

# Creating Tradition Through Interposition Exploring the Foundation of the *lakāra* in the *Tiṅanta* Section of the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* and the *Prakriyākaumudī*

Mittal Trivedi

Università degli Studi di Cagliari, Italia

**Abstract** As the progenitor of *Navya Vyākaraṇa*, the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita is known for its *prakriyā*-based approach to Pāṇinian grammar. However, the *Prakriyākaumudī* by Rāmacandra Śeṣa has already established a precedent for a creative presentation of *prakriyā*. The present study aims to assess the innovation, structural integrity, and cohesiveness of these texts using the initial four *sūtras* of the *tiṅanta* section which develop the concept of the *lakāra*. The commentaries by Viṭṭhala and Jñānendra Sarasvatī help to understand the progression of these concepts as the texts disseminated into the Sanskrit world.

**Keywords** Pāṇini. Aṣṭādhyāyī. *Navya Vyākaraṇa*. *Prakriyā*. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita. Rāmacandra Śeṣa. *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī*. *Prakriyākaumudī*. Trimuni. Bhartṛhari. Contextualisation.

**Summary** 1 Introduction. – 1.1 Premise of the Study. – 2 Outline of the Study. – 2.1 The *Prakriyākaumudī*. – 2.2 The *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī*. – 3 Conclusion.



## Peer review

Submitted 2023-02-10  
Accepted 2023-03-21  
Published 2023-06-26

## Open access

© 2023 Trivedi | © 4.0



**Citation** Trivedi, M. (2023). "Creating Tradition Through Interposition: Exploring the Foundation of the *lakāra* in the *Tiṅanta* Section of the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* and the *Prakriyākaumudī*". *Bhasha. Journal of South Asian Linguistics, Philology and Grammatical Traditions*, 2(1), 59-78.

**DOI** 10.30687/bhasha/2785-5953/2023/01/003

## 1 Introduction

The emergence of what is known as the Navya Vyākaraṇa school of Pāṇinian Sanskrit grammar was fuelled by the seventeenth-century CE text by Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* (SK). It utilises a thematic structure to organise the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (fifth century BCE) by rearranging the approximately 4,000 rules of Pāṇini into categories of grammatical processes such as the initial four sections on *sandhi*, the sections on the derivation of the *subanta* (those ending with the affixes *suP*),<sup>1</sup> the *kr̥danta* (those ending with the primary substitute affixes of the category *kr̥t*), the *samāsa* (compounds) etc. Historically, the SK has been considered a pioneer in the *prakriyā* method of grammar. However, the SK does not deserve exclusive credit for this creative structure. In a long line of what are known as *prakriyā* texts, the SK's structure offers only a standardisation, and nowhere is this more evident than when compared to its sixteenth-century predecessor, the *Prakriyākaumudī* by Rāmacandra Śeṣa (PK). The PK has a structure that is nearly identical to the SK as it utilises novel arrangements to order the rules in certain sections. The PK is frequently contradicted by the SK, especially in its commentaries, for improper usage of words. This categorical style rearrangement, however, functions within an ecosystem of hermeneutical ancillary texts which provide the supplementary material required to arguably reinforce the *śāstric*<sup>2</sup> value in understanding the rules of Pāṇini, albeit, out of their original textual sequence.<sup>3</sup> These texts include works such as the *Dhātupāṭha* and the *Gaṇapāṭha*, the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa,<sup>4</sup> the *Tattvabodhinī* of Jñānendra Sarasvatī, the *Bālamānoramā* of Hari Dikṣita, the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari, the *Prauḍhamānoramā* of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita all claiming the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (MBh) as the ultimate authority for modern *vyākaraṇa* (Deshpande 2002). Over the centuries, various texts outside of the Pāṇinian tradition have also experimented with different techniques in attempting to reformulate Pāṇini's format into one that is more friendly to students. More

---

All translations of the Sanskrit text within this article are by the Author unless otherwise stated.

- <sup>1</sup> The *anubandhas* (i.e. markers) are capitalised to distinguish the metalanguage from the language exclusively in the English translations and not in the Sanskrit citations.
- <sup>2</sup> A rearrangement of the rules appears to be acceptable by Navya Vyākaraṇa as long as they are still Pāṇini's original rules.
- <sup>3</sup> These texts are also responsible for the development of the idea of the *trimuni* and the development of the historical authority of sages to determine the proper usage of grammar. For more on this see Deshpande 1985, 2005, and 2016.
- <sup>4</sup> More often than not, *paribhāṣās* from the *Vyāḍiparibhāṣāvṛtti* which have not been carried over by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa in his own work have also been referenced to explain phenomena.

importantly, a significant number of these scholars were considered to be outside the Pāṇinian tradition by those of the Navya Vyākaraṇa school due to their inclusion of colloquial grammatical examples or lack of deference to the *trimuni* system.<sup>5</sup> The central idea in all these grammars was a re-interpretation of the rules given by Pāṇini to simplify Sanskrit grammar. For example, the *Haimaśabdānuśāsana* of Hemacandra Sūri utilised Pāṇini's style of *sūtra* organisation to derive words related to the Jaina canon. The textual study is conducted with the idea that the works will be taught in the exact sequence in which they are written due to the interconnected nature of the original text and with its commentary.

### 1.1 Premise of the Study

While the terms *prakriyā* and Navya Vyākaraṇa are used interchangeably today, historically, they have been somewhat separate where the term *prakriyā* referred to the derivation-oriented texts inspired by the *Kātantra* of Śārvavarman from the ninth century. The *Kātantra* aimed to shorten the amount of effort required to form a word in the Pāṇinian system to make it more accessible to those who could not dedicate the extensive effort required to study Pāṇini's grammar in the traditional system. Thereafter, other scholars were similarly inspired to create a restructured version of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* using different methods of economisation within their grammar to aid in the process of linguistic derivations. Fruits of this effort to simplify the *śāstra* can be seen in texts such as the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* by Candragomin (fifth century CE) and the *Mugdhabodha* by Vopadeva (tenth century CE) which introduced new attempts at categorising the *prakriyā* of Sanskrit forms as an important part of their grammars. These texts also promoted Sanskrit education by making it relevant to contemporary Sanskrit, inspiring a revival in the form of the creation of new works more faithful to Pāṇini, such as the *Rūpavatāra* by Dharmakīrti (eleventh century CE), *Rūpamālā* by Vimalasarasvatī (fourteenth century CE) and the *Prakriyāsarvasva* by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (seventeenth century CE). Eventually, the SK brought the *prakriyā* method into the Pāṇinian school and standardised it by including all the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Since a significant portion of the SK's structure is similar to that of the PK, it suggests that the SK is most likely designed on the foundations of the PK and the earlier *prakriyā* texts of

---

<sup>5</sup> Bali (1976, 24-6) states that the *Kātantra* system "deviated" from the traditional system of *utsarga* and *apavāda* in organising its *sūtras* and, in the following passages, repeatedly poses *Kātantra*, *Cāndra*, *Haima*, and *Mugdhabodha* in juxtaposition to the "prakriyā-works of the Pāṇinian school". Accordingly, the "prakriyā method" became the "prakriyā school" of grammarians who adhered to Pāṇini's rules and techniques.

Dharmakīrti and Vimalasarasvati. Whatever the case, the aim of the current study is a modest contribution to assess the primary goal of the SK by asking the question: is the SK a pedagogical text, as it is used today, or a commentarial text?

## 2 Outline of the Study

A comparative approach to analysis promises to offer an optimal understanding of the aim of the text in its proper context (Ganeri 2008, 553-4). Therefore, this study focuses on exploring the foundation of the *lakāra* as presented within the initial *sūtras* of the *tiñanta* section of the PK and the SK.<sup>6</sup> Considering the structure of the texts, a few standard observations are necessary:

- there are two sequences of *sūtras* to remember, one from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and another from the *prakriyā* text.
- The *prakriyā* has been fragmented for gradual comprehension of the content.
- The connection between relevant rules relies on the instruction of the teacher.

Due to the break it creates in the interconnected understanding of the rules, these factors speak to the nature of the transmission and its subsequent effect on the holistic comprehension of Pāṇini's grammar and its mechanisms. To explore a dimension of this issue, the current study is limited to five rules read with the following three points of discussion:

1. innovation of the text in terms of its structure/content;
2. structural integrity according to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*;
3. the overall cohesiveness of the content in the two texts in terms of *prakriyā*.

Due to differences in the approach of the PK and the SK, the two sequences (given below) do not match with each other and, thus, present a slightly different view of *prakriyā*. The PK and the SK both explain Pāṇini's rules but the former aims to teach while the latter functions more as an assertion of grammatical principles on *prakriyā* despite the fact that it has been implemented as a pedagogical text in more recent times.

The rules in question comprise of the following five rules of the *tiñanta* section in the two texts:

---

<sup>6</sup> The subject matter relates to my ongoing doctoral thesis where I am exploring the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī*'s *tiñanta* section to understand Navya Vyākaraṇa's claims of staying true to the Pāṇinian idea of grammar.

- *dhātoḥ* (A 3.1.91);
- *laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve cā karmakebhyaḥ* (A 3.4.69);
- *vartamāne laḥ* (A 3.2.123);
- *lasya* (A 3.4.77);
- *tip-tas-jhi-sip-thas-tha-mip-vas-mas ta-ātām-jha-thās-āthām-dhvam-  
iḍ-vahi-mahiṅ* (A 3.4.78).

The difference in the sequence of the rules between the two texts heavily contributes to the tone that they set for the introduction of the derivational process of the verbal section. The *prakriyā* school, in general, promotes a slightly different sense of grammar than what can be understood by reading the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself, and, as such, has several shortcomings inherent in its sequence. Disregarding this for the moment, the tone of the two texts differs from each other as well despite both proclaiming to be part of *prakriyā*. To understand this sense, I have attempted a brief analysis of the rules in question by also taking in consideration the commentaries *Prasāda* of Viṭṭhala and *Tattvabodhinī* of Jñānendra Sarasvatī. The sequence of the presentation will follow the rule number in each text and is divided into two sections: the explanation with derivational examples and then the analysis.

## 2.1 The *Prakriyākaumudī*

The text of the PK begins with a verse establishing the premise of *prakriyā* as given by Rāmacandra Śeṣa:

*prakṛtiḥ sā jayaty ādyā yayā dhātvdīrūpayā |  
vyajyante śabdārūpāni parapatyayasamnidheḥ ||  
(Trivedi 1931, 2)<sup>7</sup>*

*prakṛti* is that which comes first, through whose form, such as a verbal base, the linguistic forms are derived due to proximity to the following affix.

The *Prasāda* commentary of Viṭṭhala clarifies that the verbal roots *bhū* etc. are to be considered the *prakṛti* while the affix is the one that holds the meaning of the final verbal form – “*kasmāt parapatyayasamnidheḥ | paraś cāsau pratyayaś ca parapatyayaḥ pratyate'rtho'smād iti pratyayas tibādis tasya samnidhis tasmāt*”

---

<sup>7</sup> The *sūtras* taken from the *Prakriyākaumudī* do not contain the sequence numbers of the rules according to the text but only the numbers of the *sūtras* according to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Therefore, the relevant page number of the text is provided as the point of reference.

(PK 1931, 2).<sup>8</sup> The commentary continues with a more philosophical discussion on the interpretations of *prakṛti* according to the Sāṅkhya, Nyāya and Vedānta schools. From a more *prakriyā*-related perspective, the *adhikāra* of the rule A 3.1.22 *dhātor ekāco halādeḥ kriyāsamabhihāre yañ* is acknowledged before the one presented by the following rule. However, the *Prasāda* clarifies that the rule will be explained in the section related to the affix *yañ*.

2.1.1 PK 1: *dhātoḥ* (A 3.1.91)

*ā trṭiyādhyāyāntam vaksyamāṇāḥ pratyayā dhātor jñeyāḥ.  
teṣv ādau daśa lakārah pradarśyante. laṭ. liṭ. luṭ. lṛṭ. leṭ. loṭ. lañ. liñ.  
luñ. lṛñ.* (Trivedi, Trivedi 1931, 4-5)

Affixes which are mentioned until the end of the third *adhyāya* [of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*] should be known [to apply] after a verbal base. Among these [affixes], first, the ten l-forms are presented: *laṭ. liṭ. luṭ. lṛṭ. leṭ. loṭ. lañ. liñ. luñ. lṛñ*.

Using simple language, the PK states a clear scope of its application. Naturally there is a discrepancy created by the re-arrangement of the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This is further heightened by the *vṛtti*'s reference to the placement of this rule within the structure of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as one encompassing all affixes until the end of the third *adhyāya*. However, the premise presented by the PK partially justifies the restructuring within the framework of *prakriyā* as A 3.1.91 states that an affix is applied after a verbal base (*dhātoḥ*),<sup>9</sup> creating the structure *dhātu + affix*. An interesting feature of the PK is that it introduces small notes as transitions into *prakriyā* such as the one available after the *vṛtti* of this rule which introduces the ten *lakāras* as the primary affixes to be used after a verbal base - 'Among these (affixes), first, the ten l-forms are presented' - forming *dhātu + [laṭ etc.]* as the preliminary derivational structure of a verbal form. The *lakāras* are introduced in the sequence of the vowels as they are introduced within the Māheśvara Sūtra, first with those marked with a *Ṭ* and then with those marked with a *Ñ*.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> 'Why due to the presence of the following affix (*parapratyaya*-)? *parapratyaya*- is that which is an affix and at the same time subsequent (i.e. this is a karmadhāraya compound). It is said that the meaning is understood from this, i.e. the affix is *tiP* etc.; the proximity is of this; it is due to the proximity of this'.

<sup>9</sup> The term *dhātvādi* in the initial verse of the PK acknowledges the use of a verbal root also for the formation of word forms such as the *kṛdanta* where the final word may not be designated as a verbal form.

<sup>10</sup> In the body of the text, however, the *lakāras* are introduced in a slightly modified sequence to the one presented - *laṭ, liN, loṭ, lañ, luN, liṬ, luṬ, liN, lṛṬ, lṛN* - displaying

The *Prasāda* presents a comment on the relevance of the *adhikāra* sūtra in the context of *prakriyā* against the rule A 3.1.91:

*‘dhātoḥ’ ity ārabhya ā tṛtīyādhyāyaparīsamāpti ity arthaḥ. dhātavo nāma kriyāvācino bhvādayaḥ. te ca dvividhāḥ sakarmakā akarmakāś ceti.* (Trivedi, Trivedi 1931, 4)

It [the *adhikāra* rule A 3.1.91] is understood to begin with *dhātoḥ* [A 3.1.91] [and continue] until the end of the third *adhyāya*. Verbal bases are those [verbal roots beginning with] *bhū* etc. which denote an action. They are of two types, *sakarmaka* and *akarmaka* [loosely translated as ‘transitive’ and ‘intransitive’].

The beginning of the *adhikāra* is clearly stated as the rule A 3.1.91 *dhātoḥ* continuing until the end of the third *adhyāya* along with a basic definition of a verb (*dhātavo nāma kriyāvācinaḥ*). Naming the transitive and intransitive as two different characteristics of a verbal base, the commentary also presents a basic overview with examples of each category of verbs in clear, concise language. Viṭṭhala describes at least three different types of transitive and intransitive verb forms (Trivedi, Trivedi 1931, 4):

---

1a. *tatra karmasāpekṣām kriyām āhus te sakarmakāḥ.*

Where they say that the action requires an object, these are transitive (verbs).

- *yathā kaṭam karotītyādayaḥ*

Such as, *kaṭam karoti*

(‘he makes a mat’) etc.

2a. *athavā ye karmakarṭṛgatam vyāpāradvayam ācakṣate te sakarmakāḥ*

Otherwise, those (verbs) whose double function can refer to both the object and the agent are called transitive.

- *yathā pacaty ādayaḥ. yathā odanādigatam vikledādi karṭṛgatam adhiśrayaṇādi.*

For instance, when *pacati* is said, the action of getting wet refers to rice etc. and the action of putting (the rice in the pot) on the fire etc. refers to the agent.

1b. *akarmakāḥ punar ye karmanirapekṣām kriyām āhus...*

Moreover, intransitive are those whose action does not require an object.

- ...*āste śete tiṣṭhatītyādayaḥ.*

Such as *āste, śete, tiṣṭhati* (‘he sits/lies down/stands’)

---

2b. *ye tu karṭṛgatam eva te akarmakāḥ.*

Those [whose function] can only refer to the agent are intransitive.

- *yathāste śete ity ādayaḥ.*

Such as *aste* (he sits), *śete* (he lies down) etc.

---

a greater inconsistency than the one found in the SK.

---

3a. *athavā kriyārtho dhātuḥ sakarmakaḥ.*  
Otherwise, a verbal base whose sense is an action is (designated as) transitive.  
- *tatra sapariśpandasādhanasādhyā kriyā.*  
Therein, that action which has to be accomplished by means of the accomplishment of a movement is (designated as) a *kriyā*.

3b. *bhāvārtho dhātur akarmakaḥ*  
A verbal base whose sense is an eventuality is (designated as) intransitive.  
- *aparīśpandasādhanasādhyo bhāvāḥ.*  
That which does not have to be accomplished by means of the accomplishment of a movement is (designated as) a *bhāva*.

Despite these statements, the *Prasāda* clarifies that the transitive and the intransitive usages may overlap depending on the meaning that is to be conveyed in a given sentence, such as in the example *bhāraṃ vahati* which expresses the meaning of carrying something heavy despite not having an object stated and *nadī vahati* which expresses the flowing of a river. The *Prasāda* also elaborates on the role of the verbal root in containing the meaning of the object. This is substantiated with a verse from the *Vākyapadīya* to authorise the claim for instances where the difference in meaning versus usage allows the transitive and intransitive to apply outside of the bounds of its conventional uses that have been understood according to the present rule.<sup>11</sup>

Following this description regarding the role of the rule A 3.1.91 *dhātoḥ*, the text of the PK continues with the *ṽṛtti* introducing the ten *lakāras* that are to be introduced after a verbal base. The *Prasāda* reiterates this organisation of *lakāras* and presents a transition to the next *sūtra* where the role of the transitive and the intransitive verbal bases will be explained with respect to the *lakāras*.

### 2.1.2 PK 2: *laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve cā karmakebhyaḥ* (A 3.4.69)

*lakārāḥ sakarmakād dhātoḥ karmaṇi kartari cākarmakād bhāve kartari ca syuḥ.*  
'*pratyayaḥ*' '*paraś ca*' *ity anuvartate*

l-forms should apply to transitive verbal bases [A 3.1.91] when an agent [*kartṛ*] or a patient [*karman*] is signified and to intransitive verbal bases when an agent or the mere action is signified.

The rules *pratyayaḥ* [A 3.1.1] and *paraś ca* [A 3.1.2] are carried over [to the next rule].

In this rule, the *ṽṛtti* of the PK clearly exhibits the role of the *lakāras* in conjunction with the verbal base that has been presented. Furthermore, the PK draws connections to the *anuvṛtti* of the rules A 3.1.1-3

<sup>11</sup> *dhātor arthāntare ṽṛtter dhātvarthenopasaṃgrahāt | prasiddher avivakṣātaḥ karmaṇokarmikā kriyā || 3.7.88 || (Rau 1977, 139).*



from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* which, in addition to providing a smooth connection to the following rule A 3.2.123, are also instrumental in deciding the position of the affixes with respect to the verbal bases. Mentioning these rules also reinforces the connection of the text to the sequence of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The *Prasāda* echoes the PK's structure and explains the *anuvṛtti* of A 3.4.67 to this rule as the inclusion of the *kṛt* affixes within the *tiñ* processes.

*lakārā dvividhāḥ tiñbhāvino 'tiñbhāvinaś ca. tatra tiñbhāvinām kṛtsamjñāniṣedhāt 'kartari kṛt' ity asyānupasthānāt svārthe vidhiḥ syāt. atinbhāvinām tu 'kartari kṛt' iti kartary eva syād iti vacanam ārabhyate. "lakārāḥ". laḍādayo daśa karmaṇi kartur īpsitatame kartari kriyāyām svatantra bhāve dhātvarthe.* (Trivedi, Trivedi 1931, 6)

l-form affixes are twofold, those intended to occur as *tiñ* and those which are not intended to occur as *tiñ*. Therein, due to the exclusion of the designation of *kṛt* for those which are intended to occur as *tiñ*, because of the absence of this, namely [the rule A 3.4.67] *kartari kṛt*, there should be an injunction in their own meaning [of *tiñ*]. On the other hand, the teaching that the affix which is not *tiñ* should only be used in the sense of the agent according to *kartari kṛt* is undertaken. "*lakārāḥ*". The [ten *lakāras*] *laṭ* etc. in the sense of the most desired object of an agent [*kartṛ*], in the sense of an agent, in the sense of an action, in the sense of an independent eventuality conveying the sense of the verbal base.

With the two types of *dhātu* having been introduced by the PK, the *Prasāda* introduces the two types of *lakāras* - *tiñ* and *atiñ*. Viṭṭhala also hints at the difference between the two by stating that A 3.4.67 does not appear in the *anuvṛtti* of the present rule and, thus, has no utility in *tiñ* processes. Furthermore, it can also be understood that the non-*tiñ* are only used in the *kartari* sense.

### 2.1.3 PK 3: *vartamāne laṭ* (A 3.2.123)

*ārabdhāparisamāptakriyopalakṣite kale vācye dhātor laṭ pratyayaḥ syāt. aṭāv itau. ādeśavidhānasāmarthyān na lasyetsamjñā.*

After a verbal base, the l-form affix *laṭ* should be introduced when the period of time to be expressed refers to an action which has begun but not finished.

*a* and *Ṭ* are markers. The *l* [of *laṭ*] does not obtain designation as a marker as it is entitled to take an affix by substitution.

The PK clearly defines the scope of the *vartamāna* in the *vṛtti* itself. As part of a detail for derivation, Rāmacandra has also specified that the *l* of the *l*-form affix would not obtain the designation of a marker since it is required for the purpose of substitution (i.e. the *tiP* etc. *l*-substitutes). The corresponding *Prasāda* commentary describes the scope of actions when they are expressed in the *vartamāna* within the confines of this rule:

*atheha kumārāḥ krīḍantīti pravṛttasya virāme tiṣṭhanti parvatā itī  
nityapravṛtteḥ ca katham laṭ vartamānatvābhāvāt.*  
(Trivedi, Trivedi 1931, 6)

However, how is [the introduction of] *laṭ* warranted in the case of a break of continuity in [the example] *kumārāḥ krīḍanti* [‘the young boys play’] and in the case of a permanent continuity in [the example] *tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ* [‘the mountains stand’] as there is an absence of the characteristic of the present tense [mentioned before]?

Here, the commentary uses two examples, *kumārāḥ krīḍanti* (‘the young boys play’) and *tiṣṭhanti parvatāḥ* (‘the mountains stand’) to discuss the dimensions of the present tense as one of an ongoing action. The prospective end of the children playing is contrasted with the constant existence of the mountains (i.e. without an end or beginning) to argue that an action unable to be carried forward cannot be constituted within the present tense. The actions are meant to represent a paradigm of continuity which is an important part of the present tense according to the *vṛtti*. The argument presented by the *Prasāda* here is based on the verse 3.80 by Bhartṛhari<sup>12</sup> stating that, because mountains are stable fixtures on a landmark and are in a state of natural permanence (unless an external force disturbs that state), their state (i.e. *tiṣṭhanti*) is also described in the present tense in this case because they are viewed relative to the action of the young boys playing. Moreover, the act of playing can be interrupted by the children as they take breaks, but those acts would still be considered a part of their ongoing activity of playing – *antarālakriyās tu nāntariyakatvād avyavadhāyikās tadavayavabhūtā vā* – which is, again, a rephrasing of the verses 3.9.82-83 from the *Vākyapadīya*.<sup>13</sup> The *vṛtti* specifies the *l* of *laṭ* is excluded as a marker for the pur-

---

**12** *parato bhidyate sarvam ātmā tu na \*vikalpate | parvatādīsthitī tasmīn pararūpeṇa bhidyate || 3.9.80 ||* (Rau 1977, 162). Note on translation: Rau has used the word *vikalpyate* in his edition but mentions *vikapate* as an alternate usage found in some manuscripts and is the one used by the *Prasāda*.

**13** *vyavadhānam ivopaitī \*vicchinna iva dṛśyate | kriyāsamūho bhajyādīr antarālapravṛttibhiḥ || na ca vicchinna-rūpo ‘pi so ‘virāmān nīvaratē | sarvaiva hī kriyāyena samkīrṇevopalabhyate || \*tadantarāle dṛṣṭā vā sarvaivāvayavakriyā || 3.9.*

pose of subsequent substitutions to the l-form in *prakriyā* while also mentioning the derivational advantages of the markers *Ṭ* for rule A 3.4.79 *ṭita ātmanepadānām ṭere*<sup>14</sup> and the significance of the *a* for A 3.4.83 *vido liṭo vā*.<sup>15</sup>

#### 2.1.4 PK 4: *lasya* (A 3.4.77)

*ity adhikṛtya*.

The PK does not explain this *adhikāra* and neither does the *Prasāda* comment upon this *sūtra*, which minimises its importance in *prakriyā*. There has been a pattern in the later *prakriyā* texts, such as the *Kaumudī*s written after Dikṣita, of omitting the *adhikāra sūtras* from the main body of the text which indicates a growing simplification of the mechanism of grammar created by Pāṇini. This could be another example of such an instance.<sup>16</sup>

## 2.2 The *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī*

Compared to the more philosophical verse that begins the *tiṅanta* section in the PK, the SK starts with a more traditional *maṅgalācaraṇa* verse<sup>17</sup> praising the glory of the Vedas and the seers and begins the grammar with a presentation of the ten *lakāras*:

*tatrādau daśa lakārāḥ pradarśyante. laṭ. liṭ. luṭ. lṛṭ. leṭ. loṭ. lañ. liñ. luñ. lṛñ. eṣu pañcamo lakāraś chandomātragocarah.*

Here, we first present the ten *lakāras*: *laṭ. liṭ. luṭ. lṛṭ. leṭ. loṭ. lañ. liñ. luñ. lṛñ*. Of these, the fifth *lakāra* is only available in the Vedas.

---

82-83.5 || (Rau 1977, 163). Note on translation: similar to the previous note, Rau uses *nivṛtta*, *tadantarāla*, respectively for those marked with an asterisk.

<sup>14</sup> The *ātmanepada* l-form affixes marked with a *Ṭ* obtain zero-replacement to the syllable with the final in a group of vowels (A 1.1.64).

<sup>15</sup> The *parasmaipada* l-substitute affixes *ṇal*, *atus*, *us*, *thal*, *athus*, *a*, *ṇal*, *va*, and *ma* (A 3.4.82) of *liṭ* are optionally used for *laṭ* after the verbal base of *vid*.

<sup>16</sup> An observation made by Valentina Ferrero and conveyed personally.

<sup>17</sup> “1. The All-pervading is supremely glorious and though without attributes is constantly being praised, day by day, by the Great Seers, illustrious with the attributes of Vaidic Studentship and Worthiness, and who possess all praiseworthy qualities. 2. In the First Half have been treated the affixes which occur in the Fourth and the Fifth Adhyāyas of Pāṇini. Now are being taught the affixes that occur in the third Adhyāya” (Vasu 1906, 1).

This approach might be in keeping with the idea that the *pratyaya* is taught first by Pāṇini in the third *adhyāya* and, correspondingly, should be presented first in a text that deals primarily with the *prakriyā* aspect of the A. The *leṬ* is immediately relegated to the Vedic section and removed from consideration as part of any *prakriyā* dealing with the 'normal' *lakāra*.

2.2.1 SK 1: *vartamāne laṬ* (A 3.1.123)

*vartamānakriyāvṛtter dhātor laṬ syāt. aṭāv itau.*

The affix *laṬ* should be introduced after a verbal base [A 3.1.91] whose characteristic is an action performed in the present tense. *a* and *Ṭ* are designated as markers.

The SK presents the affix *laṬ* in its role as the placeholder for substitute affixes which express actions occurring in the present tense. The l-form *laṬ* then obtains the designation of *it* for its markers *a* and *Ṭ* using A 1.3.2-3.<sup>18</sup> The extremely short *vṛtti* provides basic details relevant to derivation while the interpretative aspects are provided by the *Tattvabodhinī*:

*vartamāna ity etat prakṛtyarthaviśeṣaṇam ity āha -  
vartamānakriyāvṛtter dhātor iti. dhātor iti sūtram ātṛṭiyādhyāyāntam  
adhikriyata iti bhāvaḥ. - laṬ syād iti. tasya vācyatvam anupadam eva  
sphuṭībhaviṣyati. vartamānakālas tu tadvācyah kim tu dyotyah eva.  
lañādiṣv api bhūtādikālo yathāyatham dyotyā evety avagantavyam.  
vastutas tu vācyatvābhyupagamo' pi sugama iti vidhyādisūtre  
vakṣyāmaḥ. - aṭāvitāviti. akāra uccāraṇārtha iti tu noktam,  
liḍādivailakṣṇyasampādanāt tasyāvāśyavaktavyatvāt. (Panshikar  
2002, 332)*

[The *ācārya*] maintained that the word *vartamāna* qualifies the meaning of the *prakṛti* [i.e. verbal base] - *vartamānakriyāvṛtter dhātor iti*. It is to be understood that the aphorism *dhātoḥ* [A 3.1.91] is placed as the heading and extends until the end of the third *adhyāya* - *laṬ syād iti*. Its statement will only become evident step by step. However, the present tense expresses this, but it is only suggested. Besides, in the *laṆ* etc. [l-forms] the past tense has to be gradually understood as only suggested.

<sup>18</sup> A 1.3.2 *upadeśe 'janunāsika it*, A 1.3.3 *halantyam*.

The commentary attempts to create a verb + affix setup to compensate for the SK's focus on the affix - *vartamāna ity etat prakṛtyarthaviśeṣaṇam ity āha* - whereas the PK states it outright. Unlike the PK, the scope of the term *vartamāna* has not been defined but the indication of its relationship with *prakṛti* does furnish the meaning of the present tense to the verbal base. As a response to the use of the word *dhātu* in the *vṛtti*, the *Tattvabodhinī* presents its relevance to the *adhikāra* of rule A 3.1.91 spanning the remainder of the third *adhyāya*. It also ascribes the true scope of a verbal base as that conveyed by the subsequent affix *laṭ* - *tasya vācyaṭvam anupadam eva sphuṭībhaviṣyati*. A brief explanation of the present tense being a *dyotyā*, i.e. 'to be expressed, implicitly conveyed' and not *vācya* i.e. 'expressing a sense' presents the development of a meaning from the combination of verbal base + affix. The commentary notes that more examples supporting this idea will be provided in the *vidhi* etc. rules (i.e. A 3.3.161) presenting the context within which each *lakāra* is used. The *anuvṛtti* of the rule *dhātoḥ* is provided in the commentary with the note that its meaning is expressed by the term which follows it, making the *pratyaya* central to the derivational process. Another interesting fact is that the *anunāsika* in *laṭ* (A 1.3.2) is not commented upon which suggests that the intricacies of the *svara* do not hold much importance for the SK.<sup>19</sup>

## 2.2.2 SK 2: *laḥ karmaṇi ca bhāve cākarmakebhyaḥ* (A 3.4.69)

*lakārāḥ sakarmakebhyaḥ karmaṇi kartari ca syur akarmakebhyo bhāve kartari ca.*

l-forms should apply after transitive verbal bases [A 3.1.91] when an agent [*kartṛ*] or a patient [*karman*] has to be signified and after intransitive verbal bases when an agent or the mere action has to be signified.

The sequence of this rule is the same between the two texts but the approach to explanation is vastly different. The SK presents a very brief *vṛtti* which the *Tattvabodhinī* expands upon with the relevance of this rule with A 3.4.67 and 3.4.70. The commentary begins with the *anuvṛtti* of A 3.4.67 *kartari kṛt*:

---

<sup>19</sup> This applies generally to the so-called 'regular' *prakriyā* as there are other rules where the *svara* has been mentioned by the SK later on in the *bhavadī* section but only when it is explicitly stated as part of a *sūtra*.

*cakārāt 'kartari kṛt' ityataḥ kartarītyanukṛṣyate, sakarmakaviṣayam cedam. akarmakeṣu karmanīty amśasya bādhitvāt, bhāve cety uttaravākyena tatra viśeṣavidhānāc ca tad etad āha - sakarmakebhyaḥ iti - bhāve ceti. cakāreṇa kartaivānukṛṣyate na tu karma, asaṁbhavāt tadāha. - bhāve kartari ceti. (Panshikar 2002, 332)*

'kartari' is drawn over from [the rule A 3.4.67] *kartari kṛt* by the use of *ca* and this [use] is intended as a characteristic of transitive verbs. In this manner, in the case of intransitive verbs and by the cancellation of the portion '*karmani*', he said this is valid because of the specific teaching of the following utterance '*bhāve ca*'. By the [use of] *ca* only the agent is drawn over, not the object, due to its impossibility. He said this. - *bhāve kartari ceti*.

As the *sūtra* leaves an understanding of the *sakarmaka* to the explicit mention of the *akarmaka*, the commentary presents a short explanation to understand this mechanism of exclusion to ensure that the scope of the transitive is also understood according to the rule. One aspect of the argument also relates to questions regarding the relevance of this rule - *nanu bhāvakarmanor ātmanepadavidhānāt 'śeṣāt kartari-' iti parasmaipadavidhānāc ca jñāpakāl lakāraṇām bhāvakarmakartāro 'rthā anumātum śakyanta iti kim anena sūtreṇa 'However, due to the teaching of the ātmandepada ending in the bhāva and karman and due to the teaching of the parasmaipada endings according to the rule śeṣāt kartari- (A 1.3.78) the meanings of bhāva, karman, and karṭṛ can be inferred through because of a clue, therefore, what is the purpose of this rule?' Answering this, the argument states that otherwise affixes such as *GHaÑ* etc. would become applicable to 1-forms attaching to transitive verbs in examples such as *ghaṭam kriyate devadattena*, where the transitive action of forming a pot would be inaccurately expressed by the affix *GHaÑ* instead of the accusative. The affix *GHaÑ* is only introduced in the *bhāva* (A 3.3.18), which is applicable only for the intransitive verbs according to A 3.4.69. A significant portion of the argument is taken from the MBh on this rule.<sup>20</sup> The main idea here is that the rules A 1.3.13 and A 1.3.78 designate the verbal forms to be used in the *ātmanepada* and the *parasmaipada* while A 3.4.67 and A 3.4.69 relate to the *lakāras*. Depending on a specification of the *lakāras* is a more desirable option since it has a wider scope of application to verbal forms rather than an attempt to directly introduce specific verbal endings. The proposed argument is also a more indirect approach to designating the *bhāva*, *karman*, and *karṭṛ* because after rejecting three possible re-formulations of this rule - 1) *akarmakebhyaḥ bhāve laḥ*, 2) *bhāve**

20 Mbh ad A 3.4.69, ll. 5-12 (Kielhorn 1965, 179-80).

*cā karmakebhyaḥ*, and 3) *laś ca bhāve cā karmakebhyaḥ* – the current form is accepted for the purpose of A 3.4.70 *tayor eva kṛtya-ktakhalarthāḥ*<sup>21</sup> which also requires the *anuvṛtti* of *bhāve* and *karmaṇi*.

A major part of the residual commentary<sup>22</sup> focuses on explicating the opinion of the grammarians against that of the Naiyāyikas regarding the function of the *lakāra* in understanding the meaning of the verb form. Ultimately, the idea of the verbal base + affix together creating the meaning of the word is highlighted as the most desirable and the meaning is not dependent exclusively on the affix. Considering the meanings that were introduced by the *Prasāda* in A 3.1.91, the *Tattvabodhinī* appears to refute them because they are not found in the MBh and, therefore, not acceptable to Patañjali. A variety of arguments considering the role of the *kartṛ*, *karman*, and *bhāva* in various rules are presented with the commentators Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta being accepted as reliable authorities on the resolution of any particular argument.

### 2.2.3 SK 3: *lasya* (A 3.4.77)

*adhikāro 'yam.*

'This is an *adhikāra* (rule).'

*varṇagrahane pratyayagrahaṇaparibhāṣā, arthavad grahaṇaparibhāṣā ca na pravartate iti lunāti, cūḍāla, ity ādau tibādy ādeśaḥ kuto na bhavati cet. atrāhuḥ. 'laḥ karmaṇi' iti sūtre nirdiṣṭānām kartrādyarthānām anuvṛtteḥ kartrādyarthe vihitasya lakārasya grahaṇam iti... yad vā dhātor ity adhikārād dhātor vihitasyaiva lasy eha grahaṇam iti noktātiprasaṅgaḥ. lasy etsañjñā tu na bhavati, phalābhāvāt. na ca litsvaraḥ phalam, ṇalo littvena tadabhāvasya jñāpanāt...* (Panshikar 2002, 334)

'If the *paribhāṣā* '*varṇagrahane pratyayagrahaṇa-*' and the *paribhāṣā* '*arthavad grahaṇa-*' are not applicable then why is the substitution of *tiP* etc. affixes [in examples such as] *lunāti*<sup>23</sup> ['he cuts'], *cūḍāla*<sup>24</sup>

---

**21** A 3.4.70 *tayor eva kṛtyaktakhalarthāḥ* 'The affixes *kṛtya* and *кта* apply after a verbal base in the meanings of the affix *KHaL* (A 3.3.126) when it signifies those two (*bhāve* and *karmaṇi*) senses'.

**22** The commentary for this rule spans two pages in the SK so only a few small portions have been reproduced here for the sake of brevity.

**23** The *parasmaipada* present tense third person singular form for *lūṅ chedane* (DP 9.16) + *Śnā* + *tiP*. The *l* belongs to the verbal base here and, thus, does not obtain substitution with *tiṅ* affixes.

**24** Masculine/neuter singular vocative of *cūḍāla* applies the affix *laC* and, so, also does not obtain substitution with *tiṅ* affixes.

['he who carries the wick'] not possible? They said. The *karṭṛ* etc. meanings taught in the rule *lah karmaṇi* from *anuvṛtti* obtains employment of an *l*-form supplied in the *karṭṛ* etc. meanings... Alternatively, there is only the introduction of a *lakāra* introduced after a verbal base taught in the domain of the rule *dhātoḥ* [A 3.1.91], in this way there is no automatic extra-extension. And there is no designation of *l* as a marker due to its futility [*phalābhāvāt*]. Nor is the purpose the accent of the marker *L*, as can be understood by the absence of it for *ṆaL* embodied by the marker *L*...'

In the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, this rule governs the section for *l*-substitutes and, in conjunction with A 3.4.78 *tip-tas-jhi-sip-thas-tha-mip-vas-mas ta-ātām-jha-thās-āthām-dhvam-iṭ-vahi-mahiṇ* presents the rules that are the foundational substitutes for the *lakāra* affixes. In contrast, the SK only states that this *sūtra* is an *adhikāra*. The *Tattvabodhinī* presents a small commentary on the significance of the substitution of *l* with the *tiP* etc. affixes to understand the implications of the single *l* that is leftover from the *lakāras* in *prakriyā*. The commentary also refutes the applicability of the *paribhāṣās varṇagrahaṇe pratyayagrahaṇa* (Nāgeśa Pbh 21)<sup>25</sup> and *arthavad grahaṇe* (Nāgeśa Pbh 14)<sup>26</sup> in carrying over the properties of a single phoneme of an affix to its substitute through *sthānivadbhāva*. The application of the *tiP* affixes in the meaning of the *karṭṛ*, *karman*, and *bhāva* is dependent upon *sūtras* which declare their affiliation with one of the three categories, such as A 3.1.68 *kartari śap* or A 3.3.18 *bhāve*.<sup>27</sup> Finally, the *Tattvabodhinī* declares that the *l* leftover after the zero-replacement of markers is not to be eliminated itself as it would make its existence futile. The commentary incorrectly equates the *l* with a marker *L* to help endorse its lack of accent with the absence of one in the affix *ṆaL*.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> A *paribhāṣā* with these exact words is unavailable in both the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa and the *Vyāḍiparibhāṣāvṛtti*, but the closest approximation that fits the meaning is *paribhāṣā* 21 of the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara - varṇāśraye nāsti pratyayalakṣaṇam* "(An operation) which is caused by an affix, does (in case the latter should disappear) not take place, if it depends on the letter or letters (of the affix and not on the affix as such)" (transl. Kielhorn, Abhyankar 1960, 111).

<sup>26</sup> "(A combination of letters capable of) expressing a meaning (denotes), whenever it is employed (in grammar, that combination of letters in so far as it possesses that meaning, but it) does not denote (the same combination of letters) void of a meaning" (transl. Kielhorn, Abhyankar 1960, 81-2).

<sup>27</sup> Of course, this point has a philosophical aspect dealing with the intention of the speaker but that has not been referred to by the sources in this section and, therefore, will not be included in the present analysis.

<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, this does indicate that the *Tattvabodhinī* does not believe the rule A 3.1.3-4 applies to a *lakāra*.



2.2.4 SK 4: *tip-tas-jhi-sip-thas-tha-mip-vas-mas ta-ātām-jha-thās-āthām-dhvam-iṭ-vahi-mahiñ* (A 3.4.78)

*ete 'ṣṭādaśa lādeśāḥ syuḥ.*

'These eighteen [affixes]<sup>29</sup> should be substitutes of l-forms [A 3.4.77].'<sup>30</sup>

*samāhāre dvandvaḥ. iṭṣaṣṭakāra āgamaliṅgam na bhavati saptadaśabhir ādeśaiḥ samabhivyāhārāt. kiṃ tu 'ito 't' iti viśeṣaṅārthaḥ. er ad ity ucyamāne edhevahi edhemahity atrāpi syāt, varṇagrahaṇe pratyaya grahaṅārthavadgrahaṇaparibhāṣayor apravṛtteḥ. kecit tu 'iṭo 't' ity atra liñ ity anuvartanāl liñādeśasyevarṇasy eti samānādhikaraṅyena vyākhyāne edhevahi edhemahity ādāv atiprasaṅgo nāsty eva. na hi tatra ikāramātram ādeśo bhavati. tena 'iṭo 't' ity atra ṣṭakāraḥ spaṣṭapratipattiyartha evety āhuḥ...mahiño nākāras tañ tiñ iti pratyāhārārthaḥ, sa ca samudāyānubandho na tv avayavānubandho vyākhyānāt. (Panshikar 2002, 334)*

[This rule uses a] *dvandva* in the sense of a *samāhāra* ['gathering/grouping']. The Ṭ of [the 1st p. sing. *ātmanepada* affix] *iṭ* is not an indication of an augment [i.e. by the rule A 1.1.146] but comes from mentioning together the seventeen [*tiñ*] substitutes. Furthermore, has the purpose of specifying *iṭo 't* [A 3.4.106]. When saying the substitution of *a* in the place of *i* [A 3.4.106], this [substitution] should also happen in the verbal forms *edhevahi* ['may you two prosper'] *edhemahi* ['may we prosper'] due to the inapplicability of the *paribhāṣā* of *varṇagrahaṇe pratyayagrahaṇam* [Nāgeśa Pbh 21] and the *paribhāṣā arthavad grahaṇa* [Nāgeśa Pbh 14].<sup>31</sup> Some, however, maintain that by the *anuvṛtti* of *liñ* in the rule *iṭo 't*, the l-substitute of *liñ i* does not have an automatic extra-extension at all by co-occurrence in the exposition of *edhevahi*, *edhemahi* etc. Indeed, here only *i* becomes a substitute. It is said only for a clear understanding of the ṭ of the rule *iṭo 't*... the *ñ* of *mahiñ* is for [the formation] of the *pratyāhāra* [*tiñ* or *tañ*], therefore it is the marker of a group but not a marker of a component due to the exposition [of the affixes].

The SK only provides the basic definition of the rule in the *vṛtti* but the *Tattvabodhini* branches out into an analysis of the first person singular *ātmanepada* affix *iṭ* according to the rule A 3.4.106.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> *pratyayaḥ* A 3.1.1

<sup>30</sup> *lasya* A 3.4.77

<sup>31</sup> See footnotes 25-6 for the meaning of the *paribhāṣās*.

<sup>32</sup> Correspondingly, since the subject of this rule has been addressed here in A 3.4.78, the commentary for A 3.4.106 itself does not say much.

The marker  $\dot{N}$  is clarified as being used to create the *pratyāhāra* designation of  $ta\dot{N}$  and  $ti\dot{N}$  rather than influencing the process of *gaṇa* for examples such as *iṣeḥ* and *eṣiṣimahi*. Similarly, words such as *vṛṣcateḥ*, *prṣcateḥ*, *vavraścimahe*, and *papracchimahe* do not obtain *samprasāraṇa* through the rule A 6.1.16 either. There is definitely a variety of forms used, albeit with a degree of complexity that the SK does not prepare the student for. For example, the word form *eṣiṣimahi* is the *karman* form of the verbal root *iṣa* of the *kryādi gaṇa* in the *ātmanepada* augmented by  $\dot{a}\dot{N}$  and using the *ṆiC* form of the benedictive mood ( $\dot{a}\dot{N}$  + *iṣa ābhikṣṇye* + *ṆiC* +  $li\dot{N}$ ). The verbal form *iṣe* is the second person singular *ātmanepada* form for *iṇ gatau* of the *adādi gaṇa*. Similarly, the forms *vavraścimahe* and *papracchimahe* are formed from *vraścā* originating from a *sūtra* A 8.2.36<sup>33</sup> and *praccha* which originates from *praccha jñīpsāyām* of the *tudādi gaṇa* and is in the *ātmanepada*. This *sūtra* does not contain a *bhāṣya* by Patañjali; however, the *Tattvabodhinī* is very similar to the *Nyāsa*'s commentary on this rule, suggesting a possible influence. The claim that the sole purpose of the marker  $\dot{N}$  of *mahi\dot{N}* is to form a *pratyāhāra* falls short of offering the explanation that its purpose to cancel the process of *gaṇa* is invalidated by the rule A 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit*.<sup>34</sup> The *Nyāsa* on this rule is a little more detailed while the *Tattvabodhinī* has condensed a lot of the information and made the commentary a little more difficult to follow.

### 3 Conclusion

In terms of innovation, both the texts are clearly novel in their own way for the manner in which they present the rules of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* but it is equally evident through their distinctive approaches that they appear to have different aims. The PK, as stated within its name, focuses on illuminating *prakriyā*, including only the immediately relevant considerations regarding the rules of Pāṇini within the sequence constructed by the text. The initial verse provides the context of *prakṛti* + *pratyaya* and this is the foundation of the subsequent rules to build the skeleton of a verbal form. The PK's approach to the establishment of the *lakāras* is heavily aided by the *Prasāda* which complements the main text with verses from the *Vākyapadīya* as well as the MBh to establish the authority of its arguments within the gram-

<sup>33</sup> A 8.2.36 *vyaścā-bhrasja-srja-mṛja-yaja-rāja-bhrāja-cchaṣām ṣaḥ* 'The last letter of the verbal form of *vraśc*, *bhrasj*, *srj*, *mṛj*, *yaj*, *rāj*, *bhrāj*, and those ending with the letter *ś* and *ccha* are substituted with *ṣ* when followed by affixes beginning with letters of *jHaL*.

<sup>34</sup> A 1.2.4 *sārvadhātukam apit* - A *sārvadhātuka* affix which is not marked with *P* is understood as though marked with *N*.

matical tradition. Some of these arguments, such as that of the transitive and intransitive verbs, are later refuted by the *Tattvabodhinī* due to their non-correspondence with the MBh. The SK, on the other hand, presents very short *vṛttis* with similarly short explanations by the *Tattvabodhinī*, excepting the rule A 3.4.69. The content of the *Tattvabodhinī* appears to focus more on a few technical details that need a grammatical reasoning. The PK-*Prasāda* approach conveys its arguments in the sense of a balanced formation of *prakṛti + pratyaya* while the SK-*Tattvabodhinī* approach orients itself around the formation of an affix which is later attached to a verbal base.<sup>35</sup>

Both these texts are obviously not completely true to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and require much didactic material to be added so that they can be used as a pedagogical text. Considering the primarily oral nature of the Sanskrit tradition, it is understood that the texts may be read more creatively depending on the scholar. Despite this, the *prakriyā* and the inclination of the scholar to adhere to the structure of the text ensure a degree of predictability in their use. In terms of the *sūtras* studied here, the PK's approach provides a more systematic introduction to the foundation of the *lakāras* due to its introduction of the *anuvṛtti* and the presentation of examples. In contrast, the SK's method is more focused on maintaining correctness in the derivation with a view towards cultivating a reverence for the study of the *śāstras*. The SK, while claiming a more Pāṇinian approach, is a text that cannot be read on its own to develop an understanding of grammatical concepts whereas the PK manages to convey the main point decisively in these four rules. There are also references to topics and rules that have not yet been addressed in the text of SK at this point and are not particularly relevant to the stage of derivation. In this sense, the PK is more consistent about its content and seems to provide a progression into the subject matter. The Sanskrit used by the PK and the *Prasāda* is unrefined and basic compared to that of the SK and the *Tattvabodhinī*. However, the *Prasāda* is also a more student-friendly commentary than the TB which appears to use a mix of commentary from the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, *Nyāsa*, *Padamañjarī*, and the MBh. A more extensive study of the texts and their contexts may shed more light on the forthright wording of the PK or the elusive subtleties within the SK.

---

**35** Deshpande (2016) explores the possible religious backgrounds of the scholars in the grammatical tradition and how their view is reflected in a dualistic vs non-dualistic view of meaning in a verbal form (i.e. *dhātu + affix*).

## List of abbreviations

A = *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini  
SK = *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita  
PK = *Prakriyākaumudī* of Rāmacandra Śeṣa  
MBh = *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali

## Bibliography

- Abhyankar, K.V. (1962). *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgajibhaṭṭa*. Part I, *Edited Critically with the Commentary Tattvādarśa of M.M. Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar*, vol. 1. 2nd ed. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Kielhorn, F.; Abhyankar, K.V. (eds) (1960). *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgajibhaṭṭa*. Part II, *Translation and Notes*, vol. 2. 2nd ed. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Deshpande, M.M. (1985). "Historical Change and the Theology of Eternal Sanskrit". *Zeitschrift Für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 98(1), 122-49.
- Deshpande, M.M. (2002). "Fluidity of Early Grammatical Categories in Sanskrit". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 122(2), 244-7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3087617>.
- Deshpande, M.M. (2005). "Ultimate Sources of Validation for the Sanskrit Grammatical Tradition: Elite Usage versus Rules of Grammar". Squarcini, F. (ed.), *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*. Florence: Firenze University Press, 361-87. <https://doi.org/10.7135/upo9781843313977.015>.
- Deshpande, M.M. (2016). "Appayya Dīkṣita and the Lineage of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita". *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 44(1), 115-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9254-3>.
- Ganeri, J. (2008). "Contextualism in the Study of Indian Intellectual Cultures". *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 36(5), 551-62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-008-9039-7>.
- Katre, S.M. (1987). *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini in Romanised Transliteration*. Austin: University of Texas Press. Texas Linguistics Series. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x00151626>.
- Kielhorn, F. (1965). *The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Vol. 2, *Adhyāyas III, IV, and V*. 3rd ed. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Panshikar, V.L.S. (2002). *Siddhāntakaumudī with the Tattvabodhinī of Jñānendra Sarasvatī and the Subodhinī Commentary of Jayakṛṣṇa*. Reprint. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Prakashan. The Vrajajīvan Prācyabhāratī Granthamāla 5.
- Rau, W. (1977). *Bhartṛharis Vākyapadīya: die Mūlakārikās nach den handschriften herausgegeben und mit einem pāda-index versehen/von Wilhelm Rau*, Bd. 4. Weisbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Abhandlungen Für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XLII. <https://doi.org/10.2307/602486>.
- Trivedi, R.B.K.P. (ed.) (1925). *Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmacandra (In Two Parts)*, part 1, vol. 1. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series LXXXII.
- Trivedi, R.B.K.P.; Trivedi, A.K (eds) (1931). *Prakriyākaumudī of Rāmacandra (In Two Parts)*, vol. 2(2). Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series LXXXII.
- Vasu, S.C. (1906). *The Siddhāntakaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita Edited and Translated into English*, vol. 2(1). 1st ed. 4 vols. Allahabad: The Panini Office.