

Carrying Over (*anuṣaṅga*) in Kumārila’s *Explanation of the System*

Andrew Ollett 🌿 Kumārila Conference, June 1, 2024

PROBLEM SETTING: UP TO ŚABARASVĀMIN

1. **anuṣaṅga**: lit. copying part of an antecedent sentence and “sticking it onto” a sentence as a **supplement** (*vākyaśēṣa*) by which the latter sentence, otherwise incomplete, is completed.

2. *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā* 1.2.7: *yā tē agnē ’yaḥśayā tanūr vārṣiṣṭhā gahvarēṣṭhā ugrām vácō ápāvadhīt tveṣám vácō ápāvadhīt sváhā yā tē agnē rajāśayā yā tē agnē harāśayā.*

s_1	<i>yā tē agnē ’yaḥśayā</i>	tanūr vārṣiṣṭhā gahvarēṣṭhā ugrām vácō ápāvadhīt tveṣám vácō ápāvadhīt sváhā
s_2	<i>yā tē agnē rajāśayā</i>	[<i>tanūr vārṣiṣṭhā gahvarēṣṭhā ugrām vácō ápāvadhīt tveṣám vácō ápāvadhīt sváhā</i>]
s_3	<i>yā tē agnē harāśayā</i>	[<i>tanūr vārṣiṣṭhā gahvarēṣṭhā ugrām vácō ápāvadhīt tveṣám vácō ápāvadhīt sváhā</i>].

s_1	O Agni, as for thy iron-clad	body, most excellent, established in the deep, it hath chased away the cruel word, it hath chased away the fearful word; Hail!
-------	------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

s_2	O Agni, as for thy silver-clad	[...]
-------	--------------------------------	-------

s_3	O Agni, as for thy gold-clad	[...]
-------	------------------------------	-------

Translation based on Eggeling’s translation of *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 3.4.4.24, p. 110

3. *Eclipsis est defectus dictionis, in quo necessaria verba desunt* (“Ellipsis is an incompleteness of speech, in which necessary words are missing”: St. Isidore, by way of Merchant 2013)

🌿 (site of) ellipsis: that which is missing or unpronounced

🌿 antecedent: the antecedent word(s) or phrase(s) that complete the ellipsis

? Is the above example actually ellipsis (i.e., ellipsis as it occurs in natural language), or is this a technical/editorial convention of Vedic texts?

4. Śabara on 2.1.48: several questions

🌿 when a sentence of the Veda is incomplete, what do we supplement it with?

🌿 a copy of part of another sentence (which implies that the supplement is Veda), or

🌿 insert something that we ourselves come up with (which implies that the supplement is not Veda = *laukikō vākyaśēṣaḥ*)?

🌿 what constraints are there on the relationship between the sentence containing the supplement (s_1) and the incomplete sentence(s) (s_2 etc.)?

🌿 do they need to be strictly contiguous (*anantaram*)?

🌿 does the supplement need to occur before the incomplete sentence?

🌿 is the connection syntactic or semantic (or neither)?

Following Śabara we can outline two (non-exclusive) approaches: **contiguity theories** (which state that only a contiguous linguistic expression can be “carried over” as a supplement) and **dependency theories** (which state that a supplement x can be “carried over” so long as the dependencies of the incomplete sentence y are not fulfilled by anything between x and y).

One specific problem: in 2, s_1 is contiguous with s_2 , but not with s_3 ; hence it would seem that it could supplement s_2 but not s_3 . Śabara’s two solutions:

1. contiguity (*ānantarya*): s_2 and s_3 constitute a group (*samudāya*) with which the supplement is contiguous

2. (dependency-informed) proximity (*sannidhi*): the supplement is proximate to both s_2 and s_3 , in a specific sense that includes dependency relations

Kumāriḷa (pp. 454–455) says “some people take the position that these are merely alternative explanations, while others say that Śābara has given the latter because he was unsatisfied with the former” (*tatra kaiścid vyākhyānavikalpa ēvety āśritam, aparē tu vadanti pūrvatrāparitōṣād uttarāṃ kṛtam*); this raises the possibility that some of the novel ideas in Kumāriḷa’s discussion are based on earlier commentators whose work is lost. Kumāriḷa himself says that the first explanation is “capricious” (*rājaikaputrakṛdā*).

5. Śābara on 2.1.48:

kiyāṃs tu kālaḥ saṃnidhir iti. ucyatē. yāvati śaknōty ubhāv apy apēkṣitum. kaś cāsau. ānanta-
taryaṃ saṃbandhipadavyavāyō vā. tāvati hi śaknōty ubhāv api apēkṣitum. saṃbandhipadavyavāyē
hi saṃbandhād ēva pūrvasaṃskārō nāpaiti. yatrāpy aparēṇa sākāṅkṣēṇa vyavāyas tatrāpy asti
saṃbandhaḥ.

But for how long can it be said that the supplement is “proximate”? — As long as it is able to depend on both. — And what is that “proximity” anyway? — Either contiguity, or separation by words that have a connection, since it is for that long that the supplement is able to depend upon both. For when there is a separation by words that have a connection, the trace of the first element does not disappear from the connection itself. A connection exists even when another element intervenes, provided that the intervening element has a dependency.

separation (*vyavāya*) = the interposition of s_2 between the supplement (which is part of s_1) and s_3 .

dependency (*ākāṅkṣā*) = s_2 dependencies are fulfilled by the supplement (which is part of s_1).

No precise definition of dependency is given here, but the **model** is the mutual dependency of a transitive verb in the active voice for an object in the accusative case.

The supplement continues to be available to fulfill dependencies of subsequent elements (s_n) if every interposed element ($s_2, s_3, \dots s_{n-1}$) is “connected to,” i.e., completed by or has its dependencies filled by, the supplement.

6. *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* 1.2.1: citpātis tvā punātu vākpātis tvā punātu dēvās tvā savitā punātv āchidrēṇa pavitrēṇa vāsōḥ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ.

s_1	citpātis tvā punātu	[?]
s_2	vākpātis tvā punātu	[?]
s_3	dēvās tvā savitā punātv	āchidrēṇa pavitrēṇa vāsōḥ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ

s_1	May the Lord of Thought purify you	
s_2	May the Lord of Speech purify you	
s_3	May the divine Savitṛ purify you	with the purifier that has no holes, with the rays of the Vasu, the Sun.

→ Here the putative supplement (*āchidrēṇa pavitrēṇa vāsōḥ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ*) is not actually necessary to make the prior elements complete. **What do you think?** (cf. “I scream, you scream...”)

The answer in 2.1.48 is that the putative supplement, as an adverbial phrase modifying *punātu*, is understood everywhere that *punātu* occurs.

7. *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā* 1.2.15: sám tē vāyúr vātēna gáchatām sám yajátrair ángāni sám yajñápatir āśísā

<i>s</i> ₁	sám tē vāyúr vātēna	gáchatām
<i>s</i> ₂	sám yajátrair ángāni	[?]
<i>s</i> ₃	sám yajñápatir āśísā	[?]

<i>s</i> ₁	May	Vāyu	be united	with your breath
<i>s</i> ₂		your limbs		with the sacrificers
<i>s</i> ₃		the Lord of Sacrifice		with your prayer

Here the fact that *ángāni* (plural) cannot be construed with (*sám gáchatām*) (singular) means that “carrying over” cannot happen; we still understand the verb as “may [they] be united” but because the form would be different (*sám gáchantām*) this has to be considered a “non-Vedic supplement” (*laukikō vākyaśēṣaḥ*).

→ This shows that *anuṣaṅga*, at least in this context, is not just ellipsis completion as we understand it, but literally copying the exact forms from an antecedent sentence into the site of ellipsis.

KUMĀRILA AS THE SOURCE FOR THE THREE CODETERMINANTS OF RELATION

Review: Kumāriḷa does not use the term *anvaya* to refer to a “relation” between word-meanings. This is an invention (indeed the calling card) of Prabhākara (cf. Yoshimizu 1997: 43 n. 57). Kumāriḷa instead uses *sambandha*, and uses it of words rather than word-meanings. But Kumāriḷa seems to be responsible for formulating dependency, proximity, and compatibility as the three things by which a connection can be known, and this idea is taken up both by Prabhākara (who actually seems rather critical of it) and by Śālikanātha. The latter consecrates them as the three codeterminants (*upalakṣaṇa*) of a relation, for which he specifically credits Kumāriḷa; I assume that it is from Śālikanātha that this triad has entered all subsequent discussions of sentence meaning.

By the way, if Śālikanātha (who was concerned with relational meanings) repurposed these concepts from Kumāriḷa (who was concerned with connections between linguistic expressions), it could explain why everyone seems confused about whether these concepts refer to linguistic expressions or meanings, and relatedly, whether they are to be interpreted syntactically or semantically.

8a. Kumāriḷa, *Explanation* on 2.1.48:

ākāṅkṣā saṁnidhānaṁ ca yōgyatā cēti ca trayam
sambandhakāarakatvēṇa kl̥ptam nānantaraśrutiḥ

Dependency, proximity and compatibility
are considered to be the three things
that cause a connection, not contiguity.

Sōmēśvara calls these *anvayahētu* (p. 693).

8b. Kumāriḷa (Vārttikakārapādamiśra), *Bṛhaṭṭīkā* (?), quoted by Śālikanātha on 2.1.48 (p. 397):

anuṣaṅgi padaṁ yat syād ādimadhyāntavarty api
apēkṣāsattiyōgyatvaiḥ tasya sarvēṇa saṅgatiḥ

As for the word that is carried over,
that goes with every incomplete sentence,
on account of requirement, vicinity, and compatibility,
whether it appears at the beginning, middle, or end.

9a. Kumāṛila, *Explanation* p. 455

sannidhir iti **buddhau viparivṛttiḥ**.

Proximity means that something **continues to be present in the mind**.

cf. Śālikanātha p. 389: *atha sannidhiḥ kaḥ? yasyārthasya śravaṇāntaram ākāṅkṣāyōgyatābhyām arthāntarē buddhiviparivṛttiḥ*.

9b. Kumāṛila, *Explanation* p. 456

ēvaṁ vākyē padānām prakaraṇē ca vākyānām sambandhō yāvat sākāṅkṣēṇa **tatsambandhārḥēṇa** parasyāpy anantarīkartuṁ samarthēna vyavadhānam.

In this way, the connection of words within a sentence, and of sentences within a discourse, extends as long as what separates them (a) has dependencies that would be fulfilled by the other words, (b) **is fit for a connection** with them, and (c) is capable of making them contiguous with something else.

cf. Śālikanātha p. 390: *kiṁ punar idaṁ yōgyatvaṁ nāma? ucyatē — yat sambandhārham*.

KUMĀRILA AS A CONTIGUITY THEORIST

The final comment in **9b** calls for some additional clarification.

Whereas Śābara's final view is that **proximity** is the ultimate cause of connecting an incomplete sentence with its supplement, and includes contiguity and separation by words possessing a connection, Kumāṛila explains the latter case as "just a type of contiguity." In other words (and despite what he says in **7a** above), he collapses the distinction that Śābara made between proximity and contiguity. This is because he insists that the supplement **is actually copied and pasted** into the site of ellipsis.

10. Kumāṛila, *Explanation* p. 254:

yady api cāsau prathamamantrē kṛtārthatvān na tāv ākāṅkṣati, tau tu tēna vinānupapadyamānāv ātmasamīpē 'nyasyānāmnānād ēvaṁ puruṣaṁ prayuñjātē — sarvasamīpē sakṛt paṭhitum aśakyaḥ pramāṇāntaralabhyatvāc ca punaḥpunaraśrāvītō 'yam, āvayōr apy arthēnāmnātaḥ śēṣō, naikasyaiva sannidhiviśēṣanimittabhrāntyā kalpayitavya iti.

And although the putative supplement does not depend on the other two sentences, since its dependencies are fulfilled in the first sentence, those two, for their part, nevertheless do not make sense without it, and hence because there is nothing else transmitted near them, they compel a person as follows: "Look, this cannot be recited *simultaneously* near each one of the sentences, and so it has to be repeated, since it is arrived at through other means of knowledge [in the latter two sentences]; it's for *our* sake that the supplement is transmitted; don't be misled by its closer proximity to the one sentence into postulating that it is transmitted for its sake alone."

11. Kumāṛila, *Explanation* p. 455

sambaddhapadavyavahir apy ānantaryaparakāra ēva. katham?

anantarēṇa sambaddhaḥ syāt parasyāpy anantaraḥ
tataḥ punas tadārūḍhaḥ parānantaryam aśnutē

Separation by connected words is also just a type of contiguity. How is that?

When *a* is connected with a contiguous element *b*,
then *a* could be contiguous with a further element *c*:
after that, once it is tacked onto *c*,
it can be contiguous with other elements.

I have encountered this verse in literary commentaries explaining how a single supplement can be carried over to multiple incomplete sentences.

As in a few other instances, Prabhākara in the *Long Notes* appears to be aware of an innovation of Kumārila's (i.e., something that is not in Śābara's *Commentary* at all) and purports to improve upon it.

12. Prabhākara, *Long Notes*, p. 394

satyam, ākāṅkṣā sannidhiḥ yōgyatvaṁ ca sambandhē hētuḥ. sannidhānaṁ punar nāvyavadhānāpēkṣam. kiṁ tarhi? sajātīavyavadhānāpēkṣam.

It's true that dependency, proximity and compatibility are the cause of a connection. But being proximate does not depend on the absence of separation. Rather, it depends on the absence of separation by a homogeneous supplement.

Prabhākara does not define "homogenous" (*sajātīyaka*) but he clearly thinks that this reformulation solves all of the problems mooted by Śābara (p. 398):

yatrēdānīm śēṣiṇi nirākāṅkṣāṇi śēṣaś ca sākāṅkṣaḥ, tatrāpi saiva kathā asajātīavyavadhānāt sarvaiḥ sambandhaḥ. kimarthaṁ tarhi punarlikhyatē? tad ēva tu na jñāyatē.

Now in those cases where the sentences have no unfulfilled dependencies, while the supplement does, the same exact account applies: the supplement connects with all of the sentences, because they are not separated from it by a homogeneous supplement. — Then why the repetition here? — I have absolutely no idea.

Final questions:

- ✿ Much of the discussion in 2.1.48–49 concerns not what we understand in the site of ellipsis (that is obvious) but whether it counts as Veda or not.
- ✿ *Anuṣaṅga* appears to apply only to those cases where it *does* count as Veda because it is derived (in Kumārila's account) by a copy-paste operation.
- ✿ There are more general questions about the nature of the connection between supplements and what they supplement (*śēṣa* and *śēṣin*).
 - ✿ Śābara highlights dependency, but is unclear on what precisely the word means, and dependency admits of many interpretations (syntactic, semantic, psychological, etc.).
 - ✿ Compatibility is simply glossed as *sambandhārha* in Kumārila's account (is this circular?).
 - ✿ Proximity, too, has been treated very differently, either involving the notion of dependency (in which case it is not really an independent criterion) or involving the notion of contiguity (in an extended and possibly circular sense of bringing one element into contiguity with other).

Primary sources

Explanation of the System = *Tantravārttika* in Subbāśāstrī (ed.), *Śrīmājjaimininirṇṭē mīmāṃsādarśanē āditya ārabhya dvitīyādhyāyaprathamapādāntaḥ prathamō bhāgaḥ*. Puṇya [Pune]: Ānandāśramamudrālaya, 1929.

Ānandāśramasamskṛtagranthāvaliḥ 97.

Fundamentals of Sentence Meaning = *Vākyārthamātrkā* in Subrahmaṇyaśāstrī (ed.), *Prakaraṇapañcikā Mahāmahōpadhyāyaśrīmacchālikanāthamiśraviracitā*. Kāśī: Kāśīhindūviśvavidyālayamudraṇālaya, 1961.

Long Notes = *Bṛhatī* in S. Subrahmaṇya Sastrī (ed.), *Bṛhatī of Prabhākara Miśra, with Rjūvimalā Pañcikā of Śālikanātha* (part III). Madras: University of Madras, 1962. Madras University Sanskrit Series 24.

References

Merchant, Jason. 2013. "Diagnosing Ellipsis." In *Diagnosing Syntax*, edited by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 537–542. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199602490.003.0026.

Yoshimizu, Kiyotaka. 1997. *Der 'Organismus' des Urheberlosen Veda: Eine Studie der Niyoga-Lehre Prabhākara's mit ausgewählten Übersetzungen der Bṛhatī*. Vienna: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien.