhānāt.*

vaṣṭi bhāgurir allopaṃ¹ avāpyor upasargayoḥ |
 [tā]pañ c.p. halantānām diśā vācā kṣudhā [gi]reti² lopaḥ ||

5

||upo || upa khāryyām iti· karmapravacanīyatve yasmād adhikam ityādinā
 10 saptamī upa gova[r]ddhanam iti govarddhanād dhīnam³ ity arthaḥ ||

||apa || apa trigarttā[d] iti· pañcamy apā[n]paribhir iti pañcamī
 15 pari⁴ trigarttād iti parer varjana iti dviruktiḥ ||

||ān || vacanagrahaṇam⁵ ityādi⁶ ayam abhiprāyaḥ vacanagrahaṇe sati bahu-
 20 vīhir labhyate maryyādeti⁷ vacanaṃ yatra⁸ sūtre maryyā⁹ [tan ma]ryādāvacaṇam sūtram
 tat punar ān maryyādābhividhyā¹⁰ iti· tatra yasminn arthe sa¹¹ ān karmapra-
 vacanīyaṣaṃjñako¹² bhavati¹³· abhividhir iti¹⁴· abhivyāptir¹⁵ gṛhyate· a samudrād iti
 pūrvavat pañcamī ||

¹SJ: allopa ityādinā. ²SJ om. ³SJ: -nā. ⁴SJ adds pari. ⁵SJ: -ṇād. ⁶SJ: iti. ⁷SJ adds etad. ⁸SJ: yasmin. ⁹SJ om. ¹⁰SJ: -dhyor. ¹¹SJ om. ¹²SJ: -saṃjño. ¹³SJ adds iti. ¹⁴SJ: api. ¹⁵SJ om.

vaṣṭi bhāgurir allopaṃ avāpyor upasargayoḥ |
*tāpaṃ cāpi halantānāṃ diśā vācā kṣudhā girā ||*⁶⁹⁶ iti loṇaḥ.

86. hīne. (P.1.4.86)

(*Bhv.*) hīne dyotyē 'nus tannāmā syāt. anv arjunaṃ yoddhāraḥ. tato hīnā ity arthaḥ.

5

87. upo 'dhike ca. (P.1.4.87)

(*Bhv.*) upo 'dhike hīne ca tannāmā syāt. upa khāryām droṇaḥ. upa govardhanaṃ śābdikāḥ.⁶⁹⁷

(*Pañj.*) || **upo** || upa khāryām iti karma pravacanīyatve *yasmād adhikam* ityādinā (P.2.3.9) saptamī. upa govardhanaṃ iti govardhanād dhīnā ity arthaḥ.

10

88. apaparī varjane. (P.1.4.88)

(*Bhv.*) etau varjane tathā syātām. apa trigartebhyaḥ. pari srughnād vṛṣṭo devaḥ.

(*Pañj.*) || **apa** || apa trigartebhyaḥ iti *pañcamy apānparibhir* iti (P.2.3.10) pañcamī. pari ⟨pari⟩ trigartebhyaḥ iti⁶⁹⁸ *parer varjana* iti (P.8.1.5) dviruktiḥ.

15

89. āñi maryādāvacanē. (P.1.4.89)

(*Bhv.*) sīmāyām āñi tannāmā syāt. ā samudrād vṛṣṭo devaḥ. vacanagrahaṇād abhivyāptau ca. ākumāraṃ yaśas tava.⁶⁹⁹

(*Pañj.*) || **āñi** || vacanagrahaṇād ityādy ayam abhiprāyaḥ. vacanagrahaṇe sati bahuvrīhir labhyate. *maryādeti* vacanaṃ yatra sūtre tan *maryādāvacanam* sūtram. tat punar *āñi maryādābhividhyor* iti (P.2.1.13) tatra yasminn arthe sa āñi karma pravacanīyasamjñako bhavati.⁷⁰⁰ *abhividhir* ity abhivyāptir grhyate. ā samudrād iti pūrvavat pañcamī (cf. P.2.3.10).

⁶⁹⁶ The first half of this verse is cited in the *Dhātuvṛtti* 2.48 and in *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.21. According to Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1984: 104 fn. 1) the verse is quoted in the *Nyāsa*, where *pādas cd* have the reading: *āpaṃ caiva halantānāṃ yathā vācā niśā diśā*, and in the *Tīkāsarvasva*, which has the following reading:

tāpaṃ cāpi halantānāṃ diśā vācā girā kṣudhā |
vaṣṭi bhāgurir allopaṃ avāpyor upasargayoḥ ||.

⁶⁹⁷ Chakravartī (1918: 56): **upakhāryām droṇaḥ. upa govardhanaṃ śābdikāḥ.** Dwarikadas Śāstri (1971: 51) and Mishra (1989: 45): **upakhāryām droṇaḥ. upagovardhanaṃ śābdikāḥ.**

⁶⁹⁸ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: *pari pari trigartebhyo vṛṣṭo devaḥ. Bhv.: pari srughnād vṛṣṭo devaḥ.*

⁶⁹⁹ Cf. *Pat.* ad loc.: *ākumāraṃ yaśaḥ pāñiner iti. (Mb. I 347.23).* This is also cited in *Kāś.*

⁷⁰⁰ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *vacanagrahaṇe hi sati bahuvrīhir labhyate. 'maryādā' ity etad vacanaṃ yatra sūtre tan maryādāvacanam. ... tat punaḥ sūtram 'āñi maryādābhividhyoḥ' ity (P.2.1.13) etat tatra cāñi maryādābhividhyor vartamāna upātta ity ubhayatrāpi bhavati.*

5

||lakṣaṇe || kañcid viśeṣam āpannam¹ i[ttham]bhūtam² bhāgaḥ svī-
 kriyamāno 'mśaḥ vyāptum īcchā vīpsā· vṛkṣam³ parīti⁴ pañcamy apāṇparibhir
 iti pañcamī na bhavati apena⁵ sāhacaryyād varjanārthasya pare
 10 sūtragrahaṇāt⁶ lakṣaṇādiṣu kiṃ· odanaṃ pariṣiñcati upasargāśrayaṃ śatvaṃ
 bhavati⁷ ||

15

||abhi || yan mām abhiṣyād iti upasargaprādurbhyām iti⁸
 mūrddhanyaḥ⁹ karmapravacanīyasaṃjñāyā abhāvād upasargasaṃjñābādho nāstīti
 kṛtvā· asteh sopasargasya sakarmakatvāt [mā]m iti karmani dvitīyā¹⁰ ||

20

||prati ||¹¹ yo nārāyaṇaḥ pratīti pratinidhipratidāne ca yasmād iti
 pañcamī karmmapravacanīyatve¹² pratiyoge pañcamyās tasiḥ ||

¹SJ: āpanna. ²SJ: -taḥ. ³SJ: vṛkṣa-. ⁴SJ adds atra. ⁵SJ: supā. ⁶SJ: tatra grahaṇam.
⁷SJ adds eva. ⁸Cf. fn. 10. ⁹SJ adds iti. ¹⁰SJ has this sentence after upasargaprādurbhyām iti.
¹¹SJ adds yo. ¹²SJ om.

90. lakṣaṇetthambhūtākhyānabhāgavīpsāsu pratiparyanavaḥ.

(P.1.4.90)

(*Bhv.*) cihnādau dyotye pratiparyanavaḥ karma pravacanīyāḥ syuḥ. vṛkṣaṃ prati vidyotate vidyut. vṛkṣaṃ pari. vṛkṣaṃ anu. evaṃ mātaram prati sādhuḥ. yad atra mām prati syāt. vṛkṣaṃ vṛkṣaṃ 5
prati siñcati.

(*Pañj.*) ||**lakṣaṇe**|| kaṃcid viśeṣaṃ āpannam **itthambhūtam**. **bhāgaḥ** svīkriyamāṇo 'ṃśaḥ. vyāptum icchā **vīpsā**.⁷⁰¹ **vṛkṣaṃ parīti pañcamy apānparibhir** iti (P.2.3.10) pañcamī na bhavaty apena sāhacaryād varjanārthasya pare(ḥ) sūtragrahaṇāt.⁷⁰² lakṣaṇādiṣu kim? odanaṃ pariśiñcati.⁷⁰³ upasargāśrayaṃ ṣatvaṃ 10
bhavati (cf. P.8.3.65).

91. abhir abhāge. (P.1.4.91)

(*Bhv.*) abhir bhāgavarjitalakṣaṇādaḥ tan nāmā syāt. vṛkṣaṃ abhi vidyotate vidyut. mātaram abhi sādhuḥ. vṛkṣaṃ vṛkṣaṃ abhi siñcati. abhāge kim? yad atra mām abhiṣyāt. upasargāśrayo mūrdhanyaḥ. 15

(*Pañj.*) ||**abhi**|| yan mām abhiṣyād iti⁷⁰⁴ upasargaprādurbhīyām iti (P.8.3.87) mūrdhanyaḥ. karma pravacanīyasaṃjñāyā abhāvād upasargasamjñābādho nāstīti kṛtvā astēḥ sopasargasya sakarmakatvān mām iti *karmaṇi dvitīyā* (P.2.3.2).⁷⁰⁵

92. pratiḥ pratinidhipratidānayoḥ. (P.1.4.92)

(*Bhv.*) pratiḥ sadṛśapratyarpaṇayos tathā syāt. yo nārāyaṇataḥ prati. 20
māṣān asmaḥ tilebhyaḥ prati yacchati.

(*Pañj.*) ||**prati**|| yo nārāyaṇaḥ pratīti pratinidhipratidāne ca yasmād iti (P.2.3.11) pañcamī. karma pravacanīyatve pratiyoge *pañcamyās tasīl* (P.5.3.7).

93. adhiparī anarthakau. (P.1.4.93)

(*Bhv.*) anarthakāv⁷⁰⁶ adhiparī tathā syātām. kuto 'dhy āgacchati? 25
kutaḥ pary ānayaṭi? gatyupasargasamjñābādhaḥ phalam. anarthakau kim? adhigamya. pariṇīya.

⁷⁰¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: kaṃcit prakāram āpannam itthambhūtam... svīkriyamāṇo 'ṃśo bhāga yas tv asvīkriyamāṇe 'ṃśe bhāgaśabdāḥ prayujyate. ... padārthān vyāptum icchā vīpsā.

⁷⁰² Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: atha pariśabdāyoge pañcamī kasmān na bhavati 'pañcamy apānparibhiḥ' iti (P.2.3.10)? varjanaviṣaye sā vidhīyate apaśabdasaḥacaryāt.

⁷⁰³ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc.: lakṣaṇādiṣu iti kim? odanaṃ pariśiñcati.

⁷⁰⁴ *Bhv.*: yad atra mām abhiṣyāt.

⁷⁰⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: yady apy astir akarmakas tathāpy akarmakā api dhātavaḥ sopasargāḥ sakarmakā bhavantīti karmaṇi dvitīyā.

⁷⁰⁶ Chakravarti (1918: 57 fn. 41) notes another reading: **anadhikārthau** and this is known to Viśvarūpa.

||adhi|| anadhikārthāḥ iti dhātvarthāḥ¹ dhātvarthād adhikam
 arthaṃ na [bru]vata² iti kṛtvā³ sarvathā hy anarthakatve kriyasambandhābhāvāt
 gatyupasargasamjñābādho⁴ na prasajyata⁵ iti sūtrāvastho⁶ 'narthakaḥ syāt | kuto
 'dhy āgata iti upapadavibhakteḥ kāravibhaktir balīyasīti

5 karmapravacanīyadvitīyām badhitvā 'pādāne⁷ pañcamī||

10

||ati|| niṣpanne 'pi phale kriyāpravṛttir atikramaḥ⁸ | atikramaṇe kiṃ
 atiṣṭutaṃ· pūjāyām ity eva atiṣiktaṃ ṣatvaṃ pūrvavat ||

15

20

25 ||apiḥ|| sarpiṣo 'pi syād iti sarpiṣo hi yo binduḥ tena sahāpīśabdasya
 yogo na sarpiṣā tena sarpiṣābdā[d dv]itīyā na bhavati | bindvarthe syāt padam
 iti upalakṣaṇamātram etat tena sambhāvanādaḥ jayed⁹ ityādy api boddhavyaṃ

¹SJ om. ²SJ: brūtaḥ. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ: -bhāvo. ⁵SJ: yujyata. ⁶SJ: sūtrārambho. ⁷SJ:
 -dāna-. ⁸SJ: atikramaṇam. ⁹SJ: stūyād.

(*Pañj.*) ||**adhi**|| **anadhikārthāv** iti dhātvarthāv iti dhātvarthād adhikam arthaṃ na bruvata iti kṛtvā sarvathā hy anarthakatve kriyāsambandhābhāvād gatyupasargasamjñābādho na prasajyata iti sūtrāvastho 'narthakaḥ syāt.⁷⁰⁷ **kuto 'dhy āgata** ity⁷⁰⁸ *upapadavibhakteḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasīti* (*PP* 48, *NP* 94) karmapravacanīyadvitīyāṃ (cf. P.2.3.8) badhitvāpādāne pañcamī (P.2.3.28).⁷⁰⁹ 5

94. suḥ pūjāyām. (P.1.4.94)

(*Bhv.*) **pūjāyām sus tannāmā syāt. su siktaṃ tvayā.**⁷¹⁰ **upasargāśrayaṃ ṣatvaṃ na bhavati.**

95. atir atikramaṇe ca. (P.1.4.95)

(*Bhv.*) **atipravṛttir atikramaḥ. tasmin pūjāyām cātis tan nāmā syāt.** 10
ati siktaṃ tvayā. pūjāyām. ati stutam. atistutiḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**ati**|| niṣpanne 'pi phale kriyāpravṛttir **atikramaḥ.**⁷¹¹ **atikramaṇe** kim? atiṣṭutam. **pūjāyām** ity eva. atiṣiktam <iti> ṣatvaṃ pūrvavat (cf. P.8.3.65).

96. apiḥ padārthasambhāvanānvavasargagarhāsamuccayeṣu.
(P.1.4.96) 15

(*Bhv.*) eṣu vartamāno 'piśabdaḥ karmapravacanīyaḥ syād ity ekaḥ sūtrārthaḥ. sarpiṣo 'pi syāt. bindupadārthe 'piśabdaḥ. eṣu yat padaṃ vartate tat praty apiśabdaḥ karmapravacanīyaḥ syād iti dvitīyaḥ sūtrārthaḥ. sarpiṣo 'pi syāt. bindvarthe syāt padaṃ. tat prati apiśabdaḥ karmapravacanīyaḥ. tenopasargāśrayaṃ ṣatvaṃ na bhavati. 20
sarpis tu prati na karmapravacanīya iti dvitīyā na syāt. sambhāvanā yogyatā. **api sthāṇuṃ jayed rāmaḥ** (*Bhaṭṭ.* 8.91c). **anvavasargaḥ prākāmyam. api siñca api stuhi. garhā nindā. api stuyād vṛṣalam. samuccaye. api siñca api stuhi. ubhayaṃ kuru.**

(*Pañj.*) ||**apiḥ**|| **sarpiṣo 'pi syād** iti sarpiṣo hi yo binduḥ tena sahāpiśabdasya 25
yogo na sarpiṣā. tena sarpiḥśabdād dvitīyā na bhavati.⁷¹² **bindvarthe syāt padaṃ** ity upalakṣaṇamātram etat. tena sambhāvanādau **jayed** ityādy api boddhavyam.

⁷⁰⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* ad loc. (*gatyupasargasamjñābādhanārthā karmapravacanīyasamjñā vidhīyate*) and *Nyāsa* on iti (*karmapravacanīyasamjñā gatyupasargasamjñābādhanārthanena vidhīyate*).

⁷⁰⁸ *Bhv.*: **kuto 'dhy āgacchati.**

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *karmapravacanīyeti dvitīyā na bhavati upapadavibhakteḥ kārakavibhaktir balīyasīti vacanāt.*

⁷¹⁰ Chakravarti (1918: 57), Dwarikadas Shastri (1971: 52) and Mishra (1989: 45): **susiktaṃ tvayā.**

⁷¹¹ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *niṣpanne 'pi phale stutiḥ pravṛttety arthaḥ.*

⁷¹² Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *atha sarpiḥśabdāt dvitīyā kathaṃ na bhavati? apiśabdena tasya yogā-sambhavāt. sarpiṣo hi yā mātrā sāpiśabdena yuktā na sarpiḥ.*

tadviṣaye tu¹ karmaṇi [dv]itīyā jayed iti sambhāvanavacaneṣv² alamartheṣv iti³ liṅ· ||

5

||vibhāṣā || yan mām⁴ adhi karotīti karmapravacanīyatvena gatitvābhāvāt
10 tiṅ codāttavatīti nighāt{o}ābhāvaḥ· adhi kṛtveti⁵ samāsābhāvaḥ ||

||laḥ || la iti saṣṭhy[e]kavacanam lādeśāpeksayā ata evāha lādeśā iti
15 prathamābahuvacanatve yady api sthānivatvāl lādeśānām api parasmaipadatvaṃ
labhyate tathāpy uttarasūtre '[lā]deśasyāpy ānasyātmanepadasaṃjñā⁶ syāt· atra
ca vibhaktivipariṇāmena pratipattigauravadoṣaḥ syāt | tib ityādi rūpodāharaṇam
kāryodāharaṇan tu akārṣīt apuṣad iti ||⁷

20

25

||tiṅaḥ || tiṅ iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam tipas tiṅśabdād⁸ ārabhya māhiṅo⁹
nākāreṇa parasmaipadagrahaṇam ātmanepadagrahaṇaṅ cānuvarttate· tad ayam
arthaḥ· tiṅaḥ¹⁰ parasmaipadasya yāni trīṇi ye trayas trikāḥ tathā tiṅa ātmanepadasya

¹SJ om. ²SJ: -nāva-. ³SJ adds -ādinā. ⁴SJ: yam. ⁵SJ adds karmapravacanīyatve gatitvābhāvān na. ⁶The underlined phrase is repeated (in brackets) after āna of ānasyātmanepadasaṃjñā. ⁷The commentary of this sūtra as given in SJ: la iti ṣaṣṭhyaikavacanam ādeśāpeksayā | at evāha lādeśā ityādir ityā rūpodāharaṇam. ⁸SJ: tikārād. ⁹SJ: mahiṅo. ¹⁰SJ: tiṅ-

tadviṣaye tu karmaṇi dvitīyā. **jayed** iti saṃbhāvanavacaneṣv alamartheṣv iti liṅ (cf. P.3.3.154).⁷¹³

97. adhir īśvare. (P.1.4.97)

(*Bhv.:*) aiśvare gamye 'dhis tan nāmā syāt. adhi pañcāleṣu brahmadattaḥ. 5

98. vibhāṣā kṛñi. (P.1.4.98)

(*Bhv.:*) adhiḥ kṛñi vā karma pravacanīyaḥ syāt. yan mām adhikariṣyati yan mām adhi kariṣyati vā. adhikṛtya adhi kṛtvā vā. uktā nipātāḥ.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**vibhāṣā**|| yan mām adhi karotīti karma pravacanīyatvena gatitvābhāvāt *tin*(*i*) *codāttavatīti* (P.8.1.71) nighātābhāvaḥ. **adhi kṛtveti** samāsābhāvaḥ. 10

99. laḥ parasmaipadam. (P.1.4.99)

(*Bhv.:*) lādeśāḥ parasmaipadam ucyante. tip tas jhi sip thas tha mip vas mas śatṛ kvasu.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**laḥ**|| **la** iti ṣaṣṭhyekavacanam lādeśāpekṣayā. ata evāha lādeśā iti. prathamābahuvacanatve yady api sthānivattvāl lādeśānām api parasmaipadatvam 15 labhyate tathāpy uttarasūtre 'lādeśasyāpy ānasyātmanepadasaṃjñā syāt.⁷¹⁴ atra ca vibhaktivipariṇāmena pratipattigauravadoṣaḥ syāt. **tib** ityādi rūpodāharaṇam. kāryodāharaṇam tv akārṣid apuṣad iti.

100. tañānāv ātmanepadam. (P.1.4.100)

(*Bhv.:*) tañ etau ca lādeśāv ātmanepadam ucyante. tañ iti tātāñ jha 20 thās āthām dhvam id vahi mahiñ. āna iti śānackānaca.

101. tiñas trīṇi trīṇi prathamamadhyamottamāḥ. (P.1.4.101)

(*Bhv.:*) tiñam trīṇi trīṇi padāni krameṇa prathamamadhyamottama- 25 saṃjñakāni syuḥ. tiptasjhi tātāñjha iti prathamāḥ. tato madyamaḥ. tata uttamāḥ.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**tiñah**|| **tiñ** iti pratyāhāragrahaṇam tipas tiśabdād ārabhya māhiño nākāreṇa. parasmaipadagrahaṇam ātmanepadagrahaṇam cānuvartate. tad ayam arthaḥ: tiñah parasmaipadasya yāni trīṇi ye trayas trikāḥ tathā tiña ātmanepadasya

⁷¹³ The use of word *saṃbhāvanavacaneṣu* could mean that Viśvarūpa interpreted the second *pada* of the compound in the present *sūtra* as *saṃbhāvana*, which is what we find in *Kāś.* (*padārthe saṃbhāvane anuvavarge gargāyām samuccaye ca vartamānaḥ apiḥ karma pravacanīyasamjño bhavati*), and not as *saṃbhāvanā*, which is what Puruṣottamadeva did. However, it is also possible that Viśvarūpa uses the form *saṃbhāvana* because it appears in P.3.3.154 (*saṃbhāvane 'lam iti cet siddhāprayoge*).

⁷¹⁴ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *tañānāv ātmanepadam ity* (P.1.4.100) *atra tu laḥ ity anena tañānayoh sambandho nopapadyate na hi tañānau lau bhavataḥ.*

yāni trīṇi ye¹ trayas trikās² te yathāsamkhyam̐ prathamamadhyam((o))ttamasamjñakā bhavanti· ||

5

||tāny e || tāny eva trīṇi trīṇi³ padāni ekaikaśo 'nukrameṇa ekavacana-dvivacanabahuvacanasamjñakāni bhavantīty ayam arthaḥ sampadyate tenedam uktaṃ tib ity ekavacanam ityādi ||

10

||supaḥ || tathā syād iti yathā tiṇo vyavasthā tathā supo 'pīty arthaḥ· tena supo 'pi trīṇi trīṇi padāni⁴ ek((ai))kam anukrameṇaikavacanadvivacanabahuvacana-
15 samjñakāni⁵ bhavantīty ata⁶ āha sur ity ekavacanam ityādi ||

||vibha || vibhajyate prātipadikārtho⁷ 'nayeti karaṇe ktin suptinau samjñinau ||

20

25

||yuṣma || sāmānyena⁸ prayoge prāpte⁹ niyamārtham idaṃ¹⁰ lakāreṇa samānādhikaraṇe yuṣmadīti yuṣmadartha ity arthaḥ tena yasmin¹¹ yuṣmadarthe madhyamapurūṣaḥ¹² sa yadi lakāravācyo pīty arthaḥ tadantavidhinā paramatvaṃ

30

¹SJ: te. ²SJ adds: tathā cātmanepadasya ca yāni trīṇi te trayas trikāḥ. ³SJ om. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: ukta-. ⁶SJ om. ⁷SJ adds dhātu-. ⁸SJ: sāmānya-. ⁹SJ: prāpta-. ¹⁰SJ: vacanam. ¹¹SJ adds yasmin. ¹²SJ: madhyamaḥ.

yāni trīṇi ye trayas trikās te yathāsaṃkhyam prathamamadhyamottamasamjñakā bhavanti.

102. tāny ekavacanadvivacanabahuvacanāny ekaśaḥ. (P.1.4.102)

(*Bhv.:*) tāni trīṇi trīṇi padāni pratyekam ekavacanadvivacanabahuvacanasamjñakāni syuḥ. tib ity ekavacanam. tas iti dvivacanam. 5
jhīti bahuvacanam. evam anyatrāpi.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**tāny e**|| tāny eva trīṇi trīṇi padāny ekaikaśo 'nukrameṇa ekavacanadvivacanabahuvacanasamjñakāni bhavantīty ayam arthaḥ saṃpadyate. tenedam uktam **tib ity ekavacanam** ityādi.

103. supaḥ. (P.1.4.103)

(*Bhv.:*) supaś ca tathā syāt. su ity ekavacanam au iti dvivacanam. jas 10
iti bahuvacanam. evaṃ sarvatra.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**supaḥ**|| tathā syād iti yathā tiṇo vyavasthā tathā supo 'pīty arthaḥ. tena supo 'pi trīṇi trīṇi padāny ekaikam anukrameṇaikavacanadvivacanabahuvacanasamjñakāni bhavantīty ata āha **sur ity ekavacanam** ityādi. 15

104. vibhaktiś ca. (P.1.4.104)

(*Bhv.:*) sup tiṇ ca vibhaktir ucyate.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**vibha**|| vibhajyate prātipadikārtho 'nayeti karaṇe ktin (cf. P.3.3.19, 94). 20
suptiṇau saṃjñiṇau.

105. yuṣmady upapade samānādhikaraṇe sthāniny api 20
madhyamaḥ. (P.1.4.105)

(*Bhv.:*) lakāreṇa samānādhikaraṇe yuṣmady upapade madhyama-
puruṣaḥ syāt. tvaṃ pacasi. yuvāṃ pacathaḥ. yūyaṃ pacatha. tvaṃ
dṛśyase. yuvāṃ dṛśyethe. yūyaṃ dṛśyadhve. sthāninīti. gamyamāne
'pi yuṣmadi. odanaṃ pacasi. mayā dṛśyase. **bhavatprayoge neṣyate.** 25
bhavān karoti. samānādhikaraṇe kim? tvayā dṛśyate.

(*Pañj.:*) ||**yuṣma**|| sāmānyena prayoge prāpte niyamārtham idam. **lakāreṇa**
samānādhikaraṇe yuṣmadīti yuṣmadartha ity arthaḥ. tena yasmin yuṣmadarthe
madhyamapuruṣaḥ sa yadi lakāravācyo 'pīty arthaḥ. tadantavidhinā paramatvaṃ

ya((ā))sīty api bhavati grahaṇavateti tu¹ na pravarttate tasyāḥ pratyā-
 yavidhitvāt² sapūrvāc ceti pratyayavidhau³ jñāpitatvāc ca | yat tu⁴ śeṣo ghy
 asakhir ity atroktam⁵ nasakṛtā grahaṇavatā prātipadike⁶ tadantavidhir
 nāstīti tat sāmānyajñāpakam āsṛitya | tvām⁷ atikrānto 'titvam yātīti⁸
 5 yuṣmadarthasyābhāvāt rūpo⁹ py aṅgīkriyata ity uktam prak | atvam¹⁰
 sampadyata iti tvadbhavatīty atra prathamapuruṣa{h} eva yuṣmadarthasya
 gaṇatvāt | bhavān yātīty atra yady¹¹ api yuṣmadartho¹² [rū]pābhāvān na bhavati
 rūpavato 'rthasya grahaṇāt na ca sy¹³ atra rūpasya gamyamānatvam bhavacchabde-
 nārthasyoktatvāt tvattaro yāsīty atra taparaḥ svārth{e}akatvān¹⁴ madhyamapuruṣa
 10 eva kalpapāda¹⁵ tūbhayaṃ yadānya¹⁶ evāsi samvṛtta iti-
 vad abhedavivakṣāyām kiñci.nyūnau yuṣmadartha ākhyāyate tadā sādrśyān
 madhyamapuruṣaḥ tvatkalpo ..sīti yadā tv anyā evocyate¹⁷ tadā prathamapuruṣa
 eva tvatkalpo yatīti ||

¹SJ om. ²SJ: -vidhiviṣayatvāt. ³SJ: -vidhi-. ⁴SJ om. ⁵SJ: atra tu yad uktam. ⁶SJ om.
⁷SJ: tvam. ⁸SJ adds atra na bhavati. ⁹SJ: rūpavadartha. ¹⁰SJ adds tvam. ¹¹SJ: saty. ¹²SJ:
 -rthe. ¹³SJ om. ¹⁴SJ: svārthikatvāt. ¹⁵SJ: kalpapādes. ¹⁶SJ: yad anya. ¹⁷SJ: anyatra vocyate.

yāsīty api bhavati. *grahaṇavateti* (cf. *PP* 78, *NP* 31) tu na pravartate tasyāḥ pratya-
 yavidhitvāt *sapūrvāc ceti* (P.5.2.87) pratyayavidhau jñāpitatvāc ca. yat tu *śeṣo ghy*
asakhir ity (P.1.4.7⁷¹⁵) atroktam *nyāsakṛtā grahaṇavatā prātipadike*⟨na⟩ *tadantavidhir*
nāstīti (*PP* 78, *NP* 31) tat sāmānyajñāpakam āśritya.⁷¹⁶ tvām atikrānto 'titvaṃ yātīti
 yuṣmadarthasyābhāvāt (cf. fn. 723). rūpam apy aṅgīkriyata ity uktam prak.⁷¹⁷ atvaṃ 5
 ⟨tvaṃ⟩ saṃpadyata iti tvadbhavatīty⁷¹⁸ atra prathamapuruṣa eva yuṣmadarthasya
 gaṇatvāt.⁷¹⁹ bhavān yātīty atra yady api yuṣmadartho rūpābhāvān na bhavati
 rūpavato 'rthasya grahaṇāt. na cāsyātra rūpasya gamyamānatvaṃ bhavacchabde-
 nārthasyoktatvāt.⁷²⁰ tvattaro yāsīty atra *taparāḥ svārthakatvān* madhyamapuruṣa
 eva.⁷²¹ kalpapādaḥ (cf. P.5.3.67) tūbhayam. yadānya evāsi saṃvṛtta iti- 10
 vad abhedavivakṣāyāṃ (?)⁷²² kiṃcinnyūno yuṣmadartha ākhyāyate tadā sādrśyān
 madhyamapuruṣaḥ: tvatkalpo yāsīti. yadā tv anya evocyate tadā prathamapuruṣa
 eva: tvatkalpo yātīti.⁷²³

106. prahāse ca manyopapade manyater uttama ekavac ca.
 (P.1.4.106)

(*Bhv.*) **parihāsagatau manyopapadasya dhātor uttame prāpte**
madhyamaḥ puruṣaḥ syāt. manyateś ca madhyame prāpta uttamaḥ.

⁷¹⁵ This *sūtra* reads *asakhi* for *asakhir*, but Viśvarūpa obviously knew the second variant. Cf. *Pañj.* on P.1.4.7.

⁷¹⁶ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.7: *iha śobhanaḥ sakhāsyeti susakhir iti, susakher āgacchatīty atra tadantavi-
 dhinā pratiśedhaḥ prāpnoti, sa ca 'grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāsti' iti pratiśedhān na
 bhavati.* Cf. also this passage of the *Pañjikā* with *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.105: *katham paramatvaṃ paṭhasi.
 grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti tadantavidhir nāstīti tadantatvābhāvāt. ucyate:
 'sapūrvāc ce'-ti pratyayavidhau jñāpakāt pratyayavidhiviṣāye kaiś cit sāmānyeneyam svīkriyate. tathā
 'śeṣo ghy asakhi'-ty atra nyāsaḥ susakher āgacchaty, atisakher āgacchatīty atrāsakhīti na pratiśedhaḥ.
 On sāmānyajñāpakam āśritya see Śīradeva's explanation of the *paribhāṣā* in question: *anye ca
 sāmānyena pratyayavidhau cāpratyayavidhau ca paribhāṣām āhuḥ.* [Abhyankar (1967: 222)].*

⁷¹⁷ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *katham atitvaṃ pacatīti. 'svaṃ rūpam' ity atra rūpagrahaṇād
 rūpavadartho 'py aṅgīkriyata iti jñāpitam. tenārthāntaravṛttitvāt prathamapuruṣa eva.*

⁷¹⁸ Cf. *Pat.* ad loc.: *atvaṃ tvaṃ saṃpadyate tvadbhavati madbhavatīti (Mbh. I 354.10).*

⁷¹⁹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *atvaṃ tvaṃ saṃpadyate tvadbhavatīty atra prathamapuruṣa eva
 yuṣmadarthasya gaṇatvād yathāmahān mahān saṃpanno mahadbhūtas candramā ity atra 'ān ma-
 hata' ityādinā nātvaṃ bhavatīti nyāsaḥ.*

⁷²⁰ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *bhavān yātīty atra tu saty api yuṣmadarthe rūpābhāvān na bhavati.
 arthavato rūpasya grahaṇāt. na cātra rūpasya gamyamānatvam. bhavacchabdenārthasyoktatvāt.*

⁷²¹ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *tvattaro yāsīty atra taparāḥ svārthikatvād yuṣmady upapada iti
 madhyamapuruṣaḥ.*

⁷²² One might consider the emendation *bhedavivakṣāyāṃ*, in accordance with *Durghaṭa* ad loc. (see
 fn. 723). However, since the reading present in the manuscript makes sense as well, I have refrained
 from any emendation.

⁷²³ Cf. *Durghaṭa* ad loc.: *kalpādaḥ tūbhayam. yadā hy anya evāsti bhavān saṃvṛtta iti
 ced bhedavivakṣāyāṃ kiṃcidbhūto yuṣmadartha ucyate syāt tadā madhyamapuruṣaḥ. tvatkalpo
 yāsīti. yadā tv anya evocyate tadā prathamapuruṣaḥ. tvatkalpo devadatto yātīti rakṣitāḥ.
 Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *kvacit tu vṛttāv evāyaṃ granthaḥ paṭhyate iha ca atitvaṃ pacati
 atyahaṃ pacatīty atrātikrāntapradhānena samāse yuṣmadasmador asāmānādhikaraṇyāt prathama
 eva bhavati iha tv iṣad asamāptas tvaṃ tvatkalpaḥ pacati matkalpaḥ pacāmīti kālāntaradr̥ṣṭagaṇa-
 rahito yuṣmadasmadartha eva tvatkalpamatkalpaśabdābhyām ucyata iti madhyamottamaḥ bhavataḥ
 tatsadr̥ṣapadāntarābhīdhāne tu prathamāḥ tathā tvattaraḥ pacasi mattaraḥ pacāmi paramatvaṃ pacasi
 paramāḥ pacāmīti kālāntaradr̥ṣṭagaṇāṭīśayaviśiṣṭo yuṣmadasmadartha evocyate iti bhavaty eva.**

||prahā || pariḥāsagatau manyase pa((ā))syāmīty¹ atrārthe manye pāsyasīti²
 5 prayogaḥ | mantur anekatve 'pīti yady api bahavo mantāro bhavanti
 tathāpy ekagrahaṇād³ ekavacanam eva⁴ manyase pītam tad atithibhir iti
 pariḥās{o}ā{va}bhivyaktaye ||

10

||asma || ahaṃ dṛśya ityādi⁵ karmaṇy asmadarthe samānādhikaraṇe
 lakāraḥ ṭer etvam⁶ ato guṇe pararūpatvañ ca ||

15

||paraḥ || saṃhitāyāṃ⁷ dadhy a[trety a]tra iko yaṇ acīti yaṇādeśaḥ
 20 sannikarṣāvivaḥṣāyān tu doṣa atra⁸ ||

||virā || viramyate 'neneti virāmo 'ntyo varṇaḥ vṛkṣa iti· avasāna-
 saṃjñāyāṃ kharavasānayor visarjanīyaḥ⁹ ||

25 iti śrīviśvarūpaviracitāyāṃ bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapanājikāyāṃ
 prathamō dhyāyah sampūrṇaḥ¹⁰ ||

¹SJ: yāsyāmīti. ²SJ: yāsyasītīti. ³SJ: ekavadgrahaṇāt. ⁴SJ: evaṃ. ⁵SJ: iti. ⁶SJ: yak
 guṇaṇiṣedhaḥ. ⁷SJ: saṃhitāsaṃjñāyāṃ. ⁸SJ: saṃhitāyāṃ kiṃ dadhi atra. ⁹SJ: visargaḥ. ¹⁰SJ:
 sadupādhyāyaśrīviśvarūpakṛtau bhāṣāvṛttipañjikāyāṃ prathamō 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ.

sa caikavan mantur anekatve 'pi. ehi manye payaḥ pāsyasi. na pāsyasi. pītaṃ tad atithibhiḥ. prahāse kim? ehi manyase dadhyannaṃ bhokṣye. sādhu manyase. evaṃ manyadhve 'pi.

(*Pañj.*) ||**prahā**|| parihāsagatau manyase pāsyāmīty atrārthe **manye pāsyasīti**⁷²⁴ prayogaḥ. **mantur anekatve 'pīti** yady api bahavo mantāro bhavanti 5 tathāpy ekagrahaṇād ekavacanam eva.⁷²⁵ manyase **pītaṃ tad atithibhir** iti parihāsābhivyaktaye.

107. asmady uttamaḥ. (P.1.4.107)

(*Bhv.*) asmadi vācya uttamaḥ puruṣaḥ syāt. ahaṃ pacāmi. āvāṃ pacāvah. vyaṃ pacāmaḥ. ahaṃ dṛśye. āvāṃ dṛśyāvahe. vyaṃ 10 dṛśyāmahe. gamyamāne 'pi. pacāmi. dṛśye.

(*Pañj.*) ||**asma**|| ahaṃ dṛśya ityādi karmaṇy asmadarthe samānādhikaraṇe lakāraḥ. ṭer ettvam (cf. P.3.4.79). ato guṇe pararūpatvaṃ (cf. P.6.1.97) ca.

108. śeṣe prathamaḥ. (P.1.4.108)

(*Bhv.*) yuṣmadasmadbhyām anyasmin prathamaḥ puruṣaḥ syāt. sa 15 bhāti. tau bhātaḥ. te bhānti.

109. paraḥ sannikarṣaḥ saṃhitā. (P.1.4.109)

(*Bhv.*) atyantapratyāsattiḥ saṃhitocyate. dadhy atra. madhv atra.

(*Pañj.*) ||**paraḥ**|| saṃhitāyām **dadhy atrety** atra *iko yaṇ acīti* (P.6.1.77) yaṇādeśaḥ. saṃnikarṣāvivaḥṣāyām tu doṣa atra. 20

110. virāmo 'vasānam. (P.1.4.110)

(*Bhv.*) pare varṇābhāvo 'vasānam ucyate. vṛddhaḥ. siddhiḥ.

(*Pañj.*) ||**virā**|| viramyate 'neneti **virāmo** 'ntyō varṇaḥ. **vṛkṣa**⁷²⁶ ity avasāna-saṃjñāyām *kharavasānayoṛ visarjanīyaḥ* (P.8.3.15).

iti śrīviśvarūpaviracitāyām bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikāyām 25
prathamō 'dhyāyaḥ saṃpūrṇaḥ.

⁷²⁴ *Bhv.*: manye payaḥ pāsyasi.

⁷²⁵ Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *yatra dvau mantārau bahavo vā tatrāyam ekavadbhāvo vidhīyate. anyatra tu mantur ekatvād evaikavacanam siddham.*

⁷²⁶ *Bhv.*: vṛddhaḥ.

Index of names and titles

Ācārya – P.1.2.12

Bhāgavṛttikṛt – P.1.4.32

Bhāṣāvṛtti – p. 1

Bhāṣya – P.1.1.5, 57; 1.2.1; 1.3.67; 1.4.3, 7

Bhāṣyakāra – p. 2; P.1.2.6; 1.4.7

Gālava – P.1.3.1

Jayāditya – p. 1

Jayādityādivṛtti – p. 1,

Kātyāyana – p. 2; P.1.1.57

Nyāsa – P.1.4.7

Nyāsakāra – P.1.4.7, 21

Nyāsakṛt – P.1.4.105

Pāṇini – p. 1, 2

Puruṣottamadeva – p. 1

pūrvācārya – P.1.3.1

Raghu – P.1.1.11

Śrīmatpāṇinyādisūtra – p. 1

Śreṣṭhavṛtti – P.1.3.67

Sūtrakāra – P.1.2.6

vārttika – P.1.4.65

Viśva – P.1.1.11

Vyāḍi – P.1.3.1

The
Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā
of Viśvarūpa

Volume II

A critical examination of the first *adhyāya*

Introduction to volume II

The second volume of the present work contains a detailed examination of the first *adhyāya* of Viśvarūpa's *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā* (which is here referred to as the *Pañjikā*). The centre of interest rests on the style¹ of this commentary and on the question of Viśvarūpa's indebtedness to other grammarians. For this reason it seems appropriate to offer a brief survey of persons and treatises which might have influenced Viśvarūpa, before we take up his commentary.

As will be shown in II.3.2.1.1, almost nothing is known about the person of Viśvarūpa and yet he is here assigned to the so-called 'Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar'.² A few words of explanation are required to justify this decision.

Four out of five preserved manuscripts of the *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā* are classified as written in Maithili script.³ This could indicate that Viśvarūpa belonged to Mithilā. Three reasons, however, suggest that we should ascribe him to the Bengali tradition. Firstly, it is questionable whether we can differentiate between Maithili and Bengali scripts.⁴ Secondly, Viśvarūpa's work is a commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* by Puruṣottamadeva, who most probably lived in Bengal.⁵ Thirdly, we know that very

¹ On the term 'style' see II.2.2.

² The word 'Bengali' is used by me with three meanings: it refers to 1) the language spoken in Bengal (what is in this work very seldom a case), 2) a person who comes from Bengal and, most frequently, 3) it is used as an adjective applying to someone or something belonging or relating to Bengal. In the third meaning 'Bengali' seems nowadays to replace the word 'Bengal' used earlier.

³ The manuscript being in possession of the Asiatic Society of Bengal is said to be written in Bengali characters.

⁴ The script in two 'Maithili' manuscripts of the *Pañjikā* to which I have had access is almost identical as in 'the Bengali' manuscript, differing only in one *akṣara*. Cf. also what S. K. Chatterji (1970: 225) says about these two scripts: '(1) [i.e. Bengali-Assamese] and (2) [i.e. Maithili] are practically identical: almost all the forms in (2) are found in old MSS. written in (1).'

⁵ The Bengali origin of Puruṣottamadeva is widely accepted by scholars, with the exception of S. K. De (²1960b), according to whom no grammarian presented here in I.1-10 can be undoubtedly ascribed to Bengal. The opinions of S. K. De are, however, very extreme and rarely justified by more substantial evidence than by statements that other views are 'fanciful' (p. 24) or 'prove nothing' (fn. 377).

close cultural contacts existed between Mithilā and Bengal. After the Muslim invasion of Bengal, Mithilā became a shelter for Sanskrit learning. This state continued long after Muslims conquered Mithilā, since the destruction of Brahmanical and Buddhist culture was not as devastating there as in Bengal.⁶ So even if we assume that Viśvarūpa was an inhabitant of Mithilā, his cultural indebtedness to Bengal is more probable.

⁶ Chatterji (1970: 102).

Part I

The Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar

At the beginning some important questions should be dealt with. Firstly, is it justified to use the term 'the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar'? Secondly, what do we actually mean by it? And consequently, which grammarians are generally to be included in this tradition? The replies to these questions would differ from scholar to scholar and would range from a long list of names of Bengali grammarians and statements about an immense impact of Bengal on Sanskrit grammar to denying the latter and raising doubts about the Bengali origin of many so-called Bengali grammarians.

Before we focus our attention on these three questions, let us note that in the literature on the subject two terms are generally used for what is here called 'the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar'. These are: 'the Bengal(i) school of Pāṇini's grammar' and 'the Bengal(i) branch of Pāṇini's grammar'. Some authors, e.g. Kali Charan Shastri, evidently regard 'school' and 'branch' as synonyms and, consequently, apply them both.

Let us now begin with the second question, which is apparently easy to answer. It is usually assumed, albeit tacitly, that grammarians of Bengali origin belong to the Bengali tradition (or school, or branch) of Pāṇini's grammar. At this point problems concerning ascribing a particular text to this part of India arise. Geographical and historical details which could be helpful in assigning a work to a certain region of India are scanty in grammatical literature and the few that are present have become the subject of various interpretations. In that case it would be extremely desirable to have some additional criteria which would aid the determination of a geographical region of a work. The difficulty of formulating such criteria is indicated by the mere fact that even scholars whose works are devoted to studying the Bengali tradition of

grammar rarely took up the question ‘What makes a certain text belong to Bengal?’

One of the exceptions is Chintaharan Chakravarti (1930: 237), who while discussing Bengali contribution to Sanskrit literature formulated three criteria which can be applied whenever no other way of proving Bengali origin of a work is left. They are: ‘1) peculiarities of personal names, surnames or titles, 2) provenance of the manuscripts of the work, 3) tradition’. But he also noted their insufficiency, theoretical and practical, and provided an example of Sarvānanda’s *Ṭikāsarvasva*, which is undoubtedly a Bengali work, but manuscripts of which are found only in South India and are written in South Indian scripts.

In effect, it is not surprising that various scholars who approached this topic enumerated various names of grammarians who are supposed to belong to Bengal. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946) and Kali Charan Shastri (1972) fairly unanimously present a similar list of names and this has been accepted by me for reasons mentioned below. Quite the opposite view is held by S. K. De (²1960b: 67), who attributes Bengali origin only to Sṛṣṭidhara, the author of the commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. General works on the history of Sanskrit grammatical literature usually make no statements about geographical affiliations.

Facing these difficulties, it must be stated that it is not the aim of the present work to clarify whether a particular grammarian really came from Bengal or not. In the presentation of possible sources from which Viśvarūpa could have drawn composing his *Pañjikā* it does not really matter whether, for example, Jinendrabuddhi was a Kashmirian or a Bengali. The most important thing is that the *Nyāsa* was not only immensely popular in Bengal⁷ but has also shaped other grammatical texts. Consequently, in the present analysis I will not speak about ‘the Bengali school or branch of Pāṇini’s grammar’, because the scholars who use these terms lay emphasis on the origin of grammarians they include in their lists. Instead, I will here present ‘the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini’s grammar’, which comprises not only these grammarians who were Bengalis by birth or choice, but also those whose works were popular in Bengal. To answer the first of our questions we must ponder whether all the grammatical treatises belonging to what we have called ‘the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini’s grammar’ have anything in common. Indeed, this seems to be the case.

Some general observations regarding the so-called Bengali grammarians were made by Chakravarti (1918: 19-20), while he was speaking about the time of Sṛṣṭidhara.

⁷ This popularity is shown mostly by two facts: frequent quotations (explicit or tacit) from the *Nyāsa* found in treatises of Bengali grammarians, and numerous commentaries on it written by them (see I.2.1).

Namely, Chakravarti notices that most of the authors assigned to Bengal were not very well acquainted with the *Mahābhāṣya*. The *Mahābhāṣyakāra* is naturally treated by them as an authority, but citations from his work, as Chakravarti (1918: 19) remarks, ‘will often be found either wrong or altogether non-existent’. The position of the *Mahābhāṣya* was taken by the *Kāśikā* and, first of all, by the *Nyāsa* (the most important work in the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini’s grammar). A great part of Bengali treatises are commentaries on the *Nyāsa*, among them such eminent ones as the *Anunṛyāsa* and the *Tantrapradīpa*. However, although the *Nyāsa* was undoubtedly very popular and intensely studied in Bengal, it does not mean that the *Nyāsakāra* enjoyed such authority as Patañjali. Jinendrabuddhi was not considered infallible and, consequently, his opinions were sometimes doubted or even criticised. This feature noted by Chakravarti is likely to be true not only for Śṛṣṭidhara, but also for much earlier grammarians.⁸

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [15]-[16]) mentions one more characteristic trait of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini’s grammar. According to him, not only the *Nyāsa* but also its two commentaries, the *Anunṛyāsa* and the *Tantrapradīpa*, were frequently quoted by Bengali grammarians. Bhattacharya considers these three works to be ‘the great triad of an advanced course of grammar in Bengal’.

Now, I think, we can easily answer the questions asked at the beginning of this chapter. If we accept the definition proposed here, it is absolutely plausible to speak of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini’s grammar and we are also justified in adopting the longer list of ‘Bengali grammarians’ offered by D. Ch. Bhattacharya and K. Ch. Shastri.

I.1 Jayāditya and Vāmana

Jayāditya and Vāmana are considered to be the authors of the *Kāśikā*, the title of which is said to refer to the place of its composition.⁹

This fact could imply that they were not Bengalis, but the decisive evidence for their

⁸ Renou (1940: 58) notes that many quotations from the *Mahābhāṣya* which are found in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* of Śaraṇadeva cannot be located in Patañjali’s commentary.

⁹ Cf. *Padamañjarī* on the second introductory verse of the *Kāśikā*: *kāśiketi deśato 'bhidhānam. kāśiṣu bhavā 'kāśyādibhyaḥ thaññīthau'* (P.4.2.116) *kāśikā*. Similarly Ujjvaladatta explains and characterises the title of the famous work: *kāśr. kāśiḥ. vṛddhetkośalādītvāt ṇyañ* (cf. P.4.1.171). *kāśyau. kāśayāḥ kṣatriyāḥ. teṣaṃ nivāso 'ṇ. kāśayo deśaḥ. kāśiṣu jāto bhava iti thaññīthau. kāśikaḥ. kāśikā. kāśiṣayāntaḥpātītvād vārāṇasyās tatra bhavatvena kāśiṣu bhaveti sārasaṃgrahavṛttiḥ kāśikā* (*Uṇ.-vṛtti* IV.117 *sarvadhātubhya in*). For *sārasaṃgraha*, see the beginning of the *Kāśikā*:

vṛttau bhāṣye tathā dhātunāmapārāyaṇādīṣu |
vīprakīrṇasya tantrasya kriyate sārasaṃgrahaḥ ||.

geographical affiliations is found wanting.¹⁰ However, as the most popular work of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar, the *Nyāsa*, is a commentary on the *Kāśikā*, it is necessary to devote some space to this treatise too.

I.1.1 The *Kāśikā*

The *Kāśikā* is the oldest extant commentary on the whole of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. In contrast to Kātyāyana and Patañjali, who first investigated whether the formulation of Pāṇini's *sūtras* was correct or whether it should be in any way changed, the authors of the *Kāśikā* had a practical purpose. They gave short paraphrases of Pāṇinian rules and supplied examples and counterexamples for better comprehension of the *sūtras*. They also provided other readings of rules, but they did not enter into a detailed discussion of other opinions. More frequently they immediately presented what they regarded as the final view.

Quotations are rather rare in the *Kāśikā*. Most of them are from Vedic texts¹¹ and from the *Mahābhāṣya*. Among literary works the following are cited or referred to: Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* (on P.1.3.23), the *Mahābhārata* (e.g. on P.1.1.11, 4.1.103) and the *Rāmāyaṇa* (on P.4.1.95).¹² Predecessors in grammar are usually mentioned as *eke*, *kecit* etc., but some names also appear, e.g. Padaśeṣakāra (on P.7.2.58), Saunāga's school (on P.7.2.17) and followers of Āpiśali (on P.7.3.95).¹³

Although the *Kāśikā* seems to be easy and straightforward, it presupposes knowledge of the *Mahābhāṣya*.¹⁴ The authors of the *Kāśikā* incorporated many changes in wording of *sūtras* which were suggested by Kātyāyana or Patañjali. Kielhorn (1887) has shown that the text of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as given in the *Kāśikā* differs from the text known to Kātyāyana and Patañjali. He counted 58¹⁵ such differences and classified them in four groups.¹⁶ It is noticeable that many of these changes are also found in the

¹⁰ Even the above mentioned explanation of the title *Kāśikā* is not the only one. Śṛṣṭidhara, commenting on the final verse of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, mentions two interpretations of the word *kāśikā*: *kāśayati prakāśayati sūtrārtham iti kāśikā jayādityaviracitā vṛtṭiḥ. kāśyāṃ bhavā vā* [as quoted in Chakravarti (1918: (19))].

¹¹ Vedic quotations in the *Kāśikā* have been collected by Rau (1993).

¹² S. L. Athalekar wrote a Ph.D. thesis on quotations in the *Kāśikā* at University of Poona. I am indebted to Prof. Dr. A. Aklujkar for this information.

¹³ The views of these grammarians which are cited in the *Kāśikā* are not taken from the *Mahābhāṣya*. Although Patañjali quotes the opinions of Āpiśali and of Saunāga school, these quotations deal with different topics than those found in the *Kāśikā*.

¹⁴ See Thieme (1956).

¹⁵ Because only 1713 rules are treated by Patañjali, nearly 600 *sūtras* are fully and approximately 350 are partly quoted in the *Mahābhāṣya* (Kielhorn, 1887: 184), it is possible and cogent that the number of differences is much bigger than 58.

¹⁶ These are: 1) cases of *yogavibhāga*, 2) additions to original *sūtras*, 3) other alterations of rules, 4) cases of whole rules added to the text.

Cāndravyākaraṇa. As Candra's grammar is said to be older than the *Kāśīkā*, Kielhorn (1886: 183) assumes that the authors of the *Kāśīkā* used the text of Candragomin. However, as he himself remarks, this assumption causes some problems. It is strange that Candra or his grammar are never mentioned in the *Kāśīkā*, although in some cases (P.2.4.21, 4.3.115, 6.2.14) referring to the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* would, according to Kielhorn, give much better examples than those actually used.¹⁷ Bronkhorst (1983: 369, 380) tries to find a solution to this problem and suggests that the authors of the *Kāśīkā* and Candra could have used another source, so there is no need to suppose that the authors of the *Kāśīkā* knew the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*. Bronkhorst's suggestion has been harshly criticised by Oberlies (1989: 7-10),¹⁸ who sees it as proven beyond doubt that the authors of the *Kāśīkā* borrowed from the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*.

Traditionally, the *Kāśīkā* is said to have two authors: Jayāditya and Vāmana. This double authorship is supposed to explain inconsistencies found in the text¹⁹ and was first stated by Jinendrabuddhi.²⁰ This theory was adopted by other Indian grammarians, who then differentiated between the opinions of Jayāditya and Vāmana.²¹

The fact that the *Kāśīkā* is a work of two grammarians has also been accepted by modern scholars, but their opinions differ as regards the question of the precise contributions of Jayāditya and Vāmana. According to Chakravarti (1913-16: [16]), the generally accepted view is that the first four *adhyāyas* are attributed to Jayāditya and the rest to Vāmana. However, many scholars think that Jayāditya commented on the

¹⁷ See Kielhorn (1886: 184-5).

¹⁸ There is not enough space here to discuss his criticism in details, because this task would presuppose the presentation of Bronkhorst's arguments, which take almost fifty pages. But it seems indispensable to mention at least some points. Firstly, it is important to state how Bronkhorst achieves his theory. His first step is to show that certain improvements on the *Dhātupāṭha* took place in the period between Patañjali and Candra. Then, he demonstrates that the authors of the *Kāśīkā* did not make changes in the *Dhātu*, *Sūtra*- and *Gaṇapāṭha*, but they relied on the text they had. And finally, the question is discussed whether these changes were known to Candra or whether they were introduced after him. This is missing in Oberlies's criticism, so its readers can easily get the impression that some statements of Bronkhorst are entirely unfounded. Secondly, as far as the argumentation of Oberlies is concerned, he seems to think that the only possibility of explaining the existence of similar features which two works have is that one of them borrowed from the other. The assumption of borrowing from the third treatise is for him 'eine von vorne herein völlig unwahrscheinliche These' (p. 8). However, it must be remembered how little we know about the period in question. It is sure that the grammatical interest was great at this time, but what is left to us are only the names of grammarians. To conclude this excursus, I do not want to state that I entirely agree with Bronkhorst. Some of Oberlies's remarks, e.g. that the argumentation of Bronkhorst mostly relies on one example of P.3.3.122 or that it would be advisable to discuss the authorship of the *Cāndravṛtti* in this context, are very convincing. Nevertheless, Bronkhorst's 'assumption' (as Bronkhorst calls it in § 4.1), although difficult to prove, is entirely possible. Besides, in his criticism Oberlies has not proposed any solution to the problems which arise when we assume that the authors of the *Kāśīkā* borrowed from Candra and which have been already pointed out by Kielhorn.

¹⁹ Differences in the comments of the two authors have been studied by Ojihara (1961, 1962, 1964). Some more inconsistencies in the *Kāśīkā* have been found by Bronkhorst (1983).

²⁰ See *Nyāsa* on P.3.1.33: *nāsti virodhaḥ bhinnakarṭṛkatvāt. idaṃ hi jayāditya vacanaṃ tat punar vāmanasya.*

²¹ See *Padamañjarī* on P.3.1.33, *Śabdakaustubha* on P.1.1.5. Cf. also Chakravarti (1913-16: [16]).

first five and Vāmana on the last three chapters.²²

It must be also noted that both these views pose problems. Firstly, some comments of Jinendrabuddhi seem to suggest that Jayāditya wrote a commentary on the last three *adhyāyas* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.²³ This was discussed by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 190-191; 1946: [2]) and mentioned by Chakravarti (1913-16: [17]).²⁴ Secondly, it is strange that Vāmana was not mentioned by I-tsing. Regarding this second problem Chakravarti (1913-16: [16]-[17]) writes: ‘Was it because Vāmana held then a subordinate position, either as a pupil of the other or a very new writer who had not therefore attained yet reputation enough to be named as an author? Or were the last four Adhyayas of the book a subsequent addition to, or a recast by Vāmana of the form in which Jayāditya had left them? ... Probably Vāmana wrote down his share of the *Kāśikā* shortly after I-tsing had left India and so he is not at all mentioned by the former.’

The last alternative, that Vāmana composed his part of the *Kāśikā* after I-tsing left India, has been widely accepted.²⁵ However, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 190-2; 1946: [2]-[3]) thinks that Jayāditya wrote a complete *vr̥tti* on the whole of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and Vāmana revised and enlarged the last three chapters of it.²⁶

Another solution has been proposed by Bronkhorst (1983: 401-2). He suggests that Jayāditya collected *sūtras*, *vārttikas* and other *vārttika*-like statements and these were incorporated in the *Kāśikā-vr̥tti* by Vāmana. The inconsistencies could be explained by differences in sources and reluctance of the author(s) of the *Kāśikā* to deviate from the tradition. However, as Bronkhorst (p. 402) himself states, his proposition is ‘somewhat speculative’.

I.1.2 Jayāditya and Vāmana

Any discussion of Jayāditya and Vāmana confronts us with problems. The fact that we cannot be quite sure which part of the *Kāśikā* each of them wrote and whether they did it simultaneously or Jayāditya wrote first and Vāmana revised and enlarged his work makes attempts to find out anything about the authors of the *Kāśikā* very difficult.

²² Cardona (1976: 279), Belvalkar (1915: 36), Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 502-3).

²³ Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.3.1.33, where the opinion of Jayāditya on P.7.2.11 is discussed.

²⁴ D. Ch. Bhattacharya adds an example which shows that Jayāditya and Vāmana commented on the same rule (P.6.4.22).

²⁵ Belvalkar (1915: 36), Renou (1940: 26) to mention a few.

²⁶ Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946: [3]) gives a short characteristic of Vāmana’s commentary.

They are said to be Buddhists,²⁷ as they begin the *Kāśīkā* without any salutation to a god and supply un-Brahmanic illustrations to Pāṇini's rules.²⁸ But the question arises: Were Jayāditya and Vāmana Buddhists or only one of them? D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [3]) thinks that Jayāditya was a Buddhist and Vāmana a Brahmanic scholar, who tried to make the Buddhist work acceptable for Brahmins. According to Bhattacharya, Vāmana revised the commentary of Jayāditya in Benares.

There have been also some discussions regarding the identity of the grammarian Vāmana with the famous poetician. This supposition is, however, rejected by M. Sen (1934) and Kane (³1961: 147).

As far as the dates of Jayāditya and Vāmana are concerned, two facts are important. Firstly, the date of Jayāditya's death can be determined on the basis of I-tsing's report.²⁹ Secondly, in the *Kāśīkā* on P.1.3.23 Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* is cited.³⁰

On consideration of these pieces of evidence and dating Jinendrabuddhi circa 700 AD, Cardona (1976: 280-81) places the *Kāśīkā* in the seventh century. This dating is shared by almost all modern scholars.³¹

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 190; 1946: [3]) proposes circa 650 AD for Jayāditya and 700-750 AD for Vāmana.

I.2 Jinendrabuddhi

Jinendrabuddhi's commentary on the *Kāśīkā* marks, as far as our present sources go, the real beginning of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar. His *Nyāsa* has been commented upon and cited many times. In a certain way it took the place of the *Mahābhāṣya*. In view of this fact, it is not so important whether Jinendrabuddhi was actually a Bengali or a Kashmirian. In any case, the description of his work should not be missing in this short survey of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar.

²⁷ Chakravarti (1913-16: [17]), Belvalkar (1915: 36), Renou (1940: 26).

²⁸ See Chakravarti (1913-16: [17]). D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [3]) sees in the example *pramāṇasamuccaya* on P.3.3.42 an allusion to Dignāga's treatise.

²⁹ See Takakusu (1896: 176). I-tsing wrote most probably in 691-692 AD (see Takakusu, 1896, 176 fn. 4) that nearly 30 years had passed since the death of Jayāditya. That gives the date 661-662 AD for Jayāditya's death.

³⁰ Bhāravi is usually placed in the sixth century. See Kane (³1961: 119-20) and Lienhard (1984: 184).

³¹ Chakravarti (1913-16: [16]-[17]), Renou (1940: 26), Scharfe (1977: 174).

I.2.1 The *Nyāsa*

Jinendrabuddhi's commentary on the *Kāśikā* bears the title *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā*, but it is better known as the *Nyāsa*.³² It is an extensive commentary, the style of which has sometimes been compared to that of the *Mahābhāṣya*.³³ The title *Nyāsa* is said to refer to the characteristic trait of this work, according to which its author shows that any additions to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, as e.g. stated in *vārttikas*, are not necessary, if we interpret *sūtras* correctly. This means that as they are actually stated (*yathānyāsam*) the rules are capable of covering the additional cases.³⁴

Chakravarti (1913-16: [18]) supposes that the *Nyāsa* was the first of the commentaries on the *Kāśikā*, but according to D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 193; 1946: [4]) the *Nyāsa* was preceded by other commentaries, which Jinendrabuddhi consulted while writing his treatise. It is certain that the period between the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa* was long enough for other commentaries to be written, as it was long enough for scribal mistakes to be made in copying the *Kāśikā*. Remarks about 'bad copyists' (*kulekhakair likhitam*, *lekhakapramādadoṣa*) or 'recent bad copyists' (*etad udāharaṇaṃ pramādād idānīntanaiḥ kulekhakair likhitam*) are found in the *Nyāsa* on P.1.1.5; 4.1.2 and 6.3.79.

It is regrettable that Jinendrabuddhi so seldom refers to his predecessors by name. In his voluminous commentary he mentions only Āpiśali (on P.1.3.22, 4.2.45; 7.2.10), Vyādi (on P.7.2.11), Cūlibhaṭṭi, Nallūra,³⁵ Śvobhūti (on P.7.2.11) and Kuṇḍavāḍava³⁶ (on P.7.3.1).³⁷ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [5]) adds to this list the *Amarakośa*, but Chakravarti (1913-16: [20]) remarks that the reference to it is not found in Bengali manuscripts.

Literary citations are not very abundant either. Chakravarti (1913-16: [20]) has found one quotation from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, one from the *Mahābhārata* (on P.2.216) and one from the *Manusmṛti* (on P.4.1.20). Rare and unidentified quotations are listed by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [5]).

The *Nyāsa* has been commented upon many times, particularly often by Bengali grammarians. The most eminent Bengali commentaries are the *Anunyanāsa* (see I.4) and the

³² Other names are: *Kāśikānyāsa*, *Jinendranyanāsa*. See Chakravarti (1913-16: [18]).

³³ See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 195).

³⁴ See Cardona (1976: 279), D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 196) and Renou (1940: 27).

³⁵ Cūlibhaṭṭi and Nallūra are mentioned in the commentary on the introductory verse of the *Kāśikā*. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [5]) has Nirlūra instead of Nallūra. On these two grammarians see Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 498-9).

³⁶ One Kuṇḍavāḍava is cited by Patañjali in *Mbh.* II 100.8, III 317.9. He is identical with the grammarian quoted by Jinendrabuddhi and in the first of these two passages from the *Mahābhāṣya* the same examples are discussed as in the *Nyāsa* on P.7.3.1. Patañjali also quotes the opinion of one Vāḍava (*Mbh.* III 421.13), but it is difficult to tell whether he is identical with Kuṇḍavāḍava.

³⁷ See also D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [5]) and K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 181).

Tantrapradīpa (see I.6.1). Others are: the *Nyāsoddīpana* of Nandanamiśra (see I.11.1), Narapati Mahāmiśra's *Nyāsaprakāśa* (see I.11.2), commentaries by Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara (see I.11.3) and by Śrīmānaśarman (see I.11.5). The only commentary which undoubtedly does not belong to Bengal has been written by Mallinātha and is entitled *Nyāsoddyota*.³⁸

I.2.2 Other works

Jinendrabuddhi is also said to have written the *Viśālāmalavatī*, a commentary on Dīnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. It is not proven that the author of the *Viśālāmalavatī* really was the famous grammarian, but there is enough evidence to make it seem probable. Hayes (1983) mentions the following facts speaking for this identification: the name Jinendrabuddhi, the same creed (Buddhism), the same colophon found in these two commentaries, a predilection for a bodhisattvayāna sect of Buddhism, grammatical expertise and the fact that the lifetime of the grammarian Jinendrabuddhi falls within the timespan assigned to the commentator of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.

I.2.3 Jinendrabuddhi

Jinendrabuddhi left no information about himself, so it is extremely difficult to state anything definitive about him. Scholars have concentrated on three points: Jinendrabuddhi's creed, place of activity and his lifetime.

I.2.3.1 Creed of Jinendrabuddhi

Jinendrabuddhi begins his work without an obligatory salutation to a god and in the colophons calls himself Bodhisattvadeśīyācārya.³⁹ These two facts point out that he was a Buddhist, which has been universally accepted by modern scholars.⁴⁰

³⁸ For the opinion that the *Nyāsoddyota* is the only non-Bengali commentary on the *Nyāsa*, see D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 197). On the authorship of the *Nyāsoddyota*, see Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 568-9). The latter (p. 567-8) mentions also a commentary on the *Nyāsa* by one Ratnamati, but the evidence does not seem to be strong enough to prove that Ratnamati wrote a commentary on the *Nyāsa* and did not express his opinion about a statement of Jinendrabuddhi in another kind of treatise.

³⁹ Chakravarti (1913-16: [20]) mentions three explanations of *bodhisattvadeśīya*. According to the first one, the suffix *deśīyar* is added by P.5.3.67 in the meaning of a slight incompleteness. In the other two opinions the suffix *cha* (*īya*) is added. It is either *cha* taught in P.4.2.138 or in P.1.1.75 (sic). Since P.1.1.75 is one of three rules defining *vṛddha*, what is meant here is probably P.4.2.118 (*vṛddhāc chaḥ*).

⁴⁰ Chakravarti (1913-16: [19]), Renou (1940: 27), D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 197), K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 180) and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 561).

Chakravarti (1913-16: [19]), however, mentions an opinion according to which Jinendrabuddhi is held to be a Jaina.

I.2.3.2 His place of activity

Jinendrabuddhi is often said to be a Bengali, but no conclusive evidence for this can be provided.⁴¹ Aiming to support this view, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 197) notes that a large number of manuscripts of the *Nyāsa* are found in Bengal and that commentaries on the *Nyāsa* have been written almost exclusively by Bengali grammarians (I.2.1). The former fact has been also confirmed by Chakravarti (1913-16: (3)-(6)).⁴²

Let us also mention that as reported by Bühler (1877: 13, 73), according to Kashmirians, Jinendrabuddhi lived at Varāhamūla-Hushkapura in Kashmir. However, that does not make him necessarily a Kashmirian, since at that time the cultural contacts between Bengal and Kashmir were very close.⁴³

Thus, most probably, S. K. De (²1960: 23-24) is right when he doubts if the place of Jinendrabuddhi's activity can be ever determined.

I.2.3.3 Jinendrabuddhi's date

In the heated discussions about Jinendrabuddhi's lifetime mainly the following five arguments have appeared: a) Bhāmaha referred to the *Nyāsa*, b) the *Nyāsa* is mentioned by Māgha in his *Śīsupālavadha*, c) Kaiyaṭa knew the *Nyāsa*, d) Jinendrabuddhi predated Haradatta, e) the name Jinendrabuddhi appears in some inscriptions. These five reasons have by no means been accepted by all scholars. The first two are especially controversial and facts speaking for and against each of them have been vehemently discussed.

I.2.3.3.a The first argument about Bhāmaha's reference to the *Nyāsa* is based on *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* VI.36-37:

śiṣṭaprayogamātreṇa nyāsakāramatena vā |
trcā samastaśaṣṭhikam na kathamcid udāharet ||
sūtrajñāpakamātreṇa vṛtrahantā yathoditah |
akena ca na kurvīta vṛttiṃ tadgamako yathā ||.

⁴¹ The Bengali origin of Jinendrabuddhi is accepted by K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 180) and Dash (1991: 4). D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 197) considers Jinendrabuddhi either to be a Bengali or to have lived there for a long time.

⁴² The exceptions are Vedic portions of the *Nyāsa* and the section 8.2, towards which Bengali pundits 'had a kind of dislike'. See Chakravarti (1913-16: (6)).

⁴³ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [4]).

This passage has been translated by Kane (³1961: 115-6) as follows:

‘A poet should in no case employ (lit. utter) in his work a compound in which a word ending in the *trc* affix (i.e. *tr*) is compounded with another word that would be in the genitive (when the compound is dissolved), by merely relying on the usage of the *śiṣṭas* or on the opinion of the author of *Nyāsa*; as the word *vṛtrahantā* is employed by merely relying on the indication furnished by a *sūtra* of Pāṇini, one should not form a compound with a word ending in *aka* as in the case of the word *tadgamaka*.’⁴⁴

There is some controversy regarding the translation of the passage. Thus some scholars have thought that according to Bhāmaha the compound *vṛtrahantr* was explicitly mentioned by the Nyāsakāra.⁴⁵ Consequently, because they failed to find it in Jinendrabuddhi’s treatise,⁴⁶ they came to the conclusion that Bhāmaha did not refer to Jinendrabuddhi. However, the text cited above does not imply that the example *vṛtrahantr* was actually given by the Nyāsakāra. This has been pointed out by Kane (³1961: 117-118) and Pathak (1912: 234), although their argumentation and translations differ slightly. The main problem, however, remains. Even if we accept that *vṛtrahantr* does not have to be explicitly taught in the *Nyāsa* mentioned by Bhāmaha, it is still not proven that Bhāmaha had Jinendrabuddhi in mind when he was speaking about the Nyāsakāra.

Thus, in the course of the discussion it has been argued that there had been other Nyāsakāras than Jinendrabuddhi and one of them could have been meant by Bhāmaha.⁴⁷ It is supposed that Sāyaṇa quoted from different *Nyāsas* (*Kṣemendrannyāsa*, *Bodhinyāsa*, *Śākaṭāyananyāsa*). This argument has been rejected by Pathak (1912: 235-36), who has shown that the term Nyāsakāra, when it is used in the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti* without any specifications, refers always to Jinendrabuddhi.

Pathak (1912: 233) and Chakravarti (1913-16: [25]), although for different reasons, objected to another proposition, according to which Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra is supposed to be identical with Devanandin Pūjyapāda.

⁴⁴ Cf. also Pathak’s (1914: 20) translation, which is slightly different: ‘One should under no circumstances employ a genitive compound ending in *trc* such as *vṛtrahantā* either on the grounds that such compounds are used by the learned or in accordance with the opinion of the Nyāsakāra by the mere *jñāpaka* or inference drawn from [Pāṇini’s] *sūtra*. Nor should one form a compound with *aka* like *tadgamaka*.’ For the details about this kind of compound as well as of Jinendrabuddhi’s opinion on it, see Pathak (1914: 22-25) and Kane (³1961: 116-117).

⁴⁵ As it is assumed e.g. by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 564).

⁴⁶ In the commentary on P.2.2.16 Jinendrabuddhi says that the marker *c* in the suffix *trc* implies that the prohibition taught in this rule does not apply to words ending in *trn*. However, he gives an example *bhīṣmaḥ kurūṇām bhayaśokahantā* and not *vṛtrahantā*. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 564) has been searching for *vṛtrahantā* in the *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.30, also without success.

⁴⁷ See e.g. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 563-4).

To recapitulate, Pathak (1912: 235-6; 1914: 25), Chakravarti (1913-16: [25]), Liebhich (1930: 363) and Kane (³1961: 117) maintain that Bhāmaha could have referred only to Jinendrabuddhi.⁴⁸ S. K. De (²1960a: 48-49) and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 563-4) opposed this view.⁴⁹

If we accept the opinion that Bhāmaha had Jinendrabuddhi in mind, ascertaining the lifetime of the author of the *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* and in this context his relation to Daṇḍin becomes a crucial task. S. K. De (²1960: 47) assumes that Bhāmaha was prior to Daṇḍin and dates (p. 49-50) the former in the period between the last quarter of the 7th and the middle of the 8th century. Kane (³1961: 78-80, 102-32) and Pathak (1912: 236-37) postulate the priority of Daṇḍin. Pathak dates Bhāmaha some time in the 8th century, Kane (p. 84, 132) regards the first half of the 8th century as appropriate. Gerow (1977: 228), leaving aside the problem of the relation between Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, suggests the period 700-750 AD for the latter.

I.2.3.3.b Another heated controversy has arisen about one verse in Māgha's *Śiśu-pālavadhā*. In *Śiśu* II.112 Māgha compares *rājanīti* with *śabdavidyā* through punning words:

anutsūtrapadanyāsā sadvṛttiḥ sannibandhanā |
śabdavidyeva no bhāti rājanītir apaspaśā ||

A royal policy which does not include [employing] spies, even if it takes no step deviating from a rule, when it is characterised by good conduct and when it rewards well [for services done],⁵⁰ seems to us like the science of grammar which is *anutsūtrapadanyāsa*, *sadvṛtti* and *sannibandhanā*, but *apaspaśā*.

Mallinātha and Vallabha say that *nyāsa* refers to Jinendrabuddhi's treatise, *sadvṛtti* to the *Kāśikā* and *sannibandhanā* to the *Mahābhāṣya*, so the last part of the passage would mean: 'even if it includes [the study of] the *Nyāsa*, which does not deviate from *sūtra*, [the knowledge of] the *Kāśikā* and the *Mahābhāṣya* but which neglects *Paspaśā*.' Scholars unanimously agree upon the last two identifications. The first one has been also accepted by Pathak (1902), Kane (³1961: 147) and Chakravarti (1918: 3; 1913-16: [22]-[23]). Opponents of interpreting *nyāsa* as Jinendrabuddhi's commentary have provided two arguments. The first one is that *nyāsa* does not refer here to the kind of grammatical treatise, but it is rather used in the meaning which it has in the *Mahābhāṣya* as a 'wording of a rule', e.g. in *yathānyāsam evāstu*, the phrase repeatedly

⁴⁸ Similarly, Gerow (1977: 228) states that Bhāmaha quotes Jinendrabuddhi, but he discusses no details of this topic.

⁴⁹ The summary of arguments is given by Kane (³1961: 115-18).

⁵⁰ In the translation of *sannibandhanā* I follow Mallinātha, who writes: *santi nibandhanāny anujīvyādīnām kriyāvasāneṣu dattāni gohiraṇyādiśāśvatapāritoṣikadānāni yasyām sā*.

met with. This reasoning was adopted by Kielhorn (1908) and D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [4]).⁵¹ Another group of scholars has maintained that although Māgha meant a work called *Nyāsa*, it must not necessarily have been Jinendrabuddhi's commentary. The facts speaking for and against this suggestion are the same as in the case of the Nyāsakāra mentioned by Bhāmaha.

If we accept the explanation given by Mallinātha and Vallabha, the question of Māgha's date becomes crucial. Kane (1914: 91) notes that Māgha is quoted by two poeticians: Vāmana and Ānandavardhana. Thus, assuming for Vāmana the second half of the 8th century, Kane (p. 94) suggests that Māgha cannot be dated later than 750 AD. Recently, Lienhard (1984: 188) has used the same arguments as Kane, but since he regards Vāmana as belonging to the 9th century,⁵² his conclusion is that Māgha must be dated earlier than the beginning of the 9th century.

A very controversial opinion about Māgha's lifetime has been adopted by Kielhorn (1906). On the inscriptional grounds he attributes the author of the *Śīsupālavadhā* to the second half of the 7th century. His view, however, has not met with the acceptance of other scholars.⁵³

I.2.3.3.c The attention of some scholars has been attracted to the problem of the mutual relationship between Jinendrabuddhi and Kaiyaṭa. The *Nyāsa* or the Nyāsakāra is not explicitly quoted in the *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa*, but certain opinions cited by Kaiyaṭa are similar to those found in Jinendrabuddhi's commentary. Examples of such concordance have been collected by Pathak (1931: 246-7), Chakravarti (1913-16: [21]) and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 562).

Kaiyaṭa is usually dated 11th century,⁵⁴ so if we agree with the scholars who consider Jinendrabuddhi to precede Kaiyaṭa, we have to place the former before the 11th century.

⁵¹ Cf. Kielhorn's (1908: 500) translation of *Śīśu* II.112:

'The policy of kings, even when it takes no step that is contrary to rule, and when it provides a livelihood (for dependents) and makes donations (for services rendered), by no means prospers without (the employment of) spies – just as the study of grammar does not prosper without (a knowledge of) the (introduction called) *paspasā*, even when (in the interpretation of rules) no words are supplied that are not in the *sūtras*, and when (the study is) aided by commentaries and the Mahābhāṣya.'

⁵² However, on p. 92 Vāmana is put at about 800 AD and on p. 244 in the middle of the 8th century, in all those cases without giving any grounds for such a dating.

⁵³ Kielhorn's reasoning depends on the statement of Māgha that his grandfather was a minister of king Varmala, whom Kielhorn identifies as king Varmalāta. However, the name of the king mentioned by Māgha has been preserved in manuscripts of the *Śīsupālavadhā* in various variants: Varma, Nirmalānta, Dharmanābha, Dharmanātha, Dharmalābha, Dharmalāta, Dharmadeva, Varmalāta and Carmalāta (see the edition of Durgāprasād and Śivadatta, introduction p. 6). Thus, the identification proposed by Kielhorn is open to doubt.

⁵⁴ Cardona (1976: 347: fn. 344).

I.2.3.3.d The relation between Jinendrabuddhi and Haradatta⁵⁵ has been also the subject of debate. Kielhorn (1908: 502) assumes that Jinendrabuddhi copied from Haradatta, but this opinion was based, as he freely admitted, on his impression and has turned out to be wrong. Haradatta referred not only tacitly to Jinendrabuddhi,⁵⁶ but in the commentary on P.4.1.22 he quoted the opinion of the Nyāsakāra.⁵⁷ This fact strengthens the view that Jinendrabuddhi must be dated earlier than the 11th century.

I.2.3.3.e Another argument has been used by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [4]), who tries to determine Jinendrabuddhi's date on inscriptional grounds. He assumes that Jinendra was mentioned in a Campā inscription from 840 Śaka (918 AD). Although Bhattacharya refers to the text of the inscription as given in Majumdar's *Champā*,⁵⁸ he makes no mention of the fact that, according to Majumdar, here Jinendra is to be understood as synonymous with Buddha.⁵⁹

These are the main points which have appeared in the debate about Jinendrabuddhi. On the basis of some of these arguments scholars have proposed various dates for the author of the *Nyāsa*.

According to Chakravarti (1913-16: [21]-[26]), Jinendrabuddhi preceded Kaiyaṭa and was alluded to by Māgha and Bhāmaha. Thus Chakravarti sets the date of the *Nyāsa* at ca. 725-750 AD.

On inscriptional grounds and assuming a considerable span of time between Vāmana and Jinendrabuddhi, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [4]) dates the author of the *Nyāsa* in the period between 800 and 850 AD. Bhattacharya rejects the opinion that Jinendrabuddhi was referred to by Māgha and Bhāmaha.

Renou (1940: 27-28) accepts the precedence of Jinendrabuddhi to Kaiyaṭa and the

⁵⁵ Some scholars have assigned Haradatta to the 13th century (e.g. Pathak, 1931: 251). This opinion was rejected by Cardona (1976: 281) on the grounds that Dharmakīrti refers to Haradatta. Belvalkar (1915: 40) dates the author of the *Padamañjarī* ca. 1100 AD, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 576) to 1058/59 AD. Cardona suggests that Haradatta might be assigned to an even earlier period.

⁵⁶ The examples of such references found in the *Padamañjarī* have been presented by Pathak (1914: 27-29).

⁵⁷ See also Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 561), Pathak (1931: 250-1).

⁵⁸ This book was edited in 1927 and reprinted as Majumdar (1985).

⁵⁹ Cf. Sanskrit text and its translation as given in Majumdar (1985: 138-9):

III. *mīmāṃsasaṭṭarakaḥ jinendrasūrmis sakāśīkāvyaḥ karaṇodakaughah |*
ākhyānaśaivottarakalpamīnaḥ paṭiṣṭha eteṣv iti satkavīnām ||.

III. 'He who (skilfully played in the) good waves which were the six systems of Philosophy beginning with Mīmāṃsā and those of Jinendra (i.e. Buddha), and in the mass of water which was (Pāṇini's) Grammar with Kāśīkā, who was a fish (in the water) which was the Ākhyāna and the Uttarākālpa of the Śaiva; because among the learned, he was the most skilful in all these subjects.'

view that Bhāmaha and Māgha had the commentary on the *Kāśikā* in mind. On this basis he dates Jinendrabuddhi 8th century.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 561-4) agrees that Haradatta and Kaiyaṭa were later than Jinendrabuddhi, but he is opposed to the suggestion that Bhāmaha and Māgha referred to him. Therefore, in his opinion, Jinendrabuddhi is to be put at ca. 700 AD.

Reasonings of Pathak (1931) and Cardona (1976: 280-1) were similar to that of Chakravarti, but they dated Jinendrabuddhi ca. 700 AD.

I.3 The Bhāgavṛttikāra

The *Bhāgavṛtti* was once very popular in Bengal, which is testified by many quotations from it in other works.⁶⁰ Puruṣottamadeva said in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti* that he based it on the *Kāśikā* and the *Bhāgavṛtti*.⁶¹ Later, the *Bhāgavṛtti* lost its position, probably to the advantage of the *Tantrapradīpa*⁶² or, as some think, to the advantage of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.⁶³ Manuscripts of the text still existed in the 17th century,⁶⁴ but they are lost today.

I.3.1 Characterization of the *Bhāgavṛtti*

The *Bhāgavṛtti* was a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The arrangement of the *sūtras* corresponded with that laid down by Pāṇini, but with a certain peculiarity. It seems that the text was divided into two parts: a *bhāṣābhāga* dealing with the *bhāṣā*⁶⁵ and a *chandobhāga* treating the Vedic usage. This division gave the name to the treatise.⁶⁶

An opinion held by most scholars is that the *Bhāgavṛtti* was largely loyal to the *Mahābhāṣya* and criticised the *Kāśikā* wherever the final verdict of Jayāditya and Vāmana differed from the one made by Patañjali.⁶⁷ However, Kali Charan Shastri (1972: 205) expressed the view that the Bhāgavṛttikāra followed the *Kāśikā*. The only

⁶⁰ Quotations from the *Bhāgavṛtti* have been collected by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1964-5).

⁶¹ See I.7.1 for details.

⁶² S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 282).

⁶³ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [23]).

⁶⁴ See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [7]).

⁶⁵ The term *bhāṣā* generally means ‘language’. Here it denotes the language spoken by the upper classes in the time of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali and it opposes the Vedic language used for the ritual purposes. See Deshpande (1979: 1-10) for details.

⁶⁶ The evidence of this division is provided by Goṃcandra and the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. See Chatterji (1931a: 418) and S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 276 fn. 1).

⁶⁷ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 198-99), Chatterji (1931a: 415-6), Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 515).

argument which he offered is the final couplet of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, in which Puruṣottama-deva says that anyone wishing to understand the final views of the *Kāśikā* and the *Bhāgavṛtti* should read his *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.⁶⁸ This is, however, not convincing enough to accept Shastri's opinion. Chakravarti (1913-16: [15]) thought that the *Bhāgavṛtti* was older than the *Kāśikā* (see I.3.2), so the influence of the latter on the former work or the opinion that the *Bhāgavṛtti* criticised the *Kāśikā* was unacceptable for him.

Another view which can be mentioned here is one held by S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 278), who maintained that the *Bhāgavṛtti* was indebted to Bhartṛhari and Durgasiṃha, the Kātantra commentator, dated back to 8th century by Belvalkar (1915: 88) and to the second half of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1984: 631-633).

I.3.2 The authorship of the *Bhāgavṛtti*

Many scholars have tried to establish the identity of the author of the *Bhāgavṛtti*. Four names have been proposed up to now: Bhartṛhari, Vimalamati, Vābhaṭa and Indu.

One exponent of the theory about the identity of the Bhāgavṛttikāra and Bhartṛhari is Chakravarti. In his frequently cited introduction to the edition of the *Nyāsa* (1913-16: [13]) he ascribed three grammatical works to Bhartṛhari: a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Vākyapadīya* and the *Bhāgavṛtti*.⁶⁹ He provides the following arguments to prove his thesis. Firstly, he identifies the word *Pei-na* used by I-tsing with the *Bhāgavṛtti* and supports his reasoning with the translation of the term offered by Takakusu (1896: 180), who proposes to render the *Pei-na* as *beḍa* or *veḍa* (but not as Chakravarti suggests [p. 14] *vedavṛtti* or *veḍāvṛtti*). Takakusu (1896: 180 fn. 3) mentions also that a work called *Beḍavṛtti* is actually found in Bhandarkar (1888: 146).⁷⁰ Chakravarti (p. 14, fn. 17) interprets *vedavṛtti* (sic) as a corrupt form of the word *bhejavṛtti* or *bhedavṛtti* and suggests that the *Bhāgavṛtti* was meant here.

Secondly, he quotes three passages which, according to him, speak for Bhartṛhari's authorship of the *Bhāgavṛtti*. The first comes from the *Tantrapradīpa* on P.8.3.21 *uñīca pade*, which teaches that before the particle *u*, the consonants *v* and *y* preceded by the vowel *a*, short or long, are elided:

⁶⁸ *kāśikābhāgavṛtṭyoś cet siddhāntaṃ boddhum asti dhṛṭ |
tadā vicintyatāṃ bhrātar bhāṣāvṛttir iyaṃ mama ||.*

⁶⁹ On the same page he also ascribes three *śatakas* (*Vairāgya-*, *Nīti-* and *Śṛṅgāra-śataka*) to Bhartṛhari, but later on (page 14-15) he admits that the evidence to prove the same authorship of the grammatical works and the didactic poems is not sufficient.

⁷⁰ This is manuscript No. 277 (= 381) containing the *Janmāmbhodhi* and *Beḍāvṛtti* of Naracandra. According to Bhandarkar (1888: 68, 146) it is a jaina work, whose manuscript is dated 1707 AD.

*bharṭṛhariṇā cāsya nityārthataivoktā. tathā ca bhāgavṛttikṛtā pratyudāharaṇam upanyastam tantrē utam tantray utam iti. vāmano 'pi lopenaivodāharaṇam ukta-vān.*⁷¹

Bharṭṛhari said that this [rule] is always to be observed. Accordingly (*tathā ca*) the Bhāgavṛttikṛt mentioned a counterexample *tantrē utam*, [which takes the form] *tantray utam*. Vāmana too gave this example [and the one] with the elision.

Notes

The word *pade* is used in the *sūtra* in order to prohibit the application of the rule in the case of *uñ*, which is the substitute of the root *veñ* before the suffix *kta* (as in *uta*). Thus, in the example *tantrē utam*, the vowel *e* of *tantrē* will be replaced by *ay* in accordance with P.6.1.78 *eco 'yavāyāvah*. Then, by P.8.3.19 *lopaḥ śākalyasya* the consonant *y* can be elided. This would give two phrases: *tantray utam* and *tantra utam*. Now, because *uñ*, being the part of *utam*, is not a *pada* (but only its part), rule P.8.3.21 cannot apply. This means that the elision of *y* is not obligatory and that both, *tantray utam* and *tantra utam*, are correct. If P.8.3.21 applied, only *tantra utam* would be correct.

The last sentence of the passage quoted above needs some explanation. The *Kāśikā* on P.8.3.21 has: *pade iti kim? tantra utam tantray utam*, with and without the elision. The sentence *vāmano 'pi lopenaivodāharaṇam uktavān* is a little bit confusing, because it could mean that Vāmana gave this example only with the elision (i.e. *tantra utam*), which is not the case and which would not make a good counterexample for the *sūtra* (because it is *tantray utam* which is important if we want to show whether P.8.3.21 applies in this case).

The second appears in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.7.3.34 (and not on P.8.3.37 as Chakravarti writes):

*yathālakṣaṇam aprayukteṣv ity*⁷² *uparāma udyāma*⁷³ *ity eva bhavatīti bharṭṛhariṇā bhāgavṛttikṛtā coktam.* [Gaṇapati Śāstri's edition, p. 117]

On account of the [maxim] that in case of not current [words] they are built according to the rule, Bharṭṛhari and the Bhāgavṛttikṛt said that only *uparāma* and *udyāma* are [correct].

Notes

Rule P.7.3.34 *nodāttopadeśasya māntasyānācameḥ* teaches that the vowel of a root ending in *m* and having the accent *udātta* in the original enunciation with the exception of *cam* with the preverb *ā* is not replaced by *vṛddhi* when *ciṅ* or a *kṛt*-suffix follow. The roots *yam* (*Dhp.* 1.1033) and *ram* (*Dhp.* 1.906) have the *anudātta* accent; therefore, this rule does not apply to them. Thus, when a *kṛt* suffix *ghañ* is added to them, *vṛddhi* replaces the vowel *a* of *yam* and *ram*, as taught in P.7.2.116 *ata upadhāyāḥ*, and we have *udyāma* and *uparāma*.

Note the different wording of this passage in Renou's edition of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*: *yathālakṣaṇam aprayukteṣv ity udyama uparama ity eva bhavatīti bhāgavṛttikṛtā bharṭṛhariṇā ca likhitam*. However, because the derivatives from *yam* and *ram* are used as illustrations of the maxim *yathālakṣaṇam aprayukteṣu* ('Words which

⁷¹ The text as quoted by Chakravarti (1913-16: [14]).

⁷² Cf. Pat. on P.1.1.24: *yathālakṣaṇam aprayukte* (*Mbh.* I 84.7).

⁷³ Chakravarti (1913-16: [14]) has *udayāma*, probably just a misprint.

are not current are formed according to the rules'), the text as given by Gaṇapati Śāstrī (with *udyāma* and *uparāma*) makes better sense. On the other hand, it should be added that according to the *Kāśikā* on P.7.3.34 only *uparāma* and *udyāma* are correct, because they are used in *Dhp.* 1.1033 (*yama (yamu) uparame*) and 1.380 (*aḍa udyame*). Note also that *udyāma* is found e.g. in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 8.5.1.13, but *udyāma* and *uparāma* are mentioned in the *Amarakośa* (3.2.11 and 37). Cf. also Renou (1940: 111 fn. 17).

The third reference stems from the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti* of Sṛṣṭidhara on rule P.8.4.68 *a a*:

*bhāgavṛttir bhartṛhariṇā viracitā śrīdharasenanarendrādiṣṭā.*⁷⁴

The *Bhāgavṛtti* was composed by Bhartṛhari on command of king Śrīdharasena.

Chakravartī's proposal has encountered harsh criticism. Probably the first scholar to reject it was Bhattacharya (1922: 198), but he seemed to believe that Chakravartī's assumption was only made on the authority of Sṛṣṭidhara, so he has not dealt with the other arguments. He supplies, however, two citations which speak against the identification of the *Bhāgavṛttikāra* with Bhartṛhari.⁷⁵ These will be dealt with later on. As far as Sṛṣṭidhara is concerned, Bhattacharya remarks that his opinion 'is open to doubt'.

Similar reasoning is adopted by Haraprasāda Shāstrī (1931: xxxvii), who points out that Sṛṣṭidhara belonged to the 17th century and he obviously confused Bhartṛhari with Bhaṭṭi, whose patron was Śrīdharasena. Shāstrī concludes that Sṛṣṭidhara's view could not be decisive in settling the question of the authorship of the much earlier *Bhāgavṛtti*. Shāstrī also quotes the first argument of Chakravartī, but he comments on it only with the remark that it is 'absolutely unconvincing'.

Eventually, Kshitis Chandra Chatterji (1931a: 413-14) thoroughly dealt with the argumentation of Chakravartī. He refuses to recognise 'twisting the vowels and consonants in a word' (as in case of interpretation of the word *Pei-na* with *Veḍa* or *Beḍa*) as a scientific method. As far as the first two quotations are concerned, he points out that they treat opinions of three (Bhartṛhari, the *Bhāgavṛttikṛt* and *Vāmana*) and two (Bhartṛhari and the *Bhāgavṛttikṛt*) different grammarians respectively. The phrase *tathā ca* must be understood as 'similarly' (and not as introducing a quotation, as Chakravartī probably interpreted it). Chatterji's argument against the opinion of Sṛṣṭidhara is much the same as that of Shāstrī.

⁷⁴ The text as quoted by Chakravartī (1913-16: [14]). This differs slightly from the passage given in Chakravartī (1918: (19)), where *viracitā* stays at the end of the sentence.

⁷⁵ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 198 fn. 21) cites the passage from the *Tantrapradīpa* which Chakravartī used in his argumentation, but he seems to be unaware of this. According to Bhattacharya, the above fragment alludes to the commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* by Bhartṛhari.

The above clearly leads to the conclusion that ascribing the authorship of the *Bhāgavṛtti* to Bhartṛhari is untenable. Furthermore, some quotations found in other grammatical works demonstrate that their authors regarded Bhartṛhari and the Bhāgavṛttikāra as being two different personalities. Three such citations were presented by Chatterji (1931a: 415), the first two were also mentioned by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 198).

The first passage is found in Śīradeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* on *paribhāṣā* 4 (*āgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gr̥hyante* 'Augments, which become subordinate to this [morph to which they are added], are also meant when this [morph] is mentioned').

asyāṃ satyāṃ 'prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu ca' (P.8.4.11) ity atra numgrahaṇasya prayojanaṃ na dṛśyate. bhartṛhariṇā tūktam yaḥ prātipadikānto nakāro na bhavati tadarthaṃ numgrahaṇaṃ prāhiṇvat iti. atra hi hīver laṇi numo ṇatvam iti. tatra ca pūrvapadādhikārah. samāse ca pūrvottarapadavyavahārah. tat katham iha ṇatvam iti na vyaktikṛtam iti bhāgavṛttikṛtoktam.

If this [*paribhāṣā*] is [in force], a purpose of the expression of *num* in P.8.4.11 is not seen. But Bhartṛhari said that the mention of *num* is for the sake of *n* not final in a *prātipadika*, as in *prāhiṇvat*. For in this [word] there is the retroflexion of [the augment] *num*, when *laṇi* is added to *hiv*. [However,] in that case the *adhikāra* of *pūrvapada* (cf. P.8.4.3) [exists]. [And the talk of] the previous and the next *pada* is found in the case of a compound. Therefore, the Bhāgavṛttikāra said that it has not been made clear [by Bhartṛhari] why there is the retroflexion here (i.e. in *prāhiṇvat*).

Notes

Rule P.8.4.11 *prātipadikāntanumvibhaktiṣu ca* teaches an optional retroflexion of *n* final in a *prātipadika* or belonging to the augment *num* or being a part of a case or personal suffix, when the phone which causes this retroflexion occurs in the first element of a compound. Let us take the example *māṣavāpa* 'sowing of *māṣa* beans'. In the nominative plural the suffix *jas* is generally to be added, but after neuter nominal stems it is substituted by *śi*, as prescribed in P.7.1.20 *jaḥśasoḥ śih*. By rule P.7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ* the augment *num* is added to *māṣavāpa* and by P.6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsambuddhau* the vowel *a* of *-vāpan* is lengthened. This gives us the form *māṣavāpāni*. Then, by P.8.4.11 the *n* of *num* can be optionally replaced by *ṇ* so that *māṣavāpāṇi* is also correct. However, if we accept the *paribhāṣā* quoted above, the augment *num* would be the (final) part of the *prātipadika* and it would be replaced by *ṇ* even if *num* were missing in the *sūtra*. At this point of the discussion Śīradeva quotes the opinion of Bhartṛhari, according to whom the mention of *num* in P.8.4.11 is for the sake of *n* non-final in a *prātipadika*, as e.g. in *prāhiṇvat*, 3rd sing. Par. impf. Let us have a look at the derivation of this form. The root *hiv* is mentioned in *Dhp.* 1.622 and is marked with the vowel *i* (*hivi*). It takes the preverb *pra* and the suffixes of the imperfect (*laṇi*).

pra + hiv + laṇi → *pra + (hiv + num) + laṇi* (P.7.1.58) → *pra + hinṇ + laṇi* (P.1.1.47) → *pra + hinṇ + śap + tip* (P.3.1.68) → *pra + (a + hinva) + tip* (P.6.4.71) → *pra + ahinva + ti* (P.1.3.3, 9) → *pra + ahinva + t* (P.3.4.100) → *prāhiṇvat* (P.6.1.101) → *prāhiṇvat* (P.8.4.11).

However, it can be objected that in P.8.4.11 the *adhikāra* ‘*pūrvapadāt*’ from P.8.4.3 *pūrvapadāt saṃjñāyām agah* has to be understood and this narrows the scope of the application of P.8.4.11 to compounds. Therefore, in the opinion of the Bhāgavṛttikāra, Bhartṛhari has not satisfactorily explained why in the example *prāhiṇvat* the *n* of *num* is replaced by *ṇ*.

The second citation is taken from Goyīcandra’s *Vivaraṇī* (1.328), being a commentary on the *Samkṣiptasāra*.

bhartṛharisaṃmatam idam udāharaṇam bhāgavṛttikṛtāpy udāhṛtam.

This example is approved by Bhartṛhari and also quoted by the Bhāgavṛttikṛt.

And the third one comes from the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.3.21 (vārtt. 5 ad loc.)

gatatācchīlya iti bhāgavṛttih. gatavidhaprakārās tulyārthā iti bhartṛhariḥ.

In the *Bhāgavṛtti* [the wording is] *gatatācchīlye*. Bhartṛhari has *gatavidhaprakārās tulyārthāḥ*.⁷⁶

Apart from criticising Chakravarti, Chatterji (1931a: 414) has proposed his own solution to the problem of the Bhāgavṛttikāra’s identity. In his opinion the name of the Bhāgavṛttikāra was actually Vimalamati. He quotes a passage from Śrīpatidatta’s *Kātantrapariśiṣṭa* (1.142) as evidence:

*dyaur oko 'sya divaukāḥ autvam okārasya. yady api divarthe divam iti niścitam tathāpy okāranivṛttyartham iha divaukaṣaḥ pāṭhaḥ. tathā ca bhāgavṛttikṛtā vimala-
matināpy eṣa nipātitaḥ.*⁷⁷

One whose home (*okas*) is a sky (*div*) is called *divaukas*. [In this form] there is a substitution of *au* for *o*. Even if it is decided that *diva* [is used] for *div*, then the reading *divaukas* is for the sake of exclusion of [a form with] *o*. Accordingly, it was put down as an exception (which is to be accepted as it is mentioned and not to be derived through parts) also by the Bhāgavṛttikṛt Vimalamati.⁷⁸

Even if we accept this, we do not know much more about the author of the *Bhāgavṛtti*. Chatterji (1931a: 414) mentions two Vimalamatis: the author of a commentary on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and the other quoted by Trilocanadāsa in his *Kātantravṛttipañcikā* on the *Kātantra*. It cannot be, however, determined whether these two were one person and whether this was the same Vimalamati who is supposed to have written the *Bhāgavṛtti*. The identification of the Bhāgavṛttikṛt with Vimalamati was accepted by Cardona (1976: 284) and Renou (1940: 30), but it was rejected by D. Ch. Bhattacharya

⁷⁶ See also Renou’s (1940: 49-50) translation of the passage: ‘La Bhāgavṛtti (lit dans la teneur dudit vt. non «comportement», mais) «nature» (*gata*). D’après Bhartṛhari *gata-vidha-prakāra* ont le sens de semblable.’

⁷⁷ Since neither an edition nor manuscripts of the *Kātantrapariśiṣṭa* have been available to me, I quote the text as given in Chatterji (1931a: 414).

⁷⁸ Cf. *Durghaṭa* on P.6.1.131: *tena vā divaukasa iti. kaninpratyaṅyāntena divaśabdena divā oko yeṣām iti bhāgavṛttih.*

(1946: [6]). In fact, the last sentence of the passage under discussion is similar to the excerpt from the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.7.3.34 (... *iti bhāgavṛttikṛtā bhartṛhariṇā ca likhitam*), which has been quoted above, and as there, it is also here possible to translate it as: ‘Accordingly it was put down as an exception (which is to be accepted as it is mentioned and not to be derived through parts) by the Bhāgavṛttikṛt and also by Vimalamati’.⁷⁹ It does not make Chatterji’s hypothesis necessarily false (as it is one of the two possible translations), but certainly more substantial evidence is required to prove it.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1964-5: 1-2) is the author of a still another solution, which combines arguments speaking for Bhartṛhari and Vimalamati. He claims that the name of the Bhāgavṛttikāra was Vimalamati, who was also known as Bhartṛhari. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka assumes the existence of three Bhartṛharis. The first and the most famous one was, according to him, the author of the *Vākyapadīya* and of the commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. The second one was supposed to write the *Bhāṭṭikāvya* and the third one composed the *Bhāgavṛtti*.⁸⁰

It is beyond question that Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka’s theory is original, but it is also artificial and dangerous. It is not proper to try to solve authorship problems by a quick assumption of existence of more persons bearing the same name (although in some cases this might be true) or ascribing two names to one author. Moreover, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka’s proposition suffers from all the faults the two hypotheses previously discussed have.

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [6-7]) had another idea about the Bhāgavṛttikṛt. In his opinion the author of the *Bhāgavṛtti* was called Vābhaṭa. His argumentation is based on fragments from Gadaśiṃha’s commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya* and on Jumarānandin’s *Rasavatī* on the *Samkṣiptasāra*, the oldest work of the Jaumara school of grammar. The weakness of his thesis lies in need of an emendation of the citation from the *Rasavatī*,⁸¹ so we cannot help agreeing with D. Ch. Bhattacharya when he says that more substantial evidence of his hypothesis would be required.

⁷⁹ Another possible translation would be: ‘Similarly it was put down as an exception also by the Bhāgavṛttikṛt, whose opinions are pure (i.e. correct)’. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. A. Wezler for this suggestion.

⁸⁰ Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1984: 513-14).

⁸¹ Bhattacharya’s argument is as follows: In the commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya* IX.15, Gadaśiṃha quotes the opinion of the Bhāgavṛttikṛt, according to whom the reading of the passage in question should be: *rañjitaṃ nu vividhaṃ taruśailam* instead of *rañjitā nu vividhās taruśailāḥ*. The reading suggested by the Bhāgavṛttikṛt is found in the *Rasavatī* on VII.366. However, Jumarānandin remarks: *vābhaṭas tu paṭhati rañjitā nu vividhās taruśailāḥ tarupradhānāḥ śailās taruśailā ity arthaḥ*. Bhattacharya acknowledges that this would rather oppose the view of Vābhaṭa to the view of the Bhāgavṛttikṛt, but he is convinced that the passage from the *Rasavatī* is corrupt and the correct reading is: *vābhaṭaḥ paṭhati. rañjitā nu iti pāṭhe ...*

The last theory about the author of the *Bhāgavṛtti* which will be dealt with here is propounded by S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 285 and fn. 1). He suggests that Indu wrote the *Bhāgavṛtti*.⁸² He supports his hypothesis with a quotation made in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.2.3.16: (*indunā pravibhajyante namaskṛtya munitrayam*)⁸³ and claims that *pravibhajyante* refers to the *Bhāgavṛtti*. Then, he cites the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.3.3.58, where an opinion of Indu is presented. According to S. P. Bhattacharya, this statement corresponds to the view of the *Bhāgavṛtti* as reported in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.3.3.56. Further, he points out that Indu was the author of a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

Can we accept his suggestion? S. P. Bhattacharya (p. 287) himself admitted that his identification is not sufficiently proven. Indeed, the strongest among his arguments is the first one, but one quotation from the unknown source (see fn. 83) cannot make reliable evidence. The second argument loses its force if we examine it thoroughly. Although the views of Indu and of the *Bhāgavṛttikṛt* as reported in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* and the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, respectively, are indeed similar, they are not exactly the same.⁸⁴ Moreover, the fact that two grammarians held the same opinion on one subject does not have to mean that they were one person. And finally, as it will be shown in I.4.2, the view that Indu wrote a text called *Indumatī* is not entirely convincing. Besides, it is only based on the commentary of Viṭṭhala (15th century) on the *Prakriyākāumudī*.

The hypothesis of S. P. Bhattacharya has met with little response from scholars. It is only mentioned by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 514), who rejects it, and by Cardona (1976: 359 fn. 464), who refers to the opinion of Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. From the above discussion it is correct to conclude that in the present state of our knowledge the identity of the *Bhāgavṛttikāra* remains unknown. The proposed solutions have turned out to be completely unsatisfactory or at best possible, but not convincing.

⁸² S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 286) rejects the theory that Indu was the author of the *Anunyāsa*.

⁸³ The whole text as given by Renou: *katham 'indunā pravibhajyante namaskṛtya munitrayam', 'atas teṣāṃ vivekārtham namaskṛtya munitrayam' iti. namoyoge caturthīsaṃbhavāt*. Renou does not translate the quoted passage and does not state its source. It could be a part of a *śloka*, but it is difficult to decide on the meaning of *indunā pravibhajyante* without knowing the context (especially, the subject) of the whole phrase.

⁸⁴ Cf. *Durghaṭa* on P.3.3.58: *ktalyuttumunkhalartheṣu vāsarūpavidhir nāstīti. tatra bhāvalyūṭo grahaṇam iti pratyayasūtre 'er ac' ity (P.3.3.56) ac pravartata iti indunoktam*. (see also I.4.2). According to it, Indu claimed that *lyuṭ* used in *paribhāṣā PP 76 (NP 68)* refers to *lyuṭ* prescribed by P.3.3.115, so it means that in case of *lyuṭ* which is added by P.3.3.117 we can apply P.3.1.94 (*vāsarūpo 'striyām*). The *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.3.3.56 says: *vāsarūpeṇa ktādayo 'pi bhavanti – bhūtam śīsūnā vṛṣṭam devena varṣaṇam meghasya iti bhāgavṛttiḥ*. So it is clear that the *Bhāgavṛttikṛt* holds the opinion that P.3.1.94 can be also used in the case of *ktā* etc., and not only in the case of *lyuṭ* used in the sense of *karaṇa* and *adhikaraṇa* (cf. P.3.3.117).

I.3.3 The date of the *Bhāgavṛtti*

The large number of treatises which quote from the *Bhāgavṛtti* shows the immense popularity this work must have once enjoyed.⁸⁵ The longest lists of these texts have been provided by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1964-5: 5-6; ⁴1984: 515-16) and S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 274-5). Here only some titles are mentioned: Maitreya's *Tantrapradīpa*, Puruṣottama's *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* and *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*, Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*, Goyīcandra's *Rasavatī* etc.

Most probably the earliest of the authors mentioned above is Haradatta, who is usually dated 1000-1100 AD.⁸⁶ This means that the Bhāgavṛttikāra can be dated before circa 950-1050 AD.

It is much more difficult to fix the upper limit for his date. It involves finding quotations in the *Bhāgavṛtti*, which is not easy, as the work itself is known only from citations. It is, however, fairly certain that the Bhāgavṛttikṛt discussed quotations from Māgha's *Śīśupālavadhā*, the *Kirātārjunīya* and the *Bhṛṅgikāvya*.⁸⁷ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [5]-[6]) adds the *Nyāsa* to this list also.

The relationship between the Bhāgavṛttikāra and Kaiyaṭa has been the subject of controversy. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 199) sees in the *Tantrapradīpa* on P.8.1.12 an indication that the Bhāgavṛttikāra preceded Kaiyaṭa. Similarly S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 284) notes that most probably Kaiyaṭa knew the *Bhāgavṛtti*. K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 205) cautiously remarks that the Bhāgavṛttikṛt either preceded Kaiyaṭa or came immediately after him. On the other hand, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1964-5: 5; ⁴1984: 515) mentions Kaiyaṭa's *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* among the works which cite the *Bhāgavṛtti*, but he does not give any details about it.

Bearing in mind the above mentioned facts, D. Ch. Bhattacharya proposed 900 AD as the date of the *Bhāgavṛtti*, but in his later work (1946: [8]) he regarded 950 AD as more appropriate. S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 284) places the *Bhāgavṛtti* around the end of the 10th century. Chatterji (1931a: 418) cautiously states that the *Bhāgavṛtti* was written between 850 and 1050 AD.

⁸⁵ The quotations from the *Bhāgavṛtti* are also found in such late works as the *Siddhāntakaumudī* and Śṛṣṭidhara's commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.

⁸⁶ For the criticism of the later dating proposed for Haradatta, see Cardona (1976: 281).

⁸⁷ For the details, see Chatterji (1931a: 416-17), D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 198). From these three *mahākāvya*s Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* is usually dated 6th century. Lienhard (1984: 184) even puts it into the first half of the 6th century. According to him (p. 181), the *Bhṛṅgikāvya* belongs to the period between the beginning of the 6th and the middle of the 7th century. In our context the most important is the date of the latest poem, the *Śīśupālavadhā*. Its date is, however, uncertain. Lienhard (p. 188) says that it must have been earlier than the beginning of the 9th century. See also I.2.3.3.b.

Much earlier dating is adopted by Chakravarti and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, but their reasons are different.

Chakravarti (1913-16: [15]) identifies the *vṛtti* mentioned in the *Kāśikā* on P.8.3.45⁸⁸ with the *Bhāgavṛtti*, thus making the *Bhāgavṛtti* older than the *Kāśikā*.⁸⁹ Furthermore, as he ascribes the authorship of the *Bhāgavṛtti* to Bhartṛhari and I-tsing mentioned that Bhartṛhari died 10 years before Jayāditya, Chakravarti (p. 26) proposes ca. 625 AD as the date of the *Bhāgavṛtti*.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka's decision is based on the statement of Śṛṣṭidhara that the *Bhāgavṛtti* was composed on the order of king Śrīdharasena. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1964-5: 2-3) identifies him as Śrīdharasena IV (as opposed to Śrīdharasena III, who was in his opinion a patron of the author of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*) and suggests 655-659 AD (702-705 Vikrama era) as the date of the *Bhāgavṛtti*.⁹⁰

As the identification of the *Bhāgavṛttikṛt* with Bhartṛhari is uncertain and the opinion of Śṛṣṭidhara cannot be considered as absolutely trustworthy, it seems better to ascribe the *Bhāgavṛtti* to the period between 850 and 1050 AD.

I.3.4 The commentaries of the *Bhāgavṛtti*

In his commentary *Puruṣakāra* on the *Daiva*, Kṛṣṇalīlāsuka mentions Śrīdhara, who commented on the *Bhāgavṛtti*.⁹¹ Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1984: 517) identifies this Śrīdhara with Śrīkara (or Śrīkāra) quoted in the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*.⁹² and maintains that Śrīdhara's work was earlier than the *Tantrapradīpa*.⁹³ It is, however, difficult to make a definite statement regarding the dating of Śrīdhara's commentary, because the text is now lost and quotations from it are rare.

⁸⁸ *bhāṣye vṛttau ca nityaṃ samāse 'nuttarapadaṣṭhasyety (P.8.3.45) atra paramasarpīḥ kuṇḍīkety etad eva pratyudāharaṇam.*

⁸⁹ Chakravarti (1913-16: [15]) supports his reasoning with the following argument. The Nyāsakāra mentions the *Cūlibhaṭṭivṛtti*, which, according to Chakravarti, preceded the *Kāśikā*. Chakravarti identifies this work with the *Cūrṇi* of Bhartṛhari mentioned by I-tsing.

⁹⁰ See also Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1984: 514-5).

⁹¹ *Puruṣakāra* on *Daiva* 6: *bhāgavṛttau tu 'sīkṛsekṛ' ity adhikam api paṭhyate. tac ca 'sīkṛ secane' iti śrīdharo vyākarot.* Śrīdhara is also mentioned in *Puruṣakāra* on *Daiva* 76: *tathā ca śrīdharo nṛtyāgena nṛtyādīn paṭhitvā 'etān sapta varjayitvā' ity āha.*

⁹² See *M.Dhv.* on *nāth* (1.7). Śrīkara is mentioned twice in the commentary on this root and once the variant reading *śrīdhara* is noted. See *M.Dhv.* p. 53, fn. 2.

⁹³ See also Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1964-5:4).

I.4 The Anun्यāsakāra

There are two main problems concerning the *Anun्यāsa*, namely its character and its authorship. Both are difficult to solve because the text of the *Anun्यāsa* is lost.⁹⁴

I.4.1 The character of the *Anun्यāsa*

The most important question is the following: Which treatise did the *Anun्यāsa* comment on? There are two answers to this question. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 570) sees in the *Anun्यāsa* a commentary on the *Kāśīkā*, but he does not mention any reasons for his decision. Another opinion is that the *Anun्यāsa*, as its title suggests, was a commentary on Jinendrabuddhi's treatise, and this view is generally accepted.⁹⁵

I.4.2 The authorship of the *Anun्यāsa*

In his preface to the edition of the *Nyāsa* Chakravarti (1913-16: [19]) mentions the opinion according to which the *Anun्यāsa* and the *Tantrapradīpa* are actually the names of the same work, which would make Maitreya Rakṣita the author of the *Anun्यāsa*.⁹⁶ Also Aufrecht (1891: 16) and Liebich (1930: 363) identified these two works.

This view has now been generally abandoned by scholars. The testimony of Sīradeva, who showed in his *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* examples of differences of opinions between Maitreya Rakṣita and the Anun्यāsakāra, speaks against this identification. In the commentary on *paribhāṣā* 14 (*ekayoganirdiṣṭānām saha vā pravṛttiḥ saha vā nivṛttiḥ* '[All words connected in sense] which are enunciated in one *sūtra* [even if they are understood there by *anuvṛtti*] either recur or cease to recur [in the following rules]') Sīradeva wrote:

(a) *upadeśagrahaṇānuvartanaṃ prati rakṣitānun्यāsayor vivāda eva.*

⁹⁴ It was extant in the 17th AD, as a manuscript of the *Anun्यāsa* is known to be possessed by the scholar Rāmanātha Vidyāvācaspati. See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [9]).

⁹⁵ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 200), Renou (1940: 28), Cardona (1976: 357 fn. 444).

⁹⁶ Chakravarti (1913-16: [19]) does not cite any argument for such an identification. He mentions only that the *Tantrapradīpa* is often called *Vṛttipradīpa* in the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*. However, in the edition of the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti* by Dwarikadas Shastri (1964) the name *Vṛttipradīpa* appears only once, on 1.159 (*aṭṭa atikramaṇahimsayoh*): *dopadho 'yam smaryate iti maitreyah. topadho 'yam iti ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ ity (P.8.4.41) atra nyāsavṛttipradīpakārādayah. svāmy api kvipi ad iti takāraśravaṇārthaṃ topadhatvam uktvā dopadhatvam apy āha. maitreyas tu svamate dopadhatvam uktvā topadhatvam matāntaram āha.* Furthermore, this passage seems to go against the hypothesis that *Vṛttipradīpa* refers to Maitreya's *Tantrapradīpa*.

There is a difference [of opinions] between Rakṣita and the *Anun्यāsa* regarding the supplying [from a previous rule] of the term *upadeśa* [in P.1.3.8].

Another fragment of Sīradeva's work throws light on the name of the Anun्यāsakāra. In the commentary on *paribhāṣā* 36 (*ktalyuṭtumunkhalartheṣu vāsarūpavidhir nāsti* P.3.1.94 *vāsarūpo 'striyam* is not valid in case of the suffixes *кта*, *lyuṭ*, *tumun* and those having the meaning of the suffix *khac'*) he wrote:

(b) *ata eva 'āśite bhuvah karaṇabhāvayoḥ'* (P.3.2.45) *ity atra yad uktaṃ nyāsakṛtā ghañam sārūpyād bād hate khac. lyuṭpratyayaḥ punar vāsarūpavidhinā bhavaty eva. āśitaṃbhavaṃ āśitabhavanam*⁹⁷ *iti tad upapadyate. etasmin vākye indumaitreyayoḥ śāśvatiko virodhaḥ.*⁹⁸ *tathā hi. pratyayasūtre* (P.3.1.1) *'nun्यāsakāra* *uktavān. pratiyanty anenārthān iti pratyayaḥ. 'er ac' ity* (P.3.3.56) *ac. 'puṃsi samjñāyām ghaḥ prāyeṇa' iti* (P.3.3.118) *vā gha iti. maitreyaḥ punar āha. 'puṃsi samjñāyām' iti* (P.3.3.118) *ghapratyaya eva. 'er ac' ity* (P.3.3.56) *acpratyayas tu karaṇe lyuṭā bādhitavān na śakyate kartum. na ca vā 'sarūpavidhir asti. ktalyuṭ ityādivacanāt.*

For this very reason, as the Nyāsakṛt said in the commentary on P.3.2.45, the suffix *khac* blocks *ghañ*, because they have the same form. The suffix *lyuṭ* is again added by the rule about the optionality of [suffixes] having different forms (cf. P.3.1.94). Thus [the examples] *āśitaṃbhava* and *āśitabhavana* are appropriate. In this matter there is a permanent discrepancy between Indu and Maitreya. For in [the commentary on] the *pratyayasūtra* (P.3.1.1) the Anun्यāsakāra said [as follows]. A suffix is that through which they recognize meanings [of words]. By P.3.3.56 the suffix *ac* is added. According to P.3.3.118 the suffix *gha* is optional. But Maitreya said that only the suffix *gha* is added by rule P.3.3.118. The suffix *ac* should not be attached, because [it] is prohibited through *lyuṭ* which [operates] in the sense of instrument (cf. P.3.3.117). The rule about the optionality of [suffixes] having different forms is not valid because of mention of *ktalyuṭ* [in the *paribhāṣā*].

Notes

According to P.3.1.94 *vāsarūpo 'striyām*, suffixes which have the same meaning but different forms (after their markers have been elided) can optionally be added to a root, with the exception of those enumerated under the heading *striyām* (P.3.3.94 *striyām ktin*). The present *paribhāṣā* limits the application of this rule in the case of the suffixes *क्ता* etc. However, as Sīradeva explains in the portion of his commentary which precedes the quoted passage, this limitation does not take place when the suffixes *क्ता* etc. are prescribed by general rules and the restriction belongs to the portion preceding the heading *striyām*. This is the case in the derivation of *āśitaṃbhava* and *āśitabhavana*. When the instrument is to be expressed, the suffix *khac*, prescribed in P.3.2.45 *āśite bhuvah karaṇabhāvayoḥ*, is added to *āśita* + *bhū*. It debars the suffix *ghañ* (cf. P.3.3.19), which could not be added optionally, because *ghañ* has the same form as *khac*. It could also block the suffix *lyuṭ* (added in accordance with P.3.3.117), but since *khac* is taught in the portion preceding P.3.3.94, rule P.3.1.94 *vāsarūpo 'striyām* operates here. Thus, because *khac* and *lyuṭ* have different forms, they

⁹⁷ Abhyankar (1967: 205) reads *āśitaṃbhavanam*.

⁹⁸ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [9]) gives this sentence as: *etasmin vākye indumitramaitreyayoḥ śāśvatiko virodhaḥ*. However, this reading is not noted by Abhyankar (1967: 205).

can both apply and the derived forms are respectively *āśitaṃbhava* (with the augment *mum* prescribed in P.6.3.67) and *āśitabhavana*. Cf. *Nyāsa* on P.3.2.45: *evaṃ ca ghañlyuṭor apavādo bhavati. vāsarūpavidhinā lyuḍ api bhavaty eva – āśitabhavana odana iti. ghañas tu sarūpatvād bādhaka eva.*

From this passage it is clear that Sīradeva regarded Indu as the author of the *Anunyāsa*. The opinion that Indu, or Indumitra, wrote the *Anunyāsa* has been widely accepted among scholars.⁹⁹

Chatterji (1931: 418), rejecting the view that the *Tantrapradīpa* and the *Anunyāsa* are identical, notes that quotations from these two commentaries found in other works easily show that they are quite different treatises, but he has not supplied any examples apart from the passage (b) cited here.¹⁰⁰ This fragment seems to be crucial for ascribing the *Anunyāsa* to Indu.

If we accept Indu as the author of the *Anunyāsa*, the fact of the animosity between the Anunyāsakāra and Maitreya would be confirmed also in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. In the commentary on P.3.3.58 Śaraṇadeva opposes the opinions of Indu and Rakṣita. In the discussion on the correctness of the example *kriyate sārasaṃgrahaḥ*¹⁰¹ Śaraṇadeva said:

(c) *ktalyuṭtumunkhalartheṣu vāsarūpavidhir nāstīti.*¹⁰² *tatra bhāvallyuṭo grahaṇam iti pratyayasūtre* (P.3.1.1) ‘*er ac*’ *ity* (P.3.3.56) *ac pravartata iti indunoktam. rakṣitena tu sāmānyena lyuṭ gṛhītaḥ. tanmate bāhulakād ac.*

‘The rule about the optionality of [suffixes] having different forms (cf. P.3.1.94) does not apply in case of *kta*, *lyuṭ*, *tumun* and of suffixes having the meaning of *khal*.’ In this [*paribhāṣā PP 78 (NP 68)*] *lyuṭ* which is added in order to denote state (cf. P.3.3.115) is employed. Therefore, in [the commentary on] *pratyayasūtra* (P.3.1.1) Indu said that the suffix *ac* takes effect by P.3.3.56. But Rakṣita understood [in *PP 78 (NP 68)*] *lyuṭ* in general. In his opinion [the suffix] *ac* [is added to the stem *saṃgraha*] because of diversity [in the application of the rule].

Because this is somewhat similar to the example from the commentary on *paribhāṣā* 36 and in both cases this opinion of the Anunyāsakāra is said to be found in the

⁹⁹ Chatterji (1931b), Renou (1940: 56), V. Raghavan (1945: 78), D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [9]-[10]), Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 570) mention Indumitra or Indu as the author of the *Anunyāsa*. K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 204, 238) gives only the variant Indumitra. Both, Indu and Indumitra are cited in many grammatical treatises, the former, much more frequently. As far as I can gather, the question whether Indu and Indumitra are the same personage has not been discussed. See also fn. 98.

¹⁰⁰ Chatterji’s second example comes from the *Durghaṭavṛtti* and illustrates the discrepancy between the opinions of Indu and Maitreya Rakṣita, so it cannot be used as a proof that the *Anunyāsa* was not written by Maitreya Rakṣita.

¹⁰¹ Cf. the beginning of the *Kāśikā*.

¹⁰² The text as given by Renou. Śāstrī has *bhavati* before *kta*-. Renou interpreted it as a part of the previous sentence.

commentary on *pratyaśāstra*, it seems very probable that Indu, also called Indumitra, was the author of the *Anunyaśāstra*.

Thus the authorship of the *Anunyaśāstra* has been clarified to a high degree of probability, but still nothing definitive is known about the Anunyaśākāra. The name Indu appears very frequently in Kṣīrasvāmin's commentary on the *Amarakośa*, but from the quotations found there it is clear that this Indu was a commentator on the *Amarakośa* or on a similar treatise.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 523-4) considers Indumitra to be the author of a commentary *Indumatī* on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. He points out that the name *Indumatī(-vṛtti)* is mentioned several times in the *Prasāda*.¹⁰³ The passage from the *Prasāda* on P.8.2.19 is meant to demonstrate that this *Indumatī* was a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and that its author was Indumitra.¹⁰⁴ It is, however, difficult to accept the proposition of Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. There are two main points which make his argumentation unconvincing. The first includes the problem of the interpretation of *tathā ca*, which Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka obviously renders as introducing a quotation, but which can also mean 'accordingly'.¹⁰⁵ The second one is the unreliable wording of the whole passage. The edition of the *Prasāda* by Trivedi (1925-31) considerably differs from the text presented by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, e.g. it does not contain the name of Indumitra in the relevant fragment.¹⁰⁶ Thus, the strongest argument speaking in favour of Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka's suggestion is the appearance of the word *Indumatī* in the *Prasāda*, but it alone is not enough to prove Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka's thesis.

I.4.3 The date of the *Anunyaśāstra*

Quotations from the *Anunyaśāstra* are found in Puruṣottama's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (three times), the *Durghaṭāvṛtti* (19 times), Śiradeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (11 times), Ujjvala-

¹⁰³ Cf. *Prasāda* on P.5.4.135 (*tathoktam indumatyām*), P.5.4.136 (*tathendumatyām vikalpa udāhṛtaḥ*), P.6.3.6 (*tathoktam indumatyām vṛttau*). The text as given in Trivedi (1925-31: I 610, 686). For the second example the optional reading *indumitreṇa vikalpa udāhṛtaḥ* is said to be found. See S. P. Bhattacharya (1946: 285 fn. 3).

¹⁰⁴ The text as quoted by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 524): *etac ca indumitramatenoktam. pratyaśāstra iti (P.3.1.1) sūtre pratyaśāstrāyate trāyate 'rtho 'smād iti pratyaśāstrāḥ. 'puṃsi saṃjñāyām ghaḥ prāyeṇa' iti (P.3.3.118) ghāntasya pratyaśāstrāyāśabdasyānvarthasya niṣedho jñāpaka iti bhāvāḥ. tathā ca indumatyām vṛttāv uktam – prates tu vyañjanavyavahito ya iti bhavati nimittam iti keśāṃcin mate prater api bhavati.*

¹⁰⁵ A similar problem has appeared in the discussion about the authorship of the *Bhāḡāvṛtti*. See I.3.2.

¹⁰⁶ Trivedi (1925-31: II 145 and corrigenda II 828):

etac ca yadumitramatenoktam. pratyaśāstra iti (P.3.1.1) sūtre pratyaśāstrāyate jñāyate 'rtho 'smād iti pratyaśāstrāḥ. 'puṃsi saṃjñāyām ghaḥ prāyeṇa' iti (P.3.3.118) ghāntasya pratyaśāstrāyāśabdasyānvarthasya nirdeśo jñāpaka iti bhāvāḥ. tathā ca indumatyām vṛttāv uktam. prates tu vyañjanavyavahito 'ya iti na nimittam iti pratyaśāstra iti na jñāpakam iti keśāṃcin mate prater api bhavati latvam.

Words which differ from the text given by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka are underlined (see fn. 104).

datta's *Uṇādivṛtti* (once), Sarvānanda's *Amaratīkāsarvasva* (twice), the commentary of the *Prakriyākaumudī* called *Prasāda* (twice) and in the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti* (once). Opinions of Indu or Indumitra are also reported and discussed by Puruṣottamadeva in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* (twice) and the *Bhāṣyavyākhyāprapañca* (three times),¹⁰⁷ in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* (three times), Sīradeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (once) and Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādivṛtti* (once).

The earliest author to refer to the *Anun्यāsa* is thus Puruṣottamadeva, who is usually dated middle of the 12th century (see I.7.6).

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [9]) regards Indu as an elderly contemporary of Maitreya and presents two arguments. The first and not very convincing argument is the example from the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, in which Sīradeva speaks about *śāśvatiko virodhaḥ* between Indu and Maitreya (see I.4.2, citation b). The second one is the passage from the *Tantrapradīpa* on P.1.2.1, in which Maitreya is supposed to tacitly criticise Indu. However, without having the whole text of the *Anun्यāsa* and without an edition of the *Tantrapradīpa*, it is difficult to decide in favour of Bhattacharya's suggestion. What this one example shows is that Maitreya rejects a view which was, according to Sīradeva, held by Indu,¹⁰⁸ but we cannot be sure that what Maitreya is actually criticising is the opinion of Indu. Nevertheless, if we accept Bhattacharya's argumentation, it will only slightly shift the lower limit for the Anun्यāsakāra from the early 12th century to the 11th century.

The upper limit of his date is very difficult to specify, because the few extant quotations from the *Anun्यāsa* do not give any clues as to which grammatical or literary works were known to its author.

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 199) mentioned Indu among Bengali grammarians who flourished in the early 11th century AD, but more than 20 years later he (1946: [9]) placed him in the second half of the 11th century.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 571) dates the *Anun्यāsa* between 800 and 1150 AD, which is cautious, but, in my opinion, appropriate.

I.4.4 The commentaries

The *Anun्यāsa* was commented on by Śrīmānaśarman of the 15th century (see I.11.5); the text of this commentary is lost now.

¹⁰⁷ There is one passage in the *Kāraṅcakāra* where the opinion of Indumitra is mentioned. Although in opinion of D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 116, 117 fn. I) this fragment is an insertion into the corpus of the text, he still ascribes its authorship to Puruṣottamadeva.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Sīradeva on *paribhāṣā* 14.

I.5 Govardhana

Govardhana's name is known from references found in grammatical and lexicographic treatises of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar. He is cited in Sarvānanda's *Ṭīkāsarvasva*,¹⁰⁹ Rāyamukuṭa's *Padacandrikā*,¹¹⁰ Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādivṛtti*,¹¹¹ Subhūticandra's commentary on the *Amarakośa*¹¹² and in the *Manoramā*.¹¹³

It is universally accepted that Govardhana wrote a commentary on the *Uṇādisūtra*. This is confirmed by the character of quotations found in works mentioned above. The decisive evidence comes, however, from the *Ṭīkāsarvasva*, where Govardhana's *Uṇādivṛtti* is cited,¹¹⁴ of Govardhana and from Ujjvaladatta, who presents the text of *Uṇ.* IV.68 as given by Govardhana together with its interpretation.¹¹⁵

Some scholars attribute the authorship of other works to Govardhana. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [19]) suggests that Govardhana also wrote a commentary on the *Dhātupāṭha*. According to him, this is meant in the *Manoramā* (under root *śundh* of *curādi*), but this citation would also fit in well in the commentary on the *Uṇādisūtra*.¹¹⁶ Chintamani (1934: 376-7) found a passage in Subhūti's still unedited *Kāmadhenu* which seems to suggest that Govardhana composed a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.¹¹⁷

Since references to Govardhana are not very abundant, it is difficult to fix his dates. Bhattacharya (1922: 199) proposes the early 11th century for him, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka the 12th century.

¹⁰⁹ Under I.1.59; 7.37; II.6.21, 6.110; 7.23; 9.29; III.3.169; 5.38 [the numeration as given in Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1914; 1915-17; 1917)].

¹¹⁰ Under I.2, 5, 59, 87; II.62, 89, 275, 419; III.54, 86, 154, 325, 468, 471.

¹¹¹ Govardhana is mentioned in *Uṇ.-vṛtti* II.107; III.40; IV.20, 213, V.19 and the *Govardhanavṛtti* in *Uṇ.-vṛtti* IV.68.

¹¹² See Chintamani (1934: 372-3).

¹¹³ One example from Ramānātha's *Manoramā* is given by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [19]). See fn. 116. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 204) mentions instead of the *Manoramā* the *Praudhāmanoramā* of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, but he does not specify where exactly Govardhana is referred to.

¹¹⁴ *dantyaśaḥ. tālavyo 'pīti govardhanaṇādivṛttiḥ* [*Ṭīkāsarvasva* on I.1.59].

There is dental *s* [in *asrapaḥ*, but] *Uṇādivṛtti* [says] that it [could be] also palatal [*s*].

¹¹⁵ *govardhanavṛtttau tu ades trin nic cety ades trin syāt. nit. cakārāt trip. nid iti vacanān nakārasya netsamjñā* [*Uṇ.-vṛtti* IV.68].

The commentary of Govardhana [on *Uṇ.* IV.68 reads] *ades trin nic ca*. Thus [the suffix *trin*] is added after *ad*. Because of *ca* [the suffix] *trip* is [also] affixed. The mention of *nid* means that *n* is not called *it*.

According to Chintamani (1934: 372-3; 376-7), Govardhana's *Uṇādivṛtti* is also referred to in Subhūti's *Kāmadhenu*, but Chintamani supplies no relevant quotation.

¹¹⁶ Cf.: *vibhrājase makaraketanam arcayantītyādayaḥ katham? skhalitam iti govardhanaḥ. tad asat* [quotation as given by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [19])].

¹¹⁷ *tathā ca śraviṣṭhādisūtre* (cf. P.4.3.34) *govardhanaḥ – ṣaḍ dadhātīti ṣaḍdana ṣaḍdā samjñāyām ṣaṣa ā dhasya ca tuṭvaṃ aṣāḍhaḥ aṣoḍho nāsāḍhaḥ (?) vāraviratreti ṣatvam eta ātvaṃ nipātanāt iti* [Chintamani (1934: 377)].

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka's argumentation consists of two arguments. Firstly, without stating any reason for his decision, he (²1973: 205) identifies this Govardhana with the author of the *Āryāsaptaśatī*, who is supposed to have lived during the reign of King Lakṣmaṇasena.¹¹⁸ However, this identification of the poet Govardhana with the grammarian is doubtful and, as far as I can judge, it is an opinion shared by few scholars.¹¹⁹ Secondly, he assumes that Govardhana was meant in the illustration *upa govardhanaṃ śābdikāḥ* given by Puruṣottama in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.1.4.87.¹²⁰ Since Puruṣottama himself is quoted in Sarvānanda's *Ṭikāsarvasva*,¹²¹ Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (p. 206) sets the date of Govardhana's *Uṇādivṛtti* at ca. 1143 AD.

I.6 Maitreyarakṣita

Maitreyarakṣita, called also Maitreya or Rakṣita, was an eminent grammarian, most probably of Bengali origin. Only two of his works have survived: the *Tantrapradīpa* and the *Dhātupradīpa*. The latter was known and often quoted even by Southern grammarians. The *Tantrapradīpa*, although usually considered to be his masterpiece, has never circulated outside Bengal. Its manuscripts are found only in Bengal and are written in Bengali characters.¹²²

¹¹⁸ Lienhard (1984: 97). This dating is supported by the following famous verse, which is said to be a part of an inscription:

*govardhanaś ca śaraṇo jayadeva umāpatiḥ |
kavirājaś ca ratnāni samitau lakṣmaṇasya ca ||.*

See Peterson and Durgāprasāda (1886: introduction p. 37-38). Cf. also *Gītagovinda* I.4 (I.3):

*vācaḥ pallavayaty umāpatidharaḥ saṃdarbhaśuddhiṃ girāṃ
jānīte jayadeva eva śaraṇaḥ ślāghyo durūhadrute(h) |
śṛṅgārottarasatprameyaranair ācāryagovardhana-
spardhī ko 'pi na viśrutaḥ śrudharo dhoyī kavikṣmāpatiḥ ||.*

Variants in brackets are found in the edition by Kulkarni.

¹¹⁹ S. K. De (²1960b: 68 fn. 378) vehemently objects to this identification.

¹²⁰ See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [19]) and S. K. De (²1960b: 68 fn. 378). Chakravarti (1918: [5]) thinks that Govardhana, the author of the *Āryāsaptaśatī* is meant here. It is difficult to guess whether Chakravarti identifies the poet with the grammarian.

¹²¹ It is usually accepted that the *Ṭikāsarvasva* was composed in 1081 Śaka era, corresponding to 1159/60 AD. See Vogel (1979: 315). As an argument speaking for this dating Sarvānanda's commentary on the *Amarakośa* I.4.21 is provided: *idānīm caikāśīti varṣādhikā-sahasraikaparyantena śakābdakālena ṣaṣṭivarṣādhikadvicatvāriṃśacchatāni kalisandhyāyā bhūtāni. tathā ca gaṇitacūḍāmaṇau śrīnivāsaḥ – 'kalisandhyāyāḥ khasamayakarakṛtavarṣāni' (?) (4260)*. The date 1081 of Śaka era is usually interpreted as the date of the composition of the *Ṭikāsarvasva*. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [34]-[36]) argues that this assumption is based on a misunderstanding and that the year 1081 refers to Śrīnivāsa. His argumentation is strengthened by the fact that a similar passage, also with the name of Śrīnivāsa as the authority and with the identical date of 4260 Kaliyuga, appears in the commentary of Rāyamukūṭa. See fn. 223. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [36]) places Sarvānanda in the last quarter of the 12th century.

¹²² K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 902-3).

I.6.1 The *Tantrapradīpa*

Although not so popular in India as the *Dhātupradīpa*, the *Tantrapradīpa* was much studied and highly estimated in Bengal. The text has not yet been published, but the manuscripts of it are extant.¹²³

The *Tantrapradīpa* is a commentary on the *Nyāsa* and in certain aspects different from other commentaries. Rakṣita not only often discusses the views of other grammarians, but also quotes them by name, which makes the *Tantrapradīpa* very important for the study of the history of grammar. It is worth noticing that the *Bhāgavṛtti* is frequently cited by Rakṣita (36 times), followed by Kaiyaṭa's *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* (30 times).¹²⁴ Among other authorities quoted in the *Tantrapradīpa* we can mention: Āpiśali, Udayakara, Kṣapaṇaka, Cullibhaṭṭi, Anupadakāra, Padaśeṣakāra, Bhartṛhari and the *Rūpāvatāra*. This enumeration is not complete. The comprehensive lists of names and titles quoted in the *Tantrapradīpa* are provided by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [11]-[12]) and K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 893-4).

Another peculiarity of the *Tantrapradīpa* is that some *sūtras* are interpreted not only according to Pāṇini's school of grammar, but also according to the Cāndra system.¹²⁵

Furthermore, as is not uncommon, Maitreya points out the mistakes of scribes and suggests better readings where possible. He does not hesitate to criticise the *Nyāsa*.¹²⁶

The great popularity of the *Tantrapradīpa* is demonstrated by the fact that it is very frequently quoted by Bengali grammarians. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [15]-[16]) has used this observation to formulate a kind of criterion for determining a Bengali origin of other works. He is of the opinion that any writer who often cites from the *Nyāsa*, the *Anunyāsa* and the *Tantrapradīpa* 'may prima facie be taken as belonging to Bengal'.

The *Tantrapradīpa* was commented upon several times. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 202) mentions three such commentaries: the *Tantrapradīpoddīpana* by Nandana Nyāyavāgīśa, the *Tantrapradīpaprabhā* by Sanātana Tarkācārya (see I.11.4), and the anonymous *Tantrapradīpālōka*, all of them unedited and preserved in marginal quotations or fragments.

¹²³ Haraprasāda Shastri (1931: 19) mentions an edition of the *Tantrapradīpa* by Babu S. C. Cakravarti, but he has not supplied any detailed information about this edition, which, as far as I can gather, is not recorded by any other scholar.

¹²⁴ The number of quotations is taken from D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [12]).

¹²⁵ See K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 896-7).

¹²⁶ See K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 897-8).

I.6.2 The *Dhātupradīpa*

The *Dhātupradīpa* is a commentary on the Pāṇinian *Dhātupāṭha*. It deals with 1938 roots, some *sautra* verbs are omitted.¹²⁷ From the verse at the end of the *Dhātupradīpa*, we know that it was written after the *Tantrapradīpa*.¹²⁸

The *Dhātupradīpa* does not contain many quotations. Among the grammatical authorities referred to are: Āpiśali, the Bhāṣyakāra, Candra, Kalāpa, Jayāditya, Vāmana, the *Nyāsa*, the *Sarvasva*¹²⁹ and the *Rūpāvatāra*.¹³⁰

The *Dhātupradīpa* itself had attained pan-Indian popularity and was frequently quoted not only by Bengali grammarians, but also by Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka in his *Puruṣakāra* and by Sāyaṇa in the *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*, both of Southern India.

One question needs answering: Did Maitreyarakṣita know the *Kṣīratarāṅginī*? Liebich (1930: 360) states that neither does Maitreya mention Kṣīrasvāmin nor does Kṣīrasvāmin refer to Maitreya. Kali Charan Shastri (1947: 891) and Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946: [11]) do not mention Kṣīrasvāmin or the *Kṣīratarāṅginī* among the works cited by Maitreya. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 91-93), however, maintains that Maitreya rejects some opinions of Kṣīrasvāmin. He (⁴1984: 92-93) quotes some passages from the *Dhātupradīpa*, where Maitreya refers to the opinion of other grammarians (*eke, kecit, apare*). As these views are similar to those of Kṣīrasvāmin, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 93) concludes that Kṣīrasvāmin must have preceded Maitreya Rakṣita. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka's opinion was also adopted by Cardona (1976: 289). The *Dhātupradīpa* was commented upon at an early stage. The text of this commentary is now lost and its author remains unknown. Quotations from the *Dhātupradīpaṭīkā* are found in the *Ṭīkāsarvasva* (III.1.64), the *Durghaṭavṛtti* (on P.3.1.28, 5.4.119, 6.4.34) and Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādisūtravṛtti* (I.82).

¹²⁷ See K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 890).

¹²⁸ *vṛttinyāsaṃ samuddiśya kṛtavān granthavistaram | nāmnā tantrapradīpaṃ yo vivṛtās tena dhātavaḥ ||*. [Chakravarti (1919: 154)].

Who having explained the *Nyāsa* on the (*Kāśikā*)-*vṛtti*, elaborated a detailed gloss [on it] called *Tantrapradīpa*, this one commented upon the roots.

¹²⁹ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [11]) identifies this with the *Upādhyāyasarvasva* of Dāmodarasena. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [20]) supposes that the *Sarvasva* was a kind of etymological treatise. The text is lost now, but it was quoted by Bengali grammarians from Rakṣita downwards.

¹³⁰ K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 891) and D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [11]).

I.6.3 Other works

It seems probable to hold that Rakṣita also wrote a work called *Durghaṭa*, which is cited three times by Ujjvaladatta (*Uṇ.-vr̥tti* II.57, III.160, IV.1)¹³¹ and which is supposed to have served as a model for Śaraṇadeva's treatise.¹³²

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 426-7) attributes to Maitreya a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. He provides four quotations from Śiradeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* which are supposed to back up his hypothesis. The last of his examples is, as Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka himself admits, open to doubt, because the reading ascribed by Śiradeva to a *bhāṣyaṭīkā* is found in Kaiyaṭa's commentary.¹³³ The wording of the first example significantly differs from the edition of Abhyankar,¹³⁴ so finally there are two references left:

- on *paribhāṣā* 25: *etac ca 'sarvasya dve' ity (P.8.1.1) atra bhāṣyavyākhyānaṃ rakṣitenoktam* [Abhyankar (1967: 189)], and
- on *paribhāṣā* 33: *tatraitasmin bhāṣye rakṣitenoktam* [Abhyankar (1967: 201)].¹³⁵

The opinion of Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, although not improbable, remains an exception and, as far as I can see, has not been discussed yet.

I.6.4 Maitreyarakṣita

Maitreyarakṣita was an eminent grammarian, who was acquainted not only with Pāṇini's school, but also with the Kālāpa and the Cāndra systems, as he informs us in his *Dhātupradīpa*.¹³⁶ Like some others of the so-called Bengali grammarians,

¹³¹ Ujjvaladatta always uses the phrase *iti durghaṭe rakṣitaḥ*, so it is clear that he meant the *Durghaṭa* by Rakṣita.

¹³² D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [13]).

¹³³ See Śiradeva on *paribhāṣā* 92: *anye tv āhuḥ. halacor ādeśo na sthānivad iti. ata eva 'nāglopiśāsvr̥ditām' ity (P.7.4.2) atra rakṣitenoktam. halacor ādeśo na sthānivad iti. yadi hi syāt tadā sthūlādīnāṃ yaṇādīlope 'vādeśo vaktavyaḥ syāt. sthavyān iti. anye ca bahavo doṣā uktāḥ. tasmād dhalacor ādeśo na sthānivad iti. iha punar aglopigrahaṇasāmarthyāt samudāyalope 'py aglopīty āsrīyate. kevalāglope pratiśedhasyānarthakyād iti bhāṣyaṭīkāyāṃ nirūpitam.* [Abhyankar (1967: 250)]

¹³⁴ Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 427): *enac ca 'āto lopa iti ca' ity (P.6.4.64) 'tita ātmanepadānāṃ ṭer e' ity (P.4.3.79) atra ca bhāṣyavyākhyānaṃ rakṣitenoktam* and Abhyankar (1967: 170): *etac ca 'āto lopa iti ca' ity (P.6.4.64) 'tita ātmanepadānāṃ ṭer e' ity (P.4.3.79) atra ca bhāṣye vyākhyātam. rakṣitenoktam.* (Śiradeva on *paribhāṣā* 9). Contextually, the text as given by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka suits better, especially if we would emend it to *-vyākhyāne*.

¹³⁵ This is followed by a quotation, which thus stems from Rakṣita.

¹³⁶ *ākṣya bhāṣyajaladher atha dhātunāmapārāyaṇakṣapaṇapāṇiniśāstravedī | kalāpacāndramatatattvavibhāgadakṣo dhātupradīpam akaroj jagato hitāya ||* [Chakravarti (1919: 155-6)].

Having drawn [it] out of the ocean of the *Mahābhāṣya*, he, who knows the lists of roots and substantives as well as Kṣapaṇa (Jaina) and Pāṇini's instruction and who is acquainted with the difference of the true nature of the Kālāpa and the Cāndra systems, composed the *Dhātupradīpa* for the welfare of the world.

Maitreya was a Buddhist writer, which is evident from his homage to Mañjuḥoṣa in the introductory verse of the *Dhātupradīpa*.¹³⁷

Although the name Maitreyarakṣita ‘Protected by Maitreya’ fits in well with a Buddhist, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 200-201; 1946: [14]-[15]) proposes that Rakṣita was the name of the grammarian and Maitreya his title.¹³⁸ He presents two arguments. Firstly, he has found some manuscripts of the *Tantrapradīpa* with *maitreyaśrīrakṣita* in colophons and one manuscript of the *Dhātupradīpa* where the name of the author is read *śrīrakṣita*. Secondly, he refers to the opinion recorded by Adam, according to which Maitreyarakṣita was a native of the village of Majgaon in the Natore Thana of Rajshahi. This fits well with a tradition that Maitreyarakṣita belonged to the Maitreya family of Vārendra Brahmins.

S. K. De (1960b:¹³⁹ 24 fn. 113) found Bhattacharya’s arguments as stated in 1922 ‘unwarranted and hasty’ and pointed out that Maitreya is a modern cognomen. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946: [15]) showed in reply that the Maitreya family was known at least in the 15th century.

Maitreyarakṣita is usually dated 11th or the 12th century. Chakravarti (1913-16: [26]) proposed 1100 AD for him. Liebich (1930: 360) argued that Maitreyarakṣita must have lived later, because Puruṣottamadeva did not mention him. Liebich’s argument turned out to be false after the editions of Puruṣottama’s *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* and *Jñāpakasamuccaya* were published (1946). In both these treatises Maitreya is referred to. This fact and Maitreyarakṣita’s mention of Kaiyaṭa have made D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 200, 203) date the author of the *Tantrapradīpa* 1050-1100 AD. In his later work (1946: [13]-[14]) he alters this dating slightly to 1075-1125 on the grounds that Maitreya quoted from the *Rūpāvatāra*, where Haradatta is mentioned,¹⁴⁰ and Haradatta himself referred to the Bhāgavṛttikāra.¹⁴¹ Additionally, Bhattacharya (1946: [14]) supposes that Maitreya might have been referring to Bhojadeva under P.7.3.19.

K. Ch. Shastri (1947: 901-2) presents an argumentation similar to that of Bhattacharya (1922) and, consequently, places Maitreya in the period between the second half of the 11th century and the beginning of the 12th century.

¹³⁷ *mañjuḥoṣaprasādena dhātūnām vṛttim ārabhe |
bahuśo ‘mūn yathā bhīmaḥ proktavāms tadvad āgamāt ||* [Chakravarti (1919: 1)].

By the favour of Mañjuḥoṣa I begin an explanation of roots in the way Bhīma manifoldly taught them and according to the tradition.

¹³⁸ That his name must not be understood as a compound is also confirmed by Ujjvaladatta in *Uṇ.-vṛtti* I.38, who while explaining the word Maitreya, gives an example *maitreyo rakṣitaḥ*, which undoubtedly refers to the famous grammarian.

¹³⁹ First published in 1943 in the *History of Bengal* edited by R. C. Majumdar.

¹⁴⁰ See also Cardona (1976: 281).

¹⁴¹ See *Padamañjarī* under P.1.3.67; 2.1.16; 5.3.12; 6.1.9.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 427) admits that exact dating is impossible, but he suggests the period 1145-75 of Vikrama era for Maitreyarakṣita, which corresponds to 1088-1119 AD.¹⁴²

I.7 Puruṣottamadeva

The name Puruṣottamadeva or Puruṣottama appears many times in the history of Sanskrit and Prakrit literature. There are at least 27 works of various character ascribed to him. Needless to say, it is controversial whether all of these were composed by one person. Researchers disagree on this point. The most detailed survey of the works which Puruṣottama is supposed to have written as well as of the opinions of scholars on their authorship is given by Dash (1991: 44-54).

The writings ascribed to Puruṣottamadeva can be divided in five categories. These are works:

a) dealing with Sanskrit grammar: the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, the *Kāraḥakakra*, the *Prāṇapaṇā*, the *Gaṇavṛtti*, the *Daśabalakārikā*, the *Uṇādivṛtti*, the *Durghaṭa(-vṛtti)*, the *Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna*, the *Kāraḥakārikā*;¹⁴³

b) on Prakrit grammar: the *Prākṛtānuśāsana*;

c) lexicographic: the *Hārāvalī*, the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, the *Varṇadeśanā*, the *Dvirūpakośa*, the *Ekākṣarakośa* and the *Varṇābhīdhāna*;¹⁴⁴

d) literary: the *Chandomakhānta*,¹⁴⁵ the *Gopālārcaṇāvidhi*, the *Viṣṇubhaktikalpalatā*, verses mentioned in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, in the *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya* (= *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*) and in the *Padyāvalī*;¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² See also Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 536), where the dating 1083-1109 AD is adopted.

¹⁴³ The *Kāraḥakārikā* is mentioned only by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 430-31), who omits instead the *Daśabalakārikā*. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka and Mishra (1989: (2)) claim that Puruṣottama composed the *Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna*. The *Gaṇavṛtti* and the *Daśabalakārikā* are omitted by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [23]-[36]). Chakravarti (1918: [1]) ascribes to Puruṣottama the following grammatical treatises: the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, the *Daśabalakārikā* and the *Gaṇavṛtti*. Dash (1991: 44) takes no account of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, the *Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna* and the *Kāraḥakārikā*.

¹⁴⁴ The *Varṇābhīdhāna* is mentioned only by Chakravarti (1918: 1). S. K. De (²1960: 69 fn. 388) refers to other lexicographic treatises ascribed to Puruṣottama. These are: the *Uṣmabheda*, the *Jakārabheda* and the *Śabdabhedaprapāśa*.

¹⁴⁵ Dash (1991: 44-45) and S. R. Banerjee (1977: 44) give the title of the work as the *Chandomakhānti*. See also fn. 196.

¹⁴⁶ The *Viṣṇubhaktikalpalatā* is mentioned only by Chakravarti (1918: 1). The *Chandomakhānta* appears in the list of works ascribed to Puruṣottama in Dash (1991: 44-45), Sircar (1970: 108) and S. R. Banerjee (1977: 44). The *Gopālārcaṇāvidhi* is mentioned as attributed to Puruṣottama in Dash (1991: 44-45).

e) others: the *Raghuṭīkā* and a commentary on the *Mahābhārata*.¹⁴⁷

It cannot be definitively stated which works are by the same author.¹⁴⁸ Usually it is said that the grammatical treatises were composed by the same person. Some scholars (Nitti-Dolci, Abhyankar) identify the grammarian Puruṣottama with the lexicographer, others (Sircar) are inclined to attribute the literary writings also to the grammarian.¹⁴⁹

Since the present work concentrates on the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar, it is obvious that the grammarian Puruṣottama will form the main focus of attention. It does not mean that the other treatises will be completely left out of consideration, but their description is kept rather short.

I.7.1 The *Bhāṣāvṛtti*

The *Bhāṣāvṛtti* is certainly the most famous work of Puruṣottamadeva. Even in the 19th century it was the first grammatical treatise studied by Sanskrit students in the Rajshahi district of Bengal.¹⁵⁰

The *Bhāṣāvṛtti* is somewhat similar to the *Kāśīkā*, but, according to its title, it omits Vedic rules. The order of *sūtras* is the same as in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the comments are relatively easy and rich in illustrations. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [24]) counted as many as 475 poetical quotations in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Additionally, Puruṣottama cites opinions of other grammarians, e.g. Kaiyaṭa, Candragomin, Bhartṛhari and Śrutapāla. Apart from the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Kāśīkā*, the *Nyāsa* and the *Bhāgavṛtti*, he also consults such rarely mentioned works as the *Keśavavṛtti* and the *Māthurī Vṛtti*.

In the introductory verse Puruṣottamadeva pays homage to Buddha and informs us that he composed the commentary *Laghvī* dealing with *bhāṣā*.¹⁵¹ This second title of Puruṣottamadeva's treatise, i.e. *Laghvṛtti*, fits in with the fact that the work is brief and presents a lower course of Sanskrit grammar.

In the last stanza we read that anyone wishing to understand the final views of the *Kāśīkā* and the *Bhāgavṛtti* should consult the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.¹⁵² Thus it is clear that

¹⁴⁷ On the *Raghuṭīkā*, see Chintamani (1934: 378-79). The commentary on the *Mahābhārata* is mentioned by Abhyankar (1967: 28).

¹⁴⁸ S. R. Banerjee (1977: 44-45) notes that several persons with the name Puruṣottama lived in Eastern India at this time, which is also proved by inscriptions found in Bengal.

¹⁴⁹ For details, see Dash (1991: 44-54).

¹⁵⁰ See DiBona (1983: 82).

¹⁵¹ *namo buddhāya bhāṣāyāṃ yathātrimunilakṣaṇam |
puruṣottamadevena laghvī vṛttir vidhīyate ||*.

On the term *bhāṣā* see fn. 65.

¹⁵² *kāśīkābhāgavṛttyoś cet siddhāntaṃ boddhum asti dhī |*

Puruṣottamadeva based his commentary on these two works.

The enormous popularity of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* can be illustrated by the fact that it was repeatedly commented upon. The most famous and well-known commentary was written by Sṛṣṭidhara (see I.11.6) and is entitled the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*. It has received differing judgements from scholars. Chakravarti (1918: II) considers it ‘rather needlessly profuse and of little edification’. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [26]) is not so critical and regards the commentary as ‘on the whole illuminating’.

In any case, the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti* could be very important for the study of the history of Sanskrit grammar literature, as Sṛṣṭidhara provides many quotations from treatises which are now lost, e.g. from the *Anunyāsa*, the *Bhāgavṛtti*, the *Keśavavṛtti* and the *Upādhyāyasarvasva*. The long list of authorities cited by Sṛṣṭidhara is supplied by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946: [25]-[26]).

A very learned commentary called *Phakkikāvṛtti* was written by Sanātana Tarkācārya (see I.11.4). He discusses the views of previous commentators on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, but he does not mention their names. His opinions are not to be found in the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*, nor does Sṛṣṭidhara refer to Sanātana’s treatise.

Two other commentaries can be mentioned: the *Tattvārthasaṃdīpanī* of Ṣaṣṭhīdāsa Mīsrācārya, from which only the first three folios are preserved, and last but not least the *Bhāṣāvṛtti(vivarāṇa)pañjikā* of Viśvarūpa.

I.7.2 The *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*

The *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* by Puruṣottama is a short work on *paribhāṣās*, due to its conciseness known also as the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* (in contrast with the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Siiradeva). In the introductory verse Puruṣottama describes it as *Lalitā*.¹⁵³

The work contains 120 rules, but there is also the *Paribhāṣāpāṭha* by Puruṣottama, which has only 95 *paribhāṣās* given in quite a different order than in his *vṛtti*.¹⁵⁴

In his *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* Puruṣottama often quotes such authorities as the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*. Besides, he mentions the *Anunyāsakṛt* (three times),

tadā vicintyatām bhrātar bhāṣāvṛttir iyaṃ mama||

¹⁵³ *athāta paribhāṣāṇām vacanānām ca tādrśām |*
saṃkṣīpya lalitām vṛttiṃ prastauti puruṣottamaḥ||

According to Hāldār (1943-44: 377), *Lalitā* is the title of Puruṣottamadeva’s commentary.

¹⁵⁴ It is often stated that the order of the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* roughly follows the arrangement of rules in the *Vyādīyaparibhāṣāvṛtti*. See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [29]), Abhyankar (1967: 27) and Dash (1991: 98). This is true for about the first 30 *paribhāṣās*, but not for the whole of the text. Similarly, if we compare the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* with the *Vyādīyaparibhāṣāpāṭha* as given in Abhyankar (1967), the result will be much the same. Furthermore, there is no similarity of the arrangement of the *paribhāṣās* in the *Paribhāṣāpāṭha* either with the *Vyādīyaparibhāṣāvṛtti* or with the *Vyādīyaparibhāṣāpāṭha*.

Bhartṛhari (once), the Bhāgavṛttikṛt (once), Bhāguri (once), Mihira (once), Rakṣita (once) and Śrutapāla (twice).

Puruṣottama's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* seems not to be as popular as the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, perhaps because it was superseded by Śīradeva's work, which was based on it.

I.7.3 The *Jñāpakasamuccaya*

In the introductory verse of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, which (like the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*) does not contain any salutation to an *iṣṭadevatā*, Puruṣottama tells us that he wrote the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* after the composition of the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*.¹⁵⁵ The *Jñāpakasamuccaya* consists of circa 200 *jñāpyas*, some of which are identical or almost identical with *paribhāṣās*.¹⁵⁶ The *jñāpyas* are arranged according to the place where a pertinent *jñāpaka* appears in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Consequently, the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* is divided, like Pāṇini's treatise, into eight *adhyāyas* and each *adhyāya* into 4 *pādas*.

This work seems to be the first of its kind in the history of Sanskrit grammar and was much more popular than Puruṣottama's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*. It was cited in Subhūti-candra's commentary on the *Amarakośa*¹⁵⁷ and in the *Durghaṭāvṛtti* of Śaraṇadeva.¹⁵⁸

Just as in the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* here too Puruṣottama provides many citations from the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*. Among the works and authors quoted the following could be mentioned: the *Anunyanāsa* (once), the *Anunyanāsakṛt* (once), *Anupadakāra* (once), *Avalokopādhyāya* (once), *Indumitra* (twice), *Kaiyaṭa* (three times), the *Nairhurīvṛtti* (once), *Bhartṛhari* (once), the *Bhāgavṛtti* (once), *Rakṣita* (9 times), the *Rūpāvatāra* (once), Śāśadhara (once) and Puruṣottama's own *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (once).

¹⁵⁵ *yaś cakre paribhāṣāṇāṃ vṛttim vṛddhasuṣmatām |
puruṣottama ārebhe sa jñāpakasamuccayam ||*.

¹⁵⁶ For example, *PP* 23 (*saty api saṃbhavā bādhanam bhavati*), *PP* 63 (*vyavasthita vibhāṣayāpīha kāryāni kriyante*) and *PP* 76 (*ktalyuttumunkhalartheṣu vāsarūpavidhir nnāsti*) are identical respectively with *Jñ.S.* p. 92, 63 and 75; *PP* 84 (*anīyam āgamaśāsanam*) is very similar to *Jñ.S.* p. 75 (*āgamaśāsanasyānīyatā*).

¹⁵⁷ Strictly speaking, in the portion of the commentary which has been examined by Chintamani (1934), Subhūti mentions one *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, but he does not give the name of its author. However, since there is no evidence that at the time of Subhūti some other *Jñāpakasamuccaya* than that written by Puruṣottamadeva could have existed, it is highly probable that Subhūti had Puruṣottamadeva's treatise in mind.

¹⁵⁸ On P.2.1.12, 2.2.1, 2.4.53, 6.1.45, 8.4.55. In all these cases only the title *Jñāpakasamuccaya* is given and not the name of its author. See also fn. 157.

I.7.4 The *Kāarakacakra*

The *Kāarakacakra* is a short treatise on *kāarakas*. It begins with two introductory stanzas, the first of which includes a salutation to Buddha (Sarvajña), but in contrast to the above mentioned works of Puruṣottama the name of the author is missing.¹⁵⁹ Although the work bears the title *Kāarakacakra*, the author first describes declension triplets, starting with *prathamā* and ending with *saptamī*. Under some of *vibhaktis* he discusses *kāarakas*: under *dvitīyā*, *karman*; under *ṛtīyā*, *karṭṛ* and *karāṇa*, etc. After the treatment of *saptamī* some specific questions are dealt with.

The *Kāarakacakra* cites a large number of *kārikās*, whose source is very seldom given. Few authors and titles are mentioned by name; they are: Kajjaṭa (once), the *Nyāsa* (once), the *Nyāsakṛt* (twice), *Bhartṛhari* (once), the *Bhāṣya* (once), the *Bhāṣyakṛt* (twice), Maṇḍanamīśra (once) and the *Vṛttikāra* (twice).¹⁶⁰

The *Kāarakacakra* is referred to by name only by Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara in his *Kātantrapradīpa*.¹⁶¹

There is one interesting fact concerning the *Kāarakacakra*. As D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]) reports, the whole text of the *Kāarakacakra*, except for two introductory verses, is identical with the *Kāarakaparīkṣā* by Paśupati.¹⁶² The only difference (apart from minor variant readings) is that the work of Paśupati contains five more folios and continues from where the *Kāarakacakra* ends. Bhattacharya remarks that the name of Paśupati, although cited in the *Rasavatī*, is almost completely unknown in Sanskrit literature and the identification of the author of the *Kāarakaparīkṣā* with Paśupati mentioned by Jumarānandin is doubtful. He also thinks that it is either a rare case of ‘wholesale plagiarism’ or both authors borrowed from the same source. Regarding this second alternative, we must note that this would make a still rarer case of double plagiarism, as it would mean that both Puruṣottama and Paśupati had copied another treatise.

Two alternatives seem to me to be more cogent. The first one, i.e. that Paśupati ‘borrowed’ from Puruṣottama, is mentioned by D. Ch. Bhattacharya. It is open to doubt whether the original work of Puruṣottama contained the whole of the text as it is preserved in the *Kāarakaparīkṣā* or the end of the work was composed by Paśupati. In that

¹⁵⁹ *munim praṇamya sarvajñaṃ sarvajñānaprakāśakam |
bālānāṃ kathiyate 'rthāya mayā kāarakacakraṃ ||.*

¹⁶⁰ In the passage which D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 116) does not regard as belonging to the original *Kāarakacakra* Indumitra and Hariśarma are mentioned (each of them once).

¹⁶¹ See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]). Viśvarūpa quotes frequently from the *Kāarakacakra*, but at least in the part examined here he mentions neither the title of the work nor its author.

¹⁶² One manuscript of it is preserved in the collection of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. See Belvalkar (1938: 292-3).

case it is possible that Paśupati wanted to improve on the *Kāṛakacakra*. The second possibility would be that the work under discussion was actually written by Paśupati and was falsely attributed to Puruṣottama. It is worth noting that the fragment from the *Kātantrapradīpa* quoted by Bhattacharya mentions the name *Kāṛakacakra*, but not its author. It can be also added that it is not uncommon in the history of Sanskrit grammar for one work to be referred to by two or more different names (cf. Puruṣottama's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*). Further, as mentioned above, it is remarkable that the *Kāṛakacakra* does not contain the name of its author.

However, it must be clearly stated that in the present state of our knowledge it is difficult to decide in favour of either alternative.

I.7.5 Other grammatical works

Puruṣottama is credited with the authorship of many other grammatical texts. Most of those mentioned below, except for the *Daśabalakārikā* and the *Prākṛtānuśāsana*, are completely lost and their attribution to Puruṣottama is controversial.

I.7.5.1 The *Prāṇapaṇā*

Puruṣottama appears to have written a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya* called *Prāṇapaṇā*. This treatise is lost now, but the commentary on it, entitled *Bhāṣyavyākhyā-prapañca*, is still preserved. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 430) maintains that the *Prāṇapaṇā* was also commented upon by a Śāṅkara. However, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]) sees in Śāṅkara's work, from which only a short passage is extant, a commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*.¹⁶³ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]-[31]) also believes that the original text of Puruṣottama's treatise did not extend beyond the first *pāda*, so it could be his last work.

I.7.5.2 The *Durghaṭavṛtti*

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 526) and D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [28]) ascribe one *Durghaṭavṛtti* to Puruṣottama. This treatise is referred to by Sarvānanda in his *Tīkāsarvasva* on *Amarakośa* II.6.22:

puruṣottamadevena gurviṇīty asya durghaṭe 'sādhutvam uktam. tantrāntareṣu ca gurvīty eva pātho dṛśyate.

¹⁶³ Śāṅkara's text was commented upon by Maṇikaṅṭha in his *Prāṇipāṇīta*, a manuscript of which is extant. See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]) and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 430).

Puruṣottamadeva said in the *Durghaṭa* that the form *gurviṇī* is incorrect. And in other treatises only the reading *gurvī* is seen.

It is interesting to note here that Śaraṇadeva discusses the form *gurviṇī* on P.5.2.115 and holds it correct.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka also points out that many quotations in Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* which are attributed to Puruṣottama cannot be found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* and he suggests that they might belong to his lost *Durghaṭavṛtti*.

The thesis that Puruṣottama composed the *Durghaṭavṛtti* is backed up by the testimony of Subhūti, who wrote in his commentary on the *Amarakośa*:

uktam ca lakṣyalakṣaṇadurghaṭe puruṣottamenaiva [quotation as given in Chintamani (1934: 379)].

Thus it seems that the full title of Puruṣottama's work is *Lakṣyalakṣaṇadurghaṭa*.

I.7.5.3 The *Uṇādivṛtti*

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [28]) and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (21973: 208) are of the opinion that Puruṣottama wrote a commentary on the *Uṇādisūtra*. Both maintain that Ujjvaladatta and Sarvānanda quote from this lost work of Puruṣottama. It is indeed true that Ujjvaladatta and Sarvānanda cited opinions of Puruṣottama on some *Uṇādisūtras*, but they do not mention explicitly that these quotations come from Puruṣottama's *Uṇādivṛtti*. As far as I am aware, the only author who did it was Subhūti.¹⁶⁴

I.7.5.4 The *Gaṇavṛtti*¹⁶⁵

Chakravarti (1918: 1) was perhaps the first scholar to state that Puruṣottama composed a commentary on the *Gaṇapāṭha*. However, he has not supplied any details about this treatise or reasons which made him ascribe it to Puruṣottama. Nevertheless, this statement was repeated by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (21973: 157) and Dash (1991: 44-45). Also Abhyankar (1961: 236) and S. R. Banerjee mention the *Gaṇavṛtti* among treatises attributed to Puruṣottama.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Chintamani (1934: 378): *tandrīr vallarigolīś śaṣkulihalyāvalidhūliḥ iti govardhanapurūṣottamaṇādivṛttau*. Cf. also *Ṭikāsarvasva* on I.7.37: *tathā cāruṇadattaḥ – 'tandrīvallarīśālīśaṣkulihalyāvalir dhūliḥ'. 'sautras tandrīr anāgamah' iti govardhanaḥ* [Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1914: 164)].

¹⁶⁵ The *Gaṇavṛtti* has been by me, as by other authors, classified as the grammatical work, although it could be also a kind of lexicographic treatise.

I.7.5.5 The *Daśabalakārikā*

The *Daśabalakārikā* is a short treatise dealing with the roots which belong to more than one conjugation class. Abhyankar (1961: 183) says that the name of its author is unknown. Aufrecht (1891: 247) and Haraprasāda Shastri (1931: 181) attribute this work to Daśabala.¹⁶⁶ However, Chakravarti (1918: 1), S. R. Banerjee (1977: 44) and Dash (1991: 44-45) ascribe it to Puruṣottama, but they do not mention any grounds for their decision.

I.7.5.6 The *Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna*

As far as I can gather, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 430-1) and Mishra (1989: (2)) are the only scholars who ascribe to Puruṣottama a commentary on a treatise entitled *Kuṇḍalī*, which they take to be a work by Śrutapāla. In order to prove the existence of the *Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna* Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka quotes the fragment of Śaṅkara's commentary,¹⁶⁷ which he takes to be the commentary on the *Prāṇapaṇā*, while D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]) holds it for the commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. Furthermore, D. Ch. Bhattacharya's interpretation of the pertinent passage differs essentially from that of Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka and, consequently, Bhattacharya does not mention the *Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna* among the works attributed to Puruṣottama.¹⁶⁸

I.7.5.7 The *Kāarakakārikā*

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 431) mentions among the works composed by Puruṣottama a *Kāarakakārikā*, which he regards as different to the *Kāarakakakra*. He gives no details about the work, nor does he state where this work is referred to.

I.7.5.8 The *Prākṛtānuśāsana*

Puruṣottama, the author of the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* is regarded as belonging to the eastern Prakrit grammarians.¹⁶⁹ It is also usually accepted that the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* and the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* are the works of one and the same person (see I.7.6).

¹⁶⁶ Shastri adds also that the *Daśabalakārikā* belongs to the Jaumara school of grammar.

¹⁶⁷ For the text of Śaṅkara's commentary, see Appendix C.

¹⁶⁸ For D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [30]) *kuṇḍalī* means 'knot' and is not the name of a treatise. Thus, according to him, Puruṣottama comments on knotty passages and not on a work called *Kuṇḍalī*.

¹⁶⁹ Nitti-Dolci (1938b: 89) and Banerjee (1977: 42).

The *Prākṛtānuśāsana* is only preserved in one incomplete manuscript written in old Nevari script and dated 385 of the Nepal era, which corresponds to 1265 AD. This manuscript, beginning with the third chapter, has been edited by Nitti-Dolci (1938).

The *Prākṛtānuśāsana* gives a short description of several Prakrit dialects, among them also some minor ones such as Upanāgara, Kaikeya, Ṭakka, Vakkara, Kuntala, Pāṇḍi and Siṅghala.

I.7.6 The grammarian Puruṣottama

The first question we are confronted with is: Have all these grammatical works described above been written by one and the same person?

It is generally accepted by scholars that the treatises on Sanskrit grammar ascribed to Puruṣottama were written by the same person. The only exceptions are the *Daśabalakārikā* and the works whose existence has not been cogently proved, as in case of the *Kuṇḍalvīvyākhyāna* and the *Kāraḥakārikā*.

However, some controversies have arisen regarding the author of the *Prākṛtānuśāsana*. As Dash (1991: 46-49) notes, most scholars agree that the Prakrit grammar was composed by the author of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Nevertheless, S. R. Banerjee (1977: 43) speaks against this identification, although his arguments are not very strong. On the other hand, L. Nitti-Dolci (1938a: xxi) is inclined to identify the Prakrit grammarian not only with the Sanskrit one, but also with the lexicographer. She points out that the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* contains Prakrit words.

A cautious attitude has been adopted by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946: [23]), who assumes that the *Prākṛtānuśāsana* was written by Puruṣottama, the Sanskrit grammarian, but he adds also that we do not have any direct evidence to prove it.

Another problem that has attracted the attention of scholars is connected with Puruṣottama's creed. On the basis of the salutation to Buddha which is contained in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* Puruṣottama is said to be a Buddhist. The additional arguments are his illustrations of Pāṇini's rules found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*: *praṇamya śāstre sugatāya tāyine* (P.1.4.32), being a quotation from the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, *na doṣapṛati bauddha-darśane* (P.2.1.9), *bauddhīyaṃ matam* (P.4.2.114) etc.¹⁷⁰ However, Abhyankar (1967: 28-29) seems to doubt if Puruṣottama was actually a Buddhist. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [23]-[24] fn. I) points out a predilection of Puruṣottama for Śaivism, but it is

¹⁷⁰ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [23] fn. I), Chakravarti (1918: 7), Dash (1991: 64-65) and Zachariae (1933: 3).

doubtful whether the fact that such examples as *śaivīyam* and *śivaḥ pātuḥ* appear in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* is strong enough to prove this predilection.¹⁷¹ Another fact, mentioned by Bhattacharya, that all commentators of Puruṣottama considered him to be a Brahmanic writer says more about the religious attitude of these commentators than of Puruṣottama.

Let us also mention the opinion of Dash (1991: 65), according to which Puruṣottama was born as a Brahman, as shown by his title Deva, and he later converted to Buddhism.

In this work a much more important question than the one about the creed of Puruṣottama is the one concerning his place of birth and activity. Usually, it is said that Puruṣottama was a Bengali and the following facts are supplied as evidence.

- 1) All the commentators of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* came from Bengal.
- 2) King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal is said to have been a patron of Puruṣottama (see below).
- 3) Most of the manuscripts of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* have been found in Bengal.¹⁷²
- 4) The popularity of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* even in the 19th century in Bengal is confirmed in Adam's report.¹⁷³
- 5) Puruṣottama does not differentiate between *ba* and *va*.¹⁷⁴
- 6) He supplies as the illustration for P.2.2.24 the phrase *lekhako nāstidoṣakaḥ*, which is characteristic for Bengali scribes.¹⁷⁵
- 7) Several illustrations found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* show that its author was acquainted with and fond of Bengal.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷¹ Precisely speaking, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [23]-[24] fn. I) considers the author of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* a Buddhist 'by his profession' with the predilection for Śaivism.

¹⁷² Chakravarti (1918: 1-4) based his edition of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on 12 manuscripts, all of them in Bengali script. He also states that there are many other Bengali manuscripts giving the text of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* and its commentary by Sṛṣṭidhara, which he considers to be inferior to those he used. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [33] fn. I) notes that in contrast to a large number of Bengali manuscripts only three are found in Mithilā, one in Bombay and one in Madras.

¹⁷³ See DiBona (1983: 82).

¹⁷⁴ See *Bhv.* on the *śivasūtras*: *aś haś vaś jhaś jaś punar baś*.

¹⁷⁵ Chakravarti (1918: 8 fn. U) notes that Bengali scribes used to attach an apology *yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāstidoṣakaḥ* ('As seen, so written; the scribe is not guilty') to manuscripts they copied. The bahuvrīhi-compound *nāstidoṣaka* is somewhat unusual and it is explained in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.2.2.24 as follows: *lekhako nāstidoṣaka ity avyayābhyām astināstīśabdābhyām samāsaḥ*.

¹⁷⁶ He mentions Padmāvati (a river in North and East Bengal) in P.6.3.120. Cf. also such examples as: *vaṅgāḥ janapadaḥ* (P.1.2.51), *vaṅgā janapado ramaṅgīyaḥ* (P.1.2.52), *varendrīmagadham* (P.2.4.7) etc.

These are only some of the arguments mentioned in the course of the discussions about Puruṣottama.¹⁷⁷ A detailed presentation of facts speaking for the Bengali origin of the author of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* has been supplied by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [32]-[33]) and Dash (1991: 54-62).

However, it would be not correct not to mention the opposite opinion. S. K. De (²1960b: 67) considers Puruṣottama's affiliation to Bengal 'extremely problematic'; yet the same goes for his argumentation, which I think has been convincingly demonstrated by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [32] fn. I, [33] fn. I).¹⁷⁸

Concluding, we can remark that each of these pieces of evidence alone would not be sufficient to prove the Bengali origin of Puruṣottama, but taken together they make it almost certain that he was a Bengali.

The last question to be dealt with now is the date of Puruṣottama. Three facts are mentioned in this context. Firstly, Puruṣottama and his *Bhāṣāvṛtti* are cited in Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭāvṛtti*, which is dated 1173/74 AD. Secondly, Sarvānanda quotes the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* and opinions of Puruṣottama in his *Ṭikāsarvasva*.¹⁷⁹ Thirdly, Sṛṣṭidhara says in his commentary *Bhāṣāvṛtṭyarthavivṛti* that Puruṣottama composed the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on the bidding of king Lakṣmaṇasena.¹⁸⁰

Although it is controversial whether we can trust the opinion of Sṛṣṭidhara, many scholars have accepted it.¹⁸¹ Lakṣmaṇasena is believed to have come to the throne in circa 1179 AD.¹⁸² In that case we are forced to adopt the opinion of Chakravarti (1918: 9), who suggests that Lakṣmaṇasena might have asked Puruṣottama to compose a commentary on Pāṇini's *sūtras* while he still was a prince.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁷ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [32]) adds among other things the argument [32] that Puruṣottama quotes frequently from the *Nyāsa*, the *Anuṇyāsa* and Maitreya Rakṣita.

¹⁷⁸ S. K. De (²1960: 68) maintains that the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* 'had circulation in North Bengal and Mithilā' and was justly criticised for this statement by D. Ch. Bhattacharya, who reminds that only three manuscripts of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* has been reported from Mithilā. See fn. 172.

¹⁷⁹ The *Ṭikāsarvasva* is usually dated 1159/60 AD. However, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [36]) places it in the last quarter of the 12th century. See fn. 121.

¹⁸⁰ Chakravarti (1918: 5 fn. N).

¹⁸¹ See Chakravarti (1918: 5), Abhyankar (1967: 29), Shastri (1972: 222), Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 429), D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [32]), Dash (1991: 55).

¹⁸² Different dates have been proposed for the beginning of Lakṣmaṇasena's reign. Chakravarti (1918: 8) assumes 1169 AD for his accession, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [34]) 1170-78 AD, Dash (1991: 66) 1179 AD. On the other hand, Renou (1940: 31) adopted the date 1119 AD. The date accepted here, although mentioned also by Dash, is taken chiefly on the authority of Majumdar (1971: 231), who (p. 241-48) presents a survey of different opinions about the chronology of Sena rulers.

¹⁸³ The statement of Sṛṣṭidhara raises another question. Why was Puruṣottama not included in the list of 'five jewels' of Lakṣmaṇasena given in the famous couplet (see fn. 118). Chakravarti (1918: 7-8) suggests that Puruṣottama's extremely strong devotion to Buddhism could have been the reason for omitting his name. To be sure, Śaraṇadeva was also a Buddhist, but, according to Chakravarti, not so ardent as Puruṣottama. It is needless to say that this is only a hypothesis and a very controversial one at that. Much more probable is another explanation – for which I am

Thanks to the testimony of Śaraṇadeva, there are no great differences between Puruṣottama's dates as proposed by various scholars. Chakravarti (1918: 5, 8-9) sets the date of the composition of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* to the period 1169-1172 AD, if we accept the identity of Śaraṇadeva, the author of the *Durghaṭavṛtti* with Śaraṇa mentioned as one of 'five jewels' of king Lakṣmaṇasena,¹⁸⁴ or at circa 1150 AD in the other case. K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 222) places Puruṣottama after Maitreya and before Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 203) and Dash (1991: 67) propose the period 1100-1150 AD for him. According to Bhattacharya (1946: [34]) the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* was composed about 1140 AD. Nitti-Dolci (1938a: xxi) dates Puruṣottama in the period between the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 429) places the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* before 1159/60 AD.¹⁸⁵

I.7.7 The lexicographer Puruṣottama

Six lexicographic works are attributed to Puruṣottama.

The *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* is a supplement to the *Amarakośa*, whose division it generally follows. It contains a collection of uncommon words, among them a large number of Buddhist and Prakrit terms.¹⁸⁶

The *Hārāvalī* is a small treatise, comprising ca. 280 verses and divided into two parts: one dealing with synonyms and another one with homonyms. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [23] fn. I) thinks that unlike the author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, whom he considers to be a Buddhist, the author of the *Hārāvalī* was a Śaiva.

Other lexicographic works of Puruṣottama are very short. The *Ekākṣarakośa*, which as the title suggests treats monosyllabic vocables, numbers less than 40 *ślokas*.¹⁸⁷ The *Dvirūpakośa* contains 75 *ślokas* and deals with words spelt in two ways. The *Varṇadeśanā* is a treatise on orthographical variations and, according to D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [24] fn. I), might be the work of a grammarian.

The sixth work called *Varṇābhidhāna* is very controversial. As far as I can gather, it is mentioned only by Chakravarti (1918: 5), but he fails to say what has made him

indebted to Prof. Dr. A. Aklujkar – that Puruṣottama might not have been at the court, because he was already a respectable scholar to be asked by Lakṣmaṇasena as a prince.

¹⁸⁴ See fn. 118.

¹⁸⁵ Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka regards 1159/60 AD as the date of the *Ṭikāsarvasva*'s composition. For the controversies arising concerning this date, see fn. 121.

¹⁸⁶ Vogel (1979: 332) and Nitti-Dolci (1938a: xxi).

¹⁸⁷ S. K. De (²1960: 69 fn. 388) notes that one of manuscripts gives the full name of the author of the *Ekākṣarakośa* as Puruṣottamadevaśarman.

ascribe it to Puruṣottama. According to Aufrecht (1891: 553), the *Vaṛṇābhīdhāna* is 'a glossary of monosyllables' composed by Nandana Bhaṭṭa.¹⁸⁸

There are different opinions as to the date and the place of activity of the lexicographer Puruṣottama. Vogel (1979: 331-2) refers to views of other scholars according to whom this Puruṣottama was a descendant of Lakṣmaṇasena's minister Halāyudha or a kṣatriya of Orissa or the king of Kalinga living in the 15th century at Cuttack. He himself maintains that Puruṣottama was a Bengali and a Buddhist. Moreover, he (p. 331) identifies him with the grammarian. As Hemacandra does not refer to Puruṣottama, nor he to Hemacandra, Vogel (1979: 331) dates Puruṣottama in the first half of the 12th century.

Similarly L. Nitti-Dolci (1938a: xxi) identifies the grammarian Puruṣottama with the author of the lexicographical treatises and dates him in the period between the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century.

Dash (1987; 1991: 43, 50-54) suggests that the lexicographer Puruṣottama belonged to the South of Orissa. This opinion is based on geographical data found in the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*.

I.7.8 The poet Puruṣottama

It is very difficult to state anything definitive about the poet Puruṣottama. His verses are mentioned in the anthology *Subhāṣitaratnakośa*¹⁸⁹ of the Buddhist Vidyākara,¹⁹⁰ belonging to the 11th-12th century.¹⁹¹ Also Śrīdharadāsa, the author of the *Saduktikarṇāmrta*, which was composed in 1205 AD,¹⁹² included in his work verses of Puruṣottamadeva.¹⁹³ These two anthologies were compiled in Bengal, so it could be possible that they referred to the same poet. Puruṣottamadeva, whose stanzas are quoted in Rūpa Gosvāmin's *Padyāvalī*, seems to be another personage, since some manuscripts give the full name of the author as Gajapati Puruṣottamadeva. He is said to have belonged to the dynasty of Orissa's rulers and can be dated in the second half of the 15th century.¹⁹⁴

¹⁸⁸ Similar also in Eggeling (1889: 297-8) and R. Mitra (1874: 23-24).

¹⁸⁹ It is also known under the wrongly conjectured title *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya*. See D. D. Kosambi in the introduction to Kosambi and Gokhale (1957), p. XIII.

¹⁹⁰ Three verses are attributed to Puruṣottamadeva and two to Puruṣottama.

¹⁹¹ Lienhard (1984: 87) and D. D. Kosambi in the introduction to Kosambi and Gokhale (1957), p. XXXI.

¹⁹² Lienhard (1984: 87), Sternbach (1974: 16).

¹⁹³ One verse (1581 in Banerji's edition) is attributed to Puruṣottama and six to Puruṣottamadeva.

¹⁹⁴ S. K. De (1990: 211).

The fourth literary work ascribed to Puruṣottama, i.e. the *Viṣṇukalpalatā*, is according to Sternbach (1974: 72 fn. 351) a lyric poem.¹⁹⁵

As far as I can gather, the *Gopālārcanāvidhi* is mentioned only by Dash (1991: 44-45) and the *Chandomakhānta* appears among the works ascribed to Puruṣottama in Dash (1991: 44-45), Sircar (1970: 108) and S. R. Banerjee (1977: 44). None of these scholars gives any details about these works.¹⁹⁶

I.8 Śaraṇadeva

Śaraṇadeva, like Śiradeva and Ujjvaladatta, is famous as an author of only one treatise, but this has gained enormous popularity. His *Durghaṭavṛtti* was not the first work of this kind in the history of Sanskrit grammar literature. Before him Maitreyarakṣita and Puruṣottamadeva had written similar treatises, but their *Durghaṭavṛttis* are lost now, probably because Śaraṇadeva's composition has eclipsed them.

I.8.1 The *Durghaṭavṛtti*

Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* is in every respect a remarkable book. It is not a full commentary on Pāṇini's work, but, first of all, an explanation of difficult and seemingly incorrect words. Thus only approximately 500 rules, arranged as in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, are dealt with there. Vedic rules are almost completely ignored;¹⁹⁷ therefore, the second *pāda* of the sixth *adhyāya* is entirely omitted.

Sometimes Śaraṇadeva gives a short explanation of a *sūtra*, but most of all he starts his commentary with a question about a word¹⁹⁸ that seems to contradict a treated rule. In the course of the discussion, led in the form of a fictive dialogue, opinions of other grammarians are abundantly quoted. Especially frequently Śaraṇadeva refers to Maitreyarakṣita (120 times), the *Nyāsa* (69 times), *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (44 times), *Mahābhāṣya* (43 times), *Bhāṣavṛtti* (33 times) and the *Anunyāsa* (22 times).¹⁹⁹ From lexicographic sources he used among others the *Amarakośa*, *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, *Viśvaprakāśa*

¹⁹⁵ According to Sternbach (1974: 72 fn. 351), it was edited in the *Kavyamālā Series* 31 (Bombay 1886-1913). Chakravarti (1918: 1) classifies the *Viṣṇukalpalatā* as a ritual work.

¹⁹⁶ Both these works are enumerated in *NCC*: the *Gopālārcanavidhi* from *Āgamakalpataru* of Puruṣottamadeva of Puri, in *NCC* 6, p. 155, and the *Chandomakhānta* by Puruṣottama Bhaṭṭa, in *NCC* 7, p. 103.

¹⁹⁷ Renou (1940: 52).

¹⁹⁸ I do not differentiate here between various interpretations of the term 'word'. Therefore, 'word' is here understood as the word-form (inflectional form) as well as the base-form (citation-form).

¹⁹⁹ The statistical data as given in Renou (1940: 58). Renou notes that many quotations from the *Mahābhāṣya* cannot be found in the present text of Patañjali's work.

and the *Kāmadhenu*. The seemingly incorrect words come often from literary works such as the *Bhṛṅgikāvya*, *Śiśupālavadha*, *Kumārasambhava*, *Raghuvamśa*, *Meghadūta* etc.²⁰⁰ Besides, Śaraṇadeva mentions works whose titles are unknown to us. These are: the *Śuddhasubanta*, the *Prasiddhapada*, the *Suvarṇarekhā*, the *Prayogamukha*, the *Aṣṭadhātu* and the *Kalpapañcikā*.²⁰¹

The present form of the *Durghaṭavṛtti* was not written by Śaraṇadeva, but, as remarked in the introductory verses of the work, by one Sarvarakṣita,²⁰² whose opinion is also quoted on P.1.3.40.

I.8.2 Śaraṇadeva

In the introductory verse of the *Durghaṭavṛtti* Śaraṇadeva pays homage to Buddha (Sarvajña).²⁰³ He quotes from the *Buddhacarita* of Aśvaghoṣa, *Jātakamālā* X,31 and notes that the irregular forms *mālyavarebhir gandhavarebhiḥ* are *bauddhaprayoga* (on P.7.1.9).²⁰⁴ These facts, most strongly the salutation to Buddha, point out that Śaraṇadeva was a Buddhist. As far as I can gather, this opinion is shared by all scholars.²⁰⁵

Śaraṇadeva is usually said to have belonged to Bengal. There are two arguments set forth in this context. Firstly, Śaraṇadeva quotes frequently from grammatical works of Bengali authors. Secondly, he is identified by some scholars as being the poet Śaraṇa mentioned in the famous couplet about the ‘five jewels’ of king Lakṣmaṇasena (see fn. 118) and in *Gītagovinda* I.4.²⁰⁶ The poet Śaraṇa lived during the reign of the

²⁰⁰ Renou (1940: 70-74).

²⁰¹ See Renou (1940: 60).

²⁰² *vākyaḥ charaṇadevasya cchātrāvagrahapīdayā | śrīsarvarakṣitenaiṣā saṃkṣīpya pratisaṃskṛtā ||* [3rd introductory verse].

With pain [caused by] obstacles of pupils [in understanding grammar], Sarvarakṣita abbreviated and revised this [*Durghaṭavṛtti*] at Śaraṇadeva’s bidding.

²⁰³ *natvā śaraṇadevena sarvajñaṃ jñānahetave | bṛhadbhaṭṭajanāmbhojakośavikāśabhāsvate ||* [first introductory verse; see also fn. 210].

²⁰⁴ Zachariae (1933: 6, 12-14). Renou (1940: 49) notes that quotations from Buddhist literature are numerous and typical for the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but he (p. 72-3) has given no more examples than Zachariae. See also Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 527-8).

²⁰⁵ For example, by Renou (1940: 49), K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 225) and Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 527-8).

²⁰⁶ *śaraṇaḥ ślāghyo durūhadrute*. In Kulkarni’s edition it is a part of I.3 and it has *-druteḥ* instead of *-drute*. There have been many translations of this passage (with the reading *-drute*), but none of them has been generally accepted. Chakravarti (1918: 7) paraphrases it as: ‘Śaraṇa is praiseworthy in dealing with (liquefying) the stiff’, Pischel (1893: 29) suggests that Śaraṇa was ‘rühmenswert in der schwerverständlichen Schnelldichtung’. According to Stoler Miller (1977: 69) ‘Śaraṇa is renowned for his subtle flowing sounds’. The identification of Śaraṇa and Śaraṇadeva is accepted by Chakravarti (1918: 7) and Renou (1940: 48-9). For the whole text of *Gītagovinda* I.4, see fn. 118.

famous king Lakṣmaṇasena, who was his patron. Śaraṇa's verses are found in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*²⁰⁷ and the *Padyāvalī*.²⁰⁸

Śaraṇadeva belongs to those few Indian authors whose precise date is known. He said in the introductory verse of the *Durghaṭavṛtti* that he had composed it in the year 1095 of the Śaka era,²⁰⁹ which corresponds to 1173/74 AD.²¹⁰

I.9 Sīradeva

Sīradeva is known as the author of only one work, a commentary on *paribhāṣās*, but his treatise has gained enormous popularity all over India. It is said that Sīradeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* was superseded only by Nagojī's *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*.²¹¹

I.9.1 The *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*

Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* contains 130 *paribhāṣās*,²¹² which are arranged according to the order in which they appear in the *Mahābhāṣya*. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [29]) supposes that this was inspired by Puruṣottama's *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. It is difficult to prove this claim, but it is certain that Sīradeva not only knew works of Puruṣottama, but he also frequently borrowed from them.²¹³ Though Sīradeva names Puruṣottama only four times, he comments on almost all the *paribhāṣās* which are discussed in the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* and he includes some *jñāpyas* of Puruṣottama.²¹⁴

As the title of the treatise suggests, the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* is an extensive and very learned commentary. Sīradeva discusses the opinions of other grammarians and quotes very frequently from the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Nyāsa*, and Maitreyarakṣita, to whom he

²⁰⁷ In the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* 16 verses are ascribed to Śaraṇa, three to Śaraṇadeva and one to Cirantanaśaraṇa.

²⁰⁸ See *Padyāvalī* 168, 235, 262, 265, 369 and 370. Two of these (369-370) are identical with verses found in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (302-3 = I.61.2-3).

²⁰⁹ *śakamahāpativatsaramāne ekanabhonavapañcavitāne | durghaṭavṛttir akāri mude vaḥ kaṭhāvibhūṣaṇahāralateva ||* [2nd introductory verse].

²¹⁰ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [21]) thinks that Śaraṇadeva lived in the village Bṛhadbhaṭṭa. He reads the phrase *bṛhadbhaṭṭajanāmbhojakośavīkāsabhāsvate* from the first introductory verse (see fn. 203) with *-bhāsvatā* at the end and refers it to Śaraṇadeva and not to Buddha. Cf. Renou's translation of the first introductory verse: 'Śaraṇadeva, après avoir rendu hommage à l'Omnicient, en vue de la Connaissance qui brille de l'éclat d'un calice de lotus sur les êtres dont il est le haut Seigneur'.

²¹¹ Abhyankar (1967: 30) and D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 205-6).

²¹² According to Abhyankar's edition. K. Ch. Shastri (1957: 103) remarks that the edition of the Benares Sanskrit Series contains 132 rules.

²¹³ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [29]).

²¹⁴ For example, it is the case with *paribhāṣā* 27, 61, 89 and 94.

refers as Maitreya or Rakṣita. Besides, Sīradeva cites views expressed in the *Bhāgavṛtti* and the *Anunyāsa*.

The popularity of the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* is confirmed by the many commentaries written on it. The most popular commentary was written by Śrīmānaśarman (see I.11.5) and bears the title *Vijayā*. This very short treatise was edited by Abhyankar (1967: 274-92). The remaining commentaries are extant only in manuscripts. Apart from the *Vijayā*, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 291-2) mentions four works: a commentary by Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita, which he dates circa 1687/8 AD, and three anonymous commentaries: the *Paribhāṣāvivarāṇa*, written in 1527/8 AD, and two treatises whose manuscripts have been found in Madras: the *Paribhāṣāvṛttisaṃgraha* and the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*.

I.9.2 Sīradeva

Sīradeva does not divulge any information about himself. Therefore, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 289) states that it is impossible to say anything definite about Sīradeva's place of activity. However, the fact that Sīradeva so frequently quotes from the *Kāśikā*, *Nyāsa*, *Anunyāsa*, *Bhāgavṛtti* and the works of Maitreyarākṣita and that he knew Puruṣottama's treatises very well suggests that he came from Bengal or, at least, that he lived there. The former possibility is assumed by D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [21]) and K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 226).

It is also difficult to determine Sīradeva's lifetime. There are only two clues which can aid us in this question. Firstly, Sīradeva quotes Puruṣottamadeva, so he must have followed him. Secondly, he is himself cited by Sāyaṇa in his *Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*,²¹⁵ which is usually placed in the 14th century.²¹⁶ On these grounds Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 289-90) cautiously states that Sīradeva can be placed between 1143 and 1344 AD. Similarly K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 232) assigns him to the period between 1200 and 1350 AD. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 205) dates him 13th century. Abhyankar (1967: 30) considers him to belong to the second half of the 12th century.

²¹⁵ For example, in *M.Dhv.* under the root *kṛt* (10.102).

²¹⁶ Cardona (1976: 289). Dwarikadas Shastri (1964: 15) maintains that Sāyaṇa's work was written between 1355 and 1364 AD. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 103) dates Sāyaṇa to the period 1315-1388 AD. Kulke (1985: 127-32) differentiates between Mādhava, a minister of the early rulers of Vijayanagara, and the scholar Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya, who might have been a minister of the kings Bukka I and Saṅgama II. According to Kulke the earliest inscription which mentions Vidyāraṇya can be dated 1375 AD. In the following years his name is mentioned several times and he is said to have passed away in 1386 AD. If we accept that, it seems highly probable that the literary activity of brothers Mādhava(-Vidyāraṇya) and Sāyaṇa took place in the second half of the 14th century.

I.10 Ujjvaladatta

Ujjvaladatta is the author of an eminent commentary on the *Uṇādisūtra*. His treatise attained pan-Indian popularity and made the works of his predecessors fade into oblivion.

I.10.1 The *Uṇādivṛtti*

Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādivṛtti* is a commentary on the *pañcapādī* version of the *Uṇādisūtra*. Ujjvaladatta begins his work with a salutation to Gaṇeśa and gives a list of the works he used writing his treatise. He informs us that many *vṛttis* on the *Uṇādisūtra* had been written before him, but they all went into decline and were corrupt by then. However, he examined them thoroughly and included their quintessence in his own commentary.²¹⁷

Ujjvaladatta consulted not only previous *Uṇādivṛttis*, but also other grammatical works. He frequently quotes the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Nyāsa* and the *Bhāgavṛtti* and gives opinions of Maitreyarākṣita, Puruṣottama as well as Candra. He refers, although not so often, to the *Anunyāsa* and Govardhana. In addition to what is to be expected in this kind of treatise, he frequently cites lexicographic literature, first of all the *Amarakośa*, quotations of which are to be found on almost every page of Ujjvaladatta's work. To illustrate the *sūtras* he supplies many literary citations, for example from the *Raghuvamśa*, the *Kumārasambhava* and the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* to mention only some of them.

I.10.2 Ujjvaladatta

Like so many Indian authors, Ujjvaladatta did not leave any information about himself. Colophons at the end of the first three *pādas* suggest that he was also called Jājali.²¹⁸ Two facts point out that he must have come from Bengal or at least from

²¹⁷ *uṇādivṛttayo 'nekā bhūribhiḥ sūribhiḥ kṛtāḥ |*
tās tv idānīm viparyastāḥ sūtraśabdārthadhātavaḥ ||4||.
tā evātha samālocya granthān anyāmś ca vistarāt |
sarvataḥ saram ākṛṣya mayā vṛttir viracyate ||5||.

Numerous commentaries on *uṇādi[-sūtras]*, which were written by many learned men, have nowadays become erroneous, i.e. [wording of] *sūtras*, meaning of words and [form of] roots [in them are incorrect]. Having thoroughly examined these and other works, and drawing out of them all the essence, I compose [my own] commentary.

²¹⁸ For example: *iti mahopādhyāyajājalītyaparanāmadheyaśrīmadujjvaladattaviracitāyām uṇādivṛttau prathamah pādaḥ.*

the eastern part of India. Firstly, like Puruṣottamadeva, Ujjvaladatta had difficulty with differentiating between *va* and *ba*, which is seen in his *vṛtti* on *Uṇ.* I.19: *valer guk ca* (*Uṇ.-vṛtti* I.20). Ujjvaladatta cites here the root *vala prāṇane*. However, the *Dhātupāṭha* contains only one root *vala* and this is *vala samvarane* (*Dhp.* 1.520), given e.g. in the *Siddhāntakaumudī* on *Uṇ.* I.19. Instead, there are three *dhātus bala* and one of them is *Dhp.* 10.85: *bala prāṇane*.²¹⁹ It is obvious that Ujjvaladatta had this root in mind while explaining the form *valgu*.

Secondly, in the introductory verses of the *Uṇādivṛtti* Ujjvaladatta mentions authors and works he consulted. These are: the *Nyāsa*, the *Anun्यāsa*, the *Bhāgavṛtti*, the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Dhātupradīpa*, the *Dhātupradīpaṭikā*, the *Varṇadeśanā*, the *Upādhyāyasarvasva* as well as Rakṣita and Subhūti.²²⁰ This list of authorities has been for D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [20]) the crucial argument speaking in favour of the Bengali origin of Ujjvaladatta.

The lifetime of Ujjvaladatta is uncertain. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 20) places him in the period between the last quarter of the 12th and first quarter of the 13th century, but he does not supply any evidence for this dating. K. Ch. Shastri (1972: 239) dates Ujjvaladatta 14th century. He does it on the grounds of two facts: Ujjvaladatta quotes from Maheśvara's *Viśvaprakāśa*²²¹ written in 1111/12 AD²²² and is himself cited by Rāyamukūṭa,²²³ whose date, according to Shastri, is 1431 AD.²²⁴

A very controversial date has been proposed by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (²1973: 212), who claims that the *Uṇādivṛtti* was composed in circa 1143/44 AD. He (p. 209-212) provides four arguments. Firstly, Ujjvaladatta is quoted by Sāyaṇa in his *Mādhavīyā*

²¹⁹ Cf. also *Dhp.* 1.893: *bala prāṇane dhānyāvarodhe ca*.

²²⁰ *vṛttiṃ nyāsam anun्यāsaṃ rakṣitaṃ bhāgavṛttikām |*
bhāṣyaṃ dhātupradīpaṃ ca tattikām varṇadeśanām ||2||
upādhyāyasya sarvasvaṃ subhūtiṃ somanandinam |
kaliṅgahaṭṭacandrādīn samikṣyaiṣā kṛtir mama ||3||.

²²¹ For example in *Uṇ.-vṛtti* I.7, 39, 52, 69 to mention some of them. Quotations from the *Viśvaprakāśa*, often abbreviated as *Viśva*, are numerous.

²²² Vogel (1979: 329).

²²³ See *Padacandrikā* I.231, 239 and II.15 (numeration as given by K. K. Dutta).

²²⁴ This exact date of Rāyamukūṭa's *Padacandrikā* is widely accepted by scholars. In the *Padacandrikā* I.124 Rāyamukūṭa describes the traditional way of calculating time and then states: *idānīm ca śakābdāḥ 1353 dvātriṃśadabdādhikapañcaśatottaratatuḥ sahasravarṣāṇi kalisandhyāyā bhūtāni (4532). tathā ca gaṇitacūḍāmaṇau mahintāpanīyarājapaṇḍitaśrīnivāsaḥ kalisandhyāyāḥ khasamaya-karaktavarṣāṇi bhūtāni 4260*. This is usually interpreted in such a way that the year 1353 of Śaka era, corresponding to 4532 Kaliyuga, refers to the time when Rāyamukūṭa composed the *Padacandrikā*. As an authority the opinion of Śrīnivāsa is quoted. K. K. Dutta (1966-78: I 157 fn. 464) considers the year 4260 to be the date of Śrīnivāsa's treatise (see also fn. 121). D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1941: 456, 467-8) disagrees with this date for the *Padacandrikā* and regards the year 1353 of Śaka era to be an incidental mention of the date, which is according to him 'the record of an important event witnessed by the author' or a borrowing from another author. Bhattacharya (p. 468) himself proposes the date 1474 AD for the composition of the *Padacandrikā*. His hypothesis, based on colophons of few manuscripts, has justly caused vehement discussion among scholars, details of which are presented by K. K. Dutta (1966-78: III (27)(30)).

Dhātuvṛtti,²²⁵ which is usually dated middle of the 14th century (see fn. 216). Secondly, he cites the opinion of the Medinīkāra, whom Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka places before 1093 AD.²²⁶ This is, however, uncertain. Vogel (1979: 347) proposes dating the Medinīkāra between 1200 and 1275 AD.²²⁷ Thirdly, Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka identifies the quotation found in the *Puruṣakāra* on *Daiva* 21 with the *Uṇādivṛtti* on *Uṇ.* II.25.²²⁸ Fourthly, he identifies a citation in the *Ṭīkāsarvasva* on II.10.19 with Ujjvaladatta's commentary on *Uṇ.* I.117 (*Uṇ.-vṛtti* I.116).²²⁹ Thus, according to Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, Ujjvaladatta is to be put between the Medinīkāra on one side and Sarvānanda and Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka on the other. However, this argumentation suffers from some faults. As stated above, the dating of the Medinīkāra proposed by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka is controversial. Furthermore, his two last arguments cannot be regarded as completely convincing. It is true that the similarities between the passages from the *Puruṣakāra* in the first case and the *Ṭīkāsarvasva* in the second one and the pertinent fragments from the *Uṇādivṛtti* are striking, but we cannot forget that Ujjvaladatta used previous commentaries on the *Uṇādisūtras* in his work, so it is possible that Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka and Sarvānanda quoted predecessors of Ujjvaladatta. And last but not least, the dates of Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka and Sarvānanda are not certain. Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1905: v-vi) states that the date of Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka is impossible to determine and he suggests roughly the 13th century for him. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka himself assigns Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka to the long period between 1168 and 1294 AD. As far as Sarvānanda is concerned, many scholars believe that the *Ṭīkāsarvasva* was written in 1159/60 AD. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [34]-[36]) points out that this dating is based on a misunderstanding and proposes the last quarter of the 12th century for Sarvānanda.²³⁰

To recapitulate, if we take the dates of Puruṣottama and the Medinīkāra as the upper limit for Ujjvaladatta and the date of Sāyaṇa as the lower limit, it seems plausible to place Ujjvaladatta somewhere in the 13th century.

²²⁵ Cf. *M.Dhv.* on the root *vṛñ varṇe* (*Dhp.* 5.8).

²²⁶ The most important reason which has made Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1973: 210-11) propose this date is the fact that the *Medinī* is mentioned and cited in Mallinātha's commentary on the *Śisūpālavadha* and in the *Mañkhatīkā*. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka dates Mallinātha approximately 1093 AD, which is very controversial, as the date usually ascribed to him is the 14th century (see, for example, Lienhard 1984: 118). Mañkha is universally placed in the first half of the 12th century, but in the opinion of Vogel (1979: 347 fn. 177) the pertinent quotation is interpolated.

²²⁷ The reason for settling this date is, among other things, the fact that the Medinīkāra refers in the colophon to the *Viśvaparakāśa*.

²²⁸ Cf. *Puruṣakāra* about a root *śu* (*uṇādivṛttau tu sautro 'yaṃ dhātuḥ*) and *Uṇ.-vṛtti* II.25 (*śu gatāv iti sautraḥ*).

²²⁹ Cf. *Ṭīkāsarvasva* on II.10.19 (*prajñādyani cāṇḍāla ity uṇādivṛttih*) and *Uṇ.-vṛtti* I.116 (*prajñāditvād aṇi cāṇḍāla ity api*). Jibananda Vidyasagara has *prajñādivād* for *prajñāditvāt*, probably just a misprint.

²³⁰ See fn. 121.

I.11 Other scholars

It seems that Ujjvaladatta was the last eminent Bengali grammarian. Though a lot of scholars were active in the field of grammar after Ujjvaladatta, none of them gained great popularity. However, it would be unjust to deprecate their efforts. Their works are typical for the scholastic period and the large number of grammatical commentaries, especially on the *Nyāsa*, written during this time shows the lively interest of Bengalis in Sanskrit grammar.

Since almost all the scholars mentioned below lived approximately in the same period, they are discussed in this chapter in alphabetical instead of chronological order.

I.11.1 Nandanamiśra

Nandanamiśra wrote two commentaries: one on the *Nyāsa*, called *Nyāsoddīpana*, and another one on the *Tantrapradīpa*, entitled *Tantrapradīpodyotana*. According to Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946: [18]), incomplete manuscripts of both these treatises are still available.

Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (⁴1984: 567) ascribes to Nandanamiśra only the *Nyāsoddīpana*, but this statement is based on the misunderstanding of Bhattacharya's words.

The date of Nandana is difficult to settle, but D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [18][19]) proposes the 15th century for him.

I.11.2 Narapati Mahāmiśra

Narapati Mahāmiśra is an author of a commentary on the *Nyāsa*, called *Nyāsaprakāśa*, fragments of which are preserved in manuscripts. According to D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [16]), Narapati Mahāmiśra belonged to the Lahiri family and his son was none other than Pragalbhācārya, the celebrated scholar of *navyanyāya*.²³¹

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [16]) dates Narapati Mahāmiśra in the first half of the 15th century.

²³¹ Pragalbha has been usually taken as belonging to Mithilā. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [16]) argues that he was a Bengali and this was accepted by B. K. Matilal (1977: 108).

I.11.3 Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara

Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara was one of the greatest Bengali scholars of the period under discussion and a very prolific writer. D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [18]) gives a list of works written by Puṇḍarīkākṣa. Here only his grammatical treatises will be mentioned and these are: commentaries on the *Nyāsa*, the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, Durgasiṃha's *Kātantraṭīkā* and on the *Kātantrapariśiṣṭa* as well as an independent work called *Kāarakakāumudī*. As can be seen from this list, Puṇḍarīkākṣa seems to have had a predilection for the Kātantra school. Even his commentary on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* is written according to the Kātantra grammar, which he justifies with the lack of popularity of this system as contrary to Pāṇini's grammar, which according to him was very well known in his days.²³²

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [18]) dates Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara in the end of the 15th century.

I.11.4 Sanātana Tarkācārya

Sanātana Tarkācārya composed two works: a gloss on the *Tantrapradīpa*, entitled *Prabhā*, and the *Phakkikāvṛtti*, a commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.²³³ Both his works are preserved in fragments, which still await publication.

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [19]) considers Sanātana Tarkācārya to belong to the Ghoṣāla family and dates him about 1500 AD.

I.11.5 Śrīmānaśarman

Śrīmānaśarman was a celebrated scholar, proficient not only in grammar, but also in logic, *dharmaśāstra*, *tantra* and poetry. Among the many books he wrote were commentaries on the *Anunyāsa*, the *Tantrapradīpa*, the *Nyāsa* and Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*.

The commentary on the *Nyāsa* is preserved in marginal notes at Rajshahi.²³⁴ The very short commentary on the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*, called *Vijayā*, was edited by Abhyankar (1967: 273-92). Śrīmānaśarman's commentaries on the *Anunyāsa* and the

²³² See the beginning of his *Bhaṭṭikā* (the text as given in Bhattacharya, 1946: [18]):
pāṇiniprakriyāyām me prasiddhatvān na kautukam |
kalāpaprakriyā tasmād aprasiddhā ca kathyate ||.

²³³ On the second of these works see I.7.1.

²³⁴ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [17]).

Tantrapradīpa are lost now, but we know about their existence from Śrīmāna himself and citations found in other works. The commentary on the *Anunyāsa* is mentioned by Śrīmānaśarman in the *Vijayā*.²³⁵

Quotations from his commentary on the *Tantrapradīpa* are found in an anonymous commentary on the *Tantrapradīpa*.²³⁶

Śrīmānaśarman belonged to the Campāhaṭṭi family of Vārendra Brahmins²³⁷ and, according to D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [16]-[17]), lived in the second half of the 15th century.

I.11.6 Sṛṣṭidhara

Sṛṣṭidhara is known as the author of the commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, called *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*.²³⁸

His full name seems to be Sṛṣṭidharaśarman,²³⁹ but in some manuscripts he is called Sṛṣṭidharacakravartin.²⁴⁰ The fact that his commentary was known only in North Bengal suggests that Sṛṣṭidhara was a Bengali. Chakravarti (1918: 9) adds a remark that the title Cakravartin is held by many Brahmins in Bengal.

The dating of Sṛṣṭidhara's lifetime is controversial. According to Chakravarti (1918: 10), he must have flourished in the 17th century. This date was also adopted by S. K. De (1960: 67).

D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1922: 204; 1946: [26]-[27]), however, disagrees with such a late dating and puts Sṛṣṭidhara in the last half of the 15th century. He notes that Sṛṣṭidhara quoted from many ancient and unknown authors and used Subhūti's and not Rāyamukūṭa's commentary on the *Amarakośa*. According to Bhattacharya, this would have been impossible with the late writer.

²³⁵ See the colophon of the *Vijayā*:

anunyāsādisārasya kartrā śrīmānaśarmanā |
śrīlakṣmīpatiputreṇa vijayeyaṃ vinīrmitā || [Abhyankar (1967: 292)].

²³⁶ See D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [17]).

²³⁷ See the colophon of the *Vijayā*: *iti vārendracampāhaṭṭīyaśrīśrīmānaśarmanīrmitā sīradevabhṛhat-paribhāṣāvṛtītippanī vijayakhyā samāptā ||* [Abhyankar (1967: 292)].

²³⁸ See I.7.1. The first *pāda* of this commentary was edited by Vedāntatīrtha (1912).

²³⁹ This is the name that appears at the end of each *pāda*. See Chakravarti (1918: 9) and D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [24]).

²⁴⁰ See Chakravarti (1918: 9).

I.12 Decline of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar

The scholars mentioned in I.11 belonged to the scholastic period in the history of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar. Afterwards, Pāṇini's school seems to have lost its importance in Bengal. It is difficult to tell when this process of deterioration began, since we cannot precisely date these last significant Bengali grammarians. In any case, it was long gone by the 19th century, when Adam wrote his reports on the state of education in Bengal. In the 30 years between his second report and *General Report on Public Instruction for 1865-66* the number of seminaries and students of Sanskrit grammar in Rajshahi district decreased by more than one third. Instead, the rival schools of the Kālāpa and the *Mugdhabodha* gained in popularity.²⁴¹

At the beginning of the 20th century Pāṇini's grammar was completely unknown in Bengal and manuscripts of the *Nyāsa*, once so celebrated and popular, were found covered in dust and cast away as useless.²⁴²

²⁴¹ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [1]-[2]).

²⁴² See Chakravarti (1913-16: (3)-(4)).

Part II

The *Pañjikā*

In the preceding chapters our attention was focused on the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar, in other words, on what might be called the context of the *Pañjikā*. Now, we take up Viśvarūpa's work itself. The aim of the following analysis is not only to explore the *Pañjikā* as an isolated grammatical treatise but also to show it against a background of the Pāṇinian tradition as well as from the historical perspective (to the extent it is possible).

I begin the ensuing investigation by explanation of some important and equivocal terms which are crucial for my undertaking and by presenting the methodology adopted here (II.1-2). The analysis proper starts in the chapter II.3 and closes in II.7 with the short evaluation of the *Pañjikā*.

II.1 Some terminological problems

The present examination of the *Pañjikā* could fall into the scope of what some call stylistics. However, even a cursory glance at various so-called stylistic analyses or at textbooks on stylistics reveals that the scope of this discipline and, consequently, its terminological apparatus are neither precisely settled nor universally agreed upon. Therefore, to avoid misunderstandings which are likely to appear in such a situation, I find it absolutely indispensable to elucidate at least those terms which are crucial for the ensuing investigation of the *Pañjikā*.

II.1.1 Style and stylistics

The term most frequently used in analyses, especially of literary texts, and the term which will also appear here is style. However, style belongs to those terms which have

been so variously interpreted that their meanings have become unclear. There are perhaps as many definitions of style as there are stylisticians.²⁴³ Ohmann (1970: 260-2) puts different approaches to style and stylistics in twelve categories, which range from diachronic stylistics to the statistical study of grammatical features.²⁴⁴ Still, his list is not claimed to be exhaustive. In such a situation, it might be tempting to adopt a general, broad definition of style, as for example the one Ohmann (1970: 263) calls ‘the common sense notion of style’. According to it, a style is simply ‘a way of doing it’. However, although this definition would apparently reduce the multiplicity of definitions of style, it would not make clear what is actually understood by this term. The problem with such broad definitions is that their limits can be freely stretched according to the person who interprets them so that they eventually become void or even contradictory. This is also the case with Ohmann’s proposition. Note that Ohmann (1970: 261) sees the literary structure of a work as related to style but not being its component. However, his definition of style as ‘a way of doing it’ does not necessarily exclude such architectonic elements from the notion of style.²⁴⁵ Thus, as the broad definition of style seems to be not very useful, another possibility would be to accept one of the many interpretations of the notion of style. These can be roughly divided into two categories: one which we might call a narrow meaning of style, i.e. style of writer’s language, and the second one which not only includes style as language use but also comprises such elements as literary structure or the author’s attitude towards himself and the reader.²⁴⁶ The diffuseness of the latter category and the fact that the first type of definition of style prevails in linguistic stylistics²⁴⁷ have compelled me to adopt the narrow meaning of style in the present analysis. No

²⁴³ Cf. style definitions in Spillner (1974: 25-59), Sowinski (1999: 17-57) and in all papers in Chatman (1971).

²⁴⁴ A simpler categorisation is presented by Crystal and Davy (1969: 9-10), who distinguish four kinds of style: style as language habits of one person, or of a group of people at one time, style as ‘saying the right thing in the most effective way’ and style as referring to literary language.

²⁴⁵ Notice that this is just the question of defining ‘it’. If ‘it’ is a particular story the author wants to tell, style understood as ‘a way of doing it’ can also comprise literary structure. See Leo (1966: 18-19) for whom literary structure is one of the most important stylistic elements. On the other hand, if ‘it’ is a sentence or a kind of idea behind it or in the generative grammar the deep structure of this sentence, ‘a way of doing it’ comes closely to the notion of style used in linguistic stylistics or, as in the last case, in the generative stylistics.

²⁴⁶ One problem which is also discussed in this context is the relationship of stylistics and linguistics on one side and literature studies on the other. The first type of style definitions would mean that stylistics is closely connected with linguistics, although the nature of this connection is also highly disputable. Crystal and Davy (1969: 9) see in stylistics a part of linguistics while for Juilland (1967: 382) stylistics begins at that point where linguistics ends.

²⁴⁷ On the term ‘linguistic stylistics’, see Halliday (1967). According to him (p. 218): ‘Linguistic stylistics might ... be defined as the description of literary texts, by methods derived from general linguistic theory and within the framework of a description of the language in question, and the comparison of such texts with others, by the same and by different authors, in the same and in different genres.’ Note that Halliday narrows the scope of linguistic stylistics to literary texts, what makes his definition a little bit problematic.

doubt, the decision in favour of this interpretation of style does not mean that we have successfully escaped from definitional problems. This will be clearly seen in II.4.2.1, where different definitions of style as used in linguistics are presented. At this point, it is important to note that accepting this meaning of style makes the stylistical analysis only one part of the present examination of the *Pañjikā*.

II.1.2 Literary and non-literary texts

One of the reasons why it is difficult to find the method suitable to scrutinise the *Pañjikā*, or more generally grammatical treatises, is that stylistics, in any meaning we use that word, has dealt mainly with so-called literary texts such as novels or poems. The analysis of non-literary texts is regarded as possible to be carried out by the methods of stylistics in the opinion of some scholars²⁴⁸ (although few have done it²⁴⁹) or is seen rather as falling into the scope of discourse analysis or text linguistics by others. A slightly different standpoint is taken by stylisticians who deny the existence of the dichotomy between literary and non-literary texts.²⁵⁰ In fact, what are literary texts and what is literature? Does literature comprise all works written in a certain culture or only those which are fictional? Or is it so that only ‘culturally validated’ texts merit the label ‘literature’?²⁵¹ And what makes a certain text literary: its intrinsic, perhaps linguistic, qualities or rather the attitude of a reader? The answers to these questions are manifold and, consequently, the definitions of literature given by various scholars are partly contradictory.²⁵² On the other hand, as in the case of style, there are attempts to formulate the definition of literature broad enough to include, perhaps not all, but as many as possible approaches to this phenomenon. One of them is the famous characterisation of literature formulated by Leonard Bloomfield (1933: 21-22), who writes: ‘Literature, whether presented in spoken form or, as is now our custom, in writing consists of beautiful or otherwise notable utterances.’ But again, what does it mean ‘notable’ or even ‘beautiful’? It is common knowledge that the notion of beauty differs from individual to individual and what is notable for one person can be the object of disdain for another. However, this definition could allow us to treat the *Pañjikā* as a literary text. We can have doubts whether it, or its language, is ‘beautiful’ but because of its content it could be regarded as ‘otherwise notable’.

²⁴⁸ See Crystal and Davy (1969: e.g. 80).

²⁴⁹ Analyses of some non-literary English texts are given in Crystal and Davy (1969), in whose opinion techniques of stylistic analysis should be applied first to non-literary texts before one employs them to literature, which is generally much more difficult to analyse (p. 80).

²⁵⁰ Fowler (1986: 71).

²⁵¹ See *ELL* vol. 4, p. 2261.

²⁵² For various definitions of literature, see *ELL* vol. 4, p. 2261-66.

Still, I think, it is obvious that the attempts to define what literature is, are doomed to failure.²⁵³ Thus, it seems to be a logical consequence to abandon this dichotomy entirely or at least to agree with those scholars who postulate the necessity of one (discourse/stylistic) theory for both literary and non-literary texts.

II.1.3 Form and content

The most important trait of the *Pañjikā* which was crucial to settling the method of its critical analysis is the predominant character of the content of the *Pañjikā* and the marginal role played by its language, which serves only as a medium for the content. Therefore, since the methods which have been invented to examine texts in which the aesthetical use of language is at least of as much importance as its informative value focus almost exclusively on language, they seem to be inappropriate to describe the *Pañjikā*. Consequently, in contrast to other critical studies the present work will lay the emphasis on the content of the treatise examined. Precisely speaking, the procedure applied in the following chapters makes use of another dichotomy which appears in linguistics, i.e. the dichotomy between form and content. Form and content are here understood in their elementary meaning. We could say that the form is how something is said (or written) and content what is said (or written) or, using Ohmann's definition of style, a form would be a way of saying (or writing) it and content would be 'it'.²⁵⁴

I must admit that despite being very convenient for the sake of analysis, grounding the study of the *Pañjikā* on the dichotomy of form and content is in a way artificial and not indisputable. Some linguists completely deny the possibility of separating form from content.²⁵⁵ They say that to change a single word in an utterance is like changing its meaning, an opinion which might sound very familiar to Indologists dealing with Pāṇini's grammar. To support this view about inseparability of form and content the well-known fact that real synonyms do not exist is supplied.²⁵⁶ Apart from this

²⁵³ Especially, the attempts to define literature through its intrinsic qualities have proven fallacious. The other tendency (e.g. found in Pratt 1977 and, interestingly enough, also adopted by Searle 1979: 59), i.e. to seek the nature of literature in external circumstances such as the attitude of a reader, is much more promising, but also not indisputable. See also II.3.1.

²⁵⁴ For the sake of the present analysis I have found the form/content dichotomy much more useful than dealing with three levels of communication such as meaning, form and substance (or discourse, syntax and phonology). Although Coulthard (1977: 1) claims that these three levels are universally accepted among linguists, my impression differs from his assertion. At least in stylistic studies the form/content division has proven very helpful, even if (or perhaps, because) it has been the subject of severe criticism. See Leo (1966), Ohmann (1970), Fowler (1971: e.g. 20).

²⁵⁵ Still others, such as Leo (1966: 30) and Barthes (1971: 6, 10), argue that there is no content at all and only form (or, according to Barthes, multiplicity of forms) exists.

²⁵⁶ See Hirsch (1972, especially p. 88) and so-called New Critics. About the latter, see Fowler (1972: 19-22). See also Ohmann (1970: 263-4) and Hendricks (1976: 19), both criticising the exponents of the idea of inseparability of form and content.

theoretical problem some practical difficulties emerge if we try to draw the boundary between form and content in the case of the *Pañjikā*. Let me mention one simple example. Viśvarūpa makes enormous use of the *Nyāsa* in his work.²⁵⁷ He adopts not only opinions of Jinendrabuddhi but also his wording, sometimes with slight changes but the source of Viśvarūpa's inspiration is still easily recognisable. In other words, he takes over the content and the form of the *Nyāsa*.

Do these difficulties mean that it would be better to abandon the idea of the dichotomy of form and content? I think that would carry things too far. Note that the opinion of inseparability of form and content is not free from theoretical problems either. Its consequence would be, as is pointed out by Ohmann (1970: 264), that we would be forced to admit that there is no such a thing as style at all or that it is to be regarded as a part of content. Both conclusions go against our intuitive understanding of style and make all the stylistic analyses superfluous. In such a situation I would propose adopting the following attitude. We can admit the existence of the dichotomy of form and content just for the sake of analysis, irrespective of what we actually think about the real relationship between these two entities. This is similar to the practical approach to the problem of lack of exact synonyms. Even if we maintain that it is impossible to find real synonyms, we still use (or create) dictionaries of synonyms. As far as practical difficulties such as the one stated above are concerned, the best thing is to decide independently in every single case. However, as content is primary and form secondary in the *Pañjikā*, the tendency is to deal with these cases in the chapters treating the content.

II.2 Critical analysis of the *Pañjikā*: preliminary remarks

Before I take up the analysis of the *Pañjikā*, it would be appropriate to decide what my undertaking shall be called. So far I have spoken of a thorough examination or simply of an analysis of the *Pañjikā*. I have tried to avoid the term 'stylistic analysis' because of its inaccuracy. In fact, as is said above, the analysis of the *Pañjikā*'s style forms one, but certainly not the most important, part of the present work. Another possibility which can be taken into consideration would be to name my task literary criticism, but the ambiguity of the label 'literary' has prevented me from using this term either.²⁵⁸ By replacing the troublesome adjective 'literary' by the

²⁵⁷ See II.6.1-II.6.4.

²⁵⁸ Note that according to some definitions of literature the *Pañjikā* cannot be seen as a literary text. See II.1.2 & II.3.1.

perhaps more suitable ‘linguistic’, one obtains the term ‘linguistic criticism’, which has been employed by Roger Fowler (1971: e.g. 10; 1986). Since some ideas of Fowler have influenced my approach, it could be argued that this term used to label my analysis of the *Pañjikā* would serve its purpose well. However, I neither share Fowler’s sociolinguistic attitude nor do I strictly follow his method. On these grounds, I have decided either to stick to such general expressions as an analysis or an examination or to speak of the ‘critical analysis’ of the *Pañjikā*. It might be objected that these terms are vague, but since employing such unmarked words does not arouse any expectations of how the analysis should be carried out, I regard their vagueness as an advantage rather than a drawback.

Now, a few words can be said about the rough scheme of the ensuing analysis and about the principles underlying it. I have already referred to Fowler, whose ideas have had an impact on the final shape of the present work. However, the dominant trait of the examination of the *Pañjikā*, i.e. its grounding on the dichotomy of form and content and dividing it into two parts, one dealing with the form of the *Pañjikā* and the other with its content, is new. At this point it must be once again emphasised that this division is convenient because of the character of Viśvarūpa’s commentary, i.e. because of the marginal role played by its language. It would be less desirable in the case of literary works such as poems, dramas or novels, since the form of these literary genres contributes enormously to their content. Furthermore, although the dichotomy of form and content is crucial to the present analysis, it is not the sole factor having an influence on it. A new dimension is added by treating the *Pañjikā* not only as text but also as discourse. Since, as will be discussed below, dealing with a work as discourse means among other things focusing on the message it carries, as well as on its participants and its contexts, it could appear that the form/content division roughly corresponds to the text/discourse distinction. But it is not that simple. It is true that what is said in the part treating the content has more to do with seeing the *Pañjikā* rather as a discourse than as a text but, on the other hand, some elements of the *Pañjikā*’s form (e.g. the structure of argumentation) belong to the features of a discourse and not of a text. Furthermore, the facets of discourse such as its contexts or participants cannot be treated as constituents of form or content. Thus, the border between text and discourse runs parallel to the line dividing form from content, these two pairs are partly intertwined but they are far from being identical.

Consequently, the analysis of the *Pañjikā* begins with the discussion of extra-textual elements of discourse. Then, the form of Viśvarūpa’s commentary is being examined, starting with what I have called ‘basic form’, which comprises the structures of the whole text and of the commentary on a single *sūtra*. The last section of this part

deals with the *Pañjikā*'s style and special emphasis is put here on its cohesion. In the chapter treating content, two topics are discussed in greater detail. Firstly, the source of Viśvarūpa's inspiration is sought. Secondly, the question as to whether or not and if so, to what extent, the *Pañjikā* contains original ideas is taken up.

The critical analysis will be closed by the evaluation of the *Pañjikā*, the part which many stylisticians avoid.

II.3 The *Pañjikā* as discourse

We can look at the *Pañjikā* or at any other text in different ways. We can describe its structure, count chapters, say something about its language and about its content. This will to a certain extent correspond to understanding the *Pañjikā* as text. Furthermore, we can analyse Viśvarūpa's arguments and we can search for his faults or inconsistencies and taking this step means that we begin to see Viśvarūpa's commentary in a new dimension, i.e. we treat it not only as text but also as discourse. Moreover, if we ask questions about the author of the *Pañjikā*, about his religion and his education, the circumstances in which his work was composed and about the people for whom this treatise was written for, we concentrate exclusively on the discursal aspects of the *Pañjikā*.²⁵⁹ At this point it is necessary to ask what we actually understand by the term discourse. And, as so often happens in linguistics, definitions of discourse are manifold and not unanimously agreed upon. Perhaps the most general one sees in discourse simply 'language use' or 'language-in-use'.²⁶⁰ For the sake of the present analysis the characteristics of discourse and of its relation to text as given by Roger Fowler (1986) seem to be especially appropriate. Albeit the passage in question is a little bit lengthy it is worth citing here. At the beginning of the seventh chapter of his *Linguistic Criticism* R. Fowler (1986: 85-6) states:

'To look at language as text entails the study of whole units of communication seen as coherent syntactic and semantic structures which can be spoken or written down. Roughly speaking, texts can be regarded as the medium of discourse ... Discourse is the whole complicated process of linguistic interaction between people uttering and comprehending texts. To study language as discourse requires, therefore, attention to facets of structure which relate to the participants in communication, the actions they perform through uttering texts, and the contexts within which discourse is conducted. All of these "extra-linguistic" factors are systematically reflected in

²⁵⁹ As it could be expected, the terms 'text' and 'discourse' have been variously interpreted. See *ELL* vol. 2, p. 940-49 and vol. 9, p. 4564-68. In the present analysis I follow to a large extent their interpretation as given in Fowler (1986).

²⁶⁰ See *ELL* vol. 2, p. 940-949.

the structures of the sentences and (and thus texts) which speakers utter. Or, to put it the other way around, the form of language has developed in response to its discourse functions so as to provide the means of expression for all the personal actions, interpersonal relationships, and connections with context that are mediated through discourse.'

Consequently, the analysis of the *Pañjikā* will concentrate on these three elements mentioned above: the participants, their action and the contexts of communication. But before we take up close examination of these aspects, I would like to mention another approach to literary discourse. What I mean is the method of Mary Louise Pratt, who applies speech act theory to literary discourse. Interestingly enough, her list of benefits resulting from employing this theory closely coincides with the characteristics of discourse cited above. In her book bearing the significant title *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse* she writes:

'In sum, speech act theory provides a way of talking about utterances not only in terms of their surface grammatical properties but also in terms of the context in which they are made, the intentions, attitudes, and expectations of the participants, the relationships existing between participants, and generally, the unspoken rules and conventions that are understood to be in play when an utterance is made and received.' (Pratt 1977: 86)

Here the emphasis is also laid on these three aspects of communication mentioned above, namely: the participants (e.g. their intentions, attitudes and expectations), the action (e.g. the intentions of the participants), and the context (e.g. attitudes of the participants, the prevailing rules and conventions). Thus, it seems that speech act theory could become a very useful instrument in analysing literary discourse. However, to avoid misunderstanding, it must be stated that what Pratt proposes is on no account a fully-developed theory of literary discourse. She herself sees it rather as a part of 'some preliminary groundwork' carried out 'in the hope of providing some basis for future discussions' (p. viii). This partly explains why in the present examination only some of the elements discussed by her will be examined. Another reason lies in the difference of objects of analysis, which are literary works such as novels and poems in one case and a grammatical treatise in another. At this point we must come back to the problem of the literary/non-literary opposition. The views of Pratt and Fowler are only slightly different in this regard. While Fowler (1986: 71) considers the alleged dichotomy between literature and non-literature superfluous, Pratt (1977: xiii) takes this dichotomy for granted, but she postulates the necessity of developing discourse theory which will cover literary and non-literary utterances. What is much more important, both, Fowler and Pratt, vehemently object to the often voiced thesis about the intrinsic linguistic properties which are supposed to distinguish literary from

non-literary texts. Fowler (1971: ix) holds this thesis to be ‘one of the greatest sources of confusion and error in poetic aesthetics’.²⁶¹ Pratt (1977: 3-37) minutely examines arguments of the Russian Formalists and the Prague School stated in favour of this theory and convincingly points out its flaws and inconsistencies. Having her arguments in mind and seeing the fact that in many cases it is difficult to tell on first sight if we are dealing with a literary or non-literary text, we must agree with Fowler (1981: 188 ff.) and Pratt (1977: xiii) that discourse theory has to satisfactorily explain literary as well as non-literary discourse. And to accept this means that we are allowed to use some elements of Fowler’s and Pratt’s methods in examining such a text as the *Pañjikā*. However, before we do that, let us have a look at the definition of literary discourse as given by Pratt and to see to what extent this fits in with the *Pañjikā*.

II.3.1 The *Pañjikā* as (an example of) literary discourse?

According to Pratt (1977: 152) ‘literary works belong to the class of utterances addressed to an Audience²⁶²; within this class they belong to the subclass of utterances that presuppose a process of preparation and selection prior to the delivery of the utterance; and they belong to the subclass of utterances whose relevance is tellability and whose point is to display experience.’ Now, let us focus our attention on each of these three aspects of a literary work and on their applicability to the *Pañjikā*.

The first claim that ‘literary works belong to the class of utterances addressed to an Audience’ places literature in a more general framework of performer/Audience relations and, consequently, it deprives it of its exclusivity. It is also easily fulfilled in the case of the *Pañjikā*, where we clearly have two participants: the speaker (the writer), i.e. Viśvarūpa, and the voluntary Audience, that is, the reader(s) of his commentary. Admittedly, it can be argued that this condition of having an Audience is very trivial. Trivial or not, it has far-reaching consequences. Note that, as Pratt (1977: 101) remarks, many human activities occur in turns and the loss of the usual balance ‘brings with it a redistribution of obligations and expectations among the participants’ (p. 105). In particular, it means that the Audience, which voluntarily waives its access rights, will expect more from the speaker’s contribution than is usually the case when the communication is carried out in turns, e.g. within a conversation, or when the renouncement has not occurred of one’s own free will, as it is the case with speeches at obligatory events. Likewise, the obligation lying on the speaker (or

²⁶¹ See also Fowler (1971: 89; 1981: 21).

²⁶² Pratt (1977: 106) uses, and I have adopted her convention, the capitalised ‘Audience’ to denote the voluntary audience as opposed to audiences which have inferior status and which, consequently, are generally forced to give up their access rights.

the writer) that he should not waste his Audience's time also increases. Further, Pratt (1977: 109-111) argues that as if to restore the destroyed balance, the Audience gains the right to judge the performance, which is in many cases not seen as accomplished if the judgement is missing or its lack is understood as a very negative verdict.

According to Pratt (1977: 116), expectations of the Audience have their roots not only in the fact that the Audience has given up its rights to perform an act of communication, but because the Audience knows to be dealing with a literary work. This is an important point in Pratt's argumentation, since it reveals her belief that 'literariness' resides 'not in the message, but in a particular disposition of speaker and audience with regard to the message, one that is characteristic of the literary speech situation' (p. 87). Thus, knowing to deal with a literary text, the Audience expects that the text should be definitive, i.e. that its author had time to prepare it and what he has delivered is at least in his eyes a satisfactory version. Additionally, since a literary work is usually printed, it means that it has been selected by certain people who are regarded to be specialists (publishers, critics etc.). To anticipate a possible objection, let us remark that according to Pratt, these three characteristic features of literary works, i.e. their definitiveness, preparation and pre-selection, are valid to a certain extent also in the case of orally composed literature.²⁶³ Now, the question arises whether the *Pañjikā* can be characterised by these three traits. As we know, Viśvarūpa's commentary was certainly composed in writing. We cannot be absolutely certain if Viśvarūpa completed his work, but this seems to be quite probable. Furthermore, we are entitled to assume that he had time to prepare his commentary and that he considered it to be satisfactory. Thus, although a little bit hesitatingly, we can assume that the *Pañjikā* in all likelihood fulfils the conditions of definitiveness and preparation. It is much more difficult to decide whether the *Pañjikā* passed through the process of selection. In my opinion, in the case of Indian works, or any works functioning in the tradition within which Gutenberg's invention did not play an important part, there are two major ways the process of selection can be carried out.²⁶⁴ Firstly, manuscripts of a work could be chosen to be copied and if it was several times the case (especially if the manuscripts are found in different parts of India), it is a strong proof of positive selection. Secondly, a work could be widely known, as is seen from quotations and mentions of its title or of its author(s) found in other treatises. Now, as far as I can gather, only five incomplete manuscripts of the *Pañjikā*, some of them in a very poor condition, have survived and they are written by a different hand.²⁶⁵ This

²⁶³ See Pratt (1977: 117, fn. 4).

²⁶⁴ This, of course, holds good for works composed in writing.

²⁶⁵ For details of manuscripts, see II.3.2.1.1 and the introduction to volume I.

means that someone (and most probably not Viśvarūpa himself) did indeed select the *Pañjikā* to be copied. It is difficult to tell whether and to what extent the *Pañjikā* was known and studied. Quotations from it, mentions of its title or the name of its author are, to my knowledge, not found. But it must be immediately added that the grammatical literature which has been composed after the *Pañjikā*, especially those works which were written in east India, have not been published yet, so an absolutely reliable evidence to support this claim cannot be found. However, we can at least assume that the *Pañjikā* has not had any great impact on grammatical literature in India and in the best case we can compare Viśvarūpa's commentary with a book which has been published once but which nobody or only few have bought. Consequently, we can say that the *Pañjikā* has only partly passed through a process of selection. It will be also an aim of my undertaking to point out possible grounds for this failure.

To discuss the third characteristic of a literary work as given by Pratt, we must consult Grice's Cooperative Principle and in particular his maxims of Quality, which roughly say that a speaker should believe his assertion to be true.²⁶⁶ In case of 'verbs of saying' some analysts add one more requirement, namely, that what is stated must not be obvious for a speaker and a hearer. This is called by some the Assertibility Condition.²⁶⁷ However, Pratt (1977: 134, 147-151) argues that the Assertibility Condition is not a decisive feature of literary works. She points out that on the one hand, the assertion can fulfil both the Assertibility Condition and the maxims of Quality and still it can be inappropriate when the hearer (the Audience) could not be possibly interested in hearing this assertion; on the other hand, the story which the hearer already knows and which is not necessarily true can be told (or read) once again and it is not felt to be inappropriate. This fact makes Pratt to impose a condition of tellability on literary works and to attribute the highest priority to it. According to Labov (1972: 370-71), from whom Pratt has taken over this concept, an event is tellable or reportable if it is somewhat unusual or unexpected, terrifying or wonderful. Consequently, I think, it is obvious that in this regard the *Pañjikā* considerably differs from thus understood literary discourse, and we are compelled to classify Viśvarūpa's commentary as an informing assertion (or text) rather than a 'display text'.²⁶⁸ The maxims of Quality and the Assertibility Condition do certainly prevail in the *Pañjikā*, since we have no reason to think that Viśvarūpa wrote anything he regarded as false or anything he was sure everybody perfectly knows. Furthermore, as the condition of displaying an ex-

²⁶⁶ See Grice (1975: 46).

²⁶⁷ In adopting this term I follow Pratt (1977: 134 ff.). Searle (1969: 66; 1979: 62) calls it simply the preparatory condition for assertions (strictly speaking it is one of two preparatory conditions).

²⁶⁸ I accept here the extension of concepts of tellability and display from assertions to natural narratives and (literary) works as it is proposed by Pratt (1977: 141-143).

perience is irrelevant in the case of a work such as the *Pañjikā*, we must conclude that Viśvarūpa's commentary does not possess the third feature of a literary work as given by Pratt.

To sum up, having been judged by Pratt's criteria, the *Pañjikā* must be included into the category of non-literary texts. This does not remain without consequences on the ensuing analysis. Firstly, we are thus entitled to choose only some elements of the methods designed to examine literary discourse. Secondly, knowing with which of Pratt's conditions the *Pañjikā* does not comply makes this choice easier and more deliberate. Note that for this selection, it is much more important that the *Pañjikā* does not fulfil the conditions of tellability and displaying experience, than that it has only partly gone through the process of selection, since this failure is caused by the unpopularity of Viśvarūpa's commentary rather than by its being non-literary. And last but not least, let me point out that labelling the *Pañjikā* as an informing text (assertion) confirms the division of the present analysis into two parts dealing respectively with the form and the content of the *Pañjikā*.

II.3.2 Three discursual aspects of the *Pañjikā*

Let us summarise which steps towards the analysis of the *Pañjikā* have been taken so far. Firstly, some terminological problems concerning the concept of style, the literary/non-literary opposition and the form/content split have been clarified. Secondly, the possibility and necessity of treating the *Pañjikā* not only as text but also as discourse have been pointed out. Thirdly, we have accepted the demand of developing discourse theory to include literary as well as non-literary discourse. Fourthly, we have noted that the *Pañjikā* lacks the qualities of tellability and display experience and, therefore, according to the criteria worked out by Pratt, cannot be treated as literary discourse. Consequently, and it is the fifth step, it has been said that while examining the *Pañjikā* we are entitled to choose only some elements of methods designed to analyse literary discourse. With regard to this last conclusion, it can be objected that this seems to be contrary to the postulate that discourse theory should describe literary as well as non-literary discourse. This is, however, not the case. Note that the methods of analysing texts depend not only on discourse theory but also on the objects of the analysis. Thus, if these objects considerably differ, their analyses will also inevitably vary. For example, if we examine a handbook on mathematics (or a cookbook etc.) we can ask all the questions about its audience or its author, his religion etc., but the answers to these questions are either obvious (pupils, students) or they cannot be given on the basis of the text.

Having the above in mind, we are now in the position to begin the analysis of the *Pañjikā*. In this chapter some discorsal elements of Viśvarūpa's commentary will be discussed. As has been mentioned above, in the opinion of Fowler three aspects of discourse are especially important. These are: the participants of communication, their action and the contexts within which an act of communication takes place.

II.3.2.1 The participants

As a rule, each act of communication presupposes two participants or two groups of participants. They are, on one side, the speaker(s) or the writer(s) and, on the other side, the audience, depending on a situation being the hearer(s) or the reader(s).

Below we are going to throw a little bit of light on the author of the *Pañjikā* and on its audience, i.e. people for whom this work was probably written for.

II.3.2.1.a The author of the *Pañjikā*

To start with, let us resume what we know about the author of the *Pañjikā*. As has already been mentioned several times, the *Pañjikā* was written by the grammarian called Viśvarūpa. However, the name is almost everything we know about him for sure. Anything else, his date, place of birth and activity, profession, other works he wrote (if it at all was the case) or to a lesser degree his creed remains the matter of speculation.

It is perhaps not very surprising that Viśvarūpa's date is uncertain, since the dating of Indian works usually turns out to be a very laborious and tricky task. Thus, as far as Viśvarūpa is concerned, the only thing we can state beyond any doubt is that he was posterior to Puruṣottamadeva. Unluckily, Viśvarūpa was very sparing in quoting grammatical treatises or literary works and the few citations which are present in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* come either from unknown sources or from texts which are older (e.g. from the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, see also II.6.2) or at least not very much more recent than the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.²⁶⁹ Similarly, it is difficult to set the upper limit of Viśvarūpa's date, since, as far as I can gather, the *Pañjikā* itself is not quoted in any other treatise. At this point it is worth mentioning that the 13th and 14th centuries are often considered to be a dark period in the intellectual and literary life of

²⁶⁹ As it will be shown in II.6.5.4, Viśvarūpa might have consulted Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*, which is dated 1173/74 AD (see I.8.2). This dating makes Śaraṇadeva contemporary with Puruṣottamadeva, even if the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* was composed earlier than the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, which follows from the fact that Śaraṇadeva often quotes from the former (see I.7.6).

Bengal, during which scarcely any work was written.²⁷⁰ Naturally, this does not make the dating of Viśvarūpa simpler. In this situation it could be especially rewarding to specify the relation between Viśvarūpa and Sṛṣṭidhara, another commentator on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, who can be put at the end of the 15th century. This will be done in detail in II.6.5.6. Anticipating the results of the comparison of these two commentaries, we can state here that in neither of them any hint can be found that its author knew the other commentary. Moreover, although, as D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [25]-[27]) notes, Sṛṣṭidhara quotes 18 times from one *Pañjikā*, this work seems to be different from Viśvarūpa's treatise. These two facts may (but do not have to) suggest that Viśvarūpa and Sṛṣṭidhara were almost contemporary or that they belonged to different regions. Nevertheless, D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [27]) assumes that Viśvarūpa's commentary is older than that of Sṛṣṭidhara. This opinion is not shared by N. K. Dash (1991: 82), according to whom Viśvarūpa belonged to the second half of the 16th century and Sṛṣṭidhara to the 15th century. However, neither D. Ch. Bhattacharya nor Dash support their views with any arguments.

A very controversial dating has been proposed by Jha (2001: 1-7), who assigns Viśvarūpa to the 13th century. Firstly, he believes that Viśvarūpa lived in Mithilā. Secondly – and this is his 'strongest' argument – he has found the name Viśvarūpa in Maithili genealogical works. Strictly speaking, he has found this name twice: both Viśvarūpas lived in the 13th century, the first one was the son of Devadhara and the second belonged to the Oinavāra dynasty. Although, as Jha (2001: 4 fn. 1) remarks, either of them could have written the *Pañjikā*, he favours the first one. Thirdly, he identifies Upādhyāya and the *Pañcikā* quoted in the *Kṣīrataraṅginī* with Viśvarūpa and his *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*. Can we accept his opinion? The answer has to be in the negative. His first argument is not crucial to setting Viśvarūpa's date; let us then begin with the second one. Generally, it must be stated that apart from the question of how reliable such genealogical works are, the mere identity of name, especially if it is not unusual, proves nothing and cannot be regarded as serious evidence. Even the fact that Jha's line of reasoning results in two Viśvarūpas reveals how dangerous and illusory his argumentation is. As far as the third argument is concerned we must remember that the title Upādhyāya is so common that it would be absurd to identify every Upādhyāya with Viśvarūpa. The same goes for the *Pañjikā* versus *Pañcikā*. In addition, since Maitreya Rakṣita seems to have known the *Kṣīrataraṅginī*, the assumption that Kṣīrasvamin knew Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā* leads us to the entirely unacceptable conclusion that Viśvarūpa had lived earlier than Maitreya and, consequently, earlier

²⁷⁰ Majumdar (1973: 262).

than Puruṣottamadeva, whose treatise Viśvarūpa had commented upon.²⁷¹ Thus, I think, it is obvious that the dating and the grounds for it proposed by Jha have to be rejected.

Before I present my proposition of Viśvarūpa's date, I would like to ponder for a while the evidence given by the manuscripts of the *Pañjikā*. Three of those, which I have examined, bear no date but as has been stated in the introduction to the present edition,²⁷² if we have a closer look at them, the impression is reinforced that they were most probably copied at the end of the 15th or at the beginning of the 16th century. Two manuscripts which Jha (2001: 9) has utilised, are dated respectively 1649 and 1450 AD. Consequently, Viśvarūpa must be placed somewhere in the period between the middle or perhaps the last quarter (if we accept that Viśvarūpa drew from Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*) of the 12th and the middle of the 15th century. Furthermore, if we assume, as has been mentioned above, that Sṛṣṭidhara and Viśvarūpa were almost contemporaries, we can assign Viśvarūpa to the first half of the 15th century. However, I must admit that I am far from being entirely convinced about this and, consequently, this date could be shifted in any direction in case new evidence is found.

Next, let us take up the question of Viśvarūpa's place of activity. This task is not so difficult as the previous one, since the evidence speaking for Bengal as the region where Viśvarūpa belonged to is in my opinion quite convincing. We can begin with two facts suggesting that Viśvarūpa lived in the eastern part of India. Firstly, similarly to Puruṣottamadeva, Viśvarūpa does not hold apart *va* from *ba*, which is clear from his differentiating between *yaralavīyavakāra* and *vargīyavakāra*.²⁷³ Secondly, in the manuscripts of the *Pañjikā* the letters *ś* and *ṣ* are often confused.²⁷⁴ Admittedly, this piece of evidence is not very strong as it tells more about scribes than about the author himself, but at least it means that Viśvarūpa's commentary was studied in some parts of east India. The remaining evidence limits what we roughly called the eastern part of India to Bengal. First of all, the very fact that Viśvarūpa comments on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, which was very well known in Bengal, corroborates our hypothesis, although it alone would not prove anything, since the popularity of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* extended beyond the

²⁷¹ This is the case unless one proposes another date for Kṣīrasvamin, which however Jha has not done.

²⁷² Strictly speaking, in the introduction to the *Pañjikā*'s edition only two manuscripts have been examined, because the third one does not include the first *adhyāya* and, consequently, has not been used in the present edition. Still, much of what has been said about manuscripts A and B can be also stated about this third manuscript (Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project B 35/3; National Archives Nepal, Catalogue No. I.1536, *vyākaraṇa* 95), which is perhaps a little bit more recent than B.

²⁷³ See *Pañj.* on the *Śivasūtras*.

²⁷⁴ The consonant *v* as well as sibilants *s* and *ś* lost their importance already at the stage of *Māgadhi* Prakrit, from which Bengali and Maithili developed. See S. K. Chatterji (1970: 257-259).

boundary of Bengal. However, Viśvarūpa seems to be acquainted with other treatises written by Bengali authors and some of them could hardly have been known outside Bengal. We can mention here two other works of Puruṣottamadeva, namely, the *Kāṛakacakra* and the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, which have never gained the fame of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Moreover, it is just possible that Viśvarūpa knew the *Durghaṭavṛtti* by Śaraṇadeva, who was a Bengali. Viśvarūpa mentions further the *Bhāgavṛtti*, which had once been very popular in Bengal till its position was taken by the *Tantrapradīpa* or perhaps even later by the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. In addition, Viśvarūpa was very well versed in the *Nyāsa* and he incorporated its text into the *Pañjikā* at almost every step, but on the other hand, his knowledge of the *Mahābhāṣya* was obviously very limited. This, as we have seen at the beginning of part I of the present work (see p. I), is the characteristic trait of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar. Before we close this discussion, let us consider one problem which has been already mentioned in the introduction to the first part of the present analysis. What I mean is the assumption that Viśvarūpa might have belonged to Mithilā rather than to Bengal. This is supported by the fact that four manuscripts of the *Pañjikā* are classified as written in Maithili script, but that tells us probably more about the scribes than about Viśvarūpa. Nevertheless, even if this does not seem convincing enough to prove that Viśvarūpa was an inhabitant of Mithilā, it would be certainly useful to think over what would speak against such a hypothesis. It is sure that because of political and cultural relations existing between Mithilā and Bengal we cannot entirely exclude it. The transfer of ideas between these two regions did take place and Mithilā is said to have become the shelter of Sanskrit studies after the invasion of Muslims in India.²⁷⁵ However, Mithilā was famous rather for its *navyanāyā* school and not for grammar.²⁷⁶ No grammarian belonging to Pāṇini's system is known to have lived in mediaeval Mithilā,²⁷⁷ while in the same period there were many Bengali Pāṇinīyas beginning with Puruṣottamadeva and ending with such scholars as Śṛṣṭidhara, Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara, Śrīmānaśarman or others mentioned in I.11. Instead, in Mithilā Padmanābhaddatta composed his *Supadma-vyākaraṇa* with a commentary on it (*Supadmapañjikā*) and other auxiliary treatises, thus founding the new non-Pāṇinian school called after his treatise Saupadma.²⁷⁸ Besides, there is enough evidence that the Sanskrit studies in Bengal were not entirely

²⁷⁵ Chatterji (1970: 102). Note also that while the 13th and 14th centuries are regarded to be dark age in Bengal, they are said to be the golden period in Mithilā. See Majumdar (1973: 262) and Thakur (1956: 379). About the cultural relations between Bengal and Mithilā, see Thakur (1956: 380-1).

²⁷⁶ Thakur (1956: 380-1), R. C. Majumdar (1973: 229-30), Sh. K. Mishra (1988: 80-81).

²⁷⁷ Sh. K. Mishra (1988: 82-83).

²⁷⁸ Padmanābhaddatta is usually dated 14th or 15th century. For more information about him and his school of grammar, see Thakur (1956: 375), Sh. K. Mishra (1988: 82-83) and, first of all, Belvalkar (1915: 111-113).

extinguished after the Muslim conquest of Bengal. Still in the 15th century and later Navadwipa was famous for *navyanāyā* studies.²⁷⁹ Moreover, Majumdar (1973: 231) mentions a few further centres of Sanskrit learning in mediaeval Bengal, but he does not specify when they flourished. And last but not least, the term Maithili script is vague. Differences between Maithili and Bengali scripts are so tiny that some scholars deny at all their existence.²⁸⁰ Dimitrov (2002: 29) claims that this term can be conventionally used and as such applies to any variety of Bengali or Maithili script. Thus, having taken into consideration what has been said above, we can safely assume that either Viśvarūpa was a Bengali (by birth or choice) or he was under the influence of the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar.

The third point which is now going to be made concerns the question of Viśvarūpa's faith. The text of the *Pañjikā* as given in manuscript A begins with *om namaḥ kṛṣṇāya* followed by *hariṃ girāṃ patiṃ natvā*. In manuscript B the word *kṛṣṇāya* is replaced by *gaṇapataye*. In addition, in both manuscripts the word *buddha* from the introductory greeting *namo buddhāya* found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* is elucidated as *viṣṇu* (*buddharūpiṇe viṣṇave nama iti*) and, needless to say, in manuscript A as *kṛṣṇa*. However, this is the only piece of evidence which the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* provides us with. Contrary to Puruṣottamadeva, Viśvarūpa refrained from changing examples given in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* as well as from introducing new ones being conform with his creed. Even in the commentary on P.1.1.73, where Puruṣottamadeva uses *pāṇinīyam śaivīyaṃ buddhīyaṃ matam* instead of neutral *udāharaṇas* in the *Kāśikā* (*śāliyaḥ mālīyaḥ aupagavīyaḥ kāpaṭavīyaḥ*), Viśvarūpa not only comments on all examples of Puruṣottamadeva but also does not add any further one. To sum up, Viśvarūpa seems to have been a Vaiṣṇava, perhaps even a worshipper of Kṛṣṇa, but since the latter possibility is confirmed by only one manuscript, we are on the safe side if we use the broader term Vaiṣṇava.

As far as Viśvarūpa's profession is concerned, we could imagine that he might have been one of those scholars who having attained proficiency in grammar or other branches of Sanskrit studies have taught at a school of learning (see II.3.2.3). This is also suggested by the fact that he is called *upādhyāya* at the end of the second *adhyāya* and *mahopādhyāya* at the end of the first *pāda* of the first *adhyāya*, the second *pāda* of the fifth *adhyāya* and of the third *pāda* of the sixth *adhyāya*.²⁸¹

Before we focus our attention on the readers of the *Pañjikā*, let us note that the

²⁷⁹ Majumdar (1973: 229-31).

²⁸⁰ See Chatterji (1970: 225).

²⁸¹ About the titles *upādhyāya*, *mahopādhyāya* and *mahāmahopādhyāya*, see Thakur (1956: 380) and Sh. K. Mishra (1988: 96).

name Viśvarūpa is in no way unique in the history of India and of Sanskrit literature. One of two sons of the famous king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal was called Viśvarūpasena (12/13th century).²⁸² In the history of Mithilā there was one Viśvarūpa Ṭhākura (probably the second half of the 13th century) belonging to Oinavāra line.²⁸³ There were also several scholars called Viśvarūpa: the author of the commentary on Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya*²⁸⁴ and the lexicographer whose treatises were used by Maheśvara Kavi (the beginning of the 12th century²⁸⁵). Another Viśvarūpa belonging to Mithilā wrote a commentary *Bālākrīḍā* on the *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti*.²⁸⁶ Furthermore, Abhyankar (1961: 336) mentions one more Viśvarūpa who is supposed to have lived in the 16th century and to have composed a grammatical treatise called *Viśvarūpanibandha*. However, Abhyankar does not give any more information about this grammarian.²⁸⁷

II.3.2.1.b The Audience of the *Pañjikā*

The first question we should ask if we are going to characterise the Audience, i.e. the readers, of the *Pañjikā* is for whom Viśvarūpa wrote his commentary. However, on the grounds of what we know about the *Pañjikā*, we are certainly not able to give any definite answer to this question. Still, it seems to be quite possible that Viśvarūpa taught at a school of learning and, consequently, that the *Pañjikā* was designed for his students. This is supported by three facts. Firstly, the *Pañjikā* gives the impression of being straightforward and relatively simple, but at the same time it incorporates the ideas and wording found in the *Kāśīkā* and the *Nyāsa*. One might say that in places it presupposes the knowledge of these two treatises or that it requires an explanation of the teacher. Secondly, and this suits well with our first point, as reported by Adam in 1836, in those schools in Rajshahi which taught Pāṇinian grammar, the first treatise to be studied was Puruṣottamadeva's *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, followed by the *Nyāsa*.²⁸⁸ Furthermore, one scholar is said to use Śṛṣṭidhara's commentary while teaching the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.²⁸⁹ What is true for the 19th century could be valid for the earlier period,

²⁸² Majumdar (1971: 236).

²⁸³ For the history of the Oinavāra dynasty, see Thakur (1956: 292 ff.). In this context it is worth mentioning that according to the tradition prevailing in Mithilā, members of the Oinavāra family were very learned. For instance, the grandfather of Viśvarūpa, O'ena Ṭhākura is said to be a great scholar. See Thakur (1956: 293).

²⁸⁴ This Viśvarūpa lived most probably earlier than the 6th century. See Matilal (1977: 84).

²⁸⁵ Vogel (1979: 330).

²⁸⁶ Sh. K. Mishra (1988: 109). Derrett (1973: 49) dates this Viśvarūpa in the first half of the 9th century.

²⁸⁷ Aufrecht (1891: 586) mentions only one *Viśvarūpanibandha*, which is a part of the *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa*. According to Jha (2001: 6-9), the *Viśvarūpanibandha* is a no longer existing work on *dharmaśāstra* and was written by the author of the *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*.

²⁸⁸ DiBona (1983: 82).

²⁸⁹ DiBona (1983: 166).

too. Consequently, it is also conceivable that the *Pañjikā* was read along with the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* at some Bengali schools of learning. Thirdly and lastly, as has already been mentioned, Viśvarūpa is sometimes called *upādhyāya* or *mahopādhyāya*.

To follow this hypothesis means that the *Pañjikā* was first of all written for the students of schools of learning. Who were they? Although theoretically all ‘twice-born’ were allowed to study, Brahmins practically dominated higher Sanskrit schools. This was the case in the 19th century, so it is likely to have been the rule four centuries earlier. Furthermore, girls were to a large extent excluded from Sanskrit education. Female scholars were rare and it is probable that they had received their instruction first of all at home.²⁹⁰

As in the 19th so in the 15th century, there were two kinds of pupils. Some of them came from distant villages, so they lived at their teacher’s house. Others, who were inhabitants of the same village as their teacher, used to come only to receive instruction and in the evening they returned to their parents’ house.

As far as the age of pupils is concerned, we are told by Adam that commonly eleven years old boys commenced the study of Sanskrit grammar and the average duration of instruction in this branch of learning was somewhere between seven and ten years.²⁹¹

II.3.2.2 The action

The second aspect of discourse as mentioned by Fowler (1986: 86) consists of the actions performed by the participants of the act of communication. In the case of the spoken discourse, especially where it takes place in turns, all the participants are equally important. This changes when the discourse becomes written down and, consequently, the writer as playing the active part gains more significance. Of course, I do not intend to claim that the Audience of the written text should be left out of consideration. Apart from the situations when the author completely ignores his future readers, the Audience and its expectations (at least as seen by the author) are reflected in the text itself.

Let us now look at the *Pañjikā* from this perspective. We might begin with what is obvious and perhaps even trivial. The *Pañjikā* is a commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* and,

²⁹⁰ Majumdar (1973: 233-4) and Ghosh (2002: 233-5).

²⁹¹ In Rajshahi the study of literature (comprising grammar) was begun by boys at seven till fourteen years old. The duration of studies amounted to between eleven and twenty two years. See DiBona (1983: 81). In Murshidabad students commenced the study of grammar at the age of 11.9 years and completed them when they were almost nineteen-year-olds (18.8). Ibid., p. 226. In Burdwan the Sanskrit grammar education was begun by eleven-year-olds (11.4) and it was completed when they reached the age of almost twenty one (20.7). Ibid., p. 234.

as it will be pointed out in II.4, it belongs to what we might roughly call the *Nyāsa* type as contrary to the *Durghaṭa* type. It means that Viśvarūpa explains first of all the *sūtras* and Puruṣottamadeva's commentary on them instead of taking examples which apparently go against Pāṇini's rules as a starting point of his commentary, as is done by Śaraṇadeva in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. Furthermore, Viśvarūpa's explanations are rather simple, not of a very scholarly type as for instance the works of Nāgojībhaṭṭa are. The above suits quite well with the supposition stated in the previous subsection that the *Pañjikā* could have been designed for the students of Bengali schools of learning.

At this point of our discussion we can go a little bit deeper and ponder for a while on how the *Pañjikā* can be characterised in terms of the speech act theory. In II.3.1, while considering whether the conditions of tellability and displaying experience could apply to Viśvarūpa's work, we have stated that the *Pañjikā* can be rather classified as an informing than a display text. However, if we extend the notion of illocutionary force from assertions to whole texts,²⁹² we will be compelled to slightly modify our statement. Namely, it seems that the illocutionary force which could be ascribed to the *Pañjikā* is not this (or perhaps not only) of an informing assertion but rather that of arguing or perhaps of teaching.²⁹³ In the case of these three illocutionary forces, the preparatory and sincerity rules are much the same, but the essential rules differ.²⁹⁴ While we are arguing, we want to convince our interlocutor that something is true, but it is not necessarily our aim, when we are only stating something. Next, if we accept that the illocutionary force of the *Pañjikā* is rather that of teaching, the essential rule would be not so much that the speaker (writer) wants just to state something, as it is in the case of assertions, nor that he wants to convince his Audience, as in the case of

²⁹² At first glance such an extension seems to be rather questionable. However, it is perhaps less difficult to accept it if we note that not only single sentence utterances but also utterances which consist of two or more sentences can (and sometimes must) be treated as single speech acts, and that as such, they have only one illocutionary force. (Although I also agree with the opinion that more than one illocutionary act can be performed by a single utterance, see *ELL* vol. 8, p. 4132). This has been aptly shown by Pratt (1977: 141-3), e.g. by comparing such utterances as 'Thank you for the hideous sweater' and 'Thank you for the sweater. It is hideous'. Pratt makes a further step and extends the concepts of tellability and display from one sentence assertions to texts. Moreover, she remarks that 'utterances with a single point or purpose must be treated as single speech acts' (p. 141). I think, this is clearly the case with the *Pañjikā*. Note also that, on the other side, Brewer and Lichtenstein (1982: e.g. 477) claim that each text has at least one perlocutionary function, in other words they apply the concept of perlocutionary act to a text as well as to a single sentence utterance.

²⁹³ Austin (1962: 98-99) mentions neither arguing nor teaching among illocutionary acts, but it is clear that the list given by him is in no way exhaustive. Searle (1969: 54-71) discusses nine types of illocutionary acts, but under assertions he points out its difference to arguing, which is not separately treated by him. For other categorisations of illocutionary acts, see *ELL* vol. 8, p. 4124-25.

²⁹⁴ According to Searle (1969: 66-7) there are two preparatory rules of assertions. The first tells that the speaker 'has evidence (reasons, etc.) for the truth of p [i.e. the proposition]'; the second, that it is not obvious to the speaker and the hearer that the hearer knows the proposition. Furthermore, the speaker should believe that the proposition in question is true. This is called sincerity rule. The essential rule for assertions has been formulated by Searle as follows: 'Counts as an undertaking to the effect that p [i.e. proposition] represents an actual state of affairs.'

arguing (although ideally it should also be the part of his undertaking), but that he wants the interlocutor to acknowledge and learn something.

II.3.2.3 The context

Roughly said, the context of communication includes all the circumstances within which discourse takes place. In examining the various facets of these circumstances with regard to the *Pañjikā*, let us follow Fowler (1986: 86-101), who makes use of three kinds of context: context of utterance, context of culture and context of reference.

By context of utterance the immediate physical surroundings of the communication are understood. The location of the participants, their number, the channel employed and the presence or absence of any kind of split (temporal and spatial) in the communication are the most important elements of this context. Thus, the *Pañjikā* belongs to these kinds of discourse which have one, identifiable speaker (writer), i.e. Viśvarūpa, and the anonymous Audience consisting of many people (at least this was probably intended). The channel is writing and, as is almost always the case with written works, the participants take part in the communication at different points in time and space.

Much more interesting than this first, relatively simple kind of context is the second one, i.e. context of culture. To use Fowler's (1986: 88) words, this comprises 'the whole network of social and economic conventions and institutions constituting the culture at large, especially in so far as these bear on particular utterance contexts and influence the structure of discourse occurring within them.' We must admit that it is not an easy task trying to specify the context of culture of the *Pañjikā*. The greatest difficulty arises from the fact that the date of Viśvarūpa and to a certain extent also the region where he lived are uncertain. This problem can be partly solved by adopting a working hypothesis that Viśvarūpa wrote his commentary in Bengal in the first half of the 15th century.

Having accepted this, we can proceed by noting that in the case of the *Pañjikā*, four elements of context of culture seem to be significant. They are: historical backgrounds, religious movements existing at the time of its composition, the situation of science and education in the relevant period and the grammatical tradition prevailing in Bengal. However, among these four components the last one is doubtlessly the most, and the first one the least, important.

As far as the political history of Bengal is concerned, we have to notice that from the 13th century onwards Bengal was ruled almost exclusively by Muslim sovereigns. The only Hindu sultan who reigned in Bengal after the Muslim conquest was Rājā Gaṇeśa.

After the death of Ghiyās-ud-dīn A'zam Shāh in 1410 AD Gaṇeśa stayed at first in the background, but it was he who appointed three subsequent kings and then controlled them. Eventually, in 1417 AD Gaṇeśa ascended the throne as Danujamardana Deva. However, this period of Hindu rule in Bengal was short and troubled, since the Muslim society in Bengal, outraged at the reign of an unbeliever, asked Ibrāhīm Nūr Qutb-ul-Ālam, the ruler of Jaunpur, to help them to remove Gaṇeśa from the throne. Gaṇeśa died in 1419 AD and the circumstances of his death are unknown. He was succeeded by his son Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad Shāh, who had converted to Islam. Shortly after his death in 1433 AD, the so-called later Iliyās Shāhī dynasty came to power.

To conclude this short characterisation of the historical backgrounds of the *Pañjikā*, we might say that the most important point arising from it is that apart from some exceptions, the Muslim invasion in Bengal meant the end of royal patronage of Hindu culture.

Let us now depict the religious life in Bengal in the 15th century. The religion which was supported by the Bengali rulers and which was in most cases a key to a career was, naturally, Islam. Buddhism was probably no longer very popular at the time of the Muslim conquest of Bengal and in the 15th century it was practically non-existent. The position of Jainism was only slightly better. Among Hindus, Śaiva, Śākta and Vaiṣṇava sects were quite popular. At the beginning of the 16th century the teaching of Caitanya filled thousands of Bengalis with enthusiasm, thus launching a new religious movement. And last but not least, one peculiar trait of religious life in Bengal, i.e. the existence of the cult of minor goddesses such as Maṅgalachaṇḍī, Manasā and Bāsulī, which are not recognised by the upper classes of Hindu society, is worth mentioning.²⁹⁵

The third issue which we are going to discuss now is the intellectual life of Bengal, especially the state of education, in the 15th century. As already mentioned, the 13th and 14th centuries are sometimes said to be the dark age in cultural life of Bengal. Some scholars claim that no literary or scientific text can be assigned to these two hundred years.²⁹⁶ This might be a little bit exaggerated, but it is certainly true that there are not many works which can be with high probability put into this period. It is partly due to scarcity of such works and partly because either the time or the region of their composition cannot be determined. Among Bengali grammarians two can be ascribed to this period. These are Sīradeva (12th-14th AD, see I.9.2) and Ujjvaladatta (13th AD, see I.10.2), but their dating is far from being univocally agreed upon. From the 15th century onwards not only Sanskrit but also Bengali literature flourishes. It

²⁹⁵ Majumdar (1973: 218).

²⁹⁶ See Majumdar (1973: 262), who quotes some opinions on the subject.

is in this ‘renaissance’ age that Viśvarūpa probably wrote his commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.

Let us now ponder on how the Bengali educational system might have been in the 15th century. It is difficult to state anything for sure on the subject because we lack any information on the state of education in this period. What we have is, on the one hand, the description how ancient education looked or how it should have looked and, on the other hand, reports about the state of education in Bengal coming from the beginning of the 19th century. However, from these two extremes we can try to depict the Bengali ‘school system’ of the 15th century.²⁹⁷

As stated by Adam in his second report, in the first half of the 19th century there were two kinds of Hindu schools: elementary and higher ones. In elementary schools the instruction took place in Bengali and children were taught reading, writing and arithmetic. Although this type of school was not taken into account by early prescriptions, such as the *Manusmṛti*, it probably existed long before Muslim conquest of India. These elementary schools were connected with village assemblies and they provided a minimum of education for children who were excluded from traditional Sanskrit studies.²⁹⁸ Traditional Sanskrit education was cultivated at higher schools, which Adam termed ‘schools of learning’.²⁹⁹ Traditionally, Vedas were supposed to be the main subject of studies, but, as we are told by Adam, they were not very popular in Rajshahi, the district he explored in his second report; instead, grammar was the favourite branch of learning there.³⁰⁰ Contrary to elementary schools, in higher schools the instruction was given in Sanskrit. In Rajshahi three groups of subjects were taught: literature, which also included grammar, law (*smṛti*) and logic (*nyāya*). Each group presupposed the knowledge of the previous subject, therefore logic enjoyed theoretically the highest reputation.³⁰¹ As far as grammar was concerned, it is seen from the reports of Adam compared with other evidence that Pāṇini’s grammar was gradually being replaced by treatises belonging to non-Pāṇinian schools, which were mostly easier than the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.³⁰² However, we might assume that in the

²⁹⁷ Much of what will be said below about the Bengali educational system prevailing in the 15th century applies as well to previous and next centuries; so that in case the dating of Viśvarūpa has to be later modified, the description of this element of context of culture will not lose its relevance.

²⁹⁸ Ghosh (2002: 230-1).

²⁹⁹ DiBona (1983: e.g. 74).

³⁰⁰ DiBona (1983: 76).

³⁰¹ DiBona (1983: 80-81).

³⁰² Even from Adam’s reports it is clearly seen that Pāṇini’s grammar was studied first of all in Rajshahi, where it was taught in 6 out of 13 grammar schools. See DiBona (1983: 82). Apart from Rajshahi, only in Birbhum Pāṇini’s grammar with the *Kaumudī* (probably the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*), and not with the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* as in Rajshahi, was taught (ibid., p. 230). In other districts explored by Adam only non-Pāṇinian treatises were used. These were the Kātantra and the *Mugdhabodha* in Murshidabad (ibid., p. 227) and the *Mugdhabodha* and Jivagosvāmin’s *Harināmāmṛta* in Burdwan

period under discussion the prevailing system was that of Pāṇini. This is corroborated by the remark of Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara that he wrote the commentary on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* according to the Kātantra grammar because this system was not popular in his days, contrary to Pāṇini's grammar which was widely studied. Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara is usually dated in the end of the 15th century.³⁰³ Furthermore, as has already been mentioned in the previous subsection, in the 19th century in grammar schools in Rajshahi, the first treatise to be taught was Puruṣottamadeva's *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (in one case with the commentary of Sṛṣṭidhara on it) followed by the *Nyāsa*. The *Kāśikā* was not separately studied, it was known only through its commentary. In addition, Adam reports that in the district of Birbhum the treatise *Kaumudī* (probably the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*) belonging to the Pāṇinian tradition was used.³⁰⁴ Among non-Pāṇinian systems the following were studied in the districts described by Adam: the Kātantra, Jaumara, the school of Bopadeva, schools arisen around the *Ratnamālā*³⁰⁵ and the *Harināmāmṛta* of Jīvagosvāmin.³⁰⁶

The profession of teaching was traditionally to be performed by Brahmins. Since this was mainly the case in the 19th century, it must have been the rule in the earlier period. Furthermore, Adam notes that only one school in Rajshahi was run by two scholars. The common situation was (and this must be true for the 15th century) that what is here called a school consisted of one teacher to whom pupils came for instruction.³⁰⁷ Teachers did not have to gain proficiency in all three groups of subjects mentioned above. Many pundits from Rajshahi were mere grammarians, so if a student wanted to learn e.g. Sanskrit literature as well, he had to find another teacher after he completed his grammar studies.³⁰⁸

The financial situation of scholars varied. It depended much on where they lived

(ibid., p. 234). Besides, in Birbhum non-Pāṇinian treatises such as the *Samkṣiptasāra* and the *Mugdhabodha* were used (ibid., p. 230). In Rajshahi the Kātantra grammar was studied in two schools, the *Mugdhabodha* in three and the *Ratnamālā* (see fn. 305) in two (ibid., p. 82). See also Chandra Chakravarti (1913-16: (29)), who remarks that manuscripts of the *Nyāsa* which he collected for the edition of this commentary came chiefly from North Bengal, especially from Rajshahi district, and only a very few from West Bengal. He states also that at the beginning of the 20th century Pāṇinian grammar was not known at all in Bengal [p. (3)-(4)]. The popularity of other systems such as the Kātantra and the *Mugdhabodha* in the 18th and 19th century in Bengal is seen from the list of works composed in this period and given by Chinaharan Chakravarti (1930: 254-56). See also Bhattacharya (1946: [1]-[2]).

³⁰³ See also I.11.3.

³⁰⁴ DiBona (1983: 230).

³⁰⁵ What Adam meant by the *Ratnamālā* is the *Prayogaratnamālā*, an elementary treatise comprising elements of Pāṇinian and Kātantra grammar, and dated 14th century by Abhyankar (1961: 251). According to Aufrecht (1891: 356) it was written by Puruṣottama Śarman. Abhyankar gives the author's name as Puruṣottamavidyāvāgīśa.

³⁰⁶ See fn. 302.

³⁰⁷ DiBona (1983: 76).

³⁰⁸ DiBona (1983: 76, 82-83).

and how famous they were. The majority of teachers who dwelled and taught in villages led a rather humble life. They had no regular income, since traditionally they were rewarded at the end of studies (*dakṣiṇā*). This old custom was surely also common in the 15th century. They could have been supported by local rulers who were expected to grant them money, a piece of land etc.³⁰⁹ Besides, teachers used to be invited to funerals, marriages, festivals etc. and at these occasions they were bestowed with presents.³¹⁰ They could also participate in intellectual competitions. Those who visited many centres of learning and defeated other scholars were called *digvijayin* ('victorious in all quarters of the earth') and some of them were certainly very prosperous. Last but not least, a few scholars lived at the courts of local rulers or enjoyed their patronage. Naturally, after the Muslim conquest of Bengal the situation of Hindu scholarship got worse. However, some sultans are told to have been interested in Hindu culture and to have patronised Hindu scholars and writers.³¹¹

What we have described so far were relatively small schools, both elementary and higher ones. However, they were not the only kind of schools existing in mediaeval Bengal. Apart from them, there were big centres of learning, which we could call universities, existing at that time. Navadwipa in Bengal as well as Mithilā were said to have such universities. Both were famous for *navyanyāya* studies.³¹² In addition, Majumdar (1973: 231) enumerates some further centres of learning which were known in mediaeval Bengal. They are: Bansberia, Tribeni, Kumarhatta (Kāmārhaṭi), Bhaṭṭapālī (Bhāṭpārā), Gondalpārā, Bhadreswar, Jaynagar-Majilpur, Āndul and Bāli.

The last element of the *Pañjikā*'s context of culture which has been mentioned above is the grammatical tradition existing in the 15th century in Bengal. This is no doubt the most important factor bearing on Viśvarūpa's commentary. It has been also displayed in chapter I of the present work. Furthermore, in II.6 we focus our attention on possible influences other treatises had on the *Pañjikā*. Admittedly, the works taken into consideration there belong to the Pāṇinian system of grammar. It can be, however, argued that non-Pāṇinian treatises were also studied in Bengal in the period in question and that they could have had some bearing on Viśvarūpa's commentary. The reason why they were not considered here is that Pāṇini's system prevailed in the 15th century, what follows from the remark of Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara, which he made at the

³⁰⁹ DiBona (1983: 74-75).

³¹⁰ DiBona (1983: 79).

³¹¹ For instance, Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak Shāh (1459-1474 AD) is said to have patronised Muslim as well as Hindu men of learning. According to some researchers 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh (1493-1519 AD) was a patron of Hindu scholars and writers. See Majumdar (1973: 42; 54-57) and Ghosh (2002: 224).

³¹² Majumdar (1973: 229-230) and Sh. K. Mishra (1998: 80-81).

beginning of his commentary on the *Bhāṭṭikāvya*.³¹³

Last but not least, let us take up the context of reference of the *Pañjikā*. Fowler (1986: 89) sees in it ‘the topic or subject-matter of a text’, and in the case of the *Pañjikā* it is clearly the Pāṇini’s grammar or, more precisely, the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva.

II.4 Basic form of the *Pañjikā*

In this chapter I am going to explain how the text of the *Pañjikā* is made. To describe this task, I have used the term ‘basic form’, by which I mean a kind of grid into which the content of the *Pañjikā* is put. In other words, this chapter deals with the rough scheme according to which Viśvarūpa’s commentary is built up.

The basic form of the *Pañjikā* has been influenced by one crucial factor, viz. the kind of discourse, which is in this case a scientific treatise in the field of Sanskrit grammar. Once Viśvarūpa made a decision to write a commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, he did not have much freedom in forming his work. Thus, he had to follow the division of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, which in turn corresponds to the division of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. It is difficult to make statements about the whole text of the *Pañjikā*, because only its fragments have been preserved and out of these only one part is examined here, but if the text was completed (which is likely, as we have almost the whole commentary on the sixth *adhyāya*), it was divided into eight *adhyāyas* and each *adhyāya* comprised four *pādas*. The text of each *pāda* consists of commentaries on Pāṇini’s rules belonging to this particular section. Occasionally two *sūtras* are commented on together, but the rule is that each *sūtra* is discussed separately. The above is in no way surprising, since this scheme is very well known from other grammatical commentaries. Nevertheless, one trait of the *Pañjikā* could be mentioned here, even if it is not confined only to this text. Namely, while Puruṣottamadeva treats, in accordance with the title of his work, all of Pāṇini’s rules with the exception of those dealing with *chandās*, Viśvarūpa leaves some *bhāṣā-sūtras* uncommented. In the first *adhyāya*, which is scrutinised here, there are 52 rules referring to *bhāṣā* which are skipped by Viśvarūpa. It still makes up no less than 15,7 % of the rules explained by Puruṣottamadeva.

As with the division of the *Pañjikā*, so the structure of the commentary on the individual *sūtras* is highly predictable. There are, roughly speaking, two kinds of commentaries on grammatical rules and treatises. The first one, much commoner, focuses on the wording of the commented text, using examples to illustrate the theoretical dis-

³¹³ See I.11.3.

cussions. The second one takes as a starting point a particular example having something to do with the commented text, mostly an example apparently going against it. The first type is represented, for instance, by the *Nyāsa* and the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, and the second one by the *Durghaṭāvṛtti*. Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā* belongs to the first type. Thus, the typical commentary on a single *sūtra* in the *Pañjikā* begins with the explanation of a word (or words) from Pāṇini's *sūtra*, eventually followed by an example. Then, some words or phrases from the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, being mostly Puruṣottamadeva's illustrations of Pāṇini's rules, are discussed. In the course of the explication other *sūtras* are quoted. Usually only their beginnings, allowing to identify them, are cited, with the interruption sometimes coming in the middle of a word. Frequently, instead of a quotation, its paraphrase or a term or phrase characteristic for the *sūtra* in question are used.³¹⁴ As is typical for this kind of treatise, the opinions of other grammarians are occasionally presented. The names of grammarians are seldom mentioned, but this fact is neither surprising nor exclusively specific to the *Pañjikā*.³¹⁵

This structure of the commentary on the individual *sūtras* is not always followed by Viśvarūpa. Some elements mentioned above might be missing so that sometimes the commentary on the *sūtra* is confined to a discussion of one example. Although, by and large, we can say that the commentary on a single *sūtra* in the *Pañjikā* is highly schematic, still three traits of Viśvarūpa's work are worth mentioning, even if they are also found in other commentaries. Firstly, in most cases the explanation of an example begins by quoting it, then its *prakriyā*, i.e. rules used for its formation, follows. However, in places the inverted order is applied; *prakriyā* intertwined with the discussion of some theoretical problems precedes and the illustration is put at the end.³¹⁶ Secondly, the order of examples discussed by Viśvarūpa does not always correspond to the order of these examples as found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.³¹⁷ Thirdly, not all examples of Puruṣottamadeva are treated, instead some illustrations from the *Nyāsa* and other works (or perhaps original examples given by Viśvarūpa) are dealt with.

To sum up, we have to state that the structure of the *Pañjikā* as well as the structure of the commentary on a single *sūtra* are typical for this kind of treatise and they do not contain any new features.

³¹⁴ As, for example, *halñyādīlopam* (e.g. in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.3) instead of *halñyābbhyo dīrghāt sutīsy aprktaṃ hal* (P.6.1.68) or *pratyayalakṣaṇena* (in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.39) instead of *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* (P.1.1.62).

³¹⁵ For details of works quoted in the *Pañjikā*, see II.6.2.

³¹⁶ This is the case, for example, in the commentary on P.1.1.56, 68; 1.2.41.

³¹⁷ It happens seven times in the first *adhyāya*, so it is unlikely just a scribal mistake.

II.5 Style of the *Pañjikā*

In the previous chapter we examined the basic form of the *Pañjikā* as well as the form of the commentary on a single *sūtra*. Now it could be expected that afterwards we should scrutinise the form of sentence in the *Pañjikā* as the next unit smaller than the commentary on a single *sūtra*. This will not be the case. Instead, we are going to take up the style of Viśvarūpa's commentary, i.e. we will explore its language. Admittedly, the term style is sometimes used as confined to a sentence alone, but since I do not share this opinion, an analysis of stylistic features of a sentence in the *Pañjikā* makes up only one part of this chapter.

However, before we begin an examination of the style of the *Pañjikā*, we have to return to the discussion on the term style which has been entered upon in II.1.1.

II.5.1 Linguistic style

As will be recalled, in I.1.1 we have decided to adopt the narrow meaning of style, according to which style is understood as a language use of a particular writer (or of a group of writers). This has removed some difficulties connected with style; nevertheless, it has not clearly settled what the phenomenon which is going to be described here actually is like. There are still many definitions of style which are partly contradictory. Since the present work is not intended to discuss with full particulars the new (and old) trends in linguistic stylistics, I limit myself to three main types of approaches to style as proposed by Freeman (1970: 4-15). According to him, style is defined mainly as deviation from the norm, as recurrence of convergence of textural pattern, or as a particular exploitation of a grammar of possibilities.³¹⁸

Out of these the first group is the most questionable. Defining style as a deviation from the norm has two main drawbacks.³¹⁹ It compels us to admit that there are texts (or utterances) devoid of style. The second drawback, and a much more important one, is contained in the definition itself. The logical question which now emerges is:

³¹⁸ For another categorisation, consult Sowinski (1999: 52-57).

³¹⁹ More than these two drawbacks have been pointed out by scholars. In the opinion of Freeman (1970: 5) methodology of this school overwhelms the subject. Špillner (1974: 32-40) lists seven faults of defining style as deviation from the norm. They are: 1) this theory presupposes the existence of texts without style; 2) the norm and deviation cannot be precisely defined; 3) style is negatively defined; 4) the relation between deviation from the norm and stylistic features is not easily seen, because there are deviations which are not stylistic features (e.g. mistakes) and there are stylistic features which cannot be seen as deviations from the norm; 5) the categories of 'author' and 'reader' are neglected; 6) this theory cannot be applied to texts without features deviating from the norm; 7) in the course of the literary analysis, the greatest emphasis is laid on rare stylistic devices and, consequently, the text as a whole (e.g. its structure) is neglected.

What is actually the norm?³²⁰ As Jakobson rightly pointed out,³²¹ each style has its own specific norm. Thus, what is a deviation as seen from the perspective of one subcode is entirely normal in another one. Instead of the term norm Bloch uses the expression ‘the language as a whole’, but it does not remove any difficulty either.³²² Does the norm or ‘the language as a whole’ refer to the grammar of a language or rather language usage (or, if we put it slightly different, should the norm be understood on the level of *langue* or *parole*)? Note that especially spoken language differs from the norm, if it is understood as described by grammar, and these kinds of deviations are in the large part better classified as mistakes and not elements of an individual’s style. Intuitively we might understand what is meant by the definition of style as deviation from the norm, but it is difficult to translate this intuition into scientific terms.³²³ Nevertheless, some methods of the ‘deviation school’ can be useful (and are indeed used by followers of other theories). Especially the term *foregrounding*, which has been introduced by Mukařovský,³²⁴ has gained certain popularity. In the process of foregrounding some components of utterance are put in the foreground, in contrast to others which remain in the background. This is achieved by catching the attention of the recipient who hears or reads something different from what he or she expects. This surprise effect is only possible if the foregrounded element deviates from the norm current in this particular kind of utterance. According to Mukařovský, foregrounding attains its maximum intensity in poetic language, where it puts communication in the background, while the act of expression stays in the foreground.

The second group of definitions of style has been influenced by Jakobson’s famous remarks about poetic language (‘the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination’)³²⁵ and by his analysis of Baude-

³²⁰ Todorov (1971: 30-31) mentions two possible definitions of norm: norm identical with everyday language and norm as a particular type of discourse.

³²¹ See the discussion of Osgood’s paper ‘Some Effects of Motivation on Style of Encoding’ as recorded in Sebeok (1960: 330).

³²² See Bloch (1953: 42): ‘The style of a discourse is the message carried by the frequency-distributions and transitional probabilities of its linguistic features, especially as they differ from those of the same features in the language as a whole’. This definition has been vehemently criticised by Freeman (1970: 5-6), who doubts whether ‘the frequency distributions and transitional probabilities’ of natural language can ever be known and, even if they could have, if they might reveal something important about style.

³²³ The recent tendency is to understand the term norm as the norm of a particular subcode. See Riffaterre’s (1967: 426-7) ‘stylistic context’ in the role of the norm. But even if we adopt this meaning of norm and abandon, using Freeman’s words, a chimera of ‘language as whole’, it does not help us either. The core of the problem with the norm lies perhaps in its subjective and dynamic character. It changes in time, i.e. what was ‘normal’ yesterday does not have to be so today, and it differs from individual to individual. Norm is an abstract entity and the language norm has a lot of in common with the personal aesthetical taste, which cannot be expressed in scientific terms.

³²⁴ See Mukařovský (1970).

³²⁵ See Jakobson (1960: 358). Interpretations of this dictum are presented in Freeman (1970: 10), Fowler (1986: 74-76) and Posner (1969: 31-46).

laire's poem 'Les Chats', which he carried out with Lévi-Strauss.³²⁶ In examining this poem Jakobson concentrates on finding sets of equivalences existing on any possible level (phonetical, morphological, semantical, syntactical) and uses these equivalences to divide the text. Thus, his method is to a certain extent mechanical, but at the same time not free from subjective evaluation. In the ideal situation, the accumulation of equivalences should point to the same division of a text, but (as we can expect it) this is seldom the case. Much more frequently (and this also happens in the analysis of 'Les Chats') we have to deal with several rivalling hypotheses, so we are compelled to choose one which for some reasons seems to be dominant or the most important.³²⁷

The term equivalence is not the only one used in works belonging to this group of definitions of style. Another crucial concept is cohesion, which has been elaborated by Halliday and Hasan (1977). To put it simply, we speak about cohesion when the interpretation of one linguistic element presupposes the existence of another one or, as in the case of collocation, when several units which tend to appear in the same environment occur in a given (passage of) text. For details of cohesion the reader may consult II.5.6, where this concept is scrutinised more closely.

According to the third kind of definitions of style, style is a particular exploitation of a grammar of possibilities. What sounds as a very broad definition, which can comprise all various approaches to the phenomenon, is first of all used in studies based on the transformational-generative grammar.³²⁸ One of the prominent supporters of this approach to stylistic analysis is Richard Ohmann. His method consists in 'breaking down a sentence in a stretch of discourse into underlying kernel sentences' and in 'specifying the grammatical operations that have been performed upon them'.³²⁹ This already indicates that the weakness of the generative stylistics lies in narrowing its notion to syntax. Admittedly, Ohmann (1970: 276) is aware of the fact that style is not simply syntax, but he sees in syntax 'a central determinant of style'. This central position of syntax is seen more vividly in the stylistic analysis of the prose of Edward Gibbon and Ernest Hemingway carried out by Curtis W. Hayes. Similarly to Ohmann, Hayes (1970: 295) assures that 'style exists at all levels, not merely at the syntactical level', but at the same time his definition of style as 'a characteristic, habitual, and recurrent use of the transformational apparatus of language' (see p. 280) contradicts this statement. Still another problem is posed by the presupposition un-

³²⁶ It was originally published in French in 'L'Homme. Revue française d'anthropologie' II/1 (1962). I have utilised the German translation from 1969. See Jakobson and Lévi-Strauss (1969).

³²⁷ For the criticism of Jakobson's method, see Riffaterre (1966) and Posner (1969: 38-39, 42-46).

³²⁸ However, the idea of style as choice is not an invention of generativists. About such an understanding of style in non-generative works, see Spillner (1974: 45-46).

³²⁹ See Ohmann (1970: 267).

derlying the generative approach that it is possible to state exactly the same thing in different ways,³³⁰ or, using Ohmann's words, that 'the idea of style implies that words on a page might have been different, or differently arranged, without a corresponding difference in substance'.³³¹ This leads us to the problem of existence (or lack) of real synonyms. As has been stated in II.1.3, the view about the existence of exact synonyms is highly controversial. So-called synonyms can have different connotative meanings, can be used in different social situations or in different sentence constructions.³³² Furthermore, I am not sure if the demand on style, so explicitly stated by Ohmann, that it 'should' say the same thing in a different way is at all necessary and correct. Utterances which differ only in style (especially if we almost equate it with syntax) are known mainly from works dealing with stylistics and are seldom (if at all) found in language usage and never in literature.

Two further remarks can be made about the concepts of style presented above. Firstly, it is also possible to group various approaches to style in two categories depending on the main focus of the notion of style, this focus being either sentence or the whole text. Thus, the generative (and partly 'the deviation from the norm') stylistics studies style first of all on the sentence level, while the works belonging to Freeman's second category concentrate on those elements of style which go beyond the sentence limit. Hill (1958: 406) even excludes those features which are confined only to the sentence. According to him 'stylistics concerns all those relations among linguistic entities which are statable, or may be statable, in terms of wider spans than those which fall within the limits of the sentence'.

Secondly, alone the abundance of definitions of style suggests that none of them have been really satisfactory. Ohmann (1970: 262) explains the failure of previous attempts to define style by the absence of an appropriate linguistic theory that is 'inclusive, unified, and plausible'. Needless to say, in his opinion the generative grammar supplies such a theory, while the structuralist clearly does not. It is difficult to reason with such a sweeping statement. Furthermore, although choosing the linguistic theory can partly have influence on the results of the stylistic analysis and in any case on the methodology applied, I would see the failure of various definitions of style (inclusively the generative one) in attempting to define style using exclusively objective terms. The fear of subjectivity and impressionism³³³ has compelled scholars to formulate still new

³³⁰ See also Spillner's criticism of this approach (1974: 23-24).

³³¹ Ohmann (1970: 264).

³³² Notice that to state that exact synonyms do not exist is not identical with the assumption that form and content are inseparable. Form and content can be treated as different entities which are connected together so that a change in one of them entails a change in the other.

³³³ See criticism of impressionism as given in Ohmann (1970: 260), Hayes (1970: 280) and Spillner (1974: 76-77). See also Fowler (1971: 15-16) on aestheticians' approach, Neo-Aristotelianism and New

definitions as the old ones have turned out to be inappropriate. However, the question arises if it is at all possible to abandon subjectivity in describing the language style. I doubt it, because even such objective methods as statistical ones are not deprived of subjectivity. After all, we have to decide which linguistic elements should be counted and the results must be interpreted. And we can hardly ignore such subjective elements of language as its aesthetic features and effects it has on the recipient. Thus, to define style ‘scientifically’, meaning objectively, is as illusory as trying to define scientifically what art is. It does not mean that I propose to return to the so much condemned impressionism in the stylistic analysis. I merely postulate to accept the imperfection of any definition of style and the existence of such aspects of style which cannot be satisfactorily captured by objective methods.

II.5.2 The method of analysis

Having in the previous subsection described the variety of definitions of style, it is now appropriate to explain how this term is understood in the present work. In doing so three points which underlie my approach should be made. Firstly, I categorically reject the definition of style as deviation from the norm, irrespective of what is meant by norm. Consequently, in my opinion every text has its own style. It can be uninteresting or shared by many other works but it does exist. Secondly, I also object to the theory about intrinsic linguistic properties which are supposed to distinguish literary from non-literary texts. Thirdly and lastly, in my opinion style is a phenomenon which is neither confined to sentence nor it stays exclusively beyond it. Generally, apart from the restriction connected with the second point stated above, I would call my approach structuralist, although I do not deny that the methods of generative stylistics can prove convenient to examine syntactical features of style.

In the ensuing exploration of the *Pañjikā*’s style two terms, nominality and cohesion, play an important role. In the following three sections the *Pañjikā* as an example of so-called nominal style stays in the centre of interest. This part of analysis is based mainly on Hartmann’s exhaustive investigation of nominal style as given in his *Nominale Ausdrucksformen im wissenschaftlichen Sanskrit*. In II.5.6 cohesive elements of Viśvarūpa’s commentary are being described. This is done on the grounds of the excellent work *Cohesion in English* written by Hasan and Halliday.

To be precise, we start the examination of the *Pañjikā* by some general remarks about nominal style, then the style of the *Pañjikā* on the level of word (II.5.4) and sentence

Critics. Spencer and Gregory (1970: 82) plead for the combination of impressionistic and linguistic approach.

(II.5.5) is treated. Cohesion, which is investigated in II.5.6, as a textual phenomenon belongs to these two levels, but at the same time it stays above them or, as we can also say, it unites them.

Before we take up the concept of nominal style, it must be added that the following analysis of the *Pañjikā*'s style does not pretend to be exhaustive. Only some stylistic features are investigated below. However, it points the way one can go and it is sufficient for an evaluation of the style of Viśvarūpa's commentary.

II.5.3 Nominal style in the *Pañjikā*

The so-called nominal style is in no way a unique Sanskrit development. It occurs also in other Indo-European languages, but beyond the sphere of science it is not highly esteemed and we are usually taught to avoid it.³³⁴ This unfavourable opinion, present e.g. in English, does not refer to nominal style in Sanskrit. In fact, as nominal style is widely spread in Sanskrit, condemning it there would mean that we criticise the great part of or, according to others, even the whole Sanskrit literature.³³⁵

Now, what is actually nominal style? Where does it end and where does its counterpart, verbal style, begin? Before we try to approach the definition of nominal (or verbal) style, we must first of all set down what should fall into the categories 'noun' and 'verb'. Does an adverb count as a noun? Do infinitives or participles belong to the group of verbs or nouns? These questions might be difficult with regard to other languages, but they are easily answered by Sanskrit grammarians. According to them, only two parts of speech exist: a noun (*subanta*) and a verb (*tinanta*). What has a case suffix (even if it has been elided) is the former and what has a personal suffix (even if it has been elided) is the latter. Thus, since in adverbs, conjunctions, infinitives etc. case suffixes are either present or they are supposed to have been elided, these words are treated as nouns.³³⁶

Having solved the first problem, we can now focus our attention on the definition of nominal style. At the outset, let us notice a simple fact that almost every (Sanskrit) sentence contains more nouns than verbs. Consequently, it would be not sufficient to state that the most characteristic feature of nominal style is the predominance of nouns over verbs. Another possibility would be, as suggested by Wells (1960: 214-15), to examine the relation between a Noun-Word and a Verb-Word Quotient. On the

³³⁴ For English, see, for instance, Wells (1960: 214).

³³⁵ See Hartmann (1955: 17).

³³⁶ Indeclinable words are according to Pāṇini nominal bases (cf. P.1.2.45-46). Case suffixes which should be added to them are elided by P.2.4.82.

basis of our observations we could try to specify where the border between verbal and nominal styles lies. Albeit this method would certainly deliver some interesting information, I doubt that it could provide us with a unanimously accepted criterion of nominal style.

Much more promising than playing with numbers is seeing in nominal and verbal styles tendencies rather than separate opposite entities. Admittedly, in this context the term style is perhaps not the best one. It would be much more appropriate to speak of characteristic features of a certain style and to call these features nominality (or, as contrary to this, verballity). Thus, nominality and verballity would form a continuum of degree and every text could be placed somewhere between these two poles. Only by accepting such an interpretation of the term nominal style, can we agree with the often voiced opinion that no field of Sanskrit literature is free from nominal style, i.e. from nominality.

Let us now turn to the *Pañjikā*. Without doubt, the *Pañjikā* does not exhibit the degree of nominality present in *sūtra* works, where verbs are indeed a rarity. Nevertheless, even if sentences which contain a verb are not infrequent in the *Pañjikā*, they are not the commonest and the most typical for this commentary. Furthermore, the characteristic elements of nominality, such as usage of certain suffixes, compounds, abstract nouns and lexical replacements of inflectional suffixes, do abundantly occur in the *Pañjikā* (see II.5.4). The ensuing analysis does not have as its aim to explore the nominal elements of the *Pañjikā*'s style, but still I focus my attention on these features in the chapters dealing with vocabulary and sentence. In II.5.6 the textual elements of the *Pañjikā* will be taken up. Since as far as I can gather, this aspect of nominal style has not been examined yet, I cannot compare results of my research with characteristics of nominal style, but I do not expect that they would substantially differ from them.

Perhaps one more remark should be made before we go into details of the *Pañjikā*'s style. For obvious reasons, in the following analysis I do not, of course, consider the examples discussed by Viśvarūpa. That means that, for instance, while examining the occurrences of verbal forms present in the *Pañjikā*, I do not count as such verbs used as illustrations.

II.5.4 Vocabulary

One could think that to depict grammatical discussions in which ideally even the slightest difference in wording does not remain without consequences, an abundance

of vocabulary and grammatical means is required. However, the *Pañjikā* strikes us with its, let us call it, lexical and grammatical scantiness. The term scantiness is not used here pejoratively. It simply points out the fact that in the *Pañjikā* a few means are employed to express a maximum of content. This scantiness has two major reasons. One is the technical character of Viśvarūpa's commentary and the predominance of its content over the form. Thus, for a better understanding it is much more efficient to repeat the same word than to use another one, which possibly would not be the exact synonym of the first. The second reason, although not absolutely unconnected with the first one, is the degree of nominality in the *Pañjikā*, whose consequence is the reduction of morphological categories, or better said, the reiterated employment of a few morphemes to express certain notions.

This systematic usage of few grammatical devices is, according to Hartmann (1955: 31), typical of nominal style. He groups these devices in four main types such as: (primary) suffixes, lexical replacements of inflectional suffixes, compounds and abstract nouns.

In the first group Hartmann mentions five suffixes: *-ka*, *-in*, *-vat* (*-mat*), *-tr* and *-ya*. They all occur in the *Pañjikā*, but the most frequent are forms with the suffix *-ka* in its three functions examined by Hartmann: as an adjective (e.g. *āpekṣika* 'relative' as in *Pañj.* on P.1.2.43, *śaiṣika* 'relating to the remainder' as in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.58), as a formal sign of *bahuvrīhi*-compound (e.g. *anarthaka* 'meaningless, useless', e.g. in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.68, 1.2.6, 45; *-saṃjñaka* 'called, named', e.g. *iṭsaṃjñaka* in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.64, 1.3.2 etc.) and as an agent-suffix (e.g. *grāhaka* 'one who grasps' in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.10, terminus technici *kāraka*). Examples of the suffix *-ka* are numerous and easily found in the *Pañjikā* so I will limit myself to those quoted above. Next at the scale of frequency of occurrence in the *Pañjikā* is the suffix *-vat* (*-mat*) in the notion of 'possessing'. Some instances of words built with *-vat* are *ekāravat* 'having the phone *e*' (e.g. on P.1.3.30) and *aghoṣavat* 'voiceless' (e.g. on P.1.1.50). The possessive suffix *-in*³³⁷ and the gerundive suffix *-ya* (frequently denoting the object of action) are less common in the *Pañjikā*, but there are still ca. 20 words with each of these suffixes which are found in the first *adhyāya*. They are, for example, *saṃjñin* 'having a name, receiving a name' (e.g. on P.1.1.1), *sthānin* 'original form, that which should be substituted' (e.g. on P.1.1.56), *kārya* '(an operation) which should be done' (e.g. on P.1.1.1), *vācya* 'to be said' (e.g. on P.1.2.45). Among suffixes scrutinised by Hartmann, the suffix *-tr* is the rarest in the *Pañjikā*. It is contained e.g. in *śāstr* 'teacher' (P.1.4.3, 32) and in terminus technici *kartṛ* 'agent', which is, however, very

³³⁷ According to Hartmann (1955: 43), the suffix *-in* expresses the notion of 'correlate to' ('korrelat, Korrelat zu ...').

frequently used (e.g. on P.1.2.5).

The second characteristic trait of nominal style according to Hartmann consists in systematic usage of certain words to express the function of inflectional suffixes. Among the replacements of case suffixes the commonest in the *Pañjikā* are compounds with *artham* ‘for the sake of’ as the last element employed in the meaning of a dative (as e.g. on P.1.1.1). The locative is sometimes conveyed by *-gata* (as in P.1.2.10) or *-stha* (as in P.1.4.45). Compounds with *-dvaya* at the end have the meaning of dual number (as e.g. on P.1.1.70). The replacement of plural suffixes is not found in this portion of the *Pañjikā*. Not only case suffixes can be substituted by lexical units. Some aspects of finite verbal forms are also liable to being otherwise expressed. For instance, in the *Pañjikā* the identity function is often taken over by compounds with *-bhūta*, *-rūpa*, *-lakṣaṇa* and *-ātmaka*. Modality is conveyed by *saṃbhava* (or more frequently *asaṃbhava*) at the end of a compound (e.g. on P.1.1.56, 58; 1.2.59). Occasionally *prasaṅga* (in P.1.1.58) and *darśana* (in P.1.4.60) are used.

Compounds make the third group of ‘nominal devices’ as given by Hartmann. Although they are not restricted to nominal style, the possibility to combine several bases increases the degree of nominality and, as seen above, can also fulfil the function of inflectional (even personal) suffixes. The compounds are numerous in the *Pañjikā*, but as a rule they are not very long. The longest compound in the first *adhyāya*, *suṭṣuptinṭṛṅkrñprabhṛtayah* ‘*suṭ*, *sup*, *tiñ*, *tṛn*, *krñ* etc.’ (in the commentary on the *Śivasūtras*), consists of six elements; more typical are two, three or four.

The fourth and last lexical trait of nominal style according to Hartmann is the usage of abstract nouns. These are sorted into the following six groups: root nouns, stems ending in *-a* (and *-ā*), built with *-ana* (*-anā*), with *-ti*, *-tva* (or *-tā*) and abstract nouns consisting of suffixes causing *vṛddhi*. The *Pañjikā* contains instances of all these groups. However, the most common are two of them: the second, ending in the suffix *-a*, and the fifth, built with the suffix *-tva* (or *-tā*). From the former, the word *bhāva* ‘existing, becoming; state’ (and *abhāva*) occurs very frequently, especially as the last element of a compound. The instances of this usage are numerous, I mention only a few found in the commentary on the first five *sūtras*: *ekāsaṃjñādhikārābhāva*, *guṇābhāva*, *sthānivattvābhāva*, *sthānivadbhāva*, *guṇābhāva*. Forms with *-tva* are also abundant (e.g. *bhatva* ‘state of being *bha*’, *svaritatva* ‘state of having the accent *svarita*’) and they are employed to express the same meaning which is conveyed by a compound with *-bhāva* at the end. The suffix *-tva* is used more frequently than the relevant form with *-bhāva*, the suffix *-tā* occurs seldom.³³⁸

³³⁸ Even in the commentary on the same *sūtra* the forms with *-bhāva* and *-tva*, both having the

To end with, let us make some remarks about verbs found in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*. As already stated, verbs are quite frequent in the *Pañjikā*, i.e. the process of nominality has not been taken to the extreme there. Verbs such as *pravartate*, *asti*, *sampadyate* or *bhavati* are frequently used merely to express existence and in this function as copula they could be easily omitted without changing the meaning of a sentence.³³⁹ Still, there are quite many occurrences of ‘normal’ usage of verbs, in both active and passive. They often occur in etymological explanations, such as *saṃkhyāyate gaṇyate anayeti saṃkhyā* (‘*saṃkhyā* is that by which it is estimated, i.e. counted’ on P.1.1.23), and in sentences which express the notion of modality, future tense or desire (e.g. *syāt*, *bhūt*, *kuryāt*, *anuvartisyate*, *vivakṣyate*). Moreover, as is to be expected in a grammatical treatise, many of them convey the meaning of understanding (e.g. *gam*, *jñā*, *grh*), learning (e.g. *paṭh*), telling or teaching (e.g. *vac*, causative forms of *jñā*, *budh*, *sūc*), being valid or invalid (e.g. *labh*, *sidh*, *nivṛt*) or being blocked or negated (e.g. *bādh*, *pratiśidh*, *niśidh*).

Last but not least, let us mention one more trait of the *Pañjikā*’s vocabulary, its collocation. Contrary to other elements examined in this subsection, collocation has nothing to do with the phenomenon of nominality. Moreover, although it reveals an important aspect of vocabulary, it itself belongs to textual features of discourse and as such will be closer scrutinised in II.5.6.5.

II.5.5 Sentence

To analyse sentences of any work means to know at least where one sentence ends and another begins. This might seem to be trivial, but in the case of the *Pañjikā* it is not. Admittedly, Bengali script employs a *daṇḍa* (or a double *daṇḍa*) as a sign of sentence border. Furthermore, both kinds of *daṇḍa* are found in the manuscripts of the *Pañjikā*. However, occurrences of these two signs are so rare there that it is impossible to treat pieces of text lying between them as one sentence. A double *daṇḍa* generally opens and closes the commentary on a single *sūtra*. Sometimes it appears in the middle of the commentary to mark the end of a quotation or seldom to signal the change of subject. A single *daṇḍa* is used to close some bigger thematic portions within a commentary on a single *sūtra* or it is put at the end of the second *pāda* in verses quoted by Viśvarūpa. In manuscript A another sign, a dot written

same meaning, can occur, as for instance *sthānivattva* and *sthānivadbhāva* in the commentary on P.1.1.4.

³³⁹ Cf. e.g. *Pañj.* p. 4: *etad uktam bhavati* and ... *mālīkarotīty ākāragrahaṇam bhavati* with *Pañj.* on P.1.2.64: *tenaitad uktam* and *Pañj.* p. 5: *yaralavīyavakārasya neḍ vaśīty atra grahaṇam*. Cf. also *Pañj.* on P.1.1.26: *nanu ... tayor niṣṭhāsaṃjñēti spaṣṭa eva itaretarāśrayadoṣaḥ* and *Nyāsa* ad loc.: ... *itaretarāśrayo doṣo bhavati*.

in the middle of a line, is frequently employed. It seems possible that it indicates the end of a sentence, but, on the other hand, some occurrences of this mark cannot possibly have this function. Thus, unless we regard these problematic instances of the dot as mere scribal mistakes and, consequently, accept the dot as the sign marking the sentence border, we are deprived of any graphic help in making a decision about sentence boundary. This means that in most cases a full stop in the edition of the *Pañjikā* has no equivalent in the manuscript. Therefore, it is necessary to explain on what basis the decision where to place a full stop has been made.³⁴⁰

To begin with, it seems reasonable to have a look at definitions of a sentence offered by western linguistics and Indian tradition. However, the hope to find there a universally valid and accepted answer to the question about the nature of a sentence comes to nothing. Even the number of various attempts to define a sentence which are undertaken in these two traditions suggests the vagueness of the term ‘sentence’. And indeed, whether we see in a sentence the largest independent syntactic form which cannot be embedded in any other syntactic form by any grammatical rule as Bloomfield (1933: 170) did or we accept Kātyāyana’s definition, according to which semantically connected words among which one is a verbal form constitute a sentence,³⁴¹ we will always have to deal with some cases where our definition proves inappropriate. Thus, it is perhaps not a coincidence that such a vast work as *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (ELL)* does not have an entry for ‘sentence’, instead only sentence types are treated there.

After these preliminary remarks I would like to present two main guidelines I have adopted in dividing the text of the *Pañjikā* into sentences. Firstly, I am inclined to accept that the dot found in manuscript A could have had the function of marking the end of a sentence. However, I do not follow this mark blindly and regard it rather as an additional help. Secondly, the definition of sentence which I particularly often used is that of Kātyāyana,³⁴² but I consider a complex sentence to be one sentence and, as is to be expected, I do not treat each finite verbal form employed as an *udāharaṇa* as a separate sentence. Needless to say, I do not want to claim that the criteria mentioned above are sufficient and completely satisfactory and that they have been applied everywhere without any exception. They are only tendencies and in places the

³⁴⁰ In this context let us note the observation of Hartmann (1955: 126) that the borders of nominal sentences are often fluid.

³⁴¹ See vārtt. 9 (*ākhyātaṃ sāvyayakāra-kaviśeṣaṇaṃ vākyaṃ*) and 10 (*ekatīṅ*) on P.2.1.1 (*Mbh.* I 367.10, 16). On the differences between the understanding of sentence by Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, see Deshpande (1987) and Bronkhorst (1990).

³⁴² In case of nominal sentences Kātyāyana assumed that the finite verbal form of the verb ‘to be’ has to be understood. See vārtt. 11 on P.2.3.1 (*avakāśo ‘kāra-kam iti cen nāstir bhavantīparaḥ prathamapuruṣo ‘prayujyamāno ‘py asti, Mbh.* I 443.5-6).

decision actually made can differ from them.

Now, we can proceed with the analysis of sentences in the *Pañjikā*. Generally, there are two main types of sentences in Sanskrit: a verbal and a nominal one. Both are found in the *Pañjikā*, but the latter occurs more frequently. However, it does not mean that verbal sentences are exceptional there. They are frequently used in etymological explanations and in cases where the notion other than that of present or past tense is to be conveyed (see II.5.4). Verbal sentences found in the *Pañjikā* are generally short and not very complicated in structure. Simple sentences prevail but complex ones, e.g. with a structure *yad... tad...* in all its variations (*yatra... tatra...*, *yathā... tathā...* etc.) or with a conjunction *hi* opening the causal clause, are also present.

The second type of a sentence, a nominal one, can occasionally contain a verbal form, but it functions merely as a copula. In his analysis of nominal style Hartmann divides a nominal sentence into two categories. In the first one, both the agent and the predicate are in the nominative. This group comprises appositional and participial sentences, as well as sentences with the construction *yad... tad...* The second form of a nominal sentence contains the agent in the genitive and the predicate in the nominative. Among these four subcategories of nominal sentence, the participial one is the rarest. The one with the agent in the genitive is especially frequent in description of operation of substitution, elision or affixing.

Since examples of all these kinds of sentences, including the participial one, are easily found in the *Pañjikā*, I will give here only one instance of each kind.

Nominal sentence, type I:

a) appositional: *saṃkhyā saṃjñinī* (on P.1.1.25) ‘Numeral is the one which is to be termed.’

b) participial: ***pracurārthāv*** *iti vacanād vaipulyasaṃghavacanau nivartitau*. (on P.1.1.23) ‘Because of stating *pracurārthau* (“having the notion of ‘many’”) the words *vaipulya* (“largeness”) and *saṃgha* (“heap, multitude”) are suspended.’

c) with the construction *yad... tad...*: *ikas te iti vācye yad guṇavṛddhī grahaṇam tat saṃjñāvidhāne niyamārtham sūcayitum*. (on P.1.1.3) ‘[*Guṇa* and *vṛddhi* are present in the *sūtra* by the virtue of *anuvṛtti*. Thus,] when it (i.e. the *sūtra*) could be formulated as *ikas te* (“these [take the place] of *ik*”), the use of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* [in the *sūtra*] is for the sake of indicating that the cause [of this mention] is the restriction [only] in the case of [prescriptions] containing these technical terms.’

Nominal sentence, type II:

ā sarvanāmna iti (P.6.3.91) *dakārasyāttvam*. (on P.1.1.23) ‘[On *tāvatkṛtvas*:] By rule P.6.3.91 *ā sarvanāmnaḥ* there is the state of *āt* of the phone *d* (i.e. the phone *d* is substituted by *ā*).’

To end with, I would like to point out two more traits of sentence structure which are liable to attract the attention of the reader. Albeit these two traits are not restricted only to the *Pañjikā*, they are still, I think, worth mentioning here. They are, firstly, an abundant usage of the locative absolute and, secondly, a small number of occurrences of subordinate clauses, whose function in the case of causal clauses has been taken over partly by the ablative form of compounds ending with an abstract noun in *-tva* and partly by the construction with *iti*. Both these characteristics or, in other words, three structural elements (the locative absolute, the ablative of compounds ending in *-tva*, the construction with *iti*) are met with in all the sentences of the *Pañjikā*, irrespective of the fact whether they are classified as verbal or nominal ones.

II.5.6 Textual features: cohesion in the *Pañjikā*

Having examined the language of the *Pañjikā* at the level of a single word and a sentence, let us now consider the textual aspects of Viśvarūpa’s commentary. In fact, what makes the *Pañjikā*, or generally speaking, any other work a text? Although we usually know if a particular unit of language constitutes a text, the answer to the question about the nature of texture, i.e. about the nature of ‘being a text’, is fairly complex. There are many factors, belonging to form or content of a work, being linguistic or non-linguistic, that contribute to texture. They are no doubt the structure of a work (see II.4) and the presence of what Fowler (1986: 61) calls ‘a progressive sequence of ideas’. The latter means that an author is expected to stay more or less on the topic, but simultaneously he is not supposed to repeat the same proposition all the time. To these two non-linguistic elements we must add one linguistic aspect of texture, cohesion.

Cohesion is a semantic concept elaborated by Halliday and Hasan (²1977). It occurs when an element in a text presupposes another one, without which it cannot be decoded. The classic example would be that of a personal pronoun referring to a person or thing already mentioned in the text. These two items, the interpreted one and that by which the other one is interpreted, form a cohesive tie.

Cohesion is not a uniform concept. According to Halliday and Hasan it is divided

into five types: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. The boundaries between these categories are in no way clear-cut, but this does not so much speak against the theory of cohesion but simply proves the complexity of language.

Now, one important point needs to be made. Namely, although cohesion is treated here after the chapters dealing with vocabulary and sentence, it does not mean that it stays above the sentence. Cohesion makes sentences hang together, but it is also present in the sentence itself. However, within the boundaries of one sentence, cohesion is not the only text-forming (linguistic) element, another one being the sentence structure.

Before I begin the discussion of the first category of cohesion, viz. reference, I would like to make some general observations about Viśvarūpa's commentary. There are roughly two types of text in the *Pañjikā*: one consisting only of simple *prakriyās* and the second one containing some more complicated and general discussions. It is characteristic for the first kind that cohesive elements are rarely used there. The reason for this might be that in the case of such compact and relatively plain explanations, the mere development of ideas is sufficient to express the content. Where problems arise and the discussion becomes more vivid and complex, cohesive elements have to be used if we want to avoid ambiguity. Or we can also say that cohesion belongs to the form of a work and progress to its content and that in *prakriyās* the content is still more important than it is in other portions of the *Pañjikā* and the form plays a marginal role there.

II.5.6.1 Reference

If a linguistic item cannot be semantically interpreted in its own right and needs something else to be correctly decoded, it stays in a semantic relation called reference. This 'something else' can belong to the context of utterance – in this case we speak of exophoric reference – or it can be an element of the text and the reference is called endophoric. Furthermore, a linguistic item can point to a textual unit found in the preceding or in the following portion of the text. In the first case, which is much more frequent, the reference item is said to be anaphoric, otherwise it is cataphoric. Let us note that since cohesion is defined as a relation between two (or more) linguistic units only endophoric reference is cohesive.

Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 31-87) have put reference items of English into three categories: demonstratives, personals and comparatives. These are also found in Sanskrit and almost all of them are present in the *Pañjikā*.

Albeit, as already mentioned, some parts of the *Pañjikā* are virtually devoid of cohesive

elements, reference is very common in Viśvarūpa's commentary. The biggest group of reference items is formed by demonstratives *tad*, *idam* and *etad*, but adverbs *atra*, *tatra*, *ataḥ* and *iha* are also frequently found in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*. A *sūtra* which is commented upon is referred to by *idam*, *etad*, by the adverbial demonstrative *atra* 'here, in this *sūtra*' and rarely by *iha*. A *sūtra* or item which has been just mentioned in the commentary is pointed to by *tad*, *idam*, *etad* and by *atra*. The adverb *atra* is frequently put after *iti* closing a quotation. However, in this case it always refers to the element (e.g. the quoted *sūtra*) which is located within the same sentence as *atra* and it is, therefore, questionable whether we can treat this usage of *atra* as cohesive. The demonstratives mentioned so far are first of all employed anaphorically. Cataphoric usage of demonstratives occurs seldom in the *Pañjikā*. In this sense the demonstrative *idam* is mostly employed, but there is also one occurrence of *tad* referring to the following text.³⁴³

As far as the second category of reference, i.e. personals, is concerned, it is interesting to note that the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* does not contain any single example of cohesive personals. This is partly due to the nature of Sanskrit and partly constitutes a characteristic trait of the *Pañjikā* or of any scientific treatise in Sanskrit. Thus, Sanskrit does not have proper pronouns of the third person; instead, their function is taken by demonstratives. On the other hand, the pronouns of the first and second person are not found in Viśvarūpa's argumentation. They occur only in examples discussed by him, but in these examples they are not endophoric and, thus, non-cohesive.³⁴⁴

Let us now take up the last group of reference items, the comparatives. They are present but relatively rare in the *Pañjikā*. The system of comparison has been split by Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 76) into two main groups: general and particular comparison, which are further subdivided. Thus, general comparison includes the categories of identity, similarity and difference. The second group, particular comparison, falls into numerative and epithet. For the sake of the present analysis I have to a large extent adopted this categorisation, with a slight difference in that I do not differentiate between identity and similarity.³⁴⁵

³⁴³ This is the case in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.5.

³⁴⁴ We could call them quasi-exophoric, because they are found either in quotations from other works where they are endophoric or in commonplace phrases which are given for the sake of illustration but which do not have anything to do with the situation (context of utterance) of the writer, i.e. Viśvarūpa. See, for example, *Pañj.* on P.1.1.29 or on P.1.4.105.

³⁴⁵ Instead of speaking about 'identity' and 'similarity', I would rather use the term 'likeness', which is also in this context employed by Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 77). Besides, note that in the opinion of Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 77-78), the category 'difference' comprises two kinds of difference: non-identity and non-similarity.

Viśvarūpa first of all makes use of general comparison, which takes place when two items are compared and either the likeness or the difference between them is expressed. In the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* the following comparatives are found: *tathā*, *tādṛśa*, *evam* and *tulya*, belonging to the former category, and *apara*, *antara*, *anya*, *anyatra*, *anyathā* and *śeṣa*, belonging to the latter. In the case of particular comparison, two items are compared in respect of a certain property, which can be spoken of in terms of quantity (numerative comparison) or of quality (epithet). The commonest property, which is the object of such comparison in the *Pañjikā* is the position of two linguistic units (mostly phones), and the comparatives used on these occasions are *pūrva* and *para*.

II.5.6.2 Substitution

Substitution consists in replacing one linguistic item with another. This seems to resemble reference, but the difference between reference and substitution is fundamental. Substitution takes place on the level of wording, reference is a semantic relation. While two items linked by a relation of reference have the same referential meaning, i.e. they refer to the same person or thing, this is not the case with substitution. Furthermore, a reference item can point to any direction, while a substitute is potentially anaphoric, and thus, cataphoric substitutes are extremely rare. Perhaps one of the most important features differentiating these two types of cohesion is that of repudiation or modification. A substitute carries over some part of the meaning of another linguistic item. The component which is not carried over is repudiated (or modified) and the fact that there is something that is repudiated distinguishes substitution from reference, where the whole meaning of the linguistic item is taken over.

Substitution is categorised according to the grammatical function of a substitute. In English there are three types of substitution: nominal (one, ones, same), verbal (do) and clausal (so, not). As we can see from the previous sentence, the list of substitutes in English is rather short. This is also the case in Sanskrit, which clearly prefers ellipsis and lexical reiteration (or even repetition) to substitution. Furthermore, albeit Sanskrit knows the categories of noun, verb and clause, only clausal substitution is of importance in Sanskrit texts.

As already stated, the crucial concept in describing substitution is that of repudiation or modification, the second term being more suitable while we speak of clausal substitution. The fact that something in the substituted clause is modified helps to distinguish substitution from ellipsis. According to Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 131), clausal substitution takes place in three environments. These are: report, condition

and modality. In all these contexts, the clause which is substituted is modified because it becomes part of a report, a condition or a statement judging its probability. All these three types of clausal substitution are possible in Sanskrit but only conditional substitution is found in the *Pañjikā*.

There are two clausal substitutes which are used by Viśvarūpa in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*. These are *evam* and *tathā*. The latter is employed more frequently and occurs in such phrases as: *evam sati...* (on P.1.1.6, 37; 1.2.5), *yadi syād evam...* (on P.1.2.1) and *yady evam...* (on P.1.4.3). The substitute *tathā* appears in the *Pañjikā* in *tathā ca sati...* (on P.1.2.6). The negative substitute *na* is not found in the part of the *Pañjikā* which is examined here.

II.5.6.3 Ellipsis

Strictly speaking, ellipsis cannot be put on the same footing as other kinds of cohesion, because it should rather be classified as a kind of substitution, namely, a substitution of a linguistic item by zero. However, although the nature of ellipsis is similar to that of substitution, the method of its analysis is somewhat different. While we explore substitution, we deal with a linguistic unit which should be interpreted by taking recourse to some other part of the text. In the case of ellipsis, we have to recognise that something has been omitted in the text and then, we can search for the elided element. The important point here is that it is the sentence structure that reveals that something is missing.

Similarly to substitution, ellipsis in English is divided into three types: nominal, verbal and clausal; this categorisation can also be accepted for Sanskrit.

Before I give some examples of ellipsis found in the *Pañjikā*, let me mention two features distinguishing ellipsis in Sanskrit from that in English. Firstly, it has to be mentioned that verbal ellipsis is not so common and complex in Sanskrit as it is in English. This is due to the fact that a verbal group is built mainly analytically in English and synthetically in Sanskrit. Consequently, such aspects of a verbal group as finiteness (inclusive modality), polarity, voice and tense³⁴⁶ are expressed by affixes in Sanskrit, and affixes cannot be freely elided. At this point it is also important to state what is not to be confused with ellipsis in Sanskrit. Namely, as has already been mentioned, the typical nominal sentence does not contain any finite verbal form. According to Sanskrit grammarians, one could supply the verb meaning ‘to be’ in order to complete a nominal sentence, so we could argue that we have a kind of

³⁴⁶ This is according to Halliday and Hasan (1977: 167).

ellision here.³⁴⁷ However, this is not ellipsis in the sense discussed here. The finite verbal form can be supplied to make a sentence a sentence, if we accept Kātyāyana's definition of *vākya*,³⁴⁸ but this finite form does not have to be (and normally it is not) present in the preceding portion of the text. In the case of cohesive ellipsis, the element which has been omitted must occur in the text, predominantly in its preceding portion. The second difference between ellipsis in Sanskrit and in English is the fact that in the case of the former, the distinction between the three types of ellipsis is still less clear-cut than it is in English. In English clausal ellipsis tends to be difficult to set apart from verbal ellipsis, or as Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 197) have put it, we can look at verbal ellipsis from another angle, 'taking the clause as the point of departure'. In addition to this, in Sanskrit, especially in so-called nominal style, the difference between nominal and clausal ellipsis becomes unclear. If one nominal group or even one noun can form a sentence (and in the *Pañjikā* this is not such an unusual case), how should we classify its elision? Let us take, for example, the excerpt from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.4 *na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke*, which teaches the suspension of substitution by *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* when an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix causing an elision of a part of a root follows. Commenting upon this *sūtra*, Viśvarūpa asks about the necessity of the word *dhātu* in the rule in question: *dhātugrahaṇam kim*. The answer is: *anubandhalope mā bhūt* ('[The word *dhātu* is used] so that [the *sūtra* P.1.1.4] would not apply when there is the elision of the marker'). In the translation given above, two portions of the text have been added. The second one must be supplied from the general context of the discussion and its lack in the original text is non-cohesive in the sense adopted here. The first one corresponds to *dhātugrahaṇam* from the previous sentence in the *Pañjikā*. The omission of *dhātugrahaṇam* is an example of nominal ellipsis, but it can be also treated as clausal ellipsis.

Generally, nominal ellipsis seems to be the most common in the *Pañjikā*. The type of nominal/clausal ellipsis, such as presented above, occurs quite frequently in similar situations, i.e. in short answers to questions. However, Viśvarūpa uses also nominal ellipsis of, let us call it, pure type, being an ellipsis of a nominal group (or of its part) which cannot be interpreted as clausal ellipsis. Let us have a look at the passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.1 *vṛddhir ād aic*, which teaches that *āt*, meaning the long vowel *ā*, and *aic*, meaning the vowels *ai* and *au*, are called *vṛddhi*. In the *Pañjikā* on this *sūtra* Viśvarūpa asks the following question: *nanu kim iyam samudāyasya samjñā uta pratyekam?* ('Now, does this term [*vṛddhi*] refer to the collection [of all the vowels mentioned in the rule] or to each single one of them?'). Next, he discusses

³⁴⁷ See fn. 342.

³⁴⁸ See fn. 341.

the possibility of the first alternative and then states: *ataḥ pratyekam ity eṣa pakṣaḥ sthiraḥ* ('Hence, the view is settled that [the term in question refers to] each single [element].'). The word *saṃjñā* ('term') has to be supplied here from the preceding text, but this time it is not the immediately preceding sentence, since ellipsis occurs in the fourth sentence after the one with the term *saṃjñā*.

As far as verbal ellipsis is concerned, it must be noted that in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* there is no single example where only the finite verbal form is elided. The omission of the verbal form is always accompanied by the elision of a nominal group, so that in these cases we can rather speak of clausal ellipsis.

However, on the other hand, clausal ellipsis does not have to take place only when the finite verbal form has been elided. Let us once again take an excerpt from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.1. Now, the unusual order of words in this *sūtra* is discussed.

nanu sarvatra pūrvam saṃjñā nirdiśyate yathād eṅ guṇaḥ (P.1.1.2) *bhūvādayo dhātava iti* (P.1.3.1) *tat katham iha na tathā kṛtam? ucyate: vṛddhisābdasya maṅgalārthatām sūcayitum.*

Now, everywhere [in the grammar] the item which is to be named is mentioned at the first place, as, for example, in P.1.1.2 *ad eṅ guṇaḥ* ('[The vowels] *a* and *eṅ*, i.e. *e* and *o*, are called *guṇa*') and in P.1.3.1 *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ* ('*bhū* etc. are called *dhātu*'); thus, why is it not so done here? It is said [that this is not so done here] to indicate that the word *vṛddhi* is [used] for the sake of auspiciousness.

The omission of *iha na tathā kṛtam* is an example of clausal ellipsis, but this clause does not contain any finite verbal form.

To end with, let us mention one more instance of clausal ellipsis. What I mean is the answer *na* given to yes/no questions. This is used, for example, in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.2 *ad eṅ guṇaḥ*, where Viśvarūpa writes:

nanu vṛddhisāṃjñā bādhikā syāt? na. ekāsaṃjñādhikārābhāve samāveśo 'pi sambhavyeta.

Now, would the term *vṛddhi* not prohibit [*guṇa*]? No. In the case of the absence of *adhikāra* '*ekā saṃjñā*' [prescribing only one name to one grammatical element, as taught in P.1.4.1], the simultaneous application [of the terms *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*] would be also possible.

II.5.6.4 Conjunction

Conjunction differs considerably from the kinds of cohesion explained so far. Conjunctive elements do not primarily point to other textual units, it is rather that their meaning presupposes the presence of two portions of a text and at the same time it

combines them. As Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 227) put it, conjunction ‘is no longer any kind of a search instruction, but a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before’.

At this point it is important to specify what is meant here by ‘textual units’ or by the more vague expression ‘what is to follow’ and ‘what has gone before’. Halliday and Hasan are not entirely consistent in this respect. On the one hand, they maintain (p. 7-9) that cohesion (and thus also conjunction) operates not only between sentences but also within the sentence, although in the latter case it is not the sole element contributing to texture. On the other hand, explaining the relation of conjunction they state (p. 232) that ‘cohesion is a relation between sentences, not a relation within the sentence’.³⁴⁹ Thus, while it is beyond any doubt that conjunction is a relation between sentences, it is questionable whether conjunctive elements operating within the sentence are cohesive or not. Since firstly, I tend to agree with the opinion that cohesion can take place within the sentence, and secondly, as mentioned in II.5.5, the boundary of sentences in the *Pañjikā* might sometimes be difficult to draw, in the present work the existence of cohesion not only between sentences but also within a single sentence is assumed. However, to avoid misunderstanding, let me add that not every conjunctive element in the sentence must be cohesive. Some belong clearly to the sentence structure or they connect linguistic items within one syntactical unit. These are not treated as cohesive in the ensuing analysis.³⁵⁰

Having made these preliminary remarks, let us examine conjunction in the *Pañjikā*. Some of the most frequent conjunctives in the *Pañjikā* are: *tu*, *ca* and *nanu*. Others are, for instance, *api*, *hi*, *atha*, *athavā*, *tarhi*, *idānīm* and *punar*.

The category ‘conjunctives’ seems to be relatively simple, but it is not exempt from interpretation problems. Thus, there is a group of conjunctives which are formally a combination of a reference and conjunctive item. These are: *tathā hi*, *tathā ca*, *tathāpi*, *kiṃ ca* and *kiṃ tu* to mention some.³⁵¹ However, since the meaning of a reference element is vague in them and, consequently, they function rather as a whole and not as a combination of two items, they are classified as conjunctives here.

Still another classificatory problem is caused by a group of conjunctives which are

³⁴⁹ However, note that the first opinion stems from the part written by Hasan alone, while the second one comes from the chapters which Halliday and Hasan wrote together, so that the apparent inconsistency could reflect the difference of opinion between these two authors. See Halliday and Hasan (²1977: vii-viii).

³⁵⁰ Some examples of such non-cohesive conjunctives are: *yathā*, *yataḥ*, *yad*, all introducing the subordinate clause, or conjunctives belonging to the constructions *yad... tad...*, *yathā... tathā...*, *yadī... tad...*, *yadā... tadā...* etc. They are all elements of the sentence structure and, thus, non-cohesive. Similarly, *ca* or *vā* etc. used to connect two (or more) items within one (e.g. nominal) group are also not counted among cohesion.

³⁵¹ These are also found in the *Pañjikā*.

formally demonstratives such as: *tad*, *ataḥ*, *tatra*, *tataḥ*, *tasmāt*, *tena*, *anena*. In some cases they serve in the *Pañjikā* (and, in general, in Sanskrit) as reference items, in others they clearly combine sentences. Still, there are some occurrences of these words where it is difficult to decide whether we are dealing with a reference or conjunctive item, because both would make sense in the particular context.

II.5.6.5 Lexical cohesion

There are two rather different phenomena which fall within the sphere of lexical cohesion. These are reiteration and collocation.

Reiteration is in some respects similar to reference, since a reiterated item refers to another linguistic item with which it has the same referent. However, in the case of reference, a linguistic element which points to something else (within or outside the text), cannot be semantically interpreted in its own right, i.e. reference to something else is contained in the definition of a reference item. In contrast to this, a reiterated item can be understood by itself, although in some cases its meaning is so broad that we cannot speak of a sharp borderline between reference and reiteration.

Halliday and Hasan (²1977: 278) distinguish five kinds of reiteration, according to the nature of the reiterated item, which can be the same item (repetition), its synonym, near-synonym, superordinate or a general word (such as *thing* or *man* in English).

Among these five, repetition is without doubt the most frequent in the *Pañjikā*. Especially technical terms are either repeated or expressed by reference items but are rarely referred to by their synonyms or superordinates.³⁵²

Next in the categorisation of Halliday and Hasan is the usage of synonyms and near-synonyms, which I would prefer to put into one group. This kind of reiteration does not occur very frequently in the *Pañjikā*, but it appears, for example, in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.3, where *-śabda* and *-samśabdana* are used.

The reiteration by superordinate is extremely rare in the *Pañjikā*³⁵³ and the use of a general word is not found in the first *adhyāya*, which is examined here.

Before I come to collocation in the *Pañjikā*, I would like to mention one more linguistic phenomenon which lies on the borderline between reiteration as presented above and

³⁵² Some examples of repetition are found in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.58, 65, 66 to mention a few.

³⁵³ One example of reiteration by superordinate, which is admittedly not very convincing, is given in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.39: *īhāṃ cakra iti ijādeś ca ity* (cf. P.3.1.36) *ām. āma iti* (P.2.4.81) *ler luk. pratyayalakṣaṇena* (cf. P.1.1.62) *krdantatvāt prātipadikatve* (cf. P.1.2.46) *suḥ*. It might be argued that *pratyaya* in *pratyayalakṣaṇena* is the superordinate of *li* from the preceding sentence. However, it is much more probable that *pratyayalakṣaṇa* refers to P.1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam*.

collocation. This phenomenon is much like reiteration with the difference that the reiterated item does not have to have the same referent as the item to which it refers. It is also worth mentioning that this kind of cohesion is much more frequent in the *Pañjikā* than the referential reiteration described at the beginning of the present subsection.

Let us now examine one passage from the beginning of the *Pañjikā*. This is an excerpt from Viśvarūpa's comment on *śabdānuśāsana*.

śabdāś ca kecit bherīdaṇḍādīsamīyogajāḥ kecit kaṇṭhatālvādisamghaṭṭajāḥ. te 'pi kecit svarūpāḥ kecid varṇātmakāḥ kecid apabhraṃśasvabhāvāḥ kecid vācakā iti.

And some sounds are produced by the contact of a kettle-drum, and a stick etc., some are produced by the contact with the throat (i.e. soft palate or glottis),³⁵⁴ with the hard palate etc. Of those some represent only their own form, some have the nature of *varṇa*, some are by nature corrupted and some are expressive.

Notes

If a sound, in this case a single phone, is pronounced, it can represent its own form (*svarūpa*), but if it is understood as a *varṇa*, it stands for all the phones of the same quality regardless their nasality and accent. Thus, when, for example, *u* is articulated, it can mean either this individual short vowel with features such as accent and nasality (or its lack), or the abstract vowel *u*, which represents all the variants of *u*, short, long or *pluta*; nasal or not, *udātta*, *anudātta* or *svarita*. For details, see Deshpande (1975).

In this passage the word *kecit* is six times repeated but each time it refers to different kinds of sounds or words. Furthermore, *-samīyoga-* and *-samghaṭṭa-* and also (although to a lesser degree) *-rūpa*, *-ātmaka* and *-svabhāva* are examples of reiteration by using near-synonyms, but likewise, none of the words have the same referent. However, even without having the same referent, the simple reiteration of these linguistic items does contribute to the cohesion of this passage.

Let us now take up collocation, being the most problematic kind of lexical cohesion. Collocation consists in the co-occurrence of lexical items which for some reasons tend to appear in similar environments. Obviously, those words which occur in almost all textual contexts (e.g. pronouns, demonstratives or general words) have little collocational force. This force diminishes also with the distance separating related lexical items. The problematic nature of collocation is perhaps connected with the subtlety of this concept. There are no precise criteria as to which linguistic items can form a collocational chain or how many words can separate them in the text so that we can still speak of collocation. Therefore, Hasan and Halliday (²1977: 290) postulate that in examining collocation of any language or text we should utilise not only our knowledge of the language but also our common sense.

³⁵⁴ About the terms *kaṇṭha* and *kaṇṭhya* see Allen (1953: 33, 52).

Despite these difficulties let us have a look at the collocation in the *Pañjikā*. As we have seen in II.5.4, the vocabulary of this text is that of a grammatical treatise. Grammatical terms have without doubt a collocational effect. Verbal forms contribute less to collocation in the *Pañjikā*, because the majority of them (*bhū*, *as*, *pravṛt*, *kr*, *labh* etc.) can occur in any textual context. A little more collocational force is possessed by verbs such as *vac*, *paṭh*, *prasaṅ*, *sūc* or *bādh*. This huge collocational chain of grammatical vocabulary has an influence on the whole text of Viśvarūpa's commentary. There are, however, some instances of smaller collocational chains. For example, in etymological explanations we frequently find words which are derived from the same root or are otherwise somewhat similar to the word explained.³⁵⁵ However, to sum up, it seems that apart from the collocational force created by the employment of grammatical vocabulary, collocation does not play any significant role in the *Pañjikā*.

II.5.7 Evaluation of the *Pañjikā*'s style

To start with, let us recapitulate what the most important features of the *Pañjikā*'s style are. Firstly, the *Pañjikā* is a typical example of so-called nominal style but it has not achieved the degree of nominality present in *sūtra* works. Secondly, the vocabulary of the *Pañjikā* is that of a grammatical treatise. It is not very rich or manifold, since words and especially technical terms are rather repeated there than paraphrased. Furthermore, as it is common in nominal style, the number of morphological categories tends to be smaller in the *Pañjikā* than in literary texts. These two features, repetition and the reduction of morphological forms, create the impression of a certain 'scantiness' of the *Pañjikā*'s language. Thirdly, as far as the sentence is concerned, Viśvarūpa's commentary contains verbal as well as nominal sentences, but the latter kind is much more frequent there. The structure of sentence is not very complicated. Simple sentences prevail and there is a tendency to use the construction with *iti* or with the ablative instead of a subordinate clause. Fourthly and lastly, cohesion does not play any significant role in the *Pañjikā*, whose *prakriyā* sections are almost devoid of it. However, since any longer piece of text cannot be entirely free from cohesion, it is also present in Viśvarūpa's commentary and among its various kinds, reference, ellipsis and non-referential reiteration occur most frequently.

On the whole, the *Pañjikā* seems to be typical of its genre and as far as its language is concerned, it does not in any way stand out from other grammatical commentaries.

³⁵⁵ Cf., for instance, *Pañj.* on P.1.1.9 (*asyate kṣīpyate 'nnādīkam asmīn ity āsyam mukham*) or on P.1.1.23 (*saṃkhyāyate gaṇyate anayeti saṃkhyā*). Explanations of words are not the only situation where small collocational chains occur. See, for example, *kāryodāharaṇa* and *rūpodāharaṇa* used in P.1.1.7-8. The usage of these two terms has certain collocational force, which arises not only from the repetition of the word *udāharaṇa*.

II.6 Analysis of the content of the *Pañjikā*

In the present chapter the attention of the reader will be directed from the form of the *Pañjikā* to its content. However, I do not intend to explore in detail the content of the *Pañjikā*. Instead, I propose to concentrate on two issues which can be summed up by the following questions. Firstly, had the *Pañjikā* been influenced by other grammatical works and if so, by which ones and to what extent? Secondly, what was the originality of Viśvarūpa's contribution? The answers to these questions will be given below and they are indispensable if we want to try and evaluate this treatise. Naturally, in the course of the examination, other elements of the *Pañjikā*'s content, such as the way Viśvarūpa argues, problems he takes up, inconsistencies in his reasoning etc., will also be mentioned, but they are not treated here as being the most important.

II.6.1 Preliminary remarks

In comparison with many other grammatical treatises, such as the *Nyāsa*, *Padamañjarī* or even Sṛṣṭidhara's commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, the *Pañjikā* seems to be straightforward and compact. Viśvarūpa seldom explores problems connected with the interpretation of the *sūtras*, he concentrates rather on *prakriyās*, i.e. derivation of words. Scholarly discussions, if they appear, mostly deal with difficulties caused by a quoted example. This first impression which we get, while reading the *Pañjikā*, does not necessarily mean that Viśvarūpa was lacking in scholarship. On the contrary, as is often the case with short and apparently easy works, the *Pañjikā* is deeply rooted in the grammatical tradition and in places it presupposes the knowledge of earlier treatises. Among these the most important is the *Nyāsa*, whose enormous influence is the most characteristic trait of the *Pañjikā*. This influence hardly needs proving, because borrowings from the *Nyāsa* are so numerous that it suffices to read two pages of the *Pañjikā* to notice it. Let us, however, mention the main points of the evidence which lead us to this assumption. Firstly, examples discussed by Viśvarūpa and not found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on the relevant *sūtra* stem in great part from the *Nyāsa* (see II.6.3). Secondly, as already mentioned, Viśvarūpa frequently borrows from Jinendrabuddhi's commentary and he takes over not only the ideas found in the *Nyāsa*, but also the way they are formulated (see II.6.4). Thirdly, the cases where Viśvarūpa presents an opinion contradictory to that of Jinendrabuddhi are extremely rare (see II.6.6.1).

These three issues will be amplified in II.6.3-4 and in II.6.6.1. In addition, in II.6.5 we shall examine the indebtedness of the *Pañjikā* to grammatical treatises other than

the *Nyāsa* and in II.6.6 we are going to discuss the ideas which could possibly point to the originality of Viśvarūpa's contribution.

II.6.2 Names and titles mentioned and quoted in the *Pañjikā*

The very first information about the texts known by Viśvarūpa can be gathered from the names of grammarians and titles of works mentioned in the *Pañjikā*. However, since Viśvarūpa seems not to have paid much attention to discussions of knotty points in the interpretation of the *sūtras*, he seldom quotes opinions of other grammarians, and if he does, he usually omits the title of the quoted work as well as the name of its author. Nevertheless, a few titles and names of grammarians appear in the *Pañjikā*. In the first *adhyāya* Viśvarūpa mentions the following treatises and their authors: Vyāḍi (once), Gālava (once), Pāṇini (twice), Pāṇini as the Sūtrakāra (once) and as Ācārya (once), the *Bhāṣya* (seven times) and the Bhāṣyakāra (three times), *vārttika* (once) and Kātyāyana (twice), the *Kāśikā* as *jayādityādivṛtti* (once), the *Nyāsa* (once) and the Nyāsakāra or the Nyāsakṛt (three times), the Bhāḡavṛttikṛt (once); the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (once) and Puruṣottamadeva (once).³⁵⁶ One quotation from the lexicographic work called by Viśvarūpa *Viśva*, the usual term used for the *Viśvaparakāśa*,³⁵⁷ appears in the commentary on P.1.1.11, but I have not succeeded in finding the relevant citation.³⁵⁸

Not only does Viśvarūpa very seldom refer to grammatical treatises but also he rarely illustrates Pāṇini's *sūtras* by quoting literary works. Some exceptions to this rule stem from the *Meghadūta* (on P.1.3.12), the *Kumārasambhava* (on P.1.4.4), the *Bhāṭṭikāvya* (on P.1.3.56, 63) and the *Raghuvamśa* (on P.1.1.11), but only the last one is mentioned by its name (*raghu*).

In addition, Viśvarūpa cites one verse from the *Vākyapadīya* (on P.1.4.49) and one from the *Bhāvanāviveka* (on P.1.4.42). However, these two verses are found in Puruṣottamadeva's *Kāraḡacakra*, from which Viśvarūpa often draws (see II.6.5.3), so it is quite possible that this work was the only source of these two quotations.

The final issue which I wish to clarify in this section concerns one of the main theses of the present work, which says that Viśvarūpa borrowed abundantly from the *Nyāsa* and did not know the *Mahābhāṣya* very well (see II.6.5.1 for this last point). However, the fact that the *Bhāṣya* and the Bhāṣyakāra are mentioned in the *Pañjikā* twice as often as the *Nyāsa* and its author seems to argue against this thesis. On the other hand, the evidence speaking for Viśvarūpa's indebtedness to the *Nyāsa* is so immense that we

³⁵⁶ For details, see the index to the edition of the *Pañjikā*.

³⁵⁷ It is thus called, for example, in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. See Renou (1940: 64).

³⁵⁸ I would like to thank Prof. Dr. C. Vogel who kindly helped with the search for this citation.

are compelled to consider other possible reasons for these relatively frequent references to the *Mahābhāṣya*. In my opinion, the most plausible explanation is connected with the position which Patañjali and his treatise had among later Bengali grammarians. Although in the times of Viśvarūpa the *Mahābhāṣya* was most probably not studied in Bengal (see the beginning of part I), it was still treated as an authority which one should quote or at least mention.³⁵⁹

II.6.3 Examples discussed in the *Pañjikā*

In order to prove the indebtedness of the *Pañjikā* to the *Nyāsa* or to examine the degree of its originality, it is useful to have a look at examples discussed by Viśvarūpa. It is not surprising that the majority of them stem from the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, but it is worth mentioning that Viśvarūpa takes no pains to discuss all the examples found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Out of 1401 examples given by Puruṣottamadeva in the first *adhyāya* of his commentary, only 538 (38%) are commented upon in the *Pañjikā*. On the other hand, Viśvarūpa adds 250 ‘new’ illustrations. Let us now focus our attention on these examples and especially on their possible source.

The procedure adopted here is as follows. I have searched for these ‘new’ illustrations in most grammatical works which Viśvarūpa may have known. Firstly, I consulted the commentaries on the same rule as that under which the example is discussed in the *Pañjikā*. Then, if the example could not be found using this method, I sought it in the commentary on the related rules. This method can seem a little bit awkward, but I have deliberately decided not to sift through the whole grammatical treatises. What was decisive in choosing this method was the fact that a lot of words used as examples in grammatical commentaries are commonplace such as *bhavati* or *pacati*, and they can be and actually are employed as illustrations for many *sūtras*.³⁶⁰ Thus, it is not very remarkable if Viśvarūpa gives the same example as the one which appears in the *Nyāsa* if it illustrates quite a different rule there. Furthermore, it is much more convincing if the same example is discussed in the similar context, i.e. under the same rule or elsewhere but explaining the same grammatical operation.

³⁵⁹ See also II.6.5.2.

³⁶⁰ For example, *bhavati* is given in *Bhv.* on P.1.3.1, where it serves as an example of a verb, and in *Bhv.* on P.1.3.8, where it illustrates the fact that the marker *ś* of *śap* should be elided. The verb *pacati* is used on several occasions: in *Bhv.* on P.1.3.62 (to show that a desiderative verb will take *parasmaipada* suffixes when a primary verb does) and on P.1.3.72 (as an example of a verb expressing an action done for the sake of someone else than the agent). Besides, it constitutes a part of such examples as *pacati panasam* (e.g. *Kāś.* on P.1.1.7), *sthālyāṃ pacati* (*Bhv.* on P.1.4.45), *sthālī pacati* (*Pañj.* on P.1.4.54) etc. Other *udāharaṇas* which frequently appear in grammatical literature are: *rājapurusaḥ*, *bhinnaḥ* and *agnicit* to mention a few.

Thus, if we closely examine these 250 examples, we will find that the majority of them, 161 (64 %), come from the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*.³⁶¹ This does not mean that the remaining 89 illustrations can only have originated with Viśvarūpa. Twenty *udāharaṇas* are found in Puruṣottamadeva's treatises: eight in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* but in the commentary on a different rule than in the *Pañjikā*, eight in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and four in the *Kārakacakra*.³⁶²

Twenty-one examples occur in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, ten are explained in the *Padamañjarī*. One example is somewhat similar to those found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* and in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*.³⁶³ Thus, thirty-seven examples, which, theoretically, could be Viśvarūpa's unique contributions, are left over. They are given below with the number of the *sūtra* where they appear and with some short remarks.

1-2) *śālā* and *dākṣi* (on P.1.1.1) are used as the examples of, respectively, *atadbhāvita*- and *tadbhāvita-vṛddhi*. Both of them are quite common and even if they are not found in the commentary on P.1.1.1 in any of treatises mentioned in II.6.5, they frequently appear in other contexts there.

3) *agavīt* (on P.1.1.3) is employed to show that the real aim of rule P.1.1.3 is to prohibit a *vṛddhi* vowel (and not a *guṇa*).

4) *prāptā* (on P.1.1.9): Viśvarūpa uses *prāptā* to explain the need of *āsya* in the *sūtra*. This issue is also discussed in the *Kāśikā* and *Nyāsa* ad loc. but the example quoted there is *tarptā*.

5) *śātravaṃ va papur yaśaḥ* (on P.1.1.11): This citation from the *Raghuvaṃśa* illustrates the fact that *va* can be also used in the sense of similarity.

6-7) *prāṇidāya* and *pranidāsayati* (on P.1.1.20) are examples of, respectively, the verb *dī* being *ghu* and the verb *das*, which is not *ghu*. The *Padamañjarī* ad loc. gives *pranidārayati* instead of *pranidāsayati*. Cf. also Śiradeva's *pranidāśayati* on *SP* 127.

³⁶¹ To be precise, 139 examples are identical with those found in the *Kāśikā* and/or in the *Nyāsa*, 22 are similar to them. Let us mention three examples of the second type to show the nature of similarity between *udāharaṇas* given in the *Pañjikā* and those discussed in the *Kāśikā* or *Nyāsa*. In the commentary on P.1.1.70, Viśvarūpa explains an example *kīlālapābhīḥ śrutam yābhīḥ*. In the *Nyāsa* on the same *sūtra*, only the word *kīlālapābhīḥ* is explained, but it is quite possible that it comes from the quotation given by Viśvarūpa. The sentence *gamayati grāmam putram* appears in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.52, the *Kāśikā* has the similar *gamayati mānavakam grāmam* and the *Durghaṭavṛtti*: *gamayati grāmam vipram*. In the commentary on P.1.4.58, Viśvarūpa discusses the example *parā senā*, which reminds us of *parā jayanti senāḥ* from the *Kāśikā* and *parā jayati senā* from the *Padamañjarī*.

³⁶² There are also two examples from Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* which are not counted here, because they are also found in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. The word *vaiyākaraṇa*, discussed in the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* on *PP* 34 (and in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.57), is treated in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.1.57 and *bhīndhaki* from the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* on *PP* 40 (and from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.2) is explained in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.6.4.101 as well as in the *Padamañjarī* on P.1.4.2.

³⁶³ *Pañj.* on P.1.4.3 has *suśriye sudhiye subhruve sudhenave viprāya*, while Puruṣottamadeva gives examples: *sumataye 'tisriye sudhiye viprāya* (*Bhv.* on P.1.4.6) and the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.4.3 discusses: *sumataye priyaviprāya*.

8) *dvitayakāḥ* (on P.1.1.33): Similarly to Viśvarūpa, Haradatta illustrates the *sūtra* by adding the example with the suffix *-ka*. However, Haradatta adds this suffix to *nema* and not to *dvitaya* as Viśvarūpa did.

9-10) *deyam* and *dheyam* (on P.1.1.51) are given as an answer to the question about the need of *uḥ* used in the *sūtra*. The same problem is taken up in the *Kāśikā* and *Nyāsa* but *kheyam* and *geyam*, and not *deyam* and *dheyam*, are cited there.

11) *paṭapaṭāyate* (on P.1.1.64): This is one of these examples which appear in grammatical texts on several occasions, e.g. *Kāś.* quotes it on P.1.3.90 as an illustration of *ātmanepada*. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.64 it is used as the example of application of the term *ṭi*.

12-13) *upasamkhyāna* and *pravayaṇa* (on P.1.2.1) are examples of words which could have not been obtained if *gānikuṭādi* from P.1.2.1 had been a *bahuvrīhi* and not a *dvandva* compound.

14) *vivejītha* (on P.1.2.2), being 2. sg. Par. perfect of the verb *viḥ* which belongs to the third class, proves that this root is not meant in P.1.2.2.

15) *svapitaḥ* (on P.1.2.5): Viśvarūpa gives this example to reject the possibility of reading *kit* instead of *nit* in P.1.2.1.

16) *ayaṃsīt* (on P.1.2.15) shows that the aorist form of a verb *yam* is treated as having the marker *k* only if it takes *ātmanepada* suffixes.

17) *syanditvā* (on P.1.2.18) is another example of P.1.2.18.

18) *sidhitam anena* (on P.1.2.21): Viśvarūpa quotes *sidhitam anena* to illustrate the fact that the rule under question applies only to verbs with the penultimate *u*. See *Kāśikā*'s example: *likhitam anena*.

19) *pracakṣya* (on P.1.2.27) is used in the *Pañjikā* to prove the necessity of *ac* in P.1.2.27. The *Kāśikā* and *Nyāsa*, which discuss the same topic, have *prarakṣya* and *pratakṣya* instead. Because of a certain similarity between Bengali *akṣaras ca* and *ta* (especially if they are not clearly written), it cannot be excluded that *pracakṣya* in the *Pañjikā* is actually borrowed from the *Kāśikā* or the *Nyāsa* but it has been changed due to a scribal error.

20-21) *pūrvāparādhārottaram* and *pūrvāparādhārottarāni* (on P.1.2.63) illustrate the application of the *paribhāṣā* PP 50 mentioned in *Bhv.* on P.1.2.63.

22) *paceya* (on P.1.3.4): Contrary to what is taught in P.1.3.4, in the case of *paceya* the consonant *t* of *at* is a marker. The *Durghaṭavṛtti* gives an example *yajeya*, but still

it is possible that Viśvarūpa borrowed from Śaraṇadeva, but instead of *yaj* he used the root *pac* employed in three other *udāharaṇas* given in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.1.3.4.

23-25) *pāpacyate*, *śāyayati*, *hanti* (on P.1.3.12): *pāpacyate* illustrates the fact that *ātmanepada* suffixes can also depend on the marker *ñ* of *yañ* (the suffix of the intensive). The causative *śāyayati* is given to show the correctness of the maxim that grammatical elements lose their markers when they are combined. The last example, *hanti*, proves that in P.1.3.12, *it* should be connected separately with *ñ* and with *anudatta*, and not only with *ñ*.

26) *munibhāryām upayacchati* (on P.1.3.56) is employed to show that rule P.1.3.56 does not operate in the case of this *udāharaṇa*.

27) *vādayāṃ cakrire dhakkāḥ* (on P.1.3.63): This quotation from the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* gives an example of non-application of P.1.3.63.

28) *śrethatuḥ* (on P.1.4.13) illustrates the *jñāpya* (*Jñ.S.* p. 64) quoted by Viśvarūpa.

29) *brahmaṇḍbhyo dadur vastrāṇi* (on P.1.4.32) is an example of the application of the *paribhāṣā PP* 117 cited by Viśvarūpa in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.32.

30-31) *dhanam sprhayati* and *dhanasya sprhayati* (on P.1.4.36) should show that the form of a sentence depends on the aspect of the action which the speaker wishes to emphasise and they are alternatives to *dhanāya sprhayati* given in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. The *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.4.36 discusses an example *puṣpāṇi sprhayati*.

32) *sthālyām adhiśeśayīti* (on P.1.4.46) is an exception to P.1.4.46.

33-36) *svāhā hutabhukpriyā*, *svāhāṃ paśya*, *avadattam*, *nāstidoṣaḥ* (on P.1.4.57): The first two are examples of *svāhā* being not a *nipāta*. The word *avadattam* is an example of *upasargapratirūpaka* and *nāstidoṣaḥ* is an example of *vibhaktipratirūpaka*.

37) *akārṣīt* (on P.1.4.99) illustrates the application of *sūtra* P.1.4.99.

Compared with 788 examples found in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*, the number thirty-seven does not seem to be much impressive. Furthermore, if we have a closer look at the *udāharaṇas* presented above, we can see that many of them are commonplace or somehow similar to examples found in other treatises. Really interesting are only six illustrations: *śātravaṃ va papur yaśaḥ*, *pravayaṇa*, *upasaṃkhyāna*, *munibhāryām upayacchati*, *vādayāṃ cakrire dhakkāḥ* and *brahmaṇḍbhyo dadur vastrāṇi*, but even their usage at these particular places in the commentary does not necessarily stem from Viśvarūpa and the reasons for that are given in II.6.6.

II.6.4 The influence of the *Nyāsa* on the *Pañjikā*

There is hardly any need to raise the question whether Viśvarūpa knew the *Nyāsa* or not. Taking into account the role this commentary played in the Bengali tradition of the Pāṇinian grammar,³⁶⁴ it would be difficult to believe that any grammarian belonging to this tradition was not acquainted with Jinendrabuddhi's commentary. The question concerns rather the degree of influence that the *Nyāsa* had on the *Pañjikā*.

In the present section I am going to demonstrate that Viśvarūpa drew enormously from the *Nyāsa* while he was writing his *Pañjikā*. As has already been mentioned, there are several factors which speak in favour of this assumption: 1) direct references to the *Nyāsa* made by Viśvarūpa, 2) examples discussed by Jinendrabuddhi and found also in the *Pañjikā*, 3) affinity of ideas and wording between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā*, and 4) the rareness of cases where Viśvarūpa disagrees with Jinendrabuddhi or discusses problems not scrutinised in the *Nyāsa*.

These four points are not all of the same importance; the weakest is no doubt the first one; the strongest, the third. In this section our attention will focus first of all on the strongest argument, but before we begin with its exploration, let us ponder for a while the remaining pieces of evidence.

As has been stated in II.6.2, in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*, Viśvarūpa mentions the *Nyāsa* and its author four times. In two cases, the sole name Nyāsakṛt is recorded, without reference to any particular view. Two others (on P.1.4.7 and on P.1.4.105) are references to the opinion of Jinendrabuddhi expressed in the commentary on P.1.4.7. Thus, the fact that the *Nyāsa* is mentioned in the *Pañjikā* confirms our assumption that Viśvarūpa knew this treatise but is certainly not sufficient to prove the thesis about the indebtedness of the latter to the former.

The second argument, that the majority of examples discussed by Viśvarūpa but not found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* can be traced back to the *Nyāsa*, has been explicated in II.6.3. Admittedly, this point is much more convincing than the first one, but still, on its own, it does not suffice to specify the degree of the *Pañjikā*'s dependence on the *Nyāsa*.

Much more helpful in fulfilling this undertaking are the last two arguments, which are also somewhat connected each with the other. As has been stated above (in II.6.1), the examples of similarities between the *Pañjikā* and the *Nyāsa* are numerous and their range encompasses, on the one hand, the affinity of problems discussed in these two commentaries, and on the other hand, identity of phrases or even of sentences

³⁶⁴ See the beginning of part I.

used in these two works. Occurrences of either kind of similarity can easily be found in the present edition of the *Pañjikā*, where the pertinent passages from the *Nyāsa* are given in footnotes, or at least the fact that the affinity between these two texts exists is pointed out.

As is to be expected, the cases of similarity between the *Pañjikā*'s content and that of the *Nyāsa* are the most frequent ones. In passages belonging to this category, Viśvarūpa discusses the same problems or the same examples as found in the *Nyāsa*. However, the wording of the *Pañjikā* does not resemble that of the *Nyāsa*. Since the *Nyāsa* is a huge and learned commentary, it is hardly surprising that not all the problems discussed there are investigated in the *Pañjikā* and at the same time, those that are taken into account by Viśvarūpa are not examined in complete detail. Frequently, Viśvarūpa skips some stages of Jinendrabuddhi's argumentation or instead of introducing alternative propositions, he immediately offers the *siddhānta*. Thus, in places, the *Pañjikā* gives the impression of presenting the summary of discussions found in the *Nyāsa*.

Because the amount of passages from the *Pañjikā* which contain similar ideas to those given in the *Nyāsa* is huge, and besides, their existence does not form the strongest argument speaking in favour of the thesis about the immense indebtedness of the *Pañjikā* to the *Nyāsa*, I quote only one short example of affinity of content here. For the remaining passages, the reader may consult the edition of the *Pañjikā*.

The example stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.6 *dīdhīvevītām*, which teaches that neither *guṇa* nor *vṛddhi* should replace the vowels of the roots *dīdhī* and *vevī* and of the element *it*. Now, the question arises what *it* actually is: the augment *it* or the root *it*.

āgamasyeṭo grahaṇam na dhātor ita kaṭa gatāv ity³⁶⁵ asya dhātusāhacaryāt prāptasya pūrvanipātavyabhicāreṇa (cf. P.2.2.34) *sāhacaryasya nirastatvāt*.

[In P.1.1.6] the augment *it* is mentioned and not the root *it* given in *Dhp.* 1.340, which would wrongly apply because of the association with the roots [*dīdhī* and *vevī*]. [This is so,] because the association with these roots is annulled by the deviation from the rule about the priority [of a word in a compound].

Let us now compare how the same problem is treated by Jinendrabuddhi.

atha 'ita kiṭa kaṭī gatau' ity (*Dhp.* 1.340-2) *asya grahaṇam kasmān na bhavati, yuktam caitat, dhātusāhacaryāt? naitad asti; iha 'alpāctaram' iti* (P.2.2.34) *itaḥ pūrvanipāte kartavye tadviparyāsam kurvataitat sūcitam – 'anyo 'py atra kaścid viparyāso vijñeyah' iti. tena dhātusāhacaryād dhātugrahaṇe prāpte tadviparītasyaivāgamasya grahaṇam vijñāyate*.

³⁶⁵ See *Dhp.* 1.340-2 and *Nyāsa* ad loc.: *ita kiṭa kaṭī gatau*. *Pad.* has: *ita kiṭa gatau*.

Thus, why is the root *iṭ* from *Dhp.* 1.340-2 not understood here, [although] it would be appropriate, because of the association with the roots [*dīdhī* and *vevī*]? This is not so, because [in that case] *iṭ* should have been placed at the beginning [of the compound] as taught in P.2.2.34 *alpāctaram* (‘That which has fewer vowels [is put at the beginning of a *dvandva* compound]’), and by deviating [from the prescribed order, Pāṇini] points out that another alteration is to be understood here. Therefore, while, because of the association with the roots [*dīdhī* and *vevī*], the root [*iṭ*] would be wrongly understood, the augment [*iṭ*], which is opposite to it (i.e. to the root *iṭ*, which is expected), is recognized to be mentioned.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me emphasise that occasional concurrence of such similar passages found in the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā* taken on their own may have been accidental. However, the great number of such cases as well as the other arguments stated above make the fact of existence of similarity in ideas between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā* meaningful. In particular, two facts are very important here and they constitute the fourth of our arguments. Firstly, Viśvarūpa seldom discusses issues other than those which are presented in the *Nyāsa* (see II.6.6.1). Secondly, he rarely offers another solution to the problem than that proposed by Jinendrabuddhi (see II.6.6).

Although the above with high probability points to the *Pañjikā*’s indebtedness to the *Nyāsa*, the most decisive proof is given by those passages from the *Pañjikā* where an identity in ideas is accompanied by a similarity in form. This similarity encompasses identity or slight modifications of sentences or phrases which are found in the *Nyāsa*. The cases of identity are of course not very frequent but still, in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* there is one example of the whole sentence which seems to have been taken from the *Nyāsa*. In the commentary on P.1.4.1 *ā kaḍārād ekā samjñā*, while discussing the term *virodha*, Viśvarūpa writes: *sa ca virodha ekāsamjñādhikāre sati bhavati nāsati* (‘And this conflict [of two rules] takes place [only] under the *adhikāra* “*ekā samjñā*” and not where this [*adhikāra*] is not [valid]’), and the same sentence occurs in the *Nyāsa* on the same *sūtra*.

In other cases, which are much more frequent, Viśvarūpa carries over a sentence from the *Nyāsa*, but he introduces some changes to it. The devices he employs (deliberately or not) are of a different kind. He replaces words with their synonyms or with their reference items. He changes the order of a sentence or its construction. He resolves compounds or, on the contrary, forms new ones out of independent words occurring in the *Nyāsa*. As a rule, he skips some parts of sentences, thus, making them shorter, or, as seldom happens, he adds new words. Notwithstanding all these modifications, the source of such sentences is still easily recognisable and their great number contributes to the *déjà vu* effect which one who knows the *Nyāsa* gets while reading the *Pañjikā*.

Let us now illustrate the above by quoting some examples.

1) In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.38 *taddhitaś cāsarvavibhaktiḥ*, which prescribes the name *avyaya* to these words ending in *taddhita* suffixes which are not declined in all cases, Viśvarūpa writes.

sarva ete yataḥprabhṛtayo vibhaktyarthapradhānāḥ. sa ca vibhaktyarthaḥ sampannaḥ prātipadikārtha itī tatra ca prathamaiva (cf. P.2.3.46) *bhavatīty atra ca saṃkhyāviśeṣābhāvād ekavacanam* (cf. P.1.4.22) *eva bhavatīty asarvavibhaktitvam.*

The main meaning of all these beginning with *yataḥ* is that of a case suffix. And, the meaning of a case suffix accomplishes the meaning of a *prātipadika*; therefore, the nominative is employed here and because the difference in number is lacking, only the suffixes of singular are added. This is [known as] the state of not possessing all case suffixes.

The relevant passage in the *Nyāsa* reads as follows:

sarva ete tataḥprabhṛtayaḥ vibhaktyarthapradhānāḥ. sa ca vibhaktyarthaḥ prātipadikārthaḥ sampanna itī prātipadikārthe prathamaiva bhavati. sāpi saṃkhyāviśeṣābhāvān na sarvā. kiṃ tarhi? ekavacanam eva, tasyotsargatvāt.

The similarity between these two passages is striking. The differences, which are underlined, are few and unimportant. While the *Nyāsa* has *tataḥprabhṛtayaḥ*, Viśvarūpa uses the compound *yataḥprabhṛtayaḥ*. Furthermore, Viśvarūpa changes the order of *sampannaḥ prātipadikārthaḥ* and instead of repeating *prātipadikārthe* writes *tatra ca* ('and in that [sense]' or 'and there'). Where, at the end of the passage, the *Nyāsa* has three sentences in a dialogue style, Viśvarūpa employs one relatively short sentence.

2) Another typical example of such borrowing from the *Nyāsa* is found in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.2.42 *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayaḥ* ('A compound *tatpuruṣa* whose elements have the same locus is called *karmadhāraya*'), where Viśvarūpa writes:

yato 'nekapadasya bhinnapravṛttinimittasya ekasminn arthe vṛttiḥ tat sāmānādhikaraṇyam.

The state of having the same locus (*sāmānādhikaraṇya*) takes place when several words which have different causes of application are employed as referring to one thing.

Let us compare the *Nyāsa* ad loc.:

anekasya ca śabdasya bhinnapravṛttinimittasyaikasminn arthe vṛttiḥ sāmānādhikaraṇyam.

Here, the differences between these two sentences are still fewer. Viśvarūpa employs the construction *yataḥ... tat...*, which is absent in the *Nyāsa*, and forms the compound *anekapadasya*, instead of using the phrase *anekasya ca śabdasya*.

3) Rule P.1.3.67 *ner añau yat karma nau cet sa kartānādhyāne* teaches the addition of *ātmanepada* suffixes after a root with the causal suffix **ṇi**, provided: firstly, that the direct object of the verb without the causal suffix becomes the agent of the verb with the causal suffix, and secondly, that the root does not mean remembering with regret. In the *Pañjikā* on this *sūtra* Viśvarūpa discusses the example *darśayate bhṛtyān nṛpaḥ*:

darśayate bhṛtyān nṛpa ity atrāpi dṛśyamānasya rājño darśanakriyāṃ prati atīśayenānukūlyopagamāt prayojakakarṭṛtvam. bhṛtyānāṃ tu prayojyatvāt karma-tvam.

In the example *darśayate bhṛtyān nṛpaḥ* the king, who is seen, is – by his extraordinary kindness – the causal agent in regard to the act of seeing, but the servants are the direct object (*karman*), because of their dependence.

The relevant passage from the *Nyāsa* has the following explanation:

atrāpi dṛśyamānasya rājñāḥ darśanakriyāyām atīśayenānukūlyabhāvopagamanāt prayojakatve vivakṣite bhṛtyānāṃ ca prayojyatve ṇic.

As we can see, Viśvarūpa uses the construction with *prati* instead of the locative of *darśanakriyā*, which occurs in the *Nyāsa*. He skips the word *bhāva* from the compound *ānukūlyabhāvopagamanāt* and uses the synonym *upagama* instead of *upagama*. Where Jinendrabuddhi employs the long construction with the locative absolute (*prayojakatve vivakṣite*), Viśvarūpa divides it into two statements: ... *ānukūlyopagamāt prayojakakarṭṛtvam* and *bhṛtyānāṃ tu prayojyatvāt karmatvam*, using *karmatva* in the place of **ṇic**, which occurs in the *Nyāsa*.

4) The last passage I am going to present in this subsection stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.19 *tasau matvarthe*, which teaches that lexical units ending in *t* or *s* are called *bha* when a suffix expressing the notion of the suffix *mat* follows. Viśvarūpa comments on the word *tasau* from the *sūtra*.

tasāv iti varṇagrahaṇam. na ca tābhyāṃ paro matvarthīyaḥ pratyayaḥ sambhavati. ataḥ sāmartyāt tadantavidhir vijñāyata ity āha tāntaṃ sāntam iti.

By *tasau* [in P.1.4.19] phones are understood. And no suffix having the meaning of *mat* can be added [only] after them (i.e. after *t* and *s*). Thus, because [the *sūtra*] has to be meaningful, the prescription about ending in it (i.e. in phones mentioned in the rule) is recognized and, therefore, he (i.e. Puruṣottamadeva) says *tāntaṃ sāntam* ('what ends in *t*, what ends in *s*').

Let us now compare this passage with the *Nyāsa* ad loc.

tasāv iti varṇagrahaṇam. na ca varṇamātrān matvarthīyaḥ sambhavati. ataḥ sāmartyāt tadantavidhir vijñāyata ity āha – takārāntam ityādi.

By *tasau* phones are understood. And no [suffix] having the meaning of *mat* can be added after phones only. Thus, because [the *sūtra*] has to be meaningful, the prescription about ending in it (i.e. in phones mentioned in the rule) is recognized and, therefore, he (i.e. the author of the *Kāśikā*) said *takārāntam* ('what ends in the phone *t*') etc.

The first and the third sentence of these two passages are virtually identical, with the slight difference that Viśvarūpa quotes *tāntam sāntam* from the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* instead of *takārāntam* found in the *Nyāsa*, which (i.e. *takārāntam*) is a quotation from the *Kāśikā*. Furthermore, Jinendrabuddhi closes his citation with *ityādi*, while Viśvarūpa has a simple *iti*. In the second sentence, where Jinendrabuddhi uses the ablative case *varṇamātrāt*, Viśvarūpa writes *tābhyāṃ paraḥ* and adds *pratyayaḥ* after *matvarthūyaḥ*.

These four passages from the *Pañjikā* are not the only ones which are similar in their wording to the *Nyāsa*. However, they illustrate the mechanism of change which Viśvarūpa introduces into the text of the *Nyāsa* and, I think, they are convincing enough to prove the thesis that Viśvarūpa drew abundantly from the *Nyāsa*. The inquisitive reader may consult the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.2, 3, 9, 26, 51, 55, 56, 58 to mention a few more examples of the similarity in wording which exists between Viśvarūpa's commentary and the *Nyāsa*.

II.6.5 Influence of other grammatical treatises on the *Pañjikā*

In this section we will take up the question of whether Viśvarūpa drew from any other treatises apart from the *Nyāsa*. It is no surprise that we will concentrate principally on the possible influence of those works which most probably belong to the Bengali tradition of grammar. There are however two exceptions to this rule. Firstly, we will examine whether Viśvarūpa borrowed from the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Padamañjarī*. I think there is no need to explain why we should consider the first of these treatises; the grounds for the second choice will be elucidated in II.6.5.5. Secondly, as the observant reader will probably note, the titles of some treatises are lacking in the list presented below. In particular, we do not explore the influence of Ujjvaladatta's *Uṇādivṛtti*, because this commentary is of a different kind than the *Pañjikā* and I do not believe that Viśvarūpa could have borrowed much from it. For the same reason and because the work is now lost, the *Uṇādivṛtti* of Govardhana is not mentioned here either. The *Anunyāsa* and the *Bhāgavṛtti* will also not be considered, because neither of them is extant and the quotations from them referring to the first *pāda* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* are not abundant enough to allow us to draw any conclusion with regard to their possible influence on the *Pañjikā*. Finally, practical reasons were decisive in omitting Maitreya

Rakṣita's *Tantrapradīpa*, since its manuscripts were not accessible to me while I was preparing the edition of the *Pañjikā*. As far as the *Dhātupradīpa* is concerned, it must be stated that in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* there is not a single passage that bears any resemblance to this work. This cannot be surprising because the *Dhātupradīpa* is not only a very concise treatise but also of a different kind than Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā*. Having noted these restrictions, we can now begin our examination. The works whose influence on the *Pañjikā* we will scrutinise are here put in chronological order.

II.6.5.1 The *Mahābhāṣya*

As has already been mentioned in the introduction to part I, Bengali grammarians seem not to have known the *Mahābhāṣya* very well. Chakravarti (1918: 19-20) has made this observation with regard to the time of Sṛṣṭidhara, which roughly corresponds to that of Viśvarūpa, but we have also pointed out that most probably this tendency had begun earlier (see the beginning of part I). Notwithstanding the fact that the *Mahābhāṣya* was not intensely studied in Bengal, Patañjali was still regarded as an authority among Bengali grammarians and, consequently, it was appropriate to quote his opinions. The result of these two trends is that those alleged quotations from the *Mahābhāṣya* are often either inaccurate or not found there at all.

Below we will examine whether the above holds good also for the *Pañjikā*. In the first *adhyāya*, Viśvarūpa refers ten times to the *Bhāṣya* or the *Bhāṣyakāra*, which is much more than the four references to the *Nyāsa* and its author. There is, however, a big difference between the way Viśvarūpa utilises the *Nyāsa* and the *Mahābhāṣya*. On the one hand, he takes as his own Jinendrabuddhi's ideas, phrases or even whole sentences at almost every step of his argumentation, without mentioning the *Nyāsa* at all. On the other hand, apart from a few quotations and quasi-quotations from the *Mahābhāṣya*, he seems to ignore this text completely. Albeit there are many cases of affinity of wording and content between the *Pañjikā* and the *Mahābhāṣya*, this is exclusively the case when the same topics are also discussed in other treatises, above all in the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*. Additionally, two such references could stem from the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and one from the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. Four are found in the *Padamañjarī*. Moreover, where the wording in the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa* differs from that in the *Mahābhāṣya*, the former is used by Viśvarūpa.³⁶⁶ Furthermore, Viśvarūpa 'incorporates' in his commentary not only the text of the *Nyāsa* but also that of the

³⁶⁶ This is the case in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.27 and on P.1.2.2. In addition, in the commentary on P.1.1.41 Viśvarūpa explains the example *upakumbhaṇṇmanyaḥ*. That, as well as *upamaṇṇikaṇṇmanyaḥ*, is given in the *Mahābhāṣya*, but only one, exactly that which is quoted in the *Pañjikā*, is found in the *Nyāsa* ad loc.

Kāśikā and Puruṣottamadeva's *Kārakacakra*, *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* and *Jñāpakasamuccaya* (see II.6.5.2-3). Therefore, it is all the more remarkable that he does not do the same with the *Mahābhāṣya*.

Now, let us concentrate on the direct references to the *Bhāṣya* which are found in the *Pañjikā*. Out of ten references, two (on P.1.4.7) concern the same opinion of the Bhāṣyakāra, another one appears at the beginning of the *Pañjikā*, where the Bhāṣyakāra is enumerated among the three *munis*. One citation (on P.1.1.57) is partly illegible and the emendation proposed in the present edition is based on the *Mahābhāṣya*, so it would be preferable not to consider this case here. Thus, references to seven different opinions of Patañjali remain to be scrutinised. Among them two quotations (on P.1.2.6, 1.4.3) are repetitions of citations found in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Two other opinions (on P.1.3.67 and P.1.4.7) are also discussed respectively in the *Nyāsa* and in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but neither the name Patañjali nor the title of his work are mentioned there. In addition, in the commentary on P.1.1.5, Viśvarūpa states that the two forms *tundaparimṛja* and *tundaparimārja* are taught by Patañjali. The opinion of Patañjali is not shared by the authors of the *Nyāsa*, *Durghaṭavṛtti* and the *Padamañjarī*, who regard only *tundaparimṛja* as correct. In the commentary on P.1.2.1 *gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'nñin nit* ('[The suffixes] which have as a marker neither *ñ* nor *ṅ* and which are added to [the root] *gāṅ* or to [the roots] belonging to the group beginning with [the root] *kuṭ* are treated as having the marker *n*'), Viśvarūpa assigns to Patañjali an opinion that *ac* from P.1.1.73 (*vṛddhir yasyācām ādis tad vṛddham*) should be understood as an attribute of *gāṅ*, thus, giving the meaning *ajādeśo gāṅ*, 'the substitute of [the root] *gāṅ* which (i.e. substitute) begins with a vowel'. However, I have not succeeded in finding this opinion in the *Mahābhāṣya*.³⁶⁷ Finally, while explaining P.1.4.3, Viśvarūpa repeats the citation *īdūtor eveyaṃ saṃjñā* ('This term [i.e. *nadī*] applies only to [vowels] *ī* and *ū* [and not to words ending in them]'), which in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* is ascribed to the Bhāgavṛttikṛt. After this citation Viśvarūpa writes *bhāṣyamataṃ etat yuktaṃ ca*. However, such a quotation is absent in the *Mahābhāṣya* or, to be precise, in the edition we have. Thus, there are two possible interpretations of Viśvarūpa's statement. Either he meant that this quotation from the *Bhāgavṛtti* could also be found in the *Mahābhāṣya* and, therefore, it is correct or he simply mistakes the *Bhāgavṛtti* for the *Mahābhāṣya* here.

To sum up, the above seems to tally with the observation made by Chakravarti. The *Mahābhāṣya* is mentioned several times in the *Pañjikā*. It is regarded as an authority,

³⁶⁷ Cf. the *Nyāsa* on P.1.2.2, where, likewise, rule P.1.1.73 is brought into Jinendrabuddhi's argumentation, but this time the word *ādi* is combined with *iṭ* in order to obtain the meaning *īdādiṭpratyayaḥ* 'the suffix beginning with *iṭ*'.

but is most probably known only from quotations found in other treatises or through hearsay. In any case, Viśvarūpa does not use the text of the *Mahābhāṣya* in the manner which he utilises the text of the *Nyāsa* and other grammatical works.

II.6.5.2 The *Kāśikā*

In II.6.4 we have shown that the author of the *Pañjikā* drew enormously from the *Nyāsa*. Since the latter is a commentary on the *Kāśikā*, it can be expected that Viśvarūpa knew the *Kāśikā*, or it would at least be surprising if the contrary were the case. This conviction is further backed by the similarity between some passages from these two treatises. The nature of these similarities resembles that of the affinity between the *Pañjikā* and the *Nyāsa* as stated in II.6.4. However, it might be asked whether Viśvarūpa's knowledge of the *Kāśikā* could have stemmed exclusively from the *Nyāsa*. Such a possibility is rather small, but for a while let us take it into consideration. Indeed, in many cases it is not easy to set apart the influence of the *Kāśikā* from that of the *Nyāsa*, because of certain affinity between these two treatises. Jinendrabuddhi comments on the text of the *Kāśikā* and this means that he discusses similar problems, quotes passages from the *Kāśikā* and treats the examples given there. Consequently, especially in cases where an idea expressed by Viśvarūpa is also found in the *Kāśikā* (and in the *Nyāsa*), it might be difficult to decide whether Viśvarūpa draws from the *Kāśikā* or from the *Nyāsa*. Even if the wording of such a passage resembles that of the *Kāśikā*, frequently we cannot exclude the possibility that Viśvarūpa could have utilised the text of the *Kāśikā* as quoted in the *Nyāsa*. There are, however, many instances where Viśvarūpa clearly borrows from the *Kāśikā*, because either the *Nyāsa* does not discuss the topic in detail or even at all, or it does not quote the whole passage in question. Below, we will examine such examples.

1) Let us begin with one instance of literal borrowing from the *Kāśikā*. In the commentary on P.1.1.8 *mukhanāsikāvavano 'nunāsikaḥ* ('An *anunāsika* is [a phone which is] pronounced partly with the mouth and partly with the nose') Viśvarūpa writes:

mukhagrahaṇam kim? anusvārasyaiva syāt. nāsikāgrahaṇam kim? kaccatāpānām mā bhūt.

Why is [the word] 'mouth' (*mukha*) mentioned [in the *sūtra*]? [Because without it] only the *anusvāra* would be [called *anunāsika*]. Why is [the word] 'nose' (*nāsikā*) mentioned? So that [consonants] *k*, *c*, *ṭ*, *t* and *p* would not be [called *anunāsika*].

Exactly the same passage is found in the *Kāśikā*. Although Jinendrabuddhi comments on the above, he does not quote the whole piece of the text. He begins with the long

commentary on *anusvārasyaiva syāt*, omits the question about the aim of *nāsikā* in P.1.1.8 and then continues with the citation of the last sentence.

2) The next of our examples stems from the commentary on P.1.1.9 *tulyāsyaprayatnam savarṇam* (‘[Phones] which have the same place of articulation in the mouth and the same articulatory effort are [called] *savarṇa*, i.e. homogenous’), where Viśvarūpa writes:

(1) *āsyagrahaṇam kim?* (2) *kacaṭatapānām tulyaprayatnānām bhinnasthānānām mā bhūt.* (3) *kiṃ ca syāt?* (4) *prāptety atra takāre pare pakārasya lopaḥ syāt* (cf. P.8.4.65). (5) *prayatnagrahaṇam kim?* (6) *icuyasānām tulyasthānānām bhinnaprayatnānām nivṛttyartham.* (7-8) *anyathā aruś cyotatīty atra cakāre parataḥ śakārasya lopaḥ syāt* (cf. P.8.4.65).

Why is [the word] ‘mouth’ (*āsya*) mentioned [in the *sūtra*]? So that [the term *savarṇa*] would not apply to *k*, *c*, *t*, *t* and *p*, which have the same articulatory effort but different places of articulation. What would happen then? In [the example] *prāptā*, the consonant *p* preceding *t* would be elided. Why is [the word] ‘effort’ (*prayatna*) mentioned [in the *sūtra*]? So that [the term *savarṇa*] could be refuted in the case of *i*, palatal plosives, *y* and *ś*, which have the same place of articulation but different efforts. Otherwise, in *aruś cyotati* the consonant *ś* preceding *c* would be elided.

The relevant fragment from the *Kāśikā* reads as follows:

(1) *āsyagrahaṇam kim?* (2) *kacaṭatapānām bhinnasthānānām tulyaprayatnānām mā bhūt.* (3) *kiṃ ca syāt?* (4) *tarptā tarptum ity atra ‘jharo jhari savarṇe’ iti* (P.8.4.65) *pakārasya takāre lopaḥ syāt.* (5) *prayatnagrahaṇam kim?* (6) *icuyasānām tulyasthānānām bhinnajātīyānām mā bhūt.* (7) *kiṃ ca syāt?* (8) *aruś cyotatīty atra ‘jharo jhari savarṇe’ iti* (P.8.4.65) *śakārasya cakāre lopaḥ syāt.*

This passage is not identical with the one from the *Pañjikā*, but the differences between these two excerpts are minimal. In the second sentence, the sequence of *bhinnasthānānām* and *tulyaprayatnānām* is reversed. In the fourth, Viśvarūpa has the example *prāptā* instead of *tarptā* and *tarptum* in the *Kāśikā*, but in this case we cannot rule out the possibility that this is a scribal error. To my knowledge, the example *prāptā* is not found in any other treatise, while *tarptā* appears not only in the *Kāśikā* but also in the *Nyāsa*, *Durghaṭavṛtti*, *Padamañjarī* and even in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (on P.8.4.65). Furthermore, in this sentence, Viśvarūpa does not quote P.8.4.65, he reverses the order of *takāre* and *pakārasya* and adds *pare* after *takāre*. In the sixth sentence, the term *bhinnaprayatnānām* is used in the place of *bhinnajātīyānām* from the *Kāśikā*, but it may be a variant reading of the *Kāśikā*, since precisely this compound is cited in the *Nyāsa*. Moreover, Viśvarūpa employs a nominal construction (*nivṛttyartham*) instead of the verbal one (*mā bhūt*). Next, the *Pañjikā* does not have

the question *kiṃ ca syāt?* (7), instead Viśvarūpa begins the eighth sentence with *anyathā*. Other changes are similar to those of the fourth sentence: in the *Pañjikā*, the text of P.8.4.65 is omitted, the order of *śakārasya* and *cakāre* is changed and *parataḥ* is added after the latter. These modifications are all of the same kind as those which have been described in II.6.4, dealing with the influence of the *Nyāsa* on the *Pañjikā*.

Let us now have a look at the *Nyāsa* on the relevant passage. Jinendrabuddhi begins with the commentary of *bhinnasthānānām* from the second sentence, then comments on *tarptā* and *tarptum*, continues with the discussion of *bhinnaprayatnānām*, quoted instead of *bhinnaḥṭyānām* from the *Kāśikā*, and ends with the analysis of the example *aruś cyotati*. As we can see, also in this case Viśvarūpa clearly had the text of the *Kāśikā* in mind and not that of the *Nyāsa*.

3) The last example which we will consider now stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.2.11 *liṅsicāv ātmanepadeṣu*, which teaches that when *ātmanepada* suffixes follow, the aorist suffix *sic* and the substitutes of *liṅ*, both beginning with a consonant other than *y*, *v*, *r* and *l* and added after a root ending in a consonant which is preceded by a vowel *i*, *u* or *ṛ*, short or long, or by *ḷ* are treated as having the marker *k*.

ika ity eva yakṣiṣṭa ayaṣṭa. samprasāraṇam syāt (cf. P.6.1.15). *ātmanepadeṣu iti kim? asrākṣīt. amāgamo na syāt* (cf. P.6.1.58). *halantād ity eva ceṣiṣṭa. guṇo na syāt* (cf. P.1.1.5). *jhal ity eva vartiṣiṣṭa. guṇo na syāt*.

[*Sic* and *liṅ* are treated as having the marker *k*] only after [roots ending in a consonant which is preceded by] vowels *i*, *u*, *ṛ* or *ḷ* [or by the homogenous vowels; therefore,] *yakṣiṣṭa* and *ayaṣṭa* [are correct]. [Otherwise, in the case of these examples] *samprasāraṇa* [of *yaj*] would take place [because the suffixes of the benedictive and aorist added to *yaj* were treated as having the marker *k*]. Why is ‘when *ātmanepada* suffixes follow’ (*ātmanepadeṣu*) [stated in the *sūtra*]? So that in the case of *asrākṣīt* the augment *am* would not be added. [*Sic* and *liṅ* are treated as having the marker *k*] only ‘after [roots] ending in a consonant’, so that *ceṣiṣṭa* [could be obtained]. [Otherwise,] *guṇa* would not be [substituted here]. Only ‘[the suffix] beginning with a phone from the *pratyāhāra jhal*’ [is treated as marked with *k*,] so that *vartiṣiṣṭa* [would be correct]. [Otherwise,] *guṇa* would not be [substituted].

Notes

Sic mentioned in the *sūtra* is one of aorist suffixes. *Liṅ* generally means suffixes of the potential or of the benedictive, but the substitutes of *liṅ* which begin with a consonant other than *y*, *v*, *r* and *l* can be only *ātmanepada* suffixes of the benedictive.

Let us now have a look at the examples *yakṣiṣṭa* (3rd sing. \bar{A} . ben.) and *ayaṣṭa* (3rd sing. \bar{A} . aor.). After the root *yaj*, the suffixes of the benedictive and the suffix *sic* are not treated as marked with *k*, because the vowel *a* is not included in the *pratyāhāra ik*. Were the vowel *a* included in *ik*, these suffixes employed after *yaj* would be marked with *k*. Then, *sūtra* P.6.1.15 *vacisvapiyajādīnām kiti* (‘[The consonants *y*, *v*, *r* and *l* of the roots] *vac*, *svap* and of these belonging to

the *gaṇa* beginning with [the root] *yaj* [are vocalised] when [a suffix] having the marker *k* follows') would apply and the vocalisation of *y* of *yaj* would take place. This would result in **ikṣiṣṭa* and **aiṣṭa*.

Furthermore, only *ātmanepada* suffixes of the benedictive and aorist are treated as marked with *k*. For example, in *asrākṣīt*, the *parasmaipada* suffix *t* is not treated as marked with *k*. Were it marked with *k*, the augment *am* would not be added. It is, namely, taught in P.6.1.58 *sr̥jīdr̥śor jhaly am akiti* that before a suffix not marked with *k* and beginning with a consonant other than *y*, *v*, *r* and *l*, the augment *am* is added to the roots *sr̥j* and *dr̥ś*. Without the augment *am*, the form of 3rd sing. Par. aor. would be **asārḁṣīt* (cf. P.7.2.3).

Ātmanepada suffixes of the benedictive and the suffix *śic* are treated as marked with *k* only when they are added to a root ending in a consonant. Thus, after the root *ci*, these suffixes are not treated as marked with *k* and the *gaṇa* can be substituted for the final *i*, as in *ceṣṣiṣṭa*. Otherwise, the *gaṇa* substitution would be prohibited by P.1.1.5 *kniti ca*.

And last but not least, *ātmanepada* suffixes of the benedictive and the suffix *śic* are treated as marked with *k* only when these suffixes begin with a consonant other than *y*, *v*, *r* and *l*. For example, in the case of *vartiṣṣiṣṭa*, the suffix of 3rd sing. Ā. ben. is *iṣṣiṣṭa* (with three augments: *iṭ* at the beginning, *sīyut* and *sut*). It begins with a vowel, so it cannot be treated as marked with *k* by the present *sūtra*. Consequently, the *gaṇa* substitution of *r* belonging to *vṛt* is not prohibited by P.1.1.5 *kniti ca*.

Let us compare it with the text found in the *Kāśikā*:

ikaḥ ity eva – yakṣiṣṭa, ayaṣṭa. samprasāraṇaṃ hi syāt. ātmanepadeṣv iti kim? asrākṣīt, adrākṣīt. 'sr̥jīdr̥śor jhaly am akiti' ity (P.6.1.58) amāgamo na syāt. halantād ity eva – ceṣṣiṣṭa, aceṣṭa. gaṇo na syāt. jhal ity eva – vartiṣṣiṣṭa, avartiṣṭa. gaṇo na syāt.

The differences between these two passages are similar to those shown in the previous example. The text of *sūtra* P.6.1.58 and, apart from the first sentence, each second illustration (*adrākṣīt*, *aceṣṭa*, *avartiṣṭa*) given in the *Kāśikā* are not cited by Viśvarūpa. Additionally, in the second sentence the *hi* present in the *Kāśikā* is omitted in the *Pañjikā*.

As in the two previous cases, Jinendrabuddhi neither comments comprehensively on the passage nor wholly quotes it. He begins with the example *yakṣiṣṭa*, then cites and comments on the second sentence and last of all, he explains the form *adrākṣīt*.

These three are the most convincing passages speaking for the thesis that Viśvarūpa knew the *Kāśikā* not merely from the citations in the *Nyāsa* but as an independent text. Viśvarūpa frequently utilised the *Kāśikā* and, as in the case of the *Nyāsa*, the range of borrowings from the *Kāśikā* encompasses literal citations, slightly modified sentences and similarity of ideas. The examples of literal quotations from the *Kāśikā* are not very numerous³⁶⁸ and sometimes they are too short to decide whether they actually stem

³⁶⁸ These are found in the *Pañjika* on P.1.1.7, 8, 9, 38, 1.4.49 and 60.

from this commentary or are commonplace phrases used by many grammarians.³⁶⁹ The variety of modifications introduced into the passages from the *Kāśikā* has been illustrated above and are all of the same kind as those applied to the text of the *Nyāsa*. Let us also remark that, as is to be expected, borrowings from the *Kāśikā*, which is after all much shorter than Jinendrabuddhi's commentary on it, are less numerous than those from the *Nyāsa*.

To end with, we will briefly deal with the evidence which apparently speaks against the thesis that Viśvarūpa was well acquainted with the *Kāśikā*. Firstly, the *Kāśikā* is mentioned only once in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* (as *jayādityādivṛtti*), just at its beginning, but no opinion is ascribed to this commentary. However, let us remember that Viśvarūpa rarely refers to names of grammarians or titles of treatises. Moreover, the fact that he several times mentions the title of a work does not necessarily mean that he knew it very well, as has been seen in the case of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Thus, this argument is too weak to refute our thesis. Let us now examine the second one. In the commentary on P.1.1.14, Viśvarūpa cites the form *prāgnayah* instead of *prāgnaye* in the *Kāśikā*. There are two possible explanations for this: either it is a scribal error or while writing this passage, Viśvarūpa had the text of the *Nyāsa* before him and he wrongly resolved the sandhi in *prāgnaya iti*. Likewise – and this is the third piece of evidence – in the commentary on P.1.2.12, the *Kāśikā* (and the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*) has the form *ṛvarṇāntāt*. The *Nyāsa* quotes it as *ṛkārāntāt* and this is also repeated in the *Pañjikā*. Thus, we could also argue that Viśvarūpa employs here the text of the *Nyāsa* and not that of the *Kāśikā*. However, we cannot exclude that *ṛkārāntāt* is simply a variant reading of the *Kāśikā*. But even if this were not so, the evidence provided by this and the previous example is not very convincing. Namely, at best it proves that in these two places Viśvarūpa used the text of the *Nyāsa* rather than that of the *Kāśikā*, but it does not prove that this is everywhere the case.

To sum up, the arguments presented above are not sufficient to refute the thesis that Viśvarūpa knew and utilised not only the text of the *Nyāsa* but also that of the *Kāśikā*.

II.6.5.3 Works of Puruṣottamadeva

In this subsection we are going to take for discussion the question if Viśvarūpa knew and borrowed from Puruṣottamadeva's works. To perform this undertaking we only need to focus our attention on Puruṣottamadeva's grammatical treatises. Of these we can ignore those whose authorship is highly controversial and needless to say those

³⁶⁹ They are *prayatanam prayatnaḥ* (*Kāś.* on P.1.1.9) and *cakārah samjñāsamāveśārthaḥ* (*Kāś.* on P.1.4.60) to mention a few.

which are now lost. Furthermore, since the *Pañjikā* is a commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* and consequently Viśvarūpa's acquaintance with it cannot seriously be questioned, and for the same reason, he could hardly have utilised this text in the same manner as he did the *Nyāsa* and the *Kāśikā*, we can to a large extent leave the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* out of our considerations. In this way, three works of Puruṣottamadeva: his *Kāṛakacakra*, *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, have been selected.

We should begin our analysis by making three remarks. Firstly, none of these three treatises is mentioned in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*. However, as has already been stated, this does not necessarily mean that Viśvarūpa did not know them. In fact, it would be rather surprising if this were the case. After all, Puruṣottamadeva gained a certain popularity within the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar, so if Viśvarūpa commented on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, he could be also expected to know other works of Puruṣottamadeva. Secondly, the task of determining whether, and if so to what extent, Viśvarūpa utilised these three texts, poses additional difficulties. The reason for that is relatively simple. None of these treatises is a commentary on Pāṇini's *sūtras*. Consequently, Viśvarūpa could not borrow from them as directly and as frequently as he did from the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*. Thirdly, it is certain that Puruṣottamadeva knew the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa* very well and that he drew from them. Thus, in some cases it might be difficult to tell the influence of Puruṣottamadeva's works apart from that of the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*.

Keeping the above in mind, we will now examine in detail the question of Viśvarūpa's indebtedness to Puruṣottamadeva's *Kāṛakacakra*, *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*. It might be convenient – or at least it is encouraging – to begin with the easiest case, so we will now consider the possible influence of the *Kāṛakacakra* on the *Pañjikā*.

The examples of borrowings from the *Kāṛakacakra* are not very numerous but still, they provide evidence strong enough to prove that Viśvarūpa drew from this treatise. There are four passages in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* which are more or less similar to those from the *Kāṛakacakra*. Additionally, in the commentary on two other *sūtras*, Viśvarūpa gives the same citations which appear at the relevant places in the *Kāṛakacakra*. As is to be expected, all these passages are found in the fourth *pāda*, strictly speaking in the *kāṛaka* section.

The first of our examples stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.24 *dhruvam apāye 'pādānam*, which defines the term *apādāna* as a fixed point in describing the action of going away. Viśvarūpa ponders the sentence *apasarato meṣād apasarati meṣaḥ* 'A sheep is going away from another sheep which is [also] going away':

athāpasarato meṣād apasarati meṣa ity atra katham apādānatvaṃ yāvatā dvayor apy apasaraṇena yogād ekasya dhruvatvāyogāt? naitad asty āśrayabhedenāpasaraṇa-kriyābhedāt. tatra yad ekasyāpasaraṇaṃ tatrāparasyānanupraveśād dhruvatvam. yadi hy anupraveśaḥ syān meṣāv apasarata iti prayogaḥ syāt.

Thus, why [can we speak about] *apādāna* in the case of [the example] *apasarato meṣād apasarati meṣaḥ*, although no sheep possesses the [trait of] firmness, because both are going away? This is not so, because since the acts of going away are different, the relation of dependence [between two sheep] is [also] different. In that case, when one sheep is going away, the other is [treated as being] firm, because it does not enter [into the action of going]. But when entering [into the action of going] is to be [expressed, the sentence] *meṣāv apasarataḥ* ('Two sheep are going away') would be used.

Let us now compare this passage with the *Kāraṅcakra*. In the discussion of the ablative case suffixes Puruṣottamadeva first explains the example *dhāvato 'śvāt patito 'śvavāhakaḥ* 'the rider fell off the running horse'. The most important question concerns the ablative case suffix in *dhāvato 'śvāt*. It is namely argued that the running horse cannot be treated as the firm point of departure. This objection is swept away by pointing out the fact that there are two different activities involved here: one being the running of the horse and the other, the rider's falling off it. With regard to the second action, the running of the horse is irrelevant and consequently, a horse can be regarded as being firm. At this point of discussion Puruṣottamadeva says:

*yady evam apasarato meṣād apasarati meṣa ity atra dvayor apasaraṇena katham ekasya dhruvatvam. ucyate. āśrayabhedenāpasaraṇakriyābhedāt. tatra yady ekasyāpasaraṇaṃ tatreтарыānanupraveśāt dhruvatvam. yadi hy anupraveśaḥ syāt tadā meṣāv apasarata iti syāt.*³⁷⁰

If it is so [that in the example *dhāvato 'śvāt patito 'śvavāhakaḥ* ('A horse rider fell off the running horse') both actions, falling off the horse and running, are different], how is it possible that in *apasarato meṣād apasarati meṣaḥ* one sheep is [said to be] firm, although both [sheep] are going away? It is said that [this is so,] because since the acts of going away are different, the relation of dependence [between two sheep] is [also] different. In that case, when one sheep is going away, the other is [treated as being] firm, because it does not enter [into the action of going]. But when entering [into the action of going] is to be [expressed, the sentence] *meṣāv apasarataḥ* ('Two sheep are going away') would be used.

Although these two passages are neither identical, nor their affinity as striking as in the cases mentioned in II.6.4 and in II.6.5.2, it is, I think, obvious that the similarities between them cannot be accidental. Their first sentences do not resemble each other much, but in the remaining ones the differences are minor. The *Pañjikā* has *naitad asti* instead of *ucyate* in the *Kāraṅcakra*, *yad* instead of *yadi* and *-aparasya* instead

³⁷⁰ D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 111).

of *-itarasya*. In the last sentence, Viśvarūpa skips *tadā*, but adds *prayogaḥ* at the end. And if we note that the *Nyāsa* does not have anything similar to it, we are compelled to conclude that Viśvarūpa obviously utilised the text of the *Kāraḥcakra* when he was writing the commentary on P.1.4.24.

The next passage interesting in this context stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.32. It is also much more difficult to interpret than the previous one, because the topic discussed here is treated in the *Nyāsa* as well. Thus, the explanation of *saṃpradāna* and *dāna*, found in the *Pañjikā*, is identical and in the latter case very similar to that given in the *Nyāsa* and in the *Kāraḥcakra*. The remaining commentary by Viśvarūpa can rather be sorted into the category of ‘similarity in ideas’, which makes the search for the source of Viśvarūpa’s inspiration still more difficult. It might perhaps have been impossible to decide whether in this particular case Viśvarūpa drew from the *Kāraḥcakra* or from the *Nyāsa* if there had not been just one fact speaking in favour of the former. Namely, after the explication of *dāna*, which involves such words as *pūjā*, *anugraha* and *kāmyā*, Viśvarūpa characterises these concepts by quoting three *ślokas*, each one dealing with one term. The same *ślokas* appear at exactly the same point of discussion in the *Kāraḥcakra* and are absent from the *Nyāsa*.

The next two passages, taken from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.42 and 49, are similar in some respects. In both cases, the text of the *Nyāsa* differs from that of the *Pañjikā* (and of the *Kāraḥcakra*), so we may exclude the *Nyāsa* as the source of borrowing. Furthermore, the pertinent text of the *Kāraḥcakra* is much longer than Viśvarūpa’s commentary. On the whole, these two passages provide us with the example of similarity in content but not in form; but, occasionally, some phrases or even sentences from the *Pañjikā* are identical with those from the *Kāraḥcakra*. And last but not least, in the commentary on both these *sūtras*, Viśvarūpa supports his argumentation with quotations from the *Bhāvanaviveka* (in *Pañj.* on P.1.4.42) and from the *Vākyapadīya* (in *Pañj.* on P.1.4.49). Remarkably enough, the same citations are found in the relevant parts of the *Kāraḥcakra*.

Finally, let us examine the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.45 and 54. In both cases, the text of Viśvarūpa is relatively short and the explanation given by him is found in the *Kāraḥcakra* as well as in the *Nyāsa* and partly in the *Kāśikā*. However, there are two quotations there, one on each *sūtra*, which are also given by Puruṣottamadeva in the *Kāraḥcakra*. The first one (on P.1.4.45) is used in the *Pañjikā* as well as in the *Kāraḥcakra* as an illustration of three kinds of *adhikaraṇa*. The second one, ascribed by Puruṣottamadeva to Bhartṛhari, closes the commentary on P.1.4.54 in the *Pañjikā*.³⁷¹

³⁷¹ I resist quoting these five passages in the present chapter. A curious reader may consult the

I think, the above dispels any doubt that could possibly arise about the indebtedness of Viśvarūpa to the *Kāraṅgacakra*. The evidence is strong enough to demonstrate that Viśvarūpa not only knew the *Kāraṅgacakra*, but also utilised it in the same way as he did the *Kāśīkā* and the *Nyāsa*.

Now we come to the discussion about the influence of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* on the *Pañjikā*. To begin with, let us note that both the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* are commentaries on collections of maxims; in the former these are *jñāpyas* and in the latter, *paribhāṣās*. Thus, there are two ways Viśvarūpa could have possibly utilised these texts. He could have borrowed from the commentary on the maxims in a fashion which has been already exemplified here, but he could also have quoted or alluded to maxims alone without drawing from Puruṣottamadeva's explanatory remarks. Obviously, irrelevant of whether we want to prove Viśvarūpa's acquaintance with the works of Puruṣottamadeva or whether we want to scrutinise the degree of originality of the *Pañjikā*, the first method of employing these texts is much more interesting for us and provides us with much stronger evidence. After all, the fact that Viśvarūpa quotes *paribhāṣās* or *jñāpyas* does not have to mean that he had the collections of Puruṣottamadeva in mind. Moreover, if this actually were the case, this fact alone would not deprive Viśvarūpa of his originality. Consequently, we are going to focus our attention on the first kind of evidence below, using the second only as an additional argument.

The number of passages where Viśvarūpa drew from the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* is even smaller than in the case of the *Kāraṅgacakra*. In the first *adhyaḃya* of the *Pañjikā*, four examples of similarity with the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* can be found: in the commentary on P.1.1.56, 58, 1.3.12 and 1.3.90. Among these, the excerpts from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.58 and 1.3.12 are similar to the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* only on the content level, the wording differs from that given by Puruṣottamadeva. Additionally, in the case of the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.12, it is difficult to decide whether Viśvarūpa's text (or rather the ideas contained there) resembles that of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* or of the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*.

Thus, we will now concentrate on two remaining passages, beginning with the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.56. It also provides us with a good example to demonstrate how, in spite of the outward similarity, the text of the *Pañjikā* differs from that of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. To be precise, we will see how Viśvarūpa simplifies the argumentation of Puruṣottamadeva.

edition of the *Pañjikā*, where the pertinent fragments of the *Kāraṅgacakra* are given in footnotes. However, because the passages from the *Kāraṅgacakra* corresponding to the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.42 and 49 are rather lengthy, they are not cited in full in the present edition; instead, they are given in Appendix D.

In the middle of the commentary on P.1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo 'nalvidhau* ('A substitute is like the original form, but not in the case of *alvidhi*'), Viśvarūpa explains the meaning of *alvidhiḥ* as *alāśrayo vidhiḥ* 'a rule depending on (a) phone(s)'. Afterwards he states:

tenāgrahād ity atra graho 'liṭīti (cf. P.7.2.37) *dīrghatve kṛte sthānivadbhāvād idrūpatva iṭa iṭīti* (P.8.2.28) *sico lopah. tatra dīrghagrahaṇaṃ hy evamarthaṃ kriyate: alvidhitve 'pi sthānivadbhāvo yathā syāt.*

Thus, in [the example] *agrahīt* [the augment *iṭ*, which is added to the aorist suffix *sic* coming after the root *grah*,] is lengthened by P.7.2.37 *graho 'liṭi dīrghaḥ* and then, because [the substitute] is like the original, [*iṭ* is treated as] having the form of *iṭ*, in which case, [the suffix] *sic* is elided by P.8.2.28 *iṭa iṭī*. The mention of *dīrgha* [instead of the shorter *iṭ*] in [sūtra P.7.2.37] is made for the following reason: so that the rule about treating the substitute as the original would also take place when an operation concerns phones.

Notes

Let us have a look at the derivation of *agrahīt* (3rd sing. Par. aor.): $a + \text{grah} + \text{sic} + \text{tip} \rightarrow \text{agrah} + (\text{iṭ} + \text{sic}) + \text{tip}$ (P.7.2.35).

Rule P.7.2.37 *graho 'liṭi dīrghaḥ* teaches lengthening of the augment *iṭ* added at the beginning of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix with the initial consonant other than *y*, if this suffix is not a substitute of *liṭ*, i.e. it is not the suffix of the perfect. The suffix *sic* fulfils these conditions; therefore, we have:

$\text{agrah} + (\text{iṭ} + \text{sic}) + \text{tip} \rightarrow \text{agrah} + (\text{iṭ} + s) + \text{ti}$ (P.1.3.2, 3, 9) $\rightarrow \text{agrah} + (\text{iṭ} + s) + t$ (P.3.4.100) $\rightarrow \text{agrah} + (\text{iṭ} + s) + (\text{iṭ} + t)$ (P.7.3.96).

Now, rule P.8.2.28 *iṭa iṭī* prescribes the elision of the consonant *s* which follows the augment *iṭ* and precedes *iṭ*. Because the substitute *iṭ* of the augment *iṭ*, which is introduced to *sic*, is treated as the original, i.e. as *iṭ*, the elision of *s* can take place and at this stage of derivation we have: $\text{agrah} + \text{iṭ} + (\text{iṭ} + t)$. Then, the markers *ṭ* are elided and this results in: $\text{agrah} + \bar{i} + \bar{i}t \rightarrow \text{agrahīt}$ (P.6.1.101).

Now, I propose to compare this text with that of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*:

phalaṃ ca jñāpakasyāgrahād ity atra graho 'liṭi dīrgha iti (P.7.2.37) *dīrghagrahaṇāt yatnataḥ sthānivad ity atideśāt idrūpatve iṭa iṭīti* (P.8.2.28) *sijlopasiddhir iti. atra dīrghagrahaṇaṃ hi evamarthaṃ kriyate iti alvidhitve 'pi sthānivadbhāvo yathā syāt.* [Jñ.S. p. 59]

The wording of these two passages is quite similar and the differences between them are minor. Thus, Viśvarūpa opens the discussion by saying *tena* instead of *phalaṃ ca jñāpakasya* in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. After the quotation of P.7.2.37, he writes *dīrghatve kṛte* instead of *dīrghagrahaṇāt*. He skips *yatnataḥ* and after that, *ity atideśāt*, and he uses *sthānivadbhāvāt*, where Puruṣottamadeva has *sthānivat*. Furthermore, the quotation of P.8.2.28 is closed in the *Pañjikā* by *sico lopah* and in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* by *sijlopasiddhir iti*. The next sentence opens either with *atra* (in the *Pañjikā*) or with *tatra* (in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*). The rest of the sentence

is identical, with the exception of *iti* lacking in the *Pañjikā* and present after *kriyate* in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.³⁷² However, in spite of the apparent similarity between these two passages, the argumentation of Puruṣottamadeva is more complicated than that of Viśvarūpa. Namely, having stated that *alvidhi* means *alāśrayo vidhiḥ*, Puruṣottamadeva suggests that the mention of *analvidhi* in P.1.1.56 implies the existence of the maxim: *sāmānyāśrayaṃ viśeṣāśrayaṃ vā yat kāryaṃ sthānivad ity atideśāt prāpnoti tanniṣedhārtham* (‘[The word *analvidhau*] serves to prohibit this operation which depends on general or on minor [properties] and which would wrongly apply because of the extension given by [the phrase] “like the original”.’). Otherwise, he argues, the *paribhāṣā*: *sāmānyātideśe viśeṣasyānatideśaḥ* (‘When an extension depending on general properties takes place, an extension depending on minor ones does not occur.’) would apply and *analvidhiḥ* found in P.1.1.56 would not have been necessary. To support this, he gives an example *pratidīvyā*. Then he closes the discussion of the problem by pointing out the benefit (*phala*) of this *jñāpya*, which is the usage of P.7.2.37 in forming *agrahīt*.³⁷³ In contrast, Viśvarūpa does not mention the existence of the *jñāpya* discussed by Puruṣottamadeva at all. He omits the two middle steps of Puruṣottamadeva’s reasoning and directly combines the fact that *alvidhiḥ* means *alāśrayo vidhiḥ* with the usage of P.7.2.37 in the derivation of *agrahīt*.

However, even if the structure of Viśvarūpa’s argumentation differs from that of Puruṣottamadeva, the very fact that the wording of the *Pañjikā* so much resembles that of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* cannot be explained otherwise than by the assumption that Viśvarūpa drew from the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.

To support this statement let us examine the following passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.90 *vā kyaṣaḥ*, which teaches that *parasmaipada* suffixes are optionally added after denominative verbs formed with the suffix *kyaṣ*:

kyaṣvidhau cakāreṇa (cf. P.3.1.12) *kyañ anuvartya kyaṣkyañbhyām ubhayapada-siddhau vā kyaṣa iti vacanaṃ jñāpayati: vyavasthitavibhāṣayāpīha kvacit kāryāṇi kriyanta iti* (cf. *Jñ.S.* p. 63, *PP* 62 and *NP* 99). *na ca vācyam kyañpakṣe lohiniyata ity asya kyañmāninoś ceti* (P.6.3.36) *pumvanniṣedhaḥ na kopadhāyā ity* (P.6.3.37) *atra neti yogavibhāgāt siddhatvāt. vyavasthitavibhāṣayā tu lohitaḍipāṭhitebhyo nīlādibhyo nityam ātmanepadaṃ bhavati. tena lohitaḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ iti* (cf. *vārtt.* 1 on P.3.1.13, *Mbh.* II 24.20) *vacanaṃ bhr̥śādiṣv itarāṇīti* (*vārtt.* 2 on P.3.1.13, *Mbh.* II 24.23) *vaktavyam na bhavati*.

³⁷² Since the position of *iti* after *kriyate* is a little bit odd, its omission could be seen as the improvement on the text of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.

³⁷³ See *Jñ.S.* p. 59: *tathānalvidhāv iti vidhigrahaṇam alāśrayo vidhir alvidhir ity uttarapadalopīsamāse sāmānyāśrayaṃ viśeṣāśrayaṃ vā yat kāryaṃ sthānivad ity atideśāt prāpnoti tanniṣedhārtham kriyate pratidīvyety atra lyapo balāditvāśraya idniṣedho yathā syāt. anyathā hi sāmānyātideśe viśeṣasyānatideśa ity (PP 64, NP 101) yad eva pratyayatvārdhadhātukatvādisāmānyāśrayaṃ tad evātideśena syāt na balāditvaviśeṣāśrayam iti pratidīvyety atra lyapo balāditvābhāvād id nāstīti kiṃ vidhigrahaṇena? phalaṃ ca...*

In the rule prescribing *kyas̥* (i.e. in P.3.1.13 *lohitādiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ*) *kyan̄i* is also present by *anuvṛtti*, because of the word *ca* [in P.3.1.12]. Therefore, when after what ends in *kyas̥* or *kyan̄i*, both suffixes, *parasmaipada* and *ātmanepada*, are already obtained, rule P.1.3.90 teaches [the maxim] ‘Grammatical operations are also in some cases made here in the sense of *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* (i.e. their optional character is irregular)’. And it cannot be argued that in the case of *kyan̄i*, in [the example] *lohinīyate*, the masculine form would be prescribed by P.6.3.36 *kyan̄imāninoś ca*, because it would be prohibited by *na* resulting from splitting rule P.6.3.37 *na kopādhāyāḥ*. But, because of the irregular option (*vyavasthitavibhāṣā*), *ātmanepada* suffixes are always added after ‘*nīlā* etc.’, [although] they are enumerated under *lohitādi*. Thus, the statement ‘*kyas̥* is added after *lohita* and what ends in *ḍāc*’ [is not needed] and ‘after *bhr̥śādi* other suffixes are prescribed’ should not be declared.’³⁷⁴

Notes

The above needs a little bit of explanation. The denominative suffix *kyan̄i* is taught in P.3.1.11-18, with an exception of P.3.1.13 *lohitādiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ*, where the suffix *kyas̥* is prescribed after words belonging to the list ‘*lohita* etc.’ and after words ending in the suffix *ḍāc*. Since *k*, *ñ* and *ṣ* are markers, they are elided and the actual suffix is in both cases *ya*. However, there is one difference between them. Verbs which are formed with the suffix *kyan̄i* take *ātmanepada* suffixes, as prescribed in P.1.3.12 *anudāttañita ātmanepadam* (‘After [verbs] having as a marker either a vowel with an *anudātta* accent or [the consonant] *ñ*, *ātmanepada* suffixes are added’). By P.1.3.90, verbs with the suffix *kyas̥* take optionally *parasmaipada* suffixes. Now, it is argued that in P.3.1.13 not only the suffix *kyas̥* but also the suffix *kyan̄i* are prescribed. Thus, in case of *lohita*, we can add both these suffixes and the resulting verbs would be *lohitāyate* (with *kyan̄i*) and *lohitāyati* (with *kyas̥*). Therefore, Viśvarūpa says that P.1.3.90 is understood as prescribing *vyavasthitavibhāṣā*. That means that this option is irregular and valid only in some cases. Now, what is a purpose of teaching *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* in P.1.3.90? The answer is that by doing that we can justify the fact that *parasmaipada* suffixes are optionally added only after *lohita* and stems ending in the suffix *ḍāc*, but after words belonging to the group ‘*nīlā* etc.’, which is included in ‘*lohita* etc.’, only *ātmanepada* suffixes are adjoined. Consequently, two *vārttikas* of Kātyāyana can be rejected. However, before we do that we must solve one problem regarding the denominative *lohinīyate*. It is, namely, said that if we add *kyan̄i* after *lohinī*, *lohinī* would be substituted by its masculine form *lohita*, as taught in P.6.3.36 *kyan̄imāninoś ca* (‘[A feminine word not ending in *ū* and having a masculine form is substituted by this masculine form] also when the suffix *kyan̄i* or *mānin* follow’). This objection can be rejected, because the substitute by the masculine form is prohibited if we split P.6.3.37 *na kopādhāyāḥ* (‘[A feminine word] with the penultimate *k* is not [substituted by its masculine form]’) into *na* and *kopādhāyāḥ*. Thus, there is no need of assuming that in case of *lohinīyate*, the suffix *kyas̥* must be added.

Now let us compare Viśvarūpa’s explanation with the relevant excerpt from the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.

³⁷⁴ We might also emend the text in the *Pañjikā* and write *kyas̥vacanam iti* (as it is given in the *Mahābhāṣya* and *Kāśikā*) instead of *kyas̥ iti vacanam*. However, because the reading we have in the manuscript makes good sense either, I have refrained from introducing this emendation.

lohitādidājbhyaḥ kyaṣvidhau (cf. P.3.1.13) *yogavibhāgena cakāreṇa vā kyañam anuvartya kyaṣkyañbhyāṃ lohitāyati lohitāyate ityādau ātmanepadaparasmaipadasiddhau parasmaipadātmanepadavidhau vā kyaṣa iti* (P.1.3.90) *vacanaṃ jñāpayati vyavasthitavibhāṣayāpīha kāryāṇi kriyante iti. na ca vācyam asati vā kyaṣa ity asmin kyañpakṣe lohinīyata ity atra kyañmāninoś ceti* (P.6.3.36) *pumvadbhāvah prāpnoti. yato na kopadhāyā ity* (P.6.3.37) *atra na iti yogavibhāgena pumvadbhāvanīsedho bhaviṣyatīti. tasmād vā kyaṣa iti vyavasthitatvāt vibhāṣayāḥ lohitadājbhya evātmanepadavikalpaḥ sidhyatīti. nīlādibhyas tu lohitādīparipathitebhyo 'pī nityam ātmanepadaṃ bhavati. tena lohitadājbhyaḥ kyaṣvacanaṃ* (vārtt. 1 on P.3.1.13, *Mbh.* II 24.20) *bhṛśādiṣv itarāṇīti* (vārtt. 2 on P.3.1.13, *Mbh.* II 24.23) *na vaktavyaṃ bhavati.* [*Jñ.S.* p. 63]

In P.3.1.13 *lohitādidājbhyaḥ kyaṣ*, which prescribes [the addition of] **kyaṣ**, [the suffix] **kyañ** is present by *anuvṛtti* due to splitting rule P.3.1.13 [into *lohitādidājbhyaḥ* and **kyaṣ**] or due to the word *ca* [in P.3.1.12]. Therefore, in *lohitāyati* and *lohitāyate*, the *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada* suffixes are already obtained and [the fact] that they are [once again] prescribed in rule P.1.3.90 teaches [the maxim] ‘Grammatical operations are also made here in the sense of *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* (i.e. their optional character is irregular)’. And it cannot be said that in case P.1.3.90 were not stated and, consequently, when [the suffix] **kyañ** were added [after *lohinī*], by P.6.3.36 *kyañmāninoś ca* the masculine form would be wrongly applied in [the example] *lohinīyate*. [This is not the case], because the masculine form will be prohibited by *na* resulting from splitting rule P.6.3.37 *na kopadhāyāḥ*. Therefore, because of the irregular option [laid down] in P.1.3.90, *ātmanepada* is optional only after *lohita* and what ends in **ḍāc**. But after ‘*nīlā* etc.’, even though they are enumerated under *lohitādi*, the *ātmanepada* suffixes are always added. Thus, *vārttikas* 1 and 2 on P.3.1.13: ‘**kyaṣ** is prescribed after *lohita* and what ends in **ḍāc**’ and ‘after *bhṛśādi* other suffixes are prescribed’ should not be stated.

As we can see, the present example is characterised by a lesser degree of similarity than the previous one. First of all, in the interpretation of rule P.3.1.13, Puruṣottamadeva states two options: the splitting of the *sūtra* and drawing *ca* from the previous rule, while Viśvarūpa mentions only the first possibility. Still, to my mind, the source of Viśvarūpa’s inspiration has to be the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. Otherwise, it would be very difficult to reasonably explain why so many phrases from the *Pañjikā* are identical or similar to those from the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.

To sum up, these two passages from the *Pañjikā* point out that with high probability Viśvarūpa utilised the text of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. However, this conclusion will become less convincing if we take a closer look at the *jñāpyas* quoted in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*. Among 17 *jñāpyas* cited by Viśvarūpa, only two are identical³⁷⁵ and seven almost identical³⁷⁶ to those from the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. The wording of six other *jñāpyas* differs more essentially from that of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, but three

³⁷⁵ These are quoted in *Pañj.* on P.1.2.41 and P.1.3.2.

³⁷⁶ See *Pañj.* on P.1.1.58, 1.2.1, 6, 14, 45; 1.3.12, 90.

of them more or less resemble the text of maxims found in the *Nyāsa*,³⁷⁷ and the other three differ to the same extent from these two treatises.³⁷⁸ The remaining three *jñāpyas* are not discussed in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, one of them appears (but in a slightly different wording) in the commentary on *PP* 1³⁷⁹ and the other is similar to the maxim quoted in the *Nyāsa*.³⁸⁰ As far as the third *jñāpya* is concerned, I must admit that I have not been successful in finding its source.³⁸¹ Thus, the evidence given by *jñāpyas* quoted in the *Pañjikā* to some extent contradicts the assumption that Viśvarūpa utilised the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. It is really disturbing that eight *jñāpyas*, almost half of all the *jñāpyas* cited in the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā*, either differ essentially in their wording from *jñāpyas* found in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* or are not discussed there. Naturally, this poses many questions. Did Viśvarūpa really utilise the text of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*? Did he have another text of this sort which he consulted? In that case, either this text has to be similar to that of Puruṣottamadeva or we must assume that Viśvarūpa used the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and some other collection of *jñāpyas* as well. Theoretically, it might also be possible that Viśvarūpa consulted only the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* but for some reason modified the text known to him. However, if we accept this possibility, we have to answer the question why Viśvarūpa should have done such a thing. Similarly, the hypothesis that Viśvarūpa may have had another commentary on *jñāpyas* does not seem to be very convincing. As far as I can gather, Puruṣottamadeva's *Jñāpakasamuccaya* is unique in the Pāṇinian tradition and, I think, we should not accept an explanation which presupposes the existence of a text which is nowhere even alluded to. What, then, could we propose as the solution to the problem raised here? In my opinion, the evidence provided by the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* does not allow the question why *jñāpyas* quoted by Viśvarūpa differ from those of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* to be satisfactorily answered. Nevertheless, unless we are willing to assume the existence of another treatise similar to the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, it seems quite certain that Viśvarūpa drew from Puruṣottamadeva's text.

The last issue I wish to discuss here is the possible influence of Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* on the *Pañjikā*. However, the evidence provided by the first *adhyāya* of Viśvarūpa's commentary does not lead us to any reasonable conclusion with regard to this problem. There are three passages that must be taken into consideration here. They come from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.45, 1.3.12 and 1.3.18. They all discuss topics similar to those found in the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, but their wording differs from that of

³⁷⁷ See *Pañj.* on P.1.1.59, 1.3.30, 1.4.13.

³⁷⁸ See *Pañj.* on P.1.2. 45; 1.2.14; 1.4.42.

³⁷⁹ See *Pañj.* on P.1.2.45.

³⁸⁰ See *Pañj.* on P.1.1.51.

³⁸¹ See *Pañj.* on P.1.4.11.

Puruṣottamadeva's treatise. Furthermore, the first and the third of these passages are very short, consisting respectively of two or one short sentence. The second passage is much longer, but the topic is treated not only in the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* but also in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and it would be very difficult to decide to which of these two Viśvarūpa's commentary is more similar.

As in the case of the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, let us also have a look at *paribhāṣās* quoted in the *Pañjikā*. In the first *adhyāya*, *paribhāṣās* are cited 27 times. The quotation is identical 23 times and quite similar to the text of the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* once. Moreover, one quotation is similar to the text of the *Paribhāṣāpāṭha*. Thus, there are two cases left where the wording of the *paribhāṣā* as cited by Viśvarūpa differs from that of given by Puruṣottamadeva. However, even the fact that the text of other *paribhāṣās* is identical to that used by Puruṣottamadeva does not necessarily prove that Viśvarūpa quoted the maxims from Puruṣottamadeva's treatise. After all, the same *paribhāṣā* can be found in many collections. Thus, it must be admitted that although it would be difficult to believe that Viśvarūpa did not know Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, the evidence provided by the first *adhyāya* of his *Pañjikā* does not suffice to prove that Viśvarūpa drew from the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*.

To sum up, the testimony given by the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* points out that Viśvarūpa knew and borrowed from Puruṣottamadeva's *Kāraṅcakakra* and most probably from his *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. In regard to the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* nothing conclusive can be stated.

II.6.5.4 The *Durghaṭāvṛtti*

We are now going to examine the possible influence of Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭāvṛtti* on the *Pañjikā*. To begin with, let us summarise what we have already said about affinity of texts as given, for example, between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā*. As you may recall, we have roughly distinguished two kinds of similarity, which we might call similarity in ideas or content and similarity in form. We have also found many passages in the *Pañjikā* and correspondingly in the *Nyāsa* which belong to either category. In fact, the abundance of occurrences of similarity in ideas has made this type almost as important in proving the indebtedness of the *Pañjikā* to the *Nyāsa* as similarity in form has been. However, let us note that in cases where the amount of passages which resemble another text is not so large, similarity in form provides us with much more conclusive evidence. After all, the fact that two works discuss the same topics or give similar solutions to some problems could be either accidental or due to the influence of some other treatise(s). It is this situation we have to deal with in this subsection.

There are eight passages from the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* which somehow resemble the text of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. If we compare this number with four passages which are similar to the *Kāraṅgacakra*, we might expect to get a convincing answer to the question about the indebtedness of the *Pañjikā* to the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. However, as we will see, most of the passages presented below differ in their wording from the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. Even in cases which we could classify as examples of similarity in form, the differences between the text by Viśvarūpa and by Śaraṇadeva are much bigger and more abundant than those shown, for example, in II.6.4. Sometimes the sequence of examples or topics under discussion differs. Sometimes the wording of a maxim quoted is slightly altered. Again, at another point, the wording of commentary is similar but an important part present in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* is missing in the *Pañjikā*, which causes a slight change in argumentation. In brief, these examples are not all of the same ‘clear’ type as those examined in II.6.4. In many cases, it is difficult to even classify a passage into one kind of similarity. This is the reason why I have decided to discuss the relevant passages in the order they appear in the *Pañjikā* instead of trying to put them into a single category first.

1) Consequently, we begin our examination with a short passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.9 *tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇam*, which defines the term ‘homogenous’ (*savarṇa*). Thus, two phones are homogenous if they have the same place of articulation and the same articulatory effort. Let us now have a look at Viśvarūpa’s explanation of the word *praklpyamāna*:

tena praklpyamāna ity atra ṛvarṇāc cety atkupvādinā natvaṃ na bhavati (cf. P.8.4.2). *jñāpakam cātra ṛ lḡ ity (Ś.sū. 2) atra lḡkārasyopādānam*.

Therefore (i.e. because *ṛ* and *l* are mostly, but not always, treated as being homogenous), in [the case of] *praklpyamānaḥ*, [the prescription that] ‘[the substitution of *n* by *ṇ* takes place] also after the phoneme *ṛ* [i.e. after *ṛ* or *ṝ*]’ does not cause the substitution by the phone *ṇ* [prescribed] in P.8.4.2 *atkupvāṇnumvyavāye ‘pi*. This is indicated by the mention of the phone *l* in [the *Śivasūtra*] ‘*ṛ lḡ*’.

Notes

Rule P.8.4.2 *atkupvāṇnumvyavāye ‘pi* prescribes the substitution of *n* by *ṇ* even when a vowel, *h*, *y*, *v*, *r*, a velar or labial consonant, the prefix *āri* or the augment *num* separate *n* from a phone causing the substitution. These phones are *r* and *ṣ* and, as it is already taught by Kātyāyana and Patañjali, also the vowel *ṛ*.³⁸² Furthermore, by the mention of the vowel *ṛ* also its homogenous vowels, i.e. *ṝ* and *l*, are understood. Consequently, the substitution by *ṇ* should take place in the case of *praklpyamānaḥ*. This is not the case, because the vowels *ṛ* and *l* are not always treated as homogenous, which is indicated by the mention of the phone *l* in the *Śivasūtra* ‘*ṛ lḡ*’.

³⁸² Cf. vārtt. 1 on P.8.4.1: *raṣābhyāṃ natva ṛkāragrahaṇam (Mbh. III 452.2)* and Patañjali on it: *raṣābhyāṃ natva ṛkāragrahaṇam kartavyam. raṣābhyāṃ no ṛaḥ samānapada ṛkāṛāc ceti vaktavyam (Mbh. III 452.3)*.

Compare this with Śaraṇadeva's text:

katham prakṛpyamānaḥ. ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ savarṇasaṃjñā vaktavyety ṛvarṇāc ceti ṇatvaprasaṅgāt. ucyate ur iti vaktavye varṇagrahaṇam asyānityatvārtham. tena. yad vā 'ṛ ḷg' ity (Ś.sū. 2) atra pratyāhāra ḷgrahaṇam śakyam akartum. yathā sāvārṇyād ṛkāra ṛkāram gṛhṇāti tathā ḷkāram api grāhayiṣyati. kim ḷkāreṇa. taj jñāpayaty ṛkāra-ḷkārayoḥ sāvārṇyam anityam iti. tena yathā ḷṣptaśikhēti 'guror anṛta' iti (cf. P.8.2.86) pluto bhavati na tv anṛta iti pratiṣedhas tathā prakṛpyamāna iti ṇatvābhāvaḥ.

How [do we obtain] *prakṛpyamānaḥ*, although *ṇ* could be applied because of [the maxims] 'it should be declared that the phones *ṛ* and *ḷ* are called homogenous' and '[the substitution of *n* by *ṇ* takes place] also after the phoneme *ṛ*' (*ṛvarṇāc ca*)? It is stated that [this is because the term] *varṇa* is used [in *ṛvarṇāc ca*], although it should be formulated '*uḥ*' [and that shows] that this rule does not always operate. Or it is so, because in the *pratyāhāra[sūtra]* it is possible not to mention [the phone] *ḷ*. As, because they are homogenous, the phoneme *ṛ* includes *ṝ*, it would also include the phone *ḷ*. Thus, what is the phone *ḷ* for? This makes [us] realize that the phones *ṛ* and *ḷ* are not always [treated as being] homogenous. Therefore, as in the case of *ḷṣptaśikhā* [the substitute] *pluta* [prescribed] in P.8.2.86 *guror anṛto 'nantyasyāpy ekaikasya prācām* takes place, although it would be prohibited by *anṛtaḥ* ('not of *r*'), so there is no *ṇ* in *prakṛpyamānaḥ*.

Notes

Śaraṇadeva gives two possible explanations why phones *ṛ* and *ḷ* are not always homogenous. Firstly, he says that the fact that we have *ṛvarṇāc ca* and not *uṣ ca*, which is much shorter, indicates that *ṛ* and *ḷ* are sometimes treated as not homogenous. The second reason given by him is the same as the one found in the *Pañjikā*.

Furthermore, Śaraṇadeva mentions not only *prakṛpyamānaḥ* but also *ḷṣptaśikhā* as the examples in which the vowel *ḷ* is not treated as homogenous with *ṛ*. Were *ḷ* in *ḷṣptaśikhā* homogenous with *ṛ*, it would not be substituted by *pluta*. It is, namely, said in P.8.2.86 *guror anṛto 'nantyasyāpy ekaikasya prācām* that according to eastern grammarians a vowel which is prosodially long is also substituted by a *pluta*, but only one at the same time. This prolongation has two exceptions: a vowel final in an utterance and the vowel *ṛ*. Consequently, not only the vowel *ṛ* would be excluded from this operation, but also *ḷ*, which is homogenous with *ṛ* and, like *ṛ*, a short vowel. However, since *ḷ* and *ṛ* are not always treated as homogenous, *ḷ* in *ḷṣptaśikhā* can be prolonged and, similarly, the example *prakṛpyamānaḥ* is correct.

As can easily be seen, Śaraṇadeva's elucidation is much longer than Viśvarūpa's commentary and these two passages clearly belong to the category 'similarity in ideas'. The *Nyāsa* discusses the example *prakṛpyamāna* neither under P.1.1.9 nor under Ś.sū. 2 nor under P.8.4.1-2.

2) The second passage stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.2.1 *gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'ñṇin nit*, which teaches that suffixes which are devoid of markers *ñ* and *ṇ* and which are added

to the root *gāñ* or to the roots belonging to the group beginning with *kuṭ* are treated as having the marker *ñ*. Consequently, as prescribed in P.1.1.5 *knīti ca*, such suffixes do not cause the *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* substitution. Now, the question arises why in *likhanam* and *likhiṣyati* the *guṇa* is missing.

kuṭa ādih kuṭādih kuṭ ādir yasyeti sa kuṭādih. tatraikaśeṣeṇa likher (cf. Dhṛp. 6.72) api nīttve likhanam likhiṣyatītyādisiddhiḥ.

That which stands before *kuṭ* and this which follows *kuṭ* are *kuṭādi*. Therefore, by [the rule about] the only remainder (i.e. P.1.2.64), [the suffixes] after *likh* are also [treated as] having the marker *ñ* and, therefore, *likhanam*, *likhiṣyati* etc. are obtained.

Notes

Viśvarūpa has to account for words such as *likhanam* and *likhiṣyati*, which do not contain *guṇa*, which should apply by P.7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*. His answer is that the suffixes *lyuṭ*, (*ana*) and *sya* added to *likh* are treated as having the marker *ñ* and, consequently, P.1.1.5 prohibits *guṇa*. Now, the question arises how it is possible that these suffixes are treated as having the marker *ñ*. The compound *kuṭādi* is usually interpreted as meaning ‘*kuṭ* etc.’; thus, it refers to the group of roots beginning with the root *kuṭ* mentioned in *Dhṛp.* 6.73. However, it can also refer to what stays before *kuṭ*, i.e. to the root *likh* mentioned in *Dhṛp.* 6.72. Now, rule P.1.2.64 *sarūpāṇām ekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau* teaches that in case of morphs having the same form and taking the same case suffix only one morph remains. This rule applies here and instead of two *kuṭādi* we have only one.

Śaraṇadeva’s argumentation is a little more complicated, since he first introduces the maxim *saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ* (‘A prescription including a technical term is not always to be observed’), which should also account for the fact that *likh* belongs to the class of *kuṭādi*-verbs:

*ucyate: or od iti kartavya ‘or guṇa’ iti guṇagrahaṇena jñāpitam: saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ. tathā kuṭa ādih kuṭādir ity ekaśeṣeṇāntarbhāvāl likheḥ kuṭāditvam.*³⁸³

It is said that when rule P.6.4.146 *or guṇaḥ* could be formulated ‘*or oṭ*’, the mention of *guṇa* in this *sūtra* implies [the following maxim]: ‘A prescription including a technical term is not always to be observed’. Thus, because by [the rule about] the only remainder, that which stands before *kuṭ* is included in [the list] *kuṭādi*, [the root] *likh* belongs to *kuṭādi*.

Next in the commentary on the same *sūtra*, Śaraṇadeva discusses an example *masiprasūr lekhanī*. He explains the unexpected form *lekhanī* by the fact that *ālekhana* and *vilekhana* are used by Pāṇini himself, respectively, in P.6.1.142 *apāc*

³⁸³ Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *katham likhitum, svayam eva likhiṣyate, yāvataḥ kuṭeḥ pūrvam likhiḥ paṭhyate? kaścid āha – ‘kuṭasyādih, kuṭa ādir yeṣāṃ te kuṭādayaḥ, kuṭādis ca kuṭādayas ceti bahuvrīḥītatpuruṣayoḥ saḥavivakṣāyām “svarabhinnānām yasyottarasvaravidhiḥ sa śiṣyate” iti bahuvrīḥeḥ śeṣaḥ. tatra tatpuruṣavṛtīyā saṃgrhīto likhir api nīttvasya nimittam’ iti. evaṃ tu likhitvā lekhitvā līlikhiṣati lilekhiṣati ‘śakuniṣv ālekhane’ ity anupapannaṃ syāt. tasmād yady avāśyam upapādanīyam – ‘saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ’ iti guṇo na bhaviṣyati.*

catuṣpācchakuniṣv ālekhane and in *Dhp.* 1.54 *rada vilekhane*. Viśvarūpa takes up a similar example *lekhanī masīprasūh*, but he accounts for it by quoting a maxim *atideśe kāryam anityam* (*Jñ.S.* p. 74, ‘An operation which comes about because of an extended application is not always valid’). However, it is worth noting that the example in question is found neither in the *Kāśīkā* nor in the *Nyāsa* nor, as far as I can see, in any other treatise.³⁸⁴

3) Let us now take up an excerpt from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.12 *anudāttaṇīta ātmanepadam*, which teaches the addition of *ātmanepada* suffixes after roots having as a marker a vowel with the *anudātta* accent or the consonant *ṇ*. Viśvarūpa ponders the root *caḅṣiṇī*, which has two markers, although only one (*i*) would be sufficient to obtain the correct derivation.

caḅṣiṇo (cf. *Dhp.* 2.7) *yujātmanepadārtham ekānubandhe kartavye dvyanubandhaka-grahaṇam jñāpayaty: ātmanepadam anityam iti* (cf. *PP*² 78 and *NP* 93.4). *tena śiṇjadvalayasubhagaiḥ iti sidhyati*.

The use of two markers in [the case of the verb] *caḅṣiṇī*, although one marker would do to obtain [the suffix] *yuc* (cf. P.3.2.149) and *ātmanepada*, implies that [a rule prescribing] *ātmanepada* is not always to be observed. Therefore, [the example] *śiṇjadvalayasubhagaiḥ* is established.

Notes

The root *caḅṣiṇī* has two markers: the vowel *i* with the *anudātta* accent and the consonant *ṇ*. However, by the present rule the marker *i* alone is sufficient to obtain an *ātmanepada* suffix after *caḅṣ*. Similarly, the same marker causes the addition of the suffix *yuc*, as taught in P.3.2.149 *anudāttetaś ca halādeḥ* (‘[The suffix *yuc* is added] also after those [roots] which have a vowel with the *anudātta* accent as their marker and which begin with a consonant’). Thus, the marker *ṇ* in *caḅṣiṇī* implies the existence of the maxim that rules prescribing *ātmanepada* suffixes are not always valid. This maxim accounts for the *parasmaipada* suffix in *śiṇjat* in *śiṇjadvalayasubhagaiḥ* ‘by [her clappings] pleasing with the jingling bracelets’ (*Meghadūta* II.19). The root *śiṇj* is enumerated in *Dhp.* 2.17 (*śiḅi avyakte śabde*) and it has the marker *i* with the *anudātta* accent. Consequently, by the present rule it should have taken an *ātmanepada* suffix.

We can now compare this passage with the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.3.12.

*katham ‘śiṇjadvalayasubhagaiḥ’ iti meghaḅ. ucyate. caḅṣiṇo yujartham ātmanepadārtham cekārānubandhe kartavye dvyanubandhatvaṃ jñāpayati anudāttaṇīta ātmanepadam anityam iti.*³⁸⁵

³⁸⁴ In the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* the relevant maxim is used to explain the phrase *api śākaṃ pacānasya*. See *Jñ.S.* p. 74.

³⁸⁵ Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *samudāyabandhe tu caḅṣiṇa eva syāt; sa hy anudāttet paṭhyate, vicakṣaṇa ity atra yuj yathā syāt. ṇakāras tv anudāttetvanibandhanasyātmanepadasyānityatvajñāpanārthaḅ, tena ‘sa evāyaṃ nāgaḅ sahati kalabhebhyaḅ paribhavam’, ‘na sahāmi sāhasam asāhasiki’ ityādi siddham.*

To begin with, Śaraṇadeva, as is typical for him, presents a quotation (in this case from the *Meghadūta*) which seems to go against the *sūtra* under discussion. His explanation of *śiñjat* is quite similar to the one found in the *Pañjikā*. However, where Śaraṇadeva has two words: *yujartham* and *ātmanepadārtham*, Viśvarūpa uses one compound: *yujātmanepadārtham*. Then, instead of *cekārānubandhe* in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, Viśvarūpa writes *ekānubandhe*, probably as a contrast to *dvyanubandhagrahaṇam*, which corresponds to *dvyanubandhatvaṃ* in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. And last but not least, the maxim quoted by Viśvarūpa does not contain *anudāttanītaḥ*. Still, notwithstanding these differences, this passage could serve as an example of what we have called similarity in form.

4) We shall now focus our attention on the passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi* defining the term *ghi*. The important question concerning this rule is whether the final vowels *i* and *u* alone are called *ghi* or rather nominal stems ending in them. In the first case the exception is made of *i* and *u* belonging to the feminine stems called *nadī* and of *i* final in *sakhi*. In the second, the feminine stems called *nadī* and the word *sakhi* are not termed *ghi*. In the passage quoted below Viśvarūpa discusses three examples: *susakher āgacchati*, *sakhinā vānarendreṇa* and the pair *bahusakhyā / bahusakhyuḥ*. Apart from the second one, the remaining are given in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Almost the same examples are explained by Śaraṇadeva, but he discusses *atisakher* in place of *susakher*. Moreover, the order of examples in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* is different from that in the *Pañjikā*. Śaraṇadeva begins with *sakhinā vānarendreṇa*, then takes up *atisakher āgacchati* and closes the discussion by exploring *bahusakhyā* and *bahusakhyuḥ*. Note that the order in which Viśvarūpa discusses these three examples does not correspond to their order in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, since the pair *bahusakhyā / bahusakhyuḥ* precedes there the example *susakher āgacchati*, which closes the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.1.4.7.

Pañj. on P.1.4.7:

asakhir iti prathamānirdeśād avayavasya na ghitvam. tena grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti (PP 78, NP 31) **susakher āgacchatīti**. **asakhi** alpārthe nañ. tena sakhinā vānarendreṇeti. bhāṣyakāramatena tu idunmātraṃ ghisamjñakam. **asakhir** iti ṣaṣṭhyarthe subvityayena prathamā. tathā **cāsakhir** iti sakhiśabdasyekārasya ghitvaniṣedhād **bahusakhyā bahusakhyur** iti sidhyati. evaṃ ca **dvandve ghīty** (P.2.2.32) **atra ghyantam pūrvam nipatatīty upapadyate**.

The nominative case in *asakhiḥ* [used in the present *sūtra*] shows that parts of grammatical elements are not [named] *ghi*. Thus, PP 78 ('By the explicit mention of a *prātipadika* [it is shown that] an operation does not apply to that which ends in this [*prātipadika*]?') [takes effect and we have the example] *susakher āgacchati*. [The

prefix] *nañ* [used] in *asakhi* is employed in the sense of ‘smallness’ and, therefore, [the phrase] *sakhinā vānarendreṇa* [is correct]. But in the opinion of the Bhāṣyakāra only [the phones] *i* and *u* are called *ghi*. By the transposition of the case suffix, the nominative case in *asakhiḥ* [is understood] in the sense of the genitive. Accordingly, because in *asakhiḥ* the name *ghi* is prohibited with regard to [the phone] *i* of the word *sakhi*, [the examples] *bahusakhyā* and *bahusakhyuḥ* are accomplished. Thus, [the opinion that] P.2.2.32 *dvandve ghi* [means that the word] ending in *ghi* is placed at the beginning [of a compound] is appropriate.

Notes

The wording of the *sūtra* as known to Viśvarūpa seems to be *śeṣo ghy asakhiḥ* with the nominative case after *asakhi*. This nominative case points to the fact that nominal stems ending in *i* and *u* are called *ghi*. Otherwise, Pāṇini would have used the genitive case, meaning ‘but not [*i*] of *sakhi*’. Furthermore, because *sakhi* is a *prātipadika*, PP 78 applies and the prohibition regarding *sakhi* is not applicable to what ends in *sakhi*. Therefore, *susakhi* is called *ghi* and consequently, *susakher āgacchati* is correct. The next example is *sakhinā vānarendreṇa*. Here, although *sakhi* is not called *ghi* and the expected form would be **sakhyā*, we have *sakhinā* with the suffix typical for stems called *ghi*. The solution to this problem is that the prefix *nañ* (*a*) in *asakhi* is interpreted in the sense of ‘smallness’ and this means that in some cases the negation does not apply. Now, we take up the examples *bahusakhyā* and *bahusakhyuḥ*. Here, the situation is similar to that in *susakhi*: by PP 78 *bahusakhi* could be called *ghi* and the expected forms would be **bahusakhinā* and **bahusakheḥ*. Therefore, Viśvarūpa accepts the opinion that in the present *sūtra* only the vowels *i* and *u* are called *ghi*. Consequently, because the vowels *i* and *u* are not *prātipadika*, PP 78 cannot apply here. The vowel *i*, not only in *sakhi* but also in *bahusakhi*, is not termed *ghi* and thus *bahusakhyā* and *bahusakhyuḥ* are correct.

As usual, we will compare Viśvarūpa’s commentary with that of Śaraṇadeva:

katham sakhinā vānarendreṇa. ucyate: alavaṇā yavāgūr itivad alpārthe naño vidhānād ity anunyāsaḥ. katham atisakher āgacchatīti. asakhīti pratiṣedhāt. asakhīti prathamānirdeśād ivarṇovarṇāntasya ghitvam. pratiṣedhaś ca sakhiśabdasyaiva na varṇamātrasya. tadantavidhinā prāpnotīti cen na. tatra hi grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti kevalasyaiva niṣedho na tadantasya. yady evaṃ katham bahusakhyā kṛtaṃ, bahusakhyur iti. ucyate: asakhīti vyatyayena ṣaṣṭhyarthe prathameti varṇamātrasya ghitvam. pratiṣedho 'pi tasyaiva. tathā ca 'dvandve ghi'-ty atra ghyantaṃ pūrvaṃ nipatatīty ucyata iti vṛtīḥ. evaṃ ca sakhi śabdāvayavasyekārasya ghitvapraṣedhād bahusakhyā, bahusakhyur iti bhāṣyānugato rakṣitaḥ.

How [do we obtain] *sakhinā vānarendreṇa*? It is said: ‘Because as in *alavaṇā yavāgūḥ* (“not salty rice-gruel”), [so in *asakhi* the affix] *nañ* is prescribed in the sense of “smallness”.’ This [opinion is stated in] the *Anunyāsa*.

How [do we obtain] *atisakher āgacchati*? Because of the negation *asakhi*. The nominative case in *asakhi* [used in the present *sūtra*] shows that the phones *i* and *u* are [named] *ghi*. The negation applies to the word *sakhi* and not to the phones only. And if [it is said that] this is obtained because the prescription applies to what ends in [the element mentioned in the *sūtra*], this [opinion] is not [correct].

In this case, by *PP* 78 ('By the explicit mention of a *prātipadika* [it is shown that] an operation does not apply to this what ends in this [*prātipadika*']) the [phones] alone would be prohibited and not that what ends in them.

If it is so [that only phones are prohibited and not what ends in them] how [do we obtain the examples] *bahusakhyā kṛtam* and *bahusakhyuḥ*? It is said that by transposition, the nominative case in *asakhi* [is understood] in the sense of the genitive and, therefore, only phones are called *ghi*. The prohibition applies also only to them (i.e. only to phones). Accordingly, it is explained that P.2.2.32 *dvandve ghi* [means that the word] ending in *ghi* is placed at the beginning [of the compound].³⁸⁶ And thus, because the name *ghi* is prohibited with regard to the phone *i* being a part of the word *sakhi*, [the examples] *bahusakhyā* and *bahusakhyuḥ* [are correct]. This [is stated by] Rakṣita, who follows the *Bhāṣya*.

On the whole, these two passages belong to the category 'similarity in ideas' but the last but one sentence of Viśvarūpa's explanation is quite similar to the last sentence of Śaraṇadeva's commentary. Let us also note that the *Nyāsa* ad loc. has the example *susakher āgacchati* and Jinendrabuddhi's elucidation of it might also have served as a source of Viśvarūpa's inspiration.

5) Our fifth passage is very short and comes from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.8 *patiḥ samāsa eva*, which teaches that the vowel *i* of *pati* is called *ghi* only if *pati* is a part of a compound. When *pati* stands alone it is not termed *ghi* and consequently, in the instrumental case the expected form would be *patyā* and not *patinā*. However, in the example *patinā nīyamānāyāḥ*, this apparently incorrect form appears and this is how Viśvarūpa justifies it:

śeṣo ghy asakhipatī iti niṣedhe siddhe yad etan nīyamārtham vacanam tad asyānityatvajñāpanārtham. tena patinā nīyamānāyā ityādi sidhyati.

Since the prohibition would be obtained if [this and the preceding rule] were formulated *śeṣo ghy asakhipatī*, the [actual] wording used to express the negation implies that [the present rule] does not always operate. Therefore, [the example] *patinā nīyamānāyāḥ* and others are established.

Śaraṇadeva begins his commentary on the *sūtra* by giving three citations with apparently incorrect words *patinā* and *patau*:

*katham patinā nīyamānāyāḥ puraḥ śukro na duṣyati. tathā gate mṛte pravrajite klībe ca patite patau. tathā patau jīvati yā nārī upoṣya vratacāriṇī āyuṣyam harate bhartuḥ sā nārī narakaṃ vrajet. ucyate: śeṣo ghy asakhipatīti vaktavye pṛthakkarāṇam hy asyānityatvajñāpanārtham.*³⁸⁷

³⁸⁶ This sentence is probably taken from the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on P.1.4.7: *tathā ca dvandve ghīty* (P.2.2.32) *atra ghyantaṃ pūrvaṃ nipatatīty ucyate*. The statement *ghyantaṃ pūrvaṃ nipatati* comes from the *Mahābhāṣya* (Pat. on vārtt. 3 on P.1.2.27, *Mbh.* I 203.5,9)

³⁸⁷ Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *kiñca 'asakhipatī' ity ucyamāne patiśabdasya samāse 'pi na syāt – patigrhe iti. tathā ca sakhiśabdasya samāsāvayavasyāpi ghisamjñāyā abhāvāt – sakhigrhe, grhasakhāyāv iti cānīyamaḥ pūrvanipātasya.*

How [do we obtain the example] *patinā nīyamānāyāḥ puraḥ śukro na duṣyati?* Similarly, [how do we obtain] *gate mṛte pravrajite klībe ca patite patau and patau jīvati yā nārī upoṣya vratacārīṇī āyusyaṃ harate bhartuḥ sā nārī narakaṃ vrajet?* [This critical objection is refuted, since] it is stated that because [the present and the previous rule] could be formulated *śeṣo ghy asakhipatī*, the separation [of P.1.4.8 from P.1.4.7] implies that this [rule, i.e. P.1.4.8] does not always operate.

The passage from the *Pañjikā* is too short to allow us to decide with which kind of similarity we deal here. The phrase *asyānityatvajñāpanārtham*, as well as the alternative wording of the *sūtra* in question are identical in the *Pañjikā* and in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but this is too little to prove that Viśvarūpa drew from Śaraṇadeva's work. Furthermore, Viśvarūpa gives only one quotation (and this in a much shorter form than in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*) instead of Śaraṇadeva's three, but he implies the existence of other ones by *ityādi*. It is also worth noting that the example treated by Viśvarūpa (and Śaraṇadeva), as far as I can gather, is not found in any other treatise. The *Padamañjarī*, for example, which also mentions the possibility of rephrasing the *sūtra*, gives three different *udāharaṇas* with *pati* and *sakhi*: *patigrhe*, *sakhigrhe* and *grhasakhāyau*. The *Nyāsa* does not discuss the topic at all.

6) Similarly to the preceding passage, the one we are going to take up now is also relatively short. Its wording slightly resembles that of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but on the whole, it serves rather as an example of 'similarity in ideas'. Let us see how, in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.13 *yasmāt pratyayavidhis tadādi pratyaye 'ṅgam* ('What begins with that [morph] to which the suffix is added is called *aṅga*, when this suffix follows'), Viśvarūpa accounts for the lack of *guṇa* in *nuvati*:

nuvatīti ṇu stavane (Dhp. 6.104). tudādītvāt śe kṛte piti sārva dhātuke vikaraṇasyāṅgatve pugantalaghūpadhasyeti (P.7.3.86) guṇaḥ prāpnoti. na. antaraṅgatvād vikaraṇāśraya uvañ kriyate.

In [the example] *nuvati* [we have the root] *nu* meaning 'praising'. Because it belongs to the sixth class, the *vikaraṇa śa* is added. When the *sārva dhātuka* having the marker *p* is to be added, [that what ends in] the *vikaraṇa* could be treated as the base (*aṅga*) and by P.7.3.86 the *guṇa* vowel [o] could wrongly replace [the u of *nu*]. This is not the case. Because of [the maxim about] *antaraṅga* operation, [the substitute] *uvañ* depending on the *vikaraṇa* is employed.

Notes

The root *nu* belongs to the sixth class; therefore, by P.3.1.77 *tudādībhyah śah the vikaraṇa śa* is added to it. The *vikaraṇa śa* is a *sārva dhātuka* suffix not marked with *p* and as such treated as if marked with *k* (by P.1.2.4 *sārva dhātukam apit*). Consequently, by P.1.1.5 *knīti ca* it does not cause the *guṇa* substitution, which is taught in P.7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* ('[When a *sārva dhātuka* or an *ārdha dhātuka* suffix follows, the *guṇa* is] also [substituted for the vowels \tilde{i} , \tilde{u} , \tilde{r} and \tilde{l}] belonging to a causal stem which takes the augment *puk* or to a root

having as its penultimate a short vowel [i.e. *i*, *u*, *r* or *l*']. Instead, by P.6.4.77 *aci śnudhātubhruvām yvor iyañuvañau* the vowel *u* of *nu* is replaced by *uvañ* and the final form is *nuvati*. It is, however, argued that the suffix *tip* marked with *p* could cause the *guṇa* substitution of *u* in *nu*. Namely, when *tip* is to be added, *nu+a* is treated as a base (*aṅga*) and since its penultimate (*u*) is short, rule P.7.3.86 could apply. This would result in **no+a+ti* → **navati* (P.6.1.78). Thus, these two operations (the substitution by *uvañ*, depending on the *vikaraṇa śa*, and the *guṇa* substitution, depending on *tip*) obviously conflict. However, the former one is an *antaraṅga* operation with regard to the latter, which is thus a *bahiraṅga*, and because of the well-known maxim *antaraṅgabahiraṅgayor antaraṅgam balavat* (PP 43), teaching that an *antaraṅga* operation takes place before a *bahiraṅga* operation, the *u* of *nu* is replaced by *uvañ* and not by *o* and the final form is *nuvati*.

And this is how Śaraṇadeva explains the same *udāharaṇa*:

katham nu stavane 'tas tudāditvāc chapratyaye kṛte nuvatīti. tadādighraṇād vikaraṇāntasyāṅgatve sārva dhātukāśrayaguṇaprasaṅgāt. ucyate: antaraṅgatvād uvañ vikaraṇāśrayaḥ.

How [is the example] *nuvati* [obtained], although the suffix *śa*, prescribed after verbs belonging to the sixth class, is added after [the root] *nu* meaning 'praising'? Because *guṇa* depending on *sārva dhātuka* could here apply [and this happens], since the mention of *tadādi* [in the *sūtra* means that] what ends in a *vikaraṇa* becomes a base (*aṅga*). [This critical objection is refuted since] it is stated that because of [the maxim about] *antaraṅga*, [the substitute] *uvañ* depending on the *vikaraṇa* is added.

As was the case in the preceding example, the *Nyāsa* ad loc. does not explain *nuvati*.

7) Albeit the next passage from the *Pañjikā* is identical to a part of Śaraṇadeva's commentary, this identity could be accidental or due to the traditional way of explaining the *udāharaṇa* under discussion.³⁸⁸ In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.27 *vāraṇārthānām īpsitaḥ*, which teaches that in case of verbs meaning obstructing this what is desired by the agent is called *apādāna*, Viśvarūpa writes:

kūpād andhaṃ vārayatīty andhasya gamyatvenepsitaḥ kūpaḥ.

In [the example] *kūpād andhaṃ vārayati*, the well (*kūpa*) is aimed at by the act of going [performed] by the blind.

In the *Durghaṭavṛtti* ad loc. Śaraṇadeva takes up two examples, the one discussed in the *Pañjikā* and the sentence *agner māṇavakaṃ vārayati*:

³⁸⁸ Compare, however, an explanation of this example (and of *agner māṇavakaṃ vārayati*) given in the *Padamañjarī* ad loc.: *kriyāśabdasya tu grahaṇe vāryamāṇasyāndhāder gamanādīkriyayā kūpāder āpyamānatvāt siddhyati, andhaś cāpaśyann api gantavyaṃ jigamiṣati, anyathā na kvacit tasya pravṛtīḥ syāt.*

*katham kūpād andham vārayaty, agner māṇavakaṃ vārayatīti. kūpasyāgner karmaṇo 'nīpsitatvāt. ucyate: andhasya gamyatvenepsitaḥ kūpaḥ. māṇavakasya jyotīrūpo 'rthaḥ sprhaṇīyatvenepsita iti rakṣitaḥ.*³⁸⁹

How [do we obtain the examples] *kūpād andham vārayati* and *agner māṇavakaṃ vārayati*, although the well and the fire are not desired by the object? [This critical objection is refuted, since] it is stated that the well is aimed at by the act of going [performed] by the blind. [The fire] is desired by the boy, because he desires something having a form of light. This is the view of Rakṣita.

None of these two sentences is discussed in the *Nyāsa*.

8) The last passage we are going to consider here stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.105 *yuṣmady upapade samānādhikaraṇe sthāniny api madhyamaḥ*. This *sūtra* teaches that the addition of the suffix of the second person takes place when *yuṣmad* is used or only understood in the sentence and it is in agreement with the verb. In contrast to examples discussed above, the following passage is quite long. Therefore, to facilitate its examination I have divided its text into five parts.

(1) *tadantavidhinā paramatvaṃ yāsīty api bhavati. grahaṇavateti* (cf. *PP* 78, *NP* 31) *tu na pravartate tasyāḥ pratyayavidhitvāt sapūrvāc ceti* (P.5.2.87) *pratyayavidhau jñāpitavāc ca. yat tu śeṣo ghy asakhir ity* (P.1.4.7) *atroktaṃ nyāsakṛtā grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti* (*PP* 78, *NP* 31) *tat sāmānyajñāpakam āśritya.*

(2) *tvām atikrānto 'titvaṃ yātīti yuṣmadarthasyābhāvāt. rūpam apy aṅgīkriyata ity uktaṃ prāk.*

(3) *atvaṃ tvaṃ sampadyata iti tvadbhavatīty atra prathamapuruṣa eva yuṣmadarthasya gauṇatvāt.*

(4) *bhavān yātīty atra yady api yuṣmadartho rūpābhāvān na bhavati rūpavato 'rthasya grahaṇāt. na cāsyātra rūpasya gamyamānatvaṃ bhavacchabdenārthasyoktatvāt.*

(5) *tvattaro yāsīty atra tarapaḥ svārthakatvān madhyamapuruṣa eva. kalpapādaḥ* (cf. P.5.3.67) *tūbhayam. yadānya evāsi samvṛtta itivad abhedavivakṣāyāṃ (?) kiṃcinnyūno yuṣmadartha ākhyāyate tadā sādrśyān madhyamapuruṣaḥ: tvatkalpo yāsīti. yadā tv anyā evocyate tadā prathamapuruṣa eva: tvatkalpo yātīti.*

(1) Because the prescription applies to what ends in [the element mentioned in the *sūtra*], also in [the example] *paramatvaṃ yāsi* ('the excellent you go'³⁹⁰), [the suffix of the second person] is added. *Paribhāṣā PP* 78 ('By the explicit mention [of a *prātipadika* it is shown that an operation does not apply to this what ends in this *prātipadika*']') does not take effect here, because it [operates] when the prescription

³⁸⁹ Cf. also *Pad.* ad loc.: *iha tarhi na syād – agner māṇavakaṃ vārayati kūpād andham iti, na hy agnikūpau vārayitur vāryamāṇasya vābhipretau? kriyāśabdasya tu grahaṇe vāryamāṇasyāndhāder gamanādikriyayā kūpāder āpyamānatvāt siddhyati, andhaś cāpaśyann api gantavyaṃ jīgamīṣyati, anyathā na kvacit tasya pravṛttiḥ syāt.*

³⁹⁰ See fn. 392 for the explanation of this compound given by Haradatta.

about a suffix is made and [this is known] from rule P.5.2.87 *sapūrvāc ca*, which implies that [this *paribhāṣā* takes effect], when a suffix is prescribed. And *paribhāṣā PP 78*, which is taught by the Nyāsakṛt in the commentary on P.1.4.7, depends on the general *jñāpaka*.³⁹¹

Notes

Rule P.5.2.86 *pūrvād inih* prescribes an addition of the suffix *ini* after *pūrvā*. The next rule, P.5.2.87 *sapūrvāc ca*, teaches that this suffix is added also in case *pūrvā* is preceded by some other word. Now, we could say that P.5.2.87 is not necessary, because by P.1.1.72 *yena vidhis tadantasya*, in P.5.2.86 not only *pūrvā* but also what ends in it could be understood. Thus, P.5.2.87 indicates the existence of *PP 78* but it also shows that *PP 78* applies only when the addition of a suffix to a *prātipadika* mentioned in a *sūtra* is prescribed. In the example *paramatvaṃ yāsi*, the suffix of the second person comes after the verb (which is not a *prātipadika*) and not after *tvam*; therefore, *PP 78* cannot take effect here.

(2) In [the example] *atitvaṃ yāti* ('he who has surpassed you, goes'), where *atitvam* means 'he, who surpassed you', [the suffix of the second person is not applied], because the meaning of *yusmad* is not present. It has been said earlier [that the mention of *rūpa* in P.1.1.68 *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā* means that the meaning and] also the form [should] agree.

(3) [We say] *tvadbhavati* ('he becomes you'), when someone not being you becomes you. In this [example], only the suffix of the third person is added, because the meaning of *yusmad* is secondary.

(4) Even though in [the example] *bhavān yāti* ('your honour goes') the meaning is that of *yusmad*, [the suffix of the second person] is not applied, because the form [of *yusmad*] is not present; and [this happens, since in P.1.1.68 *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā*] the meaning of what has [the same] form is understood. And here, [in the example under discussion] its form (i.e. that of *yusmad*) is not understood, because the meaning is expressed by the word *bhavat*.

(5) In *tvattaro yāsi* ('exceedingly you go') the suffix *tarap* is *svārthika*, (i.e. it has the same meaning as the stem it is added to), and thus, the suffix of the second person is added. In the case of *kalpap* etc., there are two [possibilities]. When you have become someone else and the lack of difference is wished to be expressed, the meaning of *yusmad* is said to be partly present, and then, the suffix of the second person is applied, as in *tvatkalpo yāsi* ('you, who seem to be like a different person, go'). When only another [person] is meant, then the suffix of the third person is applied, as in *tvatkalpo yāti* ('he, being almost like you, goes').

Notes

The suffix *tarap* is prescribed in P.5.3.57 *dvivacanavibhajyopapade tarabīyasunau*. The suffixes *kalpap* etc. are *kalpap*, *deśya* and *deśyār*. As taught in P.5.3.67 *īśadasamāptau kalpabdeśyadeśyarah*, they are added to a nominal or verbal stem, when the slight incompleteness is to be expressed. For the interpretation of *tvattara*, *tvatkalpa* as given by Haradatta, see fn. 392.

³⁹¹ Cf. Sīradeva's explanation of the *paribhāṣā* in question: *anye ca sāmānyena pratyayavidhau cāpratyayavidhau ca paribhāṣām āhuḥ*. [Abhyankar (1967: 222)].

Now, let us compare this passage with the one from the *Durghaṭavṛtti*:

(1) *katham paramatvaṃ paṭhasi. grahaṇavatā prātipadikena tadantavidhir nāstīti tadantavidhir nāstīti tadantatvābhāvāt. ucyate: 'sapūrvāc ce'-ti pratyayavidhau jñāpakāt pratyayavidhivīṣaye kaiś cit sāmānyeneyaṃ svīkriyate. tathā 'śeṣo ghy asakhī'-ty atra nyāsaḥ susakher āgacchaty, atisakher āgacchatīty atrāsakhīti na pratīṣedhaḥ.*

(2) *nanu tadantatvaṃ svīkriyate. katham atitvaṃ pacatīti. 'svaṃ rūpaṃ' ity atra rūpagrahaṇād rūpavadartho 'py aṅgīkriyata iti jñāpitam. tenārthāntaravṛttitvāt prathamapurūṣa eva.*

(3) *atvaṃ tvam saṃpadyate tvadbhavatīty atra prathamapurūṣa eva yuṣmadarthasya gauṇatvād yathāmahān mahān saṃpanno mahadbhūtaś candramā ity atra 'ān mahata' ityādinā nātvaṃ bhavatīti nyāsaḥ.*

(4) *bhavān yātīty atra tu saty api yuṣmadarthe rūpābhāvān na bhavati. arthavato rūpasya grahaṇāt. na cātra rūpasya gamyamānatvam. bhavacchabdenārthasyoktatvāt.*

(5) *tvattaro yāsīty atra tarapaḥ svārthikatvād yuṣmady upapada iti madhyamapurūṣaḥ. kalpādau tūbhayam. yadā hy anya evāsti bhavān saṃvṛtta iti ced bhedavivakṣyāyāṃ kiṃcidbhūto yuṣmadartha ucyate syāt tadā madhyamapurūṣaḥ. tvatkalpo yāsīti. yadā tv anya evocyate tadā prathamapurūṣaḥ. tvatkalpo devadatto yātīti rakṣitah.³⁹²*

(1) How [do we obtain] *paramatvaṃ paṭhasi* ('the excellent you study'), when because of *paribhāṣā PP 78* ('By the explicit mention of a *prātipadika* [it is shown that] an operation does not apply to this what ends in this [*prātipadika*']), the prescription does not apply to what ends in the element [mentioned in the *sūtra*] and thus, [in *paramatvaṃ paṭhasi* the prescription] does not apply to what ends in it, (i.e. in *tva*)? [This critical objection is refuted since] it is stated that some claim that this [*paribhāṣā*] takes effect generally in the domain where a suffix is prescribed, because rule P.5.2.87 *sapūrvāc ca* prescribing a suffix implies that. Similarly, [the examples] *susakher āgacchati* and *atisakher āgacchati* [given] in the *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.7 are not prohibited by *asakhī*.

(2) Now, it is claimed that the prescription refers to what ends in [the element mentioned in the *sūtra*], but then, how [is the example] *atitvaṃ pacati* ('he, who has surpassed you, cooks') [to be explained]? From the mention of *rūpa* in rule P.1.1.68 *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā*, it is known that also the meaning of what has that form [should] agree. Therefore, because [in the above example, *tvam*] is used to denote something else, the suffix of the third person is added.

(3) [We say] *tvadbhavati* ('he becomes you'), when someone not being you, becomes you. In this [example] only the suffix of the third person is added, because the

³⁹² Cf. also *Pad. ad loc.:* *kvacit tu vṛttāv evāyaṃ granthaḥ paṭhyate, iha ca atitvaṃ pacati atyahaṃ pacatīty atrātikrāntapradhānena samāse yuṣmadasmador asāmānādhikaraṇyāt prathama eva bhavati, iha tv iṣad asamāptas tvam tvatkalpaḥ pacasi, matkalpaḥ pacāmīti kālāntaradr̥ṣṭagaṇarahito yuṣmadasmadartha eva tvatkalpamatkalpaśabdābhyām ucyata iti madhyamottamau bhavataḥ, tatsadr̥ṣadārthāntarābhīdhāne tu prathamah, tathā tvattaraḥ pacasi, mattaraḥ pacāmi, paramatvaṃ pacasi, paramāhaṃ pacāmīti, kālāntaradr̥ṣṭagaṇātīśayaviśiṣṭo yuṣmadasmadartha evocyate iti bhavaty eva.*

meaning of *yuṣmad* is secondary, as in the example *mahadbhūtaś candramā* ('the moon is full'), where *mahadbhūta* means 'something not being great has become great'. Here, the substitute *āt* prescribed by P.6.3.46 does not take place. This is [the view found in] the *Nyāsa*.

Notes

P.6.3.46 *ān mahataḥ samānādhikaraṇajātīyayoḥ* prescribes the substitution of the final phone of *mahat* by the long vowel *ā* (*āt*), when *mahat* is the first element of a compound and has the same locus as the second element or when it is followed by the suffix *jātīya*. This rule could apply in the case of *mahadbhūta*, but according to Jinendrabuddhi the substitution by *āt* does not take place because the meaning of *mahat* is secondary. Cf. *Nyāsa* ad loc.: '*amahān mahān sampanno mahadbhūtaś candramā iti yatrārthe vyanto mahacchabdo vartate tatraiva bhūtaśabdo 'pi tasmāt samānādhikaraṇye saty āttvena bhavitavyam' – iti kasyacid bhrāntiḥ syāt, atas tām nirākartum āha – amahān mahān ityādi ... gauṇasā cātra mahadarthaḥ. tadabhidhānāc ca mahacchabdo 'pi gauṇa iti na bhavaty āttvam.*

(4) In [the example] *bhavān yāti* ('your honour goes'), [the suffix of the second person is not added], because although the meaning is that of *yuṣmad*, its form is not present, since the form of what is meaningful is used. Here, [in the example under discussion], the form [of *yuṣmad*] is not understood, because the meaning is expressed by the word *bhavat*.

(5) In *tvattaro yāsi* ('exceedingly you go'), the suffix *tarap* is *svārthika*, (i.e. it has the same meaning as the stem it is added to) and, thus, when *yuṣmat* is understood, the suffix of the second person is added. In the case of *kalpa* etc., there are two [possibilities]. When your honour has become someone else and the difference is wished to be expressed and, [moreover], the meaning of *yuṣmad* is said to be partly present, then the suffix of the second person is applied, as in *tvatkalpo yāsi* ('you, who seem to be like a different person, go'). When only another [person] is [wished to be] expressed, then the suffix of the third person is applied, as in *tvatkalpo devadatto yāti* ('Devadatta, being almost like you, goes'). This is [the view of] Rakṣita.

Of these five parts, the two first ones are similar, first of all, on the content level. The wording differs and even the examples elucidated there are slightly altered. While Viśvarūpa ponders *paramatvaṃ yāsi* and *atitvaṃ yāti*, Śaraṇadeva explains *paramatvaṃ paṭhasi* and *atitvaṃ pacati*. The third part is, on the contrary, almost identical in both commentaries, with the exception that Śaraṇadeva quotes an opinion of Jinendrabuddhi, which is omitted by Viśvarūpa. Similarly, the fourth part of Viśvarūpa's commentary to a great extent resembles the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. The differences are minor. Where Viśvarūpa writes *yadi*, Śaraṇadeva uses *tu sati*. Consequently, the *Pañjikā* has the nominative case of *yuṣmadartha* instead of the locative in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. Furthermore, Viśvarūpa states *rūpavato 'rthasya grahaṇāt*, what corresponds to *arthavato rūpasya grahaṇāt* in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. And finally, in the last sentence of this part, Viśvarūpa adds *asya* between *ca* and *atra*. The fifth part is, likewise, quite similar in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* and the *Pañjikā*. In the first sentence, Viśvarūpa

omits *yusmady upapada iti*, but adds *eva* after *madhyamapuruṣaḥ*. The second, short sentence is identical. In the next one, in the explanation of the second person suffix in *tvatkalpo yāsi*, Viśvarūpa consistently uses the second person (*anya evāsi samvṛttah*), while Śaraṇadeva employs the respectful form of address with *bhavant* (*anya evāsti bhavān samvṛttah*). Then Viśvarūpa puts *-vat* after *iti* and Śaraṇadeva, *ced*. The next difference could be due either to a scribal mistake or another understanding of the passage. Namely, Viśvarūpa writes *abhedavivakṣāyām* (‘when the lack of difference is wished to be expressed’, i.e. although you are different you are still the same person), where Śaraṇadeva has the opposite, *bhedavivakṣāyām* (‘when difference is wished to be expressed’, i.e. the difference between you as you are usually and you as you are at this moment). Furthermore, Viśvarūpa describes *yusmadartha* as *kiṃcinnyūnaḥ*, and not as *kiṃcidbhūtaḥ* present in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. He writes *ākhyāyate* instead of *ucyate* and skips *syāt*, but then adds *sādṛśyāt* before *madhyamapuruṣaḥ*. The next sentence is almost identical, but Viśvarūpa uses *eva* to stress *prathamapuruṣaḥ*. The example which closes the discussion differs slightly, since the *Pañjikā* does not have *devadattaḥ*. Moreover, Śaraṇadeva states that he took this *udāharāṇa* from Rakṣita and this information is lacking in the *Pañjikā*.

To these eight passages we could add two further ones. The first stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.57 and deals with the formation of *vaiyākaraṇa* and the dictum *tanvantīty atredabhāvaḥ*. However, this passage has not been cited here, because the same topic is minutely treated in the *Nyāsa* and it is difficult to decide whether the text by Viśvarūpa resembles more that of the *Nyāsa* or rather that of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. The reason why I have omitted the next passage is different again. In the commentary on P.1.4.11, the *Pañjikā* and the *Durghaṭavṛtti* take up the example *bhettā*, but the explanations given in these two treatises vary considerably, so that the sole identity of the *udāharāṇa* cannot prove anything.

Let us now summarise what we have said so far. As we have seen, the items of evidence presented above are not all of the same significance. The passages from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.12 and 1.4.105 as well as four rarely used examples, namely: *lekhanī masiprasūḥ* (on P.1.2.1), *śiñjadvalayasubhagaiḥ* (on P.1.3.12), *sakhinā vānarendreṇa* (on P.1.4.7) and *patinā nīyamānāyāḥ* (on P.1.4.8), are the strongest ones. It is certain that the similarity between the *Durghaṭavṛtti* and the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.12 and P.1.4.105 cannot be accidental. Thus, there are two possible explanations for this. The simplest one is that Viśvarūpa drew from Śaraṇadeva’s *Durghaṭavṛtti*. However, we cannot exclude another possibility, namely, that Viśvarūpa might have borrowed from some other source. It is also worth noting that this alternative would justify the fact which we mentioned at the beginning of this subsection, i.e. that the passages from the

Pañjikā which we could classify as similar in form to Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* are not all of the same pure type as examples of similarity in form of the *Pañjikā* and the *Nyāsa*. Now, the question about the treatise which might possibly be taken into consideration arises. Theoretically, the treatise we are looking for could be the source for Śaraṇadeva's commentary or it could be based on it. As we have seen in part I of the present volume, we have no reason to believe that any other work similar to the *Durghaṭavṛtti* was written after Śaraṇadeva composed his commentary, but there were two *Durghaṭavṛttis* prior to it. These are the *Durghaṭavṛtti* by Rakṣita, which is said to serve as a model for Śaraṇadeva, or the same kind of treatise by Puruṣottamadeva, which Śaraṇadeva probably knew, since he often quotes Puruṣottamadeva's opinion. However, both these commentaries are now lost, so our hypothesis cannot be proven and the only thing we can be sure about is that Viśvarūpa drew from some other work than these examined up to now and this work could be Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* or some other treatise similar to it.

II.6.5.5 The *Padamañjarī*

It is quite certain that Haradatta, the author of the *Padamañjarī*, came from South India. Consequently, the reader might be surprised that we take up the question of a possible influence of the *Padamañjarī* on the *Pañjikā* at all. The reason is this: in some places Viśvarūpa discusses topics or examples which are found neither in the *Kāśikā* nor in the *Nyāsa* nor in any other treatise examined in II.6.5, but which are explored by Haradatta. However, what is noteworthy is that although all these passages treat the same problems as in the *Padamañjarī*, their wording clearly differs from that of Haradatta's commentary. Even similar phrases are rare, to say nothing of sentences. Moreover, when Haradatta and Viśvarūpa ponder the same topic, the illustrations used by them or the solutions proposed by them are often different.

To illustrate this statement, let us now have a good look at some of the relevant passages from the *Pañjikā* and the *Padamañjarī*.

1) The first passage stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.4 *na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke*, which teaches that the substitution by *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* does not take place when an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix which causes an elision of a part of a root follows. In his commentary on this rule, Viśvarūpa explains the examples *dedyah* and *jaṅgamaḥ*.

dīn kṣaye (*Dhp.* 4.26). *dedyā ity atra dīno yuḍ aci kṛitīti* (P.6.4.63) *yuḍ jaṅgama ity atra gamahanetyādinā* (P.6.4.98) *upadhālopaḥ syāt. tasmād asmin viṣaye aci yaṅo 'ci ceti* (P.2.4.74) *samudāyasya lopas tenājjhalsamudāyasya sthānivattvaṃ nāsti*.

[The root] *dī* is used in the sense of perishing. In *dedyah*, [the augment] *yut* [enjoined] by P.6.4.63 and in *jaṅgamah*, the elision of the penultimate [prescribed] by P.6.4.98 would [wrongly] apply. Thus, with regard to these [examples], when [the suffix] *ac* follows, the combination [of phones] is elided by P.2.4.74; therefore, the combination of a vowel and a consonant is not treated as the original.

Notes

The examples of application of the present *sūtra* given by Viśvarūpa (and by Puruṣottamadeva) are nouns formed with the suffix *ac* added to frequentative stems. Let us now have a look at the example *loluvaḥ* ‘cutting much, a great cutter’, which Viśvarūpa discusses before *dedyah* and *jaṅgamah*. In the frequentative, the suffix *yañi* is added to the root *lū* (by P.3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yañi*) and by P.3.1.32 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ* the stem ending in *yañi* is called *dhātu*. Then, the suffix *ac* is introduced, as taught in P.3.1.134 *nandigrahipacādibhyo lyuṇinyacaḥ*, and we have: *lū + yañi + ac*. At this stage rule P.2.4.74 *yaño 'ci ca* teaching the elision of *yañi* when it is followed by the suffix *ac* applies. However, although elided, the suffix *yañi* still causes the reduplication of the root *lū*, which is prescribed in P.6.1.9 *sanyañoḥ*. Additionally, the long vowel *ū* is reduplicated as *o* in accordance with P.7.4.82 *guṇo yañlukoh*. Thus, we have: *lo + lū + ac*. Now, the suffix *ac* is an *ārdhadhātuka*, and by P.7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*, the vowel *ū* of *lolū* would be also substituted by its *guṇa*. However, because *ac* causes the elision of the part of a root, namely of the suffix *yañi*, the *guṇa* substitution is prohibited by P.1.1.4. Consequently, the vowel *ū* is substituted by *uvañi* (by P.6.4.77 *aci śnudhātubhruvāṃ yvor iyañuvañau*), then the suffix of the nominative singular is added and the final form is *loluvaḥ*. Now, it is argued, we do not need the present *sūtra* to block the *guṇa* substitution in that case. In the example above we have used P.2.4.74 to elide the suffix *yañi*, but if we elide the vowel *a* of *yañi* by P.6.4.48 *ato lopah* and the consonant *y* by P.2.4.74, the suffix *yañi* will be treated as still present before *ac* and thus prevent *ū* from being substituted by its *guṇa*. However, if we accept this – Viśvarūpa argues – the nouns *dedyah* and *jaṅgamah* would not be obtained. Let us examine *dedyah* first:

$dī + yañi + ac \rightarrow dī + y + ac \rightarrow dī + ac \rightarrow de + dī + ac$ (P.7.4.82)

If the suffix *yañi* is treated as present before *ac*, one could see the combination of *yañi* and *ac* as an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix beginning with a vowel and marked with *ñ* and in this case rule P.6.4.63 *dīño yuḍ aci kñiti* would wrongly apply. This *sūtra* teaches the addition of the augment *yut* to an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix which begins with a vowel and is marked with *k* or *ñ*. With the augment *yut*, the final form would be **dedīyah*. Similarly, in the case of *jaṅgamah* the separate elision of *a* and of *y* would lead to an undesirable form.

$gam + yañi + ac \rightarrow gam + y + ac \rightarrow gam + ac$

At this stage of derivation, P.6.4.98 *gamahanañanakhanaḥasām lopah kñity anañi*, teaching the elision of the root vowel of *gam*, *han*, *jan*, *khan* and *ghas* before a suffix (other than the aorist suffix *añi*) which begins with a vowel and is marked with *k* or *ñ*, could wrongly apply. Namely, similarly as in the case of *dedyah*, we could see the combination of *yañi* and *ac* as a suffix beginning with a vowel and marked with *ñ*. This would lead to **gm + ac*. However, the correct derivation is as follows:

$gam + ac \rightarrow ga + gam + ac$ (P.7.4.60) $\rightarrow gan + gam + ac$ (P.7.4.85) $\rightarrow jan + gam + ac$ (P.7.4.62) $\rightarrow jaṅgam + ac$ (P.8.3.24) $\rightarrow jaṅgam + ac$ (P.8.4.58)

Therefore, Viśvarūpa concludes, we have to accept that by P.2.4.74 not only *y* of *yañi* is elided but the whole suffix and because the zero-substitute of the

combination of phones (i.e. of a vowel and a consonant) cannot be treated as the original element, rule P.1.1.4 is needed to block the *guṇa* substitution in examples such as *loluvah* etc. See also notes on the next passage.

Let us now see how Haradatta accounts for these examples.

kiṃca yady ato lopah kriyeta, jaṅgama ity atra ‘gamahana’ ity (cf. P.6.4.98) *upadhālopaḥ syāt. athātrānānti pratiśedhas tarhi darīdṛśa ity atra ‘rīdṛśoḥ’ iti* (cf. P.7.4.16) *guṇaḥ syād; dedya ity atra ‘dīno yuḍa aci’ iti* (P.6.4.63) *yuḥ syāt; sanīsrāṃsaḥ danīdhvaṃsa ity atra ‘aniditām’ ity* (cf. P.6.4.24) *upadhālopaḥ syāt; yāyāvāra ityādiṣv ākāralopaḥ syāt. yadā punar yogavibhāgam akṛtvā viśeṣavihitah samudāyaluk kriyate, tadā halacor ādeśasya sthānivattvābhāvād upadhālopādayo na bhavantīty avaśyaṃ samudāyasya lug eṣitavyaḥ.*

Moreover, if the phone *a* had been elided [by P.6.4.48], the penultimate in *jaṅgamaḥ* would be [wrongly] elided by P.6.4.98. But [it could be said that] in this *sūtra* (i.e. P.6.4.98), [the elision of the penultimate] is prohibited if *arī* follows; in that case, [r of] *darīdṛśaḥ* would be substituted by *guṇa*, as taught in P.7.4.16, [according to which this substitution takes place if *arī* follows]. In *dedyaḥ*, [the augment] *yuḥ* could be added according to P.6.4.63, in *sanīsrāṃsaḥ* and *danīdhvaṃsaḥ* the penultimate would be elided by P.6.4.24 and in *yāyāvāraḥ* etc. the phone *ā* would be elided. However, if rule [P.6.4.49] is not split and the combination [of phones] is elided by *luk* specifically prescribed [in P.2.4.74], then the substitute of a consonant and a vowel is not treated as the original and, consequently, [the operations such as] the elision of the penultimate and others [mentioned above] do not take place. Thus, the elision of the combination [of phones] prescribed by the word *luk* is certainly to be approved.

Notes

Like Viśvarūpa, Haradatta first explains the example *loluvah* and discusses the possibility of the separate elision of *a* of the suffix *yarī*. His argumentation slightly differs from Viśvarūpa's.³⁹³ Namely, he rejects the elision of *a* by P.6.4.48 *ato lopah*, because this rule would be suspended by more specific P.2.4.74 *yaño 'ci ca*. In his opinion, this fault would be avoided if we split P.6.4.49 *yasya halaḥ*. Thus, *yasya* alone would mean that even the final *a* of *ya* should be elided before an *ārdhadhātuka*. In that case the vowel *a* (and not the whole suffix *yarī*, as Viśvarūpa maintains) would be treated as present, when the *guṇa* substitution is about to take place. This is due to P.1.1.57 *acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*, because in the case of *lolū + *a + ac*, the elision of *a* is caused by the *ārdhadhātuka ac* and the *guṇa* substitution applies to what precedes the zero-substitute of the vowel *a*. This is, however, rejected by Haradatta, because by *pūrva* in *pūrvavidhau* this phone is meant, which immediately precedes a vowel which has undergone the substitution, but at the stage before the substitution has taken place. In the case of our example this would be *y* of *yarī* and not *ū* of *lolū*. This means

³⁹³ See *Pad.* on P.1.1.4: *nanu ca yānakārasyaṭo lope kṛte tasya sthānivattvād eva guṇavṛddhī na bhaviṣyataḥ, yathā – pāpacaka iti ‘ata upadhāyāḥ’ iti vṛddhiḥ, na hy atrānena nīśedhaḥ sidhyati, kiṃ kāraṇam? aniglakṣaṇatvāt. nālopo labhyate, ‘yaño 'ci ca’ iti samudāyalukā pratipadavīhitena bādhitatvāt. yogavibhāgāt siddham – ato lopo bhavaty ārdhadhātuke, tato ‘yasya’ ya ity asya samudāyasya yo ‘kāras tasyāpi lopo bhavati. kimartham idam? viśeṣavīhitena samudāyalukāto lopo mā bādhitī. tena sthānivattvād eva guṇavṛddhī na bhaviṣyataḥ. yathāiva tarhi guṇavṛddhī na bhavata evaṃ kṣetriyaḥ, cekriyaḥ, loluvaḥ, toṣṭuvaḥ, suśruva itīyānuvañāv apy acpratyayam apekṣya na syātām ... na ca punar api sthānivadbhāvāḥ, ādiṣṭād acaḥ pūrvatvāt.*

that we do not have to split P.6.4.49 and that the suffix *yañi* should be elided by P.2.4.74. Note also that in that case we cannot apply P.1.1.57, because the zero is a substitute of the whole *yañi*, i.e. of a combination of a vowel and a consonant, and not of a vowel only, as required in P.1.1.57. Additionally, Haradatta points other examples which speak against the separate elision of the vowel *a*. These are: *jan̄gamah*, *dar̄dr̄śah*, *dedyah*, *san̄sraṃsah*, *dan̄dhvaṃsah* and *yāyāvarah*.

Interestingly enough, in the case of *jan̄gamah* Haradatta's explanation differs from Viśvarūpa's. Namely, in his opinion P.6.4.98 *gamahanaṅjanakhanaghasāṃ lopah kñity anani* cannot be applied to elide the penultimate *a* of *gam*, because this is prohibited by *anani* mentioned in the *sūtra*. Actually, *añi* used in P.6.4.98 (and in P.7.4.16 discussed below) means the aorist suffix, but according to Haradatta it can be also interpreted as a part of the frequentative suffix *yañi*. Thus, *jan̄gamah* has turned out to be an inappropriate example; therefore, Haradatta presents another one: *dar̄dr̄śah*. In the case of this example, if we accept the separate elision of *a* of *yañi*, rule P.7.4.16 *ṛdr̄śo 'ñi guṇah*, which prescribes the *guṇa* substitution for the roots with the final *r*, short or long, and for the root *dr̄ś*, when the (aorist) suffix *añi* follows, would wrongly apply.

Rule P.6.4.24 *aniditām hala upadhāyāḥ kñiti* teaches that before a suffix marked with *k* or *ñi*, the penultimate *n* of roots which end in a consonant and which are not marked with *i* is elided. Thus, if in the case of *san̄sraṃsah* and *dan̄dhvaṃsah* the vowel *a* (with a marker *ñi*) is treated as present, the penultimate *n* of *sraṃs* and *dhvaṃs* would be wrongly elided.

Rule P.6.4.64 *āto lopa iṭi ca* prescribes the elision of the final *ā* of a root followed by an *ārdhadhātuka* beginning with a vowel and marked with *k* or *ñi* or by an *ārdhadhātuka* taking the augment *iṭ*. According to Haradatta, this rule could apply in the case of *yāyāvarah* (*yā* + *yañi* + *varac*), if we accepted that the vowel *a* of *yañi* is separately elided. Note that also Viśvarūpa (in *Pañj.* on P.1.1.4) discusses this example, but he rejects it.

Thus, Haradatta explains more examples than Viśvarūpa does. Moreover, not only the wording of the *Pañjikā* in no way resembles that of the *Padamañjarī* but also argumentation given in these two treatises differs.

2) In P.1.1.9 *tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇam* Pāṇini defines the term *savarṇa* 'homogenous' as applying to phones which have the same place of articulation and the same articulatory effort. This definition as it stands is too broad; therefore, the next *sūtra*, P.1.1.10 *nājjhalau*, teaches that vowels and consonants are not homogenous one with another. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.10 Viśvarūpa ponders on whether *sūtra* P.1.1.69 *aṅudit savarṇasya cāpratyayah* should apply here.

evaṃ ca saṃjñāvidhāne grahaṇakaśāstrasyānabhinirvṛttatvān nājjhalāv ity atrājgrahaṇenāgrhītasavarṇam evopāttam iti dīrghāṇām apratiśiddhā savarṇasaṃjñā. tenāgrhītasavarṇānām ayaṃ pratiśedhaḥ. grhītavarṇānām tu kumārī śeta ityādau savarṇadīrghābhāvārtham (cf. P.6.1.101) iko yaṅ acīty (P.6.1.77) ato 'cīty anuvartanīyam.

Thus, when a term is prescribed, the rule teaching the inclusion (i.e. P.1.1.69) does not function. Therefore, by the mention of a vowel in the present *sūtra* (*nājjhalau*), a phone by which its homogenous phones are not included (cf. P.1.1.69) is meant.

This is why the term *savarṇa* does not exclude long [vowels] and the exclusion [given in the present rule] refers to homogenous phones (*savarṇa*) which are not included [by P.1.1.69]. In the case of phones included [by P.1.1.69], such as in [examples] *kumārī śete* etc., the lengthening of homogenous phones does not take place, because [in P.6.1.101, the term] *ac* ('a vowel') from P.6.1.77 is present.

Notes

Rule P.1.1.69 *aṇudit savarṇasya cāpratyayah* teaches that whenever a vowel or one of the consonants *y, v, r, l* or an item having the marker *u* is used, not only these phones which are explicitly mentioned in a rule are meant, but also any phone which is homogenous with it. Thus, by *a* not only the short vowel *a* but also the long and prolonged ones are understood. Now, in P.1.1.10 the *pratyāhāra ac* is used. This *pratyāhāra* includes all the phones enumerated in the *Śivasūtras* beginning with *a* and ending in the marker *c*. These are *a, i, u, r, l, e, o, ai* and *au*. The question is whether long vowels, such as *ā, ī, ū* and *ṛ, ̄*, are also understood in P.1.1.10. In case they are, they cannot be homogenous with any consonant. This seems to be plausible and desirable, since otherwise in examples such as *kumārī śete*, the long vowel *ī* would be homogenous with *ś*. Then, P.6.1.101 *akah savarṇe dīrghah*, teaching the substitution by the long vowel for the vowel *ā, ī, ū, ṛ, ̄* or *l (ak)* and the homogenous phone that follows it, could apply and this would cause the replacement of *ī* and *ś* by *ī*. However, Viśvarūpa argues that phones which are included by P.1.1.69 are not to be understood in P.1.1.10. In the case of the example *kumārī śete* the undesirable substitution can be prohibited if in P.6.1.101 the word *aci* from P.6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* is read. Then, P.6.1.101 would mean that the substitution of a homogenous long vowel takes place when a homogenous vowel follows. Since *ś* is a consonant and not a vowel, the replacement taught in P.6.1.101 does not take place. For details on P.1.1.9-10 and on the concept of homogeneity, see Deshpande (1975: especially 61-69).

The same topic is taken up by Haradatta.

'nājjhalau' ity agrhītasavarṇānām acāṃ grahaṇam iti siddham. avaśyam cāgrhītasavarṇānām evācāṃ grahaṇam eṣṭavyam, anyathā hy aj iti grhyamāṇa ikārah śakārasya grāhakah syāt. na cāsminn api sūtre 'yam eva niṣedhaḥ, svātmani kriyāvirodhāt. ato 'jgrahaṇenāpi śakārasya grahaṇam, halṣu copadeśād dhalgrahaṇenāpīti śakāradvayasya mithaḥ savarṇasamjñā na syāt. tataś ca 'paraśśatāni kāryāṇi' ity atra śatāt parāṇi, śatād adhikānīti viḡrhyā 'karṭṭkarāṇe kṛtā bahulam' iti (P.2.1.32) bahulavacanāt samāse pāraskarādītvāt suṭi kṛte 'anaci ca' iti (P.8.4.47) śakārasya dvirvacane paraśśatānīti sthite madhyamasya śakārasya 'jharo jhari savarṇe' iti (P.8.4.65) lopo na syād iti sarvadā śakāratrayaśravanaprasaṅgaḥ. ato 'grhītasavarṇānām acāṃ grahaṇād ikāraśakārayor apratiśiddham savarṇatvam iti 'kumārī śete' ity atra mā bhūd iti dīrghavidhau 'aci' – ity anuvartya tadanuvṛttisāmarthyāc cāj eva.

It is established that in P.1.1.10 [only] vowels by which their homogenous are not included [by P.1.1.69] are meant. Moreover, the mention of only these vowels by which their homogenous are not included [by P.1.1.69] is certainly desirable, because otherwise, when *ac* is mentioned, the phone *i* would also include the phone *ś*. And the present rule does not prohibit such [an inclusion], because of a conflict of action with regard to the own nature [of a phone]. Thus, by the mention of

ac, the phone *ś* would also be understood and because it is enunciated among consonants, it will be also understood by the mention of *hal*. These two phones *ś* would not be called homogenous with each other. Therefore, in [the example] *paraḥśatāni kāryāṇi* ('more than one hundred deeds'), which is analysed as *śatāt parāṇi* [meaning] 'exceeding one hundred', a compound [of *para* and *śata*] is formed, because *bahula* is mentioned in P.2.1.32. Since [*paraḥśata*] belongs to the *gaṇa* 'pāraskara etc.', [the augment] *suṭ* is added [to *śata*] (by P.6.1.157) and the phone *ś* is doubled by P.8.4.47. Thus, when *paraśśatāni*³⁹⁴ is established, the middle *ś* would not have been elided by P.8.4.65 and [consequently] three phones *ś* would always occur. Thus, because [it is stated that in the present *sūtra*] the mention is made of vowels by which their homogenous are not included [by P.1.1.69], the homogeneity of the phones *ī* and *ś* cannot be negated. In *kumarī sete*, when the lengthening of a homogenous phone is prescribed, *aci* from P.6.1.77 is present by *anuvṛtti* and because *anuvṛtti* should be meaningful, [it is transformed into] *ac*.

Notes

Haradatta's argumentation is similar to, but also more detailed than, that of Viśvarūpa. For example, he explains why in P.1.1.10 phones by which their homogenous are included by P.1.1.69 should not be understood. Suppose for a moment that it were the case. Then, the vowel *i*, which in P.1.1.10 is referred to by *ac*, would comprise all the varieties of *i* as well as the sibilant *ś*. Thus, by P.1.1.10 not only *i* but also *ś* are not homogenous with any consonant. This would lead to the absurd statement that *ś* is not homogenous with *ś* and to the incorrect form **paraśśśatāni*.

Let us now have a look at the derivation of the compound *paraḥśatāni*. It is formed out of *para* and *śata* in accordance with P.2.1.32 *karṭrkarāṇe kṛtā bahulam*. Although this rule prescribes optionality of compounding of an element with the third case suffix expressing the agent or the instrument with a stem ending in a *kṛt* suffix, the word *bahulam* means that compounding can sometimes take place where it actually would not be expected, as for example in *paraḥśata*. At this stage we have *para* + *śata* and because *paraḥśata* is supposed to belong to the list 'pāraskara etc.', the augment *suṭ* is added to *śata*, as taught in P.6.1.157 *pāraskaraprabhṛtīni ca samjñāyām* ('And the compounds beginning with *pāraskara* are names [formed irregularly with the augment *suṭ*]'). This leads to *para* + *śśata*. Now, according to Haradatta, the *s* of *suṭ* is changed into *ś* (by P.8.4.40) and the first *ś* can be reduplicated by P.8.4.47 *anaci ca* ('[The reduplication of all the consonants except *h* takes place] also when no vowel follows') giving the form *paraśśśata*. By rule P.8.4.65 *jharo jhari savarṇe*, all the consonants with the exception of nasals, *h*, *y*, *v*, *r* and *l* can be optionally elided when they are followed by a homogenous consonant and preceded by any consonant. In the example *paraśśśata*, this rule can be applied only when the middle *ś* is regarded as homogenous with the third one. In that case we have the form *paraśśata*.

The commentary of Haradatta is much longer than that found in the *Pañjikā* and, similarly to the first passage, its wording differs from that of Viśvarūpa's treatise.

3) Our next passage comes from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.22 *taraptamapau ghaḥ*, which assigns the technical term *gha* to suffixes *tarap* and *tamap*. In the *Pañjikā* ad loc.

³⁹⁴ Strictly speaking, it is **paraśśśatāni*.

Viśvarūpa discusses the possibility of rephrasing the *sūtra*.

taraptamabvidhau tau sad iti-(P.3.2.127)-*vat tau gha iti kartavye prakaraṇa-
vyatikrameṇa samjñāvidhānaṃ jñāpayati: kvacit svārthe tarap. tena lopaś ca bala-
vattara iti* (*pāda d of śloka-vārttika* on Ś.sū. 5, *Mbh.* I 32.24).

When *tarap* and *tamap* are prescribed [in P.5.3.55-57], [the rule] ‘*tau ghaḥ*’ could be added [after P.5.3.57], as is done in the case of ‘*tau sat*’ (P.3.2.127). Because of going beyond [the limits of] the section [dealing with suffixes *tarap* and *tamap*], the [present] definition teaches that *tarap* is sometimes used in the own meaning [of the base]. Therefore, [we have the maxim]: ‘And elision is powerful’.

Notes

In P.3.2.124-126 the suffixes *śatṛ* and *śānac* are prescribed. The next rule, P.3.2.127 *tau sat*, teaches that these both suffixes are called *sat*. Now, Viśvarūpa argues that it would be also possible to define *gha* in the section where *tarap* and *tamap* are prescribed.

Note that in P.5.3.55-56 the suffixes *tamap* and *iṣṭhan* and in P.5.3.57 the suffixes *tarap* and *īyasun* are taught. In P.5.3.58-65 the addition and operations concerning *iṣṭhan* and *īyasun* are dealt with. Thus, the only place where the rule such as *tau ghaḥ*, as proposed by Viśvarūpa, could be added is after P.5.3.57, because in this case one could argue that the fact that it were not done at the end of the whole section indicates that only *tarap* and *tamap* are meant.

The same possibility is taken into consideration in the *Padamañjarī* ad loc.

*ātiśāyanikaprakaraṇa eva tādī ghaḥ, pitau gha iti vā kartavye prakaraṇotkarsēṇa
samjñākaraṇam anyo 'pi tarab astīti sūcanārtham, tena 'alpāctaram'* (P.2.2.34)
'lopaś ca balavattaraḥ' ityādaḥ svārthe tarap siddho bhavati.

Alternatively, in that very part treating comparison (*ātiśāyanikaprakaraṇa*), [the rule] ‘*tādī ghaḥ*’ or ‘*pitau ghaḥ*’ could be formulated. Because this topic is omitted (i.e. such a *sūtra* is not stated there), the [present] definition implies that there is also another [suffix] *tarap*. Therefore, in P.2.2.34 *alpāctaram* and in [the maxims] *lopaś ca balavattaraḥ* (‘And elision is powerful’) and others, [the suffix] *tarap* used to express the meaning [of the base] is established.

Notes

The first *sūtra* of the section, where the suffixes *tamap*, *iṣṭhan*, *tarap* and *īyasun* are taught, reads: *atiśāyane tamabiṣṭhanau*, hence Haradatta speaks of *ātiśāyanikaprakaraṇa*.

As in the other two examples, the wording of the commentary by Haradatta and by Viśvarūpa have nothing in common. Even the rephrasing of the *sūtra* which they consider differs. Haradatta mentions two proposals: *tādī ghaḥ* and *pitau ghaḥ*, while Viśvarūpa discusses *tau ghaḥ*.

4) The fourth passage examined here stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.2.5 *asaṃyogāl lit kit*, where Viśvarūpa rejects the idea of changing *nit* from P.1.2.1 into *kit*. To remind

you, P.1.2.1 *gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'ñṅin nit* teaches that suffixes which are devoid of markers \tilde{n} and η and which are added to the root *gāñ* or to the roots belonging to the list beginning with *kuṭ* are treated as having the marker \tilde{n} .

evaṃ kuṭādisūtre kid vidhīyatām. naivam. svapita ity atra kittve samprasāraṇaṃ (cf. P.6.1.15) *jāgrta ity atra guṇaḥ syāt* (cf. P.7.3.85).

Thus, in the rule about *kuṭādi*-roots (i.e. P.1.2.1) *kit* should be prescribed. This is not so, [because] if the marker *k* were prescribed, *samprasāraṇa* would take place in *svapitaḥ* and *guṇa* in *jāgrtaḥ*.

Notes

By *anuvṛtti*, *nit* from P.1.2.1 is also present in P.1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*, which teaches that *sārvadhātuka* suffixes not marked with *p* are treated as having the marker \tilde{n} . Thus, in case *kit* were read in P.1.2.1, these suffixes would be treated as having the marker *k*. Consequently, in the example *svapitaḥ* ‘they both sleep’ the suffix *tas* would be treated as having the marker *k* and by P.6.1.15 *vacisvapīyajādīnām kiti* (‘When a suffix with the marker *k* follows, [the consonants *y*, *v*, *r* and *l* of the roots] *vac*, *svap* and roots enumerated in the list “*yaj* etc.” [are replaced by a vowel]’) *v* of *svap* would be replaced by *u* and the form **suptaḥ* would be the result. Similarly, in the example *jāgrtaḥ* ‘they both are awake’, rule P.7.3.85 *jāgro 'vicinṇalñitsu* could apply. This *sūtra* teaches that *r* belonging to the root *jāgr* is substituted by a *guṇa* vowel, except before the suffix *vi*, the aorist suffix *cin*, the personal suffix *nal* and before the suffix with the marker \tilde{n} . If we read *kit* in P.1.2.4, and not *nit*, this substitution would take place and give the form **jāgartāḥ*.

Haradatta opens the discussion by posing a question ‘Still, may be, only the marker *k* should by extension apply also after *gāñ* and *kuṭādi*?’ (*yadi punar gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'pi kittvam evātidīśyeta?*) and he answers it immediately: ‘This is not possible’ (*naivam śakyam*). Then, he explains several examples such as *nuvidā*, *dhuvidā*, *kuṭitvā*, *puṭitvā*, *jāgrtaḥ*, *jāgrati*, *rjataḥ*, *rjuḥ* etc., but *svapitaḥ* is lacking and, needless to say, the wording of the *Pañjikā* differs from that of the *Padamañjarī*.

5) Let us now consider a passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.3 *yū stryākhyau nadī*, which teaches that \tilde{i} and \tilde{u} (or what ends in them) final in stems expressing something feminine are called *nadī*.

īdūtor eveyam ityādi bhāṣyamataṃ etat yuktaṃ ca. anyathāc chīnadyor ity (cf. P.7.1.80) *atra śīnadyoḥ parataḥ yad uktaṃ tan nopapadyate. na hi tadantastryākhyasābdasya saṃjñāyāṃ tadekādeśayor ikārokārayoḥ saṃjñā yuktā. asmin darśane lakṣmīyavāgūprabhṛtīnām samudāyagatastrītvam avayava upacarya nadī-saṃjñety āhuḥ. anyathā lakṣmīyavāgūprabhṛtīnām ikārākārayor astryākhyatvād nadīsaṃjñā na syāt. pūrvatra vyākhyāna āc chīnadyor ity* (cf. P.7.1.80) *atra nadyavayavo grhyate.*

This [term, i.e. *nadī*,] applies only to \tilde{i} and \tilde{u} . This is an opinion [found] in the *Mahābhāṣya* and it is appropriate. Otherwise, what is said (in P.7.1.80) that [the augment *num* is added] to [roots] ending in *a* or \tilde{a} , when \tilde{s} or *nadī* follows, would

not be appropriate. For when the term [*nadī*] applies to a word which denotes something feminine and which ends in it (i.e. in *ī* or *ū*), this term [*nadī*] is not suitable [to refer] to *ī* and *ū*, which are parts of it. Some say that according to this view, the state of denoting something feminine, which in the case of *lakṣmī*, *yavāgū* etc. depends on the whole form [of a word], goes over to a [constituent] part [of this word] and this [part] is termed *nadī*. Otherwise, because *ī* and *ū* of *lakṣmī*, *yavāgū* etc. do not denote anything feminine, the term *nadī* would not apply to them. According to the explanation [of the present *sūtra*, which is given] in the preceding part [of the *Pañjikā* and which presents an opinion of Puruṣottamadeva, namely, that the term *nadī* applies to what ends in *ī* or *ū*], in the case of rule P.7.1.80, a [constituent] part of *nadī* is meant.

Notes

In his argumentation Viśvarūpa refers to P.7.1.80 *āc chīnadyor num*, which prescribes optionality of the augment *num* which is added to the suffix *śatr* introduced to a verb ending in *a* or *ā* and followed by the case suffix *śī* or by *nadī*. If we understood the term *nadī* as referring to stems ending in *ī* or *ū* and not to these vowels only, the word *nadī* used in P.7.1.80 would serve no purpose, because no feminine stem can be added after the suffix *śatr*. What is here desired is the addition of the feminine suffix *ñip*. Thus, there are two possibilities: either the term *nadī* should apply only to the vowels, or in P.7.1.80 the constituent parts of *nadī* are meant.

Haradatta states that rule P.1.1.72 *yena vidhis tadantasya* ('The prescription applying to a linguistic unit, applies also to what ends in it') is always valid in the case of phones, but as is implied by P.1.4.14 *suptinantaṃ padam* ('What ends in a case or personal suffix is called *pada*'), it is sometimes prohibited when suffixes are concerned. The next question which he discusses is: How do we know that in the present rule only phones and not suffixes are understood?

kathaṃ punar jñāyate varṇayor evedaṃ grahaṇaṃ na pratyayayor iti, iyaṇuvaṅsthānapraṭiṣedhāt. yadi tadantasya saṃjñā, kathaṃ vakṣyati – śīnadyoḥ parataḥ nadyantād aṅgād uttarasya iti? samudāyasya nadītvāt tadavayavabhūtāv īdūtāv api tathoktau.

How is it known that only phones are meant here and not suffixes? Because of the negation of those [linguistic elements] which take the substitute *iyarī* or *uvarī*. If the term [*nadī*] applies to what ends in it (i.e. in *ī* or *ū*), why would he say 'before *śī* and *nadī*' [meaning that the augment *num* is added] to the *aṅga* followed by what ends in *nadī*? Because the whole element is named *nadī*, *ī* and *ū* which are parts of it are also so called.'

Like Viśvarūpa, Haradatta alludes to P.7.1.80, but his explanation is much shorter than that of Viśvarūpa. As is to be expected, the wording of these two passages is completely different.

6) The last passage we will consider here comes from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.17 *svādiṣṭv asarvanāmasthāne* assigning the term *pada* to stems to which the suffixes beginning

with the suffix *su* but different from *sarvanāmasthāna* are added. The passage in question is rather short and treats the possibility of rephrasing the *sūtra*.

śasādiṣv aśāv iti na kṛtaṃ śyāṃ bhasaṃjñāpratiṣiddhyartham sāmṇī iti.

[The *sūtra*] is not formulated as *śasādiṣv aśau* ('What stands before the suffix *śas* and others [taught in P.4.1.2-5.4.151] with the exception of *śi* [is called *pada*]') for the sake of not prohibiting the term *bha* before *śī*, as in *sāmṇī*.

Notes

The suffixes 'su etc.' are prescribed in P.4.1.2-5.4.151. The first 21 of them are case suffixes. As taught in P.1.1.42-43, the term *sarvanāmasthāna* is assigned to the suffix *śi*, which replaces the nominative plural and accusative plural case suffixes added to a neuter stem, and to the first five case suffixes enumerated in P.4.1.2 if they are not attached to a neuter stem. Now, it could be argued that if we want to exclude *sarvanāmasthānas* from the list 'su etc.', it would be easier to omit the first five case suffixes (which are called *sarvanāmasthāna*) and begin the list with *śas*. However, because the suffix *śi* is also *sarvanāmasthāna*, one should exclude it as well. This is what the alternative wording of the *sūtra* does. Now, let us take the example *sāmanī* with the nominative (or accusative) dual case suffix: *sāman + au (aut)*. The stem *sāman* is neuter; therefore, by P.7.1.19 *napuṃsakāc ca* the suffix *au* (or *aut*) is replaced by *śī*. In either wording of the *sūtra* the stem *sāman* is not regarded as being a *pada*. However, if we do not change the wording of the *sūtra*, *sāman* becomes a *bha*, which is not the case with the new wording. The point is that the phrase *svādiṣu* or *śasādiṣu* is present by *anuvṛtti* in the next rule. P.1.4.18 *yaci bham* defines the term *bha* as a stem to which a suffix belonging to the list 'su etc.' and beginning with a vowel or the consonant *y* is added. If we change *svādiṣu* into *śasādiṣu* this would mean that only if the suffix belonging to the list 'śas etc.' and beginning with a vowel or *y* follows, a stem is called *bha*. The suffixes *au* and *aut* do not belong to the list 'śas etc.', the same is thus true for their substitute. Therefore, *sāman* would not be treated as *bha*. The consequence of that is that we could not apply either P.6.4.134 *allopo 'naḥ*, teaching the elision of the vowel *a* belonging to the final portion of a stem called *bha*, or P.6.4.136 *vibhāṣā niśyoḥ*, which prescribes the optionality of this elision before the locative suffix and before the suffix *śī*. Thus, if we adopt the new wording of P.1.4.17 the only form of the nominative or accusative dual of *sāman* would be *sāmanī* (instead of *sāmanī* or *sāmṇī*). This is neither correct nor desirable; therefore, the wording *śasādiṣv aśau* has to be rejected.

As we can see, Haradatta's elucidation of the topic is much more detailed.

atha kasmāc chasādiṣv iti nocyate, evaṃ hi 'asarvanāmasthāne' iti na vaktavyaṃ bhavati? uttarārthaṃ suṭy api napuṃsake bhasaṃjñā yathā syāt, sāmṇī ity atra mā bhūd bhasaṃjñā.³⁹⁵ 'vibhāṣā niśyoḥ' iti (P.6.4.136) vacanasāmarthyād evābhasyāpy allopo bhaviṣyati. tatrāyam apy artho yasyetyādau 'śyāṃ pratiṣedhaḥ' iti (vārtt. 1 on P.6.4.148, Mbh. III 227.1) na vaktavyaṃ bhavati; abhatvād eva siddham. iha tarhi supadī brāhmaṇakule iti padbhāvo na syād abhatvāt, iha ca sāmāni paśyeti bhatvād allopaḥ syād iti yathānyāsam evāstu.

³⁹⁵ Both editions of the *Padamañjarī*, Dwarikadas Shastri and Shukla (1965-67) and Tripathi and Malaviya (1986-94), put a full stop after *bhūt*.

Thus, why is it not said ‘śasādiṣu’, [although this wording would be better,] since in that case *asarvanāmasthāne* would not have to be stated? [This alternative wording of P.1.4.17 is not chosen by Pāṇini] for the sake of the next [rule], so that the term *bha* could apply to the neuter base followed by the first five case suffixes (strictly speaking, by the nominative and accusative dual); [otherwise], the term *bha* would not apply in the case of *sāmnī* [and the phone *a* of *sāman* would not be elided by P.6.4.134].

[This objection is not justified, since the phone] *a* will be elided, even if it does not belong to *bha*, because rule P.6.4.136 (‘[The elision of a phone *a* belonging to a *bha* ending in *an*] is optional before the suffix of the locative singular and the suffix *śī*’) has to be meaningful. [And] in that case, the purpose [of the alternative wording of the present *sūtra*] is also that *vārttika* 1 on P.6.4.148 (‘[The elision of *i*, *ī*, *a* and *ā* prescribed in] P.6.4.148 [should be] prohibited before *śī*’) does not have to be stated, because when the name *bha* does not apply, [the same result as with the *vārttika*] is accomplished.

In this case, then, [the alternative wording of the *sūtra* should be rejected, because otherwise,] in [the example] *supādī brāhmaṇakule* the substitution by *pad* would not take place, since the stem is not called *bha*, and in [the example] *sāmāni paśya* [the phone] *a* could be elided, because it belongs to *bha*. Therefore, let [rule P.1.4.17] be formulated exactly as it is.

Notes

Contrary to Viśvarūpa, Haradatta is not satisfied with the example *sāmnī*. He argues that the elision of the vowel *a* in *sāmanī* would take place, because of rule P.6.4.136 *vibhāṣā niśyoh*, which otherwise would serve no purpose. He adds even one more advantage of the new wording of P.1.4.17, i.e., the fact that *vārttika* 1 on P.6.4.148 would not be necessary. However, also Haradatta rejects the alternative wording of P.1.4.17. He mentions two examples: *supādī brāhmaṇakule* and *sāmāni paśya*. In the first one, the stem *pād* being a *bha* is replaced by *pad*, as taught in P.6.4.130 *pādaḥ pat*. However, similarly to the example *sāmnī*, when the suffix *śī* is introduced to *supād*, the new wording of P.1.4.17 would deprive this stem of the name *bha*. In the second example, the suffix *śas* is added to *sāman*, and according to the new wording of P.1.4.17, *sāman* would be called *bha*. Thus, by P.6.4.134 *allopo* ‘*naḥ*’ mentioned above, the vowel *a* of *sāman* would be elided and this would result in **sāmni paśya*.

As in all the passages quoted above, the text of the *Pañjikā* differs from that of the *Padamañjarī*.

To these six passages from the *Pañjikā* we could add the very short excerpt from Viśvarūpa’s commentary on P.1.1.49, where the necessity of the *sūtra* is proven. Haradatta’s argumentation is much longer than that of Viśvarūpa, but the core of the problem remains the same. Needless to say, the wording of the passage from the *Pañjikā* is different from that of Haradatta’s commentary. Nevertheless, I have decided not to quote the relevant passages here, because a part of the text of the *Pañjikā* as given in the manuscript is illegible and in reconstructing it I have consulted the *Padamañjarī*.

And lastly I would like to draw the attention of the reader to five further passages from the *Pañjikā* which deal with similar topics as those treated in the *Padamañjarī*. They stem from the commentary on P.1.2.1, 1.3.12, 1.4.8, 27 and 105 and, what is interesting, the same topics are discussed in Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*. The pertinent passages from these three treatises are given in the previous subsection, with excerpts from the *Padamañjarī* quoted in footnotes. Let us first have a look at the text of Viśvarūpa and Haradatta. The similarity between them is of the same kind as we have seen above. The problems under discussion are similar, but the wording is completely different. Haradatta's elucidation is longer than that of Viśvarūpa and he uses different examples or adds other ones to support his argumentation. In contrast to this, the wording of the passages from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.12 and for the most part on P.1.4.105 to a great extent resembles that of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. The similarity between the passages from the *Pañjikā* and the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.2.1 and 1.4.8 consists first of all of discussing the same rare examples. The wording of the short passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.27 is identical to the text of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but as we have mentioned in the previous subsection, this may be accidental.

To sum up, the fact that in all the passages discussed above not only the wording of the *Pañjikā* and the *Padamañjarī* but also a large part of the examples explained there differ seems to show that most probably Viśvarūpa did not know or at least did not utilise the *Padamañjarī*, while he was writing his *Pañjikā*. On the other hand, we can assume that the topics he takes up in the commentary on P.1.1.4, 10, 22, 1.2.5, 1.4.3 and 1.4.17 might stem from some other treatise(s) as the topics elucidated in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.2.1, 1.3.12, 1.4.8, 27 and 105 possibly stem from Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* or from some other work similar to it. However, we must immediately add that we have no evidence to identify the treatise(s) Viśvarūpa might have consulted.

II.6.5.6 The *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*

Our examination of influences of other grammatical treatises on the *Pañjikā* would be incomplete if we did not consider Sṛṣṭidhara's *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*. After all, it is, like the *Pañjikā*, a commentary on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, so it is to be expected that Viśvarūpa might have drawn from it or have referred to or criticised it. However, let us not forget, it is not at all certain whether Viśvarūpa could really have borrowed from Sṛṣṭidhara. Although the opinion that Viśvarūpa is anterior to Sṛṣṭidhara seems to prevail among scholars dealing with the Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar, the opposite view has an eminent supporter in the person of D. Ch. Bhattacharya.

However, both hypotheses, that Viśvarūpa was posterior or anterior to Sṛṣṭidhara, suffer from the same disadvantage. There is not a single piece of evidence to prove either of them. According to D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: [26]-[27]), who had at his disposal manuscripts of the whole *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti* and of portions of the *Pañjikā*, neither of these two commentaries on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* contains a hint that its author could have known the other work. Admittedly, Sṛṣṭidhara mentions one *Pañjikā* 18 times, but, as Bhattacharya (1946: [26]-[27]) remarks, it cannot be the treatise Viśvarūpa wrote.³⁹⁶ Furthermore, in the part of the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti* to which I had access and which comprises the first 59 *sūtras* from the first *pāda* of the first *adhyāya*, Sṛṣṭidhara does not directly or indirectly refer to Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā*. Besides, the explanations given by Sṛṣṭidhara and Viśvarūpa differ considerably each from the other. The problems discussed by Viśvarūpa or the argumentation used by him are often different from those employed by Sṛṣṭidhara, and if they are similar, they are found in the *Nyāsa* or in other treatises. Needless to say, the wording of these two commentaries is almost never similar.

Nevertheless, I have found two passages where Sṛṣṭidhara expresses an opinion which I have not found in any other treatise, apart from the *Pañjikā*.

The first one comes from the commentary on P.1.1.8 and deals with the compound *mukhanāsikā*. Unlike Jinendrabuddhi, who includes this compound in the *gaṇa mayūravyaṃsakādi*, Viśvarūpa explains it as belonging to *śākapārthivādi*. This is also the opinion found in the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*.

The second passage is taken from the commentary on P.1.1.29 and treats the meaning of the compound *tvatkapitrka*. Both, Sṛṣṭidhara and Viśvarūpa, explain it as *tvam kutsitaḥ pitā asya*. The notion of 'contempt', however, is not necessarily present in the *Nyāsa*.³⁹⁷

Now the question arises whether these two passages can prove that either Sṛṣṭidhara or Viśvarūpa had known and possibly had borrowed from the other commentary. In my opinion, such a conclusion would not be justified. Firstly, these two instances of similarity are not very important. Secondly, the wording of these passages differs considerably. Consequently, it seems to be more plausible that these two issues belong

³⁹⁶ In fact, in the commentary on P.1.1.11, Sṛṣṭidhara cites an opinion from this *Pañjikā*, and this opinion is absent in Viśvarūpa's explanation of the *sūtra* in question. Admittedly, though it is not very probable, we cannot rule out the possibility that the citation in question stems from Viśvarūpa's treatise, but it is taken from the commentary on another *sūtra*. However, unless we find the passage in Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā* which corresponds to the quotation from the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*, we have to agree with D. Ch. Bhattacharya that references to the *Pañjikā* found in Sṛṣṭidhara's commentary do not come from Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā*.

³⁹⁷ For more information on these two passages, see II.6.6.1, example 2 and 3.

rather to the same (late Bengali?) grammatical tradition, from which both, Sṛṣṭidhara and Viśvarūpa, drew.

To sum up, facing the evidence which is now available, it is better to conclude that Sṛṣṭidhara's and Viśvarūpa's commentaries were written independently of each other.

II.6.5.7 Other works

In this subsection we will approach the question of whether Viśvarūpa possibly borrowed from work other than those mentioned so far. What is the evidence for or against such an assumption? To begin with, let us have a look at three passages from the *Pañjikā*. They are all similar in a way. The opinions of Viśvarūpa, or in one case the opinion quoted in the *Pañjikā*, are found also in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but there they are assigned to other grammarians.

The first excerpt comes from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.4 *neyaṇuvāṅsthānāv astrī*, which teaches that the feminine stems ending in *ī* or *ū* which take respectively the substitutes *iyāñi* or *uvāñi* are not called *nadī*, with the exception of the word *strī*, which is always termed *nadī*. This is how Viśvarūpa comments on *subhru* used in the *Kumārasambhava*. The stem *subhrū* is feminine and by P.6.4.77 *aci śnudhātubhruvāṅ yvor iyaṇuvāṅau* its final *ū* is replaced by *uvāñi*. Consequently, by the present rule *subhrū* should not be called *nadī* and in the vocative case rule P.7.3.107 *ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ*, teaching that in the vocative the final vowel of stems called *nadī* (and of stems meaning 'mother') is shortened, would not apply.

vimānanā subhru kutaḥ pitur gr̥ha ityādisiddhaye (Kumāra 5.44b) vāmīty (P.1.4.5) ato vāgrahaṇam anuvartamānaṃ śiṃhāvalokitanyāyena vyavasthitavibhāṣātvena samāśrayaṇīyam.

To justify [the word *subhru* in] *vimānanā subhru kutaḥ pitur gr̥he* and other [examples], it should be assumed that by the maxim about a lion that looks backwards the word *vā* 'optionally' from P.1.4.5 *vāmi* is valid here and this is the irregular option (*vyavasthitavibhāṣā*).

In the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.4.4 Śaraṇadeva ascribes this opinion to Śrīkaṇṭha.³⁹⁸

vāmīty ato vāgrahaṇam apakṛṣya vyavasthitavibhāṣātvād iti śrīkaṇṭhaḥ.

Śrīkaṇṭha [thinks that the word *subhru* is called *nadī*], because the word *vā* has been pulled from P.1.4.5 *vāmi* and because it is the irregular option.

Similarly, in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.7 *śeṣo ghy asakhi*, which defines the term *ghi*, Viśvarūpa elucidates an example *sakhinā vānarendreṇa*.

³⁹⁸ Citations in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* suggest that Śrīkaṇṭha was a grammarian; however, nothing precise is known about him. See Renou (1940: 61).

asakhi alpārthe nañ³⁹⁹ tena sakhinā vānarendreṇeti.

[The affix] *nañ* [used] in *asakhi* [is employed] in the sense of ‘smallness’ and, therefore, [the phrase] *sakhinā vānarendreṇa* [is correct].

Notes

For the explanation of this passage, see II.6.5.4, example 4.

This time, according to Śaraṇadeva the opinion stated above stems from the *Anunyāsakāra*.

kathaṃ sakhinā vānarendreṇa. ucyate: alavaṇā yavāgūr itivad alpārthe naño vidhānād ity anunyāsaḥ.

How [do we obtain] *sakhinā vānarendreṇa*? It is said: ‘Because as in *alavaṇā yavāgūḥ* (“not salty rice-gruel”), [so in *asakhi*, the affix] *nañ* is prescribed in the sense of “smallness”.’ This [view] is [stated in] the *Anunyāsa*.

The last passage which will be discussed here and which contrarily to the above passages contains an explicit quotation is taken from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.52 *gati-buddhipratyavasānārthaśabdakarmākarmakāṇām aṇikartā sa ṇau*, which teaches that the agent of certain non-causal verbal stems (strictly speaking, of those having the meaning of motion, understanding and eating, and of verbal stems which have sounds as their direct object and of intransitive stems) becomes the direct object when the root takes the causative suffix.

gamayati grāmaṃ putram ity atra grāmādeḥ karmatvaṃ na prāpnoti. kartuḥ kriyayā hi vyāpyamānasya karmatvaṃ na karmakriyayā. ucyate: karṭṭgrahaṇaṃ tatra svatantropalakṣaṇārthaṃ karmatve 'pi putrādeḥ svātantryasyānupahatatvāt.

In [the example] *gamayati grāmaṃ putram* [the word] *grāma* etc. does not wrongly become the direct object. After all, [a word] becomes the direct object, [only] when it refers to that which is to be obtained by the action of the agent and not [to what is to be obtained] by the action of the object. [This critical objection is refuted, since] it is stated that the mention of the agent [in P.1.4.52] is for the sake of implying that [agent] as someone independent and because even when *putra* etc. are treated as direct objects, they do not abandon their independence.

In the *Durghaṭavṛtti* on P.1.4.52, a similar quotation is ascribed to Maitreya Rakṣita.

kathaṃ gamayati grāmaṃ vipram iti. aṇikartuḥ karmatve tat-kriyāvīpyasya grāmasya karmatvaṃ na syāt. karmasaṃjñāvidhau karṭṭgrahaṇāt. ucyate: tat karṭṭgrahaṇaṃ svatantropalakṣaṇaṃ karmatve 'pi svavyāpāre svātantryasyānupahatatvād iti rakṣitaḥ.

How [do we obtain the example] *gamayati grāmaṃ vipram*? The agent of the sentence without the causative suffix becomes the direct object, so that *grāma*

³⁹⁹ Cf. *Medinī* (*avyayāni* 1ab): *aśabdaḥ syād abhāve 'pi svalpārthapratīṣedhayoḥ.*

which is to be obtained by the action of this [object] cannot become the direct object [as well]. [The answer to this question is:] because the agent is mentioned in the rule defining the term *karman* (i.e. in P.1.4.52). [Precisely speaking, this critical objection is refuted, since] it is stated that this mention of the agent implies [the agent as] someone independent, because even when [the agent of the sentence without the causative suffix] becomes the direct object, it does not abandon the independence as far as its own activity is concerned. This is said by Rakṣita.⁴⁰⁰

Now, the question arises whether in the examples quoted above Viśvarūpa actually draws directly from Śrīkaṇṭha, the Anunyasakāra and Rakṣita or rather his knowledge of their opinions stems from the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. To my mind, although the first possibility cannot be excluded with absolute certainty, the second seems to be much more probable. After all, it is already significant that these three opinions are quoted in the *Durghaṭavṛtti*. In addition, if we remember that most probably Viśvarūpa borrowed either from Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* or from some other treatise of this kind and, on the other hand, that there is no other piece of evidence in favour of the hypothesis that Viśvarūpa knew and utilised treatises of Śrīkaṇṭha, the Anunyasakāra and Rakṣita,⁴⁰¹ we are, I think, compelled to adopt the view that in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.4, 7 and 52 Viśvarūpa drew from the *Durghaṭavṛtti*.

A final point which needs our consideration is a question whether Viśvarūpa knew and utilised Śiradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*. However, the evidence supplied by the first *adhyāya* of the *Pañjikā* does not allow us to answer this question definitely. The only thing we can tell is that in the part of the *Pañjikā* examined here, there is not a single passage which clearly has to stem from Śiradeva's treatise. One part of Viśvarūpa's commentary on P.1.2.1 is somehow similar to Śiradeva's explanation of *SP* 127, but examples used in both these treatises are different. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that Viśvarūpa did not know the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*. These two works are of different character, so it is not really surprising that we cannot find any borrowing from the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* in the *Pañjikā*.

⁴⁰⁰ Cf. also *Pad.* on *gamayati māṇavakaṃ grāmam* (*Kāś.* on the present *sūtra*): *katham atra grāmasya karmatvam, yāvatā kartur īpsitatamaṃ karmety ucyate ... ato yasyām avasthāyām grāmasya karmatvaṃ na tasyām māṇavakasya karmatvam, yasyām ca nyantāvasthāyām māṇavakasya karmatvaṃ na tasyām grāmasya karmatvam; pūrvapravṛttatvād.*

⁴⁰¹ This means that in the case of Śrīkaṇṭha and the Anunyasakāra, we are not able to find any more similarities between opinions of these two grammarians and opinions of Viśvarūpa, just because works of Śrīkaṇṭha are unknown and the text of the *Anunyasā* is not extant. As far as the *Tantrapradīpa* of Maitreya Rakṣita is concerned, its comparison with the *Pañjikā* was not possible for the reasons mentioned in the introduction to II.6.5.

II.6.6 Original ideas of Viśvarūpa

Up to this point we have focused our attention on influences the *Pañjikā* might have undergone and we have ascertained that Viśvarūpa drew abundantly from the grammatical tradition available to him. The question which now arises is whether the *Pañjikā* contains anything new at all. In this (II.6.6) and the next (II.6.7) subsection we will try to answer this question.

The first step we shall take towards fulfilling this task is to look for passages in the *Pañjikā* which contain ideas not found in any other treatise. However, to anticipate a possible objection, let us remark that although there is no other way to examine the degree of the *Pañjikā*'s originality, the fact that we will find several topics which are not treated in any other grammatical work mentioned in II.6.4-5 does not mean that these ideas stem from Viśvarūpa. After all, we cannot exclude the possibility that Viśvarūpa borrowed from some treatises which (for one reason or another) we have not consulted. There are several works which could be mentioned here, in the first place, Maitreya Rakṣita's *Tantrapradīpa*, extant only in manuscripts, which were not accessible to me while I was working on Viśvarūpa's *Pañjikā*. Furthermore, Viśvarūpa might have borrowed from Maitreya's *Durghaṭavṛtti* or from the *Durghaṭavṛtti* written by Puruṣottamadeva or perhaps from the *Anuṅyāsa* or the *Bhāgavṛtti*. All these treatises are now lost and with the exception of the last, quotations from them found in grammatical literature are scarce. And last but not least, it is quite possible that Viśvarūpa might have utilised some works belonging to non-Pāṇinian schools of Sanskrit grammar, since some of them (the Kātantra, Jaumara etc.) might have been known and studied in Bengal already at his time.⁴⁰²

Thus, bearing the above in mind, we can now take up our analysis. This is divided into two parts. The first one treats those passages from the *Pañjikā* in which the same or very similar topics to those from the *Nyāsa* are discussed, but the argumentation of Viśvarūpa differs from that of Jinendrabuddhi. In the second part, we scrutinise those passages which contain ideas or topics not examined in a way Viśvarūpa did either in the *Nyāsa* or in any of treatises mentioned in II.6.5. For the sake of convenience, the passages where Viśvarūpa rejects the necessity of the *sūtra* under discussion, although Jinendrabuddhi does not question its need at all, are also included in this part.⁴⁰³

⁴⁰² See also II.3.2.3.

⁴⁰³ Such passages belong to both of our categories. On the one hand, they could be included in II.6.6.1, since we can be sure that if Jinendrabuddhi does not discuss the need of a rule in question, it means that he regards it as necessary and, in this case, we have a clear conflict of opinions between Jinendrabuddhi and Viśvarūpa. On the other side, the whole topic (the question whether the *sūtra* is redundant) is a new one, thus belonging also to II.6.6.2.

II.6.6.1 Opinions different from those found in the *Nyāsa*

The examples of disagreements between Viśvarūpa and the Nyāsakāra are rare and mostly deal with minor problems. Sometimes, Viśvarūpa presents other arguments than those given by Jinendrabuddhi, or adds alternative ones, but his conclusion remains the same as in the *Nyāsa*. Rarely does he propose another interpretation or another solution to the problem. Even more rarely does he reject an opinion of Jinendrabuddhi. Moreover, Viśvarūpa does not criticise Jinendrabuddhi overtly, he simply states an opinion which is not held by the author of the *Nyāsa*.

Below I present the relevant passages from the *Pañjikā* in the order they appear in Viśvarūpa's commentary.

1) The first passage is taken from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.1 *vṛddhir ād aic*, which defines the term *vṛddhi*. In the commentary on this *sūtra* Viśvarūpa accounts for the unusual sandhi in *aic*.

aij iti pratyāhāreṇa aikāra-aukārau gr̥hyete. kutvaṃ ca nipātanān na bhavaty ayasmayādipāṭhād bhatvād (cf. P.1.4.20; P.8.2.30) vā.

By the *pratyāhāra aic*, the phone *ai* and the phone *au* are meant. And the velar consonant (*k*) is not substituted [for *c*], either because it was so stated by Pāṇini, or because [*aic*] should be read in the list 'ayasmaya etc.' and, therefore, is regarded as *bha*.

Notes

The substitution of palatal plosives by velar ones takes place at the end of a *pada* and before a suffix beginning with a consonant belonging to the *pratyāhāra jha*. This is taught in P.8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*.

The list 'ayasmaya etc.' is mentioned in P.1.4.20 *ayasmayādīni cchandasi* and contains irregular words formed by rules pertaining either to a *bha* or to a *pada*.

The same topic is discussed in the *Nyāsa* but only one explanation, namely, that *aic* belongs to the *gaṇa ayasmayādi*, is given there.

2) In P.1.1.8 *mukhanāsikāvacanā 'nunāsikaḥ* Pāṇini defines the term *anunāsika* as that speech sound which is pronounced through the nose with the mouth. In the following passage from the *Pañjikā* ad loc. Viśvarūpa explains the compound *mukhanāsikā*.

mukhasahitayety anena śākapārthivāditvān madhyapadalopī samāsaḥ (cf. vārtt. 8 on P.2.1.69, *Mbh.* I 406.5) *sūtra iti darśayati*.

By *mukhasahitayā* [Puruṣottamadeva] shows that [*mukhanāsikā*] belongs to [the list] 'śākapārthiva etc.' and, consequently, it is a compound whose middle element has been elided.

Notes

Pāṇini does not mention the list ‘śākapārthiva etc.’. It is taught by Kātyāyana in vārtt. 8 on P.2.1.69 *varṇo varṇena*. Compounds belonging to this group are *karmadhārayas* having at the beginning a *tatpuruṣa* whose last element has been elided. Viśvarūpa simply says that the middle element of these compounds has been elided. Note that also according to Sṛṣṭidhara the compound *mukhanāsikā* belongs to the list ‘śākapārthiva etc.’. Cf. his *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti* ad loc.: *tasmāt ayam atra samāsaḥ, ity āha mukhasahitayetyādi. śākapārthivādi*. For the terms *uttarapadalopa* and *madhyamapadalopa*, see Deshpande (1986).

In contrast to Viśvarūpa, who explains *mukhanāsikā* by including it into the *gaṇa śākapārthivādi*, Jinendrabuddhi sees it as belonging to the *gaṇa mayūravyaṃsakādi*.

mukhasahitā nāsikā mukhanāsikā *ity anena mukhanāsikāśabdo 'yaṃ tatpuruṣaḥ, na dvandva iti darśayati. tatpuruṣas tu mayūravyaṃsakāditvād* (cf. P.2.1.72) *veditavyaḥ*.

By *mukhasahitā nāsikā mukhanāsikā* [the author of the *Kāśikā*] shows that the word *mukhanāsikā* is a *tatpuruṣa* compound and not a *dvandva*. And [it is] a *tatpuruṣa*, because it belongs to [the list] ‘*mayūravyaṃsaka* etc.’.

Notes

The list ‘*mayūravyaṃsaka* etc.’ is mentioned in P.2.1.72 *mayūravyaṃsakādayas ca* and compounds belonging to this group are irregular *tatpuruṣas*.

3) In rules P.1.1.27-36 Pāṇini defines the term *sarvanāman*. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.1.29 *na bahuvrīhau* (‘[The words belonging to the list “sarva etc.” are] not [called *sarvanāman*] when they occur in a *bahuvrīhi* compound’) Viśvarūpa explains the *bahuvrīhi* compound *tvatkapitṛka*.

tvatkapitṛka *iti tvaṃ kutsitaḥ pitā asya iti nadyṛtaś ceti* (P.5.4.153) *kap*.

In [the case of the compound] *tvatkapitṛkaḥ*, [which is resolved as] ‘who has you as a bad father’, the suffix *kap* [prescribed] by P.5.4.153 *nadyṛtaś ca* is added.

In the opinion of Jinendrabuddhi, the compound *tvatkapitṛka* is formed out of *tvaṃ pitāsyā* when the meaning of ‘not known [very well]’ etc. is to be expressed (*ajñātādyarthavivakṣāyām*). Then, he ponders whether in the formation of this compound, the affix *akac* prescribed by P.5.3.71 *avyayasarvanāmnām akac prāk ṭeḥ* (‘[The affix] *akac* is added before the last vowel of particles and *sarvanāmans*’) or the suffix *ka* enjoined by P.5.3.70 *prāg ivāt kaḥ* (‘Up to rule P.5.3.96 *ive pratikṛtau* [the suffix] *ka* [should be understood]’) is added to *tvat* and opts for the latter. Similarly, Puruṣottamadeva decides in favour of the suffix *ka*, but he states that the compound in question is formed to express the meaning of ‘contempt etc.’ (*kutsādyarthe*); thus, he excludes the notion of ‘not known [very well]’.⁴⁰⁴ Viśvarūpa takes one more step

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. P.5.3.73 (*ajñāte*) and P.5.3.74 (*kutsite*).

and restricts the meaning of the compound to contempt only. He does not discuss whether the affix *akac* or *ka* should be applied here, so we can assume that he agrees with Puruṣottamadeva. Finally, he claims that at the end of the compound, the suffix *kap* prescribed by P.5.4.153 *nadyrtaś ca* ('[The suffix *kap* is] also [added] to what ends in *r* or to a feminine stem called *nadī*, [if they belong to the final element of a *bahuvrīhi* compound]') is added and this is also taught by Jinendrabuddhi. Thus, the difference between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā* is a very small one and consists merely of confining the meaning of the compound. It is interesting to note that the same meaning of *tvatkapitṛka* is given also by Sṛṣṭidhara: *kiṃ tu tvaṃ kutsitaḥ pitā yasyeti vākye antaraṅgatvāt prathamam evākac prāpnoti. tataś ca tvakatpitṛka iti bhavet. tvatkapitṛka iti na syāt* [*Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti* ad loc.].

4) Rule P.1.2.45 *arthavad adhātur apratyayaḥ prātipadikam* teaches that a meaningful linguistic item which is neither a root nor an affix is called *prātipadika*. In the *Pañjikā* on this *sūtra* Viśvarūpa explains why the prohibition regarding a root does not exclude stems ending in a *kṛt* suffix.

yata ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati: adhātur iti pratiśedho na kṛdantadhātor yad ayam oḥ supīti (P.6.4.83) *dhātoḥ paraṃ supraṃ nimittam āśrayati. tato 'pratyaya iti pratipattigauravavāraṇāya.*

[The mention of *adhātu* in the present *sūtra* does not mean that roots ending in the suffix *kṛt* are excluded], since the practice of the Teacher reveals that by the prohibition of the root, the root ending in a suffix *kṛt* is not [prohibited], as in P.6.4.83 *oḥ supī* He attaches a case suffix after a root as a condition [on which an operation prescribed in the rule takes place]. Therefore, *apratyaya* is [mentioned in the *sūtra* only] for the sake of removing the difficulty of understanding.

Notes

The first part of Viśvarūpa's argumentation is not free from difficulties. Firstly, the opinion that stems ending in *kṛt* are not prohibited by *adhātuḥ* is contrary to the maxim *kvibantā dhātutvam na jahati* ('[Roots] ending in *kvip* do not abandon their nature of being a root'), since the suffix *kvip* belongs to *kṛt* suffixes. It is interesting to note that this maxim is quoted in the *Nyāsa* on P.1.2.45 and in the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.2, as well as in Puruṣottamadeva's *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. Secondly, in rule P.6.4.83 *oḥ supī* Pāṇini teaches that before a case suffix beginning with a vowel, the final *ū* of a root which contains more than one syllable is substituted by *v*, if this *ū* is not preceded by a conjunct consonant belonging to the root. Traditionally, P.6.4.83 applies to roots ending in a *kvi* suffix. The suffix *kvi* (comprising *kvip* and *kvīn*) is elided by P.6.1.67 *ver aprktasya* and its main function is to make a root a nominal stem. One could argue that the fact that the *anuvṛtti* of *dhātoḥ* is present in P.6.4.83 and refers to a stem ending in a *kvi* suffix seems to speak rather for treating these stems like roots. Viśvarūpa's argumentation is probably as follows. P.6.4.83 indicates that a case suffix is added to a root having a *kvi* suffix. If a case suffix is added, then a root ending in *kvi*, which is also a *kṛt* suffix, is called *prātipadika*. That means that it is not prohibited by P.1.2.45 and in particular, not by *adhātuḥ*. This is, however, not quite

correct. One of weaknesses of this argumentation is the fact of using an example with a *kvī* suffix in reasoning, whereby the results are extended to what ends in a *kṛt* suffix. Furthermore, it is also an example of *itaretarāśrayadoṣa*, since we have to assign the term *prātipadika* to the stems ending in a *kvī* in order to add a case suffix to them and to apply P.6.4.83, but at the same time we use the very same *sūtra* to prove that these stems are called *prātipadika*. The only solution to the last problem would be to read in P.6.4.83 *kvau* from P.6.4.40. However, this would still not remove the first fault mentioned above.

The second step of Viśvarūpa's argumentation, i.e. that *apratyayah* serves no purpose, is quite plausible. Namely, the next *sūtra*, P.1.2.46 *kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca*, prescribes the extension of the application of the term *prātipadika* to these stems which end in *kṛt* or *taddhita* suffixes and to compounds. This means that among stems ending in suffixes only those which end in *kṛt* or *taddhita* suffixes are called *prātipadika* and what ends in any other suffix does not take this name.

A similar problem is discussed by Jinendrabuddhi, who ponders whether roots ending in the suffix *kvīp* are excluded by the present rule. However, he does not refer to P.6.4.83, but simply states that they become *prātipadika* by *sūtra* P.1.2.46.

5) In P.1.4.15 *naḥ kye* Pāṇini teaches that before the suffixes *kya* (*kyac*, *kyāñi* and *kyas*) only stems ending in *n* are called *pada*. Thus, before *kya* the application of the term *pada* is restricted to stems ending in *n*. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.15 Viśvarūpa ponders whether the opposite restriction, the restriction of the name *pada* of stems ending in *n* to these stems to which the suffix *kya* is added, is possible.

viparītanīyamo nāśaṅkanīyaḥ kya eva nāntam iti brahmahastibhyāṃ varcasa iti
(P.5.4.78) *nirdeśāt*.

[The objection that this could mean] the opposite restriction as 'what ends in *n* [is called a *pada*] only when *kya* follows' should not be raised, because of the mention of [the word *brahma-* in] P.5.4.78 *brahmahastibhyāṃ varcasah*.

Notes

In P.5.4.78 the word *brahman* is the first element of a *dvandva* compound. As such it is supposed to have a case suffix, which is however elided by P.2.4.71 *supo dhātuprātipadikayoḥ*. Still, by P.1.1.62 *pratyayalope pratyayalakṣaṇam* the case suffix is considered to be present and, therefore, *brahman* is a *pada*. In that case, P.8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya* can apply and the final *n* is elided. Thus, the fact that in P.5.4.78 the final *n* of *brahman* is elided indicates that *brahman* is a *pada* here. Consequently, the other interpretation of a *sūtra* mentioned by Viśvarūpa has to be rejected.

The same possibility is discussed and refuted in the *Nyāsa*, with the small difference that Jinendrabuddhi gives as an argument P.8.2.8 and not P.5.4.78, as Viśvarūpa does. Thus, Jinendrabuddhi says:

nāntam kya eva ity eṣa viparītanīyamo nāśaṅkanīyaḥ 'na nisambuddhyoḥ' iti
(P.8.2.8) *pratiśedhāt*.

[The objection that this could mean] the opposite restriction as ‘what ends in *n* [is called a *pada*] only when *kya* follows’ cannot be raised because of the negation [given] in P.8.2.8 *na nisambuddhyoḥ*, [which otherwise would become useless].

Notes

P.8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya* teaches the elision of the *n* final in a *pada* which is a part of a *prātipadika*. The next rule, P.8.2.8 *na nisambuddhyoḥ*, prohibits this elision before the suffix of the locative and the vocative. Now, if a stem ending in *n* were called *pada* only before the suffix *kya*, rule P.8.2.8 would be useless, because the suffix *kya* is neither the locative nor the vocative case suffix.

6) Rule P.1.4.28 *antardhau yenādarśanam icchati* teaches that when concealment is to be expressed, the reason why (or the person by whom) one does not want to be seen is called *apādāna*. In the *Pañjikā* ad loc. Viśvarūpa thus interprets *yena* used in the *sūtra*.

ubhayaprāptāv ity (P.2.3.66) atra prayogagrahaṇānuvṛttau (cf. P.2.3.64) sākṣād ubhayoḥ kartṛkarmaṇoḥ prayoge niyamād yeneti hetāv iyaṃ tṛtīyety (cf. P.2.3.23) ata āha yena hetuneti.

In P.2.3.66 *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi*, the word *prayoga* is present by *anuvṛtti* [from P.2.3.64]. Thus, because of the restriction that both the agent and the object are to be explicitly used, the instrumental case in *yena* conveys the cause. Therefore, [Puruṣottamadeva] says *yena hetunā*.

Let us now compare this passage with the explanation of Jinendrabuddhi.

yeneti kartari tṛtīyā. nanu ca kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti iti (P.2.3.65) ṣaṣṭhyā bhavitavyam iti? naitad asti; ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi iti (P.2.3.66) niyamāt karmaṇy eva na kartari. karma tv atrādarśanasyātmā tasyāntaraṅgatvāt sa eva karma vijñāyate.

The instrumental case in *yena* conveys the agent. Is it not so that by P.2.3.65 *kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti* [the agent] should be [expressed] by the genitive case? It is not so. Because of the restriction [given] in P.2.3.66 *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi*, the genitive case is used only in the sense of the object and not of the agent. Now, here the object of non-seeing is the self, because it is the most related to the own body (*antaraṅgatvāt*);⁴⁰⁵ thus, only that (i.e. the self) is known to be the object.

Notes

In the opinion of Jinendrabuddhi, *yena* in P.1.4.28 is used to express the agent, but this assumption compels the Nyāsakāra to explain why Pāṇini employs *yad* in the instrumental and not in the genitive case as taught in P.2.3.65 *kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti* (‘[The genitive case suffix is added] after a stem expressing the agent or the direct object, when they are connected in meaning with a verbal noun’). Jinendrabuddhi replies that the genitive case suffix is prohibited by P.2.3.66 *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi*, which teaches that in case both, the object and the agent, could be expressed, only the object takes the genitive case suffix. Now, the question is, what is the object in P.1.4.28 and Jinendrabuddhi answers: *ātman* (‘self’). Thus, a word expressing the agent cannot take the genitive case suffix,

⁴⁰⁵ About this common sense *antaraṅgatva*, see Bronkhorst (1986: 33-34).

but it takes the instrumental case suffix as prescribed in P.2.3.18 *karṭṛkaraṇayos tṛtīyā*. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.28 Viśvarūpa follows Puruṣottamadeva, who explicates *yena* by *yena hetunā*. Therefore, Viśvarūpa needs the word *prayoga* from P.2.3.64 to be understood in P.2.3.66, because then this *sūtra* would mean that the genitive case suffix is added to the object, when the object and the agent are actually expressed in the sentence. This is not the case with P.1.4.28 and, consequently, *yena* cannot express the agent. Thus, it conveys the cause as prescribed in P.2.3.23 *hetau*.

7) Rule P.1.4.35 *dhārer uttamaraṇaḥ* teaches that when the verb *dhṛ* is used, the creditor is called *saṃpradāna*. In the *Pañjikā* on this rule, Viśvarūpa comments on the example *dhārayati*. This is taken up also in the *Nyāsa*, but while Jinendrabuddhi sees in *dhārayati* the causative of the root *dhṛ* belonging to the *bhvādi* class, Viśvarūpa counts *dhṛ* among the roots of the tenth class.

dhṛṇi dhāraṇe. caurādikaḥ.

[The root] *dhṛ* [is used] in the meaning of ‘holding’. It belongs to the *caurādi* class.

8) Our last passage stems from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.59 *upasargāḥ kriyāyoge*, defining the term *upasarga*. In the *Pañjikā* on it, Viśvarūpa rejects the necessity of including *marut* into the list of *upasargas*, although Jinendrabuddhi accepts the corresponding *vārttika*. However, Viśvarūpa’s refutation is justified by the fact that he comments on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, i.e. on the treatise dealing with the *bhāṣā* (see fn. 65) and not with the language of Vedic texts, and the word *marut* is used in the latter.

upasamkhyānam atra na likhitam marucchabdasya bhāṣāyāṃ prayogādarśanāt.

The addition [of *marut*] is not written here, because the word *marut* is not used in the *bhāṣā*.

As is clearly seen from the passages examined above, Viśvarūpa’s opinion seldom differs from that of Jinendrabuddhi and if it does, the difference is mostly a minute one. In two cases, the discrepancy between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā* is due to the fact that Viśvarūpa follows Puruṣottamadeva’s explanation or, as in the last example, that he comments on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. The ideas found in two other passages are given also in Sṛṣṭidhara’s *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*, but it does not necessarily mean that Viśvarūpa drew from Sṛṣṭidhara (see II.6.5.6 for more details). Thus, there are four passages left which could possibly contain some original ideas of Viśvarūpa.

II.6.6.2 Opinions which are not found anywhere

Having examined the examples of disagreement between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā*, we are now going to take up those passages from the *Pañjikā* which contain ideas not

found in any other treatise mentioned in II.6.4-5. Before we do that, one more point about the principles used for selecting these passages should be made. The requirement was that the chosen examples should express some new idea but at the same time that idea should not be commonplace or so obvious that this fact might have been the reason why no one else has regarded it as worth mentioning. Needless to say, this last criterion can turn out to be a weak point in the following analysis, because, naturally, the decision whether something is obvious or not is very subjective.⁴⁰⁶ However, I think, this is the only way to proceed if we do not want to cope with a great amount of evidence which in the end proves nothing.

As in II.6.6.1, the ensuing passages are numbered and quoted in the order they appear in the *Pañjikā*.

1) At the beginning of the *Pañjikā*, Viśvarūpa explains the compound *śabdānuśāsana* as follows.

śabdānuśāsanam iti kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛtīti (P.2.3.65) karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī. prathamataḥ prādisamāsaṃ kṛtvā tataḥ kṛdyogalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhī samasyata iti samāsaḥ. karmaṇi ceti (P.2.2.14) pratiśedho 'tra na pravartate. yatra sāmartyaprāptam ubhayor upādānam asti tatrobhayaprāptau karmanīty (P.2.3.66) aṣṭhī ṣaṣṭhyāḥ samāse 'yaṃ pratiśedhaḥ kartari ceti (P.2.2.16) punaḥpratiśedhāt karmaṇi ceti (P.2.2.14) cakārasyāvadhāraṇārthatvāc ca. śeṣalakṣaṇayā vā ṣaṣṭhyā (cf. P.2.3.50) samāsaḥ. vistaras tu granthavistarabhayān na likhitaḥ. **śabdānuśāsanam** iti vyākaraṇa-śāstrasyedam anvarthaṃ nāma: śāstram ca śiṣyāñ śāsti viśiṣṭe viṣaye 'vasthāpayatīti kṛtvā. śabdāś ca kecit bherīdaṇḍādisaṃyogajāḥ kecit kaṇṭhataḥvādisaṃghaṭṭajāḥ. te 'pi kecit svarūpāḥ kecid varṇātmakāḥ kecid apabhraṃśasvabhāvāḥ kecid vācakā iti.

The genitive case in *śabdānuśāsana* expresses the object as taught in P.2.3.65 *kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛtī*. Firstly, the compound with [*anu* from the *gaṇa*] *prādi* is made, then the word in the genitive case characterised by the connection with the word ending in [the suffix] *kṛt* is compounded. Such is the compound [*śabdānuśāsana*]. The suspension [of compounding, as taught] in P.2.2.14 *karmaṇi ca*, does not take effect here. This suspension takes place where both (the agent and the object) could be employed, because they are both related in meaning, and where [consequently] the compound of the word in the genitive case [is prescribed] by P.2.3.66 *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi*. [This is known] from the renewed suspension [of compounding taught] in P.2.2.16 *kartari ca* and because the word *ca* means 'limitation'.⁴⁰⁷ Alternatively, [*śabdānuśāsana*] is a compound with the word in the genitive case characterised by [the word] *śeṣa* [as described in P.2.3.50 *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe* ('In remaining cases the genitive suffix [is added]')]. The detailed description is not written here, because we are afraid of making this treatise too extensive. The word *śabdānuśāsana* is a meaningful name of the science of grammar (i.e. a name which is given according to the sense of its constituent parts), since [*anuśāsana* is that

⁴⁰⁶ In the present analysis, I have adopted a cautious attitude and, consequently, I might have included here too many passages rather than too few.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. *Kāś.* on P.2.1.48: *cakāro 'vadhāraṇārthaḥ*.

which] teaches pupils the science and establishes them in a particular field. Moreover, some sounds are born out of the contact with a kettle-drum, with a stick etc., some are born out of the contact with the throat (i.e. soft palate or glottis),⁴⁰⁸ with the hard palate etc. Of those some represent only their own form, some have the nature of *varṇa*,⁴⁰⁹ some are by nature corrupted, some are expressive.

From this relatively long passage, only the parts which are underlined express new ideas. The whole text has been quoted here just for better understanding. Moreover, the first of the underlined pieces belongs, strictly speaking, rather to the previous subsection. Thus, in his explanation of the compound *śabdānuśāsana* as a genitive *tatpuruṣa* Viśvarūpa states that the genitive case of *śabda* occurs due to P.2.3.65 *karṭṛkarmanoh kṛti* ('[The genitive case suffix is added] after a stem expressing the agent or the direct object when they are connected in meaning with a verbal noun') or P.2.3.50 *śaṣṭhī śeṣe* ('In remaining cases the genitive suffix [is added]'). Furthermore, he rejects the objection that in the former case, compounding would be prohibited by P.2.2.14 *karmaṇi ca*, which teaches that compounding of a word ending in the genitive case suffix which expresses the direct object does not take place. He points out that by P.2.2.14 only the genitive case which is formed by P.2.3.66 *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* can be negated, i.e. when both the agent and the direct object are present in a sentence and consequently, by P.2.3.66 only a word expressing the latter takes the form of the genitive. So far, his explanation corresponds to that of the *Nyāsa*. However, Viśvarūpa adds two more arguments: the suspension of compounding prescribed in P.2.2.16 *karṭari ca* ('And [a word ending in the genitive suffix is not compounded with a word ending in the suffix *trc* or *aka*] when the latter expresses the agent') and the notion of 'limitation' conveyed by *ca*. Then, he says that *śabdānuśāsana* qualifies the science of grammar and he explains it as *śāstraṃ ca śiṣyāñ śāsti viśiṣṭe viṣaye 'vasthāpayati*. In contrast to this, Jinendrabuddhi renders *anuśāsana* as *anuśiṣyante saṃskriyante vyutpādyante 'nena śabdā ity anuśāsanam*. This difference is neither very important nor worth mentioning. However, what is interesting is how Viśvarūpa characterises *śabda*. Jinendrabuddhi, following the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Kāśikā*, mentions two kinds of words, *laukika* and *vaidika*. Viśvarūpa takes *śabda* in the meaning of 'a sound unit' and divides it into articulate and inarticulate sounds. Then, four categories of the latter ones are mentioned, these being *svarūpa*, *varṇātmaka*, *apabhraṃśasvabhāva* and *vācaka*.

2) In P.1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* Pāṇini teaches that when *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* are explicitly prescribed by a rule, they replace the vowels *ī*, *ū*, *ṛ* or *ḷ*. In the *Pañjikā* on this rule Viśvarūpa examines the need of a word *guṇa* in the *sūtra* and concludes:

⁴⁰⁸ About the terms *kaṇṭha* and *kaṇṭhya*, see Allen (1953: 33, 52).

⁴⁰⁹ For details on *svarūpa* and *varṇātmaka*, see p. II.5.6.5.

tasmād guṇaṃ prati mandadhiyāṃ sukhapratipattaye kṛtam idam. vṛddhiṃ prati tu kartavyam eva.

Therefore, as far as the *guṇa* is concerned, this [rule] is stated to make the understanding easier for those who are slow-witted. But this [rule] should indeed be formulated for the sake of *vṛddhi*.

Jinendrabuddhi follows the *Kāśikā* and states that *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* are mentioned in the *sūtra* in order to indicate that if these terms are used in a rule to express substitutes, the substitution takes place only of the vowels \tilde{i} , \tilde{u} , \tilde{r} or l . He does not consider the possibility that *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* could be omitted in P.1.1.3. This is done in the *Padamañjarī*, but Haradatta's conclusion is in accord with the *Kāśikā* and the *Nyāsa*: he maintains that both *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* should be mentioned in P.1.1.3.

3) Rule P.1.2.1 *gāṅkuṭādibhyo 'ñṇin nit* teaches that suffixes which are devoid of markers \tilde{n} and η and which are added to the root *gāñ* or to *kuṭādi* are treated as having the marker \tilde{n} . Viśvarūpa begins his commentary on P.1.2.1 with the question concerning the compound *kuṭādi*. It is usually understood as denoting the list 'kuṭ etc.'. However, in that case, according to sandhi rules, the expected form would be **kuḍādi*. Viśvarūpa proposes two explanations for this apparently incorrect form.

jaśtvaṃ (cf. P.8.2.39) *na kṛtaṃ sūtre kuḍa bālyā ity (Dhp. 6.89) asya dhātoḥ śaṅkānivṛttaye kuṭa ity akāra uccāraṇārtho vā.*

In the *sūtra*, the substitution by the voiced unaspirated plosive (*jaś*) does not take place, so that the doubt whether the root *kuḍ* is here understood could be removed or because *kuṭa* [and not *kuṭ*] is used here and the marker *a* is for the sake of pronunciation.

Notes

The substitution of t (in *kuṭ*) by d is prescribed in P.8.2.39 *jhalāṃ jaśo 'nte* ('At the end [of a *pada*] all consonants with the exception of *y*, *v*, *r*, *l* and nasals are replaced by a corresponding voiced unaspirated plosive').

The same problem is treated in the *Padamañjarī*, but the answer given by Haradatta is slightly different.

kuṭa ādir yeṣāṃ iti bahuvrīhāv antarvartinyā vibhaktyā padatve 'pi jaśtvaṃ na bhavati, anakriyamāṇarūpavināśaprasaṅgāt. atha vā – 'kuṭa kauṭilye' iti dhātupāṭhe yo 'kāras tena saha sānubandhānukaraṇaṃ draṣṭavyam.

When [*kuṭādi*] is interpreted as the *bahuvrīhi* compound which is resolved as *kuṭa ādir yeṣāṃ*, then the case suffix is present in the middle [of this compound] and, therefore, although [*kuṭ*] is a *pada*, the substitution by the voiced unaspirated plosive does not take place. [And this is so,] because [in this case] it is possible to remove [the application of] a similar form [such as *kuḍ*]. Or, the resemblance to the word with the marker *a*, [which appears] in *Dhp. 6.73 (kuṭa kauṭilye)*, should be understood here.

Then, Viśvarūpa explains the second option, namely, that in the rule under discussion, the root *kuṭ* is used with the marker *a*.

sthānivadbhāvo 'pi nāsti pūrvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivad iti (PP 112). ekādeśasyādivadbhāvān (cf. P.6.1.85) na jaśtvam akārasyoccāraṇasāmarthyāt.

And because of [the *paribhāṣā*] ‘When [an operation] prescribed in the last three *pādas* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is about to take place, [the rule about] the original form does not apply’, [the single substitute of *a* of *kuṭa* and of *ā* of *ādi*] is not treated as the original. [Moreover,] the substitution by the voiced unaspirated plosive, [which could apply] since the single substitute [*ā* of *a* and *ā*] is treated as the beginning [of *ādi*], does not take place, because the utterance of the vowel *a* [in *kuṭa*] must have some purpose.

Notes

Still, if we assume that not *kuṭ* but *kuṭa* is understood in the *sūtra*, the substitution by the voiced unaspirated plosive could take place. Namely, rule P.6.1.85 *antādivac ca* teaches that a single substitute is considered as the final of the preceding item or as the initial of the following item. Thus, the substitute *ā*, which replaces *a* of *kuṭa* and *ā* of *ādi*, can be treated as the beginning of *ādi*, in which case rule P.8.2.39 could still apply. Viśvarūpa gives two reasons why this is not possible: *paribhāṣā PP 112* and the fact that the marker *a* has to have some purpose.

Later in the commentary on this *sūtra*, Viśvarūpa writes:

gā ān kuṭa ādir ṇyantaḥ ku kavargo vā ṭādisābdena ṭakārāder dhātor ity eṣāṃ grahaṇaṃ na syād avayavaprasiddheḥ samudāyaprasiddhir baltīyasīti (PP 101, NP 98) nyāyāt.

The following should not be understood here: *gā*, *ān*, *kuṭa*, *ādir*, *ṇyantaḥ* (‘ending in *ṇi*’) or *ku* meaning velar consonants, or by the word *ṭādi*, a root beginning with a consonant *ṭ*. [This is so,] because of the maxim ‘The meaning [obtained from] the whole is stronger than that [obtained from] the part’.

4) As taught in P.1.2.2 *viḥa it*, a suffix which takes the augment *iṭ* and is added to the root *viḥ* is treated as having the marker *ṇi*. In the *Pañjikā* on this rule, Viśvarūpa discusses two problems which are ignored by other grammarians. Firstly, he explains why in the *sūtra* under discussion the verb *viḥ* belonging to the sixth class is understood.

oviḥ bhayacalanayor ity (Dhp. 6.9) asya taudādikasya grahaṇaṃ kuṭādisāhacaryād vyāpter nyāyāc ca. na tu settvād viḥir pṛthagbhāva ity (Dhp. 3.12) asyāpi krādiniyamād it (cf. P.7.2.13, 35) vivejitheti sambhavāt.

Because of the maxim about [taking] the comprehensive sense [instead of the restricted one] and because it is mentioned in the neighbourhood of ‘*kuṭ* etc.’, the root *oviḥ* belonging to the sixth class and used to express fear or movement is understood here. And, since [the verb mentioned in P.1.2.2] has to take [the augment] *iṭ*, [the root] *viḥir* used to express separateness is not [meant in P.1.2.2], because it has [the augment] *iṭ* [only] due to the negation concerning *kr* and other [roots mentioned in P.7.2.13] and because, consequently, *vivejitha* is possible.

Notes

The root in the *sūtra* is mentioned without any marker. Therefore, because of the maxim about taking the comprehensive sense instead of the restricted one, it would be possible to understand the roots *ovij̄* and *vij̄r* here. There are some reasons why only the first root is meant in P.1.2.2. Firstly, the fact that this rule follows P.1.2.1, where roots ‘*kuṭ* etc.’ belonging to the sixth class are mentioned, indicates that the root *vij* belongs also to the sixth class and this is the case with *ovij̄* and not with *vij̄r*, which is enumerated in the third class. Secondly, the root *vij* should belong to so-called *seṭ* roots, after which *ārdhadhātuka* suffixes beginning with a consonant other than *y* take the augment *iṭ*. However, suffixes added to the root *vij̄r* generally do not take this augment. Thirdly, because the form *vivejitha* from *vij̄r* is possible, this root cannot be meant in P.1.2.2. Now, how is *vivejitha* possible if *vij̄r* is an *aṇiṭ* root? The answer is given in rule P.7.2.13 *kṛsr̥bhṛvṛstudrusruśruvo liṭi*, which teaches that after *kṛ*, *sṛ*, *bhṛ*, *vṛ*, *stu*, *dru*, *sru* and *śru*, the personal suffixes of the perfect do not get the augment *iṭ*. Because all these roots with the exception of *vṛ* are *aṇiṭ*, and the suffixes of the perfect attached to them would not take the augment *iṭ* even when this rule were not stated, this *sūtra* indicates that the suffixes of the perfect do not get the augment *iṭ* only if they are added to these roots. If they are attached to some other roots, they take (under certain conditions, as prescribed in P.7.2.35) the augment *iṭ*. Therefore, the suffix *thal* added to the root *vij̄r* takes the augment *iṭ*. Furthermore, the vowel of *vij̄r* is replaced by the *guṇa*, as taught in P.7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*. Were *vij̄r* meant in P.1.2.2, the suffix *thal* would be treated as having the marker *ṛi* and the *guṇa* would be prohibited by P.1.1.5.

Secondly, he comments on the example *udvejitā* given by Puruṣottamadeva.

añṇidgrahaṇānuvṛtteḥ pañcamyā vipariṇāmāt ṇyantānām bhādīnām upasaṃkhyānāt paribhāṣā anityā jñāpakasiddham na sarvatrety (PP 118, NP 116) anena vā ity ata āha ṇyantād.

[The *paribhāṣā* ‘*prakṛtigrahaṇe ṇyadhikasyāpi grahaṇam*’ does not apply], because *añṇiṭ* is present here by *anuvṛtti* and it is transformed, so that it takes the ablative case suffix, or because of the addition concerning the roots *bhā* etc. ending in the causative *ṇi* (cf. P.8.4.34), or because of [the maxims] ‘A *paribhāṣā* is not always applicable’ or ‘What is obtained by a *jñāpaka* does not apply everywhere’. Therefore, he says: ‘because it ends in *ṇi*’, [the word *udvejitā* is correct].

Notes

The form *udvejitā* seems to be incorrect. The suffix *ṭr* has the augment *iṭ* and it is added to *ovij̄* with the preverb *ud*, but it is obviously not treated as having the marker *ṛi*. The explanation given by Puruṣottamadeva is that not *vij* alone but the causative of *vij* is understood here. However, Viśvarūpa quotes (in the preceding passage) the maxim *prakṛtigrahaṇe ṇyadhikasyāpi grahaṇam*, teaching that the same operations apply to the causative as to the non-causative stem. Then, he gives four different reasons why this *paribhāṣā* should not apply here.

The first part of his explanation is similar to the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, but Viśvarūpa adds the possibility of applying the two maxims quoted above.

5) In P.1.2.12 *uś ca* Pāṇini teaches that the suffixes of the benedictive and potential and the suffix *siṭ* are treated as having the marker *k*, if they begin with a consonant

other than a nasal, *y*, *v*, *r* and *l* (*jhal*) and if they are followed by *ātmanepada* suffixes. In the *Pañjikā* on this rule Viśvarūpa proposes an improvement on the example *tīrṣīṣṭa nadīm* ('may [he] cross over the river') quoted by Puruṣottamadeva.

prāyeṇa pustakeṣu tīrṣīṣṭa nadīm iti paṭhyate. tac ca tarateḥ parasmaipaditvān na sambhavatīti stīrṣīṣṭa nadīm iti pāṭhaḥ.

[The phrase] *tīrṣīṣṭa nadīm* is generally mentioned in the manuscripts. But it is not correct, because *tī* always takes *parasmaipada*-suffixes. Therefore, the [correct] reading is *stīrṣīṣṭa nadīm* ('may [he] bestrew the river').

6) The next passage is taken from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.1 *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ*, which defines the term *dhātu* 'root' as that item which is enumerated in the list 'bhū etc.', i.e. in the *Dhātupāṭha*. In the commentary on this *sūtra*, Viśvarūpa rejects the possibility of treating *bhūvāde*, being a stage in the formation of *bhūvādayaḥ*, as *avyaya*.

bhūvādaya ity atra jasi ceti (P.7.3.109) *guṇe kṛta ejantatve 'vyayatvaṃ nāsti lākṣaṇikatvāt kṛnmejanta ity* (P.1.1.39) *atrāntagrahaṇasyaupadeśikārthatvād aupadeśikapṛāyogikasya paribhāṣayā* (cf. *PP* 4, *NP* 120.2) *vā. ayādeśe kartavye* (cf. P.6.1.78) *'siddhaparibhāṣā* (cf. *PP* 41, *NP* 50) *nāsti nājānantarya iti* (cf. *PP* 42, *NP* 51) *niśedhāt*.

In the formation of *bhūvādayaḥ*, when *guṇa* has been substituted by P.7.3.109 *jasi ca*, [the form *bhūvāde*] ending in [*e*] belonging to the *pratyāhāra ec* does not become an *avyaya*, either because [*bhūvādayaḥ*] is stated in the [present] *sūtra* or because [the word] *anta* from P.1.1.39 *kṛnmejantaḥ* is employed here and by *paribhāṣā PP* 4 it has the meaning of a grammatical element. When the substitution by *ay* should be done, *paribhāṣā* 41 [teaching that the operation regarded as a *bahiraṅga* is invalid] does not take place, as it is prohibited by *PP* 42 ('When [an *antaraṅga* operation which should take effect] depends on the proximity of a vowel, [the rule about a *bahiraṅga* operation] is suspended').

Notes

The suffix *jas* of the nominative plural is added to the compound *bhūvādi*: *bhūvādi + jas* → *bhūvādi + as*. Rule P.7.3.109 *jasi ca* teaches that the final short vowel of a nominal stem is replaced by a corresponding *guṇa* when *jas* follows. Thus, we have *bhūvāde + as*. Now, the question arises whether *bhūvāde* is an *avyaya*. It is namely taught in P.1.1.39 *kṛnmejantaḥ* that nominal stems ending in a suffix *kṛt* which has the consonant *m* or the vowels *e*, *o*, *ai* or *au* as its final are called *avyaya*. Were *bhūvāde* an *avyaya*, the case suffix *jas* would be elided after it. However, this possibility is rejected by Viśvarūpa and he gives two reasons for that. Firstly, the very fact that Pāṇini uses the word *bhūvādayaḥ* indicates that **bhūvāde* is not an *avyaya*. Secondly, *PP* 4 *aupadeśikapṛāyogikayor aupadeśikasyaiva grahaṇam* teaches that when both, a grammatical element or an element of usage, could be understood, only a grammatical element is meant. In the case of P.1.1.39, which prescribes the name *avyaya* to what ends in *ec* (*e*, *o*, *ai* or *au*), it means that stems which are termed *avyaya* should end in *ec* not as a result of some operations, but because they are so enunciated in the grammar. This is not the case with **bhūvāde*. Let us also note that Viśvarūpa's argumentation is, to put it politely, slightly artificial. The form **bhūvāde* does

not end with a *kṛt* suffix, so the question whether it is an *avyaya* or not does not actually arise.

The next step in the derivation of *bhūvādayaḥ* is the substitution of *e* by *ay*, as taught in P.6.1.78 *eco 'yavāyāvaḥ*. Now, according to Viśvarūpa this substitution is an *antaraṅga* with regard to the substitution by *guṇa* prescribed by P.7.3.109. Consequently, by *PP* 41 (*asiddham bahiraṅgam antaraṅge*) the *guṇa* substitution is treated as *asiddha* when P.6.1.78 is about to apply. This is, however, not the case because of *PP* 42 (*nājānantarye bahiraṅgaprakṛptiḥ*). Thus, we obtain the form: *bhūvādayas* → *bhūvādayaru* (P.8.2.66) → *bhūvādayaḥ* (P.8.3.15).

- 7) In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.2 *upadeśe 'j anunāsika it*, Viśvarūpa discusses the etymology of the technical term *it*, which denotes a ‘marker’ and is defined in this rule.

id itīṅdhātoḥ kartari kvip (cf. P.3.2.178): *eti gacchati palāyata ity anvarthasamjñā-vijñānaṃ kṛtvā tasya lopa ity* (P.1.3.9) *anena na pratyākhyāyate. prastutasthānād apagame sthānāntare 'pi prayogaḥ sambhāvyate.*

In the case of *it*, the [suffix] *kvip* is added to the root *iṅ* to express the notion of the agent. Thus, having the meaning of ‘it goes, moves, vanishes’, [*it*] is recognized as a self explanatory term, but is not repudiated by P.1.3.9 *tasya lopaḥ* (‘Elision of this [*it*]’). [After all,] when it vanishes from one place under discussion, it could still be used in another.

- 8) In the following passage from the *Pañjikā* on P.1.3.5 *ādir nītuḍavaḥ* (‘The initial *nī*, *tu* and *ḍu* are *it*’), the necessity of the marker *i* of *nī* is accounted for.

ikāravato nīśabdopādānaṃ medyatīty atra kartrabhiprāya ātmanepadābhāvārthaṃ (cf. P.1.3.72) *kṛñāder vartamāne ktasya* (cf. P.3.2.187) *nivṛttyarthaṃ ca.*

The usage of the sound unit *nī*, including the phone *i*, is for the sake of the absence of an *ātmanepada* suffix, when [the action] is intended for its agent, as in the case of *medyati*, and for the sake of forbidding the [affixing of] *кта* expressing the sense of the present time after roots *kṛñ* etc.

Notes

The root *mid* (*nīmidā snehane*) belongs to the first and the fourth class (*Dhp.* 1.779; 4.133). As the root of the fourth class, it has a marker *ā* with an *udātta* accent and, therefore, takes *parasmaipada* suffixes. Now, were by the present rule only *nī* and not *nī* called *it*, the root *mid* would not be *nīt* but *nīit*. In that case, by P.1.3.72 *svaritanītaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* it would take *ātmanepada* suffixes, when the fruit of the action were intended for its agent. This is, however, not desirable, because only the form *medyati*, with the *guṇa* prescribed by P.7.3.82 *nider guṇaḥ*, is correct.

Furthermore, rule P.3.2.187 *nītaḥ ktaḥ* teaches that the roots marked with *nī* take the suffix *кта* denoting the present time. Suppose P.1.3.5 teaches that only the initial *nī* is a marker and, consequently, P.3.2.187 read *nītaḥ ktaḥ* (‘roots marked with *nī* take the suffix *кта* [to denote the present time]’), then the suffix *кта* added to *kṛñ* etc. would express the meaning of the present time.

- 9) Rule P.1.3.12 *anudāttaṅgita ātmanepadam* prescribes the addition of *ātmanepada* suffixes after roots marked with the vowel with the *anudātta* accent or with *nī*. In

the *Pañjikā* on this *sūtra*, Viśvarūpa discusses three problems. At first, the example *śāyayati* is explained. Afterwards, the question whether the *yathāsamkhyā* principle should apply here is dealt with. Then, the possibility of resolving the compound *anudāttanīt* so that *it* combines only with *ñ* is rejected.

śāyayatīty atra tu nivṛttānubandhatārabdhaḥ samudāya iti na bhavaty ātmanepadam. anudāttanītas tañānābhyāṃ yathāsamkhyāṃ nāsty asvaritatvāt. ihed iti pratyekam sambandhaḥ. anyathā hy abhīṣṭe 'sandehārtham nīdanudāttebhya iti kuryāt.

In the case of *śāyayati*, however, because of the [maxim] ‘The combination is based on the state deprived of any marker’ the *ātmanepada* suffix is not added. [The rule about] the respective order (P.1.3.10), according to which personal suffixes belonging to the *pratyāhāra tañ* would come after verbs having as a marker a vowel with the *anudātta* accent and the suffixes *āna* (cf. P.1.4.100) would be added after roots with *ñ* as a marker, does not take effect, since the *svarita* [accent] is lacking [here]. [Moreover], in this *sūtra*, the [word] *it* is separately connected [with *anudātta* and *ñ*]. Otherwise, when it had been desired [that it is connected only with *ñ*, the Teacher] would have formulated this rule as: ‘*nīdanudāttebhyaḥ*’, so that no doubt arises.

Notes

In the example *śāyayati* the suffix *yañ* of the frequentative is added to *śī*. The question is whether the marker *ñ* of *yañ* marks also the combination of *śī* and *yañ*. Viśvarūpa rejects this possibility and quotes the maxim, which supports his view. Consequently, the *parasmaipada* suffix in *śāyayati* is correct.

As taught in P.1.4.100 *tañānāv ātmanepadam*, the suffixes included in the *pratyāhāra tañ* and suffixes *āna* are called *ātmanepada*. Thus, the term *ātmanepada* denotes two kinds of suffixes and the question arises whether rule P.1.3.10 *yathāsamkhyāṃ anudeśaḥ samānām* applies in the interpretation of P.1.3.12. If this were the case, P.1.3.12 would mean that the suffixes *tañ* should be added to roots marked with a vowel with the *anudātta* accent, and the suffixes *āna*, to roots marked with *ñ*. However, as Viśvarūpa argues, the application of P.1.3.10 is not possible here, because of the lack of the accent *svarita*. The opinion that rules in whose interpretation P.1.3.10 is to be employed are marked with the accent *svarita* is already found in the *Kāśikā* on P.1.3.10: *iha kasmān na bhavati – ‘veśoyaśa-āder bhagād yal’* (P.4.4.131) ‘*kha ca*’ (P.4.4.132) *iti? svaritena liṅgena yathāsamkhyāṃ. yatra neṣyate tatra svaritatvaṃ na pratijñāyate. ‘svaritenādhikāraḥ’* (P.1.3.11) *iti svaritagrahaṇaṃ pūrveṇāpi sambadhyate*. For the functions of *svarita* as described in the *Mahābhāṣya*, see Cardona (1968).

The last problem taken up by Viśvarūpa concerns the interpretation of the compound *anudāttanīt*. Should *it* be connected with *anudātta* and *ñ* or only with *ñ*? The latter possibility would decisively change the meaning of the *sūtra*, which would thus teach that *ātmanepada* suffixes should be added to roots having the accent *anudātta* (but not necessarily the marker vowel with the accent *anudātta*) or being marked with *ñ*. This suggestion is also rejected by Viśvarūpa. Had Pāṇini desired such a meaning of the *sūtra*, he would have formulated it *nīdanudāttebhya ātmanepadam*. Consequently, as stated by Viśvarūpa, the present wording of the rule indicates that *it* should be connected with *anudātta* and with *ñ*.

10) Rule P.1.3.16 *itaretarānyonyopapadāc ca* prescribes the addition of *ātmanepada* suffixes after roots with *itaretara* or *anyonya* as an *upapada*. In the commentary on P.1.3.16, Viśvarūpa investigates the possibility of rephrasing the *sūtra*.

itaretarārthopapadād ity ukte yady api parasparopapadāc ceti vaktavyaṃ na jāyate tathāpi na kṛtaṃ mithopapadān mā bhūd ity evamartham.

In case [the present rule] were formulated as *itaretarārthopapadāt* ('after verbs with an *upapada* having the meaning of *itaretara*'), even if [*vārttika* 1 ad loc.] 'and after verbs which have *paraspara* as an *upapada*' would not have to be stated, yet this (i.e. the new wording of the *sūtra*) is not done for the sake of blocking the application [of the rule under discussion] to [verbs] which have *mithas* as an *upapada*.

11) P.1.3.35 *akarmakāc ca* teaches that *ātmanepada* suffixes are added to *kṛ* with the preverb *vi* when this verb is used intransitively. In the *Pañjikā* ad loc., Viśvarūpa states that the present *sūtra* points out the fact that transitive roots can be also employed without their direct objects.

karoter akarmakād iti viśeṣaṇaṃ jñāpayati: sakarmakasyāpi dhātoḥ karmāvivaḥṣāyāṃ kvacid akarmakatvam.

In [the present rule, which is to be understood as] 'after *kṛ* which has no direct object', the attribute [of *kṛ*, which is a transitive verb,] reveals that in some cases, when the direct object is not wished to be expressed, even transitive roots are treated as having no direct object.

12) Rule P.1.3.63 *āmpratyayavat kṛṅo 'nuprayogasya* lays down the rule for the usage of *ātmanepada* suffixes in the periphrastic perfect. They are added to *kṛṅ* used as an auxiliary verb, if a root which is to be put in the periphrastic perfect and to which the suffix *ām* is added takes *ātmanepada* suffixes. In the *Pañjikā* on this rule Viśvarūpa explains the quotation *vādayāṃ cakrire dhakkāḥ* ('Big drums were played'), which comes from the *Bhṛṅgikāvya*. In this example, the verb *kṛ* has the *ātmanepada* suffix *irec*, although the root *vad* takes *parasmaipada* suffixes. This seems to go against the *sūtra* under discussion.

kartarīty (cf. P.1.3.14) anuvṛtṭyā kartari niyamād bhāvakarmanos tu bhavaty evātmanepadaṃ vādayāṃ cakrire dhakkā iti (Bhṛṅg. 14.3a).

However, since the restriction [taught in this rule] takes effect [only] when the agent is to be expressed, [which is known] because *kartari* [from P.1.3.14] is present [here] by *anuvṛtṭi*, an *ātmanepada* suffix is in fact added when the state or the direct object is to be expressed, as in the case of *vādayāṃ cakrire dhakkāḥ*.

13) Rule P.1.3.67 *ṇer aṇau yat karma ṇau cet sa kartānādhyāne* teaches the addition of *ātmanepada* suffixes after a root with the causal suffix *ṇi*, provided, firstly, that the direct object of the verb without the causal suffix becomes the agent of the verb with

the causal suffix, and secondly, that the root does not mean remembering with regret. In the *Pañjikā* on this *sūtra*, Viśvarūpa holds the view that *ṇeh* is used only for the sake of subsequent rules.´

anau yat karma tasya nau kartṛtve vijñāyamāne pratyāsattyā ṇyantād ātmanepadaṃ bhaviṣyati. tasmāṇ ṇer iti spaṣṭārtham uttarārtham ca. pratyudāharaṇaprapañcas tu śreṣṭhavr̥ttāv anusandheyah.

That which functions as the direct object of [a verb] without [the suffix] *ṇic*, this becomes the agent when [the suffix] *ṇic* is added. When this is recognized, because of the immediate proximity [of *ṇic*], an *ātmanepada* suffix will be added after that which ends in *ṇic*. Therefore, [in the *sūtra*, the word] *ṇeh* is used for the sake of clarity and for the sake of subsequent rules. Further explanation of counterexamples should be given in the in the excellent commentary (i.e. in the *Kāśikā*).

14) In the commentary on P.1.3.79 *anuparābhyām kṛñah* (‘[*Parasmaipada* suffixes are added] to *kṛñ* with the preverb *anu* or *parā*’), Viśvarūpa explains how we know that *parasmaipada* suffixes should be added to *kṛ* with *anu* or *parā* when the fruit of the action goes to the agent or when *kṛ* has one of the meanings enumerated in P.1.3.32.

etac ca gandhanādisūtrād anantaram nānuparābhyām iti vaktavye 'tra karaṇād avasīyate.

And this is known because of making this [prescription] here, although [the rule] *nānuparābhyām* (‘and not after *anu* and *parā*’) could be stated immediately after the *sūtra* with *gandhana* etc. (i.e. after P.1.3.32).

Notes

Rule P.1.3.72 *svaritañitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale* prescribes the addition of *ātmanepada* suffixes when the fruit of the action performed by the agent goes to him. Moreover, the root *kṛ* takes *ātmanepada* suffixes if it is used in one of senses enumerated in P.1.3.32 *gandhanāvakṣepaṇasevanasāhasikyapratiyatnaprakathanopayogeṣu*. The present *sūtra* applies also in the domain of these two rules; namely, *parasmaipada* suffixes are added to *anukṛ* or *parākṛ* even when the fruit of the action goes to the agent, or when these verbs express one of the meanings enumerated in P.1.3.32. This statement is not new, it is also found in the *Kāśikā*. What is new in the *Pañjikā* are the grounds which Viśvarūpa gives. He says that Pāṇini could have formulated this rule as *nānuparābhyām* and have put it directly after P.1.3.32. In that case it would teach an exception to P.1.3.32 only. The fact that this rule is taught after P.1.3.72 indicates that it makes an exception to these both rules.

15) As prescribed in P.1.4.1 *ā kaḍārād ekā samjñā*, each linguistic item taught up to *kaḍāra* has only one technical name. The *Pañjikā* on this rule includes two ideas which could possibly constitute the original contribution of Viśvarūpa. Firstly, Viśvarūpa explains why in the rule under discussion *ekā samjñā* is not a compound. Secondly, the question how it is known that the scope of this *sūtra* extends to P.2.2.38 *kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraye* (‘In a *karmadhāraya* compound the words “*kaḍāra* etc.” [are put first]’)

and not to P.2.1.3 *prāk kaḍārāt samāsaḥ* ('Up to *kaḍāra*, i.e. P.2.2.38, compounds [are taught]') is taken up. This is treated also in the *Padamañjarī*, but the reason given there is slightly different. While Viśvarūpa uses *vyāptinyāya* in his argumentation, Haradatta regards the fact that P.2.2.38 is independent (*svātantryāt*) and P.2.1.3 depends on it as decisive. Let us now have a closer look at the text of the *Pañjikā*.

samāse saty uttarapadārthaprādhānyād ekāśabdasyāprādhānyam syād viśeṣaṇatvāt. vyāpter nyāyāt prādhānyāt samāsavidhau (cf. P.2.1.3) *saṃjñāsamāveśārthapragādi-grahaṇāc ca kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraya ity* (P.2.2.38) *avadhiḥ. na tu prāk kaḍārāt samāsa ity* (P.2.1.3) *ata āha kadārāḥ karmadhāraya ityādi.*

If [*ekā saṃjñā*] were a compound, then because of the predominance of the meaning of the latter element [of the compound], the word *ekā* would not be predominate, because it is a qualifier. Because of the maxim about taking a comprehensive sense [instead of a restricted one] and because of the predominance [of P.2.2.38] and because in the section treating compounds, *prāk* etc. (i.e. *prāk kaḍārāt* in P.2.1.3) is used for the sake of giving the term [*samāsa*]; [it is rule] P.2.2.38 *kaḍārāḥ karmadhāraye* [which marks] the limit [of the *adhikāra* P.1.4.1 and] not, however, P.2.1.3 *prāk kaḍārāt samāsaḥ*. Therefore, he quotes P.2.2.38.

16) Rule P.1.4.3 *yū stryākhyau nadī* teaches that *ī* and *ū* (or what ends in them) final in stems expressing something feminine are called *nadī*. In the *Pañjikā* on this rule, the idea of drawing *vā* from P.1.3.90 *vā kyaṣaḥ* to interpret P.1.4.6 *ñiti hrasvaś ca* seems to be new.

yady evaṃ ñiti hrasvaś cety (P.1.4.6) *anena suśriye sudhiye subhruve sudhenave viprāyeti katham nāvayavāśrayā nadīsaṃjñā ucyate? vā kyaṣa ity* (P.1.3.90) *ato vāgrahaṇam maṇḍūkaplutinyāyenānuvartate. sā ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā.*

When it is so (i.e. that the term *nadī* depends on the domain of the sense of feminine [*strī*], which resides in parts of words), why is it said [in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*] that by P.1.4.6 *ñiti hrasvaś ca*, in [the case of] *suśriye sudhiye subhruve sudhenave viprāya*, the term *nadī* does not reside in parts of words? [It is so, because] due to the maxim about the jump of a frog, the word *vā* from P.1.3.90 *vā kyaṣaḥ* is present here by *anuvṛtti*. And this (i.e. the name *nadī* taught in P.1.4.6) is an irregular option (*vyavasthitavibhāṣā*).

17) In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.14 *suptiñantaṃ padam* ('What ends in a case or personal suffix is called *pada*'), Viśvarūpa accounts for the lack of the augment *ñut* in *suptiñanta*.

Notes

As taught in rule P.8.3.32 *ñamo hrasvād aci ñamuṇ nityam*, after a word ending in *ñ*, *ṇ* or *n* preceded by a short vowel, the same nasal consonant is always added at the beginning of the next *pada*, if it begins with a vowel. The *pratyāhāra ñam* comprises the consonants *ñ*, *ṇ* and *n* and consequently *ñamuṇ* used in the *sūtra* means the augments *ñut*, *ṇut* and *nut*. The word *suptiñanta* from P.1.4.14 is a compound and consequently, its elements (*sup*, *tiñ* and *anta*) are *padas*. Thus, in accordance with P.8.3.32 the augment *ñut* should be attached to *anta*, in which case the *sūtra* would have been phrased as **suptiññantaṃ padam*.

Pañj. on P.1.4.14:

sūtranirdeśād āgamānityatvād (cf. *PP* 84, *NP* 93.2) *vā na namo hrasvād iti* (cf. P.8.3.32) *ñuṭ*.

[In the present rule the augment] *ñuṭ* is not [added] in accordance with P.8.3.32, because [*tiñanta*] is stated in the *sūtra* or because augments are not always to be added.

18) In P.1.4.21 *bahuṣu bahuvacanam* Pāṇini teaches the addition of plural suffixes when multiplicity is to be expressed. Accordingly, when two or one element are meant, dual and singular suffixes are respectively added. This is prescribed in P.1.4.22 *dvyekayor dvivacanaikavacane*. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.21 Viśvarūpa expresses the opinion that rules P.1.4.21-22 are unnecessary.

bahuvacanaikavacanadvivacanānām anvarthakatvena bahūni dve ekaṃ vaktītyādi niruktyā siddhau sūtradvayam idaṃ mandabuddhigrhītaphalaṃ vaicitryārtham vā.

The terms *bahuvacana*, *ekavacana* and *dvivacana* are meaningful (i.e. they are used according to their sense). Thus, [the examples such as] *bahūni dve ekaṃ vakti* and others are obtained by etymological interpretation [of *bahuvacana* etc.] and, consequently, these two *sūtras* are stated so that the slow-witted can understand them or they are for the sake of variety.

19) In the opinion of Viśvarūpa, rule P.1.4.27 *vāraṇārthānām īpsitaḥ*, which teaches that in case of verbs meaning obstructing this what is desired by the agent is called *apādāna*, is redundant.

baudhāpādānena pūrveṇa siddhe prapañcārtham idaṃ.

Since [an item wished, used with verbs expressing restraining, can be regarded as] a mental *apādāna*, [and as such its state of being an *apādāna*] is obtained by the preceding *sūtra* (i.e. P.1.4.24), this [rule, i.e. P.1.4.27] is [only] for the further explanation.

20) In P.1.4.49 *kartur īpsitatamaṃ karma* Pāṇini defines the direct object (*karman*) as that which is mostly intended by the action of the agent. In P.1.4.50 *tathā yuktaṃ cānīpsitam* the notion of *karman* is extended on that which is similarly connected with the agent but not desired by him. In the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.50, Viśvarūpa proposes putting rules P.1.4.49-50 together and rewording them as *kartuḥ kriyayā vyāpyamānaṃ karma*.

kartuḥ kriyayā vyāpyamānaṃ karmeti siddhau sūtradvayam idaṃ prapañcārtham.

These two rules are [stated only] for further elucidation, because [their sense could be] accomplished, if [the previous rule were formulated as] *kartuḥ kriyayā*

vyāpyamānam karma ('The direct object is that which the agent reaches by his action').⁴¹⁰

In conclusion, let us make a few remarks about the passages we have just examined. Firstly, they are mostly not very long. Secondly, although they treat different topics, we can distinguish at least three characteristic types. In the first one, Viśvarūpa negates the necessity of the *sūtra* in question. In the second one, he elucidates some details of this rule or considers some changes in its wording. In the third one, he explains examples which are taken either from the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* or from some literary work. And finally, let us once again stress the fact that the list of passages given above should not be understood to be a presentation of ideas which form an original contribution of Viśvarūpa. Some of them might in fact stem from Viśvarūpa, but it is very unlikely that this holds good for all of them.

II.6.7 Evaluation of the content of the *Pañjikā*

The most visible trait of the *Pañjikā* is its shortness. Viśvarūpa's treatise is neither very long, e.g. it is much shorter than Sṛṣṭidhara's commentary, nor very detailed. One might get the impression that it has been designed to help its readers to study the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* within the shortest possible time-span. However, if we take a closer look at it, we can see that it is not always simple or easily understandable. Viśvarūpa does not skip all the tiny or difficult details. He mentions them, but most frequently he does not explain them thoroughly. In other words, he often outlines the argumentation given in other works, without going into lengthy discussion. Consequently, the reader of the *Pañjikā* who is not very well acquainted with Pāṇini's grammar needs some kind of additional help to understand and appreciate this commentary, and this help might be given either by a teacher or by other grammatical treatises they can consult. As far as the second point is concerned, we have seen that in most cases, the work which could supply us with pieces of information which are unclear or altogether lacking in the *Pañjikā* is Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, which in the Bengali tradition of the Pāṇinian grammar practically took the position of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Other sources of Viśvarūpa's inspiration seem to be Puruṣottamadeva's *Kāraṅcakāra* and, most probably, also his *Jñāpakasamuccaya*. Thus, we come to another important trait of the *Pañjikā*. Namely, as has been shown above, Viśvarūpa incorporated in his commentary not only ideas but also wording found in the works of his predecessors. Cases of

⁴¹⁰ Likewise, Haradatta discusses the possibility of rephrasing P.1.4.49 in order to compress the desired text into one rule. His propositions are: *kriyāphalayogī karma* and *parasamavetakriyāphalayogī karma*. However, after close examination, both these formulations turn out to be unsatisfactory. Cf. *Pad.* on P.1.4.50.

similarity, especially between the *Nyāsa* and the *Pañjikā*, are so frequent and obvious that we can safely exclude the possibility that their presence is only coincidental. However, although such a writing ‘technique’ is highly unusual and condemned in western tradition, it is not exceptional in India. For example, let me remind you of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita and his *Siddhāntakaumudī*, whose wording is in places very much like that of Rāmacandra’s *Prakriyākaumudī*, although Bhaṭṭojī strongly criticises Rāmacandra.⁴¹¹ Consequently, the fact that Viśvarūpa incorporates the text of the *Nyāsa* (and other works) in the *Pañjikā* does not have to imply that the *Pañjikā* is just a kind of summary of other grammatical treatises or that it is uninteresting and completely devoid of any new idea. Therefore, it cannot be at all surprising that we have found quite a lot of passages in the *Pañjikā* which contain new issues. However, on closer inspection, these ‘new topics’ seldom turn out to concern major problems. They deal rather with details, give new explanation of some examples or add some arguments to the ones used in the *Nyāsa*. And last but not least, we must not forget that the list of passages in II.6.6 is not to be understood as Viśvarūpa’s unique contribution, because it still cannot be excluded that Viśvarūpa borrowed from treatises which for some reason have not been consulted in the present analysis.

Thus, bearing all this in mind, it is very difficult to evaluate the content of the *Pañjikā*. Certainly, the *Pañjikā* is not a very elaborate or sophisticated commentary. On the other hand, it is also unlikely, although not altogether improbable, that it does not contribute anything new to the grammatical tradition in India. However, how big or how important Viśvarūpa’s contribution really was is a question which cannot be answered here.

II.7 Evaluation of the *Pañjikā*

This final chapter deals with two main issues. At first, a short summary of what has been said so far about the *Pañjikā* will be given. Then, we approach the question concerning possible reasons for which the *Pañjikā* did not become popular in Bengal (and, in general, in India).

Before we take up these tasks, let me make one important remark. As the observant reader will no doubt notice, in the following recapitulation I try to avoid using such expressions as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ when speaking about the *Pañjikā*. Albeit these adjectives are mostly associated with the process of evaluation, they are in fact subjective, whereas my endeavour is to employ terms which are as objective as possible.

⁴¹¹ K.P. Trivedi (1925-31: vol. I, xxxiii-xxxiv).

Bearing this in mind, we can now turn to the first issue and recall the most important traits of the *Pañjikā*. The first one which could be mentioned here is the fact that the basic form, as well as the structure of a commentary on a single *sūtra* found in the *Pañjikā* are very typical for this kind of treatise. Secondly, the vocabulary of the *Pañjikā* seems not to differ much from other grammatical works. Thirdly, its sentences are predominantly nominal, with a predilection for the locative absolute and abstract nouns. Regarding this point, we notice that such sentences are characteristic for late (sub-)commentaries, but they are already present in the *Nyāsa*.⁴¹² Fourthly, while the form of the *Pañjikā* is relatively easy to evaluate and it hardly stands out from that of other grammatical treatises, it is much more difficult to state anything definite about its content. Similarity between the *Pañjikā* and the *Nyāsa* does not necessarily deprive Viśvarūpa's commentary of any innovative element and unless we can consult all the works Viśvarūpa might have known, our statements about the degree of the *Pañjikā*'s originality will be partly speculative. Still, one thing is sure. The *Pañjikā* is, on the one hand, far from being outstanding but on the other hand, we cannot say where on the scale from 'mediocrity' to 'secondary' it is to be put.

Now, we come to the most exciting part, i.e. to the question why the *Pañjikā* has never been popular in Bengal. What we have said so far shows that although the *Pañjikā* is not a work of genius, in which case it would perhaps have had greater chance of winning a wide audience (I am of course aware that brilliant works can also be ignored by society), there is nothing in it that could sufficiently explain its failure to become widely studied. Thus, if it is not due to the *Pañjikā*, what other reasons could have come into play?

In my opinion, there are some possible explanations. Firstly, we cannot exclude that as several times happened in the history of grammatical literature, the *Pañjikā*'s unpopularity might have been caused by Sṛṣṭidhara's *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*, which is much more informative and eloquent than the *Pañjikā*. After all, Sṛṣṭidhara's commentary was still being studied in Bengal in the 19th century. Secondly, and I think that this point is far more important than the first one, the time when Viśvarūpa wrote his treatise and the period after that were very unpropitious for the study of Sanskrit grammar. With the Muslim invasion of Bengal, Hindu scholarship lost the support of a royal court, which most probably made the profession of a Sanskrit teacher financially unattractive. We can imagine that this process was accompanied by the deprecation of the social status of pundits; after all, this dependence of social status and the average

⁴¹² To compare, in the *Mahābhāṣya* verbal sentences are quite frequent and also much shorter than those of later (sub-)commentaries. On the other hand, short commentaries, such as the *Kāśikā* and the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, tend towards short sentences, but the process of nominality is much more advanced in them than it is in the *Mahābhāṣya*.

income associated with a profession can be observed even today. The consequence of that was the diminishing interest in the study of Sanskrit grammar. In addition, the old tendency to find an easy and short method of learning Sanskrit, whose product was also the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, resulted in the growing popularity of non-Pāṇinian systems. This is also the third factor which could have contributed to the lack of popularity of the *Pañjikā*. Admittedly, at the time of the *Pañjikā*'s composition the Pāṇinian school of Sanskrit grammar prevailed in Bengal, but this period soon came to an end and systems such as the Kātantra and that of the *Mugdhabodha* flourished.

To sum up, in such circumstances it was difficult for any grammatical work belonging to Pāṇini's school of Sanskrit grammar to win a wider audience, to say nothing of a work which, like the *Pañjikā*, is typical for the late scholastic period, when grammatical discussions ceased to be vivid and of interest to more than a few students.

Appendix A

Variant readings of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*

	Text of the <i>Bhāṣāvṛtti</i> as given in Chakravarti (1918)	Variant reading in the <i>Pañjikā</i>
on P.1.1.4:	guṇavṛddhiśabdenānabhi- dhānāt	guṇavṛddhiśabdenāvidhānāt
on P.1.1.9:	ḷvarṇo dīrgho nāsti	ḷvarṇasya dīrgho nāsti
on P.1.1.12:	amū āsāte	amū ānaya
on P.1.1.25:	kati paśya	kati paśyāmi
on P.1.1.38:	tataḥ	yataḥ
on P.1.1.38:	tatra	yatra
on P.1.1.51:	raparo bhūtvā prasajati	raparo bhūtvā prasajjate
on P.1.1.63:	lukṣlulupśabdair lupte	lukṣlulupśabdair lupte pratyaye
on P.1.1.65:	upāntyo varṇa upadhā	upānto varṇa upadhā
on P.1.1.65:	śiṣṭaḥ	śiṣṭam
on P.1.1.69:	khaṭvīsyāt	khaṭvībhavati
on P.1.1.71:	ādir varṇaḥ	ādivarṇaḥ
on P.1.2.13:	ṛvarṇāntāt	ṛkārāntāt
on P.1.2.26:	dyutamudādeḥ	dyutādīḥ
on P.1.2.26:	didyutiṣate didyotiṣate	vididyotiṣate vididyutiṣate
on P.1.2.45:	kāṇḍe kuṇḍe	kāṇḍe kuḍye
on P.1.2.48:	bahuśreyasī rājā kulaṃ vā	bahupreyasī rājā kulaṃ vā
on P.1.2.49:	pañcaśaṣkuliḥ	pañcaśaṣkulaḥ
on P.1.2.54:	yogasya sambandhasyā- nupalabdheḥ	yogasya sambandhasyā- pratīteḥ
on P.1.3.16:	vyatilunanti	lunanti
on P.1.3.88:	āsayati vipram	āsayati mitram
on P.1.4.21:	suptiṅām aviśeṣeṇa vidhānād	suptiṅām aviśeṣavidhānād
on P.1.4.42:	kriyāsiddhau prakṛṣṭopakārakam	kriyāsiddhau prakṛṣṭam kārakam
on P.1.4.54:	vipreṇa pacyate	pacyate vipreṇa

on P.1.4.78:	prādhvaṅkr̥tya kuṭumbaṃ sthitaḥ	prādhvaṅkr̥tya kuṭumbaṃ gataḥ
on P.1.4.91:	yad atra mām abhiṣyāt	yan mām abhiṣyāt
on P.1.4.93:	kuto 'dhy āgacchati	kuto 'dhy āgataḥ
on P.1.4.106:	manye payaḥ pāsyasi	manye pāsyasi

Appendix B

Examples which are absent in the *Kāśīkā* and in the *Nyāsa*

B.1 Examples found in other works of Puruṣottama:

a1) in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, but in some other place than in the *Pañjikā*:

- *gleyāt* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.7, *Bhv.* on P.6.4.68;
- *vāñmayam* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.8, *Bhv.* on P.8.4.45;
- *stauti* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.61, *Bhv.* on P.7.3.89;
- *cikṛṣuḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.69, *Bhv.* on P.3.2.168;
- *madhyaḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.69, *Bhv.* on P.4.3.9;
- *jāgrtaḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.2.5, *Bhv.* on P.7.3.85 (also in *Pad.* on P.1.2.5);
- *stāt* – *Pañj.* P.1.4.2, *Bhv.* on P.7.1.35 (also in *PP* 39-40);
- *dhīpsati* – *Pañj.* P.1.4.11, *Bhv.* on P.1.2.10;

a2) in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*:

- *atisarvāya* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.29, *Jñ.S.* p. 57;
- *pratāmau, pratāmaḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.39, *Jñ.S.* p. 58 (also in *Pad.* on P.1.2.5)
- *agrahīt* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.56, *Jñ.S.* p. 59;
- *adita, adhita* – *Pañj.* on P.1.1.56, *Jñ.S.* p. 62;
- *edhiṣyate* – *Pañj.* on P.1.3.12, *Jñ.S.* p. 63 (also in *PP* 53);
- *lohinīyate* – *Pañj.* on P.1.3.90, *Jñ.S.* p. 124;

a3) in the *Kārakacakra*:

- *apasarato meṣād apasarati meṣaḥ, meṣāv apasarataḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.24, *Kāraka* p. 111;
- *ākāśe śakunayaḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.45, *Kāraka* p. 116 has: *khe tiṣṭhanti śakunayaḥ*;
- *āsīś chinatti* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.54, *Kāraka* p. 109;

B.2 Examples found in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* of Śaraṇadeva

- *prakṛpyamānaḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.1.9;
- *lekhanī masiprasūḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.2.1;
- *vaiyākaraṇaḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.1.57 (also in *PP* 34);
- *puṣṭiḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.3.3;
- *śīñjadvalayasubhagaiḥ* – *Pañj.* 1.3.12
- *śāstrāṇy upāyaṃsate* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.3.56;
- *bhindhaki* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.2, *Durghaṭa* on P.6.4.101 (also in *PP* 39-40 and in *Pad.* on P.1.4.2);
- *mañjuśriyāṃ śastari* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.3;
- *vimānanā subhru kutaḥ pitur gṛhaḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.4 (also in *Pad.* on P.1.4.4);
- *sakhinā vānarendreṇa* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.7;
- *patinā nīyamānāyāḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.8;
- *bhettā* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.11;
- *nuvati* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* on P.1.4.13;
- *tvāṃ prati kruddho nṛpaḥ* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.37, *Durghaṭa* ad loc. has *tāṃ* instead of *tvāṃ*;
- *apuṣat* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.99, *Durghaṭa* on P.3.4.46 has *apuṣat svapoṣam*;
- *paramatvaṃ yāsi* – *Pañj.* on P.1.4.105, *Durghaṭa* ad loc. has *paramatvaṃ paṭhasi* (*Pad.* ad loc. has *paramatvaṃ pacasi*);
- *tvadbhavati* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* ad loc.;
- *bhavān yāti* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* ad loc. (*Pad.* ad loc. has: *bhavān pacatu*);
- *tvattaro yāsi* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* ad loc. (*Pad.* ad loc. has: *tvattaro pacasi*);
- *tvatkalpo yāsi* – *Pañj.* and *Durghaṭa* ad loc. (*Pad.* ad loc. has: *tvatkalpo pacasi*);
- *tvatkalpo yāti* – *Pañj.* ad loc., *Durghaṭa* ad loc. has: *tvatkalpo devadatto yāti*;

B.3 Examples found in the *Padamañjarī*

- *upasarajah* – *Pañj.* and *Pad.* on P.1.1.3;
- *yāyāvarah*, *dedyah*, *jaṅgamah* – *Pañj.* and *Pad.* on P.1.1.4;
- *piṭhāṅṣi brāhmaṇakulāni* – *Pañj.* and *Pad.* on P.1.1.6;
- *godau nāma hradau* – *Pañj.* and *Pad.* on P.1.1.38;
- *likhanam* – *Pañj.* on P.1.2.1, *Pad.* ad loc. has *likhitum*, *likhiṣyate*;
- *jāgrtaḥ* – *Pañj.* and *Pad.* on P.1.2.5;
- *bobhava* – *Pañj.* and *Pad.* on P.1.2.6;
- *aghāniṣātām* – *Pañj.* on P.1.2.14, *Pad.* ad loc. has *ghāniṣīṣṭa*.

For examples not found in any other text, see II.6.3.

Appendix C

Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*

oṃ namo mahādevāya.

oṃ namaḥ paradevatāyai.

atha mahābhāṣyaṃ likhyate.

*yas tyaktvā rūpam ādyaṃ prabhavati jagato 'nekadhānugrahāya
prakṣīṇakleśarāśir viśamaviśadharo 'nekavaktraḥ subhogī |
sarvaññānaprasūtir bhujagaparikarāḥ prītaye yasya nityaṃ
devo 'hīśaḥ sa vo 'vyāt sitavimalatanur yogado yogayuktaḥ ||*

*phaṇibhāṣye 'tra durghatvaṃ kajjateṇa prakāśitam |
śrutapālasya rāddhāntaḥ kuṇḍalī(lyāṃ?) kuṇḍalāyate ||*

*trikam etat samākhyānaṃ māheśvaraniyojananam |
śaṅkaras tu sudurbuddhiḥ sāgaram tartum icchati ||*

*tathāpi sadvajrasamutkīrṇabhāṣyamaṇau bāṣpachedyajaranmṛṇālatantugatāgatasaho-
daro 'stu śaṅkarasya buddhivāni(ṇi?)jyam iti |*

*samā(khyāta)ś ca puruṣottamadevaḥ parisamāptasakalakriyākālāpaḥ kuṇḍalīvyākhyāne
baddhaparikarāḥ pratijānīte |*

*kuṇḍalīsaptake ye 'rthā durbodhyāḥ phaṇibhāṣitāḥ |
te sarve pratipādyante sādhuśabdena bhāṣayā ||*

yadi duṣprayogaśālī syāṃ phaṇibhakṣyo bhavāmy aham ||

*atha bhāṣyavṛttivyācikyāsurddevo vighnanāśāya sadācārapariprāptam iṣṭadevatānati-
svarūpaṃ maṅgalam ācacāra | tat padyaṃ yathā |*

*namo budhāya buddhāya yathātrimunilakṣaṇam |
vidhīyate prāṇapaṇā bhāṣāyāṃ laghuvṛttikā || iti deva –*

[D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 120)]

Appendix D

Two passages from the *Kāraṅgacakra*

1) corresponding to the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.42

*karaṇaprayojanalakṣaṇaḥ karṭṛvyāpāraḥ iti karaṇavyavahitaḥ kartā kriyāsiddhau
vyāpriyate. karaṇam punar avyavadhānena kriyāṃ nirvartayatīti avyavadhānena
kriyānirvartakatvāt atīśayatvaṃ karaṇasya. tad uktaṃ*

*kriyāyāḥ pariniṣpattir yad vyāpārād anantaram |
vivakṣyate yadā tatra karaṇatvaṃ tadā smṛtam ||*

*evaṃ sata eva prakarṣasya vivakṣā, na asata ity uktaṃ bhavati. avyavadhānena
kriyānirvartakatvasya vidyamānatvāt. nanu yadi karaṇavyavahitaḥ kartā kriyāyāṃ
vyāpriyate tadā katham asya kartuḥ prādhānyam. ucyate. tadadhīnapravṛttitvāt
karaṇasya, nāsty eva hi tat karaṇam, yat kartradhiṣṭhānaṃ nāpekṣate. ataḥ parāyatta-
pravṛttitvāt karaṇam apradhānam. kartā hi tannirapekṣaḥ svasāmarthyenaiva pra-
vartata iti prādhānyam. dhātūktakriyatvāc ca kartuḥ prādhānyam, na hi karaṇakriyā-
dhātunābhidhīyate. yadā tv abhidhīyate tadā karaṇam api kartā bhavati. yathā sādhu
asiś chinatti. tad uktaṃ maṇḍanamīśreṇa*

*karaṇam nāma sarvatra karṭṛvyāpāragocaraḥ |
tirodadhāti kartāraṃ prādhānyam tannibandhanam ||.*

[D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 109)].

2) corresponding to the *Pañjikā* on P.1.4.49:

*nanu katham karma kārakam. kārakam hi kriyānimittam bhavati. iha ca kriyāsādhyam
karma. tat katham tatsādhyam karma tasyāḥ sādhanam bhavitum arhati. tad uktaṃ*

*nirvartyam kārakam naiva kriyā tasya hi sadhikā |
vikāryam api bhāvena virodhān naiva kārakam ||*

*prāpyatvāt pūrvikāvasthā na sā karma budhair matā |
prāpyāvasthā kriyāsādhyā sādhyatvāt sādhanam na hi ||*

*anayoḥ ślokeyor ayam arthaḥ. yad asat utpadyate tan nirvartyam karma. tasya ca
kriyākṛta evātmalābhaḥ iti pūrvam tasyāsattvam. asataś ca katham kārakatvam. atho-
cyate – kriyāto labdhātmasattvam paścāt kriyāntaram prati kārakam bhaviṣyati. tathā
coktaṃ*

*ātmalābhe hi bhāvānāṃ kārakāpekṣitā bhavet |
labdhātmanāṃ svakāryeṣu pravṛttiḥ svayam eva hi ||*

*visadr̥śo 'yam upanyāsaḥ. yatra hi kāraṇāntarād udpadya tena kāryāntaraṃ kimapi
kriyate tatredam ucyate. yatra tu tasyā evātmānaṃ labdhvā tasyā eva kārakam
iti tatra ekaviśayatvād ayuktam. tathāhir kriyādhīnaṃ karma karmādhīnā ca
kriyā. karmābhāve kriyā nāstīti dvayor apy abhāvaḥ. anyonyāśrayatvañ ca karma
kriyām apekṣate kriyāpi karmeti. vikārya prāpyayor api vikāryatāprāpyatārūpayoḥ
kriyāsādhyatvāt sādhanatvaṃ na sambhavati. tad evaṃ trividhe 'pi karmaṇi
kārakatvam anupapannam. atrocyate. kartuḥ kriyayā yad āptum utpādayitum
vikārayitum prāptum vā iṣṭatamaṃ tat karmeti trividhe 'pi karmaṇi svagato vyāpāro
'stīti tadapekṣayā karmaṇaḥ kārakatvam aviruddham. tathāhi yat tāvad utpadyate
tasyotpattikriyāyāṃ kartṛbhūtasya karmabhāvaḥ. taduktaṃ –*

*svavyāpāre ca kartṛtvaṃ sarvatraivāsti kārake |
vyāpārabhedāpekṣāyāṃ karaṇatvādisambhavaḥ ||*

*evaṃ kaṭam karotīty asyāyam arthaḥ – kaṭam utpadyamānam utpādayatīty arthaḥ.
tathā cuktam.*

*karoti kriyamāṇena na kaścit karmaṇā vinā |
bhavaty arthasya yaḥ kartā karoteḥ karma jāyate ||*

*nirvartyādīṣu yat pūrvam anubhūya svatantratām |
kartrantarāṇāṃ vyāpāre karma sampadyate punaḥ ||*

*kaṭo bhavaty utpadyate bhavater utpattivacanatvāt. kaṭam karoti kaṭam utpadyamānam
utpādayatīty arthaḥ. tena bhavaty arthasya kartuḥ karmatā. yady ayaṃ kaṭo 'nutpatti-
dharmā bhavet tadā devadattas taṃ kartum na śaknuyāt.*

[D. Ch. Bhattacharya (1946: 105-8)].

Index

- Amarakośa*, 10, 20, 29, 30, 32, 33, 41, 43, 44, 49, 51, 55, 60
- Amaraṭīkāsarvasva*, see *Ṭīkāsarvasva*
- Anunyāsa*, 5, 10, 24, 27, 29–31, 34, 40, 41, 48, 51, 54–56, 59, 60, 124, 147, 170–172
- Anunyāsakāra, 27–29, 31, 40, 41, 170, 171
- Anupadakāra, 34, 41
- Āpīśali, 6, 10, 34, 35
- Āryāsaptaśatī*, 33
- Aṣṭadhātu*, 52
- Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 6, 8, 10, 17, 24, 30, 32, 39, 41, 51, 85, 88, 124, 182
- Aśvaghōṣa, 52
- Avalokopādhyāya, 41
- Bālākrīdā*, 80
- Bhāgavṛtti*, 17, 18, 20–26, 30, 34, 39–41, 51, 54–56, 78, 124, 126, 172
- Bhāgavṛttikāra, 17, 18, 20–25, 37
- Bhāgavṛttikṛt, 19, 20, 22–26, 41, 114, 126
- Bhāguri, 41
- Bhāmaha, 12–17
- Bhāravi, 6, 9, 25
- Bhartṛhari, 18–23, 26, 34, 39, 41, 42, 134
- Bhāṣāvṛtti*, 1, 4, 6, 17, 18, 24, 25, 33, 38–41, 44–49, 51, 59, 60, 75–81, 85, 86, 88, 89, 113–116, 118, 119, 124, 126, 128, 131, 132, 146, 148, 167, 168, 178, 189, 191, 193–195, 197
- Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*, 20, 40, 48, 60, 167, 168, 174, 175, 178, 193
- Bhāṣya*, see *Mahābhāṣya*
- Bhāṣyakāra, see Patañjali
- Bhāṣyakṛt, see Patañjali
- Bhāṣyavyākhyāprapañca*, 30, 43
- Bhaṭṭikāvya*, 23, 25, 26, 52, 55, 59, 75, 86, 88, 114, 118, 187
- Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita, 32, 192
- Bhāvanāviveka*, 114
- Bodhinyāsa*, 13
- Bhojadeva, 37
- Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*, 21, 27, 30, 31, 36, 40, 53, 54, 59, 171
- Candra, 7, 35, 39, 55
- Cāndravṛtti*, 7
- Cāndravvyākaraṇa*, 7, 22
- Chandomakhānta*, 38, 51
- Cullibhaṭṭi, 34
- Cūlibhaṭṭi, 10
- Daiva*, 26, 57
- Dāmodarasena, 35
- Daṇḍin, 14
- Daśabalakārikā*, 38, 43, 45, 46
- Devanandin Pūjyapāda, 13
- Dhātupāṭha*, 7, 32, 35, 56, 184
- Dhātupradīpa*, 33–37, 56, 125
- Dhātupradīpaṭīkā*, 35, 56
- Diñnāga, 11

- Durgasiṃha, 18, 59
Durghaṭavṛtti of Maitreyaraksita, 36, 51, 156, 172
Durghaṭavṛtti of Puruṣottamadeva, 38, 43, 44, 51, 156, 172
Durghaṭavṛtti of Śaraṇadeva, 5, 19, 22–25, 29–31, 35, 41, 44, 48, 49, 51–53, 75, 77, 78, 82, 89, 114, 116–118, 125, 126, 128, 141, 142, 145, 146, 149, 150, 153–156, 167, 169–171, 183, 198
Dvirūpakośa, 38, 49
Ekākṣarakośa, 38, 49
Gadasiṃha, 23
Gajapati Puruṣottamadeva, 50
Gālava, 114
Gaṇavṛtti, 38, 44
Gītagovinda, 33, 52
Gopālārcanāvidhi, 38, 51
Govardhana, 32, 33, 55, 124
Goyīcandra, 17, 22, 25
Haradatta, 12, 16, 17, 25, 37, 117, 151, 152, 156, 158–167, 181, 189, 191
Hārāvalī, 38, 49
Harināmāmṛta, 85, 86
Hemacandra, 50
Indu, 18, 24, 28–31
Indumatī, 24, 30
Indumitra, 29, 30, 41, 42
Jayāditya, 5, 7–9, 17, 26, 35
Jinendrabuddhi, 4, 5, 7–17, 27, 67, 113, 119–121, 123–127, 129–131, 148, 154, 168, 172–174, 176–178, 180, 181, 191
Jīvagosvāmin, 85, 86
Jñāpakasamuccaya, 25, 30, 37, 38, 41, 53, 78, 116, 125, 126, 132, 135–141, 145, 175, 191, 197
Jumaranandin, 23, 42
Kaiyaṭa, 12, 15–17, 25, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41
Kalāpa, 35
Kalpapañcikā, 52
Kāmadhenu, 32, 52
Kārakacakra, 30, 38, 42, 43, 45, 78, 114, 116, 126, 132–135, 141, 142, 191, 197, 201
Kārakakārikā, 38, 45, 46
Kāraparīkṣā, 42
Kāśikā, 5–10, 14, 16–20, 26, 27, 29, 39–41, 54, 79, 80, 86, 114, 116, 117, 124–132, 134, 135, 138, 145, 156, 174, 180, 181, 186, 188, 193, 197
Kātantra, 22, 59, 85, 86, 194
Kātantrapariśiṣṭa, 22, 59
Kātantrapradīpa, 42, 43
Kātantraṭīkā, 59
Kātantravṛttipañcikā, 22
Kātyāyana, 6, 17, 100, 107, 114, 138, 142, 174
Kavīndravacanasamuccaya, 38, 50
Kāvyaḷaṅkāra, 12, 14
Keśavavṛtti, 39, 40
Kirātārjunīya, 6, 9, 23, 25
Kṛṣṇalīlāsuka, 26, 35, 57
Kṣapaṇaka, 34
Kṣemendranāyāsa, 13
Kṣīrasvāmin, 29, 35
Kṣīrataraṅginī, 35, 76
Kumārasambhava, 52, 55, 114, 169
Kuṇḍavāḍava, 10

- Kuṇḍalīvyākhyāna*, 38, 45, 46
- Mādhava, 54
- Mādhavīyā Dhātuvṛtti*, 13, 26, 27, 30, 35, 54, 57
- Māgha, 12, 14–17, 25
- Mahābhārata*, 6, 10, 39
- Mahābhāṣya*, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18, 20, 23, 36, 39–43, 45, 51, 53, 55, 56, 78, 114, 115, 124–127, 131, 138, 148, 163, 180, 186, 191, 193, 200
- Mahābhāṣyakāra, see Patañjali
- Mahābhāṣyapradīpa*, 15, 25, 34
- Maheśvara, 56
- Maitreya, see Maitreyarakṣita
- Maitreyarakṣita, 25, 27–29, 31, 33–38, 41, 48, 49, 51, 53–56, 76, 125, 148, 151, 154–156, 170–172
- Mallinātha, 11, 14, 15, 57
- Maṇḍanamīśra, 42
- Maṇikaṇṭha, 43
- Maṅkha, 57
- Maṅkhaṭīkā*, 57
- Manoramā*, 32
- Manusmṛti*, 10, 85
- Māthurī Vṛtti*, 39
- Medinī*, 57, 170
- Meghadūta*, 52, 114, 145, 146
- Mihira, 41
- Mugdhabodha*, 61, 85, 194
- Nairlurīvṛtti*, 41
- Nallūra, 10
- Nandana Bhaṭṭa, 50
- Nandana Nyāyavāgīśa, 34
- Nandanamīśra, 11, 58
- Naracandra, 18
- Narapati Mahāmīśra, 11, 58
- Nyāsa*, 4–16, 18, 25, 27, 28, 34, 35, 39–42, 48, 51, 53–56, 58, 59, 61, 67, 78, 80, 82, 85, 86, 89, 113–117, 119–132, 134, 135, 140, 141, 143, 145, 148–151, 153–156, 168, 172, 173, 175, 176, 178, 180, 181, 191–193, 197
- Nyāsakāra, 5, 13, 15, 16, 26, 114, 173, 177
- Nyāsakṛt, 28, 42, 114, 119, 152
- Nyāsaprakāśa*, 11, 58
- Nyāsoddīpana*, 11, 58
- Nyāsoddyota*, 11
- Padacandrikā*, 32, 56
- Padamañjarī*, 5, 7, 16, 25, 37, 113, 116, 124–126, 128, 149, 150, 156, 159, 162, 163, 165–167, 181, 189, 199
- Padaśeṣakāra, 34
- Padmanābhaddatta, 78
- Padyāvalī*, 38, 50, 53
- Pāṇini, 1, 3–6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 32, 34, 36, 39, 41, 46, 48, 51, 59, 61, 63, 66, 78–80, 82, 85–89, 95, 100, 114, 119, 121, 132, 144, 147, 159, 166, 167, 172–177, 180, 183, 184, 186, 188, 190, 191, 194
- Pañjikā*, 1, 4, 40, 63, 65–84, 87–90, 94–143, 145, 146, 148–151, 154–156, 159, 161–164, 166–180, 182, 184–195, 197, 201
- Paribhāṣāpāṭha* of Puruṣottamadeva, 40, 141
- Paribhāṣāvivarāṇa*, 54
- Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, anonymous commentary on the *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*, 54

- Paribhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva, 25, 30, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 116, 126, 132, 135, 140, 141
- Paribhāṣāvṛtti* of Sīradeva, see *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*
- Paribhāṣāvṛttisaṃgraha*, 54
- Paśupati, 42, 43
- Patañjali, 5–7, 10, 17, 35, 42, 51, 100, 114, 115, 125, 126, 142, 147
- Phakkikāvṛtti*, 40, 59
- Prabhā*, 59
- Prakriyākaumudī*, 24, 30, 192
- Prākṛtānuśāsana*, 38, 43, 45, 46
- Pramāṇasamuccaya*, 9, 11, 46
- Prāṇapaṇā*, 38, 43, 45
- Prāṇīpaṇita*, 43
- Prasāda*, 30
- Prasiddhapada*, 52
- Praudhamanoramā*, 32
- Prayogamukha*, 52
- Prayogaratnamālā*, 85, 86
- Puṇḍarīkākṣa Vidyāsāgara, 11, 42, 59, 78, 86, 87
- Puruṣakāra*, 26, 35, 57
- Puruṣottama, see Puruṣottamadeva
- Puruṣottama, a poet, 50
- Puruṣottama Bhaṭṭa, 51
- Puruṣottamadeva, 1, 17, 18, 25, 30, 31, 33, 37–51, 53–57, 75, 77–80, 82, 86, 88, 89, 114–116, 123, 126, 131–137, 139–141, 156, 157, 164, 172–175, 177, 178, 183, 184, 191
- Puruṣottamadeva, a poet, 50
- Puruṣottamadeva of Puri, 51
- Raghuṭīkā*, 39
- Raghuvamśa*, 52, 55, 114, 116
- Rakṣita, see Maitreyarakṣita
- Rāmabhadra Dikṣita, 54
- Rāmacandra, 192
- Ramānātha, 32
- Rāmāyaṇa*, 6, 10
- Rasavatī*, 23, 25, 42
- Ratnamālā*, see *Prayogaratnamālā*
- Ratnamati, 11
- Rāyamukuṭa, 32, 33, 56, 60
- Rūpa Gosvāmin, 50
- Rūpāvatāra*, 34, 35, 37, 41
- Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, 38, 50, 53
- Śākatāyananyāsa*, 13
- Samkṣiptasāra*, 22, 23, 85
- Sanātana Tarkācārya, 34, 40, 59
- Śaṅkara, 43, 45
- Śaraṇadeva, 5, 25, 29, 36, 41, 44, 48, 49, 51–53, 75, 77, 78, 82, 118, 141–144, 146–150, 154–156, 167, 169–171, 198
- Sarvānanda, 4, 30, 32, 33, 43, 44, 48, 57
- Sarvarakṣita, 52
- Sarvasva*, 35
- Śaśadhara, 41
- Ṣaṣṭhīdāsa Miśrācārya, 40
- Sāyaṇa, 13, 35, 54, 56, 57
- Siddhāntakaumudī*, 25, 56, 192
- Sīradeva, 21, 27–31, 36, 40, 41, 51, 53, 54, 59, 84, 116, 152, 171
- Śīśupālavadha*, 12, 14, 15, 25, 52, 57
- Śrīdhara, 26
- Śrīdharadāsa, 50
- Śrīkaṇṭha, 169, 171
- Śrīmānaśarman, 11, 54, 59, 60, 78
- Śrīpatidatta, 22
- Sṛṣṭidhara, 4–6, 20, 25, 26, 40, 47, 48, 60, 76–78, 80, 86, 113, 125, 167–

- 169, 174, 175, 178, 191, 193
 Śrutapāla, 39, 41, 45
Subhāṣitaratnakośa, 38, 50
 Subhūti, *see* Subhūticandra
 Subhūticandra, 32, 41, 44, 56, 60
Śuddhasubanta, 52
Supadmapañjikā, 78
Supadmavyākaraṇa, 78
Suvarṇarekhā, 52
 Śvobhūti, 10

Tantrapradīpa, 5, 11, 17, 18, 20, 25–
 27, 29, 31, 33–35, 37, 58–60, 78,
 125, 171, 172
Tantrapradīpāloka, 34
Tantrapradīpaprabhā, 34
Tantrapradīpoddīpana, 34
Tantrapradīpoddīyotana, 58
Tattvārthasaṃdīpanī, 40
Ṭkāsarvasva, 4, 30, 32, 33, 35, 43, 44,
 48, 49, 57
Trikāṇḍaśeṣa, 38, 46, 49–51
 Trilocanadāsa, 22

 Udayakara, 34
 Ujjvaladatta, 5, 30–32, 35–37, 44, 51,
 55–58, 84, 124
Uṇādisūtra, 32, 44, 55, 57
Uṇādivṛtti of Govardhana, 32, 33, 124
Uṇādivṛtti of Puruṣottamadeva, 38, 44
Uṇādivṛtti of Ujjvaladatta, 30–32, 55–
 57, 124
Upādhyāyasarvasva, 35, 40, 56

 Vābhaṭa, 18, 23
Vākyapadīya, 18, 23, 114, 134
 Vallabha, 14, 15
 Vāmana, 5, 7–9, 15–17, 19, 20, 35
Varṇābhīdhāna, 38, 49, 50
Varṇadeśanā, 38, 49, 56
 Vidyākara, 50
Vijayā, 54, 59, 60
 Vimalamati, 18, 22, 23
Viśālāmalavatī, 11
Viṣṇubhaktikalpalatā, 38
Viṣṇukalpalatā, 51
Viśvaparakāśa, 51, 56, 57, 114
 Viśvarūpa, 1, 2, 4, 40, 42, 63, 67–
 69, 71–83, 85, 87–90, 94–97,
 99, 102–108, 111–132, 134–150,
 154–162, 164, 166–169, 171–193
Viśvarūpanibandha, 80
 Viṭṭhala, 24
Vivaraṇī, 22
Vṛttipradīpa, 27
 Vyāḍi, 10, 114
Vyāḍīyaparibhāṣāvṛtti, 40
Yājñavalkyasmṛti, 80

