

PĀṆINI AND PĀṆINĪYAS ON THE ŚEṢA-DEVICE*

A.C. Sarangi

1.0 Introductory

The word Śeṣa i.e 'rest' or 'remainder' has been used sixteen times in Pāṇini(P)'s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (*Aṣṭ*). Through out the *Aṣṭ*, P has maintained consistency as far as the meaning of this theoretical terminology is concerned. But at times the later Pāṇinīyas have put forth different views in connection with the meaning or purpose of this term Śeṣa which seems to be alien to Pāṇinian procedure. Hence, an humble attempt has been made here to examine the opinions of later Grammarians including Kātyāyana (Kty) and Patañjali (Ptj)

1.1 Theoretical Terminology versus Technical Terminology

At the outset, a clear-cut distinction should be made between these two types of terminology used by P. Grammar is no doubt a technical treatise and P has used technical terms in his *Aṣṭ*, be they artificial, self-explanatory or sample terms. Broadly speaking, as Ptj has opined, all these can be termed as technical terms. Besides these technical terms, P has used some other meaningful terms which help in understanding his Sūtras. He has not felt the necessity to analyse them. He freely borrows these terms from other sciences, literature or simply from usage.

1.1.1 Paul Kiparsky⁽¹⁾ has categorised these terms under six groups like (1) semantic terms which P thought to be the task of philosophy to analyse and hence he abstained from analysing (2) terms pertaining to ritual and vedic studies viz. *Chhandas*, *Yajus*, *Ṛc*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Mantra* and *Bhāṣā* etc. (3) terms denoting elementary spatial relations between objects like *ādī*, *anta*, *pūrva*, *para*, *madhya* etc. (4) terms referring to the form and application of grammatical rules. These include, *lakṣana*, *vidhi*, *sthāna*, *sthānin*, *prakṛti upadeśa*, *ādeśa*, *prāpti*, *siddha*, *asiddha*, *vipratīṣedha* *adhikāra akathita*, *anabhihita* and the Śeṣa. True, these terms are not analysed by P, but they are used throughout the *Aṣṭ* with proper consistency. They help in formulating certain meta-rules which help in interpreting the Sūtras. To quote Kiparsky⁽²⁾: "They are meta-grammatical in the sense that they refer not to concepts about which grammatical analysis must theorise, but to the basic equipment which one brings to the very task of grammatical analysis." He further adds, "it should be noted that many of these terms are common property of the Sūtra-technique as applied not only in grammar but also in ritual and elsewhere." In this perspective let us analyse the Śeṣa terminology which has been successfully utilized by P as a device which is sure to help in interpreting Sūtras. This also is bound to contribute much to the grammatical thought, once a deeper analysis is carried on in all his Sūtras referring to this Śeṣa device. Two more categories of such terms i.e. (5) and (6) are phonological and other grammatical terms, the analysis of which is beyond the scope of this paper.

1.1.2 Although some apparently looking synonymous terms are used by P in different contexts, they are not used with similar meaning conditions. For example, the terms like *Śeṣa*, *Akathita* and *Anabhihita* look like synonymous terms and the later grammarians too have raised similar issues during their discussions. But all agree to the fact that these terms are actually not synonymous and formally each has its specific role to play. In a few cases, loosely, *Śeṣa* may be compared with the terms like *anyataḥ* (4.1.10). Here the distinction between the *Śeṣa* on the one hand and the words like *anyataḥ* (4.1.10), *anyebhyaḥ* (3.2.173, 3.3.130, 3.2.75) *anyeṣām* (6.3.137) and *anyeṣu* (3.2.10) on the other hand is clearly discernible. When P takes recourse to the *Śeṣa*-device, all the possible instances under his observation seem to be complete. But when he uses other words like *anyataḥ* etc., he does not seem to be sure about the completeness of his observation. The terminology *Śeṣa* is formally introduced by P as a device and once he has introduced the term, he has stuck to this throughout.

2. The Śeṣa-Device

P has followed this device to put together instances which have not been taken care of by earlier rules. After enumerating special cases, P formulates a general rule to cover the remaining instances which he calls *Śeṣa*. The following are the Sūtras where P makes a general statement utilizing this device in relation to the special cases stated earlier.

2.1 śeṣāt kartari parasmaipadam (1.3.78)

This rule declares that the suffixes of the *Parasmaipada* are enjoined in the sense of the agent after all the verbs not falling under previously stated 66 Sūtras i.e. from 1.3.12 to 1.3.77. Thus the *Śeṣa* here denotes the remaining cases.

2.2. śeṣo ghyasakhi, (1.4.7)

Here also the word *Śeṣa* is used with relation to previously stated Sūtras: 1.4.3-6. This Sūtra explains the technical term *ghi*. The word *hrasva* is understood here. The Sūtra means: the rest of the words ending in short *i* or *u* (which are not the names of females, or if they are feminine names, they are not *nadī* words) are called *ghi* with the exception of the word *sakhi*. Other two Sūtras 1.4.8 and 1.4.9 also define *ghi* but these are again special cases in respect to this general rule that defines the term *ghi*.

2.3. śeṣe prathamāḥ (1.4.108)

The verbal terminations are called the lowest or *prathama puruṣa* when in agreement with verbs and the accompanying words are not *yusmad* 'you' or *asmad* 'I'. Here the statement *Śeṣa* is used in relation to the rules, 1.4.105-107 which prescribe the 2nd person and 1st person terminations.

2.4. lṛṭ śeṣe ca (3.3.13)

The affix *lṛṭ* is enjoined with a root in the remaining cases i.e. when the futurity is pure and simple. The word *Śeṣa* here is relational with respect to Sūtras 3.3.3-12.

2.5. śeṣe lṛṭ ayadau (3.3.151)

In the remaining cases i.e. in cases where the words *yacca* or *yatra* are not used to imply wonder and the word *yadī* is not accompanied, the first future is used in preference to the potential. Here the word *Śeṣa* is used in relation to Sūtras, 3.3.148-150 where the stated

conditions are enumerated.

2.6. ārdhadhātukaṁ śeṣaḥ 3.4.114

The remaining suffixes i.e. the suffixes other than *tiṅ* and *śit* (3.4.113) are called *ārdhadhātuka* (in the *dhātu-adhikāra*). The word *Śeṣa* here is used with respect to the previous Sūtra, *tiṅ-śit sāravadhātukam*, 3.4.113. The following three Sūtras are the special enumerations of this type of suffixes.

2.7. śeṣe (4.2.92)

This is a section-heading rule up to 4.3.134. According to this Sūtra, the suffixes to be taught in this section would have senses other than stated earlier (4.1.92–4.2.91).

2.8. śeṣād vibhāṣā (5.4.154)

The suffix *Kaṭ* is enjoined after all *Bahuvrīhi* compounds after which no *samāsānta* suffix has been enjoined earlier.⁽³⁾ Kaiyaṭa says that the word *Śeṣa* in 5.4.154 does not refer to compounds which have not been prescribed so far i.e. to all *Bahuvrīhi*-compounds but only to those compounds which are formed by the Sūtra, *anekam anyapaḍārthe* (2.2.24)

2.9. nadyāḥ śeṣasya anyatarasyām (6.3.44)

In all the remaining feminine words called *nadī*, the substitution of short vowel is optional under the meaning conditions just stated in the previous Sūtra, *gha-rūpa-kalpa-celaḍ-bruba-gotramata-hateṣu nyah-anekācaḥ-hrasvaḥ* (6.3.43) Here also the *Śeṣa* refers to the previous Sūtra and means thereby these feminines which are not formed by long *ī* and are called *nadī* and those feminines which end in long *ī* but consist of one syllable.

2.10. śeṣe lopah (7.2.90)

In the remaining cases i.e. where *ā* or *y* is not substituted⁽⁴⁾ the finals of *yusmad* and *asmad* are to be dropped. The word *Śeṣa* here is used for the sake of clarity, although universally before all case-suffixes the finals are dropped.

2.11. halādiḥ śeṣaḥ (7.4.60)

This Sūtra simply means that out of the consonants of the reduplicate, (i.e. *abhyāsa*) the remainder (*Śeṣa*) is the initial consonant. The *Kāśikā-vṛtti* (*KV*) paraphrases *śiṣyate* as *avasthāpyate*, i.e. 'retained'. Thus of the reduplicate, the first consonant is retained and the rest syllables are dropped⁽⁵⁾.

2.12. śeṣe vibhāṣā (8.1.41)

In the association of the word *āho*, a finite verb retains its accent optionally in the senses other than praise.⁽⁶⁾ The word *Śeṣa* is used here in locative conveying the meaning condition other than the sense stated earlier i.e. praise.

2.13. śeṣe vibhāṣā (8.1.50)

Here too this Sūtra prescribes that the verb retains accent optionally when the particles *āho* and *utāho* do not precede the verb. The word *Śeṣa* is used with reference to the previous Sūtra *āho-utāho ca anyatarasyām* (8.1.49)

2.14. śeṣe vibhāṣā akakhādāv aśānta upadeśe (8.4.18)

The Sūtra speaks of the phonological change of the prefix *ni* to *ṇi* preceding to the verbs other than those stated in the earlier Sūtra (8.4.17) when these verbs are preceded by *upasarga* competent to cause the change, provided that in the original enunciation the verbs have not an

initial *ka* or *kha*, nor end with *ṣa*. The statement *Śeṣa* here has a clear reference to the previous Sūtra (8.4.17).

In all these previous cases the *Śeṣa*-device has been utilized mainly with reference to the previous Sūtra or Sūtras and the opinions of the commentators are mostly the same with the opinion of P as far as the meaning and purpose of the *Śeṣa*-device utilized in the *Aṣṭ* are concerned.

3.0. The *Śeṣa*-device and the Pāṇinian notion of syntax as well as semantics

P's *Aṣṭ* deals with all the four branches of linguistics i.e. phonology and morphology explicitly, semantics and syntax implicitly. The semantics and syntax are like the two sides of the same coin. The discussion of the one is incomplete without that of the other. Behind each utterance there lies the meaning-input implicitly. It is the grammarian's duty to cautiously frame the Sūtras with proper meaning-conditions in order to avoid the over-statements caused by the over-application of his Sūtras. The syntax, as defined by J.A.F. Roodbergen,⁽⁷⁾ "is that part of grammar which studies the way in which words are formally organised into a larger meaningful combinations with a view to enabling the listener to correctly interpret the speaker's intention". In this context, the *Śeṣa*-device followed in two important Sūtras i.e. *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* (2.3.23) and *ṣaṣṭhi śeṣe* (2.3.50) may be taken for a deeper analysis. Out of these two rules, although the Sūtra *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* is a rule for compounding and the compound-formations belong to morphology, the pāṇinian notion of compound-theory strictly adheres to syntactic and semantic relationship of different words in the stage of non-technical constituent analysis.⁽⁸⁾

3.1. *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* (2.2.23)

3.1.1 This Sūtra defines the compound *Bahuvrīhi* with the help of the *Śeṣa*-device. Simply this Sūtra means that the remaining compound is *Bahuvrīhi*. Again the word *Śeṣa* here is used in relation to the earlier Sūtras which prescribe the compound-formations of *Avyayibhāva* and *Tatpuruṣa*. The word *Śeṣa* here is used in the nominative and probably refers to the *Samāsa* in the Sūtra *prāk kadārāt samāsaḥ* (2.1.3). This is the view of the *Kāśikākāra*⁽⁹⁾ when he says that *Bahuvrīhi* comes in when other compounds are not stated. Here Haradatta and Jinen-drabuddhi too bring home to the same view.⁽¹⁰⁾

3.1.2 Kty does not say anything clearly on the word *Śeṣa* on the preseat Sūtra. He just rejects two possible alternatives. (i) *Śeṣa* cannot mean *śeṣaḥ śabdaḥ*, as all the compoundable words have been stated earlier.⁽¹¹⁾ (ii) *Śeṣa* cannot mean *śeṣaḥ arthaḥ* as all meanings have already been covered earlier.⁽¹²⁾

3.1.3 Ptj agrees with the views expressed by Kty by refuting these two alternatives and gives at last his own comment: *trikas tarhi śeṣa-grahaṇam, yasya trikasya anuktaḥ samāsaḥ sa śeṣaḥ. kasya cāmuktaḥ. prathamāyāḥ*. For Ptj, *Śeṣa* here refers to the *vibhakti* and so the remaining triplet is the nominative case with reference to which compound formation has not yet been specially prescribed. As P has framed some special Sūtras like *saptamī viśeṣaṇe bahuvrīhau* (2.2.35) justifying the compounds like *kaṇṭhekālah*, it is indicated that generally the constituents are in nominative in *Bahuvrīhi*. Ptj specifically asserts that *Śeṣa* must not refer to *Samāsa* to exclude the *Avyayibhāva* compounds like *ummattagaṅgam*,⁽¹³⁾ conveying *anyapadārtha* which is a pre-

requisite of *Bahuvrīhi*.⁽¹⁴⁾ But the very fact is that non-appositional constituents are possible in *Bahuvrīhi* compounds. May be, Ptj has failed to read the mind of P here and most probably *Śeṣaḥ-Samāsaḥ* as the *Kāśikākāra* believes, is correct.

3.1.4 The Grammarians beginning from Kty onwards do not seem to be sure about the Pāṇinian usage of this *Śeṣa*-device here. Although Kty's view is not clearly stated here, Kaiyaṭa following Ptj tries to convince us that the word *Śeṣa* in this Sūtra is redundant and hence it must not be understood in the Sūtra *anekam anyapadārthe* (2.2.24). Then only the *Bahuvrīhi* compounds like *dvīrāvātīkaḥ* (*deśaḥ*) will be justified even though the Sūtra, *naḍibhīśica* (2.1.20) prescribes the *Avyayībhāva* with a numeral as its first member. On the other hand, if the word *Śeṣa* is not retained in the Sūtra, *śeṣo bahuvrīhiḥ* (2.2.23) and then not understood in the Sūtra *anekam anyapadārthe* (2.2.24), the compounds like *ummattagaṅgam* etc. will come under *Bahuvrīhi* as well as *Avyayībhāva* and as the latter is specially prescribed, it prevails over the former. Hence the conclusion follows that the word *Śeṣa* is not required in the Sūtra. Again Ptj understands *Śeṣa* in the Sūtra *cārthe dvandvaḥ* (2.2.29). But the examples discussed there (viz. *vaiyākaraṇayājñikau* and *kṛtākṛte*) never show to prove that the *Anuvṛtti* of *Śeṣa* is necessary there. However, in the context of compounds, a general statement like *śeṣaḥ samāsaḥ* seems to be a more practical solution.

3.2. *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe* (2.3.50)

3.2.0 The Sūtra just means that the sixth case-suffix is enjoined in the remaining cases i.e. the genitive endings express the notions not covered so far. The KV explains the present rule as *karmādibhyo yo'nyāḥ, prātipadikārthavyatiriktāḥ svasāmīsambandhādīḥ śeṣaḥ*. Thus, according to him, the word *Śeṣa* refers to the owner-owned relation etc. which is other than *karman* etc. and different from the nominal stem-meaning.

3.2.1 Kty is silent regarding the meaning of the word *Śeṣa* in the present Sūtra. Ptj explains the meaning of *Śeṣa* here as *Karmādibhyo ye anyerthāḥ sa śeṣaḥ*. Ptj clearly states that *Śeṣa* means any relation other than the *Kāraka* relations. Again he himself raises the counter question:

yady evaṁ śeṣo na prakalpate, na hi karmādibhyo'nye arthāḥ santi. Here Kaiyaṭa comes forward and clarifies the *pūrvapakṣin's* stand taken by Ptj that *Śeṣa*-relations pre-suppose *kriyā-kāraka* relations irrespective of the actual expression of the verb and for this he quotes Bharṭṛhari.⁽¹⁵⁾ Ptj is not satisfied with his first definition of *Śeṣa* (i.e. other than *Karman* etc.) and redefines the term as *karmādīnam avivakṣā*. Thus Ptj leaves the grammatical control to the sweet will of the speaker. The *vivakṣā* technique probably is first referred to by Candragomin who justifies different modes of *Kāraka*-expressions to the wish of the speaker.⁽¹⁶⁾ Candragomin avoids the *Śeṣa*-device here and for genitive relations he frames the Sūtra *ṣaṣṭhī sambandhe* (C 2.1.95). That *vivakṣā* being not a grammatical concept, is perhaps hinted by Ptj, himself, when he says that there cannot be absence of any intention to express what does exist and so he gives examples from the usage viz. *alomikā eḍakā* (*a woolless-goat*), and *anudarā kanyā* (*no-belly-girl*) etc. But this argument seems to be unscientific as he mixes up linguistics with rhetorics.

3.2.2 The *Kāraka*-theory is the key-stone of the Pāṇinian syntactical arch. The neo-grammarians have gone deep into the subject and have clearly visualized the deep and the

surface structure of a sentence. In this context the genitive endings conveying the different relations may be looked into as the surface structure and the underlying *Kriyā-kāraka* relation as the deep structure. In the example, *pituh putrah*, the genitive ending expresses the producer-product relation whereas one can choose the *Kriyā-kāraka* relation and can use the sentence as *pitā putram ajanayat*.

3.2.3 The *Śeṣa*-relations are other than the *Prātipadikārtha* or *Kāraka* relations. In a phrase like *nīlah ghaṭaḥ* “an indigo-blue jar” both the *Prātipadikas* are in in appositional rereationship. The *Kāraka*-relations are always established with the action. On the other hand, the *Śeṣa*-relations pre-suppose *Kriyā-kāraka* relations and hence there is no need to take the help of a non-grammatical device like *vivakṣā*. It will not be out of place to investigate the deep structure of one example viz. *naṭasya śṛṇoti*. Here *naṭa* does not come under any *Kāraka*-designation, not even it can be termed as *akathita-karman* as the root *śru* is not included in the list of verbs which take double accusatives. Hence the genitive case-ending is added to the word *naṭa* by *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe* (2.3.50).

3.2.4 Later commentators starting from Ptj onwards hold the view that the word *Śeṣa* is continued from 2.3.50 to 2.3.64. Joshi-Roodbergen have rightly remarked that this goes against the rules for *Anuvṛtti*⁽¹⁷⁾ as *Śeṣa* and *Karman* etc are incompatible terms. If *Śeṣa* is to be understood and interpreted as *avivakṣā*, the Sūtras 2.3.51–64 will be redundant as the intended *kāraka*-relations can be expressed by the Sūtras 2.3.2 etc. and the *Śeṣa* relations can be expressed by 2.3.50. To make these (2.3.51–64) Sūtras meaningful the motif is attached by the later *Pāṇinīyas* that genitive endings must be added in these cases and in no other situation they will be dropped because the restatement will have an emphatic value. Hence compounding is not allowed as in compounds there arises the question of deletion of the endings. As a consequence, the *Vārttika* (Vt.) 1 on 2.2.10 directing non-compounding of a *pratipadavidhānā ṣaṣṭhī* (2.3.51–64) becomes redundant. The very Vt. of Kty goes to prove that he too did not conceive any such idea in connection with the *Vivakṣā*.

3.2.5 The Sūtra, *adhīgarthadayeśāṃ karmani* (2.3.52) prescribes genitive ending to express *karman* in connection with the verbs having the senses of *adhī* (to remember) *day* (to distribute) and *iś* (to be the owner of). Ptj explains the Sūtra by providing us with the examples like *mātuḥ smarati*. The passive form will be *mātuḥ smaryate* for the justification of which Kty framed a Vt, *karmādiṣu akarmakavat vacanam* (2.3.52.1). Ptj takes the plea of the suffix *vat* in the Vt and justifies his intended example like *mātā smaryate* as passive form for *mātaram smarati*. But strictly to P, the usage like *mātaram smarati* was undesired and to avoid such wrong construction he framed a special Sūtra (2.3.52). Kty’s Vt. (1) here seems to be intended solely to justify Pāṇinian usage and so it is a clear indication that the *Śeṣa* is not understood in 2.3.52 and the *śeṣa* should not be redefined as *avivakṣā*.

4. Concluding Remarks

4.1 All the above said instances only go to prove that P is systematic throughout his *Aṣṭ* when he has taken the help of this device. Always he has placed such general Sūtras at the end of the particular sections after enumerating special instances in the beginning. The *Śeṣa* has

always been used by P in the sense of residue.

4.2 Kty's position with regard to the device is at times not clear but sufficient indication is given here that he followed P very closely. May be, he understood P better as he was closer to P chronologically than other Pāṇinīyas.

4.3 One may wonder as to the intention of Ptj as well as that of the later commentators who usually follow Ptj in connection with all sorts of grammatical conflicts.⁽¹⁸⁾ Although some grammatical justifications have been suggested here and there, one is at a loss to see the way Ptj at times tries to interpret the Śeṣa-device. Ptj appears to be unhistorical when he redefines Śeṣa as *avivakṣā*. As has been stated earlier, the *vivakṣā* is quite alien to the grammatical instruction and hence such a free-licence is quite unwarranted in the hands of a speaker whether he is a *śiṣṭa* (i.e. the learned) or not. P took such a metagrammatical concept like Śeṣa and successfully utilized it as a basic equipment to explain his grammatical analysis but Ptj, a great grammarian, went away so much from the original intentions of P by taking recourse to *vivakṣā*: This appears strange.

REFERENCES

- *This paper was accepted for presentation in the Indian Linguistics- Section of the All-India Oriental Conference held in the University of Jaipore, Rajasthan during 29-31, October, 1982.
- (1) *Pāṇini as a Variationist*, Ed. by S.D. Joshi, (Poona University), 1979, pp. 217 ff.
 - (2) Loc. cit.
 - (3) From the Sūtra, *uraḥ prabhṛtibhyaḥ kap* (5.4.151) upto *nadī-ṛtaśca* (5.4.153).
 - (4) See Sūtras, 7.3.84-7.3.89.
 - (5) Unlike other Sūtras, the Śeṣa- device here has nothing to do with the previous Sūtras.
 - (6) See the Sūtra, *tu-paśya- paśyata- ahaiḥ- pūjāyām* (8.1.39).
 - (7) See J.A.F. Roodbergen, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya: Bahuvrīhi-Dvandvāhnikā*. Ed. by S.D. Joshi. University of Poona, (1974), Introduction: p. iv, n. 16.
 - (8) Ibid, p. XLii.
 - (9) See *Kāśikā* on 2.2.23; *upayuktād anyah śeṣah. śeṣo samāso bahuvrīhisamjño bhavati. kaśca śeṣah? yatrānyah samāso noktaḥ.*
 - (10) See Padamañjarī on 2.2.23: *yeṣāṃ padānām yasmīnmarthe avyayībhāvādikah samāso na vihitaḥ sa śeṣa ityarthah.* Also see Nyāsa on the same Sūtra: *yatrānyā samāsasamjñā na vihityarthah.*
 - (11) Cf. Kty's Vt. 2.2.23.1: *śeṣa-vacanam padaścaścermābhāvāt* and *M* on this: *śeṣa-vacanam padaścet tanna-kiṃ kāraṇam. abhāvāt. na hi santi tāni padāni yeṣāṃ padānām anuktaḥ samāsaḥ.*
 - (12) Cf. Kty's Vt. 2.2.23.3: *arthaśced aviśiṣṭam.* Again *M* on this: *na hi santi te arthāḥ yeṣu anukta-samāsaḥ.*
 - (13) By the Sūtra, *anyaḥpadārthe ca samjñāyām* (2.1.21).
 - (14) By the Sūtra, *anekam anyaḥpadārthe* (2.2.24)
 - (15) See *Vākyapadīya (VP)*, III. 7.157:
VP, ed. by K.A. Subramania Iyer, Poona (Deccan College), 1963, p.354.
 - (16) See *Vṛtti* on C. 2.1.49: *vivakṣātaḥ kārakāṇi bhavanti.* For details regarding the present issue See S.D. Joshi, J.A.F. Roodbergen, *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Kārakāhnikā* (Poona University), 1975, pp. xvi-xviii.
 - (17) See Joshi-Roodbergen, *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Prātipadikārtha- Śeṣāhnikā* (Poona University) 1981, pp.80 ff.
 - (18) Cp. the oft-quoted maxim: *yathottaram muninām prāmānyam.*