



HAL
open science

Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit

Jan E.M. Houben

► **To cite this version:**

Jan E.M. Houben. Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit. Bulletin d'Études Indiennes, 2015, Bulletin d'Études Indiennes (BEI), No. 32: Les études sur les langues indiennes: leur contribution à l'histoire des idées linguistiques et à la linguistique contemporaine (Textes réunis par Émilie Aussant et Jean-Luc Chevillard), 32, pp. 149-170. halshs-01413909

HAL Id: halshs-01413909

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01413909v1>

Submitted on 11 Dec 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Author's copy of

“Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit: features and principles of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva of Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr” *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* (Paris), vol. 32, pp. 149-170.

appeared in:

Bulletin d'Études Indiennes (BEI), No. 32 (2014) [2015]

Les études sur les langues indiennes: leur contribution à l'histoire des idées linguistiques et à la linguistique contemporaine (Textes réunis par Émilie Aussant et Jean-Luc Chevillard), pp. 149-170.

[= Proceedings of the **Panel : The Indian Traditions of Language Studies**

Jean-Luc Chevillard, CNRS—Université Paris 7 (France), jlc@ccr.jussieu.fr

Emilie Aussant, Université de Bordeaux III (France), emilie.aussant@aliceadsl.fr

International Conference on the History of Language Sciences: **ICHoLS XI Potsdam** vom 28. August bis 2. September 2008]

Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit : features and principles of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva of Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr.

Jan E.M. Houben

Abstract:

Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit : features and principles of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva

At around 350 B.C.E. Pāṇini composed a grammar of the language of the Vedas and the spoken high-standard language (which we now call Sanskrit) that pushed other grammatical works into oblivion. In the course of the centuries several additions and adaptations have been proposed and variously accepted in the rules and in the lists of roots and other lexical items. This gave rise to different forms and interpretations of Pāṇini's grammar, and also to grammars that appeared under a new title even if they are largely derived from and inspired by Pāṇini's grammar. Among the available versions, the little-known Prakriyā-sarvasva by the brilliant and versatile author Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr (17th century) is at least as comprehensive as the well-known Pāṇinian grammar of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, the Siddhānta-kaumudī, but significantly differs from it in both method and substance, even if both remain within the framework of Pāṇini's system. The Prakriyā-Sarvasva provides many novel perspectives on theoretical issues in Pāṇinian grammar and represents a much neglected pragmatic approach (in contradistinction to the exegetic approach of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita). Since its object is Sanskrit as used and accepted not only by the three sages – Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali – but also by later authors of the Sanskrit tradition, it can be justly regarded as a Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit. Three different dimensions of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva confirm this: the features of the grammar, which, like the Siddhānta-Kaumudī, is a re-ordered version of Pāṇini's grammar; the principles of the grammar as explained and illustrated in a special section of the grammar; the defence of the basic principles of his approach against other grammarians, in a verse in his commentary and developed in a brief separate treatise.

Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit : features and principles of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva of Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr.¹

Jan E.M. Houben

1.1

Wilhelm Halbfass once observed that “ ... in general, those who present themselves as the most orthodox and uncompromising guardians of the sanctity and authority of the Veda are not necessarily closest to its spirit” (Halbfass 1991: 390). This was meant to apply to the ancient Indian philosophical school Sāṃkhya-Yoga in contrast to Pūrva-mīmāṃsā and Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika which were “supposedly more ‘orthodox’ ” schools (Halbfass *ibid.*), that is, more in accordance with the Vedas.

In the course of the centuries and millennia, the Indian grammatical tradition that goes back to Pāṇini (350 B.C.E.) developed numerous schools differing in a number of relatively small details in the basic texts and in their interpretation and elaboration. To my knowledge, all major current specialists of Pāṇinian grammar, in India and in the “West,” go back, directly or indirectly, to a single school within the tradition of Pāṇinian grammar, the one founded by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita² in the early seventeenth century – ca. 2000 years after Pāṇini – and completed and perfected by Nāgeśa in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century.

Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s main contributions to technical grammar were the Siddhānta-kaumudī and a major commentary on it, the Prauḍha-manoramā. The Siddhānta-kaumudī is a re-ordered Pāṇinian grammar in broad outlines very similar to its predecessor, the Prakriyā-kaumudī of the 14th / early 15th century grammarian Rāmacandra. An important commentary on this Prakriyā-kaumudī was composed by Śeṣa-Śrīkṛṣṇa (also referred to as Śeṣa, Śrīkṛṣṇa or Śeṣa-kṛṣṇa), who was a direct teacher of Bhaṭṭoji.³ Where Bhaṭṭoji’s Siddhānta-kaumudī deviates from the Prakriyā-kaumudī and the commentary of Śrīkṛṣṇa, it is usually an attempt to be more close to the view of authoritative grammarians, who are, for Bhaṭṭoji, limited to three, and only three, grammarians of antiquity: Pāṇini himself, Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Criticisms were leveled against Bhaṭṭoji’s Siddhānta-kaumudī, especially by students of the school of Śrīkṛṣṇa, that is, the school of Bhaṭṭoji’s teacher.⁴

¹ This article is based on my presentation at ICHoLS XI Potsdam in 2008 and was finalized within the framework of ANR 11 BSH2 003 03, intitulé PP 16-17 : Pāṇini et les Pāṇinéens des XVIe-XVIIe siècles.

² Benares, the place where Bhaṭṭoji worked, is still a stronghold of his school, although attempts have been made to break its dominance for instance by adherents of the Arya Samaj (cf. Clementin-Ojha 2004). The solid popularity of Bhaṭṭoji’s and Nāgeśa’s school among grammarians of Maharashtra (e.g., Pune, Satara) is well-known. Dr. K.V. Abhyankar, Pt. Bhagavat Śāstrī, Dr. S.D. Joshi, their students Madhav Deshpande, Paul Kiparsky, Johannes Bronkhorst and J.A.F. Roodbergen – the latter initiated me into Pāṇinian grammar in 1984 – are all thoroughly trained in the texts and theoretical choices of Bhaṭṭoji’s and Nāgeśa’s school. Also Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat (student of Pdt. M.S. Narasimhācārya; cp. Filliozat 1988: 33) and George Cardona (student of Raghunatha Sharma, Varanasi, and of others), had teachers who themselves had studied under students of (students of ...) students of Nāgeśa or Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa. For a tree giving the teacher-student relationships from Nāgeśa for a few generations up to his own time see Kielhorn’s table (PBhĪŚ xxivf, footnote); an expanded table, updated till about a century later, is found at the end of K.V. Abhyankar’s preface to the second edition (1960) of Kielhorn’s edition and translation of Nāgeśa’s PBhĪŚ.

³ Cf. Bali 1976 : 4-7, 126, 151.

⁴ Among these critics was the famous Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, court poet of Shah Jahan (1592-1666, ruling the Mughal Empire from 1627 – 1658). Because the date of Jagannātha’s literary activity is quite well established at 1620-1665 (Kane 1971: 324) on account of his links with and references to various historical personalities. Jagannātha belonged to a younger generation than Bhaṭṭoji. For grammar not only Jagannātha but also Jagannātha’s father were students of Vīreśvara, the son of Śrīkṛṣṇa who was Bhaṭṭoji’s teacher.

Bhaṭṭoji accepted only Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali as authoritative grammarians, but Śrīkṛṣṇa had been ready to accept in his work the authority also of later, post-Patañjali, grammarians. The controversy between Bhaṭṭoji's family (the Mahīdhara-family⁵) and the Śeṣa-family stretched over several generations, and has till now not been adequately analyzed. In reaction to the criticism of followers of Śrīkṛṣṇa and others, Bhaṭṭoji wrote his Prauḍha-manoramā, a learned commentary on his own Siddhānta-kaumudī. This commentary accomplishes two major aims. First, it shows with great technical detail how his position on numerous grammatical topics follows from the works of the foundational grammarians of antiquity, Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali, who are regarded as the three sages, *muni-traya*. Second, it argues, or rather simply posits, that the collective authority of these three sages is absolute while later grammarians have no authority unless they base themselves directly on them; and, moreover, that among them the later grammarian has more authority than the preceding one(s).⁶

With a variation on the expression used by Halbfass in the passage cited above we can say that Bhaṭṭoji presents himself as “the most orthodox and uncompromising guardian of the authority” of grammar of Pāṇini and his two successors. We may then continue with a question parallel to the second part of Halbfass’ observation: When Bhaṭṭoji presented himself as “the most orthodox and uncompromising guardian of the authority” of Pāṇini’s grammar, how close was he to its spirit ?

1.2

With his Siddhānta-kaumudī and Prauḍha-manoramā, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita was not the first to emphasize the importance of the *muni-traya* (“triad of sages”), Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali.⁷ However, he was the first to demonstrate that their authority – and especially the final authority of Patañjali – need not only be nominal or rhetorical but can be an absolute authority in grammatical practice as well. In a time when the public that was to use the grammars was gradually more and more alienated from the actual use of Sanskrit – in a time when vernaculars had a strong role in poetry and in scholarly and religious texts and the socio-linguistic territory of Sanskrit had decreased or was at least under serious threat⁸ – this was, indeed, a small step of a grammarian but a giant leap for Sanskrit grammar: it was an irreversible transition from a grammar with an underlying basically open “authority structure” to a grammar with a strictly limited and closed “authority structure” (cf. Houben 2008a). The choice to limit authority to these three authors may have been arbitrary and counter to logic, it did make things easier for beginning students since the number of difficult exceptions to be studied is significantly reduced. The fact that this choice implied that works such as the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas become “grammatically wrong” – unless Vedic usage (*ārṣa prayoga*) is invoked – may seem a

Bhaṭṭoji’s literary activity has hence been placed between ca. 1580 and 1630 (Gode 1954b, 1954c, 1956b; Kane 1971: 324; Bali 1976: 4)

⁵ According to Abhyankar & Shukla (1977) Bhaṭṭoji was a “Telugu Brahmin”; the Bhāratīya Saṁskṛti Kośa (Joshi et al. 1997-2000, vol. 6: 369) s.v. Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita notes that he was a Telugu Brahmin and belonged to the Taittirīya school of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda. Ramamurti (1973: 30-31 and 1980) argued that Bhaṭṭoji's family is from a village near a temple dedicated to the deity Śrīkālahasti in current Andhra Pradesh; Bhaṭṭoji's brother Raṅgoji wrote a special hymn to praise this deity. The family name Mahīdhara is attested for another member of Bhaṭṭoji's family, Lakṣmīṅśimha, author of the Vedāntic text Ābhoga.

⁶ This relation is formulated in the principle *yathottaram muninām prāmāṇyam* posited already by Kaiyaṭa in the 11th century; in practice this means that the final authority rests with Patañjali.

⁷ Cf. Deshpande 1998, 2001.

⁸ Wezler 1996

drawback from a modern perspective. In fact, it must have been an additional boon to those who did not want to attribute to the Mahābhārata and Purāṇic texts an authoritative status with regard to ritual and religion.

It turns out that, apart from others before him such as Appayya-dīkṣita,⁹ Bhaṭṭoji-dīkṣita himself argued vehemently against attributing a high level of authority to these texts. This he did most extensively in his voluminous but little studied work the *Tattva-kaustubha*. The opening verses are as follows:

*viśveśam sac-cid-ānandaṁ vande'haṁ yo'khilam jagat /
carikarti barībharti saṁjārīharti līlayā //
keladī-veṅkaṭendrasya nideśād viduṣāṁ mude /
dhvāntocchittau paṭutaras tanyate tattva-kaustubhaḥ //
phaṇi-bhāṣita-bhāṣyābdheḥ śabda-kaustubha ud-dhṛtaḥ /
sāṅkarād api bhāṣyābdhes tattva-kaustubham uddhare //*

"I bow to the lord of the universe, who is Being-Consciousness-Bliss, who in play continuously produces, continuously maintains, and continuously destroys the entire universe.

At the command of king Veṅkaṭa of Keladī, for the joy of the sages, the gem of true principles (*tattva-kaustubha*), most clear in removing darkness, is (here) displayed (by me).

The gem of (correct) words (*śabda-kaustubha*) has (already) been extricated from the ocean of the Mahābhāṣya, formulated by the hooded snake (Patañjali); (now) also from the ocean of the commentary of Śāṅkara, I extricate (in the current work) the gem of true principles."

The first sentence of the first Pariccheda clarifies Bhaṭṭoji's intention:

*iha khalu ke cit pāñcarātrādy-āgamāṁś tad-anusāri-purāṇa-bhāgāṁś copajīvyā tad-
adhikāri-tattvam aparyālocayantaḥ śrautas-mārtamārgaṁ tyajanti tyājayanti ca / tān
samyak śikṣayitūṁ tantrādy-adhikāri tāvan nirūpyate*

"Currently, indeed, there are some who live in dependence on the Āgamas of Pañcarātra etc., and on the sections of the Purāṇas that follow these, and who, not clearly perceiving the principle of who is entitled to those [Āgamas and Āgamic Purāṇa-sections], desert the path of Śrauta and Smārta [rituals], and make others desert that path [too]. In order to properly teach these persons, the one entitled to the Tantras etc. is first of all described."

The discussion that follows tries to show with the help of numerous citations that¹⁰ "those who, either on account of a curse of Gautama etc., or on account of a very bad action, have gone outside the fold of the Veda, and those born from mixed wombs, they are the ones entitled to Tantras etc., and, according to suitability, women and śūdras."

The whole work consists of three Paricchedas of unequal length – the middle one, discussing and refuting Madhva's commentary on the Brahma-sūtras and re-establishing the one by Śāṅkara, being by far the longest. The available edition is incomplete (in the copy available to me part of the second and the entire third Pariccheda are missing). In the formulation of a *pūrvapakṣa* in the second Pariccheda the opponent cites a (so-called) revealed text: *brhanto hy asmin guṇāḥ iti śruteḥ*. Later on Bhaṭṭoji rejects this because the passage from a revealed text is not real, only imagined: *brhanto hi iti śrutes tvat-kalpitatvāt* (TK p. 9).

The main opponents of Bhaṭṭoji in the *Tattva-kaustubha* are therefore the teacher Madhva and his followers. Madhva is known to have supported his positions and his arguments with numerous citations from otherwise untraced and unidentified texts the

⁹ According to Swaminathan (1973: 20), Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita "was initiated into Pūrvamīmāṃsā and Vedānta by Appayya Dīkṣita." The importance of Appayya Dīkṣita for Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita esp. with regard to the latter's position vis à vis the Mādhyas has recently been highlighted by Prof. Madhav Deshpande (forthc. (b)).

¹⁰ TK p. 1: *śāpād vā gautamādīnām pāpād vā mahato narāḥ / ye gatā veda-bāhyatvaṁ ye ca saṁkīrṇa-yonijāḥ // te' dhikriyante tantrātau strī-śūdrāś ca yathāyatham /*

authenticity of which was doubted from the time of Madhva onwards.¹¹ (Cf. Roque Mesquita 1998, 2000 and Houben 2000 for the large number of unknown literary sources of Madhva.) Madhva and his followers were also the opponents for other members of Bhaṭṭoji's family. The skill of Bhaṭṭoji's brother Raṅgoji in refuting Mādhva's system in debates is highlighted at the beginning of the *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa* (also in its compact version, the *Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra*) of Kaunḍa-bhaṭṭa (the son of Raṅgoji and hence a nephew of Bhaṭṭoji).¹² Kaunḍa-bhaṭṭa's brief reference implies that Raṅgoji obtained a resounding victory in such disputes. On the other hand, documents reporting the Mādhvas' perspective on a concrete dispute that took place at the court of Veṅkaṭappā, Nāyaka king of the small kingdom of Ikkeri (in Kerala) claim that victory was unequivocally achieved by Raṅgoji's opponent Vidyādhiśa.¹³

What were the parameters of disagreement between, on the one hand, Bhaṭṭoji and his family and followers, and, on the other hand, Mādhva and his adherents? One prominent parameter (a) is the opposition Dvaita versus Advaita Vedānta, esp. with regard to the interpretation of the *Brahma-sūtra*. It would be an error to see this as the only disagreement. Even from sample passages from what is available of the *Tattva-kaustubha* (some we saw above), it is clear that another important parameter concerns (b) the validity for Brahmins of the traditional texts (*āgamas*) of Pañcarātra – their validity for non-Brahmins and women is not disputed – compared to that of Vedic texts on Śrauta and Smārta ritual; Bhaṭṭoji wrote several works specifically with regard to this type of problems in the domain of Śrauta and Smārta ritual; still another parameter is (c) Vaiṣṇava religious philosophy that leaves no significant place for Śaiva elements versus a religious outlook that accepts Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva elements.¹⁴ Finally, (d) the acceptability of certain forms as correct words (*śabda*) played a role in these discussions.¹⁵

In itself this observation on the *Tattva-kaumudī* and other lesser known works of Bhaṭṭoji and his family members would be of only marginal, anecdotal interest in a discussion on Bhaṭṭoji as grammarian. However, the approach in Bhaṭṭoji's greatly successful *Siddhānta-kaumudī* (which was written earlier) turns out to be precisely parallel to the one in his *Tattva-kaumudī* (although written later the subject apparently had his passionate interest since long). Not only in ritual and religious life does Bhaṭṭoji seek to

¹¹ On the basis of an extensive study of textual evidence and of the religious background and context of Madhva (13th cent.), Roque Mesquita (1998, 2000; a review: Houben 2000) concludes that the passages that are cited from "unknown sources," usually in order to establish points that deviate from the Brahminical tradition and from doctrines adhered to by Śāṅkara and other Vedāntic teachers, are mainly composed by no-one else than Madhva himself. According to Mesquita this does not necessarily mean that Madhva was a fraud and forger, as was claimed by roughly contemporaneous opponents and later by Appayya Dīkṣita. In the light of his religious background and on the basis of his own statements it can be inferred that Madhva sincerely believed that he wrote the passages in question under direct inspiration of Viṣṇu, as he regarded himself as an incarnation of Vāyu, Viṣṇu's son.

¹² Cf. the fourth opening verse in VBhS: *praṇamya pītarāṃ raṅgojibhaṭṭābhīdham dvaita-dhvānta-nivāraṇādi-phalikāṃ pumbhāva-vāgdevatām* "having saluted respectfully my father named Raṅgojibhaṭṭa, who a male form of the Deity of Speech (Sarasvatī) who successfully achieves things such as the removal of the darkness of the doctrine of Dvaita Vedānta ... "

¹³ See Deshpande forthc. (a) for a discussion of some of these documents (a) and especially of an unpublished one entitled *Raṅgojibhaṭṭa-dhikkāra*.

¹⁴ If we regard the opening lines of a work as an index of the author's belief, we see that Bhaṭṭoji's invocations are Vaiṣṇava in character, whereas Nāgeśa, for instance in his *PbhI*, invokes in a universalistic mood, *sāmbaśivam brahma*.

¹⁵ Cf. Swaminathan (1973: 20): "The *Tattvakaustubha* is a refutation of the charges of Madhva and his followers against Śāṅkara's Advaita. Bhaṭṭoji herein exposes, very often, the shallowness of the knowledge of grammar of the Mādhva writers."

establish reliable "foundations" with arguments which consist mainly in weighing, in a Mīmāṃsā style of argumentation, the relative authoritativeness of various sources; also in grammar he basically does hardly anything else than weighing the relative authoritativeness of various sources. In ritual Bhaṭṭoji finds his reliable foundations in Vedic Śrauta-texts, in the religious and philosophical doctrine of Vedānta he finds them in the commentary of Śaṅkara that is held to be finally authoritative; in grammar, finally, he finds a solid, authoritative ground in the *muni-traya*, the position of ultimate authority being occupied by Patañjali's commentary on Pāṇini and Kātyāyana. In this regard we can speak of Bhaṭṭoji's "brilliant foundationalism." Bhaṭṭoji's "foundationalism"¹⁶ in grammar was "brilliant" because in order to establish it in detail a profound mastery of Pāṇini's grammar was needed. In order to provide the desired solid authoritative basis to Sanskrit grammar it was moreover necessary to posit it as a closed system of rules and metarules – something it had never been in a true sense of this term for around two millennia, although Kātyāyana's and Patañjali's investigations on selected *sūtras* had prepared the ground for such an approach. The culmination in this trend came only a few generations later with Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa's Paribhāṣenduśekhara which examined and analysed 122 principles of interpretation that were not explicitly formulated by Pāṇini but that had been invoked both in *pūrva-pakṣas* and in *siddhāntas* in the Pāṇinian tradition from Kātyāyana and Patañjali onwards. As for Bhaṭṭoji, the close parallelism between his enterprise in the Tattva-kaustubha and that in the Śabda-kaustubha is borne out both by the similarity in the title and by the opening verse of the Tattva-kaumudī, already cited: *phaṇi-bhāṣita-bhāṣyābdheḥ śabda-kaustubha ud-dhṛtaḥ / śāṅkarād api bhāṣyābdhes tattva-kaustubham uddhare //* The corresponding line at the beginning of the Śabda-kaustubha: *phaṇi-bhāṣita-bhāṣyābdheḥ śabda-kaustubham uddhare //* "from the ocean of the Mahābhāṣya, formulated by the hooded snake (Patañjali), I extricate (in the current work) the gem of (correct) words."

In Bhaṭṭoji's and his successor Nāgeśa's effort to be more orthodox than the orthodox and to place Pāṇinian grammar on an absolute footing, something was gained, something was lost. Among things that were gained there was the simpler authority structure underlying the grammar, and a passion for grammar as a closed system. Among things that were lost was the capacity of grammar to account for certain forms of later Sanskrit (as used by otherwise widely respected authors¹⁷). More generally, something of

¹⁶ The term "fundamentalism" initially referred to the strong adherence to a set of beliefs expressed in the series of articles *The Fundamentals* (1910-1915), which constituted a bible-oriented response to modernist, liberal theology; in the 1980s it was applied to developments in Iran; after that to groups within any religious and/or political community seeking to defend "fundamentals" in doctrine and/or ritual against others who have already innovated according to evolving circumstances. With regard to grammar (Houben 2008b) I have used the term in a generalized sense but with the initial "intellectual" bend, without suggesting the use of "arguments" of physical violence to convince opponents. Since the meaning carried by the term 'fundamentalism' in pre-1980s usage is increasingly obfuscated by recent developments, I now propose to express it by the term 'foundationalism'.

¹⁷ It seems that Bhaṭṭoji did not use the argument of "incorrect sanskrit" directly against the epic and Purāṇic texts – although he did argue for their relatively low authoritative status – but against commentators and interpreters of these texts (of Mādhva conviction). Also Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa is careful enough to note that his father Raṅgoji attacked not so much Gautama and Jaimini (the reputed authors of the systems of Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā respectively) but their commentators (VBhS, fourth opening verse: *gautama-jaiminīya-vacana-vyākhyātr̥bhīr ... teṣāṃ vaco dūṣaye*). On the other hand, according to a statement that is to be verified (Swaminathan 1973: 21) it would have been Raṅgoji's aim to "establish the Advaita philosophy by demonstrating the untenability of the dualistic philosophical systems, especially the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika ..."

Pāṇini's spirit of liberality was lost, the spirit attested, for instance, in Pāṇini's adopting as optional the views of other grammarians before him and of his time.

1.3

Our preceding observations on well-known and lesser known features of Bhaṭṭoji's work and life are necessary to appreciate the specific characteristics of the work and life of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, who, as we will see, went in several respects in quite different and even opposite directions compared to Bhaṭṭoji.

Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr (in Kerala), author of the devotional poem Nārāyaṇīya and of several literary and scholarly works, was also the author of a grammar in which Pāṇini occupies a central position even if no absolute authority is attributed either to him or to his two successors, Kātyāyana and Patañjali. There is disagreement about the date of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's death, but his birth date is referred to in some documents and is generally accepted to be 735 Malayalam Era or 1560 C.E. The date of his literary activity was between ca. 1580 and ca. 1620, which does not exclude that he may have lived well beyond the latter date.¹⁸ Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa was hence contemporaneous to Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita – although they never met there are anecdotes that they set out to travel to their respective residences but gave up the effort before reaching their goal.

Apart from the Nārāyaṇīya (a poetic summary of the Bhāgavata Purāna on the incarnations of Viṣṇu that became famous throughout India) and the Prakriyā-sarvasva (which was largely forgotten even in Kerala within a few decades after its completion), Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa has numerous works on his name, in such diverse domains as poetry, scholarly works and Vedic ritual. They include a Dhātukāvya that tells the story of the killing of Kaṁsa by Kṛṣṇa illustrating one by one the use of the roots of the Dhātupāṭha; several *campūs* (compositions in mixed verse and prose) on epic themes such as the Rājasūya-campū on the Rājasūya of Yudhiṣṭhira and the Dūtavākya on Kṛṣṇa's role as mediator between the Pāṇḍavas and Duryodhana; panegyrics on current kings such as Vīrakerala, king of Cochin, and Devanārāyaṇa, king of Ampalapuḷa (the latter being the one who requested him to compose the Prakriyā-sarvasva); and part one of the Mānameyodaya, an overview of Mīmāṁsā according to the school of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa.

2.1

Although in the view of the extreme orthodoxy of the school of Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgeśa, the Prakriyā-sarvasva of Nārāyaṇa could probably hardly be regarded as Pāṇinian, it is thoroughly Pāṇinian both according to Nārāyaṇa's own statement and according to its substance.

Nārāyaṇa's own statement in introductory verse no. 9 (in the *gīti* metre) is as follows:

*ayam acyuta-guru-kṛpayā pāṇini-kātyāyanādi-kāruṇyāt /
yatnaḥ phala-prasūḥ syāt kṛta-rāga-raso 'dya śabda-mārga-juṣām //*

"Through the compassion of the teacher Acyuta (Piṣāroṭi) and on account of the kindheartedness of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and others, this effort should be fruitful – this effort whose taste of passion is today accomplished for those who enjoy the way of words." /// this effort which is essentially a passion that is today accomplished for those who enjoy the way of words.///

¹⁸ Venkitasubramonia Iyer 1972: 20-23 regards as acceptable a statement of the astrologer Neḍumpayil Kṛṣṇan Āśān, whose line of teachers goes back to Acyuta Piṣāroṭi, the grammar teacher of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. According to him, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa lived for 106 years. Kunjunni Raja found this difficult to believe and argued that he must have passed away before 1655 when the task to finish the Mīmāṁsā work Mānameyodaya is given to another scholar after Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa had finished its first part (Kunjunni Raja 1958: 130-135).

this effort which is essentially (which is having the *rasa* 'essence' of) a passion (*rāga*) that is today accomplished (*kṛta*) for those who enjoy the way of words.

The features of the Prakriyā-sarvasva are contrasted with those of other works, and its substance is explained in introductory verses 5 (Śārdūlavikrīḍita) and 6-7 (two *gītis*), which are placed in the mouth of Nārāyaṇa's sponsor, the king Devanārāyaṇa of Ampalapuḷa:

Verse 5 :

*vṛttau cāru na rūpasiddhi-kathanā[>nam] rūpāvatāre punaḥ
kaumudyādiṣu cātra sūtram akhilaṁ nāsty eva tasmāt tvayā /
rūpānīti-samasta-sūtra-sahitaṁ spaṣṭaṁ mītaṁ prakriyā-
sarvasvābhīhitaṁ nibandhanaṁ idaṁ kāryaṁ mad-uktādhvanā //*

"In the (Kāśikā-)Vṛtti the description of the formation of the form (of words) is not nice ; and again in the Rūpāvatāra (of Dharmakīrti) and in works such as the (Prakriyā-) kaumudī (of Rāmacandra), in these the text of the sūtras is not complete ;

that is why you (Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa) should compose, according to the way which I (Devanārāyaṇa) tell you, this clear work of moderate extension called Prakriyā-sarvasva that contains all sūtras and the formation of forms."

Verses 6-7 :

*iha sañjñā paribhāṣā sandhiḥ kṛt taddhitāḥ samāsās ca /
strīpratyayāḥ subarthāḥ supām vidhiś cātmane-pada-vibhāgaḥ //
tiṅ api ca lārthaviśeṣāḥ sananta-yañ-yañlukaś ca subdhātuḥ /
nyāyo dhātur uñādiś chāndasam iti santu vimśatiḥ khaṇḍāḥ //*

"There must be twenty sections (khaṇḍāḥ) in this (work) :

I. *sañjñā-(khaṇḍāḥ)* – (section on) technical terms

II. *pari-bhāṣā-* – metarules

III. *sandhi-* – phonetic modifications where morphemes and words meet

IV. *kṛt-* – primary suffixes

V. *taddhita-* – secondary suffixes

VI. *samāsa-* – compounds

VII. *strī-pratyaya-* – feminine suffixes

VIII. *sub-ārtha-* – the meaning of nominal endings

IX. *sub-vidhi-* – rules for nominal endings

X. *ātmanepada-parasmaipada-vibhāga-* – distinction between active and medium

XI. *tiṅ-* – verbal endings (according to ten present-classes & according to ten *la-kāras* of times and modes)

XII. *lārtha-viśeṣa-* – particularities in the meaning of the *la-kāras*

XIII. *san-anta-* – desideratives

XIV. *yañ-* – intensives

XV. *yañ-luk-* – intensives without -ya-

XVI. *sub-dhātu-* – denominatives

XVII. *nyāya-* – rules and general principles in the derivation of forms

XVIII. *dhātu-* – verbal stems: "roots"

XIX. *uñādi-* – suffixes for the formation of nominal stems (apart from *kṛt* and *taddhita* suffixes, etc.)

XX. *chāndasa-* – rules for the accents and for the vedic language."

2.2

At the end of chapter XI on verbal endings, Nārāyaṇa gives a verse (in the *sragdharā* metre) that, in a nutshell, explains his position in a controversy on the authoritativeness of Pāṇini. The same verse appears again at the beginning of the Apāṇinīya-pramāṇatā where the argument is expanded.

*"pāṇinyuktaṁ pramāṇaṁ, na tu punar aparaṁ candra-bhojādi-sūtram."
ke 'py āhus — tal laghiṣṭham : na khalu bahuvīdāṁ asti nirmūla-vākyam /
bahv-aṅgīkāra-bhedo bhavati guṇa-vaśāt; pāṇineḥ prāk kathaṁ vā;
pūrvoktaṁ pāṇiniś cāpy anu-vadati; virodhe 'pi kalpyo vikalpaḥ //*

" 'Authoritative is (exclusively) what Pāṇini (or the *munitraya*) said, but not the other grammars of Candra, Bhoja etc.' This is what some are saying — this is extremely weak [as is clear from the following arguments] :

- (1) Indeed, by persons (such as Candra and Bhoja) who know much no base-less statement is passed. (Hence, the grammars of Candra, Bhoja etc. cannot be dismissed just like that.)
- (2) There is difference in acceptance (of grammatical works) by many persons on account of (diverging) qualities (of those works). (A grammar accepted by few persons on account of its difficulty is not automatically non-authoritative.)
- (3) And how was the situation (with regard to linguistic correctness) before Pāṇini? (Even without Pāṇini's grammar people could speak correct Sanskrit.)
- (4) And Pāṇini (himself) repeats what has been said by predecessors (and thus accepts their authority).
- (5) Even if there is a contradiction (between other authorities and Pāṇini) a (grammatical) option is to be created (so that the non-Pāṇinian grammarian need not be rejected)."

2.3

From the beginning of the Apāṇinīya-pramānatā we understand that *pāṇinyuktam pramānam* refers specifically to the view that only the *munitraya* has authority:

atra tāvad 'indra-candra-kāśakṛtsnyāpīśali-śākaṭāyanādi-purātanācārya-racitānām vyākaraṇānām apramānatvam eva, munitrayoktasyaiva tu prāmāṇyam' iti ke cit paṇḍitam-manyā manyante / tad apahasānīyam eva; candrādi-vacasām anāpta-praṇītatvābhāvena prāmāṇya-niścayāt śāstrāṇām aprāmāṇyam vadadbhis teṣām anāptatve pramāṇam vaktavyam //

"To begin with, there are some who, thinking themselves to be learned, say that the grammars composed by ancient teachers such as Indra, Candra, Kāśakṛtsni, Āpīśali, Śākaṭāyana, are not authoritative; only what is said by the three sages (*muni-traya*) is authoritative. This is indeed ridiculous. The statements of Candra etc. are certainly authoritative, since they are not formulated by untrustworthy persons."

The view that only the *munitraya* has authority is, of course, exactly parallel to the one most successfully promoted by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita in the early 17th century. There is no sign or trace that in formulating this verse and its elaboration, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa thought of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his work. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, whether slightly junior or slightly senior to Bhaṭṭoji, is clearly not familiar with the work of Bhaṭṭoji but describes the field of grammar just before Bhaṭṭoji's work became known when he says that the Kaumudī (i.e., the Prakriyā-kaumudī of Rāmacandra) is accepted in all regions (*kaumudyaś ca sarvadeśa-parigrahāt*). On the other hand, there is no indication that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita was ever acquainted either with Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's grammar or with his polemic tract the Apāṇinīya-pramānatā; in any case, he never reacted to it. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's arguments against a fixation on the *muni-traya* would have applied to Bhaṭṭoji's work in grammar, but they were never confronted with it.

To refute the exclusive authoritativeness of the *munitraya*, Nārāyaṇa puts forward, for instance, that no authoritative statement is found in revealed or in transmitted texts that says that "other grammars" are not authoritative; nor do the statements of the three sages (*muni-traya*) or their commentaries say this:

śabdaś ca vaidiko vā manv-ādi-kathito vā na vyākaraṇāntarānām aprāmāṇya-bodhako dṛśyate / na ca muni-traya-vacanām tad-anusāri-granthāntaram vā punar itara-prāmāṇya-pratikṣepakam sākṣād īkṣāmahe /

"No statement is found, either Vedic or made by Manu and others, that expresses that other grammars would not be authoritative; nor do we see statements of the three munis or of works of their followers that directly reject the authority of others."

In order to support the correctness of the "un-Pāṇinian" Sanskrit of Vyāsa, the reputed author of the Mahābhārata, Nārāyaṇa cites two verses:

aṣṭādaśa purāṇāni nava vyākaraṇāni ca /

nirmathya caturo vedān muninā bhārataṁ kṛtam //

"After churning the eighteen Purāṇas, nine grammars and the four Vedas, the sage (Vyāsa) composed the Mahābhārata."

*yāny ujjahāra bhagavān vyāso vyākaraṇāmbudheḥ /
tāni kiṁ pada-ratnāni bhānti pāṇini-goṣpade //*

"The gems of words which the venerable Vyāsa lifted up out of the ocean of grammar, can they shine in the puddle of Pāṇini?"

2.4

Further noteworthy features of the Prakriyā-sarvasva¹⁹ are the following:

(1) The Prakriyā-sarvasva adopts a completely original arrangement in 20 chapters (which, as we have seen, is attributed to king Devanārāyaṇa in one of the opening verses); Bhaṭṭoji's Siddhānta-kaumudī, on the other hand, is closely modelled after the Prakriyā-kaumudī from which he only differs at points where adherence to the *muni-traya* is at stake. Remarkable compared to other *prakriyā*-works is the prominent position in the Prakriyā-sarvasva of the section dealing with *kṛt*-affixes, immediately after the sections dealing with *saṁjñā*, *paribhāṣā* and *sandhi*.

(2) Comments are not exegetic or polemical but straightforward, pragmatic and in a lucid Vṛtti-style so that usually no further commentary is needed; for instance, the famous sūtra AA 1.1.68 *svaṁ rūpaṁ śabdasyāśabdasāñjñā* to which Patañjali, Bhartṛhari and later Pāṇinīyas devote extensive discussions – as is justified from the point of view of the theory of grammar and philosophy of language – is commented upon as follows : *vṛddhy-ādi-śabda-sāstroka-saṁjñāto'nyeṣāṁ śabdānāṁ svarūpaṁ eva grāhyaṁ na tv arthagrahaḥ / 'agner dhak (AA 4.2.33) ity-ukte pāvakāder na / kva cit tv artha-graho'sti / sa tatra vakṣyate /*

"Other than words which are technical terms explicitly mentioned in the discipline, the own form of words is to be taken (in order to be subjected to a grammatical procedure enjoined by a rule); but the meaning is not taken (in order to be subjected to a grammatical procedure). If it is said *agner dhak* "The affix *dhak* is introduced after nominal stem *agni*- 'fire'," the procedure does not apply to "fire" (but to the linguistic form *agni*). At some places, however, the meaning is taken. That will be said at the respective places."

(3) Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, constantly referred to in the work of Bhaṭṭoji and his school to the present day, is rarely mentioned by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa.

(4) The Prakriyā-sarvasva is a more complete grammatical treatise than the Siddhānta-kaumudī as it contains a section on rules of interpretation, the seventeenth chapter or Nyāya-khaṇḍa; in Bhaṭṭoji's school this lacuna of the Siddhānta-kaumudī was filled three generations later by Nāgeśa's Paribhāṣenduśekhara. The Prakriyā-sarvasva contains no Liṅgānuśāsana: this is regretted by Venkitasubramonia Iyer (1972: 75) who considers it one of the defects of the work. However, this absence is in line with the importance Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa attributes to the linguistic knowledge of the speaking mass which, as we will see, is also evident from other statements and indications and which suits Nārāyaṇa's "living language" approach to Sanskrit.

(5) Grammatical examples are often original statements on the life of Kṛṣṇa and frequently of remarkable poetic beauty.²⁰ Otherwise there is no interference of theology in grammar:

¹⁹ An analysis and study of the Prakriyā-sarvasva, at a time that no complete edition was available, is found in Venkitasubramonia Iyer's "critical study" of 1972, which extends and supersedes the author's introduction to the third fasc. of the Trivandrum ed. of PS (Trivandrum 1947) ; see also Kunjunni Raja 1958; 119-152 on Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa and his work, including the Prakriyā-sarvasva.

²⁰ See now also Houben 2012b.

Pāṇini and other grammarians are not deified, *pratyāhāra-sūtras* are not *śiva-* or *māheśvara-sūtras*.²¹

(6) An important point in a comparison with the school of Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgeśa, and probably part of an explanation for the persisting lack of interest over the last century or so, is that Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa shows no passion for presenting the grammar as a closed system; there are rules of thumb (*nyāyas*) to help in the interpretation, but there is no attempt to construct an explicit system of metarules; lists of linguistic items are principally open-ended, with additions explicitly attributed to specific post-Pāṇinian authorities sometimes inserted in the list, sometimes added in a separate section at the end. More than to “generative grammar” this is congenial to “construction grammar” (just as Pāṇini’s grammar as read by Bhartṛhari: cf. Houben 2009a and 2009b).

3.1

The section on rules of interpretation has substantial parallels with the collections of *paribhāṣās* of Nāgeśa-bhaṭṭa, those in the *Vyāḍīya-paribhāṣā-vṛtti*, etc. However, in Nārāyaṇa’s grammar they function indeed as *nyāyas* which one may or may not choose to invoke (this is the same in Bhaṭṭoji’s work: in the domain of *paribhāṣās* he did not go beyond his predecessors). There is no trace of an underlying attempt to turn grammar into a closed axiomatic system of rules and metarules, as is evident in the work of Nāgeśa. The *paribhāṣā*-section in Bhoja’s grammar, the *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇam*, has been followed by Nārāyaṇa to a great extent. In the available manuscripts and editions, the *nyāyas* are neither numbered nor always clearly identifiable within the commentary in which they are embedded. According to my analysis, Nārāyaṇa’s chapter contains 121 *nyāyas*, divided over two main groups, one group of 102 mostly with commentary, the second group, 103-121, without any commentary. Within the first group, a distinction can be made between the first 88 which, with a few exceptions, follows the *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇam* and the last 14 which do not do so, but have parallels elsewhere. A reasonably reliable text is presented in the Trivandrum edition (fifth fascicule that appeared in 1987), which I have checked against manuscript T2091 of the Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum. The new edition (or “compilation”) of Pisharoti has added a few printing mistakes and is in any case for the Nyāya-chapter better ignored.²² A systematic comparison with other collections of *Paribhāṣās* or rules of interpretation is missing in the current editions and studies. A large number of collections of *Paribhāṣās* have been critically edited and compared in the *Paribhāṣā-saṁgraha* by K.V. Abhyankar (1967).²³

3.2

The introductory verse of the Nyāya-chapter reveals, first of all, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa’s distinctive attitude towards the Nyāyas as principles to be invoked when needed instead rather as a set of strict metarules, and, second, the importance he attributes to the *Paribhāṣā*-section in the grammar of Bhoja.

bahūpayuktā yuktau ye rūpasiddhāv api kva cit /
tān nyāyān ekato vakṣye bhojarājoktavartmanā //

²¹ On diverging perspectives on grammar and esp. the *pratyāhāra-sūtras* see the important study of Deshpande 1998.

²² The same applies to the Chāndasa chapter (chapter XX) of the *Prakriyā-sarvasva*: Houben 2012a: 167-168 note 11.

²³ For the *Paribhāṣās* attributed to Vyāḍī there is now Wujastyk’s 1993 edition (with translation and study).

"The principles that have been frequently used in the reasoning (when applying rules for the derivation of words), and occasionally even in the derivation of a linguistic form, those principles I will state (now) all together following the way of the statements of king Bhoja."

The statement in this verse forms a pair with the prose statement appearing at the end of rule 102 and before the subsequent group of 19 rules without any commentary:

evam bhojādy-uktān uktvānye 'pi asphuṭa-dṛṣṭāntodāharaṇā nyāyā likhyante

Having thus pronounced the statements of Bhoja (most of principles 1-88) and others (89-102), other principles, for which the illustrations and examples are not clear, are also written (in the subsequent section).

3.3

Most remarkable in Nārāyaṇa's collection of *nyāyas* is the enormous amount of trust placed in the speaker's *vivakṣā* 'desire to express'. This is unequalled in other collections of *nyāyas* or *paribhāṣās*, where they are either absent or do not occupy a very prominent place. In Nārāyaṇa's collection, three *nyāyas* dealing with *vivakṣā* are conspicuously placed at the beginning of the collection.

(01) *vivakṣātaḥ kārakāṇi* // SKĀ 1.2.63; absent in PbhI; elsewhere only in Cāndra and Hema.

The *kārakas* are (attributed to the objects that figure in the situation to be expressed in the sentence) according to the (speaker's) wish to express.

Comm.

karmādi-kārakāṇi prayoktur vivakṣām anusṛtya yathārham syuḥ / paraśuś chinattīti karaṇasya karṭṛtvam / sthālī pacati, śhālyā pacatīty adhikaraṇasya karṭṛtva-karaṇatve.

Nārāyaṇa's trust in the speaker's *vivakṣā* is even more evident if we compare these statements with the remarks of commentator Nārāyaṇa Daṇḍanātha in his commentary *Hṛdaya-hāriṇī* on the corresponding *paribhāṣā* in Bhoja's SKĀ, 1.2.63 :

prayoktur vaktum icchayā karmādīni kārakāṇi bhavanti / vivakṣā hi kula-vadhūr iva na laukikīm prayoga-maryādām atikrāmati / sthālī pacati, śhālyām pacati / akṣān dīvyati, akṣair dīvyati, akṣeṣu dīvyati, akṣāṇām dīvyati / vivakṣāyāś ca niyatatvāt saty apy apāye dhanuṣā vidhyatīty eva, na dhanuṣo vidhyatīti / kaṁsa-pātryām bhukta ity eva, na kaṁsa-pātryā bhukta iti /

(02) *kārakād anyatrāpi vaktur vivakṣita-pūrvikā śabda-pravṛttir jñeyā* // from *vaktur* ... this has a parallel in Kātantra-PbhS 64 and Kālāpa-PbhSV 83 (where *jñeyā* is missing); a different version with *śabdārtha-pratipattiḥ* instead of *śabda-pravṛttir* in Kātantra-PbhSV 61.

"Also outside (the domain of) the *kārakas*, it is to be known that the use of words is preceded by that which the speaker wants to say."

Comm.

yathā "pradīyatām dāśarathāya maithilī" (Rāmāyaṇa 6.9.21) *ity atrāpatya iṅi prāpte sambandha-mātra-vivakṣayāṅ /*

(03) *sūtre liṅga-vacanādy-aprāmānyam *avivakṣātaḥ**²⁴ // SKĀ 1.2.64, Cāndra 70 (... *avivakṣitatvāt*); elsewhere in the form *sūtre liṅga-vacanam atantram* (PbhI 73).

In the grammatical rule, grammatical gender, number etc. are not authoritative, because they are not based on the (sūtra-author's) wish to express (a specific gender or number or other category to the exclusion of others).

3.4

Next there is a section (04-09) with six principles concerning *anuvṛtti* ; eight principles on how to interpret the sūtras and how to identify the elements to which they refer ; and many rules on the sequence of application and the relative force of rules.

A selection which can speak for itself:

²⁴ The edition gives: *api vivakṣātaḥ* (which corresponds with T2091) and notes as variant *-mavivakṣā*.

(22) gaṇa-mukhyayor mukhye kārya-sampratyayaḥ // PbhI 15 ; VyPbh 4(3) (Abhyankar does not note this for SKĀ)

‘vāsudevārjunābhyām vun’ (AA 4.3.18) ity etat tat-pratimā-bhakte na bhavati, amukhyatvāt /

(23) prasiddhe saha-carite ca //

kārya-viddhiḥ prasiddhy-anusāreṇa sāhacaryānusāreṇa ca jñeyaḥ / śrāddhe śaradaḥ (AA 4.3.12) ity atra prasiddham śrāddham evoktam, na śrāddhāvān / evaṃ prasiddha-bhū-dhātv-ādy-ukta-sij-lopa-bhuvo-vug-ādir ācāra-kvib-anta-bhū-prabhṛtau na / abhāvīt, bubhāva / ‘antarāntareṇa yukte’ (AA 2.3.4) ity atra nipātenāntara-śabdena saha-carito nipāta evāntareṇa-śabdo grāhyaḥ, na tṛtīyāntaḥ /

(24) kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime // VyPbh 5a(6) ; SKĀ 1.2.72.

svenaiva paribhāṣitaṃ kṛtrimam / tasminn eva kārya[m] syāt, na tv akṛtrime loka-prasiddhe / yathā ‘karmaṇy aṇ’ (AA 3.2.1) ity-atra karma-kāraṇam eva gṛhyate, na kriyā /

(25) kva cid ubhaya-gatiḥ // VyPbh 5b(7) ; SKĀ 1.2.73.

bahu-gaṇādīnām saṃkhyā-tvaṃ kṛtrimam / ekādīnām akṛtrimam / tad-ubhayam api saṃkhyā-grahaṇeṣu gṛhyate

...

(61) nāniṣṭārthā śāstra-pravṛttiḥ // SKĀ 1.2.124 (also in Hema, elsewhere absent)

śiṣṭānām anīṣṭān chabdān sādhayituṃ śāstraṃ na pravartayitavyam / yathā vacanti gharanti ity-ādy-aprayukteṣu / [vac II occurs only in sg., vacmi, vakṣi, vakti, imp. vaktu ; ghṛ III jigharti]

...

The following three received a prominent place in Nāgeśa's list of *paribhāṣās*, but have no special importance in Nārāyaṇa's list.

(66) kārya-kālaṃ saṃjñā-paribhāṣam // PbhI 2, SKĀ 1.2.129

(67) yathoddeśaṃ saṃjñā-paribhāṣam // PbhI 3, SKĀ 1.2.130

...

(73) vyākhyānato viśeṣa-pratipattiḥ // PbhI 1 (adds : na hi sandehād alakṣaṇam), SKĀ 1.2.133

...

The last one of the group of *nyāyas* that are usually commented upon is as follows:

(102) vicitrā sūtrasya kṛtiḥ pāṇineḥ // This statement has no parallel among the *paribhāṣās* noted by Abhyankar (1967). Prof. Aklujkar suggested the statement could be in the Kāśikā where it is indeed found: Kāśikā on AA 1.2.35 and on AA 7.2.78. Similar in structure but of a different character is the statement found in the MBh I:468.10 (on AA 2.3.66) *śobhanā khalu pāṇineḥ sūtrasya kṛtiḥ* (also in Kāśikā on AA 2.3.66).

The commentary on this *nyāya* is remarkable as it refers to one more principle which underlies many others but which is not separately mentioned (perhaps because it is not directly used for the derivation of linguistic forms). The example cited to illustrate lack of brevity is noteworthy:

laghumārgeṇa siddhe gauravaṃ na grāhyam ity-ādeḥ kva cid anāśrayaṇād aniyatety arthaḥ / yathā veti vācye 'nyatarasyām graha ityādiḥ /

Nārāyaṇa confirms here the problematic status of the traditional treatment of the terms for option in Pāṇinian grammar, which was demonstrated by Paul Kiparsky in 1979. Kiparsky's solution to the problem has been accepted by some and rejected by others, who are also unwilling to accept the problematic status (for an overview of the discussion: Houben 2003).

4.

We can conclude on the basis of this brief overview that Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's *Prakriyā-sarvasva* provides an important new and unexpected perspective on Pāṇini and the Pāṇinian

tradition. This does not replace the perspective provided by the school of Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgeśa but it supplements, complements and corrects it in crucial ways.

If we go back to the parameters we mentioned earlier in connection with the polemic disputes between grammarians of the Śeṣa family and Bhaṭṭoji and their respective followers, we can state the following:

(a) As for the opposition Dvaita versus Advaita Vedānta, Melputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa is fully engaged in the *bhakti-mārga* which presupposes a dualistic outlook, but he speaks with sincere respect of the Advaita Vedāntist Śaṅkara²⁵ and in the Apāṇinīya-pramāṇatā he defends the correctness of one of his "un-pāṇinian" verb-forms: *hunet* (instead of *juhuyāt*). The opposition Dvaita versus Advaita seems entirely irrelevant for Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, who shows interest in the study of basic texts of Vedānta and its commentaries.

(b) Another dichotomy in the Śeṣa - Bhaṭṭoji disputes was Vaiṣṇava *bhakti* and the adherence to Vedic ritual. In the case of Nārāyaṇa the two are harmoniously combined. There is no sign that Nārāyaṇa's enthusiasm for Vaiṣṇava *bhakti* interfered with his engagement in Vedic ritual or with his interest in Mīmāṃsā.

(c) Nārāyaṇa's Vaiṣṇava religious philosophy leaves no significant place for Śaiva elements, but he refers to Advaita philosopher Śaṅkara with full respect.

(d) In the hands of Nārāyaṇa, minor differences in using linguistic forms can hardly be instrumentalized for polemic purposes.

Where Bhaṭṭoji is most close to Patañjali, Nārāyaṇa is closer to positions which he directly ascribes to Pāṇini, without paying attention to the Mahābhāṣya (which he knows and occasionally cites). He is closer in spirit to the oldest complete running commentary on Pāṇini, the Kāśikā, and, of course, to Bhoja, who appears as the most recent and most comprehensive authority on Sanskrit grammar.

Two important qualities of the grammatical work of Bhaṭṭoji gave it a significant advantage over the Prakriyā-sarvasva: (a) the simplified "authority structure" underlying correct Sanskrit; (b) the passion for a closed system of rules in grammar. Nārāyaṇa was a poet, a *kavi*, like those who composed the Ṛg-veda which was studied by Nārāyaṇa as it was by his family of the Ṛg-vedic Āśvalāyana-school. For the accomplished *kavi* that Nārāyaṇa turned out to be, Sanskrit was indeed a fully "living" language. Nārāyaṇa's liberal approach places language use in the foreground and asks grammar to follow and account for it. Grammar is basically open-ended and there is no endeavour to construct a closed system of rules and meta-rules. The increasing interest in "construction grammar" in current linguistics may be expected to stimulate a very long awaited fresh appreciation of the work of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa.

²⁵ Cf. Kunjunni Raja 1958: 140f.

Abbreviated titles of Sanskrit sources

- AA = Aṣṭādhyāyī (*sūtra-pāṭha*) of Pāṇini (the abbreviation AA for the Aṣṭādhyāyī, i.e., *aṣṭa-adhyāyī*, is distinctive vis à vis the English indefinite article and in line with abbreviations such as VP for Vākyapadīya, i.e., *vākya-padīya*, etc.).
- AP = Apāṇinīya-pramāṇatā (sānubandhā) of Melputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa; (a) ed. by E.V. Nampūtīrī: Trivandrum: Reddiar & Sons V.V. Press Branch, 1942; (b) new ed. and transl. by E.R. Sreekrishna Sharma, under the title Apāṇinīya-prāmāṇya-sādhanam: Tirupati: Sri Venkatesvara University Oriental Research Insitute, 1968; (c) without acknowledgement or reference to (b) the same text and translation (with minor corrections and a few new misprints) appears also at the end of PS (b) on pages numbered separately from 1-30.
- Cāndra = Cāndraparibhāṣāsūtrāṇi, see Abhyankar 1967.
- Hema = Hemacandra, see Abhyankar 1967.
- K = Kāśikā of Vāmana and Jayāditya, ed. by Aryendra Sharma and Khanderao Deshpande, Hyderabad: Osmania University, 1969, repr. 2008.
- Kātantra-PbhS = Kātantra-paribhāṣā-sūtra, see Abhyankar 1967.
- Kālāpa-PbhSV = Kālāpa-paribhāṣā-sūtra-vṛtti, see Abhyankar 1967.
- MBh = (Vyākaraṇa-) Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, ed. by F. Kielhorn (vols. I-III), Bombay. 1880-85 ; Third revised edition K.V. Abhyankar, Poona, 1962-1972.
- PbhI = Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgeśa, (a) ed. and transl. by F. Kielhorn, Bombay: Indu-Prakash Press, 1868-1874; second edition by K.V. Abhyankar, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1960-1962; (b) see Abhyankar 1967.
- PK = Prakriyā-kaumudī of Rāmacandra, with the commentary Prasāda of Viṭṭhala, ed. by K.P. Trivedi, pt. I-II, Bombay 1925-1931.
- PS = Prakriyā-sarvasva of Melputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa; (a) ed.: Trivandrum: Thiruvananthapuram : Oriental Research Institute, Manuscripts Library, 1931-1992 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 106, 139, 153, 174, 258, 262, 263), by Sambasiva Sastri (fasc. 1 – 2 [1931, 1938]), Ramaswamy Sastri (fasc. 3 [1947], introduction by S. Venkitasubramonia Iyer), Suranad Kunjan Pillai (fasc. 4 [1954]), Madhavan Unni (fasc. 5, 7 [1987, 1992]), Visweswari Amma (fasc. 6 [1989]); (b) synthetic volume ("compiled by") K.P. Narayana Pisharoti, Guruvayur: Guruvayur Devaswom, 1998 – for critical apparatus this depends largely on (a) which is not mentioned; over and above the division into 20 chapters and into two main parts, *pūrvabhāga* (ch. 1-17) and *uttarabhāga* (ch. 18-20) a division into seven *bhāgas* is indicated which corresponds to the division into seven fascicules in edition (a).
- ŚabdaK = Śabda-kaustubha of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, ed. by Gopal Sastri Nene and Mukund Sastri Puntamkar, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office (3 vols.), second ed. 1991.
- SK = Siddhānta-kaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, with the Tattvabodhinī commentary of Jñānendra Sarasvatī and the Subodhinī commentary of Jayakṛṣṇa, ed. by Vasudev Lakshman Shastri Panashikar, Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, reprint 2002.
- SKĀ = Sarasvatī-Kaṇṭhābharāṇa of Bhoja, (a) ed. with Daṇḍanātha Nārāyaṇa's Hṛdaya-hāriṇī Vyākhyā, by V.A. Ramaswami Sastri, Trivandrum: 1948-; (b) section on Paribhāṣās: see Abhyankar 1967.
- TK = Tattva-kaustubha of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, incomplete ed. by T.K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar, Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, 1954; for Pariccheda 3 ms of B.O.R.I., Pune.
- PM = Praudha-manoramā of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, with Laghu-śabdaratna of Hari Dīkṣita, Jyotsnā of Pt. Madhava Sastri Bhandari, and Kucamardinī commentary of Panditarāja Jagannātha, ed. by Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri, Benares: Haridas Sanskrit Series, 1934.
- VBhS = Vaiyākaraṇa-bhūṣaṇa-sāra of Kauṇḍa-bhaṭṭa, ed. by Adyaprasad Misra: Varanasi, Sampurnand Sanskrit University, 1988.
- VyPbh = Vyādi's Paribhāṣāvṛtti, (a) ed. and transl. by D. Wujastyk 1993; (b) see Abhyankar 1967.

Other references

Abhyankar, K.V.

1967 *Paribhāṣāsamgraha* (a collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās).
Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Abhyankar, K.V. and Shukla, J.M.

1977 *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Vadodara: University of Baroda. Reprint 1986.
Bali, Suryakant

1976. *Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita: His Contribution to Sanskrit Grammar*. New Delhi: Munshiram
Manoharlal.

Clementin-Ojha, Catherine

2004 "La vérité religieuse selon Svāmī Virajānanda Sarasvatī, renonçant, grammairien,
et maître du fondateur de l'Ārya samāj." In : *De l'Arabie à l'Himalaya. Chemins
croisés en hommage à Marc Gaborieau* (ed. by Bouillier, V. and Servan-Schreiber,
C.): 423-451. Paris, Maisonneuve et Larose.

Deshpande, Madhav M.

1997 "Who inspired Pāṇini? Reconstructing the Hindu and Buddhist Counter-Claims."
Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 117.3 : 444-465.

1998 "Evolution of the Notion of Authority in the Pāṇinian Tradition." *Histoire –
Epistémologie – Langage*, Tome XX, fasc. 1: *Les Grammaires Indiennes*: 5-28.

forthc. (a) "Will the winner please stand up : Conflicting Narratives of a 17th Century
Philosophical Debate from Karnataka." (ms. of presentation at the Workshop
"Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgoji: grammarians and philosophers of language in early modern
Banaras," Oxford, 29 Feb. 2008.)

forthc. (b) "Appaya Dīkṣita and the Lineage of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita." (paper presented at the
219th Meeting of the American Oriental Society, Albuquerque, March 13-16, 2009)

Gode, P.K.

1954a *Studies in Indian Literary History* [collected papers], Vol. II. Bombay: Bharatiya
Vidya Bhavan.

1954b "A New Approach to the Date of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita." Gode 1954a: 65-74.

1954c "Varadarāja, a pupil of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and his Works – between A.D. 1600 and
1650." Gode 1954a: 316-327.

1956a *Studies in Indian Literary History* [collected papers], Vol. III. Bombay: Bharatiya
Vidya Bhavan.

1956b "The Contact of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and some Members of his Family with the Keḷadi
rulers of Ikkeri – between c. A.D. 1592 and 1645." Gode 1956a: 316-327.

Halbfass, Wilhelm

1991 *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought*. Albany: SUNY-press.

Houben, J.E.M.

2000 Review of Mesquita 1997 in *Asiatische Studien / Etudes Asiatiques* 54.2: 463-468.

2003 "Three Myths in Modern Pāṇinian Studies." (Review article of George Cardona,
Recent Research in Pāṇinian Studies, Delhi 1999.) *Asiatische Studien / Études
Asiatiques* 57.1: 121-179.

2008a "Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's 'Small Step' for a Grammarian and 'Giant Leap' for Sanskrit
Grammar." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 36: 563-574.

- 2008b “Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s brilliant ‘fundamentalism’ : grammar, ritual, religious life.” (Presentation at the Workshop “Bhaṭṭoji and Nāgoji: grammarians and philosophers of language in early modern Banaras,” Oxford, 29 Feb. 2008.)
- 2009a “Bhartṛhari as a ‘Cognitive Linguist’.” In: *Bhartṛhari : Language, Thought and Reality* (Proceedings of the International Seminar, Delhi, December 12-14, 2003) (ed. by M. Chaturvedi) : 523-543. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- 2009b “Pāṇini’s Grammar and Its Computerization : A Construction Grammar Approach.” In: *Sanskrit Computational Linguistics : Third International Symposium, Hyderabad, India, January 2009, Proceedings*. (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 5406) (ed. by Amba Kulkarni et Gérard Huet) : 6-25. Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- 2012a “Studies in India’s Vedic Grammarians, 1: Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa’s Prakriyā-sarvasva and Pāṇini’s Śe.” In: *Studies in Sanskrit Grammars: Proceedings of the 14th World Sanskrit Conference* (ed. G. Cardona, A. Aklujkar, H. Ogawa): 163-194. New Delhi : D.K. Printworld.
- 2012b “Grammar & Other Modes of the Mind.” In: *Saṃskṛta-sādhitā – Goodness of Sanskrit : Studies in Honour of Professor Ashok N. Aklujkar* (ed. by Ch. Watanabe, M. Desmarais, Y. Honda): 311-329. New Delhi : D.K. Printworld.
- Joshi, Mahadevasastri, P. Hodarkar and V.G. Sahasrabuddhe (eds.)
1997-2000 *Bhāratīya Saṃskṛti Kośa* (10 vols.; in Marathi). [Third print; first ed. 1962-1979.] Pune, Anamola Prakāśan.
- Kane, P.V.
1971 *History of Sanskrit Poetics*. Fourth Edition [revised and updated]. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kiparsky, Paul
1979 *Pāṇini as a Variationist*. Pune: Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona.
- Kunjunni Raja, K.
1958 *The Contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit literature*. Madras: University of Madras. (pp. 119-152: Chapter VI, "Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr")
- Mesquita, Roque
1997 *Madhva und seine unbekanntenen literarischen Quellen: einige Beobachtungen*. Wien: University of Vienna, Institute of Indology.
2000 *Madhva’s unknown literary sources: some observations*. [Updated English ed. of Mesquita 1997 with new indices.] New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Ramamurti, K.S.
1973 “Vyākaraṇa.” *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* (Tirupati), vol. XVI, pt. 1-2 (Proceedings of the Seminar on Āndhras’ Contribution to Indian Culture, 27th – 29th March, 1972): 25-35.
1980 “The Nativity of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita.” *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* (Tirupati), vol. XXIII, pt. 1-2 (S.V.U. Silver Jubilee Number): 51-54.
- Swaminathan, V.
1973 “Advaita.” *Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal* (Tirupati), vol. XVI, pt. 1-2 (Proceedings of the Seminar on Āndhras’ Contribution to Indian Culture, 27th – 29th March, 1972): 19-24.

Venkatasubramonia Iyer, S.

1972 *Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's Prakriyāsarvasva; a critical study*. Trivandrum: University of Kerala.

Wujastyk, Dominik

1993 *Metarules of Pāṇinian Grammar: Vyāḍi's Paribhāṣāvṛtti, Critically Edited with Translation and Commentary*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

Pāṇinian grammar of living Sanskrit : features and principles of the Prakriyā-Sarvasva of Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa of Melputtūr.

Jan E.M. Houben

titre en français: *Grammaire pāṇinéenne du sanskrit vivant: caractéristiques et principes du Prakriyā-Sarvasva de Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa de Melputtūr*

Résumé:

Grammaire pāṇinéenne du sanskrit vivant: caractéristiques et principes du Prakriyā-Sarvasva de Nārāyaṇa-Bhaṭṭa de Melputtūr

Aux alentours de 350 avant notre ère, Pāṇini composa une grammaire qui tenait compte de la langue des Védas et de la langue parlée haut-standard (que nous appelons maintenant sanskrit). Sa grammaire de haute perfection poussa d'autres travaux grammaticaux dans l'oubli. Au cours des siècles, plusieurs ajouts et adaptations ont été proposés et acceptés dans les règles et dans les listes d'éléments lexicaux tels que les racines verbales. La grammaire de Pāṇini s'est développé sous plusieurs formes marginalement différentes entre elles mais toujours pāṇinéennes, et elle était à la base de grammaires apparues sous un nouveau titre, même si elles sont largement dérivées et inspirées de la grammaire de Pāṇini. Parmi les versions disponibles, le Prakriyā-Sarvasva peu connu de l'écrivain brillant et polyvalent Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa de Melputtūr (17ème siècle) est au moins aussi complète que la grammaire pāṇinéenne bien connue de Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, la Siddhānta-kaumudī, mais elles diffèrent pourtant dans leur méthode et dans la substance, tout en restant pleinement dans le cadre du système de Pāṇini. Le Prakriyā-Sarvasva fournit de nombreuses perspectives nouvelles sur des questions théoriques dans la grammaire pāṇinéenne et représente une approche pragmatique beaucoup négligée (en opposition avec l'approche exégétique de Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita). Comme son objet est le sanskrit tel qu'il est utilisé et accepté non seulement par les trois sages – Pāṇini, Kātyāyana et Patañjali – mais aussi par les auteurs ultérieurs de la tradition sanskrite, il peut à juste titre être considéré comme une grammaire pāṇinéenne du sanskrit vivant. Ceci est confirmé dans trois dimensions du Prakriyā-Sarvasva: (a) les traits de la grammaire, qui, comme la Siddhānta-Kaumudī, est une version réordonnée de la grammaire de Pāṇini; (b) les principes de la grammaire tels qu'expliqués et illustrés dans une section spéciale de la grammaire; (c) la défense des principes de base de son approche contre d'autres grammairiens dans une strophe dans son commentaire et développée séparément dans un bref traité.