

# VYĀKARAṆA MAHĀBHĀṢYA OF PATAÑJALI ON PĀṆINI 3.1 (ĀHNIKAS 1 TO 7) (6)\*

Stephen Peter THOMPSON

## 37.1 *kaṇḍvādibhyo yak* ||3/1/27||

*kim arthaḥ kakāraḥ / guṇavrddhipratṣedhārthaḥ / kiñtīti guṇa-  
vrddhipratṣedho yathā syāt / naitad asti prayojanam / sārva-  
dhātukārdhadhātukayor aṅgasya guṇa ucyate dhātoś ca vihitāḥ  
pratyayaḥ śeṣa ārdhadhātukasaṃjñā labhate na cāyaṃ dhāto-  
vidhīyate /*

## 37.5 *kaṇḍavādīni hi prātipadikāni* /

**Pāṇini 3.1.27:** The *pratyaya yak* acts after *kaṇḍu* and the rest (scratching/itching).

**Bhāṣya:** What is the purpose of the letter *k*? (The purpose is) for the prohibition of *guṇa* and *vrddhi*. So that the prohibition of *guṇa* and *vrddhi* should be applicable. This is not the purpose. *Guṇa* is stated for an *aṅga*/base followed by a *sārvadhātuka* or an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*, and the *pratyaya* (ordained after a *dhātu*) which is one of the remainder (of *pratyayas* other than those called *tiñ* (verb endings) or those having an indicatory *ś/śit*) receives the technical name *ārdhadhātuka* and this (*pratyaya yak*) is not ordained after a *dhātu*, for *kaṇḍu* and the rest are *prātipadikas*/crude bases.

## 37.6 *kaṇḍvādibhyo vāvacanam* ||1||

*kaṇḍvādibhyo veti vaktavyam* //

---

\* The preceding parts of the present paper were published in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā*, vols., 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27. 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.

37.8 *avacane hi nityapratyayatvam //2//*

*akriyamāṇe hi vāvacane nityaḥ pratyayavidhiḥ prasajyeta //  
tatra ko doṣaḥ /*

**Vārttika 1:** After *kaṇḍu* and the rest, (*yak*) (acts) optionally.

**Bhāṣya:** It should be stated that (*yak*) optionally acts after *kaṇḍu* and the rest.

**Vārttika 2:** For when (this option) is not stated, the *pratyaya* (*yak*) invariably/*nitya* must be applicable.

**Bhāṣya:** For when the word *vā*/optionally is produced (in the *sūtra*) the invariable *pratyaya* rule would be applicable. What fault is there (in that)?

37.10 *tatra dhātuvidhitukpratiṣedhaḥ //3//*

*tatra dhātuvidhes tu kaśca pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ syāt/ kaṇḍvau  
kaṇḍvaḥ/ aci śnudhātubhruvām yvoriyaṇuvaṇau (6.4.77) ity  
uvaṇādeśaḥ prasajyeta/ iha ca kaṇḍvā kaṇḍve noḍdhātvoḥ  
(6.1.175) iti pratiṣedhaḥ prasajyeta // yuk ca pratiṣeddhavyaḥ/  
valguḥ mantur iti / hrasvasya piti kṛti tukprāpnoti //*

**Vārttika 3:** There (in the context of the *sūtra*) is prohibition of *tuk āgama*/augment and of the *dhātu* rule.

**Bhāṣya:** There it should be said that there is prohibition of the *dhātu* rule and of the *āgama tuk* (= *t* added to the final of what precedes). (If *kaṇḍu* has the name *dhātu* then the following examples) *kaṇḍv-au* and *kaṇḍv-aḥ uv-an ādeśa*/substitute would be applicable (instead of the correct *ādeśa* by *iko yaṇ aci 6.1.77*) by *aci śnu dhātu bhruvām yvoriyaṇ uvaṇau 6.4.77* “In the presence of a *pratyaya* beginning with a vowel, in the place of the *u*, of the fifth class *vikaraṇa śnu*, of the final short or long *i* or *u* of a *dhātu* and in the place of the *ū* of *bhrū*, *iy-an* (= *iy*) for *i* or *ī* and *uv-an* (= *uv* for *u* or *ū*) are the *ādeśas*”.

And here *kaṇḍv-ā* (by the itching) and *kaṇḍv-e* (for the itch) would have been applicable to them. The prohibition of *udātta* for the

*vibhakti pratyaya* by *noṅ dhātvoḥ* 6.1.175 (“After the semi-vowel *ādeśas* of the *udātta ū* (feminine *pratyaya* by *ūṅ-utah*” 4.1.66) or of the *udātta* final vowels of *dhātus* when preceded by a consonant, the *bha*/weak case endings beginning with a vowel do not take the *udātta*/acute accent”), (would have been applicable if *kaṇḍu* had the name *dhātu*).

And *t-uk* (*āgama*/augment) is to be prohibited (in the case of) *valguḥ* “handsome, beautiful” and *mantuḥ* “advice, fault, transgression” etc. (in the *kaṇḍvādi gaṇa*) *tuk āgama*/augment obtains by *hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk* 6.1.71 “*T-uk* is the *āgama* for the final short vowel (of a *dhātu*) in the presence of *kṛt pratyaya* with an indicator *it p*”.

37.15 *hrasvayalopau ca* //4//

*hrasvayalopau ca vaktavyau syātām / valguḥ mantur iti / kim artham idaṃ na hrasva evāyam antaraṅgatvāt / akṛdyakāra iti dīrghatvaṃ prāpnoti // yalopaḥ / yalopaś ca vaktavyaḥ/ kaṇḍūḥ valguḥ mantur iti / kim artham idaṃ na valītyeva siddham / valīty ucyate na cātra valādiṃ paśyāmaḥ / nanu ca kvibvalādiḥ/*

**Vārtika 4:** And there is a short vowel (for *kaṇḍa* etc.) and *lopa* of the *ya*.

**Bhāṣya:** It should he stated ‘let there be a. short vowel (for *kaṇḍu* etc.) and *lopa* of *ya* (*yak*). (Short vowel thus) *valguḥ*, *mantuḥ*.

What is the purpose of this (statement)? Is it not already short? Because of being *antaraṅga*, the letter *ya* (= *yak*) being not a *kṛt pratyaya*, lengthening of the final vowel of the *aṅga*/stem obtains. (Therefore short must be stated.) Further, there is *lopa* elision of *ya*, and *lopa* elision of *ya* should be stated (as in the *prātipadika* forms) *kaṇḍuḥ mantuḥ* and *valguḥ*. What is the purpose of this? Is it not established (already) by the vowel rule that when *val* (*pratyāhāra* of all consonants except *y*) follows there is *lopa* of *y* (c.f. *lopo vyor-vali* 6.1.66) “There is *lopa* elision of *v* and *y* in the presence of a *val* (any consonant except *y*)”? When *val* follows we do not see anything beginning with a *val* (but rather *ya*) *lopa* of *y* is stated. But surely *kvip* is beginning with a *val*?

37.19 *kviblope krte valādyabhāvān na prāpnoti / idam iha sampradhāryam / kviblopaḥ kriyatām vali lopa iti kim atra kartavyam / paratvāt kviblopaḥ / nityaḥ khalv api kviblopaḥ / krte 'pi yalope prāpnoty akrte 'pi prāpnoti / nityatvāt paratvācca kviblope krte valādyabhāvān na prāpnoti / evaṃ tarhi pratyayalakṣaṇena bhaviṣyati / varṇāśraye nāsti pratyayalakṣaṇam //*

Because of the absence of a (form) beginning with a *val* (the *sūtra*) does not obtain. Here this should be deliberated upon whether there is to be effected *kvip-lopa*/elision or a *lopa* when *val* follows. What is to be done here? Because of the *kvip* (*lopa*) rule being subsequent (*lopo vy-or vali* 6.1.66) *kvip lopa* is elided. *Kvip lopa* is also indeed a *nitya*/invariable rule/operation. Even when *ya lopa* occurs (*kvip lopa*) obtains (and) when *ya lopa* has not been effected it (still) obtains, when *kvip lopa* has been effected. Because of being a *nitya* (invariable) rule and being subsequent, and because of the absence of initial *val*, (*lopo vy-or-vali* 6.1.67) does not obtain. Well then by (*pratyaya lopa*) *pratyaya lakṣaṇam* (1.1.62) “When *lopa* elision of a *pratyaya* has taken place the *pratyaya* still exerts its influence, and the operations dependent on it take place as if it were present manifestly”, (the *lopa*) will still be applicable. (But) “When there is a grammatical operation, dependent upon letter (rules and causes/*nimitta*), there is no *pratyaya lakṣaṇa*”. (*Paribhāṣā* 21)

38.1 *atha kriyamāṇe 'pi vāvacane yadā yagantāt kvip tadaite doṣāḥ kasmān na bhavanti/ naitebhyas tadā kvib drakṣyate / kiṃ kāraṇam / anyebhyo 'pi drṣyate / (3.2.178) ity ucyate na caitebhyas tadā kvibdrṣyate / yathaiva tarhi kriyamāṇe vāvacane 'nyebhyo 'pi drṣyata ity evaṃ atra kvib na bhavaty evaṃ akriyamāṇe 'pi na bhaviṣyati // avaśyam etebhyas tadā kvib eṣitavyaḥ / kiṃ prayojanam/ etāni rūpāṇi yathā syur iti //*

Now even when the *vā*/optionally is expressed, when *kvip* (acts) after that ending in *yak*, then how can there not be these faults? Then, *kvip* will not be seen after these. What is the reason? Thus it is stated, *anyebhyo 'pi drṣyate* 3.2.178 “The *pratyaya kvip* is seen after other *dhātus* also besides those previously mentioned, in the sense of the Agent having such a habit etc.”, and so then *kvip* is not seen after

these.

As in fact then, when the expression of *vā*/optionality is effected, so here the *sūtra* (*anyebhyo'pi dṛśyate 3.2.178*) is not applicable, so even (when the expression of *vā*/optionality is not being effected), (*kvip*) will not be applicable. It is essential that the *kvip* be sought (i.e. approved) after these. What is the purpose? So that these forms (*kaṇḍuḥ* etc.) be possible (as valid forms).

38.6 *tat tarhi vāvacaṇaṃ kartavyaṃ / na kartavyaṃ / ubhayaṃ kaṇḍvādīni dhātavaś caiva prātipadikāni ca / ātaś cobhayaṃ kaṇḍūyatīti kriyāṃ kurvāṇe prayujyate 'sti me kaṇḍūr iti vedanāmātrasya sānidhye // apara āha /*

38.10 *dhātuprakaraṇād dhātuḥ kasya cāsañjanād api / āha cāyamimaṃ dīrghaṃ manye dhātur vibhāṣitaḥ //*

Then that expression of *vā*/optionally must be made? No, it does not have to be made. *Kaṇḍu* and the rest are both *dhātus* and *prātipadikas*. And indeed they are both for the sake of usage. '*kaṇḍū-ya-ti*', "He scratches" (*yak*) is applied when the verb is being formed; (and) '*asti me kaṇḍūḥ*', "I have an itch/scratch"; when there is a mere sensation (of an itch). And others say in a *Śloka Vārttika*:

**Śloka Vārttika:** "(What ends in *yak*) is called *dhātu* because of (being in the sphere of) the *dhātu adhikāra*/governing rule, and because of the (indicatory) *k* attached (to prevent *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*). And he states this with long *ū* (of *kaṇḍū*) "I think (these) *dhātus* are optionally designated".

#### Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.27

##### Vārttika Summary

*Yak* is stated as optional after *kaṇḍu* etc. in the first; the second giving the reason because otherwise it would be *nitya*. The third, by stating that the *dhātu* rule and *tuk* augment do not apply, indicates how it cannot be invariable/*nitya*. The fourth states a further operation: shortening of the vowel and *lopa* of *ya*.

##### Bhāṣya Summary

*Patañjali* introduces the first *vārttika* by showing the *it k* cannot be to prevent *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* of a *dhātu* since these *kaṇḍu* etc. are *prātipadikas*.

So *Vā. 1* states they are also optionally called *dhātus*. On two he asks, what fault would there be in *ya* being *nitya*? He explains on the third, it would mean 6.4.77 wrongly applying, as well as 6.1.71.

On the last *vārttika* he says statement of short is because being *antaraṅga* and not *kṛt*, otherwise lengthening applies. *Lopa* is stated because *ya* is outside the scope of 6.1.66. By 1.1.62 we expect *pratyaya lakṣaṇa* but *Pari. 21* says nowhere is there a grammatical operation dependent on letters. *Kvip* by 3.2.178 is essential for the forms *kaṇḍū* etc. However, *vā* is not needed because *kaṇḍū* etc. are both *dhātus* and *prātipadikas*. The first for *kaṇḍūyati* etc. the latter for *kaṇḍūḥ* etc.

Another view is *kaṇḍū* etc. ending in *yak* are *dhātus* because of being within the sphere of the governing rule and because of *it k* (to prevent *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* of a *dhātu*). The stating of *kaṇḍū* with long *ū* is a clue to *dhātu* being an optional designation.

### 3.1.27 *kaṇḍvādibhyo yak*

“What is the purpose (of the letter *k* in *yak*)?”

The mention of *yak* is to show the twofold nature of *kaṇḍū* and the rest (having the same *dhātu* as well as *prātipadika* the *k* has scope in preventing *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* for them as *dhātus* by 1.1.5 – *Nāgeśa*).

37.3 *k iti ca 1.1.5* “And that which otherwise would have caused *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* does not do so when it has an indicatory *k g* or *ñ*.”

So *kaṇḍū* does not take *guṇa* as otherwise it would by *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* 7.3.84 “In the presence of *sārvadhātuka* or an *ārdhadhātuka* *pratyaya guṇa* acts in place of an *ik (i u r l)* vowel final of an *aṅga*.

*ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣa 3.4.114* “The remainder of the *pratyayas* other than *tiṅ* (verbal endings) and those with an indicatory *ś* acting after a *dhātu*, are called *sārvadhātuka pratyayas*.”

*kaṇḍvādibhyo vāvacanam iti* / To show a purpose for the latter *k* he alludes to another matter. The meaning is ‘when the *kaṇḍū* and the rest are called *prātipadika* that should be stated as optional (otherwise) they are called *dhātus*.’

*tatra ko doṣa iti* / What fault (in *yak* being *nitya*)? The sense is that *kaṇḍū* and the rest are established as valid (*prātipadika*) forms by *kvip pratyaya* even when the *pratyaya yak* is treated as *nitya/invariable*.

*Pradīpa: tatreti* “There (in the *sūtra*) is prohibition of *āgama* and the name *dhātu*.”

He says this in order to show that the desired form is not established as valid by means of *kvip* (alone). When the *pratyaya kvip* is ordained after the word *kaṇḍūya* there is not the condition of being like the original, for the *lopa* in place of *a*, when *uvañ ādeśa* is to be effected (by 6.4.77).

*Udyota: ‘kvau luptaṃ na sthānivat’* “When *kvi* follows the *lup* elision is not like the original.”

*Pradīpa: kvilugupadātvacanparanirhrāsakutveṣūpasamkhyānam // Vā° 2 na padānta 1.1.58* “Because of the prohibition of *sthānivatva* when there

is *luk kvip*, penultimate vowel, *caṅ* (aorist) or shortening of a vowel or a guttural substitute.” Now then, even if because of *lopa a* of *ya* being treated like the original, *sthānivat*, there were *uvaṅ*, still *ūṭh* will be effected in place of the *v* (by 6.4.19). When *ūṭh* is to be effected by ‘having a *v* prior to an indicated vowel’, there is absence of *sthānivatva*.

Hence *uvaṅ āgama* is not applicable in place of *ūṭh* and in that context *uvaṅ* (wrongly) obtains after the word *kaṇḍū* when two things made of gold follow. However by *oḥ supi* 6.4.83 “When *sup*/case *pratyaya* follows beginning with a vowel then the semivowel *v* is *ādeśa* for the final *ū* of a stem containing more than one syllable, if it ends in a *dhātu* ending in *ū* not preceded by a conjunct consonant forming part of the *dhātu*.” So *yaṅ ādeśa* is stated for that not preceded by a conjunct consonant.

c.f. *M. Bhā* on *P. 1.1.58 Vā 2*

1.153.5 *kvau kim udāharanam / kaṇḍūyater apratyayaḥ kaṇḍūr iti / naitad asti / yalopavidham na sthānivat / kaṇḍūya kvip ‘anyebhyo ’pi drśyate’ 3.2.178 veraprktasya 6.1.67 (lopa) upadeśe 1.3.2 halantyam 1.3.3 laśakva 1.3.8 tasya lopaḥ 1.3.9 but kvibantād dhātutvaṃ na tyajanti yalopa* “Dhātu nature is not rejected after *kvip*. There is ‘y’ elision ” by *lopo vyor vali* 6.1.66 “There is *lopa* elision of *v* and *y* in the presence of (any consonant except *y* =) *val*.”

2.37.17 *akṛdyakāra iti dīrghatvaṃ prāpnoti /*

There is *akṛtsārvadhātukayor dīrghaḥ* 7.4.25

“The long vowel acts in place of the final vowel of an *aṅga* in the presence of a *pratyaya* beginning with a *ya* and having an indicative *k* or *ṅ* when it is neither a *kṛt* not *sārvadhātuka pratyaya*.”

37.22 *nityatvāt paratvāc ceti*

“(When *kvip* has been effected) because of being a *nitya*/invariable rule (and being *para*/subsequent)”.

*Lopo vyor vali* 6.1.66 does not obtain. This is stated ‘having resorted to’ the rule before *veraprktasya* 6.1.67 “(Lopa of the *vi* reduced to a single consonant)”, namely *lopo vyor vali* so that when a *val* follows there is *lopa* of the *v* (if present).

2.37.23 *varṇāśraya iti*

“When there is a grammatical operation dependent on letter (rules and causes) there is no *pratyaya lakṣaṇa* (operational effect).”

The resort to the letter rule ‘*lopo vyor vali*’ means *lopa* of *v* and *y* but not resort to the *pratyaya* (e.g. *kvip*). However, when the view expressing option/*vā* is taken, due to non-production of *yak* (the form becomes established as desired).

38.2 ‘*naitebhya iti*’ /

“(Then *kvip* will) not (be seen) after these.”

The sense is, because of ordaining *kvip* in the sense of agent and because of the meaning of agent not being understood as (applicable to) *kaṇḍūh*.

38.4 ‘*avaśyam iti*’

“It is essential (*kvip* be sought/approved after these).”

The sense is, ‘*kvip*’ should be effected in the sense of abstract action/*bhāve*, because of (falling within the scope of the *vārttika* 9).

Vā 9 ‘*sampadādibhyaḥ kvip*’ 3.3.108 After *sampad* etc. is *kvip*

38.8 *vedanāmātrasyeti* /

“(When there is) a mere sensation (of an itch) and (here) the word *vedanā* is understood as having the form of a substantive (i.e. sensation or feeling) not something to be accomplished (e.g. making known).”

c.f. ‘*nyāsaśrantho yuc*’ 3.3.107 Vā 1

*yucprakaraṇe ghaṭṭivandividibhya upasaṃkhyānam* ||1||

See note on 3.1.18. In that context *yak* is applicable in the sense of its ‘*vedanā*’ feeling pain *prakṛti*/base = *svārthe* only after *dhātus* within the sphere of the governing rule *dhātoḥ*, but after *prātipadikas*. When *su* etc. (*sup*/case endings) arise, the forms *kaṇḍūh* etc. become established as valid (as nouns).

38.10 ‘*kasya ceti*’ /

“And because also of the indicatory *k* attached (to prevent *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*).”

The meaning is, that because of having the aim of prohibiting *guṇa* or depending on having the technical name *ārdhadhātuka*, obstructing the ordaining of (the name) *dhātu*, and also because of the letter *k* produced, *dhātu* is known as *kaṇḍū* and the rest causing *yak* to issue forth ...

38.11 ‘*āha ceti*’ /

“And he states (this with long *ū* ...).”

And from view of the reading as a final long vowel this nature of *dhātu* is determined. The meaning is that, when *dhātu* is invariable and *yak* is invariable, because of there being a non-*kṛt* letter *y*, the validity of lengthening is established by 7.4.25 and the reading of a long vowel would be pointless.

*anye dhātvibhāṣitaḥ* / “Others think these *dhātus* are optionally so designated.”

*vibhāṣitaguṇa* and optionally takes *guṇa*.



38.12 *kamer ṇin* //3/1/30//

*kim artho 'yaṃ ṅakāraḥ vṛddhyarthah / ṅṅ itīti vṛddhir yathā syāt / kriyamāṇe 'pi vai ṅakāre vṛddhir na prāpnoti / kiṃ kāraṇam / kṅiti ca (1.1.5) iti pratiṣedhāt / ṅit karaṇa- sām- arthyād bhaviṣyati // ata uttaram paṭhati /*

**Pāṇini 3.1.30:** The *pratyaya ṇin* acts after the *dhātu kam* (to desire).

**Bhāṣya:** What is the purpose of the letter *ṅ*? For the purpose of (causing) *vṛddhi* so that (by *ata upadhāyāḥ* 7.2.116) (*ṅṅ it-i*) “*Vṛddhi* acts in the place of the penultimate short *a* of an *aṅga*/base when in the presence of a *pratyaya* having an indicatory *ṅ* or *ṅ*” and so that here there should be *vṛddhi* (of *kam*). Even when the letter *ṅ* (indicatory) is being produced, *vṛddhi* does not obtain. What is the reason? Because of the prohibition “*kṅ-it-i ca*” (1.1.5) “And that which otherwise would have caused *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* does not do so when it has an indicatory *k* or *ṅ*. It will be applicable (here) by force of (specific) formation (of the *pratyaya* with an *it ṅ*). Therefore he reads as follows:

38.16 *ṇini ṅitkaraṇasya sāvakāśatvād vṛddhipratiṣedhaprasaṅgaḥ*  
//1//

*ṇini ṅitkaraṇam sāvakāśam / ko 'vakāśah / sāmānyagraha- ṅārtho ṅakāraḥ / kva sāmānyagrahaṅārthenārthah / ṅeraniṅi (6.4.51) iti / ṇini ṅitkaraṇasya sāvakāśatvād vṛddheḥ prati- ṣedhaḥ prāpnoti // ṅitkaraṇam api tarhi sāvakāśam / ko 'vakāśah / sāmānyagrahaṅāvidhātārtho ṅakāraḥ / kva sāmānyagrahaṅāvidhātārthenārthah / atraiva /*

**Vārttika 1:** In respect of the presence of *ṇin* (*pratyaya*) there is occasion for the prohibition of *vṛddhi* because of the producing of the indicatory *ṅ* (of *ṇin*) having scope of application elsewhere.

**Bhāṣya:** In respect of *ṇin pratyaya* the indicatory *ṅ* (of *ṇin*) has scope of application elsewhere. What scope of application has it? The letter *ṅ* is for the purpose of inclusion of *ṇin* in a general (group of *pratyayas*). Where is the purpose of ‘including it with a general

(group of *pratyayas*)’ served? (In the *sūtra*) *ṇer-an-iṭ-i* 6.4.51 “*Lopa* acts in place of the *i* of the *pratyaya ṇiṅ* (the *ṇ* and *ṅ* which are both indicatory/ *it*) in the presence of an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* i.e. other than a *tiṅ* or a *śit pratyaya* (*ārdhadhātukaṃ śeṣaḥ* 3.4.114)”. Because of their being scope of application for the indicatory *ṇ* in *ṇiṅ* produced (here), prohibition of *vr̥ddhi* obtains. Then the producing of indicatory *ṅ* also has scope of application elsewhere. The letter *ṅ* is not for preventing the application of the general reference to (*ṅ*). Where is purpose of it not preventing the application of the general reference served? Just here (viz. *ṇeraniṭi* 6.4.51).

38.20 *śakyo 'tra sāmānyagrahaṇāvidhātārtho 'nyo 'nubandha āsaṅk-*  
*tum / tatra ṅakārānurodhāḍ vr̥ddhipraṭiṣedhaḥ prāpnoti /*  
*avaśyam atrātmanepadārtho ṅakāro 'nubandha āsaṅktavyo*  
*ṅita ity ātmanepadam yathā syāt / evam apy ubhayoḥ sāva-*  
*kāśayoḥ praṭiṣedhabalīyastvāt praṭiṣedhaḥ prāpnoti / evaṃ*  
*tarhy ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati na kamer vr̥ddhipraṭiṣedho*  
*bhavaṭīti*

38.25 *yad ayaṃ na kamyamicamām iti mitsaṃjñāyāḥ praṭiṣedham*  
*śāsti /*

Here it is possible to attach another *anubandha* (indicatory letter) for not preventing the application of the general reference (*ṅ*). Therefore because of the (specific) reference to the letter *ṅ*, prohibition of *vr̥ddhi* obtains. It is essential here that the letter *ṅ* be attached as *anubandha* for the purpose of *ātmanepada* (*pratyayas*) so that having an *it ṅ* there should be *ātmanepada*. Then also, when both these have scope of application elsewhere, because of prohibition being stronger, prohibition obtains. Well then the master’s usage makes known that there is no prohibition of *vr̥ddhi*. Since (the *gaṇa sūtra* in the *dhātu pāṭha*) teaches prohibition of the technical name *m-it* by stating the rule *mit sañjñā*, prohibition is not applicable for *kam-i* (am and *cam dhātus* in the *bhvādi gaṇa*) “*na kamyamicām*”.

39.1 *mitpraṭiṣedhasya cārthavatvāt //2//*

*mitpraṭiṣedhasya cārthavatvāt praṭiṣedhaḥ prāpnoti / artha-*  
*vān mitpraṭiṣedhaḥ ko 'rthaḥ / ṅiṅantasya ṅici yā vr̥ddhis tasyā*  
*hrasvatvaṃ mā bhūd iti / nanv etasyā api kṛti ceti prati-*

*sedhena bhavatavyam/ na bhavitavyam / uktam etat kniti  
pratiṣedhe tan nimittagrahaṇam iti //*

**Vārttika 2:** And (there is prohibition of *vṛddhi*) because of *m-it* prohibition having a purpose (elsewhere).

**Bhāṣya:** And because of *m-it* prohibition having purpose (elsewhere), prohibition of *vṛddhi* obtains. Prohibition of *m-it* has a purpose (elsewhere). What is the purpose? So that the *vṛddhi* (which acts on the penultimate short a of an *aṅga*/base) ending in the *pratyaya* *ṇiṅ* when *ṇic* follows, should not become a short vowel. (c.f. ‘*hetu-mati ca*’ 3.1.26). (*ṇic*) ‘*ata upadhāyāḥ*’ 7.2.116 (*vṛddhi*, *ñ-ṇ-it-i*) ‘*mitām hrasvah*’ 6.4.92. “The *dhātus* having an indicatory *m* (800-873 of the *bhvādigāṇa*) retain their penultimate short vowel before the causative *ṇi*”.

Surely even for this the prohibition *kn-it-i-ca* (1.1.15) (“And that which otherwise would have caused *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* does not do so, when it has an indicatory *k*, *g* or *ṇ*”) should be applicable. It should not be applicable. This has been stated (in *Vā. 1* and *2 of 1.1.5*), “When there is prohibition of (*guṇa* or *vṛddhi*) when that having *anubandha* *k*, *g* or *ṇ* follows, specific mention of *nimitta*/cause (should be made)”.

39.5 *evaṃ tarhi na ṇiṅantasya ṇici yā vṛddhis tasyā hrasvatvaṃ  
prāpnoti / kiṃ kāraṇam/ ṇiṅā vyavahitavāt / lope kṛte nāsti  
vyavadhānam / sthānivad bhāvād vyavadhānam eva // ṇiṅy eva  
tarhi mā bhūd iti / ṇiṅi ca na prāpnoti/ kiṃ kāraṇam / asiddham  
bahiraṅgalakṣaṇam antaraṅgalakṣaṇa iti // naiva vā punar  
ṇiṅantasya ṇici vṛddhiḥ prāpnoti / kiṃ kāraṇam /*

Well then short for that *vṛddhi* acting in place of (the short a of that *aṅga*) ending in the *pratyaya* *ṇic* when *ṇic* follows, (by *mitām hrasvah* 6.4.92) does not obtain. What is the reason? Because of being separated by (the presence of) *ṇiṅ pratyaya*, when *lopa* is effected (by *ṇeraniṅi* 6.4.51), there is no intervention. Because of the substitute/*ādeśa* being like the original/ *sthānivat*, there is no intervention. Then when *ṇic* alone follows it should not be applicable. And when *ṇiṅ* follows it does not obtain. What is the reason? *asiddham bahiraṅgalakṣaṇam antaraṅgalakṣaṇe* “That which is *bahiraṅga*

(expecting more conditions or operations) is (regarded as) not having taken effect (or as not existing). When that which is *antar-aṅga* (inner, expecting less conditions) is to take effect". (*Pari.* 50) Nor indeed again does *vṛddhi* obtain when *ṇic* follows for that which ends in the *pratyaya ṇiṅ*. What is the reason?

39.9 *ṇiṅā vyavahitatvāt / lopa kṛte nāsti vyavadhānam / sthānivad bhāvād vyavadhānam eva // idaṃ tarhi prayojanaṃ yat tac ciṅnamulor dīrgho 'nyatarasyām (6.4.93) iti dīrghatvaṃ taikamer ṇiṅi mā bhūd iti / kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇaṃ tatra dīrgo 'nyatarasyām ity ucyate na hrasvo'nyatarasyām ity evocyeta /*

Because of the intervention by *ṇiṅ* when *lopa* elision is effected there is no intervention. In fact because of *lopa* elision being '*sthānivat*' (like the original), by (*sthānivat ādeśaḥ*) "*acaḥ parasmin pūrva-vidhau*" (1.1.57), "A substitute/ādeśa in the place of a vowel caused by something which follows, should be regarded as that whose place it takes when a rule would otherwise take effect on what stands prior to the original vowel", there is intervention.

This then is the purpose (of prohibition) that the lengthening which is taught by (the *sūtra*) *ciṅ-ṇamulo dīrgho 'nyatarasyām* 6.4.93; "Optionally a long vowel acts in place of the penultimate of the causative of *m-it dhātus* before *pratyaya ciṅ* (*prathama puruṣal* third person singular of passive aorist) and before the *pratyaya ṇamul* (absolutive)", should not be applicable here for (the *a* of) *kam* (to desire) when *ṇiṅ pratyaya* follows. But again, what is the reason why there (in the *sūtras*) lengthening optionally ... is stated and shortening optionally is not stated?

39.12 *yathāprāptaṃ cāpi kamer hrasvatvam eva / tartāyam apy artho hrasvagrahaṇaṃ na kartavyaṃ bhavati prakṛtam anuvartate / kva prakṛtam / mitāṃ hrasvaḥ (92) iti / kā rūpasiddhiḥ aśami aśami śamaṃ śamaṃ śamaṃ śamaṃ /*

39.15 *vṛddhyā siddham / na sidhyati / nodāttopadeśasya mānta-syānācameḥ (7.3.34) iti vṛddhipratishedhaḥ prāpnoti / ciṅkṛtoḥ sa pratiśedho na ṇici //*

And also in conformity with a previous rule (i.e. regularity) there is in

fact a short vowel (ordained) for *kam-i* (by *mitām hrasvaḥ* 6.4.92). There also this is the meaning, that mention of the word *hrasva* need not be made (because) the original (word *hrasva*) follows on (by *anuvṛtti* from a previous *sūtra*). Where is the original *hrasva*? (In the *sūtra* *mitām hrasvaḥ* 6.4.92 (“*Dhātus* having an indicatory *m* retain their penultimate short vowel before the causative *ñi*”). What form is ordained? For example *a-śam-i* or *a-śām-i* “He was caused to be quiet”. *śamam samam* or *śāmam śāmam* “having often become quiet”. It can be obtained by *vṛddhi* (i.e. lengthening). It is not obtained. The prohibition of *vṛddhi* obtains (by the *sūtra*) *nodāttopadeśasya māntasyānācameḥ* 7.3.34 (“*Vṛddhi* is not *ādeśa*/substitute for the vowel of that *dhātu* which ends in *m* (e.g. *kam*) and is *udātta* acute accented (in the *dhātu pāṭha*) in the presence of the aorist *pratyaya ciṅ* or a *kṛt pratyaya* with an indicatory *ñ* or *ṇ* but not in the case of the *dhātu cam* after *upasarga ā*”). (This is not a fault). That prohibition of *vṛddhi* is before *ciṅ* or *kṛt* with it *ñ* or *ṇ*, not when *ṇic* (causative *pratyaya*) follows.

39.17 *idaṃ tarhi / ajani ajani janam janam jānam jānam / janivadhyoś ca (35) iti vṛddhi pratiśedhaḥ prāpnoti / so 'pi ciṅkṛtor eva // ṇijvyavahiteṣu tarhi yaṅlope copasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyaṃ syāt / śamayantaṃ prayojitavān aśami aśāmi śamaṃ śamam śāmaṃ śāmam / śaṃśamayateḥ aśaṃśami aśaṃśāmi śaṃśamaṃ śaṃśamam śaṃśāmaṃ śaṃśāmam / kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇaṃ na siddhayati / ciṅṇamulpare ṇau mitāmaṅgānām hrasvo bhavattīty ucyate yaścātra ṇiścīṅṇamulparo na tasmin midaṅgaṃ yasmiñś ca midaṅgaṃ nāsau ṇiścīṅṇamulparaḥ /*

This then (is the reason). (The examples are) *ajani* or *ajāni* “He was begotten”, *janam janam* or *jānam jānam* “having often been born”. Prohibition of *vṛddhi* obtains (by the *sūtra*) *jani vadhyośca* 7.3.35 (“*Vṛddhi* is not the *ādeśa*/substitute for the vowels of the *dhātus jan-i* and *vadh-i* before the passive aorist sign *ciṅ pratyaya* and *kṛt pratyayas* with indicatory *ñ* or *ṇ*”). That also (applies) only when *ciṅ* or *kṛt (pratyayas)* follow. There should be made additional enumeration when (several) *ṇic* (i.e. the causative of causatives) intervene then, and when *yaṅ lopa* (intensive) has occurred. *śamayantaṃ prayojitavān* i.e. *aśam-i* or *aśām-i* “He compelled the one causing quietness” and *śamaṃ śamam* or *śāmaṃ śāmam* “having

compelled the one causing quietness again and again”. From (the intensive) *śaṃśamayati śaṃśami* or *aśaṃśāmi* “He entirely caused the one causing to be [made] appeased or extinguished”. (The absolutive) *śaṃśamaṃ śaṃśamam* or *śaṃśāmaṃ śaṃśāmam* “having again and again caused the causer to be entirely [made] appeased”.

But what is the reason *hrasva* is not valid/effective? When there is *ṇi* (causative) with *ciṅ* or *ṇamul* following, it is stated there is applicable a short vowel for those *aṅgas* (i.e. *dhātus* become bases). And that which is here (an *aṅga*) ending in the causative *pratyaya ṇi* with *ciṅ* or *ṇamul* following, at that time is not an *aṅga* having an *it m/mit*; and when there is (present) an *aṅga* (base) which is *mit*, then that is not one which ends in *ṇi* with *ciṅ* or *ṇamul* following.

39.22 *ṇilope tarhi kṛte ciṅṇamulparaḥ / sthānivad bhāvān na ciṅṇa-  
mulparaḥ // atha dīrgho'nyatarasyām ity ucyamāne yāvātā  
sthānivad bhāvah katham evaitat sidhyati / etad idānīm  
dīrghagrahaṇasya pratojanaṃ dīrghavidhiṃ pratyajādeśo na*

39.25 *sthānivad iti stānivadbhāvapratiṣedhaḥ siddho bhavati // yadā  
khalv apy āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā bhavanti tadā ṇici ṇiṅ  
nāsti tadarthaṃ ca mitpratiṣedhaḥ syāt // tasmāt pratiṣedhaḥ  
prāpnoti //*

Then, when *lopa* elision of *ṇi* has been effected (by *ṇer-aniṭi* 6.4.51) then *ciṅ* or *ṇamul* (remain) following (the *aṅga*). Because the *ādeśa*/substitute (here *lopa*) is regarded as the original/*sthānivad* or *ciṅ* or *ṇamul* do not follow (immediately) after (the *aṅga*).

Now when it is being stated “long/*dīrgha* optionally” in so far as there is the condition of *sthānivattva* (the *ādeśa lopa* being regarded as like the *ṇi* it replaces), how in fact (can) this be valid? Now this is the purpose of mentioning “long/*dīrgha*” (by *sūtra na-padānta* etc. 1.1.58); in relation to a “lengthening rule (the long vowel) substitute is not *sthānivad*/like the original it replaces”. Thus (by that rule) the prohibition of *sthānivattva* is established as valid. Even when indeed, by the *sūtra āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā* 3.1.31 (“The *pratyaya āya* and the rest viz. *īyaṅ* and *ṇiṅ* are optionally added, when it is desired to express oneself with an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*”), are applicable then when *ṇic* follows, there is not *ṇiṅ*, and for that reason there should be prohibition of (the technical name) *mit* (for *kam* etc.). Therefore the prohibition obtains.

40.1 *uktam vā* //3//

*kim uktam / taddhitakāmyor ikprakaraṇād iti //*

**Vārttika 3:** Or it was (in fact) stated (previously).

**Bhāṣya:** What was stated? “Because of the context being *ik* (*i, u, r, ḷ* vowels only), (*guṇa* and *vṛddhi* prohibition is not applicable by *knitica* 1.1.5) for *taddhita pratyayas* (in the *sūtra taddhitesvacāmādeḥ* 7.2.117) and for *kam* (*dhātu* by *ata upadhāyāḥ* 7.2.116)” i.e. 1.1.5  
**Vārttika 4:** *taddhita kāmyor ik prakaraṇāt.*

**Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.30**

**Vārttika Summary**

The first *vārttika* points out the possibility of prohibition of *vṛddhi* by virtue of *it ṅ* because *it ṅ* has scope elsewhere. Moreover, the second states, prohibition of *it ṅ* (which prevents *vṛddhi*), also has scope elsewhere. The third gives the solution as having already been stated, namely there is no *ik* vowel whose *vṛddhi* could be prohibited.

**Bhāṣya Summary**

The introduction simply explains the function of *it ṅ* is to cause *vṛddhi* of *a*, by 7.2.116, but it appears that is barred by *it ṅ* 1.1.5. Explaining the first *vārttika*, *Patañjali* specifies the scope of *ṅi* at 6.4.51 but he says *it ṅ* also has scope in that *sūtra* to prevent non-application of general mention. Because this could be achieved by another *it* letter and because the other function of indication *ātmanepada* is weaker, then prohibition still obtains. However, the *gaṇa sūtra* makes known by implication that there is no prohibition of *vṛddhi*.

On the second *vārttika* *Patañjali* explains where the scope for prohibition of *mit* is namely 6.4.92. As no specific mention of *nimitta* is made, 1.1.5 does not annul this. However, shortening does not obtain by 6.4.92, because of *sthānivat-lopa ṅi* intervening. For the same reason *vṛddhi* does not obtain. Another reason for the prohibition is cited to prevent lengthening by 6.4.93 ... Prohibition of *vṛddhi* does not in fact apply by 7.3.34 when *ṅic* follows. Nor is the reason 7.3.36, since that also applies only when *ciṅ* or *krts* follow. Nor is it relevant to the causative of the causative, for when that ending in *ṅit* has *ciṅ* or *ṅamul* following, the *aṅga* is not *mit* and vice versa. Finally prohibition of a long vowel *ādeśa* is made by 1.1.58, so that not intervening, *ciṅ* follows. When *ṅiṅ* is not applied by 3.1.31 and *ṅic* follows, then prohibition of *mit* obtains.

Finally *Patañjali* explains what is implied by the third *vārttika* namely a reference to *vā. 4* on *1.1.5*, because of the context being *ik*, *vrddhi* cannot apply to *kam* and hence prohibition is not possible.

2.38.22 ‘*niti iti ātmanepadam*’ / (*anudāttaṅṅita ātmanepadam 1.3.12*)

“After a *dhātu* having an indicatory *anudātta* vowel or an indicatory *ñ* the *pratyayas* are *ātmanepada*.”

2.38.33 ‘*kamer ñiñ*’ / ‘*pratiṣedhabalīyastvād iti*’ /

(When both these have scope of application elsewhere) because of prohibition being stronger (prohibition obtains).

*pari 112 niṣeḍaśc balīyāmsah*

*Kaiyaṭa*: The pre-eminence of the strength of the prohibition is because of the prohibition’s nature of barring (even *antaraṅga*) rules due to its *apavāda* nature.

2.39.2 *hrasvatvam // mitāṃ hrasva 6.4.92*

2.39.4 *ñiti pratiṣedhe tān nimittagrahaṇam 1.1.5 Vā° 1*

2.39.5 *ñinantasyeti /*

“... short for the *vrddhi* acting in place of (short a of an *aṅga*) ending in the *pratyaya ñic* (when *ñic* follows).”

*Ñic* applies for one directing, or causing the one desiring (or causing anyone to love (cf. ‘*Rtussamhāra*’)).

2.39.6 *lope kṛte / ‘neraniṭi’ 6.4.51*

“when *lopa* is effected (by *ner aniṭi 6.4.51*)”

The meaning should be prohibition of *mit*, so that there is no *jñāpaka* (implied rule) from *vrddhi* caused by *ñic*.

2.39.7 *ñiñi ceti /*

“And when *ñiñ* follows (it does not obtain).”

*Hrasvatva*/shortening (should be added) to complete the sense.

2.39.8 *asiddham iti /*

“(That which is *bahiraṅga* (expecting more operations)) is regarded as not having taken effect (when that which is *antaraṅga* (having fewer conditions) is to take effect).”

The meaning is that when ‘shortening’ is to be effected *vrddhi* being *bahiraṅga* is (treated as of non-effect).

2.39.10 *kamer ñiñ*

*sthānivad iti // na padāntadvirvacanavareyalopasvarasavarṇānusvārādirghajaścāvṛddhiṣu 1.1.58* “A vowel *ādeśa* is not *sthānivad* in rules



relating to the finals of words, to the doubling of letters, to the *pratyaya varac*, to elision of *ya*, to accent, to homogeneous letters, to *anusvāra*, to the lengthening of vowels and to the substitution of *jaś* and *car* letters.”

2.39.10 *sthānivadbhāvād iti /*

“Because of *lopa* elision being *sthānivat*/like the original *sthānin* (there is intervention).”

When the context is a rule concerning a penultimate letter then by *vā.2* (on 1.1.58) *na padānta (kvilugupadhātva)* there is prohibition of being like the *sthānin*. It should be stated in fact, that applies only to a *pratyaya* rule. And similarly prohibition is not applicable when *vṛddhi* is to be effected in the example here *paṭayati* (He strings together).

2.39.11 *kiṃ punar iti /*

“But again, what is the reason (lengthening is optionally stated ... )?”

The sense is, because of the prohibition of *vṛddhi* in case of *kami*. When *ṇin* follows invariable shortening alone is established, so that prohibition of *mit* is not to be effected. However, being effected, only the *jñāpaka* (is applicable) for *vṛddhi* when *ṇin* follows.

2.39.18 *upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyaṃ syāt iti /*

“There should be additional enumeration (when several *nic*’s intervene).”

The meaning is ‘the possibility obtains of the view that (there be additional) optional application of *vṛddhi*’.

2.39.24 *etad idānīm /*

“Now this (is the purpose of mentioning *dīrgha* (long)).”

And hence the prohibition of *mit* is for preventing the optional lengthening, not a *jñāpaka*/implied rule.

2.39.26 *yadeti /*

“When indeed by 3.1.31, *ṇin* is optionally added.” (*āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā*)

The meaning is when *ṇin* is effected after *kam-i* not ending in *ṇin*, then there the prohibition of *mit* would be applicable for the purpose of preventing shortening.

**40.3 āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā ||3/1/31||**

*katham idaṃ vijñāyate /*

**Pāṇini 3.1.31:** The *pratyayas āya* and those that follow (viz. *īyañ* and

*ṇiṅ*) optionally act when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows.

**Bhāṣya:** How is this (*sūtra* to be) understood?

40.4 *āyādibhyo yad ārdhadhātukaṃ tasminn avasthite vāyādīnām nivṛttir bhavatīti / āhosvid āyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukaṃ tasminn avasthite vāyādīnām utpattir bhavatīti / kiṃ gatam etad iyatā sūtreṇāhosvid anyatarasmin pakṣe bhūyaḥ sūtram kartavyam gatam, ity āha / katham / yadā tāvad āyādibhyo yad ārdhadhātukaṃ tasminn avasthite vāyādīnām nivṛttir bhavatīti tadāviśeṣeṇa sarvamāyādiprakaraṇam anukramyāyādaya ārdhadhātuke vety ucyate / yadāpy āyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukaṃ tasminn avasthite vāyādīnām utpattir bhavatīti tadāikaṃ vākyaṃ tac cedam ca / gupūdhūpavicchīpanīpanībhyā āyaḥ (28) ārdhadhātuke vā / rterīyaṅ (29) ārdhadhātuke vā / kamer ṇiṅ (30) ārdhadhātuke veti // kaścātra viśeṣaḥ /*

Either, when that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after *āya* and the rest is present, optionally there is the cessation of *āya* and the rest, or when that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after bases ending in *āya* and the rest, is actually present, there is optionally arising of *āya* and the rest. Is this understood by such a *sūtra* or in the alternative view, should another *sūtra* be formed? He says it is understood. How? When (it is stated) as above “when that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after *āya* and the rest is present, optionally there is cessation of *āya* and the rest”; then without distinction having enumerated all the section of (*sūtras* ordaining) *āya* and the rest, the *sūtra āyādaya ārdhadhātuka vā* is uttered. Also, when (it is stated as above) “when that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after bases ending in *āya* and the rest is actually present, there is optionally arising of *āya* and the rest”, then there is a single sentence comprising this and that (which follows). *gupū-dhūpa-vicchi-panī pani-bhya āyaḥ* 3.1.28 (*ārdhadhātuka vā*) “The *pratyaya āya* acts after the *dhātus gup* (to protect), *dhūp* (to heat), *panī* (to contract and to praise), and *pan* (to praise) optionally when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows”. *rter īyaṅ* 3.1.29 (*ārdhadhātuka vā*) “The *pratyaya īyaṅ* acts after the *dhātu rti* (to reproach), optionally when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows”. *kamer ṇiṅ* 3.1.30 (*ārdhadhātuka vā*) “The *pratyaya ṇiṅ* acts after the *dhātu kam* (to desire) optionally when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*

follows”. What is the difference between these two interpretations?

40.13 *āyādibhyo yad ārdhadhātukam āyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukam iti cobhayathāniṣṭa prasaṅgaḥ //1//*

40.15 *āyādibhyo yad ārdhadhātukam āyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukam iti cobhayathāniṣṭaṃ prāpnoti / yadi vijñāyata āyādibhyo yad ārdhadhātukaṃ tasminn avasthite vāyādīnāṃ nivṛttir bhavatīti guptiḥ jugopeti ceṣṭaṃ na sidhyati / idaṃ cāniṣṭaṃ prāpnoti gopāṃcakāra gopeti ca / idaṃ tāvad iṣṭaṃ siddhaṃ bhavati gopāyāṃcakāra gopāyeti //*

**Vārttika 1:** Both the (following positions) (give rise to) an undesired contingency: “When that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after *āya* and the rest (is present there is cessation of *āya* etc. optionally) and (when that) *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after the bases ending in *āya* and the rest is present, there is arising of *āya* etc. optionally.

**Bhāṣya:** An *ārdhadhātuka (pratyaya)* which acts after *āya* and the rest ‘or’ an *ārdhadhātuka* which acts after the bases (ending in) *āya* and the rest; both these obtain as undesired possibilities. If (the meaning of the *sūtra*) is understood as “when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* that acts after the *pratyaya āya* and the rest is present, the optional cessation of *pratyaya āya* and the rest is applicable”, the desired form *guptiḥ* (protecting) and *jugopa* (protected) do not become established as valid and these understood forms obtain *gopāṃcakāra* (“He protected”) and *gopā* (protector).

40.18 *atha vijñāyata āyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukaṃ tasminn avasthite vāyādīnāṃ utpattir bhavatīti guptiḥ jugopeti ceṣṭaṃ siddhaṃ bhavati /*

40.20 *idaṃ cāniṣṭaṃ na prāpnoti gopāṃcakāra gopeti / idaṃ tv iṣṭaṃ na sidhyati gopāyāṃcakāra gopāyeti //*

Now then (the *sūtra*) is understood (also to mean) “When an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after a base ending in *āya* or the rest is present optionally there is arising of *āya* and the rest”. The desired forms *gupti* and *jugopa* become established as valid. And these undesired forms do not obtain, *gopāṃcakāra* and *gopā*.

However, these are not established: *gopāyām cakāra* and *gopāya*.

40.21 *idaṃ tāvad iṣṭaṃ sidhyati gopāyāṃcakāreti / katham / astv  
atrāyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukaṃ liṭ tasminn avasthite  
vāyādaya āmmadhye patiṣyati yathā vikaraṇās tadvat // idaṃ  
tarhīṣṭaṃ na sidhyati gopāyeti //*

Just this form is established as valid: *gopāyāṃcakāra*. How? Let there be here the *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya liṭ* (perfect) after a base ending in *āya* and the rest. When that is present (in the mind), optionally *āya* and the rest (arise), and *ām* will fall/come in the middle like a *vikaraṇa pratyaya*. Then this desired form is not established, viz. ‘*gopāya*’.

*siddhaṃ tu sārvaradhātuke nityavacanād anāśritya vāvidhānam  
//2//*

40.25 *siddham etat / katham / aviśeṣeṇāyādīnām vāvidhimuktivā  
sārvaradhātuke nityam iti vakṣyāmi //*

**Vārttika 2:** However it is established that when a *sārvaradhātuka pratyaya* follows (or is determined upon in the mind), because of not having resorted to (the used of the word) *vā*, there is (automatically) *nitya/invariable* ordaining of *āya* and the rest.

**Bhāṣya:** This is established (already). How? Having expressed the optional rule for *āya* and the rest without a specific restriction, I shall say *invariable/nitya* when a *sārvaradhātuka pratyaya* follows.

41.1 *syādibalīyastvaṃ tu vipratīṣedhena tulyanimittatvāt //3//*

*syādibhistvāyādīnām bādhanaṃ prāpnoti vipratīṣedhena / kiṃ  
kāraṇam / tulyanimittatvāt / tulyaṃ hi nimittaṃ syādīnām  
āyādīnām ca/ syādīnām avakāśaḥ / kariṣyati hariṣyati / āyādī-  
nām avakāśaḥ / gopāyati dhūpāyati / ihobhayaṃ prāpnoti /  
gopāyiṣyati dhūpāyiṣyati / paratvāt syādayaḥ prāpnuvanti //*

**Vārttika 3:** However, since the cause (of the operation) is the same, there is preeminence in strength for *sya (vikaraṇa) pratyaya* 3.1.33

and the rest (over *āya*) etc. by reason of a conflict (of rules of equal force requiring the later rule to prevail).

**Bhāṣya:** By reason of a conflict (of rules of equal force requiring the subsequent to prevail) the barring of *āya* and the rest by *sya* (*vikaraṇa pratyaya*) and the rest obtains. What is the reason? Because of the cause (occasioning an operation) being the same (in both cases). For the cause (occasioning manifestation) of *sya* and the rest and *āya* and the rest is the same (viz. when a *tiṅ* i.e. *sārvaradhātuka pratyaya* follows). There is scope (of application) for *sya* and the rest: *kar-i-sya-ti* (“He will make”) and *hariṣyati* (“He will take”). There is scope (of application) for *āya* and the rest (as) *gopāyati* “He protects”; *dhūpāyati* “He fumigates or perfumes with incense”. Here both obtain: *gopāyati* “He will protect”; *dhūpāyisyati* “He will perfume with incense”. Because of being the subsequent (rules) *sya* and the rest (by *syatāst* *lṛluṭoḥ* 3.1.33 and the rest) obtain (i.e. become wrongly applicable).

41.6 *na vāyādividhānasyānavakāśatvāt* //4//

*na vaiṣa doṣaḥ / kiṃ kāraṇaṃ / āyādividhānasyānavakāśatvāt /  
anavakāśā āyādaya ucyante ca te vacanād bhaviṣyanti / nanu  
cedānīm evāvakāśaḥ praklṛpto gopāyati dhūpāyatīti / atrāpi  
śapsyādir bhavati / yady apy atrāpi śapsyādir bhavati na*

41.10 *tv atrāsti viśeṣaḥ sati vā śapyasati vā* /

**Vārttika 4:** Or else (this difficulty does not arise) because of there not being scope (of application) for the ordaining of *āya* and the rest.

**Bhāṣya:** This is not a fault. What is the reason? Because of there being no scope (of application) for the ordaining of *āya* and the rest. *Āya* and the rest are without scope (of application) elsewhere, and they which are stated (by sūtras) will be applicable because of express statements in a rule. But surely, now is there not scope (of application) in fact made (in these examples)? *gopāyati* “He protects”, *dhūpāyati* “He perfumes with incense”. Here also *śap sya* and the rest are applicable (by *kartari śap* 3.1.68 etc.). Although here also *śap, sya* and the rest are applicable, yet there is no difference when *śap* is present or not present.

41.10 *anyad idānīm etad yad ucyate nāsti viśeṣa iti / yat tu tad uktam āyādīnām syādibhir avyāpto 'vakāśa iti sa nāsty avakāśaḥ / avaśyam khalv apy atra śapsyādir eṣitavyaḥ / kiṃ kāraṇam / ropāyantī dhūpāyantī śapsyanor nityam (7.1.81) iti numyathā syād iti // yadi tarhy anavakāśā āyādaya āyādibhiḥ syādīnām bādhanam prāpnoti / yathā punar ayaṃ sūtra- bhedena parihāro yadi punaḥ śapi nityam ity ucyeta / sidhyati/ sūtram tarhi bhidyate //*

This which is stated viz. “there is no difference” is something else. However with reference to that which was stated “the scope of *āya* etc. is not pervaded by *sya* etc.” (I say) there is no scope for *āya* etc. It is essential also indeed that *śap*, *sya* etc. be sought. What is the purpose? So that *num āgama* (augment) he invariably applicable because of the rule *ś-ap-śyanor nityam 7.1.81*. When the *pratyaya śatr* acts after a verbal *aṅga* (base) ending in the *vikaraṇas ś-ap* and *śyan*, it invariably takes the augment *num* before the *napunsaka* (neuter) case ending *ś-i* (*i*) and the feminine *ī* (*nadī*). If then *sya* etc. have no scope, the barring of *sya* etc. by *āya* etc. obtains. However, as there will be avoiding (of this problem) by dividing the *sūtra* (in two), if again it is simply stated “when *śap* follows, invariable (application of *āya* etc.)”, it is established as valid. But then the *sūtra* is (to be) divided (into two).

41.16 *yathānyāsam evāstu / nanu cuktam āyādibhyo yad ārdhadhātukam āyādiprakṛter yad ārdhadhātukam iti cobhayathāniṣṭaprasaṅga iti / naiśa doṣaḥ / ārdhadhātuka iti naiśa parasaptamī kā tarhi / viśayasaptamī / ārdhadhātukaviśaya iti / tatrārdhadhātukaviśaya āyādiprakṛter āyādiṣu kṛteṣu yo yataḥ pratyayaḥ prāpnoti sa tato bhaviṣyati /*

Let it be as written. But surely indeed it was stated (previously) (*Vārttika 1*) the following positions give rise to an undesired contingency: “When that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after *āya* and the rest (is present, there is optionally cessation (of the appearance) of *āya* and the rest)”, and “(when that) *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after the bases (ending) in *āya* and the rest, is present, the arising of *āya* etc. is optional”. This is no fault because *ārdhadhātuke* is not *para saptamī* (seventh case in the sense of “when

that follows, the operation is to take place on that which is immediately prior to that in the seventh case” (1.1.66 *tasminniti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*). What then? *viṣaya-saptamī* “The seventh/*adhikaraṇa*/locative case in the sense of “with regard to that sphere”. *ārdhadhātuka viṣaya* in the domain of *ārdhadhātuka* (*pratyayas*). There in the domain of *ārdhadhātuka pratyayas* (in the mind), when *āya* and the rest have been formed after a base (ending) in *āya* and the rest, whatever *pratyaya* obtains after a stem will be added to that stem.

### Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.31

#### Vārttika Summary

The first *vārttika* presents two possible undesired meanings of the *sūtra*, the first speaks of cessation of *āya* etc. optionally when an *ārdhadhātuka* acts after the *pratyayas āya* etc., the second, arising of *āya* etc. when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* acts after the *prakṛtis* ending in *āya* etc. By the very fact of not using the word *vā*, the second *vārttika* states, *āya* etc. are invariably ordained when an *ārdhadhātuka* follows. The third *vārttika* says *sya* etc. prevail over *āya* etc. because of being the later of rules of equal force in conflict. The fourth dismisses the last because of *āya* etc. not having scope of application elsewhere.

#### Bhāṣya Summary

The introduction spells out the two possible view of the *sūtra* given in the first *vārttika*. Either this *sūtra* is understood after all three previous *sūtras* or it is understood as a supplement to each.

The *Bhāṣya* on the first provides the examples showing the desired forms which do not arise and the undesired that do arise following either interpretation. The second establishes *gupti* and *jugopa* and avoids *gopām cakāra*, but does not establish *gopāyām cakāra* and *gopāya*. However, the penultimate is valid when *liṭ* follows (in the mind), *ām* operates as *vikaraṇa*.

*Patañjali* explains the second *vārttika* as meaning *nitya* when a *sārvadhātuka* follows. Where both *āya* etc. and *sya* etc. obtain as *gopāyīṣyati*, *Patañjali* explains in the third, the latter would be expected to prevail. This is not a problem because of requiring scope and due to ‘*ato guṇe*’ 6.1.97, the presence of *śap* makes no difference. To avoid another possibility of *āya* etc. without scope barring *sya* etc., a division of the *sūtra* into two is proposed.

The two undesired possible interpretation are finally avoided by explaining *ārdhadhātuka* as having seventh case in the sense of ‘with regard to that sphere’. So in the sphere of *ārdhadhātuka* (held in the mind)

when *sya* etc. have been formed after a *prakṛti* ending in *āya* etc., whatever *pratyaya* obtains after a stem will be added to that stem.

2.40.3 ‘*āyādayaḥ*’ /

*Pra.* Having resorted to *parasaptamī*/seventh case in the sense of (action taking place of that immediately in front of) that which follows 1.1.66, there is consideration of two views, i.e. because consideration has not begun in relation to *viṣaya* ...

... *katham iti* / having thought of the fault of both views he asks the question ‘How?’.

*āhosvid anyatarasminn iti* / Or else in the other alternative ...

He thinks the word *nivṛtti* (cessation) or *utpatti* (arising), should be indicated. *Nāgeśa*: the purpose must be reflected on, because everywhere in the rule/sentence even in the absence of these they are understood. In one view, when more is to be effected in fact, and because of the *Bhāṣya* aiming at that, in some places the word *utpatti* is an optional reading.

When *āyādaya* is in fact established (already by *anuvṛtti*) there is (possible) a change of the ending to fifth case for *āyādayati*. The meaning is ‘that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after *āya* and the rest, when that follows, *āya*, and the rest do not arise after *gup* and the rest’.

40.7 ‘*yadā tāvad iti*’ /

When *āya* and the rest are ordained, without regard to the subsequent as cause of operation/ *paranimitta* by means of the sentences ordaining *āya* and the rest without regard to the sentence, then by reason of that, when an *ārdhadhātuka* follows, in their view cessation is effected. Even though words are eternal, still in context of formation of words in the science (of grammar) in some places by way of *lopa*/elision of that arisen, cessation is effected. In some places by reason of ordaining an *apavāda*/exception (*pratyaya*) the non-arising of the *utsarga*/general (*pratyaya*) is made known (e.g. *adi prabhṛtibhyaḥ, śapah* 2.4.72). Hence the view which supports *nivṛtti*/ cessation (to be added) is not inappropriate.

40.19 *yadeti* /

“When (also that *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* which acts after the base ending with *āya* and the rest and when that is established (in the mind as desired), optionally, there is arising of *āya* and the rest applicable).”

A view is: ‘When this union of three *sūtras* is the remainder (to be supplied) then there is the existence of one sentence/*ekavākyatā*; when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows *āya* and the rest optionally arise.’ If then there is ‘the existence of one sentence’ then when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows *āya* and the rest would not arise. This is no fault. Here alone, when it is to be stated *gup dhūp* “(act) optionally when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* follows” because of a different reading, “when a



*sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows also *āya* and the rest are applicable” is thus known. However, by reason of ‘being one sentence’, “when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* only follows” they are optionally so ordained.

40.18 ‘*gopāṃcakāra gopeti ca*’ /

He protected, protector.

*kās pratyayādāmamantre liṭi* 3.1.35 “The *pratyaya ām* acts after the *dhātukas* (to cough) and those *dhātus* formed by *pratyayas* (derivative verbs) when *liṭ* (perfect) follows except in the Veda.”

‘*a pratyayāt*’ 3.3.102 “After the *dhātus* that end in a *pratyaya* there is the *pratyaya a*, the word being feminine”

- *gopā*

2.41 *gopāyatīti* / He protects.

He thinks ‘because of the absence of any qualification’. Here there is not arising of *śap* and there is no scope of application for *āya* etc.

2.40.5 *paratvāt syādayaḥ prāpnuvanti* /

“Because of being subsequent rules, *sya* and the rest obtain ...”

*syatāsī lṛluṭo* 3.1.33 When *lṛ* (*lṛṭ* conditional and *laṭ* second future) and *luṭ* (first future) then *sya* and *tāsī* are respectively *vikaraṇa pratyayas* of a *dhātu*. “The *pratyaya śap* acts after a *dhātu* when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows signifying the agent.”

2.40.10 ‘*anyad idānīm iti*’ /

Now (what is stated) is that something else is not a qualification.

The sense is that even in the absence of a distinction or qualification, because of the force of the rule (itself) it is produced by *śap*. Here, however, for the form *kāmayate* ‘he desires’, there is in fact a qualification because of the absence of this form without *śap*.

2.40.14 *yathā punar iti* /

... “But as (there will be) avoiding (of this problem) by dividing the *sūtra* (into two).” However, that was stated by the *vārttikakāra* namely “However, it is established that when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows, (or is determined on in the mind), because of not resorting to the word *vā*, there is invariable ordaining of *āya* etc.”

Thus by division of the *sūtra* being stated, the refutation was expressed. The meaning is, when a division of the *sūtra* has to be effected as ‘invariably when *śap* follows (*āya* etc.)’ such a reading/statement has to be made whereby ‘no fault is possible’. But surely because of the *tudādi* character of *vicch* (*dhātu* to go) it would be formed with *ś-a vikaraṇa* but not with *śap*. Well then, the purpose is (said to be) to imply a difference in the written text. However, the written text has to be effected as ‘invariable/*nitya* when *śap* follows’.

41.20 *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ* //3/1/32//

*antagrahaṇam kim artha na sanādayo dhātava ity evocyeta /  
kenedānīm tadantānām bhaviṣyati / tadanta vidhinā // ata  
uttaram paṭhati /*

**Pāṇini 3.1.32:** Words ending with the *pratyaya san* and the rest (have the name *dhātu*).

**Bhāṣya:** What is the purpose of the mention of *anta* (end)? Could one not just say *sanādaya dhātavaḥ* “*pratyayas* beginning with *san* are called *dhātus*”. By reason of what (rule) will there now be (the name *dhātu*) for those which end in that (*pratyaya*)? By the *tad anta* rule (viz. *yena vidhis tad antasya* 1.1.72) “A rule which is enjoined with regard to a particular attribute applies to words having that attribute at their end as well as to that attribute itself”. Therefore (*the Vārttika-kāra*) speaks the following:

41.23 *sanādiṣvantagrahaṇa uktam* //1//

*kim uktam / padasaṃjñāyām antavacanam anyatra saṃjñā-  
vidhau pratyayagrahaṇe tad antavidhipraṭiṣedhārtham iti /  
idaṃ cāpi pratyayagrahaṇam ayaṃ cāpi saṃjñāvidhiḥ //*

**Vārttika 1:** A reply was stated (previously) 1.4.14 Vā. 1 with regard to the mention of *anta* in relation to *san* and the rest (*pratyayas*).

**Bhāṣya:** What was stated (in 1.4.14 Vā. 1)? “The expressing of *anta* (ending), in the rule ordaining the technical name *pada* viz. “*sup-tiṅ-antam padam*” 1.4.14 (“That which ends in a *sup* (case nominal ending) or a *tiṅ* (verbal ending) is called *pada* (fully inflected word)” was for the purpose of prohibiting the *tadanta* (“for that ending in that”) rule elsewhere when there is specific mention of a *pratyaya* in a *saṃjñā sūtra* (giving a technical name to a linguistic unit). And this also is a specific mention of a *pratyaya* and also it is a *saṃjñā* (technical name) rule.

42.1 *kim arthaṃ punar idam ucyate na bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ* (1.3.1)  
*ity eva siddham / na sidhyati / pāṭena dhātusaṃjñā kriyate na*

*ceme tatra paṭhyante / katham tarhy anyeṣāṃ apaṭhyamānānām  
dhātusaṃjñā bhavati / aster bhūḥ bruvo vaciḥ cakṣiṇaḥ khyāñ  
(2.4.52, 53, 54) iti / yady apy ete tatra na paṭhyante prakṛtayas  
tv eṣāṃ tatra paṭhyante tatra sthānivad bhāvāt siddham /*

42.5 *ime 'pi tarhi yady api tatra na paṭhyante yeṣāṃ tv arthā  
ādiśyante te tatra paṭhyante tatra sthānivad bhāvāt siddham /*

For what purpose is this stated? Is not in fact (the technical name *dhātu* already) established (by the *sūtra*) “*bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ*” 1.3.1 "The words beginning with *bhū* (to be or become) and denoting action are called *dhātus*"? No it is not established. The technical name *dhātu* is formed by the recitation (of the seed forms in the *dhātu pāṭha*) and these are not recited there. How is it then that for others not being recited (in the *dhātu pāṭha*) the technical name *dhātu* is applicable? (As in the *sūtras*) “*aster-bhūḥ*” 2.4.52 “*Bhū* is the *ādeśa* (substitute) of the *dhātu as* (to be) when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* is to be applied”; *bruvo vaci* 2.4.53 “*Vac-i* is the *ādesa* of *brū* (to speak) when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* is to be applied”; ‘*cakṣiṇaḥ khyāñ*’ 2.4.54 “*Khyāñ* is the *ādeśa* of *cakṣiṇ* (to perceive, to tell) when an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* is to be applied”. Although these are not recited/listed there nonetheless the original/*sthānin* of them is recited. There (the name *dhātu*) is established as valid because of these *ādeśas* being like the originals. Also although they are not recited (in the *dhātu pāṭha*), nonetheless those for which meanings are indicated there, are recited. There too because of being like the original/*sthānin* (meanings/*arthas* given in the *dhātu pāṭha* with each *dhātu*), (the name *dhātu*) is established as valid.

42.6 *na siddhyati / ādeśaḥ sthānivad bhavātīty ucyate na cema  
ādeśāḥ / ime 'py ādeśāḥ / katham / ādiśyate yah sa ādeśa ime  
cāpy ādiśyante // evam api ṣaṣṭīnirdiṣṭasyādeśāḥ sthānivad  
bhavātīty ucyate na ceme ṣaṣṭīnirdiṣṭasyādeśāḥ / ṣaṣṭīgra-  
haṇaṃ nivartīsyate / yadi nivartate 'pavāda utsargakṛtaṃ  
prāpnoti / karmanyaṃ (3.2.1.) āto 'nupasarge kaḥ (3) iti ke 'py  
aṅkṛtaṃ prāpnoti / naiṣa doṣaḥ / ācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati  
nāpavāda utsargakṛtaṃ bhavātīti yad ayaṃ śyanādīnkāṃś-  
cicśitaḥ karoti / śnam śnā śnuriti //*

It is not established. It is said “The *ādeśa* is like the original/

*sthānivat*” but these are not *ādeśas*. There also are *ādeśas*. How? That which is pointed out/*ādiśyate* in an *ādeśa* and these too are ‘pointed out’. Well then it is said “(only) the *ādeśa* of those (originals) which are mentioned in the sixth case are like the original/*sthānivat*, and these *ādeśas* are not in place of those mentioned in the sixth case. The mention of sixth case will cease. (*‘śaṣṭhī sthāneyogā 1.1.49’* and *‘sthānivad ādeśo ’nal vidhau 1.1.56’*). If it ceases, (the operation) produced by the *utsarga sūtra* causes in the case of *apavāda* in relation to *karman 3.2.1* (“*aṅ pratyaya* acts after a *dhātu* when the *karman* (object) is in composition with it as an *upapada* (subordinate word)” = (*utsarga sūtra*) and *āto ’nupasarge kaḥ 3.2.3* “*pratyaya ka* acts after a *dhātu* ending in long *ā* when no *upasarga* precedes and when the *karman* (object) is in composition with it”. That caused by the *apavāda pratyaya* obtains in place of *ka*. There is no fault. The usage of the Master makes known that when (there is applicable) an *apavāda sūtra* that which is caused by the *utsarga* is not applicable. Because of this situation he makes some (*vikaraṇa pratyayas*) *śyan* and the rest have an indicatory *ś* (as) *śyan śnam śnā* and *śnu*.

### Notes on *MahāBhāṣya* on *Pāṇini 3.1.32*

#### *Vārttika* Summary

Although there is specific mention of a *pratyaya* and it is a *saṃjñā* rule, the prohibition of the *tadanta* rule by *vā. 1* on *1.4.14* does not apply because of stating *anta*.

#### *Bhāṣya* Summary

*Patañjali* explains in the introduction the reason for mention of *anta* is so *1.1.72* may apply. On the first *vārttika* he explains the reference to *1.4.14 vā. 1* indicating the *anta* in this rule conveys the same meaning as in *1.4.14*. The name *dhātu* is established elsewhere by *1.3.1* even for those not actually recited in the *Dhātu Pāṭha* because *ādeśas* of those recited there. Not however, for *sananta* etc., hence this *sūtra*. These are not *ādeśas* even if they are ‘pointed out’, since the sixth case ending word is not what they replace. Finally he mentions there is an implied rule, that when an *apavāda* is applicable the *utsarga pratyaya* is not applicable, so *śyan* etc. with *it ś* in place of *śap*.

2.41.22 ‘*tadantavidhinā*’ / By the *tad anta* rule *yena vidhis tadantasya 1.1.72* “A rule which is enjoined with regard to a particular attribute applies to words having that attribute at their end, as well as that attribute

itself.”

2.41.25 ‘*pratiṣedhārtham iti*’ /

For the purpose of prohibiting (*tadanta* rule elsewhere)

*padasaṃjñāyām antavacanam anyatra saṃjñāvidhau*

*pratyayagrahaṇe tadantavidhipratiṣedhārtham* / 1.4.14

*vā*° / The expression of *tad anta* in any other than in the *pada* technical name rule, is for the purpose of prohibiting the *tadanta* rule (when there is mention of a *pratyaya*).

2.42.1 *sanādyantāḥ* / *bhūvādaya ity eveti* /

*Pra.* (Is not *dhātu*) in fact (established by) the *sūtra bhūvādaya* ‘words beginning with *bhū* and denoting action are called *dhātus*?’

The sense is such because of resorting to the interpretation of the meaning as ‘*dhātus*’, expressing becoming/*bhū*. There the meaning is ‘and thence because of expressing verbal activity the technical name *dhātu* is established as valid for those ending in *san* and the rest’.

2.42.2 ‘*pāṭheneti*’ /

(Technical name *dhātu* is established) by recitation (in *Dhātu Pāṭha*).

The sense is ‘because of the connection each one has, the word *ādi* etc. and the technical name *dhātu* is ordained after the meaning and (the form) is recited’. The meaning is ‘because of the mention there of an *ādeśa* word in place of a word used in its conventional sense, it is established there only for those which have the nature of *ādeśa* on the cessation of the original *sthānin*, so that the mention there is for them alone.

2.42.7 ‘*ime ’pṭi*’ /

“These also are *ādeśas*.”

The meaning is, the mention there is of a word which is an *ādeśa* of one cause of verbal activity. Here *codayanti*, ‘they impel’, if by reason of being like the original the technical name *dhātu* is enjoined for *san* and the rest, then because of the absence of (applicability of *tadanta* rule), the augment *aṭ* etc. dependent on having the technical name *aṅga*, obtain for *pratyayas* alone and are desired for those *aṅgas* ending in *pratyayas*. And the *pratyaya yañ* is enjoined in the sense of its base/*svārthe* after a *dhātu* expressing verbal activity characterised by repetition, and *āya* etc. unqualified are enjoined in the sense of the base. Thus because of the absence of any cessation of the original, and due to absence of any cessation of the original, and due to absence of *sthānivatva*, the technical name *dhātu* does not obtain.

Here it is said because of the maxim ‘all are the *ādeśas* of the whole *pada*’ (1.1.20 *vā*. 5). The form ‘He desires to make’ there is the *aṅga*/base ‘making’ in the sense of *dhātu iṣ* desire. When there is occasion for the *dhātu iṣ* occurring, the word ‘*cikṛṣa* is indicated as ending in *san* because

the *dhātu*-nature of that ending (in a *san pratyaya*), is established as valid.

The intention of the *Bhāṣyakāra* is that when there is the possibility of the use of the word *lū* (to cut), expressing the activity of cutting distinguished by repetition, the word *lotūyate* is indicated ‘He cuts intensely’. When there is occasion for *gup-i*, ‘the word’ *gopāya* (is indicated), ‘He shuns, detests’ (also *svārthe*).

42.1 (2) ‘*ṣaṣṭhīgrahaṇam nivartisyate*’ /

“The mention of sixth case will cease.”

*ṣaṣṭhīsthāne yogā* 1.1.49 “The sixth case implies the relation of ‘instead’”, i.e. that for which something is substituted.

*sthānivadādeṣo ’nalvidhau* 1.1.56

### 42.13 *syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ* ||3||1||33||

*ime vikaraṇāḥ patyante tatra na jñāyate ka utsargaḥ ko ’pavāda iti / tatra vaktavyam ayam utsargo ’yam apavāda iti / ime brūmo yagutsargo ’pavāda śabādih syādayaś ca //*

**Pāṇini 3.1.33:** In the presence of *lṛ* and *luṭ*, *sya* and *tāsi* act as (*vikaraṇa pratyayas*) after a *dhātu*.

**Bhāṣya:** These *vikaraṇa pratyayas* are recited (but) it is not known there which is the *utsarga sūtra* (general) and which is the *apavāda* (particular *sūtra* debarring the general). There it should be stated “this is an *utsarga sūtra*, (and) this is an *apavāda sūtra*”. These we will state: “*yak* is an *utsarga pratyaya*” (by) *sārvadhātuke yak* 3.1.67. “The *pratyaya yak* acts after a *dhātu* when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows, denoting the action or the object” and *śap* and the rest and *sya* and the rest are *apavāda sūtras* c.f. *kartari śap* 3.1.69 “The *pratyaya śap* acts after a *dhātu* when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows signifying the agent”.

42.16 *yady evam apavādavipratīṣedhāc śabādibādhanam // apavādavipratīṣedhāc śabādibhiḥ syādīnām bādhanam prāpnoti / śabādīnām avakāśaḥ / pacati yajati / syādīnām avakāśaḥ / pakṣyate yakṣyate / ihobhayaṃ prāpnoti / pakṣyati yakṣyati / paratvāc śabādayaḥ prāpnuvanti //*

**Vārttika:** If this is so, “because of the conflict (of rules of equal force

requiring the subsequent to prevail) the subsequent of (two) *apavāda sūtras* bars the prior so there is debarring by *śap* and the rest”.

**Bhāṣya:** Because of the conflict (of rules of equal force requiring the subsequent to prevail) the subsequent of two *apavāda sūtras* is debarred, and there obtains debarring by *śap* and the rest of *sya* and the rest. There is scope for *śap* and the rest in *pacati* “He cooks”, *yajati* “He sacrifices”. There is scope (of application) for *sya* and the rest (in) *pakṣyate* “It will be cooked” and *yakṣyate* “It will be sacrificed”. Here both obtain, *pakṣyati* “He will cook” and *yakṣyati* “He will sacrifice”. Because of being subsequent (rules to *sya* and the rest) *śap* and the rest obtain.

42.20 *apavādo nāmānekalakṣaṇaprasaṅgaḥ // apavādo nāma bhavati yatrānekalakṣaṇaprasaṅgaḥ / tatra bhāvakarmanor yag-vidhīyate kartari śapkaḥ prasaṅgo yad bhāvakarmanor yakam kartari śabādayo bādheran // evaṃ tarhi yakṣapāv utsargāva-pavādāḥ śyanādayaḥ syādayaś ca //*

**Vārttika:** There is occasion for the word *apavāda* having more than one definition.

**Bhāṣya:** The (word) *apavāda* is such that it is possible to have more than one definition and here *yak* is ordained in the sense of *bhāva* (abstract notion of a *dhātu*) or *karman* (object), (but) *śap* (is ordained) in denoting *kartr* (agent). What is the contingency where *śap* and the rest in the sense of agent would debar *yak* in the sense of action/*bhāva* and object/*karman*? Well then, *yak* and *śap* are (by) *utsarga sūtras*, *śyan* and the rest and *sya* and the rest (by) *apavāda sūtras*.

42.22 *apavādavipratīṣedhāc śyanādibādhanam // apavāda- vipratīṣedhāc śyanādibhiḥ syādīnām bādhanam prāpnoti / śyanādīnāmavakāśaḥ / dīvyati sīvyati / syādīnāmavakāśaḥ pakṣyati yakṣyati / ihobhayaṃ prāpnoti /*

42.25 *deviṣyati seviṣyati / paratvāc śyanādayaḥ prāpnuvanti // naiṣa doṣaḥ / śabādeśāḥ śyanādayaḥ kariṣyante śap ca syādibhir bādhyate tatra divādibhyaḥ syādiviṣaye śabeva nāsti śabeva nāsti kutaḥ śyanādayaḥ / tat tarhi śapo grahaṇam kartavyam/*

**Vārttika:** Because of a conflict (of rules of equal force requiring the subsequent rules to prevail over the earlier rules, *utsarga sūtras* here would prevail over), the *apavāda sūtras*, so *śyan* and the rest would debar (*sya* and the rest).

**Bhāṣya:** Because of a conflict, there obtains debarring of *sya* and the rest by *śyan* and the rest. There is scope (of application) for *śyan* and the rest: *dīvyati* “He plays” and *sīvyati* “He sews”. There is scope (of application) for *sya* and the rest *pakṣyati* “He will cook” and *yakṣyati* “He will sacrifice”. Here both obtain *deviṣyati* “He will play dice” and *seviṣyati* “He will sew”. Because of being subsequent *śyan* and the rest obtain.

There is no fault, for *śyan* and the rest will be produced as the substitutes of *śap*. Moreover *śap* is debarred, by *sya* and the rest. There, after *div* and the rest, in the context of *sya* and the rest, *śap* in fact is not present, how much less *śyan* and the rest. Then should specific mention of *śap* be made?

43.1 *na kartavyam/ prakṛtam anuvartate / kva prakṛtam / kartari śap (3.1.68) iti / tadvai prathamānirdiṣṭam ṣaṣṭhīnirdiṣṭena cehārthaḥ / divādibhya ity eṣā pañcamī śabiti prathamāyāḥ ṣaṣṭīm prakalpayaṣyati tasmād ity uttarasya (1.1.67) iti / pratyaya- vidhirayaṃ na ca pratyayavidhau pañcamyah prakalpikā bhavanti / nāyaṃ pratyayavidhiḥ /*

It should not be made. The original (*śap*) follows on (from a previous *sūtra*). Where is the original? (In the *sūtra kartari śap 3.1.68*) “The *pratyaya śap* acts after a *dhātu* when *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows signifying the agent”. That really is mentioned in the first case, but here the purpose is conveyed by sixth case indication. (No fault here). The fifth case (in the *sūtra divādibhyaḥ śyan 3.1.67*) “After *div* and the rest (acts *pratyaya śyan*)” will put the sixth case in place of the first (case indication for the *pratyaya*) *śap* because of the *sūtra tasmād-ityuttarasya 1.1.67* (“That indicated in the fifth case enjoins an operation or *ādeśa*/substitute for that (immediately) following”). This is a *pratyaya* rule and in a *pratyaya* rule fifth case words cannot effect change. This is not a *pratyaya* rule.

43.5 *vihitaḥ pratyayah prakṛtaś cānuvartate // atha vānuvrttiḥ*



*kariṣyate / sārva dhātuke yak (3.1.67) syātāsī lṛluṭoḥ cli luṇi cleḥ sic bhavati kartari śap (68) syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ cli luṇi cleḥ sijbhavati / divādibhyaḥ śyan (69) syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ cli luṇi cleḥ sijbhavati // athavāntaraṅgāḥ syādayaḥ / kāntaraṅgatā / lāvasthāyām eva syādayaḥ sārva dhātuke śyanādayaḥ //*

The *pratyaya* is already ordained and the base follows on (from a previous *sūtra*). Or otherwise there will be effected *anuvṛtti* (following on from previous *sūtras* of the elements required). (As) *sārva dhātuke yak 3.1.67* (*pratyaya yak* acts after a *dhātu* when a *sārva dhātuka pratyaya* follows denoting action/*bhāva* or object/*karman*) (may require following on from previous *sūtras*). “*sya tāsī lṛluṭoḥ*” 3.1.33; “*cli luṇi*” 3.1.43 (In the presence of the *pratyaya luṇi* (aorist sign) *pratyaya cli* acts after a *dhātu*) and “*cleḥ sic*” 3.1.44 (“*Sic* acts in the place of the *pratyaya cli*”). Similarly the *sūtra kartari śap 3.1.68* (tr. above) (may require the following same *sūtras* by *anuvṛtti*) “*sya tāsī lṛluṭoḥ*” 3.1.33 (“In place of *śap*, *sya* and *tāsī* act when *lṛ* or *luṭ* follow”). “*cli luṇi* and *cleḥ sic* (Similarly the *sūtra*) “*divādibhyaḥ śyan 3.1.69*”. (“After the *dhātus div* and the rest *śyan* acts in place of *śap*” (may require)) *syatāsī lṛluṭoḥ; cli luṇi* and *cleḥ sic*. Otherwise *sya* and the rest (as *vikaraṇa pratyayas* with no specific meaning designated other than that of their own base/*svārthe*) are *antaraṅga* (requiring fewer operations).

What is the nature of *antaraṅga* (here)? The only condition *sya* and the rest have is “when a *la* (*lṛ* and the rest of tense/mood *pratyayas*) follow (whereas) *śyan*” and the rest have (the additional condition) “when a *sārva dhātuka pratyaya* follows (signifying action/*bhāva*, object/*karman*, or agent/*kartr*)”.

### Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.33

#### Vārttika Summary

The first (possible) *vārttika* states *śap* bars the *apavāda pratyayas* before it by *vipratīṣedha*. The second points out the possibility of the word *apavāda* having more than one meaning. The third shows that for the same reason *śyan* etc. *utsarga pratyayas* would bar *sya* etc. *apavāda pratyayas*.

#### Bhāṣya Summary

The introduction states the need to distinguish among the *vikaraṇa pratyayas* which are *utsargas* and which *apavādas*. *Yak* is *utsarga*, *śap* etc.

and *sya* etc. *apavādas*. In cases like *pakṣyati* both *śap* and *sya* obtain so by *vipratīṣedha śap* would have prevailed. We may understand *śap* also as *utsarga* ordained in the sense of *kartr*, whereas *yak* is in the sense of *bhāva* and *karman*. The rest are *apavādas*. Due to being subsequent, *śyan* would seem to bar *sya* etc. but in fact *śyan* is *ādeśa* of *śap*, and *śap* is barred by *sya*. Special mention of *śap* need not be made here, for we may understand the first case in the sense of sixth case for it by *anuvṛtti*, because that is implied by use of fifth case in 3.1.67 etc. according to 1.1.67. The final priority of *sya* etc. over *śap* can be achieved by *anuvṛtti* or by recognising that *sya* is *antaraṅga* in relation to *śyan* etc. *bahiraṅga*, since they require the additional condition of having a *sārvadhātuka* following.

2.42.13 *syatāstī / ime iti /*

These (*vikarāṇa pratyayas ...*)

He asks to know the (qualities of the properties) of general/*utsarga pratyayas* and the exception/*apavāda*.

2.42.15 ‘*yagutsarga iti*’ /

*Yak* is an *utsarga/general pratyaya*

The sense is that through the *anuvṛtti* of *bhāva* and *karman* because of being ordained after merely the one condition ‘when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows’ (it is *utsarga*).

‘*yagutsargo /*’ 3

*sārvadhātuke yak* 3.1.67 (*bhāvakarmanoh*) “The *pratyaya yak* acts after a *dhātu* when a *sārvadhātuka* (3.4.113) *pratyaya* follows denoting the abstract action/*bhāva* of the object/ *karman*.”

‘*śabādi*’ 4

‘*kartari śap*’ 3.1.58 (*sārvadhātuke dhātoḥ*) “The *pratyaya śap* acts after a *dhātu* when *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* follows signifying the agent.”

2.42.16 *apavādapratīṣedhād iti /*

“Because of the conflict (there is barring of *śap*) by *vipratīṣedhe paraṃ kāryam* 1.4.2

“When rules of equal force prohibit each other the the latter/subsequent in the order of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is to take effect.”

The meaning is, when there is a conflict among the *apavādas* or exceptions to the *utsarga yak*, between *śap* and the rest and *sya* and the rest, because *śap* and the rest are later, *śap* and the rest would be applicable.

2.42.16 *apavāda iti /*

Where there is the possibility of an *utsarga* characterised (*pratyaya*) and one characterised as *apavāda* there is usage of the *apavāda*.

However, the meaning is in the *yak* rule, because of the mention of *bhāva* and *karman* following on and because of there being a possibility of *yak* in the sense of agent there is not the nature of being *apavāda* for that.

2.42.21 *śyannādayaḥ 5//*

*divādibhyaḥ śyan 3.1.69*

The *pratyaya śyan* acts after a *dhātu* of the *divādi gaṇa* when a *sārvadhātuka pratyaya* denoting the agent follows.

2.43.9 *lāvasthāyām iti //*

“When *la* (*lṛ* and the rest of the tense/mood *pratyayas* follow).”

And surely because of being subsequent, the *ādeśa* of *la* should be applied. And there is not non-invariability/*a-nityatva* for the *ādeśas* of *la*, even when *sya* and the rest have been effected, because of the possibility of the substitutes of *la*, due to resort to the qualification ordained, that (they be) in place of *la*, which has been ordained after a *dhātu*, even within the context of the *dhātu* governing rule, as far as the conclusion of the third *adhyāya*. So then, even when the *ādeśas* of *la* have been effected, *sya* and the rest, being *antaraṅga* (having few conditions), in fact are applicable. For in that rule the sense of agent etc. is not resorted to, as having the nature of *sārvadhātuka* or qualification of the meaning, by (any) word. However, *śyan* and the rest, because of their nature of (having to resort to or) depend on that (qualification agent), are *bahiraṅga* (requiring more operations). And it is essential that this be assented to, ‘when the *ādeśas* of *la* have been effected, *sya* and the rest are effected’. Otherwise, how could there be an implied rule/*jñāpaka* for this meaning, ‘the accent of a *vikaraṇa*, by reason of the ordaining *anudātta* for a *sārvadhātuka* substitute of *la* following *tāsī*, bars the accent of the *sārvadhātuka ādeśa* of *la*’?

2.43.9 *Pra. lāvasthāyām iti*

For if, ‘when a *la* follows *tāsī* is effected, and afterwards the *sārvadhātuka pratyaya*’, then applies the (*vārttika 9* on *6.1.158*) *satīśiṣṭatvāt* (*la sārva-dhātukasya udāttatve*) ‘because of the comparatively superior strength of a subsequent acute, replacing the one previous in the process of the formation of a word, *udātta* obtains in the place of the *anudātta* accent on the substitute of *sārvadhātuka ādeśa* of *la*’.

The *jñāpaka* (implied rule) that the rule is for the purpose of an *anudātta* accent, which has not obtained (yet by rule) would not then be acceptable. However, those who say ‘because of the *bahiraṅga* nature of the *ādeśas* of *la* when there is *ekavākyatā* (being a single sentence) (applicable for the sentence ordaining *ādeśas* of *la*) and further by reason of the connection with the section (ordaining) *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada* together with ordaining of number as well as because of the *antaraṅga* nature, it is in fact in the context of *la*; and (so finally) because

of ordaining for each *pada*, *sya* and the rest are applicable. It is not established by those people that the previously spoken of meaning as a *jñāpaka* is applicable for the ordaining of *anudātta* for the *sārvadhātuka ādeśa* of a *la* which follows after *tāsi*.’

**43.10 sabbahulaṃ leṭi //3/1/34//**

*sibutsargaś chandasi //1//*

*sibutsargaś chandasi kartavyaḥ //*

**Pāṇini 3.1.34:** *Sip* diversely acts as *pratyaya* after a *dhātu* in the presence of *leṭ* (*pratyaya* signifying the Vedic subjunctive).

**Vārttika 1:** *Sip* should be ordained as a general *pratyaya* in *chandas/veda*.

**Bhāṣya:** *Sip* should be made applicable as a general *pratyaya* in the *chandas*.

*sanādyante neṣatvādy arthaḥ //2//*

*sanādyante ca kartavyaḥ / kiṃ prayojanam / neṣatvādy arthaḥ / indro nastena neṣatu / gā vo neṣāt //*

**Vārttika 2:** Because of the occurrence of the words *neṣatu* (let him lead) and the rest (*sip* is also applicable) in (the context of) *san* and the rest.

**Bhāṣya:** And (*sip*) should be effected in the context of the governing *sūtra sanādyantā dhātavaḥ 3.1.32*. “Words ending with the *pratyaya san* and the rest are called *dhātus*”. What is the purpose? For the sake of (the verbal forms) *neṣatu* and the rest. And *Indra nas tena neṣatu* “Let *Indra* lead us by that (path etc.)” (*ni-s(ip)-(s) a (p)-tu(loṭ) gā vo neṣāt* “May he lead your cows”).

**43.16 prakṛtyantaravāt siddham //3//**

*prakṛtyantaravāt siddham etat / prakṛtyantaram neṣatiḥ /*

**Vārttika 3:** (This is) established because of being different from the base.

**Bhāṣya:** This is established because of being different from the base *neṣati* ((Cl. 1. P.) to moisten, sprinkle (M. W.) but (*dhātu pāṭha neṣṭ* 617) *gatau* “He goes” is a different base.)

43.18 *neṣatu neṣṭāditi darśanāt //4//*

*neṣatu neṣṭāditi drśyate //*

43.20 *atha kim arthaḥ pakāraḥ / svarārthaḥ / anudāttau suppitau*  
(3.1.4) *ity eṣa svarō yathā syāt //*

**Vārttika 4:** Because of seeing (the forms) *neṣatu* and *neṣṭāt*, it is established that it is a different base (in use in the language).

**Bhāṣya:** (The forms) *neṣatu* and *neṣṭāt* are seen (in the literature). Now what is the purpose of the letter *p*? For the sake of accent. So that this (*anudātta*/grave) accent be applicable by the *sūtra* “*anudāttau sup pitau*” 3.1.4 (“A *sup pratyaya* and a *pratyaya* with an indicative *p* is *anudātta*”).

43.22 *pitkaraṇānarthakyaṃ cānackatvāt //5//*

*pitkaraṇaṃ cānarthakam / kiṃ kāraṇam / anackatvāt /*  
*anacko 'yaṃ tatra nārthaḥ svarārthena pakāreṇānubandhena //*  
*iṭi vṛte sācko bhaviṣyati /*

**Vārttika 5:** The producing of an indicative *p* is pointless because of the *pratyaya* not having a vowel.

**Bhāṣya:** The producing of an indicative *p* is pointless. What is the reason? Because *sip* is (in fact) without a vowel. Being without a vowel, the indicative letter *p* with which it is endowed, is not for the purpose of accent. When (the augment) *iṭ* is formed (then) it will become possessed of a vowel.

44.1 *iṭo 'nudāttārtham iti cedāgamānudāttatvāt siddham //6//*

*āgamānudāttatveneṭo 'nudāttatvaṃ bhaviṣyati // evaṃ tarhi*

*sabayam kartavyah /*

**Vārttika 6:** If the purpose is *anudātta* for the *iṭ āgama* (augment) then *anudātta* (accent) is already established because of (the statement) *anudātta* for the augment.

**Bhāṣya:** By reason of the statement about *anudātta*/grave accent for *āgamas*/augments. the *āgama iṭ* will be *anudātta*. Well then this should be prescribed as *śap*.

44.3 *kiṃ pryojanam / yadava yāsisīṣṭhāḥ / ekājlaṣṇaṇa iṭpratiṣedho mā bhūditi / kvāyam akāraḥ śrūyate // na kvacic chrūyate lopo 'sya bhaviṣyaty ato lopa ārdhadhātuka iti / yadi na kvacic chrūyate nārthaḥ svarārthena pakāreṇānubandhena evam api kartavya eva / kiṃ prayojanam / anudāttasya lopo yathā syād udāttasya mā bhūditi / kiṃ ca syāt / udāttanivṛttisvaraḥ prasajyeta //*

What is the purpose? As when (it is said) here *ava yāsisīṣṭhāḥ Ṛgveda 4.1.4* “Avert/put far away (from us the wrath of the divine *Varuṇa*)”. So that there should not be prohibition of *iṭ āgama* (due to being) characterised by a single vowel. Where is the letter *a* heard? Nowhere is it heard. There will be applicable *lopa* elision of that by “*ato lopaḥ 6.4.48 (ārdhadhātuke)*” (“*Lopa* acts in the place of the final short *a* of an *aṅga* (base) in the presence of an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*”). If it is not heard anywhere, then there is no point in the indicator letter *p* for the purpose of indicating accent. Even so it should not be effected. What is the purpose? So that there should be *lopa* elision of that which has an *anudātta*/grave accent and there should not be elision of that having an *udātta* (acute) accent. And what would be (the significance of that)? An accent which is caused by *anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ 6.1.161 (udāttah)* (“In place of an *anudātta* (grave accent) *udātta* (acute) accent acts when on account of it the preceding *udātta* is *lopa* elided.”)

2.44.8 *sibbahulam chandasi nit //7//*

*sibbahulam chandasi nidvaktavyah / savitā dharmam sāviṣat / pra ṇa āyūṃṣi tāriṣat //*

**Vārtikka 7:** Diversely in the *chandas/veda sip* has an indicatory *ṇ*.

**Bhāṣya:** It should be stated that diversely in the *chandas sip* has an indicatory *ṇ*.

**Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.34**

**Vārttika Summary**

The first states *sip* is an *utsarga pratyaya*. Due to the occurrence of *neṣatu* etc. The second says *sip* is inferred to also be applicable in the context of *san* etc. The third says this is valid because of being different from the base *neṣati* etc. as contrasted to the forms *neṣāt* etc. seen in use, pointed out in the fourth. The sixth states that *it p* is pointless because of the actual *pratyaya s(ip)* having no vowel. Moreover, the seventh points out, if it is claimed the purpose is *anudātta* for the *āgama*, that has already been stated. Lastly the seventh *vārttika* points out that diversely *sip* also has an *it ṇ* in the *Chandas*.

**Bhāṣya Summary**

*Patañjali* provides the examples from the *Veda* for the second *vārttika* and provides the different base referred to in the third. Introducing the fourth he points out *it p* would signify *anudātta* for the *pratyaya* by 3.1.4. He introduces the sixth by suggesting it could be for *anudātta* augment. Instead he then proposes *śap* instead of *sip*, although the *a* will in fact be *lopa* by 6.4.48. The purpose, he reveals on the sixth, is so there be *lopa* of that having *anudātta* vowel, so that 6.1.161 does not apply. Finally he provides the example from the *Veda* for the last *vārttika*.

2.43.11 *sibbahulam / sibutsarga iti /*

*Pra*° Without having mentioned any following cause/condition *s-ip* is to be ordained after a *dhātu* in the class of *san* and the rest. Therefore, when there is the technical name *dhātu* for that ending in that (*sip*), the forms *neṣatu* etc. are established as valid. After the word *nī* (to lead) when *sip* follows and *guṇa* is effected when *loṭ* (imperative also) follows the form *neṣata* is derived.

14 *sanādyante ca kartavyaḥ /*

c.f. *sanādyantā dhātavaḥ* 3.1.32

16 *prakṛtyantaravād iti /* This is established because of being different from the base. Because of the reading in the *Dhātu Pāṭha* of *jeṣṛ* 6.16 *neṣṛ* 6.17 *eṣṛ* 6.18 *preṣṛ* 6.19 *gatau* in the sense of going, the general *pratyaya* is not to be effected (here) in the sense of 'he leads'. However, the meanings 'put far away from' *ava yāsisīṣṭhāḥ* etc. are to be effected in

fact.

19 *neṣatu neṣtād iti drśyate /*

*neṣatu neṣtād iti* Let him lead, may he lead.

*Udy. drśyate iti bhāṣye pāṭhaḥ / loka 'pṛti śeṣaḥ /* This is read in the *Bhāṣya*, 'in popular usage' is required to complete the sense. The form *neṣtād* is a scribal error.

2.44.2 *sabayam iti /*

Well then this (should be presented as) *sap*.

The sense is that just as among the *pratyayas san* and the rest, so here in fact there is option/*vā*.

2.44.3 *yad ava yāsisīṣṭhā iti /*

As when (it is said) 'Avert/put far away (from the wrath of Varuṇa)'

*Dhātu yā* to go, preceded by *upasarga ava* followed by *śap = liñ* (optative) *madhyama puruṣa*/second person, e.g. *ātmane*. With *s-ut* and *sī-yuṭ* as augments, *iṭ* becomes the augment of that beginning with the augment *sī-yuṭ* because of the *aṅga* ending in *śap* having more than one vowel. c.f. *ekāca upadeśe 'nudāttat 7.2.10 (na iṭ)*

If however, *sip* is effected, then it is essential that the letter *i* be explained as for the purpose of pronunciation. Otherwise it would be heard. Then (in that context), because of the *dhātu* ending in *sip*, having only one vowel, prohibition of *iṭ* augment would be applicable. But surely, that *dhātu* here which is *anudātta* in an original teaching (namely) the word *yā* (*dhātu*, to go) does not have an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* after it, because of being separated by *sip*. And that, after which, ending in *sip*, there is an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*, is not *anudātta* in an *upadeśa*? Well then, when *san* and the rest are parts (of *aṅgas*) having the name *dhātu*, because of the *sūtra sanādyantā dhātavaḥ* (for so the meaning was explained) then there is the possibility of the prohibition of *iṭ* augment, because of the mention by reference to *yāti* (to go), as having *sip* forming part of *yāti*. When, also by reason of resorting to *sthānivad bhāva* the *sūtra* is rejected, then by being *sthānivat*, prohibition of augment *iṭ*, in fact obtains, due to the *anudātta* single vowel (*dhātu*) being heard.

2.44.3 *iṭa pratiṣedho*

*ekāca upadeśe 'nudāttāt 7.2.10*

The augment *iṭ* is not added to that *pratyaya* which is connected to a *dhātu* in (the *Dhātu Pāṭha*) *upadeśa* of one vowel and *anudātta* accent.

2.44.4 *ato lopa ārdhadhātuke*

*ato lopa 6.4.48 (ārdhadhātuke)*

"The *a* at the end of an *aṅga*/stem is *lopa*/elided before a *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*."



2.44.6 *anudāttas teti /*

“(So that there should be *lopa* elision) of that which has *anudātta*.”

Without resorting to the next *sūtra dhātoḥ* (6.1.162 ‘A *dhātu* has *udātta* accent on the end syllable’) this was stated. Otherwise this (comment) of the *Bhāṣya* is a resort to the reading of this very example.

2.44.6 *udāttasyeti /*

“(so that) there should not be (elision) of that having *udātta* accent.”

Due to the *udātta* accent on the *a* of the word *sa*, with either *pratyaya* or *dhātu* accent, when there is *anudātta* for the *sārvadhātuka* substitute of *la*, (due to being so in the *upadeśa* and being *sārvadhātuka* because of *chandasi ubhayathā* 3.4.117), the accent causing cessation of *udātta* would become applicable for *aṭ* augment. However, when there is present the letter *p*, *anudātta* only is applicable (3.1.4). And because of the force of the *it* letter *p* alone, the *dhātu* accent is not applicable, for the letter *a* of the word *sa* or because of the reading in this place/example. However, the word *yā* (to go) in fact is not applicable. That which is *anudātta* because if *tiṅ natiṅaḥ* 8.1.28.

“A finite verb is *anudātta* when a word precedes it which is not a finite verb”, is prohibited by *nipātair yayādi* 8.1.30, “the finite verb retains its accent in connection with the particles *yat*, *yādi*, etc.”

2.44.7 *udāttanivṛtisvaraḥ //*

*anudāttasya ca yatrodāttalopaḥ* 6.1.161

In place of an *anudātta* vowel there is *udātta* when on account of it the preceding *udātta* is elided.

2.44.9 *ṇidvaktavyaḥ /*

“It should be stated *sip* has an *it ṇ*.”

*aco ṇṇiti* 7.2.115 “Before *pratyayas* having an indicatory *ṇ* or *ṇ vrddhi* acts as the *ādeśa* for the final vowel of the *aṅga*.”

*sāviṣat iti /* “(*Savitṛ*) created or set in motion (*dharma*).”

There is *anudātta* for the word *āva* by *tiṅ codāttavat* 8.1.71 “A *gati* becomes *anudātta* when followed by an unaccented finite verb.” This is the form of *dhātu sū* to impel when *leṭ* (Vedic subjunctive) follows.

*tāriṣat iti /* “May he extend” (This is the subjunctive of *tī/tarati* (to cross over)).

**44.10 *kāspratyayād-ām-amantre liṭi //3//1//35//***

*kāsgrahaṇe cakāsa upasaṃkhyānam //1//*

*kāsgrahaṇe cakāsa upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam / cakāsāṃ-  
cakāra // na kartavyam / cakāspratyayāditi vakṣyāmi / cakās-  
grahaṇe kāsa upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam / kāsāṃcakre /  
sūtraṃ ca bhidyate // yathānyāsamevāstu / nanu cokatam  
kāsgrahaṇe cakāsa*

44.15 *upasaṃkhyānam iti / naiṣa doṣaḥ /*

**Pāṇini 3.1.35:** The *pratyaya ām* acts after the *dhātu kās* (to cough) and those *dhātus* that are formed by *pratyayas* (derivative verbs *san*, and the rest) in the presence of *liṭ* except in the *mantra/veda*.

**Vārttika 1:** When there is mention of *kās* (there should be) additional enumeration (of the form) *cakāsa*.

**Bhāṣya:** Additional enumeration should be made of the form *cakāsa* (as taking the *pratyaya ām*), as *cakāsāṃcakāra* “He shone”. It should not be made. I shall state, “after *cakās* and the *dhātus* formed by *pratyayas* (acts *ām*)”. When *cakās* is mentioned additional enumeration should be made of *kās* (as followed by *ām*). And the *sūtra* is split i.e. is changed. Let the *sūtra* be as written. But surely it was stated when *kās* was mentioned, ‘additional enumeration of *cakās* (as followed by *ām*)’.

44.15 *cakāsśabde kāsśabdo 'sti tatra kāspratyayād ity eva siddham/  
na sidhyati / kiṃ kāraṇam / arthavataḥ kāsśabdasya grahaṇam  
na ca cakāsśabde kāsśabdo 'rthavān // evaṃ tarhi kāsya  
anekā-ca iti vaktavyam / kiṃ prayojanam / culumpādy artham /  
culumpāṃcakāra daridrāṃcakāra //*

This is not a fault. When the word *cakās* is present there is the word *kās* (also present). So in fact, “after *kās* and that formed by a *pratyaya*” is established. It is not established. What is the reason? The mention of the word *kās* having meaning (is intended), and (when we say) “when the word *cakās* (is present) there is the word *kās*”, *kās* does not have meaning. Well then it should be stated that “when *kās* and a *dhātu* having more than one vowel (is present *ām* acts)”. What is the purpose? (For other examples of *dhātus* not formed from *pratyayas* taking *ām*). For the sake of *culumpa* and the rest *culumpāṃcakāra* “He fondles a child or calf”. *daridrāṃcakāra* “He

was in need or became poor”.

**Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.35**

**Vārttika Summary**

As well as mentioning *kās*, the form *cakās* should be enumerated, as followed by *ām*.

**Bāṣya Summary**

*Patañjali* having given the derived form *cakāsāṃcakāra* and discussed alternatives to the *vārttika*, rejects stating *cakās* instead of *kās* because of the included *kās* not being meaningful and proposes replacing ‘*pratyayād*’ in the *sūtra* by the words ‘after a *dhātu* having more than one vowel’.

*kāspratyayā /*

Surely here the mention of *pratyaya* is pointless. Having ordained *ām* generally by a division of the *sūtra* ‘*ām amantrē liṭi*’, I could explain the mention of *kās* as for the purpose of restriction. If it is said that “due to being established ‘when ending in a *pratyaya*’ because of *kās* (example only) as the example after a *dhātu* sought in the *Dhātu Pāṭha*”, that is not so because of the purpose of mentioning ending in a *pratyaya*-formed *dhātu* for those ‘having more than one vowel’. Therefore, after *ka* and the rest in the sense of conduct formed with *kvip*, *ām* does not act. And this is hinted at in *haradatta*’s book<sup>1</sup>: “And do not let that ending in a *pratyaya* and having one vowel in fact be (applicable) because when it is established, by mention of *kvip* only, the pointlessness of mentioning *pratyaya* is cogent”. And because of happening to conflict with *Bhāṣya*’s usage *gopāyāticakāra* etc.

**44.19 ijādeś ca gurumato ’ṅcchaḥ ||3/1/36||**

44.20 gurumata āmvidhāne liṅnimittāt pratiṣedhaḥ ||1||

*gurumata āmvidhāne liṅnimittāt pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ / iyeṣa uvoṣa / guṇe kṛte ijādeś ca gurumato ’ṅccha ity āmprāpnoti // gurumad vacanam idānīm kim arthaṃ syāt /*

**Pāṇini 3.1.36:** The *pratyaya ām* acts when *liṭ* follows after a *dhātu*

<sup>1</sup> *Padamañjari* on *Kāśikāvṛtti*.

beginning with an *ik* (*i, u, r, ḷ*) vowel and having a prosodial heavy/*guru* vowel, excepting the *dhātu rcch* (to go).

**Vārttika 1:** When *ām* is ordained after a *dhātu* with a prosodially heavy vowel caused by *liṭ* (perfect) *pratyaya* itself, there is prohibition (of *ām*).

**Bhāṣya:** It should be stated that there is prohibition (of *ām*) when *ām* is ordained after a *dhātu* with a prosodially heavy syllable caused by *liṭ* (*pratyaya* itself). As *īyeṣa* "He desired" (from *iṣ icchāyām*) *uvoṣa* "He burnt" (from *uṣ dāhe*). When *guṇa* has been effected (by *puganta laghūpadhasya ca 7.3.86*) ("*Guṇa* acts in place of a short penultimate vowel of a *dhātu* that ends in a single consonant and for *ik* vowels of the causative stems which take the augment *p-uk* (7.3.86) in the presence of a *sārvadhātuka* or an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*"), *ām* obtains after the *dhātu rcch* beginning with an *ik* vowel and having a prosodially heavy syllable. What now should be the purpose of the expression "having a prosodially heavy syllable"?

45.1 *gurumadvacanam kim artham iti ceṇ nalyuttame yajādi-  
pratiṣedhārtham //2//*

*gurumadvacanam kim artham iti ceṇ nalyuttame yajādīnām mā  
bhūd iti / iyajāham uvapāham /*

**Vārttika 2:** If (it is asked) what is the point of the expression "having a heavy syllable" (the answer is) it is for the purpose of prohibiting (*ām*) for *yaj* and the rest when the first person singular substitute *ṇal* follows.

**Bhāṣya:** If it is said 'what is the purpose of saying "having a heavy syllable"?', then (the answer is that) it is so that (*ām*) should not be applicable for *yaj* and the rest when the first person singular/*ṇal* *uttama pratyaya ādeśa* follows. (As) *iyajāham* "I worshipped", *uvapāham* "I sowed or scattered seeds".

45.5 *upadeśavacanāt siddham //3//*

*upadeśe gurumata iti vaktavyam // yady upadeśagrahaṇam*

*kriyata uccherām vaktavyaḥ / vyucchām cakāreti //*

**Vārttika 3:** (This is) established because of expression in an original teaching/upadeśa.

**Bhāṣya:** It should be stated that “after a *dhātu* having a prosodially heavy syllable in the original teaching, if a specific mention of the original teaching is made, it should be stated that *ām* acts after (the *dhātu*) *ucch-i* (*vivāse* banishment, *uñche* gleaning)”. *vyucchām cakāra* “He was banished” or “shone forth”.

85.7 *rcchipraṭiṣedho jñāpaka uccherāmbhāvasya //4//*

*yad ayam anṛccha iti praṭiṣedhaṃ śāsti taj jñāpayaty ācāryas  
tugnimittā yasya gurumattā bhavati tasmād ām iti // sa tarhi  
jñāpakārtha*

45.10 *rcchipraṭiṣedho vaktavyaḥ / nanu cāvaśyaṃ prāpty artho 'pi  
vaktavyaḥ / nārthaḥ prāpty arthena / rcchatyṛtām (7.4.11) ity  
rccher liṭi guṇavacanam jñāpakaṃ na rccher liṭyām bhavatīti /*

**Vārttika 4:** The prohibition of *rcch-i* is a *jñāpaka* (implied rule), that for *ucch-i* there should be the *pratyaya ām*.

**Bhāṣya:** The fact that the master teaches prohibition by the statement ‘not after *rcch*’ makes known that *ām* acts after that *dhātu* whose heavy syllable is caused by the *tuk* augment (by the *che ca* 6.1.73 “Augment *t* acts (as augment) of a preceding short vowel also when *ch* follows (in uninterrupted speech)”). Then it should be stated “the prohibition of *rcchi-i* is for making a *jñāpaka* (implied rule)”. The mention of *rcch* in the rule is meant not only for *jñāpaka* but also for its own sake. *rcch* must just be liable for *ām* then only prohibition is possible. The mention of *rcch* is to indicate *prāpti* (obtainment) of *ām* after *rcch* itself. And surely it is essential (to show) application (of *ām* after *rccha*) also. No purpose is served by mentioning it for the application (of *ām* after it). Because of the *sūtra* “*rcchavṛtam*” 7.4.11 (“*Guṇa* acts for the vowel of *rcch*, *r* and *dhātus* ending in long *r̄*”), in place of the vowel *rcchi-i*. The express mention of ‘*guṇa* (for the initial vowel) when *liṭ* (perfect) follows’, indicates that there is an implied rule/ *jñāpaka* that *ām* is not applicable after *rcchati*.

45.11 *naitad asti jñāpakam / artyartham etat syāt / katham punar  
rccher liṭi guṇa ucyamāno 'rtyarthaḥ śakyo vijñātum /  
sāmarthyāt / rcchir liṭi nāstīti kṛtvā prakṛtyartham vijñāyate /  
tad yathā / tiṣṭater it (7.4.5) jighrater (6) vā iti caṇi  
tiṣṭatijighratī na sta iti kṛtvā prakṛtyartham vijñāyate //*

This is not an implied rule/*jñāpaka*. The rule is for the sake of *dhātu r* (with *ādeśa*/sub-stitute *rcch*). But how is it possible to know that ‘the statement of *guṇa* for *rcchi* is for the sake of (the original *dhātu r*)?’ By force of (specific statement). The (substitute) *rcch-i* (in place of the original *r*) does not occur when *liṭ* follows (because it has not an indicative *ś*). Having formed (this conclusion) it is known that (the rule) is for the sake of the original (*dhātu r*). As for example having formed the conclusion that substitutes *tiṣṭhati* and *jighrati* do not occur when *caṇ* (reduplicated aorist of a causative stem follows) (from the observation of their presence in the *sūtras*) ‘*tiṣṭater-it*’ 7.4.5 (“When in the presence of *ṇi* (causative) followed by *caṇ*, short *i* is the *ādeśa* of the penultimate of the *dhātu sthā*” (in the form *sthāp* 7.3.36 e.g. *atiṣṭhipat*) and ‘*jighrater-vā*’ 7.4.6. (“Optionally when in the presence of *ṇi* followed by *caṇ*, *i* is the *ādeśa* in place of the penultimate of the *dhātu ghrā*” (in the form *ghrāp* 7.3.36 e.g. *ajighripat*); it is known that (the *sūtras*) are for the sake of the original *dhātus sthā* and *ghrā*.

45.15 *kiṃ punar arter liṭi guṇavacane prayojanam / āratuḥ āruḥ etad  
rūpaṃ yathā syāt / kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇam na sidhyati / dvirvacane  
krte savarṇadīrghatve ca yadi tāvad dhātugrahaṇena gra-  
haṇam ṛkāṛāntānām liṭi guṇo bhavātīti guṇe kṛte raparatve ca  
aratuḥ arurity etad rūpaṃ prasajyeta / athābhyāsagrahaṇena  
grahaṇam uratvaṃ raparatvaṃ halādiśeṣo 'ta ādeḥ (7.4.70) iti  
dīrghatvam ātoḥ lopa iṭi ca (6.4.64) ity ākāralopaḥ atuḥ ur iti  
vacanam eva śrūyeta /*

But again what is the purpose in stating *guṇa* for the *dhātu r* (= *arti*) when in the presence of *liṭ* (perfect)? So that these forms *āratuḥ*. “They both went” *āruḥ* “They (all) went” should be applicable. But again what is the reason (*guṇa*) is not established (here)? When the dual is effected and there is lengthening of the homogeneous vowel (here *a*), if (*ā* can be) taken/understood by the mention of the *dhātu*,

there is *guṇa*; (that) mention is the (cause of) *guṇa* for all *dhātus* ending in *r* when *liṭ* follows, and when *guṇa* has been effected and *r* following effected (by *uraṇ raparah 1.1.51*), the forms *aratuḥ* and *aruḥ* would be applicable. Now, if *ā* is understood by the mention of *abhyāsa* (reduplicated syllable, which is prefixed), (there is) mention of (the rule) ‘*ur-at*’ 7.4.66 (“Short *a* acts in place of the short or long *r* of the reduplicated syllable”) for that having the characteristic of having a *r* following (by *uraṇraparah 1.1.51*. “In place of *r* (short or long) *aṇ* (= *a i u*) having an *r* following” and mention) of the rule ‘*halādiḥ śeṣaḥ*’ 7.4.60 (“of the consonants of the reduplicative syllable, only the first is retained, the remainder are *lopa* elided”), and (mention of the *sūtra*) “*ata ādeḥ*” (7.4.70 “A long vowel acts as *adeśa* of the initial *a* of a reduplicated syllable in the perfect/*liṭ*”) and of (the *sūtra*) *āto lopa iṭi ca 6.4.64*. “*Lopa* acts in place of the final *ā* (of a *dhātu* in the presence of an *ārdhadhātuka pratyaya* with the *āgama iṭ*, as well as when it begins with a vowel and has an indicatory *k* or *ṛ*”, (*asamyogātliṭkit 1.2.5*) so that the expressions which actually would be heard are *atuḥ* (‘they both go’) and *uḥ* (‘they go’).

2.45.20 *guṇe punaḥ sati guṇe raparatve ca dvir vacanaṃ halādiśeṣo 'ta āder iti dīrghatvaṃ tataḥ siddhaṃ bhavati yathātatuh ātur iti // kiṃ punaḥ kāraṇaṃ savarṇadīrghatvaṃ tāvad bhavati na punar uratvam / paratvād uratvena bhavitavyam / antaraṅgatvāt / antaraṅgaṃ savarṇadīrghatvaṃ bahiraṅgaṃ uratvam / kāntaraṅgatā / varṇāvāśritya savarṇadīrghatvam aṅgasyoratvam / uratvam apy antaraṅgaṃ / katham /*

But when there is *guṇa* present, (then) when *guṇa* is effected (*r* becomes *a*) and also a following *r* (is added by 1.1.51); (there is) reduplication (by *ajāder dvitīyasya 6.1.2*); *lopa* elision of the non-initial consonants in the reduplicate (by *halādiḥ śeṣaḥ 7.4.60*) and a long vowel in place of the initial short *a* of the reduplicated syllable in the perfect (by *ata ādeḥ 7.4.70*), so that then it becomes established (as a valid form): as for example *ātatuh* “They both wandered about (as religious mendicants)”, *ātuḥ* “They (all) wandered about”. What is the reason there is just lengthening (of the reduplicated syllable *a*) but not (application of the *sūtra*) *ur-at 7.4.66* (*a* in place of *r* or *r̄*)? Because of being a letter *sūtra*, ‘in place of *r* or *r̄* *a*’ should be

applicable. Because of being *antaraṅga* (more inner/less operations), lengthening should be applicable. Lengthening in place of two homogeneous *ak* (*a i u r l*) vowels/*savarṇa dīrghatva* is *antaraṅga*. A in place of *r* or *ṛ/urat-tva* is *bahiraṅga* (more outer/having more operations). What is the nature of *antaraṅga* (here)? Having resorted to two letters or sounds, (only) the long homogeneous (sound is the one *ak* for the one before and the one after), (but) *ur-at-tva* (takes place) for an *aṅga* (’s final letter). *Urattva* is also *antaraṅga*. How?

45.25 *vakṣyaty etat prāgabhyāsavikārebhyo ’ṅādhikāra iti / ubhayor antaraṅgayoh paratvād uratvam / uratve kṛte raparatvaṃ halā-diśeṣo ’ta āder iti dīrghatvaṃ parasya rūpasya yaṇādeśaḥ*

46.1 *siddhaṃ bhavaty āratuḥ ārur iti // athāpi kathaṃ cid arter liṭi guṇenārthaḥ syāt / evam api na doṣaḥ/ ṛcchatyṛtām ity ṛkāro ’py atra nirdiśyate / katham/ praśliṣṭanirdeśo ’yam / ṛcchati ṛ rtām ṛcchatyṛtām iti //*

*Patañjali* will say this “*prāg-abhyāsa vikārebhyo ’ṅādhikārah*” on 6.4.1. “The governing *sūtra aṅgasya* (forms a base) or has its scope of application as far as “*atra lopo ’bhyāsasya*” 7.4.58. (Therefore *urat* 7.4.66 is not an *aṅga* rule). For both there is the nature of being *antaraṅga*; so because of being subsequent *urat* rule prevails. When *uratva* has been effected there is a following *r/raparatva* (and) “all non-initial consonants of the reduplicated syllable are *lopa*”/*halādih śeṣaḥ* 7.4.60. There is a long vowel in place of the initial *a* of a reduplicate and the semivowel is the substitute (for the vowel) of the form of that following (the reduplicated syllable), (so the forms) *āratuḥ* (“They both went”) and *āruḥ* (“They went”) are established (as valid).

Now even somehow the purpose of the *sūtra* is *guṇa* for *arti* (*dhātu r* to go) when *liṭ* (perfect) *pratyaya* follows, even so there is no fault. Here (in the *sūtra*) *ṛcchatyṛtām* 7.4.11 (“*Guṇa* acts in the perfect of *ṛch*, *r* and *dhātus* ending in long *ṛ*”) the letter *r* (short) is also mentioned. How? This is indication of a coalescent (vowel) i.e.  $r + r = \bar{r}$  *ṛcchati-r-rt-ām* (is formed from) *ṛcchati* (to go) *r* (to go) and of those *dhātus* ending in long *ṛ*.

46.3 *ihāpi tarhi prāpnoti cakratuḥ cakrur iti / saṃyogādi- grahaṇaṃ niyamārthaṃ bhaviṣyati/ saṃyogāder evākevalasya nānyasyā-*



*kevalasyeti//*

46.5 *tad etad antareṇārter liṭi guṇavacanam rūpaṃ siddham antareṇa carcchigrahaṇam arter liṭi guṇaḥ siddhaḥ / sa eṣo 'nanyārtha rcchipraṭiṣedho vaktavya uccher vāmvaktavyaḥ // ubhayaṃ na vaktavyam / upadeśagrahaṇam na kariṣyate / kasmān na bhavati iyeṣa uvoṣa /*

Then here also in (the forms) *cakr-atuḥ* and *cakr-uḥ* the mention of “beginning with a conjunct consonant” (by *rtaś ca samyogāder guṇaḥ* 7.4.10 “*Guṇa* acts for a *dhātu* ending in a short *r* and beginning with a conjunct consonant, in the presence of *liṭ* (perfect)”, will be for the purpose of a restriction. (*Guṇa*) only for that *dhātu* which begins with a conjunct consonant not (thus) having a vowel on its own, nor any other *dhātu* on its own (without a conjunct consonant). That expression of *guṇa* for *arti* (*dhātu r*) when *liṭ* follows is established without mention of *arti* and without reference to or mention of (substitute) *rcch*. It is established that there is *guṇa* of *arti* in the presence of *liṭ*. This prohibition of *rcchi*, which has no other purpose, should he stated or it should be stated that there is *pratyaya ām* for *dhātu ucch-i*. Neither should be stated. Specific mention of ‘original teaching/upadeśa’ (i.e. *dhātu pāṭha*) will not be made. Why is it not applicable to *iyeṣa* “He desired” and *uvoṣa* “He burnt”?

46.8 *uktam vā //5//*

*kim uktam / saṃnipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tad vighātsyeti //*

**Vārttika 5:** Or (the reply) was stated (before).

**Bhāṣya:** What was stated? (*Pari. 85 P.1.1.39, Vā. 3*) “(That which is taught in) a rule (the application of) which is occasioned by the combination (of two things), does not become the cause of the destruction of that combination” (i.e. *iyeṣa* and *uvoṣa* become *gurumat* but this does not occasion *ām*).

46.10 *ūrṇoteś copasaṃkhyānam //6//*

*ūrṇoteś copasaṃkhyānam kartavyam / prorṇunāva // na vaktavyam /*

**Vārttika 6:** There should be additional enumeration (of the prohibition of *ām*) after the *dhātu urṇu/urṇo-ti*.

**Bhāṣya:** Additional enumeration (of prohibition of *ām*) after *urṇo-ti* should be made. (The proper form is) *prorṇunāva* “He covered”. It should not be stated.

46.12 *vācya ūrṇor nūvadbhāvo yaṅprasiddhiḥ prayojanam / āmaś ca pratiśedhārtham ekācaścedupagrahāt // athavokāro 'py atra nirdiśyate / katham avibhaktiko nirdeśaḥ / anṛccha u anṛccho dayāyāsaś ca (3.1.37) iti //*

**Śloka Vārttika:** It should be stated that *urṇu* should be treated like *dhātu nu* (to praise) so that *yaṅ* (intensive *pratyaya*) is established as valid; also for the prohibition of *ām pratyaya*, and (further) having one vowel like *nu* (there will be) prohibition of *iṭ* (*āgama*).

**Bhāṣya:** Or otherwise the letter *u* is also mentioned here. How? There is indication without a *vibhakti*/case ending. So ... *anṛccha 3.1.36 + u* (becomes by *sandhi* when the *sūtras* are considered as in *saṃhitā*), *anṛccho dayāyāsaś ca (3.1.37) (V.M. om.)*. (So that the *sūtras* mean ... “not after *rcch*, and a *dhātu* ending in *u*”, “After the *dhātus dayā* (to give, protect and go) and *ās* (to sit) there acts the *pratyaya ām* when *liṭ* (perfect) follows”.)

#### Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.36

##### Vārttika Summary

The first is a prohibition of *ām* when the *guru* vowel is caused by *liṭ*. The second explains the reason for ‘*gurumato*’ is to prohibit *ām* for *yaj* etc., when *ṇal uttama* (first) person follows. The third says the *sūtra* is established by stating ‘in an *upadeśa/Dhātu Pāṭha*’. The fourth states that the very prohibition of *ām* after *rcch* is an implied rule ‘after *ucch-i*, also having the augment *tuk*, there should be *ām*’. The fifth returns to the first and says this has already been stated (in *Vā. 3* on *1.1.39*). The sixth simply states *ām* should also not act after *ūrṇu*. Finally the *śloka vārttika* says *ūrṇu* should be treated like *nu* so that *yaṅ* is established and so that *ām* and *iṭ āgama* are prohibited.

**Bhāṣya Summary**

*Patañjali* having given the examples *iyesa* etc. explains how the *guru* vowel is effected by 7.3.86. On the second he simply gives the necessary examples, and similarly with the third. In discussing the fourth, having explained the *jñāpaka* by reference to *tuk* by 6.1.73, he concludes after long debate that *rcch* also would obtain *ām*, since 7.4.11 is not a *jñāpaka* for that referring to *r* with *ādeśa rcch* etc., that neither prohibition of *rcchi* should be stated nor *ām* be stated for *ucchi* because all has already been stated. On the fifth *vārttika* he explains what was stated, namely: That rule which is occasioned by the combination of two things does not become the cause of the destruction of that. On the sixth he provides the examples and then says it need not be stated, because of the *śloka vārttika* (?) Finally an alternative solution to the *vārttika* is given to deal with the exception *ūrṇu*, so that an *u* without case ending is in the *sūtra*, so that it means ‘not after *rcch* or an *u*-ending *dhātu*’.

*Pra.* ‘*ijādeh / uvoṣeti*’ / “He burnt.”

But surely here, by virtue of the option, in *uṣavidajāgr-  
bhyo* ‘*nyatarasyām* 3.1.38 “The *pratyaya ām* optionally acts after *uṣ* (to burn), *vid* (to know), and *jāgr* (to wake) when *liṭ* follows”, so *ām* should be applicable. Here they say ... because of the absence of *guṇa* in the dual and the plural and the absence of a prosodically heavy vowel, option has scope of application, because of which, where there is a heavy vowel there invariably/*nitya ām* obtains. “When there is a conflict of rules of equal force the subsequent prevails” (applies here) and not having resorted to the nature of the strength of a rule, states expressly the words for which it is meant, namely a *prātipadika vidhi*. The example was given by the *Bhāṣyakāra* because there, when option in fact is resorted to, it will be applicable. This does not have to be mentioned here.

2.44.21 *guṇe kṛte /*  
‘*pugantalaghupadhasya ca*’ 7.3.86

*Pra.* 2.44.22 ‘*gurumadvacanam iti*’ //

(What is the purpose of) the expression ‘having a heavy syllable’. The sense is that here also when lengthening of two *savarṇa* vowels has been effected, as *iṣatuḥ+ṛṣuḥ* (they two desired+they all desired) because of then having a prosodially heavy syllable, everywhere after an *ik*-beginning *dhātu* with a heavy syllable, *ām* should be applied. Because of the force of expressing ‘having a heavy syllable’, he will resort to the (statement) ‘for that *dhātu* having a heavy syllable in the context (only) of the *upadeśa/Dhātu Pāṭha*’.

2.45.2 ‘*yajādtnām*’ // (*ām* should not be applicable for *yaj* and the rest).

c.f. *liṭyabhyāsasyobhayeṣām* 6.1.17 “There is a *sāmprasāraṇa*/vocalisation of the semivowel of the reduplicate (*abhyāsa*) of both.”  
*vacyādi* (6.1.15) *grahyādi* (6.116) (*vacisvapiyajādīnām kīti*)

*Pra.* 2.45.4 *upadeśavacanād iti* //

“(Established) because of being expressed in an original teaching.”

By *vacana* is intended ‘explanation’ otherwise, when there is rejection by one rule of another rule which quality would be applicable? Therefore, when there is a *nitya* rule because of resorting to *matup* when in the situation of the original teaching, the meaning is he will resort to ‘having a heavy syllable (as condition)’.

2.45.7 *ucher iti* //

For *dhātu ucchi* (there should be *ām*). *Dhātu ucchi vivāṣe* in sense of banishment, because of a heavy vowel not being read (the long vowel is to indicate it never takes augment *iṭ* when *kta* of past participle passive follows (7.2.14).

2.45.8 ‘*tugnimitā*’ // *ām* acts after that *dhātu* whose heavy syllable is caused by *tuk* augment.

*Pra.* *che ca* 6.1.73

The implication by the mentioning of *tuk* is that all augments therefore, are excluded. Here *in khām cakāra* ‘He went’, is applicable as valid.

2.45.9 *jñāpakārtha*

“for making an implied rule.”

The mention of *rcch* in the rule is meant not only as a *jñāpaka* but also for its own sake. *Rcch* must first be liable for *ām*, then only prohibition is possible. So, the mention of *rcch* is to indicate *prāti* obtainment of *ām* after *rcch* itself.

2.45.10 ‘*prāptyarthe pṛti*’ // The meaning is that it is for the obtainment of prohibition.

*rccher liṭi guṇavacanam* / ‘In place of the vowel of *rcchi* the express mention of *guṇa* (for the initial vowel when *liṭ* follows), *rcchi dhātu* not having a light vowel in the penultimate would not have received *guṇa* by ‘*pugantalaghūpaghasya ca*’ 7.3.86

If *guṇa* will be applicable because of the rule even if *ām* intervenes, then ‘when present’ by *tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe* 1.1.66 this would be barred. Therefore, it is known (by *jñāpaka*) that by the enjoining of *guṇa* there is absence in fact of *ām*.

“By force of (specific statement we know *guṇa* is for *dhātu r*.” The meaning of this is *dhātu r* (*gati prāpanayoḥ* ‘to get and attain’, 936) when *tip* and *sup* follow, then *rccha* is the *ādeśa* by 7.3.78, not the *rcch* without an *ādeśa*.

2.45.13 'nāstīti' / 'rcchir liṭi'

(The substitute *rcchi*) does not occur in place of *r* when *liṭ* follows. The absence of that *ādeśa rccha* (which occurs when it *ś* follows) is when the perfect follows.

*pāghrādhmāsthāmnādāndrśyarti sartiśadasadām pibajighradhamatiṣṭha-manayacchapaśyarcchadhauśīyasīdāḥ* 7.3.78 In the presence of a heavy syllable an indicatory *ś* (*śap* etc. present character *vikaranas*) the following substitutes take place. *piba* for *pā*, *jighra* for *ghrā*, *dhama* for *dhmā*, *tiṣṭha* for *sthā*, *mana* for *mā*, *yaccha* for *dāṇ*, *paśya* for *drśa*, *rccha* for *r*, *dhau* for *sr*, *śīya* for *śad*, *sīd* for *sad*.

2.45.13 'tiṣṭhater iti' //

“(When *ṇi* is followed by *caṇ*, *i* is *ādeśa* of penultimate of *sthā* (to stand).”

The conclusion of this is that *ādeśas* do not occur when reduplicated aorist (*caṇ*) follows because of their presence in this *sūtra*. The meaning is that here too when a *pratyaya* with an *it ś* follows *sthā*, having effected the *ādeśa tiṣṭha* in its place (some) indication has been made. There, ‘by reason of that form’, (indicates) the word *sthā* alone is understood (as having *ādeśa* before *saṅ*).

2.45.16 'dvirvacana iti' /

“When the dual is effected ... (lengthening of homogeneous vowel).”

Due to the *yaṅ* substituted by reason of the (exceptional) prior rule prevailing when two of equal force are in conflict, the doubling is then effected. For so, when the rule ‘being like the *sthānin*/original’ applies, even for two *yaṅ ādeśa* (applies) invariably when the dual is being pressed, so the conflict (of rules of equal force) is regular. Or else, just like *nī-nyataḥ* (they both lead), here should have *yaṅ ādeśa* because dual is prior, in fact *yaṅ* does not operate, so here too when doubling has been effected, lengthening of the *savarṇa* vowel must apply. *Yaṅ* either does not operate, or when *yaṅ* is present, because of its being like the original, there is doubling. When that has been effected there, because of its being subsequent to *yaṅ*, the substitute rule ‘*savarṇa* lengthening’ (is applied).

2.45.16 'yadi tāvad iti' //

If (*ā* can be understood) just (by the mention of the *dhātu* there is *guṇa* and that mention is cause of *guṇa*) for all *dhātus* ending in *r* when *liṭ* follows.

The sense is that because of the condition of the one *ādeśa* being like the last of the prior and the first of the subsequent, (*antādivacca* 6.1.85) because of the designation/stratagem of ‘either way’ (option) for both the *ādeśas* and because of being like the original/*sthānin* ...

2.45.16 ṛkārāntānām liṭi guṇo / rcchatyatām 7.4.11

‘There is *guṇa* in the perfect for *rcch*, *r*, and *dhātus* ending in long *ṛ*.’  
*raparatve* / When *r* following applies ...  
*uraṅ raparaḥ* 1.1.51 “In place of *r* or *ṛ* there is *a i* or *u* with *r*  
 following.”

2.45.18 ‘*uratvam*’ // *urat* 7.4.66  
*ata ar* (1.1.51) is *ādeśa* in place of *r* or *r* of a reduplicate.  
 ‘*haladiśeṣah*’ / 7.4.60 of the consonants of the reduplicate only the first is  
 retained, the rest are *lopa*/elided.

2.45.20 ‘*guṇe kṛte* / *pugantalaghpadhasya ca*’ 7.3.86

2.45.21 ‘*savarṇadīrghatvam* // *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghah*’ 6.1.101  
 When a simple vowel (*a i u r ḷ*) is followed by a homogeneous vowel, the  
 corresponding long vowel is the one *ādeśa* for both prior and subsequent.

2.45.23 ‘*antarāṅgatvād iti*’ //  
 “Because of being *antarāṅga* (having less operations), (lengthening  
 should not be applicable).”

This statement that ‘a rule relating to an *aṅga* is stronger than when a  
 letter rule’, however, is (really) only applicable in the sphere where what  
 relates to *aṅga* and what relates to letters have the same resort/locus, just  
 as instrument/*kāraka* (may refer to) a collection. *Guṇa* and *vṛddhi* are  
 applicable because of the *yaṅ* substitute. Here however, resorting to *liṭ*  
 (perfect) there is short *a* by ‘*ur-at*’ followed by *r*. However, (with) resort  
 to two letters, lengthening of the *savarṇa* vowel applies. This is, when the  
 two rules have different ‘resorts’/loci.

2.45.25 ‘*aṅgādhikāra*’  
*prāgamyāsavikārebhyaṅgādhikāra* 6.4.1  
*bhāṣya* / See text for translation.

46.1 ‘*athāpīti*’ /

Now even (when the purpose is *guṇa* for *r* when *liṭ* follows there is  
 no fault).

The sense is, that the *aṅga* governing rule operates until the end of the  
 seventh *adhyāya* so that *vavraś ca* etc. depending on that are established  
 as valid.

*Uddyota*: Here *samprasāraṇa* of *r* and *ur-at* are effected when for it a  
 subsequent cause points to it as *aṅga* so that then would be prohibition of  
*samprasāraṇa* by ‘*na samprasāraṇe samprasāraṇam*’ 6.1.37 but being  
 like the *sthānin* is established as valid.

2.46.2 *rkāro* ‘*pīti*’ /

The letter *r* is also (mentioned).

The sense is because of the indication of plural (in the *sūtra*).

24.6.3 ‘*ihāpīti*’ /

Then here also (in *cakratuḥ* ... mention of beginning with a consonant will be for restriction).

The sense is (the mention of) *r* being because of the existence of *tadanta* rules mentioning letters.

*saṃyogādigrahaṇam* // *ṛtuś ca saṃyogāder guṇaḥ* 7.4.10 ‘A *dhātu* ending in short *r* and preceded by a conjunct consonant receives *guṇa* in the perfect.’

2.46.4 *saṃyogāder iti* / *akevalasya* /

“*Guṇa* only for that *dhātu* which begins with a conjunct consonant not thus having a vowel on its own.”

The meaning is for that together with another letter. And after that *dhātu* only the mention stands (applicable).

2.46.5 ‘*sa eṣa iti*’ /

“This prohibition of *rcchi* ... should be stated.”

The meaning is for the sake of a prosodically heavy *dhātu* which is the cause of the *āgama*. By resorting to the *paryudāsa*/prohibition ‘exception’ *an-rcca*, *ām* is applicable after *uchi* because of the mention implied in relation to a *dhātu* ‘like that (i.e. *rccha*)’. Otherwise, although by reason of the ordaining of *guṇa*, *ām* is not applicable after *rcchi* is known (to be so), still the prohibition *an-rccha* by reason of the possibility of its ordaining, is producing a *jñāpaka* applicable for the purpose spoken of.

2.46.6 *upadeśagrahaṇam iti*

“(Neither should be stated.) (There is) specific mention of original teaching.”

The meaning is *gurumataḥ* is *matup* (with sense of having) being the basis for all having that nature as possessed of a heavy syllable; as for example, ‘*pīṛmān*’ means ‘having a father’. However, this is not an invariable rule, so he will explain.

2.46.9 *sannipātalakṣaṇa iti* /

That taught in a rule, the application of which is occasioned by combination (of two things does not become the cause of destruction of that combination).

*Liṭ* ‘is the cause of the combination’, i.e. (requiring) *guṇa* does not become the cause of *ām* causing the destruction of that combination: *yeṣa* and *uvoṣa*, through *gurumat* do not take *ām*.

2.46.9 *na vā sannipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittam tadvidyātasya* 1.1.39 *vā*

3

2.46.10 *urṇoter iti /*

(Additional enumeration of prohibition of *ām*) after *urṇoti*.

The meaning is a prohibition.

2.46.13 *ekācaś ceḍ upagrahāt //*

(*Yañ* is valid) having one vowel (like *nu* there will be prohibition of *iṭ* (*āgama*)).

*dhātor ekāco halādeḥ kriyā samabhihāre yañ 3.1.22*

*śryukaḥ phiti 7.2.11*

The augment *iṭ* is not added to a *pratyaya* with an indicatory *k* when it acts after the *dhātu* or after a single syllable *dhātu* ending in *u* or *ū*, *r*, *ṛ* in the *Dhātu Pāṭha*.

2.46.14 *ukāropīti /*

Or otherwise the letter ‘*u*’ (is mentioned here) whereby *ām* is not applicable for *urṇoti* ending in *u*. (When *sūtras* considered in *saṃhitā*)

2.46.15 *anuccho dayāyāśāś ceti /*

*anṛccha + u* becomes *anṛccho*. He shows the form of reciting one *sūtra* with *saṃhitā* (operating).

**46.16** *uṣavidajāgrbhyo ’nyatara syām //3/1/38//*

*vider āmkit //1//*

*vider āmkid vaktayaḥ / vidām cakāra // na vaktavyaḥ / vidir a-kārāntaḥ / yady akārānto vetīti guṇo na sidhyati / liṣaṃ-niyogena / evam api vivedeti na sidhyati /*

46.20 *evam tarhy āmsaṃniyogena //*

**Paṇini 3.1.38:** *Pratyaya ām* optionally acts after the *dhātus uṣ* (to burn) *vid* (to know) and *jagr* (to wake) when *liṭ* (perfect) follows.

**Vārttika 1:** *Ām* having an indicatory *k* acts after *dhātu* (*vid*).

**Bhāṣya:** It should be stated that that *ām* having an indicatory *k* acts after *vid*. *vidām cakāra* “He knew”. It should not be stated. (The *dhātu* *vid* ends in the letter *a* (in the *sūtra*). If it ends with the letter *a* then the form *veti* is not possible to be established with *guṇa* (of the penultimate vowel). (Then) in conjunction with *liṭ* (perfect, this should be stated). So also *viveda* “He knew”, is not possible to be



established. Well then, (only) in conjunction with the *pratyaya ām* (*vid* ends in *a*).

46.21 *bhāradvājyaḥ paṭanti/ vider āmkinipātanād vā guṇatvam iti//*

The followers of *Bhāradvāja* read: “*Kit ām* acts after *vid* or (treating forms like *vidāñcakāra* etc.) as (an irregular form), absence of *guṇa* (is justified).”

### Notes on *MahāBhāṣya* on *Pāṇini* 3.1.38

#### *Vārttika* Summary

After the *dhātu vid*, *ām* should be considered as having an *it k*.

#### *Bhāṣya* Summary

Having given the derived form, *Patañjali* rejects the *vārttika* since prevention of *guṇa* is prevented by *vid-a* ending in *a* in conjunction with *ām*. Followers of *Bhāradvāja* give another solution to accept the *vārttika* or regarding absence of *guṇa* as justified by treating the forms as *nipātanas*.

46.18 *kidvaktavyaḥ*

(*Vid*) should be stated as having a *k* (so preventing *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* by *kiti ca* 1.1.5 (*iko guṇavṛddhī na*)).

*upavida / vidir akārananta iti / Dhātu vid* ends in *a* (in the *sūtra*).

The sense is the nature of ending in *ā* as (the characteristic) of *dhātu vid* in the *sūtra* is laid down as an irregular form. Another, having thought, ‘in fact in the *Dhātu Pāṭha vid* ends in *a* and by reason of that or (this form) of *vid* is stated’, he says *yadi iti* (it ends in *a* ... )

46.19 *guṇe na sidhyaṭīti /*

“(The form *ve-tti*) is not possible to be established with *guṇa*.”

The meaning is that, because of the absence of the letter *i* (of *vid*) having the nature of being penultimate, and because of the absence of *lopa* elision of the final *a*, the form *vidati* would be derived.

46.20 *āmsanniyogeneti /*

(Well then only) in conjunction with *ām* (does *vid* end in *a*).

The meaning is by reason of the principle nature of *ām*, because of being non-ordained (as a *pratyaya* which is principal in relation to the

subordinate *prakṛti*, its succession (is valid) after *vid* ending in *a*).

**46.22 bhīhrībhrhuvām śluvacca //3/1/39//**

*śluvatideśe kiṃ prayojanam/*

**Pāṇini 3.1.39:** The *pratyaya ām* acts optionally after the *dhātu bh-ī* (to fear), *hrī* (to be ashamed), *bhr* (to nourish) and *hu* (to sacrifice) in the presence of *liṭ*; and when *ām* is *pratyaya* the effect is as if there were *ślu* elision (and the *dhātus* belonged to the *juhvādi gaṇa*, even for the purpose of *liṭ ārdhadhātuka pratyaya*).

**Bhāṣya:** What is the purpose of the extended application being like *ślu*?

**47.1 śluvatideśe prayojanam dvitvetve //1//**

*bibharām cakāra//*

**Vārttika 1:** The purpose of the extended application of the rule as “being like *ślu*” is for the sake of reduplication and the *ādeśa* (substitute) *i* (in the reduplicate).

**Bhāṣya:** (For example) *bibharām cakāra* “He carried (the burden)”.

**Notes on MahāBhāṣya on Pāṇini 3.1.39**

The purpose of the extended application/ *śluvat* is for reduplication and *ādeśa i*.

**Bhāṣya Summary**

*Patañjali* simply provides the example, *bibharām cakāra*.

**2.47.1 bhī hrī / śluvat atideśa iti /**

The purpose of the extended application of the rule as ‘being like *ślu* ... He asks this: Reduplication has to in fact be ordained anyway (because class 3), what is the point of the extended application? By ‘*na lumatā-ṅgasya 1.1.63*’ “For that *aṅga* whose *pratyaya* has been elided by the use of words containing *lu* (namely *lu-k ślu* and *lup*), the operations dependent

on it, do not take place regarding such a base.” This being elision by *luk ślu*, prohibition of *guṇa* is not applicable. This is prohibition of the obtainment from the *sūtra* ‘*pratyaya lopa pratyayalakṣaṇa*’ and that obtainment is not applicable here.

2.27.2 *bibharāṃcakāra* //

He carried.

*ślau* 6.1.10 “For a non-reduplicate *dhātu*, there is reduplication in the presence of *ślu* (*vikaraṇa pratyaya*).”

*bhr̥ṇāmit* 7.4.76 “Short *i* acts in place of the vowel of the reduplicates of the *dhātus* *bhr̥ṇ* (*maṇ* and *o-hāṇ*) in the presence of *ślu* *vikaraṇa*.

### 2.47.3 *kṛñcānuprayujyate liṭi* //3/1/40//

*kim artham idam ucyate / anuprayogo yathā syāt / naitad asti prayojanam / āmantam avyaktapadārthakam tenāparisamāpto 'rtha iti kṛtvānuprayogo bhaviṣyati // ata uttaram paṭati /*

**Pāṇini 3.1.40:** After a *dhātu* ending in *ām pratyaya*, the *dhatu* *kṛ* (to do) is joined in the presence of the *liṭ* (*pratyaya* for the perfect).

**Bhāṣya:** Why is this said? So that there should be subsequent use (of an auxiliary verb). This is not the purpose. That which ends in the *pratyaya ām* is with an inarticulate word-meaning and so the meaning not being fully completed, there will be subsequent use (of an auxiliary verb). Hence he next recites what follows:

47.6 *kṛṇo 'nuprayogavacanam astibhūpratiṣedhārtham* //1//

*kṛṇo 'nuprayogavacanam kriyate 'stibhūpratiṣedhārtham / astibhuvor anuprayogo mā bhūd iti //*

**Vārttika 1:** The stating of *kṛṇ* (as being for) subsequent use (as an auxiliary verb) is for the purpose of prohibiting *as-ti* (to be) and *bhū* (to become).

**Bhāṣya:** The stating of *kṛṇ* (as for) subsequent use (as an auxiliary verb) is for the purpose of prohibiting *as-ti* (to be) and *bhū* (to become), (in that capacity), so that there should not be additional use

of *asti* and *bhū* (as auxiliary verbs).

47.9 *ātmanepadavidhyartham ca //2//*

47.10 *ātmanepadavidhyartham ca kṛṅo 'nuprayogavacanam kriyate /  
ātmanepadam yathā syāt // ucyaṁāne 'py etasminn avaśyam  
ātmanepadārtho yatnaḥ kartavyaḥ // astibhūpratiśedhārthena  
cāpi nārthaḥ /*

**Vārttika 2:** And for the purpose of a rule ordaining *ātmanepada* *pratyayas*.

**Bhāṣya:** The stating of additional use (as an auxiliary verb) for the *dhātu kṛṅ* is also made for the sake of the rule ordaining *ātmanepada* *pratyayas*. Even when this is being (here) stated, still effort has to be made specifically for the purpose of (obtaining) *ātmanepada* (endings) by *ām pratyayavat kṛṅo 'nuprayogasya 1.3.63* “Like the *dhātu* which takes *ām pratyaya* (if the *dhātu* be conjugated with *ātmanepada* endings) so for the *dhātu kr* (to do) when joined there as auxiliary, the terminations are *ātmanepada* (even when the fruit does not accrue to the agent)”. But the purpose is also not for the prohibition of *asti* and *bhū* (as auxiliary verbs).

47.13 *iṣṭaḥ sarvānuprayogaḥ //3//*

*sarveṣāṁ eva kṛbhvastīnām anuprayoga iṣyate / kim iṣyata*

47.15 *evāhosvit prāpnoty api iṣyate ca prāpnoti ca / katham / kṛṅ iti  
naitad dhātugrahaṇam / kim tarhi / pratyāhāragrahaṇam / kva  
saṁniviṣṭānām pratyāhāraḥ / kṛbhvastiyoga ity atah prabhṛtyā  
kṛṅo ṅakārāt //*

**Vārttika 3:** It is desired that there be subsequent use (as auxiliary verbs) for all (three).

**Bhāṣya:** Subsequent use (as auxiliaries) is desired for all (three) *kr*, *bhū* and *asti*. It is desired or does it in fact also obtain? It is desired and it obtains. How? This *kṛṅ* is not just a mention of (the one) *dhātu*. What then? It is reference to a *pratyāhāra*. Where is (formed) the *pratyāhāra* (drawing together) of those contained in it? From the *sūtra*

*kṛbhvastiyoge 5.4.50 onwards up to the letter ñ of kṛño 5.4.58.*

47.18 *sarvānuprayoga iti ced aśiṣyam arthābhāvāt //4//*

*sarvānuprayoga iti ced aśiṣyaṃ kṛño 'nuprayogavacanam / kiṃ  
kāraṇam /*

47.20 *arthābhāvāt / āmantam avyaktapadārthakam tenāparisamā-  
pto 'rtha iti kṛtvānuprayogo bhaviṣyati // idaṃ tarhi prayoja-  
nam kṛbhvastīnām evānuprayogo yathā syāt pacādīnām mā  
bhūd iti / etad api nāsti prayojanam /*

**Vārttika 4:** If (we accept the statement of additional usage) of all (as auxiliaries), (the statement of subsequent usage) need not be taught because (the word ending in *ām*) has no meaning.

**Bhāṣya:** If (it is said) 'additional use of all (three *dhātus* as auxiliaries)', the expressing of additional use of *kṛñ* (as auxiliary), is a thing necessary to teach. What is the reason? Because the meaning is absent. The word ending in *ām* has an inarticulate meaning, so the meaning is incomplete; there will then be applicable subsequent use (of auxiliaries). This then is the purpose so that there should be subsequent use (as auxiliaries) of *kr*, *bhū* and *asti* only and not of *pac* (to cook) and the rest. This too is no purpose.

47.23 *arthābhāvāc cānyasya //5//*

*arthābhāvāc cānyasya siddham / kṛbhvastayaḥ kriyāsāmānya-  
vācīnaḥ kriyāvīśeṣavācīnaḥ pacādayo*

48.1 *na ca sāmānyavācīnor eva vīśeṣavācīnor eva vā prayogo  
bhavati / tatra vīśeṣavācīna utpattiḥ sāmānyavācīno 'nu-  
prayokṣyante //*

**Vārttika 5:** Due to the other (*dhātus*) being without meaning.

**Bhāṣya:** Due to the other (*dhātus*) being without meaning, this non-applicability of other *dhātus* is established. *Kr*, *bhū*, *asti* express a general or common activity; *pac* and the rest express a particular/special activity. And the usage (in the language) is not only of (*dhātus*) expressing general (action) nor only of those expressing

particular (action). There, (where the forms are derived from a *dhātu* expressing particular action), the *dhātus* expressing general (action) will be employed after, in addition (as auxiliary verbs).

48.3 *liṭparārthaṃ vā* //6//

*liṭparārthaṃ tarhi kṛṅo 'nuprayogavacanāṃ kriyate /*

48.5 *liṭparasyaivānuprayogo yathā syād anyaparasya mā bhūd iti //  
kiṃ parasya punaḥ prāpnoti / laṭparasya / na laṭparasyānupra-  
yogena bhūtakālo viśeṣitaḥ syāt //*

**Vārttika 6:** Or else it is for the sake of (when) *liṭ* (perfect) follows.

**Bhāṣya:** Then it is for the sake of (when) *liṭ* follows that the stating of the additional use of *kṛṅ* (as auxiliary) is made; so that the additional use should be only for that which has *liṭ* following, and should not be applicable for that having any other *pratyaya* following. But for what (other *pratyaya*) following does it obtain? For a following *laṭ* (present). Past time would not be specified by means of subsequent use of that, having *laṭ* following.

48.6 *niṣṭāparasya tarhi mā bhūd iti / na niṣṭāparasyānuprayogena  
puruṣopagrahau viśeṣitau syātām / luṅparasya tarhi mā bhūt /  
na luṅparasyānuprayogenaṅadyatano bhūtakālo viśeṣitaḥ syāt /  
laṅparasya tarhi mā bhūt / na laṅparasyānuprayogenaṅady-  
atanah parokṣah kālo viśeṣitaḥ syāt //*

Then so that it should not be applicable for that having a *niṣṭhā* (i.e. past participle passive *ktā* and past participle active *k-tavat-u*) following. The persons and voice/*pada* of a *dhātu* would not be specified by the additional use (of auxiliaries) for that having *niṣṭhā* following. Then, so that it should not be applicable for that having *luṅ* (aorist) following. The past-time not of the present day would not be specified by the additional use (of auxiliaries) for that having *luṅ* following. Then so that it should not be applicable for that having *laṅ* (imperfect) following. The time not of the present day and beyond the sight (of the speaker, i.e. completed action in the remote past), would not be distinguished by the additional use (of auxiliaries) for that having *laṅ* following.

48.10 *ayaṃ tarhi bhūte parokṣe 'nadyatane laṅvidhīyate haśaśvator laṅ ca (3.2.116) iti tatparasya mā bhūd iti / etad api nāsti prayojanam / ekasyā ākṛteścaritaḥ prayogo dvitīyasyās trītyasyās ca na bhavati / tad yathā / goṣu svāmyaśveṣu ceti / na ca bhavati goṣu cāśvānām ca svāmīti //*

Well then this *laṅ* is ordained in the sense of past time not of the present day and beyond the sight of the speaker (by the *sūtra* “*haśaśvatorlaṅ ca 3.2.116*” (“The *pratyaya laṅ* acts after a *dhātu* when the particles *ha* and *śaśvat* are connected with it and when the *dhātu* denotes past action unperceived by the speaker and before commencement of the present day”); thus (stating of additional use is) so that it should not be applicable for that having *laṅ* following (under those conditions). This also is not the purpose. Usage ascertained for one form is not applicable for a second or a third. As for example *goṣu svāmyaśveṣu ca* The lord of the cows and the horses; and so (the same rule) is not applicable. (here): *goṣu cāśvānām ca svāmī* “He is lord of the cows and the horses”.

48.14 *arthasamāpter vānuprayogo na syāt //7//*

48.15 *arthasamāptes tarhy anuprayogo na syāt / āmantena parisamāpto 'rtha iti kṛtvānuprayogo na syāt // etad api nāsti prayojanam / idānīm eva hy uktam āmantam avyakta-padārthakam tenāparisamāpto 'rtha iti kṛtvānuprayogo bhaviṣyātīti //*

**Vārttika 7:** Or else because of the meaning being completely accomplished there would not be additional use (of auxiliaries).

**Bhāṣya:** Then because of the meaning being completely accomplished there would be no additional use (of auxiliaries); having made (the statement) ‘the meaning is completed by ending in the *pratyaya ām*’. For now in fact having made (the statement) ‘the meaning was not completed by that’ because it was stated that ‘since that which ends in *ām* has an inarticulate meaning’; additional use (of auxiliaries) will be applicable.

48.20 *viparyāsanivr̥tyartham vā //8//*

48.19 *viparyāsanivṛtyartham tarhi kṛñō 'nuprayogavacanam kriyate /*  
48.20 *īhām cakre / cakra īhām iti mā bhūt //*

**Vārttika 8:** Or else it is for the purpose of preventing interchange.

**Bhāṣya:** Then the expression of additional use of auxiliaries is made to prevent inversion of the order (or auxiliaries) *īhām cakre* “He endeavoured to obtain”. So that *cakra īhām* should not be applicable.

48.21 *vyavahitanivṛtyartham ca //9//*

*vyavahitanivṛtyartham ca kṛñō 'nuprayogavacanam kriyate/  
anveva cānuprayogo yathā syāt / īhām cakre / vyavahitasya mā  
bhūt // īhām devadattaś cakra iti //*

**Vārttika 9:** And for the purpose of preventing being placed apart/separated.

**Bhāṣya:** The stating of additional use (of auxiliaries) is also made for the sake of *kṛñ* being prevented from being separated (from the main *dhātu*); so that the additional use should only take place immediately after only as *īhām cakre*; so that (additional use) should not be applicable for (*dhātu* and auxiliary being) separated (as) *īhām devadattaś cakre* (“Devadatta endeavoured to obtain”).

48.24 *iti śrībhagavatpatañjaliviracitam vyākaraṇamahābhāṣye tr-*  
*tīyādhyāyasya prathame pāde trīyamāhnikam //*

Thus (ends) the third *Āhnika* in the first *pāda* of the third *adhyāya* in *Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya* composed by the blessed master *Patañjali*.

#### Notes on *MahāBhāṣya* on *Pāṇini 3.1.40*

##### **Vārttika Summary**

The first states that the specific mention of *kr* is for the purpose of prohibiting *as* and *bhū* being auxiliary verbs. The second adds it is also for *ātmanepada*. The third counters the first by saying it is desired that all three be auxiliaries. Due to *ām* having no meaning, the fourth states, the statement of additional usage need not be taught. Moreover other *dhātus*



are not applicable because of not having (general) meaning, the fifth explains. The sixth suggests another possible reason for *krñ* etc., namely that it only applies when *liṭ* follows. Another view is presented in the seventh, that it would not be applicable because the meaning has been completely expressed. The eighth homes in on the real purpose, namely to prevent interchange, and the ninth states also for preventing *dhātu* and auxiliary being separated.

### **Bhāṣya Summary**

*Patañjali* introduces by explaining that since *ām* has an inarticulate meaning, so that the meaning is not completely expressed, subsequent use of an auxiliary is necessary. On the second he explains 1.3.63 is also needed for *ātmanepada*. Then on the third he explains *krñ* as a *pratyāhāra* of all three 5.4.50-58. The fourth he says, implies the purpose is so that the three are auxiliaries and not *pac* etc. On the fifth he explains the distinction between the former expressing general activity and the latter particular activity. Hence the former may be used after the latter. The implication of the sixth is that some other like *laṭ* obtain is not possible, because of not expressing past time. Similarly *niṣṭhā*, *luñ*, and *lañ* are shown not to obtain, nor even *lañ* under the conditions of 3.2.116. Usage ascertained for one form is not applicable for another. Contrary to the statement in the seventh *vārttika* he says that since *ām* has inarticulate meaning additional use of auxiliaries will be applicable. On the eighth he states it is to prevent inversion of *ihām cakre* etc. Finally the purpose is so there be not additional use for the *dhātu* and auxiliary being separated.

2.47.4 *krñcānu / kim artham iti /*

“And *krñ* is used ... Why is this said?”

Even without beginning the *sūtra*, the subsequent usage (of auxiliaries) is established as valid, having taught time, instruments for accomplishing the action, number, backward direction etc. (it is applicable) for *krñ* having *liṭ* (perfect) following. For after that ending in *ām* a particular time is to be obtained/insisted on, but not another meaning. There, the subsequent usage (of an auxiliary) will not be applicable for a *dhātu* of the same meaning (as) *oṣāmu-voṣa* (He heated). Because of all meaning being manifest by the subsequent (*dhātu*) alone, there is the possibility of that ending in *ām* being meaningless. Nor (is it) even (possible) for that having a different meaning (as *ihām, papāca* ‘He endeavoured to obtain, He cooked’). Because of not (even understanding) *sādhana*/instrument for accomplish- ing the action as connected with that ending in *ām*. However, *krñ* expresses general (activity). The sense is that also the usage of expressing general and special (activities) is congenial to understanding a distinction of meaning (between the *dhātu* and its auxiliary).

*Pra.* on 2.47.4 *anuprayoga iti /*

(So that there should be) subsequent use (of an auxiliary).

The sense is that, although all meaning is not manifest (after) that ending in *ām*, still because of the force of usage etc., it will be so (therefore) that this should be stated for the purpose of establishing as valid subsequent uses (of an auxiliary).

2.47.4 *āmantam iti /*

“That which ends in *ām* (has an inarticulate word meaning).”

The sense is that, because of the force of usage etc. for the meanings previously stated, ascertainment is not possible, so for the purpose of expressing that meaning, the subsequent use (of an auxiliary) is established as valid.

2.47.6 *kr̥ iti Vā. 1*

To show this restriction, so that subsequent usage be for *kr̥/karoti* only, and should not be for *bhū* and as he states (*Vā. 1*) *kr̥ṇo* etc.

2.47.9 *ātmanepadeti / Vā 2*

(And for the purpose of a rule ordaining) *ātmanepada pratyayas*.

The meaning is that when subsequent usage of *kr̥ṇ* is established as valid, repetition is for the purpose of the subsequent usage of that having extremely similar qualities, therefore *karoti* is used as an auxiliary only for that ending in *ām*, ending in *ātmanepada* and for an *ātmanepada* base; thus the *sūtra*:

2.47.11 *āmpratyayavatkr̥ṇo 'nuprayogasya (3.1.63)*

“Like the *dhātu* that takes *ām pratyaya*, if the *dhātu* take *ātmanepada* so that this is true of *kr̥* when joined as an auxiliary. It also is *ātmanepada* (even if fruit does not accrue to the agent).” (This *sūtra*) is not to be effected/produced.

2.47.11 *avaśyam iti /*

“It is essential (effort has to be made for obtaining *ātmanepada*).”

The sense is that, because of the meaning of agent being understood even by *parasmaipada* endings, the subsequent usage would be for (a *dhātu* ending in that (*parasmaipada*)).

2.47.15 *pratyāhāragrahaṇam iti /*

“It is a reference to a *pratyāhāra*.”

And this is known because the mention of *kr̥ṇ* here in the *sūtra* “*ām pratyayavat kr̥ṇo 'nu-prayoge' 1.3.69* (see previous note) is for the purpose of *as* and *bhū* ceasing to be applicable. And the verb *sam-pad* will not be applicable as an auxiliary verb because of a conflict of meaning (with *kr̥ bhū* and *as* having the general meaning of activity), (in spite of it coming within the province of the *pratyāhāra* beginning with *kr̥ṇ* and

ending with *ñ*).

2.47.17 *kṛno ñākārāt /*

“Thus the *pratyāhāra* is formed beginning with *kṛ* and ending with *ñ*.”

*kṛbhvastiyoge sampadyakartari cvi* (5.4.50) to *kṛño dviṭiyatrṭīyaśambabījāt kṛsau* (5.4.58)

2.47.19 *aśiṣyam iti / Vā° 4*

“(Subsequent usage) need not be taught because the word ending in *ām* has no meaning.”

It is not even used for preventing of usage of *vidyati* (to exist/be). Due to the enumeration of all these used and to not seeing use of it as an auxiliary (in the language).

2.48.1 *na ceti / Vā. 5*

“And (the usage is) not (only of *dhātus* expressing generalisation in or only of those expressing action).”

The sense is, because of the absence of usage of two (verbs) having the same meaning. And for the purpose of showing the general customs/usage, it was stated ‘because of expressing general (activity)’. However, there is not ordaining of *am* after *kṛ*, *bhū* and *as* expressing general (activity). A qualifying word is not able to illuminate/make visible the meaning as expressing general (activity). On the contrary, by the rejection of another qualification it is (obstructing)/inimical to that meaning.

2.48.4 *laṭparasyeti / Vā. 6*

“(For what other *pratyaya* does that *it* obtain?) For a following *laṭ*.”

The sense is, because of the teaching of the qualification *bhūta* ‘past tense’ in connection with that ending in *ām*. Having resorted to the present ... though in place of the past, and having past as the preceding/prior, the usage of *laṭ* should be applicable.

2.48.5 *na laṭ parasyeti /*

“(Past time would not be specified by means of subsequent use) for that having *laṭ* following.”

Because of the subsequent use of an auxiliary having the purpose of manifesting the meaning of that ending in *ām*, and that having *laṭ* expressing the present, which is a conflicting time, will not be used subsequently as an auxiliary.

2.48.11 *ekasyā iti /*

“(Usage ascertained) for one form (is not applicable for a second).”

This principal is well known in the *Veda* and the popular usage. For as when there are the instruments for accomplishing the action ‘He ties it to

the *khadira* tree' or 'He ties it to the *palāśa* tree' etc. are optional, so that with whatever means/instrument the action is undertaken, with that very one it is accomplished. There (in that context), if sometime there is tottering or failure of the *khadira* tree then the *barbura* which is like that, and because of similarity, thinking of it as *khadira*, it is put in its place/substituted; but the *palāśa* tree is not taken hold of (grasped) on both sides. By reason of a difference in instruments of the action, (and) because of the different nature of the action, there is the possibility of not accomplishing the action undertaken.

2.48.11 *ekasyā iti* /

Also in the worldly (usage), when to teach the state of 'wealth /possessions' and 'cord of possessions/wealth' the sixth case is had recourse to/treated of (in the example)

*Pradīpa: 32.7 prayojye kartari iti*

"(Sixth case does not obtain) in the sense of agent to be prompted or compelled."

*tasyā prādhānyāditi bhāvah/* The sense is because of its not being principal *kartṛkaraṇayostrīyā 2.3.18 (anabhihite)* would be applicable.

*Pradīpa: abhiśāvayatīti/* He causes him to press out (the *soma*).

*nyarthasyopasargo viśeṣaka iti bhāvah/* The sense is that the *upasarga* is a (qualifying or) attribute of the meaning of *ni*.

*Pradīpa: 32.11 eteṣām eveti/*

"For these (*dhātus*) alone (not ending in *ni* that which is agent in the non-causal state has *karman* applicable in the causal when *ni* follows)."

*nyarthasya prādhānyāt tenepsitatamasya prayojanasya siddhā karma-saṃjñā/ na ca svavyāpārā 'pekṣayā svātanyātparatvāt kartṛsaṃjñā prāpnotīti yuktaṃ vaktum/ prayojyāpārasyā prādhānyāt pradhānā pradhānavyāpārasaṃnidhau ca pradhānanimittasya kāryasya yuktatvāt/ niyamena tu pradhānaprayuktakāryaṇyāvṛttau guṇanimittakārya-saddhāvāt kartṛtvam bhavateva tad uktaṃ hariṇā/ guṇakriyāṃ svātanyāt preṣaṇe karmatāṃ gataḥ/ niyamāt karmasaṃjñāyāḥ svadharmenā-bhidhīyate // iti 3.7.127*

"The technical name *karman* is established as valid for that prompted which is most desired to be obtained; therefore because of the meaning of *nic* being principal. And further it is not proper to say that the technical name agent obtains, because of 'independence' being subsequent with regard to its own activity.

... Because of the activity of that to be prompted being non-principal and because of the non-suitability of the effect as cause of the principal in presence of the activity of the principal and the non-principal. However, when by a restriction there is turning away from the principal used operation and because of the existence of an operation which is a subordinate cause, agentship is in fact applicable (i.e. valid)."

That was stated by *Bhartṛhari*:

“The agent who becomes the object of the act of prompting is called by his own characteristic (agent), because he retains his independence with regard to his own minor or subordinate action and also because of the restriction of the name (*karman*) (to special cases).”

*Pradīpa: 32.13 nāsāv iti/*

“That (person) is not (impelled by saying go to the village).”

*grāmaḥ prakṛtyarthasya karma na tu nyarthasyety arthaḥ/*

The meaning is that village is the object/*karman* of the meaning of the prakṛti but not of the meaning of *ṇi*.

*Nāgeśa*: This is essential by reason of the *sakarmaka*/transitive nature of the *dhātu gam*, because of it expecting a *karman* and because of the expectation of a *karman* for that having the meaning of *ṇi* being quietened by reason of the object (being that) to be prompted.

*Pradīpa: 32.14 sādhanaviśiṣṭām iti/*

“(One impelled to do an action) which is distinguished by a *kāraka*.”

*grāma karmakām gamanakriyā prayojyaḥ preṣyati - prāpnotyarthah/*

The meaning is that ‘That one to be prompted impels the action of going to the village, which it has as its object’ obtains.

*sa ca preṣyate prāpyate/*

*London*

*U.K.*