Bhaṭṭākalaṅkadēva and Philosophy

Andrew Ollett ❧ June 18, 2023

1 Sūtram 442: *dhātōr ēkānēkatvē 'm-ar-ay-ir-en-enavō 'nya-yuṣmad-asmāsu kartari*

VṚTTIḤ — anya-yuṣmad-asmad-arthēṣu pratyēkam ēkatvānēkatvayōr vivakṣitayōr yathā-kramaṁ dhātōḥ am, ar, ay, ir, en, ev, ētē pratyayā bhavanti kartari abhidhēyē. anyatvaṁ ca yuṣmad-asmad-apēkṣaṁ sannidhānāt. anyasminn ēkatvē am, anēkatvē ar. ēvaṁ yuṣmad-arthē 'pi ēkatvē ay, anēkatvē ir. tathaivāsmad-arthē 'pi ēkatvē en, anēkatvē evu.

PRAYŌGAḤ — *tān irddaṁ, tām irddar*; *nīn irdday, nīm irddir*; *ān irddeṁ, ām irddevu*. anya-yuṣmad-asmadām aprayōgē 'pi tad-artha-vivakṣāyāṁ bhavanti. *nōḍidaṁ, nōḍidar*; *nōḍiday, nōḍidir*; *nōḍideṁ, nōḍidevu. dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍeṁ*; *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍay*; *nimmaṁ kaṇḍaṁ*; *nimmaṁ kaṇḍeṁ*; *ennaṁ kaṇḍaṁ*; *ennaṁ kaṇḍay* ity-ādāv anya-yuṣmad-asmadām prayōgē 'pi vyadhikaraṇatvād am-ādayō na bhavanti.

COMMENTARY — When singularity or plurality regarding another, us, or you is intended, the suffixes *am*, *ar*, *ay*, *ir*, *en*, and *evu* appear after a verbal root, when the agent of the verbal action is being expressed. Because 'another' is close to 'us' and 'you,' it is in relation to those two. For another we have *am* in the singular and *ar* in the plural; for you we have *ay* in the singular and *ir* in the plural, and for us we have *en* in the singular and *evu* in the plural.

USE — *tān irddaṁ* (he was), *tām irddar* (they were); *nīn irdday* (you [sg.] were), *nīm irddir* (you [pl.] were); *ān irddeṁ* (I was), *ām irddevu* (we were). These suffixes are used to express these meanings even when the corresponding words for persons are not used: *nōḍidaṁ* (he saw), *nōḍidar* (they saw); *nōḍiday* (you [sg.] saw), *nōḍidir* (you [pl.] saw); *nōḍideṁ* (I saw), *nōḍidevu* (we saw). In the following examples, words for persons *are* used, but corresponding suffixes are not, because they do not refer to the same person: *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍeṁ* (I saw D.); *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍay* (you [sg.] saw D.); *nimmaṁ kaṇḍaṁ* (he saw you [pl.]); *nimmaṁ kaṇḍeṁ* (I saw you [pl.]); *ennaṁ kaṇḍaṁ* (he saw me); *ennaṁ kaṇḍay* (you saw me).

enō dīrgham api kēcid icchanti.

　tani-vaṇṇaṁ lañcam īvēṁ
　　puruḷi ninage pū-goñcalaṁ bēgadindaṁ
　ninag’ īvēṁ tumbi kendā-
　　vareya misupa mel-moggeyaṁ māṇad’ enduṁ
　ninag’ īvēn añce kampaṁ
　　ninag’ osayisuveṁ kūḍe teṅgāḷiy enn ō-
　panan ind’ āraydu tand’ enn-
　　oḍan irisidoḍ’ end’ āke mātāḍutirppaḷ[1]

ātanuṁ nīnuṁ irddir; *ātanum ānum irddevu*; *ānum ātanum irddevu* ity atra śabda-para-vipratiṣēdhāt parāśraya ēva bhavati.

VYĀKHYĀ — iha tāval lōkē prayōgārhaṁ śabdatattvaṁ dvividham. nāma-prakṛtikaṁ dhātu-prakṛtikaṁ cēti. tatra nāma-prakṛtikaṁ sub-anta-strī-pratyaya-kāraka-samāsa-taddhitādi-bhēda-prabhēdaṁ sa-prapañcaṁ nirūpyēdānīṁ dhātu-prakṛtikaṁ savistaraṁ nirūpayituṁ upakramamāṇas tāvat tiṅantaṁ nirūpayitum āha — *dhātōr* ity-ādi.

Some people accept long *ēn* as well:

She said: If you look for my lover right now and bring him back to me, I will give you, parrot, a ripe fruit as a gift, and to you, bee, I will straightaway give a cluster of flowers, and to you, goose, I will give you the brilliant soft bud of a red lotus, always without interruption, and I will make your fragrance beautiful, south wind.

In the following examples the latter person (in the list given in the *sūtra*) is the one the verb agrees with: *ātanuṁ nīnuṁ irddir* (he and you were); *ātanum ānum irddevu* (he and I were); *ānum ātanum irddevu* (I and he were).

DISCUSSION — Now in this world there are two basic categories of linguistic expressions that can be used, those based on *nouns*, and those based on *verbal roots*. Among them, those based on nouns, with their varieties such as declensions, feminine suffixes, thematic roles, compounds, and secondary derivates have already been discussed at length, and now, with *sūtra* 442, we will commence the detailed discussion of those based on verbal roots, starting with finite verbs.

1.　Aṇḍayya's *Kabbigara Kāvaṁ*, v. 63. The meter is *mahāsragdhare* (*sragdhare* with two light syllables instead of a heavy syllable at the beginning).

yady api lōkē dvi-vidham ēva tattvaṁ vācya-vācaka-
prabhēdāt, tatra sarvō 'py arthō vācyō 'bhidhēya iti yāvat,
sarvō 'pi śabdō vācakō 'bhidhānam iti, tathā ca dhātavō
'pi kriyā-rūpasyārthasya vācakā iti abhidhānāni bhavanti,
abhidhānaṁ tu nāmaivēti sarvam api śabda-tattvaṁ nāma-
prakṛtikam ēvēty aikadhyam ēva nānaikadhyam iti kutō
dvaidhyam iti; tathāpi nāma-śabdēnātra vastu-vācakam
ēvōcyatē, na vācaka-mātram. *vastu-vācīni nāmanī*ti va-
canāt.[2] dhātavō hi na vastu-vācakāḥ, api tu kriyā-vācakā
ēva. *kriyārthō dhātur* ity uktatvāt.[3] kriyā ca na vastūcyata
iti.

Now it is the case that there are two categories of things in the world, those that express and those that are expressed, among which every thing can be expressed, i.e., is a denotable, and every linguistic expression can express, i.e., is a denotation. Accordingly verbal roots, too, are denotations, since they express a thing, viz. an action, and denotations are just nouns. Hence every category of linguistic expression is based on nouns, so there is just a single category, not more than one. How then can there be two categories? Notwithstanding this line of reasoning, the linguistic expression "noun" here expresses something that itself expresses an *entity*, not an expression in general, in accordance with the statement "nouns express entities." For verbal roots do not express entities, but rather actions, since it has been said that "the meaning of a verbal root is action."

---

2. *Kātantram*, commentary on 2.4.1 (*nāmnāṁ samāsō yuktārthaḥ*).
3. *Śākaṭāyaṇaśabdānuśāsanam* 1.1.22.

nanu pramāṇa-siddham artha-jātaṁ sarvam api vastv ēva bha-vati. śaśa-viṣāṇādikam aprāmāṇikaṁ tuccham ēvāvastu iti lōkē prasiddhiḥ. tathā ca kriyāyā api vastutvāt katham avastutēti cēn na. kriyāyā vastu-dharmatvam ēva, na vastutvam. anēka-dharmātmakō bhāvō hi vastūcyatē. *dravya-paryāyātmakam vastv* iti vacanāt.[4] naikaikaṁ dharma-mātram iti. dharmāṇāṁ vastv-aṁśatvēna vas-tutvābhāvāt. atha vastv-aṁśā api vastūny ēvēti cēt kim upacāra-vr̥ttyā, mukhya-vr̥ttyā vā? nādyaḥ, iṣṭāpattēḥ. na dvitīyaḥ, vastv-ānantya-prasaṅgāt. atō vastv-aṁśānāṁ na prasiddha-vastuvad vastutvaṁ, nāpi tucchavad avastutvam, kintu vastv-aṁśatvam ēvēti. taduktaṁ *tattvārtha-ślōka-vārttikē*[5] —

naiṣa vastu na cāvastu vastv-aṁśaḥ kathyatē yataḥ
nāsamudraḥ samudrō vā samudrāṁśō yathōcyatē

iti. na ca samudrāṁśō 'pi samudra ēvēti śaṅkyaḥ. aṁśāntarasya tattvātattvānyataratva-nirṇayē bādhaka-sadbhāvāt. tad apy uk-tam[6] —

One might object that it is quite well-known in the world that all things established by valid sources of knowledge are in fact entities, and anything that is not so established is a non-entity, i.e. a nothing, like a hare's horn; accordingly, even action must be an entity, if it is not to be a non-entity! This is wrong, since action has the *property* of an entity, but it is not itself an entity. For an entity is something that consists of many properties, according to the statement that "an entity consists of substance and modification." And no entity can be a property alone. For properties form parts of entities, and hence they are not themselves properties. One might object that parts of entities, too, are simply entities, but in that case, do you mean would they be called so by transference or by primary reference? It can't be the first, because then you and I would be in agreement. And it can't be the second, because then it would follow that enti-ties are infinite. Hence parts of entities are not themselves entities, like the entities we are familiar with, nor are they non-entities, like nothings, bur rather just parts of entities. As was said in the *Tattvārtha-ślōka-vārttikam*:

This is neither an entity, or a non-entity,
since it is called a part of an entity,
just as a part of the ocean
is neither the ocean nor non-ocean.

Nor should one think that a part of the ocean is just the ocean, because another part would sublate the determination of its being either the ocean or not. As was said:

---

4. *Pramāṇamīmāṁsā* 1.1.30, although perhaps quoted from an earlier source.
5. Part 2, p. 322 (where the text in fact begins *nāyaṁ vastu na cāvastu*).
6. *Tattvārthaślōkavārttikam* part 2, p. 322.

tan-mātrasya samudratvē śēṣāṁśasyāsamudratā
samudra-bahutā vā syāt tattvē kvāsti samudravit

If that alone were to be the ocean,
then another part would be, too,
and there would be a multiplicity of oceans.
If that were the case, what would our
cognition of "ocean" refer to?

iti. atō vastv-aṁśānāṁ vastutvam aupacārikam ēva, na vāstavam iti. ata ēva na tad-grāhakaṁ pramāṇaṁ kintu naya ēva. naya-pramāṇa-bhēda-cintā tu mahatīty āstāṁ tāvad ity uparamyatē.

Hence we can only call parts of entities "entities" in a transfered sense, not essentially. And for this reason what yields the idea that they are entities is not a source of knowledge (*pramāṇam*), but only a perspective (*nayaḥ*). But there is an enormous discussion of the difference between perspectives and sources of knowledge, so let's let this be.

kiñca, astu vānyatra yathā-kathañcid vastv-aṁśasyāpi vastut-vaṁ. *vaiyākaraṇa*-matē tu kriyā-bhinnasyaivārthasya vastutvēna kathanam iti tad-vācakāny ēva nāmāni. kriyāyās tu avastutvēna na tad-vācakaṁ nāmōcyatē. nāmnāṁ samāsō yuktārtha iti *kā-tantra*-śāstrē 'pi nāma-śabdēna dhātu-vyavacchēdakaraṇāc ca. atō nāma-dhātu-prakṛti-bhēdād dvaividhyam anupaplutam ēvēti.

Moreover, we could say, in other cases, that a part of an entity is an entity in a certain respect. But according to the grammarians we can only call something separate from action an entity, and nouns are just what express that; by contrast, since an action is not an entity, it is said not to be expressed by a noun. Moreover by using the linguistic expression "noun" (in *sūtra* 2.4.1) the *Kātantram* distinguishes them from verbal roots. Hence the twofold distinction of linguistic expressions based on nouns and verbal roots stands.

tatra dhātu-prakṛtikaṁ dvividham: tiṅ-antaṁ kṛd-antaṁ cēti. dhā-tubhyas tiṅ-kṛtyōr ēvōtpattēḥ. yady api tēbhyō vikaraṇa-rūpā dapa-da-vādi-pratyayāś ca bhavanti, tathāpi tē dhātōs tiṅi kṛti vā vihitē tad ēva nimittam āsādya tad-āyattās saṁskārakatayaiva vidhīyantē, na svatantratayā kasyacid vācakā bhavantīty avagantavyam.

Among these two groups, the group based on verbal roots is itself twofold, consisting of finite verbs and primary derivatives. Although the suffixes *dapa*, *da*, and *v* occur after verbal roots in the form of tense-forming suffixes (*vikaraṇa-*), it should nevertheless be understood that they are occasioned by the addition of a finite verbal ending or primary derivative suffix to a verbal root, and that they are added only as a kind of preparation (*saṁskāratayā*) in dependence upon them; they are not expressive of anything on their own.

tatra kṛt-pratyayāḥ kartrādi-kārakē bhāvē ca yathāyōgaṁ bhavanti. tiṅ-saṁjñakās tu saṁskṛtē kartari karmaṇi bhāvē ca bhavanti. bhāṣāyāṁ tu kartṛ-karmaṇōr ēva, na bhāvē. ata ēva bhāṣāyāṁ dhātv-artha-lakṣaṇō bhāvaḥ kṛd-vācya ēvēti rāddhāntaḥ.

dhātavō 'pi dvēdhā, sakarmakā akarmakāś cēti. tatra karmaṇi pratyayāḥ sakarmakēbhya ēva, nākarmakēbhyaḥ. kartari tu sarvēb-hyō 'pi bhavantīti vaktum āha *dhātōr* iti. sakarmakād akarmakāc ca dhātu-mātrād ēva na tad-viśēṣād iti prakṛti-nirdēśaḥ.

am-ar-ay-ir-en-evava iti ṣaṇṇāṁ pratyayānāṁ svarūpa-nirdēśaḥ.

nanv amādīnāṁ pratyayānām am-ar-ay-ir-en-evu tiṅ iti tiṅ-saṁjñā kṛtāsti. tathā ca *liṅgāt sub* iti vad dhātōs tiṅ ity ēva nirdēśō yuktō lāghavāt. na pratyēka-nirdēśō gauravāt saṁjñā-karaṇa-vaiyarthāc cēti cēt.

Among them, primary derivative suffixes are used both in the sense of a thematic role, such as the agent, and in the sense of the verbal action itself (*bhāvē*), whereas finite verbal suffixes are used in Sanskrit in the sense of the agent, the patient, and the verbal action itself, but in the vernacular only in the sense of the agent or the patient, and not in the sense of the verbal action itself. For this reason we hold that, in the vernacular, the verbal action associated with the meaning of a verbal root must be expressed by a primary derivative.

Verbal roots, too, are twofold: transitive and intransitive. Among them, patient-oriented suffixes only follow transitive roots, not intransitive roots; agent-oriented suffixes, however, follow all roots. This is why he says *after a verbal root*. He uses the bare form to indicate that the suffixes follow any root, transitive or intransitive, and not a specific category.

With *am-ar-ay-ir-en-evavaḥ* he uses the proper form of the six suffixes.

Objection: The suffixes beginning with *am* have been given the technical term *tiṅ*, and that for reasons of economy it would have been more appropriate to say "after a verbal root, *tiṅ*," just as he earlier said "after a nominal base, *sup*" (*sūtra* 203), rather than to list them individually, which is both less economical and would make the technical term useless.

6

na. lāghavādarēṇa tathā karaṇē tiṅ-saṁjñāḥ pratyayatvāviśēṣāt sarvē 'pi yugapat prasajyērann ity aniṣṭa-bhiyā tathā mā prasaṅkṣīd ity ēvam arthaṁ gauravam apy anādṛtya tathā nirdēśaḥ kṛta iti. na caivaṁ karaṇē 'py ēṣa dōṣaḥ samānaḥ. na hy am-ādīnāṁ pratyēka-nirdēśō yugapat-prāptiṁ niruṇaddhi. tathā ca bhakṣitē 'pi laśunē na śāntō vyādhir iti syād iti vācyam. pratyēka-nirdēśē 'nya-yuṣmad-asmāsu pratyēkam ēkatvānēkatva-vivakṣayā ṣaṭsu viṣayēṣu ṣaṇṇāṁ tēṣāṁ yathā-saṅkhyēnaiva prāptir bhavati. yaugapadyānavakāśāt. naivaṁ tiṅ iti nirdēśē yathā-krama-prāptiḥ. sama-vacana-bhāvād yugapat-prāptir ēva syāt. tathā ca liṅgāt sub ity anantaraṁ karmaṇy am ity-ādivad atrāpītara-vyāvṛttyā niyamārthaṁ yatnaḥ kartavyaḥ. tat-karaṇē ca gauravam. atō 'traivaṁ nirdēśa ēva varaṁ lāghavād ity abhiprētya tathaiva vivṛṇōti *anyasminn ēkatvē am anēkatvē ar* ity-ādi.

Response: This is wrong. Supposing we did so, for reasons of economy, then everything designated by the technical term *tiṅ* would apply at once, since they are all equally suffixes. And we don't want that. That is why they have been listed, notwithstanding the lack of economy. Moreover, it is not the case that the same fault (viz. simultaneous application) applies if we list the suffixes in this way, too. You might be thinking: well, if listing the suffixes individually blocks their simultaneous application, then it might be that illness does not subside even when garlic is eaten.[7] But when they are listed individually the six suffixes apply to the six referents, that is to say, to another, you, and us, each singular and plural respectively, since there is no scope for them to apply simultaneously. And they would not apply in the right order if the technical term *tiṅ* were to be used; instead, they would all apply simultaneously, since *tiṅ* would express all of them equally. And accordingly, just as *sūtra* 204 (*karmaṇy am*, "the ending *am* in the sense of the patient") comes right after *sūtra* 203 (*liṅgāt sup*, "a declensional ending comes after a nominal base"), here too effort would have to be taken to restrict the rule by excluding other operations, and that would result in a lack of economy. For this reason the formulation in the *sūtra* is better, for reasons of economy. And with this in mind he expains the *sūtra* accordingly ("for another we have *am* in the singular and *ar* in the plural").

---

7. I am not sure of the meaning of this expression.

nanv anyatvam itara-nirūpaṇādhīna-nirūpyaṁ vastu-svarūpam. lōkē sarvatra kiñcid apēkṣya kaścid anya iti prasiddhēḥ. tathā ca yad-apēkṣayānyatvaṁ tan-nirūpaṇam āvaśyakam. tad-anirūpaṇē tan-nirūpaṇasyāsambhavād ity āśaṅkya nātrāpēkṣaṇīyam anyan nirūpyam.

yatō 'tra yuṣmad-asmad-dvayaṁ sannihitam asti. atas tad-apēkṣam ēvānyatvam ity āha *anyatvam* ity-ādi. tatra hētum āha *sannidhānād* iti. vyāpti-pratyāsattyōḥ pratyāsattir garīyasīti nyāyād iti.

nanv ēvam api yad-apēkṣam anyatvaṁ tat prathamatō nirūpaṇīyam. tasya tan-nirūpaṇādhīnatvāt. tathā ca yuṣmad-asmad-anyēṣv ity ēva vaktavyam. yathā miṅas triśō 'smad-yuṣmad-anya iti *jainēndra-śāstram*.[9] nānya-yuṣmad-asmāsv iti vyutkrama iti cēt,

na, am-ādīnāṁ ṣaṇṇām ēkatvādiṣu ṣaṭsu viṣayēṣu yathā-krama-siddhy-artham ēvaṁ nirūpaṇam. anyathā viṣaya-viṣayiṇāṁ vyatyāsaḥ syāt. asti caivaṁ rītiḥ prācāṁ api. yathā lō 'nya-yuṣmad-asmāsu tip-tas-jhi-sip-thas-tha-mib-vas-mas iti.[10] *jainēndra-śāstrē* tūddēśyē vidhēyē cōbhayatrāpi tathaivānupūrvīti tathā nirdēśaḥ. ata ēva tatra miṅ ity ēva pratyāhārō na tiṅ ity avagantavyam.

Objection: To be "another" means to be an entity that depends for its description on the description of something else, since in the world, in every case something is "another" in reference to something. And accordingly we require a description of the think in reference to which something else is "another," since it would be possible to describe it without describing that. And "another" is not described in relation to anything else in this *sūtra*.

Response: He addresses this with "another." In this case "another" is in relation to the words "you" and "us" that are proximate to it in this *sūtra*. He gives the reason: "because it is close." The principle is that between invariable concomitance and proximity, proximity is stronger.[8]

Objection: Even if this were the case, then that in relation to which it is "another" ought to have been mentioned first, and accordingly he should have said "you, us, and another," as was done by the *Jainēndra* grammar. "Another, you, and us" is out of order.

Response: No, in fact they are described in order that the suffixes (*am* etc.) can apply in order to the six referents, beginning with the singular. Otherwise the referents and the corresponding suffixes would have been exchanged. Moreover this is how ancient grammars, too, have done it, for example *lō 'ny-yuṣmad-asmāsu tip-tas-jhi-sip-thas-tha-mib-vas-mas*. As for the *Jainēndra* grammar, you should understand that it has mentioned the terms in that way so as to maintain the order of the topic and comment in both cases, and that is precisely why it uses the abbreviation *miṅ* rather than the abbreviation *tiṅ*.

---

8. I do not know the source of this principle.
9. *Jainēndravyākaraṇam*
10. *Śākaṭāyanavyākaraṇam*

nanu yuṣmad-asmac-chabdau pūrva-śāstrēṣu sarvatra tyad-ādi-gaṇa-paṭhitau. tayōś ca bhāṣāyām anupasarjanayōḥ prayōga ēva nāsti. nāvyaya-śatṛ-tyad-ādīty anēna liṅga-saṃjñāyā ēva niṣēdhāt. ataḥ katham anayōr atra prayōgaḥ, yat-sannidhānād ēkānēkatva-viṣayē dhātōḥ pratyayōtpattir? iti cēt.

Objection: The linguistic expressions *yuṣmad* and *asmad* are included in a list of *pronouns* in all earlier grammars, and those are not used in the vernacular, except as the first member of a compound, since they are excluded from the technical term "base" (*liṅga-*) by *sūtra* 10 (*nāvyaya-śatṛ-tyad-ādi*, "indeclinables, participles, and pronouns are not considered bases"). How, then, can they be used in this *sūtra*, such that the relevant suffixes appear after a verbal root to express singularity or plurality in proximity to them?

9

na. atrānya-yuṣmad-asmāsv iti na sākṣād ētē śabdāḥ
samabhivyavahāra-viṣayatayā vivakṣitāḥ, yēnēdam āpādanaṁ śōb-
hēta, kintu tad-artha-vācakā bhāṣā-viṣayā ēvāmādi-pratyaya-vidhi-
niyāmakatayā vivakṣitā iti nōkta-dōṣaḥ. tatra yuṣmac-chabdārtha-
vācakō nin-śabdaḥ asmac-chabdārthasya tu en-śabdaḥ. tābhyām
anyē yē 'rthās tēṣāṁ sarvēṣāṁ sāmānyēna vācakas tan-śabdaḥ.
viśēṣēṇa tu tat-tad-vācakās tadbhava-tatsama-dēśya-prabhēdānām
aviśēṣā ēvēti tan-nin-en-śabda-samabhivyāhāra-sācivyēna nirdiśati
tān irddaṁ, *tām irddar* iti-ādi. tatrāpi tat-tac-chabda-sannidhānē
saty ēva dhātōs tat-tat-pratyayōtpattir iti na nirbandhaḥ, kintu
tac-chabda-sannidhānē tad-asannidhānē 'pi vā tat-tad-artha-
vivakṣā-mātrēṇāpi tathā tat-tat-pratyayōtpattir bhavatīti. ata ēva
cātra sūtrē asmāsv ity artha-pradhānō nirdēśaḥ. anyathā asmatsv
ity ēva prayujyēta nāsmāsv iti. artha-viṣayē hi yuṣmad-asmac-
chabdayōr asādhāriṇī prakriyā. śabda-svarūpa-viṣayē tu sādhāriṇy
ēva. yathā yuṣmadi madhyamaḥ asmady uttamaḥ yuṣmad-asmadōḥ
padaṁ padāt param ity ādi-pūrva-śāstra-prayōga ity abhiprētyāha
*anyē*ty-ādi.

Response: In this *sūtra*, the linguistic expressions *anya*, *yuṣmad*, and *asmad* are not intended to refer to the linguistic forms directly — which would make this objection quite appropriate — but what is intended, rather, are the linguistic expressions that express those meanings in the vernacular, such that they can constrain the operation of the rules for the suffixes in question. Hence the fault that you have brought up does not apply. Among those linguistic expressions, *nin* expresses the meaning of the linguistic expression *yuṣmad* ("you"), and *en* expresses the meaning of the linguistic expression *asmad* ("us"), and *tan* expresses in general all those meanings apart from those two. With the examples (*tān irddaṁ*, *tām irddar*, etc.) he indicates, by including the linguistic expressions *tan*, *nin*, and *en*, that there is no difference between the linguistic expressions that express those meanings across the divisions of Sanskrit-derived, Sanskrit-identical, and regional lexemes. Despite this, however, one should not insist that the relevant suffixes are added to a verbal root *only* when the corresponding linguistic forms are present; rather, the relevant suffixes are added anytime there is the *intention* of expressing the corresponding meanings, whether the corresponding linguistic expressions are present or not. That is why *asmāsu* is used in this *sūtra*, with an emphasis on the meaning of the word *asmat*, rather than *asmatsu*, which would indicate the linguistic form of *asmat* itself. For the special derivation of the linguistic expressions *yuṣmad* and *asmad* is called for when they refer to a meaning, and the general derivation only when they refer to the linguistic forms themselves. Earlier grammars, for example, have used "second person in the presence of *yuṣmad*" and "first person in the presence of *asmad* to indicate a form that follows another in the presence of the words *yuṣmad* and *asmad*. With all this in mind, he says: *anya* etc.[11]

---

11. Patañjali's *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣyaḥ* on 1.4.105.

uktaṁ ca *kātantra*-śāstrē nāmni prayujyamānē 'pi prathama iti. api-
śabdād aprayujyamānē 'py abhyupagamāt. tathā pāṇinīyē 'pi. yuṣ-
madi samānādhikaraṇē sthāniny api madhyama iti. sthāniny apīty
aprayujyamānē 'pi. yasyāprayuktasyārthaḥ pratīyatē sa sthānīti
vaiyākaraṇā iti rītim abhiprētya tathā tan-ādi-śabda-prayōgam
antarāpi pradarśayati *nōḍidaṁ*, *nōḍidar* ity-ādi.

atra *tān* iti sāmānyatō vā *dēvadattaṁ*, *yajñadattam* ity-ādi-viśēṣatō
vā vivakṣaṇīyam. yady apy atrāmādīnāṁ ṣaṇṇāṁ pratyayānāṁ
dvayōr dvayōr yathā-kramaṁ prathama-madhyamōttama-puruṣa-
saṁjñā prasiddhā. yad āha *darpaṇa-kāraḥ*[12] —

> am-ar-ay-ir-en-evugaḷ akkuṁ
> kramad-ēkānēka-vacanadoḷ pratyēkaṁ
> samanise yugaḷatey ākhyā-
> ta-mārggadoḷ nelasi ninda puruṣa-trayakaṁ

Moreover it says in the *Kātantra* "the third person is used even
when a noun is used, and from the word "even" we understand that
it is used even when a noun is not used. *Pāṇini*'s grammar similarly
says "the second person is used with reference to something coref-
erential with the word 'you,' even when there is a substituend." The
latter means that the second person is used even when something
coreferential with 'you' is not used, since grammarians consider
that form to be a substituend whose meaning is understood even
when it is not used. With this in mind, he exemplifies the suffixes
even without the use of the words *tān* and so on (*nōḍidaṁ*, *nōḍidar*,
etc.).

In these cases one can either intend a general "another" with *tān* or
a specific "another" with Dēvadatta, Yajñadatta, and so on. Now it
is true that each two of the six suffixes (*am* and so on) in order have
the well-known technical terms "third person," "second person,"
and "first person." As the author of the *Darpaṇam* says:

> There are the suffixes
> *am*, *ar*, *ay*, *ir*, *en*, and *evu*;
> in which each successive pair expresses
> the singular and plural, in that order,
> of the three persons in verbal agreement.

---

12. *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇaṁ*

11

iti. *nāgavarmā*py asūtrayat *tāsu dvē dvē prathama-madhyamōttama-purusā* iti.[13] tathāpy atra tat-samjñā-krta-prayōjanābhāvād akaranam. samjñā-karanam hi prayōjanārtham. tac cēt samjñān-tarēna tēna vināpy vānyathaiva sidhyati. na tad avaśyam vaktavyam iti niyamah. asti ca pūrva-śāstrēsu apy ēsā rītih. yathā *kātantra-pāninīyā*di-śāstrē trīni trīni prathama-madhyamōttama-purusā iti samjñā. *jainēndra*-matē tu minas triśō 'smad-yusmad-anyā iti samjñāntaram ēva. *śākatāyana*-matē tu lō 'nya-yusmad-asmāsv ity-ādinā vinaiva samjñām prakriyā nirvyūdhā. atō 'trāpi tayaiva rītyā nirvōdhum śakyata ity ēvam abhiprāyēnaiva tad-akaranam, na tu tad-artha-nisēdhamanasēti mantavyam.

Similarly Nāgavarman's *sūtra* reads: "the third, second, and first person are represented by each pair." Nevertheless we have not used these technical terms, because there is no reason to do so. For there has to be a reason for making a technical term, and if the same thing can be accomplished without it, or with a different technical term, then we don't need it. This is a constraint of ours, and the same procedure is found in earlier grammars. For example, in the *Kātantra* and *Pāninīya* grammars, the technical terms "third person, second person, and first person" are used for each triplet (of finite verbal endings). But in the *Jainēndra* grammar, we have another technical term entirely (*minas triśō 'smad-yusmad-anyā*). And in *Śākatāyana*'s grammar, the derivation proceeds without any technical term at all (*lō 'nya-yusmad-asmāsv*). Hence, in this case, too, it can proceed in the same way, and with this in mind we have not used the technical terms "third person," "second person," and "first person." But don't think that we have done so to reject the meanings of those terms.

---

13. *Karnātakabhāsābhūsanam sūtra* 198.

nanv atrānya-yuṣmad-asmāsu pratyēkam ēkānēkatvayōr yathā-kramam am-ādi-pratyayā vihitāḥ. na hi tē sarvatraivaṁ niyamēna prayujyantē. kvacid vyabhicāra-darśanād iti tad udāhṛtya darśay-ati *dēvadattanam* ity-ādi. *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍeṁ*, *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍay* atrōbhayatrāpi *dēvadattanam* ity anyaikatva-sannidhānē 'pi na dhātōr *aṁ* dṛśyatē. tathā *ninnaṁ kaṇḍaṁ*, *ninnaṁ kaṇḍeṁ* atrōbhayatrāpi *ninnam* ity yuṣmad-ēkatva-sannidhānē 'pi na dhātōr *ay*. tathā *ennaṁ kaṇḍaṁ*, *ennaṁ kaṇḍay* atrōbhayatrāpi *ennam* ity asmad-ēkatva-sannidhānē 'pi na dhātōr *en*. sarvatrāpi pratyayān-tarasyaiva śravaṇāt. tathā tatraiva prayōgē *dēvadattaraṁ*, *nimmaṁ*, *yemmam* ity anēkatva-prayōgaś ca. tathā *dēvadattaniṁ kāṇalpaṭṭir*, *kāṇalpaṭṭevu*; *ninniṁ kāṇalpaṭṭar*, *kāṇalpaṭṭevu*; *enniṁ kāṇalpaṭṭar*, *kāṇalpaṭṭir* ity-ādi karmaṇi prayōgē sarvatrāpy ukta-lakṣaṇābhāvāt katham ētad ity anuyōgē tat tathaivēty prativakti *am-ādayō na bhavantī*ti.

Objection: The suffixes *am* etc. are taught, in sequence, for "an-other," "you," and "us," in the singular and plural. For they are not necessarily used in this way in all cases, since we observe some deviation. To exemplify this he brings forward forms like *dēva-dattanam*. In both *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍeṁ* ("I saw Dēvadatta") and *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍay* ("You saw Dēvadatta"), we have a singular term for "another" (*dēvadattanan*), but *am* is not observed after the verbal root. Similarly in both *ninnaṁ kaṇḍaṁ* ("He saw you") and *ninnaṁ kaṇḍeṁ* ("I saw you"), we have a singular term for "you" (*ninnan*), but *ay* is not observed after the verbal root. Similarly in both *ennaṁ kaṇḍaṁ* ("He saw me") and *ennaṁ kaṇḍay* ("You saw me"), we have a singular term for "us" (*ennan*), but *en* is not observed after the verbal root, since in all these cases we have a completely different suffix. We have similar uses in the plural with *dēvadattaran*, *nimman*, and *emman*. And similarly *dēvadattaniṁ kāṇalpaṭṭir* ("you were seen by Dēvadatta"), *kāṇalpaṭṭevu* ("we were seen"), *ninniṁ kāṇalpaṭṭar* ("they were seen by you"), *kāṇal-paṭṭevu* ("we were seen"), *enniṁ kāṇalpaṭṭar* ("They were seen by us"), *kāṇalpaṭṭir* ("you were seen") — how can these passive usages be accounted for, since the definining characteristic is absent? He responds to this objection with the phrase "The suffixes *am* etc. do not occur" etc.

tatra hētum āha—*vyadhikaraṇatvād iti.* ayam āśayaḥ. atrānyaikatvādiṣu am-ādi-pratyayāḥ kartari vidhīyantē. tatra sāmānādhikaraṇyaṁ vivakṣaṇīyam. samānādhikaraṇē kartarīti. na cāyam arthas sūtrēṇāsūcitaḥ katham abhyupagantava ity śaṅkyaḥ, sāmarthya-siddhatvāt. śruta-prakṛta-sāmarthyānumitō hi sūtrārtha iti. pūrva-śāstrē 'pi tathaivāṅgīkaraṇāt. yady apy ayam arthaḥ kvacit *pāṇinīyādau* mandānugrahārthaṁ samānādhikaraṇē iti sākṣād ēvōk-taḥ, anyatra tu sāmarthya-labhya iti sākṣād-avacanē 'py aṅgīkṛta ēvēty atrāpy avaśyaṁ aṅgīkartavyam ēva. sāmānādhikaraṇyaṁ cātra tiṅ-vācyasya kartuḥ karmaṇō vā prathamānta-padābhidhēyatvam ēva nānyat.

nanu yadi nōcyatē tad tad ēvābhidhattē nānyēnōktasyānyō 'bhid-hāyaka iti. tathā ca tiṅ-vācyasya kartuḥ karmaṇō vā tiṅ ēvābhid-hāyaka iti katham asya prathamābhidhēyatā. anyathā ghaṭa-pada-vācyaḥ paṭa-padābhidhēyō 'pi syād iti atiprasajyata iti cēt.

With "because they are not coreferential" he gives the reason for this. Here is the idea. The suffixes *am* and so on are taught in the sense of the agent in reference to another in the singular and so on. Their coreferentiality with the agent is intended ("in the sense of a *coreferential* agent"). And one should not wonder at how this meaning is arrived at despite not being indicated by the *sūtra*, because it is provided by context (*sāmarthya-*). For the meanings of *sūtra*s are elicited based on the context of what is actually uttered, since earlier grammars have accepted this as well. Now it is true that Pāṇini and others have made this meaning explicit for the benefit of dull people (by saying "coreferential"), but in other cases they have accepted it without saying so explicitly, since it can be obtained from context. Hence we have to accept it here as well. And in this case coreferentiality consists precisely in the agent or patient, which is expressed by the finite verbal suffix, being denoted by a word ending with the first case suffix.

Objection: Unless you actually said, "this denotes this; one thing does not denote something that is expressed by something else," and "a finite verb denotes either an agent or a patient, which is in turn expressed by the finite verb." how can [the agent or patient] be denoted by the first case suffix? Otherwise it would end up that what is expressed by the word "pot" would end up being denoted by the word "cloth."

atra brūmaḥ. pacati, pacasi, pacāmīty-ādau kartari prayōgē kartā
tāvat pratīyatē. tatra dhātv-arthānukūla-kṛtimān kartēti sāmānyataḥ
kartṛtva-prakāraka-pratītāv api sa kō vēti viśēṣa-bubhutsāyām itara-
vyāvṛttyā kartṛ-viśēṣa-dēvadattvādi-prakāraka-pratipatty-arthaṁ
dēvadattas tvam aham ity-ādy-anya-yuṣmad-asmat-padāni prayu-
jyantē. yady api tatra dēvadattādi-śabdā ēvānvaya-vyatirēkābhyāṁ
dēvadattādy-artha-vācakāḥ, tathāpi prayuktair ēva śabdair arthāv-
abōdhō nāprayuktaiḥ. prayōgaś ca na prakṛti-mātrasya pratyaya-
mātrasya vā. na kēvalā prakṛtiḥ prayōktavyā, na ca kēvalaś ca
pratyaya iti niyamāt. kintu padatvam āpannasyaiva. padatvaṁ ca
savibhaktikasyaiva nāvibhaktikasya. *vibhakty-antaṁ padam* iti
vacanāt.[14] atō 'tra padatva-nirvāhārthaṁ yayā kayācid vibhaktyā
bhāvyam. tatra kā vā prayōktavyēti cintāyāṁ dvitīyādayō vib-
haktayaḥ karmādi-kārakē sambandhē ca yathā-yathaṁ vidhānād
upakṣīṇa-śaktikās sāvakāśā iti prathamaikāparam anyatrāvidhānād
an-upakṣīṇa-śaktir niravakāśā viśiṣṭāstīti saivātra vidhīyata iti tad
ēva prathamānta-padābhidhēyatvam iti.

Response: In active usages like "he cooks," "you cook," "I cook,"
an agent is understood. In those cases, there is a general notion
whose relational qualifier is "being an agent," viz. "the agent is the
one who is possessed of an action that is conformant to the meaning
of the verbal root." Nevertheless, when there is a desire to know
who the agent is more specifically, the words for another, you, and
us, viz. "Dēvadatta," "you," or "I," are used for the sake of an un-
derstanding whose relational qualifier is a particular agent, such as
"being Dēvadatta," through excluding the others. And although,
thanks to positive and negative concomitance, it is the linguistic
expression "Dēvadatta" (etc.) in those earlier cases that expresses
the meaning Dēvadatta, nevertheless the awareness of the meaning
comes through the linguistic expressions that are actually used, not
through those that are not used. Moreover there is no use of a base
or an affix on its own, since there is the constraint that neither a
base nor an affix on its own can be used. Indeed they have to be
used once they become a word, and only something with an inflec-
tion can become a word, not something without an inflection, since
it is said that "a word is that which ends in an inflectional affix."
For this reason, there must be some inflectional affix or another,
in order to guarantee that the form is a word. Given that that is the
case, when we think about which inflectional affix is to be used,
the second case etc. have exhausted their capacity in expressing
factors like the patient, and connection, since that the way they are
taught, and are therefore spoken for; by contrast, the first case has
not exhausted its capacity to express anything else, since it is not
taught for anything else, and is therefore not spoken for, and this
is what distinguishes it. Hence that inflectional affix is taught in
these cases, and hence that is what it means to be denoted by a word
ending in the first case.

na ca dvitīyādivat prathamāpy anyatra vihitaivēty upakṣīṇa-
śaktir ēva. tāsām iva sarvaika-vākyatayaikatra vidhānāb-
hāvē 'pi vaiyākaraṇa-mata-bhēdēna tasyā api saṅkhyādy-
artha-viśēṣēsu vidhāna-darśanāt. tathā hi: ēka-dvi-bahāv iti
śākaṭāyanaḥ, prathamā-vibhaktir liṅgārtha-vacanē iti *sarvavarmā*,
prātipadikārtha-liṅga-vacana-parimāṇa-mātrē prathamēti *pāṇinir*
ity ēvaṁ tat-tan-mata-bhēdēna tatra tatra vidhāna-darśanāt katham
ēṣāpy an-upakṣīṇa-śaktir ucyatē. vihita-sthala ēva śakty-upakṣayād
iti vācyam. idam ēva hi tat-tad-abhiprāya-prayālōcanāyāṁ tiṅ-
vācya-kāraka-sāmānādhikaraṇya ēva paryāptam iti. tat-paryālōcanā-
prakāras tu nyāsa-bhāṣyādi-granthēṣv ēva prapañcita iti tatraivānu-
sandhēyō 'sya grantashya saṅkṣēpa-ruci-adhikāritvād iti. ata ēva
miṅaikārthaivēti tat-sāmānādhikaraṇya ēva prathamaṁ nyarūru-
pad bhagavān *dēvanandī*. tad ētat sarvam ākalanaṁ bhāṣāyām api
samānam ēva. tattva-cintāyā yukti-cintāyāś ca sarvatrāpy aviśēṣāt.
kēvalaṁ prakriyā-cintā-mātram ēva paraṁ viśiṣyatē nānyad iti.
tathaivātrāpi prathamam asūtrayat *sūtrakārō muktē* iti. vicāritaṁ
ca tatraivaitat. tad idaṁ sāmānādhikaraṇyam kartarīva karmaṇy
apy anusandhēyam. ataḥ samānādhikaraṇa ēva kartari karmaṇi
vāmī am-ādayō bhavanti nānyatra. *dēvadattanaṁ kaṇḍay* ity-ādiṣu
pradarśita-sthalēṣu tu anyaikatvē saty api dvitīyānta-padābhidhāna-
viṣayatayā prathamānta-padābhidhāna-viṣatayā nāstīti sāmānād-
hikaraṇyābhāvād am-ādayō na bhavantīti.

atrām-ādīnāṁ madhyē pañcamō hrasvādir ēva yady api sūtrē
nirdiṣṭas tathāpi dīrghādīm api kēcid icchantīti āha *en*-ity-ādi.
tathā ca prayōgaḥ —

Nor is it the case that the first case is taught for something else, like the second case, and therefore its capacity for expressing something else has also been exhausted. For although those other cases are not taught ... we see that the first case, too, expresses particular meanings such as number. That is to say: Śākaṭāyana teaches it in reference to one, two, or many; Śarvavarman teaches it in reference to the gender and number; Pāṇini teaches it in reference to the meaning of the stem, the gender, and the number. Hence we see it taught in reference to different things according to the different views of the grammarians. How, then, can it be said that its capacity to express its meaning is not exhausted? One could say that it is because its capacity is exhausted only in the place that is taught. For this

---

14.

tani-vaṇṇaṁ lañcam īvēṁ
    puruḷi ninage pū-goñcalaṁ bēgadindaṁ
ninag’ īvēṁ tumbi kendā-
    vareya misupa mel-moggeyaṁ māṇad’ enduṁ
ninag’ īvēn añce kampaṁ
    ninag’ osayisuveṁ kūḍe teṅgāḷiy enn ō-
panan ind’ āraydu tand’ enn-
    oḍan irisidoḍ’ end’ āke mātāḍutirppaḷ

iti. tathātra tṛtīyam aikāram ardhaikāram api kēcid icchanti.

    śrī-kānta nīne sale ge-
    ldai kantuvan amala-mukti-satiyoḷ neṟed’ ā-
    ntai kiḍada sukhaman uḷidargg’
    ī kṛtyam asādhyam aṟiven ān avaṟoḷavaṁ

tathā

    kantuvan ent’ aḷaṟiside kṛ
    tāntanan uṟad’ entu gelde mukty-aṅganeyaṁ
    ent’ oliside niravadhi-sukha-
    santatiyan ad’ entu paḍede pēḷ eneg’ arhā

iti ca prayōga-darśanāt. nanu ca vākya-prayōgēṣu kriyā-kāraka-
samanvayō dvēdhā bhavati sahānvayaḥ pratyēkānvayaś cēti. ya-
trānēkēṣu kāraka-padēṣu kriyāpadam ēkaṁ sahaivānvēti sa sahān-
vayaḥ. yatra tu tat pratyēkam ēvānvēti sa pratyēkānvaya ucyatē.
ubhayathāpi prayōga-darśanāt. tatrādyasya yathā —

    avatōkāvaḷi naicikī-pratati ghṛṣṭi-śrēṇi-pīnōdhnikā-
    nivahaṁ baṣkayaṇī-kadambakam acaṇḍī-maṇḍalaṁ dhēnu-kō-
    ṭivaśā-santati-vatsakā-samudayaṁ praṣṭauhikānīkam i-
    rdduvu gōvardhana-gōtra-gōtra taṭadoḷ gōvinda-gōvṛndadoḷ

iti. dvitīyasya yathā —

Similarly, in the following example,

Śrīkānta, you alone have conquered well Kantu, joining with
(neṟedu) the good woman (sati) of pure liberation, you have joined
(āntai) pleasure that does not fade (kiḍada), This deed was impossi-
ble for the rest (uḷidarge). I know (among them?)

Similarly:

17

tridaśānaka-vāsanav asu-
gu divya-ravam ātapatram esaḷ vaḷe camaraṁ
sad-amala-bhā-maṇḍalam ese-
vudu ninnoḷ jinapa nīne jagad-ārādhyam

iti. tatra pratyēkānvayē yāvanti kāraka-padāni santi tāvatsv api kriyāpadasyāvṛttyā samanvaya iti na kāpy anupapattiḥ. sahān-vayē tu yatrānyaika-vacanāny ēva bahūni santi tatra tad-anēkatvē niyuktam aram ēvādāya prayōktuṁ śakyatvē 'pi yatrānya-yuṣmadōr anyāsmadōr yuṣmad-asmadōr vā dvayōr dvayōr anya-yuṣmad-asmadāṁ trayāṇāṁ vā padānāṁ prayōgas tatrānēkatva-vācinām ar-ir-evūnāṁ madhyē kiṁ vā prayōktavyam. sarvasyāpi nimittasya jāgarūkatvād ity āśaṅkyātrānya-yuṣmad-asmadām uttarōttarāśritam ēva kāryaṁ nānyad iti pratipādayituṁ tathaivōdāhṛtya darśayati *ātanuṁ nīnum irddir* ity-ādi. parāśraya iti parāpēkṣayā yaḥ paras tad-āśraya ity arthaḥ. tatra bījam āha — *śabda-para-vipratiṣēdhād* iti. ayam āśayaḥ. anya-yuṣmad-asmāsv ity atrānyatva-pratipattau pratiyōgi-pratipatty-arthaṁ sannihitayōr yuṣmad-asmadōḥ prāg ēva nirūpaṇīyatvē tatrāpy asmad-yuṣmadōr vyutkramē 'py adōṣatvē 'pi yad artham anya-yuṣmad-asmāsv ity ēva pāṭha-kramaḥ kṛ-tas tat-paripāṭīm āśrityōttarōttarāśraya ēva vidhir bhavati. ētēna yugapad-vacanē paraḥ puruṣāṇām iti *kātantra*-śāstravad yatnāntara-karana-prayāsō nānubhōktavya iti śucitam iti.

References