

VYĀKARAṆA MAHĀBHĀṢYA OF PATAÑJALI ON PĀṆINI 3.1 (ĀHNIKAS 1 TO 6) (3)*

Stephen Peter THOMPSON

6.3 *ādyudātaś ca //3/1/3//*

*kim artham idam ucyate / ādyudātto yathā syād antodāto mā
bhūd /*

6.5 *naitad asti prayojanam/ yam icchaty antodāttam karoti tatra cakāram anubandham āha ca*

*'cito 'nta udātta' iti / madhyodāttas tarhi mā bhūd iti /
madhyodāttam api yam icchati tatra repham anubandham
karoty āha copottamaṃ iti maṃ riti /*

*(6.1.217) iti / anudāttas tarhi mā bhūd iti / anudāttam api
yam icchati tatra pakāram anubandham karoty āha cānudāttau
suppatau (3.1.4)*

iti / svaritastarhi mā bhūd iti / svaritam api yam icchati

6.10 *karoti tatra takāram anubandham āha ca tatsvaritam (6.1.185) iti /*

*ya idānīm ato 'nyaḥ pratyayaḥ śeṣaḥ so 'ntareṇāpi vacanam
ādy udātta eva*

*bhaviṣyatīti nārtha ādyudāttavacanena // evam api yeṣām eva
pratyayānām*

*svaro niyamyate ta eva niyatasvarāḥ syur ya idānīm aniyata-
svaraḥ sa*

*kadācid ādyudāttaḥ kadācidantodāttaḥ kadācin madhyodāttaḥ
kadācid anudāttaḥ kadācit svaritaḥ*

syāt / ādyudātta eva yathā syād ity evam artham idam ucyate //

* The preceding parts of the present paper were published in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* Vols. 23 and 24. In Dr. Thompson's Ph.D. dissertation critical notes are provided in chapter 6, but in the present paper those notes are inserted after the text and translation of the *Mahābhāṣya* on each *Pāṇinisūtra* for the convenience of the reader. Accordingly, the present reproduction lacks an independent chapter presenting those notes.

6.15 *atha kimartham ca pratyayasamjñāsaniyogenādyudāttatvam
 ucyate 'nudāttatvam ca
 na yatraivānyasvaras tatraivāyam ucyeta / ñnityādir nityam
 (6.1.197)
 pratyayasya ca / adupadeśāl lasārvadhātukam anudāttam sup-
 pitau ceti /
 tatrāyam apy arthe dvir ādyadāttagrahaṇam dviś cānudātta-
 grahaṇam na kartavyam bhavati /
 prakṛtam anuvartate // ata uttaram paṭhati /*

Pāṇini 3.1.3: And a pratyaya has initial udātta (acute accent).

Bhāṣya: Why is this said? (It is said) so that there should be initial *udātta* and not be final *udātta*. This is not the purpose. Whatever he desires to have final *udātta* he produces (the *pratyaya*) in that context having an indicatory *c* and says “*citaḥ*” (6.1.163) (*antaḥ, udāttah*) “A stem formed by a *pratyaya* or *āgama* or *vikāra* having an indicatory *c* has *udātta* accent on the end syllable”. Then, it is so that middle *udātta* should not be applicable. Also whatever (*pratyaya*) he wants with middle *udātta* there he produces the indicatory letter *r* and says ‘*upottamam riti*’ (6.1.217). “What is formed by a *pratyaya* having an indicatory *r* has *udātta* on the penultimate syllable, the full word consisting of more than two syllables”. Then so that there should not be *anudātta* (on the *pratyaya*). (Here) too whatever words he wants with *anudātta* there he produces the indicatory letter *p* and says ‘*anudāttau suppitau*’ (3.1.4). “The *sup* / case *pratyayas* and the *pratyayas* having an indicatory *p* (*pit*) are *anudātta* (grave)”.

Then so that it be not *svarita* (circumflex). (Here) too whatever *pratyaya* he wants with a *svarita* accent there he produces the indicatory letter *t*. And he says ‘*titsvaritam*’ (6.1.185). “A *pratyaya* having an indicatory *t* is *svarita* (circumflex).

Now whatever other *pratyaya* remains there will be *udātta* even without this statement. So there is no purpose in the statement of *ādyudāttah*.

Even then, these *pratyayas* whose accent is fixed, only would have fixed accents but those which do not have a fixed accent are sometimes *ādi udātta* (initial *udātta*), sometimes middle *udātta*, sometimes *antodātta* (final *udātta*) and sometimes *svarita*. This rule is stated so that there be initial *udātta* only.

Now why is initial *udātta* or (final) *anudātta* stated here in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*? In that place in the Sixth *Adhyaya* where in fact there is another reference to accent, this accent also should have been taught. (For instance) where indeed there is stated *ñ-n-ityādir nityam* (6.1.197) (“Whatever is derived with a *pratyaya* having an indicatory *ñ* or *n* has *udātta* accent invariably on the first syllable”). This is ‘also for a *pratyaya*’. Also (*tāsyā-nudāṭṭen nid*) *adupadeśāl la sārvaḍhātukam anudāṭṭam (ahnviṇoh)* (6.1.186) “The personal endings and their substitutes = *la* (3.2.124-126) when (they are) *sārvaḍhātuka* (3.4.113) etc. are unaccented, after the (characteristic of the periphrastic future) *tāsi*, after a *dhātu* which in the *dhātupāṭha* has an unaccented vowel or *ñ* (with the exception of *hnuñ* and *iñ*) or *n* as indicatory letter, as well as what has a final ‘*a*’ in the *dhātupāṭha*/original teaching/*upadeśa* and also that which has an indicatory *p* (*pit*) or a *sup* (case ending) has *anudātta*”. And there also the purpose is that two mentions of *udātta* and two mentions of *anudātta* should not be made. The original (words) (viz. *udātta*, *anudātta*) follow on from previous *sūtras*. Therefore he reads as follows:

6.20 *ādyudāṭṭatvasya pratyayasamjñāsamṇiyoge prayojanam yasya samjñākaraṇam tasyādyudāṭṭārtham //1//*

ādyudāṭṭatvasya pratyayasamjñāsamṇiyogakarāṇa etat prayojanam yasya samjñā kriyate tasyādyudāṭṭatvam yathā syāt //

Vārttika 1: ‘The purpose of the statement of there being initial *udātta*/acute in conjunction with the technical term *pratyaya* is so that whatever is given the technical name (*pratyaya*) also has initial *udātta*’.

Bhāṣya: This is the purpose of the statement of initial *udātta*/acute with the technical name *pratyaya*, namely that whatever is given the technical name *pratyaya* is characterised by having an initial *udātta*.

6.23 *asamṇiyoge hi yasmāt sa tadāder ādyudāṭṭatvam tadantasya cānudāṭṭatvam //2//*

akriyamāṇe hi pratyayasamjñāsamṇiyogenādyudāṭṭatve prat-

yayagrahaṇe

6.25 *yasmāt sa tadāder grahaṇam bhavatīti tadāder evādy-
udāttatvaṃ prasajyeta tadantasya*

7.1 *cānudāttatvam // atha kriyamāṇe 'pi pratyayasamjñāsamniyo-
genādyudāttatve*

*'nudāttatve ca kasmād eva tadāder ādyudāttatvaṃ na bhavati
tadantasya*

*cānudāttatvam / utpannaḥ pratyayaḥ pratyayāśrayāṇām kār-
yāṇām nimittam*

*bhavati notpadyamānaḥ / tad yathā / ghaṭaḥ kṛto ghaṭāśrayā-
ṇām kāryāṇām*

nimittam bhavati na kriyamānaḥ //

Vārttika 2: For when there is no conjunction there is the characteristic of initial *udatta* for that after which that *pratyaya* is ordained and the characteristic of *anudatta*/acute accent for final of the same.

Bhāṣya: For when initial *udatta* characteristic is not being produced in conjunction with the technical term *pratyaya*, (initial *udatta* characteristic would attach to the beginning of that alone which ends in the *pratyaya*) and the final *anudatta* would attach to that (word which ends with the *pratyaya*) because (of the *paribhāṣa* rule) *pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa (vihitas) tadādeḥ (tadantasya) grahaṇam* “ a *pratyaya* denotes whenever it is employed (in grammar, a word form) which begins with that to which the *pratyaya* has been added and ends (with the *pratyaya*)”.

Now even while initial *udatta* (characteristic) and/or *anudatta* characteristic is being produced in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*, why does not in fact initial *udatta* (characteristic) and final *anudatta* apply to the initial of that word (which ends with a *pratyaya*)? A *pratyaya* (which is) produced is the cause of the operations dependent on the *pratyaya* and not the (*pratyaya*) which is being produced. As for example: The pot which has been made is the cause of the operations dependent on that pot and not the (pot) which is being made.

7.5 *na vā prakṛterādyudāttavacanam jñāpakam tadāder agraha-
nasya //3//*

*na vaiṣa doṣaḥ / kiṃ kāraṇam / yadayam ñnityādir nityam iti
prakṛter ādyudāttatvaṃ śāsti tajjñāpayatyācāryo na tadāder
ādyudāttatvaṃ
bhavatīti // tadantasya tarhy anudāttatvaṃ prāpnoti /*

Vārttika 3: This difficulty does not (arise because) the rule of the initial *udātta* for the *prakṛti* (base) indicates that there is no mention of the initial of that (*pratyaya* which helps form it).

Bhāṣya: Nor is this a fault. What is the reason? When he teaches *ñ nityādirnityam* (6.1.197) ('whatever is derived with a *pratyaya* having an indicatory *ñ* or *n* that has *udātta* invariably on the initial'), there is thus the characteristic of initial *udātta* for the base/*prakṛti*. The master thus makes known that there is not then the characteristic of initial *udātta* for that beginning of the word formed with (a *pratyaya*). Then the characteristic of *anudātta* obtains for that word ending with a *pratyaya*.

*prakṛtisvarasya ca vidhānasāmarthyāt pratyayasvarābhāvaḥ
//4//*

7.10 *yad ayaṃ dhātor antaḥ prātipadikasyānta iti prakṛter anto-
dāttatvaṃ
śāsti tajjñāpayatyācāryo na tadantasyānudāttatvaṃ bhavatīti/
katham
kṛtvā jñāpakam / yatra hyanudāttaḥ pratyayaḥ prakṛtisvaras
tatra prayojayati //*

Vārttika 4: And because of the force of the rule for accent of the base, there is absence of accent for the *pratyaya*.

Bhāṣya: When he teaches *dhātor (antaḥ)* 'For a *dhātu* there is *udātta* on the final syllable' and *prātipadikasya antaḥ* 'For a *prātipadika* (base) there is *udātta* on the final syllable', the master makes known (by *jñāpaka*) that the characteristic of *anudātta* is not for that (word) which ends with the *pratyaya*. How is the *jñāpaka* (implied rule) formed? Where the *pratyaya* is *anudātta* there the accent of the *prakṛti* (base) becomes applicable.

āgamānudāttārthaṃ vā //5//

āgamādanudāttārthaṃ tarhi pratyayasamjñāsamniyogenādyudāttatvam ucyate /

7.15 *pratyayasamjñāsamniyogenādyudāttatve kṛta āgamā anudāttā yathā syur iti //*

Vārttika 5: Or (the rule is) for the purpose of *anudātta* accent for *āgamas*.

Bhāṣya: Then the characteristic of *udātta* is stated in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya* for the purpose of the *anudātta* accent for *āgamas*. So that when the characteristic of *udātta* is produced by the simultaneous (conjunction) with the technical name *pratyaya*, the *āgamas* (augments) may be *anudātta* (grave).

7.16 *na vāgamasyānudāttavacanāt //6//*

na vaitadapi prayojanam asti / kiṃ kāraṇam / āgamasyānudāttavacanāt /

āgamā anudāttā bhavantīti vaksyāmi / ke punar āgamā anudāttatvam

prayojayanti / iṭ / lavitā / iṭ tāvanna prayojyati /

7.20 *idamiha sampradhāryam / iṭ kriyatām ādyudāttatvam iti kim atra kartavyam /*

paratvādiḍāgamaḥ / nityam ādyudāttatvam / kṛte 'pīti prāpnoty akṛte 'pi

7.22 *prāpnoti/ iḍ api nityaḥ / kṛte 'pyādyudāttatve prāpnoty akṛte 'pi prāpnoti / anitya iṭ / anyathāsvarasya kṛta ādyudāttatve prāpnotyathāsvarasyākṛte svarabhinnasya ca prāpnuvan vidhir anityo*

bhavati / ādyudāttatvam apy nityam / anyasya kṛta iti

7.25 *prāpnoty anyasyākṛte śabdāntarasya ca prāpnuvanvidhir anityo bhavati /*

ubhayor anityayor paratvādiḍāgamaḥ / antaraṅgam tarhy ādyudāttatvam /

kāntaraṅgatā / utpattisamniyogenādyudāttatvam ucyata utpanne pratyaye

prakṛtipratyayāvāsṛityāṅgasyeḍāgamaḥ / ādyudāttatvam api

nāntaraṅgaṃ

- 8.1 *yāvatā pratyaya āśrīyamāṇe prakṛtirapyāśritā bhavati /
antaraṅgaṃ evādyudāttatvam / katham / idānīm eva hy uktaṃ
na pratyayasvaravidhau
tadādividhir bhavatīti / śīyut tarhi prayojayati /*

Vārttika 6: Nor is (the rule valid) because of the rule of *anudātta* for augments.

Bhāṣya: Nor is this also the purpose. What is the reason? Because of the rule of *anudātta* for augments, I will say ‘Augments are *anudātta*’. But which augments have the characteristic of *anudātta* applicable to them?

The augment *iṭ* has the characteristic of *anudātta* e.g. *lavitā* “He will cut”. The augment *iṭ* does not have the characteristic of *anudātta*. This is to be considered here: Let *iṭ* be formed with *udātta*. What is to be done? Because of the *iṭ* rule being *para* (subsequent) the *iṭ āgama* (is applicable). Initial *udātta* characteristic is invariable. For it is applicable even when it is produced or not produced. (The *āgama*) *iṭ* is also invariable. It obtains even when initial *udātta* is effected or it is not effected. *iṭ* is variable, for it obtains in one way when the accent is made initial *udātta*, while it obtains in another way when the initial accent is not made (*udātta*); and the rule applicable to that which contains different accents (at different times) is variable. Initial *udātta* accent is also variable. For it is effected on one when *iṭ* is not added to it and the rule obtaining for a different word becomes variable. When both are variable the *iṭ āgama* rule applies because of being a subsequent or *para* rule.

Then the characteristic of initial *udātta* is *antaraṅga*. What is the state (or condition) of *antaraṅga*? The characteristic of initial *udātta* is stated simultaneously in connection with the arising (of the *pratyaya*), whereas the *āgama iṭ* obtains being dependent upon *prakṛti* only after the *pratyaya* is produced. Also the characteristic of initial *udātta* is not *antaraṅga* inasmuch as when the *pratyaya* is being resorted to, the *prakṛti* is also resorted to. Initial *udātta* is in fact *antaraṅga*. How? Just now it was said — in a rule for *pratyaya* accent the *tad ādi* (i.e. a word beginning with that) rule does not apply. Then *śīyut* has the characteristic of *udātta*.

avacane hi sīyudāder ādyudāttatvam //7//

- 8.5 *akriyamāṇe hy āgamānudāttatve kriyamāṇe 'pi pratyaya-
samjñāsamniyoge
nādyudāttatve sīyudāder liṅ ādyudāttatvam prasajyeta / laviṣīya
paviṣīya //*
*tat tarhi vaktavyam āgamā anudāttā bhavantīti / na vaktavyam/
ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayatyāgamā anudāttā bhavantīti yadayam
yāsuṭ
parasmaipadeśūdātto nic ca (3.4.103) ity āha / naitad asti
jñāpakam /
vakṣyaty etat / yāsuṭo nidvacanam pidartham udāttavacanam
ceti / śakyamanena
vaktum yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣu bhavaty apicca liṅ bhavatīti /
so 'yam evaṃ laghīyasā nyāsenā siddhe sati yadgarīyāmsam
yatnam ārabhate taj jñāpayaty ācārya āgamā anudāttā
bhavantīti /
śakyam idaṃ labdhum //*

Vārttika 7: For when there is not a specific rule (for *āgama* to be *anudātta*) there is the characteristic of initial *udātta* for the actual initial of *sīyut* (*āgama*).

Bhāṣya: When the characteristic of *anudātta* for an *āgama* is not (stated even when initial *udātta* characteristic is) stated, *udātta* characteristic would be wrongly attached to the *liṅ* with the initial *āgama sīyut* even when initial *udātta* characteristic is stated in connection with the technical name *pratyaya* e.g. *laviṣīyá*, 'May I cut;' *pariṣīyá*, 'May I purify.' Then should that be stated as 'augments are *anudātta*'? No, it (need) not be stated. The master's usage causes this to be known that augments have *anudātta* accents since he states this rule, *yāsuṭ parasmaipadeśūdātto nic ca (3.4.103)* 'yāsuṭ is added to the *parasmaipada* ending in *liṅ*, and it is *udātta* as well as *nit*. This is not an implied rule or *jñāpaka*. He will say that "the stating of *it n* for *yāsuṭ* is for expressing 'not *pit*', (and being not *p-it*) states *udātta* (for *yāsuṭ*)" (3.4.103 *Vā. 1*). By reason of that it is possible to say 'there is the augment *yāsuṭ* when *parasmaipada pratyayas* of *liṅ* follow and *liṅ* is without indicatory *p* (therefore accented *udātta*)'. When this can be achieved thus by a briefer (written or) literal text the

fact that he begins a great expression or effort suggests that the master makes known (by the implied rule) that *āgamas* have *anudātta* accent. Then it is possible thus to obtain (this rule).

yady eva vacanādathāpi jñāpakādāgamā anudātā bhavanty āgamaistu

8.15 *vyavahitavād ādyudāttatvaṃ na prāpnoti / āgamā avidyamānavad bhavantīti*

vakṣyami / yadyāgamā avidyamānavad bhavantīty ucyate lavitā avādeśo na

prāpnoti svaravidhāv iti vakṣyāmi / evam api lavitā

udāttādanudāttasya svaritaḥ (8.4.66) iti svarito na

prāpnoti / śaṣṭhiko svara iti vakṣyāmi / evam api śikṣitaḥ

niṣṭhā ca dvyajanāt (6.1.205) it yeṣa svaraḥ prāpnoti /

pratyayasvaravidhāv iti vakṣyāmi // tat tarhi vaktavyam āgamā avidyamānavad bhavantīti / na vaktavyam / ācāryapravṛttir

jñāpayaty āgamā

avidyamānavad bhavantīti yad ayaṃ yāsuḥ parasmaipadeṣū-dāto niccetvāha /

naitad asti jñāpakam / vakṣyaty etat / yāsuḥo nidvacanam pidartham udāttavacanam

ceti / śakyam anena vaktum yāsuḥ parasmaipadeṣu bhavaty apicca liṅ bhavātīti /

so 'yam evaṃ laghīyasā nyāsenā siddhe sati yadgarīyāmsam yatnam ārabhate

tajjñāpayatyācārya āgamā avidyamānavad bhavantīti //

Bhāṣya: Although it is from a rule, still it is from an implied rule (*jñāpaka*) that it is known that *āgamas* have *anudātta* accent, (still) because of being separated by *āgamas* the characteristic of initial *udātta* does not obtain (for the *pratyaya*). I will say “augments are as if they did not exist”. If it is said “*āgamas* are as if they did not exist”, then the substitute *av* for *lavitā* does not obtain. I will say “(this applies) in the context of an accent rule (only)”. Even then also (in the case of *lavitā* because of the rule *udāttād anudāttasya svaritaḥ* (8.4.66). ‘The *svarita* accent is in place of an *anudātta* accent following after an *udātta* accent’. *Svarita* accent does not obtain (as required for the *i* of *lavitā*). (Then) I will say (this applies only) in relation to accent rules in the sixth *adhyāya*. Also thus (there in the

example) *udātta* accent obtains for *śikṣitāḥ* (learnt, studied, taught) because of the rule *niṣṭhā ca dvyajanāt* (6.1.205) (“A two-syllable participle in *ta(niṣṭhā)*, when a name, has the *udātta* on the first syllable, but not if the first syllable has an *ā*”. I will say, “In the context of the (rules of) *pratyaya* accent, (the *āgamas* are as if non-existent *avidyamānavat*)”.

Then is that to be stated, “Augments are as if they did not exist”? It (need) not be stated. The master’s usage makes known that augments are ‘as if they did not exist’ since he states the rule ‘*yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣūdātta*’ (3.4.103) “*Yāsuṭ* is added to the *parasmaipada* endings of *liṅ* and it is *udātta* as well as *ñ-it*”.

This is not an implied rule (*jñāpaka*). For he will say that the statement of *ñ-it* (having an indicatory *ñ*) for “*yāsuṭ* is for the purpose of *piṭ* (i.e. preventing *pit*) and thus for expressing *udātta* accent”. (3.4.103 *Vā 1 and 2*)

It is possible for him to say, “*yāsuṭ* is the augment of *parasmaipada liṅ* and *liṅ* is not *pit* (without an indicatory *p*). Since this (teacher) begins a greater effort when it could be achieved by a briefer written text, the master’s usage makes known ‘augments are as if non-existent’”.

ādyudāttasya vā lopārtham //8//

8.25 *ādyudāttasya tarhi lopārtham pratyayasamjñāsamniyogenādy-udāttatvam ucyate /
pratyayasamjñāsamnyogenādyudāttatve kṛte udāttanivṛttisvaraḥ
siddho bhavati /
sraughnī māthurīti / atra hi paratvāl lopaḥ pratyayasvaram
bādheta //*

Vārttika 8: Or (the rule is) for the sake of (the situation where there is) elision for that word with the initial *udātta*.

Bhāṣya: Then characteristic initial *udātta* is stated in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya* for the sake of the situation where there is elision of initial *udātta*. When that having the *udātta* accent is formed in conjunction with the technical term *pratyaya*, the accent resulting from the cessation (elision) of a (preceding) *udatta* is established (as for example). ‘*Sraughnī*’ born or living in *srughana*,

māthurī (a female coming from or born in, belonging to *Mathurā*. Because of being a *para* rule the *lopa* (by *yasyeti ca* (6.4.148)) would cancel the *pratyaya udātta* accent.

9.1 *na vā bahiraṅgalakṣaṇatvāt //9//*

*na vaitad api prayojanam asti / kiṃ kāraṇam / bahiraṅga-
lakṣaṇatvāt /
bahiraṅgalakṣaṇo lopo 'ntaraṅgalakṣaṇaḥ svaraḥ / asiddham
bahiraṅgam antaraṅge //
avaśyaṃ caiṣā paribhāṣāśrayitavyā //*

Vārttika 9: Nor (is the rule necessary) because of the rule being characterised as *bahiraṅga*.

Bhāṣya: Nor is this the purpose. What is the reason? Because of being characterised as *bahiraṅga*, the *lopa*/elision rule is *bahiraṅga*. The accent rule is characterized as an *antaraṅga* (inner rule). 'That which is *bahiraṅga* is (regarded as) not having taken effect (or as not existing) when that which is *antaraṅga* (is to take effect)'. And it is essential to resort to this *paribhāṣā*.

9.5 *avacane hi ṅinnitkitsvatiprasaṅgaḥ //10//*

*anāśrīyamānāyām asyāṃ paribhāṣāyāṃ kriyamāṇe 'pi
pratyayasamjñāsamniyogenādyudāttatve ṅinnitkitsvatiprasaṅ-
gaḥ syāt /
autsī kamsikī ātreṣṭi / atra hi paratvāllopo
ṅinnitkitsvarānbādheta // naiṣa doṣaḥ / ṅinnitkitsvarāḥ
pratyayasvarāpavādāḥ / na cāpavādaviṣaya utsar-
go 'bhiniviṣate/
pūrvam hy apavādā abhiniviṣante paścād utsargāḥ / prakalpya
vāpavādaviṣayaṃ
tata utsargo 'bhiniviṣate / na tāvad atra kadācit pratyayādy-
udāttatvam
bhavaty apavādāṅṅinnitkitsvarānpratīkṣate / kamsikyāṃ bhūyān
parihāraḥ /
anyasyātrodāttatvam anyasya lopaḥ / āder udāttatvam antyasya
lopaḥ //*

*idaṃ tarhi ātreṃyīti / atra hi paratvāl lopah kitsvaram bādheta /
tasmād eṣā paribhāṣāśrayitavyā / etasyāṃ ca satyāṃ śakyam
pratyayasamṇiyogenādyudāttatvam avaktum //*

Vārttika 10: For when there is not statement of *antarāṅga* rule there is an over-application of the rule in relation to *it ñ, n* and *k*.

Bhāṣya: For when this *paribhāṣā* is not being resorted to there would be unwarrantable stretch of rule in relation to *it ñ, n* and *k*, even when the characteristic of initial is being produced in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*.

e.g. in *autsī* (female produced or being in a well, female descendant of *Utsa*)

kānsikī (a feminine thing made of or relating to bell-metal)

ātreṃyī (female descendant of *Atri*)

For here *lopa* being a following (i.e. latter/*para*) rule would cancel the accent of those having *it ñ, n* and *k*.

This fault does not obtain. The (*udātta*) accents associated with those having *it ñ, n* or *k* are exceptions to the general rule stating *pratyaya* accent. The general *sūtra* does not enter the domain of the exceptional rule. For first, the *apavāda* rules enter, then afterwards the *utsarga*/general rules. Having (first) settled or fixed the sphere of the exceptional rule, the general/*utsarga* rule enters. Just here there is never *pratyaya* accent (because of this *apavāda sūtra*). One expects exceptional/*apavāda* rules concerning accents for those *pratyayas* having *it ñ, n* or *k*. Another device to remove (the difficulty) in relation to *kānsikī* (feminine thing, made of bell-metal) is as follows: for there is *udātta* characteristic for one and *lopa* elision for another. *Udātta* for the initial and *lopa* for the final.

Then (there is) this (example) *ātreṃyī*(female descendant of *Atri*). Here *lopa* by *yasyeti ca* (6.4.148) being subsequent would cancel the *udātta* accent (on the final) of that conjoined with that having the *it k* (6.1.165). Therefore, this *paribhāṣā* should be resorted to. When this exists, it is not possible to say there is characteristic initial *udātta* simultaneously in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya* (i.e. outside the domain of *vipratishedhe param kāryam* (1.4.2) because it is part of the technical name and not a *vidhisūtra*).

9.15 *pratyayādyudāttatvād dhātor antaḥ //11//*

pratyayāyudāttatvād dhātor anta ity etad bhavati vipratīṣedhena / pratyayāyudāttatvasyāvakāśo yatrānudāttā prakṛtiḥ / samatvām simatvām / dhātor anta ity etasyāvakāśo yatrānudāttāḥ pratyayaḥ / pacāti paṭhāti / ihobhayam prāpnoti / gopāyāti dhūpāyāti / dhātoranta ity etad bhavati vipratīṣedhena //

Vārttika 11: Instead of the characteristic of initial *udātta* for a *pratyaya*, final (*udātta*) for a *dhātu* (verbal seed form) is to be applied.

Bhāṣya: Instead of the characteristic of initial *udātta* for a *pratyaya*, a final *udātta* (for a *dhātu*) is applicable by reason of a conflict (of rules of equal strength). When the base has *anudātta* there is scope for initial *udātta* characteristic for the *pratyaya*,

e.g. *samatvām* (equality, equanimity); *simatvām* (entirety, wholeness).

There is scope for this rule *dhātor antaḥ* where the *pratyaya* is *anudātta* e.g. *pacāti* (he cooks), *paṭhāti* (he recites). Both obtain here (in the examples) *gopāyāti* (he protects), *dhūpāyāti* (he fumigates or perfumes with incense).

Equal rules being in conflict, this rule *dhātor antaḥ* (being subsequent) is applicable.

9.20 *pitsvarāt titsvaraṣṭāpi //12//*

pitsvararāt titsvaraṣṭāpi bhavati vipratīṣedhena / pitsvarasyāvakāśaḥ pacati paṭhati / titsvarasyāvakāśaḥ / kāryam hāryam / ihobhayam prāpnoti / kāryā hāryā / titsvaro bhavati vipratīṣedhena //

Vārttika 12: Instead of the (*anudātta*) accent in connection with that having an indicatory *p*, the (*svarita*) accent in connection with that having an indicatory *t* (is applicable) when feminine *pratyaya tāp* is added.

Bhāṣya: Instead of the (*anudātta*) accent in connection with an indicatory *p*, the (*svarita*) accent in connection with an indicatory *t*

(6.1.185) is applicable when the feminine *pratyaya tāp* follows, by reason of a conflict of (rules of equal strength/requiring the following rule to prevail). The *anudātta* accent followed by *it p* has scope (in the examples) *pācati* (he cooks), *pāṭhati* (he recites).

The *svarita* accent (ordained by) *it t* has scope here: *kāryām* (it is to be made), *hāryām* (it is to be taken). Both obtain here in the examples *kāryā*, *hāryā*. The *svarita* accent in connection with that having *it t* is applicable by reason of mutual conflict between two rules of equal strength (requiring the subsequent to prevail).

citsvaraś cāpi pitsvarāt //13//

9.25 *citsvaraś cāpi pitsvarād bhavti vipratīṣedhena /
citsvarasyāvakaśaḥ / calanāḥ copanāḥ / pitsvarasya sa eva /
ihobhayam prāpnoti / āmbaṣṭhyā sauṁvīryā/ citsvaro
bhavati vipratīṣedhena //*

Vārttika 13: And instead of an (*anudātta*) accent (ordained) in connection with that having *it p*, *udātta* ordained in connection with that having *it c* prevails when (the feminine *pratyaya*) *cāp* follows.

Bhāṣya: And instead of an (*anudātta*) accent (ordained in connection with *it p*) an *udātta* accent (ordained in connection with *it c* prevails) by reason of a conflict (of rules of equal strength requiring the following rule to prevail). There is scope for the accent (ordained because of *cit*) (for example) in *calanaḥ* (moving, shaking), *copanaḥ* (moving).

The same is in fact an example of accent in connection with that having an *it p* accent. Both obtain here, namely in *āmbaṣṭhyā* (queen of the *Ambaṣṭayas*), *sauṁvīryā* (princess of the *Sauṁvīras*). The accent due to the indicative *c* is applicable by reason of conflict (of rules of equal force requiring the following to prevail).

na vādyudāttasya pratyayasamjñāsamniyogāt //14//

*na vārtho vipratīṣedhena / kiṁ kāraṇam / ādyudāttasya
10.5 pratyayasamjñāsamniyogāt / pratyayasamjñāsamniyogenādy-
udāttatve kṛte
satiśiṣṭatvād dhātusvaro bhaviṣyati //*

*ayam cāpyayukto vipratīṣedhaḥ pitsvarasya
titsvarasya ca / kiṃ kāraṇam /*

Vārttika 14: Nor is (*vipratīṣedha* applicable) because initial *udātta* is taught in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*.

Bhāṣya: No purpose is achieved by *vipratīṣedha* (by which when there is a conflict of rules of equal force the following one prevails). What is the reason? Because the (characteristic) of initial *udātta* is taught in connection with the technical name *pratyaya*. When the (characteristic of) initial *udātta* is formed (simultaneously) by connection with the technical name *pratyaya* there will be an *udātta* accent on the *dhātu* because of its being residual (i.e. the remainder in place of the previous accent in the order of the word's formation). Moreover this conflict (of equal rules) between the accent due to *it p* and the accent due to *it t* is not proper. What is the reason?

tāpi svaritenaikādeśaḥ //15//

*tāpi svaritenaikādeśo bhavati / idam iha sampradhāryam /
svaritatvaṃ kriyatām ekādeśa itī kimatra kartavyam /
paratvāt svaritatvam / nitya ekādeśaḥ / kṛte 'pi hi svaritativē
10.10 prāpnotyakṛte 'pi prāpnoti / svaritatvam apī nityam /
kṛte 'pyekādeśe prāpnotyakṛte 'pi prāpnoti / anityaṃ svarita-
tvam /
anyasya kṛta ekādeśe prāpnotyanyasyākṛte śabdāntarasya ca
prāpnuvanvidhir anityo bhavati / ekādeśo 'py anityaḥ /
anyathāsvarasya kṛte svaritativē prāpnotyanyathāsvarasyākṛte
svaritativē svarabhinnasya ca prāpnuvanvidhīranityo bhavati/
antaraṅgastarhy ekādeśaḥ / kāntaraṅgatā / varṇāvāśrityai-
kādeśaḥ padasya svaritatvam / svaritatvam apy antaraṅgam /
katham / vaksyaty etat / padagrahaṇaṃ pariṇāmartham itī /
ubhayor antaraṅgayoḥ
paratvātsvaritatvam / svaritatave kṛta āntarthataḥ /
svaritānudāttayor ekādeśaḥ svarito bhaviṣyati //
ayam cāpy ayukto vipratīṣedhaḥ pitsvarasya citsvarasya ca /
kiṃ kāraṇam/*

Vārttika 15: When *tāp* follows, the one substitute (for the one before and the one after will be) with *svarita* accent.

Bhāṣya: when *tāp* (feminine *pratyaya*) follows, the one substitute (for the one before and the one after) will be with a *svarita* accent. Here this is to be deliberated upon. Let *svarita* be effected as the single substitute. What is to be done here? The (rule of) *svarita* accent being subsequent is applicable. (The rule teaching) the 'one substitute' is a *nitya* (invariable) rule, for it obtains (even) when *svarita* is produced and also when it is not produced. *Svarita* accent is also invariable. It obtains when there is a single substitute effected and also when not effected. *Svarita* accent is variable. It obtains for one when the single substitute is effected and for another when not effected. Obtaining for a different word the rule becomes variable. A single substitute is also variable. For on the one hand it obtains when the characteristic of *svarita* is produced for an accent, while on the other (it obtains) when characteristic *svarita* is not produced for the accent.

Also when a rule is applicable to a different accent it is variable/*a-nitya*. (When both are variable because of being a subsequent) rule, *svarita* prevails. Then the single substitute (rule) is *antarāṅga* 'interior'. What is the nature of being *antarāṅga*? The single substitute depends upon two letters while *svarita* accent depends upon the word. *Svarita* characteristic is also *antarāṅga*. How? He will say this.

The reference to *pada* (word) is for the purpose of transformation. When both are *antarāṅga*, because of being a subsequent rule *svarita* prevails.

When the characteristic *svarita* accent is produced because of near relationship of *svarita* and *anudātta* accents the one substitute for both will be *svarita*, and this conflict of that having an indicatory *p* (*anudātta*) accent and that having an indicatory *c* (final *udātta*) accent is also not proper. What is the reason?

cāpi citkaraṇāt //16//

10.20 *cāpi citkaraṇasāmarthyād antodāttatvaṃ bhaviṣyati //*

Vārttika 16: When *cāp* feminine *pratyaya* follows because of having an indicatory *c* there will be final *udātta*.

Bhāṣya: When *cāp* (feminine *pratyaya*) follows because of the force of making it an *it c* (there will be final *udātta* accent).

NOTES ON MAHĀBHĀṢYA ON PĀṆINI 3.1.3

General Summary

Bhā.: The rule is stated so there be initial *udātta* only.

Vā. 1: The purpose of the statement of there being initial *udātta* in conjunction with the technical term *pratyaya* is so that whatever is given the technical name *pratyaya* also has initial *udātta*.

Vā. 2: For when there is no conjunction, there is the characteristic of initial *udātta* for that after which that *pratyaya* is ordained and characteristic of *anudātta* for the final of the same.

Vā. 3: This difficulty does not arise, because the initial *udātta* for the *prakṛti* indicates that there is no mention of the initial of that (*pratyaya* which helps form it).

Vā. 4: And because of the force of the rule for *udātta* for the *prakṛti* there is absence of accent for the *pratyaya*.

Vā. 5: Or the rule is for the purpose of *anudātta* accent for *āgamas*.

Vā. 6: Nor is this rule valid because of the rule of *anudātta* for *āgamas* (augment).

Vā. 7: For when there is not a specific rule for *āgamas* to be *anudātta* there is the characteristic of initial *udātta* for the actual initial of *sīyut* (*āgama*).

Bhā.: There is a *jñāpaka* “*āgamas* are as if non-existent”.

Vā. 8: Or the rule is for the sake of the situation where there is elision for that word having initial *udātta*.

Vā. 9: Nor is the rule necessary because of the (*lopa*) rule being characterised as *bahirāᅅga*.

Vā. 10: For when there is no statement of an *antarāᅅga* rule there is an over-application of the rule in relation to *it ñ n* and *k*.

Vā. 11: Instead of the characteristic of initial *udātta* for a *pratyaya*, final *udātta* for a *dhātu* is to be applied.

Vā. 12: Instead of the *anudātta* accent in connection with that having an indicative *p*, the *svarita* accent in connection with that having an indicative *i* is applicable when the feminine *pratyaya* *tāp* follows.

Vā. 13: And instead of an *anudātta* accent ordained in connection with that having an *it p*, *udātta* accent ordained in connection with that having an *it c* prevails, when the feminine *pratyaya* *cāp* follows.

Vā. 14: Nor is *vipratishedha* applicable, because initial *udātta* is taught in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*.

Vā. 15: When *tāp* follows, the one substitute for the one before and the

one after will be with a *svarita* accent.

Vā. 16: When *cāp* feminine *pratyaya*, follows there will be final *udātta* because of its having an indicatory *c*.

Vārttika Summary

Kātyāyana explains in the first *vārttika* why the rules for a *pratyaya*'s accent should be given here and not in the accent section from 6.1.158 to the end; it is so that initial *udātta* should apply simultaneously with the technical name *pratyaya*.

In the second *vārttika* he explains the consequences of not simultaneously ordaining the accent with the technical name, namely the '*tadādeḥ tadantasya*' *paribhāṣā* would apply, so that instead of the *pratyaya* having an initial *udātta* the word form ending in that *pratyaya* would receive the accent on its initial syllable.

The third *vārttika* points out that the rule ordaining initial *udātta* for *prakṛtis* formed by *pratyayas* with *it ñ* or *n* is an implied rule, that for those formed by any other *pratyayas* the *prakṛti* does not have such an accent.

The fourth *vārttika* deals with the other aspect of the *paribhāṣā*... *tadantasya*, viz. the requirement that if for the beginning of that ending with a *pratyaya* there should be *udātta*, it follows that for the end of such a word there would be *anudātta* accent. This is barred by the *jñāpaka*, derived from there being a rule for final *udātta* of a *dhātu*, which of course would not be necessary if the *pratyaya* were *anudātta*.

Kātyāyana suggests in the fifth *vārttika* another possible purpose for the rule being in conjunction with the name *pratyaya*, that *āgamas* as a result will be *anudātta*. However, this is not a real possibility, for the sixth *vārttika* states that such a rule for *anudātta* augments has already been stated.

The other view is put in the seventh *vārttika*, that without specifically stating a rule *āgama anudātta* there would have been *udātta* for the *ī* of *sīyut*.

Another possible reason for the rule being in conjunction with *pratyaya* is stated in *vārttika* eight, as establishing *udātta* before the vowel is *lopa*/elided, so that there may be *udātta* in place of *anudātta* by 6.1.161. However, this last purpose is not required, if it is realised that *lopa* rules are *bahirāṅga* in relation to *antarāṅga svāra* (accent) rules, according to *vārttika* nine.

The tenth *vārttika* explains that the *antarāṅga paribhāṣā* implied in the last *vārttika* will prevent unwarrantable stretch of the general rule in relation to *it ñ n* and *k*.

The eleventh *vārttika* now points out another exception to the general initial *udātta* for a *pratyaya* when final *udātta* for a *dhātu* is ordained by *dhātoḥ* 6.1.162.

In the next two *vārttikas* Kātyāyana is concerned with exceptions to

3.1.4 ‘*anudāttau suppitau*’, directly, whereas in the previous *vārttika* this was implied. In the twelfth he shows that the *svārīta* accent bars *anudātta* resulting from *it p*, when *ṭāp* follows if the *pratyaya* has an *it t*.

The thirteenth *vārttika* serves to underline the fact that the *udātta* accent connected with *it c* will bar the *anudātta* arising from *it p* only when *cāp* follows.

Having presented the *pūrvapakṣa* in the last *vārttikas*, Kātyāyana now states in the fourteenth that it is not necessary (being based on *vipratīṣedha*) because initial *udātta* is taught simultaneously with the name *pratyaya* by this very *sūtra*. In the penultimate *vārttika* it is said that *vārttika 12* was also incorrectly based on *vipratīṣedha* because *svārīta* is simply the one *ādeśa* / substitute for *svārīta* and *anudātta*, containing both.

Finally in *vārttika* sixteen, it is stated why more specifically *vārttika 13* is incorrectly based on *vipratīṣedha* because the very purpose of the letter *c* of *cāp* is to prescribe *udātta*.

Bhāṣya Summary

Patañjali introduces the first *vārttika* by asking in general why initial *udātta* need be stated. If in fact final and middle *udātta*, *anudātta* and *svārīta* are specifically prescribed elsewhere, then it would appear no rule is required for initial *udātta* since they are the remainder/*śeṣa*. However, where no specific rule applies prescribing accent in a fixed place, then this rule is required to ensure that such *pratyayas* only have initial *udātta*, and not any of the other possibilities.

This having been clarified, Patañjali introduces the subtler problem, as to why these two rules on *udātta* and *anudātta* accent on 3.1.3-4 are introduced here, simultaneously with the technical name *pratyaya*, when they could easily have been stated in the sixth *adhyāya* first *pāda*, with the other accent *sūtras* and by the device of *anuvṛtti* they would have achieved greater brevity. As it is, the words of these two *sūtras* will effectively have to be repeated in 6.1.

Since the first two *vārttikas* are complementary, Patañjali makes his comments after the second. The consequence of no simultaneous conjunction with *pratyaya* would be the operation of the *paribhāṣā* stated here, and often elsewhere by Patañjali ‘a *pratyaya* denotes ... a word form which begins with that to which it has been added and ends with the *pratyaya*’. He then draws a vital distinction between the form in process of being produced and the completed form. Just as the pot being produced does produce operations like carrying water, so accent prescribed with *pratyaya* is totally disconnected from operations referred to in the *paribhāṣā*.

In his discussion of *vārttika* three, Patañjali explains the implied rule/*jñāpaka* referred to, which states that a *prakṛti*’s initial will be *anudātta*, when not followed by *pratyayas* with *it ñ* or *n* (6.1.197) so that

the *paribhāṣā* is not relevant for the initial anyway.

The second half of the *paribhāṣā* ... '*tadantasya*' is also now shown not to be applicable. In discussing this fourth *vārttika* the *Bhāṣyakāra* shows that by the prescription of final *udātta* for a *dhātu* (6.1.162) and a *prātipadika* (*Phīṭ sūtra* 1) it is an implied rule that *prakṛti udātta* final is applicable where a *pratyaya* is *anudātta*.

Turning to *āgamas*, Patañjali explains the fifth *vārttika* as saying, by having simultaneous connection of *udātta* initial with a *pratyaya*, augments will necessarily be *anudātta*.

The *Bhāṣya* on the sixth *vārttika*, having first quoted the 'rule' of *anudātta* for augments, takes one example, the augment *iṭ* joined to *tāsi* after *dhātu lū* to form *lavitā*. Patañjali considers the two rules in turn, initial *udātta* and augment *iṭ*, agreeing that both are variable but that initial *udātta* is *antaraṅga* (requiring fewer operations). Then what of *sīyut* being *udātta*?

Nonetheless, some specific statement is needed to show *āgamas* are *anudātta*. *Sīyut* etc. would (otherwise) receive the *udātta* intended for the *pratyaya* they precede. So Patañjali, in his discussion on *vārttika* seven, deals at length with the implied rule/*jñāpaka* inferred from 3.4.103, that other than *yāsuṭ* mentioned in that *sūtra* as *udātta*, all others must of necessity be *anudātta*. However, the problem remains as to whether they are to be regarded as existing. Unless they are treated as non-existent for *pratyaya* rules they will receive the accent and not the *pratyaya*. This too can be implied from the *sūtra* 3.4.103, because of the rule being expressed less briefly than is possible.

On the eighth *vārttika* Patañjali explains how by '*udātta* initial' being stated simultaneously with the name *pratyaya*, this enables the *udātta* resulting from the elision of a preceding *udātta* to replace an *anudātta* (by 6.1.161). However, that would seem to be barred by 6.4.1, 48 because of being *para*.

The *paribhāṣā* suggested by *vārttika* nine is clearly stated by Patañjali: 'That which is *bahiraṅga* is as of non-effect, when that which is *antaraṅga* is to take effect'. Thus the *lopa* rule is *bahiraṅga* in relation to the accent rule.

In the *bhāṣya* on the tenth *vārttika* two examples are given, *autsī* and *kansikī*, to illustrate the necessity for the *antaraṅga paribhāṣā*. To prevent over-application of *paratva* in relation to elision of that with *it ñ n* or *k*, Patañjali points out this apparent conflict does not exist, because *apavāda sūtras* like 6.1.197 always operate first. So in the case of *kansikī* the problem is avoided by stating *udātta* for the initial of the *pratyaya* and *lopa* for the final of the *prakṛti*. In the case of *ātryeyī* the *paribhāṣā* is essential, and the initial *udātta* not needed.

Patañjali explains why *vārttika* eleven speaks of *dhātu* being final *udātta* instead of the *pratyaya* initial *udātta*, namely because of a conflict of rules requiring the subsequent to prevail. So in fact '*dhātoḥ*' 6.1.162

applies.

In the *bhāṣya* on the twelfth *vārttika*, again *vipratīṣedha* (conflict of rules of equal strength requiring the subsequent to prevail) is given as the reason the *svarita* acts in place of the *anudātta* caused by *it p* when *ṭāp* follows; as in *kāryam*. Similarly the *bhāṣya* on the thirteenth *vārttika* speaks of *udātta* caused by *it c* acting in place of the *pit anudātta*, when in the presence of *cāp*; as in *āmbaṣṭhyā* by reason of *vipratīṣedha*.

The last two *vārttikas* are now shown to be wrongly based on *vipratīṣedha*. Instead *vārttika* fourteen suggests, and the *bhāṣya* explains, when there is simultaneous conjunction of initial *udātta* with the name *pratyaya*, the next stage in the formation of the words is the final *udātta*, prescribed for a *dhātu* which acts in place of it as the remainder.

The conflict apparent between the *pit* accent and the *tit* accent is not real. Instead, the fifteenth *vārttika* says, the single *ādeśa* for the prior and the subsequent is *svarita*. Patañjali discusses these two alternatives ‘*ekādeśa*’ or ordaining of *svarita* accent in place of the *anudātta*. When both are concluded to be *anitya* (variable), *svarita* prevails because of being subsequent. Similarly when both are agreed to be *antaraṅga*, *svarita* again prevails, for the same reason. However, when (it is acknowledged) the *svarita* is brought about, because of the near relationship between *anudātta* and *svarita* the latter containing the former, the one substitute for both must be *svarita*.

Finally Patañjali explains why there is in fact no *vipratīṣedha* between *pit* and *cit*, because of the very force of creating an *it c* being to ordain final *udātta* accent.

Pradīpa

6.3 ādyudāttaś ca

“Due to there not being pronunciation of vowels without an accent, and because of the fixed nature of another accent (than initial *udātta*) in relation to different *pratyayas*, consequently there will only be initial *udātta* applicable for a *pratyaya*.”

So having thought, there is the question:

6.4 ‘*kim artham iti*’

“Why is this said?”

6.12 *yeṣām eti*

“Even so (only those *pratyayas* whose accent is fixed would have fixed accents).”

The meaning is: When there obtains an unfixed accent for those having an *it c*, due to the restriction thus ‘that having an *it c* is only final *udātta*’ there would be a fixed accent only for them. However, for the others, there is the possibility of no fixed accent.

7.2 *pratyayāśrayānām iti*

“(A *pratyaya* which is produced is the cause of the operations) dependent on the *pratyaya* (and not the *pratyaya* (still) being produced).”

The meaning is this. This is a reference to those that end (with such *pratyayas* and their operations). When this *sūtra* ‘*ādyudāttaś ca*’ is present in every *sūtra*, *tavya* etc. actually while being produced have initial *udātta* applicable, so *tip* etc. (by 3.1.4) have *anudātta*. Thus there is no fault.

7.3 *ghatāśrayānām iti*

“(The pot which has been made is cause of the operations) dependent on that pot, (not the pot still being made).”

The meaning is ‘the carrying of water’ etc.

7.6 *yad ayam iti*

“When he (teaches *ñ nityādir nityam* 6.1.197 there is thus initial *udātta* for the *prakṛti*).”

If initial *udātta* were established by stating ‘and for a *pratyaya*’ (after 6.1.197) *ñ nityādir nityam* (this *sūtra* *ādyudāttaś ca*) would not have to be undertaken, if there were thus mention (of *udātta*) for its initial.

7.10 *prātipadikasyānta iti*

“For a crude base *udātta* on the final” by ‘*phiṣonta udāttaḥ*’ *phiṣ* *sūtra* 1.1
“There is the characteristic *udātta* for the final of the *prakṛti* (base).”

7.11 *yatra hīti*

“For where (the *pratyaya* is *anudātta prakṛti* accent becomes applicable)”
In the case of *yāti* ‘He goes’ etc. when there is a *pratyaya* with an *it p* (here *tip*), *udātta* is applicable for (the final) of the *dhātu*. However, in the case of *yātaḥ* ‘They both go’ and *yānti* ‘They (all) go’ etc., by reason of the initial *udātta* for the *pratyaya* (*tas* and *anti*), because of the rule ‘*sati śiṣṭa* (*svarabaliyastvam*) 6.1.158 *Vā.* 9’, ‘An accent prescribed subsequently has greater strength and prevails, by replacing the earlier accent’, the *udātta* on the *dhātu* is barred. And in the case of *kṛṣṇātaraḥ* (ending in ‘*tara-p + su* both *anudātta*) final *udātta* is heard for the *prātipadika kṛṣṇa*. Also if the final of a *pratyaya* were *anudātta*, then the meaning is ‘being without a sphere (of application) there would be final *udātta* for a *dhātu* and a *prātipadika*’. In the case of *āste* ‘He sits’ and *śete* ‘He lies’ etc., if there exists *anudātta* for a *sārvadhātuka ādeśa* of *la* (here *ta* of *tiñ*), it is not an implied rule, because of the *dhātu* accent (now) having a sphere of application. Here too, because of the possibility of the *tadanta* rule applying, in fact there is an implied rule.

7.13 *āgamānudātārtham veti* [*Vā.* 5]

“Or the rule is for the purpose of *anudātta* accent on *āgamas*.”

The word *vā* is in the sense of *tarhi* ‘then’. In the case of *lāvitāvyam* ‘it is

to be cut' etc., when the initial *udātta* is effected at the time of the arising of *tavya-t*, afterwards the *āgama it* being effected by 'śeṣānighāṭa' the remainder of (the word) is *anudātta* (= '*anudāttam padam ekavarjam*' 6.1.158 'A word is with the exception of one syllable *anudātta*'). The meaning is that otherwise, because of being subsequent when *it āgama* is effected, because of forming a part of that and due to its mention with the mention of *pratyaya*, there would in fact be applicable the production of initial *udātta* for *it* augment.

7.18 *ke punar iti*

"But which (augments have *anudātta*)?"

Here another questioner is to be seen. However, the one by whom it was stated 'Or else not' only asks from contrariety or perverseness.

7.19 *laviteti*

"He will cut."

Here is the *luṭ* (periphrastic future of *lū* to cut) replaced by *tip* and the *vikaraṇa tāsi*. *Tip* is then replaced by *dā* (2.4.85). Here if *it* were not *anudātta*, then because of forming a part of *tāsi* it would be *udātta*. By the remainder being *anudātta* the *ā* of *tāsi* is *anudātta*, and thus due to the absence of *lopa/* elision of an *udātta*, the (*udātta*) accent resulting from the cessation of a preceding *udātta* ('*anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ*' 6.1.161 'An *anudātta* vowel has also the *udātta* when on account of it the preceding *udātta* is elided'), would not be applicable for the letter *ā*. However, when there is *anudātta* for *it āgama* the *ā* of *tāsi* is in fact *udātta*, because of which the vowel resulting from cessation of (prior) *udātta* is established as valid.

7.20 *paratvādiḍāgamaḥ*

"Due to the *it* rule being subsequent, *it āgama* is applicable." by '*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*' 7.2.35 'An *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* (3.4.114) etc. beginning with a *val* (any consonant except *y*) receives the *āgama it*'. e.g. *lav-i-tā*.

7.22 *svarabhinnasyeti*

"(The rule applicable to that) which contains different accents (at different times becomes variable)."

The sense is that, although an accent possesses form, because of its nature of causing difference in hearing, it in fact makes a different word.

8.1 *prakṛtirapyāśriteti*

"(When the *pratyaya* is being resorted to) the *prakṛti* also is resorted to."

The sense is by reason of the *Paribhāṣā* 23:

'*pratyayagrahane yasmāt sa vihitas tadādes tadantasya grahaṇam.*'

'A *pratyaya* denotes, when employed, the word form which begins with

that to which it has been added, and ends with the *pratyaya* itself.’

8.1 *antarāgameveti*

“Initial is in fact *antarāṅga*.”

‘Hence *i* augment is not applicable’ (as *antarāṅga*) is the meaning.

8.6 *laviṣīyeti*

“May I cut.”

This is benedictive/*āśir-liṅ*. Here, due either to being ordained as a qualification or because of being subsequent, *sīyut* is effected prior, and afterwards is the *ādeśa* of *la*. In that context the initial *udātta* being effected, *sīyut* in fact would be applicable. Due to the statement, however, ‘*āgamas* are *anudātta*’, when there is *anudātta* for *sīyut* by the *sūtra* ‘*īto ’t*’ 3.4.106 (‘Short *a* is the *ādeśa* of the *i ātmanepada uttama puruṣa* (first person) singular in the Optative and the Benedictive’) there is established as valid *udātta* for the short *a*. This is the meaning.

8.9 *pidartham iti*

“(The stating of *it ṅ* for *yāsuṭ* is for expressing *pit* and being not *pit* states *udātta* for *yāsuṭ*.)”

‘*yāsuṭo ṅid vacanam pidartham*’ 3.4.103 *Vā. 1.*

udāttavacanam ca Vā. 2.

The meaning is, due to forming part of *pit*, in examples like *cinuyāt* ‘May he collect’, when there is the possibility of *anudātta* for *sīyut*, there is the statement (by *vārttika*) not a *jñāpaka*, of *udātta*.

8.13 *āgamair iti*

“... (because of being separated) by *āgamas* (initial *udātta* does not obtain for a *pratyaya*.)”

The meaning is, due to being separated (by *āgama*) in the case of the initial nature of *laviṣīya* etc. the initial nature does not obtain for the *pratyaya*. However, when the *sūtra* has been undertaken, when initial *udātta* has been effected in conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*, *āgamas* are applicable (as *anudātta*), so there is no fault.

8.16 *laviteti*

“The cutter, (because of *udāttādanudāttasya svaritaḥ* 8.4.66 *svarita* does not obtain for the *i* of *lavitā*.)”

Due to ending in *ṭṛṇ* this has initial *udātta* ‘*ṭṛṇ*’ 3.2.135 “The *pratyaya* *ṭṛṇ* acts after all *dhātus* in the sense of agents having such a habit.”

‘*ṅ nityādir nityam*’ 6.1.197 “Whatever is derived with a *pratyaya* having an indicatory *ṅ* or *n* has the *udātta* accent invariably on the first syllable.”

8.20 *yadayam*

“Since he (states the rule “*yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣūdāttonicca āgamas* (3.4.103))are as if they did not exist.”

Āgamas would prevent (accent) being initial then in the forms like *cinuyātām* ‘may the two collect’. Because of *yāsuṭ* being the initial of a *pratyaya udātta* is established, but that one may not be effected. The meaning is, ‘However, it is done, when initial *udātta* is to be effected for a *pratyaya*’, which makes known the non-existence of *āgamas*.

8.26 *sraughnīti*

“Born or living in *Srugghna*.”

On the view that a minute account has to be made for distinguishing (the word) when *sraughna* + *a* (of *ah*)+ *ī* (*nīp*) is established, due to the *paratva* (being subsequent) of the initial *udātta*, from the proposed alternative *sūtra* ‘*pratyayasya ca*’ (following after 6.1.197), when *lopa* of *a* is effected by ‘*yasyeti ca*’ 6.4.148 (‘The final *i* and *a* (long or short) of a *bha* stem are *lopa* / elided before a *taddhita pratyaya* and before the feminine *pratyaya ī*’). Because of the absence of ‘cessation of *udātta*’ the accent resulting from cessation of *udātta* (‘*anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ*’ 6.1.161) would not be in place of *ī*. However, when there is simultaneous conjunction, at the time of ordaining initial *udātta* with the technical name *pratyaya*, there is no fault.

9.1 *bahirāṅgalakṣaṇa iti {Vā. 9}*

“(Nor is the rule necessary because of the rule) being characterised as *bahirāṅga*”

The cause of (indicating) femininity, long *ī*, is *bahirāṅga* since there is understanding of it as in regular course (being) for the sake of the meaning of the *prakṛti* etc. and the cause of ‘*lopa*’/ elision of that is also *bahirāṅga*.

9.7 *auṭśīti*

“A female produced or being in a well, a female descendant of *Utsa*.”

Born in a well. By ‘*utsādibhyo ’ñ*’ 4.1.86.

“The *pratyaya añ* acts after the word *utsa* etc., in the various senses taught prior to ‘*tena divyati*’ etc. (4.4.2) etc.”

Feminine *pratyaya nīp* is then added by *ṭiḍ-dhānañ-dvayasaj-daghnaj-mātrac-tayap-ṭhak-thañ-kañ-kvarapaḥ* 4.1.15. If here, due to being subsequent, *lopa* were to bar the initial *udātta* characteristic of that having an *it nī*¹, then because of the nature of initial *udātta* being for a *pratyaya*, the (*udātta*) accent resulting from the cessation of (a prior) *udātta* would be in fact applicable for the letter *ī*.

9.7 *kansikīti*

“A feminine thing made of or relating to bell-metal.”

Bought with bell-metal. By ‘*kansāṭ ṭiṭhan*’ 5.1.25.

¹ ‘*ñ nityādir nityam*’ 6.1.197 ‘Whatever is derived with a *pratyaya* having an *it nī* or *n* has *udātta* invariably on the first syllable’.

“The *pratyaya tīthan (ika)* acts in the senses taught up to 5.1.63 after the word *kansa*.”

And when *ñip* is also effected (by 4.1.15) there is thought to be *udātta* when the *ika ādeśa* (in place of the letter *th* by 7.3. 50) has not (yet) been effected.

9.7 ātreṃyīti

“Female descendant of *Atri*.” By ‘*itaś cāniñah*’ 4.1.122.

“The *pratyaya dhak (eya)* acts in the sense of descendant, after a two-syllable nominal stem/*prātipadika* ending in short *i*, but not, however, after a word ending in the patronymic *pratyaya iñ*.”

The *ādeśa eya* occurs first for the purpose of establishing the accent, which is like that in the *upadeśa* (original teaching, i.e. *dhak*) according to ‘*āyan-ey-īn-īy-iyah pha-dha-kha-cha-ghām-pratyaya-ādīnām*’ 7.1.2, then *ñip*. Here the accent from cessation of *udātta* would not be applicable. However, when *antarāṅga* is being resorted to for accent, there is no fault.

9.11 kansikyām iti

“(Another device to remove the difficulty) in relation to *kansikā* (... *udātta* for one and *lopa* for the other).

The meaning is due to the *it c* of *thac*, *ika ādeśa* is first, then initial *udātta* for the *pratyaya*, thus there is not *lopa* of *udātta*.

9.13 kitsvaram

“(Here *lopa* (by ‘*yasyeti ca*’ 6.4.148) being subsequent would bar the *udātta* accent on the final of that conjoined with that having an *it k* (‘*kitah*’ 6.1.165 *antah, udātta, taddhitasya*).”

The meaning is that hence the accent resulting from cessation of *udātta* would not be applicable. Now he states the purpose, ‘When there is an accent rule in simultaneous conjunction with the technical name *pratyaya*’.

9.15 pratyayādyudāttatvād iti [Vā. 11]

“Instead of initial *udātta* for a *pratyaya* (final *udātta* for a *dhātu*).”

When ‘*pratyayasya ca*’ is (proposed as) stated immediately after *ñ-nityādir-nityam*’ 6.1.197, then due to being subsequent, the *pratyaya* accent would bar the *dhātu* accent. However, when it remains as read then the *dhātu* accent bars the *pratyaya* accent.

9.20 pitsvarāditi [Vā. 12]

“Instead of *anudātta* in connection with that having *it p* (*svarita* in connection with an *it t*, when feminine *tāp* follows).”

The sense is this is established as valid here, when there is ordaining of *anudātta*, (but) nowhere else.

9.22 *kāryeti*

“(It *t* has scope here) ‘It is to be made!’”

It is thought before *svarita* is the single *ādeśa*. In that context, due to being like the final, in relation to the prior for the single *ādeśa*, *it t*, accent (*svarita*) obtains. However, due to ‘being like the initial in relation to the subsequent’ there is occasion for *it p* accent.

10.3 *na veti*

“Nor is (*vipratishedha* applicable because initial *udātta* is taught in conjunction with the name *pratyaya*).”

The sense is that, due to the *antarāṅga* nature of the accent, simultaneously conjoined with the technical name *pratyaya*, there is not ‘conflict of rules/*vipratishedha*’.

10.9 *paratvāt svaritatvam*

“The rule for *svarita* being subsequent (is applicable).”

This was stated without having regard to the *antarāṅga* of the *svarita*. For *īp pratyaya* is a cause, which has regard to femininity and is a single *ādeśa* (for two) and is *bahirāṅga*.

10.17 *āntaryataḥ*

“Because of the near relationship (of *svarita* and *anudātta* accent, the one *ādeśa* for both will be *svarita*).”

However, when there is *svarita*, *anudātta* also exists (included within it), thus of the *svarita* and *anudātta*, the *svarita* is the nearest (in *sthāna*).

10.19 *cāpīti*

“And when *cāp* follows, (because of *it c*, final *udātta*).”

The sense is, if the nature of the *it c* had been for the purpose of not preventing general mention then ‘*yaṅaṣṭāp*’ would have been the *sūtra* enjoined in the section dealing with the *pratyaya īp*, (instead of the actual *sūtra* ‘*yaṅaś cāp*’ 4.1.74 (The feminine *pratyaya cāp* acts after a stem which is formed by the *pratyaya ṅyaṅ* or *ṣyaṅ*).

EXTRA NOTES

6.3 “*ādī*” *ān + du-dā-ñ* (Dh.P. *ju u a 1092 dāne*)+*ki*

By ‘*upasarge ghoḥ ki*’ 3.3.92 (*bhāve, kartari, kārake*)

“The *pratyaya ki* acts, when denoting mere action and related to the action not as an agent after a *ghu dhātu* (1.1.20 *dā, dhā, adāp*) when an *upasarga* is in composition with it.”

6.3 *udāttaḥ ud + āñ + dudāñ + kta*

By ‘*niṣṭhā*’ 3.2.102 (*ktaktavatū 1.1.26, dhātoḥ, bhāve*)

'*ac upasargāt taḥ*' 7.4.47 (*daḥ, ghoḥ, ti, kiti*)
'*uccair udāttah*' 1.2.29

6.4 *citaḥ* 6.1.163

"For words formed with *pratyayas* having an indicatory *c* the *udātta* accent falls on the final, taking *prakṛti* and *pratyaya* as an aggregate."

bahuc + patuḥ = bahupatuḥ

Note: the accent is not on 'hu' but on the last syllable of *prakṛti* + *pratyaya*. So with *akac* by "avyaya sarvanāmnāmakacprāk teḥ" 5.3.71

Although the *pratyaya* is added in the middle of the word the accent will fall on the end.

6.7 *upottamam riti* 6.1.217

A penultimate syllable can obviously be only in a word consisting of three or more syllables.

e.g. *karaṇīyam* 'to be made' fr. *anīyar* 3.1.96; *haraṇīyam* 'to be taken'.

This debars 3.1.3.

6.8 *anudāttau suppitau* 3.1.4

Apavāda of 3.1.3.

dṛṣad au = dṛṣadau, two stones (*au* is *anudātta*)

pacati 'He cooks' (*ti = tip anudātta*) but not *pacataḥ* 'They two cook' because not *pit*.

6.10 *titsvaritam* 6.1.185

cikīrṣyam 'to be wished to be done' with *yat* 3.1.97.

6.16 *ñnityādir nityam* 6.1.197

gārgyaḥ with *yañ* (4.1.105) Grandson or lower descendant of *Garga*.
vāsudevakaḥ with *vun* (4.3.98 'vāsudevārjunābhyām vun').

Vāsudeva, 'the God in which all dwell'. This is an *apavāda* of 3.1.3.

6.16 *tāsyānudātenñidadupadeśāl lasārvadhātukam anudāttam ahnviṇoḥ*
6.1.186

"The personal endings and their substitutes (*la* 3.2.124-26) are, when they are *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113 etc.) *anudātta* accented, after the characteristic of the periphrastic future (*tāsi*), after a *dhātu* which in the *Dhātu Pāṭha* has an accented vowel or an indicatory *ñ* (with the exception of *hnuñ* and *iñ*), as well as after what has a final *a* in the *Dhātu Pāṭha*." e.g. *tāsi kārtā kātārau kārtārah*

This is *apavāda* of *pratyaya* accent by 3.1.3.

6.24 *pratyayagrahane yasmāt sa tadāder grahaṇam bhavati*

c.f. *Bhā.* 1.2.48/224.4 etc.

This very important *paribhāṣā* states the guiding rule that, "When a

pratyaya is given in a rule as a *nimitta* (causing something) the *pratyaya* denotes a word form which begins with that to which the *pratyaya* has been added and ends with the *pratyaya* itself.” e.g. the *sūtra* ‘*yañiñoś ca*’ 4.1.101 (*phak*), which prescribes *phak* (*āyana*), has the words *yañ* and *iñ* which respectively mean *yañanta* and *iñanta*. In the word *paramagārgyāyana* from *paramagārgya*, *gārgya* is looked upon as *añanta* to which *phak* (*āyana*) is affixed, and hence *paramagārgyāyana* is the form and not *paramagārgyāya*.

7.10 *dhātoḥ* 6.1.162 (*antaḥ, udāttah*)

e.g. *pācati, pāthati* etc.

‘*prātipadikasyāntaḥ*’ ‘For that ending in a *prātipadika*’ is a reference to ‘*phiso ’nta udāttah*’ *Phīṭ sūtra* 1.1 (*prātipadikam*) ‘A nominal stem/*prātipadika* is finally *udātta*’, e.g. *uccaiḥ*.

7.17 *āgamā anudāttā bhavantīti vakṣyāmi*

“I will say augments are *anudātta*.”

Pat. probably refers to 3.4.103 *Vā.* 3/2.186.19, 20.

‘*āgamānudāttārtham vā*’ *athavaitaj jñāpayatyācārya āgamā anudāttā bhavanti* c.f. *Vyāḍiparibhāṣā pāṭha pari* 109 7.18 *iṭ/lavitā*

lū ‘*dhātoḥ*’ 6.1.162 (*antaḥ udāttah*)

lū luṭ ‘*anudāttampadam-ekavarjam*’ 6.1.158 ‘*syatāsi lṛluṭoḥ*’ 3.1.33

lū tāsi ‘*lasya*’ 3.4.77

lū tāsi tip ‘*tiphasijhi*’ 3.4.78 ‘*anudātta suppitau*’ 3.1.4

lū iṭ tāsi tip ‘*ārdhadhātukam śeṣaḥ*’ 3.4.114 ‘*ārdhadhātukasyed valādeḥ*’

7.2.35 ‘*sthānivad-ādeśo ’nal vidhau*’ 1.1.65

lū iṭ tāsi dā ‘*luṭaḥ prathamasya dāraurasah*’ 2.4.85

lo iṭ ā ‘*teḥ*’ 6.4.143 ‘*anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ*’ 6.1.161

lavitū ‘*pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*’ 7.3.86 ‘*eco ’yavāyāvah*’ 6.1.78

7.20 *paratvādiḍāgamah*

“Because of the *iṭ* rule being subsequent the *iṭ āgama* is applicable (before *dā* becomes *udātta* by ‘*anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ*’ 6.1.161).”

‘*ārdhadhātukasyed valādeḥ*’ 7.2.35

‘An *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* (3.4.114 etc.) beginning with a consonant (except *y*) receives the *āgama iṭ*.’

e.g. *lav-itā*

8.3 *sīyut*

by *liṅaḥ sīyut* 3.4.102

“*sīyut* is the *āgama* of *liṅ* (optative).”

Lopa-elision of *s* by ‘*liṅaḥ salopo ’nantyasya*’ 7.2.79

y lopa by ‘*lopo vyor vali*’ 6.1.66

e.g. *edheta* ‘He may increase’.

8.6 *liṅaḥ sīyut* 2.4.102

ut is indicatory; *u* usually indicates augment/*āgama*;

ṭ indicates it is to be added to the initial of that which follows, by '*ādyantau takitau*' 1.1.46

laviṣīya 'May I cut'; *paviṣīya* 'May I purify'.

By '*īto't*' 3.4.106 (*liṅaḥ*) 'Short *a* is the *ādeśa* of the *i* of the *ātmanepada* *uttama puruṣa* (1st. Sg.) in the Optative and the Benedictive /*liṅ*'.

luṅ (*kriyā. u. se* 1483 *chedane*) *āsirliṅ*

lū iṭ '*lasya*' 3.4.77 '*tiptasjhi*' 3.4.78

lo a '*sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*' 7.3.84 (*iko guṇaḥ*)

lo iṭ sīyā '*liṅaḥ sīyut*' 3.4.102 '*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*' 7.2.35

laviṣīyā '*eco* '*yavāyāvah*' 6.1.78

'*ādeśapratyayayoḥ*' 8.3.59

Similarly with *pūn* (*bhvā. ā. se.* 966 *pavane*)

8.8 *yāsuṭ parasmaipadeśūdātto nic ca* 3.4.103

This is *apavāda* of *sīyut*. The actual augment is *yās* (*u* indicates *āgama ṭ* for the initial of that following). All *āgamas* being *anudātta*, this *sūtra* uses the word *udātta* to show that this augment is an exception to the general rule. Although *liṅ* has an indicatory *ṅ* and therefore its substitute being *sthānivad* 1.1.56 would also be regarded as having an *it ṅ*, the repetition of *ṅit* in the *sūtra* indicates the *paribhāṣā* '*lakārāśrayaṅitvam ādeśānām na bhavati*' 'The *ṅ* belonging to *la* does not influence its substitutes', i.e. *laṅ* and *lṅ* are not regarded as having an *it ṅ*. e.g. *kuryāt* '*liṅaḥ salopo* '*nantyasya*' 7.2.79

8.9 *yāsuto nidvacanam pidartham* 3.4.103 *Vā. 1*

By '*anudāttau suppitau*' 3.1.4 'That which has an *it p/ pit* is *anudātta*'.

'*udāttavacanam ca*' 3.4.103 *Vā. 2*. The corollary thus states that a *pratyaya* without an *it p*, and not *sup*, is *udātta*.

So *yāsuṭ* is stated positively therefore as being *udātta* (because of '*sārvadhātukam apit*' 1.2.44 (*ṅit*) it would have been *ṅit* anyway). The specific statement is therefore the basis of the *paribhāṣā* '*lakāra ...*' quoted in the previous note.

8.11 *laghīyasā nyāsenā siddhe sati yadgarīyāsamyatnamārabhate ... (taj-jñāpayatyācārya ...)*

A regular formula of *Pat*. "When this can be achieved by a briefer literal text, the fact that he begins a great effort suggests that the master makes known a *jñāpaka ...*" cf. *Bhā. 1.2.27/204.24* etc.

8.15 *lavitā avādeśaḥ*

av is in place of the *o* of *lo* (*guṇa* of *lūṅ*) by *eco* '*yavāyāvah*' 6.1.78 because of the following *ac* (vowel), *i-ṭ* (augment).

8.16 *lavitā udāttādanudāttāsyā svaritaḥ* 8.4.66

This is 'one who cuts', a cutter: *lūñ* (1423 *chedane*) + *ṭṛn*' 3.2.135.

"The *pratyaya ṭṛn* acts after all *dhātus* in the sense of the agent having such a habit etc."

The *n* of the *ṭṛn* is indicatory and regulates accent by '*ñ-n-ityādir nityam* 6.1.197 'Whatever is formed by a *pratyaya* having an *it ñ* or *n* has *udātta* invariably on the first syllable.'

lū + ṭṛn, 6.1.197

lo ṭṛn '*sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*', 7.3.84

lo iṭ ṭṛ '*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*' 7.2.35, '*āgamā anudāttā bhavanti*'

lav i ṭṛ '*eco 'yavāyāvah*' 6.1.78

lav i ṭṛ su '*rduśanaspurudaṅśo 'nehasām ca*', 7.1.94

lav i ṭṛ an s '*apṭṛnṭṛcsvasṛnapṭṛneṣṭṛtvastṛkṣatṛhotṛpotṛprasāstṛñām*', 6.4.11

lavitān s '*halñyābhyo dirghāt sutisyaprktam hal*', 6.1.68

lavitā 'na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya' 8.2.7

lavitā 'udāttād anudāttasyā svaritaḥ', 8.4.66

Thus the augment *i-ṭ* becomes *svarita* because following the *udātta a* of *lav*.

8.17 *śikṣitaḥ*, learnt, taught.

'*niṣṭhā ca dvyajanāt*', 6.1.205

"A disyllabic participle (passive *cta* or active *ktavatu*, '*ktaktavatū niṣṭhā* 1.1.26), when a name, has *udātta* on the first syllable but not if that syllable is an *ā*."

This is an *apavāda* of 3.1.3.

śikṣitaḥ — Here *udātta* 'obtains' for the first *i* of *śikṣitā* because the second *i* is the augment *i-ṭ* and is 'as if it did not exist'/*avidyamānavat* (2.8.14 etc.), and this is not desired. In fact, because this form is polysyllabic the *sūtra* will not bar 3.1.3 and *udātta* falls on the *pratyaya cta*.

8.26 *udāttanivṛttisvaraḥ*

"The accent resulting from the cessation of the preceding *udātta* by '*anudāttasyā ca yatrodāttalopaḥ* 6.1.161",

"In the place of the *udātta* on a vowel, there is *udātta* accent, when on account of it the preceding *udātta* is *lopa*-elided."

e.g. *kumāra + ī (ñip)* (*anudātta* by 3.1.4)

kumār a lopa (by '*yasyeti ca*' 6.4.148) *ī* becomes *udātta kumārī*

8.26 *sraughnī*

sraughna m. N. of a town to the N. of *Hāstināpura* Var. Br. S.

'*phiso 'nta udāttaḥ*' 1.1 *phīṭ*

'*ādyudāttaś ca*' 3.1.3 (*pratyayah*)

sraughnā + aṅ ‘*prāgdīvyato ’ṅ*’ 4.1.83 ‘*tatra jātaḥ*’ 4.3.25 (*aṅ*)
sraughnaḥ ‘*abhinīṣkrāmati dvāram*’ 4.3.86 born or living in *Srughna*,
 coming from or leading to *Srughna* etc., a gate which leads towards
Srughna.

sraughna + ṅīp ‘*ṭiḍḍhāṇāṅdvayasajdaghnajmātractayapṭhakṭhañ kañkva-*
rapaḥ’ 4.1.15

anudāttau suppitau 3.1.4

sraughna ī ’yasyeti ca’ 6.4.148

sraughnī 6.1.161 a woman born or living in *Srughna*.

Similarly *mathrī* a woman born or living in *Mathura*.

8.27 *paratvāl lopaḥ pratyayasvarām bādhetā*

“Because of the *lopa*-elision of ‘*a*’ being by a subsequent rule, namely,
 ‘*yasyeti ca*’ 6.4.148, it would bar the *udātta* accent on the *pratyaya*
 enjoined by 3.1.3, because of ‘*vipraṭiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam*’ 1.4.2 ‘When
 rules of equal force prohibit each other, then the last in the order (of the
Aṣṭhādhyāyī) is to take effect.”

9.3 ‘*asiddham bahiraṅgam antaraṅge*’ *pari. 50*

(a) *antaraṅga* is ‘a rule, the causes of the application of which lie within or
 before the sum of the causes of a *bahiraṅga* rule’. Put in another way we
 may say ‘the *antaraṅga* rule always requires fewer operations than the
bahiraṅga’. (*Antaraṅga* and *bahiraṅga* are *bahuvrīhi* compounds; they are
 adjectives denoting a rule or an operation, or that taught in a rule). The
 word *aṅga* here denotes neither ‘member of a body’ nor the grammatical
 term defined in *P. 1.4.13*; but it is equivalent to ‘*upakāraka*’ ‘that which
 assists (an operation) or it denotes the *nimitta* i.e. the cause of the
 operation.)

(b) *bahiraṅga* in like manner “that rule whose causes of application lie
 outside or beyond the causes of the *antaraṅga* rule is *bahiraṅga*.”

e.g. *siv* (to sew) + *na*, by ‘*cchvoḥ śūḍanunāsike ca*’ 6.4.19 (*ūṭh* for *v*)

si ū + na by ‘*pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*’ 7.3.86 *guṇa* for *ū* before *na*
 (*bahiraṅga*) and by ‘*iko ’yañaci*’ 6.1.77 *y* for *i* before *ū* (*antaraṅga*)
 therefore *s+y+o+na syona* m.f.n. soft, n. soft couch.

(c) *asiddham* c.f. ‘*pūrvatrāsiddham*’ 8.2.1

(Regarded as) not existing, or as not having taken effect (as a rule or
 operation taught in grammar), unaccomplished, uneffected, imperfect.

See *Pari. 36* and *79 Vyādi*.

9.7 *auṭsī*

utsa + aṅ ‘*utsādibhyo ’ṅ*’ 4.1.86

“a spring, fountain (metaphorically applied to the clouds)”
 ‘*tasyāpatyam*’ 4.1.92, ‘*ādyudattaś ca*’ 3.1.3,) *R.V.A.V.* etc.

utsa + ṅ + ṅīp, ‘*ṭiḍḍhāṇāṅ ...*’ 4.1.15 (*ataḥ strīyām*)

auts + aṅ + ṅīp, ‘*taddhite śvacām ādeḥ*’ 7.2.117 (*ṅ-ṅīti*, *vṛddhi*)

aũtsa + ī, 'ñ-nityādir nityam' 6.1.197 (udāttah)

nīp, 'yasyeti ca' 6.4.148 (bhasya, taddhite, lopaḥ) tannimitta lopaḥ bahiraṅga.

aũtsī, 'udāttād anudāttasya svaritaḥ' 8.4.66, a female produced or being in a well'.

See *Pradīpa* "yady atra paratvālopa ādyudāttatvam ñillakṣaṇam bādheta tadā pratyayasodāttatvād udāttanivṛttisvara ikārasya syād eva". If here, due to being subsequent *lopa* were to bar the initial *udāttā* characteristic of that having an *it ñ* then..."

9.7 *kāmsikī*

kansā m.n. (*dhā kam-u. bhvā. ā se 443 kāntau 'a vessel made of metal.' 'vīṭīvadihanikamikaṣibhyaḥ saḥ' uṇ. 3.62) kam+sa 'drinking vessel, cup.' A.V.X. 10.5*

kansa ṭīṭhan (= ika), 'kansāṭ ṭīṭhan' 5.1.25, 'tena krītam' 5.1.37 etc., 'ādyudāttasca' 3.1.3

kansa ṭīṭhān nīp 'ṭīṭhānañ' 4.1.15, 'ṭhasyekaḥ' 7.3.50

kansa ika ī, 'ñ-nityādir nityam' 6.1.197, 'yasyeti ca' 6.4.149

kāns ika ī, 'udāttād anudāttasya svaritaḥ' 6.4.66

kānsikī, a feminine thing relating to or made of bell-metal.

See *Pradīpa* 'kansāṭ ṭīṭhan iti ṭīṭhani nīpī ca ṭhakārasyākṛta ikādeṣe udāttatva manyate'. The *pratyaya ṭīṭhan/ ika* acts in senses taught up to 1.63 after the word *kāmsa* and when *nīp* is also effected...

9.7 *ātreṭī*

ātri, (ad + trini. ad. a. 1011 bhaksane 'adestrinīṣca' Uṇ. 4.68), 'a devourer' R.V.2.8.5;

N. of a great *ṛṣi*, author of a number of Vedic hymns.

ātri dhak 'itaścāniṅaḥ' 4.1.122 (dvyacaḥ), 'tasyāpatyam' 4.1.92

ātri dhak 'kiti ca' 7.2.118 (vrddhi, taddhiteṣv acāmādeḥ)

atr ēy nīp, 'ṭid-dhānañ ...' 4.1.15,

'āyāneyinīyahphaḍhakhachghām pratyayādīnām'² 7.1.2

'ādyudāttas ca' 3.1.3

ātreṭā ī, 'kitaḥ' 6.1.165 (taddhitasya, antaḥ, udāttah)

ātreṭ ī, 'yasyeti ca' 6.4.148

ātreṭ ī, 'anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ' 6.1.161, female descendant of Atri.

See *Pāṇ.* 2.4.65 'atribhṛgukutsavasiṭthagotamāṅgirobhyaś ca' (*bahuṣu, tenaivāstriyām luk*)

² Here the *udāttā* accent on the previously *anudāttā nīp* which is the cause of the preceding *udāttā* being elided, would not have been applicable if 'yasyeti ca' operates first. But when the *antarāṅga* rule applies, there being first resort for the sake of accent by 6.1.161 it operates and there is no fault.

See *Pradīpa* ‘āyannādiṣu upadeśivadvacanam svarasiddhyartham iti. pūrvam eyādeśaḥ nīp. atrodattanivṛttisvara na syāt. antaraṅgatve tu svarasyāsrīyamaṇe doṣābhavaḥ’. Trans. page 34. The ādeśa “*eya*” occurs first for the purpose of establishing the accents which is etc.

9.16 *dhātor antaḥ*

by ‘*dhātoḥ*’ 6.1.162 (*antaḥ, udāttaḥ*)

“A *dhātu* has *udātta*/acute accent on the final syllable”, e.g. *pācati* (he cooks), *pāṭhati* (he recites), *úrṇoti* (he covers).

9.16 ‘*vipratīṣedhena*’

By ‘*vipratīṣedhe param kāryam*’ 1.4.2 ‘When rules of equal strength prohibit each other, then the last in the order of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is to take effect.’ i.e. ‘*dhātoḥ*’ 6.1.162 prevails over ‘*ādyudāttaśca*’ 3.1.3

9.17 *yatra anudātta prakṛtiḥ*

“When the base has *anudātta* accent.”

samatvām simatvām e.g. equality, entirety/all.

cf. *Ph.S.* ‘*tvattvasamsimety anuccāni*’ 4.10 ‘The words *tvat, tva, sama* and *sima* are wholly *anudātta*’. Examples ‘*nabhantām anyake same*’ *R.V.* 8.39.1 ‘May all the others die away’, ‘*vāsastanute simasmai*’ *R.V.* 1.115.4 ‘Straight over all, (night) spreadeth out her garment’.

9.18 *gopāyā ti dhūpāyā ti*

‘*gupūdhūpavicchīpanīpanibhya āyaḥ*’ 3.1.28

‘The *pratyaya āya* acts after *dhātus gupū* (to protect), *dhūp* (to heat), *vicchi* (to approach), *paṇi* (to contract or praise), and *pan* (to praise).’

‘*āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā*’ 3.1.31 ‘The *pratyaya āya* and those that follow it (*īyaṅ* and *ṇiṅ*) optionally act when it is intended to express oneself through an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*’

9.20 *pitsvarāt*

“Instead of (*anudātta*) in connection with that having an *it p*.”

cf. use of fifth case/*apādāna*/ablative similar to *Pāṇini* in ‘*anunāsikāt paro ’nusvāraḥ*’ 8.3.4/ *Si.K.*137 ‘*anunāsikam vihāya ’roḥ pūrvasmāt paro ’nusvārāgamah syāt*’

9.21 *vipratīṣedhena*

“By reason of a conflict of rules of equal strength.”

‘*anudāttau suppitau*’ 3.1.4 ‘The *sup*/case *pratyayas* and *pratyayas* having an indicatory *p* are *anudātta*.’ ‘*titsvaritam*’ 6.1.185 (A *pratyaya* having an indicatory *t* is *svarita* (circumflex).’

9.22 *kāryam*

‘to be made, done, effected, etc.’

ḍu-krñ (ta. u. a. 1472 karane) + *nyat*, ‘*rhalor nyat*’ 3.1.124, ‘*titsvaritam*’ 6.1.185 similarly *hāryam*

9.22 *kāryā*

kārtā + *tāp*, ‘*ajādyataṣṭāp*’ 4.1.4

‘*akah savarne dīrghah*’ 6.1.101, ‘*titsvaritam*’ 6.1.185

Similarly *hāryā*

9.25 *citsvaraś vipratīṣedhena*

‘*citaḥ*’ 6.1.163, ‘A stem (formed by a *pratyaya* or *āgama* or *ādeśa*) having an indicatory *c* has *udātta* on the final syllable.’

‘*yañāś cāp*’ 4.1.74, ‘The feminine *pratyaya cāp* acts after a stem which is formed by the *pratyaya ñyañ* or *ṣyañ*.’

9.25 *calanāḥ*, ‘moving, movable, tremulous, shaking’

cala (*bhvā. pa. se. 403 mandāyām gatau*) + *yuc*.

‘*calanaśabdārthād akarmakād yuc*’ 3.2.148 (*tacchi, lādiṣu*).

‘*yuvor anākau*’ 7.1.1.

Similarly *copanāḥ* ‘moving’.

cupa (*bhvā. pa. se. 403 mandāyām gatau*) + *yuc*.

10.1 *pītsvaraśya sa eva*

“The same is in fact an example of that having an *it p* because each is formed with the *sup vibhakti su = s = ru = ḥ* by ‘*svaujas ...*’ 4.1.2, ‘*sasajuṣo ru*’ 8.2.66, ‘*kharavasā ...*’ 8.3.15, ‘*anudāttau suppitau*’ 3.1.4.

10.1 *āmbaṣṭhya*, ‘queen, princess of the *Ambaṣṭhas* or wife of the king of the *Ambaṣṭhas*’ country, and people, or simply a woman of the *Ambaṣṭha* race’ *M.Bh.* 7.3399 seqq.

ambaṣṭha, ‘*vaiśya ca dvijanma ca tayoh sūtaḥ. ambe tiṣṭhati*’

sthā. (*bhvā. pa. a. 928 gatinivṛttau*) + *ka*

ambaṣṭha ‘*supi sthaḥ*’ 3.2.4, ‘*tasyāpatyam*’ 4.1.92 (*aṅ*)

ambaṣṭha + *ñyañ* = *āmbaṣṭhya* ‘King of the *Ambaṣṭhas*.’ *Ai. Br.* 8. 21. 6

‘*vṛddhet kosalājādāññyañ*’ 4.1.171 (*janapadaśabdāt, kṣatriyāt*)

āmbaṣṭhya + *cāp*, ‘*yañāścāp*’ 4.1.74, ‘*anudāttau suppitau*’ 3.1.4, ‘*citaḥ*’ 6.1.163

Similarly *sauvīryā*

10.5 *satiśiṣṭatvād dhātusvaro bhaviṣyati*

“There will be *udātta* for the *dhātu* because of its being residual”,

satiśiṣṭa prescribed subsequently, occurring after the preceding has taken place. cf. ‘*sati śiṣṭe pi vikaraṇasvaraḥ sārva dhātukasvaram na bādhetā*’

‘Even though prescribed subsequently, the *vikaraṇa* accent would not bar the accent on *sārva dhātuka pratyaya*.’ Although the words *sati* and *śiṣṭa* are separate, they are generally taken as combined in an adjectival sense, qualifying the word *svara* / accent, as in the dictum,

'satisiṣṭasvarabalīyastvam' Vā. 9 on 'anudattam padam ekavarjam'
6.1.158

"There is comparatively superior strength for a subsequent accent which prevails by replacing all the ones obtaining before in the formation of the word."

... 'anyatra vikaraṇebhya iti vaktavyam'

'except when it is a vikaraṇa accent.' S.K. 3650

cf. on 1.1.56 'sthānivadādeśo 'nalvidhau' Vā. 33 bhā 'tatrārdhadhātuka-sāmānye 'vadhibhāve kṛte sati ṣiṣṭatvāt pratyayasvaro bhaviṣyati' 3.2.83/2.110.13 'satisiṣṭatvācśyanaḥ svarah prāpnoti'.

10.7 svaritenaikadeśa

"One substitute with svarita accent."

'akāḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ' 6.1.101 (ekāḥ pūrvaparayoḥ)

'After an ak vowel (a i u r ḷ), in the presence of a savarṇa vowel (homogeneous/of the same family) the corresponding long vowel is the one for the one before and the one after (= ekādeśa)', but by this vārttika the accent on that long vowel will not overrule the svarita.

e.g. for kārya + ṭāp the one substitute will be long ā with the svarita accent because this will be by a later rule 6.1.186 than the anudatta by 3.1.4.

10.8 sampradhāryam

"To be considered, deliberated upon." Frequently used by Pat. to indicate the view presented is now to be questioned.

10.9 paratvātsvaritatvam nitya ekādeśaḥ etc.

See pari. 'paranīyāntaraṅgāpavādānām uttarottaram balīyaḥ'

S.K. 46 on 'svaritenādhikārah' 1.3.12

'Of the four kinds of rules, namely a subsequent/para, an invariable/nitya, an antaraṅga (inner, fewer operations), and an apavāda (special, exceptional) rule, each of the ones following possesses greater force than any one of the rules mentioned before it.' (An expansion of 'vipratīṣedhe param kāryam' 1.4.2)

10.9 paratvāt ... nitya ... kṛte 'pi hi ... prāpnotyakṛte 'pi ... prāpnoti... etc.

One of Patañjali's typical 'pattern arguments' found repeated almost word for word in many other places. c.f. 3.1.3 vā. 6/ 2.7.25, 3.1.36 vā. 4/ 2.45.23 etc.

10.9 nitya invariable, eternal.

(1) Eternal, as applied to śabda word in contrast to dhvani sound which is kārya (evanescent). The sound with meaning or without meaning, made by men and animals is impermanent; but the sense is of the idea awakened in the mind by the evanescent audible words, which

on reaching the mind is of a permanent or eternal nature.

cf. 'sphoṭaḥ śabda dhavanis-tasya vyāyāmādupajāyate'.

cf. also vyāptimatvāt-tu śabdasya. Niru. 1.1

(2) Constant, not liable to be set aside by another.

c.f. upabandhastu deśaya nityam na rundhe nityam nityaśabdaḥ
prāptyantaraniṣedhārthaḥ Tai. Pra. 1.45/4.18

(3) Unchangeable, permanent, imperishable.

c.f. bhā on 8.1.4 'ayam nityaśabdo 'styeva kūtaṣṭhesv avicāliṣu
bhāveṣu vartate'.

(4) Always or invariably applying, as opposed to optional; in
connection with rules that do not optionally apply.

cf. 'upapadasamāso nityasamāsaḥ ṣaṣṭhīsamāsaḥ punarvibhāṣā' bhā.
on 2.2.19

(5) Constant as applied to a rule which applies, if another
simultaneously applying rule were to have taken effect, as well as
when that rule does not take effect.

cf. 'kvacitkṛtākṛtaprasaṅgamātreṇāpi nityatā' Pari. 46

"Occasionally it happens that an operation is *nitya* solely because it
would apply if (another operation that applies simultaneously) were to
have taken effect and applies when (that operation) does not take
effect."

The operations which are *nitya* according to this *paribhāṣā* take effect in
preference to others which are not *nitya* although they may be *para*.

cf. 'parānnityam balavat' Pari. 42

"A *nitya* rule possesses (greater) force than a subsequent rule, (which is
not *nitya*) because it would apply if the subsequent rule were to have taken
effect and applies when the latter does not take effect."

10.15 padagrahaṇaṃ parimāṇārtham

"The mention of *pada* (word) is made for the purpose of measure, so that
there should be a unit fixed to a *pada* and not to a sentence as '*anudāttam
padam ekavarjam*' 6.1.158."

'A *pada* is with the exception of one syllable unaccented/*anudātta*', see
Udyota on 4.3.1.1.40 *Vā. 4.*

'*padatvam yāvad bhavati yāvataś ca bhavati tāvat tāvatī ca sannihitam
ekavarjam sarvam anudāttam bhavatīty athaḥ*'

10.16 svaritativ kṛte āntartataḥ svaritānudāttayor ekādeśaḥ svarito bhaviṣyati

"The *anudātta* accent exists within the *svarita*, as part of it, therefore, it is
nearer in *sthāna* than *anudātta* in considering the *ekādeśa* for an *udātta*"
of (*kārya*) and an *anudātta ā (tāp)*.

Pra. 'svarita tv anudātto 'pi vidyata iti svarita 'nudāttayor
svarito 'ntaratamaḥ'

c.f. 'samāhāraḥ svaritaḥ' 1.2.31

'*tasyāditaḥ udāttam ardhahrasvam*' 1.2.32

10.20 *citkaraṇāsāmarthyād*

"Because of the force of mentioning *c*."

Otherwise the *c* would be *vyartham* (useless) whereas *p* is standing for *anudātta* (otherwise it) would be for *sāmānyagrahanārtham* 'for the sake of general mention'.

10.21 *guptijkidbhyaḥ san//3/1/5//*

gupādiṣv anubandhakarāṇaṃ kim artham /

Pāṇini 3.1.5: '*San pratyaya* acts after the *dhātus gup, tij* and *kit*.'

Bhāṣya: 'What is the purpose of the indicatory letters in *gup-a* etc.?'

gupādiṣv anubandhakarāṇaṃ ātmanepadārtham //1//

gupādiṣv anubandhāḥ kriyanta ātmanepadaṃ yathā syāt //
kriyamāneṣv apy anubandheṣv ātmanepadaṃ naiva prāpnoti /
kiṃ kāraṇaṃ /

sanā vyavahitatvāt / pūrvavatsanaḥ (1.3.62) ity evaṃ bhaviṣyati/

pūrvavatsana ity ucyate na caitebhyaḥ prākṣaṇa ātmanepadaṃ
nāpi

parasmaipadaṃ paśyāmaḥ / evaṃ tarhy anubandhakarāṇa-
sāmarthyād bhaviṣyati //

athavāvayave kṛtaṃ liṅgaṃ samudāyasya viśeṣakaṃ bhavi-
iṣyati/ tad yathā /

goḥ sakthani karṇe vā kṛtaṃ liṅgaṃ gor viśeṣakaṃ bhavati /
yady avayave kṛtaṃ

liṅgaṃ samudāyasya viśeṣakaṃ bhavati jugupsayati mīmāṃsa-
yatīty atrāpi

prāpnoti / avayave kṛtaṃ liṅgaṃ kasya samudāyasya viśeṣakaṃ
bhavati/

yaṃ samudāyaṃ yo 'vayavo na vyabhicāراتi / sanaṃ ca na
vyabhicarati nicaṃ

punar vyabhicarati / tad yathā / goḥ sakthani karṇe vā kṛtaṃ
liṅgaṃ

goreva viṣeṣakaṃ bhavati na gomaṇḍalasya/

Vārttika 1: The producing of an indicatory letter in *gup-a* and the rest is for the purpose of *ātmanepada* (*vibhakti pratyayas*).

Bhāṣya: The indicatory letters in *gup-a* and the rest are produced so that there be *ātmanepada* (*pratyayas*) applicable. (Now) even when the indicatory letters are produced *ātmanepada* does not in fact obtain. What is the reason? Because of being separated by (*pratyaya*) *san*. (The rule) *pūrvat sanaḥ* (1.3.62) “A *dhātu* which is *ātmanepada* in its original form before taking *san* will also be *ātmanepada* when it ends in the *pratyaya san*”, thus will be applicable. It is said that (*ātmanepada* endings are added) after a *dhātu* ending in *san* and not before *san* is added do we either see *ātmanepada* or *parasmaipada*. Then by (force of) creating indicatory letters (*ātmanepada* endings) will be added. Or else a sign made in a part will be distinctive of the whole. As for example, a mark on the thigh or ear of a cow is a distinguishing characteristic for the whole cow. If a sign made on a part becomes the distinction for the whole then (*ātmanepada* would be) wrongly applicable also to *jugupsyati* (He causes someone to seek to defend themselves or be on their guard), or *mīmāṃsyati* (he causes someone to investigate). Of which whole does the mark made on a part become the characteristic? Of that from which a part does not deviate. It does not deviate from *san*, but from *ṇic* it does deviate (i.e. *san* is *nitya*, *ṇic* *anitya*). For instance the mark made on a cow’s thigh or ear is a characteristic of a cow and not a group of cows.

NOTES ON MAHĀBHĀṢYA ON PĀṆINI 3.1.5

General Summary

Vā. 1

The it letter in *gup-a* etc. is for the purpose of *ātmanepada*.

Bhā.

By force of producing *it* letters.

Or a sign made in a part will be distinctive of a whole.

Vārttika Summary

Kātyāyana simply explains that the *a* in *gup-a* etc. is to indicate *ātmanepada*.

Bhāṣya Summary

Patañjali in his discussion of the *vārttika*, first puts the *pūrvapakṣa* view that due to *san* intervening, 1.3.62 will apply and there will be *ātmanepada* for what was originally so, not because of the *it a* (*anudātta*). However, in the case of these *dhātus* neither *pada* is seen before *san*, so by the force of the *it a* only *ātmanepada* applies.

He now explains with a typical graphical illustration that, just as a mark on one part of a cow stands for the whole cow but not for the whole herd of cows, so the *a* of *gup-a* etc. indicates all formations with *san* will receive *ātmanepada* but not those with *ni* (causative) etc.

gup dhātu pāṭha bhvā se 970 gopane + san

San = sa. The final *n* is *it* by ‘*halantyaṃ*’ 1.3.3 and ‘*tasya lopah*’ 1.3.9, and signifies that whatsoever is derived with this *pratyaya sa-n* has the *udātta* accent invariably on the first syllable by ‘*ñ-nityādir nityam*’ 6.1.197 (*ādyudāttaḥ*).

When *san* is added there is reduplication of the *dhātu* by ‘*sanyaṅoh*’.

6.1.9 (*sannantasya yañantasya ca dve sto ’jādes tu dvitīyasya*).

‘The reduplicated form (ending with *san*) is looked upon as different from the original *dhātu* for the purpose of conjugation. However, it takes for conjugation a *pratyaya* of the same *pada* as the original *dhātu*.’

cf. ‘*sanādyantā dhātavaḥ*’ (3.1.32)

“The aggregate of words ending in the *pratyaya san* and the rest are called *dhātus*.”

In P.3.1.5 and 6 *san* follows *dhātus* with the sense of those *dhātus*, i.e. *svārthe*.

Kāś. quotes this (*vārttika* 187)

‘*nindākṣamāvyadhipratikā reṣu sannīṣyate ’nyathāyathāprāptam pratyayā bhavanti*’.

“It is desired that *san* (act after these *dhātus*) in the sense of blame, patience, and healing of disease but elsewhere the *pratyayas* act in the regular way.”

jūgupsate by ‘*kuhoś cuḥ*’ 7.4.62, *j* is the reduplicate of *gup* (lit. to seek to defend one’s self from (abl.), to be on one’s guard).

cf. *tenāsau loko na sampūryate tasmāj jugupseta*

(*Chāndogya* 5.10.8) (Be born and die). ‘Thereby the other world does not become filled up. Therefore this should be despised’.

10.21 *tij* (*bhā a se 971 niśāne*)

by ‘*coḥ kuḥ*’ 8.2.38 (g)+‘*khari ca*’ 8.4.55 (k)

(cf. Gk. *stiz* ω, Lat. *distinguo*.)

titikṣate R. V. 2.13.3

(Lit. ‘He desires to become firm or sharp’,) He bears with firmness, suffers with courage.

cf. *āgamāpayino ’nityāstānstitikṣasva bhārata / Gītā* 2.14

“(The sense contacts) come and go, they are impermanent. Then endure them bravely, O descendant of *Bharata*.”

kit (bhvā. pa. se. 993 nivase rogāpanayane.) + *san*
by ‘kuhoś cuḥ’ *k* exchanged for *c*. cf. ‘pracikitsa’ R. V. 1.91.23, ‘provide
for (both sides in the fray for booty)’.

‘yasminn idam vicikitsanti mrtyo yatsamparāyo mahatī bruhi nas tat’
Katha Up. 1.29

‘O Death, tell us of that thing about which people entertain doubt in the
context of the next world ... and whose knowledge leads to great result.’

cf. ‘parakṣetre cikitsya’ 5.2.92 (*kṣetriyac*)

“The word *kṣetriyac* is anomalous, meaning ‘curable in another body’,
‘not curable in this life’.”

Pradīpa

10.21 *gupticki / gub-iti*.

There the recitation of *kit* was simply for showing succession (of *dhātus* in
the text), but not to indicate (having an *it k* and therefore) as being
‘*anudātet*’ having an indicatory *anudāta* vowel (and therefore,
ātmanepada by 1.3.12.

anudātanitta ātmanepadam

“After a *dhātu* with an *anudāta* vowel or an indicatory *n* the *vibhakti*
pratyayas are *ātmanepada*.”)

10.22 *gupādiśv iti*

“What is the purpose of the *it* letter in *gup* etc.? The question is: Is it due
to the invariable nature of the *san*’s sphere of application, because of the
non-production of *laṭ* etc. after (*dhātus*) without any other (*vikaraṇa*,
pratyaya)?”

10.23 *ātmanepadartham iti [Vā 1]*

“(The *it* letter in *gup-a* etc.) is for the purpose of *ātmanepadam*.”

The sense is after those ending in *san*.

cf. ‘*svaritanitaḥ kartrabhiprāye kriyāphale*’ 1.3.72

“After a *dhātu* marked with a *svarita* accent or which has an indicatory *it n*,
the terminations of the *ātmanepada* are employed when the fruit of the
action accrues to the agent.”

11.1 *pūrvavad iti*

“A *dhātu ātmanepada* in its original form before *san*, will be *ātmanepada*
when it ends in *san*.”

The sense is, due to the extended application of the sign (of *ātmanepada*).

11.1 *pūrvavatsanaḥ* 1.3.62

“After a desiderative *dhātu*, *ātmanepada* is employed if it would have
been used after the original *dhātu*.”

The general rule: ‘If the primary *dhātu* is *parasmaipada* its desiderative
will also be *parasmaipada*; if the primary *dhātu* is *ātmanepada* its

desiderative will be *ātmanepada*.’

11.2 *na caitebhya iti*

“And after these (*dhātus* without *upasarga* before *san*, we see neither *ātmanepada* nor *parasmaipada*).”

That is an extended application of an operation. The sense is that when there is extended application of a sign (of *pada*), however, there is the possibility of *ātmanepada* also in examples like ‘*anucikīrṣati*’ ‘He desires to imitate’.

11.3 *evam tarhīti*

“Then, indeed (by force of the producing *it* letters *ātmanepada* will be applicable).”

The sense is, even when separated by *san*.

11.4 *atha veti*

“Or else (a sign made in a part will be distinctive of the whole).”

The sense is that, where there is no purpose for the attachment of a sign on a part, that is in fact for the purpose of the whole. The *Bhāṣya* is taught (as words of the wise). Here in (discussion on) ‘*pūrvavatsanaḥ*’ the explanation is diffusely given, hence it has to in fact be determined (if it is *Bhāṣyakāra*’s or another’s view!)

11.5 *līṅgam gorviśeṣakam bhavati*

“(A mark on the thigh or ear of a cow) is the distinguishing characteristic of the cow.”

See *lakṣaṇa* for *līṅga* in *P. 6.3.115* ‘*karṇe lakṣaṇasya ...*’

“Before *karṇa* there is the substitution of a long vowel for the final of the preceding word when it denotes a proprietorship mark on the ears of cattle ...”

e.g. *dātrākarnaḥ*

Kāś. ‘*yat paśūnām svāmiviśeṣasambandha jñāpanārtham dātrākaraḍi kriyate tad iha lakṣaṇam grhyate.*’

“The word *lakṣaṇa* here means a peculiar mark put or made on the ears of animals in the form of a sickle etc. showing the proprietorship.”

11.6 *jugupsayati*

“He causes someone to seek to be on their guard.”

‘*mimānsayati*’ “He causes someone to investigate.”

Neither are found in the literature.

If the sign on a part were to become the distinction of the whole, the rule ‘*pūrvavatsanaḥ*’ 1.3.62 would become applicable to the causative of the desiderative as well. Whereas in fact the addition of *ni* has the effect of forming a new *dhātu* independent of this *sūtra*’s influence.

11.10 *mānbadhadānśānbhyo dīrghaś cābhyāsasya*//3/1/6//

abhyāsadīrghatve 'varṇasya dīrghaprasaṅgaḥ //1//

abhyāsasya dīrghatve 'varṇasya dīrghatvaṃ prāpnoti / mīmāṃ-
sate //

nanu cettve kṛte dīrghatvaṃ bhaviṣyati / katham punar utpatti-
saṃniyogena

dīrghatvaṃ ucyamānam itvaṃ pratīkṣate / atha katham abhy-
āsam pratīkṣate /

vacanād abhyāsam pratīkṣata itvaṃ punarna pratīkṣate /

Pāṇini 3.1.5: The *Pratyaya san* acts after the *dhātus mān, badha, dān* and *śān* and there is a long vowel for the reduplicative syllable.

Vārttika 1: When a long (is ordained) for the reduplicative syllable there is occasion for lengthening of the letter *a*.

Bhāṣya: When lengthening (is ordained) for the reduplicative syllable, lengthening of the letter *a* wrongly applies, e.g. *mīmānsate* 'He reflects upon, considers or investigates'. Now surely when *i* (augment) is produced, there will be lengthening. But how (when) lengthening is being stated in conjunction with the arising (of the *pratyaya*), does one expect the letter *i*? Now how does one expect a reduplicative syllable? One expects a reduplicative syllable because of the rule (*sanyaṅaḥ 6.1.9*), (because lengthening is ordained for the reduplicative syllable), but one does not expect augment *i*.

11.15 *na vābhyāsavikāreṣv apavādasyotsargābādhakatvāt* //2//

na vaiṣa doṣaḥ / kiṃ kāraṇam / abhyāsavikāreṣv apavādasyo-
tsargābādhakatvāt / abhyāsavikāreṣv apavādā utsargān na
bādhanta ity evaṃ dīrghatvaṃ ucyamānam itvaṃ na
bādhiṣyate//

atha vā mānbadhadānśānbhya ī cābhyāsasyeti vaksyāmi /

11.20 *evam api halādiśeṣāpavāda ikāraḥ prāpnoti / ī cāca iti*
vaksyāmi// atha vā mānbadhadānśānbhyo dīrghaś

*ceto 'bhyāsasyeti vakṣyāmi / sidhyati / sūtram tarhi bhidyate //
yathānyāsam evāstu / nanu cōktam abhyāsadīrghatve 'varṇasya
dīrghaprasaṅga iti / parihr̥tam etan na vābhyāsavikāreṣv
apavādasyotsargābādhakatvāditi // athavā naivam vijñāyate
dīrghaś ca abhyāsasyeti / katham tarhi / dīrghaś ca
ābhyāsasyeti/ kim idam ābhyāsasyeti / abhyāsavikāra*

11.25 ābhyāsah tasyeti //

Vārttika 2: Or there is no (difficulty) because of the *apavāda* (*sūtra*) not annulling the *utsarga* (*sūtra*) in case of modification in the reduplicative syllable.

Bhāṣya: Nor is this a fault. What is the reason? Because in relation to change in the reduplicative syllable the *apavāda* do not annul the *utsarga* (*sūtras*). When there are changes in the reduplicative syllable, the *apavāda* (*sūtras*) do not annul the *utsarga* (*sūtras*). Thus lengthening being stated, the letter *i* will not annul it. Or else I will (rephrase the *sūtra* and) say, “after *mān*, *badha*, *dān* and *śān*, (*san pratyaya*) and long *ī* acts in place of the reduplicative syllable”. So also long *ī* obtains as *apavāda* (of the rule) *halādih śeṣāḥ* (7.4.60) “Of the consonants of the reduplicative syllable only the first is retained, the remainder are elided”. I will (modify the *sūtra*) and say “... and long *ī* is in place of the vowel (of the reduplicative syllable)”. Or else I will (modify the *sūtra* and) say “... *san pratyaya* acts after *mān*, *badha*, *dān* and *śān* and there is lengthening of the short *i* of the reduplicative syllable”. It is (now) established. But then the *sūtra* is split (into two). Let it be according to the text of the *sūtra* as laid down. Now, was it not indeed said, “When there is lengthening of the reduplicative syllable there is occasion for lengthening of *a*” (*Vārttika 1*)? This was avoided by *Vārttika 2*. Nor when there are changes in the reduplicative syllable do *apavādas* debar *utsarga sūtras*. Or else (the *sūtra*) is not understood thus (as reading) *dīrghaśca abhyāsasya* “and lengthening of the reduplicative syllable”. How then? *dīrghaścābhyāsasya* “and lengthening of the changed/ modified reduplicative syllable”. What is the meaning of *abhyāsasya*? *Ābhyāsa* is change of (or prescribed in connection with) the reduplicative syllable. “Of that (let there be lengthening)”.

NOTES ON MAHĀBHĀṢYA ON PĀṆINI 3.1.6

General Summary

Vā. 1: When long is ordained for the reduplicative syllable there is occasion for lengthening the letter *a*.

Vā. 2: Or there is no difficulty because of an *apavāda sūtra* not barring the *utsarga* in the case of a modification in the reduplicative syllable. *Bhā* reads the *sūtra* as ‘And the lengthening of the modified reduplicative syllable.’

Vārttika Summary

In the first *vārttika Kātyāyana* focuses on the possibility of the lengthening referred to in the *sūtra* wrongly applying to the *a* of *mān* etc. in the reduplicative syllable.

The second *vārttika* is a reply to this *pūrvapakṣa* explaining that, contrary to the general rule that *apavādas* bar *utsargas*, in the case of operations modifying the reduplicative syllable, this does not apply, so the problem does not arise.

Bhāṣya summary

Patañjali explains the *pūrvapakṣa* in the first *vārttika*. One does not expect *i* in the reduplicate (by ‘*sanyataḥ*’ 7.4.79, because of not being short *a*) but a reduplicative syllable is expected (by ‘*sanyaṅḥ*’ 6.1.9), therefore long *ā* would obtain. In the explanation of the second *vārttika* he first says that the *i* rule will not bar the lengthening in this *sūtra* because of the exceptional *paribhāṣa* referred to. Modifications are then suggested in the *sūtra* to clarify and to shorten, namely *ī* instead of the word *dirgha* = *acaḥ* (of a vowel), or add the word *itaḥ* so that the *sūtra* specifically states lengthening ‘of an *i*’. Rather than change the text he returns to the *paribhāṣā* solution given in the second *vārttika*. Finally *Patañjali* offers a characteristically ingenious linguistic solution, namely the word in the *sūtra* is really *ābhyāsasya* so means ‘(lengthening) of the modified reduplicative syllable’.

Pradīpa

11.11 *abhyāsa dirgha iti [Vā. 1]*

“When long is ordained for the reduplicative syllable ...”

He says this because the special rule (would) bar the general *sūtra*.

11.13 *atha katham iti*

“Now how (when lengthening is being stated in conjunction with the arising of the *pratyaya*, does one expect the letter *i*?

The sense is that just as because of the statement in the rule ‘for the reduplicative syllable’ lengthening is expected of the vowel of the *abhyāsa*, so due to another statement of rule, ‘ordained *i*’ also (is expected).

11.15 *abhyāsavikareṣv iti* [Vā. 2]

“(Apavāda does not bar *utsarga*) in the case of modification of the reduplicative syllable.”

And this (the *sūtrakāra*) will make known by the mention of *akit* in the *sūtra*. Here ‘*dirgho’kitaḥ*’ 7.4.83 ‘A long vowel is *ādeśa* for the *a* of the reduplicate in the Intensive (with expressed or elided *yañ*) when the reduplicate receives no augment having an indicatory *k* (like *nīk* and *nuk*’. This gives the first condition for the *jñāpaka*, because when the augment *n* is added the reduplicate will end in a consonant, and not ending in a vowel there will be no occasion for lengthening, hence the use of *akitaḥ* is gone.

11.20 *ī cāca iti*

“(I will say) ‘and long *ī* (is) in place of the vowel (of the reduplicative syllable)’.”

The meaning is, ‘in place of the final of that ending in a vowel’. And when ‘*halādiśeṣaḥ*’ 7.4.60 ‘Of the consonants of the reduplicate, only the first is retained, the remainder *lopa*-elided’, is not effected there is no vowel ending final.

11.24 *abhyāsa vikāra iti*

The “(Abhyāsa is) changed (and) prescribed in connection with the reduplicative syllable.”

And that is in fact ‘having *ī*’. For it is not possible just for the *ādeśa* of *lopa* to be ordained due to not having a form. And if there were lengthening of a short vowel, then the indication of the *taddhita* form (*ābhyāsa*) would be pointless. Due to the proximity of ‘the vowel *paribhāṣā*’ with the hearing of *dirgha* (lengthening) because of ordaining lengthening for what has a final vowel; when there is ordaining of long, it is either for a short or a long vowel, because of the absence of distinction. Therefore, the nature of *i* alone is made known by the *taddhita* formation. Otherwise having rendered that null when *san* follows, that modification /*vikāra* which is ordained by ‘*sanyataḥ*’ 7.4.79 (‘*i* is the *ādeśa* for a final short *a* of a reduplicate in the Desiderative’), is understood to be mentioned for that alone. And short is applicable for *bādh-i* also as for *mān* etc. by the application of the maxim *parjanyaavat* (like the rain, *sūtras* fall on all irrespectively).

11.10 *mān*

mān (Dh.P. *bhāva. a. se. 972 pujāyām*)+*san*

man mān by ‘*sanyaṅoḥ*’ 6.1.9

(For a non-reduplicate *dhātu* ending in *san* (Desiderative) or *yañ* (Intensive) *pratyayas*, there is reduplication.’

‘*sanyataḥ*’ 7.4.79

“*i* acts in place of the final short *a* of the reduplicate in the desiderative.”

ma mān sa, ‘*halādiśeṣaḥ*’ 7.4.60

“Of the reduplicate the first consonant is left; the other consonants are elided.”

mi mān sa, ‘naścaāpadāntasya jhali’ 8.3.24

mīmāṅsate (by this *sūtra*) (*anusvārah*) He reflects upon, considers, examines, investigates.

mām from *man-a* 1176 *jñāne*

cf. Zd. *man*; Gk. *menw*, *memona*; Lat. *meminisse*, *monere*; Goth. *gamunan*; Germ. *mennen*; Eng. *mean*.

cf. taṃ devā amīmāsanta A. V. 12.4.42

mahāśrotriyaḥ sametya mīmāṃsam acakruḥ Chā. Up. 5.11.1

“Great adepts in the *Veda* assembled together and conducted a discussion.”

atha nu mīmāṃsyam eva te manye viditam Kena Up. 2.1,

“Therefore (*Brahman*) is still to be deliberated upon by you. (Disciple:) I think (*Brahman*) is known.”

bādha (*bhvā a se 973 bandhane*) + *san*

M.W. *bādh* (*bhvā. a. se. 5 vilodane*)

bībhatsate b = bh by ‘*ekāco baśo bhaṣ jhaśantasya sdhvoh’ 8.2.37* He feels an aversion for, loathes, shrinks from (abl.).

cf. puruṣaḥ svādgetaso bibhatsate Tai.Bra. 1.1.2.8

dāna (*bhvā u se 994 khandane*) + *san*, *didānsate* ‘He is or makes straight’ *Kās.*

śāna (*bhvā u se 995 tejane*) + *san*, *śiśānsate* ‘He whets, sharpens’ *Kās.*

Kās. atrāpi sann arthaviśeṣa iṣyate maner vijñāsāyām; bādher vairupye; dāner arjave; śāner niśāne.

“Here too *san* is desired with a special sense. After *man-i* (it acts) in the sense of the desire to know/investigation, after *bādh-i* in the sense of malformation/disgust, after *dān-i* in the sense of upright/straight/true, and after *śān-i* in the sense of whetting or sharpening.”

‘*dirghaḥ*’, *dr* (*kryā. pa. se. 1493 vidārane*) + *ghak*

uṇ. 3.72, ‘dṛnater ghak ca’ or uṇ. bahulakāt.

‘*abhyāsa naś*’, *abhi* + *asu* + *ghaṅ*;, *abhimukhyenāsyate, kṣepe karmaṇi asu* (*di. pa. se. 1209 kṣepane*)

‘*Akartari ca kārake sañjñāyām’ 3.3.19 (ghāṅ)*

11.15 na vābhyāsavikāreṣv apavādasyotsargabādhakatvāt

cf. Pari. 66, ‘abhyasavikāreṣu bādhyabādhakabhāvo nāsti’

“So far as changes of the reduplicative syllable are concerned, rules (which teach those changes) do not supersede one another.”

So the substitution of short *i* (by 7.4.79) would be superseded by the substitution of a long vowel (3.1.6) for the vowel of the reduplicate syllable because this latter rule is *antaraṅga* in regard to the former.

11.25 *abhyāsavikārah ābhyāsah*

cf. *tasya vikārah* 4.3.134

“The *pratyaya an* (and the rest 4.1.83 etc.) act after a word in the sixth case in construction in the sense of ‘a modification thereof’.”

12.1 *dhātorḥ karmaṇaḥ samānakartṛkād icchāyām vā*//3/1/7//

*dhātor iti kim artham / prakartum aicchat prācīkṣat /
sopasargād utpattir mā bhūt /*

Pāṇini 3.1.7: Optionally the *pratyaya san* acts in the sense of desire after a *dhātu* expressing the object (wished for) and having the same agent of action (as the wisher).

Bhāṣya: What is the purpose of saying “after a *dhātu*”? *Prakartum aicchat* or *prācīkṣat* “He wanted to make”. So that there should not be arising (of *san*) after (*dhātu*) in conjunction with/along with an *upasarga*.

karmagrahaṇāt sanvidhau dhātugrahaṇānthakyaṃ //1//

*karmagrahaṇāt sanvidhau dhātugrahaṇānthakyaṃ /
karmaṇaḥ samānakartṛkād icchāyām*

12.5 *vā sanbhavatīty eva dhātor utpattir bhaviṣyati / sopasargaṃ vai
karma
tata utpattiḥ prāpnoti* //

Vārttika 1: Because of the mention of *karman* in the *san* rule the mention of *dhātu* is pointless.

Bhāṣya: Because of the mention of *karman* in the rule (ordaining) *san*, the mention of *dhātu* is pointless. Since (it was) just (stated), “Optionally (*san* acts) in the sense of desire after that expressing the object (wished for) and having the same agent of the action (as the wisher) “there will be arising (of *san*) after the *dhātu*”. A *dhātu* along with an *upasarga* (would in fact be having) an object/*karman*, hence *san* wrongly obtains after that.

12.6 *sopasargaṃ karmeti cet karmaviśeṣakatvād upasargasyā-
nupasargaṃ karma* //2//

*sopasargaṃ karmeti cet karmaviṣeṣaka upasargaḥ / anupa-
sargaṃ eva hi karma //*
avaśyaṃ caitad evaṃ vijñeyam anupasargaṃ karmeti /

Vārttika 2: If (you say) the *karman* is the *dhātu* together with an *upasarga*, because of an *upasarga* being a qualification of *karman* (in reality) *karman* is (a *dhātu*) without an *upasarga*.

Bhāṣya: If (we say) *karman* is (a *dhātu*) together with an *upasarga* (we imply that) an *upasarga* specifies or distinguishes *karman*. Surely in reality *karman* is without an *upasarga*. Also it is essential that this should be known that *karman* is without an *upasarga*.

*sopasargasya hi karmatve dhātvadhikāre 'pi sano 'vidhānam
akarmatvāt //3//*

12.10 *yo hi manyate sopasargaṃ karmeti kriyamāṇe 'pi tasya
dhātugrahaṇe sano vidhiḥ syāt /*
kiṃ kāraṇam / akarmatvāt //
idaṃ tarhi prayojanaṃ subantād utpattirmā bhūt /

Vārttika 3: For when the *karman* is together with an *upasarga*, even in the context of the governing *sūtra*, “*dhātoḥ*”, there is no rule for *san* because of the *dhātu* not being the *karman/object*.

Bhāṣya: For him who thinks *karman* is together with an *upasarga* even when specific mention of the word *dhātu* is being made for it, the *san* rule would not be (applicable) to *san*. What is the reason? Because of (*dhātu*) not being a *karman*. This then is the purpose, so that (*san*) should not act after a word ending in a *sup/case* ending.

12.13 *subantāccāprasaṅgaḥ kyajādīnāmapavādatvāt //4//*

*subantāc ca sano 'prasaṅgaḥ / kiṃ kāraṇam / kyajādīnām
apavādatvāt /*

12.15 *subantātkyajādayo vidhīyante te 'pavādatvād bādhakā bhav-
iṣyanti //*

Vārttika 4: And there is not occasion (for 'san' acting after) a word ending in *sup*/case ending because of *kyac* and the rest having the nature of *apavāda* rules (annulling the effects of the *utsarga* rules).

Bhāṣya: And there is no occasion for *san* acting after *sup*/case endings. What is the reason? Because of *kyac* and the rest having the nature of *apavāda* (*sūtras* annulling the effects of *utsarga sūtras*). *Kyac* and the rest are ordained after word-*sup*/case endings. Being *apavāda sūtras* they will annul (the *utsarga san sūtra*).

12.16 *anabhidhānādvā //5//*

*atha vānabhidhānāt subantād utpattirna bhaviṣyati / na hi
subantād utpadyamānena sanecchāyā abhidhānaṃ syāt /
anabhidhānāntata utpattir na bhaviṣyati //
iyaṃ tāvad agatikā gatiryaducyate 'nabhidhānād iti //*

12.20 *yadapy ucyate subantāc cāprasaṅgaḥ kyajādīnām apavādatvād
iti*

*bhavet kasmāccid aprasaṅgaḥ syād ātmeccchāyām /
pareccchāyām tu prāpnoti /*

12.21 *rājñāḥ putram icchatīti // evaṃ tarhīdam iha vyapadeśyam
sadācāryo na*

*vyapadeśati / kim / samānakartṛkād ity ucyate na ca subantasya
samānaḥ kartāsti / evaṃ api bhavet kasmāccid aprasaṅgaḥ
syādyasya kartā*

*nāsti / iha tu prāpnoti āsitum icchati śayitum icchatīti/
icchāyāmarthe sanvidhīyata icchārtheṣu ca tumun / tatra*

13.1 *tumunoktatvāt tasyārthasya sanna bhaviṣyati / evaṃ apīha
prāpnoti/*

*āsanam icchati śayanam icchatīti / iha yo viśeṣa upādhir
vopādīyate*

*dyotyē tasmins tena bhavitavyam / yaś cehārtho gamyate
āsitum icchati*

*śayitum icchatīti svayaṃ tām kriyām kartum icchatīti nāsāv iha
gamyate āsanam icchati śayanam icchatīti / anyasyāpy āsanam
icchatītyeṣo 'py artho*

13.5 *gamyate / avaśyaṃ caitad evaṃ vijñeyam / yo hi
manyate 'dyotyē tasmins tena*

bhavitavyam iti kriyamāṇe 'pi tasya dhātugrahaṇa iha

prasajyeta

samgatam icchati devadatto yajñadatteneti //

Vārttika 5: Or because of not expressing (the meaning desired).

Bhāṣya: Or else because of not expressing (the meaning desired in the proper way) there will not be the arising of *san* after a word ending in a *sup/case pratyaya*. For by (conjoining) with *san* being produced after a *sup pratyaya* there would not be expression of the meaning 'desire'. Hence because of not expressing (the meaning of desire) there will not be production (of a word form). This is the resort of one who has no (other) resort (i.e. last resort cf. *Yajñ 1.4.345*) namely when it is said 'because of not expressing (the meaning desired)'. Moreover it is said, there is not occasion (for *san*) after a *sup/case* ending word, because of *kyac* and the rest having the character of *apavāda* (special rules setting aside general ones). That may be so. There may be no occasion after some *sub-anta* words when the sense is 'desire for oneself'. But when the desire is for the sake of another (*san*) obtains, e.g. "He desires a son for the kings". Well then there is here sometimes (something) to be indicated which the Master does not indicate. What? "After a (*dhātu*) having the same agent (as the wisher)" is stated, but the same agent is not found in connection with a word ending in a *sup pratyaya*. It may even be that there is non-applicability (of *san*) after something (or other) which does have the same agent, but here it does obtain, "He desires to sit down", "He desires to lie down".

San is ordained in the sense of desire, and *tumun* (is ordained) in the sense of desire. There, because of being expressed by *tumun*, *san* will not be applicable for that meaning. But then here it obtains "He wants a place to sit", "He wants a place to lie". That (*san*) should be ordained when it is understood as a specific feature to be indicated. Here what is taken as a special quality or qualification, when it is expressed, should be "by means of that" (*pratyaya*). Here the meaning that is understood from "He wants to sit" and "He wants to lie down", namely that he himself wants to do that action, is not understood from the expressions "He desires a seat" or "He desires a bed".

Also "He desires a seat for another" is also understood as the meaning. It is essential too that this should be realised. For he who thinks "when it is not expressed, (*san*) should be there even while being formed" (would make) the specific mention of *dhātu* for that

(context) wrongly applicable. As “*Devadatta* desires friendship with *Yajñadatta*”.

13.9 *karmasamānakarṭṛkagrahaṇānarthakyaṃ cecchābhidhāne pratyayavidhānāt //6//*

*karmasamānakarṭṛka-grahaṇaṃ cānarthakam /
kiṃ kāraṇam / icchābhidhāne pratyayavidhānāt /*

13.10 *icchāyām abhidheyāyām sanvidhīyate //*

Vārttika 6: Also the mention of the object having the same agent is pointless because of the ordaining of the *pratyaya san* when ‘desire is being expressed’.

Bhāṣya: The mention of the agent (being) the same (for the *dhātu*) as for the *karman*/object is pointless. What is the reason? Because of the ordaining of the *pratyaya (san)* when desire is to be expressed. When desire is being expressed *san* is ordained.

13.11 *akarmaṇo hy asamānakarṭṛkāḍ vānabhidhānam //7//*

*icchāyām abhidheyāyām sanvidhīyate na cākarmaṇo
'samānakarṭṛkāḍ votpadyamānena sanecchāyā abhidhānaṃ
syāt/
anabhidhānāttata utpattir na bhaviṣyati //*

Vārttika 7: (*San*) is not known (to occur) after that which is not *karman*/object and which has not the same agent (as that of the wisher of the *karman*).

Bhāṣya: When desire is being expressed *san* is ordained but not after that which is not *karman* or not having the same agent (as that of the *karman*) and by the *san* being produced there may be expression of desire. Hence due to not expressing it there will not be arising (of the form).

13.14 *aṅgaparimāṇārthaṃ tu //8//*

13.15 *aṅgaparimāṇārthaṃ tarhy anyataratkartavyaṃ karma-grahaṇaṃ dhātugrahaṇaṃ vā /*

- aṅgapararimāṇaṃ jñāsyāmīti // kiṃ punar atra jyāyaḥ /
dhātugrahaṇam eva
jyāyaḥ / aṅgaparimāṇaṃ caiva vijñātaṃ bhavatyapi ca dhātor
vihitah
pratyayaḥ śeṣa ārdhadhātukasamjño bhavatīti sana ārdha-
dhātukasamjñā siddhā bhavati //
yac cāpyetaduktam karmagrahaṇāt sanvidhau dhātugrahaṇā-
narthakyaṃ
sopasargaṃ karmeti cet karmaviśeṣakatvād upasargasyā-
nupasargaṃ karma sopasargasya hi
karmatve dhātvadhikāre 'pi sano' vidhānam akarmatvād iti
svapakṣo 'nena varṇitāḥ/ yuktam iha draṣṭavyaṃ kiṃ nyāyyaṃ
karmeti/
etaccātra yuktam yat sopasargaṃ karma syāt / nanu coktam
sopasargasya hi karmatve
dhātvadhikāre 'pi sano' 'vidhānam akarmatvād iti / naiṣā
doṣaḥ/
karmaṇa iti naiṣa dhātusamānādhikaraṇā pañcamī / karmaṇo
dhātor iti /*
- 13.25 *kiṃ tarhi / avayavayogaiśā ṣaṣṭī / karmaṇo yo dhātur avayava
iti /
yady avayavayogaiśā ṣaṣṭhī kevalād utpattir na prāpnoti /
cikīrṣati /
jihīrṣatīti/ eṣo 'pi vyapadeśivadbhāvena karmaṇo dhātur
avayavo
bhavati // kāmaṃ tarhy anenaiva hetunā kyaj api kartavyaḥ /
mahāntaṃ*
- 14.1 *putram icchatīti / karmaṇo yat subantaṃ avayava iti / na
kartavyaḥ/
asāmarthyān na bhaviṣyati / katham asāmarthyam /
sāpekṣam asamarthaṃ bhavatīti //*

Vārttika 8: However it is for the purpose of determining the *aṅga*.

Bhāṣya: Then for the purpose of determining the *aṅga* the reference should be made to either *karman* or *dhātu* (so that) “I will know the measure of *aṅga*”. But which one is preferable? The (specific) mention of *dhātu* is preferable (to *karman*). And in fact the measure of the *aṅga* is known, as also the technical name *ārdhadhātuka* is

established for *san* (by the statement) “the rest (of the *pratyayas* ordained after a *dhātu* have the technical name) *ārdhadhātuka*” (3.4.114). As for that which was said “because of the specific mention of the word *karman* in the *san* rule, the mention of the word *dhātu* is pointless” (*Vā 1*) “If (you say) *karman* is *dhātu* with an *upasarga*, because of the *upasarga*’s nature of qualifying *karman*, the *karman* is (in fact) without, or distinct from, the *upasarga*” (*Vā 2*) “for even when there is the characteristic of *karman* for an *upasarga* conjoined (with a *dhātu*) when in the sphere of the *dhātu* governing rule (3.1.91), because of *dhātu* not being *karman* “there is no ordaining of *san*” (*Vā 3*). By this (statement) was described (the *pūrva pakṣa*’s) own view.

It is proper to see which is a proper *karman*. This is proper here that (a *dhātu*) conjoined with an *upasarga* should be *karman*. But surely it was said, “even when there is the characteristic of *karman* for an *upasarga* in conjunction (with a *dhātu*) in the sphere of the *dhātu* governing rule, because of the absence of the characteristic *karman* there is no affixing of *san*” (*Vā 3*).

This is not a fault. (The word) *karmanah* (in the *sūtra*) is not fifth case in the same case relationship i.e. in apposition with the word *dhātu*, as *karmano dhātor* (which would mean ‘after a *dhātu* which is *karman*’). What then (is it)? This is sixth case ‘signifying part’ as ‘that *dhātu* which is part of a *karman*’. If this is sixth case signifying ‘syntactical dependence on’ a part, the arising (of *san*) after (a *dhātu*) alone does not obtain e.g. *cikīrṣati* (he desires to make) *jihīrṣati* (he desires to take).

This also is a *dhātu* by reason of its nature of representing (a secondary thing as the principal one) which is part of *karman*. Then granted, because of this very cause *kyac* also is to be applied, here obtains “He desires a great son” and thus (seems to apply) ‘that *sup*/case ending word which is a part of *karman*’. It is not to be applied. Because of there being no syntactical connection (*san*) will not be applicable. How is there not syntactical connection or adequacy? The ‘inadequacy’ is, whatever has ‘expectancy’ or dependence on another word inside a compound is not in syntactical connection (with another word’.

14.3 *vāvacaṇānarthakyaṃ ca tatra nityatvātsanaḥ //9//*

vāvacaṇaṃ cānarthakam / kiṃ kāraṇam / tatra nityatvātsanaḥ /

*iha dvau pakṣau vṛttipakṣaś cāvṛttipakṣaś ca / svabhāvataś
 caitadbhavati
 vākyam ca pratyayaś ca / tatra svābhāvike vṛttiviṣaye nitye
 prāpte vāvacanena kim anyacchakyam abhisambandhum
 anyadataḥ samjñāyāh/
 na ca samjñāyā bhāvābhāvāv iṣyete / tasmān nārtho vā-
 vacanena //*

Vārttika 9: And the word *vā* (optionally) is pointless because of the invariable nature of *san* in that context.

Bhāṣya: And the expression *vā* (optionally) is pointless. What is the reason? Because of the invariable nature of *san* in that context. Here are two points of view, the compounded view or view of integration and the uncompounded view or view of non-integration. And this is natural that there be (both) the sentence formed by simple words and the compound word formed by a *pratyaya*. There, in the sphere of natural compounding the *pratyaya* (*san*) invariably obtaining, what else is it possible to connect by the expression *vā* (optionally) other than the technical name (*pratyaya*)? Also (the possibility of) presence or absence of a technical name is not desired. Therefore the expression ‘*vā*’ has no meaning (here).

14.8 *tumunantād vā tasya ca lugvacanam //10//*

*tumunantād vā sanvaktavyastasya ca tumuno lugvaktavyah /
 kartum icchati cikīrṣati /*

Vārttika 10: Optionally (*san* should be ordained) after that ending in the (*pratyaya*) *tumun* and for that (*tumun*) the (operation of) *luk* (elision) (should be stated).

Bhāṣya: It should be stated that (*pratyaya*) *san* acts optionally after that which ends in (*pratyaya*) *tumun*, and that there is *luk* elision of that *tumun*, e.g. *kartum icchati* (becomes) *cikīrṣati* (He desires to make).

14.10 *linuttamād vā //11//*

*liñuttamād vā sanvaktavyastasya ca liño luvaktavyaḥ /
kuryām iticchati cikīrṣati //*

Vārttika 11: Optionally (*san* acts) after the first person of *liñ* (optative).

Bhāṣya: Optionally after *liñ* (optative) in the best/first person *san* acts and it should be stated that there is *luk* elision of *liñ*, e.g. *kuryām icchati* becomes *cikīrṣati* (His desire is that he might make something).

14.13 *āśaṅkāyām acetaneṣūpasamkhyānam //12//*

*āśaṅkāyām acetaneṣūpasamkhyānam kartavyam / āsmā
luluṭhiṣate kūlaṃ*

14.14 *pipatiṣatīti / kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇam na sidhyati / evaṃ manyate
cetanāvata etad bhavaticchati kūlaṃ cācetanam // acetana-
grahaṇena nārthaḥ /
āśaṅkāyām ity eva / idam api siddham bhavati śvā mumūrṣati//*

Vārttika 12: Additional enumeration (of *san*) in relation to non-sentient beings in the sense of fear or apprehension (of the speaker).

Bhāṣya: Additional enumeration should be made (of *san* acting) in relation to non-sentient beings in the sense of fear or apprehension. *Āsma luluṭhiṣate* (I fear the stone is on the point of falling) (lit. wishes to roll). *kūlaṃ pipatiṣati* (I fear the bank is about to fall). But what is the reason (the fear) is not justified? (Thus) one thinks that desire is possible only for a sentient being but the bank is insentient. The specific mention of 'non-sentient' is pointless. Only (the mention of) 'in the sense of fear or apprehension' (is enough). Then this (usage) also *śvā mumūrṣati* (The dog is about to die or fears he will die) is also established.

14.17 *na vā tulyakāraṇatvād icchāyā hi pravṛttita upalabdhiḥ //13//*

*na vā kartavyam / kiṃ kāraṇam / tulyakāraṇatvāt tulyam hi
kāraṇam cetanāvati devadatte kūle cācetane / kiṃ kāraṇam /*

icchāyā hi
 pravṛttita upalabdhiḥ / icchāyā hi pravṛttita upalabdhir
 bhavati/
 yo 'py asau kaṭaṃ cikīrṣur bhavati nāsāvāghoṣayati kaṭaṃ
 kariṣyāmīti /
 kiṃ tarhi / sannaddhaṃ rajjukīlakapūlapāṇiṃ dr̥ṣtvā tata icchā
 gamyate /
 kūlasyāpi pipatiṣato loṣṭhāḥ śīryante bhidā jāyate
 deśād deśāntaram upasaṃkrāmati / śvānaḥ khalv api
 mumūrṣava ekāntaśīlāḥ
 sūnākṣāś ca bhavanti //

Vārttika 13: Or else (the distinction) is not applicable because of the same nature of the cause. For the understanding arises from the use of *icchā* (desire).

Bhāṣya: Or else this should not be stated. What is the reason? Because of the same nature of the cause. For the cause is the same in relation to *Devadatta*, a sentient being, and the bank which is insentient. What is the reason? For the understanding of *icchā* arises from the activity. For the understanding of *icchā* is possible only through the activity. One who is desirous of making a mat, does not proclaim aloud “I will make a mat”. What then? Having seen him with a bundle of rope-pins then the desire is understood. Also the clods of earth of a bank about to fall are crushed, splitting occurs and from one place it goes to another place. Dogs indeed also who are about to die are habitually alone (and) their eyes become swollen.

upamānād vā siddham //14//

14.15 *upamānād vā siddham etat / katham / luluṭhiṣata iva
 luluṭhiṣate/
 pipatiṣatīva pipatiṣati // na tināntenopamānam asti /
 evaṃ tarhīcchevecchā //*

Vārttika 14: (This usage) is established because of simile.

Bhāṣya: Or else this (usage) is established because of simile. How? *luluṭhiṣate iva luluṭhiṣate* “He wishes to roll as it were or he is on the

point of rolling”. *pipatiṣati iva pipatiṣati* “He wishes to fall as it were or he is on the point of falling”. Truly a simile with *tiñ* (verbal ending) word is not possible because they are *sādhya*(to be established) not *siddha* (already established). Then the ‘desire’ is ‘desire as it were’.

15.1 *sarvasya vā cetanāvattvāt //15//*

*atha vā sarvaṃ cetanāvat / evaṃ hy āha kamsakāḥ sarpanti /
śarīṣo 'dhaḥ svapiti / suvarcalā ādityam anuparyeti /
āskanda kapilakety ukte tṛṇamāskandati / ayaskāntamayaḥ
saṃkrāmati /
rṣiḥ paṭhati / sṛṇota grāvāṇaḥ //*

Vārttika 15: Or else (the usages are established) because of everything having consciousness (or being sentient).

Bhāṣya: Otherwise all have consciousness. For then he says “The metal goblets creep or move gently”. “The *śrīṣa* tree (acacia) sleeps (below) on the ground”. “*Suvarcala* (the wife of the sun) follows the sun in going round”. When this has been said “Leap, O Reddish One (*Kapilaka*) he leaps on the grass”. The magnet (made of lode-stone) comes near or approaches iron. The seer (*rṣi* = *veda*) recites. “Harken O ye *soma* pressing stones”.

15.5 *ime iṣayo bahavaḥ paṭhyante / tatra na jñāyate kasyāyam arthe
sanvidhīyata iti / iṣeśchatvabhāvinaḥ / yady evaṃ kartum anv-
icchati
kartum anveśaṇā atrāpi prāpnoti / evaṃ tarhi yasya
striyām icchetyetadrūpaṃ nipātyate / kasya caitannipātyate /
kāntikarmaṇaḥ //*

Many *iṣ* (*dhātus*) are read (in the *Dhātupāṭha*). In that context is it not known in the sense of which *dhātu iṣ san* is ordained? Because of the condition of *cha* (irregularly coming after) *iṣ* (with *śa pratyaya* but without *yak pratyaya* to form the *nipātana* form *icchā*). (*San* is ordained in the sense of that *iṣ* which takes the *ādeśa ch*). If so then (*san*) wrongly applies also here in the (forms) *kartum anvicchati* (he seeks to make). *Kartumanveśaṇā* (she is seeking to make) (*dhātu iṣ tudādi*/class 6 but not in the sense of desire). Well, the (*san*) is

ordained in the sense of that *iṣ* for which this form *icchā* (3.3.101) is laid down irregularly in the feminine. And for what is this irregular formation laid down? For that which is the object of desire.

15. 8 *atheha grāmaṃ gantum icchatīti kasya kiṃ karma / iṣer ubhe karmanī /*

yady evaṃ grāmaṃ gantum icchati grāmāya gantum icchatīti gatyarthakarmanī

15.10 *dviṭīyācaturthyau na prāpnutaḥ / evaṃ tarhi gamer grāmaḥ karmeṣergamiḥ karma /*

evam api iṣyate grāmo gantum iti parasādhana utpadya-mānena lena

grāmasyābhidhānaṃ na prāpnoti / evaṃ tarhi gamer grāmaḥ karmeṣerubhe karmanī //

Now here (in this example) *grāmaṃ gantum icchati* ('He desires to go to the village'), what is the *karman*/object of what? Both are objects of (*dhātu iṣ* to desire). If so, then the *karman*/accusative and the *sampradāna*/dative in the two forms *gramam* and *grāmāya* (ordained by the rule *gatyārtha* etc. etc.) do not obtain in denoting the object of (*dhātus*) with the sense of motion. Well, then *grāmam* (village) is the *karman* (of the *dhātu gam* (to go), *gam* (the *karman* of the *dhātu iṣ* to desire). Thus also in the sentence *iṣyate grāmo gantum* (where the *karman*/object *iṣ* to desire is expressed by the *lakāra*/verbal form), *grāmo* is *prathamā* / nominative and *gantum* is *bhāva*/abstract notion of the verb. The *kāraka*/relation to the action is of a different *iṣ*/to go and wrongly does not obtain as the expression (or the designation) of the village (as object) by the *la*/verbal ending being produced. Well, then *grāmaḥ* is the *karman* of *dhātu gam* and both (*grāma* and *gam*) are the *karman* of *dhātu iṣ*.

*atha sanantātsanā bhavitavyam / cikīrṣitum icchati
jihīrṣitum icchatīti / na bhavitavyam / kiṃ kāraṇam /
arthagatyārthaḥ śabdaprayogaḥ / arthaṃ sampratyāya-
viśyāmīti śabdaḥ prayujyate /
tatraikenoktatvāt tasyārthasyāparasya prayogena na bhavi-
tavyam / kiṃ kāraṇam /
uktārthānām aprayoga iti / na tarhīdānīmidaṃ bhavati
eṣitum icchati eṣiṣatīti / asty atra viśeṣaḥ / ekasyātreṣeṣiḥ*

*sāadhanam vartamānakālaś ca pratyayah / aparasya bāhyam
sāadhanam sarvakālaś ca*

*pratyayah // ihāpi tarhy ekasyeṣeḥ karotiviśiṣṭa iṣiḥ sāadhanam
vartamānakālaś ca pratyayah / aparasya bāhyam sāadhanam
sarvakālaś ca pratyayah /*

*yenaiva khalv api hetunaitadvākyam bhavati / cikīrṣitum icchati
jihīrṣitum icchatīti tenaiva hetunā vṛttirapi prāpnoti /*

15.20 *tasmāt sanantāsanah pratiṣedho vaktavyah / tam cāpi
bruvateṣisana*

iti vaktavyam / bhavati hi jugupsīṣate mīmāṃsīṣata iti //

śaiśikānmatubarthīyācchaiṣiko matubarthikah /

sarūpah pratyayo neṣṭah sanantān na saniṣyate //

iti śrībhagavatpatañjalīviracite vyākaraṇamahābhāṣye

tritīyasyādhyāyasya prathame pāde prathamam āhnikam //

Now would *san* be (applicable) after that which ends in *san*? (e.g.) *cikīrṣitum icchati* (He desires to desire to make), *jihīrṣitum icchati* (He desires to desire to take)? It is not to be applicable. What is the reason? The use of words is for the comprehension of meaning. A word is used thus (with the intention),

“I will cause the meaning to be known/understood”. There, because of that meaning having been spoken by one (*san*), the employment of another does not take place. What is the reason? There is no employment (or linguistic units to express) meanings which have already been expressed.

Then (this) expression — *eṣitum icchati* (He desires to go) does not obtain. Here is a distinction. Here (*dhātu*) *iṣ* is the instrument of the action of one (other) (*dhātu*) *iṣ* and the (*tin*/verbal) *pratyaya* (conveys the sense of the) present time (whereas) the external instrument of the action of the other (*dhātu*) (has) a *pratyaya* conveying all. Here also then *iṣ* (*dhātu*) is distinguished by having (the infinitive of *dhātu*) *kr* for one of (the forms) of (*dhātu*) *iṣ* and is the instrument of the action/*sādhana* (while the *tin*/verbal) *pratyaya* conveys the sense of the present time.

The instrument of action for the other (form) is external and the *pratyaya* (*tumun*) conveys all or any time. Indeed by whatever cause the sentences ‘*cikīrṣitum icchati*’ (He desires to desire to make) and ‘*jihīrṣitum icchati iti*’ (He desires to desire to take) are (valid), by reason of that very cause integration also obtains. Therefore after that

ending in *san*, prohibition of *san* should be stated. And that too he should say as, 'it should be stated of *san* in the sense (of the *dhātu*) *iṣ* (to desire). For it is thus (applicable in the case of the *svārthe san*) (3.1.5 and 6) e.g. *jugupsīṣate* (He desires to abhor), *mīmānśīṣate* (He desires to investigate).

Śloka Vārttika: Śaiṣika (pratyayas) after śaiṣika (pratyayas), matup arthīya (pratyayas) after matup arthīya (pratyayas) (are not desired; pratyayas of the same form are not desired (to follow after one another) neither is san after san desired.

Now here ends the first *Āhnika* in the first *pāda* of the third *adhyaya* in the *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya* composed by the Blessed Master *Patañjali*.

Pradīpa

12.1 *dhātoḥ karmanah*

“(Optionally *san* in the sense of desire) ‘acts’ after a *dhātu* expressing the object.”

After a *dhātu* when occasioned by the meaning it has (the function of) expressing the object and has the same agent (as the desirer). Also those two, even though having the nature of the meaning of the *pratyaya* (i.e.) of desire, due to juxtaposition are understood only with regard to that. So the meaning of the *pratyaya* is applicable as having as its subordinate word in construction/*upasargana* the meaning of the *prakṛti*. Otherwise there would be no connection between the *prakṛti* and the *pratyaya*.

12.2 For the purpose of introducing the *Vārttika* he asks the question: *dhātoriti kimarthamiti*

“What is the purpose of saying ‘after a *dhātu*’?”

This is the sense: the *dhātu* alone expresses the verbal activity. However, the *upasarga* is a qualifier (of that activity). Hence, having the nature of expressing the object and the same agent as the desirer, as occasions of the meaning, it is only in fact possible they occur after a *dhātu*.

12.2 *sopasargāditi*

“(So that there be not arising of *san* after a *dhātu*) along with an *upasarga*.”

Due to (it being said) the verbal activity is distinguished by a combination (of *dhātu* and *upasarga*) alone, there is occasion for the arising of *san*. Hence the sense is, there is occasion for dual *vibhakti* etc. in fact after the combination.

12.3 *karmagrahanād iti [Vā. 1]*

“Due to the mention of *karman* (in the *san* rule, mention of *dhātu* is

pointless).”

This is an implication or synecdoche (part for the whole) whereby it should also be known ‘due to the mention of having the same agent (as the desirer)’.

12.5 *sopasargam iti*

“A *dhātu* along with an *upasarga* (would in fact be ‘having an object’ hence *san* (wrongly) obtains after that).”

1.7 *dhātoḥ* // See Introduction for etymology and uses.

‘*dhātu*’ *ñasi/ ḍudhā* (ju u a 262 *dhāranapoṣanayoḥ*) *tun sitanigamibhasisacyavidhāñkruśibhyastun uṅ* 69

“After the primary element or seed form of words.”

It is from the seed that growth takes place (misleadingly translated ‘root’). Therefore, we shall retain the *saṃskṛta* word *dhātu*.

ñasi// tasmādityuttarasya 1.1.67 (*nirdiṣṭe*)

karman ñasi// ḍukṛñ (ta u a 1472 *karāṇe*) *manin karmaṇi sārva dhātubhyo manin uṅ* 584

sārva dhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ 7.3.84 (*iko guṇaḥ*)

‘*karturīpsitatamaṅ karma*’ 1.4.49 (*kāraṇe*)

“That most desired to be attained by the agent is the *Karman*/object in relation to the accomplishment of the action.”

Of four kind(a:) *nirvartya* When anything new is produced, e.g.

kaṭaṃ karoti, He makes a mat, *putraṃ prasūte*, She bears a son.

(b) *nikārya* When change implied either of substance or form, e.g.

kāṣṭhaṃ bhasma karoti, He reduces fuel to ashes.

suvarṇaṃ kuṇḍalaṃ karoti, He fashions gold into an earring.

(c) *prāpya* When any desired object is attained, e.g.

grāmaṃ gacchati, He goes to the village,

candraṃ paśyati, He sees the moon.

(d) *anīpsitam* When an undesired object is abandoned.

e.g. *pāpaṃ tyajati*, He abandons evil.

cf. *tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam* 1.4.50

akathitam ca 1.4.51

gatibuddhipratyavasānārthaśabdakarmākarmakāñāmaṇi kartā sa nau 1.4.52

anabhihite 2.3.1 *karmaṇi dvitīyā* 2.3.2

samāna – kartṛka ñasi//

“Having the same subject of Agent of the activity, (i.e. that which is spoken of) in a sentence.

c.f. also ‘*samānakartṛkeṣu tumun* 3.3.158 *sama maha mānena vartate/*

samānaṃ manamasya iti vā/ mā lyuṭ kṛtyalyuṭo bahulam 3.3.113 *mān* (ju

ā a 1088 *māne*) *kartṛka//* ‘*nadyrtaś ca*’ 5.4.153 (*kapa svārthe, bahuvrīhi*)

kr + ṛ (*ḍukṛñ ta u a* 1472 *karāṇe*)

ṅvulṛcau 3.1.133

sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ 7.3.84

icchā ni// yādāpaḥ 1.3.113

3.3.181 (*ga*) *nerāmnadyāmnībhyaḥ* 7.3.116

iṣu (*tu pa se* 1351 *icchāyām*) *ch tām*

iṣugamiyamām chaḥ 7.3.77 (*ṣiti*)

ajādyataṣṭāp 4.1.3 (*striyām*)

‘in the sense of desire’

kā karmatvaṃ samānakarṭṛkatvaṃ ca dhātorarthakāarakam/

The nature of the *karman* (object) and having the same *karṭṛ/agent* have regard to the meaning of the *dhātu*.

kartumicchati cikīrṣati/ “He desires to make.”

kṛ san iko jhal 1.2.9 (*san kit*)

Pratyaya san beginning with a *jhal* letter (all consonants except semivowels and nasals) is like *ki-t* after *dhātus* ending in *ik* vowels, therefore no *guṇa* 1.1.5

kṛ... ajjhanagamām sani 6.4.16 (*dīrghaḥ*)

ki ṛta iddhātoḥ 7.1.100

kira uraṇ raparaḥ 1.1.51

kīra hali ca 8.2.77 (*dīrghaḥ*)

kīrṣe tip ādeṣapratyayayoḥ 8.3.59 (*inḥoḥ*)

cikīrṣati sanyaṇo 6.1.9 *sanyataḥ* 7.4.79 *kuhoṣcuḥ* 7.4.62

2 *prakartunaicchat prācīkīrṣat/*

Why the specific mention of *dhātu*? So that (the operations caused by *san* should not be related to the *dhātu* in conjunction with the *upasarga* (but to the *dhātu* alone).

kā sopasargādutpattirmābhūt

Here the augment *aṭ* for the imperfect precedes the *dhātu cikīrṣa* not the *upasarga pra*, by *luṇ laṇ lṛṅkṣvaḍudāttaḥ* 6.4.71

2.12.5 *karmaviśeṣaka iti* “(we imply that) an *upasarga* specifies or distinguishes *karman*.”

Hence due to this very expression, there is prohibition of sixth case (*tatpuruṣa*) *samāsa* (compound) as variable/transient/*anitya*. This is the meaning: the *dhātu* alone expresses the action because the nature of the object is of the *dhātu* alone not also (object) of the meaning of the *upasarga*. As has been stated ‘The mat only is *karman/object* there and because of syntactic agreement/same case relationship, there will be applicable second case after *bhīṣma* etc. So how the separable nature of the object of the qualifier? As spoken previously *kaṭa/mat* is object and so are *bhīṣma/ huge* etc., nonetheless because of the non-*karman* nature of the combination of *karman* after a combination there will not be applicable the arising (of a *pratyaya san*). [*Bh.* on 2.3.1 *Vā.* 4]

12.6 *sopasargam*

A *dhātu* that has one of the twenty-two *upasargas* (*pra* and the rest)

prefixed.

akarmakā api vai sopasargā, sakarmakā bhavanti

12.9 *sopasargasya hi karmatvam*

Vā. 3

*Kai yadi saṅghātasya arthadvārakaṃ karmatvaṃ syāt
tadā avayavasya akarmatvāt tataḥ sanpratyayo na syāt/*

‘If the nature of being object were occasioned or caused by the meaning of the combination (of *dhātu* and *upasarga*), then because of the part having the nature of being not object, the *pratyaya san* would not be applicable.’
karmaṇaḥ 3.1.7 ityeṣā pañcamī

This *karmaṇaḥ* in the *sūtra* is fifth case (agreeing with *dhātoḥ* ‘after a *dhātu*’).

*ṣaṣṭhyāṃ tu satyāṃ karmano ’vayavāt dhātoḥ san ity āśrīyā-
māṇo ’nupasargānna syāt/*

But when sixth case is resorted to, the sense is ‘*san* (acts) after a *dhātu* which is a part of the *karman/object*’. It would not be applicable after (a *dhātu*) without an *upasarga*.

Therefore, (this verse from the *Vākyapadīya*):

aḍḍādināṃ vyavasthāyai (v.l. vyavasthārtha)

prthaktvena prakalpanāt (v.l. vikalpanam)

dhātūpasargayor dhātuḥ (v.l. śāstre)

kriyāvācīti nirṇayaḥ (dhātoreva tu tādrśaḥ) // Vā pa 2.180

“In expressing verbal activity, or in the science (of grammar) *dhātus* and *upasargas* are assumed to be different for the sake of establishing the augment *aṭ* and the rest, but their combination is (really) the *dhātu*.”

It is for such purposes as fixing the position of the augment *aṭ* that *dhātus* and *upasargas* are regarded separately in the discipline. In reality the *dhātu* is like that, (i.e. joined to an *upasarga*).

12.12 *subantād iti*

“(This then is the purpose so that *san* should not act) after a word ending in a *sup/case* ending.”

Because its nature is optional, in the case of *san* being (desired) the sense is *kyac* etc. have scope (instead). However, it was not stated ‘after a crude base/*prātipadika*.’ Because of the expression ‘for an object/*karman*’ and when the nature of object exists because of its very existence there is necessity for that ending in a *sup/case pratyaya*.

12.14 *kyajādinām iti*

“(No occasion for *san* acting after a *sup*... because of *kyac* etc. having the nature of *apavāda (sūtras)*.”

The rule ordaining *san* is only after the *karma/object*. The sense is that *kyac* etc. act after that ending in a case *pratyaya* qualified by the object.

And where the *utsarga*/general rule and the *apavāda*/particular/exception are optional here by the particular there is no separate/free *upasarga* (from a *dhātu*), moreover, it is in fact a sentence/compound.

12.16 *anabhidhānād vā*

“Because of not expressing (the meaning desired).”

This expression occurs frequently in the *M.Bh.* referring to such words or phrases as could be formed by rules of grammar or used according to some rules but are not found in current use recognised by learned persons or scholars.

cf. *taccānabhidhānaṃ yatrāptairuktaṃ tatraivaḥ
anyatra tu yathālakṣaṇaṃ bhavatyeva/ padamañja 3.2.1
anabhidhānād vyadhikaraṇanāṃ bahuvrīhirna bhaviṣyati/
yatra tv abhidhānamasti tatra vaiyadhikaraṇyepi bhavaty eva samāsaḥ/*

12.19 *iyam tāvad agatikā gatiḥ// 3.1.7 vā 5*

Without resort or resources. (This is the resort (of one who has no other) resort) *Kathā. S.*

Occurs in compound with *gati* in *Yajñ Smṛti 1.345* meaning the resort of one who has no resort, a last resort.

Occurs at only one other place in *M.Bh. 81.68.380, 7/8*

*agatikasyāpi yathāsyāt/
... siddham pūrvaṇāgatikasyāpi/...*

*Kai lakṣaṇāśrayā lakṣyasya vyavasthā nyāyyā
lakṣyāśrayeṇa tu lakṣaṇavyavasthāpanaṃ gatyantarā bhāvād iti/*

‘The conventional rule is that the condition of that to be indicated is the resort to that indication/sign. However, by resorting to that to be indicated indirectly, there (must be) fixing of the indication (sign/definition) because of the absence of any other way.’

12.21 *vyapadeśyaṃ sad iti/*

“(Well then) this is here sometimes (something) to be indicated (which the master does not indicate).” i.e. that existing, good, worthy to be indicated, he does not indicate.

12.22 *na ca subantasya samānaḥ kartāsti/*

“And the same agent is not found in connection with a word ending in a *sup*/nominal *pratyaya*.”

Kai. ‘na ca subantasyeti’/

And not for that ending in a *sup*
putrādeḥ satvabhūtārthābhidhāyivā /

The sense is ‘Having caused the meaning of the substantive (i.e. noun) ‘san’ and the rest to be set forth’.

sādhasyaiva sādhanasambandhayogyatvād iti bhāvaḥ /

Because of the appropriateness of the connection of that to be

accomplished with the means of accomplishing it (i.e. noun etc.).”

kaṭhaṃ karoti ityādāv api subantena

“He makes the mat.” Also in such examples by a *sup*/noun ending word.

siddharūpo 'bhidhīyate / śabdāntarasannidhānāt

The established form is designated; however it is through proximity to another word.

12.14 *tumunoktatvād iti*

“(There) because of being expressed by *tumun* (*san* will not be applicable for that meaning).”

The meaning is ‘he desires’ with *tumun* (signifying) as the efficient cause. And it is not proper to say having barred the usage of that ‘he desires’. *tumun/san* is applicable. Due to there being occasion for absence when there is absence of that *tumun* due to its nature as efficient cause of the *upapada*/dependent subordinate word.

sādhyatā pratīyate / yathoktaṃ hariṇā

The nature of that to be accomplished is known. As was stated by *Bhartṛhari*.

nirvatyo vā vikāryo vā prāpyo vā sādhanāśrayaḥ /

kriyānām eva sādhyatvāt siddharūpo 'bhidhīyate // vā pa 3.7.79

“Whether the object is something to be made, or something to be modified or something to be reached it is the substratum of power and is presented as an accomplished thing (*siddharūpa*), because it is only actions which are to be accomplished (*sādhya*).”

12.23 *āsitum icchati/*

“He desires to sit down.”

The sense is through the nature of that ending in *tumun* as expressing the form/nature of that to be accomplished there is a link with the agent. Here there is prohibition of *kyac* (‘in presence of *kyac* prohibition of an indeclinable ending in *m*’).

12.24 *tumun*

samānakarṭṛkeṣu tumun 3.3.158 (icchartheṣu)

“The *pratyaya tumun* acts after a *dhātu* when another *dhātu* meaning (to wish) is in construction provided that the agent of both *dhātus* is the same.”

icchati, vaṣṭi, or vāṃcchati bhoktum, “He desires to eat”

13.2 *āsanamicchati śayanamicchati*

“He wants a place to sit, he wants a place to lie”.

It is ordained in the sense merely of a *lyuṭ* (*bhāva*) but not when the *upapadas* are in the sense of desire and there is the same agency with regard to the action to be expressed by the *dhātu*.

lyuṭ ca 3.3.115 (napuṃsake, bhāve)

“The *pratyaya lyuṭ (ana)* acts after *dhātus* when the name of an action is expressed in the neuter gender.”
hasan cchātrasya ‘the laughter of the student’.

13.2 *iha yo viśeṣa iti/*

“That *san* should be ordained when what is understood as a specific feature or quality (is to be indicated).”

The sense is the meaning to be expressed by that ending in *san/tumun* is the same word but that a qualification/*upādhi* is distinct. Sometimes, however, the (worldly) usage is without (this) difference (of meaning).

[After this point *Kaiyata* is only selectively translated]

3.1.7 *vā 8 1. aṅga parimāṇārtham* “for the purpose of determining/measuring the *aṅga*.”

cf. *yasmāt pratyayavidhis tadādi pratyaye 'ṅgam 1.4.13*

“After whatsoever a *pratyaya* is enjoined (be it a *dhātu* or *prātipadika*) that which begins therewith when a *pratyaya* follows has the name *aṅga*.

vā 6 parimāṇārtham ca // 6

parimāṇārtham ca dvitīyaṃ pratyayagrahaṇam kriyate /

Vārttika “and for the purpose of determining”.

Bhāṣya And the second mention of *pratyaya* is made for the purpose of determining (the limit of the *aṅga*).

yasmātpratyayavidhistadādyāṅgam itīyaty ucyamāne

dāśatayasyāpyāpy aṅgasamjñā prasajyeta /

“If it were only being stated ‘after whatsoever a *pratyaya* is enjoined that which begins therewith has the name *aṅga*’, then the technical name *aṅga* would be applicable for ten times (the length of the word).”

anudāttādeś ca 4.3.140

The *pratyaya añ* acts in the sense of modification or part after a word having *anudātta* accent on the first syllable.

13.14 *padagrahaṇam parimāṇārtham//4*

“The mention of *pada* (is made) for the purpose of determining (the limit of the accent)”.

bhā...vākyasya mā bhūdanudāttaṃ padamekavarjam 6.1.158

So it should not be applicable to a sentence “A word/*pada* is with the exception of one syllable unaccented”. 6.1.158

Used by *Pāṇini* in *ārhādagopucchasamkhyā parimāṇātṭhak 5.1.19*

“Up to the *sūtra 5.1.63 tad arhati* inclusive, the *pratyaya ṭhak (ika or ka)* bears rule with the exception of the word *gopuccha* or a numeral or a word denoting a measure or capacity.”

sarvato mānam, measuring all round.

In connection with utterance of letters it is used in the sense of *mātrakāla*/time of one or more *mātra*.

cf. *tiṇi codāttavati 8.1.72*

cf. also ‘A *gati* becomes *anudātta* when followed by an accented finite

verb.’

tiṅgrahaṇamudāttatvajñāḥ parimāṇārtham/ 2

Vā. 1 “The mention of *tiṅ* being *udātta* is for the purpose of measuring/determining.”

13.17 ‘*śeṣā ārdhadhātukasamjño*’

ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ 3.4.114 (tiṅ śit dhātoḥ)

“The remainder (i.e. the *pratyayas* other than *tiṅ*, i.e. verbal *vibhakti pratyayas* which replace *la*/tense *pratyayas*) and those with an indicatory *ś* (*śap vikaraṇa* etc.) acting after a *dhātu* are called *ārdhadhātuka*.”

Therefore the augment *iṭ* becomes applicable (because it begins with a ‘*val*’ for the initial *san* by

ārdhadhātuksyedvalādeḥ 7.2.35

and it will cause *guṇa* in place of the *ik* vowel of a preceding *dhātu* by *sārvadhātukārdhadhātayoḥ 7.3.84 (iko guṇaḥ) dhātusamānādhikaraṇā pañcamī*.

“fifth case in the same case relationship with the word *dhātu*.”

samānādhikaraṇa //

“a grammatical agreement in case with (comp.)

cf. *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāvaprathamāsamānādhikareṇe 3.2.124*

“The *pratyayas śatṛ* and *śānac* and *ādeśa* of *laṭ* when agreeing with what does not end with the first case”, “common or same government... for case relation”. Words which have the same individual object (*dravya*) referred to by means of their own sense and which are in the same case, co-ordinate words.

cf. also *tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhārayoḥ 1.2.42*

kā adhikaraṇaśabdaḥ abhidheyavacī /

samānādhikaraṇaḥ samānābhidheyāḥ /

24. *avayavayogaiṣā ṣaṣṭhī*

“This is sixth case signifying a part”

cf. *bhā* on *ekāco dve prathamasya 6.1.1 vā 2*

“In place of the first portion containing a single vowel there are two”

avayavayogaiṣā ṣaṣṭhī / dhātorya ekājavayava iti /

“That part of a *dhātu* containing a single vowel.”

(and on *dāderdhātorḍhaḥ 8.2.32*)

“Of a *dhātu* beginning with a *d, gh* is *ādeśa* for *h* before *jhal* or when final in a *pada*.”

dhātoryo dādiravayava iti

“That *dhātu* having *a* as its initial part.”

26. *cikīṛṣati// a 12.14.19*

Śa Bra 1.9.2, 23

“to wish, to make or do, intend to do, intend, begin, strive after...”

jihīṛṣati// a 2.25.3, 5.29.15

“to wish to take to oneself, or appropriate, covet, desire, long for.”

13.26 *vyāpadeśivadbhāvena/*

“By its nature of ‘having a name’ or representing (a secondary thing as a principal one). For example, a person or thing, without any second (or third etc.) is looked upon as the first or the last.”

cf. “*vyāpadeśivad ekasmin*” *pari 30*

“(An operation which affects) something, on account of a special designation which attaches to the latter, affects that which likewise stands alone (and to which therefore, just because the reason for it does not exist, that special designation does not attach).”

ādyantavadekasmin 1.1.21

“An operation should be performed on a single letter as upon an initial or upon final.”

(Of frequent occurrence in *M.Bh.*)

e.g. *pa pa vā 18 // sūtre vyākaraṇe śaṣṭyartho ’nupapanna iti*

If the term ‘*vyākaraṇa*’ means *sūtra* (the rules), then the meaning of the genitive ending cannot be justified.

S.D. Joshi 139/40 *naiṣa doṣa ... vyāpadeśivadbhāvena bhaviṣyati/*

No difficulty here by means of treating (an item which cannot have a designation in primary sense of the term) like the item which has that designation (in the primary sense of the term).

13.27 “*Kyac* is also to be applied.”

supa ātmanaḥ kyac 3.1.8

“The *pratyaya kyac* optionally acts in the sense of wishing after a word ending in a *sup/case pratyaya* expressing the object wished as connected with the wisher himself/herself.”

putrīyati, “He desires a son of his own.”

14.1 *asāmārthyān na/*

“Because of there being no syntactical connection/absence of syntactical connection.”

cf. *dadhnā paṭuḥ/ dhṛtena paṭuḥ/ asāmārthyādatra*

Clever by means of curds/clever by means of ghee. Here (compounding) will not take place.

(*samāso*) *na bhaviṣyati/ kathamasāmārthyam/*

Because there is no semantic connection. How is there no semantic connection?

sāpekṣasasamarthaṃ bhavati/ na daghnaḥ paṭunā sāmārthyam/

That which requires an outside word is treated as semantically unconnected. (No semantic connection of *dadhi* with *paṭu*.)

kena tarhi/ bhujinā/ daghnā bhukte paṭuriti/ bhāṣya 2.1.30

There is no semantic connection of *dadhi* with *paṭuḥ*. Then with what (is *dadhi* connected) With (the supplied verb) *bhuj* (to eat) as ‘a clever man eats the curds’.

14.2 *sāpekṣam 2.1.1 bhā*

asamarthaṃ bhavati / S.D.J. on SA 26

“That which requires (an outside word, i.e. a word outside the compound as its qualifier) is (treated) as semantically unconnected/expectancy in sense”.

If a word outside is connected with a word inside a compound especially a second or further member the sense becomes ambiguous, and expectancy in such cases is looked upon as a fault.

14.5 *ṛttipakṣaś cāvṛttipakṣaś ca//*

ṛttipakṣa/ The alternative method of compounding words as contrasted with simple words connected as a phrase or sentence.

ṛtti ṛtti lit. rolling, course *ṛ* (*ṛ*) *vartena*

The action use or occurrence of a word (in grammar) a complex formation which requires explanation or separation into its parts (as distinguished from a simple or uncompounded form).

e.g. any word formed with a *kṛt* or *taddhita pratyaya*, any compound and even duals and plurals which are regarded as *dvandva* compounds, of which only one number is left, and all derivative verbs. Both methods are found in use:

cf. *iha dvau pakṣau ṛttipakṣaścāvṛttipakṣaśca/*

svabhāvataścaitat bhavati vākyaṃ ca samāsaśca/

bhāṣya 2.1.1 394 vā 2

lines 3-6 identical except for *samāsa/pratyaya*

Two alternative views are here: the view of *ṛtti*, integration, and view of *avṛtti* non-integration, and this is naturally there; compound and sentence/ or non-compound expression.

3.3.7 *vā 30*

14.8 *tumun pratyaya/*

“A *kṛt pratyaya tum* forming the infinitive: ‘*tu*’ is *uccāraṇārtha* for purposes of pronunciation; *na* for initial *udātta* accent.”

by *ñnityādir nityam 6.1.197*

samānakartṛkeṣu tumun 3.3.158 (icchārtheṣu)

icchati bhoktum, “He desires to eat.”

Kai. tumunnantād iti / laghvevaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ bhavatīti bhāvaḥ/

vacanasāmarthyāc copapadaśravaṇaṃ bādhitvā pakṣe tadīye 'rthe sanpratyayo bhavati/

By force of the rule stated having barred the meaning of a subordinate word in compound, in the alternative meaning *san* is applicable.

Udyota. na vacanasāmarthyād iti / ata eva copapadā bhāvo 'pi tumun ṛttiviṣaye iti bodhyam

From the force of actual expression of the rule. Hence even in the absence of a subordinate word in construction *tumun* should be known as

applicable in sphere of integration/ compounding.

14.10 vā 11

Not discussed by *Kaiyaṭa* or *Nāgeṣa*. No examples known of the usage.

ḍu kṛñ (*karane ta u a 1472*) *liñ/ mip*

kṛ u tanādikṛñbhyaḥ uḥ 3.1.79

karah sārva dhātukārdhā dhātukayoḥ 7.3.84

kura ata ut sārva dhātuke 6.4.110

kur na bhakurcchurām 8.2.79 (*dirghaḥ, rvoḥ*)

kur yās yāsuṭparasmaipadesudātto nicca 3.4.103

kur yā liṅgaḥ salopa'nantyaṣya 7.2.79

kur ye ca 6.4.109 (*utah, lopah*)

kuryām tasthanamipām tāntattāmaḥ 3.4.102

3.1.7 vā 12

14.14 *luluṭhiṣṭe*

Only recorded here and 3.1.7 *vārttika 14*

luṭḥ (*bhvā ā se upaghāte 749*) *san*

luṭḥ tūdi pa saṃśleṣaṇe 1381

luṭḥa div pa viloḍane 1222

pipatiṣati, to be about to fly or fall

pat! (*bhvā pa se gatau 845*)

(cf. Zd pat Gk petomai, pipto Lat. peto)

A.V. Mantr. S. Ś. Br.

3-4 *cetanāvata etad kūlaṃ cācetanam*

“Only for that ‘having consciousness’/‘sentient’, but the bank lacks consciousness.” *Pat.* uses this contrast seven times: 1.1.50, 11, 123, 79, 125, 15/16etc.

14.13 *śvā mumūrṣati*

“The dog wishes or is about to die/face death.”

mṛñ (*tu ā a prāṇatyāge*) *san 1404*

iko jhal (*kit*) 1.2.9

kiti ca 1.1.5 (*na guṇa*)

mṛ ajjhanagamām sani 6.4.16 (*dirghaḥ*)

mura udoṣṭhyapūrvasya 7.1.102 (*u*)

uraṇ raparaḥ 1.1.51 (*r*)

mumūrṣati hali ca 8.2.77 (*dirghaḥ*)

2.18.196 *Kai*

śunaścaīnye'pi jīvitasya priyatvāt

vyādhyādyabhibhave 'pi tiryavatvāt martumicchā nāsti/

“Even though a dog has consciousness, because of the nature of the love for life, when attacked by disease etc. (even for an animal there is no desire to die).”

3.1.7 vā 13

14.13.7/8

śvānaḥ khalv api mumūrśava ekāntaśilā śūnā bhavanti

“Also dogs indeed who are about to die are habitually alone and their organs of sense/eyes become swollen.”

nā śūnākṣā iti prasṛtākṣā ityarthah/

śūnyākṣā iti viṣayagrāhicakṣuṣa ity arthaḥ/

Nāgeśa observes *śūnākṣa* means protruding eyes (another) reading *śūnyākṣa* (‘Vacant eyes’) means the eyes do not perceive the object.

3.1.7 vā 14.15

14.15 *upamānād vā siddham*

upamāna// n. comparison, resemblance, analogy, simile: the object with which anything is compared (*Pāṇ.*), standard of comparison, a particle of comparison; (in log.) recognition of likeness, comparison (the third of the four *pramānas* or means of correct knowledge).

cf. *upamānāni sāmānyavacanaiḥ* 2.1.55

“The case-inflected words denoting ‘objects of comparison’ are compounded with words denoting what is likened to them, by reason of the latter possessing qualities in common with the former and the compound is a *tatpuruṣa*.”

e.g. *ghana śyāna* cloud-black (*kṛṣṇa*)

upamāna upameya – sāmānya

2.14.26 – *na tiñantenopamānamasti*

A simile/comparison is not possible with a finite verb/*tiñ* ending, (because they are *sādhya*, to be accomplished, not *siddha*, already accomplished).

Kai. tiñantārtheneti bhāvah

The sense ‘with that having the meaning of a finite verb/*tiñ* ending’.

iva śabdaprayoge tu

However, there is ‘superimposition’ in the case of the word *iva*.

adhyāropo vidyate roditīva gāyati nrtyatīva

As if dancing, he sings as though weeping.

paripūrṇena ca nyūnasyopamānaṃ bhavati

And the comparison is that of less (than perfect) with that accomplished (perfect, whole or complete).

kriyā ca sarvā svāśraye samāpteti nyūnatvāsambhavas tāsyaṃ / tad uktam

“And all verbal activity (finds) completion/perfection in its own substratum. It was stated that is not possible.”

14.16 *yenaiva hetunā haṃsaḥ patatīty abhidhīyate/*

“The reason why one uses the expression ‘it flies’ in regard to a swan is found completely in an *āti*.”

ātau tasya samāptatvād upamārtho na vidyate/ vā pa 3.9.57

(Sparrow) also.

Therefore there is no scope for comparison

bhinna jātiyānām ca kriyānām sādrśyaṃ nāsti

And there is no similarity for different types of verbal activity as

bhukta iva gacchatīti //

‘He goes as if he eats’ (is not possible).

3.1.7 vā 15 sarvasya vā cetanāvāt//

Or else the usages are established because of everything having consciousness

Kai. ātmādvaitadarśaneti bhāvah/

The sense is ‘through the perception or realisation of the non-dual self’.

2.15.3 *suvarcalā ādityamanu paryeti*

“*Suvarcalā* (wife of the Sun) follows the sun in going round.”

= *dhanvantari*

Moving in a curve, N. of a deity to whom oblations were offered in the North East quarter *Kaus* 74 of the Sun *M.Bh.* 3.155 Physician of the Gods *M.Bh.* (*Nighaṇṭu*)

survarcalā ośadhiviśeṣa

A particular kind of medicinal herb or plant, linseed *Polarisia*. *Icosandra*.

suvarcalādivyakāntā sūryabhaktā sukhodbhavā /

“Beloved wife of *Āditya*, devotee of the sun, arisen from pleasure.”

Found in *sauvarcalam* - belonging to or coming from *suvarcala* N. of a country, n. (or in) sochal salt (prepared by boiling down soda with emblic myrobalan *Kaus.S.* 36.12

sauvarcalam ośadhivat śuklaprasanam

like medicine with white blossom

Dānlabhāṣya explains

suvarcalā prasiddhā/ trisandhyāsadrśī

“Three divisions of the day (dawn, noon, sunset) like *Hibiscus Rosa Sinensis* flower.”

Kai. vedah sarvabhāvānām caitanyaṃ pratipādayatīty arthah/

“The meaning is that the *Veda* teaches the consciousness of all beings/ states/objects.”

śṛṇota grāvānu // ‘Hearken, O ye Soma pressing stones’.

Tai Saṃ 1.3.13.1

Mai Saṃ 1.3.1

Kā Saṃ 3.9

3.1.7 vā 15

1. *ima iti //* Many *iṣ dhātus* are read in the *Dhātu Pāṭha*.

Kai. śāśnāśyanvikaraṇāstraya ity arthah/

The meaning is three *vikaranas*.

Cl. 6 ś (*iṣu tu pa se 1351 icchāyām*)

Cl. 9 śnā (*iṣa kryā tu pa se 1424 ābhikṣṇye*)

Cl. 4 śyun (*iṣa di tu pa se 1127 gatau*)

2. *tatreti* In that context

iccheti nipātanaṃ trayāṇāmapi sambhavati iti manyate

He thinks that because there is the irregular form laid down *icchā* 3.13.101 there is also possible a formation from all three of them

chatvabhāvina iti //

because of the *pratyaya śa* acting after *iṣ dhātu*.

icchā 3.3.101

The form *icchā* is laid down as an irregular form /*nipātana*

Kai. icchēti śapratyayo yogabhāvaśca nipātyate/

The *pratyaya śa* (acts after *iṣ* because of the indicatory *ś*) by

iṣugamiyamām chaḥ 7.3.77 (*śiti*)

(*ch* is *ādeśa* of *śa* of *iṣ*) and irregularly there is absence of *yak* ordained by *sārvadhātuke yak* 3.1.67

kāntikarmaṇaḥ // for that which conveys/produces desire.

Kai. kāntiḥ kāmanā/ desire

abhilāṣastatkriyasyetyarthaḥ The meaning is of that which forms the desire.

anvicchati ityasya gaveśayatīyartho na tu

The meaning of this *anvicchati* is to seek after, search.

kāmayata iti sanna bhavati/ but not to desire, so *san* is not applicable.

iṣorubhe karmaṇi Both are objects of (*dhātu*) *iṣ* (to desire)

Kai. yo hi grāmagamanam icchati tasyeṣikriyayomayam īpsitam na kevalo grāmo nāpi kevalam gamanam ity arthaḥ/

“For he who desires to go to the village both are desired to be attained by the action of *iṣ* (to desire) not only the village nor even only the going.”

6. *gatyarthakarmaṇi dviṭīyacaturthyau ceṣṭāyāmanadhavani* 2.3.12

“In the use of *dhātus* implying motion, the place to which motion is directed takes the *pratyayas* of the second (*karman*) and fourth (*saṃpradhāna*) *vibhakti* is in denoting the object when physical motion is meant and the *karman* is not a word expressing a road.”

grāmaṃ / grāmāya gacchati/ He goes to the village.

manasā hariṃ vrajati He goes mentally to *Hari*.

15.10 *parasādhana iti*

a different operator/*kāraka*

Kai. parasyena sādhanam yatkarma tatra lakāro utpadyate/

tac ca gamanameva na tu grāma ity arthaḥ/

For that *karman* which is the instrument of the accomplishment of a different *iṣ* to go, the *la* (tense *pratyaya*) arises and that *iṣ* is (desire for) going only, but not the (desire for) the village. This is the meaning.

ajā nīyate grāmamiti/

1.4.51, 335 *parasādhana utpadyamānena lenājāyā abhidhāna na prāpnoti*

The goat is brought to the village.

Here the *pratyayas* called *l* being generated to express the different *sādhana* an(operator-*kāraka*) would incorrectly not express (the object *ajā* = goat).

15.13 *arthagatyarthah śabdaprayogaḥ/ artha sampratyāyayiṣyāmīti śabdah prayujyate/*

“The use of words is for comprehension of meaning. A word is used thus (with the intention) ‘I will cause the meaning to be understood.’”

Maxim repeated word for word

1.1.44 2, 105

2.1.1 17, 370

5.2.94 20, 692

13 *uktārthānām prayogaḥ//*

“There is no (re-)employment (of linguistic units to express) meanings which have already been expressed.”

Frequently used in *M.Bh.* see *Pari. 51* of *Paribhāṣāpāṭhas* of *Vyādi.* See *Par 28, 46*

Kātantra, 47 Kalāpa

15.21. *jugupsīṣate // guptijkidbhyaḥ san 3.1.5*

“He desires to abhor.”

mīmāṃsīṣate mānbadānaśānbhyodīrghaś cābhyāsasya 3.1.6

3.1.7 *śloka vārttika*

15.22 *śaiṣikān* Remaining or remnant, used with reference to a *taddhita pratyaya* prescribed in senses other than those mentioned before the *sūtra śeṣe 4.2.92*

‘The *pratyayas* taught hereafter have senses other than those mentioned before this.’

‘Let a meaning other than those of which progeny (*tasyāpatyam 4.1.92*) was first mentioned, and the fourfold meaning the last, be called *śeṣa* and in that remainder of senses let there be the *pratyayas an* etc.’

e.g. *śrāvaṇaḥ* audible, namely sound from *śrāvaṇaḥ aupaniṣadaḥ* treated of in the *Upaniṣads* i.e. the Self.

15.22 *matubarthīyān*

Pratyayas having the sense of *matup* i.e. in the sense of possession.

matup taddhita pratyaya changed in some cases to *vat*

(*mādupadhāyāś ca matorvo yavādibhyaḥ 8.29*)

“For the *ma* of the *pratyaya mat* is substituted *va* if the stem ends in *sa* or *a* (and *ā*) or if these are in the penultimate position but not after *yaya* and the rest applied after any noun or substitute/substantive in the sense of who possesses that, which contains that or in the popular sense of possession.”

(*mata manta ī*)

tadasyāstyāsminn iti matup 5.2.94

“The *pratyaya matup* acts after a word with the first case in construction in the sense of whose it is or in whom it is.”

gavo 'sya santi gomat gomān devadattaḥ

“Devadatta having (or rich in) cows.”

vṛkṣā asmin santi vṛkṣavat vṛkṣavān parvataḥ

“A mountain having trees on it.”

There are other *taddhita pratyayas* prescribed in the same senses as *matup*:
lac (5.2.96-98) *ilac* (19 100 105 117) *śa na* (100) *ṇa* (101) *vini* (102, 121,
122) *ani* (102, 115, 116, 128, 129-137) *aṅ* (103, 104) *uraca* (106) *ra* (107)
ma (108) *va* (109, 110) *iran irac* (111) *valac* (112, 113) *ṭhan* (115, 116) *ac*
(127) *ba bha su ti tu tra yasa* and *matup* after *rasa* etc.
matubadhikāra is 5.2.92-140

London

U.K.