

**CHAPTER I**  
**SOME ASPECTS OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF**  
**SANSKRIT GRAMMAR**

Language is the best medium for communication and appropriate expression of thoughts, ideas and emotions. Adequate and authentic knowledge of a language is very much required for the scientific, literary and social communication that a human being has to do for his social as well as psychological requirements. Therefore, the intensive learning of Grammar becomes indispensable for the proper understanding of fundamental skills ordained through grammatical principles that helps one in maintaining the purity as well as beauty of the language and that gives the communicator a sophisticated place among the civilized people of the society. Ordinary expression that a person of slum is not at all a good expression and that cannot be taken into consideration when we talk of a good communication.

Therefore, several questions need to be answered before we proceed for the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar. The questions like - ‘What is the significance of Sanskrit grammar? How did it come into existence? When did it change into an unavoidable tool for learning the language? How it got systematized? What are the nature, scope and limitations of grammar?’

That is the reason why the study of Grammar is highly emphasized by the scholars throughout the ages. Grammar is considered to be the most important system of knowledge. Technically it is called a *Śāstra* which may be roughly translated as a scientific discipline or a knowledge system technically called *Vyākaraṇa*.

The term ‘*Vyākaraṇa*’ has been defined and explained by ancient intellectuals in different ways. The most popular definition of *Vyākaraṇa* is *Vyākriyante Prakṛti-pratyayavibhāgapūrvakam Śabdā Anena iti Vyākaraṇa*; it means – grammar is that which dissolves words into elements (i.e. stem and suffix). The word *Vyākriyante* is constituted from the combination of the prefixes *Vi* and *Ān* with third person plural form of the present tense of the root *Kṛ* in passive voice. *Vyākriyante* means *Vyutpādyante*. It suggests that original the *Vyākaraṇa* was made for *Vyutpatti* or etymology. From this perspective, *Nirukta* of Yaskācārya is also a treatise on grammar.

Patañjali very rightly calls it *Athaśabdānuśāsanam* and he begins his great commentary with the word *Śabdānuśāsanam*. The term is very significant and it denotes the practical aspect of grammar that is for framing principles for the correction of the language. In this context, Patañjali also specifies the objectives of grammar which I will deal with in the proper context in this chapter.

Moreover, the great grammarian-philosopher Bhartṛhari who gives a new term to the entire system, calls it *Sādhujñānaviśayā*<sup>1</sup> and puts it at par with *Smṛti*, the subject of which is to bring the correctness in the language. It also suggests the hidden meaning intended by Bhartṛhari that grammar closely and coherently follows Veda and it becomes evidently clear from expression of Kālidāsa – *Śrutirivārtham Smṛtiranvagacchat*. It is also known as a science that deals with *Pada-saṁskāra* i.e. made for the correctness and proper use of words.

*Chāndogya Upaniṣad* enhances the importance of grammar by saying it as *Vedānām Veda*<sup>2</sup>. There are numerous eulogistic expressions on grammar. However it is also visualized as the mouth of *Veda-puruṣa*. Such as -

---

<sup>1</sup> साधुत्वज्ञानविषया सेयं व्याकरणस्मृतिः ।

अविच्छेदेन शिष्टानामिदं स्मृतिनिबन्धनम् ॥ १.१५८॥ Bhartṛhari, *VP*, p.59

<sup>2</sup> Ch. Up. 7.1, p. 171 Śāṅkara had taken it in the sense of Grammar.

छन्दः पादौ तु वेदस्य हस्तौ कल्पोऽथ पठ्यते ।

ज्योतिषामयनं चक्षुर्निरुक्तं श्रोत्रमुच्यते ॥४१॥

शिक्षा घ्राणं तु वेदस्य मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम् ।

तस्मात् साङ्गमधीत्यैव ब्रह्मलोके महीयते ॥४२॥<sup>3</sup>

इति कर्तव्यता लोके सर्वा शब्दव्यपाश्रया ।

यां पूर्वाहितसंस्कारो बालोऽपि प्रतिपद्यते ॥१.१२९॥<sup>4</sup>

Vyāsa in the MB glorifies *Vyākaraṇa* by saying that the correct use of language produces excellent merit and means of that merit the authentic user of the language attains heaven.

दिवं स्पृशति भूमिं च शब्दः पुण्यस्य कर्मणः ।

यावत् स शब्दो भवति तावत् स्वर्गे महीयते ॥१९९.१३॥<sup>5</sup>

Bhāmaha gives prime importance to the proper use of a language in poetic composition -

शब्दश्छन्दोऽभिधानार्थ इतिहासाश्रयाः कथाः ।

लोको युक्तिः कलाश्चेति मन्तव्याः काव्यगैर्ह्यमी ॥१.९॥<sup>6</sup>

Ācārya Daṇḍi also announces that one should not make a single mistake in any composition which spoils the beauty of the entire work like a spot of lapracy spoils the beauty of the entire body.

<sup>3</sup> Pāṇini, *Pāṇinīśikṣā*, p.48.

<sup>4</sup> Bhartṛhari, *op cit*, p.50

<sup>5</sup> Vyāsa, *Māhābhārata*, *Vanaparva* 199.13. p. 576

<sup>6</sup> Mammaṭa, *KP*, p.9

S.K. Belvalkar brings to light the objective of grammar that was in the inceptions of the system,

“It was deemed necessary to preserve intact from generation to generation the inherited stock of Vedic poetry, attention came naturally to be focused upon the peculiarities of that forms of the language and this was the beginning of the grammar proper.”<sup>7</sup>

Moreover, a popular verse from unknown source presents the importance of studying grammar in a very humorous way –

यद्यपि बहु नाधीषे तथापि पठ पुत्र व्याकरणम् ।

स्वजनः श्वजनो मा भूत्सकलं शकलं सकृत्छकृत्॥

Sanskrit grammar fortunately is very systematic, scientific and it also solves all the communicative purposes. The term grammar with respect to Sanskrit grammar is not confined to any one branch of knowledge. It is taken in a broad sense which includes phonetics, linguistics, philosophy, morphology, semantics, syntax, etc. All these branches of grammar appear as if inter-woven with each other since the time of the Vedas.

### **I.1. Some Aspects of the Prepāṇinian Grammatical Philosophy**

It is hard to tress out the exact time when grammatical speculations came into existence and they were systematized. The development of different methods and literature on grammar can be assumed from the study of the available literature of Vedas and other sources. Here literature from Vedas means *Samhitās* and their *Padapāṭha*, *Brāhamaṇas*, *Prātiśākhya*s and other sources means *Nirukta*, *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *Mahābhāṣyam*, *Vākyapadīyam*,

---

<sup>7</sup> Belvalkar, S.K., *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, p.3.

*Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasārsah*, etc. The available data strongly indicate that more weightage has been given to the study of grammar since the Vedic era or rather it was considered to be a pre-requisite for learning the Vedas. Grammar was studied as a helping guide for penetrating into the structure of the Vedic texts; as it is stated by Patañjali -

“ब्राह्मणेन निष्कारणो धर्मः षडङ्गो वेदो ऽध्येयो ज्ञेयश्च इति ।  
प्रधानं च षट्स्वङ्गेषु व्याकरणम् । प्रधाने च कृतो यत्नः फलवान्  
भवति ।”<sup>8</sup>

He further enumerates the importance of grammar for the study of the Vedic words -

“पुराकल्प एतदासीत् – संस्कारोत्तरकालं ब्राह्मणा व्याकरणं  
स्माधीयते । तेभ्यस्तत्तत्स्थानकरणनादानुप्रदानज्ञेभ्यो वैदिकाः  
शब्दा उपदिश्यन्ते ।”<sup>9</sup>

It means that Brahmin student, as a rule, used to take up grammar first for his study as an essential step towards the study of the Vedic words i.e. *Vedas*.

It is generally believed that the philosophical tenets on Grammar are developed in the post Pāṇinian era especially by Patañjali and Bhartṛhari. But a keen study of the Vedic and post Vedic grammatical treatises makes it clear that the philosophical discussions on topics of grammatical speculations are instituted in the *R̥gveda* itself. Many references are found in the *Vedas* which advocate the hypothesis that Vedic scholars too, have worked on the topic of the philosophy

---

<sup>8</sup> Patañjali, *MB*, p. 10.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p. 26.

of grammar. There are some *mantras* and passages which present the glimpse of early philosophy of grammatical speculations -

चत्वारि शृङ्गा त्रयोऽस्य पादाः द्वे शीर्षे सप्तहस्तासो अस्य ।

त्रिधा बद्धो वृषभो रोरवीति महो देवो मर्त्या आ विवेशा॥

“Four are his horns; three are his feet; his heads are two, his hands are seven: the triple-bound shower (of benefits) roars aloud: the mighty deity has entered amongst men.”<sup>10</sup>

चत्वारि वाक् परिमिता पदानि तानि विदुर्ब्राह्मणा ये मनीषिणः ।

गुहा त्रीणि निहिता नेङ्गयन्ति तुरीयं वाचो मनुष्या वदन्ति॥<sup>11</sup>

“Four are the definite grades of speech: those *Brahmanas* who are wise know them: three, deposited in secret, indicate no meaning: men speak the fourth grade of speech.”<sup>12</sup>

उत त्वः पश्यन्न ददर्श वाचमुत त्वः शृण्वन्न शृणोत्येनाम् ।

उतो त्वस्मै तन्वं वि सस्त्रे जायेव पत्य उशती सुवासाः॥

“One (man) indeed seeing Speech has not seen her; another (man) hearing her has not hear her; but to another she delivers her person as a loving wife well-attracted presents herself to her husband”<sup>13</sup>

Patañjali explains:

चत्वारि शृङ्गाणि । चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपाताश्च ।

त्रयोऽस्य पादाः । त्रयः काला भूतभविष्यद्वर्तमानाः । द्वे शीर्षे । द्वौ

<sup>10</sup> RV. IV. 5.13.3, p. 324

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, I.22.8.45, p. 105

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p. 112

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, X. 6.3.4, p, 242

शब्दात्मानौ नित्यः कार्यश्च । सप्त हस्तासो अस्य । सप्त विभक्तयः । त्रिधा  
बद्धः । त्रिषु स्थानेषु बद्ध उरसि कण्ठे शिरसीति । वृषभो वर्षणात् ।  
रोरवीति शब्दं करोति ।<sup>14</sup>

Here we find the mention of fourfold classification of the word, tenses, two, varieties of a word, seven cases, the places of pronunciation and four divisions of speech. The *mantras* of the *RV* present the threefold aspects of grammar viz. 1) operational part in the classification of word, cases and tense; 2) philosophical aspect in categorizing the word into eternal (*Nitya*) and operational (*Kārya*), the four varieties of Speech, etc.; and 3) linguistic in mentioning the places of pronunciation. Thus, it is evident that the problem concerning the structure and the philosophy of grammar were dealt by Vedic seers.

Some references are found in the *Taitirīyā Samhitā* like –

“स वाच स सृष्टां यजमान ईश्वरोऽनु पराभवतोर्विभक्तयो भवन्ति वाचो  
विधृत्यै यजमानस्यापराभावाय... सप्त जिह्वा”<sup>15</sup>

The *mantra* talks about the twofold division of speech i.e. *Parā* and *Aparā*; the seven varieties of tongue must be in the sense of seven cases.

While discussing philosophy of language, *Yoshiyuki Iwasaki* comments -

“Besides the scientific analysis and systematization of the language, represented by Pāṇini’s Grammar, there was another trend of thought in the ancient Indian tradition towards speculations on the language, in general and its nature. We find the word (*Vāk*) adorned as a deity in the *R̥gveda* and observe mystical contemplation of the word in the *Brāhamaṇa* literature and numerous *Volksetymologien* in the *Upaniṣads*

<sup>14</sup> Patañjali, *op cit*, p.18

<sup>15</sup> *Taitirīyā Samhitā*, pp.601-602.

with the attempt to reach to the nature of the object denoted by the word.”<sup>16</sup>

The method of *Pada-pāṭha*<sup>17</sup> arrangement of the *Samhitās* of the Vedas seems to be the very first step towards the study of stem and suffix. When people might have faced problems regarding the original form and accent of the word, they had thought to develop some new method for the proper understanding of a word. So, they started segregating each and every word of the *Samhitā*. This method became known as *Pada-pāṭha*. The word *Samhitā* itself suggests ‘a collection or combination’. Therefore, *Pada-pāṭha* is the method in which words of *Samhitā* are presented in their original forms and accents. In the *Pada-pāṭha*, we find the disjoining of *Sandhi*, *Samāsa*, Prefix, etc. It is also interesting to note here that in the Vedic texts, the prefix and the verb are not put together all the time. We may find the prefix in the beginning of the line and the verb at the end. Hence, the method of *Pada-pāṭha* is helpful in case of the conjugated prefix and verb. Gradually some other methods of *Pāṭhas* like *Jatā*, *Mālā*, *Śikhā*, etc<sup>18</sup> are developed. These eight methods of *Pāṭha* are known as *Vikṛtis*. It is generally believed that this technique of different *Pāṭhas* is coined for the protection of the Vedas. But, this belief doesn’t seem true completely. The Vedic scholars had more concern about the proper pronunciation of a word with the appropriate accent rather than for the protection of the text. That is why *Pada-pāṭha*, even though being secondary to the *Samhitās*, has given equal importance like *Samhitās*.

V.N. Jha remarks:

“the analysis received that the concept *Pada* in the designation *Pada -pāṭha* is a grammatical concept. When it was compared

---

<sup>16</sup> Yoshiyuki Iwasaki, *Pāṇini to Patañjali*, p. 101

<sup>17</sup> The credit of the arrangements of the *Pada-pāṭha* is ascribed to Śakaṭāyaṇa.

<sup>18</sup> जटा माला शिखा रेखा ध्वजो दण्डो रथो घनः । अष्टौ विकृतयः प्रोक्ता वेदरक्षाप्रयोजनात् ॥ Śaunaka, *Caranvyūha-sūtras*, p. 40

with that of Pāṇini it was discovered that Śākalya represents Pre-Pāṇini stage of this concept.”<sup>19</sup>

He further remarks about the use of *Daṇḍa* as well as *Avagraha* in the *Pada-pāṭha* and why the name *Pada-pāṭha* is ascribed to these texts:

“We are tempted to say that the entire analysis of the *Pdk* (*Padakāra*) is based on the concept of the term *Pada*. Wherever, there is a *Daṇḍa* or an *Avagraha* the portion preceding the *Daṇḍa* or the *Avagraha* is a *Pada* according to the *Pdk*. This explains why Śākaṭāyana’s text is called a *Pada*-text.”<sup>20</sup>

After the segregation of a word into stem and suffix, Vedic scholars started interpreting and explaining the word. Such interpretation or explanation gave rise to the texts like *Brāhmaṇa*. The word *Brāhmaṇa* suggests interpretation or collection of the *Brāhmaṇas* i.e. *Mantras*. - ब्रह्मणां वेदानामिमानी व्याख्यानानि ब्राह्मणानि ॥<sup>21</sup>

Rameśa Lowe remarks:

“The references of ‘*Brāhmaṇam*’ clearly indicate that the term signified a comment, discourse or explanation concerning a ritual or a *mantra* and not a particular text. In the *Kau.B.* (*Kauśitakī Brāhmaṇa*) often and in the *Ait.B.* (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*) in a few cases, the phrase ‘तस्योक्तं ब्राह्मणम्’ or ‘इति ब्राह्मणमुदाहरन्ति’ is used. The term here denotes only an explanation.”<sup>22</sup>

In this context, the view of Martin Haug is worth quoting-

---

<sup>19</sup> Jhā, V.N., *Studies in the Padapāṭhas and Vedic Philology*, p. 1.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, P. 18

<sup>21</sup> Lowe, Rameśa Kumāra, *The language of the Taittirīyā Brāhmaṇa*, p. 1

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, p. 2

“The word *Brāhmaṇa* is derived from the root *Brih* means to raise or to grow. By *Brāhmaṇa* we have always to understand that part of the Veda (*Brāhmaṇical* revelation) which contains speculations on the meaning of the *mantras*, gives precepts for their replication, relates stories of their origin in connection with that of sacrificial rite and explain the secret meaning of the latter.<sup>23</sup>”

In the *Brāhmaṇa* literature we find the real beginning of the grammar whereas we notice some etymological explanation such as – *Yadarodīt Tadrudrasya Rudratvam*.<sup>24</sup> In the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* we find reference of some popular grammatical terms. Such as -

“ओंकारं पृच्छामः को धातुः किं प्रातिपदिकं किं नामाख्यातं किं लिङ्गं किं वचनं का विभक्तिः कः प्रत्ययः कः स्वर उपसर्गो निपातः किं वै व्याकरणं को विकारः को विकारी कतिमात्रः कतिवर्णः कत्यक्षरः कतिपदः कः संयोगः किं स्थानानुप्रदानकरणं..।”<sup>25</sup>

“को धातुरित्यापृर्धातुरवतिमप्येकेरूपसामान्यादर्थसामान्य-  
न्नेदीयस्तस्मादा-पेरोङ्कारः सर्वमाप्नोतीत्यर्थः कृदन्तमर्थवत्  
प्रातिपदिकमदर्शनं प्रत्ययस्य नाम सम्पद्यते निपातेषु चैनं  
वैयाकरणा उदात्तं समामनन्ति तदव्ययीभूतमन्वर्थवाची शब्दो न  
व्येति कदाचनेति ।...”<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> *Taitirīya Brāhmaṇam of the R̥gveda*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>24</sup> Chakravarti, P.C., *The philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 21.

<sup>25</sup> *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.24, p. 12

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, 1.26 p. 12-13

A passage from the same text defines Indeclinable in the following manner -

सदृशं त्रिषु लिङ्गेषु सर्वाषु च विभक्तिषु ।

वचनेषु च सर्वेषु यन्न व्येति तदव्ययम् ॥<sup>27</sup>

All the above citations lead to the following conclusions:

- The terms like root, verb, crude form, indeclinable, etc. have been explained for the first time during period of *Brahmanas*.
- It is the beginning of the writing of the *Vyākhyā* or gloss<sup>28</sup>.
- This represents a kind of philosophical discussion on the different elements (i.e. stem and suffix) of the word.

The *Prātiśākhya*s were primarily written to show the euphonic and other changes that the words undergo in the *Samhitā* form. The *Prātiśākhya* works are not aimed to give the sense of words, or with their division into stem and suffix, or their etymology, or their explanation. They contain more or less, Vedic passages arranged from the point of view of *Sandhi*<sup>29</sup>. According to some scholars, the *Prātiśākhya*s are said to be composed after the composition of *Nirukta* and before *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The time of the *Prātiśākhya*s is 700 to 500 BC<sup>30</sup>. But the view of S.K. Belvallar is different. He placed *Prātiśākhya*s prior to *Nirukta*<sup>31</sup>. The oldest specimens of the *Prātiśākhya*s are beyond the reach, and most of the existing treatises are of modern origin, some of them being even posterior to Pāṇini. The view of A.A. MacDonell on this –

“The *Prātiśākhya*s demonstrate that the phonetics character was also the same... Probably soon after the completion of the actual

---

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>28</sup> पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिः विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना । पूर्वपक्षसमाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम् ॥

<sup>29</sup> Abhayaṅkara, K.V. & Śukla, J.M., *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 276.

<sup>30</sup> *Śuklayajurveda-Prātiśākhya*, p.7

<sup>31</sup> Belvalkar, S.K., *op cit*, pp. 4-5.

*Brāhamaṇas* the hymns of *Ṛgveda* were fixed in the phonetic form of the *Samhitā* text; and after no long interval, in order to guard that text from the possibility of any change or loss, the *Pada* text was constituted by Śākalya, whom the *Āraṇyakas* or appendixes to the *Brāhamaṇas*, the *Nirukta* and the *Ṛk-Prātiśākhya* presuppose. By this analysis of the *Samhitā* text, its every word, stated in a separate form as unaffected by the rules of euphonic combinations... ”

Why the *Prātiśākhyas* came into existence, is nicely explained by Virendra Kumar Verma -

“जब लोक-भाषा का विकास हुआ तो संहितात्मक वैदिक मन्त्रों की भाषा से आर्यजन अपरिचित होने लगे । ऐसी परिस्थिति में वर्ण, स्वर, मात्रा, संधि, छन्दः आदि के विशिष्ट नियमों के अभाव में वैदिक मन्त्रों का शुद्ध उच्चारण दुरूह-सा हो गया ।...सभी वैदिक मन्त्रों के शुद्ध उच्चारण के लिये वेद की प्रत्येक शाखा का ध्वनि-विषयक अध्ययन सम्पन्न हुआ । एक-एक शाखा से सम्बद्ध होने के कारण ही ये ग्रन्थ ‘प्रातिशाख्य’ कहलाते हैं ।”<sup>32</sup>

He further argues:

“...उदात्त आदि स्वरों, वर्णों के उच्चारण के गुणों और दोषों, वर्णों की उत्पत्ति, पद-पाठ बनाने के नियमों आदि अनेक महत्त्वपूर्ण विषयों का सुसम्बद्ध विवरण इन प्रातिशाख्यों में प्रस्तुत किया गया है । वैदिक मन्त्रों के अर्थ-ज्ञान के लिये जिस प्रकार निरुक्त- ग्रन्थ उपयोगी है उसी प्रकार मन्त्रों के बाह्य स्वरूप के ज्ञान के लिए प्रातिशाख्य-ग्रन्थ उपयोगी हैं ।”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya of Śayanka along with Uvvaṭṭabhāṣya*, Introduction, p. 13

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid*

He very nicely explicates the significance of *Prātiśākhya*s which deserves to be quoted here -

“शिक्षा-ग्रन्थ, व्याकरण-ग्रन्थ और छन्दोग्रन्थ सभी वेदों के विषय में सामान्य बातें बतलाते हैं; उनका वेद की किसी विशेष शाखा के साथ होने के कारण प्रत्येक प्रातिशाख्य शाखा-विशेष का ऊहापोह करके उसका विशिष्ट एवं साङ्गोपाङ्ग अध्ययन प्रस्तुत करता है। ... जिन्हें शिक्षा-ग्रन्थों, व्याकरण-ग्रन्थों और छन्दोग्रन्थों में स्थान नहीं मिला है।”<sup>34</sup>

R.C. Pāṇḍeya remarks:

“They (*Prātiśākhya*s) give etymological derivations of words and also a brief statement of phonetic laws. They have carried out the task of the *Brāhamaṇas* successfully and must have initiated the necessity for writing a complete grammar of the Sanskrit and the Vedic languages. The *R̥k-Prātiśākhya*s begin its enquiry by saying that a sentence is composed of parts (*Pada-prakṛti-samhitā*).”<sup>35</sup>

The above discussion leads to the conclusion that the main aim of the *Prātiśākhya*s was to systematize the rules of accent of particular Veda by presenting some rules of euphonic combinations. It may be because at the time of *Prātiśākhya*s, Vedic scholars had to deal with the problem of various recitations of accents. Thus, they thought to bring uniformity in the accents by providing texts called *Prātiśākhya*s.

Yāska's *Nirukta* (9<sup>th</sup> century BC) is a commentary on the list of Vedic words popularly known as *Nighaṇṭu*. Here we find the list of synonyms of the Vedic words in first three chapters. Another list of the difficult words is also given

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>35</sup> Pāṇḍeya, R.C., *The Problems of Meaning in Indian Philosophy*, p.11

separately in the *Nirukta*. It is noteworthy that such type of collection of words with all possible synonyms was the first attempt of its kind.

Rudolph Roth observes:

“This might be quoted as the evidence of the commentator on the *Nirukta* who at the very beginning of the *Nirukta* says that the collection of *Nighaṇṭu* which Yāska calls *Samāmnāya*, *Enumeration*, had been prepared by the ancient sacred teachers, by Ṛsis, for the better understanding of the vedic hymns.”<sup>36</sup>

Further, he states about the *Nighaṇṭavas*. How the roots, nouns and other words are dealt with in this book is also clarified by him:

“In addition to the Vedas ... have composed also *this book* (*Nighaṇṭavas*) in which are enumerated the roots for an action, the nouns for expressing an idea, likewise words which have several significations and finally the names of the Gods”<sup>37</sup>

*Nirukta* also presents the study of Sanskrit from a philological perspective. It deals with the branch of cognate science and discusses some problems of semantics. It is believed that the study on the science of meaning is comparatively modern and its methods are developed by western philological researches; but it seems that such kind of study was already developed into a scientific branch by ancient etymologists of India. The antecedence ideas regarding nature of words<sup>38</sup>, the relation between the sign and the object signified, the eternal<sup>39</sup> connection between *Śabda* and *Artha*, the derivability of

---

<sup>36</sup> Roth, Rudolph, *Introduction to the Nirukta and the Literature related to it*, p.4

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*, p.4

<sup>38</sup> सर्वो हि शब्दोऽर्थप्रत्ययार्थं प्रयुज्यते ॥ तन्त्रवार्तिक under 1.3.8. and अर्थगत्यर्थः शब्दप्रयोगः। अर्थसम्प्रत्याययिष्यामीति शब्दः प्रयुज्यते । Patañjali, *op cit*, p. 15

<sup>39</sup> औत्पत्तिकस्तु शब्दार्थेन सम्बन्धः। MS, 1.1.5 तथा सिद्धे शब्दार्थसम्बन्धः । तथा नित्यो ह्यर्थवतामर्थैरभिसम्बन्धः । Patañjali, *op cit*, p. 7

words<sup>40</sup> from verbal roots, the method of naming objects, the origin of certain words (as *Kaka*, *Kokila*, *dundubhi*, etc.) from an imitation of natural sound<sup>41</sup>, and the way words change their meanings (as *Kavi*, *Mṛga*, *Kuśala*, *Praviṇa*, etc.) have been scientifically dealt with by Yāska who has classified the word into four types such as -

चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपाताः ।<sup>42</sup>

In the *Nirukta*, Yāska has also discussed the controversy on *Khaṇḍa* and *Akhaṇḍa* (i.e. divisibility vs. completeness) variety of a word. The view of Audumbarāyaṇa is examined here who states that the words do not exist in reality. Sounds are *temporal*. They become audible for some time and then they destroyed. Sounds and words are objects of senses, and are subject to origin and destruction –

इन्द्रियनित्यं वचनमौदुम्बरायणः।<sup>43</sup>... अयुगपदुत्पन्नानां वा  
शब्दानामितरेतरोपदेशः ।<sup>44</sup>

The other view is - the form of the word in a sentence changes when coalescence takes place between the words. Words that constitute an utterance cannot be separately identified. Thus, there are two views. Firstly, words are real and combination of the words forms a sentence; secondly, *Samhitā* is real and words are inferred realities.

R.C. Pāṇḍeya holds the view –

---

<sup>40</sup> नामान्याख्यातजानीति शाकटायनो नैरुक्तसमयश्च । Yāska, *Nirukta with the commentary of Skandasvāmin and Maheśvara*, p. 33

<sup>41</sup> काक इति शब्दानुकृतिस्तदिदं शकुनिषु बहुलम् *ibid*, p. 149

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*, p. 3

<sup>43</sup> Śrīskandasvāmimaheśvara, *Nirukta-bhāṣya-ṭīkā*, p. 1

<sup>44</sup> *ibid*, p. 6

“If we include the *Prātiśākhya*s and the *Nirukta* in the Vedic literature we can safely say that at the end of the Vedic period metaphysical and syntactical problems of language have been fully stated. The school of Indian philosophy has developed their views on the basis of these problems.”<sup>45</sup>

Yāska’s science of exposition proceeds on the assumption that words are meaningful linguistic units. He takes the fully inflected form (*Pada*), separates the *Vibhakti* from the word and then demonstrates the derivation of the word on the basis of its meaning from the verb-root. It is clear that Yāska maintains a distinction between *Śabda* and *Pada*. *Śabda* is the basic word (base) without any affix, derivational or inflectional; while the *Pada* is derivational affix for forming a noun. Thus, in the second chapter while distinguishing *Pada* and *Śabda*, Yāska gives this definition “that meaning unit of language which is used in the world to refer to objects and which is manifested by uttered sound is *Śabda*”.

तद्येषु पदेषु स्वर-संस्कारौ समर्थौ प्रादेशिकेन गुणेनान्वितौ स्यातां तथा  
तानि निर्ब्रूयात् ।<sup>46</sup>

All these information suggest that Yāska has accumulated the changes that Sanskrit language had undergone during later Vedic period. He had shown the change in the form and meaning of word, some new concept of interpretation of a word and the diversified views of earlier philologists on words. He had tried to redefine some terms which were already dealt by *Brāhmaṇas*. It might be because the concepts of noun, verb, etc. had become ambiguous; or people might have some confusion regarding the use of the Vedic words.

---

<sup>45</sup> Pāṇḍeya, R.C. *op cit*, p.12

<sup>46</sup> Śrīskandasvāmimaheśvara, *op cit*, p. 58

## I.2. Pāṇinian Grammatical Philosophy

Pāṇini's AA (7<sup>th</sup> century BC) is the most valuable record from the grammatical and historical point of view. After Pāṇini many other schools of grammar came into existence and gave rise to a vast literature, but the work of Pāṇini is almost without a parallel. The system of grammar founded by Pāṇini was studied with uncommon zeal, like a *Vedāṅga*. The *Vārtikas* of Kātyāyaṇa and commentary of Patañjali shaped it as a complete work and elevated it to the unsurpassed position. It covers all the aspects of grammar which were discussed in the earlier literature and opens new avenues for the successors.

It seems that Pāṇini was more concerned about the form of language than its meaning. He has thoroughly examined the parts of speech and etymological derivations of words. He always tried to explain the spoken language of his time by providing a scientific explanation of words.

R.C. Pāṇḍeya remarks on Pāṇini's work:

“We hardly find any discussion on the question of eternity of words. He was concerned with speech and its parts...His inquiry was limited only to those problems which were dealt with in the *Prātiśākhya*s and the *Nirukta*. He has his metaphysical presuppositions and a definite attitude to all those problems which were first set out in the Upaniṣads.”<sup>47</sup>

This remark of the R.C. Pāṇḍeya doesn't seem true completely. It is a fact that Pāṇini's grammar is meant for *Pada-siddhi*. But at the same time it cannot be denied that Pāṇini's grammar does not have any relation with the philosophy of grammar. It is because of two reasons 1) the entire MB which initiated the systemization of the philosophy of Grammar, is based on the AA of Pāṇini 2)

---

<sup>47</sup> Pāṇḍeya, R.C., *op cit*, p.16

there are some aphorisms of AA which throw light on the philosophical thoughts -

- स्वं रूपं शब्दस्याशब्दसंज्ञा ॥१.१.६८॥
- सरूपाणामेकेषो एकविभक्तौ ॥१.२.४३॥
- अर्थवदधातुरप्रत्ययः प्रातिपदिकम् ॥१.२.४५॥
- तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात् ॥१.२.५३॥
- कालोपसर्जने च तुल्यम् ॥१.२.५७॥
- जात्याख्यायामेकस्मिन् बहुवचनमन्यतरस्याम् ॥१.२.५८॥
- कारके ॥१.४.२३॥
- ध्रुवमपायेऽपादानम् ॥१.४.२४॥
- स्वतन्त्रः कर्ता ॥१.४.५४॥
- चादयोऽसत्त्वे ॥१.४.५७॥
- प्रातिपदिकार्थवचनलिङ्गमात्रे प्रथमा ॥२.३.४६॥
- शब्दवैरकलहाभ्रकण्वमेघेभ्यः करणे ॥३.१.१७॥
- कर्मणि च येन संस्पर्शात् कर्तुःशरीरसुखात् ॥३.३.११६॥
- समुच्चये सामान्यवचनस्य ॥३.४.५॥
- लः कर्मणि च भावे चाकर्मकेभ्यः ॥३.४.६९॥
- तस्य भावस्त्वतलौ ॥५.१.११९॥
- वचोऽशब्दसंज्ञायाम् ॥७.३.६७॥
- प्रकारे गुणवचनस्य ॥८.१.१२॥

It is also noteworthy that Pāṇini in his AA uses the word *Śabda* only once in 1.3.34 (वेः शब्द-कर्मणः।). Here this word is used in the sense of sound. It is true that entire AA is not a text on the grammatical philosophy as the VP, but nobody can ignore AA when we have discussion on the philosophy of grammar.

It is important to note here the observation of Suryakant Bālī on the post-Pāṇinian grammarians;

“Between Pāṇini and Patañjali, we have three grammarians, viz.. Sphoṭayana, Audumbarayana and Vyāḍi, who are said to have written on this topic (i.e. Philosophy of grammar). Of them first is believed to be the expounder of the time-honoured theory of *Sphoṭa*, but no regular record of his work is now available. The position of the other two grammarians, too, is no better, because we have only stray reference to the sometime existence of their works. On this basis, it is assumed that they, too, had written something upon the theory of *Sphoṭa*.”<sup>48</sup>

As stated in the earlier passage, *Samgraha* of Vyāḍi (5<sup>th</sup> BC) is another valuable work which is highly appreciated in the history of Sanskrit grammar. It is believed that Vyāḍi has written a very huge work on the Sanskrit grammar. Not only Patañjali but Bhartṛhari has also quoted him on several occasions.

संग्रहोऽप्यस्यैव शास्त्रस्यैकदेशः । तत्रैकतन्त्रत्वाद् व्याडेश्च  
प्रामाण्यादिहापि सिद्धशब्द उपात्तः ।<sup>49</sup>

शौभना खलु दाक्षायणस्य संग्रहस्य कृतिः ॥ २.३.६६ ॥<sup>50</sup>

प्रायेण संक्षेपरुचीनल्पविद्यापरिग्रहान् ।

संप्राप्य वैयाकरणान्संग्रहेस्तमुपागते ॥ २.४८४ ॥<sup>51</sup>

वैजिसौभवहर्षक्षैः शुष्कतर्कानुसारिभिः ।

<sup>48</sup> Bālī, Sūryakānta, *Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: His Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar*, pp. 39-40.

<sup>49</sup> Patañjali, *op cit*, p. 21

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid*, p. 32

<sup>51</sup> Bhartṛhari, *op cit*, p. 189

आर्षे विप्लाविते ग्रन्थे संग्रहप्रतिकञ्चुके॥२.४८४॥<sup>52</sup>

It is generally believed that *Samgraha* dealt with some philosophical problems like *Nitya* and *Anitya* varieties of word, *Prākṛtadhvani*, *Vaikṛtadhvani*, *Varṇa*, *Pada*, *Vākya*, *Arhta*, *Upasarga*, *Nipāta* etc. But unfortunately this seminal work is lost to posterity.

### I.3. Post Pāṇinian Grammatical Philosophy

Patañjali is the second name after Pāṇini. His work MB is still regarded as the highest authority on all problems of grammar. He has changed the entire vision to look at the grammar. He initiated the systematic contemplation on the philosophical part of the grammar. According to P.C. Chakravarti –

“He (Patañjali) proceeded on a new line with the consequence that grammar received a far more scientific treatment in his hands and ultimately came to be regarded as a particular system of philosophy... There is indication in the first ‘*Āhnika*’ of the *Mahābhāṣyam* that grammar was not only a heterogeneous combination of *sūtras* with Pāṇini, but it was treated by him as a regular science.<sup>53</sup>”

C. Kunhan Raja opines that MB is work which incorporates discussion on the nature of the word and sentence. He further remarks that the writing style of Patañjali is very precise, clear and unambiguous. His view is -

“It (MB) is monumental work of great literary importance. In point of style he continues the prose style of the *Brāhmaṇas* and of the *Nirukta* of Yāska. But he has perfected it... the book

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid*, p. 190

<sup>53</sup> Chakravarti, P.C., *op cit*, p. 30.

takes the form of a discourse conducted for an assembly of attentive listeners by a great scholar.”<sup>54</sup>

Patañjali<sup>55</sup> has expressly stated that a significant word is permanently related to its meaning. The relation of a word with its meanings is called *Nitya* in the sense which is found to be current in popular usage from eternal time<sup>56</sup>. This relation is grammatically known as *Śakti*<sup>57</sup> or may be viewed as one of identities; a word is *Śakti* (i.e. capable of denoting the sense) and the meaning is *Śakya* and the relation between them is called *Yogyatā*.

Banamāli Biswāla remarks –

“In the light of *Mahābhāṣya*, it can be said that Patañjali’s observation towards the science of grammar is developed into three different branches: i) *Śabdāsiddhi* ‘formation of words’, ii) *Arthaniryana* ‘determination of meaning’ and iii) *Śabdārthasambandha* ‘the relation between the word and its sense’.”<sup>58</sup>

Unlike Pāṇini, Patañjali begins his work with the word *Śabda* (*Atha Śabdānuśāsanam*). He gives the example of words of both Vedic and worldly. He explains *Śabda* by giving the example of cow, “that which when manifested in articulated sounds brings to the hearer’s mind the cognition of cow-individuals characterized by the attributes such as dewlap, tail, hump, hooves and horns, etc.”<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Kunhan, Raja K., *Survey of Sanskrit Literature*, P. 247

<sup>55</sup> नित्यो ह्यर्थवतामर्थैरभिसम्बन्धः । Patañjali, *op cit*, p.7

<sup>56</sup> सम्बन्धस्यापि व्यवहारपरम्परयानादित्वान्नित्यता । Kaiyaṭa on MB, *Mahābhāṣya-pradīpa*, p. 34

<sup>57</sup> शब्दार्थयोः सम्बन्धश्च शक्तिरूपं तादात्म्यमेवेति । Annambhaṭṭa, *Tarkasaṁgrahaḥ with Dīpikā commentary*, p.47

<sup>58</sup> Biswāla, Banamāli, *Patañjali*, p. 73

<sup>59</sup> Patañjali, *op cit*, p. 4

Patañjali has accepted both *Sphoṭa* and *Dhvani* as two different entities. He accepts *Sphoṭa* as *Śabda* and *Dhvani* as *Śabdaguṇa*; *Dhvani* or sound is said to be the indicator of *Sphoṭa*, the eternal sound.

स्फोटः शब्दो ध्वनिः शब्दगुणः ।<sup>60</sup>

Banamāli Biswāla opines -

“*Sphoṭa* refers to such a word which communicates the meaning to the hearer as different *dhvani* or sound in ordinary expression. On the light of MB (*Mahābhāṣyam*), Kaiyaṭa presents three features of *Sphoṭa*-theory: i) it is over and above the phonetics, ii) it is manifested through *Nāda* and iii) it is *Vācaka*.”<sup>61</sup>

After Patañjali, Bhartrhari is adorned with great respect as a philosopher-grammarians. His work VP is based on the MB of Patañjali. His work VP entirely deals with the philosophical aspect of Grammar. It is the first attempt of its kind. No other work in the history of Sanskrit is available prior to VP which discusses the problems with such enthusiasm and keenness. He entirely changed the perspective of the study of grammar. From his time study of grammar is taken as an instrument for achieving the emancipation<sup>62</sup>. The concept of *Śabdabrahma* and *Nādabrahma* is fundamentally propagated by him. He established grammar as a distinguished system of philosophy.

अनादिनिधनं ब्रह्म शब्दतत्त्वं यदक्षरम् ।

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid*, p. 18

<sup>61</sup> Biswāla, Banamāli, *op cit*, p.78.

<sup>62</sup> तद्वारमपवर्गस्य वाङ्मलानां चिकित्सितम् । पवित्रं सर्वविद्यानामधिविद्यं प्रकाशते  
Bhartrhari, *op cit*, p.8

विवर्ततेऽर्थभावेन प्रक्रिया जगतो यतः ॥ १.१ ॥<sup>63</sup>

यदेकं प्रक्रियाभेदैर्बहुधा प्रविभज्यते ।

तद्वाकरणमागम्य परं ब्रह्माधिगम्यते ॥ १.२२ ॥<sup>64</sup>

Yoshiyuki Iwasaki comments:

“Having the Vedantic monism and the Pāṇinian grammar as his metaphysical and linguistic background, respectively, he deals with metaphysical, ontological and epistemological issues under the influence of the various philosophical schools.”<sup>65</sup>

Bharṭṛhari says that words that we speak are momentary and they cannot be the bearer of meaning. They are only manifestations of a real language which is the true bearer of meaning. This language is the highest reality and the whole world of words and objects is a manifestation of this Absolute Word. Our speech imperfectly imitates this. A sentence is more real than the word and the sentence does not have parts; words and sentence are not distinct. The division of words, sentence and letters are for our convenience; it is not real. Speech is one whole without parts.

He says that the real meaning of words is neither the particular nor the universe; it is Pure Existence. Our language means the Absolute Existence which he calls *Brahman*. Words as bearers of meaning (and not those words that we speak) are eternal and they are eternally and inseparably related to the Absolute Existence. He says that the relation between words and objects is not created. It is natural. Words by their very nature refer to objects. ‘No knowledge is possible without words; all knowledge is in the form of language’.

---

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid*, p. 1

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid*, p. 9

<sup>65</sup> Iwasaki, Yoshiyuki, *op cit*, pp. 101-102

न सोऽस्ति प्रत्ययो लोके यः शब्दानुगमादृते ।

अनुविद्धमिव ज्ञानं सर्वं शब्देन भासते ॥ १.१३१ ॥<sup>66</sup>

Thus, Absolute Existence itself manifests in the form of words and their meaning. There is no difference between them, Brahman Himself is the word and the realization of the Absolute is the highest aim of the human soul. The science of meaning and language is a most easy path to reach the Absolute.

इदमाद्यं पदस्थानं सिद्धिसोपानपर्वणाम् ।

इयं सा मोक्षमाणानामजिह्वा राजपद्धतिः ॥ १.१६ ॥<sup>67</sup>

The supreme importance of *Śabdaśāstra* lies in the fact that it deals with words whereby we think, know and express our thoughts to others. Every word is a symbol of intelligence. Puṇyarāja particularly points out that the use of words (*Śabda-bhāvanā*) acts as an important factor in the manifestation of qualified knowledge (*Savikalpakajñāna*) –

सा हि वागूपता प्रत्यवमर्शः सविकल्पकज्ञानं तत्सम्पादिकेत्यर्थः<sup>68</sup>

Bhartṛhari has accepted both *Khaṇḍa* and *Akhaṇḍa* views. He gave many examples. When a mother says his child – “*see the food is not eaten by the crows*” the word crow is used to mean both animal and birds. Another example is – “*the sun is set*” this sentence can be interpreted in various ways depending upon the intention of the speaker. It can be meant “it is time to worship” for an ascetic; “it is time to make love” for a lover; “it is time to go out to steal” for a thief.

---

<sup>66</sup> Bhartṛhari, *op cit*, p.50

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid*, p. 8

<sup>68</sup> Puṇyarāja on *VP* 1.125, p. 56

The sentence is the primary entity of meaning in communication and that words are real in the sense that they have a primary denotation became a basic assumption of the tradition of grammar. The second issue is the nature of words. There are three standpoints reported and discussed by Bhartṛhari in VP (I.107). The Mīmāṃsakas believe that when a speaker has a desire to communicate something, his effort produces vibrations in his breath and it is breath that moves up and strikes against palate, the teeth and the lips becomes audible as sound. He further reports – “atoms in which powers of conjunction and division reside have the power to produce effects, a power which through division manifests as shade and light and which through conjunction becomes *Śabda*”.<sup>69</sup> The opinion of Patañjali is – the knowing self (Antaratma) itself is presented as the potentiality of words to denote the sense. The knowledge existing in the self, in order to express itself, takes the form of words<sup>70</sup>.

It is interesting to note the observation of P.C. Chakravarti on the purpose of study of grammar. They are –

1. The fundamental basis of grammar is not purely artificial but appears to be more or less natural. A careful study of the *Paribhāṣās* and of the rules of euphonic combinations makes it abundantly clear that the principles of grammar have close affinity with popular axioms and laws of nature. How grammar is related to popular usage is best shown by Patañjali in his elaborate expression of the rules of grammar<sup>71</sup>. The aim of grammar was not to coin new words and expressions for use, but takes them in the very forms in which they are popularly used.

---

<sup>69</sup> Bhartṛhari, *op cit* 1.112-113, pp. 45

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid*, *op cit* 1.115, p. 46

<sup>71</sup> नैवेश्वर आज्ञापयति, नापि धर्मसूत्रकाराः पठन्ति – अपवादैरुत्सर्गा बाध्यन्तामिति । किं तर्हि ? लौकिकोऽयं दृष्टान्तः । Patañjali, *op cit*, p. 115

2. It was believed that the seers of the Vedic age were born with spiritual vision to possess all knowledge intuitively and that is why the sacred hymns come to light through them. In the next age, the seers came who were comparatively inferior to those seers. The seers of this age called *Śrutarṣi*. These *Rṣis* were not gifted with intuitive knowledge from their very birth. They received knowledge either through the grace of their preceptor or through the study of the Vedas. In this age, the many earlier texts were interpreted. But at the same time there was a fear of misinterpretation of the *Samhitā*. Therefore, in order to save *Samhitā* from misinterpretation, the special attention was directed towards the study of the grammar and *Nirukta*. We find the support of this hypothesis in the MB<sup>72</sup> and in NI<sup>73</sup> also. In this age, Grammarians and Nairuktas seriously engaged themselves in the arduous task of preserving the Vedic texts intact by advocating the eternity of *Śabda*, on the one hand and by analyzing the entire structure of the Vedic words on the other<sup>74</sup>.
3. The third stage, when the popularity of the Prakṛta languages, grew up to high extend. In this period, Sanskrit had been confined to the cultured community. But, these Sanskrit-speaking people had to come in touch with mass whose language was Prakṛta. As a result of this intercourse, many Prakṛta forms crept into Sanskrit and become almost naturalized in course of time. Due to this, the form of pure Sanskrit got malformed and distorted. The number of Sanskrit speaking people gradually decreased and Prakṛta dialects began to obtain greater popularity. This undesired change was noticed by the linguists and grammarians of that time. They drew hard and fast rules for regulating the language with sole motive of the preservation of their sacred language. This is observed in the

---

<sup>72</sup> रक्षार्थं वेदनामध्येयं व्याकरणम् । *Ibid*, p. 4

<sup>73</sup> अथापीदमन्तरेण मन्त्रेष्वर्थप्रत्ययो न विद्यते । *Yāska, op cit*, p. 43

<sup>74</sup> Chakravarti, P.C., *op cit*, p. 10.

statement of Patañjali when he says *Atha Śadbānuśāsanam* in the very beginning of his MB. It is understood as *Sādhvanuśāsane'smin Śāstre*<sup>75</sup>.

T. Burrow observes:

“...there was a strong tendency among the Brahmins, the guardians of these literatures and of the religious and the social system that went with it to preserve the language against the change. This applied not only to the preservation of the sacred texts themselves ... This led to a growing divergence between the language of the educated classes and that of the people.”<sup>76</sup>

Thus, many different systems of grammar came into existence and commentators after commentators started elaborating and supplementing discussions in the light of new facts. In the absence of data, we cannot exactly determine the number and the date of the systems of grammar prevailing in ancient India. A mention of eight ancient schools of grammar is found<sup>77</sup>. Pāṇini had referred few ancient grammarians on several occasions<sup>78</sup>. Patañjali has also referred to Vyāḍi and others in his magnificent work MB.

S.K. Belakarkar states:

“...even a bare catalogue of the names of grammarians ancient and modern and such of their works are still preserved ... a dozen different schools of Sanskrit grammarians at least 300 writers in the field including

---

<sup>75</sup> Patañjali, *op cit*, p. 104,

<sup>76</sup> T, Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language*, p. 35.

<sup>77</sup> ऐन्द्रं चान्द्रं काशकृत्स्नं कौमारं शाकटायनम् । सारस्वतं चापिशलं शाकलं पाणिनीयकम् ॥ Belvalkar, S.K., *op cit*, fn. 5, p.8

<sup>78</sup> संबुद्धौ शाकल्यस्येतावनार्षे 1.1.16, तृतीयाषु भाषितपुंस्कं पुंवद् गालवस्य 7.1 74, ऋतो भारद्वाजस्य 7.2.63, अङ् गार्ग्यगावलयोः 7.3.99, ई३चाक्रवर्मणस्य 6.1.130, सर्वत्र शाकल्यस्य 8.4.51, अवङ् स्फोटायनस्य 6.1.123, लोपः शाकल्यस्य 8.3.19, , quote some sutra having the name of ancient grammarians.

those that are known to us only from quotations, and more than a thousand separate treatises original as well as explanatory.”<sup>79</sup>

Further he remarks on the nature and content of the texts that present the philosophical discussion:

“This is also the place where we can introduce a host of treatises on the philosophy of grammar – dealing with questions such as the nature of sound, the connection between word and its meaning or of sentence its component parts, and so forth. The issues have been raised and dealt with in the *Mahābhāṣya* itself ... The earliest of such treatises is the *Vākyapadīya* of Bharṭṛhari and the latest deserving a special mention is the *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhantabhūṣaṇa* of Kondabhatta...”<sup>80</sup>

At the close end of the mediaeval period of Indian Philosophy (1200 AD) we find distinct three tendencies with regard to the philosophy of language. The first is of the Naiyāyikas, the Mīmāṃsakas, the Jainas and the Buddhists who were trying to study the nature of referent of words and they were opposed to the Absolutist view on the ground that words make a sentence; words are prior to sentence. Real words make an aggregate called sentence. The second was developed by the followers of Bharṭṛhari who maintained that sentences are prior to words and words are unreal abstractions of the real sentence. The meaning is inseparably related to words. Objects cannot be taken without words. The third tendency was working in the sphere of syntax. Many commentators and sub-commentators were written on the aphorisms of Pāṇini and on the MB. They were concerned more with the meaning of words and other philosophical questions. The philosophy of Upaniṣads as exposed by

---

<sup>79</sup> Belvalkar, S.K., *op cit*, p. 1.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid*, p. 46.

Patañjali and Bhartṛhari found its exponents in Bhaṭṭoji, Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa Bhāṭṭa who wrote elaborate works on the philosophy of language.

George Cardona remarks:

“There are later Pāṇinīya treatises in which such issues are dealt with in full. Not only are the issues considered, but the view of other schools of thought are also given detailed attention. The three major Pāṇinīya treatises on semantics and philosophy of grammar are Bhartṛhari’s *Vākya-padīya*, Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa’s *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* and Nāgeśa’s *Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhānta-māñjā*.”<sup>81</sup>

#### I.4. Grammatical Philosophy of the Navya-Nyāya System

The *Nyāya* system, specially the *Navya-nyāya* has made valuable contribution to the study of grammar. The Naiyāyikas are credited with for expounding the most scientific theory about the origin of sound. According to them, *Śabda* is a quality of sky, i.e. space (*Śabdaguṇa-Ākāśam*)<sup>82</sup>. *Śabda* is liable to production and destruction<sup>83</sup> which are known as *Kārya* or non-eternal things. They have explained the relation between *Śabda* and its meaning with reference to the will of god. *Śakti* or primary signification of word is not determined, but is fixed by the volition of god (*Samketa*). They have accepted four conditions of a word for the formation of an intelligible and logical sentence. The four conditions are *Ākāṅkṣā*, *Yogyatā*, *Sannidhi* and *Tātparya*.

---

<sup>81</sup> Cardona, George, *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*, pp. 293-294.

<sup>82</sup> Annambhaṭṭa, *op cit*, p.48

<sup>83</sup> प्रागुत्पत्त्रभावोपपत्तेश्च। and आदिमत्वादैनद्रियकत्वात् कृतकवदुपचाराच्च । Gautama, NS. 2.2.12.& 2.2.14, pp. 45-46

According to the Naiyāyikas, *Śābdabodha* or verbal knowledge is derivable from a sentence<sup>84</sup> and not from individual words; and so far as verbal cognition is concerned, the knowledge of adjective (*Viśeṣaṇa*) must have precedence to that of noun (*Viśeṣya*). They have made a distinction between *Upasargas* and *Nipātas*, holding the former to be indicative (*Dyotaka*) and the latter as directly expressive of the sense (*Vācaka*).

Gaṅgeśopādhyāya who flourished in Mithila in the 12<sup>th</sup> century AD, is said to be the propounder of *Navya-nyāya* style of writing. Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* is an epoch-making and remarkable work due to the originality of thoughts. It initiated a new order of thinking that was readily assimilated by the latter grammarians. Scholars of outstanding genius such as Raghunātha, Mathurānātha, Jagadīśa and Gadādhara tried their level best to popularize the new school of logic by following in the path of Gaṅgeśa. The view of P.C. Chakravarti on this –

“the *Śabda khaṇḍa* deals, among other things, with all important problems of grammar: 1) it has established the trustworthiness of *Śabda* as *Pramāna*; 2) it has advanced arguments in support of the non-eternal character of *Śabda*; 3) it has shown how to determine the *Śakti* of primary signification of words; 4) it has given an adequate treatment of *Dhātu*, *Upasarga*, *Nipātas* and *Samāsa*; 5) it has elaborately dealt with expectancy, compatibility, proximity and import as essential factors of verbal knowledge; and 6) it has discussed the question of the origin of corrupt words.”

The super-excellence of the technique of *Navya-nyāya* is clearly borne out by the fact that the scholars of all branches have spontaneously accepted this

---

<sup>84</sup> वाक्यभावमवाप्तस्य सार्थकस्यावबोधतः । सम्पद्यते शाब्दबोधो न तन्मात्रस्य बोधतः ॥ Tarkālamkāra, Jagdīśa, *SSP*, p. 89

technique as an instrument to make their arguments more effective and logical. The influence of *Navya-nyāya* is seen over the modern school of grammar, the modern *Vedānta*, the modern criticism and dissertations on literature and Rhetoric, and also on the modern *Mīmāṃsā*.

Satishacandra Chatterjee and Dhirendramohan Datta comment:

“*Śabda* or testimony, we have seen, gives us knowledge about certain things through the understanding of the meaning of sentences, either spoken or written by some authoritative person. ...So we may say that words are significant symbols. This capacity of words to mean their respective object is called their *Śakti* or potency, and it is said to be due to the will of God...a sentence (*Vākya*) is a combination of words having a certain meaning.”<sup>85</sup>

## I.5. Grammatical Philosophy of the Mīmāṃsā School of Philosophy

Certain Mīmāṃsā doctrines are found to have close relationship with those of grammar e.g. the eternity of *Śabda* (*Śabdanityatva*). The Mīmāṃsakas have not only accepted the eternity of words with all earnestness but have made it fundamental tenet for defending the eternal character of the Vedas.

दर्शनमुच्चारणं तत्परार्थं परमर्थं प्रत्याययितुम् । उच्चरितमात्रे हि विनष्टे  
शब्दे अर्थं प्रत्याययितुं न शक्नुयात्।<sup>86</sup>

It means that the words are held to be *Nitya* on account of their being used for the purpose of signifying the sense. Words do not exist only for a moment and

---

<sup>85</sup> Chatterjee, Satisacandra & Daṭṭa, Dhīrendramohana, *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, p.200.

<sup>86</sup> Śabara, *Śabara-bhāṣyam on MS*, p. 65

do not disappear completely after the utterance (as hold by Naiyāyikas), but it continues to exist to express the intended meaning.

The Mīmāṃsakas take sound to be eternal, as it is manifested by the utterance and is represented by the letters, whereas the grammarians have gone a step beyond sound. They sought to find out the subtle element which is exactly manifested by sound. They realised the existence of *Sphoṭa* as the final cause of sound.

In the *Ślokaṅkārtika*, Kumārila has devoted a lengthy chapter to refute the theory of *Sphoṭa* as expounded by the grammarians. As the theory of *Sphoṭa* is apprehended to destroy the glorious edifice of the Vedas by declaring all divisions of sentences and words as merely artificial, the Mimamsakas could not recognize the existence of the *Sphoṭa* apart from sound. The assumption of *Sphoṭa* is thus untenable from the Mīmāṃsā point of view. According to them, the letters that constitute a word are found to be significant, and it is, therefore, nothing but unreasonable to acknowledge an incomprehensible thing as *Sphoṭa*, which is materially distinct from letters.

दीपवद्वा गकारादिर्गवादेः प्रतिपादकः। ध्रुवं प्रतीयमानत्वात्तत्पूर्वं

प्रतिपादनात् ॥12. 136॥<sup>87</sup>

“Or like the lamp, the Letters *Ga* and the rest are the indicators of the objects of ‘cow’, etc. , because the Letters are always recognized on the utterance of the letters; and because the Letters are always recognized prior (to the cognition of the object)”<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Kumārilaḥḥaṭṭa, *SV*, p 723

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid*

The *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* 2.1.3 and 2.1.4 give the definitions of *Nāma* and *Ākhyāta* respectively, which reminds us the definitions suggested by Yāska. The *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* 2.1.6-7 speak of two fold division of action, namely, primary and secondary -

यैर्द्रव्यं न चिकीर्ष्यते, तानि प्रधानभूतानि, द्रव्यस्य गुणभूतत्वात् ।

“Those actions that are not meant to be productive or purificatory of material substances are Primary, because the material substance is a secondary factor.”<sup>89</sup>

यैस्तु द्रव्यं चिकीर्ष्यते गुणस्तत्र प्रतीयते, तस्य द्रव्यप्रधानत्वात् ।

“While those that tend to produce or purify a material substance are to be recognized as secondary, because in regard to those the material substance is the dominant factor.”<sup>90</sup>

There is a distinct section in the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* called *Vyākaraṇādikaraṇa* (1.3.9) dealing mainly with the problems of grammatical interest. The subject discussed in this particular section is almost the same as dealt with by Patañjali in the first *Āhnika* of the MB. The questions like - ‘why correct words like *Gauḥ*, etc. as well as the incorrect ones like *Gavi*, *Goṇi*, *Gopatalikā*, etc., are found to be equally expressive of senses’ have been dealt by the author.

गोशब्दो यथा सास्त्रादिमति प्रमाणं, किं तथा गाव्यादयोऽप्युत नेति सन्देहः ।<sup>91</sup>

How, then, are we to distinguish correct words from incorrect ones? According to the *Mīmāṃsakas*, it is grammar or *Vyākaraṇa-smṛti* that serves as the helping guide for such discrimination. The rules of grammar are, therefore, held to be authoritative and a kind of trustworthy evidence.

---

<sup>89</sup> Jaimini, *NS*, p. 136

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>91</sup> Śabara, on *MS* 1.3.25, p. 69

## I.6. New Grammatical Philosophical System

Bhaṭṭoji's *SKau* and *VBK* are based on the theory of Patañjali's MB. In *SKau*, Bhaṭṭoji has discussed purpose of grammar and the importance of correct speech. In this regard, he owes everything to MB. Bhaṭṭoji has adopted a new method for explaining the *Śabda*. This method is different from that of *Patañjali*. According to Patañjali '*Śabda* is that which is immediately grasped after one pronounces it.'<sup>92</sup>

According to Bhaṭṭoji, words have the power of conveying meaning as the sense organs have the capacity of comprehending their objects. This capacity is beginningless and natural. This power of words is *Śabdaśakti*. He also admits that even *Apabramśa-śabdā*s have the power to convey the sense. Further, Bhaṭṭoji has given discussion on the topics like – eight varieties of *Sphoṭa*, meanings of *Dhātu*, *Lakārārtha*, *Prātipadikārtha*, *Kāraṅkārtha*, *Samāsārtha*, etc.

Bhaṭṭoji has not expressed any philosophic thought on gender, perhaps because he separately deals with it in the gloss on the *Liṅgānuśāsana* of Pāṇini. Finally he ends his discussion on *Śabdabrahma* which is considered as the most significant theory of Philosophy of grammar.

Sūryakānta Bālī's observation –

“Between Bharata Miśra (a commentator on VP) and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣīta, we have as many as six works which discuss in detail the theory of *Sphoṭa* and also Kaiyaṭa, who, in his *Pradīpa* on the *Mahābhāṣya*, has offered elaborate speculations on the Philosophy of Sanskrit grammar.”<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> अथवा प्रतीतिपदार्थको लोके ध्वनिः शब्दः । Bhaṭṭojidīkṣīta, *Skau*, p. 90

<sup>93</sup> Bālī, *Suryakānta, op cit*, p. 40.

The VB is one of the stupendous works on the philosophy of Grammar. It was written by Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa. The style of writing the text is highly sophisticated like that of *Navya-nyāya* style and the writer profusely makes use of *Navya-nyāya* terms throughout the text. It mainly presents an elaborative discussion on the 74 *Kārikās* of Bhaṭṭoji's *VSK*. Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa has also written a compendium bearing the title *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāraḥ*. The content of *VBS* is same as *VB* does. Here the author has avoided lengthy discussions to give brevity to the text.

Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa has explicated the many grammatical concepts. He has critically examined and discussed the view points of the contemporary philosophers like Mīmāṃsakas and Naiyāyikas who have also attempted to deal with the grammatical categories. He also strongly refutes and substantiates the theories propounded by his predecessors.<sup>94</sup>

The *Vaiyākaraṇa-siddhānta-mañjūṣā* of Nāgeśa is a work of great merit and it deals with almost all the problems of the linguistic philosophy. The *VSM* is written in the *Navya-nyāya* style of writing. The theories propounded by Nāgeśa are mostly taken from the VP of Bharṭṛhari. At places he differs from Bharṭṛhari; e.g. Nāgeśa has accepted the four division of *Vāk viz.* परा, पश्यन्ती, मध्यमा and वैखरी; while Bharṭṛhari accepts only three.

वैखर्या मध्यमायाश्च पश्यन्त्याश्चैतदद्भुतम् ।

अनेकतीर्थभेदायास्त्रय्या वाचः परं पदम्॥<sup>95</sup>

In this way, Nāgeśa identifies *Para* with *Śabdabrahma*. Bharṭṛhari has mentioned two varieties of meaning *viz.* subjective and objective whereas Nāgeśa holds that both word and its meaning as subjective which is identical. But Patañjali, while explaining, *Upadeśa* and *Uddeśa*, accepts indirectly both

---

<sup>94</sup> See second chapter for the detailed discussion on *VBS*.

<sup>95</sup> Bharṭṛhari, *op cit* 1,159, p. 59

the aspects of subjective and objective. Thus, Nāgeśa stands quite contrary to Patañjali and Bhartṛhari.

The refutation by Nāgeśa of *Anvitābhīdhānavāda* of Bhāṭṭapāda is similar to that of Bhartṛhari. Moreover, he follows Bhartṛhari's *Sphoṭa* theory. So far as the treatment of *Sphoṭa*, *Samāsaśakti*, *Dhātvartha*, *Tiṅgartha*, *Lādeśa*, etc. is concerned, Nāgeśa has followed the path of Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa.

Nāgeśa has refuted the *Anirvacaniya* view of Vedāntis. According to him there is nothing like *Anirvacaniya*. Naiyāyikas believe in *Jñānalakṣaṇapratyāsatti* but Nāgeśa refutes it on the ground that it can only help in cognizing the existing thing but not those which have either passed or are yet to come. Logicians take conjugation as a relation but Nāgeśa takes it as a category. They accept genus (*Jāti*) in substance (*Dravya*), quality (*Guṇa*) and action (*Karma*). But on the basis of *Vaiśeṣika* and *Nyāya*, Nāgeśa takes genus in *Ākāṅkṣā*, inherence and others<sup>96</sup>. According to Bhartṛhari *Śabdabrahma* and *Parābrahma* are identical and so the realization of *Śabdabrahma* is the realization of *Parābrahma*. But Nāgeśa says that there is distinction between *Śabdabrahma* and *Parābrahma*.

Thus it is clear that Nāgeśa is undoubtedly indebted to Patañjali and other grammarians yet the influence of Bhartṛhari and Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa is more visibly noticeable.

The view of Ramaprakasha Varni is

“चिन्तन के वैविध्य से व्याकरणशास्त्र दो भागों में विभक्त होता है ।

१. प्रक्रिया २ दर्शन। ...दर्शन का चिन्तन साक्षात्कृतधर्मा वैदिक

ऋषियों से आरम्भ होकर व्याडि, स्फोटायन, पाणिनि, कात्यायन,

पतञ्जलि और भर्तृहरि के द्वारा समुपबृंहित होते हुए कैयट, भट्टोजि

---

<sup>96</sup> सामान्यं विशेष इति बुद्ध्यपेक्षम् । (VS 1.2.3) and समानप्रसवात्मिका जातिः । (NS 2.2.71)

दीक्षित, कौण्ड भट्ट और नागेश भट्ट तक पराकाष्ठा को प्राप्त कर चुका है।”<sup>97</sup>

Thus, we can bring to a close, from the above given data and the discussion thereon, that an intent consideration on the philosophical aspect of language and its parts has been dealt with since the time of the Vedas. In the Vedic literature we find these discussions in germinated form. Gradually, it developed into an independent branch of knowledge by the efforts of intellectuals of different eras. And it is evident that this branch of knowledge has attracted the scholars of other disciplines to work on it. The collective efforts of these renowned scholars of Sanskrit Philosophy brought it the supreme most position than the other language could ever have. They have reflected on the reality of word, its nature, its definition, its meaning, its relation to meaning, its place in grammar, its difference from *Pada* and sentence.

The texts dealing with the philosophy of Grammar mostly focuses on

- the origin of the language
- meaning of word
- varieties of word
- *Padanīyatā*
- *Vākyanīyatā*
- Meaning of root
- Meaning of compound
- Meaning of tense, case suffix
- Sphoṭa

---

<sup>97</sup> Varṇī, Rāmaprakāśa, *Sanskṛita Vyākaraṇa Darśana Ke Vividha Sopāna*, Parimal, p. 1