



BRILL

# Meanings of *ca* ‘and’ in the Lexicographical Tradition

*Beyond Patañjali*

*James W. Benson*

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

*james.benson@wolfson.ox.ac.uk*

*John J. Lowe* | ORCID: 0000-0003-0131-1575

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

*john.lowe@ames.ox.ac.uk*

*Adriana Molina-Muñoz* | ORCID: 0009-0009-4212-5374

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

*adriana.molina-munoz@ames.ox.ac.uk*

*Yiming Shen*

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

*yiming.shen@ames.ox.ac.uk*

Received 30 May 2025 | Accepted 8 October 2025 |

Published online 4 November 2025

## Abstract

While the four-fold definition of the meaning of *ca* ‘and’ developed within the grammatical tradition of *vyākaraṇa* had, and still has, wide currency, more extensive inventories of meanings are attributed to *ca* in the lexicographical (*kośa*) tradition, particularly from the twelfth century on. In this paper we review the grammatical tradition’s four-fold approach to the meaning of *ca*, and then contrast this with what is found in the *kośa* tradition.

## Keywords

Sanskrit lexicography – *kośa* – grammar – *vyākaraṇa* – coordination – conjunction

### 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The meanings and functions of the apparently simple word *and* have long been a question of interest in modern Western linguistics, and the same was true of Sanskrit *ca* ‘and’ in the ancient and medieval Indian grammatical tradition. Modern Western linguistics recognizes two primary meanings of *and*: intersective (or Boolean) conjunction (primarily clausal conjunction) and collective (group-forming or non-Boolean) conjunction (primarily item conjunction); and there is ongoing debate over which meaning is basic (Champollion 2016). The ancient Indian tradition of linguistic analysis, *vyākaraṇa*, by contrast, distinguished four meanings/functions (*artha*)<sup>2</sup> of *ca* ‘and’: *samuccaya* ‘aggregation’, *anvācaya* ‘supplementary addition’, *itaretarayoga* ‘mutual connection’, and *samāhāra* ‘collection’.<sup>3</sup> The four-fold approach to the meaning of *ca* ‘and’ begins with Patañjali (c. 150 BC) and, though in the details understood in slightly different ways through the subsequent near two thousand-year history of the tradition (to the last great authority in the tradition, Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, fl. 18th century), was never seriously challenged or augmented within the tradition of *vyākaraṇa* itself.

A wider range of meanings is attributed to *ca* ‘and’ in the lexicographical (*kośa*) tradition, up to an inventory of around ten meanings which gains some currency from Hemacandra’s time onwards.<sup>4</sup> While modern studies can be found which discuss the four-fold definition of the grammarians (for example,

1 For insightful comments on versions of this work we thank: the audience of the conference “Indian Theories of Meaning and Grammar—Novel Perspectives”, INALCO, 6–8 June 2023, in particular Brendan Gillon; the attendees of the Graduate Philology Seminar, Oxford, 17 June 2025; and Diwakar Acharya and Kate Crosby. This work was supported by the LINGUINDIC project ([www.linguindic.com](http://www.linguindic.com)), funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant Agreement No. 851990).

2 The wide semantic range of the word *artha*, used in the compound *cārtha* ‘the meanings/functions of *ca* ‘and’’, including ‘meaning, function, purpose, object’ etc., makes it difficult to translate. For simplicity we henceforth mainly adopt the translation ‘meaning’, except where ‘function’ is clearly to be preferred.

3 These meanings are discussed and exemplified in §2.

4 Similarly, for example, the Oxford English Dictionary lists sixteen meanings for the English conjunction *and* (of which four are obsolete), considerably more than generally assumed in modern semantic work.

Murti 1974: 308–327, Panchal and Kulkarni 2019), the wider range of meanings found in the *kośa* tradition remain hitherto unstudied. The additional meanings attributed to *ca* in the *kośa* tradition not only offer a valuable insight into the finer details of the uses of *ca* in Sanskrit (or at least, an insight into how the Sanskrit lexicographers perceived its use), but also raise interesting questions regarding the degree of interaction (or lack thereof) between the lexicographical and grammatical traditions. The lexicographers could not have been unaware of the four-way division of the meanings of *ca* in the grammatical tradition, but at the same time the grammarians were unlikely to be unaware of the wider range of meanings of *ca* as attested in Sanskrit texts and recorded by lexicographers; yet the grammarians hold consistently to Patañjali's four meanings.

In this paper, we first (§2) present an overview of the four meanings attributed to *ca* in the grammatical tradition, since these are also the first meanings attributed to *ca* in the lexicographical tradition—both in the sense that they are the primary meanings attributed to *ca* in the earliest *kośas*, and in the sense that they usually appear first in later, more extensive, lists. We then turn (§3) to the lexicographical tradition, tracing the development of longer lists of meanings for *ca*, and exemplifying and discussing these additional meanings, focusing particularly on the list found in Hemacandra's *Anekārthasaṃgraha* (§4). In §5 we draw our conclusions.

## 2 Patañjali's Four Meanings of *ca*

The tradition of *vyākaraṇa*, from Patañjali on, approaches the meaning of *ca* 'and' from a very specific angle: nominal compounding. Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (ca. 5th century BC) defines the scope of *dvandva* compound formation in *sūtra* 2.2.29 using the word *cārthe* 'in the meaning of *ca* 'and''. It is consequently in relation to this rule that the subsequent tradition treats the meaning of *ca* 'and', such that for the grammarians, the question remains inextricably linked with the issue of *dvandva* compounding.

### (1) *cārthe dvandvaḥ*. (A. 2.2.29)

'(When two or more words ending in a case-affix are semantically related to each other (*samartha*)) in the meaning 'and', they are (optionally) made into a compound; and the compound so formed is labelled *dvandva*.'<sup>5</sup>

5 The parts of the translation in parentheses are inferred in the rule by the process of *anuvṛtti* from earlier rules.

While Pāṇini makes reference to semantic notions such as *cārtha*, it is not the task of the grammar to explicate meaning, so he does not further specify what *cārtha* does or does not refer to. Conceivably, Pāṇini might have had in mind a definition such as the one in Yāska's comment on *ca* in the *Nirukta* (ca. 5th century BC):<sup>6</sup>

- (2) *ceti samuccayārtha ubhābhyāṃ saṃprayujyate.* (*Nirukta* 1.4)  
 'The word *ca* is used in the sense of *samuccaya* 'aggregation', and is joined together with both (meanings).'<sup>7</sup>

This is the earliest surviving definition of a meaning of *ca*. Yāska illustrates the meaning of *ca* with an example from the *Rgveda*:<sup>8</sup>

- (3) *ahaṃ ca tvam ca vṛtrahan saṃyujyāva sanibhya ā.* (RV 8.62.11ab)  
 'I and you, o Vṛtra-smasher—let us two yoke ourselves together for winnings.' (Jamison and Brereton 2014: 1149)

The *Nirukta* gives only this single meaning for *ca*; the meaning *samuccaya* is also not exclusive to *ca* in the *Nirukta*, but is attributed also to the particles *ā* and *vā* 'or'.

The earliest surviving commentator on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Kātyāyana, does not discuss the meaning of *ca* as such, but proposes an alternative interpretation of A. 2.2.29 which does not reference the meaning of *ca*. It is Patañjali, commenting both on A. 2.2.29 and Kātyāyana's *Vārttikas* on the same, who introduces the four meanings of *ca* in what became perhaps the most important and influential statement on the meaning of *ca* 'and' in the Indian tradition:

- (4) *kaḥ punaś cena kṛto 'rthaḥ. samuccayo 'nvācaya itaretarayogaḥ samāhāra iti. samuccayaḥ. plakṣaś cety ukte gamyata etad nyagrodhaś ceti. anvācayaḥ. plakṣaś cety ukte gamyata etat sāpekṣo 'yam prayujyata iti. itaretarayogaḥ. plakṣaś ca nyagrodhaś cety ukte gamyata etat plakṣo 'pi nyagrodhasahāyaḥ, nyagrodho 'pi plakṣasahāya iti. (plakṣaś ca nyagrodhaś cety ukte) samāhāre 'pi kriyate plakṣanyagrodham iti. tatrāyam apy artho dvandvaikavadbhāvo na paṭhitavyo bhavati. samāhārasyaikatvād eva siddham.* (*Mahābhāṣya* v. 1, p. 434, ll. 9–14)

6 Sarup (1921: 8; 1927: 31).

7 The word 'meanings' (*arthābhyām*) is supplied in Durga's commentary.

8 This example will be discussed further below (§4.10).

'But what is the meaning expressed by *ca* 'and'? (It is) *Samuccaya*, *anvacāya*, *itaretarayoga*, (and) *samāhāra*. (As for) *samuccaya*, when one says *plakṣas ca* 'and the white fig tree', this is understood: *nyagrodhas ca* 'and the banyan tree also'. (As for) *anvacāya*, when one says *plakṣas ca* 'and the white fig tree', this is understood: (that) this (the word *plakṣa*) is used as a dependent (word). (As for) *itaretarayoga*, when one says *plakṣas ca nyagrodhas ca* 'both the white fig and the banyan tree', this is understood: both the white fig tree accompanied by the banyan tree, and the banyan tree accompanied by the white fig tree. When one says *plakṣas ca nyagrodhas ca* 'both the white fig and the banyan tree' (a compound) is formed also in the case of *samāhāra*, (as in) *plakṣanyagrodham* 'a white fig tree and a banyan tree (as a unit)'. In that (understanding of the rule) there is also this gain, that (a rule for) *dvandvaikavadbhāva* 'treatment of a *dvandva* as (referring to) a single entity' (i.e. for the formation of *samāhāra*) does not need to be formulated. It is effected simply by the singularity of *samāhāras*.'

The four meanings attributed to *ca* by Patañjali are the only meanings explicitly accepted in discussions of *cārtha* in the subsequent grammatical tradition.<sup>9</sup> Within the mainstream Pāṇinian tradition this is perhaps not surprising, given the increasing authority attributed to Patañjali within that tradition.<sup>10</sup> Yet even in the non-Pāṇinian traditions of *vyākaraṇa*, the same four meanings are standard. For example, in the Kātantra tradition,<sup>11</sup> we find the same four meanings, although the interrelation of these meanings is somewhat different, perhaps reflecting an attempt to integrate Patañjali's four meanings with the older single meaning approach seen in the *Nirukta*.<sup>12</sup>

In the following subsections we offer a summary of how the grammatical tradition understood and exemplified each of the four meanings of *ca*, as a point of comparison for what we find in the lexicographical tradition.

9 As discussed below, some authors, including Patañjali himself, accept certain other meanings/uses of *ca* in the context of specific Pāṇinian rules, but they never generalize any such uses beyond the Pāṇinian context as meanings of *ca* as such. See Renou (1957: 143–144) on these other uses identified in the grammatical tradition.

10 On the principle of *yathottaram munīnām prāmāṇyam*, that the authority of the three primary figures in the tradition follows their relative recency (such that Patañjali's authority trumps that of Kātyāyana, whose authority trumps that of Pāṇini), see e.g. Deshpande (1993, 1998) and Vergiani (2005).

11 The *Kātantrasūtra*, possibly dated to the first century AD, is the earliest surviving tradition of *vyākaraṇa* besides the Pāṇinian tradition, and one of the most popular and influential; see Shen 2018.

12 This is discussed further in Benson et al. (forthcoming).

## 2.1 Samuccaya

As discussed above, *samuccaya* is the oldest recorded meaning attributed to *ca* ‘and’ in the Indian tradition, and may have been a/the meaning known to Pāṇini.<sup>13</sup> But what is really intended by the term *samuccaya* ‘aggregation’? Patañjali’s example for *samuccaya* (in ex. 4 above) is elliptical. If, when we say *plakṣas ca* ‘and the white fig tree’, we understand *nyagrodhas ca* ‘the banyan tree also’, then presumably *plakṣas ca* ‘and the white fig tree’ follows something that includes the word *nyagrodha*. Kaiyaṭa’s understanding is that we assume a complete sentence involving *nyagrodha*, such that with the addition of *plakṣas ca* we effectively end up with two clauses:

- (5) a. *nyagrodho dṛśyatām!*  
       ‘Look at the banyan tree!’  
       b. *plakṣas ca.* ‘And, the white fig tree.’

The resulting full meaning would be something like ‘look at the banyan tree and also look at the white fig tree’.

A somewhat different example is given for *samuccaya* by Kaiyaṭa, who adopts an example originally given by Kātyāyana (but not attributed to any specific meaning of *ca* by him or by Patañjali):

- (6) *ahar ahar nayamāno gām aśvaṃ puruṣaṃ paśum vaivasvato na tṛpyati surāyā iva durmadī.* (*Mahābhāṣya* v. 1, p. 431, ll. 3–4)  
       ‘Vaivasvata is not satisfied (even by) daily carrying off (to death) a cow, a horse, a man, (or) any sacrificial animal, just like one who does not easily get drunk (is not satisfied) with (any amount of) liquor.’

In this example, the sequence of nouns *gām aśvaṃ puruṣaṃ paśum* are understood to be coordinated but, crucially, the grammarians consider compounding to be impossible here. The word *ca* ‘and’ itself is also absent, of course, and both these facts feed into the discussion of this example, in ways which go beyond the present scope. Nāgeśa later explicitly denies that (6) is an example of *samuccaya* (*Uddyota*, p. 470a). Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita follows Kaiyaṭa in offering (6) as his example for *samuccaya* in his *Śabdakaustubha* (vol. 2, p. 216), but in his later *Siddhāntakaumudī* (vol. 2, p. 184) gives a rather different example (7).

13 The idea of *samuccaya* as the single meaning of *ca* may survive in some form in the Kātantra tradition, where the term is used to encompass not only what Pāṇinian grammarians would recognize as *samuccaya* but also the compounding meanings of *itaretarāyoga* (§2.3) and *samāhāra* (§2.4).

- (7) *īśvaraṃ gurum ca bhajasva.*  
'Honour god and (your) teacher.'

Bhaṭṭoji's example here is structurally similar to Patañjali's example (at least as understood by Kaiyaṭa), in involving a single *ca* which coordinates two nouns in relation to a single verb. Although the verb occurs only once, we understand (following the commentators) two sentences: 'honour god' and 'honour your teacher'.

The *vyākaraṇa* tradition almost exclusively treats *ca* in relation to nominal coordination, which is understandable given the context of *dvandva* compounding. However, we do find explicit acknowledgment of the possibility of *kriyāsamuccaya*, a *samuccaya* of actions, where two verbs are conjoined, in Nāgeśa (e.g. *Laghumañjūṣā* p. 1499):

- (8) *devadattaḥ pacati hasati ca.*  
'Devadatta cooks and laughs'.

## 2.2 Anvācaya

*Anvācaya* is perhaps the most problematic and interesting of the four meanings assigned to *ca* by Patañjali. In discussing A. 2.2.29 itself, Patañjali offers little insight into his understanding of the term, using the same example for it as for *samuccaya*, and noting only an additional notion of dependence (*sāpekṣa*) in the case of *anvācaya*. Patañjali's understanding of *anvācaya* as a meaning of *ca* is, though, evidently related to his understanding of the function of *ca* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and on A. 3.1.11 he is rather more detailed:

- (9) *salopasanniyogenāyaṃ kyañ vidhīyate. tena yatraiva salopas tatraiva syāt. payāyate. iha na syāt. api kākaḥ śyenāyate. naiṣa doṣaḥ. pradhānaśiṣṭaḥ kyañ. anvācayaśiṣṭaḥ salopaḥ. yatra ca sakāraṃ paśyasīti. tad yathā. kaś cid ukto grāme bhikṣāṃ cara devadattaṃ cānayeti. sa grāme bhikṣāṃ carati. yadi devadattaṃ paśyati tam apy ānayati. (Mahābhāṣya v. 2, p. 20, ll. 21–24)*

'This suffix *kyañ* is prescribed together with the injunction of elision of (a final) *s*. So (the rule could be understood as saying that) only where there is elision of *s*, just there (*kyañ*) should be used. (An example is) *payāyate* 'is (i.e. tastes) like milk' [from *payas* 'milk']. (But) here it would not apply: *api kākaḥ śyenāyate* 'even a crow acts like an eagle' [with *śyenāyate* from *śyena* 'eagle']. This is not a problem. (The suffix) *kyañ* is taught as the primary thing; elision of *s* is taught as supplementary [*anvācaya*], and applies (only) where you see *s*. It's like this. Someone is told, 'go beg

for alms in the village, and bring Devadatta'. He begs for alms in the village; if he sees Devadatta, he also brings him.'

Patañjali's point here is that the word *ca* in *A. 3.1.11* (*kartuḥ kyañ salopás ca*) introduces the operation of *salopa* only as a subordinate operation conditional on the primary operation introduced by the rule, the addition of the suffix *kyañ*. Patañjali interprets many uses of *ca* by Pāṇini in this way as introducing dependent operations, the application or non-application of which do not compromise the applicability of the superordinate operations.

Kaiyaṭa's discussion of *anvācaya* (on the *Mahābhāṣya* ad *A. 2.2.29*) focuses on the semantic inequality in this type of coordination, which is what prevents the possibility of compounding:

(10) *yadā tv ekasya prādhānyaṃ tadā itarasya tadanurodhena kriyāsaṃbandhād bhinnakakṣyatayā nāsti paraspareṇa sāmartyam ity anvācaye samāsābhāvaḥ. pradhānābhīdhāyi padaṃ cārthe na vartate, api tv apradhānam evety anekasya padasya cārthavṛttivābhāvād dvandvābhāvaḥ. (Pradīpa, vol. 2, p. 469a, ll. 32–36)*

'But when one (of the meanings) is predominant, then since the other item is connected with the (same) action through its conformity to that (predominant meaning), there is no mutual semantic connection due to their differing status. Therefore in *anvācaya* there is no compounding. The word denoting the predominant (meaning) does not function in relation to the meaning of *ca*, but only the (word denoting the) subordinate (meaning) does, and so since it is not the case that more than one word functions in relation to the meaning of *ca*, there is no (formation of a) *dvandva*.'

While Kaiyaṭa focused on explicating Patañjali's highly oblique example of *anvācaya* given under *A. 2.2.29*, the example in (11), based on Patañjali's example given under *A. 3.1.11* (9), replaces the earlier example in the discussion of *A. 2.2.29* already in Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* commentary (ca. 800AD) on the *Kāśīkāvṛtti*, and this tradition of exemplification is later adopted by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita (e.g. *Śabdakaustubha* vol. 2, p. 216).

(11) *bho baṭo bhikṣām aṭa gāṃ cānaya.*

'O boy, go collect alms, and bring a cow.'

Bhaṭṭoji defines *anvācaya* in a similar way to Patañjali: it shares the essential features of *samuccaya*, with the difference that one of the coordinated ele-

ments is dependent (*anuṣaṅgin*). For Bhaṭṭoji, *anvācaya*, as *samuccaya*, does not allow compounding because of the lack of *sāmarthya*.

While most of the Pāṇinian tradition follows the Patañjalian model whereby *anvācaya* stands on a level alongside *samuccaya*, *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*, one later text, the *Ratnaprakāśa* commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, dating to a similar period as Bhaṭṭoji, considers *anvācaya* to be a subtype of *samuccaya*.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, the Kātantra tradition sharply separates *anvācaya* from the other three meanings of *ca*.<sup>15</sup>

Nāgeśa interprets *anvācaya* somewhat differently from Kaiyaṭa, glossing his description *bhinnakakṣyatā* 'having a different status' (in ex. 10), as *bhinnakriyānvayitā* 'being connected with a different action'.<sup>16</sup> This is, for him, the defining feature of *anvācaya*: the conjoined noun is connected with a different verb, whereas in *samuccaya* (and *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*) both nouns are necessarily connected with the same verb. Like Bhaṭṭoji, Nāgeśa adopts the example of *anvācaya* in (11).

### 2.3 Itaretarayoga

Compared with *samuccaya* and *anvācaya*, the meanings of *ca* associated with *dvandva* formation appear less problematic, and their treatment over the history of the grammatical tradition appears much more uniform.

From Patañjali on, examples of *itaretarayoga* involve *vigrahas* with as many *cas* as items coordinated, thereby contrasting with *samuccaya* and *anvācaya*. The equality at the syntactic level in the *vigraha* serves to reflect the equality at the semantic level both in the *vigraha* and more importantly in the corresponding compound. This notion of mutual connection or dependence, however understood, plays an important part in the later tradition as a general constraint on *dvandva* formation, whether phrased as e.g. *parasparasahitatā* 'state of mutual accompaniment' or *sāmarthya* 'semantic connectedness'.

Patañjali's own discussion of *itaretarayoga* does not include an example of the presumably resulting compound, only of the coordinated phrase and its semantic gloss:

- (12) *itaretarayogaḥ. plakṣas ca nyagrodhas ca ity ukte gamyata etat plakṣo 'pi nyagrodhasahāyāḥ, nyagrodho 'pi plakṣasahāya iti. (Mahābhāṣya v. 1, p. 434, ll. 11–12)*

14 *samuccayaviśeṣa evānvācayaḥ (Ratnaprakāśa, vol. 5 pp. 188–189).*

15 For more details see Benson et al. (forthcoming).

16 *Uddyota, vol. 2, p. 469b, l. 22.*

‘(As for) *itaretarayoga*, when one says *plakṣaś ca nyagrodhaś ca* ‘both the white fig and the banyan tree’, this is understood: both the white fig tree accompanied by the banyan tree, and the banyan tree accompanied by the white fig tree.’

Later authors, in contrast, exemplify *itaretarayoga* only or primarily with a compound (e.g. *plakṣa-nyagrodhau*), and never without.

Nāgeśa discusses the *vigraha* of *itaretarayoga* compounds, focusing on the difference between this and *samuccaya*. For Nāgeśa, in contrast to the usual single *ca* of *samuccaya*, in *itaretarayoga* both (/ all) words are marked with their own *cas* and are thereby conjoined with each other; this results in a mutual, symmetrical, connection or conjunction.

(13) *atredaṃ bodhyam: samuccaye caśabdena svasamabhivṛtāpādārtha itarasāhityaṃ budhyate, itarasmiṃs tu na. ata evetaretarayogād bhedaḥ. ata eva tatra cadvayaprayogaḥ, atraikasyaiva. ... samuccaye casamabhivṛtasya kiṃcid aprādhānyam pratīyate. (Bṛhaccabdenduśekhara vol. 2, pp. 1139–1140)*

‘Here this is to be understood: in a *samuccaya* there is understood through the word *ca*, in the meaning of the word spoken alongside it (i.e. alongside the word *ca*), a connection with the other (word), but in (the meaning of) the other word (itself) no (such connection is understood). For this reason (*samuccaya* is) different from *itaretarayoga*. (And) for this reason there (i.e. in *itaretarayoga*) two *cas* are used, here (i.e. in *samuccaya*) just one (*ca* is used). ... In *samuccaya* a certain non-predominance is understood in the word spoken alongside (the single) *ca*.’

#### 2.4 Samāhāra

Of the four meanings of *ca* proposed by Patañjali, *samāhāra* is the least discussed. Sometimes, as in Patañjali, it is merely mentioned as a second type of *dvandva* compound alongside *itaretarayoga*, and in almost all respects it appears to be taken to share the same features as *itaretarayoga*. Where it is distinctly discussed, it is in relation to how one accounts for the singular number; on a semantic level, the singular collection is predominant in *samāhāra*, and it is this alone that differentiates it from *itaretarayoga*.

Patañjali does at least give an example of *samāhāra* (unlike *itaretarayoga*): *plakṣa-nyagrodham* ‘a white fig tree and a banyan tree (as a unit)’.

In the *Siddhāntakaumudī*, Bhaṭṭoji likewise says very little about *samāhāra*, defining it merely as *samūha* ‘collection’, and giving the example *saṃjñāparibhāṣam* ‘a collection of technical names and principles of interpretation’. The

*Bālamānoramā* attributes *parasparasāhitya* 'state of mutual accompaniment' to both *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*, and specifies the difference between the two in terms of differing qualifier-qualificand relations: with *itaretarayoga* the *parasparasāhitya* is a qualifier of each of the items coordinated, whereas with *samāhāra* the items are qualifiers of the collection constituted by the items (the *samūha*  $\approx$  *sāhitya*) and it is the collection itself that is connected with the verb by means of the collected items.<sup>17</sup> This understanding reflects Bhaṭṭoji's more extensive discussion in his *Praudhamānoramā* (vol. 2, p. 951).

### 2.5 Summary

The grammatical tradition considers only four meanings for *ca*: *samuccaya*, *anvācaya*, *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*. While there is recognition of *ca* being used to coordinate verbs, the primary concern of the grammatical tradition from the beginning was the relation between coordination and *dvandva* compounding. The two meanings *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra* were sufficient to cover the two types of *dvandva* compound, and it appears that *samuccaya* and *anvācaya* were sufficient for the grammarians to cover contexts of coordination where compounding did not occur. They did not, therefore, have any real need to look beyond Patañjali's four meanings, and as Patañjali's authority grew more absolute, there would have been increasingly less rationale for doing so.

## 3 The Lexicographical Tradition (*kośa*) and the Meanings of *ca*

Alongside the grammatical tradition and its restricted four-fold approach to the meaning of *ca* 'and', the lexicographical tradition developed a more extensive inventory of meanings.<sup>18</sup> At least in part, of course, this is because the concern of the lexicographical tradition was rather different from that of the grammarians: while the grammarians always approached the question from the perspective of *A. 2.2.29* and the conditions on *dvandva* compounding, the

17 *tatretaretarayogadvandve sāhityaṃ dravyaviśeṣaṇam, yathā dhavakhadīrau chinddhīti, samudītāv iti gamyate. samāhāradvandve tu samūho viśeṣyam, yathā samjñāparibhāṣam iti.* (*Bālamānoramā*, vol. 2, p. 184)

18 For the following sections, we consulted all *kośas* listed by Vogel (2015) for which we were able to find printed editions. In addition, we consulted one as yet unedited *kośa*: Padmanābhadaṭṭa's *Bhūriprayoga* (MS Wilson 414a, Bodleian Libraries Oxford = entry 436 in Aufrecht 1864: 192). The *Bhūriprayoga* reads (incorporating our corrections): *cānvācayasamāhāretaretarasamuccaye | pakṣāntare tathā pādapūraṇe 'py avadhāraṇe* (ll. 9–10, folio 96b).

*kośa* tradition was not so constrained, seeking rather to specify and clarify the range of meanings and functions of the lemma *ca* found in Sanskrit literature.

At the same time, the early *kośa* tradition did not stray far from the four-fold approach of the grammarians, a fact that attests to the huge influence of the grammatical tradition on the early *kośa* tradition (as indeed on every intellectual tradition in ancient India). The most popular, influential and oldest Sanskrit lexicographical work surviving in its entirety is the *Nāmalīṅgānuśāsana* or *Amarakośa* (ca. 500AD) of the Buddhist scholar Amarasiṃha.<sup>19</sup> Although a significant temporal gap, around 650 years, exists between the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Amarakośa*, the latter's inventory of meanings of *ca* differs from Patañjali's four-fold inventory only slightly. In fact, Amarasiṃha's main entry for *ca* lists precisely the four Patañjalian meanings:

- (14) *cānvācayasamāhāretaretarasamuccaye*. (*Amarakośa* 3.3.241, p. 440)  
'(The particle) *ca* express *anvācaya*, *samāhāra*, *itaretara*, and *samuccaya*.'

Besides the trivial abbreviation of *itaretarayoga* as *itaretara*, there is no difference here from Patañjali's account of *cārtha*.<sup>20</sup> After giving these four meanings, however, the *Amarakośa* attributes a further meaning/function<sup>21</sup> to *ca* and a number of similar particles:<sup>22</sup>

- (15) *tu hi ca sma ha vai pādapūraṇe ...* (*Amarakośa* 3.4.5, p. 444)  
'(The particles) *tu*, *hi*, *ca*, *sma*, *ha*, and *vai* are used for *pādapūraṇa*.'

The function of *pādapūraṇa* 'completing a metrical unit' refers to the apparent use of *ca* and some other particles in metrical texts purely to fill out the metre, with no semantic load.<sup>23</sup>

Two other early *kośas* treat *ca* but go no further than the four Patañjalian meanings. Śāvata's *Anekārthasamuccaya* (date uncertain; Vogel 2015: 34) mentions only *anyonyārtha*, a synonym of *itaretarayoga*,<sup>24</sup> *samāhāra*, and *anvā-*

19 None of the older fragmentary texts listed in Vogel (2015) (including Vācaspati's *Śabdā-mava*, Vyāḍi's *Utpalinī* and Vikramāditya's *Samśārāvarta*) attest fragments mentioning *ca*.

20 The *Amarakośa* (3.3.875) also attributes the meaning *samuccaya* to the particle *api*, as also found in the grammatical tradition: *garhāsamuccayaprasāsaṅkāsambhāvanāsv api*.

21 Cf. fn. 2; this is the only *artha* attributed to *ca* which should really be referred to as a function rather than a meaning, since it is by definition semantically vacuous.

22 On the variant reading of *Amarakośa* 3.4.15 which attributes the meaning *avadhāraṇa* to *ca*, see fn. 53 below.

23 We provide examples of this and other meanings of *ca* in §4 below.

24 A variety of terms are used within the *kośa* tradition for the meaning referred to by Pata-

*cayādi* 'anvācaya etc.', by which presumably *samuccaya* is intended also to be inferred. Yādavaprakāśa's *Vaijayantī* (eleventh century), likewise mentions only the same four meanings.

Around the turn of the twelfth century there appears a "veritable lexicographical boom" (Vogel 2015: 45). In one of the many *kośas* dating to this period, the Patañjalian four-fold definition of the meaning of *ca* is still treated as sufficient. Ajaṅyapāla's *Nānārthasaṃgraha* (before 1140; Vogel 2015: 45) differs only trivially from Patañjali in using the term *anyonyārtha* for *itaretarayoga*. A few later authors also restrict themselves to the four Patañjalian meanings, including Irugapa's *Nānārtharatnamālā* (end of the fourteenth century), Rāghava's *Nānārthamañjarī* (perhaps contemporaneous with the *Nānārtharatnamālā*) and Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa's *Śabdaratnākara* (early fifteenth century).<sup>25</sup>

However, in most *kośas* from the twelfth century on we find expanded inventories of meanings of *ca*. In Maheśvara's *Viśvaprakāśa* 'Light on All' (1111/1112 AD, cf. Vogel 2015: 51–53), we find seven meanings attributed to *ca*: the five of the *Amarakośa*, plus *pakṣāntara* 'alternative perspective',<sup>26</sup> and *avadhāraṇa* 'restriction, affirmation':

- (16) *cānvācaye samāhāre 'py anyonyārthe samuccaye pakṣāntare tathā pādapūraṇe 'py avadhāraṇe. (Viśvaprakāśa 24.27)*  
 '(The particle) *ca* expresses *anvācaya*, *samāhāra*, *anyonyārtha*, *samuccaya*, *pakṣāntara*, *pādapūraṇa*, and *avadhāraṇa*.'

The *Viśvaprakāśa* "exercised a very lively influence on the evolution of lexicography" (Vogel 2015: 51). The same seven-member inventory is found in Śīdharasena's *Viśvalocana* (first half of the thirteenth century), in Medinikara's *Nānārthasabdakośa* (also thirteenth century), and in Padmanābhadaṭṭa's *Bhūriprayoga* (fourteenth century).<sup>27</sup> Puruṣottamadeva's *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* (first half of the twelfth century) slightly expands this inventory, adding the meaning *hetu* 'cause'; he also uniquely uses the term *vinīścaya* 'determination, ascertainment' for Maheśvara's *avadhāraṇa* 'restriction'.<sup>28</sup>

---

ñjali as *itaretarayoga*: *itaretara*, *anyonyārtha* (the most common), *anyonya*, *anyonyayoga*, *mīthoyoga*, and *parasparārtha*.

25 On the dates of these texts and authors, see Vogel (2015: 79–82).

26 The meaning of *pakṣāntara* in this context is problematic and will be discussed below.

27 On the latter, cf. fn. 18.

28 That these rather different terms are intended to refer to the same function is undeniable. Viśvanātha's *Koṣakalpataru* (seventeenth century) includes the full inventory of ten meanings given by Hemacandra (see below), but with *niścaya* ( $\approx$  *vinīścaya*) for *avadhā-*

A somewhat different eight-member inventory is found in Mañkha's *Anekārthakośa*, from the second half of the twelfth century (Vogel 2015: 56). Mañkha's list differs from Puruṣottamadeva's in omitting *pādapūraṇa* and *vinīścaya/avadhāraṇa*, but includes instead *tulyakāla* 'simultaneous action' and *vinīyoga* '(?)multiplicitous injunction'. Mañkha also, uniquely, uses the term *yadyartha* for what is otherwise consistently termed *paṣāntara*.<sup>29</sup>

Thus far we have discussed individual *kośas*; but we must also consider the commentarial literature within the *kośa* tradition, in particular the tradition of commentary on the *Amarakośa*. The earliest surviving commentary on the *Amarakośa*, the *Amarakośaṭīkā* of Jātarūpa (Pant 2000), dating to the end of the tenth century (Vogel 2015: 25–26), has no (surviving) commentary on the relevant verses. But the *Amarakośodghāṭana* of Bhaṭṭa Kṣīrasvāmin, eleventh century (Vogel 2015: 26–27), not only comments on and illustrates the meanings offered in the *Amarakośa*, but adds another three: *vinīyoga*, *tulyayogitā*, and *hetu*; this is similar to Mañkha's list, but omitting *yadyartha/paṣāntara*. As an eleventh century text, this list predates all the twelfth century *kośas* mentioned above. As for other (at the latest) twelfth century commentaries, the *Kāmadhenu* of Subhūticandra (Vogel 2015: 27–28) is not available in the relevant portion, while the *Ṭikāsarvasva* of Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda (Vogel 2015: 28–29) does not add to the meanings given in the *Amarakośa*.

Also in the twelfth century, the famous Jain polymath Hemacandra Sūri composed the *Anekārthasaṃgraha* 'Collection of Polysemous Words', one of four *kośas* to his name. Hemacandra was "the uncrowned king of medieval lexicography, and the dictionary-maker next to Amarasimha in reputation"; the compilatory nature of Hemacandra's *kośas* means that they "sum up" the achievements of the Indian lexicographical tradition up to the twelfth century (Vogel 2015: 57). We might therefore reasonably expect that the list of meanings given for *ca* in the *Anekārthasaṃgraha* effectively represents the maximal agreed list in the tradition at that time, or at least that it would omit no meaning broadly accepted at that time. And this is, indeed, what we find. Hemacandra gives ten meanings for *ca*, being the set union, as it were, of the eight-member inventories of Puruṣottamadeva and Mañkha:

---

*raṇa*. Moreover, Bhānuji Dikṣita's *Vyākhyāśudhā* commentary on the *Amarakośa* glosses *avadhāraṇe* as *niścayārthaka* (e.g. 3.4.15, p. 447).

29 Cf. §4.6.

- (17) *cānyonyārthasamāhārānvācayeṣu samuccaye*  
*hetau pakṣāntare tulyayogitāviniyogayoḥ*  
*pādapūraṇe 'avadhṛtau ... (Anekārthasaṃgraha 7.8–9a)*  
 '(The particle) *ca* expresses *anyonyārtha*, *samāhāra*, *anvācaya*, *samuccaya*, *hetu*, *pakṣān-tara*, *tulyayogitā*, *vinīyoga*, *pādapūraṇa*, and *avadhṛti*.'

Vogel (2015: 65) observes that there are striking similarities between the *Anekārthasaṃgraha* and Maheśvara's *Viśvaparakāśa*, which could reflect a direct relationship between the two or their dependency upon a common model. In terms of the meanings attributed to *ca*, the only similarities shared only by these two works, and not also by those of Mañkha and Puruṣottamadeva, are the use of the term *anyonyārtha* (vs. *itaretara* and *itaretarayoga* by Mañkha and Puruṣottamadeva respectively), and in the use of a derivative of *ava-dhṛ*, *avadhṛta*, for the meaning that Maheśvara terms *avadhāraṇa* and Puruṣottamadeva terms *vinīscaya*. Hemacandra's list, then appears to be a compilation of the meanings found in the works of Maheśvara, Mañkha and Puruṣottamadeva.

Almost all *kośas* in the subsequent tradition give only a subset of the inventory offered by Hemacandra. One exception is Viśvanātha's *koṣakalpataru*, mentioned above, which lists all of Hemacandra's meanings plus, uniquely, *saṃgraha*. As a general term referring to a collection, it is unclear how *saṃgraha* is supposed to differ from e.g. *samuccaya*, and since we have nothing further to go on, we do not consider this term further. Two commentaries on the *Amarakośa* also offer one meaning each not found in Hemacandra. The *Amarapadavivṛti* of Liṅgayasūri, dated 1150–1300 (Vogel 2015: 29), lists all ten meanings found in Hemacandra and adds *anubandha*. The *Amarapadavivaraṇa* of Bom-magaṅṭi Appayārya, a related commentary also from South India and dating to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century (Vogel 2015: 29–30), instead adds *bhedaviśeṣa*. These meanings will be discussed in §4.11 below.

Otherwise, as stated, later texts omit one or more of Hemacandra's ten meanings. Some such texts have been mentioned above; others include: Mahīpa's *Anekārthatilaka* (second half of the fourteenth century), which gives nine meanings, omitting only *vinīyoga*; Makarandadāsa's *Paramānandīyanāma-mālā* (second half of sixteenth century), who gives seven meanings, omitting *avadhāraṇa* and, uniquely, three of the Patañjalian meanings, *samuccaya*, *anvācaya* and *itaretarayoga*;<sup>30</sup> the *kośa* attributed to 'Rudra', which does not survive but which is referred to by many lexicographers in the later tradition

30 Makarandadāsa does however use the term *samasta*, which may be intended to cover one or more of these meanings. The omission of such central Patañjalian terms suggests perhaps that Makarandadāsa was not aiming for comprehensiveness.

(and must be earlier than its first reference in Medinikara's *Nānārthasābdakośa* of the thirteenth century; Vogel 2015: 73–74), included, according to Bhānuji Dikṣita (on *Amarakośa* 3.4.15, p. 447) the same seven meanings found in the *Viśvaprakāśa*. Mathureśa Vidyālaṅkara's *Śabdaratnāvalī* (second half of seventeenth century) provides the only six-member inventory we are aware of, adding only *avadhāraṇa* to the five meanings from the *Amarakośa*.<sup>31</sup> Among the commentaries on the *Amarakośa*, we note only the *Padacandrikā* of Rāyamukūṭa, dated 1431–1432 (Vogel 2015: 30), which cites the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* in adding *pakṣāntara*, *hetu* and *vinīścaya* to the five meanings of the *Amarakośa*.

Table 1 lists the meanings of *ca* as found in the *kośas* and commentaries discussed in this section which treat the term.

It is one thing to compile list of the meanings assigned to *ca* by the various *kośas*; it is quite another to define with certainty what was understood by each meaning. The *kośas* themselves do not offer examples, so we cannot be sure what each *kośa* author, particularly the earlier authors, understood for each meaning. We can, though, get relatively close to Hemacandra's understanding of the ten meanings he assigns to *ca*, through a commentary on the *Anekārthasaṃgraha*, the *Anekārthakairavākarakaumudī*, written by Hemacandra's pupil Mahendra (c. 1150 AD).<sup>32</sup> Mahendra offers examples for each of the ten meanings, examples which presumably align closely with Hemacandra's understanding of the meanings.

More or less contemporary with Hemacandra and Mahendra was another Jain of western India, Vardhamāna, author of the *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*, a unique non-Pāṇinian grammatical work consisting of a versification of a *gaṇapāṭha* with an auto-commentary, datable to 1140/1141 AD.<sup>33</sup> The *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* includes a list of meanings for *ca* almost identical to that given by Hemacandra, lacking only *pakṣāntara*:

(18) *cety anvācayasamāhāretaretarasamuccayavinīyogātulyayogitāvadhāraṇahetuṣu ... pādapūraṇe* 'pi. (*Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* 1.4; Eggeling 1879: 4) ' [The particle] *ca* expresses *anvācaya*, *samāhāra*, *itaretara*, *samuccaya*, *vinīyoga*, *tulyayogitā*, *avadhāraṇa*, and *hetu*. ... also *pādapūraṇa*.'

31 This may reflect a tradition which reads *avadhāraṇa* as a meaning attributed to *ca* in *Amarakośa* 3.4.15. This is discussed in fn. 53.

32 The text of the *Anekārthakairavākarakaumudī* is edited in extracts and published together with the text of the *Anekārthasaṃgraha* in Zachariae (1893). On Mahendra and his *Anekārthakairavākarakaumudī*, see e.g. Zachariae (1893: xiii) and Vogel (2015: 65–68).

33 On dating the *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*, see Eggeling's (1879) preface.

TABLE 1 Meanings of *ca* in the *kośa* tradition

		Meanings/functions of <i>ca</i>										
Lexicographical Text (numbers following Vogel 2015)		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
5.	Amarasīpḥa's Nāmalingānūsāsana	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	itaretara	pādapūrana						
7.	Sāvata's Anekārthasamuccāya		anvācāya (adi)	samāhāra	anyonyārtha							
11.	Yādaprakāśa's Vaijyāntī	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	mithyoyoga							
13.	Ajāyapāla's Nānārthasamgraha	samuccāya (Iti samuccāya)	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonyārtha							
17.	Māheśvara's Viśvaprakāśa	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonyārtha	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	avadhāraṇa				
6.(1)	Īśīrasvāmīn's Amarakośodghāna	(samuccāya)	(anvācāya)	(samāhāra)	(itaretara)	(pādapūrana)			hetu	viniyoga	tulyayogitā	
18.	Puruṣottamadeva's Trikāṇḍaśeṣa	(samuccāya)	(anvācāya)	(samāhāra)	(itaretara)	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	viniścāya	hetu			
19.	Mānīkha's Anekārthakośa	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	itaretara		yadyārtha		hetu	viniyoga	tulyakāla	
21.	Hemacandra's Anekārthasamgraha	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonyārtha	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	avadhīta	hetu	viniyoga	tulyayogitā	
0.	Rudra's Rudrakōśa	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonyārtha	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	avadhāraṇa				
26.	Medinikara's Medinikōśa	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonya	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	avadhāraṇa				
27.	Sīdharasena's Viścaloana	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonyārtha	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	avadhāraṇa				
6.(4)	Liṅgayasūri's Amarapadaivṛtti	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	itaretara	pādapūrana	cedārtha	avadhāraṇa	hetu	viniyoga	tulyayoga	anubandha
28.	Padmanābhādatta's Bhūnīprayoga	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	itaretara	pādapūrana	pakṣāntara	avadhāraṇa				
29.	Māhīpa's Anekārthaliaka	samuccāya	sākaḷya?	samāhāra	parasparārtha	pādapūrta	pakṣāntara	avadhīta	kāraṇa		samāna	
30.	Irugapa's Nānārthatanamālā	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	mithyoyoga							
6.(7)	Bommagāṇi Appayāya's Amarapadaivivaraṇa	(samuccāya)	(anvācāya)	(samāhāra)	(itaretara)	pādapūrana	cedārtha	avadhāraṇa	hetu	viniyoga	tulyayoga	bheda(viśeṣa)
31.	Rāghava's Nānārthamājjarī	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	itaretara							
32.	Vāmanabhāṭṭa Bāna's Sabbdaratnākara	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	mithyoyoga							
33.	Makarandadāśa's Paramānandyanamamālā	samasta?	samasta?	samāhāra		pādapūrta	pakṣāntara		kāraṇa	viniyoga	samāna	
38.	Viśvānātha's Kośakāpataru	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhīta	anyonyayoga	pādapūrta	pakṣāntara	niścāya	hetu	viniyukti	tulyayoga	samgraha?
41.	Mathureśa Yūdyālamkāra's Sabbdaratnāvalī	samuccāya	anvācāya	samāhāra	anyonyārtha	pādapūrana		avadhāraṇa				

This text also offers examples for these nine meanings. Although strictly speaking a grammatical work, and not a *kośa* as such, it is quite likely that there was influence in at least one or the other direction between Vardhamāna and Hemacandra/Mahendra; Eggeling (1879) observes a number of striking ‘coincidences’ between Hemacandra’s *gaṇas* and Vardhamāna’s text.

Beyond these, examples can also be found in some of the commentaries on the *Amarakośa* from the same period. So the *Ṭikāsarvasva*, commenting on AK 3.3.241, illustrates the four (Patañjalian) meanings mentioned in that verse. Kṣīrasvāmin’s *Amarakośodghāṭana* does the same, but adds examples also for the three additional meanings that he mentions there. As Kṣīrasvāmin is now dated to the eleventh century (Vogel 2015: 26), his examples are the earliest we have. Looking slightly later, the *Amarapadavivṛti* of Liṅgayasūri, 1150–1300, provides examples of all eleven meanings it attributes to *ca*; as does the fourteenth century *Amarapadavivarāṇa*. We also find examples of the four Patañjalian meanings in the fifteenth century *Padacandrikā* of Rāyamukūṭa.

Taking these examples together, then, we can at least get some sense of what was understood by the ten or so meanings attributed to *ca* in the lexicographical tradition, particularly in the eleventh to twelfth centuries, where the majority of our data comes from. We turn to these examples in the next section.

#### 4 The Meanings of *ca* in the *Kośas*

In this section we discuss the ten meanings of *ca* found in the lexicographical tradition, focusing particularly on their exemplification in the eleventh to twelfth century texts introduced above: Kṣīrasvāmin’s *Amarakośodghāṭana* (AKU), Vardhamāna’s *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* (GRM), Mahendra’s *Anekārthakairavākarakaumudī* (AKK), and Sarvānanda’s *Ṭikāsarvasva* (ṬiS). The examples in the *Amarapadavivṛti* (AVvṛ), twelfth to thirteenth century, and those in the *Amarapadavivarāṇa* (AVva), fourteenth century, are also considered, although they may represent a slightly later and/or geographically distinct (Southern) tradition of exemplification. That is, at least, we cannot assume that all our authors understood the meanings they were attributing to *ca* in the same way, and so their examples in principle may not be directed at precisely the same senses.

Most of the examples offered by the different authors are simple, prose examples, similar to those given for the four meanings treated in the mainstream grammatical tradition. Some authors offer poetic examples; in particular, Mahendra’s are poetic examples mostly taken from Kālidāsa or other prominent Classical poets.

#### 4.1 Samuccaya

The oldest attested examples of *samuccaya* in the *kośa* tradition are those of Kṣīrasvāmin's AKU, which illustrates both coordination of verbs and of nominals:<sup>34</sup>

(19) *pacati ca paṭhati ca caitraḥ*. (AKU p. 224)  
'Caitra cooks and reads.'

(20) *gārgyo vātsyaś cāgatau*. (AKU p. 224)  
'Gārgya and Vātsya have come.'

The *Ṭikāsarvasva* offers a different example of nominal coordination:

(21) *yogine rogiṇe ca dadyāt*. (ṬiS p. 158)  
'One should give to an ascetic and an invalid.'

More clearly than the AKU example (20), perhaps, this example illustrates the coordination of two unrelated items: the injunction is evidently to give separately to ascetics and invalids.

The GRM (1.4, p. 4, l. 3) offers only an example of verb coordination, the same example given in the AKU (19). The example in (19) is most similar to the example of *kriyāsamuccaya* given by Nāgeśa (8). As discussed above, the grammatical tradition in general focuses on nominal coordination, since their concern is primarily the relation between coordination and *dvandva* compounding. But where that concern does not apply, there is no difficulty with exemplifying *samuccaya* primarily or exclusively with *kriyāsamuccaya*, and this is indeed what we find in the *kośa* tradition. At least from Nāgeśa's perspective, a meaningful difference between his own example and (19) would be that (19) has two *cas*, as many as elements coordinated, which for Nāgeśa was a standard feature of *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*, not *samuccaya*. Again, the *kośa* tradition is not necessarily so strict.

The AKK's example of *samuccaya* is given in (22).<sup>35</sup> Like Vardhamāna, Mahendra chooses an example both of *kriyāsamuccaya*, and also involving two *cas*:

34 The earliest surviving example of *samuccaya* we are aware of is that given by the *Nirukta*, from RV 8.62.11a (ex. 3 above), and repeated (in abbreviated form) in Bhoja's *Śṛiḡāraprakāśa* (p. 21), also earlier than the AKU.

35 This and all other examples from the AKK given here are taken from Zachariae (1893: 189).

- (22) *vikāraḥ ko 'py antar jaḍayati ca tāpaṃ ca kurute.* (*Mālatīmādhava* 1.30d)  
 'A certain inner transformation, (which ...), both freezes and burns.'

The contrast of the two actions, freezing and burning, renders this a striking and memorable example of *samuccaya*.

Of later commentaries, the only one to offer examples other than simple prose examples of nominal coordination is the AVva (pp. 576–577). One is taken from the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*:

- (23) *śaṃ ca me máyaś ca me priyám ca me ...* (*Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 4.7.3.1)  
 'May (there be) for me prosperity, comfort, desire ...'

This is followed by an example of *kriyāsamuccaya*:

- (24) *purīm avaskanda lunīhi nandanaṃ muṣāṇa ratnāni harāmarāṅganāḥ  
 viḡrhya cakre namucidviṣā balī ya ittham asvāsthyam ahardivaṃ divaḥ.*  
 (*Śiśupālavadhā* 1.51)  
 'After dueling with Indra, he launched a violent assault on his capital city; he cut down the Nandana pleasure garden there, looted the god's treasury, and carried off his divine women, bringing about lasting disquiet in heaven.'<sup>36</sup>

In this example, there is no explicit *ca*; the sense of *samuccaya* is understood. This example is quite different from all other examples, referring to *A. 3.4.3 samuccaye 'nyatarasyām*, which licenses the use of the imperative in case of '*samuccaya*'. In this example, the use of imperatives in expressing a combination of actions illustrates this Pāṇinian rule.

Finally, the AVva also offers an example of coordination of attributes (*guṇas*):

- (25) *paṭānto raktaḥ śuklaś ca.* (AVva p. 577)  
 'The ends of the cloth are red and white.'

Altogether, then, the lexicographical tradition exemplifies *samuccaya* with much more variety than the grammatical tradition, going beyond the context of nominal coordination and if anything privileging verbal coordination in this context.

<sup>36</sup> Translation of Dundas (2017: 23), who reads *vaśi* for *balī*.

#### 4.2 Anvācaya

Almost without exception, the *kośa* tradition exemplifies *anvācaya* with the same sentence given in (11) above, an example originally deriving from Patañjali's discussion of *anvācaya* under A. 3.1.11, and first attested in this form in Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* (c. 800 AD).<sup>37</sup>

(26) *bhikṣām aṭṭa gāṃ ca ācaya.*

'Go and collect alms, and bring the cow.'

This example appears in the AKU (p. 224), the GRM (1.4, p. 4, l. 2), the TĪS (p. 153), the AVVṚ (p. 575), the AVVA (p. 576, with a lengthy explanation), the *Amarapada-pārijāta* (p. 578) and the *Padacandrikā* (p. 335).

The only text which provides a different example is the AKK. The AKK illustrates *anvācaya* with an example taken from Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*:

(27) *hitvā tasmin bhujagavalayaṃ śambhunā dattahastā*

*krīḍāśaile yadi ca viharet pādacāreṇa gaurī*

*bhaṅgībhaktyā viracitavapuḥ stambhitāntarjalaughah*

*sopānatvaṃ vraja padasukhasparśam ārohaṇeṣu. (Meghadūta 60)*

'And if Gaurī, to whom Śambhu (= Śiva) extends (his) hand having removed (his) snake bracelets, would roam about for pleasure on foot in that pleasure-mountain (= Kailāsa), (then) arranging your body into a series of waves, stiffening the water floods within, become a staircase soft for her feet to touch as she climbs.'

The wider context of this verse is, of course, the *yakṣa*'s request to the cloud to take a message to his beloved. In the more immediate context, verse 158 contains a request for the cloud to continue its journey to mount Kailāsa. Taking either the wider or the narrower context, the verse cited here serves as an additional, and subsidiary, request, quite parallel to the example in (26). That is, the *yakṣa* says, if circumstances require, become a stairway for Gaurī, but only as a subsidiary of the main injunction, to travel north and deliver the message, which remains the priority.

37 Only two *kośas* do not explicitly use the term *anvācaya* to designate a meaning of *ca*. One is that of Makarandadāsa, the incompleteness of whose inventory was discussed above (fn. 30). Mahīpa's *Anekārthatilaka* lists nine meanings, eight of which correspond to meanings given by Hemacandra, excepting *anvācaya* and *vinīyoga*. Mahīpa's ninth term is *sākalya*, which we tentatively translate in this context as 'including all parts', and which is most likely to correspond to *anvācaya*, in the sense that *anvācaya* involves the inclusion of something subsidiary to something core, resulting in a more 'complete' reference.

### 4.3 Itaretarayoga

As noted above, what the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition consistently refers to as *itaretarayoga* attracts a variety of terms in the *kośa* tradition, most commonly *anyonyārtha* but also *mithoyoga*, *anyonya*, *anyonyayoga*, *itaretara* and *parasparārtha*. All terms reflect the idea of reciprocal reference: two words so associated each denote not only their own meaning but also the meaning of the other word. The GRM, and a number of the AK commentaries, provide the same example as Patañjali (12); the GRM most explicitly gives both the *vigraha* and the resulting compound:

- (28) *plakṣasā ca nyagrodhasā ca. plakṣanyagrodhau.* (GRM 1.4, p. 4, l. 3)  
'a white fig tree and a banyan tree'

This example is given also in the AKU (p. 224), the *Amarapadapārijāta* (p. 578), and the *Padacandrikā* (p. 335). The AVva slightly expands the example to *plakṣanyagrodhau saha tiṣṭhataḥ* 'a white fig tree and a banyan tree stand together', adding in the dual agreement on the verb (cf. the discussion following ex. 31).

The example given in the AVvṛ, cited also in the AVva, is a near quote from the *Mahābhāṣya*:

- (29) *devadattayajñadattābhyām idaṃ kāryaṃ kartavyam.* (AVvṛ p. 575)  
'This task should be done by Devadatta and Yajñadatta (together).'

Ad A. 4.1.36 (*Mahābhāṣya* vol. 2 p. 216) and 5.1.64,76 (ibid. vol. 2 p. 357), Patañjali gives almost the same sentence as an illustration of a *paribhāṣā*-like principle of rule application.<sup>38</sup> The point is that both must work together; Patañjali explains: *devadattāpāye yajñadatto 'pi na karoti* 'If Devadatta is absent, Yajñadatta too does not work'. This is reminiscent of a distinction discussed by Nāgeśa in the *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* (vol. 2, p. 124), between *caitreṇa maitreṇa ca kṛtam* and *caitramaitrābhyām kṛtam*, wherein the former gives us the perception of agency as existing in the two individuals and the latter as existing in their *samudāya*. This example, then, serves to highlight the relative unity of the items coordinated in *itaretarayoga* in comparison with *samuccaya*.

In contrast, the AKK and TĪS exemplify *itaretarayoga* rather differently, with examples that do not involve compounds. The AKK provides not only an example (30) but also a brief explanation (31).

38 Patañjali's text varies only in reading *karma* for *kāryam* in the first instance, and dropping the word altogether in the second.

- (30) *tayor jagṛhatuḥ pādān rājā rājñī ca māgadhi  
tau gurur gurupatnī ca prītyā pratinanandatuḥ.* (*Raghuvaṃśa* 1.57)  
'The king (Dilīpa) and (his) queen (Sudakṣiṇā), the daughter of the king  
of Magadha, grasped their (=Vasiṣṭha and his wife Arundhatī's) feet (i.e.  
by way of salutation). The guru (Vasiṣṭha) and the guru's wife (Arundhatī)  
delightedly saluted them in return.'
- (31) *atretaretarayogasyodbhūtāvayavabhedatvāj 'jagṛhatuḥ' iti dvivacanam.*  
(Zachariae 1893: 189)  
'In this (example), because in *itaretarayoga* the distinction of parts is  
manifest (lit. arisen), in the word *jagṛhatuḥ* (there is) dual number.'

Mahendra's claim here connects with an issue of verbal agreement with coordinated nouns which is discussed in the later grammatical tradition, in particular by Nāgeśa (*Laghumañjūṣā* pp. 1499–1500; cf. *Bṛhacchabdaratna* p. 950). Nāgeśa draws a contrast between conjunctions of two singular nouns involving one *ca* and those involving two: in the former case, the verb should show singular agreement, but in the latter dual. That is, for example, *caitro maitraś ca pacati* 'Caitra and Maitra cook', vs. *caitraś ca maitraś ca pacataḥ* 'id.'. The use of the dual when there are two *cas* appears to be understood to reflect an equality in the connection of the two nouns with the action. In contrast, when there is one *ca*, Nāgeśa says that the verbal suffix is singular because only the item without the *ca* is connected (with the verb), while the noun with *ca* brings about the perception of a *samūha*, but one in which the division of items is not evident.<sup>39</sup>

Here, Mahendra's example actually violates Nāgeśa's rule, in that there is only a single *ca*, but the verb appears in the dual.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, Mahendra's point is not about the number of *cas*; rather he is focusing on the verbal agreement and taking that in a way that appears parallel to Nāgeśa. So the dual agreement on the verb is indicative of the equal connection of both nouns with the verb—what Mahendra refers to as 'distinction of parts'—and this, of course, is crucial in the distinction between *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*.<sup>41</sup> So while Mahendra does not provide a canonical example of *itaretarayoga*, involv-

39 *Caitro maitraś ca pacatityādau nityam ekavacanāntākhyātāprayoga eva. carahitasya kevalasyaivānvayāt. casahitenāpy anudbhūtāvayavabhedasamūhasyaiva pratīteḥ* (*Laghumañjūṣā* p. 1499).

40 Presumably the point can be extend to *gurur gurupatnī ca* and the dual verb *pratinanandatuḥ* in the second hemistich.

41 That the dual verbal agreement serves to indicate *itaretarayoga* may explain why the use of two *cas* is not considered necessary.

ing either a compound or a standard *itaretarayoga vighraha* involving two nouns each with a *ca*, his example does reach the same point from a rather different direction. The ṬīS offers a briefer but entirely parallel example:

- (32) *mātā pitā ca jayataḥ*. (ṬīS p. 156)  
‘Mother and father win.’

#### 4.4 Samāhāra

The earliest example for *samāhāra* is once again unproblematic from the perspective of the grammatical tradition; in the AKU (p. 224) and (GRM 1.4, p. 4, l. 2–3), both compounded and non-compounded forms are given:

- (33) *pāṇī ca pādau ca. pāṇi-pādam*.  
‘two hands and two feet’

Most other AK commentaries give simply a *samāhāra* compound: *chatropāna-ham* ‘parasol and sandal’ (AVvṛ p. 575, AVva p. 576), *mārdaṅgikapāṇavikam* ‘drummers and percussionists’ (AVva p. 576, found earlier in the *Kāśikā* on A. 2.4.2), *aśvalīvardam* ‘horse and ox’ (*Padacandrikā* p. 335), *govalīvardam* (v.l., vs. ed. *govalīvardau*) ‘cow and ox’ (*Amarapadapārijāta* p. 578).

In the AKK, Mahendra contrasts *samāhāra* with *itaretarayoga* in terms of grammatical number (34), before exemplifying the former with a *subhāṣita*-style verse (35).

- (34) *samāhāre tu tirohitāvayavabhedatvād ekavacanam*. (Zachariae 1893: 189)  
‘In *samāhāra*, on the other hand, because the distinction of its parts (is) concealed/covert, (there is) singular number.’

- (35) *arthasya mūlaṃ nikṛtiḥ kṣamā ca*  
*kāmasya vittaṃ ca vapur vayas ca*  
*dharmasya dānaṃ ca dayā damaś ca*  
*mokṣasya sarvārthanivṛttir eva*.  
‘The root of *artha* (is) deception and forbearance. (The root) of *kāma* (is) wealth, beauty and youth. (The root) of *dharma* (is) giving, compassion, and discipline. (The root) of liberation (is) none other than the cessation of all *arthas*.’

Mahendra’s focus here appears to be that in the first three *pādas* we find sequences of coordinated nouns which are identified with the singular noun *mūlam* ‘root’. So, in *pāda* a, *nikṛtiḥ* ‘deception’ and *kṣamā* ‘forbearance’ are coor-

minated with *ca*, and treated as the singular root of *artha*; and likewise with the coordinations in *pādas* b and c. This singular 'agreement' parallels and contrasts with the dual agreement illustrated in Mahendra's example for *itare-tarayoga* above (30).<sup>42</sup>

This is, then, quite a different exemplification of *samāhāra* from that of the grammarians (and even the other lexicographers), who only ever exemplify it with a compound. Mahendra's example shows a quite insightful understanding of *samāhāra*, as a function of *ca* that exists independently of the compound formation, evidenced not only in the formation of singular *dvandvas*, but also in singular agreement with coordinated nominals.

The TĪS offers a different, and rather difficult example:

- (36) *śuṣmīṇī ca harītakī cāddhi.*  
'Eat *śuṣmīṇī* and Myrobalan (together?).'

We assume this is best understood as a medical prescription to eat both plants(?) together. But here there is neither compound, nor singular agreement, distinguishing this as *samāhāra*.

#### 4.5 Pādapūraṇa

In the following subsections we discuss the non-Patañjalian meanings attributed to *ca* in the *kośa* tradition. We order them, as far as possible, by their breadth of acceptance across the *kośa* tradition, that is, in practice, by the number of texts that mention a given meaning.

The most widely accepted meaning, or rather function, of *ca* beyond the Patañjalian four is termed *pādapūraṇa* (occasionally *pādapūrta*); this is first found in the *Amarakośa*, as discussed above, and is accepted by all but one of the *kośas* that go beyond the four Patañjalian meanings.<sup>43</sup> The earliest example in the tradition, found in the AKU (p. 228) and GRM, is an untraced half *śloka* with *ca* supplying the final syllable in the line:<sup>44</sup>

42 In principle, the sequence *vapurvayaḥ* could be taken as a *samāhāra dvandva* 'beauty and youth'. However, it is preferable to understand it as two separate words in conjunction, as it must be in a variant of the *pāda* given by Böhlingk (1870), referred to by Zachariae (1893):

(i) i. *kāmasya mūlaṃ ca vapur vayas ca*

Here, the second *ca* clearly coordinates *vapuḥ* and *vayaḥ*: 'and the root of *kāma* is beauty and youth'.

43 The exception is Mañkha's *Anekārthakośa*.

44 An earlier example is found in Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (p. 29). Bhoja cites *Kumārasaṃbhava* 5.13: *viloladr̥ṣṭaṃ hariṇāṅganāsu ca*. However, this *ca* works perfectly well in the

- (37) *bhīmaḥ pārthas tathaiva ca*  
 ‘Bhīma and Arjuna likewise’

The same example appears in the later AVva. The point is, presumably, that *tathaiva* alone would be sufficient to express the sense of conjunction: ‘Bhīma, Arjuna likewise ...’.

A similarly basic example is given by the AVvṛ commenting on AK 3.4.5, (p. 616), given also by the AVva (p. 617):

- (38) *sa ca prāha ca rājānam.*  
 ‘And he addressed the king.’

The AKK’s example is a quote from the *Mahābhārata*:

- (39) *dharme cārthe ca kāme ca mokṣe ca bharatarṣabha yad ihāsti tad anyatra yan nehāsti na tat kva cit. (Mahābhārata 1.56.33 (=18.5.38))*  
 ‘O king of the Bhāratas, what lies herein (in the *Mahābhārata*) in relation to *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma*, and *mokṣa*, that (may be) elsewhere (too), but what is not herein (exists) nowhere (else).’

The point for Mahendra, presumably, is that four *cas* are not strictly necessary for the coordination: the final *ca* alone would suffice. The first three, then, function merely to fill the metre.

The AVvṛ offers a similar example, the second hemistich of a verse found in near-identical form in a few *purāṇic* passages which lists the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu:<sup>45</sup>

- (40) *rāmo rāmaś ca rāmaś ca buddha kalkīti te daśa.*  
 ‘The ten (incarnations of Viṣṇu) are: [the Fish (*matsya*), the Tortoise (*kūrma*), the Boar (*varāha*), the Man-lion (*narasiṃha*), the Dwarf (*vāmana*),] (Paraśu)rāma, Rāma(candra), Rāma(kṛṣṇa), Buddha and Kalki.’

---

context of the verse as expressing conjunction; Bhoja may have been using *pādapūraṇa* merely to refer to the fact that the *ca* here is the final word of the verse, in some sense therefore serving to complete the verse and fulfill its metrical requirements, while still indicating conjunction.

45 The closest parallel is *Padmapurāṇa* 6.229.41 (vol. 5, p. 761), which reads: *rāmo rāmaśca rāmaśca kṛṣṇaḥ kalkī ca te daśa*. Similar is *Padmapurāṇa* 6.71.27 (vol. 4, p. 244): *rāmo rāmaś ca kṛṣṇaś ca buddhaḥ kalkī tataḥ smṛtaḥ*. A similar verse appears in the *Revākhāṇḍa* of the *Vāyupurāṇa* (see [https://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/corpustei/transformations/html/sa\\_revAkhANDa-of-the-vAyupurANa-rkv.htm](https://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/corpustei/transformations/html/sa_revAkhANDa-of-the-vAyupurANa-rkv.htm)). The first hemistich consistently reads: *matsyaḥ kūrmo varāhaś ca narasiṃho 'tha vāmanaḥ*.

The verse was evidently chosen for its memorable repetition of the name Rāma, and the fact that only some of the ten names are explicitly coordinated, those that are coordinated being therefore unnecessarily so.

#### 4.6 Pakṣāntara

Almost as widely accepted as *pādapūraṇa* is *pakṣāntara* 'alternative perspective'; accepted by all authors from the twelfth century on who go beyond Patañjali's four meanings.<sup>46</sup> It is, however, the only meaning given by Hemacandra that is not given in the GRM, and it is also omitted by several of the commentaries on the AK, including the AKU.

As noted above, while most *kośas* which mention this meaning use the term *pakṣāntara*, one, the *Anekārthakośa* of Mañkha, uses the term *yadyartha*; this name is also found in the *Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti* (p. 2), an undated text by Tilaka clearly influenced by Kṣīrasvāmin; the name *cedartha* is used by the AVṛ (p. 575) and the AVva (p. 577). These terms are synonymous with *pakṣāntara*, because *Amarakośa* 3.4.12 glosses *yadi* and *cet* with *pakṣāntare*. It is this that points us to the origin of this meaning of *ca*. In *A.* 8.1.30, Pāṇini refers to a particle *caṇ*, distinct from (though homophonous in the surface representation with) *ca* 'and'. This particle shares the property of *yadi* 'if', *cet* 'if', and other subordinating particles that the main verb in its clause does not lose its accent. Although Pāṇini does not specify the meaning of this *caṇ*, Kātyāyana defines it as synonymous with *cet* 'if'.<sup>47</sup> This *ca* 'if' is well-attested in Vedic, and is found at least once in the *Mahābhārata* (Oberlies 1997: 17–18), in the following example, and perhaps a couple of other early Classical texts, but as noted by Oberlies, was otherwise completely lost in Classical Sanskrit.<sup>48</sup>

46 With the exception of the late Mathureśa Vidyālaṅkāra.

47 *caṇ niviśiṣṭaś cedarthe* (MBh. 3.375.8); cf. Oberlies (1997: 17–18). The particle *cet* is, in fact, a combination of *ca* 'if' and the emphatic particle *id*. The *ca* 'if' and *ca* 'and' are in origin identical, and both senses can be reconstructed to Proto-Indo-European, with the sense 'if' attested also in Hittite, Gothic and possibly Greek and Latin; cf. Keydana (2018: 2215–2216). For Gonda (1957: 51–54), the conditional sense may be the older one; in contrast Klein (1985) argues that the conditional uses could be independent innovations in the daughter languages, a possibility rejected by Keydana (2018: 2215–2216).

48 Oberlies refers to Gonda (1957: 52–54) for the "obliteration" of this meaning in Classical Sanskrit. Besides the example given in (41), we are aware of no certain non-Vedic examples of *ca* meaning 'if' (outside the *kośa* literature); Gonda notes *Buddhacarita* 7.23, but we see no reason to read *ca* in that sense in that verse; Böhtlingk and Roth (1858: 905) note a v.l. in Bhartṛhari's *Nītiśataka* 45 (or 37; Oberlies, l.c.), *lobhaścāsti (asti ced) guṇena kiṃ*; the Kosambi edition has yet a different reading, also with *cet*.

- (41) *jīvitum cecchase mūdha hetum me gadataḥ śṛṇu. (Mahābhārata 3.256.10cd)*  
 'If you wish to live, fool, listen as I tell you how.'

The examples offered in the AVṛ and AVva reflect this *ca* 'if':

- (42) *tvaṃ ca mā nayase rājann āgamiṣyāmi sajjitaḥ. (AVṛ p. 575)*  
 'If you take me with you, O king, I will come equipped.'
- (43) *tvaṃ ca gacchasi kāryaṃ naḥ setsyati. (AVva p. 577)*  
 'If you go, our task will be accomplished.'

A similar example is found in the *Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti* of Tilaka:<sup>49</sup>

- (44) *tvaṃ cāgamiṣyasi kṛtārthāḥ smaḥ. (Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti p. 2)*  
 'If you will come, our goal will have been achieved.'

The AVva explicitly connects this meaning with the use of the *anubandha* ण with *ca*. The same recognition may explain the omission of *pakṣāntara* by the GRM: as a work in the grammatical tradition, rather than a *kośa*, the GRM may either not have accepted the Pāṇinian *caṇ*, or may have considered it separate from *ca* 'and'.<sup>50</sup>

As noted above, *pakṣāntara* can be a synonym of *yadyartha*, and it seems likely that this is the origin of the term *pakṣāntara* as a meaning of *ca* in the *kośa* tradition; no text gives both *pakṣāntara* and *yadyartha*/*cedartha* as distinct meanings of *ca*. However, the AKK's example for *pakṣāntara*, an untraced verse in the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre, clearly does not reflect the understanding of *pakṣāntara* as *yadyartha*:

- (45) *kaikeyyāḥ kva varo, vareṇa vipinaprasthānāyācñā kva ca?*  
*kvāyaṃ vaṃśaśirovikartanavidhiḥ, sītāpahāraḥ kva ca?*  
*sugrīvānugatīḥ kva ca, kva ca vadhas tasyāpi laṅkāpater?*

49 In the earlier *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* of Bhoja, a similar example is given for this meaning (attributed specifically to *caṇ*), which Bhoja labels *vikalpa* (pp. 20–21): *tvaṃ ca gantā kim atra me*.

50 The relation between the two particles could be understood in different ways. Sāyaṇa refers to the Vedic *caṇ* as a *nipātāntara* 'different *nipāta*' from *ca* 'and', whereas Nāgeśa and a few other later grammarians treat it as fundamentally the same *nipāta*, but marked with the *anubandha* ण when expressing *yadyartha*.

*ekaikaṃ racitādbhutaṃ samabhavat puṇyairi kavīnām adaḥ.* (Zachariae 1893: 189, ll. 14–17)

'Where (is) Kaikeyī's boon, and where (is Rāma's) request to depart for the forest through a boon (i.e. granted to him)?

Where (is) this cutting off the head of the lineage (i.e. expelling Rāma), and where (is) the abduction of Sītā?

And where (is Rāma's) following of Sugrīva, and where (is Rāma's) slaying even that lord of Lañkā (= Rāvaṇa)?

Through the merits of the poets, each one of these came about, fashioned with wonder.'

The first three *pādas* of the verse in (45) refer to six major events of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in chronological order. The six events appear in pairs, two in each *pāda*, with a *ca* conjoining the second member of each pair with the first. There is an additional *ca* in the third *pāda* expressing conjunction with the preceding *pāda*.

Since every clause is a question, there is no possibility of understanding *ca* to mean 'if' here. We must assume that Mahendra understood *pakṣāntara* differently, presumably in something more like the common usage 'a different argument, an alternative viewpoint'. Under such an assumption there are conceivably two possible ways of understanding the expression of *pakṣāntara* in Mahendra's example. First, we could assume that the members of each pair are presented as alternative viewpoints with respect to each other, and that the three *cas* which coordinate the pairs—that is, the first, second and fourth—are expressing this type of conjunction. This is perhaps easiest to see in the first *pāda*, where there is a clear contrast between the boon granted to Kaikeyī by Daśaratha, which Kaikeyī used to expel Rāma, and Rāma's own request to go and live in the forest through a boon granted to him. It is, however, not clear that there is any direct connection in the second *pāda*, between the expulsion of Rāma and the abduction of Sītā. In the third *pāda*, we could perhaps understand the notion of alternative perspectives in the contrast between the apparent subordination of Rāma to Sugrīva, expressed in the term *sugrīvānugati*, and Rāma's victory over the much more powerful Rāvaṇa.

Under that interpretation, the third *ca* would be expressing a simple conjunction, or perhaps even just functioning for *pādapūraṇa*. Alternatively, we could take each member of the sequence as representing a different episode presented as an alternative viewpoint on the Rāma story; in this case, all four *cas* express an alternative viewpoint (in the loosest sense). That is, there are not three pairs, but a sequence of six events, each rather different and presented so as to illustrate the range of topics covered in the epic. It would then only be the

first member of the second pair that is not explicitly coordinated; but *ca* can be omitted, and its sense inferred, so this is not problematic.

However we understand Mahendra here, we can hypothesize that the meaning *pakṣāntara* entered the tradition through the early, primarily Vedic, use of *ca* in the sense ‘if’, but either that this understanding was not retained through the whole *kośa* tradition, or perhaps that some parts of the *kośa* tradition reinterpreted the meaning, given the loss of *ca* ‘if’ in Classical Sanskrit. Mahendra’s example shows that at least for some authors of this period, the original sense of *pakṣāntara* as a meaning of *ca* was no longer known or accepted; but since the term was available in the tradition, it could naturally be used for conjunctive uses of *ca* which involve the coordination of clauses presenting ‘alternative perspectives’ in some way. It seems plausible that at an earlier period, such uses would have simply fallen under *samuccaya*.<sup>51</sup>

#### 4.7 Avadhāraṇa

The meaning *avadhāraṇa*, alternatively called *avadhṛta*, *vinīścaya*, or *nīścaya*, is widely accepted in *kośas* from the twelfth century on, being omitted by only two of those *kośas* that go beyond the Patañjalian meanings.<sup>52</sup>

The meaning *avadhāraṇa* is attributed to a number of words already in the *Amarakośa*: *mātram* (3.3.178, p. 427), *tu* (3.3.242, pp. 440–441), *yāvad ... tāvad* (3.3.246, p. 441), *hi* (3.3.257, p. 443), and *evam*, *tu*, *punar*, *vā* and *eva* (3.4.15, p. 447).<sup>53</sup> These words give some sense of the range of *avadhāraṇa* for Amara,

51 Cf. the discussion in §4.10.

52 It is omitted by Mañkha and Makarandadāsa.

53 The latter two forms could in principle be read alternatively as *vai* and *vā* (in *sandhi*, *vaivety ...*); this is implied by the GRETIL text, which prints *vai vety ...*. In addition, if *eva* is not read at the end of this sequence, it is possible to read *eva* instead of *evam* as the first member of the sequence. The AKU (p. 229) explicitly understands *evam* at the start and *vā+eva* at the end, as do the *Padacandrikā* and AVṛ. However, the AVva (p. 631) and TĪS (p. 164) read the first word of the sequence as *eva*, and read either *vā* or *ca* (see below) as the final word. Whether read at the start or end of the sequences, it makes sense to understand *eva* in this verse, since otherwise this absolutely standard meaning of *eva* would not be attributed to it in the *Amarakośa* (its only other possible appearance in the AK is 3.4.9 *va vā yathā tathaiivaivam sāmye*, where the reading is uncertain, with *iva* possible instead of *eva*).

As noted in (46), 3.4.15 has an alternative reading, attributed to Subhūticandra (e.g. in the *Padacandrikā*, and in Bhānuji Dikṣita’s commentary on the *Amarakośa*), which includes *ca* (in place of *vā/eva* at the end of the sequence) among the words to which the meaning *avadhāraṇa* was attributed. According to Vogel (2015: 27), Subhūticandra’s *Kāmadhenu* commentary on the AK was composed between 1060 and 1172, probably in the first half of the twelfth century. The AKU, of roughly the same date, does not read *ca*. It

certainly including, but not necessarily limited to, restriction, delimitation and emphasis.

- (46) *syur evaṃ* [v.l. *eva*] *tu punar vaivety* [v.l. *vai cety*] *avadhāraṇavācakāḥ*.  
(*Amarakośa* 3.4.15, p. 447)  
'(The particles) *evaṃ*[/*eva*], *tu*, *punar*, *vai/vā*, and *vā/eva*[/*ca*] are expressive of *avadhāraṇa*.'

The term *avadhāraṇa* is also used as a semantic definition in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*: *A.* 2.1.8 *yāvad avadhāraṇe* specifies *avadhāraṇa* as a meaning of *yāvad*, where the sense is understood as 'restriction, delimitation', e.g. *yāvadamatraṃ brāhmaṇān āmantrayasva* 'invite as many brahmins as there are vessels'. *A.* 8.1.62 (*cāhalopa evety avadhāraṇam*) further refers to *avadhāraṇa* as a meaning of *eva*, and it is in defining the meaning of *eva* that *avadhāraṇa* is most commonly found in the *Kāśikā*.<sup>54</sup> The *Kāśikā* defines the meaning of *eva* on multiple occasions, usually as *evakāra iṣtato 'vadhāraṇārthaḥ* (e.g. on 1.4.8).<sup>55</sup> Commenting on *A.* 2.1.8, and also 5.3.58, the *Kāśikā* goes further and defines what is meant by *avadhāraṇa* in this context: *avadhāraṇam iyattāparicchedaḥ*, which Renou (1957: 65) translates as "délimitation consistant à dire 'cela et pas davantage'", i.e. 'this and no more'.

Importantly, Patañjali sometimes interprets an instance of *ca* as having the sense of *eva*, saying (on *A.* 2.1.17, 2.1.48, 2.1.72, 2.4.9): *kimarthaḥ cakāraḥ? evakārārthaḥ*. The *Kāśikā*, on the first three of these passages, defines the sense more precisely: *cakāro 'vadhāraṇārthaḥ*.<sup>56</sup> In all three cases, the point of the 'restriction' is that the compounds introduced by the rule should not be made a part of a larger compound. For example, *A.* 2.1.17, *tiṣṭhadguprabhṛtīni ca*, introduces a list of compounds beginning with *tiṣṭhadgu* 'when the cows are stand-

---

is impossible to know whether the reading of *ca* in this verse could have influenced the adoption of *avadhāraṇa* as a meaning for *ca* in the *kośas* of this period, or whether the reading merely reflects the existing acceptance of *avadhāraṇa* as a meaning for *ca*. There does not seem to be sufficient evidence to attribute the inclusion of *ca* here to Amara's original text.

- 54 *A.* 8.1.62 refers to a context involving *ca*: if there are two clauses coordinated, without an explicit *ca* (or *aha*), and *avadhāraṇa* is expressed using *eva*, then the first verb retains its accent. The tradition assumes that when the absence of *ca* is referred to by the term *lopa*, its meaning is nevertheless understood.
- 55 The element of choice indicated by *iṣtataḥ* distinguishes the 'restriction' from a *niyama*; cf. Renou (1957: 65).
- 56 The same phrase is also used by the *Nyāsa* commenting on the *Kāśikā*'s use of *ca* ad *A.* 2.3.37. The same meaning is also attributed to *tu* 'but' by the *Kāśikā* ad *A.* 4.1.163.

ing (to be milked). Larger compounds containing any of these compounds, e.g. *paramatiṣṭhadgu*, are ruled out.<sup>57</sup>

The GRM's example for *avadhāraṇa* is given in (47).<sup>58</sup>

- (47) *atītaḥ panthānaṃ tava ca mahimā vānmanasayoḥ. (Śivamahimnaḥstava 2)*  
 'It is your greatness (alone?) that has (really?) transcended the path of speech and mind.'

If we were to read *ca* in this example as expressing 'restriction', we would naturally interpret that restriction as applying to *tava*: 'the greatness of you and you alone ...'. However, in its gloss of this example, the GRM implies a somewhat different sense: *he deva yas tava mahimā, sa vānmanasayoḥ panthānaṃ mārgam atīta eva, ullaṅghitavān evety arthaḥ*. This gloss cannot easily be understood if we take the sense of *ca* here to be 'restriction'; but it can be understood if we read a slightly different sense of *avadhāraṇa*: 'affirmation' or 'confirmation'. The sense intended by the GRM, then, is roughly 'your greatness has certainly transcended ...'. Although 'restriction' and 'affirmation' appear to be rather different senses of *eva*, the tradition treats them both under the heading of *avadhāraṇa*. For example, the entry for *eva* in Hemacandra's *Anekārthasaṃgraha* (7.48, p. 197) lists four meanings: *aupamya* 'comparison', *paribhava* 'insult', *iṣadārtha* 'slightly' and *avadhāraṇa*. The first three are completely different from both 'restriction' and 'affirmation', which must both be covered by the last.

In the *Kāśīkā*, then, the attribution of *avadhāraṇa* as a meaning of *ca* appears to be limited to 'restriction', though *avadhāraṇa* in the sense 'affirmation' is not explicitly ruled out. This latter sense of *avadhāraṇa* is clearly accepted by the GRM; this could be seen as an expansion of the range of this use of *ca*.

The AKK's (untraced) example for *avadhṛti* (= *avadhāraṇa*) is given in (48).

- (48) *karmakṣayāc ca +nirvāṇam. (Zachariae 1893: 189)*<sup>59</sup>  
 'Liberation indeed(?) [results] only(?) from the destruction of *karma*.'

This example can be interpreted in either way: under the 'restriction' reading, it is from the destruction of *karma*, only that and nothing else, that liberation

57 *Kāśīkā*: *cakāro 'vadhāraṇārthaḥ. aparāḥ samāso na bhavati, paramatiṣṭhadgu iti.*

58 This example appears also in the later AVva (p. 577).

59 We correct the printed text's *nirmāṇam*.

results. Under the 'affirmation' reading, liberation indeed, assuredly, results from the destruction of *karma*. Given that this example entirely lacks a context, it is impossible to decide between the two interpretations.

The attribution of the meaning *avadhāraṇa* to *ca* is found beyond the grammatical and lexical tradition from at least the twelfth century. The earliest we have identified is Durvekamiśra's *Dharmottarapradīpa* (c. 1100), a commentary on Dharmottara's *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* (commentary on Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu*), where the meaning *avadhāraṇa* is attributed to *ca*. 49 times, either as the only meaning given (×30), or as one of two possibilities given by the commentator (e.g. *hetāv avadhāraṇe vā*). This is out of a total of around 180 glosses of the word in the commentary.<sup>60</sup> *Avadhāraṇa* is common as a gloss of *ca* in later commentarial literature.

Two later examples appearing in AK commentaries are:

(49) *velām atītā tava ceyam ājñā*. (AVvṛ p. 575)  
'It is *your* command that has surpassed its limit.'

(50) *ātmā ca saccidānandaḥ*. (AVva p. 631)  
'It is *ātman* that is 'Existence, Thought and Joy''

Both of these could be understood under either sense of *avadhāraṇa*.

Once again, then, we appear to be dealing with a meaning for *ca* which is first attested in the earlier grammatical tradition, albeit not one of the main four presented by Patañjali, and which was picked up and continued outside the grammatical tradition. It is not clear whether there was ever any clear distinction made between the sense of 'restriction' and that of 'affirmation', but the former only is found in the grammatical tradition, and the latter only securely in the *kośa* tradition.

#### 4.8 Hetu

The meaning *hetu* 'cause' is attributed to *ca* in a number of *Kośas*, most of which also accept the two meanings considered in the following two sections, *vinīyoga* and *tulyayogitā*.<sup>61</sup> The exception is Puruṣottamadeva's *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*, which is the only text to add *hetu*, and not also *vinīyoga* and *tulyayogitā*, to the otherwise seven-member list of meanings treated above. The earliest example

60 These numbers come from electronic searches of the GRETEL text: [https://gretel.sub.uni-goeettingen.de/gretel/1\\_sanskrit/6\\_sastra/3\\_phil/buddh/durdhpru.htm](https://gretel.sub.uni-goeettingen.de/gretel/1_sanskrit/6_sastra/3_phil/buddh/durdhpru.htm).

61 Two of our texts use the synonym *kāraṇa* in place of *hetu*.

given for *hetu* appears in the AKU (p. 224), the *Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti* (p. 2) and also in the GRM, followed in all texts by the same explanation:<sup>62</sup>

- (51) *grāmo na gantavyaḥ, śītaṃ ca. śītāt kathaṃ gamyata ity arthaḥ.*  
 “‘One should not go to the village, and (it is) cold.’ The meaning is: due to coldness, how can one go (to the village)?”

The AKK example is given in (52).

- (52) *tasmai himādrehḥ prayatām tanūjāṃ yatātmane rocayitum yatasva  
 yoṣitsu tadvīryaniṣekabhūmiḥ saiva kṣamety ātmabhuvopadiṣṭam.  
 guror niyogāc ca nagendrakanyā sthāṇuṃ tapasyantam adhīyakāyām  
 anvāsta ity apsarasām mukhebhyaḥ śrutam mayā matpraṇidhiḥ sa va-  
 rgaḥ. (Kumārasambhava 3.16–17)*  
 ‘Try to make the devoted daughter of the Himalayan mountain please him (though he is) self-controlled. (Since) the self-born (Brahma) has instructed that only she among women is a fit recipient of his seed; (and) since, due to her father’s order the daughter of the mountain king attends upon Sthāṇu (= Śiva) as he performs asceticism on the upper part (of the Himālaya)—so I have heard from the mouths of the *apsarases*, that group who are my spies.’

It is not immediately obvious how Mahendra takes the *ca* in (52) here to express *hetu*. The fact that the *ca* follows a noun in the causal ablative case appears to be coincidental. But the information expressed in KS 3.17—that Parvatī is currently attending on Śiva—can be taken as part of the reason for the request expressed in 3.16. In 3.16 Indra requests Kāma to make Parvatī pleasing to Śiva because, first and foremost, Brahma has decreed that she alone is worthy of being impregnated by him. Verse 17 then gives an additional explanation for the request: Parvatī is already there, serving him. The intended sense is close to English *and moreover*: ‘Please make Parvatī pleasing to Śiva, because Brahma has declared ...; and moreover she’s already there serving him!’

Still, the causal sense is relatively weak, and it would surely be possible to analyse the use of the *ca* here as merely coordinative, an example of *samuccaya*, or perhaps even as *pādapūraṇa*.

62 We follow the reading of the *Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti* (p. 2), *grāmo na ...*, which matches with the explanation that follows; the GRM and AKU editions both read *grāmas ca ...*, which cannot easily be aligned with the following sentence.

The meaning *hetu* is assigned by the *Amarakośa* to *hi* (3.3.257, p. 443) and *yat ... tat, yataḥ ... tataḥ* (3.4.3, p. 444). Our earliest evidence for *hetu* as a meaning for *ca* is found in Dharmottara's *Nyāyabinduṭīkā* (8th century). Commenting on *Nyāyabindu* 2.45, Dharmottara interprets all three occurrences of *ca* in the verse with the phrase *cakāro hetvarthaḥ* (Malvania 1955: 144–145).<sup>63</sup> Durvekamiśra's *Dharmottarapradīpa* (c. 1100) commentary on the *Nyāyabindu-ṭīkā* takes this possibility further: he assigns the meaning *hetu* to *ca* twenty-five times ( $\times 15$  as the only meaning,  $\times 10$  as one of two possibilities). In addition, Durvekamiśra glosses *ca* as *yasmāt* or *yasmādarthe* 82 times. Given that *yasmādarthe* must be a near synonym of *hetvarthe* (both are used in other commentaries to gloss *hi*), this means that more than half of the *cas* glossed by Durvekamiśra (107/181) are assigned the meaning *hetu* by him. At least in this commentarial tradition, then, the assignation of *hetu* to *ca* was extensive by the twelfth century.

The AVṛ and AVva offer additional, simple examples of *ca* meaning *hetu*:

(53) *rājā ca draṣṭavyaḥ*. (AVṛ p. 575)  
'For the king must be seen.'

(54) *na cānyatas tasya śarīrarakṣā*. (AVva p. 577 = *Raghuvamśa* 2.4)  
'For the protection of his body was not from another.'

#### 4.9 Tulyayogitā

This function of *ca* goes by various names: *tulyakāla* (Mañkha's *Anekārthakośa*), *tulyayogitā* (Hemacandra), *samāna* (Mahīpa's *Anekārthatilaka* and Makarandadāsa's *Paramānandīyanāmamālā*), and *tulyayoga* (Viśvanātha's *Kośakalpataru*). We use here Hemacandra's name, which as discussed below also has significance in the *alamkāra* tradition.

Like *hetu*, *tulyayogitā* is one of the 'second' group of additions to the Patañjalian meanings of *ca*; all *kośas* available to us that accept *tulyayogitā* (under whatever name) also accept *hetu*; all but one also accepts *vinīyoga*, the third of this group, and only one text accepts *hetu* but not also *tulyayogitā*.

The very earliest example of *tulyayogitā* in the *kośa* tradition is found in the AKU (p. 224):

63 Stcherbatsky (1930: 104) comments: "The interpretation of the three *ca*'s as "because", and the coordination of the three different questions seems artificial."

- (55) *dhyātāś copasthitaś ca*. ‘(It is) (no sooner) thought on (than it is) perceived.’

The GRM’s example for *tulyayogitā* is given in (56).

- (56) *kṛtaṃ ca garvābhimukhaṃ manas tvayā kim anyad evaṃ nihatās ca no dviṣaḥ*.  
 ‘No sooner had you turned (your) mind towards pride—what else?—than our enemies were thus crushed (by you).’

This example, a half verse in the *vaṃśastha* metre, appears also in Mammaṭa’s *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* (4.109ab, vol. 1 p. 77).<sup>64</sup> The verse is a eulogy of a king: at the king’s mere thought of obtaining pride by defeating his enemies, he had already done so. The *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* comments on this verse (vol. 1 p. 77 l. 13): *atra tulyayogitādyotakasya ‘ca’ iti nipātasya* ‘here (is an example) of the particle *ca* manifesting *tulyayogitā*’.<sup>65</sup>

The *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* dates to the eleventh century and thus predates not only the GRM but also all the *kośas* that list this function (all twelfth century on), such that the *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* may perhaps be the source of the attribution of this meaning to *ca*. However, in using the term *tulyayogitā*, the *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* is not referring to a meaning of *ca* as such, but to an *alaṃkāra*, a poetic figure of speech, recognized throughout the *alaṃkāra* tradition (see Gerow 1971: 191–193). Mammaṭa is therefore saying that the *ca* in (56) serves to reveal the particular figure of speech, but not necessarily that *ca* directly expresses this meaning.

Gerow (1971: 191) defines the poetic *tulyayogitā* as: “a figure in which several subjects sharing a property or mode of action, though in unequal degrees, are represented as equivalently endowed; the lesser subject is thus magnified.” Similarly, the early twelfth century scholar Ruyyaka defines the term thus (*Alaṃkārasarvasva* 23): *aupamyasya gamyatve padārthagatatvena prastutānām aprastutānām vā samānadharmābhisambandhe tulyayogitā* ‘*tulyayogitā* (occurs) when a comparison is to be understood, when there is a connection of praiseworthy or non-praiseworthy things with a common feature through (that feature) occurring in the items referred to.’

64 The complete verse as given in the *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* runs: *kṛtaṃ ca garvābhimukhaṃ manas tvayā. kim anyad? evaṃ nihatās ca no dviṣaḥ. / tamāṃsi tiṣṭhanti hi tāvad, aṃśumān na yāvad āyāty udayādrimaulitām.*

65 Commentaries on the *Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa* explain that this expression of *tulyayogitā* serves to highlight the *vīrarasa* ‘heroic sentiment’ of the line.

Gerow cites the example given by Bhāmaha (3.27):

- (57) *śeṣo himagiris tvaṃ ca mahānto guravaḥ sthīrāḥ*  
*yad alaṅghitamā yādāś calantīm bibhṛtha kṣitim.*  
 ‘The primeval serpent, the Himalaya and you are great, weighty and firm;  
 since you, surpassing all limitation, support the unstable world.’

Here too, the word *ca* appears, but that is not to say that *ca* means *tulyayogitā*. Moreover, the term *tulyayogitā* as an *alaṅkāra* term is rather broad, covering potentially any kind of shared properties. But the GRM example above illustrates specifically simultaneity of action, and the same is true of the AKK’s example:

- (58) *pratigrahītum praṇayipriyatvāt trilocanas tām upacakrame ca*  
*saṃmohanaṃ nāma ca puṣpadhanvā dhanuṣy amoghaṃ samadhatta*  
*bāṇam.* (Kumārasaṃbhava 3.66)  
 ‘No sooner had Trilocana (i.e. Śiva) started to receive that [rosary] (from Pārvatī)—for (= Śiva) is affectionate towards (his) supplicants—than the flower-bowed one (i.e. Kāma) placed on (his) bow the infallible arrow called *Saṃmohana*.’

This simultaneity of action can certainly fall under *tulyayogitā*, but the latter could include many other kinds of shared properties, as in (57). The alternative term *tulyakāla*, found in Mañkha’s *Anekarthakośa*, is more restricted, and does in fact reflect how this meaning of *ca* is exemplified in the GRM and AKK. Hemacandra’s use of the term *tulyayogitā* appears to reflect an explicit alignment with the *alaṅkāra* concept, and presumably would encompass the full breadth of the *alaṅkāra* term. The later term *samāna* appears to reflect a similar semantic breadth.

The question of simultaneity of action versus a somewhat more general sense is addressed by Ollett (2024: 160) in his edition of the *Alaṅkāradappaṇō*, comparing the treatment in the *Alaṅkāradappaṇō* with that of Bhāmaha’s *Kāvyālaṅkāra*:

The general idea of *samajōiā* or *tulyayōgitā* (BALANCE, literally “the fact of possessing a connection with the same thing”) is that one thing, let us call it the TARGET, is said to perform the same action as something else, the STANDARD, hence implying a comparison with the STANDARD that is favorable to the TARGET. This much seems to be clear from the definitions in both texts, which are almost identical. There is one key dif-

ference: the *Mirror* [= *Alaṅkāradappaṇō*] speaks of “actions taking place at the same time” (*samakālakiriā*), whereas the *Ornament* [= Bhāmaha’s *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra*] speaks of “actions with the same effects” (*tulyakāryakriyā*). The latter is corroborated by Udbhaṭa’s commentary ....

Ollett goes on to argue that *samakālakiriā* is a ‘correction’ of an earlier *samakaj-jakiriā*, which would be the same as Bhāmaha’s definition. Ollett therefore takes the definition involving simultaneous action as secondary within the *alaṅkāra* tradition; it would appear to be this secondary definition which is adopted in the *kośa* tradition.

Altogether, then, this meaning of *ca* is closely related to, and may derive from, the earlier *alaṅkāra* concept termed *tulyayogitā*. This figure of speech need not, but commonly would, appear in a context where *ca* is used, and it is understandable that, as in the *Kāvyaṅprakāśa*, where *tulyayogitā* is understood and *ca* does appear, the latter could be understood to be functioning as the explicit indicator of the figure. This has then been accepted as a distinct sense of *ca* in the *kośa* tradition.

For the south Indian commentaries, the AVṛ and AVva, on *tulyayogitā*, see the following section.

#### 4.10 Viniyoga

The meaning *viniyoga* is accepted by four of the *kośas* consulted, all of which also accept *tulyayogitā* and *hetu*. The precise force of *viniyoga* in this context is uncertain, but it seems likely that it is associated with the use of the term *viniyoga* in A. 8.1.61 *aheti viniyoge ca*. This rule cancels the *anudātta* accentuation of the first of a pair of finite verbs when the particle *aha* is used, in the context of *viniyoga*. The *Kāśikā* glosses *viniyoga* here as *nānāprayojano niyogaḥ* ‘multiplicitous injunction’, with the example:

- (59) *tvam aha grāmaṃ gaccha, tvam aha aranyaṃ gaccha.*  
 ‘Go to the village, and also go to the forest.’

Although the particle *ca* is treated in several of the rules preceding and following A. 8.1.61, this rule does not apply to contexts where *ca* appears, but only to *aha*. Nevertheless, the GRM example for *viniyoga* is at least similar to the *Kāśikā* example under 8.1.61:

- (60) *ahaṃ ca tvam ca putra gacchāvaḥ.*  
 ‘O son, you and I, let’s go.’

In the absence of further detail, this example could be analysed in a number of ways, but it is certainly possible to take this as an example of 'multiplicitous injunction' in a broad sense, that is as two distinct injunctions, one enjoined on the first person, the other on the second person.

Support for this understanding of *vinīyoga* may come from the *Kāśikā*, which twice specifies the function of *ca* as *saṃnīyogārtha* 'having the purpose of connected injunction', on *A.* 3.3.12 and 5.3.72. For example, in the latter case, 5.3.72, *kasya ca daḥ*, specifies the replacement of a *k* at the end of an indeclinable stem with a *d* when the infix *akac* is introduced, resulting in e.g. *dhakid* from *dhik*. The *Kāśikā* glosses this rule, saying: *kakārāntasya prātipadikasya akacsamnīyogena dakārādeśo bhavati. cakāraḥ saṃnīyogārthaḥ*. That is, this rule applies alongside the introduction of *akac* (5.3.71), and the *ca* serves to indicate that the rules are to be interpreted together. Although *saṃnīyoga* and *vinīyoga* are not perfect synonyms, they are perhaps close enough that this statement of the *Kāśikā* could partly underlie the attribution of *vinīyoga* to *ca* in the *kośas*.

The AKK's example for *vinīyoga* is given in (61).

(61) *madhuś ca te manmatha sāhacaryād asāv anukto 'pi sahāya eva samīraṇo nodayitā bhaveti vyādiśyate kena hutāsanasya? (Kumārasaṃbhava 3.21)*

'O Manmatha (= Love), that Spring, since (he) is (your) companion, (will) surely (be your) assistant even if unasked—(for) who would tell wind "(O wind,) become the inciter of fire!"'

Mahendra's interpretation of the *ca* in *pāda a* as expressing *vinīyoga* is once again not immediately clear, but perhaps results from the context of Indra commanding Love to attack Śiva. Yet, while there is a broad context of commanding, the verse in question does not contain an overt command. We can best understand this as an implied command '... let him be accepted by you ...' implying '... accept him ...'.

The earliest attested example of *vinīyoga*, from the AKU (p. 224), is *Ṛgveda* 8.62.11ab, given above as (3). That example is clearly parallel to those given above, in particular (60), involving as it does a first and second person dual exhortation. As we saw above, this example is given in the *Nirukta* (1.4, p. 31) to exemplify *samuccaya*.<sup>66</sup> This would suggest that *vinīyoga* is a meaning of *ca*

66 Jamison and Brereton (2025) note that 8.62.11ab is unusual in including both subjects of the 1du. verb explicitly, since more commonly the *ahām* is omitted; they attribute this to the hymn's emphasis on the partnership of god and human. This unusual syntax may explain Yaska's choice of this example.

closely related to *samuccaya*, and likely only distinguished from it at some point after Amara.

In this respect, it is interesting to note that Tilaka's *Nipātāvyayopasargavṛtti* (p. 1) says that *itaretarayoga*, *samāhāra* and *vinīyoga* are all types of *samuccaya*, and then proceeds, alongside an example of *itaretarayoga*, to cite RV 8.62.11ab, presumably as an example of *vinīyoga*.<sup>67</sup> These texts therefore seem to reflect an understanding that *vinīyoga* involves at a basic level an aggregation, as found in *samuccaya*, but that it can on some level be distinguished, if only as a sub-type of *samuccaya*.

The south Indian commentaries the AVṛ and AVva diverge slightly from the rest of the tradition with regard to *vinīyoga* and *tulyayogitā*. Their examples for *tulyayogitā* are, unexpectedly, almost identical to (60) above: the AVṛ offers *tvam cāhaṃ ca sakhe gacchāva*, while the AVva offers the almost identical *tvam cāhaṃ ca gacchāvaḥ*. For *vinīyoga*, both texts give the same example:

(62) *paṭha ca paca ca*.  
'Recite and cook!'

This example fits the pattern of connected injunction; it is closest to the *Kāśikā* example given above (59). The examples given for *tulyayogitā* are more similar to the examples given in the AKU and GRM for *vinīyoga*, but do in any case involve simultaneous action, so their inclusion there is not incomprehensible. The different assignation of examples to types must reflect a distinct tradition, and if nothing else demonstrates that there is, in fact, relatively little between these two meanings of *ca*.

#### 4.11 Other Meanings

We noted above that in the late Viśvanātha's *Koṣakalpataru*, the meaning *saṃgraha* is listed for *ca*, alongside all the ten meanings discussed above, implying that it is something different from these. However, no example is provided, and given the rather generic nature of the term, we cannot say any more about it.

The AK commentaries the AVṛ and AVva offer one additional meaning each, together with an example. The older of the two, the AVṛ, lists a meaning *anubandha*; the example it provides appears to be an example of *ca* 'if':

67 The understanding of *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra* as subtypes of *samuccaya* is paralleled in the *Kātantra* tradition of *vyākaraṇa*, but the inclusion of *vinīyoga* is unique to our knowledge.

- (63) *tvam ca gacchasi kāryam naḥ setsyati.*  
'If you go, our task will be accomplished.'

This is exactly the same example later offered by the AVva for *cedartha* (*pakṣāntara*); (63) is repeated from (43). It is unclear how the AVvṛ understands this as being different from *cedartha*, which the AVvṛ lists and exemplifies separately, and if it is intended to be different, what *anubandha* means in relation to this example. It is possible, of course, that the term *anubandha* could refer to the *anubandha* on the Pāṇinian *caṅ* 'if', but there is no obvious explanation for the positing of this as a separate sense alongside *cedartha*.

On the other hand, the additional meaning given by the AVva is new: *bheda* or *bhedaviśeṣa* 'difference':

- (64) *sa khalu tvām anuvartate tvam ca nirapekṣaḥ.*  
'He indeed follows you, but you disregard (him).'

The commentary explains: *tvam punar nirapekṣa ityarthah*. The contrastive sense comes out well in the example; this is the first, and to our knowledge only, recognition in the tradition of the use of *ca* in the sense 'but'.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper we have traced the development of the inventories of meanings, or functions, assigned to *ca* in the Sanskrit lexicographical tradition. The basis for all treatments of *ca* in both the grammatical and lexicographical traditions is the four-way distinction proposed by Patañjali in the context of accounting for *dvandva* compounding: *samuccaya*, *anvācaya*, *itaretarayoga* and *samāhāra*. The *Amarakośa* accepts Patañjali's four meanings of *ca*, and these four remain central in the later lexicographical tradition, all present in almost every *kośa* produced.

Alongside these four, the *Amarakośa* adds merely the function of *pādapūraṇa* 'completing a verse line'. But from the eleventh to twelfth centuries, alongside the relative proliferation of *kośa* production, we find further expansions of the list of meanings assigned to *ca*. These come primarily in two groups: *pakṣāntara* 'if'/'alternative perspective' and *avadhāraṇa* 'delimitation'; and *hetu* 'cause', *vinīyoga* 'multiplicitous injunction' and *tulyayogitā* 'equal connection'.

Some of these meanings have histories that reach back many centuries. *Pakṣāntara* derives from the largely pre-Classical *ca* 'if'; *avadhāraṇa* can be traced to at least the *Kāśikāvṛtti*. *Hetu* is attested in Buddhist philosophical commen-

tary from the 8th century; *tulyayogitā* is clearly associated with the *alamkāra* of the same name.

These additional meanings therefore show highly heterogeneous origins, at least as far as we can trace them. We do not appear to be dealing with any actual extension in the semantic range of *ca* in the history of Sanskrit, but an increasing refinement in distinguishing the nuances of usage of the word. This is clearest in the case of *viniyoga*, the earliest exemplification of which is the same example used by Yāska for *samuccaya*. The recognition of distinct sense of *ca* could also be expanded from restricted origins; thus the attribution of *avadhāraṇa* to *ca* in three instances in the *Kāśīkā* relates only to the interpretation of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but its acceptance into the *kośa* tradition a few hundred years later implies a more general possibility that *ca* could express this meaning.

At the same time, it cannot be said that the *kośa* tradition was, or even attempted to be, comprehensive in enumerating all possible meanings or uses of *ca*. For example, both Böhtlingk and Roth (1858) and Apte (1890) recognize disjunction as a possible meaning for *ca*. This is not entirely unrecognized among ancient authors: Durvekamiśra (in the *Dharmottarapradīpa*) twice notes *ca* as meaning *vā* 'or'. But this is never mentioned in the lexicographical tradition. Presumably there was not sufficient weight of recognized usage, or tradition of acceptance of such a meaning, for the *kośa* authors to admit in into their works.

Ultimately, this study tells us as much, if not more, about the lexicographical tradition as/than it does about the meaning of *ca* itself. The lexicographers of the twelfth century and on appear to have sought to collate meanings for *ca* from a wide range of sources, not limited to the grammatical tradition but including e.g. the *alamkāra* and commentarial traditions. But they appear, at least from the texts that offer examples, not always to have understood the meanings they were collating, or at least to have represented them somewhat differently from the meaning originally intended. We also see the development of distinct traditions of understanding and exemplification. But after the twelfth century there is very little advance; it is rare for new meanings to be assigned to *ca* after this period; only the AVva offers one additional sense that is clearly distinct from earlier meanings. This history of one particular word may reflect broader patterns in the history of the *kośa* tradition, but further work on this relatively understudied tradition is required to uncover such patterns.

## Text Editions

### *Lexicographical Works*

- Anekārthakośa*: Zachariae (1897)  
*Anekārthatilaka*: Patkar (1947)  
*Anekārthasaṃgraha*: Zachariae (1893)  
*Anekārthasamuccaya*: Kulkarni (1929)  
*Amarakośa*: Śivadatta (1929)  
*Amarakośodghāṭana*: Oka (1913)  
*Amarapadavivṛti*, *Amarapadavivarāṇa*, and *Amarapadapārijāta*: Ramanathan (1978)  
*Kośakalpataru*: Patkar and Sarma (1957)  
*Ṭikāsarvasva*: Gaṇapatiśāstrī (1917)  
*Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*: Seelakhandha (1916)  
*Nānārthamañjarī*: Sharma (1954b)  
*Nānārtharatnamālā*: Sharma (1954a)  
*Nānārthasaṃgraha*: Chintamani (1937)  
*Nīpātāvyaṃyopasargavṛtti*: Somesvara Sarma (1951)  
*Nīrukta*: Sarup (1921, 1927)  
*Padacandrikā*: Dutta (1966–1978)  
*Paramānandīyanāmamālā*: Kulkarni (1968–1971)  
*Medinikośa*: Hoshing (1940)  
*Vaijayantī*: Oppert (1893)  
*Viśvaparakāśa*: Śīlaskandha and Bhaṭṭa (1911)  
*Viśvalocana*: Nandalālaśarman (1912)  
*Śabdaratnākara*: Sharma (1965)  
*Śabdaratnāvalī*: Chaudhuri (1970)

### *Grammatical Works*

- Aṣṭādhyāyī*: Böhtlingk (1887)  
*Uddyota*: Kudāla et al. (1935–1945)  
*Kātantra* texts: Dwivedī (1999) and Eggeling (1874)  
*Kāśīkāvṛtti*: Misra (1985)  
*Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*: Eggeling (1879)  
*Nīrukta*: Sarup (1927)  
*Pradīpa*: Kudāla et al. (1935–1945)  
*Praudhamanoramā*: Shastri (1992)  
*Bālamānoramā*: Chaturveda and Vidyābhāskara (1961)  
*Bṛhacchabdaratna*: Shastri (1992)  
*Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara*: Sītārāmaśāstrin (1960)  
*Mahābhāṣya*: Kielhorn (1880–1885)

- Laghumañjūsā*: Bhandari and Pendsey (1989)  
*Laghuśabdenduśekhara*: Pendse (1927)  
*Śabdakaustubha*: Nene (1929)  
*Siddhāntakaumudī*: Chaturveda and Vidyābhāskara (1961)

### Others

- Kāvyaṣaṣṭakāśa*: Parikh (1959)  
*Kumārasaṣṭhava*: Parvanikara and Paraba (1886)  
*Dharmottaraṣṭadīpa*: Malvania (1955)  
*Mahābhārata*: BORI (1999)  
*Mālatīmādhava*: Bhandarkar (1876)  
*Meghadūta*: Stenzler (1874)  
*Raghuvaṣṭa*: Pandit (1869)  
*Vikramorvaṣṭya*: Pandit (1879)  
*Śivamahimnastava*: Brown (1965)  
*Śiśupālavadhā*: Dundas (2017)  
*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*: Raghavan (1998)

### References

- Apte, V.S. (1890). *The practical Sanskrit-English dictionary, containing appendices on Sanskrit prosody and important literary & geographical names in the ancient history of India, for the use of schools and colleges*. Poona: Shiralkar.
- Aufrecht, Theodor (1864). *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae; Pars octava codices Sanscriticos complectens*. Oxford: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Benson, James W., John J. Lowe, Adriana Molina-Muñoz, and Yiming Shen (forthcoming). 'The meaning of *ca* 'and': Coordination and compounding in the Indian grammatical tradition'. To appear in *Journal of the American Society for Premodern Asia*.
- Bhandari, Madhava Shastri and Narahari Shastri Pendsey (eds.) (1989). *Vaiyakaranasiddhanta Laghumanjusha by M.M. Sri Nagesha Bhatta with two commentaries called 'KUNJIKĀ' of Shri Durbalacharya and 'KĀLA' of Balam Bhatta* (2 vols.). Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 2nd edition.
- Bhandarkar, Ramkrishna Gopal (ed.) (1876). *Mālatīmādhava by Bhavabhūti with the commentary of Jagaddharay*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot.
- Böhlingk, Otto (1870). *Indische Sprüche*. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften. Volume 1, 2nd edition.
- Böhlingk, Otto (1887). *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Leipzig: H. Haessel.
- Böhlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth (1858). *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (vol. 2). St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- BORI, (The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute) (1999). 'The Mahābhārata'. Authorised and regularly updated electronic text, based on John Smith's revision of Prof. Muneo Tokunaga's version of the text, subjected to detailed checking by a team of assistants based in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune. <http://bombay.indology.info/mahabharata/statement.html>.
- Brown, W. Norman (1965). *The Mahimnastava or praise of Shiva's greatness*. Poona: American Institute of Indian Studies.
- Champollion, Lucas (2016). 'Ten men and women got married today: Noun coordination and the interactive theory of conjunction'. *Journal of Semantics* 33, pp. 561–622.
- Chaturveda, Giridharaśarman and Parameśvarānandaśarman Vidyābhāskara (eds.) (1961). *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī Bālamānoramātattvabodhinīśahitā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Four volumes. Vol. 4 title: *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī Bālamānoramātattvabodhinī-śekhara-subodhinī-candrakalā-samalaikṛtā*.
- Chaudhuri, Manindra Mohan (ed.) (1970). *Śabdaratnāvalī (an early seventeenth century kośa work compiled in the name of Musā-Khān) by Mathureśa*. Bibliotheca Indica work number 292 issue number 1591, Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- Chintamani, T.R. (ed.) (1937). *Nanarthasaṅgraha of Ajayapāla*. Madras University Sanskrit Series 10, Madras: University of Madras, 1st edition.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (1993). 'The changing notion of *śiṣṭa* from Patañjali to Bharṭṛhari'. *Asiatische Studien* 47(1), pp. 95–115.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (1998). 'Evolution of the notion of authority in the Pāṇinian tradition'. *Histoire Epistémologie Langage* 20(1), pp. 5–28.
- Dundas, Paul (ed.) (2017). *The killing of Shishupala*. Cambridge, MA: Murty Classical Library of India / Harvard University Press.
- Dutta, Kali Kumar (ed.) (1966–1978). *Amarasimhviracite nāmalingānusāsane rāyamukutaṅkṛtā pada-candrikā*. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- Dwivedī, Jānakīprasāda (1999). *Kātantravyākaraṇa of Ācārya Śarvavarmā. Part II, Volume 2 with four commentaries: 'Vṛtti' and 'Tīkā' by Śrī Durga Singh, 'Kātantravṛtti-pañjikā' by Śrī Trilocanadāsa, 'Kalāpacandra' by Kavirāja Suśeṣaśarmā, 'Samikṣā'*. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University.
- Eggeling, Julius (ed.) (1874). *The Kātantra with the commentary of Durgasimha*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Eggeling, Julius (ed.) (1879). *Vardhamāna's Ganaratnamahodadhi with the author's commentary*. London: Trübner & co.
- Gaṇapatīśāstrī, T. (ed.) (1917). *Nāmalingānusāsana of Amarasimha: with the commentary Tīkāsarvasva of Vandyaghatīya-Sarvānanda* (vol. 4). Trivandrum: Travancore Government Press.
- Gerow, Edwin (1971). *A glossary of Indian figures of speech*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gonda, Jan (1957). 'The use of the particle *ca*'. *Vāk* 5, pp. 1–73.

- Hoshing, Jagannāth Śāstri (ed.) (1940). *Nānārtha śabda koṣa or Medinī koṣa by Śrī Medinīkara*. The Kāshi Sanskrit Series (Haridās Sanskrit Granthamālā) 41 (Lexicography Section 1), Benares: The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series Office.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton (2014). *The Rigveda: The earliest religious poetry of India. An English translation*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton (2025). 'Rigveda translation: Commentary'. <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/> (version 5-10-2025).
- Keydana, Götz (2018). 'The syntax of Proto-Indo-European'. In Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, Matthias Fritz, and Mark Wente (eds.), *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics* (vol. 3), Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 2195–2228.
- Kielhorn, Franz (1880–1885). *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali* (3 vol.). Bombay: Government Central Book Depot.
- Klein, Jared S. (1985). *Toward a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda. Vol. 1. Coordinate Conjunction* (2 parts). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kudāla, Śivadatta D., Raghunāth Kāśīnāth Śāstrī, and Bhārgavaśāstrī Jośī (eds.) (1935–1945). *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgeśa's Uddyota*. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press. Vol. 2: 2nd edition, edited by Śivadatta D. Kudāla and Raghunāthśāstrī; vol. 3: 1st edition, edited by Raghunāth Kāśīnāth Śāstrī and Śivadatta D. Kudāla; vol. 4: 1st edition, edited by Bhārgavaśāstrī Jośī; vol. 5: 1st edition, edited by Bhārgavaśāstrī Jośī.
- Kulkarni, Eknath Dattatreya (1968–1971). *Paramānandīyanāmāla of Makarandadāsa* (2 vols.). Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute. Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 7–8.
- Kulkarni, Narayan Nathaji (ed.) (1929). *Śāśvatakoṣaḥ: The Anekārthasamuchchaya of Śāśvata, A lexicon of Sanskrit words*. Poona: Oriental Book Agency.
- Malvania, Paṇḍita Dalsukhbhai (ed.) (1955). *Paṇḍita Durveka Miśra's Dharmottara-pradīpa [Being a sub commentary on Dharmottara's Nyāyabindutika, a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Nyāyabindu]*. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute. Tibetan Sanskrit Text Series vol. 2.
- Misra, Śrīnārāyaṇa (ed.) (1985). *Kāśīkāvṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (along with commentaries Vivaraṇapañcikā–Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra)*. Vārāṇasī: Ratna Publications. Six volumes.
- Murti, M. Srimannarayana (1974). *Sanskrit compounds: A philosophical study*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Nandalālaśarman (ed.) (1912). *Śrīśrīdharasenācāryaviracita Viśvalocanakośa aparānāma (Muktāvalīkośa) bhāṣāṭīkāsameta*. Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sagar Press, 1st edition.
- Nene, Gopal Śāstri (ed.) (1929). *The Śabda Kaustubha by Pandit Bhattoji Dikshī. Vol. 11–Fas. 5 to 10. From the second pāda of 1st adhyāya to second pāda of 3rd adhyāya, and Sphota Chandrikā by Pandit Srikrishna mauni*. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Vidya Vilas Press.

- Oberlies, Thomas (1997). 'Pāli, Pāṇini and 'popular' Sanskrit (*miscellanea Palica VI*). *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 23, pp. 1–26.
- Oka, Krishnaji Govind (ed.) (1913). *The Nāmalingānuśāsana (Amarakosha) of Amarasimha with the commentary (Amarakoshodghātana) of Kshīrasvāmin*. Poona: D.G. Khandekar.
- Ollett, Andrew (2024). *The Mirror of Ornaments (Alaṅkāradappaṇō): A Prakrit work of poetics*. Napoli: UniorPress.
- Oppert, Gustav (ed.) (1893). *The Vajjayanti of Yādavaprakāśa*. Madras: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press.
- Panchal, Sanjeev and Amba Kulkarni (2019). 'Co-ordination in Sanskrit'. *Indian Linguistics* 80(1–2), pp. 59–76.
- Pandit, Shankar P. (ed.) (1869). *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa with the commentary of Mallinātha* (Volume 1). Bombay: Indu-Prakash Press.
- Pandit, Shankar P. (ed.) (1879). *Vikramorvaśyam: A drama in five acts by Kālidāsa, edited with English notes*. Bombay: Government Central Book-Depot.
- Pant, Mahes Raj (ed.) (2000). *Jātarūpa's commentary on the Amarakośa: for the first time critically edited together with an introduction, appendices and indices* (2 vols.). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Parikh, Rasiklal C. (ed.) (1959). *Kāvyaṅgīkāśa of Mammāṭa with the Saṅketa named Kāvyaḍarśa of Someśvara Bhaṭṭa (son of Devaka of the Bhāradvāja family)*. Rājasthāna Purātana Granthamālā 46–47, Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute.
- Parvanikara, Narayana Bhatta and Kashinatha Panduranga Paraba (eds.) (1886). *The Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa with the commentary (the Sanjivini) of Mallinātha (1–8 sargas) and of Sītārāma (8–17 sargas)*. Bombay: Nirnaya-Sagara Press.
- Patkar, M.M. (ed.) (1947). *Anekarthatilaka of Mahīpa*. Sources of Indo-Aryan Lexicography 1, Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Patkar, Madhukat Mangesh and K.V. Krishnamurthy Sarma (eds.) (1957). *Kośakalpataru of Viśvanātha Fascicule 1*. Sources of Indo-Aryan Lexicography 14-1, Poona: Deccan College Sanskrit Dictionary Department.
- Pendse, Narahari Sastri (ed.) (1927). *Laghuśabdenduśekhara by Nāgojibhaṭṭa with a commentary Chandrakalā by Bhairva Miśra* (2 vols.). Benares: Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office. Kashi Sanskrit Series 5.
- Raghavan, Venkatyarama (ed.) (1998). *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa of Bhoja. Part I*. Cambridge, MA: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University. Harvard Oriental Series 53.
- Ramanathan, A.A. (ed.) (1978). *Amarakośa, with the unpublished South Indian commentaries* (vol. 2). Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Renou, Louis (1957). *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*. Paris: Librairie Champion.
- Sarup, Lakshman (1921). *The Nighaṅṭu and the Nirukta. Introduction, English translation and notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Reprint 1967, Motilal Banarsidass.

- Sarup, Lakshman (ed.) (1927). *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta. The oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology and semantics*. Lahore: University of the Panjab. Reprint 1967, Motilal Banarsidass.
- Seelakkhndha, C.A. (ed.) (1916). *The Trikāndaçesha A collection of Sanskrit nouns by Sri Purushottamadeva King of Kalinga India With Sārārtha Candrikā a commentary by C.A. Seelakkhndha*. Bombay: Khemaraaja Shrikrishnadāsa.
- Sharma, Bellikoth Ramachandra (1954a). *Nānārtha-ratnamālā of Irugapa Daṇḍādhi-nātha*. Poona: Deccan College Post-Graduate & Research Institute. Sources of Indo-Aryan Lexicography 8.
- Sharma, B.R. (ed.) (1965). *Śabdaratnākara of Vāmana-bhaṭṭa-bāṇa*. Mithilāvidyāpī-ṭhagranthamālā 1 Prācīnācāryagranthāvalī 16, Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1st edition.
- Sharma, K.V. Krishnamoorthy (ed.) (1954b). *Nānārthamanjarī of Rāghava*. Sources of Indo-Aryan Lexicography 9, Poona: Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute.
- Shastri, Sitaram (1992). *Prauḍhamanoramā of Mahāmahopādhyāya Śrī Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita. Together with Brhachchhabdaratna an unpublished commentary of Mahāmahopādhyāya Śrī Hari Dīkṣita and Laghuśabdaratna of Mahāmahopādhyāya Śrī Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa* (Vol. 2). Banaras: Banaras Hindu University.
- Shen, Yiming (2018). 'Fundamentals for the study of the *Kātantra*'. *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā* 34, pp. 57–86.
- Śilaskandha and Ratna Gopāla Bhaṭṭa (eds.) (1911). *Viśvaprakāśa by Śrī Mahēśvara*. Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series 160 and 168, Benares: Chowkhambā Sanskrit Book-Depot, 1st edition.
- Śivadatta (ed.) (1929). *The Nāmalingānuśāsana (Amarakośha) of Amarasimha with the commentary (Vyākhyāsudhā or Ramāśramī) of Bhānuji Dīkṣit (son of the grammarian Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣit)*. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgar Press, 5th edition revised by Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇṣīkar edition.
- Somesvara Sarma, Appalla (ed.) (1951). *Nipatavyayopasargavritti of Tilaka*. Tirupati: Tirumala-Tirupati Devasthanams Press.
- Stcherbatsky, F.Th. (1930). *Buddhist Logic, volume 2*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk sssr.
- Stenzler, Adolf Friedrich (1874). *Meghadūta: der Wolkenbote gedicht von Kālidāsa*. Breslau: Max Mälzer's Hofbuchhandlung, 1st edition.
- Sītārāmaśāstrin (ed.) (1960). *Brhat-Śabdenduśekhara*. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya. Three volumes.
- Vergiani, Vincenzo (2005). 'Dealing with conflicting views within the Pāṇinian tradition: on the derivation of *tyādṛś* etc.' In Federico Squarcini (ed.), *Boundaries, dynamics and constructions of traditions in South Asia*, Firenze: Firenze University Press, pp. 411–433.

- Vogel, Claus (2015). *Indian lexicography. Revised and enlarged edition*. München: P. Kirchheim. Edited by Jürgen Hanneder and Martin Strauber.
- Zachariae, Theodor (1893). *Der Anekarthasamgraha des Hemachandra mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare des Mahendra. Quellenwerke der Altindischen Lexikographie 1*. Wien: Alfred Hölder.
- Zachariae, Theodor (ed.) (1897). *Atha śrīmaṅkhakośaṣ ṭīkāsārasahitaḥ. Der Maṅkhakośa herausgegeben mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare und drei Indices. Quellenwerke der Altindischen Lexikographie 3*, Wien and Bombay: Alfred Hölder and Education Society's Press.