

A STUDY ON SANSKRIT SYNTAX (4):*
ŚABDAKAUSTUBHA ON P.1.4.45-48
[ADHIKARAṆA]

Noriyuki KUDO

Text, Translation and Notes

23. *ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam* [P.1.4.45: SK. 632].

23.0 Explanation of the rule{ 127, 16-19}

Text: *ādhriyante 'smin kriyā ity ādhārah*. “*adhyāyanyayodyāva* [sam-
hārādhārāvayās ca]” [P.3.3.122] *ityādinā karane GHaÑ*.^{*1}
kriyāśrayayoḥ kartṛkarmaṇor dhāraṇāt paramparayā kriyām
prati^{*2} *ādhārah tat kārakam adhikaraṇam syāt*. “*kaṭe āste*,”
“*sthālyām pacati*.”

*1. *Tattvabodhinī* on SK. 632 [I, 694]: “*adhyāyanyaya —*” *iti sūtre*
“*avahārādhāra —*” *ity upasaṃkhyānādhikaraṇe GHaÑ*. And the *Nyāsa*
says [on P.1.4.45, I, 560]: “*adhyāyanyayodyāva*” *ityādinādhārasabdo*
“*dhikaraṇe GHaÑ*” *vyutpāditaḥ*. Read *adhikaraṇe* instead of *karane*.¹

*2. After this word, MS has *ya(h)* (100R1). Add *ya*.

Translation: The word ‘*ādhāra*’ means “a place wherein actions are sustained.” [This form *ādhāra* derives] with a suffix *GHaÑ*, denoting locus, introduced by P.3.3.122. Since the agent or the object are [direct] substratum of the action, the locus is indirectly related to the action. Such a locus [functioning as] *kāraka* is called *adhikaraṇa*. For example, “*kaṭe āste*: X sits on a mat” or “*sthālyām pacati*: X cooks in a pan.”

Notes: At first, the word *ādhāra*, the introduced of the designation *adhikaraṇa*, is explained by means of its etymological paraphrase. The above passage of ŚK is based on that of the KV on P.1.4.45 [I, 561]: *ādhriyante 'smin kriyā gūṇaḥ ity ādhārah*. *kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kriyāśraya-*

* This paper is the fourth part of ongoing my study on the *Śabdakastubha*. Previous parts are as follows: part 1 = KUDO [1996]; part 2 = KUDO [1997(a)]; part 3 = KUDO [1998].

¹ *MDhV* on √*dhr-* [p. 486]: *ādhārah — ‘adhyāya’ ityādinādhikaraṇe GHaÑ*.

bhūṭayor dhāraṇakriyām prati ya ādhāras tat kārakam adhikaraṇa-samjñam bhavati. (Tr. The word ‘*ādhāra*’ means “an attribute wherein actions are subsisted. With regard to the action [such as] “*dhāraṇa*: holding,” the *kāraka* which becomes locus of the agent or the object as the substratum of the action is called *adhikaraṇa*.) Furthermore, the *Nyāsa* states grammatical element in derivation [I, 560]: ‘*adhyāyanyāyodyāva ityādinā*’ ‘*dhārasabdo dhikaraṇe ghañanto vyutpāditah.* (Tr.: The suffix *GHañ* [in the sense of ‘location’ by P.3.3.117] is added to form the word *ādhāra* by P.3.3.122).² Hence, etymologically, this word expresses an idea of ‘location’ on which actions are being holding.

Problem arises. When we admit this etymological sense of the word *ādhāra*, it should inevitably cover the notions of the agent (*karṭr*) and the object (*karman*) because actions are found on either of two. *Nyāsa* says [I, 560-1]: *yady ādhriyante kriyā yasmin sa ādhāraḥ iti, evam hi sati karṭrkarmaṇor evādhikaraṇasamjñā prasajyeta, tayor eva hi kriyā ādhriyante. tathā hi — karṭrsthā vā kriyā bhavati, karmasthā vā.* (Tr. If it is locus that is holding the actions, the designation *adhikaraṇa* should be applied to the agent or the object as the action is subsisted only on either of two. In other words, the action is belonging either to the agent or to the object). To distinguish the levels of locus, the *KV* gives a qualification on this rule as “*karṭrkarmaṇoḥ kriyāśraya-bhūṭayor*” and the *SK* No. 632 (= P.1.4.45, I, 693-4) also states “*karṭrkarmadvārā tan niṣṭhakriyāyā ādhāraḥ kārakam adhikaraṇa-samjñāḥ syāt* (Tr. Through an agent or an object, a *kāraka* which becomes a locus of the action resided in [the agent or the object] is called *adhikaraṇa*.) In this way, since the relation to action is rearranged in a hierarchy, that is, direct relation or indirect, the designation *adhikaraṇa* is only applied to the item which has indirect relation to the action through either the agent or the object. See the *Nyāsa* [I, 561-562]:

kriyāyās tu dhāraṇam sāḥṣād, vyavadhānena vā; karṭrkarmaṇoḥ kriyāśrayayor dhāraṇāt. tatra pūrvasya vyavacchedārtham ‘karṭrkarmaṇoḥ’ ity uktam. tad etad uktam bhavati — karṭrkarmaṇoḥ kriyādhārābhūṭayor dhāraṇāt kriyāyā abhimukho ya ādhāras tasyādhikaraṇasamjñā bhavātīti. tad evam kriyā-

² P.3.3.122: *adhyāyanyāyodyāvāsamhārādhārāvayās ca.* “[The words] *adhyāya-*, *nyāya-*, *udyāva-*, *samhāra-*, *ādhāra-*, and *āvāya-* are derived with *krī*^{3.1.93} affix^{3.1.1} *GHañ*^{3.3.120}, signifying an instrument or locus^{3.3.117}.”

*dhārabhūtakarṭṛkarmadhāraṇadvāreṇa (562) kriyāyā abhi-
mukho ya ādhāras tasyādhikaraṇasamjñā, yato 'nena vidhīyate
tato na bhavati pūrvasya doṣasya prasaṅgaḥ. na hi karṭṛ-
karmaṇor anena prakāreṇa kriyāṃ praty ādhāratvam, api tu
sākṣād eva kriyādhāraṇāt.*

Tr.: Subsisting the actions is [twofold,] i.e., directly or indirectly. It is because the agent or the object, the substratum of the actions, can hold the actions. In this [comment of the *KV*], in order to exclude first relation from [the scope of the term *adhikaraṇa*] it is said '*karṭṛkarmaṇoḥ.*' Namely, [P.1.4.45] means that the locus which is in presence of the actions, since it is holding the agent or the object which are [direct] locus of the actions, is designated as *adhikaraṇa*. In this way, the locus presenting in the occurrence of action is called *adhikaraṇa* through the act of holding of the agent or the object which are direct substratum of the actions. As far as the rule is prescribed in this way, it is not [applied to *karṭṛ* or *karman*]. Thus, above difficulty [= over-application to *karṭṛ* or *karman*] does not stand. Both the agent and the object do not have the locus-ness in this sense but rather they are direct substratum of the actions.

Examples given in the *KV*. are explained in the *Nyāsa*, taking into account above distinction of the levels of locus, namely "*kaṭe āste iti. karṭṛsthā kriyā yatra pūrveṇa prakāreṇādhriyate tasyodāharaṇam, bhāsanakriyāyāḥ karṭṛsthatvāt. sthālyāṃ pacatīti. karmasthā kriyā yatrādhriyate tasyodāharaṇam; vikledanakriyāyāḥ karmasthatvāt: On 'kaṭe āste.' This is an example to show a location wherein an action residing in the agent is subsisted because an act of appearance is found on the agent's side. On 'sthālyāṃ pacati.' It is an example to show the location wherein an action residing in the object is subsisted because an act of softening is found on the object's side."* [I, 562]

23.1.1 Conflict with *karṭṛ/karman* { 127, 20-21 }

Text: *syād etat, sākṣātkriyādhārayoḥ karṭṛkarmaṇor eva kuto neyaṃ samjñeti cet? na parābhyāṃ karṭṛkarmasamjñābhyāṃ bādhitatvāt.*

Translation: If it is a case, then how is not this designation applied to [either] the agent or the object, both being the direct substratum of the actions? [Answer:] It is not [correct] because those two designations are prescribed later than this designation *adhikaraṇa*.

Notes: As stated above, both *kartr* and *karman* are direct substratum of the actions. This directness to actions is related to the meanings of the verbal roots. According to Bhattoji Dikṣita, the verbal root denotes two meanings, i.e., ‘*vyāpāra*: activity’ and ‘*phala*: result’ (see *VMM* k.2). The agent is the substratum of the activities and the object is that of the result. Such a relationship is direct and inherent. On the other hand, the locus does not have the actions in itself, in other words, it does neither perform the activity nor have the result. It is related to the activity when the agent is existent on it and related to the result when the object is existent on it. In order to clarify this indirectness of the locus to the actions, commentators give the additional phrases such as “*karṭṛkarmanoh kriyāśrayabhūtayor*” (by *KV*), “*kriyādhārabhūta-karṭṛkarmadhāraṇadvāreṇa*” (by *Nyāsa*), and “*kriyāśrayayoh karṭṛ-karmanor*” (by *ŚK*).³

However, the blocking of the operation of P.1.4.45 to the agent or the object is made by the order of rules in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Since the terms *kartr* (54) and *karman* (49) are prescribed later than term *adhikaraṇa*, two rules which are prescribed both terms can prevail over 45 according to the *paratva* principle.

We have another exposition of blocking the application of term *adhikaraṇa*. This is stated in the *Nyāsa* (ibid., I, 562):

nanv evam api karṭṛkarmanor mukhyaṃ kriyādhāratvam, sāksāḍ eva kriyādhāraṇāt. karṭṛkarmadhārasya tu kaṭāder gaṇatvaṃ, kriyāśrayabhūtakarṭṛkarmadhāraṇadvāreṇa kriyādhāraṇāt. tatra mukhye ādhāre sati gaṇasyādhikaraṇasaṃjñā na prāpnotīti sa doṣas tad avastha eva? naitad asti; tamaBgrahanena jñāpitam etat — gaṇasyāpy ādhārasyādhikaraṇasaṃjñā bhavatīti. bhavatu gaṇasyādhikaraṇasaṃjñā, mukhyasyāpi kartuḥ karmaṇas ca kasmān na bhavatīti cet, na; paratvād anavakāśatvāc ca karṭṛkarmasaṃjñābhyāṃ bādhyamānatvāt. adhikaraṇasaṃjñā hi pūrvā gaṇa ādhāre sāvakāśā, tadviparīte tu karṭṛkarmasaṃjñā ite tābhyāṃ bādhyamānā notsaḥate tayor viṣayam avagāhitum.

Tr.: [Objection:] Both *kartr* and *karman* have primary locus-ness since they are directly holding the actions. On the other hand, the one which is holding [the actions] through the agent or the object

³ *LS* on P.1.4.45 [I, 722]: “*kārake*” ity *adhikārāt kriyājanake etatpravṛtṭyopasthitatvād ādhārah kriyāyā eva. tatrepsitatamasvatantrapadābhyāṃ sāksāṭkriyādhārayoh karmakarṭṛ-saṃjñābhyāṃ bādhat paramaparayā tadāśrayasya grahanam.*

such as 'mat', etc. has secondary locus-ness since it can hold the actions [only] through the act of holding the agent or the object which are [direct] substratum of the actions. Then, if an item [to which the designation *adhikaraṇa* is applied] is primary locus [in this rule], it is impossible to do so to the secondary locus. Again, we have to face to the difficulty stated above.

[Answer:] It is not correct. It is indicated by the mentioning *-tamaP* [in the domain of *kāraka* rules] that the designation *adhikaraṇa* is applicable even to the secondary. In fact, this designation should be applied to the secondary [otherwise the usages would not be justified]. Then, how is not this designation [applied] to either the agent or the object, both being primary locus? It is because of *paratva*-principle and no-scope of application (*anavakāśatva*) that the operation of P.1.4.45 to agent and to object is blocked. That is to say, the designation *adhikaraṇa* is prescribed earlier than the designations *kartr̥/karman*, and it is applied to the locus elsewhere but latter two designations are not. When items are excluded from the scope by two [rules], they are not fallen into the scope of the rules [which are blocking].

In this passage of the *Nyāsa*, it is explained that the distinction among the items which have primary and secondary significances is done by the use of the suffix *-tamaP*. This explanation is based on the discussion of the *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.42 [I, 558-559]:

tamaBgrahanam kim? gaṅgāyām ghoṣa iti. yadi tamaBgrahanam na kriyate, tato 'dhikaraṇasamjñā na syāt. iha hi dvividha ādhāraḥ — gaṇaḥ, mukhyaś ca. tatra mukhyo ya ādheyena vyāpyate, yathā — tileṣu tailam asti; atra tailenādheyenādhārabhūtās tilā vyāptāḥ. avyāpto gaṇo, yathā — gaṅgāyām ghoṣa iti. atra hi sāmīpyād gaṅgāyā ādhāratvam upacaritam, na mukhyam, vyāptyabhāvāt. tatrāsati tamaBgrahaṇe "gaṇamukhyayor mukhye kāryasampratrayaḥ" iti mukhyasyaivādihikaraṇasamjñā syāt, netarasya; tamaBgrahaṇāt tasyāpi bhavati. ... (559) ... tat kiṃ tamaBgrahaṇena? tad etat tamaBgrahanam jñāpanārthaṃ kṛtam. etad anena jñāpyate — "iha kārakādhikāre itaḥ sūtrād anyatra viṇā tamaBgrahaṇena prakarṣo nāśrīyate" iti. tena "ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam" [P.1.4.45] ity anena "gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ" ityādāv amukhyasyāpi gaṅgāder ādhārasyādihikaraṇasamjñā siddhā bhavati.

Tr.: On “*tamaBgrahaṇam kim? gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ.*” If the suffix is not added to [sādhaka- in P.1.4.42], it would lead to non-application of the designation *adhikarāṇa* [to *gaṅgā* in case of “*gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ*”]. The locus is twofold, i.e., secondary (*gauṇa*) and primary (*mukhya*). Firstly, the primary [locus] is the one that is pervaded by the thing located (*ādheya*). For example, “*tilaṣu tailam.*” In this example, ‘sesame seed’ (*tila*), the locus, is pervaded by ‘oil’ (*taila*), a thing located. On the other hand, [the locus] which is not [all-]pervaded is secondary. For example, “*gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ*: a village is located on [the bank of] Gaṅgā.” In this case, though the locus-ness is admitted to the Gaṅgā through the relation of proximity (*sāmīpya*), [the Gaṅgā] is not primary [locus] because it is not pervaded by [the village]. If there were no use of the suffix *-tamaP* [in this rule, i.e., P.1.4.42], the designation [*adhikarāṇa*] would be only applied to the primary locus according to *Pbh.* No. 15 that “when an operation makes effect to both primary and secondary item, it is applicable only to the primary.” By mentioning *-tamaP* [in P.1.4.42] [P.1.4.45] becomes applicable to it [= the secondary locus]. ...

Then, what is effective by mentioning the suffix *-tamaP*? It serves as an indicator. Namely, it is indicated that “in the *kāraka* section from this rule onward the most excellence is not intended without the suffix *-tamaP*.” Therefore, in cases of “*gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ,*” etc. the designation *adhikarāṇa* becomes applicable even to the secondary locus such as Gaṅgā, etc. by P.1.4.45 [because the word *ādhāra* is not intended to denote “the primary” alone].

23.1.2 Proof {127, 21-23}

Text: *ata evāhuḥ* - [VP.III.7.148]

*karṭṛkarmavyavahitām asāksād dhārayat kriyām /
upakurvāt kriyāsiddho*^{*1} *śāstre 'dhikarāṇam viduḥ*^{*2} // iti.

*1. The present edition of the VP gives *kriyāsiddhau*, same as MS100R4.
Read -*siddhau*. *2. VP. *smṛtam*.

Translation: Therefore, it is said [by Bharṭṛhari]: “When the action is being accomplished, the one which is holding it indirectly through [either] the agent or the object [and] helping in [the accomplishment of it] is called *adhikarāṇa* in the grammar.”

23.2 Relation to the verb {127, 24-26}

Text: *ata eva "bhūtale ghaṭaḥ" ityādau astīty asyādhyāhāro niyataḥ. yathā "puṣpebhyaḥ" ity atra sprhayateḥ. ata eva ca nañā saha kārakānvayam vadantaḥ parāstāḥ.*

Translation: Therefore, in the expressions like "*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*: a pot on the ground" the supplement of [verb] *asti* is inevitable. For [another] example, "*puṣpebhyaḥ*." In this expression we need the verb *sprhayati*. In this way, those who claim that *kāraka* has relation with the negative particle are refuted.

Notes: In this passage, the problem regarding to the supplement of the verb is suddenly introduced. Apparently it is the logicians who are attacked here. However, since this ŚK's passage is too short to realize what is intended by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, we need to command a bird's eye view of related texts.

At first, Helārāja, commenting on above VP. III.7.148, talks about the action but his comment does not straightly deal with the supplement but the indication of the agent or the object though the use of the verb [348, 18-20]: *prthivyām śete, sthālyām pacyata ityādau cākhyātaśabdāt kriyāviśiṣṭe karṭṛkarmanī pratipadyete, na kriyāmātram tato nikṣṭarūpam iti kriyāśrayadhāraṇād eva loke 'dhikarāṇasya kriyopakārah pratiyate na sākṣāt.* (Tr.: In the examples such as "*prthivyām śete*: X is lying on the ground" and "*sthālyām pacyate*: X is cooked in a pan," the agent and the object, both qualified by the action, are realized by the verb. The action itself does not have lower status than it. Thus, *adhikarāṇa* is recognized as an assistant of action because it is holding the substratum of the action [i.e., agent or object] but not directly.)

Next is the *Darpaṇa*, a commentary on the *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇasāra* of Kaunḍa Bhaṭṭa. It says [259]:

"bhūtale ghaṭa" ityādau na yatra kriyāśravaṇam tatrāhi kārakatvanirvāhāya tadadhyāhārasyāvaśyakatā. idṛśasthale paramparāsambandhasyāpi kriyā'nvayitvarūpakāratvaghāṭakatā, śāstraprāmāṇyāt. ata evā'kṣaśauṇḍa ityādau sāmārthyopapattiḥ, evañ ca bhūtale ghaṭo 'stīty atra bhūtalavṛttir ghaṭo varttamānasattā''śraya iti bodhaḥ. nañsamabhivyāhāre tu tādrśasaptamyarthā'bhāvo ghaṭāmśe bhāsata ity āhuh.

Tr.: In the expression "*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*," wherever [the verb denoting] the action is not expressed, the supplement of it [= the verb] is inevitable in order to keep [the relation of] the *kāraka*. In

this case, the indirect relation (*paramparāsambandha*) serves as the *kāraka*-ness in the form of being the corelatum of the action. It is authorized. Thus, in a compound form “*akṣaśauṇḍa*: fond of gambling” a syntactic relationship is established. [Namely, this compound is formed by P.2.1.40 which prescribes the compounding the words ‘*śauṇḍa*,’ etc. with the word ending in the seventh case. However, since the *kāraka*-relation must be syntactically connected with the verbs, in the process of compounding we need certain verbal form that relates to the *kāraka*, i.e., *adhikaraṇa* represented in the seventh case.]⁴ In this way, in the expression “*bhūtale ghaṭo ’sti*: there is a pot on the ground” the verbal understanding is “the pot is occurring on the ground, being the substratum of the existence in the present time.” However, when the negative particle is used, ‘absence,’ the meaning of the seventh case, is manifested on the pot. Thus said by them [Naiyāyikas].

The sentence “*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*” is an oft-quoted example to show the “*ādhārādheyabhāva*: the relation of substratum and superstratum” and the “*abhāva*: absence” denoted by the negative particle *nañ*. Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa (ca. 1570),⁵ one of Navya-Naiyāyika, discusses it with respect of the meaning of locative case.⁶ See the following passages of the *Kārakacakra* [p. 81]:

[Text106]⁷ *na caivaṃ*^{*1} *kriyānirūpitādhikaraṇatvasyaiva sarta-
tra saptamyarthatve vinā kriyāyogaṃ “bhūtale ghaṭa” ityādi-
prayogo na syād iti vācyam. iṣṭatvād iti vaiyākaraṇāḥ.*

adhikaraṇatvam ādheyatvaṃ vā^{*2} *saptamyarthah. sa ca yatra
kriyānvayī tatra kārakatvā*^{*3} *vyavahārah. ata eva “bhūtale*

4 The syntactic relationship between the word ending in the seventh case and the word ‘*śauṇḍa*’ is discussed in the *MBh* ad P.2.1.1 [I, 360, 7]: “*saptamī śauṇḍaiḥ*” [40] *akṣaśauṇḍaḥ strīśauṇḍaḥ. samarthagrahaṇam kim artham. kuśalo devadatto ’kṣeṣu śauṇḍaḥ pibati pānāgāre*. The latter is an example where the syntactic relation does not occur and thus the compounding is not possible. As for the supplement of the verb in the compound ‘*akṣaśauṇḍa*,’ Kaiyata says [on P.2.1.40, *Pradīpa*, II, 3831]: *vṛtyantarbhūtaprasaktyādikriyāpekṣo ’kṣādīnām ādhārābhāvah* (The word *akṣa*, etc., which are depending on the action of “*prasakti*: taking advantage of occasion,” etc. whose meanings are included in the compounds, serves as ‘locus.’)

5 On the date of Bhavānanda, see KUDO [1997b], p. 37 and other sources referred in that page.

6 Cf. KUDO [1997a, 152-155] *apādāna* (1): §2.3.2 and note 9.

7 This “Text number” is based on the edition of *KC*(b) [= (2)]. Abbreviations used in the text portion are A= *KC*(a) [= (1)]; B= *KC*(3).

ghataḥ” ityādi^{*4} kriyāśūnyavākyād bhūtalādheyo ghaṭa iti śābdabodho bhavaty eveti naiyāyikāḥ.^{*5}

*1. B.om. na caivam. *2. B.ca. *3. B.om. -tva-. *4. B.ityādaḥ. *5. B.nyāyavidah.

Translation: Grammarians say. One cannot argue that when the meaning of locative case ending is [defined as] the locus-ness (*adhikaraṇatva*) described by the action elsewhere, the expression “*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*” would not be made unless it is associated with the action because such an usage [with a verb] is [really] desired.

The logicians say that the locative case ending denotes the locus-ness or the superstratum-ness (*ādheyatva*). Whenever it is related to the action, it is called *kāraka*. Therefore, since the sentence “*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*” is lacking for the action, the verbal understanding such as the pot being the superstratum of the ground is obtained.

[Text 107] “*grhe sthālyām odanaṃ pacati*” ity atra nirukta-sambandhena grhādhipikarāṇa^{*1}-sthālyadhikaraṇakaudanakarmakapākānukūlakṛtimān ity anvayadhīḥ. “*bhūtale ghaṭa*” ityādaḥ saptamyā adhikaraṇatvam arthaḥ. tatra^{*2} prakṛtyarthasyāśrayatvena prathamāntārthasya ca nirūpakatvenānvayaḥ. tathā ca^{*3} bhūtalanīṣṭhādhipikaraṇatānirūpako ghaṭa ity anvayadhīr^{*4} iti prāñcaḥ.

nirūpakatvādeḥ sambandhasya pratiyogitāvachedakatvābhāvān nañarthānvayānupapattyā ādheyatvam eva^{*5} saptamyarthāḥ. tatra ca^{*6} prakṛtyarthasya nirūpakatayā prathamāntārthasyādhipikaraṇatayānvaye bhūtalanirūpitādheyatvavān ghaṭa ity anvayabodha iti navyāḥ.

*1. B.gehādhipikaraṇaka-. *2. A.atra, B.ad. ca. *3. B.om. tathā ca. *4. B.-bodha. *5. B.om. *6. B.cā-

Translation: [Among the logicians,] old school holds that in the expression “*grhe sthālyām odanaṃ pacati*: X cooks rice in the pan in his house”, according to the [indirect] relation mentioned above, the verbal understanding is as follows: he has the effort conducive to the act of cooking in which rice is the object, pan is the locus of it [= rice], and house is the locus of it [= pan]. In case of “*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*,” the locative case means the locus-ness (*adhikaraṇatva*). In that case the meaning of the base [= the ground] is related to it [= locus-ness] as the substratum, and that of the word ending in the nominative case [= the pot] is related to as the describer. Thus,

the verbal knowledge is that the pot is the describer of the locus-ness existing in the ground.

[On the other hand,] neo-logicians hold that since the relation like the describer-ness is devoid of the delimitor-ness of the counterpositive-ness, it is not related to the meaning of *nañ*, i.e., the absence [because *nirūpakatva* is not *vṛttiniyāmakasambandha* and, on the other hand, the absence is related to its locus through *svarūpasambandha*, one of the *vṛttiniyāmakasambandha*.] Thus, the superstratum-ness alone is the meaning of the locative case. In that case, the meaning of the base is related to it [= superstratum-ness] as the describer and that of the word ending in the nominative case is related to as the locus. Therefore, the verbal understanding is that the pot has the superstratum-ness described by the ground.

Necessity of the verb in the expressions is explicitly related to the difference how to construe and realize the verbal understanding. Roughly speaking, the grammarians hold “the verbal-meaning-bounded understanding” (*bhāvārthamukhyaviśeṣyakaśābdabodha*) and, on the other hand, the Naiyāyikas “the word-ending-in-the-nominative-case-bounded understanding” (*prathamārthamukhyaviśeṣyakaśābdabodha*).⁸ Matilal says [1968, p. 158]:

The usual semantic convention is that the meanings of two nonverbal stems cannot directly connected with each other in our minds. Some entity, which is referred to (or “meant”) by a case ending must be presented to our mind (i.e., must arise as an *upasthiti* or mental presentation) in order to connect the meanings of the two nonverbal stems. Thus, ground (*bhūtala*) and pot (*ghaṭa*) remain unconnected images in the mind until the mind is presented with an image of the relation *occurrence* (*vṛttitva*), which is supplied by the meaning of the locative case ending in the sentence “*bhūtale ghaṭaḥ*” (*‘bhūtala’* + the locative ‘-e’ and *‘ghaṭa’* + the nominative ‘-s’ or ‘-h’) = “(There is) a pot *on* the ground.”

Namely, the Naiyāyikas contrue that this “some entity” which connects two nominals is provided by the meaning of the case ending but, on the other hand, the grammarians need the verb itself. Probably Bhattoji

⁸ See Rao [1969], pp. 16, 23. In the impersonal constructions, however, they admit that the meaning of the verb is principal element in the verbal understanding.

Dikṣita keeps it in his mind when he says “*ata eva ‘bhūtale ghaṭaḥ’ ityādaḥ astīty asyādhyāhāro niyataḥ.*”

On the example “*puspebhyah [sprhayati],*” it is quoted from the *KV* on P.1.4.36 [I, 553]: *puspebhyah sprhayati. phalebhyah sprhayati.*

23.3 Classification of the *adhikaraṇa* { 127, 26-28 }

Text: *trividham caitad adhikaraṇam iti “samhitāyām” [P.6.1.72] iti sūtre Bhāṣyam — aupaslesikam vaiṣayikam abhivyāpakañ ceti. “kaṭe āste,” “gurau vasati,” “tileṣu tailam” iti.*

Translation: It is already proclaimed in the *MBh.* that this *adhikaraṇa* is of three types, namely “*aupaslesika*: contact-based,” “*vaiṣayika*: objective,” and “*abhivyāpaka*: pervasive.” [Examples for each types are] “*kaṭe āste*: X is sitting on a mat,” “*gurau vasati*: X lives with his teacher,” and “*tileṣu tailam*: there is oil in sesame seeds.”

Notes: This classification of *adhikaraṇa* is based on the *MBh.* We can find several passages that categorize the senses of *adhikaraṇa*.⁹ For instances, *MBh* ad P.4.2.92 [II, 291, 7-8]: *gotragrahaṇam sāmūhikeṣu jñāpakam daivayātavagrahaṇam vaiṣayikeṣu bhāstāyaṇagrahaṇam vaivāsikeṣu*; ad P.5.1.96 [II, 361, 17-20]: *yathaiva hi yan māse kāryam, tan māse bhavam bhavaty evam yady api māse dīyate tad api māse bhavam bhavati tatra tatra bhava ity eva siddham. na sidhyati. na tan māse dīyate. kiṃ tarhi. māse gate. evam tarhy aupaslesikam adhikaraṇam vijñāyate*; ad P. 5.2.45 [II, 381, 3-5]: *yady api tāvad vyāpake vaiṣayike vādhikaraṇatve sambhavo nāsty aupaslesikam adhikaraṇam vijñāsyate. ekādaśā kārṣāpaṇā upasliṣṭā asmiñ śata ekādaśam śatam*; ad P.6.1.72 [III, 51, 8-9]: *adhikaraṇam nāma triprakāram vyāpakam aupakṣepikam¹⁰ vaiṣayikam. śabdasya ca śabdena ko 'nyo 'bhisambandho bhavitum arhaty anyad ata upaslesāt. “iKo yaÑ aCi” [P.6.1.77] aCi upasliṣṭasyeti tatrāntareṇa samhitāgrahaṇam samhitāyām eva bhaviṣyati.*

⁹ Cf. *LŚ* on P.1.4.45 [I, 723]: *tridheti. tatra sakalāvayavyāptau vyāpakādhārattvam. yathā tileṣu tailam. idam eva mukhyam adhikaraṇam iti “svaritena” [P.1.3.11] ity atra “sādhakatamam” [P.1.4.42] ity atra ca bhāṣye spaṣṭam. upa samīpe śleṣaḥ sambandhas tat kṛtam aupaslesikam, ata eva “iko yanaci” [P.6.1.77] ity atrādāv aupaslesike ādhāre saptamy uktā “samhitāyām” [P.6.1.72] iti sūtre bhāṣye. tatrājādisamīpyam evegādīnām. “yan māse ‘tikrānte dīyate tasya māsa aupaslesikam adhikaraṇam” ity uktam “tatra ca dīyate” [P.5.1.96] iti sūtre ca bhāṣye. “tadasmimn adhikam” [P.5.2.45] iti sūtre ca bhāṣye spaṣṭam idam “kaṭe āste” iti tu naupaslesikodāharaṇam yuktam. uktabhāṣyavirodhāt.*

¹⁰ This is a misprint in the Kielhorn edition. Read *aupaslesikam*.

Although this *ŚK* does not observe the meanings of *adhikaraṇa* in detail, the differences are compactly discussed in the *Nyāsa* (on P.1.4.45, [I, 562])¹¹:

tat punar adhikaraṇam triprakāram — aupasleṣikam, vaiṣayikam, abhivyāpakaṅ ca. tatrādye — kaṭe āste, sthālyām pacatīti katāder apy ādhārasya hy ādheyena sahopaśleṣaḥ saṃyogalakṣaṇo ' stīty aupasleṣikam tad bhavati. vaiṣayikam — gurau vasati, gaṅgāyām ghoṣa iti. prativasatīti viṣayo hy ananya-trabhāvah, yathā cakṣusprabhṛtīnām rūpādibhyo 'nanyatrabhāvāc cakṣurādīnām rūpādayo viṣayā ity ucyante, evaṃ śiṣyādīnām gurvādībhyo 'nanyatrabhāvād eṣām te viṣayā iti. nanu ca "ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam" ity uktam, ādhāras ca ko bhavati? ya āśrayaḥ, āśrayaḥ saṃyogataḥ samavāyato vā bhavati, na ca śiṣyādīnām guruprabhṛtibhiḥ saha saṃyogaḥ samavāyo vā 'sti, tad ayuktaṃ teṣām adhikaraṇatvam? naitad asti; yadāyattā hi yasya sthitiḥ, sa vināpi saṃyogasamavāyābhyām tasyāśrayo bhavati, yathā — rājāyattasthitatvāt puruṣasya rājeti, na ca rājñā puruṣasya saṃyogasamavāyau staḥ. tathā hi — tadadhīnasthititvāt rājāśrayaḥ puruṣa iti loke vyapadiśyate, tathā śiṣyādīnām gurvādyāyattā sthitiḥ ity yuktas tān prati guruprabhṛtīnām āśrayabhāvah. abhivyāpakam yathā — tileṣu tailam, dadhni sarpir iti. tilādīkam tailādīkam ādheyam vyāpyāvatiṣṭhata iti tilādīkam abhivyāpakam adhikaraṇam. yady apy atra tilādīnām tailādībhiḥ saha saṃyogo 'sti, tathāpi deśavibhāgābhāvād atra saṃśleṣavyavahāro nāstīty aupasleṣikāt tat pṛthag evopa-sthāpyate.

Tr.: The *adhikaraṇa* is threefold, namely *aupasleṣika*, *vaiṣayika* and *abhivyāpaka*. On the first. In the usages such as “*kaṭe āste*” and “*sthālyām pacati,*” etc., ‘*ādhāra*’ such as “*mat, pan,*” etc. is in contact with ‘*ādheya*’ in the form of ‘*conjunction*’ (*saṃyoga*). This is a type of *aupasleṣika*.

11 Another distinctive explanation, which is in Navya-nyāya style, is give by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa. See the *VSM* [162]: *tatra ādhāras tridhā — aupasleṣiko vaiṣayiko 'bhivyāpakaṅ ca, iti. tatra saṃyogasamavāyādisambandhena kartṛkarmasambaddha ādyah. viṣayatāsambandhena tatsambaddho dvitīyah. vyāpakatvasambandhena tṛtīyah. tatra "kaṭe āste" ity atra svavṛttikartṛkatvasambandhena "kaṭavṛttīśayanam" iti bodhah. "mokṣe icchā asti" ity atra svaviṣayakartṛkatvasambandhena "mokṣavṛttir icchākartṛkā satta" iti bodhah. "sarvasmin ātmā 'sti" ity atra svavyāpakakartṛkatvasambandhena "sarvavṛttir ātmakartṛkā sattā" iti bodhah. "mūle vrkṣaḥ kapisamyoginy asti" ityādau avyāpyavṛttidharmavatkartṛkakriyāsamaabhivyāhāre svavṛttisvāvacchedyadharmāśrayakartṛkatvasambandhena kriyāyām anvayo vyutpattivaicitṛyāt. yatrāpi kriyāpadam na śrūyate tatrāpy adhyāhāryam, iti dik.*

The second type is *vaiṣayika*, e.x. “*gurau vasati*,” and “*gaṅgāyām ghoṣah*.” It means that the content such as “living, dwelling” occurs in no other place (*ananyatrabhāva*). As an “eye’ (*caṅsur*), etc. do not separately exist from ‘form’ (*rūpa*), etc., so ‘form,’ etc. are the content of ‘eye,’ etc. In the same manner, ‘pupil’ (*śiṣya*), etc., do not separately dwell in from ‘teacher’ (*guru*), etc. and as such the latter (= teacher) is the content of the former (= pupil).

[Objection]: In P.1.4.45 it is said that “*ādihāro dhikarānam*.” [Once again,] what is meant for by the word *ādihāra*? It is nothing but “*āśraya*: substratum” and [being substratum] is possible through [the relation of] either *saṃyoga* or *samavāya*. In the previously given example [i.e., “*gurau vasati*”] pupil does not have [the relation of] *saṃyoga* nor *samavāya* with teacher. Therefore, it is not admitted that teacher is regarded as *adhikarāna*.

[Answer:] It is not correct; Y’s subsistence is depending on X and in this case X [= *guru*] can become *āśraya* of Y [= *śiṣya*] without [the relation of] *saṃyoga* and *samavāya*. [Consider another example.] We have an usage “*puruṣasya rājā*: a king for a servant.” In this case, [the servant’s] subsistence is depending on the king but the king have neither *saṃyoga* nor *samavāya* with the servant. In other words, since [the servant] is depending on [the king], it is said in ordinary communication that the servant has the king as his substratum. Likely, since the pupil is depending on the teacher, the teacher has the substratum-ness for [the pupil].

The third type is *abhivyāpaka*, e.x. “*tilēṣu tailam*,” “*dadhni sarpiḥ*: there is ghee in coagulated milk.” Since the sesame seeds, having pervaded oil, remain existing, the sesame seeds are regarded as *adhikarāna* of *abhivyāpaka*-type. Even though [it is claimed that] the sesame seeds have the relation of conjunction with the oil, since there is no difference in their place, it cannot be described that such a relation is ‘contact.’ Therefore, [this type of *adhikarāna*] is necessary to be established as the different category from *aupaśleṣika*.

In spite that the *adhikarāna* is traditionally classified into three, there is no difference in their nature according to Bhartrhari [VP III. 7. 149]: *upaśleṣasya cābhedas tilākāśakatādiṣu / upakārās tu bhidyante saṃyogisamavāyinām* // “As regard to ‘contact,’ there is no difference

in cases of 'tila,' ākāśa,' or 'kaṭa,' etc.. However, its role is differentiated according to the relation of conjunction (*saṃyoga*) or inherence (*samavāya*)." As claimed by the commentary on this verse, "upaśleṣa: contact" itself denotes the relation of substratum and superstratum (*ādhārasyādheyena saṃbandhaḥ*) and this relation is remained identical even though it is classified into three types of *adhikaraṇa*. On the example for *vaiṣayika*-type, "gurau vasati," Helārāja says that this contact is mentally conceived (*bauddha*). Furthermore, he admits the locus-ness to 'absence' (*abhāva*): "śatror abhāve sukham" *ityādaḥ abhāvasya bauddhaṃ kārakatvam iti prāg eva nirṇītam* (In the expression "śatror abhāve sukham: when Śatru is absent, a pleasure [occurs]," the mentally [perceived] *kāraka*-relation is granted to the absence. It is already confirmed). Taking "mentally conceived" factor in to consideration, one of the meaning of *adhikaraṇa* is extensively interpreted, in other words, all three types of *adhikaraṇa* is met in one concept, i.e., *upaśleṣika*. (Helārāja on do. [349]: *upaśleṣa ādhārasyādheyena saṃbandhaḥ. yadvaśād asāv ādhārah. tasya triṣv apy adhikaraṇeṣv abhedah. anyathā tu saṃyoginy ādhāre saṃbandhaḥ, anyathā tu samavāyinīti saṃbandhibhedād bhinnatvena vyapadeśah. tathā hi "kaṭe āste devadatta" iti saṃyoginaḥ kaṭasya sakalāvayavavyāpytyā devadattopaśleṣo na dṛṣyate, api tu katipayāvayavavyāpyety avišeśād aupaśleṣika iti sāmānyasaṃjñayādhāro 'yam ucyate. "tileṣu tailam" iti tu samavāyinā tailarasena tilānām samastāvayavavyāpytyā lokaprasiddhyā saṃbandhād vyāpakam etad adhikaraṇam. "khe śakunaya" ity atra tv ākāśasya tāttvikāvayavābhāvāt kalīptapradeśatayā saṃbandhād vaiṣayikam etad adhikaraṇam. ananyatrābhāvaś cātra viṣayārthah. evaṃ "jale matsyā" ity ādhārapradeśāpekṣayā caitad aupaśleṣikam adhikaraṇam. "gurau vasati" iti śiṣyānām gurvadhīnāyām vṛttau vaiṣayikam adhikaraṇam guruḥ. upaśleṣo 'py atra baudhaḥ. evaṃ "yuddhe sannahyati" iti yuddhābhisamndhinā sannahanasya tanutrādibandhanarūpasya pravṛtteḥ yuddham viṣayah. "gaṅgāyām gāva" iti gaṅgāśabdah sāmīpyāt pradeśavṛttir ity aupaśleṣikam adhikaraṇam. "śatror abhāve sukham" ityādāv abhāvasya bauddhaṃ kārakatvam iti prāg eva nirṇītam.)*

The *Tattvabodhinī* remarks fourth type of *adhikaraṇa*, i.e., *sāmīpika* (proximate [locus]) [on SK No.632, I, 694]: *nadyām āsta ityādyartham sāmīpikam adhikaraṇam caturtham api kecid icchanti*. It is regarded as an independent type of the second *vaiṣayika*.

24. *adhiśīNsthāsām karma* [P.1.4.46: SK. 542].

24.0 Explanation of the rule {127, 29-30}

Text: *adhipūrvānām eṣām ādhārah karma syāt. "adhiśete; adhi-
tiṣṭhati; adhyāste vā vaikuṅṭham hariḥ."*

Translation: The locus is [also] called *karman* when it accompanies with the [verbal roots, √śīN- [Dhp. II. 22], √sthā- [I. 975] and √ās- [II. 11] which are all] prefixed with *adhi-*. For example, "*adhiśete; adhi-
tiṣṭhati; adhyāste vā vaikuṅṭham hariḥ*: Hari lies down (*adhiśete*); remains (*adhi-
tiṣṭhati*); settles (*adhyāste*) in Vaikuṅṭha."

Notes: SK No. 542 [I, 619] gives same comment, without any alternation, and it is based on the *KV* on P.1.4.46 [I, 563]: *pūrvenā-
dhikarāṇasamjñāyām prāptāyām karmasamjñā vidhīyate. adhipūrvā-
nām śīn-sthā-ās-ity eteṣām ādhāro yas tat kāraṇam karmasamjñam
bhavati. grāmam adhiśete. grāmam adhi-
tiṣṭhati. parvatam adhyāste.* (Tr. In case where the designation *adhikarāṇa* is given by previous rule [P.1.4.45], the designation *karman* is [also] used. That *kāraṇa* which is the locus [of the action expressed by the verbal roots such as] √śīN-, √sthā-, √ās- prefixed with *adhi-* is called *karman*. For example, "*grāmam adhiśete*: X lives in a village," "*grāmam adhi-
tiṣṭhati*: X is staying in a village," and "*parvatam adhyāste*: X settles on a mountain.")

From the opening comment of above *KV* we come to know that this rule 46 is specifically applied to the cases that are primarily included in the scope of the rule 45, in other words, that rule 46 is a special rule (*apavāda*) against the general rule (*utsarga*) 45. The condition for the attribution of the designation *karman* to *ādhāra* is whether three verbs listed in 46 are prefixed by *adhi-* or not. When the verb, e.x. √śīN-, is used in the expression and it is prefixed with *adhi-* as well, the locus of the action denoted by that verb, although it is *adhikarāṇa* in underlying construction, is called *karman* and it takes the accusative case by P.2.3.2.

All three verbs are originally intransitive (*akarmaka*); when they are prefixed with *adhi-*, they are regarded as transitive verb (*sakarmaka*) as far as the grammatical operation is concerned because they have 'object' in their denoting meanings. Therefore a passivization becomes possible. This is clearly stated in the *MDhV* on "*śīN svapne*" [p. 339]

(II. 26 = Kṣīra° II. 24, p. 180): *grāmo 'dhiśayyate* — “*adhiśiṅsthāsām*” [P.1.4.46] *ity ādhārasya karmatvāt karmani calādayo bhavati*.¹²

Then, why does this passivization become possible? On this matter, neither the *ŚK* nor the *KV* (including the *Nyāsa* and the *PM*) give any comment but the *Bālaṃanoramā* alone suggests its reason, namely [SK. No. 542, I, p. 619]: *adhī tu saptamyarthasyādhārasya dyotakah. vaikuṅṭhe śete, tiṣṭhaty, āste vety arthaḥ*. This preverb *adhi-* is listed as fourteenth member in the *gaṇapāṭha* 154 for P.1.4.58 and the *Nirukta* 1.3 states its meaning as follows [Sarup ed., part III, p.30; p. 13]: *adhīty uparibhāvam aiśvaryaṃ vā*. It is the former meaning, “being above,” that becomes an issue here.¹³ As the preverb *adhi-* itself indicates the notion of ‘locus,’ when it is used with the verb, the notion of ‘locus’ is already expressed. This might be a semantic reason for re-attribution of the designation from *adhikaraṇa* to *karman*. The above-quoted examples, therefore, are respectively same as “*śete; tiṣṭhati; āste vā vaikuṅṭhe hariḥ*” in their denotation.¹⁴

25. *abhiniviśaś ca* [P.1.4.47: SK. 543].

25.0 Explanation of the rule {127, 31-128, 1}

Text: *etatpūrvasya viśater ādhāraḥ karma syāt. “grāmam abhiniviśate.” abhiniveśa āgrahaḥ, tadvān bhavātīty arthaḥ. akarmako 'yam, tatrādhikaraṇasya karmasaṃjñā vidhīyate. praveśanārthe tu siddhaiva.*

Translation: The locus of [the action denoted by] √*viś-* which is prefixed by *abhini-* is called *karman*. Example is “*grāmam abhiniviśate*: X enters in a village.” The word ‘*abhiniveśa*’ [usually] means ‘affection’ (*āgraha*) [and the verb *abhini-√viś-*] means “to have [strong] affection for.” This [itself] is an intransitive verb and the locus [of the action] is called *karman*. [This re-attribution] is only approved when [the verb] means ‘entering’ (*praveśana*).

Notes: This rule prescribes the re-attribution of the designation *adhikaraṇa* to *karman*. The operation of it makes it possible to transfer

12 As to other verbs, the *MDhV* does not mention any passive construction. On “*ās upaveśane*” [II, 14 (= Kṣīra°, pp. 330-1), it says: *grāmam adhyāste* — “*adhiśiṅsthāsām karma*” *iti ādhārasya karmatvam*. On “*sthā gatinivṛtau*” [I, 650], no example formed by P.1.4.46 is given.

13 The latter is formalized in P.1.4.97: *adhir īsvare*.

14 The difference between the grammatical classification and the semantic (rather, popularly) usages is found here. See Deshpande[1991(b)], p. 477: we find a mismatch between the semantics of the construction and the *kāraka* category.

the active voice construction into the passive construction same as previous one.

However, this rule, as we will see in the next passage of the *ŚK*, is not obligatorily applied to the cases but in some cases it is applicable and in other cases not. This type of option is called *vyavasthitavibhāṣā*. The problem is how we can distinguish the cases to which this rule is applicable from the cases not. Almost all commentaries (such as the *KV*, the *Nyāsa*, the *PM* and the *MDhV*) do not leave any comment on this point but this passage of the *ŚK* alone gives clear statement: “[This re-attribution] is only approved when [the verb] means ‘entering’ (*praveśanārthe tu siddhaiva*).” That is to say, the meaning of *abhini-√viś-* is “*abhiniveśa, āgraha*” (*Bālamānoramā* says “*apratihata-pravṛttimat: the one having an activity which is not prevented*”)¹⁵ on one hand and the application of this rule is restricted in case when the meaning is ‘entering’ on the other hand. Such a meaning-condition becomes a criteria of this operation and only when this meaning is intended, P.1.4.47 is applicable, e.x. “*grāmam abhiniviśate*”; when the meaning is ‘*āgraha*,’ the rule 47 does not become effective, e.x. “*pāpe ’bhiniveśah*.” (It is uncertain whether any example in which *abhini-√viś-* is used in the sense of ‘entering’ and at the same time its locus is called *karman* — in the actual expression it is a word ending in the accusative case — is available or not.)

25.1 On the optional use of this rule {128, 1-4}

Text: “*parikrayaṇe sampradānam*” [P.1.4.44] *iti sūtrād ihānyatarasyāṃgrahaṇam anuvarttate maṇḍūkaplutinyāyena. vyavasthitavibhāṣā ceyam. “eṣv artheṣv abhiniviśtānām” iti samarthasūtrasthabhāṣyaprayogaś ceha mānam.*¹⁶ *tena “pāpe ’bhiniveśah” ityādi siddham.*

Translation: The word ‘*anyatarasyām*’ in P.1.4.44¹⁷ is continued to this rule by means of “*maṇḍūkapluti: a frog jump*.” In this case, an

¹⁵ *Bālamānoramā* on *SK* 543 [I, 619]: *abhiniviśate sanmārgam iti. āgrahavān ity arthaḥ. apratihatapravṛttimān ity arthaḥ. nanv evaṃ sati pāpe ’bhiniveśa ity atrāpi karmatvād dvitīyā syād ity āha — parikrayaṇa iti.*

¹⁶ *LŚ* on P.1.4.47 [I, p. 646]: *etac ca “eṣv artheṣv abhiniviśtānām” iti pratīke samarthasūtre Kaiyaṇe. pare tv etadbhāṣyaprayogād ’abhiniviś’ ity ānupūrvyā avikrtāyā yatra śravaṇam tatraivaitatsūtrapravṛttir anyatarasyāṃgrahaṇānūvṛtttau vyavasthitavibhāṣāśrayeṇa ca na mānam ity āhuḥ.* (According to commentary on the *LŚ*, it is a criticism against Kaiyaṇa.)

¹⁷ As to the *anuvṛtti* from P.1.4.44, with reference to superfluous word *ca* in this rule is discussed by Joshi-Bhate [1984, pp. 45-46].

‘optionality’ [indicated by the word *anyatarasyām*] is *vyavasthitavibhāṣā* (limited option which is sometimes applied and sometimes not). This [interpretation] is validated by the *bhāṣya* on P.2.1.1. Therefore, an example [wherein the locative case is used] such as “*pāpe ’bhiniveśaḥ*: intentness on what is bad” is certified as correct usage.

Notes: In the previous passage, an outline of the optionality of this rule is referred. Rule 47 is optional and this optional employment is obtained by the word ‘*anyatarasyām*’ which is continued from P.1.4.44. Since the word *anyatarasyām* passes over 45-46 by jumping, this type of *anuvṛtti* is called ‘*maṇḍūkapluti*.’

In general, the optional rule is threefold: *prāpte*, *aprāpte*, and *ubhayatra*. It is explained, for instance by Sharma [1987, pp. 114-118] that “*prāpte* whereby something provided as obligatory (*nitya*) is made optional, *aprāpte* whereby something not provided for is provided optionally and *ubhayatra* where both *prāpte* and *aprāpte* provisions are made optional (p. 114).”¹⁸

Vyavasthitavibhāṣā is yet another type of optional rule. It is already used by Patañjali: ad P.2.4.56 [I, 488, 12]: *yadi LAṬaḥ ŚatṚṢānaCau vā bhavato vyavasthitavibhāṣā ca*; ad P.3.2.124 [II, 127, 14-15]: *ajer vī bhavati vā vyavasthitavibhāṣā*; ad P.7.1.56 [III, 260, 14-15]: *iha tāvac śrīnām udāro dharuṇo rayīnām vibhāṣāmi nadīsamjñā sā chandasi vyavasthitavibhāṣā bhaviṣyati*.¹⁹

The passage of the *MBh* is quoted to illustrate the case that P.1.4.47 is not applied. *MBh* ad P.2.1.1 [I, 363, 11-12]: *svabhāvata eteṣām śabdānām eteṣv artheṣv abhiniviṣṭānām nimittatvenānvākhyānam kriyate* (Of these words, in nature, such and such meanings are remained attached (*abhiniviṣṭānām*), and as such explanation [of these words] is given as *nimitta*). Non-application of 47 is also explained in the *KV* on P.1.4.47 as follows [I, 563]: *katham “kalyāṇe ’bhiniveśaḥ,” “pāpe ’bhiniveśaḥ,” “yā yā samjñā yasmin yasmin samjñīny abhiniviṣata” iti? “anyatarasyām” iti vartate, “parikrayaṇe sampradānam anyatarasyām” [P.1.4.44] ity atah. sā ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā vijñāyate* (Tr.: Why does this happen: [this rule is not applied] in the expressions like “*kalyāṇe ’bhiniveśaḥ*: affection for friend” “*pāpe ’bhiniveśaḥ*: intentness on bad deed,” and “*yā yā samjñā yasmin yasmin samjñīny abhiniviṣate*: such and such designation is

18 Also cf. Kiparsky [1980], p. 228.

19 For the explanation about these rules, see Sharma [1987], pp.114-118.

appointed to such and such designated” ? This is due to the word *anyatarasyām* continued from P.1.4.44. Thus noted it be as *vyavasthitavibhāṣā.*)²⁰

25.2 On the form of *abhini-* {128, 4-7}

Text: *iha sūtre ner alpāCtarasya paranipātākaraṇam idṛśānupūrvīkasamudāyavivakṣārtham. teneha na “niviśate yadi śūkaśikhāpade” iti. karmatvavivakṣāyān tu tatrāpi bhavitavyam eva dvitīyayā.*

Translation: Since a prefix *ni-* [in the compounding form *abhi-ni-*] has fewer vowels than *abhi-*, it should be placed first in compounding such as **ny-abhi-* [by P.2.2.34] but the form *abhini-* as a whole is here desired [by Pāṇini]. Therefore, this rule cannot become applicable to the cases wherein [the form *abhini-* is not used], e.x. “*niviśate yadi śūkaśikhāpade.*” However, if the *karman* status [which is not *adhikaraṇa*-turned but originally] is intended to [*śūkaśikhāpada*], the second case is introduced.

Notes: According to a principle about the order of constituents in Dvandva compound, the form *abhi-ni-* is not desired since P.2.2.34 prescribes that a word having fewer vowels than the other is to be placed first (*alpāCtaram* [In a Dv.^{2.2.32} compound^{2.1.3} a nominal word] having fewer vowels is placed as a preceding member^{2.2.30}). If this compound is a Dvandva which is consisted of two elements in the sense of “[either] *abhi-* or *ni-*,” it should be prescribed in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as ‘**ny-abhi-*.’ Nevertheless, since the form *abhi-ni-* is in fact used in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in spite of the principle about the order, it is nothing but the form *abhini-* as a whole that is intended by Pāṇini.²¹

26. *upānvadhyāNvasaḥ* [P.1.4.48: SK. 544].

26.0 Explanation of the rule {128, 8-9}

Text: *etatpūrvakasya vasater ādhāraḥ karma syāt. “upavasati; anuvasati^{*1}; adhivasaty; āvasati vā grāmam senā.”*

*1. MS omits this word.

²⁰ Cf. the *MDhV* on √viśA- [pp. 489-490]: *grāmam abhiniviśate — “abhiniviśaś ca” ity ādhāraḥ karma atra maṇḍūkaplutyā “parikrayane sampradānam anyatarasyām” ity ato nyatarasyāṅgrahaṇānūvṛttes tasya ca vyavasthitavibhāṣātvāt “kalyāṇe bhiniveśaḥ,” “pāpe bhiniveśaḥ,” “yā yā samjñā yasminn abhiniviśate” ityādau karmatvābhāvah.*

²¹ See the *PM* on P.1.4.47 [I, 563]: *ner alpāCtarasyāpūrvanipātād ‘abhini’ iti samudāyō-nukaraṇam ity āha — abhinipūrvasyeti. anyathā’bhīpūrvasya nipūrvasya ceti brūyāt.*

Translation: *Ādhāra* is called *karman* when it denotes locus of [the action expressed by] the verbal root \sqrt{vas} - preceded by those preverbs [i.e., *upa-*, *anu-*, *adhi-* or *āN*]. For examples, “*upavasati; anuvasati; adhivasaty; āvasati vā grāmam senā*: An army stays in the village; near the village; around the village; behind the village.”

Notes: This rule is also an exception to 45. When the verbal root \sqrt{vas} - prefixed by *upa-*, *anu-*, *adhi-* or *āN* is used in the expression, the locus of that action is called *karman*.²² The line of explanation in the *ŚK* is same as that of the *KV* (on P.1.4.48 [I, 563]: *upa-anu-adhi-ān-ity evam pūrvasya vasater ādhāro yas tat kārakam karmasamjñam bhavati. grāmam upavasati senā, parvatam upavasati. grāmam anuvasati senā, grāmam adhivasati, grāmam āvasati*). The passivization also becomes possible due to the reason stated above (see Notes on 24.0).

26.1 On the *Vārttika* I on this rule {128, 10-12}

Text: *vaser aśyarthasya pratiśedho vaktavyaḥ. arthaśabdo nivṛttivacanaḥ. vyadhikaraṇe śaṣṭhyau. vācyavācakabhāvaḥ śaṣṭhyarthaḥ. bhojananivṛtter vācako yo vasis tasya nety arthaḥ. “grāme upavasati.”*

Translation: [According to the *Vt.* on this rule,] a prohibition [of applying the term *karman* to the item which is *ādhāra*] is to be ruled when the verbal root \sqrt{vas} - is used in the sense of eating. Here the word *artha-* means “*nivṛtti*: cessation.” Two words ending in the sixth case [namely, *vaser* and *aśyarthasya*] do not stand in syntactical agreement. Instead, the genitive case represents the relation of signified and signifier. Therefore, [this *Vt.*] intends that [P.1.4.48] does not apply to the case wherein \sqrt{vas} - expresses the sense of “to stop eating.” [The example using the locative case,] “*grāme upavasati*: X refrains from eating in the village.”

Notes: This explanation of Bhaṭṭoji is based on the *PM*²³ (on P.1.4.48 [I,563]): *arthaśabdo nivṛttivacanaḥ, vyadhikaraṇe śaṣṭhyau, aśy-*

²² Joshi-Roodbergen [1995], p. 131 states that the word *karman* is continued from P.1.4.46 by means of ‘*sāmarthya*’ because there is no indication of *anuvṛtti*, i.e., *ca*.

²³ Kaiyaṭa also gives this first alternative. *Pradīpa* on P.1.4.48 [II, 260r]: *arthaśabdo nivṛttivācī. vyadhikaraṇe śaṣṭhyau. aśyarthasya vācako yo vasis tasyety arthaḥ*. On the basis of similarity of the wording and no mention of the second alternative in the *ŚK*, here, the *PM* is likely to be the source of the *ŚK*.

arthasya yo vācakas tasyety arthaḥ. bhojananivṛttivācina iti yāvat. Problem concerning to this *Vt.* is how to deal with the word ‘*aśyārtha*.’ We have two alternatives.²⁴

First alternative is given in the *KV* which realizes it as “*bhojananivṛtti*: to cease eating” (on P.1.4.48 [I, 563]: *vaser aśyārthasya pratiśedho vaktavyaḥ. grāme upavasati. bhojananivṛttim karotīty arthaḥ*). In this case, the element ‘*aśy-*’ is probably identified with the verbal root “*ásA bhójane* (Dhp. IX 51) and the second element ‘*-artha*’ is taken as the sense of “*nivṛtti*: refraining” which is based on the *Amarakoṣa* 3.86ab: *artha* ‘*bhidheyaraivastuprayojananivṛttiṣu* [p. 412].²⁵ Two words ending in the sixth case are standing in syntactic non-agreement (*vyadhikaraṇe*), according to the *PM*, and by supplying the word ‘*vācaka*’ the phrase means “the verbal root \sqrt{vas} - which denotes the meaning of refraining from eating.”

Second is given by Kaiyaṭa (*Pradīpa* on P.1.4.48 [II, 260r]: *athavā śīÑor arthaḥ śyārthaḥ na śyārtho ‘śyārthaḥ. tasya asthānārthasyety arthaḥ. sthāne hi śīñ vartate yathā jalāsaya iti. tena grāme tiṣṭhatīty atrārthe grāmam upavasatīti prayogaḥ. asthānārthatve tu grāme upavasatīti.*) In his explanation, the word *aśyārtha* is analyzed as a negative Bahuvrīhi compound which means “*a-śy-artha*: the one not having the meaning *śī-*.” According to Kaiyaṭa, element *-śy-* is nothing but the verbal root $\sqrt{śīÑ}$ - (*svāpne*, Dhp. II 22). As far as we follow his interpretation, we have to realize the phrase “*aśyārthasya vaser*” as “of [the action] denoted by the verbal root \sqrt{vas} - which denotes the meaning other than ‘staying’” and thus the operation of 48 is prohibited if \sqrt{vas} - is used in the sense of “fasting.” In other words, the usage “*grāmam upavasati*” is always meant for “he is staying in the village” (because that 48 is applicable is equal to say that the meaning of verb is “staying” which is not excluded by *Vt.* I) and “*grāme upavasati*” is “X refrains from fasting” (because the operation of 48 does not occur in terms of the prohibition by *Vt.* I).²⁶

However, above argument is, as is pointed out by Joshi-Roodbergen [1975, p. 147], “far-fetched” and it is sufficient for the adequate

24 In the following, the present writer owes a lot to Joshi-Roodbergen [1975, p. 147].

25 Cf. *Bālamānoramā* on *SK* 544 [I, p. 620]: “*artha* ‘*bhidheyaaivastuprayojananivṛttiṣu*” *ity Amarāḥ*. See also *LŚ* on P.1.4.48 [I, p. 646]: “*maśakārtho dhūmah*” *itivad aśer nivṛttyarthasyety tadarthaḥ*.

26 As to two alternatives given by Kaiyaṭa, Nāgeśa regards the first as correct: *anayor ādyavyākhyaiḥ yuktā bhāṣyasvārasyāt* [Uddyota on P.1.4.48, I, 260r].

application of rule to say, just as Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita does in his *SK* No. 544, that *Vt* I: *vaser aśyarthasya pratiśedho vaktavyaḥ* is re-stated as “*abhuktyarthasya na*: [the application of the designation *karman*] is prohibited [when \sqrt{vas} - means] not-eating.”

26.2 Option {128, 12-15}

Text: *katham “upoṣya rajanīm ekām” iti? “kālādhvanoḥ [atyanta-samyoge]” [P.2.3.5] iti dvitīyā bhaviṣyati.*

katham “ekādaśyām na bhujjīta” iti? upapadavibhakteh kārakavibhaktir bhaviṣyati.

Translation: How is the case of “*upoṣya rajanīm ekām*: Do fast for one night”? Here, the second case ending is introduced by P.2.3.5. Or how about “*ekādaśyām na bhujjīta*: do not eat on the eleventh day of a fortnight.”? Here, according to Pbh. no.94, [the locative] case underlied by *kāraka* [here, i.e., *adhikaraṇa*] is stronger than *upapadavibhakti* [i.e., second case by P. 2.3.5 in this case and thus the locative case is introduced].

Notes: Patañjali rejects this *Vt.*, saying that “*na vaktavyaḥ. nātropapūrvasya vaser grāmo 'dhikaraṇam. kasya tarhi. anupa-sargasya. grāme 'sau vasams trirātram upavasatīti*” (‘village’ does not serve as the *adhikaraṇa* of the verbal root \sqrt{vas} - preceded by *upa*-. Then, of which? [The verbal root \sqrt{vas} -] without the preverb as is in the case of “*grāme 'sau vasams trirātram upavasati*: he, staying in the village, refrains from eating for three days”) [*MBh* ad P.1.4.48 I, 332,6-8]. Here, Patañjali attributes the designation *adhikaraṇa* to *grāma* by supplying the present participle *vasan* as the direct participant to ‘village’ and the designation *karman* to *trirātra* as the locus of the action denoted by *upa-√vas*-. In this way, the prohibition of applying *karman* is well-managed even without *Vt. I* by introducing the idea of direct/indirect participant (*antaraṅga/bahiraṅga*).²⁷

However, it is not accepted as the proper explanation; according to P.2.3.5, it is possible to introduce the second case to the word expressive of time, e.g., *trirātra*-, without resorting to the assignment of *karman* by P.1.4.48. It is not a case of necessity to bring the *antaraṅga/bahiraṅga* technique into the meaning of particular verbal root. Therefore, as is stated in this *ŚK* passage, the usages are justified

²⁷ It is Kaiyaṭa who clearly introduces *antaraṅga/bahiraṅga* to explain the *MBh*. See Joshi-Roodbergen [1975], pp. 148-9. See also *VP* III.7.153-155 and Helārāja’s commentary on those (pp. 351-345).

either by P.2.3.5 or by the predominacy of *kāraka*-based case ending (*kāarakavibhakti*).

As for the examples,²⁸ see the *Nyāsa* on P.1.4.48 [I, 563]: “*upoṣya rajanīm ekām*” *iti, trirātram upavasatīty atra ca “kālādhvanoḥ” iti dvitīyā. athavā “kālabhāvādhvagantavya” iti karmatve. atrārthaśabdo nivṛttivacana iti bhojananivṛttivācina ity arthaḥ. vaktavyam iti vyākhyeyam ity arthaḥ. tatredam vyākhyānam — ihāpy anyatarasyām-grahaṇam anuvartate, sā ca vyavasthitavibhāṣā vijñāyate; tena vaser aśyarthasya pratiśedho bhaviṣyati.*

(to be continued)

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

(‡: newly added in this part)

(A-1) Sanskrit Sources [Pāṇinian].

KV: *Kāśikavṛtti* of Vāmana and Jayāditya.

(a) Eds. by Aryendra Sharma and Khanderao Deshpande, 2 vols. Sanskrit Academy Series Nos. 17, 20. Hyderabad: Osmania University, 1969-70.

(b) — with Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa (Kāśikāvivaranaṭṭīkā)* and Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*.

Ed. by D.D. Shastri and K.P. Shukla, 6 vols. Ratna Bharati Series Nos. 5-10. Varanasi: Ratna Publication, 1965-67. [Text referred by volume and page].

LS: *Laghuśadendusekhara* of Nāgeśa (Nāgoji) Bhaṭṭa.

with a commentary *Chandrakalā* by Bhairava Mīśra, Ed. by Narahari Śāstri Pende (Re-ed. by Gopāla Śāstri Nene), Vols. 2, Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 5, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, 2nd. 1987.

MBh: Patañjali's *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*.

(a) Ed. by F.Kielhorn, rev. by K.V. Abhyankar, 3 vols. Poona: BORI, 1962, 1965, 1972. [Text is referred by volume, page, and line]

(b) — with the *Pradīpa* of Kaiyaṭa and *Uddyota* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa.

Ed. by Guru Prasad Shastri (rev. by Bal Shastri) 6 vols. (7 parts), (Vol. 1 has two parts. The first part contains Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's *Śabdakaustubha* but only *navāhnikas*). Varanasi: Vani Vilas Prakashan, 1987. (Rep. of Shri Rajasthan Sanskrit College Granthamala 30, 1938 ?).

(c) — with *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota*.

Eds. by Bhārgavaśāstri Bhikāji Joshi et al. 6 vols. Vrajajīvan Prācyabhāratī Granthamālā No. 23, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1988. (Rep. NSP. edition) ; Volume 2 is edited by M.M. Pandit Shivadatta Sharma. [Text referred by volume and page]

MS: Manuscript of *ŚK* preserved in Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. No. 655 of 1891-95, folios 48. lines 11, letters 42, Devānāgarī, Saṃvat 1847.

MDhV: *Mādhaviyadhānūvṛtti* of Mādhava or Sāyaṇa.

Eds. by Pt. Ananta Sastri Rhadake and Pt. Sadasiva Sarma Sastri, Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 103, Varanasi, 1934.

Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi.

see *KV*(b). [Text referred by volume and page].

P: Pāṇini.

²⁸ See also *LS* on P.2.3.5 [I, pp. 566-7]: “*ekādaśyām rātrau jāgryā*” *ityādāv adhikarānatva-vivakṣānā na dvitīyā.*

PM: Padamañjari of Haradatta Miśra.

(a) see *KV*(b). [Text referred by volume and page].

(b) Eds. by P. Sri Ramacandrudu and V. Sundara Sarma. 2 vols. Sanskrit Academy Series No. 26, Hyderabad, 1981.

ŚK: Śabdakaustubha of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

(a) Ed. by Gopāla Shastri Nene. 3 vols. Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series No. 2. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Office, rep. 1991.

(b) see *MBh*(b).

SK: Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

with *Bālamānoramā* and *Tattvabodhinī*.

Eds. by Giridhara Śarmā Caturveda and Pārameśvarānanda Śarmā Bhāskara, 4 vols. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1958-1961.

VB: Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa.

Ed. by Pt. Manudeva Bhaṭṭācārya. Harijivandas Pracyavidya Granthamala No. 2, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan, 1985.

VBS: Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇsāra of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa.

with *Darpaṇa* commentary by Śrī Harivallabha.

Ed. by Chandrika Prasad Dwivedi. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala No. 42, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 1989.

VMM: Vaiyākaraṇamatonmajjana of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita.

see *VBS*. and *VB*.

VP: Vākyapādīya of Bhaṭṭarṣhari.

(a) Ed. by Wilhelm Rau. Abhandlung für die Kunde des Morgenlandes Bd. 42.4. Wiesbaden, 1977.

(b) Eds. by K.V. Abhyankar and V.P. Limaye. University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. 2, Poona: University of Poona, 1965.

(c) — *Kāṇḍa* III. part i, with *Prakīrnaka-Prakāśa* of Helārāja. Ed. by K.A. Subrahmanya Iyer. Deccan College Monograph Series No. 21, Poona: Deccan College, 1963.

— *Kāṇḍa* III. part ii. Ed. by K.A. Subrahmanya Iyer, Poona: Deccan College, 1973.

VSLM: Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntalaghumañjūṣā of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa.

Eds. by Pt. Madhava Shastri Bhandari, Pt. Narahari Shastri Pendey, et al. 2 vols. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 44. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Office, 2nd ed., 1989.

VSM: Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntamañjūṣā of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa.

Ed. by Kapila Deva Shastri. Kurukshetra: Vishal Publication, 1985.

(A-2) Sanskrit Sources [Other Systems].

AK: Amaraḥkoṣa or *Nāmalīṅgānuśāsana*.

with the Commentary *Vyākhyāyāsudhā* or *Rāmāśramī* of Bhānuji Dīkṣita.

Ed. M.M. Pandit Sivadatta Dādhimatha (Rev. Vāsudeva Lakṣmana Panaśīkara), Brajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala No. 1, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 2nd ed., 1987.

KC: Kāraḥcakra of Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa.

(1) Ed. by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1923 [previously as (a) = abbrev. A in the text portion].

(2) Ed. by Brahma Śāṅkara Śāstrī, Haridāsa Saṁskṛta Granthamālā No. 154, Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1942 [previously (b). Text referred by page].

‡(3) Ed. by Mahadeva Gangādhara Bakre, in *Vādārthasaṁgraha*, part 2, Bombay: The Gujarati Printing Press, 1914, pp. 1-23 [abbrev. B in the text portion].

(B) Secondary Sources.

Deshpande, Madhava M.

1991(b) "Prototypes in Pāṇinian Syntax," in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 111, Number 3, July-September, pp. 465-480.

- Joshi, S.D. and Saroja Bhate.
 ‡1984 *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit Class B, No. 9, Pune: University of Poona.
- Joshi, S.D. and J.A.F. Roodbergen.
 1975 *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya, Kāraḥnikā* (P.1.4.23-55). Publication of the Centre of the Advanced Studies in Sanskrit, Class C No.10. Poona: University of Poona.
 ‡1995 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, with Translation and Explanation. Note, vol. IV (1.4.1-1.4.110), Pune: Sahitya Academy.
- Kiparsky, Paul.
 ‡1980 *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. (ed. by S.D.Joshi) The MIT Press, Cambridge and London. Co-published by the Poona University Press, Pune: University of Poona.
- Katre, Sumitra M.
 1987 *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kudo, Noriyuki
 1996 "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (1): Śabdakaustubha on P.1.4.23," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā*, vol.17, pp.27-64.
 1997(a) "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (2): Śabdakaustubha on P.1.4.24 [Apādāna (1)]," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā*, vol. 18, pp. 143-181.
 ‡1997(b) "Shin-ronrigakuha no Kouji-syutaisei (*karṭṛtva*) Teigi — Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa *Kāraḥcakra* Dai-ni-syou," in *Bukkyo Daigaku Bukkyougakkai*, vol. 5, pp. 29-74 ("Bhavānanda Siddhāntavāgīśa on *Karṭṛtva*: Annotated Japanese Translation of the *Kāraḥcakra* §2," in *The Bulletin of the Association of Buddhist Studies*, Bukkyo University, Vol. V, pp. 29-74) [In Japanese].
 ‡1998 "A Study on Sanskrit Syntax (3): Śabdakaustubha on P.1.4.25-31 [Apādāna (2)]," in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā*, vol.19, pp. 83-123.
- Matilal, B.K.
 1968 *The Navya-Nyāya Doctrine of Negation -- The Semantics and Ontology of Negative Statements in Navya-Nyāya Philosophy*. Harvard Oriental Series 46. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Rao, Veluri Subba
 1969 *The Philosophy of A Sentence and its Parts*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.
- Sharma, Rama Nath.
 1987, 1990 *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vols. 1, 2. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Part-time Lecturer
Bukkyo University
Kyoto