

शब्दानुगमः
Indian linguistic studies
in honor of
George Cardona

Volume I
Vyākaraṇa and Śābdabodha

edited by
PETER M. SCHARF

18 December 2021

Scharf, Peter M., ed. शब्दानुगमः : *Indian linguistic studies in honor of George Cardona*, volume 1, *Vyākaraṇa and śābdabodha*. Providence: The Sanskrit Library, 2021.

Copyright ©2021 by The Sanskrit Library.

All rights reserved. Reproduction in any medium is restricted. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, except brief quotations, in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission of the copyright holder and publisher indicated above.

ISBN vol. 1: 978-1-943135-01-1

ISBN vol. 2: 978-1-943135-02-8

ISBN set: 978-1-943135-03-5

The Sanskrit Library
89 Cole Avenue
Providence, RI 02906
USA
sanskritlibrary.org

Table of contents

Preface	iii
Contributors	xv
Tables of contents	xix
भाष्यसम्मताष्टाध्यायीपाठः a work on variations in the sūtras of the <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> TANUJA P. AJOTIKAR, ANUJA P. AJOTIKAR, and PETER M. SCHARF	1
Rule-prioritization principles in the derivation of compound absolutives in <i>lyap</i>. PETER M. SCHARF	55
Are taddhita affixes provided after prātipadikas or after padas? PETER M. SCHARF	125
On the necessity of immediate sequence (<i>ānantarya</i>) in the <i>Aṣṭā- dhyāyī</i> SHARON BEN-DOR	171
Pāṇini's definition of the bahuvrīhi as <i>śeṣa</i> 'remainder' MASATO KOBAYASHI	217
On the formation of ekadeśisamāśas ANDREY KLEBANOV	237
<i>Sarvadarśanasamgraha</i> and <i>Vākyapadīya</i> JOHANNES BRONKHORST	297

On the construction <i>artha</i> + instrumental	
TORU YAGI	313
The Vedic subjunctive prescribed in A. 3.4.7	
EIJIRŌ DŌYAMA	323
Fragments of ancient versified Sanskrit grammars?	
HARTMUT SCHARFE	375
Singling out the place where rules apply: materials from the discussion on Pāṇini's description of substitution	
MARIA PIERA CANDOTTI and TIZIANA PONTILLO	385
Two levels of optionality in the <i>Kaccāyana Vyākaraṇa</i>	
ALEIX RUIZ-FALQUÉS	431
Sanskrit grammatical schools: a first overview	
ÉMILIE AUSSANT	467
Correct speech (<i>śabda</i>): from the perspective of the Veda and Pāṇinian grammar	
JUNICHI OZONO	481
An eccentric commentator on the <i>Mahābhāṣya</i>: Śivarāmeṇdra Sarasvatī	
PIERRE-SYLVAIN FILLIOZAT	509
Śālikanātha's theory of the sentence-referent	
KEI KATAOKA	531
Navya-nyāya views of the meaning of verbal suffixes: Gaṅgeśa and Raghunātha	
TOSHIHIRO WADA	557
व्यञ्जनायाः सर्ववाक्यसाधारणत्वम् बलराम शुक्ल	583

Appendix: Bibliography of George Cardona's publications	601
Index of primary texts cited	629
Author index	659

Sarvadarśanasamgraha and *Vākyapadīya*

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Abstract: The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* claims that Bharṭṛhari has shown that reflection on accents justifies the presence of a set of sūtras in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that deal with compound formation, viz. A. 2.2.10–16. Bharṭṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* does no such thing, not even the passage of its *Vṛtti* that seems most relevant in this context. My research strongly suggests that the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is in reality misled by a passage in Puruṣottamadeva's *Bhāṣāvṛtti* that it mistakenly believes to be based on Bharṭṛhari's work. No solution to the problem had so far been proposed. Indeed, the problem had not been identified in scholarly literature.

Keywords: *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, Bharṭṛhari, *Vākyapadīya-Vṛtti*, Puruṣottamadeva, *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, accent, compounds

The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (14th century CE) quotes a number of verses from Bharṭṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and refers several times to that text and its author in Chapter 13 on “Pāṇini's philosophy” (*Pāṇinidarśana*). Usually the references are unproblematic, but in one case it is enigmatic. It occurs in the following line:

Teṣāṃ svaracintāyām upayogo vākyapadīye hariṇā prāda-
rśī. (Abhyankar 1978: 291, l. 33–34)

This line occurs in the middle of a discussion on the justification of sūtras that prohibit compound formation with a preceding genitive, and means:

The use of those sūtras in the reflection on accents has been demonstrated by Bharṭṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya*.

There is no clarification, and no specification what part of the *Vākyapadīya* is concerned. We depend on the context of this brief remark in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* to understand it.

The chapter on “Pāṇini’s philosophy” contains a discussion of the compound *śabdānuśāsana* ‘word-teaching’ that is used by Patañjali at the beginning of his *Mahābhāṣya*. The discussion raises the objection that this compound is prohibited. It begins as follows:

Atra kecit paryanuyuñjate: anuśāsikriyāyāḥ sakarmakativāt karmabhūtasya śabdasya kartrbhūtasyaścāryasya prāptau satyām Ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi (A. 2.3.66) *ity anuśāsanabalāt karmaṇy eṣā ṣaṣṭhī vidhātavyā. Tathā ca Karmaṇi ca* (A. 2.2.14) *iti samāsapraṭiṣedhasambhavāc cha-bdānuśāsanaśabdō na pramāṇapatham avataratīti.* (Abhyankar 1978: 289, 1. 15–19)

Some ask: The verb ‘teach’ (*anu-śās*) is transitive. Its object ‘word’ (*śabda*) and its agent ‘the teacher’ are both present, so that by the teaching *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* (A. 2.3.66) a genitive case ending should be prescribed for the object. And thus the expression ‘word-teaching’ cannot be warranted because the compound can be prohibited by the rule *karmaṇi ca* (A. 2.2.14).

A. 2.3.66 *Ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* states: “A *ṣaṣṭhī* [genitive case-ending] occurs to express only the *karman* [object], when both *kartr* [subject] and *karman* [object], if not expressed otherwise, are to be expressed by introducing *ṣaṣṭhī* [a genitive case-ending] after stems used in conjunction with an item ending in *kṛt* [a primary nominal suffix]” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: III.165). The rule implies that the verbal phrase *ācāryaḥ śabdān anuśāsti* ‘the teacher teaches words’ can give rise to the nominal phrase *śabdānām anuśāsanam ācāryeṇa* ‘the teaching of words (genitive) by the teacher (instrumental)’. A. 2.2.14 (*karmaṇi ca*) states: “A *pada* [word] which ends in *ṣaṣṭhī* [a genitive case-ending] and denotes *karman* ‘object’ also does not combine, in a *tatpuruṣa* compound, with a syntactically related *pada* which ends in

sUP [a nominal case-ending]” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: III.80). The rule implies that the words *śabdānām anuśāsanam* ‘teaching of words’ cannot be compounded into *śabdānuśāsanam* ‘word-teaching’.

The above objection is answered in the immediately following passage. The answer begins as follows:

Atrāyaṃ samādhir abhidhīyate yasmin kṛtpratyaye kartṛkarmaṇor ubhayoḥ prāptir asti tatra karmaṇy eva ṣaṣṭhī-vibhaktir bhavati na kartarīti bahuvrīhivijñānabalān niyamate. Tad yathāścāryo gavāṃ doho ’śikṣitena gopālakeneṭi. (Abhyankar 1978: 289, l. 19–22)

To this the following answer is given: In the case of a primary suffix (*kṛtpratyaya*) where both the agent and the object can be expressed, the genitive case-ending will only be used for the object, not for the agent. This restriction results from understanding the compound *ubhayaprāptau* as a bahuvrīhi.¹ An example is ‘The milking of the cows (genitive) by the inexperienced cowherd (instrumental) is amazing’.

This passage is similar to the *Kāśikā* on A. 2.3.66.²

However, in the case of *śabdānuśāsana* the agent is not expressed, so that A. 2.3.66 *Ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* does not apply. As a result A. 2.2.14 *Karmaṇi ca* does not apply either:

*Śabdānuśāsanam ity atra tu śabdānām anuśāsanam nārthānām ity etāvato vivakṣitasyārthasyācāryasya kartur upādānena vināpi supratipādyatvād³ ācāryopādānam akimcītkaram. Tasmād ubhayaprāpter abhāvād ubhayaprāptau karmaṇīty eṣā ṣaṣṭhī na bhavati. Kim tu **Kartṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti** (A. 2.3.65) iti kṛdyoge kartari karmaṇi ca*

¹*ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* is now analyzed as *yasmin (kṛtpratyaye kartṛkarmaṇor) ubhayoḥ prāptir asti tatra karmaṇi*.

²*Kāśikā* on A. 2.3.66: *Ubhayaprāptāv iti bahuvrīhiḥ. Ubhayoḥ prāptir yasmin kṛti so ’yam ubhayaprāptiḥ, tatra karmaṇy eva ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavati, na kartari. Āścāryo gavāṃ doho ’gopālakena.*

³Reading *supratipādyatvād* for *supratipādatvād*.

ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavatīti kṛdyogalakṣaṇā ṣaṣṭhī bhaviṣyati. Tathā cedhmapravraścānapalāśaśātānādivat samāso bhaviṣyati. (Abhyankar 1978: 289 l. 22–290 l. 22)

In the compound ‘word-teaching’, on the other hand, the intended meaning, viz. ‘teaching of words only, not of meanings’, is clearly conveyed without mentioning the agent, i.e. the teacher. Mentioning the teacher is therefore irrelevant. Since, then, the agent and the object do not both come into the picture, the genitive case-ending prescribed in the rule *ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* (A. 2.3.66) does not apply. It is rather the genitive case-ending prescribed by *karṭṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti* (A. 2.3.65) for the agent and the object in connection with the primary suffix so that it is a genitive case-ending characterized by a connection with a word ending in a primary suffix. In this way, ‘word-teaching’ will be a compound like *idhmapravraścāna* ‘fuel-cutter, hatchet’, *palāśaśātāna* ‘tree-cutting’.

A. 2.3.65 *Karṭṛkarmaṇoḥ kṛti* prescribes a genitive case-ending for words expressive of agent or object in connection with a word ending in a primary suffix: “A *ṣaṣṭhī* [genitive case-ending] occurs after a stem to express *karṭṛ* [subject] and *karman* [object], when the stem is used in conjunction with an item which ends in *kṛt* [a primary suffix] (2.1.93 *kṛd atīn*), and when *karṭṛ* and *karman* are not expressed otherwise” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: III.164). The immediately following sūtra A. 2.3.66 (*Ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi*; see above p. 298) limits the genitive case-endings to words expressive of the object when both agent and object are expressed. Since in *śabdānām anuśāsanam* the agent is not expressed, the genitive *śabdānām* is due to the general rule A. 2.3.65 rather than to its restriction A. 2.3.66. And the compound *śabdānuśāsana* can be formed with the general rule A. 2.2.8 *Ṣaṣṭhī*.⁴ According to our passage, *śabdānuśāsana* ‘word-teaching’ falls in the same cat-

⁴A. 2.2.8 *Ṣaṣṭhī*: “A *pada* which ends in *ṣaṣṭhī* ‘sixth triplet of *sUP*’ optionally combines, in a *tatpuruṣa* compound, with a syntactically related *pada* which ends in *sUP*” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: III.74).

egory as *idhmapravraścana* ‘fuel-cutter, hatchet’, *palāśaśātana* ‘tree-cutting’.⁵

To complete this part of its presentation, the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* points out that A. 2.3.66 *Ubhayaprāptau karmaṇi* is not universally valid according to some:

Kartary api ṣaṣṭhī bhavatīti kecid bruvate. Ata eva evoktam kāsīkāvr̥ttau: kecid aviśeṣeṇaiva vibhāṣām icchanti śabdānām anuśāsanam ācāryeṇācāryasya veti. (Abhyankar 1978: 290, l. 28–30)

Some say that the genitive can also be used to denote the agent. That is why it has been stated in the *Kāsīkāvr̥tti*: “Some accept an option without distinction: teaching of words by the teacher or of the teacher”

The quotation from the *Kāsīkā* (on A. 2.3.66) is exact. The relevance of this quotation to the formation of *śabdānuśāsana*, on the other hand, is not clear.

At this point the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* tries a completely different approach, stating:

Atha vā śeṣalakṣaṇeyam ṣaṣṭhī. Tatra kim api codyam nāvataraty eva. (Abhyankar 1978: 290, l. 31)

Alternatively, this is a genitive defined by the rule *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe* (A. 2.3.50) “genitive in the remaining cases”. In that case no criticism applies.

A. 2.3.50 (*ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*) prescribes a genitive case-ending in different meanings.⁶ The *Kāsīkā* specifies what these different meanings are by stating, “different from an object and so on” (*karmādibhyo ’nyaḥ*), and adds that ownership and other such relationships are meant (*svasvāmi-sambandhādih*). The present passage proposes to take *śabdānām* in one of those different meanings. Since then the word now no longer carries

⁵These are also the examples given in the *Kāsīkā* under A. 2.2.8 *Ṣaṣṭhī*.

⁶A. 2.3.50 *Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*: “A *ṣaṣṭhī* occurs after a nominal stem when the remainder (*śeṣa*) is to be expressed” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: III.153).

the meaning ‘object’, A. 2.2.14 *Karmaṇi ca* cannot prevent compound formation.

Unfortunately, this simple solution raises new problems:

Yady evaṃ tarhi śeṣalakṣaṇāyāḥ śaṣṭhyāḥ sarvatra suvacatvāt śaṣṭhīsamāsapraṭiṣedhasūtrāṇām ānarthakyaṃ prāpnuyād iti cet (Abhyankar 1978: 290 l. 31–291 l. 33)

Objection:

If it is like this, given that a genitive characterized by ‘remaining cases’ can be stated in all circumstances, the sūtras that prohibit composition with a genitive would be pointless.

One of the sūtras prohibiting composition with a genitive is A. 2.2.14 *Karmaṇi ca*, as we have seen (p. 298). It is part of a set of sūtras, A. 2.2.10–16, all of which prohibit composition with a genitive that expresses a certain meaning. All these sūtras become pointless if the genitive ending can be added in a sense different from the ones indicated in these sūtras.

This objection is answered in the now following lines:

Satyam. Teṣāṃ svaracintāyām upayogo vākyapadīye hariṇā prādarśi. Tad āha mahopādhyāyavardhamānaḥ:

Laukikavyavahāreṣu yatheṣṭam ceṣṭatām janaḥ.

Vaidikeṣu tu mārgēṣu viśeṣoktiḥ pravartatām..

Iti pāṇinisūtrāṇām arthavattvam asau yataḥ.

Janikartur iti brūte tatprayojaka ity api..

iti. (Abhyankar 1978: 291, l. 33–38)

Response:

True! **The use of those sūtras in the reflection on accents has been demonstrated by Bhartrhari in his *Vākyapadīya*.** The great teacher Vardhamāna expresses it like this: In worldly usage people can behave as they wish. In Vedic practice special ways of speaking must prevail. The sūtras of Pāṇini have in this way a purpose, because he himself

uses the compounds *janikartuḥ* and *tatprayojakaḥ* (which he should not use).

The interpretation of this passage is difficult, as will become clear in what follows. It is about the use of the sūtras that prohibit composition with a genitive. Before trying to identify the passage in Bhartr̥hari's *Vākyapadīya* here referred to, let us look at the verses attributed to "the great teacher Vardhamāna".⁷

These verses indicate a difference between Vedic usage and worldly usage. Rules must be strictly applied in Vedic usage, while in worldly usage "people can behave as they wish". Pāṇini himself uses the compounds *janikartuḥ* and *tatprayojakaḥ*, in A. 1.4.30 and A. 1.4.55 respectively, even though these compounds are forbidden by A. 2.2.16 *Kartari ca*.⁸

Haradatta, the author of the *Padamañjarī* commentary on the *Kāśīkā*, says the following about *janikartuḥ* under A. 1.4.30:

Janeḥ kartā janikarteti karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhyā samāsaḥ. Ayam eva nirdeśo jñāpayati: Kartari ca iti pratiṣedho 'nitya iti.
'Producing-agent' (*janikartṛ*) in the meaning 'agent of producing' (*janeḥ kartṛ*) is a compound with a genitive in the sense 'object'. This instruction makes known that the prohibition *kartari ca* (A. 2.2.16) is not universally valid.

And the author of the *Kāśīkā* himself explains, under A. 1.4.55 *Tatprayojako hetuś ca*, that the compound *tatprayojaka* is here used by way of exception (*nipātanāt*). Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the *Nyāsa* commentary on the *Kāśīkā*, explains that this form is in conflict with the same prohibition *kartari ca* (A. 2.2.16).

How can the use of sūtras that prohibit composition with a genitive be demonstrated with the help of rules on accent, as the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* claims? Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar has an answer, which he

⁷I have not been able to trace these verses. Vardhamāna may be the author of the *Gaṇaratnamahodadhī*, but the verses here cited do not appear to occur in that text.

⁸A. 2.2.16 *Kartari ca*: "A genitive is not compounded with a word ending in *ṛc* or *aka* that denotes an agent." Contrast R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: III.84 which is based on the *Siddhāntakaumudī* as he explains under A. 2.2.15.

explains in his commentary on the relevant passage of the *Sarvadarśa-nasaṅgraha* (1978: 291). I paraphrase his remarks freely as follows:⁹

If, in any situation, we do not wish to express the object, a genitive may still be justified by the rule A. 2.3.50 *Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*. Composition is in that case not forbidden by A. 2.2.14 *Karmaṇi ca*. So what are those prohibiting rules good for?

Consider *godohaḥ* ‘cow-milking’, composed out of *gavām dohaḥ* ‘milking of cows’. Composition is possible because the prohibition is circumvented with the help of A. 2.3.50 *Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*. In other words, ‘cows’ is not expressive of the object of ‘milking’. This compound will have the acute accent (*udātta*) on its final syllable: *godohāḥ* by A. 6.1.220 *Samāsasya*.¹⁰

If, on the other hand, *gavām* is expressive of the object of milking, compound formation is not possible, on account of A. 2.2.14 *Karmaṇi ca*. Suppose now that A. 2.2.14 did not exist so that here too compound formation would be possible. The resulting compound *godohaḥ* would now — because the former part (*go*) is a *kāraka* (it is expressive of *karman*), and the latter part (*doha*) is a *kṛt*-formation

⁹Abhyankar’s remarks read: *Ānarthakyam iti. Saty api samāsaniṣedhavidhāyake śāstre gavām doha ity atra yadi karmatvasyāvivakṣayā gavām iti śeṣe ṣaṣṭhī kriyate tarhi samāse godoha iti prāpnoty eveti kiṃ samāsaniṣedheneti. svaracintāyām iti. Godoha ity atra śeṣaṣaṣṭhyā samāse samāsasya (A. 6.1.220) iti sūtreṇāntodāto bhavati. Etadapavādabhūtam gatikāropapadāt kṛt (A. 6.2.139) iti tu na pravartate. pūrvapadasya gatyādyanyatamatvābhāvāt. sato ’pi karmakārakasya goḥ karmatvenāvivakṣitatvāt. Gateḥ kārakād upapadāc ca paribhūtasya kṛdantasayottarapadasya prakṛtisvaro bhavatīti tadarthah. Samāsaniṣedhābhāve tu karmaṣaṣṭhyantasyāpi gopadasya dohaśabdena saha samāsaḥ syāt. Tatra ca pūrvapadasya kārakatvād anena sūtreṇa doha ity uttarapadasya prakṛtisvaraḥ syāt. Doha iti ghañpratyāyāntam nityādīr nityam (A. 6.1.194) iti sūtreṇādyudāttam. Gatikāropapadāt kṛd iti prakṛtisvareṇa tasyaivāvasthāne godohāḥ iti madhyodāttam samastam padaṃ syāt. Tac ca neṣyate. Atah samāsaniṣedha āvaśyakah.*

¹⁰A. 6.1.220 *Samāsasya*: “The final constituent of a compound is marked with *udātta* at the end.” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: V.193).

— have the natural accent of *doha*, by A. 6.2.139 *Gatikā-rakopapadāt kṛt*.¹¹ The accent of *doha* is determined by A. 6.1.194 *Ñnityādir nityam*,¹² because it has been formed with the suffix *ghañ*. This gives *dóha* for the word, and would give *godóhaḥ* for the compound. This is incorrect, and is avoided by the prohibition of compound formation in this specific case.

Abhyankar's explanation is taken over by Uma Shankar Sharma 'Rishi' (1964) in his Hindi translation of the text. Neither Abhyankar nor Sharma indicate where in the *Vākyapadīya* [Bharṭṛ-]hari is supposed to give this demonstration.

The only relevant passage that I have been able to spot occurs in the *Vṛtti* on *Vākyapadīya* 2.198, and we may provisionally assume that this is the passage to which the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* refers. (If so, this then shows that it looked upon the *Vṛtti* as part of the *Vākyapadīya*.)

The passage concerned invokes the example *mātuḥ smaraṇam* 'remembering one's mother' and wonders whether these two words can form a compound, either with the help of A. 2.3.50 *Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*, or by ignoring the prohibition. Here a critic objects:

Nanu ca svaro bhidyate. Śeṣalakṣaṇāyāḥ samāse samāsāntodāttatvena bhavitavyam. Kṛdyogāyām tu kṛdantasvaratvena.

Objection: the accent will be different. If one forms a compound with a genitive justified by A. 2.3.50 *Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*, there must be an acute accent at the end of the compound. But in the case of a genitive [expressive of the object] that is connected with the *kṛt*-formation [*smaraṇa*], then there

¹¹A. 6.2.139 *Gatikā-rakopapadāt kṛt*: "The constituent of a *tatpuruṣa* compound which ends in an affix termed *kṛt* and combines to follow a constituent termed *gati*, *kāraka* and [sic! for 'or'] *upapada*, retains its original accent." (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: V.284).

¹²A. 6.1.194 *Ñnityādir nityam*: "The initial of a form is marked *udātta* when that which has *Ñ* or *N* as an *it* follows." (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: V.179).

must be the accent of the word ending in a *kṛt*-suffix (i.e. *smāraṇa*).

We recognise the reasoning we came across in connection with the compound *godoha*. However, the *Vṛtti* does not accept this objection, stating:

Kṛdyogāyām api Ano bhāvakarmavacanaḥ ity antodāttatvam iti nāsti bhedaḥ.

There is no difference in accent, because also in the case of a genitive that is connected with a *kṛt*-formation, there is an acute accent at the end of the compound by A. 6.2.150 *Ano bhāvakarmavacanaḥ*.

The rule invoked, A. 6.2.150 *Ano bhāvakarmavacanaḥ*, states: “A constituent which ends in the affix *ana*, signifies *bhāva* ‘root-sense’ or *karman* ‘object’, and combines in a compound after a word denoting a *kā-raka*, is marked *udātta* at the end” (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: V.293). Since *smaraṇa* ends in the suffix *ana*, the compound *mātr̥smaraṇá* will have an acute accent on its last syllable, the same accent it would have if the genitive were to be justified by A. 2.3.50 *Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*.

The *Vṛtti* then discusses some other examples, none of which show the difference in accentuation that the passage should demonstrate according to the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. It does not discuss the example *godoha* which, as we have seen, *does* demonstrate this difference.

We are here confronted with a difficulty. Did the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* read this part of the *Vṛtti* differently? Or did he merely base himself on secondary information?

A passage in Puruṣottamadeva’s *Bhāṣāvṛtti* supports the second possibility. This commentary reads, under A. 2.2.16 *Kartari ca*:

Niṣedhapañcasūtrīyam svarārthā, śeṣaṣaṣṭhīsamāsasyānīvāraṇāt. Tena rājasammataḥ, rāmamahitaḥ, bhavadāsitam, bhavadāsikā, godohaḥ. ‘Tatkartā phalabhāg yataḥ’ iti bhartr̥hariḥ. ‘Kriyāviśeṣako jātivācakas tatprayojakah’ ityādyasamkhyāḥ ṣaṣṭhīsamāsā bhavanty eva. Tasmāt

kevalam kārakaṣaṣṭhīsamāse sati Gatikārapadāt kṛty uttarapadaprakṛtisvareṇaudanabhojakādāyo madhyodāttā mā bhūvan. Śeṣaṣaṣṭhīsamāse sati samāsāntodāttāḥ yathā syur iti niṣedha ārabhyate.

These five sūtras that prohibit compound formation are there for the purpose of accent, because one cannot avoid the compounds concerned with the help of a genitive defined by the rule *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe* (A. 2.3.50) “genitive in the remaining cases”. For this reason the compounds *rājasammata*, *rāmamahita*, *bhavadāsita*, *bhavadāsikā*, *godoha* [are possible]. As Bhartṛhari said: “Since its agent enjoys the fruit ...” (VP. 3.12.9d). Innumerable genitive compounds exist, such as *kriyāviśeṣaka*, *jātivācaka*, *tatprayojaka*, etc. It follows that compounds like *odanabhojaka* with an acute accent in the middle should not exist, being compounds that would result from giving the natural accent of the second member of the compound to the compound as a whole by A. 6.2.139 *Gatikārapadāt kṛty*, a rule which only applies when there is a compound with a genitive expressive of a kāraka. The prohibition is made to make sure that there will be an acute accent at the end of the compound, given that it is a compound with a genitive defined by the rule *ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*.

The five sūtras referred to are A. 2.2.12–16, all of which prohibit compound formation.

Here, then, we find a partial justification for the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*’s claim, “the use of those sūtras in the reflection on accents has been demonstrated by Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya*”. That is to say, the use of the prohibiting sūtras can be demonstrated when reflecting on accents. Puruṣottamadeva’s passage may have been known to the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, since the former lived well before

the latter.¹³ Puruṣottamadeva must have lived in the twelfth century CE (Mīmāṃsaka 1973: I.400–401), which is well before the fourteenth century in which the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* was composed. What is more, Puruṣottamadeva refers in this context to Bhartr̥hari, as does the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. The question that remains is: does the passage in Bhartr̥hari's *Vākyapadīya* referred to by Puruṣottamadeva demonstrate the usefulness of the sūtras that prohibit compound formation, as the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* claims?

The line quoted by Puruṣottamadeva is part of *Vākyapadīya* 3.12.9:

Kartrabhiprāyatā sūtre kriyābhedopalakṣaṇam. Tathābhūtā kriyā yā hi tatkartā phalabhāg yataḥ..

Subramania Iyer (1974: 97) translates:

The mention of the sūtra (A. 1.3.72) of the fruit coming to the agent implies a difference in the action, because it is only when the action is accompanied by the making of arrangements by the agent that the latter enjoys the fruit.¹⁴

Clearly this verse has nothing to do with the use of sūtras that prohibit compound formation. Helārāja's commentary does not help either. However, the line cited by Puruṣottamadeva contains the word *tatkartā* 'that-doer', a compound that should be prohibited by A. 2.2.16 *Kartari ca*.

It now becomes clear that Puruṣottamadeva cites this line to illustrate Bhartr̥hari's use of a compound that should be forbidden, not because Bhartr̥hari demonstrates here the use of sūtras that prohibit compound formation (which he doesn't).

¹³Mattia Salvini draws my attention to some passages in Puruṣottamadeva's *Kāraṅgacakra* that are similar to passages in the chapter on the philosophy of Pāṇini in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*.

¹⁴Rau (2002: 284) has: "Wenn nach Sūtra 1,3,72 das Ergebnis der Handlung dem Agens zu Gute kommen muss, deutet dies auf eine Verschiedenheit in den Handlungen hin. Weil ja nur wenn die Handlung so beschaffen ist, ihr Agens der Nutzniesser wird."

Where does all this leave us? It makes most sense to assume that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* or his informers knew a passage such as the one in Puruṣottamadeva's *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, and concluded that Puruṣottamadeva's reasoning hailed from Bharṭṛhari. Looking for confirmation of this assumption, he (or they) came across the passage in the *Vṛtti* in which the accentual consequences of different ways to create compounds are discussed. Unfortunately, the author of the *Vṛtti* did not use these to prove the need for sūtras that forbid compound formation.

Who then invented the argument based on accents to prove that these forbidding sūtras are not superfluous? Was it Puruṣottamadeva?

There is at least one passage in the *Mahābhāṣya* that claims different accents for compounds depending on the way they are formed. As in the *Vākyapadīya-Vṛtti*, that claim is put in the mouth of an opponent, and is subsequently shown to be mistaken. It occurs under A. 2.1.36 vt. 5, and concerns compounds like *aśvaghāsa* 'horse-fodder'. The opponent considers that they can be a dative compound or a genitive compound, and fears that there will be a difference in accentuation:

Nanu ca svarabhedo bhavati. Caturthīsamāse sati pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratvena bhavitavyam ṣaṣṭhīsamāse punar antodāttatvena. (MBh. I.389.13–14)

But isn't there a difference in accentuation? When we have a dative compound, the first member will retain its accent (by A. 6.2.43),¹⁵ but when we have a genitive compound, the final member will be accented (by A. 6.1.220 304) (Joshi and Roodbergen 1969: 209).

Patañjali disagrees:

Nāsti bhedaḥ. Caturthīsamāse 'pi saty antodāttatvenaiva bhavitavyam. (MBh. I.389.15)

¹⁵A. 6.2.43 *Caturthī tadarthe*: "The initial constituent of a compound which ends in *caturthī* 'fourth triplet of nominal ending' retains its original accent when a constituent with the signification of *tadartha* 'intended for that' follows" (R. N. Sharma 1987–2003: V.226).

There is no difference. Even in the dative compound the final member will be accented (Joshi and Roodbergen 1969: 209).

There is no need to study the rather complicated reason that Patañjali adduces to justify the rejection of his critic. All that counts for us at present is that he does not, here at least, accept different accents as an argument to choose between different compound formations.

It seems, then, that we are justified in thinking that the accent-based argument to prove the usefulness of the sūtras that prohibit compound formation with a genitive was invented after Bhartr̥hari, perhaps by Puruṣottamadeva. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* knew the argument but attributed it to Bhartr̥hari. Was its author (or his informers) perhaps more comfortable with the thought that the argument went back to Bhartr̥hari, whom he held in high esteem, rather than to Puruṣottamadeva, who was a Buddhist?

Abbreviations

<i>MBh.</i> <i>MahāBhāṣya</i>	Kielhorn 1962–1972
<i>VP.</i> <i>Vākyapadīya</i>	Rau 1977, Subramania Iyer 1983
vt. vārttika of Kātyāyana	Kielhorn 1962–1972

References

- Abhyankar, Vasudev Shastri, ed. and comm. 1978. *Sarva-darśana-samgraha of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava: edited with an original commentary in Sanskrit, by the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar*. 3rd ed. Government Oriental Series, Class A 1. Seen through the press by T. G. Mainkar. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

- Joshi, Shivaram Dattatray and Jouthe Anthon Fokko Roodbergen, eds. and trans. 1969. *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya; Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnikā (P. 2.1.2–2.1.49): edited with translation and explanatory notes*. Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C 5. Pune: University of Poona.
- Kielhorn, Lorenz Franz, ed. 1962–1972. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali: revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes*, rev. by Kashinath Vasudev Abhyankar. 3rd ed. 3 vols. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira. 1973. *Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-śāstra kā itihāsa*. I: 3rd ed., II: 2nd ed., III: 1st ed. 3 vols. Sonīpat: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust.
- Rau, Wilhelm, ed. 1977. *Bhartr̥haris Vākyapadīya: die Mūlakārikās nach den Handschriften herausgegeben und mit einem Pāda-Index versehen*. Wiesbaden.
- Sharma, Rama Nath. 1987–2003. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. 6 vols. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Sharma, Uma Shankar, ed. and comm. 1964. *Sarva-darśana-samgraha of Mādhavācārya: edited with an exhaustive Hindi commentary, copious appendices and Anglo-Hindi introductions*. Vidyabhawan Sanskrit Granthamala 113. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan.
- Subramania Iyer, K. A., trans. 1974. *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartr̥hari; Chapter III, pt. ii: English translation with exegetical notes*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- ed. 1983. *Vākyapadīya of Bhartr̥hari (an ancient treatise on the philosophy of Sanskrit grammar): containing the Ṭikā of Puṇyārāja and the ancient Vṛtti; Kāṇḍa II*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.