

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Yāska and the sentence: the beginning of *śābdabodha*?

(published in: *Subhāṣiṇī: Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume*. Ed. G. U. Thite. Pune: Prof. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Committee (c/o Dr. Malhar Kulkarni). 2002. Pp. 44-62)

The very first section of the Nirukta (1.1) contains, in Sarup's edition, the following passage:

*bhāvapradhānam ākhyātam/ sattvapradhānāni nāmāni/ tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne
bhavataḥ pūrvāparībhūtaṁ bhāvam ākhyātenācaṣṭe/ vrajati pacatīti/
upakramaprabhṛtyapavargaparyantaṁ mūrtaṁ sattvabhūtaṁ sattvanāmabhiḥ/ vrajyā
paktir iti/ ada iti sattvānām upadeśaḥ/ gaur aśvaḥ puruṣo hastīti/ bhavatīti bhāvasya/
āste śete vrajati tiṣṭhatīti/*

Roth's edition has the same text, but without the punctuation. The same is true for Rājavāde's¹ and Vidyāsāgara's editions (both with Durga's commentary). Bhadkamkar's edition (also with Durga's commentary) takes a middle position, adding some punctuation marks (*daṇḍas*), but not quite as many as Sarup. Sarup translates:

[T]he verb has becoming as its fundamental notion, nouns have being as their fundamental notion. But where both are dominated by becoming, a becoming arising from a former to a later state is denoted by a verb, as 'he goes', 'he cooks', &c. [45] The embodiment of the whole process from the beginning to the end, which has assumed the character of being, is denoted by a noun, as 'going', 'cooking', &c. The demonstrative pronoun is a reference to beings, as 'cow', 'horse', 'man', 'elephant', &c.; 'to be', to becoming, as 'he sits', 'he sleeps', 'he goes', 'he stands', &c.

¹ Rajavade, 1940: 19 has the following punctuation: *bhāvapradhānam ākhyātam/ sattvapradhānāni nāmāni/ tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ/ pūrvāparībhūtaṁ bhāvam ākhyātenācaṣṭe vrajati pacatīti/ upakramaprabhṛti apavargaparyantaṁ/ mūrtaṁ sattvabhūtaṁ sattvanāmabhiḥ vrajyā paktir iti/ ada iti/ sattvānām upadeśaḥ/ gaur aśvaḥ puruṣo hastīti/ bhavatīti bhāvasya/ āste śete vrajati tiṣṭhatīti/*

Houben (1997: 72) translates, similarly:

... But where both have *bhāva* "being, becoming" as the main thing, the *bhāva* which has a sequence is denoted by a verb, e.g. "he goes", "he cooks". [But the *bhāva*] which is an existing thing embodying [a *bhāva*] from the beginning to the end [is denoted] by nouns expressing an existing thing, e.g. "going", "cooking". [The pronoun] *adas* "that" is a reference to existing things, e.g. cow, horse, man, elephant. [The verb] *bhavati* "it is, becomes" [is a reference to] a *bhāva* "being, becoming", e.g. he is laying (*sic*), he goes, he stands.

These translations depend in an essential respect on Sarup's punctuation, or more precisely: on its absence at a crucial junction. Both the commentaries of Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara and of Durga understand the part *tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* as a complete sentence. This is clear from their remarks. The commentary of Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara explains (Sarup, 1982: I p. 9 l. 14-16):

tad yatrobhe ityādi/ ... yatrobhe nāmākhyāte devadattaḥ pacatīti vākyaāvasthāyām, yatreṭi śrutes tatrety adhyāhāryam, tatra bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ, bhāvasya sādhyatvāt, sattvasya ca sādhanatvāt, sādhyasādhanayoś ca sādhyasya prādhānyāt/ [46]

[Concerning] *yatrobhe* etc.: ... 'Where both' — i.e. a noun (*nāman*)² and a verb (*ākhyāta*) — [means:] in the case of a sentence [such as] 'Devadatta cooks'. Since *yatra* 'where' is expressed, *tatra* 'there' has to be supplied, [so that one gets:] 'there both have activity (*bhāva*)³ as principal [meaning]', because *bhāva* is that which is to be accomplished (*sādhya*), and *sattva* is that which accomplishes (*sādhaka*), and because, from among that which is to be accomplished and that which accomplishes, that which is to be accomplished is the principal thing.

Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara clearly understood *tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* to mean: 'Where both [a nominal word and a verb are present, there] both have activity (*bhāva*) as principal [meaning]'. They both have *bhāva* as principal meaning, because the

² Strictly speaking one should translate *nāman* 'nominal word', because it also includes adjectives. For simplicity's sake I will here use 'noun'.

³ Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara paraphrases *bhāva* as *kriyā* (Sarup, 1982: I p. 9 l. 2).

sentence — e.g., ‘Devadatta cooks’ (*devadattaḥ pacati*) — has *bhāva* as principal meaning. This *bhāva* is expressed by the verb, which is qualified by the noun.

Durga expresses his views in the following passage (Rājavāḍe, 1921: I p. 16 l. 17-24; Bhadkamkar, 1918: I p. 41 l.)::

*tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ/ .../ atha punar yatra te (variant: yatraite)
ubhe bhavataḥ/ kva ca punar ubhe etc (variant: etc ubhe) bhavataḥ/ vākye/ tatra
kasya pradhānam arthaḥ (variant: pradhānorthaḥ) kasya guṇabhūta iti/ śṛṇu/
bhāvapradhāne bhavatas tasya cikīrṣitatvāt/ vākye hy ākhyātaṃ pradhānaṃ
tadarthatvād guṇabhūtaṃ nāma tadarthasya bhāvaniṣpattāv aṅgabhūtatvāt/ evaṃ
tāvad ākhyātaṃ vākye pradhānam/*

[Concerning] *yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ*. ... But where both of them (i.e. a noun and [47] a verb) occur. But where do both occur? In a sentence. In that [situation], whose meaning is the principal thing, [and] whose is secondary? Listen. They have *bhāva* as principal [meaning], because [*bhāva*] is desired to be brought about. For in a sentence the verb is the principal thing, because it is for that, [and] the noun is secondary, because its meaning is subsidiary to the bringing about of *bhāva*. In this way, then, the verb is the principal thing in the sentence.

Elsewhere, on Nir 1.9, Durga confirms and elaborates his position by stating that in explaining a sentence a different order of words prevails from that used in recitation. When explaining, the verb is most important, then the noun, then prepositions, and finally particles (Rājavāḍe, 1921: I p. 62 l. 5-7; Bhadkamkar, 1918: I p. 91 l. 15-16: *vyākhyākāle ... ākhyātapadaṃ pradhānaṃ tad anu nāma tad anūpasargās tad anu nipātā[h]*).

Nīlakaṇṭha Gārgya, the author of the Niruktaśloka-vārttika (a metrical commentary), is of the same opinion as his predecessors, as will be clear from the following lines (Vijayapāla, 1982, p. 26 verses 199ab & 201cd-202ab):

tad yatretyādivākyena vākyārtho 'py adhunocyate/

...

nāmākhyāte prayujyete yadā vākyārthasiddhaye//

ubhe bhāvapradhāne tu tadā syātām itīritam/

The sentence *tad yatra* etc. introduces also the meaning of the sentence.

...

When [both] a noun and a verb are used in order to establish the meaning of a sentence, then both have *bhāva* as principal [meaning]; this is here proclaimed.

Rudolph Roth, too, takes *tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* to be a separate sentence, to be understood in the [48] way of Durga, Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara, and Nīlakaṇṭha. This is clear from his Erläuterungen, where he offers the following translation/interpretation (p. 4): "Wo beide verbunden stehen (im Satze) vereinigen sie sich zum Ausdruck eines Werdens."

It is tempting to understand Durga, Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara and Nīlakaṇṭha, as well as Roth, in the light of later developments of the ideas about the expressiveness of sentences, developments long after Yāska that culminated in what came to be known as *śābdabodha*. It is not necessary here to describe these developments in detail,⁴ and it must suffice to recall that the grammarians — who in this respect had to defend their position against the Mīmāṃsakas and the Navya-Naiyāyikas — came to maintain that the meaning of the verb (or more specifically that of the verbal root) is the main qualificand of the sentence, which is qualified, among other things, by the meaning of the noun that is expressive of the grammatical subject.

The earliest author whose surviving remarks are suggestive in this connection is Patañjali (2nd century B.C.E.), whose Mahābhāṣya contains the following statement:⁵

apara āha/ ākhyātaṃ savīśeṣaṇam ity eva/ sarvāṇi hy etāni kriyāviśeṣaṇāni/

Others say: "A [finite] verb with qualifications [makes a sentence]", simply. For all these [qualifying words] are qualifications to the action.

It is however far from clear that Patañjali himself accepted this position, nor is it clear that Patañjali proposes to analyse sentences in this hierarchical manner.

This changes with Bhartr̥hari (5th century C.E.), whose Vākyapadīya contains the following verses:⁶

bahūnāṃ saṃbhava 'rthānāṃ kecid evopakāriṇaḥ/

saṃsarge kaścid eṣāṃ tu prādhānyena pratīyate//

[49]

sādhyatvāt tatra cākhyātair vyāpārāḥ siddhasādhanāḥ/

⁴ Cp. Bronkhorst, 2000: § 7.

⁵ Mahā-bh I p. 367 l. 15 (on P. 2.1.1 vt. 9). Tr. Kahrs, 1986: 142 n. 2.

⁶ Vākyapadīya (ed. Rau) 3.8.40-41 (39-40 in Iyer's edition).

prādhānyenābhidhīyante phalenāpi pravartitāḥ//

Where there are many meanings, some are subsidiary; one however is understood to be the principal one when they are intimately related. (40)

In that [situation] activities are expressed, by the verbs, as principal, because they are what is to be accomplished (*sādhyā*), even though [the activities themselves], whose means of accomplishment (*sādhana*) are [already] accomplished (*siddha*), are urged forward by the result. (41)

Following verses discuss the difference in meaning between verbs like *pacati* and nouns like *pākaḥ*, an issue that is also addressed, it seems, in the passage of the Nirukta under consideration. But Bhartṛhari's discussion does not help us to determine the correct interpretation of that Nirukta passage.

And yet the importance of finding the correct interpretation of this passage cannot be denied. If Durga, Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara, Nīlakaṇṭha and Roth are right, this passage may contain the earliest seed of what was later to become an important philosophico-linguistic development, leading to *śābdabodha* in its various forms. This seed consists in the tendency to look upon the sentence as designating a principal meaning qualified by one or more other meanings. Alternatively, if Sarup's interpretation is correct, the Nirukta contains no such seed.

Sarup was not the first to propose his interpretation. P.D. Gune had done so in an article that came out in 1916. Gune makes a number of observations, among them the following (p. 158-159):

... Both Durga and Roth look upon the sentence beginning from *pūrvāparībhūtam* as a fresh one, not at all connected with the previous one *tad yatrobhe* [50] etc. They appear to think that the sentences beginning with *pūrvāparībhūtam* etc. and *mūrtam* etc., are simply further explanations of the *ākhyāta* and *nāma* respectively. I would suggest that both have missed the point. I was led to the conclusion by the examples which are given for *pūrvāparībhūtaṃ* etc. and *mūrtaṃ* etc. They are *vrajati pacatīti* and *vrajyā paktir iti* respectively. If the sense was as Durga and Roth understood it, what was the propriety of giving *vrajyā paktir iti* as examples of a *sattva* and not simply *gaur aśvaḥ* etc. as done later on?

Durga and Roth appear to believe that Yāska was thinking of the sentence, when he wrote *tad yatrobhe* etc. and that his view was that in a sentence, where both *nāma* and *ākhyāta* occur, the *bhāva* predominated. To say the least, Yāska has never

for once given any indication that he believed in the doctrine of *kriyāpradhānatva*; there is not the slightest hint, excepting this supposed one. I think Durga has here fathered his views on Yāska and Roth has copied him. Again if the sentence (*vākya*) was here foremost in Yāska's mind, in which he thought of determining the relative importance of the *nāma* and *ākhyāta*, he would not have omitted such an important word as *vākya* and indicated it by the simple correlative conjunction *yatra*. Moreover to the etymologist with a vengeance, as Yāska surely is one, the word or *pada* is everything and the sentence or *vākya* is nothing. Lastly the very division of the sentence *tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* as *tad yatrobhe* [—] *bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* as proposed by Durga and accepted by Roth, is highly unnatural and quite out of keeping with the lucid style of Yāska. [51] His sentences are clear-cut sentences, each having its own verb or predicate. the first part of the division proposed by Durga wants a predicate. And never for once does Yāska omit the word that is most important; while the reading proposed by Durga is egregiously faulty from this point of view.

...

I think the whole passage is to be explained in the following manner:

Yāska has first defined a *nāma* as *sattvapradhāna* and an *ākhyāta* as *bhāvapradhāna*, both being *padas* ... But there are some *padas* in the former category, where *bhāva* seems to be prominent. These are namely the abstract nouns, like *vrajyā*, *paktiḥ*. Here is then clearly a case where the definition of the *ākhyāta* is applicable to certain kinds of *nāma*. The question therefore is, "where both *i.e.*, *nāma* and *ākhyāta*, are characterized by the predominance of *bhāva* or becoming, how are you going to decide"? To this Yāska has a carefully considered answer. Says he "where (however) *bhāva* or becoming predominates in both, there (*i.e.* in such a case, the absence of the correlative *tatra* could be understood and is therefore immaterial) the *bhāva* in a state of flux or change (*pūrvāparībhūtam* or incomplete) is denoted by the *ākhyāta* *e.g.*, *vrajati*, *pacati*; while on the other hand a complete *bhāva* (*i.e.* a *bhāva* that is no longer in becoming or in change) which has materialized into a *sattva*, is expressed by the names of *sattva*, *e.g.* *vrajyā*, *paktiḥ* going, cooking". In *vrajyā*, *paktiḥ* which express a *bhāva* (*e.g.* *bhāvavācakaṃ nāma*) that *bhāva* is no longer in the process of becoming but is now complete; and therefore *vrajyā* and *paktiḥ* are to be classed under nouns or *nāmāni*.

The only scholar who, to my knowledge, has taken up the discussion where Gune left it, is V.K. Rajavade, who makes the following remarks (1940: 221):

tat yatra ubhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ; definitions of verbs and nouns hold so long as you treat them separately; but when you talk of them jointly, i.e., in a sentence (*yatrobhe*), which of these two is principal? In a sentence *bhāva* is principal; for it is a process of evolving something for which instruments or agents such as subject, object, etc. are necessary; these exist for the sake of evolving something; otherwise they have no reason to exist. Dr. Gune and Dr. Sarup construe *tad yathobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* along with what follows. Dr. Gune thinks that the whole is an answer to the question "what about abstract nouns where you have both the *ākhyāta* and the *nāman*;" *vrajyā*, for instance, is made of *vraj* and *yā*; so *pakṭiḥ* of *pac* and *tiḥ*; are these nouns or verbs? The answer is they are really verbs under the guise of nouns. Dr. Gune construes the whole thus: *tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ tatra pūrvāparībhūtaṃ bhāvaṃ* etc. In abstract nouns, according to this construction, both *nāman* and *ākhyāta* have *bhāva* predominant in them ... This rendering is not satisfactory; *bhāva* means becoming; is *vrajyā* a kind of becoming like *vrajati*? *vrajyā* is an accomplished fact for which *sattva* is the name; *vrajyā* is not *bhāvapradhāna*. Durga is absolutely right. Yāska might as well have omitted *tad yatrobhe bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ* as it interrupts the illustrations of nouns and verbs. *pūrvāparībhūtaṃ* etc. illustrates *ākhyāta* and *upakramaprabhṛti* etc. illustrates *nāman*.

[53]

Among more recent scholars, Eivind Kahrs (1986: 121) is of the opinion that we shall probably never be able to make out whether the interpretations offered by Durga and Skanda-Maheśvara are in keeping with the intentions of Yāska or not. Ashok Aklujkar (1999: 99), on the other hand, endorses Gune's position:

Gune (1916: 158-159) rightly argued that Durga's ... explanation of the Yāska sentence *tad yatrobhe* ... is arbitrary in that it presupposes a sentence context when Yāska gives no evidence of being specifically concerned with sentences. The same criticism would apply to the explanation found in the subsequently discovered commentary of [Skanda-Maheśvara] ...

Gune's observations are no doubt important, and Rajavade's arguments may not be compelling, yet it must be stated that Gune did not deal with all the questions surrounding the issue. This should be clear from what follows below.

It has already been noted that the choice between the two interpretations presented above depends on the punctuation to be understood and the words to be supplied. Sarup's translation presupposes the following Sanskrit text (I take what seems to me the minimum possible):

*tad yatrobhe [nāmākhyāte] bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ [tatra] pūrvāparībhūtaṃ
bhāvam ākhyātenācaṣṭe — vrajati pacatīti — upakramaprabhṛtyapavargaparyantaṃ
[bhāvaṃ] mūrtaṃ sattvabhūtaṃ sattvanāmabhiḥ [ācaṣṭe] — vrajyā paktir iti —/
Where both [noun and verb] have *bhāva* as principal [meaning], [there one]
expresses a *bhāva* that develops from earlier to later with the help of a verb — e.g.
vrajati, pacati —, [but one expresses a *bhāva* that extends] from the beginning to the
end, [54] that is embodied and has become a *sattva*, with the help of nouns
(*sattvanāman*) — e.g. *vrajyā, paktiḥ* —.*

The interpretation of Skandasvāmin/Maheśvara, Durga, Nīlakaṇṭha and Roth presupposes a different reading:

*tad yatrobhe [nāmākhyāte bhavataḥ tatra etc] bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ/
pūrvāparībhūtaṃ bhāvam ākhyātenācaṣṭe vrajati pacatīti
upakramaprabhṛtyapavargaparyantaṃ/ mūrtaṃ sattvabhūtaṃ sattvanāmabhiḥ
[ācaṣṭe] vrajyā paktir iti/*

Where both [noun and verb occur together, there they] have *bhāva* as principal [meaning]. [One] expresses with the help of a verb a *bhāva* that develops from earlier to later [and extends] from the beginning to the end; e.g. *vrajati, pacati*. [One expresses] something embodied that has become a *sattva* with the help of nouns; e.g. *vrajyā, paktiḥ*.

Both these interpretations share a difficulty: what is the subject of *ācaṣṭe*? I have supplied 'one' in the translation,⁷ but this is not really convincing since Yāska normally uses a verbal form in the plural in connection with a non-specified subject. Two examples occur in the very same section (Nir 1.1): *tam imaṃ samāmnāyaṃ niḥgaṇṭava ity ācaṣṭate* and

⁷ Both Roth and Sarup translate in the passive ('wird ausgesagt', 'is denoted'), which amounts to the same.

tatraitan nāmākhyātayor lakṣaṇaṃ pradiśanti. Numerous others occur elsewhere in the Nirukta. Some examples from the first chapters are *ācakṣīran* (1.14); *avagr̥hṇanti* (1.17); *pradiśanti*, *bhāṣante*, *abhibhāṣante* (2.2); etc.⁸

A closer study of all the occurrences of *ācaṣṭe* and *ācakṣate* in the Nirukta⁹ reveals that *ācaṣṭe* always has a definite subject, whereas *ācakṣate* frequently has a non-specified subject "they/one". A short survey of the relevant passages confirms this.

[55]

Consider first *ācaṣṭe*. This verb occurs in the following contexts, and as far as I know nowhere else in the Nirukta:¹⁰

Nir 1.2: *jāyata iti pūrvabhāvasyādīm ācaṣṭe na aparabhāvam ācaṣṭe na pratiśedhat[i] ... vinaśyātīty aparabhāvasyādīm ācaṣṭe na pūrvabhāvam ācaṣṭe na pratiśedhati* "The word *jāyate* ('is born') expresses the beginning of the earlier state, [but] it neither expresses nor prohibits the later state; ... the word *vinaśyati* ('perishes') expresses the beginning of the later state, [but] it neither expresses nor prohibits the earlier state".

Nir 1.8: *ṛcām tvaḥ pōsam āste pupuṣvān gāyatrām tvo gāyati śákvarīṣu/ brahmā tvo vādati jātavidyām yajñāsya mātṛām ví mimīta u tvaḥ/ iti ṛtvikkarmaṇām viniyogam ācaṣṭe* "The verse *ṛcām ... tvaḥ* expresses the application of the ritual acts of the priests".

Nir 3.12: *vīpakvaprajña ātmeti ātmagatim ācaṣṭe* "'The soul is of mature wisdom' describes the characteristics of the soul" (tr. Sarup).

Nir 3.22: *katarā pūrvā katarāparāyoh kathā jāte kavayaḥ kó ví veda/ vísvaṃ tmānā bibhrto yád dha nāma ví vartete áhanī cakrīyeva/ ... iti dyāvāpṛthivyoh mahimānam ācaṣṭe* "The verse *katarā ... cakrīyeva* expresses the greatness of heaven and earth".

⁸ A possible exception is Nir 2.1: *tad yeṣu padeṣu svarasaṃskārau samarthau prādeśikena vikāreṇa anvitau syātām tathā tāni nirbrūyāt/ athānanvite rthe 'prādeśike vikāre rthanityaḥ parīkṣeta/ kenacid vṛttisāmānyena/ avidyamāne sāmānye 'py akṣaravarnasāmānyān nirbrūyāt/ na tv eva na nirbrūyāt/ na saṃskāram ādriyeta/ viśayavatyo hi vṛttayo bhavanti/ yathārtham vibhaktiḥ sannamayet/* "With reference to [etymology], the words, the accent and the grammatical form of which are regular and are accompanied by a derivational modification, should be derived in the ordinary manner. But the meaning being irrelevant, and the modification not being in accordance with the grammatical derivation, one should always examine them with regard to their meaning, by the analogy of some (common) course of action. If there be no (such) analogy, one should explain them even by the community of a (single) syllable or sound; but one should never (give up the attempt at) derivation. One should not attach (too much) importance to the grammatical form, for these complex formations (*vṛttayaḥ*) are (often) subject of exceptions. One should interpret the divisions according to the meaning." (Tr. Sarup, modified, partly in the light of Mehendale, 1978: 11, 76, and Scharfe, 1977: 122 with note 26). However, the non-expressed subject of this passage is qualified by the adjective *arthanityaḥ*, and may therefore be more definite (perhaps *nairuktaḥ* "an etymologist") than is clear at first sight.

⁹ Excluding chapters 13 and 14, which are later additions.

¹⁰ The identification of these passages has been much facilitated by the electronic version of the Nirukta prepared by G. Cardona.

Nir 4.23: *áditir dyáur áditir antárikṣam áditir mātá sá pitá sá putráḥ/ víśve devá áditih páñca jánā áditir jātám áditir jánitvam/ ity aditer vibhūtim ācaṣṭ[e]* "The verse *áditir ... jánitvam* expresses the great power of Aditi".

Nir 10.26, 12.37 and 12.38 discuss three further Vedic verses, each of which "expounds the course of the life of the soul" (*ātmagatim ācaṣṭe*; tr. Sarup).

[56]

In all these passages *ācaṣṭe* has a well-defined subject.

The plural *ācakṣate*, on the other hand, often lacks a precise subject. Examples are numerous, so that the following few must here suffice:

Nir 1.1: *tam imaṃ samāmnāyaṃ nighaṇṭava ity ācakṣate* "[They] call this list (*samāmnāya*) *nighaṇṭu*".

Nir 1.20; 7.1: *tad yāni nāmāni prādhānyastutīnām devatānām tad daivatam ity ācakṣate* "[They] call the names of the deities chiefly praised *daivata*".

Nir 2.10; 2.24; 9.23; 10.26; 12.10: *tatreṭihāsam ācakṣate* "In this connection [they] tell [the following] story".

Is there an interpretation of the passage under consideration which provides *ācaṣṭe* with a subject? Such an interpretation is possible, and might take the following shape:

tad yatrobhe [nāmākhyāte] bhāvapradhāne bhavataḥ pūrvāparībhūtaṃ bhāvam ākhyātenācaṣṭe — vrajati pacatīti — upakramaprabhṛtyapavargaparyantaṃ mūrtaṃ sattvabhūtaṃ sattvanāmabhiḥ [ācaṣṭe] — vrajyā paktir iti —/

The [sentence] in which both [noun and verb] have *bhāva* as principal [meaning] expresses with the help of the verb the *bhāva* that develops from earlier to later — e.g. *vrajati, pacati* —, and with the help of nouns that which is embodied, [extends] from the beginning to the end, and has become a *sattva*, — e.g. *vrajyā, paktih* —.

Here no *tatra* corresponding to *yatra* is supplied, but *tad*, the very first word of the passage, is taken to correspond to *yatra* and to be the subject of *ācaṣṭe*.

This interpretation would oblige us to look upon the subject of *ācaṣṭe* as something that contains both a verb and a noun; or, in view of plural *sattvanāmabhiḥ*, a verb and one or more nouns; that is to say: a sentence. It is in the sentence [57] that both noun and verb have *bhāva* as principal meaning.

This interpretation is not however free from difficulties. There is, to begin with, the "very decided preference for putting the relative clause before that to which it relates" (Whitney, 1888: 196 § 512a). This would support the idea that *tad* in the above passage is

used adverbially. And indeed, there are many passage in the Nirukta where adverbial *tad* precedes a form of *yad*, which is then referred back to by a subsequently occurring form of *tad*. E.g.

- 1.1 *tad yāni catvāri padajātāni nāmākhyāte copasarganipātās ca tāni imāni bhavanti.*
- 1.3 *tad ya eṣu padārthaḥ prāhur ime taṃ nāmākhyātayor arthavikaraṇam.*
- 1.12; cp. 1.14 *tad yatra svarasṃskārau samarthau prādeśikena vikāreṇānvitau syātām saṃvijñātāni tāni yathā gaur aśvaḥ puruṣo hastīti.*
- 1.20 *tad yad anyadaivate mantre nipatati naighaṇṭukaṃ tat.*
- 1.20; 7.1 *tad yāni nāmāni prādhānyastutīnām devatānām tad daivatam ity ācakṣate.*
- 2.1 *tad yeṣu padeṣu svarasṃskārau samarthau prādeśikena vikāreṇānvitau syātām tathā tāni nirbrūyāt.*
- 2.2 *tad yatra svarād anantarāntasthāntardhātur bhavati tad dviprakṛtīnām sthānam iti pradīśanti.*
- 2.23; 2.27 *tad yad devatāvad upariṣṭāt tad vyākhyāsyāmaḥ.*
- 2.24 *tad yad dvivad upariṣṭāt tad vyākhyāsyāmaḥ.*
- 5.11 *tad yā etās cāndramasya āgāmīnya āpo bhavanti raśmayas tā aparapakṣe pibanti.*
- [58]
- 7.4 *tad ye 'nādiṣṭadevatā mantrās teṣu devatopaparīkṣā.*
- 10.16 *tad yat samānyām ṛci samānābhivvyāhāraṃ bhavati taj jāmi bhavātīty ekam.*

It will be clear from these examples that the third interpretation suggested above is confronted with major difficulties.

We are forced to conclude that, whatever way we look at it, the passage under consideration deviates from Yāska's usual style, so that certain arguments based on Yāska's style elsewhere in the Nirukta cannot be used, or only with the utmost caution. At the same time, Gune's points to the extent that Yāska was not interested in sentences, and if he had been, he would have said so, seem to me to clinch the issue.

To this can be added that it is not surprising that his commentators interpreted the passage in the light of later developments in linguistic philosophy, if indeed we may assume that they worked at or after the time that these developments were introduced and that they were aware of them. It seems indeed likely that the *śābdabodha*-like interpretation of Yāska's passage must post-date Bhartṛhari. This last observation is of some significance

in view of the the date of Durga accepted by certain scholars. Consider the following remarks by Aklujkar (1994: 9-10 n. 4):

Sarup (1928: Introduction pp. 11-12) first determined the relative chronology of those (direct and indirect) Nirukta commentators whose works are available as: Skanda > Devarāja Yajvan > Durga > Maheśvara. Then (1931: Introduction pp. 54-97) he changed his view to: Durga > Skanda > Devarāja Yajvan > Maheśvara. ... The dates assigned by Sarup ... to [these] commentators are: Durga: first century A.D., Skanda: end of fifth century A.D. or [59] beginning of the sixth century A.D., Maheśvara: twelfth century A.D. ... For the purpose of the present essay, I accept Sarup's 1931 dating of Durga and [Skanda-Maheśvara]. However, I would not be surprised if future research were to push the dates back.

Bhartṛhari lived in the 5th century C.E. The reflections presented in this article suggest that Durga may not have lived before that century, and not therefore in the first century A.D. or even earlier, as proposed by Sarup and Aklujkar.

References:

- Aklujkar, Ashok (1994): "The Ṭikākāra mentioned by Skanda-Maheśvara." *Vācaspatyam. Pt. Vamanshastri Bhagwat Felicitation Volume*. Ed. Saroja Bhate and Madhav Deshpande. Pune: Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala. Pp. 9-25.
- Aklujkar, Ashok (1999): *The Theory of Nipātas (particles) in Yāska's Nirukta*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. (Post-graduate and Research Department Series No. 42; "Pandit Shripad Shastri Deodhar Memorial Lectures" [Sixth Series].)
- Bhadkamkar, H.M., assisted by R.G. Bhadkamkar (ed.)(1918): *The Nirukta of Yāska (with Nighaṅṭu), edited with Durga's commentary*. Vol. I. Reprint: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1985. (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, no. LXXIII.)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2000): "The relationship between linguistics and other sciences in India." *History of the Language Sciences / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften / Histoire des sciences du langage*, vol. I. Ed. Sylvain Auroux, E.F.K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe, Kees Versteegh. Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter. Pp. 166-173.
- Gune, P.D. (1916): "Some notes on Yāska's Nirukta." *Indian Antiquary* 45, 157-160 & 173-177.
- Houben, Jan E.M. (1997): "The Sanskrit tradition." *The Emergence of Semantics in Four Linguistic Traditions: Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Arabic*. By Wout van Bekkum, Jan Houben, Ineke Sluiter and Kees Versteegh. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, 82.) Pp. 51-145.
- Iyer, K. A. Subramania (ed.)(1973): *Vākyapadiya of Bhartṛhari with the Prakīrṇakaprakāśa of Helārāja*. Kāṇḍa III, Part ii. Poona: Deccan College.

- Kahrs, Eivind (1986): "Durga on *bhāva*." *Kalyānamitrārāgaṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*. Ed. Eivind Kahrs. Oslo: Norwegian University Press / The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture. Series B: Skrifter 70. Pp. 115-144.
- Mehendale, M.A. (1978): *Nirukta Notes. Series II*. Pune: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Rājavāde, Vaijanātha Kāśinātha (ed.)(1921): *Durgācāryakṛtavṛttisametam Niruktam. Pūrvaśatkātmakah prathamō bhāgaḥ*. Poona: Ānandāśrama. (Ānandāśramasamskrtagranthāvali, no. 88.)
- Rajavade, V[aijanātha] K[āśināth] (1940): *Yāska's Nirukta. Volume I*. Second edition: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1993. (Government Oriental Series, Class A No. 7.)
- Rau, Wilhelm (ed.)(1977): *Bhartr̥haris Vākyapadīya*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XLII, 4.)
- Roth, Rudolph (1852): *Yāska, Nirukta. Mit den Nighaṇṭavas herausgegeben und erläutert*. Texte und Erläuterungen in einem Band. Reprint: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1976.
- Sarup, Lakshman (1921): *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta. Introduction, English translation and notes*. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1966.
- Sarup, Lakshman (1928): *The Fragments of the Commentaries of Skandasvāmin and Maheśvara. Chapter I*. Reprinted in Sarup, 1982.
- Sarup, Lakshman (1931): *Commentary of Skandasvāmin & Maheśvara on the Nirukta. Chapters II-VI*. Reprinted in Sarup, 1982.
- Sarup, Lakshman (1982): *Commentary of Skandasvāmin & Maheśvara on the Nirukta*. With additions & corrections by Acharya V.P. Limaye. 2 vols. New Delhi: Panini. (Panini Vaidika Granthamala, 11.)
- Scharfe, Hartmut (1977): *Grammatical Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (A History of Indian Literature V.2.)
- Vidyāsāgara, Jivānanda (ed.)(Im 1891): *Niruktam (Nighaṇṭuḥ). With the commentaries of Devarāja Yajvan and Durga*. Calcutta: Sarasvatīyantra.
- Vijayapāla (ed.)(1982): *Nirukta-Śloka-vārttikam*. Bahālagadhā (Sonipat, Haryana): Ramlal Kapur Trust.
- Whitney, William Dwight (1888): *Sanskrit Grammar. Including both the classical language and the older dialects of Veda and Brahmana*. Second edition. Reprint: Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1962.

Abbreviations:

Mahā-bh	Patañjali, (Vyākaraṇa-)Mahābhāṣya, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bombay 1880-1885
Nir	Nirukta
P.	Pāṇinian sūtra
vt.	vārttika on Pāṇinian sūtra