THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CREATING THE PERFECT LANGUAGE: SANSKRIT GRAMMARIANS, POETRY, AND THE

EXEGETICAL TRADITION

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH ASIAN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY

VICTOR BARTHOLOMEW D'AVELLA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MARCH 2018

Contents

Acknowledgments

I now have the enjoyable task of expressing my thanks to the many individuals who have helped me to reach this stage. First and foremost I thank my parents, Patricia and Victor J. D'Avella, for their love and tireless support in all my endeavors. My Godparents, Louise and Franco Marcantoni, were likewise always there to help out with their generous affection.

Many teachers have guided me throughout my education, and I feel it only fitting to acknowledge here the crucial role that my Latin teacher in high school, Anton Vishio, played in nurturing my fascination with classical languages. That initial spark is irreplaceable. For introducing me to the world of Sanskrit, from poetry to Pāṇini, and providing guidance throughout my graduate studies, I am most indebted to my *Doktorvater*, Gary Tubb, and can only hope that the present work will reflect a fraction of the learnedness and scholarly acumen he himself has imparted on me. I am similarly indebted to the numerous Sanskrit teachers I have had over the years and from whom I have learned so much: Jim Benson, Yigal Bronner, Whitney Cox, Csaba Dezső, Dominic Goodall, Harunaga Isaacson, Christopher Minkowski, Sheldon Pollock, David Shulman, Elizabeth Tucker, Somadeva Vasudeva, Vincenzo Vergiani, and Albrecht Wezler. Special mention, however, must be made of the two paṇḍits with whom I have had the cherished opportunity to study: H. V. Nagaraja Rao and S. L. P. Anjaneya Sharma. The latter, with whom I have been regularly reading for some years now, has offered countless hours of his time to aid me in all my questions about Sanskrit grammar and was always happy to take up any passage from the *Mahābhāṣya*, declaring that it would be as "terrible" as it was "beautiful." I have also had the great pleasure of reading Sanskrit and other Indian languages with many brilliant friends and

Abstract

In this dissertation I have attempted to document and analyze the interaction of three domains within Sanskrit literature: grammar, poetry, and their exegesis. Each of these played an important role in determining what correct Sanskrit was, although no final and long-lasting consensus was ever reached, and multiple varying opinions are represented in the corpus I have examined. Unlike in the European grammatical tradition, which emerged in Hellenistic Alexandria (3rd–2nd cent. BCE) with a focus on editing and explaining a relatively fixed body of (poetic) texts, the first extant and most important Sanskrit grammar, Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (*The Treatise in Eight Lessons*), predates the start of classical Sanskrit poetry (2nd–4th cent. CE) by some six centuries. Moreover, Pāṇini's grammar mainly sought to describe the idealized spoken language of an elite class of Brahmans, at least according to Patañjali (turn of the CE), an early and highly revered commentator on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Although classical Sanskrit poetry, broadly speaking, adheres to the linguistic standards given by Pāṇini, a number of apparently aberrant usages can be found, and later commentators on both grammatical as well as poetic texts sought to evaluate them, taking, in most cases, Pāṇini's grammar as the definitive linguistic authority. This may, from the Western vantage point, appear to be a fairly black-and-white process: if the grammar provides for a form, it is correct; if the grammar forbids a form, it is incorrect. In Sanskrit, however, there was much gray area because the exact interpretation of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, i.e., what it taught, was continually debated, and different exegetical standards came into, and fell out of, vogue over the centuries. The reason for this variability lies in the grammar's style of composition. Pāṇini gives some four thousand rules, by means of which one can derive correct forms from stems and suf-

fixes; the correct forms themselves are usually not specified. Already in the first grammatical commentaries, the exact meaning of the rules were disputed, and a complex system of interpretation developed, which included the discovery of "hidden hints" in Pāṇini's text. These, in turn, were to inform us of further metarules, which, in many cases, accounted for forms apparently neglected by Pāṇini but considered part of the target language. Consequently, when later commentators came to explain linguistic forms in poetry, they had to reach a number of interpretive decisions with several forks along the way, including even how to analyze a particular word, i.e., what its constituent parts are. The entire edifice of exegesis gains further stories when we take into account the non-Pāṇinian grammars and their accompanying commentarial literature.

To tackle this rather large body of literature spanning close to two millennia, I have focused on two works of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, "poetics," that deal with the topic of linguistic purity in poetry, Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* (*Ornamentation of Poetry*) and Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra* (*Aphorisms on the Ornamentation of Poetry*). In each work, we find a number of specific grammatical problems addressed, but in different ways and representative of different attitudes toward poets and the interpretation of Pāṇini's grammar. In preparation for studying the application of grammar to poetry, I have dedicated a chapter to the more general role of *śāstra*, roughly "science" or "knowledge system," in the earliest extant works on poetics so as to more precisely understand their nuanced and delimited domain with regard to poetic composition (ch. 2). In addition to a general overview of the chapters on linguistic purity (ch. 3 and ch. 5), I have presented two longer case studies, one from Bhāmaha's work (cf. 4) and one from Vāmana's (ch. 6), in which I trace the development of two remarks on poetic usage throughout the grammatical tradition and in a range of commentaries on poetry. In each instance, I have been able to demonstrate not only how long-lasting and varied these debates were, but also how the authorities on correct Sanskrit evolved over time.

My general findings point toward a much more vibrant and multifaceted exegetical tradition than has generally been assumed in secondary literature. Some commentators were driven by the traditional association of grammar with the Vedas and held the opinions of Patañjali as sacro-

sanct — a trend that gained momentum over time — whereas others felt free to turn to different grammars and interpretations of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* not supported by, or even in contradiction to, Patañjali. Furthermore, the non-Pāṇinian grammarians contributed more to the history of Sanskrit than has generally been assumed, and we must continue to read and publish new texts in order to obtain a more representative picture.

Preface

I adhere to the following conventions throughout the dissertation. Unless quoting sources that intentionally use Devanāgarī mixed with the Roman alphabet, I have transliterated all Sanskrit text (and Hindi) using the conventions of the International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration (IAST). In the bibliography, however, I have reproduced the romanized text given on the English title page when one is available. This often differs from the IAST. All non-English words appear in italics with the exception of "gūṇa," "sūtra," and "vṛddhi."[1] Individual Sanskrit words are generally cited in their stem form. Sanskrit roots are preceded by a radical sign (√). Sanskrit Grammatical terms from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and other grammatical texts often have *anubandha*s, "indicatory letters." These exist only within the grammatical system and are not pronounced in the standard language. I have indicated such letters with capitalization. For example, *Śnu* is the suffix *-nu* with the indicatory letter *Ś*.

All translations into English are my own unless otherwise stated. Translations of longer passages presented in indented blocks occur after the original text without quotation marks. In citing Sanskrit texts that are traditionally divided into sections such as *sarga*s, "cantos," verses, sūtras, etc., I have given a series of numbers separated by a period, beginning with the largest division and terminating with the smallest. For example, P. 1.1.10 indicates the tenth sūtra of the first *pāda*, "quarter," of the first *adhyāya*, "lesson," of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. A fourth number added to a sūtra of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* will refer to the *vārttika* on the relevant sūtra. When referencing Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, however, I follow the common convention of giving the volume (with a

---

[1]Nor "sandhi," for it has already entered the lexicon of English.

Roman numeral), page number, and line number according to the edition of Kielhorn. For example, MBh I.4.12 refers to the twelfth line of the fourth page of the first volume. When reference to a particular section of a verse is made, I indicate which quarter by adding "a" for the first, "b" for the second, and so forth. More generally, I have given references to primary sources using the abbreviations provided in the list on pp. xvff. In the main body of the thesis, however, I have used both the abbreviations and the full title of the texts for the sake of variation and to help the reader in recalling the full title of a work. Finally, references to Warder (1972–2011) will be given by "Warder" followed by an number indicating the volume. Page numbers are separated by a period, e.g., Warder 5.88. Similarly, Wackernagel's *Altindische Grammatik* will be referred to with the abbreviation followed the volume and page number, e.g., AiGr I.98.

Abbreviations

A	*Aṣṭādhyāyī*
ABORI	*Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*
AD	*A Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Apte
AiGr	*Altindische Grammatik*
AJP	*The American Journal of Philology*
AKKṣ	*Amarakośa* according to the commentary of Kṣīrasvāmin
AR	*Asiatic(k) Researches*
AS	*Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques*
AVŚ	*Atharvaveda* in the *Śaunaka* recension
BhK	*Bhaṭṭikāvya*
BhKA	*Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha
BhP	*Bhāgavatapurāṇa*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
CV	*Cāndravyākaraṇa*
DKC	*Daśakumāracarita*
DPh	*Dhātupāṭha*
DSG	*A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar* by Abhyankar and Shukla
DhvĀ	*Dhvanyāloka*
DurghV	*Durghaṭavṛtti*
GN	*Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologish-*

historische Klasse

GRM	*Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*
IA	*Indian Antiquary*
HEL	*Histoire Epistémologie Langage*
HV	*Haravijaya*
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
JIP	*Journal of Indian Philosophy*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*
JV	*Jainendravyākaraṇa*
JV(M)	*Jainendravyākaraṇa* according to the commentary *Mahāvṛtti*
JV(Ś)	*Jainendravyākaraṇa* according to the commentary *Śabdārṇavacandrikā*
JMS	*Mīmāṃsāsūtra*
JMSBh	*Bhāṣya* of Śabara on the JMS
KĀ	*Kāvyādarśa*
Kā	*Kātantra*
KāMī	*Kāvyamīmāṃsā*
KāPra	*Kāvyaprakāśa*
KAS	*Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra*
KASS	*Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha*
KirātA	*Kirātārjunīya*
KṣDPh	*Dhātupāṭha* according to Kṣīrasvāmin's *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*
KumS	*Kumārasambhava*
KV	*Kāśikāvṛtti*
KVNyāsa	*Nyāsa* (*Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā*)
KVPada	*Padamañjarī*
MahāBh	*Mahābhārata*
MBh	*Mahābhāṣya*

MBhPr	Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* on the *Mahābhāṣya*
MDPh	*Dhātupāṭha* according to Maitreyarakṣita's *Dhātupradīpa*
MeghD	*Meghadūta*
MW	*A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier Moneir-Williams
NaiC	*Naiṣadhīyacarita*
NCC	*New Catalogus Catalogorum*
NŚ	*Nāṭyaśāstra*
NS	*Nyāyasūtra*
NSBh	*Bhāṣya* of Vātsyāyana on NS
P.	sūtra of the A
PrauM	*Prauḍhamanoramā*
PrK	*Prakriyākaumudī*
PrKPras	*Prasāda*, commentary on the PrK
PrKPrak	*Prakāśa*, commentary on the PrK
PraS	*Pramāṇasamuccaya*
PrS	*Prakriyāsarvasva*
PŚ	*Paribhāṣenduśekhara*
PW	*Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* by Böhtlingk and Roth
RA	*Rūpāvatāra*
RaghuV	*Raghuvaṃśa*
Rām	*Rāmāyaṇa*
RKA	*Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Rudraṭa
RM	*Rūpamālā*
RV	*Ṛgveda Saṃhitā*
Sāk	*Śākuntala*
ŚaKau	*Śabdakaustubha*
SārV	*Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*

SāŚ	*Śabdānuśāsana* of Śākaṭāyana
SDhP	*Dhātupāṭha* occording to Sāyaṇa's *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti*
SHŚ	*Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*
SII	*Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*
ŚiśuP	*Śiśupālavadha*
SK	*Siddhāntakaumudī*
SKĀa	*Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*[*-alaṅkāraśāstra*]
SKĀv	*Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*[*-vyākaraṇa*]
ŚPra	*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*
SuRaKo	*Subhāṣitaratnakośa*
TGS	*Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit* by Renou
UṇS	*Uṇādisūtra*
UṇSUj	*Uṇādisūtra* with Ujjvaladatta's commentary
vārtt.	*vārttika* of Kātyāyana
VJ	*Vakroktijīvita*
RVBh	*Ṛgvedabhāṣya*
WZKS	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Südasiens*
ZII	*Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*

Chapter 1

Introduction

"Das Spiel war zunächst nichts weiter
als eine witzige Art von Gedächtnis-
und Kombinationsübung."[1]

—Hesse, *Das Glasperlenspiel*

1.1   Scope and Goals of the Dissertation

The core of this dissertation is an examination of how poetic language in Sanskrit is explained and regulated at the level of its grammar over the course of approximately one millennium, from the time of Bhāmaha (7th cent. CE) to Nāgeśa (17th cent. CE). The primary regulating force is the grammar of Pāṇini, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (*The Treatise in Eight Lessons*) together with its commentaries, above the *Mahābhāṣya* (*The Great Commentary*) of Patañjali, although many other schools of grammar existed along side and will be introduced below. Those who evaluated the poetic language against these prescriptive works are the commentators on poetry, authors of works on poetics, and the grammarians themselves. In addition to these theoretical discussions, I have also looked at how later poets continued or abandoned the linguistic habits of their predecessors that were subject to criticism. In short, this is a study of the interplay between theory and practice.

---

[1]"The game was, at first, nothing beyond a witty sort of étude for the memory and combinatorics." Hesse (2015: 30).

Since there are many poems and many commentaries, I have had to limit my study and attempted to do so by focusing on two works on poetics that deal specifically with this topic, Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* (*Ornamentation of Poetry*) and Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra* (*Aphorisms on the Ornamentation of Poetry*). The final chapter of each work bears the title *Śabdaśuddhi* or *Śabdaśodhana* (*Purification of Language*), and in them each author gives guidelines for good, i.e., grammatically correct, poetic usage. This seemed to be a good place to start. But, once again, further restriction was needed because it quickly became apparent that if I wanted to understand how these recommendations were received by later commentators, grammarians, and poets, a thorough treatment of even a single grammatical point could quickly mushroom to unmanageable proportions. To strike a balance, I have produced a general introduction to grammar and the other *śāstra*s in poetics (ch. 2) followed by two chapters dedicated to each work (ch. 3 and ch. 4 for Bhāmaha, ch. 5 and ch. 6 for Vāmana). The first of each pair (ch. 3 and ch. 5) will provide a general overview with a limited number of examples so that the reader may have a firm idea of the contents and the problems under discussion; in the latter two (ch. 4 and ch. 6), I will analyze one particular grammatical point in some detail so as to demonstrate how long-lasting and varied grammatical debates could become and the effects these debates had on later poetic usage.

In general, I take into consideration the commentaries on Sanskrit poems and grammatical texts, above all those in Pāṇinian tradition but also in several of the other grammatical schools as time and space allowed. This still being an enormous body of literature, I have concentrated on a fairly limited number of published commentaries (specifics will be provided below), in the hope that this study and similar ones will be extended as new material becomes available. For the Pāṇinian school, however, almost all available texts have been consulted. On this point, it must be noted that critical editions do not exist for nearly all of these commentaries and what I cite, e.g., as Mallinātha's words is a shorthand for what has been printed in the edition I have used. Although this is a well-known problem for many Sanskrit texts, it is even more of an issue in the case of commentaries on poetry because scholars have demonstrated that these texts were subject to modification during their transmission and that points of grammar were one of the

structural elements particularly liable to alteration.[2] I do not believe that this caveat diminishes the value of the following study or similar work based on the same kind of material, but if we wish to situate the ideas of these authors more precisely in the history of Sanskrit grammar and textual exegesis more generally, we must make a concerted effort to know as much as possible about what constituted the original text as well as when and where alterations were made.[3]

What can we hope to learn from reading these texts and tracing the history of grammatical debates among such commentaries and comparing it with later usage? At the most basic level, we need a new history of Sanskrit grammar, one that does not divorce the discipline from its larger context as the foundational philological tool for understanding the meaning of a text, in particular works of poetry. Grammarians reacted to poetry, poets reacted to grammarians, and commentators on poetry often made choices regarding linguistic correctness based on the grammar (or interpretation of a grammar) they chose to accept as authoritative. This last facet often had an impact on the very constitution of a poetic work because alterations were made to bring poetry into line with grammatical correctness. I have also been able to find evidence that grammarians were in dialog with the commentators on poetry. We have, therefore, a very complex network of individuals striving to determine what correct Sanskrit is. The intricacy of these debates increases rapidly because almost every step along the way is another interpretative choice that requires further justification. It is not only necessary to decide what the constituent elements of a word are but also how to understand the sūtras that could potentially account for it. We have, then,

---

[2]Goodall & Isaacson (2003: xiii–lxiv) discuss the challenges of editing the commentary by Vallabhadeva on the *Raghuvaṃśa*. The dissertation by Klebanov (2016) further substantiates how commentaries can evolve over time based on the expansion, omission, and alteration of structural elements. Similar variability can be discovered by comparing the two critical editions of Vallabhadeva's commentary on the *Kumārasambhava* by Narayana Murti and Patel. Unfortunately, textual uncertainty extents even to the poems themselves, to which many of the grammatical discussions bear witness. On the grammar side, most texts could surely be improved, but the large number of MSS for popular works like the KV and MBh — not to mention the shear length of these commentaries — make it unlikely that new critical editions will appear anytime soon. A critical edition of the KV on the *pratyāhārasūtra*s has been published by Haag and Vergiani (2011). The introduction and accompanying essays shed much light on the scale of the task at hand and the value of undertaking it.

[3]This fundamental philological work leads not only a better hypothesis of the original text but also gives us insight into when and why certain modifications took place. For example, a MS that contains clear accretions may not help us in establishing Mallinātha's original commentary, but if we are able to locate and date this MS — perhaps it is part of a larger group of similar MSS in a particular region — then we gain valuable knowledge about the demands and expectations of a particular community of readers. Such scholarship will surely serve to enrich our understanding of textual transmission and more localized reading practices.

not only a history of interpretative strategies but a history of authorities. The web becomes even more tangled when we take into consideration not only the variability within the Pāṇinian school but also the other grammatical schools, since they were not always slavish followers of Pāṇini and the *Mahābhāṣya*, as they are sometimes presented. Although such oft repeated statements to the effect that Sanskrit was codified by Pāṇini and Patañjali are to a certain extent true, or at least true for certain individuals and communities, this was hardly the case throughout much of Sanskrit's long history,[4] and even what Pāṇini's grammar prescribes is far from set in stone.[5] How we have arrived at such impressions is another story worthy of further inquiry but too vast to be dealt with at present. Much of it involves the influence of western scholars during the colonial period — which texts entered school curricula, which received funding for publication, etc.[6] — but the process reaches further back in time and hinges on the influence that key grammarians, above all Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīta and Nāgeśa, were able to exert over their contemporaries in part owing to patronage[7] but also thanks to their intellectual prowess.

More generally, I hope that the results of this study will provide a basis for further inquiry into the intellectual history of Sanskrit grammar and the forces at play in motivating the choices commentators made in adhering to one school of grammar or another. Pollock (2006: 162-188) has demonstrated the extent to which kings played a role in patronizing grammatical works and how supporting and producing correct (*sādhu*) speech mirrored the more general existence of "correctness" or order within a king's realm. Although much work remains to be done on this topic — the historical context of almost every grammatical work could be more thoroughly re-

---

[4]Pollock (2006: 162–184) has rightly emphasized the importance of non-Pāṇinian schools of grammar and provided tantalizing evidence that awaits further inquiry. For example, Pollock (2006: 176) mentions a grant dated to 1162 from King Bijjaḷa of the Kālācūri lineage of Kalyāṇa, in which the "syllabus from a Kālamukha Śaiva college in Kōḍhimaṭha" is given. Included is the "analysis of the Kaumāra [i.e., *Kātantra*], Pāṇinīya, *Śākaṭāyanaśabdānuśāsana*, and other grammars." Cf. De Simini (2016: 180) for a full translation and additional context for the inscription.

[5]A straightforward example is P. 2.2.15 and 16 discussed in ch. 3, pp. 152ff.

[6]The first grammars of Sanskrit published in English, Colebrooke (1805), Carey (1806), and Forster (1810), testify to the Sanskrit grammars in vogue at the beginning of the 19th cent. Although Colebrooke (1805: vi) [= Colebrooke (1837 II: 37f.)] took the Pāṇinian school as his authority and only rarely consulted the "popular grammars," the extensive list of grammatical works at the end of his introduction, Colebrooke (1805: ix–xvi), includes an impressive list of non-Pāṇinian grammars and their commentaries. Carey (1806: iv) claims indebtedness to not only Pāṇini but also Vopadeva (*Mugdhabodha*), Kramadīśvara (*Saṃkṣipta-vyākaraṇa*) and others. Forster (1810: xi) had made a translation and study of the *Mugdhabodha*.

[7]Cf. Pollock (2006: 175).

searched — I have attempted to determine how these grammars and their commentaries were received and put to use beyond their most basic function as tools for learning Sanskrit.[8] By presenting, in many cases for the first time, exactly how particular grammatical debates evolved over such a long span of time, I have begun to examine how methods of argumentation evolved (or did not), when and why novel ideas were introduced, and then accepted or rejected.

1.2 A Grammarian's Authority

As I have already mentioned, many of these dialogs hinge on authority, a concept integral to the history of science, academic discourses, and the regulation of human thought and action. Although this is a large topic, we can quickly focus our attention on an important passage in the *Mahābhāṣya* from which we learn who the *ācārya*, "teacher," of the sūtras is.

> *pramāṇabhūta ācāryo darbhapavitrapāṇiḥ śucāv avakāśe prāṅmukha upaviśya mahatā yatnena sūtraṃ praṇayati sma tatrāśakyaṃ varṇenāpy anarthakena bhavituṃ kiṃ punar iyatā sūtreṇa* | (MBh I.39.10–12)

> The authoritative teacher,[9] holding the sacred *darbha* grass in his hand and sitting in a pure place facing east, produced the rules of grammar with great effort. As such, it is not possible that even a single sound would be meaningless, let alone a whole rule.[10]

The term *pramāṇa* has a long history and a place of primary importance in Indian philosophy,[11] and a single English translation will not fit all contexts, but something like "a means of valid knowledge" or, somewhat less precise, "authority" will suffice at present. One of the questions I seek to answer more fully is who these grammatical authorities are for different individuals at

---

[8]"Learning Sanskrit" in the literary cultures under discussion did not simply mean to know paradigms, vocabulary, syntax, etc., but to know by heart the rules that governed the language, i.e., the sūtras of this or that grammar. Colebrooke (1805: v) [= Colebrooke (1837: 37)] attests to this fact in his grammar of Sanskrit when he writes: "I shall be likewise glad to have an opportunity of inserting the original rules of *Sanſcrit* grammar ... The knowledge of them is, therefore, material to the ſtudent of *Sanſcrit.*"

[9]The compound *pramāṇa-bhūta* is difficult to interpret precisely. Ruegg (1994), who has dedicated a very insightful and comprehensive study to the topic, may be consulted for further details, especially in the context of the first verse of Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (PS), the main focal point of the article, where the compound is applied to the Buddha. The interpretation of several grammarians is discussed on pp. 310f.

[10]Trans. Deshpande (2011: 64) with slight modifications. The same scholar has translated the same passage in Deshpande (1998: 15) with slightly different wording.

[11]For an overview of the concept, cf. Matilal (1985: 203–215), Oberhammer (2006: 67–74), and Garfield (2015: 214–216).

different points in time. Are there absolute authorities or are authorities open to criticism? How can we even identify authorities in the texts examined here?[12] But for this, we need to review what is already known about authority in the Pāṇinian tradition. Deshpande (1998) has studied the evolution of authority among the Sanskrit grammarians and shown that we need to consider several stages, one of the most important being when a supermundane status is attributed to Pāṇini, Kātyāyana,[13] and Patañjali. It is worth summarizing the findings of this article because they will serve as a backdrop for much of this study.

According to Deshpande, at the earliest stage Pāṇini did not hold his predecessors to be infallible, absolute authorities. He felt free to differ from them, although he was willing to include their opinions by mentioning their names. The later tradition took such rules as options with an honorific mention of the person who held this or that opinion. Next, Kātyāyana undoubtedly considered Pāṇini's *vacana*s, "statements," as an authority insofar as he "has some special superior knowledge which transcends common logic, and, therefore, should be respected as an overriding authority."[14] He is not, though, a *ṛṣi*, "seer," whose statements would be unquestionable, but rather an *ācārya*, "teacher," in whose rules one can still find deficiencies. Improvements are called for when Pāṇini's sūtras lead to incorrect results, i.e., they do not account for correct usage.[15] Patañjali holds many of the same views as Kātyāyana, although he tends to defend Pāṇini's formulations more vigorously but by no means universally. Patañjali tells us precisely who authoritative speakers of Sanskrit are: the *śiṣṭa*s, "the learned," a class of male Brahmans living in a particular region known as *Āryāvarta* with certain habits.[16] Crucial to his discussion is that such learned men speak in accordance with the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, even if they have not studied it, and one

---

[12]In Sanskrit commentaries, the most fundamental way of signaling an authority is through the use of the word *iti*, generally described as a quotative particle. In addition, however, *iti* also indicates a cause or reason. Cf. Tubb & Boose (2007: 209f.). When a commentator quotes a sūtra of Pāṇini or whomever, we should, in most cases, understand the *iti* at the end of the citation to express "because Pāṇini says …"

[13]Kātyāyana is the author of a large set of *vārttika*s, "critical comments," on Pāṇini's rules. They are imbeded in the MBh and the main target of Patañjali's comments. See § 1.5.1.2.

[14]Deshpande (1998: 13).

[15]As Deshpande (1998: 14) notes, we do not have any explicit statements from Kātyāyana about where correct usage derives from.

[16]MBh III.174.4–15. See the translation in Deshpande (1993: 61f.). The Brahmans are to be selfless, store only one basketful of grains, and have attained the highest wisdom in one area of learning. For the geographical limits of *Āryāvarta* and how they changed over time see Deshpande (1993: 83–107).

of the purposes of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is to be able to identify a *śiṣṭa.* With regard to Pāṇini, though, Patañjali still does not consider him to be a *ṛṣi* but only an *ācārya*, and so his rules are still subject to criticism, improvement, and even rejection[17] when they fail to account for the usage of the learned. One important development, however, is the implication of *ācāya-ācāra*, "the behavior of the teacher (scil. Pāṇini)," already present in Kātyāyana's *vārttika*s, e.g., P. 1.1.1.4. If Pāṇini's behavior — in this context, how he formulates his sūtras — is to be taken as an authority, then, in combination with the meaningfulness of every letter, word, etc., as expressed in the above quote, we can draw certain conclusions from instances where meaninglessness or redundancy appears to arise. If we discover an apparent redundancy, the superfluous letter, word, etc. must hint at (*jñāpaka*) a further rule, often a metarule.[18] The importance of the exact wording of the A is further substantiated when Patañjali labels the sūtras *chandovat*, "like the Vedas."[19] As we will see shortly, Nāgeśa latches onto this near-Vedic like status of Pāṇini's rules.

In the time after Patañjali, we can identify four important shifts: Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjli become *ṛṣi*s; Patañjali has the greatest authority of the three; Pāṇini is to have received inspiration from Śiva;[20] and Patañjali is identified with Ādiśeṣa, the serpent upon whom Viṣṇu sleeps on the milk ocean. The first shift has occurred by the time of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, where the *Mahābhāṣya* is considered an *ārṣa grantha*, "text composed by a seer," (VP II.481c) and Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali are said to be *maharṣi*s, "great seers," (VP 1.123). Deshpande (1998: 20f.) sees here an implicit acknowledgment that the likes of Pāṇini, etc. are no longer being born in Bhartṛhari's time and direct access to correct language is, therefore, not possible in the present age of decline.[21] The next important shift occurs at the beginning of the first millennium

---

[17]For rejection, we find the verbal complex *prati* + *ā* + √*khyā*, "to reject." For example, Patañjali rejects *ca*, "and," in all sūtras because its function is accounted for by *anuvṛtti*, "rolling along." MBh I.295.19: *evaṃ sarve cakārāḥ pratyākhyānte* | "In this manner all *ca*s are rejected."

[18]Cf. the phrase *ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati*, "the conduct of the teacher makes known," in, e.g., MBha I.15.15. By my count it occurs 147 times in the MBh. A similar expression is *jñāpayaty ācāryaḥ*, "the teacher makes known," which occurs 187 times in the MBh. I deal with one non-Patañjalian *jñāpaka* at length in ch. 6.

[19]The phrase *chandovat sūtrāṇi bhavanti* | "The sūtras (of Pāṇini) are like the Vedas," occurs twice: in MBh I.37.4 to explain the irregular sandhi (*-c in pausa*) in P. 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic* by applying P. 1.4.20 and in MBh I.313.5 to account for the nominative form, *yū*, in P. 1.4.3 by applying P. 6.1.106.

[20]Deshpande (1997) demonstrates that Buddhists, on the other hand, viewed Avalokiteśvara as Pāṇini's source of inspiration.

[21]This is a less explicit version of the distinction Nāgeśa will make later on. Grammarians after Patañjali are

with the nexus of Kaiyaṭa, Helārāja, and Haradatta, each of whom wrote important commentaries in the Pāṇinian school that will be discussed below.[22] It is in the work of Kaiyaṭa, a commentary on the MBh named *Pradīpa* (*Lamp*), that we find for the first time the phrase *yathottaraṃ hi munitrayasya prāmāṇyam*, "the later among the three sages (Pānini, Kātyāna, Patañjali), the greater his authority,"[23] as well as Patañjali's identification with Nāganātha, "The Lord of the Serpents," another name for Ādiśeṣa.[24] Patañjali is now the ultimate, divine authority on Pāṇinian grammar. As for Pāṇini himself, in Haradatta's *Padamañjarī* (*Garland of Words*) the revelation of the *pratyāhārasūtra*s from Śiva is stated for the first time in a now ubiquitous verse.[25] Also of relevance is the developing perception of the sūtra: it contains within itself everything that is explained in its commentaries.[26] According to this evidence, by the beginning of the second millennium the Pāṇinian school of grammar was associated with two divine beings, Śiva and Ādiśeṣa, and Patañjali served as the highest authority on the A. In the works of Nāgeśa, the final authority in Sanskrit grammar,[27] these points are further developed and solidified: Patañjali is Nāgeśa (Ādiśeṣa), the *pratyāhārasūtra*s are, as the utterances of Śiva, *śruti*, "divine revelation," and the *Aṣṭhādhyāyī* has achieved the status of a "quasi-*śruti* text." On account of this last fact, even

---

lakṣaṇaikacakṣuṣka, "only able to see the rules." See below.

[22]The relative chronology of these three authors is uncertain, and the single piece of evidence to date Haradatta prior to Dharmakīrti's *Rūpāvatāra* should not be weighed as heavily as it has been. See § 1.5.3.2. On Kaiyaṭa and Helārāja, see Vergiani (2015) for an exemplary study. Although Vergiani (2015: 211) leaves the question of priority open, he inclines toward Helārāja being Kaiyaṭa predecessor.

[23]MBhPra vol. p. 331b. A similar, if not stronger, sentiment is found in the *Dhātupradīpa* of Maitreyarakṣita, slightly later than Kaiyaṭa, quoted in Deshpande (1998: 7 and 23).

[24]MBhPra vol. IV p. 184b. Is it a coincidence that Kaiyaṭa is commenting on P. 4.2.92 *śeṣe*? For additional references to Patañjali as a serpent, see Aklujkar (2008: 61, fn. 28).

[25]KVPada vol. I p. 8f. The verse is:
yenākṣarasamāmnāyam adhigamya maheśvarāt |
kṛtsnaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ proktaṃ tasmai pāṇinaye namaḥ ||
"Homage to Pāṇini, who, after studying the traditional list of sounds from the great God (Śiva), uttered the entire system of grammar." It is still recited at the beginning of lessons on Pāṇini's grammar as I have experienced. Cf. Deshpande (1997: 446f.). The verse is also placed at the beginning of the printed text of the *Rūpāvatāra* but is not present in MSS of the text I have been able to inspect, e.g., NGMCP MS no. 5.5499, and should not be considered as original. On the constitution of the printed edition of the RA, see § 1.5.4.

[26]Deshpande (1998: 22f.) quotes from Kumārila's *Tantravārttika* ad JS 2.3.16 and reports that the same opinion is held by Jinendrabuddhi, author of the *Nyāsa*, and Bhairavamiśra, a commentator on the PŚ. These last two references are taken from Bhattachary (1966: 21) without exact citations. I have not been able to consult this work, nor could I locate the relevant passages.

[27]So he is perceived by most paṇḍits today. See § 1.5.10.

words, letters, etc. deemed superfluous by Patañjali have an unseen purpose (*adṛṣṭārtha*).[28] Lastly, Nāgeśa formulates the distinction between *lakṣyaikacakṣuṣka* and *lakṣaṇaikacakṣuṣka* grammarians. The former, of whom Patañjali was the last, have direct access to correct usage, whereas the latter can only see the rules preserved to describe the ideal language.[29]

This evolution of the authority and status of the three great grammarians sets up the basic framework on which we now need to hang new evidence so as to produce a structure more representative of the available texts and contexts in which Sanskrit grammar was employed. Several studies have already begun this work, although no larger synthesis yet exists,[30] and a tremendous amount remains to be done before this is possible, above all the publication of more commentaries. Studies such as Deshpande (1997), Pollock (2006: 162–188), Gornall (2012), and Dimitrov (2016) have already demonstrated how much stands to be gained by exploring sources outside of the Pāṇinian school and by paying close attention to historical context. With the present study, which focuses more on the development of specific grammatical debates inspired by poetic usage, I hope not only to expand the general scope of texts and authors taken into consideration but also to shed light on both grammar's role in the larger project of textual exegesis and, conversely, the role of poetic usage on the development of grammatical exegesis. If we return to Deshpande's overview of authority in Sanskrit grammar, the vast majority of grammatical texts have been omitted and even the Pāṇinian school has significantly more to offer. To take just one example — I detail my results in the final chapter — the so-called Bengali school of grammar has mostly been left out. This school developed in the second millennium CE and took not the MBh as its primary authority but rather the *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā* (*The Profuse Explanation of the Treatise from Kāśi*), or *Nyāsa* for short, of Jindenrabuddhi, a Buddhist grammarian, whose interpretation of the A was not always guided by the MBh. We will see several instances of this in the body of the dissertation. As a consequence, commentators in this school, like Śaraṇadeva and Puruṣot-

---

[28]Deshpande (1998: 25–27).

[29]Deshpande (1998: 24). Thieme (1957) offers a more detailed discussion of Nāgeśa's reasons for holding Patañjali as a supreme authority beyond the divine status attributed to him.

[30]Scharfe (1977), our most recent general history of Sanskrit grammar will be discussed below in § 1.5. See especially fn. 86.

tamadeva, present views at odds with Kaiyaṭa, Haradatta or Nāgeśa. Haradatta not often rejects Jinendrabuddhi's explanations because they are contrary to Patañjali (*tad bhāṣyaviruddham*; see ch. 4). Furthermore, We must also nuance what it means for Patañjali to be an authority. For instance, Nāgeśa rejects interpretations of the A that are not only at odds with the MBh but also lacking its express support, whereas earlier grammarians are willing to accept novel arguments so long as they do not run counter to the MBh.

Fanning out a bit, we also find evidence that the language of poets, e.g., Māgha (pp. 256f.), could serve as a guide for the interpretation of the A even for grammarians like Haradatta and Bhaṭṭoji. In such instances, poets' usage virtually carries the authority of a *śiṣṭa*. On the other hand, non-Pāṇinian grammars are called upon to explain poetic language where Pāṇini fails us. Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (*Necklace of the Goddess of Speech*) and the *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* (*The Grammar of the Goddess of Speech*) will be found in the commentaries of Aruṇagirinātha (p. 271)[31] and Hemādri (pp. 276ff.), respectively. These commentators, who on the whole do quote Pāṇini or Patañjali to explain linguistic forms, nevertheless attest to a more diverse toolkit than is usually assumed. Vāmana straddles a line between disciplines in these debates, as will be seen in ch. 6. Commentators on poetry often cite his sūtras as an authority, but grammarians, as far as I have been able to determine, all but ignore him since, it seems, he is not strictly speaking a grammarian but a writer on poetics. The precise motivations for each of these individuals is difficult to determine. Religious and school affiliation certainly played and important role — the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and the various Jain grammars are hardly acknowledged outside of Buddhist and Jain communities[32] — but it certainly was not the only factor. I hope the findings of this study will be taken into consideration while carrying out further studies on individual authors

---

[31]I have not presented all the evidence I have collected for the Bhoja's grammar as an authority in *kāvya* commentaries. I plan to do so in an independent article.

[32]But the KV and Bhoja's grammar show clear influence from the CV. Cf. Renou (1957: 126f.) and § 1.5.3.2 below. Similarly, Kṣīrasvāmin often cites, *inter alia*, the *Cāndra*-DhP in commenting on the Pāṇinian DhP. See ch. 6. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa also gives credence to the opinions of the CV as well as others in his *Prakriyāsarvasva* (*The Entirety of Derivations*) and *Apāṇinīya-prāmāṇya-sādhanam* (*The Establishment of the Authority of the non-Pāṇinians*). The Buddhist author, Maitreya Rakṣita, on the other hand, quotes Candra in his commentary on the *Nyāsa*, the *Tantrapradīpa*. Unfortunately, the only edition of this text leaves much to be desired, and the pages on which authors are to be found according to the index are incorrect. One must add, in most cases, 16 to the page number in the index to arrive at the correct page number.

and that their historical context might lead to new insights regarding their choice of authorities. I will give some basic information below, but much could be added.

Finally, we might ask why it matters at all whether or not language is *sādhu*, "correct." With a view toward general linguistic usage, such as the register and style I am using for this dissertation, my choice to avoid certain perfectly comprehensible and common forms like "gonna" or "ain't" accords with a set of conventions set forth in manuals that my intended community of readers accepts as regulating correct grammar for academic writing. To do otherwise would lead to grumbling, castigation, and possibly even rejection. For many Sanskrit grammarians, the status of Sanskrit had a number of parallels — other modes of speech were comprehensible but correct grammar played an important role in the admittance to, and admiration from, certain communities — yet also differences insofar as we find statements about acquiring *dharma*, "merit,"[33] through the use of *śuddha*, "purified," or *sādhu*, "correct," speech beginning in the *Mahābhāṣya*.[34] This added dimension incorporates grammar and the linguistic purity it regulates into the larger system of *dharma*-oriented activities that many believed to have benefits in this life and in lives to come. Several of the texts I quote and discuss throughout the dissertation will provide further testament to these assertions, although I admit that not every writer had the same motivations and determining them is still an ongoing task.

1.2.1   An Early Debate on Poetry

The origin of the debates on poetic usage and grammatical rule can be traced back to Patañjali himself, who expresses views on poets and poetry in the *Mahābhāṣya*, where numerous verses are cited[35] as examples of questionable usage. To take up but one, Patañjali, or rather the *ācāryadeśīya*, "almost-teacher," introduces a verse in the *anuṣṭubh* meter while trying to explain

---

[33]In this context, *dharma = puṇya*. Cf. Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 43, fn. 126).

[34]MBh I.8.3–6, translated and further discussed in Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 117–119). Cf. VP 1.27ab. See also Aklujkar (1996: 76): "a connotation must have existed to the effect that to be careful in speech ... is to observe a certain discipline of the mind and body and that a person's subscribing to such a discipline is an indication of his good spiritual status." In what follows are supporting citations from Kālidāsa and the author of the *vṛtti* to the VP (taken to be Bhartṛhari by Aklujkar).

[35]The verses are collected in Kielhorn (1885) [= Rau (1969: 187f.)]. A full study of the these verses remains a desideratum.

and justify the problematic form *stryākhyau*, "denoting the (grammatical) feminine (gender)," in P. 1.4.3.[36] His reason for doing so is that a word within the verse, *priyākhyebhyaḥ*, "for (the Brahmans) announcing pleasant things,"[37] poses the same morphological peculiarity as *stryākhyau*, i.e., an *upapada*-compound ending in -*ākhya* and not the correct -*ākhyāya*.[38] In response to this, the *ācārya* says:[39] MBh I.313.14 *chandovat kavayaḥ kurvanti na hy eṣeṣṭiḥ*, "Poets compose as though in the Vedic register; this is not acceptable (scil. in the standard language)."[40] The discussion continues, however, and two more derivations are suggested (of no immediate concern) before a satisfactory solution is finally found, namely, the suffix *Ka* added by P. 3.2.5.2, a vārtt. that gives an open-ended list of otherwise unaccounted forms with the suffix *Ka*. This portion of the discussion ends, however, with a validation of *priyākhyebhyaḥ* in the verse: MBh I.313.20 *evaṃ ca kṛtvā so 'py adoṣo bhavati yad uktam*, "And if we take it in that way, this word is also without fault, namely what was said." The verse is then quoted again.

The snippet from the *Mahābhāṣya* just presented anticipates many of the debates we will see throughout the dissertation. A particular form calls for explanation, and a commentator racks his brain to come up with the best solution and offers several different possibilities before settling on one in particular. More telling of a broader attitude is the role that the verse plays in the discussion

---

[36]P. 1.4.3 *yū stryākhyau nadī* | "A linguistic form ending in *ī* or *ū* that denotes the feminine gender is termed *nadī*." Cf. Johsi & Roodbergen (1995: 41f.) for a slightly different interpretation. The problem with *stryākhyau* (*strī-ākhyau*) arises when one tries to give a precise *vigraha*, "syntactic analysis," and derivation for the compound. In the first attempt, Patañjali proposes *striyam ācakṣāte*, "the two (words ending in *ī* or *ū*) denote the feminine gender." This *upapada*-compound, however, would require the suffix *Ka* by P. 3.2.3, an impossibility because Pāṇini states the condition *anupasarge*, "when there is no preverb." The only suffix available, then, is *aṆ* by P. 3.2.1, but in this case the augment *yUK* will be added by P. 7.3.33 yielding the form *stryākhyāyau*.

[37]The word is not terribly common. One parallel is Rām 2.3.30c.

[38]MBh I.313.11–13: *na tarhīdānīm idaṃ bhavati: yasmin sashrāṇi putre jāte gavāṃ dadau | brāhmaṇebhyaḥ priyākhyebhyaḥ so 'py ayam uñchena jīvati* || "So then this (scil. word in the following verse) is also not (correct). 'If, when a son was born, he (scil. the father) gave a thousand head of cattle to the Brahmans announcing pleasant things, that same (son) too will live by gleaning.'" The verse is not traceable, but the same turn of phrase is found in *Buddhacarita* 7.15a *uñchena jīvanti khagā ivānye*, "some live by gleaning like the birds." Trans. Olivelle (2008: 191). The context is the "varieties and rewards of ascetic toil."

[39]It is difficult to ascribe the statements in the MBh to the correct interlocutor. I here follow the suggestion given in MBhPra vol. II p. 219 fn. 3 that *chandovat kavayaḥ kurvanti* would be best (*varam*) connected with the following statement (*na hy eṣeṣṭiḥ*). The editors, however, follow Nāgeśa, who takes the statements to be by two different people, by placing the first statement under the heading *ekadeśi-samādhāna-sādhaka-bhāṣyam*, "the discussion that establishes a partial conclusion," and the latter under *samādhāna-bādhaka-bhāṣyam*, "the discussion that refutes the (previous) conclusions." NB that this still does not represent the *siddhānta*, "final conclusion."

[40]Is the point of this statement to compare poetic output to *sūtra*s, which are also *chandovat*? Cf. MBh I.37.4.

as a possible justification for the wording of Pāṇini's sūtra. Although this is ultimately rejected as valid reasoning, once the form in Pāṇini's sūtra is properly accounted for, the poetic form is also shown to be acceptable and hence signals that poetic language is also worthy of attention. The passing reference to the Vedic-like status of poetic language, singular in the *Mahābhāṣya*, is unfortunately too vague (who even says it in the dialog?) to draw any conclusions, but through it we can at least identify that poetry could have a special linguistic status that would make it not strictly subject to the rules of the standard language. We will return to this topic in ch. 4 in my discussion of the suffix *KvasU*. At the end of the debate, however, it does fall under the scope of standard grammar. We can gain a bit more information about Patañjali's attitude toward poets by taking into consideration an earlier passage where he debates whether or not *śloka*s, "verses," are to be taken as an authority. After a disagreeable verse is recited, it is rejected as an authority (*pramāṇa*) because it is *pramattagīta*, "sung by a negligent/intoxicated man." Only a verse *apramattagīta*, "sung by an attentive/sober man," will be accepted as a *pramāṇa*.[41] Although this discussion is not about correct linguistic usage, it further informs us about the role and qualifications of a poet that resonate with later debates.

As we are beginning to see, despite Patañjali's clearcut answer to the question about the *śiṣṭa*s, a level of uncertainty arises within the grammatical tradition about who exactly they are. A further problem, given the coreferentiality between the speech of the learned and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, is as follows. Assuming that we can determine someone to be a *śiṣṭa*, if his language appears to differ from what Pāṇini has taught, how can the disparity be resolved? The grammatical tradition — and I am still speaking of its Pāṇinian branch — had several ways of answering this question. The simplest out was to claim that the speech (usually in the form of texts) of certain individuals did not have to follow Pāṇini's rules for the standard language, the *bhāṣā*, because the authors belonged to a supermundane category of being, such as *ṛṣi*s, "seers," or Īśvara, "God," and hence

---

[41]MBh I.3.1–5. See Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 47) for a translation. We will see that Vallabhadeva often employs *pramādaja*, "born from folly," to ungrammatical forms in poetry. I suspect his turn of phrase may be based on this very passage. Nāgeśa attributes the verse by the inattentive/drunk man to the Buddha in the . Cf. Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 47, fn. 142).

did not have to follow the same rules as normal humans, however learned they may be.[42] More problematic, and hence more telling of attitudes toward grammar and the elusive class of learned men, are the great Sanskrit *kavi*s, "poets," like Kālidāsa. As I will discuss in the following chapter (and others have discussed before), poetry and poets played an important role in the representation of society and the embodiment of social norms. One of their main functions, according to works on poetics, is to instruct and help guide men toward the four ends of man (Cf. BhKA 1.2) and their language is to be exemplary.[43] When a revered teacher and supreme poet like Kālidāsa commits grammatical errors, how should we explain them? Grammarians and commentators on *kāvya* deal with this problem in a variety of ways and their answers reflect, at the very least, their personal attitudes toward a poet's status and possibly the more widespread opinions of their elite society. In brief, a grammarian or commentator, when he registers a problem at all, could simply reject a poet's words as incorrect, as Vallabhadeva does with the label *pramādaja*, "born of folly."[44]

---

[42]For non-standard forms in the Epics and Purāṇas, one often finds the term *ārṣaprayoga*, "the usage of seers." Cf. Cardona (1996), which contains important corrections to earlier perceptions about different types of Sanskrit. As Cardona (1996: 173f.) rightly points out, the Epic language or *ārṣaprayoga* is not tantamount to un-Pāṇinian usage, since commentators often do find Pāṇinian derivations, albeit with the application of *chāndasa*, "Vedic," rules. In fn. 3, p. 173, he correctly remarks, I emphasize, that "[i]n so far as a *ṛṣi* is a *śiṣṭa* whose speech is to be accounted for by the grammar, the usage in question should not fail to be describable by Pāṇinian sūtras, and commentators do indeed account for this usage by means of such rules." In the context of Tantric Sanskrit, to whatever extent the term may be justified, we similarly find the labels *aiśvara*, "godly," i.e., stemming from Īśvara, and *chandas*/*chāndasa*, terms used by Pāṇinians to describe the peculiarities of Sanskrit in Vedic texts. Cf. Goudriaan (1996), where he aptly remarks on p. 266 that "supernatural inspiration does not subject itself to critical discourse." This is true, but, recalling Cardona's words just cited, one should not be led to be believe that grammarians neglected to analyze these registers of speech. I note that, in addition to the commentators on the Epics, both Vedic and Epic/Pūrāṇic Sanskrit come under the purview of (non-critical) grammatical analysis in Sāyaṇa's commentaries on the Vedas, especially the *Ṛgveda*, and in such texts as the *Mukhabhūṣaṇa*, respectively. Commentators on the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* also refer to the text's language as *chāndasa*, e.g., Śrīdharasvāmin in his *Bhāvārthadīpikā* ad BhP 1.1d, where he explains the verb *dhīmahi*, "we ought to meditate upon," as *dhyāyater liṅi cchāndasaṃ dhyāyema ity arthaḥ*, "a Vedic (form) of √*dhyā* in the optative; it means *dhyāyema* 'we ought to meditate upon.'"

[43]Cf. Pollock (2006 183) " ... the order of Sanskrit grammar—the same order that informs the most exquisite instantiation of grammatical language, namely, *kāvya*."

[44]Being a poet did not exempt one from following grammatical rules for the standard language. Although I agree with the general thrust of Cardona (1996), I think his use of "poet" on pp. 182 and 193 might be somewhat misleading because it is *only* the poet Vālmīki, the *ṛṣi*, who may unquestionably use *ārṣa* language, *not* Kālidāsa, who is a simple *kavi*, "poet," a word that does not appear in any of the passages quoted by Cardona regarding *ārṣaprayoga*. Furthermore, the two passages from the *Durghaṭavṛtti* and *Padamañjarī* (fn. 17 and 20), to which Cardona specifically refers on p. 193 as "stressing that the poet as an insightful sage (*ṛṣi*) enjoys independence with respect to usage," contain neither the words *ṛṣi* nor *kavi*, but Vālmīki and *bhavantaḥ*, "the lords." Based on my reading, the *kavi*s of classical Sanskrit are generally not considered *ṛṣi*s and do not have access to *ārṣaprayoga*. To claim that all poets can behave as *ṛṣi*s, as Renou (1940: 127) points out, *rendrait inutile la majeure partie des interprétations littéraires dans les vṛtti*, "would render useless a major part of the literary interpretations in the *vṛtti*."

Another option is to question the interpretation of the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Does *Kālidāsa*'s use of, e.g., *tasthivān*, "he who has stood,"[45] only appear incorrect because we have not properly understood Pāṇini?

This question lies at the heart of the debates we will encounter throughout the following chapters. In fact, we may double down on our possible ignorance and further ask: how do we know we have even analyzed the words of a poem correctly? Have we identified the correct constituent elements? Commentators, both on the A and on poetry, asked themselves these questions and their answers often differed. The reason for this is a style of exegesis that allowed for flexibility both with regard to what a text means at a semantic level — what is Pāṇini teaching us? — and also at the formal level — what are the morphological units that make up a word? As I already mentioned above on p. 7, the Sanskrit grammarians could avail themselves of powerful devices like the *jñāpaka* to derive "hidden" meaning from Pāṇini's rules. This strategy often allowed for seemingly new linguistic data to be accounted for. On the other hand, words in a poem could be analyzed at the level of their morphology in such a way so as to give them a derivation obtainable through the A. The exegesis of language is, therefore, highly subjective and even the exegetical tools, in this case Pāṇini's grammar, are themselves not fixed and subject to interpretation.[46] We end up, then, with several forks: a poet's usage could be worthy of defense or not, and consequently reflect his status as a *śiṣṭa*. If it is deemed defensible, we then need to decide how to interpret both the word in question — is there more than one possible formal analysis? — as well as the sūtras that could be employed to arrive at the justification. All these possibilities permit for the complexity and variety of the debates that will form the main subject of this dissertation.

---

[45]This is one of the many forms from poetry discussed by the grammatical tradition as possibly being in violation of Pāṇini's rules for the standard language. It will also form the subject of chapter 4.

[46]How ingrained the complex formal analysis of language was in Sanskritic literary cultures is attested to by the large corpus of simultaneous narratives (*śleṣa*-poetry), i.e., texts that can be read with two or more meanings. The authors of such works exploit the power of grammatical analysis to no end. Cf. Bronner (2010). Other Indian languages also have such literature. For Tamil, see Ebeling (2010: 43f.) and for Telugu, Bronner (2010: 272–276).

1.3 Of General Interest

Although most people interested in the history of Sanskrit literature will find some of the material discussed here of relevance, this dissertation also has something to contribute to the larger field of intellectual history, the history of science, and the history of philological practices, just as these theoretical frameworks of inquiry can assist in the analysis of the data presented in this dissertation. One successful attempt to apply a theory from the history of science to Sanskrit *śāstra*, "science, systematized knowledge," is McCrea (2008), in which Kuhn's paradigm shift or scientific revolution is applied to the history of *alaṃkāraśāstra*, "poetics," specifically the introduction of *dhvani*, "suggestion," as the most important component of Sanskrit poetry and the idea that the individual components in a poem lead to the manifestation of a single *rasa*, "flavor."[47] Although I do not contend that the history of *vyākaraṇa* contains such grand paradigm ruptures until the 20th cent., most notably in the work of Paul Kiparsky, I do find certain aspects of Kuhn's work and later historians of science, such as the constructivists,[48] to be relevant to my study. One could argue that the evolution of authority in Sanskrit grammar can be viewed as paradigmatic shifts that affect how individuals — and the larger community they sought to teach — interpreted Pāṇini's sūtras and the grammaticality of Sanskrit poetry. What further informs the decision for or against an authority is the larger sociological context in which commentators were trained, including their adherence to religious or philosophical schools. For example, Haradatta begins his commentary on the *Kāśikāvṛtti* by reestablishing Pāṇini's grammar within the same Vedic context it had for Patañjali, a task he accomplishes by drawing heavily on the *Paspaśāhnika* (*Introductory Lesson for the Day*)[49] If we look beyond his commentary, we learn that Haradatta

---

[47]Kuhn (2012) lays out the evidence for his theory and demonstrates how scientific developments can be explained in terms of periods of research under a stable paradigm with ruptures leading to the adoption of a new paradigm. McCrea (2008: 19–27) details how Kuhn's theory can be applied to *alaṅkāraśāstra*. Also crucial to this study is the work of Pocock (1971), who demonstrates how significant developments in one discipline are often the result of applying a paradigm from a different discipline. In the case of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, the foreign paradigm is the hermeneutics of sentence analysis found in *mīmāṃsā*.

[48]I have found Golinksi (2005) very instructive in framing the impact of social contexts on the development of Sanskrit grammar. Her review of Kuhn's work and its reception, Golinksi (2005: 17–27), is very informative to a non-specialist of the field.

[49]For Haradatta, it is absurd to even ask, KVPad vol. 1 p. 6: *atha vyākaraṇasyaiva kiṃ prayojanam* | "Now what is the use of grammar?" To which he responds: *kim anena praśnena* | "How can you even ask the question!" The

has also composed several commentaries on other texts integral to maintaining the Brahmanical world-view: the *Āpastambagṛhyasūtra*, *Āśvālāyanagṛhyasūtra*, *Gautamadharmasūtra*, etc.[50] His strong allegiance to the MBh must, therefore, be viewed in light of the developments in other Brahminical authors such as Bhartṛhari, whom Haradatta quotes profusely, and Kaiyaṭa, whose MBh commentary Haradatta likely knew. Such factors impact the evaluation of arguments just as much as the merits of the arguments, if at times not more so.[51] In determining a particular commentator's stance, however, we need to read closely his arguments in light of his predecessors and thereby further nuance what we learn from more general statements found in opening verses.

1.3.1 On the Study and Translation of Sanskrit Grammar

One of the difficulties in studying and writing about Sanskrit grammar is that the primary texts are extremely technical and foreign to most people who have not already familiarized themselves with Pāṇini's methods and the type of argumentation that is employed throughout the tradition. I will give an example of a Pāṇinian sūtra in § 1.4 so that the reader will have an idea of the object of study and may, as one owner of Lanman's *Sanskrit Reader* inscribed under "Introductory Suggestions," give up now before it's too late.[52] At present, however, I would like to discuss how I have tried to overcome some of these obstacles, how the reader might do so as well, and the reality that many difficulties will remain.

The place of Pāṇini in Indology and western-style Sanskrit pedagogy has seen its fair share of vicissitudes. I have already drawn to the reader's attention that during the discipline's for-

---

question is absurd because, as Haradatta goes on to explain, according to tradition a Brahman has to study grammar just as he has to perform the sacrifices at three junctures of the day, a quote lifted verbatim from MBh I.1.18f. In sharp contrast, Jinedrabuddhi, who comments on the same text, includes no such prefatory remarks.

[50]Cf. Kane (1930: 347–353) for further commentaries by Haradatta and the very likely identification with the grammarian.

[51]Cf. Plofker (2009: 12) on the situation in Indian mathematics: "True perception, reasoning, and authority were expected to harmonize with one another, and each had a part in supporting the truth of mathematics."

[52]Quoted in Otter (2017: ix). Under the quotation, Otter notes: *Handschriftlicher Zusatz eines anonymen Vorbesitzers unter der Überschrift „Introductory Suggestions" in einem antiquarisch erworbenen Exemplar von C.R.* Lanmans *Sanskrit Reader.* "Handwritten addition of an anonymous former owner under the heading "Introductory Suggestions" in a secondhand copy of C. R. Lanmans's *Sanskrit Reader.*"

mative years, Colebrooke hoped to include Pāṇini's rules in a later edition of his grammar (it never appeared) because they are "material" for the study of Sanskrit.[53] This is true even if a Sanskritist does not wish to specialize in *vyākaraṇa*, "grammar,"[54] because the commenterial idiom presupposes knowledge of Pāṇini's sūtras (or some other grammar) and most of the authors we read have studied the A. Mallinātha, for example, cannot be read (in full, at any rate) without a working knowledge of the A.[55] Despite this necessity, many authors of Sanskrit grammars and primers quickly adopted the Latinate model and did away with the technical terms of Pāṇini and his sūtras.[56] Although reasons vary for this intentional neglect, most authors acknowledge that to include such technical material would greatly hinder the student's progress in learning the language[57] and the rules of Pāṇini could be deferred till a later time. Yet once the initial impenitence disappeared, the deferral became more often than not an exclusion; the teaching of Pāṇini, more of an occasional curiosity. The study of more advanced texts like the *Mahābhāṣya*, *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, or *Prauḍhamanoramā*, where one can learn the methods of argumentation, is now mostly unheard of outside of India or small reading groups. Given this situation, can technical studies of Pāṇinian grammar hope to attract a readership of non-specialists? Yes and no. Some studies that delve deep into highly technical topics with long intricate arguments will likely always remain within the domain of the specialist, as they always have. Other studies, and I hope the present dissertation might be counted among them, will be of interest to a larger audience because grammar touches on so many other branches of Sanskrit learning and is integral to their history.

But the technical discussions remain, and remain they must because without them we cannot

---

[53]Cf. p. 5, fn. 8.

[54]The word *vyākaraṇa* could be more literally translated as "analysis" but it is not, to the best of my knowledge, used in reference non-linguistic analysis.

[55]Liebich (1892: II) details many reasons we do not need to know Pāṇini, but: *wir brauchen die Kenntnis der grammatischen Sprache zum Verständnis der einheimischen Commentare; und welche Rolle diese in der indischen Philologie spielen, ist bekannt.* "we need to know the grammatical language in order to understand the native commentaries; and what role these play in Indic philology is known." Tubb & Boose (2007) have since made this language accessible to a much wider audience.

[56]Speijer (1886) remains one of the few works in popular use that includes references to Pāṇini's rules. Kale (1961) is another example, but, to the best of my knowledge, it is not very widely used.

[57]A most sympathetic explanation is given Müller (1870: iv).

detect intertextual discourses and more subtle responses to ongoing debates. They also must remain because they are a part of the received body of Sanskrit literature. If we simply skip over them or give the reader a pass when it comes to more difficult passages, there is little hope of future scholarly engagements. In order to facilitate the understanding of some of the finer grammatical points and lines of argumentation I have translated all Sanskrit passages in full (not always a given in secondary scholarship on *vyākaraṇa*) and in an idiom as natural as possible to English. As any translator of śāstric texts will know, this is a particularly challenging task for a number of reasons. In the field of grammar, it requires finding a way to translate and explain precise technical terms, fleshing out references that were originally assumed to be known from memory, and supplying a great deal of additional information taken for granted or contained in a single word. To make such texts intelligible to a reader who has little or no prior training in Sanskrit grammar, I have in most cases had to provide translations with annotation, either with footnotes or words in parentheses. The latter, often rightly discouraged in translations, I have felt obliged to retain because they are advantageous to those who want to compare my translation with the original Sanskrit. Still I admit that neither of these aids makes for a particularly smooth reading, and I have, therefore, often restated the content of particularly complex passages in what I hope to be more comfortable English prose that includes the necessary allusions in a more explicit form. In some instances, I have given bullet points so the essentials could be clearly displayed and followed. What I could not alter, however, are the basic lines of argumentation that might be counterintuitive or, at the least, not patent upon a first reading. On this point, I would ask for the reader's indulgence. If grammar is a new subject, it might take some time before a line of reasoning clicks, and certain passages might require more than one reading. With a concerted effort on both ends, however, we can begin to demystify Sanskrit grammar and open up a challenging but rewarding body of literature.

1.3.2 On Searching Texts

An important part of this study has been locating the occurrence of particular grammatical forms in a corpus of Sanskrit texts, and a few words are in order concerning the methods by which I have queried these texts and the selection of the texts themselves. I will begin with the latter. My primary source for electronic texts (e-texts) has been those available in the Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages.[58] I have also acquired from other scholars additional e-texts and typed in a few on my own or in collaboration with others. The possibility for typos or other oversights in any of these e-texts owing to human error[59] needs only brief acknowledgment and may have contributed to occasional omissions in my data. The still larger questions surrounding the text-critical methods for establishing the entered texts is all but moot, given the restrictions of time and manpower. Some of the texts used will hopefully acquire critical editions in the future and so alter my data. In short, my corpus represents at best the printed editions on which the individual texts are based, most of which are not critically edited, and variant readings have not been included in my searches at all.[60] Despite these drawbacks, I do not believe they have skewed my data in any way significant enough to change the overall picture that emerges.

In querying my corpus of texts, I have made use of *TextCrawler*, a program that can be freely downloaded.[61] The program has allowed me to identify specific strings of characters as well as variable strings by using regular expressions. While more complex methods of searching texts are becoming available thanks to tagging in markup languages like XML, the rather rudimentary methods employed here have greatly enhanced my ability to talk about frequency of forms over time and identify authors who, based on their usage, continue certain linguistic practices and, thereby, possibly adhere to certain standards of grammaticality or reference older authors. In essence, however, such tools only continue the very old philological practices of identifying

---

[58]http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gret_utf.htm. Last accessed on 11/18/2017.

[59]Many of these e-texts have not been proofread.

[60]The main exceptions are the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābharata*, for which critical editions form the basis of the e-texts. The latter also includes passages that are starred, indicating that they are not accepted into the critically edited text. For other texts, when possible, I will note variant readings found in the footnotes to the editions and ones given in commentaries on the relevant passages.

[61]https://www.digitalvolcano.co.uk/textcrawler.html. Last accessed 11/18/2017.

parallels and replace the need for indices and concordances. If we wish to speak about style, the impact of certain lexemes or forms on an audience, searching a large corpus of texts is foundational to making accurate statements because mere impressions can be misleading.

1.3.3 Chronology and Context

To assist the reader in navigating the texts cited throughout the dissertation, in the following sections I will give a basic chronology of the main texts I utilize after a few introductory words about Pāṇini. For the grammatical texts, I have given a summary of what we know about each of these works and how they relate to one another as well as to their larger historical context. As I am dealing with quite a large number of texts over a long period of time, it is unavoidable that my treatment will at times be shallow and rely heavily on secondary literature. However, my goal at this moment is not thoroughness but a convenient reference for the reader.

1.4 Introducing Pāṇini

Sanskrit grammar (*vyākaraṇa*), by which I refer primarily to the method of linguistic description found in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*[62] (A) and other grammars in Sanskrit composed on the same or a similar model, is one of the tougher indological nuts to crack for those who have learned languages according to Latinate models. The foreignness of Pāṇini's method to such minds can perhaps be best encapsulated by citing the words of two Sanskritists who had grappled with Pāṇini's rules. Sir Williams Jones is, according to Colebrooke, to have "somewhere termed them dark as the darkest oracle."[63] William Dwight Whitney later infused the perceived impenetrability of Pāṇini's grammar with derogative judgments:

> The task Pāṇini attempted was beyond the power of mortal man to accomplish, especially in the form adopted by him—which is one that no sensible man should ever

---

[62]The A contains nigh 4,000 sūtras distributed over eight *adhyāya*s, "lessons," themselves further subdivided into four *pāda*s, "quarters," each. On the exact tally of sūtras, see Sharma (2002: 3).

[63]Colebrooke (1808: 209) [= Colebrooke (1837 II: 12)].

have chosen, yet on account of which, it is very likely, his contemporaries and successors especially admired him, and made him their supreme authority.[64]

Although much can be said about Whitney's attitude and the damage it has done to Sanskrit studies, we should try to understand why these learned men would make such remarks, i.e., what are the features of the A that could incite confusion and remonstration.[65] We may begin with a few basic facts. Sanskrit, as a highly inflected language with various declensions and conjugations, lends itself to presentation in paradigms, tabular representations of a noun or verb in all its various forms. Such a paradigm can, then, be used as a blueprint for the conjugation or declension of similar nouns or verbs, respectively.[66] Pāṇini, however, has nothing of the sort. The aim of his grammar, as Patañjali points out,[67] is to give a series of general rules in the very condensed sūtra-style[68] with exceptions as appropriate, that is to say, Pāṇini tells the reader what to do in order to generate a correct word in a specific syntactic environment; he does not give, for the most part, the correct words themselves. What one is instructed to do is to assign technical terms, add suffixes and augments to nominal and verbal bases (*prātipadika* and *dhātu*s, respectively), and make further modifications and substitutions as required. The entire process is termed *prakriyā*, "derivation."[69] Although this might not sound particularly confusing, the A defines and uses a

---

[64]Whitney (1893: 176f.).

[65]Criticism of Pāṇinian grammar and similar ones is also to be found in premodern times. Cf. Prabhācandra's account of Hemacandra's grammar, the *Siddhahemavyākaraṇa*, in his *Prabhāvakacarita*: "The voluminous grammars that had existed in earliest times were impossible to read in full, even in an entire lifetime, and hence were actually an impediment to fulfilling the three life goals; they were confused, riddled with faults, or unintelligible in places. Hence scholars of today take this grammar [scil. of Hemacandra] as their standard." Trans. Pollock (2006: 590). In reality, the grammatical system Hemacandra produced was every bit as voluminous as Pāṇini's. The auto-commentaries on the *Siddhahaimavyākaraṇa* — the great running commentary (*bṛhadvṛtti*) named *Tattvaprakāśikā* and its sub-commentary, the *Śabdamahārṇavanyāsa* — rival, if not exceed, the KV and MBh in length and erudition. Cf. Belvalkar (1915: 64).

[66]Sanskrit grammar was and still is taught in this manner in India. Cf. Gerow (2002: 666f.). Texts like the *Rūpa-siddhi*, used for Hanxleden's grammar of Sanskrit, do just this. Cf. van Hal & Vielle (2013: 9–12).

[67]MBh I.6.3–7. The passage is translated in Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 77).

[68]Cf. Renou (1963). A sūtra is generally characterized by extreme brevity with no verb. *bhavati*, "is," or *syāt*, "should be," is implied. A floating, oft quoted verse defines a sūtra as follows:
alpākṣaram asaṃdigdhaṃ sāravad viśvatomukham |
astobham anavadyaṃ ca sūtraṃ sūtravido viduḥ ||
"Those who know sūtras know the sūtra to be of few syllables, without confusion, containing the essentials, multi-faceted, without superfluity, and irreproachable."

[69]What I present here is a gross oversimplification meant only to give the reader who is unacquainted with the nature of the Sanskrit grammarians a general idea of their method. The purpose of this dissertation is not to teach Pāṇini. For an overview of his grammatical system, see Cardona (1997) and Sharma (2002).

metalanguage that must be mastered before the rules themselves can be understood or applied in any meaningful way. The metalanguage includes, *inter alia*, unique functions for the cases, metarules (rules for interpreting and ordering other rules), and *it*s or *anubandha*s, "indicatory letters," that indicate the application or prohibition of other rules, etc. Finally, I should add that various syllable-saving devices have been exploited — brevity is one of the famed aspirations of Sanskrit grammarians[70] — including *anuvṛtti*, "rolling along," i.e., the continuation of a word from one sūtra into what follows when no other word in the same syntactic position blocks it,[71] and *pratyāhāra*s, "abbreviated list," i.e., the equation of a longer series of letters with a shorter (usually monosyllabic) combination of letters. All of this can be quite overwhelming and requires years of intense study to master, but it is, *pace* Whitney, well within the range of "mortal man." In many ways this type of grammar is more akin to a computer program, although the comparison should not be carried very far.

Lest all this seem too abstract, let us look in some detail at one (simple) example. Toward the end of the 2nd quarter of the 7th lesson, Pāṇini has formulated a number of rules dealing with vṛddhi-substitution, i.e., instances where one vowel is replaced by an *ā*, an *ai* or an *au*. An important rule of frequent application and consisting of only four syllables is the following:

> P. 7.2.115 *aco ñṇiti* |

> In place of the final of a base (*aṅga*) ending in a vowel, the closest matching vṛddhi-vowel, i.e., an *ā*, *ai*, or *au*, occurs when a suffix follows that bears either an indicatory *Ñ* or *Ṇ*.

For example, if we add the suffix *tnaṆ* to the root √*cyu*, the form *cyautna*, "strength,"[72] results. Since the suffix is marked with *Ṇ*, *au* will replace the final *u* in accordance with P. 7.2.115. Although the application of the rule is straightforward, the reader might be astonished that only four syllables are able to express the corresponding English translation. The reason for this disparity derives from Pāṇini's metalanguage and the various other syllable-saving techniques al-

---

[70]Cf. PŚ 122 *ardhamātrālāghavena putrotsavaṃ manyante vaiyākaraṇāḥ* | "Grammarians think (there has been) the birth of a son by saving half a mora."

[71]Treated exhaustively in Joshi & Bhate (1984), although one not need accept all of their conclusions about the original form of the A.

[72]The suffix is added by UṇSUj 4.104. Ujjvaladatta gives the gloss *bala*, "strength."

ready mentioned. Without attempting to be exhaustive, the following references for words in my translation might give some idea of what it means to read a Pāṇinian sūtra:

In place of P. 1.1.49 *ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogā* | "The genitive is connected with 'in place.'" This metarule defines a particular use of the sixth or genitive case within the A. It should be interpreted as specifying the substituendum, i.e., what is to be substituted.

base (*aṅga*) P. 6.4.1 *aṅgasya* | "Of a stem." This is an *adhikāra*, "heading rule," that governs from P. 6.4.1 up to the end of P. 7.4. All rules in these sections apply only when an *aṅga* base is in play. *aṅga* itself is defined in P. 1.4.13 (a very complex definition) and may be somewhat more accurately translated as "presuffixal stem."

the final P. 1.1.52 *alo 'ntyasya* | "A substitute occurs in place of the final letter of that which is denoted by the word presented in the genitive case." This is a metarule that restricts the location of the substituendum to the final letter of a larger sting of letters, in this case the *u* of the base *cyu-*.

ending in P. 1.1.72 *yena vidhis tadantasya* | "A rule that is applicable to a particular element is also applicable to larger strings that end in that element as well as to that element itself." Another metarule that ensures that a rule applies not only to the element mentioned in the sūtra but also to what ends in that element. In this case, vṛddhi-substitution applies not only a solitary vowel, but to what ends in a vowel, such as *cyu-*.

vowel *acaḥ* (*aco* with sandhi) is the genitive singular of the *pratyāhāra*, "abbreviated list," *aC*, and so means, according to P. 1.1.49, "in place of *aC*." Such abbreviations are created by applying to a given list P. 1.1.71.[73] The list in question that ends in *C* is found in the *Śivasūtra*s, a series of sounds set in an arrangement tailored to Pāṇini's rules. The first four of these sūtras are included under *aC* and encompass all the vowels.[74]

the closest matching P. 1.1.50 *sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ* | "The closest (among several substitutes) oc-

---

[73]P. 1.1.71 *ādir antyena sahetā* | "An initial letter together with a final indicatory letter represents the phonetic form of the initial letter itself together with all the intervening letters."

[74]Furthermore, to understand why Pāṇini has only listed short *a* and not also long *ā* or other variants with different accents, one must know P. 1.1.9 *tulyāsyaprayatnaṃ savarṇam*, another complex sūtra defining what "homorganic" sounds are, and P. 1.1.10 *nājjhalau*.

curs in place (of the substituendum)." This metarule regulates the process of substitution when several substitutes are available. The appropriate substitute is the one that is closest to the substituendum, often with respect to phonetic properties.[75] In this case, the *u* of *cyu-* is substituted by *au* because they both share a v elar (*kaṇṭhya*) place of articulation.

vṛddhi-vowel We must understand the word *vṛddhi* in the present sūtra from the preceding one. It has come via the process of *anuvṛtti*, "rolling along." That *vṛddhi* refers to *ā*, *ai*, and *au* is known from P. 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic*. Note that once again *aiC* is a *pratyāhāra*.

when a suffix Since this rule falls under the domain of *aṅgasya* the element that follows (see the next entry) must be a suffix because an *aṅga* is by definition a base with a following suffix.[76]

follows P.1.1.66 *tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya* | "When an item is presented in the seventh (loc.) case, an operation is to be directed toward what precedes (the item in the seventh case)." In other words, a word in the loc. gives the right-hand context for a rule. *ñṇiti* is in the loc.

that bears either an indicatory Ñ or Ṇ *ñṇiti* stands in the loc. case and is a bahuvrīhi compound with the meaning "that which has a Ñ of Ṇ as an indicatory letter (*it*)." The indicatory letters are defined in P. 1.3.2–8 and then elided by P. 1.3.9 before pronunciation. The application of these sūtras belongs properly to the suffix *tnaṆ*, for without them we would not know that Ṇ by P. 1.3.3 is an indicatory letter.

From this example, and I emphasize that I have not been exhaustive in my annotation, the reader should now have an idea as to why the sūtra on its own could appear oracular — it's utterly unintelligible to the uninitiated[77] — and perhaps not the best way to present the rule in question to a general audience, since it requires that a number of other rules have been memorized. Most grammarians of Sanskrit writing in the style of the Greek and Latin grammatical tradition would prefer, in the first place, to use more words and perhaps give a list of suffixes under a heading, such as, "the following suffixes cause vṛddhi-strengthening of final radical vowel." Ultimately,

---

[75]Deshpande (1975) treats this topic, *sāvarṇya*, in a book-length study of over 200 pages.

[76]Not all commentators include *pratyaye* in their gloss of the sūtra. The KV, Rāmacandra, and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīta do not, but Dharmakīrti does (RA vol. I p. 46), as well as Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (PraKPrak vol. I p. 243).

[77]One well versed in Pāṇini's metalanguage could easily make sense of a hitherto unknown rule provided its place within the A were given.

however, both types of rules strive to describe the same phenomenon. What differs is how information is presented and retrieved. The cause for the disdain of one and the praise of the other rests in the educational habits of the teachers and students, the value placed on memorization, and an appreciation of a certain algebraic elegance. Yet an even larger conceptual divergence between Graeco-Roman grammar and Pāṇini's is that the former explicitly seeks to account for the language of a partially still extant canonical set of literary, i.e, mostly poetic, texts whereas the aim of the A, which predates the major works of classical Sanskrit by several hundred years, is to generate an idealized, now mostly inaccessible, *spoken*[78] language with only marginal, sometimes vague remarks about the language of the then preexisting and now still available literature, the Vedas.[79] For someone like Dionysius of Thrax, the author of the first extant grammar of Greek, *Tékhnē Grammatikḗ*, the poetic idiom of Homer, the classical tragedians, etc., formed the core of grammatical studies, as can be gleaned from his definition of *grammatikḗ*, a term with greater breadth than English "grammar": "*grammatikḗ* is the empirical knowledge of the expressions commonly used among poets and prose writers."[80] Indeed, the sixth and most beautiful (*kálliston*) section is *krísis poiēmátōn*, "criticism of poems." This data-driven and poetry-centric approach to grammar, would go on to influence later Latin grammars and thence the grammars of the European languages and the attitudes of their grammarians. Although Pāṇini certainly based his grammar on usage known to him,[81] since all the details of that exact idiom are rarely

---

[78]Although Plato expressed reservations about the use of writing, prophesying that it would produce forgetfulness in those who learned the technology, the Graeco-Roman tradition of grammar is, as the name itself signifies, oriented toward the written word. Cf. Irvine (1994: 25–30) on Plato. For the importance of the writing by Hellenistic times, cf. Irvine (1994: 38f.): "[t]he underlying model of language was writing ... [t]he written text was privileged over speech, which came to be seen as merely ephemeral and local."

[79]Pāṇini's description of the Vedic literature is the subject of Thieme (1935). Cf. Liebich (1885), in which Pāṇini's description of case is compared with the usage found in the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*, and Kiparsky (1980: 56–75), where the application of optional sūtras is measured against Vedic usage. The difficulty of finding an accurate representative of Pāṇini's language — excluding linguistic specimens that were composed to exemplify the sūtras themselves — when a large Vedic corpus exists, has inspired the *grell klingende Antithese* in Benfey (1874: 3f.), that the Indians had the most wonderful language (scil. Vedic), for which they wrote no grammar, and the most wonderful grammar, for which there was no language. I must point out, however, that we know virtually nothing about the A's original context, aims, or use. The earliest source for any such information is the MBh written centuries later. I will later touch briefly on the quixotic effort to date these works.

[80]*Ars grammatica* p. 5: γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. Translated in Swiggers & Wouters (2002: 11). The passage is also translated and discussed in Irvine (1994: 43), although the former translation is more accurate.

[81]As I have already pointed out and will discuss again shortly, Pāṇini's commentators were concerned with (poetic)

reflected in the Sanskrit of later times and the grammar fails to account accurately for Vedic, or even all of classical Sanskrit, one must wonder, as did Whitney: why not just compose and use a different grammar?[82] This reasoning, however, misses the point of the A, or rather, it neglects to engage with the literary culture and countless individuals for whom Sanskrit was inseparable from the A. In this context, one should understand Max Müller's slightly hyperbolic pronouncement: "Whatever people may say, no one knows Sanskrit, who does not know Panini (*sic*)."[83]

A further point of necessity, easily derived from the above example, likewise underscores the larger context of Pāṇini's grammar. The A is not a work that one simply picks up off the shelf and reads, but it requires, like all sūtra-works in Sanskrit, the addition of a commentary from a teacher who has already mastered the text. We unfortunately do not have Pāṇini's own commentary, although scholars have speculated that some explanations may be more original to Pāṇini's own intention. Be that as it may, within the long history of the Pāṇinian tradition, the A was associated and studied with a vast and very learned body of commenterial literature in which various avenues of interpretation were explored and every letter of the grammar came under scrutiny.[84] For some of the metarules I cited above there are dozens of pages of exegesis, beginning with Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and extending to book-length studies from the modern era. Throughout much of its history, advanced study of the A involved a deep engagement with the problems raised by Patañjali and the author of the *vārttika*s, Kātyāyana, how to think through their arguments, and finally grasping each rule's role in the structure of the grammar. Although correct language remained at the heart of the commentators' interpretive program, it was necessary to provide an equally correct derivation for this language within the confines of the A (and later the additions by Patañjali and Kātyāyana) and based on a proper explanation of the sūtras. As noted above, what counted as correct or proper, both in the domain of usage and exegesis,

---

usage and sometimes even took pains to account for it.

[82]Once again, it is worth noting that there are still many similarities between Pāṇini and the Greek and Latin grammarians insofar as both sought to describe a particular ideal. In the case of the A, however, we have lost that ideal for the most part.

[83]This statement, quoted and translated into Sanskrit in RA vol. I p. xvii with fn. *s* by Rangacharya, was give as part of an advertisement for works by Rai Bahadur Sris Chandra Vasu published by the Panini Office. It occurs, *inter alia*, at the end of Griffith (1912) on p. 143, if one continues the pagination of the main text.

[84]I discuss this literature in the following section.

fluctuated over the course of time, and using the A as a quick reference grammar became even more impractical.

To rehash the main points of this section, the A is a set of rules with which the user can generate correct Sanskrit words out of nominal or verbal bases and suffixes. The interpretation of these highly condensed sūtras gave way to an extensive commentarial tradition, the study of which formed into a highly regarded and complex discipline unto itself. The target language of the grammar was, according to Patañjali, the speech of a class of learned Brahmans in a specific region of northern India, although some attention was given to the existing Vedic literature at the time. Unlike the European tradition of grammar, the A and its earliest commentators do not strive to describe a specific set of literary texts, and the great classics of Sanskrit literature, above all poetry, postdate the A by over half of a millennium. From the modern vantage point, especially in light of Graeco-Roman grammars, it appears that the cart has been put before horse. But it was precisely this situation, which forced the great interpretive feats that brought the Sanskrit grammarians such fame or infamy, as the case may be. Finally, it is worth emphasizing again that the study of A formed one of the core learned pursuits in Sanskritic culture.

1.5   Outline of Grammatical Texts

We do not as yet have any single reference work in English[85] that could adequately provide the reader with the basic facts of the long and illustrious Sanskrit grammatical tradition, especially the non-Pāṇinian schools.[86] Nevertheless, I wish to limit myself, for the most part, to only those

---

[85]In Hindi, see Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1973), *Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā itihāsa* with much valuable information, but modern scholarship is not often cited and the different schools of grammar are not treated evenly.

[86]Scharfe's *History of Grammatical Literature*, (1977), does not fulfill this desideratum, and, in fact, the much older *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar* by Belvalkar, (1915), is still, in many regards, a more thorough and informative work. The reader is encouraged to look up the reviews by Rocher (1978) and Cardona (1979), and note Rocher (1978: 81)'s sentiment that "[m]y disappointment is all the greater upon examination of what we have been offered," and Cardona (1979: 117)'s evaluation that "[a]t times [Scharfe] fails to given (*sic*) even the barest minimum of information, at others he shows a penchant for petty quibbling while overlooking the obvious, and there is throughout an apodictic tone which is scarcely justified." I must similarly note that the *Philosophy of the Grammarians* in the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Coward & Kunjunni Raja (1990), will also not serve as a proper history of Sanskrit grammar, albeit for different reasons, given the more limited scope of the book. Rather bizarre editorial choices have made even basic features of the book impractical, e.g., there are no page numbers from pp. 370–433, inclusive, and the bibliography

texts that will play a major role in the body of my thesis, neglecting out of considerations of time and space a large number of works that are still in need of scholarly attention. These limitations in place, I will proceed to discuss, in roughly chronological order, the major works of Sanskrit grammatical tradition[87] beginning with the *Mahābhāṣya* and terminating with Nāgeśa and a few of his followers. I will try to give additional references to the non-Pāṇinian school, especially when they are wanting in Scharfe (1977).

1.5.1 The Triad of Sages

1.5.1.1 Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

Much ink has already been spilled on attempts to pinpoint the date and place of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali, collectively referred to as the *munitraya*, "Triad of Sages." Pāṇini, the author of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, is to have hailed from Śalātura near modern day Taxila in Pakistan[88] and lived sometime around 400 BCE. He clearly had predecessors, whose opinions he gives, but nothing is known about them.[89] Efforts to arrive at an exact date for Pāṇini have been as tedious as they are uncertain.[90] More recent evidence for Pāṇini's date, presented in von Hinüber (1989: 34f.),

is arranged by topic and then year, not by the author's last name. Cf. Bronkhorst (1992) for a critical review.

[87]For the Pāṇinian tradition we are very fortunate to have the exhaustive critical bibliographies in Cardona (1976) and (2004). There are, of course, several noteworthy publications since the last volume.

[88]Cf. BhKA 6.62a *śālāturīyamatam* | "the opinion of the man from Śalātura" (here clearly a reference to Pāṇini), GRM 2a *śālāturīya-* with the gloss *śalāturo nāma grāmaḥ | so 'bhijano 'syāstīti śālāturīyas tatrabhavāt pāṇiniḥ* | "The town is Śalātura by name. One who has is that as his *abhijana* is *Śālāturīya*, i.e., Pāṇini because (his ancestors) were there." Reference is to P. 4.3.90 *abhijanaś ca*. The commentators, beginning with Patañjali (MBh II.314.7f.), understand *abhijana*, in contrast to *nivāsa*, "one's actually dwelling place," as *abhijano nāma yatra pūrvair uṣitam*, "*abhijana* is where one's forefathers lived." Vardhamāna, therefore, did not believe Pāṇini necessarily lived in Śalātura. The 7th cent. Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, Xuanzang (Hsüan Tsang), reports Śalātura as the birthplace of Pāṇini in his *Record of the Western Regions*. For a translation of the passage, see Li (1996: 68f.).

[89]He cites ten to be exact. We cannot write much of a history of grammatical scholarship prior to Pāṇini. What is known about linguistic speculation from the Vedic literature and Yāska's *Nirukta* sheds little light on the development of Pāṇini's highly technical mode of linguistic description, although some of his techniques, such as substitution and metarules, have parallels in other sūtra-literatures. For linguistic speculations and terminology in Vedic literature, Liebich (1919b: 3–17) is still of great value. See also Scharfe (1977: 78–87) with more recent secondary literature. On Yāska and the *Nighaṇṭu*, Sarup (1920), Scharfe (1977: 117–123), and Kahrs (1998). For the connection between Pāṇini and ritual, cf. Renou (1941–1942) [= Staal (1972: 435–478)] and Freschi & Pontillo (2013).

[90]Cardona (1976: 260–268), with dozens of citations, rehashes the hitherto available arguments. Cardona relies, as do many others, on a wildly speculative notion that a certain amount of time must have elapsed between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana, and between Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Although Cardona (1976: 267) rightly admits that "subjectivism enters," I know of no reason why a century, two centuries or a decade *must* intervene between either set of authors. If the A was a real hit and made waves, then surely reactions would have been swift in coming. Furthermore, the

has come from the interpretation of P. 5.2.120,[91] a sūtra for the formation of *rūpya*, which can mean an object that possesses a struck (*āhata*) form or a praiseworthy form. Just as the KV *ad loc.*, von Hinüber takes this to be a reference to punched coins, and since punched coins only first appear in the north-west of India in 350 BCE, we have a terminus post quem for Pāṇini, and many scholars have adopted this as firm evidence.[92] The evidence, however, is very flimsy and based on a number of assumptions for which no evidence is offered (why does *āhata* have the technical sense of a "punched"?), and Cardona (2015: 174, fn. 38) is right to find "[t]his assumption unjustified."

Regarding the text of A, I should only like to mention, in addition to what I have already said above, that we do not know with great certainty how it came to be, in what context, and even what its original form was. Our first witness to the entire A, the sūtras as commented on in the KV, shows that the text had already undergone alteration.[93] Even Kātyāyana and Patañjali knew of sūtras that had different readings.[94] This instability of the sūtra-text over such a long period of time has rightly led scholars to question to what extent the A, as we have it, reflects Pāṇini's original text, and query whether internal evidence might reveal other sorts of tampering such as additions and the rearrangement of rules or whole sections.[95] The A could well be a composite text with a final redaction much later than its individual parts, a scenario that would essentially demolish any hope of establishing a date on internal evidence. Similar skepticism urges us to investigate whether the sūtras have been correctly interpreted by the extant commentators and

---

dates of Kātyāyana and Patañjali find no firmer footing.

[91]P. 5.2.120 *rupād āhatapraśaṃsayor yap* | "The suffix *yaP*, in the sense of possession, optionally comes after *rūpa*, which occurs in reference to something qualified by *āhata* or praise." The exact meaning *āhata*, "beaten, struck," is crucial to the argument, but not discussed by von Hinüber.

[92]Cf. Falk (1993: 303f.). Houben (2009: 6, fn. 1) goes so far as to say that "[t]he date of 'ca. 350 BCE' for Pāṇini is thus based on concrete evidence which till now has not been refuted." Cf. Scharfe (2009: 28, fn. 1) for further references and discussion of the numismatic evidence. Nevertheless, he still does not debate the interpretation of *āhata*, which is crucial for making the link with coins in the first place.

[93]It has long been known that the authors of the KV have modified or had before them a modified version of Pāṇini's sūtras, when compared with the evidence from the MBh. Cf. Kielhorn (1887) [=Rau (1969: 226–184)] and Oberlies (1996) as well as (2006). The latter demonstrates that many of the modifications date back to the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*, usually following the suggestion of Kātyāyana or Patañjali. In many ways the *sūtra-pāṭha* of the JV and CV also serve as evidence for the contents of the A. Other sūtras clearly derive from *vārttika*s.

[94]Cf. Cardona (1976: 153f.).

[95]One of the more extreme views is found in Joshi & Roodbergen (1983).

what the reason for their (mis)interpretation may have been. These are perfectly valid questions, and anyone who studies Pāṇini should be made aware of what we know about the text's development. Further insight into the composition of the A and Pāṇini's linguistic principles may well also result from such inquiries. Nevertheless, one must at some point ask what the final outcome of such studies will be and to what extent are the results able to be verified. In my view, the situation boils down the following: if Kātyāyana and Patañjali did not have the original text of the A before them and their interpretation of the rules is at times incorrect, then even if modern scholars were to definitively reconstitute the original form of the A and determine the original interpretation of the sūtras, these results would have little or no relevance to the entire later commentarial tradition that spans almost two millennia.[96] This, I strongly believe, is lamentable because it is precisely these texts that played such a pivotal role in Sanskrit literary culture and because virtually all of these texts are in desperate need of critical editions (or simply publication!), translations, and annotation. As for verification, since an older commentary on the A is unlikely to come to light, we will never have the opportunity to test the various hypotheses in any sort of productive way. Finally, the line of argumentation in such scholarship ascribes to Pāṇini a certain type of reasoning, i.e., the same as the modern researcher, which is more presumptuous than often admitted.

1.5.1.2 The *Mahābhāṣya*

Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (MBh) counts as one of the most learned and difficult texts among human literary production. As fate would have it, it is also our first witness to the A, that is to say, much like the A itself, the now available commentarial tradition begins at an extraordinarily advanced stage with questions and discussions suited for the post-doc not the beginner. Regarding the work's date and the details of its author, an enormous body of secondary literature exists,[97] and

---

[96]Kiparsky (2007) is a fine example of how we can better understand why Patañjali and others would interpret a sūtra contrary to what Pāṇini originally intended, namely, to account for new or overlooked data. Nevertheless, it still has little relevance for the rest of the tradition.

[97]For a summary of arguments for dating Patañjali, see Cardona (1976: 266–270), Joshi & Roodbergen (1976: i–xxxiv), Pollock (2006: 168f.), and Bronkhorst (2016: 42–52).

the long-standing scholarly consensus of the mid-2nd cent. BCE has been rightly called into question. Pollock, more recently, presents a mid-2nd CE date as credible.[98] Since none of the evidence for dating Patañjali is particularly concrete in my view and his precise date plays no role in the following dissertation, I am content with leaving the question open and assuming that the MBh was written sometime around the turn of the Common Era.

To give an idea to someone unfamiliar with the MBh of how monumental this work is, we may quote the popular saying: *mahābhāṣyaṃ vā pāṭhanīyaṃ mahārājyaṃ vā pālanīyam* | "One can either study the *Mahābhāṣya* or rule a great realm."[99] Both tasks, should they be carried out successfully, require tremendous training, dedication, and occupy a person throughout the entirety of his/her life. What makes this text so difficult is not, as one might at first expect, the complexity of its language, but rather the assumption that the reader has a mastery not only of the A but also of the various problems involved in its interpretation as would arise during a more elementary study of Pāṇini's grammar. As for the content of the work, the MBh is not a direct commentary on the A but, above all, a "discussion" (*bhāṣya*) of the *vārttika*s, "critical comments," (vārtt.) by Kātyāyana as well as a number of other grammatical arguments presented in metrical form (*kārikā*s).[100] All of this takes place in the form of a lively debate between what later commentators identify as an *ācārya*, "teacher," and one or more *ācāryadeśīya*s, "almost-teachers."

---

[98]Pollock bases this date, in part, on the likely advent of *kāvya*-literature with reference to Sicar (1939). The other source cited in Pollock (2006: 80f., fn. 15), however, has been misunderstood. Frauwallner (1960: 111) does not refer to the mid-2nd cent. CE, but rather BCE; dating Patañjali to this time period or even earlier is impossible, according to Frauwallner. In the penultimate sentence of the same paragraph, after remarking on the difficulties of giving precise dates during this period, Frauwallner only asserts that it is dubious to date Patañjali before the beginning of the common era (*Mir scheint … ein Ansatz Patañjali's vor dem Beginn unserer Zeitrechnung bedenklich.*).

[99]Cited, e.g., in Scharfe (1977: 152).

[100]Kātyāyana has formulated approximately 4,239 *vārttika*s on 1,245 sūtras. Patañjali has commented on an additional 468 sūtras. Cf. Kielhorn (1886b: 203) [=Rau (1969: 206)]. There are 260 *kārikā*s. The exact number of *vārttika*s, and whether they are Kātyāyana's, is difficult to determine because Patañjali does not always indicate this information in a very direct manner. Kielhorn (1876) [=Rau (1969: 1–64)] proposed a method for separating out a vārtt. from the surrounding *bhāṣya* — basically that Patañjali usually restates the vārtt. — but in a later publication, Kielhorn (1886b) [=Rau (1969: 206–214)] himself criticizes, and endeavors to improve upon, his early proposal. Cf. Rocher (1978: 84), who draws attention to the problem and Kielhorn's self-criticism. Bronkhorst (1987: 1–13) revisits the problem and draws our attention to the fact that Kielhorn has added words in his edition of the MBh so as to bring the text into closer conformity with his theory. See further Bronkhorst (1994: 250–253), where he discusses the matter again with a response to Wezler's criticisms. Strangely, Kielhorn (1886) is not cited in either of these publications. I, deferring to the modern standard, follow Kielhorn's numbering of the *vārttika*s in his edition.

Leaving aside biographical questions about Kātyāyana,[101] we may view him as examining and testing the validity of Pāṇini's rules, the accuracy of his wording, and how they fit together into the larger system. Patañjali, following Kātyāyana's example, does the same to his *vārttika*s and to those rules of Pāṇini on which he comments independently. In some places Kātyāyana and Patañjali accept Pāṇini's rules as they are formulated but in others, *both* commentators come to the conclusion that certain sūtras require either modification in their basic formulation or additions (*upasaṃkhyāna, iṣṭi*). Sometimes entirely new rules are formulated, but sometimes sūtras are rejected as superfluous.

Although such learned grammatical debates occupy Patañjali in the vast majority of his commentary, we also learn from the MBh something about how Patañjali envisioned the world in which the A was studied and to what end. Much of the information regarding this milieu derives from the *Paspaśā* (*Introduction*) to the MBh, the most thoroughly studied portion of the text.[102] Patañjali situates the use of Pāṇini's grammar squarely in the limited world of the sacred, above all the ritual, as can be gleaned from the fives uses (*prayojana*s) of grammar, the first of which is *rakṣā*, "preservation (of the Vedas)."[103] Together with the oft-quoted passage about the *śiṣṭa*s "learned" mentioned above on p. 6, we can have little doubt about Patañjali's idealized linguistic context for Sanskrit.

1.5.2   The First Non-Pāṇinian Grammars

However much Patañjali may have tried to make the A a text of Brahmans and an important part of successfully caring out the Vedic ritual, it is in the grammars of the Jains and Buddhists that we find our first extant responses to Patañjali.

---

[101]It's only worth noting in the present context that he had predecessors who also commented on the A in a similar fashion. See Scharfe (1977: 136–148). Kātyāyana's date is plagued by many of the same problems as Patañjali's, on which it is based. Cf. Cardona (1976: 267).

[102]Translated with extensive annotations in Joshi & Roodbergen (1986). For a list of earlier translations, see Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: i). The *Paspaśā*, along with a few other passages from the MBh, has served as the basis for almost all discussions about Sanskrit's sociolinguistic status at the turn of the CE. See in particular Deshpande (1993: 17–32 and 53–74), Aklujkar (1996: 59–86), Kelly (1996: 87–108), and Pollock (2006: 45–50). I make no attempt here to rehash what has already been thoroughly discussed.

[103]Summarized in Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: v). The two take the list of uses or purposes of grammar to be a vārtt. and not from Patañjali's own pen. For their justification, see Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 26, fn. 72).

1.5.2.1 The *Kātantra* of Śarvavarman (2nd–4th cent.)

The *Kātantra* (Kā) has a complex history.[104] Fragments of this grammar with a commentary, and a seemingly earlier version named *Kaumāralāta*, have come to light in the Turfan (modern Turkestan) and are dated to the 4th–5th cent. CE.[105] The oldest version is, therefore, usually dated to the first centuries CE, but there is no firm evidence for one century or another. The Kā gained quickly in popularity and was subsequently augmented to cover the same range of topics as the A.[106] Although the Kā was studied throughout most of India and beyond, the grammar had a close affiliation with Buddhists, as its presence in the Turfan, Tibetan translations, and the commentary by Durgasiṃha, a Buddhist, attest to. As is typical of almost all the non-Pāṇinian grammars, the Kā does not formulate rules for Vedic usage or for the pitch accent. The following commentaries (many more exist) are available in print and have been consulted by me:

- A *vṛtti* and *ṭīkā* by Durgasiṃha (6th–8th cetn.?).
- The *Śiśyahitānyāsa* by Ugrabhūti (10th or 11th cent.).
- The *Kātantravṛttipañjikā*, a sub-commentary on the Durgasiṃha's *vṛtti*, by Trilocanadāsa (12th cent.).[107]
- The *Kalāpacandra*, a commentary primarily on the last, by Kavirāja Suṣeṇaśarman.

---

[104]For a general description, cf. Belvalkar (1915: 68–76), Liebich (1919a) with German translation, Scharfe (1977: 162f), and Shen (2014: 11–37). The last is particularly valuable for an English overview of what we know about the Kā, its manuscripts, commentaries, date, etc., as well as a detailed bibliography. The various introductory material in the 1997 edition by Dwivedī also contains much information. Cf. Pollock (2006: 62 and 169–172) for the early reception of the Kā and its patronage.

[105]Unless otherwise noted, all subsequent dates will be CE.

[106]Cf. Cardona (2008) and Shen (2015: 20–23). The original grammar of less than 450 sūtras did not include sections on primary derivatives (*kṛdanta*s), secondary suffixes (*taddhita*s) or compounds.

[107]He is cited by Vopadeva (13th cent.). Cf. Belvalkar (1915: 74).

1.5.2.2 The *Jainendravyākaraṇa* (mid-5th cent)

The little studied *Jainendravyākaraṇa* (JV)[108] of Devanandin (Pūjyapāda)[109] (mid-5th cent.)[110] is the first attempt to recreate the A with additions from the MBh but without the rules for the pitch accent or the Vedic language. There are two recensions of the grammar: a shorter version (3063 sūtras), found primarily in the north among the Śvetāmbara Jainas, with the commentary *Mahāvṛtti* (*Great Commentary*) by Abhayanandin (JV(M))[111] and a longer version (3708 sūtras), found primarily in the south among the Digambara Jainas, with the commentary *Śabdārṇava-candrikā* (*Moonlight among the Ocean of Words*) by Somadeva (JV(Ś)).[112] The former is the (more) original version, whereas the latter is the younger. The difference between the two, however, goes beyond mere additions, and there are also discrepancies in terminology and the formulation of rules. Furthermore, there are two recasts in the *Kaumudī*-style: one based on the JV(M), the *Pañcavastuka* by Śrutakīrti,[113] and one for the JV(Ś), the *Jainendraprakriyā* or *Prakriyāvatāra* of Guṇanandideva.[114] Finally, Pathak (1931–32: 27) mentions yet another redaction of JV(M) among Śvetāmbaras titled *Bhagadvāgvādinī*.[115] The JV is Pāṇini to the extreme, by which I refer to how

---

[108]In general, see Zachariae (1880), Belvalkar (1915: 52–56), Scharfe (1977: 168f.).

[109]The precise name of the author of the sūtras has drawn the attention of scholars, but an exhaustive presentation of the available data is still wanting, above all, the evidence of the colophons. Cf. Kielhorn (1881) [=Rau (1969: 180–184)] and Pathak (1883).

[110]Bronkhorst (1985), arguing on the basis of Devandin's other work, the *Sarvārthasiddhi*, argues for a date not long after 455. Cf. Birwé (1971: 35–44) with the caveat that Birwé's relative chronology of the JV(M) and the CV is no longer accepted. Oberlies (1996) agrees, although he is more insistent on Devandin's priority to the Candragomin.

[111]Abhayanandin lived between Māgha, whose verse (ŚiśuP 1.47) he cites ad JV(M) 4.3.114 for the form *praticaskare*, and the KV, perhaps in the early 7th cent. Cf. Zachariae (1880: 308) and Oberlies (1996: 273ff.).

[112]The younger recension (as well as the older) is already known to Akalaṅka (ca. 750). Cf. Birwé (1971: 44–53), according to whom the recension is by Guṇanandin. Based on a note in Kielhorn's MS, the commentator, Somadeva (also Somasūri), is to be dated to 1205 during the reign of Bhojadeva (Bhoja II), and the commentary was composed in Ājurikā. Cf. Kielhorn (1881: 76) [=Rau (1969: 181)].

[113]Cf. Kielhorn (1881: 76) [=Rau (1969: 181)], Belvalkar (1915: 56). Pathak (1931–32: 26) gives the date Śaka 1045 (= 967/8 CE) for one Śrutakīrti, but it need not be the author of the *Pañcavastuka*. In fact, since Pathak generally does not translate or explain the Sanskrit passages he cites, it is unclear why he believes *śrutakīrti* to be a proper name at all. See the following footnote for further discussion. I have not had access to this work.

[114]What is found in Pathak (1931–32: 26f.) about the *Jainendraprakriyā* and its author, has been refuted by Birwé (1971: 33). That Somadeva availed himself of this commentary while writing the *Śabdārṇavacandrikā* requires more evidence.

[115]The scholarship on the *Jainendravyākaraṇa* is rather limited, and since the bibliography given in Scharfe (1977: 205) is rather sparse — he lists no secondary literature save Birwé's introduction to the edition of the *Śākaṭāyana-vyākaraṇa* — I give here additional references. Zachariae (1880) and Kielhorn (1881) [=Rau (1969: 180–184)] independently (Kielhorn was not aware of Zachariae's article) provide the first basic but rather complete overviews of the grammatical school, although Burnell (1875: 97ff) was also aware of it and had had access

---

Devanandin has taken the economizing devices in the A to a new level. He has replaced almost all polysyllabic technical terms with monosyllabic ones, e.g., *samprasāraṇa* becomes *ji*, *dhātu* becomes *dhu*, etc.[116] In addition, certain suggestions have been taken over from the MBh, mostly those that would help to shorten the grammar, e.g., Devanandin does away with the *ekaśeṣa* rules, a fact that has given the name *anekaśeṣaṃ vyākaraṇam* to the JV.[117] Finally, the rules for the Vedic language as well as for the pitch accents are omitted. Otherwise, the JV follows the layout of the A quite closely, as can be easily ascertained from the comparative lists on pp. 431–488 of Tripāṭhī's edition. The divergences are also apparent. My last general remark about the content of the grammar is that it is Jain not simply because of its author, commentator, and primary users, but also on account of the initial sūtra: JV 1.1.1 *siddhir anekāntāt*, "There is the establishment (of words) on the basis of multiplicity." As Abhayanandin goes on to explain in his commentary, we should understand from *anekāntāt* that words are *anitya*, "impermanent," because they are manufactured (*kṛtaka*), and that this foundational concept of Jain philosophy is also responsible for the correct application of grammatical sūtras, e.g., the immediately following one, which defines *svam* (= *savarṇam*, "homorganic," of P. 1.1.9), is only sensible (*upapadyate*) when we assume the multiplicity of objects as having both similarity and dissimilarity.[118]

The JV did not, as the text's current circulation would lead us to believe, remain within the

---

to parts of the grammar. Zachariae discusses only the JV(M) on the basis of a MS in the then Königliche Bibliothek of Berlin. Kielhorn, on the other hand, mentions the two main recensions as well as the *Pañcavastuka* and correctly presumes the priority of the JV(M). Belvalkar (1915: 52–56) is generally less informative than Kielhorn and Zachariae (it does not seem he is aware of this article), although he does incorporate a few important points from Pathak (1914), e.g., that the KV knew the JV. Cf. Pathak (1914: 210). Unfortunately, Belvalkar also follows Pathak's then unpublished belief that the JV(Ś) is the "truer" version, a theory later published in Pathak (1931–32). Birwé (1971: 25–44) refutes Pathak's arguments and establishes Kielhorn's earlier assumption on a firm foundation. Scharfe (1976: 169f.) is excessively brief. Bronkhorst (1985) and Oberlies (1996) investigate the relation of the JV and its commentaries to the CV and KV. Further work is needed on this school despite Kielhorn (1881: 76)'s [=Rau (1969: 181)] harsh and unfair judgment: " ... among various grammars which have come under my notice, there is none more wanting in originality, none more worthless than the *Jainendram*." Belvalkar (1915: 54f.) likewise offers little reason to study the JV.

[116] A complete list is given in the second appendix to Tripāṭhī's edition on pp. 459f.

[117] Cf. Kielhorn (1881: 77) [= Rau (1969: 182)] and Birwé (1971: 27).

[118] *Mahāvṛtti* ad JV(M) 1.1.1: *etac ca vastunā sādharmyavaidharmyātmake 'nekānte saty upapadyate* | "And this (JV 1.1.2) makes sense when there is the multiplicity consisting of being similar and dissimilar to an object." The example is that *a* and *ā* are *sva* with one another because they are similar in place of articulation and different with respect to length. Abhayanandin also demonstrates the difficulties if only similarity or dissimilarity were taken into consideration. He offers the additional example of JV(M) 1.1.5.

confines of Jain communities. Rather, as Oberlies (1996) has demonstrated, this grammar and its early commentaries had an impact on both the CV and the KV. We can be rather certain that Candragomin knew the sūtra text of the JV and, most likely, a now lost *vṛtti* that originally accompanied the sūtras. Oberlies (1996) has also provided further evidence that the KV made use of the JV and the *Mahāvṛtti*.[119]

1.5.2.3   The *Cāndravyākaraṇa* (Late 5th cent.)

That we now have the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* (CV) of Candragomin, a Buddhist scholar of great renown (late 5th cent.),[120] is owed to the efforts of Bruno Liebich, who around the turn of the 20th cent. published the sūtra-text, its commentary, and the ancillary works, the *Dhātupāṭha*, and *Uṇādisūtra*.[121] The grammar differs in many respects from both the A as well as the JV, although the underlying goal was still much the same as the latter: to improve upon the A in light of the MBh. The most salient feature, in sharp contrast to the JV, is that it does not make use of *saṃjñā*s, "technical terms," and is even named the *asaṃjñakaṃ vyākaraṇam*, "grammar without technical terms," in the *vṛtti* ad CV 2.2.68. It further differs from the JV in that Candragomin has made no effort to follow Pāṇini's presentation of topics, an overview of which is available in Liebich (1920b: 3f.), and that there is slight evidence to show that the grammar once contained a section on Vedic rules and accents.[122] On the other hand, the CV lacks much in detail when compared to the A or the JV. Consequently, it seems that the grammar must have always been closely linked to a commentary to explain overly general rules. The *vṛtti*, "running commentary," that is now available on the CV has been the topic of some debate since Dash (1986: 8–12) has produced evidence that this is not a *svavṛtti* by Candragomin himself, but rather by one Dharmadāsa, who is mentioned

---

[119]See the summary in Oberlies (1996: 308f.).

[120]Cf. Liebich (1899) and (1930: 264–272). In general on the CV, see Scharfe (1977: 164–167). On the identity of the grammarian Candragomin with the author of the play *Lokānanda* and the verse-epistle *Śiṣyalekha*, see Hahn (1992) with a discussion of dissenting views and further literature.

[121]Liebich (1895) gives an extensive overview of Candragomin and the literature on the CV available in Tibetan with excerpts. In Liebich (1902) the sūtra-text, *dhātupāṭha*, and *uṇādisūtra*s were published. The CV with vṛtti followed in Liebich (1918).

[122]See Scharfe (1977: 164, fn. 11) and Aussant (2011: 210f.).

in the colophons of several MSS.[123]

The CV holds a place of particular importance in the early history of Sanskrit grammar, and it is worth noting a few of the details here. Besides the CV and the school that grew out of it, which I will discus shortly, it is thanks to Candra that the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* was revived under King Abhimanyu of Kashmir after a period of neglect in the region. Upon completing his investigation of Patañjali's work, he is to have propagated its study and even authored his own grammar. Reference here is to two well-known and thoroughly studied passages in Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*.[124] Although we do not know anything about the study of the MBh elsewhere in India during this period of time, Candragomin made a large enough impact on the scholarly consciousness that Bhartṛhari felt compelled to mention him in his brief survey of Pāṇinian grammar at the end of the 2nd *kāṇḍa*, and it was still compelling in the 12th cent., when Kalhaṇa wrote the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. Once again, we find that the MBh was cultivated, if not saved, in the hands of non-Brahmans, and the result of this engagement was, much like we saw with Devanandin, not a commentary on the MBh but a new grammar that integrated the improvements noted by Patañjali and Kātyāyana: a new and improved A. This does not mean, however, that the CV was irrelevant for the later Pāṇinian tradition. As was already observed in Kielhorn (1886), many of the explanations and additions in the KV can be found in the CV or its *vṛtti*. Although we cannot eliminate the possibility that both drew on a common source, as

---

[123]At the end of Liebich's edition of the commentary we find *secunda manu śrīmad-ācārya-dharmadāsasya kṛtir iyam*, "this work of the venerable teacher Dharmadāsa." See further the manuscript of the CV with *vṛtti* in the University of Cambridge library: https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01691-00005/1 (Last accessed 20/10/2017). For an overview and discussion of the debate surrounding the commentary's authorship, cf. Vergiani (2011) with further secondary literature. More studies are needed, but I find the evidence for a separate authorship compelling.

[124]VP 2.482–487 and RT 1.176. RT 4.488 continues the story of the MBh under Jayāpīḍa. Aklujkar (1978) argues that the verses in the VP are not by Bhartṛhari himself but by a student. Neither source gives the name Candragomin, simply Candra. Nevertheless, there seems to be little reason to doubt the identity of the two grammarians. Already by the time of Stein's edition and translation of the RT, these passages had attracted the attention of several scholars. Cf. Stein (1900 I: 31f., fn. 176). Joshi & Roodbergen (1976: i–xxxiv) discuss *passim.* the history of the interpretation of these passages and add their own interpretation on pp. xxxiif. Cardona (1977–78) and Aklujkar, in a series of publications (see Aklujkar (1991) with further references), also discuss the relevant passages in some detail with ample citations and evaluative judgments of previous scholarship. Unfortunately, Aklujkar (1991) does not include a complete bibliography (only "select"), and one must turn to other publications to determine the exact references, e.g., Cardona (2004: 7–93). Cardona (1978: 78–82) gives a very lucid overview of the passages. I do not wish to take up the precise interpretation of these verses at present. Suffice it to say that a *communis opinio doctorum* does not yet exist.

argued in Bronkhorst (2002), I still find it difficult to insist that KV did not draw on the CV and its commentary.[125] Another indication that the *Cāndra*-school had a long-lasting influence on the Pāṇinian tradition can be found in the commentary on the *Dhātupāṭha* by Kṣīrasvāmin, the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* (11th cent. Kashmir), in which ample citations to the *Cāndra-Dhātupāṭha* are to be found.[126] The grammar's impact even extended into the middle of the second millennium, when Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa cites the CV as an authority, an example of which we will see in ch. 4, § 4.6.6. But the primary domain of the CV remained in Buddhist communities, especially in Sri Lanka, and it is indeed rare to find commentators of the Pāṇinian school referring to the CV, whereas Buddhists made use of the CV when commenting on Sanskrit works, the primary examples being Ratnaśrījñāna on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* and Vasubandhu on the *Abhidharmakośa*. The full impact of the *Cāndra*-school is still being realized, as recent studies and editions have shown.[127] I have only availed myself of the sūtra-text and the *vṛtti*.

---

[125]Aussant (2011) has taken the logical step of placing the two commentaries on the *Pratyāhārasūtra*s side by side and noting the differences and similarities. The amount of identical text is overwhelming. Nevertheless, Aussant (2011: 211) remains skeptical that the CV *vṛtti* is the direct source for the KV. More watertight evidence that the KV knew the CV comes from Oberlies (1996: 312–314), who has given an incomplete list of 19 instances where pronouns (*kecit*, "some," *anye*, "others" and *apare*, "others") can be shown to refer to either the CV, the JV or the commentaries thereon. Two of these can be traced back only to the CV *vṛtti*. Once a thorough comparison of all three commentaries has been carried out, it might be possible to distinguish the content of a third, now lost commentary that was part of the Pāṇinian school. One could hypothesize that the innovations of the CV *vṛtti* that the KV has not adopted or only alluded to by some, etc. were part of the lost commentary.

[126]On this author and commentary, which I will discuss further in ch. 6, see Liebich (1930: 201–215).

[127]Though no longer very recent, Dash (1986) and Oberlies (1989) are to date the most detailed study of the CV since the works of Bruno Liebich. Oberlies has published four further studies on the CV, Oberlies (1989), (1992), (1996), and (2012), the last one detailing many of the texts of the grammatical school awaiting editing and publication. Gornall (2012) has studied the impact of the presentation of the *kāraka*s in the CV on later Pāli grammars. Cf. Gornall (2014). Dimitrov has done much to unearth and publicize the larger commentarial tradition on the CV. Dimitrov (2007) provides an edition of the *Viṃśatyupasargavṛtti*, "A commentary on the 30 Preverbs," with the Tibetan translation. Dimitrov (2010) presents a manuscript of the *Candrālaṃkāra* of Sāriputta (Vijayagarbha), a commentary on Ratnamati's *Candravyākaraṇapañjikā*, itself a commentary on the CV and its *vṛtti*. Dimitrov (2016), a monumental work, traces the history of Ratnamati (Ratnaśrījñāna) and discusses a number of important texts associated with the *Cāndra*-school.

1.5.3 The Pāṇinīyas up to Kaiyaṭa

1.5.3.1 Bhartṛhari (5ᵗʰ–6ᵗʰ cent.)

The development of Sanskrit grammar in the centuries after Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* is marked, above all, by Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (VP; *The Treatise on Sentence and Word*) (5ᵗʰ–6ᵗʰ cent.),[128] or perhaps the *Trikāṇḍī*,[129] an expansion of Patañjali's philosophy of language with many important innovations and numerous competing views from different philosophical schools mixed in.[130] Part of the continuity with the MBh is the Brahmanic (or Vedic) frame for the study and use of grammar, as is made abundantly clear in the opening verses of the first or *Brahma-kāṇḍa*: they lay out the non-dualism of *brahman*, which one can obtain through the Vedas — themselves the manifestation of a singular.[131] Correct (*sādhu*) words, established by the learned according to tradition, effect *dharma*, "merit,"[132] and grammar (*vyākaraṇa*) itself is elevated to a means of achieving *brahman*.[133] The philosophical achievements of the VP are the discussion of *sphoṭa*,

---

[128]On Bhartṛhari's life and times and his identification as the author of other works including the collection of poems known as the *Śatakatraya* or *Subhāṣitatriśatī*, see Houben (1996: 3–10) and Cardona (1976: 295–299). We know next to nothing about his life, although he was certainly well acquainted with the Vedic ritual and the Maitrāyaṇīya branch of the Yajurveda. The body of literature on the VP is growing, but we still lack a critical edition and a complete, annotated translation. Rau's edition, (1977), is a first step toward a critical edition, but since he did not take into consideration MSS of the VP with commentaries, much work is still left to be done. I will use this edition for citing the *kārikā*s.

[129]Cf. Aklujkar (1969). Aklujkar has provided ample evidence that the final *kāṇḍa* of the VP, the *Pada-kāṇḍa* (*Section on Words*) or *Prakīrṇa(ka)* (*Miscellanea*) was conceptualized as a treatise in its own right or, at the very least, enjoyed some independence from the first two *kāṇḍa*s, which carried the name *Vākyapadīya* for certain individuals. The designation (not necessarily a title) *Trikāṇḍī*, however, is only attested once in a punning verse by Helārāja at the conclusion of his commentary on the *Prakīrṇaka* and cited in Aklujkar (1969: 555); Gokulanāthamiśra, Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa, and Haribhāskara, however, identify verses from the *Prakīrṇaka* as belonging to the text named *Vākyapadīya*. Cf. Aklujkar (1969: 554). I do not, therefore, think that there is much precedent (or even evidence) for naming Bhartṛhari's *magnum opus* the *Trikāṇḍī* and so will continue to collectively refer to all three *kāṇḍa*s as the *Vākyapadīya* with due acknowledgment of the possible inaccuracy. Cf. Houben (1995: 6, fn. 8) and Cardona (2004: 247–249) for further discussion of the problem.

[130]For an introduction and summary of the VP, see Aklujkar (1970) and Subramania Iyer (1969).

[131]A good, short summary is given in Cardona (1999: 92). Houben (1995: 15–20) has argued that the VP evinces a sort of "perspectivism," which amounts to claiming that Bhartṛhari was willing to accept the validity of different philosophical arguments or perspectives in various contexts. In order to ascribe this mindset to Bhartṛhari, one must, as Houben (1995: 15) suggests we do, ignore the opening of his work and then return to it after reading other sections. Cardona (1999: 92ff.) demonstrates the difficulties and oddities of this approach. Cf. Cardona (2009) for a longer treatment. I agree with Cardona that we should best take the introduction to a work as representing the background for the remainder.

[132]VP 1.27ab.

[133]VP 1.22cd *tad vyākaraṇam āgamya paraṃ brahmādhigamyate* | "With recourse to grammar that supreme *brahman* is reached."

"burst," in the first *kāṇḍa* and the sentence as the true unit of semantic analysis in the second *kāṇḍa*. Although Bhartṛhari is most often lauded for his contributions to the philosophy of language, as distinct from grammar proper, i.e., the application and interpretation of Pāṇini's rules (an anachronistic distinction), his contributions to the latter have hardly been studied. It is worth noting that the *vṛtti-samuddeśa*, which deals with the technicalities of *vṛtti*, "integration,"[134] on the basis of the MBh in a highly technical manner, is nearly as large as the entire first two *kāṇḍa*s combined. In addition to the VP, and of some importance to this dissertation, is Bhartṛhari's commentary on the MBh, the *Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā* or *Tripādī*,[135] which has been preserved in a single MS now housed in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin.[136] Both works testify to the sustained interest in the MBh into the middle of the first millennium and, moreover, its continued relevance to Brahmanical philosophy and ritual.

1.5.3.2 The *Kāśikāvṛtti* (7th cent.)

Though lacking in the philosophical profundity of Bhartṛhari's VP, the *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV)[137] of Jayāditya and Vāmana[138] (7th cent.?[139]) is of monumental importance for the remainder of the Pāṇinian tradition and holds the place as both our first extant *vṛtti*, "running commentary," on the A and the first witness to all of Pāṇini's sūtras. I have already drawn attention to the influence of the *Jainendravyākaraṇa* and *Cāndravyākaraṇa* on KV and would only add that the KV also often differs from Patañjali in the interpretation of individual sūtras, for which reason many

---

[134]In this context *vṛtti* is a difficult term to translate. It refers to how the semantics of a word result from the addition of suffixes or composition.

[135]So called because it only covers the first three *pāda*s of the A. Aklujkar 1971 has also sought to correct how we name Bhartṛhari's commentary on the MBh. Once again, the argumentation does not entirely convince. Cf. Houben (1996: 6, fn. 9).

[136]For the editions and translations now available, see Cardona (2004: 219).

[137]For an overview, cf. Cardona (1976: 278–282). Haag & Vergiani (2011) contains a few general remarks and our only critical edition of a portion of the KV, the *prayāhārasūtra*s.

[138]There is evidence from colophons, Jinendrabuddhi, and possibly the KV itself for the composite nature of the text as we have it. Cf. Bhattacharyya (1922: 190–192) and (1946: 2f.), Cardona (1976: 278f.), Bronkhorst (1983: 399–402) with further references, and Kulkarni (2002) and (2008). Traditionally the commentary on the first five *adhyāya*s belongs to Jayāditya and the rest to Vāmana. How exactly to interpret the data is still open

[139]The lower date for the KV is generally said to be the poet Bhāravi (early 6th cent.), because a partial verse from his poem, the *Kirātārunīya*, is found quoted in the KV ad P. 1.3.23. The upper limit is Jinendrabuddhi (8th cent.), the author of a commentary on the KV. Further evidence comes from the Chinese pilgrim, Yijing. Cf. Cardona (1976: 280f.) and Haag & Vergiani (2011: 15, fn. 1).

later commentators like Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīta argue against the KV and give different interpretations for some of Pāṇini's rules.[140]

The two published commentaries on the KV are:

- The *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañjikā* or *Nyāsa* by Jinedrabuddhi (8th cent.)
- The *Padamañjarī* by Haradatta Miśra (12th cent.?)

Both of these commentaries are voluminous and very sophisticated, often repeating discussions from the MBh. Jinendrabuddhi,[141] however, does not strictly follow Patañjali in his interpretation of sūtras and introduces a number of novel explanations. I will discuss one such interpretation in ch. 4 (pp. 193ff.) regarding the suffix *KvasU*. One of the most characteristic features of this commentary is the attempt to remove additions (*vārttika*s, *iṣṭi*s, etc.) to the A and instead proceed *yathānyāsam*, "according to the set wording (of the sūtras)." Jinendrabuddhi also wrote a commentary named *Viśālāmalavatī* on Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*.[142]

Haradatta,[143] who properly belongs to the second millennium after Kaiyaṭa, may be briefly discussed here. I have already given some details about his life and works above on p. 16. He is a staunch supporter of grammar as an integral part of Vedic education and cites the MBh and VP throughout his work. Haradatta's date has been pushed back into the first millennium based on very slim evidence,[144] namely that there is *one* citation from the *Padamañjarī* in the *Rūpāvatāra* by Dharmakīrti.[145] This one piece of evidence goes against all else that we know about Haradatta, especially the fact that he seems to know Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* (but not cited by name) and that

---

[140]Joshi & Roodbergen (1991: 5) believe that the examples transmitted in KV, which differ from Patañjali's, may give us a clue as to "the authentic meaning of a *Pāṇinisūtra*."

[141]Cf. Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006 II: 11–17) with further literature. In Bengal, a substantial commentarial literature grew around the *Nyāsa*, of which only parts of the *Tantrapradīpa* by Maitreyarakṣita have been published. Cf. Bhattacharya (1946: 9–19).

[142]Cf. Hayes (1983), Steinkellner, Krasser, & Lasic (2005: xl–xlii), and Pind (2009: 25–29).

[143]Cf. DSG 443f., Tripathi (1981: xvii–xxi), and Kane (1930: 347–353) for general details. Based on his third introductory verse, Haradatta's father was Padmakumāra, and his elder brother, Agnikumāra. His teacher is said to be *Aparājita*, but this could also just be another adjective modifying *ācārya*, and both are in apposition to *jyeṣṭa*, "elder brother." Sharma (1985) is one of the few studies on the *Padamañjarī* and contains helpful lists of works cited.

[144]Cf. Cardona (1976: 281).

[145]RA vol. II p. 157.

the *Padamañjarī* is not cited until Sāyaṇa (13th–14th cent.).[146] To substantiate the single quote in the *Rūpāvatāra*, we need to examine the MSS because "the printed text differs largely from the Ms. almost on every page."[147] Until the contents of the *Rūpāvatāra* can be more securely established, I see no reason to diverge from the more logical date of the 12th cent.

1.5.4 The *Rūpāvatāra* of Dharmakīrti (10th cent.)

One of the most important works for the remainder of the Pāṇinian school is the *Rūpāvatāra* (*Descent of Forms*) (RA) by one Dharmakīrti, a Buddhist (10th cent.) from the south, possibly even Sri Lanka.[148] Although heavily indebted to the KV, the primary innovation of RA is the arrangement of Pāṇini's sūtras (not all of them and with Vedic and accent rules omitted) into *avatāra*s, "descents," so as to teach derivations (*prakriyā*s) with greater clarity to the advantage of students.[149] This model of grammar, later known as the *Kaumudī*-style, would become the most popular way of presenting the A (and other grammars as well), culminating in Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī*. This is the first extant work of the Pāṇinian school to do away with all Vedic rules, although, as I show in ch. 4, what is Vedic is not always so straightforward. Unfortunately, the only printed edition of the RA is not representative of the available MSS and likely contains many alterations unspecified by the editor (see the preceding section). A critical edition is needed for meaningful future scholarship. We can, however, broadly see an attempt to create simplified

---

[146]That Śaraṇadeva (12th), who quotes a wide range of authors and often by name, does not mention Haradatta's *Padamañjarī* adds further evidence for this work's late date. Cf. Renou (1940: 57f., fn. 2).

[147]Belvalkar (1938: 73). I have inspected a few MSS of the *Rūpāvatāra* at BORI and can confirm this statement. Unfortunately, I was at the time not aware of this problem and did not check to see if the reference to Haradatta was in the MSS.

[148]We unfortunately know very little about the author. Cf. Rangacharya (1916: v–vii [Preface] and i–xix [*granthaprakāśakasya vijñāpanā*]), Cardona (1976: 285). Lalithambal (1995: 3–12) has amassed most of the relevant evidence. The key piece comes from Cōḻa Tamil inscriptions dating back to the first half of the 11th cent. (during the reigns of Rājendra and then Rājādhirāja) in which sponsorship for the *Rūpāvatāra* is mentioned. Cf. Lalithambal (1995: 10f.). The text is quoted by later grammarians, e.g., Hemacandra, Maitreyarakṣita, Śaraṇadeva.

[149]The opening verse reads:
sarvajñam anantaguṇaṃ praṇamya bālaprabodhanārtham imam |
rūpāvatāram alpaṃ sukalāpam ṛjuṃ kariṣyāmi ||
"After bowing to the omniscient (Buddha), whose virtues are endless, I shall make this 'Descent of Forms,' small, well-ornamented, and upright, in order to instruct the young." I do not know of other instances of the adjective, *sukalāpa. kalāpa* could also mean "bundle" or perhaps it is a reference to the *Kālāpa*, i.e., *Kātantra* grammar, whose topical arrangement the RA follows. The grammar is so named because Śarvavarman is to have gotten it from the tail feathers (*kalāpa*) of Kumāra's peacock. Cf. Trivedi (1925: 24, fn. †).

version of the A that could compete with the shorter and less complex Kā and CV. In explaining Pāṇini's sūtras, Dharmakīrti has often followed the KV quite closely.

1.5.4.1 The *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa (11th cent.)

The *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa* (*Light on the Mahābhāṣya*) (MBhPra) of Kaiyaṭa (11th cent.),[150] a running commentary on Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, is a seminal work for the Pāṇinian tradition and integral to the understanding of the MBh. Kaiyaṭa refutes the opinions of earlier grammarians who are at odds with Patañjali.

1.5.5 The Later Non-Pāṇinians

Too many schools of grammar developed after the CV, especially in the first half of the second millennium, to deal with them all here. The reader is referred to Belvalkar (1915) and Scharfe (1977: 187–190) for a brief account. In what follows I have only provided basic information on those schools that are most relevant for the present dissertation and about which I might have something novel to add.

1.5.5.1 The *Śabdānuśāsana* of Śākaṭāyana (9th cent.)

The *Śabdānuśāsana*[151] (ŚāŚ) of Śākaṭāyana (late 9th cent.)[152] with auto-commentary *Amoghavṛtti* may not be the most innovative grammar, but it attests to the ongoing process of incorporating developments from earlier works (A, MBh, JV(M) and (Ś), and CV) into a new unified whole. Although the grammar is now mostly associated with Śvetāmbara Jains, evidence from inscriptions proves that the grammar was once studied among other groups.[153] Its later history is of importance, not only because Hemacandra made extensive use of the ŚāŚ, but also because Dayāpāla

---

[150]Cf. Cardona (1976: 347, fn. 343) with further references. The first grammarian to quote Kaiyaṭa (usually written *kajjaṭa* in the Bengal) is Maitreyarakṣita. Cf. Bhattacharya (1946: 12).

[151]For an overview, see Belvalkar (1915: 56–61). Birwé (1971) provides much valuable information regarding earlier scholarship and many details about the grammar's methods, contents, and relation to previous grammars. It is one of the most outstanding studies of a non-Pāṇinian school of grammar to date.

[152]We are able to date Śākaṭāyana because his auto-commentary, the *Amoghavṛtti*, is named in honor of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa King Amoghavarṣa I (ca. 814–877). Pathak (1914: 207) gives the range Śaka 736–789 = 814/5–867/8 CE.

[153]See fn. 4.

made a recast of the grammar in the *Kaumudī*-style in the early 11th cent., i.e. shortly after the RA.[154]

1.5.5.2   The Grammatical Works of Bhojadeva (11th cent.)

King Bhoja of Dhārā (first half of 11th cent.) has a wide range of works credited to his name. Of relevance here are his grammar, the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (*The Necklace of the Goddess of Speech*) (SKĀv) and his voluminous *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (*Light on Passion*) (ŚPra), in which the first eight chapters are dedicated to grammar and other linguistic topics.[155] Neither one of these works has received the full scholarly attention they deserve, although both of them have much to offer regarding the history of Sanskrit grammar and its role within poetry. The grammar proper has many unique and commendable features that set it apart from others.[156] The work appears to have wielded much influence in the centuries after its initial appearance and was taken to be an authority (or at least acknowledged) by later Pāṇinians like Viṭṭhala (15th cent.)[157] and Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (16th cent., Kerala). Like other non-Pāṇinian grammars, Bhoja incorporated many of the addenda from the MBh into his sūtras, but the CV also served as an important model,[158] evidence for which we will see in ch. 4, § 4.5.5, on the (non-)Vedic status of *KvasU*. The SKĀv also provided commentators on poetry with an authoritative source that could better describe poetic usage than Pāṇini's grammar. We will see examples of this from Aruṇagirinātha (p. 271) and Kṣīrasvāmin in ch. 5 (p. 286). The connection with poetry is made all the more conspicuous because Bhoja authored a work on poetics by the same name. In order for Sarasvatī, the Goddess of Speech, to be have a

---

[154]Dayāpāla appears to have been active at the court of the Chaulukya King Jayasiṃha II. Oppert (1893) has published another *Kaumudī*-style version of the ŚāŚ, the *Prakriyāsaṃgraha* with the commentary of Abhayacandrasūri (14th cent.). Other commentaries on the ŚāŚ are available and await publication. Cf. Belvaklar (1915: 59f.)

[155]Raghavan (1978: 12–22).

[156]It is the only non-Pāṇinian grammars to treat the pitch accent and rules for the Vedic language (SKĀv 8), except perhaps the CV. The relegation of these rules to the final chapter of the grammar would be followed by later Pāṇinian grammarians, Rāmacandra, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. Material that is generally ancillary to other grammars is included in the sūtra-text itself, e.g., the contents of the *gaṇa*s, the *Uṇādisūtra*s (SKĀv 2.1–2.3), the *Phiṭsūtra*s (SKĀv 8.3.110–195), and additional *paribhāṣā*s not found in the A (SKĀv 1.2). Cf. Renou (1957).

[157]Cf. fn. 190.

[158]Cf. Renou (1957: 126f.) for an example. Another example I have come across is the arrangement of P. 4.2.46 *caraṇebhyo dharmavat*. Bhoja both copies the wording of the CV sūtra and the sūtra's transposition to a different section: CV 3.3.94 *caraṇād vuñ* = SKĀv 4.3.261.

complete necklace, she requires both grammar and poetics.[159] We have one printed commentary on the SKĀv, the *Hṛdayaharaṇī* by Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha.[160]

1.5.5.3 Hemacandra's *Śabdānuśāsana* (early 13th cent.)

One of the most ambitious undertakings in the history of Sanskrit grammar is the collection of works penned by the Jain monk Hemacandra.[161] In addition to his grammar, the *Siddha-hemacandraśabdānuśāsana* (*The Instruction on Words by Hemacandra and Siddha(rāja)*) (SHŚ), Hemacandra constructed an entire set of reference works on language: *Uṇādisūtra*s, *Dhātupāṭha* (a list of verbal roots), Lexicons,[162] a *Liṅgānuśāsana* (on the gender of words), and a voluminous work on poetics, the *Kāvyānuśāsana*, with two commentaries. These were carried out in Aṇhilavāḍ (Patan) with patronage from, if not at the command of, two Chaulukya kings, Jayasiṃha Siddharāja (r. 1092–1141) and his son Kumārapāla (r. 1142–1173). All of these works are furnished with a commentary, at times more than one. His grammar, for example, has a *vṛtti*, "running commentary," in three sizes: *laghu*, "light," *madhyama*, "medium," and *bṛhat*, "large."[163] In addition, there is a sub-commentary on the *bṛhadvṛtti*, the *Śabdamahārṇavanyāsa* (*The Great Ocean of Words Treatise*), possibly an allusion to Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, which contains exhaustive discussions of many grammatical points, derivations for words within the SHŚ, and references to numerous other grammars, often by name. Much like Bhoja, whose library was brought to Aṇhilavāḍ after Jayasiṃha sacked Dhārā, Hemacandra envisioned his grammar as going part and parcel with his work on poetics.[164] The primary, but not only, model for the SHŚ was the

---

[159]To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time in the Sanskrit tradition that we find grammar and poetics so closely linked, albeit still in two works. Bhoja strengthens this link in the ŚPra, where grammar is fully integrated. This expanded notion of grammar is reminiscent of the oldest Tamil grammar, the *Tolkāppiyam*, which likewise includes a section dedicated to poetics (*poruḷ*).

[160]Birwé (1964) has contributed a study to this commentary.

[161]On Hemacandra, see Bühler (1889) and Pollock (2006: 181f. and 588–590). On his grammatical works, Belvalkar (1915: 61–68).

[162]Hemacandra's lexicographical works become very popular and were oft quoted by commentators. See Vogel (1979: 335–345) for an overview of these works.

[163]In the edition available to me this last commentary is titled *Tattvaprakāśikā* (*Illumination of the Essence*).

[164]*Kāvyānuśāsana* 1.2:
śabdānuśāsane 'smābhiḥ sādhvyo vāco vivecitāḥ |
tāsām idānīṃ kāvyatvam yathāvad anuśiṣyate ||
"In the 'Instruction on Words' we have investigated the correct forms of speech. Now, how they become poetry can

46

Śabdānuśāsana of Śākaṭāyana.[165]

1.5.6   The Commentaries on the Pāṇinian *Dhātupāṭha*

Before returning to the remaining history of Pāṇinian grammar in the second millennium it is worth noting at this juncture the three commentaries on the Pāṇinian *Dhātupāṭha* (*Recitation of Roots*) (DhP)[166] of which I have availed myself in this dissertation. In chronological order, they are:

1. Kṣīrasvāmin's *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* (*River of Milk*), early 12th cent.[167]

2. Maitreya Rakṣita's *Dhātuprardīpa* (*Lamp on the Roots*), 12[th][168].

3. Sāyaṇa's *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* (*Mādhava's Commentary on the Roots*), 14th cent.

Although the DhP is, in principle, a list of the roots to which suffixes can be added, it provides much more information on account of the appended *anubandha*s, "indicatory letters," accompanying meaning entries, and the ten verbal classes into which the roots are divided. The first play an integral part in the application of Pāṇini's rules, and hence Pāṇini must have assumed a DhP of a similar nature to the one we have today, although certainly not identical. The task of a commentator on the DhP is, at the very least, to exemplify the forms derived from the roots, but he also establishes the text of the DhP itself[169] and offer differing opinions regarding a range of topics from alternate readings to proper derivations for the given forms. Kṣīrasvāmin and Sāyaṇa are far more discursive than Maitreya and give us a wide range of valuable quotes, many from texts now lost. Furthermore, the DhP commentators tend to take into consideration material from

---

be properly taught."

[165]Cf. Kielhorn (1894) [= Rau (1969: 246–250)].

[166]The Sanskrit DhPs have been extensively studied in Liebich (1920a) and Palsule (1961). Further information is available in Liebich (1930) including a comparison between various DhPs, further extended in Palsule (1955).

[167]We are able to date Kṣīrasvāmin's work with surprising exactness because he cites Bhoja, and, in turn, Hemacandra and Vardhamāna cite Kṣīrasvāmin. Cf. Liebich (1930: 201–204) and Cardona (1976: 289).

[168]An exact date for Maitreyarakṣita is not known, but he appears to have known the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇi*, although neither the work nor author is cited by name. Śaraṇadeva quotes Maitreya's work in his *Durghaṭavṛtti* (dated 1172). Cf. Cardona (1976: 289). For further information on Maitreya, see the following section.

[169]For this reason, a citation from the DhP only obtains a specific referent when the commentator (or other editor) is given. I have generally cited Kṣīrasvāmin's DhP especially when discussing texts by authors who predate all known versions of the DhP for the simple reason that his is the earliest.

outside the Pāṇinian tradition, thus furnishing us with evidence for intercollegiate scholarship on grammar. I will draw on these commentaries in ch. 5 and more extensively in ch. 6.

1.5.7   The Pāṇinīyas of the 2nd Millennium

The grammatical works of the Pāṇinian school belonging to the 2nd millennium encompass a wide range of works, many of which remain unpublished. We may, however, divide these into four main categories: the so-called Bengali school of grammar; the *Prakriyākaumudī* of Rāmacandra and its commentaries; Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī* (SK) with its commentaries; and the works of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa along with their commentaries. The work of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa represents still yet another strand, although it did not circulate very widely outside of Kerala. These divisions should not be interpreted as representing independent groups that did not interact with one another (for chronological reasons some interactions are impossible). Rather, they will simply help to guide the following presentation.

1.5.7.1   The Bengali School

The hallmark of this school, as all publications on the topic make known, is the focus on the Jinedrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, for which there are further, mostly unpublished or lost sub-commentaries.[170] The close link with Jinendrabuddhi is likely related to strong Buddhist communities throughout the region and the study of his works as Vikramaśīla and Nālanda. As we will see, many key figures were also Buddhist. Another important commentary on the A that was mostly cited by the grammarians of Bengal[171] is the now lost *Bhāgavṛtti* by Vimalamati (?).[172] This was possibly the first work in which the Vedic rules were separated out from the rules for the standard language (*bhāṣā*) and treated in different sections (*bhāga*s). Thanks to a number of studies, still relatively

---

[170]One of the most important lost commentaries on the *Nyāsa* is the *Anunyāsa* by Indumitra (latter half of 11th cent.). Maitreya appears to have often criticized it. Cf. Bhattacharya (1946: 9f.).

[171]Cf. Bhattacharya (1946: 6f.): The *Bhāgavṛtti* has been quoted more or less by almost all the Bengali grammarians of note … In striking contrast with this the references to the Bhāgavṛtti are very few and far between in the classical works of Bhaṭṭoji, Mādhava and Haradatta outside Bengal."

[172]On the name of the author of the *Bhāgavṛtti*, see Cardona (1976: 359, fn. 464) but without reference Bhattacharya (1946: 6f.), who rejects the name Vimalamati. He is proposes Vābhaṭa instead but admits that further evidence is needed.

small, a great deal of information is available about grammatical activity in the north-east of India from around the 12th cent. down to the modern day.[173] I present here only those works most relevant for my dissertation. For further detail, the reader is referred to Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006 II: 3–61) with a very complete bibliography, Chakravarti (1913–1916: 2–30), Bhattacharyya (1922) and (1946: 1–36), and Renou (1940: 5–75).[174]

1. Maitreya Rakṣita's *Tantrapradīpa* (*Lamp on the Text*) on the *Nyāsa* (12th cent.).

   After the *Nyāsa*, the *Tantrapradīpa* was perhaps the most important text in the Bengali school and itself received further commentaries. In contrast to the *Dhātupradīpa*, this work does not appear to be known at all outside of Bengal. Another, now lost work by Maitreya is the *Durghaṭa*. It, along with another *Durghaṭavṛtti* by Puruṣottamadeva, probably served as the model for Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* and dealt with difficult words from poetry.[175] Although Maitreya held Patañjali in high esteem, he was also well versed in other systems of grammar, the CV and Kā[176]

2. Puruṣottama's *Bhāṣāvṛtti* (BhV) (*Running Commentary on the Standard Language*), *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (*Running Commentary on the Metarules*), and *Jñāpakasamuccaya* (*A Collection of Hints*), mid-12th cent.

   Puruṣottama was a Buddhist and paṇḍit at the court of Lakṣmaṇasena (r. 1179–1205),[177] at whose request the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* was written. This work served as the standard introductory commentary to the A in Bengal. It treats only the rules for the *bhāṣā*, "standard language," and drew heavily on the *Bhāgavṛtti* as well as the works of Maitreya Rakṣita. This sharp

---

[173]Despite the vibrant tradition of Pāṇinian grammar in the region, the A and its commentaries would all but die out by the 20th cent. According to Chakravarti (1913–1916: 30), the last paṇḍit of Pāṇinian grammar in "North Bengal" was Pītāmvara Tarkālaṅkāra, the court Paṇḍit of the Mahārāja of Nattore (Rajshahi): "With his death in 1916, the class of such grammarians of north Bengal was alas extinct." Cf. Chakravarti (1918: 20f.): "This state [scil. of not studying the A or MBh] continued for a pretty long time. Even a few decades ago, the Bengali pundits were unable to construe the hymns of the Rig-Veda and the Aphorisms of Panini's Grammar, especially those on accents. This retrogression dated probably from the 16th century A.D. Oh! for its utter banishment from Bengal."

[174]Renou's introduction to the *Durghaṭavṛtti* contains a concise overview of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition (ch. 1) but goes into considerable more detail regarding Śaraṇadeva and the milieu of his work (ch. 2).

[175]Cf. Aufrecht (1859: XV) and Bhattacharya (1946: 13).

[176]In the final verse to the *Dhātupradīpa*, Maitreya calls himself *kālāpa-cāndra-mata-tattva-vibhāga-dakṣaḥ*, "skilled in sifting the essential opinions of the Kālāpa [= *Kātantra*] and *Cāndra* (schools of grammar)."

[177]Cf. Knutson (2014) for details of courtly life and the larger historical context.

contrast will be utilized in determining the status of the suffix *KvasU* in ch. 4. Several commentaries are available on this work, but only part of one, the *Bhāṣāvivaraṇapañjikā* on the first *adhyāya* has been published in Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006 I).[178]The *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* was later superseded by Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* (*Large Commentary on Metarules*). Puruṣottamadeva is also to have written a *Durghaṭavṛtti*.[179]

3. Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti* (*Commentary on the Difficult*), 1173/74.

Śaraṇadeva composed a commentary on select sūtras of the A with an eye to explain particularly difficult words from literature. Since the work has been treated at length and translated into French by Renou (1940–54), I refer the reader to this publication for further details.[180] It represents a concerted effort to evaluate the viability of questionable poetic language, and, to do so, Śaraṇadeva draws on a wide range of sources but with a particular emphasis on the then available works of the Bengali school thus far mentioned. His opinions, as we will see in, are from time to time at odds with the later, more strict adherents of the MBh, e.g., regarding the interpretation of P. 1.2.67 (p. 254).

4. Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* (*Great Running Commentary on the Metarules*), 13th–14th cent.

The main evidence for placing Sīradeva, about whom we know very little, in the company of the grammarians from Bengal is his references to the *Nyāsa, Anunyāsa, Bhāgavṛtti*, the works of Maitreya Rakṣita, and Puruṣottamadeva. Unlike many of the other works associated with the Bengal school of grammar, Sīradeva's commentary on metarules spread across the subcontinent and was the standard work of the sort until Nāgeśa's *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*.[181] He must have lived after Puruṣottamadeva but before Sāyaṇa, by whom he is quoted.

---

[178]Excerpts from *Sṛṣṭidhara*'s commentary, the *Bhāṣāvṛttyarthavivṛti*, are available in the notes to Chakravartiś edition.

[179]Cf. Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006: II: 43f.).

[180]See further Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006 II: 141–155 and 198f.) for the in influence of The *Durghaṭavṛtti* on Viśvarūpa.

[181]Cf. Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006 II: 54.).

1.5.8   Rāmacandra's *Prakriyākaumudī* (late 14th cent.)

The *Prakriyākaumudī* (*Moonlight of Derivations*)[182] (PrK) of Rāmacandra, a Ṛgveda brahman from *Andhrapradeśa*,[183] once held much the same place as the *Siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita as a popular[184] recast of Pāṇini's rules (although not all of them) with a number of commentaries. In contrast to the RA and BhV, Rāmacandra includes a short section on the derivation of Vedic forms (*vaidikī prakriyā*), possibly inspired by Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Ṛgveda, in which Pāṇinian derivations play a key role in the exegesis.[185] If the absence of Vedic and accent rules in the Kā was part of the "desacralization of the use of Sanskrit,"[186] Rāmacandra is signaling a return to grammar as a *vedāṅga*, "part of the Veda," much like Haradatta.

The two published commentaries on the PrK are:

1. the *Prasāda* (PrKPras) by Rāmacandra's grandson Viṭṭhala (15th cent.).[187]

2. the *Prakāśa* (PrKPrak) by Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (latter 16th cent.).[188]

The former commentary is less discursive than the latter, but Viṭṭhala includes most of what Rāmacandra has left out, i.e., most of the omitted sūtras of the A, including those for the pitch ac-

---

[182]According to Viṭṭhala (PrKPras vol. I p. 5.) and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (PrKPrak vol. III p. 614) the title means: "A Treatise like Moonlight among Derivations (= Grammars)." Viṭṭhala also adds "Derivation like Moonlight."

[183]We learn much about Rāmacandra from the opening verses to his grandson's commentary, the *Prasāda*. For an overview of the work, its author and its commentaries, see Trivedi (1925: ix–lvi) and Cardona (1976: 285f.). Benke (2010: 17–67) contains much valuable information on Rāmacandra, his family, and those affiliated with the PrK.

[184]Although the SK was already giving the PrK a run for its money, the fact that the latter was not printed in full till 1931 also contributed to its desuetude and neglect in modern times. Colebrooke utilized both works for his grammar and mentioned them side by side more than once. Cf. Colebrooke (1801: 208f.) and (1805: vi) [= Colebrooke (1837 II: 10f. and 38].

[185]Rāmacandra's grandson, Viṭṭhala, exemplifies the application of Pāṇini's Vedic rules by providing derivations for the words in the first *varga* of the RV, i.e., RV 1.1.1–5. Many similarities to Sāyaṇa's commentary are evident.

[186]Pollock (2006: 62). A roughly contemporaneous and similar but smaller work, the *Rūpamālā* of Vimalasarasvatī, also includes two Vedic rules (P. 7.1.50 and 7.1.39) in the *chāndasa-mālā*, "Vedic Garland," to explain a few peculiarities of Vedic declension: *devāsaḥ*, *visūcīḥ* (sic. cf. Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2.4a), *vrajatīḥ* (e.g., BhP 10.5.11d), *parame vyoman* (e.g., AVŚ 18.4.30d), etc. Cf. Trivedi (1925: xxxf.).

[187]Although Viṭṭhala is Rāmacandra's grandson, it is still difficult to date this commentary very precisely. Rāmacandra may have written the PrK at a relatively early age, perhaps in his 20's c. 1380. If Viṭṭhala wrote the *Prasāda* at an early age, again in his 20's, then a date as early as 1420 seems possible. This is, however, nothing more than speculation. A citation from the *Prasāda* in Hemādri's commentary on the *Raghuvaṃśa*, if genuine, suggests an earlier date for the *Prasāda*.

[188]Benke (2010: 31) gives the dates 1510–1590. The commentary was commissioned by Vīravara, a minor king of Patrapuñja in the Doab, for the benefit of his son, Kalyāṇa. Benke (2010) should also be consulted for Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa's activity in the field of *Dharmaśāstra*, especially the *Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi* (*Crown Jewel of the Śūdra's Conduct*). His commentary on the PrK is part of a larger attempt to standardize Brahmanical practices in the 16th cent. Benke (2010: 60–67) gives a list of other works ascribed to Kṛṣṇa, including several on grammar.

cent and Vedic language (PrKPras vol. II pp. 715–790), the *Uṇādisūtras* (PrKPras vol. II pp. 603–647), the *Phiṭsūtra*s for accentuation of nominal stems (PrKPras vol. II pp. 749–753), etc.[189] He also references a number of Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian works/authors including, among the former, the MBh, Bhartṛhari, the KV, the *Nyāsa*, the *Rūpāvatāra*, Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*, etc., and among the latter, Bhoja's SKĀv (and *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa-prakiryā*), Śarvavarman's Kā (*Kaumāra*) along with Durgrasiṃha,[190] Vopadeva's *Mugdhabodha*, and Hemasūri (Hemacandra).[191] Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, on the other hand, pays more attention to the refutation of the faulty opinions that previous grammarians have held, including Viṭṭhala, under the guiding light of Patañjali.

1.5.9 Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī* (17th cent.)

The importance of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita for the remaining history of Sanskrit grammar is well-known. His recast of the A, the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (*Moonlight of Conclusions*) has become the standard work on Sanskrit grammar and a large commentarial literature has sprung up around it. Unlike the other recasts so far mentioned, Bhaṭṭoji's is complete with a separate section for the Vedic rules, a DhP, *Gaṇa*s, and a *Liṅgānuśāsana*. In addition to the SK, we will primarily be interested in the following two commentaries by Bhaṭṭoji:

1. The *Śabdakaustubha* (*The Word like Viṣṇu's Gem*), an incomplete running commentary on the sūtras of the A.[192]

2. The *Prauḍhamanoramā* ((*The Commentary that) Delights the Bold*), a commentary on the

---

[189]In his introduction, Viṭṭhala lays out his intention to supplement those sūtras Rāmacandra has left out. See the eighth introductory stanza:
spaṣṭatvāt samupekṣitāni katicid vyākhyātakalpatvato
rāmācāryavarair amūni viśadaṃ vyākhyāmi sūtrāṇy ahaṃ |
granthe 'smin svarasādhanaṃ katipayān auṇādikāṃś ca bruve
sthāne tāṃś ca gaṇān yathāmati tathā nyāyān padaiḥ sūcitān || 8 || (PrKPras I p. 2)
"Since they are evident, the teacher Rāma has disregarded some sūtras because they are as good as explained. Those I will explain explicitly. In this text, I describe how to generate the accent and some *Uṇādi* suffixes and at (their proper) place the lists and so too, in accordance with my judgment, the rules of interpretation (*paribhāṣā*s) indicated by (particular) words."

[190]In opening verse 2c, Viṭṭhala mentions both Bhoja and Durga(siṃha) by name.

[191]Indices II and III in PrKPras vol. II pp. 839f., which give proper names occurring in the PrK and PrKPras, are without page references. I have not yet been able to verify the location or frequency of all these names.

[192]The commentary covers P. 1, 2, 3.1–2, and 4.

Siddhāntakaumudī.[193]

The relative chronology of the two works is as given. It is in these two commentaries that Bhaṭṭoji sought to establish his *siddhānta*s, "definitive conclusions," regarding the interpretation of the A by analyzing the ideas of his predecessors. He is often polemic, especially in the latter, and does not hesitate to attack even his own teacher, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, in order to establish the ultimate authority of Patañjali.[194] These works are invaluable for the history of Sanskrit grammar as we can often read the entire interpretive history of sūtra from the MBh to Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. Both works are furthered commented on numerous times over. I have mostly referred to Nāgeśa's (but attributed to Haridīkṣita) *Śabdaratna* on the *Prauḍhamanoramā*. A further commentary on the SK is the *Śabdenduśekhara* likewise by Nāgeśa in both a *bṛhat*, "large," and a *laghu*, "light," version.

1.5.10   Nāgeśabhaṭṭa (17th–18th cent.)

The grammatical works of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa or Nāgojibhaṭṭa, a student of Bhaṭṭoji's grandson, Haridīkṣita,[195] serve as the final authority in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, and those who come after him seek, for the most part, only to expound Nāgeśa's often terse commentaries.[196] In addition to the two commentaries on the SK mentioned above, I have also drawn on the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* (PŚ),[197] a collection of metarules with commentary, and the *Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa-uddyota* (*The Brilliance of the Lamp on the Great Commentary*), a commentary on Kaiyaṭa's work

---

[193]Since it is twice given as by Bhaṭṭoji, Belvalkar (1915: 39) and Scharfe (1977: 174), I note that the *Bālamanoramā* is by Vāsudeva Dīkṣita (18th, Tanjore).

[194]Cf. Deshpande (2012) on Bhaṭṭoji's conservatism and the larger movement to winnow the śāstric traditions in this time period. The famed Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, court paṇḍit of Shah Jahan, who also studied in the lineage of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, rebuked Bhaṭṭoji in his work *Manoramākucamardana* (*Crushing the Breasts of the Proud (Woman)*). A similar, unpublished work is Cakrapāṇi's *Prauḍhamanoramākhaṇḍana* Cf. Belvalkar (1938: 125–127) and Trivedi (1925: XXXV, fn. †).

[195]Cf. MBhPra vol. I pp.16f. A list of works, totally over 40, is given in fn. 1 on p. 17. Nāgeśa received patronage from Rāmavarman of Śṛṅgaverapura near Allahabad. Cf. Coward and Raja (1990: 321f.) for a summary of his life and some of his works.

[196]Nāgeśa did, however, come under attack. Śeṣādrisudhī's *Paribhāṣābhāskara* consists of polemics against the PŚ in "bitter language which almost shows the bad taste of the author," as Abhyankar (1967: 32) puts it.

[197]The title of the work is not easily translatable into English since it is a pun. Pāyaguṇḍe, Nāgeśa's student, gives several interpretations for the word as the title of the work. The first is that it is a work on whose peak the metarule is a moon because it illuminates the meaning. In regard to Śiva, the word means he on whose head the moon is like a metarule, i.e. it illuminates widely. A metarule is compared to a lamp in the MBh I.359.5–7.

and occasionally directly on the MBh as well. Many faults are pointed out in the *Pradīpa*. As already discussed, Nāgeśa's work are characterized by a strong conservatism guided solely by Patañjali as the ultimate authority on the Sanskrit language, and he is willing to argue against any and all of his predecessors.

1.5.11   Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (1560–1666)

Although his works did not spread far beyond South India, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa of Melputtūr (1560–1666)[198] represents for us one of the last grammarians of the Pāṇinian tradition to openly embrace the grammatical works of the non-Pāṇinians. His magnum opus is the *Prakriyāsarvasva*, a recast of Pāṇini's A, including the Vedic rules as well, with commentary but in an order quite different from what we find in the similar works of Rāmacandra and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. For example, after treating, technical terms (*saṃjñā*s), metarules (*paribhāṣā*s), and sandhi, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa moves onto *kṛt*-suffixes (primary derivatives).[199] Furthermore, the grammar repeatedly incorporates the opinions of non-Pāṇinians, such as Bhoja and Candra, one example of which we will encounter in ch. 4, § 4.6.6. An important and often quoted source for Nārāyaṇa is a still unpublished commentary on the KV, the *Vṛttipradīpa* (*Lamp on the Running Commentary*) by Rāmadeva Miśra, which is still available in MSS and also known from Sāyaṇa's commentary on the DhP, e.g., ad SDhP I.49. Rāmadeva must have lived after Haradatta, whom, according to Sāyaṇa (*loc. cit.*), he follows. Nārāyaṇa not only saw it fit to adopt the opinions of the non-Pāṇinians when commenting on the A but also went so far as to write a short treatise in their defense: the *Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇyasādhana*.[200] Study of his grammatical works is being carried out by Jan Houben, who has made two recent contributions, Houben (2012b) and (2014).

In addition to his activities as a grammarian, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa also produced two works of poetry: the *Dhātukāvya*, a poem that exemplifies all the roots in the DhP,[201] and the *Nārāyaṇīya*, a work of similar scope and plan as those of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. There might be some correla-

---

[198]For his life and times, see Kunjunni Raja (1980: 119–152).
[199]In ch. 4 we will see differences in arrangement on a more local scale.
[200]Cf. Sreekrishna Sarma (1968).
[201]See the introduction to Venkitasubramonia Iyer (1970).

tion between Nārāyaṇa's views on grammar and his poetic works. In the *Nārāyaṇīya*, we find a number of forms that a normal person, i.e., a non-*ṛṣi*, should not be able to use because they do not strictly follow Pāṇini's rules or should be considered Vedic. Although this choice certainly stems from the poem's model, Nārāyaṇa may also have intended to to defend it at the grammatical level as well. This is certainly true for his use of *KvasU*, which according to the PrS is not a strictly Vedic form.

1.6 Sanskrit Poetry

Since the most important type of Sanskrit for this dissertation is Sanskrit poetry, a few remarks are in order.[202] What I will refer as Sanskrit poetry, a translation of the word *kāvya*, comprises a vast body of literature beginning, according to tradition,[203] with Valmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* and continuing up to the present day. Although no simple definition will capture all the varieties of Sanskrit poetry, it is a form of the Sanskrit language to which heightened beauty or ornamentation has been added and which should produce some sense of wonder, emotional or intellectual,[204] in the reader or listener. Some of the poetry appeals to seemingly universal experiences such as the hardships of life, love and longing, old age, sunsets, etc., while much of it relies on established tropes foreign to readers who are not familiar with the conventions or customs of the original setting. For example, to say a woman walks like a goose or elephant is commonplace and complimentary in Sanskrit poetry but will hardly have the same effect in most other literary cultures. But the difficulties in appreciating Sanskrit poetry extend beyond foreign customs or tropes. Meter, the placement of words, and the succession of sounds play a pivotal role in complementing

---

[202]I will speak about the study of poetry in Sanskrit, *alaṅkāraśāstra*, in the following chapter. Both of theses have been studied more thoroughly than the Sanskrit grammarians. On both Sanskrit poetry and poetics, see Ingalls (1965: 1–29), Warder I, Tubb (1979: 1–103). The last work is particularly helpful for understanding the *mahākāvya*, "great poem." De (1960), Kane (1961), Gerow (1977) offer us detailed histories of Sanskrit poetics with much useful information. McCrea (2008) takes a fresh perspective on the history of poetics by focusing on the development of the theories of suggestion (*dhvani, vyañjanā*) and *rasa*, "flavor," under the influence *mīmāṃsā*. For an overview of Sanskrit Poetry, see Lienhard (1984) and Warder (1972–2011), the latter quite thorough.

[203]Already the earliest texts in Sanskrit, the hymns of *Ṛgveda*, are forms of poetic expression.

[204]I include "intellectual" so as to not exclude *citrakāvya*, "flashy poetry," which often dazzles the mind and not the heart. This form of poetry has been long pooh-poohed by both Sanskrit writers on poetry as well as modern critics.

the meaning; much of this cannot be easily translated into other languages.[205] There are also several different types of poetry. It can be a single stanza (*muktaka*), complete on its own, or a "Great Poem" (*mahākāvya*) consisting of thousands of stanzas divided into *sarga*s, "sections, cantos," or something in between, a bit of poetry (*khaṇḍa-kavya*). The "Great Poem" will be our primary source for linguistic usage because it is in these works that poets sought to show off grammatical virtuosity to the extent that entire poems were composed to exemplify grammatical rules.[206] This genre attests to poetry's importance in education. Poetry formed a major part of a child's elementary lessons in Sanskrit, as we will see on several occasions later on. In whatever form, the composition and enjoyment of Sanskrit poetry was one of the most beloved past times throughout the language's history and often served to express the kingly power and the mores of the times.[207]

1.7   Commentaries on Poetry

The final prong of this dissertation are the commentaries on poetry, written to facilitate the reading of the text, to interpret it, and to instill in the student the knowledge that he is to have learned in the other śāstras, especially grammar, lexicography, and *alaṅkāraśāstra*.[208] I have drawn rather freely on many commentaries on a number of poems, but above all *mahākāvya*s, and will not attempt here to give a thorough treatment of either the individual commentaries or commentators. This has often been done in the editions to the individual commentaries, but much research remains to be carried out. As I have already discussed on p. 2, the majority of these texts have not been critically edited and the contents of the commentary can vary from MS to MS. If the status quo remains, all studies of Sanskrit philology will be based on a corpus of texts that is the product

---

[205]In recent times, the only attempt to render a long Sanskrit poem into English verse (not free verse) is Desző & Goodall (2012). Their introduction is valuable for understanding the difficulties involved in translating Sanskrit poetry and why English verse is still a viable option. See also Brough (1968) for often creative translations and a frank introduction to Sanskrit poetry.

[206]A genre known as *śāstrakāvya*, "science-poetry." Cf. Lienhard (1984: 225–227). On the place of poetry in education, cf. Gerow (2002). The works of Kālidāsa, especially the *Raghuvaṃśa*, are to have played an integral part. Cf. Goodall (2001: 124).

[207]Cf. Pollock (2006), especially part I, and (2004).

[208]On Sanskrit commentaries, see Tubb and Boose (2007: 1–5) and Pollock (2015).

of a massively distorting bottleneck. Below are the commentators I most frequently refer to, their approximate date, and the commentaries they have written.

1. Vallabhadeva (10th cent., Kashmir):[209]

   - On the works of Kālidāsa: *Pañjikā*[210] on *Kumārasambhava*,[211] and *Meghadūtavivṛti* on the *Meghadūta*, and *Raghupañcikā*[212] on the *Raghuvaṃśa*.

   - *Sandehaviṣauṣadhi* on Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*.[213]

2. Hemādri (15th cent.?):[214] *Raghuvaṃśadarpana* on Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa*.

3. Cāritravardhana (early 15th cent.):[215] *Śiśuhitaiṣiṇī* on Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*.

4. Aruṇagirinātha (14th–15th cent., Kerala):[216]

   - *Prakāśikā* on Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa*.

   - *Prakāśikā* on Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*.

5. Mallinātha (14th–15th cent.):[217]

   - *Saṃjīvinī* on Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*, *Meghadūta*, and *Raghuvaṃśa*.

   - *Sarvapathīnā* on Bhaṭṭi's *Bhaṭṭikāvya*.

   - *Ghaṇṭāpatha* on Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*.

   - *Sarvaṅkaṣā* on Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*.

   - *Jivātu* on Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhīyacarita*.

---

[209]For a discussion of Vallabhadeva's date and what we know about him, see Goodall & Isaacson (2003: xiii–lxiv). Vallabhadeva is not the earliest available commentator. Rather, it is likely one Prakāśavarṣa, whom Vallabhadeva quotes. The thesis of Klevanov (2016) will treat this commentator and the difficulties in editing his commentary on the *Kirātārjunīya*. For now, cf. Goodall & Isaacson (2003: xvi, fn. 8).

[210]Cf. Patel (1986: 30f.) on the nomenclature. There seems to be a great deal of variation in the names of the commentaries on Kālidāsa's works.

[211]Möhrke (1933) has studied this commentary in relation to Mallinātha.

[212]On the spelling of the title, see Goodall & Isaacson (2003: xiii, fn. 2).

[213]Rau (1949) has studied this commentary.

[214]Hemādri is generally assumed to be before Mallinātha, who, in turn, is usually dated to the 14th–15th cent. Cf. Nandargikar (1971: 12–15) on Hemādri and Lalye (2002: 14) on Mallinātha. But if Hemādri has indeed quoted Viṭṭhala's *Prasāda* ad RabhuV 15.68, then the chronology becomes rather tight since Viṭṭhala's commentary is most likely early or mid-15th cent., but the dating is far from precise.

[215]Likely later than Hemādri but before Mallinātha. Cf. Nandargikar (1971: 15–21).

[216]Cf. Venkitasubramonia Iyar (1984).

[217]Lalye (2002) for a study of Mallinātha. A list of his commentaries on poetry can be found on p. 17 and their relative chronology on p. 19. More work, especially on critically establishing the text of his commentaries, is needed

6. Nārāyāṇapaṇḍita (16th cent.)

- *Vivaraṇa* on Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava.*
- *Padārthadīpikā* on Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa.*[218]

Other commentaries will be mentioned up in passing with relevant references.

---

[218]Both of these commentaries are heavily indebted to those of Aruṇagirinātha and usually expand upon his rather terse and pointed remarks.

Chapter 2

The Language of Poetry

vāṇy ekā samalaṅkaroti puruṣaṃ yā saṃskṛtā dhāryate |
kṣīyante khalu bhūṣaṇāni satataṃ vāgbhūṣaṇaṃ bhūṣaṇam ||

"Only speech that is kept *saṃskṛta* ornaments a person.
Ornaments decay of course.
The eternal ornament is the ornament of speech."[1]

—Bhartṛhari

2.1   Introduction

In this chapter I will explore how Sanskrit *kāvya*, "poetry," has been defined in the early works
on poetics by Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, and Vāmana as well as what role the *śāstra*s, "sciences," play in
these definitions. To this end, I will collect together general comments on the importance and
purposes of śāstric knowledge including poetic *doṣa*s, "faults," which will shed further light on
the relation between "correct" (*sādhu*) poetry and the *śāstra*s, since one of the main applications
of the latter to the former is the removal of faults. While demonstrating the ways authors have
conceptualized correct poetic language, I will underscore the implicit and explicit parallels with
the grammatical tradition's idea of correct language and how the authors of treatises on poetics

---

[1] *Śatakatrayam* 1.15cd, Kosambi (1946: ९).

have followed or modified the concepts of the grammarians. The findings of the chapter will provide the backdrop for what follows and help us to contextualize the grammatical discussions we find in the later sections of the BhKA and KAS.

Given the large number of works on Sanskrit poetics currently available, I have narrowed the focus of this chapter to these three texts for two reasons. On the one hand, since I wish to go into some detail regarding the topics outlined in the preceding paragraph, a wider selection of texts would result in a chapter of inappropriate length and a study of śāstric knowledge throughout the history of poetics in India would be more suitable to a dissertation unto itself. Furthermore, later writers on poetics do not contribute to the field of grammar in poetry as extensively as Bhāmaha and Vāmana, so diving into this large pool of literature would in fact not add much new material for our present purposes. One could also argue that these three early works already establish the topics I am most interested in, while the later treatises tend to rework the same general concepts in an ever more elaborate scheme.[2] Lastly, scholarship on these foundational works — those of Bhāmaha and Vāmana in particular — is rather scanty, and I would like to make my own contribution to filling this gap.

2.2 The Differentiae

The *śāstra*, "system of knowledge, science," in Sanskrit most often equated with the West's *ars poetica* or "poetics" is known as *alaṅkāra-śāstra*, "ornamentation-science, the science of ornamentation." The name itself conveys the primary focus of study, the ornaments or embellishments a poet uses to beautify his language so that it becomes poetry. This focus is reflected in the titles of several works of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, such as Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra*, and Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, to name but a few. There are even several very popular works in the field that deal exclusively with *alaṅkāra*s and leave aside other, more general topics.[3] But many

---

[2]Cf. Pollock (2003: 42f.): "What divides this remarkable tradition [scil. *alaṅkāraśāstra*] … is minor in comparison with what unifies it."

[3]Udbhaṭa's *Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha* and Appayya Dīkṣita's *Kuvalayānanda* are representative. Each of these authors also dealt with the more fundamental and technical questions about poetry in other works: Udbhaṭa in

*ālaṅkārika*s, "authors of works on poetics,"[4] who wrote more generally about poetry explored a wide range of linguistic features by which poetic language could be defined. Consequently, *kāvya-lakṣaṇa*, "the differentia of poetry," has often served as an alternative designation both for *alaṅkāraśāstra* in general as well as for individual texts.[5]

The term *kāvya-lakṣaṇa* appears in the several works on poetics.[6] For example, Daṇḍin, the author of the most widely read and translated text in *alaṅkāraśāstra*, the *Kāvyādarśa* (KĀ; *Mirror of Poetry*),[7] even refers to his own treatise as *kāvya-lakṣaṇa* in the opening verses.[8] Similarly, Bhāmaha proclaims he has composed his work after understanding the *kāvyalakṣman*.[9] The term *lakṣaṇa*, which I have translated as "differentia," has the basic meaning of "mark," "feature," or "characteristic," and so a *kāvyalakṣaṇa* is a set of features that characterize poetry, the most prominent of which is ornamentation. That Sanskrit poetics was concerned with more than just figures of speech is well known, but I want to highlight the fact because it helps to direct attention to a wider spectrum of linguistic features that can be used to define poetry, in particular grammar. Before turning to these, however, we must look at the other side of the coin.

Where there is a *lakṣaṇa*, "differentia," there must also be a *lakṣya*, "what is differentiated." Such etymologically linked dichotomies abound in Sanskrit: Instead of "part" and "whole," one

---

his commentary, the *Bhāmahavivaraṇa*, on Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* (now mostly lost), and Appayya in the *Citra-mīmāṃsā*.

[4]English is ill-equipped to talk about poetics, at least from a morphological standpoint. There is no commonly used word for "the author of a work on poetics" though one finds occasionally "poetician," e.g., Shulman (2007: 305). The adjective "poetological," meaning "relating or pertaining to poetics," has begun to find more currency, e.g., Ebeling (2010: 29), and seems indispensable in several contexts. I will, however, try to retain the Sanskrit terminology as much as possible.

[5]This more general *lakṣaṇa* is to be distinguished from the *lakṣaṇa*s found in the NŚ ch. 17 and discussed in Raghavan (1942: 1–47).

[6]Śāstrī gives a helpful list which is summarized in Dimitrov (2002: 8, fn. 15).

[7]Unless otherwise stated, I follow the text as given with Rantaśrījñāna's commentary. Furthermore, I have used Dimitrov's critical editions of the text for the portions of the KĀ they cover.

[8]KĀ 1.2cd *yathāsāmārthyam asmābhiḥ kriyate kāvyalakṣaṇam*. "We compose, to the best of our ability, the definition of poetry." Whether or not this is the title of Daṇḍin's work is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, one cannot dispute that it was possible to refer to it by this name, as Ratnaśrījñāna has, e.g., ad KĀ 3.97, and to its author as the *lakṣaṇa-kāra*, "author of the *lakṣaṇa*," as Kuntaka has in VJ p. 209. Thakar and Jha, the editors of the KĀ with Ratnaśrījñāna's commentary, adopt this title. See Thakur & Jha (1957: 17) and, with more commitment, p. 29 of their Sanskrit introduction: *asmābhir atra ṭīkākārasaṃmataṃ kāvyalakṣaṇam iti nāmadheyaṃ sarvatrorarīkṛtam*. Dimitrov rejects the idea in Dimitrov (2002: 7–9).

[9]BhKA 6.64b *avagamya svadhiyā ca kāvyalakṣma* | "After understanding the differentia of poetry with my own intellect." *lakṣman* is a synonym for *lakṣaṇa* based off the same root. Cf. AKKṣ 1.3.17.

usually finds the *avayava*, "part" and *avayavin*, "thing possessing the parts." In the present context of poetics the *lakṣya* is invariably poetry,[10] but the history of the two terms resonates with the most basic study of language in the Sanskrit tradition, *vyākaraṇa*, "linguistic analysis, grammar." In the introduction to the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Paspaśā*, Kātyāyana discusses the meaning of *vyākaraṇa* in a series of *vārttika*s. The last one together with Patañjali's *bhāṣya* is as follows:

[vārtt.] *lakṣyalakṣaṇe vyākaraṇam. ‖ 14 ‖*

[*bhāṣya*] *lakṣyaṃ ca lakṣaṇaṃ caitat samuditaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ bhavati | kiṃ punar lakṣaṇaṃ lakṣyaṃ ca | śabdo lakṣyaṃ sūtraṃ lakṣaṇam |* (MBh I.12.15–17)

Vārtt. 14 Grammar is both the differentiated and the differentia.

[Commentary] Grammar is a collection, namely, the differentiated and the differentia. But what is the differentia and the differentiated? The differentiated is the word and the differentia is the *sūtra*.

Although Patañjali prefers an earlier definition for *vyākaraṇa*,[11] it is Kātyāyana's final word on the matter, and his idea of defining grammar as a set of characteristics for the object of study extends easily to *alaṅkāraśāstra*. Through grammar speech is given its precise shape (*vi-ā-kṛ*)[12] with well defined elements such as *dhātu*s, "roots," and *pratyaya*s, "suffixes." Because of grammar we know precisely what correct language is, what its features are, and how we can both recognize it and reproduce it. The job of *alaṅkāraśāstra* is similar insofar as by studying it we can recognize poetry through a certain set of defining features as well as create it by incorporating those features into our language.

---

[10]This was certainly a common semantic specialization. From an early period in Tamil *ilakkaṇam* and *ilakkiyam*, phonological adaptations of *lakṣaṇam* and *lakṣyam*, are the primary denotations for "grammar" and "literature," respectively.

[11]Patañjali, after discussing some difficulties with the present vārtt., repeats an earlier definition for *vyākaraṇa*, namely *sūtram*. See Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 173–185) for a translation of the entire passage with notes.

[12]See *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 6.4.7.3 in which the gods implore Indra: *imáṃ no vácam vyákuru |* "make this speech articulate for us!" Cf. Sharfe (1977: 80). One cannot take for granted how difficult it is to give shape to, to analyze, a "shapeless," unanalyzed language.

2.3 Defining Poetry

A definition creates a meaningful set of elements that is then useful within a larger system.[13] For example, by adopting the axioms or postulates of Euclidean geometry, one can go on to discover other properties of shapes and even apply this knowledge to architecture, surveying, and astronomy.[14] Within the Sanskrit intellectual world, we find an abundance of such definitions in Pāṇini's grammar. The *saṃjñā*s, "technical terms," not only economize later rules by bringing a particular class of elements under one term,[15] but they also highlight certain common phonetic, phonological, and morphological properties.[16] When we turn to defining *kāvya*, "poetry," the process is in many ways similar — we wish to demarcate a class of texts for some purpose — but there is added complexity because the creator of the definition must take into account a number of preexisting opinions about what poetry is and then decide which features are necessary, which are optional, and which, when absent, do not automatically abrogate membership to the class, but simply make for "bad" poetry. Also, one must then ask: What purpose does this created set serve? What is being excluded and included and on what bases? The *ālaṅkārika*s are aware of the inherent complexity of these questions, and though attempts are made at defining poetry with a single proposition, often the definition of poetry is the work as a whole with a staggering amount of detail and optionality (in some cases). In what follows we will survey some of these definitions and then turn our attention to the aforementioned topics of *śāstra* and *doṣa*s, "faults," within *alaṅkāraśāstra*. From these we will be able to gain considerable insight into grammar's role in the definition of poetry.[17]

---

[13]Outside of the system, axiomatic definitions serve little purpose, and one can hardly speak of their truth value. In his commentary ad JMS 1.1.5, Śabara discusses the validity of ad hoc definitions in contradistinction to the innate (*autpāttika*) relation between word and meaning valid in the real world, i.e., outside of the specific system to which the definition has been tailored.

[14]For the artificiality of these axioms to manifest, one need only ask, as Einstien did: *Was meinst du mit der Behauptung, daß diese Sätze wahr seien?* "What do you mean with your assertion that these laws are true?" Einstein (2008: 1).

[15]For example, *gha* is defined as the suffixes *taraP* and *tamaP* in P. 1.1.22 *taraptamapau ghaḥ*.

[16]For example, by defining a set of words as *sarvanāman*s, "pronouns," Pāṇini is able to account for morphological peculiarities in their declension.

[17]For a broad overview of what *kāvya* is, both according to its definition within the *alaṅkāra* tradition (mainly from Bhoja's ŚPr) as well as its socio-political functions, see Pollock (2003: 39–130), particularly pp. 41–61 and then again Pollock (2006: 75–144).

2.3.1 Bhāmaha

2.3.1.1 Sound and Sense

> *vāgarthāv iva sampṛktau vāgarthapratipattaye*
> *jagataḥ pitarau vande pārvatīparameśvarau*

> "Like sound and sense mingled together so both are understood
> I praise the parents of the world, Pārvatī and the Supreme Lord."

> —Kālidāsa, *Raghuvaṃśa* 1.1

We may begin with what is undoubtedly the most influential definition of poetry, Bhāmaha's *śabdārthau sahitau kāvyam*, "poetry is sound and sense united."[18] This definition resonates throughout the remainder of the tradition with further qualification added by later authors.[19] But Bhāmaha has not formulated this statement in a void like an entry in a dictionary. Rather, it forms part of a larger discussion about the nature of poetry at the beginning of his first chapter. In the three preceding verses (1.13–15), Bhāmaha notes two opinions of earlier *ālaṅkārika*s and then states his own opinion, which is a combination of the two. The verses run as follows:

> *rūpakādir alaṅkāras tasyānyair bahudhoditaḥ |*
> *na kāntam api nirbhūṣaṃ vibhāti vanitānanam || 1.13 ||*
> *rūpakādim alaṅkāraṃ bāhyam ācakṣate pare |*
> *supāṃ tiṅāṃ ca vyutpattiṃ vācāṃ vāñchanty alaṅkṛtim || 1.14 ||*
> *tad etad āhuḥ sauśabdyaṃ nārthavyutpattir īdṛśī |*
> *śabdābhidheyālaṅkārabhedād iṣṭaṃ dvayaṃ tu naḥ || 1.15 ||*
> *śabdārthau sahitau kāvyaṃ gadyaṃ padyaṃ ca tad dvidhā |*
> *saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ cānyad apabhraṃśam iti tridhā || 1.16 ||* (BhKA)

> Others have said in various ways that metaphor, etc. are its [scil. *kāvya*'s] ornament.
> Not even the beautiful face of a woman is radiant when unembellished. (1.13) Others
> assert that metaphor, etc. are external ornaments. They presume that the (proper)

---

[18]BhKA 1.16a.

[19]I will discuss some of the later formulations below, but see De (1960: 36f.) for an overview of later formulations and Pollock (2003: 45), who provides a lucid translation of Bhoja's take on the definition of *kāvya* in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. Bhāmaha is the author of our earliest extant treatise on poetics. More detail about his work can be found in De (1960 I: 32–54) and (1960 II: 34–54), Kane (1961: 78–88), Naganatha Sastry (1970: vii–xx), Gerow (1977: 225–233), and Śarmā & Upādhyāya (1981: 1–71). As for his date in the early 7th CE and his claim to the earliest extant *ālaṅkārika*, see Bronner (2012), who (joining other scholars) argues persuasively for the priority of Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin.

production of nouns[20] and verbs is the ornamentation of speech. (1.14) That, they say, makes for beautiful language; the (mere) production of meaning is not like that (i.e., capable of making beautiful language). But we desire both because (poetic) ornaments are divided between sound and sense. (1.15) Poetry is sound and sense united. It is of two varieties: prose and verse. It is of three varieties: Sanskrit and Prakrit, the other Apabhraṃśa. (1.16)

These verses require some comment.[21] The two opinions put forth here set up the dichotomy so essential to all linguistic speculation, the difference between *artha*, "meaning, object, sense," and the *śabda*, "sound, uttered word," that we use to convey the *artha*. Some maintain that only semantic figures of speech like metaphor can make ordinary language into poetry, while others assert that it is the correct production[22] and arrangement of the words that are the ornaments of poetry, not semantic ornaments because they are external, i.e., they are not inherent to poetry whereas the sounds are.[23] Bhāmaha therefore sees poetry as being the inseparable combination of both sound and sense qualified by ornamentation as well as other conditions laid out in the remainder of the work, but the motivation for this division and then unification has a much deeper history in Sanskrit linguistic thought. Let us, then, look more closely at these terms and the relation between sound and sense in the Sanskrit śāstric traditions.

śabda and *artha*, what I have here rendered as "sound and sense," are not easily translated

---

[20] *sup* = *subanta*, "what ends in a case suffix." The scope of *subanta* is much wider than "noun" in English, since within the Pāṇinian school of grammar all fully formed words must end in either a case ending (*suP*) or personal ending (*tiṄ*). Even indeclinables are capped off with a case that is then elided by P. 2.4.82. A more exact, albeit less literal, translation of *supāṃ tiṅāṃ ca* would be "complete words."

[21] For stanzas BKA 1.13–15 there exists number of translations into English, e.g., Sastri (1956: 10–13), De (1960 II: 38), Jha (1967: 161f.), Naganatha Sastry (1970: 5f.), and Krishnamoorthy (1977: 295). Sastri and Shastry are translating the text as a part of Bhāmaha's work, whereas Jha is translating the passage as quoted in the 6th *ullāsa* of Mammaṭa's KāPr (*vṛtti* ad KāPr 6.1). Similarly, Krishnamoorthy's translation of the stanzas is found within the context of Kuntaka's *Vakroktijīivta* (*vṛtti* ad VJ 1.7 = Krishnamoorthy (1977: ९)). Raghavan (1978: 83) quotes this passage but offers no exact translation. Ideas stemming from the theory of suggestion (*dhvani*) are often anachronistically incorporated into these translations. See, e.g., Govindabhaṭṭa's *Pradīpa* ad KāPra 47/6.1 for an explanation incorporating the theory of suggestion: *arthasyaiva vibhāvādirūpatvena rasavyañjakatvāt tanniṣṭho rūpakādir evālaṅkāraḥ kaiścid uktaḥ |* "Some say that semantic ornaments such as metaphor, etc., are the only ornaments because sense alone, as it constitutes emotion, etc., suggests poetic flavor (*rasa*)."

[22] *vyutpatti* refers to any production including educational training, but in reference to words, it implies production according to the rules of grammar and, in the context of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, to a particular production of poetic words that gives rise to *śabdālaṅkāra*s "ornaments of sound," such as alliteration.

[23] Thus the explanation Māṇikyacandra reports in his commentary, *Saṅketa*, ad KāPra 6.1: *apare tu kāvya-svarūpāsamavetatvena rūpakādyarthālaṅkārāṇāṃ bahiraṅgatāṃ manvānāḥ suptiṅvyutpatteḥ kāvyasvarūpasam-avetatvenāntaraṅgatām āhuḥ |* "But others say that the production of nouns and verbs is internal insofar as it is inherent to the very form of poetry, since they think that semantic ornaments such as metaphor, etc., are external insofar as they are not inherent."

out of Sanskrit.[24] *śabda* can range from simply *dhvani*, "sound, noise," as Patañjali glosses it in the *Paspaśāhnika*,[25] to communicative linguistic forms[26] to language itself,[27] somewhat akin to Latin *vox*, "voice," which can be *aut articulata... aut confusa*, "articulated (i.e., comprehensible) or confused (i.e., meaningless)."[28] *artha*, in the linguistic context, refers to both the semantic content of a word as well as the object that the word represents, either in the physical world or the speaker's or listener's mind. I have chosen "sound and sense" in this context because it can, and hopefully does, conjure up poetic and poetological associations like the verses extracted from Part II of Alexander Pope's *An Essay on Criticism* and now often titled *Sound and Sense*,[29] or the introduction to poetry by Laurence Perrine and Thomas Arp[30] likewise so titled. I also find this translation satisfying in the present context because it does not import much foreign, anachronistic, or loaded linguistic terms such as "signifier" and "signified" would.[31]

The *sambandha*, "connection," between these two concepts has long been a focal point of speculation among the philosophers of India, especially with regard to whether the relationship is eternal (*nitya*) or not (*anitya*). The position that the relation between sound and sense is eternal features in the philosophies of both the grammarians as well as the *mīmāṃsaka*s whose foundational texts, Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* and Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*s, respectively, both include definitive statements on the matter near their start. In the *Mahābhāṣya* the vārtt.:[32] *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe*, "when it is the case that the connection between a word and its meaning is (permanently) established." Following the interpretation of Patañjali, sound, sense, and

---

[24]For an overview of these two terms, see Houben (1995: 31–35) and Coward & Kunjunni Raja (1990: 5f.)

[25]MBh I.1.12f.

[26]Cf. Patañjali's influential definition: MBh I.1.10f. *yenoccāritena sāsnālāṅgūlakakudakhuraviṣāṇināṃ sampratyayo bhavati sa śabdaḥ* | "A *śabda* is that by which arises the conception of beings that possess a dewlap, a tale, a head, hooves, and horns." Here Patañjali is dealing with a particular *śabda*, namely, *gauḥ*, "cow," but the definition is, *mutatis mutandis*, transferable to other objects.

[27]As in the first line of Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* where *brahman* (n.) is said to be *śabda-tattva*, "one whose essence is language."

[28]Donatus (2009: 16)

[29]Cf. Boynton (1903: 72a): "The sound must seem an echo to the sense."

[30]Perrine & Arp (1992).

[31]More detailed discussions of *artha* can be found in Ganeri (2006: 9–33) and Deshpande (1992: 1–6).

[32]Not marked as such in Kielhorn's edition (MBh I.6.16), but Patañjali clearly treats it as one by both commenting on it and noting that the *ācarya*, "teacher" (i.e., Kātyāyana), has commenced his treatise with the word *siddha* to gain auspiciousness (*maṅgalārtham*). Cf. the translation in Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 90f.).

their relationship are permanent, i.e., *siddha*, "established," = *nitya*, "permanent," in this context. Bhartṛhari, the great digester of the *Mahābhāṣya*, offers a version of the vārtt. reworked with Patañjali's comments in mind:

> *nityāḥ śabdārthasambandhās tatrāmnātā maharṣibhiḥ |*
> *sūtrāṇāṃ sānutantrāṇāṃ bhāṣyāṇāṃ ca praṇetṛbhiḥ || VP 1.23 ||*

> The authors of the sūtras together with the critical comments and the commentary have handed down that words, objects, and their connection are eternal.[33]

Similarly, toward the beginning of Jaimini's work, we find JMS 1.1.5, the first portion of which is: *autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandhaḥ*, "moreover, the connection of sound with sense is inborn."[34] Once again the adjective describing this relation is initially glossed as *nitya*, "permanent," and then later *apauruṣeya*, "not of personal production," by the *Bhāṣyakāra*, Śabara. The impetus for holding that there exists a permanent link between *śabda* and *artha* derives from the axiomatic status of the Vedas not only as eternal but also as an instantiation of reality, when not reality itself. By extending this line of thought to language and reality in general, there arose numerous philosophical debates about just how language does or simply cannot correspond to reality.[35] Given *alaṅkāraśāstra*'s close affiliation with *vyākaraṇa* and *mīmāṃsā*, Bhāmaha's definition of poetry seems to play off of such passages from the MBh and JMS and indicates a similarly intertwined relation in poetic language both at the level of ornamentation as well as the level of content.

One particular concept the *ālaṅkārika*s take over from the grammarians is the idea that *sādhu śabda*, "correct language," must be used in order to accurately and meritoriously express the intended sense.[36] What is not correct is a *doṣa*, "fault," and must be extirpated. Bhāmaha lays out his notions of (in)correct usage in several passages in the first section and then dedicates the last

---

[33]The compound *śabdārthasambandhāḥ* is best taken as a *itaretara-dvandva*, i.e., a collection of three distinct objects. This is the interpretation given in the *vṛtti* ad VP 1.23: *nityaḥ śabdo nityo 'rtho nityaḥ sambandha ity eṣā śāstravyavasthā* | "The word is eternal. The object is eternal. The connection is eternal. This is the particular stance of the *śāstra*." This corresponds to Patañjali's understanding of the just quoted vārtt., the model for the present verse.

[34]See Jha (1933: 8) for a full translation of the sūtra along with Śabara's commentary and Scharf (1996: 269–271).

[35]See Bronkhorst (2011) for further discussions.

[36]The relation between *dharma*, "religious merit," knowing the rules of grammar, and correct usage also occupies a good portion of the *Paspaśā*, MBh I.8.1–6 and I.10.4–11.

three *pariccheda*s, "divisions," of his *Kāvyālaṅkāra* to different types of faults and poetic dos and don'ts. Those found in the opening portion of his work are of a more general nature while the fourth *pariccheda* treats specific faults in the spheres of semantics, grammar, meter, and contradictions with established norms. The fifth focuses on fallacies in a syllogism, and the final section is devoted to the application of grammar. I will first turn to the more general errors and then look at two of the specific faults given in the fourth *pariccheda*. A more detailed discussion of the final section will be reserved for the following two chapters. But in order to understand why poetry should be given such attention, we must first understand what exactly is at stake in poetic composition. What can it do?

2.3.1.2 The Products of Poetry

Bhāmaha presents poetry as no idle task for a dilettante. On the contrary, the responsibilities of a poet are of great moment because what can be achieved through poetry are life's greatest goals:

> *dharmārthakāmamokṣeṣu vaicakṣaṇyaṃ kalāsu ca* |
> *prītiṃ karoti kīrtiṃ ca sādhukāvyanibandhanam* || 1.2 || (BhKA)

> Skill in *dharma*, financial and sensual gain, liberation and the arts too, delight as well as fame, such things does a sound poetic composition help us obtain.

This verse[37] gives "sound" (*sādhu*) poetic composition a role in achieving life's primary goals, the four *puruṣārtha*s, "ends of man," as well as bringing delight and fame.[38] As the noun *nibandhana* can refer to both the act of composition as well as what is composed, i.e., a literary work,[39] so that the listed benefits may be got by composing poetry as well as from reading and studying it. The inclusion of *sādhu*, "correct, sound," has deep echoes within the grammatical tradition, and paves the way for the lengthy discussions on poetic faults and how to remove them.

In the following verses Bhāmaha returns to the topic of fame in particular and emphasizes

---

[37]Quoted in the *Locana* ad DhvĀ 1.1 (p. 40) with the reading -*niṣevaṇam*, "pursuit, practice," although the Kāvyamālā edition (p. 12) of the DhvĀ notes that two manuscripts, क, ख also have -*nibandhanam*, the reading of all the editions of the BhKA.

[38]De (1960 II: 39–41) discusses the development of the purposes of poetry in later *alaṅkāraśāstra* literature. It is, however, important to dwell on the synchronic context of an author's statements and not immediately view them in hindsight. Pollock (2004) deals specifically with the first three *puruṣārtha*s.

[39]The suffix *LyuṬ* = -*ana* has great versatility by P. 3.3.113 *kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam*.

that if a poet should desire renown that lasts on this earth after he has departed to heaven, he must devote himself to the composition of poetry (BhKA 1.6–8), but the main theme leading up to the discussion of sound and sense quoted above is the relation between poetry and *śāstra* and how within this relationship *śāstra* plays the subordinate role, albeit one indispensable for the creation of poetry. This dynamic is brought out in verses 3–5:

> *adhanasyeva dātṛtvaṃ klībasyevāstrakauśalam |*
> *ajñasyeva pragalbhatvam akaveḥ śāstravedanam || 1.3 ||*
> *vinayena vinā kā śrīḥ kā niśā śaśinā vinā |*
> *rahitā satkavitvena kīdṛśī vāgvidagdhatā || 1.4 ||*
> *gurūpadeśād adhyetuṃ śāstraṃ jaḍadhiyo 'py alam |*
> *kāvyaṃ tu jāyate jātu kasyacit pratibhāvataḥ || 1.5 ||* (BhKA)

> For someone other than a poet[40] to know the *śāstra*s is like a penniless man being generous, a eunuch being skilled in weaponry, and an ignorant man speaking confidently. (1.3) What is wealth without good manners? What is the night without the moon? What would eloquence be without skill in poetry? (1.4) Even men of dull intellect can learn science from a teacher's instruction, but poetry is born, if at all, to someone with inspiration (*pratibhā*). (1.5)

The first two of these verses emphasize in a different way how the obtainment of systematized knowledge becomes meaningful and effective only through a poet, and the third that the art of poetry is in fact far more difficult to master than the other disciplines, for which all one needs is a teacher. Based on the three standards of comparison presented in BhKA 1.3, only the poet is able to be generous with his knowledge of the *śāstra*s — the idea being either that only a poet has the ability to learn and then impart such knowledge whereas someone else, though he may want to give, cannot because he does not have the means to do so; only the poet has the skill to wield this knowledge effectively and not look foolish when speaking. The last in the triad sets poetry apart from other skills by introducing *pratibhā*, "inspiration," a concept closely associated with Bhartṛhari's philosophy of language and discussed throughout the tradition of Sanskrit poetics as an essential requirement for a poet.[41] Yet despite poetry's extraordinary status as something that gives meaning to the *śāstra*s but cannot be acquired along the same lines, it nevertheless depends

---

[40]I understand the *a*-privative (*naÑ*) in the sense of *anyatā*, "otherness."

[41]There are a number of studies on the concept in both traditions. For Bhartṛhari and philosophy of language, see Hattori (1980) and Tola (1990). For poetics see Swamy (1989) and Shulman (2008).

upon them.

In the following quartet (BhKA 1.9–12), Bhāmaha provides a mini syllabus for the would-be poet, a topic much elaborated on in later works of poetics[42] and in the allied genre of *kaviśikṣā*, "education of a poet."[43] and bolsters the reason such training is needed and the consequences of being a bad poet:

> *śabdaś chando 'bhidhānārthā itihāsāśrayāḥ kathāḥ |*
> *loko yuktiḥ kalāś ceti mantavyāḥ kāvyahetavaḥ*[44] *|| 1.9 ||*
> *śabdābhidheye vijñāya kṛtvā tadvidupāsanam*
> *vilokyānyanibandhāṃś ca kāryaḥ kāvyakriyādaraḥ ||1.10 ||*
> *sarvathā padam apy ekaṃ na nigādyam avadyavat*
> *vilakṣaṇā hi kāvyena duḥsuteneva nindyate || 1.11 ||*
> *nākavitvam adharmāya vyādhaye daṇḍanāya vā |*
> *kukavitvaṃ punaḥ sākṣān mṛtim āhur manīṣiṇaḥ || 1.12 ||* (BhKA)

> The causes of poetry are considered to be word (i.e., grammar), meter, the meanings of words (lexicography), stories based on traditional lore, the world (i.e., worldly experience), logic, and the arts. (1.9) Having understood words and what is denoted (by them), having studied at the feet of those who know about such things, and having examined the compositions of others, (only then) should one take the trouble to compose poetry. (1.10) By all means not even a single reprehensible word should be uttered since one is condemned for disobedient poetry, like for a bad son. (1.11) Not being a poet does not lead to demerit, sickness or punishment, but being a bad poet, the wise say, truly spells death. (1.12)

I note the prominence given to the study of linguistic topics, the first being grammar itself and that the requirement to understand "words and what is denoted (by them)" reflects the sound and sense constituents of poetry already dealt with above. Furthermore, the utterance of a single faulty word can lead to derision, a reality born out by the habits of *ālaṅkārika*s and commentators over the centuries. The word *vilakṣman-*, "without/contrary to definition,"[45] used to describe bad poetry, reflects the adherence to normativity, i.e., poetry should fall in line with a particular set of definitions. These verses reinforce the *sādhutva*, "correctness," of the poetic composition

---

[42]E.g. KAS 1.3.1 on the *kāvyāṅga*s, RKA 1.18–19, KāMī 1.4, etc.

[43]See De (1960 II: 283–298).

[44]The reading *-hetavaḥ* is found by the fragments of the *Bhāmahavivaraṇa*. Cf. Gnoli (1962: XL, 8). I have also confirmed this reading in a MS of the BhKA in the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg. MS 59b f. 185v ln. 2.

[45]The *upasarga vi* can express, *inter alia*, *vigata*, "devoid of" or *viruddha*, "contradictory to." Cf. Dimitrov (2007: 54f.).

mentioned in the second verse, for it is only through purity of expression that the gains of poetry are able to be effectively obtained. The final line, that being a bad poet is tantamount to death, must be viewed in light of the lofty effects of poetry (skill in the ends of man, fame, and delight) as well as the fact that it is through poetry that one is able to obtain immortal fame (cf. BhKA 7–8) and without it one is truly dead.

2.3.1.3 Fault Finding

In order to achieve the required correctness in a poetic composition, the *ālaṅkārika*s have listed a number of *doṣa*s, "faults," that must be removed from good poetry.[46] Several elements of these lists derive from NŚ 16.88, where ten *kāvyadoṣa*s, "poetic faults," are presented and then subsequently defined and exemplified in NŚ 16.89–94. Bhāmaha borrows several faults from Bharata although under slightly different names. The types of faults in Bhāmaha's work correspond, for the most part, to the *kāvyahetu*s, "causes for poetry," given in BhKA 1.9 and thereby signify the need to acquire proper training in the *śāstra*s in order to ensure flawless poetry. There is, however, an emphasis on linguistic flaws pertaining to both formal grammatical correctness as well as semantics and the logical syllogism, both of these receiving their own chapters, but importance is also placed on the fact that a poem's content needs to conform to norms of the (idealized) world, reason, and the *śāstra*s more generally.

The discussion of faults spreads over the last three chapters (4–6) in the BhKA but already comes up toward the end of the first (BhKA 1.37–53). Chapter 4 is dedicated to 15 faults (or alternately 10 with one having 6 types), chapter 5 to faults in logic, and chapter to 6 to formal linguistic errors, although the opening verses discuss theories of language. The ten *doṣa*s[47] found in the first chapter are divided into six types of expressions poets should not use (BhKA 1.37d *kavayo na prayuñjate* | "Poets do not use.") and three kinds of faulty (*duṣṭa*) and one kind of difficult (*kaṣṭa*) wording. The reason for noting these ten faults in the initial chapter seems to be that they are of a more general nature, whereas those found in the latter chapters are infractions

---

[46]See Raghavan (1978: 203–243) for a survey of the topic.
[47]The first six in BhKA 1.37 are never explicitly termed *doṣa*s, but that they are so is clear from the context.

against a more specific *śāstra* or rule. This holds well with Bhāmaha's scheme in the first chapter, where he lays much of the ground work for what poetry is.

To elaborate more on this division and the basis for placing the ten faults in the first chapter, I will show that they serve to carve out a domain for poetic language that would otherwise be possible in ordinary language, or, to put it negatively, would not be excluded by any particular rule from another *śāstra*. More specifically, four place a prohibition against using overly obscure formulations, i.e., words used to denote things that would be theoretically possible but are not a part of good poetic diction. These *doṣa*s are *neyārtha*, "(a poetic expression) in which the meaning must be teased out," (BhKA 1.38),[48] *anyārtha*, "(a poetic expression) in which the meaning is another (unexpected) meaning," (BhKA 1.40), *avācaka*, "unexpressive (poetic expression)," (BhKA 1.41), and *gūḍhaśabdābhidhāna*, "(a poetic expression) in which the meaning of the words is hidden" (BhKA 1.45). Of the remaining two, *kliṣṭa*, "tormented," is left undefined (BhKA 1.40) and *ayuktimat*, "containing something unsuitable," pertains specifically (somewhat oddly so) to the use of non-human messengers such as clouds, winds, the moon, etc. (BhKA 1.42), though an exception is made for maddened love-sick people.[49] An example from the previous four will suffice to demonstrate my point.

Bhāmaha says that poets do not use poetry that is *gūḍhaśabdābhidhāna*, "in which the meaning of the words is hidden." His example is the verse:

> *gūḍhaśabdābhidhānaṃ ca na prayojyaṃ kathaṃ cana |*
> *sudhiyām api naivedam upakārāya kalpate || 1.45 ||*
> *asitartitug adricchit svaḥkṣitāṃ patir advidṛk |*
> *amidbhiḥ śubhradṛgdṛṣṭair dviṣo jeghnīyiṣīṣṭa vaḥ || 1.46 || (BhKA)*

> In no way should poetry be used in which the meaning of the words is hidden. This does not serve to help even to the clever. (1.45) [For example:] "May the son of the one whose path is black, who pierces the mountain, the lord of the heaven-dwellers, who has not-two eyes, slay over and over your enemies with his non-oily bright looks." (1.46)

---

[48]All of the faults are adjectives in the neuter sing., and we can easily supply *kāvya-vākya*, "expression in a poem," from the context.

[49]This is undoubtedly a reference to Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*, in which a love-sick *yakṣa* addresses a cloud and requests it to carry a message to his beloved.

Although we do not have any further remarks from Bhāmaha about the hidden meaning in the verse,[50] we can assume that it is the oblique reference to Kumāra conveyed by the adjectives in the first line, especially the first one, the meaning of which is particularly obscure based on the word choice: *tuc*, "son," is a rare Vedic word, and *asita-ṛti*, "whose path is black," i.e., "fire," is not exactly straight forward; the word *ṛti* in the sense of path is also uncommon, though its derivation is transparent.[51] One could further speculate that the mouthful *jeghnīyiṣīṣṭa*, an *āśirliṅ*, "benedictive," of the *yaṄ*, "intensive," from √*han*, "to kill," would be problematic, — and indeed it is rather recherché[52] — but I do not see it as containing any "hidden" meaning unless it is the obscurity of the derivational process its that needs to be taken into consideration. The point, in any case, is that Bhāmaha perceives excessive complexity in the conveyance of meaning a blemish upon a good poem. This might be fine for other genres, and indeed commentators frequently claim to illuminate the *gūḍhārtha*, "hidden meaning," of a root text,[53] but such forms of expression have no place in poetry. The other three faults mentioned above fall under the same general heading, although they differ in their details.

Of the remaining four faults of speech (BhKA 1.47–53), three deal with the subject of vulgar speech. Poetry that is *śruti-duṣṭa*, "faulty to the ear," includes "dirty words," many of which refer to primary sexual characteristics or what they emit. *artha-duṣṭa*, "faulty in meaning," in contrast, relies not on the explicit mention of vulgarity but its implication through double entendre. *kalpanā-duṣṭa*, "faulty in construction," language results when indecorous words occur because of an infelicitous conjunction of words which, on their own, do not occasion a blush.[54] The last,

---

[50]The verse is fortunately quoted in Bhoja's SKĀa ad 32cd (p. 30, ex. 43) as an example of *asaukumārya*, "non-tenderness." The commentator, Rāmasiṃha, provides a very elucidating gloss on the verse, which I will follow.

[51]It is derived from √*ṛ*, "to go," with the suffix -*ti* to form an action noun.

[52]The form is not accounted for by Pāṇini's rules, so Kātyāyana has formulated three *vārttika*s ad P. 7.4.30 to accommodate it. The first two are abortive attempts to remedy the problem, but the third *yaṅprakaraṇe hanter himsāyāṃ ghnī*, "in the derivation of the intensive, *ghnī* is substituted for √*han* when it means 'to harm'," properly accounts for the derivation and is included, under the somewhat modified form, *hanter himsāyāṃ yaṅi ghnībhāvo vaktavyaḥ*, in the KV ad P. 7.4.30 and then in the various recasts of the A: RA vol. II p. 204 (after P. 7.3.55), SK ad P. 7.4.85, etc.

[53]For example, Madhusūdana's commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* is titled *Gūḍhārthadīpikā* (*A Lamp for the Hidden Meaning*), and in their opening verses the authors of the KV claim that their commentary is *vivṛta-gūḍha-sūtra-arthā*, "one by which the hidden meaning of the sūtras is uncovered."

[54]The example in BhKA 1.52 is *śauryābharaṇaḥ*, i.e., *śaurya-ābharaṇa*, "he whose ornament is heroism," which inadvertently (?) contains the noun *yābha*, "fuck." The same humorous phenomenon exists in English and was

śruti-kliṣṭa, "harsh on the ears," consists of sequences of sounds that would be considered less than mellifluous such as *ajihlad*, "S/he delighted." Once again, there is nothing wrong with any of these words in other contexts, but within poetry they detract from the overall aesthetic that Bhāmaha thinks poets ought to strive for. Finally, it should be noted that Bhāmaha does allow some leeway for inappropriate words so long as they add beauty.[55] The closing verses of the first section (BhKA 1.55–8) give examples. We will see a more context-sensitive treatment of the faults in Daṇḍin.

The ten (or sixteen) faults listed in chapter 4 of the *Kāvyālaṅkāra* have a more specific character and many of them are more objective (in a certain sense) violations either of normative rules found in the *śāstra*s or of facts in the world as it (ideally) is. I present below the *doṣa*s and, when possible, the corresponding rule that they violate and the rule's sources in a preexisting discipline. Once again, all of the following words are adjectives modifying a word like *kāvya*, "poetry," or *kāvya-vākya*, "a sentence/phrase of a poem."

1. *apārtha* "(poetic expression that is) devoid of meaning." Cf. *apārthaka* in NS 5.2.10.

2. *vyartha* "(poetic expression that is) contradictory in meaning." Cf. *vyāghāta* in NS 2.1.57.

3. *ekārtha* "(poetic expression that has) the same meaning," repetition of content. Cf. *punarukta* in NS 5.2.14.

4. *sasaṃśaya* "(poetic expression that has) doubt."

5. *apakrama* "(poetic expression that is) disorderly," violation of *yathāsaṅkhya*, "parallelism." Cf. P. 1.3.10.

6. *śabdahīna* "(poetic expression that is) defective of (correct) words," violation of grammatical rules.

7. *yatibhraṣṭa* "(poetic expression that is) broken by the caesura," incorrect caesura.

8. *bhinnavṛtta* "(poetic expression in which) the meter is broken," faulty metrical pattern.

---

frequently exploited in Bart Simpson's prank phone calls to Moe, the bar tender, e.g., Hugh Jass (*The Simpsons* season 8, episode 8).

[55]BhKA 1.55ab *kiṃcid āśrayasaundaryād dhatte śobhām asādhv api* | "Sometimes even a faulty word creates splendor on account of the beauty of its surroundings." This seems to be how Śrīharṣa can work in NaiC 7.133. Cf. Narayana Rao and Shulman (2012: 66f.) for the Telugu version as well.

9. *visandhi* "(poetic expression that has) no junction," unpleasing, though grammatical, hiatus.

10. *virodhi* "(poetic expression that) contradicts:"

    - *deśavirodhi* "contradicts region"
    - *kālavirodhi* "contradicts time"
    - *kalāvirodhi* "contradicts the arts"
    - *lokavirodhi* "contradicts the world"
    - *nyāyavirodhi* "contradicts logic"
    - *āgamavirodhi* "contradicts tradition"

Of these ten faults, the first four are of a semantic nature and can be found in other *śāstra*s (especially *nyāya* and *mīmāṃsā*); three (*śabdahīna*, *apakrama*, and *visandhi*) concern more formal grammatical violations against Pāṇini's rules; and two (*yatibhraṣṭa* and *bhinnavṛtta*) are metrical defects according to *chandaḥśāstra*, "metrics." The five "contradiction"-faults arise when the content of a poem goes against traditionally accepted norms as established by various other *śāstra*s. This list reinforces the idea that one can compose good poetry only by mastering all of the major disciplines of the time.

With regard to the linguistic faults, the division between semantic flaws and those against formal grammar highlights the scope of *vyākaraṇa*. For instance, both Bhāmaha and Vātsyāyana ad NS 5.10 give *daśa dāḍimāni ṣaḍ apūpāḥ*, etc., "ten pomegranates, six cakes, etc." as an example for *apārtha*.[56] The source of this example is to be found in the MBh ad P. 1.1.1.2, Kātyāyana's second vārtt. in a lengthy discussion about the purpose of making a section on technical terms (*saṃjñā*s). Here Patañjali notes that in actual linguistic usage we find utterances that are both meaningful and meaningless.[57] The example then given for a meaningless utterance is a list of words which have neither syntactic connection nor rhyme or reason: "ten pomegranates, six cakes, a bowl, cumin, a lump of sesame and so forth." Such nonsense, however, does not violate grammar or *śabdānuśāsana*, "instruction in words," since the primary goal is to teach how to

---

[56]BhKA 4.8cd *dāḍimāni daśāpūpāḥ ṣaḍ ityādi yathoditam ‖* The word order is different *metri causa*.

[57]MBh I.38.3f. *loke hy arthavanti cānarthakāni ca vākyāni dṛśyante |* "For, in the (linguistic habits of the) world one finds both meaningful and meaningless utterances."

analyze correctly formed words; the sense or external referents are not what is it taught.[58] Hence the scope of the fault *apārtha* does not overlap with *śabdahīna*, "devoid of (correct) language."

Turning briefly to the two faults I have identified as pertaining to linguistic forms, *śabdahīna* and *visandhi*, we can see more precisely how grammar plays a role. Bhāmaha defines and exemplifies *śabdahīna* as follows:

> *sūtrakṛtpadakāreṣṭaprayogād yo 'nyathā bhavet |*
> *tam āptaśrāvakāsiddheḥ*[59] *śabdahīnaṃ vidur yathā* || 4.22 ||
> *spurattaḍidvalayino vitatāmbhogarīyasaḥ |*
> *tejas tirayataḥ sauraṃ ghanān paśya divo 'bhitaḥ* || 4.23 || (BhKA)

> They understand such usage to be *śabdahīna*, "devoid of (correct) speech," as occurs contrary to the accepted usage of Pāṇini and the word-makers[60] because it is not established (as correct) by authoritative (teachers) and their students. (4.22) Look at the clouds all over the sky! They are surrounded by flashing lightning, stretched and rather heavy with water, obstructing the radiance of the sun. (4.24)

Bhāmaha gives us no indication of the fault, but as Naganatha Sastry (1970: 80) points out, the faulty word is *tirayataḥ*, "obstructing." The difficulty lies in deriving the verbal stem *tiraya-*. Although it is clearly from the indeclinable *tiras*, a member of the *svārādi* list (Gaṇapāṭha 254.44), there is no grammatical rule for deriving such a verb. Instead, one should use *tirobhū*, "to be obstructed," or *tiraskṛ*, "to obstruct."[61] Nevertheless, the form is not without use in later literature, although commentators will usually gloss it with the proper *tiraskṛ*.[62]

---

[58]Cf. Jinendrabuddha emphasizes this point nicely, KVNyāsa vol. I p. 8: *śabdānuśāsanam ity atra tu śabdānām idam anuśāsanam, nārthānām ity etāvato 'rthasya vivakṣitatvāt |* "But because here in 'word-instruction' the meaning that is intended to be expressed is only this much: this is an instruction in words, not in meanings."

[59]The alternate reading is *āptaśrāvakāḥ siddheḥ* as printed in Trivedi's edition, p. 229. The meaning of the verse, however, would not change much: "the teachers and their students understand such usage to be *śabdahīna*, 'devoid of (correct) speech,' … on the basis of the established (language)."

[60]*padakāra*- lit. "word-maker" is generally given as "the author of the *padapāṭha*." Patañjali informs us, MBh II.85.5, III.117.18–19 and III.398.9, that: *na lakṣaṇena padakārā anuvartyāḥ padakārair nāma lakṣaṇam anuvartyam |* "Rule (scil. the rules of grammar) need not follow the word-makers; word-makers surely need follow the rule." Cardon (2012) has studied Pāṇini's critical evaluation of the *padakāras*' morphological analysis. On the MBh passages, c.f. Cardona (2012: 44, fn. 24). The mention of the *padakāras*, whose work is strictly within the realm of Vedic scholarship, appears somewhat out of place in the present context, but if we consider Bhāmaha to be speaking about Sanskrit most broadly, then it would be sensible to also include those who defined the words of the Vedas. The 20th cent. commentator, Tātācārya, perhaps also somewhat puzzled by the appearance of the *padakāras* at this juncture, glosses the word with "Kātyāyana." I am not, however, aware of any parallel for this meaning. Kātyāyana is often the *vākyakāra*, "author of the statements." Cf. ŚPra III p. 171, where P. 8.1.28.1 is quoted in conjunction the *vākyakāra*.

[61]Cf. P. 1.4.71 and 72.

[62]*tiraya-* occurs, e.g., in the *Ratnāvalī* 4.13 and HV 5.146. The anomalous formation is discussed in Bartholomae (1906: 115).

The second such fault, *visandhi*, "without sandhi," receives no definition, only an example. This is an interesting fault, the history of which will occupy a short study that has not made it into the dissertation. At present, I will simply note that this fault restricts the domain of formal grammar within a poetic composition. In the example verse (BhKA 4.28), a hiatus between two vowels occurs three times in *pāda*s a and b because the first vowel is *-e* of the neuter dual accusative, and such a vowel does not enter into sandhi. This kind of absence of sandhi, though perfectly grammatical, constitutes a fault for Bhāmaha. Similar to the need for the semantic faults and *śabdahīna*, so too here *visandhi* is needed because otherwise grammar would allow for such formations.

The remaining two chapters of Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* specialize in logical and grammatical faults. I will discuss the latter thoroughly in the following chapter alongside the analogous chapter in Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra*. In this discussion additional light will be thrown on Bhāmaha's somewhat unique perspective on the intersection between grammatical language and poetic language.

2.3.2   Daṇḍin's *Mirror*

Reading the texts of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha side by side offers us a glimpse into the earlier history of *alaṅkāraśāstra*. Both authors are clearly reacting to a preexisting tradition and taking their own stance on several issues that must have been of importance in their day. Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, "Mirror on Poetry," or *Kāvyālakṣaṇa*, "Differentia of Poetry," however, gives the impression of a more innovative, forward-looking text, whereas Bhāmaha often comes across as more conservative and theoretical. Some of the finer distinctions in the two authors' approach to the *śāstra*s and grammar in particular will be highlighted in the following chapter. At present I will outline Daṇḍin's general attitude toward what poetry is and how various other disciplines are required for a successful composition. In this regard there is much overlap in the two works.

Daṇḍin opens his work with several verses on the usefulness of learned speech (KĀ 1.3–4), the lasting fame as well as the prosperity it can bring (KĀ 1.5–6), and the importance of studying

the *śāstra*s so that one can recognize faults and make poetry pure (KĀ 1.7–9). These topics, reminiscent of what we saw in Bhāmaha, form part of the basic tenets of *alaṅkāraśāstra*.[63] Verses 6–8 are worth looking at in more detail.

> *gaur gauḥ kāmadughā samyakprayuktā smaryate budhaiḥ |*
> *duṣprayuktā punar gotvaṃ prayoktuḥ saiva śaṃsati || 1.6 ||*
> *tad alpam api nopekṣyaṃ kāvyaṃ duṣṭaṃ kathaṃ cana |*
> *syād vapuḥ sundaram api śvitreṇaikena durbhagam || 1.7 ||*
> *guṇadoṣān aśāstrajñaḥ kathaṃ vibhajate naraḥ |*
> *kim andhasyādhikāro 'sti rūpabhedopalabdhiṣu || 1.8 || (KĀ)*

> The wise recall that speech, when correctly used, is a wish-granting cow, but when used faultily it announces that the user is a cow. (1.6) A poem that is even a little faulty must in no way be given any attention. Even a beautiful body would be impossible to enjoy with a single spot of leprosy. (1.7) How can someone who does not know the *śāstra*s differentiate virtues from faults? Does a blind man have any authority in perceiving the difference between colors? (1.8)

The first verse is a humorous reworking and expansion upon a rather famous passage from the *Mahābhāṣya*: "a single word, correctly understood, in accordance with the *śāstra*s, (and) well-used is the wish-granting cow in heaven,"[64] itself a quotation from the so-called *bhrāja* verses, authored by Kātyāyaya according to Kaiyaṭa.[65] Daṇḍin consciously links his introduction to the purity of poetic language with the more general dialog about the importance of correct language in the *Paspaśā*, "Introduction" to the *Mahābhāṣya*, where Patañjali discusses the dangers of speaking without first studying grammar and the benefits if one does study the subject. In the second half of the present verse, it is noted that one risks making a fool of himself. A similar conceit is found in BhKA 1.12, which warns that though there is no danger in not being a poet, being a bad poet

---

[63]The zero-tolerance attitude toward flaws eventually forms part of the basic definition for poetry — most famously in KāPra 4ab *tad adoṣau śabdārthau saguṇāv analaṅkṛtī punaḥ kvāpi* "it (scil. poetry) is flawless sound and sense accompanied by good qualities but sometimes without ornamentation" — did not last throughout the whole tradition. Some later authors, Viśvanātha, Jagannātha, etc., note that such high standards can in fact exclude some very beautiful poetry and that flawless poetry need not be good poetry. Cf. Raghavan (1978: 204–210).

[64]MBh I.58.14–17 *ekaḥ śabdaḥ samyagjñātaḥ śāstrānvitaḥ suprayuktaḥ svarge loke kāmadhug bhavatīti* | Patañjali then continues: *yadi ekaḥ śabdaḥ samyagjñātaḥ śāstrānvitaḥ suprayuktaḥ svarge loke kāmadhug bhavati kimartham dvitīyaḥ tṛtīyaḥ ca prayujyate | na vai kāmānāṃ tṛptir asti ||* "If a single word, correctly understood, in accordance with the *śāstra*s (and) well-used is a wish-granting cow in heaven (and) in the world, to what end is a second and a third (word) used? There is no satisfying desires." See also Houben (2012: 4–6) for a discussion of the passage and its citation in the MBhPr and MBhD, to which I can add the KVPada vol. I p. 11.

[65]MBhPr vol. I p. 36a&b, where Kaiyaṭa quotes the same passage as *śruti*. See also Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 48f.).

means death (cf. p. 70 above).[66]

After establishing the advantages and drawbacks of the correct use of language, Daṇḍin introduces the topic of faulty poetry, which must be avoided at all costs, even if just slightly off. The graphic comparison of a barely blemished poem to a beautiful body with just a single spot of leprosy continues the entertaining style, but likewise serves to underscore that in order to write good poetry, the poet must strive for perfection. The final verse, then, brings in the notion of the *śāstra*s, the main purpose of which is to allow someone to discern between the good qualities (*guṇa*s) and the faults (*doṣa*s). Our first commentator on the KĀ, Ratnaśrījñāna, expands on the use of *śāstra* and repeatedly emphasizes its necessity for developing the *caturvarga*s, "the group of four (life goals)," one of the main topics dealt with in a *mahākāvya* according to Daṇḍin (KĀ 1.15c).[67] For example, in his now unfortunately lacunose remarks on the first ten verses, Ratnaśrī notes that the śāstras teach[68] or illuminate the four goals of life,[69] that it is only from *śāstra* that life's undertakings can be defined by the cultivation of the four goals,[70] and finally that poetry itself, by falling in line with *śāstra*, will be free from faults, replete with good qualities and efficacious in the pursuit of life's goals.[71]

Turning to the specific treatment of faults in the third chapter of the KĀr 3.125–185,[72] we find more or less the same two and a half verses as in BhKA 4.1.[73] In what follows, KĀ 3.126cd–127,

---

[66]Vāḍijaṅghaladeva, a commentator on the *Kāvyādarśa* cites this verse from the BhKA in his commentary on the present passage.

[67]Cf. Ratnaśrī's comment ad KĀ 1.3 p. 2 *kāvyaṃ cedaṃ caturvargalakṣaṇam* | "poetry is characterized by the group of four (life goals)."

[68]*caturvargaśāsanāt śāstrāṇ[āṃ]* ad KĀ 1.3 p. 2.

[69]*jyotir ālokaḥ śabdahvāyaṃ śāstrasaṃjñakaṃ caturvargaprakāśakatvāt* | ad KĀ 1.4 p. 3. "The light, i.e., the splendor, is called 'language,' i.e., termed *śāstra*, because it illuminates the group of four."

[70]*sarvalokayātrā caturvargavyutpattilakṣaṇā śāstrād eva* | ad KĀ 1.3 p. 3. "All of life's undertakings are characterized by developing the group of four (life goals) because of *śāstra*."

[71]ibid. *[ataḥ] śāstrānusāreṇa guṇavat [kāvyam ekāntataḥ] puruṣārthasādhanam | doṣas tu svalpo 'pi śāstraprabhāvād evāpaneyaḥ* | "Therefore by following the *śāstra*s poetry comes to be suffused with good qualities, an all-around means for a man's goals, but even a a tiny fault should be removed by the power of *śāstra*."

[72]See also the discussions in De (1960 II: 86–88), Gupta (1970: 170–181), and Raghavan (1978: 219–224). A recent German translation is available in Dimitrov (2011: 270–277). In Tatacharya's edition of 1936 the section on *doṣa*s forms a fourth *pariccheda*, and a spurious prefatory verse is added: *kāvye doṣā guṇāś caiva vijñātavyā vicakṣaṇaiḥ | doṣā vipattaye tatra guṇāḥ sampattaye yathā* || "The experts can understand faults as well as good qualities in a poem. Just as faults therein ensure failure, so do good qualities ensure success." It is also found in two of Shastri's MSS, क and अ, Shastri (1970: 374).

[73]The only difference is in the final syllable of the first verse; BhKA 4.1 reads *visandhi ca* whereas KĀ 3.125 reads *visandhikam*.

Daṇḍin distinguishes himself from Bhāmaha by limiting the number of faults to exactly ten and then explicitly rejecting an in-depth analysis of faults within the logical syllogism.[74] The reason for doing so is that such an analysis is *karkaśaprāyaḥ* "quite difficult," by which we can infer that the topic is beyond the scope of a text on poetics. The commentator, Ratnaśrījñāna, writes at some length on the subject in his remarks ad KĀ 3.127. Although he does not necessarily represent Daṇḍin's own view, his remarks are worth noting. After offering three glosses on *karkaśaprāyaḥ*, he continues:[75]

> And here (in a work on *alaṅkāraśāstra*) a mostly simple investigation concerning the good qualities and faults specifically restricted to poetry is the topic at hand. Therefore **what profit**, i.e., what purpose, which is the determination of the good qualities and faults restricted to poetry, is there in **such** a quite difficult investigation **being licked at**,[76] i.e., being tasted by means of engagement? The idea is: there isn't any!
>
> And so this is what (Daṇḍin) means: in a work that defines poetry the faults and the good qualities that are restricted to poetry are investigated, not those that are also common to the other *śāstra*s because it would consequently result in a collection of all of the *śāstra*s. And therefore, in this context, the other disciplines would be of no use in gaining proficiency in all the good qualities and faults because the branches of knowledge have just that as their fruit (i.e., to help people gain such a proficiency). There (in the branches of knowledge) there is proficiency in the good qualities and faults that are restricted to these (i.e., the individual disciplines). This too (scil. the

---

[74]KĀ 3.127 *pratijñāhetudṛṣṭāntahānir doṣo na vety asau | vicāraḥ karkaśaprāyas tenālīḍhena kiṃ phalam ||* "Whether a missing proposition, reason, or example is a fault or not, that investigation is quite difficult. What's the use of touching upon it!" See also Bronner (2012: 101f.) for a discussion of this verse as evidence for the priority of Bhāmaha. Dimitrov (2011: 515) discusses the variant readings.

[75]For the same of space, I have omitted the Sanskrit text. See Dimitrov (2011: 400). The text begins at the end of in ln. 6 with *iha ca*. The words in bold face are quoted from Daṇḍin's text.

[76]I have rendered *ālīḍha* "licked at" literally although the image is not common in English. "Touched upon" would be more prosaic as, Dimitrov's rendering with *berühren*. Similarly, in Bronner (2012: 102), the translation "introducing it" seems too bland. In Dimitrov (2012: 515) there is a lengthy discussion on whether or not to read the *upasarga ā*, and, as Dimitrov notes, the gloss *āsvādita* does not really help to decide. I would also add that *āsvādita* is the exact gloss we would expect for *līḍha* since this is how the root √*lih* is defined in KṣDhP 2.6 *lihá āsvādane*. If then *ālīḍha* is the correct reading, the *ā* has not been glossed.

KĀ) would be useless for anything other than what's already established because there would be no restriction on anything and because in this way one would not see a limitation on the proficiencies in good qualities and faults for each discipline ...[77] Therefore, **what's the use of even licking at it** is a good way to say that when a work that defines poetry is made into a definition of the authoritative means of knowledge, then it's just braggadocio!

This is the closing passage in Ratnaśrī's rather lengthy commentary on the verse and serves as a final justification for why Daṇḍin should disregard a thorough treatment of deficiencies in the syllogism. In the first place, if poetics expands its domain to include a treatment of faults very specific to other disciplines, it will rob those disciplines of their purpose and turn *alaṅkāraśāstra* into a sort of all encompassing farrago. Should a work of poetics aspire to provide definitions for lofty concepts like *pramāṇa*, "authoritative means of knowledge," it would be nothing more than hallow bragging. We see here not only a more explicit statement about the division of labor between *alaṅkāraśāstra* and the other *śāstra*s, which I tried to deduce from Bhāmaha's treatment of faults above, but also that the teaching of certain types of faults are restricted to certain disciplines. So, while it is imperative to teach the faults of a syllogism in *nyāyaśāstra*, "the science of logic," we need not find a full discussion in poetics. To return specifically to KĀ 3.127, it is somewhat ambiguous whether Daṇḍin means that a fault in the syllogism is not important for good poetry, or that we simply should not bother to discuss such a topic because it is treated elsewhere in more detail. Ratnaśrī's comments point toward the later.

One of the striking features about Daṇḍin's treatment of the *doṣa*s is that he gives, when possible, the circumstances in which a fault is permissible. I have already drawn attention to a similar, albeit less precise, reasoning in the BhKA where Bhāmaha is willing to allow an *asādhu*, "objectionable," word provided it can produce beauty.[78] Under the fault *ekārtha*, he notes some

---

[77]I have omitted from *tat kiṃ chando* to *apekṣyatā* |

[78]BhKA 1.55–58. Daṇḍin (KĀ 1.95f.) too permits certain "vulgar" words, like *udgīrṇa*, "belched out," provided they are used metaphorically. See Loewey Shacham (2015: 169f.) for a discussion of this word and a break with tradition in Telugu poetry.

exceptions for repetition,[79] and there is also a noted exception for *ayuktimat* — addressing an inanimate object — if the speaker is delirious.[80] Daṇḍin, however, goes much further and adds exceptions to five of the ten faults,[81] what Ratnaśrī and Vādijaṅghaladeva term *apavāda*, "an exception to a general rule."[82] *ekārtha* and *saṃśaya*, in fact, are considered to be ornaments when used under the proper conditions. The exceptions to the first two faults, *apārtha* and *vyartha*, reflect important pragmatic features of literary language that cannot be overlooked. In both cases Daṇḍin notes that the faults are in fact not faults when someone of a particular mental state speaks the unacceptable words. An *apārtha*, "meaningless," utterance becomes pukka when coming from the mouth of someone intoxicated, mad, or simple,[83] or, more generally put, someone not in their right state of mind.[84] *vyartha*, "contradictory (speech)," will similarly not incur reproach provided the speaker is in a state of mental derangement.[85] Because of these exceptions poets can represent the thoughts or words of human beings in their full emotional range, an essential part of literature. Among the exceptions to the other three faults, those for *ekārtha* and *sasaṃśaya* deserve a few words as well.[86] As already mentioned, both of these faults are able to be *alaṅkāra*s under the right circumstances. *ekārtha*, "tautology," will become acceptable when the author wishes to express

---

[79]BhKA 4.14.

[80]BhKA 1.42.

[81]For *apārtha* KĀ 3.128cd and 3.130, for *vyartha* KĀ 3.133, for *ekārtha* KĀ 3.137, for *sasaṃśaya* KĀ 3.141, and for *apakrama* KĀ 3.146.

[82]Ratnaśrī ad KĀ 3.130 spells out the relationship: *utsargas tv asambhavamātram ity apavādamukhena niga-mayann āha |* "Since he concludes by way of an exception that the general rule is simply not (always) possible, he says ..." Dimitrov (2011: 404). On a stylistic note, Ratnaśrī introduces each of these *apavāda* verses with a slightly different phrasing.

[83]KĀ 3.128cd *tan mattonmattabālānām ukter anyatra duṣyati |* "it (scil. an *apārtha* utterance) is faulty so long as it is not the utterance of someone drunk, mad or simple." As Ratnaśrī notes, and it is quite often the case, *bāla* does not just mean a "child" but rather one who is deficient in a number of ways: *bālā heyopādeyajñānavikalā avyutpannās tathā bālā alpāḥ śaktivikalā avṛddhā asambaddhabhāṣiṇaḥ* "*bāla*s are those who lack the knowledge about what is to be rejected and accepted, they are without proper education; also *bāla*s are small, i.e., lacking strength, immature; they do not speak in connected (utterances)." Cf. AKKṣ 1.6.42ab and 3.206.

[84]KĀ 3.130ab *idam asvasthacittānām abhidhānam aninditam |* "This (scil. meaningless speech) is not reprehensible as an utterance of people who are not of sound mind."

[85]KĀ 3.133 *asti kā cid avasthā sā sābhiṣaṅgasya cetasaḥ | yasyāṃ bhaved abhimatā viruddhārthāpi bhāratī ||* "There is a certain state of the deranged mind in which even contradictory speech can be intended." *sābhiṣaṅga* means *kāmādiparavaśa*, "subservient to passion, etc.," according to Vādijaṅghaladeva.

[86]The exact formulation of the exception to *apakrama*, "disorderly," is somewhat muddled in the transmission. See Dimitrov (2012: २२० for the apparatus criticus. Ratnaśrī clearly gives two readings and glosses both of them. The gist, however, is that the original order may be broken if one would otherwise have to make an effort to adhere to it, or if there is good reason for making a difficult construction, i.e., one that goes against the original order. See also Dimitrov (2012: 521) for a discussion of Ratnaśrī's gloss on the first half of the verse.

some heightened emotion such as compassion.[87] In fact, it is only by transgressing the normative concepts of proper speech that such feelings can be conveyed to the reader. *sasaṃśaya*, "doubtful speech," on the other hand, may be employed provided that the poet intends for a doubt to arise for some purpose. In the explanation of the given examples, Daṇḍin notes that the ambiguous speech of the female confidant serves to create a sense of confusion in her friend's lover. The normal flaw is only when the reader himself becomes confused, not someone in the text. Much as with the first two flaws, here too we find a distinction between quotative usage, i.e., certain forms of speech that are acceptable when they occur in the mouths of personae within the poem, and raw or unmediated usage that negatively effects the reader. In addition, though, the fault of *sasaṃśaya* can be considered an ornament to the poem because it adds another level of emotion to the vignette without being explicit.

In this brief discussion of the exceptions to the flaws, we can see how Daṇḍin has been able to find a domain for poetry outside of the linguistic standards as set forth both in other *śāstra*s as well as within the *alaṅkāraśāstra* tradition itself. By doing so he has accounted for both quotative speech, which can reflect the internal state of the speaker, as well as noting that the very violation of rules can convey extraordinary emotion. Unfortunately, we do not know how innovative Daṇḍin is in providing these exceptions, especially in making them into *alaṅkāra*s. Although Bhāmaha provides some exceptions, two of which are also based on the emotional state of the speaker,[88] the reasoning is less sophisticated and not dwelt on, whereas Daṇḍin gives examples and integrates the exceptions into half of the faults. Lastly, I note that Daṇḍin has tacitly followed the method of *lakṣaṇa*, "defining," practiced by the grammarians as well as the Mīmāṃsakas whereby the *utsarga*, "general rule," is then superseded by an *apavāda*, "exception."[89] This adds a further śāstric touch.

Before leaving Daṇḍin we must examine his definition of *śabdahīna*, "(poetic expression) de-

---

[87]KĀ 3.137 *anukampādyatiśayo yadi kaś cid vivakṣyate | na doṣaḥ punarukte 'pi pratyuteyam alaṅkṛtiḥ ||* "If some heightened state of compassion etc. is desired to be expressed, there is now fault even when there is repetition; moreover this is an ornament."

[88]The exception to *ayuktimat* in BhKA 1.42 and *ekārtha* in BhKA 4.14 noted above.

[89]The *locus classicus* is MBh I.6.4–7.

void of (correct) language."

> *śabdahīnam anālakṣyalakṣyalakṣaṇapaddhatiḥ |*
> *padaprayogo 'śiṣṭeṣṭaḥ śiṣṭeṣṭas tu na duṣyati || 3.148 || (KĀ)*

> (An utterance) devoid of good language is the usage of a word, accepted by the un-
> learned, (and) to which no path either in exemplary language or grammar is visible.
> But, if it is accepted by the learned, it is not faulty.

The definition is remarkable on several levels. On a purely sonic level, the *yamaka*s, "twinning,"[90] add a very ornamental flavor to the perhaps rather dry subject of grammar.[91] As for the structure of the definition we find a division of authorities for correct usage reminiscent of discussions in the *Mahābhāṣya*. To begin with, incorrect usage is defined not just by the rules of grammar but also by the *lakṣya*, "what is defined, the examples, the target language."[92] If this division is meaningful, then *lakṣya* could be understood as an indication of the larger scope of language than what the rules can describe, i.e., something larger than just what the rules are capable of generating; otherwise, giving both would be meaningless since if a word goes against a rule, it is not an example, and if it is not an example, there is no rule for it. The second half of the verse specifies this other domain not governed by rules; it is *śiṣṭeṣṭa*, "what is accepted by the learned." This final verse-quarter, with the adversative *tu*, "but," and the explicit statement that such usage is not faulty can, once again, only be meaningful in the case that it does not simply correspond to usage described in grammar and (existing) examples. The *yamaka* that occurs at this point in the verse with the word *śiṣṭeṣṭa* only further highlights the dichotomy and power the learned hold in creating correct language. Before connecting this passage with its roots in the grammatical tradition, a brief comparison with Bhāmaha's definition of the same fault and his attitudes toward the "learned" will be instructive for understanding the array of possible attitudes toward grammar's role in poetic language and serve as a prelude to the longer discussion of the

---

[90]In Sanskrit poetry, *yamaka* is a sound-based figure of speech (*śabdālaṅkāra*) that involves the repetition of the same string of sounds but each with a different meaning. Cf. Gerow (1971: 223ff.).

[91]Daṇḍin does not exemplify this kind of *yamaka*. In Dimitrov's notation it is A^{a3}-A^{b1} : B^{c3}-B^{d1}, meaning that an element A (here *lakṣya*) occurs at the end of the first quarter-verse and the beginning of the second quarter-verse, and a second element B (here *śiṣṭeṣṭa*) occurs at the end of the third quarter-verse and at the beginning of the fourth quarter-verse. See Dimitrov (2012: 12f.) for an explanation of the schematic representation and other examples.

[92]Ratnaśrī glosses *lakṣya* with *udāharaṇa*, "example": *lakṣyate tad iti **lakṣyam** udāharaṇam*, "**target**, that which is defined, i.e., an example." Dimitrov (2012: 418).

this topic in the following chapter when we turn to chapters on language purification in the BhKA and KAS of Vāmana.

Bhāmaha's definition of the fault *śabdahīna*, translated above (p. 76), shows some similarities to Daṇḍin's insofar as they both mention that violations of the grammar are not acceptable, but that the larger linguistic world exists outside of the normative treatises does not figure at all in the verse. The mention of *āptaśrāvaka*, "students of authoritative teachers," does not seem to be equivalent to *śiṣṭa* and is certainly not loaded with the history that the latter term is.[93] Regardless of the exact meaning of the verse, Bhāmaha gives us very concrete evidence that he opposes the view supported by Daṇḍin when in BhKA 6.27a and 36a he explicitly mentions that the usage of the *śiṣṭa*s is *not* sufficient reason to adopt such language for poetry.[94] As will be shown, such statements fall in line with others made by Bhāmaha in the last chapter of his work as he seeks to further delimit poetic language from the larger accepted corpus. Daṇḍin, on the other hand, endorses the time-old view of the grammarians, that the *śiṣṭa*s are the ultimate arbitrators of language and their word is final.

At this point it is worthwhile to explain in some more detail on what basis Daṇḍin does not simply invoke *lakṣaṇa*, "rule," but also emphasizes *lakṣya*, "example, target," and *śiṣṭeṣṭa*, "what is accepted by the learned." Let us begin with the distinction between *lakṣya* and *lakṣaṇa* in the context of Sanskrit grammar. There are several very concrete examples within the system of linguistic description of the A. for an unsymmetrical or unpredictable relationship between the rules of grammar and the words they generate. The most famous example is P. 6.3.109 *pṛṣo-darādīni yathopadiṣṭam*, "the words *praṣodara*, etc. are in accordance with how they are taught," and Patañjali's commentary thereon.[95] In numerous places Pāṇini refers to a list of *prātipadika*s (i.e., nominal stems) simply with the first word from the list followed by *ādi*, "beginning with," ap-

---

[93]Bhāmaha certainly could have used *śiṣṭa* here as it fits metrically. The "learned" are, in any case, said to be those who can speak in accordance with the A. even though they have not studied it and none of their defining characteristics as given by Patañjali includes their education or *guru-paramparā*.

[94]The verses will be translated and discussed in the following chapter, pp. 126 and 151, respectively.

[95]MBh III.173.19–174.15.

pended to it. Presumably by the time of Patañjali[96] and certainly by the time of the KV,[97] the word *ādi* has come to either indicate a closed list or mean *ākṛti/prakāra*, "form, nature, class."[98] Patañjali notes that the list in P. 6.3.109 is of the later type, i.e., words of the same class as *pṛṣodara*,[99] and then goes on to explain that *yathopadiṣṭam* refers to the instruction of the *śiṣṭa*s. The famous discussion of the *śiṣṭa*s need not be repeated here,[100] but I will emphasize that Patañjali clearly states that these learned men also know other (words),[101] and so Daṇḍin's distinction incorporates nicely Patañjali's concept of Sanskrit extending in a way beyond what is in the textbooks.

Another instance is the *dhātu-pāṭha*, "recitation of roots." The A presupposes a DhP with roots divided into ten *gaṇa*s, "lists," with the appropriate tags (*anubandha*s) to indicate which rules may apply to a particular root. Yet Patañjali, at the end of his discussion on the purposes (or rather purposelessness) of the *dhātupāṭha* ad P. 1.3.1.13, whittles away at another one of its uses proposed by Kātyāyana. Here Patañjali rejects part of vārtt. 12, which states: *bhūvādipāṭhaḥ prātipadikāṇapayatyādinivṛttyarthaḥ*, "the recitation of (the roots) √*bhū*, etc. is in order to exclude the nominal stems and *āṇapayati*, etc." This, and the other two other forms, *vaṭṭati* and *vaḍḍhati*, given by Patañjali, are Prakrit forms of Sanskrit *ājñapayati*, *varttate*, and *varddhate*, respectively. In his comments on the following vārtt. Patañjali rejects the idea that the exclusion of the latter is a possible purpose for the recitation of the verbal roots:

---

[96]In his comments ad P. 2.1.59 *śreṇyādayaḥ kṛtādibhiḥ* (MBh I.400.13), Patanjali notes that the members of the first list are recited (*paṭhyante*), whereas the second list is an *ākṛti-gaṇa*, "form-list," i.e., a list whose members all share common feature. This is, however, the only instance of an *ākṛtigaṇa* in the MBh.

[97]The authors of the KV declare 28 lists to be *ākṛtigaṇa*s. More than half of these occur in the *taddhita* chapter of the A., indicative, perhaps, of the rather unpredictable set of words to which the secondary suffixes are applicable.

[98]Cf. Kayaiṭa's glosses on the MBh ad P. 2.1.59 *śreṇyādayaḥ kṛtādibhiḥ*: MBhPra vol. II p. 403a *atrādiśabdo vyavasthāvācī, kṛtādir ity atrādiśabdaḥ prakāravācī prayogadarśanāc codāharaṇasthānīyaḥ katipaye vṛttikāraiḥ pradarśitāḥ* | "The word *ādi* here (scil. in *śreṇayādaḥ*) is expressive of a fixed settlement (on the list of words); in *kṛtādi*, the word *ādi* is expressive of a type, and based on observed usage some (of the words), which take their place among the examples (for the list). This has been shown by the authors of the KV."

[99]MBh III.173.17–174.1 *kāni punaḥ pṛṣodarādīni* | *pṛṣodaraprakārāṇi* | "What are *pṛṣodara* etc.? (Words) which are of the *pṛṣodara* sort."

[100]See my discussion in ch. 1, p. 6. Cf. Deshpande (1993: 60–65) for a translation of the MBh passage and references to similar passages in the *dharma* literature. On the *pṛṣodara* list, see also the *vṛtti* ad VP 1.12 and Cardona (1996: 176).

[101]MBh III.174.14 *ayaṃ nūnam anyān api jānāti* | "Such a man (scil. *śiṣṭa*) also knows other (words)." Nāgeśa further clarifies: MBhPra vol. V p. 261f. *aṣṭādhyāyyanadhyayane 'pi tatpratipāditasādhujñānena devānugrahaṃ śiṣṭatvaṃ ca nirṇīya yān anyān api prayuṅkte te 'py anena tathaiva sādhutvena jñātāḥ* | "After determining (another man's) grace from God and learnedness through his own knowledge of correct (words) taught in the A., he knows those other words to be correct all the same that (the learned man) uses, even though there is no instruction (about them) in the A."

śiṣṭaprayogād āṇapayatyādīnāṃ nivṛttir bhaviṣyati | sa cāvaśyaṃ śiṣṭaprayoga upāsyo ye 'pi paṭhyante teṣām api niparyāsanivṛttyarthaḥ | loke hi kṛṣyarthe kasiṃ prayañjate dṛśyarthe ca diśim || (MBh I.259.12–14)

Because of the usage of the learned there will be the exclusion of *āṇapayati*, etc., and the usage of the learned certainly has to be respected; its purpose is to prevent incorrect usage of even those (roots) which are recited. For in the world people use √*kas*, "to go, instruct," (KṣDhP II.14 *kasi gatiśāsanayoḥ*) in the sense of √*kṛṣ*, "to plow," (KṣDhP VI.6 *kṛṣa vilekhane*) and √*diś*, "to grant," (KṣDhP VI.3 *diśa atisarjane*) in the sense of √*dṛś*, "to see," (KṣDhP I.1037 *dṛśir prekṣaṇe*).[102]

The gist is that we do not need to have a *dhātupāṭha* for keeping out unwanted forms; we can learn which roots are correct on the basis of *śiṣṭaprayoga*. But, even if we do insist on reciting a *dhātupāṭha*, we still need the learned in order to keep Prakrit roots distinct form their homophonous Sanskrit counter parts.

The very close of the DhP itself comments on the open-ended nature of the list: *bahulam etan nidarśanam*, "This instructive list is variable." The earliest commentators on the DhP, Kṣīrasvāmin, notes three categories of roots which are not in the DhP[103]: *laukika*, "in common use," *sautra*, "from Pāṇini's *sūtras*," and *vākyakārīya*, "from the commentators";[104] He then sums up: *vardhate hi dhātugaṇaḥ*, "for the list of roots is growing."[105] We learn from Vāmana, who quotes these words as traditional knowledge, that the check on the growth of the list is likewise regulated by *śiṣṭaprayoga*.[106] The notion of an ever-expanding language, albeit checked by an elite class of speakers, finds expression in Ratnaśrī's comments ad KĀ 3.148. At the close of his remarks on the verse he explains that among the endless heap of words, some can be got from grammar, while others from the usage of the learned. Since receiving instruction from the learned is tantamount

---

[102] The point of the last sentence is that there are Prakrit forms of Sanskrit roots which are homophonous with proper Sanskrit roots.

[103] The list corresponds to KAS 5.2.2.

[104] The example *culumpādayaḥ* refers back to a remark by Patañjali ad P. 3.1.35.1. In order to account for the form *cakāsāñcakre*, Patañjali believes we should include the word *anekāc*, "containing more than one vowel," in the sūtra. This will also allow us to include other disyllabic roots like *culump*, etc.

[105] Cf. KṣDhP p. 213.

[106] *vṛtti* ad KAS 5.2.2 *vardhate dhātugaṇa iti hi śabdavida ācakṣate | tenaiṣāṃ gaṇapāṭhe 'numatiḥ śiṣṭaprayogād iti ||* "For those who know language declare that the list of roots is growing. Therefore one can infer that they are in the recitation of the lists (of roots) on the basis of the usage of the learned." For further detail see my discussion in ch. 5, pp. 282f.

to a lecture on grammar, one cannot distinguish between the two.[107]

Daṇḍin next exemplifies the fault with a verse that contains a number of grammatically incorrect forms, much in the same manner as Bhāmaha. The commentators point out the various faults by referring or alluding to the violated sūtras. For identifying the faults we may follow Ratnaśrī, who avails himself of the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, a rarity in the commentaries available to us at present, but indicative of the popularity of the CV in Buddhist circles, especially in Sri Lanka where he himself and others were deeply engaged with Candragomin's grammar.[108] Still though, when glossing the *śiṣṭas* ad KĀ 1.2, Ratnaśrī puts Pāṇini at the top of the list of grammarians. The verse and its faults are as follows:

> *avate bhavate bāhur mahīm arṇavaśakvarīm |*
> *mahārājann † ajijñāsau †[109] nāstīty āsāṃ girāṃ rasaḥ || 3.149 || (KĀ)*

O Greatking, yours arm protect the water-belty earth.[110] In such a (verse) that does not intend to express (any meaning) the words have no flavor.

The faults are:

1. *avate → avati. ātamanepada* for *parasmaipada*. Cf. P. 1.3.12 and 78 and CV 1.4.46.[111]

---

[107]Dimitrov (2012: 418): *ananto hi śabdarāśiḥ | tatra kaś cic chabdaḥ śabdānuśāsanād gṛhyate kaś cid āptaprayogāt tatkalpāt | śabdānuśāsanam api hy āptopadeśa iti na kaś cid anayor viśeṣaḥ |* "For the heap of words is endless. Among them, some words can be got from grammar; others, because their valid status is based on the use of the qualified."

[108]See Gornall (2013) and Dimitrov (2016).

[109]The final word of pāda c appears to be corrupt, and I have not yet found a very satisfying emendation. See Dimitrov (2012: 220) for the available variants. The context demands, I believe, another ungrammatical word, possibly *ajijñāso* (*ajijñāsaḥ* without sandhi), "you investigated," which should take the ātm. endings by P. 1.3.54. The meaning, however, is not satisfactory. If I am correct at least in seeing another ungrammatical form behind *ajijñāsau*, the text must have already been corrupt by the time of Ratnaśrījñāna, whose commentary on this point also seems corrupt as well. Based on the MS evidence, the form quoted from the verse is *jijñāsite*, which is an unmetrical. See the apparatus in Dimitrov (2012: 410) and his notes to the passage on p. 523. NB that much of the commentary on this verse has required emendation.

[110]The English is intentional.

[111]Dimitrov (2012: 420) has marked the passage in Ratnaśrī's commentary concerning *avate* with *cruces desperationis*: †*avatir ataṅānas taṅānī*† *prayuktaḥ |* I believe, however, that the passage makes perfect sense as printed and should be translated as follows: "The verbal root √*av*, which does not take the ātm. endings, has been used as taking the *ātmanepada* endings." *ataṅānaḥ* is a *bahuvrīhi* compound agreeing with *avatiḥ* and means, "which does not take the endings *taṅ* or *āna*." *taṅānī* likewise agrees with *avatiḥ* and is a nominative sing. of *taṅānin*, "which takes the endings *taṄ* and *āna*." Dimitrov's error stems from an unfamiliarity with grammatical terminology in the non-Pāṇinian systems. The CV lacks technical terms (*saṃjñās*) and therefore uses *taṅānāḥ* (e.g., CV 1.4.46 *taṅānā yathāpāṭham*) to refer to what Pāṇini terms *ātmanepada* in P. 1.4.100 *taṅānāv ātmanepadam. taṅānin* is therefore equivalent to the very familiar *ātmanepadin*. In the *vṛtti* to the CV, we even find *ataṅāna* used in reference to non-*ātmanepada* roots ad CV 1.2.87 *śaktivayaḥśīleṣu* (≈ P. 3.2.129): *śaktyādiṣu gamyamāneṣu laṭaḥ śānaj bhavati. punarvidhānād ataṅānebhyo 'pi |* "The suffix *ŚānaC* occurs in the place of the personal or participial endings when there is the accompanying

2. *bhavate → bhavataḥ.* Dative for genitive.

3. *arṇavaśakvarī → arṇavaśakvarīkā.* Absence of *kaP* at the end of a compound. Cf. P. 5.4.153 and CV 4.4.141.

4. *mahārājan → mahārāja.* Absence of *ṬaC* at the end of a compound. Cf. P. 5.4.91 and CV 4.4.76.

As we will see in the following chapter, these grammatical topics are of concern to other writers on poetic faults. But why does it matter if we use *ātmanepada* endings in place of *parasmaipada* endings? As Rantaśrī points out, one could even object that we have a nice bit of *anuprāsa*, "alliteration," in the first hemistich; does not that count for something, isn't there some *rasa*? Unfortunately his direct response to this question has become rather garbled in transmission and pertains to the part of the verse already noted to be corrupt, but his simile explains the situation vividly. It is possible to place a very beautiful bouquet of flowers anywhere, but if we lay it down upon soiled earth, it has not a chance of being beautiful; it is *niṣphala*, "fruitless." The point is that when the very foundation of a poem lacks purity, ornamentation will not achieve its intended effect and will fall flat.[112]

The following two, and final, verses dealing with the fault of *śabdahīna* represent Daṇḍin's attitude toward grammatical faults and contrast with his willingness to see extenuating circumstances for several of the other faults mentioned above. Let us look at them in some detail.

> *dakṣiṇādrer upasaran mārutaś cūtapādapān |*
> *kurute lalitādhūtapravālāṅkuraśobhinaḥ ‖ 3.150 ‖*

> *ityādi śāstramāhātmyadarśanālasacetasām |*

---

meanings 'ability, age, or habit'; because it has been prescribed again, (*ŚānaC* occurs) even after non-*ātmanepada* roots." The point is that *ŚānaC* is usually only for *ātmanepada* verbs, but with the given accompanying meanings it is also acceptable after *parasmaipada* verbs. In Pāṇinian terminology, this is the suffix *CānaŚ* of P. 3.2.129. A nice example is *jayamānam* in *Jānakīharaṇa* 1.12b. *tānanin* also finds a satisfactory parallel in the *vṛtti* ad CV1.4.59: *śikṣis taṅānavān eva |* "The root √*śikṣ* takes only *parasmaipada* endings." Although *-vat* is a different suffix, it is functionally equivalent to *-in*. The suggested emendations in Dimitrov (2012: 522f.) are, therefore, unnecessary.

[112]Dimitrov (2012: 420): *śuddhāyāṃ hi bhūmai nyastaḥ puṣpaprakaraḥ śobhate | yaḥ punar apūtāyām bhuvi nikṣipy-ate kusumanikaraḥ sa niṣphala eva | tathā śuddhāyāṃ śabdapaddhatau raso 'nuprāsādiḥ śobhate nānyathā |* "For a bouquet of flowers, when laid upon pure earth, is beautiful, but a heap of flowers that is placed upon impure earth is simply ineffectual (in creating beauty). So too is flavor, like alliteration, beautiful only in a pure track of words, nowhere else."

apabhāṣaṇavad bhāti na ca saubhāgyam ujjhati ‖ 3.151 ‖ (KĀ)

> The wind emerging from the southern mountain makes the mango trees glimmer
> beautifully with the curves of their shoots dancing and shaking. (3.150) Such verses
> appear like deviant speech to those whose intellect is too dull to see the greatness of
> grammar, and they (the verses) do not quit their beauty. (3.151)

In the second verse, Daṇḍin gives fair warning to those who, because they possess only sopho-
moric knowledge of grammar, might condemn a verse for falsely perceived grammatical errors,
much in the way an amateur stickler of English grammar would correct "for John and me" to "for
John and I." The deeper point, however, is that language which relies on more recherché gram-
matical rules does not diminish the beauty or correctness[113] of a verse. Grammatical complexity
is no hindrance to the ultimate enjoyment and beauty of the verse. How then could this verse ap-
pear to contain faults? What kind of knowledge is the amateur grammarian lacking? To answer
these questions I must refer to the explanations of the our trusted commentators, Ratnaśrījñāna
and Vādijaṅghaladeva, who, however, do not note the same set of potential faults.

Both commentators highlight different issues with the verse, for which there is a partial expla-
nation. Ratnaśrī focuses in on the syntax of *dakṣiṇādrer upasaran*, "approaching from the south-
ern mountain." Whereas Vādijaṅghaladeva notes potential problems with the forms *apasaran*
(his reading)[114] and *kurute*. Let us start with Ratnaśrī. A dimwitted person (*kudhī*) might find the
use of the ablative suspect because the ablative is defined by motion away,[115] but here we have
motion of approach.[116] To counter this facile understanding, Ratnaśrī offers two alternatives. The

---

[113]Ratnaśrī glosses *saubhāgya* as *sādhutva*, "correctness," Dimitrov (2012: 412), whereas Vādijaṅghaladeva gives
sundaratva, "beauty," Tatacharya (1936: 328).

[114]See his paraphrase of the first two words of the verse: *dakṣiṇādrer apasaran malayaparvatād apagacchan*, "de-
parting from the southern mountain, i.e., going away from Mt. Malaya." The variant is not noted in Dimitrov's
aparatus ad KĀ 3.150.

[115]The ablative or fifth case is associated with the *kāraka* called *apādāna*, which is defined as a fixed point in
reference to motion away. Cf. P. 1.4.24 *dhruvam apāye 'pādānam* and P. 2.3.28 *apādāne pañcamī*.

[116]Dimitrov (2012: 524) has translated this entire passage of the commentary about the ablative in his *philologische
Bemerkungen.* Although his translation is overall very sound, I do not believe that he has completely understood part
of Ratnaśrī's statement about why the ablative is here incorrect. The Sanskrit reads: *atra kila dakṣiṇādrer upasaraṇe
bhāvāt pañcamī na yujyate 'pāyalakṣaṇatvāt tasyāḥ* | Of interest is the phrase *dakṣiṇādrer upasaraṇe bhāvāt.* His
translation is: "Hier paßt der Ablativ als Ursprungsort (*bhāvāt*) im Falle des Sichnäherns des südlichen Berges nicht
… " Before proposing my own translation, Dimitrov's cannot be correct for a number of reasons. To begin with, I
note that Ratnaśrī later on points out that we *can* justify the ablative when one understands that the approach is
from a place (*upasaraṇaṃ hi tata āgamanam*). Second, *bhāva* does not usually mean *Ursprungsort*, "place of origin."
Pāṇini supplies a sūtra for just such instances, namely P. 1.4.31 *bhuvaḥ prabhavaḥ*. Here the Sanskrit word for place

first is the quite obvious interpretation that even though the verb does not express motion away but rather approach, we can still have a place from which the approach occurs.[117] The second explanation derives ultimately from the first vārtt. ad P. 2.3.28. MBh I.455.4: *pañcamīvidhāne lyablope karmaṇi upasaṅkhyānam* | "In prescribing the fifth case there is the addition that (the fifth case occurs) in the sense of the direct object when an absolutive in -*ya* has been elided." This rule is invoked when a word in the ablative is construed with a verb that lacks motion away and is not otherwise covered in the A. Its inclusion in the KV ad P. 2.3.28 signifies that it is, from the viewpoint of tradition, a necessary addition to the A. The example from Patañjali is: *prāsādam āruhya prekṣate. prāsādāt prekṣate.* "Having ascended the palace roof s/he looks out. S/he looks out from the palace roof." The *lyabanta, āruhya,* is deleted and its direct object then occurs in the ablative.[118] Similarly, Ratnaśrī glosses the sentence with: *dakṣiṇādrim āmṛśyopasarann †iyann iti lyablopalakṣaṇā vā pañcamy eva yujyate,* "Or 'so much (wind)[119] approaching after having touched/wiped the southern mountain,' so the fifth case alone is fitting insofar as it is defined by the elision of an absolutive in -*ya*." I cannot say for sure that Daṇḍin would have agreed with Ratnaśrī, but this seems like a reasonable possibility. The significance of the near fault will be discussed after we see the alternatives.

Turning now to Vādijaṅghaladeva,[120] we encounter a completely different set of grammatical problems. This time errors are of a more formal, as opposed to syntactic, nature. The participle

---

of origin is *prabhava*. More generally the ablative case in Sanskrit represents an *avadhi*, "limit." Cf. CV 2.1.81 and KV ad P. 1.4.24. If Ratnaśrī is here saying that the southern mountain is the origin, then the ablative would be justified. Finally, the syntax is not correctly construed. The fifth case (*pañcamī*) is not being equated (*als*) with *bhāva*, for which we would expect *bhāvatvena* or the like. In any case, such an interpretation must be excluded since it is the object that takes the case ending, not the case ending itself, that is the origin, etc. This is indeed what we find in the following sentence *ādhāreṇa vyāpyena vā dakṣiṇādriṇā bhāvyam* | "The southern mountain should be the locus or the direct object." A *vibhakti* can only occur in (loc.) some sense or another. I would therefore propose the following translation: "On this point it's said that since the southern mountain occurs (*bhāva*) in relation to act of approaching, the fifth case is not fitting because it (scil. the fifth case) is characterized by motion away."

[117] *na caitad evam upasaraṇaṃ hi tata āgamanam iti viśleṣayogāt* | "And this (grammatical fault) is not so because there is connection with separation since approaching is coming from a place."

[118] On the construction, see further Desphande (1985: 58).

[119] The reading *iyann* of the MS does not yield immediate sense although it is a proper word. *Pace* Dimitrov (2012: 524), *iyan* is not the present participle from the root √*i*, "to go," (which would be *yan* in this case), but the nom. masc. sing. of *iyat*, "so much, so large." The suggested emendation to *āyan*, "coming," would of course be a fitting gloss on *upasaran*, but such a synonymic gloss at this place in the commentary feels quite out of place.

[120] Tatacharya (1936: 328).

apasaran, "going away," could be considered incorrect because the root √*sṛ* is to be replaced by *dhau* by P. 7.3.78 when a suffix marked with the tag letter *Ś* follows. Since the present participle suffix is *ŚatṚ* (P. 3.2.124), we expect *apadhāvan*.[121] Our way back to grammatical correctness comes this time from the *Kāśikā*, our first extant running commentary on the A. Toward the end of the commentary ad P. 7.3.78 we find the following opinion: *sarter vegitāyāṃ gatau dhāvādeśam icchanti | anyatra sarati anusaratīty eva bhavati ||* "They accept the substitute *dhau* for √*sṛ* when the going is swift. In other cases there is just *sarati, anusarati*." I cannot trace this suggestion further back than the KV, but both Kṣīrasvāmin and Sāyaṇa accept the meaning condition on the substitution in their respective commentaries on the Pāṇinian DhP,[122] and Vādijaṅghaladeva follows suit.[123] The dimwitted stickler must have forgotten or never learned this stipulation on Pāṇini's rule.

The second objection concerns the main verb *kurute*, "makes," and the problem is the *āt-manepada* ending. Certain verbs, though they do not inherently take the *ātmanepada* endings, can take them under certain conditions. The most general of these conditions is when the fruit of the action is directed back toward the agent, provided the root is marked with a *svarita* accented vowel or a *Ñ* in the DhP.[124] √*kṛ* is just such a root, its DhP form being KṣDhP VIII.10 *ḌUkṛÑ*. There appears, then, to be no reason to find fault with the form. According to Vādijaṅghala, our straw man fails to understand that a rule like P. 1.3.72 is dependent on the speaker's intent, in Sanskrit *vivakṣā*, "the desire to express"; it is not a rule that can just be applied automatically. So the solution is that the author of the verse describes the wind as making the mango trees glimmer beautifully etc. for its own benefit.[125] Why that should be the case is not elaborated upon, but one can imagine various scenarios such as an anthropomorphized wind messenger or the

---

[121]Vādijaṅghaladeva's objection reads: *tathā hy apasarann iti kila sarteḥ dhāvādeśaḥ prāpnoti |* "For example (such dimwitted people) will say that in *apasaran* √*dhāv* obtains as the substitute for √*sṛ*."

[122]KṣDhP I.982 *pāghrādhmeti* (P. 7.3.78) *vegitāyāṃ gatau dhāvādeśaḥ |* MāDhP I.932 *yadāyaṃ saratir vegitagamane varttate tadā pāghrādinā śitpratyaye* (P. 7.3.78) *dhāvādeśe dhāvati ityādi |*

[123]*sarteḥ jave dhāvādeśo nāpagame |* "*dhāv* is the substitute for √*sṛ* in the sense of 'speed,' not 'departing.'"

[124]P. 1.3.72 *svaritañitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale.*

[125]*svaritañitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphala iti bhavaty ātmanepadam | kartrabhiprāyasya kriyāphalasya vivakṣitatvād iti ||* "The *ātmanepada* ending does occur by P. 1.3.72 because the speaker desires to express that the fruit of the action is directed toward the agent."

like. We must now ask why someone would think these are faults, or more importantly, what do these depictions of people making such errors tell us about the types of grammatical knowledge necessary at the time.

Ratnaśrī's defense of the fifth case — I will here remain closer to the Sanskrit grammatical terminology — is twofold. One, the dimwit has adhered too closely to the literal, Pāṇinian definition of the *kāraka* known as *apādāna*. Within the system of the A, the case endings can either express a *kāraka*, i.e., a semantic relation between a noun and an action, or they are assigned in connection with other non-verbal words such as prepositions. These are termed *kārakavibhakti*s and *upapadavibhakti*s, respectively. As a *kārakavibhakti* the fifth case is limited to *apādāna*, the primary definition of which is *dhruvam apāye*, "a fixed point with relation to motion away" (P. 1.4.24). Under the influence of this definition, a foolish person will believe that the fifth case, via *apādāna*, can occur only with verbs that are synonymous with *apāya*, "departure," and not other verbs of motion such *upa* + √*sṛ*, "to approach," which are antonyms. With these, s/he will expect either a direct object or locus, i.e., the second or seventh case (accusative or locative in Latinate terms).[126] This is cleared up by noting, rather simplistically, that one does not only approach a place, but that one can also approach *from* a place. The second defense, as already explained, stems from a vārtt. that Katyāyana has formulated on P .2.3.28 in order to account for a usage not covered by Pāṇini. Although this interpretation is not strictly incompatible with the first, it does allow us to entirely drop the notion of motion away since the vārtt. only requires that *lyabanta*, "absolutive in -*ya*," be dropped and that its *karman*, "direct object," appear in the fifth case. It says nothing about the semantics of the main verb. Although I do not wish to push the following point too enthusiastically, it's possible to infer that Ratnaśrī is here making a critique of the Pāṇinian definition of *apādāna* (and by extension the fifth case), for which I proffer the following reasoning. Within the CV the proposed grammatical error would not arise at all since in this grammar there is no definition for *apādāna* or meaning condition for the fifth case

---

[126]The words Ratnaśrī puts in the mouth of the dimwit are: *upasaraṇāpekṣayā tv ādhāreṇa vyāpyena vā daṣiṇādriṇā bhāvyam | tataś ca saptamī dvitīyā vā yujyate |* "But with respect to approaching there has to be a locus or a direct object, and so the seventh of the second case is appropriate." Note that *vyāpya* is used in the CV much in the same sense as *karman* in the A. Cf. the *vṛtti* ad CV 2.1.43 and Gornall (2013: 90f.).

which requires *apāya*, "departure." Furthermore, both justifications of the fifth case are covered by the single sūtra CV 2.1.81 *avadheḥ pañcamī*, "the fifth case occurs after a limiting point."[127] This definition, by removing any specific reference to *apāya*, allows for a wide variety of verbal actions — not just motion away — in relation to the limiting point, including also mental (i.e., non-physical) movement.[128] In addition, as the *vṛtti* to CV 2.1.81 points out, even the *lyablopa* construction falls within the rule's scope because in such examples as *prāsādāt prekṣate*, "looks out from the terrace," the terrace is perceived as a limit with respect to act of looking out.[129] By this reasoning, the Pāṇinian analysis involving *lyablopa* need not be, and indeed is not, mentioned at all in the CV or its *vṛtti*. By demonstrating the falsely perceived grammatical error in more or less Pāṇinian terminology and suppressing any reference to the CV, Ratnaśrī has made, I believe, a veiled attack on the A. If the dimwit had learned the CV, perhaps he wouldn't have made such an error. Finally, and somewhat ironically, I suspect that the strong association of the fifth case with a verb of motion away might be responsible for the alternate reading *apasaran* in the recension of Vādijaṅghaladeva noted above.

If Ratnaśrī's explanation of a perceived fault in KĀ 3.150 tacitly favors non-Pāṇinian knowledge of the Cāndra school of grammar, Vādijaṅghala's demonstrates the necessity of understanding the A, through the commentarial tradition and not based on the sūtras alone. The necessity for (authoritative) commentary goes part and parcel with the A since the time of Patañjali, who repeatedly (twelve times to be exact) states: *vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattir na saṃdehād alakṣaṇam*, "there is precise understanding from interpretation since something cannot remain ill-defined on

---

[127]I adopt the translation by Gornall (2013: 265).

[128]Candragomin is taking a cue from Patañjali who argues in MBh I.327.23–328.3 that, if we understand *apāya* in not merely a physical sense but also mental, we can do away with P. 1.2.26–31. Nevertheless, he still considers the formulation of P. 1.4.24 to be correct. The point is summarized in Joshi & Roodbergen (1975: 73f.). Gornall (2013: 77f.) explains how the CV sūtra goes one step further and accounts for some instances of the fifth case such as an *upapadavibhakti*.

[129]As with so much in the CV, this reasoning is also derived from the Patañjali, who after exemplifying the six proposed *vārttika*s ad P. 2.3.28 does away with each one by demonstrating that each fifth case in question does indeed fall under the scope of the *kāraka apādāna* Cf. MBh I.455.19–456.5. For the example at hand he says: *apakrāmati tat tasmād darśanam* | "so one's vision proceeds away from it (scil. the terrace)." I note here in passing that although Patañjali has rejected these additions, the KV accepts them and this sets the precedent for the later grammatical tradition.

account of doubt."[130] Interpreting the A without a proper commentary can only lead one astray. As described above, the first fault concerning the substitution of √*dhau* for √*sṛ* comes not from any statement in the A but rather from the KV and later the commentaries on the DhP which follow suit. The solution to the second perceived fault, the *ātmanepada* endings on *kurute*, likewise depends on the notion of *vivakṣā*, "the intention to express," an extremely important concept in the application of Pāṇini's rules,[131] but not explicitly mentioned in the grammar itself. For both commentators, and I do highly suspect for Daṇḍin as well, knowing the basic rules was not sufficient to be a good grammarian. Only by mastering the larger body of commentarial literature, above all the *Mahābhāṣya* but eventually the *Kāśikā* as well, could one properly understand and compose Sanskrit. In composing poetry, and Daṇḍin does not mince words his words in KĀ 3.151, a poem does not lose any of its beauty even when a poet fashions words that require a detailed knowledge of the grammatical commentaries.

Our rather long foray into with Daṇḍin's *Mirror* has given a glimpse into a poetics that in many ways parallels Bhāmaha's insofar as a thorough knowledge of the *śāstra*s remains indispensable for good poetry, but it also displays a more nuanced, if not playful, approach to their application. The numerous exceptions to the faults allow for important pragmatic contexts to enter poetry although they violate śāstric norms. In contrast, however, no exception is given for *śabdahīna*, "(poetic expression) devoid of (correct) language"; in its stead, Daṇḍin gives us a verse that could appear to the dimwitted to contain the fault but in fact does not. This is significant for two reasons: no matter in what context a grammatically incorrect verse may occur, it cannot gain beauty because the very foundation is faulty.[132] Second, the enjoyment of poetry does not diminish because its language draws on a wide range of grammatical justifications that fall outside of the core sūtra text. We will see these ideas both develop and constrict in the following chapter.

---

[130]MBh I.6.26 is the first occurrence. The maxim is incorporated in almost all the lists of *parabhāṣā*s (not in the lists associated with the *Kātantra* and *Jainendra* schools of grammar) and features as the first one after Puruṣottamadeva, including Nāgeśa's definitive work, the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*. See Abhyankar (1967: 488).

[131]See Deshpande (1979), van Nooten (1983), Radicchi (1994), and Scharf (2002). Joshi & Roodbergen (1975: xvi-xix) and Gornall (2013: 75–83) for the Cāndra tradition where the notion of *vivakṣā* plays an even more expanded role.

[132]Cf. KĀ 1.7 and 10.

2.3.3 Vāmana's Sūtras and *Vṛtti*

Vāmana attempted to do for poetics what other *śāstra*s already took for granted, a sūtra text, and in fact the only one of its kind in the long history of *alaṅkāraśāstra*.[133] To this end he composed the *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra*, divided into *adhyāya*s grouped into *adhikaraṇa*s, with a *svavṛtti*, "auto-commentary." It is possible that he was active at the court of King Jayāpīḍa (779–813 CE) in Kashmir at the end of the 8th and beginning of the 9th centuries,[134] where he would have been part of very lively intellectual circles, especially for grammar and *alaṅkāraśāstra*. As we know from the RT 4.486–499, king Jayāpīḍa set out to cultivate both himself and his land by bringing paṇḍits from all over the region and even reintroduced the study of the *Mahābhāṣya*. One learned grammarian named Kṣīra is said to have tutored Jayāpīḍa personally.[135] This intensive study of grammar, which presumably must have also included the CV along with its *vṛtti* and the KV,[136] may have served as impetus for Vāmana to compose an *alaṅkāra* work in the sūtra format with a *svavṛtti* and to include an extensive section on *śabdaśuddhi*, "purification of language." As for *alaṅkāraśāstra*, the presence of Udbhaṭa, who worked at the court of Jayāpīḍa as his *sabhāpati*, "Master of the Salon,"[137] may also have influenced Vāmana. Many statements in the KAS contradict the BhKA and are perhaps evidence for a rivalry between the two since Udbhaṭa wrote a very important, although now mostly lost, commentary on the BhKA, the *Vivaraṇa*.[138] Regardless of the truth of these inferred details, Vāmana wrote during a time of great intellectual flourishing in Kasmir, and his attitudes toward *śāstra* and grammar in poetry were to have lasting effects both within

---

[133]On Vāmana's life and work in general see Cappeller (1880: III–XII), De (1960 I: 78–83) and (1960 II: 89–107), Kane (1961: 139–147), and Gerow (1977: 233–238). Jha (1928) offers an English translation. There are not many studies of the KAS. I mention here Tubb (1985) and Hattori (2004). I will discuss Vāmana's work in a bit more detail at the beginning of ch. 5.

[134]The evidence for this is the following quarter-verse from Kalhaṇa's *Rājataraṅgiṇī*: RT 4.497d *bubhūvuḥ kavayas tasya vāmanādyāś ca mantriṇaḥ* ‖ "They were his poets and Vāmana etc. were his ministers," as well as "the tradition of the Kashmirian pandits" according to Bühler (1877: 64f.). Vāmana's citations of Bhavabhūti (KAS 1.2.12 and 4.3.6) and Rājaśekhara's citation of Vāmana in the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* place him at the time of Jayāpīḍa.

[135]Kṣīra is not Kṣīrasvāmin who wrote, *inter alia*, important commentaries on the *Amarakośa* and *Dhātupāṭha* during the 12th cent. See Liebich (1930: 201–204).

[136]Vāmana was certainly not an author of this work since Jinendrabuddhi's *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañcikā*, or *Nyāsa*, was already written by the 8th cent. Cf. Hayes (1983). A possible grammatical work by Vāmana is the *Liṅgānuśāsana*. See Franke (1890: 28f.).

[137]RT 4.495.

[138]The available fragments from an extremely damaged manuscript are published in Gnoli (1962).

poetics and the later commentarial tradition on poetry.[139]

As one might expect from a sūtra text, the KAS lays out a description of poetry, its causes, and so forth in very terse language with hardly any of the entertaining and vivid turns of phrase found in Daṇḍin or Bhāmaha but with all the economy of Pāṇini. The very first sūtras of the first *adhyāya*, which deals with the *śarīra*, "body," of poetry may serve both to exemplify this style as well as introduce the theme of *śāstra* and *doṣa*s.

> *kāvyaṃ grāhyam alaṅkārāt* || 1.1.1 ||
> *saundaryam alaṅkāraḥ* || 1.1.2 ||
> *sa doṣaguṇālaṅkārahānādānābhyām* || 1.1.3 ||
> *śāstratas te* || 1.1.4 ||
> *kāvyaṃ sadṛṣṭādṛṣṭārthaṃ prītikīrtihetutvāt* || 1.1.5 || (KAS)

> KAS 1.1.1 Poetry must be understood from ornamentation.
> KAS 1.1.2 Ornamentation is beauty.
> KAS 1.1.3 It exists by means of removing faults and adding good qualities and ornamentation.
> KAS 1.1.4 These two are because of study.
> KAS 1.1.5 Poetry has seen and unseen purposes because it is the cause for enjoyment and fame.

We may first point out a few features of his style to support the claim made above that Vāmana set out to create a text in the venerable sūtra tradition. Starting at the paratextual level, the KAS is divided into twelve *adhāyaya*s "lessons," a nomenclature mostly associated with the great sūtra texts such as the *Brahmasūtra*, *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, and of course Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*; the commentator Gopāla even refers to the KAS as *dvādaśādhyāyī*, "the treatise in twelve lessons,"[140] strongly recalling the title of Pāṇini's grammar. The term *alaṅkāra* is defined as "beauty," and this particular meaning is then to be applied within the system of Vāmana's work, much in the way Pāṇini defines technical terms within the scope of his grammar. In both *doṣaguṇālaṅkārahānādānābhyām* and *sadṛṣādṛṣṭārthaṃ prītikīrtihetutvāt* one set of elements is linked with other according the principle of *yathāsaṅkhyam*, i.e., the first element of one list is matched with the first ele-

---

[139]Nevertheless, the KAS lost popularity after some time and had to receive new life from later commentators. Only the commentary,*Kāmadhenu*, of Gopendratripurabhūpālatilaka, as he calls himself in verse 8 of his introductory stanzas, has been published. See ch. 5 for further details.

[140]*ity eṣa dvādaśādhyāyīprameyānām anukramaḥ*, "so is the order of the topics in the treatise in twelve lessons." KAS p. 2 of Śrīkṛṣṇasūri's edition. Subsequent page references are to this edition.

ment of the other, the second with the second as so forth.[141] And, perhaps most characteristic of this style, there are no finite verbs, one sure way to achieve brevity. Beyond these formal characteristics, the necessity of the *vṛtti* for correctly understanding the sūtras locates the text well within the realm of *śāstra*. For example, the word *kāvya* cannot be understood in its standard meaning *guṇālaṅkārasaṃskṛtau śabdārthau*, "sound and sense perfected by good qualities and ornaments," but rather metaphorically as just "sound and sense."[142] Similarly, Vāmana glosses *alaṅkāra* as *alaṅkṛti*, a *nomen actionis* (*bhāvasādhana*), in order to include the *guṇa*s.[143] We will later on also see the feature of *anuvṛtti*, "rolling along," i.e., the continuation of a word from one sūtra to subsequent ones, as in KAS 2.2.15 where the word *pratipattyai* has to be understood from KAS 2.2.13. These points and others will be evident as we proceed through portions of the text.

The content of these sūtras will by now be somewhat familiar. In the first four Vāmana presents a series of causes that connect poetry to the śāstras in rapid-fire succession. Poetry is grasped from *alaṅkāra*, i.e., beauty; *alaṅkāra* exists because faults have been removed and good qualities and *alaṅkāra* (beauty) have been added; these two actions depend on *śāstra*. Vāmana will later note in his brief exposition of the *adhikārin*, "man authorized (to study this work)," that such śāstric learning bears no fruit among *avivekin*, "undiscriminating," poets, just as the clearing nut (*kataka*) has not a chance of purifying mud.[144] The fifth and final sūtra of the *adhyāya* repeats two of the purposes of poetry we have already encountered (BhKA 1.2 and cf. KĀ1.105). Unlike Bhāmaha, however, Vāmana does not include any discussion about the ends of man, although in his *vṛtti* he cites a verse in which the result of fame is said to be *svarga*, "heaven."

The lengthiest discussion of the *śāstra*s the KAS occurs in the third *adhyāya* on *kāvyāṅga*, "limbs of poetry," which Vāmana defines as *loka*, "the affairs of men," *vidyā*, "knowledge," and

---

[141]The comments in the *Kāmadhenu* on the respective words make just this point, KAS p. 10f., *yathāsaṅkhya* is defined in P. 1.3.10.

[142]*Kāmadhenu* ad 1.1 *kāvyaśabdo 'yaṃ guṇālaṅkārasaṃskṛtayoḥ śabdārthayor vartate | bhaktyā tu śabdārthamātravacano 'tra gṛhyate ||*

[143]Cf. Gopendra's comments *alaṅkāraśabdasya karaṇavyutpattipakṣe tu na guṇānāṃ kāvyagrahaṇahetutvam iti |* "But in the view that the word *alaṅkāra* is derived in the sense of an instrument, the qualities will not be a cause for grasping poetry."

[144]KAS 1.2.4f.

prakīrṇa, "miscellanea."[145] The kinds of *vidyā* are then given in KAS 1.3.3 where grammar (*śab-dasmṛti*, "recollection of words") stands at the head of the list.[146] As Gopendra makes us aware, grammar occupies the first place in the list because it is the root (*mūla*) of all the sciences.[147] In the following *sūtra*s Vāmana explains what we stand to gain from acquiring the individual types of knowledge. In the case of grammar he says:

śabdasmṛteḥ śabdaśuddhiḥ || 1.3.4 ||

[svavṛtti:] śabdasmṛter vyākaraṇāc chabdānāṃ śuddhiḥ sādhutvaniścayaḥ kartavyaḥ | śuddhāni hi padāni niṣkampaiḥ kavibhiḥ prayujyante || (KAS)

KAS 1.3.4 From grammar there is the purification of language.

[Auto-commentary:] From **śabdasmṛti**, i.e., grammar, the purification of words, the establishment of correctness must be made, since unwavering poets use pure words.

Such a passage will come as no surprise at this point, but the use of the word *śabdasmṛti*, literally, "recollection of words," could serve to add a certain prestige to grammar by affiliating it with *smṛti*, the recollected body of literature that has a level of authority second only to the *śruti* literature or Vedas. The choice of the adjective *niṣkampa*, "without trembling, stable, fearless"[148] that accompanies *kavi*, "poet," points toward the unflinching dedication a poet must have in adhering to grammatical correctness and the commitment to thoroughly understanding grammatical texts to achieve that end. We can, therefore, see at least a partial justification for Vāmana's inclusion of an entire section on *śabdhaśuddhi* in the final chapter of his. The remaining *vidyā*s will be familiar from Bhāmaha, and Vāmana duly explains their importance in no particularly exciting manner.

---

[145]KAS 1.3.1 *loko vidyā prakīrṇaṃ ca kāvyāṅgāni ||*

[146]KAS 1.3.3 *śabdasmṛty-abhidhānakośa-cchandoviciti-kalā-kāma-śāstra-daṇḍanīti-pūrvā vidyāḥ |* "The types of knowledge are the prerequisites: grammar, dictionaries, metric, the study of the arts and love, and polity."

[147]KAS p. 27: *vyākaraṇaṃ hi mūlaṃ sarvavidyānām iti yuktyā prathamoddiṣṭāyāḥ śabdavidyāyā upayogaṃ darśay-ati*, "He (scil. Vāmana) demonstrates the application of linguistic knowledge which has been listed first by the reasoning that 'for grammar is the root of all the sciences.'"

[148]*nirbhaya*, "fearless," is the gloss Gopendra gives.

2.3.4 The Faults of the *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra*

The second *adhikaraṇa*, "topic," comprised of two *adhyāya*s, is dedicated to poetic *doṣa*s that Vāmana defines as the opposite of the *guṇa*s;[149] they are the cause for removing poetic beauty and must be recognized so they can be abandoned.[150] Unlike Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, we find here a deviation from the ten *doṣa*s derived ultimately from the NŚ, although there are still many similarities. The most innovative feature of their treatment is the classification into four groups as follows:

1. *padadoṣa*s "faults at the word level" (KAS 2.1.2.4–10).

   - *asādhu* "incorrect word."
   - *kaṣṭa* "difficult word."
   - *grāmya* "rustic word."
   - *aprīta* "unpleasant word."
   - *anarthaka* "meaningless word."

2. *padārthadoṣos*s "faults at the word-meaning level" (KAS 2.1.11–22).

   - *anya* "different word-meaning."
   - *neya* "teased out word-meaning."
   - *gūḍhārtha* "hidden word-meaning."
   - *aślīla* "vulgar word-meaning."[151]
   - *kliṣṭa* "tortured word-meaning."[152]

3. *vākyadoṣa*s "faults at the sentence level" (KAS 2.2.1–8).

   - *bhinnavṛtta* "a sentence with broken meter."
   - *yatibhraṣṭa* "a sentence ruined by its caesura."
   - *visandhi* "a sentence with a bad juncture."

---

[149]KAS 2.1.1 *guṇaviparyayātmano doṣāḥ ‖*

[150]KASv 2.1.1 *kāvyasaundaryākṣepahetavas tyāgāya doṣā vijñātavyāḥ |*

[151]Also a sentence level fault in KAS 2.1.22.

[152]Also a sentence level fault in KAS 2.1.22.

4. *vākyārthadoṣa*s "faults at the sentence-meaning level" (KAS 2.2.9–24).

- *vyartha* "a meaningless sentence."
- *ekārtha* "a sentence with a repeated meaning."
- *sandigdha* "a sentence with a dubious meaning."
- *ayukta* "a sentence with unfitting meaning."
- *apakrama* "a sentence with meaning out of order."
- *loka-vidyā-viruddha* "a sentence that opposes the customs of the world or knowledge."

These four categories arise from two divisions: *śabda*, "sound," vs. *artha*, "meaning," and *pada*, "word," vs. *vākya*, "sentence." Faults that are based on sound occur more or less upon simply hearing a word without giving too much thought to the meaning, which could be perfectly innocuous. For instance, we need not fully understand a *grāmya*, "rustic," or *aprīta*, "unpleasant," i.e., scientific, word to recognize it as such. Similarly on the *vākya* side, in a *yatibhraṣṭa* sentence, there is no need to understand a verse to find its metrical break defective or unbecoming. The faults in meaning, on the other hand, pertain to what one understands from hearing a word or a group of words fashioned into sentence. Vulgarity (*aślīla*), dubiousness (*sandigdha*), and disorder (*apakrama*) all fall into this category, as well as meanings that are particularly difficult to grasp for one reason or another (*neyartha*). These divisions have a lasting effect on the classification of faults in later writers on poetics such as Rudraṭa's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* and Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, even if the exact same scheme is not adopted en bloc.[153] Vāmana also applies the *śabda* vs. *artha* distinction to the *guṇa*s, "good qualities," (KAS 3) and the *alaṅkāra*s (KAS 4) for the first time. This more systematized, linguistically oriented approach to *alaṅkāraśāstra* may very well reflect the intellectual, grammatically charged climate of Jayāpīḍa's court discussed above. The distinction between word and sentence is very reminiscent of Bhartṛhari's work, which treats the sentence in the second chapter and the word in the third chapter. Unfortunately there is not space at present to discuss many of the fascinating features of Vāmana's explanation and exem-

---

[153]Rudraṭa classifies his faults only into word or sentence. Bhoja has only *pada-doṣa*s but then *vākya-doṣa*s, "sentence-level faults," and *vākyārtha-doṣa*s, "semantic faults at the level of the sentence."

plification of the faults, but we will make a few more observations regarding tolerance and what role ungrammaticality plays.

Strictly speaking, Vāmana considers the teaching of *doṣa*s unnecessary since it is possible to infer them based on the fact that they are the opposite of the *guṇa*s.[154] Nevertheless, he gives us a *prapañca*, "extended exposition," *saukaryāya*, "for the sake of convenience."[155] Keeping in line with the prominent place alloted to grammar in the list of the *vidyā*s, the first fault is *asādhu*, "incorrect (language)," in KAS 2.1.5, but before looking at this sūtra in more detail, other more general features should be noted. As was the case in the works of both Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin, Vāmana allows for exceptions (*apavāda*s as noted in the *vṛtti*) to the faults under certain circumstances that are mentioned immediately after the general definition for the *doṣa*. The exceptions, however, are limited to only three faults (*anarthaka*, *aślīla*, and *vyartha*), far fewer than in Daṇḍin especially by percentage, and hardly exhibit the same sensitivity to poetic usage, most of the justifications being grounded in the *śāstra*s or simple pragmatism, not because of the need for certain poetic effects. A cursory look at the three will make this point clear.

The first exception is to *anarthaka*, "meaningless, purposeless word," in KAS 2.1.9,[156] defined in metrical terms as *pūraṇārtha*, "for the purpose of filling out (the meter)." The *vṛtti* explains that these include not just *avyaya*s, "indeclinables," like *tu*, "but," but other words as well according to the *daṇḍāpūpanyāya*, "rule of the stick and the cake," a kind of inference.[157] In the following sūtra, KAS 2.1.10, Vāmana exonerates such words when they are *vākyālaṅkārtha*, "for the beautification of a sentence."[158] His example is an unidentified verse in the *pṛthvī* meter where the poet has used the indeclinable *khalu*, which could potentially just be a verse-filler, but here adds beauty. The patent subjectiveness of such reasoning should go without much comment, but I suspect

---

[154]KAS 2.1.2 *guṇaviparyayātmāno doṣāḥ* | "The faults constitute the opposite the good qualities."

[155]KAS 2.1.3 *arthatas tadavagamaḥ* | "The comprehension of them results from their meaning," and 2.1.4 *saukaryāya prapañcaḥ* | "There is an extended exposition for the sake of convenience."

[156]KAS 2.1.9 *pūraṇārtham anarthakam* ‖ Cf. BhKA 5.67, where poetry with *bahupūraṇa*, "many fillers," is rejected.

[157]Gopendra gives two definitions for the "rule," which basically means that if one proposition is true then another most certainly must also be true. Cf. Jacob (1907: 29). He then unpacks the application of the *nyāya* and clarifies that if mere indeclinables so used are faulty, how much more so words that refer to objects.

[158]As Gary Tubb has pointed out to me, *vākyālaṅkārtha* words were mostly likely model particles that served to give a sentence a certain idiomatic, natural feel that the Sanskrit grammarians and lexicographers never fully theorized or explained.

Vāmana has chosen neither his wording nor the example haphazardly. In the Sanskrit *kośa*s one of the meanings of *khalu* is *vākyālaṅkāra*, "an ornamentation for the sentence."[159] By formulating the exception in this language, Vāmana has incorporated a śāstric prescription for a particular particle and then extended it more so as to include others, all the while harmonizing the norms of *alaṅkāraśāstra* with those of lexicography. The subjectivity of the judgment call allows for quite a wide range of application to save a respected poet from a blemish.

The second exception is to *aślīla*, "vulgar (word-meaning)," in KAS 2.1.15.[160] These are defined as polysemic words, one meaning of which is *asabhya*, "not belonging to the salon," i.e., "indecorous," and also one that can cause someone to recall something indecorous.[161] In the *svavṛtti*, Vāmana gives the examples *varcas*, which can occur in the meaning of *tejas*, "splendor," and *viṣṭā*, "excrement,"[162] and *kṛkāṭikā*, "joint of the neck," which evokes the word *kāṭi*, "bier."[163] This search for evocative words, however, can be carried too far, and Vāmana gives three conditions for when potential vulgarity in a word should be ignored: KAS 2.1.16 *na guptalakṣitasaṃvṛtāni*, "hidden, secondary, and covered (indecorous word-meanings) are not vulgar." This is Vāmana saying, "don't get carried away." One shouldn't search high and low in all the dictionaries for hidden or obscure (*gupta*) vulgar definitions of words with a well known polite meaning, or think too long about what a word could mean secondarily (*lakṣita*), and if the vulgar meaning of a word is universally covered (*saṃvṛta* = *lokasaṃvīta*), let it be because no one would now see its vulgarity. The examples are of interest because they help to identify Vāmana's relation to his predecessors. As a *gupta* vulgar word, Vāmana gives *sambādha*, "throng, vagina,"[164] and thereby rejects Bhāmaha's classification (BhKA 1.49a) of the word as *śrutiduṣṭa*, "harsh on the ears," because the widely known meaning is "throng." The AK does not seem to know the word

---

[159]Cf. AKKṣ 3.3.256b

[160]KAS 2.1.15 *asabhyārthāntaram asabhyasmṛtihetuś cāślīlam* | "An *aślīla* (word-meaning) is indecorous and also one that is the cause for recollecting something indecorous."

[161]Cf. BhKA 1.47, 49 and 50 on *śrutiduṣṭa* and *arthaduṣṭa* and KĀ 1.66–68.

[162]Cf. AKKṣ 3.3.232a *tejaḥpurīṣayor varcaḥ*.

[163]Gopendra quotes the *Vaijayantī, bhūmikāṇḍa, kṣatriyādhyāya* 216c *pretayānaṃ khaṭiḥ kāṭiḥ*. Oppert (1893: 122) reads: *śavayānaṃ kaṭaḥ khāṭiḥ*. If *kṛkāṭikā* actually contains the indecorous word within it and does not simply sound like it (this is the more likely case, I believe), then we should emend Oppert's reading.

[164]The gloss is *guhya*, "pudendum (muliebre)."

in this meaning but others do.[165] The examples for the third category, on the other hand, support Daṇḍin (KĀ 1.68). In both texts words like *bhaginī*, "sister, woman," are said to have a universally hidden meaning, although one can easily analyze them as *asyā bhaga iti bhaginī*, "she has a vagina, vagina-ed." The word with an inappropriate secondary (*lakṣita*) meaning is *janmabhū*, not surprisingly at this point, "vagina." As in Bhāmaha, there is particular concern with words that could refer to bodily discharges or (female) reproductive organs. Reasons for this are not particularly hard to come by. In addition to exciting blushes, the female reproductive organs can be polluting and even indirect mention of them would defile the beauty of a poem. Cf. Ingalls (1965: 198). Yet at the linguistic level, Vāmana's exceptions show that there can be excessive adherence to the science of lexicography and over zealous recourse to secondary usage has its limit. He understands something like dead metaphors in the third group; sure, all the pieces are there, but we do not actually analyze them like that. This is an instance of *śāstra* bowing to worldly practice which it cannot override. At the close of this section, in the *vṛtti* ad KAS 2.1.19, Vāmana gives the following verse to demonstrate how people of his time, and in India still, are confronted on a daily basis with an object ripe for an indecorous interpretation but which everyone simply accepts:

> *saṃvītasya hi lokena na doṣānveṣaṇaṃ kṣamam |*
> *śivaliṅgasya saṃsthāne kasyāsabhyatvabhāvanā ||* (*vṛtti* ad KAS 2.1.19)

> For seeking out faults in what is hidden to the world is not suitable.
> For whom could there be anything indecorous in the form of Śiva's *liṅga*?

These discussions about propriety in *alaṅkāraśāstra* give us a window into the topics suitable for the *sabhā*, "salon," and deserve further study for understanding cultural norms in ancient India.

The last exception is to KAS 2.2.11 *ekārtha*, "a sentence-meaning with the same meaning," i.e., tautology.[166] Such sentences contain a word or words that express a meaning already present in other word(s). According to the following sūtra,[167] the fault can become acceptable provided that

---

[165]Halāyudha's *Abhidhānaratnamālā* 5.41ab and *Medinīkośa dhāntavarga* 37.

[166]KAS 2.2.11 *uktārtapadam ekārtham ||* "*ekārtha* is a sentence meaning in which there are words whose meaning has already been expressed."

[167]KAS 2.2.12 *na viśeṣaś ced ekārthaṃ duṣṭam ||* "*ekārtha* is not faulty if there is a specification."

it serves a particular purpose, namely *viśeṣa*, "specification," but this loophole is not to be applied as one pleases; it is subject to further conditions that Vāmana lists in the next six sūtras. The first five of these pertain to certain two-word compounds in which the lexemes both express a similar concept, but the first member adds a specification of some sort or other to the second member. Hence, they are all *karmadhāraya* compounds. One example will suffice. KAS 2.2.15 treats the compound *muktāhāra*, "string of pearls."[168] Since the word *hāra* can convey the meaning "string of pearls" on its own,[169] how can we justify *muktā* which also means pearls? Vāmana says in the *vṛtti* that it is to express the purity of the necklace, i.e., that no other precious stones are mixed in. The sixth type of specification differs from the other five insofar as it is syntactic.[170] Based on the example to the sūtra, *jagāda madhurāṃ vācaṃ viśadākṣaraśālinīm*, "she spoke soft words replete with pure letters," this exception accounts for the use of nouns that are inherent in the verbal action and would therefore be redundant unless they received some further specification from an adjective. So, in the example, *vācam*, "speech, words," is already understood from the verb *jagāda*, "spoke," but may surface so that it can receive a qualification in the form of adjectives *madhurām*, etc. A similar example is given in the *Kāmadhenu* subcommentary.[171] Vāmana closes this section of exceptions to *ekārtha* by stating a general rule of thumb: KAS 2.2.19 *tad idaṃ prayukteṣu*, "this, what has been the topic at hand, occurs among (words) already in use." This means that a poet is not free to generate new, analogous expressions on the model of the words given in the preceding sūtras; only those that earlier great poets have used and that are now well-established can be recycled in new works. In fact, the whole list of exceptions to the fault of tautology arises

---

[168]KAS 2.2.15 *muktāhāraśabde muktāśabdaḥ śuddheḥ* | "In the word *muktāhāra*, the word *muktā* is for the purpose of perceiving purity." Note that *pratipattyai*, "for the purpose of perceiving," has come down by *anuvṛtti* from KAS 2.2.13.

[169]Cf. AKKṣ 2.6.105a *hāro muktāvalī* or similarly *Vaijayantī, pātālakāṇḍa* 138a *jalādhyāya*.

[170]KAS 2.2.18 *viśeṣaṇasya ca* | "and for the purpose of a qualification." Note Vāmana's use of *ca* to bring a section to a close as in the A.

[171]Gopendra, following Mammaṭa's commentary ad KāPra 7.10d, rejects Vāmana's example because it would have been possible to use a *kriyāviśeṣaṇa*, "adverb," as in *jagāda madhurodāraviśadākṣaram īśvaraḥ*, "the lord spoke with sweet, noble, and pure letters," and thereby eliminate the repetition all together. In its place he suggests *nīlanīra-javikāsahāriṇā kāntam īkṣaṇayugena vīkṣate*, "she looks at her lover with a pair of eyes ravishing as the blooming of the blue water lily." (KAS p. 62). Here we know that one looks with the eyes so technically their mention is redundant, but since the eyes receive a qualification their mention is necessary. Mammaṭa gives a similar example with walking (*vraj*) and feet.

as an effort to explain existing practices. The theory must accommodate practice. But, the reason that such usages cannot serve as the basis for new words is precisely because they do violate a general śāstric prohibition and are permitted only by virtue of the weight of the tradition that supports them.

Vāmana formulates exceptions to the faults when a conflict arises between theory and utility, or theory and well-established practice. Under the first category come the faults that can be justified by noting that they serve some additional utility or purpose that trumps the general violation. This is the case for *anarthaka*, "meaningless word," where the faulty particle adds some ornamentation to the sentence, and *ekārtha*, "tautology," where the tautologous word conveys some additional bit of information or serves to accommodate an otherwise impossible syntactic structure. As noted, this last exception is ultimately regulated by established usage. To settle the conflict between the fault of *aślīla*, "vulgar word-meaning," and usage, Vāmana places limits on the application of lexicography and the hunt for secondary meaning — sometimes a cigar is just a cigar, especially when such meanings are universally obscured. The final example of Śiva's *liṅga*, which everyone knows has great potential for sexual interpretations but no one finds unseemly,[172] reflects the banality of over-sexualizing objects or words because they convey something non-sexual according to the community that uses them and this is ultimately of more importance. Although these three exceptions do not touch on the need to break norms to express emotion and add flavor to poetry, as was the case with Daṇḍin, Vāmana has offered a systematic and nuanced navigation between theory and practice which had a far-reaching impact in the tradition of *alaṅkāra* śāstra.[173]

I mention briefly the *doṣa* of *asādhu*, "incorrect word," in KAS 2.1.5 *śabdasmṛtiviruddham asādhu*, "an incorrect word is contradictory to the linguistic tradition (i.e., grammar)." Of note is the switch in terminology from *śabdahīna* in Bharata, Bhāmaha, and Daṇḍin, to *asādhu*. Although this word was used in the earlier treatises it did not have the technical meaning of ungrammati-

---

[172]One possible interpretation would be that the *liṅga* is something sexual but is nevertheless not perceived as something unseemly. Based on the context of the quote, however, the more likely interpretation is that the *asabhya* aspect of the object simply does not come to mind like in *subhaginī* etc.

[173]Cf. KāPra 7.10/58. In his commentary Mammaṭa basically repeats the exceptions to *ekārtha* from Vāmana.

cal.[174] By choosing to depart from the word's more traditional usage in *alaṅkāraśāstra*, Vāmana can both save a few syllables and recall the language of the *Mahābhāṣaya* and other grammatical works where *sādhu śabda*, "correct language," plays and important role. The placement of *asādhu* at the very top of the list of faults mirrors *śabdasmṛti*'s at the beginning of the *vidyā*s in KAS 1.3.3 and highlights its supreme importance. The example for the fault, *anyakārakavaiyarthyam*, "the futility of making mistakes," is in violation of P. 6.3.99 which prescribes the augment *dUK*. The correct form should be *anyatkārakavaiyarthyam*. Besides the rather clever example, the *sūtra* and the *vṛtti* do not offer much for further discussion.

2.4   Conclusions

In this chapter I have shown in some detail how the three earliest authors on *alaṅkāraśāstra*, Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin, and Vāmana, have approached the concept of poetry in general, its purposes and importance in life, and the role that the *śāstra*s play in creating it. By analyzing the sections on *doṣa*s I have demonstrated that all authors are concerned about *kāvya* falling in line with śāstric tenets, especially correct grammar, since this constitutes the most basic material — the body — of poetry. The exceptions to the faults reveal how the *ālaṅkārika*s maneuvered between practice and theory. There are limits to *śāstra* determined by various criteria but mostly through the usage of the learned. In the following chapters I will look at the sections on *śabdaśuddhi*, "linguistic purification," in both Bhāmaha and Vāmana and discuss further their attitudes toward grammar. We will see that Vāmana's somewhat more creative and tolerant approach eventually wins out and has lasting ramifications for poetic commentaries and even the transmission of poems themselves.

---

[174]For example in BhKA 1.55, 57 & 58 *asādhu* refers rather generally to a faulty word, but based on the context and examples (*viklinna* and *gaṇḍa*) Bhāmaha has in mind the faults dealt with in the first *pariccheda* such as *śrutiduṣṭa* and *śrutikaṣṭa*.

Chapter 3

Bhāmaha's Purification of Language

3.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter I discussed the role of *śāstra* in the three earliest works of Sanskrit poetics by analyzing both passages that directly address the topic as well as the proposed *doṣa*s, "flaws," and their exceptions. From this we can conclude that each author, to one degree or another, felt beholden to the normative prescriptions of the *śāstra*s but also sought to limit their domain in application to poetry so as to both accommodate necessary features otherwise strictly banned and exclude what is strictly allowed but inappropriate. Indeed, the reworking of the *doṣa*s from Bharata's initial list — either by exceptions as in the case of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha or tweaking it in the case of Vāmana — represents a reaction to the norms within *alaṅkāraśāstra* itself insofar as these texts took the list of faults in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* as a model in need of some modification. By understanding how and why these authors developed their nuanced approaches to śāstric literature, we are in a position to engage more meaningfully the subject of grammar, which, although a recurrent topic in the last chapter, did not feature very prominently since all three authors were fairly straightforward in awarding *vyākaraṇa* carte blanche. This picture will now be revised and sharpened as we enter into the more technical sections dedicated exclusively to grammar in the final chapter of both the BhKA and the KAS. Through our broader understanding

of Bhāmaha's and Vāmana's attitudes toward the *śāstra*s, it will be possible to better contextualize these sections and see to what extent the more general attitudes apply to *vyākaraṇa*.

In the present and three following chapters I will treat in some detail *śabdaśuddhi*, "linguistic purification," as presented in the BhKA and the KAS. Besides being of importance for understanding the individual authors' conception of grammatically correct, *poetic* language, they are also of great moment for the later tradition of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, *vyākaraṇa*, and the commentaries on poetry that begin at the end of the first millennium. The common ground for all three of these areas is the relation between *prayoga*, "usage," and grammatical rule and how to best harmonize the two, if at all. As we will see, poetic usage becomes increasingly important for defining what good Sanskrit is, all the while the grammatical tradition seeks new ways of handling the available literature. Although latter grammarians or commentators on poetry do not reference the BhKA, many of the grammatical points Bhāmaha pays attention to remain a topic of discussion in the later literature. We can, therefore, assume that Bhāmaha was responding to ongoing debates about grammatical correctness among his contemporaries. Vāmana's section, on the other hand, was more well received, and references to it are found not infrequently in commentaries on poetry. I will offer a tentative explanation for this unbalanced reception later on. At present we will look at Bhāmaha's work in depth.

3.2   Bhāmaha's Purification

The *Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha is unique among works on poetics in Sanskrit in that it contains two sections, the fifth and sixth *pariccheda*s, dedicated to the technical subjects of *nyāya*, "logic,"[1] and *vyākaraṇa*, "grammar," and how the two should regulate the poetic idiom. Later works on *alaṅkāraśāstra* certainly do not shy away from discussing technical linguistic topics, especially the *vṛtti*s, "modes of conveying meaning,"[2] but none follow Bhāmaha's model with the exception

---

[1]I will have to leave aside the section on logic out of consideration for space and the scope of topic at hand, although it is certainly worth further investigation for the early history of *nyāya*. See Śarmā & Upadhyāya (1981: 40–55), Pathak (1931), Diwekar (1929), Tucci (1930), and Subhadra (2008: 185–206).

[2]See McCrea (2008), especially chapters V, VII, and X, and Gerow (2001).

of Vāmana who takes up only grammar and in a rather different way.[3] Reasons for this shift will become clear in the following chapters but it seems that a division of labor was established during the rise of the commentarial tradition on poetry and other developments in the grammatical tradition. In this chapter, I will provide an overview of the sixth *pariccheda* of the BhKA, an analysis of select passages that help to refine our understanding of Bhāmaha's vision of grammatically correct poetry, and finally a survey of the specific grammatical rules to which Bhāmaha gives attention. This last topic will extend into the following chapter where one specific rule is looked at in great detail.

3.2.1 Philosophy of Language

The sixth and final chapter of the BhKA can be divided into three main topics. Verses 1–6 describe the importance of grammar for poetic composition, 7–22 treat questions in philosophy of language (what is a word, how does it convey meaning, etc.), and 23–61 discuss various grammatical rules one should or need not heed in poetic composition. The final three verses, 62–64, are a sort of summary and standard self-abasement. Proceeding not entirely according to order, I would like to begin with the verses that summarize various explanations of how language functions. As this section is somewhat of a dead-end even within the BhKA itself and not as pertinent to my argument as the other two, I will not dwell excessively long on it, although much like the preceding section on logic, the views Bhāmaha presents are important in situating him within the development of linguistic speculation during the first millennium.[4]

---

[3]Bhoja dedicates a large part of the ŚPra (chapters 1–8) to grammar, but it is so all-encompassing that it is tantamount to a detailed introduction to Sanskrit grammar itself. Several of Bhoja's classifications are novel, e.g., the types of roots, the number of sub-*kāraka*s, etc., and worthy of further investigation in another place. It is surprising that he does not seem to refer to his own grammar, the SKĀv.

[4]Several scholars have attempted to pin down the sources for Bhāmaha's views on logic and the syllogism — Śarmā & Upadhyāya (1981: 40–55), Tucci (1930), Pathak (1930), Warder (1958), Kulkarni (1983: 125–129), Subhadra (2008: 185–206) — and thereby determine his place in the (relative) chronology of Sanskrit authors. The results are summarized in Bronner (2011: 86.f) and Subhadra (2008: 33–35). Bhāmaha must have been after Diṅnāga, whose *apoha*, "exclusion," theory he refutes in BhKA 6.16–19, although he nevertheless agrees with him on other points such as there being only two *pramāṇa*s and three parts to the syllogism. NB that these ideas were also available from other sources: the early Vaiśeṣikas also postulated only two *pramāṇa*s and the reduction of the syllogism to three parts dates back to Vasubandhu's *Vādavidhi* even if he does not fully champion this position outside of the debate. On the *pramāṇa*s see below. For the syllogism in the philosophies of Vasubandhu and Diṅnāga, see Potter

In his short digression into philosophy of language, Bhāmaha presents and rejects several views dealing with the definition of *śabda*, "word," and its relation to *artha*, "meaning." In sum, after rejecting the views of the grammarians and the Buddhists, Bhāmaha will side with a view more akin to the Naiyāyikas/Vaiśeṣikas, "logicians/realists," who accept a sort of compact at the beginning of time concerning which *śabda*s will denote which *artha*s. Yet ultimately, the whole topic is dismissed as too complicated, and homage is paid, perhaps tongue in cheek, to those wise men who have dedicated more thought to subject. I suspect that the flurry of ideas on the nature of language in the wake of Bhartṛhari and Diṅnāga goaded Bhāmaha to at least weigh in on the matter. Owing to its brevity and at times rather veiled references to philosophical schools, the section is somewhat challenging to elucidate. Nevertheless, I believe I have been able to trace many of the references and have attempted to give the likely sources for these ideas, especially from the *Mahābhāṣya* and *Vākyapadīya*, two works Bhāmaha is very likely to have known based on internal evidence. Other sources are the Buddhist philosophers, especially Diṅnāga for the theory of *apoha*,[5] and possibly the works of Kumārila with whom Bhāmaha may have been a contemporary.

3.2.2 Against the Grammarians and Mīmāṃsakas

To begin the debate, Bhāmaha presents a faulty definition attributed to *pare*, "others," which overshoots its mark because it fails to ascribe any sonic aspect to *śabda*. These people merely say that a word is something from which we have a cognition regarding *artha*s, "objects, meanings." There are several obvious counterexamples from among which Bhāmaha chooses smoke and light as they would logically also count as as words under such a definition, the implication being that from them we have the cognition of fire.[6] Kumārila also cautions against associating the word

---

(1999: 570–574), Potter (2003: 42–47), and Franco (1990).

    [5]Based on the fifth *pariccheda* of the BhKA, scholars have attempted to demonstrate that Bhāmaha also knew the works of Dharmakīrti, but Śarmā & Upādhyāya (1981: 50) conclude that, "Bhāmaha's borrowing from Dharmakīrti is any thing (*sic*) but possible." Tucci (1930) and others were to follow suit, although some still remain open, e.g. Steinkellner (2005: xlii). The debate is summarized in Bronner (2011: 86f.) with references to further secondary literature.

    [6]BhKA 6.7 *pratītir artheṣu yatas taṃ śabdaṃ bruvate pare | dhūmabhāsor api prāptā śabdatānyānumāṃ prati ||* "Others say that a word is that from which there is a cognition with respect to objects. Smoke and light are (then)

too exclusively with something that conveys meaning and provides the same counter example of smoke.[7] A second definition is then proposed whereby a word is that which is a meaningful collection of *varṇa*s, "letters,"[8] such as "a," etc. and uttered for the purpose of conveying an object,[9] a slight reworking of Patañjali's famous definition of the word *gauḥ* in the *Paspaśāhnika*.[10] The inclusion of *varṇāṇāṃ samudāyaḥ*, " a collection of letters," as a meaning bearing unit derives from a discussion in *vārttika*s 8–15 ad *Śivasūtra* 5 and the accompanying *bhāṣya*, where it is argued that a *saṃghāta*, "heap," (glossed as *samudāya* by Patañjali) of letters is meaningful.[11] Note that Bhāmaha even echoes *saṃghāta* in the following verse with *saṃhati*, a different primary derivative from the same root ($\sqrt{han}$) with the same meaning.

The next three verses present a series of objections to this idea, but the exact purport of the conclusion somewhat eludes me. First, a doubt is raised regarding how a collection can be meaningful when the letters it is made up of are not,[12] and that lumping the letters together is also not acceptable since they have a specific order.[13] Both of these problems are well known to the grammarians, and the former is already raised in the *Mahābhāṣya* in the section just cited. The latter problem — that when the letters are (mentally) lumped together in an unordered mass, we lose the ability to distinguish between, e.g., *mataḥ* and *tamaḥ* — becomes a primary argument for postulating *sphoṭa*, "burst," a cause for the conveyance of meaning that arises from the sounds but is different from them. Bhāmaha goes on to note that a group cannot remain apart from

---

also taken to be a word with regard to inferring fire."

[7] *Ślokavārttika*, *Sphoṭavāda* 5–7, in particular 7ab: *agnyādīn gamayanto 'pi śabdā dhūmādayo na hi* | "For smoke etc., which make fire, etc. understood, are not words."

[8] I adopt here Allen's translation of *varṇa* for the reasons given in Allen (1953: 13–16). I must still emphasize that *varṇa*, "letter," always refers to an auditory phenomenon and not a visual one. Such a translation is, I believe, still better than phoneme or the like. Avoiding modern technical terminology, which itself is not always particularly stable, when translating Sanskrit is crucial for an unbiased and accurate presentation of the material in English.

[9] BhKA 6.8 *nanv akārādivarṇānāṃ samudāyo' bhidheyavān* | *arthapratītaye gītaḥ śabda ity abhidhīyate* || "Now, one could object that a collection of letters like *a*, etc. bears what is denoted (i.e., the meaning). 'Word' is definited as what is uttered in order to convey meaning."

[10] Quoted and translated above in 26, p. 65. Cf. VP 2.330.

[11] MBh I.30.1–32.11. Cf. Joshi (1967: 1–20) for an overview of Patañjali's ideas as well as Coward & Kunjunni Raja (1990: 115–117), although the latter falsely ascribe the concept of *pravāhanityatā*, "permanence in the stream," to Patañjali; it is a later development found, e.g., in Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*, MBhPr vol. I p. 59a.

[12] Cf. *vārttika*s 14 and 15 ad *Śivasūtra* 5.

[13] BhKA 6.9 *pratyekam asamarthānāṃ samudāyo 'rthavān katham* | *varṇānāṃ kramavṛttitvān nyāyyā nāpi ca saṃhatiḥ* || "How can it be that a group of letters, individually meaningless, is meaningful? Because the letters occur in a (certain) order, a lump is also not reasonable.

its members, as a house from the timber, walls, and ground.[14] The example of a house directly refutes an argument in the *Mahābhāṣya* to justify that a collection can be made up of meaningless parts. In this passage Patañjali uses the example of a chariot: it can function as a conveyance only with all its parts even though none of them on their own can do so.[15] Here the theories of the Mīmāṃsakas also become palpable in Bhāmaha's argument, for they uphold the view that meaning derives directly from the letters and there is no need to postulate that the group conveys meaning.[16]

The last two verses before Bhāmaha presents his own opinion drive the last nails in the grammarian's coffin. It is first concluded that a *kūṭastha* (scil. word?) is a verbal machination made in vain. Only that for which there is direct perception or inference truly exists.[17] The limitation of the *pramāṇa*s to only *pratyakṣa*, "direct perception," and *anumāna*, "inference," is characteristic of both early Vaiśeṣika and Diṅnāga's flavor of Buddhist philosophy.[18] The term *kūṭastha*, however, requires an explanation. Within the *Mahābhāṣya*, *kūṭastha*, "immovable, indestructible,"[19] occurs in a few contexts.[20] After its initial introduction as one of the meanings of *siddha* and hence a

---

[14]BhKA 6.10 *na cāpi samudāyibhyaḥ samudāyo 'tiricyate | dārubhittibhuvo 'tītya kim anyat sadma kalpyate ||* "Nor can a group be distinguished from its constituent elements. What else is a house but the timber, walls, and ground?"

[15]MBh I.220.22–24 *yathā tarhi rathāṅgāni vihṛtāni pratyekaṃ vrajikriyāṃ praty asamarthāni bhavanti tat-samudāyaś ca rathaḥ samartha evam eṣāṃ varṇānāṃ samudāyā arthavanto 'vayavā anarthakā iti ||* "Then it's like the parts of a chariot: when they are dismantled, they are not capable of the act of motion, and yet their collection, the chariot, is capable. In this way, groups of letters are meaningful; the parts, meaningless."

[16]JMSBh p. 45–48 ad JMS 1.1.5. In sum (p. 48): *na ca pratyakṣo gakārādibhyo 'nyo gośabda iti | bhedadarśanābhāvād abhedadarśanāc ca | gakārādīni hi pratyakṣāṇi | tasmād gaur iti gakārādivisarjanīyāntaṃ padam akṣarāṇy eva | ato no tebhyo vyatiriktam anyat padaṃ nāmeti |* "And the word *gauḥ* is not directly perceived as different from *g*, etc. because one does not see a difference but rather non-difference, since the letters *g*, etc. are directly perceived. Therefore, the word *gauḥ* beginning with *g* and ending in *ḥ* is just letters. So, there is no word distinct from them." Kumārila defends the same view in his *Ślokavārttika Sphoṭavāda* 69f. Cf. Verpoorten (1987: 26f.).

[17]BhKA 6.11 *tasmāt kūṭastha ity eṣā śābdī vaḥ kalpanā vṛthā | pratyakṣam anumānaṃ vā yatra tat paramārthataḥ ||* "Therefore this verbal jugglery of yours, namely, that the word is *kūṭastha*, is in vain. That for which there is direct perception or inference (can be) truly (understood)." This is the second time Bhāmaha states that he accepts only two *pramāṇa*s, *pratyakṣa*, "direct perception," and *anumāna*, "inference," the first time being BhKA 5.5. On *kūṭastha*, see the following paragraph.

[18]The Vaiśeṣika sūtras discuss only *pratyakṣa* and *liṅga*, "inferential mark." Candramati (5th cent.) likewise accepts only the two in his *Daśapadārthaśāstra*. See Potter (1977: 174 and 276). In his PS 1.2, Diṅnāga states that the *pramāṇa*s are limited to these two. Cf. Śarmā & Upādhyāya (1981: 44f.) and Potter (2003: 36–43).

[19]Kaiyaṭa provides the gloss *avināśin*, "non-perishing," (MBhPr vol. I p. 60a), and Nāgeśa further explains: *kūṭam ayoghanas tadvat tiṣṭhanti ye teṣu saṃsargināśe 'pi svayam anaṣṭeṣv ity arthaḥ ||* "A *kūṭa* is an iron anvil; those things which stand like it (scil. *kūṭa*), they have not perished even in the destruction of the ephemeral. This is the meaning." (*loc. cit.*)

[20]MBh I.7.3 & 21, I.18.14–16*, I.75.8*, I.122.24*, I.136.12*, II.123.25, III.364.24, III.420.22*. The starred references contain the set phrase quoted below.

synonym for *nitya* (MBh I.7.3), five of its other occurrences are in the set phrase *nityeṣu śabdeṣu kūṭasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavyam anapāyopajanavikāribhiḥ* | "Among permanent words there must be indestructible, inseparable letters that are neither subtracted, added, or modified," which comes up as an objection when it seems that part of word is in one way or another impermanent as, for example, when an *āgama*, "augment," is added.[21] Bhāmaha appears to be mocking the reasoning that the letters themselves are eternal and to support the non-eternality of sound, a tenant of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Buddhist philosophies and repeatedly upheld in their texts.[22] Still, it is not entirely clear to me why he chose the term *kūṭastha* which does not feature very prominently in later grammatical — there is not even a single occurrence in the *kārikā*s of the VP — or *Nyāya* literature. Although Patañjali uses *kūṭastha* only in reference to letters, its transference to *śabda* does not seem unwarranted. (It does however feature in Kumārila's *Ślokavārttika* in the *Śabdanityatā* section.) Finally, Bhāmaha rejects the *sphoṭa* theory flat out in a rather sarcastic tone, likening it to the proverbial flower in the sky, i.e., something that has no basis for existence.[23] Given this rather terse and flippant rebuttal, Bhāmaha seems to have first mainly argued against the philosophy of language as found in the *Mahābhāṣya*, as the parallels I have pointed out show, and only as a sort of afterthought turns to Bhartṛhari's innovative doctrine, indicating perhaps that it was still too new (or perhaps too absurd) to require further discussion. This accords well with the concerns of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika texts of the first millennium which hardly engage the *sphoṭa* doctrine until the tenth century in the works of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa and Śrīdhara,[24]

---

[21]In both MBh I.75.8ff. ad P. 1.1.20.5 and MBh I.122.24ff. ad P. 1.1.46, the solution proposed is to conceptualize augmentation as an *ādeśa*, "substitution"; the augmented word completely replaces the augmentless word. The theory is epitomized in the verse (MBh I.75.12f. = MBh III.251.12f.): *sarve sarvapadādeśā dākṣīputrasya pāṇineḥ | ekadeśavikāre hi nityatvaṃ nopapadyate ||* "All (alterations) are substitutions for an entire word in the opinion of Pāṇini, son of Dākṣī, since it is not suitable that (something) be permanent when there is a modification in one place."

[22]The basic arguments are presented in NS 2.2.13–21 and elaborated in the NSBh of Vātsyāyana. Cf. Potter (1977: 13f., 228f., 254–256, and 324f.) for a summary. On the Vaiśeṣika side, see VS (of Candrānanda) 2.2.24–43 and Potter (1977: 214). For the Buddhists, a good example is the refutation in Vasubandhu's *Vādavidhi* summarized in Potter (2002: 570ff.).

[23]BhKA 6.12 *śapathair api cādeyaṃ vaco na sphoṭavādinām | nabhaḥkusumam astīti śraddadhyāt kaḥ sacetanaḥ ||* "And the word of the supporters of *sphoṭa* cannot be accepted even on their oath. What sort of intelligent person would believe in flowers in the sky?"

[24]Cf. Potter (1977: 152) in general and pp. 384ff. for the *Nyāyamañjarī* and 516f. for the *Nyāyakandalī*. Kumārila was of course penning his attack on *sphoṭa* possibly during Bhāmaha's lifetime. In general on *sphoṭa*, see Joshi (1976: 20–91), Kunjunni Raja (1963: 95–148), and Coward & Kunjunni Raja (1990: 66–80). Joshi offers a particularly

but which routinely argue against the eternality of sound as already noted.

3.2.3   Bhāmaha's Own View on Language

We finally arrive at Bhāmaha's own view about language: a compact has been made in the past such that one particular group of sounds denotes one particular object/meaning for the benefit of worldly discourse.[25] As noted in the introduction to this section, Bhāmaha very clearly subscribes to the theory of language propounded in both the *Nyāya-* and *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*s, which each deal with the topic in similar words.[26] In rounding off this section on the nature of language, one last jab is hurled at those *manda*, "slow," people who take the word to be *kūṭastha*, "immovable," and something other than just sound, not to mention that they believe these conventional meanings to constitute the supreme truth.[27] Yet, after so much discussion, Bhāmaha throws up his hands and says the relationship between word and meaning may be permanent or transient; let's pay homage to the learned as they are the authorities in determining such matters.[28] This type of verse, one that declares the difficulty or impossibility of describing a topic in full and the author's unsuitability to the task, is common practice in the BhKA (and other works as well), and Bhāmaha concludes several chapters in a similar manner.[29]

---

clear overview of the evolution of the *sphoṭa* doctrine with particular emphasis on Bhartṛhari's original ideas.

[25]BhKA 6.13 *iyanta īdṛśā varṇā īdṛgarthābhidhāyinaḥ | vyavahārāya lokasya prāg itthaṃ samayaḥ kṛtaḥ ||* "Just so many letters are denotative of the corresponding meaning. Such compact has been made long ago for the purpose of communication among people in the world."

[26]NS 2.1.55 *na sāmayikatvāc chabdārthasampratyayasya |* "No (scil. the reasoning thus far is not valid), because comprehending the meaning of a word is conventional." VS 7.2.24 *sāmayikaḥ śabdād arthapratyayaḥ |* "The comprehension of a meaning from a word is conventional." Cf. Kunjunni Raja (1963: 21–24).

[27]BhKA 6.14 *sa kūṭastho 'nupayāyī ca nādād anyaś ca kathyate | mandāḥ sāṃketikān arthān manyante pāramārthikān ||* "Such an immutable word is said to be imperishable and nothing other than sound. Slow people think that conventional meanings are the ultimately true."

[28]BhKA 6.15 *vinaśvaro 'stu nityo vā sambandho 'rthena vā satā | namo 'stu tebhyo vidvadbhyaḥ pramāṇaṃ ye 'sya niścitau ||* Pāda b is not entirely clear to me.

[29]BhKA 2.95 on the headache of further elaboration of the *alaṅkāra*s, BhKA 4.51 on Bhāmaha's inability to fully know the intention of the cultivated, BhKA 5.69 on the authority of wiser men, and BhKA 6.62 on the overwhelming magnitude of Pāṇini's grammar.

3.2.4 Refutation of *apoha*

If the *sphoṭa*-doctrine could be dismissed in a mere 32 syllables, Bhāmaha could not conclude his discussion on language without launching a lengthier attack (four times as long: BhKA 6.16–19) on the Buddhist theory of *anyāpoha*, "exclusion of others," first put forth by Diṅnāga (ca. 480–540[30]) and condensed in the fifth chapter of his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and *vṛtti* thereon.[31] The theory, *in nuce*,[32] turns on its head the intuitive notion that the word "cow" refers to the object cow because the two are always associated with one another. In its stead, Diṅnāga proposes that it is rather the mutual absence of all other word-object relations that allows us to *infer* a word's referent; "cow" refers to an object qualified by the exclusion of other referents (*arthāntaranivṛttiviśiṣṭa bhāva*). In other words, we infer that "cow" means cow because it does not mean anything else. This reasoning extends from Diṅnāga's theory of logical inference (*anumāna*), whereby we infer fire from smoke because it is associated with nothing else.[33] Furthermore, it is specifically "things" (*bhāva*s, *vastu*s) that the word excludes, although later proponents tweak the theory in response to other philosophical developments.[34] In response, Bhāmaha notes that if, for example, the word "cow" denotes everything other than a cow, then we need to hunt for the sound that will create the notion of cow.[35] Furthermore, it is problematic that a single entity has a pair of *phala*s, "fruits, results," one that excludes and another that affirms.[36] Finally, Bhāmaha asserts that we

---

[30]Cf. Frauwallner (1961: 134–137) for Diṅnāga's date, although Pind (2009: 12 fn. 20) mentions the need for reevaluation in light of the Sāṅkhya philosopher Mādhava's familiarity with Diṅnāga. Unfortunately, no further elaboration is given.

[31]See Pind (2009) (dissertation now published as Pind (2016) but I have not yet had access to the published work) for a full introduction, edition, and translation of the chapter. Since Diṅnāga wrote the PS as a digest and defense of his philosophy, many of the ideas presented in it were already known from earlier works, and the tenets of his philosophy are at times only presented *en passant*, e.g., the actual *apoha* theory is laid down in a mere two *kārikā*s PS 5.35–36 and their *vṛtti*. Cf. Pind (2002: 12). The circulation of Diṅnāga's philosophy before the PS can be seen from a rebuttal to Mādhava's critique of the *apoha* doctrine in the PS. Cf. Pind (2009: 12).

[32]Cf. Pind (2009: 43–60) for a full overview of the theory.

[33]Indeed, *apoha* is central to the entire philosophical system of many Buddhists. Cf. McCrea & Patel (2010: 1).

[34]The theory undergoes several modifications over the coming centuries especially in the hands of Dharmakīrti, Dharmottara, and Jñānaśrīmitra. Cf. McCrea & Patel (2010: 9–34) for a very succinct and lucid summary and Kunjunni Raja (1962: 78–92).

[35]BhKA 6.17 *yadi gaur ity ayaṃ śabdaḥ kṛtārtho 'nyanirākṛtau | janako gavi gobuddher mṛgyatām aparo dhvaniḥ ||* "If the word 'cow' produces its meaning when there is the exclusion of other (objects), another sound must be sought after that produces the cognition of a cow in the meaning of 'cow.'"

[36]BhKA 6.18. *arthajñānaphalāḥ śabdā na caikasya phaladvayam | apavādavidhijñāne phale caikasya vaḥ katham ||* "Words result in the knowledge of objects, and one thing cannot have a pair of results. How can you maintain that

do not understand things other than cows when we hear the word "cow" because the word itself directly brings to mind the object cow, not through any process of excluding non-cows. One reason for refuting the theory at all may have been that it directly contradicted the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of linguistic denotation whereby words can refer to objects because of the *jāti*, "class," that inheres in objects.[37] According to Diṅnāga, it is not *jāti* but *apoha* that resides in objects and allows for them to be referred to by words. Bhāmaha's refutation of the *apoha* theory, therefore, accords well with his leanings toward Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and pre-Diṅnāga Buddhist logic we have already seen in his favoring of two *pramāṇa*s and the non-eternality of sound. One must also briefly mention that it is thanks to this passage that additional evidence exists for determining Bhāmaha's date since it is quoted in later works by Jinendrabuddhi and Śāntarakṣita.[38]

3.2.5   Concluding Remarks

The section closes with three verses about the general nature of language and the futility of trying to pin down its specifics. Knowing *śabda*s and what it is they denote is a difficult road to go down,[39] and words themselves can hardly be limited or specified owing to the diversity of languages and their reference to endless objects.[40] Sandwiched in between is a stray, brief statement about the four, possibly five, classes of words, namely those that refer to a *dravya*, "object," *kriyā*, "action," *jāti*, "universal," *guṇa*, "quality," and, according to others, *yadṛcchā* "spontaneous/proper names."[41] The verse recalls Patañjali's mention of a four- or threefold classification of the con-

---

one thing has two results: the knowledge of exclusion and of affirmation?"

[37]Cf. Pind (2009: 30 & 54).

[38]The tantalizing mention of a *nyāsakāra* in BhKA 6.3.36 has caused a wave of ink to flow. See once again Bronner (2011: 90–95) for an overview. In addition to there being a disparity between Jinendrabuddhi's statement and Bhāmaha's reference (*tṛC* and *tṛN* are quite distinct), the evidence brought forth in Pind (2009: 27f.) convinces that Jinendrabuddhi lived well after Bhāmaha at the time of Śāntarakṣita in the eighth century, both of whom discuss Bhāmah's refutation of the *apoha* theory under the clear influence of Dharmakīrti. There remains, however, less than solid evidence that the grammarian Jinendrabuddhi and the Buddhist philosopher were the same person, namely only the mention in a colophon to the *Viśālamālavatī Ṭīkā* (Jinendrabuddhi's commentary on the PSV) that the author was an "erudite grammarian" and a similar explanation of a grammatical point in the *Viśālamālavatī* ad PSV 5.14 & 27 and the *Nyāsa* ad P. 2.1.57. Cf. Pind (2009: 26f.).

[39]BhKA 6.20cd *ke śabdāḥ kiṃ ca tadvācyam ity aho vartma dustaram* || "What are words and what is expressed by them? Alas, this is a difficult path to cross."

[40]BhKA 6.22 *nānābhāṣāviṣayiṇām aparyantārthavarttinām | iyattā kena vāmīṣāṃ viśeṣād avadhāryate* || "Who can precisely delimit the extent of these words that cover many languages and refer to unlimited object.?"

[41]BhKA 6.21.

ditions for using a word (*pravṛtti*),[42] but Bhāmaha expresses himself too tersely to give more precision. In any case, it seems to be the last bit of requisite information for a theory of language.

What are we to make of this somewhat frenetic tour of philosophical ideas about language in a work on *alaṅkāraśāstra*? Why has Bhāmaha bothered at all to touch upon concepts such as the eternality of sound and the denotation of words, and even reject two of the most hotly debated theories of language for centuries to come? Concrete or very confident answers to such questions will elude us unless further evidence turns up, e.g., a manuscript of Udbhaṭa's commentary on the BhKA, but a few remarks can, I believe, surpass mere speculation. Bhāmaha clearly wanted his readers, i.e., potential poets and readers of poetry, to approach a poetic text with a certain understanding of language, one that is by all means relatively simple and based on what is clearly perceptible: sounds are not eternal, there is no mystical entity above the words such as *sphoṭa*, and denotation occurs in a straightforward fashion without the need for taking the circuitous route proposed by the proponents of the *apoha*-theory. If we think in terms of one of the larger philosophical dichotomies in Indian philosophy, Bhāmaha adheres to the *asat-kārya-vāda*, "the doctrine of the non-existent effect," i.e., that when something new is produced, it did not previously exist in the cause. The standard example is the production of a pot from clay. For a proponent of the *asat-kārya-vāda*, the pot (the *kārya*) did not already exist in the clay (the cause). This is a basic tenet of the Vaiśeṣika school of philosophy and opposes the contrary doctrine of the Sāṃkhya school, the *sat-kārya-vāda*, according to which the result (e.g., the pot) already existed in the cause (e.g., the clay).[43] The other philosophical views that Bhāmaha supports — the non-eternality of sounds, the two *pramāṇa*s, the three part syllogism — also accord well with the *asat-kārya-vāda*. Indeed, when we turn to Bhāmaha's approach to Pāṇinian grammar in the next section, we will see that his philosophical outlook also played an important role. For example,

---

[42]MBh I.19.20–21: *catuṣṭayī śabdānām pravṛttiḥ | jātiśabdāḥ guṇaśabdāḥ kriyāśabdāḥ yadṛcchāśabdāḥ caturthāḥ |* "The condition for using a word is fourfold: universal-words, quality-words, action-words, (and) the fourth spontaneous words." That not everyone includes *yadṛcchāśabda*s is also noted under the following vārtt. . MBh I.20.38f. Cf. Scharf (1996: 22 fn. 6). That words can also denote individual objects (*dravya*s) is of course known from elsewhere in the *Mahābhāṣya* and ascribed to Vyāḍi. MBh I.244.8 (P. 1.2.64.45). Cf. Kunjunni Raja (1962: 75–78). The name *ḍittha* is mentioned again in BhKA 6.25.

[43]Most other philosophical schools also fall into one of these two categories. On the *asatkāryavāda*, cf. Frauwallner (2003: 110–114) and Dasgupta (1922: 319f.).

Bhāmaha rejects efforts to squeeze more information out of a rule than is already apparent. Consequently, as we will learn, Bhāmaha discourages a poet from using grammatical forms that are got by splitting a rule (*yoga-vibhāga*, cf. BhKA 6.29d) or through hints (*jñapaka*, cf. BhKA 6.26c). Both of these devices allow for one to see more descriptive potential in a sūtra than meets the eye, much as an adherent of the *sat-kārya-vāda* can see more in clay than just clay. With respect to the composition of poetry, this emphasis on empiricism also guides Bhāmaha to take a rather negative stance toward difficult poetry that is in need of excess commentary (BhKA 1.20d and 2.20[44]) or that one needs to "crack open" in order to enjoy like the unripe wood-apple (BhKA 5.62). We can also view these attitudes as responses to the incorporation of *citra-kāvya*, "flashy poetry," into the poems of Bhāravi (KirātA 15) and Māgha (ŚiśuP19).[45] One final justification for this preference for simplicity is the didactic goals of poetry Bhāmaha mentions in BhKA 1.2 and already discussed in the preceding chapter.

3.3   A Grammar for Poetry

If Bhāmaha found the philosophy of the Pāṇinian grammarians unacceptable — including such basic tenets as the eternality of sound and the *sphoṭa* doctrine — he wholeheartedly endorsed their authority as the guardians of *sādhu*, "correct," usage and saw the mastery of their works as a magnificent task and an absolutely integral part of a poet's training. We learn of Bhāmaha's convictions from two sets of verses, BhKA 6.1–3 and 6.62f., that frame the last chapter and are thematically connected by an ocean metaphor. The first group presents a vivid image of the full complex of grammatical texts likened to the ocean with all its dangers,[46] and are worth quoting in full as they detail the grammatical curriculum and begin Bhāmaha's justification for the study

---

[44]See pp. 120 and 125 below.

[45]Ānandavardhana, the author of the *Dhvanyāloka*, likewise does not hold such poetry in high regard. Cf. Ingalls et al. (1990: 635–637).

[46]In the conventions of Sanskrit poetry, the completion of a particularly challenging task is equated to crossing the ocean, the comparison often being extended, as here, to include other oceanic horrors such as sea monsters and the like. Within the grammatical tradition, see Kaiyaṭa's opening verses 6–7 to his *Pradīpa* on the MBh where the *Mahābhāṣya* is the ocean and Bhartṛhari's work is the causeway. In poetry, cf. *Raghuvaṃśa* 1.2 and, for the extended comparison, *Buddhacarita* 1.70.

of grammar.

> *sūtrāmbhasaṃ padāvartaṃ pārāyaṇarasātalam |*
> *dhātūṇādigaṇagrāhaṃ dhyānagrahabṛhatplavam || 6.1 ||*
> *dhīrair ālokitaprāntam amedhobhir asūyitam |*
> *sadopabhuktaṃ sarvābhir anyavidyākareṇubhiḥ || 6.2 ||*
> *nāpārayitvā durgādhaṃ amuṃ vyākaraṇārṇavam*
> *śabdaratnaṃ svayaṃgamyam*[47] *alaṃ kartum ayaṃ janaḥ || 6.3 ||* (BhKA)

> Without crossing that unfathomable ocean of grammar, which has sūtras for water, words for vortices, lists as its depths, roots and the *uṇādi* (suffixes) as its sea monsters, tenacity in thought as its great raft, whose far shores are seen by the wise, despised by the insipid, constantly enjoyed by all sciences as cow elephants, such a man will not be able to make a gem of a word which can be understood by itself.

The simile effectively brings out both the challenges involved in mastering the entire complex of grammar, which includes not only the sūtras but also ancillary material like the *uṇādi* suffixes etc., and the reward gained from such efforts, a *śabda-ratna*, "gem of a word," which can only be obtained by braving the depths of the ocean.[48] Bhāmaha also includes a reference to the foundational role grammar plays for the other knowledge systems (*vidyā*s) by likening them to cow elephants who delight (presumably by swimming) in the ocean water of grammar. One intriguing word is the adjective to *śabda-ratna*, *svayaṃ-gamya*, "comprehensible by itself," because it alludes to the importance of grammar-regulated language in communicating clearly to others.[49] Although a certain amount of supermundane power was attributed to the use of correct speech from at least the time of Patañjali, the ease of comprehension Bhāmaha ascribes to such grammatically polished "word-gems" seems rather to highlight that there existed a standard training in grammar shared by a larger community. Only by playing according to the established rules can a poet hope for his poem to be well understood.

The centrality of the Pāṇinian tradition in Bhāmaha's community is brought out in two verses

---

[47]I have adopted Trivedī's proposed emendation of *svayaṅgamam* to *svayaṅgamyam*, which gives better sense and corrects the metrical defect. I have not, however, been able to locate any parallels for the form.

[48]In Hindu mythology, gems are one of the many precious items emitted from the milk-ocean when the gods and demons churned it.

[49]This is the exact opposite of what we find in the famous verse in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 22.34 in which the poem is said to be *vyākhyāgamya*, "understandable through a commentary." This verse has often been cited in connection with BhKA 1.20 and 2.20 where such poems are criticized.

toward the close of the work. The first, BhKA 6.62, specifies for the first time that Pāṇini's doctrine (*sālāturīyam matam*) is the grammatical school under discussion. Furthermore, to go through it incrementally here is not Bhāmaha's task, and if someone should reach its far shore that will surely be a wonder. The following verse provides further information about Pāṇini's grammar in the "world," i.e., scholarly community.

> *vidyānāṃ satatam apāśrayo 'parāsāṃ*
> *tāsūktān na ca viruṇaddhi kāṃścid arthān |*
> *śraddheyaṃ jagati mataṃ hi pāṇinīyaṃ*
> *mādhyasthyād bhavati na kasyacit pramāṇam || 6.63 || (BhKA)*

> Always a resource for the other sciences, it does not contradict anything said in them because the Pāṇinian doctrine is to be trusted in the world. Since it serves as an impartial mediator it is not the (philosophical) authority for any (philosophical system).

I find the last *pāda* somewhat difficult to interpret and will come back to it presently. The first three *pāda*s, however, are perfectly comprehensible. As was metaphorically spelled out in the opening stanzas just cited, the other sciences enjoy or make use of (*upabhuj*) grammar. So too here it is an *apāśraya*, "resource, support" for them and, accordingly, does not contradict what is found in them. This ecumenical role of grammar among the Sanskrit disciplines derives from that fact that regardless of which doctrine one might follow or what kind of text one wishes to write, correct language is the bedrock of every composition. For example, within the context of the *vedāṅga*s, "appendices to the Veda," *vyākaraṇa* has often won the place of most importance (*pradhāna*) because it allows us to understand the meaning of words.[50] Consequently, Bhāmaha proclaims that, "the Pāṇinian doctrine is to be trusted in the world." This statement of allegiance to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* does not so much as raise an eyebrow for most readers today, but if we place ourselves in Bhāmaha's time (latter half of 6th to early 7th cent.), it has far greater significance because of the rival grammatical schools of that era, above all the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and the *Jainen-*

---

[50]The *locus classicus* is MBh I.1.19 *pradhānaṃ ca ṣaṭsv aṅgeṣu vyākaraṇam |* "Among the six appendices (scil. to the Veda), grammar is predominant." Haradatta adds the reason: KVPada I p. 7 *padapadārthajñānasya tadāyattatvāt |* "because knowledge of the meaning of words is dependent upon that (scil. grammar)." Elsewhere in his opening remarks, essentially a short essay on grammar based on the *Paspaśāhnika*, Haradatta finds even questioning the use of grammar risible: KVPada I p. 6 *atha vyākaraṇasya kiṃ prayojanam | kim anena praśnena | sarvathādhyeyaṃ vyākaraṇam |* "Now what is the use of grammar? How can you ask such a question! By all means must grammar be studied." On the place of grammar in the Sanskrit tradition see Cardona (2007).

dravyākaraṇa, both of which clearly had very strong followers in Buddhist and Jain circles[51] and merited attention in Brahmanical circles as well. The justification for such trustworthiness in Pāṇini and his followers is the school's ability to be an impartial judge (*madhyastha*). Bhāmaha has chosen to recommend the Pāṇinian school because it is not only trusted throughout the world, but also because it does not have any specific affiliations in the way that the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and *Jainendravyākaraṇa* did. One wonders, though, what Bhāmaha meant with *pāṇinīyam matam*. As we have seen, he rejects rather central tenets of the grammarians' philosophy that certainly cannot be described as *madhyastha*, "netural," or even *śraddheya*, "trustworthy," in the world. I conclude, therefore, that what is intended is the narrower sense of *pāṇinīya*, namely the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* along with the necessary additions made by Kātyāyana and Patañjali and not the metaphysical baggage we find in the *Mahābhāṣya* and even more so in the *Vākyapadīya*. If we think back to the end of the last section and Bhāmaha's penchant for the empirical, this reference to the limited Pāṇinian school makes good sense.

Returning to the beginning of the section, Bhāmaha introduces other reasons for studying grammar beyond simple linguistic correctness but instead tied to originality.

> *tasya cādhigame yatnaḥ kāryaḥ kāvyaṃ vidhitsitā |*
> *parapratyayato yat tu kriyate tena kā ratiḥ || 6.4 ||*
> *nānyapratyayaśabdā vāg āvibhāti mude satām |*
> *pareṇa dhṛtamukteva sarasā kusumāvalī || 6.5 ||*
> *mukhyas tāvad ayaṃ nyāyo yat svaśaktyā pravartate |*
> *anyasārasvatā[52] nāma santy anyoktānuvādinaḥ || 6.6 ||* (BhKA)

Someone who wishes to create a poem must make an effort in learning it (scil. grammar). What pleasure can something bring that derives from confidence in another/another's knowledge.[53] (6.4) Speech whose words come from another's understanding do not shine to the delight of the learned. It's like a garland of flowers, still fresh,[54] (but)

---

[51]The *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, as we have already seen, was the go-to grammar of Ratnaśrījñāna in his commentary on the KĀ, and its promulgation in Sri Lanka has already been mentioned. Works from both grammatical schools were translated into Tibetan at a relatively early date.

[52]Śarmā and Upādhyāya report this reading as variant for *anye sārasvatā* in fn. 1, p. 41. Tātācārya has also adopted it in his edition. The other reading might be translated "other are learned (*sārasvata*) only by name."

[53]*pratyaya* has several possible translations in to English. The two most common semantic fields are "confidence, trust, etc." and "understanding, comprehension." Both meanings seem fitting here.

[54]*sarasa* lit. "with juice, flavor" means "fresh" in the case of flowers and "full of emotional flavor" in the case of a poem, a *śleṣa*, "double entendre."

worn and discarded by another. (6.5) This is a primary rule of thumb that it (scil. language) comes into use by one's own power. The ones who just repeat what others have have borrowed eloquence. (6.6)

The exhortation that one who wishes to create a poem must make an effort in the study of grammar is justified by a series of sententiae on the displeasure the learned have toward what is not just borrowed, but also what is not based on one's own understanding of language. The poet should be able to show his work, as it were, if called upon to do so. Although there is certainly an aspect of plagiarism involved here, i.e., mere copying, given the context Bhāmaha seems also to be speaking about the need to have an in-depth understanding of how a word can be derived within the grammatical system, what rules to apply when, and how to properly manipulate language. This is not only supported by the lengthy discussion in the last half of the chapter, but also substantiated by the habit of commentators on poetry of pointing out the appropriate rules for deriving words.

As we finally wind our way to the heart of the section, a discussion about the poetic propriety of some two dozen forms as governed by the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Bhāmaha leads us in with a single verse introduction to the new section (BhKA 6.23, after the philosophy of language disputation), and then follow several rules of thumb, some of which shed more light on what the domain of poetic language looks like within the realm of acceptable speech (BhKA 6.24–30). A few of the prohibitions are repeated from the sections on faults in the first and the fourth chapters. I will look at a few of these rules in more detail when they bear on our understanding of how the complex of grammatical works is being restricted or they provide evidence for other novel attitudes of Bhāmaha. Otherwise I shall offer only a summary, but more detail can be found in Subhadra (2008: 214–216).

The opening verse is rather straightforward and may be given with little comment:

vakravācāṃ kavīnāṃ ye prayogaṃ prati sādhavaḥ |
prayoktuṃ ye na yuktāś ca tadviveko 'yam ucyate || 6.23 || (BhKA)

What here follows is an investigation into those words which are correct for the use of poets whose speech is crooked as well as those which are not fit to be used.

The use of the word *sādhu*, "good, correct," but this time with a specification of scope, signals that we will now be moving within a subset of the larger realm of *sādhu* words, some of which are already familiar from other parts of the work. For example, Bhāmaha reiterates in BhKA 6.25 his prohibition on indecorous language: no *apeśala*, "uncharming," words[55] or *grāmya*, "vulgar," speech.[56] Yet, many of his guidelines focus on how readily understandable a word is. Such ease of comprehension is impeded by several factors like the use of rare meanings found only in reference works (i.e., the *kośa*s and DhP),[57] technical terms from śāstric literature or antiquated Vedic words.[58] In addition to these lexical factors, Bhāmaha also objects to having recourse to certain types of derivational practices for obtaining a word from Pāṇini's rules. These restrictions and the extent to which they are followed or not by later authors indicate shifts in both how the system of grammar was applied to poetic language and, in turn, what methods of interpretation were seen fit for understanding the generative power of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

3.3.1   Lexical Faux Pas

From the lexical restrictions just mentioned, I would like to look at three in more detail, as I have a few points that have thus far been missed in the rather slender secondary literature on the BhKA. To begin with, Bhāmaha gives *piṇḍīśūra*, "cake-hero, coward," as an example of a *grāmya* word one should not use,[59] and indeed the word has very few occurrences in the literature I have been able to search and none in the works of Aśvaghoṣa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Māgha, Mayūra, and Ratnākara.[60] The word is, however, perfectly pukka from the point of grammar and lexicography. It is given in the *pātresamitādi gaṇa*, "list," ad P. 2.1.48 in the KV, itself a subsection of the *yuktārohyādi* list mentioned in P. 6.2.81. These are all given by *nipātana*, "setting down (without derivation)," in part, because of their irregular accent on the first syllable by the latter sūtra.

---

[55]That is to say, the *duṣṭa* words defined and exemplified in BhKA 1.47–52.

[56]Cf. BhKA 1.19 & 35.

[57]BhKA 6.24 & 26ab.

[58]BhKA 6.27.

[59]BhKA 6.25

[60]I have found a single occurrence in each of the following works: *Subhāṣitāvalī* 463c, Rūpagosvāmin's *Haribhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* 4.3.12a, and Jīvagosvāmin's *Gopālacampū* 1.31.7.

According to the KV, the word *piṇḍīśūra* occurs in the sense of an insult based on *nirīhitā*, "lack of motivation."[61] The lexicographers take up the word relatively late, its first appearance being in Halāyudha's *Abhidhānaratnamālā* 2.212cd (10th cent.)[62] and then again in Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* 477ab/3.141ab (12th cent.).[63] There is, however, an occurrence of *piṇḍīśūra* in one of the earlier *mahākāvyas*, namely, in *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 5.85.[64] Unfortunately, the date of Bhaṭṭi remains somewhat uncertain and his relation to Bhāmaha is a topic of great interest and speculation.[65] The purported connection between the two authors lies primarily in the similar ordering of the poetic figures defined in the BhKA and exemplified in the 10th canto of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, but there are problems, and the exact identification of the figures is to some extent speculative since they all date back to later commentators and not to Bhaṭṭi himself. Furthermore, the authors disagree on a number of points. For example, Bhāmaha criticizes[66] *vyākhyāgamya*, "understandable-through-a-commentary," poetry (language should be *svayaṃgamya*, "easily understandable on its own," as noted above on p. 120), whereas Bhaṭṭi boasts that he has composed just such a poem in the penultimate verse, *Bhāṭṭikāvya* 22.34.[67] Whoever may have written first, one is clearly re-

---

[61]KV ad P. 2.1.48 *piṇḍīśūrādiṣu nirīhitayā* (scil. *kṣepaḥ*) | The sub-commentaries thereon add the following: KVNyāsa II p. 62f. *yo na kiṃcit kartuṃ samarthaḥ sa piṇḍīśūra ity evamādibhiḥ padair abhidhīyate* | "The words *piṇḍīśura*, etc. denote someone who is not capable of doing anything." KVPada II p. 62 *piṇḍī odanapiṇḍaḥ, tatraiva śūro nānyatreti nirīhatā* | "a *piṇḍī* is a ball of rice; only with regard to that and nothing else is he courageous. Thus, a lack of motivation."

[62]Vogel (1979: 321).

[63]Both entries include the two synonyms *gehenardin*, "shouting only at home," and *geheśūra*, "brave only at home," which are also listed in the *pātresamitādi* list.

[64]BhK 5.85*rākṣasān baṭuyajñeṣu piṇḍīśūrān nirastavān | yady asau kūpamāṇḍūki tavaitāvati kaḥ smayaḥ ||* "You frog in a well! if he's only tossed out those pusillanimous demons at the sacrifices of those silly Brahmins, what astonishment can you have at just that?" Two of the commentators, Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha, note the grammar of the word by reference to P. 2.1.48, although only Mallinātha gives the citation from Halāyudha's lexicon already noted. Its absence in the *Jayamaṅgalā* may well indicate that Jayamaṅgala wrote before Halāyudha, i.e. before the 10th cent. Cf. Kane (1960: 77) for Jayamaṅgala's date as sometime between 800–1050.

[65]Lienhard (1984: 180f.) discusses the most relevant data for Bhaṭṭi's date and the problems surrounding various proposals. What appears to be an important piece of evidence for dating Bhaṭṭi to the reign of one Śrīdharasena in the 7th cent., the final verse of the poem in Jayamaṅala's recension, is called into question because it is absent in Mallinātha's text. Diwekar (1929), who argues that Bhaṭṭi knew and reacted to Bhāmaha's work, raises important problems about how the figures in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* were identified in the first place and notes several other parallel passages to support Bhaṭṭi as the later author. De (1960: 50–56), who places Bhāmaha in the 7th or 8th century, believes Bhaṭṭi is not only a predecessor of Bhāmaha but that he relies on an older, now lost work on poetics. I tend, however, to agree with Diwekar that there is not reason to insist that Bhaṭṭi followed any particular work to a tee and that he likely belonged to those who opposed Bhāmaha on certain points, much like Daṇḍin.

[66]Cf. BhKA 1.20 and 2.20.

[67]I appreciate and acknowledge the more subtle reading of these passages in Diwekar (1929: 825), namely that according to Bhāmaha a poem should not need an *excessive* (*ati-*) comment (BhKA 1.20) and that *vyākhyāgamya*

acting to the other. Bhaṭṭi's use of the word *piṇḍīśūra* is either a flagrant violation of Bhāmaha's rather prudish attitude or Bhāmaha is chastising Bhaṭṭi and people like him who would use such language. As a matter of fact, *piṇḍīśūra* is not the only word Bhaṭṭi uses from the *pātremitādi* list with a similar connotation. Earlier in the same canto, 5.41, we find the word *gehenardin*, "roaring at home," i.e., someone who only has the courage to shout in his own home, which also occurs as a synonym in the *kośa* entries cited above. Bhaṭṭi, therefore, seems to have twice violated Bhāmaha's recommendation. Although I do not think this evidence can help us very much in determining Bhaṭṭi's priority to Bhāmaha or vice versa, it does further connect the two authors, and the fact that none of these words is used by any of the famed classical poets (to the best of my knowledge) may be taken as a testament to Bhāmaha's lasting influence on the composition of poetry. More generally, we can detect here Bhāmaha's rejection of the genre *śāstra-kāvya*, poems composed primarily to exemplify the rules of grammar or other technical treatises.[68]

In BhKA 6.27[69] we come across four categories of words whose use is problematic, although they are accepted in general. In the first place, Bhāmaha reins in the authority of the *śiṣṭa*s, "learned," for poetic usage; their usage, which covers a wide range of topics, is not always going to be suitable for poetry. The second reason appears to be a reference to other grammatical works (*tantra*s), perhaps even to the *Kātantra* given Bhāmaha's choice of words. The fourth reason emphasizes that we must exclude all Vedic words, although they are certainly correct. The Vedic language was already a separate category of antiquated words and constructions by the time of Patañjali, and many grammars dropped the Vedic rules altogether. The third item, however, has not yet been correctly identified in my opinion. The Sanskrit text of the last line reads: *chandovad iti cotsargān na cāpi cchāndasaṃ vadet.* Naganatha Sastry (1970: 120) translates, "Nor [scil. may you employ] words used in the *Vedas* because of the general rule छन्दोवत् सूत्राणि भवन्ति, nor words peculiar to the Vedas." Naganatha Sastry has completed the quote *chandovat* with a maxim used

---

poetry seems only to refer to very *śāstra*-like (*śāstravat*) compositions (BhKA 2.20). This makes it less likely that Bhāmaha is replying to Bhaṭṭi, in which case we would expect *avyākhyāgamya* or the like.

[68]On the genre, see Lienarhd (1984: 225–227) and Venkitasubramonia Iyer (1970: is–xvii).

[69]BhkA 6.27 *na śiṣṭair uktam ity eva na tantrāntarasādhitam | chandovad iti cotsargān na cāpi cchāndasaṃ vadet ||* "One should not speak (a word) just because it has been used by the learned nor a word established by another *tantra* (grammatical work?), and also no Vedic words on the basis of the general rule *chandovat* 'like the Vedas.'"

twice in the MBh[70] to explain peculiarities of Pāṇinian sūtras: *chandovat sūtrāṇi bhavanti*, "Sūtras are like the (the language of) the *Veda*s."[71] For example, the very first sūtra, P. 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic*, contains the irregularity of a *c* in word-final position, whereas palatals are not a permitted final in Sanskrit.[72] The exact explanation need not concern us,[73] but it is this Veda-like status of the sūtra language that permits the irregularity. This quote does not make sense in the present context. I do not believe that anyone ever thought of poetry to be like sūtras.[74] Nevertheless, I do believe that the general rule (*utsarga*) that Bhāmaha actually refers to stems from the MBha but is *chandovat kavayaḥ kurvanti* (MBh I.313.14), "poets compose as though in the Vedic register."[75] Recall from ch. 1 that the dictum occurs during a discussion of the dubiously formed word *stryākhyau*, "which denote a feminine gender," in P. 1.4.3 and that one of the interlocutors brings up an unidentified verse as support for Pāṇini's usage and then states that *chandovat kavayaḥ kurvanti*, implying that we should tolerate grammatical anomalies in poetry.[76] This passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* is not cited by other authors I am familiar with, but perhaps it was in vogue during Bhāmaha's day. Nevertheless, the rejection of this maxim underscores that no excessive freedom in grammar may be granted to poets even if sanctioned by a statement from the *Mahābhāṣya*.[77]

In this section Bhāmaha offers a few guidelines for the derivation of words. In addition to the general disapproval for *durbodha*, "difficult to understand," words like *śrautra*,[78] which are based on a convoluted derivation, he specifically prohibits the use of *leśa-jñāpaka*s, "slight hints,"[79] as

---

[70]MBh I.37.4 & I.133.5.

[71]Kaiyaṭa, specifies: MBhPr I p. 153b *na vaiśeṣikādisūtrāṇy api tv aṅgatvād vyākaraṇasūtrāṇy eva* | "Not the sūtras of the Vaiśeṣikas etc., but only the sūtras for grammar because they are a part (of the Vedas)."

[72]By P. 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*. Cf. Whitney (1896: 50).

[73]*ādaic* needs to be termed both *bha* and *pada*.

[74]At least in Sanskrit. While reading the *Bālavyākaraṇamu*, a 19th cent. grammar of Telugu by Cinnaya Sūri, with S. L. P. Anjaneya Sharma, it was repeatedly impressed upon me that Chinnaya Sūri made certain choices in diction and grammar so as to create exceptionally beautiful *sūtramu*s, which Telugu literati prise for both their content as well as their musical qualities.

[75]Keith (1920: 20) briefly mentions this passage and Joshi & Roodbergen (1995: 45) explain the passage in full.

[76]As already explained, Patañjali does not accept this example as a valid means to justify Pāṇini's language, but once he solves the irregularity in *stryākhyau*, he returns to the verse and declares it is also acceptable.

[77]Was Bhāmaha trying to ensure that students understood that *chandovat kavayaḥ …* was not Patañjali's final conclusion?

[78]BhKA 6.25a *śrautrādiṃ na tu durbodham*, "(scil. one should not use) a word difficult to comprehend such as *śrautra*."

[79]BhKA 6.26cd *na leśajñāpakākṛṣṭaṃ saṃhati dhyāti vā yathā* || "(one should not use) a word got by a subtle hint like *saṃhati*, 'congresses,' or *dhyāti*, 'thinks.'" Trivedī p. 237 prints: *na leśajñāpakākṛṣṭasaṃhati …* . Tātācārya p. 143

well as *yogavibhāga*, "the splitting of a rule."[80] Let us look at each of these in turn. The example of a *durbodha* word is given as *śrautra*.[81] Accepting this emendation, the evolution of the form is as follows. The word *śrotriya* is set down as an irregular form in P. 5.2.84 *śrotriyaṃś chando 'dhīte*, "*śrotriyaN* means 'studies the Vedas.'" As the KV notes, we have the option of interpreting the form as completely underived with no division between the stem and the suffix, or as a ready made form but still with a division between the base *śrotra* and the suffix *GHaN = iyaN* by P. 7.1.2.[82] The next step is to add the suffix *aN* by a vārtt. ad P. 5.1.130. The sūtra enjoins the suffix *aN* after certain words in the sense of *bhāva*, "existence," or *karman*, "activity," but not after *śrotriya*. The vārtt. is included specifically to remedy this deficit. Together with Patañjali's commentary it runs as follows:

> *aṇprakaraṇe śrotriyasya ghalopaś ca* || 1 ||

> [*Bhāṣya*] *aṇprakaraṇe śrotriyasyopasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyaṃ ghalopaś ca vaktavyaḥ* | *śrotriyasya bhāvaḥ śrautram* || (MBh II.371.10–12)

> Vārtt. I. In the context of *aN*, of *śrotriya*, and the elision of *GHa*.

> [Commentary] Mention must be made of *śrotriya* in the context of *aN* and the elision of *GHa* (=*iya*) must be stated. The state of being a *śrotriya* 'one whose studies the *Veda*s' is *śrautra*.

What does Bhāmaha object to in this? It cannot be that we require a vārtt. to obtain the form since he explicitly says we may use the *upasaṃkhya*s, "additions," in BhKA 6.29ab. The reason is, to the best of my understanding, that this word is homophonous with *śrautra* in the sense of "ear," derived from *śrotra* with the *svārtha*, "semantically neutral," suffix *aN* by P. 5.4.38. In addition,

---

emends to *na leśajñāpakākṛṣṭaṃ saṃhanti ...* I do not see any particular need to change *saṃ* to *sa*, but it does not change the point. *hanti* here exemplifies the recherché meaning one can assign to √*han* on the basis of KṣDhP II.2 *hana hiṃsāgatyoḥ*, "√*han* occurs in the sense of injuring and going," but it is not in common use and therefore discouraged. This corresponds to the BhK 6.26ab. I also follow Tātācārya p. 144 in understanding *leśa-jñāpaka* as a *karmadhāraya* compound: *liśyate alpībhavatīti leśaḥ sa cāsau jñāpakaś ca*, "it is both *leśa*, i.e., what is '*liś*-ed' or becomes small, and a hint." I will explain *dhyāti* below.

[80]BhKA 6.28cd *tam ādriyet prāyeṇa na tu yogavibhāgajam* || "One should respect such a word (scil. got from an addition by Kātyāyana or Patañjali) but not one born of splitting a rule."

[81]Tātācārya p. 143 is the first to make this emendation to the *editio princeps*, which reads śrotrādiṃ. Naganatha Sastry (1970: 119f.) further emends to *śrautrīya*, but this seems unnecessary.

[82]KV ad P. 5.2.84: *śrotriyaṃś chando 'dhīte iti vākyārthe padavacanam* | *chando vā śrotrabhāvaḥ tad adhīte iti ghaṃś ca pratyayaḥ* | "*śrotriyaN* is the expression of a word in the sense of the phrase 'studies the *Veda*.' Or, *śrotra* replaces *chandas* (when applying the sūtra) P. 4.2.59 *tad adhīte*, "studies it (scil. *chandas*) and there is the suffix *GHaN*."

śrautra, "the state of being one who studies the *Veda*s," is not morphologically transparent insofar as *iya* which encodes the meaning "studies" is lost entirely. Bhāmaha would presumably have preferred a poet to avoid a form which is difficult to understand both on account of homophony as well as the less than straightforward derivation.

The other more explicit references to the derivational process in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* are Bhāmaha's prohibitions on *jñāpaka*s (BhKA 26cd) and *yogavibhāga* (BhKA 6.29d) in forming *poetic* words. These are some of the interpretive devices[83] employed by commentators on the A, from the time of Kātyāyana onwards in order to derive less than apparent meaning from the sūtras without altering the text. Although some of the reasoning involved may strike the modern reader as beyond the pale of responsible philology, these devices formed the theoretical foundation for interpreting Pāṇini's grammar till the very end of the tradition, and only in modern times has the validity of these methods been seriously questioned.[84] Bhāmaha, of course, only questions their applicability in the realm of poetry. Once again, we unfortunately cannot say a great deal about what Bhāmaha had in mind on account of the brevity of his statements, but even with just these few words it is possible to limn his general theory by unpacking the context of these devices in the grammatical tradition.

I have already touched upon *jñāpaka*s in ch. 1, p. 7, and the device will return to take center stage in ch. 6.[85] As already briefly explained, the discovery of a *jñāpaka* hinges on an apparent redundancy in Pāṇini's teaching, ranging from a single letter to an entire rule. Since Pāṇini cannot have employed even a single letter in vain, the seemingly redundant element must indicate information not explicitly stated,[86] quite often a *paribhāṣā* or "metarule." This is a favored method of interpretation from Kātyāyana, who resorts to *jñāpaka* 44 times,[87] and continues to be explored throughout the remainder of the tradition. Bhāmaha seeks to curtail the application of this de-

---

[83]Kielhorn (1887c) [Rau (1969: 233–241)] lists 22 such devices and provides a concise introduction to the general topic.

[84]See my discussion in the introductory chapter.

[85]See DSG p. 163, TGS p. 150, and Kielhorn (1887c: 244f.) for a general definition, discussion, and examples.

[86]Cf. MBh III.54.4 *na hi kiṃcid asmin paśyāmi śāstre yad anarthakaṃ syāt* | "For nothing I see here in this work could be meaningless," and MBh I.39.11f. *tatrāśakyaṃ varṇenāpy anarthakena bhavituṃ kiṃ punar iyatā sūtreṇa* | "Not even a letter could be useless there (scil. in Pāṇini's work), how much less so large a sūtra?"

[87]Kielhorn (1887c: 244, fn. 1)

vice or at least some variety of it, the *leśa-jñāpaka*. If we accept analysis offered by Tātācārya that the compound is a *karmadhāraya*, i.e., "a minute hint," and not a *dvandva*, i.e.,"a bit and a hint," then we should determine what Bhāmaha may have meant by his words. To do so, we unfortunately only have the term itself, otherwise not known to me from primary or secondary literature, and the example *dhyāti*. According to Tātācārya, with whom I am in full agreement, we can only justify the form *dhyāti* by invoking the *paribhāṣā* PŚ 93.3 *gaṇakāryam anityam*, "an operation on a list (of the DhP) is non-mandatory," the existence of which is based on a *jñāpaka* in P. 3.1.79.[88] The difficulty with the form is that KṣDhP I.957 √*dhyai*, "to contemplate," belongs to the first class of verbs (*bhvādi-gaṇa*) and should be conjugated as *dhyāyati*.[89] By applying the above mentioned *jñāpaka*, however, we can elide the class sign of the first class (*ŚaP*) and conjugate the root according to the second class (*hvādi-gaṇa*). The most remarkable aspect of this metarule is that it does not derive from Patañjali and first appears in the collection of *paribhāṣā*s belonging to the *Kātantra* school, although it is included in the collections of the Pāṇinian school beginning with Puruṣottamadeva.[90] Without Patañjali's express support, Nageśa will feel compelled to reject the *jñāpaka* and the metarule.[91] In the absence of any further information from Bhāmaha himself or from an ancient commentary, we have now examined the available evidence and can tentatively draw a conclusion about what exactly was meant by *leśa-jñāpaka*. I suspect that Bhāmaha, like Nageśa, did not much care for those *jñāpaka*s that lacked Patañjali's authority and that *leśa-jñāpaka* might be understood as a "minor hint," i.e., one that was founded on the reasoning of newer grammarians. The only further supporting piece of evidence I can offer for this hypothesis is that Bhāmaha also rejects the composition of an agent noun in *tṛC* with a objective genitive *sūtrajñāpakamātreṇa*, "on the basis of only a hint that is a sūtra," in BhKA 3.37a. I will return to this passage below. At the very least, however, we see another instance of Bhāmaha shunning excessive interpretation of a text to reveal new meaning.

---

[88]Coincidentally, I will discuss this *jñāpaka* again in ch. 6 where more detail will be given regarding the reasoning that leads to the discovery of the hint.

[89]The form *dhyāti* occurs, e.g., in MahāBh 12.46.11c and 12.228.34b.

[90]See ch. 6 for more details.

[91]Cf. Kilehorn (1960: 441–444).

The third prohibited device mentioned by Bhāmaha is *yogavibhāga*, "splitting of a rule," which also dates back to the MBh and has had considerable impact on the text of the A as given in the KV and later commentaries.[92] As the word suggests, a commentator will propose that a rule be split into two (but once into three[93]) rules in order to accommodate forms that would otherwise not be accounted for. The authors of the KV clearly saw some (eight to be exact) of the divisions as necessary and valid "alterations" and incorporated them into the *sūtrapāṭha*, "recitation of the sūtras" upon which they commented. Yet, just as in the case of *jñāpaka*s, Kātyāyana and Patañjali were surely not the only commentators to suggest such splits and other creative means of interpretation. Bronkhorst (2008) provides evidence for interpretors of the A who did not follow Patañjali, including one Udbhaṭa (9th cent.) who went rather wild in applying such devices as *yogavibhāga*. As a consequence his works have perished.[94] We may assume, without too much imagination, that Bhāmaha was helping to guard his would-be poets against such rogues by rejecting *vibhāga* in toto. We get the overall impression that Bhāmaha was a Pāṇinian purist and did not think highly of derivations that involved going beyond the received text, and he may have been reacting against the authors of the KV who had recently produced a definitive commentary on the A based on a modified text.[95]

---

[92]Cf. Kielhorn (1887b:179f.) for instances where the text of the A has been altered in the recension of the KV according to splits and other additions suggested by Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Kātyāyana has recommended *yogavibhāva* 25 times and Patañjali more than 70. Cf. Kielhorn (1887c: 247).

[93]P. 7.3.117, 118, and 119 were originally one sūtra.

[94]Bronkhorst culls evidence from the well-known verses on the decline of *Mahābhāṣya* studies in VP II.481–486 and Cakradhara's *Nyāyamañjarīgranthibhaṅga* in which certain difficult words (*śobhā* etc.) are derived according to Udbhaṭa's unorthodox (i.e., non-Patañjalian) practices. It is possible but by no means certain that this is the same Udbhaṭa who authored the *Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha*. Although there is some truth in Bronkhorst's observation, both the KV and Jinendrabuddhi, author of the *Nyāsa* on the KV, go against the MBh or offer interpretations that lack the support of Patañjali. Haradatta, author of a later commentary on the KV, is often at pains to defend statements in the KV and flat out rejects comments of Jinedrabuddhi as *bhāṣyaviroddha*, "contradicted by the *(Mahā)bhāṣya*." The next chapter on *KvasU* will provide an example of just this situation.

[95]Although the splits were incorporated into the standard recension of the sūtras, knowledge of their original form was still known to, and discussed by, the commentators of all ages, like Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa, as Kielhorn (1887b) notes. The KV itself often mentions the reason for splitting a rule, e.g., KV ad P. 1.4.58.

3.4   Specific Rules

3.4.1   Introduction

We may now dive into the ocean, or perhaps rather, stroll into the forest of grammar — a metaphor that better suits our needs. In what follows I will discuss a select number of the sūtras to which Bhāmaha refers in BhKA 6.31–60, demonstrate what grammatical debates are at stake, and why Bhāmaha gives advice for these sūtras in particular. This will require a certain amount of both "technical" language as well as detailed argumentation, which I will do my best to explain in a lucid fashion with the non-"expert" in mind. Such technical explanations are necessary for the simple fact that so much hinges on technicalities. To return to our metaphor, it is not possible to view the Sanskrit grammatical tradition as a forest without intimately knowing the trees. Indeed, one must not simply stroll through the forest and observe the species of each tree, but one must also stop altogether and gaze lovingly at the branches, the bark, the leaves, and even the patterns intricately etched into the leaves. Without this attention to detail, any discussion of the forest runs the risk of the errors, pointless superficialities, and grandiose edifices constructed on half-truths. In the context of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition (Pāṇinian or otherwise), we must always keep in mind that there can be no particularly meaningful understanding without following the evolution of thought from the *Mahābhāṣya*. As Thieme quite aptly put it: "No Pāṇinīya can be properly understood, unless he be taken as a link in the continuous chain that connects Patañjali and Nāgojībhaṭṭa."[96] In the following discussions, I will demonstrate the validity of this statement and its importance in correctly understanding the text at hand. The very first sūtra alone will give ample opportunity to exemplify this and other relevant points about the evolution of the Pāṇinian tradition down to the present day.

---

[96]Thieme (1956: 10).

3.4.2 On *mārjanti*

Bhāmaha begins the treatment of individual sūtras (BhKA 6.31–60) in the same way as Pāṇini begins his grammar with the word *vṛddhi*, "prosperity, the vowels *ā*, *ai*, and *au*," both a technical grammatical term and an auspicious word.[97] The verse in full is:

> *vṛddhipakṣaṃ prayuñjīta saṃkrame 'pi mṛjer yathā |*
> *mārjanty adhararāgaṃ te patanto bāṣpabindavaḥ* || 6.31 || (BhKA)

> One should use the vṛddhi option for the root *mṛj*, "to wipe," even when a *saṃkrama* (suffix)[98] follows. For example: "The teardrops, as they fall, wash away (*mārjanti*) the red on the lower lip."

One need know very little, and indeed really no Pāṇini at all, to understand the gist of Bhāmaha's advice. If we turn first to Whitney's grammar, we find that with regard to the root √*mṛj*: " ... the same [scil. vṛddhi-] strengthening is said to be allowed in weak forms before endings beginning with a vowel: thus, **mārjantu**, **amārjan**,"[99] and can conclude that there is the option of using either *mṛjantu* or *mārjantu*. Bhāmaha would prefer a poet to use the form *mārjantu* since it contains the vṛddhi vowel, *ā*.[100] Rather straightforward. But given that Bhāmaha in all likelihood had not read Whitney's grammar, we should seek out another explanation. Let us next check two comments written in English on this verse. Naganatha Sastry (1970: 121f.) gives the following translation and comment:

> In the case of the root "*Mrj*" employ the form with '*vṛddhi*' although both forms are permissible. The tears falling down wash off the colour of your lips.

> The root "*Mrj*" in the present tense takes '*Vṛddhi*' compulsorily before strong terminations beginning with a consonant. Before terminations beginning with a vowel (even though weak) it takes *Vṛddhi* optionally. See 'मृजेर्वृद्धिः' (7-2-14 [*sic*]) and its *Vārttika* 'किङित्यजादौ वा.'

---

[97]As Patañjali explains (MBh I.40.5–10) Pāṇini has formulated P. 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic* as such so that there is an auspicious word at the beginning of his work. Usually (though there are still other exceptions, e.g., P. 1.2.41) the syntax for a definition sūtra is predicate followed by subject, i.e., *saṃjñin*, "what receives the technical term," then the *saṃjñā*, "technical term," as in P. 1.1.2 *adeṅ guṇaḥ*. Subhadra (2008: 216) notes the auspicious beginning as well.

[98]*saṃkrama* will be clarified in due course.

[99]Whitney (1896: 625).

[100]In the Pāṇinian system of grammar, *ār* is not a vṛddhi vowel — *r* is not a vowel — but rather simply *ā*. The *r* appears, however, automatically by P. 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*.

Naganatha Sastry certainly translates the spirit of the verse. He also offers a reference to the Pāṇinian sūtra, correctly quoted but with the wrong sūtra number (the sūtra is P. 7.2.114), that is responsible for the vṛddhi-strengthening in forms like *mārṣṭum*, *mārṣṭavyam* etc., and notes that a vārtt. thereon accounts for the optionality. Ultimately, however, the explanation does not differ substantially from Whitney's since neither the sūtra nor the vārtt. are explained; we are still in the realm of *parapratyaya*. Subhadra (2008: 216) gives more or less the same commentary albeit she does translate the vārtt. : "a 'kit' or 'ṅit' affix whose first letter is a vowel..." All of this certainly puts us on the right path, but little of it helps us to understand why Bhāmaha has made such a recommendation[101] or how the forms *mārjanti*, etc. are derived within the A. Finally, it is worth noting that the word *saṃkrama* in the verse receives no explanation at all, and no such vārtt. will be found ad P. 7.2.114 if one looks into the MBh. If we now follow Thieme's advice, all will unravel.

Before diving into the relevant portion of the MBh, a few preliminaries about *mārjanti* and *mṛjanti* are in order. The root √*mṛj*, "to wipe, cleanse," (KṣDhP II.67 = MDhP II.56 *mṛjūṣ śuddhau*) belongs to a list of verbal roots known as the *adādi gaṇa*, "the list beginning with √*ad* 'to eat'," in the *Dhātupāṭha*. As such, P. 2.4.72 *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ*, "there is (*luk* elision) of the suffix *ŚaP* after the roots √*ad* etc." applies,[102] the *vikaraṇa*, "class sign," *ŚaP* is elided, and the personal endings are added directly to the root (hence the "root-class" according to English terminology[103]) Since the elision is done with *luk*, the elided suffix *ŚaP* will not leave its mark behind — P. 1.1.63 debarrs P. 1.1.61 — and the strengthening of the root will depend on the characteristics of the following personal ending. As *sārvadhātuka* suffixes by P. 3.4.113, they generally cause a final *iK* vowel[104] or a medial light *iK* vowel of a base (*aṅga*)[105] to be replaced by the corresponding guṇa vowel. P. 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*, "guṇa and vṛddhi occur in place of an *i*, *u*, *ṛ* or *ḷ* (of any

---

[101]Subhadra (2008: 216) gives the explanation: "Bhāmaha's view is that in poetry the vṛddhi is more beautiful to be used." We should, however, first seek for a more concrete and, less subjective reason.

[102]By P. 3.1.68 *kartari śap*, *ŚaP* is added, unless otherwise stated, to verbal roots when making a finite form based on the present stem.

[103]Cf. Whitney (1896: 231–242).

[104]*iK* is a *pratyāhāra*, "condensed list," that stands for the vowels *i*, *u*, *ṛ*, and *ḷ* of any length, intonation, or nasality.

[105]P. 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* takes care of the final vowel of an *aṅga*, and P. 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* accounts for a medial light vowel as well as the vowel preceding the augment *p*.

length, etc.)," specifies that when the words "guṇa" or "vṛddhi" are prescribed as a replacement for another vowel, it is only in place of an *iK* vowel and not others, i.e., *ā*, *e*, etc. For example, the root √*dviṣ* (KṣDhP/MDhP II.3 *dviṣa aprītau*), "to hate," also belongs to the *adādi* class and will take and then lose the *vikaraṇa ŚaP*. When we add the personal ending *tiP* of the third person singular *parasmaipada*, the light medial vowel will be replaced by the guṇa vowel *e*, and we have *dveṣṭi*.[106] As is well known, however, guṇa-strengthening does not occur everywhere in the entire paradigm of *dviṣ*, e.g., *dviṣanti*, "they hate."[107]

To account for the lack of strengthening, Pāṇini created the following, somewhat involved system. Since guṇa-strengthening by P. 7.3.84ff. is effected by any following suffix, Pāṇini has marked some suffixes with a *K*, *G* or *Ṅ* — termed *it*s or *anubandha*s "tag letters" — which indicate that guṇa and vṛddhi are barred by P. 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*.[108] Yet, none of the personal endings (listed in P. 3.4.78) are marked with a *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ*. Instead, Pāṇini has formulated the rule P. 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*, "a *sārvadhātuka* suffix not marked with a *P* is considered as marked with *Ṅ*," that extends (*atideśa*) the *anubandha Ṅ* to all *sārvadhātuka* suffixes not marked with a *P*.[109] Those that are marked with a *P* comprise the *parasmaipada* singular endings *tiP*, *siP* and *miP*. So, instead of marking fifteen suffixes with *Ṅ*, Pāṇini created a rule which depends on an already present *anubandha*, and economy is achieved. The main points to bear in mind as we proceed to the details of *mārjanti*/*mṛjanti* are the following:

1. The strengthening of the vowel in finite verbal forms of the root-class is determined by the personal endings (P. 7.3.48ff.).

2. Suffixes marked with *K*, *G*, and *Ṅ* block guṇa and vṛddhi strengthening (P. 1.1.5).

3. The words "guṇa" and "vṛddhi" are used to replace only *iK* (*i*, *u*, *ṛ*, *ḷ* of any length) vowels (P. 1.1.3).

---

[106]The *t* becomes retroflex by P. 8.4.41 *ṣṭoḥ ṣṭunā*, "(In place of *s* or a dental consonant) there will be *ṣ* or the corresponding retroflex consonant when in contact with an *ṣ* or retroflex consonant."

[107]In general, the root only has the strong form in the *parasmaipada* singular of the present and imperfect (but also certain imperative forms). See Whitney (1896: 228f. & 232–242) for further details on the root-class verbs. The same rules for strengthening apply to the other non-thematic classes as well.

[108]The tradition reads a *g* in P. 1.1.5 although this does not seem likely to be what Pāṇini intended. See Kiparsky (2007) and Cardona (1997: viii–xxxix) for different takes on the matter.

[109]*P* also prevents a suffix from bearing the accent by P. 3.1.4 *anudāttau suppitau*.

4. All personal endings except for those of the *parasmaipada* singular are marked with Ṅ (P. 2.1.4).

With this in mind, let us proceed to the details of *mṛj* and why it is problematic.

3.4.2.1   Patañjali on *mārjanti*

If the root √*mṛj* were like other roots of the *adādi* class, we would not face the present difficulties, but as it happens, √*mṛj* is irregular insofar as there is vṛddhi-strengthening in its strong forms: *mārjmi*, "I wipe," *mārkṣi*, "you (sing.) wipe," *mārṣṭi*, "he/she/it wipes," etc. and not the expected guṇa-strengthening as we find in *dveṣṭi*, etc. In fact, *mṛj* takes vṛddhi strengthening in all places where other verbs take guṇa.[110] To account for this anomaly, Pāṇini has formulated the sūtra P. 7.2.114 *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*, "there is vṛddhi in place of (the *iK* vowel) of the base (*aṅga*) *mṛj*."[111] Accordingly, all suffixes not marked with a *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ* will cause the stem to change to *mārj* and not *marj* as would be expected by P. 7.3.86. The next problem is that, based on usage, vṛddhi can optionally be extended to certain weak forms, so that we have both *mṛjanti* and *mārjanti*. The question is, can the rules of Pāṇini account for these forms and if not, how does the tradition deal with the deficit? In the MBh, Patañjali brings up the problem not under P. 7.2.114 but in his comments ad P. 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*, "guṇa and vṛddhi occur in place of an *iK* vowel." In his and Kātyāyana's rather lengthy remarks on this sūtra (covering some nine pages in Kielhorn's edition), Patañjali discusses a number of topics that focus on the purposefulness of each of the words in the sūtra. When he arrives at the purpose of the word *vṛddhi*, the sūtra P. 7.2.114 comes into play and it is debated whether or not this sūtra constitutes a justification for mentioning *vṛddhi* in P. 1.1.3. Toward the end of the discussion, Patañjali mentions that in the opinion of other grammarians there is the option for vṛddhi under certain circumstances. The passage runs as follows:

---

[110]e.g., *kartā* vs. *mārṣṭā*, both made with the agentive suffix *TṛC*.

[111]It is important to note that P. 7.2.114 falls within the purview of P. 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*, "belonging to a base." Reference is to the rather complex technical term *aṅga*, "presuffixal base," defined in P. 1.4.13. For present purposes it will suffice to say that for P. 7.2.114 to apply, *mṛj* must be followed by a suffix.

evaṃ tarhīhānye vaiyākaraṇā mṛjer ajādau saṃkrame vibhāṣā vṛddhim ārabhante |
parimṛjanti parimārjanti; parimṛjantu parimārjantu; parimamṛjatuḥ parimamārjatuḥ
ityādyartham | (MBh I.48.9f.)

So then on this topic other grammarians optionally[112] introduce vṛddhi for *mṛj* when a *saṃkrama* (suffix) beginning with a vowel follows so as to account for forms like the following: *parimṛjanti* or *parimārjanti*, "They wipe all around." *parimṛjantu* or *parimārjantu*, "May they wipe all around!" *parimamṛjatuḥ* or *parimamārjatuḥ*, "The two of them have wiped all around."

In giving the opinion of these other grammarians, Patañjali appears to have partially reproduced their original wording by including the otherwise unattested[113] technical term *saṃkrama*, which must have been sufficiently well-known at the time to require no further explanation. The authors of the KV are the first to explain that it refers to what prohibits guṇa and vṛddhi substitution,[114] i.e., suffixes marked with *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ*. These other grammarians simply make an addition to the A and offer no in-house derivation. Patañjali responds to these grammarians that, sure, the forms must be accounted for, but we can do so in a more Pāṇinian fashion. His proposal is as follows:

tad ihāpi sādhyam | tasmin sādhye yogavibhāgaḥ kariṣyate | mṛjer vṛddhir aco bha-
vati | tato 'ci kṅiti | ajādau ca kṅiti mṛjer vṛddhir bhavati | parimārjanti parimārjantu |
kimartham idam | niyamārtham | ajādāv eva kṅiti nānyatra | kvānyatra mā bhūt |
mṛṣṭaḥ mṛṣṭavān iti | tato vā | vāci kṅiti mṛjer vṛddhir bhavati | parimṛjanti parimār-
janti | parimamṛjatuḥ parimamārjatur iti |

This (the optional forms of *mṛj* with vṛddhi) should be established here (in Pāṇini's grammar) as well. Since it must be established, a rule split will be made.[115] (The resulting rule is:) *mṛjer vṛddhir acaḥ*, "A vṛddhi vowel occurs in place of a vowel of

---

[112]Given the rarity of the forms with vṛddhi — Whitney (1886: 238) notes only *mārjīta* — it is possible that the original authors of this addendum used *vibhāṣā* in the sense "a less preferable option" as suggested by Kiparksty (1979).

[113]All other attestations are direct citations or references to this passage.

[114]KV ad P. 1.1.5 *saṃkramo nāma guṇavṛddhipratiṣedhaviṣayaḥ |* "*What falls within the scope of prohibiting guṇa and vṛddhi goes by the name* saṃkrama. Haradatta KVPada I pp. 83f. gives an etymological gloss on *saṃkrama*: *saṃkrāmato 'pakrāmato guṇavṛddhī asmād iti kṛtvā |* "he takes *saṃkrama* as 'something from which both guṇa and vṛddhi pass over, i.e., depart.'" Dharmakīrti RA II p. 24 seems to be the first to state that it is a *kṅitāṃ prācāṃ saṃjñā*, "A technical term of the old (grammarians) for (suffixes) marked with *K*, *G* or *Ṅ*."

[115]This refers back to a proposal in P. 1.1.3.8 to split P. 7.2.115 *aco ñṇiti* so that *acaḥ* can be combined with P. 7.2.114 and the sūtra will mean: "a vṛddhi vowel occurs in place of a vowel of √*mṛj* (i.e., in place of *ṛ*)." The goal is to eliminate the need for mentioning *vṛddhi* in P. 1.1.3 since P. 7.2.114 is an instance where the *sthānin*, "item to be substituted," is not mentioned in a vṛddhi substitution. Cf. MBh I.47.14–19. Kātyāyana on P. 1.1.3.10, however, rejects this attempt because if the vṛddhi vowel comes in place of an *aC* vowel. Then, the prohibition against vṛddhi substitution made by P. 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca* cannot apply since it only prohibits guṇa and vṛddhi when such vowels occur in place of an *iK* vowel as governed by P. 1.1.3. Patañjali now revives the rule split.

mṛj." Then there is *aci kṅiti*, "when a suffix beginning with a vowel and marked with a *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ* follows."[116] (The new sūtra reads:) *ajādau ca kṅiti mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*, "A vṛddhi vowel occurs in place of (the vowel) of √*mṛj* when a suffix beginning with a vowel and marked with a *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ* follows."[117] (So we obtain the forms:) *parimārjanti* and *parimārjantu.* For what purpose is this (formulation)? In order to restrict. (The vṛddhi substitution) occurs when a suffix marked with a *K* and beginning with a vowel follows, not elsewhere. In which other instance may it not occur? *mṛṣṭaḥ* and *mṛṣṭavān.*[118] Then there is *vā*, "optionally." (The new sūtra is:) *vāci kṅiti mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*, "Vṛddhi-substitution optionally occurs in place of (the vowel) of √*mṛj* when a suffix beginning with a vowel and marked with a *K* or *Ṅ* follows." (So we obtain:) *parimṛjanti* or *parimārjanti*; *parimamṛjatuḥ* or *parimamārjatuḥ.*

Patañjali does not explain in any detail how exactly to arrive at the final form of the sūtra: *vāci kṅiti mṛjer vṛddhiḥ.* The words *vāci kṅiti* should probably be understood as his own addition. The difficulty in gathering these words from other sūtras of the A can be seen in the *Chāyā* of Pāyaguṇḍe (a student of Nāgeśa in the 18th cent.[119]) on Nāgeśa's *Uddyota*, itself a commentary on Kaiyaṭa's *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa.* Here Pāyaguṇḍe explains that Patañjali has given an *apūrvaṃ vacanam*, "new statement,"[120] and that Nāgeśa has said that *aci* alone is Patañjali's own word because he wished to indicate the disagreement among those who strive to pluck the words *vāci kṅiti* from other sūtras.[121] Their reasoning, Pāyaguṇḍe states, is as follows:

> *apekṣāto 'dhikāraḥ iti nyāyena āto ṅitaḥ ity ato vibhaktivipariṇatasya ṅitaḥ ity asya, aci ra ṛtaḥ ity ato 'cīty asya, jarāyā ity ato 'nyatarasyām ity asyānuvṛttyā kiti ca ity asyāpakarṣeṇa ca tādṛśārthalābha iti vadatsu …* (MBhPra vol. I p. 193a, fn. 6)

> Among those who argue that such a meaning can be obtained by the following: According to the maxim, "heading rules are (employed) based on necessity,"[122] by means

---

[116]This seems to be an addition proposed by Patañjali, although one could, rather dubiously, obtain these elements from other rules, as Pāyaguṇḍe shows. See below.

[117]Patañali presumably drops *acaḥ* since it is not properly part of the rule. Nāgeśa notes, MBhPra vol. I p. 193a, that the only statement (*vacana*) is *aci*; the addition of *ādau* comes automatically by the metarule PŚ 33. See Kielhorn (1960: 168–170).

[118]Both suffixes, *Kta* and *KtavatU* are marked with a *K* but do not begin with a vowel so there can be no vṛddhi substitution at all. Note that with this formulation we no longer need to worry about whether or not the prohibition against guṇa and vṛddhi substitution by P. 1.1.5 applies since "suffix beginning with a vowel" has now been added as a condition for vṛddhi.

[119]Cf. Coward & Kunjunni Raja (1990: 357).

[120]MBhPra vol. I p. 193a, fn. 6: *aci kṅiti vā ity evāpūrvaṃ vacanaṃ mṛjeḥ iti sūtrād agre pāṭhyam ity arthaḥ* | "Only *aci kṅiti vā* is the new statement that should be recited first after the sūtra P. 7.2.114 *mṛjeḥ.*"

[121]MBhPra vol. I p. 193a, fn. 6: … *tādṛśārthalābha iti vadatsu asaṃgatiṃ sūcayann āha acīty eveti* | "In order to point out the disagreement among those who argue that such a meaning can be obtained (scil. *aci kṅiti vā*), Nāgeśa says 'only *aci* is Patañjali's statment.'" What occurs in the ellipsis I will explain presently.

[122]The *paribhāṣā* occurs as sūtra in Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, SKĀv 1.2.65, and as *Nyāyasaṃgraha* 12

138

of the continuation of *ṅitaḥ* with a change of case from P. 7.2.81 and of *aci* from P. 7.2.100, and of *anyantarasyām* (= *vā*, "optionally") from 7.2.101, as well as by attraction of *kiti* from P. 7.2.118.

The same information may be presented in a clearer format as follows:

1. *ṅiti* from P. 7.2.81 *āto ṅitaḥ*, with a change of case (*vibhaktivipariṇata*).

2. *aci* from P. 7.2.100 *aci ra ṛtaḥ*.

3. *vā* (i.e., optionality) from P. 7.2.101 *jarāyā jaro 'nyatarasyām*.[123]

4. *kiti* from P. 7.2.118 *kiti ca*.

The first elements are got by *anuvṛtti*, "continuation," while the fourth is obtained from a later sūtra by *ākārṣa*, "attraction." Pāyaguṇḍe notes all this to validate Patañjali's additions to the rule in his own words and not through an extended hunt and peck as others have done. Jinendrabuddhi, for example, explains the presence of optionality by allowing *anyatarasyām* to hop from P. 7.2.100 into the sūtra by *maṇḍūkaplutinyāya*, "the maxim of the frog leap," a type of *anuvṛtti* commentators invoke when a word "hops" over an intermediate rule into another.[124] However we obtain these elements, Patañjali has effectively incorporated an observation of other grammarians in Pāṇinian terminology, defended Kātyāyana's rule split of P. 7.2.115, and altered P. 7.2.114 in such a way that *vṛddhi* is no longer needed in P. 1.1.3. The next question is: how do later grammarians respond to this proposal and how does it help to clarify Bhāmaha's position.

3.4.2.2 The Non-Pāṇinians on *mārjanti*

After the *Mahābhāṣya* later grammarians incorporate the optional forms of *mṛj* with vṛddhi into their works, be they non-Pāṇinian grammars or commentators on Pāṇini's sūtras. Usually this

---

of Hemacandra according to the tabulation in Abhyankar (1967: 468f.). In both cases the singular *adhikāraḥ* is used. Bhoja's commentator, Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha, explains the rules as follows: *lakṣyeṣu lakṣaṇapravṛttāv arthitam apekṣā | ekatropāttasyānyatra vyāpāro 'dhikāraḥ | so 'pekṣayā hetubhūtayā bhavati |* "*apekṣā*, 'expectancy,' is what is required in applying the rules for the target forms. An *adhikāra*, 'heading,' is the employment of what has been mentioned in one place in another place. It occurs with *apekṣā*, 'expectancy,' as its cause."

[123]*anyatarasyām* is another word for "optionally." *vā* often replaces the longer *vibhāṣā* and *anyatarasyām* in reformulation of Pāṇinian rules.

[124]KVNyāsa I p. 86 *anyantarasyāṃgrahaṇaṃ ca maṇḍūkaplutinyāyenānuvartate*, "and mention of *anyantarasyām* continues by the maxim of the frog leap." Jinendrabuddhi does not seem interested in accounting for the other added words.

rule follows immediately upon the general rule for vṛddhi substitution in *mṛj*, although Vopadeva combines them into one in his *Mugdhabodha*. Below I give the rules in select non-Pāṇinian schools in roughly chronological order:

1. *Cāndravyākaraṇa*

   - CV 6.1.1 *mṛjer āt* (*ataḥ*)[125] || "A long *ā* occurs (in place of the short *a*) of √*mṛj*."

     The sūtra has a different formulation in part because the CV does not avail itself of technical terms (*saṃjñā*s).[126] For instance, there is neither *vṛddhi* or *guṇa* as technical terms. Like in the A, a suffix will generally cause guṇa-strengthening of a final *iK* vowel by CV 6.2.1 and of a medial light vowel by CV 6.2.4 when a suffix follows. In this case, the *ṛ* is first replaced by *a* with *r* added automatically by CV 1.1.15, so we get *marj*. Then, by the present sūtra the *a* in *marj* is replaced by *ā*, so we get *mārj*. The *Kātantra* follows the same procedure. See below.

   - CV 6.1.2 *ṛto 'ci vā* (*mṛjer āt*) || "(A long *ā*) optionally occurs in place of the short *ṛ* (of *mṛj*) when a suffix beginning with a vowel follows."

     The formulation necessarily refers to suffixes that do not cause guṇa-strengthening since the substitution is in place of *ṛ* not *a* as above. Candragomin did not adopt Pāṇini's method of marking the *apit sārvadhātuka* suffixes with Ṅ, but rather formulated CV 6.2.8, which teaches that personal endings (*tiṄ*) and endings marked with a Ś, excepting those marked with a P and those of the precative (*āśirliṅ*), do not cause guṇa-substitution.

2. *Jainendravyākaraṇa*

   - JV 5.2.1 *mṛjer aip* || "There is an *aip* (= vṛddhi) vowel in place of an *iK* vowel of the base *mṛj*."

     aip is the technical term for vṛddhi by JV 1.1.15 *ādaig aip*. The JV also has an equivalent

---

[125]Supplied from CV 5.4.175.

[126]Recall the commentary ad CV 2.2.68: *candropajñam asaṃjñākaṃ vyākaraṇam*, "the grammar taught by Candra is without technical terms."

of *aṅga*, namely *gu* defined in JV 1.2.102. The present sūtra falls within the scope of JV 4.4.1 *goḥ* = P. 6.4.1 *aṅgasya* with the same implications.

- JV 5.2.2 *kṅity aci vā* (*mṛjer aip*) ‖ "There is optionally (a vṛddhi vowel in place of an *iK* of the base √*mṛj*) when a suffix marked with a *K* or *Ṅ* follows and begins with a vowel."

3. *Kātantra*

- Kā 3.8.23 *marjo mārjiḥ* ‖ "In place of *marj* there is *mārj*."
  The Kā has employed the same method as the CV albeit with a bit more prolixity. The idea is that there is the general rule, Kā 3.5.2 *nāminaś copadhāyā laghoḥ*, that suffixes cause guṇa-strengthening of a medial light vowel, so we get *marj* only when a suffix has been added. The present sūtra then automatically replaces all instances of *marj* with *mārj*.

- *Durgavṛtti*: *aguṇe svare vā vaktavyam: parimārjanti, parmṛjanti* | "It must be stated that (*mārj*) optionally occurs (in place of √*mṛj*[127]) when a suffix that does not cause guṇa-substitution and begins with a vowel follows."

4. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*

- SKBhv 7.1.1 *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ* ‖ "There is vṛddhi in place of the *iK* vowel of √*mṛj* (when a suffix follows)."

- SKBhv 7.1.2 *ṛto 'ci vā* ‖ "There is optionally (vṛddhi) in place of the *ṛ* (of √*mṛj*) when a suffix beginning with a vowel follows."
  The commentary on this sūtra is not available, so my translation is somewhat tentative.

5. *Siddhahemacandraśabdānuśāsana*

- SHŚ 4.3.42 *mṛjo 'sya vṛddhiḥ* ‖ "There is vṛddhi in place of the *a* of √*mṛj*."

---

[127]We need to understand *mṛjeḥ* and not *marjaḥ* by force of the context, as Durgasiṃha points out in his *Ṭīkā ad loc.*: *mṛjer iti sambandho 'rthavaśāt.*

Similar to the CV, vṛddhi substitution takes place after the ṛ of mṛj has been replaced by √ar.

- SHŚ 4.3.43 ṛtaḥ svare vā ǁ "There is optionally vṛddhi in place of the short ṛ (of √mṛj) when a suffix beginning with a vowel follows."

6. *Mugdhabodhavyākaraṇa*

- MV 694 (9.25, *adādiprakaraṇa*) *mṛjo 'kaṅiti vrir vā tv acy aṇau* ǁ "There is a vṛddhi vowel in place of the vowel of √mṛj when a suffix not marked with a *K* or *Ṅ* follows, but optionally when a suffix beginning with a vowel and not causing guṇa-substitution follows."

  aṇau is the loc. sing. of aṇu, "a suffix which does not cause ṇu substitution." ṇu is the technical term for guṇa as defined in MV 1.6. Just as in the A., the *anubandha* Ṅ is extended to the personal endings not marked with a *P* by MV 8.5.

7. *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*

- SārV II.152 *mṛjer guṇanimitte pratyaye pare vṛddhir vācyā kiti ṅiti svare vā* |
  "*vṛddhi* must be said to occur in place of (the vowel) of √mṛj when a suffix that causes guṇa follows, optionally when a suffix marked with a *K* or *Ṅ* and beginning with a vowel follows."

Of note is that each of these grammars adopts the wording of Patañjali (not that of the other grammarians) *mutatis mutandis* to account for the peculiarities of each system. This will contrast with what we find in the commentaries on the A.

During the course of the first half of the first millennium the descriptive grammar, the *lakṣaṇa*, of Sanskrit reached a certain stability and codification. Within and without the Pāṇinian tradition this process involved the incorporation of the *upasaṅkhyāna*s, "addenda," and *iṣṭi*s, "desiderata," found in the *Mahābhāṣya* into a unified text, most often a commentary in the Pāṇinian tradition, but as Kielhorn (1887b) has shown, the sūtras themselves underwent occasional modifications as well. Although the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* offers a great deal of insight into these developments, the

Kāśikāvṛtti arrives on the scene as not only the first commentary on the entire A., but also the first indication within the Pāṇinian school as to how and which updates were to be incorporated into one systematized textual body of knowledge. Despite the questions surrounding the KV's sources[128] and its exact authorship, the KV had a lasting impact on the Pāṇinian tradition, and we shall begin our investigation into √*mrj* there. The goal will be to see how the text of the MBh was worked into these commentaries and explained.

As yet, we have seen the discussion of *mārjanti/mrjanti* coming under P. 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī* in the MBh and given as a vārtt. on P. 7.2.114 *mrjer vṛddhiḥ* by the modern commentators on the BhKA. The KV, however, finds still a third place to discuss the addition: under P. 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*. I have explained this sūtra in brief above as being responsible for blocking guṇa and vṛddhi substitution when they would otherwise be expected.[129] After giving examples of suffixes marked with each of the three *anubandha*s, we find the following statement:

> *mrjer ajādau saṃkrame vibhāṣā vṛddhir iṣyate | saṃkramo nāma guṇavṛddhipratiṣedhaviṣayaḥ | parimrjanti parimārjanti; parimrjantu parimārjantu |* (KV ad P. 1.1.5)

> It is accepted that there is a vṛddhi vowel in place of (the vowel in) √*mrj* when a *saṃkrama* (suffix) beginning with a vowel follows. (A suffix) which has scope in prohibiting guṇa and vṛddhi is named *saṃkrama*.

The reader will note right away that the authors of the KV have chosen the wording of the other grammarians for the *iṣṭi* and not Patañjali's own, more economical phrasing *vāci kṅiti*. This contrasts with all the non-Pāṇinian grammars we have seen who adopt Patañjali's words to their respective systems. The KV has rather chosen to preserve the original citation in the MBh even though Patañjali's own words could easily have been quoted as they are simply a more Pāṇinian way of saying the same. For this we may offer the following reasoning. The KV will relocate a vārtt. or addition stated under one sūtra in the MBh to a different sūtra, if it contextually makes

---

[128]Bronkhorst (2002: 185) has taken the rather extreme view that "it [is] a priori improbable that the Kāśikā … should have as a major source a text like the Cāndra-vyākaraṇa" on the basis that it belongs to another grammatical school and the CV is never mentioned in the KV. The idea is presented also in an earlier publication Bronkhorst (1983: 379–382) and further argued in Bronkhorst (2004), but the evidence in the latter merely supports the existence of other commentaries prior to the KV. I, as well as others, remain more open to its influence and find some of Bronkhorst's arguments do not necessarily lead to his conclusions. See Oberlies (1996) and Aussant (2011).

[129]The exact gloss of the KV is: *kṅinnimitte ye guṇavṛddhī prāpnutas te na bhavataḥ |* "The guṇa and vṛddhi (vowels) which obtain because of a suffix marked with a *K*, *G* or *Ṅ*, do not occur."

better sense under the other sūtra.[130] For the optional vṛddhi forms of √*mṛj* one might have expected the KV to make the addition after or within P. 7.2.114 like the non-Pāṇinian grammars, but instead the authors followed the logic that the addition is in fact a modification of how to apply P. 1.1.5, i.e., it allows for vṛddhi when it should be blocked by the presence of a suffix marked with a *K* etc. This is clear from the larger context within the MBh where Kātyāyana in P. 1.1.3.7 and Patañjali thereon propose that the purpose of *vṛddhi* in P. 1.1.3 is for a later sūtra, namely P. 1.1.5. Therefore, from a systemic and metalinguistic point of the view, a statement about the optional vṛddhi forms of √*mṛj* belongs to P. 1.1.5 and not to the rule that enjoins vṛddhi for √*mṛj* generally, P. 7.2.114. A further justification for the location and wording of the *iṣṭi* in the KV is that the authors often distinguish between *vārttika*s and *iṣṭi*s made by Kātyāyana and Patañjali and the additions Patañjali attributes to others. This habit is lost in the later tradition.[131] The present case is somewhat of a mixed bag insofar as the initial observation stems from other grammarians, possibly of another school, but Patañjali goes on to accept and adopt the addendum to Pāṇinian phrasing. In a corresponding manner, the KV uses the rather neutral *iṣyate*, "is accepted," and retains the original wording with the non-Pāṇinian term *saṃkrama*. The KV, therefore, keeps the original foreignness of the statement as presented in the MBh but has relocated it to P. 1.1.5 because, at a systemic level, the addition requires a modification of how the *anubandha*s *K*, etc. operate. As we will now see, the later tradition, heavily dominated by the need for *prakriyā*s, "derivations," and moving away from the MBh, makes further adjustments.[132]

---

[130]In addition to the present example, I have noted P. 2.1.69.8 is moved to P. 2.1.60 in the KV, P. 2.2.8.2 to P. 2.2.9 in the KV, P. 3.4.89.1 to P. 3.4.86 in the KV, and P. 6.2.93.1 to P. 2.2.9 in the KV. There are surely more examples, but I do not know of a complete list or a study on the topic.

[131]Compare the MBh on P. 3.1.11, P. 4.1.39, P. 6.1.36, and P. 6.1.166 with the KV for just a few examples. If we look at P. 3.1.11 *kartuḥ kyaṅ salopaś ca*, which prescribes the suffix *KyaṄ* after a noun to indicate that the agent behaves like the said noun, we find that Kātyāyana's third vārtt., *ācāre galbhaklībahoḍebhyaḥ kvib vā*, is reproduced in the KV vebatim (except *avaglabh-* for *galbha-* under the influence of Patañjali's examples *avagalbhate*, etc.) plus *vaktavyaḥ*, "the suffix must be stated," as is characteristic of Patañjali's gloss on a vārtt., whereas the addition that Patañjali gives under *apara āha*, "another person says," is attributed to "some" (*ity eke*) in the KV. Observe that in the *Siddhāntakaumudī* both the vārtt. and the opinion of some are formulated identically with *vaktavyaḥ*.

[132]Puruṣottamadeva (12th cent.) alone follows the KV in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti* ad P. 1.1.5.

3.4.2.3 The Later Pāṇinians on *mārjanti*

Beginning with *Rūpāvatāra* (RA) of Dharmakīrti (10th cent., not to be confused with the much earlier philosopher), a series of commentaries emerged on the A that sought to explain the rules of Pāṇini in a fashion more conducive to *prakriyā*s, "derivations." To achieve this end, the commentators rearranged Pāṇini's rules so that the derivation of a particular form or class of forms could be learned comfortably in a single lesson and without the anxiety of wondering what rule should apply next (for the most part). Although the RA is the first grammar where this process is put down in writing, since the derivation of words was always the main purpose of the A, we can safely assume that a similar pedagogical method existed before Dharmakīrti's work.[133] In accordance with this principle, the rules needed for forming the present tense of √*mrj* are gathered in a single section with the heading *atha adādau lugvikaraṇe laṭ*, "now the present tense among the *adādi*, 'root-class' (verbs) whose class sign is elided." The first rule is P. 2.4.72 *adādibhyo śapaḥ*, "there is (*luk*) elision of *ŚaP* after the roots *ad* etc."[134] When we come to √*mrj* we find the following:[135]

> *mrjūṣ śuddhau | mrjer vrddhiḥ | mrjer aṅgasyeko vrddhir bhavati | guṇasyāpavādaḥ | raparatvam | vraścādinā ṣatvam | ṣṭutvam | mārṣṭi, mrṣṭaḥ | mrjer ajādau saṃkrame vibhāṣā vrddhiḥ | saṃkrama iti guṇavrddhipratiṣedhaviṣaye kṅitāṃ prācāṃ saṃjñā | mārjanti, mrjanti | mārkṣi, mrṣṭaḥ, mrṣṭha | mārjmi, mrjvaḥ, mrjmaḥ |*

mrjŪṢ in the meaning "cleansing."[136] There is vrddhi in place of (the vowel of) √*mrj*.[137] Vrddhi occurs in place of an *iK* vowel of the base √*mrj*. This sets aside guṇa-substitution. There is the following *r*.[138] (By the rule) beginning with *vraśca* etc.[139] there is the retroflexion of *s* and the dentals.[140] (So we obtain the forms:) *mārṣṭi*, "S/he wipes." *mrṣṭaḥ*, "The two wipe." There is optionally vrddhi of √*mrj* when a *saṃkrama* (suffix)

---

[133]The *Nyāsa* often gives somewhat detailed derivations for the examples in the KV.

[134]RA II p. 16)

[135]In the following quotations I have mostly followed the punctuation and layout of the editions used. The text of the RA in the printed edition only puts the sūtra numbers in parentheses. I have in this instance, left out all numbering in the Sanskrit text so as to give a better feel for how the original read.

[136]KṣDhP II.67 = MDhP II.56.

[137]P. 7.2.114 *mrjer vrddhiḥ*.

[138]Reference is to P. 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ* whereby an *r* automatically follows an *a, i* or *u* vowel of any length that replaces *r*.

[139]P. 8.2.36 *vraśca-bhrasja-srja-mrja-yaja-rāja-bhrāja-cchaśāṃ ṣaḥ*, whereby the final consonant of particular roots, including √*mrj*, is replaced by *ṣ* when a consonant, excluding the semivowels, save *l*, and the nasals, follows.

[140]P. 8.4.41 *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ*.

follows and it begins with a vowel. *saṃkrama* is a technical term of the ancients in the meaning of (a suffix) within the scope of preventing guṇa and vṛddhi. (So we have the forms:) *mārjanti* or *mṛjanti*, "They wipe." *mārkṣi*, "You (sing.) wipe."[141] *mṛṣṭaḥ*, "You two wipe." *mṛṣṭha*, "You (pl.) wipe." *mārjmi*, "I wipe." *mṛjvaḥ*, "We two wipe." *mṛjmaḥ*, "We wipe."

Dharmakīrti has stripped away all theoretical explanations and mainly focused on how the rules apply and what effects they have on their input. In the present section he presents the present tense paradigm of several verbal roots and the rules necessary to derive them. When the rules have not yet been taught he cites them, otherwise he gives a brief reference to them. As such, it makes most sense to mention the optional vṛddhi forms of √*mṛj* in combination with P. 7.2.114 and in particular when he arrives at the third person singular plural. This contradicts with the reasoning of the KV noted above. Here application trumps theory. The addition cited in the RA also retains the exact wording of the other grammarians as we have seen in both the MBh and the KV, i.e., with the foreign term *saṃkrama* and the use of *ajādau* instead of *aci*.

The *Rūpamālā* (RM) of Vimalasarasvatī (14th cent.[142] is the next rearrangement of Pāṇini's grammar after the *Rūpāvatāra* and we begin to notice subtle shifts. Much like RA, the RM has a section that deals primarily with the vagaries of the present system, although he abandons the narrative style of Dharmakīrti and rather comments on specific sūtras with fewer signposts for the necessary rules leading to the derivation at hand. The exposition of √*mṛj* is as follows:

mṛjūṣ śūddhau |

221. *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ* || 7 | 2 | 114 ||

guṇāpavādaḥ | *vraścādinā ṣatvam* | *mārṣṭi* | *mṛṣṭaḥ* | *mṛjer ajādau kṅiti vā vṛddhir iṣyate* | *mārjanti* | *mṛjanti vā* |

KṣDhP II.57 √*mṛj* in the sense of cleansing.

P. 7.2.114 (RM 221) vṛddhiḥ (in place of the *iK* vowel) of (the stem) √*mṛj*.

[141]The change of *j* to *g* by P. 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ* has already been taught in the *vibhakti-avatāra* on RA I p. 98 (note this blocks P. 8.2.36), the change of *s* to *ṣ* by P. 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* is given in the *sandhi-avatāra* on RA I p. 28, and finally the change of *g* to *k* by P. 8.4.55 *khari ca* is to be found on RA I pp. 18 & 20, also in the *sandhi-avatāra*. These three rules must apply in this order as the output of a later rule cannot feed into a previous rule in the last three *pāda*s of the A. Cf. P. 8.2.1 *purvatrāsiddham*.
[142]Cf. Scharfe (1977: 174).

This sets aside guṇa-substitution. By P. 8.2.36 *vraśca-*, etc. there is *ṣ*. (So we obtain:) *mārṣṭi*, "S/he wipes." *mṛṣṭaḥ*, "They two wipe." Vṛddhi is optionally desired in place of (the vowel) of √*mṛj* when a suffix beginning with a vowel and marked *K*, *G* or *Ṅ* follows. (So we obtain:) *mārjanti* or *mṛjanti*, "They wipe."

This is all familiar from the RA, but the wording of the option for vṛddhi has begun to change and we approach something like Patañjali's final formulation. The old technical term *saṃkrama* has been replaced with its Pāṇinian equivalent *kṅiti*, and the clunky *vibhāṣā* has been slimmed down to *vā*, just as Patañjali penned them. The word *iṣyate* is also introduced as in the KV. What remains is *ajādau*, "(a suffix) that begins with a vowel." As noted above, the word *ādi* is superfluous within the Pāṇinian system because of a *paribhāṣā* (PŚ 33) that informs us that *aci* alone, because it's in the loc. case and modifying a suffix, indicates that the following suffix begins with a vowel.[143] It is not entirely clear why this last bit from the other grammarians' phrasing has remained. It will, however, be eliminated in the following phase.

A few centuries prior to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī*, the *Prakriyākaumudī* (PK) of Rāmacandra (14th/15th cent.) was the dominant recast of Pāṇini's grammar with learned commentaries by Viṭṭhala and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Bhaṭṭoji's own teacher. This work likewise abandons the more narrative style of the RA and gives fewer examples, but the explanations are usually quite similar to what we find in the KV. On P. 7.2.114 Rāmacandra has the following to say:

mṛjer vṛddhiḥ ‖ 7 | 2 | 114 ‖

mṛjer iko vṛddhiḥ syāt sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ ‖ *guṇāpavādaḥ* | *vraśca iti ṣaḥ* | *mārṣṭi* | *kṅiti ca iti na vṛddhiḥ* | *mṛṣṭaḥ* | *kṅity aci mṛjer vṛddhir veṣyate* | *mṛjanti* | *mārjanti* | *mārkṣi* | *mṛjyāt* | *māṣṭu* | *mṛjantu* | *mārjantu* | *mṛḍḍhi* |

P. 7.2.114 vṛddhi in place of √*mṛj*.

There should be a vṛddhi vowel in place of the *iK* vowel of √*mṛj* when a *sārvadhā-tuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* suffix follows (P. 7.3.86). This puts aside guṇa-substitution. By P. 8.2.36 *vraśca* ... there is *ṣ*. By P. 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca* there is not vṛddhi. (So we obtain the

---

[143]I have tried to capture at least the essence of the *paribhāṣā*. The full meaning is somewhat more complex. Kielhorn's translation is as follows: "When a term which denotes a letter is exhibited (in a rule) in (the form of) the Locative case (and qualifies something else which likewise stands in the Locative case, that which is qualified it must be regarded as) beginning with the letter (which is denoted by the term in question, and not as ending with it)." Kielhorn (1960: 168f.)

form:) *mṛṣṭaḥ*,[144] "wiped." vṛddhi is optionally accepted in place of (the *iK* vowel) of √*mṛj* when a suffix marked with *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ* and beginning with a vowel follows. (So we obtain either) *mṛjanti* (or) *mārjanti*, "They wipe." *mārkṣi*, "You (sing.) wipe." *mṛjyāt*, "One should wipe." *māṣṭu*, "May one wipe!" *mṛjantu* (or) *mārantu*, "May they wipe!" *mṛḍḍhi*, "Wipe!"

We at least reach the wording, even if in a slightly different order, of Patañjali (*vāci kṅiti mṛjer vṛddhir bhavati*) with the addition of *iṣyate* from the KV.

The final and now most widely studied text of the Pāṇinian tradition is the *Siddhāntakaumudī* (SK) of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīta (16th). His commentary's relatively short and sweet:

1142 *mṛjū śuddhau*

2472 | *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ* | 7 | 2 | 114 | *mṛjer iko vṛddhiḥ syād dhātupratyaye pare* ‖ *kṅity ajādau veṣyate* ‖ *vraśca iti ṣaḥ* | *mārṣṭi* | *mṛṣṭaḥ* | *mṛjanti, mārjanti* | *mamārja* | *mamārjatuḥ mamṛjatuḥ* | (etc.)[145]

DhP 1142 [= KṣDhP II.57] *mṛj* in the sense of "wiping."

P. 7.2.114 (=SK 2472) Vṛddhi occurs in place of the *iK* vowel of √*mṛj* when a root-suffix follows.[146] It (scil. vṛddhi) is optionally desired when (a suffix) marked with a *K*, *G* or *Ṅ* and beginning with a vowel follows. By P. 8.2.36 *vraśca*-, etc. there is *ṣ*. *mārṣṭi*, "wipes." *mṛṣṭaḥ*, "They two wipe." *mṛjanti* or *mārjanti*, "They wipe." *mamārja*, "S/he wiped." *mamārjatuḥ mamṛjatuḥ*, "They two wiped."

Bhaṭṭoji, in a rather surprising turn of events, reverts back to the phrasing found in the RM, minus the word "vṛddhi" which can be understood from context. It is unclear why he chose to reintroduce *ajādi* after it was properly deleted in the PK.[147] In any case, we have finally arrived at the formulation of the vārtt. cited in the modern commentaries on the BhKA.

---

[144] √*mṛj* + *Kta.*

[145] I have left out the remaining forms as they are not relevant.

[146] The reason Bhaṭṭoji includes the term *dhātupratyaya*, "root-suffix," refers back to the discussion in the MBh ad P. 7.2.144. The issue at hand is whether √*mṛj* refers simply to the root, or can we also understand *KviP* derivatives from √*mṛj*, i.e., an agent noun with a null suffix like *kaṃsa-parimṛj*, "one who rubs outs Kaṃsa," where the final element is identical to the root. If so, then we would expect vṛddhi strengthening. Although Kātyāyana raises and defends this idea, Patañjali comes to Pāṇini's rescue and notes that we can exclude such instances by a *jñāpaka*, "hint," namely the listing of *bhrauṇahatya* as an irregular form in P. 6.4.124. See Kielhorn (1960: 428–230) for a full explanation.

[147] Haradatta (KVPad I p. 86) suggested that *ādi* was not redundant because it indicated that only those suffixes that originally (*mukhya*) began with a vowel were to be taken into consideration and not their substitutes. This proposal, however, is not tenable, since Patañjali quotes the examples *mamārjatuḥ* (MBh I.48.7), in which the suffix *tas* is replaced by *atur* by P. 3.4.82. Nāgeśa expressly refutes this idea as well. See MBhPra I p. 193.

Before returning at long last to Bhāmaha after this detour through the forest of grammar, I would like summarize the results of this journey and highlight a few important points about the development of the Pāṇinian tradition. The two main points of interest have been the wording of the addendum and the sūtra to which is has been attached. The creators of the non-Pāṇinian grammars had the simple option of either adding another sūtra to the main body of the text or incorporating the optional vṛddhi forms into a single sūtra. The Pāṇinians, on the other hand, had to decide both the exact wording of the addition and where it best belonged. The KV relocated the optional vṛddhi to P. 1.1.5 because of the effects it has on the *anubandhas* K etc. Puruṣottamadeva followed suit. The authors of the *kaumudī*-style grammars chose, according to their focus on derivations, to place it alongside the general rule for creating the vṛddhi forms of √*mṛj*, P. 7.2.114. The wording of the addition, however, shows a variety of fluctuation from the RA to the SK. The shift from the original wording of the other grammarians to Patañjali's own words (for the most part) highlights the increasing authority that Patañjali enjoyed throughout the later tradition.

Bhāmaha clearly accepted the added option for vṛddhi in the paradigm of √*mṛj* since Patañjali gave it his blessing. I assume, however, that he would have preferred the simple addition as apposed to the tortured attempt to extract the needed words from the text as we saw in Pāyaguṇḍa's *Chāyā*. Still, the restriction to the vṛddhi forms *causa pulchritudinis* rings shallow. I would suggest, rather, that Bhāmaha is following the lead of Pāṇini and suggesting poets make use of vṛddhi in √*mṛj* because such a form would increase prosperity. That certain grammatical forms can bring more benefit than others finds expression in a verse from the *Mahābhāṣya* ad P. 3.1.48.1:

> *nākam iṣṭasukhaṃ yānti suyuktair vaḍavārathaiḥ |*
> *atha patkāṣiṇo yānti ye 'cīkamatabhāṣiṇaḥ ||* (MBh II.55.4.f.)

> They go to heaven, the longed for happiness, with well-yoked chariots (drawn) by mares. Now those who say *acīkamata*, they go by foot.

The context is how to build the aorist of the root √*kam*, "to desire," all the details of which need not detain us. The gist is that the first vārtt. ad P. 3.1.48[148] allows for the suffix *CaṄ*, the sign of

---

[148]P. 3.1.48.1 *ṇiśridrusruṣu kamer upasaṃkhyānam* | "among roots ending in *Ṇi*, as well as √*śri*, √*dru*, and √*sru*, there is the further addition of √*kam*."

the reduplicated aorist,[149] to occur after √*kam* even when *ṆiṄ* is suspended by P. 3.1.31.[150] When we add *CaṄ*, there are, then, two possible forms: *acakamata* (without *ṆiṄ*) and *acīkamata* (with *ṆiṄ*).[151]

As for the verse, Kaiyaṭa records two interpretations in his *Pradīpa* (MBhPra vol. III p. 100b). According to the first, both forms are technically correct, but people who say that aorist of √*kam* is *acakamata* have a more luxurious journey to heaven than those who use *acīkamata*. The reason is that one must remember this particular vārtt. (P. 3.1.48.1) in order to form *acakamata*. Such excellence in recollection is dully rewarded, whereas forgetfulness excludes one from a first class ride in a chariot drawn by mares.[152] Others, however, divide the words of the first quarter-verse differently than how I have done in the quotation above. They read: *na akamiṣṭa sukhaṃ*. As Kaiyaṭa explains, this refers to people who say that the aorist of √*kam* is *akamiṣṭa* — an utterly incorrect form — and, consequently, do not go to heaven at all.[153] Returning to the first interpretation, which seems more plausible, Nāgeśa explains that the gist (*tātparya*) of the passage is that one obtains more *dharma*, "merit," by using words whose derivation requires a special rule.[154] Bhāmaha's suggestion to make use of the special option for √*mṛj* can be viewed as following

---

[149]This variety of *luṅ*, "aorist," is mostly associated with the causative or other verbal stems ending in -*aya* in the present. √*kam* builds its present stem, *kāmaya*-, with the suffix *ṆiṄ* by P. 3.1.30.

[150]P. 3.1.31 *āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā* | "When an *ārdhudhātuka* suffix follows, the suffixes *āya*, etc. are optional." *āya*, etc. refers to the three suffixes in P. 3.1.28–30, the last of which is *ṆiṄ*. Without the vartt., *ṆiṄ* would be necessary for the application of P. 3.1.48, i.e., for *CaṄ*.

[151]The difference between the two forms hinges on the application of P. 7.4.93. If applied, the reduplication of the *CaṄ*-aorist will be treated *sanvad*, "like the desiderative," i.e., a radical *a* will be reduplicated with an *i* by P. 7.4.79: *acīkamata*. If not applied, we have normal reduplication of *a* with *a*: *acakamata*. For P. 7.4.93 to apply, *ṆiṄ* must be added to √*kam*.

[152]MBhPra vol. III p. 100b: *yais tu acīkamata ity uktaṃ te patkāṣiṇo yānti lakṣaṇāsmaraṇāt | nindārthavādo 'yaṃ lakṣaṇasmaraṇādarārthaḥ ||* "But those who say (the aorist of √*kam*) is *acīkamata* go on foot because they have forgotten the rule. This statement of derision is for the purpose of showing respect for remembering the rule."

[153]MBhPra vol. III p. 100b: *anye tv āhuḥ akamiṣṭeti yair uktaṃ ta evopacārād akamiṣṭaśabdenānukaraṇaśabdenocyante* | "But others say the following: with the quoted word *akamiṣṭa* those very people who say (the aorist of √*kam*) is *akamiṣṭa* are referred by metaphorical association." The word *akamiṣṭa* should be understood as a sort of nickname for those who use this form. One could imagine a similar situation in (American) English, e.g., encountering George H. W. Bush after 1990 and saying something like "Well, if it isn't Mr. "Read my lips," in reference to his broken campaign promise for no new taxes. The form *akamiṣṭa* is falsely built on analogy with the so-called *iṣ*-aorist as in *apaviṣṭa*, "cleansed." This alternate interpretation is rejected by Nāgeśa as not being in accordance (*ananuguṇa*) with the MBh. Cf. MBhPra vol. III p. 100b.

[154]MBhUd vol. III p. 100b *evaṃ ca sāmānyaśāstrānugatalakṣyaprayogāpekṣayā viśeṣaṇlakṣaṇānugataśabdaprayoge dharmādhikyam ity asya bhāṣyasya tātparyam ||* "And so the gist of this *Bhāṣya* (passage) is that there is additional merit when one uses a word that follows a specific rule as apposed to using a (word) that is described following general instruction (i.e., rules)."

similar logic, and we need not see this as a mere personal opinion for what counts as beautiful language. The use of a special grammatical rule, when a general one would have sufficed, adds something extra to the linguistic content. It reflects the learnedness of the speaker and requires an equally learned audience to be appreciated. Such a display of knowledge is best not viewed as boastful but rather as adding to the aesthetic experience by skilfully playing within the limits of the poetic conventions, a solid mastery of grammar being one of them. Whether or not Bhāmaha also believed that additional merit could be won through the application of special rules is not made explicit in the text itself, but reading the two passages together offers a possible reason for Bhāmaha's preference for the vṛddhi forms of √*mrj*.

3.4.3   Bhāmaha and the *Nyāsakāra*

An important set of verses in the BhKA is 6.36 and 37:

> *śiṣṭaprayogamātreṇa nyāsakāramatena vā* |
> *tṛcā samastaṣaṣṭhīkaṃ na kathaṃcid udāharet* || 6.36 ||
> *sūtrajñāpakamātreṇa vṛtrahantā yathoditaḥ* |
> *akena ca na kurvīta vṛttiṃ tadgamako yathā* || 6.37 || (BhKA)

> Under no circumstances should one use a genitive compound with (a word ending in the suffix) *tṛC*, neither based on the mere usage of the learned nor on the opinion of the author of the *Nyāsa*. (6.36) For example, *vṛtrahantṛ*, "Vṛtra-slayer," has been uttered on the basis of a mere hint within a sūtra. And, one should not make a complex form (*vṛtti*) (i.e., a genitive compound) with (a word ending in the suffix) *aka*, like *tadgamaka*, "it-conveyor, a conveyor of it." (6.37)

Although this verse has been much discussed in the secondary literature because of the reference to a *nyāsakāra*, "the author of the *Nyāsa*," a possible designation for Jinendrabuddhi, I will touch on it once again because a full explanation of the problem is not readily available in English and the history of the debate among later grammarians is of interest for how difficult forms are handled. Let us first lay out the simple facts first. Bhāmaha refers to a prohibition on the formation of genitive compounds with nouns ending in the suffixes *tṛC* and *aka*,[155] which corresponds to

---

[155]The suffix *tṛC* forms generic agent nouns by P. 3.1.133 *ṇvultṛcau*. P. 3.3.169 *arhe kṛtyatṛcaś ca* allows for the added semantic content of "worthy, suitable" to such nouns. The suffix *aka*, on the other hand, represents potentially 8 Pāṇinian suffixes. See Böhtlingk (1887: 181*). Practically speaking, however, we are dealing only with the suffixes

P. 2.2.15 and 16. Let us revisit some of these passages and compare the findings with what we find in the secondary literature, in particular Bronner (2012), as this is the article most scholars of today will have read. I begin simply with the two sūtras P. 2.2.15 and 16 along with the commentary of the KV since this is the commentary Bhāmaha is likely to have known and the work on which Jinendrabuddhi wrote his *Nyāsa*. My translation of the sūtra follows the KV's interpretation.

> P. 2.2.15 *tṛjakābhyāṃ kartari* (*ṣaṣṭhī*[156]) *na*[157].

> [KV] *kartṛgrahaṇaṃ ṣaṣṭhīviśeṣaṇam | kartari yā ṣaṣṭhī sā tṛcākena ca saha na samasyate | bhavataḥ śāyikā | bhavata āsikā | bhavato 'gragāmikā | tṛc kartary eva vidhīyate tatprayoge kartari ṣaṣṭhī nāsti | tasmāt tṛjgrahaṇam uttarārtham |*

> P. 2.2.15 With (words ending in) *tṛC* and *aka* in the sense of an agent (a word in the genitive is not compounded).

> [KV] The mention of the word *kartṛ* (i.e. *kartari*) is a qualification of the genitive. A genitive which occurs in the sense of an agent is not compounded with a (word ending in) either the suffix *tṛC* or *aka*.

> [Examples:]

> Your good sir's turn for repose. Your good sir's turn for sitting. Your good sir's turn for eating first.[158]

> The suffix *tṛC* is enjoined only in the sense of an agent (i.e., it forms only agent nouns). A genitive in the sense of an agent does not occur in connection with it (scil. the suffix *tṛC*). The mention of the suffix *tṛC* is for the following (sūtra).[159]

In sum, if we follow the KV, P. 2.2.15 deals only with the compounding of subjective (*kartari*) genitives with action nouns ending in the suffix *aka* (i.e., *ṆvuC*) and not *tṛC*.

The following sūtra, P. 2.2.16, is the only sūtra that governs the prohibition mentioned by

---

ṆvuL as prescribed in P. 3.1.133 to form agent nouns and *ṆvuC* in P. 3.3.111 *paryāyārhaṇotpattiṣu ṇvuc* to form action nouns with the listed semantic specifications. The sequence *vu* is replaced by *aka* according to P. 7.1.1 *yuvor anākau*.

[156]From P. 2.2.8.

[157]From P. 2.2.10.

[158]As Jindendrabuddhi points out, all of these nouns are formed with the suffix *ṆvuC* in the sense of the action itself (*bhāve*) with the additional meaning *paryāya*, "succession, turn," (= *paripāṭī* according to the KV ad P. 3.3.111) by P. 3.3.111 *paryāyārhaṇotpattiṣu ṇvuc. śāyikā* and *agragrāsikā* are also cited as examples for this sūtra in the KV.

[159]Since an agent noun already expresses the agent of the action, it's impossible to have a genitive in the sense of the agent, i.e., a subjective genitive, for the same action. The same holds true in English. In the phrase "John's writer" "John" cannot be the agent of writing.

Bhāmaha. Once again the text along with the KV is as follows:

P. 2.2.16 *kartari ca* ||

[KV] *kartari ca yau tṛjakau tābhyāṃ saha ṣaṣṭhī na samasyate | sāmarthyād akasya viśeṣaṇārthaṃ kartṛgrahaṇam itaratra vyabhicārābhāvāt | apāṃ sraṣṭā | purāṃ bhettā | vajrasya bhartā | nanu ca bhartṛśabdo 'py*[160] *ayaṃ yājakādiṣu paṭhyate | samband-hiśabdasya patiparyāyasya tatra grahaṇam | akaḥ khalv apy odanasya bhojakaḥ | sak-tūnāṃ pāyakaḥ ||*

P. 2.2.16 And (a noun in the genitive is not compounded with a word ending in the suffixes *tṛC* or *aka*) when they express an agent.

[KV] A genitive is not compounded with (a word ending in the suffixes) *tṛC* or *aka*, which occurs in the sense of an agent. Based on context the mention of *kartṛ* (i.e., *kartari*) is for the purpose of qualifying the suffix *aka* because there is no possibility for deviation (from expressing an agent) in the other (suffix *tṛC*).

[Examples:] Discharger of waters. Breaker of cities. Bearer of the thunderbolt.

Now one could object that this word *bhartṛ* is also listed in the list beginning with *yājaka* (in P. 2.2.11). In that context there is mention of the relationship term, a synonym for *pati*, "husband."[161]

The suffix *aka* as well of course:

[Examples:] Eater of rice. Drinker of gruel.

Only this sūtra, P. 2.2.16, prohibits compounding of agent nouns with a genitive expressing a direct object, i.e., an objective genitive. If we compare this with Bronner (2012: 92), there is a stark disharmony: "*Aṣṭādhyāyī* 2.2.15 (*tṛjābhyāṃ kartari*)—a *sūtra* that literally forbids the compound of agents ending *tṛc* (and *aka*) with objects in the genitive." In footnote 108 on the same page, Bronner adds: "More accurately, the prohibition of a genitive combination with agents in *tṛc* is completed in the following *sūtra* (2.2.16 *kartari ca*)." According to Bronner it is not P. 2.2.16 that

---

[160]I have tentatively changed *hy* of the printed edition to *'py*, i.e., *api*, because *hi*, "for," does not make good sense in the context, whereas *api*, "also," fits the context very well.

[161]P. 2.2.11 lists words formed with *tṛC* and *aka* that can form genitive compounds and among these the word *bhartṛ* is listed. These are exceptions to the present prohibition. The objection is that since the word *bhartṛ* has already been permitted to form genitive compounds, why does *vajrasya bhartā* not form a compound. The solution is that in the *yājaka* list, *bhartṛ* does not denote "bearer," i.e., an agent noun, but rather it is a synonym for *pati*, "husband." Thus, the suffix *tṛC* does not express an agent in the *yājaka* list and therefore does not fall within the scope of the present prohibition.

prohibits the genitive compounds but P. 2.2.15. Why this contradiction?

If we follow the interpretation of these two sūtras throughout the Pāṇinian tradition, most commentators follow the KV, which is the first commentary we have on the sūtra, since neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali comment on them.[162] This includes the *Rūpāvatāra*,[163] the *Durghaṭavṛtti* of Śaraṇadeva,[164] the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva,[165] the *Prakriyākaumudī* of Rāmacandra,[166] and Annambhaṭṭa in his *Mitākṣara*, a running commentary on the A.[167] This interpretation, however, was not universal.[168] Within the Pāṇinian tradition the first to deviate from the KV's explanation appears to one Rāmadeva Miśra, the author of the *Vṛttipradīpa* on the KV,[169] and frequently cited by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (Kerala, early 16th cent.) in his *Prakriyāsārvasva*, who follows Rāmadeva's explanation on these two sūtras. His glosses and examples are as follows:

P. 2.2.15 *tṛjakābhyāṃ kartari* ‖

[*Vyākhyā*] *kartrarthābhyāṃ tṛjakābhyāṃ ṣaṣṭhī na samasyate | purāṃ bhettā | vajrasya bhartā | harer arcakaḥ | janikartuḥ prakṛtiḥ tatprayojako hetuś ca iti sūtroktyā tṛjakayoḥ samāsaniṣedho 'nityaḥ ‖*

---

[162]Kātytāyana and Patañjali do have remarks ad P. 2.2.14 that bear on P. 2.2.15. I will discuss these below.

[163]RA I p. 175 *tṛjakābhyāṃ kartari | kartari yā ṣaṣṭhī sā tṛcākena ca saha na samasyate | apāṃ sraṣṭā, bhavato 'gragāmikā | kartari ca | kartari ca yau tṛjakau tābhyāṃ saha ṣaṣṭhī na samasyate | purāṃ bhettā, odanasya bhojakaḥ |* The glosses are identical to those in the KV. The printed edition includes *apāṃ sraṣṭā* as an example for P. 2.1.15, but this must be an error based on the gloss and the second example given. Without access to the manuscripts, however, I do not wish to make any further speculations.

[164]*Durghaṭavṛtti* ad P. 2.2.16 discusses the same type of forms as Bhāmaha, i.e., agent nouns compounded with objective genitives. This implies that Śaraṇadeva must have understood the sūtras in the same fashion as the KV.

[165]Puruoṣottamadeva gives in essence the same glosses as the KV, although he does specify for P. 2.2.16 that the genitive is *karmaṇi*. This is left out of the other glosses.

[166]The exact wording of the glosses deviates from the KV, although the resulting interpretation and examples are the same. PrKV I p. 506: P. 2.2.15 *tṛjakābhyāṃ kartari | kartari ṣaṣṭhyās tṛjakābhyāṃ na samāsaḥ |* "There is no compounding of a word ending in the sixth case in the sense of an agent with (a word ending in) the suffix *tṛC* or *aka*." On P. 2.2.16: *kartrarthatṛjakābhyāṃ ṣaṣṭhyā na samāsaḥ |* "There is no compounding a word in the genitive (with a word ending in) the suffix *tṛC* or *aka* in the sense of an agent."

[167]I have been unable to find this sūtra in Vimalasarasvatī's *Rūpamālā* despite a very thorough search, and the only printed edition does provide an alphabetical index of the sūtras.

[168]Joshi & Roodbergen (1997: 32–47) discuss the two different interpretations, but they only ascribe the alternative to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. For their translation of the sūtra they prefer to follow Bhaṭṭoji. Sharma (2002: 81–84) also notes the two alternatives and likewise selects a modified version of Bhaṭṭoji's interpretation as his translation. Cardona (1997: 216) is surprisingly vague and mentions only the interpretation of the KV.

[169]The work is partially available in MSS from Kerala and Tamil Nadu, but I have yet to see them. Cf. Venkitasubramonia Iyer (1972: 37f.). Sāyaṇa cites Rāmadeva Miśra at least once by name in his *vṛtti* on the DhP (MDhV p. 80) as repeating Haradatta (*haradattānuvādī rāmadevamiśraḥ*). This would place him around the 13th cent. Cf. NCC IV p. 119.

P. 2.2.15 (A word in the genitive is not compounded with a word ending in) the suffixes *tr̥C* and *aka* in the sense of an agent.

[Commentary] A word ending in the sixth case is not compounded with a word ending in the suffix *tr̥C* or *aka* when they express an agent.

[Examples:] The breaker of cities. The bearer of the lightning-bolt. A worshiper of Hari.

Based on the wording of the sūtras P. 1.4.30 *janikartuḥ prakr̥tiḥ* and 1.4.55 *tatprayojako hetuś ca* the (present) prohibition against compounds with (nouns ending in) *tr̥C* and *aka* is not always valid.

P. 2.2.16 *kartari ca* ‖
kartari ṣaṣṭhy akena na samasyate | bhavataḥ śāyikā | paryāyādau ṇvuc ayam | rāmoktaiva sūtrayor vyākhyā |

P. 2.2.16 and in the sense of an agent.

A word in the genitive case which has an agent as its referent is not compounded with a word ending in the suffix *aka*.

[Example:] Your good sir's turn for reclining. This is the suffix *ṆvuC* by P. 3.3.111 *paryāya*, etc.

(This) explanation of the two sūtras has been stated by Rāma(deva Miśra).

If we look, however, outside of the Pāṇinian tradition, I believe there is even earlier evidence of the alternative interpretation. In his grammar, the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, Bhojadeva (11th) has reworked the two Pāṇinian sūtras, presumably so as to remove the uselessness of mentioning *tr̥C* in P. 2.2.15 and to clarify other doubts the sūtras might give rise to. Furthermore, and of most relevance to the present case, his reworking of P. 2.2.15 along with Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha's commentary, the *Hr̥dayahāriṇī*, thereon reflect the same interpretation we find in the *Prakriyāsārvasva*. They are together:

SKĀv 3.2.144 *kartary akena* ‖

[*Hr̥dayahāriṇī*] *kartari yā ṣaṣṭhī sā akapratyayāntena saha na samasyate | bhavata āsikā | bhavataḥ śāyikā | bhavato gāmikā | kartarīti kim | ikṣubhikṣikāṃ me dhārayasi ‖*

SKĀv 3.2.144 With *aka* in the sense of the agent.

155

[Commentary] A word ending in the genitive case, which expresses an agent, is not compounded with a word ending in the suffix *aka*.

[Examples:] Your good sir's turn for sitting. Your good sir's turn for reclining. Your good sir's turn for going.

Why "in sense of the agent"? [Observe:] You support my sugarcane-eating.

SKĀv 3.2.145 *kartṛtṛjakābhyām* ||

[*Hṛdayahāriṇī*] *kartari yau tṛjakau tābhyāṃ saha ṣaṣṭhī na samsayate | apāṃ sraṣṭā | purāṃ bhettā | odanasya bhojakaḥ | saktūnāṃ pāyakaḥ* ||

SKĀv 3.2.144 With agentive *tṛC* and *aka*.

[Commentary] The sixth case is not compounded with (a word ending in either of) the two suffixes *tṛC* or *aka*, which express an agent.

[Examples:] The releaser of the waters. The breaker of cities. The eater of rice. The drinker of gruel.

Although the end result is the same, Bhoja has essentially reversed the interpretation and order of the Pāṇinian sūtras, but, following the KV, retained the same order of the prohibitions (the first for subjective genitives with *aka*, the second for objective genitives with both *aka* and *tṛC*), and eliminated the uselessness of mentioning *tṛC* together in the same sūtra as *aka* as is the case in P. 2.2.15 (recall that the KV has said it is mentioned only for the purpose of the following sūtra). The repetition of *aka* may be viewed as slightly awkward but since the suffix occurs in two different meanings (first as an action noun, and then as an agent noun), it is permissible. Hemacandra, who made use of Bhoja's grammar, adopts a similar strategy in his *Śabdānuśāsana*, although he arguably improves on Bhoja's formulation since he does not repeat *aka*.[170] In any case, that there was the potential for applying a similar interpretation to Pāṇini's rules must have

---

[170]SHŚ 3.1.82 *na kartari* | "A word ending in a genitive that occurs in the sense of an agent is not compounded with a word ending in the suffix *aka*." 3.1.83 *karmajā tṛcā ca* | "A word which ends in a genitive that has been enjoined in the sense of a direct object is not compounded with a word ending in the suffix *aka* which has been enjoined in the sense of an agent and also not a word ending in the suffix *tṛC*." My translation follows the gloss found in Hemacandra's own "large commentary," the *Tattvaprakāśikā*, "The Truth-Illuminator," vol. III p. 141. The formulation of the second sūtra deviates even further from Pāṇini's, but it is still clear that SHŚ 3.1.82 reflects P. 2.2.16 and SHŚ 3.1.83 is a reworking of P. 2.2.15.

gotten the attention of later commentators since this is essentially how Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, based on Rāmadeva Miśra's *Kāśikāvṛttipradīpa,* interprets the Pāṇinian sūtras in question: P. 2.2.15 *tṛjakābhyāṃ kartari* — the sūtra with both suffixes — prohibits agent nouns ending in *tṛC* and *aka* from forming compounds with a genitive (and logically only *karmaṇi,* i.e., objective, genitives), whereas P. 2.2.16 *kartari ca* forbids an action noun in *aka* from compounding with a *kartari,* i.e., subjective, genitive. The suffix *tṛC* does not take part in the prohibition since it always forms agent nouns and can therefore only be construed with an objective genitive. Based on the evidence at hand, this appears to be a clear case where non-Pāṇinian grammarians exercised some influence on the interpreters of the A.

The final link in the chain, as always, is Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī* with its constellation of commentaries. Bhaṭṭoji's comments reflect influence from both the wording of the *Prakriyākaumudī,* the primary grammar he had studied under his teacher Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, who himself wrote the commentary *Prakāśa* on the PrK, and the interpretation presented in the *Prakriyāsārvasva.*[171] Bhaṭṭoji explains the two sūtras as follows:

> P. 2.2.15 *tṛjakābhyāṃ kartari* ‖
>
> *kartrarthatṛjakābhyāṃ ṣaṣṭhyā na samāsaḥ | apāṃ sraṣṭā | vajrasya bhartā | odanasya pācakaḥ | kartari kim | ikṣūṇāṃ bhakṣaṇam ikṣubhakṣikā |*
>
> P. 2.2.15 With *tṛj* and *aka* in the sense of the agent.
>
> There is no compounding of a genitive with (a word ending in) the suffixes *tṛC* or *aka,* which have an agent as their meaning/referent.
>
> [Examples:] The releaser of water. The bearer of the lightning-bold. The eater of rice.
>
> Why "in the sense of the agent'? [Observe:] eating of sugarcane, sugarcane-eating.
>
> P. 2.2.16 *kartari ca* ‖
>
> *kartari ṣaṣṭhyā akena na samāsaḥ | bhavataḥ śāyikā | neha tṛj anuvartate | tadyoge kartur abhihitatvena kartṛṣaṣṭhyā abhāvāt* ‖

---

[171]It is reported that Bhaṭṭoji knew Nārāyaṇa's work and even traveled south to meet the author himself. The meeting never took place because Nārāyaṇa died while Bhaṭṭoji was en route.

P. 2.2.16 And in the sense of the agent.

There is no compounding of a genitive in the sense of an agent with a (word ending in the suffix) *aka*.

[Example:] Your good sir's turn for reclining. Here the word *tṛC* does not continue, because in connection with it the genitive in the sense of an agent does not occur since the agent has already been expressed (scil. by the suffix *tṛC*).

As even a quick glance will show, Bhaṭṭoji has followed quite closely the interpretation given by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa. Of particular note is that he specifies only the suffix *aka* as being relevant for P. 2.2.16 exactly as Nārāyaṇa and much in the same spirit as Bhoja's revised version of the sūtra *kartary akena*.[172] In terms of syntax, however, he follows Rāmacandra insofar as he substitutes the noun *samāsa*, "compounding," with an objective genitive for *samasyate*, "is compounded," with a nominative, which is still likewise used *karmaṇi*, i.e., in the sense of the object. The compound *kartrartha*, "having an agent as its reference/meaning," is found in both commentaries and may also have origins in Bhoja's reformulation *kartṛtṛjakābhyām*. As already mentioned while discussing the corresponding sūtras in *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, this alternative interpretation eliminates the purposeless mention of *tṛC* in P. 2.2.15.

In addition to the parallels between the various sources so far cited and Bhaṭṭoji's final *siddhānta* on the matter, there may well have been good reason to follow such an interpretation from within Bhaṭṭoji's own educational lineage. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, the teacher Bhaṭṭoji scandalously contradicted in his *Prauḍhamanoramā*, makes a pertinent observation in his commentary, the *Prakāśa*, on the *Prakriyākaumudī*. He initially explains P. 2.2.15 in words almost identical to those from the KV,[173] namely, that according Rāmacandra's interpretation of the sūtra, the word *kartari* qualifies only the word *ṣaṣṭhī*, which is continued by *anuvṛtti* from P. 2.2.8, and not *tṛC* or *aka*. In the next breath, however, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa observes the following:

---

[172]And Hemacandra's as well. SHŚ 3.1.82 *na kartari* requires the continuation of *aka* from the preceding sūtra.

[173]KV ad P. 2.2.15: *kartṛgrahaṇaṃ ṣaṣṭhīviśeṣaṇam* | "The mention of *kartṛ* (i.e., *kartari*) is a qualification of the genitive." | PrKPr II p. 130: *kartṛgrahaṇaṃ ṣaṣṭhyā viśeṣaṇaṃ na tṛjakayoḥ | kartari ca ity etat tu tṛjakayor viśeṣaṇaṃ na ṣaṣṭhyā ity abhiprāyeṇa vyācaṣṭe* | "the mention of the word *kartṛ* is a qualification of the genitive not of *tṛC* and *aka*, but in P. 2.2.16 *kartari ca* this (scil. mention of *kartari*) is a qualification of *tṛC* and *aka*, not of the genitive. With such an intention he explains..."

vastutas tu kartṛgrahaṇam iha tṛjakaviśeṣaṇaṃ sākṣāc chrutatvāt | uttaratra tu ṣaṣṭhī-
viśeṣaṇam iti viparyayo yuktaḥ | evaṃ hi tṛjgrahaṇam uttarārtham iti na vaktavyaṃ
bhavati | na caivaṃ kartari ca ity atra tṛcaḥ sambandhāsambhavād nityaṃ krīḍāvika-
yoḥ ity atrānanuvṛttiḥ[174] *śaṅkyeta iti vācyam iṣṭatvāt|* (PrKPr II p. 130)

> But in fact, *kartari* does qualify the two suffixes *tṛC* and *aka* because [they] are heard
> in the presence (of *kartari*). On the other hand, it is a qualification of the genitive
> in the following sūtra. This is a fitting reversal because one must not say that the
> continuation of *tṛC* and *aka* is for what follows. And in this manner, one need not
> say that the non-continuation of *tṛC* could be doubtful in P. 2.2.17 since it has no
> connection in P. 2.2.16.

The point is that according to the old interpretation in the KV, etc., the word *tṛC* is not needed
in P. 2.2.17 as the commentators duly note, but the word's sudden and baseless disappearance
from the *anuvṛtti* should cause some discomfort. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa believes that his alternative expla-
nation provides such a reason, namely that P. 2.2.16 cannot apply to nouns in *tṛC* because agent
nouns can never be construed with a subjective genitive, and if it is left out in P. 2.2.16, there
is reason for leaving it out in P. 2.2.17. That Kṛṣṇa generally follows the alternative interpreta-
tion of P. 2.2.15 and 16 is also confirmed in his comments elsewhere, e.g., ad P. 2.2.9.[175] We can
surmise that Bhaṭṭoji followed his teacher's reasoning based on support from his own comments
in the *Śabdakaustubha* ad P. 2.2.17 where we find the justification *tayoḥ śrutatvāt*, "because the
two (suffixes) are heard (in the sūtra)," as the reason why *kartari* should qualify the suffixes *tṛC*
and *aka* in P. 2.2.15. This reflects Kṛṣṇa's *sākṣāc chrutatvāt* quoted above to justify the same
interpretation.[176]

After reaching the end of the grammatical tradition, like the lion, we must also look back. As
already mentioned above, there is no *bhāṣya* on P. 2.2.15 and 16, but there is a fleeting reference
to P. 2.2.15 or 16 in the second vārtt. ad P. 2.2.14 *karmaṇi ca.* Much like the discussion so far, the

---

[174]I emend the text here slightly. The editor prints *atra nānuvṛttiḥ* with the variant *atrānanuvṛttiḥ* given in fn. 1. My
reasoning is that one has doubts about why *tṛC* should not continue into P. 2.2.17 if we understand the sūtras as
Rāmacandra et al. do. If we have sentential negation, the sentence does not yield any good sense.

[175]PrKPrak II p. 123. Here he notes that P. 2.2.9 forms an exception to P. 2.2.15 not to 2.2.16 in contrast to the KV
and others.

[176]The same discussion is repeated by Jñānendrasarasvatī in his *Tattvabodhinī*, a commentary on the *Siddhāntakau-
mudī*. SK *Tattvabodhinī* II p. 53. He also notes explicitly the disagreement with the KV: *kartṛṣaṣṭhyās tṛjakābhyām iti
vṛttikāravyākhyānam ayuktam iti dhvanayann āha|* "Implying that the explanation of the author of the KV, namely
that there (compounding) of a subjective genitive with nouns ending in *tṛC* and *aka* is unsuitable, he says..."

main issue with P. 2.2.14 is what the locative *karmaṇi*, "in the sense of the direct object," modifies. The first *vārttika* suggests that it modifies *ṣaṣṭhī*, "the word in the genitive," but this creates several problems, the first of which is that we then need an additional rule to permit compounding of an objective genitive with a primary derivative not in the sense of an agent.[177] The second objection in the second *vārtt.* is that if we understand *karmaṇi* as qualifying the genitive, then stating a prohibition against compounding an agent noun in *tṛC* or *aka* becomes useless because they will already be taken care of (*siddha*) by the present *sūtra*.[178] As an example, Patañjali gives *apāṃ sraṣṭā*. The final interpretation of *karmaṇi* in P. 2.2.14 is that it refers only to an objective genitive got by P. 2.3.66, i.e., when both a subjective and objective genitive could obtain, only the object is put in the genitive and the agent in the instrumental. Unfortunately, this is all too vague to know which of the following two sūtras Patañjali is referring to since according to the KV *tṛjakābhyām* is also continued into P. 2.2.16, and Patañjali does not give us any positive evidence that he disagrees with this interpretation. This uncertainty is likely the reason for the conflict in the later tradition.[179]

We may summarize the above findings as follows: Pāṇini composed two sūtras, P. 2.2.15 and 16, that forbid certain types of genitive compounds with nouns ending in the two suffixes *tṛC* and *aka*. The explanation of the KV — P. 2.2.15 prevents subjective genitives (*kartari ṣaṣṭhī*) from compounding with action nouns in *aka* and P. 2.2.16 forbids objective genitives (*karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī*) from compounding with agent nouns — remained the standard in almost all Pāṇinian commentaries up to the 16th cent. when Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa switched the meaning of

---

[177] That is to say, a word like *pravraścana* in the sense of the instrument for cutting should be allowed to compound with a direct object of cutting like *idhma* in *idhmavraścana*, "wood-cutting instrument."

[178] P. 2.2.14.2 (MBh II.425.4) *tṛjakābhyāṃ cānarthakaḥ pratiṣedhaḥ* | "And the prohibition (against compound an objective genitive) with words ending in the suffixes *tṛC* or *aka* is useless."

[179] Sharma (2002 vol. III: 93) believes that the KV has gone against the MBh because "[t]he *Mahābhāṣya* (II: 685) accepts that *karmaṇi*, from rule 2.2.14, is carried as a qualifier of *ṣaṣṭhī* in 2.2.15." Since only a page reference is given to the edition by Vedavrata and neither a precise quotation nor translation is provided, I can only guess at what Sharma had in mind, but whatever that may have been, there is nothing in the MBh ad P. 2.2.14 that supports Sharma's assertion. Indeed, Patañjali's final conclusion, that *karmaṇi* in P. 2.2.14 refers only to objective genitives obtained by P. 2.3.66, makes it unlikely that he wished *karmaṇi* to continue into the following sūtra, where such a meaning would be rather awkward. Joshi & Roodbergen (1973: 166–170) follow the KV without compunction when translating and commenting on the relevant passage from the MBh. Further evidence against Sharma would be that Bhaṭṭoji does not cite this MBh passage in support of his interpretation of P. 2.2.15 and 16.

the two sūtras. One earlier source possibly from the 13ᵗʰ cent., the *Kāśikāvṛttipradīpa* of Rāmadeva Miśra, was certainly the inspiration for Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, but this alternative interpretation did not gain wide currency till Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita adopted it. The absolute earliest source now available for the alternative interpretation, however, seems to come from outside of the Pāṇinian tradition, namely from Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*.[180] There is, however, no mention of Bhoja in any of the sources I have been able to examine, and similarly Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa does not mention Rāmadeva Miśra. Finally, it seems that one reason for the confusion, besides Pāṇini's rather cryptic wording, is that neither Kātyāyana nor Patañjali has commented on the two sūtras,[181] and without their authority as guidance, the tradition was unable to fully stabilize.

3.4.4   Three Tricks

With a relatively clear picture in mind now of how the tradition has handled the interpretation of the two sūtras, we can return to Bhāmaha. In BhKA 6.36 and 37ab the issue is raised that some commentators have found a way around the prohibition on the basis of *śiṣṭaprayoga*, "usage of the learned," *nyāsakāramata*, "the opinion of the author of the *Nyāsa*," and a *sūtrajñāpaka*, "hint," in the text of the A. itself. Bhāmaha does not approve of any of these, as we would expect based on his previous statements about derivations. According to the summary in Bronner (2012: 91), Kobayashi (1978) makes a similar point. As we will see, several of Bhāmaha's statements in this section of the 6ᵗʰ chapter serve to support a particular interpretation of the A.

Of relevance for chronology is, as mentioned above, a reference to a *nyāsakāra* and his possible identification with Jinendrabuddhi. Trivedi (1913: 259–261) has shown with great accuracy and thoroughness (although exact translations of the relevant passages are still missing) that based on the readings in the available texts, the identification is simply not possible. The reason is that Bhāmaha mentions that one should not form genitive compounds with nouns ending in

---

[180]The CV has dealt with compounds in far less detail. Compounding a word with another expressive of a *kāraka*, "factor," is handled in but one sūtra: CV 2.2.16 *kārakaṃ bahulam* | "A factor ending in a case ending semantically unites (*ekārthībhavati*) with a noun in various ways."

[181]If we recall Bronner's translation — that P. 2.2.15 deals with objective genitives — it is patent that he has followed, in part, the non-KV interpretation of the two sūtras, although based on fn. 108 he also mixes in a bit of the old.

tṛC whereas Jinendrabuddhi finds a way to form compounds with *tṛN*. The difference between the two suffixes as indicated by the *anubandha*s should not be taken lightly, and Bronner's remark that "... it is possible that Bhāmaha deliberately mentioned *tṛc* here if he found Jinendrabuddhi's distinction between *tṛc* and *tṛn* invalid and considered him to be allowing *tṛc* by another name," cannot hold much water especially in light of BhKA 6.48b, where *tṛN* is specifically listed having the additional sense of *tacchīlādi*, "having it (the action of the root) as one's habit etc."[182] Pathak (1914: 24), who argues quite forcefully for Bhāmaha's knowledge of Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, simply disregards the problem and rather overstates that "... the Nyâsakâra's ज्ञापक has not been accepted by subsequent writers though it is known to them."[183] It is at this point worthwhile to restate the relevant passages and add new ones so as to understand how the tradition handled these problems.[184]

According to Bhāmaha, of the three reasons by which one might think of justifying a compound in violation of P. 2.2.16 (or 15 depending on the interpretation), the first is on the bases of *śiṣṭaprayoga*, "the usage of the learned." For this we can find a variety of examples, mostly compounds in *tṛC*, from the Sanskrit literature known in the 6th cent., above all the Epics, Purāṇas, and other texts composed in a less rigid Sanskrit like the *Manusmṛti* etc., but examples from the Vedic literature are virtually unknown.[185] There is of course Pāṇini's own usage in P. 1.4.30 *janikartṛ* and P. 1.4.55 *tatprayojaka*, both of which are in violation of his own rules. This accords well with

---

[182]The two suffixes are only formally identical if one ignores the pitch accent. Nouns ending in *tṛC* carry the accent on the suffix, whereas for those in *tṛN* the accent falls on the root. One might argue that this would be a reason to blur the distinction. Semantically, however, the difference between the two is quite important. Agent nouns in *tṛC* are generic (but note the added semantics in P. 3.3.169), whereas those in *tṛN* indicate that the agent does the action habitually, characteristically or particularly well (*tacchīla-taddharma-tatsādhukāriṣu*) by P. 3.2.135. Furthermore, *tṛC* can take an objective genitive (P. 2.3.65), while *tṛN* has an objective accusative (P. 2.3.69). That this distinction remained relevant in later Sanskrit can be gleaned from the fact that the non-Pāṇinian grammars continue to distinguish the two even when they leave out the pitch accents. *tṛC*: CV 1.1.139, Kā 4.2.47, JV (M) 2.1.106, ŚāŚ 4.3.85, SKĀv 1.3.87, SHŚ 5.1.48, *Mugdhabodha* 8.62 (*tṛ*. So listed in Böhtlingk's index p. 239, but the corresponding sūtra does not give the suffix). *tṛN*: CV 1.2.89, Kā 4.4.15, KV 2.2.113, ŚāŚ 4.3.222, SKBhv 1.4.187, SHŚ 5.2.27, *Mugdhabodha* 26.26 (but = *tṛC* semantically). See Kiparsky (2016) for an in-depth treatment of the differences between the two suffixes both in Pāṇini and Vedic literature.

[183]Pathak's arguments in other publications concerning the history of Sanskrit grammar have proven hasty or simply inaccurate, and one should not rely on them without independent evaluation. Cf. Birwé (1971: 27–37).

[184]As already mentioned, Trivedi (1913) and Pathak (1914) will have quoted some of these passages, but at best a summary is given. Kobayashi's article, in Japanese, is also not accessible to a terribly wide audience.

[185]See AiGr II.1 p. 188f. for more examples and an historical overview of such compounds.

Pāṇini's date in about the 4th BCE and the general observation that most of the forms that do not fall in line with Pāṇini's grammar are more recent or marginal developments within the language (although oversights, dialectical difference, etc. are likewise possible). As we have already seen, the role of the *śiṣṭa*s in the overall governance of the Sanskrit language is accepted since the time of Patañjali, and I have discussed some invocations of "the usage of the learned" in connection with KĀ 3.148. Bhāmaha, however, voices the opinion that usage based on such models will not suit poetic compositions, presumably because such language could hinder the common enjoyment of poetry by introducing unfamiliar or dubious forms that the reader/listener would puzzle over.

The second reason Bhāmaha gives is the *nyāsakāramata*, "the opinion of the author of the *Nyāsa*." As already noted, the reason given in Jinendrabuddhi's *Kāśikāvivaraṇapañcikā* does not match what Bhāmaha says in his verse, and based on other evidence for Jinendrabuddhi's date, it seems unlikely that the two were contemporaneous. Yet, regardless of this thorny problem of intertextuality, the attempts to explain such compounds to which Bhāmaha objects for composing poetic language continue to occupy Sanskrit grammarians for the remainder of the tradition and are an excellent example of how post-Pāṇinian grammarians, beginning already with Kātyāyana, attempted to account for such forms either by additions to the A (only Kātyāyana and Patañjali) or by creatively interpreting Pāṇini's rules.[186] The case of the genitive compounds is particularly representative of the strategies for the creative interpretation of Pāṇini's sūtras because there are several explanations for the forms as Bhāmaha points out. Let us review the evidence somewhat more systematically.

We shall begin with the Jinendrabuddhi's commentary ad P. 2.2.15. The relevant passages runs as follows:

> *atha kimarthaṃ tṛcaḥ sānubandhakasyoccāraṇam | tṛno nivṛttyartham iti cet naitad asti | tadyoge na lokāvyayaniṣṭhā ityādinā ṣaṣṭhīpratiṣedhāt | evaṃ tarhy etad eva jñāpakaṃ tṛṇyoge 'pi kvacit ṣaṣṭhī bhavatīti | tena bhīṣmaḥ kurūṇāṃ bhayaśokahartā ityādi siddhaṃ bhavati ||* (KVNyāsa I p. 117)

---

[186]On the development of Sanskrit one may consult Renou (1956). For the developments between the time of Pāṇini and Patañjali see Laddu (1974) and Sarangi (1985).

Now to what end is there the utterance of *tṛC* along with the indicative letter (scil. *C*)? If you say "it is in order to prevent *tṛN*," this is not so, because in connection with it (the suffix *tṛN*) there is a prohibition against the genitive by P. 2.3.69. So then this is a hint. Sometimes a genitive occurs even in connection with *tṛN*. Thereby such forms as *bhayaśokahartā*, "fear-and-sorrow-remover," in "Bhīṣma is the fear-and-sorrow-remover for the Kurus" are established.

The point is relatively simple.[187] As the grammarian always thinks about brevity (*lāghava*), Jinendrabuddhi raises the question why Pāṇini has formulated the sūtra with *tṛC* when he could have said just *tṛ* and saved a syllable. *tṛ* would have then referred to both *tṛC* and *tṛN*. The simple answer would be that Pāṇini wanted to exclude *tṛN* and only speak of *tṛC*. This sounds reasonable. Yet, even if the sūtra were formulated with *tṛ*, the sūtra would have no scope over *tṛN* anyways because an objective genitive cannot be construed with an agent noun in *tṛN* by P. 2.3.69. So, if Pāṇini could have achieved the same result by using *tṛ* and thereby also save a letter, why did he use *tṛC*? Jinendrabuddhi believes that it was in order to show that *tṛN* does sometime take an objective genitive and Pāṇini, in order not to exclude such compounds, only mentions *tṛC*. As an example he gives a quarter verse in the *indravajrā* meter: *bhīṣmaḥ kurūṇāṃ bhayaśokahartā*, "Bhīṣma is the remover of fear and sorrow for the Kurus." Unfortunately the verse cannot be traced, and I have not been able to find the relevant compound *bhaya-śoka-hartṛ* in any searchable or indexed texts. The closest parallel I have found is *śoka-hartā*, "misery-remover," in *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* 3.13.48c, and the un-compounded equivalent *śokasya hartā* is found in Aśvaghoṣa's *Saundarānanda* 7.5a. Whatever the source may have been, Jinendrabuddhi thought it worthy of mentioning as a representative form that can be saved from grammatical incorrectness by the present *jñāpaka*.

Pace Pathak (1914: 24), Jinendrabuddhi's *jñāpaka* continues to be cited and certainly not outright rejected by subsequent Pāṇinians. Before giving the other authors who cite the *Nyāsa*, it will be instructive to briefly note the alternative explanation for such compounds because these are usually given alongside Jinendrabuddhi's. The first derives from Pāṇini's own usage. In two sūtras a compound occurs that appears to be in violation of the prohibition in question: *janikartṛ*

---

[187]See also the summaries in Trivedi (1913) and Pathak (1914: 23).

in P. 1.4.30 *janikartuḥ prakṛtiḥ* and *tatprayojaka* in P. 1.4.55 *tatprayojako hetuś ca*. These occurrences are also what Bhāmaha likely had in mind when he says not to form genitive compounds based on a *sūtra-jñāpaka*, "hint in a sūtra." The logic would then be that Pāṇini has shown through his own usage that such compounds are sometimes permissible, i.e., the prohibition is *anitya*. The other way out, is to consider that such compounds are not formed with a *karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhī*, "objective genitive," but rather with a *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī*, "remaining, i.e., not otherwise specified, genitive."[188] In order for this explanation to be sensible, one must understand that the genitive prohibited by P. 2.2.16 (or 15 following Bhaṭṭoji et al.) does not refer to a *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* but rather only to a genitive obtained by a specific rule other than P. 2.3.50, in this case a *karmaṇi*, "objective," genitive by P. 2.3.65 *kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti*.[189] As a result, P. 2.2.8 *ṣaṣṭhī*, "a word ending in the sixth case is optionally compounded with noun ending in a case," can apply and the later prohibition loses its scope. The only formal difference between a *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* compound and a *kārakaṣaṣṭhī* compound is the accent.[190] Kaiyaṭa is generally credited with proposing such an explanation.[191] There are, then, three possible ways to justify genitive compounds with agent nouns in *tṛ* and *aka*:

1. Jinendrabuddhi's *jñāpaka*: agent nouns in *tṛN* can both occur with a genitive and be compounded with a genitive by P. 2.2.8.

2. *śiṣṭaprayoga*/*sūtra-jñāpaka*: The usage of Pāṇini (or Patañjali) makes the prohibition not always valid. Note that in the commentaries the term *śiṣṭaprayoga* is usually not explicitly

---

[188]Such genitives are assigned by P. 2.3.50 *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe* and account for genitives of possession among others. Vergiani (2009) has treated this type of genitive at some length.

[189]P. 2.3.65 prescribes the genitive in the sense of an agent or a patient in connection with a primary derivative (*kṛdanta*). That is to say, the sūtra deals with objective and subjective genitives. Based on *vārttika*s by Kātyāyana ad P. 2.2.8 and 10, the whole interaction and interpretation of these rules is somewhat convoluted, and a proper explanation here would result in excess without a corresponding gain. See Joshi & Roodbergen (1973: 124–128) for a detailed explanation and translation of the relevant passages. Puruṣottamadeva in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti* ad P. 2.2.16 makes clear in glossing the sūtra that the genitive is specifically *karmaṇi*, "objective." Cf. also Vāsudeva Dīkṣita's comments ad SK on P. 2.2.15 (SK II p. 54): *pratyāsattyā kārakaṣaṣṭhyā evāyaṃ niṣedhaḥ* | "Based on proximity (to *karmaṇi* in P. 2.2.14) this prohibition is only for genitives that express a *kāraka*."

[190]This point is highlighted by Haradatta ad P. 2.2.12 (KVPada vol. II p. 114), Puruṣottamadeva in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti* ad P. 2.2.15, and Bhaṭṭoji in his *Śabdakaustubha* vol. II p. 203. If a *kārakaṣaṣṭhī*, then P. 6.2.139 applies and the second member of the compound retains its original accent. If it is a *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī*, P. 6.1.223 applies, and the compound is accented on the final vowel.

[191]MBhPr II p. 236b. Kaiyaṭa attempts to explain the word *guṇiviśeṣa*, "modifier of the qualified," in the MBh and proposes: *ata eva vacanād anityaḥ ṣaṣṭhīsamāsapratiṣedhaḥ | śeṣaṣaṣṭyā vā samāsaḥ* | "because of this very expression (scil. *guṇiviśeṣaka*) the prohibition against a genitive compound (by P. 2.2.16) does not always apply. Or, there is compounding of an unspecified genitive."

used.

3. *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī*: The genitive is not actually an objective genitive but a *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* by P. 2.3.50 and compounded by P. 2.2.8.

The following commentators justify the genitive compounds in question. The methods they use are noted by the names given to them above.

1. Haradatta Miśra, *Padamañjarī*.

   - *śiṣṭaprayoga*: On P. 1.4.30 (KVPada I p. 543), the use of *janikartṛ* indicates that P. 2.2.16 is *anitya*, "not always valid."
   - *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī*: On P. 2.2.12 (KVPada II p. 114) *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* used to explain the compounds *janikartṛ* and *tatprayojaka* in P. 1.4.30 and P. 1.4.55 respectively instead of claiming them the result of *nipātana*, "the setting down (of irregular forms)."

2. Śaraṇadeva, *Durghaṭavṛtti* ad P. 2.2.16.

   - First, Jinendrabuddhi's *jñāpaka* along with the example *bhīṣmaḥ kurūṇāṃ bhayaśoka-hartā*. Attributed explicitly to the *Nyāsa*.
   - Second, *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī*, attributed to *anyaḥ*, "another."

3. Puruṣottamadeva, *Bhāṣāvṛtti* ad P. 2.2.16.

   - *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī*: No attribution. Several examples are given for apparent violations of P. 2.2.12–16. Against P. 2.2.12: *rājasammata*, "king-esteemed, esteemed by the king," *rāmamahita*, "Rāma-honored, honored by Rāma" (cf. *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 10.2b); against P. 2.2.13: *bhavadāsita*, "sir-seat, sir's seat"; against P. 2.2.15: *bhavadāsikā*, "sir-turn-for-sitting, sir's turn for sitting"; against P. 2.2.14: *godoha*, "cow-milking, milking of the cows"; against P. 2.2.16: *tatkartṛ* (quoted from VP 3.12.9d with attribution to Bhartṛhari), *kriyāviśeṣaka* (cf. P. 1.3.1.7), *jātivācaka* (Cf. P. 1.2.10.1 and P. 4.1.14.7), *tatprayojaka* (cf. P. 1.4.55).

4. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa ad P. 2.2.15 in *Prakriyāsārvasva* (PrS vol. IV p. 14).

- *śiṣṭaprayoga*: P. 1.4.30 and 55 cited to prove the prohibition is not always valid (*anitya*). No example.

5. Viṭṭhala, *Prasāda* ad P. 2.2.16 in PrK (PrKPras I p. 507).

   - Jinendrabuddha's *jñāpaka*, no attribution. Example: *bhīṣmaḥ karūnāṃ bhayaśoka-hantā*.
   - *śiṣṭaprayoga*: P. 1.4.30 and 56 cited to prove the prohibition not always valid (*anitya*). Example: *nijatrinetrāvataratvabodhikām*, "(an eye) indicating the fact that his own descent is from the three eyed one (Śiva)" from NaiC 1.6d.

6. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa ad P. 2.2.16 in *Prakriyākaumudī* (PrKPrak II p. 131).

   - *śiṣṭaprayoga* in P. 1.4.30 and 56 cited to prove the prohibition is not always valid (*anitya*). Examples: emphbhīṣmaḥ karūnāṃ bhayaśokahantā, *hitakāraka*, *guṇaviśeṣaka* (Cf. MBh I.321.13).
   - Jinendrabuddhi's *jñāpaka*. Attributed to *anyāḥ*, "others."

7. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita SK and *Śabdakaustubha*.

   - In both works the example is: Example: *ghaṭānāṃ nirmātus tribhuvanavidhātuś ca*, "of the maker of the pots and of the triple-world-creator," *tribhuvanavidhātṛ* is the problematic form.
   - In the *Śabdakaustubha* Jinendrabuddhi's *jñāpaka* is given first with attribution to *nyāsakāra*.
   - In both works, *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* is attributed to Kaiyaṭa. This is the second explanation in *Śabdakaustubha*, and the only one in the SK.
   - In the *Śabdakaustubha* the third and last explanation is *śiṣṭaprayoga*. This is attributed to *bahavaḥ*, "many."

One could also add the remarks of Jñānendrasarasvatī in his *Tattvabodhinī*, cited in Pathak (1914: 25), but he more or less repeats what is in the *Śabdakaustubha* except that he adds that the *śiṣṭaprayoga*-

option is *manda*, "stupid."[192] From these citations emerges a somewhat more complete picture of how later Sanskrit grammarians handled an awkward set of forms from the point of Pāṇini's rules, and that there are indeed examples from poetry. None of the commentators argue specifically against Jinendrabuddhi, although only *Śaraṇadeva* gives his *jñāpaka* as the first option. Only two commentators, Puruṣottamadeva and Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, give a single explanation, *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* and *śiṣṭaprayoga*, respectively. Bhaṭṭoji seems ultimately to prefer the *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* option since it is the explanation given in his SK, whereas the others are discussed only in his works for more advanced pupils, the *Śabdakaustubha* and *Prauḍhamanoramā*. The slight preference for *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* may well derive from the authoritativeness of Kaiyaṭa, who gives this as his second, preferred explanation (*vā*, "or (rather)"), after first proposing the *śiṣṭaprayoga* view.[193] Yet overall we find that commentators put forth a variety of options just as Bhāmaha notes a variety of explanations in his BhKA. This is quite remarkable if we recall that Bhāmaha wrote at a time before all the commentators quoted above lived, including most likely Jinendrabuddhi; it demonstrates that problems within the grammatical tradition have a much deeper history than the available texts allow us to reconstruct and that it is difficult to pinpoint true innovations or the emergence of new practices based on the available evidence.[194] Turning to sources outside the Pāṇinian tradition, such as the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, and Hemacandra's works, may help us get a clearer picture even of the later tradition, but such work has hardly been begun. In the following chapter, I will investigate another problematic set of sūtras referred to by Bhāmaha that deal with the perfect active participles or *kvasvanta*s. Many of the points about the diversity of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition and the long-lasting problems Bhāmaha points out at a relative early stage in the tradition's history will be further substantiated.

---

[192]SK II p. 54 *kecit tu janikartuḥ, tatprayojako hetuś ca iti nirdeśād anityo 'yaṃ samāsaniṣedhaḥ ity āhuḥ | tan maṇḍaṃ śeṣaṣaṣṭhīsamāsenoktanirdeśopapatteḥ* | "But some say that because of the indication in P. 1.4.30 and P. 1.4.55, the prohibition against forming such compounds is not mandatory. This is stupid because it is suitable to explain the statements by a *śeṣaṣaṣṭhī* compound."

[193]See the passage quoted and translated above in fn. .

[194]Bronkhorst (2010) expresses a similar sentiment, citing the loss of Buddhists, Ājīvikas, and Cārvakas in India.

Chapter 4

Can Poetry Be Vedic?

The Curious Case of *KvasU*

tad etat pratipadyantāṃ
bhāṣye kṛtapariśramāḥ |
nānye sahasram apy andhāḥ
sūryaṃ paśyanti nāñjasā ||

"A matter such as this those
who have greatly labored in the *Bhāṣya* may understand,
not others. Blind men, though they number a thousand,
never truly see the sun."[1]

4.1   An Indulgence

My study of the single suffix *KvasU*, which forms the perfect active participle, evolved unexpectedly, and my investigation led me into so many unforeseen grammatical adventures and discoveries (from my own perspective) that what was originally planned as just another few pages expanded at a rate I could hardly control, and before it was over a new chapter had emerged. The length and technical nature of the chapter may be justified, if justification should be wanted, by the results of the study and their implication for how we should understand the history of San-

---

[1]Haradatta gives this verse at the end of his commentary ad P. 2.1.36, KVPada vol. II p. 54.

skrit grammar. In sum, I have pursued the suffix *KvasU* in as many grammars, commentaries, and poetic works, including the epics, as I could to determine when and in whose opinion the suffix was considered Vedic. The catalyst for this investigation remains the *Kāvyālaṅkāra* of Bhāmaha and his unassuming statement that the suffix *KvasU* is accepted as non-Vedic (*acchāndasa*) in the realm of poetry. This spark sent a fire down a number of as yet unexplored avenues winding deep into non-Pāṇinian territory and illuminated not only how varied the opinions of the grammarians were, but also how poets followed or rejected certain grammatical traditions. The three main phenomena, I believe, that this study helps us to understand are the varied interpretation and hence translation of Pāṇini's sūtras, the authority of Patañjali, and the interaction between theory and practice. Furthermore, it has made sufficiently evident how important the now mostly neglected non-Pāṇinian grammars are for writing the history of Sanskrit grammar and the extent to which they have influenced the Pāṇinian tradition itself. To achieve these ends though, it is imperative to present evidence from a range of sources — and I wish I could have cast my net even wider — over a long period of time with close attention to changes in detail. Only through this method could a clear picture emerge.

4.2   The Problem with *KvasU*

Our final example from the BhKA will bring us into the realm of Vedic, or possibly Vedic, Sanskrit. As is pointed out at the beginning of the *Mahābhāṣya*,[2] Pāṇini's grammar treats both common (*laukika*) as well as Vedic (*vaidika*) words. If unmarked, a rule can be applied to form either type of word, but if marked as "Vedic" by the word *chandasi*, "in Vedic literature," or with some similar designation,[3] it is restricted to that particular domain and should not occur in the *bhāṣā*, "standard language."[4] On the other hand, some rules are specifically marked with *bhāṣāyām*,

---

[2]MBh I.1.2–4.

[3]E.g., *mantre* in P. 2.4.80, *brāhmaṇe* in P. 5.1.62, etc. The terms have been studied by Thieme (1935: 67ff.) and reviewed in Kiparsky (1980: 56). *chandasi* is the most general designation for "sacred literature" (Thieme's translation) but more specifically the *saṃhitā*s of the four Vedas.

[4]According to Kaiyaṭa, *laukika* words form the outermost domain, and Vedic words are a subset of them. Patañjali mentions them here only to give them prominence. Cf. MBhPra I p. 10b: *vaidikānām api laukikatve prādhānyakhyā-*

"in the standard language," to indicate that the rule and resulting form(s) are valid only in the standard language.[5] One of the hallmarks of non-Pāṇinian grammars is that they omit these Vedic rules,[6] including the accent rules, since for all intents and purposes the original pitch accent had become irrelevant for standard Sanskrit in the Common Era and was relegated to the description of Vedic Sanskrit[7] despite originally forming an integral part of Pāṇini's standard language. The exact boundary between the two forms of Sanskrit, however, shifted over time, and Kātyāyana occasionally made provisions for a few suffixes or rules marked as Vedic in the A to enter the standard language.[8] Bhāmaha, much like his predecessor, points to one more case in BhKA 6.42f.:

> *puṃsi striyāṃ ca kvasvantam icchanty acchāndasaṃ kila |*
> *upeyuṣām api divaṃ yathā na vyeti cārutā* || 6.42 ||
> *ibhakumbhanibhe bālā dadhuṣī kañcukaṃ stane |*
> *ratikhedapariśrāntā jahāra hṛdayaṃ nṝṇām* || 6.43 || (BhKA)

In the masculine and the feminine they accept words ending in the suffix *KvasU* to be non-Vedic, so it's said. In such examples as *upeyuṣām*[9] *api divam*, "of even those who have approached heaven," no charm is lost, (as well as in the example:) "a young

---

panāya pṛthagupādānam | "Given that Vedic words are also common words, separate mention is made of them in order to announce their prominence." The logic, according to Nāgeśa on the passage (MBhPra I p. 11a and note the alternate reading *laukikatve 'pi*), is that since everything separated from Brahma is a worldly object (*lokapadārtha*), even the Veda is within the realm of the ordinary world. The alternate explanation Kaiyaṭa gives is that only words of the standard language (*bhāṣā*) are common and hence the Vedic ones must be mentioned separately. Cf. Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 10) for further discussion.

[5]Renou (1955: 114f.) discusses the term in some detail and provides further references to earlier literature. He rightly concludes that *le terme bhāṣā … doit s'opposer purement et simplement à « chandasi » et désigner le domaine « non-védique »* "the term *bhāṣā* … ought to be opposed, plain and simple, to *chandasi* and designate the 'non-Vedic' domain." In the A, *bhāṣāyām* relegates the application of a rule to the standard language and at the exclusion of the Vedic language in six of its seven occurrences: P. 4.1.62, 4.3.143 (and 144 by *anuvṛtti*), 6.1.181, 6.3.20, 7.2.88, and 8.2.98. The other instance in P. 3.2.108, discussed and translated below, optionally extends a Vedic suffix to certain roots in the standard language but does not exclude those roots from the Vedic language. NB that earlier interpretations of *bhāṣāyām* as "in the colloquial language" are not correct. Cf. Böhtlingk (1977: 261*), who gives *die Umgangssprache*, "colloquial language," and Joshi (1975), who still maintains (p. 212) that *bhāṣā* refers to "[t]he peculiarities of the colloquial language at the time of Pāṇini."

[6]Except Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* in the eighth *adhyāya* and evidently the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* in its original form, for which see Scharfe (1977: 164, fn. 11).

[7]There are exceptions. In the discussions of *śleṣa*, "double entendre," the difference of pitch accent can be of importance in *śabdaśleṣa*, a double entendre based on extracting two different words from the same set of letters. Indurāja (*Laghuvṛtti* on the *KASS*, pp. 60f.) discusses the different pitch accent that arises depending on the analysis. On the other hand, Mammaṭa and his followers generally adhere to the dictum in the auto-commentary to KāPr 84: *kāvyamārge svaro na gaṇyate |* "In the way of poetry the accent does not count."

[8]The following *vārttika*s demonstrate that this was Kātyāyana's practice: P. 3.2.171.3 the suffixes *Ki* and *KiNI*, P. 3.3.130.1 the suffix *yaC*, P. 8.2.70.1 sandhi of *pracetas*, and P. 8.3.1.2 sandhi of *bhavat*, *bhagavat*, and *aghavat* in the voc.

[9]Perfect active participle of *upa* + √*i* in the gen. masc.pl.

girl who has placed (*dadhuṣī*[10]) a bodice on her breast, which resembles the pot-like temples of an elephant, thoroughly worn out by her labors of passion, has stolen the heart of men."

Bhāmaha would like to move the *kvasvanta*s or perfect active participles[11] out of the realm of Vedic and welcome them into poetic language, excepting forms in the neuter. As we have seen in previous examples, Bhāmaha refers to a problem that will last throughout the remainder of the tradition and puts at loggerheads the usage of great poets, including Kālidāsa, with the express opinion of the *munitraya*, "triad of sages," Pāṇini, Kātyātana, and Patañjali. Pāṇini's treatment of the perfect active participles is at first blush relatively straightforward, and it will be illustrative to present the full series of relevant rules, all of which fall under the general heading rule (*adhikāra*) P. 3.2.84 *bhūte*, "in the past," meaning that the suffixes prescribed within this domain indicate that the action expressed by the root occurred at some point the general past,[12] i.e., without the more specific qualification *parokṣe*, "beyond one's experience," or *anadyatana*, "not on the present day," that are mostly associated with the morphology of the perfect (*liṭ*)[13] and imperfect (*laṅ*),[14] respectively. The following translation gives only a general idea of what the sūtras mean, which varies to some degree between the commentators.[15] I will fill in more detail as we proceed.

P. 3.2.105 *chandasi liṭ* [*bhūte*,[16] *dhātoḥ*[17]] ||

In Vedic literature the suffix *liṭ* occurs in the sense of past time after a root.

---

[10] Perfect active participle of √*dhā* in the nom. fem. sing.

[11] On the formation, syntax, and historical development of the suffix, see AiGr II.2 pp. 909–915 with literature. Oberlies (2003: 268f.) gives a few additional references. I will use *kvasvanta* and perfect active participle interchangeably. By these designations I exclude the etymologically related but semantically divergent *vidvat*, "learned." In the A Pāṇini rightly treats the form separately from the other perfect active participles in P. 7.1.36 *videḥ śatur vasuḥ*, whereby the present active participles suffix *ŚatṚ* is replaced by *vasU* after the root √*vid*.

[12] We should here supply *dhātvarthe bhūte*, "the meaning/referent of the verbal root that has passed," i.e., the *kriyā*, "action." Cf. MBh II.111.4f. and the KV ad P. 3.2.84. Commentators often use the term *bhūtasāmānye*, "in the sense of general past," to specify this type of past tense from others, in particular in reference to the aorist (*luṅ*). The earliest occurrence, to the best of my knowledge, is in the KV ad P. 3.2.120, but see also KVNyāsa vol. II p. 618 ad P. 3.2.108 and p. 624 ad P. 3.2.111 (on *luṅ*).

[13] P. 3.2.115. *liṭ* is technically both *parokṣe* and *anadyatane*.

[14] P. 3.2.111.

[15] The KV diverges from the MBh on several points. As these do not concern the main topic at hand, I will reserve such discussions to the footnotes for the most part. The rules are briefly discussed in Biswas (1968: 20f).

[16] Continued from P. 3.2.84.

[17] Continued from P. 3.1.91.

P. 3.2.106 *liṭaḥ kānaj vā* [*chandasi,*[18] *bhūte, dhātoḥ*] ||

In Vedic literature the suffix *KānaC* optionally[19] occurs in place of the suffix *liṭ* after a root in the sense of past time.

P. 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca* ||

And so does the suffix *KvasU*.[20]

P. 3.2.108 *bhāṣāyāṃ sada-vasa-śruvaḥ* [*bhūte, vā,*[21] *kvasu*[22]] ||

In the standard language the suffix *KvasU* optionally occurs after the roots √*sad*, "to sit," √*vas*, "to dwell," and √*śru*, "to hear,"[23] in place of *liṭ* in the sense of past time.
P. 3.2.109 *upeyivān-anāśvān-anūcānaś ca* ||

And (in the same sense there are the set forms) *upeyivān*[24] "who has approached," *anāśvān*, "who has not obtained," and *anūcāna*, "one who has recited."[25]

The first sūtra places us in the realm of the Vedic language and describes the usage of the suffix *liṭ*, the underlying suffix for the perfect,[26] in the sense of a general past tense, and not the more specific sense of *liṭ*, "beyond one's perception," as prescribed by P. 3.2.115 *parokṣe liṭ*. Accordingly, a perfect form such as *dadarśa*, "has seen," can refer to any past event of seeing. The two following sūtras optionally permit *liṭ* to be substituted by the suffixes *KānaC* and *KvasU*, the *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada* perfect participles, respectively.[27] According to the KV, these suffixes can

---

[18]Continued from the preceding sūtra.

[19]A topic that will periodically occur concerns the application of P. 3.1.94 *vāsarūpo 'striyām*, often referred to as the *vāsarūpavidhi*. In brief, this rule short-circuits among *kṛt* suffixes the standard metarule that a specific rule (*apavāda*) supersedes a general rule (*utsarga*), provided the suffixes are not identical and not feminine. This rule does not, however, apply to the substitutes of the *lakāra*s and so the *vā* is necessary in the present rule, but commentators differ on this point. See Haradatta's discussion on *na ca bhavati* (KVPada vol. II p. 616) and mine on p. 210 with fn. 156, and Kielhorn (1960: 353f.) for more details on this *paribhāṣā*.

[20]P. 3.2.106 and 107 formed a single sūtra at the time of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Their split (*yogavibhāga*) occurs for the first time in the KV. Cf. KV ad P. 3.2.107 *yogavibhāga uttarārthaḥ* | "Splitting the rule is for the purpose of what follows." That is to say, only *KvasU* should continue into the next sūtra.

[21]Continued from P. 3.2.106.

[22]Continued from the preceding sūtra.

[23]*śuśruvān* can also mean "one who has studied, i.e., "a scholar."

[24]The KV makes an important correction, thoroughly embraced by the later tradition. The *upa* on *upeyivān* should be ignored, and the *kvasvanta* of √*i*, "to go," may be used with any or no *upasarga*. I will discuss this point later on.

[25]A literal translation. The standard meaning is given in KṣAK 2.7.10 *anūcānaḥ pravacane sāṅge 'dhītī*, "*anūcāna* means one well studied in the sacred works along with their ancillary texts (*aṅga*s)."

[26]More accurately stated, the morphology associated with forms termed "perfect" in Latinate terminology. In Pāṇini's grammar, one and the same suffix or form can have different meanings under different circumstances.

[27]Thus the KV. The MBh reasons that the word *vā*, "optionally," occurs only for the sake of later sūtras and that finite *liṭ* forms are taken care of by P. 3.4.6 *chandasi luṅlaṅliṭaḥ*, which permits the promiscuous intermingling of the

substitute for *liṭ* in any sense including *parokṣe liṭ* and not just *bhūte liṭ* enjoined in the previous rule, but Patañjali and his followers only allow *bhūte liṭ*.[28] According to the KV, Patañjali, and other modern translators, the word *chandasi* continues into these two sūtras (or sūtra),[29] and there is no reason for objecting to this *anuvṛtti*. The final two sūtras then move us into the realm of the *bhāṣā*, "standard language," where the suffix *KvasU* is permitted to substitute for *liṭ* after three verbal roots, √*sad*, √*vas* and √*śru* in the sense of (general) past time. According to the interpretation of the Pāṇinīyas, these three perfect active participles can replace any of the finite past tenses (*laṅ*, *liṭ* and *luṅ*) in the standard language.[30] The final rule gives three *nipātana*s, "irregular forms set down without derivation," to be admitted in standard Sanskrit. Later on in the sixth chapter, P. 6.1.12, Pāṇini adds three more set forms, *dāśvān*, *sāhvān*, and *mīḍhvān*, which the commentators also identify as irregular perfect active participles without reduplication and

---

three past tenses.

[28]On this point the KV and MBh part ways. The KV insists that *liṭaḥ* in P. 3.2.106 could have continued from the preceding sūtra because the case of a word may change from one sūtra to the next as the context demands. This is known as (*vibhakti*)-*vipariṇāma* and is used from time to time in the MBh, e.g., P. 1.1.56.14. See also DSGr p. 356 and TGr p. 279. *liṭaḥ* will therefore be redundant if we cannot assign it another purpose. To remove the problem, the KV says that its purpose is so that the rule applies to *liṇmātra*, "*liṭ* plain and simple," i.e., any *liṭ* regardless of which rule enjoins it, even *parokṣe liṭ*. Kātyāyana and Patañjali do not see the same problem as the KV and in discussing the purpose of *vā* (MBh II.114.18–23) they state that *KānaC* and *KvasU* are substitutes *anena vihitasya*, "for the (*liṭ*) which has been prescribed by that (i.e., sūtra P. 3.2.105)." Kaiyaṭa fills out the details, indicating that P. 3.2.105 is the referent of *anena* and goes on to explain that: MBhPra III p. 183a *tasyaiva liṭa ihānukṛtatvād ānantaryād iti bhāvaḥ*, "the underlying idea is: because only that *liṭ* occurs in a contiguous rule on account of its being copied (*anukṛta*) here." Kaiyaṭa tacitly invokes the *paribhāṣā* (PŚ 61) that requires us to understand the closer of two possible referents (*liṭ* in P. 3.2.105) and not the more distant one (*liṭ* in P. 3.2.115). Haradatta points out this discrepancy between the KV and the MBh in his comments on *pūrvasyaiva* in the KV, KVPada vol. II p. 616. Correct *pratyayāntaraṃ* to *pratyayānantaraṃ*. I discuss this issue in connection with the CV below on pp. 197f.

[29]KV ad P. 3.2.107: *chandasi liṭaḥ kvasur ādeśo bhavati* | "*KvasU* is (optionally) the substitute for *liṭ* in the Vedas." *vā*, "optionally," has been left out, presumably because of *ca* and the mention of the division of the sūtra later on. The passages from the MBh and KV will be discussed below.

[30]I flag here at the outset that a somewhat complicated discussion arises with regard to the tenses *KvasU* can denote and what exactly in the sūtra is optional. Once again the KV does not follow the MBh, but the end result is mostly the same. Part of the conundrum is presented in Sharma (2002: 416f.). I will say more below in § 4.4.1.1, p. 198.

valid for both the Vedic and standard language.[31] In sum, Pāṇini, Patañjali,[32] and the KV have all limited the forms in *KvasU* to nine roots in the standard language, while the full productivity of the perfect active participle only exists in the Vedic language. Bhāmaha, however, would like to see free use of these participles in the standard language of poetry.

4.2.1   The Grounds for Objection

It is not without good reason that Bhāmaha goes against the Pāṇinian tradition as known to him.[33] The forms in question have some frequency in the two *mahākāvya*s of Kālidāsa, the *Kumārasambhava* and the *Raghuvaṃśa*, and other works as well, specifically, though, in *mahākāvya* and the epics. To better substantiate Bhāmaha's desideratum and see how it played out, I will proceed in the following manner. First, I will present the usage of the perfect active participles in *mahākāvya*s with additional references to other forms of poetry as well epic literature from the beginning of the first millennium CE and extending into the second. This will give us an initial idea of practice and clues about the grammatical theory to which certain authors may have adhered. Then, I will endeavor a somewhat exhaustive treatment of the suffix *KvasU* in grammatical literature, after which I will return to the commentators' explanations on the relevant passages and tally them with my findings from the grammarians. The ample material for *KvasU* grants us a perfect case study for the development of theory in the face of practice and the harmonization (or lack thereof) between the two. It will also perhaps breathe new life into many understudied grammars.

---

[31]Cf. KV ad P. 6.1.12: *dāśvān sāhvan mīḍhvān ity ete śabdāś chandasi bhāṣāyāṃ cāviśeṣeṇa nipātyante* | "The following words: *dāśvān*, 'pious,' *sāhvan*, 'capable,' and *mīḍhvān*, 'munificent,' are set down in both the Vedas and the standard language without distinction." In practice, however, these forms are rare after the Vedic period, and as a result, it seems, the grammarians were not unanimous in including the rule for the standard language. Dharmakīrti (RA II p. 246) and Puruṣottamadeva both include it in their grammars, while Rāmacandra omits it and Bhaṭṭoji relegates it to the Vedic section of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*. There is similar disharmony among the non-Pāṇinian grammarians. Candragomin includes a similar rule (CV 5.1.9), as does Bhoja (SKĀv 6.1.11) and Hemacandra (SHŚ 4.1.15), but the JV in both recensions has no corresponding provision for the forms. It seems that the CV and KV are responsible for the rule's inclusion in grammars for standard Sanskrit. I suspect, therefore, that they had a rather archaic flavor when used in later literature as in, e.g., RaghuV 14.71d *dāśvān* and the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. For the latter see § 4.2.5. They will nonetheless be tallied with the standard forms below.

[32]Patañjali even calls the suffix *chāndasa*, e.g., ad P. 1.2.18, MBh I.200.10. This plays an important role in our story, and I will return to it in due course.

[33]Or rather, as we can conclude he knew it based on the available texts.

4.2.2 Selection of Texts

Regarding the choice of texts for my corpus, since this study springs from a statement about poetic usage, I have searched as much *kāvya*, both in verse and in prose, as was available. In addition, I have examined the entire *Rāmāyaṇa* and the first nine *parvan*s of the *Mahābhārata* for comparison. From a brief survey of the Purāṇic literature, I was able to able to determine that hardly any *kvasvanta*s exist in this genre and have therefore excluded them from a more exhaustive query except for the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, where a number of archaic forms occur including, as we might expect, *kvasvanta*s. The corpus includes the following works arranged in alphabetical order by author's name, when available. In the case of an incomplete search, I have given in a footnote the portion of the text examined. Next to each work I have included in parentheses the number *kvasvanta*s I have found in the format: T(otal), V(edic), S(tandard).

1. Abhinanda's *Kādambarīkathāsāra*[34] (0)

2. Abhinanda's *Rāmacaritamahākāvya*[35] (2 T, 2 V, 0 S)

3. *Amaruśataka* (0)

4. Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita*[36] (7 T, 4 V, 3 S)

5. and *Saundarānanda* (7 T, 3 V, 4 S)

6. Bāṇa's[37] *Harṣacarita*[38] (0)

7. and *Kādambarī* (0)

8. *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (52 T, 16 V, 36 S[39])[40]

9. Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*[41] (21 T, 0 V, 21 S)

10. *Bhaṭṭikāvya*[42] (15 T, 0 V, 15 S)

11. Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambava* (8 T, 3 V, 5 S)[43]

12. and *Meghadūta* (0)

---

[34]9th cent. Kashmir. Warder 5.311–127. All dates in this list are CE.

[35]9th cent. Bengal. Warder 5.100–127

[36]1st–2nd cent. Ayodhyā (?). Warder 2.144–181.

[37]Late 6th–7th cent., active at Harṣa's court in Kānyakubja. Cf. Warder 4.1–52.

[38]Limited to *ucchvāsa*s 1–4 and 6–8.

[39]10 of these standard forms are from the set forms given in P. 6.1.12. Although the grammarians technically consider these forms valid for both the Vedic as well as the standard language, given their rare occurrence in classical Sanskrit, it would be more accurate to count them among the Vedic *kvasvanta*s from the perspective of usage. Cf. fn. 31. See also my discussion below in § 4.2.5

[40]The date, authorship, and provenance of the *Bhāgavata* is *ein weites Feld*, although scholarly consensus places it in the Tamil country, probably at the end of the first millennium CE. Cf. Rocher (1986: 138–151).

[41]6th cent. Warder 3.198–233.

[42]7th cent. Warder 4.118–121.

[43]5th cent. Ujjayinī (?). Warder 3.122–154

[44]7th–8th cent. Sri Lanka. Warder 4.252–269. I have searched only Cantos 1–10.

13. and *Raghuvaṃśa* (30 T, 12 V, 18 S)

14. Kumāradāsa's

    Jānakīharaṇa[44] (2 T, 0 V, 2 S)

15. Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*[45] (24 T, 0 V, 24 S)

16. Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's

    Nārāyaṇīya[46] (34 T, 21 V, 13 S)

17. Padmagupta's

    Navasāhasāṅkacarita[47] (10 T, 1 V, 9 S)

18. Ratnākara's *Haravijaya* (98 T, 56 V, 42 S)[48]

19. Śivasvāmin's

    Kapphiṇābhyudaya[49] (5 T, 1 V, 4)

20. Śrīharṣa's

    Naiṣadhīyacarita[50] (21 T, 7 V, 14 S)

21. Valmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* (24 T, 10 V, 14 S)

22. Vidyākara's *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*[51]

    (3 T, 1 V, 2 S)

23. Vyāsa's *Mahābhārata* (147 T, 85 V, 62 S)[52]

My intention in choosing these texts has been to test to what extent poets, above all the authors of *mahākāvya*s, availed themselves of *kvasvanta*s built on roots besides those generally accepted for the standard language. The usage of poets prior to Bhāmaha could likely have motivated his statement about *KvasU* being non-Vedic, whereas those after him could have been following or rejecting it, as the case may be. Since poets do not specify which grammatical or poetological texts they accept or deny as authoritative, I cannot say with any great deal of certainty that they must have known this work and not another, albeit chronological impossibilities logically rule some out. At most, the presence of these participles can only tell us that a poet has accepted them as part of his poetic diction. The complete absence of such forms, on the other hand, is weaker since their omission may be due to mere chance, but I will argue that in most instances this is quite unlikely. A comparison with the epics provides a broader picture and telling trends that allow us to have added insight into how poetic Sanskrit differs from other genres.

The grunt work of my searches consisted of looking for strings of letters that appear in the

---

[44] 7th cent. Śrīmālā. Warder 4.133–144.

[45] 16th cent. Kerala. Lienhard (1984: 143).

[46] 10th–11th cent. Dhārā. Warder 4.133–144.

[47] 9th cent. Kāśmir. Warder 4.133–144.

[48] 9the cent. Kashmir. Cf. Hahn (2007: 1–23).

[49] 12th cent. Warder 7.281–319.

[50] A collection of poems assembled in 12th cent. Bengal. See Ingalls (1965: 30–49) for the sources of the individual poems.

[51] *parvan*s 1–9

paradigm of the perfect active participle, such as *-vān, -vāṃs, -vad, -uṣā*, etc. I had to determine by my own mental faculties whether or not each occurrence of these strings formed part of a *kvasvanta*. Here I must confess freely that I am likely to have erred despite my best efforts for accuracy. When I have quoted a form, however, I have checked the printed editions for the correctness of the text and variant readings when available. I have also read the entire verse in which a cited form appears and perused the surrounding verses for context to the extent that time and my mental fortitude permitted. The methodology outlined above clearly has a number of caveats and restrictions, the removal of which would certainly have enhanced my study, but even taking them into consideration, I am pleased that the results allow for a number of definitive conclusions and will add a greater understanding of how poets and grammarians responded to each others' work.

4.2.3 *Kvasvanta*s in Poetry

We shall begin with data from poems that may have inspired Bhāmaha's view on *KvasU*. The poets we can assume came before Bhāmaha are Aśvaghoṣa, Kālidāsa, Bhartṛhari,[53] and Bhāravi. Amaru, Bāṇa and Kumāradāsa are possible contemporaries, but given the rather slippery date of Bhāmaha himself, it is hard to say. In the following lists, I exclude the six verbal forms permitted in the standard language by P. 3.2.108 and 109 as they do not require any special sanction. I have also included the forms of √*i* not based on *upeyivān*, which are strictly not sanctioned by Pāṇini, but accounted for by the KV.[54] These are marked with an asterisk (*). My choice to include Aśvaghoṣa, whose works did not leave much of a mark on *alaṅkāraśāstra* as we have it today,[55] is based on the fact that Kālidāsa knew his works well, and his grammatical style could have influenced the latter.[56]

---

[53]Despite Kosambi's admirable edition of Bhartṛhari's *Śatakatraya*, Kosambi (2000), it is still somewhat uncertain exactly which poems go back to the individual named Bhartṛhari, and to which period of time they belong. In any case, the *muktaka* genre clearly rejects the *kvasvanta*, so it is of little consequence for this study.

[54]I have not included forms with an additional *upasarga* such as *sam-upeyivān*.

[55]See Sternbach (1978: 104) and Zachariae (1933).

[56]See Tubb (2014a) for the connections between the two authors.

- Aśvaghoṣa (14 T, 7 V, 7 S)

    – *Buddhacarita* (7 T, 4 V, 3 S)

        1. 3.43a *ūcivān*, "he who has spoken."[57]

        2. 4.36d *tasthuṣī*, "she who has stood."

        3. 5.20d *sameyivān*,* "he who has come together."

        4. 5.36a *ūcivāṃsam*, "him who has spoken."

        5. 12.2d *upajagmivān*, "he who has approached."

    – *Saundarānanda* (7 T, 3 V, 4 S)

        1. 1.44b *tasthuṣaḥ*, "them who have stood."

        2. 2.8d *eyivān*,* "he who has come."

        3. 3.22b *tasthivān*, "he who has stood."

        4. 9.18c *nijaghnivān*, "he who has struck down."

        5. 12.4d *eyivān*,* "he who has come."

- Kālidāsa (38 T, 15 V, 23 S)

    – *Kumārasambhava*[58] (8 T, 3 V, 5 S)

        1. 6.64a *ūcivān*, "he who has spoken."[59]

        2. 6.72b (*ā*)*tasthuṣā*, "by him who has taken up."[60]

        3. 8.50b *anutasthivān*, "he who has performed."

    – *Raghuvaṃśa*[61] (30 T, 12 V, 18 S)

        1. 2.29a *tasthivāṃsaṃ*, "him who has stood."

        2. 3.62b *tasthuṣaḥ*, "of him having stood."

---

[57]The translation for these participles out of context is merely perfunctory and intended only to give the basic semantics of the underlying verb and, to some degree, reflect the case, number, and gender.

[58]The verse numbering follows Mallinātha's text.

[59]The variant *uktivān* is reported in several editions, e.g., those of Avināśacandramukha, p. 185, fn. 7. In his commentary on the verse Vidyāmādhava mentions that the reading is known to him. On this see below.

[60]There are three readings for pāda b. Vallabhadeva, Mallinātha, and Cāritravardhana give *padam ātasthuṣā tvayā*. Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇa read *padam ākramya tasthuṣā*. Vidyāmādhava has *padam ākramya tiṣṭhatā |*

[61]The verse numbering follows Mallinātha's text.

3. 5.34b *adhijagmuṣaḥ*, "of you who has obtained."

4. 5.61a *tasthivāṃsam*, "him who has stood."

5. 8.75c *vijajñivān*, "he who has understood."

6. 9.59a *uttasthuṣaḥ*, "of it which has stood up."

7. 9.82a *sameyivān*,* "he who has come together."

8. 10.78b (*vṛṣṭiḥ*) *petuṣī*, "(rain) which has fallen."

9. 11.19a *nipetuṣī*, "she who has fallen down."

10. 11.65b *tasthuṣā*, "by him who has stood."

11. 11.91c *ūcivān*, "he who has spoken."

12. 15.96b *adhitasthuṣi*, "when it had ascended."[62]

13. 16.86a *ūcivān*, "he who has spoken."

Note that the number of roots is fairly limited. From these 22 occurrences, there are only six roots: √*gam* (2), √*jñā* (1), √*pat* (2), √*vac* (5), √*sthā* (11), and √*han* (1). The root √*sthā* is by far the favored. Kālidāsa has used all the same roots as Aśvaghoṣa with the exception of √*han*, but he has added √*jñā*. These will be important to keep in mind while looking at the rest of the data since a precedent set by Kālidāsa can have long-lasting influence. Note that there are forms from √*i* with *upasarga*s other than *upa* in the works of both authors. The *kvasvanta*s from the standard language are well represented. Aśvaghoṣa has two such forms in the *Buddhacarita*[63] and two in the *Saundarānanda*.[64] These are all from *upeyivān*. Kālidāsa has five non-Vedic *kvasvanta*s in the *Kumārasambhava*,[65] and 18 in the *Raghuvaṃśa*.[66] In contrast to Aśvaghoṣa, who has only forms from (*upa*) √*i*, Kālidāsa has derivatives from four of the six permitted roots, excluding only *vas* and *anāśvān*, two of the rarer forms across the board. Based on this evidence we can conclude there was at least some motivation for Bhāmaha to make his suggestion. Furthermore, the KV's proposal to ignore the *upa* in *upeyivān* accords well with the usage found in both authors' works.

---

[62]The locative is part of a locative absolute construction.

[63]*Buddhacarita* 5.8d *upeyivān*, and 8.62c *upeyuṣaḥ*.

[64]*Saundarānanda* 5.29c *upeyivāṃsam*, and 11.57d *upeyivān* (deemed spurious by Johnston (1928: Notes 155)).

[65]*Kumārasambhava* 2.4d *upeyuṣe*, 5.12d *niṣeduṣī* (< √*sad*), 6.10b *upeyuṣām*, 6.15c *anūcānāḥ*, and 8.11b *niṣeduṣaḥ*.

[66]Examples from the three roots used are: 2.6d *niṣeduṣīm*, 11.51b *śuśruvān*, and 15.70b *upeyivān*. NB also 14.71d *dāśvān* by P. 6.1.12.

180

If we turn, however, to the major poets of the centuries following Kālidāsa, i.e., Bhaṭṭi, Bhāravi, Kumāradāsa, Bāṇa, Subandhu, Daṇḍin, and Māgha, we cannot but be astonished to see that the strictly Vedic forms completely disappear, while those that Pāṇini gives for the standard language (built on √*sad*, etc.) remain relatively common in the *padya*, "verse," *kāvya*s and more specifically the *mahākāvya*s: 15 in the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*,[67] 21 in the *Kirātārjunīya*,[68] and 24 in the *Śiśupālavadha*.[69] Among these, forms from √*i* other than *upeyivān* are extremely rare, only one in *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 4.1.d *īyivān*, and one in KirātA 1.11c *īyivān*.[70] Māgha adheres strictly to Pāṇini's set form, *upeyivān*. The last of the early *mahākāvya*s, Kumāradāsa's little studied *Jānakīharaṇa*, contains only two forms, both from √*i*, in the fist ten cantos: 4.11b *upeyuṣaḥ* and 7.34c *īyuṣi*. In the portions of the *gadya*, "prose," *kāvya*s I have been able to search, I have not found a single perfect active participle from any root. This most likely indicates a difference in style. The only reason to use such forms as permitted in P. 3.2.108 and 3.2.109 would be to demonstrate knowledge of Pāṇinian grammar and give an epic, grand flare (we will see they are common in the epics, especially the *Mahābhārata*); the authors of prose *kāvya*s may not have felt such forms to be stylistically appropriate. Although I must admit to being unable to search the complete corpus of the early prose *kāvyas*, the absence in the portions I have searched is at the very least telling. The permitted forms are similarly absent or extremely rare in *muktaka*s, "independent stanzas,"[71] and the dramas. We can therefore tentatively draw two conclusions so far. In the first place the use of any *kvasvanta* within the domain of poetry was reserved for the highest style, the *mahākāvya*. Second, the post-Kālidāsa

---

[67]References are to Jayamaṅgala's numbering unless otherwise noted. From all roots except *anāśvān*. 5 from √*sad*: 3.12a *upaseduṣas*, 3.26b *āseduṣaḥ*, 6.135b *upaseduṣām*, 11.1a *āseduṣi*, 14.22d *niṣedivān*; 2 from √*vas*: 3.27a *proṣivān*, 6.135c *ūṣuṣām*; 3 from √*śru* 1.20a *śuśruvān* = 6.136a = 14.22a; 4 from √*i*: 3.6a *upeyivāṃsam*, 4.1d *īyivān*, 6.136c *upeyivān*, 14.22b *abhyupeyuṣaḥ*; 1 from *anūcāna*: 6.136d *anūcānaiḥ*.

[68]Only three roots are represented: 5 from √*sad*: 3.24c *prasedivāṃsam*, 17.23a *prasedivāṃsam*, 18.18a *āseduṣām*, 18.20c *niṣedivāṃsam*, 18.38b *niṣeduṣām*; 15 from √*i* 1.11c *īyivān*, 4.32b *upeyuṣī*, 5.43b *upeyuṣi*, 6.22b *samupeyivān*, 8.7b *upeyuṣī*, 8.10a *upeyuṣaḥ*, 8.12a *upeyuṣīṇām*, 9.2b *upeyuṣi*, 13.39a *upeyivān*, 14.26c *upeyuṣaḥ*, 14.38a *upeyuṣīṃ*, 14.46c *upeyuṣā*, 15.10b *upeyuṣām*, 17.65b *upeyuṣi*, 18.42c *abhyupeyuṣām*; one from *anāśvān*: 12.2b *anāśuṣaḥ*.

[69]Each of the roots except for *anūcāna*-, is represented. Five from √*sad*: 1.16b *niṣedivān*, 1.17a *praseduṣaḥ*, 12.7b *niṣedivān*, 13.24c *upasedivadbhiḥ*, 14.68b *niṣeduṣaḥ*; One from √*vas*: 3.59c *adhyūṣuṣaḥ*; two from √*śru*: 2.118d *śuśru-vān*, 13.1a *śuśruvān*; 15 from *upa* + √*i* (always with *upa*), e.g., 1.32c *upeyuṣaḥ*, 2.3b *samupeyuṣi*, etc.; one from *anāśvān*: 14.49c *anāśuṣā*.

[70]There is also the reading *eyivān* as the commentaries of Vidyāmādhava (p. 13 of Chatterji's edition) and Citrabhānu (pp. 18f. of Gaṇapati Śāstrī's edition) attest to. The latter specifies that the suffix *KvasU* stands in for a *parokṣe liṭ*, a comment I have not seen elsewhere.

[71]Forms are also absent in the searchable works of Kṣemendra.

181

authors up to and including Māgha could not brook the rather dubious status of P. 3.2.107 as non-Vedic even in poetry. Although this is an *argumentum ex nihilo*, the concomitant occurrence of the other permitted perfect active participles points more to an intentional omission rather than happenstance, especially for poets like Bhāravi and Māgha, who do not shy from grammatical virtuosity. The intentionality is even stronger, if not entirely definite for Bhaṭṭi, since he aims to exemplify the rules of Sanskrit grammar and dutifully provides examples for five of the six roots in P. 3.2.108 and 109 (*anāśvān* is missing) in the span of two verses:

> *te hi jālair gale pāśais tiraścām **upaseduṣām** |*
> ***ūṣuṣām** paradāraiś ca sārdhaṃ nidhanam aiṣiṣuḥ* || 6.135 ||
> *ahaṃ tu **śuśruvān** bhrātrā striyaṃ bhuktāṃ kanīyasā |*
> ***upeyivān anūcānair** ninditas tvaṃ latāmṛga* || 6.136 || (*Bhaṭṭikāvya*)[72]

> For they (scil. the previous elders) sought with nets and nooses for their necks the destruction of the animals who had come near and of those who had lived with others' wives. I, however, O monkey (scil. Valin)! have heard that you, after approaching a woman enjoyed by your younger brother, were reprimanded by those who are versed in the Vedas.

Bhāmaha's advice, if known to these poets, has fallen on deaf ears. More definitively, Kālidāsa's usage of the Vedic *kvasvanta*s was not sufficient grounds for them to adopt these questionable grammatical forms.

This strict adherence to the letter of the law comes to an abrupt and forceful end in the Brobdingnagian poem of Ratnākara, the *Haravijaya*. Of the nigh hundred perfect active participles I have counted in this largest of *mahākāvya*s, 56 should, strictly speaking, count as Vedicisms as they are not formed from the six roots given in P. 3.2.108 and 109. As though to prove the full legitimacy of P. 3.2.107 for the (poetic) *bhāṣā*, Ratnākara uses the suffix *KvasU* with a wide range of roots in the *Haravijaya*, as the following incomplete list amply demonstrates:

1. √*i* : 13.13a *īyuṣā.**
2. √*kṛ* : 46.35a *cakṛvāṃsam.*[73]
3. √*krudh* : 7.42a *cukrudhivāṃsam.*
4. √*gam* : 9.74a *upajagmuṣā.*
5. √*tan* : 44.30a *ātenuṣām.*
6. √*dhā* : 17.84a *abhidadhuṣī.*

---

[72]6.138f. according to Mallinātha.
[73]The alternate reading *cakrivāṃsam* is noted.

7. √*dhuv* : 34.37a *dudhuvuṣā*.

8. √*nah* : 15.39a *pinehivāṃsaḥ*.

9. √*nī* : 50.45a *ānemuṣaḥ*.

10. √*mlā* : 17.100b *mamluṣī*.

11. √*pat* : 9.9b *nipetivāṃsaḥ*.

12. √*phal* : 20.44b *pratipheluṣībhiḥ*.

13. √*bhid* : 34.22a *bibhidivān*.

14. √*bhram* : 34.38.a *sambhremuṣā*.

15. √*mṛd* : 28.91a *mamṛduṣā*.

16. √*vac* : 50.16a *ūcuṣī*.

17. √*viś* : 22.54b *viviśuṣīḥ*.

18. √*śam* : 16.7a *viniśemuṣām*.

19. √*sad* : 36.13b *āseduṣaḥ*.

20. √*sṛj* : 13.17b *sasṛjuṣām*.

21. √*sthā* : 44.51b *tasthuṣi*.

22. √*śru* : 14.14a *śuśruvān*.

23. √*hā* : 16.35b *juhuṣām*.

There are also 10 derivatives from √*i* either without an *upasarga* or with one different from *upa*,[74] indicating the KV's interpretation of the sūtra was acceptable. Oddly, I have found no forms derived from *anūcāna* or *anāśvān*. One possible explanation for this change, and there are others as we shall see, could be Ratnākara's milieu in 9th century Kashmir,[75] where Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* served as the foundational text for the study of *alaṅkāraśāstra*.

This resurgence of the *kvasvanta* is, however, short-lived, and in later *kāvya* works all perfect active participles dwindle down to a trickle. Abhinanda keeps a few Vedic forms alive in his *Rāma-carita*: 2.54a *ūcivān*, 3.34b *ājagmuṣaḥ*.[76] Padmagupta[77] works in only a single Vedic participle, 13.59a *ūcivān*, in his *Navasāhasāṅkacarita*. On other hand, *kvasvanta*s tagged for the standard language are not entirely absent, especially from *upeyivān*.[78] In the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*, Śrīharṣa sparingly employs a few forms, 15 in total, of which 6 could be considered Vedic, but only from two roots. √*sthā*: 5.19d *tasthivān* (= 5.40b, 18.33b); 20.161d *uttasthivān*; and √*vac*: 5.128a *ūcivān* (= 17.107d).[79] That all the roots from which these poets have built Vedic *kvasvanta*s are found in

---

[74]E.g 6.134a *īyuṣi* and 24.28a *udīyuṣaḥ*.

[75]Cf. Lienhard (1984: 199f.) and Smith (1985).

[76]Note I have only been able to search the first three *sarga*s. On Abhinanda's style, which shows a "return to the relatively simpler manner of Aśvaghoṣa" and is innovative but "immediately understandable," see Tubb (2014c).

[77]Padmagupta's *mahākāvya* has been more recently discussed in McCrea (2010: 504f.).

[78]From *upeyivān*: *Navasāhasāṅkacarita* 1.31a *upeyivāṃsam*, 5.3b *upeyuṣi* (= 6.9b), 7.8c *upeyuṣā* (= 8.67a), 17.50d *upeyuvadbhiḥ*. Two derived from √*sad*: 4.33a *niṣeduṣā* and 10.47a *prasedivān*.

[79]Of the remaining 9, two are from √*sad*: NaiC 2.17a *praseduṣā*, 14.45c *praseduṣaḥ*; the others are from √*i* with *upa*: 2.99b *upeyuṣā*, without it: 12.17b *īyuṣī*, and with other *upasarga*s: 15.84b *samīyuṣaḥ*.

183

Kālidāsa points toward a certain comfort with forms already sanctioned by the master poet and an imitation of his style.

The next significant revival of the perfect active participle I have noted occurs in the *Nārāyaṇīya* of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (16th cent. Kerala) with 34 forms, 21 of which fall within the scope of Vedic usage. Like Ratnākara, Nārāyaṇa does not hesitate to demonstrate the productivity of the *KvasU* suffix by affixing it to several different roots:

1. √*kṛ* : 10.85.6a *pracakruṣi*.

2. √*gam* : 10.39.5c *ajagmuṣī*[80] (cf. 10.39.6c).

3. √*dā* : 10.80.2d *dadivān* (cf. 9.34.1b, 10.40.6b, 10.78.2a).

4. √*dhā* : 10.38.3a *dadhuṣā*.

5. √*pā* : 10.47.1d *papivān*.

6. √*bandh* : 10.82.4b *babandhuṣi*.

7. √*budh* : 10.82.8b *bubudhuṣā*.

8. √*muh* : 10.82.6a *mumuhuṣi*.

9. √*vac* : 10.37.5d *ucivān* (= 10.37.5d, 10.60.9b, 10.68.8d; cf. 4.17.9a).

10. √*viś* : 2.5.4b *viviśivān*.

11. √*śaṃs* : 10.85.2d *śaśaṃsuṣi*.

12. √*sthā* : 2.7.2b *tasthivān* (cf. 10.68.2b).

Below I will attempt to explain Nārāyaṇa's affinity for these forms, clustered especially in the tenth *skandha*, by citing both his grammatical works as well as the model for his poem, the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*.

4.2.4   *Kvasvanta*s in the Epics

Both for the sake of comparison between genres and to present a part of the wider linguistic back-drop for my study, I have surveyed the following works from the epic and purāṇic traditions: the first nine *parvan*s of the *Mahābhārata*, the entire *Rāmāyaṇa*, and the entire *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. The language of the two great epics represents a form of Sanskrit not so heavily regulated by Pāṇini (or other grammarians) with many irregularities, from the viewpoint of classical San-

---

[80]This is one of only two instances I have found of a *kvasvanta* compounded with the privative particle *naÑ-* (= *a-*), the other being Mbh 5.48.29d *anapeyivān*. The verse describes Yogamāyā's miraculous ascension into the sky in her full form as the eight-handed fierce goddess after Kaṃsa had dashed her human form on the rocks. She then glitters in the sky *adhastalam ajagmuṣī*, "without having gone to the nether world." The positive form *jagmuṣī* occurs in the immediately following verse in which the goddess addresses Kaṃsa and then departs for her earthly dwellings.

skrit, in morphology, sandhi, conjugation, and declension.[81] Among the two, the Rāmāyaṇa, the *ādikāvya*, "first poem," certainly comes closer to the Pāṇinian standard and frequently served as a model for the later poets both thematically as well as linguistically. As to whose speech and what time period the language of the two epics represents, there is no single answer, both of the texts having grown significantly over the centuries at the hands of many individuals and the precise date of redaction varying between the different recensions. Nevertheless, both works appear to have reached a somewhat stable form by the time of Bhāmaha in the 7th cent., and certainly comprised a large body of well-known literature that grammarians of the first millennium CE could have taken into consideration. By examining this linguistic data, we obtain a picture of another register of the language that a very wide range of the Sanskrit-speaking population knew and was certainly more accessible than the learned *mahākāvya*s. The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, on the other hand, is a much later work, which clearly sought to adopt archaic language so as to give off a Veda-like aura.

The composers of the *Mahābhārata* make fairly frequent of use *kvasvanta*s. Based on the e-text of the Mbh available on GRETIL and including the verses not accepted into the critical edition, there are 144 perfect active participles in the first nine *parvan*s, of which 85 should be considered Vedic; these are, however, restricted to just a few roots: √*gam*, √*jñā*, √*pat*, √*pad*, √*yaj*, √*vac*, √*sthā*, √*han*, and √*hṛ* (just once Mbh 1.40.1c *vijahrivān*). Of those roots sanctioned by Pāṇini, all but one (Mbh 1.71.55c *śuśruvāṃsaḥ* = 3.134.23a) are from √*i* with and without *upasarga*(s). With regard to case, number, and gender, they are almost exclusively in the masc. nom. sing., and serve as the main verb. For the most part they are at the end of a hemistich in the *anuṣṭubh* meter, where the participle easily fills the iambic cadence. Twenty forms are located elsewhere in the verse. Metrical considerations probably played a role in the decision to use such forms as *upeyivān*, "has approached," (e.g., Mbh 1.70.46d), *jaghnivān*, "has killed," (e.g., Mbh1.119.38d), and *pedivān*, "has set forth," (e.g., Mbh 1.155.28b), since the corresponding past active participles in either *-tavān* (*ktavatvanta*s) or in *-ta* (*ktvānta*s) would be unmetrical in the same position at

---

[81]On the language of the epics in general see, Oberlies (2003). Brockington (1969) briefly discusses the nine *kvasvanta*s in the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* including the odd form *apriyaśaṃsivān* in 2.16.60d.

the end of a hemistich: *upetaḥ*, *hatavān*, and *pannaḥ*. Other roots whose *ktvānta*s do metrically fit are found in this position, e.g., Mbh 3.3.30d *avāptavān*. As before, it's worth noting that √*i* is used with *upasarga*s other than *upa*. I have noted 19 instances in my data set, e.g., Mbh 1.198.19 *īyivān*, 3.60.32d *eyivān*, 4.7.8c *sameyivān*, etc. We can safely conclude that the data from the Mbh supports the continued use of *kvasvanta*s in the post-Vedic period from a wider number of roots than Pāṇini allowed and that √*i* need not occur with *upa*.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* presents us with a drastically different picture. I have located only 24 perfect active participles in the entire epic, with none whatsoever in the third *kāṇḍa*. From among these, ten are to be considered Vedic: Rām 2.10.31e *āpedivān*, 2.14.17d *abhidadhyuṣī*, 2.66.43d *up-apedivān*, 2.88.27a *vijahrivān*, 5.3.7d *abhipedivān*, 7.10.6d *tasthivān*, 7.13.38b *jaghnivān* = 7.57.16b, 7.76.18d *upajagmivān* = 7.94.9d. From √*i*, six are combined with an *upasarga* other than *upa*: 1.76.018b *sameyivān*, 2.56.17d *eyivān*, 2.59.13c *īyuṣaḥ*, 4.18.21b *apeyuṣaḥ*, 6.47.126d *eyivān*, and 6.66.1d *eyivān*. These are accounted for by the KV. All that remains within the realm of strict Pāṇinian Sanskrit are eight forms only one of which, Rām 1.18.20b *śuśruvān*, is not a form of *upeyivān*.[82] The drastic decline in frequency of these forms reflects their overall decline in later Sanskrit and complete disappearance in most genres. Nevertheless, there are enough Vedic *kvas-vanta*s to demonstrate that Pāṇini's rules were not taken to be inviolable, or, vice versa, the now available Pāṇinian grammarians prior the KV did not account for two thirds of these forms. Although this evidence from the *Rāmāyaṇa* is much slimmer than that from the *Mahābhārata*, they both align well with each other and provide a linguistic register outside of *kāvya* that employed perfect active participles beyond the bounds of Pāṇini's rules.

4.2.5 The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* and *KvasU*

The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* does not lend itself to easy classification, although it does officially number among the *Purāṇa*s.[83] One of the striking features of this text is its highly archaic language, an

---

[82]Among these I include the forms of *upeyivān* with an additional preverb: Rām 1.68.7b *abhyupeyivān* and 1.72.1d *samupeyivān*. *upeyivān* alone is found at Rām 1.41.9d, 1.57.2d, 2.18.7b, 2.48.31b, and 7.95.16d.

[83]But sometimes not. See Rocher (1986: 146f.) for references to individuals in the Sanskrit tradition who did not consider the word *Bhāgavata* in the list of 18 *Purāṇa*s to refer to the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*.

object of investigation in modern scholarship that received its primary impetus from Wackernagel and was subsequently taken up by Meier (1931), Van Buitenen (1966), and Biswas (1968).[84] These studies have shown that the author of the *Bhāgavata* took over a number of forms from Vedic literature possibly as "an attempt at Sanskritization of the popular Krishna legend."[85] We can, therefore, anticipate that Vedic *kvasvanta*s will make an appearance in this work, and we are not let down. I have noted 16 forms from the following seven roots:

1. √*gam* : 10.57.6d *jagmivān.*

2. √*jñā* : 4.23.2d *jajñivān.*

3. √*dṛś* : 3.4.12d *dadṛśvān.*[86]

4. √*vac* : 1.3.11d *ūcivān* (= 3.1.14a, 4.21.19c, 9.3.1d, 10.6.56d).

5. √*vah* : 5.10.6b *ūhivān.*

6. √*sthā* : 3.10.18d *tasthuṣām* (= 3.13.43a and cf. 4.23.2a, 6.3.12a, 7.3.29a).

7. √*han* : 4.11.1a *jaghnivān* (= 4.24.5d).

Among these there are two new roots, √*dṛś* and √*vah*; the others can be found already in the early *kāvya*s. *dadṛśvān* appears to be taken over directly from RV 4.33.6 and 10.139.4. As per usual, forms from √*i* with *upasarga*s other than *upa* or none at all are attested.[87] The presence of these forms in the BhP can be taken as another indication that they gave a particular elevated, if not archaic, flare to poetry. We can also now see that the *Nārāyaṇīya* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa also had precedent in the BhP for employing his *kvasvanta*s, albeit at a much greater frequency.

Among the forms permitted in the standard language, the non-reduplicated perfect active participle, *mīḍhvān*, "munificent," set down as irregular in P. 6.1.12, makes up eleven (about one third) of all 36 such occurrences. *dāśvān*, "pious," in BhP 8.22.23d is another such form given in the same *sūtra*. As I remarked earlier in fn. 31, the Vedic or non-Vedic status of the forms in

---

[84]Cf. Rocher (1968: 146). Meier (1931: 33) gives the references to Wackernagel.

[85]Van Buitenen (1966: 33) and quoted in Rocher (1968: 146).

[86]Cf. Meier (1931: 58). This is the only *kvasvanta* that Meier notes, although his general remark that the perf. act. part. appears to be restricted to a particular, albeit larger number of roots than Pāṇini gives, is certainly supported by the present study. Cf. Biswas (1968: 20f.).

[87]E.g., BhP 3.26.16d *īyuṣaḥ*, 4.26.11b *eyivān.*

P. 6.1.12 was not settled among the grammarians, despite the KV's explicit remarks that they are valid for both Vedic as well as the standard language. Usage, however, tells us that they were considered unfit for standard Sanskrit, even poetry, and the sudden appearance of *mīḍhvān* and its derivatives in the archaizing BhP corroborates this impression. Returning to the grammarians, we can see once again that the CV, which includes *dāśvān*, etc., and of which the authors of KV and Bhoja made use, quietly exerted considerable influence on the Sanskrit grammatical tradition. That the later grammarians, Rāmacandra and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, tacitly[88] rejected the statements of the KV demonstrates that usage had a role in the interpretation of Pāṇini's rules and that the authority of the KV was by no means assured. We shall return to these same themes again.

4.3 The Grammarians on *KvasU*

After seeing the waxing and waning of the perfect active participle in Sanskrit *kāvya* literature and the epics, we must now examine how the grammarians describe the domain of *KvasU*. We may then compare this with the remarks of the commentators. This will prove a particularly fruitful test case, not only because there is abundant evidence from practice, but also on account of the rather stark and at times even explicitly acknowledged divide between the Pāṇinians themselves and also other grammarians. Furthermore, the case of *KvasU* allows for a microcosm of how the authority of Patañjali gains gravity over the course of time and by what means the grammarians resolve usage with the *muni*'s words. Let us, then, begin our journey with Patañjali after a few more details regarding the suffix *KvasU* and the interpretation of the sūtras that prescribe it.

The wording of the series of sūtras cited above (P. 3.2.105–109) poses a number of interpretive obstacles for the commentators, all of which are dealt with to one degree or another in the *Mahābhāṣya* and rehashed in the later commentaries. The divergent positions of the KV, some of which have been noted above, provide fuel for later critics who defend Patañjali. For the debate

---

[88]I have not yet located any passage where these particular comments of the KV are criticized. Haradatta envisions them as a reply to one who (KVPada vol. IV p. 462) *dāśvādīnāṃ prācuryeṇa chandasi prayogadarśanāc chāndasam etat sūtram iti manyamānam*, "thinks that this sūtra pertains to Vedic usage because one sees the use of (the forms) *dāśvān*, etc. mostly in the Vedas." So it seems that Bhaṭṭoji had like-minded predecessors.

surrounding whether or not the general application of *KvasU* (and *KānaC*) is restricted to the Vedic language (*chandasi*), the primary issue is the use of the *anubandha*, "indicatory letter," *K* at the beginning of the two suffixes. As noted before, one of the main functions of marking a suffix with *K* (*kitkaraṇa*, "making (a suffix) be one which has *K* as its *it*, i.e. *anubandha*") is to prevent the application of P. 7.3.84 and 86, which cause a final vowel and a penultimate light vowel of a root etc., to be replaced by the corresponding guṇa vowel.[89] The presence of *K* will therefore block guṇa-substitution from applying in cases like *cakṛ + KvasU* so that the nom. masc. sing., is *cakṛvān* and not *cakarvān**. This straightforward explanation, however, cannot satisfy someone well versed in the A like Kātyāyana. The reason is that Pāṇini automatically makes the suffixes of the perfect, i.e., the substitutes for *liṭ*, marked with *K* under certain circumstances, viz. when the root does not end in a conjunct consonant and the replacement suffix is not already marked with a *P*.[90] This is achieved with P. 1.2.5 *asaṃyogāl liṭ kit* [*apit*], "The (the substitutes for) *liṭ* are marked with a *K* when following a root which does not end in a conjunct consonant and the suffix is not already marked with a *P*." In the example just given, *cakṛvān*, *K* has no purpose since *KvasU* will be marked with a *K* by P. 1.2.5. Nevertheless, Kātyāyana still finds a use for *K* and Patañjali manages to find fault. In their own words:

> [*bhāṣya*] *atha kitkaraṇaṃ kimartham | nāsaṃyogāl liṭ kit ity eva siddham |*

> [*vārtt.*] *kitkaraṇaṃ saṃyogāntārtham || 3 ||*

> [*bhāṣya*] *kitkaraṇaṃ kriyate saṃyogārtham | saṃyogāntāḥ prayojayanti | vṛtrasya yad badbadhānasya rodasī | tvam arṇavān badbadhānāṁ aramṇāḥ | añjer ājivān iti || chāndasau kānackvasū | liṭ ca chandasi sārvadhātukam api bhavati | tatra sārvadhātukam apit ṅid bhavati iti ṅittvād upadhālopo bhaviṣyati ||* (MBh II.115.3–8)

> [Commentary] Now, to what end are (the suffixes) marked with *K*? Is it not taken care of by P. 1.2.5 alone, "the (substitutes for) *liṭ* are marked with *K* when following a root which does not end in a conjunct consonant and the suffix is not already marked with a *P*"?

---

[89]Devasthali (1967: 63–76) explains the uses of *K* in detail.

[90]Recall the discussion in the preceding chapter of *mṛjanti* and the sūtra P. 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*. Cf. p. 135. This is the same process of extending (*atideśa*) an *anubandha* to a suffix not overtly marked with the said *anubandha*. In this instance, Pāṇini extends *kittva*, "being marked with *K*." The condition *apit*, "not marked with a *P*," continues into the next sūtra.

Vārttika III: Marking (the suffixes) with *K* is for the sake of (roots) ending in a conjunct consonant.

[Commentary] Marking (the suffixes) with *K* is done for the purpose of (roots) ending in a conjunct consonant. The (roots) ending in a conjunct consonant cause the use of (*K*). (For example:) RV I.52.10c "When … of Vṛtra, who was pressing harder the two world-halves,"[91] (and) RV V.32.1b "You brought to peace the floods which had been hard pressed."[92] From the root *añj* (one forms the perfect active participle) *ājivān*.[93] The suffixes *KānaC* and *KvasU* are both Vedic. And *liṭ* in the Vedas is also a *sārvadhātuka* suffix.[94] In that case, since it (*KvasU*) is marked with *Ṅ* because as a *sārvadhātuka* suffix not marked with *P* it becomes marked with *Ṅ*,[95] the elision of the penultimate (nasal in such examples just cited)[96] will occur.

In his analysis of Kātyāyana's vārtt., Patañjali imagines what would happen if *KvasU* were not marked with *K*. Is there any way to achieve the same result, namely, the elision of the penultimate nasal by P. 6.4.24? The answer is yes. According to P. 3.4.117 *chandasy ubhayathā*, there is no distinction between *sārvadhātuka* suffixes and *ārdhadhātuka* suffixes in deriving Vedic forms. Normally *sārvadhātuka* suffixes are only the personal endings (*tiṄ*) and suffixes marked with the *anubandha* *Ś* by P. 3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*, except those that replace *liṭ* and the *āśirliṅ*, "benedictive," which Pāṇini exceptionally includes under the *ārdhadhātuka* suffixes by P. 3.4.115f.,

---

[91]Translation by Jamison & Brereton (2015: 167). The analysis of the form *badbadhānasya* (and *badbadhānān* in the following citation) is not consistent among the commentators. Patañjali must have taken it as a perfect participle of *bandh*, "to bind," so that the *anubandha K* will cause the elision of the penultimate *n* by P. 6.4.24 *aniditāṃ hala upadhāyāḥ kṅiti*, "there is the elision of a penultimate *n* of a presuffixal base (*aṅga*) not marked with an *I* when a suffix marked with a *K*, *G*, or *Ṅ* follws," and Kaiyaṭa explains accordingly (MBhPra III.183b): *bandha bandhane chāndasatvād abhyāsadhakārasya halādiḥ śeṣeṇa nivṛttyabhāve jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi jaśtvaṃ dakāraḥ* | "(The root is) KṣDhP VII.37 *bandhA* 'to bind'; when there is no removal of the letter *dh* in the reduplicated syllable by P. 7.4.60 *halādiḥ śeṣaḥ* because (the form) is Vedic, it is deaspirated (*jaśtva*) by P. 8.4.53 *jhalāṃ jaś jhaśi*." Sāyaṇa, on the other hand, as well as modern linguists, derives the form from *bādh*, "to press, block," (KṣDhP I.6 *bādhṛ viloḍane*), but they differ on the cause for the reduplication. Sāyaṇa (RVBh vol. I p. 266) sees an irregular transfer to the *hvādi* or reduplicating *gaṇa* (P. 2.4.76) with the suffix *CānaŚ* by P. 3.2.129. Modern linguists, quite justifiably, take it as a middle participle of the intensive (*yaṅluk*). Cf. Macdonell (1910: 391). In either case the reduplicated syllable is extraordinary. That other grammarians disagreed with Patañjali's interpretation is perhaps indicated by the fact that the KV provides different and more straightforward examples ad P. 3.2.106: *agniṃ cikyānaḥ* | "He has piled up the fire." *somaṃ suṣuvāṇaḥ* | "He has pressed the soma."

[92]Translation by Jamison & Brereton (2015: 697). *badbadhānān*, the same stem as before, is here taken in a passive sense by both modern interpreters and Sāyaṇa. The latter's gloss (VPr vol. II p.557) is *bādhyamānān*.

[93]Once again, the point is that *K* will cause the elision of the penultimate nasal by P. 6.4.24.

[94]Normally the replacements for *liṭ* are *ārdhadhātuka* by P. 3.2.115 *liṭ ca*, but by P. 3.4.117 *chandasy ubhayathā* "in Vedic literature a suffix can be either (*sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka*)," they can be either.

[95]P. 1.2.4.

[96]P. 6.4.24.

but in the Vedas this distinction is blurred. Consequently, P. 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit* could apply to *KvasU* and mark it with *Ṅ*.[97] Now since the application of P. 6.4.68 is conditioned (in part) by a following suffix being marked either with a *K*, *G*, or a *Ṅ*, it can still apply even if *KvasU* were not marked with *K*, and the elision of the penultimate nasal of *bandh* and *añj* is achieved without any recourse to *K*. Once Patañjali has demonstrated that *K* is not necessary for the given examples, another purpose must be sought.

Kātyāyana, aware of the weakness in his first proposal, offers a second. The alternative purpose for marking *KvasU* with *K* concerns the application of P. 7.4.11 *ṛcchatyṛtām*. This sūtra deals with the perfect of the verbs *ṛch* (KṣDhP VI.15 *ṛchA indriyapralayamūrtibhāvayoḥ*), *ṛ* (KṣDhP I.983 *ṛ gatiprāpaṇayoḥ* and KṣDhP III.16 *ṛ gatau*), and all roots ending in a long *ṝ*. We are concerned with the last group. The sūtra states, in short, that the vowel of such roots takes guṇa-substitution when a perfect suffix follows. There is, however, an immediate conflict with one of the rules we have just seen. P. 1.2.5 marks all the perfect suffixes except the singular of the *parasmaipada* with *K* and so debars guṇa- and vṛddhi-substitution by P. 1.1.5. Does P. 7.4.11 override the presence of the *anubandha K*, i.e., the prohibition of P. 1.1.5? It must, because if did not, it would have no scope of application at all, since the forms of the *parasmaipada* singular will cause guṇa-strengthening regardless as they are not marked with *K* by P. 2.1.5. Therefore, in deriving such forms as *nicakaruḥ*, "they have thrown down," from *ni + kṝ*, we can ignore the facts that P. 1.2.5 marks the 3rd pers. pl. ending (originally *jhi*, then *us* in the perfect by P. 3.4.82) with *K* and that guṇa should be blocked. P. 7.4.11 will take over so there is guṇa-strengthening of the final *ṝ*, and the correct form *nicakaruḥ* will be produced.[98] With this in mind, let us see Kātyāyana's second reason for using *K* in *KvasU*.

> [vārtt.] *ṝkārāntaguṇapratiṣedhārthaṃ vā* || 4 ||

> [bhāṣya] *ṝkārāntaguṇapratiṣedhārthaṃ tarhi kitkaraṇaṃ kartavyam | ayaṃ liṭy ṝkārāntānāṃ pratiṣedhaviṣaye guṇa ārabhyate | sa yathaiveha pratiṣedhaṃ bādhitvā guṇo bhavati teratuḥ teruḥ evam ihāpi syāt titīrvān titirāṇaḥ | punaḥ kitkaraṇāt pratiṣidhy-*

---

[97] The same arguments are also presented in brief in the *Bhāṣya* ad P. 1.2.18, MBh I.200.10–12.

[98] The same explanation is given for the *anubandha K* in suffixes *Ki* and *KiNI* taught in P. 3.2.171. Cf. MBh II.134.20–23.

ate || (MBh II.115.9–12)

Vārttika IV: Or, it is for the purpose of prohibiting guṇa of (roots) ending in ṝ.

[Commentary] Then, marking (the suffixes) with a *K* must be done for the purpose of prohibiting guṇa (substitution[99] of the final vowel) of (roots) ending in ṝ. This guṇa is introduced within the scope of a prohibition (scil. P.1.1.5). Just as after blocking the prohibition (by P. 1.1.5) guṇa applies here in *teratuḥ*, "the two have crossed," *teruḥ*, "they have crossed," so too would (guṇa apply) here in *titīrvān*, "he has crossed," *titirāṇaḥ*, "he has crossed," (if *KvasU* were not marked with *K*), but because it is marked with *K* (guṇa) is prohibited.

Patañjali explains Kātyāyana's alternative purpose by pointing to two sets of examples: *teratuḥ*, *teruḥ* and *titīrvān*, *titirāṇaḥ*. The first set exemplifies that the guṇa prescribed by P. 7.4.11 will block the general prohibition against guṇa as enjoined in P. 1.1.5. The perfect suffixes *-atus* and *-us* are marked with *K* by P. 1.2.4, and hence P. 1.1.5 would usually be applicable, were it not for P. 7.4.11.[100] The second set should explain why *KānaC* and *KvasU* must be marked with *K*. The idea is simply that since suffixes occurring in place of *liṭ* and not marked with *P* are automatically marked with *K* (or *Ṅ*), Pāṇini must have marked *KānaC* and *KvasU* with *K* for a special purpose, otherwise he would be subject to the accusation of superfluity, a grave sin for a grammarian. Its purpose, in a sense, is to strengthen the power of the two suffixes to block any and all guṇa-substitutions including P. 7.4.11. As a consequence, when we derive forms such as *titīrvān*, P. 7.1.100 *ṝta id dhātoḥ* will apply so that ṝ is replaced by *ir* and eventually lengthened to *īr* by P. 8.2.77 *hali ca*.[101] Kātyāyana and Patañjali have now successfully defended the existence of *K* on the suffixes *KānaC* and *KvasU*.

Based on these passages from the *Mahābhāṣya*, there is no hint that the suffixes *KānaC* and *KvasU* could be generally productive in the standard language, and, in fact, Patañjali even ex-

---

[99]By P. 7.4.11.

[100]In deriving forms such as *teruḥ*, the guṇa-strengthening is obscured by the contraction of *tatar-* to *ter-* just as *papat-* contracts to *pet-* in its weak forms. P. 6.4.122 governs the transformation of *tatar-* to *ter-* and requires a short *a* in the presuffixal base (*aṅga*). To meet this criterion, the successful application of P. 7.4.11 is necessary so the final ṝ of *tṝ* will become *tar* and the form *tatar-* can arise.

[101]Since the lengthening is triggered, *inter alia*, by a following consonant (*hal*), the second √*i* of *titirāṇaḥ* remains short, i.e., P. 8.2.77 cannot apply. In the Vedas we find *titirvāṃsaḥ* (RV 1.36.7d) with a short √*i*; no form with a long *ī* is attested, nor is *titirāṇa*. Also, one would expect *tatirāṇaḥ* based on *sthānivadbhāva* as prescribed in P. 1.1.59 *dvirvacane 'ci*. *tatirāṇaḥ* is the form found in the *Mahāvṛtti* ad JV(M) 2.2.88 where JV(M) 1.1.59 (= P. 1.1.59) is even cited. See fns. 108 and 157 below.

plicitly qualifies them with *chāndasa*, "Vedic," as we have seen above.[102] Nevertheless, somewhat free use of the perfect participles continued well after the Vedic period, especially in the *Mahābharata* with examples in the early *mahākāvya*s as well. Some grammarians felt the need to justify this linguistic reality. Jinendrabuddhi is the first grammarian of the Pāṇinian school to do so, even though he goes against both the explicit statements of Patañjali and his own root text, the *Kāśikāvṛtti*.[103] To grant the two suffixes general application in the *bhāṣā*, "standard language," Jinendrabuddhi puts forth the following argument. Although it mostly builds on the MBh passages just quoted, the logical conclusions one should draw from the presence of the *K* on *KānaC* and *KvasU* go beyond Patañjali's reasoning.

> *kitkaraṇaṃ kitkāryārtham | tat punaḥ bandha bandhane ity evamādayaḥ saṃyogāntāḥ prayojayanti nānye | asaṃyogāntebhyaḥ asaṃyogāl liṭ kit iti siddhaḥ | saṃyogāntā api kittvaṃ bhāṣāyāṃ prayojayanti na cchandasi | tatrāha chandasy ubhayathā iti liṭaḥ sārvadhātukatvāt sārvadhātukam apit iti ṅittvam asty eva | na kittve ṅittve vā cchandasi kaś cid viśeṣo 'sti | bhāṣāyāṃ tu yady asaṃyogāntebhyaḥ kittvaṃ na syād yo 'yam ṛcchatyṛtām iti guṇaḥ pratiṣedhaviṣaya ārabhyate sa yatheha bhavati[104] nipaparatuḥ tathehāpi syāt nipapurāṇaḥ iti | kittve ca sati na bhavati | bhāṣāyāṃ tu kittvam arthavad bhavati | ...[105] | bhāṣāyāṃ kānaj bhavatīty asmād eva jñāpakād avasīyate |*
> (KVNyāsa II p. 616)

Marking (*KānaC*) with *K* is for the purpose of operations (conditioned by the presence of) the *anubandha* *K*. But only roots such as KṣDhP IX.37 *bandhA bandhane* that end in a conjunct cause the use of it (scil. the *K*), not others. After (roots) not ending in a conjunct consonant, (being marked with *K*) is taken care of by P. 1.2.5 *asaṃyogāl liṭ kit*. And, roots ending in a conjunct consonant will bring about the use of the (suffix) being marked with *K* in the standard language, not in the Vedas. On this matter he (scil. Pāṇini) says the following: since by P. 3.4.117 *chandasy ubhayathā*, "in the Vedas (the suffixes) are both (termed *sārvadhātuka* and *ārdhadhātuka*)," *liṭ* is termed *sārvadhātuka*, it is certainly marked with *Ṅ* according to P. 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*, "a *sārvadhātuka* suffix not marked with *P* is marked with *Ṅ*." In the

---

[102]In addition to the already quoted passage, Patañjali uses *chāndasa* to qualify *KvasU* alone in MBh I.200.10 and III.337.1.

[103]KV ad P. 3.2.106. *liṭaḥ kānaj vā | chandasi liṭaḥ kānaj ādeśo bhavati vā |* "In the Vedas *KānaC* is optionally the substitute for *liṭ*." And, ad P. 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca | chandasi liṭaḥ kvasur ādeśo bhavati |* "In the Vedas the *KvasU* is (optionally) the substitute for *liṭ*."

[104]Both printed editions include a *na* before *bhavati*, but I am unable to make sense of the passage with the negative. The point is that P. 7.4.11 does apply in the immediately following examples because the suffixes, i.e., the replacements for *liṭ*, are not explicitly taught with *K* (*aupadeśika*). Analogously, *KānaC* without its *K* would also permit P. 7.4.11 to apply. Based on this reasoning I have deleted *na*.

[105]The omitted passage gives information regarding the *prakriyā*, "derivation," of *nipapurāṇaḥ*. These details do not concern us at the moment.

Vedas there is simply no difference between (a suffix) being marked with *K* and being marked with *Ṅ*. But in the standard language if *K* were not to occur as a marker (on a suffix) after a (verbal root) not ending in a conjunct consonant,[106] that very guṇa (substitution), which is introduced by P. 7.4.11 *ṛcchatyṛtām* within the scope of a prohibition (scil. P.1.1.5), just as it (guṇa) occurs in *nipaparatuḥ*, "the two of them have set down," *nipaparuḥ* 'they have set down,'[107] it would also apply here: *nipapurāṇaḥ*, "he who has set down."[108] But given that the (suffix is marked with *K*), it (guṇa by P. 7.4.11) does not apply. But in the standard language (*KānaC*) being marked with *K* is meaningful ... One can conclude based on just this hint (*jñāpaka*) that *KānaC* occurs in the standard language.

In brief, the *jñāpaka* is that the *K* in *KānaC* (and *KvasU*) is only meaningful (*arthavat*) in the standard language (*bhāṣā*) because in the Vedas the *liṭ* suffixes can always be marked *Ṅ* when they cannot be marked with *K*; In other words when P. 1.2.5 can't apply, P. 1.2.4 can step in, and so marking the suffixes with a *K* is redundant when applying the rules to Vedic forms. Well aware that this freedom is not possible in the standard language, Pāṇini taught *KānaC* (and *KvasU*) with *K* so as to hint that the suffixes are intended to occur after any root in the *bhāṣā* as well. The precise logic and implications are somewhat fuzzy in my opinion, and Jinendrabuddhi sidesteps Patañjali's argument that *K* is necessary even for Vedic forms because it prevents guṇa by P. 7.4.11. Yet, regardless of the *jñāpaka*'s validity in the opinion of anyone else, Jinendrabuddhi has provided a justification that he presumably believes holds water. It is unfortunate that he does not give a citation from literature, but in some respects a justification within Pāṇini's system is stronger than actual usage and well in accord with Jinendrabuddhi's goal to read as much into the text of the A as possible. Finally, lest one object that *KvasU* has been neglected, in his comments on the following sūtra, P. 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca*, Jinedrabuddhi interprets the *K* of *KvasU* in the

---

[106]In this hypothetical, P. 1.2.5 could not extend the *K* marker to the suffix because the root ends in a conjunct consonant. In the Vedas however, P. 1.2.4 could step in.

[107]Since there is no context for *ni* + √*pṝ*, I simply follow Whitney's translation of the verb *nipṛṇāmi* in AVŚ 18.2.30a in Whitney & Lanman (1906: 839). The same form is found in a following hymn, AVŚ 18.4.42b, where Whitney translates it as "I offer," Whitney & Lanman (1906: 882).

[108]Cf. my note on *teruḥ* and *titīrvān*. The crux of the argument is the same, namely that we want guṇa in the finite forms like *nipaparatuḥ*, etc., but not in the participles like *nipapurāṇaḥ*. In order to ensure the prohibition, *KānaC* (and *KvasU*) must be marked with *K*. Note that in √*pṝ* the final *ṝ* is replaced by *u(r)* because it is preceded by a labial consonant. Cf. P. 7.1.102 *ud oṣṭhyapūrvasya*. The reduplicated syllable, however, is based on √*pṝ* by P. 1.1.59. I suspect that Jinendrabuddhi has chosen *nipapurāṇaḥ* instead of *titirāṇaḥ* from the MBh because *titirāṇaḥ* appears un-Pāṇinian insofar as *sthānivadbhāva* should apply to the base during reduplication whereby we would want *tatirāṇaḥ* much like *papurāṇaḥ*. See fn. 101, p. 192 and and fn. 157, p. 210.

same manner as for *KānaC* (KVNyāsa vol. II p. 617): *kitkaraṇaṃ kānaca iva draṣṭavyam* | "Marking (*KvasU*) with *K* should be viewed like (marking) *KānaC* (with *K*)." The same set of arguments and outcomes may be repeated for *KvasU*. As we will see later on some subsequent Pāṇinians are quick to dismiss this logic, primarily because it runs against Patañjali's express statement that these suffixes are *chāndasa*, "Vedic."[109] But why, in the first place, does Jinendrabuddhi want these suffixes to apply in standard language as well? As I have shown, the use of these participles by Kālidāsa and in other works like the *Mahābhārata* must have served as an impetus, but there appears to have been at least one other factor, the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*.

4.4   The *Cāndravyākaraṇa* on *KvasU*

As a Buddhist, Jinendrabuddhi was, in all likelihood, familiar with the once influential and popular *Cāndravyākaraṇa* by Candragomin along with its *vṛtti* (likely by another author, Dharmadāsa). Its influence on the *Kāśikā* is now well documented,[110] and we would not be too rash to assume that it had some impact on Jinendrabuddhi in composing his commentary on the KV. Although a thorough comparison of the two works is well beyond the scope of my present task, I believe that I can furnish one piece of evidence in support of this hypothesis and at least get the ball rolling. So far, Patañjali and the authors of the KV have unequivocally stated that *KānaC* and *KvasU* are restricted to the Vedic language in their application to any root. The exceptions are limited to a mere six verbal roots in P. 3.2.108 and 109. Recall also, that the *kvasvanta* of these roots can stand in for any of the three past tenses. Candragomin, who eliminated all the Vedic rules from the main section of his grammar, should, therefore, mention only the six exceptional forms from P. 3.2.108 and 109, preferably in a more economic way. Yet this is not quite what we find in the CV. The sūtras along with the *vṛtti*, corresponding roughly to P. 3.2.107–9, are as follows:

> CV 1.2.73 *śrusadvaso liḍ vā* [*bhūte*[111]] ||

---

[109]Haradatta already notes the conflict and rejects Jinendrabuddhi's argument on the basis that it contradicts the *Bhāṣya*. I discuss this passage below in § 4.6.5.

[110]Discussed in ch. 1.

[111]CV 1.2.62 *bhūte* || governs up to CV 1.2.81.

[*vṛtti*] *śṛṇotyādibhyo bhūte liḍ vā bhavati | upaśuśrāva upāśrauṣīt upāśṛṇot | upasasāda upāsadat upāsīdat | anuvāsa anvavātsīt anvavasat ||*

CV 1.2.74 *liṭaḥ kvasuḥ ||*

[*vṛtti*] *liṭaḥ kvasur ādeśo vā bhavati | upaśuśruvān upaśuśrāva | jagmivān jagāma ||*

CV 1.2.75 *īyivān anāśvān anūcānaḥ ||*

[*vṛtti*] *liḍantā ete śabdā vā nipātyante | īyivān iyāya; upeyivān upeyāya; samīyivān samiyāya | anāśvān nāśa | anūcānaḥ anūvāca ||*

CV 1.2.73 *liṭ* occurs optionally in the sense of past time after the roots √*śru*, "to hear," √*sad*, "to sit," and √*vas*, "to dwell."[112]

[Commentary] *liṭ* occurs optionally in the sense of past time after √*śru*, etc. (For example:) *upaśruśrāva*, "has heard," (but without the option we have:) *upāśrauṣīt*, "heard," (and) *upāśṛṇot*, "heard." *upasasāda*, "has respectfully approached," (but without the option we have) *upāsadat*, "approached respectfully," and *upāsīdat*, "approached respectfully." *anuvāsa*, "has dwelt near," (but without the option we have) *anvavātsīt*, "dwelt near," (and) *anvavasat*, "dwelt near."

CV 1.2.74 *KvasU* occurs optionally in place of *liṭ* in the sense of past time.

[Commentary] *KvasU* is optionally the substitute for *liṭ*. (For example:) *upaśuśruvān* (or) *upaśuśrāva*, "has heard." *jagmivān* (or) *jagāma*, "has gone."

CV 1.2.75 *īyivān anāśvān* and *anūcānaḥ* (are set forms) optionally in the sense of past time.

[Commentary] These words (*īyivān, anāśvān,* and *anūcānaḥ*) ending in a *liṭ* suffix, are optionally[113] set forms. (For example:) *īyivān* (or) *iyāya*, "has gone"; *upeyivān upeyāya*, "has approached"; *samīyivān* (or) *samiyāya*, "has come together." *anāśvān* (or) *nāśa*, "has not obtained." *anūcānaḥ anūvāca*, "has repeated."

Let us first describe in a bit more detail how these sūtras are composed and arranged. CV 1.2.73 permits the suffix *liṭ* in the sense of the general past after the roots √*śru*, etc. Based on the CV and its *vṛtti*, the exact interpretation of the sūtra is somewhat uncertain. I assume what is meant is that when the option is applied, we obtain the finite perfect (the first example of each triad) as

---

[112]The order of the roots has been rearranged to avoid the addition of *v* after √*śru* in Pāṇini's sūtra.

[113]The scope of the option ranges over the use of the perfect active participle in place of other finite perfect forms, as the examples show.

an alternative to any of the other past tenses, i.e., the imperfect (*laṅ*) and aorist (*luṅ*). When the option is not applied we have the other past tense forms per usual.[114] Pāṇini does not have any equivalent sūtra, strictly speaking. According to the commentators on the A, only the perfect active participle of √*sad*, etc. can stand in for any of the three past tenses, not the finite perfect. I will return to this topic below.

The next sūtra, functionally equivalent to P. 3.2.107, allows for the suffix *KvasU* to optionally replace *liṭ*. Based on the examples there is no restriction on which *liṭ KvasU* can replace, i.e., it can be either the *bhūte liṭ* in the preceding sūtra or the *parokṣe liṭ* prescribed in CV 1.2.81, otherwise the equivalence *jagmivān* and *jagāma* would not be possible, since *bhūte liṭ* was restricted to √*śru*, etc.[115] Although examples are not given, it follows that the *kvasvanta*s from the three roots √*śru*, etc. can stand in for any of the three past tenses, just as the finite perfect forms *śuśrāva*, etc. can be employed for any past tense. The *kvasvanta* of any other root can only stand in for the normal *parokṣe* perfect. Finally, the last sūtra in the triad gives the set forms for three more roots, just as in P. 3.2.109. According to the commentator, they are optional only for the finite perfect forms. I note now that the CV has altered *upeyivān* to *īyivān*, a point I will return to shortly. In sum, *bhūte liṭ* is optional after √*sad*, etc., *KvasU* is an optional substitute for any *liṭ*, and the three set forms are options to the finite perfect.

4.4.1 The *Cāndravyākaraṇa*'s Influence

To what extent has the CV and its *vṛtti* influenced the KV and other commentators? I will demonstrate in the following sections that there are indications, to varying degrees of certitude, that the KV and Jinendrabuddhi repeat ideas found for the first time in the CV. To begin with a very clear parallel between the KV and CV, remember that the KV said that *liṭaḥ* in P. 3.2.106, though

---

[114]I base this on the remarks in the much fuller commentaries on Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* and Hemacandra's *Śabdānuśāsana*. Bhoja has borrowed CV 1.2.73–75 almost verbatim in his *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* 1.4.143–145, and Hemacandra, presumably following Bhoja, likewise has a very similar set of sūtras. The first of these ŚHŚ 5.2.1 is in fact identical to CV 1.2.73, *mutatis mutandis*, to account for differences in technical terms. See §§ 4.5.5 and 4.5.6 below.

[115]Once again the commentaries ad SKBhv 1.4.144 and ad SHŚ 5.2.2 both substantiate this interpretation. The former explains that *liṭaḥ* refers to both the *liṭ* that has just been stated as well as the *liṭ* that will be stated. See § 4.5.5 below.

obtainable through *anuvṛtti*, is not redundant because it indicates that Pāṇini refers to *liṅmātra*, "simply *liṭ*," i.e., any *liṭ* suffix obtained by any rule. This is the same interpretation the *vṛtti* must assume for *liṭaḥ* in CV 1.2.74 (≈ P. 3.2.106) otherwise we could not arrive at the pair *jagmivān, jagāma*, since only CV 1.2.81 *parokṣe liṭ* can assign *liṭ* to *gam*. As I explained above in fn. 28 (p. 174), the KV differs on this point from Patañjali, who takes *liṭaḥ* in P. 3.2.106 to refer only to *bhūte liṭ* in the preceding sūtra. The CV and KV, however, are unanimous.[116]

4.4.1.1 The Tenses of *KvasU*

Another point for discussion among the grammarians is how best to account for the fact that the *kvasvantas* of √*sad*, etc. are alternatives to all three finite past tenses. As mentioned above (p. 174 and fn. 30), the Pāṇinīyas, beginning with the MBh, believe this to be the case even if to do so requires either additions or some acrobatics. Yet, one important difference is that according to the MBh, *upaśuśrāva*, etc. cannot optionally stand in for *upāśrauṣīt* or *upāśṛṇot* as it can in the *vṛtti* ad CV 1.2.73; instead only *upaśuśruvān*, the participle, can take on the meaning of the respective past tenses. Kātyāyana's five vārttikas ad P. 3.2.108 propose various addenda so that the past tense suffixes interact properly with *KvasU* after √*sad*, etc. First, Kātyāyana slightly reformulates the sūtra. The suffix *liṭ* (in the sense of unqualified past time) optionally occurs after √*sad*, etc.[117] so that the aorist, which is also *bhūte*, does not lose its opportunity to apply after √*sad*, etc.[118] Next, this *liṭ* should also occur in the sense of the other two past tenses,[119] and finally *KvasU* invariably (*nitya*) replaces *liṭ* when expressing a tense other than *parokṣe*, "beyond one's senses," i.e., when equivalent to the imperfect or aorist.[120]

Patañjali does not disagree with the ultimate result but believes we can achieve much of the

---

[116]As are the commentaries on SKBhv 1.4.144 and SHŚ 5.2.2. The latter even repeats *liṅmātra* but in the parlance of his own grammar *parokṣāmātra*.

[117]P. 3.2.108.1–5 *bhāṣāyāṃ sadādibhyo vā liṭ* | "*liṭ* occurs optionally after √*sad*, etc. in the standard language." This is an instance where Kātyāyana has assumed that the sūtra should have a particular meaning without first examining the original wording of the sūtra.

[118]P. 3.2.108.2 *tadviṣaye luṇo 'nivṛttyartham* | "So that *luṅ* is not prevented in that (scil. *bhūte*) domain."

[119]P. 3.2.108.3 *anadyatanaparokṣayoś ca* | "and in the sense of 'not today' and 'beyond one's perception.'"

[120]P. 3.2.108.5 *tasya kvasur aparokṣe* | "*KvasU* occurs in place of it (scil. *liṭ*) when not in the sense of 'beyond one's perception.'" I have left out the fourth vārtt. as it just explains how *laṅ* and *parokṣe liṭ* block a *bhūte* suffix.

same result by making use of *anuvṛtti* rather freely applied. His solution is, nonetheless, quite clever. He assumes Kātyāyana's first vārtt. and part of his last. The basic rule is: *bhāṣāyāṃ sadādibhyo vā liṭ bhavati | liṭaś ca kvasur bhavati |* "*liṭ* optionally occurs in the standard language after √*sad*, etc., and *KvasU* occurs in place of *liṭ*."[121] Patañjali then allows the sūtra as such to continue in toto into the three rules for *luṅ* (P. 3.2.110), *laṅ* (P. 3.2.111), and *liṭ* (P. 3.2.115). Because the optionality has scope only over *liṭ* and not *KvasU*, the solution ultimately hinges on *KvasU* invariably replacing only the *liṭ* prescribed in this version of P. 3.2.108, and not *parokṣe liṭ*. As the sūtra moves into the rules for *luṅ*, etc., *liṭ* will optionally replace *luṅ*, etc., in their respective meanings, and *KvasU* will invariable replace this *liṭ*. Note that in the case of P. 3.2.115 *parokṣe liṭ*, *liṭ* replaces *liṭ* and *KvasU* replaces only the second *liṭ*. Thus, the finite perfect forms of √*sad*, etc., aren't blocked. In the end we obtain such formulations as in MBh II.116.7–9: *anadyatane bhūtakāle laṅ bhavati.* (Cf. P. 3.2.111) *bhāṣāyāṃ sadādibhyo vā liḍ bhavati liṭaś ca kvasur bhavati,* "*laṅ* occurs in the sense of 'in the past but not today.' The suffix *liṭ* optionally occurs (in the sense of 'in the past but not today') after the roots √*sad*, etc., in the standard language, and *KvasU* occurs in place of *liṭ*." This is a very neat and tidy solution on Patañjali's part. Note however, that *upasasāda*, or the like, never occurs as an optional form for *upāsadat* or *upāsīdat* because *KvasU* replaces *liṭ* before the personal endings have the opportunity to appear.[122] Given the continuation of *vā* and the perfect forms *upaśuśāva*, etc., in the *vṛtti* ad CV 1.2.73, the commentator does not follow Patañjali/Kātyāyana in making *KvasU* a necessary substitute for the general past *liṭ*. Furthermore, that *KvasU* can optionally replace *liṭ* after any root is clearly an innovation of the Cāndra school (from our vantage point), most certainly to account for documented usage of the perfect active participle as we have seen in *kāvya* and the epics.

If we turn now to the KV, we find a number of differences. In the first place, the scope of the option covers *KvasU* and not *liṭ*, that is to say we must first be able to add *liṭ* in the sense of the

---

[121]Kaiyaṭa (MBhPra III p. 184b: *liṭaḥ kānaj vety ato vety anuvartate.*) says that the word *vā* is got from P. 3.2.106 by *anuvṛtti*.

[122]Cf. the final statement of PŚ 69 p. 151. I mention this detail because later grammarians continue to fiddle with just this problem.

general past tense[123] and then replace this *liṭ* with *KvasU*. This immediately leads to the problem that this particular *liṭ* is not available in the standard language, only in the Vedic by P. 3.2.105. The KV solves the problem as follows:

> KV ad P.3.2.108: *sada vasa śru ity etebhyaḥ parasya liṭo bhāṣāyāṃ viṣaye vā kvasur ādeśo bhavati | ādeśavidhānād eva liḍ api tadviṣayo 'numīyate |*

> The suffix *KvasU* is optionally the substitute in the standard language for the *liṭ* that follows √*sad*, √*vas*, and √*śru*. Only because the substitute (*KvasU*) is prescribed is *liṭ* in this domain (the standard language) inferred.

The reasoning is perfectly sound. How could we have *KvasU* as a substitute for general past *liṭ*, if general past *liṭ* does not occur in this context? Hence, *liṭ* must also occur after √*sad*, etc., just as in CV 1.2.73 *śrusadvaso liḍ vā* explicitly prescribes. This procedure is entirely new and is presumably intended to counter the need to make Kātyāyana's first vārtt. ad P. 3.2.108.[124] But does this imply that *liṭ* can develop into a finite verb with the sense of general past, as we saw in the CV *vṛtti*? On this point the KV becomes rather cheese-paring with its words — the text never mentions, e.g., *KvasU* as an obligatory substitute — although the fact that it does not give a finite perfect form alongside its example: *upasedivān kautsaḥ pāṇinim |* "Kautsa sat at Pāṇini's feet," points more in the direction of a no.[125] The KV also shows that when we do not take the option for *KvasU*, the other tenses will apply per usual.[126] Finally, recourse is made to the same *anuvṛtti* trick found in the MBh to account for the fact that the *kvasvanta*s can also take on the meaning of the past tenses "not today" and "beyond one's perception."[127] Can any of this be tied to the

---

[123]Both the KVNyāsa and KVPada vol. II p. 618 confirm that we are here talking about *bhūtasāmānye liṭ*.

[124]Kātyāyana makes the addendum that *liṭ* optionally occurs after √*sad*, etc. See the following paragraph. Note that Kaiyaṭa also supports the KV's reasoning, MBhPr III p. 184a.

[125]Jinendrabuddhi (KVNyāsa vol. II p. 617) also thought no. He argues that since *liṭ* can only be inferred by its sign, *KvasU*, if we do not have *KvasU* we can no longer infer *liṭ*, and hence there is no possibility for a finite perfect in the sense of the general past. Cf. the discussion in the *Amoghavṛtti* below on p. 214.

[126]*tena mukte yathāprāptaṃ pratyayā bhavanti |* "Therefore when (the suffix *liṭ*) has been laid aside, the (other past tense) suffixes occur as usual." Unfortunately, neither KV commentator comment on this sentence.

[127]*laṅliḍviṣaye 'pi parastād anuvṛtteḥ kvasur bhavati |* "*KvasU* also occurs in the domain of the imperfect and perfect because of continuing hereafter." I have adopted the reading of the Osmania edition of the KV. The other editions I have consulted have *luṅlaṅviṣaye*, which cannot be correct since the domain of *luṅ*, i.e., general past tense, is already taken care of by *bhūte liṭ* in the present sūtra. The *Nyāsa*'s comments on this short passage (KVNyāsa II p. 620) further confirm the reading of the Osmania edition because *KvasU* is only explained in the domain of *laṅ* and *liṭ*, quoting at the end MBh II.116.8–10 without ascription, part of which I cited above. Cf. *Śabdakaustubha* vol. II p. 463 where we also find *laṅliḍviṣaye 'pi bhavati parastād anuvṛtteḥ*.

CV? Two points harmonize well with the Cāndra school while going against the MBh: that the option has scope over *KvasU* and not *liṭ* closely resembles the *vṛtti* ad CV 1.2.74,[128] and that *liṭaḥ* in P. 3.2.106/7 stands for any *liṭ*, i.e. *KvasU* can occur in place of any *liṭ*, not just *bhūte liṭ*, is the same interpretation needed for CV 1.2.74, although the *vṛtti* does not make this explicit. Recall that this interpretation is substantiated by the commentaries on the similar sūtras in the SKBhv and SHŚ. Lastly, although the inference of *bhūte liṭ* after √*sad*, etc. has no known predecessor in the grammatical tradition, it elegantly accounts for Kātyāyana's first vārtt. ad P. 2.3.108, the basis for CV 1.2.73, without fiddling with the text of the A. The KV, however, appears to diverge from CV with regard to the finite perfects of √*sad*, etc. in the sense of the general past tense. Based on the examples and the *Nyāsa*, as well as later commentaries, the KV does not permit *śuśrāva*, etc., to stand in for any past tense, as *śuśruvān*, etc., can. According to the CV *vṛtti*, on the other hand, such forms are unquestionably permitted. The grammatical schools will remain in schism on this point.

4.4.1.2 The *upasarga upa*

Another innovation of the two first Pāṇinian grammars, the JV(M) and CV, is the abense of *upa* in the *kvasvanta* of √*i*, i.e. *īyavān* is permitted. In the CV,[129] the three *nipātana*s or "set forms," taken over from P. 3.2.108 into CV 1.2.75, include the slight modification *īyivān* for *upeyivān*. This indicates that the perfect active participle of √*i* may be used with any or no *upasarga*. As I have documented along the way, such forms without *upa* are attested in classical Sanskrit *kāvya*s and epic literature. The use of these forms in works like *Bhaṭṭikāvya* and *Kirātārjunīya*, both of which contain no examples of the Vedic *KvasU* and generally follow the Pāṇinīyas assiduously, suggests that there is a grammatical justification for them. No hint, however, is given in the

---

[128]Haradatta, a rather strict adherent to the MBh and worried that one might construe the sūtra incorrectly, i.e., not in accordance with the MBh, notes KVPada vol. II p. 620: *na vāvacanena kvasur abhisambadhyate ... liḍ abhisambadhyate | bhāṣāyāṃ sadādibhyo vā liṭ | tasya nityaṃ kvasur ādeśo bhavati | vṛttigrantho 'py asminn arthe yojanīyaḥ |* "*KvasU* is not syntactically connected with *vā* 'optionally' ... *liṭ* is syntactically connected (with *vā*). *liṭ* optionally occurs in the standard language after √*sad*, etc. *KvasU* is invariably the substitute for *liṭ*. The text of the KV must also be construed in this meaning." This obviously goes against the most natural reading of the KV.

[129]See pp. 208f. for a translation and discussion of the relavent JV(M) sūtra.

MBh that *īyivān* may occur on its own or with an *upasarga* other than *upa*. It is only in the KV

ad P. 3.2.109 that we find a justification for such forms. Although without Patañjali's explicit

blessing, the basis for this interpretation does mimic a common exegetic technique favored by

the author of the *Bhāṣya*, namely that an element of the sūtra, in this case the *upasarga upa*, is

declared not to be *tantra*, "predominant," (= *pradhāna* as noted, e.g., in KVNyāsa vol. 3 p. 493 and

AKKṣ 3.3.731).[130] Since we will see other grammarians remark on this topic below, if we turn for

a moment to the commentators on the *kāvya*, there is ample evidence that the KV served as the

main justification for such forms. To cite but a few:

- Jayamaṅgala ad *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 4.1: *tad īyivān gatavān | upeyivānanāśvānaś ca ity atropasar-*
  gasyātantravtāt kevalād apīṇaḥ kvasuḥ ||

  He (scil. Rāma) who has gone, i.e., who went, there. The suffix *KvasU* occurs also after the

  bare root √*i* because in P. 3.2.109 the *upasarga* is not predominant.

- Mallinātha ad *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 4.1: *upeyivān iti kvasvantanipātana*[131] *upopasargābhyāsasyā-*
  tantratvād anyopasṛṣṭo 'nupasṛṣṭo vā sādhur eva ||

  According to P. 3.2.109 the set form *upeyivān* ending in the suffix *KvasU* is certainly correct

  with another *upasarga* (i.e., other than *upa*) or with no *upasarga* because the *upasarga upa*

  and the reduplicated syllable are not predominant.

- Devarājaya ad KirātA 1.11: *upeyivān sūtre nātropasargas tantram iti vṛttikāravacanād īyivān*
  iti rūpam |

  Based on the statement of the author of the (*Kāśikā*)*vṛtti* that the *upasarga* is not predomi-

  nant in the sūtra P. 3.2.109, the form is *īyivān*.

- Vidyāmādhava ad KirātA 1.11: *nanu upeyivānanāśānanūcānaś ca iti nipātanād upeyivān ity*
  eva prayoktavyam iti cen naiṣa niyamaḥ | yad uktaṃ vṛttikāreṇa na cātropasargas tantram

---

[130]See DSG p. 182f. for examples from the MBh. The relevant KV passage ad P. 2.1.109 reads: *na cātropasargas
tantram | anyopasargapūrvān nirupasargāc ca bhavaty eva |* "And here (in the word *upeyivān*) the *upasarga* is not of
primary importance. (The suffix *KvasU*) surely occurs after (the root √*i*) preceded by other *upasarga*s and without
any *upasarga*." Cf. MBhPr III p. 184 (ad P. 3.2.109) where Kaiyaṭa gives the same explanation in his first comment on
this sūtra, and SK ad P. 3.2.109 where the *upa* is labeled *avivakṣitam*, "not intended."

[131]Trivedi prints -*nipātane upa*-. I believe, however, that the nominative is the correct interpretation. The sandhi
would be the same with either the locative or the nominative.

anyopasargān nirupasargāc ca bhavaty eva iti | tasmād idam āṅpūrvasya iṇaḥ kvasau rūpam |

Now one could object that by P. 3.2.109 only (the form) *upeyivān* should be used because it is set down (as such). If one says that, (we respond) no, this is not a restriction because of what the author of the (*Kāśikā*)*vṛtti* has said, 'and the *upasarga* here is not predominant, (*KvasU*) certainly occurs after (the root √*i*) with a different *upasarga* and without any *upasarga*.' Therefore this is the form of the root √*i* preceded by the (*upasarga*) *āṄ* with the suffix *KvasU*.[132]

- Mallinātha ad KirātA 1.11: *upeyivānanāśānanūcānaś ca iti kvasupratyayānto nipātaḥ | nopasargas tantram iti kāśikākāra āha sma |*

  By P. 3.2.108 there is the set form ending in the suffix *KvasU*. The author of the *Kāśikā*(*vṛtti*) has said "the *upasarga* is not predominant.

The commentators' reliance on the KV, even when not expressly named, confirms that there was likely no other acceptable source for justifying such forms, i.e., the commentators did not wish to draw on other grammatical traditions. Nāgeśa, however, notes that others rebuff this line of argumentation and insist that only *upeyivān* is valid in the standard language.[133]

Before picking up again the story of *KvasU*, we may reflect on two of the more straightforward developments discussed so far and how the KV dealt with them. The CV and JV(M) have changed *upeyivān* to *īyivān* so as to better describe actual usage, evidence for which I have presented above. The KV, in all likelihood taking a cue from the CV or JV(M), accounts for the same modification of the rule, but without meddling with the *sūtra* text itself, although this is not beyond the KV. Instead, we find a justification following one of the methods of Patañjali and not openly contradicting him either. Such a non-confrontational procedure shields the ar-

---

[132]Note that Vidyāmādhava reads *eyivān* for *īyivān*. Citrabhānu likewise comments on this reading.

[133]In discussing an alternate reading in the *Mahābhāṣya* mentioned by Kaiyaṭa (*iy* for *īy*), Nāgeśa says (MBhPra III p. 185b): *bhāṣye iy iti hrasvapāṭhe īyivān ityādu chāndaso varṇavyatyayo bodhyaḥ | loke tv upeyivān ity eva sādhuḥ | upa ity avivakṣāyāṃ mānābhāvād ity anye |* "In the reading of a short (vowel) *iy* in the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*, one should understand that the change of sounds in such forms as *īyivān* is Vedic. Others say that in the ordinary world, however, only the form *upeyivān* is correct because it is out of a lack of proof when *upa* is said to be not intended." N.B. that Nāgeśa uses *anye* and *pare*, "others," to refer to scholars whose opinion he supports. *kecit*, on the other hand, is for those whose opinion lacks the support or goes against the MBh. Cf. Thieme (1957: 50 with fn. 2). On the KV's original argument see 130. Kaiyaṭa appears to be the first one to replace *atantra* with *avivakṣita*, which is then repeated in later grammars such as the *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

gument from criticism, as would befall Jinendrabuddhi, whose arguments contradict Patañjali's own words. I would therefore count this as another instance of the KV incorporating material from a source other than the MBh, most likely the non-Pāṇinian grammars, into its interpretation of a sūtra. What makes this case somewhat unusual, is that the author of KV has not simply taken over an idea from the CV but has done so with a clever justification in the style of Patañjali. The second issue is the general applicability of *KvasU* to the standard language, which receives no attention in the Pāṇinian tradition as we have it until Jinendrabuddhi makes a case for it. The KV completely ignores it, although the CV accounts for it, in all likelihood because Patañjali is more than clear about the suffix being Vedic. Even when we come to Jinendrabuddhi's argument, which for all intents and purposes imitates the MBh quite well, it never wins much favor in the Pāṇinian school because it contradicts Patañjali. A further point worth noting is that we have yet to see any mention of usage being a motive for the changes. This does not mean that the usage was not there, or that the grammarians are working only within the fog of theory. Rather, it is patent that there would be no reason to offer new interpretations if the corresponding forms were not in use. Unfortunately, we can never say with absolute certainty that Candragomin was the first to introduce these alterations into a grammatical system and even that the KV and Jidendrabuddhi drew inspiration from his work, but the evidence points towards the CV's influence, and the case of *KvasU* supports others' work that has found a close link between the KV and CV. In what follows we will see how other schools of grammar deal with the same set of problems.

4.5   The Non-Pāṇinians

Candrogomin's acceptance of *KvasU* for standard Sanskrit coupled with its continued usage in literature are likely to have given rise to the *communis opinio* among many grammarians over the course of time that the suffix should be acknowledged as generally applicable after any root, but others, especially the close followers of the MBh, remained hesitant to give the suffix their blessing, and the varied opinions are often noted or refuted. In addition to demonstrating the de-

scriptive spirit of grammar, the opinions of these more liberal grammarians indicate that Patañ-jali's word did not enjoy the supreme authority it would among later Pāṇinians. In seeing how this debate plays out, we will remain at first within the non-Pāṇinian schools and then look at how the commentators on the A of the second millennium dealt with the problem of *KvasU*.

The consensus among the non-Pāṇinian grammarians is that *KvasU* (and at times also *KānaC*) has general applicability. As most of these grammars were composed by non-Vedic authors, i.e., Buddhist and Jains, they do not treat the Vedic language at all, and the discussion regarding whether or not a sūtra comes under the scope of the standard language (*bhāṣā*) or Vedic does not arise. What does come under discussion is whether or not *KvasU* can be used after roots other than the six given in P. 3.2.108f. Furthermore, the issue of the finite perfect as a general past tense also receives some attention. The sūtras themselves, as always, do not provide much information, but the commentators, in fleshing out the ideas encapsulated therein, offer us a number of insights into the debates going on at the time.

Below I have given the sūtras prescribing *KvasU* from the following non-Pāṇinian grammars: the *Kātantra* of Śarvavarman, *Jainedravyākaraṇa*,[134] the *Śabdānuśāsana* of Śākaṭāyana (9th), the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhoja, and the *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana* of Hemacandra. These are in chronological order, save perhaps the *Kātantra*, on which see below. With respect to the com-mentators, note that Durgasiṃha (6th–8th cent.) on the *Kātantra* likely comes after Abhayanandin (late 7th cent.), and that Somadeva (12th–13th cent.) is somewhat later than Hemacandra. A few other grammars will be mentioned in notes while discussing these passages but no other works add anything of much moment. I have included the basic gloss of the sūtra, but other comments that illuminate or bear on the matter at hand have been freely appended. In sum, every grammar-ian except Devanandin (Pūjyapāda) makes a provision for the general application of *KvasU* (and sometimes *KānaC*). In this instance, Devanandin is clearly following the MBh more closely than the others. Further research into the *Jainendravyākaraṇa* will certainly yield additional evidence

---

[134]In both the recension of Abhayanandina and Somadeva. The root text of the latter is usually attributed to Guṇanandin (8th–9th) cent. under the name *Śabdārṇava*. Cf. CII 6 pp. lxxviii f. It is, therefore, slightly later than the *Śākaṭāyanavyākaraṇa*, which was composed under the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarṣa I in the 9th cent.

of the grammar's conservatism with respect to his fellow non-Pāṇinians. As will be evident from a perusal of the following sūtras, all authors, except Devanandin, have done away with *upeyivān* and adopted *īyivān* as suggested first by the Candragomin and defended in the KV.

4.5.1 *Kātantra*

kvansukānau parokṣāvac ca [*atīte*[135] *dhātoḥ*[136]] ‖ 4.4.1 ‖

Durgavṛtti: *atīte vartamānād dhātoḥ kvansukānau bhavataḥ | tau ca parokṣeva vyapadiśyete | pecivān pācayañcakṛvān | … | atītādhikāraḥ kim | śrusadavasām atītamātre kvansur abhidhātavyaḥ | upaśuśrāva upāśrauṣīt upāśṛṇot upaśuśruvān | … | tathā iṇo nañpūrvāc cāśnāteḥ | īyivān | … | śṛnotyādaya eva amī bhāṣāyāṃ rūḍhāḥ ‖*

Durgaṭīkā: *śṛṇotyādaya eva iti | anye dhātavaḥ kvansukānāntāś chandasy eva ityādi | te ca parokṣakālaviṣayā eva | śāstrakāraṇamataṃ tu lakṣyate | anye 'pi dhātavaḥ kvansukānāntā bhāṣāyām | yad ayam atīrṇghasaikasvarātam iḍ vansau ity āha | gamahanavidaviśadṛśāṃ vā iti | anya āha anūcānād anyatra kānaś chandasīti |*

Vṛttipañjikā: *śṛṇotyādaya eva iti | anye tu parokṣakālaviṣayāḥ kvansukānāntāś chandasy eva ity arthaḥ | tat tu matāntaram | sūtrakārasya mataṃ lakṣyate kvansukānātāḥ parokṣakālaviṣayā amī bhāṣāyām api yasmād atīrṇghasaikasvarātām iḍ vansau iti | gamahanavidaviśadṛśāṃ vā ity āha | na caitac chandoviṣayatayā caritārtham iti śakyate vaktuṃ chāndasānāṃ śabdānām ihānādarād iti ‖*

Kātantra 4.4.1 *KvansU* and *Kāna*[137] occur after a root in the sense of past time and like the "beyond one's perception" tense suffix.

Durgavṛtti: The two suffixes *KvansU* and *Kāna* come after a root that occurs in the sense of past (time). And the two are designated as though a "beyond one's perception" suffix.[138] "He has cooked." "He has made cook." … What is the heading "in the past" for? *KvansU* must be stated for (the roots) √*śru*, √*sad*, and √*vas* only in the sense of past time.[139] (For example:) *upaśuśrāva upāśrauṣīt upāśṛṇot* (alternate with)

---

[135]From Kā 4.3.81.

[136]From Kā 3.2.4.

[137]The *C* is absent here and in the following grammars because in the A it indicates that the resulting word is oxytone by P. 6.1.163f.

[138]In the *Kātantra* (Kā 3.1.13) and Hemacandra's *Śabdānuśāsana* (SHŚ 5.2.11f.), the personal endings of the perfect are referred to as *parokṣā* (sc.*vibhakti*) instead of *liṭ*. Cf. Chatterji (1948: 11). Most regrettably Chatterji has adopted the habit of noting technical terms in the *Kātantra* without reference.

[139]The issue is that we can understand *atīte*, "in the past," from *parokṣāvat*, so why should the rule fall under the scope of the heading *atīte*? Durgasiṃha wishes to point to the fact that the *kvansvanta*s of the six roots √*śru*, etc., occur in the sense of the general past and are not limited to *parokṣe*, "beyond one's perception," as is the case for all other roots. This, I believe, is how he accounts for the perfect active participles standing in for any of the three

upaśuśruvān ... Similarly for the root *iṆ* and *aś* preceded by *naÑ* (scil. *an*) ... Only those (roots) *śṛṇoti*, etc. are idiomatic in the standard language.

Durgaṭīkā: On "**only those (roots) *śṛṇoti*, etc.**": Other roots, when ending in the suffixes *KvansU* and *Kāna* occur only in the Vedas, etc., and they have their domain only in a past time beyond one's perception.[140] But the opinion of the maker of the treatise is observed. Other roots too end in the suffixes *KvansU* and *Kāna* in the standard language given that he says: Kā 4.6.76 "the augment *iṬ* occurs with the roots *ad*, *iṆ*, *ghas*, those consisting of a single vowel (when reduplicated), and those ending in *ā* when *vansU* follows,"[141] and Kā 4.6.76 "The augment *iṬ* optionally occurs with the roots *gam*, *han*, *vid*, *viś*, and *dṛś* (when *KvansU* follows)."[142]... Another says that other than in *anūcāna*, the suffix *Kāna* (just) occurs in the Vedas.

Vṛttipañjikā: On "**only those (roots) *śṛṇoti*, etc.**": The meaning is that other forms, however, ending in the suffixes *KvansU* and *Kāna* in the domain of time beyond one's perception occur only in the Vedas. But there is another opinion. The author of the sūtras says Kā 4.5.76 and 77. And it cannot be said that this (treatise) succeeds in its goal by having scope over the Vedas because here there is no regard for Vedic words.

Regarding the wording of the sūtra, I emphasize the use of -*vat* on *parokṣāvat* because both JV(M) 2.2.88 (according to the *vṛtti*) and SHŚ 5.2.2 adopt this formulation. Assuming the *Kātantra*'s priority to the JV(M) (and assuming this sūtra formed part of the work at the time of the JV's composition), this would be one of its influences, although the reverse scenario is also possible, since we do not know exactly when this sūtra became a part of the *Kātantra*.[143] Whenever the sūtra was added, the author wanted it to be for general use. There are no other rules providing for even the set forms *īyivān*, *anāśvān*, and *anūcāna* nor any mention of √*sad*, etc., having a special

---

past tenses. His comments in the *ṭīkā* illuminate the point: *tena yathāviṣayam atītaprayogān udāharati* | "Therefore he exemplifies the uses of the past tenses according to their respective scopes," and is reminiscent of the KV ad P. 3.2.108: *tena mukte yathāprāptaṃ pratyayā bhavanti* | "Therefore when (the suffix *liṭ*) has been laid aside, the (other past tense) suffixes occur as usual." There is not, however, a sūtra that allows for the finite perfect forms to occur in the sense of general past like CV 1.2.74. See section § 4.4 above.

[140]This is contrary to what we find in A, where the Vedic *kvasvanta*s are in the sense of *bhūtasāmānya* "general past."

[141]This sūtra corresponds to P. 7.2.67. For the logic of the argumentation see my notes below.

[142]This sūtras corresponds to P. 7.2.77.

[143]We know from Durgasiṃha ad Kā 4.1.1: *siddhigrahaṇaṃ bhinnakartṛtvān maṅgalārtham* "the word *siddhi* 'prosperity' is mentioned for the sake of auspiciousness because there is a different author," that the fourth *adhyāya* on *kṛt* suffixes does not stem from *Śarvavarman*. The *Kātantra* appears to have originally not contained sections on the derivation of nominal stems in general, i.e., primary derivatives (*kṛdanta*s), secondary derivatives (*taddhitānta*s), and compounds (*samāsa*s). Yet, by the time of Durgasiṃha, whose date ranges from the 6ᵗʰ to the 8ᵗʰ centuries, these sections had all been added. See Cardona (2008: 302–307) who marshals together the relevant passages and secondary literature. Oberlies (1996: 275) dates the expanded *Kātantra* to a time prior to the JV(M).

status. The great commentator Durgasiṃha adds a tremendous amount of information in his commentaries on the often imprecise root text, and here he includes specifics for the irregular formations and the tense issue with √śru, etc. Note that he follows the order of the three roots as they are listed in CV 1.2.73 and not Pāṇini's order. For our present investigation regarding the Vedic status of *KvasU*, his remarks and his sub-commentator's are revealing with regard to usage and prescription. The two suffixes are accepted in the standard language, but in practice only those from √śru, etc. are common. Yet in his own sub-commentary, Durga refutes those who would actually restrict *KvansU* to √śru, etc. and make the rest Vedic. To counter such an opinion, he cites rules prescribing the augment *iṬ* before *KvansU* (Kā 4.5.76 and 4.5.77) to prove that Śarvavarman intended the suffix for the standard language. If such forms as *jagmivān* were not found in the standard language, Kā 4.6.76 would not have been included. The other sub-commentator, Trilocana, notes in addition that the *Kātantra* pays no heed to the Vedic language. Although we find statements about actual usage, there are still no quotes from any texts.

4.5.2 *Jainendravyākaraṇa* with the *Mahāvṛtti*

vassadiṇo vasur liṇ mam [*bhūte*[144]] || 2.2.88 ||

Abhayanandin: *vas sad iṇ ity etebhyo bhūte vasur bhavati liḍvan masaṃjñaś ca | anūṣivān śrīdattaṃ dhānyasiṃhaḥ | upasedivān upādhyāyaṃ śiṣyaḥ | īyivān upeyivān upādhyāyaṃ śiṣyaḥ | … | liḍvadādeśād dvitvam | … | prākter vāsamaḥ iti luṅādayo bhavanti | anvavātsīt | anvavasat | anūvāsa | … | kvasukānau liḍādeśau sarvadhātubhya ity eke | kvasur lo mam | … | liḍādeśatvād eva kittve siddhe sphāntārthaṃ kitkaraṇam anayoḥ | tair evācāryaiḥ vasv ekājādghasām iḍ iti vasau parata ekācām ākārāntānāṃ ghaś ced vihitaḥ | pecivān | papivān | jakṣivān | iha kasmān na bhavati | bibhidvān | cicchidvān | halmadhe liṭy ataḥ ity anena etvacakhayoḥ kṛtayor vaso ya ekāc tatraiveḍ bhavati | … ||*

JV(M) 2.2.88 After √*vas*, √*sad*, √*iṆ* there is *vasU* like *liṭ* (and termed) *ma*.

Abhayanandin: After the roots *vas*, "to dwell," √*sad*, "to sit," and *iṆ*, "to go," there is

---

[144]From JV(M) 2.2.78.

the suffix *vasU* like *liṭ*[145] and termed *ma*, "parasmaipada,"[146] ... [147] Because of the extension "like *liṭ*" there is reduplication ... (Examples:) Dhānyasiṃha lived (*anūṣivān*) near Śrīdatta. The student sat at (*upasedivān*) the teacher's feet. The student went to (*īyivān*) / approached (*upeyivān*) the teacher ... By JV(M) 2.1.81 "up to the word *kti*, non-identical (suffixes) are optional,"[148] the aorist, etc. also occur: *anvavātsīt*, *anvavasat*, *anūvāsa* ... Some say that *KvasU* and *Kāna* are the substitutes for *liṭ* after all roots. *KvasU* receives the technical term *ma* by JV(M) 1.2.150 (= JV(Ś) 1.2.177) *lo mam*, "the substitutes for *la* are termed *ma*." ...[149] When the fact that (the two suffixes) have a *K* is established only because they are substitutes for *liṭ*, marking the two of them with a *K* gains a clear purpose.[150] These same teachers (*ācārya*s) have assigned the augment *iṬ* by (? P. 7.2.67) *vasv ekājādghasām iṭ*, "for reduplicated stems in a single consonant, roots ending in *ā*, and the root *ghas*, 'to eat' there is the augment *iṬ* on the suffix *vasU*."[151] (For example:) *pecivān*, "He has cooked." *papivān*, "He has drunk." *jakṣivān*, "He has eaten." Why not (the augment *iṬ*) here? *bibhidvān*, "He has split." *cicchidvān*, "He has cut." The augment *iṬ* is added in this case only to a (stem) which consists of a single vowel when *vasU* follows, provided that *e*-substition (for short *a*) and the elision of the reduplicated syllable[152] have taken place by JV(Ś) 4.4.117 "*e* occurs in place of a short *a* in between two consonants and there is elision of the reduplicated syllable when a *liṭ* suffix follows marked with a *K*, *G*, or an *Ṅ*."[153]

The following two sūtras, omitted here, provide for *śuśruvān* (JV(M) 2.2.89 *śruvo 'niṭ*), *anāśvān*, and *anūcāna* (JV(M) 2.2.90 *anāśvānanūcānau*.). The JV, at least as understood by Abhayanandin, makes three choices in its descriptive technique that differ from Pāṇini's. *īyivān* (note the loss of *upa*) can be derived and need not be given as a set form because the following rule, JV(M) 2.2.89 *śruvo 'niṭ*, hints (*jñāpaka*) that the general prohibition against adding the augment *iṬ* to *kṛt*

---

[145]I presume that Devanandin employs *liṭ* here in the same manner as Pāṇini does in P. 3.2.171, where the commentators, beginning with the MBh I.469.9 (ad P. 2.3.69.2), interpret *liṭ* as *liḍvat*, "like *liṭ*."

[146]In the JV *ma* = parasmaipada of the A. Cf. JV(M) 1.2.150 *lo mam*. The suffix *vasu* must here be designated as *ma*, i.e. parasmaipada, because *vasU* is not included in JV(M) 1.2.150. Pāṇini does, however, include *vasU* in his definition of parasmaipada in P. 1.4.99.

[147]In the omitted portion the derivation of *īyivān* is dealt with.

[148]This is the equivalent of P. 3.1.94 *vāsarūpo 'striyām*, the so called *vāsarūpavidhi* mentioned above on p. 173, fn. 19.

[149]In the omitted portion Abhayanandin makes provision for *KvasU* and *Kāna* so that they can designate *kartṛ*, *karman*, and *bhāve*. Cf. fn. 167 below.

[150]In what is omitted Abhayananda repeats the two purposes for *K* given in the MBh (see pp. 189f.), namely the elision of a penultimate *n* (*nakha*) in *ājivān* and the prevention of guṇa (*eppratiṣedha*) in *titīrvān*.

[151]Only Pāṇini has such a sūtra. The corresponding sūtra in the JV(Ś) has slight differences: JV(Ś) 5.1.111 *kvasy aikājghasaḥ*. I have not yet been able to locate a corresponding sūtra in the JV(M).

[152]*ca-kha* is equivalent to *abhyāsa-lopa* in the A. Cf. JV(M) 1.1.61 and 4.3.6 for the technical terms *kha* and *ca*, respectively.

[153]Although the previous sūtra did not have an exact match in the JV(Ś), Abhayanandin must now be citing from the parallel recension of the JV. In his own text the sūtra is JV(M) 4.4.110 *ato halmadhye 'nādeśāder liṭi*. Cf. P. 6.4.120.

suffixes beginning with a *vaŚ* consonant (JV(M) 5.1.114) does not apply to *vasU*.[154] Second, the suffix *vasU* is said to be *liḍvat* "like *liṭ*," a move that eliminates the difficulties that arise for the Pāṇinian school in explaining which *liṭ KvasU* replaces, because *liṭ* here only serves as an indicator of morphology, specifically reduplication. This appears to be a borrowing from the *Kātantra*. Lastly, and as a result of the last point, the three past tense *lakāra*s can occur in their respective domains alongside the *vasvanta* forms because JV(M) 2.1.81 (≈ P. 3.1.94), which overrides the *apavāda-utsarga* relation between non-identical suffixes outside of the feminine gender,[155] applies freely since *vasU* is no longer a substitute for a *lakāra*. In the Pāṇinian tradition the *lakāra*s form a set of exceptional suffixes not subject to the *vāsarūpavidhi*. Consequently, the word *vā* is needed in P. 3.2.108 to make *KvasU* an exception to the exception (according to some), but in the JV(M) *vā* is not necessary.[156]

The JV(M) clearly rejects the use of *vasU* after all roots since a sūtra prescribing *vasU* generally is entirely missing. Abhayanandin does, however, remark that in the opinion of some (*eke*), *KvasU* and *Kāna* are substitutes for *liṭ* and occur after all roots. As substitutes for *liṭ*, both suffixes will not be termed *ma* by JV(M) 1.2.150 (= JV(Ś) 1.2.177). Our commentator goes on to discuss the details of the suffix, such as the purpose of *K*, in the same fashion we have seen in the MBh ad P. 3.2.106/107, and gives brief derivations for the forms *ājivān*, *titīrvānaḥ*, and *tatirāṇaḥ*,[157] examples also taken from the MBh. While presenting the opinion of these others, Abhayanandin quotes two sūtras that help us determine who the *eke* are, because neither of them is found in the JV(M). The first, *vasv ekājādghasām iṭ*, is P. 7.2.67 and accounts for the addition of *iṬ* to various stems when *vasU* follows. The second sūtra, *halmadhe liṭy ataḥ*, is JV(Ś) 4.4.117 and also regulates the addition of *iṬ*. I suspect that the first sūtra is an error (on whose part I cannot not

---

[154]Cf. the first hemistich of the first *ślokavārttika* ad P. 3.2.109, MBh II.117.7.

[155]JV(M) 2.1.81 *prākter vāsāmaḥ* lacks the condition *astriyām* of P. 3.1.94 because it only extends up to but does not include JV(M) 2.3.75 where the feminine suffixes begin.

[156]See p. 173, fn. 19 concerning the necessity of *vā* in P. 3.2.108. It is emphasized by the Pāṇinian commentators that the *vāsarūpavidhi* does not apply in the case of suffixes that are substitutes for *lakāra*s. PŚ 67–69 list all three contexts in which the *vāsarūpavidhi* does not apply (the last deals with the *lakāra*s). Cf. also MBh II.79.27–80.4 for the special status of the *lakāra*s. The same technique, i.e., using *-vat*, is found in the Kā 4.4.1 and SHŚ 5.2.2. See §§ 4.5.1 and 4.5.6, respectively.

[157]As noted above, Abhayanandin has *tatirāṇa* instead of *titirāṇa* of the Pāṇinīyas. He justifies the form because *sthānivadbhāva* should apply to the base during reduplication by JV(M) 1.1.59. See fns. 101 and 108 above.

venture to guess) for JV(Ś) 5.1.111 *vasy aikājghasaḥ*.[158] With this correction, the entire discussion works perfectly within the JV(Ś). This other recension of the JV with the *Śabdārṇavacandrikā* of Somadeva prescribes *KvasU* and *Kāna* as substitutes for *liṭ* after any root in JV(Ś) 2.2.103 *liṭaḥ kvasukānau* (see below) and thereby also permits *KvasU* to be termed *ma* by JV(Ś) 1.2.177 *lo mam*. We can thus tentatively conclude that Abhayanandin knew the alternate recension of the JV and had respect for its proponents as he evinces by employing the honorific title *ācārya*.[159] The whole section dealing with the perfect active participles, JV(Ś) 2.4.103–106, serves as the basis for Śākaṭāyana's grammar and will be presented below.

I would also like to briefly discuss my findings vis-à-vis Oberlies's hypothesis that the KV knew the CV and its *vṛtti* as well as the JV and Abhayanandin's *Mahāvṛtti*.[160] Because of the sparseness of the CV *vṛtti*, the results are rather limited, but I believe we can at least record a few similarities and possible borrowings. The most salient common thread is the acceptance of *īyivān*, i.e., without *upa*, in each work. Since the JV(M) and CV were able to word their sūtra texts as they saw fit, no further remark was needed about the difference with the A. The KV, however, made use of Patañjalian reasoning (*upa* is *atantra*) to bring Pāṇini's rule into accord with the two earlier grammars. The differences are also noteworthy. The JV has radically altered the interaction of *KvasU* within the *vāsarūpavidhi* by introducing the notion of being like *liṭ* (*liṭvat*, borrowed from the *Kātantra*?) and eliminating the process of substitution. The CV retains *vā* in the sūtra so that the same problem does not arise, and even if it did, the CV handles the optionality among the *kṛt* suffixes much more simply.[161] As we will see in the following sections, Hemacandra also makes use of -*vat*. If the *Kātantra* was indeed known to Devenandin, this is an excellent example of how he combined aspects of the two systems.

---

[158]This is the simplest explanation. I cannot give a good reason for why Abhayanandin would suddenly cite a Pāṇinian sūtra when the corresponding JV(Ś) sūtra was available.

[159]This raises a number of chronological problems regarding the date of the JV(Ś). Since its purported author Guṇanandin lived toward the end of the 9ᵗʰ cent., we must either assume that there already had existed another alternate version of the JV or Abhayandin is quoting from an altogether lost text.

[160]Oberlies (1996).

[161]Namely with CV 1.1.103 *bahulam*. Oberlies (1996: 277–282) discusses the *paribhāṣā* in the three grammars with regard to the *tācchīlika* suffixes.

4.5.3   *Jainendravyākaraṇa* with the *Śabdārṇavacandrikā*

liṭaḥ kvasukānau ‖ 2.2.103 ‖

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: *dhoḥ parasya liṭaḥ sthāne kvasukānau staḥ | pecivān | rarajvān | pecānaḥ | rarajānaḥ ‖*

vassadiṃśroḥ kvasuḥ ‖ 2.2.104 ‖

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: *ebhyo liṭaḥ kvasuḥ syāt | anūṣivān | upasedivān | upeyivān | śuśruvān ‖*

anāśvān ‖ 2.2.105 ‖

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: *nañpūrvād aśnāter liṭaḥ kvasuḥ syād iḍabhāvaś ca nipātyaḥ | anāśvān tapaś cakāra ‖*

kartary anūcānaḥ ‖ 2.2.106 ‖

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: *vacer anupūrvāt kartari kārake kāno nipātyaḥ | anūcāno vratopapanno 'śeṣaśāstrapārago vā | kartari iti kiṃ anūktaḥ ‖*

JV(Ś) 2.2.103 In place of *liṭ* there is *KvasU* and *Kāna*.

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: *KvasU* and *Kāna* occur in place of *liṭ* which follows a root. (For example:) *pecivān*, "He has cooked." *rarajvān*, "He has dyed." *pecānaḥ*, "He has cooked for himself." *rarajānaḥ*, "He has dyed for himself."[162]

JV(Ś) 2.2.104 *KvasU* after √*vas*, "to dwell," √*sad*, "to sit," √*iN*, "to go," √*śru*, "to hear."

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: After these roots the suffix *KvasU* should occur in place of *liṭ*. (For example:) *anūṣivān*, "He has lived near." *upasedivān*, "He has sat near (as a student)." *upeyivān*, "He has approached." *śuśruvān*, "He has heard."

JV(Ś) 2.2.105 *anāśvān* (is a set form).

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: The suffix *KvasU* should occur in place of *liṭ* after √*aś* (class 9) preceded by *naÑ* (= *an*), and it must be set down because of the lack of the augment *iṬ*. *anāśvān* (means) "he has practiced austerities."

---

[162]Both √*pac* and √*rañj* are *ubhayapadin* roots insofar as the ātm. endings are to be used when the fruit of the action is intended for the agent. The *anubandha* Ñ alone triggers this usage in the JV(Ś), e.g., ŚDhP 910 *raṃjAUÑ rāge* in contrast to the JV(M) and the A, where both a *svarita anbandha* and Ñ serve this function. Cf. JV(Ś) 1.3.82 (= JV(M) 1.2.68 = P. 1.3.72). On the DhP of the JV(Ś) see Palsule (1961: 42–44). None is known for the JV(M).

JV(Ś) 2.2.106 *kartary anūcāna* (is a set form) expressing the agent.

Śabdārṇavacandrikā: The suffix *Kāna* must be set down as expressing the agent *kāraka* after the root √*vac* preceded by *anu. anūcāna* (means) "one who has taken a vow" or "one who has mastered all the disciplines." Why state *kartari*? (Observe that when a past tense suffix expressing the *karman*, "patient,") there is *anūktaḥ* (with the suffix *Kta*).

As will be evident from a quick comparison with Śākaṭāyana's *Śabdānuśāsana*, one grammar is clearly borrowing from the other.[163] The similarities are: JV(Ś) 1.2.103 = ŚāŚ 1.4.80, the four roots √*vas*, √*sad*, √*iN*, and √*śru* are lumped into a single *samāhāra dvandva* in JV(Ś) 1.2.104 and ŚāŚ 1.4.81, and the mention of *kartari* along with *anūcāna/anuvac* in JV(Ś) 1.2.106 and ŚāŚ 1.4.81.

Regretfully, Somadeva is extremely concise and leaves out any discussion regarding the optionality of *KvasU* and *Kāna* and the details of the derivation. It would be instructive to know how the two suffixes interact with other *lakāra*s now that they are substitutes *liṭ*. The addition of *kartari* in JV(Ś) goes back to vārtt. IV ad P. 3.2.109 *anūcānaḥ kartari* and is generally included in the glosses on other sūtras.[164]

4.5.4 Śākaṭāyana's *Śabdānuśāsana*

liṭaḥ kvasukānau [vā[165]*] || 1.4.80 ||*

Amoghavṛtti: *liṭo laḥ sthāne 'taṅtaṅvat kvasukānāv ādeśau vā bhavataḥ | jagmivān saṃyuge | tasthivān saḥ | jaghnivān andhakāram | ... | vāgrahaṇāt tiṅo 'pi bhavanti | jagāma | jaghāna | tasthau | tatāra ||*

śrviṇvassado 'nuvacaś ca kartari bhūte [kvasukānau vā] || 1.4.81 ||

Amoghavṛtti: *śru iṇ vas sad ity etebhyo 'nupūrvāc ca vaceḥ parasya bhūte sāmānye dyotye kartari vartamānasya liṭo 'taṅtaṅvat kvasukānāv ādeśau vā bhavataḥ | ... | bhūtegrahaṇaṃ bhūtasāmānyapratipattyartham | nābhūte liḍ asti*[166] *| tatra ca ata eva*

---

[163]The JV(Ś) may well be later than the ŚāŚ.

[164]Cf. KV ad P. 3.2.109 *vacer anupūrvāt kartari kānaj nipātyate | "*The suffix *KanaC* is stet down in the sense of an agent after the √*vac* when preceded by *anu*" and *Mahāvṛtti* ad JV(M) 2.2.90 *vacer anupūrvāt kartari kāno nipātyate |* Its absence in the CV is somewhat surprising.

[165]From ŚāŚ 1.4.79.

[166]The text reads *nābhūteriḍasti*, which I take to be typo. I have also slightly altered the punctuation for the sake of clarity

vacanād ādeśapakṣe liḍ anumīyate | tadabhāve luṅ | … ||

ŚāŚ 1.4.80 *KvasU* and *Kāna* optionally occur in place of *liṭ*.

Amoghavṛtti: *KvasU* for *ataṄ* (*parasmaipadin* roots) and *Kāna* for *taṄvat* (*ātmane-padin* roots)[167] optionally occur as the substitutes in place of the *l* of *liṭ*. (For example:) "He has gone into battle." "He has stood." "He has beaten darkness." …[168] Because of the mention of "optionally" there are also the personal endings: "He had gone." "He has beaten." "He has stood." "He has crossed."

ŚāŚ 1.4.81 After √*śru* "to hear," √*iṆ*, "to go," √*vas*, "to dwell," √*sad*, "to sit," and *anuvac*, "to repeat" in the sense of the agent in the past.

Amoghavṛtti: *KvasU* for *ataṄ* (*parasmaipadin* roots) and *KānaC* for *taṄvat* (*ātmane-padin* roots) optionally occur in place of *liṭ* occurring in the sense of the agent when the general past is to be illuminated after these (roots): √*śru*, √*iṆ*, √*vas*, √*sad*, and after √*vac* preceded by *anu* …[169] The mention of "in the past" is for the purpose of communicating "general past." It is not *liṭ* in a different past tense. Because of that very statement, *liṭ* can be inferred when one opts for the substitute (*KvasU*). When it (*KvasU*) is not there, there is *luṅ* (the aorist). (For example:) *aśrauṣīt*, "S/he heard," etc.

The use of a perfect active participle in place of the finite perfect (*parokṣe*) is an option for all roots. The separate mention of the six roots √*śru*, etc. (*anāśvān* is given as a set form in the following rule ŚāŚ 1.4.82, not quoted), however, does not permit the *kvasvanta*s to stand in for any of the three past tenses. Instead, they may only alternate with the aorist, as is shown in the *Amoghavṛtti*, because their tense is general past (*bhūtasāmānya*). This is not only novel but an indication that Śākaṭāyana has ignored Patañjali and the other commentators we have come across. The inference of *liṭ* in the sense of the general past after √*śru*, etc. clearly comes from the KV, and the remark that when *KvasU* is not there, *luṅ* obtains has similarities with the passage from the *Nyāsa* discussed above (p. 200, fn. 125). Śākaṭāyana removes the question about which *liṭ* is intended, since *bhūte liṭ* occurs only for the separately listed roots, i.e., *śuśruvān*. All other perfect participles must stand in for the standard *parokṣe liṭ*. Finally, note also that only a single set form is

---

[167]It is necessary to specify that the suffixes are for *parasmaipadin* and *ātmanepadin* roots because Śākaṭāyana has completely eliminated the rather complex system of relating the technical terms parasmaipada and ātmanepada to the personal endings (P. 1.4.99 and 100) and then *kartṛ*, *karman*, and *bhāva* to the two technical terms (P. 1.3.13, 78, etc.).

[168]There are additional examples in the omitted portion.

[169]I admit here the now well-known examples and a few points of derivation.

necessary in Śākaṭāyana's grammar, whereas Pāṇini and Candra required three and Devanandin two (JV(M) 2.2.90 *anāśvānanūcānau*) plus an ad hoc rule for the lack of the *iṬ* augment in *śuśruvān* (JV(M) 2.2.89). The wording of the sūtras is also novel. By incorporating *iṆ* after √*śrū* a half *mātrā* is eliminated.

4.5.5 Bhoja's *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*

śrusadavasibhyo liḍ vā || 1.4.143 ||

Hṛdayaharaṇī: *śṛṇotyādibhyo bhūtakālārthavṛttibhyo dhātubhyaḥ kartari bhāvakar-maṇoś ca liṭpratyayo vā bhavati | upaśuśrāva | upaśrauṣīt | upāśṛṇot | … |*

liṭaḥ kvasuḥ || 1.4.144 ||

Hṛdayaharaṇī: *liṭo 'nantaroktasya punarvacanād vakṣyamāṇasya ca sthāne kartari kvasur bhavati vā | upaśuśruvān upaśuśrāva | … jagmivān jagāma | papivān papau | pecivān papāca ||*

īyivānanāśvānanūcānaḥ || 1.4.145 ||

Hṛdayaharaṇī: *ete śabdā bhūte kāle liḍantāḥ kartari vā nipātyante | īyivān upeyivān |* … || (SKBhv vol. I pp. 162f.)

SKĀv 1.4.143 *liṭ* is optional after √*śru*, √*sad*, and √*vas* (in the sense of the past).

Hṛdayaharaṇī: The suffix *liṭ* in the sense of the agent as well as the action itself and the patient after the roots √*śru*, etc., when their occurrence refers to past time. (For example:) *upaśuśrāva*, "has listened," (or) *upāśrauṣīt* or *upāśṛṇot*, "S/he listened." …[170]

SKĀv 1.4.144 *KvasU* in place of *liṭ*.

Hṛdayaharaṇī: The suffix *KvasU* optionally occurs in place of the *liṭ* denoting the agent which was just (i.e., in the last sūtra) mentioned and in place of the one that will be mentioned (i.e., 1.4.155 *parokṣe liṭ*) on account of its (*liṭ*'s) repetition. (For example:) *upaśuśruvān upaśuśrāva*, "has listened," *jagmivān jagāma*, "has gone," *papivān papau*, "has drunk," *pecivān papāca*, "has cooked."

SKĀv 1.4.145 *īyivān anāśvān anūcānaḥ* (are set forms).

---

[170]In the remainder of the commentary further examples are given and the *anubandha*s on *liṭ* are explained.

Hṛdayaharaṇī: These forms, ending in *liṭ* in the sense of the past time, are optionally set down. (For example:) *īyivān*, "has gone," *upeyivān*, "has approached."

Here Bhoja follows the CV very closely; the only difference is the use of the plural on *śrusadava-sibhyaḥ*. As remarked above, his commentator, Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha, elucidates a few points regarding the interpretation of the CV. The finite perfect of √*śru*, etc. may occur in the sense of the general past and hence alternate with the imperfect and aorist. The perfect active participle can occur after any root and in place of any *liṭ*, just as the KV has interpreted *liṭaḥ* in P. 3.2.106.

4.5.6   Hemacandra's *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana*

śrusadvasbhyaḥ parokṣā vā || 5.2.1 ||

Bṛhadvṛtti: *bhūte ity anuvartate | śṛṇotyādibhyo dhātubhyo bhūtārthavṛttibhyaḥ pa-rokṣā vibhaktir vā bhavati | upaśruśāva upasasāda anūvāca | vāvacanād yathāsvakālam adyatanī hyastanī ca | upāśrauṣīt upāśṛṇot | ... anye tu śrvādibhyo bhūtamātre kvasum evecchanti na parokṣām | ... ||*

tatra kvasukānau tadvat || 5.2.2 ||

Bṛhadvṛtti: *tatra parokṣāmātraviṣaye dhātoḥ parau kvasukānau pratyayau bhavataḥ tau ca parokṣāvad vyapadiśyete | tatra kvasuḥ parasmaipadatvāt kartari kānas tv āt-manepadatvād bhāvakarmaṇor api | śuśruvān | ... | pecivān | ... | kecit tu ebhya eva kva-sur nānyebhyaḥ kānas tu pratyaya eva neṣyate ity āhuḥ | apare tu sarvadhātubhyaḥ kvasum evecchanti na kānam | bhūtādhikāreṇaivoktaparokāṣāviṣayatve labdhe tatra-grahaṇam parokṣāmātrapratipattyartham, tena pecivān ityādi siddham | (SHŚBṛhad vol. V p. 111–115)*

veyivadanāvadanūcānam || 5.2.3 ||

SHŚ 5.2.1 After the roots √*śru*, "to hear," √*sad*, "to sit," and √*vas*, "to dwell," the beyond-one's-perception (ending)[171] optionally occurs.

Bṛhadavṛtti: "In the sense past time" continues (from SHŚ 5.1.158). After the roots √*śru*, etc., whose activity has a past referent, the beyond-one's-perception personal ending optionally occurs. *upaśruśāva upasasāda anūvāsa.* Because of the mention of an option the (other past tense suffixes) denoting past time today and yesterday[172]

---

[171]As noted above (fn. 138, p. 206), *parokṣā* is basically equivalent to *liṭ* by SHŚ 5.2.11f.

[172]*adyatanī* and *hyastanī* are equivalent to the suffixes *luṅ* and *laṅ* in the A. Cf. SHŚ 5.2.4 *adyatanī* and 5.2.7

occur according to their own proper time.[173] *upāśrauṣīt upāśṛṇot.* But others want only the suffix *KvasU* in the sense of past time after √*śru*, etc., not the finite perfect endings ...[174]

SHŚ 5.2.2 In that (sense) *KvasU* and *Kāna* like that.

Bṛhadvṛtti: The two suffixes *KvasU* and *Kāna* occur after a root in that (sense), i.e., within the scope of beyond-one's-perception suffix,[175] and both of them are designated as being (morphologically) like the beyond-one's-perception suffix (i.e., the perfect).[176] In this case *KvasU*, because it is parasmaipada, designates the agent but *Kāna*, because it is ātmanepada, designates the action itself and the patient as well. (For example:) *śuśruvān*, "he has heard." ... But some say that *KvasU* is accepted only after these (roots, i.e., √*śru*, etc.) not after others, but the suffix *Kāna* is not accepted at all. But others accept *KvasU* alone after all roots, not *Kāna*. Since one understands the domain of the two suffixes to be the beyond-one's-perception suffix just stated under the heading "(general) past tense," the mention of *tatra* (in the sūtra) is so that one understands the bare beyond-one's-senses suffix (i.e., any such suffix). Thereby such forms as *pecivān*, "has cooked,"[177] are taken care of.

SHŚ 5.2.3 There are optionally the set forms *īyivad*, *anāvad*, and *anūcāna*.

Hemacandra has basically merged the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* with the *Kātantra*. From the former he has taken the basic structures of the rules (√*śru*, etc. in the sense of general past tense, general rule for *KvasU* and *Kāna*, the three set forms) and from the latter the terminology (*parokṣā* for *liṭ*) as well as the use of the suffix -*vat*, "like," although this could also have originated with the JV(M). By adopting this latter technique, Hemacandra also dispenses with the issue of the *vāsarūpavidhi*.[178] He also adheres to the view that the perfect can be used as a general past tense for √*śru*, etc. and that all roots can form perfect participles in the standard language. To my great regret the *Śabdamahārṇavanyāsa*, Hemacandra's subcommentary on the *Bṛhadvṛtti*, is not available on this portion of the grammar. The editor, Śrī Vijayalāvaṇya Sūri, has composed his

---

anadyatane hyastanī.

[173]Cf. KV ad P. 3.2.108: *tena mukte yathāprāptaṃ pratyayā bhavanti |* and fns. 126 and 139

[174]The portion omitted presents another view regarding the use of the tenses and more details on the purpose of *vā* with regard to the *vāsarūpavidhi*.

[175]It is important that *parokṣā* is here a suffix, not a specification of tense.

[176]That is simply to say that they have reduplication etc., as Hemacandra notes later on in the commentary.

[177]Just as in the CV and the SKBhv the perfect suffix *liṭ* can occur only in the sense of the general past after the roots √*śru*, etc., so in order to derive forms like *pecivān*, *KvasU* must also be able to replace the perfect suffix in the sense of beyond one's perception.

[178]See above fn. 19 on p. 173 and p. 210 with fn. 156.

own commentary to supplement the missing portion.

4.5.7   Conclusions from the Non-Pāṇinians

One could add other schools to this list, but their citation would swell the present discussion without adding much profit. However, for the sake of nearing completeness, I mention the following works which also include *KvasU* and *Kāna*(*C*) for the standard language: Malayagiri's *Śabdānuśāsana*, *ākhyāta* 1.21–23,[179] Buddhisāgarasūri's *Pañcagranthin Vyākaraṇa* 4.1.21.4 (11th cent.), Vopadeva's *Mugdhabodha* 24.132, and *Sārasvata* (SārV *kvasvādi-prakriyā*, vol. II p. 238–270).[180] The passages I have quoted above demonstrate without question that outside of the Pāṇinian school of grammar there was no hesitation to include *KvasU* (and sometimes also *Kāna*(*C*)) as substitutes for the perfect or as a general past tense for roots other than √*śru*, etc. The only exception, the JV in Abhayanandin's recension, might be explained by the more strict adherence on Devanandin's part to Patañjali. Nevertheless, by the time the *Mahāvṛtti* was written, there existed grammarians, quite possibly in the *Jainendra* tradition itself, who accepted *KvasU* as valid in the standard language like the other non-Pāṇinians. In the learned discussions among the commentaries and sub-commentaries on the JV, Kā, and SHŚ, the opinion of the Pāṇinīyas, be they explicitly named or not, finds mention time and again, but there is not a single citation from literature. Durgasiṃha makes the brief observation in his *vṛtti* that actually only the roots √*śru*, etc., which one must take to also include √*i*, √*aś* and √*vas*, were in current use (*rūḍha*) with *KvasU* and *Kāna*. This tallies well with the data I have so far collected, in which forms from these roots are particularly common (especially √*sad* and √*i*), and with the reluctance of such poets as Bhaṭṭi, Bhāravi, and Māgha to use Vedic forms like Kālidāsa. Nevertheless, he and the sub-commentator, Trilocanadāsa, go on to defend the *Kātantra*'s position against others, i.e., the Pāṇinīyas, who insist on restrictions to the Vedic language, by referring to other sūtras in the grammar that prove the suffixes are an integral part of the *Kātantra* and hence must be for the

---

[179]Malayagiri follows *Śākaṭāyana* in not allowing the perfect as a general tense for √*śru*, etc.

[180]The suffix is available to all roots, expresses a general past tense, and is treated like the perfect suffix (*ṇabevat*) with regard to reduplication.

standard language because, as Trilocana points out, in this grammar no heed is paid to the Vedic language (*chāndasānāṃ śabdānām ihānādarāt*). On this point, it is telling that the remarks about the roots in actual currency (*rūḍha*) receives no further comment but rather give rise to a solid defense for the free application of the suffixes in the current language with arguments based on the internal consistency of the *Kātantra* grammar alone. The fact that the grammar is written for the standard language means, *de jure*, that all that the grammar teaches for the standard language even when there appears to be conflicting, or, at the very least, unsupportive evidence from usage. In closing, I highlight again the extraordinary influence both the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* and *Kātantra* had on the later grammatical tradition. All of the works we have looked at so far, including in all likelihood Jinendrabuddhi, drew inspiration from them in one way or another.

4.6   The Later Pāṇinīyas

4.6.1   Introduction

But how unanimous were those Pāṇinīyas, more broadly defined as the grammarians commenting on the A or sub-commentaries thereon? Is there a reason why some would deviate from the view of Patañjali and others not? As we have seen before, serious work on the A continued unabated into the second millennium. At the beginning of this period stands the famed commentary of Kaiyaṭa on the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Pradīpa*, largely indebted to Bhartṛhari (to whatever extent his commentary on the MBh was available). The importance of this work for cementing the authority and indeed the comprehension of the *Mahābhāṣya* cannot be understated. Yet homogeneity was far from being reached, especially in the region of modern-day Bengal,[181] where Jinendrabuddhi's text enjoyed great popularity[182] and the commentary of Puruṣottamadeva on the A, the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, become one of the standard works up until colonial times along with a host

---

[181]For the grammatical literature in Bengal see Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. 2: 3–62) and (2010). The former, her dissertation, contains an excellent summary and analysis of earlier work on Pāṇinian grammar in Bengal.

[182]Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. 2: 9–17).

of mostly still unpublished commentaries.[183] Further disputations on specific grammatical points will naturally arise in the commentaries on poetic works, since most of these commentators rely on the A when explaining grammatical points. I will now discuss the Pāṇinian sources of the second millennium and and follow the discussion to its logical end in the works of Nāgeśa.

4.6.2   The Early Recasts of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

The the first two *Kaumudī*-style grammars, the *Rūpāvatāra* (RA) of Dharmakīrti and the *Rūpamālā* (RM) of Vimalasarasvatī, both acknowledge the use of *KvasU* in the standard language but in different ways. Dharmakīrti, who does not treat Vedic forms, provides the necessary sūtras to derive the perfect active participle[184] but does not mention the condition *chandasi* in his explanation of P. 3.1.107 *kvasuś ca*, for which he provides examples from nine roots.[185] The only occurrence of *chandasi* is in P. 6.1.12, a rule that teaches three perfect active participles without reduplication (see above fn. 31, p. 175.), where he notes that the words are set down (*nipātyante*) without qualification for both the Vedic and standard language (*chandasi bhāṣāyāṃ cāviśeṣeṇa*).[186] Even though Dharmakīrti copies verbatim from the KV in several places,[187] in explaining P. 3.2.106 and 107 the word *chandasi* is entirely missing, whereas the KV carries it down from P. 3.2.105. One can therefore safely assume that the forms taught in the RA, e.g., *pecivān*, *jaghnivān*, etc., are acceptable for the standard language. Vimalasarasvatī, on the other hand, explains that the two suffixes are enjoined for use in the Vedas, but notes that the forms also find currency in the standard language,[188] and gives the example *tasthivān*, "he who has stood." His choice of example points, I strongly believe, to Kālidāsa's usage of √*sthā* (*Raghuvaṃśa* 2.29a) documented above. Since both of these commentaries are very short and give only the most basic explanation, there

---

[183]Cf. Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. 2: 38–51). The commentary is so called because it only treats rules for the standard language.

[184]RA II pp. 245–247. P. 3.2.106, 107; P. 7.2.35, 11, 67, 68, 64; P. 8.2.65; *Bhāṣya* ad P. 7.2.68; P. 6.1.12; P. 3.2.108, 109.

[185]We find the following forms: *babhūvān, edhāñcakṛvān, pecivān, jagmivān*, or *jaganvān, jaghnivān* or *jaghanvān, vividvān* or *vividivān, viviśivān* or *viviśvān*, and *dadṛśivān* or *dadṛśvān*.

[186]RA II p. 246 = KV ad 6.1.12.

[187]Compare, for example, Dharmakīrti's explanation of P. 3.2.108 and 109, RA II p. 246 with the remarks of the KV on the same sūtras. Among these borrowings is the KV's characterization of *upa* as not *tantra*. See above § 4.4.1.2.

[188]RM II p.55: *kānac kvasuś ca chandasy ādeśau vihitau | prayogas tu bhāṣāyām api dṛśyate | tasthivān ||*

is no need to dwell on them any longer.

4.6.3 Puruṣottama's *Bhāṣāvṛtti*

When we come to Puruṣottamadeva, however, the situation changes and the Nyāsakāra returns at last. In the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, P. 3.2.105–109 are listed, but the first two appear only for the sake of *anuvṛtti*. The third however, P. 3.2.107, receives the following commentary:

> *kvasuś ca* || 3.2.107 ||

> **Bhāṣāvṛtti**: *liṭaḥ kvasur veti trayam adhikriyate | śeṣaś chāndasaḥ | nyāsakāras tu kā-nackvasoḥ kitkaraṇād bhāṣāyām api prayogam icchati | … | sthā tasthivān | padam āsasthuṣā tvayā | pā papivān | tṝ titīrvān ||*

> **P. 3.2.107** And *KvasU*.

> **Bhāṣāvṛtti**: The triad, *liṭaḥ*, "in place of liṭ," *KvasU*, and *vā*, "optionally," is a heading. The rest is for the Vedas. But, the Nyāsakāra accepts the use of *KānaC* and *KvasU* in the standard language as well. (For example:)[189] √*sthā* (forms) *tasthivān*, "he who has stood," (as in) KumS 6.72b, "by you who has reached a place"; √*pā* (forms) *papivān*, "he who has defended"; √*tṝ* (forms) *titīrvān*, "he who has crossed."

One of the commentators on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, Viśvarūpa (early 15th cent. Bengal),[190] adds in his *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*: *etad eva kitkaraṇaṃ jñāpakaṃ kānackvasor bhāṣāyāṃ sādhutve | chandasi tu chandasy ubhayathā iti ṅittvena siddham* || "It's precisely this marking (the suffixes) with a *K* that is a hint for *KānaC* and *KvasU* being correct in the standard language. In the Vedas, however, (the suffixes) are already marked with a *Ṅ* by P. 6.4.5." Viśvarūpa presents Jinendrabuddhi's proof that *KvasU* and *KānaC* are also valid in the standard language as an alternative to the more standard Pāṇinian view, which he clearly knew. Even without a ringing endorsement for the unorthodox stance, I view the lack of refutation as significant especially when compared with other commentators, like Haradatta and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, and the mention of the *Kumārasambhava* can only help to bolster the need for such a justification. The order, however, is a theoretical defense of *KvasU* and then the presentation of actual usage. We can also cite another sources for Pu-

---

[189]I have omitted some of the examples.

[190]Viśvarūpa and his commentary are the subject of Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005). His date and region is discussed on pp. 75–80. Unfortunately her critical edition of the commentary does not include the present section.

ruṣottama's acceptance of Jinedrabuddhi's approach, his *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, a work in which the *jñāpaka*s, "hints," found in Pāṇini's sūtras are listed in the same order as the sūtras themselves. In discussing P. 3.2.106 and 107, Puruṣottama reports that the Nyāsakāra has said the suffixes *KanaC* and *KvasU* are both used in the standard language because the suffixes are marked with *K*.[191]

Elsewhere in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* we find additional evidence that Puruṣottamadeva accepted *KvasU* for the standard language. As we saw in the RA (fn. 184, p. 220.), Pāṇini has provided a number of sūtras for the derivation of *kvasvanta*s. Those that do not pertain to √*śru*, √*sad*, and √*vas* are technically Vedic. One such example is P. 8.2.65 *mvoś ca*, which regulates the change of a root final *m* to *n* when an *m* or *v* follows. On this sūtra Puruṣottama has the following to say:

> *mavayoḥ parayor dhātor masya naḥ syāt | makāre chāndasam udāharaṇam | vakāre kvasau jaganvān | yeṣāṃ tu cchandasi kvasur iti mataṃ teṣāṃ chandaḥsūtram etat |* (*Bhāṣāvṛtti* ad P. 8.2.65)

> *n* occurs in place of a final *m* of a root when followed by *m* or *v*. The examples when a *m* follows are Vedic. When *v* follows in *KvasU* (an example is) *jaganvān*, "he who has gone." But for those who hold the opinion that *KvasU* (only) occurs in the Vedas, this is a Vedic sūtra.

Although Puruṣottamadeva has simply presented two points of view here, his phrasing implies that he accepts *KvasU* in the standard language, but others do not. By coupling these comments with those on P. 3.2.107 and in the *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, a clear picture emerges that Jinendrabuddhi's hint has full validity in the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. This all fits well with Puruṣottamadeva's provenance of Bengal where the *Nyāsa* retained an active following and demonstrates how variation within the Pāṇinian school continued based on regional sub-schools. A further factor that likely allowed the non-Vedic status of *KvasU* to continue was the absence of a strong tradition of *Mahābhāṣya* studies in Bengal, as can be seen from Viśvarūpa's commentary.[192] Note that although religious

---

[191]*Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 73: *Nyāsakāras tu ... kānackvasoḥ kitkaraṇasāmarthyād bhāṣāyāṃ prayoga ity avādīt |* The *tu* contrasts Jinendrabuddhi's opinion with that of the *Bhāgavṛtti*, a now lost commentary on the A that divided Pāṇini's rules into a *bhāṣābhāga*, "standard language portion," and *chandobhāga*, "Vedic portion." This is one of the most significant losses in the Pāṇinian tradition and the basis for the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Cf. Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. 2: 17–26).

[192]Cf. Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. II: 78): "... but on the other hand, his (scil. Viśvarūpa's) knowledge of the *Mahābhāṣya* was obviously very limited."

affiliation likely played a role in the initial spread of the *Nyāsa* to Bengal,[193] once the tradition had taken hold, Brahman commentators like Viśvarūpa, a Vaiṣṇavite (likely a devotee of Kṛṣṇa), perpetuated it.[194]

4.6.4   Rāmacandra's *Prakriyākaumudī*

As we close in on the final three recasts of the A, we still do not quite find unity on the question of *KvasU*. It seems that up until the time of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, the weight of usage and other grammarians had overshadowed Patañjali's own words. The two works leading up to the *Siddhāntakaumudī* follow more closely their immediate predecessors instead of looking toward the conservatism displayed in the final stage of Pāṇinian studies. Furthermore, we discover a somewhat new arrangement of the sūtra text and even a few familiar sūtras missing. Let us begin with Rāmacandra's *Prakriyākaumudī* (late 14th cent.) along with extracts from the commentaries of Viṭṭhala, Rāmacandra's grandson (early 15th cent.), and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (latter 16th cent.).[195]

> *liṭaḥ kānaj vā* || 3.2.106 ||

> *liṭaḥ kānaj ādeśo vā syāc chandasi | prayogavaśād loke 'pīti kecit | taṅānāv ātmanepadam | dvitvādi | cakrāṇaḥ* || (PrKPras II p. 575/PrKPrak vol. III p. 541)

> **Prasāda**: *citkaraṇam antodāttārthaṃ kitkaraṇaṃ kitkāryārtham | chandasi liṭ ato liṭgrahaṇe 'nuvartamāne 'pi punar liṭgrahaṇaṃ sarvasya liṭa ādeśo yathā syād ity evamartham | anyathā tasyaiva syāt | **prayogavaśāt iti** | tathā cāmarasiṃhe kānacaḥ prayogaḥ | śiśvadāno 'kṛṣṇakarmā iti | kṣīrasvāminā ca vyākhyātam | śvidi śvaitye | liṭ | kānaj iti* || (PrKPras II p. 575)

> **Prakāśa**: *kid ayaṃ bhāṣāyām apīti kecit | bhāṣye tu chāndasa eveti sthitam | ... ||* (PrKPrak vol. III p. 541)

> *kvasuś ca* || 3.2.107 ||

---

[193]Maitreyarakṣita, the author of the *Tantrapradīpa*, a commentary on the *Nyāsa*, and Puruṣottamadeva were both Buddhist.

[194]Cf. Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. II: 79).

[195]Both of these commentaries can be quite lengthy, especially the latter, so I have chosen only the most relevant passages. I have also omitted some remarks by Rāmacandra as they introduce a few difficulties not yet discussed, such as the use of √*i* in P. 7.3.85.

liṭaḥ kvasur ādeśo vā syāt | babhajvān | ... || (PrKPras II p. 576/PrKPrak vol. III p. 541)

Prakāśa: ***babhajvān*** *| bhañjo āmarddane | dvitvādi | kittvān nalopaḥ | udittvān num | saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ | bhāṣye tu chāndasaḥ kvasur iti sthitam | tathā cottaratra bhā-ṣāyām ity ucyate | ... ||* (PrKPrak vol. III p. 541)

[P. 7.2.67, 7.2.68]

dāśvān sāhvān mīḍhvāṃś ca || **6.1.12** *||*

ete kvasvantā nipātyante || (PrKPras II p. 578/PrKPrak vol. III p. 544)

Prasāda: *kvasuś ca ity anenaiva vyākhyātaprāyatvād upekṣitaṃ vyākhyāyate | bhāṣāyāṃ sadavasaśruvaḥ ||* 3.2.108 *|| sadādibhyaḥ kvasuḥ syād bhāṣāyām | ... ||* (PrKPras II p. 578)

upeyivān anāśvān anūcānaś ca || 3.2.109 *||*

ete nipātyante | nātropasargas tantram || samīyivān | īyivān | ... || (PrKPras II p. 579/PrKPrak vol. III p. 544)

Prakāśa: *... | bhāṣāyāṃ ca kvasus tasya vidhīyate | evaṃ tarhy ādeśasāmarthyād bhū-tamātre bhāṣāyām api liḍ anumīyate | tasya nityaṃ kvasur ādeśaḥ | vānuvṛtteḥ pakṣe luṅādayo yathāprāptā api | ... ||* (PrKPrak vol. III p. 544)

P. 3.2.106 In place of *liṭ* there is optionally *KānaC.*

KānaC is optionally the substitute for *liṭ* in the Vedas. Some say on the strength of usage that it is also occurs in the ordinary world. P. 1.4.100 "the *taṄ* endings and *āna* are termed ātmanepada." There is reduplication etc. (Example:) *cakrāṇaḥ*, "has done for himself."

Prasāda: Marking (the suffix) with a *C* is so that the word is oxytone; marking (the suffix) with a *K* is for the purpose of operations pertaining to elements marked with *K*. Even though the mention of *liṭ* continues from P. 3.2.105 *chandasi liṭ*, *liṭ* is mentioned again so that the substitute occurs in place of every (*liṭ*). Thus is its purpose. Otherwise it would occur only in place of it (the *liṭ* in P. 3.2.105).[196] On "**on the strength of usage**": And so there is the use of *KānaC* in Amarasiṃha('s *koṣa*). AKKṣ 3.1.46 *śiśvidāno 'kṛṣṇakarmā |* It has been explained by Kṣīrasvāmin: KṣDhP I.10 *śvidI śvaitye*, "to be white," the suffix *liṭ*, the suffix *KānaC.*[197]

Prakāśa: Some say that this (suffix) marked with *K* is also in the standard language, but it stands in the *Bhāṣya* that it is Vedic.

---

[196]These comments follow the KV.

[197]In the printed edition edited by Govind Oka (1913: 172) the reading is *śvidi śvaitye, liṭaḥ kānaj vā |*

P. 3.2.107 And *KvasU*.

KvasU should be the substitute for *liṭ*. (Examples:) *babhajvān*, "has crushed" etc.

Prakāśa: On the form **babhajvān**, "he who has crushed": (From KṣDhP VII.16) *bhañjO* in the meaning, "to crush." There is reduplication etc. Because the suffix is marked with *K* there is elision of the *n* (by P. 6.4.24). Because it is marked with a short *U* there is the augment *n* (by P. 7.1.70). There is elision of the final of the conjunct consonant (by P. 8.2.23). But it stands in the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya* that *KvasU* is Vedic, and so in the following (sūtra, P. 3.2.108) it's said "in the standard language." **P. 7.2.12** *dāśvān, sāhvān, mīḍhvān* (are set forms).

Prasāda: (A sūtra), which has been disregarded because it is more or less already explained by the sūtra P. 3.2.109,[198] is explained (now): P. 3.2.108 *bhāṣāyāṃ sadavasaśruvaḥ*, "the suffix *KvasU* should occur after √*sad*, etc. in the standard language" …

P. 3.2.109 *upeyivān, anāśvān* and *anūcānaḥ* (are set forms).

These are set forms. Here the *upasarga* is not predominant. (For example:) *samīyivān. īyivān.*

Prakāśa: … And in the standard language *KvasU* is prescribed in place of it (scil. *liṭ* enjoined in P. 3.2.105). Then in this way *liṭ* is also inferred in the standard language only in the sense of past time because of the strength of the substitute. *KvasU* is inevitably the substitute for it (scil. *liṭ* from P. 3.2.105). Because of the continuation of "optionally" the aorist etc. also occur when applicable.

The freedom to interpret this set of sūtras contrary to the *Mahābhāṣya* persists, though not entirely unquestioned, into the penultimate stage of Sanskrit grammar as represented by Rāmacandra and his immediate successors. The defense for *KvasU* and *KvānaC* is based on usage as in the RM, though quotations from literature are not given. His grandson, Viṭṭhala, does supply a single example from the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* of Amarasiṃha with the explanation of Kṣīrasvāmin. Why Viṭṭhala turns to lexicographical work instead of drawing on the abundant examples in *kāvya* literature, as later grammarians do, remains unclear, but given the high respect accorded to the *Amarakośa* throughout the history of Sanskrit, citing it as an authority for proper usage is not incomprehensible. So sure is Rāmacandra that *KvasU* and *KānaC* are universally applicable that

---

[198]Recall that Viṭṭhala lays out his intention to supplement those sūtras Rāmacandra has left out in his eighth introductory stanza.

he even takes the logical step of removing P. 3.2.108 all together. The reason is that if P. 3.2.106 and 107 can apply to the standard language there is no need to include P. 3.2.108, which originally provided a way for the perfect active participle to enter the *bhāṣā* with certain roots. His grandson, as he often does, notes the missing *sūtra* and explains it, here following the KV quite closely. There is no mention of the conflict with Patañjali. When we reach Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, however, the authority of the *Bhāṣya* once again takes precedent over actual usage, and there is evidently no room for leeway. Mention of Jinendrabuddhi's proof that Pāṇini intended *KvasU* and *KānaC* for the standard language is entirely wanting in these three texts,[199] and the only refutation against the objection that usage warrants *KvasU* and *KānaC* in the standard language is that Patañjali says the suffixes are Vedic. This argument is not new, and I have already mentioned (fn. 109) that Haradatta employed the same strategy a few centuries earlier. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa begins, in many ways, the next and final stage of traditional Pāṇinian studies in India. Although he takes Rāmacandra's text as the basis for his commentary, Śrī Kṛṣṇa nevertheless notes many of the inconsistencies between the *Prakriyākaumudī* and the *Mahābhāṣya*, a practice he would later pass on to his pupil, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

To take an additional example of how Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa works in an interpretation of Patañjali, let us look at the issue with how to understand the optionality of P. 3.2.108 and 109. In the passage from the *Prakāśa* I have quoted ad P. 3.2.109, Patañjali's notion that *liṭ* optionally occurs after the given roots in the sense of past time and is then necessarily replaced by *KvasU* is clearly laid out. None of the other commentators quoted in this section make note of the this interpretation and based on their glosses, they follow the KV in saying that *KvasU* optionally replaces *liṭ*.[200] Rāmacandra, oddly enough, does not note any option at all unless we understand it from his gloss on P. 3.2.107, *liṭaḥ kvasur ādeśo vā syāt*, "may *KvasU* optionally be the substitute for *liṭ*," although he gives no examples for the alternative. Viṭṭhala, however, does make the remark

---

[199]Kṛṣṇa seems to make a veiled reference to Jinendrabuddhi's idea that *K* serves as a *jñāpaka* when he says *kid ayaṃ bhāṣāyām*. "this (suffix) marked with *K* is in the standard language." By referring to *KānaC* as *kid ayam* I suspect he wants to hint that the *anubandha K* is the reason some hold the belief.

[200]RA II p. 246 *ebhyaḥ parasya liṭaḥ bhāṣāyāṃ vā kvasur ādeśo bhavati* | P. Puruṣottamadeva: *sadāder bhāṣāyāṃ liṭaḥ kvasur vā syāt* |

ad P. 3.2.109 that *upapūrvād iṇo liṭaḥ kvasuḥ*, "*KvasU* occurs in place of *liṭ* after *iṆ* preceded by *upa*." A few lines later he brings in the option: *vāvṛtteḥ pakṣe luṅādayo 'pi*, "Because of the continuation of optionally the suffixes *luṅ*, etc. occur in the (other) option." But the fact still remains that Patañjali's explanation that *liṭ* is optional and *KvasU* is a mandatory substitute is completely absent. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa steps in to make sure that the MBh is followed, when he says that *tasya nityaṃ kvasur ādeśaḥ*, "*KvasU* is invariably the substitute for it (scil. *liṭ*)." He does not, however, remedy a rather un-Patañjalian remark by Viṭṭhala, namely that *liṭaḥ* in P. 3.2.106 stands in for every *liṭ*, not just the *liṭ* got by the preceding sūtra. Such lapses will not be tolerated in final stage of Pāṇinian grammar, to which we now turn.

4.6.5   Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Siddhāntakaumudī*

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣkita (16th–17th cent.) and his followers look back to the *Mahābhāṣya* as an ultimate authority. Anything that contradicts the opinion of Patañjali should be rejected. This mindset, however, had been long in the making and we have seen glimpses of it in Haradatta Miśra[201] and again in Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa in the last section. Since the former is the first in the Pāṇinian tradition to argue against Jinendrabuddhi in this manner, it is worth citing his text now for the sake of comparison. After discussing the purpose of *K* and rehashing much of the *Nyāsa*'s arguments cited above (p. 193), Haradatta says dismissively:

> *kitkaraṇasāmarthyād bhāṣāyām api kānaj (/kvasur) astīty etat tu bhāṣyavirodhād up-*
> *ekṣyam* | (KVPada vol. II p. 617 & 618)

> The idea that the suffix *KānaC* (or *KvasU*[202]) occurs in the common language because
> of the strength of marking (the suffix) with *K* is to be disregarded since it contradicts
> the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*.

Yet as we have seen, Haradatta's conservatism and ultimate reliance on the *Mahābhāṣya* is not so widespread within the larger grammatical tradition and no author we have surveyed repeats this line of reasoning until Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

---

[201]See also fn. 109 above.
[202]The same sentence is stated in the commentary on the following sūtra with *kvasur* in place of *kānaj*.

When Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita comes on the scene with his *Siddhāntakaumudī*, he unsurprisingly follows the opinion of Patañjali, as his teacher Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa did, but he cannot fully ignore the evidence available before him, staring him in the face, as it were. As a result we find the following statement in the *Siddhāntakaumudī* on the triad of sūtras, P. 3.2.105–107, furnished with a caveat:

> *iha bhūtasāmānye chandasi liṭ | tasya vidhānamānau kvasukānacāv api chāndasāv iti trimunimatam | kavayas tu bahulaṃ prayuñjate | taṃ tasthivāṃsaṃ nagaropakaṇṭhe | śreyāṃsi sarvāṇy adhijagmuṣas te ityādi ||* (SK IV pp. 112f.)

> Here the suffix *liṭ* occurs in the sense of general past time in the Vedic literature. It is the opinion of the three sages (scil. Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali) that both *KvasU* and *KānaC*, which are enjoined in place of it (scil. *liṭ* in the sense of a general past tense), are Vedic. Poets however, employ (them) variously. (For example:) RaghuV 5.61a "him who stood at the edge of the city" and 5.34b "of you who has obtained all good things," etc.

Bhaṭṭoji here makes a slightly different move from the his predecessors insofar as he gives the opinion of the three sages of grammar and then adds that the practice of the poets differs, a claim bolstered by the two citations from the *Raghuvaṃśa* of Kālidāsa. The plainness of the comments is unsurprising given the partly utilitarian goal of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, to provide a basic understanding of the A for beginners. The addition of the quotes from Kālidāsa was certainly motivated by this goal since students learning the SK were likely to have encountered these very passages in their readings, the *Raghuvaṃśa* being one of the most widely read works of Sanskrit literature. Bhaṭṭoji has simply preempted the student's objection: "but Kālidāsa uses such form…" I cannot, however, give any explanation for these two passages in particular.[203] However the case may be, Bhaṭṭoji, instead of using a very general phrase such as *prayogavaśāt*, "by force of usage," rather carves a separate domain for poets without overtly passing judgment and criticizing them. The short passage demonstrates that the usage of the poets, even at this most conservative of times in the grammatical tradition, could not be swept under the rug.

To make up for the terseness of the SK, Bhaṭṭoji had two other platforms where he could expand and justify his ideas, the *Śabdakaustubha*, an elaborate running commentary on the sūtras of the A, and the *Prauḍhamanoramā*, a learned commentary on the SK. The remarks on a sūtra in

---

[203]As the data presented above shows, they are not the first Vedic *kvasvanta*s in the *Raghuvaṃśa*.

the SK were there simply to allow the students to understand and apply the given rule. Theoretical problems and other opinions were dealt with in more advanced treatises. Let us now look briefly at these two graduate level works of Bhaṭṭoji and how Nāgeśa, the final link for this study, adds one final twist.

4.6.5.1   *Śabdakaustubha* and *Prauḍhamanoramā*

In his two aforementioned works, Bhaṭṭoji delves into the long history of Sanskrit grammar, drawing on works spanning from Patañjali down to his teacher, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. In the *Śabdakaustubha*, we usually find a summary of the debates regarding each sūtra and then Bhaṭṭoji's *siddhānta*, "final judgment." The *Prauḍhamanoramā*, on the other hand, is more focused on clarifying the brief comments in the SK, but often repeats much of the information in the *Śabdakaustubha*. I cite below a short passage from each work that gives us further insight into Bhaṭṭoji's mind.

> **Śabdakaustubha** ad P. 3.2.107:

> *yat tu kecit kitkaraṇasāmarthyād bhāṣāyām api kvasukānacau staḥ ity āhuḥ | tad bhāṣyaviruddham | bhāṣāyāṃ sada ityādisūtraviruddhaṃ ca ity upekṣyam*[204] *|* (ŚaKau vol. II p. 463)

> But some say that because they are marked with *K*, both *KvasU* and *KānaC* also occur in the standard language. This is contradicted by the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*, and it is contradicted by the sūtra P. 3.2.108. So, (such a statement) should be ignored.

> **Prauḍhamanoramā**:

> **trimunimatam** *ity ata eva kitkaraṇasāmārthyād bhāṣāyām api kvasukānacau staḥ iti keṣāṃ cid utpekṣā nādartavyeti haradattamādhavādigranthe spaṣṭam iti bhāvaḥ |* **kavayas tv** *iti | gatānugatikatayā iti*[205] *bhāvaḥ |* (PrauM II p. 806)

> On "**the opinion of the triad of sages**": The underlying idea is as follows: The fancy of some people that for this very reason[206] — because they are marked with *K* — both *KvasU* and *KānaC* also occur in the standard language, need not be respected. This

---

[204]Cf. KVPada ad P. 3.2.107, vol. II p. 618.

[205]The printed edition gives *gatānugatikayeti*. Based on sense and following the reading found in the *Tattvabodhinī* (vol. IV p. 113) on the same passage, the correction is patent.

[206]Bhaṭṭoji has just rehashed Jinendrabuddhi's argument that the *anubandha K* indicates the general applicability of *KvasU* in the standard language. Since I have quoted and explained this passage above, there is no need for its repetition.

is clear in the works of Haradatta, Mādhava and others.[207] The underlying idea of **'but poets … '** is that (they use the suffixes as they do) because they follow those who have gone before.

The two passages complement each other nicely. As before, the express opinion of Patañjali trumps any argument based on the assumed internal logic of the A. The grounds that *prayoga*, "usage," of other respected authors like Amarasiṃha might here serve as a justification is completely ignored since all correct standard Sanskrit must ultimately derive from Patañjali, no one else. Bhaṭṭoji also gives a reason why poets compose as they do; they are *gatānugatika*s, "followers of those who have gone before." This is not particularly high praise, and the term more often than not indicates a sort of blind, thoughtless adherence to tradition without discrimination.[208] Unfortunately, Bhaṭṭoji does not offer any further detail regarding this term, but at least one of his commentators takes the citation of such forms composed by Kālidāsa as a clue that there must be a valid, i.e., Patañjalian, justification for the forms.

To meet this challenge and justify the perfect active participles in Kālidāsa and other writers, a Sanskrit grammarian following in Bhaṭṭoji's school must either base his reasoning on arguments present in the *Mahābhāṣya* or, even better, quote Patañjali's own words.[209] Four sources I have been able to consult attest to a final defense of *KvasU*, originating between Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and the most famed student in his lineage, Nāgeśabhaṭṭa.[210] In the latter's commentaries on the SK, the *Śabdenduśekhara*, both the *laghu*, "light," (p. 806) and *bṛhat*, "heavy," version, as well as in his *Uddyota* (MBhPra vol. IV pp. 203f.), an argument attributed to *kecit*, "some," is proffered on the authority of Patañjali's usage. A more reduced version is also found in Vāsudeva Dīkṣita's *Bāla-*

---

[207]The relevant passage from Haradatta's *Padamañjarī* has already been quoted above p. 227. I have as of yet been unable to locate a discussion of these suffixes in the *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* by Sāyaṇa. I do not doubt, however, that it is there.

[208]See, for example, *Harṣacarita* Ucchvāsa 2, p. 53: *salilānīva gatānugatikāni bhavanty avivekināṃ manāṃsi* | "The minds of undiscriminating men follow those who have gone before like the waters (of a river)." Cf. NaiC 5.55 (with Nārāyaṇa's commentary) as well.

[209]Take, by way of example, the form *śāśvataḥ*, "eternal," in *Kumārasambhava* 2.15 along with Mallinātha's commentary thereon. The form is noted down as an irregularity and a quote from Vāmana's KAS 5.2.51 is given as an authority. His authority, in turn, is Patañjali's use of *śāśvata* in MBh III.226.18. See Kale's remarks in his notes to the verse, Kale (1917: Notes 35f.).

[210]Jñānendrasarasvatī does not mention the argument in his *Tattvabodhinī* on the SK (vol. IV p. 113). This could be taken as evidence that he didn't know the argument since others who do know it, like Nāgeśa and Vāsudeva, report it, but fully conclusive his silence is not.

manorāmā on the SK (mid 18th; vol. IV p. 113). It runs as follows in the *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara*:

> ***chāndasau*** *chandasīti prakramya vidhānād iti bhāvaḥ | kecit tu vibhāṣā pūrvāhṇeti sūtre papuṣa āgataṃ papivadrūpyam iti bhāṣye laukikavigrahavākye 'pi kvasuprayoga-darśanāt kvacil loke 'pi kvasur bhavatīti noktaprayogeṣu doṣaḥ | uktabhāṣyaprāmāṇyāt saṃyogāntebhyaḥ paraṃ chandasy eveti kalpyam | kānac ca cchandasy eva | uttarasū-traṃ tu tebhyo 'nyatra kvacid evety arthajñāpanārtham ity āhuḥ |* (vol. III pp. 2064f.)

> On "**(the two suffixes) are Vedic**": the underlying idea is that (they are Vedic) because they are prescribed with the (condition) "in the Vedas" advancing (into P. 3.2.106 and 107 from P. 3.2.105). Yet, some people say the following: There is no fault in the stated uses (of *KvasU*) since *KvasU* occurs sometimes even in the ordinary world based on the observed use of *KvasU* also in a non-technical gloss in the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya* on P. 4.3.24. (Patañjali says), namely, "*papivadrūpya* means 'what has come because of one who has protected.'"[211] On the authority of the stated (passage from) the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya* it can be finagled that (the suffix *KvasU*) after roots ending in a conjunct consonant is restricted to just the Vedic literature, and *KānaC* occurs only in Vedic literature. But the following sūtra (scil. P. 3.2.108) is for the purpose of making known the meaning that (*KvasU*) occurs sometimes after (roots) other than those (scil. √*sad*, √*vas*, and √*śru*).

The crux of the argument is that Patañjali has used the form *papuṣaḥ*, "from one who has protected," a perfect active participle of √*pā*, "to protect," in the abl. sing. Furthermore, the context in which Patañjali employs the form adds weight to the argument that it truly belongs to the standard language. We find *papuṣaḥ* as part of a *laukikavigrahavākya*, "non-technical analytic phrase," for the complex formation *papivadrūpyam*, "what has come from/because of one who has protected," and as Nāgeśa points out in the *Uddyota* on the MBh ad P. 4.3.24 while discussing the form *prauṣṭhaḥ*, non-technical analytic phrases are not Vedic.[212] The authors of this argument have therefore found a fairly solid proof by the standards of the day that *KvasU* can indeed be used in the common language with any root. Since Nāgeśa does not specifically refute this argument, one can assume he at least did not entirely disapprove of it.

All the minor variations in wording between the four sources are hardly worth mentioning. Only two points stand out as adding more information. In the *Uddyota*, Nāgeśa adds that these

---

[211]Cf. P. 4.3.81 *hetumanuṣyebhyo 'nyatarasyāṃ rūpyam*, which prescribes the suffix *rūpya* after a word ending in the fifth (abl.) case in the formula *tata āgatam*, "what has come from X," (cf. P. 4.3.74) and is a cause or a person. This is significant because an analytic phrase cannot be *chāndasa*.

[212]MBhPra IV p. 203b: *na hi vigrahavākyaṃ chandaḥ |*

anonymous people believe that P. 3.2.108, which gives the three roots √*sad*, etc., only provides examples.[213] Second, Vāsudeva Dīkṣita introduces Bhaṭṭoji's statement, that poets make use of the suffix in various ways, by first citing Patañjali's usage as pointing towards the occasional correctness of the perfect active participles in the standard language.[214] This presentation makes it seem as though Bhaṭṭoji was aware of the argument and based his remark about the poets on it, a clear case of reading later material back into the text commented upon. The transition from citation of an argument to incorporating it into Bhaṭṭoji's logic exemplifies well, on the one hand, how commentators can impose later or foreign ideas upon their root text, and on the other hand, that this argument had gained unquestioned acceptance in some circles.

4.6.6   Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's *Prakriyāsarvasva*

I would be remiss not to mention, at least in brief, the opinion of the oft overshadowed Keralite, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (late 16th–17th cent.). His treatment of *KvasU* is somewhat idiosyncratic and clearly incorporates non-Pāṇinian ideas. Without going into all details, his presentation of *KvasU* runs as follows. In the portion dealing with *kṛt* suffixes (*kṛt-khaṇḍa*) with past tense meaning (*bhūte*), Nārāyaṇa introduces (PrS vol. II p. 43) P. 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca* immediately after P. 3.2.115 *parokṣe liṭ* and as its optional replacement.[215] Thereafter follow eleven sūtras pertaining to the details of reduplication and the addition of the augment *iṬ*, somewhat similar to what we saw in the RA. Just as we reach the end of the *khaṇḍa*, Nārāyaṇa presents P. 3.2.108 and 109 as the last two sūtras. In his commentary ad P. 3.2.108 he remarks that with respect to these three roots, the suffix *liṭ* occurs only in the sense of *bhūte*, "past time," and that *KvasU* is a mandatory replacement for it in the ordinary world.[216] Accordingly, the perfect active participle of these roots differ from those of other roots with respect to their tense. Generally, the *kvasvanta*s are substitutes for the

---

[213]Cf. MBhPra IV 203bf,: *etadbhāṣyaprāmāṇyād eva kvasur loke 'pi kvacid bhavait | bhāṣāyāṃ sadavasa ity atra sadādigrahaṇaṃ tūdāharaṇamātram ity āhuḥ |* "They say that based on the authority of this passage from the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya, KvasU* also occurs in the ordinary world. Moreover, in the sūtra P. 3.2.108 the mention of √*sad*, etc. are mere examples."

[214]*Bālamanoramā* IV p. 113: *tena loke 'pi kvacit kvasoḥ sādhutvaṃ sūcitam |* "This points to the fact that the suffix *KvasU* is sometimes correct even in the standard language."

[215]PrS vol. II p. 43 ad P. 3.2.107: *liṭaḥ kvasur vā syāt |*

[216]PrS vol. II p. 49 ad P. 3.2.108*eṣāṃ loke bhūtārthamātre liṭ | tasya ca nityaṃ kvasuḥ syāt |*

parokṣe perfect, but in the case of these six roots, they convey an action in the general past.

This is certainly the most novel treatment of the *kvasvanta*s we have encountered and runs against Patañjali's interpretation of the sūtras. To begin with our main focus, the generally productive suffix *KvasU* is clearly not restricted to the Vedas, but this we have seen. The distribution of the tenses, however, is very odd. As we have seen, Patañjali has assigned the temporal meaning (*sāmānya*)*bhūta*, "(general) past," to the *liṭ* that *KvasU* substitutes in P. 3.2.107.[217] The forms generated by P. 3.2.108, however, should be able to optionally stand in for any past tense.[218] Nārāyaṇa completely changes the situation insofar as the general *KvasU* has only the value of the normal *parokṣe* perfect, i.e., *liṭaḥ* refers to *parokṣe liṭ*, whereas the *KvasU* specified for the roots √*sad*, etc. is restricted to *bhūte*, the reason for which might be derived from the original context of P. 3.2.108f. under the *bhūte* heading. Quite in line with Patañjali is the mention that *KvasU* is the mandatory substitute for *liṭ* with the three roots. For the most part, this very much flies in the face of Patañjali, although bits of the MBh are recognizable. What then motivates Nārāyaṇa to take such unorthodox liberties with the A?[219]

From the PrS itself we are fortunate to have a rather explicit answer to this question. The section on *KvasU* discussed in the last paragraph is bookended by two verses regarding the decision to include *KvasU* in the standard language. The verses in full are as follows:

> *sūtravārttikabhāṣyeṣu chāndasāv eva kevalam |*
> *kānackvasū iti vyaktaṃ sādhitaṃ mādhavādibhiḥ ||*
>
> *loke 'pi dvayam astīti kaumudī vāvadīti sā |*
> *kvasur eva tu loke 'stīty uditaṃ bhojabhūbhujā ||*
>
> *tadvaśād bahuprayogāc ca liṭaḥ kvasur ucyate |* (PrS vol. II p. 42, introduction to P. 3.2.115.)
>
> *kaumudyāṃ tu liṭaḥ kānaj veti loke 'pi kānaci |*
> *saṃjagmānaś ca cakrāṇa ityādy apy asti taṅvatām ||* (PrS vol. II p. 50 ad P. 3.2.109.)

---

[217]See MBh II.114.22–115.2 and my discussion on p. 174, where I also discuss the view of the KV that *liṭ* should refer to any *liṭ*.

[218]See p. 199 above.

[219]Houben (2014) provides some answers to this question.

(Introduction to P. 3.2.115:)

In the sūtras (scil. of Pāṇini), the *vārttika*s (of Kātyāyana), and the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya* (of Patañjali) *KānaC* and *KvasU* are just Vedic plain and simple. Mādhava and others have clearly established this.[220] The (*Prakriyā*)*kaumudī* forcefully argues that the pair (of suffixes) is also in the ordinary world,[221] but King Bhoja has said that only *KvasU* is in the ordinary world.[222]

By the force of this (statement of Bhoja) and on account of much usage, the suffix *KvasU* is said to occur in place of *liṭ*.

(Conclusion to P. 3.2.109:)

In the (*Prakriyā*)*kaumudī* (it is said) that *KānaC* optionally occurs in place of *liṭ*. In the ordinary world too there are such forms as *saṃjagmānaḥ*, "they who have assembled," *cakrāṇaḥ*, "they who have made for themselves,"[223] when *KānaC* (is added to) ātmanepada roots.

Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa cites the same objection to the use of *KvasU* in the standard language, viz. that it goes against the *munitraya*, but notes the opinion of two other heavyweights, Bhoja and Rāmacandra. Bhoja's advice is ultimately followed since we do not find *KānaC* incorporated into this part of the PrS, and Nārāyaṇa appears to have included the opinion of Rāmacandra for the sake of completeness and out of deference to the most popular Pāṇinian grammar of his day. What I find particularly telling in this brief discussion, is that Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa quotes authorities for what occurs in common usage, not common usage itself. I admit that Nārāyaṇa does tack on *bahuprayogāc ca*, "on account of much usage," and because but he does not muster up any examples whereas the statements of other grammarians are cited and pitted against each other. The primary mover is not usage itself but the authorities who tell us what is in usage.[224]

We have now looked at the opinions of a wide range of grammarians covering some two thousand years, from Patañjali up to Vāsudeva Dīkṣita. Although surely more grammatical works

---

[220]Cf. Bhaṭṭoji's remark in the *Prauḍhamanoramā* cited above in § 4.6.5.1 that Haradatta and Mādhava have refuted Jinendrabuddhi's proof for the non-Vedic use of *KvasU* and *KānaC*.

[221]Cf. PrKPrasāda II p. 573f. ad 3.2.106 f. and my translation above in § 4.6.4.

[222]Cf. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* 1.4.144 and § 4.5.5.

[223]The latter is also given as an example in the PrKPrasāda II p. 575 ad P. 3.2.106.

[224]Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa wrote a whole essay on the authority of non-Pāṇinian grammarias titled the *Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇyasādhanam* (*The authoritativeness of the non-Pāṇinīyas*). It is edited and translated in Sreekrishna Sarma (1968).

could be added, especially from the later period, I feel that the data presented so far will suffice to give a picture of how a conflict between usage and grammatical rule played out over almost the entirety of the tradition. The basic problem that Bhāmaha initially brought to our attention was whether or not the suffix *KvasU* can be used in the standard language of poetry with any root despite the clear restrictions among the three sages, Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali. This restriction is contradicted by data from both poetic works such as those of Kālidāsa and Ratnākara, as well as epic and purāṇic literature such as the *Mahābhārata* and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. All of the *kāvya* works postdate the three sages of grammar, and the epics were perhaps not held as correct Sanskrit.[225] So it comes as no surprise that none of them made any sort of provision. Grammarians working outside of the Pāṇinian tradition, all post-Kālidāsa with the exception, perhaps, of the *Kātantra*, were quick to note the discrepancy and, in the same spirit as Patañjali, had no qualms about working in *KvasU* (and at times *KānaC*) as unrestricted suffixes. In fact, right from the first grammars by Candragomin and Śarvavarman, the suffix *KvasU* leaves the domain of the Vedas and enters the standard language. As we have seen, all other non-Pāṇinian grammarians accept this modification unquestioned and without qualification, save Devanandin whose primary goal was simply to streamline the information in the A and *Mahābhāṣya* by exploiting syllable-saving techniques (although recall that he did remove the *upa* from *upeyivān*). Within the Pāṇinian tradition, Jinendrabuddhi made a rather unsuccessful attempt to justify *KvasU* and *KānaC* according to the same type of argumentation found in the *Mahābhāṣya*, i.e., that *K* must have a purpose other than the obvious one. Only Puruṣottamadeva (also Buddhist) along with his commentator, Viśvarūpa (Vaiṣṇavite but working in the Bengali school), cite his view without disapproval. A few centuries before Puruṣottama, Dharmakīrti had tacitly accepted such forms but gives no further comment. On the other hand the later Pāṇinīyas, Vimalasarasvatī and Rāmacandra together with his grandson Viṭṭhala, note that the suffix can occur in the standard language on account of *prayoga*, "usage," and make no mention of Jinendrabuddhi's proof. For

---

[225]We do not have any statements from Patañjali on the status of so-called "epic" Sanskrit, although such texts in one form or another must have existed in his day. Still, since he did not attempt to account for the many aberrations from the Pāṇinian standard, we can conclude that for Patañjali the language of the Epics lay outside the realm of Sanskrit for ordinary humans.

them, I conjecture, Jinendrabuddhi's argument had come under attack and it was more prudent to leave it out rather than be associated with a rogue. Mention of usage, however, could not be ignored since it was simply there in the works of Sanskrit's most revered poet, Kālidāsa. When Jinendrabuddhi's argument is brought up, it is to refute it by the glib comment that it contradicts the *Mahābhāṣya*. This begins already with Haradatta Miśra, who generally adheres quite strictly to the authority of the Mahābhāṣya, and continues in the commentaries of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Jñānendrasarasvatī, etc.[226] For such refutations to hold water, they had to have been made in an environment where Patañjali's authority counted as the final word. Using the suffix *KvasU* as a litmus test, we can conclude that a fair number of grammarians felt no need to follow Patañjali to the letter and give at least some deference toward usage. Those that do view the *Mahābhāṣya* as an incontrovertible authority are clustered around well-known resurgences in Patañjalian studies and linguistic conservatism. Haradatta lived close to (but likely after) the time when Helarāja and Kaiyaṭa breathed new life into the *Vākyapadīya* and *Mahābhāṣya*, respectively,[227] with their extraordinarily erudite and penetrating commentaries. It is, therefore, no surprise that he quotes over a hundred *kārikā*s from the Vākyapadīya and shares many common views, at times verbatim, with Kaiyaṭa.[228] The intellectual milieu of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita also sought to rein in a long history of śāstric discourse under the paradigm of the discipline's most authoritative personage, Patañjali in the case of grammar, Śaṅkara in the case of Vedānta.[229] For this reason Nārāyaṇa's grammatical works could not take hold as a transregional text, relying as he does on non-Pāṇinian authorities for determining correct usage. Yet, the weight of usage must have pressed on the grammarians, and a new (after nigh two thousand years of study!) justification for *KvasU* was put forth relying entirely on Patañjali's own words as recorded in the *Śabdenduśekhara*s and accepted in Vāsudeva's *Bālamanoramā*. It is here that our story must end

---

[226]According to Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, Mādhava (i.e., Sāyaṇa in his *Dhātuvṛtti*) is said also to have refuted Jinendrabuddhi's proof.

[227]Vergiani (2015) demonstrates the close connection between the *Pradīpa* and the *Prakāśa* as well as pointing out *en passant* an instance (fn. 77) where Haradatta also seems to know the works of Kaiyaṭa and Helarāja.

[228]Pathak (1931: 248–250) presents evidence that Haradatta was later than Kaiyaṭa and attacked his views in some instances.

[229]Cf. Deshpande (2015).

on the auspicious occasion of harmony between theory and practice.

4.7   Commentators on *KvasU* in *Poetry*

As the grammarians raged about how to best explain or control usage, others sought to make sense of texts, especially poetry, through commentaries. Although I will enter into a more detailed discussion of the Sanskrit commentators in the following two chapters, for now they will serve as representatives of another, though allied strand of thought on the Sanskrit language. Since many commentators make remarks about a word's derivation,[230] usually within the framework of the A, for the edification of the student, their explanations can offer us another window into the important debates on grammar and how usage and rule were unified. On the flip side, we can get an idea about which grammatical texts a particular commentator knew on the basis of his quotations and the assumed stances on particular grammatical points.[231] Finally, particularly problematic forms prompt not only interesting grammatical discussions but can also lead to textual emendation, as Goodall (2001) has shown. The case of *KvasU* provides us with a bit of everything. In the discussion below I will look at the explanation given by several commentators on *kvasvanta*s in the *Kumārasambhava*, *Raghuvaṃśa*, *Haravijaya*, and *Naiṣadhīyacarita*. The commentators who mention anything of interest are Hemādri (14th cent.) on *Raghuvaṃśa*, Vidyāmādhava (ca. 1350[232]) on *Kumārasabhava*, Mallinātha (14th/15th cent.) on both, and Rājānaka Alaka on the *Haravijaya*. I will then correlate them with what we have learned from the grammatical tradition in the preceding section.

---

[230]Not all commentators make remarks on grammar and many not consistently. The frequency of grammatical quotations in Mallinātha's commentaries is actually rather high in comparison. Of similar frequency on the *Raghuvaṃśa*, for example, only Hemādri rivals Mallinātha, and surpasses him in many regards. Cf. Nandargikar (1897: 13) "But the commentary of Hemādri excels by far all the others both in point of scholarship and judgment."

[231]I will discuss the point again later on, but determining what exactly a commentator wrote at a particular time is not as easy as simply opening an edition of Mallinātha and saying: look this is what Mallinātha wrote! No critical edition of Mallinātha exists and the extent to which the MSS differ is not even documented. Unfortunately one must at present understand "Mallinātha's" or the like to refer to the text as established by Nandargikar or Kale or the like.

[232]cf. Pingree (1981: 649).

4.7.1 Mallinātha on *KvasU*

Though not chronologically first among our commentators, we can dispense with Mallinātha at the outset because he makes only the plainest of remarks regarding the *kvasvanta*s, quoting P. 3.2.107 *kvasuś ca* only once ad RaghuV 2.29a while glossing *tasthivāṃsam*: *tasthivāṃsam sthitam. kvasuś ca iti kvasupratyayaḥ.* "Him, who has stood, who stood. The suffix *KvasU* by P. 3.2.107." Another more explicit gloss is ad NaiC 5.19d on *tasthivān*: *tasthivān tasthau. liṭaḥ kvasur ādeśaḥ.* "He was standing, he has stood. *KvasU* is the substitute for *liṭ*." Otherwise, Mallinātha simply gives, in most cases, the equivalent past active participle in *-KtavatU* and a note that the suffix is *KvasU*, e.g., ad Kum. 6,64a: *ūcivān uktivān. vaceḥ kvasupratyayaḥ.* "He who has spoke, who spoke. The suffix *KvasU* after the root *vac*." The lack of any discussion about the Vedic status of *KvasU* points, we can infer, that Mallinātha did not find the form problematic and may very well have been working with Rāmacandra's new *Prakriyākaumudī*. They also come from the same geographical area, Āndhra. Even if we disregard the PrK, Mallinātha would still have had any number of other grammatical treatises, both Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian, at his disposal that support the use of *KvasU* in the standard language as unproblematic, including the *Mugdhabodha* of Vopadeva, whose opinion Mallinātha quotes ad Kum. 2.1 and refers back to in his commentary ad KirātA 17.63.[233]

4.7.2 Hemādrī and Vidyāmādhava on *KvasU*

Hemādri and Vidyāmādhava, however, both note that there is a problem with *KvasU*. Hemādri takes up the issue at the first occurrence of a *kvasvanta* in the *Raghuvaṃśa*, verse 2.29a. Here we read the following comment: *prayogavaśāl loke 'pi iti kecit bhāṣāyāṃ kvasuḥ.* "Some (say) that 'by the force of usage also in the ordinary world,' the suffix *KvasU* (occurs) in the standard language." Although the statement has no particularly distinguishing features, it is identical to what we have seen in the PrK ad P. 3.2.106 (see § 4.6.4) up to the word *kecit*, and Hemādri may

---

[233]I thank Andrey Klebanov for this intriguing reference. He discusses Bhāravi's verse and the commentaries thereon in his dissertation.

well be quoting Rāmacandra, who in turn is likely referring to the non-Pāṇinian grammarians, possibly Bhoja or the commentators on the Kātantra. As we have seen the statement itself is of moment in the Pāṇinian school since it is the first time that usage is given as a *justification* for *KvasU*,[234] and Hemādri's citation of it in a commentary on the *Raghuvaṃśa* could not be more fitting because the usage to justify *KvasU* that seems to be on everyone's mind is Kālidāsa's. Since Hemādri neither raises any further objections nor offers a different defense, the citation regarding the power of usage sufficed to put the issue to rest.

Vidyāmādhava can similarly not let the first instance of a Vedic *kvasvanta* in the *Kumārasam-bhava* (KumS 6.64) pass by in silence. His remarks are, however, more detailed and point to the larger debate, so the passage is worth quoting in full:[235]

> *ūcivān ity asya vyutpattir mṛgyā pāṇinīye vaceḥ kvasuvidhānābhāvāt bhāṣāyāṃ sada-vasaśruvaḥ upeyivānananāśvānanūcānaś ca ity ebhya eva dhātubhyo bhāṣāyāṃ kvasu-vidhānād iti | atra kvacid ataḥ kāraṇād ity uktavāṃs tam evārtham iti pāṭhaḥ |*

> The derivation of the form *ūcivān*, "he who has spoken," should be investigated be-cause the suffix *KvasU* is not enjoined after √*vac* in the Pāṇinian (school of grammar) since it is enjoined only after those roots (in) P. 3.2.108 and P. 3.2.109. For this reason in some places there is the reading *uktavāṃs tam evārtham*.

Vidyāmādhava explains with clarity why the form cannot be in accordance with Pāṇini's rules and does not offer a defense either by citing usage or the trick of Jinendrabuddhi. Instead, he informs us that to remove the blemish, another reading has crept into the manuscripts, namely *uktavān*, the past active participle (*ktānta*), which seamlessly fills out the same metrical pattern. Other editors of the *Kumārasambhava* have also noted this reading.[236] In addition to a compul-sion to correct the text in the direction of Pāṇinian purity, another explanation for this alteration in some MSS must have been the common gloss *uktavān*. Since it metrically fits and was certainly

---

[234]Recall that Vimalasarasvatī gives a weaker version, namely that the use of the suffix is also seen in the standard language (see § 4.6.2), and Puruṣottamadeva quotes Jinedrabuddhi as wanting *KvasU* to be used in the standard language *because* the suffix is marked with *K* (see § 4.6.3).

[235]The edition of the text I am relying on, an unpublished PhD dissertation, abounds in the most simple errors. For example, both of the Pāṇinian sūtras quoted in the passage below are printed incorrectly, and for the *pratīka* the impossible hybrid *ūcitavān* stands in all its barbarous glory. I have emended without further comment.

[236]E.g., in Avināśacandramukha's edition, p. 185 fn. 7 and Patel's on p. 196, fn. 4 ad KumS 6.64. None of the MSS used by Narayana Murti for his edition of Vallabhadeva's commentary on the *Kumārasabhava* have this reading according to his apparatus on p. 179.

more familiar to scribes, especially the less learned, *uktavān* could have easily crept in through carelessness. Furthermore, his remarks demonstrate that despite the opinion put forth by various grammarians that *KvasU* should be accepted in the standard language, the authority of the Pāṇinīyas could still outweigh them all and served as the main standard by which the language of poets was measured time and again.

4.7.3 Alaka on *KvasU*

The final and most prolonged comment on a *kvasvanta* in a *kāvya*-commentary comes from Alaka[237] on the *Haravijaya*. Based on the abundant use of these forms in Ratnākara's work, one expects that the commentator would take pains to show that there is no objection to the author's language, and we are not disappointed. On verse 5.45 he says the following:

> *uttasthuṣa iti kvasoś chandasi vidhānād bhāṣāyām ayaṃ prayogaḥ pramādaja ity āhuḥ |*
> *anye punaś chandasi liṭaḥ chandasy ubhayathā iti sārvadhātukatvāt kvacid atideśikena*
> *kvacic ca tathāvidhānena kittvenābhimatalakṣyasiddheḥ kānacaḥ kitkaraṇam apār-*
> *thakam iti tatsāmarthyenāsya bhāṣāyām api prayogābhyupagamād etajjātīyakasya*
> *kvasor apy evamādau tadviṣayatāṃ pratipedire | uktaṃ ca kānackvasu kikinau yaṅlug*
> *iti bhāṣāyāṃ prayogadarśanād iti ||* (HV p. 60)

> On (the form) **uttasthuṣaḥ**: They say that because it is prescribed in the domain of the Vedic literature, this usage in the standard language is born of folly. But, given that marking *KānaC* with *K* is without purpose because in the domain of the Vedas the suffix *liṭ* is in some instances *sārvadhātuka* by extension according to P. 3.4.117, and because in some instances the intended form is established by being marked with *K* by such a rule (P. 1.2.5?), others accordingly have believed that, because of *KānaC*'s acceptance in the standard language on the basis of *K*'s strength, the suffix *KvasU* too, being of a like nature, had the same domain in the same manner. And it has been said that *KānaC, KvasU, Ki, KinI,* and *yaṅluk* (intensive without an overt suffix) are in the standard language because one sees them in use.

Alaka cites two opinions. Some have simply written off the usage as *pramādaja*, "born from folly," a statement not uncommonly found in commentaries on poetry where the poet has violated a

---

śāstric (grammatical) norm.[238] Yet, there are anonymous others who can justify this suffix in the standard language by using the same reasoning as Jinendrabuddhi. Alaka lays out the argument in some detail, albeit rather compressed in comparison to Jinendrabuddhi's own words, and thereby signals to his readers that this justification is needed when explaining the form. Since the defense of *KvasU* comes second (the opposite of how Haradatta and Bhaṭṭoji present the argument) and is not flatly rejected, Alaka appears to find it palatable, but he may have just wanted to present all the opinions without adding his own judgment. The final statement, which I have not found elsewhere, highlights nicely the exact debate we have been following, namely that there are those willing to accept certain suffixes in the standard language, including *KānaC* and *KvasU*, on the basis of usage. The accompanying suffixes *Ki* and *KiNI* are particularly interesting because Pāṇini taught them as strictly Vedic after a select number of roots, but already Kātyāyana saw the need to permit them into the standard language but restricted to a small set of roots.[239] By lumping these two sets of suffixes together, the other grammarians view, I would argue, the acceptance of *KvasU* and *KānaC* as simply continuing the tradition of Patañjali and Kātyāyana; they are simply updating Pāṇini's work to better describe actual usage.

It is impossible to give any definitive reason for why Ratnākara used so many *kvasvanta*s and what he thought of their derivation, but their large quantity, especially in contrast to his renowned predecessors Bhāravi and Māgha, calls for some reasonable speculation. To begin with the most trivial explanation, he had Kālidāsa as a model and there is certainly some truth to Bhaṭṭoji's *gatānugatikatā* theory of poetic composition; time and again we see one poet echoing his predecessor's diction or themes. But taking into account the fact that Ratnākara lived during the 9th century in Kashmir and eventually received patronage from Avantivarman, we can assume

---

[238]This phrasing occurs already in Vallabhadeva, who declares, e.g., that the form *puṣpoccaya* in Kum. 3.61 to be *pramādaja*, "born from folly," because the use of the suffix *aC* instead of *GhaÑ* is in violation of P. 3.3.40. On *pramādāt*, "because of folly," see Goodall (2001).

[239]P. 3.2.171 *ādṛgamahanajanaḥ kikinau liṭ ca* | "(In Vedic literature) the suffixes *Ki* and *KiNI* occur after roots ending in a long *ā* and roots ending in an *ṛ*-vowel (of whatever length) and the roots √*gam*, √*han*, and √*jan* in the sense of having the action of the root as one's habit etc., and the two suffixes are like the perfect." *chandasi* continues from the preceding sūtra. In *vārttika*s III and IV Kātyāyana allows the two suffixes into the standard language after the roots √*dhā*, √*kṛ*, √*sṛ*, √*jan*, √*nam* and then in certain set forms from intensive roots, for which Patañjali mentions another grammarian's opinion that they derive from the intensives. The KV and later grammarians accept both of these additions.

that he had access to a lively intellectual community in which a wide range of texts were studied, especially grammar and poetics. In all likelihood, Ratnākara knew Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṅkāra* — it is profusely quoted by his contemporary Ānandavardhana — and there is a good chance that he also had access to the *Nyāsa* as well as the *Kātantra* with the commentaries of Durgasiṃha (plus many others now lost and unknown). All these works would have sanctioned the use of *kvasvantas*. Furthermore, Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta lived after Ratnākara so their intense conservatism and deference to Patañjali could not have influenced his usage. I see all these factors as contributing toward Ratnākara's choice to revive the perfect active participle, and, conversely, that Ratnākara is demonstrating his acceptance of the grammatical form based on any one of the arguments set out above, and this approval appears to have been long-lasting. Some three centuries later, we know that the suffix *KvasU* or more accurately *KvansU* remained a part of the theoretical poetic language in at least one school of thought in Kashmir. In his *Samanvayapradīpa*, Devaśarman (12th cent. Kashmir[240]) mentions the suffix *KvansU* in verse 41b[241] along with other *kṛt* suffixes. Unfortunately there is no further discussion of the suffix or its questionable usage, but its mention nevertheless confirms that Devaśarman sanctioned the *kvasvanta* for the poetic language and that he used the *Kātantra* school of grammar in addition to Pāṇini's and the Sārasvata.[242]

4.8   Conclusions

In this lengthy but certainly still incomplete study of the suffix *KvasU* in Sanskrit *kāvya* literature, their commentaries, and the grammatical tradition, I have ventured to demonstrate how a simple statement by Bhāmaha sometime in the 7th cent. played out over the course of the following centuries. Through the story of this lone suffix many of the dynamics present in debates surrounding the Sanskrit language and how to define or describe it are represented. In summary, I would like to highlight the three interlinked points: the interpretation of Pāṇini's sūtras, the authority of

---

[240]See Hahn (2008) for an edition, introduction, and translation of the text.
[241]Hahn (2008: 187f.).
[242]See Hahn (2008: 75–85) for further details on the grammatical schools in the *Samanvyapradīpa*.

Patañjali, and the tug of war between prescription and usage. All of these issues arise naturally from the question: what is correct Sanskrit?

The usual assumption, so often repeated, that classical Sanskrit was regulated by Pāṇini's grammar, cannot in all cases yield a precise meaning, and it certainly does not represent the state of affairs for most of Sanskrit's storied history. The most difficult part of the assumption is that the interpretation of the A remained stable over the centuries. As the case for *KvasU* has demonstrated, there were competing theories on how to interpret the sūtras, and these theories were taken seriously by commentators both on the A and on poetry as well as by the poets themselves. The existence of multiple interpretations of the sūtras in question has failed to make it into the many translations of the A,[243] which, in the case of *KvasU*, is particularly misleading for the wider field of Sanskrit grammar since the non-Pāṇinians accepted *KvasU* as valid in the standard language (excepting of course the JV(M) as already noted), and these grammars were immensely popular. Indeed, their wont to follow the *Siddhāntakaumudī* or the *Kāśikāvṛtti* unjustly limits our understanding of Sanskrit grammar and completely eradicates developments and debates over an entire millennium, the very time period during which a vast quantity of Sanskrit was written and the tradition of commenting on poetry and the Vedas developed. To better understand the background of these commentators a broader reading of grammatical literature is essential.

The second point that this study of *KvasU* highlights is the varying status of Patañjali over the course of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition. Based on the *Cāndravyākaraṇa, Kāśikāvṛtti*,[244] *Nyāsa*, and Bhāmaha himself, the great commentator did not hold the same ultimate authority as he later would for Bhaṭṭoji and even more so for Nāgeśa.[245] Bhāmaha, though aware of the

---

[243]The translations of Böhtlingk (1971: 104), Vasu (1894: 452), Renou (1966: 203), and Sharma (2002: 415) do not reflect or even mention that some grammarians considered *KvasU* to be applicable in the standard language. Vasu (1907: 118), as a translation of the SK, includes the passage cited above about the poets' usage of *KvasU*. Joshi and Roodbergen in the their incomplete translation of the A often discuss competing views, although not always thoroughly, and their primary focus is usually to recover the original meaning of the A. They unfortunately did not translate the series of sūtras under discussion. On the translations of the A more generally see Rocher (1975: 20).

[244]Although the KV here follows Patañjali in considering *KvasU* a strictly Vedic suffix, there are several other discrepancies, e.g., the designation of *sampradāna* as an *anvartha saṃjñā*, "etymologically significant technical term," in the KV ad P. 1.4.32. As Bhaṭṭoji notes, ŚaKau vol. I p. 121, Patañjali does not accept this view.

[245]Cf. Thieme (1957) for an informative discussion of Nāgeśa's view on Patañjali as the last authority on Sanskrit.

MBh,[246] emphasizes the opinion of Pāṇini and those belonging to his school over all others with no mention of the "triad of sages" or Patañjali as an ultimate authority.[247] Jinendrabuddhi is similarly chary of directly referencing Patañjali with no mention of the *munitrayam*, although he clearly borrows much of his material from the MBh. Without taking Patañjali as the final touchstone for interpreting Pāṇini, Jinendrabuddhi and non-Pāṇinian grammarians were free to continue to expand and tweak the grammar of Sanskrit without hesitation, and, as we have seen in the case of *KvasU*, Jinendrabuddhi could continue working with Patañjalian argumentation to establish a proof for the suffix's non-Vedic status. When Haradatta comes on the scene, we see for the first time that, regardless of how well reasoned, any interpretation that goes against Patañjali must be cast aside. Thereafter, only Puruṣottamadeva and his commentator Viśvarūpa mention the Nyāsa's justification for *KvasU* as a reason for extending the suffix to the *bhāṣā*, whereas later Pāṇinīyas cite usage as grounds, and then only according to "some."[248] After Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa there was no sympathy left for Jinedrabuddhi and the school spawned from Bhaṭṭoji deferred to Patañjali without exception. Even the rogue Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa chose to cite usage.

We may then, in sum, identify three ways commentators in the Pāṇinian tradition have dealt with *KvasU*:

- Freedom to include *KvasU* in the standard language *pace* Patañjali based on a *jñāpaka*: Jinendrabuddhi, Alaka, *Rūpāvatāra* (?),[249] Puruṣottamadeva and Viśvarūpa.

- (Hesitant) acceptance of *KvasU* based on usage without mention of Jinendrabuddhi: Vimala-sarasvatī, Hemādri, Mallinātha (?),[250] Rāmacandra, Viṭṭhala, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa.

- Rejection of *KvasU* for the standard language based on Patañjali/Pāṇini: Haradatta, Vidyā-mādhava (reported and based only on Pāṇini), Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, Nāgeśa.

---

[246]Bhāmaha makes no direct reference to Patañjali or the *Mahābhāṣya*. The only hint we have is in BhKA 6.29, where he approves of a word established based on an *upasaṅkhyāna*, "supplement" or an *iṣṭi*, "desideratum," both terms used to describe the remarks of Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Cf. my discussion above on p. 128.

[247]Bhāmaha certainly includes Patañjali in *pāṇinīyamatam*, "the opinion of the Pāṇinīyas," in BhKA 6.62.

[248]As I have shown, Rāmacandra clearly accepts this addendum because he has eliminated P. 3.2.108, which becomes superfluous only when P. 3.2.107 applies to the standard language; this his grandson, Viṭṭhala, has explained in full.

[249]We only know that Dharmakīrti accepted the suffix as non-Vedic, we do not know on what grounds.

[250]Mallinātha does not discuss the validity of the suffix, so his motives are not clear. At the very least he does not reject it.

There is surely more than one explanation for why each of the commentators and grammarians accepted the stance he did, but religious creed certainly was a factor. The only region in Indian where the *Nyāsa* had a lasting popularity and authority was Bengal. The commentary took root in the region during the early part of the second millennium where Buddhist studies and literature in general flourished, and several prominent Buddhist grammarians composed works directly relating to, or at least relying on, the *Nyāsa.* By the time Puruṣottamadeva wrote his *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, supposedly at the behest of the great patron of the arts, Lakṣmaṇasena, while he was still a crown prince,[251] Maitreyarakṣita had already written his commentary on the *Nyāsa*, the *Tantrapradīpa*, and an earlier commentary the *Anunyāsa*, now lost, was also in circulation. In time, additional commentaries and sub-commentaries would accumulate around the *Nyāsa*, for most part still unpublished or lost, and so firmly establish the text in Bengal even after Buddhism died out. On account of this popularity, the *Mahābhāṣya* did not fair well, and the commentators on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* appear to have had only secondhand knowledge of Patañjali's work.[252] In fact, the entire Pāṇinian school was to virtually die out in Bengal, supplanted by Vopadeva's *Mugdhabodha* and the *Kātantra*.[253] I do not blame Buddhism for the loss of the *Mahābhāṣya* in Bengal, rather I emphasize that the work of the Buddhist *Jinendrabuddhi* was able to take hold there because other co-religionists gave it a firm footing, and in the absence of the *Mahābhāṣya*, the use of *KvasU* could be justified by reference to the *Nyāsa.* The presence of the *Mahābhāṣya* and a high respect for Patañjali, coupled with a more Veda-oriented faith, forced the acceptance of *KvasU* to be increasingly unpopular, as we have seen in the texts of Haradatta, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, Bhaṭṭoji, and Nāgeśa. It would seem an important factor was the obtainment of purity of speech for meritorious purposes. If Patañjali was considered the sage to determine that purity, his infallible word had to be followed. The remaining, more middle-path individuals bring us to my point concerning theory and practice.

---

[251]According the commentator on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, Sṛṣṭidhara Lakṣmaṇasena desired a light commentary on Pāṇini's sūtras for only the *bhāṣā.* Cf. Chakravarti (1918: 5) where the Sanskrit is quoted in fn. N and Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2006 vol. 2: 27–61) for an updated discussion. Knutson (2014) has most recently dealt with the court of Lakṣmaṇasena, but unfortunately does not treat any grammatical literature.

[252]Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. 2: 78) and Chakravarti (1918: 19f.).

[253]Cf. Wielnińska-Soltwedel (2005 vol. 2: 85f.) with further references to Adam's Reports.

If anything might justify the length of this study, it is the result that, at least in the case of *KvasU*, theory and practice in the realm of grammar were in dialog with one another and that only a relatively small portion of the evidence points towards insouciance or rejection of practice.[254] This is nothing new. Patañjali and Kātyāyana make hundreds of additions to Pāṇini's grammar because his rules did not cover actual usage. The grammarians did not make up forms based on the theoretical application of the rules at that time,[255] rather they came from usage; grammarians are not like potters, as a well-known passage tells us — we can't simply go to them and ask for a word.[256] Less anecdotally, (*a*)*darśanāt*, "because one sees/does not see (i.e., in usage)," occurs repeatedly throughout the MBh to justify additions or the application of rules. Although a process of crystallization took place over time by which the prescriptive rules took precedence over practice and in the end one could only say "because I see such usage in the Mahābhāṣya,"[257] many grammarians, especially those outside of the brahmanical Pāṇinian tradition, looked to usage as a guide for their new grammars and continued the work of Patañjali and Kātyāyana. The extent to which this is true and the frequency with which it occurred must await further research, but I suspect that the history of Sanskrit grammar will continue to need refinement as more details are noticed and a wider range of texts are read and taken into consideration.

---

[254]Compare Pollock (1985: 499): "Theory is held always and necessarily to precede and govern practice; there is no dialectical interaction between them." Pollock's dictum certainly has validity in the texts from Dharmaśāstra and Mīmāṃsā that he discusses, although I cannot speak to them with much authority. In his discussion of Sanskrit grammar (pp. 504f.), however, I would point out that he only discusses passages from the MBh deriving from the *Paspaśāhnika* and the famed passage ad P. 6.3.109, where the *śiṣṭas* are invoked and defined, along with the commentaries of Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa. As I have tried to show, a *Mahābhāṣya*-centric approach to the Sanskrit grammarians cannot reflect the true variety of the tradition.

[255]Later grammarians clearly did. Perhaps the most ingenious example is when Bhaṭṭoji proves there are 108 ways to pronounce *saṃskartā* in the SK I pp. 138–140 ad P. 8.3.34.

[256]MBh I.7.28–8.2.

[257]This is the exact case with the opinion reported by Nāgeśa and Vāsudevadīkṣita that we can use *kvasvanta*s because Patañjali did so in a *laukika vigraha*.

Chapter 5

The Maintenance of Purity:

Vāmana's *Śabdaśuddhi*

"Man hat schon vor alters gesagt:
die Grammatik räche sich grausam auf ihren Verächtern."[1]

—Goethe

kim anena vanyagajaśaucena |

"What's the point here of washing a wild elephant?"[2]

—Haradatta

5.1   Introduction

Despite the long lasting grammatical debates that Bhāmaha touches upon in his *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, later writers on grammar, poetics, and poetry did not see it fit to cite any of his thoughts on linguistic purity.[3] The reasons for this neglect are perhaps not so difficult to divine. To begin,

---

[1]Goethe *An Zelter*, 23.2.1832. ["It's been said long ago: grammar takes horrific revenge upon its detractors."]

[2]Haradatta on ŚiśuP 4.20, KVPada vol. VI p. 379.

[3]I could easily be mistaken given the wide range of commentaries in the two genres and the lack of indices to many of these works, especially commentaries on *kāvya*. I can note, however, that no part of the sixth *pariccheda* of the BhKA is quoted in Ratnaśrījñāna's commentary on the KĀ, the *Dhvanyāloka* or the *Locana*, a commentary

Bhāmaha does not explicitly engage with the grammatical tradition in a very profound way, even if some of his remarks point to existing debates. We find no elaborate arguments regarding derivations, only mandates and guidelines.[4] A more prominent reason, at least from the point of view of the tradition after the 9th cent., is that Vāmana's own section on *śabdaśuddhi*, "linguistic purity," dealt with the same topic but in a much more rigorous manner and was, consequently, primed to supplant Bhāmaha's judgments of poetic language. The success of the final section of *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra* can be measured by its citation in commentaries on poetry and its influence on later works dedicated to the analysis of poetic language, such as the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, *Sāhityakaṇṭakoddhāra*, and *Mukhabhūṣaṇa*. Internal to the Sanskrit tradition of poetics, however, such sections that deal exclusively with grammatical correctness completely disappear after Vāmana, and in their stead arise commentaries on poetry and other independent works that deal specifically with grammatical difficulties in poetic language.[5] In the present chapter, I will take up the KAS of Vāmana and examine its relation first to the BhKA and then to later commentarial literature on both grammar and poetry. In the following chapter I will delve into one particularly interesting sūtra and explore its impact over a longer time frame, paralleling in some ways the previous chapter on *KvasU*.

5.1.1   Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra*

Since the KAS will be our main focus in this chapter it is worth briefly reviewing the work's general place in the history of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, its use in commentaries on poetry, and the available secondary literature. I have already discussed Vāmana's time and place, 9th cent. at the court of Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir (799–813), above in ch. 2. Detailed information about the work's content

---

on the former. This absence is rather conspicuous in Ratnaśrī's work since he quotes from every other *pariccheda* among his 27 citations of the BhKA. There are also no citations in Hemādri's *Raghuvaṃśadarpaṇa* and Mallinātha's *Saṃjīvanī*.

[4]Unfortunately, we cannot know very much about how Udbhaṭa in his now mostly lost commentary on the BhKA, the *Vivaraṇa*, might have fleshed out and justified Bhāmaha's proclamations. From the available fragments, fr. 51–53 in Gnoli (1962: 51–55) pertain to the sixth *pariccheda*.

[5]Bhoja includes a lengthy discourse on grammar at the beginning of the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, but this is of quite a different nature. Grammarians seem to take an ever increasing interest in discussing questionable poetic usages. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Nāgeśa both frequently discuss these, often at length. These debates still await systematic collection and study.

can be found in the standard histories of *alaṅkāraśāstra* already cited.[6] *In nuce*, Vāmana, elevates *rīti*, "style," to the very essence (*ātman*) of poetry, which is itself "to be grasped from beauty".[7] The beautifying factors, *guṇas*, "positive qualities," and *alaṅkāras* "ornaments, figures of speech," determine the kind of style a poetic composition has. The *doṣas*, "faults," which can only diminish the beauty of the poetic body, must be avoided. This conceptualization clearly has its roots in Daṇḍin's KĀ, where *guṇas* and style receive far more attention and weight than in the BhKA, although Vāmana theorizes and organizes the material in a manner that Daṇḍin did not. As such, the KAS contrasts starkly with the other extant work on poetics created at Jayāpīḍa's court, Udbhaṭa's *Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṅgraha* (*Collection of the Essence of Poetic Ornamentation*) (KASS), in which, as the title itself indicates, the ornaments occupy the central position and no **overt** theory of poetry is attempted.[8] The basis for this work is the BhKA. Should the two *ālaṅkārika*s have both been active at the same court, they would have supported rather different outlooks on the analysis of poetry, and later on I will supply evidence that Vāmana is indeed responding to Bhāmaha (§ 5.2). If we had more of Udbhaṭa's *Vivaraṇa* on the BhKA we might well identify additional evidence of a dialog, but the situation is, unfortunately, not likely to change.[9]

Although Vāmana may well have had followers and certainly innovated, we must agree with Gerow (1977: 236) that "[Vāmana's] theory is one of the significant dead-ends in the history of Indian poetics." Whatever theoretical novelty the KAS may have brought to *alaṅkāraśāstra*, it

---

[6]The prefaces (*Vorrede*, *bhūmika*s etc.) to the printed editions of the KAS contain information important for understanding the reception of the treatise in the 19th and early 20th centuries, even if certain facts, such as the dating of the text, have proven inaccurate. The earliest description of the work is Aufrecht (1864: 206f.). Cappeller (1875: III–XI) is of particular value for earlier references to the KAS in manuscript catalogs as well as drawing one's attention to Meheścandra's remarks in his introduction to the *Kāvyaprakāśa*, Nyayaratna (1866: 2–4). Vāmana's treatise is universally praised for its lucidity and brevity. Cappeller's *Vorrede*, p. VI, also provides a list of the poetic work's cited in the KAS, the only one I know of.

[7]See the quoted text and translation above on p. 97.

[8]A close reading of the KASS, however, reveals monumental shifts in the theoretical approach to poetics, as Bronner (2016) has deftly demonstrated.

[9]That the two *ālaṅkārika*s were "very likely rivals" (De (1960 I: 80), Gerow (1977: 233)) seems born more of romantic fancy than grounded in any available evidence. From their extant works "there is no trace of mutual reference or apparent controversy" (loc. cit.). Later *ālaṅkārika*s, however, seem to have taken sides as we learn from references to *vāmanīyas* "followers of the Vāmana" and *audbhaṭas* "followers of Udbhaṭa" in later works. They occur for the first time in the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*: *vāmanīya* in ch. 4 p. 18 and ch. 5 p. 20, *audbhaṭa* in ch. 6 p. 22 and ch. 9 p. 44. Further occurrences of *audbhaṭa* or the like are given in Banhatti (1982: xxiii). Though these references have repeatedly been given to emphasize the rivalry between the two schools, they are rarely juxtaposed, but see *Rasagaṅgādhara* p. 478.

could not compete with the imminent wave of *dhvani*, "suggestion," that would revolutionize and consume poetics in India.[10] This does not, however, translate to unimportance for the later tradition or present day research into the history of *alaṅkāraśāstra*, as I hope to show. Still it must be admitted that the KAS appears to have quickly fallen out of favor and even approached oblivion not long after its creation, since the author of our first extant commentary on the work, Sahadeva (9th–10th cent.), reports that his teacher Mukula Bhaṭṭa (latter half of the 9th cent.[11]), presumably also the author of the *Abhidhāvṛttimātṛkā*, revived the KAS after it had *bhraṣṭāmnāyam*, "its transmission had been disrupted."[12] The revival must have been successful because we find references to the KAS and Vāmana's followers (the *vāmanīya*s) in the *alaṅkāraśāstra* literature of the immediately following generation and beyond. Pratīhārendurāja, who also learned at the feet of Mukala Bhaṭṭa, exhibits a certain inclination toward Vāmana's work in his commentary on Udbhaṭa's KASS, undoubtedly inspired by his teacher.[13] Abhinavagupta also knew and referred to the KAS in his commentaries on the DhvĀ and the NŚ.[14] Lastly, I should mention that Bhoja availed himself of the KAS quite extensively in both his SKĀa and ŚPra, as can be seen by the number of examples and summary *śloka*s in these works taken from the KAS.[15] The KAS received

---

[10]Cf. McCrea (2008: 38): "Thus Vāmana's emphasis on *guṇa* and *rīti* does not really entail any significant departure from the formalist aesthetic of 'The Alaṃkāra School.'"

[11]Cf. De (1960 I: 73–76).

[12]The opening verses of Sahadeva's *vivṛti*, "explanation," run as follows:

veditā sarvaśāstrāṇāṃ bhaṭṭo 'bhūn mukulābhidhaḥ |
labdhvā kutaścid ādarśaṃ bhraṣṭāmnāyaṃ samuddhṛtam || 1 ||
kāvyālaṅkāraśāstraṃ yat tenaitad vāmanoditam |
asūyā tan na kartavyā viśeṣālokibhiḥ kvacit || 2 ||
ākarṇya bhavatas tasmād dayitasya vidhīyate |
vivṛtiḥ sahadevena vāmanīyasya samprati || 3 ||

"A Brahman named Mukula knew all the sciences. After getting hold of a copy from somewhere he revived this forgotten work on poetics that arose from Vāmana. Men with exceptional insight will not be displeased. After hearing (the work) from such a master, Sahadeva now composes an explanation on Vāmana's cherished (work)." Verses 1–2 are quoted in Kane (1923: XLVIII) and Krishnamachariar (1974: 735, fn. 5) but not translated.

[13]Cf. Bronner (2016: 135) along with McCrea (2008: 265–266) and De (1960 II: 79). Studying these two roughly contemporaneous commentaries on the two main authors from the "Jayāpīḍa moment" will certainly yield important insights into the history of *alaṅkāraśāstra*.

[14]Ānanda is likely to have known the KAS and indirectly referred to it, at least according to Abhinava. Cf. Ingalls et al. (1990: 66): "he [scil. Ānanda] is referring to such authors as Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa and Vāmana," and De (1960 II: 79). Tubb (1985) has unearthed a covert explanation of Vāmana's *śabdaguṇa*, "phonetic texture," in the *Abhinavabharatī*.

[15]By "summary *śloka*s" I refer to the verses Vāmana gives in his *vṛtti* at the end of a topic to summarize the preceding discussion. They are introduced by the words *atra ślokaḥ/-au/-āḥ*, "on this (topic) there is/are the *śloka*(s),"

yet another revival sometime after the 14ᵗʰ century when Gopendra Tripurahara Bhūpāla Tilaka wrote his commentary, the *Kāmadhenu.* This is a very valuable work both for understanding the KAS and its auto-commentary as well as Gopendra's discussions about the evolution of poetics in the later works of Mammaṭa, Vidyādhara, Vaidyanātha, and others.

One of the most important features of the KAS for the history of Sanskrit poetics is that it is the first, wholly extant work to contain citations from available literature,[16] only a small fraction of which can be identified but many of which resurface in later treatises on *alaṅkāraśāstra*[17] or in anthologies of Sanskrit poetry. Since Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, and Udbhaṭa composed their own examples in the large majority of cases, it is only in Vāmana's work that we can observe the application of poetological theory to preexisting poetry for the first time.[18] In a similar manner, we have in the *Śabdaśuddhi* the first extensive treatment of poetic language in light of the Pāṇinian system of grammar.

5.2   Vāmana responds to Bhāmaha

Although we cannot identify an extended rebuttal of the BhKA in the KAS in the way that is possible with other works on poetics (e.g., between the KĀ and BhKA), Vāmana has left behind

---

or the like. Such verses occur in the commentary to KAS 1.1.5, 1.2.11, 1.2.12, 1.2.13, 1.3.29, 2.1.19, 2.2.19, 3.1.2, 3.1.8, 3.1.11, 3.1.24, 3.2.14, and 4.1.7. It is somewhat unclear whether or not these mnemonic stanzas are by Vāmana himself or taken from another author, especially since some seem to contradict what Vāmana himself has just said. Cf. Tubb (1985: 568) " ... a sequence of verses giving apparently contradictory definitions of some of the qualities." In favor of Vāmana's authorship, Indurāja, while commenting on KASS 6.7 (p. 82), introduces two such *śloka*s from KAS 3.1.2 and 3.1.25 with *avocad bhaṭṭavāmanaḥ*, "master Vāmana said (the following)." Bhoja quotes from these quite frequently.

[16]The fragments of Udbhaṭa's *Vivaraṇa* also contain quotations.

[17]Bhoja borrows heavily from the examples in the KAS for his two works on poetics, although not always for the same purpose.

[18]The situation is not quite so black and white. Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin both appear to have occasionally reformulated existing verses to fit into the *anuṣṭubh* meter. Vāmana, on the other hand, also composed his own verses as he tells us in his *vṛtti* ad KAS 4.3.33: *ebhir nidarśanaiḥ svīyaiḥ parakīyaiś ca pukalaiḥ | śabdavaicitryagarbheyam upamaiva prapañcitā ||* "The simile, alone the source for the diversity of (poetic) speech, has been treated at length with these (afore cited) examples of my own composition as well as a number by others." Cf. Bronner (2016: 86f.). Vāmana does not tell us which verses he himself has composed, but Śrīdharadāsa in his anthology, the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, ascribes six verses to one Vāmana. Four of these can be traced back to the KAS: 52, 1065 (= *vṛtti* ad KAS 4.1.9), 1109, 1132 (= *vṛtti* ad KASv 3.2.9), 1244 (*vṛtti* ad = KASv 4.2.2), 1315 (= *vṛtti* ad KASv 4.1.10). The ascriptions could, of course, indicate that Śrīdharadāsa only knew that these verses came from the KAS, not that they were specifically penned by Vāmana himself.

some subtle evidence that he is in fact responding to Bhāmaha. The plainest indication of this is Vāmana's choice to treat the same subject matter, linguistic purity, in the same place in his treatise as Bhāmaha did, although curiously, its location at the end of the KAS is almost the only similarity between the two sections. Vāmana's *Śabdaśuddhi*, despite being much longer than the sixth chatper of BhKA and covering a much wider range of sūtras,[19] overlaps with it in its treatment of only three sūtras: P. 1.2.67 (BhKA 6.32 and KAS 5.2.1), P. 3.2.162 (BhKA 6.48 and KAS 5.2.40), and P. 5.2.116 (BhKA 6.57 and KAS 5.2.57). We will begin our study of the section on linguistic purity in the KAS by briefly considering these three sūtras so as to determine how Vāmana and Bhāmaha differ in their treatment of the same grammatical points. Although my analysis will be somewhat superficial, all essential points will be included and well-founded conclusions will be possible.

5.2.1 Only One Remains

One of the strongest pieces of evidence I can muster to support my claim that Vāmana is directly responding to the BhKA occurs at the very beginning of KAS 5.2, a prominent place to make a strong statement. Both KAS 5.2.1 and BhKA 6.32 comment on P. 1.2.67 *pumān striyā*, "a masculine form alone remains when accompanied by a feminine form." This rule accounts for such usages like *brāhmaṇau*, "two Brahmans," derived from *brāmaṇaś ca brāhmaṇī ca*, "a male Brahman and a female Brahman." In such contexts, one can represent the two words of masculine and feminine gender in a single word with the masculine gender and the dual case ending. One could not use the feminine, *brāhmaṇyau*, which only means "two Brahman women." From the time of the MBh, the explanation of this sūtra has always included the condition that the rule applies *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ*, "only if the difference (between the two words) is defined by that (scil. gender)."[20] The point is that the motivation for adding the feminine suffix can only be the want to express the feminine gender. This condition continues from a preceding sūtra (P. 1.2.65), and no commentator

---

[19]See Cappeller (1880: XIf.) for a list of sūtras that Vāmana refers to; they total 82. This is a significant increase when compared to Bhāmaha's 33, as given in Diwekar (1929: 828).

[20]MBh I.248.9. Cf. KV ad P. 1.2.67 where *tat-lakṣaṇa* is glossed as *strīpiṃsalakṣaṇaḥ*, "defined by feminine and masculine."

I am aware of rejects it. We can understand its implication by taking a counterexample from the KV ad P. 1.2.67: *indraś ca indrāṇī ca indrendrāṇyau*, "Indra and Indrāṇī (is equivalent to) Indra-Indrāṇī," and not *indrau*, "the two Indras." The reason why we can't apply P. 1.2.67 is because the suffix *ṄīṢ* on *indrāṇī* also carries the additional semantic information *puṃyogād ākhyāyām*, "(the suffix occurs) in the sense of a designation based on a connection with a man," i.e., the suffix is used to name a man's wife.[21] When we form *indrāṇī*, the resulting word does not simply convey "Indra of the feminine gender," but rather "consort" of Indra. Consequently, we cannot apply P. 1.2.65 because of the additional meaning in the resulting noun brought out by the suffix. This is relatively clear cut.

Bhāmaha, despite what we have just seen in the grammatical literature, goes squarely against Pāṇini's rule as it is interpreted by all the commentators I have read.[22] The following verse is therefore quite startling:

sarūpaśeṣaṃ tu pumān striyā yatra ca śiṣyate |
yathāha varuṇāv indrau bhavau śarvau mṛḍāv iti || 6.32 || (BhKA)

But (one should employ)[23] the remainder of identical forms[24] also where the masculine form accompanied by the feminine form remains. For example they say: the two Varuṇas, the two Indras, the two Bhavas, the two Śarvas, the two Mṛḍas.

Bhāmaha, who possibly knew the KV as well as other commentaries on the A, defies their opinion in no subtle way. He lists among the possible examples not only the form that the KV explicitly forbids, *indrau* (from *indraś cendrāṇī ca*),but gives five out of the first six words in P. 4.1.49 (only *rudrau* is missing), the very rule we need to apply in order to create the name of the female consort of Indra, etc.[25] Since we have no premodern commentary on this verse, we could only

---

[21]Cf. P. 4.1.48. The following sūtra is responsible for the augment *anUK*.

[22]Note these also include Abhayanandin ad JV(M) 1.1.100. Although the JV is one of the *anekaśeṣa* grammars, Abhayanandin still quotes the rules in his commentary and interprets *pumān striyā* in the exact same manner. Cf. Birwé (1972: 27). As he notes, the notion of doing away with these rules dates back to Kātyāyana in P. 1.2.64.33. One slight exception, however, will be given just below.

[23]I follow here Tātācāryaśiromaṇi's gloss in his *Udyānavṛtti* ad BhKA 6.32.

[24]This refers to the more general rule that one says *vṛkṣāḥ*, "trees," instead of *vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca vṛkṣaś ca*, "a tree and a tree and a tree." Only one form needs to remain among the three identical ones.

[25]P. 4.1.49 *indra-varuṇa-bhava-śarva-rudra-mṛḍa-hima-araṇya-yava-yavana-mātula-ācāryāṇām ānuk*. Technically the sūtra has two functions depending on which word in the list we chose. Up to and including *mṛḍa*, a name for Śiva, the rule only enjoins the augment *ānUK*, *ṄīṢ* having been taken care of by the preceding sūtra. For

speculate how to explain Bhāmaha's reasoning.

Fortunately, there is one Pāṇinian commentator who tries to justify this usage: Śaraṇadeva. He tackles the usage head-on in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* ad P. 1.2.67, where he first presents much the same objection to forming words like *bhavau* or *rudrau* as I have given above.[26] He finds a solution by recalling that Jinendrabuddhi has proposed to split P. 1.2.67 into two rules: *pumān* and then *striyā.* By doing so, Jinendrabuddhi argues, we can account for the word *gāvau*, "a bull and a cow," from *gauś cāyaṃ gauś ceyam.* The perceived difficulty stems from the fact that *gauḥ* (m.), "bull," is identical to *gauḥ* (f.), "cow," and hence there is no difference at all between the two forms. Since the condition *tallakṣaṇaś ced eva viśeṣaḥ*, "only if the distinction is determined by that (gender)," is not fulfilled we cannot apply P. 1.2.67. To circumvent this difficulty, Jinendrabuddhi suggests splitting the sūtra so that there is a very general rule, *pumān*, "only the masculine form remains," and with this new rule we need not worry about whether or not the feminine form is distinct. If one objects that this could lead to all sorts of unwanted forms, we are reminded that this will not be a problem *yogavibhāgād iṣṭasiddheḥ*, "because one establishes (only) what is accepted (*iṣṭa*) by force of splitting a rule."[27] Śaraṇadeva simply applies the same logic:

> *ucyate pumān striyety atra nyāsakṛtā pumān iti yogavibhāgaḥ kṛto 'sya siddhaye |* (DurghV ad P. 1.2.67)

> It is said that the author of the *Nyāsa* (Jinendrabuddhi) has made a rule split here in P. 1.3.67 *pumān striyā*, i.e., *pumān*, in order to establish this (i.e., forms such as *bhavau* etc.).[28]

Could Bhāmaha have had something similar in mind? it is not likely based on what we know from the BhKA, above all because he unequivocally rejects the use of *yogavibhāga* in BhKA 6.29. Or is this an exception? Whatever the justification may have been, if there was any at all, the recur-

---

the remaining words, P. 4.1.49 enjoins both the suffix and the augment.

[26]Śaraṇadeva offers no quote from literature, only the bare words *bhavau, rudrau.*

[27]This is Jinendra's second attempt to explain *gāvau*. KVNyāsa vol. I p. 383 *atha vā pumān iti yogavibhāgaḥ kriyate | tenehāpy asaty api strīpuṃsakṛte viśeṣe puṃsa evaikaśeṣo bhavati | na caiva saty atiprasaṅgo bhavati yogavibhāgād iṣṭasiddher iti |* "Or rather the rule is split: a masculine form remains. Thereby here (in *gāvau*) also the masculine form will remain even when no distinction is made between the masc. and fem. (forms). Additionally, when this is the case, there will not be over application (of the split rule) because one establishes (only) what is accepted by force of splitting a rule."

[28]Cf. Renou (1941: 33) for a French translation and additional notes.

rence in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* demonstrates that the forms were still considered worthy of defense into the 12th century, even if only in a small circle.

Vāmana begins his purification of language by ridding the reader of any notion that such forms as *bhavau* or *rudrau* could be defensible. Although the KV clearly rejects these on good grounds, there must have been some other, now mostly lost, current of thought that sought to justify these forms. Since one defender of these forms was an important figure in *alaṅkāraśāstra*, Vāmana must have felt compelled to start off with a serious inquiry into the matter:

> *rudrāv ity ekaśeṣo 'nveṣyaḥ* ‖ KAS 5.2.1 ‖

The single remainder in *rudrau*, "the two Rudras" should be investigated.

We need not dwell long on the details of his reasoning because it follows the summary given above from other grammarians: forms such as *rudrāṇī* also convey the proper name of a consort and are not applicable to P. 1.2.67.[29] In this instance, Vāmana clearly falls in line with the majority of the Pāṇinīyas. Bhāmaha, however, whether coincidentally or not, sides again with an argument that can be justified with the help of the *Nyāsa*.[30] Lastly, I would like to draw attention to another possible reference to Bhāmaha's verse in Vāmana's sūtra. It will be recalled that five of the six relevant nominal stems in P. 4.1.49 are listed in BhKA 6.32; the only one missing is *rudra*, but Vāmana supplies it with the very first word of the first sūtra of the section. With this rather simple and seemingly uncontroversial opening, we witness a swift and definitive attack against Bhāmaha; the message: Vāmana is here to set the record straight.

5.2.2 Updating

The other two sūtras treated in both works highlight how Vāmana handled the same material in a more meaningful and relevant way than Bhāmaha. The first of these is P. 3.2.162, a rather inconspicuous sūtra not discussed in the MBh, that prescribes the addition of the suffix *KuraC*

---

[29] *svavṛtti* ad KAS 5.2.1 *atra tu puṃyogād ākhyāyām iti viśeṣāntaram apy astīti | etendrau bhavau śarbāv ādayaḥ prayogāḥ pratyuktāḥ |* "But here (in *rudrāṇī*) there is also another distinction, namely, because of consortion with a man in denoting a proper name. By this fact such forms as *indrau, bhavau, śarvau* have been countered."

[30] Recall that Jinendrabuddhi also gave the defense for *KvasU* in the standard language, a view Bhāmaha supports for poetry.

after the roots √*vid*, "to know," √*bhid*, "to break," and √*chid*, "to cut." The resulting forms, *vidura*, *bhidura*, and *chidura* are agentive nouns (or adjectives), and the action is performed habitually, characteristically, or particularly well by the agent.[31] In BhKA 6.48,[32] Bhāmaha appears to give a simple reminder about the suffixes that fall under the domain of P. 3.2.134: they must be used with the added qualification that the action is performed habitually etc. Among them, certain suffixes are particularly (*viśeṣeṇa*) acceptable (desired?), including *KuraC*. The basis for singling these out eludes me at the moment.

Vāmana's sūtra, on the other hand, amounts to a correction to the KV.[33] Ad P. 3.2.162, the authors of the KV supply that when *KaruC* is added to √*bhid* and √*chid*, the resulting forms are not agent nouns, but rather *karmakartṛ*, i.e., both the patient and the agent of the action, as in *bhiduraṃ kāṣṭhaṃ*, "the stick, broken (all by itself)."[34] Later commentators, beginning with Haradatta,[35] find the accuracy of this statement questionable, and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita does not include any such vārtt. in the SK, although his predecessor, Rāmacandra did.[36] Before coming to the reason for this hesitancy, I note that this is yet another of the many instances where the KV appears to have borrowed from the commentary to the *Cāndravyākaraṇa*, where ad CV 1.2.108 (= P. 3.2.162) the gloss for *bhidura* is *bhidyate svayaṃ eva bhidnatti vātmānam*, "breaks all by itself or breaks itself," and *mutatis mutandis* the same for √*chid*.[37] Later commentators on the A first question

---

[31]P. 3.2.162 falls under the heading *tacchīla-taddharma-tatsādhukariṣu* in P. 3.2.134. *KuraC*, as a *kṛt* suffix without further specification, forms agentive nouns by P. 3.4.67.

[32]BhKA 6.48 *tācchīlyādiṣu ceṣyante sarva eva tṛṇādayaḥ | viśeṣeṇa ca tatreṣṭā yuckurajvarajiṣṇucaḥ ||* "And in the meaning of habitually etc. all the suffixes starting with *tṛN* are accepted and in this (meaning) especially *yuC, KuraC, varaC, iṣṇuC*." Note that Bhāmaha's mention of *tṛN* here makes it very unlikely that he considered *trC* and *tṛN* to be interchangeable.

[33]KAS 5.2.38 *bhidurādayaḥ karmakartari kartari ca ||* "*bhidura*, etc. occur in the sense of the patient-agent and the agent." That is to say, *bhidura* can mean "breaker" or refer to something that has broken all by itself, i.e., is both the agent and the patient of the act of breaking.

[34]KV ad P. 3.2.162 *bhidicchidyoḥ karmakartari prayogaḥ |* "The use of (the suffix *KuraC*) after √*bhid* and √*chid* is in the sense of patient-agent." That this is the case for *bhidura* can be grounded in the MBh II.67.5 ad P. 3.1.87, where Patañjali gives the example: *bhiduraṃ kāṣṭhaṃ svayam eva |* "the stick, broken all by itself." I will discuss *chidura* presently.

[35]Jinendrabuddhi does not raise any objection.

[36]PraKauPra vol. III p. 544. Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, however, notes Māgha's usage to exclude *chidura* in the sense of the agent-patient. See below.

[37]He continues, however, to note that the *kartari* interpretation is accepted by some (*kecit*), for which he provides the examples *doṣāndhakārabhiduraḥ*, "breaker of the darkness of night," and *dṛptāripakṣacchiduraḥ*, "cutter of the wings of the arrogant enemies." The first example is remarkable because Candragomin uses the exact same compound in *Śiṣyalekha* 5c, a work that must have been known to the CV commentator. This could be used as evidence to

whether *chidura* can be used in this reflexive sense *not* because Patañjali does not support it, but because the great poet Māgha uses *chidura* as an agentive (*kartari*) noun/adj. in *Śiśupālavadha* 6.8.[38] Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita is the first to point out the absence any supporting statement in the MBh and adds that Māgha's usage is in concert with Patañjali but at odds with the KV.[39] We observe here how the authority for questioning or rejecting the validity of a grammatical point switched from a poet to Patañjali but only toward the end of the tradition. For some five hundred years, Māgha's usage sufficed to object against the KV.

Let us return now to Vāmana. His sūtra, KAS 5.2.38, though reflecting the KV's addendum to P. 3.2.162 (and without doubt the opinion of other grammarians) is not identical to it. Vāmana has given an open-ended list of terms, beginning with *bhidura*, that are *both* agentive as well as *karmakartari*, and his examples illustrate both usages:

Patient-Agent *bhiduraṃ kāṣṭam*[40], "the broken stick," *bhiduraṃ tamaḥ*, "the broken darkness," *chidurātapo divasaḥ*, "the day whose darkness is cut off," *bhaṅgurā prītiḥ*, "bent (broken) affection."

Agent *timirabhiduraṃ vyomnaḥ śṛṅgam*, "the sky's horn that breaks darkness," *matsaracchidu-*

---

support the theory that the author of the *vṛtti* is not the same as the author of the CV itself, since Candragomin would presumably not ascribe to "some" the interpretation of his own sūtra that supports his own usage, that is to say, Dharmadāsa places the same restrictions on *bhidura* and *chidura* as the one we find in the KV. Oberlies (1996: 296), which came to my attention after writing this note, has reached a similar conclusion. Furthermore, Renou (1936: § 58) is to have already noted the occurrence of the compound in the *Śiṣyalekha*. I unfortunately have not yet had access to this publication and repeat only the citation in Oberlies (1996: 296, fn. 104). The *Mahāvṛtti* ad JV 2.2.145 makes a similar restriction, which Oberlies (1996: 297) assumes to have been taken over from the CV *vṛtti*.

[38]ŚiśuP 6.8cd *gurumatsaracchidurayā*, "(by the cuckoo) who cuts great pride." A similar example, *matsaracchiduram*, is given in the auto-commentary ad KAS 5.2.38. Both Haradatta and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa cite Māgha's usage as contradicting the KV's statement. KVPada vol. III p. 668 (= PraKPra vol. III p. 544.) *māghas tu śuddhe kartari prayuṅkte gurumatsaracchidurayādurayācitam aṅganāḥ iti* | "But Māgha employs (the suffix *KuraC* after √*chid*) in a pure agentive sense: 'the ladies gave their unsolicited (body to their lover, informed) by (the cuckoo) who cuts great pride.'" See Dundas (2017: 117) for a full translation of the verse. One should not, however, translate *kim api* as "discreetly." It is the direct object (patient) of *pratibodhitāḥ* and means *ajñāyamānam vastu*, "a matter not known," according to Vallabhadeva, or *parair durbodhaṃ rahasyaṃ hitam*, "a secret service impossible for others to know," according to Mallinātha. According to the MDhV ad SDhP VIII.3 *chidir dvaidhīkaraṇe*, Ātreya considers the KV's addendum *prāyika*, "excessive."

[39]PrauM vol. II p. 812: *karmakartarīti vṛttiḥ* | *naitad bhāṣye dṛṣṭam* | *tathā ca māghaḥ mukhye kartari prāyuṅkte* | "The KV says that (the suffix *KuraC*) occurs in the sense of the patient-agent (after √*bhid* and √*chid*). This is not found in the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*. And similarly, Māgha uses (the suffix *KuraC* after √*chid*) in the original agentive sense." ŚiśuP 6.8cd. follows.

[40]Cf. KV ad P. 3.2.162.

257

raṃ prema, "love, the cutter of pride,"[41] *mātaṅgaṃ mānabhaṅguram,* "the elephant (?) that bends pride."[42]

The KV, according to all interpretations, restricts *KaruC* after √*bhid* and √*chid* to a patient-agent sense.[43] We can, therefore, see how Vāmana is updating or correcting the KV's update, even if such usages as *chidurātapaḥ* would later be rejected by other grammarians. With a view to the history of Sanskrit grammar, this is the first piece of evidence we have that the KV's addendum was not accurate because it either was too restrictive (Vāmana), did not account for actual poetic usage (Haradatta, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa), or lacked the support of Patañjali (Bhaṭṭoji).

In bringing this discussion to a close, we may cite one supporter of Vāmana, Śaraṇadeva. In the DurghV ad P. 3.2.162[44] we are asked how to justify forms quoted from Amara,[45] Vyoṣa (i.e., Bhaṭṭa Bhaumika),[46] (*Jāmbavatī*)*vijaya*,[47] and Māgha.[48] Śaraṇadeva states that these forms are contrary to the KV but gives a passage slightly different from the one in our available editions.[49] To justify these forms, however, he quotes from the present sūtra of Vāmana: *chidibhideḥ kartari*

---

[41]Cf. ŚiśuP 6.8cd *gurumatsaracchidurayā*. Has Vāmana simplified Māgha's words for easy illustration?

[42]The compound *mānabhaṅgura* occurs in poetic works, although I have not been able to locate this exact phrase. Cf. *Harṣacarita* Ucchvāsa 4, p. 143, BhKA 2.27b = VJ 3.75b.

[43]Were this not a restriction, there would be no need to note Māgha's usage of *chidura* as an agent noun/adj. as being contrary.

[44]Cf. Renou (1945: 40f.) for a French translation of the passage and additional notes.

[45]AK 1.1.47b *kuliśaṃ bhiduraṃ paviḥ* | "axe, breaker, thunderbolt." Kṣīrasvāmin quotes, without further comment, P. 3.2.162 to justify the suffix *KuraC* in the sense of the agent, but Vandyaghaṭīyasarvānanda cites KAS 5.2.38 in his *Ṭīkāsarvasva* part I p. 36. He also reports the opinion of one Śrīkaṇṭhasoma, who labels Māgha's usage as *asādhu*, "incorrect."

[46]*Rāvaṇārjunīya* 4.29b *saṃsārabandhacchidurān dvijātīn*, "twice-born (Brahmans) who break the bonds of worldly existence." Zachariae (1933: 11) was the first to identify this quote. The poem, composed sometime before the 11th cent. by Bhaṭṭa Bhīma, exemplifies Pāṇini's sūtras according to their sequence in the A. The present verse is coordinated with P. 2.1.40f, and *saṃsārabandha-* is an example of a seventh case compound with *bandha* by P. 2.1.41, i.e., *saṃsāre bandha-* ⇒ *saṃsārabandha-*. The reading *ghoṣaḥ*, printed by Renou (1945: 40) and Ganapati Sastri p. 62, is undoubtedly to be emended to *vyoṣaḥ* on the basis of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti ad loc.* The claim in Bhattacharya (1946: 24) that this is "an epithet … earned from the earliest times by Bhaṭṭa Bhaumaka," is, unfortunately, not further substantiated. It seems to be a reference to a particularly spicy type of medicine, a possible comparison for Bhaṭṭa Bhaumaka's educational but challenging poem.

[47]A now lost poem by Pāṇini. Cf. Zachariae (1933: 8). The edition of Ganapati Sastri gives only *vijayaḥ*, but the *Bhāṣāvṛtti* ad P. 3.2.162 contains the fuller title *jāmbavatīvijayakāvye*. Renou (1945: 40f.) prints *jāmbavatīvijayaḥ*, presumably on the basis of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. The quote is in the *Upendravajrā* meter: *karīndrabandhacchiduraṃ mṛgendram* | "the king of beasts who cuts the bonds of the king of elephants."

[48]ŚiśuP 6.8cd.

[49]DhurgV ad P. 3.2.162 *bhideḥ chideḥ karmakartari cāyam iṣyate iti vṛttāv uktatvāt kevale na syāt* | "(The suffix *KuraC*) should not occur exclusively (in the sense of an agent) because it has been stated in the (*Kāśikā*)*vṛtti* that 'and this (suffix *KuraC*) is accepted after √*bhid* and √*chid* in the sense of the patient-agent.'" Is this a lost alternate reading or simply a restatement?

ceti vāmanoktatvāt, "(We can justify these forms) because Vāmana has said that after √*bhid* and √*chid* (the suffix *KuraC*) also occurs in the sense of the agent." This is a significant passage for the KAS because it is the only instance I know of where a commentator on the A quotes Vāmana by name as an authority.[50] Also of interest is the justification for the addition of *kartari* in the KAS and repeated in the DurghV. At the end of Vāmana's auto-commentary to KAS 5.2.38, he specifies the source for his sūtra in the following manner:

> *karmakartari cāyam iṣyate ity atra cakāraḥ kartari ca ity asya samuccayārthaḥ ||* (*svavṛtti* ad KAS 5.2.38)

> In the statement: "and this (suffix) is accepted in the sense of the patient-agent"; *ca* "and" is for the purpose of including the statement "and in the sense of the agent."

In the DurghV ad P. 3.2.126 (quoted in fn. 49) Śaraṇadeva attributes the phrase *karmakartari cāyam iṣyate* to the KV, and in the sub-commentary to the KAS, the *Kāmadhenu*, Gopendra believes the *bhāṣyakṛt*, i.e., Patañjali, to have uttered it.[51] These exact words occur in the KV ad P. 3.1.96, a sūtra that adds the three gerundive suffixes *-tavyaT*, *-tavya*, and *-anīyaR*. After the first vārtt. to the sūtra has been mentioned — the addition of the rare suffix *-KelimaR*[52] — we find the sought after statement, which refers to the suffix *-KelimaR* in this context, i.e., "and this (suffix *-KelimaR*) is accepted in the sense of patient-agent."[53] If Vāmana had the KV in mind (he may well have had another commentary on the A too!), we can account for his reference to this phrase by assuming that he was in error or that he had a different version of the KV than ours today. Śaraṇadeva supports the latter hypothesis since he also attributes the same phrase to the KV in commenting on P. 3.2.162. Another possibility is that Vāmana somehow took this as sort of metarule because, as we know from the examples, he includes forms such as *bhaṅgura*, "bent,"

---

[50]As we will see, ideas first proposed (or recorded) in the KAS resonate throughout the tradition, but neither the work nor its author are named.

[51]In the MBh this phrase does not appear, *pace* Cappeller (1880: 12). *karmakartari ca* does show up in P. 3.1.48.2, P. 3.1.52.2, P. 3.1.114.4, and P. 3.2.83.1, but none of these are directly relevant to the present discussion.

[52]Cf. AiGr II.2 p. 513 with additional literature. Both Jindendrabuddhi (KVNyāsa vol. II p. 494) and Haradatta (KVPada vol. II p. 495) believe that we can do without this and other gerundive suffixes added in the *vārttika*s because Pāṇini has used the plural *kṛtyāḥ* in P. 3.1.95.

[53]As we should expect by now, the more conservative Pāṇinians, Haradatta (KVPada vol. II p.495), Kaiyaṭa (MBhPra vol. III p. 141b), Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa (PraKauPra vol. III p. 453), Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, etc., reject this addendum, while others are either not bothered by it, e.g. Jinendrabuddhi, or adopt it expressly, e.g., Puruṣottamadeva ad P. 3.1.96, Rāmacandra (PraKauPra *loc. cit.*), etc.

which are derived by P. 3.2.161 with the suffix *GHuraC*. On this sūtra, the KV notes that *bhañjeḥ karmakartari pratyayaḥ svabhāvāt*, "after √*bhañj* the suffix (*GhuraC*) occurs in the sense of the patient-agent because of its own nature."[54] Once again, the KV's remark is restrictive, whereas Vāmana wants, with a single, well justified sūtra, to account for both the agentive and patient-agentive uses of *bhidura*, *bhaṅgura*, etc. Although we have an occurrence in the KV of the passage cited by Vāmana for justification, it is, unfortunately, still not clear based on the KV or MBh how *karmakatari cāyam iṣyate* was applied to P. 3.2.161f.

Regardless of our explanation for this seemingly misplaced passage, we can still lay out the following progression: The KV restricted the usage of *GhuraC* and *KuraC* with certain roots to the patient-agent, likely on the basis of usage and other commentaries like the CV *vṛtti*. None of these restrictions were found in the MBh nor even the idea that these suffixes were exclusively *karmakartari*.[55] Vāmana, with additional evidence, further modifies the interpretation of P. 3.2.161f. to suit his linguistic data but does so by insisting that his apparent innovation was already present, just hidden in *ca*, "and." To prove that poetic usage here plays an important role, we need only recall *mānabhaṅgura*, an agentive use of *bhaṅgura*, in the *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa as well as the other citations given in the DughV. This one sūtra alone from the KAS demonstrates well the extent to which Vāmana engaged in a very meaningful and lasting way with poetry and the grammatical tradition. In comparison, Bhāmaha's corresponding verse on *KuraC* comes across as rather trivial.

The last of the three sūtras referenced in both the BhKA and KAS is P. 5.2.116, which governs the addition of the possessive suffixes *inI* and *ṭhaN* (= *ika* by P. 7.3.50) after a list of words beginning with *vrīhi*.[56] As has been observed before,[57] the *gaṇas*, "lists," to which Pāṇini refers are, if fixed at all, given in full for the first time in the KV. Nevertheless, the exact membership of

---

[54]Later grammarians do not rail against the exclusive *karmakartari* usage of *bhaṅgura* as we have seen them do against *bhidura*. Nevertheless, Bhaṭṭoji does not mention the restriction in his SK, although in the *Prauḍhamanoramā* (vol. II p. 812.) it is quoted but with a distancing *āhuḥ*, "they say."

[55]As pointed out in fn. 34, the MBh offers an example for *bhidura* as *karmakatari* but not as a general rule.

[56]P. 5.2.116 *vrīhyādibhyaś ca* | "And (the suffixes *inI* and *ṭhaN*) occur after *vrīhi* 'rice' etc. in the sense of *matUP* (i.e., possession)."

[57]Cf. my discussion on p. 85.

each list remained in flux over the course of time and often depended on the usage of the learned (*śiṣṭaprayoga*). Both Bhāmaha and Vāmana deal with the *vrīhyādi* list in their works on poetics, the former in a somewhat vague way; the later, more specifically.

BhKA 6.57 informs us that wise men use the two suffix *inI* and *ṭhaN* in poetry and that among such forms those in conjunction with *mekhalā*, "belt," *mālā*, "garland," and *māyā*, "deceit," are held in particularly high regard.[58] Applying the two suffixes to these nouns, we obtain the following forms: *mekhalin* and *mekhalika*, "belted," *mālin* and *mālika*, "garlanded," and *māyin* and *māyika*, "deceitful." Relying on the MBh and KV, which both comment on this sūtra, we can already find some contradiction. While *māyin* and *māyika* are both given as examples in the KV ad P. 5.2.116, Kātyāyana (P. 5.2.116.1) has restricted a subclass of the *vrīhi* list to one suffix or the other. Consequently, *inI* should only come after *śikhā*, "peak," etc.; *ṭhaN*, only after *yavakhada*, etc. According the KV ad P. 5.2.116, our first source to specify the contents of these lists, both *mekhalā* and *mālā* are listed in the first one, and such forms as *mekhalika* and *mālika* should, therefore, be barred.[59] Bhāmaha, on the other hand, will approve of these prohibited forms, like *mālika*, which is also discussed in the DurghV ad P. 5.2.116.[60] Whether or not Bhāmaha specifically meant to go against the established lists in the KV, is not entirely clear given the terseness of the verse, which need not insist that both suffixes occur on each of the words listed. Even if this were in fact the case, that the forms *mālika* and *mekhalika* are so poorly attested does not lend much gravity to Bhāmaha's opinion.

Vāmana, on the other hand, makes a very definitive statement about membership to the *vrīhyādi* list, namely, that we can derive *dhanvin*, "possessing a bow, archer," because *dhanvan*, "bow," is recited in the said list.[61] Basing ourselves again on the KV and other versions of the *gaṇa*

---

[58]BhKA 6.57 *iniḥ prayuktaḥ prāyeṇa tathā ṭhaṃśca manīṣibhiḥ | tatrāpi mekhalā-mālā-māyānāṃ sutarāṃ matau ||* "The wise have generally employed (the suffixes) *inI* as well as *ṭhaN*. Among these both are held in high esteem for *mekhalā*, 'belt,' *mālā*, 'garland,' and *māyā*, 'deceit.'"

[59]Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita also includes them in his *śikhādi* sublist to the *vrīhyādi* list, *Gaṇapāṭha* 181 (SK vol. IV p. 666). His list is slightly longer than the one in the KV but without consequence for our present discussion. Cf. fn. 5 ad GRM 425, p. 447 for other opinions.

[60]Śaraṇadeva raises just this problem regarding the word *mālikaḥ* but offers a different solution, namely, it is not the suffix *ṭhaN* but rather *ṭhaK* by P. 4.4.55 with the meaning "flower vendor." See Renou (1945: 134) with notes. In fn. 4, he claims that the word is attested in the *Harṣacarita* but gives no precise reference.

[61]KAS 5.2.57 *dhanvīti vrīhyādipāṭhāt ||*

known to us from Pāṇinian sources, *dhanvan* is not included, although Jinendrabuddhi deems it an open-ended list, membership to which is determined by the usage of the learned.[62] It therefore stands to reason that Vāmana is either making an addendum or a specification,[63] and on good grounds. *dhanvin* is not only widely attested in *kāvya*[64] but also in *Amarakośa* 2.8.70a, one of the first texts memorized in a traditional Sanskrit education. To account for all these forms, Vāmana has composed his sūtra. That its validity held throughout the later tradition can easily be seen by perusing commentators on the cited passages, who generally account for *dhanvin* by referring to its inclusion in the *vrīhyāda* list.[65] Another indication is that Vardhamāna, who appears to have known Vāmana's work(s),[66] has included *dhanvan* in GRM 425, for which he gives *Śākuntala* 2.5 as an example. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, somewhat surprisingly, does not add *dhanvan* to his *vrīhyādi* list even though it does differ from what is given in the KV. Somewhat different from the previous example of *KuraC*, we have here an update to the KV from the KAS[67] that found resonance among a wide range of commentators — even if he is not cited by name. Still, the grammatical tradition ultimately denies it when we read Bhaṭṭoji.

5.2.3 Summary

Although Vāmana neither mentions Bhāmaha by name nor quotes his work in the KAS or its auto-commentary, we can conclude for various reasons that Vāmana knew the BhKA and that he was responding to specific grammatical points put forth by Bhāmaha. The strongest evidence for a direct response is the fact that Vāmana chose not only to write a section titled *śabdaśuddhi* at the

---

[62]KVNyāsa vol. IV p. 223: *ubhayatrādiśabdaḥ prakāre | śiṣṭaprayoge yebhya inir eva dṛśyate te śikhādayo draṣṭavyāḥ | te hi tebhyaṣ ṭhanaṃ vihitavantaḥ |* "In both instances (scil. *vrīhyādi* and *śikhādi*) the word *ādi* 'beginning' occurs in the meaning 'sort, type.' The words *śikhā*, etc. should be seen as those after which the suffix *inI* alone is found in learned usage. For, they (scil. the learned) have enjoined *inI* after them."

[63]From the auto-commentary ad KAS 5.2.52, we learn that Vāmana had some idea about which words belonged to which lists — in this instance *vaṃśa* in the *digādi* list (P. 4.3.54) — and that this was a topic under discussion.

[64]Kālidāsa: KumS 3.10d *dhavninaḥ*, RaghuV 11.4b *dhanvinau*, *Śākuntala* 2.5c *dhanvinām*. ŚiśuP 18.9a *dhanvibhiḥ*. NaiṣC 10.117b *smara-dhanvine*. Others can easily be found.

[65]Kṣīrasvāmin ad AK 2.8.70 = Vallabhadeva ad KumS 3.1 = Hemādri ad RaghuV 11.4 = Vallabhadeva ad ŚiśuP 18.9: *vrīhyāditvād iniḥ* "-*inI* because (*dhanvan*) belongs to the list beginning with *vrīhi*." Mallinātha ad ŚiśuP 18.9: *vrīhyāditvād inipratyayaḥ*, and many more.

[66]Vardhamāna might well have even written his work to clarify the precise meaning of certain forms that were being debated.

[67]Vāmana's originlity is impossible to know for certain, for we have lost so much.

close of his work just as Bhāmaha but even began this section with a direct counter of Bhāmaha's acceptance of *varuṇau*, etc. The other two instances, where both authors handle the same sūtra, do not offer the same kind of explicit contradiction, but they do demonstrate how Vāmana took up the same topics in a more profound manner so as to engage the KV and other grammatical sources now lost to us. For this reason later commentators (but rarely those on the A) found the KAS worthy to cite as an authority, an honor not bestowed upon the BhKA. As other examples will show, Vāmana also rejects Bhāmaha's restriction on derivations (BhKA 6.29), namely, that one should not use of *jñāpaka*s, "hints," or *yogavibhāga*, "rule splitting," to achieve a correct form. In the next chapter, where I investigate one particular sūtra in great detail, we will see that Vāmana is in fact the author (or first recorder) of a very important *jñāpaka*. Furthermore, though not a direct response to Bhāmaha per se, Vāmana ensured that his rules were pointed and clearly applicable to existing poetic usage in a manner that Bhāmaha does less often. For this reason, it is usually quite easy to compare Vāmana's rules and examples with the practice of poets whose works we can now search. In the remainder of this chapter, we will look at additional sūtras from the KAS and see how they worked their way into the commentarial literature and at times went so far as to supplant the grammarians themselves.

5.3   A Grammar for Poetry

When Vāmana came to write his chapter on linguistic purity, he had before him a wealth of Sanskrit literature, only a portion of which exists for us today, and an already long tradition of linguistic analysis as represented by the different schools of Sanskrit grammar and *Mīmāṃsā*. For Sanskrit grammar, the now extant texts that Vamana could have known based on chronology are fairly limited. These include: the MBh with Bhartṛhari's *Dīpikā*, the VP with the *vṛtti* (and possibly others), the KV with Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa*, the CV with its *vṛtti*, the JV with some commentary,[68] possibly Abhayanandin's *Mahāvṛtti*, and the Kā, possibly with Durgasiṃha's com-

---

[68]If the author of the KAS and the *Liṅgānuśāsana* are identical, which seems likely, then Vāmana definitely knew the *Jainendra-* and *Cāndravyākaraṇa* since both are referred to in the work on gender. Cf. Dalai (1918: vi–ix).

mentary. That Vāmana worked within the Pāṇinian system is abundantly clear from the names of his suffixes as well as the citations in the auto-commentary. However, he is interacting with the received tradition in a way that we cannot fully appreciate, not only because we have so few of the texts he did (at most three, each with a single commentary), but also because we are not privileged to the countless oral debates that must have gone on at Jayāpīḍa's learned court, where Vāmana is to have been active. We can even imagine that the King's obsession with grammar[69] compelled Vāmana to write the *Śabdaśuddhi* so that poetry too could be properly regulated both at the theoretical level of poetics as well as in its formal grammar. The goal of the short treatise resembles, in many ways, what Patañjali did in the MBh to the extent that in both works the authors discuss a series of terse comments on Pāṇini's rules in order to clarify and update his grammar: Vāmana does so with his own sūtras; Patañjali, with the *vārttika*s of Kātyāyana. While Patañjali took as his target the Sanskrit language of a community of learned Brahmans, Vāmana sought to provide an authoritative text for poetry that took into account the usage of the new class of potential *śiṣṭa*s, the poets, and gave clear answers to questionable usages. How much success Vāmana's *Śabdaśuddhi* enjoyed among later commentators and grammarians will occupy us for the remainder of this and the following chapter.

Before diving into the specifics, I must note the limitations of this study and their cause. Ideally, I would at this point give some basic statistics as a starting point, so that we could at least know how frequently Vāmana is quoted by each available commentator, which of his rules are most popular, and quickly spot any trends. Such rudimentary information, however, is difficult to come by because citations in commentaries are usually not indexed. I have only found an appendix with works cited or the like for the following: on the *Raghuvaṃśā*, Vallabhadeva's *Raghupañcikā* (Goodall & Isaacson (2003), the first 6 *sarga*s), Mallinātha's *Saṃjīvanī* (Nandargikar's edition), and Hemādri's *Raghuvaṃśadarparṇa*; Mallinātha's *ṭīkā* on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* (ed. Trivedī

---

[69]Recall that Jayāpīḍa is to have revived the *Mahābhāṣya* in Kashmir, studied under a great grammarian named *Kṣīra* (not the author of the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*), and gained long lasting fame for his learnedness. Cf. RT 4.488, 489, and 491. After he turned wicked, poets even penned verses honoring his grammatical prowess while simultaneously describing his cruelty. Cf. RT 4.635 and 637.

1898), and a partial list for Mallinātha's *Ghaṇṭāpatha* on the *Kirātārjunīya* (NSP 1912).[70] We have no indices for any commentary on the *Kumārasambhava*, the *Meghadūta*,[71] Jayamaṅgala on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, the *Naiṣadhīyacarita*[72] nor any of the commentaries by Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, etc. Even with indices indirect or unnamed references are often missed. The larger problem, however, is to what extent our printed versions, most of which are not critically edited, represent what someone like Mallinātha composed. I can do little about this within the scope of the dissertation, but it is well worth reminding the reader of the very rudimentary work remaining to be done on Sanskrit *kāvya* commentaries.[73] The references I have so far compiled, limited as they may be, are given below:

1. KAS 5.2.3: Mallinātha ad RaghuV 4.28d *tarjayan.*[74]

2. KAS 5.2.8: Hemādri, Aruṇagirinātha, and Nārāyaṇa ad RaghuV 18.9c *lambhayitvā.*[75]

3. KAS 5.2.9: Hemādri ad RaghuV 8.46c, 10.41b,[76] and 14.40b *me.*

4. KAS 5.2.10: Hemādri ad RaghuV 3.8c *tiraścakāra.*

5. KAS 5.2.11: Hemādri ad RaghuV 4.9c *nātiśitoṣṇaḥ.*

6. KAS 5.2.14: Hemādri ad RaghuV 13.16d and Mallinātha ad KirātA 9.78a[77] *bimbādhara-.*

7. KAS 5.2.18: Mallinatha ad KirātA 2.27b *arthagauravam.*[78]

8. KAS 5.2.19: Mallinatha ad KirātA 2.37a *kopajanmanaḥ*[79] and ad 5.34 *śucimaṇijanmabhiḥ.*[80]

---

[70]After a reference to Vāmana in verse 4.24, the editors add *ādi,* "etc." Roodbergen's translation is also not indexed.

[71]Pathak (1912: 116) does give a list of "Works and Authors mentioned in Commentary" but only gives one instance per entry, presumably the first.

[72]Except an index to chapters 1–11 with the commentary of Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita. There are no citations of Vāmana there.

[73]At a very late stage, shortly before the final submission of this dissertation, Chandra (1972) came to my attention. In this article, p. 354f., all references to Vāmana in Mallinātha's commentaries are given. I regret that I have not had time to properly incorporate this discovery. I note simply here the number of references per commentary: 34 for the *Śiśupālavadha,* 3 for the *Meghadūta,* 7 for the *Kirātārjunīya,* 2 for the *Bhaṭṭikāvya,* 3 for the *Raghuvaṃśa,* 9 for the *Kumārasambhava,* and 13 for the *Naiṣadhīyacarita.* Chandra does not indicate whether these references are to Vāmana, the author of the KAS, or Vāmana, the co-author of the KV.

[74]See Dwivedī's edition for alternate readings.

[75]See Dwivedī's edition for alternate readings.

[76]Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇa both appear to be aware of, if not have in mind, Vāmana's *sūtra* since they gloss *me* in 10.41b as *mayā.* The latter even notes that is it is a *nipāta,* "indeclinable," just as Vāmana.

[77]Passage translated with annotation in Roodbergen (2004: 139).

[78]Passage translated with annotation in Roodbergen (1984: 112f.).

[79]Passage translated with annotation in Roodbergen (1984: 125).

[80]Passage translated with annotation in Roodbergen (1984: 299).

9. KAS 5.2.20: Hemādri, Aruṇagirinātha, Nārāyaṇa, and Mallinātha ad RaghuV 7.7a *agrapā-dam*; Mallinātha ad KirātA 5.29 *agrakaram*,[81] Mallinātha ad ŚiśuP 7.29 *agrahastaiḥ*.

10. KAS 5.2.22: Hemādri ad RaghuV 12.39d *vikṛteti*, Rāghavabhaṭṭa ad *Śākuntala* 1.1 *sarvabī-japrakṛtir iti*.

11. KAS 5.2.23: Aruṇagirinātha, Mallinātha, Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita ad KumS 8.62, Rāgavabhaṭṭa ad *Śākuntala* 3.4 *śakyam*.[82]

12. KAS 5.2.27: Hemādri ad RaghuV 11.15b, Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇa ad KumS 1.34d, Mallinātha ad KumS 1.35d[83] *āsa*.[84]

13. KAS 5.2.31: Mallinātha ad RaghuV 9.57b *sahacarīm*.

14. KAS 5.2.35: Hemādri ad RaghuV 9.19d *ariha-*.

15. KAS 5.2.36: Hemādri ad RaghuV 6.39b *cāpadharaḥ*.

16. KAS 5.2.37: Hemādri ad RaghuV 6.39b *cāpadharaḥ*.

17. KAS 5.2.40: Hemādri ad RaghuV 3.37d and 5.24d *avatāra*.[85]

18. KAS 5.2.41: Hemādri ad RaghuV 7.14a *spṛhaṇīyaśobham*.[86]

19. KAS 5.2.42: Hemādri ad RaghuV 11.73c *vrīḍam*.[87]

20. KAS 5.2.44: Hemādri ad RaghuV 3.26a and Mallinātha ad KumS 5.65a *āha*.[88]

21. KAS 5.2.47: Hemādri ad RaghuV 6.35b *rambhoru* and 8.69a (*svavṛtti*) *madirākṣi*.

22. KAS 5.2.48 Hemādri ad RaghuV 13.15a *arālabhru*.[89]

23. KAS 5.2.51 Hemādri ad RaghuV 14.14b *śāśvatam*.

24. KAS 5.2.52 Hemādri ad RaghuV 6.8b *somārkavaṃśye*,[90] Mallinātha ad BhaṭṭiK 1.13 *udāra-*

---

[81]Passage translated with annotation in Roodbergen (1984: 294).

[82]The reading in *Śākuntala* is as given with the commentary of Rāghavabhaṭṭa. See p. 296, fn. 212 below for a brief discussion of the variants.

[83]Same as the previous verse but with different numeration.

[84]Kṣīrasvāmin ad KṣDhP I.934, giving Vāmana's name, quotes this sūtra along with KumS 1.35d. Puruṣakāra also quotes it ad *Daiva* 185ab, mentioning both Vāmana and his work by name.

[85]Cf. Goodall and Isaascon (2003: 325).

[86]See Dwivedī's edition for alternate readings.

[87]Though they give no citation, Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇa use the same argument as Vāmana to justify the masculine gender of *vrīḍa* in their commentaries *ad loc.*

[88]Cf. Goodall (2001: 109–119).

[89]An alternate reading. See the apparatus to this verse in Dwivedī's edition. Aruṇagirinātha and Nārāyaṇa attribute it to Vallabhadeva.

[90]Cf. Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 381) and their apparatus to this verse.

vaṃśyaḥ.

25. KAS 5.2.55 Hemādri ad RaghuV 7.3a *sānnidhya-*.

26. KAS 5.2.68 Hemādri ad RaghuV 19.35b *-urasaḥ.*[91]

27. KAS 5.2.69 Hemādri ad RaghuV 2.35c and 12.37d *avehi*, not *avaihi.*[92]

28. KAS 5.2.75 Hemādri ad RaghuV 2.41b *niśamya.*

29. KAS 5.2.82 Hemādri ad RaghuV 5.38c[93] and Hemādri, Mallinātha, Aruṇagirinātha, Nārāyaṇa ad 9.50d *kāmayāna-*.

30. KAS 5.2.83 Hemādri ad RaghuV 3.1d *daurhṛda.*[94]

31. KAS 5.2.86 Mallinātha ad MeghD 10 *mandaṃmandam.*

A thorough investigation of all these citations would be out of place at present. Nevertheless, we may offer a few interpretations of the sorely incomplete data. To start most simply, several of the great commentators, Hemādri, Aruṇagirinātha, Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, and Mallinātha, were familiar with Vāmana's *Śabdaśuddhi* and felt some need to quote it, Hemādri being unquestionably the most eager (25 citations). His numerous quotes also demonstrate, when compared with other commentaries, that commentators who knew the KAS were not compelled to quote from it in every instance it was relevant. Although such neglect could be chalked up to meaningless inconsistency, two examples demonstrate a possible progression. Mallinātha could have quoted KAS 5.2.27 ad RaghuV 11.15b to explain *āsa*, "has been," but instead gives the simple gloss *babhūva.* Similarly, ad RaghuV 6.8b Mallinātha could have cited KAS 5.2.52 but again provides only a basic gloss *soma-sūrya-vaṃśa-bhave*, "(the group of princes) in the lineages of the moon and of the sun." The absence would normally not be terribly meaningful, but since Mallinātha does cite the respective sūtras from the KAS in his commentaries on the *Kumārasambhava* and *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, one wonders whether he was restraining his citations of Vāmana till he got to more advanced works when his students would have to go deeper into grammatical issues.[95] It is lamentable

---

[91]See Dwivedī's edition for alternate readings.

[92]Cf. Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 298). See their apparatus and Dwivedī's for alternate readings.

[93]An alternate reading. Cf. Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 370) and their apparatus to this verse.

[94]An alternate reading. See the aparatus in Goodall and Isaacson (2003) to this verse.

[95]The *Raghuvaṃśā* was in all likelihood the first text students read. This is hypothesis is partially confirmed by

that we do not have a full index of Mallinātha's citations in his commentary to the *Kirātārjunīya*, *Śiśupālavadha*, and *Naiṣadhīyacarita* as we could more readily see how his methods of citation changed.[96] Finally, among the mostly superficial observations is that nearly half of the passages (9 out of 20) from the RaghuV where Vāmana is invoked have variant readings. I have given references to the discussion of the variants by Goodall and Isaacson in the footnotes and will take up others later, but this should further reinforce the effect of grammar on the transmission of a text. Now that we can see without doubt that the *Śabdaśuddhi* was firmly part of the exegetical tools of the later commentators, we must ask what purpose exactly did these citations from the KAS serve.

To understand why commentators would fall back on Vāmana's sūtras, we need to know roughly what they prescribe. To this end, one could broadly classify the rules of the *Śabdaśuddhi* into three main categories based on how they relate to the prior grammatical norm. Roughly speaking, they can reaffirm rules from the A that were presumably being broken or for which there were dubious interpretations. Such sūtras could be used to chastise poetic usage. Alternatively, they can add new information to account for suspect forms either by offering a novel interpretation of a sūtra or by simply making an addendum. As pointed out before, it is not possible to determine in every instance how original Vāmana was, but the reaction of later commentators and grammarians can at least give us some idea about who innovated. To demonstrate each of these three groups, I will give a few representative examples. Thereafter, I will demonstrate that in at least one instance Vāmana's *Śabdaśuddhi* become so firmly associated with the explication of poetry that it supplanted earlier grammatical sources like the *Mahābhāṣya*. Along the way, we will also encounter instances of other grammatical works that served well the needs of poets and their commentators.

---

the largest number of quotations (37) stemming from the *Śiśupālavadha*, a particularly difficult poem.

[96]It could also help to determine the relative chronology of Mallinātha's commentaries, although such a question is difficult to answer without cross-references.

5.3.1 Rejection

In this subsection I give two short examples of Vāmana clearly rejecting known poetic usage.

5.3.1.1 On *avaihi*, "understand!"

Let us start with something simple: KAS 5.2.69 *avaihīti vṛddhir avadyā.*, "The vṛddhi vowel (*ai*) in *avaihi*, 'understand!' is reprehensible." The 2nd pers. sing. imperative of *ava* + √*i*, "to understand," can be nothing else than *avehi*, i.e., *ava* + *ihi* ⇒ *avehi*, as expected.[97] In practice, though, both forms are found, and the unexpected *avaihi* pops up in the *Mahābhārata* and other genres where non-standard Sanskrit is employed.[98] Surprisingly, Sanskrit poets also appear to have employed the form despite the clear violation of grammar. Aśvaghoṣa uses *avaihi* in *Saundarānanda* 16.7b[99] as does one Śabdārṇava in SuRaKo 724d.[100] Perhaps more surprisingly, Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 284) accept *avaihi* as the original reading seven times in the first six *sarga*s of the *Raghuvaṃśa* with Vallabhadeva's commentary on the basis of MS evidence. That Hemādri notes the fault ad RaghuV 2.35c along with a citation of KAS 5.2.69 can only help to confirm the direction of change. To account for the reverse change, from a grammatical form to an ungrammatical, albeit well attested form, defies common sense and all likelihood. That later commentators tend to prefer *avehi*,[101] usually without noting any variant reading, is a testament to the force of grammar on the transmission of the text. Since there is no metrical difference between *avaihi* and *avehi*, why not adopt the correct form? We will see other examples of change in the name of grammatical correctness in this and the following chapter. Bear in mind as well that this is an example of the influence or continuation of Epic diction in early *kāvya*, a topic that Vāmana deals with in different ways. In this case, he has rather successfully discouraged later poets from using

---

[97]*avaihi* likely developed on the basis of analogy to *avaitu*, "may he understand," the 3rd pers. sing. imperative. Also, as Goodall and Isasacsn (2003: 284) note, *e* and *ai* are subject to confusion in various scripts. The Middle-Indic pronunciation of *ai* as *e* also likely did not help matters.

[98]I have noted *avaihi* in MahāBh 12.282.5c, 12.303.16a, and 14.9.26c; *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* 27.5 and 73.21; *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 3.7.20d etc.; *Mokṣapāya* 26.45b and 89.129d.

[99]Johnson, the editor, records no variant.

[100]The grammatically correct *avehi* is recorded as a variant by Kosambi and Gokhale.

[101]Other commentators have *avaihi* as their primary reading or otherwise record it. See Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 298, 303 and 304).

avaihi (I have found no other examples in printed editions of *mahākāvya*, although my search has been rather limited.[102]) and even helped to alter the text of those who did.

5.3.1.2 On *āha*, "he said/she said"

One of the strongest and most applicable condemnations in the *Śabdaśuddhi* is KAS 5.2.44 *āheti bhūte 'nyaṇalantabhramād bruvo laṭi*, "(One uses) *āha* 'says' as a past tense (of √*brū*) because of confusing other words ending in *ṆaL* with √*brū*, 'to speak,' in the present tense."[103] This sūtra, a simple reaffirmation of P. 3.2.84, condemns the usage of Kālidāsa in 10 places[104] where he maintains an antiquated use of *āha* as a past tense, "said," instead of its classical usage as an alternative to the present tense form of √*brū*.[105] Although Vāmana, falling in line with grammatical rule, disapproves of this usage, others have suggested that *āha* here is not the verb *āha* at all, but a formally identical *nipāta*, "set form," that just so happens to look and function like a finite verb.[106] This was clearly an attempt to save what others faulted. Since Goodall has thoroughly demonstrated how this grammatical inaccuracy caused the text of Kālidāsa to change over the course of time and how the commentators have dealt with the problem, I have little to add except that we find still another explanation for *āha* — with specific reference to Kālidāsa — in an as yet unnoticed source: the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhojadeva.

Aruṇagirinātha ad KumS 5.65 (= 5.64 with Vallabhadeva) explains the usage of *athāha* as follows:

---

[102]I suspect that *avehi* in NaiC 2.19b originally started out as *avaihi*. Three MSS of Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita's commentary have this reading, as recorded in the apparatus *ad loc.* in Jāni's edition, p. 108. Furthermore, Nārāyaṇa goes on at length in his commentary *ad loc.* as to why only *avehi* is the correct form. Although he does not record any alternate reading, his defensive remarks make me suspect he knew that some read *avaihi*.

[103]The sūtra and auto-commentary are translated in full with annotation in Goodall (2001: 117f.). This article treats the problem in much more detail than I will here.

[104]Listed in Goodall (2001: 109): RaghuV 3.25, 3.63, 12.2; KumS 4.43, 5.64, 6.25, 6.88, 7.47, 7.82, 8.50. The references to the RaghuV are according to Vallabha; those to the KumS, according to the edition by Narayana Murti (1980).

[105]According to P. 3.2.84, *āh* may optionally substitute √*brū* throughout the 3rd person, and in the 2nd person except the pl. In earlier stages of Sanskrit, *āha*, etc. had a past tense value. Cf. Grassman p. 161.

[106]Cf. Goodall (2001: 114). Two sources are cited for this explanation by Hemādri ad RaghuV 3.26 (3.25 with Vallabha's commentary), the *Pāṇinīyamatadarpaṇa* and the *Gaṇadarpaṇa*, neither of which is still extant. Note that Hemādri repeats the corrupt quotation from the *Pāṇinīyamatadarpaṇa* ad RaghuV 11.15 where it correctly reads: *asty asmi manye śaṅke brūhy āsāha ṇalarthakau*. See p. 276 below. There are many similarities to GRM 13, in which Vardhamāna lists a particle *āha* as having the meaning *uvāca*, "has said." The example in the commentary *ad loc.* is from KumS 5.65.

atheti | athaśabdasya tadāditvād āheti laṭ | tadādau ceti bhojasūtram |

> On **atha**: Since the word *atha*[107] belongs to the list beginning with *tadā*, "then," the present tense (verb) *āha*, "says" (has been used). (Cf.) Bhoja's sūtra (SKĀv 1.4.165): "(the *luṅ*, 'imperfect,' and *laṭ*, 'present,' tense suffixes) also (optionally come after a root that occurs in a meaning qualified by the past tense but not of today) in the company of *tadā*, 'then,' etc."[108]

This rule optionally allows either the aorist (*luṅ*) or the present (*laṭ*) tense suffixes to be used in expressing an action in the past, but not today, i.e., in place of the imperfect (*laṅ*) or perfect (*liṭ*),[109] provided that they are accompanied by certain words like *tadā*, "then." Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, who often elaborates the concise commentary of Aruṇagiri, adds after quoting Bhoja's sūtra: *bhojasūtrānusāreṇāthaśabdayogād bhūtārthe laṭ*, "The present tense (has been used) in the sense of a past tense because of a connection with the word *atha* 'now,' in accordance with Bhoja's sūtra." That Bhoja had passages by Kālidāsa in mind when composing this rule is supported by his commentator, Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha, who quotes not only this verse but also KumS 3.72, where the use of the present tense *caranti*, "they go," has also puzzled commentators. Since, however, it is accompanied by the particle *yāvat*, which also belongs to Bhoja's *tadādi* list, we should understand *caranti* as expressing a past tense action.[110] This is a rather fascinating turn of events. Bhoja was certainly familiar with the KAS and cites it not infrequently in his works on poetics, but when it came to grammar, he was willing to go against Vāmana and find a subtle way

---

[107]I leave *atha* untranslated here since Aruṇagiri gives it more of a functional rather than semantic meaning.

[108]My translation of the sūtra is based on the commentary of Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha: *bhūtānadyatanakālaviśiṣṭe 'rthe vartamānād dhātos tadādau copapade luṅlaṭau pratyayau vā bhavataḥ*. Hemacandra, not surprisingly, has a corresponding sūtra: HŚA 5.2.16 *sme ca vartamānā*. In his *Bṛhadvṛtti ad loc.* (vol. V p. 127b), he even cites this verse as well as 3.72 from the *Kumārasambhava*, following Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha quite closely as we will see.

[109]The perfect is a subclass within the general semantic domain of "past time but not today," usually having the added specification *parokṣe*, "beyond one's perception."

[110]Vallabhadeva is perturbed by *caranti* and labels its use here as *na nyāyyaḥ*, "not making any sense." He finds a similar fault in ŚiśuP 1.15. His commentary on KumS 3.72 is unremarkable except for the fact that between the two versions, as transmitted in different MSS, we can detect a shift in terminology. The commentary as printed by Patel (p. 112) reads as follows: *carantīti bhūte 'tra prayoge na nyāyyaḥ | yato 'tīte vihitābhiḥ parokṣādibhir bhāvyam |* "The use here of 'they go' with past tense meaning does not make any sense because there should be *parokṣā*, etc., which are enjoined in the past tense." I am quite convinced that Vallabhadeva is here using the terminology of the *Kātantra* because both *parokṣā* and *atīte* are characteristic of the grammar's technical terminology. Cf. Kā 3.1.13 *parokṣā* (= P. 3.2.115), where *parokṣā* is a suffix equivalent to *liṭ*, and Durga's *vṛtti* thereon, where we find *atīte kāle* as opposed to the Pāṇinian *bhūte kāle*. Narayana Murti's text (p. 90) conforms to Pāṇinian terminology: *carantīti laṭprayogo na tathā nyāyyaḥ | bhūte liḍādibhir bādhitatvāt |* "The use of *laṭ* in 'they go' does not make any sense because it is blocked by *liṭ*, etc. in the past tense." Observe how *parokṣābhiḥ* changes to *liḍādbhiḥ* and *atīte* to *bhūte*.

to exonerate the usage of Kālidāsa from this most glaring of faults. That Aruṇagiri, and Nārāyaṇa more explicitly, view Kālidāsa as following Bhoja's rules — composed some six hundred years after the *Kumārasambhava* — does not indicate that new grammars contain new rules, but rather that the rules always existed; others had simply failed to formulate them. In closing, however, we might take to heart the words of Vidyāmādhava ad KumS 4.43 that follow upon the explanation that *āha* is a particle: *tathāpi mahākavayo 'tītārthe 'pi viprayuñjate vyākaraṇaprayogamūlam eva.* "Nevertheless, great poets break away from the foundation of grammatical usage (by using *āha*) with a past tense meaning."[111] Great poets violate the rules.

Other sūtras could be added under this category, including KASA 5.2.1 on the *ekaśeṣa* forms, *rudrau*, etc., and KAS 5.2.46 on *avatāra*,[112] but the two I have briefly discussed here are some of the most straightforward and telling examples I have found. They highlight two important points: Vāmana does not hold back from attacking even Kālidāsa's poetry,[113] and, secondly, it seems likely that his criticisms were an important factor in effecting alterations in poetry toward a grammatically acceptable text. Grammaticality, however, was not a fixed concept. We have also observed how others like Bhoja, the author of the *Pāṇinīyadarpaṇamata*, etc. tried to save certain usages against Vāmana's and others' fault finding. In some instances they were successful, in others not. On the whole, however, the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition progressed toward a more strict interpretation of the A, i.e., in accordance with the MBh, and many of these more creative explanations were rejected. For now, we will turn to a few instances of attempts at inclusion.

5.3.2 Admission

If the examples so far have painted Vāmana as a stickler rather than a free thinker, what follows will demonstrate his willingness to offer justifications for poetic usage. From the existence of

---

[111]The text is far from certain throughout the unpublished dissertation in which the edition is available to me. Vidyāmādhava also cites NaiC 3.134 as another example of a past tense *āha*. The commentator Nārāyaṇa explains it as an indeclinable that resembles a finite verb (*vibhaktipratirūpakam avyayaṃ bhūtārthe*), while Mallinātha relies on P. 3.3.131 according to which a present tense verb can refer to the proximate paste.

[112]See the discussion in Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 325).

[113]Nor did the commentators, especially Vallabha, who, as we have seen and will see again, has no qualms about labeling Kālidāsa's faulty words as *pramādaja*, "born from folly."

such sūtras, we can infer that the forms and rules under discussion were subject to criticism or misunderstanding and Vāmana wished to give his own judgment in the hopes of providing clarity. Why some forms could be excused and not others is one problem that I have not yet been able to adequately theorize and may well hinge on grammatical ideas or texts now lost to us. Whatever his reasons may have been, Vāmana could be as welcoming as he was dismissive.

5.3.2.1 On a "has been" (*āsa*)

Our first example, KAS 5.2.27, takes up many of the same themes that we saw in the previous section but this time in a more positive light since Vāmana finds a way to accept, rather than reject, a particular form. The first commonality is that we are once again concerned with the usage of Kālidāsa, who chose, on five occasions,[114] to employ the form *āsa*, "has been," as the perfect of √*as*, "to be," instead of *babhūva* as prescribed by Pāṇini.[115] That this rule did not exist for the earlier language is attested in the Vedic literature and, to a much lesser extent, in the Epic/Purāṇic literature.[116] Unlike the previous case of *āha*, however, I have not found any other precedent for using *āsa*, etc. in the works of Aśvaghoṣa,[117] so that Kālidāsa's decision to revitalize the form comes across as quite deliberate and a bold intertextual reference to earlier Vedic literature. With this bit of background, let us turn to Vāmana's explanation.

> *āsety asateḥ* || KAS 5.2.27 ||

> [*svavṛtti:*] *lāvaṇyam utpādyam*[118] *ivāsa yatnaḥ ity atra āsa ity asater dhātoḥ as gatidīp-*

---

[114]KumS 1.35d (34d with Vallabha); RaghuV 11.15b, 11.63b, 11.81c, 14.23c.

[115]P. 2.4.52 *aster bhūḥ* | "√*as* occurs in place of √*bhū* when an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix follows." Since the endings of the perfect (*liṭ*) are termed *ārdhadhātuka* by P. 3.4.115, √*bhū* will replace √*as* throughout the perfect tense. Excluded here is, of course, the use of *āsa*, etc. as an auxiliary verb in the periphrastic perfect. Cardona (1996: 179f.) also briefly discusses the problem of *āsa*. I have, however, been able to add further passages.

[116]Examples from the RV can be found in Grassmann (1873: 151). Oberlies (2003: 389) lists just a single form from the two Epics: Rām 1.9.16b *āsa*. I have not been able to find others but have also not searched very thoroughly.

[117]After Kālidāsa, I have noted only one attestation of *āsa* in a *kāvya*, Śrīharṣa's NaiC 20.24c, but there may well be others. Such forms are found, unsurprisingly, in the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, e.g., 2.7.10c *āsa*. Cf. Biswas (1968: 15) and Viśvanāthacakravartin's commentary *Sārārthadarśinī ad loc.*: *āsa abhūt*.

[118]All the editions I have been able to consult print *lāvaṇyam utpādya*, which cannot be correct and appears to be a conflation of two other available readings. Vallabhadeva, Mallinātha, and Cāritravardhana have: *lāvaṇya utpādya ivāsa yatnaḥ*, "there was, as it were, a struggle when beauty had to be produced"; Aruṇagiri and Nārāyaṇa (KumS 1.34d): *lāvaṇyam utpattum āsa yatnaḥ*, "there was an effort to create beauty," with a hidden causative meaning in *utpattum* (*antarbhūtaṇyartha*). Aruṇagirinātha, however, quotes Vāmana as reading *lāvaṇyam utpādyam ivāsa*

tyādāneṣu ity asya prayogaḥ | na asteḥ bhūbhāvavidhānāt ||

KAS 5.2.27 *āsa* is from √*as*.

[auto-commentary:] On *āsa* in (KumS 1.35) 'there was, as it were, an effort in creating beauty,' there is the use of the root (KṣDhP I.934) √*as* 'to go, to shine, to receive,' not of (KṣDhP II.56) √*as* 'to be' because (in that case) there is a rule (P. 2.4.52) for the occurrence of *bhū*.

Although *āha* and *āsa* appear to be on the same plane with regard to grammatical irregularity, Vāmana can excuse the latter because there was already a path within the existing system of grammar, which was not the case for *āha* (assuming the indeclinable explanation for *āha* is post Vāmana). The solution is quite simple. The DhP contains two roots √*as* (KṣDhP I.934 and KṣDhP II.56), one whose perfect is *āsa* and one whose perfect is *babhūva*. Since the class I root can have the fairly bleached meaning *dīpti*, "shining, appearing," and regularly forms the perfect *āsa*, Vāmana derives *āsa* in Kālidāsa's works from this root instead of the expected meaning "to be." One could question here the validity of such a root in the first place (did Vāmana invent it?) or the appropriateness of the meaning (we would not be alone to ask this, see below), but, although Vāmana does have rather liberal views about the expansion of the DhP (cf. KAS 5.2.2 and my discussion below), it is highly unlikely that he made up a DhP entry.[119] As for semantic satisfaction from creative derivations, we will return to this topic presently as well as in the following chapter.

The commentators on these passages with *āsa* reveal an interesting development and one that helps us piece together a few more details about the sources and authorities for grammaticality at different points in time. Vallabhadeva finds this use of *āsa* unacceptable and says ad KumS 1.34d: *āseti kavīnāṃ pramādajaḥ prayogaḥ*, "poets' use of *āsa* is born of folly."[120] The reason given is that P. 2.4.52 ought to apply here. What is even more revealing is the following reference to *anye*,

---

yatnaḥ, "the beauty to be created was, as it were, a struggle." This is undoubtedly correct. He then attributes the reading of Vallabhadeva et al. to Dakṣiṇāvarta, who, Aruṇagiri specifically mentions, follows Maitreyrarakṣita in his *Dhātupradīpa* ad MDhP 890. This reading is then criticized by Aruṇagiri because of *visandhi*, "hiatus" (there are two in a row *lāvaṇya* **u***tpādya* **i***vāsa*) and because the meaning is unacceptable since *āsa*, understood as *gatyarthe*, "a verb of motion," requires a *karman*, "direct object, patient."

[119]On the early history of the DhP, cf. Bronkhorst (1981) and (1983). I will have more to say about the DhP shortly.

[120]How significant is the plural *kavīnām*? Did Vallabhadeva have other examples in mind? At least one other commentator did.

"others," who hold that there is an irregular indeclinable (*nipāta*) that *tiṅantapratirūpaka*, "has the semblance of a finite verb," a theory that Vallabha rejects out of hand, insisting that there can only be a finite form.[121] We are immediately reminded of the explanation of *āha* as a particle that Hemādri cites ad RaghuV 3.25 from the *Pāṇinīyamatadarpaṇa* and *Gaṇadarpaṇa*. It seems that Vallabha either did not know Vāmana's work, a possibility given its ebb in popularity, or found it too distasteful to quote. Aruṇagirinātha, however, approves of Vāmana's explanation,[122] as does Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita.[123] In contrast to Vallabhadeva, neither mentions the possibility of a particle. Mallinātha, on the other hand, not only mentions both possibilities, but attributes the particle idea to one Śākaṭāyana and records Vallabhadeva's dismissal. Finally, Vāmana's opinion is given with the gloss *didīpe*, "has shone," as the meaning of *āsa*.[124] Cāritavardhana likewise rejects the idea of a particle and openly accepts Vāmana's explanation. He adds, however, one oft quoted notion about roots: *dhātūnām anekārthatvād āseti babhūvārthe iti*, "because roots have multiple meanings *āsa* occurs in the meaning of 'has been,'" a remark that counters any objections to deriving *āsa* from class I √*as* based on semantics. This is a big win for Vāmana, and we can add other supporters: Kṣīrasvāmin, Puruṣakāra, and, implicitly, Maitreyarakṣita.[125] On the other hand, Vardhāmana ad GRM 1.3a considers *āsa* a particle with the meaning *babhūva*, although he does not shy away from mentioning the divergent opinion of Vāmana and Vallabhbadeva's

---

[121]Vallabhadeva ad KumS 1.35: *yat tv anye bruvate tiṅantapratirūpako nipātaḥ iti tad asat | tādṛśasya tiṅantasyaiva bhavanāt* (corr. *bhāvāt* ?) | "But what other says, that there is a particle with the semblance of a finite verb, is not true because there exists only a finite verb with such an appearance." For the last phrase, I have here reproduced Narayana Murti's text, which yeilds better sense than Patel's (p. 26): *tādṛśasya tiṅantasyābhāvāt*, "because such a finite form does not exist."

[122]Aruṇagiri ad KumS 1.34d *atrāseti prayogaṃ samarthayituṃ vāmanasūtram āsety asateḥ* | "In order to support the usage *āsa* here (in the verse) there is Vāmana's sūtra (KAS 5.2.27) '*āsa* is from class I √*as*.'"

[123]Nārāyaṇa specifies that *āsa* is equivalent to *didīpe*, one of the meanings for class I √*as*.

[124]Mallinātha ad KumS 1.35 *āseti babhūvārthe tiṅantapratirūpakam avyayam | ity āha śākaṭāyanaḥ | vallabhas tu na tiṅantapratirūpakam avyayam aster bhūḥ iti bhvādeśaniyamāt tadṛktiṅantasyaivābhāvāt | kiṃ tu kavīnāṃ prāmādikaḥ ity āha | vāmanas tu asa gatidīptyādāneṣv iti dhātor liṭi rūpam idam ity āha | asa ity anudātted dīpyārthe | āsa didīpe | pravṛtta ity arthaḥ ||* "Śākaṭāyana says that *āsa* is an indeclinable with the semblance of a finite verb in the sense of 'has been.' But Vallabha says that it is not an indiclinable with the semblance of a finite verb because there exists no such finite verb since √*bhū* is the substitute (for √*as*) by P. 2.4.52. Rather, poets have (usages) born of folly. Vāmana, on the other hand, says that this form belongs to the perfect of the root √*as* in the meaning of going, shining and receiving. √*as* is marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel in the meaning of to shine. *āsa* = 'has shined.' The meaning is: 'it arose.'"

[125]In his commentary ad MDhP I.890 *asa gatipītyādāneṣu*, Maitreya quotes KumS 1.35d as an example. The exact references for the others have already been given above in fn. 84, p. 266.

disregard for the idea that the particle resembles a finite verbs.

On the *Raghuvaṃśa* passages mentioned above, most of the commentators available to me repeat one opinion or the other, or give a simple gloss, usually *babhūva*. Hemādri, however has a relatively long and informative passage ad RaghuV 11.15. Despite the length, I provide the passage in full because of a number of unique references and ideas.

> **āsa** *iti vibhaktipratirūpakam avyayam aster bhūbhāvavidhānāt | pāṇinīyamatadar-*
> *paṇe ca asty asmi manye śaṅke brūhy āsāha ṇalarthakau iti | kārayāmāsa ity atra tu*
> *vidhānasāmarthyāt aster bhūbhāvo na | vāmanas tu* [KAS 5.2.27[126]] *āsety asateḥ asa*
> *gatikāntidīptidāneṣu ity | asya dhātupradīpe 'py ayam eva dhātur uktaḥ | sārasvata-*
> *kāramate tu bhūbhāvasyābhāvāt āsa iti* [cf. SārV II.4.28] *aster eva | tathā* [KṣDhP II.56]
> *as bhuvi ity atra āsety udāhṛtaṃ sārasvatasya nārendraṭippaṇe* [ChUp 6.1.1] *śvetake-*
> *tur hy āruṇeya āsa[127] ityādi śrutipurāṇayor bahuśaḥ prayogadarśanāt | kumārasam-*
> *bhave 'pi* [KumS 1.34d] *lāvaṇya utpādya ivāsa yatnaḥ | raghau* [RaghuV 11.15b] *prā-*
> *durāsa bahulakṣapācchaviḥ iti |* [RaghuV 11.81c] *niṣprabhaś ca ripur āsa tatkṣaṇam*
> *iti* [RaghuV 14.23c] *tenāsa lokaḥ pitṛmān vinetrā iti ca asates tad rūpam iti cen na |*
> *arthāsaṃgatiḥ | asti cādeśavidher aniyatatvam iti tathā |* [*tathā hi*] *cakṣiṇaḥ khyādeśaḥ*
> *ārdhadhātuke[128] vihitaḥ | tasya vicakṣaṇa iti yucpratyaye vyabhicāraḥ | tathā bruño*
> *vacādeśasya brāhmaṇabruva ity atrābhāvaḥ | ajater vyādeśasya samajyādau iti sāras-*
> *vataṭīkāyām | nanu aster bhūr asārvadhātuke iti śarvavarmaṇā uktam | satyam |* [SārV
> II.35.19] *lokāc cheṣasya siddhiḥ iti sūtre tad api asmābhiḥ svīkriyata eva | tathādeśa-*
> *vidher aniyatatvaṃ tair evāṅgīkṛtaṃ vicakṣaṇa ityādau iti |* [*Abhidhānaratnamālā*
> 2.251ab] *jātimātropajīvī ca kathyate brāhmaṇabruvaḥ iti halāyudhaḥ ||*

On "**has been**": it is an indeclinable that has the semblance of a (personal) ending because of the rule that √*bhū* occurs in place of √*as*, and in the *Pāṇinīyadarpaṇa* (it is said:) "*asti, asmi, manye, śaṅke, brūhi, āsa, āha* (are indeclinables), the last two hav-ing the meaning of a 3rd pers. sing. perfect."[129] Here in the form *kārayāmāsa*, "has caused to do," √*bhū* does not occur in place of √*as* by force of the rule's context.[130] But Vāmana (says it belongs to) √*as* in the sense of going, desiring, shining, giving (in KAS 5.2.27:) "*āsa* is from class I √*as*." This root is also mentioned (as belonging) to it (*āsa*) in the *Dhātupradīpa*.[131]

---

[126]The exact phrase, *gatikāntidīptidāneṣu* is not found in other editions of the KAS or in any of the DhPs that I have been able to consult.

[127]The standard reading is: *śvetaketur hāruṇeya āsa.*

[128]The printed text has *sārvadhātuke*, but from the context *ārdhudhātuke* must be the correct reading.

[129]Cf. fn. 106 for this same citation in reference to *āha.*

[130]Cf. KV ad P. 3.1.40: *kṛñ iti pratyāhāreṇa kṛbhvastayo gṛhyante | tatsāmarthyād aster bhūbhāvo na bhavati |* "With the abbreviation *kṛÑ* (the roots) √*kṛ*, √*bhū*, and √*as* are included. By force of this context, √*bhū* does not occur in place of √*as*." The idea is simply that since √*bhū* is explicitly mentioned, it would be redundant to list √*as* if √*bhū* were to also replace it in the periphrastic perfect. Cf. also P. 3.1.40.1 and the *bhāṣya* thereon.

[131]Cf. fn. 125, p. 275 above.

But in the opinion of the author of the *Sārasvata* grammar, (*āsa*) can only be from (class II) √*as* since there is no √*bhū* (in place of √*as*).[132] Accordingly, in the *Ṭippaṇa* of Nārendra[133] *āsa* is given as an examples for √*as* in the meaning "being" because one often comes across such usages in the sacred (*śruti*) and Purāṇic literature as in: (ChUp 6.1.1) "for Śvetaketu was the son of Āruṇi." Also in the *Kumārasambhava* (1.35d) "there was, as it were, an effort in beauty being produced"; in the *Raghu*(*vaṃśa* 11.15b): "(Tāḍakā) appeared having the complexion of a night during the dark fortnight," (11.81c) "the enemy was momentarily without brilliance," and (14.23c) "the world had a father with (Rāma) as their leader."

If one says that this is a form of the class I √*as*, (we respond) no, because the meaning is not agreeable. And so (one says) that the rules for substitutes are not settled.[134] (The basis for this is as follows:) √*khyā* is prescribed as the substitute for √*cakṣ* when an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix follows.[135] There is a deviation from this rule in *vicakṣaṇa* "perceptive."[136] In a similar manner, √*vac* does not occur as the substitute for √*bruÑ* in *brāhmaṇabruva*, "calling oneself a Brahman," (and) √*vī* does not occur as the substitute for √*aj* in *samajyā*, and so forth.[137] So it is stated in the commentary to the *Sārasvata* (grammar).[138] Now, one may object that Śarvavarman (the author of the *Kātantra*) has said Kā 3.4.87 "*bhū* occurs in place of √*as* when a non-*sārvadhātuka* suffix follows."[139] That's true. We also surely accept (the idea) in the sūtra: SārV II.35.19 "the rest is established from general usage (*loka*)," so they[140] surely accept that the

---

[132]It follows then that in the *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*, *āsa* is just a normal perfect of √*as* without any mention of the suppletive paradigm given in the A. *babhūva* can, therefore, only be from √*bhū*. Later versions of the *Sārasvata*, however, contain a provision (vārtt.) for √*bhū* to be the substitute in the perfect: SārV II.4.28 *aster anapi bhū vaktavyaḥ | "√*bhū* must be stated to occur in place of √*as* when a suffix other than *aP* follows." Cf. Belvalkar (1915: 94f.). Such addenda are likely the work of Anubhūtisvarūpācārya, and the present passage is a clear indication that Hemādri knew the SārV without these additions. See further fn. 141, p. 278. Note that *aP* is similar to Pāṇini's *ŚaP*. As Candrakīrtisūri informs us in his commentary, the *Candrakīrti*, ad SārV II.1.10, *aP* is used in only four meanings: the present tense (*vidyamānārtha*, SārV I.2.7), an injunction or hypothetical (*vidhi-sambhāvanārtha*, SārV I.2.18), a blessing or a command (*āśiḥpreraṇārtha*, SārV I.2.22), and the imperfect (*anadyatanārtha*, SārV I.2.25).

[133]Belvalkar (1915: 95), in discussing the authorship of the SārV, reports that the commentator Kṣemendra appears to attribute the SārV to Nārendrācārya. Furthermore, Viṭṭhala is also to have cited one grammarian named Nārendrācārya in his *Prasāda* on the *Prakriyākaumudī*, but the location of the passage is not given.

[134]I have not found this as a metarule elsewhere. The logic of the argumentation in what follows is a sort of mixture of two systems. As far as I understand the passage, the commentator on the SārV whom Hemādri quotes wants to argue that even if we assume √*bhū* substitutes √*as*, like Pāṇini and Śarvavarman prescribe, since there are exceptions to the general rules for substitution regarding √*cakṣ* and √*brū*, all substitutions are without strict application. According to the Pāṇinians, however, forms like *vicakṣaṇa* and *samajyā* are not deviations *per se*, but are rather duely accounted for with *ad hoc* rules. The SārV, on the other hand, does not have rules to account for such forms. See the following footnotes for clarification.

[135]Reference here must be to SārV 2.5.1, despite the fact that *ārdhudhātuke* is not employed there. *anapi* has a very similar function to *ārdhadhātuke* in the Pāṇinian system. Cf. P. 2.4.54 *cakṣiṅaḥ khyāñ*. This means that √*khyā* replaces √*cakṣ* in all non-finite forms.

[136]This exception is noted in P. 2.4.54.10, and Patañjali (MBh I.487.22) gives *vicakṣaṇa* as an example. There is no such provision in the SārV.

[137]SārV I.1.93. In the A the form is accounted for by P. 3.3.99.

[138]The quote seems to begin with *asti cādeśavidher*.

[139]The point is that this forbids *āsa* as a perfect of √*as*.

[140]"they" must refer to the followers of the *Kātantra*.

rules for substitution are not settled (and can derive) *vicakṣaṇa*, etc. (Cf.) Halāyudha (in his *Abhidhānaratnamāla*) 2.251ab "and one who makes a living off his caste, one who calls himself a Brahman."

We can present Hemādri's train of though as follows:

1. *āsa* is an *avyayam* on the authority of the *Pāṇinīyamatadarpaṇa*.

2. Vāmana explains *āsa* as from class I √*as*, "to go, etc.," and Maitreyarakṣita supports him.

   - Rejected because the meaning is incongruent (*asaṃgati*).

3. *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* does not prescribe √*bhū* as a substitute for √*as*, "to be," so no problem. This can be justified based on:

   (a) Usage:

      - *Śruti* and Purāṇas, e.g., ChUp 6.1.1.

      - *Kāvya*: KumS 1.35d, RaghuV 11.15b, 11.81c, 14.23c.

   (b) The metarule: *ādeśavidher aniyatatvam*, "rules of substitution are not settled."

      This rule is also justified by usage: *vicakṣaṇa* and *brāhmaṇabruva*, with a reference to Halāyudha's *Abhidhānaratnamālā*, where the substitution does not take place.

   (c) SārV II.35.19 defers ultimately to usage.

4. Even if we follow the *Kātantra*, the metarule just cited will cover such irregular substitutions.

This fascinating passage reveals the variety of sources available to a second millennium commentator in an incredibly condensed space. Hemādri not only mentions already familiar texts like the KAS and the *Pāṇinīyamatadarpaṇa* but brings us face to face with an extremely popular, non-Pāṇinian grammar, the *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*.[141] The sudden reference to this work, not

---

[141]The *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* originated sometime in the 13th cent. and gained great popularity throughout much of India, especially in the North at the Muslim courts, possibly on account of its concise (700 sūtras) presentation of Sanskrit. It is commonly attributed to Anubhūtisvarūpācārya, but, as Belvalkar (1915: 95) demonstrates, others attribute authorship to a Nārendra(-ācārya). The former is more properly the creator of the *Sārasvata-prakriyā*, a rearrangement and expansion of the original rules. Despite its importance as a basic grammar (the British were also well acquainted with it; cf. Colebrooke (1805: xii) and Wilkins (1808: xii)) with numerous commentaries, the work has continued to fall into obscurity with almost no modern scholarship. See Belvalkar (1915: 91–104) for a general overview. Slaje (1991) demonstrates the grammar's connection to Kṛṣṇadāsa's *Pārasīprakāśa*, a Sanskrit to Persian grammar, an important proof of the work's prevalence in Mughal court life.

cited elsewhere in the *Raghuvaṃśadarpaṇa*, can be explained by the simple fact that according to this work √*bhū* does not substitute √*as*. Modern scholars would perhaps label this as a simplification or even an oversight — as noted, a provision was indeed later added, mostly likely by Anubhūtisvarūpa — and not view it as a conscious decision to account for usage. Hemādri, on the other hand, takes this as a very deliberate choice and finds further support in the commentary of Nārendra, who culls examples from the Vedas and poetry that the *Sārasvata* can account for. The other part of the argument deals with proving the existence of a metarule, otherwise unknown to me, that the rules for substitution can be rather loosely applied in order to obtain a desired, well-attested form. For this last maxim, we rely on the final sūtra of the SārV, which informs that usage ultimately controls what is otherwise not tightly regulated. In sum, we gain here a rare glimpse into how grammar could be dealt with outside of the Pāṇinian system. As I have noted in the introduction and have shown on multiple occasions thus far, it is only rare because of the resources available to modern scholars and a general erasure of the competing schools of Sanskrit grammar from the scholarly consciousness.[142]

5.3.2.2   On "desiring" (*kāmayāna-*)

Another, less involved example is KAS 5.2.82. Since this rule is of importance for the history of metarules in Sanskrit grammar, it is worth citing it in full with the auto-commentary:

> *kāmayānaśabdaḥ siddho 'nādiś cet* || 5.2.82 ||
>
> [*svavṛtti*:] *kāmayānaśabdaḥ siddhaḥ āgamānuśasanam anityam iti muky akṛte yady anādiḥ syāt* ||
>
> KAS 5.2.82 The word *kāmayāna*, "desiring," is established, if it is not first.
>
> [Auto-commentary:] The word *kāmayāna*, "desiring," is established given that (the augment) *mUK* has not been added on the basis of (the metarule) "the teaching of augments are non-mandatory," if it should not be first.

The exact meaning of the conditional phrase is not entirely clear to me, and it has received dif-

---

[142]An interesting parallel are the commentators on the *Amarakośa* who use non-Pāṇinian systems of grammar given in Zachariae (1897: 22). Some of these commentaries are already mentioned by Colebrooke (1808: viiif.) [= Colebrooke (1837: 56f.)].

ferent interpretations.[143] Leaving this problem aside, Vāmana undoubtedly wants to welcome *kāmayāna* into the fold of grammaticality, because otherwise only *kāmayamāna* with the augment *mUK* would be correct.[144] To justify leaving off the augment, Vāmana cites a metarule that latter grammarians, starting with Puruṣottamadeva, list among the collections of *paribhāṣā*s.[145] However, it has its first appearance in the KV ad 7.1.1 and must, therefore, have developed at a time posterior to the MBh and Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāsucana*.[146] The motivation for specifically mentioning this form appears, once again, to be Kālidāsa's language in the *Raghuvaṃśa*, where he twice uses the form: RaghuV 5.38c and 19.50d. Similarly we find ample Epic antecedents for *kāmayāna* in both the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*.[147] The form does not, however, seem to have had much of a life in classical Sanskrit *kāvya* after Kālidāsa despite Vāmana's explanation, and even the text of the *Raghuvaṃśa* suffered "correction" in the first instance.[148] Hemādri has *gantukāmā* as his primary reading, although he goes on to mention, not disapprovingly, *kāmayānā* as an alternate reading with a citation of KAS 5.2.82 as support.[149] Mallinātha, Aruṇagirinātha (most likely), Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, and Sarvajñavanamuni read *sābhilāṣā*. Vallabhadeva retains the original reading and even justifies the lack of the augment by citing the maxim proposed by Vāmana,

---

[143]The oldest interpretation stems from the commentator Gopendra (Sahadeva has nothing to say on the matter), and he glosses the conditional phrase as: *sa ca prāmāṇikaiḥ prayuktaś cet*, "and provided it (scil. *kāmayāna*) is used by authoritative people." This could refer to those who know the metarule quoted just before and are thoroughly versed in grammar but also to those who, for non-grammatical reasons, possess authority. How this derives from *anādi* is not entirely apparent. Cappller (1880: 20) translates as follows: *wenn es nicht zum ersten Male gebraucht wird.* "if it is not used for the first time." Jha (1928: 123) offers: "if its use can be traced to long-established usage." Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 370) do not translate the sūtra but give the interpretation that "[Vāmana] meant rather to justify the usage occurring in 'old' poetry, while disapproving of it in new compositions."

[144]The ending of the ātm. participle is *ŚānaC* (= *ānâ*) in Pāṇinian terms. When, however, it follows a verbal stem in short -*a*, the augment *mUK* (= *m*) is added by P. 7.2.82.

[145]Based on Abhyankar's collation of *paribhāṣā*s, it can be found in the following works: *Kālāpaparibhāṣāsūtra* 21 (Abhyankar (1976: 78)), 74 with Puruṣottamadeva's *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* (Abhyankar (1976: 149)), 98 with Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* (Abhyankar (1976: 254)), 87 with Nīlakaṇṭha's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (Abhyankar (1976: 311)), 100 in Haribhāskara's *Paribhāṣābhāskara* (Abhyankar (1976: 365)), and PŚ 93.2. I will not go into the details regarding the proof for this metarule's existence. For this, the reader may consult the passages just cited.

[146]Such a dubious pedigree and the lack of explicit support from Patañjali led Nāgeśa to ultimately reject this and the other rules under PŚ 93. See the final section of the following chapter for more details.

[147]MahāBh 1.2.92b, 1.206.13d, 5.33.72a, 7.122.18a, etc. *Rāmāyaṇa* 2.94.22d, 5.20.38c, etc. See Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 370) for additional citations from the epics. It is also to be found in the archaizing *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*: BhP 4.1.6a, 10.30.36b, etc.

[148]Goodall and Isaacson (2003: 370) are, in my opinion, correct in accepting the reading of the Kashmirian MSS as original. Jinasumdra also retains *kāmayānā*.

[149]He also offers a second interpretation whereby *kāma-yānā* is a *bahuvrīhi* compound: *kāmaṃ yānaṃ gamanaṃ yasyāḥ*, "whose vehicle, means of going, is desire." Cf. Vallabhadeva's explanation in fn. 150, p. 281.

albeit without ascription, and by giving a supporting example from the *Rāmāyaṇa*; an alternative explanation follows.[150] In the second occurrence of *kāmayāna*, however, we find no variants in Dwivedī's critical apparatus. Accordingly, several commentators cite Vāmana to explain the form: Mallinātha, Aruṇagirinātha, and Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita.[151] One possible explanation for the alteration in the first instance and not in the second is that the 19th *sarga*, with its erotic content and less than glorious end of King Agnivarṇa,[152] was not a suitable chapter to be read with young children at the early stages of learning Sanskrit. As a consequence, there would have been less motivation to smooth over grammatical oddities that have a recherché explanation. With this example, we see another positive treatment of a possibly dubious usage of Kālidāsa, the explanation for which may well lie in the fact that the KV offered a means for explication that was absent for forms like *āha*. Still, with regard to altering or retaining the form, we can note that other factors besides grammar, such as whether or not it occurred at the early stages of Sanskrit learning, may have played a pivotal role. Also worthy of note is that Vāmana is only the second person to make use of what would later be a standard *paribhāṣā* but one without the express support of Patañjali, a topic I will delve into in the following chapter.

5.3.2.3 On Growing Roots

The final *sūtra* from the KAS I would like to discuss in relation to acceptance deals with the Sanskrit *Dhātupāṭha*, "recitation of roots," and how it is to be constituted. One of the long-standing debates about this list is its authorship, specifically, did Pāṇini have his own DhP and, if so, how does it relate to the DhP we currently have. In short, he certainly did have one, and it most certainly was different from the one we now possess,[153] but it hardly seems to have ever been

---

[150]Vallabhadeva ad RaghuV 5.38: *kāmayānety atrāgamavidher anityān mugabhāvaḥ | yathā bahv etat kāmayā-nasyetyādi | yad vā kāmena yānaṃ yasyāṃ sā svecchāmātratantrā ||* "in this (form), *kāmayānā*, the augment *mUK* is absent because a rule for an augment is non-mandatory. For example Rām 6.5.101 'of her desiring this very much.' Or rather, it is she whose conveyance is by means of desire, one whose contrivance is only her own desire."

[151]Nārāyaṇa designates the metarule quoted by Vāmana as a *nyāya*, "maxim."

[152]For the content of this *sarga*, see Dezső (2014).

[153]Bronkhorst (1981) and (1983) deal with the history of the DhP, in particular whether or not the authors of the KV were willing to make alterations and the originality of meaning entries. Ultimately, Bronkhorst (1983: 360) argues that "[t]he whole of the Dhātupāṭha, including the meaning entries, was apparently considered by the authors of the *Kāśikā* as Pāṇini's own word, in which no alternatives should be made." Whether or not this is true — I find it difficult

conceived of as a closed list, as I have pointed out on the basis of the text of the DhP itself (*bahu-lam etan nidarśanam*) and a sūtra from Vāmana.[154] I would like to return to this sūtra and look more closely at its influence. The sūtra along with the auto-commentary run as follows:

mili-klibi-kṣapi-prabhṛtīnāṃ dhātutvaṃ dhātugaṇasyāparisamāpteḥ || KAS 5.2.2 ||

[*svavṛtti*] *milati viklabati kṣapayatītyādayaḥ prayogā dṛśyante | tatra mili-klibi-kṣapi-prabhṛtīnāṃ kathaṃ dhātutvaṃ gaṇapaṭhitānām eva dhātusaṃjñāvidhānāt | vardhate dhātugaṇaḥ iti hi śabdavida ācakṣate | tenaiṣāṃ gaṇapāṭhe 'numatiḥ śiṣṭaprayogād iti* ||

KAS 5.2.2 √*mil*, "to assemble," √*klav*, "to be afraid,"[155] and √*kṣap*, "to destroy," are roots because the list of roots is not complete.

[Auto-commentary:] One finds the usages: *milati*, "assembles," *viklavati*, "is afraid," *kṣapayati*, "destroys,"[156] etc. How, in those usages, can √*mil*, √*klab*, √*kṣap*, etc. be roots because the technical term *dhātu*, "root," is prescribed only for (items) recited in the list (scil. DhP)? About this he says: because the list of roots is not complete. For those who know language (*śabda*) declare that the list of roots is growing. Therefore, these (√*mil*, etc.) are accepted in the recitation of the list (of roots) on the basis of the usage of the learned.

In addition to confirming, yet again, the authority of the learned, this sūtra asserts that the DhP was not a closed entity toward the end of the first millennium, an opinion shared by others, as we will see. Before turning to further evidence in support of this statement, in particular from Bhojadeva, we should first determine whether Vāmana had any specific reason for mentioning these particular roots, i.e., were √*mil*, etc. current in *kāvya* literature prior to the 9th century?

I present below the authors who have used the three roots in question as finite verbs (for the most part). My selection is limited to those who are prior to or approximately coeval with Vāmana, although I have also included references to a few authors or anthologies later than the

---

to prove conclusively — the Pāṇinian DhP reached the first extant commentators, Kṣīrasvāmin and Maitreyarakṣita, in different versions. It is worth noting that Cardona (2004: 99–104) has taken some pains to demonstrate that (p. 104) "the major claim upon which Bronkhorst [scil. Bronkhorst (1983)] bases so much of his later argumentation itself rests on an insufficient understanding of what is said in the text of the Mahābhāṣya to which Bronkhorst appeals." I must admit that I had independently arrived at a similar conclusion and agree, furthermore, with the assertion of Cardona (2004: 279, fn. 5) that Bronkhorst has been willing to draw fairly sweeping conclusions on rather shaky, if not misunderstood, evidence. I hope to take up the topic at a later point.

[154]I have briefly touched upon these topics in chapter 2, p. 87.

[155]The spelling *klab* is also found.

[156]I will discuss the semantics of √*kṣap* below.

9th cent. in order to show that the roots continued to be in use.

- √*mil*: *Amaruśataka* 11a[157] Bāṇa's *Caṇḍīśataka* 87d;[158] Dāmodaragupta's *Kuṭṭanīmata* 592a;[159] Daṇḍin's DKC Ucchvāsa 2, p. 22;[160] Mayūra's *Sūryaśataka* 68b;[161] Śrīharṣa's NaiC 1.97c, 4.67d, 6.3c etc.;[162] SuRaKo 1.6a (7), 1.11b (12), 3.1b (25), etc.[163]

- √*klav*: *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* ch. I p. 8 v. 7b.[164] Most common is the adj. *viklava*, "frightened, bewildered, confused," which is well attested in *kāvya* from the time of Aśvaghoṣa.[165] In all likelihood √*klav* was posited to explain this adj. See below.

- √*kṣap*:[166] KumS 5.28b;[167] RaghuV 8.47d;[168] Śāk 7.34c;[169] DKC Ucchvāsa 1.5, p. 52;[170] *Harṣa-carita* Ucchvāsa 7, p. 222;[171] *Kuṭṭinīmata* 366a,[172] 819c,[173] 974c;[174] SuRaKo 17.8b (472), 17.33d (497), 21.52d (686), 33.74a (1092), 48.6d (1599).[175]

This data set, incomplete as it may be, demonstrates beyond doubt that Vāmana had good

---

[157]With Vema's commetnary: *yātāḥ kiṃ na* **milanti**, "do not those who have left return?"

[158]**milatsu** *trividiṣu*, "before the assembled inhabitants of heaven." Trans. Quackenbos (1917: 346).

[159]*sataḍin-**milad**-balākām*, "of lightning and assembling cranes." Trans. Dezső & Goodall (2012: 229).

[160]*nija-caraṇa-kamala-yugala-**milan**-madhu-karāyamāṇa-kākapakṣaṃ*, "him, whose locks of hair were acting like the bees gathering on his own pair of lotus-like feet.

[161]*aśrānta-bhrānta-cakra-krama-nikhila-**milan**-neminimnā*, "[i]ndented by the felly which is connected in its entirety with the course of the wheel that is unweariedly revolving." Trans. Quackenbos (1912: 188).

[162]I have tallied over a score of occurrences.

[163]The reader may consult Ingalls (1965: 59f, 61, 66f.) for a translation of the individual verses. I have noted over a dozen occurrences of √*mil* in the SuRaKo.

[164]**viklabanti** *divi grahāḥ*, "The planets grow frightened during the day." This is an example given for √*klav*, on which see below. I have not located any other attestations of finite forms.

[165]*Buddhacarita* 1.68b, *Saundarānanda* 7.46d, MeghD I.37d, KirātA 1.6a, ŚiśuP 7.43d.

[166]NB that Vāmana does not provide any meaning for this root and what I list here is purely based on formal considerations. Modern lexicographic sources associate *kṣapayati* with √*kṣi*, "to destroy," for which see PW p. 545, MW p. 328a, Whitney (1885: 25) and AD p. 622a, as well as with class X √*kṣap*, "to throw," for which see PW p. 530, MW p. 326a, and AD p. 622a.

[167]*tad aṅgaṃ* **kṣapayanty** *aharniśam*, "tormenting her own body day and night." *kṣapayantī* is a reading peculiar, as far as I know, to Vallabhadeva. Others read *glapayantī*, "causing to grow faint," which has a similar meaning.

[168]**kṣapitā** *tadviṭapāśrayā latā*, "the vine, clinging to its (scil. the tree's) boughs, was destroyed." Based on the glosses of Hemādri and Mallinātha, *nāśitā* and *pradhvaṃsitā*, "caused to perish," respectively, *kṣapitā* was perceived as a causative of a root meaning "to perish."

[169]*mamāpi ca* **kṣapayatu** *nīlalohitaḥ*, "May Śiva end my (rebirth) as well."

[170]*katham imāṃ kṣapāṃ* **kṣapayāmi**, "How can I make this night pass?"

[171]*śarīraṃ* **kṣapayataḥ** *śuna iva nijadāraparaṅmukhasya*, "of a man who ignores his own wife like a dog who causes his own body to perish."

[172]**kṣapayati** *vasanāni sadā*, "will always tear up all the clothes." Trans. Dezső & Goodall (2012: 155).

[173]*tatrātmānaṃ* **kṣapayati**, "will torment himself." Trans. Dezső & Goodall (2012: 131).

[174]**kṣapayati** *yaj janam evaṃ*, "and tortured men." Trans. Dezső & Goodall (2012: 365).

[175]The reader may consult Ingalls (1965: 180, 185, 226, 315, 420) for a full translation of each verse.

reason to single out the three roots that head his list. Each root, however, has a slightly different story to tell. The of case of √*mil* is remarkable because it does not show up in the works of the earlier poets, namely, Aśvaghoṣa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, and Māgha.[176] Although I certainly may have missed attestations for any number of reasons, I do not believe it would be rash to conclude that we see the very emergence of √*mil* in the poems of Bāṇa, Mayūra, Daṇḍin, etc., and that it is precisely these usages (as well as others) that Vāmana wanted to account for. The root's continued popularity can, therefore, be justified both by the habits of great poets as well as by the support of the KAS and other theoretical texts, as we will see presently. For √*klav*, which is well attested in the primary derivative, *viklava*, the situation differs — at least from the standpoint of a modern grammar of Sanskrit — insofar as Vāmana (or some predecessor) has created a root for what is an underived adj.,[177] a scenario backed by the near complete absence of finite forms in literature and its only noted attestation deriving from an example for the root itself. The root √*kṣap*, with the present stem *kṣapaya-*, is the most intriguing of the three. On account of the root's long pedigree back to Kālidāsa, its absence in the DhP is striking, and our modern dictionaries of Sanskrit, as I have pointed out in fn. 166, explain the form as a causative from √*kṣi*, "to destroy." The commentators to *Raghuvaṃśa* 8.47d, quoted in fn. 168, agree with this meaning. Another possible etymology of the root is that it derives from *kṣāpayati*, "to make burn, set on fire," a back-formation with a shortened *a*.[178] From the view of semantics, this makes good sense and would also fit well with Vallabhadeva's gloss ad KumS 5.28b *kleśayantī*, "paining." But regardless of how we might want to explain the development of each root, Vāmana was well justified in wanting to add them to the DhP. The question now is whether or not his advice was heeded.

Like so many of our oldest śāstric texts, the Pāṇinian DhP cannot be divorced from the commentaries that accompany it with the implication that the earliest commentator, Kṣīrasvāmin

---

[176]Whitney (1885: 121) gives the root as attested only in the classical language. More specificity can be found in PW p. 783 *ad loc.*: "Diese im Epos und auch bei Kâlidâsa, wie es scheint, noch nicht vorkommende Wurzel (im Dhâtup. kann sie später eingefügt worden sein) is wohl aus मिथ् hervorgegangen." My own searches confirm this distribution.

[177]Cf. Mayrhofer (1967: 202), where no likely etymology is offered. On the other hand, cf. Kṣīrasvāmin's derivation quoted below.

[178]Cf. Mayrhofer (1992: 423) for further references. Mayrhofer grades this etymology with a *vielleicht* "perhaps."

(11th cent. Kashmir) — with Maitreyarakṣita close on his heels — is responsible not only for his own explication of the root text but is simultaneously its editor as well. We cannot, therefore, know with any certainty what the Pāṇinian DhP looked like for Vāmana or any one else prior to Kṣīrasvāmin, and a comparison with the MDhP gives an idea of how much variation existed. If we take Kṣīra at his word, however, he has exercised a very light editorial hand and done his best to explain the text as received and add, with proper citation for the most part, the opinions of others, above all those of Durga on the *Kātantra Dhātupāṭha* and Candra on the *Cāndra Dhātupāṭha*.[179] If we want to understand how Vāmana's general suggestion and the specifically mentioned roots were adopted (or not), we must turn first to the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* and then the later DhP commentators and follow up any leads. We can, then, move further afield and look at the DhP of other grammars. Thankfully, Liebich (1930: 212f.) has already carried out the task of collating the different DhPs. We may summarize his findings as follows:

- √*mil*: MDhP VI.83 *mila śleṣaṇe*, VI.155 *mila saṅgame*; SDhP VI.82 *mila śleṣaṇe*, SDhP VI.145 *mila saṅgame*; Cāndra DhP VI.7 *mila saṃgame*; Śākaṭāyana DhP VI.76 *mila saṃghāte*, Hemacandra DhP IV.97 *mila saṃśleṣaṇe*.[180] Absent in the "old" *Kātantra* DhP[181] and noted by Kṣīrasvāmin, KṣDhP VI.71 *mila śleṣaṇa iti Durgaḥ*, as a root according to Durga, i.e., from the Kātantra DhP.

- √*klav*: absent. Kṣīrasvāmin mentions √*klav* in his commentary (p. 198), on which see below.

- √*kṣap*: MDhP X.384 *kṣapa preraṇe*; SDhP X.395 *kṣapa preraṇe*;[182] Hemacandra DhP X.323.

---

[179]On his reportative rather than judgmental commenterial style, see the close of his remarks ad KṣDhP I.8: *yuktāyuktatve tv atra sūrayaḥ pramāṇam; vayaṁ hi matabhedapradarśanamātreṇaiva kṛtārthāḥ, munimukhyānāṁ vākyaṁ kathaṁkāraṃ vikalpayāmaḥ? vayam api hi skhalanto 'nyaiḥ kivan nopālapsyāmahe!* "But learned men are the authority with regard to what is admissible or not, since how could we, who have reached our goal merely by presenting the divergences of opinion, call into question the statements of the highest sages? For, how much will the likes of us, when we stumble, be criticized by others!" Cf. Palsule (1961: 246). On the inclusion and analysis of others' opinions, see his sixth opening verse: *bhagnāḥ Pārāyaṇikāś Candrādyā api ca yatra vibhrāntāḥ | tān dhātūn vivarītuṃ gahanam aho adhyavasitāḥ smaḥ ||* "Where the scholars are at odds and when Candra, etc. diverge, we are obliged, alas! at great pains, to explain those roots."

[180]Cf. the table in Liebich (1930: 338).

[181]When Liebich (1930: 213) speaks of √*mil*'s absence "im alten Kātantra-Dh." he refers to the Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit DhP in the Tanjur collection, given by him in Anhang III. Palsule (1961: 36–41) has argued convincingly that there is no particular reason to assume that this DhP belongs specifically to the *Kātantra* school of grammar. What presently goes under the name of the *Kātantra* DhP together with a commentary is by Durgasiṃha. Cf. Palsule (1961: 49–53). This work is not yet published. Cf. Verhagen (1994: 82).

[182]Here, both Maitreya and Sāyaṇa are giving √*kṣap* as an example of a root that is *anukta*, "unstated," (in the DhP)

Kṣīrasvāmin mentions √kṣap in KṣDhP I.860 as root from a sūtra by Bhoja = SKĀv 1.1.192.

Of the three roots singled out by Vāmana, only √mil gained wide acceptance in the DhP's. According to Kṣīrasvāmin, it was already present in Durga's DhP but not in the version of the Pāṇinian DhP he had received. Candra also has it in his DhP. The two later commentators on the Pāṇinian DhP have √mil but do not mention it as coming from another source. √kṣap, on the other hand, only enters the DhP's of Maitreya and Sāyaṇa as an example for roots that were not recited in the DhP but which should still be considered roots because the list of class X roots is only exemplary, not exhaustive, a notion built into the DhP itself with the *dhātusūtra*: *bahulam etan nidarśanam*, "this illustration (of the roots) is variable."[183] √klav, finally, seems to have been too fictitious for anyone to seriously list it as a root. The reason that √mil and √kṣap were able to obtain admittance into the DhP appears to be based on the frequency of their usage, i.e., wide acceptance by learned men, whereas the near absence of √klav as a finite verb did not warrant inclusion.[184]

So far we have seen that the roots mentioned by Vāmana were in use, even if somewhat artificially in the case of √klav, and that several DhP's adopted the other two. There is, however, additional evidence in the theoretical treatises that Vāmana's sūtra played an important role in the expansion of the DhP. For this we will remain with the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* but must also look to Bhojadeva, an occasionally quoted predecessor of Kṣīrasvāmin.[185] So far we have seen one sūtra from SKĀv 1.1.192 to justify the inclusion of √kṣap, but a longer passage is quoted from the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (ch. 1 p. 7f.) in the context of *bahulaṃ etan nidarśanam*. Let us look at the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* passage (p. 198) in more detail since it is here that both the KAS and the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* play an important role.

---

but that should still be considered as one.

[183]Kṣīrasvāmin applies this to the entire DhP (cf. below), whereas Maitreya and Sāyaṇa limit it to the tenth (*curādi*) *gaṇa*: DhPra p. 149 = MDhV p. 401 *curādāv adantadhātudarśanaṃ bahulaṃ veditavyam* | "It should be understood that the illustration of the roots ending in short *a* in class X is variable."

[184]That is to say, I postulate that most grammarians were content to take *viklava* as a mere adjective without an underlying root. Note, however, that Kṣīrasvāmin still refers to √klav when glossing *viklava* in his commentary ad AKKṣ 3.1.44a: *viklavate kāratarībhavati viklavaḥ* | *klavir dhātugaṇāparisamāpter laukikaḥ* | "what is *viklava* is frightened (*viklavate*), i.e., becomes timid. √klav is a root on the basis of general usage because the list of roots is not complete."

[185]Namely, ad KṣDhP I.9, 854ff., 872, 1033; X.392.

[*dhātusūtra*] *bahulam etan nidarśanam.*

yad etad bhavatyādi (KṣDhP I.1) *dhātuparigaṇanaṃ tad bāhulyena nidarśanatvena jñeyam. tenāpaṭhitā mili–klavi–prabhṛtayo laukikāḥ, stanbhu-stunbhv-ādayaś* (P. 3.1.82) *ca sautrāś culum– pādayaś* (MBh II.55.18 ad P. 3.1.35) *ca vākyakārīyā dhātava udāhāryāḥ. vardhate hi dhātugaṇaḥ. tathā ca śrībhojaḥ...*

[Dhātusūtra:] This illustration (of the roots) is variable.

The entire list of roots that begins with √*bhū* should be understood as a variable illustration. Therefore roots that have not been recited, such as √*mil*, √*klav*, etc. from common usage, and ones like √*stambh* "to support," √*stumbh*, "to stop," etc. (cf. P. 3.1.82) found in sūtras, as well as roots like √*culump*, "to swing," etc. (MBh II.55.18 ad P. 3.1.35) from the author of the statements (i.e., Patañjali) should be exemplified, since the list of roots grows. Bhoja, moreover, (gives the following examples).

Kṣīrasvāmin gives a threefold division of the roots not listed in the DhP (*apaṭhita*):[186]

1. *laukika*, "derived from common usage," roots.[187]

2. *sautra*, "derived from (Pāṇini's) sūtra," roots.[188]

3. *vākyakārīya*, "derived from the author of the statements (i.e., Patañjali)," roots.

Although it is not cited by name, Kṣīrasvāmin must have known KAS 5.2.2[189] and appears to be drawing on this sūtra when he mentions √*mil* and *vardhate hi dhātugaṇaḥ*. I do not doubt this, but there seems to have been yet another intermediary, namely Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.

This encyclopedic work on poetics begins with a lengthy exposition of grammar, near the beginning of which the three types of *prakṛti*, "basic elements," are listed: *dhātu*s, *pratyaya*s, "suffixes," and *prātipādika*s, "nominal stems." Roots are then further subdivided into six types — each of the three basic elements has six subtypes — in a symmetric way. They can be:[190]

1. *paripaṭhita-dhātu*s, "roots recited (in the DhP)."

2. *aparipaṭhita-dhātu*s, "roots not recited (in the DhP)."

---

[186]Sāyaṇa repeats this division in his MDhV (pp. 401f.) where he records that others, i.e., Kṣīrasvāmin, extend the scope of *bahulam etan nidarśanam* to all *gaṇa*s. As already noted, Maitreya and Sāyaṇa both restrict it to the tenth class. Cf. fn. 183

[187]Cf. commentary ad KṣDhP I.197 and I.553.

[188]The KV ad P. 7.2.18 also speaks of √*rabh* as a *sautra* root in order to give a base for *viribhita* listed in P. 7.2.18.

[189]Kṣīrasvāmin cites the KAS under Vāmana's name ad KṣDhP IV.61 and I.934.

[190]*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* ch. 1 p. 7–12.

3. *paripaṭhita-aparipaṭhita-dhātu*s, "roots recited (in the sūtra) but not recited (in the DhP)."

4. *pratyaya-dhātu*s, "roots formed with a suffix (such as *saN*, etc.)."[191]

5. *nāma-dhātu*s, "roots from nouns (i.e., denominatives)."

6. *pratyaya-nāma-dhātu*s, "suffix-noun-roots."[192]

The first three categories are the types of roots Kṣīrasvāmin deals with in the passage quoted above. *Aparipaṭhita* corresponds to *laukika*; *paripaṭhitāparipaṭhita*, to *sautra* and *vākyakārīya*. Despite not repeating Bhoja's categories, which are singular in Sanskrit grammar, Kṣīrasvāmin does go on to quote four verses that derive, presumably, from those that Bhoja gives as examples for the roots not recited in the DhP as well as roots from the sūtras.[193] That Bhoja likewise knew of Vāmana's sūtra comes through in the roots that he uses in his example verse:

> **milanty** *āśāsu jīmūtā* **viklavante** *divi grahāḥ* |
> *tapaḥ*[194] **kṣapayati** *prāvṛṭ kṣīyante kāmivigrahāḥ* ‖ (ŚPra ch. 1 p. 8)

> The clouds assemble in the directions. The planets become frightened during the day.
> The rain destroys the heat. The bodies of the lovers perish.

The reason that neither of these authors mentions Vāmana, though they both knew the KAS, can perhaps be explained by a general acceptance at the time that the DhP was in need of updating based on the usage of learned men like the great poets cited above. Vāmana's sūtra was, therefore, only a reaffirmation of a well-known fact. In any case, Bhoja usually does not mention his sources by name. In the case of Kṣīrasvāmin, it may have been sufficient, or even of greater value, to quote Bhoja as an authority instead of Vāmana. Recall that the SKĀv 1.1.192 was cited for the addition of √*kṣap*. It seems that we have hardly begun to appreciate the importance of Bhoja's grammatical works for the later tradition.[195] What we can observe with certainty, however, is how grammarians found ways to expand the list of roots by incorporating data from sources like

---

[191]The desiderative, causative, etc. roots.

[192]These include roots formed from nouns with the null suffix *KviP* in the sense of acting like by P. 3.1.11.3.

[193]The verses, as numbered in Liebich's edition p. 198, correspond to those in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* pp.7–9 as follows: 1 = 7 (with minor variants), 2 = 8 (with minor variants), 3 = 9, 4 = 5. The rearrangement is so as to match the order in which the types of roots are listed in the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*.

[194]Rāghavan prints *tāpaṃ* in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* p. 8.

[195]Cf. Aurṇagirinātha's citation of the SKĀv 1.4.165 ad KumS 5.65, discussed above on p. 271.

literature and, in the case of Kṣīrasvāmin, from non-Pāṇinian sources like Durga. One oddity, in my opinion, is that we lose any reference to the list of roots being governed by the usage of the learned, as we saw in the KAS, although one could argue that it is implied.

We may close this discussion on KAS 5.2.2 by reflecting on how the later DhP commentators handled the same issue of expansion and what kind of implications this has for the reflexivity of the grammatical tradition at different points in time and space. In essence, Maitreya and Sāyaṇa take more or less the same approach. To begin with, and as I have already pointed out above[196], both of them limit the maxim *bahulam etan nidarśanam* to the final *gaṇa*, the consequence of which is that √*mil* cannot be added as an *apaṭhita* root because it belongs to class VI, whereas √*kṣap* can since it is a class X root. These factors must have led to the presentation of the DhP as commented on by Maitreya and Sāyaṇa: √*mil* is listed without any hint that it is an addition and √*kṣap* is given as an example of what should be included in the tenth *gaṇa* even if not explicitly listed. Although Sāyaṇa certainly knew the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* — there is no evidence that Maitreya did — and hence the history of how these roots entered into the DhP, he chose to elide the influence of the non-Pāṇinian sources and present the two roots as an organic part of the DhP. For Kṣīrasvāmin, √*mil* was from Durga and √*kṣap* from Bhoja. I stress, though, that this is no generalization. Sāyaṇa has preserved for us an unbelievable wealth of information about the history of Sanskrit grammar and the interpretation of the DhP, but in this instance we happen to be able to trace the history of a few roots independent of Sāyaṇa and have discovered that he has not told the entire story. The trend to attribute more and more to the Pāṇinian tradition and to forget the other traditions is on full display here. If we wish to understand how Sanskrit grammar developed during much of its history, we must delve into the other systems and read the available commentators closely for signs of what has been lost or omitted.

---

[196]See p. 286, fn. 183

5.3.3   Summary

With this handful of examples I have tried to demonstrate that the KAS provided commentators with an important reference work outside of the strict domain of grammar for criticizing or defending poetry and that many of the grammatical points Vāmana addressed continued to generate debate and new explanations both inside and outside of the Pāṇinian tradition. I could add further examples, such as KAS 5.2.9 for the addition of *te* and *me* as instrumentals, but this task would be best reserved for a new annotated translation of the entire *Śabdaśuddhi*. The underlying motivation for many of these discussions is the ongoing project among a group of learned exegetes to make sense of a large, highly valued body of literature, Sanskrit *kāvya*, in light of the normative texts at their disposals, above all the A. One reason that we find commentators struggling to fit poetic usage in the framework of Pāṇini's grammar is that he, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali did not account for many of the linguistic features of Epic/Purāṇic Sanskrit, a neglect that would not have caused much trouble had the great Kālidāsa not chosen to retain many of these forms in his own poetry. As I have shown, *avaihi*, *āha*, *kāmayāna-*, *āsa*, and, I add now, *me* as an instrumental[197] all have parallels in the Epics or even Vedic literature, much as was the case for the perfect active participles in *KvasU*. But in accounting for these forms commentators hardly seem to have been able to reach any long-lasting consensus, ranging from Vallabhadeva's censorious *pramādaja*, "born from folly," to Hemādri's grand survey of possible explanations for *āsa*. In such texts we witness the growth of manifold discourses open to adopting new sources as authorities, such as Bhoja and the *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa*, for those very instances where Pāṇini and Patañjali fail to support the usage of great poets. Much further research is needed on this topic, but I hope the evidence thus far offered will convince that we have yet to fully understand the means and sources of textual analysis and perceptions of what Sanskrit has been during its long history.

---

[197]For examples of *me*, *te*, etc. as instrumental pronouns in the epics, see Oberlies (2003: 102) with further references. I have given instances of this usage in *kāvya* on p. 265 above.

5.4 Move over, Patañjali

Our final adventure in the KAS will take us back to Patañjali and reveal how this most venerable of grammarians was supplanted as an authoritative source thanks to Vāmana's more accessible formulation. Unlike many of the examples we have seen so far, this one will provide some insight into how the vast ocean of the *Mahābhāṣya* and Bhartṛhari's commentary thereon was digested for the later commentarial tradition without, at times, any acknowledgment of the ultimate source. I find this particular case important for the history of Sanskrit grammar and its application to literature because it parallels, in some ways, how the KV and other non-Pāṇinian systems of grammar sifted out important addenda from the MBh for simpler presentation and tighter incorporation into the framework of a unified Sanskrit grammar. Although I would not go so far as to say that those commentators who cite Vāmana did not know the MBh (many undoubtedly did), they nevertheless did not feel obliged to reference the great commentary when it was possible to do so. Besides adding to our understanding of what counts as an authoritative source, if we view this example from the point of pedagogy, it also indicates what kind of texts students were expected to know and to pass on to their own students when explicating the poetic masterpieces.

We will now take up an example of syntax. The root √*śak*, "to be able," can be used in Sanskrit with an infinitive in a manner similar to English, as in *devadattas tvāṃ draṣṭuṃ śaknoti*, "Devadatta is able to see you." The usage of √*śak*, however, diverges from English when the speaker wishes to express a further level of modality such as necessity, obligation, or the like. Such modal expressions are often rendered with a passive construction in Sanskrit, a literal translation of which would be clumsy in English. For example, if one wanted to say in Sanskrit "Devadatta must be able to see you," one possible translation would be *śakyā tvaṃ devadattena draṣṭum*, literally," you must be able to be seen by Devadatta." Yet, neither one of the provided English translations captures the exact grammar of the Sanskrit. For in Sanskrit the gerundive, or future passive participle, *śakya*, expresses the passive voice (not the inf. as in English) and agrees in case, number, and gender with the patient (*karman*) of the main verb "to see," namely *tvam*,

"you." Since Sanskrit has only an active infinitive, the same form *draṣṭum* occurs in both sentences and the morphology of √*śak* determines the voice: *śaknoti* is active, whereas *śakyā* is passive. The most relevant point from this grammatical exposition for the following discussion is that the verbal adjective *śakya* must agree in case, number, and gender with the patient of the main verb, in this case *tvam*, "you," (fem., sing.). The construction described above has two further variations, as Speijer (1886: 304) explains, one of which is in violation of Pāṇinian norms and consequently causes problems for commentators. The objectionable construction arises when the neut. sing. form *śakyam* appears to be modifying a word in the nominative,[198] but not in the neut. sing. Take, for example, the following hemistich from the *Mahābhārata*:

śakyam adya tvayā bhartuṃ moghas te 'yaṃ pariśramaḥ || (MahāBh 12.8.9cd)

Literally: "Today it should be able to be endured by you, this fruitless labor of yours."

Idiomatically: "Today you must be able to bear this fruitless labor of yours."

According to the rule given above, we expect *śakyaḥ*, which agrees with *pariśramaḥ*, "labor," in case, number, and gender. Since this construction occurs from time to time in Epic as well as Classical Sanskrit, including *kāvya* (examples to come), a commentator must either reject the usage outright and condemn the author for his bad grammar or find a way out. Vāmana, as already promised, provides an escape.

śakyam iti rūpaṃ karmābhidhāyāṃ liṅgavacanasyāpi sāmānyopakramāt[199] *|| KAS 5.2.23 ||*

KAS 5.2.23 The form *śakyam* occurs for the denotation of the patient because gender and number also start off generally.

Vāmana himself provides a passage to which we may apply this sūtra. By now, it will come as no surprise that it stems from Kālidāsa.

---

[198]The non-problematic variation is the impersonal or *bhāve* construction whereby the gerundive *śakya* stands in the nom. neuter sing., i.e., *śakyam*, and the patient and agent occur in the acc. and instr., respectively. This is a rather rare construction. Besides for the example which Speijer cites, Rām 3.40.4 (numbered 3.38.4ab in the critical edition), I have also noted an example in MahāBh 6.116.12. For a more thorough study of constructions with a neuter adj. such as *śakyam*, *yuktam*, etc., see Höfer (1847). As he notes on p. 182, concern about such seemingly ungrammatical constructions in western scholarship goes as far back as Westergaard. I am not aware of any secondary literature on the Sanskrit grammarians' discussions on this topic.

[199]Other editions invert *karmābhidhāyām* and *liṅgavacanasyāpi* with no real effect on meaning.

śakyam oṣadhipater navodayāḥ karṇapūraracanākṛte tava |
apragalbhayavasūcikomalāś chettum agranakhasaṃpuṭaiḥ karāḥ || KumS 8.62 ||

> The newly arisen rays of the the herb-lord (i.e., the moon), tender like timid sprouts
> of barley, could be cut by the curves of your fingernails' tips so as to adorn your ear
> with an ornament.

In this finely crafted verse, *śakyam* does not agree with the word in the nominative, *karāḥ*, "rays"
masc. pl., but thanks to Vāmana's sūtra, readers of the *Kumārasambhava* need not find fault with
Kālidāsa's grammar. Now it is our task to understand why *śakyam* can be used in this manner
and on what authority Vāmana formulated his justification.

The problem for which Vāmana wants to provide an explanation and the explanation itself
are old. The purport of the sūtra is as follows: Vāmana takes *śakyam* to be a common form with
respect to both number and gender because these categories start out (*upakrama*) as general, i.e.,
viśeṣānapekṣāyām without reference to a particular, as he supplies in the auto-commentary ad
KAS 5.2.23. Gopendra explains that the common gender is the neuter and the common number
is the singular,[200] and that we have no reference to any specific number or gender because it is
the poet's wish to express these commonalities.[201] All of this must be understood at the cerebral
level, i.e., the beginning of the mental process of referencing an object and building a sentence. I
would, however, also like to test whether or not there is, in usage at least, a syntactic restriction
by which *śakyam* should come before its head noun. This will be taken up below. As for possible
sources within the grammatical tradition, we find already in the MBh that Patañjali ad P. 6.4.174.4
accords a rather general status to the neuter among the three genders, though in terms slightly
different from Vāmana's.[202] Furthermore, by P. 1.2.69 Pāṇini himself prescribes the neuter and,
optionally, the singular for referring to multiple words whose genders are neuter as well as fem. or

---

[200]*Kāmadhenu* ad KAS 5.2.23 *liṅgasāmānyaṃṃ napuṃsakaṃ vacanasāmānyam ekatvam |* "the neuter is the common with respect to gender. The singular is common with respect to number."

[201]*Loc. cit. liṅgavacanasāmānyasya vivakṣaṇād|* "because of the intention to express the commonality in gender and number."

[202]MBh III.234.21 *ekaśrutiḥ svarasarvanāma yathā napuṃsakaṃ liṅgasarvanāma |* "mono-tone is undistinguished with respect to the accents just as the neuter is undistinguished with respect to the genders." *sarvanāman* literally means "a name for all, pronoun," but in this context it seems to mean something closer to "undistinguished, undifferentiated." Cf. TGS p. 329 where this passage is cited and translated. Renou renders *sarvanāman* with "indifférenciation."

masc. Haradatta ad P. 1.2.69 claims just this.[203] Yet the *locus classicus* for this construction, which Vāmana himself may or may not quote in his *svavṛtti*,[204] stems from the Mbh. Patañjali, quite unintentionally, planted the seed for this discussion of *śakyam* while commenting on a vārtt. in the *Paspaśāhnika* (the exact context is of no moment for our present discussion):

> *śakyaṃ cānena śvamāṃsādibhir api kṣut pratihantum |* (Mbh I.8.10)

> And therefore hunger can be beaten back even by dog-flesh etc.

Although the semantics of this statement have dietary implications, from a grammatical point of view only the disagreement between the neuter *śakyam* and the fem. sing. noun *kṣudh* (*kṣut* in sandhi), "hunger," causes concern. We are fortunate that this passage occurs toward the beginning of the MBh in a section for which Bhartṛhari's commentary is available and can, therefore, see whether his remarks influenced Vāmana.

In his commentary, Bhartṛhari identifies the problem with Patañjali's sentence and offers the following defense for the usage:

> *naiṣa doṣaḥ | sāmānyopakramo viśeṣeṇābhidhānam | iha śakeḥ kṛtyaḥ sāmānyadravyav-iṣaye karmārthe pravṛttaḥ | sa prāptaliṅga evājahalliṅgatāviśeṣeṇa bhidyate |* (Bronkhorst (1987b: 26))

> This is not a problem. There is a beginning with generality; the denotation (of the object) with specificity. Here (in Patañjali's statement) the gerundive has been employed after √*śak* in the sense of a direct object, the referent of which is a general object. Only once it has acquired its gender, is it distinguished by the qualification of having an inseparable gender.

Bhartṛhari's comments on this passage constitute, quite possibly, the only extant discussion of the *śakyam* problem prior to Vāmana, and should, therefore, prove helpful in understanding Vāmana's sūtra. In the first place, the main point of his comment and Vāmana's sūtra seem strikingly

---

[203]KVPada vol. I p. 385 *sāmānyavivakṣāyām ekaśabdatvam ekavacanam napuṃsakatvam ca bhaviṣyati |* "When there is the intention to express a commonality, there will be a single word, the singular number, and the neuter gender."

[204]The passage is absent in the edition edited by Śrīkṛṣṇasūri, which I generally follow, but present in the others I have been able to consult. Cappeller (1880: 10) also translates it. Immediately after KumS 8.62, the editions have: *atra ca bhāṣyakṛdvacanaṃ liṅgam | śakyaṃ ca śvamāṃsādibhir api kṣut pratihantum iti |* "The words of the author of the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya* are a token (of the correctness of this construction): 'and hunger can be beaten back even by dog-flesh.'" Note the absence of *anena* in comparison with the standard reading of the passage in Kielhorn's edition, in which no variants are listed for this passage.

similar, both in sense and wording. Bhartṛhari's explanation also asserts that one can begin with a general notion of an object, and therefore use the neuter gender (and singular[205]) since it is not specific to any one gender. A similar idea, with closer wording to the MBh passage, is also formulated in the *Vākyapadīya* in the *Liṅgasamuddeśa*, "Exposition on Gender" (VP 3.13.18cd), for which Helarāja gives the example *kiṃ jātam*, "what happened?" when one is unsure about the specific qualities the object of inquiry possesses.[206] Helarāja's comments and example give us a better idea about the general syntactic and semantic contexts where the neuter can be used in reference to an undistinguished object and are a later witness to more or less the same explanation Vāmana reports on the basis, one can presume, of Bhartṛhari.[207]

Zooming out a bit, I would like to briefly turn to other attestations of this construction and how commentators have dealt with them. The construction appears first in the *Upaniṣad*s, more extensively in the Epics, and subsequently occurs with some regularity in classical Sanskrit, above all in poetry.[208] That we find a somewhat problematic construction (i.e., one in need of comment) once again entering *kāvya* from the Epics is in concert with the other examples from the KAS presented above, and further occurrences are not difficult to come by, both in the *Mahābhārata*[209]

---

[205]Bhartṛhari does not mention number because there is no such conflict in Patañjali's sentence, but one could easily extend the same logic to number as we have seen Haradatta do in his *Padamañjarī* in fn. 203 above.

[206]In VP 3.13.18cd Bhartṛhari introduces *sarvanāman* from the MBh: *sthiteś ca sarvaliṅgānāṃ sarvanāmatvam ucyate* || "and stability (= neuter gender) is said to be the 'pronoun' of all the genders." Cf. the *Prakāśa* of Helarāja *ad loc.*: *yathā hi tadādi sarvanāma vastumātrapratyavamarśajanakam avihatapravṛtti sarvatra, tathā napuṃsakam api viśeṣāvivakṣāyām abhedena sarvaliṅgaparāmarśakaṃ kiṃ jātam ityādāv avyakte guṇasandehe prayogārham iti* || "For just as a pronoun like 'it' etc. generates a reference back to any object without its motivation for usage being impeded in reference to anything, so too does the neuter refer to all genders when one does not intend to express anything particular (and) it is properly used in such sentences like 'what happened?' in reference to an indistinct object about whose qualities there is doubt."

[207]Kaiyaṭa's explanation of the MBh passage (MBhPra vol. I p. 66b) also continues the same line of argumentation, although he adds: *tataḥ śabdāntarasambandhād upajāyamānam api strītvaṃ bahiraṅgatvād antaraṅgasaṃskāraṃ na bādhate iti śakyam ... kṣut ity uktam* | "Therefore, since being feminine, even though it is produced on account of a connection with another word (scil. *kṣudh*), does not block an internal formation because it is external, 'hunger can be ... ' is said." Reference is here to the metarule PŚ 50, which prescribes a hierarchy of application for two operations applicable at the same time. The operation with a cause internal to the other will take precedence. See Kielhorn (1960: 221–268) for a complete translation and explanation. Kaiyaṭa treats the cause for the feminine gender on *śakyam*, i.e., *kṣudh*, as external to other causes for applying case and gender to *śakyam*, such as the speaker's intention not to express something specific. A similar argument can be found in Rantaśrījñāna's *ṭīkā* ad KĀ 2.166 p. 116.

[208]Cf. AiGr II.2 p. 800 with earlier literature. Though here asserted, I have not been able to independently confirm any examples from the *Upaniṣad*s.

[209]I offer the following instances found in the critical edition: MahāBh 1.99.4.ef *na te **śakyam** anākhyātum **āpad** dhīyaṃ tathāvidhā* "For such a calamity as this cannot be named by you." 1.130.5ab *sa kathaṃ **śakyam** asmābhir*

295

and the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[210] Sanskrit *kāvya* likewise contains a fair number of examples beginning with the poetry of Aśvaghoṣa.[211] Kālidāsa likewise does not shy away from the construction[212] nor do some of his followers,[213] although both Bhāravi and Māgha avoid it, another indication that these two authors have striven for an indubitable level of grammatical correctness. Given the fact that the *śakyam* construction can be justified both by reference to Patañjali's own words and explained, according to such grammarians as Bhartṛhari, Helarāja, and Kaiyaṭa, on a theoretical level by invoking the speaker's intention, commentators had options for clarifying such passages with *śakyam*. Vallabhadeva, following the text printed in Patel's edition p. 60,[214] reproduces most closely Bhartṛhari's words in his *Dīpikā*, i.e., that one begins generally and then moves to denote a specific object and therefore the difference in gender does not prevent coreferentiality.[215] Mallinātha gives much the same explanation but adds a citation of KAS 5.2.23 and that Patañjali is

---

apakraṣṭuṃ balād itaḥ "How can he be driven back from here by us with force?" The apparatus records: "Ñ₂,₃ B D T₁ G (G₆ om.) M₅ शक्यतेस्मा॰ — " This variant appears to "correct" the construction. 5.50.58cd *cakre **pradhir** ivāsakto nāsya **śakyaṃ** palāyitum*, "like a felly fasted onto a wheel (the repetitious nature of time) cannot be escaped by him." Note that *asya* should be construed as the agent. Cf. Höfer (1847: 184). MahāBh 5.103.33cd ***ete devās** tvayā kena hetunā **śakyam** īkṣitum* "How can these gods be seen by you?" Additional occurrences can be found in MahāBh 12.243.16c, 13.8.28cd, 13.35.20ab, 13.103.32ab, 13.134.57cd, 14.48ef.

[210]Examples from the critical edition are: Rām 1.6.8 ***kāmī** vā na **kadaryo** vā **nṛśaṃsaḥ puruṣaḥ** kva cit | **draṣṭuṃ śakyam** ayodhyāyāṃ **nāvidvān** na ca **nāstikaḥ** ||* "Not a lustful man or a miser or a crueal one could be found anywhere in Ayodhyā, and also not an unlearned one and not a non-believer." Sim. 1.6.15ef. 4.27.8cd ***śakyam añjalibhiḥ pātuṃ vātāḥ** ketakigandhinaḥ ||* "The winds, redolent of screw pine flowers, can be drunk with cupped hands." See also Rām 4.018.023c, 4.40.43cd, 4.41.45ab, 5.9.41cd, 6.47.106.

[211]Two examples in *Buddhacarita* 2.2ab ***ye ... na maṇḍalam śakyam** ihābhinetum*, "which (elephants) cannot be brought to the stable," and 12.102ab.

[212]KumS 8.62, translated above on p. 293, and 8.72 *śakyam ... pattrajarjaraśaśiprabhā... utkacayitum* "the moonlight, broken into pieces by the foliage, can be braided"; Śāk 3.4 *śakyam ... āliṅgituṃ pavanaḥ*, "the wind is able to be embraced." This is the reading given with Rāghavabhaṭṭa's commentary. There is, however, the other reading *śakyo 'ravinda-* given by Vasudeva (2006: 134) and Pischel (1922: 29). The reading with *śakyam*, however, is also known to Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita and Govindarāja, a commentator on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as we will see presently, and I do not doubt that it is the original one. The change to *śakyo* was possible because the *āryā* meter employed here is based on a moraic and not a syllable count.

[213]I provide here but a few examples: Daṇḍin in DKC Ucchvāsa 2.1, p. 55 ***aśkyaṃ** hi ... **daśanacchada** eṣa cumbayitum*, "this lip cannot be made to kiss." Abhinanda in *Rāmacarita* 2.17 ***śakyam** arcitum ... **raviḥ** ||* "The sun can be praised." Ratnākara in HV 45.23cd ***sā** tarjanītulitavistṛtasaṃniveśā **śakyaṃ** vidhātum ativelabalair bhavadbhiḥ* "It (scil. the earth) can be made by you, who has excessive force, to have its vast expanse comparable to the index finger."

[214]It is to be questioned whether this is in fact Vallabhadeva's commentary. See the arguments proffered in Narayana Murti's edition, pp. XIXf.

[215]Vallabhadeva ad KumS 8.62 *pūrvaṃ sāmānyopakramaḥ paścād viśeṣābhidhānam iti bhinnaliṅgavacanatve 'pi sāmānyādhikaraṇyaṃ na virudhyate |* "First there is a general beginning; afterwards, reference to a specific object. Therefore, coreferentiality (between *śakyam* and *karāḥ*) is not obstructed even though (*śakyam*) expresses a different gender."

the authority for such a usage.[216] These two commentators do not fail to live up to expectations: Vallabhadeva provides a straightforward, though well researched gloss with no citation whereas Mallinātha gives a much longer gloss with due reference to Vāmana and the master grammarian, Patañjali. If we now move somewhat further afield and examine the statements of other commentators, we will see that other possibilities were available.

Two other, now familiar commentators on the *Kumārasambhava*, Aruṇagirinātha and his follower and expounder, Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, explain *śakyam* in KumS 8.52 in much the same way as Mallinātha insofar as KAS 5.2.23 is quoted, but what is absent in both commentators is any reference to Patañjali or any other grammatical authority. In addition to Vāmana's sūtra,[217] Aruṇagiri only notes that *sāmānyopakramo viśeṣāvivakṣā*, "a general beginning is the absence of the intention to express a specific." Nārāyaṇa expands on his predecessor's comments but does not add anything we have not already seen in other grammatical commentaries. What he does add is two further examples of the construction, both of which I have already quoted: Śāk 3.4[218] and Rām 4.27.8cd. The absence of any reference to Patañjali in these two commentaries is striking considering that two other examples from poetry are marched forth. A similar intertextual justification is also employed by Govindarāja in his commentary on the *Rāmāyaṇa* in which he also cites Śāk 3.4 as another example of *śakyam*.[219] Taking a completely different route, Cāritravardhana does not cite any of the authors or grammatical explanations discussed so far but rather

---

[216]Mallinātha ad KumS 8.62: *śakyam iti viparītaliṅgavacanasyāpi sāmānyopakramāt karmābhidhāyakatvam | paścāt karmaviśeṣākāṅkṣāyāṃ karāḥ iti nirdeśo na virudhyate | yathā vāmanaḥ śakyam iti rūpaṃ liṅgavacanasyāpi sāmānyopakramatvād iti | atra pramāṇam śakyaṃ śvamāṃsenāpi (sic) kṣut pratihantum iti bhāṣyakāraprayogaḥ iti ||* "On 'it is possible': even though it expresses a different gender, it denotes the patient because of a general beginning. Afterwards the specification 'hands' is not obstructed when there is expectation of a specific patient. For example, Vāmana says that 'the form *śakyam* (even applies) to what expresses a (different) gender because of a general beginning.' For this the authority is the usage of the author of the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*: 'hunger can be beaten back even by dog flesh.'"

[217]In Aruṇagiri's commentary as printed, KAS 5.2.23 reads: *śakyam iti rūpam **a**liṅgavacanasyāpi karmābhidhāyāṃ sāmānyopakramāt*, with the negative particle *naÑ* appended to *liṅgavacanasya* and with two words in inverted order.

[218]This passage, in turn, has a very thorough commentary by Rāghavabhaṭṭa, who cites first Patañjali's usage of *śakyam* and then KAS 5.2.23.

[219]Govindarāja ad Rām 1.6.8. Note that he explains *śakyam* as a *nipāta*, "set form," and thereby rejects the grammatical explanations thus far examined.

derives *śakyam* as a *bhāve*, "action," noun with the suffix *ṆyaT* by P. 3.1.124.[220] He then gives

the underlying idea (*bhāva*) as *tvayā karṇapūraṃ kartum utsāhaḥ kriyatām*, "an effort should be

made by you to make an ornament for your ear." In this manner, Cāritravardhana has been able

to skirt the entire issue about the gender and number of *śakyam*. Other explanations may well

have existed, but the commentaries I have quoted are perhaps sufficient at present to identify

both consistencies and areas of variation.

This last example from the KAS is unique among those we have so far looked at because it

allows us to trace the explanation given by Vāmana back to earlier grammatical sources, a privi-

lege we do not have for most of the other sūtras in the *Śabdaśuddhi*. As as consequence, we can

know with greater exactness the authorities that commentators could chose from when giving

their own justification for the *śakyam* construction. To summarize, Mallinātha and Rāghavab-

haṭṭa, the most thorough of the quoted commentators, refer to both Vāmana and Patañjali —

Mallinātha even identifies Patañjali as the *pramāṇa*, "valid means of knowing," for the construc-

tion — whereas Vallabhadeva, at the other extreme, only provides the grammatical justification

about how a speaker can at first express himself in general terms with the neuter but fails to quote

any text or authority by name. Aruṇagiri only cites Vāmana without mentioning Patañjali, and

Nārāyaṇa follows suit but includes further examples from Kalidāsa's oeuvre and the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Cāritravardhana comes up with an entirely novel explanation for which one only needs recourse

to Pāṇini's sūtras. These commentators represent how much variety there can be in both the type

of explanation as well as how a certain explanation is justified. Most relevant to the KAS is the

fact that Vāmana served as an intermediary between the grammatical tradition and the poetic

commentaries, that is to say, the KAS is quoted and not Bhartṛhari or some other grammarian. In

the somewhat extreme case of Aruṇagiri and Nārāyaṇa, Patañjali's usage is not mentioned as a

model but rather other examples from *kāvya* (in Nārāyaṇa's commentary). We observe here that

examples of a similar grammatical construction in poetry could serve to fill the same structural

---

[220]Cāritravardhana ad KumS 8.62: *śaknoteḥ ṛhalor ṇyat iti bhāve ṇyat* | "*ṆyaT* after √*śak* in the meaning of the action." Cf. P. 4.1.124 *ṛhalor ṇyat* "*ṆyaT* occurs after a root ending in *ṛ* or a consonant." The *kṛtya*, "gerundive," suffixes range from P. 3.1.95–133 and denote either the action or the patient of the root to which they are added. Cf. MBh II.81.3 and KV ad P. 3.3.171: *bhāva-karmaṇoḥ kṛtyāḥ*.

element in a commentary as a quote from the *Mahābhāṣya*. Lastly, a commentator such as Cāri-travardhana ignored all previous explanations and came up with his own. Much as we saw with *āsa*, commentators on Sanskrit poetry could and often did avail themselves of modes of linguistic analysis outside the strict Pāṇinian tradition and rarely does a lasting consensus appear to have been reached.

5.5 Conclusions

From my study of just a few select sūtras in this chapter, I have been able to situate Vāmana's *Śabdaśuddhi* as an important player within the three interconnected domains that have been our main concern throughout this thesis: grammar, Sanskrit poetry, and commentaries thereon. Vāmana, as a master grammarian and wide reader of *kāvya*, could zoom in on specific problematic usages within his corpus of Sanskrit literature and offer, in many cases, a means to validate them within the current Pāṇinian system of grammar, although simple additions were also necessary such as *te* and *me* as instrumentals. Unfortunately, in many instances we do not know to what extent Vāmana innovated when his explanations are unprecedented in our extant sources, and later commentators' reliance on a sūtra from the KAS is no guarantee of originality. This point was clearly born out by the case of *śakyam*. If we did not have access to Bhartṛhari's *Dīpikā* on the MBh, Vāmana would be our earliest source that fully and clearly explains how one can express an object generally with the neuter gender. Nailing down how Vāmana interacted with the grammatical texts he received is further hampered by the fact that grammarians generally do not quote his work when discussing various explanations of Pāṇinian sūtras or seemingly aberrant forms from poetry. The only exception to this I have so far found is in the DurghV ad P. 3.2.162 on *chidura*, *bhidura*, etc. Still, from our vantage point it is in the KAS that several important concepts appear for the first time, like deriving *āsa* from class I √*as*, adding *dhavan* to the *vrīhyādi* list, and the metarule that the teaching of augments is not mandatory as in *kāmayāna*. In the following chapter we will have the occasion to track the development of another metarule

perhaps first proposed by Vāmana. The larger trajectory of such innovations, however, lands, more often than not it seems, in a rejection from either Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita or the great Nāgeśa,[221] a result of an ever increasing deference to Patañjali.

Among commentators on Sanskrit poetry, Vāmana had a much warmer reception (or a reception at all) than among the grammarians. The *Śabdaśuddhi* undoubtedly formed a part of the standard works a good reader of *kāvya* should know by heart and one that commentators would come to rely on, even if not universally. Vallabhadeva seems to tacitly accept Vāmana's explanation of *kāmayāna* ad RaghuV 5.38 and of *śakyam* ad KumS 8.62, but does not even mention the basic argument in favor of *āsa* ad KumS 1.34. Hemādri, on the other hand, quotes most frequently from the KAS, after Pāṇini's sūtras and the *vārttika*s, as a source for discussing Sanskrit grammar, and I have the impression that this holds for Mallinātha as well although exact statistics are not available. Beyond the rather obvious observation that the *Śabdaśuddhi* gained popularity among commentators because it was tailored for just this purpose, the work's prominence reflects the larger culture of textual exegesis throughout the first half of the second millennium and beyond. Far from being in an exclusive dialog with the version of Sanskrit described/prescribed by Pāṇini and Patañjali, we have unearthed several other individuals who were taken as important authorities for grammatical correctness, such as Vāmana and Bhojadeva.

As for the poetry itself, Vāmana plays an integral part because his sūtras often point us to places where a text was liable to change and provides us with, or at least directs us to, the grammatical discussions that help to explain why a particular passage would be subject to alteration. Many of these usages were problematic for grammarians because they continued particular forms from the language of the Epics (or even the Vedas) that the three sages of grammar did not account for in their grammar, at least in the domain of the standard language. Through the *Śabdaśuddhi* and later texts with similar goals, many of these deviations were able to find acceptance in the Pāṇinian system, and we bear witness to one of the early attempts to bring the language of the sacred texts (*śruti*, *śmṛti*, *itihāsa*, *purāṇa*s) into the fold of grammar via *kāvya*. This process contin-

---

[221]Nāgeśa rejects both metarules in the PŚ, Bhaṭṭoji does not accept *dhavan* into the *vrīhyādi* list, and already Haradatta does away with the broader meaning of the suffix *-KuraC*.

ues later in the commentaries of Sāyaṇa on the Vedas and smaller works like the *Mukhabhūṣaṇa* and *Ārṣaprayoga*, in which attempts are made to find Pāṇinian derivations, often quite creative, for non-standard forms. The study of these works will have to wait for a later time.

Chapter 6

The Life and Death of a *Jñāpaka*

tan na bhāṣye 'darśanāt |

"It does not exist because it is not found in the *Bhāṣya*."[1]

—Nāgeśabhaṭṭa

6.1 Introduction

Paralleling the longer case study from the BhKA, in this second chapter on the KAS I will present a more detailed exploration of the reception and development of one sūtra from the KAS. Unlike the study of *KvasU*, however, the contents of Vāmana's rule — a *jñāpaka*, "hint," leading to general maxim — is eventually incorporated into one of the most complex ancillary texts of Sanskrit grammar, the collections of *paribhāṣā*s, "metarules," and has a vibrant life throughout the Pāṇinian tradition and the commentarial literature. In addition to belonging to a different branch of Sanskrit grammar, this study will illustrate just how disruptive Nāgeśa can be to his received tradition by defaulting to Patañjali for all matters grammatical. Furthermore, I hope to contribute to our understanding of how the *paribhāṣā* literature evolved over the course of time and that the justifications for these metarules could derive from sources outside of grammar proper, at least

---

[1]See § 6.8.

from the evidence presently available to us.

6.2   A Problem of Voice

One of the well known morphological instabilities of the verbal system in early Indo-Aryan is the use of the *parasmaipada* (hence para.[2]), "active, transitive,"[3] and *ātmanepada* (hence ātm.[4]), "middle," endings with specific verbal roots in the active voice (*kartari*). The former more or less oust the latter at the stage of middle Indo-Aryan.[5] If we base ourselves on Pāṇini's grammar, however, the use of these endings in the active voice is thoroughly regulated for classical Sanskrit: some verbs always take para. endings, some always ātm., and many can take the one or the other (*ubhayapadin* roots) based on certain semantic or syntactic conditions.[6] Yet deviations from the prescriptions of Pāṇini occur in a variety of genres, in particular the Epics and Purāṇas,[7] and these changes in the language are usually continued into the Prakrits. For example, the root √*labh* should always take the ātm. endings in classical Sanskrit: *labhate*, "takes," but we encounter *labhati* in the Epics,[8] and the same form continues into the Prakrits under the guise of *lahaï*.[9]

Although it is generally acknowledged within the Sanskrit tradition that the authors of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and the Purāṇas composed in *ārṣa* Sanskrit — the register of the inspired *ṛṣi*s "seers, sages" — and did not, therefore, need to follow the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* for the standard language that a poet like Kālidāsa should also deviate from the Pāṇinian norm gave

---

[2]The corresponding adjectival form is *parasmaipadin* in Sanskrit. I will, however, use the same abbreviation for both.

[3]Both are poor, albeit traditional, translations of *parasmaipada* for the simple reason that the *ātmanepada* endings are also used both transitively and in the active voice. Cf. Whitney (1896: 200), especially § 529 in which the "Hindu grammarians" are misrepresented.

[4]The corresponding adjectival form is *ātmanepadin* in Sanskrit. As before, I will use the same abbreviation for both.

[5]Cf. Lassen (1837: 333f.), Pischel (1900: 321, 324f.), and Woolner (1917: 42). The ātm. endings are still present in Pāli and the inscriptions of Aśoka as well as sporadically in the Prakrits. Cf. Bloch (1970: 234) and Ghatage (1993: 89f.), the later specifically for examples from *Ardhamāgadhī*.

[6]See P. 1.3.12–93. Rocher (1968) has investigated Pāṇini's treatment of voice extensively.

[7]Oberlies (2003: 129–132) with further literature. Patañjali (MBh II.64.2–4) cites fluctuations in the ātm. and para. endings as one of the features of Vedic usage that splitting P. 3.1.85 can account for. Cf. Cardona (1996: 183f. and 187).

[8]For examples, see Oberlies (2003: 501).

[9]Woolner (1928: 52). The form *lahe*, "I take," with the ātm. ending is also met with in some Prakrits, e.g., in *Ardhamāgadhī* and *Śauraseṇī*. Cf. Ghatage (1993: 90) and Wollner (1912: 45), respectively.

grammarians as well as commentators reason to pause and contemplate whether there might be a way to justify such seemingly incorrect usages without altering the text of Pāṇini's grammar or its appendix, the *Dhātupāṭha* (*Recitation of Roots*). The reason for this, as we have seen, is that *kāvya* should be composed in a grammatically pure (*śuddha*) Sanskrit as determined by the rules of grammar, usually Pāṇini's. Since poets are not seers like Vyāsa, they cannot lay claim to divinely inspired language and thereby evade accusations of grammatical incorrectness. Nevertheless, poets like Kālidāsa are highly revered as learned men who should not make such slips, so we should ask ourselves whether the fault lies with them or with our own understanding of the rules. Recall how *āsa* and *kāmayāna* could be explained (cf. §5.3.2.2.). For the former, most people were using the wrong root; in the case of the latter, we had to employ a metarule, much as in the present case. According to Vāmana, the impression that poets have incorrectly used para. endings comes from our own misunderstanding of grammar. He is the first to offer, or perhaps to record, a solution to this particular problem, and the impact of this proposal in grammatical and commentarial literature will form the subject of the remainder of the chapter. The results will add further evidence for the influence of grammar on textual criticism in premodern times and also how the criteria for finding *jñāpaka*s, "hints," developed over the centuries.

6.3   Poets in Violation

The most general rule for the addition of the ātm. endings in the A is:

> P. 1.3.12 *anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam* ‖

> The *ātmanepada* endings occur after a verbal root having an indicatory low-pitched vowel[10] or an indicatory Ṅ.

Pāṇini here refers to the various tags, termed *it*s or *anubandha*s in Sanskrit, with which roots are furnished in the DhP. For example, the root √*ās*, "to sit," is listed in KṣDhP II.11 as *ā́sa upaveśane*,

---

[10] *anudātta* literally means "not raised, not high-pitched." Since the accents have long disappeared from the recitation of the A, there is no need to dwell here on the exact phonetic realization of an *anudātta* vowel or what the best translation might be. I will use "low-pitched" throughout.

"*ā́sA* in the meaning to sit."[11] Since the root has an indicatory low-pitched *A*, we can apply P. 1.3.12 and ultimately form *āste*, "sits" with the ātm. ending *-te* in the 3ʳᵈ pers. sing. active of the present tense. Similarly, √*śī*, "to sleep," will take the ātm. endings because it is marked with a *Ṅ* in KṣDhP II.22 *śī́ṅ svapne*, hence *śete*, "sleeps." The remaining details from this section of the A will not concern us at present. The main point is that either an indicatory low-pitched vowel or *Ṅ* on a root in the DhP will trigger the ātm. endings.

Despite the straightforwardness of the rule, authors of Sanskrit poetry did not always follow it. We can easily find many examples of poets violating this rule because grammarians have quoted a number of different forms from among Sanskrit's most illustrious poets. Commentators on poetry often point them out as well. A selection of forms thus far noted is as follows:

1. Kālidāsa

   - *Meghadūta* 76c[12]: *śiñjat-*, "jingling," in the compound *śiñjad-valaya-subhagaiḥ*, "(with claps) beautified by jingling bangles."

     We have here a present participle of the *ātmanepadin* root √*śiñj*,[13] listed as KṣDhP II.17 *śíji avyakte śabde*, "*śíjI* in the sense of an inarticulate noise." Since the *anudātta* indicatory vowel *I* accompanies the root, it must take the ātm. endings and form the present participle *śiñjāna-* with the middle participial ending, *ŚānaC*.[14] This is indeed the form that Vallabhadeva uses when glossing the compound: *śiñjāna-kanaka-kaṭaka-manoharaiḥ*, "jingling-golden-bracelet-charming," i.e. "charming because of the jingling, golden bracelets."

---

[11]Although the are no longer marked or recited in the DhP, as noted above, we know from the commentators how a root should be accented in the DhP. Taking the root √*ās*, "to sit," as an example, we can see from Kṣīrasvāmin's commentary (p. 105) that it belongs to one of the nineteen roots that are *udāttā anudāttetaḥ*, "high-pitched (and) provided with a low pitched indicatory vowel." Here, *udāttāḥ* modifies the roots just listed and tells us that the radical vowel is accented. *anudāttetaḥ*, likewise modifies the given roots but is a *bahuvrīhi* compound meaning "having a low-pitched *it*," i.e., the indicatory vowel accompanying the relevant roots is low-pitched. Liebich (1920) has conveniently listed all the roots with their proper accentuation, although there are sometimes disagreements among the commentators. Since the accentuation of the roots in the DhP is of importance for the present study, I cite roots with their appropriate accents throughout this chapter. Note that a vowel without any accent mark is to be considered *anudātta*.

[12]MegaD 76 with Vallabhadeva, 2.18 with Mallinātha.

[13]This is the form found in modern dictionaries. It is, as is often the case, different from the root found in the DhP.

[14]Cf. P. 1.4.100, which defines the ātm. endings and P. 3.2.124, which prescribes the present participle suffixes.

Śaraṇadeva quotes the form as worthy of inquiry in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* ad P. 1.3.12 p. 13, as does Sāyaṇa in the *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* ad SDhP II.9 p. 229 as well as ad SDhP II.17 and Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa in the *Prakriyāsarvasva* vol. V p. 1. See my discussion below in § 6.6.1.

- *Raghuvaṃśa* 4.28d: *tarjayan*, "threatening."

  Vāmana mentions √*tarj* as one of the roots that can take the para. endings according to the *jñāpaka* to be discussed. According to KṣDhP X.142 *tarja saṃtarjane*, we can only expect *tarjayate*. Kṣīrasvāmin ad KṣDhP *ibid.* does inform us, however, that *lakṣye bhartsayati tarjayatīti dṛśyate*, "in poetry *bhartsayati* and *tarjayati* are met with." Cited in MDhV ad SDhP X.147–148 p. 387, but explained as deriving from the class I root, SDhP I.225 *tarja bhartsane*. See my discussion below in § 6.6.2.1.

- *Raghuvaṃśa* 19.29c: *prārthayanti*,[15] "they request."

  pra + √*arth* should only take ātm. endings according to the entry KṣDhP X.357 *artha upayācñāyām*, "*arthA* in the sense of solicitation."

  prārthayanti is quoted in MDhV p. 229 and SK ad P. 2.4.46 (SK 2607, vol. III p. 446) and reported as a *varia lectio* in Dwivedī's edition, p. 639.[16] See my discussion below in § 6.6.2.2.

2. Bhartṛhari

- *Śatakatrayam* 1.98b: *śikṣatu*, "may he learn."[17] By KṣDhP I.636 *śikṣa vidyopādāne*, "*śikṣA* in the sense of conveying knowledge," the low-pitch accented *A* indicates the root takes ātm. endings. Note, however, that Kṣīrasvāmin ad KṣDhP *ibid.* remarks that para. are possible under certain semantic specifications. See also my discussion below

---

[15]A present tense in this context is highly unexpected given the perfects in the surrounding verses: 19.28d *cakāra* and 19.30c *pipriye*.

[16]In MSS K-1, AH 3, and C-4. The reading can also be found in Scharpé (1964: 291) with a reference to the 1832 edition of the *Raghuvaṃśa* published in Calcutta, to which I do not have access. For the bibliographical details, see siglum "C" in Scharpé (1964: i).

[17]According to Kosambi's edition of 1946, p. 69; poem 48 in Kosambi's edition of 2000, p. 21. Kosambi (2000: Introduction p. 73f.) himself draws the reader's attention to this form as part of a proof that "rigid Pāṇinian rules do not necessarily hold for the present collection." As we will see, this Pāṇinian rule is not so rigid. I will return to the interpretation of Pāṇini's rules in general at the conclusion of this paper.

in § 6.9."

- *Śatakatrayam* 3.2d: *jṛmbhasi*,[18] "you expand." According to KṣDhP I.416 *jṛmbhi gātravināme*, "*jṛmbhI* in the sense of spreading one's limbs," √*jṛmbh* should only take ātm. endings.

  jṛmbhasi is quoted in MDhV p. 229 and PrS vol. V p. 1.

3. Bhaṭṭi, *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 8.123b:[19] *cetayanti*, "they are attentive." According to KṣDhP 135 *cita saṃcetane* "*citA* in the meaning to discern," √*cit* should take ātm. endings not only on account of the indicatory low-pitched *A*, but also because it belongs to a list of roots explicitly noted as *ātmanepadin* in the DhP itself: KṣDhP p. 180 *ā kusmād ātmanepadinaḥ*.[20] Śaraṇadeva also includes this form in the DurghV ad P. 1.3.12 p. 13.

4. Māgha, *Śiśupālavada* 4.20a *udayati*, "rising," present participle of *ud* + √*ay* or √*i*, i.e., KṣDhP 935 *áyà gatau*, "*áyÀ* in the sense of going,"[21] or MDhP I.320 *i gatau*, "√*i* in the sense of going." Mallinātha glosses with the "correct" form *udayamāne*.[22] Haradatta in KVPada vol. 6 p. 179 and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in the SK both quote this example ad P. 8.2.19 (= SK 2326). Kṣīrasvāmin as well ad KṣDhP I.340–342. See my discussion below in § 6.6.2.3.

5. Bāṇa *Caṇḍīśataka* (*A Century to the Fierce Goddess*) 14a[23] *valati*, "advances," with para. endings against KṣDhP I.520 *vála saṃvaraṇa*, "*válA* in the sense to covering over."[24]

One could certainly find other examples, but that these famed poets, all prior to Vāmana, use forms that run against P. 1.3.12 must have risen a few eyebrows, especially among grammatical sticklers. At present, it is not my goal to divine the minds of these poets and offer an explanation

---

[18]The numbering and reading follow Kosambi's edition of 1946, p. 115. In his edition of 2000, p. 58, however, Kosambi the printed reading is *jṛmbhaṇi*, "o expanding (desire)," but the word is underlined with a squiggly line to indicate the editor's uncertainty. One misses here critical notes to the text.

[19]As numbered with Jayamaṅgala's commentary. 8.124b with Mallinātha.

[20]Cf. Palsule (1961: 34).

[21]Note that the grave accent marks a *svarita*, "circumflex," vowel.

[22]Renou (1941: 41, fn. 6) brought me to this example.

[23]For text, translation, and notes see Quackenbos (1917: 280f.).

[24]√*val* with para. endings is quite common. See further: HV 3.82c, and SuRaKo 604b and 1606d. Cf. Cappeller (1880: 25).

for their dereliction,[25] rather my objective is to understand how grammarians and commentators on poetry reacted. For this we now need to turn to Vāmana.

6.4   Vāmana finds a "hint"

According to the categories of rules presented in the preceding chapter, the sūtra to be discussed presently falls into the category of an admission. Regarding the aberrant usage of the ātm. endings, Vāmana proposes that there is a *jñāpaka*, an "informer, hint," whereby seeming violations of P. 1.3.12 disappear, as we learn from the following sūtra:

> KAS 5.2.3 *valer ātmanepadam anityaṃ jñāpakāt* ‖

The ātm. (endings) after √*val*, "to advance," are non-mandatory because of a hint.

Before proceeding to the *jñāpaka* itself, which is given in the auto-commentary, it is necessary to say a few words about the concept. That Pāṇini's grammar contains indirect statements has played an integral part of its interpretation since Kātyāyana's *vārttika*s,[26] and Patañjali makes regular use of the device as well. To identify the presence of a *jñāpaka*, one must be able to prove that some element is superfluous, by showing that the exact same outcome would result were that element not present. Since no part of the A can be without a purpose, the presence of an apparent redundancy is to inform us of some other rule.[27] These "hints" are discussed at length in subsequent commentaries as well as in independent works,[28] but their main purpose is usually to account for some usage that would otherwise not be possible. In this vein, Vāmana is simply extending an already well established interpretive principle.

As for the *jñāpaka* itself, Vāmana describes his reasoning as follows:

---

[25]Jamison (1979) offers an explanation for anomalous middle endings in the RV.

[26]The first mention of a *jñāpaka* is in P. 1.1.11.5.

[27]Cf. the definition in Renou (1940: 82): *La présence d'un élément « superflu » est le signe, le* jñāpaka *(on pourrait traduire par : révélateur, pour garder la valeur propre du terme) qu'un enseignement indirect est postulé par Pāṇini.* "The presence of a 'superfluous element' is a sign, a *jñāpaka* (one could translate it with revealer, to preserve the proper meaning of the term) that an indirect instruction is supposed by Pāṇini."

[28]Puruṣottamadeva composed the *Jñāpakasamuccaya* (*Collections of Hints*), in which he identifies the sūtras containing *jñāpaka*s following the standard order of the A. One of the primary goals of Nāgeśa in his *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* is the identification of valid *jñāpaka*s that lead to *paribhāṣā*s, "metarules." See Kielhorn (1960: iv–x). I will return to Nāgeśa below.

[*svavṛtti* ad KAS 5.2.3] *kiṃ punas taj jñāpakam | cakṣiṅo dvyanubandhakaraṇam | cakṣiṅa ikāreṇaivānudāttena siddham ātmanepadam | kimarthaṃ ṅitkaraṇam | tat kriyata anudāttanimittasyātmanepadasyānityatvajñāpanārtham | etena vedi-bhartsi-tarjiprabhṛtayo vyākhyātāḥ | āvedayati bhartsayati tarjayatītyādīnāṃ prayogāṇāṃ darśanāt | anyatrāpy anudāttanibandhanasyātmanepadasyānityatvaṃ jñāpakena draṣṭavyam iti |*

[Auto-commentary:] But what is the hint? Furnishing (the root KṣDhP II.7) √*cakṣIṄ* with two indicatory letters. The ātm. (endings) are established by the low-pitched *I* alone. What is the purpose of marking (√*cakṣIṄ*) with Ṅ? It is done so as to make known that the ātm. endings that are conditioned by an indicatory low-pitched (vowel) are non-mandatory. By this (hint) such (roots) as √*vedi*, √*bhartsi*, √*tarji*,[29] are explained because one encounters such usages as *āvedayati*, "reports," *bhartsayati*, "threatens," *tarjayati*, "threatens," etc. Also in other instances, the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings based on a low-pitched indicatory vowel must be understood by (this) hint.

We will return the listed examples below, but first let us look more closely at the *jñāpaka*. As we already know from P. 1.3.12, there are two possible ways to indicate that a root must take the ātm. endings: either by adding a Ṅ or an indicatory *anudātta* vowel. Since √*cakṣiṄ* contains both markers it would appear that there is a redundancy insofar as, if we were to eliminate one or the other, the ātm. endings would still obtain. For Vāmana, the *I* will have already taken care of (*siddham*) the ātm. endings, so the presence of Ṅ must have some other purpose and hence hint at (*jñāpana*) some other rule, namely: roots that take the ātm. endings on condition of having an indicatory low-pitched vowel need not (*anitya*) take only the ātm. endings but can take the para. endings as well. Accordingly, all the examples given above in § 6.3 and those given in the passage just cited come from roots marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel (√*śíjI*, √*jṛ́mbhI*, √*śíkṣA*, and √*válA*, etc.) and can, in accordance with the hint, take the para. endings too. Kālidāsa and any other poet who has made use of such forms are now exonerated from grammatical error. As for the form √*cakṣIṄ*, though listed in the DhP, ultimately derives its

---

[29]Reference is to KṣDhP X.168 *vida cetanākhyānavivādeṣu*, "*vidA* in the sense of experiencing, narrating, and disputing," and X. 142–143 *bhartsa tarja saṃtarjane*, "*bhartsA tarjA* in the sense of threatening." Vāmana refers here to the class X roots because he gives the form *vedi*, the stem before *guṇa*-strengthening caused by the *vikaraṇa*, "class sign," *ṆiC*. Reference cannot be to a causative of any of the other four √*vids* (KṣDhP II.55, IV.62, VI.138, VII.13) because the para. endings would be unproblematic and there would also be a difference in meaning. Similarly, one could derive *tarjayati* as the causative of KṣDhP I.124 *tarja bhartsane* but that also would result in a causative meaning which is not desired in this context. I will return to these roots when I discuss the commentaries on the DhP.

authority from Pāṇini's own usage in P. 2.4.54 *cakṣiṅaḥ khyāñ*, "√*khyā* occurs in place of √*cakṣ* when an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix follows." We, therefore, do not need to concern ourselves with the thorny question regarding the DhP's status as an authoritative, immutable text.

6.5   Grammarians on *cakṣIṄ*

Remaining on the side of theory, I will now turn to how other grammarians dealt with the apparent redundancy in √*cakṣIṄ* and Vāmana's proposed *jñāpaka*. My initial focus will be the (sub)commentators on the A up to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. Thereafter, we will examine the commentaries on the DhP and then summarize the results before moving onto the commentaries on poetry. I will hold off, however, on Nāgeśa till the very end of this study.

6.5.1   Commentators on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

6.5.1.1   Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*

Beginning with Haradatta, one of the first grammarians to deal with the topic,[30] the *anityatva*, "non-mandatoriness," of the ātm. endings after roots marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel finds general acceptance, and examples continue to be cited from literature. As Haradatta's explanation is clearly in the minds of later grammarians, it is worth citing it here in full. In his commentary on the KV ad P. 1.3.11 we find the following remarks (KVPada vol. I p. 412):

> *pratyekam icchabdasyānvaya ity āha anudātteta iti | ye dhātavo ṅitaś ceti | samudāya-sambandhe tu cakṣiṅa eva syāt | sa hy anudāttet paṭhyate vicakṣaṇa ity atra yuj yathā syāt | ṅakāras*[31] *tv anudāttettvanibandhanasyātmanepadasyānityatvajñāpanārthaḥ |*

---

[30]I have not been able to find any remark about a possible *jñāpaka* based on √*cakṣIṄ* in the *Nyāsa*. Although I have not read the entire work, Jinendrabuddhi does not mention anything about the optionality of the ātm. endings in his comments on P. 1.3.11, P. 2.4.54, or P. 7.1.58, where one might expect to find such a discussion.

[31]I correct the printed edition, which has *ñakāras*.

tena sa evāyaṃ nāgaḥ sahati kalabhebhyaḥ paribhavam[32] | *na sahāmi sāhasam asāhasikaḥ*[33] *ityādi siddham* |

> Since the word *it*, "indicatory letter," construes with each (scil. *anudātta* and *ṅ*), he (i.e. the author of the KV) says: "[after] roots that have an indicatory low-pitched vowel and an indicatory *Ṅ*." But if it were the attachment of the whole group (i.e., if a root had to be marked with both an indicatory low-pitched vowel *and* an indicatory *Ṅ*) (the present sūtra) would only apply to √*cakṣIṄ*. (This is not the case) since it is recited (in the DhP) with an indicatory low-pitched vowel so that (the suffix) *yuC* can occur as in *vicakṣaṇa*, "insightful."[34] But the letter *Ṅ* is for the purpose of making known (*jñāpana*) that the ātm. endings that are based on the occurrence of an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory. Therefore, such (verbal forms) in "that very same elephant endures (*sahati*) humiliation from the elephant studs," and "I, as a non-aggressive person, cannot tolerate (*sahāmi*) aggression," are established (as correct).

Haradatta first notes an additional purpose for *I*, namely to include √*cakṣ* within the scope of P. 3.2.149, the application of which requires a root be marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel. He then goes on to give the same explanation for *Ṅ* as we find in the KAS and provides us with two more instances from poetry in which √*sah*, "to endure," takes the para. endings although it is listed in the KṣDhP I.905 *ṣáhA marṣaṇe* with an indicatory low-pitched *A* and should only take the ātm. endings.[35] There are two important points in Haradatta's comments that might not be entirely apparent. His goal is not only to prove that *Ṅ* hints that the ātm. endings are nonessential but that they are nonessential only for those roots that take the ātm. endings by force of an indicatory low-pitched vowel, such as *ṣáhA* and not roots that take the ātm. endings by an indicatory *Ṅ*, such as √*śī*, "to sleep," whose DhP entry is KṣDhP II.22 *śíṅ svapne*. By twice

---

[32] *Subhāṣitāvalī* 631d. Otherwise not identified. The whole verse in the *śikharaṇī* meter runs:
nadīvaprān bhittvā kisalayavad utpāṭya ca tarūn
madonmattāñ jitvā karacaraṇadantaiḥ pratigajān |

jarāṃ prāpyānāryāṃ taruṇajanavidveṣajananīm
sa evāyaṃ nāgaḥ sahati kalabhebhyaḥ paribhavam ||
"He's burst the banks of the river and torn up trees as if they were lotus fibers; he's conquered his rival elephants, mad in masth, with his trunk, legs, and tusks; he's obtained disrespected old age that spawns hatred for the young generation. That very same elephant endures humiliation from the elephant studs."

[33] Unidentified quote in the *pramitākṣarā* meter. The form in question, *sahāmi*, is found elsewhere in Sanskrit literature, e.g., MahāBh 1.1.98d.

[34] According to P. 3.2.149 *anudāttetaś ca halādeḥ*, "the suffix *yuC* (=*anā*) occurs after an intransitive root containing an indicatory low-pitched vowel and ending in a consonant." P. 2.4.54.10 prohibits the substitute √*khyā*.

[35] There is also KṣDhP X.267 *ṣáhA marṣaṇe*. I will return to this entry when I discuss the DhP commentators.

marking √*cakṣIṄ* for the ātm. endings we can infer that the first *anubandha*, *I*, was not sufficient to ensure the essential status of the ātm. endings and therefore a second *anubandha*, *Ṅ*, was necessary. Furthermore, the addition of *I* was needed for the application of P. 3.2.151, so that *Ṅ* could not have been used on its own. As we will see, all of these points are disputed by other grammarians, but that Haradatta knew the same *jñāpaka* as Vāmana is undisputed. We cannot, unfortunately, say with absolute certainty that the KAS was Haradatta's only source although it seems likely that he knew the text.

6.5.1.2 Śaraṇadeva's *Durghaṭavṛtti*

Most later commentators on the A are also in agreement on the validity of this *jñāpaka* and further strengthen its necessity by mustering additional examples from literature. There is no need to quote each of them at length, but I would like to discuss a few details since examples from the latter grammarians are of interest even if their explanation is mostly repetitive. I will proceed in rough chronological order. Śaraṇadeva gives a rather lengthy commentary on P. 1.3.12 with multiple explanations for various verbal forms from poetry that seemingly take the incorrect set of endings.[36] Accordingly, the discussion about √*cakṣIṄ* begins with a question about how to justify the participle *śiñjat-* in MeghD 76c (quoted above on p. 305). Śaraṇadeva provides almost the exact same explanation as Vāmana and Haradatta,[37] but with the important difference that he allows roots marked with both a *Ṅ* as well as a low-pitched vowel to take either the ātm. or para. endings.[38] This is an extension of the Vāmana's original formulation, which was limited to roots marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel, but the evidence form usage is not as strong. Among the seven forms given as examples in the DurghV, only the last one, *trāhi*, "protect!" from KṣDhP 1014 *traiṅ pālane*, is marked with a *Ṅ* in the DhP, and for this form Śaraṇadeva gives an

---

[36]DurghV pp. 13–15 and Renou (1941: 40–45) with French translation. Note that the Renou's text differs from that of Gaṇapati Śāstri, but mostly in the order of the textual blocks. I will follow Śāstri's edition. The DurghV ad P. 1.3.12 is discussed at some length in Rocher (1968: 76–83) and overlaps to some degree with my present discussion.

[37]DurghV p. 13 *cakṣiṅo yujartham ātmanepadārthaṃ cekārānubandhe kartavye dvyanubandhatvaṃ jñāpayati anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam anityam iti* | "Given that the indicatory *I* on √*cakṣIṄ* must be added for the purpose of (the suffix) *yuC* and the ātm. endings, the occurrence of two indicatory letters hints that the ātm. endings after a root with an indicatory low-pitched vowel or *Ṅ* are non-mandatory."

[38]Cf. Renou (1941: 42, fn. 14).

alternate explanation.[39] As we will see later on, other commentators held a similar view.

Śaraṇadeva's commentary offers us the longest list of forms accountable by the *jñāpaka*, two of which I have already cited above, namely, *śiñjat-* and *cetayanti*. Of the remaining four, *syanda*, "flow!"[40] *sevati*, "serves,"[41] *ūhati*, "comprehends,"[42] *labhanti*, "they obtain,"[43] we can now trace two of the passages which have so far been left unidentified. The example for √*syand*, DurghV p. 13, comes from the *Siddhaikavīratantra* 1.18, where the text is read with minor variants.[44] The second identifiable quote is for the use of *ūhati*: *anuktam apy ūhati paṇḍito janaḥ* | "A learned man comprehends even what is unstated." This quarter forms part of a verse in the *vaṃśastha* meter found — to the best of my knowledge — in three sources: *Hitopadeśa* 2.49, *Śukasaptati* 11.4 (86), and *Gāruḍapurāṇa* 1.109.53.[45] In addition to adding sources to these passages, I have taken them up here because they bring us outside the realm of (high) *kāvya* and demonstrate that Śaraṇadeva also had in mind the Sanskrit of different genres, including Buddhist tantric texts (assuming that the *Siddhaikavīratantra* is the only source of the quote). I suspect that similar discoveries could be made throughout the DurghV by searching for the citations more widely than Renou could.

---

[39]The form can also be derived by first creating a root agent noun in *viC* by P. 3.2.75, *trāḥ*, "protector," and then by making a denominative verb with *KviP* in the sense of "acting like" according to P. 3.1.11.3. For a similar trick, see KAS 5.2.27 and Sāyaṇa's comments below in § 6.5.2.3.

[40]KṣDhP I.798 *syándū sravaṇe*.

[41]Part of a longer unidentified passage: *nīcaṃ samṛddham api sevati nīca eva dūreṇa taṃ pariharanti punar mahāntaḥ* | "Only a base man serves a base, rich man. Great men caste him far off." Cf. KṣDhP I.532 *ṣévṛ sevane*.

[42]KṣDhP I.679 *ū́ha tarke*.

[43]In the short phrase: *labhanti punar utthānam* | "They, however, obtain manhood (?)." Cf. KṣDhP I.1024 *ḍulabhaṣ prāptau*.

[44]Edition by Mikkyo Seiten Kyekyūkai. There the text is: *kāśe syanda kuśe syanda syanda tvaṃ śūnyaveśmani mama tvaṃ tathā syanda yathā syandasi vajriṇaḥ svāhā* || *syandamāne cakṣumārjanāc chāntir bhavati* || 18 ||. Cf. Gaṇapati Śāstrī's printed text:
kāśe syanda kuśe syanda syanda tvaṃ śatrumastake |
asmākaṃ tu tathā syanda yathā syandasi (ṣeṇave ?) ||
Renou (1941: 43) has the same with the exception of (*ṣeṇave*), for which he prints *keśave*. I lack the necessary familiarity with the *Siddhaikavīratantra* to give any sort of text critical evaluation of this evidence. I was able to find this passage thanks to the e-text typed in by Ryugen Tanemura and available at: http://garudam.info/files/Siddhaikav%C4%ABratantra.txt (accessed 3/7/2017).

[45]There are minor variations between the three texts.

6.5.1.3 Puruṣottamadeva and Rāmacandra

In the following centuries, the commentators on the A do not add much new to the discussion but bear witness to differing opinions. Let us turn first to the close contemporary of Śaraṇadeva, Puruṣottamadeva.[46] He does not mention anything regarding a *jñāpaka* in √*cakṣIṄ* ad P. 1.3.12, although one of his commentators, Viśvarūpa in his *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā*, does note it in near identical words to what we saw in the DurghV, including the example of *śiñjat-* from the *Meghadūta* and an unrestricted statement that the ātm. endings are non-mandatory.[47] That Puruṣottamadeva did not consider there to be any *jñāpaka* in *cakṣIṄ* is further confirmed by the absence of any reference to it in his *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* and *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.[48] Rāmacandra, the author of *Prakriyākaumudī* (14th), the important predecessor to the *Siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, likewise does not discuss any hint ad P. 1.3.12 or in his commentary on √*cakṣIṄ* and actually seems to indirectly reject the *jñāpaka* by ascribing the purpose of *I* to pronunciation (*ikāra uccaraṇārthaḥ*) since it is impossible to say *cakṣ-ṅ*.[49] Both his grandson, Viṭṭhala,[50] and Kṛṣṇa

---

[46]Although Śaraṇadeva knows and cites the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, I discuss Puruṣottamadeva after Śaraṇadeva for thematic reasons. The two were likely coeval in any case.

[47]*cakṣiṇo yujātmanepadārtham ekānubandhe kartavye dvyanubandhakagrahaṇaṃ jñāpayaty ātmanepadam anityam iti tena śiñjadvalayasubhagair iti sidhyati* | "Given that a single *anubandha* (scil. *I*) must added to √*cakṣIṄ* for the purpose of the suffix *yuC* and the ātm. endings, mentioning (the root) with two *anubandha*s hints that the ātm. endings are non-mandatory. Thereby (the form *śiñjat-* in MeghD 76c) 'with (claps) beautified by jingling bracelets' is established." Wielińska-Soltwedel (2006 I: 79) for the text.

[48]The only passage I have found that has some bearing on the optionality of the ātm. endings is in Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* ad *paribhāṣā* 109, which will be discussed below.

[49]The KV notes several times that a vowel or consonant is *uccāraṇārtha*, e.g., the *i* of the augment *in yiṬ* in P. 6.4.159. See further Scharfe (1971a: 8f.) who postulates that vowels added merely for the sake of pronunciation represent an original schwa vowel (/ə/).

[50]Viṭṭhala provides the *jñāpaka* in his commentary to √*cakṣIṄ*, PrKPras vol. II p. 208: *evaṃ ca ṅakāro 'nudāttetvanimittasyātmanepadasyānityatvajñāpanārthaḥ* | "and so the letter *Ṅ* is for the purpose of hinting at the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings conditioned by the presence of a low-pitched indicatory vowel." Viṭṭhala also gives the suffix *yuC* as a purpose of the *anudātta I* like Haradatta, but is the first commentator we have seen to introduce another technical issue surrounding the two *anubandha*s. One of the possible problems with √*cakṣiṄ* having a low-pitched *I* is that it could trigger P. 7.1.58 *idito nuṃ dhātoḥ*, which prescribes the augment *nUM* after roots marked with an indicatory *I*. The KV discusses in its final remarks ad P. 7.1.58, why roots like √*bhid* and √*chid* do not take the augment *nUM*, even though they are listed as KṣDhP 7.3 *bhidIR* and 7.4 *chidIR*, i.e., with an indicatory low-pitched vowel. The answer is that the entire group *IR* should be taken as the *anubandha*. Cf. P. 1.3.7.4. Yet even if we were to take them piecewise (*avayaśaḥ*), we can still exclude roots like √*bhidIR* because the word *anta* continues from the preceding sūtra, P. 7.1.57, so that the roots to which we add *nUM* are only those that end in *I* (*antedito dhātavaḥ*). Accordingly, the *I* in √*cakṣIṄ* cannot trigger P. 7.1.58 because of the following *Ṅ*. The first person — to the best of my knowledge — to assign this purpose to *Ṅ* is Kṣīrasvamin, for which see § 6.5.2.1 below as well as Maitreyarakṣita's comments in § 6.5.2.2. Sāyaṇa repeats it as well although he ascribes the explanation only to *kecit*, "some." See p. 324 below.

Śeṣa[51] include the *jñāpaka* in their respective commentaries in no particularly novel manner and with clear echoes from Harardatta by including the form *vicakṣaṇa* to exemplify the suffix *yuC* after √*cakṣ*. As for their examples, Viṭṭhala follows Haraddata by quoting the quarter verse *sa evāyaṃ …*, whereas Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa seems to come from *Śaraṇadeva*, for he gives: *anuktam apy ūhati paṇḍito janaḥ; labhanti punar utthānam; piṇḍaṃ grasati.* "A learned man also understands that which has not been stated; they again obtain manhood (?);[52] he eats a ball of rice." The first two are in the DurghV, whereas the last is new to this context.[53]

6.5.1.4 Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's *Prakriyāsarvasva*

Moving ahead in time and to the far south, Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa of Kerala takes the matter a step further in his *Prakriyāsarvasva* by including the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings after roots marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel but without justifying the claim at all; it is simply part of the grammar.[54] His examples are also worthy of note. To begin, he gives two verbal forms without context: *valati*, "turns" and *yotsyāmi*, "I will fight," the sigmatic future (*lṛṭ*) of √*yudh*.[55] The first must, in all likelihood, be a direct reference to the KAS (our only one!), whereas the second is probably inspired by *Bhagavadgītā* 2.4c *iṣubhiḥ pratiyotsyāmi*, "I shall fight against (the two of them) with arrows," although there are other passages as well.[56] He then repeats two examples we have already seen, *śiñjat-* and *jṛmbhasi*, and adds one will see again shortly *sphāya-nirmokasandhiḥ*[57] from Murāri's *Anargharāghava* 1.56b along with what appears

---

[51]PrKPrak vol. III p. 8: *etac cānudāttalakṣaṇam ātmanepadam anityam, cakṣiṅo ṅitkaraṇajñāpanāt* | "And those ātm. endings which are conditioned by an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory." He also adds that suffixing *yuC* is the purpose of the low-pitched *I*.

[52]Without more context it is difficult to know how to interpret *utthānam*, which most literaly means "rising up."

[53]I am not yet able to identify either of the two latter quotes, although there are parallels both for *labhanti* and *grasati*, e.g., MahāBh 5.99.6d and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 12.4.17a, respectively. NB that *piṇḍaṃ grasati* is actually an example in the DurghV ad P. 1.3.12 p. 14, but it is explained either on the basis of the use of *grasati* in the KV ad P. 6.4.14 (but not in our editions!) or because Maitreyarakṣita assigns √*gras* to the *ādhṛṣīya* roots, i.e. those that are optionally class X or I. See Renou (1941: 45) for a translation of the passage and Palsule (1961: 35) for more details on this group of roots.

[54]PrS vol. V p. 1: *anudāttetām ātmanepadam anityam* | "The ātm. endings for verbs marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory."

[55]KṣDhP IV.64 *yudha samprahāre*.

[56]The simple form *yotsyāmi* occurs multiple times elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata*, e.g. 5.144.18b, 8.33.40d etc., and once in *Brahmapurāṇa* 11.12d.

[57]Out of context, the words are difficult to translate. See Törszök (2006: 96f.) for the full verse and translation.

to be a variant of *Kāvyādarśa* 2.45d: *pāyaṃ pāyam araṃsiṣam*, "I delighted drinking time and again."[58] It is difficult to know how much to read into the absence of a proof in the PrS, although it must have been somewhat jarring to other Pāṇinians since Nārāyaṇa is the only one to leave out a reference to the *jñāpaka*.

6.5.1.5 Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita

In the works of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, which constitute the penultimate stage of Sanskrit grammar, there is little new to add to the discussion. In the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, Bhaṭṭoji twice mentions that the ātm. endings can be optional based on the familiar *jñāpaka*. The first instance arises during a discussion of P. 8.2.19 = SK 2326,[59] when the reader is asked how to explain *udayati* in ŚiśuP 4.20 (quoted above, p. 307). The first response involves taking advantage of a sandhi ambiguity in KṣDhP I.342 *káṭī́ gatau* insofar as *kaṭī* can stand for *kaṭi* + *i* with √*i* being another root of the first *gaṇa* whose present tense would be *ayati*, "goes."[60] On second thought, however, Bhaṭṭoji adds: *anudāttettvalakṣaṇam ātmanepadam anityam*, "the ātm. endings which are conditioned by an indicatory low-pitched vowel are not mandatory." In the second instance under √*cakṣIṄ* (SKDhP 1017), we learn that the basis for the *jñāpaka* depends on the Ṅ, as expected.[61] One can also read Bhaṭṭoji's *Śabdakaustubha*, which offers an overview of the many discussions surrounding P. 1.3.12, but nothing particularly new.[62]

---

[58]The transmitted reading in all editions of the *Kāvyādarśa* I have consulted is *pāyaṃ pāyam aramyata* forming part of a *bhāve*, "impersonal," construction with the agent *mayā*, "by me," in pāda c. The version with *araṃsiṣam* would require the preceding pāda to be reworked.

[59]P. 8.2.19 *upasargasyāyatau* | "*l* occurs in place of an *r* belonging to an *upasarga* when √*ay* (KṣDhP I.503) follows."

[60]SK vol. III p. 149. The explanation for this form is much older and already cited, along with the entire verse, in the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* ad KṣDhP 340–342 but attributed to the opinion of *anye*, "others." I discuss other explanations of this form below on p. 338. Cf. PrS vol. VI p. 21, where various opinions on the *dhātusūtra* are put into verse. Also quoted in the commentary ad *Dhātukāvya* 1.42.

[61]SK vol. III p.265: *ṅakāras tu anudāttettvalakṣaṇam ātmanepadam anityam iti jñāpanārtham | tena sphāyan-nirmokasandhītyādi sidhyate* | "But Ṅ is for the purpose of making known that the ātm. endings conditioned by an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory. Therefore *sphāyannirmokasandhi* etc. are established." We saw the same example, *sphāyat-* in *Anargharāghava* 1.56b, above in the preceding section.

[62]*Śabdakaustubha* vol. II p. 62. In this very learned work, Bhaṭṭoji asks how we arrive at *sahati* in the now familiar verse *sa evāyam…*, *Subhāṣitāvalī* 631d. The initial response, which is put in the mouth of others (*atrāhuḥ*), is that √*sah* belongs to the *ādhṛṣīya* roots. The second alternative (*yad vā*) is the hint in *caṣIṄ*. As Bhaṭṭoji points out, the latter is more robust and can also account for *sphāyat-* in *Anargharāghava* 1.55b.

6.5.1.6   Conclusions

We have now seen that the *jñāpaka* has the blessing of several influential and authoritative gram-
marians over a span of some 800 years. Nevertheless, it is, in my opinion, telling that Rāmacandra
leaves out the *jñāpaka* and its consequent metarule all together[63] and Bhaṭṭoji chose not to include
it ad P. 1.3.12 in the *SK*. One possible explanation for these omissions or displacements could lie
in an effort to exclude or distance the use of the *jñāpaka* from active application in a *prakriyā*,
"derivation," and reserve it only for explaining the usage of others such as great poets. This is
always the context in which the *jñāpaka* is either brought up in the first place (DurghV and SK
2326) or applied. We generally do not find the hint applied to any random root; there is usually
a quoted source. The only exception seems to be Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, who was somewhat of a rogue
grammarian. Another piece of evidence for its rather tangential status derives from the fact the
jñāpaka is completely missing from the collections of *paribhāṣā*s, "metarules" as well as Puruṣot-
tama's *Jñāpakasamuccaya* with the exception of the PŚ and Śeṣādisudhī's *Paribhāṣābhāskara*, to
which I will come in due course. We can surmise that authors of the works on *paribhāṣā*s were
perhaps hesitant to formally accept the √*cakṣIN jñāpaka* because of its dubious pedigree from a
work of poetics. Whatever the exact motives may have been, by the time of Bhaṭṭoji, the *jñāpaka*
was firmly part of Sanskrit grammar.

6.5.2   The Commentators on the *Dhātupāṭha*

We have at our disposal three major commentaries on the Pāṇinian DhP: the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* by
Kṣīrasvāmin (11th cent., Kashmir), the *Dhātupradīpa* of *Maitreyarakṣita* (11th–12th cent., Bengal),
and MDhV of Sāyaṇācārya (14th–15th cent., Vijayanagar).[64] These commentaries offer us a slightly
different angle than what we have seen in the commentaries on the A because their main focus
is to record and explain forms of root, in particular ones that may seem problematic. They also
serve as another closely related stream of commentaries that both influenced and borrowed from

---

[63]As does Dharmakīrti in the *Rūpāvatāra* and Puruṣottamadeva in his *Bhāṣāvṛtti*.
[64]Recall that Sāyaṇa knew both of his predecessors, but the two earlier commentators do not seem to know each
other.

the (sub)commentaries on the A itself. The *Kaumudī*-style grammars, in turn, took inspiration from the DhP commentaries by providing notes on select roots in their *tiṅanta* ("finite verb") section. As with the other passages we have looked at so far, the examples from literature will be of particular interest as they help to identify which texts were being read and whose usage was being taken into consideration.

6.5.2.1 The *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*

Kṣīrasvāmin — for better or worse — opens yet another can of worms that we will only partially explore. His relevant remarks on √*cakṣIṄ* are short and straightforward so we may cite them *in toto*:

> KṣDhP II.7 *cakṣiṅ vyaktāyāṃ vāci. anudātto 'nudāttet. ṅitkaraṇaṃ numniṣedhārtham, antagrahaṇaṃ hi tatra (7.1.58) anuvartate, gaṇakṛtyam anityam iti jñāpanārthaṃ ca, yathā: sa evāyaṃ nāgaḥ sahati kalabhebhyaḥ paribhavam.*

> KṣDhP II.7 √*cakṣIṄ* in the sense of articulate speech is low-pitched (and) marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel. Marking (the root) with an indicatory *Ṅ* is for the purpose of prohibiting *nUM* since mention of *anta*, "final" continues there (in P. 7.1.58),[65] and it is for the purpose of making known that an operation on a *gaṇa*, "list," is non-mandatory.[66] For example: "That same elephant endures the abuse from the young elephants."[67]

Despite the fairly exhaustive survey of Pāṇinian grammatical literature in the preceding section, we have encountered neither the *paribhāṣā gaṇakṛtyam anityam*, which is included in the majority of collections, nor the suggestion that the *Ṅ* in √*cakṣIṄ* could be a *jñāpaka* pointing toward such a metarule. In fact, no other commentator known to me arrives at the *paribhāṣā* in this manner. Based on my reading of the commentaries mentioned in ft. 66, there are two strate-

---

[65] Sc. from P. 7.1.57 into P. 7.1.58. See fn. 126 above for a full explanation of this idea.

[66] This is a *paribhāṣā*, "metarule," generally explained as permitting alternate *vikaraṇa*s, "verbal class markers," than those assigned in the A. In practice though, it usually refers only to the verbal roots moving from class II to class I (*adādi* to *bhvādi*). See below for more detail. It is given, with the minor variant *gaṇakāryaṃ*, in the following collections of *paribhāṣā*s named according to the accompanying commentary: *Kātantraparibhāṣāsūtravṛtti* 29 in Abhyankar (1967: 58), *Kātantraparibhāṣāsūtra* 31 in Abhyankar (1967: 76), Puruṣottamadeva's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* 109 in Abhyankar (1967: 156), Sīradeva's *Bhṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* 118 in Abhyankar (1967: 267), Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita's *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* 92 in Abhyankar (1967: 310), Haribhāskara's *Paribhāṣābhāskara* 120 in Abhyankar (1967: 370), PŚ 93.3, and Śeṣādi's *Paribhāṣābhāskara* 83 in Abhyankar (1967: 445f.).

[67] *Subhāṣitāvalī* 631. Also quoted by Haradatta. See fn. 32 for the full verse with translation.

gies for justifying the existence of this metarule in the Pāṇinian tradition.[68] Puruṣottamadeva believes that the use of Ṣ on KṣDhP I.469/IV.97 *kṣámūṣ sahane*[69], "*kṣámŪṢ* in the meaning to endure," hints at the *paribhāṣā* because *kṣámŪṢ* is twice marked for the application of P. 3.3.104 *ṣidbhidādibhyo 'ṅ*, "the suffix *aṄ* occurs after a root marked with an indicatory Ṣ and √*bhid*, etc.," once by being furnished with Ṣ and again by belonging to the list of verbal roots beginning with √*bhid* (or √*ghaṭ*).[70] The second strategy, which the remaining commentators rely on, is to see a redundancy in the mention of *kṛÑ* in P. 3.1.79 *tanādikṛñbhya uḥ*, the sūtra that prescribes the class marker (*vikaraṇa*) *u* for class VIII roots. Since √*kṛ* is already part of the *tanādi* list (KṣDhP VIII.10), mentioning it separately in the sūtra would be redundant unless it is meant to give us a hint.[71] Furthermore, the examples that the *paribhāṣā* is to account for are instances where the elision of *ŚaP* does not take place for class II verbs by P. 2.4.72, as in *viśvaset*, "one should trust,"[72] and *śayāmi*, "I sleep,"[73] and have nothing to do with the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings.

---

[68]Durgasiṃha finds a *jñāpaka* in the mention of *parokṣā* in Kā 3.4.21. I will return to the *Kātantraparibhāṣāsūtra-vṛtti* shortly.

[69]Maitreya and Sāyaṇa both list the class IV √*kṣam* as *kṣámŪ* in MDhP IV.100 and SDhP IV.98, respectively

[70]There is a textual problem which I believe can be easily solved. The two printed editions of the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* read: *ayam arthaḥ kṣamūṣ sahane ity asya bhidāditvād evāṅi siddhe ṣitkaraṇena jñāpitaḥ* | "This objective (i.e. the *paribhāṣā*) is hinted at by marking √*kṣam* with an indicatory Ṣ in (KṣDhP I.469) *kṣamūṣ sahane*, given that the (suffix) *aṄ* (by P. 3.3.104) is certainly already established on account of (√*kṣam*) being part of the list beginning with *bhid*." I propose to read *ghaṭāditvād* in place of *bhidāditvād* for the following reasons. An alternate reading is given in Abhyankar (1967: 156, fn. 4) and Bhattacharya (1946: 51, fn. 3): *ghaṭāditvād eva mitve siddhe*. I believe this to reflect the original reading based on Maitreya's commentary ad MDhP II.60: *kṣámūṣ sahana iti ghaṭādipāṭhenaiva siddhe ṣittvam jñāpakam anityaṃ gaṇakāryam* | "The fact that (*kṣámŪṢ*) has an indicatory Ṣ, when (its having an indicatory Ṣ) is already established by its recitation as MDhP I.442 in the list beginning with √*ghaṭ*, is a hint that operations on a *gaṇa* are non-mandatory." Sāyaṇa has a similar passage ad SDhP II.59. The point is that the *ghaṭādi* roots are marked with an indicatory Ṣ by a metarule in the DhP, *ghaṭādayaḥ ṣitaḥ* (MDhP p. 54), so there is no need to mark √*kṣam* with a Ṣ. Since it is in fact marked with a Ṣ, we must treat it as a *jñāpaka* and infer the metarule. I am not, however, entirely sure how √*kṣámŪṢ* can be among either the *ghaṭādi* roots since these are limited to a specific set of roots, usually KṣDhP I.800–872, although there are different opinions, as Kṣīrasvāmin points out after KṣDhP I.812 and ad KṣDhP I.873. A solution may come at a latter time. Furthermore, from a text critical standpoint the *mitve* of the *varia lectio* reported in the footnotes could easily be a corruption of *ṣittve*, especially in the Bengali script: শি ⇒ মি. The replacement of *ghaṭāditvād* by *bhidāditvād* may have occurred under the influence of P. 3.3.104 *ṣid-bhidādibhyo 'ṅ*. Theoretically speaking, if √*kṣam* were listed in the *bhidādi* list — it's not — this could also be a valid line of argumentation.

[71]Sīradeva, oddly enough, does not mention any *jñāpaka* for the *paribhāṣā*. Nīlakaṇṭha, Haribhāskara, Nāgeśa, and Śeṣādi all give *kṛÑ* in P. 3.1.79 as the *jñāpaka* or *liṅga* for the metarule.

[72]The class II verb, √*śvas* (KṣDhP II.60) is here conjugated as a class I verb. The correct form would be *viśvasyāt*. The form in question comes from *Pañcatantra* 3.1a *na viśvaset pūrvanirodhitasya*, "one should not trust someone he has previously injured." All the commentators listed in fn. 66 give either the quarter verse or, at the very least, this verbal form. Cf. Oberlies (2003: 529) for similar examples from the epics.

[73]Regularly class II by KṢDhP II.22 *śīṅ svapne*. The form is quoted by Puruṣottamadeva and Sīradeva. Cf. Oberlies (2003: 524) for similar examples.

Lest this brief digression should turn into nothing more than a red herring, we do in fact learn something new in Sīradeva's comments ad *paribhāṣā* 118, where he raises the issue of the voice of *śayāmi*, which should be ātm. since the root in the DhP, √*śīṄ*, is marked with *Ṅ*.[74] After initially stating that we can justify the ātm. endings because they are non-mandatory (*ātmane-padānityatvena*), he proceeds to give two justifications for their non-mandatory status. The first is ascribed to *kecid*, "some" and relies on the repetition of the root √*bhrāj* in the first *gaṇa* (KṣDhP I.193 *bhrā́jṜ* and I.875 *bhrā́jṜ*).[75] Reciting the same root twice as ātm., so the argument goes, can only be for the purpose of indicating that the ātm. endings are not mandatory, and we will, there-fore, find from time to time ātm. roots partaking of the para. endings.[76] Maitreyarakṣita reports the same opinion attributed to *eke*, "some."[77] Thereafter, Sīradeva reports another explanation

---

[74]Sīradeva's discussion appears to be motivated by a very short statement in the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣot-tamadeva in the same context Abhyankar (1967: 156): *śayāmīti parasmaipadaṃ tu anudāttaṅitaḥ iti ṅillakṣaṇam ātmanepadaṃ vyabhicaratīti asyārthasya sūcitatvāt* | "But (also) because the purpose indicated (by the *paribhāṣā*) is that the para. ending on *śayāmi* deviates from the (expected) ātm. endings conditioned by the indicatory *Ṅ* (on √*śīṄ*) according to P. 1.3.12." Besides that this *paribhāṣā* can also explain some deviant para. endings, there is not sufficient detail to determine Puruṣottama's attitude toward the finer points of the present debate.

[75]There was some dispute around the exact form of √*bhrāj* in its second occurrence in the DhP. The entire *dhātu-sūtra* reads *bhrā́jṜ ṭubhrā́śṜ ṭublā́śṜ dīptau* in KṣDhP I.875–877, but Kṣīrasvāmin reports in his commentary thereon that *ṭur ubhayasyety eke*, "*ṬU* belongs to both (roots), according to some." Both Sāyaṇa (SDhP I.823) and Maitreya (MDhP I.825) list the root as *ṭubhrā́jṜ*, and Sāyaṇa discusses the discrepancy. Cf. Palsule (1961: 246). I also note that in Sīradeva's commentary, Abhyankar (1967: 267), the quoted *dhātusūtra* is: *bhrājṜ bhrāśṜ dīptau*. That there are only two roots is in keeping with the *ubhayasya* in Kṣīrasvāmin's comments, although the absence of *ṭu* on *bhrāśṜ* is perhaps an error in Sīradeva's text. In Liebich's edition of the *Kṣīrataṅgiṇī* a third root is given, *ṭubhlā́śṜ*. In the commentary ad KṣDhP I.192ff., however, Kṣīrasvāmin himself cites the *dhātusūtra* as containing only two roots: *bhrājṜ ṭubhrāśṜ dīptau*. One wonders whether Sīradeva has preserved the original reading of the KṣDhP with just two roots, which was removed from Liebich's MSS because of contamination from other versions of the DhP, where there are three. How easily the DhP can be changed under such influence is nicely demonstrated in Mīmāṃsaka's edition of the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* p. 120, where we find KṣDhP I.192ff. as *ṭubhrājṜ ṭubhrāśṜ ṭublāśṜ dīptau*. Though he notes in fn. 5 that the *Kāśakṛtsna* and *Cāndra* DhPs leave off *ṬU*, no mention is made of the reading in Liebich's edition, which is undoubtedly closer to the correct reading.

[76]Abhyankar (1967: 267): *dvir ātmanepadiṣu pāṭho nityam ātmanepadārtham eva | evaṃ ca tad upapadyate yadi kvacid ātmanepadino 'pi parasmaipadabhājo bhavanti* | Some emendation to the printed text is necessary to yield the meaning demanded by context. As the passage stands, it means something like: "reciting (√*bhrāj*) twice among ātm. roots (occurs) necessarily only for the sake of the ātm. endings (i.e., that the root takes the ātm. endings)." This is obviously the opposite of what is intended. The double recitation cannot just be for the purpose of the ātm. endings. To remedy the problem is quite easy; I would append an *avagraha* sign to the beginning of *nityam*, i.e., *anityam* before sandhi, and place *anityam* in compound. The emended sentence then reads: *dvir ātmanepadiṣu pāṭho 'nityātmanepadārtham eva* | "A double recitation among ātm. roots (occurs) only for the sake of the non-mandatory ātm. endings." The passage then continues: "And so, it is appropriate if in some places even ātm. roots partake of the para. endings." Abhyankar also reports the reading *ātmanepadipāṭhaḥ* in fn. 5. This might be better in compound with *dviḥ*, which belongs in closer connection with *pāṭha*, as we see a few lines below with *dviṣpāṭhaḥ*. Unfortunately, the negative apparatus makes it difficult to know just what Abhyankar read in his MSS.

[77]Commentary ad MDhP I.176–178: *ātmanepadānityatvārtham ity eke* | "Some say that (reciting √*bhrāj* twice) is for the purpose of the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings." On this passage see § 6.5.2.2 below.

for the repetition of √*bhrāj*, one that is also found in the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* ad KṣDhP I. 192–195,[78]

the *Dhātupradīpa* ad MDhP I.176–178,[79] and according to Sāyaṇa, in the now lost DhP commentary, the *Sammatā*.[80] Unfortunately, it comes across extremely elliptical if not garbled in the available edition of Sīradeva's commentary.[81] The gist is that P. 8.2.36, a sūtra that prescribes the substitution of *ṣ* for the final of various roots including √*bhrāj*,[82] only applies to the second occurrence of √*bhrāj* in the DhP. The reason is said to be the be co-occurrence of √*rāj* in P. 8.2.36 and its immediate proximity before √*bhrāj* in the second DhP entry. As a result, we can derive two forms from √*bhrāj* with certain suffixes depending on which occurrence of the root we use and, subsequently, whether or not we can apply P. 8.2.36. *bhrāj* + *KtiN*, for example, yields both *bhrāṣṭiḥ*[83] and *bhrāktiḥ*,[84] "shining." The first form comes from KṣDhP I.875; the second, from KṣDhP I.195. Since such people have found another purpose for repeating √*bhrāj*, they believe that the presence of the two indicatory letters on √*cakṣIṄ* is to indicate that the ātm. endings are

---

[78]Commentary ad ad KṣDhP I. 192–195: *tathā vraścabhrasja* (P. 8.2.36) *iti ṣaḥ rājṛsahacaritasya yathā syāt: bābhrāṣṭi, asya tu bābhrākti.* "In a similar manner (scil. √*bhrāj* occurs again), so that there is *ṣ* in place of (the final *j* of √*bhrāj* that is) accompanied by *rājṚ* (i.e., KṣDhP I.875) according to P. 8.2.36: *bābhrāṣṭi* 'shines intensely,' but for the (√*bhrāj*) currently under discussion, it is *bābhrākti*, 'shines intensely.'"

[79]*tatra dviṣpāṭhaphalaṃ bruvate braścādisūtre* (P. 8.2.36) *rājisahacaritasya bhrājer grahaṇaṃ yathā syād iti | tena bhrāṣṭiḥ bhrāktir iti dvayam upapadyate |* "On this point they say the double mention of (√*bhrāj*) has a result, namely, so that in the sūtra P. 8.2.36 it is the mention of √*bhrāj* (MDhP I.825) accompanied by √*rāj*. Therefore both *bhrāṣṭi* and *bhrākti* are suitable."

[80]Commentary ad SDhP I.179: *vraścabrasjasṛ ityādinā jhali padānte ca vidhīyamānaṃ ṣatvam asya nāsti | rāji-sāhacaryāt phaṇādipaṭhitasaiva tatra grahaṇād iti maiteyakṣīrasvāmisaṃmatākārādayaḥ |* "Maitreya, Kṣīrasvāmin, the author of the *Sammatā*, etc. say that *ṣ* substitution, which is enjoined when a *jhaL* consonant (any stop, nasal, sibilant, or *h*) follows and at the end of a word by P. 8.2.36, does not apply to this (√*bhrāj*) because of the mention in this context of only (the √*bhrāj*) which is recited in the list beginning with *phaṇ* because of the accompaniment of √*rāj*."

[81]Abhyankar (1967: 267): *anye tu rājasāhacaryād rājṛsahacaritasyaiva bhrājater grahaṇam na tv ejṛ bhrejṛ bhrājṛ dīptāv iti. kvipi bhrāk ktini bhrāktir iti dviṣpāṭhaprayojanam vadanti |* "But others say: it is the mention only of that √*brāj* which is accompanied by √*rāj* because of the company of *rāj*, but not of √*bhrāj* in (KṣDhP I.192–195) *ejṛ bhrejṛ bhrājṛ dīptai*; therefore, the purpose for reciting (√*bhrāj*) twice is that when the suffix *KviP* follows there is the form *bhrāk*, 'splendor,' (and) when the suffix *KtiN* follows there is *bhrāktiḥ*, 'shining.'" The absence of a reference to P. 8.2.36 is highly suspicious and obscuring.

[82]P. 8.2.36 *vraśca-bhrasja-sṛja-mṛja-yaja-rāja-bhrāja-ccha-śāṃ ṣaḥ |* "*ṣ* occurs in place of the final of √*vraśc*, √*bhrasj*, √*sṛj*, √*mṛj*, √*yaj*, √*rāj*, √*bhrāj*, a final *ch*, and a final *ś* when a *jhaL* consonant (any stop, nasal, sibilant, or *h*) follows or at the end of a word."

[83]With the application of P. 8.2.36.

[84]For *brāktiḥ*, we apply P. 8.2.30 *coḥ kuḥ*, "a corresponding guttural occurs in place of a palatal before a *jhaL* consonant (all stops, nasals, sibilants, and *h*) and at the end of a word," (*bhrāj* + *ti* ⇒ *bhrāg* + *ti*) and P. 8.4.55 *khari ca |* "a corresponding *caR* consonant (a voiceless, unaspirated stop or sibilant) occurs in place of a *jhaL* consonant when a *khaR* consonant (any voiceless stop or a sibilant) follows," (*bhrāg* + *ti* ⇒ *bhrākti*).

321

non-mandatory.[85] One striking feature about this explanation is that Sīradeva repeats what we found in the DurghV, namely that for all roots, even those marked with a Ṅ, the ātm. endings are optional. Sīradeva's comments, though initially leading us a bit off course, have revealed not only another hint that the ātm. endings can sometimes be replaced by the para. endings, but that there is a correspondence between the interpretation of the double recitation of √bhrāj and acceptance of the jñāpaka in √cakṣIṄ. If the double occurrence of √bhrāj in the DhP signals that the ātm. endings are not mandatory, then there is no need for any hint in √cakṣIṄ. If, on the other hand, the repetition of √bhrāj is so that we can form both bhrāṣṭi and bhrākti, etc., then we need to read a jñāpaka into cakṣIṄ.

Before leaving the Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī, I would like to point out that we do find one other commentator who also explains the fluctuation of voice based on gaṇakṛtyam anityam. In the list of paribhāṣās belonging to the Kātantra school, on which Durgasiṃha wrote his vṛtti, number 29 — gaṇakṛtam anityam, "an operation on a gaṇa is non-mandatory"[86] — corresponds to the metarule under discussion. Durgasiṃha comments, after glossing the paribhāṣā, that the ātm. endings should not occur in such verb forms as pravahati, "carries along," and viramati, "halts."[87] The examples are telling about how Durgasiṃha dealt with the application of the Kātantra's rather vague rules for assigning the ātm. endings and his efforts to account for what Pāṇini describes in detail. pravahati and viramati are not roots chosen at random, but reflect the application of P. 1.3.81[88] and P. 1.3.83,[89] respectively. The point of the Pāṇinian sūtras is that they are exceptions (apavāda) to the general rule, P. 1.3.72 svaritañitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale, "the ātm. endings occur after roots marked with an indicatory svarita vowel or an indicatory Ñ when the fruit of the action is intended for the agent." pra + √vah and vi + √ram must, therefore, always take the para. endings. The KV and other commentators on these rules give pravahati and viramati

---

[85]Abhyankar (1967: 267): teṣāṃ cakṣiṇo 'nubandhadvayam ātmanepadānityatve jñāpakam | "For them, the pair of indicatory letters on √cakṣIṄ hints at the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings."

[86]Durgasiṃha points out that kṛta here is equivalent to kārya, "operation," Abhyankar (1967: 58).

[87]ibid. pravahati viramatīty ātmanepadam na syāt |

[88]P. 1.3.81 prād vahaḥ | "The para. endings occur after √vah preceded by pra when the fruit of the action is directed toward the agent."

[89]P. 1.3.83 vyāṅparibhyo ramaḥ | "The para. endings occur after √ram preceded by vi, āṄ or pari when the fruit of the action is intended for the agent."

as examples. I do not wish to go further into the *Kātantra* at this moment, but I simply note that this appears to be our only source for this metarule to apply to the ātm. endings. Since Kṣīrasvāmin was familiar with Durgasiṃha's DhP to the Kā, it is feasible that he knew his *Paribhāṣāsūtarvṛtti* as well. One piece of evidence that strengthens this theory is Sāyaṇa's citation of the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* in his MDhV: *tathā gaṇakṛtam ātmanepadam anityam iti jñāpanārtham iti taraṅgiṇīgranto 'py etenaiva pratyuktaḥ* (MDhV p. 230), "Similarly, this has also been given as a response to the text of the (*Kṣīra*)-*taraṅgiṇī* that (the indicatory Ṅ of √*cakṣIṄ*) is for the purpose of making known (the metarule) that the ātm. endings are non-mandatory when applied to a list." Sāyaṇa's reading *gaṇakṛtam* for *gaṇakṛtyam* matches the Kā's *paribhāṣā* verbatim and the addition of *ātmanepadam* clarifies the context better than what we have in the editions of *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*. Even still, there remains the difficulty as to how the ātm. endings apply to a *gaṇa*. One solution might be to see this as a reference to the way that the Kā prescribes the ātm. endings in the active (*kartari*), namely by referring to the list beginning with √*ruc* (*rucādi*).[90] Without a reference to Durgasiṃha or the Kā, however, I admit this is highly speculative.

6.5.2.2 The *Dhātupradīpa*

Maitreya has little to add except that he does not fully embrace the *jñāpaka*. His short, mostly derivative text dealing with the *anubandha*s on √*cakṣIṄ* can be quoted in full:

> *ikāro 'nudāttetaś ca halāder iti viśeṣaṇārtho yujarthaś ca | yady evaṃ tata evātmane-*
> *padaṃ setsyati | kiṃ ṅitkaraṇena | antedittvān num syāt | num mā bhūd ity arthaḥ |*
> *evaṃ tarhy akāro 'stu | tata evātmanepadam yuj api bhaviṣyati | vaicitryārtham anu-*
> *bandhadvayasyopādānam ity eke | ātmanepadānityatvajñāpanārtham ity anye |*

> The *I* (of √*cakṣIṄ*) is for the purpose of the qualification (*anudāttetaḥ*) in P. 3.2.149 and (so) for the purpose of (adding) the suffix *yuC*.[91] If this is so, then it follows that the ātm. endings are established (because of the low-pitched indicatory vowel). What is the use of marking (the root) with an indicatory Ṅ? There would be the augment *nUM* because (√*cakṣIṄ*) would (otherwise) end in an indicatory *I*. The meaning is that

---

[90]Kā 3.2.42 *kartari rucādiṅānubandhebhyaḥ* | "The ātm. endings occur after √*ruc* etc. and after roots with an indicatory Ṅ."

[91]We have seen this remark several times now starting with Haradatta. Cf. § 6.5.1.1 with fn. 34. The application of P. 3.2.149, which prescribes the suffix *yuC* = *anā*, is conditioned by a root having a low-pitched indicatory vowel, like the *I* of √*cakṣIṄ*.

(because of *Ṅ*) *nUM* will not occur.[92] In that case let there be an *A*![93] From only that (i.e. *A*) there will be the ātm. endings (by P. 1.3.12) and the suffix *yuC* (by P. 3.2.149). Some people say that the purpose of mentioning a pair of indicatory letters is variety (*vaicitrya*).[94] Others say that (mention of the pair of indicatory letters) is in oder to hint at the fact that the ātm. endings are non-mandatory.

Maitreya's dislike for the hint in √*cakṣIṄ* comes through because he ascribes it to "others" at the very end of the commentary and he does not offer any examples although they must have been known to him. This attitude tallies quite well with Maitreya's engagement with Jinedrabuddhi. Since the author of the *Nyāsa* does not mention *Ṅ* as a *jñāpaka*, Maitreya was not likely to accept it as one either, much like Puruṣottama. A further confirmation of his rejection can be found in the absence of any discussion about the *jñāpaka* in the *Tantrapradīpa* ad P. 1.3.12.

6.5.2.3 The *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti*

Our final commentator on the Pāṇinian DhP is the great exegete of the Vedas: Sāyaṇācārya. His *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* surpasses all previous commentaries in its thorough treatment of each root, discussion of various forms, and the citations from previous grammarians as well as literature. That we do not have a complete index to the authors and citations in the MDhV, despite the many editions of this work, is a great hindrance to the study of Sanskrit grammar. In the relevant passage on √*cakṣIṄ*, Sāyaṇa ties together and discusses the arguments we have so far seen and even cites two additional works that we no longer have, a commentary by one Ātreya and one titled *Saṃmatā*, both, presumably, on the DhP. He also counters an objection that one could use a different "trick" to obviate the problem of para. endings on ātm. verbs. Finally, Sāyaṇa gives a total of three citations from literature, all of which are traceable and noted above in § 6.3. To conserve space, I will summarize most of Sāyaṇa's discussion of the *anubandha*'s on √*cakṣIṄ* and quote those parts that are novel and of greatest relevance. Sāyaṇa first discusses the purpose of the *anubandha*s, noting that people are at odds (*vipratipadyante*) over *I*. Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta,

---

[92]The augment *nUM* would be added by P. 7.1.58 if the *I* of √*cakṣIṄ* were final. See fn. 126.

[93]I.e., let the root be √*cakṣA*, in which case P. 7.1.58 would not be able to apply but both P. 3.2.149 and P. 1.3.12 would. We see the same suggestions again in the *Kāmadhenu* ad KAS 5.2.3.

[94]If this statement has any other more significant meaning, I do not know it.

as well as others, believe it is necessary for the addition of *yuC* by P. 3.2.149[95] and that √*kyāÑ* will not substitute √*cakṣ* by the prohibition in P. 2.4.54.10. Next, the prevention of the augment *nUM* to *cakṣIṄ* is discussed with references to the *Mahābhāṣya* regarding the correct context in which to substitute √*khyā*. This leads to idea that the purpose of Ṅ is to prevent the addition of the augment *nUM* by P. 7.1.54 because by adding Ṅ, *I* is no longer final.[96] Sāyaṇa represses the specific authorship of this idea by assigning the it to *kecit*, "some." At this point, the *jñāpaka* is introduced as follows:

> *tasmād anteditvābhāvārthaḥ san anudāttettvaprayuktam ātmanepadam anityam iti jñāpanārtho 'yaṃ ṅakāraḥ | tena tālaiḥ śiñjadvalayasubhagaiḥ, tṛṣṇe jṛmbhasi, prārth-ayanti śayanottitaṃ priyā ityādayaḥ prayogā upapadyante | nanu śiṅkta iti śiñjaḥ jṛmbhata iti jṛmbhaḥ tadvad ācaratīti kvau śatari sipi ca śiñjan jṛmbhasīti sidhyataḥ | tathā prārthanaṃ prārthaḥ, tatkarotīti ṇau prārthayantīti | tat kim anena jñāpanena | satyam | śabdāḥ sidhyanti arthās tu sahṛdayahṛdayaṅgamā na bhavanti |*

> Therefore, this Ṅ, since its purpose is so that there is not a final indicatory *I*, occurs in order to make known (*jñāpana*) that the ātm. endings got by an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory. Thereby such usages as (*Meghadūta* 76c), "with claps beautified by jingling bangles," (*Śatakatrayam* 3.2d) "desire! you expand," and (*Raghuvaṃśa* 19.29c) "his lovers request of him when he arises from the couch," are appropriate. Now one could object that the forms *śiñjan*, "jingling," and *jṛmbhasi*, "you expand," are established when there is the suffix *Kvi*[97] in the meaning "acting like that" after "jingle," (i.e.,) "what jingles," and "expanse," (i.e.,) "what expands," and then the suffixes *ŚatṚ*[98] (for *śiñjan*) and *siP*[99] (for *jṛmbhasi*). Similarly, when the suffix *Ṇi*[100] follows "request" (meaning) "does that," *prārthayanti* (is established). What then is the point of the hint? True! (We could use these derivations.) The formal aspect of the word[101] is established, but their meanings do not enter the heart of (i.e, please) the cultivated.

Sāyaṇa directly responds to Maitreya by insisting that the *jñāpaka* can be a valid purpose of Ṅ even if it also serves to prevent the addition of *nUM*. Furthermore, he counters another objec-

---

[95]Cf. § 6.5.1.1 above. Kaiyaṭa approves of this as well in his commentary on the MBh ad P. 2.4.54.10, MBhPra vol. II p. 557a.

[96]Cf. Kṣīrasvāmin's remarks quoted on p. 318 and § 6.5.2.2, as well as Viṭṭhala's commentary in § 6.5.1.3.

[97]This is a reference to a statement in the MBh ad P. 3.1.11 (MBh II.21.16–18) that after any nominal stem the suffix *KviP* can be added in the sense of acting like the suffixed noun, e.g., *aśvati*, "horses around."

[98]The suffix of the para. present participle. Cf. P. 3.2.124.

[99]The suffix of the 2nd pers. sing. para.

[100]Added to a noun according to P. 3.1.26.5 to form a denominal verb meaning to make the referent of the suffixed noun, e.g., *sūtrayati*, "makes a sūtra."

[101]*śabda* here refers to the audible form of the words in question.

tion that raises an important governing principle in applying Pāṇini's rules. Some other clever grammarians have suggested that we can account for these forms by first deriving an agent noun from √śiñj and √jṛmbh and then adding the suffix Kvi(P) — a suffix that essentially converts any nominal base into a verbal root of the first gaṇa without altering its form. The resulting verb will, however, have the meaning "acting like." Similarly, we can get to prārthayati by adding the suffix ṆiC (later develops into -aya-) to prārtha, "request," and make a denominal verbal root prārthaya- with the meaning "to make a request." Accordingly, the forms should be translated as follows: śiñjat-, "acting like something that jingles," jṛmbhasi, "you act like something that expands," and prārthayanti, "they make a request." What Sāyaṇa does not like, however, is that although we arrive at the correct form (śabda), the artha, "meaning," is off; it does not please the sahṛdayas, the connoisseurs. Here Sāyaṇa introduces a restriction to grammatical machinations that hearkens back to what poetry in essence is: an extraordinary blending of sound and sense. If one is off, the poetry will not land. For this reason, for the sake of poetic grace, the jñāpaka is necessary.

The remainder of Sāyaṇa's comments deal with the opinions of one Ātreya, the author of a now lost commentary on the Dhātupāṭha, Kṣīrasvāmin, and the author of the Saṃmatā, another lost commentary on the DhP. Ātreya agrees that Ṅ has been added as a hint but that any root marked with a single anubandha need not take the ātm. endings.[102] This would give very wide scope to the jñāpaka since √cakṣIṄ is the only root that is doubly marked for the ātm. endings. All roots marked for ātm. endings with either an indicatory low-pitched vowel or Ṅ could indiscriminately take either set of endings.[103] Sāyaṇa disagrees (neha ārjavam paśyāmaḥ, "We do not see rectitude here.") and responds to this idea by making an observation similar to the one provided above in my annotation to the passage from the Padamañjarī (§ 6.5.1.1). The addition of an indicatory low-pitched vowel was already necessary for application of P. 3.2.149 (the suffix yuC) and could

---

[102]MDhP p. 229f. atrātreyaḥ ṅitkaraṇam ekānubandhasyātmanepadasyānityatvajñāpanārtham | "On this topic, Ātreya (says) marking (√cakṣIṄ) with an indicatory Ṅ is for the purpose of making known that the ātm. endings of a root with a single indicatory letter are not mandatory." I interpret ekānubandhasya as modifying a supplied dhātoḥ, "of a root (which has a single anubandha)." A similar construction is found in the passage of the PrS quoted above. See 54.

[103]The phonological structure of a root is the main consideration for whether an indicatory low-pitched vowel or Ṅ is employed. All the roots that take Ṅ end in a vowel except √cakṣIṄ. For a list, see Liebich (1920: 50f.) as well as Devasthali (1967: 82). Given its uniqueness, it is no wonder that the commentators sought a hidden meaning.

well have done double duty for the ātm. endings by P. 1.3.12. The only reason to add Ṅ is to show that *I* alone was not sufficient to ensure that √*cakṣ* must take the ātm. endings. Hence, roots with Ṅ have to take the ātm. endings. The same argument can also be used against Kṣīrasvāmin who argues that the Ṅ informs us that an operation does not apply to an entire gaṇa. The final opinion — and here we finally get to the dispute regarding *I* mentioned at the outset — belongs to the *suṃmatākāra*, "author of the *Suṃmatā*." He says that the *I* is simply for the purpose of pronunciation, a suggestion we have already seen in the *Prakriyākaumudī* in § 6.5.1.3, a text roughly contemporaneous with Sāyaṇa. In this opinion, P. 3.2.149 (*yuC*) will also not apply. A further refutation follows, but it need not concern us at present.

Thanks to Sāyaṇa's thorough scholarship, we have a very complete overview of the opinions regarding the *anubandha*s on √*cakṣIṄ* and the different ways they have been interpreted, including two that belong to now lost treatises. In addition, we can follow refutations for the claims that Sāyaṇa does not accept. In sum, he falls in line with the original interpretation of Ṅ given by Vāmana and rejects any of the variations thereon. As we have seen, this is the interpretation found in many of the later grammarians including Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

6.5.3 Summary of Grammatical Texts

Commentators could say a number of things regarding the oddly marked √*cakṣIṄ*. First, they could simply remain silent, in which case we tentatively assume that they did not accept or know of the *jñāpaka*, depending on chronology. Another possibility that points towards rejecting the *jñāpaka* is claiming that the *I* is for the purpose of pronunciation. If *I* does not indicate the ātm. endings, then any basis for the *jñāpaka* vanishes. This is, therefore, another tacit rejection. On the other hand, a commentator could also endorse the suggestion that Ṅ is a *jñāpaka*, but here two options are possible. One is to follow Vāmana and allow only roots with an indicatory low-pitched vowel to optionally take the ātm. endings; the other is to extend this to all roots marked with either and *I* or a Ṅ. Finally, some — no commentator tells us who exactly — believe that the double occurrence of √*bhrāj* in the DhP indicates that the ātm. endings in general are

non-mandatory. The results may be summarized as follows:

1. **No *jñāpaka***: *Mahābhāṣya, Kāśikāvṛtti, Nyāsa, Rūpāvatāra, Dhātupradīpa, Bhāṣāvṛtti.*

2. ***I* for pronunciation**: *Saṃmatā* (reported in MDhV), *Prakriyākaumudī.*

3. **Ṅ is a hint:**

   - **Restricted**: *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra, Padamañjarī* on the KV, *Prasāda* and *Prakāśa* on the *Prakriyākaumudī, Madhāvīyadhātuvṛtti, Prakriyāsarvasva, Siddhāntakaumudī, Śabda-kaustubha.*

   - **Unrestricted**: "some" in *Dhātupradīpa, Durghaṭavṛtti,* "others" in *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti,* Ātreya in MDhV, *Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjinikā* on the *Bhāṣāvṛtti.*

4. ***bhrāj* as *jñāpaka***: "some" in *Dhātupradīpa,* "others" in *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti.*[104]

5. **Other**: two *anubandha*s for the sake of *vaicitrya* according to "some" in *Dhātupradīpa; Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī, Ṅ* indicates that a rule applicable to a *gaṇa* need not always apply.[105]

The most commonly accepted version of the *jñāpaka* is the one first proposed by Vāmana, and the "main stream" Pāṇinians adhere to it. The unrestricted version, however, seems to have been primarily known and discussed in Bengal. The only authors who unambiguously accept it are Śaraṇadeva, Viśvarūpa and Ātreya, whereas Sāyaṇa explicitly refutes it. The *bhrāj* based *jñāpaka* apparently found even less favor, and we do not even know who first postulated or supported it, since it is only attributed to unnamed individuals. That the early Pāṇinians, on the other hand, saw no reason for a *jñāpaka* indicates that the distribution of the ātm. and para. endings had been accurately described by Pāṇini and no further intervention was necessary, at least not so general as Vāmana's hint. As grammar and poetics become increasingly intertwined, however, grammarians must have been willing to accept explanations that accounted for deviant forms, especially those that did not go against express statements of Patañjali. Since no objection could be raised against the present *jñāpaka* on such grounds, it could find favor among the majority of

---

[104]Here too, the non-mandatory status of the ātm. is unrestricted.

[105]Puruṣottamadeva seems to support an interpretation of the *gaṇakṛtya-paribhāṣā* whereby ātm. verbs can take para. endings.

later Pāṇinians. One can similarly explain the failure to endorse, or tacit rejection of, the *jñāpaka* by Maitreyarakṣita and Puruṣottamadeva because their primary authority, Jinendrabuddhi, does not give any indication about its existence[106] in the *Nyāsa*. Note that this is the opposite situation of *KvasU*, where its acceptance in the standard language continued in Puruṣottama's *Bhāṣāvṛtti* on the basis of the *Nyāsa* but was strongly rejected by Haradatta. Comparing these two cases nicely demonstrates the split of allegiance in the Pāṇinian tradition.

6.6   The Commentators on Poetry

As in the case of *KvasU*, the commentators on the various passages I have quoted in § 6.3 above approach the seeming irregular use of the para. endings from a somewhat different angle than the grammarians. As, commentators on *kāvya*, they are faced directly with usage and must choose how to act, whether that offering varying opinions, supporting a definitive explanation or simply ignoring the problem. The choice that a commentator makes can signal a variety of information about his pedagogy, support of a particular grammatical school, and his view on poetic language as well as the poet's competence. The data from the √*cakṣIṄ* hint is particularly rich owing to the wide range of examples I have been able to locate and the available commentaries on the cited passages. I hope even more data will become available in the future as additional commentaries are published. As we will see, a solution in the grammatical literature was no assurance that a commentator would take it up even it to avoid condemning a poet whose work he is explicating. I will return to the implications of the opinions presented in this section at its conclusion. As for the examples, many of the opinions offered by the commentators can be summed up in a short amount of space and a full exposition is not necessary. For one case, however, I have found the results worth presenting with more detail on account of the variety of explanations, the larger issues of textual transmission, and the mode of intertextuality that they raise.

---

[106]Jinendrabuddhi probably lived before Vāmana, so he would not have even been able to respond to it. Indeed the *jñāpaka*'s complete absence in the *Nyāsa* is evidence, albeit negative, that Vāmana was the first to popularize the hint.

6.6.1 *Meghadūta* 76

That the works of Kālidāsa hold a particularly important position in a Sanskrit student's education has already been discussed in the previous chapter. This will be another instance to see whether his commentators decided to defend his usage, criticize it or alter it in order to obviate a perceived grammatical fallacy. I will begin with *Meghadūta* 76 (2.18 with Mallinātha), for which I have had access to the largest number of commentaries (9).[107] We begin by first enjoying the verse in full:

> *tanmadhye ca sphaṭikaphalakā kāñcanī vāsayaṣṭir*
> *mūle baddhā maṇibhir anatiprauḍhavaṃśaprakāśaiḥ |*
> *tālaiḥ śiñjadvalayasubhagair nartitaḥ kāntayā me*
> *yām adhyāste divasavigame nīlakaṇṭhaḥ suhṛd vaḥ ||* (MeghD 76)

And between them (scil. the *aśoka* and *keśara* trees) there is a golden perch with a crystal platform fasted to its base with jewels whose hue resembles that of not very advanced bamboo, where your blue-throated friend sits at the day's close, urged to dance by my beloved with claps all the more charming for her jingling bangles.

To print and translate this verse, as I just have, requires an editorial decision because commentators knew two readings for the compound *śiñjadvalayasubhagair*. The alternate reading, **śiñjā**valayasubhagair, "jingle-bangles-charming" will be discussed shortly, but I believe for good reason that the version I have just given is the original (*śiñjadvalayasubhagair*). I will proceed through the commentaries in roughly chronological order, starting with that of Vallabhadeva, and then summarize my findings according to the explanation given.

1. *Pañcikā* by Vallabhadeva:

    matkāntayā śiñjānakanakakakaṭakamanoharais tālair vādyair nartitaḥ | śiñjer ātmanepaditvāc chiñjad iti prayogaḥ pramādajaḥ | anityo vānudāttedātmanepadavidhiḥ | (Hultzsch (1941: 41) = Tripathi et al. (2009: 276))

    (The peacock) is made to dance by my beloved with musical claps, delightful on account of the jingling, golden bracelets. Because √*śiñj* is an ātm. verb, the use of *śiñjat-* is born of folly. Or, the rule for the ātm. endings after verbs marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel is non-mandatory.

---

[107]The NCC vol. XXI pp. 140–147 lists approximately 90 commentaries!

2. *Pradīpa* of Dakṣiṇāvartanātha:

śiñjā śiñjitaṃ; śiñjāvanti valayāni śiñjāvalayāni | śākhāvṛkṣavat samāsaḥ | śiñjadvalayasubha-
gair iti pāṭhe | śiñja avyakte śabde ity ayaṃ dhātur ātmanepadī | tasmāt parasmaipadam
na bhavati | (Tripathi et al. (2009: 276))

"jingle" (is equivalent to the noun) "jingling"; bangles that possess jingle are jingle-bangles.
The compound is like "branch-tree" (i.e. a tree that possesses branches"). In the reading
"jingling-bangle-charming," the root KṣDhP II.17 √*śíji*[108] *avyakte śabde*, "√*śíjI* in the sense
of an inarticulate noise," take the ātm. endings. Therefore there cannot be the para. endings.

3. *Saṃjīvanī* of Mallinātha

śiñjidhātur ayaṃ tālavyādir na tu dantyādiḥ | śiñjāpradhānāni valayāni |

The root √*śiñj* begins with a palatal, not a dental. The bangles preeminent in jingling.[109]

4. *Cāritravardhinī* of Cāritravardhana:

śiñjā śiñjitaṃ tadyuktāni[110] *valayāni taiḥ subhagaiḥ … | siñjadvalayasubhagair*[111] *ity aśud-*
dhaḥ pāṭhaḥ | siji avyate śabde ity asyātmanepaditvāt | yad vā siñjanaṃ siñjaḥ | ghañarthe
kavidhānam | sarvaprātipādikebhya ity eke | ity ācāre kvip | tadantāt śatṛpratyayaḥ | (Tri-
pathi et al. (2009: 276))

"jingle" (equivalent to the noun) "jingling." Bangles joined with that. Charming on account
of them … The reading "jingling-bangle-charming" is incorrect/impure because KṣDhP II.17
siji avyakte śabde, "*śíjI* in the sense of an inarticulate noise," takes the ātm. endings. Or
rather, (we first form) *siñja*, "jingle" (equivalent to) *siñjana*, "jingling." There is the pre-
scription of the suffix *Ka* in the sense of the suffix *GhaÑ*.[112] According to some, the suffix

---

[108]The printed text has *śiñja*, but I do not know of a DhP that gives this as the form of the root. Without having
seen the MSS for the *Pradīpa* and in the absence of a critical apparatus, I can only assume that Dakṣiṇāvarta probably
did quote the DhP correctly and that the error crept in at a later stage or transmission.

[109]Mallinātha only discusses the reading *śiñjāvalaya-*.

[110]The printed edition give *tat yuktāni*, but a compound is clearly needed.

[111]*siñjad-*, *siji*, etc. are given in the printed edition. This seems to be a printing error in light of the correctly
spelled *śiñjā* in the preceding line, and I very much doubt that Cāritravardhana, a learned commentator, confused
his sibilants. I would, therefore, happily print the correct palatal *ś*. I have, however, left the text as it is because I have
not examined the MSS myself and because it highlights the necessity of Mallinātha's comments above regarding the
place of articulation of the initial sibilant. The dental *s* also occurs below in the commentaries of Jagaddhara and
Sumativijaya.

[112]Reference seems to be to P. 2.1.135, whereby the suffix *Ka* is added to roots with a penultimate *i*, *u*, *ṛ* or *ḷ*.

KviP occurs after all nominal stems in the sense of behaving.[113] The suffix *ŚatṚ* (pres. participle para.) occurs after a form so ending.

5. *Vidyullatā* of Pūrṇasarasvatī

śiji avyakte śabde ity ayaṃ dhātur ātmanepadī | ataḥ parasmaipaditvaṃ cintyam | (Tripathi et al. (2009: 276f.))

The root (KṣDhP II.17) *śiji avyakte śabde,* "*śíjI* in the sense of an inarticulate noise," takes the ātm. endings. Therefore that fact that (the root) takes the para. endings it to be questioned.

6. *Rasadīpinī* of Jagaddhara

śiñjitena śabdāyamānena valayena manojñaiḥ | … | siñjadvalayetyādinā vādyam uktam | siñjad ity atra parasmaipadam ātmanepadavidher anityatvād ity avadheyam | (Tripathi et al. (2009: 277))

(With claps) charming on account of the bangle sounding with jingling. What has been stated by "jingling-bangle-etc." should be discussed. One should be attentive that the para. endings occur here in *śiñjat-* because the rule for the ātm. endings is non-mandatory.[114]

7. *Subodhā* of Bharatamallika

śiñjad iti kvacid ātmanepadino 'pi parasmaipadaṃ syād iti śatṛ | pariṣvajati pāñcālī madhyamaṃ pāṇḍunandanam ityādayo bahavaḥ prayogā dṛśyante | śiñjer ghañarthe kaḥ | tataḥ kvip | tataḥ śatr ity anye | (Tripathi et al. (2009: 278))

In *śiñjat-* there is *ŚatṚ* (the para. participle) because the para. endings sometimes occur on an ātm. verb. One encounters many such usages as in, "the princess of the Pañcālas (i.e. Draupadī) embraces."[115] Others (say) there is the suffix *Ka* after √*siñj* in the meaning of *GHaÑ*. Thereafter is *KviP*. Thereafter is *ŚatṚ*.[116]

---

[113]Cf. MBh ad P. 3.1.11 (MBh II.21.16–18) and § 6.5.2.3 with fn. 97 above. One would have expected *tadvad ācāre* or the like.

[114]I interpret the first gloss to be of *śiñjāvalayasubhagaiḥ*. As we have seen above, *śiñjā* is glossed with *śiñjita*, and a verbal form, *śabdāyamāna*, is added to syntactically construe the two nouns. In the second part, Jagaddhara discusses the alternate reading.

[115]The form *pariṣvajati* from √*svaj* should take the ātm. endings according to KṣDhP I.1025 *ṣvanja pariṣvaṅge*, "*ṣvanjA* in the meaning of embrace," because it is marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel. I have not been able to identify this quote, although the same form can be found in MahāBh 11.20.7a.

[116]See my notes to the preceding passage.

Two further commentators that I have not cited are the *Sugamānvayā Vṛtti* by Sumativijaya[117] and the *Sumanoramaṇī* by Parameśvara. Sumativijaya clearly reads *siñjat-* (with dental *s*) and does not note or explain the use of the para. ending. Based on Parameśvara's commentary we are unable to determine what reading he had in the verse since he does not gloss the relevant compound and the editors only give one version of the root text, that of Mallinātha.

In making sense of these comments we may begin by presenting who knows which reading, what attitude they have toward *śiñjat-*, and what explanation for the form is cited.

1. Known Reading(s)

    - **Only *śiñjat-***: Vallabhadeva (*pramādaja*, "born of folly"), Pūrṇasarasvatī (*cintya*, "questionable"), Sumativijaya (no comment), Bharatamallika (accepted as a denominative).
    - **Only *śiñjā-***: Mallinātha.
    - **Both**: Dakṣiṇāvartanātha (secondary), Cāritravardhana (secondary), Jagaddhara (secondary).

2. Attitude Toward *śiñjat-*

    - **Accepted**: Jaddhara, Bharatamallika, Pūrṇasarasvatī (but *cintya*, "questionable").
    - **Rejected**: Vallabhadeva (*pramādaja*, "born of folly"), Dakṣaṇāvartanātha (not possible), Mallinātha (*śiñjat-* ignored entirely), Cāritavardhana (*aśuddha*, "impure").

3. Justification for *śiñjat-*

    - **Non-mandatory**: Vallabhadeva, Jagaddhara, Bharamallika.
    - **Denominative**: Cāritravardhana, Bharatamallika
    - **None**: Dakṣanāvartanātha, Pūrṇasarasvatī.

Just how silently and definitively Mallinātha can alter a text is here on full display. It is simply impossible that he did not know the other reading.[118] Several commentators, Vallabhadeva,

---

[117]Edited in Maurer (1965).
[118]Or have our printed versions left something out?

Dakṣiṇāvartanātha, Cāritravardhana, and Pūrṇasarasvatī, have reservations about the reading. Vallabhadeva slaps it with his favorite label *pramādaja*, "born of folly," though he softens this with an alternative explanation. Dakṣiṇāvartanātha simply sees no way for the para. endings to occur. Cāritravardhana goes so far as to call *śiñjat- aśuddha* an "incorrect, impure" reading with an ameliorating afterthought. Pūrṇasarasvatī finds it *cintya*, "questionable." On the other hand, Sumativijaya and Bharatamallika have no qualms, and although it is not Jagaddhara's first choice, he manages to find a solution to justify *śiñjat-* without condemning it. Given this scenario, I think there is little reason to doubt that *śiñjat-* was the original reading for much the same reasons as described in Goodall (2001: 109–112). The direction of change moves towards a certain variety of grammatical correctness, Vallabhadeva, the oldest among the commentators, knows of only this reading, and it seems impossible that someone would alter a grammatically correct text to something that could be perceived as incorrect. With a firm idea of who supports which reading, let us turn to the explanations that are given for *śiñjat-* when it is discussed.

Of the seven commentators who know the reading *śiñjat-*, four give a justification for it. As already noted in the preceding paragraph, Vallabhadeva and Cāritravardhana both condemn the reading, but then give an alternate explanation. Pūrṇasarasvatī, who marks the form at "question-able," does not bother to give any alternative justification. The two possible explanations, both of which we have already encountered, are that the ātm. endings are *anitya*, "non-mandatory," (Vallabhadeva, Jagaddhara, and Bharatamallika[119]) or that *śiñjat-* is in fact a denominative form derived from *śiñja* with the null suffix *KviP* (Cāritravardhana and Bharatamallika). Somewhat surprising is that no one presents a *jñāpaka* for the former. With regard to the latter, we may recall Sāyaṇa's remarks regarding a derivation with *KviP* (p. 325), which Cāritravardhana and Bharatamallika also suggest. Although *KviP* gets the job done at the formal level, the meaning is unsatisfactory, especially to the cultured. This last connection is somewhat rare insofar as we can very precisely trace the reaction of a grammarian to a grammatical explanation found almost

---

[119]Bharatamallika does not actually use the word *anitya* and is very vague in saying that "the para. endings some-times occur on an ātm. verb."

exclusively in poetic commentaries.[120] Indeed, Sāyaṇa's method of argumentation on this point — the explicit recourse to the *sahṛdaya*s, a word with deep poetological resonance — reflects a poetic, as apposed to a strictly grammatical, context and strengthens the claim that he is arguing against someone writing on poetry rather than on grammar. I will hold off on more general points till after I have presented the remainder of the commentators.

6.6.2 Miscellaneous Remarks

The commentaries on the remaining passages cited throughout this study do not offer such varied and rich material as we have just seen. Nevertheless, several of them either add slightly new data to what has already been presented or strengthen certain trends. I would like to look at a few of the more interesting passages.

6.6.2.1 On *tarjayan*, "threatening"

If we remain with Kālidāsa for a moment and take up his crowning work, the *Raghuvaṃśa*, two unique points come to light. The two passages quoted above in § 6.3 are 4.28 and 19.29, numbered according the Mallinātha's commentary. In the first of these the form *tarjayan*, "threatening," appears, which is suspicious because √*tarj* as a class X verb should take the ātm. endings. I have already drawn attention to others' opinions on this root (cf. p 306). Vāmana singles out √*tarj* as one of the verbs his *jñāpaka* is to account for, and it is surely no coincidence that we find a chance to apply it in the *Raghuvaṃśa*.[121] Kṣīrasvāmin notes that in *lakṣya*, "what is defined, poetry," the para. endings are also found but gives no justification. Sāyaṇa, on the other hand, derives *tarjayan* from the class I √*tarj* with the suffix *ṆiC* in his comments ad SDhP X.147. Let us know see what the commentators on the *Raghuvaṃśa* have to say.[122] I give below the opinions

---

[120]The only author to proffer a similar explanation, albeit not entirely identical, is Śaraṇadeva for *trāhi*. See § 6.5.1.2 with fn. 39 above.

[121]In fact, the para. endings on √*tarj* are more frequent than the ātm. endings based on a search of a wide range of e-texts. From *kāvya* I cite *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 7.36d *tarjayantaḥ* and 17.103a *atarjayat* and *Caṇḍīśataka* 54d *tarjayantyāḥ*. The commentators Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha on the *Bhaṭṭīkāvya* do not remark on these forms.

[122]I have consulted only a very small fraction of the some 50 commentaries available on the Raghuvaṃśa.

of Aruṇagirinātha, Hemādri, and Mallinātha.[123]

1. *Prakāśikā* of Aruṇagirinātha (RaghuV 4.28)

   tarjayann iti | curādipaṭhitasya tarjer ātmanepaditvād ṇyantādbhūvādipaṭhitāt tarjer idaṃ mantavyam | (vol. 1 p. 192)

   On "threatening": Because the √*tarj* recited in the *curādi* list (class X) takes the ātm. endings, this (form) should be considered to be from √*tarj* recited in the *bhūvādi* list (class I) ending with the suffix *Ṇi*.

2. *Raghuvaṃśadarpaṇa* of Hemādri (RaghuV 4.30)

   tarjayann iva | caurādikasya tarjer ātmanepaditvād ṇyantabhauvādikasyedaṃ rūpam | yad vā cakṣiṅo ṅitkaraṇād † anubandhasyānityatvāt †[124] parasmaipadam | (vol. 1 p. 72)

   On "as though threatening": This form belongs to the class I (√*tarj*) ending in the suffix *Ṇi* because the class X √*tarj* takes the ātm. endings. Or rather, there are the para. endings because based on the indicatory *Ṅ* of √*cakṣIṄ* the ātm. endings (?)[125] are non-mandatory.

3. *Saṃjīvanī* of Mallinātha (RaghuV 4.28)

   tarjibhartsor anudāttettve 'pi cakṣiṅo ṅitkaraṇenānudāttettvanimittasyātmanepadasyānity-atvajñāpanāt parasmaipadam iti vāmanaḥ | (p. 102)

   According to Vāmana, even though √*tarj* and √*bharts* are marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel, because we are informed by reason of the indicatory *Ṅ* of √*cakṣIṄ* that the ātm. endings conditioned by an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory, the para. endings occur.

---

[123]Vallabhadeva in his *Raghupañcikā* and Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita in his *Padārthadīpikā* do not offer any particular comment on the form. Jinasamudra in his *Raghuvaṃśaṭīkā* reads *jarjayan*, "threatening." This reading likely originated because of the grammatical difficulty under discussion. The √*jarj* is certainly obscure, its exact form being so uncertain that Kṣīrasvāmin, after noting different opinions, utters in despair: *kim atra satyam | devā jñāsyanti |* "What is the truth here? The gods will know!" (commentary ad KṣDhP I.148–750).

[124]The printed text is clearly corrupt, although based on similar passages, a number of emendations are possible. We need *ātmanepada* to construe with *anityatvāt*, "because the ātm. endings are non-mandatory." *anubandhasya* is somewhat more difficult to make sense of. We would expect something like *anudāttetām*, "for (roots) marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel." Without access to the MSS, it best not to pursue the matter further since the sense is clear enough for our purposes.

[125]I give here what must be closer to the intended meaning. As the texts stands the translation is: "because based on the indicatory *Ṅ* of √*cakṣIṄ* the *anubandha* is non-mandatory."

The first two commentators not only call upon the *jñāpaka* to explain *tarjan* but also give a partial justification for its existence. Mallinātha, unique in this regard, even cites Vāmana by name. The details of the citations here are important. Hemādri, as we have seen, knows and cites the KAS, especially the last chapter, more than any other author I have come across. Should the absence of Vāmana's name at this particular point not be a mere fluke of transmission, we can infer that he did not associate the *jñāpaka* with Vāmana as he did other grammatical explanations, but rather viewed it as a part of standard Sanskrit grammar and not a particularity of the KAS.[126] Mallinātha, on the contrary, quotes Vāmana infrequently in the *Saṃjīvanī* but chooses here to cite Vāmana's opinion by name. Was Mallinātha less willing to accept the *jñāpaka* and therefore wished to distance himself? Recall that for MeghD 2.18 he accepted an emended text that obviated the grammatical issue entirely. Lastly, Aruṇagirinātha derives the form from the causative of a class I verb, just as Sāyaṇa, a possible indication that he know the MDhV.

6.6.2.2 On *prārthayanti*, "they request"

The second problematic form in *Raghuvaṃśa* 19.29c, *prārthayanti*, need not delay us long for the simple reason that no version of the text with a printed commentary has this reading.[127] The implication is staggering. Sāyaṇa and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita know a reading of one the most popular Sanskrit texts that only two relatively late editions even report and that is either unknown to, or ignored by, all the printed commentaries. This is an even more extreme example of what we saw with *śiñjat-* and of what Goodall (2001) has demonstrated for *āha* as a past tense verb: the likely alteration of a perceived grammatical fallacy to a more acceptable form. Once again, we must ask what the more plausible direction of change is. If we apply the same criteria, we are indeed hard-pressed come up with a good reason why a perfectly sensible form like *prārthayanta* would be altered to a grammatically less satisfactory one. Even if we approach the problem from the stance

---

[126]One source that Hemādri would have surely known is Viṭṭhala's *Prasāda*, the commentary on the *Prakriyākaumudī*. See fn. .

[127]Nandargikar (1971: ५८८, 372) also does not report any variant in his apparatus or notes to the verse, where he often discusses unpublished commentaries. For the editions with the variant reading see p. 306. Harunaga Isaacson (personal communication) has also not yet found this reading in the Śārada MSS of Vallabhadeva's commentary, but the final collation for *sarga* 19 is not yet complete.

of copyists' errors, I do not see any convincing paleographic argument that could explain how *prārthayanta* would become *prārthayanti*. We should, therefore, tentatively attribute *prārthayanti* to Kālidāsa himself. If we were to base ourselves only on the commentaries available in print — and this is still an impressive list of popular, learned commentaries — there would be not even a whisper of what is likely to be the original reading. That almost all editors of the *Raghuvaṃśa* with commentaries have so far ignored the testimony of Sāyaṇa and Bhaṭṭoji demonstrates a sort of communal mental block towards the grammarians, for surely the *Siddhāntakaumudī* was known to most, if not all, of the editors. In sum, the case of *prārthayanti* underscores the value of grammatical texts and their quotations for editing Sanskrit literature.

6.6.2.3   Hark Māgha's Bells

In bringing to a close this section on the commentators, I would like to briefly discuss the example from the *Śiśupālavadha* quoted at the outset of this study on p. 307. Verse 4.20 of Māgha's brilliant poem will immediately perk up the ears of any lover of Sanskrit literature. It is because of this verse, after all, that Māgha has earned the name *ghaṇṭāmāgha*, "Māgha of the Bells."[128] The verse is worth enjoying in full.

> *udayati vitatordhvaraśmirajjāv ahimarucau himadhāmni yāti cāstam* |
> *vahati girir ayaṃ vilambi**ghaṇṭā**dvayaparivāritavāraṇendralīlām* || 4.20 || (ŚiśuP)

> When the sun is rising as the moon is setting,
> each with its ropes of rays stretched upward,
> this mountain has the pomp of a lordly elephant
> caparisoned with a pair of hanging bells.[129]

The problem, as we have already see in the SK (§ 6.5.1.5), is the very first word of the verse: *udayati*, "rising." There was no agreement on how to arrive at the exact form, most commentators offering more than one solution. Unique to this discussion about a possibly incorrect para. ending is that two of the explanations hinge on how one interprets the DhP. To rehash briefly what

---

[128]Vallabhadeva ad *Śiśupālavadha* 4.20 *anenaiva ślokena kavinā ghaṇṭāmāgha iti nāma labdham* | "On account of this very verse the poet has obtained the name 'Māgha of the Bells.'" For a fuller discussion of this verse, see Tubb (2014b: 144–148) with references to additional modern scholarship.

[129]Translation by Tubb (2014b: 145).

I presented above, one derivation involves taking advantage of a possible sandhi in KṣDhP I.342 *kaṭī*; here one could read two roots, *kaṭI* and *i*, and derive *ayati* from the later. Kṣīrasvāmin, Vallabhadeva,[130] Haradatta,[131] and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita offer this as a possibility, although all except for Bhaṭṭoji attribute it to *kecit*, "some," or *anye*, "others." Kṣīrasvāmin, for example, explains the *dhātusūtra* first without dividing *kaṭī* and then mentions the possibility of a fourth root according to others. That there was some pressure to separate out √*i* is reflected in Maitreya's corresponding *dhātusūtra*, MDhP I.317–320 *iṭa kiṭa kaṭa i gatau*.[132] Relying on the MDhP there is simply no problem with the form, perhaps one of the reasons Śaraṇadeva does not investigate it. The second explanation, which we have not yet seen, also hinges on how to interpret a *dhātusūtra*. Both Vallabhadeva and Mallinātha[133] report that "some" recite √*ayA* with a *svarita*, "circumflex accent," whereby P. 1.3.72 will permit the ātm. endings only under the condition that the result of the action is directed toward the agent. Otherwise it takes the para. endings. Among these anonymous "some" Kṣīrasvāmin is to be included,[134] while Maitreya and Sāyaṇa excluded.[135] Neither Vallabhadeva nor Mallinātha have recourse to the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings for this form.

From these divergent explanations and readings of the DhP, we see, I strongly believe, the influence of an important verse on both the commentaries to the DhP as well as the DhP itself.

---

[130]Vallabhadeva ad *Śiśupālavadha* 4.20: *iṭa kiṭa kiṭī gatāv iti kecid īkārapraśeṣaṃ varṇayanti | tasyodayatīti rūpam |* "Some describe a coalescence (of two vowels) in *ī* in (KṣDhP I.340–342) *iṭa kiṭa kiṭī gatau*. The form *udayati* belongs to it (scil. the root √*i* within *ī*)."

[131]KVPada vol. VI p. 379 *kathaṃ tarhy udayati vivatordhvaraśmirajjau iti parasmaipadam | kim anena vanyaga-jaśaucena | … | kecit iṭa kaṭī gatau ity atra ikāram api dhātuṃ paṭhanti |* How then can the para. endings occur in 'raising with its ropes of rays stretched upward'? What's the use cleansing this wild elephant! Some recite also the root √*i* in (≈ KṣDhP I.340–342) *iṭa kaṭī gatau*.

[132]See Sāyaṇa's commentary ad SDhP I.314–317 for an overview of the different opinions, all of which cannot concern us here.

[133]Vallabhadeva ad ŚiśuP 4.20: *kecit svariten madhye 'ya gatāv iti paṭhanti |* "some recite (KṣDhP I.935) √*ayA* in the sense of to go as marked with an indicatory circumflex vowel." Mallinātha *ad loc.*: *aya gatau iti svaritetam kecit icchanti |* "Some accept that (KṣDhP I.935) √*ayA* in the sense of going is marked with an indicatory circumflex vowel."

[134]KṣDhP I.935 *áyà gatau* falls within a list of *udātta, svaritet* roots stretching from KṣDhP 914 up to 944. His example for this root, *udayati dinanāthaḥ*, "The lord of the day (i.e. the sun) rises," clearly references Māgha. His other entry for √*áyA*, KṣDhP I.503, takes the ātm. endings and is similar to the MDhP and SDhP, for which see the following fn. Kṣīrasvāmin is the only commentator to give √*ay* twice. Did he or someone else create this entry for Māgha's famous verse?

[135]The roots in MDhP I.473–479 *áya váya yáya máya cáya táya ṇáya gatau* and SDhP *áya váya páya máya cáya táya ṇáya gatau* are all marked with an indicatory low-pitched *A* and will only take the ātm. endings.

If we assume that in the DhP prior Kṣīrasvāmin and Maitreya had two entries, one with *kaṭī* and another with *áyA*, there would be no way to explain Māgha's form. This is more or less what Sāyaṇa reports. We might find in this a reason why Bhaṭṭoji — NB he is the only one to even mention the possibility of applying the *jñāpaka* to *udayati* — chose to invoke the hint. The explanations based on the DhP are too variable and without a firm basis, whereas the √*cakṣIṄ* *jñāpaka* at least has the support of a wide range of grammarians going back to Haradatta.[136] As for Māgha himself, who followed the rules of grammar very closely, he may well have formulated his verse either with a particular explanation in mind or as a sort of challenge for his learned audience. Could they fault him for an incorrect word or would they find a way to explain the rules of grammar so that they accommodate his magnificent composition?

6.7   Summary of the Commentaries

Further data from other commentaries — the vast majority of which are unpublished — on these and other passages would surely provide us with a fuller picture and perhaps even new evidence, but I have surveyed broadly enough to at least make a meaningful start. The most prominent feature from these texts is that there is no consensus and a variety of explanations emerge in competition with one another. Furthermore, some explanations are specific to a certain form, such as in the case of *udayati* and *tarjayan*, because of how their roots are listed in the DhP. Mallinātha demonstrates the variability nicely: he cites Vāmana's *jñāpaka* ad *Raghuvaṃśa* 4.28 *tarjayan*, a reading of the DhP according to "some" ad *Śiśupālavadha* 4.20 *udayati*, and erases the problem altogether in *Meghadūta* 2.18c by adopting *śiñjā-*.[137] That the *jñāpaka* could have been invoked in the other instances demonstrates a certain tendency to avoid it when possible. Even when the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings is invoked, it is not always justified (Vallabhadeva, Jagaddhara, Rucipati,[138] Bharatamallika) nor explicitly limited to roots marked

---

[136]I unfortunately have not found any evidence for what Bhaṭṭoji could have thought of Vāmana.

[137]He offers no comment ad *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 7.36a *tarjayantaḥ* and 17.103a *atarjayat*, though both forms pose the same problem as *tarjayan*.

[138]Rucipati is a commentator Murāri's *Anargharāghava*. On the form *sphāyat-* in verse 1.56b, he remarks *āt-manepadānityatvād atra na taṅ* | "Because the ātm. endings are non-mandatory an ātm. ending does not occur here."

with an indicatory low-pitched vowel (Hemādri (?), Jagaddhara, Rucipati, Bharatamallika). This reflects the situation we saw among the Sanskrit grammarians. What is perhaps surprising here, however, is that Vāmana has only been cited once by name in all of the discussions we have examined, a curious situation that might be the result of the *jñāpaka*'s wide acceptance in the grammatical tradition and hence integration into standard Pāṇinian grammar.

The other unexpected result from my survey of commentators is how they handle the *Megha-dūta* passage. We can trace a development in the commentators up to Mallinātha. Vallabhadeva first criticizes *śiñjat-*, offers an explanation as an afterthought, and is not aware of an alternate reading. Dakṣiṇāvarta introduces *śiñjā-* as his primary reading but knows of, and criticizes, the other reading. At this point, Mallinātha, who must have known both readings, adopts the one without grammatical difficulty and which Cāritravardhana would label *aśuddha*, "incorrect, impure." This could be seen as further proof that Mallinātha and others preferred to avoid using the *jñāpaka* when possible, a rule of thumb that brings us back to Bhāmaha's injunction on using hints for poetic composition in BhKA 6.26. Did such thinking, be it directly from Bhāmaha or not, spur on some commentators to find alternatives to the √*cakṣIṄ* hint?

6.8   A Sudden Death

Before bringing this chapter to a close, we must look at the crowning glory of all works on metarules and hints, Nāgeśa's *Paribhāṣēnduśekhara*. Although we have already touched on several works on *paribhāṣā*s regarding *ganakāryam anityam*, we have not consulted any such works on the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings for the simple reason that it is not dealt with by any previous commentator on a collection of *paribhāṣā*s.[139] Nāgeśa, however, does give such a metarule as follows:

Cf. SS 6.5.1.4 and 6.5.1.5.

[139] The list of *paribhaṣā*s appended to Puruṣottama's *Bhāṣāvṛtti* also contains PŚ 93.3, numbered 78 in Abhyankar (1967: 160). To what extent this list is original to Puruṣottama is unknown. It certainly appears to have been influenced by the PŚ.

tathā cakṣiṅo ṅitkaraṇāt

anudāttettvalakṣaṇam ātmanepadam anityam || 93.4 ||

tena sphāyannirmoka ityādi siddham || (PŚ p. 174)

[Commentary] Similarly, on account of the indicatory Ṅ of √*cakṣIṄ*:

PŚ 93.4 The ātm. endings conditioned by an indicatory low-pitched vowel are non-mandatory.

[Commentary] Thereby such (forms as in) *Anargharāghava* 1.56b *sphāyannirmoka*-[140] are established.

The example from the *Anargharāghava* clearly ties this *paribhāṣā* with the passage from the SK quoted above in § 6.5.1.5. This is all well and good, but Nāgeśa, after citing one more *paribhāṣā*, brings a swift end to any discussion of there being a hint in √*cakṣIṄ*:

> *tan na bhāṣye 'darśanāt | bhāṣyānuktajñāpitārthaysa sādhutāyā niyāmakatve mānā-bhāvāt | bhāṣyāvicāritaprayojanānāṃ sautrākṣarāṇāṃ pārāyaṇādāv adṛṣṭamātrārtha-katvakalpanāyā evaucityāt | … | cakṣiṅo ṅakārasyānta idittvābhāvasampādanena cārit-ārthyāc ca |* (PŚ p. 174f.)

It[141] does not exist (i.e. is not so) because we do not find it in the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*, since (no one) has the authority to determine that a hinted at purpose is correct without (the hinted at purpose) being discussed in the (*Mahā*)*bhāṣya*[142] and since, when reciting etc. syllables of a sūtra whose purpose has not been explained in the (Mahā)*bhāṣya*, it is appropriate (to account for them) only (by asserting) that they have been produced (by Pāṇini) as having only unseen (rewards) as their purpose[143] … and because the Ṅ of √*cakṣIṄ* has achieved a purpose by effecting the absence of a final indicatory short *I*.

In unequivocal terms, Nāgeśa pledges his allegiance to Patañjali as the final authority on all matters of grammatical exegesis. Even if we find a seemingly useless syllable, it should not be given an interpretation without the blessing of Patañjali, let alone dispelled from a sūtra, because

---

[140] Cf. fn. 57.

[141] Nāgeśa refers back to the larger discussion regarding PŚ 93.1–5 and the reasoning that leads to the existence of the metarules.

[142] I.e. no one but Patañjali can say for sure whether or not there is a *jñāpaka* in a sūtra.

[143] Nāgeśa's formulation is difficult to reflect in English. Basically, if someone discovers that a sūtra appears to have meaningless syllables, and these syllables are not discussed in the MBh, he does not have the authority to say they serve as a *jñāpaka* because only Patañjali has this right. The purpose, then, of such syllables is that when one recites them, there will be a reward after death (*adṛṣṭa*). Cf. Deshpande (1998: 26) for a similar example regarding *M* in Śivasūtra 7.

by reciting it, a person will gain "unseen" rewards after this life. In addition, we cannot even say that the Ṅ of √cakṣIṄ has no other purpose but to indicate a *jñāpaka* because it prevents the *I* from being final and hence *nUM* from applying by P. 7.1.58. If we follow this pronouncement, its implication cannot be denied: every grammarian, every commentator who has employed the hint in √cakṣIṄ has been wrong; any poet who has used a form whose correctness depended on the *jñāpaka* has composed incorrect Sanskrit. Unlike in the case of *KvasU*, where we could find supporters and detractors reaching back to Haradatta, Nāgeśa's dictum counters a much wider range of grammarians (and probably poets), including Haradatta, Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa, and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. In fact, although others who likely knew the *jñāpaka* showed their reserve by omitting it (Puruṣottamadeva, Rāmacandra), Nāgeśa is the only one to expressly reject and argue against it.[144] Although I will return to Nāgeśa's attitude toward grammar in the concluding chapter, we can get a feeling from the jumble of arguments, textual emendations, and tacit rejections why Nāgeśa would want to try to rein in the chaos and establish Sanskrit once again according to one authority.

6.9   The Rigidity of Grammarians

In § 6.3 I have listed a number of verbs from poetry that appeared to have the wrong set of endings. Among them is one from Bhartṛhari's *Śatakatraya*, *śikṣatu*, "may he learn," which Kosambi cites as "the best example" of the invalidity of "rigid Pāṇinian rules." Kosambi is of course correct, and I agree that Pāṇini and many other grammarians, including Patañjali and Nāgeśa, would not have accepted the form *śikṣatu* as correct Sanskrit. Where Kosambi misleads, however, is in describing Pāṇini's rules as "rigid." At this point, it must be indisputable that Pāṇini's rules are far from rigid because to understand them we need to interpret them, and the interpretive breadth available among the Sanskrit grammarians evinces not only variability based on theoretical con-

---

[144]As I discussed above in § 6.5.1.3, Rāmacandra gives an explanation for the *I* of √cakṣIṄ that makes it impossible to squeeze out any hint. Whether he truly rejected the *jñāpaka* or simply did not wish to introduce it in his relatively elementary text book, is difficult to decide, although the addition of the *jñāpaka* by his grandson in the *Prasāda* could be viewed as a hint that Rāmacandra himself would have approved. This is, however, very speculative.

siderations but clear evidence that actual usage was often taken into consideration. Even Nāgeśa does not see Pāṇini's rules as rigid per se; rather, for him the interpretive authority is limited to Patañjali. In the case of *śikṣatu*, Kosambi's straw man is perhaps Tendulkar, who in his edition of the *Nīti-* and *Vairāgyaśataka*s has emended the text (*Nītaśataka* 101b) to the "correct" *śikṣatām* and remarks in his notes to the verse that "the root *śikṣ* being *Atm.* the reading *śikṣatu* is incorrect."[145] Tendulkar here follows much in the steps of Mallinātha and others who either changed or adopted a version of a text that appeared more in line with Pāṇini's rules, especially for the purpose of teaching students. This must have irked Kosambi and grated against his editorial principles because, unlike other examples we have seen, Kosambi found (almost) no MS support for *śikṣitām*.[146] Tendulkar serves as good example for how an editor will change a text simply under the influence of grammatical rule without consideration of the manuscript evidence or what the author is likely to have written. Without a doubt, blind application of assumed grammatical rules is detrimental to the critical editing of texts.

Despite this solid evidence for the adverse influence of the Sanskrit grammarians, Kosambi leaves out their positive influence and the fact that many of them fought to preserve (original) readings by modifying how we interpret the rules themselves. As we have seen, grammarians have defended and protected readings (e.g., *śiñjat-*, *prārthayanti*) that might otherwise have been lost. As for *śikṣatu*, we could easily apply the *jñāpaka* since it is marked with an indicatory low-pitched vowel in the DhP, but Kṣīrasvāmin gives another reason. Based on a vārtt. (P. 1.3.21.3), the ātm. ending only apply to √*śikṣ* when the root means *jijñāsā*, "wanting to know,"[147] but otherwise we have *śikṣati*.[148] This could also have served as an explanation for the apparently deviant

---

[145] Tendulkar (1911: Notes 57).

[146] "Grammatically and metrically correct form *śikṣitāṃ* is nowhere found." Kosambi (2001: 21), apparatus to verse 48. In the introduction p. 74, however, Kosambi says he has found the reading "in just one MS."

[147] MBh I.280.7f.

[148] Commentary ad KṣDhP I.636: *śikṣer jijñāsāyāṃ* (P. 1.3.21.3) *taṅānau: dhanuṣi śikṣate, anyatra śikṣati, śaktum icchatīti san.* "The ātm. endings occur after √*śikṣ* in the meaning 'wanting to known.' (For example): 'He wants to know about archery.' Otherwise (i.e. in other meanings) there is *śikṣati* (i.e. the para. endings). There is the desiderative suffix *saN* (meaning): wants to be able." The final phrase about the desiderative suffix *saN* appears to be a later addition. Based on Sāyaṇa's description of Kṣīrasvāmin's opinion ad SDhP I.597, Kṣīrasvamin and others take the vārtt. to be a restriction on the use of the ātm. endings with √*śikṣ*. Cf. Sāyaṇa says ad SDhP I.597: *atra taraṅgiṇīkārādayaḥ śikṣer jijñāsāyām iti vacanaṃ niyamārtham iti vyācakṣāṇā jijñāsāyā anyatra parasmaipadam āhuḥ |* "The authors of the (Kṣīra)*taraṅgiṇī* etc. say, since they explain that the statement (P. 1.3.21.3) 'after √*śikṣ* in

344

para. ending. If we rely on the actual Sanskrit grammatical tradition, not simply Pāṇini or the KV, we will find a much more diverse world, one that used the wonderfully complex system of *vyākaraṇa* to a text's advantage as often to its mutilation.

6.10 Conclusions

Although we have taken a single sūtra from the KAS as our starting point, by following various leads in both the grammatical as well as the commentarial literature, a wide ranging and vigorous debate about the ātm. endings has unfolded before our eyes. Regarding our primary focus, the *jñāpaka* in √*cakṣIṄ* and its ensuing metarule about the non-mandatory status of the ātm. endings, we can trace how Vāmana's powerful trick took on a life of its own both among grammarians and commentators. That Vāmana himself almost entirely vanishes from these discussions — only Mallinātha mentions him by name — reflects, I believe, that he was probably not the original author of the *jñāpaka* and, therefore, did not need to be cited. A somewhat more cynical interpretation would be that the grammarians, beginning with Haradatta, did not wish to acknowledge that the *jñāpaka* derived from a work on *alaṃkāraśāstra* and not from a proper grammatical treatise. This hypothesis is to some extent corroborated by the metarule's absence in the collections of *paribhāṣā*s up to the PŚ, where it is mentioned only so that it can be refuted. Nāgeśa, well aware of how other grammarians, including Bhaṭṭoji, have relied on it, wants to pull the plug once and for all. Nevertheless, his motive for doing so can only lie in the fact that the metarule had gained such popularity as the content of this chapter has demonstrated.

The commentators on poetry have likewise failed to reach unanimity on the *jñāpaka*'s validity, but this discord has spawned a fascinating range of alternative solutions and debates, the most interesting, in my opinion, being Sāyaṇa's rejection of a denominative verb for *śiñjat-* and

---

the meaning of wanting to know (the ātm. endings occur)' as serving to limit (the present root), the para. endings occur (when the root is) in a meaning other than wanting to know." Most other grammarians, Jinendrabuddhi, Kaiyaṭa, Haradatta, Sāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita etc., assume that the root in the vārtt. is the desiderative of √*śak*, which is formally identical to √*śikṣ*, "to obtain knowledge," on the grounds that the ātm. endings on √*śikṣ* in Kṣ DhP I.597 are already taken care of by the indicatory low-pitched vowel. For this reason is the short gloss in the *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī* out of place. See the remainder of the commentary ad SDhP I.597 as well as MBhPra vol. II p. 161a.

prārthayanti because they fail to yield a meaning that will touch the hearts' of the connoisseurs. Thanks to the substantial material available on the topic, we have been able to see how grammarians and the commentators on poetry were responding to one another's ideas. This last point brings us to the commentaries on the Sanskrit DhP and its commentaries, a strand of grammatical literature so far mostly neglected in secondary sources as well as in this dissertation. By cross-referencing the explanations for *udayati* in the ŚiśuP 4.20 with the available commentaries on the DhP, we can see, I would argue, how an important passage in poetry effected the interpretation of a *dhātusūtra* much in the same way as it could effect the interpretation of a Pāṇinian sūtra. I surely could have added more texts to this study, such as the non-Pāṇinian grammars, but for the time being the discussion has gone on long enough and, I hope, has added further fodder for thought about how the Sanskrit exegetic tradition developed in a dynamic community of learned scholars who continued to innovate over centuries. *alaṃ vistareṇa*!

Chapter 7

Epilogue

napuṃsakam iti jñātvā tāṃ prati prahitaṃ manaḥ |
ramate tac ca tatraiva hatāḥ pāṇininā vayam ||

"'Un-masculine' from him I learned my heart to be,
and so to her I let it flee.
But there it found its only joy.
Oh! how Pāṇini us did destroy."[1]

—Dharmakīrti

7.1   A Joke

In bringing this dissertation to a close, we may reach back once again to Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*

for a final dialog that will, I believe, encapsulate many of the issues I have raised along the way.

Patañjali reports the following conversation between a grammarian and a *sūta*, "charioteer":[2]

kiṃ ca bho iṣyata etad rūpam (prājitā) ||
*bāḍam iṣyate | evaṃ hi kaścid vaiyākaraṇa āha: ko 'sya rathasya **pravete**ti ||*
*sūta āha: aham āyuṣmann asya rathasya **prājite**ti ||*
vaiyākaraṇa āha: apaśabda iti ||

---

[1] SuRaKo 478.

[2] For previous discussions and translations of this passage see Weber (1873: 337f.) with fn. 1, Lévi (1891), Ruben (1936: 257) with partial German translation, Renou (1956: 78–80) with French translation, Renou (1957: 19) as well as TG p. 94f. s. v. *iṣṭi*, Joshi & Roodbergen (1986: 142f.), Deshpande (1993: 66), and Pollock (2006: 48f., fn. 25). The larger context is discussed in Joshi & Roodbergen (2000: 91–93).

347

sūta āha: prāptijño devānāṃpriyo na tv iṣṭijñaḥ | iṣyata etad rūpam iti ||
*vaiyākaraṇa āha: aho nu khalv anena **durutena** bādhyāmaha iti ||*
sūta āha: na khalu veñaḥ sūtaḥ suvater eva sūtaḥ | yadi suvateḥ kutsā prayoktavyā
***duḥsūtene**ti vaktavyam ||* (MBh I.488.18–22)

But sir! is this form (*prājetā*, "driver") acceptable?
Of course! Take, for example, the following:
A certain grammarian says: "Who is the driver (*pravetṛ*) of this chariot?"
The charioteer says: "I, good sir, am the driver (*prājetṛ*)."
The grammarian says: "An incorrect word!"
The charioteer says: "His majesty knows the application (of the rules) but not what is accepted as correct.[3] This form (*prājitṛ*) is accepted as correct."
The grammarian says: "Ugh, now this awful weaver (*duruta*)[4] is really being a pain in my side."
The charioteer says: "Now you must admit that 'driver' does not derive from √*veÑ*, 'to weave.' It's from √*sū*, 'to compel'! If you have to use an insult based on √*sū*, you should say *duḥsūta*, 'awful charioteer.'"

I must explain. Patañjali is discussing P. 2.4.56, which deals with the verbal root √*aj*, "to drive." Much like "to go" or "to be" in English, √*aj* is replaced by different root, √*vī*, with the same meaning when certain suffixes follow. In the same manner we say "went" and not "goed." There is, however, a problem with Pāṇini's rule — its scope is too wide and does not account for all usage — and Patañjali's predecessor, Kātyāyana, has formulated a vārtt. on the rule in order to make it more accurate. Patañjali rejects Kātyāyana's proposal and accounts for the desired usage with Pāṇini's rules alone, albeit somewhat creatively.[5] One of the forms to be accounted for is *prājitṛ*, "driver," (without substitution),[6] an alternate of *pravetṛ*, "driver," (with substitution),[7] which is the

---

[3]In the later grammatical tradition, √*iṣ*, "to want, wish," and its derivatives indicate an addition to the A, often by Patañjali, that is necessary in order to describe "desired," i.e., correct (*sādhu*) usage. For the semantics, c.f. Kaiyaṭa's gloss on *na hy eṣā iṣṭiḥ* in MBhPra vol. II p. 220a: *asādhava eva evamādayaḥ*, "such (forms) are certainly incorrect." For examples of √*iṣ* in later literature, cf. KV ad P. 1.1.5 (*iṣyate*) in reference to MBh I.48.9 and ad P. 1.2.6 (*iṣṭi*) likely in reference to CV 5.3.25f. The meaning of the root, therefore, comes closer to "accepting as correct." Kaiyaṭa glosses the present sentence as: *sautrīm eva prāptiṃ bhavān jānāti na tv ācāryāṇām iṣṭim ity arthaḥ |* (MBhPr vol. II p. 558a) "The meaning is: the good sir knows only what is got from the wording of the sūtras, not what the teachers accept to be correct." In this context, *iṣṭi* does not have to refer to any such addition by Patañjali or Kātyāyana because Patañjali ultimately accounts for the form in question using only Pāṇini's rules, but the general purport is that one should know the MBh and the teachings of other reliable grammarians.

[4]Unfortunately, the butt of the joke is not translatable. See my explanation below.

[5]Patañjali actually shortens the rule to simply *ajer vī* and has the word *vā*, "optionally," continue from the preceding sūtra into P. 2.4.56. The option, however, is labeled *vyavasthita*, "conditional," meaning that it applies in some instances but not in others.

[6]This form is given in the AKKṣ 2.8.60c.

[7]I.e., *pra + ve + tṛ*. Here √*vī* has substituted √*aj* and changed into *ve* because of the following suffix.

only correct form according to a very literal reading of the sūtra. With this in mind, let us return to the joke.

In the short dialog, a certain grammarian uses the form *pravetṛ*, "driver," in his question, whereas the charioteer switches to the form *prājitṛ* in his polite response. The grammarian is taken aback. How dare this charioteer replace his grammatically correct form, *pravetṛ*, with the *apaśabda*, "deviant/incorrect word," *prājitṛ*? The charioteer, without missing a beat, replies with a jab at the grammarian and the first hint of his superior linguistic knowledge. He says that "his majesty" knows the rules but not what is accepted and hence what the rule actually teaches. The use of *devānāṃpriya*, an old epithet of kings, most notably Aśoka, must have been intended as an insult through hyperbolic respect,[8] but also to indicate the charioteer's knowledge of the vārtt. ad P. 6.3.21, where the word is listed. The grammarian, now flustered, expresses his annoyance by calling the charioteer *duruta*, which the charioteer then corrects to *duḥsūta* by explaining the proper derivation of the word *sūta*. The grammarian has analyzed *sūta* as though it were from *su + uta*, "well woven," based on √*ve*, "to weave,"[9] and, in a failed attempt to be clever, alters the honorific prefix *su-*[10] to the pejorative *dur-*. The charioteer, knowing something about the titles of his profession, points out that *sūta* derives from √*sū*, "to compel,"[11] and the correct insult would be *duḥ-sūta*, "awful charioteer."

---

[8]Scholars have given various explanations for *devānāṃpriya* in this context. The word was part of the vocabulary known to Kātyāyana who adds it in vartt. 3 as an exception to P. 6.3.21 *ṣaṣṭhyā ākrośe*, "elision of the sixth case of the first member of a compound does not take place when contempt is to be expressed." If *devānāṃpriya* were a term of abuse there would be no need for this particular vārtt. The *Cāndravyākaraṇa* along with its *vṛtti* support this interpretation. Cf. CV 4.3.12 and 5.2.14–16. Similarly, the *Mahāvṛtti* ad JV(M) 4.3.134. Hence modern scholars see it as a reference to the honorific title that Aśoka and other kings bore. Cf. Lévi (1891: 550) *un titre de chancellerie réservé à la dignité royale*, "A title of the chancellery reserved for royal dignity." Its use in the present dialog must, therefore, be sarcastic. The authors of the KV and its commentators are all silent on the exact meaning of the word. Beginning with Kaiyaṭa, however, we find the gloss *mūrkha*, "idiot," for *deva*, and one dear to idiots is himself an idiot. See MBhPra vol. II p. 558a. Weber (1873: 338) with fn. 1 believes *devānāṃpriya* was already a double entendre and a slight against the Buddhists even in the MBh. Later authors did use it as a term of abuse, e.g., Jayantabhaṭṭa in the *Nyāyamañjarī* p. 116: *granthajño devānāṃpriyaḥ*, with a clear echo of the passage at hand. Cf. Kielhorn (1908) [= Kielhorn (1969: 1017–1020)] and Scharfe (1971b). The latter sees a translation of the Greek phrase *phílos tôn basiléōn*, "beloved by kings."

[9]Cf. KṣDhP I.1055 *veñ tantusaṃtāne*.

[10]Cf. Kaiyaṭa MBhPra II p. 558a: *pūjāyām suśabdaḥ* | "The word *su-* occurs in the sense of honor."

[11]Cf. KṣDhP IV.115 *ṣū preraṇe*. According to Kaiyaṭa (MBhPra II p. 558a) *sūta* is derived as a designation (*saṃjñā*) with the suffix *-Kta* in the sense of an agent by P. 3.4.72. Kaiyaṭa's gloss is: *rathavāhasya rathe preraṇāt sūta iti saṃjñā* | "The designation is *sūta* because he, (standing) on the chariot, compels the horse."

Like so many of the debates I have mustered forth in the preceding chapters, we find that every step in the analysis involves an interpretive decision ranging from the meaning of Pāṇini's sūtra to proper morphological analysis, and, above all, that grammarians must come to terms with usage, the driving force behind the entire discussion, including the earlier portion I have omitted. To do so, however, there is more than one path available. Kātyāyana first attempted to account for the form by formulating an addition (*upasaṃkhyāna*), but Patañjali ultimately rejected it in favor of an interpretation closer to the original wording of the sūtra (he also eliminates the word *aghañ-apoḥ*). When a still incredulous student asks if the word *prājitṛ* is really to be accepted, the dialog is quoted to demonstrate the word's usage and the consequences of being a bad grammarian,[12] i.e., one who follows rules more closely than what the rules should describe. Furthermore, the strange splitting of *sūta* exemplifies how mere morphological jugglery can lead a grammarian astray. We might recall Sāyaṇa's discussion of *prārthayanta* in the preceding chapter and that a twisted analysis of the form (as a denominative) does not please the connoisseurs. Linguistic analysis must go hand in hand with the meaning of the word in question. With these points in mind, let us return to some of the results of the dissertation.

7.2   Summary of Findings

I have sought to demonstrate that the history of Sanskrit grammar extends beyond strict grammatical texts and that many important debates are first noted in the works of Bhāmaha and Vāmana, who, in turn, were seeking to both account for, and establish, the grammar for poetry. As I have shown in ch. 2, poetic diction formed a particular subset of the Sanskrit language, not only insofar as it was ornamented but also as being devoid of a range faults (*doṣa*s), some of which are otherwise acceptable (excessive complexity, technical words, vulgarity, etc.). Among these, grammatical incorrectness blemishes the body of a poem to the core. For this reason Bhāmaha

---

[12]For another reference to bad grammarians, cf. one of the standard examples for P. 2.1.53, *vaiyākaraṇakhasūci*, "grammarians who points to the sky." As explained by Haradatta (KVPada vol. II pp. 69), this is a grammarian who, upon being asked a question, points to the sky and comments on the weather in an attempt to distract his questioner from his own ignorance.

and Vāmana must have felt compelled to compose their respective chapters on *śabdaśuddhi*, "purification of language." Such guidelines could only have been necessary in the first place if poets took occasional license that warranted either justification or repudiation, and if the rules themselves were not always so clear-cut. Neither author was willing to give poets carte blanche, but I have shown that certain questionable linguistic forms (*kvasvanta*s, *āsa*, etc.) were given approval by one means or another, although never unanimously accepted in the long run. The motivating forces behind these decisions varied, and it has been difficult to state one single guiding principle. In the case of Bhāmaha, he appears to have particularly disfavored excessive complexity in derivations and reading more into a sūtra than what was readily apparent or already accepted as a necessary addenda to the A (*upasaṃkhyāna*s and *iṣṭi*s). In the case of *KvasU*, however, he may well have simply given his approval on the strength of usage, the other currently known possibilities being expressly unpalatable.[13] Vāmana, on the other hand, was more willing to exploit the available interpretive stratagems in the grammatical tradition. Recall that Daṇḍin labels those readers fools (*kudhī*) who are unable to derive forms that rely on a more subtle understanding of Pāṇini's rules in light of the commentaries, much like the grammarian in the dialog. For Vāmana, though, it seems that only those devices with general acceptance were valid. The rejection of *āha* as a past tense, for example, likely resulted in there being no established means for explaining the form.[14] In contrast, *āsa* could be accepted because their was an available homophonous root in the DhP. As I have shown at the beginning of ch. 5, Vāmana responded, in all likelihood, directly to Bhāmaha's work so as to codify how the full range of grammatical devices could be applied to poetic language. Despite their differences, both authors evince an often creative and flexible attitude toward grammar and lack much of the rigidity commonly associated with Sanskrit grammarians. In this regard they still embody much of the accommodating spirit we have seen in the above quoted dialog.

I have, perhaps at the detriment of the BhK and KAS, used Bhāmaha's and Vāmana's remarks

---

[13]I.e. a non-Pāṇinian grammarian or Jinendrabuddhi's *jñāpaka*.

[14]The other proposal, *āha* as a particle, did not win universal favor, and the text was even emended in some strands of transmission.

on specific grammatical points to launch into two extended studies, one on the suffix *KvasU* and one on the proposed "hint" in √*caṣkIṄ*. Each one has afforded me the opportunity to document the origins, the reactions to, and evolution of each proposal over the span of nearly a millennium. There are certainly drawbacks as well as advantages in viewing Sanskrit grammar in the *longue durée* and drawing any sweeping conclusions from individual examples. For to see the big picture, we must be Brobdingnagians among the Lilliputians, and, as Gulliver learned, when the tables are turned, what seemed pristine and smooth is in fact covered in blemishes and warts. Still, much can be learned from contours. Furthermore, the interpretation of the culled data will require more nuance, contextualization, and comparison with similar research. One particular difficulty is my assumption, in some places, that one commentator was following another or a specific school based on the similarity of ideas. Nevertheless, the two studies, along with other minor notes throughout, have brought to light a number of texts long neglected and revealed how vibrant and multifaceted the discussions on grammar were. One result that I hope will have some impact is that we cannot rely on one commentary or translation of the A, especially if we wish to understand how a sūtra was understood at a particular point in time and space. By expanding my archive to poetry and commentaries thereon, I have been able to demonstrate the extent to which the grammatical debates formed an integral part of the exegetical tradition and that the tradition was not solely based on the Pāṇini's grammar but in contact with other schools as well. Similarly, the interpretation of the A was also informed by non-Pāṇinian schools. As more texts come to light, this picture will likely become even more intricate.

In addition to highlighting the complexity in the history of Sanskrit grammar and exegesis, these studies have also begun to reveal more detail about perceived linguistic authorities. Bookending the grammatical tradition is Parañjali, who describes a specific community of learned individuals, the *śiṣṭa*s, as the only ones who speak correct Sanskrit independent of the A, and Nāgeśa, who believes Patañjali to be the last author whose words are authoritative in both interpreting the A — itself an almost Vedic text by that time — and linguistic usage. Both of these points were well exemplified in the two longer case studies. *KvasU* could ultimately be saved, not

because of the overwhelming evidence from poets or clever reasoning about the indicatory *K*, but because Patañjali happened to use such a form in giving a *vigraha*, a de facto non-Vedic utterance. On the other hand, the rather popular metrarule derived from the "hint" in √*cakṣIṄ* would ultimately lose any validity for Nāgeśa because Patañjali himself did not expressly support it. In between, however, we find an often symbiotic relationship between grammarians, poetry, and the commentators with a wide ranging opinions. Vallabhadeva, it will be recalled, displays conservatism when compared to later commentators; much of what is *pramādaja*, "born from folly," for him finds a valid justification in others. In ch. 5 we saw examples of this with both *āha*, "has said" and *āsa*, "has been." In the first case, a solution could be found either in the now lost text, the *Pāṇinīyamatadarpaṇa*, or by having recourse to Bhoja's grammar, as Aruṇagirinātha does. In the second case, already Vāmana provided a valid way out within the Pāṇinian system by deriving the form from a different root, but discussion still continued and led us to the fascinating passage in Hemādri's commentary, in which both usage (including a citation from the *Upaniṣad*s) and the *Sārasvatavyākaraṇa* are quoted in order to prove the validity of Kālidāsa's words. The flow of influence also went in the other direction. Poetry could inform the interpretation of Pāṇini, as we have seen with P. 3.2.162 and forms like *chidura*. Māgha's usage in ŚiśuP 6.8d is cited by several commentators beginning with Haradatta as a basis for rejecting the KV's interpretation of rule in question. Only with Bhaṭṭoji do we find a reference to the absence of support in the MBh.

Such discussions could only arise if *kāvya*, in particular the *mahākāvya*, "great poem," was considered to have been worthy of defending. In ch. 2 I presented some reasons as to why poetry was held in such high esteem throughout Sanskrit's history, but poets were not generally granted sage-like status whereby they could freely compose in a non-standard register. That we find such dubious forms and that to explain them new rules had to be composed or stratagems thought up, testifies to two perceptions. The remarks of the commentators and their tacit alterations of the text reflect an ambivalent attitude toward poets both across time and within individuals. Vāmana, for instance, rejects *āha* but accepts *āsa*, and both are forms well attested in Kālidāsa's

works. As noted in the previous paragraph, Vallabhadeva insists that poets nod, whereas others take pains to explain. These evaluations are, in turn, dependent on the espoused grammatical system, in most cases Pāṇini's. But other grammarians, like Candragomin and Bhoja, appear to have composed their new grammars with poetic usage in mind. When formulating SKĀv 1.4.165, I have no doubt that Kālidāsa's usage of *āha* was on Bhoja's mind. The non-Pāṇinian rules for *KvasU* as a suffix of general use in the standard language also appear motivated by poetic usage. Both of these instances lead us to the other side of the coin, namely that poets felt entitled to take liberties, especially in *mahākāvya*. As I have mentioned in ch. 5, many of the examples that come under discussion are not simply incorrect according to Pāṇini, but incorrect because they cross over into the register of the Vedas or Epics, works composed by *ṛṣi*s, "seers." We need not assume that Kālidāsa fancied himself a *ṛṣi* when he employed *ūcivān*, *āha*, *āsa*, etc.; this would be anachronistic. What does seem to be the case, however, is that later readers and grammarians were concerned about who could use this type of language. Vallabhadeva may well have thought that Kālidāsa was getting too big for his britches by imitating Vyāsa or even the Vedas. One could argue, I believe, that the encroachment on Vedic territory, both by poets using, and grammarians sanctioning, Vedic forms, was one reason for the consternation among the later Pāṇinians. Bhaṭṭoji and, even more so, Nāgeśa sought to redraw the boundaries that had been muddled over the millennia by returning to the most well-established authority, Patañjali. A similar trend could be seen in other *śāstra*'s in the latter half of the second millennium and was not restricted to grammar.[15] A the same time, however, I hope this study has demonstrated that although Nāgeśa ended up the winner insofar as he is the grammarian held in the highest regard to this day, we should not forget that just prior to his time the landscape was more diverse, especially in regions like Kerala with the *Prakriyāsarvasva* and in the East with the Bengali Grammarians still studying the Nyāsa. If we hope to retrieve the full spectrum of grammar in the pre-Nāgeśa period,[16] we must continue to excavate the texts that remain either unpublished and read critically those that are already at our disposal. Our goal must be to understand how ideas evolved and

---

[15]Cf. Deshpande (2012).

[16]The spread of the SK and the works of Nāgeśa is also an area of research with much promise.

interacted with each other. Sanskrit grammar has much more to offer than correct words.

We have, just now, briefly encountered a topic in need of further inquiry: the application of *Aṣṭādhāyī* to the Vedas. The reintegration of Pāṇini's Vedic rules into the *Kaumudī*-style grammars, Sāyaṇa's commentary on the RV, and other such evidence is telling of this process, and I have dealt with it only *en passant* in the dissertation but hope to expand upon it at a later date. For now, what I have presented is just a drop in the ocean that is the study of *vyākaraṇa*, and on that note, I recall a verse that H. V. Nagaraja Rao once recited to me and which I have since located in the prefatory verses of Devabodha's *Jñānadīpikā*[17] and Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa *Prakāśa*:

> *yāny ujjahāra māhendrād vyāso vyākaraṇārṇavāt |*
> *tāni kiṃ śabdaratnāni santi pāṇinigoṣpade ||* (*Jñānapradīpikā*, p. 2)[18]

> "Are the gems of speech, which Vyāsa has retrieved out of the ocean of grammar from great Indra, to be found in Pāṇini's puddle?"

---

[17]Many thanks to Harunaga Isaacson and Whitney Cox, who independently pointed out this reference to me.
[18]= PrKPra vol. III p. 6.14 with the variant *maheśād* for *mahendrād.*

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Abhidhānaratnamālā of Halāyudha. Ed. Th. Aufrecht. London: Williams & Norgate, 1861.

Amarakośa of Amarasiṃha. (1) *Nâmalingânuśâsana (Amarakosha) of Amarasimha With the Commentary (Amarakoshodghâṭana) of Kshîrasvâmin.* Ed. Krishnaji Govind Oka. Poona: Law Printing Press, 1913. (2) *Nâmalingânusâsana of Amarasiṃha With the commentary Ṭîkâsarvasva of Vandyaghaṭîya-Sarvânanda.* Ed. T. Ganapati Sâstrî. 4 vols. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series Nos. XXXIV, XXXVIII, LI, and LII. Trivandrum: Superintendent Government Press, 1914–1917

Amaruśataka of Amaru. *Amaruśatakam With Śṛṅgāradīpikā of Vemabhūpāla.* Ed. Chintaman Ramchandra Devadhar. Poona Oriental Series no. 101. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1959.

Anargharāghava of Murāri: *The Anargharāghava of Murāri withe The Commentary of Ruchipati.* Ed. Paṇḍita Durgâprasâda and Kâînâtha Pâṇḍuranga Paraba. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sâgar Press, 1887.

Apāṇinīyaprāmāṇyasādhana of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa. See: Sreekrishna Sarma (1968).

Ars Grammatica of Dionysius Thrax. Ed. Gustavus Uhlig. Lipsia [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1883.

Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini: See Böhtlingk (1977).

Bhagavadgītā. Ed. Subhadra Jha. Sarasvatī Bhavana Granthamālā 94. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa of Vyāsa: *Mararṣivedavyāsapraṇītaṃ Śrīmadbhāgavatamahāpurāṇam śrīdharasvāmiviracita-bhāvārthadīpikā, śrīvaṃśīdharakṛta-bhāvārthadīpikāprakāśaḥ, ... samalaṅkṛtam* Ed. Kṛṣṇaśaṃkaraḥ Śāstrī. 12 Vols. [Publisher and Place of Publication unknown] 1966–1973.

Bālamanoramā of Vāsudeva Dīkṣita: See *Siddhāntakaumudī.*

Bhāṣāvṛtti of Puruṣottamadeva. See Chakravarti (1918).

Bhaṭṭikāvya of Bhaṭṭi: (1) *The Bhaṭṭi-Kâvya or Râvaṇavadha composed by Śri Bhaṭṭi with the commentary of Mallinātha.* Ed. Kamalâśaṅkara Prânaśaṅkara Trivedî. 2 Vols. Bombay Sanskrit Series no. LVI. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt, 1898. (2) *Bhaṭṭikāvya of Bhaṭṭi with The Commentary (Jayamaṅgalā) of Jayamaṅgala.* Ed. Vināyak Nārāyaṇ Shāstrī Joshi and Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Shāstrī Paṇśīkar. 8th ed. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sāgar Press, 1934.

Brahmapurāṇa: Sanskrit Indices and Texts of the Brahmapurāṇa. Ed. Peter Schreiner & Söhnen. 3 vols. Purāṇa Research Publications 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.

Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara of Nāgeśa. Ed. Sītārāmaśāstrī. 3 vols. Varanasi: Sampurananand Sanskrit University, 1996.

Bṛhadvṛtti and *Śabdamahārṇava* on the *Siddhahemśabdānuśāsana*: *Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana* of Hemacandra: *Siddhahemacandraśabdānuśāsanam svopajñatattvaprakāśikā-śabdamahārṇava-nyāsa-śrīkanakaprabhasūriracitanyāsasārasamuddhārasaṃvalitam.* Ed. Vijayalāvaṇyasūri. 6 Vols. Śrīvijayanemisūri[īśvara]granthamālāratnam nos. 33, 50, 55, 62 [Vols. 4 and 6], 69. Muṃbaī [Mumbay]: Nirṇayasāgar Pres, 1951–1983 [V.S. 2007–2039].

Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti of Sīradeva: See *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha.*

Buddhacarita of Aśvaghoṣa. Ed. E. H. Johnston. Part I. Panjab University Oriental Publications no. 31. Lahore: The University of the Panjab, 1935.

Caṇḍīśataka of *Bāṇa*: See *Sūryaśataka.*

Chāndogyopaniṣat. Ed. KāśināthaŚāstrī Āgāśe. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvali no. 14. Puṇyākhyapattana [Puna]: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya.

Cāndravyākarana of Candragomin: *Candra-vṛtti, der Original-Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra.* Ed. Bruno Liebich. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Vol. 14. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1918.

Chāyā of Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍe: See *Mahābhāṣya* (2), in which portions of the text are included in footnotes.

Daiva of Deva: *Daivaṃ devapraṇītaṃ śrīkṛṣ ṇalīlāśukamuninā viracitayā Puruṣakāra samākhyayā vyākhyayā sametam* Ed. Ta. Gaṇapatiśāstrī. Anantaśayanasaṃskṛtagranthāvali no. 1. Anantaśayana [Travancore]: Rājakīyamudraṇayantrālaya, 1905.

Daśakumāracarita of Daṇḍin: Ed. M. R. Kāle. Mumbai: Śāradākrīḍanamudrāyāṃtrālaya, 1890.

Dhātupradīpa of Maitreya Rakṣita. Ed. Srish Chandra Chakravarti. Savitārāya-smṛtisaṃrakṣana-granthamālā no. 2. Rajshahi: Varendra Research Societry, 1919.

Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana. (1) *The Dhvanyâloka of Ânandavardhanâchârya With the Commentary of Abhinavaguptâchârya.* Ed. Paṇḍit Durgâprasâda and Wâsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇśîkar. 3rd ed. Bombay: Niraṇaya Sâgar Press, 1928. (2) *Dhvanyāloka of Śrī Ānandavardhanācārya with the Lochana & Bālapriyā Commentaries by Śrī Abhinavagupta & Panditrāja Sahṛdayatilaka Śrī Rāmaśāraka.* Ed. Pattābhirāma Śāstri. Kashi Sanskrirt Series (Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā) no. 135 (Alaṅkāra Section, no. 5). Benares: Chowkhambâ Sanskrit Series Office, 1940.

Durghaṭavṛtti of Śaraṇadeva. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. 2nd ed. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. VI. Trivandrum: Government Press, 1942.

Durghaṭīkā of Durgasiṃha. See *Kātantra* (2).

Durghavṛtti of Durgasiṃha. See *Kātantra* (2).

Gaṇaratnamahodadhi of Vardhamāna. Ed. Julius Eggeling. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 1963. [Reprint of 1879 ed.]

Garuḍapurāṇa. Ed. Manmatha Nath Dutt. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies 67. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Haravijaya of Ratnākara. *The Haravijaya of Râjânaka Ratnâkara. With the Commentary of Râjânaka Alaka.* Ed. Paṇḍit Durgâprasâd and Kâśînâth Pâṇḍurang Parab. Kâvyamâlâ no. 22. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sâgara Press, 1890.

Harṣacarita of Bāṇa: Ed. Kâśînâth Pâṇḍurang Parab. 3rd ed. revised by Srînivâs Venkatrâm Toppûr. Bombay: Niraṇaya Sâgar Press, 1912.

Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇa. *"Friendly Advice" by Nārāyaṇa & "King Vikrama's Adventures"* Ed. Judit Törzsök. New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation, 2007.

Jainendravyākaraṇa of Devanandin: *Jainendra Vyākaraṇam by Pujyāpāda Devanandi with Jainendra Mahāvṛtti of Shri Abhayanandi.* Ed. Shambhu Nath Tripath and Mahadeo Chaturvedi. Jnanapitha Murtidevi Jaina Granthamala, Saṃskrit Grantha no. 17. Kāshī: Bhāratīya Jñānapītha, 1956.

Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa. Ed. S. Paranavitana and C. E. Godakumbura. Ceylon: The Government Press, 1967.

Jñānadīpikā of Devabodha: *Śrīdevabodhakṛtamahābhāratatātpāryaṭīkā jñānadīpikā mahābhārate ādiparve. Commentary by Devabodha on the Ādipārvan of the Mahābhārata.* Ed. R. .N. Dandekar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941.

Jñāpakasamuccaya of Puruṣottamadeva: See *Paribhāṣāvṛtti.*

Kapphiṇābhyudaya of Śivasvāmin. See Hahn (2007).

Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya and Vāmana: (1) Ed. A. Sharma, K. Deshpande, D.G. Padhye (Vols. 1–2), B.R. Shastry, V.S. Sarma, D.G. Padhye (Vol. 3.1), P. Ramachandrudu, V.S. Sarma (Vol. 3.2). 3 Parts in 4 Vols. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania Univiersity, 1969–1985. (2) *Kāśikavṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (Along with Commentaries Vivaraṇapañcikā—Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra).* Ed. Srīnārāyaṇa Misra. 6 vols. Varanasi: Ratna Publications, 1985.

Kātantra of Śarvavarman: (1) *The Kâtantra with the Commentary of Durgasiṃha.* Ed. Julius Eggeling. Biblioteca Indica, New Series nos. 297, 298, 308, 309, 396, 397. Calcutta: Stephen Austin and Sons, 1874–1878. (2) *Kātantravyākaraṇa of Ācārya Śarvavarmā With Four Commentaries 'Vṛtti' & 'Ṭīkā' by Śrī Durga Singha, 'Kātantravṛttipañjikā' by Śrī Trilocanadāsa, 'Kalāpacandra' by Kavirāja Suṣeṇaśarmā, 'Samīkṣā' by Editor.* Ed. Jānakīprasāda Dwivedī. 4 Parts. Sarasvatī-bhavana-Granthamālā no. 135. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, 1997–2005.

Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin. (1) *Ācāryadaṇḍiviracitaḥ Kāvyādarśaḥ ‖ Vādijaṅghāladevaviracitayā vyā-khyayā … taruṇavācaspatinā anyena ca kenāpi kṛtābhyāṃ vyākhyāntarābhyāṃ ca sahitaḥ.* Ed. Vē. Kṛṣṇamācārya. Tiruvādi: Śrīnivāsa Mudraṇālaya, 1936. (2) *Kāvyalakṣaṇa of Daṇḍin (aslo known as Kāvyādarśa) with commentary called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna.* Ed. Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha, 1957. (3) See Dimitrov (2002). (4) See Dimitrov (2011).

Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha: (1) *The Pratāparudrayaśobhūshaṇa of Vidyānātha with the commentary, Ratnâpaṇa, of Kumârasvâmin, son of Mallinâtha, and with a Critical Notice of Manuscripts, Introduction, Critical and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix Containing the Kâvyâlaṅkâra of Bhâmaha.* Ed. Kamalâśaṅkara Prâṇaśaṅkara Trivedî. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, no. lXV. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1909. (2) *bhāmahīyaḥ kāvyālaṅkāraḥ ‖ mīmāṃsārṇava-mīmāṃsākesari-śrīśailatātācāryaśiromaṇinā prācyavidyeśvareṇa kṛtayā vṛttyā kāvyālaṅkārakā-vyādarśādibahuviṣayavimarśanapareṇa upodghātena ca sametaḥ.* Ed. Śailatātācāryaśiromaṇi. Tantrodyānapupahāre Śāstrasaraḥ no. 3. Śrīpañcanada: Śrīnivāsasamudraṇāyala, 1934. (3) See Naganatha Sastry (1970).

Kāvyālaṅkāra of Rudraṭa: Ed. Durgâprasâd and Wâsudeva Laxmaṇ Śâstrî Paṇśîkar. Kāvyamālā no. 2. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sâgara Press, 1925.

Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṃgraha of Udbhaṭa: See Banhatti (1982).

Kāvyālaṅkārasūtra of Vāmana: (1) See Cappeller (1875). (2) *Kâvyâlaṅkâra Sûtra with Gloss by Paṇḍit Vâmana and a Commentary Called Kâvyâlaṅkâra Kâmadhenu By Śrî Gopendra Tripurahara Bhûpâla.* Ed. Ratna Gopālā Bhaṭṭa. Benares Sanskrit Seires nos. 134 and 140. Benares: Vidyâ Vilâs Press, 1908. (3) *Kavyalankarasutra Vritti with the commentary Kamadhenu.* Ed. Śrīkṛṣṇasūri. Sri Vani Vilas Sastra Series no. 5. Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, 1909.

Kāvyamīmāṃsā of Rājeśekhaya. Ed. C. D. Dalal and R. A. Sastry. 3rd ed. revised by K. S. Ramaswami Sastri Siromani. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1934.

Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa: (1) See Jha (1967). (2) *Śrīmāṇikyacandrasaṃketaviracitasametaḥ Kāvyaprakāśaḥ*. Ed. Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyankar. Ānandāśramasaṃsṛtagranthāvaliḥ no. 89. Puṇyākhyapattana [Pune]: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya (3) *Nāgojībhaṭṭaviracitoddyotayutagovinda-ṭhakkaraviracitapradīpasametaḥ Śrīmammaṭabhaṭṭaviracitaḥ Kāvyaprakāśaḥ*. Ed. Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyankar. Ānandāśramasaṃsṛtagranthāvaliḥ no. 66. Puṇyākhyapattana [Pune]: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya, 1929.

Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi: (1) *The Kirataarjuniya of Bhâravi with Commentary (Ghaṇṭâpatha) of Mallinâtha and Various Readings*. Ed. Paṇḍit Durgâprasâd and Kâsînâth Pâṇḍurang Parab. 8th ed. revised by T. Śrînivâsa Venkatarâma Śarmâ. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sâgar Press, 1917. (2) *The Kirâtârjunîya of Bhâravi With the commentary Śabdârthadîpikâ of Chitrabhânu*. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Sâstrî. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. LXIII. Trivandrum: Government Press, 1918. (3) "Kirātārjunīya, Canto I with the commentary of Devarājayajvan and Vidyāmādhava", ed. Kshitis Chandra Chatterji, *Calcutta Oriental Journal*. Vol. I, No. 8, pp. 1–39, 1934.

Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī of Kṣīrasvāmin: (1) See Liebich (1930). (2) Ed. Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka. 3rd ed. Sonīpata: Rāmalāla Kapūra Ṭraṣṭ, 2006.

Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. (1) *Mahākaviśrīkālidāsaviracitaṃ kumārasambhavam | śrīmallināthasūriviracitayā sañjīvinīsamākhyayā vyākhyayā sametam*. Ed. Avināśacandramukhopadhyāya. Kalikātārājadhānī [Kolkata]: Sarasvatīyantra, 1894. (2) *The Kumârasambhava of Kâlidâsa With the two commentaries Prakâsikâ of Aruṇagirinâtha and Vivaraṇa of Nârâyaṇapandita*. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Sâstrî. 3 Parts. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series nos. XXVII, XXXII, XXXVI. Trivandrum: Travancore Government Press, 1913–1914. (3) See Murti (1980). (4) See: Patel (1986). (5) *Kalidasa's Kumarasambhava with the Commentaries of Mallinatha, Charitravardhana and Sitarama*. Ed. n.n. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1989. [Reprint of 1898 ed.] (6) *Vidyāmādhavīya Commentary on Kumārasambhava - A Critical Edition and Study* Ed. P.V. Prajitha. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit, Kalady, 2010.

Kuṭṭanīmata of Dāmodaragupta. See Dezső & Goodall (2012).

Locana of Abhinavagupta: See *Dhvanyāloka*.

Mādavīyadhātuvṛtti of Sāyaṇa. Ed. Sada Śiva Śarma Śastri. Kashi Sanskrit Series (Haridas Sanskrit Granthamala) no. 103 (Vyakarana Section no. 12). Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1934.

Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. (1) Ed. Franz Kielhorn. 3 Vols. 3rd ed. revised by Kāśināth Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962–1972. (2) *The Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali with the Commentary Bhāṣyapradīpa of Kaiyaṭa Upādhyāya and the Supercommentary of Bhāṣyapradīpoddyota of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa*. Ed. Bhargava Sastri Bhikaji Josi (Vol. I and IV,, V), Shivdatta Sharma (Vol. II), Shivdatta Sharma and Raghunath Kashinath Shastri (Vol. II), Dadhriam Sharma (Vol. VI). 6 vols. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1987–1988. [Reprint of the edition of the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press]

Mahābhāṣyadīpik of Bhartṛhari. Ed. Johannes Bronkhorst. Fascil. IV, Āhnika I. Post-Graduate and Research Department Series no. 28. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, 1987.

Mahāvṛtti of Abhayanandin: See *Jainendravyākaraṇa.*

Medinīkośa of Medinikāra: Ed. Manatha Mukhopadhyaya. Calcutta: New Sanskrit Press, 1869.

Meghadūta of Kālidasa: (1) *Kalidasa's Meghaduta edited from manuscripts with the Commentary of Vallabhadeva.* Ed. E. Hultzsch. Prize Publications Fund Vol. III. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1911. (2) *Sugamānvayā Vṛtti A Late Commentary in Jaina Sanskrit on Kālidāsa's Meghadūta by the Jaina Muni Sumativijaya.* Ed. Walter Harding Maurer. 2 Vols. Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series no. 5. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute, 1965. (3) *Meghadūtam of Kālidāsa with eight commentaries (Sanjivini of Mallinatha, Panchika of Vallabhadeva, Charitravardhini of Charitravardhana, Pradia of Dakshinavartananatha, Vidyullata of Purnasarasvati, Sumanoramani of Parameshvara, Rasadipini of Jaddhara, Subodha of Bharatamallika).* Ed. Mithilaprasad Tripathi, Jagadish Sharma, and Prabhunath Dwivedi. Ujjain: Kalidasa Sanskrita Akademi, 2009.

Mahābhārata of Vyāsa: *The Mahābhārata: for the first time critically edited.* Ed. Vishnu S. Sukthankar, S. K. Belvalkar, et al. 24 Vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933–1970.

Manoramākucamardana of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja. Ed. Jatindra Mohan Mishra. Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan, 2016.

Mīmāṃsāsūtra of Jaimini: *Śrimajjaiminipraṇīte mīmāṃsādarśane ādita ārabhya dvitīyādhyāya-prathamapādāntaḥ prathamo bhāgaḥ.* Ed. Vaidyanāthaśāstrī. Vol. I. Puṇyākhyapattana [Pune]: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya, 1929.

Mugdhabodha of Vopadeva. (1) Ed. Otto Böhtlingk. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1847. (2) *Mugdhabodaṃ vyākaraṇam | mahāmahopādhyāyena śrīmatā vopadevena viracitam śrīmaddurgādāsavidyāvāgīśa-śrīrāmatarkavāgīśa-kṛtaṭīkāsametam.* Ed. Jīvānandavidyā-sāgararabhaṭṭācārya. Kalikātānagarī [Kolkata]: Siddheśvarayantra, 1902.

Mukhabhūṣaṇa. Ed. K. Kunjunni Raja. Adyar Library Pamphlet Series no. 41. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1973.

Naiṣadhīyacarita of Śrīharṣa: (1) *Śrîharsha's Naishadhîyacharita With the Commentary (Naishadhîyaprakâśa) of Nârâyaṇa.* Ed. Pandit Śivadatta. 4th ed. revised by Wâsudev Laxmaṇ Shâstrî Pansîkar. Bombay: Niraṇaya-Sâgar Press, 1912. (2) *Sri Harsha's Naishadham with The Commentary of Mallinatha (Sargas I–VI).* Ed. R. Subramanya Vadhyar. Trichinopoly: St. Joseph's Industrial School Press, 1916. (3) *Śrīharṣa praṇita Naiṣadhamahākāvya saṭīka (cāṇḍu paṇḍita kṛta naiṣadhadīpikā ṭīkā sahita) (1–11 sarga).* Jayadev Jānī. Rājasthān Purātan Granthamālā no. 188. Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, 1997.

Nārāyaṇīya of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Sâstrî. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series no. XVIII.

Trivandrum: Government Press, 1912.

Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata: *Nāṭyaśāstra with the commentary of Abhinavagupta.* Ed. M. Ramakrishna Kavi. Vol. II. Gaekward's Oriental Series no. LXVIII. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1934.

Navasahāsaṅkacarita of Padmagupta: *Navasâhasâṅka Charita of Padmagupta alias Parimala.* Ed. Vāmana Shastrī Islâmpurkar. Part I. Bombay Sanskrit Series no. LIII. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt, 1895.

Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi: See *Kāśikāvṛtti.*

Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa. Ed. Sūrya Nârâyaṇa Śukla. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1936.

Nyāyasūtra of Gautama: *Śrīmadvātsyāyanamunikṛtabhāṣyaśrīviśvanāthabhaṭṭācāryakṛtavṛttisametāni Śrigautamamunipraṇītanyāyasūtrāṇi.* Ed. Digambaraśāstrin Jośi. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ no. 91. Puṇyākhyapattana [Pune]: Ānandāśramamudaṇālaya, 1922.

Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra: See *Kāśikāvṛtti.*

Pañcagranthin Vyākaraṇa of Buddhisāgarasūri: Ed. Na. Ma. Kansāra. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 2005.

Pañcatantra of Viṣṇudharman: Ed. Patrick Olivelle. New York: New York University Press and JJC Foundation, 2006.

Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha: *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha (a collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās).* Ed. K. .V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1967.

Paribhāṣāvṛtti of Puruṣottamadeva: See Bhattachary (1946).

Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgeśa: (1) *The Paribhasendusekhara of Nāgojībhatta edited critically with the commentary Tattvādarśa of MM. Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar.* Ed. K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962. (2) *Vaidyanāthakṛtagadāṭīkāsaṃvalitaḥ paribhāṣenduśekharaḥ.* Ed. Gokhale Gaṇeśaśāstrin. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ no. 72. Puṇyākhyapattana [Pune]: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya, 1913.

Pradīpa of Govindabhaṭṭa: See *Kāvyaprakāśa* (2).

Pradīpa of Kaiyaṭa: See *Mahābhāṣya* (3).

Prakāśa of Helārāja: See *Vākyapadīya.*

Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmacandra: (1) *The Prakriyâkaumudî of Râmacandra with the Commentary of Viṭṭhala and with a cirtical notice of the Manuscripts and an Exhaustive and Critical Introduc-*

tion. Ed. Rao Bahadur Kamalashankar Pranashankar Trivedi. 2 Vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1925 and 1931. (2) *Prakriyākaumudī by Śrīrāmacandrācārya with the Commentary Prakāśa by Śrīkṛṣṇa.* Ed. Muralīdhara Miśra. 3 Vols. Sarasvatībhavana-Granthamālā Vol. 111. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, 2000.

Prakriyāsarvasva of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Ed. K. Sāmbaśiva Śastri [Parts 1–2], V. A. Ramasvami [Part 3], Śūranāṭ Kuñjan Pilla [Part 4], Em. Mādhavan Uṇṇi [Part 5], Ke. Viśveśari Amma [Parts 6–7], S. 2 Vols. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series nos. 106, 139, 153, 174, 258, 262, 263. Trivandrum: Government Press [Parts 1-]; Trivandrum: Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library for the University of Kerala [Parts 6–7], 1931–1992.

Pramāṇasamuccaya of Diṅnāga: See Ernst Steinkellner et al. (2005) and Pinda (2009).

Prauḍhamanoramā of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: (1) *Prauḍhamanoramā by M. M. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (Avyayī-bhāvāntra) (A Commentary upon his Siddhāntakaumudī) With its Gloss called Laghuśabdaratna by Sri Hari Dīkshita, and Śabdaratna Bhairavi Commentary by M. M. Pandit Śri Mādhava Sāstri Bhandārī. Śabdaratna Pradīpaka notes on Avyayībhāvānta Portion by Pandit Jagannātha Śastrī Paṇḍe.* Ed. Sāda Śiva Śarma Śāstrī. Part I. Kashi Sanskrit Series (Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā) no. 58 (Vyakarana Section no. 9). Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1935. (2) *Prauḍhamanoramā by M. M. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (A Commentary upon his Siddhānta Kaumudi) With its Gloss called Laghuśabdaratna by Sri Hari Dīkśita with Three Commentaries: Bhairavi, Bhāvaprakāśa & Saralā by M. M. Pandit Śrī Bhairava Miśra, Vaidyanātha Payagunde and Gopāl Śastri Nene.* Ed. Gopal Śāstri Nene. Part II. Kashi Sanskrit Series (Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā) no. 125 (Vyakarana Section no. 16). Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1939. (3) *Praudhamanoramá Bhaṭṭojí Díkshita's Commentary on his Siddhánta Kaumudí with its gloss called Laghu Śabdaratna by the author's Grand Son Harí Díkshita.* Ed. Ráma Śástrí Mánavallí with the assistance of Gaṅgádhara Śástrí. Second Half. Benares: Messrs. Braj B. Das & Co., 1888.

Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa: (1) *Raghuvamsa by Mahakavi Kalidasa with Prasika Commentary of Arunagirinatha & Padarthadeepika Commentary of Naryana Panditha.* Ed. K. Achyuta Poduval and C. K. Raman Nambidar. 3 Vols. Sri Ravi Varma Sanskrit Series no. 3. Tripunithura: The Sanskrit College Committee, 1964–1969. (2) See Nandargikar (1971). (3) *Jinasamudra's Commentary on the Raghuvaṃs'a of Kālidāsa.* Ed. Tapasvi Nandi. Gandhinagar: Gujarat Sahitya Akademi, 1989. (4) *The Raghuvaṃśa of Kālidāsa.* Ed. Rewā Prasāda Dwivedī. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1993. (5) See Goodall and Isaacson (2003).

Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa. Ed. M. A. Stein. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 1988. [Reprint of 1892 ed.]

Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki: (1) *The Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa: Critical Edition.* Ed. G. H. Bhatt and U. P. Shah. 7 Vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1960–1975. (2) *Rāmāyaṇa of Valmīki with the commentaries Tilaka of Rāma. Rāmāyaṇaśiromaṇi of Śivasahāya and Bhūṣaṇa of Goviindarāja.* Ed. Shastri Shrinivasa Katti Mudholakara. 7 Vols. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1983.

Rasagaṅgādhara of Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja: *The Rasagangâdhara of Jagannâtha Pandita: with The commentary of Nâgeśa Bhatta.* Ed. Paṇḍit Durgâprasâd and Kâśinâth Pâṇḍurang Parag. Kāvyamālā

12. Bombay: The Nirṇaya-Sâgara Press, 1888.

Ratnāvalī of Śrīharṣa. Ed. Āśubodhavidyābhūṣaṇa and Nityabodhavidyāratna. Kālikātārājadhānī [Kolkata]: Ghoṣayantra, 1910.

Rāvaṇārjunīya of Bhaṭṭa Bhīma. Ed. Paṇḍit Śivadatta and Kâśînâth Pâṇḍurang Parab. Kâvyâmâlâ no. 68, 1900.

Ṛgvedabhāṣya of Sāyaṇa: *Rig-Veda-Samhitâ The Sacred Hymns of the Brâhmans together with the Commentary of Sâyaṇâkārya.* Ed. F. Max Müller. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. London: Oxford University Press, 1890.

Rūpamālā of Vimalasarasvatī. *Paramahaṃsaparivrājakācārya-Śrīmadvimalasarasvatīpraṇītā Rūpāmālā hindīvyākhyāsahitā.* Ed. Keśavadevaśāstrī Pāṇḍeyaḥ. 4 Vols. 2nd ed. Dillī [Delhi]: Motīlāl Benārasīdās, 1973.

Rūpāvatāra of Dharmakīrti. Ed. Rao Bahadur M. Rangacharya and [vol. 2] M. B. Varadarajiengar. 2 Vols. [vol. I] Madras: G. A. Natesan & Col., Esplanade, Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1916; [vol. 2] Bengalore: The Bangalore Press, 1938.

Śabdakaustubha of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. Ed. Gopal Śastri Nene and [vol. 1 only] Mukund Śastri Puṇtamkar. 2 Vols. Repint from the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series nos. 3–10, 13, 14. Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, [vol. 2] 1929 and [vol. 1] 1933.

Śabdānuśāsana of Malayagiri. Ed. Bechardas J. Doshi. Ahmedabad: Bharatiya Sanskrit Vidya Bhavan, 1967.

Śabdārṇavacaṃdrikā of Somasūri [commentary on the Jainendravyākaraṇa]: *śrīmadācāryavaryasomadevasūriviracitā śabdārṇavacaṃdrikā | (jainendralaghuvṛtti)* Ed. Śrīyuta Śrīlālajaina. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965.

Saduktikarṇāmṛta of Śīdharadāsa. Ed. Sures Chandra Banerji. Sanātanajainagraṃthamālā 6. Kāśī: Audumbara Mudraṇālaya, 1915.

Sāhityakaṇṭakoddhāra. Ed. T. Venkatacharya. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.

Śākaṭāyanaśabdānuśāsana of Śākaṭāyana: *Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇam of Ācārya Śākaṭāyana [With the Svopajña Commentary, Amoghavṛtti].* Ed. Shambhunath Tripathi. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Granthamālā : Sanskrit Grantha no. 39. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Publication, 1971.

Śākuntala of Kālidasa: *The Abhijnâna-Śâkuntala of Kâlidâsa with the Commentary (Arthadyotanikâ) of Râghabhatta.* Ed. Nârâyana Bâlakrishna Godabole. Revised 8th ed. Bombay: Nirnaya-Sâgar Press, 1922.

Samanvayapradīpa of Devaśarman: See Hahn (2008).

Saṃketa of Māṇikyacandra: See *Kāvyaprakāśa* (2).

Sārasvatavyākaraṇa [of Anubhūti]: *Sārasvata Vyākarana of Anubhūti Svarūpācharya with Two Commentaries: The Chandrakīrti Commentary of Chandrakīrti and the Prasada Commentary of Vāsudeva Bhaṭṭa.* Ed. Nava Kishora Śāstrī. 2 Vols. 3rd ed. Kashi Sanskrit Series no. III. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 1985.

Sarasvatīkaṇṭābharaṇa[*-alaṅkāra*] of Bhojadeva. Ed. Kedārtnāth Śarmā and Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇśīkar. 2nd ed. Kāvyamālā no. 94. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1934.

Sarasvatīkaṇṭābharaṇa[*-vyākaraṇa*] of Bhojadeva. (1) Ed. T. R. Chintamani. Madras University Sanskrit Series No. 11. Madras: University of Madras, 1937. (2) Ed. K. Sambaśiva Śāstrī. 4 vols. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series Nos. CXVII, CXXVII, CXL, CLIV. Trivandrum: Government Press, 1935–1948.

Śatakatraya of Bhartṛhari: (1) See Kosambi (1946). (2) See Kosambi (2000).

Saundarānanda of Aśvaghoṣa: Ed. E. H. Johnston. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

Siddhaikavīratantra. Ed. Mikkyo Seiten Kyekyūkai. Taisho Daigaku Sogo-Bukkyo-Kenkyujo-Kiyo, vol.15, pp. 366–349, 1995.

Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: *Śrimadabhaṭṭojidīṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī śrīmadvāsudevadīkṣitapraṇītayā Bālamanoramākhyavyākhyayā Śrimajjñānendrasarasvatī-viracitayā tattvabodhinyākhyavyākhyayā ca sanāthitā.* 4 vols. Dillī [Delhi]: Motīlāl Banārsīdās, 2006.

Siddhahemaśabdānuśāsana of Hemacandra: *Sidhadem-Śabdānuśāsana by Kalikála-Sarvajṇa-Śrí Hemacandácháryavarya With a Short Commentary* [Laghuvṛtti] *by the Same Author and Haimdhátupátha &c.* Ed. n.n. Śrí Jain Yaśo-Vijaya Series no. 3. Benares: The Nyáya-Viśárada Śrí Yaśovijaya Benares Jain Páthśălá, 1905.

Śiśupālavadha of Māgha: (1) *The Śiśupālavadha of Māgha with Commentary (Sarvankashā) of Mallinātha.* Ed. Pandit Durgāprasāda and Pandit Śivadatta. 10th ed. revised by Vāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇśīkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sagar Press, 1933. (2) *Māghabhaṭṭa's Śiśipālavadha with The Commentary (Sandeha-Viṣauṣadhi) of Vallabhadeva (Complete).* Ed. Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhatta Shastri. Delhi: Bharatiya Book Corporation, 1990.

Ślokavārttika of Kumārala Bhaṭṭa: *Slokavartikavyakhya Tatparyatika of Umveka Bhatta.* Ed. S. K. Ramanatha Sastri. Revised by K. Kunjunni Raja and R. Thangaswamy. Madrapurīyaviśvavidyālayasaṃskṛtagranthāvali 13. Madras: University of Madras, 1971.

Śṛṅgāraprakāśa of Bhojadeva. Ed. Venkatarama Raghavan. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 53. Cambridge, MA: The Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University, 1998.

Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa of Vidyākara. Ed. D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 42. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabha. Ed. Peter Peterson and Paṇḍit Durgaprasād. Bombay Sanskrit Series no. 31. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1961. [Reprint of 1886 ed.]

Śukasaptati: *Der Textus ornatior der Śukasaptati.* Ed. Richard Schmidt. München: Verlag der k. Akademie, 1898

Sūryaśataka of Mayūra: See Quackenbos (1917).

Taittirīya Saṃhitā: *Die Taittirîya-Saṃhitā: Zweiter Theil. Kânḍa V–VII.* Ed. Albrecht Weber. *Inidsche Studien*, vol. 12. 1872.

Tantrapradīpa of Maitreya Rakṣita: *Tantrapradīpa of Maitreya Rakṣita: A Treatise on Kaśikā and Nyāsa.* Ed. Dileep Kumar Kanjilal in collaboration with Kripamayee Kanjilal. Kolkata: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 2007.

Tattvabodhinī of Jñānendrasarasvatī: See *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

Ṭīkāsarvasva of Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda: See *Amarakośa* (2).

Uṇādisūtra with Ujjvaladatta's Commentary: See Aufrecht (1859).

Vaijayantī of Yādavaprakāśa. Ed. Gustav Oppert. Madras: Government Press, 1893.

Vakroktijīvita of Kuntaka: See Krishnamoorty (1977).

Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari: (1) Ed. Wilhelm Rau. Wiesbaden: Stiener, 1977. (2) *Vākyapadīyam [Part III, Vol. II] [Bhūyodravya-Guṇa-Dik-Sādhana-Kriyā-Puruṣa-Saṅkhyā and Liṅga Samuddeśa] With the Commentaries 'Prakāśa' by Śrī Helārāja & 'Ambākartrī' by 'Padmaśrī' Pt. Raghunātha Śarmā.* ed. Raghunātha Śarmā. Sarasvatībhavana-Granthamālā Vol. 91. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, 1997.

Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇam: Ed. Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa. Bombay, Venkatesvara Press, 1912.

Viṣṇupurāṇam: *The Viṣṇumahāpurāṇam, Introduction, Text, Textual Corrections and Verse-Index.* Rajendranath Sharma. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985.

Vṛttipañjikā of Trilocanadāsa: See *Kātantra* (2).

Secondary Sources

[1] Abhyankar, K. V. (ed). 1967. *Paribhāṣāsaṁgraha (a collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās)*. Bhandarkar Oriental Rsearch Institute Post-graduate and Research Department Seires no. 7. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

[2] Aklujkar, Ashok. 1969. "Two Textual Studies of Bhartṛhari". *JAOS*, **89**, 547–563.

[3] Aklujkar, Ashok. 1971. "Mahābhāṣya-dīpikā or Tripādī". *Adyar Library Bulletin*, **35**, 159–169.

[4] Aklujkar, Ashok. 1977–78. "The Concluding Verses of Bhartṛhari's *Vākya-Kāṇḍa*". *ABORI*, **58/59**, 9–26.

[5] Aklujkar, Ashok. 1991. "Interpreting Vākyapadīya 2.486 Historically (Part 3)". *In:* Deshpande, Madhav M., & Bhate, Saroja (eds), *Pāṇinian Studies: Professor S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies University of Michigan, 1–48.

[6] Aklujkar, Ashok. 1996. "The early history of Sanskrit as supreme language". *In:* Houben, Jan E.M. (ed), *Idelology and Status of Sanskrit*. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 59–86.

[7] Aklujkar, Ashok. 2008. "Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya as a Key to Happy Kashmir". *In:* Kaul, Mirnal, & Aklujkar, Ashok (eds), *Linguistic Traditions of Kashmir*. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld (P) Ltd., 281–299.

[8] Allen, W. S. 1953. *Phonetics in Ancient India*. London Oriental Series, Vol. I. London: Oxford University Press.

[9] Apte, V. S. 1957. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Revised and Enlarged Edition. Poona: Prasad Prakashan.

[10] Aufrecht, Th. 1864. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Pars Octava Codices Sanscriticos Complectens*. Oxonium: e typographeo Clarendoniano.

[11] Aufrecht, Theodor (ed). 1859. *Ujjvaladatta's Commentary on the Uṇādisūtras*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.

[12] Aussant, Émilie. 2011. "*Kāśikāvṛtti* and *Cāndravyākaraṇa:* A Comparison of the *Pratyāhārasūtra* Section". *In:* Haag, Pascale, & Vergiani, Vincenzo (eds), *Studies in the* Kāśikāvṛtti. *The Section on the* Prayāhāras. London, New York, Delhi: Anthem Press, 191–214.

[13] Banerji, Sures Chandra. 1972. "Commentaries of Mallinātha". *In:* Hazra, R. C., & Banerji, S. C. (eds), *S. K. De Memorial Volume*. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 289–368.

[14] Banhatti, Narayana Daso (ed). 1925. *Kāvyālaṃkāra-Sāra-Saṃgraha of Udbhaṭa With the Commentary, the Laghuvṛitti of Indurāja*. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute: Poona.

[15] Bartholomae, Christian. 1906. *Zum altiranischen Wörterbuch: Nacharbeiten und Vorarbeiten*. Beiheft zum XIX. Band der „Indogermanischen Forschungen" herausgegeben von Karl Brugmann und Wilhelm Streitberg. Straßburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.

[16] Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna. 1915. *An Account of the Different Exsting Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.* Poona: Aryabhushan Press.

[17] Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna (compiler). 1938. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.* Vol. II, Grammar: Part I (Vedic & Pāṇinīya). Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

[18] Benfey, Theodor. 1874. *Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache, Erste Abhandlung: Der Saṃhitâ-Text.* Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung.

[19] Benke, Theodore. 2010. *The Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa: A 16th Century Manual of Dharma for Śūdras.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

[20] Bhate, Saroja, & Bronkhorst, Johannes (eds). 1994. *Bhartṛhari, Philosopher and Grammarian: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Bhartṛhari.* Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[21] Bhattacharya, Dinesh Chandra (ed). 1946. *Paribhāṣāvṛtti, Jñāpakasamuccaya, Kārakacakra by Puruṣottamadeva.* Rajshahi: Verendra Research Museum.

[22] Bhattacharya, R. S. 1966. *Pāṇinīya Vyākaraṇa Kā Anuśīlan.* Banaras: Indological Book House.

[23] Bhattacharyya, Dineshchandra. 1922. "Pāṇinian Studies in Bengal". *In:* N. n. (ed), *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes.* Calcutta: University of Calcutta Press, 189–208.

[24] Bühler, Georg. 1877. *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made In Káshmír, Rajputana, and Central India.* Extra Number of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Bombay and London: Society's Library, Town Hall and Trübner & Co.

[25] Bühler, Georg. 1889. *Über das Leben des Jain Mönches Hemachandra, des Schülers Devachandra aus der Vajrāśākhā.* Denkschriften der kaiserlicken Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, no. 37. Wien: Akadamie der Wissenschaften.

[26] Birwé, R. 1971. "English Introduction". *In:* Tripatha, Shambhunath (ed), *Śākaṭāyana-vyākaraṇam of Ācārya Śākaṭāyana.* Varanasi: Bharatiya Jnanapitha, 1–119.

[27] Biswas, Ashutosh Sarma. 1968. *Bhāgavata Purāṇa: A Linguistic Study, particularly from the Vedic background.* Dibrugarh: Vishveshvaranand Book Agency.

[28] Bloch, Jules. 1970 [1914]. *The Formation of the Marāṭhī Language.* Translated by Dev Raj Chanana. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[29] Böhtlingk, Otto (ed). 1977. *Pâṇini's Grammatik.* 3. Nachdruckauflage. Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

[30] Böhtlingk, Otto, & Roth, Rudolph. 1855-1875. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch.* 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.

[31] Boynton, Henry W. (ed). 1903. *The Complete Poetical Works of Alexander Pope.* Cambridge: The University.

[32] Bronkhorst, Johanne. 1983. "On the History of Pāṇinian Grammar in the Early Centuries Following Patañjali". *JIP*, **11**, 357–412.

[33] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1985. "On the Chronology of the Tattvārtha Sūtra and Some Early Commentaries". *WZKS*, **29**, 155–184.

[34] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1992. "Review of Coward and Kunjunni Raja (1990)". *IIJ*, **46**, 718–725.

[35] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1994. "A Note on Patañjali and the Buddhists". *ABORI*, **75**, 247–254.

[36] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2002. "The Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa: Some Questions". *In:* Deshpande, Madhav M., & Hook, Peter E. (eds), *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of Geoarge Cardona.* Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 182–201.

[37] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2004. "More on the Sources of the Kāśikā". *In:* Deshpande, Madhav M. (ed), *Problems in Vedic and Sanskrit Literature.* Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 47–54.

[38] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2008. "Udbhaṭa, a Grammarian and a Cārvāka". *In:* Kaul, Mirnal, & Aklujkar, Ashok (eds), *Linguistic Traditions of Kashmir.* New Delhi: D. K. Printworld (P) Ltd., 281–299.

[39] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2010. "Against Methodological Positivism in Textual Studies". *AS*, **64**, 265–274.

[40] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2011. *Language and Reality: On an Episode in Indian Thought.* Translated from the French by Michael S. Allend and Rajam Raghunathan. Brill's Indological Library, Vol. 36. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

[41] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2014. "Deviant voices in the history of Pāṇinian grammar". *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*, **32**, 47–53.

[42] Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2016. *How the Brahmins Won: From Alexander to the Guptas.* Handbook of Oriental Studies Section Two: South Asia, Vol. 30. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

[43] Bronner, Yigal. 2012. "A Question of Priority: Revisiting the Bhāmaha-Daṇḍin Debate". *JIP*, **40**, 67–118.

[44] Bronner, Yigal. 2016. "Understanding Udbhaṭa: The Invention of Kashmiri Poetics in the Jayāpīḍa Moment". *In:* Franco, Eli, & Ratié, Isabelli (eds), *Around Abhinavagupta.* Berlin: LIT Verlag, 81–148.

[45] Bronner, Yigal, Shulman, David, & Tubb, Gary (eds). 2014. *Innovations and Turning Points: Toward a History of* Kāvya *Literature.* South Asia Research. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[46] Brough, John (tr). 1968. *Poems from the Sanskrit.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

[47] Cappeller, Carl (ed). 1875. *śrivāmanaviracitā kāvyālaṃkāravṛttiḥ: Vâmana's Lehrbuch der Poetik.* Jena: Verlag von Hermann Dufft.

[48] Cappeller, Carl. 1880. *Vâmana's Stilregeln.* Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.

[49] Cardona, George. 1976. *Pāṇini: a Survey of Research.* The Hague: Mouton.

[50] Cardona, George. 1977–78. "Still again on the History of the Mahābhāṣya". *ABORI*, **58/59**, 79–99.

[51] Cardona, George. 1979. "Review of Scharfe (1977)". *IIJ*, **21**, 117–139.

[52] Cardona, George. 1996. "Some Thoughts on Ārṣaprayoga". *In:* Rani, Vijaya, & Goyal, V. K. (eds), *Śrījñānāmṛtam.* Delhi: Parimal Publications, 176–196.

[53] Cardona, George. 1997. *Pāṇini: His Work and Its Tradition. Volume I: Background and Introduction.* 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

[54] Cardona, George. 1999. "Review of Houben (1995): Approaching the Vākyapadīya". *JAOS*, **119**, 88–125.

[55] Cardona, George. 2004. *Recent Research in Pāṇinian Studies.* 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

[56] Cardona, George. 2007. "On the Position of Vyākaraṇa and Pāṇini". *In:* Preisendanz, Karin (ed), *Expanding and Merging Horizons.* Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse 351 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 53. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 693–710.

[57] Cardona, George. 2012. "Pāṇini and the Padakāras". *In:* Voegeli, François et al. (ed), *Deva-dattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume.* Bern, Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, 39–62.

[58] Cardona, George, Aklujkar, Ashok, & Ogawa, Hidieyo (eds). 2012. *Studies in Sanskrit Grammar: Proceedings of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference.* New Delhi: P.K. Printworld.

[59] Carey, W. 1806. *A Grammar of the Sunskrit Language, Composed* From the works of the most esteemed Grammarians. Serampore: The Mission Press.

[60] Carter, M. G. 2004. *Sībawayhi.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[61] Chakravarti, Srish Chandra (ed). 1913–1916. *The Kāśikā-Vivaraṇa-Pañjikā (The Nyāsa): A Commentary on Vāmana-Jayāditya's Kāśikā by Jinendra Buddhi.* Vol. I (Adhyayas 1–4). Rajshahi: Varendra Research Society.

[62] Chakravarti, Srish Chandra (ed). 1918. *The Bhasha-Vritti: A commentary on Panini's Grammatical Aphorisms excepting those which exclusively pertain to the Vedas by Purushottamadeva.* Rajshahi: Varendra Research Society.

[63] Chatterji, Kshitish Chandra. 1948. *Technical Terms and Technique of Sanskrit Grammar: Part I.* Calcutta: Visvanath Chatterji.

[64] Chaturvedi, Mithilesh (ed). 2009. *Bhartṛhari, Language, Thought and Reality: Proceedings of the International Seminar, Delhi, December 12–14, 2003.* Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[65] Colebrooke, H. T. 1803. "Sanscrit and Prácrit Languages". *AR*, 7, 199–217.

[66] Colebrooke, H. T. 1805. *A Grammar of the Sanskrit Language.* Calcutta: The Honorable Company's Press.

[67] Coward, Harold G., & Kunjunni Raja, K. (eds). 1990. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: The Philosophy of the Grammarians.* Vol. V. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[68] Dalai, Chimanlal D. (ed). 1918. *Lingânuśâsana of Vâmana with the author's own commentary.* Baroda: Central Library.

[69] Dash, Prafulla Chandra. 1986. *A comparative Study of the Pāṇinian and Cāndra Systems of Grammar (Kṛdanta Portion).* New Delhi: Ramananda Vidya Bhavan.

[70] De, Sushil Kumar. 1960. *History of Sanskrit Poetics.* 2 vols. 2nd ed. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.

[71] De Simini, Florinda. 2016. *Of Gods and Books: Ritual and Knowledge Transmission in the Manuscript Cultures of Premodern India.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

[72] Deshpande, Madhav M. 1985. *Ellipsis and Syntactic Overlapping: Current Issues in Pāṇinian Syntactic Theory.* Post-graduate and Research Department Seires No. 24. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

[73] Deshpande, Madhav M. 1992. *The Meaning of Nouns: Semantic Theory in Classical and Medieval India.* Nāmārtha-nirṇaya of Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media.

[74] Deshpande, Madhav M. 1993. *Sanskrit & Prakrit: Sociolinguistic Issues.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

[75] Deshpande, Madhav M. 1997. "Who Inspired Pāṇini? Reconstructing the Hindu Buddhist Counter-Claims". *JAOS*, **117**, 444–465.

[76] Deshpande, Madhav M. 1998. "Evolution of the Notion of Authority (*Prāmāṇya*) in the Pāṇinian Tradition". *HEL*, **20**, 5–28.

[77] Deshpande, Madhav M. (ed). 2004. *Problems in Vedic and Sanskrit Literature.* Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation.

[78] Deshpande, Madhav M. 2011. "From Orality to Writing: Transmission and Interpretation of Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī". *In:* Rotaru, Florin et al. (ed), *Travaux de symposium international: Le livre. La Roumaine. L'Europe, Troisième édition – 20 à 24 Septembre 2010, Tome III: La troisième section — Études euro- et afro-asiatique —.* Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 57–100.

[79] Deshpande, Madhav M. 2012. "Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's Perception of Intellectual History: Narrative of Fall and Recovery of the Grammatical Authority". *In:* Watanabe, Chikafumi et al. (ed), *Saṃsṛta-sādhutā: Goodness of Sanskrit.* New Delhi: D. K. Printworld (P) Ltd., 172–196.

[80] Deshpande, Madhav M., & Bhate, Saroja (eds). 1971. *Pāṇinian Studies: Professor S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume.* Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies University of Michigan.

[81] Deshpande, Madhav M., & Hook, Peter E. (eds). 2002. *Indian Linguistic Studies: Festschrift in Honor of Geoarge Cardona.* New Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[82] Desphande, Madhav M. 2014. "Appayya Dīkṣita and the Lineage of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita". *JIP*, **44**, 115–124.

[83] Devasthali, G. V. 1967. *Anubandha's of Pāṇini.* Poona: Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class B, No. 2. University of Poona.

[84] Dezső, Csaba. 2014. "'We do not fully understand the learned poet's intention in not composing a twentieth canto': Addiction as a Structuring Theme in the Raghuvaṃśa". *Journal of South Asian Studies*, **30**, 159.

[85] Dezső, Csaba, & Goodall, Dominic (eds). 2012. *"Dāmodaraguptaviracitaṃ Kuṭṭanīmatam: The Bawd's Counsel".* Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

[86] Dimitrov, Dragomir (ed). 2002. Mārgavibhāga*: Die Unterscheidung der Stilarten.* Indica et Tibetica, Band 40. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

[87] Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2007. *Lehrschrift über die Zwanzig Präberbien im Sanskrit: kritische Ausgabe der Viṃśatyupasargavṛtti und der tibetischen Übersetzung Ñe bar bsgyur ñi śu pa'i 'grel pa.* Indica et Tibetica Bd. 49. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

[88] Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2010. *The Bhaikṣukī Manuscript of the Candrālaṃkāra: study, script tables, and facsimile etidion.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[89] Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2011. Śabdālaṃkāradoṣavibhāga — *die Unterscheidung der Lautfiguren und der Fehler: kritische Ausgabe des dritten Kapitels von Daṇḍins Poetik „Kāvyādarśa" und der tibetischen Übertragung "Sñan ṅag loṅ" samt dem Sanskrit-Kommentar des Ratnaśrījñāna, dem tibetischen Kommentar des Dpaṅ Blo gros brtan pa und einer deutschen Übersetzung des Sanskrit-Grundtextes.* Veröffentlichungen der Helmuth von Glasenapp-Stiftung, Monographien Bd. 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

[90] Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2012. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati, A Philological Chronicle (*Phullalocanavaṃsa*).* Università degli studi di Napoli "L'Orientale" Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo, Series Minor LXXXII. Napoli: Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo Università degli studi di Napoli "L'Orientale".

[91] Diwekar, H. R. 1929. "Bhāmaha, Bhaṭṭi and Dharmakīrti". *JRAS*, **4**, 825–841.

[92] Dundas, Paul (ed). 2017. *Magha: The Killing of Shishupala.* Murty Classical Library of India Vol. 11. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[93] Ebeling, Sascha. 2010. *Colonizing the Realm of Words.* Albany: SUNY Press.

[94] Ebeling, Sascha. 2010. *Colonizing the Realm of Words: the Transformation of Tamil Literature in Nineteenth-Century South India.* Albany: SUNY Press.

[95] Einstein, Alber. 2009. *Über die spezielle und die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie.* Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Spektrum.

[96] Ernst, Steinkellner, Helmut Krasser, & Lasic, Horst. 2005. *Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālāmatī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā, Chapter 1,* Part 1: Critical Edition. Beijing, Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House-Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

[97] Ernst Steinkellner, Helmut Krasser, & Lasic, Horst (eds). 2005. *Jinendrabuddhi's Viśālā-malavatī Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā: Chapter 1, Part I: Critical Edition.* Sanskrit Texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region, No. 1/I. Beijing, Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

[98] Falk, Harry. 1991. *Schrift im alten Indien: Ein Forschungsbericht mit Anmerkungen.* ScriptOralia 56. Tübingen: Grunter Narr Verlag.

[99] Forster, H. P. 1810. *An Essay on the Principles of Saṅskṛit Grammar. Part I.* Calcutta: Press of Ferris and Co.

[100] Franco, Eli. 1990. "Valid Sign, True Sign". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, **34**, 189–208.

[101] Franco, Eli, & Ratié, Isabelle (eds). 2016. *Around Abhinavagupta: Aspects of Intellectual History of Kashmir from the Ninth to the Eleventh Century.* Berlin: LIT Verlag.

[102] Franke, R. Otto (ed). 1886. *Hemacandra's Liṅgânuçâsana.* 2nd ed. Vendenhoeck & Ruprecht: Motilal Banarsidass.

[103] Frauwallner, Erich. 1960. "Sprachtheorie und Philosophie im *Mahābhāṣya* des Patañjali". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archive für indische Philosophie*, **IV**, 92–118.

[104] Frauwallner, Erich. 1961. "Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archive für indische Philosophie*, **V**, 125–148.

[105] Freschi, Eilsa, & Pontillo, Tiziana. 2013. *Rule-extension strategies in ancient India.* Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

[106] Galewicz, Cezary. 2009. *A Commentator in the Service of the Empire.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

[107] Ganeri, Jonardon. 2006. *Artha: Meaning.* New Delhi, New York: Oxford University Press.

[108] Garfield, Jay L. 2015. *Engaging Buddhism: Why It Matters to Philosophy.* Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

[109] Gerow, Edwin. 1971. *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech.* The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

[110] Gerow, Edwin. 1977. *Indian Poetics. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. V, fasc. 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[111] Gerow, Edwin. 2002. "Primary Education in Sanskrit: Methods and Goals". *JAOS*, **122**, 661–690.

[112] Ghatage, Amrit Madhav. 1993. *Introduction to Ardha-Māgadhī.* 5th ed. Pune: Sanmati Teerth.

[113] Gnoli, Raniero (ed). 1962. *Udbhaṭa's Commentary on the Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha.* Department of Archaeology of Pakistan and Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente: Literary and Historical Documents from Pakistan II. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

[114] Golinksi, Jan. 2005. *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science.* Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

[115] Gonda, Jan (ed). 1973–86. *A History of Indian Literature.* 10 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[116] Gonda, Jan. 1977. *Vedic Literature. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. I, fasc. 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[117] Goodall, Dominic. 2001. «Bhūte 'āha' iti pramādāt: Firm Evidence of the Direction of Change Where Certain Verses of the Raghuvaṃśa are Variously Transmitted». *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, **151**, 103–124.

[118] Goodall, Dominic, & Isaacson, Harunaga (eds). 2003. *The* Raghupañcikā *of Vallabhadeva: being the earliest commentary on the* Raghuvaṃśa *of Kālidāsa.* Groningen Oriental Studies, v. 17. Groningen: E. Forsten.

[119] Gornall, Alastair M. 2013. *Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Laṅkā.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.

[120] Goudriaan, Teun. 1996. "Speech of the Gurus: Instances of treatment of Sanskrit in Tantric literature". *In:* Houben, Jan E.M. (ed), *Idelology and Status of Sanskrit.* Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 265–274.

[121] Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda.* Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

[122] Griffith, Ralph T. H. 1912. *Idylls from the Sanskrit.* Allahabad: Panini Office.

[123] Gunkel, Dieter, Katz, Joshua T., Vine, Brent, & Weiss, Michael (eds). 2016. *Sahasram Ati Srajas. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison.* Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

[124] Gupta, Dharmendra Kumar. 1970. *A Critical Study of Daṇḍin and his Works.* Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas.

[125] Haag, Pascale, & Vergiani, Vincenzo (eds). 2011. *Studies in the* Kāśikāvṛtti. *The Section on the* Prayāhāra*s.* London, New York, Delhi: Anthem Press.

[126] Hahn, Michael. 2007. *Kapphiṇābhyudaya or King Kapphiṇa's Triumph: A Ninth Century Kashmiri Buddhist Poem.* Ryukoku University Studies in Buddhist Culture XVIII. Kyoto: Institute of Buddhist Cultural Studies Ryukoku University.

[127] Hahn, Oliver. 2008. *Eine altindische Syntaxlehre: Devaśarmans Samanvayapradīpa nebst Autokommentar.* Geisteskultur Indiens Texte und Studien. Band 12. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.

[128] Hattori, Masaaki. 1980. "Apoha and Pratibhā". *In:* Nagatomi, M. et al. (ed), *Sanskrit and Indian Studies: Essays in Honour of Daniel H. H. Ingalls.* Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company, 61–73.

[129] Hattori, Masaaki. 2004. "Vāmana on Semantic Qualities: An Annotated Translation of the Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti (3.2.1–5. 10–14)". *In:* Hino, Shoun, & Wada, Toshihiro (eds), *Three Mountains and Seven Rivers.* Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 489–499.

[130] Hayes, Richard P. 1983. "Jinedrabuddhi". *JAOS*, **103**, 709–717.

[131] Hazra, R. C., & Banerji, S. C. (eds). 1972. *S. K. De Memorial Volume.* Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay.

[132] Hesse, Hermann. 2015. *Das Glasperlenspiel.* suhrkamp taschenbuch 79. Ulm: Ebner & Spiegel.

[133] Höfer, Albert. 1847. "Zur Lehre vom Infinitiv im Sanskrit u. Prâkrit". *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache*, **2(1)**, 181.

[134] Hines, Lillian M., & Howard, Ruth B. 1967. *Our Latin Heritage: Book III.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

[135] Hino, Shoun, & Wada, Toshihiro (eds). 2004. *Three Mountains and Seven Rivers: Prof. Musahi Tachikawa's Felicitation Volume.* Delhi: Motinal Benarsidass.

[136] Houben, Jan E.M. 1995. *The Saṃbandha-samuddeśa (Chapter on Relation) and Bhartṛhari's Philosophy of Language.* Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

[137] Houben, Jan E.M. (ed). 1996. *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language.* Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill.

[138] Houben, Jan E.M. 2009. "Pāṇini's Grammar and Its Computerization: A Construction Grammar Approach". *In:* Kulkarni, Amba, & Huet, Gérard (eds), *Sanskrit Computational Linguistics: Third International Symposium, Hyderabad, India, January 2009. Proceedings.* Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 6–25.

[139] Houben, Jan E.M. 2012a. "Grammar & Other Modes of the Mind". *In:* Watanabe, Chikafumi et al. (ed), *Saṃskṛta-sādhutā: Goodness of Sanskrit.* New Delhi: D.K. Printworld (P) Ltd., 311–329.

[140] Houben, Jan E.M. 2012b. "Studies in India's Vedic Grammars, 1: Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's Prakriyā-Sarvasva and Pāṇini's Śe". *In:* Cardona, G. et al. (ed), *Studies in Sanskrit Grammar: Proceedings of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference.* New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 163–194.

[141] Houben, Jan E.M. 2013. "Three Myths in Pāṇinian Studies". *AS*, **57**(1), 121–179.

[142] Houben, Jan E.M. 2014. "Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit: features and principles of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva of Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa of Lemputtūr". *Bulletin dÉtudes Indiennes*, **32**, 149–170.

[143] Hultzsch, E. (ed). 1911. *Kālidāsa's Meghaduta: edited from manuscripts with the Commentary of Vallabhadeva and provided with a complete Sanskrit-English Vocabulary.* London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

[144] Ingalls, Daniel H. H. 1965. *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry: Vidyākara's "Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa".* Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 44. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[145] Ingalls, Daniel H. H. 1989. "Ānandavardhana's Devīśataka". *JAOS*, **109**, 565–575.

[146] Irvine, Martin. 1994. *The Making of Textual Culture: 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory 350–1100.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[147] Jacob, Colonel G. A. 1907. *A Handful of Popular Maxims current in Sanskrit Literature.* 2nd ed. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sâgar Press.

[148] Jamison, Stephanie W. 1979. "Voice Fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial *-anta* in Active Paradigms". *IIJ*, **21**, 149.

[149] Jamison, Stephanie W., & Brereton, Joel P. 2015. *The RigVeda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India.* Oxford: South Asia Research. Oxford University Press.

[150] Jha, Ganganatha. 1967. *Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa with English Translation (Revised): (Chapters I to X) (With Index & Appendices).* Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.

[151] Jha, Ganganatha (tr). 1928. *Vāmana's Kāvyālaṃkhāra-Sūtra-Vritti.* 2nd ed. "Indian Thought" Series No. 2. Poona: Oriental Book Agency.

[152] Jha, Ganganatha (tr). 1933. *Shabara-Bhāsya.* In Three Volumes: Vol. I. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

[153] Joglekar, K. M. (ed). 1911. *Bhartṛhari, Niti and Vairagya Shatakas, with Notes, Translation, a Critical Introduction, and Bombay University Question Papers.* Bombay: Oriental Publishing Company.

[154] Joshi, S. D., & Bhate, Saroja. 1984. *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti.* Pune: Universiy of Poona.

[155] Joshi, S. D., & Laddu, S. D. (eds). 1983. *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (held in July 1981).* Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class E, No. 9. Poona: University of Poona.

[156] Joshi, S. D., & Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1976. *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Anabhihitāhnika (P. 2.3.1–2.3.17).* Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 11. Poona: University of Poona.

[157] Joshi, S. D., & Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1983. "The structure of the Aṣṭādhāyī in historical perspective". *In:* Joshi, S. D., & Laddu, S. D. (eds), *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.* Poona: University of Poona, 59–95.

[158] Joshi, S. D., & Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1986. *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Paspaśāhnika.* Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 15. Poona: University of Poona Press.

[159] Joshi, S. D., & Roodbergen, J. A. F. 1995. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini with Translation and Explanatory Notes.* Volume IV (1.4.1–1.4.110). Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

[160] Joshi, S. D., & Roodbergen, J. A. F. 2000. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini with Translation and Explanatory Notes.* Volume VIII (2.4.1–2.4.85). Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

[161] Joshi, Venkatesha Sastri. 1975. "The Significance of the Word 'bhāṣā' in the Aṣṭādhyāyī". *ABORI*, 212–218.

[162] Kahrs, Eivind. 1998a. *Indian semantic analysis: the nirvacana tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[163] Kahrs, Eivind. 1998b. *Indian semantic analysis: The 'nirvacana' tradition'.* University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 55. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

[164] Kale, Moreshwar Ramchandra. 1961. *A Higher Sanskrit Grammar.* Delhi, Patna, Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass.

[165] Kane, P. V. 1961. *History of Sanskrit Poetics.* Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Benarsidass.

[166] Kane, Pandurang Vaman. 1930. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediæval Religious and Civil Law).* Vol. I. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

[167] Kaul, Mrinal, & Aklujkar, Ashok (eds). 2008. *Linguistic Traditions of Kashmir: Essays in Memory of Paṇḍit Dinanath Yaksha.* New Delhi: D. K. Printworld (P) Ltd.

[168] Kelly, John D. 1996. "What was Sanskrit for? Metadiscursive strategies in ancient India". *In:* Houben, Jan E.M. (ed), *Idelology and Status of Sanskrit.* Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 87–108.

[169] Kielhorn, F. 1876. *Kātyāyana and Patañjali: Their Relation to Each Other and to Pāṇini.* Byculla: Education Society's Press.

[170] Kielhorn, Franz. 1885. "Quotations in the Mahabhashya and The Kasika-Vritti". *IA*, **XIV**, 326f.

[171] Kielhorn, Franz. 1886a. "Notes on the Mahabhashya". *IA*, **XV**, 203–211.

[172] Kielhorn, Franz. 1886b. "The Chandra-Vykarana and the Kasika-Vritti". *IA*, **XV**, 183–185.

[173] Kielhorn, Franz. 1887a. "Notes on the Mahabhashya: 5.—The authorities on grammar quoted in the Mahabhashya". *IA*, **XVI**, 101–106.

[174] Kielhorn, Franz. 1887b. "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*, **XVI**, 178–184.

[175] Kielhorn, Franz. 1887c. "Notes on the Mahabhashya: 7.—Some Devices of Indian Grammarians". *IA*, **XVI**, 244–252.

[176] Kielhorn, Franz. 1887d. "On the grammar Śākaṭāyana". *IA*, **XVI**, 24–28.

[177] Kielhorn, Franz. 1894. "Die Śâkaṭâyana-Grammatik". *GN*, 1–14.

[178] Kielhorn, Franz. 1908. "On Śiśupālavadha, II, 112". *JRAS*, 499–502.

[179] Kielhorn, Franz (ed). 1960. *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa. Part II: Translation and Notes.* 2nd ed. by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Institute.

[180] Kiparsky, Paul. 1979. *Pāṇini as a Variationist.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

[181] Kiparsky, Paul. 2007. "Pāṇini is slick, but he isn't mean". *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā*, **26**, 1–28.

[182] Kiparsky, Paul. 2016. "The Agent Suffixes as a Window into Vedic Grammar". *In:* Dieter Gunkel, Joshua T. Katz, Brent Vine, & Weiss, Michael (eds), *Sahasram Ati Srajas. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Stidues in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison.* Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 170–192.

[183] Klebanov, Andrey. 2016. *Texts composed while copying: A Critical Study of theh Manuscripts of Selected Commentaries on the Kirātārjunīya, an Epic Poem in Sanskrit.* Ph.D. thesis, Universität Hamburg.

[184] Knutson, Jesse. 2014. *Into the Twilight of Sanskrit Court Poetry: the Sena Salon of Bengal and Beyond.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

[185] Kosambi, D. D. (ed). 1946. *Śataka-Trayam of Bhartṛhari [The Southern Archetype of the Three Centuries of Epigrams Ascribed to BHARTṚHARI].* Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.

[186] Kosambi, D.D. 2000. *The Epigrams Attributed to Bhartṛhari: Including the Three Centuries for the first time collected and critically edited, with principal variants and an Introduction.* 2nd ed. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

[187] Krishnamoorthy, K. (ed and tr). 1977. *The Vakrokti-Jīvita of Kuntaka: Critically edited with Variants, Introduction and English traslation.* Dharwad: Karnatak University.

[188] Kuhn, Thomas. 2012. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

[189] Kulkarni, Amba, & Huet, Gérard (eds). 2009. *Sanskrit Computational Linguistics: Third International Symposium, Hyderabad, India, January 2009. Proceedings.* Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

[190] Kulkarni, Malhar. 2002. "Manuscript evidence on the issue of the Authorship of the Kāśikāvṛtti ". *In:* Thite, G. U. (ed), *Subhāṣiṇī: Prof. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume.* Pune: Prof. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Committee, 208–216.

[191] Kulkarni, V. M. 1983. *Studies in Sanskrit Sāhitya-Śāstra.* Patan: Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology.

[192] Kunhan Raja, C. et al. (ed). 1949–. *New Catalogus Catalogorum.* Madras: University of Madras.

[193] Kunjunni Raja, K. 1980. *The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit Literature.* Madras: University of Madras.

[194] Laddu, S. D. 1974. *Evolution of the Sanskrit language from Pāṇini to Patañjali: primary formations, Pāṇini 3.1.91–3.2.83.* Poona: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona.

[195] Lalithambal, K.S. 1995. *Dharmakīrti's* Rūpāvatāra: *A Critical Study.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

[196] Lalye, P.G. 2002. *Makers of Indian Literature: Mallnātha.* New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

[197] Lassen, Christianus. 1837. *Institutiones Linguae Pracritae.* Bonna ad Renum: Koenig et van Borcharen.

[198] Lévi, Sylvain. 1891. "Notes de chronologie indienne. devânâmpriya. — Açoka et Kâtyâyana". *JA*, **17**, 549–553.

[199] Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2005. "Why are Sanskrit Play Titles Strange?". *Indologica Taurensia*, **31**, 195–232.

[200] Li, Rongxi (tr). 1996. *The Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions.* Taishō Vol. 51, Number 2087. Moraga, CA: Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai America, Inc.

[201] Liebich, Bruno. 1885. *Die Casuslehre der indischen Grammatiker verglichen mit dem Gebrauch der Casus im Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa: Ein Beitrag zur Syntax der Sanskrit-Sprache.* Göttingen: Druck der Univ.-Buchdruckerei von E. .A. Huth.

[202] Liebich, Bruno. 1892. *Zwei Kapitel der Kāçikā.* Breslau: Preuss & Jünger.

[203] Liebich, Bruno. 1895. "Das Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa". *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philologisch–historische Klasse*, 272–321.

[204] Liebich, Bruno. 1899. "Das Datum des Candragomin". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, **13**, 308–315.

[205] Liebich, Bruno. 1919a. *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft: I Das Kātantra.* Sitzungsberichte der Heiderlberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 5. Abhandlung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsverlag.

[206] Liebich, Bruno. 1919b. *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft: II Historische Einführung und Dhāthupāṭha.* Sitzungsberichte der Heiderlberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 15. Abhandlung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

[207] Liebich, Bruno. 1920. *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft III. Der Dhātupāṭha.* Sitzungsberichte der Heiderlberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 10. Abhandlung. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Unversitätsbuchhandlung.

[208] Liebich, Bruno (ed). 1930. *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī.* Indische Forschung, Doppelhelft 8/9. Breslau: Verlag von M. & H. Marcus.

[209] Liehnard, Siegfried. 1984. *A History of Classical Poetry Sanskrit — Pali — Prakrit. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. III, fasc. 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[210] Loewy Shacham, Ilanit. 2015. *Kṛṣṇadevarāya's Āmuktamālyada and the Narration of a Śrīvaiṣṇava Community.* Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago.

[211] Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 1985. *Logic, Language and Reality: An Introduction to Indian Philosophical Studies.* Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[212] Maurer, Walter Harding (ed). 1965. *Sugamānvayā Vṛtti: A Late Commentary in Jaina Sanskrit on Kālidāsa's Meghadūta by the Jain Muni Sumativijaya, Critically Edited with an Introduction and Explanatory and Critical Notes.* Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series : 5. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute.

[213] Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1967. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen: A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary.* Lieferung 19 (Band 3). Heidelberg: Carlwinter Verlag, Universitäts Verlag.

[214] Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* Band I. Heidelberg: Carlwinter Verlag, Universitäts Verlag.

[215] McCrea, Lawrence. 2010. "Poetry Beyond Good and Evil: Bilhaṇa and the Tradition of Potron-centered Court Epic". *JIP*, **38**, 503–518.

[216] McCrea, Lawrence J. 2008. *The Teleleology of Poetics in Medieval Kashmir.* Cambridge, MA: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies Harvard University.

[217] Meier, Frz. Jos. 1931. "Der Archaismus in der Sprache des Bhāgavata-Purāṇa mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Verbalflexion". *ZII*, **8**, 33–79.

[218] Möhrke, Edwin. 1933. *Vallabhadeva's Commentar zu Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava (I–VII) in seinem Verhältnis zu anderen Commentaren vornehmlich zu dem des Mallinātha: Eine textkritische Untersuchung.* Würzburg: K. Trilitsch.

[219] Müller, F. Max. 1870. *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners.* 2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

[220] Moneir-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages.* New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[221] Monius, Anne E. 2001. *Imagining a Place for Buddhism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[222] Murti, Mulakaluri Srimannarayana (ed). 1980. *Vallabhadeva's Kommentar (Śāradā-Version) zum Kumārasambhava des Kālidāsa.* Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Supplementband 20,1. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

[223] N. n. (ed). 1922. *Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes.* Vol. III: Orientalia—Part I. Calcutta: University of Calcutta Press.

[224] Nagaraja Rao, H. V., & Shivakumāmarasvāmi, M. (eds). 1989. *Studies in Alaṅkāra Śāstra: Dr. Marulasiddaiah Commemoration Volume.* Mysore: Pratibha Samsat.

[225] Nagatomi, M. et al. (ed). 1980. *Sanskrit and Indian Studies: Essays in Honour of Daniel H. H. Ingalls.* Dordrecht, Boston: Reidel Publishing Company.

[226] Nandargikar, Gopal Raghunath (ed). 1971. *The Raghuvanśa of Kâlidâsa (especially adopted to meet the requirements of University Students.) with the commentary of Mallinâtha.* 4th ed. Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass.

[227] Narayana Rao, Velcheru, & Shulman, David. 2012. *Śrīnātha: The Poet Who Made Gods and Kings.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[228] Nyayaratna, Mahesh Chandra (ed). 1866. *The Kavya Prakasa, or a Treatise on Sanskrit Rhetoric, by Mammata Bhatta.* Calcutta: Kavya Prakasa Press.

[229] Oberhammer, G. (ed). 2006. *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien: Ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie.* Wien: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

[230] Oberlies, Thomas. 1989. *Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa.* Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien, 38. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

[231] Oberlies, Thomas. 1996. "Das zeitliche und ideengeschichtliche Verhältnis der Cāndra-Vṛtti zu anderen V(ai)yākaraṇas (Studien zum Cāndravyākaraṇa III)". *SII*, **20**, 265–317.

[232] Oberlies, Thomas. 2003. *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit.* Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, Vol. 5. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

[233] Oberlies, Thomas. 2006. "Zum Sūtrapāṭha des Cāndravyākaraṇa (Studien zum Cāndravyākaraṇa IV)". *In:* et al., Ute Hüsken (ed), *Jaina-itihāsa-ratna: Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag.* Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

[234] Oberlies, Thomas. 2012. "Cāndriana Inedita (Studien zum Cāndravyākaraṇa V)". *In:* Voegeli, François et al. (ed), *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume.* Bern, Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang, 143–157.

[235] Olivelle, Patrick (tr). 2008. *Life of the Buddha by Aśvaghoṣa.* New York: New York University Press and the JCC Foundation.

[236] Oppert, Gustav. 1893a. *The Grammar of Śākaṭāyana with the Prakriyāsaṅgraha Commentary of Abhayacandrasūri.* Madras: S. P. C. K. Press.

[237] Oppert, Gustav (ed). 1893b. *The Vaijayantī.* London: Madras and Sanskrit Vernacular Text Publication Society.

[238] Otter, Felix. 2017. *Grundkurs Sanskrit: Eine Einführung in die Sprache der altindischen Erzählliteratur.* Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

[239] Pāṭhak, K. B. 1883. "Pūjyapāda and the Authorship of the *Jainendra-Vyākaraṇa*". *IA*, **XII**, 19–21.

[240] Palsule, Gajanan Balkrishna. 1961. *The Sanskrit Dhāthupāṭhas: A Critical Study.* Poona: University of Poona.

[241] Patel, Gautam. 1986. *Kumārasambhavam of Kālidāsa with the commentary of Vallabhadeva.* Ahmedabad: Parijat Printery.

[242] Pathak, K. B. 1914. "Bhāmaha's attacks on the Buddhist grammarian Jinedrabuddhi". *JRAS*, **23**, 18–31.

[243] Pathak, K. B. 1930–31. "Dharmakīrti and Bhāmaha". *ABORI*, 372–395.

[244] Pathak, K. B. 1931. "Jinendrabuddhi, Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta". *ABORI*, **12**, 246–251.

[245] Pathak, K. B. 1931–32. "The Text of the Jainendra-Vyākaraṇa and the Priority of Candra to Pūjyapāda". *ABORI*, **13**, 25–36.

[246] Perrine, Laurence, & Arp, Thomas R. (eds). 1992. *Sound and Sense: An Introduction to Poetry.* 8th ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich College Publishers.

[247] Peterson, Peter. 1890. *Handbook to the Study of the Rigveda.* Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt.

[248] Pind, Ole Holten. 2009. *Dignāga's Philosophy of Language: Dignāga on anyāpoha, Pramāṇasamuccaya V: Texts, Translations, and Annotation.* Wien: Dr.phil. dissertation, Universität Wien.

[249] Pingree, David. 1981. *Jyotiḥśāstra: Astral and Mathematical Literature. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. VI, fasc. 4. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[250] Pischel, R. 1900. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen.* Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I. Band, Heft 8. Straßburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.

[251] Pischel, Richard (ed). 1922. *Kalidasa's Śakuntala: an ancient Hindu Drama.* 2nd ed. Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 16. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[252] Plofker, Kim. 2009. *Mathematics in India.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

[253] Pocock, J. G. A. 1971. *Politics, Language and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

[254] Pollock, Sheldon. 1985. "The Theory of Practice and the Practice of Theory in Indian Intellectual History". *JAOS*, **105**, 1–34.

[255] Pollock, Sheldon (ed). 2003. *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia.* Berkeley, London: University of California Press.

[256] Pollock, Sheldon. 2004. *The Ends of Man.* 12th Gonda Lecture. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

[257] Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

[258] Pollock, Sheldon. 2015. "What was Philology in Sanskrit?". *In:* Sheldon, Pollock al. (ed), *World Philology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 114–141.

[259] Pollock, Sheldon, Elman, Benjamin A., & Chang, Ku-ming Kevin (eds). 2015. *World Philology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[260] Potter, Karl H. (ed). 1977. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa.* Delhi: Motilal Bendarsidass.

[261] Potter, Karl H. (ed). 1999. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Volume VIII. Buddhist Philosophy from 100 to 350 A.D.* Delhi: Motilal Bendarsidass.

[262] Potter, Karl H. (ed). 2003. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Volume IV. Buddhist Philosophy from 350 to 600 A.D.* Delhi: Motilal Bendarsidass.

[263] Presiendanz, Karin (ed). 207. *Expanding and Merging Horizons: Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass.* Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse 351 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 53. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

[264] Quackenbos, George Payn (ed). 1917. *The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra: edited with translation and notes and an introduction together with the text and translation of Bāṇa's Caṇḍīśataka.* Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series Vol. 9. New York: Columbia University Press.

[265] Radhakrishnan, S. et al. (ed). 157. *Felicitation Volume Presented to Professor Sripad Krishna Belvaklar.* Banaras: Motilal Benarasi Dass.

[266] Radicchi, Anna. 1994. "*Vivakṣā* in the *Vākyapadīya*". *In:* Bhate, Saroja, & Bronkhorst, Johannes (eds), *Bhartṛhari, Philosopher and Grammarian.* Delhi: Motinal Benarsidass, 221–234.

[267] Raghavan, V. 1942. *Studies on Some Concepts of the Alaṅkāra Śāstra.* Madras: The Adyar Library.

[268] Raghavan, V. 1978. *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa.* 3rd ed. Madras: Vasanta Press, The Theosophical Society.

[269] Rangacharya, Rao Bahadur M. (ed). 1916. *The Rūpāvatāra of Dharmakīrti. Edited with Additions and Emendations for the Use of College Students.* Part I. Madras: G. A. Natesan & Co., Esplanade.

[270] Rani, Vijaya, & Goyal, V. K. (eds). 1996. *Śrījñānāmṛtam: A Memorial Volume in Honour of Prof. Shri Niwas Shastri.* Delhi: Parimal Publications.

[271] Rau, Wihelm. 1949. *Vallabhadeva's Kommentar zu Māgha's Śiśupālavadha: Ein Beitrag yur Textgeschichte des Māghadāvya.* Ph.D. thesis, Philipps-Universität zu Marburg.

[272] Rau, Wilhelm (ed). 1969. *Franz Kielhorn: Kleine Schriften mit einer Auswalh der epigraphischen Ausätze.* Glasenapp-Stiftung, Band 3, 1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.

[273] Renou, Louis. 1941-1942. "Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire en sanskrit". *JA*, **233**, 105–165.

[274] Renou, Louis. 1954. *Histoire de la Langue Sanskrite.* Les Langues du Monde 10. Lyons: Editions IAC.

[275] Renou, Louis. 1955. "Les nipātana-sūtra de Pānini et questions diverses". *Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes*, **I**, 103–130.

[276] Renou, Louis. 1955–69. *Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes.* Publications de l'institut de civilasation indienne, Série IN-8°. Paris: L'Institut de civilisation indienne.

[277] Renou, Louis. 1957a. "Le Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa". *Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes*, **III**, 121–217.

[278] Renou, Louis. 1957b. *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit.* Paris: Champion.

[279] Renou, Louis. 1963. "Sur le genre du *sūtra* dans la littérature sanskrite". *JA*, **251**, 165–216.

[280] Renou, Louis. 1966. *La Grammaire de Pāṇini.* 2 vols. Paris: Ecole française d'extrême-orient.

[281] Renou, Louis (ed, tr). 1940. *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva: traité grammaticale en Sanskrit du XIIᵉ siécle.* Société d'édition « les belles lettres ».

[282] Rocher, Ludo. 1986. *The Purāṇas. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II, fasc. 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[283] Rocher, Rosane. 1968. *La théorie des voix du verbe dans l'école pāṇinéene (le 14e āhnika).* Bruxelles: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles.

[284] Rocher, Rosane. 1977. "Rezension von Scharfe 1977". *Kratylos*, **23**, 81–86.

[285] Rotaru, Florin et al. (ed). 2011. *Travaux de symposium international: Le livre. La Roumaine. L'Europe, Troisième édition – 20 à 24 Septembre 2010, Tome III: La troisième section — Études euro- et afro-asiatique —.* Bucarest: Éditeur Bibliothèque de Bucarest.

[286] Ruben, Walter. 1936. *Studien zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyana.* Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.

[287] Ruegg, D. Seyfort. 1994. "'Pramāṇabhūta, *pramāṇa (bhūta)-puruṣa, pratyakṣadharman' and 'sākṣātkṛtadharman' as Epithets of the 'ṛṣi, ācārya' and 'tathāgata' in Grammatical, Epistemological and Madhyamaka Texts". *BSOAS*, **57**, 303–320.

[288] Sankara Rama Sastri, C. (tr). 1956. *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha: Paricchedas 1 to 6. With English Translation and Notes On Paricchedas 1 to 3.* Madras: The Sri Balamanorama Press.

[289] Sarangi, A. C. 1985. *Development of Sanskrit from Pāṇini to Patañjali.* Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.

[290] Śarmā, Batuk Nāth, & Upādhyāya, Baldeva (eds). 1981. *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha.* 2nd ed. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan.

[291] Sarup, Lakshman. 1920. *The Nighaṇṭu and The Nirukta: The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology, and Semantics.* London, Edinburgh, etc.: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.

[292] Sastry, P.V. (tr) Naganatha. 1970. *Kāvyālaṅkāra of Bhāmaha.* Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

[293] Scharf, Peter. 1995. "Early Indian Grammarians on a Speaker's Intention". *JOAS*, **115**, 66–76.

[294] Scharf, Peter M. 1996. "The Denotation of Generic Terms in Ancient Indian Philosophy: Grammar, Nyāya, and Mīmāṃsā". *Transactions of the American Philological Society,* New Series, **86**, i–336.

[295] Scharfe, Hartmut. 1971a. *Pāṇini's Metalanguage.* Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 89. Philadelphia: American Philological Society .

[296] Scharfe, Hartmut. 1971b. "The Maurya Dynasty and the Seleucids". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, **2**, 211–225.

[297] Scharfe, Hartmut. 1977. *Grammatical Literature. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. V, fasc. 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[298] Scharfe, Hartmut. 2009. "A New Perspective on Pāṇini". *Indologica Taurinensia*, **12**, 1–273.

[299] Scharpé, A. 1964. *Kālidāsa Lexicon: Vol. I, Basic Text of the Works, Part IV Raghuvaṃśa.* Brugge: De Tempel.

[300] Schönberger, Axel (tr). 2009. *Die* Ars maior *des Aelius Donatus: Übersetzung einer antiken Lateingrammatik des 4. Jahrhunderts für den fortgeschrittenen Anfängerunterricht.* Frankfurt am Main: Valentia.

[301] Sharma, Peri Sarweshwara. 1985. "Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*: An Analysis". *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Research*, **2**, 75–94.

[302] Sharma, Rama Nath. 2002. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini: Introduction to the* Aṣṭādhyāyī *as a Grammatical Device.* 2nd ed. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

[303] Shen, Yiming. 2014. *A Study of the Nominal Declension in the Kātantrasystem.* Cambridge University: Unpublished Master's Thesis.

[304] Shivakumara Swamy, M. 1989. "Concept of Pratibhā". *In:* Nagaraja Rao, H.V., & Shivakumara Swamy, M. (eds), *Studies in Alaṅkāra Śāstra: Dr. G. Marulasiddhaiah Commemoration Volume.* Mysore: Pratibha Samsat, 68–79.

[305] Shulman, D., & La Porta, S. (eds). 2007. *The Poetics of Grammar and Metaphysics of Sound and Sign.* Leiden, Boston: Brill.

[306] Singer, Milton (ed). 1966. *Krishna: Myths, Rites, and Attititudes.* Eas-West Press: Honolulu.

[307] Slaje, Walter. 1992. "Der Pārasīprakāśa: Über das indische Modell für Kṛṣṇadāsas persische Grammatik aus der Mogulzeit". *In:* Slaje, Walter, & Zinko, Christian (eds), *Akten des Melzer–Symposiums 1991.* Graz: Leykam, 243–273.

[308] Slaje, Walter, & Zinko, Christian (eds). 1992. *Akten des Melzer–Symposiums 1991.* Graz: Leykam.

[309] Smith, David. 1985. *Ratnākara's Haravijaya: an introduction to the Sanskrit Court Epic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[310] Speijer, J. S. 1886. *Sanskrit Syntax.* Leyden: E. J. Brill.

[311] Sreekrishna Sarma, E.R. (ed). 1968. *Apāṇinīya-Prāmāṇya-Sādhanam.* Tirupati: Sri Venkateswara University, Oriental Research Institute.

[312] Stein, M. .A (tr). 1900. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī.* Vol. I and II. Westminster: A. Constable.

[313] Sternbach, Ludwik. 1978. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Poets quoted in Sanskrit Anthologies and Inscriptions: Volume 1, Aṃśudhara – Dhoyī.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[314] Subhadra, C. R. 2008. *Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṅkāra: A Critical Study and Edition.* Calicut: University of Calicut.

[315] Swiggers, Pierre, & Wouters, Alfons (eds). 2002. *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity. Orbis* / Supplementa: monographies publées par le Centre international de Dialectologie générale (Louvain), Tome 19. Leuven, Paris, Sterling, Virginia: Peeters.

[316] Thakur, Anantalal, & Jha, Upendra (eds). 1957. *Kāvyalakṣaṇa of Daṇḍin (also known as Kārvyādarśa) with commentary called Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna.* Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

[317] Theme, Paul. 1935. *Pāṇini and the Veda: Studies in the Early History of Linguistic Science in India.* Allahabad: Globe Press.

[318] Thieme, Paul. 1956. "Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas". *JAOS*, **76**, 1–23.

[319] Thieme, Paul. 1957. "The Interpretation of the Learned". *In:* Radhakrishnan, S. et al. (ed), *Felicitation Volume Presented to Professor Sripad Krishna Belvaklar.* Banaras: Motilal Banarasi Dass, 47–62.

[320] Tola, Fernando. 1990. "Some Remarks on Bhartṛhari's concept of Pratibhā". *JIP*, **18**, 95–112.

[321] Tripatha, Shambhunath (ed). 1971. *Śākaṭāyana-vyākaraṇam of Ācārya Śākaṭāyana [with the Svopajña Commentary, Amoghavṛtti]*. Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Granthamālā: Sanskrit Grantha No. 39. Varanasi: Bharatiya Jnanapitha.

[322] Tripathi, Mithilaprasad, Sharma, Jadaish, & Dwivedi, Prabhunath (eds). 2009. *Meghadūta of Kālidāsa with eight commentaries*. Ujjain: Kalidasa Sanskrit Akademi.

[323] Tripathi, Tirth Raj. 1981. *Haradatta's Padamañjarī: A Critical Study*. New Delhi: Bhavana Prakasha.

[324] Trivedi, Rao Bahadur Kamalashankar Pranashankar (ed). 1925. *The Prakriyâkaumudî of Râmachandra (In Two Parts) with the Commentary Prasâda of Viṭṭhala*. Part I. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Institute.

[325] Törzsök, Judit (ed). 2006. *Rāma Beyond Price by Murāri*. New York: New York University Press and the JCC Foundation.

[326] Tubb, Gary A. 1979. *The Kumārasaṃbhava in Light of Indian Theories of Mahākāvya*. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.

[327] Tubb, Gary A. 1985. "Abhinavagupta on Phonetic Texture". *JAOS*, **105**, 567–578.

[328] Tubb, Gary A. 2014a. "Baking Umā". *In:* Bronner, Yigal et al. (ed), *Innovation and Turning Points*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71–85.

[329] Tubb, Gary A. 2014b. "*Kāvya* with Bells On: *Yamaka* in the *Śiśupālavadha*". *In:* Bronner, Yigal et al. (ed), *Innovation and Turning Points*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 142–194.

[330] Tubb, Gary A. 2014c. "Something New in the Air: Abhinanda's *Rāmacarita* and its Ancestry". *In:* Bronner, Yigal et al. (ed), *Innovation and Turning Points*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 357–394.

[331] Tubb, Gary A., & Boose, Emory. 2007. *Scholastic Sanskrit: A Handbook for Students*. New York: The American Institute of Buddhist Studies.

[332] Tucci, Giuseppe. 1930. "Bhāmaha and Diṅnāga". *IA*, 142–147.

[333] Van Buitenen, J. A. B. 1966. "On the Archaism of the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*". *In:* Singer, Milton (ed), *Krishna: Myths, Rites, and Attititudes*. Honolulu: East-West Press, 23–40.

[334] Van Hal, Toon, & Vielle, Christophe (eds). 2013. *Grammatica Grandonica: The Sanskrit Grammar of Johann Ernst Hansleden S.J. (1681–1732)*. Online Publication: http://pub.ub.uni-potsdam.de/volltexte/2013/6321/. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

[335] van Nooten, Barend. 1983. "*Vivakṣā-*, or intention to speak, as a linguistic principle". *In:* Joshi, S. D., & Laddu, S. D. (eds), *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Poona: University of Poona, 43–52.

[336] Vasudeva, Somadeva (ed). 2006. *The Recognition of Shakúntala by Kālidāsa.* New York: New York University Press and the JCC Foundation.

[337] Venkitasubramonia Iyer, S. (ed). 1970. *Dhātukāvya of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa with the commentaries of Kṛṣṇārpaṇa and Rāmapāṇivāda's Vivaraṇa.* Kerala University Sanskrit Department Publication no. 6. Trivandrum: Department of Sanskrit, University of Kerala.

[338] Venkitasubramonia Iyer, S. 1983. "Textual Criticism of Raghuvaṃśa on the Basis of Aruṇagirinātha's Commentary". *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal*, **XXI**, 152–168.

[339] Vergiani, Vincenzo. 2009. "Bhartṛhari on Śeṣa Relationships". *In:* Chaturvedi, Mithilesh (ed), *Bhartṛhari: Language, Thought and Reality.* Delhi: Motilal Benarsidass, 459–481.

[340] Vergiani, Vincenzo. 2015. "*Āgamārthānusāribhiḥ.* Helārāja's Use of Quotations and Other Referential Devices in His Commentary on the *Vākyapadīya*". *JIP*, **43**, 191–217.

[341] Verhagen, Pieter C. 1994. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet: Volume One Transmission of the Canonical Literature.* Handbuch der Orientalistik Handbook of Oriental Studies, Zweite Abteilung, Indien India, Achter Band. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

[342] Verpoorten, Jean-Marie. 1987. *Mīmāṃsā Literature. In:* Gonda, Jan (ed), *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. VI, fasc. 5. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[343] Voegeli, François et al. (ed). 2012. *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume.* Bern, Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang.

[344] Vogel, Claus. 1979. *Indian Lexicography.* Vol. V, fasc. 4 of Gonda, Jan (ed) *A History of Indian Literature.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

[345] Wackernagel, Jacob, & Debrunner, Albert. 1896–1954. *Altindische Grammatik.* 3 Bd. Band I: *Lautlehre*, Band II.1: *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposita*, Band II.2: *Die Nominalsuffixe*, Band III: *Nominalfexion, Zahlwort, Pronomen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

[346] Warder, A. K. 1958. "The Date of Bhāmaha". *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*, **26**, 93–96.

[347] Warder, A. K. 1972–2011. *Indian Kāvya Literature.* 8 vols. Delhi, Patna, Varanasa: Motilal Benarsidass.

[348] Watanabe, Chikafumi, Desmarais, Michele, & Honda, Yoshichika (eds). 2012. *Saṃskṛtasādhutā: Goodness of Sanskrit, Studies in Honour of Professor Ashok N. Aklujkar.* New Delhi: D. K. Printworld (P) Ltd.

[349] Weber, Albrecht. 1873. "Das Mahâbhâshya des Patañjali. Benares 1872". *Indische Studien*, **13**, 293–496.

[350] Whitney, William Dwight. *A Sanskrit Grammar, Including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana.*

[351] Whitney, William Dwight. 1893. "On Recent Studies in Hindu Grammar". *AJP*, **14**, 171–197.

[352] Wielńska-Soltwedel, Małgorzata. 2006. *The* Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā *of Viśvarupa, the first* adhyāya *and a detailed examination.* 2 vols. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.

[353] Wilkins, Charles. 1808. *A Grammar of the Sanskrĭta Language.* London: W. Bulmer and Co. Cleveland-Row.

[354] Woolner, Alfred C. 1917. *Introduction to Prakrit.* Lahore: University of the Panjab.

[355] Zachariae, Th. 1880. "Das Jainendravyākaraṇam: eine Sanskritgrammatik der Jainas". *Beiträge zur Kunde der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, **15**, 296.

[356] Zachariae, Th. 1933. "Zitate aus buddistischen Sanskritwerken". *ZII*, **9**, 1–16.

[357] Zachariaie, Th. 1897. *Die indischen Wörterbücher (Kośa).* Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I. Band, Heft 3 B. Straßburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.