VYĀKARAṆA MAHĀBHĀṢYA OF PATAÑJALI ON PĀṆINI 3.1 (ĀHNIKAS 1 TO 6) (4)*

Stephen Peter THOMPSON

16.1   supa ātmanaḥ kyac //3/1/8//

> kim arthaś cakāraḥ / svarārthaḥ / cito 'nta udātto bhavatīty
> antodāttatvaṃ yathā syāt / naitad asti prayojanam / ekājayaṃ
> tatra nārthaḥ svarārthena cakāreṇānubandhena / pratyaya-
> svareṇaiva siddham / viśeṣaṇārthas tarhi / kva viśeṣaṇā-
> rthenārthaḥ / asya cvau kyaci ca

16.5   (7.4.32-33) iti / kye ceti hy ucyamāne api kākaḥ śyenāyate
> atrāpi prasajyeta / naitad asti / tadanubandhakagra-
> haṇe 'tadanubandhakasya grahaṇaṃ nety evam etasya na
> bhaviṣyati // sāmānyagrahaṇāvighārthas tarhi / kva ca sāmānya-
> grahaṇāvighātārthenārthaḥ / naḥ kye (1.4.15) iti //

Pāṇini 3.1.8: The *pratyaya kyac* acts optionally in the sense of 'wishing for oneself' after a word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya* expressing the *karman*/object (wished) connected with the wisher's self.

Bhāṣya: What is the purpose of the letter *c*? For the purpose of accent. So that by (the rule) *'citaḥ' (antaḥ udāttaḥ) (6.1.163)* "There should be final *udāttaḥ* for that having an *it*/indicatory *c*". There should be final udātta. This is not the purpose. This (*pratyaya*) has only one vowel. Therefore there is no point in (attaching) an *it* letter *c* for the purpose of accent. By the (standard) *pratyaya* accent (by *ādyudāttaś ca 3.1.3*) the proper accent is established.

---

* The preceding parts of the present paper were published in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā*, vols. 23, 24, and 25. 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 providing those notes.

Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā 26, 2007
© Department of Indian Studies, Nagoya University

Then it is for the purpose of distinguishing. Where is the purpose of that which is meant for distinguishing? (In the *sutra*) *asya cvau* (*7.4.32*) ("A long *ī* is substituted for the final *a* or *ā* of a nominal stem before the (adverbial *pratyaya*) *cvi* (*5.4.50*) *abhūta tadbhāve kṛbhvastiyoge sampadyakartari cvi*") and *kyaci ca* (*7.4.33*) ("A long vowel *ī* is substituted for the final *a* or *ā* of an *aṅga*/nominal stem before the denominative *pratyaya kyac*").

For if '*kye ca*' is going to be uttered (instead of *kyaci ca*) here also it will wrongly apply in the form *śyenāyate* (from *kyaṅ*) in the sentence — *api kākaḥ śyenāyate* (Does the crow in fact behave like a hawk?) not 'Does the crow desire a hawk for itself'? This is not so. (The *paribhāṣa 82 tadanubandhakagrahaṇe tadanubandhakasya grahaṇam na.* "When a term with one or more *anubandha*/indicatory letters is employed (in grammar it does) not (denote) that which in addition to those (one or more *anubandhas*) has another *anubandha* attached to it", will not be applicable in this (form).

Then it is for the purpose of an unobstructed general mention and not a hindrance for the application of the term to others. And where is the meaning (found) of 'that which is meant for the purpose of unobstructed mention'? (In the *sutra*) *na kye* (*1.4.15*) "The word form ending in *n* is called *pada* when *kya* follows. (i.e. the *pratyayas kyac kyaṅ* and *kyaṣ*".

16.9 *athātmagrahaṇaṃ kim artham / ātmecchāyāṃ yathā syāt parecchāyāṃ mā bhūd iti / rājñaḥ putram icchatīti // kriyamāṇe 'pi vā ātmagrahaṇe parecchāyāṃ prāpnoti / kiṃ kāraṇam / ātmana itīyaṃ kartari ṣaṣṭī / iccetyakāro bhāve / sa yady evātmana icchaty athāpi parasyātmecchaivāsau bhavati // nātmagrahaṇenecchābhisambadhyate kiṃ tarhi / subantam abhisambadhyate / ātmano yat subantam iti // yady ātmagrahaṇaṃ kriyate chandasi parecchāyāṃ na prāpnoti / mā tvā vṛkả aghāyavo vidan / tasmān nārtha ātmagrahaṇena /*

Now what is the purpose of the word *ātman* (being mentioned)? So that (the *pratyaya*) acts in the sense of one's own desire and should not be applicable in the sense of another's desire e.g. *rājñaḥ putram icchati* 'He wants a son for the king'. Certainly, even when there is specific mention of the word *ātman* (for oneself), (the *pratyaya kyac*) obtains in the sense of another's desire. What is the reason? This word *ātmanaḥ* is

sixth case in the sense of agent (cf. *katṛkarmaņoḥ kṛti 2.3.65*). The word '*icchā*' is (derived with the) letter *a* (of the *pratyaya śa* by *3.3.101*) in the sense of state (of the *dhātu iṣ* to desire). Even if he in fact himself desires that (now) there is still his own desire for another.

(This is no fault) *icchā* 'desire' is not connected with mention of the word *ātman* (oneself). With what then? (It) is connected to that which ends in a *sup*/case *pratyaya*. Thus (it is connected with that) ending in a *sup*/case ending word (expressing his desire) for himself. If the mention of *ātman* (for oneself) is made in the *chandas*/Veda (*kyac*) does not obtain in the sense of desire for another (yet, we have the example in *Yaj. 4.34*). *mā tvā vṛkā āghāyavo vidan* "Let not the wolves desirous of evil know of (thy coming)". Therefore the mention of *ātmanaḥ* (for oneself) has no purpose.

Why is it not applicable here: *rājñaḥ putram icchati* 'He desires a son for the king'? Because of the absence of syntactical connection. How is there lack of syntactical connection? That which has expectancy (for another word) cannot be syntactically connected.
Then also in the *chandas* this (rule) does not obtain (as above *kyac* does not act in the sense of 'for another') *mā tvā vṛka aghāyavo vidan* 'Let not the malicious wolves know of (thy coming)'.

There is a distinction here. Here, even without the use of the third word, desire for another is understood. How, even without the use of the third word, is desire for another here understood? For those wolves are indeed naturally cruel or malicious. And who can desire evil/bad for himself?

16.15 *iha kasmān na bhavati rājñaḥ putram icchatīti/ asāmarthyāt / katham asāmarthyam / sāpekṣam asamartham bhavatīti / chandasy api tarhi na prāpnoti / mā tvā vṛkā aghāyavo vidan / asty atra viśeṣaḥ / antareṇāpy atra tṛtīyasya padasya prayogam parecchā gamyate / katham punarantareṇāpy atra tṛtīyasya padasya prayogam parecchā gamyate / te caiva hi vṛkā evam ātmakā himsrāḥ kaś cātmano 'ghameṣitum arhati /*

16.19 *ato 'ntareṇāpy atra tṛtīyasya padasya prayogam parecchā gamyate / yathaiva tarhi cchandasya ghaśabdāt parecchāyām kyāj bhavaty evam bhāṣāyām api prāpnoti / agham icchatīti / tasmād ātmagrahaṇam kartavyam / chandasi katham / ācārya-pravṛttir jñāpayati bhavati chandasya ghaśabdāt parecchāyām kyajiti yad ayam aśvāghasyāt (7.4.37) iti kyaci prakṛta*

ītvabādhanārtham ākāraṃ śāsti //

Therefore even without the use of a third word, desire for another is understood. Just as indeed in the *chandas* after the word *agha* (bad, dangerous) *kyac* is applicable in the sense of desire for another, so also in the (classical) speech it obtains as *agham icchati* "He desires evil". Therefore the specific mention of the word *ātman* has to be made.

How (to explain the usage) in the *chandas*? The usage of the master makes known that '*kyac* (is applicable) after the word *agha* in the *chandas* in the sense of desire for another, since he states *ā* which cancels *i* when *kyac* follows by the rule *aśvāghasyāt* (*7.4.37*) "In the *Veda* long *ā* is substituted for the final of *aśva* and *agha* before the denominative *pratyaya kyac*". Thus he teaches the letter *ā* for the purpose of the annulling of the letter *ī* according to the original *sūtra kyaci ca* (*7.4.33*) (which ordained long *ī* in the place of the final *a* or *ā* of an *aṅga* before the denominative *pratyaya kyac*).

16.24 *atha subgrahaṇaṃ kim artham / subantād utpattir yathā syāt prātipadikān mā bhūd iti / naitad asita prayojanam / nāsty atra viśeṣaḥ subantād votpattau*

17.1 *satyāṃ prātipadikād vā / ayam asti viśeṣaḥ / subantād utpattau satyāṃ padasañjñā siddhā bhavati prātipadikāt punarutpattau satyāṃ padasañjñā na prāpnoti / nanu ca prātipadikād apy utpattau satyāṃ padasañjñā siddhā / katham / ārabhyate naḥ kye (1.4.15) iti / tac cāvaśyaṃ kartavyaṃ subantād utpattau satyāṃ niyamārtham / tad eva prātipadikād utpattau satyāṃ vidhyartham bhaviṣyati //*

Now what is the purpose of mentioning *sup*? So that there should be production of a *pratyaya* after a *sup*/case ending word and not after a *prātipadika*/crude base. This is not the purpose. There is not here a distinction between the production (of a *pratyaya*) after a *sup*/case ending word and after a *prātipadika*.

This is the distinction: when there occurs production (of a form) after a *sup*/case ending word, the technical name *pada* is established. When there is production (of a form) after *prātipadika*, the technical name *pada* does not obtain. But surely when there occurs production (of *pratyaya*) after a *prātipadika* the technical name *pada* is established. How? (The *sūtra*) *naḥ kye* (*1.4.16*) "The word form ending in *n* is

called *pada* when *kya* follows (i.e. *kyac*, *kyaṅ* and *kyaṣ*)", is formed. And that necessarily should be formed for the purpose of a restriction to when there is production (of a form) after a *sup*/case ending word. That alone will be the purpose of the rule that it will be applicable when there is production (of a *pratyaya*) after a *prātipadika*.

17.9   *idaṃ tarhi prayojanaṃ subantād utpattir yathā syād dhātor mā bhūd iti / etad api nāsti prayojanam / dhātoḥ sanvidhīyate sa bādhako bhaviṣyati / anavakāśā hi vidhayo bādhakā bhavanti sāvakāśaś ca san / ko 'vakāśaḥ / parecchā / na parecchāyāṃ sanā bhavitavyam / kiṃ kāraṇam / samānakartṛkād ity ucyate / yāvac cehātmagrahaṇaṃ tāvat tatra samānakartṛkagrahaṇam / idaṃ tarhi prayojanaṃ subantād utpattir yathā syād vākyān mā bhūd iti /*

This then is the purpose, so that there should be production (of *pratyaya*) after a *sup*/case ending word and should not be after a *dhātu*. This is also not the purpose. *San* is ordained after a *dhātu* (already) and so that will cancel (the alternative). For rules without scope are (capable of) annulling (those with scope) and '*san*' has scope. What scope? Desire for another. *San* should not be (applicable) in the sense of desire for another.

What is the reason? It is stated after that which has 'the same agent'. For inasmuch as there is specific mention of the word *ātman* so there is mention of *samānakartṛ*/the same agent.

Then this is the purpose: so that production (of a form) should be after a *sup*/case ending word and should not be after a phrase (or sentence).

17.10 *mahāntaṃ putram icchatīti / na vā bhavati mahāputrīyatīti / bhavati yadaitad vākyaṃ bhavati mahān putro mahāputraḥ mahāputram icchati mahāputrīyatīti / yadā tv etad vākyaṃ bhavati mahāntaṃ putram icchatīti tadā na bhavitavyaṃ tadā ca prāpnoti / tadā mā bhūd iti // atha kriyamāṇe 'pi subgrahaṇe kasmād evātra na bhavati / subantaṃ hy etad vākyam / naitat subantam / katham / pratyayagrahaṇe yasmāt sa tadāder grahaṇaṃ bhavatīti // atha yad atra subantaṃ tasmād utpattiḥ*
17.15 *kasmān na bhavati /*

(For example as) *mahāntaṃ putram icchati* — 'He desires a great son'. Or else is not *mahāputrīyati* possible? It is when this is a sentence (or a phrase) *mahān putraḥ* 'great son' (which becomes the *karmadhāraya*) *mahāputraḥ*; *mahāputram icchati* (then becomes compounded as) *mahāputrīyati* "He desires a great son". But when this sentence occurs as *mahāntaṃ putram icchati* "He desires a great son", then the (*pratyaya kyac*) is not to be applicable; then it (wrongly) obtains and then it must not be (applicable).

Now, even while specific mention is being made of a *sup*/case ending word, for what reason does it not occur here, as this phrase ends in a *sup*? This is not ending in a *sup*/case ending. How?

> *Paribhāṣa 23: pratyaya grahaṇe yasmāt sa (vihitas) tadāder grahaṇaṃ bhavati* "A *pratyaya* denotes whenever it is employed (in grammar, a word form) which begins with that to which that (*pratyaya*) has been added and ends with (the *pratyaya*) itself".

Now why does not *kyac* occur after that *subantam*/word ending in a case/*pratyaya*?

17.16 samānādhikaraṇānāṃ sarvatrāvṛttir ayogād ekena / samānā-dhikaraṇānāṃ sarvatraiva vṛttir na bhavati / kva sarvatra / samāsavidhau pratyayavidhau ca / samāsavidhau tāvat / ṛddha-sya rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ / mahat kaṣṭaṃ śrita iti / pratyayaviddhau / ṛddhasyopagor apatyam / mahāntaṃ putram icchatīti //

Varttika: For words in the same syntactical case relation there is not everywhere integration (compounding) due to not joining with one (word only).

Bhāṣya: Everywhere in fact there is not integration of (words) having the same syntactical relation. Where is 'everywhere'? In *samāsa*/compound rules and *pratyaya* rules. Now just (for example) in relation to *samāsa* rules: *ṛddhasya rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ* "The servant of the prosperous/rich king". *mahatkaṣṭaṃ śritaḥ* "who has resorted to great evil".

In relation to *pratyaya* rules: *ṛddhasyopagor apatyam* the son of the prosperous *Upagu*. *mahāntaṃ putram icchati* "he desires a great son".

17.19 kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇaṃ samānādhikaraṇānāṃ sarvatra vṛttir na

*bhavati / ayogād ekena / na hy atraikena padena yogo bhavati /
iha tāvad daddhasya rājñaḥ puruṣa iti ṣaṣṭyantasya subantena
sāmarthye sati samāso vidhīyate / yac cātra ṣaṣṭyantaṃ na tasya
subantena sāmarthya yasya ca sāmarthyaṃ na tat ṣaṣṭyantaṃ,
vākyaṃ tat /*

But what is the reason for there not being everywhere compounding of
words in the same syntactical case relation? Because there is no joining
with one (word only). For here joining with one (word only) is not
possible.

Just here in the example: *ṛddhasya rājñaḥ putraḥ* 'the servant of
the prosperous king'. A *samāsa*/compound is ordained when there
exists syntactical relation with a *sup*/case ending word having the sixth
case. But that which here has the sixth case does not have syntactical
relation with a *sup*/case ending word. And that which has syntactical
relation does not have the sixth case ending. That is a sentence (or a
phrase).

*17.23 ṛddhasyopagor apatyam iti ca ṣaṣṭīsamarthād apatyena yogo
pratyayo vidhīyate / yac cātra ṣaṣṭīsamarthaṃ na tasyāpatyena
yogo yasya*

*17.25 cāpatyena yogo na tat ṣaṣṭyantaṃ, vākyaṃ tat // samānā-
dhikaraṇānām ity ucyate 'tha vyadhikaraṇānām katham / rājñaḥ
putram icchatīti / evaṃ tarhīdam paṭitavyam saviśeṣaṇānām
sarvatrāvṛttir ayogād ekeneti //*

And (in the example) *ṛddhasyopagorapatyam* 'the son of prosperous
Upagu', that *pratyaya* which has the syntactical connection with the
sixth case is ordained in connection with 'offspring' (i.e. a patronymic
pratyaya). But that which here is in syntactical relation with the sixth
case has no connection with 'offspring'. And that which has connection
with 'offspring' does not have a sixth case ending. This is a sentence or
phrase.

It is said, "of words having the same syntactical case relation".
Now how is it said "of those having different syntactical case relations"
(e.g.) *rājñaḥ putram icchati* "He desires a son for the king"? Then this
has to be recited "Everywhere for those words having qualifying words
there is no integration because of not connecting with one (word
only)".

18.1   dvitīyānupapattis tu / dvitīyā tu nopapadyate / mahāntaṃ putram icchatīti / kiṃ kāraṇam / na putra iṣikarma / yadi putro neṣikarma na cāvaśyaṃ dvitīyaiva / kiṃ tarhi / sarvā dvitīyādayo vibhaktayaḥ / mahatā putreṇa kṛtam / mahate putrāya dehi / mahataḥ putrādānaya / mahataḥ putrasya svam / mahati putre nidhehi / tasmān naivaṃ śakyaṃ vaktuṃ na putra iṣikarmeti / putra eveṣikarma tatsāmānādhikaraṇyān mahato dvitīyādayo bhaviṣyanti /

Vārttika: However, there is no justification for a second case (*vibhakti*).

Bhāṣya: However, (use of) second case *vibhakti* cannot be justified: *mahāntaṃ putram icchati* "He desires a great son".

What is the reason? The son is not the *karman*/object of (*dhātu*) *iṣ* (to desire) and the second case is not essential ... What then? All the *vibhaktis*/case endings beginning with the second (would not be applicable). "Made by a great son"; "give to a great son"; "bring from the great son"; "the wealth of a great son"; "present it to the great son".

Therefore it is not possible to say *putra*/son is not the object of *dhātu iṣ* (to desire). '*Putra*' alone is (in fact) the *karman* (object) of *iṣ* (to desire). Because of the same syntactical/case relation also second-case and the rest will be applicable for *mahat*.

18.7   vṛttis tarhi kasmān na bhavati / saviśeṣaṇānāṃ vṛttir na vṛttasya vā viśeṣaṇaṃ na prayujyata iti vaktavyam / yadi saviśeṣaṇānāṃ vṛttir na vṛttasya vā viśeṣaṇaṃ na prayujyata ity ucyate muṇḍa-yati māṇavakam ity atra vṛttir na prāpnoti / amuṇḍādīnām iti vaktavyam // tat tarhi vaktavyaṃ saviśeṣaṇānāṃ vṛttir na vṛttasya vā viśeṣaṇaṃ na prayujyate 'muṇḍādīnām iti / na vakta-vyam / vṛttiḥ kasmān na bhavati mahāntaṃ putram icchatīti / agamakatvāt / iha samānārthena vākyena bhavitavyaṃ pratya-yāntena ca / yaś cehārthā vākyena gamyate mahāntaṃ putram icchatīti nāsau jātucitpratyayāntena gamyate mahāntaṃ putrī-yatīti /

Then why is there no integration? It should be stated, "There is no integration of (words) which have (other words) qualifying them, nor is

a qualifying word used in conjunction with a compound (word)".

If then, it is said "there is no compounding of (words) which have (other words) qualifying them, nor is the qualifying (word) used in connection with a compounded word, then here *muṇḍayati māṇavakam* "He shaves the youth", in this case integration does not obtain. Therefore it should not be stated in the case of *muṇḍa* and the rest (*3.1.21*).

That then should be stated as "There is not integration (of words) which have (other words) qualifying them, nor is the qualifying of a compound word regular except for *muṇḍa* and the rest". No, it should not be stated. Then why is integration not possible (in the case of) *mahāntam putram icchati* "He desires a great son"? Because of the inability to communicate the meaning adequately/ *agamakatvāt*.

Here the same meaning by means of a sentence and by means of a *pratyaya* should be possible.

And here that meaning which is understood by means of a sentence as *mahāntam putram icchati* "He desires a great son" is by no means ever understood by a *pratyaya*, as *mahāntam putrāyati* (never occurs).

18.14 etasmād dhetor brūmo 'gamakatvād iti na brūmo 'paśabdaḥ syād iti / yatra ca gamakatvaṃ bhavati bhavati tatra vṛttiḥ / tad yathā / muṇḍayati māṇavakam iti / athāsya kyaj antasya kāni sādhanāni bhavanti / bhāvaḥ kartā ca / atha karma / nāsti karma/ nanu cāyam iṣiḥ sakarmako yasyāyam arthe kyaj vidhīyate / abhihitaṃ tat karmāntarbhūtaṃ dhātvarthaḥ sampanno na cedānīm anyatkarmāsti yena sakarmakaḥ syāt / kathaṃ tarhy ayaṃ sakarmako bhavati aputraṃ putram ivācarati putrīyati māṇavakam iti /

For this reason we say "there is no integration because of the non-intelligibility/inability to communicate the intended meaning". We do not say that it would be an incorrect word or language. And where there is the ability to communicate the intended meaning there is compounding. As *muṇḍayati māṇavakam* "He shaves the youth".

Now then, how many instruments of the action are there for that which ends in *kyac*? The *bhāva*/abstract state of the verb and *kartṛ*/agent. Then (what about) *karman*/object? There is no *karman*. But surely this *dhātu iṣ* has a *karman* in the sense of which (this *pratyaya*) *kyac pratyaya* is ordained. That *karman* is expressed and has

become part of the meaning of *dhātu*. Also there is now no other *karman* by which it could be transitive/*sakarmaka*. How then does this become transitive *aputram putram ivācarati putrīyati* "Him who is not his son he treats like a son". *Putrīyati māṇavakam* "He treats the youth like a son".

18.20 *asty atra viśeṣaḥ / dve atra karmaṇī upamānakarmopameya-*
karma ca / upamānakarmāntarbhūtam upameyena karmaṇā
sakarmako bhavati / tadyathā / api kākaḥ śyenāyata ity atra
dvau kartārāv upamānakartā copameyakartā ca / upamāna-
kartāntarbhūta upameyakartā sakartṛko bhavati // ayaṃ tarhi
kathaṃ sakarmako bhavati muṇḍayati māṇavakam iti / atrāpi
dve karmaṇī sāmānyakarma viśeṣakarma ca / sāmānya-
karmāntarbhūtaṃ viśeṣakarmaṇā
18.25 *sakarmako bhavati / nanu ca vṛtyaivātra na bhavitavyam / kiṃ*
kāraṇam /

Here there is a distinction. For there are two objects/*karman*, the object of comparison and the object to be compared. The object of comparison is inherent and (the verb) is transitive by means of the object to be compared.

As for example: *api kākaḥ śyenāyate* 'Does the crow behave like a hawk?' Thus here are two agents: the agent of comparison and the agent to be compared. The agent of comparison is inherent and the (verb is) together with the agent (by means of the agent) to be compared.

Then how does this have an object/*karman*? *muṇḍayati māṇavakam* "He shaves the youth." Here also there are two objects/*karman*, the general object and the particular object. The general/common *karman* is inherent and (the verb is) transitive with a specific object. Now surely there should be no integration? What is the reason?

18.25 *asāmarthyāt / katham asāmarthyam / sāpekṣam asamarthaṃ*
bhavatīti / naiva doṣaḥ / nātrobhau karotiyuktau muṇḍo māṇa-
vakaś ca / na hi māṇavakatvaṃ kriyate / yadā cobhau karoti-
yuktau bhavato na bhavati tadā vṛttiḥ / tad yathā / balīvardaṃ
karoti muṇḍaṃ cainaṃ karotīti // kāmaṃ tarhy anenaiva hetunā
kyaj api kartavyam / māṇavakaṃ muṇḍam icchatīti nobhāv
iṣiyuktāv iti / na kartavyaḥ / ubhāv atreṣiyuktau muṇḍo māṇa-

vakaś ca / katham /

Because of the absence of syntactical/case relationship. How is there this lack of syntactical relation? That which has expectancy cannot have syntactical connection. The expectancy or requiring (of another word to complete the sense) is *asamartham* (not having the ability to convey the intended meaning). This is not a fault. Here neither *muṇḍa* (shaving) nor *māṇavaka* (youth) are connected with *karoti/kṛ* (to make). For the quality of youth is not made. And when both are connected with *karoti* (in the sense of making) then there is no integration. As for example *balīvardaṃ karoti, muṇḍam cainaṃ karoti.* "He produces a bull and shaves him".

Granted, then, by the same reason this *kyac* also is to be employed here in *māṇavakam muṇḍam icchati* "He desires the youth (to be) shaved", neither is connected with the *dhātu iṣ* (to desire). It is not to be employed. Both *muṇḍa* (shaved) and *māṇavakam* (youth) are connected with the (*dhātu*) *iṣ*. How?

19.2 *na hy asau mauṇḍyamātreṇa santoṣaṃ karoti māṇavakastham asau mauṇḍyam icchati / ihāpi tarhi na prāpnoti muṇḍayati māṇavakam iti / atrāpi hy ubhau karotiyuktau muṇḍo māṇavakaś ca / na hy asau mauṇḍyamātreṇa santoṣaṃ karoti māṇavaka-stham asau mauṇḍyam nirvartayati // evaṃ tarhi muṇḍādayo guṇavacanāḥ / guṇavacanāś ca sāpekṣāḥ / vacanāt sāpekṣāṇāṃ vṛttir bhaviṣyati //*

For (this person) does not create satisfaction by merely shaving. This one desires shaving in relation to the youth.

Here also it does not obtain. *muṇḍayati māṇavakam* "He shaves the youth". Here both *muṇḍa* (shaving) and *māṇavaka* (youth) are connected with *karoti* (make). For that (person) does not create satisfaction by merely shaving. That (person) performs the act of shaving for the youth. Well then the words *muṇḍa* and the rest are expressive of qualities. And words expressive of qualities 'expect' (other words to complete the sense). There, because of the express rule, there will be the integration of (some specific) words which expect (other words to complete the sense).

19.6 *atha vā dhātava eva muṇḍādayaḥ / na caiva hy arthā ādiśyante kriyāvacanatā ca gamyate // athavā nedam ubhayam yugapad-*

bhavati vākyaṃ ca pratyayaś ca / yadā vākyaṃ na tadā pratyayaḥ / yadā pratyayaḥ sāmānyena tadā vṛttiḥ / tatrāvaśyaṃ viśeṣārthinā viśeṣo 'nuprayoktavyaḥ / muṇḍayati / kam / māṇavakam iti / muṇḍaviśiṣṭena vā karotinā tam āptum icchati // athavoktam etan nātra vyāpāro 'nugantavya iti / gamakatvād iha vṛttir bhaviṣyati muṇḍayati māṇavakam iti //

Otherwise *muṇḍa* and the rest are in fact *dhātus*. And in fact the meanings are not indicated and the expression of verbal activity is understood. Otherwise the two (a sentence/phrase and denominative *pratyaya*) do not exist at the same time. When there is a sentence, then the *pratyaya kyac* does not apply. When the *pratyaya* applies generally, then there is integration. In that context it is essential that a qualifying (word) should be used with that which wants qualifying, e.g. *muṇḍayati* "He shaves". Whom? The youth. Or he wants to connect with him by the particular act of shaving.

Otherwise this was stated "Here the activity/(of adding *kyac*) is not to be understood". Because of causing the meaning to be understood there is integration as *muṇḍayati māṇavakam* "He shaves the youth".

19.12 atheha kyacā bhavitavyam iṣṭaḥ putra iṣyate putra iti // kecit tāvad āhur na bhavitavyam iti / kiṃ kāraṇam / svaśabdenoktatvād iti // apara āhur bhavitavyam iti / kiṃ kāraṇam / dhātvarthe 'yaṃ kyaj vidhīyate sa ca dhātvarthaḥ kenacid eva śabdena nirdeṣṭavya iti //

19.15 iha bhavantas tv āhur na bhavitavyam iti / kiṃ kāraṇam / iha samānārthena vākyena bhavitavyaṃ pratyayāntena ca / yaś cehārtho vākyena gamyata iṣṭaḥ putraḥ iṣyate putra iti nāmau jātucit pratyayāntena gamyate //

Now here *iṣṭaḥ putraḥ* "a desired son" and *iṣyate putraḥ* "A son is desired", should *kyac* be applicable? Some just say "it should not be". What is the reason? Because of the desire of having been (already) expressed by its own (fully inflected) word form. Others say, "it should be applicable". What is the reason? This *kyac* is ordained in the sense of the *dhātu*. And that *dhātu* meaning should be indicated by some word. The revered one (Your Honour) says "it should not be applicable". What is the reason? Here the same meaning should be expressed by a sentence and by that which ends in a *pratyaya*. But the

meaning which is here understood, *iṣṭaḥ putraḥ* "a desired son" and *iṣyate putraḥ* "A son is desired", that is never at all understood by means of the word ending in a *pratyaya* (i.e. a denominative so ending).

19.18 kyaci māntāvyayapratiṣedhaḥ //1//

> *kyaci māntāvyayānāṃ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ / iha mā bhūt / idam icchati / kim icchati / uccair icchati / nīcair icchati //*

Varttika 1: In respect of *kyac* "a prohibition" should be made of integrating (compounding words) ending in *m* or indeclinables when the *kyac* (*pratyaya*) follows.

Bhāṣya: In respect of *kyac* a prohibition should be stated of (integrating words) ending in *m* or indeclinables when *kyac* (*pratyaya*) follows. (So that) here it should not be applicable *idam icchati* "He desires this". *kim icchati* "What does he want?" *uccair icchati* "He desires intensely" *nīcair icchati* "He desires humbly/modestly".

19.21 gosamānākṣaranāntād ity eke //2//

> *gām icchati / gavyati // samānākṣarāt / dadhīyati madhūyati kartrīyati hartrīyati // nāntāt / rājīyati takṣīyati //*

Varttika 2: Some (say) (*kyac* is applicable) after the word *go* (cow), words with simple vowels (other than a) and those ending in *n*.
  (1) *gām icchati* or *gavyati* He desires a cow. (*kyac* after *go*).
  (2) After words with simple vowels other than *a* (*kyac* acts):
      dadhīyati   He likes/desires dadhī/curds;
      madhūyati   He likes/desires honey;
      kartrīyati   He is an agent/likes to be an agent;
      hartrīyati   He is or desires to be a bearer/bringer.
  (3) After words ending in *n* (*kyac* acts).
      rājīyati   He is or desires to be a king;
      takṣīyati   He is or desires to be a woodcutter/carpenter.

41

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀṆINI 3.1.8*

Kātyāyana's first *vārttika* is of considerable general significance in relation to compounding in *saṃskṛta*; for he states that even though there be the same case relation between words, compounding will not occur if there are more than two words involved.

The next *vārttika* states that, where there are more than two words involved (as in the example *mahāntaṃ putram icchati* ('He desires a great son') the second *vibhakti* is not justified (for *putra*, since on its own it is not the *karman*/object) of *iṣ* (to desire).

The other two *vārttikas* are specific: the first is a prohibition of *kyac* acting after words ending in *m* (like *kim*) and indeclinables. The second ordains *kyac* after the word *go*, words with simple vowels other than *a* and those ending in *n*.

Bhāṣya Summary

Patañjali begins by considering the possible functions of the *it c* of *kyac*. Having shown it is not for accent, nor for distinguishing (because of '*tadanubandha*' — *Pari* 82) but for the unobstructed general mention in '*naḥkye*' *1.4.15*.

In considering the purpose of '*ātmanaḥ*' in the *sūtra*, having first put the view that it is to express the sense of one's own desire, he then suggests that it ends in the sixth case in the sense of agent, so *icchā* can also express 'one's own desire for another'. However, the retort is, the word *ātman* connects with *sup* not *icchā*. Further if *ātman* is retained, how to explain examples of desire for another in the *Vedic* example of the 'malicious wolves'? Here even without use of a third word it is clear there, desire is for another, since no one desires evil for himself. In classical language the possibility of following this analogy is avoided, by mention of *ātman*, and made known as valid in the *Veda* by specific mention in *7.4.37*.

Turning to the purpose of *sup*, *Patañjali* first shows it is not to prevent *kyac* coming after a *prātipadika*, since *1.4.15* specifically states a restriction, so that the rule will be applicable when there is production after a *prātipadika*. Nor is the purpose to prevent *kyac* after a *dhātu*, since *san* being stated after a *dhātu* bars others, since it has not scope elsewhere in the sense of desire for another. The reference to *ātman*, here implies the same agent there, and meaning for oneself. The last possible purpose, to prevent *kyac* coming after a phrase, serves to introduce the first *vārttika*. By reference to the *Paribhāṣā* '*pratyaya grahane ...*' he explains how a phrase or sentence like 'He desires a great son' cannot be *subantam*.

Patañjali explains where integration of words having the same case relationship is not possible, namely in relation to *samāsa* rules and *pratyaya* rules with example like 'He desires a great son'. He explains that because of there being more than one word to join with, in examples like 'The servant

42

there being more than one word to join with, in examples like 'The servant of a prosperous king', we cannot say there is syntactical relation with a sixth case word, since a phrase or sentence cannot end in a *sup*. Similarly in the example 'Son of the prosperous *Upagu*', there can be no syntactical connection between *apatyam* and *ṛddhasya* because of dissimilar cases. He concludes as introduction to the next *vārttika*, 'it should be stated compounding is not possible when a qualifying word occurs'.

Patañjali connects the second *vārttika* indirectly with an implied example 'He desires a great son', saying the son here is not the *karman*/expressed by second case of *dhātu iṣ*. He rejects this view, because then any of the case endings would be equally applicable. Equally, second case must be applicable for *mahat* etc. because it is in the same case relationship.

He then returns to the previous theme of the cause of non-integration being the qualifying words. This does not have to be qualified by 'except in the case of *muṇḍa* etc.' because the real reason for non-integration is inability of that formed with a *pratyaya* to communicate the meaning conveyed by a sentence. The corollary is, that there will be compounding when the ability to convey intended meaning is that there, as 'He shaves the youth'.

The *bhāṣya* now turns to the *kārakas* connected with a *kyajanta* word. *Bhāva* and *kartṛ* are clear, but how can *iṣ* have *karman* as part of its own meaning and still be transitive requiring another *karman*? The object/ *karman* of comparison is inherent in *dhātu iṣ* and it is transitive by means of the object to be compared. Even in the case of *muṇḍayati māṇavakam* two objects exist, the general inherent in the *dhātu* and the specific makes it transitive. So *karoti* being inherent has no connection syntactically with *muṇḍa* and *māṇavaka* specific objects, so *asāmarthyam* is not applicable. However, in expressing 'He desires the youth (to be) shaved' they are both connected with the *dhātu iṣ*. Here no integration occurs because there is 'expectancy', 'He desires shaving in relation to the youth'. Only because of the express rule *3.1.21* is integration possible for some specific words which have expectancy. Alternatively, we can say *muṇḍa* etc. are *dhātus* expressing verbal activity (*kṛ* understood). Or a sentence and denominative *pratyaya* are mutually exclusive alternatives. Adding *kyac* has implied 'making'. Otherwise we return to the previous view, that there is integration simply because of causing the intended meaning to be understood.

Finally, *Patañjali* considers whether *kyac* should be applicable to express the sentence with the past participle passive of *iṣ* '*iṣṭa*' or the present indicative passive *iṣyate* and concludes the meaning of the sentence could never be expressed by the *pratyaya* and hence not be applicable.

The *bhāṣya* simply provides the suitable examples to illustrate the *vārttika* prohibiting integration of *m* ending words and indeclinables in the context of *kyac*, and likewise for the rule for *kyac* after *go*, words with simple vowels other than *a* and those ending in *n*.

43

Pradīpa

2.15.1 supaḥ / sup ṅasi

'After (a word ending in a) *sup*/case *pratyaya*'

cf. *svaujasamauṭchaṣṭābhyāmbhisṅebhyāmbhyas ṅasibhyāmbhyasṅaso-sām ṅyossup 4.1.2*

yenavidhistadantasya 1.1.72 (svaṃ rūpam)

ātmanaḥ // ātman ṅasi

expressing the *karman*/object wished as connected with his/her own Self.

ata (bhvā° pa° se° 38 sātatyagamane) maniṅ

sātibhyāṃ maninmaniṅau uṅ 4.153 Uṅādi (etymology of *ātman*)

2.16.1 kyac suṃ

    Denominative *pratyaya k-ya-c (vikaraṇa)* in the sense of desiring for oneself added to nouns to form denominative *dhātus*, e.g. *putrīyati*, He desires a son for himself.

It is also added to nouns that are *upamāna* 'standards of comparison' in the sense of similar behaviour, e.g. *putrīyati chātram*, He treats his student like a son.

upamānādācāre 3.1.10

It is also added in the sense of doing/making to the words *namas, virivas, citra* e.g. *namasyati devān* He makes reverential obeisance to the gods.

namovarivaścitraṅaḥ kyac 3.1.19 (karaṇe)

kā 'karmaṇaḥ' icchāyāṃ vā ity anuvartate /

"The words *karmaṇaḥ* (after a word expressing the object) and *icchāyāṃ vā* (optionally in the sense of desire) follow on (from *3.1.7*)"

iṇikarmaṇa eṣiturātmasambandhinaḥ subantadicchāyām arthe vā kyac bhavati/

"The *pratyaya kyac* optionally acts in the sense of desire after a *sup*/case ending word, expressing that (desired) as connected with the wisher's self."

cito 'nta udāttaḥ

citah 6.1.163

"A stem formed with a *pratyaya, āgama* or *ādeśa* having an indicatory *c* has *udātta* on the final syllable."

pratyayasvareṇa siddham//

ādyudattaś ca 3.1.3

"A *pratyaya* has initial *udātta*" (unless otherwise stated.)

asya cvau, kyaci ca 7.4.32, 33

7.4.32: "In place of *a* or *ā* final of a *prātipadika* long *ī* before *pratyaya cvi* (the whole of which is elided, signifying 'become what it was not before')."

e.g. *aśuklam śuklī karoti*. 'What was not white he makes white.'

7.4.33: "In place of final *a* or *ā* of a *prātipadika* before *Kyac* denominative pratyaya long *ī* acts."

e.g. *putra (k) ya (c) tip – putrīyati*

He desires a son of his own.

kye ce ti hy ucyamāne api kākaḥ śyenāyate

If the *sūtra* were uttered as *kya ca* without *c* (the form) 'Does the crow behave like a hawk' (would be applicable), by

kartuḥ kyaṅ salopaś ca 3.1.11

"The *pratyaya kyaṅ* optionally acts in the sense of 'conduct' after a word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya* denoting the object of comparison with the Agent and there is *lopa*-elision of the final *s*."

śyena kyante (akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ) 7.4.25 śyenāyate

because of the *pratyayas kyaṅ* and *kyac* having *kya* in common, and this is not desired.

2.16.6 'tadanubandhakagrahaṇe tadanubandhakasya grahaṇa na'
  Only in *M.Bh.* See *pari°* 54 *'tadanubandhakagrahaṇe tadanubandha-kasya'* "When a term with one or more indicatory letters is employed (in grammar it does) not (denote) that which in addition to those (one or more *anubandhas*) has another *anubandha* attached to it."

Therefore, *kyac* does not denote *kyaṅ* (*Vyādiparibhāṣā pāṭha* from *PS* p.40). This is *Paribhāṣā 49* of *Śākaṭāyana paribhāṣāsūtra* p. 45 ibid) and is *paribhāṣā 38* of *Puruṣottamadeva's Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* (pp. 128-129 ibid.)

2.16.7 'sāmānyagrahaṇāvidhātārthas tarhi'//
'Then it is for the purpose of an unobstructed general mention' and not a hindrance for the application of the term to others.

sāmānyagrahaṇa avighāta/

'Then preservation of inclusive reference (for two or more terms) by a wording common to those terms, e.g. *ṅī* for *ṅīp, ṅīṣ* and *ṅīn*; *āp* for *ṭāp, ṅāp* and *cāp*.'

cf. *'athavā avaśyam atra sāmānyagrahaṇāvidhātārthaḥ*
kakāro 'ṇubandhaḥ kartavyaḥ' Mā° on 3.1.83 Vā°   7
'na kye' 1.4.15

"A word ending in *n* is called *pada* when these denominative *pratyayas kyac, kyaṅ* and *kyaṣ* follow", e.g. *rājan + kya = rājīyati*   He desires a king for himself

na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya 1.2.7 i.e. kingship for himself

kyaci ca 7.4.33 (ī)

ātmana itīyaṃ kartari ṣaṣṭhī

This word *ātmanaḥ* is sixth case in the sense of agent by the *sūtra*

kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti 2.3.65 (ṣaṣṭhī)

'The sixth case acts after a word, in denoting the agent and the *karman*/ object, when used along with a word ending with a *kṛt pratyaya*.'

(kṛdatiṅ 3.1.13)

2.16.9 Kai 'ātmecchāyām iti / atmana iccheti śeṣaṣaṣṭhyā samāso na tu kartṛṣaṣṭhyā subantadvārakaścātmana icchayā sambandho na tu sākṣāt / tenāyam arthaḥ — ātmanaḥ subantārthaṃ yadecchati tadā yathā syād iti /

evaṃ parecchāyām iti vyākhyeyam /'

'Desire for oneself' is a *śeṣa ṣaṣṭhī* — compound not agent sixth case, and the reconnection is with the desire of the self occasioned or caused by a *sup* ending word but not evidently (visiblly/directly). Therefore, this is the meaning, 'when he desires a *sup* ending object for himself then let (the *pratyaya kyac*) be applicable', so when desire is for the sake of another this is to be explained.

ātmana itīyam iti / kriyākārakasambandhasyāntaraṅgatvād iti bhāvaḥ /

The sense is that this is due to the *antaraṅga* nature of the relation between verb and *kāraka* (instrument for accomplishing the action).

Udyota on *2.16.11* (*kartari ṣaṣṭhī*) '*anenaiva sambandhenecchāyāṃ tadanvayāt / paramparāsambandhas tu na ṣaṣṭhyarthas tad āha kriyā-kārakasambandhasyeti*

'By this there is in fact connection, due to the syntactical connection with that in the sense of desire. But traditional connection/genitive has not the sixth case meaning. That he states is as for the connection of the *kāraka*/case relation and the verb.'

MBh 2.16. 11. icchetyakāro bhāve

The word *icchā* is (derived with) the letter *a* (of the *pratyaya śa* by *3.3.101*) in the sense of the action/state of the *dhātu iṣ* (to desire).

bhāve follows on by *anuvṛtti* from *sthāgāpāpaco bhāve 3.3.95*

śa follows on by *anuvṛtti* from *kṛñaḥ śa ca 3.3.100*

icchā 3.3.101 The form *icchā* is *nipātana*/irregular.

iṣu (tu° pa° se° 1351 icchāyām) śa (a)

iṣugamiyamāṃ chaḥ 7.3.77 (śiti)

hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk 6.1.71

icchā ṭāp ajādyataṣṭāp 4.1.4

icchā irregularly does not apply *sārvadhātuke yuk 3.1.67 (bhāva-karmaṇoḥ)*

Thus '*ātmanaḥ icchā*' the desire of oneself. If the correct analysis is sixth case in the sense of agent, that would include desire of oneself for another.

2.16.12 nātmagrahaṇena...// *icchā* is not connected with mention of the word *ātman*.

2.16.13 ātmano yatsubantam (It is connected with that ending in a *sup*/case ending word(what he desires) for himself, e.g. *putra* son)

Kai 'ātmagrahaṇopādānasāmarthyāt/'

"By force of including the specific mention of the word *ātman* (it must be connected with the *sup* ending word)."

nahyeṣitāramantareṇecchā bhavatīti vyabhicārā' bhāvādicchāyā viśeṣaṇa-sya niṣphalatvāt/

"For this is due to the fruitless nature of the qualification of the word *icchā* in the absence of deviation from the rule 'there is no desire without a desirer/agent of desire'."

2.16.14 '*mā tvā vŗkå aghāyavó vidan/*' *Yajurveda 4.34*
> "Let not the malicious wolves know of thy coming"
> (and *T.S. 1.2.9.1* without *vidan*)

aghāyavaḥ from *aghāyu//* m.f.n. intending to injure, malicious, wicked, spiteful (*padap. aghayu*) from *aghay*

'*aśvādyasyāt*' *7.4.37*
"In the *Veda* long *ā* acts in place of the final of *aśva* and *agha* before the denominative *pratyaya kyac*".

u by *kyācchandasi 3.2.170*
"The *pratyaya u* acts in the *chandas* after *dhātus* that have received the *pratyaya kya* in the sense of 'the agent having such a habit'."

pātaṃ no vŗkādaghāyoḥ Ŗ.V. 1.120.7, 1.27.3, etc.
"Keep us safely from the wicked wolf."

agha// aghi (bhvā° ā° se° 109 gatyākṣepe) (gatau gatyārambhe ca) ac nandigrahi pacādibhyo…acaḥ 3.1.134 (āgamaśāstrasyānityatvān na num)

2.16.15   sāpekṣam asamarthaṃ bhavatīti/
> "That which has expectancy (of another word to complete the sense) cannot be syntactically connected."

This is *paribhāṣā 27 cādraparibhāṣāsūtra (P.S.* p.47) and *paribhāṣā 85* in *Hemahainsagaṇisaṅgrhīta nyayasaṅgraha* (p.110 ibid.) frequently used by *Patañjali.*

2.16.19   hiṃstrāḥ
> "(Naturally) cruel or malicious, injurious, mischievous, hurtful, destructive."

R.V. 10.87 3, 5 only etc. a synonym for *aghāyu.* Here only in *M.Bh.*

2.16.23   ītvabādhanārtham//
> "For the purpose of barring the long *ī*"

Which follows on from *ī ghrādhbhoḥ 7.4.31* and would have been the *ādeśa* for the final *a* or *ā* of a *prātipadika* before the denominative *pratyaya kyac* by *kyaci ca 7.4.33* but that is barred by the *apavāda sūtra* ordaining *ā* for the final of: *aśva* (giving *aśvāyanto madyan Ŗ.V 7.32.23*) and of *agha* (giving *aghāyavo* etc. as in the text) by *aśvāghasyāt 7.4.37.*

2.16.24   prātipadikāt [See introduction for more detail]
> "After a nominal/crude base."

cf. arthavadadhātur apratyayaḥ prātipadikam 1.2.45
"Whatever is full of meaning, not a *dhātu* or a *pratyaya* is a *prātipadika*."

kŗttaddhitasamāsāś ca 1.2.46
"And what ends in a *kŗt* or *taddhita pratyaya* or has the name *samāsa/* compound has also the name *prātipadika*."

2.16.25   subantād utpattau satyāṃ padasañjñā siddhā//

"When there occurs production (of a form) after a *sup*/case ending word the technical name *pada* is established (as valid)."
cf. 'suptiṅantaṃ padam' 1.4.14
"Whatever ends in a *sup* (noun *pratyaya pratyāhāra*) (*su au jas, am auṭ śas, ṭā bhyām bhis, ṅe bhyām bhyas, ṅasi bhyām bhyas, ṅas os ām, ṅi os sup*) (*4.3.2*) or a *tiṅ* (verbal *vibhakti pratyaya pratyāhāra*) (*tip tas jhi, sip yas ya, mip vas mas, ta ātām jha, thām āthām dhvam, iṭ vahi mahiṅ*)(3.4.78)
has the name *pada*."

2.17.3 naḥ kye 1.4.15
e.g. *carman + kās = carmāyate ti*   It becomes leather.
akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ 7.4.25
Being called a *pada* the *n* is elided by *'na lopaḥ prātipadikāntasya' 1.2.7*

2.17.6 dhātoḥ sanvidhīyate //
   San is ordained after a *dhātu*
dhātoḥ karmaṇaḥ samānakartṛkād icchāyāṃ vā 3.2.7 (guptijkidbhyaḥ) san 3.1.5

2.17.6 anavakāśā hi vidyayo bādhakā bhavanti sāvakāśa san //
'For rules without scope (of application elsewhere) are annulling (those with scope) and *san* has scope, i.e. rules which have no opportunity of taking effect (without setting aside other rules) supersede those rules.'

2.17.16 anavakāśa //
   Having no occasion or scope of application.
Used in connection with a rule the whole of whose province of application is covered by a general rule, and hence which becomes technically useless, unless it is allowed to set aside the general rule.
See *5.4.154, 443* and on *Pari. 64*.
See *Paribhāṣā 95 (sāvakāśānavakāśayor anavakāśo vidhibalavāt)* of *śākatāyana paribhāṣāsūtra (p.s.p. 46)*
paribhāṣā 76 of *kātantra paribhāṣāsūtra* p. 77 ibid.)
paribhāṣā 103 of *Kalāpoparibhāṣā* (p. 80 ibid.)

2.17.9 mahāntaṃ putram iti // He (desires) a great son
Kai "yady atra subantasamudāyāt paraḥ kyac pratyayaḥ syāt tadā pratyā-rthabhidhāne padadvayasya pravartanāt parasparasya samāsā 'bhāvād uttarapadanibandhanam ātvaṃ na syāt/
If here the *pratyaya kyac* would be applicable after a collection (combination of *sup*/case ending words) then in expressing the meaning of the *pratyaya*, due to the absence of a compound for two words occurring one after the other with each other, the connection being with the subsequent word, there would not be the *ādeśa ā* for *mahat*.
2.17.11 mahāputram

'great son'

sanmahatparamottamotkṛṣṭāḥ pūjyamānaiḥ 2.1.61

But when there is no 'expectancy' by *2.1.61* "the words *sat* (good), *mahat* (great), *parama* (highest), *uttama* (best), and *utkṛṣṭa* (excellent), are compounded with words denoting the person deserving respect and the compound is a *tatpuruṣa*."

ānmahataḥ samānādhikaraṇajātīyayoḥ 6.3.46

"Long *ā* is *ādeśa* in place (of the final) of *mahat* (great), when a word in the same case follows and when *jātiyar* (*5.3.69*) follows."

mahārājaḥ great king; *mahāputraḥ* a great son

2.17.16   samānādhikaraṇānām iti //

Kai "samānādhikaraṇānāṃ padānāṃ madhye ekena padenā 'yogāt samudāyenaiva yogād vṛttir na bhavatīty arthaḥ /"

"The meaning is that because of not saying 'joining with one word among the words having the same syntactical relation', there will not be indeed applicable integration/compounding through joining with a combination."

saguṇasya hi putrasyeṣiṇā sambandho na kevalasyeti bhāvaḥ /

"The sense is 'for the connection is with the desirer of a son with a particular quality (greatness), not alone' (i.e. a son unqualified by any other word)."

2.17.18   ṛddhasya rājñaḥ puruṣaḥ

   'servant/man of the prosperous king'

But when joining with one only, *rājñaḥ puruṣo rājapuruṣaḥ* king's man

by '*ṣaṣṭhī*' *2.2.8*

"A word ending in the sixth case *pratyaya* is compounded with that which is in construction and the compound is a *tatpuruṣa*."

mahatkaṣṭaṃ śritaḥ, who has resorted to great evil

but *kaṇṭaṃ śritaḥ — kaṣṭaśritaḥ*, 'who has had recourse (when joining with one only) to evil.'

by *dvitīyā śritātītapatitagatātyastaprāptāpannaiḥ 2.1.24*

"A word ending with the second *sup*/case *pratyaya* is compounded with the words *śrita* (who has resorted to), *patita* (who has fallen upon), *gata* (who has gone to), *atyasta* (who has passed), *prāpta* (who has obtained), and *āpanna* (who has reached) and the resulting compound is called *tatpuruṣa*."

ṛddhasyopagor apatyam, 'The son of prosperous *Upagu*'; but without qualification compounding is possible

upagor apatyam aupagavaḥ 'the offspring of *Upagu*.'

by *prāgdīvyato 'ṇ 4.1.83*

tasyāpatyam 4.1.92

The *pratyaya aṇ* mentioned in *4.1.83* and those which follow it denote the descendant of someone.

How of those being in a different case relation? Characterised by or possessed of different *sup*/case *pratyayas*. (only on three occasions in

M.Bh.)

c.f. *kaḥ prasaṅgo yad vyadhikaraṇānāṃ samāsaḥ syāt /*

"What is the occasion there might be a compound of words having different case relations?"

bhā° 2.1.67

bhā° 2.2.24 vā° 10 bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇānām //

"A *bahuvrīhi* (is formed) of words in the same case relation."

vyadhikaraṇānāṃ mā bhūd iti /

(This is stated) so that it should not be formed of different case relations.

2.18.1 dvitīyānupapattis tv iti //

Kai. "*yadi kevalasya pratipadikārthasyeṣisambandho neṣyate tadā karmatvā bhāvat kevalāt pratipadikād dvitīyā na prāpnoti / nāpi samudāyāt tasyā 'pratipadikatvāt guṇe ca saṅkhyāyā vivakṣitatvāt.*"

"If connection of the desirer with a sole (single) word and conveying simply the sense of the *pratipadika* is not desired, then the second case does not obtain after a single *pratipadika* word because of the absence of the characteristic of *karman*/object, nor even after a combination of words, because of not having the nature of being a *pratipadika* and because, in relating to the secondary objects, numbers are being intended to be expressed."

2.17.6 putra eveti /

Kai. "*tasyai vepsitatamatvād guṇānāṃ cepsāprakarṣā 'bhavāt / svayam akarmatve 'pi tatsāmānādhikaraṇyanibandhanaḥ vibhaktir ity arthaḥ /*"

'(The object of *iṣ* is applicable) for him (*putra*) alone because of being that most desired to be obtained by the agent.'

c.f. (*karturīpsitatamaṃ karma 1.4.49*) and because of the absence of the pre-eminence of desire to be obtained for the secondary objects. Even when he himself does not have the nature of object, the meaning is that the *vibhakti* conveys the connection with the condition of relating to the same object/grammatical agreement.

2.18.7 saviśeṣaṇānāṃ vṛttir na bhavati //

> There is no integration/compounding of words having other words qualifying them.

Kai. "*ekasyaikadā vyapekṣaikārthābhāvavirodhād itibhāvaḥ /*"

'The sense is that this is because of the conflict of the condition of becoming one (integrated word) with at the same time there existing expectancy of one (other word to complete the meaning).'

P. 3.1.8.2.18.9 muṇḍayati māṇavakam, 'He shaves the youth'.

muṇḍamiśraślakṣṇalavaṇavratavastrahalavalakṛtatūstebhyo ṇic 3.1.21 (karaṇe)

'The *pratyaya ṇic* in the sense of making acts after these words as the object/*karman* of the action.'

muṇḍa, shaved, bald *Mn. Mbh.*
muḍi (*bhvā°pa°se°* 326 khaṇḍane)
akartari ca kārake sañjñāyām 3.3.29
muḍa e (*ṇic*) *tip* 7.3.84
muṇḍayati Hariv. 780.7.1.78
muṇḍaṃ karoti, He makes (him) shaved.
Here, with a compound of words having other words qualifying we have the exception to the general rule.

2.18.11   agamakatvāt //
> Because of not having the nature of making the meaning intelligible.
> (Only in *M.bh.*) non-communicativeness, inability to communicate
> adequately the intended meaning.

mā° 2.18.11 vṛtti kasmān na bhavati agamakatvāt
How then is there no integration?
Because of inability to make the meaning intelligible.
Kai. "*laukike prayoge 'numānād api gāvyādibhyo gavādy arthapratipatti-vanmahāntaṃ putram icchatītyādivākyārthasya mahāntaṃ putrīyatītyādeḥ pratītir nāstīty arthaḥ / siddhānāṃ ca śabdānāṃ saṅkaranirāsāyā 'n-vākhyānaṃ kriyate / na tv aprayuktāpūrvaśabdavyutpādanāya /*"
'The meaning is: Also from the inference (made) in relation to popular usage (of words), having ascertained/knowledge of the meaning of '*go*' etc. from the words *gāvya* etc., there is not knowledge of the meaning of the sentence *mahāntaṃ putram icchati* (He desires a great son) from the (theoretical irregular form) *mahāntaṃ putrīyati*.

> For the purpose of rejecting the mixing together/confusion of established words (with valid forms), the minute explanation is made, but not for deriving unused or unprecedented words.'

2.18.14   na brūma iti //
> We do not say (it would be incorrect word/*apaśabda*).

Kai. "*apaśabdo hi loke prayujyate sādhuśabdasamānārthas ca ayaṃ tv aprayuktatvād apaśabdavyapadeśasyāpi na bhājanam ity arthaḥ /*"
'For in the world an incorrect word is used and has the same meaning as the correct word, but this (form), because of not being used, does not even partake of the designation of incorrect word.'
cf. Paś. p. mlecche ha vā eṣa madapaśabdaḥ /

2.18.16   kāni sādhanāni bhavanti / bhāvaḥ kartā ceti //
> "How many instruments for accomplishing the action are there (for
> that which ends in *kyac*)? The *bhāva* and *kartṛ*."

Leading straight to the goal (gram), the sense of the instrumental or agent (as expressed by the case of the noun supplementary to the action itself).
Synonymous with *sādhaka* and *kāraka*
cf. sādhanaṃ ca kriyāyāḥ / kriyābhāvāt sādhanābhāvaḥ /

And the *sādhana* is the instrument of activity. From absence of activity, there is absence of any instrument for that activity.

Kai. "*karmā bhāvapratipādanaparam etat / adhikaraṇādau hi lyuḍādayo yathāyogaṃ bhavanty eva / bhāvasya ca lakārādy utpattinimittatayā sādhanavyapadeśaḥ*"

'The chief object of this, is teaching the absence of *karman* (as a *sādhana*) for *lyuṭ*. (*karaṇādhikaraṇāyoyaś ca 3.3.117*) and the rest (of the *pratyayas*) are in fact applicable in the sense of *adhikaraṇa* and the rest (of the *kārakas*). And the designation of *sādhana* for *bhāva* (abstract action/state of *dhātu*) is by reason of its nature of being a cause for the arising of *la* (verbal) *pratyayas* and the rest.'

2.18.17   *abhihitam iti* //

"(That *karman*) is expressed".

Kai. "*tataś ca jīvatītyādivadicchākyajantasyā karmakatvāt karmāṇi lādybhāvaḥ /*"

'And then because of the *akarmatva* (intransitive) nature of that (verbal form) ending in *kyac* (expressing) desire like 'he (desires to) live' and the rest, there is an absence of *la* (verbal *pratyayas*) and the rest in the sense of *karman*/object.'

2.18.18   *na cedānīm iti* /

"And there is now no (other *karman*)".

Kai. "*niyataviṣayāyā icchāyāḥ kyajantena pratipādanāntasyāś ca vastv-antaraviṣayīkaraṇā 'bhāvād iti bhāvaḥ /*"

'The sense is, because of teaching, 'with that ending in *kyac* (meaning) desire for a fixed (specified) object and because there is (absence of) making an internal object become an object'.'

2.18.18   *kathaṃ tarhīti* //

"How then (does this becomes transitive)?"

sakarmako bhavati //

Kai. "*atrāpi putrādikarmaṇo 'sty antarbhāva iti praśnaḥ /*"

'The question is 'does not here too the object *putra* and the rest become part of the (meaning of the *dhātu*)?'

This device and explanation of *Pat.* is used by *Sāyana* in his commentary on *A.V. 3.1.37*[1].

2.18.20   *upameya* //

"(The object) is to be compared"

That which is compared, subject of comparison; *Kāś.* uses it as a synonym of *upamitam* found in *upamitaṃ vyāghrādibhiḥ 2.1.56 sāmānyaprayoge*

---

[1]   *amitrasenāṃ maghavann asmān chatrūyatīmabhi*, O *Indra*, be an enemy for us against this hostile army.

"A case inflected word denoting the subject of comparison is compounded with the words *vyāghra* (tiger) etc. the latter being the standard of comparison and in construction with the former, and the compound is a *tatpuruṣa* provided that any word expressing the *sāmānya* (common characteristic) is not employed", e.g.

puruṣo 'yaṃ vyāghra iva puruṣavyāghraḥ, 'a man tiger' (in strength)

2.18.21   api kākaḥ śyenāyate //
"Does the crow behave like a hawk?"

"The *pratyaya kyaṅ* optionally acts in the sense of conduct after a word ending in a *sup/*case *pratyaya* denoting the object of comparison of the agent and there is *lopa* elision of the final *s.*"

śyena kyaṅ śyaiṅ (bhvā° ā° a° 963 gatau) inac (uṇa° 2.46)
śyenā-ya-śyenāyate (akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ 7.4.25)

2.18.23   muṇḍayatīti //
(How does this have an object) 'He shaves (the youth)'?

Kai. "*muṇḍaguṇaviśiṣṭadravyakarmaṇo dhātvarthe 'ntarbhāva iti bhāvaḥ/*"
'The sense is that inherent in the meaning of the *dhātu* is that. For if there is an object to be compared, characterised by the quality (of being that object of the action) of shaving.'

2.18.23   'atrāpi' //
"Here too (there are two objects)"

Kai. "*ṇyanto dhātur dravyamātram antarbhāvayituṃ śaknoti na tu viśeṣaṇaṃ māṇavakādikam iti bhāvaḥ /*"
'The sense is that a *ṇi* ending *dhātu* can only make implied/inherent a mere thing or object, but not a specific qualification like 'youth' etc.'

2.18.25   nanu ceti //
"Now surely there should be compounding?"

Kai. "*yady apy etaccoditaṃ ca parihṛtaṃ ca tathāpi gamakatvā'gamaka-tvaviṣayavibhāgāpadarśanāya punar upanyāsaḥ /*"
Although this question has been urged and refuted, still for knowing the division of sphere between that which is capable of making intelligible the meaning and that which does not, again there is this juxtaposition.

2.18.18   tad yathā / balīvardaṃ karoti muṇḍaṃ cainaṃ karoti /
"As for example 'he produces a bull and shaves it'."

Kai. "*balīvardaṃ evātmasambandhitvena karoti taṃ ca muṇḍaṃ krotīti yugapadubhayoḥ karotikarmatve vivakṣite muṇḍayati balīvardam iti prayogo na bhavatīty arthaḥ /*"
The sense is, by reason of the nature of the connection with the self, he makes or produces the bull and that he shaves. But when it is intended to express the nature of the object of *dhātu kṛ* simultaneously, in both cases

the usage is not applicable (in the form) *muṇḍayati balīvardam.*

2.19.2   *mauṇḍayam //*

"(This one desires) shaving of the head", tonsure, baldness
*mauṇḍayaṃ prāṇāntiko daṇḍo brāhmaṇasya vidhīyate / manu 8.379 muṇḍa
ṣyan guṇavacanabrāhmaṇādibhyaḥ karmaṇi ca 5.1.124 (tasya bhāvaḥ)
ṣyan*
"The *pratyaya ṣyan* acts after a word expressive of quality (*guṇavacana*),
and after *Brāhmaṇa* or the occupation of something or someone as well as
the nature thereof." e.g. *jaḍasya bhāvaḥ karma vā jāḍyam
muṇḍ...mauṇḍayam* coldness, chilliness, stiffness, dullness.

2.19.5   *guṇavacanāś ca sāpekṣāḥ //*

"And words expressive of qualities expect (other words to complete
the sense)."
See above *5.1.124.*

2.19.6   *dhātava iti //*

"(*Muṇḍa* and the rest) are in fact *dhātus.*"
Kai. "*sautrā dhātavo muṇḍādayas tebhyaś curādivatsvārthiko ṇij ity
arthaḥ/*"
'The meaning is that *muṇḍa* and the rest are *sūtra* (formed) *dhātus* and after
these act the *pratyaya ṇic* in the sense of the base/*svārthe* as it does after the
dhātus beginning with *cur* (Cl. 10) by *sūtra 3.1.21.*'

2.19.6   *nacaiveti //*

"In fact (the meanings) are not (indicated)."
Kai. "*yady api kriyā viśeṣābhidhāyitvaṃ muṇḍādīnāṃ naivopāttaṃ tathāpi
svābhāvikatvād arthābhidhānasya prayogād eva tad avasīyata ity arthaḥ /
yathā kaṇḍvādayo dvividhās tathā muṇḍādaya iti bhāvaḥ /*"
'Although the expressing of a particular verbal activity is not accepted for
muṇḍa and the rest, still quite naturally from usage alone of expressing their
meanings, that is known. The sense is just as *kaṇḍū* and the rest (*3.1.27*) are
two-fold (both *prātipadikas* and *dhātus*) so likewise are *muṇḍa* and the
rest.'

2.19.10 *muṇḍaviśiṣṭeneti //*

"(He wants to connect with him) by the particular act of shaving."
Kai. "*pūrvasmin parihāre karmaviśeṣāṇapekṣāyāṃ pratyayotpattir ity
uktam /*"
'In the previous refutation it was stated that the arising of the *pratyaya*
occurred when there was no regard to the *karman* as qualification.'
"*asmins tu yathā gāṃ dogdhi paya iti śuddhasya duher gavā pūrvaṃ
sambandha, paścāt tu goduhinā payasaḥ, evaṃ śuddhaḥ karotimauṇḍyena
sambadhyate, mauṇḍyaviśiṣṭas tu māṇavakenety ucyate / anenaiva nyāyena*"

māṇavakaṃ muṇḍam icchatīti kyac prāpnotīty āśaṅkayāha..."

'However, in this answer, just as it is said 'He milks the cow' ('*duh*' governing two *karmans* by *Kārika* on *1.4.51 akathitañca*), first there is connection of pure milking with the cow, but afterwards of the milk with the milker of the cow, so likewise is the pure (action) connected with the causing of shaving. However, it is stated that the (action) distinguished as shaving, is (connected there) with the youth. By this reasoning alone (though undesired) *kyac* obtains to express 'the desire to shave the youth' with this in doubt he says:'

2.19.10   atha veti //

Kai. "vyāpāro nārambhaṇīyaḥ prayatnam antareṇāpīṣṭasya siddhatvād ity arthaḥ / kyactvagamakatvān na bhavati /"

'The activity (of adding *kyac*) is not to be undertaken because of the desired (form) being accomplished without (that) effort. And *kyac* is not applicable because of not being able to make the meaning intelligible.'

taduktaṃ hariṇā

[This is not found in this form in the present text of *Vākyapadīya* but *Nāgeśa* explaining *Kaiyaṭa* quotes Bhartṛhari:]

2.19.20   "sad apīcchākyacaḥ karma tadācārakyacā hṛtam / vākya-vācyamato'vyakter yathābhyāsaḥ kramādiṣu // nageśa anyatrokta hariṇā sad apīcchākkyacaḥ karma vākya eva prayujyate / prasiddhena kṛtaḥ śabdo bhāvagarhābhidhāyinā // abhyāse tulyarūpo 'pi na yaṅantaḥ pravartate / iti"

This is with some variants *V.P. 3.14, 72-73.*

1. vṛtaḥ   2. rūpatvān na   3. prasujyate

72.B "Therefore, even though the *pratyaya kyac* expressive of desire has an object, it is used only in a sentence."

putram icchati māṇavakam iti

Helārāja: Thus only he desires a youth as his son.

73. "The word formed with the *pratyaya yaṅ (P.3.1.23)* being reserved for the well-known idea of disapproval of the action; such a word is not used to express repetition because the form would be the same (and so there might be misunderstanding)."

The expressions *lolupyate caḍakramyate jaḍagamyate* formed with *yad* express the idea of disapproval.

(lupasadacarajapajabhadahadaṃśagṝbhyo bhāvagarhāyām 3.1.24)

(nityaṃ kauṭilye gatau 3.1.23)

Or crookedness of the gait.

That is why even though the same *pratyaya* is taught in the sense of repetition of the action it is not used in that sense, because there is a possibility of misunderstanding. To express the idea of repetition the sentence is used, not the complex formation.

punaḥ punaḥ krāmati vṛtti caḍakramyate

(*dhātor ekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yaṅ 3.1.22*)

2.19.12   atheheti //

Now here *kyac* should be applicable.

Kai. "icchākyajantāt karmaṇi pratyayotpattiḥ prakārāntareṇāṣaḍkayate /"
The arising of the *pratyaya* in the sense of *karman* after that ending in *kyac* in the sense of desire is conjectured (as possible) by another way.

"tathāhi yady atra kyaj bhavati tad ecchāmātrasya kyacābhidhānād avaśyaṃ karmaṇe 'bhidhānasya tadvācinā pratyayenotpattavyam / yathā putrīyatīti kartrabhidhānāya tipā /"
For so, if here *kyac* is applicable because of the expressing by *kyac* of mere desire, it is essential for the expressing of *karman*/object that it be produced by a *pratyaya* expressing that. As for example in the form *putrīyati*, *tip* (= *ti* is to be produced) for expressing the agent (He desires a son for himself).

2.19.13   svaśabdeneti //

"Desire already expressed by its own (fully inflected) form."

Kai. "iṣṭaśabdasāmānādhikaraṇyāt putra ity anena nirbhuvateṣikriyāpekṣa-karmabhāvasyārthasya pratipādanād ity arthaḥ / ayam arthaḥ yadā kriyāphalasya karmaṇaḥ prādhānyaṃ pratipipādyiṣitaṃ tadā vākyam eva prayujyate puttra iṣṭa ityādi na tu vayajantaḥ tasyā karmakatvāt karmaṇi pratyayānutpādāt /"
'The meaning is 'By reason of the statement expressing the *putra* (as *karman*), because in the sense of the same case relation with the desired word (i.e. because of *putra* the *sup* ending word failing to express the object, *kyac* does not follow) due to the understanding of the meaning of the condition of *karman* with regard to the action of *iṣ* (to desire) being distorted or (as object distorted =) abandoned. This is the meaning, when there is the pre-eminence of the *karman*, as fruit of the action desired to be taught, then a sentence alone is used 'the desired son' etc., but not a *kyac* ending word because of its intransitive nature. There is not production of a *pratyaya* in the sense of the *karman*.'

2.19.21   gausamānākṣareti

"*Kyac* acts after the word '*go*', words with simple vowels and those ending in *n*."

Kai. "akārādayo daśa samānāḥ / tatra ḷvarṇāntasya prātipadikasya sam-bhādṛkārāntasya saptānāṅgrahaṇam asmin tu nyāse 'vyāptiḥ, vācyatītyādy-asiddhiprasaṅgāt / bhāṣyakāreṇa tu matabhedapradarśanāyopanyāsaḥ kṛtaḥ"
'The ten beginning with *a* are the same. Amongst them, because of the impossibility of a *prātipadika* in *ḷ* and *ṛ* the reference is for seven (four short and three long). In this written text there is inadequate pervasion or extent of definition (of the scope of the rule), because of the possibility of the forms *vācyati* etc. being valid forms. However, for showing a difference

of opinion by the *Bhāṣyakāra/Patañjali*, this statement is made.'

2.19.22 *gavyati*
   'He desires a cow for himself.'
vānto yi pratyaye 6.1.79
"Those ending in *v* (namely *av* and *āv*) act in place of *o* and *au* before a *pratyaya* beginning with *ya.*"
'*go kyac tip*'

2.19.24 *kāmyac ca //*
kā° subantāt karmaṇa ātmecchāyāṃ kāmyac pratyayo bhavati /

kāmyac ca //3/1/9//

2.19.25 *kimarthaś cakāraḥ / svārthaḥ / cito 'nta udātto bhavatīty*
   antodāttatvaṃ yathā syāt / naitad asti prayojanam /
2.20.1 *dhātusvareṇāpy etat siddham / kakārasya tarhītsañjñāpari-*
   trāṇārthaḥ āditaś cakāraḥ kartavyaḥ // ata uttaraṃ paṭhati /

Pāṇini 3.1.9: And the *pratyaya kāmyac* also (acts in the sense of desire for oneself after a word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya* expressing the *karman*/object wished).

Bhāṣya: What is the purpose of the letter *c*? For the purpose of accent (so that there should be final *udātta*) by the *sūtra* (*citaḥ antaḥ udāttaḥ*) (6.1.163). This is not the purpose. This is also established by the *dhātu* accent. Then the initial *c* should be made for protecting the letter *k* from being an *it*/indicatory letter. Therefore (the *vārttikakāra*) reads what follows.

2.20.1 *kāmyacaś citkaraṇān arthakyaṃ kasyedarthābhāvāt //1//*

   kāmyacaś citkaraṇam anarthakam / kakārasya tarhītsañjñā
   kasmān na bhavati
2.20.5 *idarthābhāvāt / itkāryābhāvād atretsañjñā na bhaviṣyati / nanu*
   ca lopa evetkāryam / akāryaṃ lopaḥ / iha hi śabdasya kāryārtho
   vā bhavaty upadeśaḥ śravaṇārthā vā / kāryaṃ ceha nāsti /
   kārye 'sati yadi śravaṇam api na syād upadeśo 'narthakaḥ syāt//

Vārttika 1: It is pointless to form an *it c* for *kāmyac* because there

exists no purpose in the letter *k* being called *it*/indicatory.

Bhāṣya: Forming an *it c* for *kāmyac* is pointless. Then why is not the technical name *it* applicable to the letter *k* (of *kāmyac*)? Because of the absence of purpose for an *it* letter. In the absence of a grammatical operation for an *it* letter the technical name *it* will not be (applicable). But surely *lopa*/elision alone is the (grammatical operation of *it*). *Lopa* is not a grammatical operation. For here the 'original teaching/*upadeśa*' is for the purpose of the grammatical operation or for the purpose of hearing.

And here there is no (grammatical operation). If, when there does not exist a grammatical operation hearing also is not there, then the original teaching/*upadeśa* would be useless.

2.20.7 *idaṃ tarhītkāryam /agnicitkāmyati / kitīti guṇapratiṣedho yathā*
syāt / naitad asti prayojanam / sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayor
aṅgasya guṇa ucyate dhātoś ca vihitaḥ pratyayaḥ śeṣa ārdha-
dhātukasaṃjñā labhate na cāyaṃ dhātor vidhīyate // idaṃ tarhi/
upayaṭkāmyati / kitīti samprasāraṇaṃ yathā syāt / etad api nāsti
prayojanam / yajādibhir atra kitaṃ viśeṣayiṣyāmaḥ /

This then is the grammatical operation of the *it* letter *k*, namely (in the expression) *agnicitkāmyati* "He desires to kindle the *agnicit*/sacrificial fire for himself"; so that when *it k* follows there should be prohibition of *guṇa*. This is not the purpose. When a *sārvadhātuka* or an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows, *guṇa* is stated for an *aṅga*, and the *pratyaya* which is remaining (i.e. other than *tiṅ* or *śit*) ordained after a *dhātu* obtains the technical name *ārdhadhātuka* and this (*pratyaya*) is not ordained after a *dhātu*.

Then this is the purpose, *upayaṭkāmyati* "He desires the *upayaṭ* (two additional formulas at an animal sacrifice) for himself. So that when *it k* follows there should be *samprasāraṇam*/vocalisation of the semivowel (of the *y* of *yaj*).

This also is not the purpose. We will specify (that elsewhere) by the word *k-it* (having an indicatory *k*) in connection with *yaj* (*dhātu*) and the rest.

2.20.12 *yajādīnāṃ yaḥ kid iti / kaś ca yajādīnāṃ kit / yajādibhyo yo*
vihita iti // athāpi kathañcid itkāryaṃ syāt / evam api na doṣaḥ /
kriyate nyāsa eva dvicakārako nirdeśaḥ / supa ātmanaḥ

kyacckāmyac ceti // atha vā chāndasametat / dṛṣṭānuvidhiś chandasi bhavati na cātra samprasāraṇaṃ dṛśyate /

(Saying) "And among the *dhātus yaj* and the rest whatever has an indicatory *k* ... " And which of the *pratyayas* for (*dhātus*) *yaj* and the rest have an *it k*? That which is ordained after *yaj* and the rest.

Still now, even if somehow there should be a grammatical operation (for the *it* letter) so also there is no fault. The written/literal text is formed indicating two *c* letters as *supa ātmanaḥ kyacckāmyac ca* (*c* goes by *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ 8.2.23*).

Otherwise this is a usage peculiar to the *Veda*. It is seen (as an operation) according to rule/order in conformity with what is found in the *chandas* and here *samprasāraṇam* is not seen.

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀṆINI 3.1.9*

Bhāṣya asks the purpose of the *it c*; *Vārttikakāra* says there is no purpose in *k* being called *it*. *Bhāṣya* suggests the purpose is to prevent *guṇa* in *agnicit-kāmyati* or if not for *samprasāraṇam* of *yaj* in *upayat kāmyati*. There are really two *c*'s or finally it is in conformity with Vedic usage where *samprasāraṇa* does not occur.

Pradīpa
19.24 *ātmanaḥ putram icchati putrakāmyati* /
'He desires a son of his own.'
pūñ (kryā° u° se° 1481 pavane) ktra
'*puvo hrasvaś ca*' *uṇ° 4.164*
yadvā punnarakāstrāyate / '*supi*' *3.2.4 kaḥ*
e.g. *vastrakāmyati* / *kā°*
He desires clothes for himself to represent a garment, *vām. 4.1.9* (in a quotation)
yathā śvo rathakāmyati // *kāṭhaka saṃ° 7.5*
As the horse longs for a chariot or wishes to be yoked to a chariot;

19.25 *cito 'nta udātto* //
citaḥ 6.1.163
"A stem formed by a *pratyaya*, *āgama* or *ādeśa* having an indicatory *c* has *udātta* on the end syllable."
Final *udātta* follows on by *anuvṛtti*.
karṣātvato ghano 'nta udāttaḥ 6.1.159
dhātusvareṇa // *dhātoḥ 6.1.162*
"For a *dhātu* final *udātta* accent."

e.g. *pacati gopāyati*

āditaś cakāraḥ //

"An initial *c* (should be formed)." *by cuṭū 1.3.7*

an initial *cuṃ* (*c ch j jh ñ tālu*), an initial *ṭuṃ* (*ṭ ṭh ḍ ḍh ṇ mūrdhā*) of a *pratyaya* have the technical name *it* (indicatory letter *anubandha*). The *c* (proposed) would be *iṭ* but without a *k* initial of *kāmyac* would be called *iṭ* by *laśakvataddhite 1.3.8.*

"The initial *la ś* and *ku la śa / kuṃ* (*k kh g gh ṅ kaṇṭha*) of all *pratyayas* except *taddhitas*, are called *it*," and therefore *k* would be elided by *tasya lopaḥ 1.3.9 itaḥ*

upamānād ācāre //3/1/10//

adhikaraṇāc ca //1//

20.17 adhikaraṇāc ceti vaktavyaṃ prāsādīyati kuṭyām kuṭīyati prāsāda ity atrāpi yathā syāt //

Pāṇini 3.1.10: The *pratyaya kyac* optionally acts in the sense of conduct after a word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya* denoting the object of comparison.

Vārttika 1: And (after a word denoting) location or place (of comparison, *kyac pratyaya* acts).

Bhāṣya: And (*kyac*) should be stated (as coming after a word denoting) the location of comparison. So that here too *kyac* should be applicable. *prāsādīyati kuṭyām* "In a hut, he behaves as if he were in a palace". *kuṭīyati prāsāde* "He dwells in a palace as if it were a hut, or imagining himself to be in a hut".

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀṆINI 3.1.10*

This has only one *vārttika* increasing the scope of *kyac* to <u>location</u> of comparison as well as <u>object</u>. *Bhāṣya* gives two appropriate examples: *prāsādīyati kuṭyām*, He imagines himself in a palace when in a hut. *kuṭīyati prasāde*, He imagines himself in a hut when actually in a palace. Neither appear in any other context (the latter not even in *kāśikā*).

2.20.20 kartuḥ kyaṅsalopaś ca //3/1/11//

salopasanniyogenāyaṃ kyaṅ vidhīyate tena yatraiva salopas tatraiva syāt / payāyate / iha na syāt / api kākaḥ śyenāyate // naiṣa doṣaḥ / pradhānaśiṣṭaḥ kyaṅ / anvācayaśiṣṭaḥ salopo yatra ca sakāraṃ paśyasīti / tad yathā / kaścid ukto grāme bhikṣāṃ cara devadattaṃ cānayeti sa grāme bhikṣāṃ carati yadi devadattaṃ paśyati tam apyānayati //

Pāṇini 3.1.11: The *pratyaya kyaṅ* optionally acts in the sense of conduct after a word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya* denoting the *karman*/object of comparison for the agent; and there is *lopa*/elision of the final *s*.

Bhāṣya: The *pratyaya kyaṅ* is ordained in conjunction with *lopa*/elision of *s*. Therefore wherever there is *lopa*/elision of *s*, there should the *pratyaya* (*kyaṅ*) be applicable. *payāyate* "It is fluid" (i.e. it behaves like *payas*/water or milk). Here in *api kākaḥ śyenāyate* "Does the crow behave like a hawk?" (*kyaṅ*) would not be (applicable). This is not the case. *Kyaṅ* is taught as of primary importance, (whereas) elision of *s* is propounded as a rule of secondary importance, being applicable where you see the letter *s* is (actually present). As for example, someone said "Go about begging for alms in the village and bring *Devadatta*". He goes about begging for alms in the village and if he sees *Devadatta* he brings him also.

2.21.1 salopo vā //1//

salopo veti vaktavyam / payāyate payasyate //

Vārttika 1: Optionally *lopa*/elision of *s*.

Bhāṣya: It should be stated that there is optionally *lopa*/elision of *s* (e.g.) *payāyate* or *payasyate* "It is fluid".

2.21.3 ojo 'psarasor nityam //2//

ojo 'psarasor nityaṃ salopo vaktavyaḥ / ojāyamānaṃ yo ahiṃ jaghāna / apsarāyate //

Vārttika 2: There is invariable (elision of *s*) of *ojas* and *apsaras*.

Bhāṣya: It should be stated that there is invariably elision of the *s* of *ojas* and *apsaras. ojāyamānaṃ yo ahiṃ jaghāna (ṚgVeda 2.22.11)* "Who has slain the serpent as he showed his strength". *apsarāyate* "She behaves like an apsara/nymph".

2.21.6   *apara āha / salopo 'psarasa eva / payasyata ity eva bhavit-*
         avyam iti // katham ojāyamānaṃ yo ahiṃ jaghāneti / chāndasaḥ
         prayogaś chandasi ca dṛṣṭam anuvidhīyate //

Another says, (there is) elision of the *s* of *apsaras* only. (Therefore) *payasyate* "It is fluid", alone should be its form.

   How (do we get the form) *ojāyamānaṃ yo ahiṃ jaghāna* "Who has slain the serpent as he showed his strength". (This is) a usage peculiar to the *Veda.* And in the *chandas* the operation is ordained in conformity with what is found.

2.21.8   *ācāre galbhaklībahoḍebhyaḥ kvib vā //3//*

         ācāre galbhaklībahoḍebhyaḥ kvib vā vaktavyaḥ / avagalbhate
         avagalbhāyate / klība / viklībate viklībāyate / klība / hoḍa /
         vihoḍate vihoḍāyate // kiṃ prayojanam / kriyāvacanatā yathā
         syāt / naitad asti prayojanam / dhātava eva galbhādayaḥ / na
         caiva hy arthā ādiśyante kriyāvacanatā ca gamyate //

Vārttika 3: In the sense of conduct *kvip* optionally acts after (*ava*)*galbha, klība* and *hoḍa.*

Bhāṣya: It should be stated that *kvip* optionally acts 'in the sense of conduct' after *avagalbha, klība* and *hoḍa.* (It should be stated) *avagalbhate* or *avagalbhāyate* "He is brave/valiant". (Thus) *galbha* (bold). So *klība* (impotent, eunuch). *viklībate* or *viklībāyate* "He behaves like a eunuch". So *klība.* (Now) *hoḍa* raft? Disrespect? *vihoḍate* or *vihoḍāyate* "He disregards or disrespects".

   So what is the purpose of the *vārttika*? So that the expressing of a (verbal noun) or a verbal activity should be understood. This is not the purpose. *Avagalbha* and the rest are in fact *dhātus.* Also the meanings are not in fact indicated and expressing of the verbal activity is

understood.

*2.21.12   idaṃ tarhi prayojanam/ avagalbhā viklībā vihoḍā / a
           pratyayāt (3.3.102) ity akāro yathā syāt / mā bhūd evam / guroś
           ca halaḥ (103) ity evaṃ bhaviṣyati // idaṃ tarhi / ava-
           galbhāñcakre viklībāñcakre vihoḍāñcakre / kāspratyayād āṃ
           amantre (3.1.35)*

2.21.15   ityāṃ yatha syāt /

This then is the purpose (to form the words) *avagalbhā* (boldness,
valour?) *viklībā* (impotence?) and *vihoḍā* (disregard, disrespect). So
that there should be the *pratyaya a* (by the *sūtra*) "*apratyayāt 3.3.102*".
"After a *dhātu* that ends in a *pratyaya* there is the *pratyaya a*, the word
being feminine". Thus it should not be applicable. It will be formed by
guroś ca halaḥ 3.3.103. "The *pratyaya a* acts after a *dhātu* having a
guru (prosodially heavy vowel), and ending in a consonant in the
feminine". Thus it will be (stated).

This then is the purpose: *avagalbhāñcakre* "He has been bold".
viklībāñcakre "He has behaved like a eunuch". *vihoḍāñcakre* "He has
disregarded or shown disrespect" (i.e. to form the periphrastic perfect)
so that the *pratyaya āṃ* should be (applicable) because of the *sūtra*
kāspratyayādāmamantre liṭi 3.1.35. "*Āṃ* is the *pratyaya* of the *dhātu*
kās (to cough) and of those *dhātus* that are formed by *pratyayas* (i.e.
derivative verbs), when *liṭ* (*pratyaya* conveying the sense of the perfect
tense) follows, except in the *mantra/Veda*.

*2.21.16   apara āha / sarvaprātipadikebhya ācāre kvib vaktavyo 'śvati
           gardabhatīty evam artham / na tarhīdānīṃ galbhādyanukra-
           maṇaṃ kartavyam / kartavyaṃ ca / kiṃ prayojanam / ātmane-
           padārthān anubandhānāsaṅkṣyāmīti / galbha klība hoḍa //*

Another says "*kvip* should be stated as acting in the sense of conduct
after all *dhātus*, for the sake of the forms *aśvati* "He behaves like a
horse". *gardabhati* "He represents or behaves like an ass/donkey".

Then, should there not now be brought about a methodical
enumeration of *galbha* etc.? It should be done. What is the purpose?
Thus I will attach indicatory letters for the purpose of (indicating)
ātmanepadam + *galbha, klība, hoḍa.*

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀṆINI 3.1.11*

General Summary

Bhā.: Introduces by illustrating the distinction between the rule of primary importance in the *sūtra kyaṅ* and the rule of secondary importance, elision of *s*, like begging for alms and bringing *Devadatta* (if there!)

Vā. 1: Gives optional *lopa* of *s* and *bhāṣya* gives the example of *payas*.

Vā. 2: Says the elision of *s* of *ojas* and *apsaras* is invalid. *Bhāṣya* introduces a further view that only *s* of *apsaras* is in fact elided. *Ojāyamānam* is Vedic usage.

Vā. 3: States that *kvip* optionally acts after *galbha, klība* and *hoḍa* in the sense of conduct.

Bhā.: *Bhāṣya* explains the purpose of the *vārttika* so that periphrastic perfect can be formed. Another (*vārttika*) says *kvip* should be stated as following all *dhātus* in the sense of conduct. A full enumeration of *galbha* etc. should be made for purpose of indicatory letter indicating *ātmanepada*.

Bhāṣya Summary

2.20.21 payāyate
    "It is or becomes fluid."
It behaves like '*payas*'
paya (bhvā° ā° se° 476 gatau) asun
or *pīḍ (di° ā° a° 1141 pāne)*
sarvadhātubhyo 'sun uṇa° 4 183
paya salopa kyaṅ "akṛtsārvadhātukyoḥ" 7.4.25 (dīrghaḥ)

2.20.22 pradhānaśiṣṭaḥ kyaṅ
    "*Kyaṅ* is taught or laid down as of primary importance"
anvācayaśiṣṭaḥ salopo. salopa is propounded as a rule or matter of secondary importance
    "*pradhānānvācayaśiṣṭayoḥ pradhāne sampratyaya*" *vyāḍi pari 67*
also *cf. Vardhamāna* in his *svapajña-ṭīka* on *GRM (4)*
ca iti anvacaya hetuṣu bhikṣābhaṭa gāṃ cānaya
The two occur together again in *M.Bh.* only at *7.3.118 vā° 4*
pradhānaśiṣṭabhautvam sanvācayaśiṣṭamatvaṃ yathā kyaṅi salopaḥ

2.21.1 klībaṃ m.f.(ā)n. impotent, emasculated, a eunuch
    A.V. 6.138.8/12 8.6.11
    klībate klībṛṃ (bha° ā° se° 381 aghāṣṭarya) ka igupudhajñāprīkiraḥ
    'in lack of boldness' *kaḥ 3.1.125*
klībā ya te   to behave like a eunuch *Vop. 21.7*
hoḍa m. a raft, float, boat *Trik. 1.2.13* a title of a particular class of *kāyasthas* and of *Śrotriya Brāhmaṇas* in Bengal (*SK.D. Suppl.*)

hoḍa (bhvā° ā° se° 305 anādare) ac 3.1.124
    bhvā° pa° se° 354 gatau)
to disregard, disrespect, to go, move (Vop.)
pṛthvādibhya imanijvā 5.1.122 (18 hoḍa)
vihoḍate and vihoḍatate Not even recorded in Lex.
'He disregards or goes.'
Kvip Denominative pratyaya zero acting after any substantive in the sense
behaviour/conduct. (Elsewhere a kṛt pratyaya 3.2.61, 76, 77, 87-92,
177-179)
k   laśakvataddhite   1.3.8
it   upadeśe 'janunāsika it   1.3.2
v   verapṛkattasya   6.1.67
p   halantyam   1.3.3
    tasya lopaḥ   1.3.9
3.2.11 vā 2 21.1

2.21.4   ojāyamānaṃ yo ahiṃ jaghāna
ojas ubja (tu pa se 1303 ārjave) asun uṇā 183
ubjebahe balopaś ca uṇā 4.192
ojāya akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ 7.4.25
ojāya muk śānac "laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāvaprathamasamānādhikaraṇe" 3.2.124
āne muk 7.2.82
ojāyamāna
Other examples of ojāya are:
ojāyamānastanvaś ca śumbhate (Ṛ.V 140 .6)
"(Agni) proving his might, he decks the glory of his form"
ojāyamānaṃ tuvijāta tavyāna (Ṛ.V 3.32.11)
"(O Indra) thou puissant God, more mighty (slewest Pahi) showing his
strength." The vārttika 1 and 2 are found in a semi-śloka vārttika in Kāś.
ojāso 'psaraso nityaṃ payasas tu vibhāṣayā
(sakārasyeṣyate lopaḥ śabdaśāstravicakṣaṇaiḥ (jai° sū° 2.1.91))

2.21.5 apsarāyate
    "She behaves like a nymph."
The word apsarā in found in the A.V. in the form apsarāpati a° 4.37.7
which would give the form here without s lopa if apsarā were the
prātipadika form, but it seems to be derived from apsaras
adabhyaḥ saranti taratesurana uṇ° 4.237
ap sṛ (bhvā° pa° a° 935) gatau asun
galbha m.f.n. bold Vop. 21.7
galbhāyate to be bold
avagalbhate or avagalbhāyate to be brave, valiant, Pat.
galbha (bhvā° se° 392 dhāṣṭarye) ac 3.1.34 the boldness

2.21.12 avagalbhā f. boldness, not recorded

viklībā impotence

vihoḍā disregard

'*a pratyayāt*' 3.3.102

Dhātus that end in *a pratyaya* are derivative *dhātus* (e.g. desiderative, causative, intensives and denominatives), all enjoined in this first section of *3.1.5-32*. Though taking *pratyayas* they are called *dhātus* by *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ 3.1.32*

It is after these that the *pratyaya a* is used in forming a feminine noun.

2. *guroś ca halaḥ 3.3.103* (*striyām, a*)

'*guru*' (having) a prosodially heavy vowel is defined *saṃyoge guru 1.4.11* (*hrasvam*) "When a conjunct consonant follows a short vowel it is termed heavy (*guru*)."

dīrghaṃ ca 1.4.12 (*guru*) "And a long vowel is also termed *guru*."

Therefore all three are *guru* (*o* being a *dīrgha* vowel)

2.14.3   avagalbhāṃ cakre

avagalbha ām liṭ kāspratyayādāmamantre liṭi 3.1.35 āmaḥ 2.4.8 (*le, luk*)

"There is *luk* elision in place of that *pratyaya liṭ* (sign of the perfect) coming after *am*."

kṛnvānuprayujyate liṭi 3.1.40

"After a *dhātu* ending with *ām* the *dhātu kṛ* is annexed (as auxiliary verb) when *liṭ* follows."

2.21.16   vā° 3

aśvati kā aśva ivācarati aśvāyate

Kāś. 'Some say *kvip pratyaya* (optionally acts) after all *prātipadikas*/crude bases (and *kyaṅ* in the alternative) "to behave like a horse"

aśvāyate formed with *kyac* means "to wish for horses".'

aśvāghasyāt 7.4.37 "In the *Vedas* long *ā* acts in place of the final of *aśva* and *agha* before the denominative *pratyaya kyac* (3.2.8)

'*aśvāyanto maghavan*' *R.V. 7.32.23* "Desiring horse, O *Indra*, (we call on thee)."

aśva aśrnute aśū (*svā° ā° se° 1264 vyāptau*) *kvan sanaḥteca aśūmuṣilati uṇa 1.151*

gardabhati To represent an ass *Sāh 10.21*

gardabha gardati garda (*svā° pa° se° 58 śabde*) *abhac*

kṛśṛlikaligardimyo 'bhac u 3.122

3. *ātmanepadārthānubandhānāsaṅkṣyāmīti anudāttaṅita ātmanepadam 1.3.12*

"After a *dhātu* having an indicatory *anudātta* vowel (here *a*) or an indicatory *ṅ* the *pratyayas* of the *ātmanepada* are to be applied." e.g. *galbhāyate.*

2.21.19 bhṛśādibhyo bhuvyacver lopaś ca halaḥ //3/1/12//

2.21.10   halo lopasanniyogenāyaṃ kyaṅ vidhīyate tena yatraiva halo
          lopas tatraiva prasajyeta / naiṣa doṣaḥ / pradhānaśiṣṭaḥ kyaṅ /
          anvācayaśiṣṭo halo lopo yatra ca halaṃ paśyasīti //

Pāṇini 3.1.12: The *pratyaya kyaṅ* in the sense of becoming (what the thing previously was not), acts after the *prātipadikas bhṛśa* and the rest, which do not end with the *pratyaya cvi* (5.4.50) (*a-bhūta tadbhāve kṛbhvastiyoge sampadyakartari cvi*) and there is *lopa*/elision of the (final) consonant.

Bhāṣya: Kyaṅ is ordained in conjunction/simultaneously with the elision of a (final) consonant, therefore wherever there is elision of a (final) consonant there only *kyaṅ* obtains. There is no fault — *kyaṅ* is taught as of primary importance. The elision of a (final) consonant is propounded as a rule or matter of secondary importance, i.e. (only) when you see a (final) consonant (elide it).

2.21.24   bhṛśādiṣv abhūtatadbhāvagrahaṇam //1//

          bhṛśādiṣv abhūtatadbhāvagrahaṇaṃ kartavyam / iha mā bhūt /
2.21.25   kva divā bhṛśā bhavantīti //

Vārttika 1: In relation to the words *bhṛśa* and the rest there should be specific mention of becoming what a thing previously was not before.

Bhāṣya: A mention should be made of (the meaning) "becoming what a thing was not before" in relation to the words *bhṛśa* etc., (so that) here it should not be (applicable). *kva divā bhṛśā bhavanti* — "Where do they become strong by day?"

2.22.1   cvipratiṣedhānarthakyaṃ ca bhavaty arthe kyaṅvacanāt //2//

          cvipratiṣedhaś cānarthakaḥ / kiṃ kāraṇam / bhavaty arthe kyaṅ-
          vacanāt / bhavaty arthe hi kyaṅ vidhīyate //

Vārttika 2: And the prohibition of *cvi* is meaningless because of the

statement of (ordaining) *kyaṅ* in the sense of becoming (what the thing was not before).

Bhāṣya: And the prohibition of *cvi* is meaningless. What is the reason? Because of *kyaṅ* being ordained in the sense of becoming (what it was not before). For *kyaṅ* is ordained in the sense of becoming (what it was not before).

2.22.3   bhavatiyoge cvividhānam //3//

> *bhavatinā yoge cvir vidhīyate / yatra cvinoktatvāt tasyārthasya*
> *kyaṅ na bhaviṣyati // ḍājantād api tarhi na prāpnoti / paṭapaṭā-*
> *yate / ḍājapi hi bhavatinā yoge vidhīyate bhavatyarthe kyaṣ /*

Vārttika 3: (There is) ordaining of *cvi* (in the sense of becoming what it was not before) with the *dhātu bhū*.

Bhāṣya: Cvi is ordained in conjunction with the *dhātu bhū*. Because of its meaning being expressed together with *cvi*, *kyaṅ* will not be (applicable) there. Then also after that ending in *ḍāc*, it (*kyaṅ*) does not obtain e.g. *paṭapaṭāyate* "He makes a sound (like) *paṭa paṭa* (who did not make it before)".

For *ḍāc* (also) is ordained in conjunction with the *dhātu bhū* (and) *kyaṣ* in the sense of becoming (what it was not before).

2.22.8   ḍāci vacanaprāmāṇyāt //4//

> *ḍāci vacanaprāmāṇyād bhaviṣyati / kiṃ vacanaprāmāṇyam /*
> *lohitādiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ (3.1.13) iti //*

Vārttika 4: From the authority of (another) rule, when *ḍāc* follows (there is *kyaṣ*).

Bhāṣya: There will be (applicability of *kyaṣ*) because of the authority of (another rule).

What rule's authority? *lohitādiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ (3.1.13)* "Kyaṣ acts after the words *lohita* (red)" etc. and after those that end with the *pratyaya ḍāc* (when they do not take the *pratyaya cvi*)".

2.22.11 iha kiñcid akriyamāṇaṃ codyate kiñcic ca kriyamāṇāṃ
pratyākhyāyate / sa sūtrabhedaḥ kṛto bhavati // yathānyāsam
evāstu / nanu coktam iha kasmān na bhavati kva divā bhṛśā
bhavantīti / nañivayuktam anyasadṛśādhikaraṇe tathā hy
arthagatiḥ / nañyuktam iva yuktaṃ vā yat kiñcid iha dṛśyate
tatrānyasmins tatsadṛśe kāryaṃ vijñāyate tathā hy artho
gamyate / abrāhmaṇam ānayety ukte brāhmaṇasadṛśa

2.22.15 ānīyate nāsau loṣṭamānīya kṛtī bhavati / evam ihāpy acvet iti
cvipratiṣedhād anyasminn acvyante cvisadṛśe kāryaṃ vijñāsyate/
kiṃ cāto 'nyadacvyantaṃ cvisadṛśam / abhūtatadbhāvaḥ //

Here something not being produced is spoken of and something being produced is to be rejected. That makes this division of the *sutra.*

Let it be according to the text of the *sutra,* as it is written down. And surely it was said, "Why is not (*kyan*) applicable here?" *kva divā bhṛśā bhavanti* "Where do they become many day by day" (By the *paribhāṣā 74*) *nañivayuktamanyasadṛśādhikaraṇe tathā hyarthagatiḥ* "(An expression) formed by the addition of the (negative) *nañ* or (the particle of comparison) *iva,* to (some word or other) denotes something which is different from and (yet) similar to (what is denoted by the latter) because it is so that (such expressions) are generally understood in that way".

(To explain), whatever is seen here having the (negative) *nañ* or (the particle of comparison) *iva* (implies that) in respect of that an operation is effected on another similar to that because the meaning is understood (in that way). When it is said "Bring a non-*Brāhman*" one in fact brings (someone) like a *Brāhman,* but he does not accomplish the act after having brought clods of earth.

Thus here also, because of the prohibition 'not after that (ending in) *cvi*', the operation will be known in (the context of) some other non-*cvi* ending word (but in fact) like *cvi* (in meaning). And what other than this is not ending in *cvi* but is like *cvi*? That which is becoming what it was not before.

2.22.18 iha kāścit prakṛtayaḥ sopasargāḥ paṭhyante / abhimanas
sumanas unmanas durmanas / tatra vicāryate / bhṛśādiṣūpa-
sargaḥ pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇaṃ vā syāt / abhibhavatau subhava-
tau udbhavatau

2.22.19 durbhavatāv iti / prakṛtyarthaviśeṣaṇaṃ vā / abhimanas

*śabdāt / sumanasśabdāt unmanasśabdāt durmanasśabdād iti //
yuktaṃ punar idaṃ vicārayitum / tanu tenāsandigdhena prakṛty-
arthaviśeṣaṇena bhavitavyaṃ yāvatā prākprakṛteḥ paṭhyante /
yadi hi pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇaṃ syāt prāgbhavate paṭhyeran //
neme śakyāḥ prāgbhavate paṭhitum /*

Here some bases are recited with *upasargas*, *abhi manas* (m.f.n. having
the mind directed towards, desirous of, longing for), *su-manas* (m.f.n.
good minded, well disposed, benevolent, gracious, favourable, pleasant,
agreeable), *unmanas* (m.f.n. excited or disturbed in mind, perplexed,
longing or wishing for), *dur-manas* (n. bad disposition, perversity of
mind, *cf.* Greek dus-menes) in bad or low spirits, sad, melancholy.

There, in that context it is doubted whether in the words *bhṛśa* and
the rest the *upasarga* should be optionally qualifying the meaning of
the *pratyaya* (thus *abhi*) in the sense of overcoming, conquering or
approaching; (*su*) in the sense of being excellent by nature; (*ut*) in the
sense of coming up to, reaching, arising or coming forth; (*dur*) in the
sense of being bad.

Or else (the *upasargas* serve to) qualify the meaning of the base.
Thus, (acting) after the word *abhimanas* (mind directed to, desirous),
after the word *sumanas* (good minded), after the word *unmanas*
(excited in mind), or after the word *durmanas* (bad disposition).

It is proper to ponder on this further. Surely the (*upasargas*) should
be undoubted qualifications of the meaning of the base, inasmuch as
(the *upasargas*) are recited before the base. For if they were
qualifications of the meaning of the *pratyaya* they would be recited
before *bhū*. It is not possible for these to be recited before *bhū*.

2.22.23   *evaṃ viśiṣṭe hi pratyayārthe bhṛśādimātrād utpattiḥ pra-
          sajyeta / tasmān naivaṃ śakyaṃ vaktum / na cedevaṃ jāyate
          vicāraṇā // kaś cātra viśeṣaḥ /*

For thus when the meaning of the *pratyaya* is specified, the arising of
(the *pratyaya*) after the whole of (the group) *bhṛśa* and the rest would
be applicable. Therefore it is not (in fact) possible to speak thus. And if
not thus the matter has to be discussed.

And what is the distinction here?

2.23.1   *bhṛśādiṣūpasargaḥ pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇam iti cet svare doṣaḥ*

//5//
bhṛśādiṣūpasargaḥ pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇam iti cetsvare doṣo bhavati / abhimanāyate / tiṅṅatiṅaḥ (8.1.28) iti nighātaḥ prasajyate // astu tarhi prakṛtyarthaviśeṣaṇam /

Vārttika 5: If (we accept the statement) "in the words *bhṛśa* and the rest... an *upasarga* qualifies the meaning of the *pratyaya*" (there is) a fault in relation to the accent.

Bhāṣya: If (we say) "in the words *bhṛśa* and the rest an *upasarga* qualifies the meaning of the *pratyaya*" then there is a fault in relation to accent e.g. *abhi-manāyate* "He longs for or desires". Here (by the rule) *tiṅṅatiṅaḥ* (8.1.28) "A finite verb is unaccented when a word precedes it which is not a finite verb" absence of accent would be wrongly applicable.

　　Then let it be (that) it qualifies the meaning of the base.

2.23.4　sopasargād iti cedaṭi doṣaḥ //6//
sopasargād iti cedaṭi doṣo bhavati / svamanāyateti // atyalpam idam ucyate 'ṭi doṣo bhavatīti / aḍlyabdvirvacaneṣv iti vaktavyam/ atyudāhṛtam / lyapi / sumanāyya / dvirvacane / abhi-bhimanāyiṣate // naiṣa doṣaḥ / avaśyaṃ saṅgrāmayateḥ sopa-sargād utpattir vaktavyā asaṅgrāmayata śūra ity evam artham / tan niyamārthaṃ bhaviṣyati / saṅgrāmayater eva sopasargān nānyasmātsopasargād iti //

Vārttika 6: If (we accept the statement after the word) 'together with an *upasarga*' (there is) a fault when (augment) *aṭ* follows.
Bhāṣya: If (we say) after the words together with an *upasarga* there is a fault when (augment) *aṭ* follows e.g. *svamanāyata* "He became cheerful or happy". This which is stated viz. "There is a fault when *aṭ* (augment) follows" is too small (a scope).

　　It should be stated "when there is *aṭ* (augment), *lyap* (*pratyaya*) and reduplication (there is a fault)". (The fault) "when *aṭ* follows" is already illustrated. The fault when *lyap* follows is e.g. *su-manāya* "Having become cheerful or happy". When there is reduplication, *abhimi-manāyiṣate* "He desires or longs for ... "

　　This is not a fault. It is essential that the production of *pratyayas* should be stated after *saṅgrāmayati* in conjunction with or having its

71

upasarga attached for (explaining the form) *a-saṅ-grāmayata śūraḥ* "The hero made war/fought".

It will be for the purpose of the restriction only after *saṅ-grāmayati* with its *upasarga*, not after any other verb with its *upasarga*.

2.23.9   yadi niyamaḥ kriyate svaro na sidhyati / evaṃ tarhi bhṛśādi-ṣūpasargasya parāṅgavadbhāvam vakṣyāmi // yadi parāṅgavad-bhāva ucyate 'ḍlyabavirvacanāni na sidhyanti / svaravidhāv iti vakṣyāmi / evaṃ ca kṛtvāstu pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇam api / nanu coktaṃ bhṛśādiṣūpasargaḥ pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇam iti cetsvare doṣa iti / svare parāṅgavadbhāvena parihṛtam /

If the restriction is made, then the accent is not valid.

Well then, I will say that in relation to *bhṛśa* and the rest there is the condition of being like a part of that which follows.

If it is said there is the condition of being like a part of that which follows, then (the accent of) those words having *aṭ*, *lyap* or reduplication are not valid.

I will say, "in relation to an accent rule" and having done so let it be also the qualification of the meaning of the *pratyaya*.

But surely it was stated, "if it be a qualification of the *pratyaya* then there will be a fault in relation to accent". In relation to accent it is avoided by (stating) the condition of being like that which follows.

23.14 ayaṃ   tarhi   pratyayārthaviśeṣaṇe   sati   doṣaḥ   kyaṅoktatvāt tasyārthasyopasargasya prayogo na prāpnoti / kiṃ kāraṇam / uktārthānām aprayoga iti / tadyathā / api kākaḥ śyenāyata iti kyaṅoktatvād ārcārārthasyāṅaḥ prayogo na bhavati / asty atra viśeṣaḥ / ekenātra viśiṣṭe pratyayārthe pratyaya utpadyata iha punar ekena / tatra manāyata ity ukte sandehaḥ syād amibhavatau subhavatāv udbhavatau durbhavatāv iti / tatrāsan-dehārtham upasargaḥ prayujyate // yatra tarhy ekena / utpucchayate / atrāpy anekena / pucchādudasane
23.20   pucchād vyasane pucchātparyasana iti //

This then is a fault, when the qualification of the meaning of the *pratyaya*, because *kyaṅ* has already expressed the meaning, the use of an *upasarga* does not obtain.

What is the reason? "There is not usage (of a *pratyaya* or other

word element) for (the expressing of) those meanings which have already been stated. As for example *api kākaḥ śyenāyate* "Does the crow behave like a hawk?" So here because by *kyaṅ* has been expressed 'in the sense of conduct' there is not applicability of the *upasarga āṅ* (in the sense of conduct). There is a distinction. Here, when the meaning of the *pratyaya* is specified or distinguished by one *upsarga* the *pratyaya* arises, but here (it is distinguished) by more than one. There, when it is stated *manāyate* "He is zealous, devoted, thinks or considers" there would be doubt as to whether *kyaṅ* is added in the sense of *abhi-bhavati* (one who surpasses or overcomes), (*su*) in the sense of *su-bhavati* (being of excellent nature), (*ud*) in the sense of *ud-bhavati* (one who comes up to, reaches. arises or exists), and (*dur*) in the sense of *dur-bhavati* (existing on ill luck).

Therefore for the purpose of avoiding doubt the *upasarga* is to be attached. Then, where (joined) with only one (*upasarga*) the *pratyaya* acts, (e.g.) *utpucchayate* "It raises its tail". Here also (it acts) with more than one. Thus:

pucchād-ud-asane "after *puccha* (tail) in the sense of raising".

pucchād-vy-asane "after *puccha* (tail) in the sense of wagging about".

pucchād-pary-asane "after *puccha* (tail) in the sense of throwing about *ṇiṅ* acts".

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀṆINI 3.1.12*

Vārttika Summary

Kātyāyana's first *vārttika* is an explanatory addition to the *sūtra* specifically stating the implication of mentioning *cvi*, that *kyaṅ* too acts in the sense of 'becoming what a thing previously was not after *bhṛśa* etc.' Having said this, of course, prohibition of *cvi* in the *sūtra*, he declares meaningless. The next *vārttika* is simply for clarification, since we know *cvi* is ordained in the sense of 'becoming' after *bhū* by *5.4.50*. Similarly the fourth *vārttika* reiterates that *kyaṣ* is applicable when *ḍāc* follows by *3.1.13*.

The fifth *vārttika* quotes a current view that in relation to *bhṛśa* etc., an *upasarga* qualified the *pratyaya* (*kyaṅ*) and states this will result in the wrong accent. Similarly if it is accepted that they are 'together with an *upasarga*', it produces a wrong form in relation to the augment *aṭ*.

Bhāṣya Summary

In the introduction to the first *vārttika*, *Patañjali* applies the distinction he used in the previous *sūtra* treating *kyaṅ* as of primary importance and consonant elision as of secondary importance. He simply provides an

example from the *Veda* for the *vārttika*. For clarification he simply adds on the second *vārttika* that this means *kyaṅ* is ordained in the sense of 'becoming...'. He then states the corollary of the third *vārttika*, that because of its meaning being expressed after *bhū* by *cvi*, *kyaṅ* will not be applicable. He introduces the fourth *vārttika* by showing this implies *kyaṅ* would not act after *ḍāc*, hence the need for the *vārttika*.

Having quoted the *sūtra* referred to, he advocates no change in the *sūtra*. Instead a most helpful distinction is made on the basis of *paribhāṣā 74* 'nañ-ivayukta'... , whereby we understand the addition of negative or the particle of comparison as denoting something different yet similar like 'bring a non-*brāhmaṇa*'. So we may understand *a-cvi* not ending in *cvi*, but like it in meaning 'becoming...'.

The *bhāṣya* then quotes a list of words from *bhṛśa gaṇa* with *upasargas*, asking whether these qualify the meaning of the *pratyaya kyaṅ* or the *prakṛti manas* etc. This doubt prompts the next *vārttika*, upon which Patañjali explains, 'there wrongly would be absence of *udātta* accent by *8.1.28*, if the *upasarga* qualifies the meaning of the *pratyaya*. So, let the *upasarga* qualify the *prakṛti*.'In which case he implies on the sixth, augment *aṭ* would wrongly precede both *su* and *manas* etc. Moreover the same fault applies when *lyap* and reduplication occur. Then restriction should be made to the one case where it does apply after *sam-grāmayati*. To achieve the correct accent for *bhṛśa* etc., it will have to be stated there is 'being like a part of what follows', but only in relation to accent rules, otherwise the accent with *aṭ* etc., would be wrong.

The final problem is the function of the *upasarga*. If there cannot be usage of an element for expressing what *kyaṅ* has already expressed, then *āṅ* of *śyenāyate* cannot express conduct. However, in the case of *abhi* etc. *manas*, the words are indicated with *upasarga* to remove doubt. Elsewhere with *niṅ* even where there are several *upasargas* the same operates.

> *Kāśikā bhṛśa ity evam ādibhyaḥ prātipadikebhyo 'cvyantebhyo bhuvi bhavaty arthe kyaṅ pratyayo bhavati, halantānāṃ ca lopaḥ / acveḥ iti pratyekam abhisambadhyate*
>
> "The *pratyaya k-ya-ṅ* acts in the sense of becoming (what it was not before) after the crude bases/*prātipadika bhṛśa* and the rest not ending in the *pratyaya cvi* and there is *lopa* elision (of the final) of those (words) ending in a consonant (*hal*)."

The restriction, not (ending in the) *pratyaya cvi*, is to be connected with each (word in the *bhṛśa gaṇa*).

bhṛśa m.f.n. strong, vehement, mighty, powerful, *Mn. Mbh.* etc.

bhṛśate bhṛśu (di ° pa ° se ° 1224 adhaḥ patane) kaḥ in falling down (heavily) *antarbhāvitaṇyarthāt igupadha 3.2.135*

bhṛśāyte to become powerful or strong or vehement *Bhaṭṭ 17-93* (who was not before)

bhuvi bhū ṅi m.f.n. becoming, being, casting

bhū (bhvā ° pa ° se ° 1 sattāyām) kvip (kartari)

in existence, being greatness, excellence.

anyebhyo 'pi dṛśyate 3.2.178 (kvip)

a cveḥ a cvi ṅasi

not after *cvi* actually present, but having that meaning

> (*abhūta tadbhāve*) *kṛbhvastiyoge sampadyakartāricvi 5.4.50*
>
> "The *pratyaya cvi* acts after a word when the agent has attained the new state, expressed by the word, (what the thing previously was not), and when the *dhātus kṛ* (to make), *bhū* (to be), and *as* (to be) are conjoined with it."

The whole is *lopa* elided by

cuṭū 1.3.7, 1.3.2, 6.1.67

tasya lopaḥ 1.3.9

3. "*pradhānaśiṣṭa... anvācayaśiṣṭaḥ*" see 3.1.12; 2..21.21

2.21.25 *"kva divā bhṛśā bhavanti"*

> Where do they become strong by day?

cf. naktaṃ dadṛśre kuhāciddivā īpuḥ R.V. kuhā ciddivéyuḥ 1.24.10

"Whither by day depart (the constellations) that shine at night (set high in heaven above us)?"

Kai. "atrābhūtatadbhāva bhāvaḥ"

"Here there is absence of becoming what the thing was not before "

2.22.5 *bhavatinā yoge cvir vidhīyate*

> "*cvi* is ordained in conjunction with the *dhātu bhū*."

kṛbhvastiyoge sampadyakartari cvi 5.1.40

see note on *Pat. 2.22.5*

cvinoktatvād iti

"because of (its meaning) being expressed together with *cvi*."

Kai. "cvisahacaritena bhavatinety arthaḥ"

"The meaning is with *bhū* going with *cvi*."

2.22.6 *ḍājantād api*

> "After that ending in *ḍāc* also *kyaṅ* does not obtain."

avyaktānukaraṇād dvyaj avarārddhāt anitau ḍāc 5.4.57

"The *pratyaya ḍāc* acts after the half of the word denoting an imitation of an articulate sound, when that half consists of at least two syllables, and when it is not followed by the (quotation mark) *iti*."

paṭapaṭat karoti paṭapaṭā karoti

"He makes a sound like *paṭat paṭat*."

In fact *kyaṅ* will be applicable by *lohitādiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ 3.1.13 (bhuvi)*

"The *pratyaya k-ya-ṣ* acts after the words *lohita* and the rest and after these that end with the *pratyaya ḍāc (5.4.57)* when those words do not receive the *pratyaya cvi (5.4.50)* in the sense of becoming what the thing previously was not."

paṭapaṭāyate

He makes a sound like *paṭāt* (which he had not made before).
paṭat onomatopoeic (i.e. from imitation of sounds)
paṭat ḍāc 5.4.57 see *avyaktānukaraṇāt*
paṭat paṭat ḍāc ḍāci dve vā° 8; P. 8.1.12
prakāre guṇavacanasya
paṭat paṭa ā ḍāci kṛte ṭi lopa (ṭeḥ 6.1.143)
(t-p-pa) (nāmreḍitasyāntasya tu vā 6.1.99)
paṭapaṭā kyaṣ te
nityam āmreḍite ḍāci (6.1.100) (pararūpam)
"For such a doubled sound imitation word in the presence of *ḍāc* (= *ā*) in place of the final *t* of the first member and the initial consonant of the second member, the form of the subsequent is the one *ādeśa* for both."

2.22.8   vacanaprāmāṇyāt

'Due to the authoritative statement of a rule', an expression frequently used by the *vārttika* to refer to the pre-eminence of a statement made by the *sūtra-kāra Pāṇini*.

2.22.13   "nañiva yuktam anyasadṛśādhikaraṇe tathā hy arythagatiḥ" Nāge.

Pari 74 nanu bhṛśādhibhyo bhuvyacveḥ 3.1.12 ityādau vidhīyamāna kyaṅ kva dikṣā bhṛśa bhavantīty atrāpi syād ata āha
"One might say that the *pratyaya kyaṅ* which by *3.1.12* may be added to *bhṛśa* etc., when they do not end with the *pratyaya cvi* to denote the meaning expressed by the *dhātu bhū* may be added to *bhṛśa* also in the phrase *kva divā bhṛśa bhavanti* 'Where are the (stars that were) visible (by night) in daytime?' (i.e. *kva divā bhṛśāyante*) because *bhṛśa* in this phrase does not end in *cvi* and is in construction with *bhavanti*." (The *vārttikakāra* or a previous *paribhāṣā* formulator) says therefore ... (tr. in text) "An expression formed ..."   The *bhāṣya* then explains.

2.22.13   nañyuktam iva yuktaṃ vā yuktiṃcid iha dṛśyate tatrāntyasmiṃs tatsadṛśe kāryam

vijñāyate tathā hy artho gamyate
Nāgeśa glosses on *Pari. 74*
"Whenever we see (in a rule) any term which is formed either by the addition of (the negative *nañ* or by that of *iva* to (some other word) we know that the operation (which is taught in the rule must take effect), in something which differs from (and is at the same time similar to that which is denoted by that other word) because it is in this way that (such terms) are generally understood (in ordinary life)."

2.22.15   abrāhmaṇamānayety ukte brāhmaṇa sadṛśa ānīyate nāsauloṣṭam ānīya kṛtī bhavati (abrāhmaṇām ānaya)

"For when (somebody has been told) 'fetch a non-*Brāhmaṇa*' and has thereupon brought a lump of earth, he is not considered to have done

what he ought to have done."

In ordinary life 'abrāhamaṇa' denotes the one who though he is not a Brāhmaṇa is yet similar to a Brāhmaṇa, e.g. a kṣatriya, but it cannot denote, for example, a lump of earth.

Accordingly kyaṅ can be added by 3.1.12 to bhṛśa etc. only when it does not end with cvi and yet is similar to words that end in cvi.

cf. also the earlier (?) explanation of na = iva.

"hiraṇyadanto rapaso nasūnuḥ na hi eṣa sūnuḥ

who has golden teeth is not the inciter of bodily defect for this one is not one who urges the sun

sunurūpo hi eṣa san na sūtuḥ

For (though) being of the form of the inciter he is not the one who urges (sun)."

(jaiminīya upaniṣad brāhmaṇa 3.3.15)

i.e. when the sense to be expressed is that 'that which formerly was not bhṛśa becomes or is bhṛśa. In the other cases however, kva divā etc. it follows that 3.1.12 cannot be applied. cf.

śloka vārtika	nāma dhātvarthayogī ca
apohavāda 33	nainam nañ pratiṣedhakaḥ
kumārila	vadato brāhmaṇādharmo
(abhūtatadbhāva)	anyamātravirodhinau

'nañ having connection with the increasing of the dhātu and a noun is not negative in fact, as non-brāhmin and non-righteousness of one speaking are not contradictory of (having) different mother. (7)'

2.22.18 abhi manasa (mana (di° ā° a° 1176 jñāne) asun (u° 4.189) (karaṇe)
    abhimanāya nom-ā (opt. manāyate)

to long for, desire Bhaṭṭ 5.73

sumanas

sumanāya nom. ā to become cheerful or happy

unmanas

unmanāyate to become perplexed or excited Daś 63.7

durmanas

durmanāyate to become troubled or sad, Kāś.

All in the bhṛśādi gaṇa.

tiṅatiṅ 8.1.28

"A tiṅ ending word (i.e. a finite verb) is anudātta accented (when after a word not ending in a tiṅ (verbal pratyaya))."

e.g. devadattaḥ pacati

nighāta iti (caus. of ni-han)

a blow, stroke, suppression or absence of accent

A.V. Prāt toning down, anudātta or grave accent.

Kai. "manaḥ śabdāt kyaṅi kṛte manāyata ity asya tiṅantasya padasyātiṅantāt svādeḥ padād uttaratvāt prakṛtyarthaviśeṣaṇatve tu sumanāyata ityādi tiṅantaṃ sampadyata iti tadvyatiriktapadāntarā 'bhāvān

nighātābhāvaḥ upasargasya tu dhātvantarbhāvāt tataḥ pūrvamaḍāṭau prāpnutaḥ kyañante ca tasyānupraveśāt tadvyatiriktapadābhāvāt samāsā 'bhāvāt lopā prasaṅgaḥ kyañantāc ca sani kṛte sopasargasya dvirvacanaprasaṅgaḥ."

"There is (*anudātta* accent) when *kyaṅ* is effected after the word *manas* for (the form) *manāyate*, ending in *tiṅ* because of following the word *su* and the rest, not ending in *tiṅ*. However, when (the *upasarga*) qualifies the base, (the forms) *sumanāyate* etc. become *tiṅ* ending and because of the absence of another word different from it there is absence of suppressed accent/ *anudātta*. However, because of the *upasarga* being included in the *dhātu* these (wrongly) obtain the augment *aṭ* and *āṭ* before it (instead of directly preceding the *dhātu* itself)."

And because of its entering into a *kyaṅ* ending (*dhātu*), because of the absence of a *pada*/word separate from it, and because of the absence of a *samāsa* (technical name), there is no possibility/occasion for *lopa* (of *sup* endings). And when *san* (desiderative) is effected after a *kyaṅ* ending *dhātu*, there is the possibility (undesired) of reduplication of the *upasarga*."

2.22.23 sopasargād iti cedati doṣa

If we accept the statement 'after the word together with an *upasarga*' there is a fault in relation to *aṭ āgama*

by *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣvaḍudāttaḥ 6.4.71* (*aṅgasya*)
"*Aṭ* with *udātta* accent acts as the augment of the initial of a verbal *aṅga*/stem, in the presence of the aorist, imperfect and conditional (tense *pratyayas*)."
So here the augment would have to be for the initial of the *upasarga* preceding the *dhātu* not of the *dhātu* itself (which is required)
by *ādyantau ṭakitau 1.1.46*

2.23.5 svamanāyata "He was or became cheerful."

su aṭ manāya (yañanta) (ta) laṅ (imperfect)
If the statement is accepted *aṭ* would here have to augment the initial of *su*.

2.23.6 lyap kṛt pratyaya ya ādeśa in place of ktvā (indeclinable participle/ gerund) when the dhātu it follows is preceded by an upasarga with which it is compounded, by *samāse 'nañpūrve ktvo lyap 7.1.37*

"In a compound the first member of which is an indeclinable but not *nañ*, *lyap* is *ādeśa* for *ktvā*."
l by *liti 6.1.193*
'*udātta* on the syllable immediately preceding the *pratyaya* having *it l*.'
p by *hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk 6.1.71* augment *t*
sumanāyya sumanāya lyap ato lopaḥ 6.4.48 (*ardhadhātuke*)
7. *abhi mi manāy iṭ ṣate*
'*sanyaṅoḥ' 6.1.9*
"For a non-reduplicate *dhātu* ending in *san* or *yaṅ* (intensive) *pratyayas*

there is reduplication." iṭ augment by *ārdhadhātukasyeḍvalādeḥ 7.2.35*
The reduplicate syllable is *mi* because the *dhātu* is to be reduplicated not the *dhātu* and an *upasarga* together; otherwise *abhi* would have had to be reduplicated.

sanyataḥ 7.4.73
"Short *i* is *ādeśa* for *a* of the reduplicate in the desiderative"

sanyaṅoḥ 6.1.9
"(For a non-reduplicate) *dhātu* ending in *san* (desiderative) or *yaṅ* (intensive) *pratyayas* there is reduplication."

ato lopaḥ 6.4.48
"The *e* at the end of a stem is elided before an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*."

7. *avaśyaṃ saṃgrāmayate* "It is essential that the form *saṃgrāmayati* be taken as together with its *upasarga*."

saṃgrāma (cu° u° a° 1123 yuddhe) ṇi
So that this exceptional case be allowed for, where the *upasarga sam* is intended as part of the *dhātu*

a saṃgrāmayata śūraḥ Imperfect *laṅ* with *āgama aṭ*
"The hero made war or fought."

2.23.10 *parāṅgavadbhāvaṃ vakṣyāmi*
"The condition of being like a part of that which follows " I will say…
'treatment of a word as part of another'

cf. *subāmantrite parāṅgavatsvare 2.1.2*
"A word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya*, when followed by a word in the vocative/*āmantrita* (2.3.48) is regarded as if it were a part/*aṅga* of such a vocative word when a rule relating to accent is to be applied." i.e. a *sup* ending word enters as it were the body of the vocative word, by

āmantritasya ca 6.1.198
"The first syllable of a vocative has *udātta* accent."

e.g. *śubhas patī śubhaspatī* 'of prosperity' the Lords.
The *udātta* on *patī* now falls on *su* because the two words are considered as a single word.

2.23.15 *uktārthānām aprayogaḥ*
cf. previous note.

kyaṅā ktatvād ācārarthasyāḍaḥ
'because by *kyaṅ* has been expressed the sense of conduct (there is not applicability) of *āṅ* (in that sense).'

cf. *upamānād ācāre 3.1.10*
"*Kyac* (optionally) acts in the sense of conduct (towards someone) after a word ending in a *sup*/case *pratyaya* denoting the object of comparison."

kartuḥ kyaṅsalopaś ca 3.1.11
"*Kyaṅ* optionally acts in the sense of conduct ... and there is elision of final *s*."

79

2.23.19   utpucchyate
It raises its tail. *Vop. 21,17*
pucchabhāṇḍacīvarāṇṇiṅ 3.1.20 (karaṇe)
"The *pratyaya ṇiṅ* in the sense of making, acts after *puccha* (tail) *bhāṇḍa* (pot) and *cīvara* (rags) as the *karman*/object of the action."

2.23.19   c.f. also vibhāṣotpucche
In the *tatpuruṣa* the word ... *utpuccha* may optionally have *udātta* on the final.

2.23.21   *lohitāḍiḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ //3/1/13//*

kimarthaḥ kakāraḥ / guṇavṛddhipratiṣedhārthaḥ / ṅkitīti / guṇa-vṛddhipratiṣedho yathā syāt / naitad asti prayojanam / sārva-dhātukārdhadhātukayor aṅgasya guṇa ucyate dhātoś ca vihitaḥ pratyayaḥ śeṣa ārdhadhātukasañjñāṃ labhate na cāyaṃ dhātor vidhīyate / lohitādīni prātipadikāṇi

Pāṇini 3.1.13: The *pratyaya kyaṣ* acts in the sense of becoming (what the thing previously was not) after the words *lohita* etc. and after those that end with the *pratyaya ḍāc* (5.4.57).

Bhāṣya: What is the purpose of the letter *k* (of *kyaṣ*)? For the purpose of prohibiting *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. So that there should be prohibition of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* when that having an indicatory *k*, *g* or *ṅ* follows.

This is not the purpose. It is stated that when a *sārvadhātuka* or an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows *guṇa* acts for the final *ik* (viz. *i u ṛ ḷ* vowel) of an *aṅga*/base. And the remaining *pratyayas* ordained after a *dhātu* receive the technical name *ārdhadhātuka* and this (*pratyaya kyaṣ*) is not ordained after a *dhātu*. The words *lohita* and the rest are *prātipadikas*/crude bases (not *dhātus*).

2.24.1 sāmānyagrahaṇārthas tarhi / kva sāmānyagrahaṇārthenārthaḥ / naḥ kye (1.4.15) iti / nāyaṃ nāntād vidhīyate // iha tarhi/ yasya halaḥ kyasya vibhāṣā (6.4.49, 50) iti / nāyaṃ halantād vidhīyate// iha tarhi / āpatyasya ca taddhite 'nāti kyacvyoś ca (6.4.151, 152) iti /
2.24.5   nāyam āpatyād vidhīyate // iha tarhi / kyāc chandasi (3.2.170) iti yācchandasīty etāvad vaktavyaṃ curaṇyuḥ turaṇyuḥ

bhuraṇyur ity evam artham //

Then it is for the purpose of general mention. Where is there (exhibited some) purpose in a general mention? (In the rule) *naḥ kye* (*1.4.15*) "The word form ending in *n* is called *pada* when *kya* follows" (i.e. *pratyayas kyac, kyaṅ* and *kyaṣ*). This (*pratyaya kyaṣ*) is not ordained after (a word) ending in *n*. (Therefore general mention is not the purpose).

Here is the *sūtra* 'yasya halaḥ' (*6.4.49*) "When a consonant precedes the final *y* in a verbal stem, this *y* is *lopa*/elided, before an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*" (and the *sūtra*) *kyasya vibhāṣā* (*6.4.50*) "The elision/*lopa* of *y* of the denominative stem *pratyaya kya* is optional when preceded by a consonant and followed by an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*". This (*kyaṣ*) has not been ordained after that ending in a consonant. (Therefore this is not the purpose.)

Here then, *āpatyasya ca taddhite 'nāti* (*6.4.151*) "The *y* belonging to a patronymic *pratyaya*, preceded by a consonant is *lopa*/elided before a *taddhita pratyaya* when it does not begin with *ā*" and *kyacvyoś ca* (*6.4.152*) (*halaḥ, lopaḥ*) "The *y* belonging to a patronymic *pratyaya* preceded by a consonant is elided before the denominative *pratyaya kya* and the adverbial *pratyaya cvi*". This (*pratyaya kyaṣ*) is not ordained after a patronymic *pratyaya*. (Therefore this is not the purpose.)

2.24.6   *idaṃ tarhi prayojanam / yattadakṛdyakāra iti dīrghatvaṃ tatra kṅidgrahaṇam anuvartate tad ihāpi yathā syāt / lohitāyate / kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇam tatra kṅidgrahaṇam anuvartate / iha mā bhūt / uruyā dhṛṣṇuyeti / yadi kṅidgrahaṇam anuvartate pitryam iti pitū rīṅbhāvo na prāpnoti rīṅbhāve kṅidgrahaṇam nivartiṣyate yadi nivartate katham asūyā / vasūyā ca yajāmahe /*

This then is the purpose of that letter *y* which is not a *kṛt pratyaya* causes lengthening. The mention of *kṅit* is continued in the statement of *dīrgha* by the rule when a non-*kṛt* letter *y* follows and should be continued in this rule also. (Thus lengthening takes place in) *lohitāyate*.

But what is the reason why the word *kṅiti* is specifically mentioned as following on (from the previous *sūtra*)? So that lengthening should not be applicable here *uruyā* (instr. of feminine ind. far, to a distance, *Maitr. S.*) *dhṛṣṇuyā* (ind.) boldly, strongly, firmly (*R.V.*).

If the specific word *kṅiti* follows on from the previous *sūtra*, then the (form) *pitryam* with the *ādeśa*/substitute *rīṅ* does not obtain. When

there occurs the *ādeśa*/substitute *rīṅ* the specific mention of *it k* and *ṅ* will cease (to be applicable). If it ceases how do we get the form *asūya vasūya ca yajāmahe* (*Ṛgveda 1.97.2*) "(For a fine field, for pleasant paths), for wealth, we sacrifice to you"?

24.10 *asūyater asūyā vasūyater vasūya / athavā chāndasam etad*
       dṛṣṭānuvidhiś ca cchandasi bhavatīti / yadi cchāmdasatvaṃ
       hetunārthaḥ kṅidgrahaṇenānuvartamānena / kasmān na bhavati
       uruyā dhṛṣṇuyeti / chāndasatvāt // athavās tv atra dīrghatvaṃ
       chāndasam hrasvatvam bhaviṣyati / tadyathā / upagāyantu māṃ
       patnayo garbhiṇyo yuvataya iti //

From *asūyati* (discontented with) (is derived the form) *asūya* (displeasure, indignation (esp. at the merit or happiness of another), envy and jealousy) (and) from *vasūyati* ("He desires wealth") is derived *vasūyā* (ind. through desire of wealth).

Otherwise this is peculiar to the *Veda*. And the operation or application of the rule is in accordance with the words seen in use in the *Veda*.

If being peculiar to the *Veda* is the cause, then no purpose is (served) by the mention of *kṅit* (from the previous *sūtra*). Why is (*kyaṣ*) not applicable in the case of the forms *uruyā* (far) and *dhṛṣṇuyā* (boldly)? Because (they are forms) peculiar to the *Veda*.

Otherwise (in classical literature) let there be lengthening of the vowel here. The shortening will be peculiar to the *Veda*, as for example *upagāyantu māṃ garbhiṇayo yuvatayaḥ* "Let the young pregnant wives sing to me".

24.15 *atha kimarthaḥ ṣakāraḥ / viśeṣaṇārthaḥ / kva viśeṣaṇārthenā-*
       rthaḥ / vā kyaṣaḥ (1.3.90) iti / vā yāditi hy ucyamāne pāśyā
       ato 'pi prasajyeta / naitad asti prayojanam / parasmaipadam ity
       ucyate na cātaḥ parasmaipadaṃ nāpy ātmanepadaṃ paśyāmaḥ /
       sāmānyagrahaṇāvighātārthas tarhi bhaviṣyati / kva sāmānya-
       grahaṇāvighātārthenārthaḥ / kyāc chandasīti / yācchandasīty
       evaṃ vaktavyaṃ curaṇyuḥ turaṇyuḥ bhuraṇyur ity evam artham /

Now what is the purpose of the letter *ṣ*? For distinguishing (it from other *pratyayas*). Where is the purpose for the sake of distinguishing served? (In the *sūtra*) *vā kyaṣaḥ* (*1.3.90*) "The *pratyayas* called

parasmaipada act optionally after the denominative verbs ending in the *pratyaya kyaṣ*". For if it were simply stating "*vā yāt*" "optionally after *ya*" it would be applicable even after a short *a* of *pāśyā* "A multitude of nooses or ropes, a net".

This is not the purpose that *parasmaipada* be stated, because here we do not see *parasmaipada* nor even *ātmanepada pratyayas*.

Then it will be for the purpose of common mention or inclusion without hindrance to application (of a particular term to others where it should apply). Where is the purpose for the sake of meaning common mention without hindrance to application (of a particular term to others)? (In the rule) *kyācchandas (3.2.170)* "The *pratyaya u* acts in the *chandas/Veda* after *dhātus* that have taken the denominative *pratyaya kyaṣ* in the sense of the agent having such a habit etc. In fact it should be stated viz. *yācchandasi* "after *ya* in the *Veda* (omitting *k*)". So the purpose is (for the forms) *curaṇyuḥ* (thief), *turaṇyuḥ* (swift), *bhuraṇyuḥ* (quivering).

2.24.20   lohitaḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣvacanam //1//

> *lohitaḍājbhyaḥ kyaṣ vaktavyaḥ / lohitāyati lohitāyate / paṭa-*
> *paṭāyati paṭapaṭāyate // athānyāni lohitādīni /*

Vārttika 1: The rule (should be) after *lohita* and after those words ending in the *pratyaya ḍāc kyaṣ pratyaya* acts.

Bhāṣya: It should be stated after *lohita* and those words ending in *ḍāc*, *kyaṣ pratyaya* acts.
lohitāyati, lohitāyate "He becomes red",
paṭapaṭāyati, paṭapaṭāyate "He makes the sound *paṭpaṭ*",
damadamāyati, damadamāyate "He makes the sound *damadama*".
Now (what about) the others (in the group) *lohita* and the rest (what of them)?

24.23   bhṛśādiṣv itarāṇi //2//

> *bhṛśādiṣv itarāṇi paṭhitavyāni / kiṃ prayojanam / ṅita ity*
> *ātmanepadaṃ yathā syād iti*

Vārttika 2: The others are to be read in the (*gaṇa*) *bhṛśa* and the rest.

Bhāṣya: The rest are to be read/recited in (the *gaṇa*) *bhṛsa* and the rest. What is the purpose? So that the rule (*anudātta*) *ṅita ātmanepadam* (*1.3.12*) "That having an *it/* indicatory *ṅ* (as well as gravely accented *dhātu* in the *Dhātupāṭha* takes) *ātmanepada* (*vibhaktipratyaya* when the fruit accrues to the agent)" should be applicable".

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀṆINI 3.1.13*

Vārttika Summary
In the first *vārttika Kātyāyana* states a restriction on the *sūtra*. *kyaṣ* acts only after the word *lohita* and those words ending in *ḍāc*. The rest he says in the second *vārttika* are found in *bhṛsa* and the rest.

Bhāṣya Summary
Patañjali's introduction to the first *vārttika* begins by showing that *it k* cannot be for prohibiting *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* because *lohita* etc. are *prātipadikas* not *dhātus*, nor is it for general mention, since no words end in *n* (*1.4.15*) or a consonant (*6.4.49, 50*), or ordained after patronymic (*6.4.151-2*) nor is *k* needed in '*kyācchandasi*' (*3.2.170*). Finally, it is stated that the purpose is so that the letter *y* not a *kṛt*, causes lengthening, *kṅiti* being in *anuvṛtti*, and the various Vedic exceptions being due. (Shortening here being peculiar to the Veda.)

In the case of the *it ṣ*, after showing that it cannot be for distinguishing, because neither *ātmane* nor *parasmaipada* are seen in the context of *1.3.90*, nor can it be for common mention in *3.2.170*, if we accept that applies only to three forms.

On the first *vārttika* he simply provides the implied two *ubhaya pada* examples. Finally on the second *vārttika* he explains why those other than *lohita* are to be read in *bhṛsa gaṇa*. And, being followed by *kyaṅ* having an *it ṅ*, *ātmanepada* only would be applicable.

2.23.21   Kāśikā "lohitādibhyo ḍājantebhyaś ca kyaṣ pratyayo bhavati"
    "The *pratyaya kyaṣ* acts after the words *lohita* and words ending in the *pratyaya ḍāc*."
lohita m.f. (*ā* or *lohinī*) n. (*cf. rohita*) red, red coloured, reddish
ruha (bhvā° pa° a° 859 bījajanmani prādurbhāve ca) itan
ruhe raś ca lo vā u°   3.94
ḍāc avyaktānukaraṇād dyajavarārddhādanitau ḍāc 5.4.57
See *3.1.12 Vā. 3 Note*
kyaṣ sum Denominative *dhātu* forming *pratyaya ya* after which both *parasmaipada* and *ātmanepada pratyayas* are added.

lohitāyati lohitāyate kiti ca 1.1.5

2.23.22   kiti guṇvṛddhipratiṣedho

"And that word element, which otherwise would have caused *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* does not do so, when that has an indicatory *k, g,* or *ṅ.*"

Thus the *k* of *kyaṣ* would seem to have this function.

2.23.23   sārvadhātukārdhadhātukyoḥ (7.3.84) *aṅgasya guṇa* (*ucyate*)

"*Guṇa* from *7.3.82 miderguṇaḥ* acts in the place of the final *ik* vowel by *1.1.3 iko guṇavṛddhi* of an *aṅga*/stem (*6.4.1 aṅgasya*) before the *sārvadhātuka 3.4.113* and *ārdhadhātuka 3.4.114-17 pratyayas.*"

23. *dhātoḥ ca vihita pratyayaḥ*

cf. 3.1.91 "As far as the end of the third *adhyaya* from *3.1.91* the *pratyayas* are understood to be enjoined after a dhātu."

cf. śeṣa ārdhadhātukasaṃjñā labhate

ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ 3.4.114 (tiṅ śit pratyayaḥ dhātoḥ, varjayitvā)

"The remainder, (i.e. the *pratyayas* other than *tiṅ* (verbal *pratyayas*) and those with an indicatory *ś* attached) acting after a *dhātu* are called *ārdhadhātuka.*"

2.24.2   nāyaṃ nāntād vidhīyate "This is not ordained after a word ending in *n.*"

Kāś. "na hi paṭhitānāṃ madhye nakārāntaḥ śabdo 'sti"

Kāś. 'For there is no word among those read (in the *lohita gaṇa*) which ends in the letter *n.*'

yasya halaḥ 6.4.49

"In place of the syllable *ya* final of an *aṅga* (verbal stem) preceded by a consonant, *lopa* elision acts, in the presence of an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*" (Otherwise by the previous *sūtra 'ato lopaḥ' 6.4.49* only the final *a* of *ya* would have been *lopa* by *alo 'ntyasya 5.1.22*

e.g. *bebhidya tumun bebhiditum*

kyasya vibhāṣā 6.4.50

"The *lopa* elision of *kya* in those circumstances is optional."

i.e. precedence by a consonant and followed by an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya kya* denotes *kyac* and *kyaṅ* not *kyaṣ.*

2.24.8   uruyā Maitr. S. 3.7.8 for *uruyā* ind. far, far off; *uruyā,* (Instr. of the fem.) to a distance from *uru ūrṇañ* (*a° u° se° 1039 ācchādane*)

  (*uṇortanulopas ca*)

ma ha ti hrasvaś ca u° 1.31

ghṛṣṇuyā Ind. boldly, strongly, firmly, for *ghṛṣṇupssa*

V.S.Prāt. 520; R.V. 4.21.4, etc.

P. 7.1.39

supā suluk pūrvasavarṇā ā āt śe yā ḍā ḍyā yāc ālaḥ 7.1.39

"The following irregular endings act in place of various *sup*/case endings in the *Veda.*

1. *sa* of nom. sg. for *as* of pl.,
2. *luk* elision of *sup* endings,
3. single substitution of homogeneous long vowel,
4. *ā*,
5. *āt*,
6. *e* for nom. pl. ending,
7. *yā*,
8. *ā* (*ḍā*) with elision of last vowel and consonant,
9. *yā* (*ḍmā*) with similar elision (*yāc*), and
10. *ā* (*l* accent).

Thus (*yā*) gives *uruyā ghṛṣṇuyā* for *uruṇā* and *ghṛṣuyā* the regular instrumental (or neuter) forms by *iko 'ci vibhaktau 7.1.73*
"*Num* ('*n*') is the *āgama* for a *napuṃsaka*/neuter ending when a *vibhakti*/case *pratyaya* follows beginning with a vowel."

2.24.8   yadi kidgrahaṇam anuvartate pitryam iti pitū rīṅ bhāvo na prāpnoti
        If mention of *kit* follows on then the form *pitryam* by *pituryac ca*
        4.3.79 (ṭhan) tata āgataḥ 4.3.74

        "The *pratyaya yat* as well as *ṭhan* act in the sense of come thence after the word."
pitṛ for pā (a° pa° a° 1056 rakṣaṇe) tṛn (u°   2.95)
piturāgataṃ = paitṛkaṃ pitryam
derived from or relating to a father, paternal, patrimonial, ancestral, with the *ādeśa rī*
'*rīṅ ṛtaḥ 7.4.27 (yi cvau, akṛtsārvadhātukayoḥ)*'
"*Rī* is *ādeśa* for the final short *ṛ* of a stem, before a *pratyaya* beginning with *y* when it is not a *kṛt* or a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* and before the adverbial *pratyaya cvi*."
ī of this being elided by *yasyeti ca 6.4.148 (bhasya taddhite lopaḥ)*
"The final *i* and *a* (long and short) of a weak/*bha* stem are *lopa*/elided before a *taddhita pratyaya* and before the feminine *pratyaya ī*."

2.24.10   sūyā vasūyā ca yajāmahe
        "How do we get the forms *asūyā* and *vasūyā* needing *yak* and *kyac* and therefore an indicatory *k* to prevent *guṇa*?"
sukṣetriyā sugātuyā vasuyā ca yajāmahe ṛ. 1.97.2
"With the desire for a fine field, with the desire for fine paths, and with the desire for wealth we sacrifice (to you, O *Agni*)."
supa ātmanaḥ kyac 3.1.8
"The *pratyaya kyaṣ* acts (optionally) in the sense of desire after a word ending in a *sup pratyaya* expressing the object desired as connected with the desirer himself."
na chandasyayutrasya 7.4.35
"In the *Veda* the rules causing lengthening (*7.4.25*) or substitution of long *ī* for final vowel of a stem (*7.4.73*) do not apply except in the case of *putra*."

apratyayāta 3.3.202 (mātre)
supāṃ luk 7.1.39 tṛtīyā luk

2.24.10 asūyā displeasure, indignation (especially at the happiness of another), envy, jealousy.
asūtra kaṇḍvādibhyo yak 3.1.27
asūtra ka° u° se° asūyā
a pratyayāt 3.3.202
ajādyataṣṭāp 4.1.4
asūyā "through desire of wealth" *R.V. 1.197.2*
vasu kyac (akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ 7.4.25)
vasa (bhvā° pa° a° 1005 nivāse) u (u° 1.10)

2.24.10 asūyaterasūyā (the form) *asūya* (displeasure) (is derived from the denominative *asū va ti* to be discontented with) or from *asave svāhā vasave svāhā — tai° brā° 3.10.7*
"Hail to or (may a blessing rest on) life, hail to wealth" (for *asu* and for *vasu*) by *gheṅiti 7.3.111 vasūyate vasūyā* (the form) *vasūya* (through desire of wealth) is derived from *vāsūyati* (denom. to desire for wealth).
sukṣetriyā sugātuyā vasūyā ca yajāmahe — R.V. 1.97.2
See note on P. *vasūyā* long *ū* by *7.4.25* in spite of *na chandasyaputrasya 7.4.35*
Kai. "yadi rīṅrabhāva eva nivartate na tu dīrghavidhāv api tadā asuvasu-śabdābhyāṃ pūrvavadyādeśo kṛte dīrghābhāvād asūyāvasūyeti na sidhyati asūyateḥ kaṇḍvādiyagantasyāsūyeti vasūyater icchākyajantasya vasūyety utaram"
"If only the *ādeśa* is not even in the lengthening rule, then when the substitute *ya* is effected as after *asu* and *vasu*, because of the absence of a long vowel the forms *asūya* and *vasūya* are not established. *Asūya* is formed from *asūyati* from *kaṇḍvādi gaṇa*."

2.24.13 upagāyantu mā patnayo garbhiṇayo yuvataya iti
"Let the young pregnant wives sing to me."
somasya vai rājño 'rdhamāsasya
rātrayaḥ patnaya āsana Tai Sa 2.5.6.4
"The nights were wives of king *soma* of (one) fortnight ..." and here *patni* is short by reason of vedic usage.
garbhiṇayo bhavanti vai sa 2.1.2.6 'They become pregnant.'
From *garbhiṇī* pregnant woman, short *i* by vedic licence.
cf. yunasti 4.1.77
The feminine *pratyaya ti* acts after the *prātipadika* and this receives the name *taddhita pratyaya* and thus debars *ṅip 4.1.5* or *ṅiṣ 4.1.65*
yu (a° pa° se° 1034 miśraṇe) kani
kaninyuvṛṣi u° 1.156 na lopa 8.2.7
yuvati jas by jasi ca 7.3.109

yuvatayaḥ
chāndasaṃ hrasvatvam
Shortening peculiar to the *Veda*
na chandasya putrasya 7.4.35
by *Patañjali* on *ambārthanadyor hrasvaḥ 7.3.107*
'*avaśyaṃ chandasi hrasvatvaṃ vaktavyam*
upagāyantu māṃ patnayo garbhiṇayo yuvatayaḥ'
cf. *garbhaṇikā sthūlamadhyā ... K.Artha 2.11.42*
'bulging in the middle' (Vol. 3 p. 187)
cf. *pravālakaṃ ālakandakaṃ vaivarṇikaṃ ca raktam*
coral, outcaste, coloured red
padyarāgam ca karaṇagarbhiṇikāvarjam iti
lotus, and (free from) making an embryo or product, ruby
Kai '*varṇavyasyayena dīrghaḥ kriyata ity arthaḥ*'
'The meaning is the lengthening (in the forms *asūya* and *vasūya*) is effected
by interchange of letters (short for long).'
by *vyatyayo bahulam 3.1.85 (chandasi)*
"In the *chandas* there is diversely interchange of various *vikaraṇas* and the
rest previously ordained."

2.24.14   *vā kyaṣa 1.3.90*
"After the *pratyaya kyaṣ, parasmaipada pratyayas* act optionally."
So by this *sūtra 3.1.13 kyaṣ* is ordained and we therefore have *lohitāyati* or
lohitāyate etc. and
paṭapaṭāyati or *paṭapaṭāyate* etc.
He makes a sound like *paṭ paṭ*.

2.24.16   *pāśyā* "If *vā yāt* (optionally after *ya*) were stated it would be
applicable even after the short *a* of *pāśyā*."
in fact derived by
pāśādibhyo yaḥ 4.2.49 (tasya samūhaḥ 4.2.37)
"The *pratyaya ya* acts in the sense of collection thereof after the words *pāśā*
etc."
Dh. P. *pāśa (cu° a° se° 1720 bandhane) ghañ (3.3.19)*
pāś ya ṭāp (4.1.4) pāśayā

2.24.15   *Kai.* "*naitad astīti*"
"*sāmānyavihitānām ātmanepadaparasmaipadānāṃ*
niyamārthaṃ prakaraṇam ity adoṣaḥ"
There is no fault because the matter/production (of *ṣ*) is for the purpose of a
restriction to the generally ordained *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada*
pratyayas.

2.24.19   *yācchandasīty evaṃ*
"After *ya* in the *veda* (should be stated)" because these four words are

derived from *yak* without an initial *it k* by *3.1.27.*
kaṇḍvādibhyo yak

2.24.20 lohitaḍājbhya iti
    'The *pratyaya kyaṣ* acts after the word *lohita* and words ending in *ḍāc.*'
Kai "*ādisabdapratyākhyānam etat apaṭhitasaṅgrahārthopyādiśabdo na bhavati, tasya vārttikakāraṇe dūṣitatvāt*
"This is a rejection of the word *ādi/(lohita)* and the rest. The word *ādi* is not applicable also in the sense of an unread complete enumeration or collection, because of its nature being refuted by the *Vārttika-kāra.*"
Kāś 'bhṛṣādiṣv itarāṇi' yāni lohitādiṣu paṭhyante tebhyaḥ kyaṣ eva aparipaṭhitebhyas tu kyaṣ eva bhavati
The rest of *lohit-ādi* will be found in the *bhṛṣādi gaṇa.*
The words quoted in the (group) *lohita* and the rest have *kyaṅ* only after them, (others) not quoted (it being an *ākṛti gaṇa*) have *kyaṣ* only after them.
e.g. *varmāyati varmāyate* to become clad with armour.

2.25.1   *kaṣṭāya kramaṇe //3/1/14//*

kaṣṭāyeti kim nipātyate / kaṣṭaśabdāc caturthīsamarthāt kramaṇe 'nārjave kyaṅ nipātyate / kaṣṭāya karmaṇe krāmati kaṣṭāyate / atyalpam idam ucyate kaṣṭāyeti /

Pāṇini 3.1.14: The *pratyaya kyaṅ*, in the sense of undertaking moral crookedness, acts after the word *kaṣṭa* (trouble or evil) when the latter has the fourth (*sup*/case *vibhakti pratyaya*) in construction.

Bhāṣya: Why is the word *kaṣṭa* put down or mentioned as an irregular form? *Kyaṅ* is 'put down' or mentioned irregularly in the sense of undertaking moral crookedness after the word *kaṣṭa* which is syntactically connected through the dative *sampradāna*/fourth case. *kaṣṭāya karmaṇe krāmati kaṣṭāyate* "He undertakes to do evil" (He has wicked intentions). The word *kaṣṭāya* speaks very little (about the usage).

2.25.4   sattrakakṣakaṣṭagahanebhyaḥ kaṇvacikīrṣāyām //1//

Vārttika 1: After *sattra kakṣa kaṣṭa kṛcchra* and *gahana (kyaṅ* acts) in the sense of *gahana* in the sense of desiring to do evil.

2.25.5   *sattrakakṣakaṣṭagahanebhyaḥ kaṇvacikīrṣāyām iti vaktavyām/*
            sattrāyate / sattra // kakṣa / kakṣāyate // kakṣa // kaṣṭa /
            kaṣṭāyate / kaṣṭa // gahana gahanāyate //

Bhāṣya: It should be stated that (*kyaṅ* acts) after *sattra kakṣa kaṣṭa kṛcchra* and *gahana* in the sense of desiring to do evil. *Sattra* (n. session, great *soma* sacrifice).

sattrāyate "He desires to do evil"

*kakṣa (m. lurking) *kakṣāyate* "He waits for someone in a hidden place, lies in ambush and intends something wicked".

*kaṣṭa (evil) *kaṣṭāyate* "He has wicked intentions".

*kṛcchra (m.n. causing trouble or pain, evil, bad) *kṛcchrāyate* "He feels pain or has wicked designs" (*Bhatt. 17.76*).

*gahana (n. abyss, depth, inaccessible place) *gahanāyate* "He lies in wait for someone in a secret place; he has treacherous intentions towards another".

2.25.7   *apara āha / sattrādibhyaś caturthyantebhyaḥ kramaṇe 'nārjave*
            kyaṅvaktavyaḥ / etāny evodāharaṇāni // sattrādibhya iti kim
            artham / kuṭilāya krāmaty anuvākāya / caturthyantebhya iti kim
            artham / ajaḥ kaṣṭaṃ krāmati //

2.25.10   *tat tarhi vaktavyam / na vaktavyam / naitatpratyayānta-*
            nipātanam / kiṃ tarhi / tādarthya eṣā caturthī / kaṣṭāya yat
            prātipadikam / kaṣṭārthe yat prātipadikam iti //

Another says 'It should be stated that *kyaṅ* acts in the sense of undertaking moral crookedness/dishonesty after the words *sattra* etc. ending in the fourth case (in construction)'. Those in fact (just stated) are the examples.

Why (what is the purpose of) "after *sattra*" etc.? (Otherwise it would apply here) *kuṭilāya krāmaty anuvākāya* (*kuṭilāyanuvākāya krāmati v.1*) "He proceeds to uneven recitation of a chapter of the *Veda*, (*vedic* text)".

What is the purpose of (saying) "after (those words) ending in the fourth *sup*/case"? (So that it be not applicable to any other case relation, like the following) *ajaḥ kaṣṭaṃ krāmati* "The goat steps with difficulty".

Then that surely should be stated? No, it is not necessary to state it. This is not a *nipātana*/irregular form ending in a *pratyaya*. What then?

This fourth case is employed in the sense of 'for the purpose thereof or being intended for that'. *Kaṣṭāya* in the rule means whatever *prātipadika* (stands) for *kaṣṭa*; (in other words) whatever *prātipadika* is in the sense of *kaṣṭa* (evil).

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀŅINI 3.1.14*

Vārttika Summary
Kātyāyana simply expands the scope of the *sūtra* to have *kyaṅ* acting after *sattra* etc.

Bhāṣya Summary
Patañjali explains the irregular form *kaṣṭāya* as indicating that *kyaṅ* acts after *kaṣṭa* in the sense of *sampradāna* 'undertaking to do wickedness'.

On the *vārttika* he provides the implied examples, and also gives an alternative version of the *vārttika*, stating after *sattra* etc. and adding with sense of the fourth case and undertaking moral crookedness, so *kyaṅ* does not apply to other words like *kuṭilāya* or for any other case relation like *kaṣṭam*.

Finally he explains that *kaṣṭāya* is not in fact a *nipātana* but fourth case in the sense of 'being intended for that' (evil).

Kāś. "kyaṅ anuvartate na kyaṣ / kaṣṭaśabdāc caturthīsamarthāt kramaņe 'rthe 'nārjave kyaṅ pratyayo bhavati"

"Kyaṅ follows on by *anuvṛtti* (from *3.1.11*) not *kyaṣ*. The *pratyaya kyaṅ* acts in the sense of moral crookedness when meaning 'undertaking (that moral crookedness)', after the word *kaṣṭa* having the same grammatical construction as the fourth case."

Namely *karmaņā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam 1.4.3*

"Whom one intends to connect with in the mind by means of the *karman* (be it gift, offering, or sacrifice) that is *sampradāna*/dative/fourth case."

kaṣṭāya kaṣṭa ṅe ṅer yaḥ 7.1.13 supi ca 7.3.102 (dīrgho-yañi)

kaṣati kaṣa (bhvā° pa° se° 695 hiṃsārthāḥ) kta

kticktau ca saṃjñāyām 3.3.174 (āśiṣi)

kṛcchragahanayoḥ kaṣaḥ 7.2.22 (na iṭ)

bad R. — ill, evil, wrong — *Mn. 7.210*; miserable *Mn. 12.75*; troublesome *Mn. 7.186*; worst *Mn. 7.50*; dangerous, inaccessible *P. 7.2.22* who has resorted to evil.

cf. Kāś on '*ahīne dvitīyā 6.2.47* '*kaṣṭaśritaḥ*'

2.25.1   kramaņe kramaņa ṅi
> m. a step; n. stepping, going, walking, *R.V. 6.70.3*; ifc. transgressing, *Mbh. 12.16.254*; a step *R.V. 1.155.5* approach or undertaking anything (Dat.) *P. 3.1.14*

krāmyatyanena karaṇe lyuṭ
kramu bhvā° pa° se° 673 pādavikṣepe
karaṇādhikaraṇayoś ca 3.3.117 (lyuṭ)

2.25.2 kaṣṭāyeti kiṃ nipātyata iti
"Why is the irregular form *kaṣṭāya* laid down?" i.e. fourth case when it should be fifth case.
Kai. "vidhāvanārjavam eva kramaṇam iti viśeṣo na labhyata iti kramaṇa-viśeṣalābhāya nipātanāśrayaṇam"
There is resort to *nipātana* form to obtain the qualification undertaking/ *kramaṇa* because the sense *kramaṇa* is not obtained in the rule (without it), only (the sense of) moral crookedness.

2.25.3 kaṣṭāyate kaṣṭa kyaṅ akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ 7.4.24
     'to have wicked intentions' *Vop.21.10*

2.25.4 atyalpam idam ucyate
common phrase of *Patañjali*. This (expression) *kaṣṭāya* states too little, i.e. the scope of the rule should be wider.
2.25.5 sattra
Session, a great soma sacrifice (from thirteen to one hundred days) a house, an assumed form or disguise, liberality, *R.V. 7.33.13*
Amara 3.181 "sattramācchādane yajñe sadādāne vane 'pi ca sīdantyatra / anena vā"
Dh.P. ṣadlṛ (Kyā° pa° a° 854 viśaraṇagatyavasādaneṣu)
in dissolution, going and causing to sink, disheartening
sad Ṣtran (u° 4.159)
sattrāyate sattra kyaṅ
to desire to do evil.

2.25.6 kakṣa m. lurking place, hiding place *R.V. 10.28.4*; large wood (?) *R.V. 6.45.31*; dry grass, plant, armpit
kaṣati kaṣyate vā Dh.P. *kaṣa bhvā° pa° se° 685 hiṃsārthāḥ*
vṛtṛvadihanikaṣibhyaḥ saḥ u° 3.63
kakṣa ṣyaṅ — kakṣāyate to wait for anyone in a hidden place, lie in ambush, intend anything wicked.
kaṣṭa see above 2.25.1etc.
kṛcchra m.f.n. causing trouble or pain, painful, *Mbh. 3.1366* etc. *R. 3.74.28* etc.
Amara 1.9.4 "syātkaṣṭaṃ kṛcchramābhīlam"/ kṛntati, kṛtī tu° pa° se° 1435 chedane kṛteśchaḥ krū ca u° 2.21 iti rak chaś ca
kṛcchra kyaṅ kṛcchrāyate to feel pain *Āp.Śr; P. 3.1.18.*
2) to have wicked designs *P. 3.1.14, Bhaṭṭ. 17.76.*

2.25.6 gahana m.f.(*ā*) n. deep, dense, thick, inexplicable *M.Bh. 3.16.235,*

4.5.12; n. an abyss, depth (water *Naigh. 1.12 Nir. 14.11*) *R.V. 10.129* an inaccessible place, impenetrable darkness *R.V. 1.132.6 Ś.Br. 15.7.2.17.*
amara 2.4.1 aṭavyaraṇyaṃ vipinaṃ gahanaṃ kānanaṃ vanam
gahyate gāhū bhvā° ā° se° 649 viloḍane
bahulamanyatrāpi u° 2.78 iti yuc
kṛcchra gahanayoḥ 7.2.22 iti nirdeśād dhrasvaḥ
gahana kyaṅ gahanāyate
to lie in wait for someone in a secret place, to have treacherous intentions towards another

2.25.5 kaṇva N. of a renowned *ṛṣi R.V. 1.35.10* etc., a peculiar class of evil spirits *A.V. 25.3, 4, 5*; n. sin, evil, comm. on *Uṇ. 1.158.*
kaṇa (cu° u° se° 1716 nimīlane) kvan
aśupruṣikaṇikhaṭiviśibhyaḥ kvan u° 1.152

2.25.9 kuṭilāyeti
Kai duradhyeyatvād anuvākasyānārjavam astīti bhāvaḥ
The sense is that there is crookedness/unevenness of the recitation of the Vedic text because of its nature of being difficult to be studied and learnt
'aja iti' Kai. "*anārjavayuktaṃ panthānaṃ gacchatīty arthaḥ*"
"The meaning is that (the goat) goes on a path having unevenness."

2.25.10   tādarthya eṣa caturthī
"This fourth case has the sense of 'being understood intended for that' or the nature of being for the purpose of another."
caturthī sampradāne 2.3.13
The fourth case ending acts to express the sense of *sampradāna* (recipient) if not already expressed otherwise.
karmaṇā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam 1.4.32
"Whom one intends to connect with in the mind by means of the *karman* (be it gift, offering, or sacrifice) that is the *sampradāna*/recipient."

2.25.10   caturthīvidhāne tādarthye upasamkhyānam 1 Vārttika
"To the rule *caturthī* (*sampradāne*) the word *tādarthye*, in the sense of being intended/for the sake of that, should be added …"
Bhāṣya example *yūpāya dāru kuṇḍalāya hiraṇyam*
Wood for the sacrificial post. Gold for the earring.

2.25.11   kaṣṭāya yad iti …
Kai. "*kaṣṭakṣaṇārthapratipādanāya yat prātipadikaṃ prayujyate tasmāt kramaṇe 'rthe kyaṅ bhavatīty arthaḥ kramaṇaviśeṣaś cānārjavam abhi-dhānaśaktisvabhāvyāl labhyate vyavasthitavibhāṣāvijñānāc ca pāpādi-bhyo 'tiprasaṅgā bhāvaḥ*"
The sense is 'That *prātipadika* which is used for teaching the sense indicated by *kaṣṭa* (bad, crookedness) has *kyaṅ* applicable after it in the

vṛtu bhvā° ā° se° 758 vartane
nanu ca ktinā na bhavitavyam
ṇyāsaśravyo yuc iti yucā bādhitvāt
asmād eva ktin bhaviṣyatīty adoṣa
or by *aca i uṇā° 4.139*

25.12 caraṇaṃ careti sampādayitvāt kvip
acting, performance, observance, practice.
cara bhvā° pa° se° 559 gatau bhakṣaṇe ca kvip ca 3.2.76

2.25.13 'udagīrṇasyeti' Kai. "mukhapradeśa ākṛṣṭasyety arthaḥ"
The meaning is (the chewing) of something vomited forth
avagīrṇasyeti drawn into the region of the mouth; swallowed down.
Kai. "apānapradeśān nisṛtasyety arthaḥ" The meaning is (the chewing) of
something gone away from the region of the anus or from that vital air
going downwards and out at the anus.

2.25.14   Kai. "hanucalana iti hanucalanasahacaritaṃ carvipasya mukha-
*   pradeśa ākṛṣya yac carvaṇam tatra yathā syād ity arthaḥ"*
The meaning is (the chewing) of that chewed, going with movement of the
jaws, having drawn into the region of the mouth, so that chewed there
should be applicable (as the meaning).

2.25.14   kīṭa iti
Kai apānapradeśān nisṛtam aśrnāti ity arthaḥ
The meaning is that 'the insect eats that which has gone forth from the
region of the anus.'

2.25.15   anabhighānāt
Kai romanthāyata iti kyanantena laukike
prayoge carvitacarvaṇasyaiva vābhidhānaṃ na tvārthāntarasyarthaḥ
The meaning is that 'the verb *romanthāyate* ending with *kyan* in popular
use only has the sense of chewing what has been chewed, not of any other
sense.'
tapasyati see Śa° Brā° 14.6.8.10
yo vā etad akṣaram aviditvā gārgi asmil loke juhoti dadāti tapasyati api
bahūni varṣasahasrāṇi antarān evāsya sa loko bhavati yo vā etad akṣaram
aviditvā gārgī asmāl lokāt praiti sa kṛpaṇaḥ atha ya etad akṣaram gārgi
viditvāsmāl lokāt praiti sa brāhmaṇaḥ

2.25.18   Bhagavadgītā
yat karoṣi yad aśnāsi yaj juhoṣi dadāsi yat
yat tapasyati kaunteya tatkuruṣva madarpaṇam 9.27
"Whatever thou doest, whatever thou eatest, whatever thou sacrificest,
whatever thou givest, in whatever austerity thou engagest, do it as an

offering to me."
Tai Ār 2.9.1
ajān ha vai pŕśrnī ṃ stapasyamāśabrahmasvayaṃbhū
abhyānarṣata, te ŗ ṣayo 'bhavan, tadŕṣīņāmŕṣitvam
quoted by *Yāska* on *Niru° 2.11*
"It is known; because the Self born of *Brahmā* manifested Himself to them
while practising austerities, they became seers, that is the characteristic of
the seers."

2.25.21 *bāṣpoṣmābhyām udvamane* //3/1/16//

phenāc ceti vaktavyam / phenāyate //

Pāņini 3.1.16: The *pratyaya kyan* acts in the sense of emitting after the
words *bāṣpa* (vapour) and *uṣņa* (heat) as *karman*/object of the action.

Bhāṣya: And it should be stated that (*kyan*) also acts after *phena* (foam,
froth): *phenāyate* "It foams or froths".

NOTES ON *MAHĀBHĀṢYA* ON *PĀŅINI 3.1.16*

Bhāṣya Summary
Patañjali simply adds '*kyan* also acts after phena' and provides the example
phenāyate.

2.25.21   bāṣpa uṣma bhyām udavaman ṅi
Kāś. "*karmaņa iti vartate bāṣpaśabdād ūṣmaśabdāc ca karmaņa
udvamane 'rthe kyan pratyayo bhavati*"
'After *karman*', follows on (from *3.1.15*).
"The *pratyaya kyan* acts after the word *bāṣpa* (vapour) and *uṣņa* (heat) as
objects of the action, in the sense of emitting."
bāṣpa   m. tear, tears *M.Bh.*
also *bāṣpa* steam, vapour *R.*
bāṣpa vāyati o vai bhvā° pa° se° 922 poṣaņe
                    bhvā a° pa° a° 105° gatigandhanayoḥ
'*khaṣparthilpaśaṣpa*' *Uṇ 3.28 (paḥ)*
bāṣparūpaparpatalpāḥ
bāghŗ (bhvā° ā° se° 5 viloḍane) + pa
bāṣpa kyan = bāṣpāyate to shed tears, weep *Rav.*; to emit vapour or steam
L.

2.25.21 uṣman m. heat, glow, vapour, steam, *A.V. 6.18.3*
uṣati rujati uṣa (bhvā° pa° se° 623 rujāyām) Paṇini
'anyebhyo 'pi dṛśyate' 6.2.75
uṣma kyaṅ uṣmāyate
to emit heat or hot vapour, to steam *H. Car.*
udvamana ṅi   n. the act of giving out, emitting, shedding (e.g. tears)
ṭu vama (bhvā° pa° se° 849 udagiraṇe) lyuṭ
lyuṭ ca 3.3.195

2.25.21 phena m. (once n.) foam, froth, scum *R.V. 1.104.3* (*cf.* Eng. foam)
'sphāyate' sphāyī (bhvā° ā° se° 487 vṛddhau) nak (*the*)
phenamīnau u° 3.3
phenāyate It foams or froths *M.Bh. 6.101 H.Car*

(*to be continued*)

London
U.K.