

LOKANYĀYA-S IN VYĀKARAᅇA

Thesis submitted to the
University of Calicut *in partial fulfillment of the*
requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
SANSKRIT

By
ANITHA KALLYADAN


DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT
UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
2012

DR. P. NARAYANAN NAMBOODIRI,
Professor in Sanskrit,
Department of Sanskrit,
University of Calicut.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **LOKANYĀYA-S IN VYĀKARAṆA** submitted by Anitha Kallyadan, Research Scholar, Department of Sanskrit, University of Calicut, is a bonafide research carried out by her under my supervision for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sanskrit of the University of Calicut. This has not previously formed, either in part or as a whole, the basis for the award of any Degree or Diploma.

Calicut University,
19.06.2012.


Dr. P. Narayanan Namboodiri,
(Supervising Teacher).

DECLARATION

I, Anitha Kallyadan, Research Scholar, Department of Sanskrit, University of Calicut, hereby declare that this thesis entitled **LOKANYĀYA-S IN VYĀKARAṆA** submitted by me for the award of Ph.D Degree in Sanskrit is an original research work done by me. I further declare that this thesis has not been submitted either in part or as a whole for the award of any other Degree, Diploma or Fellowship or other similar title or recognition.

Calicut University,
19.06.2012.


ANITHA KALLYADAN

CONTENTS

Title	Page No.
Preface	i-v
Abbreviations	vi
INTRODUCTION	1-32
Significance of Vyākaraṇa in Sanskrit	5
Objectives of studying grammar	8
Trimunivvyākaraṇam	11
Origin, development and scope of nyāya-s	21
Chapter I	
STUDY OF MAXIMS IN SANSKRIT GRAMMAR	33-62
1.1. Social perspective in grammar	34
1.2. Significance of applying lokanyāya	40
1.3. Role of maxims in the Vyākaraṇa	42
1.4. Concept of lokanyāya	44
1.5. Some particular maxim with negation	48
1.6. Influence of maxims in other śāstra works	49
1.7. Socio-linguistic approach	55

Chapter II

	SOCIAL REFLECTION	63-156
2.1	Structure of society	63
2.2	Social behaviours	64
2.3	Division of towns and villages	67
2.4	Family	68
2.5	Eating habits, dress and decoration	69
2.6	Status of women	71
2.7	Awareness of health	73
2.8	Entertainments	74
2.9	Dark aspects of social life	74
2.10	Nyāya-s on society	75

Chapter III

	ECONOMIC LIFE	157-179
3.1	Agriculture	157
3.2	Occupations	158
3.3	Textile industry	159
3.4	Trade	160
3.5	Transportation	161
3.6	Nyāya-s on economic	162

Chapter IV

THOUGHTS ON POLITY 180-189

- 4.1 Nyāya-s on politics 181

Chapter V

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY 190-223

- 5.1 Religious beliefs and practices 190
 5.2 Religious cults 193
 5.3 Asceticism 193
 5.4 Moral concepts 194
 5.5 Philosophical thoughts 196
 5.6 Nyāya-s on religion 198
 5.7 Nyāya-s on philosophy 211

Chapter VI

EDUCATION 224-234

- 6.1 Method of study 224
 6.2 Nature of student 225
 6.3 Nyāya-s on education 226

Chapter VII

NATURAL OBSERVATIONS 235-257

7.1	Flora	235
7.2	Fauna	236
7.3	Nyāya-s on nature	237

Chapter VIII

	OTHER NYĀYA-S	258-286
8.1	Nyāya-s on other subjects	258
8.2	Paribhāṣa	279
	CONCLUSION	287-294
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	
	INDEX- List of nyāya-s.	

PREFACE

Our nation is abounded with many traditional languages, in which Sanskrit is the crown among these languages. An affluent language has its own style, ideas and expression of verse. That ideas or idioms are the tendon of that language. They elucidate the cultural growth of a society and lighten the pulchritude of health. On decomposing these idioms, they reveal the knowledge of the society about art, aesthetic concept, universe etc. These idioms have a special potential to express the ideas. Sometimes, the idioms can express an idea in its full sense, than that of express an idea by using a lot of verse. It is like 'dew that reflects a forest full'. Gradually, these idioms became the nyāya-s and proverbs. The use of Lokanyāya-s and proverbs make Sanskrit to dazzling language and it has been blended with the linguistic and semantic peculiarities of Sanskrit. By examining the language from Vedic literature to the latest Classical literature, we can see the Sanskrit is a mine of Lokanyāya-s and proverbs. Lokanyāya means the method of using examples from well known, suitable, appropriate proverbs and sayings from the society for illustrating, supporting or opposing any idea.

Grammar is the science of language. Without the help of grammar, the analysis of language is not possible. To explain the forms of language

is the main purpose of the science of grammar. For this, to isolate and analyse the notions, which are expressed by the forms of that language, is necessary. Grammar can be learnt easily with the help of many simple examples, nyāya-s or maxims taken from the society. These simple nyāya-s help to know the difficult grammatical sūtra-s, their *prayoga* and usefulness. In order to simplify the doctrines revealed in the traditional grammar texts, several grammarians have introduced certain Lokanyāya-s for the sake of the students. These nyāya-s fulfill the need of the students and support the religious laws for maintaining the rules and regulations in the Dharmic texts. In order to acquaint with this doctrine a study of Lokanyāya-s is essential to understand the nature of the society also.

The present study focuses on the Lokanyāya-s in Vyākaraṇa, especially in Mahābhāṣya. By a thorough analysis of the maxims, the study is intended to answer the following questions.

1. How far the maxims are helpful to grammatical study?
2. What are their functions?
3. How the maxims reveal the socio-cultural aspects of that time?
4. What is the relevance of the maxims in the present age?

The thesis consists of eight chapters and an introduction among which the introduction gives the significance of Vyākaraṇa in Sanskrit,

objectives of the study grammar and the origin, development and scope of nyāya-s. The first chapter explains in detail the social perspective, significance, role and socio-linguistic approach of maxims in Sanskrit grammar. The second chapter deals with society reflected nyāya-s, the third and fourth chapter discuss the economic life and the political thought of that period respectively. Religion and philosophy are explained in the fifth chapter, sixth chapter contains the details regarding the education and chapter seven draws the picture of natural observations. Chapter eight discusses the nyāya-s related to other subjects. Finally, conclusion is given depicting the new findings of the thesis. List of maxims are given as appendix.

The text 'Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali with the commentary of 'Pradīpodyota', six volumes, published by Chaukamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi are referred to in connection with the study of the maxims in Mahābhāṣya. For making the study of nyāya easier, it is divided into many headings such as Social, Political, Economic, Education, Religion & Philosophy, Nature etc. Division of nyāya-s into various headings according to its meaning is a difficult task since one nyāya can be included in many headings. For example, *gargaśatadaṇḍananyāya* can be included in two headings, i.e. Social and Political, *vṛddhakumārīvaravākyanyāya* into Social and Economic etc. Nyāya-s are

described in each headings that related to the concerned subject. The picture of the socio-cultural aspects of that time is drawn through the analysis of these nyāya-s.

Now a days the study of maxims is a very relevant topic extending its scope into every other fields of knowledge like, anthropology, socio-linguistics, history, culture etc. Moreover, it became a cause to lead us to a right way of life. It teach us how to solve a problem easily when we face day to day life, and teach us what to do, what not to do, how to do and so on. Besides this, in śāstra the maxims are used to explain the deep and abstract topics digestively.

When my research work comes to its end, I am expressing my deep sense of gratitude to my supervising teacher, Dr. P. Narayanan Namboodiri, Professor, Dept. of Sanskrit, Calicut University, whose kind help, timely evaluation, valuable suggestions and motivations to my work for making it a reality. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. N.K. Sundareswaran, Prof. & H.O.D, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Calicut and Dr. C. Rajendran, Professor, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Calicut for their kind help in giving suggestions and motivations to complete this thesis. I wish to express my boundless thanks to all my teachers of the Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Calicut, for their constant support and encouragement. I take

this opportunity to remember the great help offered by my beloved teacher Prof. R. Vasudevan Potti, an eminent Sanskrit scholar. I am also thankful to Dr. C.H. Surendran Nambiar, a great traditional scholar in Sanskrit, who helped much me to learn Mahābhāṣya. I express my heartfelt thanks to all my friends and colleagues for their sincere help.

I would also like to express my indebtedness to my beloved father, V.K. Bhaskaran Nambiar (late) and my beloved mother, K. Janaki (late) for their inspiration and blessing. Finally, I would like to thank my husband Sri. M.P. Jayakrishnan for his sincere help and inspiration for the completion of this work.

Calicut University,

19.06.2012.

Anitha Kallyadan.

ABBREVIATIONS

AS	Arthaśāstra
Ed	Edited
KV	Kāśikāvṛtti
MB	Mahābhāṣya
MLBD	Motilal Banarsidass
MS	Manusmṛti
p	Page
P	Pāṇinisūtra
Paś	Paśpaśāhnika
PBS	Paribhāṣenduśekhara
PM	Padamañjari
Tr	Translated
Vol	Volume
VP	Vākyapadīya

INTRODUCTION

The knowledge of meaning derived from correct words and the corrupt words may have similarities but the same absorbed from the usage of correct words is considered more valuable. In this sense itself Patañjali have opined that usage among people leads to the use of words in their proper senses the science of grammar only restricts their use with a view to achieve merit¹. Otherwise, grammar simply tries to restrict usage to the correct words in the language, which consists of pure and impure words. *śabdānuśāsana* or grammar is the science, which commences the correctness of words². The derivation of *śabdānuśāsana* is “*śabdānām anuśāsanam*” and that of *anuśāsana* is “*anuśiṣyante sādhuśabdebyo vivicya jñāyante, sādhu śabdhāḥ anena*”. The affix *lyut* in *śabdānuśāsana* denotes instrument and hence the word *śabdānuśāsanam* means grammar. The grammar is the science, which indicates the correct words by separating them from corrupt words. The words are that which, when uttered, give rise to the knowledge of objects possessed of dewlaps, tails, humps, hoofs and horns. Śabda is stated by Bhartṛhari to be referring *Spoṭa*, the permanent word energy, which produces in the mind of the hearer the sense of the words heard by him. Or, in other words, word is that sound from which

there arises the knowledge of things in the affairs of the world.
“*pratītapadārthako loke dhvani śabdarityucyate*”.

Since language is inevitable for the study of any branch of science,
the Science of words supplements all the other śāstra-s.

“*kāṇādam pāṇinīyam ca sarvaśāstropakāraṅgam*”

Among the living creatures only man has been given the ability to speak and the language is a special gift to him. The enthusiasm regarding the words leads man to the analysis and classification. As a result of this grammar was formed. Vyākaraṇa is defined as the science of explaining words. Mahābhāṣyakāra derives the term vyākaraṇa as “*vyākriyante viśeṣeṇa āsamantāt vyutpādyante śabdāḥ anena iti vyākaraṇam*” that in which the words are analysed is called vyākaraṇam and speaks of both words and rules as what constitute grammar that supports the correctness of words-‘*lakṣyalakṣaṇe vyākaraṇam*’. The professed aim of grammar is the demarcation of correct sounds from the incorrect. The correct words are those, which are used by śiṣṭa-s, the enlightened people. (The followers of Dharmaśāstra-s).

Since grammar is the *śabdānuśāsana*, in the commencement of words include Vedic and classical words. In Mahābhāṣya Patañjali answers

as “both the current as well as the archaic” for the question “which words meant here?”³.

Words are used among the people. Since man is a social animal communication is also necessary. Since he deals with words for obtaining thorough knowledge in language, grammar is essential. Hence, grammar is related to people or society. Language leads to the worldly behaviours. If there was no language, the world would have been in darkness. Ācārya Daṇḍin says –

‘vācāmeva prasādena lokayātrā pravartate ⁴
idamandhaḥ tamahkṛtsnam jāyeta bhuvanatrayam
yadi śabdāhvayam jyotirāsamsāram na dīpyate ⁵.

The word is light. It lightens the world. Thus, there is inevitable relationship between the word and world. Without grammar, there is no world or people.

Based on the functions of word and its sense, Bhartrhari realized the *śabdabrahman* as the supreme entity of the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar.

“anādinidhanam brahma śabdatatvam yadaḥśaram
vivartate’ rthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yatah”⁶

That the beginningless endless and perishable one, which manifest itself into objects and from which is the creation of the universe is Brahman, i.e., *śabdabrahman*, the essential nature of which is the world.

Meaning is the manifestation of *śabdabrahma* and Veda is the only way for approaching this *śabdabrahma*. *Vedāṅga*-s are helpful for gathering the knowledge of Veda. Among the *vedāṅga* grammar is the most significant one '*mukham vyākaraṇam tasya*'. Hence, it is the path for liberation. A nonbeliever in liberation also has to study grammar.

*'tadvāramapavargasya vāṅmalānām cikitsitam /
pavitram sarvavidyānām adhididhyam prakāśate'*//

Āyurveda treats and cures the bodily diseases likewise grammar finds solution to wordily mistakes.

Bharṭhari often indicates the importance of word in his book. It is impossible to have wordily behaviours without word, and without the grammar acquiring the knowledge of meaning. Word-sense-behaviour does not exist in the absence of grammar. Hence, also grammar has some importance. In his *śabdadvaita* philosophy, he gives a very important place to *śabdabrahma*. Generally, it is seen that words may be differed. But they are the different categories of a single word. Word is the pulse of all living

creatures. It is through the word that everyone behaves. If the word disappears, the living world will be still like a log or a wall.⁹

Ānandavardhana has stated the authenticity of grammarians in ascertaining the perfectness of language saying '*prathame hi vidvāmsō vaiyākaraṇaḥ vyākaraṇamūlatvāt*'¹⁰. Using metaphor Rūpaka, Bhāmaha describes grammar as an ocean. It is a great complement to the vyākaraṇa philosophy from a literary critic¹¹.

Grammar is not only the study of sandhi and compounds, which are suitable for framing the word and sentence but also it is phonetics and philosophy. Derivation of sounds, place of utterance and efforts, vowels and consonants come under the science of words, is grammar. The *Spota* theory and *śabdabrahma* concept makes grammar a fine philosophy.

Significance of Vyākaraṇa in Sanskrit

The origin of Sānskrit grammar owes to the Vedas. According to Yāska¹² the development of the various stages of knowledge has emanated from the Vedas. The difference between the Vedic and the classical language led scholars to think of the relationship between the word and the meaning and this resulted in the birth of grammar. It is an accepted fact that grammar follows literature. The earliest Indian literature is the

Vedas and it was the primary duty in ancient time to preserve them intact. One of the means of preservation is the making of grammar and its study.

*“rakṣārtham vedānām adhyeyam vyākaraṇam”*¹³

The term Vyākaraṇa for grammatical science is ancient as it is found in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, Muṇḍakopaniṣat, and Rāmāyaṇa and in the Mahābhārata¹⁴. In the ancient times, the Brāhmaṇa-s studied grammar after their *upanayana*.¹⁵ These words of Patañjali reveal that grammar was studied in the very ancient times. Brahma is the first eloquent speaker of the Vyākaraṇaśāstra. Brahma passed it to the succeeding generations, i.e. to Bṛhaspati, Bṛhaspati to Indra, Indra to Bharadvāja, Bharadvāja to Ṛṣi-s, and to Brāhmaṇa-s¹⁶. There is a very significant reference in Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, according to which, Bṛhaspati transferred each word to Indra for over thousand divine years. Indra is considered as the first purifier of grammar-says Sāyaṇa¹⁷. Yudhiṣṭira mīmāmsaka accepts this view.

“so ’yam navavyākaraṇārthavettā brahma bhaviṣyatyapi te prasādād”

From these verse of Uttarakāṇḍa of Rāmāyaṇa states that there were 9 systems of grammar, where in it is said that, Hanumān had a mastery over

9 treatises of grammar. There is also a mention of nine works in the Vyākaraṇa in the Śrītatvanidhi¹⁸.

*'aīndram cāndram kāśakṛsnam kaumāram śākaṭāyanam /
sārasvatam cāpīśalam śākalyam pāṇinīyakam' //*

Kavikalpadruma of Vopadeva mentions the names of 8 grammarians¹⁹. In Kāśikāvṛtti mentioned 5 works of Vyākaraṇa²⁰. In the Aṣṭādhyāyī, Pāṇini mentions by name 10 other grammarians-*Āpīśali, Kāśyapa, Gārgya, Gālava, Cakravarman, Bhārdvāja, Śākaṭāyana, Śākalya, Senaka* and *Sphoṭāyana*²¹.

The science of grammar is regarded as the first and most important of Indian śāstra-s²². When one has first studied grammar, he can go in for learning any other sciences. Patañjali says that grammar is the most important of Vedānga-s and that an effort made with respect of this bears fruit.

*'pradhānam ca ṣaḍsvaṅgeṣu vyākaraṇam / pradhāne ca kṛto yatnaḥ
phalavān bhavati'*²³.

Grammar is the Science of language, to which Scholars in other fields looked for inspiration and technical assistance. Without the help of grammar, the analysis of language is not possible. To explain the forms of

language is the main purpose of the science of grammar. For this, it is necessary to isolate and analyse the notions, which are expressed by the forms of that language. Grammar is not only the discipline, which is concerned with the notions but also Logic and Philosophy equally concerned with them.

Objectives of studying grammar

It is expressed that even a fool does not adopt a course of action without a motive. *prayojanamanuddiśya na mandopi pravartate*. So Patañjali listed the *prayojana*-s of studying grammar in his Mahābhāṣya are *rakṣā* (preservation of Vedas) *ūhaḥ*, *āgamaḥ* (Vedic texts or scripture), *laghu* (simplicity), *asandehaḥ* (removal of doubts). The main aim of the grammar is the preservation of Vedas and assisting in the correct performance of sacrifices, which involve accuracy of pronunciation and frequent adaptations of mantra-s with modifications in case forms etc., as well as the correct understanding of the Vedic prescriptions. Scripture enjoins the study of grammar as *nityakarma* and it should be studied because Vedas enjoins one to do so. Here it is clearly laid down that the Vedic injunction relating to the study of grammar is to be obeyed without any consciousness of fruit. *brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇo dharmo ṣaḍaṅgo vedo adhyeyo jñeyaśca*. For ease, grammar has to be studied. A Brāhmaṇa has

to know correct words, and without the study of grammar, it is not possible to know words with a simple effort i.e., grammar is the shortest cut to the knowledge of words. Grammar has also to be studied for the removal of doubts. The sacrificers lay down; one should make the deities, Agni and Varuṇa, and offering of cow that is *sthūlaprṣati*. A doubt arises here as to whether *sthūlaprṣati* means stout as “spotted” or possessed of big spots. If one is not a grammarian cannot determine the sense from the accents. If the first vowel of the compound *sthūlaprṣati* has retained its accents, the compound is to be taken as *bahuvrīhi*, while, if the last vowel of compound is acute, the compound is to be considered as *tatpuruṣa*.

For the purity of language, Vyākaraṇa is essential. One person, who does not know grammar, is unable to use the correct words. Patañjali proclaims that only correct words should be employed, it is only during the ceremonial occasions that it is insisted upon as an inviolable rule. For example, at the time of recitation of *mantra*-s the Asura-s wrongly pronounced ‘*he arayo naśyadhvam*’ as ‘*helayo naśyadhvam*’ and were succumbed²⁴. Another example is *tvastā* also mispronounces the term ‘*indraśatru*’ with wrong accent during the ceremonial ‘*ābhicāra karma*’, only to get a child Vṛtra, who instead of slaying Indra was slayed by the latter²⁵. Grammar is to be studied so that we may become one with the great God, *śabdabrahma*

'mahatā devena naḥ sāmīyam yathā syādityadhyeyam vyākaraṇam'.

Moreover, there is an ultimate motive. One should avoid using incorrect speech forms not only to avoid being like a barbarian, but also in order to gain merit. Kātyāyana puts it as follows in his very first vārttika-
'siddhe śabdārthasambandhe lokato'rthaprayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharmaniyamaḥ'. This means “sound and sense and the relationship subsisting between the two being established as eternal, the use of words being determined by the sense current in popular speech, the science (of grammar) enjoins restrictions (i.e. the use of correct words to the exclusion of corrupt ones) for religious merit, just as we find in matters worldly and Vedic ²⁶. In this regard, Patañjali says that *'samānāyām arthāvagatau śabdaīscāpaśabdaiśca śāstreṇa dharmaniyamaḥ'*- means, meaning of both correct word and incorrect word is similar under the process of understanding, the science of grammar is for the sake of restriction about merit. Grammar is not merely as a means of knowing correct speech forms, but through this also as a means of acquiring merit and ultimate felicity- says Patañjali. The important of study of Vyākaraṇa revealed through these lines, *-ekāḥ śabdāḥ samyak jñātaḥ suṣṭu prayuktaḥ svarge loke kāmadhuk bhavati'* i.e. appropriately and correctly used and at the same time properly learned one word can fulfill one's desires.

Like other Śāstra-s, Sanskrit grammar also helpful not only to know the realities, but also the mental, intellectual and cultural development and discipline. With the proper study of grammar, one will be able to think and present apt and limited words without differentiating but co-relating them.

Trimunivyaḥkaraṇam

The ancient Indian grammarians began to analyse the word forms in literatures-both the Vedic and Classical Sanskrit and the results attained by them surpass those arrived at by any other nation. MacDonnell²⁷ justly says that, “the Sanskrit grammarians were the first to analyze word forms, to recognize the difference between root and suffix to determine the functions of suffixes and in the whole to elaborate a grammatical systems accurate and complete as to be unparallel in any other country”. The achievements of the Sanskrit grammarians in this field have also rendered valuable service to modern linguistics. Among the six vedāṅga-s, Vyākaraṇa is the most prominent. The accepted vedāṅgavyākaraṇa is Pāṇinīyam. The school of Pāṇini always has greater popularity because of its accuracy and thoroughness.

Pāṇini

The science of grammar becomes complete and systematic with the introduction of the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini. He was a native of Śālātura, son of Dākṣi²⁸, a great ancestor of the author of Samgraha²⁹, that Kautsa³⁰ was his pupil and he was known even to children³¹. He was lived in between 5th and 6th century BC with the 4000 sūtra-s he portrated generally, the then prevailing words. He has absorbed so many techniques from his predecessors. The variety in writing made Aṣṭādhyāyī, a book of grammar, which is incomparable.

Pāṇini is the most important Indian grammarian. His grammar regulates equally the language of both the Vedic and the classical Sanskrit. His great Aṣṭādhyāyī is the final product of generations of scholarship in linguistic analysis and classification. As a true descriptive grammarian, Pāṇini was mainly interested in analyzing the forms of words into their components and explaining the rules of formation. According to Bloomfield³², “Pāṇini’s grammar is one of the greatest monuments of human intelligent”. Gold Stucker thinks, “Pāṇini’s grammar is the centre of a vast and important branch of the ancient literature. No work has struck deeper root than his in the soil of the scientific development of India”.

Aṣṭādhyāyī has been universally praised as the first and foremost specimen of descriptive grammar and also been the chief source of inspiration to the linguistics engaged in describing languages all over the world. As a masterpiece of close reasoning and artistic arrangement, it has been the object of study for all who aim to cultivate their intellectual powers. Aṣṭādhyāyī is treated in a scientific way. As the name indicates, the work consists of eight chapters each has been further divided into four quarters. According to Kāśikākāra, the number of sūtra-s in the Aṣṭādhyāyī is 3983. The other names of Aṣṭādhyāyī are Aṣṭaka, Śabdānuśāsana and Vṛttisūtra.

Pāṇini has discussed his entire subject in a manner which is very simple in outline but which has proved complete in execution. His object might have been to give his student aid to memory in the sūtra style. Sūtra-s are short sentences, unambiguous, clear and comprehensive.

*“alpākṣaramasandigdham sāravat viśvatomukham /
astobhamanavadyam ca sūtram sūtravido viduḥ”//*

There are various means where by Pāṇini attempted to secure terseness and brevity of expression. The foremost among the devices used was that of the *pratyāhāra-s* and *anubandha-s*. The peculiar symbols such as *anuvṛtti*, *adhikāra*, *paribhāṣa* and *jñāpaka* are all other devices in the

framing of the sūtra-s. In addition to Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini put together a *Dhātupāṭha* or list of roots, a *Gaṇapāṭha* or the list of words, Uṇādisūtra-s (the original word without case ending suffix etc.), Phiṣūtra and Liṅgānuśāsana. It is believed that Pāṇini himself taught his grammar to many batches of students which resulted in a few minor variations in the readings of some of the sūtra-s. *‘ubhayatā hi ācāryeṇa śiṣyāḥ sūtram pratipāditāḥ kecit ākaḍārāveka samjñā iti, kecit prākkaḍārāt param kāryam*³³.

According to traditional account, his death took place from a tiger. *‘simho vyākaraṇasya karturāharat prāṇān priyān pāṇineḥ’*.

Kātyāyana

The next grammarian is Kātyāyana, the Varttikakāra. He is said to have been born at Kauśāmbi to Somadatta and Vāsudatta and educated under Varṣa at Pāṭaliputra³⁴.

*‘kauśāmbiyām somadattākhyā nāmnāgniśikha ityapi/
dviḥ bhūttasya bhāryā ca vāsudattābhidhā bhavet’//*

Based on Patañjali’s statement *‘priyataddhitāḥ dākṣiṇātyāḥ’* under the Vārttika, *‘yathā laukikavidikeṣu’* in the Paśpaśāhnika of Mahābhāṣya, it is generally considered that Kātyāyana was a southerner. Kātyāyana’s

date is generally considered to be about 350 BC. He has lived at least 200 years later than Pāṇini. He is also known with names Kātya, Punarvasu, Medhājī and Vararuci.

Common people cannot enter into Aṣṭādhyāyī, because it was written in a sūtra style, which had been proclaimed as a greater example of man's intellectual development. So Kātyāyana wrote Vārttika-s for the clarity of sūtra-s. Vārttika means the commentary on the vṛtti- ' *vṛtteryākyānam vārttikam* ' and vṛtti means the application of rules with reference to the examples- ' *śāstrasya lakṣye pravṛttiḥ* (Kaiyaṭa in his Pradīpa), Vārttika is also known with names Vākhyā, Vyākhyāna, Bhāṣyasūtra, Anutantra and Anusmṛti. Vārttika-s have not only elucidated the views of Pāṇini, but also added the explanation of words which became newly current in their times and rejected those that fell out of use.

'uktānuktaduruktānām cintā yatra pravartate

Tam grantham vārttikam prāhurvārttikajñā maṇiṣiṇaḥ

Kātyāyana was the chief among the Vārttikakāra-s. The authorship of Vājasaneyi prātiśākhya is attributed to him. He belongs to a different school of grammar; the technical terms that he uses in his rules are generally pre-pāṇinīya. He had perhaps studied the views of earlier

Vārttikakāra-s and presented them and his own view in 4000 sūtra-s. In vājasaneyaprāiśākya, has given his criticism on such of the sūtra-s of Pāṇini as fell with in the province of Vedic language. Of the 4000 sūtra-s of Pāṇini, 1500 were noticed by Kātyāyana in about 4000 vārttika-s. He has not merely stated his doubts and objections in regard to some Pāṇinīyan rules but in most cases he has shown how they can be solved suggesting alternative course with proper justification. At the same time, he always cares to prove his prepositions and when suggesting an alternative course, he always tells us that he does so. Some Vārttika-s are written in metrical forms also.

In explaining sūtra-s, Kātyāyana adopts the method, which is generally used in dealing with an *adhikaraṇa* by giving pūrvapakṣa, answering the points raised and finally giving *siddhānta*. He also explains grammatical points on the analogy of incidents found in the world and mentioned in the Vedas³⁵, from the experience of the world³⁶, from nature, from nyāya-s³⁷ or maxims. Some of his writings have taken the shape of paribhāṣa-s. He explains the authority of grammar that it enjoins the correct usage of words through such expressions as “*sādhvanuśāsane ’smin*” (1-1-44), ‘*sadanvākhyānāścāstrasya*’ (1-1-62), ‘*vacanaprāmāṇyāt*’ (8-2-1). This clearly shows the high regard Kātyāyana had towards Pāṇini.

Patañjali

The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali is an encyclopaedic and the authoritative work on Sanskrit grammar. He is believed to be an incarnation of Ādiśeṣa. It said in Vākyapadīya that this work was subjected to unmerited attack by some psuedologists like Baiji, Saubhava and Haryakṣa and was almost forgotten in the North and scholars like Candrācārya, from the South, restored it. This is corroborated by a similar statement of Kalhaṇa in Rājatarangīni that two Kings of different periods, Abhimanyu and Jayapīḍa got the Mahābhāṣya tradition restored to Kashmir through Candra and Krishṇapaṇḍita respectively. Bhartṛhari has also stated that Patañjali was the author of treatises on Yoga and Medicine.

‘kāyavāgbuddhiviṣayā ye malāssamavastithāḥ

*cikitsālakṣaṇādyātmaśāstraisteṣāṃ viśuddhayaḥ*³⁸

But there are others who think that Patañjali the author of the Mahābhāṣya is different from the author of Yogasūtra. According to the generally accepted opinion, Patañjali lived, sometimes around 150 BC during the region of Puṣyamitrasunga, the founder of Suṅga dynasty. Patañjali was an easterner. Kāśikā and Kaiyaṭa refer to Patañjali as ācārya deśīya. *pūrvam mathuryāḥ pāṭalīputram* concludes that Patañjali came

from an area east of Pāṭaliputra, i.e. modern Patna. Since Patañjali describes Kātyāyana at one place as dākṣiṇātya, it is likely that he lived, somewhere, in the North.

Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya is an elaborate treatise discussing the necessity of the sūtra-s of Pāṇini and the Vārttika-s of Kātyāyana. He shows that some of the sūtra-s are not necessary and that purpose is served by *jñāpaka-s* (indication). He sometimes disagrees with the criticism of the Vārttikakāra against Pāṇini and establishes with forceful arguments in the views of Pāṇini. He proves his points by analogy with nyāya-s current in the world.

While there are Bhāṣya-s for all the sūtra-s in Sanskrit, the Bhāṣya of Vyākaraṇaśāstra is called Mahābhāṣya, since it is not only a treatise on grammar but also the fountain-source of all nyāya-s³⁹. So the name Mahābhāṣya is very apt to this work. It is great in everything--great in bulk, great in intelligent, great in power, great in splendor. It is final court of appeal in all matters grammatical. It is not mere commentary but also a criticism on the sūtra-s and vārttika-s, wherein he gives his own views though they do not agree with those of the Sūtrakāra and Vārttikakāra. Traditionally a 'Bhāṣya has been defined as a treatise which takes all the

words of the rules one by one and explains them with sentences in keeping with the drift of the rule and then explains its own words⁴⁰.

Patañjali had chosen a free way to think about the necessity of sūtra-s and vārttika-s, but he always considered Pāṇini by the term Ācārya with respect. ‘*provāca bhagavān kātya medhājīṭ kātya*’ these words also reveal his respectful attitude towards Kātyāyana. His famous *iṣṭi*-s are his own additions to Kātyāyana’s Vārttika-s and they occupy an important position in the work.

Patañjali tries to connect the Śāstra (theory) to prayoga (practice). He attempted to uplift the grammar to the standard of philosophy by introducing the ‘*Spota*’ theory. By reintroducing the Vyākaraṇa as an absolutely necessary subject in the curriculum of Indian education in the past, he attained the credit. Mahābhāṣya is considered a store house of information about ancient India in all the matters, including political, economical, social, literary, philosophical and scientific.

The Mahābhāṣya is divided in to 8 adhyāya-s of 4 pāda-s each corresponding to the Aṣṭādhyāyī and the commentary on each pāda is divided in to āhnika-s, the number of which varies from pāda to pāda. There are 85 āhnika-s in all. It is interspersed with dialogues. An important feature of the work is that it explains many rigid and recondite śāstrāic rules

in terms of maxims derived from everyday life, which makes it higher and wider than a śāstrāic commentary and enables it to a flood of light on the religious and other aspects of contemporary life.

Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya is a treat for the students of Sanskrit. Its short, simple sentences palpitate with life and the reader feel he is dealing not with the artificial languages of latter composition but with the spoken language. The work is a marvelous specimen of perfection and beauty bearing a testimony to the author's quotation, '*jagatyanūnā bhavati hi rucirā*⁴¹' which in short means "perfection is beauty and beauty is perfection". The Sanskrit scholars had so much regard to Mahābhāṣya that they said 'either read the Mahābhāṣya or rule a large kingdom'.

"mahābhāṣyam vā paṭhanīyam, mahārājyam vā pālanīyam".

Vārttika-s and Mahābhāṣya are the descriptions as well as synthesis of Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa. Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali are traditionally known as the 'three sages'--*munitrayam*, who gave the law to the science of Sanskrit grammar. Each took for his study the whole field of the living language of his time and the contribution made by each to the stock of inherited knowledge and ideas for quite considerable. The *prātiśākhya-s* are the Vedic grammar only and the others are classical grammar only. But the trimunivvyākaraṇa is both vedic and classical. Hence, the grammar of

munitraya is all pervading one. Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya marked the highest development of the science of Sanskrit grammar as it is said on the remark that, among the three sages, the successor is the highest authority.

'yathottaram munīnām prāmāṇyam, adhikadarśitvāt'.

Origin of Nyāya-s

India has a long tradition of civilization, which has imbibed different ancient cultures. Hence, an analysis of the evolution of various strata of folklore became inevitable. The folklore study is aimed to know the real and actual characteristics of group of people and then existing music rituals and art forms. The art form and ritual of our ancestors are the messages regarding their tradition and culture. Significance of the study is it gives importance to the oral tradition also. In folk mythology, imagination and factors are interlinked. Hence, it does not bear historical validity. This collective knowledge became a form of history and it communicates a message having traditional touch. On the basis of human faith, the communicated knowledge was survived. So they are become unquestionable but acceptable piece of advice. Even though they have no historical recognition, but it goes beyond histories through the generation. Thus, folk is defined as 'history emerged as imagination'. Thus, we can

believe that sometimes the origin of the maxims, proverbs, idioms etc. is the oral tradition transmitted through these advices.

Language is essentially a social phenomenon, which is the easiest way to communicate or intention without ambiguity has attained an important role in preserving the concepts related to the past. Our ancient Sanskrit thinkers have developed several sciences as a way to understand the world, soul and Īśvara. In discussion of these scholars and hence also in scientific works they take examples from daily life of common people for the better presentation, which is the lokōktīs otherwise known as lokanyāya-s. Nyāya-s are functioned by accepting the examples, which comes in front of us in daily life. Being the different lifestyle of the world, newly committed experience of someone may be shared to the world and which may be transformed to a nyāya. For example, *rajjusarpanyāya*, *marumarīcikānyāya*, *khalekapotanyāya* etc. *arundhatidarśananyāya* and *śamkhanyāya* are related to customs, *kūrmāṅganyāya* is related with intellectual thought. *ghaṭīyantranyāya* and *sthūṇanikhānananyāya* are pertaining to domestic affairs. *kadambakorakanyāya*, *maṇḍūkaplutinyāya* and *vīcītaraṅganyāya* are related to natural sights. *gandharvanagaranyāya* and *khapuṣpanyāya* are originated from imagination. *dhānyapalālanyāya* is related with agriculture, *dehalīdīpanyāya* and *paṅkaprakṣālananyāya*, are

used for imparting a general principle. *kākadantagaveṣaṇanyāya* and *bakabandhananyāya* are derived from the thoughts about the improbable.

Development of Nyāya-s

We are unable to determine that when and where and in which book the lokanyāya firstly appeared? But by examining the language from Vedic literature to the latest classical literature we can find that the Sanskrit is a mine of lokanyāyā-s and proverbs. Various examples having proverbial meanings are seen here and there in the Vedas and Brāhmaṇa-s. In Ṛgveda, in the dialogue between Pūruruvas and Urvaśi, Urvaśi advises him not to entertain friendship with women, since their hearts are similar to the hearts of wolves, which are cruel and tame less⁴². Later this has become a Lokanyāya. For example, one of our poets addressing God of Death, tells him not to be proud of his own cruelty since there are women similar to death. *viśvajitnyāya* of Śatapathabrāhmaṇa⁴³ is seen used in Brāhmaṇa, which is a law regarding the Viśvajith sacrifice.

'*aśmalosṭanyāya*'- a maxim of stone and clod of earth, in Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat⁴⁴ is used to denote the relative importance of two things. *muñjādiṣikodddharaṇanyāya*, maxim of a poisoned arrow, in Kaṭhopaniṣat⁴⁵, *hirānyanidhinyāya*, *taptaparaśunyāya* and *sūtrabandhaśakuninyāya* in Chāndogyopaniṣat⁴⁶, *antardīpikānyāya* in

Muṇḍakopaniṣat⁴⁷, *kūrmāṅganyāya* in Kṣurikopaniṣat⁴⁸, *dhānyapalālanyāya* in Brahmabindūpaniṣat⁴⁹, *dagdhendhanavahninyāya* in Śvetāśvataropaniṣat⁵⁰ are examples of nyāya-s used in Upaniṣats. *Jalakatakareṇunyāya* in Manusmṛti⁵¹, *iṣukāraṇyāya* in Mahābhārata⁵², *gatajalasetubandhananyāya* in Rāmāyaṇa⁵³ are the some of the examples of nyāya-s used in smṛti and itihāsa. *kūtakārṣāpaṇanyāya*, *kāmsyabhojinyāya*, *ākāśamuṣṭihanananyāya* and *rumākṣipta-kāṣṭanyāya* are some of the nyāya-s seen in Mīmāṃsāsāstra. In Vedāntasāstra the following nyāya-s can be seen; *andhagolāṅgūlanyāya*, *ghaṭīyantranyāya*, *tuṣakaṇḍananyāya* and *varagoṣṭhīnyāya*. *kadambakorakanyāya*, *tantupaṭanyāya*, *sthālīpulākanyāya* and *muṇḍitasīronakṣatrānveṣaṇanyāya* are some nyāya-s in Nyāyaśāstra.

Numerous maxims and proverbs are used in Ālankāraśāstra (poetics). *araṇyarodananyāya*, *ghaṭapradīpanyāya*, *dehalīdīpanyāya*, *cchatrinyāya*, and *kākatālīyanyāya* are some examples. *viṣavr̥kṣanyāya* in Kumārasambava⁵⁴, *yācitakamaṇḍananyāya* in Naiṣadhīyacarita⁵⁵, *ghunākṣaranyāya* in Śīsupālavadhā⁵⁶, *kūpayantraghaṭikānyāya* in Mṛcchakaṭika⁵⁷, *uṣṭrakaṇḍakabhakṣaṇanyāya* in Vikramāṅgadevacarita⁵⁸, *andhadarpaṇanyāya* and *asvatarīgarbhanyāya* in Hitopadeśa⁵⁹, *pañkaprakṣālananyāya* and *vyālanakulanyāya* in Pañcatantra⁶⁰, are some

nyāya-s mentioned by poets like Kālidāsa in their works and as such, lot of nyāya-s were used by many poets.

Scope of Nyāya-s

Language is a powerful medium to express the ideas. Since there are limitations in expressing the ideas through gestures and actions, language expressed ideas more clearly and powerfully. An affluent language has its own style, ideas and expression of verse. That ideas or idioms are the tendon of that language. Gradually, these idioms became the nyāya-s and proverbs. They elucidate the growth of cultural, economic, social, political etc. of society. On decomposing these nyāya-s, they reveal the knowledge of the society about art, aesthetic concept, universe etc. These nyāya-s have a special potentials to express the ideas and to provoke the thoughts of listeners strongly. Sometimes, the nyāya-s can express an idea in its full sense than that of express an idea by using lot of verse. It is like 'dew that reflects a forest full'. Due to the poetical quality of nyāya, it is deeply rooted in the mind of the people. On course of a dispute, discussion and conversation, some raise nyāya-s for supporting and strengthening their arguments, and opposing others' arguments. The use of lokanyāya-s make Sanskrit to a dazzling language and it has been blended with the linguistic and semantic peculiarities of Sanskrit.

Nyāya-s have connections with various activities of human life and explain trends of human behaviour. There are many nyāya-s, which became a cause to lead us to a right way of life. It teach us how to solve a problem easily when we face in day-to-day life, and also teach us what to do, what not to do, how to do and so on. Moreover, nyāya-s are used to explain the deep and abstract śāstra topics.

Thus, it is evident that lokanyāya-s place an important role in both day to daylives as well as in literature. From these nyāya-s occurred in different branches of Sanskrit work, one is informed that the principles can be clearly substantiated with these lokanyāya-s which enable him to have a glance on the tradition and culture. The power of lokanyāya-s reflects wide range of meaning through simple words be an interesting study for every language students. By evaluating each and every nyāya-s, it will open a wonderful world of imagination. At the sametime, these maxims reveal to us some of the educational, social, economic, religious, cultural and political conditions of ancient India.

Not only the nyāya-s are used in Veda, itihāsa and other śāstra-s, but also in Vyākaraṇaśāstra. Pāṇini didn't use nyāya-s in his sūtra-s directly, but evaluating his work, we can guess he may be depended nyāya-s in his sūtra-s. For example, in the sūtra 'asthidadhi'⁶¹ he depends

abhedakagunānyāya because of accepting the *udātta*, in the same manner he depend *sanniyogaśiṣṭanyāya* because of accepting ‘*cha*’ in the sūtra ‘*bilvakādibhyaśchasya luk*’⁶². By seeing the example *ahinakulam* in the sūtra ‘*yeṣām ca virodhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ*’⁶³, we can conclude that he may be depended the ‘*ahinakulanyāya*’ in his work.

Kātyāyana explains the grammatical points with help of nyāya-s. *apavādanyāya*⁶⁴, *ekadeśavikṛtasyānanyatvanyāya*⁶⁵, *guruvatguruputran-yāya*⁶⁶ etc. were few nyāya-s used by him. But Patañjali is the first grammarian who applied nyāya widely. He is conscious about his readers’ difficulty and limitations; he tries to inspire them with maxims, which are expected to lighten the strain on the reader. It is like to hit two birds with a stone. Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* is a very influential book to the readers since, it has been accepted as the last and final word in the subsequent grammatical work, and he interprets each and every matter of the world in his work. This is an example of his keen observation to very minute things of the world, which is happened around him. The latter works like, *Kāśikāvṛtti*, *Padamañjari*, *Nyāsa Paramalaghumanjūṣa*, *Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhāntakaumudī* etc. are not prosperous with nyāya-s. But at the same time *Mahābhāṣya* is blessed with abundant of nyāya-s and it is, no doubt an encyclopaedic one. All most all the nyāya-s are found in the *Mahābhāṣya*, are also found in the later *Vyākaraṇa* text. Therefore, here I intended to

evaluate mainly the nyāya-s of Mahābhāṣya, and also the nyāya-s of Kāśikā, Nyāsa and Padamañjari, which are not seen in Mahābhāṣya, its usages, its purpose and its relevance, and evaluate through these nyāya-s the socio- cultural history of the period of Patañjali.

REFERENCE

1. *lokatothaprayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharmaniyamaḥ*. MB Paś.
2. Nāgesa's *udyota* on Śabdānuśāsanam, MB,P. 1.1.1.
3. *keṣām sabdānām, laukikānām vaidikānām ca*, MB,P.1.1.1.
4. Kāvyaḍarśa, Dandi 1.3.
5. Ibid, I-4
6. VP Brahmakāṇḍa I.
7. Ibid, I.4
8. Ibid, I.13.
9. Ibid, I.2,3, I-126,127
10. Dhvanyāloka I P-133.
11. Kāvyaḷankāra VI-1.3.
12. Nirukta I.20.
13. MB ,P. 1.1.1.
14. Avanīndrakumār, archaic words in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī, p-4.
15. MB, Paś.
16. Ibid.
17. Sayana *Rḡbhāṣyopodghāta*, I, p-26.
18. Yudhiṣṭiramīmāmsaka, Samskrta Vyākaraṇaśāstra ka Itihāsa, Part I
P-65.
19. Ibid, p-14.

20. KV, P. 4.2.60.
21. George Cardona, Pāṇini, A Survey of Research, p-146.
22. 'vyākaraṇam nāmeyamuttarāvidyā', Mahābhāṣya, 1.2.32.
23. MB, P. 1.1.19, 20.
24. MB, Paś, p-28.
25. Ibid, p-30.
26. Kriṣṇacandraccātarji, "Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, Paśpaśāhnika, (introductory chapter) p- 62.
27. A.A. MacDonnell, "India's past" published Oxford, p-186.
28. *sarve sarvāpadeśā dākṣīputrasya paṇineḥ*, Mahābhāṣya under *dādhādvadāp* (1.1.20) and *yusmadasmabhyām na soś* (7.1.27).
29. *śobhanā khalu dākṣāyaṇena sangrahasya kṛtiḥ* Mahābhāṣya under *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* (2.3.66).
30. *upasedivān kautsaḥ Pāṇinim*, Mahābhāṣya under *bhāṣāyām sadavaśrūvah* (3.2.108).
31. *ākumāram yaśah pāṇineḥ*, Mahābhāṣya under *ān maryādāvacaṇe* (1.4.89).
32. Language, p-11.
33. MB, P.1.4.1.
34. P.S. Subrahmaṇya Śāstri, "Lectures on Patañjali", introduction p-28.
35. *yathā laukikavaidikeṣu Paśpaśa* under 'vṛddhirādaic' 1.1.1.

36. *yathā loke under ekāco dve prathamasya 5.1.1.*
37. *ekadeśa vikṛtasyānanyatvam under 1.5.56 and 7.3.85. vyapadeśivat vacanam under 6.1.1.*
38. VP, I -148.
39. *kr̥teyatha patañjalīnā guruṇā tīrthadarśīnā sarveṣāṃ nyāyabījānām mahābhāṣye nibandhanāt, VP, II -485.*
40. *sūtrārto varṇyate yatra padaiḥ sūtrānusāribhiḥ svapadāni ca varṇyante bhāṣyam bhāṣyavido viduḥ, Parāśara Purāṇa XVIII.15. quoted in the "Dictionary of Sanskrit grammar" by V.K. Abhyankar and J.M. Śukla.*
41. *Slokavārttika 8.2.53.*
42. *Ṛgveda, X-95-15.*
43. *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa Vol II p-427.*
44. *Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣat, 6.19.*
45. *Kāthopaniṣat, 2.3.17.*
46. *Cāndokyopaniṣat, 8.3.2, 6.16.1 , 6.8.2.*
47. *Muṇḍakopaniṣat, 3.1.5.*
48. *Kṣurikopaniṣat, sloka 2.*
49. *Brahmabindūpaniṣat, sloka -18.*
50. *Śvetāśvetataropaniṣat, 6.10.*
51. *MS, IV-67.*

52. Mahābhārata śāntiparva, Chapter 178, sloka-12.
53. Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodyākāṇḍa Sarga-18, sloka-23.
54. Kumārasambava II, 55.
55. Naiṣadhīyacarita, 7.56.
56. Śiśupālavadha, 3.58.
57. Mṛcchakaṭika, X-60.
58. Vikramāngadevacarita, I-29.
59. Hitopadeśa (III-115), (II-135).
60. Pañcatantra, II-157, V-2.
61. Dr. Ranilakshmi Nrasimhasastri, “Mahābhāṣye Laukikanyāyāḥ” p-36.
62. Ibid.
63. 2.4.9.
64. ‘*tasya lopah*’ P. 1.3.9
65. P.S. Subrahmaṇya Śāstri, “Lectures on Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya”, introduction. P-40.
66. Under *sthānivdādeśoanalvidhau*, P. I-1-56.

Chapter 1

STUDY OF MAXIMS IN SANSKRIT GRAMMAR

The easiest tool to learn any language is its grammar. As the grammar itself is a rather difficult topic to learn, the Indian grammarians, after digesting the subject thoroughly, used the method of '*gudajihvikānyāya*' (the technique of smearing sweat on the tongue to disguise the bitterness) for presenting it before people. They directly showed the relation of language and society by connecting them, announcing '*yathā loke tathā vyākaraṇe*'¹. That is, any rule or regulation prevalent among the people in the society is valid for grammar also. These rules and regulations in the society is frames the picture of principles otherwise known as lokanyāya-s. Lokanyāya means the method of using examples from well-known suitable, appropriate proverbs and sayings from the society for illustrating, supporting or opposing any idea.

Language and its rules cannot be separated from the society. The common usages in the society make an important part of Vyākaraṇaśāstra. However, it should be noted that sometimes the rules in the grammar might have some differences with common usages '*na yathā loke tathā vyākaraṇe*'². Even though, most of the time, the grammar accepts the common usages as such, it will not do so always. It can either follow the

common usage or differ from it³. Thus, the grammar is beyond the common usages⁴. But, inspite of all these, the general statement—‘*yathā loke tathā vyākaraṇe*’ is the most important guideline in grammar. In order to specify the correctness of words through the medium of language Pāṇini has introduced several technical terms to limit the scope of increasing in this grammar.

1.1. Social perspective in Grammar

Aṣṭādhyāyī can be considered as the best device, to have a complete and easy understanding of the entire spectrum of Vedic and classical Sanskrit words. The great scholar, Pāṇini using his 14 aphorisms consolidated the great ocean of Vedic and classical Sanskrit words into just 42 *pratyāhāra*-s (the grammatical symbol or abbreviation). Thus from the linguistic point of view, he could bring Vedas also part of the same creative process along with the classical. According to Pāṇini, the biggest single source of *vyākaraṇa* is the society itself. He collected the wealth of words from the common people from all different classes of society, leaving the boundary of the educated class like Brāhmiṇs, Pariṣads etc, ‘*prathānapratyayārthavacanasyānyapramāṇatvāt*’⁵ and ‘*tadaśiṣyam samjñāpramāṇatvāt*’⁶ are the examples for this. ‘*muṇḍe muṇḍe matirbhinnā* or ‘*bhinnarucirhi lokaḥ*’⁷, according to this *nyāya*, in the society there can

be different and opposing about any subject. Unlike his predecessors, Pāṇini has given equal importance to all opinions in his śāstra, which made his creation much more popular.

From the beginning itself he understood the importance of the merging of society and śāstra, in order to popularise the śāstra. In this mortal world, only those things inherited from nyāya or common usage can be immortal. Anything that is not from the nyāya or common usage will only in words, but not in reality thus will perish past '*yo hyutsūtram kathayennādo grhyate*'⁸. That is why Pāṇini's grammar has gained popularity and respect and is alive even today as the biggest source of Sanskrit grammar. Without making many alterations in the construction, he could make his sūtra-s simple and beautiful. In this context, when more than on '*vidhisūtra*' is getting important at the same time for the same usage (*prayoga*) for deciding the relative importance of these '*vidhisūtra-s*' Pāṇini had created many Paribhāṣāsūtra-s as well as made use of nyāya –supported theories. Paribhāṣa-s are the first forms of regulations in application the sūtra-s. Nāgeśa has listed more than 150 Paribhāṣa-s collected from the Mahābhāṣya and received from *loka*. The knowledge about these kinds of nyāya-s can be acquired from Pāṇini's sūtra-s itself. These nyāya-s, which eliminate the contradictions from different *vidhisūtra-s*, were later called as Paribhāṣa-s⁹.

Pāṇini's work is a monument of perfection in descriptive grammar. The talent of a grammarian is described in Mahābhārata as follows-

'sarvārthānām vyākaraṇāt vaiyākaraṇa ucyate /

pratyakṣadarśī lokānām sarvadarśī bhavennaraḥ //¹⁰

The word '*sarvārtha*' is very much apt for a grammarian. That is, the grammarian should be inclusive of the rules for all or most of the words present in the transient language prevalent at that time. In this aspect Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa is beyond comparison, as quoted by "*pāṇinīyam mahat suvihitam*"¹¹.

It is common style among great scholars (Ācārya-s) to describe their own opinions as third person-statements. Thus, in spite of being the authority to interconnect the grammar and society, Pāṇini presented the ideas in a highly technical language. Continuing the tradition, Kātyāyana also, even though he has not expressed it explicitly, had a deep understanding of the greatness of common usages from a grammatical point of view. '*parokṣe ca lokavijñāte prayokturdarśanaviṣaye*'¹², '*śamhitāvasānāyorlokaviditavāt siddham*'¹³, '*lingamaśiṣyam lokāśrayatvāllīṅgasya*'¹⁴, '*lokavijñānāt siddham*'¹⁵, '*yathā loke*'¹⁶, '*lokavat halādiśeṣe*'¹⁷, all these examples (Vārttika-s) are manifestations of this.

From this several vārttika-s we could easily see the underlying lokanyāya-s. For example, ‘*abhyarhitam ca*’¹⁸ (*abhiyrrhitanyāya*), ‘*bhrāturjyāyasaḥ*’¹⁹ (*jyeṣṭhānupūrvīnyāya*), ‘*varṇānāmānupūrvyena*’²⁰ (*varṇānupūrvīnyāya*) etc. are very well illustrated here.

It was Patañjali who simplified and popularized the condensed Pāṇini-sūtra-s by introducing more clarifying examples, some of them are his own and many of them taken from the literary world as well as current, well rooted sayings from the society. He could provide the grammar a stronger and clear base of the linguistic usages. Due to this reason, Patañjali is regarded as more authoritative than the other two Ācārya-s, even though he is coming much later than they are, ‘*yathottaram munīnām prāmāṇyam*’. In one way, Patañjali’s authoritativeness ends up in Pāṇini’s greatness. Patañjali professes the highest regard to Pāṇini. At the beginning of his Mahābhāṣya, he says;

‘*pramāṇabhūta ācāryo darbhapavitrapāṇiḥ śucāvavakāśe prāṇmukha upavisya mahatā yatnena sūtram praṇayati sma. tatrāśakyam, varṇenāpyanarthakena bhavitum kim punariyatā sūtreṇa*’²¹. That is the competent teacher, having sat down facing east with purifying *darbha* grass in his hand in a pure place, composed the rules with great care--hence it is

impossible that a single sound should be without meaning much less an entire rule.

While describing the mutual relation between words and their meaning Patañjali explicitly states in Mahābhāṣya '*lokato arthaprayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharmaniyamaḥ*'²² '*lokānno lauikikaḥ siddhaḥ*'²³, the ultimate authority of grammar is people themselves. If you need a new pot, you can go to a pot maker and ask him to make a new one. But in the case of words, you can't approach a grammarian for getting new words. It should be present in the world, prevalent among people. If this is the case, the natural question that arises is why we should give grammar at all? For this Patañjali gives the answer that grammar is for organizing and arranging the already present linguistic conventions deep rooted among people for sake of dharma and its purpose is not for imposing new things. But the distinctive function of grammar is to restrict speech to correct words (as distinguished from *apaśabda*-s or corrupted words). According to Patañjali, those words are to be regarded as correct the precise meaning of which may be easily ascertained from the practice of experts or '*śiṣṭa*-s'. He gives a definition of '*śiṣṭa*-s'- '*etasminnāryāvarte ye brāhmaṇāḥ kumbhīdhānyā alolupā agrhyamāṇakāraṇāḥ kiñcidantareṇa kasyāścid vidyāyāḥ pāragāstatra bhavantaḥ śiṣṭāḥ*'²⁴

Those brāhmaṇa-s who live in this Āryāvartḥa, the land of the Āryās, who store just a basketful of grain, who are not greedy, and who without any motive have attained the highest wisdom in some branch of learning they are the śiṣṭa-s. He also says-

‘śabdapramāṇakā vāyam, yacchabda āha tadasmākam pramāṇam’.²⁵ According to this, grammar is based on śabda. We know that the base for śabda is society. Thus it turns out that society or loka is the ultimate base for grammar.

‘na hyavyavasthākāriṇā śāstreṇa bhavitavyam’²⁶, ‘śāstrato hi nāma vyavasthā’²⁷, ‘cakrakeṣviṣṭato vyavasthā’²⁸, ‘yogavibhāgādiṣṭasiddhiḥ’²⁹. All these portraites his respect for the opinions of the śiṣṭa-s or experts. He further states, when Pāṇini uses an ambiguous term, its precise meaning has to ascertain from learned interpretations by śiṣṭa-s—‘vyākhyānataḥ viśeṣapratipattiḥ na hi sandehādalakṣaṇam’³⁰. In this way, in the vārttika ‘kāraṇād dravyo śabdaniveśaḥ’³¹, by the word ‘kāraṇa’, Patañjali means the society itself. Another example is the vārttika darśanam vai hetuḥ³². Here also the word ‘darśana’ means society.

According to Jagadīśa³³, there are eight ways to understand the correct meaning of words. Among this, ‘lokavyavahāraḥ’ is considered as the most important. Pāṇini also says that in lokavyavahāra power of

conveying meaning is quite independent³⁴. Other grammarians like Bhartṛhari, Jinendrabuddhi, Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa also have utilised many lokanyāya-s, some of them very old and some of them framed by them.

From all these it is apparent that the grammarians are well versed with the social life especially the village life. *‘jānapadiṣu vidyātaḥ prāśasyo bhavati’* (Nirukta). By seeing all these illustrations and examples from common life in Mahābhāṣya concluded that most of his lifetime was spent on observing and understanding languages of common man. Because of this, only Patañjali in every step, keeps the common people in mind and takes special interest in giving suitable examples for his interpretations whether for both tough and easy deliberations.

1.2. Significance of applying Lokanyāya

The most significant feature of any language is its capability to express the meaning inherent in it and the ability to convey several meanings through a few words. Highest magnitude of such salient features of a language is considered as nyāya. The usage of pratyāhāra-s (abbreviations) in vyākaraṇa comes under this head.

The proverb ‘Brevity is the soul of art’ seems to be absolutely right in the usage of nyāya-s because nyāya-s are characterized by its potential to

reflect wide range of meaning through simple words. Therefore, the topics mentioned in highly scientific and complicated grammar texts are rendered innovative and more attractive. Nyāya-s are the suggestive of experiences in day-to-day life and also the dynamic media which reflects the emotions. The nyāya-s proposed by great scholars are useful in eliminating the complexities of the śāstra. It can be compared to the use of a boat to cross a flooded river. The scholars of ancient period started the usage of nyāya-s in śāstra owing to its extra ordinary significance. In fact, nyāya is the apt medium, which explains the topics mentioned in śāstra-s. Thus, it has the tremendous potential to link śāstra with society.

Nyāya-s are the principles that consolidate characteristic of common people and in this aspect it is similar to wise sayings. There are practical difficulties in the use of *loka*, Veda and śāstra of a language and this aspect is a matter of dispute and debate. In this context, nyāya serves as a simple means to make it completely meaningful. Nyāya-s also has the unique ability to inter connect the three stages of language in terms of divers opinions. Nyāya is also indicative of natural activities of human beings, legitimate principles, actual experience etc. These nyāya-s adopt the natural behavior of human beings as well as the qualities and behavior of the animals, birds and other organism. The entire universe is thus coming

within its limit. Certain nyāya-s give insight into the rules and regulations as well as the life style prevalent in society in a particular era.

1.3. Role of Maxims establishing the Principles in the Vyākaraṇa

Lokanyāya is a conventional well accepted principle powerful enough to shut the mouth of any opponent. The Sanskrit grammarians understood this power and successfully employed them to popularize their śāstra. According to Bhāṣyakāra, the easy understanding of śāstra is possible if they contain both general (sāmānyasūtra) as well as special (viśeṣasūtra) characteristics. In this way without illustration using lokanyāya-s the sūtra-s in grammar become incomprehensive³⁵. Supporting this view Nyāsakāra also says- '*agatyā hi khalu paribhāṣā sūtram vāśīyate*'. The structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī is founded in the principle of '*sāmānyaviśeṣa*' or '*utsargāpavāda*'. Acceptability of a rule of wide range is called '*utsarga*'. Due to other reasons, some rules function only in a limited circle. They are called '*apavāda*'.

Thus it is clear that Vārttikakāra and Bhāṣyakāra had effectively made use of both Vedic and classical examples for making the tough Sanskrit grammar more digestible. They are completely successful in this mission. From this point of view, we can say that they have completely

depended on different sources like experiences from the world, experiences from the nature, old sayings and dharmasāstras. Whenever there is an ambiguous point in the Vyākaraṇasāstra, Patañjali gives the instruction to look at the interpretation. This is solid proof for the importance of lokanyāya in the decision-making. While considering the gender in general, which has a significant role in the science of grammar, Patañjali simply says that '*lingamaśiṣyam lokāśrayatvāllinṅasya*'. There is no need of explaining the gender in vyākaraṇa. The concept of gender is a byproduct of the usages made by common man. Patañjali is the only person who has profusely used the various nyāya-s to make easy the study of difficult Vyākaraṇasāstra.

Thus the grammatical rule *apavādairutsargāḥ bādhyantām* has been very explained by using '*takrakaṇḍinyanyāya*'. '*dvigatā api hetavo bhavanti*' and '*vākyānyapi dviṣṭhāni bhavanti*' these two rules have been very easily explained by '*āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāya*' and '*vṛddhakumārīvaravākyanyāya*'. Similarly the rule '*kāryamanubhavan hi kāryi nimittatayā nāsrīyate*' is explained in very simple manner by '*māṭharakaṇḍinyanyāya*'.

Thus, the lokanyāya-s have rich position in transforming difficult and obscure vyākaraṇa treatises in to popular ones. The nyāya-s helps the

common people to understand easily the difficult grammatical matters in an interesting manner. The profuse use of lokanyāya-s in grammatical work makes us to believe that in ancient days the Sanskrit language was used as a spoken language.

1.4. Concept of Lokanyāya

Generally, lokanyāya is meant that behavioural patterns which are debited in loka, veda and śāstra. It is based on the personal and social incidents, activities, the experiences in society and nature, sayings among people of society, incidents and stories and purāṇa-s, examples (evidences), dharmaśāstras etc. it is highly elaborate in terms of usage and meaning. At the same time, it is simple and easy to mention in the form of sentences and words³⁶.

Though there three main sources such as Loka, Veda and Śāstra for languages, the lokanyāya have its origin mainly from the loka. That is why it is named as lokanyāya-s. In the science of grammar these lokanyāya-s are mentioned as '*lokavijñānam*³⁷, *lokavidit*³⁸, *lokāśraya*³⁹, *laukikoyam dṛṣṭāntaḥ*⁴⁰. Even though these words are used, an exactly meaningful word about lokanyāya has not been mentioned anywhere in Mahābhāṣya. The three terms mentioned above though have the same meaning; the apt word 'lokanyāya' was used for the first time in Padamañjari only.⁴¹

'na ca utppannānāmutppattivikalpaḥ śakyate kartumiti lokanyāyena'

Nāgeśa interprets loka as follows;

'lokyate yena śabdārthau lokastena sa ucyate

*vyavahāro 'thavā vṛddhavyavahartṛparamparā'*⁴²

That by which the meaning of the word enlightens is called *loka*. *loka* is of two types, the usage of learned people and infinite use of tradition. The usage, which is traditionally in vogue among the scholars, is called as śāstranyāya-s, and the usage among the common people is called as lokanyāya-s. Thus by '*lokavyavahāra* and '*anādivṛddhavyavahāra*', correctness and incorrectness of śabda-s achieved. Knowing the greatness of the usage of nyāya-s in śāstra, the great grammarian Pāṇini has composed the sūtra '*parinyornīṇordyūtābhreṣayoḥ*' (3-3-37) to explain the etymology of the word nyāya. This sūtra means that, the affix *ghañ* comes after the rules '*ni*' (to lead) and '*i*' (to go) when the prepositions, '*pari*' and '*ni*' are respectively in composition with them and when the words so formed respectively mean 'a game and propriety' or arrangement or law. The verb '*ni*' + '*i*' take *ghañ*, '*ni*' + '*i*' + *ghañ*, *ni+ai+gha=ni+āya=nyāya*.

Thus according to the etymology of the word nyāya laid down by Pāṇini, the meaning of the word nyāya can be explained thus- that the

gaining of appropriate meaning of the word based on rationale or Veda or usage of learned people is called nyāya. Kaiyaṭa uses the word nyāya, in the sense of ‘aucitya’ (aptness) on the practical basis—‘*karmādīni tu vijātīyakraīyāpekṣaṇādbhahiraṅgāṇīti nyāyaprāptaḥ kramaḥ*’⁴³. In the same meaning, he also used this in another instance also.⁴⁴ Patañjali and Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita also used the word nyāya in the sense of ‘aucitya’, ‘eṣo’tra nyāyaḥ ucitamityarthaḥ’⁴⁵.

In fact, in Vyākaraṇasāstra, well proved usages of Āpta-s (reliable people) and Śiṣṭa-s (learner) are called as nyāya-s. Based on the meaning of the word in wise saying, ‘*pramāṇairarthaparīkṣaṇam nyāyaḥ*’ that Pāṇini explains the meaning of *pramāṇa* as rational worldly usage in his usages ‘*anyapramāṇa*’⁴⁶ ‘*saṃjñāpramāṇa*’⁴⁷ etc. Thus the learned people are referred to by commentators as ‘*nyāyavit*’, ‘*sudhī*’, ‘*bahuśrutaḥ*’, ‘*bahudarśī*’ etc. as the masters of lokanyāya-s⁴⁸ and not as well versed in Nyāyaśāstra (Naiyayika-s). According to Nāgeśa, the word nyāya is also used in the sense of common usage.⁴⁹

In the same sense, Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita also uses the nyāya word. ‘*laukikadvividhavyavahāra upaṣṭambhakatvenodāhṛtaḥ kaiyaṭādibhiḥ*’⁵⁰ Kaiyaṭa also takes the same meaning for nyāya as it is clear from ‘*etat darśanasamśrayeṇocyate yasya ca lakṣṇāntareṇa iti. yadā tveṣa nyāya*

*āśrīyate lakṣaṇāntarapravṛttinimittamupasamharallakṣaṇaṃ balavat bhavati*⁵¹. The adducing of some usages, semblances, modes, incidents as examples to clarify certain facts is called *nyāya*.⁵²

Another noteworthy meaning of the word *nyāya* is *paribhāṣa* (explanatory *sūtra*). There are three types of *paribhāṣa*-s in *Vyākaraṇasāstra* as *jñāpakasiddha*, *nyāyasiddha* and *vācanika*. The word *nyāya* may either be taken in the sense of *lokanyāya* – a maxim from ordinary life and if a *paribhāṣa* be established by such a maxim it will be a *lokanyāyasiddha* or *nyāyasiddha*. Almost of the *paribhāṣa*-s of *Nyāyasiddha* is flourished with *lokavyavahāra*. Jaina grammarian Hemasaṅgini names his *paribhāṣākośa* as *Nyāyasaṅgraha*. From this, it is clear that the meaning of the word *nyāya* is *lokavyavahāra* or *paribhāṣa*. In *sāstra*-s, the word *nyāya* is used in the sense of *laukikavyavahāra* but also in the sense of *śāstranyāya*. Thus for example is the *paribhāṣa sakṛtgatau vipratishedhe yadbaddhitam tadbādhitameva*. Similarly, there are *nyāya*-s like *tulyabalapreṣaṇanyāya*, which is an example for *lokanyāya*. Thus the *nyāya* word is used both in the sense of *laukika* and *śāstra* meanings. And the *paribhāṣa* ‘*aniyame niyamakāriṇī paribhāṣa*’ is supportive this.

The *nyāyaśabda* is also used in this sense *jñāpaka* (suggestive) in science of grammar. Expressing the ideas indirectly in a suggestive manner

by the composition of the sūtra-s, as is done by Pāṇini in his Aṣṭādhyāyī, is called *jñāpakasiddha*. In the same manner *nyāyaśabda* is used by Patañjali⁵³, Haradatta⁵⁴, Nāgeśa⁵⁵, Bhartṛhari⁵⁶ etc. But the words sūtra and nyāya have different meanings in certain instances. ‘*śailīyamācāryasya yasya kvacidabhidhānamāśrayati, kvacinnyāyam, kvacitvacanamiti, tatsarvamucyate*⁵⁷, *nedam vyapadeśivad vacanam (sūtram) laukikoyam nyāyaḥ*⁵⁸ and ‘*nyāyāpekṣayā vacanasya balīyastvāt*⁵⁹’.

The lokanyāya-s expressing many meanings helps one to understand easily the difficult śāstra treatises. The worldly usages, which are in the nature of examples, which enhance the knowledge of worldly matters, itself, are known as nyāya-s.

1.5. Some particular Maxims with negation

In the universe, taste of people is different, which makes counter arguments in each and every matter. As such, in śāstra, for the fulfillment of aim, same nyāya-s are used its opposite what it really mean. *ubhayathā hyācāryeṇa śiṣyāḥ sūtram pratipāditāḥ, pāṇinestūbhayam matam*-these words stress the above argument. Here some of the nyāya-s are quoted.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>kṛtakāri khalvapi śāstram</i> | x | <i>akṛtakāri khalvapi śāstram.</i> |
| 2. <i>sato'pyavivakṣā</i> | x | <i>asataśca vivkṣā.</i> |

3. <i>bhuktavān punarbhunkte</i>	x	<i>bhuktavān na punarbhunkte.</i>
4. <i>guṇāḥ bhedakāḥ</i>	x	<i>abhedakāḥ guṇāḥ.</i>
5. <i>atajjātīyakam hi loke vyavadhā- yakam bhavati</i>	x	<i>bhinnajjātīyakam hi loke vyavadhāyakam bhavati.</i>
6. <i>vyāptinyāyah</i>	x	<i>pratyāsattinyāyah.</i>
7. <i>itaretarāśrayāṇi kāryāṇi prakalpante</i>	x	<i>itaretarāśrayāṇi kāryāṇi na prakalpante.</i>
8. <i>uktārthānāmaprayogaḥ</i>	x	<i>uktārthānāmapi prayogaḥ.</i>
9. <i>pratyekam vākyaparisamāptiḥ</i>	x	<i>samudāye vākyaparisamāptiḥ.</i>
10. <i>tatguṇasamvijñāna</i>	x	<i>atatguṇasamvijñāna.</i>
11. <i>anubandho 'anyatvakaraḥ</i>	x	<i>anubandho 'ananyatvakaraḥ.</i>
12. <i>sāmānyātideśe viśeṣānatideśaḥ</i>	x	<i>viśeṣānatideśe sāmānyātideśeaḥ</i>

1.6. Influence of maxims in other śāstra works.

The etymological description of term *nyāya* is '*nīyante prāpyante vivakṣitārthā yena*'; which is leading us to the intended meaning. To explain the deep and abstract śāstra topics, our ancient thinkers have used various maxims. In *darśana*-s, particularly *nyāya*, *mīmāṃsa* and *vedānta* texts contain thousands of maxims. Here the influence of maxims in philosophical works are explained and their functions to promote the concepts elaborated by that scholars.

Śri. Śankara in his Kaṭhōpaniṣatbhāṣya (1.25) explains the ‘*kākadantaparīkṣānyāya*’ to denote a fruitless effort. *naciketaḥ maraṇam maraṇasambandham praśnam pretyāsti nāstīti, kākadantaparīkṣānurūpam mā anuprākṣīḥ maivam praṣṭumarhasi iti*, i.e. Naciketa’s question whether there is life after death or not, is like the examination of a crow’s teeth.

arundhatīpradarśananyāya is originated from the custom of showing the star ‘*arundhati*’ to the bride and the groom at the time of the marriage ceremony. It is difficult to see the star directly, so the attention of the couple first drawn to the *saptarṣimaṇḍala* and to *vasiṣṭa*, a star in this group, and to *arundhati*, nearby this, which is very tiny star. It is used in cases when with a view to bring a very small thing to one’s notice, his attention is first drawn to a bigger and conspicuous object nearby and gradually to the thing in question. It is explained by Sri. Śankara in Brahmasūtrabhāṣya (1.1.8)- *arundhatīm didarśayiṣustatsamīpasthām sthūlām tārāmamukhyām prathamamarundhatīti grāhayitvā tām pratyākhyāya paścādarundhatīmeva grāhayati*’. The idea here is that the gradual instruction is needed to understand the principle of the ‘*adyāropāpavādanyāya*’.

A goat being suddenly killed by an accidental contact of a sword is illustrated by the ‘*ajākrpāṇīyanyāya*’, in Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādyā of Harṣa.

It is used to illustrate any surprising event happening altogether by chance. *pānau pañca varātakān pidhāya kaścit prcchati kati varātakāḥ iti prṣṭaścājākrpāṇīyanyāyena bravīti pañca iti*. Here the right answer happened accidentally.

uṣṭrakaṇṭakanyāya is a maxim of a camel and a thorny plant. The camel likes much to eat the thorny leaves and bark of certain plant though it has to suffer much pain. It is used to denote that one would be pleased to follow his own taste however inconvenient or undesirable it may in reality be. In Vācaspatyam it is explained thus; ‘*uṣṭrasya śamīkaṇṭakavedha-jātadukhakāle ’pi śamīpatrabhakṣaṇasukhaleśo yathā tathābhīṣṭaviṣayopārjana dukhakāle tadupārjitadravyajasukhaleśo yatropadiśyate tatrāsya pravṛttiḥ*’.

Śri. Śankara explains the character of a preceptor who does not teach well through *andhagolāṅgulanyāya* in *vedāntasūtra* (1.7.7). It is used to denote a wrong instruction will lead ones to destruction. An evil-minded person find a blind man losing his way to his village requesting help, promising his help and putting a cow’s tail into the blind man’s hand and told him to hold on and said, she will lead him to his village. ‘*yadi ca ajñasya sataḥ mumukṣoḥ acetanamātmānam ātmetyupadiśet pramāṇabhūtam śāstram śraddhadhānatayā andhagolāṅgulanyāyena*

puruṣārthān vihanyeta anartham ca ṛcchet'. A teacher who wrongly instruct about inanimate as soul to his pupil is ignorant and desiring to get his salvation and hold on the wrong instruction according to the *andhagolāṅgūlanyāya*.

sūcīkaṭāhanyāya is the maxim of a needle and a kettle. It is used to denote that when two things- the one easy and the other difficult-are required to be done, the easier should be attended first to, as when one has to prepare a needle and kettle, he should take place in hand a needle, as it is easier work compared with the preparation of kettle. *pramā* and *apramā* are the two types of *anubhava*. Though the *apramā* is to be deliberated by the *pramā*, the *apramā* is firstly divided through the *sūcīkaṭāhanyāya*. In *saptapadārthi* it is like this; *anubhavo'pi dvididhaḥ / pramā'pramā ca / pramānirūpyatvātparastād vibhaktāmapyapramām sūcīkaṭāhanyāyena prāgvibhajate'pramāpīti /*

In Nyāya Philosophy, *tantupaṭanyāya* is used to denote the principle 'the effect exists for a moment even when the cause is destroyed. Thread is the cause, and the cloth is the effect. The cloth exists shortly even when the thread is destroyed.

kadambakorakanyāya is the maxim of *kadamba* tree. They are said to burst forth simultaneously. It used to denote successive operations.

vīcītaraṅganyāyena tadutpattistu kīrtitā, kadambakorakanyāyādutpattiḥ kasyacinmate; (Bhāṣāpariccheda, *śloka-* 166), the production of sound is like the production wave in the ocean. According to some one sound comes to the seat hearing in the same manner as the anthers of a kadamba flower evolved.

maddhyadīpikānyāya, the maxim of the central lamp which lights on all sides when it keep in center of a room. *grhe dadhighaṭīm draṣṭumānīto grhamedhinā, apūpānapi taddeśān prakāśayati dīpakaḥ.* (Nyāyamañjari, p-212). The lamp placed in the room by a householder to see his milk pot, lights on the cakes also.

ākāśamuṣṭihananyāya is the maxim of striking the sky with one's fist, which used to denote a vain attempt at an impossibility. In Tantravārttika, p-170, this nyāya read like this;

'yastantūnanupādāya turīmātraparigrahāt /

paṭam kartum samīheta sa hanyāt vyomamuṣṭibhiḥ' – depending only the machine for stitching without the thread is like striking the sky with fist, i.e. a fruitless effort.

If an object can be accomplished by simple means why should we go for a difficult one- *arke cet madhu vindeta kimartham parvatam vrajet.* If you get honey from an arka tree then why you go to mountain. In

Tantravārttika (1.2.17), Kumārila says, ‘*yadyalpān mahataśca karmanah samam phalam jāyeta tato’rke cenmadhu vindetetyanenaiva nyāyenālpēna siddhe mahati na kaścitpravarteta*. If the result of an action is same even it is big or small, no one will try to do the big actions according to this nyāya.

Kumārila Bhaṭṭa in his Tantravārttika (1.3.3, p-95) used the *kūṭakārṣāpaṇanyāya*, which is the reasonless employment of base money in one’s business. There is an argument on the relative value of *śruti* and *smṛti*, he maintains that if any teaching of the letter is found to be in opposition to that of the former, it must be given up; just as a man who finds that he has been using counterfeit coins must at once abstain from so doing. *yo hi kūṭakārṣāpaṇena kamcītkālamajño lokamadhye vyavaharati na tena vivekajñānanajita vyutpattināpi tathaiva vyavahartavyam* .

A rope, which binds at both ends, is *ubhayataspāśarajjunyāya*. It is used to denote the difficulty of situation of a person when it is injurious for him either to do a thing or to live it undone. The Jaimini section of Sarvadarśanasamgraha (p-133) quotes this nyāya.

A thing though made for one purpose may also serve for another is *anyārthamapi prakṛtamanyārtha nyāya*. Kumārila in his Tantravārttika, quotes *anyārthamapi prakṛtamanyārtha nyāya* during his discussion of *śeṣa*, an accessory that which serves the purpose of something else. *na hi*

*kaścitapi śālikulyāsthāmudakam pibanmadarthametāḥ praṇītā
ityadhyavasyati / tasmādanyattādarthyamanyaścopakāra iti vijñāyate //*

paṅgvandhanyāya is a maxim of the characters of an impaired man and blind man. The impaired man mounted on the shoulders of a blind man, so as to reach the destination by which the former is furnished with the power of locomotion and the latter with sight. Mutual dependence of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* is explained by this maxim in Samkhya-kārika (sloka-21);

puruṣasya darśanārtham kaivalyārtham tathā pradhānasya /

paṅgvandhavādubhayorapi samyogastatkṛtaḥ sargaḥ // i.e. as of the lame and blind, the union of both soul and nature takes place for soul's contemplation of nature and its abstraction.

kuḍyam vinā citrakarma nyāya-like shadow with a pillar or like a painting without a canvas, the *buddhi*, *ahankāra* etc. will not exist without the *sūkṣmaśarīra*; '*citram yathāśrayamṛte sthāṅvādibhyo vinā yathā cchāyā / tadvadvinā viśeṣairna tiṣṭati nirāśrayaliṅgam*' // (Samkhya-kārika, sloka-41).

1.7. Sociolinguistic approach

Sociolinguistics is the descriptive study of the effect of any and all aspects of society, including cultural norms, expectations, and context, on

the way language is used, and the effects of language use on society. Sociolinguistics differs from sociology of language in that the focus of sociolinguistics is the effect of the society on the language, while the latter's focus is on the language's effect on the society. It is a term including the aspects of linguistics applied toward the connections between language and society, and the way we use it in different social situations.

The name sociolinguistics appeared first in the work of Haver.C. Currie, 1952 (Dittmar, 1976). De Saussure declared that language is a social fact, so it was clear that language and society are interrelated. Boas, Sapir and Whorf the famous anthropologists stressed on the need of studying language and culture together. They argued that language forms a part of culture and the cultural traits are hidden in it. Study the language of a particular community or cultural group is necessary for studying culture. Thus, a new branch known as sociolinguistics formed among the modern linguistics. According of Fishman, J.A, “the sociolinguistics means the social organization of language behaviour, including not only language usage but also language attitudes and overt behaviours towards language and language users”. Thus, it is clear that society, culture and linguistics are interrelated. Indian writers may be composed their literary work with the concept that without the sociological and cultural aspects, the study of linguistics is not possible. Because, Patañjali makes various observations on

different social aspects in his Mahābhāṣya in order to interpret the Pāṇini sūtrā-s. Therefore, this branch, sociolinguistics is not a newly introduced one but was prevalent from the ancient period onwards.

The *dhārmic* texts reveal the culture of a society and the concept of *dharma* of that era. However, the popular sayings among the common people are the easiest way to study the *dharma* concept of Indian society. These sayings otherwise known as maxims or lokanyāya-s, which are the insight, emerged from their experiences. It expresses the truth based on common sense or the practical experience of a mankind, and they are often metaphorical. A society that has a rich tradition was blended with many lokanyāya-s. These nyāya-s can be seen in stories, poetry, philosophy etc. The nyāya seen in the story is in the form of an advice, in the poetry it is aphorism, in philosophy it is nyāya, in the texts like Pañcatantra, Arthaśāstra, it is *subhāṣita* (ethical expression) and in common speech, it is *lokokti*-s. Even though, they are known in different names, actually they are lokanyāya-s.

The Sanskrit grammarians, especially Patañjali quotes several *lokokti*-s in his Mahābhāṣya. Through the study of nyāya-s, the study of vyākaraṇa become easier. It is not the study of maxims to learn vyākaraṇa but study vyākaraṇa through nyāya.

REFERENCES

1. MB. Paś, under the sūtra ‘*vr̥dhirādaic*’(1-1-1)
2. Ibid , (Ed) by Keiohorn, Vol.I under the sūtra ‘*ādyantavadekasmin* (1-1-21) p-77
3. Ibid. part I sūtra 1.1.23, p-77—‘*ubhaya gatirihabhavati*’
4. Ibid I sūtra.1.4.56, Pāṇini ‘*laukikam ca ativartate*’.
5. Pāṇinisūtra 1.2.56 according to Kāśikākāra the word ‘anya’ means loka—“*anya iti śāstrapekṣa loko vyapadiśyate. śabdairarthābhīdhānam svābhāvīkam na pāribhāṣīkam, aśakyatvāt, lokataḥ evārthagate*”.
6. Pāṇinisūtra 1.2.53 Here also ‘Samjñā prāmāṇa’ means loka. ‘*samjñāśabda hi nānālingasamkhyāḥ pramāṇam.*(Kāśikā) ‘*pramāṇam pratyāyakā vācakā ityarthah* (Nyāya).
7. Raghuvamśa—6.30
8. MB , Paś, p-12 (under *lakṣyalakṣaṇe vyākaraṇam*)
9. PBS Part I, p-1.
“*prācīna vyākaraṇatantre vacanīkāni, atra pāṇinīyatantre jñapakanyāyasiddhāni bhāṣyavarttikayorupanibhaddhāni yāni pāribhāṣārūpāni, tani vyākhyāyamte*”
10. Mahābhārata, Udyogaparva 43.36.
11. MB, Vol II,P. 4.3.66, p-285.

12. MB, Vol.I, P.3.2.111,p-119.
13. Ibid Vol.I, P.1.4.110, p- 358.
14. Ibid Vol. IV, P.4.1.3, p-198.
15. Ibid Vol.I,P. 1.1.21, p-77.
16. Ibid Vol.I, P.1.1.1, p-38.
17. Ibid Vol. III, P.6.1.2, p- 7.
18. This Vāṛttika under the Pāṇinisūtra. 2.2.34.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. MB , Vol. I,P. 1.1.1,p-39.
22. Ibid, Vol.I, Paś, p-8.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid, Vol. III,P. 6.3.109,p-174.
25. Ibid, Vol.I,Paś, p-II.
26. Ibid, Vol.II, P.3.1.91, p-74.
27. Ibid, Vol. III,P. 6.3.135, p-92.
28. Ibid, Vol.I, P.1.3.60, p-287.
29. PBS, Part I, Paribhāṣa samkya—114, p- 191.
30. Ibid, Part I Paribhāṣa samkya—1, p-1.

31. MB, Vol.II, P.2.2.29, p-736 under this sūtra Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa writes—*‘kāraṇāditi śabdārthāvasāyāheturlokavyavahāro atra kāraṇaśabdena vivakṣitaḥ.*
32. In the same sūtra Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa—*darśanamiti—lokavyvyhāra ityarthah.*
33. *śaktigrahaṃ vyākaraṇopamānakośāptavākyāt vyavahārataśca. vākyasya śeṣāt vivṛtervadanti sānnidhyataḥ siddhapadasya vṛddhāḥ* (Śabdaśaktiprakāśikā).
34. *‘pradhānapratyayārthavacanamarthesyanyapramāṇatvāt.* (Sūtra 1.2.56) Here *‘anyapramāṇatvāt* means *vyavahāramūlatvāt.*
35. *‘te khalvapi vidhayaḥ supariḡhītāt bhavanti yeṣu khalulakṣaṇaṃ prapancaśca. kevalaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ prapanco vā na tathākāraṇaṃ bhavati’.* MB,P. 2.1.58
36. (a) MB,P. 1.4.1 *‘anyatra samjñāsamāveśaḥ prāpnoti. kva anyatra? loke vyākaraṇe ca’.*
- (b) Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa P.1.4.49, *‘Iheti lokaḥ śāstraṃ ca sāmānyena nirdiśate. loke prayujyamāṇatvāt, śāstre ca udāhriyamāṇatvāt’.*
37. MB, Vol. III, P.6.3.61, p-168.
38. Ibid ,Vol.I ,P.1.4.110, p-358.
39. Ibid ,Vol.II ,P. 4.1.3, p-198.

40. Ibid ,Vol.I, P.1.1.47, p- 115.
41. PM (KV. Part II ,P.3.1.31).
42. MB, Pradīpa, P.4.1.3, p- 439.
43. Ibid, P.1.1.57, p-434.
44. Ibid, P.1.1.70, p- 535.
45. Vaiyākaraṇa siddhānta kaumudi,
46. Pāṇini,1.2.56-
‘pradhānapratyayārthvacanamāśiṣyamānytapramāṇatvāt’.
47. P, 1.2.53—*‘tadaśiṣyaṃ samjñāppramāṇatvāt’.*
48. MB, Pradīpa, P.1.4.2, p-329.
- (a) *‘nyāyamūlyam cedamantarangam balīyaḥ. na ca nyāyasya atra kenacit bādhā astīti bahuśvetyeva bhavitavyamiti nyāyavid āhuḥ.*
- (b) Ibid, sūtra 1.4.50 p-411. *‘iti nyāyavido manyante’.*
- (c) Ibid, sūtra 2.1.3 p-565 *‘iti sudhiyo vibhāvayantu’.*
- (d) Ibid, sūtra 2.1.58 p-632 *‘atra samāsābhāve pramāṇam vicārya bhāṣyārūḍham bahuśrutaiḥ.*
49. Paribhāṣāsankhya 48 p- 75
50. Śabdakaustubham Part I sūtra 1.1.57 p-223.
51. Mahābhāṣyā Pradīpa, Part V, P. 7.1.23 p-26.
52. Ibid, Part II, P. 2.1.58 p-631.

53. Ibid, Part II, P. 3.2.146 p-133.
54. PM (KV, Part V sūtra 7.1.59 p-598) ‘*ciṇo lug nyāya* (Pāṇini 6.4.109).
55. Mahābhāṣya Pradīpa, Part II, P. 1.2.64 p- 116.
56. VP 2.3.49.
57. Nyāsa (KV, Part IV, P. 5.1.12 p- 23).
58. PM (KV, Part IV, P. 6.1.1 p-438).
59. Tatvabodhini (Siddhāntakaumudī) Part II sūtra 828 p-128.

Chapter II

SOCIAL REFLECTION

In fact, history is a living story of the people. It unites a complete picture of its political, social and cultural patterns and desires. Literature and art are two main sources for our knowledge of the social and cultural texture of the past. These sources can bring us close to the life and thoughts of our ancestors. Patañjali quotes maxims, proverbs, illustrations and examples of contemporary men and matters, as a way to justify his views in grammar. These maxims present a picture of India in that time.

2.1. Structure of society

In ancient times, the whole system of Indian society was based on the *varṇāśramadharmā*. There were four principle castes as *brāhmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya* and *śūdra*. In the social organism they occupied the foremost place—*loke 'mīṣām brāhmaṇānām pūrvamānayeti yaḥ sarvapūrvah sa ānīyate*¹. The qualities of brāhmiṇ hood are fair complexioned, pure in conduct, ruddy faced, and brown haired. *tapas*, learning and birth makes a brāhmin. But without *tapas* and learning he is merely a brāhmiṇ by caste. As the *smṛti* has it, *tapam śrutam ca yoniścetyetad brāhmaṇakārakam*. Urinate while standing, eats while going were undignified actions for them

– *gacchan bhakṣayati, abrāhmaṇo 'yam tiṣṭan mūtrayati*². The importance of brāhmaṇa lies in his attempt to study and enlighten the people by teaching them in the Veda³. kṣatriya-s are the protector of the society, and the majority of soldiers of the king were from this community. vaiśya-s and sūdra-s were enjoyed their usual position in society.

2.2. Social behaviours

The people were enriched with high thinking and were very cultured. They gave more importance to morality and religious practices. They were more intelligent, virtuous, perfect and strong willed. Their skillness of applying words while conversation and propriety in selecting words are illustrated. The answer to several questions like *ko dhāvati* (who runs), *kīdrśo dhāvati* (how runs), *kim varṇo dhāvati* (which colour) etc in single word *śveto dhāvati*, denotes the genius of the speaker. The word *śveto dhāvati* take into two meanings. ‘The dog runs’ (*śvā ito dhāvati*) and ‘the white one runs’ (*śveto dhāvati*). And the word ‘*alambusānām yātā*’ also denotes two meanings, ‘go to the country of Alambusa’ and ‘able to go to the waters’ (*alam busānām yātā*).

They did not do fruitless efforts and gained two results from one work. Mango trees are irrigated and ancestors are satisfied when conducting the *pitṛtarpaṇa* ceremony under a tree⁴. *na hi bhikṣukāḥ santīti*

sthālyo nādhiśrīyante – men do not refrain from setting the cooking pots on the fire because there are beggars who may come to ask for some of the contents. *na hi mṛgāḥ santīti yavā nopiyante*⁵- men abstain from sowing barley because there are wild animals, which may devour it, indicates their strong willness in doing their jobs while they were facing so many obstructions⁶. The *vṛddhakumārivaravākya nyāya*⁷ explains, when Indra asked an old virgin, to choose a boon, she said- *putrā me bahukṣīraghṛtamōdanam kāñcanapātryām bhuñjīran*. This one boon, if granted, would give her a husband, progeny, abundance of corn, cattle, gold etc. Here her cunningness in using words will cover all that she wishes to have. The scholars who attempt to establish their silly viewpoints blamed in the society. They do a great job for getting minor results is similar to take a small bird from the top of long bamboo – *saiṣā mahatā vamsastambāllatvānukṛṣyate*⁸. Some persons could not stick on the project for a long time is similar to the character of a mangoose is illustrated by the *avatapte nakulastitanyāya*⁹, which means a mangoose does not stay on hot place for a long time. A truly wise man who would watches his surroundings and would collect from it what essential to his welfare and reject the rest. This kind of human nature is explained by the maxim of fish and its bone (*matsyakaṇṭakanyāya*)¹⁰. When a fish is caught, it is caught with its bone, but when eating, only its flesh is retained. The character of

laziness and alertness is expressed – *ya āśu kartavyānarthāṃścireṇa karoti sa ucyate śītaka iti, yaḥ punarāśu kartavyānrthānāśveva karoti sa ucyate uṣṇaka iti*¹¹. One asking a question about one thing, but his answer is about another thing is a kind of human character is also mentioned through the *āmrān prṣṭaḥ kovidānārācaṣṭe nyāya*¹². *maṇḍūkaplutinyāya*¹³, the frog's movement of jumps denotes another character of man that the fickle natured men's movement by fits and starts. Avoid one's help after one complete his requirement is another character of a human being is denoted through the *kānthārasārthanyāya – kaścit kāntāre samupasthite sārthamupādatte sa yadā niṣkrāntāntāro bhavati tadā sārtham jahāti*¹⁴. One needs the help of the caravan when he is nearing a forest and the moment he has crossed it, he dismisses it.

There are so many universally accepted principles in the society. It is seen that the beggar will not refuse first offered after getting the second one – *bhikṣuko 'yam dvitīyām bhikṣām samāsādya pūrvām na jahāti*¹⁵. Imitation of the actions never transform the qualities of the original one is a reference to indicate the delusions in human being – *na khalvapyanyat prakṛtamanuvartanād anyadbhavati, na hi godhā sarpanti sarpaṇādahirbhavatīti*¹⁶. By imitating another, one will not become the imitated. A lizard cannot be called snake on the basis of creeping.

The people were keeping morality in their life. They were punished if they do immorality and honoured for their moral work. One who keeps his cows back from eating beans of another because of his virtue, If the cow went to the field and eats the beans, it is treated as immorality and were punished. In the society, there were no competition without rival, but had rivals between equal strength¹⁷. All were cooperated with others while they were need of help. It can be seen in the *naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāya*¹⁸. Some people expect big profit from a small effort and they were selfishness in the matters related to them. People were take special attention in protecting forests, lakes, rivers, ponds etc.

2.3. Division of towns and villages

Cities were vast and prosperous with rivers. People were accustomed to measure the length of a city by that of a river. So there is a mention that Banarus extends along the Ganges and Pāṭalīputra extends along the Śoṇa. The people in the city were worthy and prosperous. The inhabitants of Pāṭalīputra were more worthy than the inhabitants of Sāmkaśya and the inhabitants of Māthura were more worthy than the inhabitants of both Sāmkaśya and Pāṭalīputra¹⁹.

The cities and villages are very different in nature. A group of house is generally called a village and even when there is only one it is

called village. The word ‘*grāma*’ has many connotations, a group of house as in *grāma* is burnt, a garden which forms boundary as in he has entered the *grāma*, the inhabitants as in ‘*grāma* is gone, *grāma* is come’²⁰. A village having cows and plants is considered as a prosperous village²¹. A village known in the name of majority caste of people and profession, in which the brāhmiṇs form the majority of dwellers, named a brāhmiṇ village²² (*brāhmaṇagrāma*) and the village of wrestlers²³ (*mallaḡrāma*), where the wrestlers are predominant.

2.4. Family

The fundamental factor of the society was family, which is considered as the nucleus of society. Most of the families are joint family, which includes a number of other relations, and the grandfather who could enjoy the affection of his sons and grandsons²⁴. The family members looked after the collective interest rather than the individual one for the whole welfare. The members of the family constituted relationship by birth between person with varying status, the eldest, second and the youngest, when there was more than one son²⁵. The birth of a son was supposed to be removed the sorrows of the family, which was hailed with joy²⁶. They celebrated the 10th day after the birth of child as *nāmakaraṇa* ceremony²⁷. The families were residing in two storeyed building²⁸. The raised platform

and the sign of a lotus can be seen in front of the house ²⁹ and the latter is the sign of prosperity. The custom of giving food to a domestic servant is an obligatory nature ³⁰.

2.5. Eating habits, dress and decoration

Boiled rice was the favourite food, which was sometimes cooked with meat ³¹. Patañjali compares the heap of rice served on a plate to the mountain Vindhya ³². Regarding the slaughter of animals, there were some restrictions imposed by custom in case of non-vegetarian. Five, five-nailed animals could be taken, but not others ³³. There permitted to eat the boar and wild cock, but restricted to those from the village itself³⁴, and those from the town also enjoyed privilege of restriction ³⁵. The flesh of a sheep and deer ³⁶ were used and removed scales and small bones of the fish before eating ³⁷. Curd (*takram*) and buttermilk (*dadhi*) are used as the ingredients to improve the taste of food – *brāhmaṇebhyo dadhi dīyatām takram kaunḍinyāya* ³⁸. They gave more importance to maintain the health as steady, for that they have executed fast, during that time they lived on water and sometimes even without it (*abbhakṣaḥ, vāyubhakṣaḥ*) ³⁹. For maintaining dignity of social relations, certain conventional dinner rules were observed. The servers were not expected to partake while the guests

were eating – *brāhmaṇa bhojyantām māṭharakaunḍinyo pariveṣetām iti na idānīm tau bhujjate* ⁴⁰.

During the period, there were in use many household utensils. They were used a type of vessel for storing water named *kumbha*, which was enough to store grains. One, store grains in *kumbha* was known as *kumbīdhānya* ⁴¹. Most of the vessels were made out of clay. Some of the vessels that used for storing water, oil, ghee etc were earthen, but copper or bronze ones were known to them and were used for taking rice, ghee as well as milk as mentioned in the story of an old virgin asking for a boon from Indra. Some of other vessels⁴² they were used are *sthāli*- a big earthen dish, *bhrāṣṭa* - kind of frying pan, *ghaṭa* – a pot. They were used cots and lamps in the rooms ⁴³.

Cloths were used primarily to cover the body – *śākaṭānācchādayāmāsa*. The upper cloth for covering shoulders was called ‘*pataḥ*’. The dyeing of cloths were common, by that they were used various colours like white, brown-red, blue, yellow, green and red. Red colour was very popular, turban cloth was dyed in that colour which was the common dress of a priest ⁴⁴. The white amidst the red reveals their taste of colour combination – *dvayoḥ raktayorvastrayormadye śuklam vastram tatguṇamupalabhyate* ⁴⁵. There are references to shaven headed persons

(*muṇḍa*), twisted hair (*jaṭi*), and cropped head with a long bunch of hair (*śikhi*). Someone arranged their bunch of hair in a top-knot and someone in very thin tresses. That people as a part of the beautification of body used ornaments. Four kinds of ornaments such as *rucaka* (necklace), *kaṭaka* (bracelet), *svastika* and *kuṇṭala* (ear rings) which are made out of a lump of gold ⁴⁶.

2.6. Status of women

In some of the civilizations in the world, women got paramount prominence and they had more roles in society. But the rest do not give appreciable power or role for them. The Vedic tradition has held a greatest respect and high regard for the qualities of women. As far as the education and religion concerned, women and men were treated as equal in Vedic times. They studied the Vedas and performed the sacrifices along with the men.

Education for girls was considered as quite important while brāhmiṇ girls were taught Vedic wisdom. This statement, '*kāśakṛtsnī brāhmaṇī*'⁴⁷ denotes that the brāhmiṇ girls have the knowledge of *mīmāṃsā* philosophy. The girls from the kṣatriya community were taught the use of bow and arrow ⁴⁸. These examples state the women education system in the time of

Patañjali. But according to Manu, ‘women are prohibited from reciting veda, even if they are from anyone of the three higher castes’⁴⁹.

The life of woman, she was called ‘*kanyā*’ in the first part up to her marriage, after that she was called ‘*bhāryā*’. Unmarried woman was called ‘*kumārī*’ and in the old age she was called ‘*vrddhakumārī*’ (old virgin). It is the duty of the parents to give their daughter to a suitable person in marriage⁵⁰. Yajurveda also emphasis the marriage of a daughter should be with a person who is learned like her⁵¹. Women were free to participate in performing arts like drama etc. – *naṭānām strīyo raṅgatā yo yaḥ pṛcchati kasya yūyam kasya yūyam iti tam tam tava tava ityāhuḥ*⁵².

Pregnancy and child protection are treated as important duties of women. Motherhood is considered as the greatest glory of Hindu women. Taittirīyopaniṣat teaches, “*mātrdevo bhava*”. Mothers provide the love, understanding and nurturing for the development of their children⁵³. According to Kauṭilya, the aim of having wife is to beget sons⁵⁴. During the period of Patañjali, there is concept that the birth of a boy will remove all sorrows of the family, which indirectly hinting at the fact that girl children only be get a secondary status. But in the family, mother was entitled to greater esteem than the father⁵⁵. It recalls the Manu’s view⁵⁶. According to Manusmṛti, the main duties of women were the management

of house and service to the husband. She had no freedom beyond that. Moreover, she permitted neither to recite vedas nor to perform rituals of sacrifices⁵⁷. He believed that the freedom to women would bring sorrow to family⁵⁸. But during the era of Patañjali, women had freedom of movement and they enjoyed the respect of their family members. They were permitted to study Vedas and allow performing rituals of sacrifices. The women enjoyed more rights and better position than what they came to have during the latter period.

2.7. Awareness of health

During this period, the people were more conscious about the good health. There is reference about various types of diseases and its treatment and they find out its causes. Unclean water causes the foot disease and impure curd is the reason for fever – *naṭvālodakam pādarogaḥ, dadhitrapusam pratyakṣo jvaraḥ*⁵⁹. They believed that the consumption of ghee would keep them alive for a long period- *āyurghṛtam*⁶⁰. A disease in connection with childbirth, sometimes, death of mother happens during the birth of first child and prolapsed child from womb also mentioned⁶¹. Remedy for curing kidney trouble is the rice gruel, and barley water for excretion⁶². The *svātantryapāratantryavivakṣānyāya*⁶³ indicates the qualities of a healthy eyes and ears. *idam me akṣi suṣṭu paśyati idam me*

karnaḥ suṣṭu śrnoti – my eyes sees well, my ears hears well. Sometimes, it may be a remark from a person who is under the treatment of eye disease or ear.

2.8. Entertainments

During that period, the people spent their time for entertainments. There is a reference about the performance on the stage and in this performance; not only the show but also the speech of the narrator and the dialogues were equally enjoyed⁶⁴. The illustration of a peacock dancing towards his beloved indicates that women performed the dance⁶⁵. Instrumental music like drum beating was common⁶⁶. Other items of recreations are wrestling, walking and fire display. People were more attracted in wrestling in some villages and there they are the majority. There is habit of walking after meals and the people enjoyed the display of fireworks⁶⁷.

2.9. Dark aspects of social life

No society in any age could be free from bad customs and habits. Desire to grow rich with little efforts, denotes the laziness in that society. Beggary was common among the people as a part of religious custom. But at the same time beggary due to poverty existed. The beggar was not

satisfied with the first alms but was eager to gather more. The dining plates of the śūdras who were not banished from the residence of Āryāvarta are considered suitable for further use after cleaning and the śūdras, those banished from the residence of Āryāvarta are not considered acceptable for further use even after ceremonial cleaning⁶⁸. The *devadattahanṛhata nyāya* indicates the crime of murder in that society. *āmiśraṇanyāya*⁶⁹ or *nīrakṣīranyāya* indicates the presence of cheating. People take off their life while they facing difficult circumstances, consuming poison to put an end to life- *viśabhakṣaṇamapi kasyacidīpsitam bhavati*⁷⁰.

In short, the social organism referred above was an advanced society with full opportunities for entertainments, freedom and in general, the people were religious outlook.

2.10. Nyāyas on society

2.10.1. ABHIRŪPAKANYĀDĀNANYĀYA

‘gave daughter to the most deserving’

‘tadyatha loke-abhirūpāyodakamāneyam, abhirūpāya kanyā deyeti / na cānabhirūpe pravṛttirasti / tatrābhirūpatamāyeti gamyate / evemihāpi sādhakam karaṇamityucyate / sarvāṇi ca kārakāṇi sādhakāni / na cāsādhake pravṛttirasti / tatra sādhatamamiti vijñāsyate’⁷¹ /

While interpreting the sūtra ‘*sādhakatamam karaṇam*’ P.1.4.42, Patañjali discusses the purpose of the suffix *tamaḥ*. To justify the addition of *tamaḥ* he quotes the example *dhanuṣā vidhyati*-he pierces with a bow. Here the two designations *apādāna* and *karaṇa* become applicable to *dhanus*. If *tamaḥ* is not added to *sādhaka*, the *karaṇa samjñā* being unspecific-any *kāraka* is *sādhaka*, would over ruled by *apādāna samjñā*. That is why the suffix *tamaḥ* is required. But *sādhaka* means *sādhakatama*, even if *tamaḥ* is not added. If all *kāraka*-s are *sādhaka*, the special mention of the word *sādhaka* will acquire an emphatic value. In support of this argument, Bhāṣyakāra explains this nyāya. In daily life we have the usages *abhirūpāyodakamāneyam*-water should be brought for the deserving one, and *abhirūpāya kanyā deyā*-the girl should be given to deserving one. But nobody thinks of giving water or his daughter to an undeserving candidate. Here the word *abhirūpa* is understood in the sense of *abhirūpatama* that is for the most deserving one. In the same way, since the *kāraka*-s are naturally effective means, the question of ineffective means does not arise. Therefore, the statement ‘*sādhaka* acquires an emphatic value’ will be understood in the sense of *sādhakatama*- the most effective means. To get this sense the use of *tamaḥ* is not required.

But later Patañjali states that the suffix *tamaḥ* is purposeful⁷². Since Pāṇini uses the superlative suffix, he indicates that in the *kāraka*

designations words are not used to express a sense in a degree higher than normal.

2.10.2. ABHYARHITANYĀYA

‘the more worthy should come first’.

‘abhyarhitam ca pūrvam nipatatīti vaktavyam / mātāpitarau / śraddhāmedhe’⁷³/

In order to illustrate the position of words in a *dvandva* compound, Patañjali uses this nyāya in the rule ‘*alpactaram*’ P 2.2.34. It means that in auspicious occasions or in functions, the priorities are given to some persons since they are noble. Like this nyāya in a *dvandva* compound, the word standing for the thing which is *abyarhita*, highly valued, in comparison with another thing takes the first place.

Using this nyāya Patañjali answered that, the words *mātā* and *śraddhā* comes first in the compound *mātāpitarau* and *śraddhāmedhe*. Mother is more regarded than the Father is, because she bears the foetus etc, and the belief is more valued than the intellect because when belief is found, intellect becomes operative for purposive action. So the valuable things come first in the *dvandva* compound. Sāyaṇa also uses this nyāya in the introduction of the commentary in the *Ṛgveda* is as follows;

“*rgvedasya prādhānyena sarvartrāmnātavād abhyarhitam pūrvamiti nyāyenābhyarhitavāt tatvyākhyānamādau yuktam*”.

2.10.3. ADHVAGAMANANYĀYA

‘the maxim of travelling on the path’

‘*tameva adhvānam kaścidāśu gacchati, kaścit ciratareṇa, kaścit ciratamena / rathika āśu gacchati / āśvikaścireṇa padātiściratareṇa śiśuściratamena*’⁷⁴/

Because of difference in the duration of pronunciation, if *taparakaraṇa* is done in *drutāvṛtti*, there is needed to read it in *madhyamā* and *vilambitā*. If it is similarly done in *madhyamā*, there is need to read it in *drutā* and *vilambitā* and if it is similarly done in *vilambitā*, there is need to read it in *drutā* and *madhyamā*. The duration of the pronunciation of *varṇa*-s in *madhyamāvṛtti* is one-third of that in *drutāvṛtti* and that in *vilambitāvṛtti* is one and one-third of that in *madhyamāvṛtti*. But *varṇa*-s are *niyatakāla* in *drutā*, *madhyamā* and *vilambitā*. *vṛtti*-s play an additional part on account of the quick and slow pronunciation of the speaker.

Here Bhāṣyakāra uses the *adhvagamananyāya*, and says that one speaker is quick in speech, i.e. pronounces sounds quickly, another is slow, and another is very slow. This is like one travelling in the same path, one

goes fast, one slowly, and one very slowly, the charioteer goes fast, equestrian slowly and foot soldier very slowly. Duration of time during the process of pronunciation depends upon the nature of the speaker. In the same way some utter the same *akāra* fastly, some utter slowly, and some utter very slowly.

2.10.4. ALPENA YATNENA BHŪYO'RTHĀKĀŅKṢĀ NYĀYA

‘the law of the biggest profit in return for a small effort’

*‘iha hi sarve manuṣyā alpēna yatnēna mahato'rthānākāṅkṣanti /
ekēna māṣeṇa śatasahasram / ekēna kuddālakēna khārīśahasram / tatra
karmadhārayaprakṛtibhirmatvarthīyairabhidhānamastu bahuvrīhiṇeti,
bahuvrīhiṇā bhaviṣyati laghutvāt’⁷⁵ /*

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*varṇo varṇena*’ P.2.1.69, Bhāṣyakāra quotes an *iṣṭi-sāmānādhikaraṇasamāsād bahuvrīhiriṣṭaḥ kadācit karmadhārayaḥ sarvadhanādhyarthaḥ*⁷⁶, which means that a *bahuvrīhi* is desired instead of a *sāmānādhikaraṇa* compound, but sometimes a *karmadhāraya* is desired instead of a *bahuvrīhi* to account for the forms *sarvadhana* etc. A *bahuvrīhi* conveys *anyapadārtha*, i.e. possession, in addition to *svapadārtha*. To convey the combination of *svapadārtha* and *anyapadārtha*, one way is a *bahuvrīhi* compound and the other is

karmadhāraya compound (*svapadārtha*) + a *taddhita* suffix in the sense of possession (*anyapadārtha*). In *vīrapuruṣako grāmaḥ*- a village having heroic men, both the *karmadhāraya* compound and *bahuvrīhi* compound are simultaneously applicable. But sometimes a *karmadhāraya* is formed instead of a *bahuvrīhi* in order to account for the forms *sarvadhanī*-who possess all goods, *sarvabījī*-who possess all kinds of seeds etc. The meaning should be denoted by *matvarthīya* suffixes, whose stem is a *karmadhāraya*.

To establish the prevalence of the *bahuvrīhi* over the *karmadhāraya*, Patañjali illustrates this *nyāya*. In this world, all people expect big profits from a small effort. For instance, by investing one *māṣa*, they expect a profit of one lakh *māṣa*-s. From one stroke of the pickaxe, they expect a profit of one thousand *khāri*-s. In *śāstra* also it is easier to convey the meaning *svapadārtha* + *anyapadārtha* in one step by a *bahuvrīhi*, than in two steps, by a *karmadhāraya* and a subsequent *taddhita* formation for economy of expression.

2.10.5. ĀMIŚRAṆANYĀYA

‘maxim of mixture of milk and water cannot be distinguished’

‘*āmiśrībhūtamivedam bhavati / tadyathā kṣīrodake samprkte
āmiśrībhūtatvānna jñāyate kiyatkṣīram, kiyadudakam, kasminnavakāśe
kṣīram, kasminnavakāśe udakamiti, evamihāpi āmiśrībhūtatvānna jñāyate
kiyatudāttam, kiyatanudāttam, kasminnavakāśe udāttam kasminnavakāśe
anudāttamiti*’⁷⁷ /

While describing the sūtra ‘*tasyādīta udāttamardhahrasvam*’ P.1.2.32, Patañjali says, the *āmiśraṇanyāya* that it is very difficult to distinguish which part is *udātta* and *anudātta* since the *svārīta* accent is mixed with *udātta* and *anudātta*.

It is not known in a mixture of milk and water that how much is milk and how much is water and in which portion it is milk, and in which portion it is water. Likewise, in *svārīta* it is not known how much is *udātta*, how much is *anudātta*, which portion is *udātta* and which portion is *anudātta*. To solve this doubt Ācārya Pāṇini has stated like a friend that in a *svārīta* accent, the first half portion is to be understood to have the *udātta* accent and the remaining half will be *anudātta*. If a short vowel is *svārīta*, its *mātra* being one, half will be *udātta* and the other half *anudātta*. If a long vowel, whose *mātra*-s will two be *svārīta*, the half will be *udātta*, the remaining 1½ will be *anudātta*. If *pluta* vowel will be *svārīta*, the first half measure will be *udātta* and the remaining 2½ will be *anudātta*.

2.10.6. ĀMRĀN PRṢTAḤ KOVIDĀRĀNĀCAṢṬE NYĀYA

‘asking about the mango tree, answer is about kovidāra tree’.

*‘anyadbhavān prṣto nyadācaṣṭe/ āmrān prṣtaḥ kovidārānācaṣṭe/
arthavattā nopapadyate kevalenāvacanāditi bhavānāsmābhiṣcoditaḥ
kevalasyāprayoge hetumāh’⁷⁸/*

Bhāṣyakāra states this nyāya under the rule ‘arthavadadhāturapratyayaḥ prātipadikam’ P.1.2.45. The *pratyaya* and the *prakṛti* alone have no meaning. The stem and suffix are related to each other having a meaning. Because of the incapacity to denote anything by itself, the bare stem *vṛkṣa* have no meaning. Then, why the word *arthavatvam* in the sūtra? Since the stem is perpetually related to the *pratyaya*, the stem alone can never be used. Here Patañjali mentions the *āmrān prṣtaḥ kovidārānācaṣṭe nyāya* and says that, the question is about one thing but the answer is about another thing. Asking about the Mango tree, the reply is about the Kovidāra tree. Whatever the question, the answer should be accordingly. By asking the question that why the word *arthavatva* needed in the sūtra, his reply is the stem and suffix are used together alone.

2.10.7. ANDHAPARAMPARĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of continuous series of blind men’.

‘*katham punaridamācāryeṇa pāṇinināvagamete sādhaḥ iti? āpiśalena pūrvavyākaraṇena / āpiśalinā tarhi kenāvagamam? tataḥ pūrveṇa vyākaraṇena / yadyevam, andhaparamparāprasaṅgaḥ, tadyathā tathā śuklam kṣīramityandhenokte, kenedamavagamamiti pṛṣṭo yadāndhāntaram mūlam nirdiśati, so’pyandhāntaram, tadā naitadvacaḥ śauklye pramāṇam bhavati, tādrgetad*’⁷⁹/

Haradatta, the author of Padamñjari, uses the *andhaparamparānyāya*, while he interpreting the sūtra ‘*atha śabdānuśāsanam*’. While saying ‘*śabdānām anuśāsanam*’, the śabda means the *anuśāsana* of correct words. How Pāṇini can understand the *anuśāsana* of each word? He learned the śabda-s from Āpiśali’s vyākaraṇa and Āpiśali learned it from his ancestor and so on. This is like the *andhaparamparānyāya*, i.e. one blind led another, he led another and so on, and it is string of blind. One blind says milk is white. How he gets it, who said it to him, another blind, he got it from another. If says, Pāṇini get the knowledge of correct words from his ancestor, it is same as the *andhaparamparānyāya*.

Haradatta cleared this doubts. Ācārya says the correct words those that are seen and understood when they are in use in each era, understanding the word *gau* is different from *gavi*, *goṇi* etc. that is in use in his era, the word *gau* is treated as correct word. There are thousands of such words in use in Veda-s, Vedāṅga-s etc. Therefore, here is no defect of *andhaparampara*.

In Muṇḍakopaniṣat, this nyāya is says like this;

*‘avidyāyāmantare vidyamānāḥ svayam dhīrāḥ
paṇḍitammanyamānāḥ /*

*janghanyamānāḥ pariyānti mūḍhāḥ andhenaiva nīyamānāḥ
yathāndhāḥ⁸⁰ //*

This idea is expressed in Vākya-padīya⁸¹ and in other works also.

2.10.8. ANUDARĀ KANYĀ NYĀYA

‘no belly girl’

*‘katham punaḥ sato nāmāvivakṣā syāt? sato’pyavivakṣā bhavati /
tadhyathā-alomikaidakā, anudarā kanyeti / asataśca vivakṣā bhavati /
samudraḥ kuṇḍikā / vindhyo vardhitakam iti⁸² /*

The word *dhruva* in the sūtra ‘*dhruvamapāye apādānam*’ P.1.4.24, means a fixed point. So the designation *apādāna* cannot apply the objects which are in motion. But in the examples like *trastāt aśvāt patitaḥ*, the designation *apādāna* is to be applied is itself in motion. It is justified by saying that the speaker does not intend the instability (*adhrauvya*) of the horse. The word *aśva* in its conventional meaning does not speak of movement. It denotes the generic feature, horseness in a horse that is quick movement. That is *dhruva* (fixed) what the speaker wants to express. So the ablative case suffix after the word *aśva* is not used to express the movement of the horse, but it is used to indicate stationary character of the horse with regard to another movement. But how to say that *adhrauvya* is not intended by the speaker when movement forms part of the lexical meaning itself in the case of *dāvataḥ patitaḥ*. To remove this difficulty Patañjali explains the *anudarā kanyā nyāya*. It all depends on what the speaker wants to express. The objects referred to by him are one thing and his way of presenting them is something else. For example, it may say that *alomikā eḍakā* -a sheep has no wool, even if, it has some wool and *anudarā kanyā*- a no-belly girl, even if she has belly. Here the speaker does not intend the existence (*avivakṣita*) of the wool and belly. Similarly in *dhāvataḥ patitaḥ* the speaker doesn’t want to express the object that referred to is in rapid motion, but wants to express is that the object is

relatively stationary, in relation to the action of falling. This he indicates by adding the ablative case ending after *dhāvat*.

2.10.9. AVIRAVIKANYĀYA / AVYAVIKANYĀYA

‘maxim of the words *avi* and *avika*’

‘*dvayoḥ śabdayoḥ samanāρθakayorekena vighraho*’*para-smādutpattirbhaviṣyatyavyavika nyāyena / tadyathā avermāmsamiti vighryā avikaśabdādutpattirbhavati āvikam iti / evam pañcasu kapāleṣu samskr̥taḥ iti vighrya pañcakapālaḥ iti bhaviṣyati / pañcakapālyām samskr̥taḥ iti vighrya vākyameva / ihāsmābhistraiśabdam sādhyam- pañcasu kapāleṣu samskr̥taḥ, pañcakapālyām samskr̥taḥ, pañcakapālaḥ iti*’⁸³/

This *nyāya* is used by Patañjali while he interpreting the *sūtra* ‘*dvigor lūganapatye*’ P.4.1.88. The two words *avi* and *avika* are equal meaning, i.e. sheep. The *taddhita* affix *ka* denotes *svārtha* (base meaning), occurs after nominal stem *avi* (sheep) forms the word *avika* (sheep). But the compound *āvika* has different analysis in the sense of the flesh of a sheep. The analysis from the word ‘*avi*’ is *avermāmsam*, and from the word ‘*avika*’ the analysis is *avikasya māmsam*, but the compound word from the two different analyses of the word *avi* and *avika* is one and same, i.e. *āvika*. *āvika* formed from the word *avika* and not form the compound *āvam* from

avi. Here, analysis is formed from the one of the word *avi* of two words, which has equal meaning, and the compound is formed from the second one word *avika*. This is *aviravika nyāya*.

The compound *pañcakapālah*-ritual oblation of food prepared in five bowels, has two analyses. *pañcasu kapāleṣu samskṛtaḥ* and *pañcakapālyām samskṛtaḥ*. Here according to *aviravika nyāya*, we take the analysis *pañcasu kapāleṣu samskṛtaḥ* and the *aṅ* occurs by the rule ‘*samskṛtam bhakṣāḥ*’ P.4.2.16 and then the deletion occurs by the rule ‘*dvigorluganapatye*’ and gets the form *pañcakapālah*. But the *aṅ* does not occur in the other analysis *pañcakapālyām samskṛtaḥ*. So we get the same compound *pañcakapālah* from the two analyses, *pañcasu kapāleṣu samskṛtaḥ* and *pañcakapālyām samskṛtaḥ*. To establish this Patañjali uses this *nyāya*.

2.10.10. BHERYĀGHĀTANYĀYA

‘like the beater of a drum’

‘*evam tarhi spoṭaḥ śabdaḥ / dhvaniḥ śabdaguṇaḥ katham? bheryāghātavat / tad yathā bheryāghātaḥ bherīmāhatya kaścit vimśati padāni gacchati, kaścit trimśat, kaścit catvārimśat / spoṭastāvāneva bhavati*’⁸⁴/

In the sūtra ‘*taparastatkālasya*’ P.1.1.70, it accepts *tatkāla* and differentiates the different *kāla*-s. If so, *taparakarāṇa* being made in either *drutāvṛtti*, *madhyamāvṛtti* or in *vilambitāvṛtti*, it will accept only that *vṛtti*, not accept others. It is cleared by saying that *varṇa*-s are *niyatakāla*, but *vṛtti*-s are based upon the quick or slow pronunciation of the speaker. For example, someone goes fast, someone slowly and someone very slowly. Here the way is *niyata*. Likewise, the *varṇa*-s are also *niyata*. This argument is not correct, because the path is the *adhikarāṇa* to the act of travelling. There is no change to *adhikarāṇa*, change is only to *kāla*. But in the case of *varṇa*, *drutā*, *madhyamā*, *vilambitā* are the *vṛtti*-s of *varṇa*, not *adhikarāṇa*. Here Bhāṣyakāra uses the *bheryāghāta nyāya* in reply to the statement of *adhvagamana nyāya* is not suitable.

He says that *spoṭa* is the *śabda* and *dhvani* is the *vyañjaka* of *śabda*, like the beater of a drum, that is if one beat a drum, the sound goes twenty steps, if another beat; it goes thirty steps, and another forty steps. Here the beat is same. The increase is due to the sound produced by beating. But the variations are its quality with reference to the *śabda*-s, there are *dhvani* and *spoṭa*. Of these, *dhvani* alone is cognizable to the sense of hearing. It is short, it is long, and it is, by nature, both short and long at the hands of some. So *drutā*, *madhyamā*, *vilambitā* are the *vṛtti*-s, which are derived from *dhvani*, the *guṇa* of *śabda*.

In Vākyapadīya⁸⁵, it is read like this,

“spoṭasyābhinnakālasya dhvanikālānupātinaḥ /

grahaṇopādhibhedena vṛttibhedam pracakṣate //

svabhāvānnyatve hrasvadīrghaplutādiṣu /

prākṛtasya dhvaneḥ kālaḥ śabdasyetyupacaryate //

śabdasyordhvamabhivyaktevr̥ttibhetam tu vaikṛtaḥ /

dhvanayaḥ samupohante spoṭātmā tairna bhidyate //

2.10.11. BHIKṢUKABHIKṢĀNYĀYA /AJAHATSVĀRTHĀNYĀYA

‘The mendicant does not give up the second alms when he already gets the first one’.

‘yuktam punaridam yadajahatsvārthā nāma vṛttiḥ syāt? bādham yuktam/ evam hi dṛśyate loke – bhikṣuko ’yam dviṭīyām bhikṣām samāsādya pūrvām na jahāti / samcayāyaiva pravartate’⁸⁶/

In the compound *rājapurusaḥ* (king-man), is it proper that integration should be called *ajahatsvārthā*-integration in which the constituents retain their own meaning. This doubt raised while interpreting the sūtra ‘*samarthaḥ padavidih’* P.2.1.1. Patañjali answered this question by taking

the *bhikṣukabhikṣā nyāya*. It is proper, because, the mendicant does not give up previous alms when he gets alms for the second time. His mind is always thinking about storing foods. It is observed in daily life. If we take the *vṛtti, ajahatsvārthā*, the result would be dual number since both constituents retain their own meaning. Here the case-ending is to be employed after the word *rājapuruṣaḥ* taken as a whole. And by the whole a special meaning, characterized by singular number is conveyed to which the constituents render assistance. Therefore, the singular is used based on the number of constituents, which are merely subordinate to the whole. Hence, there is no question of employing case-endings on account of the number of constituents.

2.10.12. BRĀHMAṆA ĀNĪYANTĀM NYĀYA

‘The maxim of bring Brāhmiṇs to the dining hall of Devadatta’.

‘*matubapi matvarthe vartate/ tadyathā-devadattaśālāyām brāhmaṇa ānīyantāmityukte yadi devadattopi brāhmaṇo bhavati, sopyānīyate*’⁸⁷ /

The rule ‘*tasau matvarthe*’ P.1.4.19, means a form, which terminates in ‘*t*’ or ‘*s*’ is termed *bham* when an affix denoting the sense of *matup* follows. Patañjali uses this *nyāya* while he discussing the question, for what purpose the word *artha* used in the *sūtra* ‘*tasau matvarthe*’. If the

sūtra being ‘*tasau matau*’, affix *matup* will only apply to *payasvān* not to *payasvī* because in *payasvī*, according to the sūtra there must be the affix denoting *matvarthe*. Even though the word *artha* will mention in the sūtra, there will not get the affix *matup*, since *matup* is not equal to the meaning of *matup*. In reply to this statement “*matup* is not equal to the meaning of *matup*”, Bhāṣyakāra interprets the *brāhmaṇa ānīyatām nyāya*, i.e. if someone says ‘bring *brāhmaṇa*-s to the dining hall of Devadatta’, Devadatta must be brought to the dining hall since he is a *brāhmaṇa*. As such *matup* is also been mentioned when use the word *matvarthe*.

2.10.13. BRĀHMAṆAGRĀMANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the *brāhmiṇ* village’

‘*aicoścottarabhūyastvāt bhūyasa eva grahaṇāni bhavisyanti / tadyathā-brāhmaṇagrāma anīyatām ityucyate / tatra cāvarataḥ pañcakārukī bhavati*’⁸⁸/

While refuting the sūtra ‘*eca igghrasvādeśe*’ P.1.1.48, Bhāṣyakāra used the *brāhmaṇagrāmanyāya*. In *ai* and *au* the second element, ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’ have greater *mātrā*-s than the other element ‘*a*’. So the shortening may happened only to ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’ respectively, the ‘*a*’ does not shortened, because ‘*a*’ has the lesser *mātra*- *aicoścottarabhūyastvāt*. So in the

example *sunu* (*su* + *nau*), due to the sūtra ‘*hrasve napumsake prātipadikasya*’ when shorten the *aukāra* in *nau*, ‘*u*’ will be shortened, not *akāra*. Similarly, in the word *prarī* (*pra* + *rai*) *ikāra* will be shortened, not *akāra*, when shorten the *aikāra* in *rai*, without the sūtra ‘*eca igghrasvādeśe*’ only *ik* (*i*, *u*) will be shortened. On supporting this view, Bhāṣyakāra quotes the *brāhmaṇagrāmanyāya*. It is said, ‘let brāhmaṇa village come, only comes brāhmaṇas, though there exist five kinds of artisans in the locality, like potter, blacksmith, carpenter, barber and washer man, since there are brāhmaṇas are the majority. Naming is on the basis of majority-*prādhānena vyapadeśāḥ bhavanti*.

2.10.14. BRĀHMAṆAKṢATRIYABHOJANABHĀJANAPARYĀYA NYĀYA

‘brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya cannot eat from a pot at the same time, but in turn’

‘*dravye padārthe tu prativyakti lakṣaṇam pravartate ityakṛtārthatvāllakṣaṇayoḥ paryāyena pravṛttiḥ prāpnoti, yathā- brāhmaṇakṣatriyādīnāmasahabhujāmekasmin bhāhane bhujikriyāyām paryāyaḥ syāt / tatra jātau padārthe kṛtārthatvād vṛttau prāptāyām vidhyarthamidamārabhyate vipraṭiṣedhe sati param kārya bhavatīti*’⁸⁹/

Jinendrabuddhi shows this nyāya in his nyāsa under the rule ‘*vipraṭiṣedhe param kāryam*’ P.1.4.2. It means that, as there is action, in turn, in the eating of Brāhmaṇa-s and Kṣatriya-s who do not eat from the same pot at the same time. Likewise, in śāstra, when two rules have application in a single context, concurrently, their application is in turn (*paryāya*). It is like the mentioning of the two masters who order their single servant to accomplish two different things at the same time. The servant of course obeys their commands in turn. If the servant is sent by them to perform some action in two different directions, then he does not perform either of those two actions. For, it will not be possible for him to perform those two actions, concurrently. This conflict will lead him to do actions are in turn. This nyāya is the instances in grammar where actions are performed in turn.

**2.10.15. BRĀHMAṆĀNĀM PŪRVA ANĪYATĀMITYUKTE
SARVAPŪRVA ĀNĪYATE NYĀYA**

‘maxim of bringing of first brāhmaṇa to the front’.

‘*tadyathā- loke brāhmaṇānām pūrva ānīyatāmityukte sarvapūrva
ānīyate / evamihāpi sarvapūrvāyāḥ kriyāyāḥ prāpnoti / naiṣa doṣaḥ /
sarveṣāmatra vrajikriyām prati paurvakālyam / snātvā, vrajati, pītvā*

*vrajati, bhūktvā vrajatīti / evam ca kṛtvā prayogo 'niyato bhavati / snātvā, bhūktvā pītvā vrajati / pītvā, snātvā, bhūktvā vrajatīti'*⁹⁰/

While the word *samānakarṭṛkayoḥ*, expressed in dual number in the sūtra '*samānakarṭṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle*' P.3.4.21, affix *ktvā* comes only for two actions; one to be located at a prior time relative to another located at a subsequent time. So the affix *ktvā* will not come to the sentence of more verbs like *snātvā pītvā bhūktvā datvā vrajati*-having bathed, drunk, eaten, and given he goes. It is expressed here in dual number, since there is no other way. Mention has to be made through some case and some number-says Patañjali. It is as one who is desirous of fish obtains fish with fins and scales since there is no other way. He takes in whatever is necessary and throws away fins and scales. But mention is made in dual number because there is no other way, it cannot take according to the world's experience. Here Patañjali uses this nyāya and says that, when we say "bring the first one among the brāhmaṇa-s, here bring the brāhmaṇa who is first in front of other brāhmaṇa-s, even if we others have also prior time compared to one among them. As the first brāhmaṇa has prior time, one among the five verbs has prior time i.e. *snātvā*.

But Bhāṣyakāra here brings another opinion that the principle action *vrajati* is important than the other four verbs. So the *ktvā* affix is applicable

to all the verbs which are prior to the principle action *vrajati* in the example *snātvā pītvā bhuktvā datvā vrajati*.

Bharṭṛhari says about this that,

yathānekamāpi ktvāntam tiñantasya viśeṣakam /

tathā tiñantam tatrāhustīñantasya viśeṣakam⁹¹ //

2.10.16. BRĀHMAṆAVASIṢṬHANYĀYA

‘the maxim of brāhmaṇa and Vasiṣṭa’

‘*vaidikānām laukikatve’pi prādhānyakhyāpanārtham pṛthag grahaṇam, yathā-brāhmaṇa āgatāḥ vasiṣṭopyāgata iti*⁹² /

The maxim of *brāhmaṇavasiṣṭa nyāya* takes its origin from the fact that as Vasiṣṭa was a brāhmaṇa. The sentence “brāhmaṇa-s have come, Vasiṣṭa has also come”, here denotes, being Vasiṣṭa a brāhmaṇa, the name Vasiṣṭa is used to give importance to him among others.

While interpreting ‘*keṣām śabdānām, laukikānām vaidikānām ca*’ in the sūtra ‘*atha śabdānuśāsanam*’, Haradatta used the *brāhmaṇavasiṣṭa nyāya*. Vedic *śabda*-s are treated as *laukika śabda*-s, since it is used in the world⁹³. Here the word ‘*vaidikānām*’ is used separately to denote the importance of ‘*vaidika śabda*’. It is same as the *brāhmaṇavasiṣṭa nyāya*.

2.10.17. DADHITRAPUSAM PRATYAKṢO JVARAḤ NYĀYA .

‘Curd and tin are fever’.

*‘antareṇāpi nimittaśabdān nimittārtho gamyate / tad yathā-
dadhitrapusam pratyakṣo jvaraḥ / jvaranimittamiti gamyate /
nadvalodakam pādārogaḥ / pādāroganimittamiti gamyate/ āyurgr̥tam/
āyuso nimittamiti gamyate’⁹⁴/*

The sūtra ‘*dvirvacane’ci*’ P.1.1.59 means that when an affix beginning with a vowel follows, that is a cause of reduplication, a substitute shall not take the place of preceding vowel, while the reduplication is yet to be made, but the reduplication having been made, the substitution may then take place. If so, this sūtra may be changed as *dvirvacananimitte* adding the word *nimitta* because, even without the word *nimitta*, the meaning of the *nimitta* is not acquired. Here Patañjali opposes this opinion by introducing the nyāya *dadhitrapusam pratyakṣo jvaraḥ* and says that, the meaning of the word *nimitta* is acquired, even without the word *nimitta*. According to this, it is said that, curd and tin are immediate fever, which means the curd and tin together is cause of fever. As such water full of reeds is foot disease, it is suggested that it causes foot disease and ghee is longevity of life, it is suggested that it produces longevity of life. Here curd and tin are cause of fever, water full of reeds is cause of foot disease and ghee is cause

of longevity of life. In these examples, the usage of *kārya* (effect) in cause is expressed through the *lakṣanāvṛtti*. Therefore, here get the meaning of cause of doubling, without the word *nimitta* in the rule *dvirvacane 'ci*.

2.10.18. DEVADATTAHANTRHATANYĀYA

‘killing the killer of Devadatta’

*‘asiddhavacanāt siddhamiti cet nānyasyāsiddhavacanādanyasya bhāvah / na hyanyasyāsiddhavacanādanyasya prādurbhāvo bhavati / tadyatā nahi devadattasya hantari hate devadattasya prādurbhāvo bhavati’*⁹⁵/

There is a doubt arise in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*’ P.1.1.57, that *vāyu+os→vāyvoḥ* and *adhvaryu+os→adhvaryoḥ*, the ‘u’ of *vāyu* is replaced by ‘v’ by the rule ‘*ikoyaṇaci*’ P. 6.1.77 and hence it become *val*, the ‘y’ should be elided by the rule ‘*lopo vyorvali*’ P. 6.1.66. Then the desired form *vāyvoḥ* does not get. This undesired deletion of ‘y’ is blocked by resorting to the suspension proposal of *asiddhatva* as against the treatment of replacement. But this *asiddhatva* would create problems in conjunctions with the derivation of *paṭu + nīṣ + ṭā → paṭvyā* and *mṛdu + nīṣ + ṭā → mṛdvyā*. To clear this matter Patañjali uses this nyāya and says that, the existence of one is not

secured through the *asiddhatva* of another. That is, Devadatta does not come back to life, if one who killed him is killed. In the derivation of *paṭu* + *ī* + *ā*, the '*ī*' is replaced by '*y*' by the rule '*iko yaṇaci*' and if the replacement of '*y*' of '*ī*' is considered suspended, cannot get back the '*ī*' that the '*y*' replaced, for it has already been killed by replacement in '*y*'. If this killer is killed by its suspension, the '*ī*' cannot back to life. If it cannot come back to life, the '*v*' replacement of '*u*' of *paṭu* and *mṛdu* could not be availed then. Since killing the killer of Devadatta does not bring Devadatta back to life, suspension is no answer to the problem. Treating the replacement of '*ī*' in '*y*' as '*ī*' that it replaced is preferred so that the replacement in '*v*' of *paṭu* and *mṛdu* could be fulfilled.

2.10.19. DURBALABALAVATVIRODHANYĀYA

'position of the weak and the strong'.

'yadyapi vipratīṣedhaśabdenedamapi labdhum śakyam tathāpi tadetadarthabodhane 'samarthamiti bhāvaḥ kadācilloke durbalabalavatorapi virodhadarśanāt'^{96/}

Nāgeśa observes this nyāya in the udyota of Mahābhāṣya under the rule '*vipratīṣedhe param kāryam*' P.1.4.2. It has been stated that *vipratīṣedha* is a *virodha* or opposition of two equals in strength. It is

something different from *virodha*, since, the opposition is also seen between the weaker and stronger individuals. But in śāstra *vipratishedha* is to be interpreted as mutual opposition (*parasparavirodha*) between equals. In *virodha*, one is *antaraṅga* and the other is *bahiraṅga*. *antaraṅga* is stronger and *bahiraṅga* is weaker- '*antaraṅgam ca balīyo bhavati*'. Here the *antaraṅga* and *bahiraṅga* are not in equal strength. Therefore, this subject is not come under the sūtra *vipratishedhe param kāryam*. So, the *nitya-anitya*, *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga*, *apavāda-utsarga* etc. are the examples of stronger and weaker. Hence, the *vipratishedha* is not come to these examples. But in śāstra, each one of the *nitya*, *antaraṅga*, *apavāda* rules are considered more powerful is accord with their order of enumeration here.

2.10.20. EKADEŚAVIKṚTANYĀYA

'a thing that is changed in one part does not there by become something else'.

'ekadeśavikṛtamanyavad bhavatīti tiṅgrahaṇena grahaṇam bhaviṣyati/ tad yadhā-śvā karṇe vā pucche vā chinne śvaiva bhavati, nāśvo na gardabha iti ⁹⁷/

Bhāṣyakāra introduces this nyāya in the sūtra ‘*stānivadādeśo ’nalvidhau*’ P. 1.1.56. It means that even when modification occurs to a part of an item, that item is treated as what it was. A dog continuous to be a dog, and is not transformed into an ass, though its tail may be cut off, or a man does not become a beast though he may lose one of his fingers. A form receives the same treatment even though it has lose part of itself or undergone some modifications. Consider *pacati* and *pacatu*, where *pacati* a form terminating in ‘*ti*’, has lost its final ‘*i*’, and *pacatu*, again a form terminating in ‘*ti*’, has had its final ‘*i*’ replaced by ‘*u*’. Rule ‘*suptiñantam padam*’ P.1.4.14 requires that the term *pada* should be assigned only to those items which end in a *sup* or *tiñ*. However, *pacati* ends in ‘*ti*’ and *pacatu* ends in ‘*tu*’. The original ‘*ti*’ which qualified *pacati* and *pacatu* as *pada*-s has been modified. So the words *pacati* and *pacatu* may be taken as *tiñanta*, by the nyāya *ekadeśavikṛtamananyavat bhavati*. That is the object is the same, though it has undergone slight modification.

2.10.21. KĀKĀDHIKARAṆATVANYĀYA

‘the maxim of something on which a crow is perched’.

‘*anubandho ’nyatvakara iti cettanna / kim kāraṇam? lopāt / lupyate ’trānubandhaḥ / lupte ’trānubandhe nānyatvam bhaviṣyati/ tadyathā-kataraddevadattasya gṛham/ ado yatrāsau kāka iti / utpatite kāke*

*naṣṭam tadgrham bhavati / evamihāpi lupṭe'nubandhe naṣṭaḥ pratyayo bhavati/ yadyapi lupyate, jānāti tvasau 'sānubandhakasya samjñā kṛtā' iti / tadyathā-itaratrāpi, kataraddevadattasya grham? ado yatrāsau kākaḥ iti, utpatite kāke yadyapi naṣṭam tadgrham bhavati antantaḥ tamuddēsam jānāti iti'*⁹⁸/

NB 6065

In the sūtra 'ktaktavatū niṣṭhā' P.1.1.26, Bhāṣyakāra uses this nyāya. After the elision of *kakāra* in *kta* stem the 'ta' is remained. The words like *lotah* and *gartah* are formed from the root 'lū' and 'gr' respectively, by *tan* suffix according to the sūtra 'hasimrgrīṇvā'midamilūpūdhurvibhyastan'⁹⁹. From the union of *kta* stem with the roots 'lū' and 'gr', the words *lūnah*, *gīrṇah* are formed. *anubandha* is elided in the *kta* stem. After the *anubandha* is dropped, how the *takāra* in the *kta* is distinguished from another *takāra*. This is the doubt. In a reply to the enquiry about the house of Devadatta, one said it is this where the crow sits. After the crow is flown, it is not possible to distinguish his house from another. So also, the words cannot be distinguished from others after the *anubandha* is elided.

Here Bhāṣyakāra answered- though the *anubandha* is elided, he knows that the *samjñā* was given which had *anubandha*. Even the crow has flown, when the crow is there in the house, he recognizes his house. Even if, he is able to understand it, doubt is again arises that 'ta' in *lotah* is that



‘*ka*’ or the ‘*na*’ in *lūnaḥ* is that ‘*ka*’. Likewise, doubt arises in his mind whether this is the house where the crow sits or the other. So a permanent distinguishing mark through the impermanent one is accepted. While the crow is sitting in the house, must be identified a raised platform or a lotus in the house¹⁰⁰. Likewise should understand the difference of two ‘*ta*’ *śabda*-s by accepting a particular *k* and particular *kāla*. The ‘*ta*’ denotes past tense and one of the three *kāraka*-s, *kartr*, *karma*, or *bhāva*. In *lūnaḥ*, there is *karma* and past tense. In *lotaḥ* there is no *kāla* and *k*. On seeing these we can understand that the ‘*ta*’ in *lūnaḥ* has *niṣṭāsamjñā*.

Bhartṛhari says this nyāya like this,

‘*adhruveṇa nimittena devadattaḡṛham yathā /*

ḡṛhītam ḡṛhaśabdena śuddhamevābhidhīyate’¹⁰¹ //

Sāyaṇa says this nyāya making clearly as-

‘*satyam vastu tadākārairasatyairavadhāryate /*

asatyopādhibhiḥ śabdaiḥ satyamevābhidhīyate’¹⁰² //

2.10.22. KANYĀBRAHMACĀRIṆĀU DAṆḌAKANDUKAHASTAU NYĀYA

‘the girl, and the celibate, a stick and ball in hands’

‘*vahanti varṣanti nadantīyadau loka eva yadhāsamkhyasam-
bandhasya dṛṣṭatvānnārtha etena? ucyate, vyutkramaṇenāpi loka
sambandho dṛśyate-kanyābrahmacāriṇau daṇḍakandukahastāviti*’^{103/}

The rule ‘*yadhāsamkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*’ P.1.3.10, which means the equivalents of elements in two sets of equal numbers, is determined based on their order of enumeration. Here a question is raised that, for what purpose this rule formulated since equivalences between enumerated items could be easily determined from this world. For example, in the verse,

vahanti varṣanti nadanti bhānti dyāyanti nr̥tyanti samāśvasanti /

*nadyo ghanā mattagajā vanāntā priyāvihīnāḥ śikhinaḥ
plavaṅgamāḥ*^{104//}

there are seven verbal forms and seven subjects. Here the verbal forms of the first line are related to their corresponding subjects, namely, *vahanti* (flow) with *nadyaḥ* (rivers), *varṣanti* (rain) with *ghanā* (clouds), *nadanti* (roar) with *mattagajā* (wild elephants), *bhānti* (glow) with *vanāntā* (forest-edges), *dhyāyanti* (meditate) with *priyāvihīnāḥ* (separated lovers), *nr̥tyanti* (dance) with *śikhinaḥ* (peacocks), *samāśvasanti* (console) with *plavaṅgamāḥ* (monkeys) without any difficulty.

For answering this question, Haradatta uses this nyāya. In the world, the sentence *kanyābrahmacārīṇau daṇḍakandukahastau*, the order of enumeration is not equivalent. If we use the equivalent enumeration, we will get words as *kanyā daṇḍahastau*-the girl with stick in hand and *brahmacārī kandukahastau*-the celibate with ball in hand. This meaning is not proper. Words such as *kanyā kandukahastau*-the girl with a ball in hand and *brahmacārī daṇḍahastau*-the celibate with a stick in hand would be considered proper. Here the meaning got not through the equivalent enumeration, but is against the rule. Since the equivalences of elements in two sets of equal numbers is determined based on their order of enumeration and just opposite of that can be find in the world, to emphasis the use of equivalent enumeration in śāstra, the rule ‘*yadhāsamkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*’ is formatted.

2.10.23. KARAṆĀNUKARAṆANYĀYA

‘the maxim of imitation of one’s work’

‘*viśama upanyāsaḥ / yaścaivam hanti, yaścānuhanti ubhau tau hataḥ/ yaścāpi pibati, yaścānupibati, ubhau tau pibataḥ / yastu khalvevamasau brāhmaṇam hanti, evamasau surām pibati iti tasyānukurvan snātānulipto mālyaguṇakaṇṭhaḥ kadalīstambham chindyāt payo vā pibet, na sa manye patitaḥ syāt*’¹⁰⁵ /

Bhāṣyakāra opposes the arguments of the Vārttikakāra regarding the enunciation of '!' for the sake of imitating the word mispronounced on account of incapacity is meaningless, by 'karaṇānukaraṇanyāya'- imitating one's work.

‘A man who witnessing another in killing, and he imitates the killing in a particular way, both will incur the sin of killing. Similarly, if a man imitating in drinking wine both of them commit the fault of drinking. But if a man witnessing the killing of brāhmaṇa or drinks the wine, he simply imitating the action of killing or drinking by cutting down a plantain stump or drinks milk after his baths, anoints his body, puts on a garland round his neck, would not incur a downfall.’ But in the sentence *brāhmaṇyṭaka ityāha*, a brāhmaṇa lady pronounced *ṭaka* instead of *ṛta* and how the imitation of the word *ṭaka* becomes fault? Here the Bhāṣyakāra mention the 'karaṇānukaraṇanyāya' and says that the man who only imitating the action of killing and drinking, i.e. Instead of killing the Brāhmaṇa he kills the plantain stump and instead of drinking the wine, he drinks milk. Imitation is only the actions.

Similarly, the imitation of the word that Brāhmaṇa lady says *ṭaka* instead of *ṛta* by another person is not incorrect. The imitator is saying

same word only, but not uses the incorrect word himself. So the enunciation of 'ʔ' is valid.

2.10.24. KUMBHAKĀRAVAIYĀKARAṆAKULANYĀYA

‘the maxim of *kumbhakāra* and *vaiyākaraṇa*’.

‘*tadyathā- ghaṭena kāryam kariṣyan kumbhakārakulam gatvāha – “kuru ghaṭam, kāryamanena kariṣyāmi iti”/ na tadvād śabdān prayuyukṣamāṇo vaiyākaraṇakulam gatvāha- “kuru śabdān, prayokṣya iti”/ tāvatyevārthamupādāya śabdān prayuñjate*’¹⁰⁶ /

The *nityatva* of śabda, *artha* and their relationship is through the world. To strengthen this view, Bhāṣyakāra asks the question-“how is it understood that śabda, *artha* and *sambandha* are *nitya*? Generally, people use words to denote various objects and they never try to prepare them. Just opposite is in the case of *anitya* objects. There is an effort is made to create them.

For instance, a man who wishes to use a pot, go to the potter’s house and says ‘make a pot to me; I have many usages of it’. But a man who wants to use words, never go to the house of a grammarian and says ‘make some words for me, I shall use them’. Even without going to the house of a grammarian, he manages to convey the desired meaning with his limited

vocabulary¹⁰⁷. Hence, it is clear that what is made that is *anitya*, and what is not made that is *nitya*. Therefore, the *śabda*, *artha* and their relationship are *nitya*, since they cannot be made.

Bhartṛhari says like this;

‘*nityāḥ śabdārthasambandhāḥ samāmnātā maharṣibhiḥ /
sūtrāṇāmanutantrāṇām bhāṣyāṇām ca pranetr̥bhiḥ*’ //¹⁰⁸

2.10.25. LAṬṬVĀNUKARṢAṆANYĀYA

‘the maxim of catch a small bird from the top of a long bamboo’.

‘*sa eṣa sūtrabhedena lkāropadeśaḥ plutyādyarthah san
pratyākhyāyate saiṣā mahato vamsastambāllaṭṭvānukṛṣyate*’¹⁰⁹ /

While discussing the purpose of the enunciation of ‘*ḷ*’, Patañjali explained the *laṭṭvānukarṣaṇanyāya* – catch a small bird from the top of a bamboo.

The *lkāropadeśa* is for the sake of *pluta* and other operations. *pluta* get in the word *klptaśikha*, by the sūtra ‘*guroranṛto nantyaśyāpye kaikasya prācām*’ P.8.2.83. By the rule ‘*krpo rolaḥ*’ P.7.2.18, *krp* is changes as *klp*. The change is brought about by means of the transformation of a phoneme. There is no originalisation taken place. But according to the

ekadeśavikṛtanyāya, the *klp* is to be understood *krp*. Thus, it creates the difficulty of the prohibition of the *pluta* in the word *kl̥ptaśikhah*. To avoid this difficulty the word *aravataḥ* should be used instead of *anṛtaḥ* in the sūtra ‘*guroranṛto nantyasyāpyekaikasya prācām*’. If doing so, there will be *pluta* in the word *kl̥ptaśikhah*, but will not get *pluta* in the word *hotṛkāraḥ*. It can be rectified by adding the word *hrasvasya* and read ‘*guroraravato hrasvasya* instead of *guroranṛtaḥ*. Making changes in the rule ‘*guroranṛtao nantyasyāpyekaikasya prācām*’ for omitting the vowel ‘*!*’ which has already been mentioned in the *pratyāhāra* for the sake of *pluta*, is similar to take a small bird from a long bamboo¹¹⁰. Thus, it is clear that Bhāṣyakāra accepts the view that the *upadeśa* of *lkāra* is not necessary.

2.10.26. MALLAGRĀMANYĀYA

‘the maxim of a village of wrestlers’

‘*yadyapi tatra vṛṣabhasyāpi sambhavastathāpi mallagrāmavad bhūyāstvāt strībhirvyapadeśo bhavati*’¹¹¹ /

While interpreting the sūtra ‘*grāmyapaśusamgheṣvataruṇeṣu strī*’ P.1.2.73, Pradīpakāra uses this nyāya. In a village there are many kinds of people living together, but this village is known as the village of wrestlers (*mallagrāma*), since they are more in number than others in the villages.

Likewise, the group of domesticated animals are going together which consists male animals like bull, buffalo etc. but this group is generally known in the name of female animals since they are more in number. In the world, which one is, more worthy that is known in that name. This factor is also indicated by Pāṇini through the word 'āmravaṇa'¹¹², i.e., in a mango grove, there may be some other trees, but still people call it a mango grove.

2.10.27. MĀṬHARAKAUNḌINYANYĀYA

‘let brāhmaṇa-s be fed, let Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya serve them food’

*‘dvirvacane’pi nemau rahau kāryinau dvirvacanasya / kimtarhi?
nimittamimau rahau dvirvacanasya / tadyathā-brāhmaṇā bhojyantām
māṭharakaunḍinyau pariveṣṭāmiti / nedānīm tau bhujjāte¹¹³ /*

During a sacrifice (yāga) conducting in a village, at the time of lunch, the sacrificer said, ‘all brāhmaṇa-s may be eaten, and Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya may be served. While he saying so, the Māṭhara and Kauṇḍinya exempted from eating food, even if they were brāhmaṇa. They could be eaten with all other brāhmaṇa, if they were not restricted by the word of the priest. There never going on two works at the same time, eating and serving.

The question is that whether the letter ‘r’ is to be used between the letter ‘h’ and ‘y’ or same as in the sūtra ‘*hayavaraṭ*’. If the letter ‘r’ be mentioned in the sūtra ‘*hayavaraṭ*’, doubling the letter of ‘r’ will take place by the rule “*acorahābhyām dve*” in the word ‘*madra hrdaḥ*’, because the letter ‘r’ is included under the *pratyāhāra*, ‘*yar*’.

2.10.28. MĀTRVATSANYĀYA

‘the maxim of calf and cow’.

‘*yeṣāmeva pratyayānām deśo niyamyate ta eva niyatadeśāḥ syuh / ya idānīmaniyatadeśāḥ sa kadācit pūrvaḥ kadācitaparaḥ, kadācinmadye syāt/ tadyatā-māturvatsaḥ kadācidagrataḥ kadācitprṣṭataḥ, kadācitpārśvataḥ bhavati*’¹¹⁴ /

During the interpretation of the sūtra ‘*paraśca*’ P.3.1.1, Patañjali remarks the necessity of the word *para*. The *taddhita* affix *bahuc* optionally occurs before a nominal stem by the sūtra ‘*vibhāṣā supo bahuc purastāttu*’ P.5.3.68, and by the sūtra ‘*avyayasarvanāmnāmakac prākṭeḥ*’ P.5.3.71, the affix *akac* occurs in the middle. Here it is clear that the remaining affixes are occurring in the end of a stem. Then why the word *para* mentioned in the sūtra *paraśca*? To clear this, Patañjali uses the *mātrvatsanyāya*. A calf when it walks with its mother, it is sometimes in

front of its mother, sometimes at her back, sometimes at her sides. There is no permanent place or rule to the calf for walking with its mother. As such if the affix *bahuc* occurs before and affix *akac* in middle, the rest of the affixes may not be occurred at the end. It may come before, in middle, or at the end of a stem. Therefore, he read the word *para* in the rule *paraśca*, to apply the affixes at the end other than *bahuc* and *akac*.

2.10.29. NA CĀNTAREᅇA PRATIYOGINAM SPARDDHĀ BHAVATI NYĀYA

‘there is no competition without a counterpart’

‘*evamapi nāntaraᅇgaᅇ / katham? sparddhāyāmātiśāyiko bhavati / na cāntareᅇa pratiyoginam sparddhā bhavati*’¹¹⁵/

In order to explain the priority of *bahuvrīhi* formation over the addition of *ādiśāyikā* suffixes in the words like, *sūkᅇmavastratarah* Pataᅇjali brings this laukikanyāya under the rule ‘*varᅇo varᅇena*’ P.2.1.68. To have the desired form *sūkᅇmavastratarah*, the *bahuvrīhi* must be formed first and the suffix is added after *bahuvrīhi*. This cannot be established because of the *paravipratīśedha* procedure, the addition of the *ādiśāyika* suffix should take place first. This would result in the undesired form *sūkᅇmavastratarah*. But the word *para* has another meaning *iᅇᅇa*-which is

desired. So the desired thing takes place in case of a conflict and the formation of the *bahuvrīhi* has priority over the addition of *ādiśāyikā* suffix by ‘*vipratīṣedhe param kāryam*’ P.1.4.2. If we take *para* means *iṣṭa*, the reference to *paravipratīṣedha* is incorrect because, the *ādiśāyikā* suffix is *antaraṅga* and *bahuvrīhi* is *bahuraṅga*. *ādiśāyikā* suffix is *antaraṅga* because, it is added after a *prātipadika* or feminine forms ending in ‘*nī*’ or ‘*āp*’ by the rule ‘*nyāpprātipadikāt*’ P.4.1.1. But the *bahuvrīhi* formation requires case-inflected words. That is it requires case-suffixes in addition to a *prātipadika*. Both in the case of *antaraṅga* and *bahuraṅga*, *antaraṅga* takes first. But the *ādiśāyikā* suffix is not *antaraṅga* because, *taddhita* is added after a word which is *samartha* (semantically connected) and the *sāmarthya* have through a case-inflected word only. Even though the *ādiśāyikā* suffix is *antaraṅga*, because it only requires the *svapadārtha*, but the *bahuvrīhi* is formed in the sense of *anyapadārtha*. This view is also rejected by saying that the *ādiśāyikā* suffix is added in the sense of competition, i.e. comparison. Comparison presupposes two items to be compared. No competition without a counterpart. So the *bahuvrīhi* is formed first and then the *ādiśāyikā* suffix.

2.10.30. NA HI BHIKṢUKĀḤ SANTĪTI STHĀLYO NĀDHIŚRĪANTE

/NA HI MRĠĀḤ SANTĪTI YAVĀ NOPYANTE

‘men do not refrain from setting the cooking pot on the fire because there are beggars, or do not abstain from sowing seed because there are wild animals’

‘na hi doṣāḥ santiti paribhāṣā na kartavyā lakṣaṇam vā na praneyam / na hi bhikṣukāḥ santiti sthālayo nādhiśrīyante / na ca mṛgāḥ santiti yavā notyante / doṣāḥ khalvapi sākalyena parigaṇitāḥ prayojanānā-mudāharaṇamātram / kuta etat? na hi doṣāṇām lakṣaṇamasti / tasmād yanyetasyāḥ paribhāṣāyāḥ prayojanāni tadarthameṣā paribhāṣā kartavyā / pratividheyam ca doṣeṣu’¹¹⁶ /

While the time of interpreting the sūtra ‘*kṛṇmejantaḥ*’ P.1.1.39, Bhāṣyakāra says the merit and demerits of the *paribhāṣa*, ‘*sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhiranimittam tadvighātasya*’¹¹⁷. It means that the rule depending upon the combination of two things never allows another rule to destroy it. This *paribhāṣa* has more defects than merits, and then there arise a question for what this *paribhāṣa* is? In reply Patañjali quotes the nyāya – *na hi bhikṣukāḥ santīti sthālyo nādhiśrīyante, na hi mṛgāḥ santīti yavā nopyante*’.

By the sūtra ‘*neryah*’, *rāma* + *ne* became *rāma* + *ya* by substituting ‘*ya*’ to a stem ending in ‘*a*’ in the place of ‘*ne*’. Here the ‘*ya*’ being taken to be *sthānivat* to ‘*e*’ gets also the designation of *sup* and therefore the final ‘*a*’ of the stem *rāma* is lengthened before ‘*ya*’ by the rule *supi ca*. Here, there is substituted ‘*ya*’ for the dative ending ‘*e*’, after a stem ending in ‘*a*’. Then short *aṅga* is the cause of this substitute ‘*ya*’. According to the *paribhāṣa*, it never destroys the short *aṅga*.

The *paribhāṣa* does not apply here. It is sometimes *nitya*, and sometimes *anitya*. Pāṇini himself indicates the *anitya* nature of this *paribhāṣa*, by forming the dative of *kaṣṭa* as *kaṣṭāya* in the sūtra *kaṣṭāya kramaṇe*. Even if this *paribhāṣa* more defects, Bhāṣyakāra emphasis the importance of this *paribhāṣa* through the nyāya ‘*na hi bhikṣukāḥ santīti sthālyo nādhiśrīyante, na hi mṛgāḥ santīti yavā noppyante*’. He says, men do not refrain from cooking because there are beggars or do not abstain from sowing seed because there wild animals since the field is near the forest. There is the need of prevention to defects and accepts the merit. Therefore, according to this nyāya acceptance of the *paribhāṣa* is suitable.

The content of this nyāya can be seen in Hitopadeśa;

‘*doṣabhīteranārambhastatkāpuruṣalakṣaṇam /*

*kairajīrnabhayād bhrātarbhojanam parihīyate //*¹⁸

2.10.31. NA HI DVIPUTRA ĀNĪYATĀMITYUKTE TRIPUTRA ĀNĪYATE NYĀYA

‘a man who has three sons could not be designated as a man with two sons.’

‘*adviprabṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam/ ihāpi pratiṣeto yathhā syāt samupābhicchādaḥ / tat tarhi adviprabṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam / na vaktavyam / yatra triprabhṛtayah santi dvāvapi tatra stah/ tatrādvyupasargasyetyeva siddham / na va eṣa loke sampratyayah / na hi dviputra ānīyatāmityukte triputra ānīyate / tasmāt adviprabṛtyupasargasyeti vaktavyam*’¹¹⁹ /

Patañjali mentions this nyāya under the rule ‘*chāderghe’ddhyupasargasya*’ P.6.4.96. The sūtra means that when the affix *gha* follows, the root *chādi* is shortening to *chada*, when there are not two *upasarga*-s for example- *pracchada* and *dantacchada*. However, in the example, *samupacchāda*, it is not shortening because; there are two *upasarga*-s. Nevertheless, the root vowel has not shortened in the example, *samupābhicchāda*, since there were more than two *upasarga*-s like *sam*, *ap*, and *abhi*. So the sūtra should read like this; *chāderghe’ddhyupra-*
bṛtyupasargasya using *addhyuprabṛtyupasargasya* instead of *addhyupasargasya*. But there is no need to change the sūtra as

addhyuprabhṛtyupasargasya, because if we read *addhyupasargasya*, it means only that are not two *upasarga*-s, and not to intend that there were more than two *upasarga*-s, which means there is one *upasarga* or more than two *upasarga*-s. So the term *addhyupasargasya* means that when there is only one *upasarga* there occur the shortening of the root *chad*, and not occur shortening when there is two, three or more *upasarga*-s. Here Patañjali uses the *nyāya* and says that if an order were given to bring the father of two sons, it would not do to bring one who had three. Therefore, if we read the word *addhyuprabhṛtyupasargasya* instead of *addhyupasargasya* in the rule *chāderge'ddhyupasargasya*, we will get the form *samupābhicchādah*.

2.10.32. NAṢṬĀŚVADAGDHARATHANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the lost horses and burnt chariot’.

‘*athavā naṣṭāśvadagdharathavat sampratyayo bhavati / tadyathā-tavāśvo naṣṭah, mamāpi ratho dagdhaḥ, ubhau samprayujyāvahai iti, evamihāpi tavāpyantarataṁ prakṛtirnāsti, mamāpyantarataṁ ādeśo nāsti, astu nau samprayoga iti*’¹²⁰ /

The ‘*naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāya*’ is based on a story that two persons in a village went out in their own respective chariots. On the way,

the horse of one person lost and another's chariot burnt accidentally. By mutual agreement, the chariot is ready to move with other person's horse and they returned to their village. Bhāṣyakāra explains this nyāya while he interpreting the sūtra '*sthāne'ntaratamaḥ*' P.1.1.50. The close association of vowels can be seen in śāstra. *ā, ai, au* are *vṛddhisamjñā* and *a, e, o* are *guṇasamjñā*. Here the place of the letter 'e' is gutturo-palatals (*kaṇṭhatālu*) and *prayatna* is *vivṛta* and the place of the letter 'i' is palatal (*tālu*) and *vivṛta prayatna*. So 'i' is the proximate *sthānin* of 'e' and 'ai'. Similarly, 'o' and 'au' have the place at gutturo-labials (*kaṇṭhoṣṭya*) and the *prayatna vivṛta* and its proximate *sthāni* is 'u' because it has the place at labials and *vivṛtaprayatna*.

But the letters 'a' and 'ā' have place gutturals and the letter 'r' has the place at cerebrals. Here the *sthānin* and the *ādeśa* have no nearness in the organ of speech. There is no similar *sthānin* to 'r' and there is no similar *ādeśa* to 'a' and 'ā'. So both associated together by the '*naṣṭāśvadagdarathanyāya*'. Then there comes *ar* and *ār* in place of 'r'.

The '*pañgvandhanyāya*' of the Sāṅkhya Philosophy is same as this nyāya;

*'puruṣasya darśanārtham kaivalyārtham tathā pradhānasya /
pañgvandhavadubhayorapi samyogastatkṛtaḥ sargah'* //¹²¹

2.10.33. NAṬABHĀRYĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of an actor and actress’.

‘vyañjanāni punarnatabhāryāvat bhavanti / tad yathā-naṭānām striyo raṅgatā yo yaḥ pṛcchati kasya yūyam iti tam tam tava tavetyāhuḥ / evam vyañjanānyapi yasya yasyācaḥ kāryamucyate tam tam bhajante’¹²²/

Patañjali uses this nyāya during he describes the state of consonants in the rule ‘*ajāderdvitīyasya*’ P.6.1.2. Consonants are depending up on the vowels. A consonant that relates to a particular vowel is like a heroine of an actor. On a theoretical stage, actor asks the actress, whose wife she is, and in reply she says that his wife. With whom she acts, she will become his wife. If she acts with another person in another occasion, she will become wife of that person. As such the consonants are associated with a vowel that to which vowel the consonants are related. For example in the words like *āṭa*, *āṭatuḥ*, *āṭuḥ*, when doubling the first one vowel *akāra*, the word *aṭ* will become doubling, due to the association of the consonant *ṭakāra* with *akāra*. Likewise in the example, *aṭiṭṣati*, the word *ṭis* will become doubling by the association of *ṭakāra* of *aṭ* with *is*, when the doubling of the second one vowel ‘*is*’.

2.10.34. NIRLUṬHITAGARBHANYĀYA

‘a child that has gone out of the womb’

‘*kā punaḥ kriyā? īhā / kā punarīhā ? ceṣṭā / kā punaśceṣṭā ?*
vyāpāraḥ / sarvathā bhavān śabdairēva śabdānācaṣṭe, na kinjītarthajātam
nidarśayati evamjātīyatā kriyēti / kriyā nāmeyamatyāntāparidrṣṭā’śakyā
piṇḍībhūtā nidarśayitum, yathā-garbho nirluṭhitah’¹²³ /

nirluṭhitagarbhanyāya is used to clear the meaning of the word *kriyā* in the vārttika *kriyāvacaṇe dhātuḥ* under the sūtra ‘*bhuvādayo dhātavaḥ*’ P.1.3.1. *dhātu* is defined to be that which denotes *kriyā*, then what is *kriyā*, the answer is *īhā*. Then what is *īhā*, *ceṣṭā*, then what is *ceṣṭā*, action. These answers are not fair to the question what is *kriyā*. Because here explain words and do not show any object telling *kriyā* is like this. *kriyā* cannot be shown as a mass, because it is not cognizable through other *pramāṇā*-s. Here Patañjali uses the *nirluṭhitagarbhanyāya* and says that, it is not like a child that has gone out of the womb, *kriyā* can be understood only through *anumāna*.

This *anumāna* is like this. When all the requisites are ready, there is sometimes a chance to say *pacati* and sometimes not. That is, evidently the *kriyā*, in the presence of which there is a chance to say *pacati*. Or it is

definitely the *kriyā* by which Devadatta having been here is now at Pāṭalīputra.

2.10.35. PHALAVYATIREKANYĀYA

‘discrepancy in getting the fruit will be the result’

‘*vyatireko’pi vai lakṣyate dṛśyate hi kṛtaprayatnāścāpravīṇāḥ, akṛtaprayatnāśca pravīṇāḥ*’^{124/}

This nyāya is used when arise a doubt that does merit accrue from the knowledge of correct words or from the use of correct words. If merit lies in the use of words, it seems that those who have worked in grammar and those who have not worked get merit. Therefore, the effort made by the grammarian for knowing correct words will be fruitless. Here Patañjali explains the *phalavyatirekanyāya*. Sometimes people who have made efforts are seen to be not clever in using words, while sometimes people are seen very clever in use of words without having made much effort for the study of words. In these cases, there is the reversal of the fruits. That is there will be fruit without effort and effort bearing no fruit.

2.10.36. PITĀPUTRAVATNYĀYA

‘same person is father and son’

*‘yadi tarhi sāmānyamapi viśeṣo viśeṣo’pi sāmānyam, sāmānyaviśeṣau
na parkalpete / prakalpete ca / katham? vivakṣātaḥ / pitā putravat /
tadyathā sa eva kañcit prati pitā bhavati, kañcitprati putro bhavati /
evamihāpi sa eva kañcitprati sāmānyam kañcitprati viśeṣaḥ’¹²⁵ /*

In the bhāṣya of the sūtras ‘*tasminniti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*’ P.1.1.66, ‘*tasmādityuttarasya*’ P.1.1.67, while Patañjali describes the definition of *sāmānya* and *viśeṣa*, he asks, if *sāmānya* become *viśeṣa* and *viśeṣa* become *sāmānya*, will there come the irregularity? Cow is *sāmānya* and a black one is *viśeṣa* to one. Black is *sāmānya* and cow is *viśeṣa* to another. Then it is not possible to decide whether one denotes *sāmānya* or *viśeṣa*. But it is depended on the intention of the speaker, i.e., if it is his desire that cow should denote *sāmānya* and black should denote *viśeṣa*, cow is *sāmānya* and black is *viśeṣa*. On the other hand, if it is his intention that black should denote *sāmānya* and cow *viśeṣa*, black is *sāmānya* and cow is *viśeṣa*. He describes another interpretation to the above problem by using *pitāputravatnyāya*. The same person is father to one and son to another. So also the something may be considered *sāmānya* with reference to one and *viśeṣa* with reference to another.

2.10.37. PRADHĀNE KṚTO YATNAḤ PHALAVĀN BHAVATI
NYĀYA

‘effort made for the principal thing bears a good fruit’

‘*brāhmaṇena niškāraṇo dharmah ṣaḍaṅgo vedo’dyeyo jñeyasca /
pradhānam ca ṣaḍaṅgeṣu vyākaraṇam / pradhāne ca kṛto yatnaḥ phalavān
bhavati*’¹²⁶/

During the discussion of *āgama* (the study of Veda), which is one of the five advantages of learning grammar, Patañjali uses this nyāya. It is a meaningless effort that, an effort made for an unnecessary one. At the same time if topic is an important one, the effort made for that bears a desired fruit.

For knowing the actual meaning of the Vedic hymns it is essential to study the six auxiliaries of Veda-*śikṣā* (phonetics), *vyākaraṇam* (grammar), *chandaḥ* (prosody), *niruktam* (Vedic interpretation), *jyotiṣam* (astronomy) and *kalpaḥ* (the made-easies for the performance of rituals). Of these six *vedāṅgā*-s, grammar is important. The grammar analyses the words in to *prakṛti* and *pratyaya*, and helps to study the knowledge of meaning. Without the grammar, there is no knowledge of meaning. So using this

nyāya Patañjali says that effort made for the important thing bears a good fruit.

2.10.38. PRADĪPANYĀYA

‘a bright shining lamp lighten the whole house’

‘*adhikāro nāma triprakāraḥ / kaścidekadeśasthaḥ sarvam
śāstramabhijvalayati / yathā pradīpaḥ suprajvalithaḥ sarvam
veśmābhijvalayati*’^{127/}

While commenting the sūtra ‘*ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogā*’ P.1.1.49, the three kinds of *adhikāra*¹²⁸ are viewed. In the *yathoddeśapakṣa*, the *samjñāsūtra*-s are standing in its own places of an implication. *vidhisūtra*-s will be associated with the *samjñāsūtra*-s. But how can one *samjñāsūtra* associated with many *vidhisūtra*-s? To answer this, Patañjali refers to the *pradīpanyāya*- just as a bright shining lamp illuminates the whole house, the *samjñāsūtra* associates with all *vidhisūtra*-s by standing in one place.

śāsaḥ is *avayavaṣaṣṭī* and *upadhāyāḥ* is *sthānaṣaṣṭī* in the sūtra ‘*śāsa idaṅ haloh*’ P.6.4.34. It means *antya* and *upadhā* of *śas* will be replaced by *ikāra*. The root *śas* being the *avayavaṣaṣṭī*, the ‘*i*’ will not come in the place of *śas* but in the place of *upadhā* of *śas*. But in the sūtra ‘*śā hau*’ P.6.4.35, *śāsaḥ* is treated as *sthānaṣaṣṭī* for *ādeśa śa*. The root ‘*śā*’ will be

replaced by the *ādeśa śā-* this sūtra means. Then one and only the sixth case suffix, one place it is *sthānaśaṣṭī* and in other place it is *avayavaśaṣṭī*. It happens in the *adhikāra* because, where it is related to *avayava* there it is *avayavaśaṣṭīadhikāra* and where it is related to *sthāna*, there it is *sthānaśaṣṭī*.

2.10.39. PRĀSĀDAVĀSINYĀYA

‘the maxim of a dweller in mansion’

‘mukhagrahaṇam śakyamakartum / kenedānīmubhayavacanānām bhaviṣyati / prāsādavāsinyāyena / tadyathā-kecit prāsādavāsinaḥ, kecit bhūmivāsinaḥ, kecidubhayavāsinaḥ / tatra ye prāsādivāsino gṛhyante te prāsādavāsigrahaṇena / ye bhūmivāsino gṛhyante te bhūmivāsigrahaṇena / ye tūbhayavāsino gṛhyanta eva te prāsādavāsigrahaṇena bhūmivāsigrahaṇena ca/ evamihāpi kecinmukhavacanāḥ, kecinnāsikāvacanāḥ, kecitubhayavacanāḥ’¹²⁹/

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*mukhanāsikāvacano ’nunāsikaḥ’* P.1.1.8, Patañjali used the *prāsādavāsinyāya*. This is a very famous nyāya. The sound whose place of articulation is *mukha* and *nāsikā* is called *anunāsikaḥ*. Therefore, in this sūtra, *mukha* and *nāsikā* are essential. If the sūtra is read without the word *mukha*, it is *nāsikāvacano ’nunāsikaḥ* and the designation

will reach only *yama* and *anusvāra*. If the sūtra is ‘*mukhavacano ’nunāsikah*’, omitting the word *nāsikā*, the designation will be liable to reach *k, c, t, t, p* etc. and not *anusvāra* and *yama*. In this situation, Bhāṣyakāra says that, through the *prāsādavāsinyāya*, it is possible to manage without the word *mukha* in the sūtra, though the designation *anunāsikah* is the place of articulation in both *mukha* and *nāsikā*.

Some are residing in upper floor, some are residing in ground floor and some are in both. One who resides in upper floor is designated as *prāsādavāsi*, and in ground floor as *bhūvāsi* and reside in both is called *prāsādavāsi* and *bhūvāsi*. The resident of the upper floor is identified, if the word *prāsādavāsi* is mentioned. If the word *bhūvāsi* is mentioned, the resident of the ground floor will be identified. Those who reside in both will be identified, both when the word *prāsādavāsi* is mentioned and when the word *bhūvāsi* is mentioned. Similarly, in the *Vyākaraṇaśāstra* the mouth sounds come into operation when the word *mukha* is mentioned. The nasal sounds come into operation when the word *nāsikā* is mentioned and both come into operation either the word *mukha* or *nāsikā* is mentioned. Then we conclude that the word *mukha* is not essential in the sūtra ‘*mukhanāsikāvacano ’nunāsikah*’.

2.10.40. PRATINIDHINYĀYA

‘the substitution of one material for another in a sacrifice’

‘*yathā laukikeṣu vaidikeṣu ca kṛtānteṣu abhūtapūrve’pi sthānaśabdo
vartate/ loke tāvat-upādhyāyasya sthāne śiṣya ityucyate, na ca
tatropādhyāyo bhūtapūrvo bhavati/ vede’pi somasya sthāne
pūtīkatṛṇānyabhiṣunuyādityucyate*’¹³⁰ /

The Mahābhāṣya states this nyāya under the rule ‘*sthānivadādeśo ’nalvidhau*’ P.1.1.56. *sthānī* is that which was and which is not. *ādeśa* is that which was not and which is. The definitions of *sthānī* and *ādeśa* are in appropriate with reference to the *nityatva* of *śabdā*-s that the existent has disappeared and the non-existent has appeared. To clear this, Patañjali explains this nyāya and says that, propriety is established from the use of the word *sthāna* with reference to an object that has not ceased to exist. It is said in the world that “let the pupil take the place of the teacher”. Here the pupil is coming instead of the teacher not to remove the teacher. If the teacher does not exist, the pupil could not be in place of the teacher. In the veda also- “let the juice be taken from *pūtīka* in place of *soma*” and *soma* has not ceased to exist there. So the definitions of *sthānī* and *ādeśa* are proper and the *nityatva* of *śabdā*-s have not any adverse.

2.10.41. SAMANDHAKĀRE PRADĪPANIMITTAM DARŚANAM

‘lamp causes sight in darkness’

‘*evam tarhi svābhāvīkī nivṛttiḥ / nanu coktam kim nañ
prayujyamānaḥ karotīti / nañnimittāttūpalabdhiḥ / tadyathā-
samandhakāre dravyāṅām samavasthitānām pradīpanimittam darśanam /
na ca teṣām dīpako nivartako bhavati*’¹³¹ /

In the rule ‘*nañ*’ P.2.2.6, Pūrvapakṣin says that if the *nañ* removes the thing itself, then certainly Kings would not keep an army of elephants and horses and Kings would simply utter the word ‘no’. Then Patañjali accepted the *svābhāvīkī nivṛttiḥ*. This view holds that removal or absence is inherent in the nature of things. Thus, the absence of brāhmiṇhood belongs to the nature of a Kṣatriya. From the use of the word *abrāhmaṇa*, we understood that this word is not a *brāhmiṇ*, but a *kṣatriya* etc., who shares some qualities with a *brāhmiṇ*. The function of *nañ* here is not to remove brāhmiṇhood as an entity in physical reality, but to bring absence of brāhmiṇhood, which is a fact of physical reality, to our knowledge. Here Patañjali explains this nyāya and says that the function of *nañ* is comparable to that of a lamp. The lamp does not itself produce the objects, which it illuminates, but it merely makes them perceptible. In the same way, *nañ* does not produce absence, but it reveals absence.

2.10.42. SAMBANDHIŚABDANYĀYA

‘relationship through the words’

‘*sambandhiśabdairvā tulyametata / tadyathā- sambandhiśabdāḥ mātari vartitavyam pitari śuśrūṣitavyam iti / na cocyate svasyām mātari, svasmin pitari iti / sambandhācca gamyate-yā yasya mātā, yaśca pita iti / evam ihāpi ātirantya iti sambandhaśabdāvetau / tatra sambandhāt etad gantavyam, yam prati yaḥ ādiḥ antya iti ca bhavati, tasya grahaṇam bhavati, svasya ca rūpasyeti*’¹³² /

On account of the non-mention of *samjñi*, the meaning of the sūtra ‘*ādirantyaena saheta*’ P.1.1.71, is not understandable. The object *samjñi* is achieved by reading word *tanmadyasya* in the sūtra. But we can’t add anything to sūtra. To solve this ambiguity in settlement Bhāṣyakāra explains the *sambandhiśabdanyaya*-it is similar to the words of relationship. *sambandhiśabda*-s are found in the expressions like, there is the necessity to behave properly towards mother, there is necessity to render service towards father. It is not said there towards one’s mother and towards one’s father. From *sambandha* it is understood who is whose mother and who is whose father. Here also in this sūtra, it should be understood that there is *grahaṇa* to that with reference to which one is taken as *ādyāvayava* and another is taken as *antyāvayava* and also to itself.

2.10.43. SĀRTHIKAPRATIŚRAYASAMBANDHANYĀYA

‘There is no mutual relation between travellers who stay over in a lodge and leave early in the morning’.

‘*astu tarhyayameva vigraho’rdham tritīyamanayoriti / nanu coktam
śaṣṭyartho nopapadyate iti / naiṣa doṣaḥ / idam tāvadayam praṣṭavyaḥ -
atheha devadattasya bhrāteti kaḥ śaṣṭyarthāḥ iti ? tatraitat syātekasmāt
prādurbhāva iti / etacca vārtam / tad yathā – sārthikānāmekapratiśraye
uṣitānām prātarutthāya pratiṣṭhamānānām na kaścit parasparam
sambandho bhavati / evaṅjātīyakam bhrātrīvyam nāma / atra ced yuktaḥ
śaṣṭyartho dṛśyate ihāpi yukto dṛśyatām*¹³³/

The Mahābhāṣya mentions this nyāya in connection with the rule ‘*anekamanyapadārthe*’ P.2.2.24. What is the meaning and derivation of the compound *ardhatṛtīyaḥ*? The compound is *bahuvrīhi* and the analysis *ardham trīyam eṣām*- the third of them is half- says Bhāṣyakāra. But this compound meaning is not correct because it is not *anyapadārtha*. *anyapadārtha* is one which is not denoted by the parts which form the compound. Then Patañjali gives another analysis *ardham trīyam anayoḥ* (the third of these two is half). In this analysis, the *anyapadārtha* refers to the two items in which the half of the third item is no longer included. But in this analysis, what is the meaning suggested by genitive case? Instead of

answering this question, Patañjali asked another question, what is the meaning of genitive in the expression *devadattasya bhrātā* (devadatta's brother)? It is possible to state that the meaning there, is the origin from the same source, which is not valid. Here Patañjali introduces the *sārthikapraṭiśrayasambandha nyāya*, and says that, there is absolutely no relationship among travellers who stay at a certain places for the night and go away in different directions at sunrise. The relationship between brothers is of the same nature. He says the genitive has 101 meanings. If the relation in the example, *devadattasya bhrātā* is sufficient then it will equally justify the genitive in *ardham tṛtīyam anayoḥ*.

2.10.44. SARVA IME SVABHŪTYARTHAM YATANTE NYĀYA

‘all are working for their own sake’

*‘neha kaścit paro’nugrahītavya iti pravartate / sarva ime svabhūtyartham yatante / ye tāvadete guruśuśrūṣavo nāma, te’pi svabhūtyarthameva pravartante / pāralaukikam ca no bhaviṣyati / iha ca naḥ prīto gururadhyāpayiṣyati iti’*¹³⁴/

In the event of saying, the *hetu samjñā* is need for the instigator, Patañjali says that, the *prayojya-prayojaka bhāva* is meaningless by using this *nyāya* in the *bhāṣya* of the rule ‘*hetumati ca*’ P.3.1.26. In this world, no

one is worked for another, but only for the sake of self, which happened not by the inspiration of others. A student who serving his teacher has also selfishness, because he serves his teacher with thought of he will get salvation (*mokṣa*) through this way of service and the *guru* will teach him very well. Similary servants are also serving their masters with the thought that, the masters will give them good food, clothes and will not be contempt. Likewise, architect, carpenter etc. also doing their work in the perception that they will get more money and the people will become their friends. In this world, all are working only for their selfishness and not by the inspiration of others. In this sense, it is meaningless that the teacher is treated as an instigator. Hence, the *prayojya-prayojaka bhāva* is worthless due to the selfishness of whole.

Bhartṛhari says about this nyāya like this,

‘nimittebhyaḥ pravartante sarva eva svabhūtaye /

abhiprāyānurodhe ’pi svārthasyaiva prasiddhaye’ //¹³⁵

In Tantravārtika it read like this,

“na hi vidhiśatenāpi tathā puruṣaḥ pravartate yathā lobhena”¹³⁶.

2.10.45. SIMHO MĀṆAVAKAḤ NYĀYA

‘boy is lion’

‘*yathā hi simho māṇavaka iti simhaguṇā māṇavake āropyante, naivamatra sambhavaḥ prayojanam vāsti, ataḥ pārīśeṣyāt samjñāsamjñīsambandha eva*’¹³⁷/

Haradatta mentions this nyāya in the interpretation of the sūtra ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’ P.1.1.1. In the sentence *simho māṇavakaḥ*, the boy is characterized as lion by *lakṣaṇāvṛtti* (indication). Here the similarity between the lion and the boy has been reflected or established to propound that the boy is as strong and intelligent as the lion. This nyāya is used here to denote the non-indication of the qualities of *vṛddhi* to *ādaic* and vice versa in the rule *vṛddhirādaic*. Here the *vṛddhi* is introduced as *samjñā* (name) and *ādaic* as *samjñī* (name bearers). Therefore, there is a relation of *samjñāsamjñī* between *vṛddhi* and *ādaic*.

2.10.46. ŚIṢṬĀNUKARAṆANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the imitation of *śiṣṭa*’.

‘*aśiṣṭāpratiśiddham ya evamasau hikkati, ya evamasau hasati, ya evamasau kaṅṭūyati it tasyānukurvan hikkecca, hasecca, kaṅṭūyecca naiva tad doṣāya syānnābhyudayāya / yastu khalvevamasau brāhmaṇam hanti,*

*evamasau surām pibati iti tasyānukurvan brāhmaṇam hanyāt surām vā
pibati so 'pi manye patitaḥ syāt'*¹³⁸ /

Bhāṣyakāra while discussing the sūtra 'r|k' uses the *śiṣṭānukaraṇanyāya*. The vowel 'l' is enunciated for the sake of imitating the mispronounced utterance of 'r' as 'l'. The context is the refutation of this second purpose of *lkārōpadeśa*.

In the world if a man who imitating another gives away in charity, performs sacrifice and studying in a specific way, both will get merit. In the Vedas, one who imitating the *sattrās* of *visvasṛt* sacrifice, he too gets prosperity. One who seeing another is laughing, scratching and hiccoughing, and imitating in the same way, his activities is neither advantageous nor harmful. But a man who imitating another, who kills a Brāhmaṇa or drinks wine, he will sure to have his fall due to gross sin.

Vārttikakāra says that, because of incapacity, *ṛtaka* was mispronounced as *ltaka* by brāhmiṇwoman and the imitating the mispronounced *ltaka* by another is improper. One who incurs the sin by killing a brāhmaṇa by imitating another, likewise the imitation of corrupt words will lead them to the sin. Therefore, the enunciation of 'l' for the sake of imitating the word mispronounced because of incapacity is in vain.

2.10.47. STHĀLĪPULĀKANYĀYA

‘a single grain of cooked rice is sufficient to judge the pot as a whole’.

‘*paryāptam karanādhikaraṇayoḥ kartṛtvam nidaraśitamapādā-
nādīnām kartṛvanidarśanāya / paryāpto hyekaḥ pulākaḥ sthālyā
nidarśanāya*’¹³⁹/

A verb can be used to express the action of the main agent, the *adhikaraṇa* and *karaṇa*. For example, *devadattaḥ pacati, droṇam pacati, edhāḥ pakṣyanti*. In these examples *karma* can be added, *odanaḥ svayameva pacyate*-the rice cooks of itself. Here the *karma* functions as the agent.

But no examples to show that the *apādāna* and *sampradāna* are presented as the agent of an action. We cannot use *grāmaḥ āgacchati* in the sense of *grāmāt āgacchati* (he comes from the village). Since the *apādāna* and *sampradāna* cannot be the main agent, we cannot call them ‘*k*’-s in the literal sense of the word. According to Patañjali each ‘*k*’ is independent as far as its own, minor action is concerned, and depended on the main agent, in so far the main action is concerned. It all depends how the speaker wants to put it. Therefore, even if we take the term ‘*k*’ in its literal sense, it remains applicable to any item, which takes part in bringing about the main

action. Then the question arise, why do you say the agent hood of the *apādāna* etc. is not known to exist-*apādānādīnām tu aprasiddhiḥ*. To answer this, Patañjali introduces this nyāya and says that, in a cooking pot all the grains being equally moistened by the hot water, when one grain is found to be well cooked, the same may be inferred with regard to other grains. In the same way, the agent hood of the *karāṇa* and *adhikarāṇa*, for which an illustration has been given is sufficient to demonstrate the agent hood of the *apādāna* etc.

2.10.48. SVĀTANTRYAPĀRATANTRYAVIVAKṢĀNYĀYA

‘organs of sense are sometimes given prominence and sometimes not given prominence’

‘*aham bravīmi, āvām brūvaḥ vayam brūmaḥ, imānīndriyāṇi kadācit svātantryeṇa vivakṣitāni bhavanti, tadyathā – idam me akṣi suṣṭhu paśyati / ayam me karnaḥ suṣṭhu śṛṇotīti / kadācit paratantryeṇa vivakṣitāni bhavanti, tadyathā – anenākṣṇā suṣṭhu paśyāmi / anena karnaṇena suṣṭhu śṛṇomīti / tadyadā svātantryeṇa vivkṣā tadā bahuvacanam bhaviṣyati / yadā pāratantryeṇa tadaikavacanadvivacane bhaviṣyataḥ*’¹⁴⁰ /

While refuting the sūtra ‘*asmadoḥ dvayośca*’ P.1.2.59, Bhāṣyakāra says that the usages *aham bravīmi, āvām brūvaḥ, vayam brūmaḥ* be

sanctioned without this sūtra. To explain this, he introduces this nyāya with an example in daily life. The organs of sense are sometimes given prominence, then the usage is ‘my eye sees well’, ‘my ear hears well’ and sometimes they are not given prominence, but at the same time intended as instruments then the usage is ‘i see well with this eye’, ‘i hear well with this ear’. Similarly, when one speaker or two intend prominence to them there is the use of the plural number, since the organs of sense are considered as more, like *vyam paśyāmaḥ* in the place of *aham paśyāmi* and *āvām paśyāvahaḥ* and prominence is not intended, there is the use of the singular and dual numbers. When the organs of sense and mind is considered as two, there is dual number and the speaker intend prominence to soul, then there is singular number, due to oneness of soul.

2.10.49. TAKRAKAUṆḌINYANYĀYA

‘let curd be offered to the brāhmaṇa-s, buttermilk to Kauṇḍinya’

*‘loke hi satyapi sambhave bādhanam bhavati / tadyathā- dadhi
brāhmaṇebhyo dīyatām takram kauṇḍinyāya iti / satyapi sambhave
dadhidānasya takradānam nivartakam bhavati / evamihapi satyapi
sambhave’cāmantyātparatvam ṣaṣṭhīsthāneyogatvam bādhiṣyate’¹⁴¹/*

takrakaunḍinyanyāya is used in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*mitaco ’ntyāt paraḥ*’ P.1.1.47. One says-let ghee be served to all brāhmaṇa-s and buttermilk to Kauṇḍinya. Even though being a brāhmaṇa, Kauṇḍinya is eligible for getting both ghee and buttermilk as per the statement. But he is possible to get only buttermilk because of the special remarks, ‘buttermilk to Kauṇḍinya’ which superseded the general rule, ‘let ghee be served to all brāhmaṇa-s’.

In the word *yaśāmsi*, the stem *yaśas* get the suffix *num* by the sūtra ‘*napumsakasya jhalacaḥ*’ P.7.1.72. The suffix *num* can come after the last vowel and also in the place of the final letter ‘s’. Then both the sūtra-s *mitaco ’ntyāt paraḥ* and *śaṣṭhī sthāneyoga* may operate here. But according to the *takrakaunḍinyanyāya* the suffix *num* comes after the last vowel by the sūtra ‘*mitaco ’ntyāt paraḥ*’ which supersede the final letter ‘s’. Likewise, in the examples, *kuṇḍāni* and *vanāni*, the suffix *num* to follow the last vowel and the final letter at the same time is not possible. Therefore, the suffix *num* will come after the last vowel superseding the final letter by the sūtra ‘*mitaco ’ntyāt paraḥ*’.

Bhartṛhari says this nyāya through this kārīka;

‘*brāhmaṇānām śrutirdagḥni prakāntā māṭharam vinā /*

māṭharastakrasambhandhāttatrācaṣṭe yathārthatām’ //⁴²

2.10.50. TAPTABHRĀṢṬAPRAKṢIPTATILANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the sesamum seed thrown on a frying pan does not stand steadily in one place’.

‘api ca iṣṭavyavastā na prakalpate / tadyathā-tapte bhrāṣṭe tilāḥ prakṣiptāḥ muhūrtamapi nāvatiṣṭhante evamime varṇāḥ muhūrtamapi nāvatiṣṭheran’¹⁴³/

This nyāya is used in the sūtra ‘*stāne antaratamaḥ*’ P.1.1.50. If the sūtra ‘*stāne antaratamaḥ*’ is taken as a *svatantravidhi*, there is chance for *nirvṛtti* of all *sthānin*-s. The *nirvṛtti* of *dadhi* and *madhu* also will happen. *dadhi* becomes the *ādeśa* of *dadhi* and *madhu* becomes the *ādeśa* of *madhu* through close similarity, if so, there is no other *ādeśa* is mentioned. If so, there will be difficulty. By the sūtra ‘*ādeśapratyayayoḥ*’ which follows the sūtra ‘*iṅ koḥ*’, the ‘*s*’ in *bisam* and *musalam* will be changed to ‘*ṣ*’. If the word *bisa* is considered as the *ādeśa* of *bisa*, there is no chance for *ṣatva*, if ‘*s*’ is considered as the *ādeśa* of ‘*s*’, there is a chance for *ṣatva*. If so happen, there is no designed decision about the correctness of words. Just like the sesamum seed thrown on a frying pan does not stand steadily in one place, so also these letters cannot stand steadily even for a moment¹⁴⁴.

2.10.51. TULYABALAVIRODHANYĀYA

‘conflict of equal strength’

‘tulyabale hyubhe śāstra / tad yathā-dvayostulyabalayorekaḥ preṣyo bhavati / sa tayoh paryāyeṇa kāryam karoti / yadā tamubhau yugapat preṣayato nānādikṣu ca kārye bhavatastadā yadyasāvavirodhārthī bhavati ubhayorna karoti / yaugapadhyāsambhavāt / nāsti yougapadhyena sambhavaḥ’¹⁴⁵ /

The term *vipratiṣedha* in the rule ‘*vipratiṣedhe param kāryam*’ P.1.4.2 is explained as *tulyabalavirodha*. It is a conflict between two rules of equal strength, where the two rules formulated for application, elsewhere, become applicable in a single context, concurrently. Patañjali explains here the equal strength of two rules through this nyāya. Two masters have only one servant, and he is serving them in different occasions in different times. But when two masters ordered him to do a job in a particular time, he will not be able to do the work simultaneously. He is helpless. This type of context is called *tulyabala*. It also happens in śāstra. In the derivation of *vr̥kṣebhyaḥ*, where *vr̥kṣa* + *bhyas*, the rule ‘*supi ca*’ P.7.3.102 requires that, the final ‘*a*’ of *vr̥kṣa* is lengthened. Rule ‘*bahuvacane jhalyet*’ P.7.3.103 requires that, the ‘*e*’ is substituted for the final ‘*a*’ of *vr̥kṣa*. Here the two rules become applicable. These rules are equal in strength. By invoking

vipraṭiṣedhe param kāryam, the ‘a’ is substituted by ‘e’ of the stem *vrkṣa* and get the form *vrkṣebhyaḥ*.

2.10.52. TUṢYATU DURJANA NYĀYA

‘the principle of satisfying the evil people’

‘*tuṣyatu durjana iti nyāyena apśabdajñānasya viparītatva-mātreṇādharmaśādhanaśāntvamabhyugamyāpi bhāṣye samādhyantara-māha athavā kūpeti*’^{146/}

While using the sentence ‘*athavā’bhyupāya evāpaśabdajñānam śabdajñāne*’, during the bhāṣya on the introductory passage, ‘*atha śabdānuśāsanam*’, Uddhyotakāra uses the ‘*tuṣyatu durjana nyāya*’. It is used in the cases in which it is thought advisable to satisfy a mischievous man. To state the true things, sometimes people accept untruth things for supporting is called *tuṣyatu durjana nyāya*. In *nyāyasūtra*, this nyāya is known as ‘*abhyupagamasiddhanta*’ or ‘*abhyupagamvāda*’. By thinking the knowledge of the corrupt words is treated as an instrument to the knowledge of the correct words, Patañjali accepts the knowledge of corrupt words as a mean of gain dharma for a while.

2.10.53. VARDHAMĀNAGARBHANYĀYA

‘maxim of growing embryo in the womb’

‘*imāvaico samāhāravarnau, mātrā’varṇasya mātrevārṇovārṇayoriti
tayoḥ pluta ucyamāna ubhayavṛddhiḥ prāpnoti/ tadyathā-garbho
vardhamānaḥ sarvāṅgaparipūrṇo vardhate*’¹⁴⁷/

Patañjali offers this maxim in the rule ‘*plutāvaica idutau*’ P.8.2.106- when the *pluta* of diphthongs happened, the prolation of the last element of these diphthongs namely; ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’ get the *pluta*. This *pluta* of ‘*ai*’ and ‘*au*’ has four *mātra*-s. Thus, *a+i* and *a+u* each have one *mātra*. But the *pluta* has only three *mātra*-s. So the increase is only to the second part of ‘*ai*’ and ‘*au*’ i.e. the ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’. Though the sound is eternal, there will not have any increase. When changes have occurred to the sound, will it affect the principle of *nityatva* of *śabda*? Here Bhāṣyakāra clears this doubt by using this *nyāya*. As the changes have occurred in the inside of the diphthongs ‘*ai*’ and ‘*au*’, the sound has no change. It is like a growth of foetus in the womb. When the foetus is growing, all parts of it are also increasing simultaneously. Likewise, in the case of *śabda*, there is no change occurred due to the increase of its elements, i.e. there is no change to the utterance of the sound, but only to the mode of utterance.

2.10.54. VIṢABHAKṢAṆAMAPI KASYACIDĪPSITAM BHAVATI NYĀYA

‘sometimes eating poison is desired’.

‘*karturīpsitatamam karmetyucyate / kasya ca nāma
viṣabhakṣaṇamīpsitam syāt? viṣabhakṣaṇamapi kasyacidīpsitam bhavati /
katham- iha ya eṣa manuṣyo dukhārto bhavati so’nyāni
dukhānyanuniśamya viṣabhakṣaṇameva jyāyo manyate / ātaścopsitam
yattad bhakṣayati*’¹⁴⁸/

Bhāṣyakāra raises the question, ‘what is the purpose of the rule ‘*tathāyuktam cānīpsitam*’ P.1.4.50. Example of this rule is *viṣam bhakṣayati* and it can be justified by the previous rule ‘*karturīpsitatamam karma*’ P.1.4.49. It cannot be justified because, *viṣa* is *anīpsita*, in the sense that nobody desires to take poison. But the rule ‘*karturīpsitatamam karma*’ says that “which is the most desired by the agent is called *karma*”. Here Patañjali introduces this *nyāya* and says that, the eating of poison becomes sometimes desired. A person who is afflicted with misery in daily life, seeing other miseries in store for him, he thinks that the best thing for him to do is to take poison only and put an end to misery.

Since even poison can be a positively desired thing to a person who wants to escape from misery, the designation *karma* can assigned to the poison by the rule *karturīpsitatamam karma*. Therefore, the examples of the rule *tathāyuktam cānīpsitam* are *grāmāntaram ayam gacchan caurān paśyati*-while going from one village to another village he sees thieves,

ahim lanḡhayati-he steps over a snake, *kaṅṭakān mṛdnāti*-he crushes some thorns.

2.10.55. VIṢAVṚKṢANYĀYA

‘a poison tree ought not to be cut down by the planter himself’

‘*na hi svakṛtameva svayam pratyācaṣṭe iti yuktam, viṣavṛkṣo’pi samvardhya svayam chettumasāmpratam iti nyāyāditi bhāvah*’¹⁴⁹ /

This nyāya introduces by Haradatta while he interpreting the sūtra ‘*lupi yuktavat vyaktivacane*’ P.1.2.51. It means that one who has watered and nurtured a poisonous tree, which he himself cannot cut. Likewise, in śāstra also one will not refute his own words. The rule ‘*lupi yuktavat vyaktivacane*’ allows the retention of the original number (*vacana*) and gender (*vyakti*) of a form whose *taddhita* affix has been deleted by *lup*. This rule may not be created by Pāṇini, because, through the rule ‘*tadaśisyam samjñāpramāṇatvāt*’ P.1.2.53, he refutes this sūtra, which means if the retention of the original number and gender of a word ought not to be taught (*aśisya*) since it is depended upon usage. If Pāṇini create the former rule, he cannot refute it. To clear this matter Haradatta uses this *viṣavṛkṣanyāya*. This nyāya is used as a verse in the Kumārasambhava¹⁵⁰ and Pañcatantra¹⁵¹.

2.10.56. VRŚCIKABHIYĀNYĀYA

‘running away through fear of a scorpion he falls in front of a poisonous snake’.

‘*apāṇinīyamiti / varṇsamāmnāyasamarthanāya pravṛttasya ekadoṣaparihārāya sakalaśastrasya vyākhyānasāpekṣaguruprakāreṇānyathākārṇe vr̥ścikabhiyetyādinyāya āpatatatīti bhāvah*’¹⁵² /

Nāgeśa in the *uddyota* of the Paśpaśāhnika uses the *vr̥ścikabhiyānyāya*. If the enunciation of the letters is for the knowledge of the desired letters, there will have defect due to the non-enunciation of the letters like *udātta*, *anudātta*, *svarita* etc. It should be solved. It is accomplished by taking that the genus of the letters is mentioned. If it is said that it is accomplished by taking the genus, the exclusion of the defects *samvṛta* etc. is necessary. The defects *samvṛta* and other are avoided by *gargādipāṭha* and *bidādipāṭha*. There is another reason for the enunciation of the *garga* and *bida* groups. The continuous interpretations of Vyākaraṇa become serious and it goes against Pāṇini’s *sūtrā-s*; because Pāṇini did not do anything to the defects *samvṛta* and others. To interpret the whole śāstra to solve the defects, which happen to enunciate the *varṇsamāmnāya*, make serious is equal to reach before a snake after running away through fear of scorpion. This *nyāya* can be seen in other works also.

2.10.57. VYAPADEŚIVADEKASMIN NYĀYA

‘a part is treated as whole’

‘*athavā punarastu sūtram / nanu cōktam sūtre vyākaraṇe
ṣaṣṭyartho ’nupapannaḥ iti? naiṣa doṣaḥ, vyapadeśivadbhāvena
bhaviṣyati*’¹⁵³/

While discussing the topic what is the meaning of the word ‘*vyākaraṇa*’, in the *paśpaśānhikā* of Mahābhāṣya, Patañjali says that ‘rule is grammar’. If the word *vyākaraṇa* means *sūtra*, then the meaning of genitive doesn’t suit in the expression *vyākaraṇasya sūtram* (rule of grammar). Then Vārttikakāra gives another definition that the term *vyākaraṇa* stands for the totality of *lakṣya* (word) and *lakṣaṇam* (rule). But there is a defect that the word *vyākaraṇa* which denotes a whole cannot denote its part. However, one who studies *sūtrā*-s alone is taken to be a *vaiyākaraṇa*. Then Patañjali accepts the first view, that the grammar is rule and justifies the use of *vyākaraṇasya sūtram* by *vyapadeśivatnyāya*. If a person has only one son he could say this is my eldest as well as my youngest son. Here for certain purposes an only son is being treated as both eldest and youngest. It is noticed among people who used the expression *rahoḥ śiraḥ* (the head of *rāhu*), although as a matter of fact that *rāhu* and head are one the same, where mind takes *rāhu* to be a whole and *śiras* to be a part. So also the

vyākaraṇa and *sūtra* are identical, yet in the expression *vyākaraṇasya sūtram* the former is taken to be the whole and the latter a part. So there is no defect in the meaning of relation.

REFERENCE

1. MB, Vol. V, P.6.2.36, p.189.
2. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.2.6.
3. *brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇena dharmo ṣaḍaṅgo vedo'dyeyo jñeyaśca*, MB, Paś.
4. *āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāya*, Mbh, Paś.
5. MB, Vol.I, P. 1.1.9.
6. Compare, *prārabhyate vighnabhayena nīcaiḥ prārabhya-*
.....Nīśataka of Bhartṛhari.
7. *vrddhakumārīvaranyāya*, MB, Vol. VI, P. 8.2.3.
8. MB, Vol.I, Pratyāhārāhnikā, ṛ ḷ k.
9. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.4.9.
10. Ibid, P. 1.2.37.
11. Ibid, Vol. IV, P.5.2.72, p.335.
12. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.2.45.
13. Ibid, Vol.I, P. 1.1.3.
14. Ibid, P. 1.1.74.
15. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.1.1.
16. Ibid, Vol. II, P.1.3.12, p.153.
17. *na hyantareṇa pratiyoginam sparddhā bhavati nyāya*, Ibid, P. 2.1.68,
tulyabalapreṣaṇa nyāya. MB, Vol.I, P. 1.4.2.

18. MB, Vol.I, P. 1.1.50.
19. *sāṅkāsyakebhyaḥ pāṭalīputrakā abhirūpatarāḥ*, MB, Vol.I, P. 1.3.11. *sāṅkāsyakebhyaśca pāṭalīputrakebhyaśca māthurā abhirūpatarāḥ*, Mbh, Vol. V, P. 5.3.57.
20. MB, Vol.I, P. 1.1.7.
21. *bhogavānayam deśa ityucyate yasmin gāvaḥ sasyāni ca vartante*, MB, Vol. V, P. 5.1.9.
22. MB, Vol.I, P. 1.1.48.
23. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.2.73.
24. *pitāmahotsaṅgadārakanyāya*, MB, Vol. IV, P. 4.1.93.
25. *bahuṣu putreṣu etad upapannam bhavati ayam me jyeṣṭhaḥ putro 'yam me madhyamo 'yam me kaṇyān iti*, MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.21.
26. *śokāpanadaḥ putro jātaḥ*, MB, Vol. III, P. 3.2.5.
27. *daśamyā uttarakālam putrasya jātasya nāma kuryāt*, MB, Paś.
28. *prāsādavāsinyāya*, MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.8.
29. *adraveṇa nimittena druvam nimittamupādatte, vedikām puṅḍarīkam vā*, MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.25.
30. MB, Vol. III, P. 3.1.26, *ya ete dāsāḥ karmakarā nāma te'pi svabhūtyarthameva pravartante, bhaktam tailam ca lapsyāmahe*.
31. *māmsaudanaḥ*, MB, Vol. II, P. 2.3.13.
32. *asato 'pyavivakṣānyāya*, MB, Vol. I, P. 1.4.24.

33. *pañcapañcanakhā bhaksya, anye abhaksya*, MB, Paś.
34. *abhaksyo grāmyakukkuto 'bhaksyo grāmyasūkarah*, MB, Paś.
35. *nagaro 'pi na bhaksyate*,
36. *aviravikanyāya*, MB, Vol. IV, P. 4.1.88.
37. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.37.
38. Ibid, Vol.I, P. 1.1.47.
39. Ibid, Paś.
40. Ibid, Pratyāhārāhnikā, *ha ya va ra t*.
41. *yasya kumbhyām eva dhānyam sa kumbhīdhānyaḥ*, MB, Vol. II, P. 1.3.7.
42. *sthālīpulākanyāya*, Ibid, P. 1.4.23, *taptabhrāṣṭatilanyāya*, Ibid, Vol.I, P.1.1.50, *kumbhakāarakulanyāya*, Ibid, Paś.
43. *khaṭvārūdhanyāya*, MB, Vol. II, P.2.1.26, *pradīpanyāya*, Ibid, Vol.I, P. 1.1.49.
44. *lohitoṣṇīṣa ṛtvijaḥ pracaranti*, Ibid, Vol.I, P.1.1.27.
45. *raktapaṭanyāya*, Ibid, P. 1.1.29.
46. *ākṛtiranyā anyā ca bhavati dravyam punastadeva*, Ibid, Paś.
47. MB, Vol. IV, P. 4.1.14.
48. Patañjali mentions śāktikī, a woman warrior.
49. MS, IX.18. *'nāsti strīṇām kriyā mantrairiti dharmā vyavasthitih / nirinriyā hyamantrāśca strīyo 'nṛtamiti sthitih //*

50. *abhirūpakanyādānanyāya*, MB, Vol. II, P. 1.4.42.
51. Yajurveda, VIII.1.
52. MB, Vol. V, P. 6.1.2.
53. *māṭṛvatsanyāya*, MB, Vol. III, P. 3.1.1.
54. AS, 3.2.43- '*putrārthā hi striyaḥ*'
55. *abhyarhitanyāya*, MB, Vol. II, P. 2.2.34, p. 473.
56. MS, II.45.
*'upādhyāyāndaśācārya ācāryāṇām śatam pitā /
sahasram tu pitṛnmātā gauraveṇātiricyate' //*
57. Ibid, IX.18 and 36.
*'yādrśam tūpyate bījam kṣetre kālopapādite /
tādrghrohati tattasminbījam svarvairvyañjitam guṇaiḥ' //(36).*
58. Ibid, IX.5.
*'sūkṣmebhyo 'pi prasaṅgebhyaḥ striyo rakṣyā viśeṣataḥ /
dvayorhi kulayoḥ śokamāvaheyurarakṣitā' //*
59. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.59.
60. Ibid.
61. *tathā sutāyām aśoṣyamāṇāyām ca bhavati prathamagarbheṇa hateti,*
62. *mūtrāya kalpate yavāgū, uccārāya kalpate yavānnam*, MB, Vol. II,
P. 2.3.13.
63. Ibid, P. 1.2.49.

64. *ye tāvadete śobhanikā namaite pratyakṣam kamsam ghātayanti pratyakṣam ca balin bandhayati iti*, MB, Vol. III, P. 3.1.26.
65. *priyām mayūrah pratinarnṛtī / yadvatvam nakhara narnṛtīṣi hr̥ṣṭah*, MB, Vol. VI, P. 7.3.87, p. 224.
66. *bheryāghātanyāya*, MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.70.
67. *alātacakranyāya*, Ibid, Vol. III, P. 3.2.124.
68. *yayirbhukte pātram samskāreṇa śudyati te 'niravasitāḥ yayirbhukte pātram samskāreṇā'pi na śudyati te niravasitāḥ iti*, MB, Vol. II, P. 2.4.10.
69. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.32.
70. Ibid, P. 1.4.50.
71. Ibid, P. 1.4.42, p-259.
72. Ibid, *siddhe sati yattamapgrahaṇam karoti tajñāpayatyācāryaḥ ksamjñāyām taratamayogo na bhavati iti*.
73. P.2.2.34, p-473.
74. MB, Vol. I, P.1.1.70, p-563.
75. Ibid, Vol. II, P.2.1.69, p-410.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid, P.1.2.32, p-28.
78. Ibid, P.1.2.45, p-47.
79. PM, KV, Vol. I.

80. Muṇḍakopaniṣad, I Maṇḍala, Khaṇḍa, 2.8.
81. VP, 1.42.
*‘hastasparsādivāndhena viṣame pathi dhāvatā /
anumānapradhānena vinipato na durlabhaḥ //*
82. MB, Vol. II, P.1.4.24, p-247.
83. Ibid, Vol. IV, P.4.1.88, p-106.
84. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.70, p-564.
85. VP, 1.75,76,77.
86. MB, Vol. II, P. 2.1.1, p-331.
87. Ibid, P. 1.4.19, p-234.
88. Ibid, Vol. I, P.1.1.48, p-408.
89. Nyāsa, KV, Vol. I, P.1.4.2.
90. MB, Vol. III, P. 3.4.21, p-261.
91. VP, 2.6.
92. PM, KV, Vol. I.
93. Compare, Nirukta 1.1., *‘teṣām manuṣyavad devatābhidhānam’*.
94. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.59, p-501.
95. Ibid, P. 1.1.57, p-477.
96. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.4.2, p-205.
97. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.56, p-451.
98. Ibid, P. 1.1.26, p-315.

99. *uṇādisūtra*, 373.

100. In the past ages it is consider that the sign of conch and lotus in front of a house is the sign of prosperity. See the *sloka* 17 in the *Meghasandēśa* (uttaramegha).

‘ebhi sādho! hṛdayanihitairlakṣanairlakṣayethāḥ /

dvāropānte likhitavapuṣau śankhapadmau ca dṛṣtvā //

101. VP, 3.2.3.

102. Pāṇinidarśana, p.117.

103. PM, KV, Vol. I, P.1.3.10.

104. Rāmāyaṇa, Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa, Sarga 28, sloka 27.

105. MB, Vol. I, *ṛlk*, p-105.

106. Ibid, Paś, p-64.

107. Compare MB, P. 1.1.44, ‘*arthagatyarthah śabdaprayogaḥ*’.

108. VP, 1.23.

109. MB, Vol. I, *ṛlk*, p-109.

110. Compare nyāya like, ‘*girimutpātya mūṣikoddhṛta nyāya*’. The same idea can be seen in *Pañcatantra*, 3.16.

‘khanannākhubilam simhaḥ pāṣāṇaśakalākulam /

prāpnoti nakhabhaṅgam vā phalam vā mūṣako bhavet’ //

111. MB, Vol. II, *Pradīpa*, P.1.2.73.

112. See, P.8.4.5, ‘*praniranta:śarekṣuplakṣāmtrakārṣyakhadirapīyūkṣā-
bho’samjñāyāmapī*’.
113. MB, Vol. I, ‘*hayavarat*’, p-126.
114. Ibid, Vol. III, P. 3.1.1, p-8.
115. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.1.68, p-411.
116. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.39, p-366.
117. Paribhāṣa No. 85.
118. Hitopadeśa, 2.26.
119. MB, Vol. V, P. 6.4.96, p-337.
120. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.50, p-424.
121. Sāmkyakārika, 21.
122. MB, Vol. V, P. 6.1.2, p-15.
123. MB, Vol. I, P.1.3.1, p-115.
124. Ibid, Paś, p-73.
125. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.66, 67, p-539.
126. Ibid, Paś, p-23.
127. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.49, p-410.
128. Some interpreters divided into four types;
‘*goyūthaḥ simhadṛṣṭiśca maṇḍūkaphlutireva ca /
gaṅgāpravāhavaccāpi adhikāraścaturvidhaḥ*’ //

Some divided into three kinds;

‘simhāvalokitam caiva maṇḍūkaplutameva ca /

gaṅgāpravāhavaccāpi adhikārastritā mataḥ’ // (Āpte dictionary).

129. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.8, p-237.
130. Ibid, P. 1.1.56, p-453.
131. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.2.6, p-426.
132. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.71, p-566.
133. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.2.24, p-454.
134. Ibid, Vol. III, P. 3.1.26, p-68.
135. VP, 3.7,124.
136. Tantravārttika, 3.4.34.
137. PM, KV, Vol. III, 4.1.88.
138. MB, Vol. I, *rlk*, p-104.
139. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.4.23, p-244.
140. Ibid, P. 1.2.59, p-67.
141. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.47, p-401.
142. VP, 2.3.4. Here Bārṭhari used *māṭhara* inspite of *kaundinya*.
143. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.50, p-418.
144. Compare, Mbh, P. 1.1.3. *‘lakṣaṇam hi nāma dhvanati bhramati muhūrtamapi nāvatiṣṭante’*.
145. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.4.2, p-205.
146. Ibid, Vol. I, Udyota, Paś.

147. Ibid, Vol. VI, P. 8.2.106, p-148.
148. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.4.50, p-263.
149. PM, KV, Part I, P. 1.2.51.
150. Kumārasambhava, 2.55.
151. Pañcatantra, 1.245.
152. MB, Vol. I, Udyota, Paś, p-84.
153. Ibid, Vol. I, Paś, p-79.

Chapter-III

ECONOMIC LIFE

The economic life of the period was copious. Land was the primary source of livelihood. There exist many good economic professions, trade, industry etc. People were engaged in other types of employments as well.

3.1. Agriculture

In ancient India, the majority of population lived in the villages and their main occupation was agriculture. The agriculture formed the backbone of the economy of the entire country. Agriculture or *kṛṣi* derived from the root *kṛṣ* means plough, which denotes not only the ploughing but other operations of agriculture such as supply of seeds, implements, animals and human labour – *nānākriyāḥ kṛṣerarthāḥ nāvaśyam kṛṣirvilekhane eva vartate , kim tarhi? pratividhāne 'pi vartate yad asau bhaktabījabalīvardaiḥ pratividhānam karoti sa kṛṣyarthāḥ*¹.

Periodical supply of water was needed for the fields after the sowing of seeds. For the purpose of water supply, they constructed canals- *śālyartham kulyāḥ praṇīyante*². If there was adequate, rainfall the crop was expected to be good³. The crop was faced destruction from animals like

deer, so agriculture was protected well – *na ca mṛgāḥ santīti yavā nopyante*⁴. After the ripe, they separated the grains from the chaff and dried from threshing floor. There is reference to pigeon's entry into the threshing floor for eating corns (*khalekapotikānyāya*)⁵. The grains were stored in jars and a person doing so was called 'kumbhīdhānya'⁶. The good crop indicated the prosperous time ahead- *eko vṛhiḥ sampannaḥ subhikṣam karoti*⁷. Magadha was famous for *śali* or rice⁸. Main crops were rice, beans (*māṣa*), seshamum (*tila*), sugarcane, cotton flax, and hemp. There exist cattle rearing as a part of agriculture. There were various kinds of cows and *śāla*-s for them and the keeper controlled them through a staff⁹.

3.2. Occupation

There were at least five artisans in each village; they are *kulāla* (potter), *karmāra* (blacksmith), *vardhakin* (carpenter), *nāpita* (barber) and *rajaka* (washerman). The potter made pots out of a lump of clay, he was also known as 'kumbhakāra', and his house is called 'kumbhakāarakulam', where pots are available¹⁰. The blacksmith was engaged in making things of domestic use of needles for sewing cloths, and arms like axe for cutting wood¹¹. The skilled workers were called *śilpīns*, who received daily wages apart from other domestic servants¹² who were generally get food and cloth only – *śilpīno nāma svabhūrtiyarthameva pravartante, vetanam ca*

*lapsyāmahe*¹³. In the *arthaśāstra*, *vetana* includes both wages paid to artisans and salaries paid to government servants¹⁴. The work of Takṣā was mentioned by Patañjali as *takṣakarma* and a Takṣā engaged to work for a King did not engaged in private work (*rājataksānyāya*)¹⁵. The goldsmith (*suvarṇakāra*), who could make different types of ornaments out of a lump of gold¹⁶. There are also reference to the *kūpakhānaka* (well digger), who engaged in the process of digging and removing earth – *kūpakhānakaḥ kūpam khaṇan yadyapi mṛtpāmsubhiścāvākīrṇo bhavati*¹⁷. There were made cloths by *tantuvāya* (weaver) from threads- *asya sūtrasya śātakam vāyeti*¹⁸.

3.3. Textile industry

The textile industry had flourished in India to a high standard. There made clothes from threads. The process of weaving comprised stretching the wrap and then weaving threads across it with a shuffle¹⁹. They were concentrated not only in making garments merely, but also making the garments is thin in a higher degree²⁰. The merchants gave more attention to the sale of garments in good quality. This may be created a competition in this field. The value of the garments varied according to the quality and which were different in various places²¹.

3.4. Trade

There was a close link between the village and the town for commercial purpose – *loke'dhikṛto'sau grāme'dhikṛto'sau nagara iti ucyate-yo yatra vyāpāram gacchati*²². Merchants visited distinct places for trade; it denotes the interprovincial commercial inter activity. The businesspersons have shops facing the main street- *atha yadā anena rathyāyām taṇḍulodakam dṛṣṭaḥ*²³. There is prohibition in the sale of certain articles. Oil and meat should not be sold when they are separated from the whole, but the cows and mustard wherein they are not separated are sold²⁴. A transaction was completed with the payment of the earnest money to the seller. In certain cases, barter was also possible in rural economy where one product was exchanged for another. From the Vedic period, the cow had formed a medium of exchange and they measure of value²⁵. Purchase and sale of animals are also done through barter. Patañjali mentions the exchange for five cows and the purchasing of a chariot for five *kroṣṭī-s*²⁶. In each transaction there required three persons, one who to give, the other to take, and the third one to watch the transaction- *tribhiḥ sāksād dṛṣṭam bhavati yaśca dadādi yasmai ca dīyate yaśca upadrṣṭa*²⁷. The individual wealth was also reckoned in terms of coin (*niṣka*)²⁸. There is a remark regarding the use of a coin with varied value in

different places named ‘*kārṣāpaṇam*’ (*rūpasāmānyanyāya*)²⁹. Patañjali indicates the use of gold coin when he refers to the purchase of two *droṇa* measures of corn with gold sufficient for it and to the purchase of one thousand horses with the amount of gold sufficient for it – *dvi droṇena hiranyena dhānyam krīṇāti, sahasraparimāṇam sāhasram, sāhasreṇa hiranyena aśvān krīṇāti*³⁰.

3.5. Transportation

There is a reference about the facilities of transport particularly various types of carriages. Enquiring the way, peoples were travelled from one village to another– *grāmāntaram gamisyāmi, panthānam me bhavānupadiśatu iti*³¹. They used forest road for walking (*kāntārasārthanyāya*). Carts and caravans were the other means of transportations. One who travels in caravans called *śakaṭasārtha*³², and the horses were used in chariots (*naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāya*). Patañjali’s reference of 500 boats or 500 rafts pointed to a flourishing riverine traffic in goods – *pañca uḍupaśatāni tīrṇāni, pañcaphalakaśatāni tīrṇāni*³³. Thus, these data presented a true picture of the economic prosperity in that time.

3.6. Nyāyās on Economic

3.6.1. DHĀNYAPALĀLANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the grain and its husk’

‘*avaśyam kayācit vibhaktyā kenacidvacanena nirdeśaḥ kartavyaḥ, tad-yathā- kaścidannārthī śālīkalāpam sapalālam satuṣamāharati nāntarīyakatvāt / sa yāvadādeyam tāvadādāya tuṣapalālānyutsṛjati / yathā kaścinmāmsārthī matsyān sakaṇṭakān saśalkānāharati nāntarīyakatvāt / sa yāvadādeyam tāvadādāya śalkakaṇṭakānyutsṛjati / evamihāpi nāntarīyakatvāt bahuvacanena nirdeśaḥ kriyate, aviśeṣeṇaikaśrutyam bhavati*’³⁴ /

Because of the word *anudāttānām* used in the sūtra ‘*svaritāt samhitāyām anudāttānam*’ P.1.2.39, in plural number there should be *ekāśruti* to one or two, since there is chance to get *ekāśruti* for three or more- Pūrvapakṣin says. In the example ‘*imam me gaṅge sarasvati*’, the word ‘*imam*’ has *udātta* in the last syllable, the word ‘*me*’ is originally *anudātta*, but by the rule ‘*udāttānudāttasya svaritaḥ*’ P.8.4.66, following an *anudātta*, it is changed into *svarita*, after the *svarita*, all *anudātta* like *gaṅge* etc. are replaced by *ekāśruti*. All the vowels of the words *gaṅge*, *yamune* etc., had *anudātta* accent by the rule ‘*āmantritasya ca*’ P.8.1.19. Here the

anudātta is more, so it gets *ekāśruti*. But in *agniveśya*, the syllables ‘ve’ and ‘śya’, following the *svarita* ‘i’ and the syllable ‘ti’ following the *svarita* ‘a’ after ‘c’ in *pacati*, there is no way to get *ekāśruti* because only for three or more to get *ekāśruti* and not for one or two by the use of plural number ‘*anudāttānām*’. To avoid this defect Bhāṣyakāra explains the *dhānyapalālanyāya* and says that one eager collecting rise with chaff and husk for food since there is no other way. He takes in whatever is necessary and throws away chaff and husk. Similarly, one who is desirous of fish procures fish with fins and scales, since there is no other way. So also, mention is made in plural number, since there is no other way. Mention has to be made through some case and some number. *ekāśruti* happens whether the syllable which follows *svarita* is one, two or many.

3.6.2. KĪLAPRATIKĪLANYĀYA

‘a wedge being struck knocks out the counter wedge’.

‘*evam tarhi svābhāvīkī nivr̥t̥tiḥ / nanu cōktam kim nañ prayujyamānaḥ karōtīti? nañ prayujuamānaḥ padārtham nivartayati / katham? kīlapratikīlavat / tadyathā- kīla āhanyamānaḥ pratikīlam nirhanti*’³⁵/

Patañjali in Mahābhāṣya uses this nyāya under the rule ‘*nañ*’ P.2.2.6. Which is the main member of the *nañ tatpuruṣa* compound *abrāhmaṇaḥ*? Is it *uttarapadārthapradhāna*, *pūrvapadārthapradhāna*, or *anyapadārthapradhāna*? *na brāhmaṇaḥ*→*abrāhmaṇaḥ*, here the final member is the main member and the compound *abrāhmaṇaḥ* does not mean the non-existence of *brāhmaṇa*, it denote the meaning *kṣatriya* etc. in the sense of *brāhmaṇasadṛśa*. But the reference of a compound is not only determined by the meaning of the main member. For instance in *rājapuruṣamānaya*- bring the King’s servant, not any servant is brought, but a servant qualified by his relation with a king. Here the subordinate member of the compound also has role in determining the reference of the compound. Similarly, in *abrāhmaṇamānaya*-bring the non-brāhmiṇ not any brāhmiṇ is brought, but a brāhmiṇ who is qualified by negation. Due to the use of *nañ*, the constituent *brāhmaṇa* in *abrāhmaṇa* is such that its meaning brāhmiṇhood has been removed, that is a meaning like *kṣatriya* etc. i.e. someone upon whom brāhmiṇhood has been superimposed on account of similarity and the absence of brāhmiṇhood by birth has been brought out (*dyotita*) by the use of *nañ*.³⁶

To clear this subject Bhāṣyakāra raises a question that the removal of brāhmiṇhood is caused by the use of *nañ* or not? Is it *svābhāvīkīnivṛtīḥ* (inherent in the nature of something) or *vācanīkīnivṛtīḥ* (dependent on the

use of the *nañ*). He accepts the *vācanikīnivṛttiḥ* and says that *nañ* being used removes a thing. When *nañ* is used along with a *brāhmaṇa* how can *nañ* remove the notion of a thing which has originated on account of the use of the word *brāhmaṇa* itself, because the word *brāhmaṇa* when uttered gives rise to the notion *brāhmiṇ*. To answer to this question *Bhāṣyakāra* mentions this *nyāya* and says that it is like wedge and counter wedge. The counter wedge fixed in a piece of wood is removed with the help of a wedge struck by a hammer, in the same way when *nañ* is used, the notion of *brāhmiṇhood*, which has originated on account of similarity with regard to a *kṣatriya*, is removed.

3.6.3. KUMBHĪDHĀNYANYĀYA

‘the maxim of an earthen jar full of paddy’.

‘*yadi punarayamidid vidhiḥ kumbhīdhānyanyāyena vijñāyeta / tad yathā- kumbhīdhānyaḥ śrotriyaḥ ityucyate / yasya kumbhyāmeva dhānyam saḥ kumbhīdhānyaḥ / yasya punaḥ kumbyām cānyatra ca dhānyam nāsau kumbhīdhānyaḥ / nāyamidid vidhiḥ kumbhīdhānyanyāyena vijñātum*’³⁷/

Interpreting the *vārttika* ‘*ira upasamkhyānam*’ under the *sūtra* ‘*cuḍū*’, *Bhāṣyakāra* says that in ‘*ir*’, ‘*r*’ takes the ‘*itsamjñā*’ by the *sūtra* ‘*halantyaṃ*’ P.1.3.3, and ‘*i*’ by the *sūtra* ‘*upadeśe janunāsika it*’ P.1.3.2. If

use of the *nañ*). He accepts the *vācanikīnivṛttiḥ* and says that *nañ* being used removes a thing. When *nañ* is used along with a *brāhmaṇa* how can *nañ* remove the notion of a thing which has originated on account of the use of the word *brāhmaṇa* itself, because the word *brāhmaṇa* when uttered gives rise to the notion *brāhmiṇ*. To answer to this question *Bhāṣyakāra* mentions this *nyāya* and says that it is like wedge and counter wedge. The counter wedge fixed in a piece of wood is removed with the help of a wedge struck by a hammer, in the same way when *nañ* is used, the notion of *brāhmiṇ*hood, which has originated on account of similarity with regard to a *kṣatriya*, is removed.

3.6.3. KUMBHĪDHĀNYANYĀYA

‘the maxim of an earthen jar full of paddy’.

‘*yadi punarayamidid vidhiḥ kumbhīdhānyanyāyena vijñāyeta / tad yathā- kumbhīdhānyaḥ śrotrīyaḥ ityucyate / yasya kumbhyāmeva dhānyam saḥ kumbhīdhānyaḥ / yasya punaḥ kumbyām cānyatra ca dhānyam nāsau kumbhīdhānyaḥ / nāyamidid vidhiḥ kumbhīdhānyanyāyena vijñātum*’³⁷/

Interpreting the *vārttika* ‘*ira upasamkhyānam*’ under the *sūtra* ‘*cuḍū*’, *Bhāṣyakāra* says that in ‘*ir*’, ‘*r*’ takes the ‘*itsamjñā*’ by the *sūtra* ‘*halantyaṃ*’ P.1.3.3, and ‘*i*’ by the *sūtra* ‘*upadeśe janunāsika it*’ P.1.3.2. If

it is said that the object is accomplished since the parts take it, there is chance for the rules pertaining to those, which are *idit* to operate, so that *num* may enter into *bhettā* and *chettā* by the sūtra ‘*idito num dhātoḥ*’ P.7.1.58. If *num* comes, the form of the word is not a desired one.

Here Bhāṣyakāra introduces the *kumbhīdhānyanyāya* and says that for a person who has grain only in a jar goes by the name *kumbīdhānya* and not one who has grain both in a jar and elsewhere, likewise, here also the *itvidhi* is understood by this nyāya. Here only ‘*i*’ have the *itsamjñā*, there should *itvidhi* only. *iditvidhi* is in the roots like *bhidir* etc. by the sūtra *idito num dhātoḥ*. Under the *kumbhīdhānyanyāya*, the *iditvidhi* cannot be taken.

3.6.4. KŪPAKHĀNAKANYĀYA

‘the maxim of a well digger’.

‘*athavā kūpakhānakavadetadbhaviṣyati/ tadyathā-kūpakhānakaḥ kūpam khaṇan mṛdāpamsubhiścāvākīrṇo bhavati, so’psu samjātāsu tata eva tam guṇamāsādayati yena sa ca doṣo nirhanyatē bhūyasā cābhyudayena yogo bhavati / evamihāpi yadyapaśbdajñāne’dharma-stathāpi yastvasau śabdajñāne dharmastena sa ca doṣo nirghāniṣyate bhūyasā cābhyudayena yogo bhaviṣyati*’³⁸/

Does merit accumulate from the knowledge of correct words or from the usage of correct words? This is the context in *Paśpaśāhnika*. If it is considered that merit accrues from knowledge, demerit also will accrue because one who knows the correct words also knows the corrupt forms. The corrupt words are greater in number, so the greater demerit will occur. This is the doubt.

Whatever *śabda* says is authority on the *Vyākaraṇaśāstra*. *śabda* says that merit results from the knowledge of correct words; it does not say that sin results from the knowledge of incorrect words. A thing, which is neither enjoined nor prohibited, leads neither to religious merit nor to demerit. For example, hiccoughing, laughing, and scratching are producing neither merit nor demerit. Likewise, the knowledge of corrupt words neither enjoined nor prohibited. But by the *tusyatu durjana nyāya* (to satisfy the evil people), if we accept that knowledge of corrupt words leads demerit, by introducing that defect can be avoided. When a well digger digging a well, his body becomes soiled with the dust, clay etc. , but as soon as he finds water, not only he gets himself clean by that water and completely removes the mud and dust attaching to his body, but also he get a kind of prosperity. So also here even though demerit accumulate from the knowledge of corrupt words, yet merit accumulate from that of correct ones, which destroys the effect of the farmer and leads to much good.

This nyāya is also seen used in Philosophy. Whenever we attained *advaitabodha*, the *bhedabodha* will be disappeared naturally from our mind. Bhartṛhari also says that, *asatye vartmani sthitvā tataḥ satyam samīhate*.³⁹ Moreover, this maxim has been made use of in the story related in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*,

‘*evam prāpnoti mahataḥ prājñō ’rthānnāpātataḥ /*

kūpakhānakavat prāpte phale doṣam nihanti ca’⁴⁰ //

3.6.5. NAUŚAKAṬANYĀYA

‘while sinking, a boat attached to another boat cannot reach the shore’.

‘*satāmādaicām samjñayā bhavitavyam / samjñayā cādaico bhāvyante / taditaretarāśrayam bhavati / itaretarāśrayāṇi ca kāryāṇi na prakalpante / tadyathā-naurnāvi baddhā netartrāṇāya bhavati*’⁴¹ /

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’, the discussion about the relationship between the *samjñā* and *samjñi*, he used the nyāya ‘*nauśakaṭanyāya*’, which means a boat attached to another boat is not able to come to its shore while sinking.

In the sūtra ‘*vrddhirādaic*’ the name *vrddhi* is to be given to the vowels *ā*, *ai* and *au* after they have come into existence and while the vowels *ā*, *ai* and *au* are to come into existence by the term *vrddhi*. So *samjñā* depends *samjñi* and *samjñi* depends *samjñā*. Here, arise the defect of independence and it is a fact that mutual dependence does not take place in operations. Here he quotes the ‘*nauśakaṭanyāya*’ and says that, a boat, which is tied to another boat, cannot save the other one by reaching the bank. But sometimes mutually depending deeds can be seen. A boat carries a vehicle and vice versa. But another thing is there. The boat carries a vehicle on water and the vehicle carries the boat on the land. For forming, a triangle by use of three sticks there is a thread. The interdependences are depends on a condition. But in ‘*vrddhirādaic*’ the interdependence is without any condition, i.e. *vrddhi* depends *ādaic* and *ādaic* depends *vrddhi*.

Here Bhāṣyakāra replies that according to Vaiyākaraṇa⁴² the words are eternal. So the word ‘*ādaic*’ is eternal. Here the name *vrddhi* given to the word *ādaic* which is already existed. Hence, the defect of interdependence will not exist.

The same idea is seen in Hitopadeśa;

‘*yadaśakyam na tacchakyam yacchakyam śakyameva tat /*

*nodake śakaṭam yāti na ca naurgacchati sthale*⁴³ //

3.6.7. NIYOGATAḤ KĀRYAMṚṆAM BHAVATI NYĀYA

“somebody has to do necessarily become debt to him”.

*‘iha yad yasya niyogataḥ kāryam, ṛṇam tasya tad bhavati / tatra
ṛṇe ityeva siddham*⁴⁴/

The rule *kr̥tyairṛṇe* P.2.1.42, should read *kr̥tyairniyoge* says Vārttikakāra. He takes the word *ṛṇa* in the sense of ‘amount to be repaid’. Therefore, the rule would not apply to examples like, *pūrvāhnegeyamsāma-sāma* to be sung in the morning and *prātaradhyeyo’nuvākaḥ*-vedic chapters to be recited in the morning. But this examples will be covered, when we replaced *ṛṇe* by *niyoge*, which refers to anything to be performed by obligation, a debt to be repaid or a ritual song to be sung.

But this can be managed by the word *ṛṇe* itself. Here Patañjali explains this nyāya and says that, in this world whatever somebody has to do obligatorily, that becomes *ṛṇa*-‘debt’ to him.

3.6.8. PARJANYAVATNYĀYA

“like the rain which falls on all places alike”

*‘dīrghānām punardīrghavacane na kimcit prayojanamasti /
akṛtakāri khalvapi śāstram parjanyaavat / tadyathā-parjanyo yāvadūnam
pūrṇam ca sarvamabhivarṣati’⁴⁵ /*

In the sūtra *iko jhal* P.1.2.9, Bhāṣyakāra says that there is no use of lengthening the ‘nī’ in *ninīṣati*. The long vowels cannot have further lengthening, because, one who has finished his food doesn’t take it again, and no one who has cleared his beard, will not repeat it. But repetition can be seen. One, who has taken his food, takes it again and one who has cut his beard does it once more. Repetitions are taken place in some cases according to its special advantages like a new dish and new barber. But there is no use of lengthening of long vowels. Śāstra doesn’t function in vain like fire that burns only that which has not been burnt. At the same time, śāstra does like clouds, what has been done. Cloud rains in all places, like mountains, oceans, fields etc. and somewhere it is very high, and somewhere it is very low. Sometimes, the rain needed in some places like mountains and fields, and not needed in some places like, rivers and oceans. As such in śāstra, the long vowel in the word *gaurīṇām* has further lengthening without any purpose. By the sūtra *nāmi*, the lengthening of vowel is needed in the words *harīṇām*, *rāmāṇām* etc. Thus by the sūtra *nāmi*, *ajanta* having lengthening in all places. The lengthening of *dīrgha*

in the word *ninīṣati* is to prevent the *guṇa* by the sūtra *sārvadhātuka ārdhadhātukayoḥ*.

This *parjanyaavarṣaṇanyāya* is also seen in Hitopadeśa;

‘*parjanyaiva bhūtānāmādhāraḥ pṛthivīpatiḥ /*

vikale ’pi hi parjanye jīvyate na tu bhūpatau’⁴⁶ //

3.6.9. RAKTAVASTRANYĀYA

‘a white cloth pressed between two red cloths seems to be red colour’

‘*naite vyañjanasya guṇāḥ kintu aca eva / tatsāmīpyāttu
vyañjanamapi tadguṇapalabhyate / taddhyathā- dvoyaḥ
raktayorvastrayoranadhye śuklam vastram tadguṇamupalabyate /
badarapiṭake riktako lohakamsastadguṇa upalabhyate*’⁴⁷ /

While describing the bhāṣya of the sūtra-s *uccairudāttaḥ* P.1.2.29, *nicairanudāttaḥ* P.1.2.30, Patañjali quotes the *raktavastranyāya*. It is seen the *guṇa*-s *udāttatva*, *anudāttatva* etc. are seen to consonants in the expression *iṣe tvorje tvā*, the commencing expression of Yajurveda. These qualities are not of consonants, but of vowels. Through their proximity of the vowels the consonants too appears to have it. Here Patañjali uses the

raktavastranyāya and says that the white cloth pressed between two red cloths gets their colour. Well-polished mirror kept in a box containing *badara* fruits seem to get their colour. So *udāttatva*, *anudāttatva* etc. are the *guṇa*-s of vowels and through their proximity, consonants too gets them and not that they are the *guṇa*-s of consonants and vowel get them through its proximity. This nyāya is same as the examples, ‘*tadsannidhānādadhīṣṭhātrtvam maṇivat*’ of Sāmkhya philosophy.⁴⁸

3.6.10. RATHASTHĀNAYANA NYĀYA

“bring a man who is sitting in a chariot”.

‘*yathā rathasya ānīyatāmiti sa ratha ānīyate tathā ṣaṣṭyādisahitayoḥ yuṣmadasmadoḥ kāryam bhavatīti vijñāyate*’⁴⁹

While interpreting the Vārttika, *yuṣmadasmadoḥ sthagrahaṇāt*, in the rule *na lumatāṅgasya* P.1.1.63, Pradīpakāra quotes this nyāya. Someone says that “bring that man who is sitting in a chariot”. Then according to the *sambandi śabda nyāya*-it is similar to the words of relationship, bring the man with the chariot in which he is sitting. If the chariot doesn’t bring it may difficult to understand that he is the person who sitting in the chariot. As such in śāstra, on account of reading *stha* in the sūtra *yuṣmadasmadoḥ ṣaṣṭīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayorvānnāvau*, the *vām*, *nāu*etc. may replace *yuṣmad*

and *asmad* only when they are followed by case suffix in genitive, dative and accusative. Reading *stha* is meaning less if the replacement of *vām*, *nāuto* the word *yuṣmad*, *asmad* without the case suffix like genitive etc. Therefore, as in this *nyāya*, in *śāstra* also replacement is applicable to the words *yuṣmad* and *asmad* only when they are followed by case suffix.

3.6.11. ŚĀKAṬĀYANAŚAKAṬASĀRTHA NYĀYA

“Śākaṭāyana doesn’t see the chariots while he sitting on that way”.

*‘bhavati vai kaścijjāgradapi vartamānakālam nopalabhate tadyathā-
vaiyākaraṇānām śākaṭāyano rathamārge āsīnaḥ śakaṭasārtham yāntam
nopalebhe / kimpunaḥ kāraṇam jāgradapi vartamānakālam nopalabhate?
manaso ’sānnidhyāt’⁵⁰/*

This maxim is offered in the *sūtra parokṣe liṭ* P.3.2.115 and *Bhāṣyakāra* says that sometimes men are not aware of the current even if they are in the state of vigilant. Śākaṭāyana, one among the famous *Vaiyākaraṇa* has not seen the chariots passed in front of him even though he is sitting in the side of the way. Sensory perception happens only in the presence of mind. So, in the absence of mind there is no perception of the present. There is no purpose of the *vārtika*, *suptamattayoruttamaḥ* for the *parokṣatva* of last verbal conjunction of *liṭ lakārato* the sleeping and

intoxicated person. Even the *parokṣatva*-that which remains beyond the power of sensory perception of a speaker, is applicable to the person who is vigilant, it is also certainly applicable to the persons who is sleeping and intoxicating. So the affix *liṭ* is obtainable is self-evident.

3.6.12. SŪTRAŚĀṬAKANYĀYA

“the simile of the thread about to be woven in to a garment and already regarded as a garment”

‘kaścit kañcit tantuvāyamāḥ- asya sūtrasya śāṭakam vayeti / sa paśyati yadi śāṭako, na vātavyaḥ / atha vātavyo na śāṭakaḥ / śāṭakaḥ vātavyaśceti vipraṭiśiddham / bhāvinī khalvasya samjñābhipretā , sa, manye, vātavyo yasminnute śāṭakityetadbhavatīti / evamihāpi sa yaṇaḥ sthāne bhavati yasyabhinirvṛttasya samprasāraṇamityeṣā samjñā bhaviṣyati’⁵¹ /

The technical term *samprasāraṇa* denotes the meaning of the sentence *yaṇaḥ ik bhavati* or the letters included in ‘*ik*’ which replace *yaṇ-* this is the discussion in the sūtra *igyāṇaḥ samprasāraṇam* P.1.1.45. If the *samprasāraṇasamjñā* refers to a sentence by the sūtra *samprasāraṇācca* P.6.1.108, which succeeds a *samprasāraṇa* becomes one with the former, lengthening of *samprasāraṇa* cannot operate. Then, why the sentence

lengthened? If *varṇa* have achieved *samprasāraṇasamjñā*, there will not be ‘*ik*’ in place of *yaṇ*. Here the *samprasāraṇa* should be come in place of *yaṇ* by the sūtra *ṣyaṇaḥ samprasāraṇam* P.6.1.13, ‘*ik*’ receives the *samprasāraṇasamjñā* only when it replaces *yaṇ*. When we say that ‘*ik*’ receives the *samprasāraṇasamjñā* when replaces *yaṇ*, the statement seems to be absurd, because, at this stage ‘*ik*’ has yet to come into existence by replacing ‘*yaṇ*’. Here comes the defect interdependence. Then Patañjali introduces the *sūtraśākāṭaka nyāya* to solve this difficulty. One asks a weaver to spin a garment out of some yarn. If it is already a garment there is no need to spin. If it is to be spun, it may not be a cloth, it only be yarn. It is contradictory to say ‘spin a cloth’. But he has said, spin a cloth anticipating the name cloth. Then it should be spun and it will get the name cloth after the yarn is spun. The real explanation of this is that the word cloth is used in a prospective application; it is used to refer the finished product, which is non-existent, when the weaver is given instructions. So also, though there is no ‘*ik*’ at present, the *samjñā* may go to the ‘*ik*’, which takes the place of *yaṇ*.

REFERENCE

1. MB ,P. 3.1.26.
2. Ibid, P. 1.1.23.
3. *devaścedvrṣṭoniṣpannāḥ śālayaḥ*, Ibid, 3.3.133.
4. Ibid, P. 1.1.39.
5. *khalekapotikānyāya*, Ibid, P. 1.1.38.
6. Ibid, P.1.3.7.
7. Ibid, P. 1.2.58.
8. *tānevaśālīnbhuñjāmahe ye magadheṣu*, Ibid, P.1.1.2.
9. *goyūthavatnyāya*, Ibid, P. 4.2.70.
10. *ghaṭenakāryamkariṣyankumbhakāarakulamgatvāha-kurughaṭam*,
kāryamanenakarīṣyāmīti, Ibid, Paś.
11. *tīkṣṇayāsūcyasīvyantīkṣṇenaparaśunāvṛścan*, Ibid, P.2.1.2.
12. *dāsyakarmakarānāmaitepisvabhūtyarthampravartante*,
bhaktamcelamcalapsyāmahe, Ibid, P.3.1.26.
13. Ibid.
14. AS. II.23..
15. MB, P. 2.1.1.
16. *suvarṇamkayācitākṛtyāyuktampiṇḍobhavati*, Ibid, Paś.
17. MB, Paś.
18. MB, P.1.1.45.

19. *āśriṅāmtantram, protamtantram*, Ibid, 1.3.38.
20. MB, P.2.1.68.
21. Ibid, P.5.3.35.
22. MB, P. 1.3.11.
23. Ibid, 3.2.115.
24. *Tailam na vikretavyam, māmsam na vikretavyamiti vyapavṛktam ca na vikrīyate avyapavṛktam gāvaḥ sarṣapāśca vikrīyante*, MB, *e o nī, ai au c.*
25. Cf. India known to Pāṇini.
26. *pañcabhirgobhiḥ krītaḥ pañcaguḥ*, MB, P.1.2.44,*pañcabhiḥ kroṣṭribhiḥ krītaiḥ rathaiḥ pañcakroṣṭribhirrathairiti*, MB, P. 7.1.96.
27. MB, P. 5.2.91.
28. *na hi niṣkadhanaḥ sataniṣkadhanenaspardhate*, MB, P. 5.3.55.
29. *tadevedambhavataḥ kārṣāpaṇamyanmathurāyāmgrhītam*, MB, *aiuḥ.*
30. MB, P.2.3.18.
31. Ibid, P. 1.1.49.
32. Ibid, P.3.2.115.
33. Ibid,P. 2.3.56.
34. MB, Vol. II, P.1.2.39, p-35.
35. Ibid, P. 2.2.6, p-426.

36. Compare MB, Vol. III, P. 3.3.9 ‘*nañivayuktamanyasadṛśādhipikaraṇe tathā hyarthagatiḥ / tathā hyartho gamyate / tadyathā abrāhmaṇamānāyetyukte brāhmaṇasadṛśam puruṣamānāyati, nāsau loṣṭamānīya kṛtī bhavati*’/
37. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.3.7, p-134.
38. Ibid, Vol. I, Paś, p-75.
39. VP, 2.238.
40. *kathāsaritsāgara, śaktiyaśolambaka, 10th taraṅg, sloka-134.*
41. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.1, p-166.
42. *siddham tu nityaśabdatvāt*, Ibid, p-167.
43. *Hitopadeśa, mitralābh, sloka-43.*
44. MB, Vol. II, P. 2.1.42, p-383.
45. Ibid, P. 1.2.9, p-9.
46. *Hitopadeśa, mitralābh, sloka-205.*
47. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.29, p-25.
48. *Sāmkhyakārika* 1.96.
49. MB, Vol. I, Pradīpa, P. 1.1.63, p-499.
50. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 3.2.115, p-191.
51. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.45, P-151.

Chapter - IV

THOUGHTS ON POLITY

Degeneration of the state affairs resulted the origin of the state, according to earlier writers. The ancient texts, *aitareyabrāhmaṇa* refer to a social contract between the King and the subject and kingship was established to protect people from anarchy (*mātsyanyāya*)¹. This makes the condition of peaceful society. The King was the first and important in the state. When the King entered in the city, everything should be in regular order and the soldiers and the followers follow him in proper order². To assist the King in the state, there was ministers³, which shows the importance of the constitutional position of the King in relation to his ministers. The King has collected a portion from the products cultivated by the subjects and it denotes the King's relation with the people⁴. One who engaged on King's work never be allowed to do his own private work – *takṣā rājakraṇi pravartamānaḥ svam takṣakarma jahāti*.

The King is the upholder and defender of *dharma*⁵. For maintaining the justice, the King introduced punishments in the form of fines and physical torture. When it is ordered by a King that, the *garga-s* shall be fined one hundred coins which means that the total fine to be collected from

all the *garga*-s must be one hundred and not that each *garga* should be made to pay a fine of one hundred coins⁶. Punishments were given to those who engaged on destruction of agriculture even if it is for to feed their cattle⁷. There is remark on a separate organization of secret agents who were entrusted on espionage work in the state especially in enemy state⁸.

4.1. Nyāyās on Polity

4.1.1. GARGAŚATADAṆḌANANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the Gargas collectively are to be fined a hundred’

‘*samudāye vākyaparisamāptiriti / tad yathā-gargāḥ śatam daṇḍyantamiti / arthinaśca rājāno hiranyena bhavanti / na ca pratyekam daṇḍayanti*’⁹ /

‘*saha*’ should be read in the sūtra *halo ’anantarāḥ samyogaḥ*, so that the whole may get the designation *samyoga* collectively and not individually. Pāṇini reads the word *saha*, whenever he wants *kārya* collectively. For example, *saha supā, ubhe abhyastam saha*.

If without the mention of the word *pratyekam*, the designation *vṛddhi* and *guṇa* can be individually applied, the mention of the word *saha* in the sūtra is not necessary. To clear this, Patañjali uses the

‘gargaśatadaṇḍananyāya’. Though the rules have individual applications, in certain cases rules have collective applications also. For instance, when it is ordered by a King that, “the Gargas shall be fined one hundred coins, it means that the total fine of hundred be collected from all the Gargas. The number of the coins is more important than the number of Gargas. So in the words like *vipra*, in the contiguous consonants ‘*p*’ and ‘*r*’ get collectively the *samyogasamjña* and in *chandra*, consonants ‘*n*’, ‘*d*’, ‘*r*’ have also collectively get the *samyogasamjña*.

4.1.2. PRATYAVAYAVAM VĀKYAPARISAMĀPTI NYĀYA

‘the maxim of the fruit of the action is seen individually’.

‘*pratyavayavam ca vākyaparisamāptirdṛśyate / tadyathā – devadattayajñadattaviṣṇumitrā bhojyantāmiti / na cocyate pratyekamiti pratyekam ca bhujihḥ parisamāpyate*’^{10/}

Bhāṣyakāra replied to a question that whether the term *vṛddhi* is applied to ‘*ā*’, ‘*ai*’ and ‘*au*’ collectively or separately to each one in the sūtra ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’ P.1.1.1. It should apply separately because the word *saha* is put in the sūtrā-s, where the collective application is required, e.g. ‘*saha supā*’, ‘*ubhe abhyastam saha*’. Though the word *saha* is not seen in the sūtra ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’, it is understood that there is no possibility to apply

the *sanjñā* collectively. By using the *pratyavayavam vākyaparisamāpti nyāya*, he says that the purport of a sentence is generally seen to be application to each one of the individual members referred to in the sentence. For example, from the sentence ‘*devadatta-yajñadatta-viṣṇumitra bhojyantām*’- let Devadatta, Yajñadatta, Viṣṇumitra be given dinner- we get the meaning that the three should be given food separately through the word *pratyekam* (individually) is not used. It never meant, three should be eaten food together. So, in the ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’, ‘*ā*’, ‘*ai*’ and ‘*au*’ individually denotes the *vṛddhisamjñā*.

4.1.3. RĀJABHṚTYANYĀYA

“maxim of King and servant”

‘*pradhāne rajani hasati tadbhṛtyā api hasanti, tasmin rudite te’pi rudanti, na tvapradhāne cedīputrādau/ tadevam anvarthasamjñeyam bhavantī pūrvapadhārthaprādhānyamavyayībhāvasya darśayati*’¹¹/

In an indeclinable compound, the meaning of its first constituent is principal (*pradhāna*). For example, in the compounds like *pratidinam*, *yathāśakti*, the meaning of *prati* and *yathā* is important. But, if the first constituent *prati* in the compound *pratidinam* is important, the second constituent *dinam* is also a part in the indeclinable compound. Likewise, in

the compound *yathāśakti*, the first constituent *yathā* is important, but at the same time, *śakti* is its part. To establish this, Nyāsakāra explains the *rājabhṛtyanyāya* in the rule ‘*avyayībhāvaḥ*’ P.2.1.5. In the world, the king is important than his people. When he laughs, his servants also laugh with him and when he cries, his servants cry. However, when one among the servants of the king laughs or cries, no one will laugh or cry with him. Therefore, in the śāstra the other constituents supporting to its first constituent in the indeclinable compound which has the meaning of its first constituent is principal.

4.1.4. RĀJAGAMANANYĀYA

“Maxim of a king’s journey with his people”.

‘yathā loke bahuṣu gacchatsu rājā gaccatīti pradhānaṃ rājā vyapadiśyate/ rājñaśca prādhānyam tadadhīnapravṛttinivṛttivādanyeṣām/ iha tu napumsakasya kim kṛtam prādhānyamiti praśnaḥ’^{12/}

While interpreting the sentence “*pradhāne kāryasampratyayāccheṣaḥ*” (since the knowledge of the denotation of *artha* takes place only in the presence of the *pradhāna*, it alone is left behind), in the Bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*napumsakamanapumsakenaikavaccāsyānyatarasyām*’ P.1.2.69, Pradīpakāra quotes this nyāya. If a King is going with his people,

due to the importance of the King, we say that ‘the king is going’. Here we knew that the people are also going. But, here referred only is the important one. Wherever there is a reference with an important and unimportant thing, there gave preference to the important thing only. As such in the rule ‘*napumsakamanapumsakenaikavaccāsyānyatarasyām*’ the neuter gender is left behind because it is *pradhāna*. Neuter gender can be understood in normal condition, which is same in everywhere, so it is important, and it considered retention of one.

4.1.5. RĀJĀMĀTYANYĀYA

“the maxim of King and Minister”

‘*evam tarhi pradhānena samavāye stālī paratandrā/ vyavāye svatantrā tadyatā amātyādīnām rājñā saha samavāye pāratan dryam/ vyavāye svātandryam*’^{13/}

Everywhere the designation *karṭṛ* would overrule the other, special designations of the speaker’s presentation. When the speaker wants to give prominence to the function of the *adhikarāṇa*, then he will transform the locative construction in to a nominative one. For instance, in *sthālī pacati* the finite verb *pacati* openly speaks of the action of the *adhikarāṇa* transformed into that of *karṭṛ* namely containing. But, when he does not

wants to express this actions openly, he will say *sthālyām pacati*-he cooks in the pot, where *pacati* speaks of the action of an agent other than *sthālī*. Since every *karaka* must be independent in one respect and dependent in another, what could be the dependence of the transformed *adhikaraṇakāraka* in *sthālī pacati*. When *pacati* refers to the role of the agent, like in *devadattaḥ sthālyām pacati*, the pot becomes dependent. But, we cannot say the pot becomes dependent, when *pacati* refers to the main agent, and still the pot is independent. To answer to this question Patañjali introduces the *rājāmātyanyāya* in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*kārake*’ P.1.4.23, and says that the pot as independent when it is not co-present with the agent and as dependent when it is co-present with the agent. For instance, the Ministers have dependence when they are co-present with the King, but independence, when separated from King.

4.1.6. RĀJATAKṢĀNYĀYA

“The maxim of King and carpenter”.

*‘yuktam punaryat jahatsvārtā nāma vṛttiḥ syāt? bādham yuktam /
evam hi drśyate loke puruṣo’yam parakarmani pravartamānaḥ svam
karma jahāti / tad yathā takṣā rājakrmani pravartamānaḥ svam takṣakarma
jahāti / evam yuktam yad rājā puruṣārthe vartamānaḥ svamartham jahyāt /
nanu coktam rājapuruṣamānayetyukte puruṣamātrasyānayanam prāpnoti /*

*naiṣa doṣaḥ/ jahadapyasau svārtham nātyantāya jahāti / yaḥ
parārthavirodhī svārthastam jahāti / tad yathā takṣā rājakarmani
pravartamānaḥ svam takṣakarma jahāti, na tu hikkita hasita
kaṇḍūyitāni*¹⁴/

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*’ P.2.1.1, Bhāṣyakāra raised the question, whether the integration in the compound *rājapurusaḥ* is *jahatsvārthā* or *ajahatsvārthā*. *jahatsvārthā* means integration which involves loss of constituent’s meaning and *ajahatsvārthā* means the integration in which the constituents retain their own meaning.

It is *jahatsvārthā-jahāti padāni svārtham yasyām sā*, that is which the words abandoned its own meaning. To clear this Patañjali explains the *rājataksānyāya* and says that a carpenter when he engaged on a job which is assigned to him by a king, gave up his own carpenter work. In the same way it is proper that the word *rājan* (king) when it is used in the sense of *purusa* (man) gave up its own meaning in the compound *rājapurusaḥ*. Then when we say *rājapurusaṁānaya-* bring the king man, it might be resulted in bringing any man instead of a man related to the King. Here he replies that, never happens so because, although the subordinate member gives up its meaning, it does mean total abandonment. It is given up the meaning, which is incompatible with the meaning of the other. If a

carpenter when doing a job assigned to him by a King, gives up his own carpenter job, but he doesn't give up his gestures like hiccupping, laughing and scratching.

REFERENCE

1. AS, 1.13.5.
2. *rājapurapraveśanyāya*, MB, Pradīpa, P.1.1.58.
3. *rājāmātyanyāya*, MB, P. 1.4.23.
4. *mahārajārtho balih, rājyagrāhyo balih,*
5. Aitareyabrāhmaṇa, 8.26, *dharmasya goptā*.
6. *gargaśatadaṇḍananyāya*, MB, P.1.1.1.
7. *māṣebhyo gām vārayati*, Ibid,
8. *guptacaranyāya*, Ibid, *a i u ṇ*.
9. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.1, p-169.
10. Ibid, p-168.
11. Nyāsa, KV, Part II, P. 2.1.5, p-18, 19.
12. MB, Vol II, Pradīpa, P. 1.2.69, p-106.
13. Ibid, Vol II, P. 1.4.23, p-245.
14. Ibid, P. 2.1.1, p-329.

Chapter - V

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Second Century BC was a period of revival of Vedic sacrifices and marked for the evolution of the Viṣṇu-Vāsudeva cult, which had originated earlier. During the period of Aśoka, the sacrifice of animals was discouraged but it was reinstated in the time of Puṣyamitrasuṅga. In this period, the ascetic religious orders also flourished. The religious condition mainly related to sacrifice, worship and performance of appropriate rituals.

5.1. Religious beliefs and practices

The old Vedic sacrifices regained their prominence by the revival of the orthodox order and some of them began to be included in the daily life of families. So, the performance of the *pañcamahāyajña* was compulsory to every house holder. According to Manusmṛti¹, they are *japa* (muttering of prayers), *homa* (the fire sacrifice), *bhūtabali* (the offering of food to all created beings), *brāhmaṇārcana* (worship of the learned brāhmiṇs), *pitṛsamtarpaṇa* (the offering of water to forefathers). The *agniṣṭoma*², *rājasūya*³, *vājapeya*⁴ are some other sacrifices they performed. Patañjali referred to the *dīrghasatra* lasting over long periods of hundred or thousand years. But, it was not possible in practice and only heard of him ritualistic

portion of the Vedic literature. *dīrghasatrāṇi vārṣasatikāni vārṣasahasrikāni ca / na ca adyatve kaścidapi vyavaharati kevalam ṛṣisampradāyo dharma iti kṛtvā yājñikāḥ śāstreṇa anuvidhate /*⁵

In *soma* sacrifices, the *soma* plant was needed and used *pūtīka* grass as substitute to *soma* plant, but *soma* had not become outmoded. *vede'pi somasya sthāne pūtīkatṛṇāni abhiṣunyādityucyate na ca tatra somo bhūtapūrvo bhavati*⁶. To drink *soma*, certain spiritual and material conditions have to be fulfilled. According to Yājñika school, the privilege of drinking *soma* is limited to a person whose family there was no one had suffered social degradation during the preceding ten generations. *evam hi yājñikāḥ paṭhanti daśapurūṣānūkam yasya grhe śūdra na vidyeraṇ sa somam pibediti*⁷. Manu⁸ looks at the problem from an economic point of view, “he who owns food to last for three years or more so as to maintain his dependents are entitled to drink *soma*”.

The officiating priests in the *yajña*-s received *dakṣiṇā* or sacrificial fee. Sometimes the *dakṣiṇā* may be in the form of gelded bull⁹, sometimes may be the cow and the same cow passed on a thousand times. ‘*sahasrakṛtyo datvā tayā sarve te sahasradakṣiṇāḥ sampannāḥ*’¹⁰. The recitation of *mantra*-s for invoking Vedic deities plays an important part in sacrifices. There was a restriction to use the incorrect words during the

recitation of *mantra-s* ¹¹. The adaptable nature of Vedic *mantra-s* with reference to case endings not provided¹² and it is interesting that the *sāmidhenīṛks* are counted as seventeen though they are only thirteen in number by reading the first and the last *ṛk-s* thrice each-*saptadaśa sāmidhenyo bhavanti iti, triḥ prathamām anvāha triruttamām ityāvṛttitāḥ saptadaśatvam bhavati*¹³.

Among the Vedic deities, Indra is one and the same Indra appears in different places simultaneously ¹⁴. *śakra*, *puruhata* and *purandara* are different names of Indra. The Sun and Moon were also worshipped ¹⁵. There exist a concept of Heaven and Hell, and one who live according the charity, entitled a place in Heaven- '*yo bhavatām odanam dāsyati sa svargam lokam gamiṣyati*'¹⁶. One word properly known and well pronounced in accordance with the grammar would grant enable him to achieve all in Heaven ¹⁷. So, the idea of *paraloka* or next world was always present in the mind of the people during this age. Taking *srāddha* is a custom of satisfying the ancestors by offering *tilodaka* has an important role in religion- *āmrāśca siktāḥ pitaraśca prīnitāḥ* ¹⁸. There was a custom existed in that period; escort the beloved guests up to see water or forest, when they returned ¹⁹.

5.2. Religious cults

Theistic devotion to particular Gods expressed the new phase of religious beliefs. In that period Śiva and Viṣṇu were very popular with separate cults. Patañjali's reference to the staging of 'bālibandhana' and 'kamsavadha'²⁰, were hinting the early belief in the existence of Viṣṇu cult. There was a sect of the Śiva-bhāgavata-s, who worshipped Śiva as *bhagavān* and whose outward sign was an iron trident-*yo ayaḥsūlenānvicchati sa āyasūlikah? kim cātaḥ / siva-bhāgavate prāpnoti*²¹. This proves the presence of Śiva cult during that period.

5.3. Asceticism

Asceticism formed an important part of the religious life of the day, which was widely spread as early as the time of *upaniṣat*-s. Supreme wisdom was the principal concept behind the practice of asceticism²². Begging is considered as the obligatory duty of a religious mendicant-*bhikṣuko'yam dvitīyām bhikṣām samāsādyā pūrvām na jahāti*²³. A mendicant with a single staff is called a *daṇḍin*²⁴ and formed a separate group dating back to the period of brāhmaṇa-s²⁵ and also mentioned by Pāṇini²⁶, Manu²⁷ etc. The mendicant with three staves is called '*parivrājaka*'²⁸ also known as *māskarīn parivrājaka* and was so called because of their doctrine of inactivity seeking peace as the highest end – *mā*

kṛta karmāni mā kṛta karmāṇi śāntir vaḥ śreyas ityāhato māskari parivrājakaḥ ²⁹. *ājīvikā*, the Buddhist sect was really a *tridaṇḍin* and the *tridaṇḍin parivrājaka* mentioned by Patañjali may be identical.

5.4. Moral concepts

The concept of *dharma* places a very important role in Indian tradition. The Veda-s, Smṛti-s, Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Pūrvamīmāṃsā are the sources of *dharma*. P.V. Kane observes, “*dharma* is one of those Sanskrit words that defy all attempts of an exact rendering in English or any other tongue. That word has several vicissitudes.” (History of Dharmaśāstrās, Vol.I, P.1).

At the beginning of the text Patañjali introduces the word *dharma* and *adharmā-śabdajñāne dharmāḥ apaśabdajñāne dharamāḥ*. The knowledge of the correct words leads to merit and the incorrect words leads to demerit. One who murders a brāhmaṇa or who drinks liquor due to ignorance, he will become a sinner. That is ignorance cannot completely serve as a resort ³⁰. When words are used in the sense in which each is current in the world injunction to use the correct word is made by the śāstra for the sake of *dharma- lokato'rthaprayukte śabdaprayoge śāstreṇa dharmaniyamaḥ*.

Hindu ethics comments upon every householder certain moral and spiritual obligations classed as *dharmaniyama*, i.e. a restriction on oneself for the sake of religious merit. It means *niyama* for *dharma*, *niyama* for the sake of *dharma* and *niyama* having for its fruit *dharma*. By the *dharmaniyama* there are some restrictions in the daily life of the people. A cock and a pig nurtured in a village are prohibited from eating. Permission given to eat the stipulated five alone of the five-nailed animals³¹, revealed that the other five-nailed animals are not to be eaten. Similarly, man meets woman to satisfy his sexual passion, it may be had in meeting any woman deserving or non-deserving, there is the restriction made that one is approachable and the other is non-approachable – *iyam gamyā iyamagamyā iti*. The concept is that, the killing of the killer of Devadatta, never cause to the re-entry of Devadatta (*devadattahantr̥hatanyāya*), is one of the finest examples of their moral thought and it denotes that they never admit the killing of a person in revenge. *sannipātalakṣaṇe vidhiranimittam tadviḡhātasya nyāya*³² reflect the concepts that never destroy the thing that depend each other. It is like the saying, ‘never cut the branch while sitting’.

Yāga, according to Mīmāṃsaka, is the soul of *dharma*. But, Patañjali always relates; *dharma* is the correct knowledge of grammar and the preservation of Vedas and assisting in the correct performance of sacrifice is the main aim of grammar. The most popular and accepted

meaning of the term *dharma*, i.e. religion, is true. Thus, it is clear that in that time ethical and moral values are upheld by many rules, which highlight the exploitation of the deep-rooted concept of *dharma* in the Indian mind.

5.6. Philosophical thoughts

The philosophical doctrines throw a light on the metaphysical speculations current during II century BC. The *rathāṅgavihṛtanyāya*³³, the parts of a chariot when taken apart are not each of them fit for movement, their combination (*samudāya*) is the chariot is fit for that, reveals the Buddhist thought *samghāta*. It is related to Milintapañca. The identification of Maskar in with *ājīvika* shows the influence of the Buddhist thought in that period- *triviṣṭabdakanyāya*.

The *rajjusarpanyāya*,³⁴ is a famous Vedanta thought, that mistaking a cord by delusion for a serpent denotes the false impression. According to them, *mithya* is like the serpent for the time to a man having illusion, the only truth being *brahma*, - *brahmasatyam jaganmithya*. The concept of *mithya* in *advaitavedānta* is revealed through the *mṛgatrṣṇānyāya* and *gandharvanagaranyāya*,³⁵ i.e. things that actually do not exist but appears to be so. *dagdhapaṭanyāya*³⁶ illustrates the unreality and insubstantiality of all phenomena, which referred in the *vedāntasāra*³⁷.

The *vṛkṣapracalananyāya*³⁸ i.e. a tree when it moves with its parts, part is evidently with in the whole suggests that the concept of *avayavin*³⁹ (the parts alone are the realities while taking the whole) in the nyāya philosophy is familiar with that time. The *tantupaṭanyāya*⁴⁰ denotes that the effect exists for a moment when the cause is destroyed, is also mentioned. The stock example for inference (*anumāna*), i.e. *parvato vahnimān dhūmāt* has paved the path for the maxim *dhūmagninyāya*⁴¹.

The killing of animals is *adharmā*, even if it is according to *śruti* as a part of sacrifice. But the *dharma* derived as a result of sacrifice, destroy this *adharmā*. It is like, while digging the well the dust and mud cover the body of the digger and the water found them last will wash it off. This *mīmāṃsā* concept reflects in the *kūpakhānakanyāya*⁴². The *niyamavidhi* of *mīmāṃsā* reveals through the maxim of *abhakṣyo grāmyakukkuṭaḥ, abhakṣyo grāmyasūkaraḥ*, which prescribes what to eat and what not to eat. The cloth get the name cloth after the yarn is spun, but we say that ‘spin a cloth’. Here the word is used in a prospective application, when the weaver finished the product- *bhāvisamjñā-vijñānanyāya*⁴³. This thought is obliged to the *mīmāṃsā* philosophy. There is a reference that when we say ‘*yavāgūm pacati*’, cooks the rice-gruel, *yavāgū* is used in a prospective application, because when the cooking is finished, it is called *yavāgū*. According to *mīmāṃsaka*, a thing that is changed in one part does not there

by become something else is illustrates by the *ekadeśavikṛtanyāya*⁴⁴, which means the cutting of a tail or ear, which does not turn it into a horse or donkey, but still a dog. The eternity of the relation between the word and sense is closely related to the *mīmāṃsā* theory⁴⁵. In addition, the *pratyāsattinyāya* of them is mentioned through the *āvanāntād odakāntād priyam pāntham anuvṛjet nyāya*. From the above reference, it is clear that these philosophical thoughts are prevalent in that period.

5.7. Nyāyās on Religion

5.7.1. ABBHAKṢANYĀYA/ VĀYUBHAKṢANYĀYA

“the maxim of living on water alone”/ “the maxim of living on air”.

*‘athavā santyekapadānyapyavadhāraṇāni / tadyathā-abbhakṣo vāyubhakṣa ityapa eva bhakṣayati, vāyumeva bhakṣatīti gamyate / evamihāpi siddha eva na sādhyā iti’*⁴⁶ /

Bhāṣyakāra mentions this nyāya while he interpreting the meaning of *siddhe* in the vārttika *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* in Paśpaśahnika. The word *siddha*, is synonym of the word *nitya* (permanent). Sometimes, there is the sense of definiteness conveyed by a single word, unaccompanied by the particle *eva* showing definiteness. For example, when the word *abbhakṣaḥ* or *vāyubhakṣaḥ* is used, it conveys the sense of living on water

alone or on air alone, without eating or drinking any other thing. Here without the word *eva*, the sense of definiteness conveyed. Similarly, the word *siddha*, here means, always established (*siddha eva*) or always produced, it does not mean ‘to be produced’ (*sāddhya*).

5.7.2. ĀCĀRYĀCĀRANYĀYA

‘the maxim of Ācārya’s usage’.

‘ācāryācārāt samjñāsiddhiḥ / tadyathā-laukikeṣu vaidikeṣu ca kṛtānteṣu / loke tāvanmātāpitarau putrasya jātasya samvṛtte ’vakāśe nāma kurvāte devadatto yajñadatta iti / tayorūpacārādanye ’pi jānanti iyamasya samjñeti / vede ’pi yājñikāḥ samjñām kurvanti spayo yūpaścaṣāla iti / tatra bhavatāmupacārādanye ’pi jānanti iyamasya samjñeti’⁴⁷ /

Bhāṣyakāra uses this nyāya while he describes the sūtra ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’ to denote the needlessness of the use of *samjñādhikāra sūtra*, ‘*atha samjñā*’ for knowing the *samjñā*, *vṛddhi*, *guṇa* etc. In the world, the parents in their own house secretly named kids and the others identify by hearing the name of each kid through the dealings of their parents and relatives. In the Vedas also Yajñikas named the sacrificial utensils as ‘*isphya*’, ‘*yūpa*’, *caṣāla* etc. and use of those words by Yajñikas, the others understand them to be their name.

So here also, some interpreters state that in the rule ‘*vrddiradaic*’ the word *vrddhi* is *samjñā* and *ādaic* (*ā, ai, au*) are *samjñins*. Other comments that in the rule ‘*sici vrddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu*’ P.7.2.1, the *vrddhi* denotes the vowels *ā, ai, and au*. Therefore, we understand that with which another is denoted is *samjñā* and those that are denoted are *samjñins*. Hence, the *vrddhi* is *samjñā* and *ādaic* is *samjñin* in the loka and śāstra. So there is no need of introducing a domain sūtra like this.

5.7.3. AGNAU KARAVĀṆĪ NYĀYA

“the maxim of offering oblation in the fire”.

‘*athavā punarastvayameva vighrahaḥ kesabrahmacāriṇo’syeti / nanu cōktaṁ- kaṭha iti prativacanam nopapadhyate iti / naiṣa doṣaḥ / agnau karavāṇi nyāyena bhaviṣyati*’⁴⁸ /

Patañjali mentions this nyāya under the rule ‘*anekamanyapadārthe*’ P.2.2.24, where a question is raised about the meaning and analysis of the compound *kiṁsabrahmacārin*. The compound is *bahuvrīhi* and the analysis is *kesabrahmacāriṇo’sya*-who are his fellow students. The answer is *kaṭhaḥ*, i.e. he is a student belonging to the *kaṭha* branch. Here the question is about a constituent meaning, which refers to a plurality of object, but the answer is only referring to single object. If the question is asking in the

form of plural word, the answer is also should be in plural, but here it is in singular word. After this discussion, by introducing the *agnau karavāṇi nyāya*, Bhāṣyakāra states that there is no difficulty in considering the singular answer. That is, somebody says to somebody, may I offer in the fire. The performer has received the reply by the words ‘offer it’, the object also permitted. In another occasion somebody else says, ‘shall it offered in the fire?’. Then the performer has received the permission by the words ‘let it be offered’, the object has also been permitted. Just as the *nyāya* works here, it works in the case of ‘who are his fellow students.’ When the answer is they are students belonging to the *kaṭha* branch, because of the relation of the *kaṭha* branch, we understood that he is a student belonging to the *kaṭha* branch certainly. Similarly, when the answer is he is a student belonging to the *kaṭha* branch, we have to understand that, they are students also belonging to the *kaṭha* branch certainly, because of the relation. As a matter of fact, they cannot be referred by the compound, since they are represented in the compound by a subordinate word.

If the question concerned here is taken in the form of sentence *kesabrahmacārino’sya*, the plural word *sabrahmacāriṇaḥ* becomes predominant. Therefore, since the answer refers to the *sabrahmacārin-s*, it should be put in plural-*kaṭhāḥ*. But, when the answer is taken in the form of the compound *kimsabrahmacārin*, then the *anyapadārtha*-a person

having fellow students, becomes predominant, and the constituent *sabrahmacārin* becomes subordinate. Therefore, since the answer refers to the *anyapadārtha*, it should be put in the singular.

5.7.4. ĀMRASEKAPITṚTARPAṆANYĀYA

“watering a mango tree and at the same time satisfying the forefathers”

‘dviḡatā api hetavo bhavanti / tadyathā-āmrāśca siktāḡ pitarāśca prīṇitāḡ iti / tathā vākyānyapi dviṣṡhāni bhavanti / śveto dhāvati, alambusānām yātetī’⁴⁹/

In the Paśpaśāhnika of Mahābhāṣya on the course of discussion about ‘what are the purpose of instructions of letters’, Patañjali answered by using the *āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāya*, which means watering a mango tree and at the same time satisfying the grandfathers, i.e. by doing one thing brings two results. The same action provides two or more results.

The introduction of letters at the beginning is for giving a serial order of letters for the sake of knowing their correct pronunciation. If so, an authoritative utterance has to be made in the case of vowels, which are *udātta*, *anudātta*, *svarita*, *anunāsika*, *dīrgha*, and *pluta*. It will be achieved on account of the general nature of the original utterance. Even if saying

so, the letters with the defect of *samvṛta* should be prohibited. The defects *samvṛta* and others are avoided by *gargādi-bidādipāṭha*, but there is another purpose served by *gargādi-bidādipāṭha*, so that correctness of the whole may be secured. Here arises the question, ‘how can two things are obtained by one single effort?’ For answer to this question, Bhāṣyakāra uses this *nyāya* and says that, both are accomplished by *gargādi-bidādipāṭha*, the correct reading is understood and the defects are removed. There can be sometimes a two-fold purpose also in doing a thing. For example, by performing *pitṛtarpaṇa* while sitting under mango tree, the mango tree is watered, as also the grandfathers are appeased at the same time. Ordinary sentences also convey a double sense. *śveto dhāvati*-the white one runs, *śvā ito dhāvati*-the dog is running away from here, and *alam busānām yātā*- go to the country of Alambusa, *alambusānām yātā*-able to go to the waters.

The *āmrasekapitṛtarppaṇanyāya* is also seen in Padmapurāṇa.

‘*eko munistāmrakarāgrahastohyāmreṣu mule salilam dadāti /*

*āmrāśca siktāḥ pītaraśca tṛptā ekā kriyā dvayarthakarī
prasiddhā*’⁵⁰//.

5.7.5. AŚOKAVANIKĀNYĀYA

“the maxim of the grove of aśoka trees”.

*‘nanu caivamapi ghaṭa paṭādaya eva kuto noktā iti vācyam,
aśokavanikānyāyāt / gavādyarthānām maṅgalatvena prātardrśyatvasya
dharmasāstre utkatvena tatpratipādakatvācchabdasyāpi maṅgalatvamiti
ādyullekhācca’⁵¹ /*

While Nāgeśa interprets the words *gauraśvapuruṣohasti*, which is in the Paśpāsāhnika, he uses this nyāya. Here he arises a question that, why Bhāṣyakāra uses the words *gauḥ*, *aśva* etc. in the examples of current words in reply to the question *keṣām śabdānām*, instead of he has to refer more common words like *ghaṭa*, *paṭa* etc. For clearing this question, he explains this nyāya and says that, Rāvaṇa kept Sīta in the grove of aśoka trees, when he could keep her in any garden. But, it is not easy to account for his preference of that particular grove to any other one, so when a man finds several ways of doing a thing, any one of them being considered as good as another, and the preference of any particular one cannot be accounted for.

**5.7.6. ĀVANĀNTĀT ODAKĀNTĀT PRIYAM
PĀNTHAMANUVRAJET NYĀYA**

“follow until see a forest or water”

‘evam tarhi lokata etat siddham/ tad yathā loke āvanāntāt, odakāntāt priyam pānatham anuvrajat iti/ ya eva prathamō vanāntaḥ udakāntaśca ā tato ’nuvrajāti’⁵²/

The use of the word *īśvara* with ‘r’ in the sūtra ‘*prāgīśvarānnipātāḥ*’ P.1.4.56, is to apply *nipātasamjñā* up to the sūtra ‘*adhirīśvare*’ P.1.4.97. If the word *īśvara* is used there, *nipātasamjñā* will apply up to the rule ‘*īśvare tosunkasunau*’ P.3.4.13. Here arise a doubt when use the word *īśvara* that, whether the word *īśvara* is in the rule ‘*adhirīśvare*’ or ‘*īśvare tosunkasunau*’. But, the application of the word *rīśvara* is clear this doubt. Here Patañjali quotes this nyāya and says that, here is no difficulty in applying the word *īśvara*. There is custom that accompany the beloved guests up to see a forest or the water when they returned. Here they are followed up to the first sight of a forest or the water. Likewise, the word *īśvara* will only apply to the first rule *adhirīśvare* and not apply to the later.

5.7.7. DĪRGHASATRANYĀYA

‘to be treated like *dīrghasattra*’

‘aprayukte dīrghasattravat / yadyapyaprayuktā, avaśyam dīrghasattravallakṣaṇenānuvidheyah / tadyathā-dīrghasattrāṇi

*vārṣasahasrikāni ca / na cādhyatve kaścīdapi vyavaharati,
kevalamsr̥ṣisampradāyo dharmā itī kṛtvā yājñikāḥ śāstrenānuvidadhate*’^{53/}

Bhāṣyakāra says in Paśpaśāhnikā- correctness of words is determined from usage. If words were not in use, they would not be called correct. The words like *ūṣa*, *tera*, *cakra*, *peca* etc. are not in use now. Then how can it treat as correct word. Patañjali answered that there are no unused words because, words are used to convey sense and to these words attached the meanings in which they are used. It can be seen the word *uṣitā* used in place of the meaning of *ūṣa*, in the sense of *tera- tīrṇa*, in the sense of *cakra kṛtavantaḥ*, in the sense of *peca pakvavantaḥ*. Although such words are not found in use, they have to be explained in grammar by framing rules, just as sacrificial sessions of long duration which last for a hundred years or for a thousand years, are not at present held by anybody. Still, writers on sacrifices prescribe and explain them, simply because usages, which are followed by ancient sages, are to be looked upon as religious, have to be sanctioned although they may not be current.

5.7.8. GURUVATGURUPUTRANYĀYA

“treating the preceptor’s son like the preceptor ”

‘*guruvadguruputra iti yathā / tadyathā guruvasmin guruputre
vartitavyamiti gurau yatkāryam tad guruputre’tidiśyate / evamihāpi
sthānikāryamādeśe’tidiśyate*’^{54/}

Bhāṣyakāra describes the nyāya *guruvatguruputra* when there arise a question why should ‘*vat*’ be read in the sūtra ‘*sthānivadādeśo ’nalvidhau*’. In the palace Rājaguru have a prominent place and get full respect from the King and the others. In his absence, his son does all things in respect of the Rājaguru and his son gets all respects what Rājaguru gets. Here he is treated only like Rājaguru, but not as Rājaguru. In the sūtra *āno yamahanah*, the *ātmanepada* conjugation is employed. According to ‘*hanovadhaluṅ*’ sūtra, *vadhādeśa* employed to *han*. If *sthānin* is the *samjñā* of *ādeśa*, *vadhā deśa* became the name of *sthāni*. Then the *ātmanepada* termination will be used only after *vadh* with ‘*ā*’ and not after *han* with ‘*ā*’. If *vat* is read, this effect cannot arise, since *ādeśakārya* can be analogized with a *sthānikārya*, same as how the Guru’s son gets homage instead of the Guru.

5.7.9. INDROPASTHITI NYĀYA

“presence of Indra at a time in all sacrifices in various places”

‘tadyathaika indreṅksmin kratuśata āhūto yugapat sarvatra bhavatyevam ākṛtiriyugapat sarvatra bhavediti’⁵⁵/

During the interpretation of the sūtra ‘*sarūpāṅāmekāśeṣa ekavibhaktau*’ P.1.2.64, Bhāṣyakāra uses the *indropasthitinyāya*. In the world, various people for the attainment of desire at the same time conduct many sacrifices in various places. At the time of sacrifice, they offer obligation to Indra by pronouncing the word ‘indra’. Indra being a single God, he accepts all the offerings from various persons from various places simultaneously. This is the *indropasthitinyāya*.

Is padārtha depending on *dravya* or *ākṛti*? Patañjali says that *dravya*-s are many and *ākṛti* is one and only and exists everywhere simultaneously. As the one Indra can be seen everywhere simultaneously, *ākṛti* also seen everywhere simultaneously. In the destruction of *dravya*, *ākṛti* exists. Because of the non-dependence of the *ākṛti* to *dravya*, *ākṛti* will not disappear, if the *dravya* destructed.

5.7.10. NĀTYANTĀYĀJÑĀNAM ŚARAṆAM BHAVITUMARHATI NYĀYA

“ignorance cannot wholly serve as a refuge”.

*‘nātyantāyajñānam śaraṇam bhavitumarhati / yo hyajānan
brāhmaṇam hanyāt surām vā pibet so’pi manye patitaḥ syāt’⁵⁶ /*

In the Paśpaśahnika of Mahābhāṣya, the Pūrvapakṣin arises a doubt in the verse *‘vāgyogavit duṣyati cāpaśabdaiḥ*, that, whether one who knows correct words knows incorrect words, and just as one obtains merit by the knowledge of correct words, demerit also incurs with that of incorrect words. The demerit becomes greater, since the incorrect words are greater in number and each correct word having a large number of corrupt forms. For example, the correct word *gauḥ* has the corrupt forms *gāvī*, *goṇī*, *gotā*, *gopotalika* and the like.

To clear this doubt, Patañjali mentions this nyāya. Ignorance cannot completely serve as a resort. He who kills a Brāhmaṇa, or who drinks wine through ignorance becomes a sinner. One should know the existing rules, ignorance is not an excuse, and knowledge is his resort.

5.7.11. ṚSISAHASRADAKṢIṆĀNYĀYA

‘the maxim of alms-giving of thousand cows’

*‘etadapi siddham / katham? lokataḥ / tadyathā- ṛsisahasramekām
kapilamekaikaśaḥ sahasrakṛtvo datva tayā te sarve sahasradakṣiṇāḥ
sampannāḥ / evamihapi anekāctvam bhaviṣyati’⁵⁷ /*

The objection is occurred in *ekāc* and *anekāc* while the *akāra* is one and the same. This can be solved by the repetition of vowel sound. But, in the words like *kiriṇā*, *giriṇā*, only the final syllable will be accented since there is only one vowel ‘i’ in both. Bhāṣyakāra removes the defect by quoting ‘*ṛṣisahasadakṣiṇanyāya*’ in the sūtra ‘*a i u ṇ*’.

In Yāga-s, Sages, one thousand in number presented one and same cow in one thousand times, have achieved the merit of having presented one thousand cows. Similarly, words with the same vowel occurring twice will be looked upon as two-vowelled or multi syllable.

5.7.12. SAPTADAŚASĀMIDHENĪNYĀYA

‘the maxim of seventeen fuel sticks’

‘*ekājanekājgrahaṇeṣu cāvṛttisamkhyānātanekāctvam bhaviṣyati / tadyathā- saptadaśasāmidenyo bhavantīti triḥ prathamāmanvāha, triruttamāmityāvṛttitaḥ saptadaśatvam bhaviṣyati / evamihāpi āvṛttito’ne- kāctvam bhaviṣyati*’⁵⁸ /

Bhāṣyakāra uses the ‘*saptadaśasāmidenīnyāya*’ in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*a i u ṇ*’. If accepting the view that the *akāra* is one and the same, there will arise a confusion regarding the application of the terms *ekāc*, *anekāc* and the like. The problem can be solved by counting separately the

repeated vowel sounds in the word. For example, in *darśapaurṇamāsiyāga*, there seventeen hymns consecrated for offering the fuel sticks. But hymns are only thirteen. The thirteen sacred hymns being counted as seventeen by the repetition of the first hymn as three and, the last one also. Similarly the one the same *akāra* is treated as different in different occasions. So in the words *kiriṇā*, *giriṇā* and the like, the multi syllabification (*anekāctvam*) will be explained by the vowel ‘i’ occurring twice in these words.

5.8. Nyāyās on Philosophy

5.8.1. ANVAYAVYETIREKANYĀYA

“the maxim of logical continuance and logical discontinuance”.

*‘ko’sāvanvayo vyetireko vā? yaḥ śabdo hīyate tasyāsāvartho yo hīyate, yaḥ śabda upajāyate tasyāsāvartho yo’rtha upajāyate, yaḥ śabdo ’nvayī tasyāsāvartho yo ’rtho ’nvayīti’*⁵⁹ /

Patañjali introduces this nyāya in the rule ‘*arthavadadhāturapratyayaḥ prātipadikam*’ P.1.2.45, to accomplish the *arthavatva* of *śabdā*-s like *vṛkṣa*. Kaiyata explains- *anvayaḥ anugamaḥ sati śabde arthāvagamaḥ, vyatirekaḥ śabdābhāve tadarthānavagamaḥ*.

If there is an effect, there is a cause. If there is no cause, there is no effect. Since the stem is always related to *pratyaya*, the stem alone can never be used. Because of the incapacity to denote anything by itself, the *arthavatvam* is not acceptable. This is the objection raised. It is achieved by *anvaya* and *vyatireka*-says Patañjali. On hearing the word *vrkṣa* it is understood that the stem *vrkṣa* ending in 'a' and also the *pratyaya* 's' and getting 'a' meaning that one having roots, branches, fruits and leaves and the idea of being one. When the word *vrkṣau* is read a portion of the original word 's' is dropped, a new word 'au' is added and the stem *vrkṣa* remains as it was- ending in 'a' is intact. A portion of the meaning is also dropped and something is newly brought in and a portion remains as it was, that is the idea of being one is discarded, the idea of being two is newly brought in and the idea of one having roots, branches, fruits and leaves remains same. From this it is clear that the part of the word which is dropped has for it the meaning which has been discarded, that the newly added part in the word has for it the meaning which is newly introduced and the part of the word which remains unchanged as for it the meaning which remains undamaged.

5.8.2. ĀTMĀ NYĀYA

“maxim of *antarātma* and *śarīrātma*”

*‘dvāvātmānau, antarātmā śarīrātmā ca / antarātmā tat karma karoti
yena śarīrātmā sukhadukhe anubhavati/ śarīrātmā tat karma karoti yena
antarātmā sukhadukhe anubhavati iti’⁶⁰/*

Bhāṣyakāra quotes the *ātmānyāya* while he interpreting the sūtra ‘*neraṇau yat karma ṇaucet sa kartānādhyāne*’ P.1.3.67. This sūtra means that *ātmanepada* appears in *nyantaprayoga*, if only the *karman* in the *anyantaprayoga* is the *karman* in the *nyantaprayoga*, if it becomes the *karṭṛ* in the *nyantaprayoga*, and sad memory is not denoted. Then the doubt arises that why the *ātmanepada ghātayate* not occurs in the example *hanti ātmānam, ghātayati ātmā* by this sūtra, because when *ātmā* is the *karṭṛ* in the *nyantaprayoga ghātayati*, and the *ātmānam* is the *karman* in the *anyantaprayoga hanti*. So Vārttikakāra introduces the *vārttika navānyante’nyasya karṭṛtvāt* and says that the *ātmnepada* need not be mentioned since the *kartāātmā* in the *nyantaprayoga* is one other than the *karman ātmā* in the *anyantaprayoga*. Whenever the *karman* in *anyantaprayoga* becomes the *kartā* in *nyantaprayoga*, there only occur *ātmanepada* in the *nyantaprayoga*.

For explaining this matter, Patañjali quotes the *ātmā nyāya*. There are two *ātmā*-s, *antarātmā*-the *ātmā* inside and the *śarīrātmā*- the physical body. *antarātmā* does any action, which produces pain, and pleasure to the

physical body and the physical body does that action which produces pain and pleasure to the *antarātmā*. Here the *karman* in the first sentence should be the *karṣṇ* in the later. But here both are different. The *karman* in the first sentence is *śarīrātmā* and the *karṣṇ* in the second sentence is *antarātmā*. Therefore, the *ātmanepada* does not occur in *hantiātmānam, ghātayatiātmā*. This nyāya is also found in the bhāṣya under the sūtra, ‘*karmavat karmanā tulyakrīyāḥ*’ P.3.1.87.

5.8.3. DAGDHAPAṬANYĀYA

“the maxim of the burnt cloth”

‘*kṛtsnasya dhātorlope guṇavṛddhiprasaṅgābhāvādanarthako niṣedhaḥ syāditi sāmartyāt dhātvekadeśalopo’tra dhātulopo’bhimataḥ / avayavakriyayā’pi samudāyasya vyapadeśadarśanāt / yathā paṭo dagdha iti*’⁶¹ /

Pradīpakāra uses this nyāya while he interpreting the sūtra ‘*na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke*’ P.1.1.4. It means that *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* in the place of ‘*ik*’ do not obtain when *ārdhadhātuka* affix conditioning deletion of part of the root follows. When the whole root is deleted, there is no chance to obtain *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. Then the sūtra ‘*na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke*’ is also meaning less. So here *dhātulopa* means

dhātvekadeśalopa i.e. deletion of root means deletion of a part of root. Here introduces the *dagdhapaṭanyāya* and says that sometimes a piece of cloth that is set on fire, is said that the whole cloth is burned, and at the same time, if the cloth is burned we use that the part of cloth is burned. Likewise, here also the word root (*dhātu*) means a part of a root (*dhātvekadeśa*).

5.8.4. PRAKṚTIVIKṚTINYĀYA

“the maxim of prakṛti and vikṛti”

*‘katham jñāyate dravyam hi nityam ākṛtiranityeti / evam hi drśyate
loke-mṛtkadācitākṛtyā piṇḍo bhavati / piṇḍākṛtimupamṛdya ghaṭikāḥ
kriyante / ghaṭikākṛtimupamṛdya kuṇḍikāḥ kriyante / ākṛtiranyā cānyā ca
bhavati / dravyam punastadeva / ākṛtyupamardena
dravyamevāvaśiṣyate’⁶²/*

In the vārttika *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* Bhāṣyakāra says that *dravya* is considered eternal and *ākṛti* is non-eternal by the *prakṛtivilkṛtinyāya*. It is seen in the world that earth is one shape becomes a clod, it is broken and it is converted in to small pots; by crushing the pots, small pitchers are made. So also, gold invested with a certain forms like a bar, by destroying the bar shape, rings are made, they are destroyed it is

made into bracelets, that shape is crushed and it is made into ear rings as bright as red hot charcoal of khadira wood. The shape changes from one to another but the substance remains the same. Though the shape is destroyed, the substance alone remains.

By this nyāya, Bhāṣyakāra indirectly denotes *pariṇāmavāda* of Sāṅkhya philosophy and the vivartavāda of Vedānta philosophy.⁶³

5.8.5. RATHĀṄGARATHANYĀYA

‘can’t go with a separate parts of a chariot, but can go with the assembly of its parts’.

*ime punarvarṇāḥ atyantamevānarthakāḥ yathā tarhi rathāṅgāni viḥrtāni pratyekam vṛajikriyām pratyasamarthāni bhavanti / tatsamudāyaśca rathaḥ samarthaḥ / evameṣām varṇānām samudāya arthavantah, avayavā anarthakā iti*⁶⁴/

The *rathāṅgarathanyāya* is explained in the interpretation of the sūtra ‘*arthavadadhāturapratyayaḥ prātipadikam*’ P.1.2.45. It is explained here a reply to a question that the letters have meaning or not. It is said that letters have meaning on account of the collection having meaning. For example, one thread is not capable to protect a man from cold, but woolen cloth made up by the collection of threads is capable to protect. Similarly,

one rice cannot remove hunger, but collection of rice can do it and the one grass-stem cannot bind, but the rope, collection of grass-stem, can do it. On the other hand, it is seen that the whole has meaning not connected with that of the parts, i.e. even a particular thread can protect a certain person from the cold, one rice can remove hunger of a particular person and one grass stem can bind certain things.

But, Bhāṣyakāra says, these letters have absolutely no meaning when they are in parts. Here he uses the *rathāṅgarathanyāya* and says that just as a chariot stripped into parts cannot go from place to place and when they assembled together can go, so also the collection of words have meaning and parts have no meaning.

5.8.6. VĪCĪTARAṅGANYĀYA/ KADĀMBAMUKULANYĀYA

‘the maxim of wave undulation or the maxim of the buds of the kadamba tree’

‘śrotrasambandhastu pradeśāntarotpannaśabdasyāpi vīcītarṅganyāyena kadambamukulanyāyena vā tatrāntare vyutpādita eva’⁶⁵ /

Uddyotakāra uses these nyāya-s during the discussion of definition of *śabda* in the sūtra ‘*a i u ṅ*’. The letter pronounced at other places, how could it contact with our ears? To answer this question, he uses the

vīcītarāṅganyāya and *kadambamukulanyāya*, and says that sound comes to the seat of hearing in the same manner as the undulation waves of water or as the anthers of a kadamba buds and thus apprehended by the ear. The *vīcītarāṅganyāya* is referred in the *Bhāṣāparicceda* like this;

‘*sarvaḥ śabdo nabhovṛttiḥ śrotrotpannastu gṛhyate /*

vīcītarāṅganyāyena tadutpattistu kīrtitā’⁶⁶ //

The maxim of the *kadamba* buds means that the bursting forth of the buds of the kadamba tree at one and the same time, they are said to burst forth simultaneously. This *nyāya* is also given as an illustration of the way in which sound is produced in our ears. *kadambakoraka nyāya* is used in the *Pariśiṣṭaparva* of Hemacandra also.⁶⁷

5.8.7. VṚKṢASTHĀVATĀNANYĀYA

“existence of wine on a tree while destroying the tree”

‘*dravyavināśe ākṛteravināśaḥ/ kutaḥ? anaikātmyāt / anekātmā ākṛterdravyasya ca / tadyathā-vṛkṣastho’vatānato vṛkṣe chinnepi na vinaśyati*’⁶⁸ /

Patañjali answers to the *vyaktivādin* by justifying the view of *jātivādin* in the rule ‘*sarūpāṅamekaśeṣa ekavibhaktau*’ P.1.2.64. It is not proper the

opinion that the *ākṛti* destructed in the destruction of *dravya*. The nature of *ākṛti* and *dravya* are entirely different. *ākṛti* is eternal one and found everywhere simultaneously. *dravya* is not so. Here Patañjali illustrates the *vrkṣasthāvatānanyāya*, and says that because of the different nature, the wine on a tree will not be destroyed, if that tree is either destroyed or cut and removed. Likewise in śāstra also due to the different nature *ākṛti* does not disappear when *dravya* is destroyed. The existence and origin of *guṇa* is under the control of *dravya*. So, when *dravya* destroyed, *guṇa* also destroyed.

REFERENCE

1. MS, III. 68, 74.
2. MB, Vol. VI, P. 8.3.82.
3. Ibid, Vol. IV, sū. 5.3.66.
4. Ibid, P. 4.3.66.
5. *dīrghasatranyāya*, MB, Vol. I, Paś.
6. *somaputīkatrṇanyāya*, Ibid, P. 1.1.56.
7. P. 4.1.93.
8. MS. XI.7.
9. *mahānirṣṭodakṣiṇādīyate*, MB, Vol. IV, P. 5.3.47.
10. *rṣisahasradakṣiṇānyāya*, MB, Vol. I, P. *a i u ṇ*.
11. *indrasatrurvardhasva*, Ibid, Paś.
12. *nasarvairliṅgairnacasarvābhiḥ vibhaktibhiḥ vedemantrāḥ nigaditāḥ*, Paś.
13. *saptadaśasāmidhenīnyāya*, MB, Vol. I, *a i u ṇ*.
14. *indropasthitinyāya*, MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.64
15. *ādityamupatiṣṭate*, *candramasamupatiṣṭate*, Ibid, Vol. V, P. 6.1.7.
16. MB, Vol. III, P. 3.3.7.
17. *ekāḥ śabdaḥ samyakjñātaḥ svargelokekāmadhugbhavati*, Paś.
18. *āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāya*, Paś.
19. *āvanāntātōdakāntātpriyampāntamanuvṛjet*, MB, Vol. II, P. 1.4.56.

20. *ākhyānanyāya*, MB, Vol. III, P. 3.1.26.
21. *sivabhāgavatanyāya*, Ibid, Vol. IV, P. 5.2.76.
22. *tapastāpasamsedavati*, Ibid, Vol. V, P. 6.1.49.
23. *bhikṣukabhikṣānyāya*, Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.1.1.
24. *daṇḍinyāya*, Ibid, Vol. VI, P. 8.2.83.
28. *triviṣṭabdhakaparivrācakanyāya*, MB, Vol. III, P. 3.2.124.
29. MB, Vol. V, P. 6.1.154.
30. *Nātyantāyaaḥjñānamśaraṇambhavitumarhati*, MB, Paś.
31. The five five-nailed animals are *śaśaka*(hare), *śalyaka*(porcupine), *godha*(iguana), *khadga*(rhinoceros) and *kūrma*(tortoise), Gautamadharmasūtra, 2.8.27.
32. MB, Vol.I, P. 1.1.39.
33. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.2.45.
34. Ibid, Vol. V, P. 6.3.46.
35. Ibid, Vol. IV, sū. 4.1.3.
36. Ibid, Vol.I, P.1.1.4.
37. Vedāntasāra, p. 55.
38. MB, Vol.I, *e o n̄ , ai au c.*
39. *sādyatvātavayavisandehāḥ*, Nyāyasūtra, 2.1.33.
40. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.10.
41. Ibid, Vol. III, P. 3.2.124.

42. Ibid, Vol.I, Paś.
43. Ibid, Vol.I, P.1.1.45.
44. Ibid, P. 1.1.56.
45. *nityohyartavatāmarthairabhisambandhaḥ.*
46. MB, Vol. I, Paś, p-60.
47. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.1, p-157.
48. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.2.24, p-453.
49. Ibid, Vol. I, Paś, p-84.
50. Padmapurāṇa sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, II -95.
51. MB, Vol. I, Udyota, Paś, p-10.
52. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.4.56, p-281.
53. Ibid, Vol. I, Paś, p-90.
54. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.56, p-445.
55. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.1.64, p-100.
56. Ibid, Vol. I, Paś, p-34.
57. Ibid, *a i u ṇ*, p-94.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.2.45, p-47.
60. Ibid, P. 1.3.67, p-183.
61. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.4, p-200.
62. Ibid, Vol. I, Paś, p-63.

63. According to Sāmkhya Philosophy, the pot is earth's *pariṇāma* and the ear rings are gold's *pariṇāma* and they are *vivarta* to Vedāntins.
64. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.45, p-201.
65. Ibid, Vol. I, Udyota, *a, i, u, ṅ*, p-54.
66. Bhāṣāpariccheda, *sloka*-165.
67. Pariśiṣṭaparva, 1.241, *pitṛā svapāṇipadmena sprsyamāṇo 'vanīpatiḥ , utkoraka kadambābho babhūva pulakāṅkuraiḥ .*
68. MB, Vol. II, P. 1.2.64, p-100.

Chapter - VI

EDUCATION

The main target of education in ancient India was to culture the mind of the people and to strengthen their intellectual and physical features. This helps to inspire them with a healthy attitude towards life. *Gurukula* system of education was existed in that period where the pupils were always under the control of the preceptor¹. Ultimate end of the education was to seek the highest knowledge. Mere study with the teacher was not enough, but perfection needed constant study. It was necessary for householders to acquire learning to enable them to win a position in society. Pupil running away from his teacher's place without completing his study was contempt as '*khaṭvārūḍha*'. The preceptor finally gave permission to enter the life of a householder after completing his education – *adhītya snātvā gurubhīranujñātena khaṭvāroḍhavyā*². This indicates that education was a necessity to equip oneself for faithfully living the life of a householder.

6.1. Method of study

Method of study during that period was learning by memory and there was a chance for discussion and interpretation of texts. Patañjali compares, the study without understanding its meaning is like a dry fuel

thrown in a place where there is no fire to ignite it³. Preceptor taught his pupils in a friendly way – *tadācāryaḥ suhṛt̥bhūtvācaṣṭe*⁴ and doubts are removed by the commentary or interpretation of him- *vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattiḥ na hi sandehādalakṣaṇam*⁵. The recital of each individual word (*pratipadapāṭha*) is not the right way of teaching because of the vast syllabus⁶, if imply the general and special rules a man could learn bigger and bigger collections of words by a small effort. It is obligatory to brāhmaṇa boy to study and teach the Vedas with its aṅgas – *brāhmṇena niṣkāraṇo dharmo ṣaḍaṅgo vedo'dhyeyo jñeyaśca*⁷. But the principal subject was grammar- *pradhāne ca ṣaḍsvaṅgeṣu vyākaraṇa*⁸. They should study grammar after their *upanayana*⁹. Pupils were slapped by the preceptor for wrong pronunciation- *ya udātte kartavyo'nudāttam karoti khaṇḍikopādyaṅyastasmin capeṭām dadāti*¹⁰.

6.2. Nature of a student

With a *kamaṇḍalu* in his hand, the student went to the householders for food and other necessities¹¹. An unstudied pupil who wandered from teacher to teacher like a crow is known as *tīrthakākaḥ* (fickle as a crow). *yo gurukulam gatyā na ciram tiṣṭati sa ucyate tīrthakāka iti*¹². The student studied at night by protecting the light from the wind and the light was produced by burning dried cow dung (*kārīṣa*)¹³. The students belonging to

same school were called *sabrahmacārin*. The pupil tried to please his teacher for his own welfare both in this world and life after, and with a thought, the guru will teach him very well ¹⁴. The *smṛti*-s also dictates to the student to give honor towards his teacher. *yājñavalkyasmṛti* ¹⁵ says, student serve or worship the teacher for the sake of learning and be attentive, but according to Manu ¹⁶, they should give honor to his preceptor both in his studentship and after. There is a reference to a student living in the village for the sake of his preceptor and his learning ¹⁷. Errors or willful default committing students were punished for the welfare of them and not to harsh them by the teacher- *sāmṛterpāṇibhirghnanti guravo na viṣokṣitaiḥ* ¹⁸.

Based on the above study of educational life in that period, it may be suggested that they planned the education on the ancient model, which laid importance on proper understanding and interpretation.

6.3. Nyāya-s on Education

6.3.1. DŪRĀT KUPITĀD GUROḤ NYĀYA

‘one should stay far away from an angry teacher’.

‘*na vā tatrāpi darśanādpratiṣedhaḥ / na vā tatrāpi darśanāt pañcamyāḥ pratiṣedho ’narthakaḥ / tatrāpi pañcamī dṛśyate-*

“dūrādāvasathānmūtram dūrāt pādāvasecanam /

dūrācca bhāvyam dasyubhyoḥ dūrāt kupitād guroḥ”¹⁹ //

While Bhāṣyakāra refutes the vārttika *dūrāntikārthebhyaha pañcamīvidhāne tadyuktāt pañcamīpratiṣedhaḥ* in the rule ‘*dūrāntikārthebhyo dvitīyā ca*’ P.2.3.35, he mentions this nyāya. By the rule ‘*dūrāntikārthaiḥ ṣaṣṭhyanyatarasyām*’ P.2.3.34, the words *dūra*, *antika* etc. govern the genitive or ablative ending. According to the sūtra *dūrāntikārthebhyo dvitīyā ca* the words *dūra*, *antika* etc may be used in the accusative, instrumental or ablative. The example of ablative is *dūrāt grāmāt*. Here both words are used with the same case ending, the sense “from a far village” become possible. If we want to convey the sense “far from the village”, we must say *dūrāt grāmasya* only. So there is a prohibition should be stated at the fifth case ending. But this prohibition is redundant because the fifth case ending is used in such instances also. For example, in the verse;

‘ dūrādāvasathānmūtram dūrāt pādāvasecanam /

dūrācca bhāvyam dasyubhyoḥ dūrāt kupitād guroḥ ’//

One should urinate far from a dwelling place; one should wash his feet far from a dwelling place. One should stay far away from outcasts and

one should stay far away from an angry teacher. So the vārttika rejects because usage clearly shows that the ablative ending is used in such cases also.

6.3.2. KAMAṄḌALUPĀṆI CHĀTRA NYĀYA

“A student with a water bowl in his hand”

*‘na hyavaśyam tadeva lakṣaṇam bhavati yena punaḥ punarlakṣyate/
kim tarhi? yat sakṛdapi nimittatvāya kalpate tadapi lakṣaṇam bhavati / tad
yathā-api bhavān kamaṅḍalupāṇim chātramadrākṣīditi / sakṛdasau
kamaṅḍalupāṇiśchātro dr̥ṣṭastasya tadeva lakṣaṇam bhavati’²⁰ /*

Patañjali introduces the maxim during the interpretation of the rule *anurlakṣaṇe* P1.4.84. The rule *anurlakṣaṇe* has to change as *anurhetau* by using the word *hetu* instead of the word *lakṣaṇā*, - says Vārttikakāra. By opposing this view, Patañjali says that, there is no need to change the rule since there get the meaning of *hetu* by the word *lakṣaṇā*. Once marked by a cause, which is not repeated again, become a mark of identity. If a person asking do you see a student with a *kamaṅḍalu* in his hand, it means that once he may be seen a student with *kamaṅḍalu* in his hand. Here the *kamaṅḍalu* is the mark of that student, since once only the *kamaṅḍalu* is with him in his hand. As such in śāstra, it is rained after the recitation of

saṃhitā of Śākalya, which became a mark of rain, because it is rained after the chanting of the *saṃhitā* of Śākalya. How the *saṃhitāpāṭha* became the cause of rain same as it became the mark of that. Therefore, there is no need to change the sūtra as *anurhetau* since the cause and mark are getting by the word *lakṣaṇa*.

6.3.3. KHAṬVĀRŪḌHO JALMAḤ NYĀYA

“A person who enter the nuptial bed without complete his Vedic study.”

‘kṣepa ityucyate, kaḥ kṣepo nāma? adhītya snātva gurubhiranujñātena khaṭvāroḍhavyā/ ya idānīmato ’nyathā karoti sa ucyate khaṭvārūḍho ’yam jālmaḥ/ nātivratavāniti’²¹ /

In order to illustrate the meaning of the word ‘*kṣepe*’ in the rule *khaṭvā kṣepe* P.2.1.25, Bhāṣyakāra mentions the *khaṭvārūḍho jālmaḥ nyāya*. When a student has completed his Vedic studies, he is fit to enter the stage of householder, for that he has taken his ceremonial bath, with the permission of his teachers, he mount the nuptial bed. If a student entered in to the nuptial bed, without completed his Vedic studies, and without the permission of his teachers, he is called *khaṭvārūḍhaḥ*. *khaṭvārūḍhaḥ* may characterize a person who has gone on the wrong path and it implies the

sense of bad behavior. So the compound *dvitīyatatpuruṣa*, *khaṭvārūḍhaḥ* conveys the sense of contempt, but the phrase *khaṭvām ārūḍhaḥ* does not convey the sense of contempt.

6.3.4. SĀMṚTAIḤ PĀNIBHIRGHNANTI NYĀYA

“children are beaten by their parents with a good hand”

‘na hyanasūyan kutsayati, na cā’pyakupito bhartsayate/ nanu ca bho akupitā api drśyante dārakān bhartsayamānāḥ/ antataste tām śarīrākṛtim kurvanti yā kupitasya bhavati/’

‘sāmṛtaiḥ pānibhirghnanti guravo na viśokṣitaiḥ /

lālanāśrayiṇo doṣāstādanāśrayiṇo guṇāḥ’²² //

The Mahābhāṣya mentions this nyāya in connection with the rule *vākyāderāmantritasyā’sūyāsammatikopakutsanabhartsaneṣu*. P.8.1.8.

Without envy, someone can’t blame another. Without anger, there is no threatening. So, the words *asūya* (envy), *kutsana* (blame) have same meaning and the *kopa* (anger), *bhartsana* (threat) have also same meaning. Hence in this sūtra there need only two words *asūya* and *kopa* and not four words. Here Patañjali removes this doubt by taking this nyāya. Threatening to the children by the parents is not with the anger, but keeping love in mind. So, it cannot say that all threatening are happened by anger.

But at the same time the sign of anger can be seen in the body. Here Patañjali says that the anger cannot be measured by seeing the sign of body because, we can see the sign of anger in the body of parents when they threaten their children, but actually they are not angered. As such in the case of blame, this is not due to envy. They are only imitating anger and envy for the sake of their children. The parents are well aware of that deep fondling may mislead the children and to keep faraway the demerits, saying good words. So, the words *asūya* and *kutsana* have different meaning and the *kopa* and *bhartsana* have also different meaning. Hence these four words are needed in the sūtra *vākyāderāmantritasyā'sūyāsammati-kopakutsanabhartsaneṣu*.

6.3.5. TĪRTHAKĀKANYĀYA

“crows are not stay for long time in sacred places”

'kṣepa ityucyate, ka iha kṣepo nāma? yathā tīrthe kāka na ciram sthātāro bhavanti, evam yo gurukulāni gatvā na ciram tiṣṭati sa ucyate tīrthakāka iti ²³/

In the example *tīrthakāka*, the relation of substratum and superstratum is not possible to express contempt. So, Patañjali explains how this compound *tīrthakāka* conveys a sense of contempt in the bhāṣya of sūtra

‘*dhvāṅkṣeṇa kṣepe*’ P.2.1.42. Just as a sacred place crows are not stationary for a long time, in the same way a student who visits teaching institutions one after the other, but does not stay at one place for a long time is called *tīrthakāka*- a student guided by whims.

Here the crow became a contempt bird because of its presence in the sacred place is only for taking food. Nothing is sacred behind this. Likewise, a selfish and lazy student, who is desirous to study without effort is contempt in *gurukula*. The sense of contempt from the compound *tīrthakāka* through the *upamānopameyabhāva*-relation of standard of comparison and this to be compared between the crow and the student, which is based on unsteadiness of objects.

REFERENCE

1. *gurunā śiṣyavat chātraḥ śiṣyeṇa ca guruścchātravat paripālayaḥ*, MB, Vol. V, P. 6.2.62.
2. MB, Vol. II, P. 2.1.16.
3. *yadadhītamavijñātam nigadenaiva śabdyate / anagnāviva śuṣkaidho na tadjvalati karhicit*, MB, Paś.
4. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.4.32.
5. Ibid, Paś.
6. *bṛhaspatirindrāya divyam varṣasahasram pratipadoktānām śabdānām śabdapārāyaṇam provāca nāntam jagāma*, Ibid, Paś.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. *purā kalpa etadāsīt- samskārottarakālam brāhmaṇa vyākaraṇam smādhīyate*, Ibid.
10. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.1.
11. *kamaṇḍalupāṇiśchātramadrākṣīt*, MB, P. 1.4.84., *yājyakuḷāni gatvā agrāsanādi labhate*, MB, P. 1.1.55.
12. MB, P.2.1.42.
13. *imakābhām chātrābhyaṃ rātriradhīta atho ābhyaṃ aharapi adhītam*, Ibid, P.2.4.32. , *tathā kāriṣoggnirnivāta ekānte supra-jvalito 'dhyayanam prayojayati*, Ibid, P. 3.1.26.

14. *ye tāvadete guruśuśrūṣayo nāma te'pi svabhūtyartham eva pravartante pāralaukikam ca no bhaviṣyati iha ca na prīto gururadhyāpayiṣyati ca*, MB, P.3.1.26.
15. Yājñavalkyasmṛti, 3.26.
16. MS, 1.71, 72.
17. *grāme gurunimittam vasāmaḥ, adhyenanimittam vasāmaḥ*, MB, P.1.1.57.
18. *sāmṛtaiḥ pāṇibhirghnanti nyāya*, Ibid, P. 8.1.8.
19. MB, Vol. II, P. 2.3.35, p-508.
20. Ibid, P. 1.4.84, p-294.
21. Ibid, P. 2.1.25, p-371.
22. Ibid, Vol. VI, P. 8.1.8, p-28.
23. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.1.42, p-383.

Chapter - VII

NATURAL OBSERVATIONS

Great Mountainous ranges, huge forests, rich flora and fauna diversify the land of India, which have lent its social and economic life additional wealth and beauty.

7.1. Flora

The study of flora furnishes an important role in the history of Indian plants. Flora has provided the people with fruits and roots as food and medicine and sprouts and flowers as means of ornamentation. Patañjali speaks of a tree as consisting of roots, trunk, fruits and leaves ¹. The important fruit-bearing tree is mango tree and it has also an important role in the *pitṛtarpaṇa*. As a part of this ceremony, water was poured under the mango tree, for satisfying forefathers. *bilva* is a wood-apple tree and the sacrificial post (*yūpa*) should be made of the wood of the *bilva* or *khadira* tree. *Khadira* and *barbura* are a kind of palm of white trunk and small leaves- *khadirabarburau gaurakāṇḍau sūkṣmaparṇau* ². In addition to this *khadira* has hard bark (*kaṇḍakavān*). There is a reference about the usage of charcoal of *khadira* wood ³. *tāla* tree and *vamśa* are also mentioned ⁴. *darbha*, *kuśa*, *pūtika* are a kind of grasses which are used in the sacrifices.

pūtika grass was substituted to *soma* in the soma sacrifices. A sweet scented flower *śephālika* used to a cloth dried with its colour called *śaiphālika*⁵. There is also a reference of a famous herb *brahmi*⁶.

7.2. Fauna

Through the evaluation of maxims, there can be seen references of large number of animals, reptiles, birds and insects and a keen observation to the nature and behavior of the animals. Mongoose does not stay on hot place for a long time and enmity between the snake and mongoose also referred. There is a reference regarding the fostering of animals like, sheep, pig, cow, bull, horse and ass. A mark being branded on the ear or on the rump of the cow⁸. The branding of the cows was known from the Vedic period onwards. The *Atharvaveda* refers to it as *lakṣma* and mentions the *mithuna* mark. Horses and bulls were used in chariot and carts respectively⁹. There is a reference of wild ox (*gavaya*)¹⁰, porcupine¹¹, deer¹², and dog¹³. A lion's evaluation of his way that he came, after proceeding is a natural habit of lion¹⁴. Jump of a frog¹⁵, moving of a snake, and lizard¹⁶, scorpion¹⁷, quick fly of a *śakuni* bird¹⁸, flying style of pigeon¹⁹, birds like crow, crane, goose, cock and peacock etc. also referred²⁰.

7.3. Nyāya-s on Nature

7.3.1. ABHRACANDRANYĀYA

“the maxim of moon in the cloud”.

*‘svabhāvataḥ eteṣām śabdānām eteṣvartheṣvabhiniviṣṭānām
nimittatvenānvākhyānam kriyate / tad yathā-kūpe hastadakṣiṇaḥ panthāḥ
/ abhre candramasam paśyati / svabhāvatastatrasthasya
pathaścandramasaśca nimittatvenānvākhyānam kriyate / evam ihāpi cārthe
yaḥ saḥ dvandvasamāso ’nyapadārthe yaḥ saḥ bahuvrīhiriti’²¹/*

While refuting the sūtra *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ* P.2.1.1, Mahābhāṣyakāra raises the question whether denotation of word meaning by compound word is natural or rather taught by grammarians. It is a natural thing, because there is no teaching of meaning. If so, from the denotation of word meanings of *anyapadārtha*, *cārtha*, *apatya*, *rakta*, *nirvṛtta* etc. through the rules ‘*anekamanyapadārthe*’ P.2.2.24, ‘*cārthe dvandvaḥ*’ P.2.2.29, ‘*tasyāpatyam*’ P.4.1.92, ‘*tena raktam rāgāt*’ P.4.2.1, ‘*tena nirvṛttam*’ P.4.2.68 respectively formulate the compounds like *bahuvrīhi*, *dvandva* etc, we may say that Pāṇini teach us meanings. The meanings denoted here represent the condition for applying designations like, *bahuvrīhi*, *dvandva* or for *taddhita* suffixes like ‘*aṅ*’. If fact,

explanation given through the way of guidance or condition to the words which is naturally endowed with these meanings. For more clarification, Patañjali describes the *abhraçandra nyāya*. The statements, *kūpe hastadakṣiṇaḥ panthāḥ* -the path is on the right hand side of the well, *abhre candramasaṃ paśya*- look at the moon in the cloud, do not confer a new position up on the path or the moon, but their existing location is explained with the help of distinctive signs, well and cloud. Similarly, the sense conjunction is mentioned in *carthe dvandvaḥ* as a sign or condition for the application of the designation *dvandva*, and denotes the meaning of another word not included in the compound is called *bahuvrīhi*.

7.3.2. ĀDITYADARŚANANYĀYA

‘the maxim of seeing of Sun’

‘*na hi eko devadatto yugapat sruḡhne ca bhavati / mathurāyām ca /
naiko draṣṭa ādityamanekādhikaraṇastam yugapat
deśaprthaktveṣūpalabhate / akāram punarupalabhate*’²² /

Bhāṣyakāra refutes the *ekatva* of *akāra* by the ‘*ādityadarśananyāya*’, the sounds are taken to be like the Sun. The one and the same Sun can be seen in different places in same time. So the one and the same *akāra* can be seen in different words in different places.

But Bhāṣyakāra object this view and says, the same person does not see the Sun in different places at the same time, but the *akāra* seen simultaneously at different places. So to state the *ekatva* of *akāra*, the *ādityanyāya* is not apt here.

7.3.3. AVATAPTE NAKULASTHITAM NYĀYA

“mangoose’s stay on hot ground”

‘kṣepa ityucyate / ka iha kṣepo nāma? yathāvatapte nakulā na ciram sthātāro bhavanti, evam kāryāṅyārabhya yo na ciram tiṣṭati sa ucyate avatapte nakulasthitam ta etaditi ’²³/

Patañjali explains how the example *avatapte nakulasthitam* in the sūtra ‘*kṣepe*’ P.2.1.46, conveys a sense of contempt. Just as a mangoose does not stay on hot place for a long time, in the same way a person taken up projects does not stick on for a long time, we use the term ‘*avatapte nakulasthitah*’ and his conduct is like a mangoose standing on hot ground that is contempt.

7.3.4. GOSAKTHIKARṆAGRAHAṆOPADEŚANYĀYA

“tell about the cow by touching its thigh or ear” .

‘athavā’sthāne’yam yatnaḥ kriyate / na hidam lokād bhidyate /
 yadīdam lokād bhidyate tato yatnārham syāt / tadyathā- agojñāya kaścid
 gām sakthani karṇe vā grhītvopadiśati ayam gauriti / na cāsmāi ācaṣṭe
 iyamasya samjñeti / bhavati cāsya sampratyayaḥ’²⁴ /

samjñādhikāra is for clear conception of *samjñā*. So there should be a sūtra *atha samjñā* before *vṛddhi*, *guṇa* etc., so that there may be clear conception that the words like *vṛddhi* are *samjñā*-s—says Bhāṣyakāra in the rule ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’ P.1.1.1. But this attempt is inopportune, for this is not different from what is met in the world. If this is different from what happened in the world, then it deserves to be specially treated. For example, one takes hold of a cow by its thigh or ear tells another ignorant of it “this is a cow”, but he never tells him that it is her *samjñā*. Correct impression is formed in the mind of the hearer. Likewise, in śāstra, to understand *vṛddhi*, there is a need of *ā*, *ai*, *au* only. *ākāra* can be shown in *mārṣṭiḥ*, when the rule *mṛjervṛddhi* is mentioned. Here he understood that the name of *ākāra* is *vṛddhi*. In this circumstance, there is no need to say ‘the name of *ākāra* is *vṛddhi*, he understood the *vṛddhi*, when saw the letter ‘*ā*’.

7.3.5. HASTIMAŚAKASANNIKARṢANYĀYA

“the proximity of elephant and mosquito is same”

‘*paraḥ sannikarṣaḥ samhitā cet drutāyāmasamhitam/ tulyaḥ sannikarṣaḥ / tulyaḥ sannikarṣo varṇānām, drutamadhyamavilambitāsu vṛttiṣu / kimkṛtastarhi viśeṣaḥ ? varṇakālabhūyastvam tu / varṇānām tu kālabhūyastvam / tad yathā-hastimaśakayostulyaḥ sannikarṣaḥ*’²⁵/

hastimaśakasannikarṣanyāya is introduced in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*paraḥ sannikarṣaḥ samhitā*’ P.1.4.108. If the closest proximity of letters is *samhitā*, there will be *samhitā* in *drutāvṛtti* only, not in *madhyamā* and *vilambitā*. Due to the continuous utterance, the proximity is equal in three *vṛtti*-s. Utterance of letter in *drutāvṛtti* is short time, in *madhyamā* it takes more time than *drutāvṛtti* and in *vilambitā* it increases. *prākṛtadhvani* and *vaikṛtadhvani* are two types of *dhvani*. *vṛtti*-s are the divisions of *vaikṛtadhvani*. So, due to the difference of *vṛtti*-s, there have difference in *kāla* in letters. But the proximity is same. Here Patañjali quotes this *hastimaśakasannikarṣa nyāya* and says that, in the world the proximity between two elephants and the proximity between two mosquitos are same. Being a big animal, the place required for the proximity of elephant is large. At the same time the mosquito need only a small place. But their proximity is same, space is different. If there is a difference in *kāla* due to the difference in *vṛtti*-s, there will have *samhitāsamjñā* to letters in all *vṛtti*-s because of the same proximity.

7.3.5. KĀKATĀLĪYANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the corw and the Palm fruit’.

*‘katham punarnityānām śabdānāmandhakādivamśasmāśrayaṇe-
nānvākhyānam yujyate? kecidāhuḥ -kathamapi kākātālīyanyāyena
kurvādivamśeṣvasamkareṇaiva nakulasahadevādayaḥ śabdāssubahavaḥ
samkalitāḥ, tānupādāya pānininā smṛtirupanibaddheti’²⁶ /*

While explaining the meaning of the sūtra ‘*ṛṣyandhakavr̥ṣṇīkurubhyaśca*’ P.4.1.114, Kāśīkākāra quoted this nyāya. It is a very famous nyāya. The direct meaning of this is as follows. At the moment a crow alighted on a Palm tree, a fruit fell from the tree. Accidently these two incidents happened simultaneously. It was not necessary that the fruit should fall at the same moment when the crow sat on the tree. The crow did not come to the tree, with the intention of eating the fruit. But it so happened that when the crow come to the tree, the tāla fruit happened to fall down and the crow got the opportunity of eating the tāla fruit unexpectedly. But it happened that way accidently. The maxim is therefore used to illustrate a startling and pure co-incidental happening.

kākātālīyanyāya is cited to illustrate how a rule affecting a permanent object is conditioned by an impermanent adjunct. An

impermanent object sometimes designates a permanent object. The words or *śabda*-s such as Nakula and Sahadeva are eternal according to Vyākaraṇaśāstra. Whereas the families or *vamśa*. Such as Andhaka, Vṛṣṇi and Kura to which they belong are non-eternal. To explain this Kāśikākāra suggests that there are two mere co-incidences that is not as cause and effect.

Bhartṛhari writes about *kākatālīya* as follows;

‘caitrasya tatrāgamanam kākaśyāgamanam yathā

dasyorabhinipātastu tālasya patanam tathā /

kriyāyām samavetāyām dravya śabdo ’vatiṣṭhate

pātāgamanayoḥ kākatālaśabdau tathā sthitau’²⁷ //

In Hitoipadeśa;

‘kākatālīyavatprāptam dṛṣṭvāpi nidhimagrataḥ

na svyam daivamādatte puruṣārthamapekṣate’²⁸/

In sense *ajākrpāṇīyam* is similar to *kākatālīya nyāya* and Padamañjarīkāra establishes this through the sūtra ‘*samāsācca tadviṣayāt*’ P.5.3.106. It is the maxim of the she-goat and the sword. It is founded on some story of a goat is being suddenly killed by accidental contact with a

sword, and is used to illustrate any surprising event happening altogether by chance. It, therefore, belongs to the same class as *kākatālīya*, *khalvāṭabilvīya* and others of a similar kind.

It is interesting to note that the Marāṭhi-speaking folk of Western India have adopted the maxim, but with a changed meaning. Molesworth defines it as, ‘the maxim of the sword upon the neck of the goat. Expressive of meekness and absolute helplessness’.

7.3.6. KHADIRABARBURANYĀYA

“the maxim of plant of khadira and barbura”

‘*athavā yattāvadayam sāmānyenopadeṣṭum śaknoti tattāvadupadiśati-prakṛtim, tato valādyārdhadhātukam, tataḥ paścādikāram, tenāyam viśeṣeṇa śabdāntaram samudāyam pratipadyate/ tadyathā-khadirabarburo gaurakāṇḍau sūksmaparṇau / tataḥ paścādāḥ - kaṇḍakavān khadira iti*’²⁹/

According to *vyākraṇasāstra*, the sound is eternal. They should neither move nor change, i.e. they should not be elided, augmented or replaced. By the sūtra ‘*ādyantau takitau*’ P.1.1.46, the *tit* and *kit* are *ādyanta*. Placement of the augments marked with *takāra* and *kakāra* is restricted by this rule. So they are *agama*-s. *āgama* is a new letter that is

inserted as an augment. If so, there is a doubt, whether the *śabda* will become *anitya*. To clear this doubt, Bhāṣyakāra denotes the *khadirabarburanyāya*. When we see three kids, we say that those kids who are wearing black pants are Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Govinda. Then we say again to denote a kid especially among the three that, the kid who wear white shirt is Rāma. Likewise, in śāstra, the *prakṛti* is generally formulated and after that the *pratyaya*-s are specially formulated. It is first generally said that *khadira* and *barbura* have pale-red branches and tiny leaves. It is then specially said that *khadira* is covered with thrones. From this characteristic *khadira* assumes a different form in the mind of the hearer. Same as, in *bhavitavya* generally reads the stem *tavya* and then specially reads the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, which commences in *val*, by the sūtra *ārdhadhātukasya iḍvalādeḥ* and then he reads *ikāra*. Then we assume the different form *bhavitavya* instead of *bhūtavya*. The changes occurred in the mind is called *agama*. The stem and suffixes are used to understand the sound easily. The word alone is considered as *nitya* and the idea of the stem and the suffix is only the assumption of the grammarian.

7.3.7. MAṆḌŪKAPLUTINYĀYA

‘the maxim of the frog moving by jumps’

*'athavā maṇḍūkagatayo`dhikārāḥ / yathā maṇḍūkā utplutyotplutya
gacchanti tadvadadhikārāḥ'*³⁰ /

In the sūtra *'iko guṇavṛddhi'*, the mention of *guṇavṛddhi* is not needed. Then how the *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* replace *'ik'*, if the expression *guṇavṛddhi* is not read here. From the sūtrā-s *'vṛddhirādaic'* and *'adenṅuṇaḥ'*, the expression *guṇavṛddhi* is applied here. Here, Pūrvapakṣin says that, if *vṛddhi* follows from the first sūtra, the second sūtra will have to be read as *adenṅuṇo vṛddhiśca* and as a result, the term *vṛddhi* will also be taken as prescribed for the vowels, *a*, *e* and *o* too. To clear this doubt Bhāṣyakāra uses the *maṇḍūkaplutinyāya*. The mere connection of the words *vṛddhi* and *ādaic* from the first sūtra to the second one, the sūtra-s will be taken to be read as *vṛddhirādaic*, *adenṅuṇaḥ vṛddhirādaic*, *iko guṇavṛddhi*. In the rule *'iko guṇavṛddhi'* the words *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* will continue from the previous rule, while the words *aden'* and *ādaic* will stop in the second rule. Or the words which are put in a rule as *adhikāra* or governing words which are meant to continue all the rules in the topic, go jumping on like frogs. The jump of a frog shows pouncing upon the desired object only, leaving aside all the other things on the way.

7.3.8. PAÑJARASTHASIMHANYĀYA

“maxim of a lion in a cage”.

‘yathā pañjarastham simhamanubhavataḥ simhapratītiḥ, pañjare, tatra hyantarvartyeva simhaḥ simhaśasbdavācya iti jānto’pi balāt pañjaramapi pratiyate tadvadihāpi vyaktigatāmeva jātimanubhavato jātirutpadyamānā balād vyakrimapi gocarayati’³¹ /

Haradatta illustrates this nyāya to state the meaning denoted by *śabda* is both *jāti* (genus) and *vyakti* (person). When we see a lion in a cage, we get the knowledge of the lion and the cage simultaneously. To see a lion in a cage, it should be seen the cage also, cannot see the lion alone. As such in Vyākaraṇaśāstra, to know the *jāti* in *vyakti*, there should be the knowledge of *vyakti* with *jāti*. Therefore, Haradatta refutes the opinion of the Pūrvapakṣin, that the knowledge of *vyakti* will not be the meaning denoted by *śabda*.

7.3.9. REKHĀGAVAYANYĀYA

“the maxim of the outline of a wild ox’s image”.

‘nityaśabdavāde tu prayogadr̥ṣṭānāmeva śāstra kālpanika-vidheyatveneṣṭapratyayavibhāgasiddhiḥ / rekhāgavayanyāyasyādyantāviti sūtre bhāṣya eva vakṣyamāṇatvāt’³²/

Udyotakāra Nāgeśa mentions this nyāya under the rule *na veti vibhāṣā* P.1.1.44, while he interpreting the vārttika, *yasyāpi kāryaḥ*

śabdāstathāpi gālavagrahaṇam pūjārtham. To know about a wild ox, an illiterate villager went to a forest and enquired of an inhabitant of that forest about the wild ox, which that he never saw before. The forester drew an outline on the ground to show the villager what kind of animal a wild ox was. The picture is not an exact one of the wild ox, but the villager gets the idea of that animal. As such, Vyākaraṇaśāstra functions by imposing *arthavatva* to *prakṛti* and *pratyaya* through *anvaya* and *vyetirekha*. To enumerate the eternal words, Grammarians assume the *prakṛti* and *pratyaya*. Then they give separate meanings to them. But there is not occurred any change to the eternity of śabda.

Bhartrhari says;

‘upāyāḥ śikṣamāṇānāṃ bālānāmupalālanāḥ /

asatyē vartmani sthitvā tataḥ satyam samīhate³³ /

7.3.10. ŚAKUNINYĀYA

‘the maxim of the simile of the quickly flying birds’

*‘yadi punarime varṇāḥ śakunivat syuḥ / tadhyathā-śakunayah
āśugāmitvāt purastādutpatitāḥ paścāt drśyante / evamayamakāropi ‘da’
‘ityatra dr̥ṣto ‘ṇḍa’ ityatra dr̥śyate³⁴ /*

‘*śakuninyāya*’ is used in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*a i u ṅ*’. Bhāṣyakāra says, the sound ‘*a*’ is like the birds. The birds are flying up in our front and immediately they are also seen behind us although they are the same, because they fly very quickly. Similarly, the letter ‘*a*’, which has been noticed in ‘*da*’ may be noticed immediately in ‘*ṅda*’ in the word ‘*daṅḍa*’.

But Patañjali says, it will not happened, if it happen the words will become *anitya*. But words are *nitya*, then the word must be invariable, indestructible and devoid of decrease and increase. If the ‘*a*’ which is seen after ‘*d*’ is afterwards seen after ‘*ṅd*’, it cannot be called invariable. Here Bhāṣyakāra emphasised the *ekatva* of *akāra* through the *śakuninyāya*.

7.3.11. ŚALYAKANYĀYA

‘the maxim of the simile of porcupine’s quills’.

‘*ekoyamakāro yaścākṣarasamāmnāye yaścānuvṛttau yaśca dhātvādisthaḥ / anubandhasankarastu prāpnoti / viṣayeṇa tu nānāliṅgakarāṇāt siddham / yadayam praviṣayam nānāliṅgamakāram karoti-karmanyāṇ, āto’nupasarge ka iti, tena jñāyate nānubandhasaṅkaro’sṭīti / yadi hi syat nānāliṅgakaranamanarthakam syāt/ ekamevāyam sarvagūṇamucchārayet / naitatasti jñāpakam /*

*itsamñjāprakṛtyarthametatsyāt / na hi anubandhaiḥ śalyakavacchakya
upacetum*³⁵ /

Is *akāra* one or many, is the question raised in the course of discussion of the sūtra ‘*a i u ṇ*’. If accepting the *ekatva* of *akāra*, *akāra* is one whether it is in *a i u ṇ* or *asya cvau* etc. or in *dhātu* etc. Then there will arise confusion in the effect of the different *anubandha*-s. Since Ācārya makes different indicators in each place like ‘*ṇ*’ in ‘*karmaṇyaṇ*’ P.3.2.1, ‘*k*’ in ‘*āto nupasarge kaḥ*’ P.3.2.3, it is learnt that there is no confusion in the effect of *anubandha*-s. If there was to arise any confusion, the reading of different indications will be of no avail, he would have read only one *akāra* with all *anubandha*-s.

Bhāṣyakāra uses the ‘*śalyakavatnyāya*’ and says that the above indication cannot suitably be given. The application of different *anubandha*-s on different occasions is presumably for giving them the designation ‘*it*’. It is not possible to apply at one time several *anubandha*-s to one single ‘*a*’, just as many quills are attached to one porcupine. Besides, in such a case there will be difficulty in getting the designation ‘*it*’, all being put together, the designation of ‘*it*’ is possible only for two, the initial and the final sounds. Therefore, it cannot be said that the *akāra* with

anubandha-s is one. Infact, the *anubandha*-s in *akāra* is for the designation ‘it’.

7.3.12. SARPADARŚANANYĀYA

“the maxim of seeing a snake”

*‘na hi svajñānaprabhṛtiparajñānaparyantamekaḥ kṣano’sti /
samūharūpatve tvavayavāntarāvacchetena svānubhūtām vartamāna-
tāmavayavāntarāvacchedena bodayitum tadutpatteḥ / bilādbilam praviśati
sarpe kimcidavayavāvacchedena sarpamanubhavatovayavāntarāvacche-
dena tam darśayitum sarpam paśyeti prayogavat’³⁶//*

Udyotakāra uses this nyāya in the bhyaṣya of the sūtra ‘*bhuvādayo dhātavaḥ*’ P.1.3.1. Seeing a portion of snake, which is moving from one burrow to another, a man, says “look at that snake”, even if he didn’t see the snake completely. Due to the movement of the snake from one hole to another, it is difficult to see the snake fully. We say that we saw snake, even though seeing a portion. Likewise, the *kriya pacati* (action of cooking) is an output of several actions i.e. putting the pot on the fire, pouring water in the pot, putting the rice in the pot, supplying fuel, etc., which are interlinked. When we see a part of these actions of cooking, we infer that it is an action of cooking.

7.3.13. SIMHĀVALOKANANYĀYA

“the maxim of lion’s glance”

*vakṣyamāṇam śākalyagrahaṇamihopatiṣṭate simhāvalokitanyāyena,
sā ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā, tena maṇivādīnām pratiṣedho bhaviṣyati*³⁷/

Nyāsakāra introduced the *simhāvalokananyāya* during the interpretation of the sūtra *īdūdedvivacanam pragṛhyam* P.1.1.11. By the *simhāvalokananyāya*, the word *śākalya* in the sūtra *sambuddhau śākalyasyetāvanārṣe* P.1.1.18, look behind to the sūtra *īdūdedvivacanam pragṛhyam*. How a lion evaluates his way that he came, after proceeding, likewise the *anuvṛtti* of the word *śākalya* is only to the 11th sūtra *īdūdedvivacanam pragṛhyam*. Actually the mentioning of the word *śākalya* is *vyavasthitavibhāṣa*. This sort of *vibhāṣa* restricts the application of optional rules in examples. Therefore, in the example *maṇī + iva*, the long vowel ‘i’ is followed by an *ac*, it becomes *maṇīva*. The long vowel is followed by an *ac*, there comes *savarṇadīrgha* by the rule *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* and the word *maṇīva* is formed. If comes the *pragṛhyasamjñā* the word becomes *maṇī iva* due to the *prakṛtibhāva* by the rule *īdūdedvivacanam pragṛhyam*.

Kālidāsa beautified this nyāya by making it a verse,

“śāśamsa tulyasatvānām sainyaḥṣe’pyasambhramam /

guhāśayānām simhānām parivr̥tyāvalokitam”³⁸ //

7.3.14. VṚKṢAPRACALANANYĀYA

‘the illustration of the shaking of a tree’

‘idam vicāryate / ya ete varṇeṣu varṇaikadeśā
varṇāntarasamānākṛtaya eteṣāmayavagrahaṇena grahaṇam syādvā na
veti / kutaḥ punariyam vicāraṇā? iha samudāyā apyupadiśyante avayavā
api / abhyantaraśca samudāye avayavaḥ / tadyathā – vṛkṣaḥ pracalan
sahāvayavaiḥ pracalati”³⁹ /

‘vṛkṣapracalananyāya’ is used in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘e o ŋ, ai au c’. The diphthongs *e*, *o*, *ai*, *au* are a result of the combination of the sounds ‘a’, ‘i’, ‘u’. Here arise the doubt that whether in the compound letters, their parts that resemble other letters operate like the latter or not. On the other hand, they should not be looked upon as separate independent parts. Under this circumstance, Bhāṣyakāra answers this by using *vṛkṣapracalana nyāya*. There are enunciated diphthongs as also simple letters that form parts of diphthongs, and part is evidently with in the whole. For example, a tree when it moves, moves with all its parts. Similarly, the rules relating to the compound letters will also liable to its parts naturally.

This nyāya is also used in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*ekāco dve prathamasya*’.

7.3.15. VRKṢAŚĀKHĀBALĀKĀNYĀYA

“maxim of sitting of a crane on the branch of a tree”.

‘*anekāntastūpalakṣaṇameva kevalam / yathā grhasya kākaḥ / tatropalabhyamānasya rūpadvayadarśanādvṛkṣe śākhābalākayoriveti praśnaḥ*’⁴⁰ /

In order to illustrate the rule *tasya lopah* P.1.3.9, Pradīpakāra brings this nyāya. If a crane come and sits on one of the branches of a tree, the branch is the part of that tree and the crane, because the crane has no permanent relation with the tree. Likewise, in śāstra, whether the *anubandha*-s like *ṇ*, *k*, *ṅ*, etc are the part of root (*ekānta*) or not (*anekānta*). This can be understood by the following examples. In the world, a person knowing the name of Devadatta is merely a person of lump of flesh having arms, legs etc. as its limb, but not a person with turban, because the turban is not a limb of him. As the turban is not a part of Devadatta, the *anubandha*-s are not a part of root. Moreover, in the world its opposite things can also be seen, i.e. Devadatta is a person with hunchback is his part, on account of it being seen there permanently. As such in śāstra,

anubandha-s are also parts of root. So Bhāṣyakāra thinks about these two opinions and ultimately accepts the *ekāntapakṣa*. In vyākaraṇasāstra these two *ekānta-anekāntapakṣa* are accepting according to its *lakṣya*. Bhāṣyakāra says- *ubhayamidamanubandheṣūktamekāntā anekāntā iti / kimatra nyāyyam / ekāntā ityeva nyāyyam / kuta etat ? atra heturvyapadiṣṭaḥ / yacca nāma sahetukam tannyāyyam /*

REFERENCE

1. *mūlaskandaphalapālāsavān*, MB, P.1.2.19.
2. *khadirabarburanyāya*, Ibid, P. 1.1.46.
3. *khadirāṅgārasavarṇe kuṇḍale bhavataḥ*, Ibid, Paś.
4. *kākatālīyanyāya*, Ibid, *latvānukarṣananyāya*, Ibid, r l k.
5. MB, P. 5.3.55.
6. Ibid, P. 3.2.33.
7. *avatapte nakulasthita nyāya*, Vyālanakulanyāya.
8. *gosakthani karṇe vā grhītvopadiśati ayam gauriti*, MB, P. 1.1.1.
9. *naṣṭāsavadagharatha nyāya*, *śākaṭāyanaśakatasārtha nyāya*.
10. *rekhāgavayanyāya*, MB, P. 1.1.44.
11. *śalyakavat*, Ibid, a i u n.
12. *nahi mrgāḥ santīti yavā noppyante*.
13. *ekadeśavikṛtanyāya*, MB, Paś.
14. *simhāvalokananyāya*, KV, Nyāsa, P.1.1.11.
15. *maṇḍūkaplutinyāya*, MB, P. 1.1.3.
16. *na hi godhā visarpanti sarpanādahirbhavati*.
17. *vṛ ścikabhiyānnyāya*, MB, Paś., Udyota.
18. *śakunivatsyuh*, MB, a i u n.
19. *khalekapotanyāya*, Ibid, P. 1.1.38.
20. *kākatālīyanyāya*, *vṛkṣaśākhābalākanyāya*, *āmiśraṇanyāya* etc.

21. MB, Vol II, P. 2.1.1, p-326.
22. Ibid, Vol. I, *a i u ṅ* p-97.
23. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.1.46, p-384.
24. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.1, p-165.
25. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.4.108, p-306.
26. KV, Part III, P. 4.1.114.
27. VP, 3.6.12.
28. Hitopadeśa, *prastāvikā, sloka* 45.
29. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.46, p-397.
30. Ibid, P. 1.1.3, p-178.
31. PM, KV, Part I, *hayavarat*, p-43.
32. MB, Vol. I, Udyota, P. 1.1.44, p-378.
33. VP, 2.238.
34. MB, Vol. I, *a i u ṅ*, p-96.
35. Ibid, p-93.
36. Ibid, Vol. II, Udyota, P. 1.3.1, p-115.
37. Nyāsa, KV, Part I, P. 1.1.11.
38. Raghuvamśa, 4.72.
39. MB, Vol. I, *e o ṅ, ai au c*, p-115.
40. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.3.9, p-410.

Chapter VIII

OTHER NYĀYA-S

8.1. Nyāyās on other subjects.

8.1.1. ANIRJÑĀTE'RTHE BAHUVACANAM PRAYOKTAVYAM

“The plural should be used, when the meaning is not exactly known”.

‘dvitṛā iti ko ’yam samāsaḥ? bahuvrīhityāha/ ko ’sya vighrahaḥ? dvau vā trayo veti/ bhaved yadā bahūnāmānayanam tadā bahuvacanamupapannam, yadā tu khalu dvāvānīyete tadā na siddhyati/ tadapi siddham/ katham? kecittāvadāhuḥ -anirjñāte'rthe bahuvacanam prayoktavyamiti/ tadyatā- kati bhavataḥ putrāḥ/ kati bhavato bhāryā iti/ apara āha- dvau vetyukte trayo veti gamyate/ trayo vetyukte dvau veti gamyate/ saiṣā pañcādhiṣṭhānā vāk/ tatra yuktam bahuvacanam’¹/

Bhāṣyakāra raises the question that in which compound does the word *dvitṛāḥ* being, while he interpreting the rule ‘*samkhyāvyāsanādūrādhikasamkhyāḥ samkhyeye*’ P.2.2.25. It is *bahuvrīhi* and its analysis is *dvau vā trayo vā* (two or three). The use of the plural in *dvitṛāḥ* will be appropriate when many are referred to and it is not so when only two are referred to. For answering this, Patañjali explains this

nyāya. Plural can be justified when the two are brought. It is common that, the use of plural number in the question, when the speaker is unaware of number of objects he refers to. For example, without the awareness of the number of sons and wives, someone asks somebody that, *kati bhavataḥ putrāḥ?* (how many sons have you), and *kati bhavato bhāryāḥ?* (how many wives do you have). Here the question is in plural. Another grammarian says that, in the analysis *dvau vā trayo vā* when *dvau vā* (may be two) is mentioned, *trayo vā* (may be three) is suggested, and vice versa. Therefore, the expression *dvau vā trayo vā* ultimately refers to five. So the use of the plural is correct.

8.1.2. . ATAJJĀTĪYAKAM HI LOKE VYAVADHĀYAKAM BHAVATI NYĀYA

‘the interception is only by the unlike, for the unlike alone stands between the like ones’.

‘katham punarjñāyate- atajjātīyakam hi loke vyavadhāyakam bhavati / evam hi kaścit kañcit pṛcchati-anantare ete brāhmaṇakule iti / sa āha-nānantare / vṛṣalakulamanayorantarā iti’² /

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*halo’nantarāḥ samyogaḥ*’ P.1.1.7, Pūrvapakṣi says that the word ‘*anantara*’ is used even with reference to

subjects, which are intercepted. But the meaning of the word '*anantara*' is not intercepted or separated, though we can see it is used in the sense of interception. For example, the expression '*anantarau imau grāmau*'- these two villages are adjoining ones- is generally used even though there are rivers and mountains dividing them. Then there is the doubt- if then the word *anantara* is used even with reference to intercepted objects, what is the purpose served by the word *anantara* in sūtra. Bhāṣyakāra answered this question by saying that, in the intercepted objects, the word *anantara* will never use. The interception is only by the unlike, for the unlike alone stands between the like ones in the world. Someone asks another- '*anantare ete brāhmaṇakule*'- are these two brāhmaṇa houses adjoining, i.e. do they not have any *anantara*? He replies – '*nānantare, vṛṣalakulamanayorantarā iti*'. No, they are not adjoining; a house of a śūdra is between them. There is no interception between the brāhmaṇa-s, and between the śūdra-s. So in the *samyogasamjñā*, the word *anantara* means the consonants which is not intercepted by the unlike sound. The unlike sound of '*hal*' is '*ac*'. Therefore, the *hal*, which is not intercepted with *ac*, is called *samyogasamjñā*. So in all cases it is the unlike alone that interceded the like ones.

Really, in *anantarāvimau grāmau*, though rivers and mountains are dividing them, the word *anantara* is use here with the concept that the

rivers and mountains are the part of the village. The word *grāma* has many denotations. It denotes group of houses, garden, inhabitants, forest, river, mountain etc.

8.1.3. ATIDEŚANYĀYA

“atideśa is suggested even without the term vati”

‘antareṇāpi vatimatideśo gamyate/ tadyathā-eṣa brahmadattaḥ , abrahmadattam brahmadatta ityāha , te manyāmahe brahmadattava-dayam bhavatiiti/ evam ihāpi asamkhyām samkhyetyāha sankhyāvaditi gamyate’³ /

Patañjali mentions this nyāya in the rule, ‘*bahugaṇavatūḍati samkhyā*’ P.1.1.23 to get *samkhyāsamjñā* to the *akṛtrima* words *eka*, *dvi* etc. because they do not get the *samkhyāsamjñā* according to the *krtrimākṛtrimanyāya*. This sūtra is not a *samjñāsūtra*, but *atideśasūtra* denoting similarity and it means that *bahu*, *gaṇa*, *vatū* and *ḍati* are like *samkhyā*. Here *atideśa* is suggested even without the term *vati* in the sūtra. For example, one says, ‘this is Brahmadatta, even though he is not Brahmadatta’. From this, we interpret that he is like Brahmadatta. So also, he calls *asamkhyā* by the name of *samkhyā* and hence it is suggested that they are like *samkhyā*. So in *samkhyāvat*, without mention the word *vati*

the word *samkhyā* only suggests *atideśa*. Hence, according to Bhāṣyakāra, *bahugaṇavatudati samkhyā sūtra* is not a *samjñāsūtra* but *atideśasūtra*.

8.1.4. CCHATRINYĀYA

‘the maxim of the men with umbrellas’.

‘*yathaikena cchatriṇā sāhacaryādanye’pi tatsahacāriṇaścchatriṇā ityucyante cchatriṇo gacchantīti, tathehāpi dyutinā sāhacaryāt śvitādayo’pi dyut iti vyapadiśyante*’⁴ /

The maxim originates from a number of persons walking along a road with their umbrellas spread overhead and some persons without their umbrellas. But to an onlooker they are all known by the person with umbrellas.

While interpreting the sūtra ‘*dyutbhyo luṇi*’ P.1.3.91, Nyāsakāra explains the *cchatrinyāya*. The root ‘*dyut*’ is only referred in the sūtra. But the *parasmaipadi* comes optionally to the roots beginning with *dyut* and ending with *kṛipū*, by the use of the plural word *dyudbhyām* in the sūtra. These verbs are *anudātta* and so by the sūtra ‘*anudāttaṇīta ātmanepadam*’ P.1.3.12, they would have been invariably *ātmanepadi*, this sūtra *dyutbhyo luṇi* makes them optionally, so it is like the person who were not wearing umbrellas designated as wearing umbrellas due to the circumstances.

It can be seen remarks about this nyāya in Vākyapadīya;

‘*puroḍāsābhidhānam ca dhānādiṣu yathā sthitam /*

cchatriṅā cābhisambandhāt cchatriśabdābhidheyatā’⁵ //

8.1.5. DRAVYAVACCOPACĀRANYĀYA

‘applications as in *dravya*-s’

‘*dravyavaccopacārāḥ prāpnuvanti / tadyathā-dravyeṣu naikena
ghaṭenāneko yugapat kāryam karoti / evamimamakāram nāneko
yugapaduccārayet*’⁶ /

In the sūtrabhāṣya of ‘*a i u ṅ*’, Bhāṣyakāra raises the question whether the *akāra* is one or many? The letter ‘*a*’ is one, and the same in the *māheśvarasūtra*-s or representing a letter ‘*a*’ in words in their formations, or in roots. If so, the same *akāra* in the words like *aśvaḥ*, *arkaḥ*, *arthaḥ* etc., applications have to be done as in the case of *dravya*-s. For example, many people cannot simultaneously deal with one pot and fetch water, similarly, several people will not be able to pronounce one, and the same letter ‘*a*’ at one time. According to the Pūrvapakṣa, the letter ‘*a*’ is not one but many.

8.1.6. KRIYĀPI KRIYAYEPSITATAMĀ BHAVATI NYĀYA

“kriyā become most desired through kriyā”

‘kriyāpi kriyayepsitatamā bhavati / kayā kriyayā? sampāśyati kriyayā prārthayatikriyayā adyavasyatikriyayā ca / iha ya eṣa manuṣyaḥ prekṣāpūrvakārī bhavati sa buddhyā tāvat kamcidartham sampāśyati , samdr̥ṣṭe prārthanā , prārthite adyavasāyah, adyavasāye ārambhaḥ ārambhe nirvṛtti nirvṛtau phalaprāptiḥ / evam kriyāpi kṛtrimam karma’⁷/

Vārttikakāra says that the word *karma* may be replaced by *kriyā* in the sūtra ‘*kartari karmavyatihāre*’ P.1.3.14 and to read as *kartari kriyāvyatihāre* because, it may denote the technical *karma* and consequently that the *ātmanepada* may appear where there is *vinimaya* in the fruit of the action suggests this. But Bhāṣyakāra says that it need not be read so, because, the people in the world use the word *karma* in the sense of *kriyā* as in *kām kriyām kariṣyasi, kim karma kariṣyasi*. Here the word *karma* means *kriyā* in the rule ‘*kartarikarmavyatihāre*’ and not the technical term *karma* through the rule ‘*karturīpsitatamam karma*’. *kriyā* is *kṛtrima karma* and *kriyā* become *īpsitatama* through *kriyā*. Here Patañjali introduces this nyāya and says that, *kriyā* become *īpsitatama* through the *kriyā* of comprehension through the *kriyā* of desire to get the fruit or through the *kriyā* of determination. He who is here a man of foresight first conceives an

object in his mind, desires then to get it, determines then to get it, draws a plan in his mind then how to get it, acts then to get it and finally arrives at the fruit. Hence, *kriyā* too is *kṛtrima karma*. So in the sūtra it does not need to read as *kriyāvyatihāre*, but to read as *karmavyatihāre* only.

8.1.7. LIṄGAMAŚIṢYAM LOKĀŚRAYATVĀLLIṄGASYA NYĀYA

“gender depends with ordinary usages of people, but not taught by grammar”

‘*yadapyucyate sarvaliṅgatā ca vaktavyeti / na vaktavyā / liṅgamaśiṣyam lokāśrayatvālliṅgasya*’⁸ /

arthena nityasamāsavacanam, sarvaliṅgatā ca vaktavyā- says Vārttikakāra in the rule *caturthī tadarthārthabalihitasukharakṣitaiḥ* P.2.1.36. That is a rule should be stated for inconvertible compounding with the word *artha* and a prescription should be made for variations in all genders as in *brāhmaṇārtham payaḥ* - milk for brāhmaṇa-s, *brāhmaṇārthaḥ sūpaḥ, brāhmaṇārthā yavāgūḥ*-rise gruel for brāhmaṇa-s.

Here the word *artha* should use in three genders as inconvertible compound. To refute this vārttika, Bhāṣyakāra uses this nyāya and says that, there is no need of this statement-“prescription should be made for variations in all genders.” Gender need not be taught by grammar because

gender depends up on the usage of people. Gender that used by the people in the world is appropriate in śāstra also. People use the form *brāhmaṇārtha* in three genders -*brāhmaṇārthaḥ*, *brāhmaṇārthā*, *brāhmaṇārtham*. Therefore the three genders will get in śāstra naturally, for which there is no need to read vārttika.

8.1.8. LOKE HYARTHAVANTI CĀNARTHAKĀNI CA VĀKYĀNI DRŚYANTE NYĀYA

“there are seen sentences sometimes making sense and sometimes making no sense”.

‘itarathā hyasampratyayo yathā loke / loke hyarthavanti cānarthakāni ca vākyāni drśyante / arthavanti tāvat-devadatta! gāmabhyāja śuklām daṇḍena / devadatta gāmabhyāja kṛṣṇām iti / anarthakāni-daśa dāḍimāni, ṣaḍapūpāḥ, kuṇḍamajājīnam, palalapiṇḍaḥ, adharorukametā kumāryāḥ, spaiyakṛtasya pitā, pratiśīna iti’⁹

This nyāya is mention in the rule ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’ P.1.1.1. Vārttikakāra has made a suggestion that before the sūtra ‘*vṛddhirādaic*’ with which the topic of technical terms commences; a governing rule (*adhikārasūtra*), such as ‘*athasamjñā*’ should be put in. It is necessary to state which word stands for the designated and which shows the

designation. That is, one should know that the terms *vrddhi*, *guṇa* and others mentioned here and in the subsequent rules, are to be understood as technical terms.

If the topic of *samjñā* be not specifically introduced as beginning with the sūtra *vrddhirādaic*, the words *vrddhi*, *guṇa* and others will not be understood as technical terms, and as a consequence, this and the following many rules will be without any sense as in ordinary language. Here Patañjali uses this nyāya and says that, there are seen even sentences sometimes making sense and sometimes making no sense. Sentences possessed of sense are- *devadatta gāmabhyāja śuklām daṇḍena*, *devadatta gāmabhyāja kṛṣṇām* (Devadatta, drive that white cow over here by a stick, drive that dark one) etc. The sentences possessed of no sense are- *daśadādimāni śaḍhapūpāḥ kuṇḍamajājīnam palalapiṇḍaḥ adharorukametata kumāryāḥ sphaiyakṛ tasya pitā pratiśīnaḥ*. (ten pomegranates, six cakes, a pot, a goat-skin, a handful of chaff, this petticoat of a girl, and this emaciated father of Sphaiyakṛta). In this example, *daśa dādimāni* etc. although the various words are correct, the whole compound sentence is without any sense as the constituent pieces have no syntactical interconnection between them. Like this senseless sentence, without the *samjñādhikārasūtra*, the words like *vrddhi*, *guṇa* etc. are also meaningless.

But later Patañjali states that the *samjñādhikārasūtra* is not necessary because, one can have a definite conception of what is *samjñā* from the manner of Ācārya's expression (*vyavahāra*).

8.1.9. NĀNĀLIṄGAKARAṆANYĀYA

'the maxim of the application of various indicators at various places'

*'lokataḥ etatsiddham / tadyathā-loke kaścit evam devadattamāha-
iha muṇḍo bhava, iha śikhī bhava, iha jaṭilo bhava iti yalliṅgo yatrocya-
talliṅgastatropatiṣṭhate / evamayamakāro yalliṅgo yatrocya-
talliṅgastatropasthāsyate'*¹⁰ /

Since Ācārya Pāṇini makes different indicators in each place it is learnt that, there is no confusion in the effect of *anubandha*-s. But there will arise a difficulty that, is the different indicators in each place is for the designation 'it'? Bhāṣyakāra answers to this question in the bhāṣya of the sūtra 'a i u ṇ', introducing the 'nānāliṅgakarāṇanyāya'.

For instance, we see in the world one telling Devadatta, "appear here with a shaven head, appear here with matted hair, appear here with a knot of hair and he coming there with that particular mark, i.e. he acts at those several places exactly as instructed. Similarly, the letter 'a' is one at in all

places; it will be understood as marked with different characteristics at different places.

8.1.10. PĀMSŪDAKANYĀYA

“the maxim of the dust mixed with water”

‘praśliṣṭāvarṇāviti/ nātra bhāgaviveko ’sti pāmsūdakavadityarthaḥ’¹¹/

Pradīpakāra used this nyāya in the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*tulyāsyaprayatnam savarṇam*’ P.1.1.9, to prevent the *savarṇasamjñā* between *e*, *o*, *i*, *au*, and *a*. The word *prayatna* in the sūtra *tulyāsyaprayatnam savarṇam*, derived as *prārambho yatnasya*, means the commencement of the effort. Then there is the chance for the letter ‘*a*’ to become like with ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’, since the former part of them are ‘*a*’. These two ‘*a*’-s in ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’ are so mixed with ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’, like dust and water that they cannot be separated. So the letter ‘*a*’ may not become *savarṇa* with ‘*ai*’ and ‘*au*’.

8.1.11. RŪPASĀMĀNYANYĀYA

‘similarity of shape’

‘rūpasāmānyāt vā siddhametat / tadyathā- tāneva śātakānācchādayāmaḥ ye mathurāyām, tāneva śālīn bhūñjāmahe ye

*magadheṣu , tadevedam bhavataḥ kārṣāpaṇam yanmathurāyām
grhūtam, anyasmimścānyābhiśca rūpasāmānyāt tadevetam iti bhavati /
evamihāpi rūpasāmānyāt siddham*^{12/}

Bhāṣyakāra proves the *ekatva* of *akāra* in ‘*a i u ṅ*’ sūtra through the ‘*rūpasāmānyanyāya*’- the ‘similarity of shape’. For example, even though objects are different, they are taken to be one from similarity of shape. We say ‘we wear ourselves with the same dress as at Mathura, we eat the same rice as we ate in Mathura, this is the same coin which we received from Mathura, although individually the dress, rice and the coin are not the same but are only similar. So, also the purpose will be achieved by taking the *akāra*-s to be one from similarity of shape.

8.1.12. SĀHACARYANYĀYA

“The maxim of association”.

*‘yadyapi tāvadayam paridrṣṭāpacāro varjane cāvarjane ca/ ayam
khalvapaśabdo’drṣṭāpacāro varjanārtha eva / tasya ko’nyo dvitīyaḥ
sahāyo bhavitumarhati- anyadato varjanārthāt / tadyatā-asya
gordvitīyenārthaḥ*^{13/}

Bhāṣyakāra mentions this *nyāya* in connection with the rule ‘*karmapravacanīyayukte dvitīyā*’ P 2.3.8. Here a question that whether *pari*

of ‘*apaparivarjane*’ P 2.3.10 is used in the sense of *varjana* (exclusion) or in the sense of *avarjana* (non-exclusion). *apa* is always used in the sense of *varjana* and the *pari* is used here in association with *apa*. So *pari* is used to denote the meaning of *varjana*. It is explained that similarity, forms the basis of association. Here Patañjali introduces the *sāhacaryanyāya* and says that when it is said that one needs an associate to a bull, a bull alone is brought neither a horse nor a donkey. Association recalls only that which similar (*sadrśa*) is. The *sāhacaryanyāya* can see in several other rules like ‘*jaśśasośiḥ*’ P.7.1.20, ‘*pareścaghāṅkayoh*’ P. 8.2.22, ‘*viparābhyām jeh*’ P.1.3.19, ‘*antarāntareṇa yukte*’ P.2.3.4.

8.1.13. SAMBHAVĪKĀRYANYĀYA

‘*bhavet yadsambhavi kāryam tannāneko yugapatkuryāt / yattu khalu sambhavi kāryamaneko’pi tad yugapat karoti / sambhavi cedam kāryamakārasyocčāraṇam nāma / tadyathā- ghaṭasya darśanam sparśanam vā*’¹⁴ /

In the bhāṣya of the sūtra ‘*a i u ṅ*’, Bhāṣyakāra deny the argument that the various other difficulties will present themselves as in the case of ordinary objects, if apply the *ekatva* of *akāra*. Impossible things can be seen in the world as several people cannot bring water with the same pot simultaneously, but in cases where many can handle the same thing at the

same time, just as seeing a pot or touching it. In the present case too, the pronouncing *akāra* is thus possible, many pronounce it at the same time.

8.1.14. SANDEHE NIYAMA NYĀYA

‘the rule is operates whenever there is a doubt’.

‘tadyathā-loke kaścit kañcit pṛcchati – grāmāntaram gamiṣyāmi, panthānam me bhavānupadiśatu iti / sa tasmāyācaṣṭe amuṣminnavakāśe hastadakṣiṇo grahītavyaḥ, amuṣminnavakāśe hastavāmaḥ iti / yastatra tiryak patho bhavati na tasmin sandeha iti kṛtvā nāsāvupadiśyate / evamihāpi sandehe niyamaḥ na cāvayavaṣaṣṭhyādiṣu sandehaḥ’¹⁵ /

In the sūtra ‘*ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyoga*’, Patañjali says that, having hundreds of meaning to *ṣaṣṭhī*, mention of *ṣaṣṭhī* in Vyākaraṇa, all meanings which it has have a chance to be applied there, it is desired that the *ṣaṣṭhī* in grammar is only *sthāneyoga* and the sūtra is read for the sake of this ‘*niyama*’. But by doing so, the doubt is that, will there come the *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* in *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* like ‘*śāsa idan̄ haloḥ*’. There is no chance for the sūtra-s dealing with *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* to come within the province of the sūtra.

There is no doubt that *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* in the sūtra ‘*śāsa idan̄ haloḥ*’. Therefore, the *niyama* is not important. If it is not said, it can be understood

by the ‘*sandehe niyama nyāya*’. Suppose one says to another, “I wish to go to the next village and please direct me”. Here replies to the stranger “you should turn right from the junction and to the left there”. He is not given any direction if there is an opposite way, since there is no difficulty for him to decide the right path. Therefore, in the sūtra also operates wherever there is a doubt. In case of *avayavaśaṣṭī* etc., there is no room for any doubt.

8.1.15. UTSARGĀPAVĀDANYĀYA

‘the maxim of general principles and specific features’

*‘katham tarhīme śabdāḥ-pratipattavyāḥ? kincit sāmānyaviśe-
ṣavallkṣaṇam pravartyam, yena alpēna yatnēna mahato mahataḥ
śabdaughān pratipadhyeran / kim punastat? utsargāpavādau / sāmānyena
utsargaḥ kartavyaḥ / tadyathā- “karmaṇyaṇ” / tasya viśeṣena apavādaḥ ,
yathā āto ’nupasarge kaḥ iti’¹⁶/*

While discussing how the exposition of science of words has to be given, Bhāṣyakāra says that it is done either by expounding of correct words, or incorrect words or both. But the enumeration of correct words is better since, it is easier and required. When it is decided that the list of correct words is to be given, there arise the question whether an inventory of all available correct words should be taken. The recital of each individual word is not the right way of teaching correct words. There

should be followed the method of laying down general principles and specific features, so that with a comparatively small effort, a man would learn bigger and bigger collections of words.

There should be stated a general rule with a wide application, as for example, “*karmaṇyaṇ*” P.3.2.1, it means that, if in a compound, the verb is preceded by the object, which qualifies it, the suffix ‘*aṇ*’ follows the verb. Then a specific exception to the rule should be given like ‘*āto nupasarge kaḥ*’ P.3.2.2, prescribing the affix ‘*ka*’ instead of ‘*aṇ*’ after a root ending in ‘*ā*’ and having any word excepting a preposition as the antecedent. These general principles and specific features are said to be *utsarga* and *apavāda* respectively.

8.1.16. VAIYĀKARAṆASŪTASAMVĀDANYĀYA

‘maxim of conversation between grammarian and charioteer’.

*‘kimca bho iṣyate etad rūpam? bādhamiṣyate / evam hi kaścīd
vaiyākarāṇa āha –ko’sya rathasya praveteti ? sūta āha- āyuṣmān
ahamasya rathasya prājiteti / vaiyākarāṇa āha- apaśabda iti / sūta āha-
prāptijño devānām priyo na tviṣṭijñah / iṣyate etad rūpamiti / vaiyākarāṇa
āha- aho khalvanena durutena bādhyāmahe iti / sūta āha – na khalu veñah*

*sūtaḥ, suvatereva sūtaḥ / yadi suvateḥ kutsā prayoktavyā dusūteneti vaktavyam*¹⁷ /

The rule ‘*ajervyaghañapoh*’ P.2.4.56 means that the word *aja* is replaced by *vī* when an *ārdhadhātuka* affix other than *ghañ* or *ap* follows. According to Pāṇini when the *ārdhadhātuka* affix follows the root *aja* with *upasarga pra*, it is replaced by *vī* and the form *pravetā* is formed. But, according to Bhāṣyakāra the sūtra shall read only *ajervī*, which may mean that *vī* optionally replaces *aj* by taking here *vā* from the rule *vā liṭi* P.2.4.55 and take it to be *vyavasthitavibhāṣa* so that it operates with reference to *pravetā, pravetum, pravītaḥ, samvītiḥ* and does not operate with reference to *samājaḥ samajaḥ udājaḥ udajaḥ samajanam, udājanam* and *samajya*. The provision should be made optional before an *ārdhadhātuka* affix which begins by the abbreviatory term *val*. This would allow the derivation of example such as *pravetā* and *prājītā*.

According to Pāṇini there have only the word *pravetā*, but Bhāṣyakāra accepts the form *prājītā* also. When the *ārdhadhātuka* affix *trc* follows, there the word *aja* replaced by *vī* so that the form *prājītā* does not occurred, but Patañjali introduces this nyāya and says that there is the form *prājītā* also.

A grammarian supporting Pāṇini questioned that ‘who is the *pravetā* (charioteer) of this chariot’. The charioteer replies that, ‘I am the *prājitā* of this chariot. It is incorrect form-says grammarian. Charioteer replies, ‘you are a learned fool, not only the forms learnt from sūtra-s and do not know the forms secured from the opinion of the Bhāṣyakāra’. Hearing these words, grammarian says that, ‘I am so slighted by this *duruta*. In reply to this charioteer says, ‘the word *sūtaḥ* is not derived from the root *vī*, but from the root *sū*. If you want to derive a term of contempt form *sū*, it should be *duḥsūtena*’. From this conversation Patañjali says, the rule *ajervyaghañapoḥ* shall read only *ajervī*.

8.1.17. VYĀPTINYĀYA

‘*na ca mukhye sati gaṇasyāśrayaṇam yuktam, gaṇamukhyayor-*
mukhye kāryasampratyayāt, naiṣa doṣaḥ, vyāpternyāyādākārasyāpi
gaunamactvamāśritya bhaviṣyati, anyathā hyaijgrahaṇameva kuryāt, na
vṛddhigrahaṇam’ ^{18/}

Nyāsakāra uses the *vyāptinyāya* when he interprets the sūtra ‘*vṛddhiryasyācāmādistat vṛddham*’ P.1.1.73. The sūtra means that, if a word consisting of many vowels, and have a *vṛddhi* vowel at the beginning in the order of vowels, that word is called *vṛddham*. Thus, the words *śātā*, *mātā*, etc have the first vowel *ā*, a *vṛddhi* vowel; therefore, they are called

vṛddham. Here the doubt arises that ‘how can we consider the long vowel ‘a’ as ‘ac’, since the short ‘a’ is ‘ac’. Short ‘a’ is primary and long ‘ā’ is secondary in ‘ac’. So the short vowel ‘a’ is ‘ac’, according to the *paribhāṣa*, ‘*gaṇamukhyayoḥ mukhye kāryasampratyaye*’. Hence, long vowel ‘a’ in the example *śālīya*, *mālīya* will not be an ‘ac’. Then there is neither *vṛddhisamjñā* nor *vṛddhasamjñā*.

Here Nyāsakāra introduces the *vyāptinyāya*. The *vyāptinyāya* is much stronger than the *gaṇamukhyayoḥ mukhye kāryasampratyayah nyāya* because, if long vowel ‘a’ is secondary to Pāṇini, he may not say that the *vṛddhi* will come to the śabda-s like *śālā mālā*. Wishing to consider the long vowel ‘a’ as ‘ac’, he use the sūtra ‘*vṛddhiryasyācāmādistat vṛddham*’ instead of ‘*aicaryasyācāmādistat vṛddham*’. Instead of ‘*aicaḥ*’ he used *vṛddhi*, so the *vyāptinyāya* is stronger than that of ‘*gaṇamukhyayoḥ mukhye kāryasampratyayah nyāya*’.

8.1.18. YATHĀSAMKHYANYĀYA

“the maxim of arranging in regular succession”

‘*tadyathā acāvidhanau devadattayajñadatta ityukte tatra na jnāyate kasyājādhanaṃ, kasyāvayava iti / yadyapi tāvalloka eṣa dṛṣṭāntaḥ, dṛ-*

*ṣṭāntasyāpi tu puruṣārambho nivartako bhavati / asti veha kaścit
puruṣārambhaḥ? astītyāḥ / kaḥ?samkhyātānudeśo nāma*¹⁹ /

In the rule *ādyantau takitau* P.1.1.46, the compound *ādyantau* is *dvanda-ādiśca antaśca iti ādyantau* and *takitau-ṭit ca kit ca* also a *dvanda* compound. Then this sūtra is worded in compounds and it is not clearly known which is *ādi* and which is *anta*. To clear this doubts Patañjali explains the *yathāsamkhyanyāya*. In the expression-*ajāvidhanau devadattayajñadattau*- Devadatta and Yajñadatta have the wealth of goats and sheep; it is not definitely known who has the wealth of goats and who has that of sheep.

Even though this ambiguity is admitted in the world, in śāstra also the doubt arises that which is *ādi* and which is *anta*. Though the doubt in the world cleared through some individual effort, in śāstra, through the sūtra *yadhāsamkhyamanudeśaḥ samānam* P.1.3.10, this doubt is removed. That is this rule means that assignment of equivalents for equal number of elements follows the order of enumeration. So the elements marked with ‘*ṭ*’ or ‘*k*’ becomes the initial and final segments respectively of items in the genitive to which they are introduced.

8.2. Paribhāṣa

8.2.1. ASIDDHAM BAHIRAṄGAMANTARAṄGE NYĀYA

“a bahiraṅga is non-existent for the purpose of an antaraṅga”

*‘tad yathā-puruṣo ’yam prātarutthāya yānyasya pratiśarīram kāryāṇi
tāni tāvat karoti / tataḥ suhr̥dām, tataḥ sambandhinām / prātipadikam
cāpyupadiṣṭam sāmānyabhūte’rthe vartate / sāmānye vartamānasya
vyaktirupajāyate / vyaktasya sato liṅgasamkhyābhyāmanvitasya
bāhyenārthena yogo bhavati /’²⁰*

This is a very famous *paribhāṣa* in Vyākaraṇaśāstra. Patañjali states this nyāya under the rule ‘*acaḥ parasmin pūrvavidhau*’ P.1.1.57. This *paribhāṣa* is of manifold benefits and certainly is it to be resorted to. The operation of this *paribhāṣa* is supported from what is seen in the world. Object in the world, which is subjected to a large number of operations, is seen thus. First, it is operated upon with reference to the closest limb, then with one a little more remote, then with one remoter than the second is and so on. It may be illustrated as follows- man, after getting up from his bed, first attends to the actions pertaining to himself, then to those of his friends and then to those who are connected with him. Likewise, in śāstra, stem too, as soon as it is mentioned, produces in the mind of the hearer the idea

of the genus, and then the individuality, and it in its turn comes in association with gender and number, so that it becomes connected with external object. The order of procedure in words is the same as is found in objects. Similar should be the operations on them. Likewise, a man relates firstly the *antaraṅga* objects, and then the *bahiraṅga*. The *paribhāṣa*, *asiddham bahiraṅgamantaraṅge* means that, the *bahiraṅga* is regarded as not having taken effect, when that which is *antaraṅga* is to take effect. The status of internal and external conditioning is determined on the basis of forms (*śabda*) and not meaning (*artha*).

8.2.2. KṚTRIMĀKṚTRIMAYOḤ KṚTRIME KĀRYASAMPRA- TYAYAḤ NYĀYA

The rule that “whenever it may appear doubtful whether an operation has reference to that which is expressed by the technical or to that which is expressed by the ordinary meaning of a particular term, the operation refers only to that which is expressed by the technical meaning of the term is question”.

*‘kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime kāryasampratyaayo bhavati/ yathā loke
gopālakamānaya kaṭajakamānya iti yasyaiśā samjñā bhavati sa ānīyate/ na
yo gāḥ pālayati yo vā kaṭe jātaḥ’²¹ /*

To get the technical term *samkhyā*, to *bahu*, *gaṇa* , *vatu*, and *ḍati*, and for the sake of getting designation to the numbers *eka*, *dvi* etc., the word *samkhyā*, has to be read in the *samkhyāsamjñā sūtra*, ‘*bahugaṇ avatuḍati samkhyā*’ P.1.1.23. Since the numbers *eka*, *dvi* etc. are not *kṛtrima* and the *samjñā* of *bahu*, *gaṇa* , *vatu*, *ḍati* etc. are *kṛtrima*, of the two, *kṛtrima* and *akṛtrima*, it is said that rules operate on *kṛtrima*, though the *nyāya kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime kāryasampratyayaḥ*. So it recognizes only the *kṛtrima* numbers *bahu*, *gaṇa* , *vatu*, *ḍati* etc. and not recognizes numbers like, *eka*, *dvi* etc. to get the designation *samkhyā*.

In the world, if one says, “bring *Gopālaka*, bring *Kaṭajaka*”, then brought one who bears that name not one who is look after cows, or, who is born on a straw-mat. People in the world do not seek after the derived meaning of a word, but they are satisfied with its meaning by *rūḍhi* and proceed further to operate upon it. Here *Bhāṣyakāra* refutes the opinion of *pūrvapakṣin* and says that, in the world, the *kṛtrimākṛtrimanyāya* operates only according by the denoting capacity or the context.

8.2.3. SAKṚDGATINYĀYA

“A prior rule once blocked by a subsequent rule remains blocked forever”.

‘trayādeśe srantasya pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ/ tistr̥ṇām/ tistr̥bhāve kṛte
trestraya iti trayādeśaḥ prāpnoti/ naiṣa doṣaḥ/ idamiha sampradhāryam
tistr̥bhāvaḥ kriyatām trayādeśa itī? kimatra kartavyam? paratvāt tistr̥
bhāvaḥ/ athedānīm tistr̥bhāve kṛte punaḥ prasaṅgavijñānāt trayādeśaḥ
kasmāna bhavati? sakṛtgatau vipratiṣedhe yadbādhitam
tadbādhitameva’²²/

This nyāya is mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya under the rule ‘stānivadādeśo ’nalvidhau’ P.1.1.56. He says that in the example *tistr̥ṇām* (*tri* + *ām*), two rules can apply. The rule ‘*trestrayaḥ*’ P.6.3.48, requires that *tri* be replaced by *trayas* and the rule ‘*tricaturoḥ striyām tistr̥catasṛ*’ P.7.2.99 requires that *tri* be replaced by *tistr̥*. These rules are equal in strength. By the rule ‘*vipratiṣedheparamkāryam*’ P.1.4.2, the subsequent rule ‘*tricaturoḥ striyām tistr̥catasṛ*’ comes and *tri* is replaced by *tistr̥* to yield *tistr̥ṇām*. But by the sūtra ‘*stānivadādeśo ’nalvidhau*’, there is a chance for the *ādeśa traya* to appear there by the sūtra ‘*trestrayaḥ*’. To avoid the scope of application of the sūtra, Patañjali mentions the *sakṛdgati nyāya* and says that, when two rules conflict with each other, the one defeated at its first operation is defeated forever. So the sūtra ‘*trestrayaḥ*’ will remain blocked forever. Just like a person killed never return to the life, in Śāstra also a rule once blocked by a subsequent rule remains blocked forever in a conflict of equal strength.

8.2.4. YATRĀNEKAVIDHAMĀNTARYAM TATRA STHĀNATAḤ ĀNTARYAM BALĪYAḤ NYĀYA

“in more proximities, give preference to the organ of utterance”

*‘atha sthāne iti vartamāne punaḥ sthānagrahaṇam kimartham?
yatrānekavidhamāntaryam tatra sthānataḥ eva āntaryam balīyo yathā syāt/
kimpunastat? cetā stotā/ pramāṇato’kāro guṇaḥ prāpnoti, sthānata
ekāraukārau/ punaḥ sthānagrahaṇātekāraukārau bhavataḥ’²³/*

The sūtra ‘*sthāne’ntaratamaḥ*’ P.1.1.50, means *adeśa* which is to replace a *sthānin* must be most homogenous to the *sthānin*. This similarity is valued in view of four factors. *sthānakṛta* (similarity based on place of articulation), *arthakṛta* (based on signification), *guṇakṛta* (based on sound quality), and *pramāṇakṛta* (based on space of articulation). But according to this *paribhāṣa-yatrānekavidhamāntaryam tatra sthānataḥ āntaryam balīyaḥ*, the nearness in the organ of utterance has preference, in the selection of proper substitute. The use of the word *sthāne* in this rule when it was available by *anuvṛtti* from ‘*śaṣṭhī sthāneyoge*’ P.1.1.49, the use of *sthāne* again is to indicate that whenever there is a possibility of similarity based on more than one factor, a similarity based on *sthāna* (place of articulation) should be considered decisive. In the world if a person died without any successor, his properties will get to his close relative, even

though he has more relatives. Likewise in śāstra also in the derivation of *ceta* (*ci+tr*) and *stotā* (*stu+tr*), ‘*sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoh*’ P.7.3.84 orders a *guṇa* replacement for ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’. They are *a/e* and *a/o*, that is ‘*a*’ also qualifies because it is similar in duration. However, in addition to being similar in duration, ‘*e*’ and ‘*o*’ are also similar to ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*’ in place of articulation, hence they win.

REFERENCE

1. MB, Vol. II, P. 2.2.25, p-456.
2. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.7, p-233.
3. Ibid, P. 1.1.23, p-307.
4. Nyāsa, KV, Part II, P. 1.3.91.
5. VP, 3.12.22.
6. MB, Vol. I, *aiuṇ*, p-92.
7. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 1.3.14, p-157.
8. Ibid, P. 2.1.36, p-382.
9. Ibid, Vol. I, P. 1.1.1, p-157.
10. Ibid, *aiuṇ*, p-93.
11. Ibid, Pradīpa, P. 1.1.9, p-245.
12. Ibid, Vol. I, *aiuṇ*, p-100.
13. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.3.8, p-493.
14. Ibid, Vol. I, *aiuṇ*, p-95.
15. Ibid, p-100.
16. Ibid, Paś, p-55.
17. Ibid, Vol. II, P. 2.4.56, p-557.
18. Nyāsa, KV, Part I, P. 1.1.73, p-225.
19. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.46, p-396.
20. MB, Vol. I, P. 1.1.57, p-474.

21. Ibid, P. 1.1.23, p-414.
22. Ibid, P. 1.1.56, p-461.
23. Ibid, P. 1.1.50, p-414.

CONCLUSION

In grammar, the analysis of formation of words is most important. Meanings are attested by usage, which is only logical. Since the grammar believes in the authority of usage (*loka*), the grammarians were fond of drawing analogies between the world of grammar and the outside world. They bring the realities of the external world to bear upon discussions of the inside world of grammar. Hence, there are numerous maxims mentioned in support of grammatical discussion.

The maxims showed the relation of language and society. They are the rules and regulations prevalent among the people in society. The source of Vyākaraṇa is the society itself. The Vyākaraṇaśāstra is simplified and popularized by introducing more clarifying examples from the society. The ultimate authority of grammar is people themselves. But taking illustration and examples from common life, the entire universe is coming within the limits of maxims. The Sanskrit grammarian understood the power of nyāya-s and employed them their sūtra to shut the mouth of any opponent and popularise their śāstra.

Maxims give insight to the rules and regulations as well as the life style existed in society in a particular era. Therefore, these maxims throw

light on the religious, social, educational, economic and other aspects of contemporary life. By evaluating these maxims, we have a clear picture of the social life in that period.

Of the fourfold classification of society the brāhmiṇs have the foremost place and the others were enjoyed the usual position. The people were more intelligent, virtuous, perfect and bold, and they gave more importance to morality and religious practices. Family is considered as the fundamental factor of society, which consisting of blood relations and the authority of the leader was recognised. Regarding the food, dress and ornaments, the social standard was high.

Women had freedom of movement, they enjoyed the respect of their family members, and they are permitted to study Veda-s and performing ritual of sacrifices. People were more conscious about the good health, and they spent their time for refreshment like dancing, playing musical instruments, drama and some other games. Since the social order was essentially based on a religio-cultural foundation, we observe a profound impact of religion and religious philosophy on the social life and behaviour of people. Although the society was in high standard, it was not free from bad customs and habits.

The economic life of the period was prosperous. Land was the primary source of livelihood. Majority of the people lived in the villages and their main occupation was agriculture. Ripening, reaping and threshing followed in the usual course and the use of agricultural labour was a necessity. The grains were stored in jars. Animal husbandry was closely associated with land, and cows and sheep were reared. Five village artisans like, *kulāla*, *karmāra*, *vardhakin*, *nāpita* and *rajaka* with their separated functions were existed in the society and domestic servants, masons, architects, well digger, weaver etc. also existed. The textile industry and trade have flourished during the period. Medium of transaction was payment of coins and in certain cases, barter was also possible. There is prohibition in the sale of certain articles. They used facilities of transport, particularly various types of carriages, such as carts, caravans, boat and rafts.

Since Bhāṣyakāra gave more attention to the common life, the information regarding Township and Kingship is too meagre. The King was the first and important in the state, who were the upholder and defender of *dharma*. For maintaining the justice, the King employed punishments in the form of fines and physical torture.

The religious condition mainly related to sacrifice, worship and performance of appropriate rituals. Theistic devotion to particular Gods expressed the new phase of religious beliefs. Śiva and Viṣṇu cult were very popular. The ascetic orders of the Parivrājaka-s and the Māskarins, evidently Ājivika-s, the Daṇḍin-s and the presence of the materialists show an interesting aspect of religious life. The concept of *dharma* places a very important role in Indian tradition. Ethical and moral values are upheld by many rules, which highlight the exploitation of deep-rooted concept of *dharma* in the Indian mind. Various types of philosophical thoughts like *mīmāṃsa*, *vedā^ṅnyāya*, *Buddhism* etc. are existed in that period.

The main aim of education in ancient India was to culture the mind of the people and strengthen their intellectual and physical features. The education system was *gurukula* system. Education for girls was considered as quite important while brāhmiṇ girls attained proficiency in Vedic concepts.

Great Mountainous ranges, huge forests, rich flora and fauna diversify the land of India, which have lent its social and economic life additional wealth and beauty.

From the detailed study of the above subject, we come to the conclusion that, in each and every aspects of the life in that period has

maintained an eminent cultural awareness and the society has acquired its highest level during the 2nd century BC.

In the century we are living in an era of pollution of all types, mind is also polluted. Mind pollution can be prevented by controlling the mind and it depends on cultivation of pure habits in thought, word and deed. Maxims tries to enable a person to take precautions for wandering off pollution both individually and collectively. It is the only way leading a person, society and nation from non-existence to existence, from darkness to light and immorality to morality. Maxims inspire a person to keep physical fitness, mental alertness, moral uprightness, spiritual attainment of the individual and the society as a whole. One can make life meaningful for collective welfare, if the maxims are properly understood and systematically practiced. Therefore, the maxims have relevance not only in the day-to-day life of that age, but also in the present ages.

Having relevance to all nyāya-s in the present age, point out here some nyāya-s for example. When a farmer working in a farm, he is facing many difficulties in the field and suffers a lot. But at the end, he gets not only sufficient grains, but also a satisfaction and prosperity. It is same to '*kūpakhānakanyāya*'. '*andaparamparānyāya*' explains the tendency of imitating prevailing in people. When any fashion becomes current, many

would follow it without any judgement as to its propriety or importance. *'matsyakaṇḍakanyāya'* is relevant because, in these days also policy of a truly wise man who would observe everything in nature and would gather from it what conduces to his welfare and reject the rest is a human behaviour. The application of *'naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāya'* reveals cooperation between people. No achievement of the nation will not be taken place without the cooperation of highly intellectuals. Thus, they exchange a mission of cooperation and social harmony, which will lead to a prosperous nation. For example, BrahMos is a stealth supersonic cruise missile which is a joint venture between Republic of India's Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO) and Russian Federation's NPO Mashinostroeyenia .

In an office, the final authority is the head of the department and in his presence, the next in charge has no right to take decisions so he is important. But in the absence of the head, the second in charge is the decision maker and he became important. It is an example for *'rājāmātyanyāya'*. *'rājapurapraveśanyāya'* is a nyāya that explains, everything should be done in regular order at the time of King entering his city, and all of his subordinates follow him in proper order. This protocol is prevalent in every country even today. *'svāmibr̥tyanyāya'* indicates the

stable state of the relation between the two persons and the need of discharge of duties.

'raktapaṭanyāya' denotes the truth that the friendship of a person leads him either to the right or to the wrong way. If his friendship is always with bad persons, they will lead him to the wrong, and his relation with good persons, he will become a good person, i.e. *"samsargajā doṣaguṇo bhavanti"*.

Now a days also a habit among the people to follow the guests up to the mode of their departure, i.e. to the gate, vehicle, bus stop etc. is an example of *'āvanāntāt odakāntāt priyam pantham anuvracet'*.

Findings:-

1. Maxims are the reflection of society and its culture.
2. Maxims help to make easy the study of deep and incomprehensible śāstra topic like grammar.
3. It inspires the readers.
4. Study of nyāya helps to study any branch of knowledge.
5. Through this nyāya, it is possible to study the historical perspective of śāstra.

6. It teach us how to solve a problem amicably and what to do, what not to do and how to do.

To sum up, maxims are an eye opening into the psychic world of man and the reactions of his natural instincts. These pearls of wisdom are beautiful, meaningful and intensive coverage of all the walks of life. The study of maxims of Vyākaraṇaśāstra is informed that the principles can be clearly substantiated and which enables to have a glance on the tradition and culture. It reveals to us some of the social, educational, economic and political conditions of ancient India. Moreover, these maxims are relevant in day-to-day life of the people.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sanskrit

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, L.N. Rangarajan (Ed & Tr), Chaukamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi, 1977.

Bhuvaneśalaukikanyāyasāhasrī, aṇḍitaṭhākuraḍattaśarma, Sreevenkatesvara steam, Mumbai, 1830.

Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇapaṇḍita, Nārāyaṇaśarma Ācārya (Ed), Chaukamba, Delhi, 1990.

Kālidāsagranthāvali of Kālidāsa, Reva Prasad Dvivedi (Ed), Kasi Hindu Visvavidyalaya, Varanasi, 1976.

Kāśikāvṛtti of Jayāditya and Vāmana with *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi and *Padamañjari* of Haradatta, VI Vols, Dwārikādās Sāstri and Kalika Prasāda Śukla (Ed), Tara Publications, Varanasi, 1966.

Kathāsaritsāgara, of Somadevabhaṭṭa, Paṇḍit Durgāprasād and Kāśinātha Pāṇḍuraṅg Parb (Ed), Nirnayasagar Press, Mumbai, 1903.

Laukikanyāyasamgrahaḥ by Raghunāta Varma, Gangādharasāstri (Ed), Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1902.

Mahābhāṣyaanigūḍhākūṭayaḥ, Dr. Devasvarūpa Miśra, Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 1978.

Mahābhāṣye laukikanyāyā, Dr. Rāṇilakṣmi Narasimha Śāstri, Rohini Publications, Rajahmundry.

Manusmṛti, Prof. J.L. Sastri (Ed), MLBD, Delhi, 1983.

Nyāyoktikośa, Chhabināth Miśra, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1978

Padmapurāṇa (Part I – V), Gurumaṇḍalagrandhamāla, Aṣṭādaśapuṣpaṃ, Kolkatta, 1957-59.

Pañcatantra of Viṣṇuśarma, M.R. Kāle (Ed), Gopalanarayana & Company, Mumbai, 1911.

Paribhāṣentusekhara of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, Paṇḍit Srī Sadāśivaśāstri (Ed), Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, Varanasi, 2001.

Vākyapatīya of Bhartṛhari, K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye (Ed), Poona University, Poona, 1965.

Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Vol. I, Bhargava Sastri Bhikaji Josi (Ed), Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 2004.

Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Vol. II, M.M. Pandit Shivdatta Sharma (Ed), Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 1988.

Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Vol. III, M.M. Pandit Shivdatta Sharma and Pandit Raghunath Kashinath Shastri (Ed), Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 1988.

Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Vol. IV, Shri. Bhargava Shastri Joshi (Ed), Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, Delhi, 1988.

Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Vol. V, Shri. Bhargava Shastri Joshi
(Ed), Chaukamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, Delhi, 1988.

Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya of Patañjali, Vol. VI, Pandit Dadhiram Sharma
(Ed), Chaukamba Sanskrit Pratishtan, Delhi, 1988.

Vyākaraṇaśāstre laukikanyāyānāmupayogaḥ, Dr. Rāmakiśora Śukla,
Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi, 1992.

Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yājñavalkya, Vāsudevaśarma (Ed), Nirmayasagar Press,
Mumbai, 1936.

English

Abhyankar, K.V and Kasinath Vasudeva, *A dictionary of Sanskrit
Grammar*, Baroda Oriental Institute, 1964.

Abhyankar, K.V and Sukla, Dr. Jayadev Mohanlal (Ed), *Patañjali's
Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Āhnika-s (1-3)*, Bhandarkar
Oriented Research Institute, Pune, 1975.

Agrawal, Vasudev Saran, *India as known to Pāṇini*, Prithivi Prakasan,
Varanasi, 1963.

Banarjee, Nikunja Vihari, *Studies in the Dharmasāstra of Manu*, Munshiram
Manoharlal Publishers, Delhi, 1980.

Belvalker, S.K, *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, The Bharatiya Book
Corporation, Delhi, 1997.

Bhagwat, Durga, *An outline of Indian Folklore*, Popular Book Depot,
Bombay, 1958.

- Bhate, Saroja, (Ed), *Bhartrhari, Philosopher and Grammarian*, MLBD, 1994.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes, *Three Problems Pertaining to the Mahābhāṣya*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1987.
- Cardona, George, *Pāṇini-A Survey of Research*, MLBD, Delh
- Cardona, George, *Pāṇini-His work And its Traditions, Vol. I*, MLBD, Delhi, 1997.
- Chatterji, Krishnachandra, *Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya*, A Mukherjee and Co. Pvt. Ltd, Culcutta, 1957.
- Goldstucker, Theoder, *Pāṇini, his place in Sanskrit literature*, Chaukamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1965.
- Jacob, G.B, *A Handful of Popular Maxims*, Nīrājanā Publishers, Delhi, 1983.
- Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Anabhihitāhnika (P.2.3.1 to 2.3.17)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1976.
- Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnika (P.2.1.2 to 2.1.49)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1969.
- Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Bahubrīhidvandvāhnika (P.2.2.23 to 2.2.38)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1974.

Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Kārikāhnikā (P.1.4.23 to 1.4.55)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1975.

Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Karmadhārayāhnikā (P.2.1.51 to 2.1.72)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1971.

Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Samarthāhnikā (P.2.1.1)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1968.

Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Tatpuruṣāhnikā (P.2.2.2 to 2.2.23)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1973.

Joshi, S.D, and Roodbergen, J.A.F (Ed), *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya, Vibhaktiyāhnikā (P.2.3.18 to 2.3.45)*, introduction, text, translation and notes, Centre of Advanced study in Sanskrit, Poona, 1980.

Kane, P.V, *History of Dharmasāstra, Vol. I*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1968.

Kielhorn, F, (Tr), *Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojibhaṭṭa*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1960.

- 14
- Kielhorn, F, *Kātyāyana & Patañjali, Their Relationship to Each other And to Pāṇini*, Indological Book House, Varanasi, 1963.
- Koul, K. Maharaj, *A Sociolinguistic Study of Kashmiri*, Indian Institute of Language Studies, Patiala, 1986.
- Limaye, V.P, *Critical Studies in the Mahābhāṣya*, Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1974.
- Puri, B.N, *India in the Time of Patañjali*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, Delhi, 1990.
- Ray, Bidyut Lata, (Ed), *Pāṇini to Patañjali- A Grammatical March*, D.K. Printworld (P) Ltd., New Delhi, 2004.
- Sarma, K, Madhavakrishna, *Pāṇini, Kātyāyana & Patañjali*, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, Delhi, 1968.
- Sarma, Ram Sharan, *Perspectives in Social and Economic History of Early India*, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, Delhi, 1995.
- Sastri, P.S. Subrahmanya, *Lectures on Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I to Vol. IV & Vol. VI*, The Trichinopoly United Printers, Annamalinagar, 1944, 1951, 1955, 1956, 1962.
- Singh, Sir Bejai, , *Sanskrit Maxims and Proverbs*, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1980.
- Singh, Sir Bejai, *Panorama of Proverbs*, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1928.

Stall, J.F, (Ed), *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammar*, MLBD, Delhi, 1985.

Vasu, S.C, (Ed & Tr), *The Siddhāntakaumudi Of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita*, 2 Vols, MLBD, Delhi, 1962.

Hindi

Mīmamsak, Yudhiṣṭir, *Samskrit Vyākaran Śāstr kā Itihās*, Samchalak Bharatiya Prachya Vidya Pratishthan, Ajmir, 1978.

Mandal, Dr. Lalit, *Mahābhāṣy me Laukikanyāy evam Lokoktiyām*, Samskrt Grandhagar, Delhi, 2009.

Sastri, Dr. Rani Lakshi Narasimha, *Mahābhāṣye Laukikanyāyāha*, Rohini Publications, Rajahmundry.

Vedalankar, Dr. Bhimsingh, *Pātanjal Mahābhāṣy me Apūrv Kalpanāyem*, Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1988.

Vedalankar, Dr. Bhimsingh, *Vyākaraṇaśāstrīya Lokanyāyaratnākar*, Penman Publishers, Delhi, 2001.

Malayalam

Kartha, Prof. P.C, *Pazhañcolprapañcam*, D.C. Books, Kottayam, 2001.

Prabhakaravaryar, K.M, *Bhāṣāvalokanam*, Vallathol Vidyapeetham, Sukapuram, 1999.

Rājarājavarma, Vadakkumkur, *Bhāṣāsailīpradīpam*, Sreeramavarma Grandhaveli, Kochi, 1949.

Ramachandran Nair, Prof, N.P., *Śailīpurāṇam*, National Bookstall, Kottayam, 1995.

Sreedharan Nair, Prof, Vettinad, *Nyāyadīpti*, National Bookstall, Kottayam,
1989.

Sundaram, Dr. N, *Samskritalaukikanyāyaṅgal*, Poorna Publications,
Thiruvananthapuram, 2002.

Vikraman, S, *Nityopayogasamskritanyāyaṅgal*, Ganga Books, Kozhikkod,
2009.

INDEX

<u>List of Nyāya-s in Vyākaraṇa</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. abbaḥṣanyāya	198
2. abhirūpakanyādānanyāya	75
3. abhracandranyāya	237
4. abhyarhitanyāya	77
5. ācāryācāranyāya	199
6. ādityadarśananyāya	238
7. advagamananyāya	78
8. agnau karavāṇi nyāya	200
9. alpena yatnena bhūyo'rthākāṅkṣā nyāya	79
10. āmiśraṇanyāya	80
11. āmrān prṣṭaḥ kovidārānācaṣṭe nyāya	82
12. āmrasekapitṛtarpaṇanyāya	202
13. andhaparamparānyāya	83
14. anirjñāte'rthe bahuvacanam prayoktavyam nyāya	258
15. anudarā kanyā nyāya	84
16. anvayavyatirekanyāya	211
17. asiddham bahiraṅgamantaraṅge nyāya	279
18. aśokavanikānyāya	203
19. atajjātīyakam hi loke vyavadhāyakam bhavati nyāya	259
20. atideśanyāya	261
21. ātmānyāya	212
22. āvanāntāt odakāntāt priyam pānthamanuvṛajet nyāya	204
23. avatapte nakulasthitam nyāya	239

24.	aviaravikanyāya	86
25.	bheryāghātanyāya	87
26.	bhikṣukabhikṣā nyāya	89
27.	brāhmaṇa ānīyantām nyāya	90
28.	brāhmaṇagrāmanyāya	91
29.	brāhmaṇakṣatriyabhojanabhājanaparyāya nyāya	92
30.	brāhmaṇānām pūrva ānīyatāmityukte sarvapūrva ānīyate nyāya	93
31.	brāhmaṇavasiṣṭhanyāya	95
32.	cchatrinyāya	262
33.	dadhitrapusam pratyakṣo jvaraḥ nyāya	96
34.	dagdhapaṭanyāya	214
35.	devdattahanṭhatanyāya	97
36.	dhānyapalālanyāya	162
37.	dīrghasatrananyāya	205
38.	dravyavaccopacāranyāya	263
39.	dūrāt kupitād guroḥ nyāya	226
40.	durbalabalavatvirodhanyāya	98
41.	ekadeśavikṛtanyāya	99
42.	gargaśatadaṇḍananyāya	181
43.	gosakthikarṇagrahaṇopadeśanyāya	239
44.	guruvatgurputrananyāya	206
45.	hastimaśakasannikarṣanyāya	240
46.	indropasthitinyāya	207
47.	kākādhikaraṇatvanyāya	100
48.	kākatālīnyāya	242
49.	kamaṇḍalupāṇi chātra nyāya	228
50.	kanyābrahmacāriṇau daṇḍakandukahastau nyāya	102

51.	karaṇānukaraṇanyāya	104
52.	khadirabarburanyāya	244
53.	khaṭvārūḍho jalmaḥ nyāya	229
54.	kīlapratikīlanyāya	163
55.	kriyāpi kriyayepsitatamā bhavati nyāya	264
56.	kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime kāryasampratyayaḥ nyāya	280
57.	kumbhakāra vaiyākaraṇakula nyāya	106
58.	kumbhīdhānyanyāya	165
59.	kūpakhānakanyāya	166
60.	laṭṭvānukarṣaṇanyāya	107
61.	liṅgamaśiṣyam lokāśrayatvāliṅgasya nyāya	265
62.	loke hyarthavanti cānarthakāni ca vākyaṇi dṛśyante nyāya	266
63.	mallagrāmanyāya	108
64.	maṇḍūkaplutinyāya	245
65.	māṭharakaunḍinya nyāya	109
66.	māṭṛvatsanyāya	110
67.	na cāntareṇa pratiyoginam sparaddhā bhavati nyāya	111
68.	na hi bhikṣukāḥ santīti sthālyo nādhiśrīyante/ na hi mṛgāḥ santīti yavā nopyante nyāya	113
69.	na hi dviputra ānīyatāmityukte triputra ānīyate nyāya	115
70.	nānāliṅgakarāṇanyāya	268
71.	naṣṭāśvadagdharathanyāya	116
72.	naṭabhāryānyāya	118
73.	nātyantāyājñānam śaraṇam bhavitumarhati nyāya	208
74.	nauśakaṭanyāya	168
75.	nirluṭhitagarbhanyāya	119
76.	niyogataḥ kāryamṛṇam bhavati nyāya	170

77.	pāmsūdkanyāya	269
78.	pañjarasthasimhanyāya	246
79.	parjanyaavatnyāya	170
80.	phalavyatirekanyāya	120
81.	pitāputranyāya	121
82.	pradhāne kṛto yatnaḥ phalavān bhavati nyāya	122
83.	pradīpanyāya	123
84.	prakṛtīvikṛtinyāya	215
85.	prāsādavāsinyāya	124
86.	pratinidhinyāya	126
87.	pratyavayavam vākyaparīsamāpti nyāya	182
88.	rājabhṛtyanyāya	183
89.	rājagamananyāya	184
90.	rājāmātyanyāya	185
91.	rājatakṣānyāya	186
92.	raktavastranyāya	172
93.	rathāṅgarathanyāya	216
94.	rathasthānayananyāya	173
95.	rekhāgavayanyāya	247
96.	ṛṣisahasradakṣiṇānyāya	209
97.	rūpasāmānyanyāya	269
98.	sāhacaryanyāya	270
99.	śākaṭāyanaśakaṭasārthanyāya	174
100.	sakṛdgatinyāya	281
101.	śakuninyāya	248
102.	śalyakanyāya	249
103.	samandhakāre pradīpanimittam darśanam nyāya	127
104.	sambandhīśabdanyāya	128

105.	sambhavīkāryanyāya	271
106.	sāmṛtaiḥ pāṇibhirghnanti nyāya	230
107.	sandehe niyama nyāya	272
108.	saptadaśasāmīdhenīnyāya	210
109.	sarpadarśananyāya	251
110.	sārthikapraṭīśrayasambandhanyāya	129
111.	sarva ime svabhūtyartham yatante nyāya	130
112.	simhāvalokananyāya	252
113.	śiṣṭānukaraṇanyāya	132
114.	sthālīpulākanyāya	134
115.	sūtraśāṭakanyāya	175
116.	svātantryapāratantrayavivakṣā nyāya	135
117.	takrakaunḍinyanyāya	136
118.	taptabhrāṣṭaparakṣiptatīlanyāya	138
119.	tīrthakāḱanyāya	231
120.	tulyabalavirodhanyāya	139
121.	tuṣyatu durjana nyāya	140
122.	utsargāpavādanyāya	273
123.	vaiyākaraṇasūtasamvādanyāya	274
124.	vardhamānagarbhanyāya	140
125.	vīcītarāṅganyāya	217
126.	viṣabhakṣaṇamapi kasyacidīpsitam bhavati nyāya	141
127.	viṣavṛkṣanyāya	143
128.	vṛkṣapracalananyāya	253
129.	vṛkṣaśākhābalākānyāya	254
130.	vṛkṣasthāvatānanyāya	218
131.	vṛścikabhiyānyāya	144
132.	vyapadeśivadekasmin nyāya	145

133.	vyāptinyaya	276
134.	yathāsamkhyanyāya	277
135.	yātrānekavidhamāntaryam tatra sthānataḥ āntaryam balīyaḥ nyāya	283

NB6065

