

AN ORDERING PRINCIPLE (ANAVAKĀŚA) IN INDIAN GRAMMATICAL TRADITION

Bhagyalata PATASKAR

Introduction:

Sublating or setting aside a rule occupies a very important position in respect of the application of the rules of grammar for arriving at the correct form. A rule which sublates or sets aside the other rule in conflict proves to be a dominant one. Such rule is called *bādhaka*. There are some criteria laid down by the grammatical tradition for a rule to be a *bādhaka*. These criteria or *bādhakas* can be called ordering principles since they determine the order of rules in conflict, *paratva*, *nityatva*, *anatarāṅgatva* and *apavādatva* are some ordering principles assumed by tradition.

anavakāśatva, sometimes also stated as *niravakāśatva* is one of the ordering principles. But we find it discussed under the *apavādatva* in the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* (PB). It is not separately discussed with all its aspects in any grammatical treatise.

Traditional understanding of *anavakāśa*

Pāṇini nowhere uses the term *anavakāśa* in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. In fact, he does not explicitly prescribe any ordering principle except the *para* principle (*vipratishedhe paraṃ kāryam*, P. 1.4.2) and the *asiddha*.¹⁾

(a) Kātyāyana uses the word *anavakāśa* very few times. He uses the word *vacanaprāmāṇya*. *Vacanaprāmāṇya* means authority of the statement. Whenever Kātyāyana uses the word *vacanaprāmāṇyāt*²⁾ he means to say that it is the authority of the statement itself that makes it applicable. If it is not given a scope of application, it will be redundant. It seems that from the view point of Kātyāyana *vacanaprāmāṇya* plays an important role in the ordering of rules.³⁾ Further, at one place Kātyāyana says *na vā ksasyānavakāśatvād apavādo guṇasya*.⁴⁾ Thus here he intends to say that the rule is *apavāda*, because it is *anavakāśa*. Kātyāyana uses the term *anavakāśa* a few times and says that a certain rule supersedes another rule because of its being *anavakāśa*. In other words, if the rule is not applied it becomes redundant. Thus on the basis of the authority of the statement one has to apply the rule which otherwise becomes useless. Thus Kātyāyana brings together these two concepts, namely, *vacanaprāmāṇya* and *anavakāśa*.

Another point which is noteworthy in Kātyāyana's discussion is that he has connected the concept of *apavāda* with *vacanaprāmāṇya*.⁵⁾

(b) Patañjali several times repeats in his M. Bh. the statement, namely, *anavakāśa vidhayaḥ sāvakaśān vidhīn bādhante*⁶⁾. Whenever the conflict arises, he first discusses the scope of the rules concerned. The belief that each and every rule must find a scope, is the basic underlying principle of ordering accepted by Patañjali. Patañjali has used two different terms, namely *anavakāśa* and *apavāda* in two different contexts.⁷⁾

It indicates that he is quite aware of two distinct fields of these concepts. But it is not clear why he uses the term *anavakāśa* wherever Kātyāyana says *apavāda*. According to Kātyāyana P. 8.2.32 is an exception to P. 8.2.31 referring to the example *dogdhum*. Commenting on that *vtt.* Patañjali says⁸⁾ that since rules are *anavakāśa* because of the force of the authoritative statement they prevail over the other rules. It is clear that Patañjali identifies *apavāda* with *anavakāśa* here.

Patañjali also accepts *vacanaprāmāṇya* as Kātyāyana does. Further he connects it with *anavakāśa* only.

(c) Following points emerge from the discussions of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, regarding *anavakāśa* and *apavāda*.

1) Both accept the subsuming characteristic of an *apavāda* rule as well as an *anavakāśa* rule.

2) Kātyāyana maintains distinction between *anavakāśa* and *apavāda*, moreover he accepts *anavakāśatva* as the cause of being *apavāda*. Kātyāyana identifies *vacanaprāmāṇya* with *anavakāśa* as well as with *apavāda*. Patañjali distinguishes *anavakāśa* from *apavāda* at one place and identifies *anavakāśa* with *apavāda* at another.

(d) Later grammarians.

The principle of *anavakāśa* as assumed by Kātyāyana and Patañjali is accepted and employed by the later grammarians in works like the *Kāśikā*, *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* and *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*.

The references to these terms in *Kāśikā* shows that the *Kāśikā* does not distinguish between these two concepts clearly.

On the contrary, the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* several times discusses a conflict between two rules. Several examples can be pointed out where the VSK assumes a rule as an *apavāda* which, in fact, is *anavakāśa*. One of the criteria of identifying the pair as *utsarga-apavāda* or *sāvakaśa-niravakāśa* is *kāryin* to which the rules are applicable, e.g. in the example *paceyuh* the *kāryins* for the two rules are different,⁹⁾ still VSK assigns the value of *utsarga-apavāda* to them.¹⁰⁾ In the discussion on the example *anaḍvān* the

VSK uses the word *viśeṣavihita* as the criterion of the *bādhakatva*.¹¹⁾ In fact, this is the case where the *anavakāśa* principle functions.

We find instances in the *PB*, where Nāgoji Bhatta assumes *anavakāśa* rule as an *apavāda* rule, e.g. in the introduction to the *PB* No.59 he says *tatra bādhake pravṛtte yady utsarga-prāptir bhavati tadā bhavaty eva yathā tattraiva yāḍādayaḥ*.¹²⁾ In the example *mālāyām* the rule dealing with the augment *yāt* is *bādhaka*. After the application of the *yāt* augment, again there is a possibility of the application of the *utsarga* rule. *PB* 59 is *kvacid apavāda-aviśaye 'pi utsargaḥ abhiniviśate*. Nāgoji Bhatta here says *abhyāsavikāresu apavādā utsargān na bādhante*.¹³⁾ The example discussed here is *ajīḡanat*. According to the context here, the *apavāda* rule P. 7.4.98 does not debar the *utsarga* rule namely P. 7.4.60.¹⁴⁾

While discussing the form *tisṛṇām*, Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa says *ata eva viśayabhede'py apavādatvam*.¹⁵⁾ The Kāryins of two rules namely P. 7.2.100 *aci ra ṛtaḥ* and P. 7.4.54 *hrasvanadyāpo nut* are quite different still there is *utsarga-apavāda* relationship.

Consequences of the traditional understanding

While applying these principles tradition did not distinguish between them. Naturally the *apavāda* principle seems to have many counter-examples. The wellknown *PB* *yena nāprāpte yo vidhir ārabhyate sa tasya bādhako bhavati*,¹⁶⁾ is discussed or interpreted as the *apavāda* *PB*, while some of the examples discussed there can be covered by *anavakāśa* principles.

The reasons behind traditional idea of *anavakāśa* and *apavāda*

The fact that both the principles of *anavakāśa* and *apavāda* refer to the special-general relationship between rules concerned, might have misled the tradition. Though the domains of *apavāda* and *anavakāśa* rules can be occupied by *utsarga* and the *sāvakāśa* rules respectively, there is a difference of *kāryin* (i.e. input representation) of each pair. e.g. P. 7/3/102 *supi ca* and P. 7/3/103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*. Both the rules share one *kāryin* namely *a*, in the example like *vṛkṣebhyaḥ*. On the other hand in the derivation of *ramāyām* the *kāryins* for the rules P. 7/3/113 *yād āpaḥ* and P. 7/3/115 *nerāmnadyāmnībhyaḥ* are different from each other. The augment *yāt* is placed before the *ni*, while the whole *ni* is replaced by *ām* by P. 7/3/116.

Consider the example *ajīḡnat* (Aorist 3rd person singular of *gaṇ* to 'count').

Two rules are in conflict at the following stage. — *a gaṇ gaṇ i a t*

P. 7.4.60 *halādiḥ seṣaḥ* and

P. 7.4.97 *ī ca gaṇaḥ*

If P. 7.4.60 is applied first, then the *kāryin* for P. 7.4.97 is, *a* in the *abhyāsa*

of *ga*, otherwise it is *ṇ* in the *abhyāsa*. Between these rules P. 7.4.97 is *anavakāśa*.

Besides this special-general relationship, there is another common property shared by both. The concept of *vacanaprāmāṇya* was connected to both of them.

This might have led the tradition to confuse between the two.

Differences between *anavakāśa* and *apavāda*

To remove the confusion, we have to understand them correctly. Following differences can be pointed out regarding their nature and function.

i) The *utsarga-apavāda* relation consists in mutual conflict between two rules. If the given rules A and B hold special-general relationship and if the rule A is applied first, there is no scope for the rule B and vice-versa,¹⁷⁾ then only the rules hold *utsarga-apavāda* relationship.

Consider the following example;

P. 3.2.1 *Karmanṇ aṇ* and P. 3.2.3 *āto 'nūpasarge kaḥ* is the traditionally accepted pair of *utsarga-apavāda* in the example like *godāyaḥ*.

go + *dā* here if we apply *aṇ* by the general rule, we cannot apply *ka* by the special rule. On the other hand, application of *ka* first destroys the condition for the application of *aṇ*. This type of mutual conflict can be called bilateral conflict, and the ordering of the rules involved in a bilateral conflict can be described as disjunctive ordering. Unless such bilateral conflict is there mere special-general relationship is not enough to assign the rules the value of *utsarga-apavāda*.

On the contrary, there is one-way, i. e., unilateral conflict between *anavakāśa* and *sāvakāśa* rules. In the example *ajīgaṇat* we can apply P. 7.4.93 *ī ca gaṇaḥ* before as well as after the application of the *halādiḥ śeṣaḥ*.

Consider the following example;

dhīmāṇ. The form is derived as follows:

dhī + *mat* + *s*, and following two rules find simultaneous application here.

P. 7.1.70 *ugid acāṃ sarvanāmasthāne'dhātoḥ*.

P. 6.4.14 *atvasantasya cādhātoḥ*.

P. 6.4.14 is *anavakāśa* because it has scope only in deriving nominative singular from the nominal bases ending in *at* and *as*

Here *upadhādīragha* (lengthening of the penultimate vowel) is possible, before as well as after the application of the *num*-augment, but if *num* is applied first there is no scope for the *upadhādīrghatva*. This type of conflict can be called one-way conflict, needless to say that the relation between two conflicting rules is not disjunctive one.

ii) In fact, *anavakāśa* is not restricted to the domain of the ordering of rules while *apavāda* is. *anavakāśa* represents a traditional method of interpreting

Pāṇini. In derivation of certain words we have to assume particular sequence of rules, otherwise Pāṇini's rule will be *anavakāśa*, i.e. redundant. As soon as we assume a certain procedure the rules obtain a scope.

Consider the following example—*khaṭvodhaḥ*. *khaṭvā ā ūdha* this is the derivational stage where following two rules find scope simultaneously.

P. 6.1.101. *akah savarṇe dīrghaḥ*

P. 6.1.87 *ād guṇaḥ*

Suppose we apply *savarṇadīrgha* first and the *guṇa* rule next, we can achieve the form *khaṭvodhaḥ* which is used in the language. In that case P. 6.1.95 *omānoś ca* will be *anavakāśa*. According to P. 6.1.95 when stem ending in *a* or *ā*, is followed by *om* or *ān*, the single substitute in the form of the following one, takes place. Of course this rule assumes contraction between verb and prefix, and thereby offers us a clue that the phonological rules are applied to the verb-preverb layer first, and then to the items lying outside that layer. P. 6.1.95 presupposes that the *guṇa* rule which is applicable to the verb-preverb layer is applied first. Therefore first the contraction between *ā + ūdhaḥ* = *odhaḥ* takes place and then *khaṭvā + odhaḥ* becomes *khaṭvodhaḥ* by P. 6.1.95. In other words, to avoid the undesired form from *khaṭvā + odhaḥ* Pāṇini is forced to give P. 6.1.95. Thus it is the *anavakāśatva* of this rule which determines the sequence of the rules in this particular case. Same is the case in the form *śivehi*

iii) When the given rules bear *utsarga-apavāda* relationship the *apavāda* rule if applied first totally sublethes the *utsarga-rule*. The example is already discussed.¹⁸⁾ On the contrary if the rules hold *sāvakāśa-anavakāśa* relationship, there are examples where *sāvakāśa* rules are applied first and then the *anavakāśa*, more over in the example like *pipye* (reduplicative past tense of *pyāy* 'to grow'), the *anavakāśa* rule is applied first and then *sāvakāśa*.

At the derivational stage:

Pyāy + liṭ following two rules are applicable:

P. 6.1.8 *liṭi dhātor anabhyāsasya*¹⁹⁾

P. 6.1.29 *liṭ yaṇoś ca*²⁰⁾

in which the latter (P. 6.1.29) is *anavakāśa*. Here we apply the *anavakāśa* rule (of *pī* substitution) first and then *sāvakāśa* rule.

The conjunctive application between rules means that there is no question of the prevalence of *niravakāśa* rule over *sāvakāśa* rule. As far as possible we must apply both of the rules. This can be done by applying *anavakāśa* rule first and then the *sāvakāśa* or vice-versa.²¹⁾

There are some examples where one of the rules in the pair is *anavakāśa*, still tradition does not assume conjunctive application between them, and hence the *PB* states as follows:

abhyāsavikāreṣu bādhyabādhakabhāvo nāsti.²²⁾

e.g. *mīmāṃsate* (present third person sg. from desiderative base of *mān* 'to

honour').

At particular stage of derivation *ma + m̄an + sa + te* following two rules are applicable simultaneously.

P. 3.1.6 *mañbadhadāñśaṇbhyo dīrghaś cābhyāsasya*²³⁾

P. 7.4.89 *san yataḥ*²⁴⁾

Out of these P. 7.4.89 is *sāvakāśa* while P. 3.1.6 is *anavakāśa*. Since tradition did not assume conjunctive application, the fact that *sāvakāśa* rule is applied first and then *anavakāśa* is justified by this *PB*²⁵⁾

acīkarat is yet another example where both the rules in conflict are *anavakāśa*.

The derivational stage *a + ka + kar + a + t* is the subject for following two rules.

P. 7.4.93. *sanvallahuni caṇpare'naglope*²⁶⁾

P. 7.4.94. *dīrgho laghoḥ*²⁷⁾

Both these rules have no independent domain, hence both these rules must be regarded as *anavakāśa*. According to tradition P. 7.4.94 is *bādhaka* and P. 7.4.93 is *bādhya*. The rules are *anavakāśa*, but the tradition did not assume conjunctive application, and naturally to justify the fact that P. 7.4.93 is applied first and then P. 7.4.94, tradition has to take recourse to the *paribhāṣā*, *abhyāsavikāresu bādhyabādhakabhāvo nāsti*.

iv) We can find certain rule being *apavāda* with reference to one *utsarga* rule, but with reference to another more restricted rule, the same rule can prove to be the *utsarga* rule.

Consider the following group of rules;

P. 3.2.1. *karmany aṇ*²⁸⁾

P. 3.2.2. *hvāvāmaś ca*²⁹⁾

P. 3.2.3. *āto'nupasarge kaḥ*³⁰⁾

Here P. 3.2.3 is an *apavāda* of P. 3.2.1, while the same rule proves to be *utsarga* in connection with P. 3.2.2. Question of domains occupied by each rule matters here. This type of characteristic, namely "relative restrictiveness" of *apavāda* rule cannot be found in *anavakāśa* rule. This quality of the *apavāda* rule emerges out of the peculiar structure of rules.

Conclusion

There is overlapping, overgeneralization as well as complexity in traditional concepts of *anavakāśa* and *apavāda* and all these are due to some common property shared by them. The common property is that both of them are restrictive or special rules in connection with other rules in conflict, namely, *sāvakāśa* and *apavāda* respectively.

anavakāśa and *apavāda* are two distinct ordering principles. Their fields of application are quite different from each other.

apavāda principle functions where there is bilateral type of conflict and rules in conflict are disjunctively applied whereas *anavakāśa* functions where there is unilateral type of conflict and the rules in conflict are conjunctively applied.

anavakāśa is accommodative type of ordering principle. Hence there is no question of prevalence of any rule by the other one, while in case of *apavāda* the same is very important.

Though both of them are ordering principles in conflict, in addition to that only *anavakāśa* functions as the traditional method for interpreting Pāṇini's rule.

NOTES

- 1) The ordering principle *paratva* accounts for the rules in *ekasamjñā adbhikāra* only i.e. P. 1.4.2-P. 2.2.38.
Rules dealing with *asiddha* principle are P. 3.4.22 *asiddhavad atrābhāt* and P. 8.2.1 *pūrvatrāsiddham*.
- 2) Vtt 4 on P. 6.1.108 *dirghatvam vacanaprāmāṇyat* Vtt. 2 on P. 8.2.1. *apavādo vacanaprāmāṇyat*, etc.
- 3) Tradition describes this as *asatisambhave bādhanam bhavati* (Tr. the rule proves to be the superseding one since it has no scope elsewhere.)
- 5) Vtt. 2 on P. 8.2.1 *apavādo vacanaprāmāṇyat* M.Bh. Vol. III P. 385/19 the rules P. 8.2.32 and P. 8.2.29 should be regarded as the *apavāda* of P. 8.2.31 and P. 8.2.23 respectively, since the very mention of the rule carries authority.
- 6) Tr. "The rules which have no scope, elsewhere debar them which have already scope". Mbh. Vol. III, P. 114/7; 311/3 etc.
- 7) "*na ganer itvam apavādatvāt halādiśeṣam bādhathe kiṃ tarhi anavakāśatva*" Mbh. Vol. III P. 357/10.
- 8) "*anavakāśau etau vacanaprāmāṇyat bhaviṣyataḥ*" Mbh Vol. III P. 385/20 These two rules namely P. 8.2.32 and P. 8.2.29 will be *anavakāśa*. But they take place because they are authoritative.
- 9) Between the rules P. 7.2.80 *ato yeyaḥ* and P. 6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*, the former prevails over the latter. The *kāryin* for *ato yeyaḥ* is *yās* while for *ato lopaḥ* is *a* in *paca* in the derivational stage *paca* + *yās* + *us*
- 10) "*madhye'pavādanyāyena hi ato lopa eva bādhyeta*"
VSK No. 2212.
- 11) "*ato viśesavihitenāpi numā ām na bādhyate, āmā ca num na bādhyate*".
The VSK No. 332.
- 12) PBMtr. P. 309.
- 13) PBMtr. 312 PB No. 59
- 14) For derivational details pl. refer to P.
- 15) PBMtr. 305 on PB No. 58
- 16) PBMtr P. 297. PB No. 58.
- 17) Because any rule if applied first destroys the condition, necessary for the application of the other rule
- 18) See Page 7. Between the rules P. 3.2.1 and P. 3.2.3 any-one if applied first blocks the application of the other.
- 19) Tr. "The root, which is not already reduplicated is reduplicated, when followed by 1Iṭ (tense affix of perfect.)"
- 20) Tr. "*pyāy* is substituted by *pī*, when followed by 1Iṭ and *yaN* also"

- 21) Between P. 6.1.8 and P. 6.1.29 we apply *anavakāṣa* rule first and then *sāvakāṣa* while between P. 7.4.60 and P. 7.4.98 we apply *sāvakāṣa* first and then *anavakāṣa* to arrive at the correct form.
- 22) Pb. No.67 from the *Paribhāṣenduṣekhara*. Tr. "So far as the modifications of a reduplicative syllable is concerned there is no *bādhya* & *bādhaka*."
- 23) Tr. "The suffix *san* is added to the verbal bases *mān* etc. and the reduplicative syllable is lengthened."
- 24) Tr. "*i* is substituted by short *a* of the reduplicative in the desiderative formation"
- 25) *īyaṃ parāntarangādibādhakānāmapy abādhakatvabodhikā. tenācīkarat mīmāṃsata ityādi siddham. ādye sanvadbhāvasya paratvāddīrghena bādhaḥ prāpnoti. antye mānbadheti dīrghenāntarangatvāditvasya bādhaḥ prāptiḥ*. Nagoji on PB No. 67.
- 26) Tr. "In the reduplicative aorist of the causative the reduplicative behaves like that of a *san* suffix, as far as the substitution of *i* for *a* is concerned when the vowel of the verbal base is light and the verbal base has not lost its *ak*-vowel."
- 27) Tr. "The short vowel of the reduplicative is lengthened in the reduplicative aorist of the causative"
- 28) Tr. "The affix *aN* is added to a verbal root in the sense of on object in composition with it"
- 29) Tr. "The affix *aN* is added to *hveñ* 'to call' *veñ* 'to weave' and *mān* 'to measure' in the sense on object.
- 30) Tr. "The suffix *aN* is added to the verbal roots ending in *ā* not preceded by *upasargas* and in the sense of an object.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

Mbh:	Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali [Kielhorn ed.]
P:	Pāṇini-sūtra
PB:	Paribhāṣā
PBMtr:	Paribhāṣenduṣekhara Marathi Translation (Ed Wadegaonkar Edition 1926)
Tr:	Translation
VSK:	Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī
Vtt:	Vārttika

Research Associate
Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit
University of Poona