

Anvayakalikā  
An alaṃkāraśāstric treatise on Sanskrit  
syntax from Kashmir

Yiming Shen  
University of Oxford

ABSTRACT

xxx

KEYWORDS

*Anvayakalikā*, the Samanvaya School of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit grammar (*apāṇinīya vyākaraṇa*), xxx

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1	The structure of this book . . . . .	7
1.2	Literature review . . . . .	7
1.3	The Anvayakalikā . . . . .	7
1.3.1	Title . . . . .	7
1.3.2	Author . . . . .	7
1.3.3	Place . . . . .	7
1.3.4	Date . . . . .	7
1.3.5	Style . . . . .	9
1.3.6	Synopsis/overview of the content/teachings of the AnK . . . . .	9
1.3.7	Sources of the AnK's teachings . . . . .	9
1.3.8	The AnK and the 'Samanvaya' school . . . . .	9
1.4	MSS used . . . . .	9
1.5	Conventions . . . . .	10
<b>2</b>	<b>A critical edition of the Anvayakalikā with notes</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1	Manuscripts . . . . .	15
2.1.1	Existent information on the AnK MSS . . . . .	15
2.1.2	The AnK MSS used for the present edition . . . . .	15
2.2	Conventions . . . . .	18
2.2.1	Apparatuses . . . . .	19
2.2.2	Symbols . . . . .	20
2.3	An overview of the content of the Anvayakalikā . . . . .	22
2.4	Edition . . . . .	27
2.5	Endnotes . . . . .	69
<b>3</b>	<b>Appendices and Indices</b>	<b>105</b>
3.1	Appendix 1. A clean reading text of the Anvayakalikā . . . . .	105
3.2	Appendix 2. Manuscript facsimile and transcription . . . . .	106
3.3	Appendix 3. Traced quotations in the Anvayakalikā . . . . .	107

3.4	Appendix 4. Untraced quotations in the Anvayakalikā . .	108
3.5	Appendix 5. A revised version of the SP-SPS with my added headings . . . . .	109
3.6	Index . . . . .	110

# Acknowledgements

The present monograph is a research output of the LINGUINDIC project, funded by the European Research Council (grant agreement no. 851990) and hosted at the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Oxford. I thank James Benson, Harunaga Isaacson, John Lowe, Adriana Molina-Muñoz, xxx for their generous help during the writing of this monograph. I thank the Bodleian Libraries Oxford for granting me access to digital images of a manuscript of the *Anvayakalikā* and allowing me to reproduce them. Ideas in the present monograph have been presented at the Paris conference, the 233rd Meeting of the American Oriental Society, March 2023, Los Angeles, and xxx—I thank the organisers and the audience at these events. Finally, I thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions.



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 The structure of this book

### 1.2 Literature review

### 1.3 The Anvayakalikā

#### 1.3.1 Title

#### 1.3.2 Author

#### 1.3.3 Place

#### 1.3.4 Date

Is Merutuṅga (in his Prabandhacintāmaṇi) a quoter or the author of the vs. «iyaṃ kaṭi mattagajendragāmini ...»? Perhaps a quoter? What consequence/significance does it have for the dating of the AnK? Perhaps no consequence/significance at all?

«tiṣṭhaty ekāṃ niśāṃ candraḥ»: To what extent can we date the AnK on the basis of the date of the Dṛṣṭāntakalikā (c. 1450 AD [Sternbach 1974 HIL4.1: 65<sub>5-6</sub>])? Perhaps this anuṣṭubh pāda presents no significant evidence for the dating of the AnK.

[20260123] Clues for dating the AnK: - The date of the youngest author/work quoted by the AnK acts as a terminus post quem. Which is the youngest author/work quoted by the AnK? Kusumadeva's Dṛṣṭāntakalikā? Assuming that (1) the AnK-quoted pāda «tiṣṭhaty ekāṃ niśāṃ candraḥ» is a part of that very vs. in the Dṛṣṭāntakalikā (DK) (i.e. it is not part of a different vs.), (2) the author of that vs. in the DK is Kusumadeva (KD) (not that e.g. the DK is merely an anthology and KD is only a quoter of

the vss. in the DK and not the author), (3) Sternbach's dating of KD (and his DK), 15th century, is right (what is Sternbach's source for his 15th-century dating?), then a terminus post quem for AnK is, based on that dating of KD, 1400 AD. In terms of presentation, I may write up everything without explicitly assuming anything (i.e. unlike above), and add at the end my remarks about the weaknesses of the arguments/links leading to this terminus post quem of 1400 AD, and how weighty/significant these weaknesses are (these weaknesses correspond to the assumptions I would otherwise have explicitly made). - The date of the oldest AnK MS acts as a terminus ante quem. - All three known AnK MSS are of paper. Does their material namely paper (rather than birchbark) provide any clue for dating the AnK? Perhaps no, no significant clue at all. Cf. 'The older Kashmiri manuscripts were invariably written on birchbark in Śāradā script. Paper has been introduced to Kashmir only relatively late, by King Zain ul Abīdīn (1420–1470 A.D.) but has been in common use for MSS only since the 17th century.' (Witzel 1994 'Kashmiri manuscripts and pronunciation': 6<sub>12-15</sub>) - The language/style of the AnK - Kashmir, alaṃkāraśāstra: When did the production of Skt. works/alaṃkāra works in Kashmir die out? What is the date of the youngest known Skt. work/alaṃkāra work produced in Kashmir? These dates may serve as termini ante quem. Consider e.g. Ratnakaṇṭha (c. 1675 AD), who wrote a comm. on the KPr. - Any work that quotes the AnK? - ...

[20241225] Ways of dating the AnK: - works and authors the AnK quotes: terminus post quem. - works that quote the AnK (perhaps we know of no such work): terminus ante quem. - the dates of the three MSS: terminus ante quem. The years of (the completion of the writing of) Dand Uare explicitly given in these two MSS: D's year is 1846/1847 AD, and O's year is xxx AD. The year of Ois not explicitly given in the manuscript. If Ois a copy of D, then probably Owas completed in 1846/1847 AD or later. (One might also try dating Oon paleographical grounds. Or perhaps even try carbon-dating.) - internal evidence: wording and phrasing of the AnK (e.g. if the AnK uses navyanyāya terms, then it likely post-dates the beginning of navyanyāya; this method may be too ethereal and thus unreliable/difficult though).

### 1.3.5 Style

### 1.3.6 Synopsis/overview of the content/teachings of the AnK

### 1.3.7 Sources of the AnK's teachings

[AnK §3] Some summarising/overviewing/overarching remarks on the presented AnK C3 parallels and related passages: The discussion of yat-tatsambandha 'the relation between the relative pronoun yad and the correlative pronoun tad' such as is found in AnK §3 seems to be originated in VV §2 (in the context of the discussion of/as the second subtype [out of altogether three] of vidheyāvimarśa 'non-consideration of what is taught as the main element', which is in turn the first type [out of altogether five] of śabdānaucitya 'verbal inappropriateness, linguistic flaw', the main theme/subject/topic of VV §2) and then carried on in Kashmir by the KPr, the VVR (which not only comments on VV's yattatsambandha theory but also expounds its own in great detail [see endnotes xx and xx]), as well as the Samanvaya-school treatises SD and SP-SPS. Other Sanskrit works, both within (e.g. Alaṃkārasarvasva?) and without Kashmir (e.g. Sāhityadarpaṇa and Hemacandra's Śabdānuśāsana), have also treated this topic, but its earliest discussions do appear to me to be in the VV. Of the VV, the VVR, the SD, and the SP-SPS, AnK §3 seems to be under the most/greatest influence from the VVR and the SP-SPS (as is clear from endnotes 3A–3G on pp. xx–xx).

### 1.3.8 The AnK and the 'Samanvaya' school

## 1.4 MSS used

☒The upper margin of O f. 1v carries the following obeisance: om̐ namaḥ śivāya ||☒

The manuscripts end thus: ... ☒[D 260r] [D 260v] [D 261r]☒

☒The manuscripts begin as follows:

U 1r1: om̐ namaḥ sarasvatyai || s⟨va⟩hr̥jjanasyānunayena ...

D 254v1: (in the top margin:) om̐ śrīśivo jayati ||

(in the main body:) om̐ namaḥ śivāya || om̐ s⟨va⟩hr̥jjanasyānunayena

...

O 1r1: (in the top margin:) om̐ namaḥ śivāya ||

(in the main body:) om̐ namaḥ śivāya || namo nārāyaṇāya⟨ṃ⟩ || om̐ svahr̥jjanasyānunayena ...

In addition, the top margin of O f. 1r carries the following elements: (1) pencilled in Latin letters and arabic numeral: '4. Anvayakalikā'; (2) beneath

(1), pencilled in Latin letters and arabic numeral: ‘Ser. NO. 19’; (3) to the right of (1), a pencilled Devanāgarī numeral ‘4’; and (4) in the top right corner, a pencilled Arabic numeral ‘1’<sup>1</sup>

## 1.5 Conventions

The *Samanvaya* school of Sanskrit grammar local to Kashmir is unique in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition as a school focusing on the syntax (*samanvaya/anvaya*) of the Sanskrit language. It treats such topics as the relative clause, verbal constructions, agreement, *viśeṣaṇa* ‘qualifier’, and the definition of sentence. The foundational work of this school is Chuḍḍaka’s *Samanvayadiś* (SD) ‘Outline of Syntax’ (possibly c. 1100 AD; from Kashmir), <the oldest known Sanskrit work dedicated to syntax>, surviving only in a single fragmentary manuscript (edition of the extant text in <Slaje 1992 (Hahn 2008b?)>; translation [in German] and study in Hahn 2000; I am currently working on a study of this work with a new edition and an English translation; for more on the SD, see <xxx>). On the basis of the SD, Devaśarman (possibly c. 1300 AD; from Kashmir) composed the metrical *Samanvayapradīpa* (SP) ‘Lamp on Syntax’ together with an auto-commentary the *Samanvayapradīpasamketa* (SPS) ‘Convention<sup>1</sup> of the *Samanvayapradīpa*’, these two works together forming an elaborate Sanskrit syntax treatise (edition, translation [in German], and study of both in Hahn 2008b; for more on the SP and the SPS, see <xxx>). In addition to these three works (namely the SD, the SP, and the SPS), we know of <two> further works that can potentially belong to the *Samanvaya* school but whose texts have not yet been discovered: Devaśarman’s *Samanvayadiksamketa*, apparently a commentary on the SD, and Devaśarman’s *Liṅgānuśāsanaṭīkā*, apparently a commentary on a certain *liṅgānuśāsana* ‘instruction on gender’—both works are referred to <as his own by Devaśarman in his SPS (Slaje 1992: 108 [§2.3–2.4])>.

The sole available SD manuscript as well as one (namely Ś<sub>2</sub>) among the four SP-SPS manuscripts used in Hahn 2008b were acquired by M.A. Stein in Kashmir in 1894. Among the many Sanskrit manuscripts acquired by Stein in Kashmir, there is one carrying a text with the title *Anvayakalikā* ‘Bud of Syntax’ (<kalikā in a work title: Appayyadīkṣita’s Śivamahimakalikāstuti; Jayantabhaṭṭa’s Nyāyakalikā (on Jayantabhaṭṭa’s Nyāyakalikā, see e.g. Graheli 2015 History and transmission of NM: 12 paragraphs 2–3<sup>2</sup>; cf. Jayanta’s Nyāya-mañjarī, and also his possibly lost

<sup>1</sup>I do not know what *saṃketa* in the title exactly denotes; ‘convention’ is a very tentative translation.

Nyāya-pallava (thus apparently a nyāya trilogy of Jayanta)); Rasakalikā of Rudrabhaṭṭa (I have PDFs of this work); Pradīpakalikā of Bhīma: "HShastri V6 vyakarana kosa chandas alamkara, 1931(1) Catalogue Asiatic Society of Bengal, with a detailed preface on these 4 sastras, bookmarked.pdf", p. 78, entry 4361.; Kusumadeva's Dṛṣṭāntakalikā 'dṛṣṭāntabuds' (pāda c of the final vs., vs. 100, of the Dṛṣṭāntakalikā ("Durgaprasada-Parab P14 1938(2) Kavyamala anthology gucchaka, Drstantakalika of Kusumadeva Ardhanarisvarastotra Srngarakalikatrisati etc.pdf", p. 86) explicitly cites the work's title as «dṛṣṭāntakalikā».); Kāmarāja's Śṛṅgāarakalikā (The title «śṛṅgāarakalikā» occurs in pāda d of all three concluding vss. of the three śatakas (one concluding vs. per śataka) ("Durgaprasada-Parab P14 1938(2) Kavyamala anthology gucchaka, Drstantakalika of Kusumadeva Ardhanarisvarastotra Srngarakalikatrisati etc.pdf", pp. 95, 104, and 112).) ›) (AnK). This paper manuscript, consisting of four folios, written in the *Śāradā* script, and presently housed in the Bodleian Libraries, Oxford, is «according to the NCC (xxx) the single known manuscript of the Anvayakalikā», a work that has never been edited, translated, or studied. Given the Kashmiri provenance of the manuscript and the word *anvaya* in the title, the AnK can potentially be a further member of the *Samanvaya* school. Slaje was the first to mention such a possibility (Slaje 1992: 108):

‘The question whether also the anonymous Anvayakalikā, likewise acquired by M.A. Stein in Kashmir and on the ground of its title <possibly belonging to/suspicious in> this context, represents a part of this “Samanvaya tradition” must, until a closer investigation of this manuscript [is carried out], still remain open.’<sup>1</sup>

«Slaje (and Hahn) have mentioned the Anvayakalikā and wondered whether it belongs to the Samanvaya School.» «Hahn 2008b talks about the AnK in: p. 202 fn. (P6); p. 221 fn. 1; p. 24 §1.2.6 par. 2; p. 24, fn. 5 (with MS information); p. 25, fn. 1 (e.g.: 'Eine eingehendere Untersuchung dieses Textes könnte unter Umständen die Frage beantworten, ob die Anvayakalikā gar von Devaśarman selbst (oder einem seiner Schüler?) stammt.');

<sup>1</sup>This is my English translation. The original, in German, is: ‘Die Frage, ob auch die anonyme, ebenfalls von M.A. Stein in Kaschmir erworbene und aufgrund ihres Titels in diesem Zusammenhang verdächtige Anvayakalikā einen Teil dieser ‚Samanvaya-Tradition‘ repräsentiert, muß bis zu einer genaueren Untersuchung dieser Handschrift noch offen bleiben.’ Note that in the German original the title of our work is misspelt as Anvayakālikā; in my English translation I have corrected it to Anvayakalikā.

Appendix 5, fnn. 2, 4 and 5; Appendix 3, fn. 1.›

The present article is the fruit of my attempts at ‘a closer investigation of this manuscript’. It offers an edition of the AnK and cast first light on its content and sources, while hunting for first traces of an answer to the question whether the AnK belongs to the Samanvaya school of Sanskrit grammar. [The structure of the present article] In what follows, I first present my edition of the AnK on the basis of the single available manuscript (§2); then, in the conclusion section (§3), I give a few preliminary remarks on the AnK; finally, in the appendix, I present reproductions of the sole available AnK manuscript plus a bare transcription of the manuscript text. Due to space limit, a translation and a study of the AnK cannot be included in the present article; these I plan to publish in future articles. ‹The present article will add to our understanding of a non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit grammatical treatise on syntax in particular, and, in general, the history of linguistic thoughts in India.› ‹not first and foremost belonging to vyākaraṇa› ‹By way of conclusion, I wish I could, with my research, make contributions to bettering our understanding of the history of linguistic ideas in India, in particular the non-Pāṇinian schools of grammar and the linguistic teachings in works in other branches of indigenous learning than vyākaraṇa. Indeed, we should not forget the fact that the learned in India talked about language not just in the works of vyākaraṇa, but also in works in other śāstras such as the alaṃkāraśāstra, nyāya, and mīmāṃsā.›

A note—perhaps in the introduction—on the *viśeṣaṇa* and *viśeṣya*’s being on the *śabda* or *artha* level: *artha*-level *viśeṣaṇas* and *viśeṣyas* seem to be common: e.g. VK 2d «*tiṅarthas tu viśeṣaṇam.*» clearly says that *viśeṣaṇa* is *artha*. Perhaps in philosophy of language or more broadly just philosophy *artha*-level *viśeṣaṇas* and *viśeṣyas* are common, and in technical grammar *śabda*-level *viśeṣaṇas* and *viśeṣyas* are common.

**FROM THE EARLIER ‘CONCLUSION: PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE CONTENT OF THE ANVAYAKALIKĀ’:**

⟨For paratextual information of the AnK, one goes to its opening verse, concluding verses, and the colophon (and anywhere else?).⟩

☒ The AnK ends with two concluding verses:

*evam kaviḥ kāvyagatiṃ vicārya kāvyam samādhāya mano  
nirundhyāt. /  
vicitraśabdārthamayaṃ suriti pratīyamānārthamanoharam ca //  
kurvan kaviḥ kāvyam upaiti kīrtiṃ śaratprasannendumarīcisubhrām. /  
kīrtiṃ ca gīrvāṇapurīnivāsanimittam ādyaṃ munayo vadanti. //*  
‘After considering in this manner the course (*gati*) of *kāvya*  
⟨[and] then composing *kāvya* (*kāvyaṃ samādhāya*)⟩, a poet  
should contain [his] mind (perhaps i.e. close his mind to the  
outside world and focus on composing *kāvya*). Composing  
*kāvya* [which] ⟨consists of⟩ wondrous sound and meaning,  
has good style, and [is] lovely due to [its] ⟨easily comprehen-  
sible (lit. being comprehended) (cf. *pratīyamāna* in the DhĀ  
vs. quoted in the AnK (*pratīyamānaṃ punar anyad eva vastv  
asti vāṇīṣu mahākavīnām /*)⟩ meaning, a poet acquires (lit.  
approaches) fame as bright as the rays of a clear autumnal  
moon (lit. a clear moon in autumn). And the sages call fame  
the foremost cause of the residence in the city of gods (i.e.  
heaven).’

☒

⟨ These two concluding verses talk about how a poet should compose *kāvya*, qualities of good *kāvya*, and the fruit a poet obtains by writing good *kāvya*. They reveal that the AnK is first and foremost a work in the *alaṃkāraśāstra* and its syntactic teachings are primarily directed at poets to enable them to compose better *kāvya*. We thus have before us an *alaṃkāraśāstra* work focusing not on such themes as the soul of poetry, the *guṇa* and *doṣa* of poetry, but on the syntax of the Sanskrit language. It is well-known that many *alaṃkāraśāstra* works (e.g. the *Kāvyaṃ prakāśa* and the *Vyaktiviveka*) do give instructions on grammar—above all, syntax—but an *alaṃkāraśāstra* work focusing on or dedicated to syntax seems to be rare. ⟩

⟨The AnK is an *alaṃkāra* text, quoting many *kāvya* works, perhaps close to the SD, SP, SPS and the *Vyaktiviveka* plus Ruyyaka’s commentary (the SD author also seems to be familiar with the *Vyaktiviveka* plus Ruyyaka’s commentary), belonging or not belonging to the Samanvaya School, xxx.⟩ ⟨The AnK occupies a middle ground between *alaṃkāraśāstra* and *vyākaraṇa*. The AnK straddles the two fields of *alaṃkāraśāstra*

and vyākaraṇa.>

☒ Our AnK manuscript has the following colophon:

*oṃ śrīr anvayakalikā pūrṇā citritā kaulagaṇeṣeneti.*

‘<Oṃ.>. <Śrī.> The *Anvayakalikā* has been completely (lit. complete) <portrayed (*citrita*)> by Kaulagaṇeṣa<(iti?)>.’

☒

<*kaulagaṇeṣa* seems to be a person name. I have not found anything in the NCC on *kaulagaṇeṣa*. Is Kaulagaṇeṣa the author of the AnK, or is he the scribe of our manuscript? This hinges on the meaning of the word *citrita*, which I cannot pinpoint despite checking around. On this matter I may turn to the audience for help: Have you ever met the word *citrita* in a colophon? Do you have an idea what this word denotes? I would very much appreciate any suggestions on this matter.>

**ITI**

## Chapter 2

# A critical edition of the Anvayakalikā with notes

### 2.1 Manuscripts

#### 2.1.1 Existent information on the AnK MSS

What information on the AnK MSS exists? NCC, the catalogues mentioned therein, IGNCA catalogue (not mentioned in the NCC), etc.

[20240804] [AnK-/AnK-MS -related information in the NCC/What the NCC says about the AnK/the AnK MSS:] On the AnK MSS (and also anything related to the AnK) the NCC provides only (check and confirm) the following information (NCC1: 241a, s.v. 'Anvayakalikā'):

अन्वयकलिका    Damodar. Ujjain II. p. 93.  
—gr. IIO. Stein 4.

'Damodar' refers to that list ..., which contains only titles of works and no MS information. 'Ujjain II. p. 93' refers to the MS designated here as 'U'. 'IIO. Stein 4' refers to the MS designated here as 'O'. Thus, the NCC records altogether two MSS of the AnK.

#### 2.1.2 The AnK MSS used for the present edition

Altogether three MSS, which constitute all the known AnK MSS, are used for the present edition: O- from Oxford (hence the siglum 'O') DUCurrent default order in the apparatus of variants: U→D→O (this will perhaps change at a later point, when the relative chronology of these three MSS can be established (if this is possible at all), to the chronological order). [20240501] Overall, where there are variants, Dand O's readings tend to

agree and U's readings tend to differ from the readings of Dand O, often/in several cases providing better readings not found in either Dor O. In a stemma codicum, thus, Dand O should be in one branch (it is possible that of Dand O, one is an apograph of the other) and U in the other branch. [20240430] It seems to me that of Dand O (old and obsolete siglum A), one may be an apograph of the other, or at least both descend from a common source (or in other words these two MSS are cognate), since both share some unique and striking mistakes (e.g. D258v «kevalasyopādāne kalpitam | karmādiviṣayapuktāt tu viṣayābhyāṃ dvaividhyam» (this is identical—even the daṇḍa after «kalpitam»—with the reading in O); D259r «(nayā) evam(ādīnām)» (for idam°); pratimānā° for pratiyamānā° in D folio 259v<sub>5</sub>; for other cases, see my label shared striking mistakes in Dand O ) that could hardly emerge otherwise. [20260202] None of the three AnK MSS contains any marginal exegetical note.

[20240501] All variants in the three MSS have been recorded in the apparatus, except that: [20240914] In other words, based on/starting from the edition one can safely and confidently reconstruct the AnK text in each of the three manuscript, not taking into consideration the details of sandhi, punctuation, or spelling (in these aspects the reconstructed text is emic, in all other aspects etc). [sandhi: (this section already includes all cases of spelling/orthography?)] - All parasavarṇa (ñ/ñ̄/ṅ/n/m) and anusvāra (ṁ) variations/alternations have been standardised to anusvāra (ṁ). / Alternations in the MSS between parasavarṇa and anusvāra are not reported and are in my established text standardised to anusvāra. / Alternating anusvāra (ṁ) and parasavarṇas (ñ/ñ̄/ṅ/n/m) are all standardised to anusvāra (ṁ). / All parasavarṇas that can alternate with anusvāra/that is optional to anusvāra are standardised to anusvāra. / Any parasavarṇa in the MSS that can alternatively be an anusvāra appears/is given as an anusvāra in my edition, that change being not reported in the apparatuses. / Any parasavarṇa in a MS that alternates with anusvāra is standardised to anusvāra. / [The following one is the best?:] Any parasavarṇa in a MS that alternates with/can optionally be an anusvāra is standardised to anusvāra and this is not reported in the apparatuses. - All -s/-ś/-ṣ and -ḥ variations/alternations have been standardised to -ḥ. - jihvāmūliyas (ḥ) and upadhmanīyas (ḥ) have been standardised to visarga (ḥ). - Any optionally geminated letter in a MS is silently removed (e.g. caittraḥ (U2r12 and D255r16) → caitraḥ). / All optional geminations have been removed. / Any optional gemination in a MS is removed and is not reported in the apparatuses. - sandhi is applied wherever it is not. ... [punctuation:] - Punctuation marks in the MSS (e.g. daṇḍa, double daṇḍa, and avagraha), whether shared by all three MSS or found only in one or two of the MSS,

are not reported in the apparatuses and are not reflected in the edition (all punctuation marks in the edition are my own). ([perhaps as a fn.:] Some Bfootnotes do include punctuation marks in the MSS (mostly *daṇḍa* I guess) (e.g. fn. 2.1.2 on p. 17 and fn. 2.1.2 on p. 17)—those punctuation marks are reported there not for their own sake but only because they form a part of a literal string of a MS that I wish to report (e.g. a *daṇḍa* between two words.) All punctuation marks in all the three MSS are however recorded as-is/accurately in my transcription of the three manuscripts in the appendix. - Purely *daṇḍa*-related corrections etc. (there are several of them in O) do not appear in my edition but appear in my transcription in the appendix.

## 2.2 Conventions

Editorial changes: My own punctuation Standardised sandhi/my own sandhi avagraha ' added My own paragraphing and sectioning

In any Sanskrit text in the present work (unless otherwise stated): all punctuation marks are mine; all sandhis are mine; all spacing is mine.

Paragraphing and sectioning are my own/mine.

sandhi is not applied at the left and right boundaries of an example, or a nyāya, or a pratīka (so as to show the exact initial and final sounds) (the non-application/absence of sandhi in these cases serves as a sort of punctuation/signal).

The punctuation marks in the main text are my own/mine (i.e. the editor's/editorial)./The punctuations in any Sanskrit text are all mine. (In the main text,) I use altogether 10 punctuation marks: (1) comma , (2) full stop . (3) exclamation mark ! (for all (?) vocatives and some imperatives) (4) question mark ? (for all questions) (5) semicolon ; (for some parallel structures) (note that I do not use colon : , for fear of confusion with visarga (is this fear justified?—IAST doesn't have visarga and hence there is no risk of confusion between colon and visarga); any function of colon is performed by em dash) (6) em dash — (7) “ single quotation mark (note that the avagraha symbol ' is not the same as the right single quotation mark ') (8) double quotation mark "" (does there really exist any instance of (8)?) (9) single daṇḍa | and (10) double daṇḍa ||. Among these, (1)–(8) are 'syntactic punctuation marks', whereas (9)–(10) are 'metrical/prosodic punctuation marks'. In prose only (1)–(8) are used; in verse all punctuation marks (1)–(10) are used, (1)–(8) for marking syntactic units, and (9)–(10) for marking metrical/prosodic units (pāda B is marked with |, d with ||, while pādas A and C are unmarked).

Any avagraha is explicitly marked with '.

All avagraha symbols are mine.

An ellipsis ... stands for abbreviated elements (elements I deem relevant but too long and thus worthy of/fit for abbreviation).

An ellipsis with square brackets [...] stands for omitted elements (elements I deem irrelevant). A bare [...] indicates what follows it is in the middle of a sentence; followed by a full stop [...]. indicates what follows it is the beginning of a sentence. (Note that the length of the elements omitted with [...] is unrestricted: it can be one sentence, a part thereof, or more than one sentence. So in cases like , [...]. and . [...]. what is omitted is not necessarily just one sentence or a part of it.)

## TYPESETTING

Verses or parts thereof/Metrical elements are set indented/set with deep indentation (and bigger line space with surrounding lines).

nyāyas and paribhāṣās are set italic.

Examples are set in a distinct sans serif font.

pratikas are set in a distinct typewriter-styled (monospace?) font.

In an example, where possible/applicable, I embolden the elements which I regard as the point in question.

bold font: In an example vs. often only one or a small number of words (such as the relative and correlative pronouns yad and tad or the particle ca) is the point, the rest being irrelevant to the issue in question. It will thus be helpful if the relevant elements could be highlighted. With this in mind, in my text I have emboldened any element which I think is the point in question.

Line numbers are set in subscript following page numbers (e.g. p. 1<sub>5</sub> denotes 'page 1 line 5').

Where the volume number is relevant, 'volume a page b line c' is abbreviated to a.b<sub>c</sub>. For example, 1.23<sub>4</sub>–56<sub>7</sub> denotes 'volume 1, page 23 line 4 to page 56 line 7'.

An asterisk preceding line numbers indicates that the line numbers are counted from the bottom up. For example, 'll. \*6–7' means lines 6–7 from the bottom.

Verse quarters (pāda) are identified using A, B, C, D, and so on, set in small capitals. For example, 1.1A denotes 'verse 1.1 pāda A'.

### 2.2.1 Apparatuses

There are three apparatuses: (A) sources and parallels, (B) variants, and (C) miscellany.

(A) (footnote mark: lower-case/small Roman numerals).

- [20250610] Afootnotes consist of two types of elements: sources and parallels. With regard to the sources, for a given verse/passage I present only its root/oldest known source plus one or more of the following five works, if that verse/passage is quoted there: the KM, the VV-VVR, the ŚP, the SD, and the SP-SPS (these are the works that have exerted the greatest influence on the AnK). For example, Kumārasaṃbhava 5.71 «dvayaṃ gataṃ saṃprati śocanīyatāṃ ...» is quoted in many works (e.g. the KPr, the Sāhityadarpaṇa, the Vakroktijīvita, the VV, the ŚP, and the SPS). It is quoted twice in the AnK, once in its entirety (fn. i on p. 29), and the other time only its pāda c (fn. i on p. 57). In both Afootnotes I present only its root source, i.e. Kumārasaṃbhava 5.71, together with its quotations in the

VV, the ŚP, and the SPS. With regard to the parallels, I include only those passages which are parallel in both meaning and wording—passages that are parallel/similar/relevant only in meaning but not in wording are not included.

- (A) includes many parallels from the Bh, VV-VVR, the SD, and the SP-SPS. Translations, paraphrases, and/or explanations of the passages from the VV and (often but not always?) the VVR can be found in "Chakravorty 1975(1) Studies in Mahimabhattacha, English paraphrase-translation of Vyaktiviveka C1, bookmarked.pdf" (for C1) and "TJha 1987(1) An elucidation of poetic blemishes in Vyaktiviveka, MIS3.8, PhD thesis Bihar, main.pdf" (for C2); those from the SD, in Hahn 2000 (and my forthcoming SD monograph); those from the SP-SPS, in Hahn 2008b. Some/many/most of the Bh passages are translated and explained in Joshi and Roodbergen's Bhāṣya series (19xx–19xx). [in the bibliography: add all Joshi-Roodbergen's Bhāṣya volumes?] For passages in (A) quoted from the above-mentioned works I won't reference the translations, paraphrases, and/or explanations individually. The global statements here already suffice. For passages in (A) quoted from works other than those mentioned above, I try my best to reference the existing translations, paraphrases, and/or explanations.

(B) (footnote mark: Arabic numerals) is a positive apparatus. My policy of reporting variants. - The MS readings reported in the Bfootnote-s (i.e. the variant footnotes) are all literal (i.e. they are the exact readings found in the MSS), unless otherwise indicated. The punctuation marks (and avagrahas?) in the constituted text, which are all mine, are omitted/not given in the Bfootnote-s.

(C) (footnote mark: symbols/shapes) occurs rarely and most of the times reports/gives para-elements/para-information in the MSS.

## 2.2.2 Symbols

☒

⟨ ⟩ enclose *akṣaras* or part of *akṣaras* whose reading is uncertain.

?? stands for one illegible *akṣara*.

· stands for part of an *akṣara* that is illegible.

☒

A pair of daggers † (the so-called *cruces desperationis*) enclose text passages that are difficult textually (textually, not in terms of its meaning/semantically/philosophically)/that I find difficult to constitute/the reading

of which I am quite uncertain about and can't find a satisfying solution/passages for whose text I cannot find a satisfying solution/passages the constituted text of which I am uncertain and unsatisfied about and yet cannot find a better solution for.

## 2.3 An overview of the content of the Anvayakalikā

Or: Synopsis of the teachings of the AnK

The present subsection is essentially perhaps just a collection of the headings (the concise form (given in the text below), the expanded form, English translation, etc.) (perhaps followed by a prose narrative based on the headings telling the reader what the Anvayakalikā teaches in each section).

☒ §1 <viśeṣaṇa>

<Alternatives: viśeṣaṇa and viśeṣya; viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāva.>

§1.1 antaraṅga viśeṣaṇa

§1.2 bahiraṅga viśeṣaṇa

§1.2.1 sādhyā-samānādhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa

sādhyasya samānādhikaraṇaṃ viśeṣaṇam (= adverb< (kriyāviśeṣaṇa)/its denotatum>)

‘a viśeṣaṇa [that] qualifies a sādhyā [and is] samānādhikaraṇa [to it]’

§1.2.2 sādhyā-vyadhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa

sādhyasya vyadhikaraṇaṃ viśeṣaṇam (<≠/≈ kāraka/kāraka word>)

‘a viśeṣaṇa [that] qualifies a sādhyā [and is] vyadhikaraṇa [to it]’

§1.2.3 nāma-samānādhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa

nāmaṇ samānādhikaraṇaṃ viśeṣaṇam (= attribute</its denotatum>)

‘a viśeṣaṇa [that] qualifies a nāman [and is] samānādhikaraṇa [to it]’

§1.2.3.1 dharma (= adjective</its denotatum> [cf. guṇavacana and jahallīṅga])

§1.2.3.2 dharmin (= noun in apposition</its denotatum> [cf. ajahallīṅga])

§2 <vākya’s abhidhāvyāpāra>

§2.1 puṣṭa

§2.1.1 śākta

§2.1.2 vaibhaktika

§2.1.3 śaktivibhaktimaya

§2.2 apuṣṭa

§2.3 duṣṭa

☒

☒

viśeṣaṇa antaraṅga viśeṣaṇa (avyavahita; e.g. ca) bahiraṅga viśeṣaṇa (flexible in position; 4 types)

☒

Prose narrative of the AnK’s teachings:

§1.0

The AnK first gives a rather neutral opening vs. At the beginning the definition of vākya is given, a definition that appears to be not an uncommon one. The next sentence, one of the longest, says that of sādhana and sādhyā sādhana is viśeṣaṇa (and sādhyā is viśeṣya). Then viśeṣaṇa is divided in two classes, antaraṅga viśeṣaṇa (those viśeṣaṇas that must immediately follow/precede its viśeṣya) and bahiraṅga viśeṣaṇa (those viśeṣaṇas for which there is no restriction about their position in the sentence/with regard to their viśeṣyas). viśeṣaṇa is of two types: antaraṅga viśeṣaṇa and bahiraṅga viśeṣaṇa.

#### §1.1

antaraṅga viśeṣaṇa is discussed. The ca in Kumārasaṃbhava 5.70D is criticised as a fault (doṣa), since it does not immediately follow its viśeṣya (i.e. «tvam»).

#### §1.2.0

bahiraṅga viśeṣaṇa is divided in four classes, depending on whether the viśeṣya is a sādhyā or nāman and whether the viśeṣaṇa is samānādhikaraṇa or vyadhikaraṇa with its viśeṣya.

#### §1.2.1

sādhyā-samānādhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇas, which are none other than kriyāviśeṣaṇas or adverbs (or their denotatum). These are in the acc. and nt. (and sg.—the sg. number is not taught here in the AnK, only the case and the gender).

- ☒ §3 *yattatsaṃbandha*
- §3.1 *puṣṭa*
- §3.1.1 *śābda* (2 types)
- §3.1.2 *ārtha* (5 types)
- §3.1.2.1 *tad* only (3 types)
- §3.1.2.1.1 *prasiddhaviṣaya*
- §3.1.2.1.2 *prakrāntaviṣaya*
- §3.1.2.1.3 *anubhūtaviṣaya*
- §3.1.2.1.4 *doṣa* 1
- §3.1.2.1.5 *doṣa* 2
- Excursus
- §3.1.2.1.6 *doṣa* 3
- §3.1.2.1.7 *doṣa* 4
- §3.1.2.2 *yad* only (2 types)
- §3.1.2.2.1 *kalpitatatkārmādiviṣaya*
- §3.1.2.2.2 *prakrāntaviṣaya*
- §3.1.2.2.3 *doṣa* 1
- §3.1.2.2.4 *doṣa* 2
- Exceptions
- §3.1.3 *atha* and *ced*
- §3.2 *duṣṭa*
- §3.3 *apuṣṭa*
- §3.3.1 *doṣa* 1
- Exception
- §3.4 Two concluding verses
- ☒

☒ The third chapter of the AnK discusses *yattatsaṃbandha* ‘the relation between the relative pronoun *yad* and the correlative pronoun *tad*’. This relation is divided into three types: *puṣṭa* ‘well-developed, good (lit. nourished)’, *apuṣṭa* ‘not well-developed, middling, neither good nor bad (lit. not nourished)’, and *duṣṭa* ‘faulty, flawed, bad’ (§3). The AnK first discusses *puṣṭa*,<sup>1</sup> which it divides into two further types: *śābda* ‘verbal’ and *ārtha* ‘semantic’<sup>2</sup> (§3.1). *śābda* comprises cases where both the relative

<sup>1</sup>I interpret the word *saṃbandha* in §3.1 as referring to the *puṣṭa* type of *yattatsaṃbandha*.

<sup>2</sup>Note that the *śābda-ārtha* typology/distinction is not unique to the subject of *yattatsaṃbandha*: it is also applied to e.g. *sādhya-sādhanabhāva* ‘the relation between *sādhya* and *sādhana*’ (VV under 1.20 [p. 8<sup>7-8</sup>]: «[...] *yanmūlo* ‘yam

pronoun *yad* and the correlative pronoun *tad* are used<sup>1</sup> and is, based on the order of *yad* and *tad* being used, of two types: either *yad* being used first and then *tad*, or the other way round (§3.1.1). *ārtha* comprises cases where only the correlative pronoun *tad* or only the relative pronoun *yad* is used<sup>2</sup> and is of five types (§3.1.2). Among these five, three are for cases where only *tad* is used: *prasiddhaviṣaya* ‘where the/whose subject is well known’, *prakrāntaviṣaya* ‘where the/whose subject has [already] been taken up’, and *anubhūtaṣaya* ‘where the/whose subject is experienced (e.g. as if before one’s eyes)’<sup>3</sup> (§3.1.2.1), each of which is illustrated with an example (§§3.1.2.1.1–3). The AnK then teaches, for cases where only *tad* is used, four *doṣas* or cases of bad usage (§§3.1.2.1.4–7), embarking on an excursus in its discussion of the second *doṣa* (§3.1.2.1.5). Having now completed its teaching of the three types of *tad*-only *ārtha*, the AnK proceeds to discuss *yad*-only *ārtha* or cases where only the relative pronoun *yad* is used, of which it teaches two types: *kalpitatatkar-mādiviṣaya* ‘xxx’ and *prakrāntaviṣaya* ‘where the subject has [already] been taken up’<sup>4</sup> (§3.1.2.2), each of which is illustrated with an example (§§3.1.2.2.1–2). Now that all five types of *ārtha* have been presented, the AnK gives the reader a small reminder that these are all within the domain of *puṣṭa* (*ārthaḥ pañcavidhaḥ puṣṭa eva* in §3.1.2.2.2). After this reminder, the AnK proceeds to teach two *doṣas* or cases of bad usage, the first one involving only *yad*, while the second one involves both *yad* and *tad*<sup>5</sup> (§§3.1.2.2.3–4),<sup>6</sup> before concluding the present *puṣṭa* section (§3.1) with the instruction that the teachings for *yad* and *tad* given up to this

---

anayoḥ sādhyasādhanabhāvaḥ. sa hi dvididhaḥ— śābdaś cārthaś ceti») and *nāmārtha* ‘the meaning of nouns’ (VV 1.80AB [p. 31]: śābdatvārthatvabhedena nāmārtho ‘pi dvidhā mataḥ. |).

<sup>1</sup>⟨Why the name «śābda»? Perhaps cite VVR’s explanation.⟩

<sup>2</sup>⟨Why the name «ārtha»? Perhaps cite VVR’s explanation.⟩

<sup>3</sup>⟨Perhaps a footnote on how to exactly understand these three terms (e.g. what kinds of compound they are and what *vigraha* they have).⟩

<sup>4</sup>⟨Perhaps a footnote on how to exactly understand the term «kalpitatatkar-mādiviṣaya». (The term «prakrāntaviṣaya» has already been explained in an earlier footnote.) Note that *prakrāntaviṣaya* also features in *tad*-only *ārtha*, being its second type.⟩

<sup>5</sup>⟨§§3.1.2.2.3–4, namely the two *doṣas* under *yad*-only, should, parallel to the three *doṣas* under *tad*-only (§§3.1.2.1.4–6), concern cases where only *yad* is used. This is however not the case, with §3.1.2.2.4 involving *tad* alongside *yad*. One may justify the inclusion of the second *doṣa* (§3.1.2.2.4) by arguing that the example’s <d> «yāni tāni» is to be understood/interpreted as one unit (rather than relative and correlative pronouns), namely as only a sort of *yad*.⟩

<sup>6</sup>☒See also fn. 4 on p. 26.☒

point also apply to *atha* ‘if’ and *ced* ‘if’<sup>1</sup> (§3.1.3).

At this point ends the discussion of the *puṣṭa* type of *yattatsambandha* (§3.1). The AnK then proceeds to discuss the *duṣṭa* type<sup>2</sup> in a very short section (§3.2) consisting of little more than just two examples.<sup>3</sup> After that, the AnK discusses the final *apuṣṭa* type, which is taught as comprising cases where <idam etc. (namely idam, etad, and adas) are used in place of tad as correlative pronouns (in other words, cases where the relative pronoun yad correlates with idam/adas/etad)> (§3.3). A *doṣa* or case of bad usage is then taught (§3.3.1),<sup>4</sup> which forms the end of the third chapter proper of the AnK.

The AnK finally terminates with two concluding verses (§3.4). ☒

<sup>1</sup>Note that here the AnK does not include the common protasis introducer *yadi* ‘if’ nor the apodosis introducers *tad* ‘then’, *tadā* ‘then’, and *tarhi* ‘then’, which it presumably understands as forms of the relative pronoun *yad* (for *yadi*) and the correlative pronoun *tad* (for *tad*, *tadā*, and *tarhi*) and thus regards as having already been covered in the discussion of *yad* and *tad*.

<sup>2</sup>This order of first teaching *duṣṭa* and then *apuṣṭa* is possibly inspired by VVR’s parallel passage, which says explicitly that it will first discuss *duṣṭa* and it will discuss *apuṣṭa* in the course of the discussion of *duṣṭa*.>

<sup>3</sup>These two examples both involve only ‘if’ and ‘then’ adverbs. We should however not follow the impression thus given and think that the *duṣṭa* type only concerns such adverbs. Instead, the *duṣṭa* type should mainly concern, just like the *puṣṭa* type, the relative and correlative pronouns *yad* and *tad*, and only secondarily the ‘if’ and ‘then’ adverbs. In particular, note that the six *doṣas* already discussed under the *puṣṭa* type (§§3.1.2.1.4–7 and §§3.1.2.2.3–4) and the one *doṣa* to be discussed under the *apuṣṭa* type (§3.3.1) are all to be considered as belonging to/cases of the present *duṣṭa* type. They are just not discussed under the present *duṣṭa* section proper (§3.2) but rather scattered in different places. Essentially the *duṣṭa* type consists of simply *doṣas* or cases of bad usage.>

<sup>4</sup>☒ The teachings of §3.3.1 are parallel to those of §3.1.2.2.4.☒

## 2.4 Edition

U 1r; D 254v; O 1r

<sup>1E1</sup>suhrj<sup>1</sup>janasyānunayena kaś cit  
 prayatnam etaṃ kurute vipaścit |  
 tridhāntarāyendhanadāhakāni  
 smṛtvā<sup>2</sup> gurūṇāṃ caraṇāmbujāni. || 1

§1 <viśeṣaṇa  
 One opening verse>

yogyatākāṅkṣā<sup>3</sup>saṃnidhimatpadakadambakaṃ vākyam.<sup>i</sup> <sup>1E2</sup>tatra nāmākhyā-  
 topasarganipātakarmapravacanīyātmakānām padānām<sup>ii</sup> viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyab-  
 hāvenāvasthāne, viśeṣaṇasya vyavacchedakatvāt<sup>4</sup> sādhyasādhanayor ekatarasyāpi<sup>5</sup>

<sup>i</sup> ≈ <Udayana's Nyāyavārttikatātparyapariśuddhi (p. xxx<sub>xxx</sub>):> **ākāṅkṣāyogyatāsattimatpadakadambakaṃ vākyam.**

Cf. Vidyāvāgīśabhaṭṭācārya's Samāsavinyāsa (apparently never edited), near the very beginning (Mironov 1914: 192<sub>17</sub>; i.o. the printed °yuktaṃ pada° I would conjecture °yuktapada°): vākyam tad ucyate. **ākāṅkṣāyogyatāsaktiyuktaṃ padakadambakaṃ vākyam.**

<sup>ii</sup> Cf. the four-way classification of pada, whose germ is already found in the Ṛgveda (Ṛgveda 1.164.45A (p. 99): catvāri vāk parimitā padāni) and early expositions already found in the Nirukta and the Bhāṣya: Nirukta 1.1 (p. 27<sub>7-8</sub>): tad yāni catvāri padajātāni nāmākhyāte copasarganipātās ca, tānimāni bhavanti. Nirukta 1.12 (p. 36<sub>7</sub>): itimāni catvāri padajātāny anukrāntāni— nāmākhyāte copasarganipātās ca. Nirukta 13.9 (commenting on Ṛgveda 1.164.45; p. 226<sub>1-4</sub>): catvāri vācaḥ parimitāni padāni. [...]. katamāni tāni catvāri padāni? [...]. nāmākhyāte copasarganipātās ceti vaiyākaraṇāḥ. Bhāṣya Paspasāhnikā (commenting on Ṛgveda 4.58.3; 1.3<sub>17</sub>): catvāri śṛṅgāni. catvāri padajātāni— nāmākhyātopasarganipātās ca. Bhāṣya Paspasāhnikā (commenting on Ṛgveda 1.164.45; 1.3<sub>26</sub>): catvāri vāk parimitā padāni. catvāri padajātāni— nāmākhyātopasarganipātās ca.

Vākyapadiya 3.1.1 (quoted below) mentions the existence of a five-way scheme, which the VV and (presumably hence) here the AnK adopt: VV under 1.7 (p. 3<sub>19-20</sub>): dvidhā hi śabdaḥ, padavākyabhedāt. **tatra padam anekaprakāram, nāmākhyātopasarganipātakarmapravacanīyabhedāt.** VV under 1.20 (pp. 6<sub>1-7</sub><sub>1-2</sub>): tad uktam— 'dvidhā kaiś cit padaṃ bhinnam, caturdhā, pañcadhāpi vā | apoddhṛtyaiva vākyebhyaḥ prakṛtipratyayādivat. ||' [Vākyapadiya 3.1.1] iti. VVR thereon (p. 7<sub>12-14</sub>): dvidhā iti. subantatiñantatayā. caturdhā iti. nāmākhyātopasarganipātavena. pañcadhā iti. karmapravacanīyaḥ pañcamo bhedaḥ.

<sup>1</sup>suhrj° em. ] s(va)hrj° UD, svahrj° O <sup>2</sup>smṛtvā UD ] smṛtā O

<sup>3</sup>yogyatākāṅkṣā° UD ] yogitākāṅkhyā° O <sup>4</sup>viśeṣaṇasya vyavacchedakatvāt U ] viśeṣaṇasyāvachchedakatvāt D, viśeṣasyāvachchedakatvāt O

<sup>5</sup>ekatarasyāpi DO ] ekarasyāpi U

viśeṣaṇatvāniyame 'pi, sādhanānām sādhyārtham upāttatvāt<sup>1</sup> salilārtham  
iva dr̥tyādinām yo hi yadartham upādīyate, sa tam prati guṇatām nāti-  
vartate<sup>1</sup> iti <sup>1T1</sup>nyāyād aprādhānye<sup>2</sup>,<sup>ii</sup> sphuṭam eva nilotpalādaḥ nilādivad<sup>3</sup>  
bhedakatvam.

tac cāntaraṅgatayā bahiraṅgatayā ca dvidhā<sup>4</sup>.

§1.1 antaraṅga viśeṣaṇa ādyam avyavahitam evārthakriyākāri lākṣādiva<sup>5</sup> sphaṭikādeḥ<sup>6</sup>. yathā  
cādiḥ. ata eva—

*dvayam gataṃ samprati śocanīyatām  
samāgamaprārthanayā kapālinah— |  
kalā ca sā kāntimatī<sup>7</sup> kalāvaṣṭas,*

U 1v

<sup>i</sup> See the next footnote.

<sup>ii</sup> Cf. VV under 1.6 (pp. 1<sub>23</sub>–2<sub>1</sub>): tathā hy arthasya tāvad upasarjanikṛtātmatvam  
anupādeyam eva, **tasyārthāntarapratītyartham upāttasya tadvyābhicārāb-  
hāvāt. na hy agnyādisiddhau dhūmādir upādīyamāno guṇatām ativar-  
tate**, tasya tanmātralakṣaṇatvāt.

VVR thereon (p. 2<sub>7-9</sub>): na hi ityādinārthāntarapratītyarthopāttasyārthasyopasarjanikṛtātmatva-  
vyābhicārābhāvaṃ nidarśayati. **guṇatām upasarjanatvam.** tasya iti guṇasya.  
tanmātralakṣaṇatvād iti. anyasiddhyartham upādīyamānatvam guṇasya  
lakṣaṇam ity arthaḥ.

Cf. VVR on VV under 1.6 (p. 2<sub>6-7</sub>): tathā hi vācyasyārthasya  
pratiyamānāpekṣayā **aprādhānyam upāyatvād avyābhicāri, 'yo hi  
yadartham upādīyate' ityādyukteḥ.**

Cf. VV under 1.7 (p. 2<sub>18-21</sub>): anyasya tūpasarjanibhāvavyābhicāra eva, **ta-  
sya tadartham upādānataḥ. yo hi yadartham upādīyate, nāsau tam  
evopasarjanī karotīti yuktam vaktum. yathodakādyupādānārtham up-  
ātto ghaṭādis tad evodakādi.** anyathā pradhānetaravyavasthā nīrniban-  
dhanaiva syāt. ata eva ghaṭādir eva pratīnidhīyate, nodakādīty asaṃbhavo  
lakṣaṇadoṣaḥ.

Cf. SP 58CD (p. 204): ktvādyantā tu kriyā tasyā **guṇatām nātivartate.** ||

<sup>1</sup>sādhyārtham upāttatvāt UD ] sādhyartham upāttatvāt O

<sup>2</sup>nyāyād aprādhānye U ] nyāyā ca prādhānye D, nyāyāc ca prādhānye O

<sup>3</sup>nilotpalādaḥ nilādivad U ] nilotpalāda nilādivad D, nilotpalāda nilavad O

<sup>4</sup>tac cāntaraṅgatayā bahiraṅgatayā ca dvidhā U ] tac cāntaraṅgatayā dvididham  
DO

<sup>5</sup>°kāri lākṣādiva U ] °kāri lakṣyādeva D, °kā(ri) lakṣyādeva O

<sup>6</sup>sphaṭikādeḥ DO ] sphuṭikādeḥ U

<sup>7</sup>kāntimatī DO ] kāntivatī U

*tvam asya lokasya ca netrakaumudī<sup>1</sup>. ||<sup>i</sup> 2*  
ity atra casyāsthāne prayogo doṣa ity āhuḥ.

---

<sup>i</sup> Kumārasaṃbhava 5.70 (p. 146).

<sup>1</sup>kaumudī UD ] <sup>2</sup>kaumadī O

§1.2 bahiraṅga viśeṣaṇa dvitīyam ubhayarūpam ayaskāntam iva lohasya<sup>1</sup>. tad dhi<sup>2</sup> vyavahitam api lohe svām śaktim upadadhāty eva. tac ca sādhyānāmnor viśeṣaṇa<sup>3</sup> bhedenā dvidhā sat<sup>4</sup> sāmānā<sup>5</sup> dhikaraṇyavaiyadhikaraṇyabhedāc caturvidham.<sup>1</sup>

§1.2.1 sādhyā- tatra samānā<sup>6</sup> dhikaraṇam<sup>7</sup> sādhyasya viśeṣaṇam<sup>8</sup> yathā— *mṛdu pacati*.  
samānādhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa

<sup>1</sup>Cf. VV under 1.70 and the saṃgrahaśloka 1.76–87 (pp. 30<sub>11</sub>–32<sub>8</sub>): nimit-  
tam ca viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyapratītyor āsubhāvitayā kramānupalakṣaṇāt sahabhā-  
vapratītiḥ. **dvidvidham hi viśeṣaṇam iṣṭam— antaraṅgam bahiraṅgam ceti.**  
**tatrādyam avyavahitam evārthakāri lākṣādivat sphaṭikādeḥ. dvitīyam**  
**ubhayarūpam ayaskāntam iva lohasya. tad dhi vyavahitam api lohe**  
**svām śaktim upadadhāty eva. tad api dvidvidham— samānādhikaraṇam**  
**bhinnādhikaraṇam ceti.**

viśeṣyo 'pi dvidvidhaḥ— dhātvartho nāmārthaś ceti. tatropasargāṇām prāyo  
dhātvartho viśayaḥ, na nāmārthaḥ. cādīnām tu nipātānām ubhayam api. ke-  
valam teṣām viśeṣyāt pūrvaṃ paścāc ca kramaṇa prayogo niyogato 'vagan-  
tavyaḥ, nānyeṣām viśeṣaṇānām.

tad evaṃ viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyasvarūpe 'vasthite yad etad antaraṅgam viśeṣaṇam  
uktam, tad gavādau gotvādivad viśeṣyasvarūpāntarbhūtam iveti tatpratī-  
tyor āsubhāvitayā kramānupalakṣaṇāt sahabhāvāvagama dyotyadyotakabhāv-  
abhramahetuḥ. ata eva ke cid eṣām dhātvantarbhāvam iva manyamānāḥ  
'ādīnām vyavasthārtham pṛthaktvena prakalpanam | dhātūpasargayoḥ śāstre.  
dhātur eva ca tādrśaḥ. ||' ityādy avocan.

**cādīnām copādīnām viśeṣyebhyo nirmalebhyāḥ sphaṭikopalebhya**  
**iva lākṣādīnām avyavadhānam eva.** tena te yadanantaram upādhiyante,  
teṣv eva viśeṣam ādhātum alam, nānyatreṭi yat teṣām bhinnakramatayā kva cid  
upādānam, tad anupapannam eva. ayathāsthānaviniveśino hi te 'rthāntaram  
anabhimatam eva svoparāgeṇoparañjayeyuḥ. tataś ca prastutārthasāsāmañ-  
jasyaprasaṅgaḥ. [...] ||

viśeṣāvagamasyāsubhāvād anupalakṣaṇāt | kramasya sahabhāvitvam bhramo  
bhakter nibandhanam. || 1.76 **viśeṣaṇam tu dvidvidham— āntaram bāhyam**  
**eva ca. | tatrāvvyavahitam sad yad arthakāri\*, tad āntaram || 1.77**  
**sphaṭikasyeva lākṣādi. dvitīyam ubhayātmakam | āyasyeva tatkāntam.**  
**tad api dvidvidham matam, || 1.78 asamānasamānādhikaraṇatvavibhe-**  
**dataḥ. |**

viśeṣyo 'pi dvidhā jñeyo, dhātunāmārthabhedataḥ. || 1.79 śābdatvārthatvab-  
hedena nāmārtho 'pi dvidhā mataḥ. | tatropasargāṇām prāyo dhātvartho viśayo  
mataḥ. || 1.80 cādīnām tu nipātānām ubhayaṃ parikīrtitam. | kevalam tu viśeṣyāt

<sup>1</sup>lohasya UO ] lo??sya (the vowel of the illegible akṣara seems to be i) D

<sup>2</sup>tad dhi DO ] tad vi U

<sup>3</sup>sādhyānāmnor viśeṣaṇa° UD ] sādhyānāmno viśeṣaṇa° O <sup>4</sup>sat DO ] tat U

<sup>5</sup>sāmānā° em. ] sāmānyā° U, samānā° DO <sup>6</sup>samānā° D ] sāmānā° UO

<sup>7</sup>ṇam UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] ṇyam D<sup>ac</sup> <sup>8</sup>viśeṣaṇam DO ] viśeṣaṇam U

D 255r atra sarvadhātūnā<sup>1</sup>m antaraṅgam karma kriyā<sup>1</sup> iti nyāyāt sādhyasya karmatve sati tadviśeṣaṇasyāpi karmatvam. kriyāyās ca liṅgābhāvān<sup>1T2</sup>nāpūṃsakaḥ<sup>2</sup> sāmānyah saṃskārah,

avyaktaliṅgam liṅgānā<sup>3</sup>m<sup>ii</sup> 3

ity uktatvāt<sup>4</sup>.<sup>iii</sup>

syuḥ pūrvaṃ paścāc ca te kramāt. || 1.81 viśeṣaṇānām anyeṣāṃ paurvāparyam ayantritām. |

itthamsthite svarūpe 'smin viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyayoḥ || 1.82 yad antaraṅgam udiṣṭam ubhayātmaviśeṣaṇam, | viśeṣye magnam iva tad gavi gotvam iva sthitam. || 1.83 ata evāśubhāvitvāt tatpratītyoḥ kramāgrahaḥ, | yanmūlās cāyam anayor dyotyadyotakatābhramah. || 1.84 prādinām dhātugarbhatvopagamāc ca yad uktavān | 'aḍādinām vyavasthārtham' ityādi viduṣāṃ varaḥ. || 1.85

**ata eva vyavahitair budhā necchanti cādibhiḥ | saṃbandham.** te hi śaktim svām upadadhur anantare. || 1.86 sāntaratve tu tāṃ śaktim anyatraivādadhahaty amī. | tatas cārthāsamañjasyād anaucityam prasajyate. || 1.87

\*The printed arthakārī in VV 1.77D (p. 31) cannot work and is to be corrected to arthakārī.

<sup>i</sup>A parallel in Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī 1.1 (Liebich 1930: 4 ll. c. 6–8): c. «kriyā hi sarvadhātūnām antaraṅgam karma, ata eva ca kriyāviśeṣaṇānām karmatvam smaranti— śobhanaṃ ghaṭo bhavati.» «For footnoteB: U1v8 reads «antaraṅgam kriyeti»; taking this reading as the point of departure, and based on this parallel, I conjecture «antaraṅgam karma kriyā iti» (i.e. adding «karma»; with this conjecture the present nyāya will function to the effect that any kriyā is a karman, and this fits perfectly with the next bit of the AnK text «iti nyāyāt sādhyasya karmatve sati»). I need to make an endnote explaining this conjecture.»

<sup>ii</sup>Untraced. (This can be an anuṣṭubh odd pāda.)

<sup>iii</sup>Cf. SPS 9D (p. 110<sub>3-6</sub>): **mṛdu pacati ityādau kriyāviśeṣaṇasya sāmānādhikaraṇyāt karmatvam napūṃsakatā ca. yad āhuḥ— 'kriyāyā nirvartyatvena karmatvāt tatsamānādhikaraṇāt\* tadviśeṣaṇānām karmatvam. liṅgābhāvāc ca sāmānyaliṅgena napūṃsakenaiva saṃskārah' [untraced] iti.**

Cf. Kāśikā 2.4.18 (vol. 1 p. 158<sub>5-6</sub>): kriyāviśeṣaṇānām ca klībatesyate. **mṛdu pacati. śobhanaṃ pacati.**

Cf. also the paribhāṣās kriyāviśeṣaṇānām karmatvam napūṃsakaliṅgatā ca (Sīradeva's Brhatparibhāṣāvṛtti 54 [p. 221; with a substantial commentary, in which an occurrence of the example **mṛdu pacati** is found in p. 222<sub>1</sub>] and Haribhāskara's Paribhāṣābhāskara 56 [p. 347; with a substantial commentary, in which an occurrence of the example **mṛdu pacati** is found in line 7]) and kriyāviśeṣaṇānām karmatvam ekatvam klībatvam ca (Nilakanṭhadikṣita's Paribhāṣāvṛtti 134 [p. 315; the commentary rejects this paribhāṣā]).

<sup>1</sup>nā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °nām° O<sup>ac</sup>    <sup>2</sup>nāpūṃsakaḥ UD ] napūṃsakaḥ O

<sup>3</sup>nā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °nām° O<sup>ac</sup>    <sup>4</sup>uktatvāt DO ] u??tvāt U

ata evājñāḥ<sup>1</sup>

sarvaḥ<sup>2</sup> **svārtham** samīhate<sup>3</sup>. ||<sup>i</sup> 4

ity atra svārthaśabdasya samānādhikaraṇatām avicārya bhinnādhikaraṇav-  
iṣeṣaṇabhṛāntyā samīhater akarmakatvād ananvayaṃ<sup>4</sup> jñātvā ‘pratīyate’  
iti pāṭham racayanti.<sup>ii</sup>

ata eva

<sup>1T3</sup>bhrāntaṃ<sup>5</sup> **deśam** anekadurgaviṣamaṃ, prāptaṃ na kiṃ U 2r  
cit<sup>6</sup> phalam.<sup>iii</sup> 5

ity<sup>7</sup>ādau *neha pacyate*<sup>8</sup>, *neha bhujyate* itivat sakarmakāṇām apy<sup>9</sup> akar-

*\*The printed tatsamānādhikaraṇāt clearly cannot work. I would conjecture in its  
place tatsamānādhikaraṇyāt or tatsamānādhikaraṇyāc ca.  
<sup>i</sup>Śiśupālavadha 2.65D (p. 67; i.o. samīhate the edition prints pratīhate, reporting in  
the meantime in fn. 1 that its manuscripts 𑂔 and 𑂕 read samīhate). The whole verse  
runs (p. 67):*

yajatām paṇḍavaḥ! svargam avatv indras! tapatv inah! |  
vayaṃ hanāma dviṣataḥ! sarvaḥ svārtham pratīhate. ||

Besides samīhate and pratīhate there exists also the reading pratīyate, apparently  
popular in Kashmir. Vallabhadeva’s Saṃdehaviṣauśadhi on the present verse re-  
veals that he knew the reading pratīyate (*ibid.*): yasmāt sarvaḥ kaś cit svārtham  
prati ātmoddeśena īhate ceṣṭate. svārtham vā ‘pratīyate’ (iti pāṭhe)[sic] prati-  
padyate ‘nutiṣṭhati. ‘īñ gatāv’ [Dhātupāṭha 4.35 (p. 73\*)] ity asya Daivādikasya  
lakāraḥ. In addition, in the Kritischer Anhang of his Śiśupālavadha translation,  
Hultzsich reports that his Śāradā manuscript of the Śiśupālavadha with the Saṃde-  
haviṣauśadhi reads pratīyate (Hultzsich 1926: 226a<sup>10-11</sup>): ‘65 pratīyate prima  
manus für samīhate.’

<sup>ii</sup> See the previous footnote.

<sup>iii</sup> Vairāgyaśataka 1A (= Śatakatrāya 148A; p. 58; i.o. bhrāntaṃ the edition prints  
bhrāntvā, with wavy underline [see below]; recall that of the three AnK manu-  
scripts, U reads bhrāntaṃ and DO read bhrāntvā [fn. 5 on p. 32]). The whole verse  
in the edition reads:

<sup>1</sup>ata evājñāḥ *em.* ] ata eva aj(j)āḥ U, ata eva | ajñāḥ DO <sup>2</sup>°rvaḥ UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °rva  
O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>3</sup>samīhate U ] s(u)mīhate D, samīhate (*there is an unrecognised short slanted  
stroke above the akṣara ha*) O

<sup>4</sup>ananvayaṃ UD ] anvayaṃ O <sup>5</sup>bhrāntaṃ U ] bhrāntvā DO

<sup>6</sup>kiṃ cit UD (kiñ cit *in both*) ] kiṃ (c)cit O <sup>7</sup>phalam ity° DO ] phalamṃ ity° U

<sup>8</sup>pacyate UD ] pa(d)yate (*there seems to be some white correction over °(d)°*) O

<sup>9</sup>sakarmakāṇām apy D ] sakarmakāṇām apy U, sakarmakāṇām apy O

makatva<sup>1</sup>vivakṣayā bhāvapratyayadarśanād bhāvaktapratyayāntasya bhramer  
 O 1v vyadhikaraṇaviśeṣaṇatām<sup>1T4</sup> ananubhavato<sup>2</sup> deśasābdasya nānvayo<sup>3</sup> durgha-  
 ṭaḥ<sup>3</sup>. <sup>1T5</sup>**māsaṃ paṭhyate**<sup>4</sup> itivat kālādīnām<sup>5</sup> sarvakriyāvyaṅgyatvāt kar-  
 matvāvyabhicārād dvitīyā<sup>6</sup>hetubhū<sup>7</sup>te karmatve 'pi

kālādikarmayoge<sup>8</sup> 'pi na śīnādyāḥ sakarmakāḥ. |

<sup>1E3</sup>ghuṇasyākṣaranirmāṇe na syād<sup>9</sup> <sup>1T6</sup>akṣaracuñcutā<sup>10</sup>. ||<sup>i</sup> 6

iti nyāyān nātra bhrameḥ sakarmakatvabhramo<sup>11</sup> vidheyaḥ. tathā ca

bhrāntvā deśam anekadurgaviṣamaṃ prāptaṃ na kiṃ cit phalaṃ.  
 tyaktvā jātikulābhimānam ucitaṃ sevā kṛtā niṣphalā. |  
 bhuktaṃ mānavivarjitaṃ paraḅṛthe āśaṅkayā\* kākavat.  
 trṣṇe jṛmbhaṇi\*\* pāpakarmanirate nādyāpi saṃtuṣyasi. ||

*I have reproduced here the edition's wavy underline (this verse contains only this one instance), a mark indicating the editor's uncertainty about the adopted reading ('A wavy line below any part of the stanza in groups I–II indicates that some other readings might have been accepted as original, [...] [p. 12<sup>9–10</sup>]). The apparatus reports 17 manuscripts read, i.o. bhrāntvā, bhrāṅtaṃ, which and which alone can be a possible alternative to the editor's adopted reading bhrāntvā. The editor probably hesitated between these two readings.*

*\*The printed reading c paraḅṛthe āśaṅkayā, with a sandhi-less °he ā° which, once sandhi is applied, becomes the unmetrical °ha ā°, cannot work. In fact paraḅṛthe āśaṅkayā does not occur in any of the sources used by the editor but is rather the editor's own suggestion, as is indicated by the star printed before the word āśaṅkayā (see e.g. p. 12<sup>7–9</sup>: '[...] starred readings are those which occur in no source at all, but have been selected in order to explain the readings actually found') and confirmed in the apparatus (p. 58). Among the 13 variants reported in the apparatus, several are at least possible, among which the most plausible appears to me to be paraḅṛtheṣv āśaṅkayā (= āśaṅkayā), found in 13 manuscripts.*

*\*\*D jṛmbhaṇi is the f. voc. sg. of the adj. jṛmbhaṇa 'gaping, expanding'.*

<sup>i</sup>This verse occurs once in the SPS, namely SPS 31 (p. 170<sup>5–6</sup>; see fn. i on p. 35), and is not found anywhere else.

<sup>1</sup>akarmakatva° D ] akarma° U, akarmatva° O

<sup>2</sup> ananubhavato conj. ] anubhavato UDO

<sup>3</sup>nānvayo durghaṭaḥ DO ] nānvayor durghaṭaḥ U

<sup>4</sup> māsaṃ paṭhyate conj. ] māṃsaṃ paṭyate UDO

<sup>5</sup>itivat kālādīnām UO ] itiva- kālādīnām D <sup>6</sup>dvitīyā° UD ] dviyātīyā° O

<sup>7</sup>'bhū° UD<sup>pc</sup> ] *apparently* °bhe° D<sup>ac</sup>, °bhu° O

<sup>8</sup>°ge UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] *illegible* (one akṣara, its vowel appearing to be i) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>9</sup>syād UD ] syad O <sup>10</sup> akṣaracuñcutā conj. ] akṣaracuñcutā UDO

<sup>11</sup>nātra bhrameḥ sakarmakatvabhramo D ] nā bhrame sakarmakatvabhramo U,  
 nātra bhrameḥ sakarmatvabhramo O

*tiṣṭhaty ekāṃ niśāṃ candraḥ*<sup>i</sup> 7

---

<sup>i</sup>*Kusumadeva's Dṛṣṭāntakalikā 65c (p. 83); Subhāṣitāvali 301c (p. 47), attributed to Kusumadeva (attribution in p. 48<sub>6</sub>) (English tr. on Haksar 2007: 16; Hindi tr. on Mālavīya 1974: 47a). The whole verse in the Dṛṣṭāntakalikā edition runs:*

guṇavān sucirasthāyī na devo 'py abhijāyate. |  
tiṣṭhaty ekāṃ niśāṃ candraḥ śrīmān sampūrṇamaṇḍalaḥ. ||

*The Subhāṣitāvali edition prints the same reading except B daivenāpi na sahyate |*

iti prayogaḥ.<sup>i</sup>

<sup>i</sup> Some consider the denotatum of a word ending in a temporal or spatial accusative (e.g. *māsam* ‘for a month’ or *krośam* ‘for a krośa [a unit of distance]’) to be *karman* (although the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has never explicitly taught this); a consequence of this view is that, given that any verbal root is capable of governing a word ending in a temporal or spatial accusative, all verbal roots will become transitive (*sakarmaka*) and there can be no intransitive (*akarmaka*) verbal roots. This issue is already discussed in the *Bhāṣya*. Cf. *śloka-vārttika* 7AB on A 1.4.51 and the *Bhāṣya* thereon (1.336<sub>1-5</sub>): *kālabhāvādhvagantavyāḥ karmasaṃjñā hy akarmanām. | 7AB kālabhāvādhvagantavyāḥ akarmakāṇām dhātūnām karmasaṃjñāḥ bhavanti vaktavyam. kāla°— māsam āste. māsam svapiti. °bhāva°— godoham āste. godoham svapiti. °adhvagantavya°— krośam āste. krośam svapiti. deśaś cākarmaṇām karmasaṃjño bhavati vaktavyam. kurūn svapiti. pañcālān svapiti.*

Cf. *vārttika* 1.4.52.8–9 and the *Bhāṣya* thereon (1.338<sub>1-9</sub>): *akarmakagrahaṇe kālakarmakāṇām upasaṃkhyānam. 8 akarmakagrahaṇe kālakarmakāṇām upasaṃkhyānam kartavyam. māsam āste devadattaḥ. māsam āsayati devadattam. māsam śete devadattaḥ. māsam śāyayati devadattam.*

*siddham tu, kālakarmaṇām akarmakavadvacanāt. 9 siddham etat. katham? kālakarmakā akarmakavad bhavanti vaktavyam. tat tarhi vaktavyam. na vaktavyam. ‘°akarmakāṇām’ [A 1.4.52] ity ucyate, na ca ke cit kadā cit kālabhāvādhvabhir akarmakāḥ. ta evaṃ vijñāsyāmaḥ— kva cid ye ‘karmakā iti. atha vā yena karmaṇā sakarmakāś cākarmakāś ca bhavanti, tenākarmakāṇām. na ca itena karmaṇā kaś cid apy akarmakāḥ. atha vā yat karma bhavati, na ca bhavati, tenākarmakāṇām. na ca itat karma kva cid api na bhavati.*

Cf. *vārttika* 2.3.5.1 and the *Bhāṣya* thereon (1.445<sub>12-446</sub>): *atyantasamyoge karmaval lādyartham. 1 atyantasaṃyoge kālādhvānau karmavad bhavata iti vaktavyam. kiṃ prayojanam? lādyartham. lātibhir abhidhānam yathā syāt. āsyate māsaḥ. śāyate krośaḥ.*

*atha vatkaranaṃ kimartham? svāśrayam api yathā syāt. āsyate māsam. śāyate krośam. akarmakāṇām bhāve lo bhavati bhāve lo yathā syāt. tat tarhi vaktavyam.*

*na vaktavyam. prākṛtam evaitat karma, yathā kaṭam karoti, śakaṭam karoti iti. evaṃ manyate— yatra kaś cit kriyākṛto viśeṣa upajāyate, tan nyāyamaḥ karmeti. na ceḥa kaś cit kriyākṛto viśeṣa upajāyate. naivaṃ śakyam. ihāpi na syāt— ādityam paśyati, himavantam śṛṇoti, grāmaṃ gacchati. tasmāt prākṛtam evaitat karma, yathā kaṭam karoti, śakaṭam karoti iti. yadi tarhi prākṛtam evaitat karma, akarmakāṇām bhāve lo bhavati bhāve lo na prāpnoti— āsyate māsam devadattena iti. tat tarhi vaktavyam.*

*na vaktavyam. ‘°akarmakāṇām’ [A 1.4.52] ity ucyate, na ca ke cit kālabhāvādhvabhir akarmakāḥ. ta evaṃ vijñāsyāmaḥ— kva cid ye ‘karmakā iti. atha vā yena karmaṇā sakarmakāś cākarmakāś ca bhavanti, tenākarmakāṇām. na ca itena karmaṇā kaś cid apy akarmakāḥ. atha vā yat karma bhavati, na ca bhavati, tenākarmakāṇām. na ca itat karma kva cid api na bhavati.*

*na tarhīdānīm idaṃ sūtram vaktavyam. vaktavyam ca. kiṃ prayojanam? yatrākriyātyantasamyogaḥ, tadartham. krośam kuṭilā nadī. krośam ramaṇīyā vanarājīḥ.*

§1.2.2  
sādhyavyadhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa

sādhyasya bhinnādhikaraṇaṃ yathā— *pacaty odanaṃ*<sup>1</sup> *caitraḥ*.

§1.2.3 nāma-samānādhikaraṇa-  
viśeṣaṇa

nāmaṇaḥ<sup>2</sup> samānā<sup>3</sup> dhikaraṇaṃ tu dharmadharmibhāvabhedena dvidhā.

§1.2.3.1 dharmā

tatra guṇavacanānām āśrayato<sup>4</sup> liṅgavacanāni bhavanti<sup>1</sup> ity uktadiśādyasya viśeṣya<sup>5</sup> liṅgasa<sup>6</sup> mkhyā<sup>7</sup> grāhitvam. yathā— *śuklaḥ paṭaḥ*, *śuklāḥ śātyaḥ*<sup>8</sup>,

*Cf. SP-SPS 30–31 and 33CD (pp. 166<sub>6</sub>–172<sub>1</sub> and 176<sub>4-5</sub>): viśayavibhāgartham āha— dvikarmakās tu śāsibrūhṛkarsivahinīrudhaḥ | duhiyācyarthajipracchi-manthidaṇḍicinetayaḥ. || 30 teṣu svapadakṛtyaktakhalādyā mukhyakarmani | śāsyādīnām. duhādīnām gauṇe kālādivarjite. || 31 mukhyakarmani śāsyādīnām prathamā; guṇakarmani duhādīnām ity arthaḥ.*

nanu kālādīnām karmasamjñācāryair uktā. tatra śāsyādiprayoge mukhyakar-  
maṇaḥ prathamāyā uktatvāt kālādīnām gauṇānām prathamāyā abhāve  
dvitīyaiveti saṃśayo nāsty eva. yadā tu duhādiprayogaḥ, tadā duhādīnām  
guṇakarmaṇaḥ prathamāpratijñānāt kālādīnām gauṇānām prathamā kiṃ  
syāt, utānyeṣāṃ guṇakarmanām iti prāpte saṃdehe tannirākaraṇāyoktam—  
kālādivarjite iti. kālādikarmanām gauṇatāyām satyām apy anyasya  
guṇakarmaṇaḥ sambhavān na prathamā. na hi kālādikarmaprayoge karmaṭā  
kathitā. anyathākarmakā dhātavaḥ sakarmakāḥ syuḥ. tathoktam— **kālādikar-  
mayoge 'pi na śijādyāḥ\* sakarmakāḥ. | ghuṇasyākṣaranirmāṇe na syād  
akṣaracuñcutā.** || iti. ādiśabdena kālabhāvādhvadeśāḥ kathitāḥ. [...].

*duhyate gauḥ payo māsam iti kālasya sā na tu. || 33CD sā prathamā.*

*\*The printed śijādyāḥ (p. 170<sub>5</sub>) is to be corrected to śinādyāḥ. śijā° is what Hahn reads in all of his four manuscripts (three in Śāradā and one in Devanāgarī), as is reported in fn. 5 on p. 170. With regard to the three Śāradā manuscripts, śijā° appears to be a misreading of śinā° by Hahn (note that the Śāradā akṣaras nā and jā can look very similar—see, for example, these two akṣaras in p. 29<sub>8-9</sub> of Slaje's Śāradā). As for the one Devanāgarī manuscript, it is likely that Hahn correctly read śijā°, and śijā° itself results from the scribe's misreading śinā° when copying from a Śāradā manuscript. śinā is a dhātupāṭha form of the verbal root √śī 'to lie, to sleep'. To exemplify this verbal root which leads the group śinādyāḥ, one of Hahn's manuscripts gives in a marginal note the example māsam śayyate (fn. 6G on p. 170). Compared to śinādyāḥ, the reading śijādyāḥ is much less likely, and Hahn's fn. 1 on p. 171 also shows that he has experienced difficulties with his reading śijādyāḥ.*

<sup>i</sup>This nyāya occurs about ten times in the vt.-Bh in varying wordings and only once in the SP-SPS (SPS 6CD, p. 100<sub>8</sub>) in exactly the same wording. See fn. i on p. 38.

<sup>1</sup>odanaṃ D ] o(d)anaṃ U, audanaṃ O    <sup>2</sup>nāmaṇaḥ DO ] nāmnā U

<sup>3</sup>nā° UD ] °nā° O    <sup>4</sup>āśrayato U ] āśrayato DO    <sup>5</sup>viśeṣya° DO ] viśeṣa° U

<sup>6</sup>sa° UD<sup>p</sup>° O ] illegible D<sup>ac</sup>    <sup>7</sup>mkhyā° U ] °nkhyā° D, °mñkhyā° O

<sup>8</sup>śuklāḥ śātyaḥ em. ] śuklāḥ śātyāḥ UD, śuklaḥ śātyāḥ O

**śukle** *vastre* iti<sup>1</sup>.

U 2v dvitīyaṣya tu svaliṅgataiva. yathā— **strī ratnam**. saṃkhyāyāṃ tu vikalpaḥ, §1.2.3.2 dharmin tena **striyo ratnam** ity api bhavati. yad uktam—

<sup>1T7</sup>**pramāṇāni pramāṇaṃ** vā vedā iti<sup>2</sup> <sup>1T10</sup>vibhāṣa<sup>3</sup>ya<sup>i</sup> 8

<sup>1</sup>This hemistich occurs once in the SP, namely SP 8AB (p. 102; quoted in the next footnote), and is not found anywhere else. Note that the present reading is based on a conjecture of mine: see fn. 2 and endnote <sup>1T7</sup> (p. 75).

<sup>1</sup>vastre iti DO ] vastra iti U

<sup>2</sup>pramāṇāni pramāṇaṃ vā vedā iti conj. ] pramāṇāni vedāḥ pramāṇaṃ veti UD, pramāṇāni vedāḥ pramāṇa veti O

<sup>3</sup>bhāṣa° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °kalpaḥ (this is a complicated case involving several marks and multiple corrections: for details, see endnote <sup>1T10</sup> on p. 75) D<sup>ac</sup>

iti.<sup>i</sup>

<sup>i</sup> Cf. *vt.-Bh 4.1.3.6 (2.200<sub>1-5</sub>)*: **guṇavacanasya cāśrayato liṅgavacanabhāvāt. 6 guṇavacanānām hi śabdānām āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti. tad yathā— śuklaṃ vastram, śuklā śāṭī, śuklaḥ kambalaḥ, śuklau kambalau, śuklāḥ kambalāḥ iti.** yad asau dravyaṃ śrito bhavati guṇaḥ, tasya yal liṅgaṃ vacanaṃ ca, tad guṇasyāpi bhavati. evam ihāpi yad ado dravyaṃ śritam bhavati śritvam, tasya yal liṅgaṃ vacanaṃ ca, tat śritvasyāpi bhaviṣyati. Among the vārttikas, *vt. 4.1.3.6* is the only directly relevant one I can find. The following six Bhāṣya passages are similar to the above-quoted passage of *Bh 4.1.3.6* and are directly relevant: *Bh 1.2.64.54 (1.246<sub>19-23</sub>)*, *Bh 2.2.6.0 (1.410<sub>19-24</sub>)*, *Bh 2.2.24.8 (1.422<sub>18-22</sub>)*, *Bh 2.2.29.0 (1.430<sub>15-19</sub>)*, *Bh 5.2.94.5 (2.394<sub>13-15</sub>)*, and *Bh 5.3.55.0 (2.414<sub>26-415</sub>)*. Cf. also *Bh 1.2.52.2 (1.228<sub>20-21</sub>)*, which contains just the nyāya, without the other elements such as the examples: idam tatra atrocryate— ‘**guṇavacanānām śabdānām āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti**’ iti.

Cf. *SP-SPS 5AB-8D (pp. 98<sub>3-104</sub>)*: tasya dvaividhyaṃ bhavati— samānādihikarāṇādibhedāt\* tasya dvibhedatā. | 5AB samānam adhikaraṇaṃ yasya, tat samānādhikaraṇam. ekavibhaktiyantapadavācyam ity arthaḥ. tadādir yo bhedaḥ, tasmāt. ādiśabdena vyadhikaraṇaṃ kathitam. tasya viśeṣaṇasya.

ādyasya bhedaṃ darśayitum āha— jahallīṅgājahallīṅgabhedād\*\* ādyam api dvidhā. || 5CD ādyam api samānādhikaraṇam api. na kevalaṃ dvibhedam eva viśeṣaṇam, api tv ādyasyāpi dvibhedatety apīśabdārthaḥ.

svarūpam āha— **tatrādyasya viśeṣyasthalīṅgasamkhyāvibhaktayaḥ.** | 6AB tatra dvibhedamadhyād ity arthaḥ. ādyasya jahallīṅgasya.

udāharaṇam āha— **vastram śuklaṃ, paṭaḥ śuklaḥ, śuklā śāṭī, paṭaḥ sitāḥ.** || 6CD paṭāḥ sitāḥ ity anena samkhyāgrahaṇatā darśitā. vibhaktigrahaṇam atraivāntarbhūtam. ‘**guṇavacanānām āśrayato liṅgavacanāni bhavanti**’ iti vacanād guṇavacanā eva śabdā udāhṛtāḥ. liṅgānuśāsanaṭīkāyām asmābhis tatra tatra liṅgavicāro vihita eveti neha pratanyate.

dvitiyaṃ kathayati— **svalīṅgatā dvitīyasya.** bahuvrīhigatasya na. | 7AB dvitīyasyājahallīṅgasya\*\*\* svalīṅgatā, anyalīṅgatā na bhavatīti bhavaḥ. ‘samāse pradhānasambandhini\*\*\*\* eva liṅgasamkhye bhavataḥ’ iti vacanād anyapadārthapradhānasya bahuvrīher anyalīṅgataiveti vicāryāha— bahuvrīhigatasya na iti.

udāharati— **strī ratnaṃ, puruṣo ratnaṃ, bahuratnā purī** yathā. || 7CD bahuratnā ity atra bahuvrīhir darśitaḥ.

evam ajahallīṅgasya viśeṣyālīṅgabhāvaṃ pratipādyā viśeṣyasamkhyāgrahaṇe vikalpam āha— **pramāṇāni pramāṇam vā vedā iti vibhāṣayā.** | 8AB

etad uktvā vibhaktiṃ nirūpayati— vibhaktigrahaṇam tasya. 8c tasya ajahallīṅgaviśeṣaṇasya. tad viśeṣyavibhaktiṃ grhṇātīty arthaḥ. yathodāhṛtam. tad uktam— ‘pramāṇādy ajahallīṅgavacanam’ iti. anena hi vacanena vibhaktiṃ grhṇātīty avagamyate.

nanu liṅgavacane yadi na grhṇāti, tarhi ko doṣo vibhaktiyagrahaṇe?— ity āśankya doṣam udbhāvayati— pariñānaṃ kim anyathā? || 8D anyathā vibhaktigrahaṇābhāve samānādhikaraṇaviśeṣaṇapariñānaṃ na bhaved ity arthaḥ.

\*SP 5AB (p. 98) is in the anuṣṭubh metre. Syllables 5–7 of SP 5A °karaṇā° being light, light, and heavy, we have here a rare (if not unmetrical) case of the sa-vipulā

<sup>1E41T8</sup> strīva<sup>1</sup> gacchati śaṅṭho 'yam.<sup>i</sup> 9

§<1.2.3.3> <upamāna: like dharmin>

D 255v ityādau tūpamānasyopameyaṃ prati vyavacchedakatve 'pi<sup>2</sup> na viśeṣyal-  
iṅgatā. evaṃ ca

avigāh<sup>3</sup>yo<sup>3</sup> 'si nārīṇām ananyamanasām api<sup>4</sup> |

anuṣṭubh, which seems to stem from the author Devaśarman himself rather than problems in the transmission of the text. For more details, see p. 86 lines 3–8 and fn. 1, where Hahn discusses both the sa-vipulā in SP 5A and the sa-vipulā in general. (As another example of the sa-vipulā anuṣṭubh I may cite Hemacandra's lexicon Anekārthasaṃgraha 7.50A pañcamyarthe niyame ca [p. 131], which, like SP 5A, has a caesura after syllable 4.)

\*\*Cf. the marginal note of Hahn's manuscript  $\hat{S}_2$  on SP 5c jahalliṅga° (p. 98 fn. 9G): tad uktam— 'dharmavāci viśeṣaṇa(m)[sic] viśeṣyaliṅgam eva. a(to)[sic] dharmavāci viśeṣaṇam jahalliṅgam' iti (bha)[sic].

\*\*\*Cf. the marginal note of Hahn's manuscript  $\hat{S}_2$  on ajahalliṅgasya (p. 102 fn. 4G): dharmivāciviśeṣaṇasyety arthaḥ.

\*\*\*\*The printed pradhānasambandhinī (p. 102<sub>3</sub>) is wrong and is to be corrected to pradhānasambandhinyāv. Among Hahn's four manuscripts,  $\hat{S}_1$  and N read pradhānasambandhinyāv,  $\hat{S}_2$  pradhānasambandhinyāv, and  $\hat{S}_3$  pradhānasambandhinī (p. 102 fn. 6). The word liṅgasamkhye being in f. du. nom., the reading to adopt is clearly that of  $\hat{S}_1$  and N, in which the ending is in f. du. nom. The reason why Hahn has instead adopted  $\hat{S}_3$ 's reading (the ending in which Hahn appears to have understood to be in nt. du. nom., as is indicated by the lack of sandhi [pragraha] in the printed pradhānasambandhinī eva [p. 102<sub>3</sub>]) is not clear, but presumably just a slip in declension.

<sup>i</sup> Kāvyaḍarśa 2.52A (p. 152; i.o. śaṅṭho the edition prints śaṅḍho). The full verse runs (ibid.):

strīva gacchati śaṅḍho 'yam. vakty eṣā strī pumān iva. |  
prāṇā iva priyo 'yam me. vidyā dhanam ivārjitā. || 2.52

Cf. Kāvyaḍarśa 2.51 and 2.53–54AB (pp. 151–153): na liṅgavacane bhinne na hīnādhikatāpi vā | upamādūṣaṇāyālaṃ, yatrodvego na dhīmatām. || 2.51 bhavān iva mahīpāla! devarājo virājate. | alam aṃśumataḥ kakṣām āroḍhuṃ tejasā nrpaḥ. || 2.53 ityevamādi saubhāgyaṃ na jahāty eva jātu cit. | 2.54AB

For a summary of the teachings, see endnote <sup>1E4</sup> on p. 77.

<sup>1</sup> strīva conj. ] ata eva strīva U, ata eva | strīva DO

<sup>2</sup> tve 'pi UD (°tve pi in both) ] °tv(ā)e pi O

<sup>3</sup> avigāh<sup>3</sup>yo em. ] avagāh<sup>3</sup>yo UD, avagrāh<sup>3</sup>yo O <sup>4</sup>api U ] iva DO

*viṣamopalabhinnormir<sup>1</sup> āpage<sup>2</sup> vot<sup>3</sup> titīrṣataḥ. ||<sup>i</sup> 10*

ityādāv upa<sup>4</sup>mānasya na viśeṣya<sup>5</sup>liṅgasamkhye.

na<sup>6</sup> ca— upamānaviśeṣaṇā<sup>7</sup>nām

*himakliṣṭam ivāmbujam<sup>ii</sup> 11*

ityāda<sup>8</sup> himakliṣṭādīnām<sup>9</sup> upamānaliṅgasamkhyāgrāhitvadarśanād<sup>10</sup> upamānasya <sup>1T9</sup>viśeṣyatvam<sup>11</sup>, na tu viśeṣaṇatvam<sup>12</sup> api, ekasyaiva viruddhadharmadvayayogād— iti vācyam, sāpekṣatvād viśeṣaṇaviśeṣya<sup>13</sup>bhāvasya. yo hi<sup>14</sup> gurugṛhādāv apradhānaḥ, sa kiṃ svagr̥he 'pi guṇatām evānubhavati?<sup>iii</sup> aparathā tūpameya<sup>15</sup>vibhaktir api katham upamānasya bhavet?

§xx <In samāsa> samāse ca pradhānasambandhinyāv eva<sup>16</sup> liṅgasamkhye. <sup>1T11</sup>†*bahu-* U 3r

<sup>i</sup> *Bhāmaha's Kāvyaśāstram 2.53 (p. 14; English tr. and explanation on Sankararamasastry 1956: 94–95).*

*Cf. Kāvyaśāstram 2.52 and 2.56–57 (p. 14): atha liṅgavacobhedāv ucyete saviparyayau. | hinādrikatvāt sa dvedhā. trayam apy ucyate. yathā— || 2.52 nanūpamīyate pañiḥ kamalena vikāsinā. | adharo vidrumacchedabhāsā bimbaphalena ca. || 2.56 ucyate— kāmam astidaṃ. kiṃ tu strīpumsayor ayam | vidhir nābhimato. 'nyais tu trayāṇām api neṣyate. || 2.57*

*For a summary of the teachings, see endnote <sup>1E4</sup> on p. 77.*

<sup>ii</sup> *Untraced. (This can be an anuṣṭubh even pāda.)*

<sup>iii</sup> *Cf. SP-SPS 58CD (pp. 204–3–206<sub>3</sub>): nanu ktvādyantā guṇakriyā katham anyasyā guṇakriyāyā guṇatām bhajate?—iti śaṅkāṃ nirasyati— ktvādyantā tu kriyā tasyā guṇatām nātivartate. || 58CD tasyāḥ mukhyatulyāyāḥ kṛdantaguṇakriyāyāḥ. yathā hi gurusamīpe jñānādīnā śiṣyebhyo mukhyo 'pi śiṣyo 'pradhānaḥ; sa evānyaśiṣyeṣu jñānanyūnatvādīnāpradhāneṣu gurvasambhave pradhānaḥ, tad vad evety arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup>viṣamopalabhinnormir *em.* ] viṣayopalabhinnormir UDO

<sup>2</sup>page° U<sup>pc</sup>D ] °pa° (°ge° is added interlinearly above °pa°) U<sup>ac</sup>, °gave° O

<sup>3</sup>vot° UD ] °got° O <sup>4</sup>ādāv upa° UD ] °ādauv upa° O <sup>5</sup>viśeṣya° UD ] viśeṣa° O

<sup>6</sup>na UO ] no D <sup>7</sup>nā° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °ṇ(e)° D<sup>ac</sup> <sup>8</sup>ityāda<sup>8</sup> UD ] ityādā O

<sup>9</sup>himakliṣṭādīnām DO ] himakliṣṭādīnām U <sup>10</sup>darśanād UD ] °darśanatvād O

<sup>11</sup>viśeṣyatvam *conj.* ] viśeṣaṇatvam UDO <sup>12</sup>viśeṣaṇatvam U ] viśeṣaṇam DO

<sup>13</sup>viśeṣya° UD ] °viśeṣa° O <sup>14</sup>yo hi DO ] hi yo U

<sup>15</sup>tūpameya° DO ] <r>ūpameya° U <sup>16</sup>pradhānasambandhinyāv eva UD (°samb° in both) ] pradhānasambandhinyāyeva O

ratno vaṇik,<sup>1</sup> astrīś caitraḥ ityādāv<sup>1</sup> anyapadārthasya<sup>2</sup> prādhānyāt talliṅ-  
gatā<sup>3</sup> dharmadharminor ubhayor api vibhaktiviśeṣagatā<sup>4</sup>.†

evam avasite 'pi viśeṣaṇaviśeṣya<sup>5</sup> bhāve kva cid apekṣayā viparyayo 'pi na  
duṣyati,<sup>1E5</sup> dāsasya svāmino<sup>6</sup> dāsīm prati<sup>7</sup> dāsyaśvāmi<sup>8</sup> tvavad i<sup>9</sup> ti sa<sup>10</sup> manantāram  
O 2r evoktam— śobhanasya rājñāḥ puruṣo 'nuyāti<sup>11</sup>.<sup>ii</sup> ata eva paśya mṛgo dhā-  
vati<sup>iii</sup> ity atra dhāvanasya<sup>12</sup> sādhanāpekṣayā prādhānye 'pi darśanāpekṣayā  
sādhanatāpi yujyate. dhāvanam paśyety atra hy arthaḥ. tathā coktam—

§xx «viśeṣaṇa-hood and  
viśeṣya-hood are relative and  
can be reversed»

<sup>i</sup>Cf. c. SP-SPS 7AB-7CD (Hahn 2008b: 102): 'samāse pradhānasamband-  
hini\* eva liṅgasamkhye bhavataḥ' iti vacanād anyapadārthapradhā-  
nasya bahuvrīher anyaliṅgataiveti vicāryāha bahuvrīhigatasya na iti.  
udāharati— 'strī ratnam'; 'puruṣo ratnam'; 'bahuratnā purī' yathā. || SP 7CD  
bahuratnā ity atra bahuvrīhir darśitaḥ.»

☒The printed «pradhānasambandhini» (p. 102<sub>3</sub>) is wrong and is to be cor-  
rected to «pradhānasambandhiniāv»: for details, see note \*\*\*\* in fn. i on p. 38.☒  
<sup>ii</sup>This example does not seem to be a common one and is possibly the AnK author's  
own. I cannot find any occurrence of it elsewhere, nor of just śobhanasya rājñāḥ pu-  
ruṣaḥ (which alone, to note in passing, will already suffice to illustrate the point in  
question, the final finite verb being irrelevant in this regard). The closest I can find  
is the following passage from the Bhūṣaṇasāra, which though contains the words  
puruṣaḥ, rājñāḥ, and śobhanasya is nevertheless about a completely different  
point (Bhūṣaṇasāra 33 [p. 477<sub>3-6</sub>]): yat tu vyapekṣāvādino naiyāyikamīmāṃsakā-  
dayaḥ— na samāse śaktiḥ, rājapuruṣaḥ ityādau rājapadādeḥ sambandhi-  
lakṣaṇayaiva rājasambandhyabhinnāḥ puruṣa ity atra bodhopapatteḥ. ata eva  
rājñāḥ padārthaikadeśatayā na tatra 'śobhanasya' ityādiviśeṣaṇānvayaḥ. In  
addition, cf. ṛddhasya rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ, a common example in śāstra found in e.g.  
the Bhāṣya (several times: e.g. Bh 1.4.13.8 [1.317<sub>23</sub>]), the VVR (VVR 2.22 [p. 30<sub>8</sub>]),  
and the Bhūṣaṇasāra (Bhūṣaṇasāra 30 [p. 463<sub>2-3</sub>]).

<sup>iii</sup>This is a common example in śāstra, found in e.g. the Vākyapadīya (2.449c [p. 100;  
in the form of mṛgaḥ paśyata yāti] and 3.8.52A [p. 152; in the form of mṛgo dhāvati  
paśya; the full verse is quoted in fn. ii on p. 42]; these two occurrences appear to

<sup>1</sup>astrīś caitraḥ ityādāv conj. ] astrī caittra ityādāv U, astrī(ś c)aittra ityādāv D,  
astrī caitra ityādāv O

<sup>2</sup>anyapadārthasya conj. ] uttarapadārthasya UDO

<sup>3</sup>prādhānyāt talliṅgatā UD ] prādhānyāl liṅgatā O

<sup>4</sup>vibhaktiviśeṣagatā D ] vibhaktiviśeṣagatā U, vibhaktiviśeṣatā O

<sup>5</sup>ṣya° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ṣa° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>6</sup>svāmino DO ] svāsino U

<sup>7</sup>dāsīm prati U ] dāsye prati D, dāse | prati O <sup>8</sup>dāsyaśvāmi° DO ] dāsyaśvāsi° U

<sup>9</sup>tvavad i° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] tvad i° (the akṣara °va° is added in the left margin) U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>10</sup>ti sa° UD<sup>pc</sup>O<sup>pc</sup> ] ti ⟨|⟩ sa° (something between the akṣaras °ti and sa°—possibly  
a daṇḍa—has been effaced) D<sup>ac</sup>, °⟨ta⟩ sa° O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>11</sup>puruṣo 'nuyāti DO (°ṣo nu° in both) ] puruṣo yāti U <sup>12</sup>dhāvanasya U ] om. DO

sādhanaṃ cet, kathaṃ sādhyam? sādhyam cet, sādhanam katham? |  
jñeyam viṣayabhedena. codyam etan nirākṛtam. ||<sup>i</sup> 12

iti.<sup>ii</sup>

§xx <passive  
absolutive/mukhyakriyā and  
guṇakriyā>

tathā devadatta ānīya pūjyate<sup>iii</sup> ityādau sādhanāpekṣayā mukhyatām anub-  
havantyo<sup>1</sup>r a<sup>2</sup>pi kriyayoḥ parasparam gauṇamukhyabhāvo 'py anivāryaḥ<sup>3</sup>,  
pitror<sup>4</sup> iva putram prati. ata eva

pradhānānva<sup>5</sup>yino<sup>6</sup> guṇāḥ<sup>iv</sup> 13

iti nyāyād guṇakriyānabhihite<sup>7</sup> 'pi sādhanē mukhya<sup>8</sup>kriyā<sup>9</sup>bhidhānabalāt U 3v  
D 256r

*be the very earliest attestations of it in the Sanskrit literature), the Kāśikā (Kāśikā 8.1.39 [vol. 2 p. 894<sub>4</sub>]), and the VVR (VVR 1.7 [p. 516–17]) (note that it is absent in the vt.-Bh, the VV, the SD, and the SP-SPS). See in addition G. Bhattacharya's article 1991 titled 'On paśya mṛgo dhāvati'.*

<sup>i</sup>Untraced. Cf. the next footnote. Note that the word *c* viṣayabhedena is found in Vākyapadiya 3.8.52c (quoted in the next footnote).

<sup>ii</sup>Cf. Vākyapadiya 3.8.45–46 and 51–52 (pp. 151–152): ekābhidhāna eko 'rtho yu-  
gapac ca dvidharmabhāk | na sambhavati. siddhatve sa sādhyāḥ syāt kathaṃ  
punaḥ? || 45 etāvat sādhanam, sādhyam etāvad iti kalpanā | śāstra eva. na vākye  
'sti vibhāgaḥ paramārthataḥ. || 46 rājñāḥ putrasya napteti na rājñi vyatiricyate |  
putrasyārthaḥ. pradhānatvaṃ na cāsya vinivartate. || 51 **mṛgo dhāvati paśyati**  
**sādhyasādhanarūpatā | tathā viṣayabhedena saraṇasyopapadyate.** || 52

<sup>iii</sup><This example, in this exact wording, occurs once in the SPS (SPS 55EF, in p. 200<sub>8</sub>). See fn. i on p. 43—the SPS passage quoted in that footnote contains that occurrence. >

<sup>iv</sup><This nyāya, in this exact wording, occurs once in the SPS (SPS 55EF, in p. 200<sub>11</sub>),

<sup>1</sup>anubhavantyo° U ] anubhavato° DO

<sup>2</sup>°r a° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] *om.* (the akṣara °r a° is added in the space between the akṣaras °to° and °pi) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>3</sup>gauṇamukhyabhāvo 'py anivāryaḥ U (°bhāvo py) ] gauṇamukhyabhāvo pi  
nirvāryaḥ D, gauṇamukhyabhāvapi nirvāryaḥ O

<sup>4</sup>pitror DO ] ⟨p⟩itror U

<sup>5</sup>pradhānānva° DO ] pradhānānva° U

<sup>6</sup>°yino UD ] °oyino O<sup>pc</sup>, °no (the scribe appears to have first written *pradhānān-  
vano* and then, upon realising he had forgotten the *akṣara* °yi°, modified the *na*  
of °no into a diacritic *i*, forgetting in the meantime however to cancel the dia-  
critic *o* of this °no, before finally writing *ya* followed by °no) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>7</sup>guṇakriyānabhihite UD ] guṇakriy(ā)nabhihite (there is an unrecognised  
slanted stroke to the upper right of the diacritic ā of °y(ā)°) O

<sup>8</sup>mukhya° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] *om.* (mukhya° is added in the bottom margin) D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>9</sup>°yā° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] *om.* (the scribe appears to have first added in the left margin, im-

prathamaiva, na dvitīyā.<sup>i</sup>

evaṃ

§xx xxx

*praśamsams tulyasattvānām sainyaghoṣe 'py<sup>1</sup> asaṃbhramam<sup>2</sup> |  
guhāgatānām siṃhānām<sup>3</sup> parivṛtyāva<sup>4</sup> lokitam. ||<sup>ii</sup> 14*

atra hi siṃhakartṛkam avalokanaṃ praśamsanasya karma. tadapekṣayaiva<sup>5</sup>  
parivartanasya pūrvakālātā. pūrvavad dvitīyāpy atra<sup>6</sup>.

where it is pāda D of an anuṣṭubh verse. See fn. i on p. 43—the SPS passage  
quoted in that footnote contains that occurrence. >

<sup>i</sup> Cf. c. SPS 55<sup>EF</sup> (Hahn 2008b: 200–202):

evaṃ yatrāpi guṇakriyāyāḥ pradhānakriyāyās caikam eva karma bhavati, tatra  
pradhānakriyayaivābhidhīyate. guṇakriyā tu guṇatvād eva pradhānakriyām an-  
veti. yathā ‘**devadatta ānīya pūjyate.**’ yathoktam—

**guṇapradhānakriyayor dhātvor ekasya karmaṇaḥ |  
abhidhānaṃ pradhānena. pradhānānvayino guṇāḥ. ||**

**iti. mukhyakriyayā karmaṇaḥ śabda 'nvayaḥ, anyayārthaḥ. tathok-  
tam—**

**evaṃ 'paktvaudano bhukto' 'bhujyate' veti kṛtīnoḥ. |  
bhojyasya bhujinā śabda, ārthas tu pacinānvayaḥ. ||**

Cf. Vākyapadīya 3.7.81:

pradhānetarayor yatra dravyasya kriyayoḥ pṛthak |  
śaktir, guṇāśrayā tatra pradhānam anurudhyate. ||

>

<sup>ii</sup> Raghuvamśa 4.75 (vol. 1 p. 163). *This verse forms a yugalaka with the preceding  
verse 4.74, which runs (ibid.):*

tato Gaurīguruṃ śailam āruroha sasādhanāḥ |  
vardhayann iva tatkūṭān uddhatair dhātureṇubhiḥ ||

(the kartṛ of the action of the finite verb B āruroha is Raghu).

mediately before the next akṣara °bhi°, the akṣara °ya° and then, upon realising  
he should have rather added °yā°, added the diacritic ā above and indicated its  
place of insertion using an arc) D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>1</sup> sainyaghoṣe 'py *em.* ] sainyaghoṣo py UDO

<sup>2</sup> asaṃbhramam U (°sambhra°) ] asaṃbhṛtam D, asaṃbh(r)tam O

<sup>3</sup> siṃhānām DO ] siḥā(ṃ)nām U <sup>4</sup> °va° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °vi° D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>5</sup> tadapekṣayaiva DO ] tadapekṣayaiva U <sup>6</sup> dvitīyāpy atra UD ] dvitīyātraiva O

§xx xxx <sup>1T12</sup>yata uktam—pradhānakriyāśaktyabhidhāne guṇakriyāśaktir apy abhihitavat prakāśate<sup>1i</sup> iti.

yathā *paktvaudano*<sup>2</sup> *bhukto*, *bhujyate* veti kṛttiṇoḥ. |  
bhojyasya bhujinā śabda, ārthas<sup>3</sup> tu pacinānvayaḥ. ||<sup>ii</sup> 15

§xx <Justifying mixture of tenses> evaṃ sati

*athāndhakāraṃ* <sup>1T13</sup>*girikandarāṇām*<sup>4</sup>  
*daṃṣṭrāmayūkhaiḥ śakalāni kurvan*<sup>5</sup> |  
*bhūyaḥ sa bhūteśvarapārśvavartī*  
*kiñcid vihasyā*<sup>6</sup>*rthapatim babhāse* ||<sup>iii</sup> 16

iti siddham, guṇa<sup>7</sup>kriyāgatavartamānakālena pradhānakriyāgatabhūtakālānurod-

<sup>i</sup>≈ SD 4.2.1.1.2 (Slaje 1992: 120): «pradhānakriyāśaktyabhidhāne guṇakriyāśaktir abhihitavat prakāśate».

Cf. SP-SPS c. 55<sup>EF</sup> (Hahn 2008b: 200): «yataḥ—

mukhyakriyābhidhāne 'nyā cōktavad dṛśyate budhaiḥ || SP 55<sup>EF</sup>

anyā guṇakriyā. tathoktam—'pradhānakriyāśaktyabhidhāne guṇakriyāśaktir anabhihitāpy abhihitavat prakāśate' iti.»

'... yady evaṃ svādumkāraṃ bhūṅkte devadatta iti ṇamulā kartur anabhihitatvāt kartari kasmāt tṛtīya na bhavati? bhujipratyayenābhihitatvāt kartā na cāsmiṇ prakaraṇe śaktiśaktimātor bhedo vivakṣyate samānakartṛtvaṃ hi virudhyate. pradhānaśaktyabhidhāne vā guṇaśaktir abhihitavat prakāśate (Kās ad Pāṇ 3.4.26).' (Hahn 2008b: 200 fn. (6P))

Helārāja's Prakīrṇaparakāśa on Vākyapadīya 3.7.85: c. «sā cābhihiteti kvedam upatiṣṭhate pradhānaśaktyabhidhāne guṇakriyāśaktir abhihitavt prakāśata iti.» ("Ogawa 2016 Study of Sadhanasamuddesa 3.7.81-86, in Japanese, ... .pdf", p. 59, with Japanese tr.) >

<sup>ii</sup><I have included this vs. in one of the footnoteA-s above. I need to move that treatment to here and adjust that footnoteA accordingly.>

<sup>iii</sup>Raghuvamśa 2.46 (vol. 1 p. 63).

<sup>1</sup>prakāśate *em.* ] prakāśyate UDO <sup>2</sup>paktvaudano DO ] pantvaudano U

<sup>3</sup>śabda ārthas U ] śabda arthas DO

<sup>4</sup>girikandarāṇām O ] girikandharāṇām UD (!—see endnote <sup>1T13</sup> on p. 82)

<sup>5</sup>kurvan UD ] kururvan O

<sup>6</sup>kiñcid vihasyā° UO (kiñcid in both) ] kiñci vihasyā° D

<sup>7</sup>siddham guṇa° U (°ddham) ] siddhiṃ guṇa° D, siddhi guṇa° O

hāt. yad āhuḥ<sup>1</sup>—

ākhyātapadavācye<sup>2</sup> 'rthe nirvartyatvāt<sup>3</sup> pradhānatā. |  
viśeṣaṇaṃ tadākṣepāt<sup>4</sup> tatkālam anurudhyate. ||<sup>i</sup> 17

U 4r dhātvartha<sup>5</sup>saṃbandhavaśāt pradhānakriyāgatam kālam upāśrayante guṇakriyāḥ.  
yadvad— *amuṣyaputraḥ sa somayājī janitāsi gomān*<sup>6</sup> iti.<sup>ii</sup>

<sup>i</sup>Vākyapadiya 3.9.99: ākhyātapadavācye 'rthe nirvartyatvāt pradhānatā. | viśeṣaṇaṃ tadākṣepāt tatkāle vyavatiṣṭhate. || (the context of this Vākyapadiya vs. seems to be the discussion of the teaching of A 3.4.1—cf. the preceding verse Vākyapadiya 3.9.98: śuddhe ca kāle vyākhyātam āmiśre na prasidhyati. | sād-hutvam ayathākālam tat sūtreṇopadiśyate. || and Vākyapadiya 3.9.101: bhūtam bhaviṣyad ity etau pratyayau vartamānatām | atyajantau prapadyete virud-dhāśrayarūpatām. ||.)

Cf. Helārāja's Prakīrṇaprakāśa on Vākyapadiya 3.7.84: c. «ākhyātapadavācye hy arthe nirvartyatvāt pradhānatā vartate. paktvā bhujyata ity atra tv ārtham api prādhānyam asti, pākasya bhojanārthatvāt.» ("Ogawa 2016 Study of Sadhanasamuddesa 3.7.81-86, in Japanese, ... .pdf", p. 58, with Japanese tr.)

<sup>ii</sup>Cf. A 3.4.1 dhātusaṃbandhe pratyayāḥ.

Kāśikā 3.4.1: dhātvarthe dhātuśabdaḥ. **dhātvarthānām saṃbandho dhātusaṃbandhaḥ viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvaḥ.** tasmin saty ayathākāloktā api pratyayāḥ sādhaso bhavanti. **agniṣṭomayājy asya putro janitā.** (kṛtaḥ kaṭaḥ śvo bhavitā. bhāvi kṛtyam āsīt.) 'agniṣṭomayājī' iti bhūtakālah, 'janitā' iti bhaviṣyatkālah. tatra bhūtaḥ kālo bhaviṣyatkālenābhisambadhyamānaḥ sādhaso bhavati. **viśeṣaṇaṃ guṇatvād viśeṣyakālam anurudhyate,** tena viparyayo na bhavati. (pratyayādhikāre punaḥ pratyayagrahaṇam adhātvaadhikāravahitā api pratyayāḥ taddhitā dhātusaṃbandhe sati kālabhede sādhaso yathā syuḥ iti.) **gomān āsīt. gomān bhavitā.** gāvo vidyante 'sya iti vartamānavihito matup, āsīt bhavitā iti saṃbandhād atīte bhaviṣyati ca sādhaso bhavati.

(Note: agniṣṭomayājī's expressing the past tense is by A 3.2.85 karaṇe yajaḥ. gomān's expressing the present tense is by A 5.2.94 tad asyāsty asmīn iti matup.) K 4.5.113 dhātusaṃbandhe pratyayāḥ.

DV 4.5.113: **dhātvarthānām saṃbandhe viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvalakṣaṇe svam kālam tyaktvā viśeṣyasya dhātvarthasya kāle kṛtsamjñakāḥ pratyayāḥ sādhaso bhavanti.** na tu tyādayaḥ, sādhyavihitatvāt. (sūtraṃ tv idaṃ sukhārtham eva.) **'agniṣṭomayājī putro 'sya janitā.'** 'agniṣṭomayājī' iti bhūte ṇiniḥ 'janitā' ity anena saṃbandhe bhaviṣyati sādhaso bhavati. (evam— 'kṛ-

<sup>1</sup>āhuḥ UD ] āhu O

<sup>2</sup>°cye U<sup>pe</sup>DO ] °e (the correction akṣara °cye is written in the left margin) U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>3</sup>nirvartyatvāt UD ] nivartyatvāt O

<sup>4</sup>viśeṣaṇaṃ tadākṣepāt UD ] viśeṣaṇa tadākṣepāt O

<sup>5</sup>dhātvartha° UD ] dhāturtha° O

<sup>6</sup>janitāsi gomān DO ] janitā(s)ya gomān (the akṣara ⟨s⟩ya can possibly be read instead as mya or, less likely, pya) U

§xx xxx sarveṣāṃ dvandvavarjitānām<sup>1</sup> samāsānām viśeṣaṇamūlatā. tatra samānā<sup>2</sup>dhikaraṇāśrayau dvigukarmadhārayau. tatpuruṣavyayībhāvau vyadhikaraṇāśrayau<sup>3</sup>. bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇānām<sup>1</sup> iti vacanād yady api bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇāśrayaḥ<sup>4</sup>, tathāpi *kaṇṭhekālah*<sup>ii</sup> ityādaḥ vyadhikaraṇāśrayo 'pi dṛśyate.<sup>iii</sup>

taḥ kaṭaḥ śvo bhavitā. 'bhāvi kṛtyam āsit.' bhaviṣyati vihito ṇinir bhūte siddhaḥ. prakaraṇāt kṛto labdhāḥ. pratyayagrahaṇaṃ sāmānyārtham.) 'gomān āsit', 'gomān bhavitā' iti. 'gomān' iti vartamāne mantuḥ 'āsīt' ity anena saṃbandhe 'tīte siddhaḥ; 'bhavitā' ity anena bhaviṣyatīti. >

<sup>i</sup> Vārttika 2.2.24.10 (1:423.16). See also below fn. iii on p. 46, where this vārttika is quoted.>

<sup>ii</sup> «kaṇṭhekālah» is a well-known/standard example of a vyadhikaraṇāśraya bv. Vt. 2.2.24.12 allows vyadhikaraṇāśraya bv.s like this one. «kaṇṭhekāla» is found in the Bh, and in at least one occurrence there is a bv. gloss for it. I should perhaps present the related Bh passages in the present footnoteA.>

<sup>iii</sup> Cf. VV under 2.10 (p. 43): (api ca 'ambikākesarī' ity atra ṣaṣṭhīsamāso nopapadyate), yataḥ sarveṣāṃ eva samāsānām tāvat prāyeṇa viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyābhīdhāyīpadoparacitaśarīratvaṃ nāma sāmānyam lakṣaṇam ācacaḥṣire vicakṣaṇāḥ, itarathā teṣāṃ samarthatānupapatteḥ. sa ca viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyābhāvō dvidhaiva saṃbhavati— samānādhikaraṇo vyadhikaraṇāś ceti. tatrādyāḥ karmadhārayasya viśayaḥ. yatra tu dve bahūni vā padāny anyasya padasyārthe viśeṣaṇabhāvaṃ bhajante, sā bahuvrīheḥ saraṇiḥ. tatraiva yadā saṃkhyāyāḥ pratiśedhasya ca viśeṣaṇabhāvō bhavet, tadā sa dvigor naṅsamāsasya ca viśayaḥ. dvitīyāḥ prakāraḥ kārakāṇām saṃbandhasya ca viśeṣaṇatvād bahuvīdhaḥ. sa tatpuruṣasya panthāḥ. tatrāpi yadāvyayārthasya viśeṣyatā syāt, tadāsāv avyayībhāvasya mārgaḥ.

VVR thereon (pp. 24–25): (itthaṃ dvitīyam vidheyāvimarśaṃ vivicya tṛtīyam apy atraiva śloke prapañcayitum upakramate- api ca ityādinā.) prāyeṇa iti dvandvaṃ varjayitvā. tatra yugapadadhikaraṇavacanatayā sāmartyaṃ prakārantareṇa samarthitam. tatrādyāḥ iti 'tatpuruṣaḥ samānādhikaraṇaḥ karmadhāraya' iti (1-2-42) vacanāt. 'bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇānām' iti vacanāt prāyeṇa bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇaviśaya eva. susūksmajatakeśādaḥ tu vyadhikaraṇānām apīṣyate. (tatraiva samānādhikaraṇe padārthe. yadā saṃkhyāyāḥ iti (vyadhikaraṇaṃ ?) 'saṃkhyāpūrvō dviguḥ' (2-1-52) iti vacanāt. pratiśedhasya iti 'naṅ' (2.2.6) iti naṅsūtrārambhāt. dvitīyāḥ iti vyadhikaraṇaḥ. kārakāṇām iti 'kartṛkaraṇe kṛtā bahulam' (2-1-32) ityādinā. saṃbandhasya iti 'ṣaṣṭhī' (2-3-50) ityādinā. tatrāpi iti kārakasaṃbandhayoge 'adhistri', 'upakumbham' ityādaḥ.)

SP-SPS 10AB (Hahn 2008b: 120–122):

<sup>1</sup> dvandvavarjitānām UD ] dvandve varjitānām O <sup>2</sup> °nā° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °ā° D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>3</sup> tatpuruṣavyayībhāvau vyadhikaraṇāśrayau DO ] tatpuruṣavyayībhāvā vyadhikaraṇāśrayau U

<sup>4</sup> bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇāśrayaḥ UD ] bahuvrīhi samānādhikaraṇāśrayaḥ O

yatra tu śābdaviśeṣaṇa<sup>1</sup>viśeṣya<sup>2</sup>bhāvamātra eva tātparyam<sup>3</sup>, na tatra samāśaḥ.<sup>i</sup> On lohitas takṣakaḥ  
yathā<sup>4</sup>— lohitas takṣakaḥ<sup>5</sup>.<sup>ii</sup> samāse hi sati<sup>6</sup> takṣakasya<sup>7</sup> lauhityāvya-  
D 256v; O 2v hicārād<sup>8</sup> viśeṣaṇavaiyarthyaṃ<sup>9</sup> syāt, vākye tu vidheyatābhiprāyeṇoktam<sup>10</sup>.  
tasmād vāstavena viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvenātrārthāvagatiḥ<sup>11</sup>. śābdagatyā  
hi takṣako viśeṣyaḥ. vastutas tu<sup>12</sup> viśeṣaṇam, lauhityasya<sup>13</sup> 1T<sup>14</sup>prād-  
U 4v hānyāt. nāpi<sup>14</sup> samāse vidheyatāvagatiḥ. tathoktam— vibhaktyanvayaṣy-  
atirekānuvidhāyini viśeṣaṇānām vidheyatāvagatiḥ<sup>iii</sup> iti. na ca vākyasamāsayor  
abhedah, yad āhuḥ—

viśeṣagrahaṇe śaktir vibhaktyarthaḥ parisphuṭaḥ. |

prāyaḥ samāsā dr̥śyante viśeṣaṇadvayāśrayāḥ | SP 10AB

prāyograhaṇam dvandvanirāsārtham. ata eva ‘viśeṣaṇadvayāśrayeṇa  
sarveṣāṃ samāsānām udbhavaḥ’ iti kuḍakoktam nirastam. samānād-  
hikaraṇavyadhikaraṇaviśeṣaṇadvayam āśrayo yeṣāṃ. karmadhārayadvigu-  
nañtatpuruṣāḥ samānādhikaraṇāśrayāḥ. tatpuruṣavyayībhāvau vyad-  
hikaraṇāśrayau. ‘bahuvrīhiḥ samānādhikaraṇānām’ iti vacanād yady  
api samānādhikaraṇāśrayo bahuvrīhiḥ kathitaḥ, tathāpi ‘kaṇṭhekālah’  
ityādaḥ vyadhikaraṇāśrayo ‘pi. >

<sup>i</sup>Cf. SPS 10CD (p. 128<sub>6</sub>): yatra tu parasparam viśeṣaṇaviṣ[ś]eṣyabhāvo nāsti, tatra samāso na bhavaty eva. Cf. also below fn. ii on p. 48, where this SPS passage is quoted. >

<sup>ii</sup>This is a well-known example richly discussed in such śāstras/śāstric disciplines as vyākaraṇa and alaṃkāraśāstra. (takṣaka is the name of a particular snake/nāga king, who is red—so saying «lohitas takṣakaḥ» is like saying «uṣṇo ḡgniḥ».) Cf. below fn. ii on p. 48, where discussions of this example are presented. >

<sup>iii</sup>≈ VV under 2.13 (p. 51<sub>7-8</sub>): vibhaktyanvayaṣyavatyatirekānuvidhāyini hi viśeṣaṇānām vidheyatāvagatiḥ. Cf. below fn. ii on p. 48, where this is quoted. >

<sup>1</sup>śābdaviśeṣaṇa° DO ] śābde viśeṣaṇa° U <sup>2</sup>ṣya° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ṣa° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>3</sup>bhāvamātra eva tātparyam DO (°paryam in both) ] °bhāvamātre eva na tātparyam U

<sup>4</sup>yathā UD ] tathā O <sup>5</sup>lohitas takṣakaḥ DO ] lohitataṣakaḥ U

<sup>6</sup>samāse hi sati U ] samāse sati DO <sup>7</sup>takṣakasya DO ] takṣikasya U

<sup>8</sup>lauhityāvyaḥhicārād UD ] lauhityā(v)yabhicārād (there is an unrecognised short slanted stroke above the akṣara °(v)ya°) O

<sup>9</sup>rthyam UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °rtham O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>10</sup>vidheyatābhiprāyeṇoktam *em.* ] vidheyatābhiprāyeṇoktam U, vidhīyatābhiprāyeṇa k(u) (the akṣara k(u) can possibly be read instead as kta) D, vidhīyatābhiprāyena O

<sup>11</sup>tasmād vāstavena viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvenātrārthāvagatiḥ U ] tasmād vā viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvenārthāvagatiḥ DO

<sup>12</sup>viśeṣyaḥ vastutas tu U ] viśeṣaḥ | vastutas tu D, viśeṣa vastutas tu O

<sup>13</sup>lauhityasya DO ] lohityasya U

<sup>14</sup>prādhānyāt. nāpi *conj.* ] prādhānyā tenāpi U, prādhānyāt tenāpi DO

prādhānyam ca vivakṣāto vākye vṛttau tathaiva ca. ||<sup>i</sup> 18

ata evāhuḥ—

*lohitas takṣaka* iti samāso 'py atra neṣyate, |  
lauhityasya vidhāv uktanyāyāt tasyāpravṛttitaḥ, || 19  
svarūpamātrasyoktau ca lauhityavyabhicārataḥ |  
*uṣṇo* 'gnir itivat. pakṣo na cāsty anyas tadatyaye. || 20

iti.<sup>ii</sup>

<sup>i</sup>Untraced.

<sup>ii</sup>< VV 2.12–13 (p. 46; the edition prints 2.12B «samāso 'trāpi» and 2.13A «'oktau tu»).

Cf. VVR thereon (p. 26): *lohitas takṣakaḥ iti. yathā takṣakaśabdād eva sarpatvajātiḥ pratīṭā, tadval lohitalakṣa(ṇo gu)ṇo[sic] 'pi tata evāvabhicārāt pratīṭaḥ. tatas tau jātiguṇau vidheyatābhiprāyeṇoktau na samāse nyagbhāvaniyau. uktanyāyād iti. vidheyatvān na samāsaḥ pravartata ity arthaḥ. pakṣo na cāsty anyas tadatyaye iti. iha dvau pakṣāv ullikhitau— takṣakasya svarūpamātrapratipādanam vā lohitaḥkhyaguṇavidhir vā. ubhayatrāpi kṛtā carcā. tadatyaye ca kathitapakṣadvayātikrame ca anyas tṛtīyapakṣo nāsti ity arthaḥ.*

Cf. VV under 2.10 (p. 43): *tad evam eṣāṃ samāsānām viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyobhayāṃśasaṃsparśitve 'pi yadā viśeṣaṇāṃśaḥ svāśrayotkarṣādhānamukhena vākyaṛthacamatkāraṇatayā prādhānyena vivakṣito vidheyadhurām adhirohed; itaras tv anūdyamānakalpatayā nyagbhāvam eva bhajet, tadāsau na vṛtter viśayo bhavitum arhati. tasyām hi sa pradhānetarabhāvas tayor astam iyād ity uktam.* (tac caitatad viśeṣaṇam ekam anekam vāstu, na tayor viśeṣaḥ kaś cit. nanu ca viśeṣaṇatvam avacchedakatvād guṇabhāvaḥ; vidheyatvam ca vivakṣitatvāt prādhānyam.)

VVR thereon (p. 25): *vidheyadhurām iti. śabdavṛtte yo vidheyaḥ, tasya kakṣyām vāstavīm vidheyatām ity arthaḥ. anūdyamānakalpatayā iti. śabdam prādhānyam anapekṣya vāstavena prādhānyenety arthaḥ. astam iyād ity ekārthibhāvād vibhaktatvenāpratīter ity arthaḥ.*

VV under 2.10 (p. 45): (vidhyānuvādabhāvo 'pi vakṣyamāṇanayena viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvātulyaphala iti tatrāpi tadvad eva samāsābhāvo 'vagantavyaḥ.)

VV under 2.13 (p. 51): **vibhaktyanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyinī hi viśeṣaṇānām vidheyatāvagatiḥ.** tata eva caiśāṃ viśeṣye pramāṇāntarasiddhasvotkarṣāpakarṣādhāyinām śābde guṇabhāve 'py ārthaṃ prādhānyam viśeṣyānām ca śābde prādhānye ārtho guṇabhāvo 'nūdyamānatvād ity uktam. vakṣyate ca. etad ācāryasyāpy anumataṃ eveti jñāyate. [...]. **samāse ca vibhaktilopān notkarṣāpakarṣāvagatir** iti (na tannibandhanā rasādipratītir iti tadātmanaḥ kāvyasyāyam vidheyāvimarśo doṣatayokta iti.)

VVR thereon (p. 27–28): **vibhaktyanvaya° iti śrūyamāṇāyā vibhatker ity**

**arthah.** (tathā ca "ṣaṣṭhyā ākrośe" (6.3.21) iti jñāpakam. rūpakam upadeśa iṣyata iti ?)[sic] pramāṇāntareṇa "loko vedas tathādhyātmaṃ pramāṇaṃ trividham" ity uktarūpeṇa siddhau yau svasya viśeṣaṇasyotkarṣāpakarṣau, tadādhāyinām arthād viśeṣyaṃ pratīty arthaḥ.) **ārthaṃ vāstavam.** (alukam āha "ṣaṣṭhyā ākrośe" (6.3.21) ity anena. cintyam iti. etadavagamāya vicāryam ity arthaḥ.) samāse ca vibhaktilopād iti. **iha hi vibhaktiśravaṇāśravaṇe (vā ?)[sic] anvayavyatirekābhyāṃ viśeṣaṇagatayor vāstavayoḥ Ṣprayojakatām bhajete.** te tu prāyeṇa vākyasamāsagatatvenopalabhyamāne samāsasya vibhaktyaśravaṇād vidheyāvimarśatām utpādayataḥ. ata eva samāse 'pi yadi vibhaktiḥ śrūyate, tadā na vidheyāvimarśaḥ. yathā 'dāsyāḥkāmukaḥ' ityādau. samāsas tu tatraikapadyādiprayojanatvena kṛtaḥ. (tannibandhanā ity utkarṣāpakarṣanibandhanā.) evaṃ ca **vibhaktyaśravaṇānvayavyatirekānuvidhāyitvaṃ** vidheyāvimarśasya vyāptyā pradarśitaṃ bhavati. (The editor's fn. § on p. 27: '§ praśabdāt prak "prādhānyaguṇabhāvayoḥ" iti pūraṇam apekṣitaṃ bhāti.)

VV c. 2.26–28 (pp. c. 57–58): «yatrotkarṣo 'pakarṣo vā viśeṣyasya viśeṣaṇāt; | tad eva vā vidheyam syāt, \*\*samāsas tatra neṣyate\*\*. || 26 anyatra tv arthasambandhamātre vaktum abhīpsite | \*\*kāmacāras\*\* tadarthaṃ hi samarthagrahaṇaṃ matam || 27 <p. 58> na tu sāpekṣatādyanadoṣajātānivṛttaye | pitroḥ sutena vandyatve sā hi nyāyena sidhyati || 28 iti \*\*\*saṃgrahaślokaḥ\*\*\*.»

SPS 10CD (Hahn 2008b: 128–136): 'nilotpalam' ity atra 'nilam' ity ukte bhramarādīnām vyabhicāraḥ, tadarthaṃ utpalapadam. 'utpalam' ity ukte śvetādau vyabhicāraḥ, tadarthaṃ āha— 'nilam' iti. na raktam, na śvetam. **yatra tu parasparaṃ viśeṣaṇaviṣ[ṣ]eṣyabhāvo nāsti, tatra samāso na bhavaty eva, yathā—[...]. 'lohitas takṣakaḥ' ityādau ca samāso na bhavati, [...] takṣakaśabdenaiva sarpajātival lohitaḥkyaguṇasyāvagamāc ca evaṃ sati vākyam api na bhavati. satyam, ke cid atrāhuḥ—'vākye hi pārāśaryādīnām viśeṣaṇānām utkarṣapratipādanārthaṃ prayuktānām paunaruktyābhāvaḥ' iti. tathā hi te pakṣadvayam ullikhanti— takṣakasvarūpapatipādanam vā lohitaśabdena kriyate, lohitaḥkyaguṇavidhir vā. tṛtīyas tu na sambhavaty eva. tatrādye pakṣe punaruktataiva. dvitīyapakṣe lohitaḥkyaguṇotkarṣapratipādanārthaṃ avāśyaṃ prayuktam sal lohitaḥpadam na punaruktatām āvahati. evaṃ sati tatra vākyam eva kāryam, na samāsaḥ. samāse hi saty utkarṣapratipādanārthaṃ prayuktasya lohitaḥpadasya samāsāntargatatvān nyagbhūtaśakter utkarṣapratipādanārthatvābhāvāt paunaruktyam syāt. na ca samāse 'py utkarṣo 'vagamyate. tathoktam—**

sambandhamātram arthānām samāso hy avalambate. |  
notkarṣam apakarṣam vā. vākyāt tūbhayam apy adaḥ. ||

iti. ataḥ samāso na bhavati. vākyam tu bhavaty eva. tathoktam—

'lohitas takṣaka' iti samāso 'trāpi neṣyate, |  
lauhityasya vidhāv uktanyāyāt tasyāpravṛttitaḥ; ||  
svarūpamātrasyoktau ca lauhityāvyabhicārataḥ |

§2 <vākya's abhidhāvypāra> ॡ<sup>2P1</sup> evaṃ vākyaṅnāṃ svārthapravṛttau tridhābhidhāvypāraḥ, puṣṭāpuṣṭa-  
duṣṭabhedāt.

§2.1 puṣṭa puṣṭo 'pi tridhā<sup>1</sup>— śāktaḥ, vaibhaktikaḥ, śaktivibhaktimayaś ca.

§2.1.1 śakta aśrūyamāṅā<sup>2</sup>yāṃ vibhaktau sāmartyāvaseyaśaktinibandhano 'nvayaḥ  
śāktaḥ<sup>3</sup>. yathā—

<sup>2E1</sup> vitrasta<sup>4</sup> śatruḥ sprhayālulokaḥ<sup>5</sup>  
prapanna<sup>6</sup> sāmanta udagrasattvaḥ |  
pratiṣṭhitaudārya<sup>7</sup> guṇo 'sipattra-  
jitāvanir nāsti<sup>8</sup> bhava<sup>9</sup> nnibho 'nyaḥ. ||<sup>i</sup> 21

atra hi vitrastaśatruśabdāyor<sup>10</sup> arthasāmartyā<sup>11</sup>vaseyāpādānaśakti<sup>12</sup>dvāreṇa

‘uṣṇo 'gnir' itivat. pakṣo na cāsty anyas tadatyaye. ||

iti. ayaṃ bhāvaḥ. padānāṃ hi vidheyānuvādyabhāvo dvidvidho 'sti— śāb-  
daḥ vāstavaś ca. tatra yadā śābdīm anūdyatāṃ tyaktvā vāstavīm vid-  
heyatāṃ yat padaṃ grhṇāti, tadā tasya samāse nyagbhāvo na kāryaḥ.  
tathoktam— ‘tasyāṃ hi sa pradhānetarabhāvas tayor astam iyāt' iti.  
atra lohitaśabdaḥ śābdīm anūdyamānatāṃ vihāya vāstavīm vidhey-  
atāṃ grhṇāti. prādhānyena pratipādayitum iṣṭo 'rtho hi vidheya ucya-  
te. ataḥ samāso na bhavati, vākya evānuvādyasyāpi viśeṣaṇasya vid-  
heyatāvagateḥ. tathoktam— ‘vibhaktyanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyini hi  
viśeṣaṅnāṃ vidheyatāvagatiḥ' iti.

(10G) Ś2 (vāstavīm vidheyatāṃ) vastubalapravṛttāṃ.

(7P) kva cid asamāsaḥ / ... rāmo jāmādagnyaḥ / vyāsaḥ pārāśaryaḥ (Durgasiṃha  
ad Kāt 2.5.5); ... kva cid vākyaṃ eva bhavati / ... lohitas takṣakaḥ / ...  
takṣakaḥ sarpaḥ (Vṛtti ad Cān 2.2.18). >

<sup>i</sup>KM 1.6 (p. 23<sub>1-4</sub>; the edition prints C adhiṣṭhitau° i.o. pratiṣṭhitau° and D nṛpas  
tvadanyaḥ i.o. bhavannibho 'nyaḥ; quoted in endnote <sup>2P1</sup> on p. 84); ŚP 8.58 (vol. 1  
p. 416; the edition prints B udūḍhasattvaḥ i.o. udagrasattvaḥ and D °jitāvaniḥ ko  
'tra bhavān ivānyaḥ i.o. °jitāvanir nāsti bhavannibho 'nyaḥ; quoted in endnote <sup>2P1</sup>  
on p. 85).

<sup>1</sup>tridhā DO ] dvidhā U <sup>2</sup>°ṅā° UD ] °nā° O

<sup>3</sup>nvayaḥ śāktaḥ DO ] nvayaḥ śā yaḥ śāktaḥ U <sup>4</sup>vitrasta° DO ] vitrastra° U

<sup>5</sup>°śatruḥ sprhayālulokaḥ U (°śatruḥ) ] °śattrur hrdayālulokaḥ DO

<sup>6</sup>prapanna° U ] prasanna° DO <sup>7</sup>°audārya° UD ] °audarya° O

<sup>8</sup>°jitāvanir nāsti D ] °jitāvanitrāsti U, °jitāvani nāsti O <sup>9</sup>°va° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] °ve° U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>10</sup>vitrastaśatruśabdāyor U ] vitrastaśattrupadāyor DO

<sup>11</sup>°rthyā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °rthā° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>12</sup>°vaseyāpādānaśakti° DO ] °vaseyāpādāśakti° U

U 5r nāsti bhavannibho 'nyaḥ ityetatprādhānyenārthenānvayaḥ pratipadyate<sup>1</sup>.

yatra tu kartrādisaktau nyagbhūtāyāṃ<sup>2</sup> vaiśeṣi<sup>3</sup>kī vibhaktir anvayahetuḥ, §2.1.2 vaibhaktika  
tatra vaibhaktikaḥ. yathā—

*namas tuṅgaśiraścumbi<sup>4</sup>candracāmaracārave |  
trailokya<sup>5</sup>nagarārambhamūlastambhāya Śambhave. ||<sup>i</sup> 22*

D 257r atra Śambhoḥ kāya<sup>6</sup>vānmanaḥprahvatālakṣaṇasya ca namaṣkārasya<sup>7</sup> yo  
'sau saṃbandhaś caturthyabhidheyaḥ, sa Śambhuṃ kāyavānmana<sup>8</sup>ḥ<sup>9</sup>prahvatayā<sup>10</sup> samārādhayāmītye<sup>11</sup>va<sup>12</sup>mārādhanakriyānibandhanaḥ. yo 'sau  
karmakaraṇayoḥ Śambhunamaskārayoḥ<sup>13</sup> saṃbandhaḥ, sa tasmin nyagbhūte<sup>14</sup> sati bhavati.☒

☒ṛtiyo yathā—

§2.1.3 śaktivibhaktimaya

O 3r *tī<sup>15</sup>rtheṣu satsu dvija<sup>16</sup>sattamebhyaḥ  
śriyaṃ dviṣadduṣṭajanād upāttām<sup>17</sup> |  
samādhinā mā<sup>18</sup>nadaḥ nityam eva*

<sup>1</sup>Harṣacarita opening verse 2 (p. 1).

<sup>1</sup>ityetatprādhānyenārthenānvayaḥ pratipadyate D ] ityetatprādhānyenārthenānvayaṃ pratipādyate U, ityetatprādhānyenārthenānvayaḥ pratipadyate O

<sup>2</sup>nyagbhūtāyāṃ UD ] nyak(bh)otāyāṃ O <sup>3</sup>°ṣi° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ṣa° O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>4</sup>°cumbi° DO ] °cumbhi° U <sup>5</sup>trailokya° UD ] trailekya° O <sup>6</sup>kāya° DO ] kārya° U

<sup>7</sup>°lakṣaṇasya ca namaskārasya U ] °lakṣaṇasya namaskārasya DO

<sup>8</sup>caturthyabhidheyaḥ sa śambhuṃ kāyavānmana° DO ] caturthya(bh)idheyaḥ śa śambhuṃ vānmana° U

<sup>9</sup>°ḥ° UD<sup>pc</sup> ] *om.* (the visarga is added interlinearly below the akṣaras °na° and °pra°) D<sup>ac</sup>, *om.* O

<sup>10</sup>°prahvatayā UD ] °pr(ai)hvatayā O

<sup>11</sup>samārādhayāmītye° DO ] samārādhayāmy etye° U <sup>12</sup>°va° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °vaṃ° D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>13</sup>śambhunamaskārayoḥ DO (°yos in both) ] śambhunaskārayoḥ U

<sup>14</sup>tasmin nyagbhūte UD ] tasmiṃ nyagbhūte O <sup>15</sup>°tī° UD<sup>pc</sup> ] ta° O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>16</sup>satsu dvija° UD ] satsv advija° O <sup>17</sup>upāttām DO ] upāttam U

<sup>18</sup>mā° UD<sup>pc</sup> ] ma° (the diacritic ā is added interlinearly above the next akṣara °na°) O<sup>ac</sup>

*kasya pradātum tvad r̥te 'sti śaktiḥ? ||<sup>i</sup> 23*

atra kevalayoḥ śaktivibhaktyoḥ pṛthaktvenānvaya<sup>1</sup>hetutayāvadhāritatvāc  
chaktivibhaktidvitayopalambhe<sup>2</sup> dvi<sup>3</sup>taya<sup>4</sup>syāpy anvayahetutvam<sup>5</sup> atra yuk-  
tam. tīrtheṣu sa<sup>6</sup>tsv i<sup>7</sup>ty a<sup>8</sup>tra saptamyādivibhaktivat tattvātmyād-  
hikaraṇādiśaktir api vyāpṛtā<sup>9</sup>,

U 5v

Ḍeṣa ca<sup>10</sup> trividhaḥ puṣṭaḥ sattvabhūtārthābhīdhāyiprātipadikānām<sup>11</sup> uk-  
taḥ. *bhuktvā vrajati* iti yaḥ kriyayor anvayaḥ<sup>12</sup>, sa puṣṭo 'pi na śāktādi-  
madhye<sup>13</sup> 'nupraviśati. evaṃ nipātādīnām jñeyam.

§2.2 apuṣṭa apuṣṭas tv<sup>14</sup> adhyāhārādi<sup>15</sup>nā. yathā—

*kamalānīva<sup>16</sup> śatrūṇām vadanāni cakarta saḥ. ||<sup>ii</sup> 24*

atra kamalānām karmatvam adhyāhṛtena<sup>17</sup> kartrā sambadhyate. yathā  
kṛntati<sup>18</sup>, tathā cakarteti vibhaktipariṇāmaḥ.

§2.3 duṣṭa duṣṭas tu pramāṇāntareṇa bādhitāḥ. yathā—

<sup>i</sup> ŚP 8.57 (vol. 1 p. 416; the edition prints B śriya dviṣadduṣṭajanānupāttām i.o. śriyam dviṣadduṣṭajanād upāttām [the edition's śriya is to be corrected to śriyam] and c mānam anitya/nidram[sic] eva i.o. mānada nityam eva; quoted in endnote <sup>2P1</sup> on p. 85).

<sup>ii</sup> Untraced.

<sup>1</sup>pṛthaktvenānvaya° UD ] pṛktvenānvaya° O <sup>2</sup>chaktivibhaktidvitayopalambhe U ] chaktivibhaktidvitiyolambhe D, chaktivibhaktidvitiyopalambhe O

<sup>3</sup>dvi° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ⟨v⟩o O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>4</sup>taya° U ] °tīya° DO

<sup>5</sup>°syāpy anvayahetutvam DO ] °syāpy invayahetutvam U

<sup>6</sup>tīrtheṣu sa° DO ] tīrtheṣ⟨ū⟩ sa° U

<sup>7</sup>°tsv i° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] °tsv a° (the vertical stroke of the diacritic i is added interlinearly below the present akṣara and the preceding akṣara sa°) U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>8</sup>°ty a° UO ] °ty ⟨a⟩° D<sup>pc</sup>, °ti D<sup>ac</sup> <sup>9</sup>°tā UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ā O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>10</sup>ca UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °⟨ś⟩ ca D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>11</sup>°prātipadikānām em. ] °prātipadikām U, °prātipadikā⟨n⟩ām D, °prātipadikānām O

<sup>12</sup>kriyayor anvayaḥ UD<sup>pc</sup> ] kriyayor anvayaḥ kriyayor anvayaḥ (the first kriyayor anvayaḥ is deleted) D<sup>ac</sup>, kriyayor iti anvayaḥ kriyayor anvayaḥ O

<sup>13</sup>śāktādimadhye UD ] śāktādimadhye O <sup>14</sup>apuṣṭas tv DO ] aparipuṣṭaḥ tv U

<sup>15</sup>°di° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] °da° U<sup>ac</sup> <sup>16</sup>kamalānīva DO ] kamalāny eva U

<sup>17</sup>°tena UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °⟨va⟩te O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>18</sup>kṛntati conj. ] kṛnteti U, kṛ⟨tt⟩e D, kṛtte O

*yam Indraśabdārthanisūdanaṃ Harer<sup>1</sup>*  
*Hiraṇyapūrvam kaśipum<sup>2</sup> pracakṣate, ||<sup>i</sup> 25*

atrEndraśabdārtho Devarājaśarīram. <sup>2T1</sup>na ca tena tan ni<sup>3</sup>sūdita<sup>4</sup>m. lokaś  
ca tam asuraṃ ‘Hiraṇyakaśipum’ iti pracaṣṭe, na tu ‘Hiraṇyapūrvam  
kaśipum’ iti.

kriyāder adhyāhārādīnā na duṣṭatā, nāpy aduṣṭatā,

kriyayā na vinā vākyam<sup>ii</sup> 26

iti nyāyāt<sup>5</sup>. ata evoktam—

D 257v ittham cāstībhavatyādi kriyāsāmānyam ucyate. |  
nāntaraṅgatayāvaśyaṃ<sup>6</sup> vaktāras tat prayuñjate<sup>7</sup>. ||<sup>iii</sup> 27

U 6r iti. vṛkṣaś chidyate ity<sup>8</sup> atra vṛkṣaḥ saṃś chidyata ity a<sup>9</sup>rtho<sup>10</sup> ‘vagamy-  
ate<sup>11</sup>’.

<sup>i</sup>Śiśupālavadha 1.42CD (p. 25). AB run (*ibid.*):

abhūd abhūmiḥ pratipakṣajanmanām  
bhiyām tanūjas tapanadyutir Diteḥ, |

<sup>ii</sup>Untraced.

<sup>iii</sup>VV 1.19 (p. 6).

<sup>1</sup>°r UD ] °ḥ O<sup>pc</sup>, om. (the visarga is added interlinearly below the akṣaras °re° and  
hi°) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>2</sup>kaśipum U ] kaśip(u)ṃ D, kaśapum O

<sup>3</sup>na ca tena tan ni° conj. ] na cetanavan ni° UDO

<sup>4</sup>°sūdita° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ?? ??(m) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>5</sup>nyāyāt UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ⟨va⟩??(t) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>6</sup>ucyate nāntaraṅgatayāvaśyaṃ em. (following the VV edition [fn. iii on p. 53]) ]  
ucyate tenāntaraṅgatāvaśyaṃ U<sup>pc</sup>DO (ucyate | te° DO), ucyate tenāṅgatāvaśyaṃ  
(the akṣaras °ntara° are added in the left margin) U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>7</sup>vaktāras tat prayuñjate U ] kartāras tat prayuñjate D, kartāras tat prayumjyate  
O

<sup>8</sup>vṛkṣaś chidyate ity U ] vṛkṣaḥ cchidyata ity DO

<sup>9</sup>saṃś chidyata ity a° em. ] san cchidyate ity a° U, san cchidyat(e) ity a° D, san  
cchidyata ity a° O

<sup>10</sup>°rtho DO ] °⟨rth⟩o U<sup>pc</sup>, °⟨tra⟩ (the scribe appears to have first written °tra and  
then intended to correct it to °rtho, forgetting however to delete the slanted  
stroke at the bottom of °tra) U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>11</sup>vagamyate U ] gamyate DO

yady apy uktam—

kriyāviśeṣo yas tv anyah pākādir vyabhicārabhāk<sup>1</sup>, |  
bahiraṅgatayā tasya prayogo 'vaśyam iṣya<sup>2</sup>te<sup>3</sup>. ||<sup>i</sup> 28

iti, tathāpi yatra svayam avagamaḥ, tatra na kiṃcid anupādāne doṣaḥ.  
ya<sup>4</sup>thā—

gāḍhā<sup>5</sup>liṅganavāmanīkṛtakucapṛobhūta<sup>6</sup>romodgamā  
sāndrasneharasātireka<sup>7</sup>vigalacchrīmannitambāmbārā<sup>8</sup> |  
'mā! mā! mānada! māti mām! alam!' iti<sup>9</sup> kṣāmākṣarollāpinī  
suptā<sup>10</sup> kiṃ nu? mṛtā nu kiṃ? manasi me līnā<sup>11</sup> vilīnā nu kim? ||<sup>ii</sup> 29

atra 'mā piḍaya! mā āyāsaya<sup>12</sup>! mānakhaṇḍaka! atīva māṃ mā<sup>13</sup> kadhathaya'  
iti svayam avagamaḥ<sup>14</sup>. yathā vā—

mā bhavantam ana<sup>15</sup>lah<sup>16</sup>, pavano vā,  
vāraṇo madakalah<sup>17</sup>, paraśur vā, |  
vajram indrakaraviprasṛtaṃ vā!

<sup>i</sup>VV 1.20 (p. 6).

<sup>ii</sup>Amaruśataka 35 (pp. 79–80 [with more sources cited]; i.o. A °prodbhūta° and B °vīgalacchrīmannitambāmbārā the edition prints respectively °prodbhinna° and °vīgalatkāñcīpradeśāmbārā, reporting in the meantime the former two readings in the apparatus).

<sup>1</sup>pākādir vyabhicārabhāk DO ] pākādivyabhicārabhāk U

<sup>2</sup>vaśyam iṣya° UD ] vaśyam siddhi° O <sup>3</sup>te UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ti O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>4</sup>ya° UDO<sup>pc</sup> (| ya° D, || ya° O<sup>pc</sup>) ] om. (doṣaḥ being the last two akṣaras of its line, || ya° is added in the right margin immediately following it) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>5</sup>thā gāḍhā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> (°thā | gāḍhā° D, °thā || gāḍhā° O<sup>pc</sup>) ] °(tha)g(ā)?? (gāḍhā° being the first two akṣaras of its line, °thā ||, together with a smudged akṣara °(tha) over which it is written, is added in the left margin immediately preceding gāḍhā°) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>6</sup>kucapṛobhūta° UD ] °kucaḥ pṛobhūta° O <sup>7</sup>rasātireka° UD ] °rasā(t)ireka° O

<sup>8</sup>nitambāmbārā D ] °nitam(b)āmbārā U, °nitambhābhāmbārā O

<sup>9</sup>mā mā mānada māti mām alam iti DO ] mā mānada māti mam alam iti U

<sup>10</sup>suptā D ] svapta U, s(u)ptā O <sup>11</sup>manasi me līnā DO ] manasi (l)īnā U

<sup>12</sup>mā āyāsaya DO (mā | āyāsaya | O) ] mā āyādaya U

<sup>13</sup>mānakhaṇḍaka atīva māṃ mā U ] mā khaṇḍaya atīva mā mā D, mā khaṇḍaya | atīva mā mā O

<sup>14</sup>svayam avagamaḥ U ] svayam avagama iti DO

<sup>15</sup>yathā vā mā bhavantam ana° D (yathā vā <|> mā) ] yathā (t)ā bhavatum ana° U, yathā | mā bhavantam ana° O

<sup>16</sup>lah UD<sup>pc</sup> O ] °lo D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>17</sup>pavano vā vāraṇo madakalah UD ] pava vā vāraṇo ma(dhu)kalah O

svasti<sup>1</sup> te 'stu la<sup>2</sup>tayā saha vṛkṣa<sup>3</sup>! ||<sup>i</sup> 30

O 3v atra mā ityetadanantaram<sup>4</sup> 'bādhiṣṭa' ity asya svayam avagamaḥ— 'mā bādhiṣṭa' iti. he vṛkṣa! ana.laḥ agnir bhavantam<sup>5</sup> mā bādhiṣṭety arthaḥ. evaṃ pavano vā ityādeḥ sambandhaḥ.

U 6v kva cit sādhanāny apy adhyāhriyante<sup>6</sup>, sādhyasya sādhanam vinānupap-  
atteḥ. yathā<sup>7</sup>—

mā bhaitṣin, mā cchaitṣin,  
mā bhāṅkṣij jātu cid bata bhavantam<sup>8</sup>! |  
sukṛtair adhvanyānām  
mārgataro svasti<sup>9</sup> te<sup>10</sup> 'stu saha latayā! ||<sup>ii</sup> 31

iti. atra vāraṇaḥ, paraśuḥ, pavana iti kāraṇānām adhyāhāraḥ<sup>11</sup>. evaṃ kāraṇāntarānām avaseyam.

yatra tu na svayam avagamaḥ, tatropādānam vinā doṣaḥ. yathā—

D 258r tathābhūtām dṛṣṭvā nṛpasadasi pāñcālata<sup>12</sup>na<sup>13</sup>yām,<sub>1</sub>

<sup>i</sup>Kāvyaḷamkārasūtravṛtti 5.1.14 (p. 59<sub>22-23</sub>; quoted in endnote <sup>2P2</sup> on p. 86); VV under 2.45 (p. 82<sub>7-8</sub>; quoted in endnote <sup>2P2</sup> on p. 87); ŚP 8.42 (vol. 1 p. 408; i.o. c vajram indrakaraviprasṛtam vā the edition prints vāhinijalabharah kuliṣam vā; quoted in endnote <sup>2P2</sup> on p. 88) and 9.337 (vol. 1 p. 514; i.o. c vajram indrakaraviprasṛtam vā the edition prints vāhinijalabharah kuliṣam vā; quoted in endnote <sup>2P2</sup> on p. 88)).

<sup>ii</sup> VV under 2.45 (p. 82<sub>10-11</sub>; i.o. AB mā bhaitṣin mā cchaitṣin mā bhāṅkṣij the edition

<sup>1</sup>indrakaraviprasṛtam vā svasti U ] indrakaraviprasṛtam svasti D, indrakar-  
avipravismṛtam svasti O

<sup>2</sup>la° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] li° U<sup>ac</sup> <sup>3</sup>saha vṛkṣa UD ] saha vakṣa O

<sup>4</sup>ityetadanantaram UD ] ityetantaram O

<sup>5</sup>gnir bhavantam UD (gniḥ bha° U) ] gni bhavantam O

<sup>6</sup>adhyāhriyante UD ] adhyāhriyate O <sup>7</sup>yathā U ] om. DO

<sup>8</sup>jātu cid bata bhavantam em. (following the VV edition [fn. ii on p. 55]) ] jātu cit  
pata bhuvatu me U, jātu cit prati bhavatu me DO

<sup>9</sup>sukṛtair adhvanyānām mārgataro svasti U ] sukṛter adh(va)nyā(nām) mārge  
svasti D, svakṛter adhvanyānām mārge svasti O

<sup>10</sup>te UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] tai O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>11</sup>kāraṇānām adhyāhāraḥ U ] kāraṇānām adhyāhāraḥ D,  
kāraṇānām adhyāhriyate O

<sup>12</sup>pāñcālata° UO ] pāñcāla ?? ta° (c. two akṣaras are completely smeared) D

<sup>13</sup>na° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °nam° D<sup>ac</sup>

vane<sup>1</sup> vyādhaiḥ sārdham suciram<sup>2</sup> uṣitaṃ valkaladharaiḥ, |  
virāṭasyāvāse sthitam anucitārambhanibhrtaṃ,  
guruḥ<sup>3</sup> khedaṃ khinne<sup>4</sup> mayi bhajati, nādyāpi kuruṣu. ||<sup>i</sup> 32

atra ‘asmābhiḥ’ iti prayojyam<sup>5</sup>. tathā khinne ity asmāt pūrvam itthaṃśab-  
daś ca prayoktavyo ‘pi noktaḥ.☒

---

*prints mā dhākṣin mā bhāṅkṣin mā bhaitṣij; quoted in endnote <sup>2P2</sup> on p. 87).*

<sup>i</sup>Veṅiṣaṃhāra 1.11 (p. 8; i.o. A pāñcāla° the edition prints pañcāla°, apparently a misprint).

<sup>1</sup>vane UO ] va(n)e D    <sup>2</sup>suciram UD ] svaciram O

<sup>3</sup>ḥ UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] *om.* (the visarga is added interlinearly below the akṣaras °ru° and khe°) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>4</sup>khinne DO ] khanne U    <sup>5</sup>°jyam UDO<sup>pc</sup> (°jyaṃ in all three) ] °jaṃ O<sup>ac</sup>

☒<sup>3P1</sup> evaṃ yattatsaṃbandho<sup>1</sup> 'pi puṣṭāpuṣṭaduṣṭabhedena<sup>2</sup> tridhā. §3 yattatsaṃbandha

tathā hi dvividhaḥ saṃbandhaḥ— śābda<sup>3</sup> ārthaś ca. §3.1 puṣṭa

śābdo yatra dvayor upādānam<sup>4</sup>. sa ca yacchabdaprakramas tacchab- §3.1.1 śābda (2 types)  
dopasaṃhāraḥ<sup>5</sup>, viparyayo vā.

ekasyānupādāne tv ārthaḥ pañcavidhaḥ. §3.1.2 ārtha (5 types)

U 7r tathā hi kevalasya tada upādāne<sup>6</sup> prasiddhaprakrāntānubhūtavaiṣayatvāt<sup>7</sup> §3.1.2.1 tad only (3 types)  
traividhyam.

tatrādyo<sup>8</sup> yathā— §3.1.2.1.1 prasiddhaviṣaya

kalā ca sā kāntimatī kalāvataḥ,<sup>i</sup> 33

iti.

prakrānto yathā— §3.1.2.1.2 prakrāntaviṣaya

so 'paśyat praṇi<sup>9</sup>dhānena saṃtatistambhakāraṇam |<sup>ii</sup> 34

<sup>i</sup> Kumārasaṃbhava 5.70C (p. 146). See fn. i on p. 29.

<sup>ii</sup> Raghuvamśa 1.73AB (vol. 1 p. 31). CD run (ibid.):

bhāvitātmā bhuvo bhartur. athainaṃ pratyabodhayat— ||

<sup>1</sup>yattatsaṃbandho UD (°samb° in both) ] yattatsaṃbandh(o) O

<sup>2</sup>bhedena D ] °tvena U, °bhedana O <sup>3</sup>śābda UD ] śābda O

<sup>4</sup>dvayor upādānam UD (°naṃ in both) ] dvayopādānaṃ O

<sup>5</sup>tacchabdopasaṃhāraḥ U ] tacchabdopasaṃhāra DO

<sup>6</sup>upādāne D ] upāne U, upadāne O <sup>7</sup>tvāt UO ] °tvā⟨ṃ⟩t D

<sup>8</sup>tatrādyo UD ] ⟨ta⟩trādyo O <sup>9</sup>ṇi° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ṇ⟨ya⟩° O<sup>ac</sup>

iti.

§3.1.2.1.3 anubhūtaṣaya anubhūto yathā—

te locane pratidiśaṃ vidhure<sup>1</sup> kṣipanti |<sup>i</sup> 35

iti.

§3.1.2.1.4 doṣa 1 <sup>3P3</sup>ata eva pratyakṣāyamāṇa<sup>2</sup>sya tadā nirdeśo doṣaḥ. yad uktam—

yaś caikavākyakartṛtve prokto, yaś cedamādibhiḥ<sup>3</sup>, |  
tacchabde<sup>4</sup>na parāmarśo na<sup>5</sup> tayor upapadyate. ||<sup>ii</sup> 36

iti. yathā—

sa vaḥ Śāsikalāmaulis tā<sup>6</sup>dātmyāyopakalpatām<sup>7</sup> |  
dvaitabuddhim apāsyemām! sā hi sarvāpadāṃ padam. ||<sup>iii</sup> 37

§3.1.2.1.5 doṣa 2 <sup>3P6</sup>tathā guṇakriyāyām svaśabdena nirdeśaḥ, mukhyakriyāyām tu<sup>8</sup> tacchabdena nirdeśo na nyāyayaḥ<sup>9</sup>. yathā—

<sup>i</sup>Tāpasavatsarāja 2.16B (p. 22). *The whole verse runs (ibid.):*

utkampinī bhayapariskhalitāmśukāntā  
te locane pratidiśaṃ vidhure kṣipantī |  
krūreṇa dāruṇatayā sahasaiva dagdhā  
dhūmānvi?(ndhi)tena[sic] dahanena na vīkṣitāsi. ||

<sup>ii</sup>VV 2.6 (p. 41; i.o. AB yaś caikavākyakartṛtve prokto the edition prints yaś caikavākye kartṛtvenokto); ≈ SP 65 (p. 222): ekavākyasthakartuś ca nirdiṣṭasyedamādibhiḥ | tacchabdena parāmarśo na kāryaḥ kavibhiḥ kva cit ||

<sup>iii</sup>Verse 1 under VV 2.6–7 (p. 41<sub>6–7</sub>); verse 1 in SPS 65 (p. 222).

<sup>1</sup>vidhure DO ] vidure U <sup>2</sup>na° em. ] na° UDO

<sup>3</sup>yaś cedamādibhiḥ em. ] yaś cedamādibhiḥ U, yaś cevamādibhiḥ DO

<sup>4</sup>bde° DO<sup>pc</sup> ] °bd(e)° U<sup>pc</sup>, °bd(o)° U<sup>ac</sup>, °e° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>5</sup>na UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] ta° D<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>6</sup>maulis tā° em. ] °maulitā° UDO

<sup>7</sup>kalpatām em. ] °kalpyatām UDO<sup>pc</sup>, °kalpitām O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>8</sup>tu UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ta O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>9</sup>nirdeśo na nyāyayaḥ em. ] nirdeśo na nyāyayaḥ UD, nirdeśo na na nyāyayaḥ O

**prajānām** eva bhūtyarthaṃ sa **tābhyo** balim agrahīt. |<sup>i</sup> 38

atra

O 4r balimꣳ **prajābhyo** jagrāha sa **tāsām** eva bhūtaye. | 39

iti ꣳyuktam.

---

<sup>i</sup>Raghuvamśa 1.18AB (vol. 1 p. 11). CD run (ibid.):

sahasraguṇam utsraṣṭum ādatte hi rasam raviḥ. ||

Excursus mukhyakriyāpekṣayaiva<sup>1</sup> sarvatra nirdeśo nyāyāḥ<sup>2</sup>. ata eva—

mude Murārer amaraiḥ Sumeror<sup>3</sup>  
**āniya yasyopacitasya śṛṅgaiḥ**<sup>4</sup> |<sup>i</sup> 40

ḥity atra śṛṅgāṇām<sup>5</sup> guṇakriyāprayuktaṃ karmatvaṃ bādhitvā karaṇat- U 7v; D 258v  
 vam. yady evam,

**utpātya Meruśṛṅgāni**<sup>6</sup> kṣuṇṇāni haritām<sup>7</sup> khuraiḥ |  
**ā<sup>8</sup>krīdaparvatās**<sup>9</sup> tena **kalpitāḥ** sveṣu veśmasu. ||<sup>ii</sup> 41

ity atra kathaṃ Meruśṛṅgāṇām<sup>10</sup> mukhyakriyayā na sambandhaḥ? kenok-  
 tam iti cet. 𑀧 'kalpitāni' iti 𑀧syāt. naitat. 𑀧 vikṛtigataliṅagrāhitvāt kriyāyāḥ<sup>11</sup>.  
 yathā— punar āvṛttaḥ su<sup>12</sup>varṇaṇiṇḍaḥ khadirāṅgārasavarṇe kuṇḍale<sup>13</sup>  
 bhavataḥ<sup>iii</sup> iti. 𑀧ata eva

prakṛter vikṛteś caiva yatrokṛtatvaṃ<sup>14</sup> dva<sup>15</sup>yor api, |  
 vācakaḥ prakṛteḥ saṃkhyāṃ grhṇāti, vikṛter na tu. ||<sup>iv</sup> 42

iti niyamo na yuktaḥ. ata eva prāyo<sup>1</sup>ji<sup>2</sup>—

<sup>i</sup>Śīsupālavadha 4.10AB (p. 129). CD run (ibid.):

bhavanti noddāmagirāṃ kavīnām  
 ucchrāyasaundaryaguṇā mṛṣodyāḥ, ||

*This verse is part of a sixteen-verse mahākūlaka (4.1–16, where 4.1–9 form the  
 main clause, whose finite verb is 4.1D dadarśa, and 4.10–16 each contains a relative  
 clause) describing the mountain Raivataka as seen by Kṛṣṇa.*

<sup>ii</sup>Kumārasambhava 2.43 (p. 52).

<sup>iii</sup>≈ Mahābhāṣya 1.7<sub>16–17</sub> (Paspasāhnikā, under «siddhe śabdārthasambandhe»):  
 «punar āvṛttaḥ suvarṇaṇiṇḍaḥ punar aparayākṛtyā yuktaḥ khadirāṅgārasavarṇe  
 kuṇḍale bhavataḥ.»

<sup>iv</sup><xxx>

<sup>1</sup>mukhyakriyāpekṣayaiva DO ] mukhyakriyāpakṣeyaiva U

<sup>2</sup>nyāyāḥ em. ] nyāyāḥ UDO <sup>3</sup>sumeror U ] svameror DO

<sup>4</sup>śṛṅgaiḥ DO ] śṛṅgai U <sup>5</sup>śṛṅgāṇām em. ] śṛṅgāṇām UDO

<sup>6</sup>meruśṛṅgāni em. ] meruśṛṅgā U, meruśṛṅgāni DO <sup>7</sup>haritām DO ] haritā U

<sup>8</sup>raiḥ ā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> (°raiḥ | ā° DO<sup>pc</sup>) ] °rai <|> ā° (the scribe appears to have added the  
 visarga over the original daṇḍa and then added a new daṇḍa) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>9</sup>s UDO<sup>pc</sup> (°ḥ O<sup>pc</sup>) ] om. (the visarga is added interlinearly below the diacritic ā  
 of °tā°) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>10</sup>meruśṛṅgāṇām U ] meruśṛṅgāṇām (in Othere is a kākapada below me° whose  
 referent or purpose is unclear) DO

<sup>11</sup>grāhitvāt kriyāyāḥ D ] °grāhyatvāt kriyāyāḥ U, °grāhitvāt krikriyāyāḥ O

<sup>12</sup>āvṛttaḥ su° U ] āvṛttaḥ su° D, āvṛttaḥ sva° O

<sup>13</sup>savarṇe kuṇḍale U ] °savarṇe kuṇḍali DO <sup>14</sup>yatrokṛtatvaṃ UD ] yatrokṛtaṃ O

<sup>15</sup>dva° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ?? O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>1</sup>prāyo° em. ] pr(ā)yo° U, prayo° DO <sup>2</sup>°ji UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ?? O<sup>ac</sup>

jaganty e<sup>3</sup>ko 'pi yas trīṇi **jāyante** vipulāny aṇuḥ<sup>4</sup> |<sup>i</sup> 43

iti. evaṃ sati

prathamam **upahitaṃ** vilāsi cakṣuḥ<sup>5</sup>  
**Sitaturage** na **cacāla** nartakīnām. ||<sup>ii</sup> 44

ity atra 'Sitaturagā<sup>6</sup>d' iti yuktam. viśleṣasya niṣidhyamāna<sup>7</sup>tvān nā<sup>8</sup>pādānam<sup>9</sup>  
 iti cet, *grāmān nā<sup>10</sup>yāti* ityādā<sup>11</sup>v api na syāt.☒

U 8r <sup>3P7</sup>kiṃ ca prakraṃyamāna<sup>12</sup>sya tadā nirdeśo na nirdoṣaḥ. yathā—

§3.1.2.1.6 doṣa 3

☒tīrthe **tadiye**<sup>13</sup> gajasetubandhāt  
 samudragām uttarato 'sya<sup>14</sup> **Gaṅgām** ||<sup>iii</sup> 45

iti.

<sup>3P8</sup>kiṃ ca parāmr̥śyasya<sup>15</sup> sāksān nirdeśe<sup>16</sup> tadaḥ prayogo 'nupapannaḥ. §3.1.2.1.7 doṣa 4  
 yathā—

<sup>i</sup>Untraced.

<sup>ii</sup>Kirātārjunīya 10.41CD (p. 158). AB run (*ibid.*):

prakṛtam anusasāra nābhineyaṃ  
 pravikasadaṅguli pāṇipallavaṃ vā. |

<sup>iii</sup>Raghuvamśa 16.33AB (p. 394; i.o. B samudragām the edition prints pratīpagām).  
 CD run (*ibid.*):

ayatnavālvayajanī babhūvur  
 haṃsā nabholāṅghanalolapakṣāḥ. ||

<sup>3</sup>nty e° U ] °nti D<sup>pc</sup>O, °nti D<sup>ac</sup> <sup>4</sup>aṇuḥ DO (aṇur in both) ] uṇuḥ U

<sup>5</sup>vilāsi cakṣuḥ DO ] vilāsacakṣuḥ U <sup>6</sup>gā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ge O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>7</sup>niṣidhyamāna° O ] niṣidhyamāna° U, niṣadhyamāna° D

<sup>8</sup>tvān nā° U ] °tvāna° DO<sup>pc</sup>, °tvā(na)na° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>9</sup>pādānam UD ] °pādānam O

<sup>10</sup>n nā° em. ] °(n n)ā° U<sup>pc</sup>, °(t yā)° U<sup>ac</sup>, °d ā° DO <sup>11</sup>dā° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] °dau U<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>12</sup>ṇa° em. ] °na° UDO <sup>13</sup>tadiye UD ] tadeye O <sup>14</sup>sya DO ] si U

<sup>15</sup>parāmr̥śyasya conj. (cf. the emboldened text in endnote <sup>3P8</sup>) ] parādr̥śyasya U,  
 parāmarśyasya DO

<sup>16</sup>sāksān nirdeśe U ] om. DO

<sup>3T2</sup>Harisraṇataparāḥ<sup>1</sup> |<sup>i</sup> 46

§3.1.2.2 yad only (2 types) <sup>3P2</sup>yadaḥ kevalasyopā<sup>2</sup>dāne <sup>3T1</sup>kalpitatatkarṁādiviṣayaprakrāntaviṣayābhyāṁ<sup>3</sup> dvaividhyam.

<sup>i</sup> Padmapurāṇa 7.19.50B (vol. 7 p. 4144). This verse forms a tilaka with the preceding verse 7.19.49 and the following verse 7.19.51; these three verses run (*ibid.*):

āsī Sarvajānir nāma brāhmaṇaḥ śuddhavaṁśajāḥ |  
 śānto dānto dayāyukto gurubrāhmaṇapūjakaḥ || 7.19.49  
 Hareḥ pūjāparaś caiva Harisraṇataparāḥ |  
 prapannakleśavidhvaṁsī satyavādī jitendriyaḥ || 7.19.50  
 prātaḥkāle nijācāragrāhī hiṁsāvivarjitaḥ |  
 ekādaśivratārato jñātipūjāparāyaṇaḥ. || 7.19.51

*Incidentally, cf. Harisraṇataparāḥ, Padmapurāṇa 6.194.47B (vol. 6 p. 3478).*

<sup>1</sup> °tatparaḥ U ] °tatparaṁ DO <sup>2</sup> °pā° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °(vā)° O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>3</sup> kalpitatatkarṁādiviṣayaprakrāntaviṣayābhyāṁ conj. ] kalpitam karmādiviṣayapraktātuviṣayābhyāṁ U, kalpitam | karmādiviṣayaproktāt tu viṣayābhyāṁ DO

ādyo yathā—

§3.1.2.2.1  
kalpitatatikarmādiviṣaya

chātrāṇām anvaye siddhiṃ dadātu **Gaṇanāyakaḥ**, |  
**yasmin** saṃmukhatām<sup>1</sup> yāte<sup>2</sup> vighnaḥ syād gaṇanāya kaḥ? ||<sup>i</sup> 47

dvitīyo yathā—

§3.1.2.2.2 prakrāntaviṣaya

cakrābhighātaprasabhājñayaiva<sup>3</sup>  
cakāra **yo** Rāhu<sup>4</sup>vadhūjanasya |  
āliṅganoddāmaṃvilāsavandhyaṃ<sup>5</sup>  
ratotsavaṃ cumbana<sup>6</sup>mātraśeṣam<sup>7</sup>. ||<sup>ii</sup> 48

D 259r ṭi.

ārthaḥ<sup>8</sup> pañcavidhaḥ puṣṭa eva.☒

prakramyamāṇa<sup>9</sup>viṣayatve<sup>10</sup> sati yacchabdasya ke<sup>11</sup>valasyopādāne ☒doṣa 1  
eva. yathā—

**yadi** manasi śamaḥ, kim aṅga cāpam<sup>12</sup>?<sup>iii</sup> 49

<sup>i</sup>SPS 64 (pp. 218<sup>1</sup>–220<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>ii</sup>*DhĀ under 2.19 (p. 64<sup>2-3</sup>).*

<sup>iii</sup>Kirātārjunīya 10.55A (p. 162). *This verse forms a yugalaka with the next verse 10.56; these two verses run (ibid.):*

‘yadi manasi śamaḥ, kim aṅga cāpam?  
śaṭha viṣayās tava vallabhā, na muktiḥ. |  
bhavatu! diśati nānyakāminībhyas  
tava hṛdaye hṛdayeśvarāvakaśam.’ || 55  
iti viṣamitacakṣuṣābhidhāya

<sup>1</sup>saṃmukhatām U ] sanmukhatām DO <sup>2</sup>te UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °(t)i O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>3</sup>prasabhājñayaiva UD ] °prasabhājñayaiva O <sup>4</sup>rāhu° UD ] bāhu° O

<sup>5</sup>vilāsavandhyaṃ UD ] °vilāvandhyaṃ O

<sup>6</sup>ratotsavaṃ cumbana° D ] ratotsarvaṃ cumbuna° U, ratotsavaṃ cumbhana° O

<sup>7</sup>śeṣam UO ] °ś(e)ṣam D

<sup>8</sup>ārthaḥ U ] ārthāḥ DO <sup>9</sup>ṇa° em. ] °na° UDO <sup>10</sup>viṣayatve U ] °sya viṣaye DO

<sup>11</sup>yacchabdasya ke° DO ] yacchabdake° U <sup>12</sup>cāpam DO ] śāpam U

ityādi<sup>1</sup>.

§3.1.2.2.4 doṣa 2 <sup>3P4</sup>kiṃ ca nairantaryeṇa sāmānā<sup>2</sup>dhikaraṇyena prayogo duṣṭaḥ. yathā— O 4v

kaṇṭhe gadgadatā<sup>3</sup> svedo mukhe vaivarṇyaṣvepathū | U 8v  
mriyamāṇasya<sup>4</sup> cihnāni **yāni tāny** eva yācataḥ. ||<sup>i</sup> 50

Exceptions ☒ anyasya tada u<sup>5</sup>pādāne na doṣaḥ. yathā<sup>6</sup>—

**yat tad** ū<sup>7</sup>rjitam<sup>8</sup> atyugraṃ kṣātraṃ tejo 'sya bhūpateḥ<sup>9</sup>, |  
divyatā<sup>10</sup>kṣais<sup>11</sup> tadānena nūnaṃ **tad** api hāritam. ||<sup>ii</sup> 51

iti.

pratiyamānaṃ<sup>12</sup> punar anyad eva  
vastv asti<sup>13</sup> vāṇiṣu mahākavīnām<sup>14</sup>, |  
**yat tat** prasiddhāvayavātiriktaṃ  
vibhāti<sup>15</sup> lāvanyam ivāṅganāsu. ||<sup>iii</sup> 52

ity atrottaravākyaasthatvād yacchabdasya na doṣaḥ.

sphuradadharoṣṭham asūyayā kayā cit |  
agaṇitagurumānalajjayāsau  
svayam urasi śravaṇotpalena jaghne. || 56

<sup>i</sup>Tantrākhyāyika 2.65 (p. 69).

<sup>ii</sup>Veṅīsaṃhāra 1.13 (p. 9).

<sup>iii</sup>DhĀ 1.4 (p. 6).

<sup>1</sup>°di UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °.(i) O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>2</sup>sāmānā° em. ] samānā° UDO

<sup>3</sup>gadgadatā DO ] gadgardatā U

<sup>4</sup>mriyamāṇasya em. ] ⟨driya⟩mānasya U, mriyamānasya DO

<sup>5</sup>u° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ?? O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>6</sup>yathā DO ] om. U <sup>7</sup>d ū° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ?? O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>8</sup>°rjitam UD ] °rjim O <sup>9</sup>sya bhūpateḥ DO ] si bhūpate U

<sup>10</sup>divyatā° D ] devitā° U, devyatā° O

<sup>11</sup>°kṣais U (the ins. akṣaiḥ and the acc. akṣān being equally good here [by A 1.4.43],

I simply follow the Veṅīsaṃhāra edition [see fn. ii on p. 64]) ] °kṣāms DO

<sup>12</sup>pratiyamānaṃ UD ] prīyamānaṃ O <sup>13</sup>eva vastv asti DO ] eva stv asti U

<sup>14</sup>mahākavīnām DO (°nām O) ] mahākavi(n)ām U

<sup>15</sup>°riktaṃ vibhāti DO (following the DhĀ edition [fn. iii on p. 64]) ] °riktaṃ ābhāti  
(the reading ābhāti is recorded in fn. 12 of the DhĀ edition) U

evam eva yadyarthayor<sup>1</sup> atha<sup>2</sup>cecchabdayoḥ prayoge<sup>3</sup> vicāryam. ya<sup>4</sup>thā<sup>5</sup>—§3.1.3 atha and ced

bhītīś **cet** te Daṇḍadhārān<sup>6</sup>, mā bhūt **tat** khalasaṃśrayaḥ<sup>7</sup>! |  
**atha** nāsti, **tadā**<sup>8</sup> sādḥūn<sup>9</sup> yatheccham avamānaya<sup>10</sup>! ||<sup>i</sup> 53

duṣṭas tu yathā—

§3.2 duṣṭa

**athopayantāram**, alaṃ samādhinā.<sup>ii</sup> 54

iti.

‘pākaś **cen** na śubhasya me<sup>11</sup> ‘dya, **tad** asau prāg eva nādāt kim u?  
svārthaś **cen** na mayāsyā, kiṃ<sup>12</sup> na bhajate dīnān<sup>13</sup> svabandhūn ayam? |  
matto randhradrśo ‘sya bhīr **yadi** na, **tal** lubdhaḥ kim eṣa tyajed?’  
ity antaḥ puruṣādhamāḥ kalayati prāyaḥ kṛto<sup>14</sup> pakriyaḥ. ||<sup>iii</sup> 55

U<sub>9r</sub> ity atra dvitīyapāde doṣaḥ.☒

☒<sup>3P5</sup>puṣṭo vyākhyātaḥ. yathāsaṃbhavaṃ duṣṭas<sup>15</sup> ca. apuṣṭas tu yatra☒ §3.3 apuṣṭa

<sup>i</sup>Untraced.

<sup>ii</sup>Kumārasaṃbhava 5.44c (p. 134). *The whole verse runs (ibid.):*

divaṃ yadi prārthayase, vṛthā śramaḥ.  
pituḥ pradeśās tava devabhūmayāḥ. |  
athopayantāram, alaṃ samādhinā.  
na ratnam anviṣyati. mṛgyate hi tat. ||

<sup>iii</sup>Rājataranṅinī of *Kalhana* 3.303 (vol. 3 p. 35).

<sup>1</sup>yadyarthayor *conj.* ] yadarthayor U, yattadarthayor (in D there is a vertical stroke above the akṣara °tta° whose meaning or purpose is unclear) DO

<sup>2</sup>°tha° UD<sup>pc</sup>O ] °⟨ca⟩° D<sup>ac</sup> <sup>3</sup>prayoge DO ] prayogo U <sup>4</sup>ya° DO ] *om.* U

<sup>5</sup>°thā DO<sup>pc</sup> (°thā || O<sup>pc</sup>) ] *om.* U, *om.* (°thā || is added in the left margin immediately before bhī°) O<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>6</sup>bhītīś cet te daṇḍadhārān U ] bhīticitte daṇḍadhārān DO

<sup>7</sup>khalasaṃśrayaḥ UD ] khalu saṃśrayaḥ O

<sup>8</sup>tadā U ] tathā DO <sup>9</sup>sādḥūn *conj.* ] sādḥū U, sādhu DO

<sup>10</sup>yatheccham avamānaya UD ] yathaccham avamāvamānaya O

<sup>11</sup>cen na śubhasya me *em.* ] cen na śu me U, ced aśubhasya me DO

<sup>12</sup>kiṃ UD ] ki O

<sup>13</sup>°n UD<sup>pc</sup> ] *om.* (in D the akṣara °n is added in the left margin) D<sup>ac</sup>O

<sup>14</sup>°to° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] ?? O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>15</sup>duṣṭas DO ] duṣ(ṭa)ś U

tadabhinnārthaparikalpanayedamā<sup>1</sup>dinām tacchabdasya samaśirṣikayopādānam. |yathā—

yasyā<sup>2</sup>abbindu<sup>3</sup>saṃsparśamātrād ga<sup>4</sup>rbhabhavaṃ<sup>4</sup> narāḥ |  
vyasanaṃ nāpnuvanty eva, Jāhnavīyaṃ<sup>5</sup> virājate. ||<sup>i</sup> 56

na cedamādīnām tacchabdārtha<sup>6</sup>tva<sup>7</sup>m iti puṣṭatvaṃ vācyam,

so 'yaṃ jagattra<sup>8</sup>yagu<sup>9</sup>rur vitanotu<sup>10</sup> kīrtim<sup>ii</sup> 57

ityā<sup>11</sup>dau punaruktatāprasaṅgāt,

īyaṃ kaṭi mattagajendragāmini<sup>iii</sup> 58

ityādau yacchabdāpekṣā ca bhavet.

§3.3.1 doṣa 1 sāmānā<sup>12</sup>dhikaraṇyena nairantaṛyeṇa prayogo duṣṭa eva. yathā—

D 259v

<sup>i</sup>Untraced.

<sup>ii</sup>Untraced.

<sup>iii</sup>Prabandhacintāmaṇi 6.[45]A (p. 24; the verse is attested in only one manuscript; Hindi tr. on Dvivedī 1940: 31). Cāṇakyanīti 1254A (vol. 2 part 3 p. 728 [with more sources cited]; this verse is placed in section B, which comprises the verses of doubtful origin; i.o. kaṭi the edition prints ghaṭi, which is the editor Sternbach's conjecture). The whole verse in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi edition runs (p. 24):

īyaṃ kaṭi mattagajendragāmini  
vicitrasimhāsanasaṃsthitā sadā |  
anekarāmājaghaneṣu lālītā  
vidher vaśān nirvasanīkṛtādhunā. ||

The whole verse in the Cāṇakyanīti edition runs (vol. 2 part 3 p. 728; note that AB matta°...°saṃsthitā is printed as a single compound):

īyaṃ ghaṭi mattagajendragāmini-  
vicitrasimhāsanasaṃsthitā sadā |

<sup>1</sup>kalpanayedamā° conj. ] °kalpanayā evamā° O <sup>2</sup>abbindu° D ] abindu° UO  
<sup>3</sup>d ga° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °d (bha)° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>4</sup>rbhabhavaṃ UD ] °rbhavaṃ O  
<sup>5</sup>jāhnavīyaṃ UD ] jāhnavīthaṃ O <sup>6</sup>tacchabdārtha° DO ] tacchabd(ā)rtha° U  
<sup>7</sup>tva° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] om. (the akṣara °tva° is added in the left margin) U<sup>ac</sup>  
<sup>8</sup>jagattra° UD ] jagattri° O <sup>9</sup>yagu° UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °(tta)??° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>10</sup>tu UDO<sup>pc</sup> ] °ta O<sup>ac</sup>  
<sup>11</sup>tyā° DO<sup>pc</sup> ] °tyā(m)° U, °ti° O<sup>ac</sup> <sup>12</sup>sāmānā° em. ] samānā° UDO

visāri romāñcanakañcukaṃ tanos  
tanoti<sup>1</sup> yo 'sau subhage<sup>2</sup> tavāgataḥ. ||<sup>i</sup> 59

anyasyedamādeḥ prayogo<sup>3</sup> 'doṣaḥ. yathā—

Exception

jyotir<sup>4</sup> yad etad, ida<sup>5</sup>m Amba tava svarūpam. ||<sup>ii</sup> 60

iti.

evaṃ kaviḥ kāvyagatiṃ vicārya  
kāvyam samādhāya<sup>6</sup> mano<sup>7</sup> nirundhyāt<sup>8</sup>. |  
vicitraśabdārthamayaṃ surīti  
pratīyamānārtha<sup>9</sup> mano<sup>10</sup>haraṃ ca || 61

§3.4 Two concluding verses

anekarāmājanalālītā. paraṃ  
vidher vaśāt saiva satī prajārthini. ||

<sup>i</sup>Kāvyaṃprakāśa 7.52.185CD (vol. 1 p. 126). AB run (ibid.):

apāṅgasamṣargi taramḡitaṃ dṛśor,  
bhruvor arālāntavilāsi vellanam, |

(note that the edition prints A apāṅgasamṣargitarāṅgitaṃ, B arālāntavilāsisivel-  
lanam, and C visāriromāñcanakañcukaṃ, all as single compounds; against these I  
have adopted my own word division above, which I think is better).

<sup>ii</sup>Pañcastavī 2.11D (p. 26). The whole verse runs (ibid.):

mūrdhni sphurattuhinadīdhitidīptiptaṃ  
madhyelalāṭam amarāyudharaśmicitraṃ |  
hṛccakracumbi hutabhukkaṇikānurūpaṃ  
jyotir yad etad, idam Amba tava svarūpam. ||

<sup>1</sup>tanoti U ] tanotu D, tanottu O <sup>2</sup>subhage UD ] svabhage O

<sup>3</sup>prayogo UD ] prayoge O <sup>4</sup>jyotir UD ] jyorir O

<sup>5</sup>°da° UD<sup>pc</sup> ] om. (in D the akṣara °da° is added in the left margin) D<sup>ac</sup>O

<sup>6</sup>samādhāya UD ] samādhaya O

<sup>7</sup>mano UD ] manor O <sup>8</sup>nirundhyāt DO ] virudhyāt U <sup>9</sup>pratīyamānārtha° U ]  
pratīmānārtha° D, pratīmānārtha° O <sup>10</sup>°no° U<sup>pc</sup>DO ] °⟨n⟩o° (the akṣara °no° is  
added below the akṣara °⟨n⟩o° in the bottom margin) U<sup>ac</sup>

kurvan kaviḥ kāṃyam upaiti<sup>1</sup> kīrtiṃ<sup>2</sup>  
śaratprasannendumarīcisubhrām. |  
kīrtiṃ ca<sup>3</sup> gīrvāṇapurīnivāsa-  
nimittam ādyaṃ munayo vadanti. || 62

U 9v

(colophon)

om śrīr Anvayakalikā pūrṇā cittritā Kaulagaṇeśeneti.

---

<sup>1</sup>upaiti U ] upeti DO    <sup>2</sup>kīrtiṃ DO ] k(ī)rtiṃ U

<sup>3</sup>kīrtiṃ ca D ] kīrtiś ca U, kīrtiṃ O

## 2.5 Endnotes

☒ <sup>1E1</sup> *suhṛjjanasyā°... caraṇāmbujāni. || 1 ]* The opening verse of the *Anvayakalikā* translates as follows:

At (lit. because of) the request of friends, a certain learned person makes the following (lit. this) effort, having remembered <in three ways> [his] gurus' foot-lotuses [which] burn away the fuelwood in the form of the obstacles.

This opening verse is rather neutral and hardly tells us anything about the work or its author. Only two small details require some comment.

First, with AB *kaś cit [...] vipāścit* the author of the AnK appears to be referring to himself in the third person, calling himself 'a certain learned person'. This appears a bit odd and suggests the possibility that this opening verse was composed by somebody other than the author of the AnK.

Second, it is not clear with which element one should construe c *tridhā*. There are five possible candidates:

- (1) B *etaṃ prayatnam* 'this threefold effort', given that the AnK has three chapters;
- (2) B *kurute*, 'makes this effort in three ways', given that the AnK has three chapters;
- (3) c °*antarāya*<sup>1</sup> 'threefold obstacles'—what are these?;
- (4) c °*dāhakāni* 'burning away the obstacle-fuelwood in three ways'—which three ways?; and
- (5) D *smṛtvā* 'having remembered in three ways the gurus' foot-lotuses'—which three ways?<sup>2</sup>

< [20250610] Following Haru's suggestion on 20250607, I am now convinced that it's best to construe *tridhā* with *antarāya* 'threefold obstacles (i.e. the ādhyātīmika, ādhibhautika, and ādhidaivika types of obstacles)'. Here are three texts where this idea of the threefold obstacles is found: (1) Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* (as *antarāya*): "Abhisamayalamkaraloka.md", l. c. 4581 «yadī vādhidāivikam ādhibhautikam ādhyātmikam cāntarāyam[next line]adhikṛtya (yathānyāyaṃ rakṣāvaraṇa-guptayo jñeyāḥ. āpad vā tridhā. sva-[next line]pratyaya-jā para-sattva-saṃkhyāta-pratyaya-jā paramatva-saṃkhyāta-pratyaya-[next

<sup>1</sup>Note that when construed with °*antarāya*° it is best to understand *tridhā*° as a part of the compound *tridhā-antarāya-indhana-dāhaka* (rather than an independent word).

<sup>2</sup>Note that remembering (the action of e.g. √*smṛ*) is distinct from saluting (the action of e.g. √*nam*), which latter can indeed be threefold: with body (e.g. *kāyena*), with speech (e.g. *vacasā*), and with mind (e.g. *manasā*).

line]jā ca.)» (2) A Gaṇeśagītā comm. (as vighna): "Ganesagita-*H*aru.md" l. c. 87: «[...] ādhyātmikādhībhautikādhīdaivikānām vighnānām bāhulyād vīplavate[*next line*]tatrādhiviyādhījo vighna ādyaḥ dvitīyaḥ śītoṣṇādījaḥ antyas tu [...]». In addition, l. 91 has [...] vighnebhyas trividhebhyo [...] (3) Gadyatrāya (as perhaps duḥkhavighna): "Gadyatrāya-*H*aru.md" l. c. 50: «ādhyātmika-ādhībhautika-ādhīdaivika-duḥkhavighnagandharahitas tvam [...]» ādhyātmika: problems with body and mind, personal problems; 2 subtypes: śārīram and mānasam ādhībhautika: problems caused by other creatures (bhūti) like birds or snakes ādhīdaivika: natural disasters, e.g. earthquake or lightning strikes The oldest attestation of this idea seems to be in sāmkhya, where these constitute three types of duḥkha. This idea was then borrowed into Buddhism. ›

<sup>1E2</sup> *tatra nāmākhyāto... bhedakatvam.* ] Near its very beginning the AnK greets us with <one of the longest sentences it has/its very longest sentence>. In the edition, I have used commas to mark sense groups, recognising four such groups:

(1) *tatra nāmākhyāto...āvasthāne* 'on the subject of ...' (on the subject of the fivefold padas' being *viśeṣaṇas* and *viśeṣyas*);

(2) *viśeṣaṇasya vyavacchedakatvāt ...āniyame 'pi* 'even though ...' (even though there is no restriction as to which one of *sādhyā* and *sādhana* is *viśeṣaṇa*);

(3) *sādhanānām sādhyārtham ... nyāyād aprādhānye* 'sādhanas being non-principal ...' (granted (2), *sādhanas* are non-principal—for two reasons, each expressed with an ablative phrase: *sādhyārtham ... dr̥tyādīnām* and *yo hi ... iti nyāyāt*); and

(4) *sphuṭam eva ... bhedakatvam* '[*sādhanas*] are very clearly *viśeṣaṇas*' (*sādhanas* being non-principal, and there being the implicit assumption that of *viśeṣaṇa* and *viśeṣya viśeṣaṇa* is non-principal and *viśeṣya* is principal, *sādhanas* are very clearly *viśeṣaṇas* [and not *viśeṣyas*].)

Crucially, note that the word *sādhanānām* in (3) is to be construed with *aprādhānye* in (3) as well as *bhedakatvam* in (4): *sādhanānām ... aprādhānye [sati] ... bhedakatvam* 'sādhanas, being non-principal, are *viśeṣaṇas*.'

In accordance with the analysis above, my tentative translation of this long sentence is as follows:

- (1) On the subject of<sup>1</sup> the words'—nouns, verbs, preverbs, *nipātas*, and *karmapravacanīyas*—functioning as *viśeṣaṇas* and *viśeṣyas* in it (= a sentence),<sup>2</sup>
- (2) even though [there is] no restriction as to which one (lit. either) of *sādhyā* and *sādhana* is *viśeṣaṇa* due to a *viśeṣaṇa*'s being a delimiter,<sup>3</sup>
- (3) *sādhana*s being non-principal (*sādhanānām [...]* *aprādhānye* [*sati*]) due to [their (= *sādhanas*')] being taken up for the sake of *sādhyā*—like a leather water bag and so on [is taken up] for water and so on—[and]<sup>4</sup> the principle that [if] (lit. for [*hi*] [if]) x is taken up for the sake of y, [then] x does not go beyond the subordinacy towards y (i.e. x is invariably subordinate to y),
- (4) [*sādhanas*] are very clearly *viśeṣaṇas* (*bhedaka* = *viśeṣaṇa*),<sup>5</sup> in the same way that (°*vat* in *nīlādivat*) [the word] *nīla*° and so on in [the word] *nīlotpala* and so on [is very clearly a *viśeṣaṇa*].<sup>6</sup>

In spite of its lengthiness and convoluted structure, the main point or the upshot of the present sentence seems to be a simple one, namely that of *sādhana* and *sādhyā*, *sādhana* is *viśeṣaṇa* (and *sādhyā* is *viśeṣya*). The logic leading to this upshot is as follows. The present sentence explicitly says that *sādhana* is *aprādhāna* 'non-principal' (*sādhanānām [...]* *aprādhānye*). What it does not explicitly say but implicitly assumes is that of

<sup>1</sup>I take the loc. in *avasthāne* as a *viśayasaptamī*.

<sup>2</sup>I construe the first word *tatra* (= *vākye*) with *avasthāne*.

<sup>3</sup>I.e. as both *sādhyā* and *sādhana* can be a delimiter, either can be *viśeṣaṇa*.

<sup>4</sup>The two ablative phrases *sādhyārtham upāttatvāt salilārtham iva dr̥tyādinām* and *yo hi yadartham upādīyate, sa taṃ prati guṇatām nātivartate iti nyāyāt* are simply put one after another without any connecting word such as *ca*, a structure I do not feel very comfortable with. (*hi*, the second word of the second ablative phrase, does not seem to connect the two phrases in any way; its presence here may be simply due to the fact that it is present in the parallels—the potential sources—in the VV and the VVR [see fn. ii on p. 28].) I am here supplying a *ca* 'and', although I am not entirely sure whether the two ablative phrases are coordinate/parallel to each other or rather have some other kind of relation. (In addition, it does not appear to me to be an attractive idea to conjecture a *ca*, e.g. to conjecture *iti nyāyāc cāprādhānye* i.o. *iti nyāyād aprādhānye*.)

<sup>5</sup>I.e. *sādhanas* are *viśeṣaṇas* and not *viśeṣyas*.

<sup>6</sup>*nīlādi*° in *nīlādivat* is genitival: *nīlādivat* = *nīlādīnām iva*, and *nīlādīnām* [*bhedakatvam*] corresponds to *sādhanānām [...]* *bhedakatvam* (mine: *yathā nīlotpālādau nīlādīnām sphuṭam eva bhedakatvam, tathā sādhanānām sphuṭam eva bhedakatvam*).

*viśeṣaṇa* and *viśeṣya*, *viśeṣaṇa* is *apradhāna* and *viśeṣya* *pradhāna* ‘principal’ (this appears to be commonsensical). Thus, *sādhana* is *viśeṣaṇa* (and *sādhya* *viśeṣya*).

<sup>1T1</sup> *nyāyād aprādhānye* ] U reads *nyāyād aprādhānye* (which I adopt), D *nyāyā ca prādhānye*, and O *nyāyāc ca prādhānye* (fn. 2 on p. 28). One possible corruption route is as follows. U’s original and correct °*d a*° first corrupted to D’s °*c a*°. Note that in the *Śāradā* script the *akṣara da* can easily corrupt to *ca*—if *da*’s upward tail is written a bit longer and touches the *śiromātrā*, then it becomes *ca* (*ca* is, however, not that easily corruptible to *da*). With °*c a*°, D’s reading *nyāyāc aprādhānye/nyāyā ca prādhānye* does not make sense and O tried to improve on it, leading to the further corruption °*c ca*. In this manner, U’s original *aprādhānye* corrupted to O’s opposite *prādhānye* (accompanied with an additional *ca*).

<sup>1T2</sup> <*nāpumsakaḥ*> ] Why do I adopt the reading *nāpumsakaḥ* and not *napumsakaḥ*?

*nāpumsaka*: two reasons: (1) *saṃskāra*: better *nāpumsaka* (2) the better two MSS have this reading

SPS9d «*napumsakenaiva saṃskāraḥ*»: this perhaps support our AnK reading *nāpu*°? *saṃskāra* Jim: ‘a way of completing a word, bringing a word to being complete/sādhya’, ‘completion’ Jim prefers *napu*°. >

<sup>1T3</sup> *bhrāntaṃ* ] As is reported in fn. 5 on p. 32, manuscript U reads *bhrāntaṃ* and DO read *bhrāntvā*. An attractive reading though *bhrāntvā* is,<sup>1</sup> I

<sup>1</sup>Considering just the verse itself, I would instinctively prefer *bhrāntvā* to *bhrāntaṃ*. *bhrāntvā* fits the verse very well. In particular, it gives a better structure to the verse than *bhrāntaṃ*, allowing *pāda* A (*bhrāntvā deśam anekadurgaviṣa-*

have adopted U's *bhrāntaṃ*, which I regard with little doubt as the original reading of the AnK, for the simple reason that later on in the same sentence the AnK says explicitly *bhāvaktapratyayāntasya bhrameḥ* 'of the verbal root √*bhram* ending in the suffix *-Kta* expressing *bhāva*'.

<sup>1T4</sup> *ananubhavato conj.* ] All three manuscripts read *anubhavato* (fn. 2 on p. 33); despite this I conjecture its negative form *ananubhavato*. It appears to me clear that the AnK understands *deśam* in the example *bhrāntaṃ deśam ...* as a *sādhya-samānādhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa* of *bhrāntaṃ* (just as in the previous example the AnK clearly understands *svārtham* as a *sādhya-samānādhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa* of *samīhate*). Given this, one would expect that *deśa* does not experience/possess the state of being a *vyadhikaraṇa-viśeṣaṇa* of *bhrānta*, hence my conjectured *ananubhavato*. (Note in addition that °*m ananu*° [in *vyadhikaraṇaviśeṣaṇatām ananubhavato*] can very easily corrupt into °*m anu*° [in *vyadhikaraṇaviśeṣaṇatām anubhavato*].)

<sup>1T5</sup> *māsaṃ paṭhyate conj.* ] Curiously, all three manuscripts read *māmsaṃ paṭyate* (fn. 4 on p. 33), which does not make sense in the context and appears to be a corruption inherited directly or indirectly from a common source. Since *kāla* 'time', among others, is being discussed, I conjecture *māsaṃ* 'for a month' in place of *māmsaṃ*. I feel less confident about my conjecture *paṭhyate* in place of *paṭyate*, but nothing better comes to mind. Following the teachings of A 2.3.5 *kālādhvanor atyantasaṃyoge* and A 2.3.6 *apavarge tṛtīyā*, my translation for *māsaṃ paṭhyate* is: '[It] is being studied for a month (and the study goes on beyond this month).'

<sup>1E3</sup> *ghuṇasyākṣaranirmāṇe na syād akṣaracuñcutā. ||* ] In addition to Hahn's *maṃ prāptaṃ na kiṃ cit phalam.*) to describe one event in one sentence, just

explanation in Hahn 2008b: 171 fn. 2, one may see for example PWG s.v. *ghuṇākṣara*, *Laukikanyāyāñjali* s.v. *ghuṇākṣaranyāyaḥ* (vol. 1 pp. 26–27), and AP appendix E s.v. *ghuṇākṣaranyāyaḥ* (vol. 3 p. 61a).

<sup>1T6</sup> *akṣaracuñcutā conj.* ] All three AnK manuscripts read *akṣaracuñcutā* (fn. 10 on p. 33). In ‹the only other known› occurrence of the present verse, namely that in SPS 31 (p. 170<sub>5–6</sub>), the edition prints *akṣaracuñcutā*, the reading of all four manuscripts used by the editor Hahn.<sup>1</sup> Of *cañcu* and *cuñcu*, one appears to be a corruption of the other—which one is more original, and which one is the corruption? This question is not easy to answer. If we confine ourselves for now to the Pāṇinian system, the *sūtra* relevant here is A 5.2.26 *tena vittaś cuñcupcaṇapau* (p. 239), which teaches, among others, the taddhita suffix *-cuñcuP* in the sense of ‘well known for something’ (hence *akṣaracuñcutā* ‘the state of being well known for letters, scribe-hood, writer-hood’), and the answer to the question above depends (at least partly) on the form of this suffix taught in A 5.2.26. Böhtlingk’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* edition 1887 (p. 239), the standard *Aṣṭādhyāyī* edition I use in the present work, as well as some other editions,<sup>2</sup> read *cuñcup°* in A 5.2.26. On the other hand, I am not aware of any source that reads *cañcup°* in the *sūtra* A 5.2.26. The form of the suffix taught in A 5.2.26 being thus exclusively *-cuñcup* (as far as my knowledge goes), *-cuñcu* appears to me to be the more original form of this suffix, of which *-cañcu* appears to be a corruption, and accordingly I conjecture

like *pādas* B (*tyaktvā jātikulābhimānam ucitaṃ sevā kṛtā niṣphalā.* ) and C (*bhuktaṃ mānavivarjitaṃ paraḅṛthe āśaṅkayā kākavat.*). The reading *bhrāntaṃ*, on the other hand, forces *pāda* A to describe the same event in two sentences (*bhrāntaṃ deśam anekadurgaviṣamaṃ. prāptaṃ na kiṃ cit phalam.*), thus ruining the parallelism. (Cf. also fn. iii on p. 32.)

<sup>1</sup>That all of Hahn’s four manuscripts read *akṣaracuñcutā* is not explicitly stated but can be inferred from the absence of any footnote on the word *akṣaracuñcutā* (there is in fact no footnote on the entire second half of the verse).

<sup>2</sup>The Osmania edition of the *Kāśikā*, the standard *Kāśikā* edition I use in the present work, reads *cuñcup°* in A 5.2.26 (vol. 2 p. 503) and reports no variant. (A 5.2.26 does not occur in the *Bhāṣya*.) In addition, the total absence of A 5.2.26 in Birwé’s article 1958 on the variants in *adhyāyas* 4–5 of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* implies that all the 12 editions (see the list on pp. 133–134) used by him, among which is also Böhtlingk’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* edition 1887, read *cuñcup°* in A 5.2.26.

*akṣaracuñcutā* against all three AnK manuscripts' *akṣaracañcutā*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1T7</sup> *pramāṇāni pramāṇaṃ vā vedā iti conj.* ] As is reported in fn. 2 on p. 37, all three manuscripts read *pramāṇāni vedāḥ pramāṇaṃ veti* (except that O omits the *anusvāra* in *pramāṇaṃ*). Although this reading, in prose, is possible, I have ventured to make the conjecture above, essentially just moving the word *vedāḥ* to immediately before the word *iti*, so that we now have an *anuṣṭubh* hemistich in *pramāṇāni pramāṇaṃ vā vedā iti vibhāṣayā*. The justification for this conjecture is that SP 8AB (p. 102; quoted above in fn. i on p. 38) reads exactly *pramāṇāni pramāṇaṃ vā vedā iti vibhāṣayā* (all Hahn's four manuscripts agree in this reading, as can be inferred from the absence of any footnote there), and, given the apparently very close relationship between the SP-SPS and the AnK, I consider it more likely that this is also the original reading in the AnK, with all three AnK manuscripts' readings being but corruptions, and it is less likely that the prose *pramāṇāni vedāḥ pramāṇaṃ veti vibhāṣayā* is the AnK's original reading.

<sup>1T10</sup> <°bhāṣa° ] This is a complicated case involving several marks and multiple corrections. The MS at this site looks like this: [image of this area of D(255r23)]

<sup>1</sup>Here I am concerned with the reading of just the *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra* 5.2.26. It may be noted in addition that in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* commentaries we do find evidence of the form *-cañcu* for the suffix in question. For example, in his text of vt.-Bh 1.3.7.1 and Bh 1.3.7.3 Kielhorn adopts the readings *cuñcup*° (vt. 1.3.7.1 [1.263<sub>11</sub>]), *cuñcup*° (Bh 1.3.7.1 [1.263<sub>12</sub>]), *keśacuñcuḥ* (Bh 1.3.7.1 [ibid.]), and *cuñcup*° (Bh 1.3.7.3 [1.263<sub>17-18</sub>]) and in the variant section (1.523a<sub>12-13</sub>) reports the following with reference to the first reading: 'G here & below *caṃcu*°; in marg. *cum*° *pāṭhām*°' (G is Kielhorn's chief manuscript [see 1.8<sub>18-21</sub> in the preface]; *pāṭhām*° apparently stands for *pāṭhāntaram*). For another example, in *Kāśikā* 5.2.26 the edition prints *cuñcup* (vol. 2 p. 503<sub>6</sub>) and *vidyācuñcuḥ* (vol. 2 p. 503<sub>7</sub>) in the text, for which it reports the variants *cañcup* and *vidyācañcuḥ* in footnotes 4 and 6 respectively.

What happens at this site appears to me to be the following. At the very beginning the scribe seems to write «°kalpaḥ», possibly under the influence of vikalpaḥ in lines 21–22 which he has just written. Then two vertical strokes are added above the akṣaras °ka° and °lpa°, one above each akṣara. In addition, two daṇḍa-like strokes are added, one to the lower left of the akṣara «°ka°» and the other to the lower right of the visarga «ḥ», as if functioning as brackets bracketing the akṣaras °kalpaḥ (these two strokes seem to correspond to the two daṇḍa-like strokes in the bottom marginal addition «| bhāṣa |»; alternatively and less likely, the daṇḍa-like stroke following «ḥ» may be meant as a full-stop daṇḍa—above in lines 21–22 we do have a daṇḍa following «ḥ» in «vikalpaḥ |», so under the influence of this first «vikalpaḥ |» the scribe not only wrongly wrote again °kalpaḥ but also the daṇḍa that follows «ḥ»—under this alternative, however, the first daṇḍa-like stroke preceding «°ka°» seem to be hard to account for, so that this alternative is less likely than the first proposal where the two strokes are thought to function as a pair of brackets bracketing the akṣaras °kalpaḥ). Then, «| kalpaḥ |» together with the two upper vertical strokes are effaced—the effacement is not total, so that these elements leave visible traces after the effacement. Then, after the effacement, an anusvāra-like dot (or perhaps a circle)—perhaps a sign of marginal addition?—is written between the two upper vertical strokes, and in the bottom margin the scribe writes something that he intended the reader to read in lieu of that effaced segment (that the scribe chooses to add things in the bottom margin rather than on top of that effaced segment/in the space where that segment is effaced is possibly because traces of the effaced elements are still visible in that space and anything written on top of these traces will become hard to read; the scribe thus chooses to add things in the bottom margin so that they can be clearly readable). In the bottom margin first he writes bha or bhā followed by one or two illegible akṣaras, all of which seem to be effaced—the effacement is again not total, leaving traces of a clearly readable consonant «bh». Then, directly beneath the marginal elements he has just effaced he writes | bhāṣa | followed by one akṣara that is also effaced and illegible (the two daṇḍas here seem to answer the two daṇḍas in above | kalpaḥ |—all these four daṇḍas seem to function as brackets marking the boundary of the elements in question). Furthermore, a circle is added above the akṣara °ṣa in «| bhāṣa |» —this is possibly an addition/insertion sign that pairs/corresponds to/answers the anusvāra-like dot/circle above; alternatively, this may be a part of an akṣara belonging to the effaced marginal addition that the effacement has not removed/alternatively, this may be a remnant of what is effaced above «| bhāṣa |».

This is my story/reconstruction of this case. We seem to have altogether three corrections at this place: an in-line effacement, a first bottom margin addition that is entirely effaced, and a second bottom margin addition that is partially effaced. At any rate, if we do not take into consideration the punctuation marks, the point of departure is °kalpaḥ, and the final destination is °bhāṣa°—this much seems clear.›

<sup>1E4</sup> *strīva gacchati ...* ] To summarise the teachings of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* and *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* passages in fn. i on p. 39 and fn. i on p. 40, we find three views on the subject of *liṅgabhedā* in *upamā* (the divergence of the genders of the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word in an *upamā*):

(1) no restriction, i.e. the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word can freely take any gender—this is the view of Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyaḍarśa* (2.51ACD and 2.54AB);

(2) partial restriction, i.e. the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word can freely take any gender barring the combination of masculine + feminine/feminine + masculine<sup>1</sup>—this is the view of Bhāmaha in his *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* (2.57ABC; the example in 2.53, by the way, nicely illustrates this with two pairs of *upamāna* and *upameya* words, one pair f. + m., and the other m. + f.); and

(3) total restriction, i.e. the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word must have the same gender—this is the view of ‘others’ (*anyaiḥ*) recorded in *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 2.57CD.

Among these three views, the AnK in its present passage appears to subscribe to view (1).

On the subject of *vacanabhedā* in *upamā* (the divergence of the numbers of the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word in an *upamā*), on the other hand, we find two views:

(a) no restriction, i.e. the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word can freely take any number—this is the view of Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyaḍarśa* (2.51ACD and 2.54AB); and

(b) total restriction, i.e. the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word must have the same number—this is the view of Bhāmaha in his *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In other words, the genders of the *upamāna* word and the *upameya* word can be m. + nt. or f. + nt. (besides m. + m., f. + f., or nt. + nt.) but cannot be m. + f. (To note in passing, it seems odd that while m. + f. is not permitted, nt. + f. is permitted.)

<sup>2</sup>In *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* 2.39–40 (p. 12) Bhāmaha enumerates seven (2.40B *sapta*) flaws

Among these two views, the AnK in its present passage appears to subscribe to view (a).

<sup>1T8</sup> *strīva conj.* (fn. 1 on p. 39) ] Not considering the *daṇḍa*, all three manuscripts offer the same reading for the initial segment of the present section (§1.2.3.3): U reads *ata eva strīva gacchati śaṅṭho yam ityādau tu | upamānasyopameyaṃ prati* and DO read *ata eva | strīva gacchati śaṅṭho yam ityādau tu upamānasyopameyaṃ prati*. The combination of *ata eva* and *tu* here found in all three manuscripts appears to me to be an infelicity: it is unnatural, awkward, and hence unlikely to be original. In particular, *tu*'s being in the third position of the sentence in a prose passage seems very odd. A possible remedy is to delete one of *ata eva* and *tu* and keep the other. I have tentatively chosen to delete *ata eva* and keep *tu* (which then falls into the second position of the sentence, the expected position), since semantically and logically the latter seems to work fine in the context (*tu* as a topicaliser, 'as for'), while the former (*ata eva* 'for this very reason') does not seem to work very well.

<sup>1T9</sup> *viśeṣyatvam conj.* ] As is reported in fn. 11 on p. 40, all three manuscripts read *viśeṣaṇatvaṃ*, a reading that does not fit the context and against which I conjecture *viśeṣyatvam*, which fits the flow of the argument well: after giving the example *himakliṣṭam ivāmbujam* 'like a snow-stricken lotus' which consists of the *upamāna ambuja* 'lotus', the

---

of *upamā* (2.40A *upamādoṣa*), among which is *vacanabheda* (2.39B °*vacobheda*) (as well as *liṅgabheda* [2.39AB *liṅga*°[...]°*bheda*] and *viparyaya* [2.39B *viparyaya*]). Starting from 2.41 (ibid.), Bhāmaha discusses them one by one. The three flaws *liṅgabheda*, *vacanabheda*, and *viparyaya* are discussed together in one section, namely that comprising 2.52–57 (p. 14). In this section, Bhāmaha does not give any theoretical discussion on *vacanabheda* but merely illustrates it with the example 2.53. This implies that for Bhāmaha *vacanabheda* is an outright *doṣa*—it is not, as is the case with *liṅgabheda*, a *doṣa* only in some qualified way. Consequently, I understand Bhāmaha's view on *vacanabheda* to be one of total restriction.

*upamādyotaka iva* ‘like’, and a *viśeṣaṇa* of the *upamāna himakliṣṭa* ‘snow-stricken’ (we do not have an explicit *upameya* here, but presumably it is a weary or haggard face), the *pūrvapakṣin* claims that the *upamāna ambuja*, being a *viśeṣya* (i.e. of *himakliṣṭa*) (*upamānasya viśeṣyatvam*), cannot be a *viśeṣaṇa* (i.e. of the *upameya*) as well (*na tu viśeṣaṇatvam api*), for a single given thing cannot possess two contradictory qualities (*ekasyaiva viruddhadharmadvayayogāt*). This claim is then rejected in what comes next in the passage.

<sup>1T11</sup> < †*bahuratno vaṇik ... vibhaktiviśeṣagatā. †* ] This sentence is textually difficult. For now I can’t think of a better way to constitute the text than the current one, although I am not completely satisfied with the constituted text.

The major problems/uncertainties are (1) «*astrīś caitraḥ*» (D, but the reading of «°ś c°» there is uncertain) vs «*astrī caitraḥ*» (UO) (p. ?? fn. ??), (2) «*anyapadārthasya*» (my conjecture) vs «*uttarapadārthasya*» (the reading of all three MSS) (p. ?? fn. ??), and (3) «*vibhaktiviśeṣagatā*» (D) (p. ?? fn. ??).

Since *bahuratna* in *bahuratno vaṇik* must be a bv., I assume that *astrī* in *astrīś caitraḥ* is also a bv., and hence adopt the reading «*astrīś*» (in «*astrīś caitraḥ*» «*astrī*» must be a bv.; under the reading «*astrī caitraḥ*» «*astrī*» must be a f. tp.). Since in a bv. the predominant element is *anyapadārtha* ‘the meaning of the other word (i.e. the word the bv. as an adj. qualifies)’, I have conjectured «*anyapadārthasya*» in place of «*uttarapadārthasya*», the reading of all three MSS. (With the reading «*uttarapadārthasya*» it may work if one understands «*uttarapada°*» to denote ‘the word following the compound’ (in the two examples, *vaṇik* and *caitraḥ*), but this sense of «*uttarapada°*» is too unusual and virtually impossible. I understand «*uttarapada°*» to denote the usual sense ‘the posterior/second member of a compound’, and under this usual sense «*uttarapada°*» is clearly not appropriate here—admittedly under the reading «*astrī caitraḥ*», which gives us the tp. «*astrī*», «*uttarapada°*» can work (*astrī* is a tp., whose *uttarapada*, which is the *pradhāna* element, is °*strī* and the compound’s gender does follow the gender of the *pradhāna* element (f.), as the principle «*samāse pradhānasambandhinyāv eva liṅgasamkhye*» teaches), but still «*uttarapada°*» cannot work with the example «*bahuratno vaṇik*», the reading of which is fairly certain).

Finally, «vibhaktivīśeṣagatā» is the reading of D, while U reads «vibhaktivīśeṣyagatā». «°vīśeṣya°» is of course one of the principal words in the present context/section which treats vīśeṣaṇas, but I cannot make good/better sense of U's «vibhaktivīśeṣyagatā». One might try adding a full stop after «tallīngatā» (thus splitting this sentence into two) and, since the second sentence needs a subject/nom., conjecturing «°r vī°» in place of «vī°» i.e. «vibhaktir vīśeṣyagatā» (with U's «°vīśeṣyagatā» the second sentence reads «dharmadharmaṇor ubhayaor api vibhaktir vīśeṣyagatā.»), but that does not make much sense since it is odd to say 'vibhakti in a vīśeṣya'. D's «vibhaktivīśeṣagatā» is the best reading among the readings of the three MSS, although admittedly it is odd to say that the vibhakti has a certain gender (the gender of the anyapada)—one would expect rather that the stem has a certain gender (this is however understandable since vibhakti 'nominal ending' is the major element that manifests the gender).

I would thus translate my constituted text: 'In the examples «bahuratno vaṇik» "a merchant having much wealth", «astrīś caitraḥ» "Caitra [who] has no wife", etc., since the meaning of the other word (i.e. the word qualified by the bv. compound) is predominant, the state of having the gender of it (= the other word) is [found] in (°gata) the particular nominal endings (vibhaktivīśeṣa) of both the property (dharma) and the property possessor (dharmin) (i.e. the nominal endings of both the dharma (i.e., in the two examples, «bahu°» and «a°», the first member of the bv. compound) and the dharmin (i.e., in the two examples, «°ratna» and «°strī», the second member of the bv. compound) have/take on the gender of the other word).'

\*\*The point of this sentence is that the nominal endings of both members of a bv. compound take on the gender of the anyapada, i.e. the word qualified by that bv. compound.\*\*

In «dharmadharmaṇoḥ» I have understood—although I am not certain about it—«dharma°» 'property, a qualifying element' to refer to, in the two examples, the first compound member «bahu°» and «a°», and «dharmin°» 'a qualified element' to refer to, in the two examples, the second compound member «°ratna» and «°strī». \*\*The interesting point taught here is that in e.g. «bahuratno vaṇik» not only the compound «bahuratna» itself takes on the gender (m.) of «vaṇij», but its two members also individually do that. In «astrīś caitraḥ», not only does °strī become m., but the privative first member «a°» also becomes m.\*\*

One alternative interpretation of «dharmadharmaṇoḥ» is to understand «dharma°» to refer to the bv. compound (in the two examples, i.e. bahuratna and astrī), which is a qualifying element, and °«dharmin» the

anyapada (in the two examples, i.e. vaṇij/caitra), which is a qualified element. Then, in e.g. «bahuratno vaṇik», the vibhaktis of both «bahuratnaḥ» and «vaṇik» will have/take on the gender (m.) of the anyapada i.e. «vaṇik». While it is appropriate to say that (the vibhakti of) «bahuratnaḥ» takes on the gender of «vaṇik», it will be odd to say that (the vibhakti of) «vaṇik» itself also takes on the gender of «vaṇik» (note the wording «dharmadharmaṇor ubhayor api», which seems to emphasise that both dharma and dharmin are involved/participate in this). I think this alternative interpretation is inferior to my interpretation above, mainly because of this «vaṇik» itself taking on the gender of «vaṇik».)

<sup>1E5</sup> <dāsasya svāmīno dāsīm prati dāsyaśvāmitvavad iti samanantaram evoktam— śobhanasya rājñāḥ puruṣo ’nuyāti. ] «dāsasya svāmīno dāsīm prati dāsyaśvāmitvavat»: my anvaya and tr.: dāsīm prati svāmīnaḥ sa- taḥ/svāmībhūtasya dāsasya dāsyaśvāmitvavat ’like the being a slave and being a master on the part of a slave [who is] the master of (lit. towards) [his own] wife (lit. slave girl).’ The idea is that a slave is a slave to his master but also is himself a master to his wife. Depending on the thing in relation («apekṣayā») a thing can acquire an opposite («viparyayaḥ») quality and there is no problem with this. In the same way, depending on the thing/word in relation, a viśeṣya can also be a viśeṣaṇa: e.g. in «śobhanasya rājñāḥ puruṣo yāti», rājan the viśeṣya of śobhana is also a viśeṣaṇa if we consider it in relation to «puruṣa». The viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāva/Being a viśeṣya or viśeṣaṇa is relative and not absolute.

The «iti» in «iti samanantaram evoktam» seems to be a ’therefore iti’ rather than a ’quote iti’, i.e. «ity [ataḥ] samanantaram evoktam—».

The idea of «samanantaram evoktam» ’[the following is] said immediately afterwards/right after’ is unclear difficult (there is no textual problem here, it seems)—where is it said? Is the AnK here referring to/quoting/re- porting/paraphrasing the words in some other work (e.g. the VV/VVR or some lost work in the Samanvaya school)? >

<sup>1T12</sup> <yata uktam— ... pacinānvayaḥ. // ] I fail to see how «yata uktam

pradhānakriyāśaktyabhidhāne ...» can be a cause («yataḥ») of what precedes it. «yata uktaṃ ... pacinānvayaḥ» seems to be talking about/seems to fall in the topic of the previous section i.e. passive absolutive-related things and does not seem to fit what immediately precedes it. One possible explanation for this is that there has occurred the displacement of chunk(s) of text (a type of 'macro-corruption'). (No MS however has a diverging/distinct order/all three MSS however agree in the order of the text.)

The passage «yata uktaṃ ... pacinānvayaḥ» seems to fit well after «mukhyakriyābhidhānabalāt prathamaiva, na dvitīyā.» On the other hand, the passage «evaṃ praśamsaṃ ... pūrvavad dvitīyātraiva.» seems to fit well after «codyam etan nirākṛtaṃ iti». Thus, one possible solution, which is perhaps also the simplest solution, is to \*\*swap/exchange the place of the two passages «tathā devadatta ānīya ... mukhyakriyābhidhānabalāt prathamaiva, na dvitīyā.» and «evaṃ praśamsaṃ ... pūrvavad dvitīyātraiva.», resulting in «(new topic: action A is the karman of action B and the word denoting action A is in the dvitīyā ) ata eva paśya mrgo ... codyam etan nirākṛtaṃ iti. evaṃ praśamsaṃ ... pūrvavad dvitīyātraiva. (new topic: passive absolutive) tathā devadatta ānīya ... mukhyakriyābhidhānabalāt prathamaiva, na dvitīyā. yata uktaṃ pradhānakriyāśaktyabhidhāne ... pacinānvayaḥ. || (new topic: justifying distinct tenses used together) evaṃ sati athāndhakāraṃ ...».\*\* (In this swapped order, «pūrvavad» in «pūrvavad dvitīyātraiva» works perhaps fine, «pūrva°» referring to perhaps «dhāvanaṃ paśya» (which is not far away from «pūrvavad».) (In the swapped order «evaṃ sati» (in «evaṃ sati athāndhakāraṃ») seems to fit fine with «... pacinānvayaḥ».—Well, «evaṃ sati» is after all not a strong connector and may fit well with anything that precedes it.) [Perhaps it is better not to adopt this swapped order in my main text, for this conjecture is too grand/big. Perhaps it is better to keep the order of the passages as it is found in the MSS (in fact all three MSS have the same order), and only suggest the swapped order in one of the endnotes, exactly as I'm doing it here. I could also ask {Haru} whether it would desirable to directly adopt this swapped order in my main text.] ›

<sup>1T13</sup> <girikandarāṇāṃ O ] girikandharāṇāṃ UD (!)

This is the only case/one of the very very few cases in the entire edition where I have preferred the reading of O, in general the least good

among the three MSS/the least well written among the three MSS/the most poorly written among the three MSS/the one of the poorest quality among the three MSS, to the readings of Uand D(in this case, Uand Dshare the same reading)/where in my view Ohas beaten both Uand D. [Why do I prefer O's reading?] I prefer O's reading «°kandarāṇām» to Uand D's shared «°kandharāṇām», because it seems the word «kandara» 'cave' fits best here/makes the best sense here (the commentators such as Vallabhadeva and Mallinātha also tell us that they understand the meaning 'cave'), while none of the senses of the word kaṁdhara (sandhi variantion kandhara), fits well in this context—also, it seems rare, if not unattested, that the word kaṁdhara could denote 'cave'. [How come Ooffers the best reading here and not Uand D? Why have the scribes of Uand Dwritten «°kandharāṇām» but the scribe of Owrote «°kandarāṇām»?] Why did the scribes of Uand Dwrite «°kandharāṇām»? One possible explanation is that they were under the influence of the preceding words «athāṇdhakāraṁ»: all the dental stops in these two words are aspirated—and, in particular, there occurs once the conjunct/ligature °ndha° in these two words—resulting in the scribes' writing the next dental stop, namely d in °kandarāṇām, as aspirated (i.e. dh) as well. The scribe of Omay have paid more attention here (it is possible that all three scribes knew the verse, a famous one, very well/by heart) and thus wrote °kandarāṇām. [Is this a significant case?] This only case/first case of the very few of the superiority of Oover Uand Din a specific reading is, however, not significant, since the word in question is a part of a well-known verse possibly known by heart by all three scribes. O's reading «°kandarāṇām» does not provide us with anything remarkable/unprecedented; and the scribes of Uand Dmay have simply made a slip here. [Haru's RV edition also records the reading °kandharāṇām] Finally, it may be helpful to remark that the RV edition used in the present work, that by Haru and Dominic and Szaba, also report both readings «°kandarāṇām» and «°kandharāṇām» for the present vs. (RV 2.46, "raghu2.pdf" p. 63). (Apart from these two, it also reports a third reading (out of altogether three readings), namely «°gahvarāṇām».) It is interesting that, as is reported in the mūla vs. apparatus there, the witnesses containing the reading «°kandharāṇām» in fact outnumber those containing the reading «°kandarāṇām». Despite this, the editors Haru et al. have there adopted the reading «°kandarāṇām» (as I'm doing here/the same as my choice here). That a large number of witnesses (how many in total?) contain the reading «°kandharāṇām» shows that «°kandharāṇām» is a wide-spread/common reading and can be a significant fact: either the scribes of all these witnesses made the same slip as those of the AnK MSS Uand D(then error of colouring/assimilation from

the preceding aspirants should be a very easily committed one), or—a possibility worth looking deeper into—«*kandharāṇam*» may indeed be the more original reading, «*kaṃdarāṇam*» being a corruption from it (then what sense should «*kandhara*» have? either *kandhara* can denote 'cave' or *kandhara* in some other sense is to be understood here) (is there a third possibility?).>

<sup>1T14</sup> <*prādhānyāt. nāpi conj.* ] *prādhānyā tenāpi* U, *prādhānyāt tenāpi* DO  
A possible corruption route: (prādhānyā)t nā(pi) → (prādhānyā)ta nā(pi)  
→ (prādhānyā) tenā(pi) (the last one/the result is exactly U's reading, with «*prādhānyā*» instead of «*prādhānyāt*»!).>

<sup>2P1</sup> *evaṃ vākyānām svārthapravṛttau ... <evaṃ nipātādīnām jñeyam. OR  
adhikaraṇādisaktir api vyāpṛtā.> (= §§2-2.1.3) ] Cf. KM 1.6 (pp. 22<sub>21</sub>-23<sub>8</sub>):  
padānām abhidhitisārthagranthanākaraḥ saṃdarbho vākyam.*

On vākya  
Definition of vākya  
Three types of vākya's  
abhidhāvāpāra

tasya ca **tridhābhidhāvāpāra** ity Audbhaṭāḥ— **vaibhaktaḥ, śāktaḥ,  
śaktivibhaktimayaś ca.** pratipadaṃ śrūyamāṇāsūpapadavibhaktiṣu kārakav-  
ibhaktiṣu vā **vaibhaktaḥ.** luptāsv api vibhaktiṣu samāsasāmarthyāt tadarthā-  
vagatau **śāktaḥ.** ubhayātmā ca **śaktivibhaktimayaḥ.**

1 vaibhakta **tatra vaibhaktaḥ—** [...] ||

2 śakta **śāktaḥ—**

*'vitrastaśatruḥ sṛḥayālulokaḥ  
prapannasāmanta udagrasattvaḥ |  
adhiṣṭitaudāryaguṇo 'sipattra-  
jitāvanir nāsti nṛpas tvadanyaḥ. ||'*

yathā vā— [...] ||

3 śaktivibhaktimaya **śaktivibhaktimayaḥ—** [...] ||

Cf. *ŚP* under 8.48–8.60 (pp. 415<sub>4</sub>–417<sub>4</sub>): vyapekṣādibhir ekārthaparataḥ On anvaya  
opāttānāṃ padārthanāṃ mitho 'bhigrathanam anvayaḥ. sa **tridhā— śāk-  
taḥ, vaibhaktaḥ, śaktivibhaktimayaś ca.** teṣu karmādiśaktibhir nirvṛt-  
taḥ **śāktaḥ.** saṃbandhādivibhaktibhir **vaibhaktaḥ.** ubhābhyāṃ punaḥ  
**śaktivibhaktimayaḥ.**

tatrākhyātasubvibhaktibhyāṃ kartṛkarmaṇor abhidhāne **śākto** yathā— 1 śākta  
[...] || 8.49

kṛdākhyātābhyāṃ bhinnakālasthakartṛśaktidvayābhidhāne subvibhaktib-  
hiḥ karmakaraṇasaṃpradānābhidhāne ca **śākto** yathā—[...] || 8.50

ākhyātavibhaktiyā hetuśaktyabhidhāne subvibhaktibhiś ca karmakartrapādānā-  
hikaraṇaśaktyabhidhāne yathā— [...] || 8.51 [...].

ākhyātena kartrābhidhāne taddhitena kṛtā ca karmābhidhāne supā kathitākathi-  
takarmābhidhāne ca **śākto** yathā— [...] || 8.52

saṃbandhavibhaktiyā **vaibhakto** yathā— [...] || 8.53 2 vaibhakta

śeṣavibhaktiyā **vaibhakto** yathā— [...] || 8.54

upapadavibhaktiyā **vaibhakto** yathā—

*'namas tuṅgaśiraścumbicandracāmaracārave |  
trailokyanagarārambhāmūlastambhāya Śambhave. ||' 8.55*

saṃbodhanavibhaktiyā ca **vaibhakto** yathā— [...] || 8.56

kāraḥ vibhaktibhiḥ saṃbandhopapadaśeṣasaṃbodhanavibhaktibhiś ca **śāk-**śaktivibhaktimaya  
**tivibhaktimayo** yathā—

*'tirtheṣu satsu dvijasattamebhyaḥ  
śriyaṃ<sup>1</sup> dviṣadduṣṭajanānupāttām |  
samādhinā mānam anitya/nidram[sic] eva  
kasya pradātuṃ tvad ṛte 'sti śaktiḥ? ||' 8.57*

yatra luptāsv api vibhaktiṣu śaktayo 'vabhāsante vibhaktayaś ca sāksād  
upalabhyante, so 'pi śaktivibhaktimayaḥ. yathā—

*'vitrastaśatruḥ spṛhayālulokaḥ  
prapannasāmanta udūḍhasattvaḥ |  
pratiṣṭhitaudāryaguṇo 'sipattra-  
jitāvaniḥ ko 'tra bhavān ivānyaḥ? ||' 8.58*

<sup>1</sup>śriyaṃ em. ] śriya edn (vol. 1 p. 416<sup>9</sup>).

yatraikataḥ śaktir anyato vibhaktiḥ, so 'pi **śaktivibhaktimayaḥ**. yathā—  
[...] || 8.59

yatra vyapekṣaktā vibhaktivipariṇāmādayaḥ pravartante, so 'pi **śaktivib-**  
**haktimayaḥ**. yathā— [...] || 8.60

<sup>2E1</sup> *vitрастаśatruḥ ... bhavannibho 'nyaḥ. || 21 ]* It may be noted in passing that this example verse contains the full gamut of *bahuvrīhi* compound types: *dvitīyābahuvrīhi* (B *prapannasāmanta*), *trītiyābahuvrīhi* (CD *asipattrajitāvani*), *caturthībahuvrīhi* (A *sṛhayāluloka*), *pañcamībahuvrīhi* (A *vitрастаśatru*), *ṣaṣṭhībahuvrīhi* (B *udagrasattva*), and *saptamībahuvrīhi* (C *pratiṣṭhitaudāryaguna*).

<sup>2T1</sup> <xxx>

<sup>2P2</sup> <kriyāder adhyāhārādīnā na duṣṭatā, nāpy aduṣṭatā, ... <evam kāraṇāntarāṇām avaseyam.> (= <§§xxx>) ] Cf. Kāvyaśāstrakārasūtra-Kāvyaśāstrakārasūtravṛtti 5.1.14 (p. 59): liṅg**ādhyāhārau** ca. 5.1.14

liṅgaṃ cādhyāhāras ca liṅgādhyāhārau. tāv atiprayuktau prayojyāv  
iti.

liṅgaṃ yathā— [...].

**adhyāhāro yathā—**

*mā bhavantam analaḥ, pavano vā,  
vāraṇo madakalaḥ, paraśur vā, |  
vajram indrakaraviprasṛtaṃ vā!  
svasti te 'stu latayā saha vṛkṣa! ||*

**atra** 'dhākṣīt'<sup>1</sup> ityādīnām **adhyāhāro** 'tyantaprayuktaḥ.

Cf. VV 2.45 and under it (p. 82<sub>4-12</sub>):

yad vā kiṃ bahunoktena? **kriyākāra**kayor api |  
yatraucityād **avagatis**, tatrānyeṣāṃ kathaiva kā? || 2.45

tatra **kriyāyā yathā—**

*'mā bhavantam analaḥ, pavano vā,  
vāraṇo madakalaḥ, paraśur vā, |  
vajram indrakaraviṣṛtaṃ vā!  
svasti te 'stu latayā saha vṛkṣa! ||'*

iti.

kāraḥ **kriyāyā yathā—**

*'mā dhākṣīn, mā bhāṅkṣīn,  
mā bhaitṣij jātu cid bata bhavantam! |  
sukṛtair adhvanyānām  
mārgataro svati te 'stu saha latayā! ||'*

iti.

Cf. VVR on VV 2.56c (p. 49<sub>3-5</sub>): yadvāśāt [VV 2.56c, p. 83] iti. [...] ityā-  
dau. atha vā yatra kāraḥ **kriyāyāḥ** pratītiḥ **kriyā**viśeṣavaśād  
vā kāraḥ, tatra **kriyākāra**kayoḥ prayogo na kārya ity ayam arthaḥ.  
**yathā—**

*'mā bhavantam'*

ityādau.

Cf. ŚP under 8.40–under 8.42 (vol. 1 pp. 407<sub>12</sub>–408<sub>4</sub>): atha saṃnidhiḥ kaḥ? On saṃnidhi  
yogyasyākāṅkṣitasya yad ānantaryam. sa dvidhā- abhidhānaviṣayo 'bhid-  
heyaviṣayaś ca. tatroccāraṇanimitto 'bhidhānaviṣayaḥ, avinābhāvanimitto  
'bhidheyaviṣayaḥ.

tayor ādyo('bhidhānaviṣayo)[sic] yathā— [...].

dvitīyo **yathā—**

<sup>1</sup>atra dhākṣīt conj. ] atrādhākṣīd edn (p. 59<sub>1</sub>)

*‘mā bhavantam analaḥ, pavano vā,  
vāraṇo madakalaḥ, paraśur vā, |  
vāhinījalabharaḥ, kuliśaṃ vā!  
svasti te 'stu latayā saha vṛkṣa! ||' 8.42*

**atra** dahatv ityādikā kriyā tadavinābhāvanimittakāt sāṃnidhyād **adhyāhṛtā**  
**analādibhiḥ sambadhyate.**

Cf. ŚP 9.336–337 (vol. 1 p. 514<sub>4-7</sub>):

**adhyāhārādigamyārthe** neyārtham iti tad viduḥ. |  
prasiddher gamyate yasmin, **na** ca tad **doṣavad. yathā—** || 9.336  
*‘mā bhavantam analaḥ, pavano vā,  
vāraṇo madakalaḥ, paraśur vā, |  
vāhinījalabharaḥ, kuliśaṃ vā!  
svasti te 'stu latayā saha vṛkṣa! ||' 9.337*

Cf. Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa 1.124 and under it (vol. 1 pp. 124 and 126):

**adhyāhārādigamyārtham** neyārtham prāg udāhṛtam. |  
sa gamyate prasiddheś cen, **na** tad **doṣavad** iṣyate. || 1.124

**yathā—**

*‘mā bhavantam analaḥ, pavano vā,  
vāraṇo madakalaḥ, paraśur vā, |  
vāhinījalabharaḥ, kuliśaṃ vā!  
svasti te 'stu latayā saha vṛkṣa! ||' 170*

**atra** ‘dahatu’ ityādinām **adhyāhāryatayā** neyatve ‘py atiprasiddhyā pratīyamā-  
natvād guṇatvam.

☒

☒<sup>3P1</sup> evaṃ yattatsaṃbandho 'pi ... vidhure kṣipantī | iti. (= §§3–3.1.2.1.3) ]  
 Cf. VV under 2.5 (pp. 39\*<sub>1</sub>–40\*<sub>1</sub>): yatra yattador ekataranirdeśenopakra- VV on yattatsaṃbandha  
 maḥ, tatra tatpratyaṃvamarśinā taditareṇopasaṃhāro nyāyyaḥ, tayor apy  
 anuvādyavidheyārthatveneṣṭatvāt, tayos ca parasparāpekṣayā saṃband-  
 hasya nityatvāt. ata evāhuḥ— 'yattador nityam abhisāṃbandhaḥ' iti. sa  
 cāyam anayor upakramopasaṃhārakramo<sup>1</sup> **dvididhaḥ— śābdaś cārthaś  
 ceti.**

**tatrobhayaḥ upādāne sati śābdaḥ.** yathā— [...] | yathā ca— [...] | iti. śābda

**ekatarasyopādāne saty ārthaḥ,** taditarasyārthasāmarthyenākṣepāt. ārtha

tatra **tadaḥ kevalasyopādāne saty ārthas trividhaḥ, prasiddhānub-** tad only (3/4 types)  
**hūtaprakrāntavastuviṣayatayopakalpitasaṃnidhinā yadā tasyābhisā-**  
**bandhāt.**

**tatra prasiddhārthaviṣayo yathā—** 1 prasiddhavastuviṣaya/prasid-  
 dhārthaviṣaya

*'dvayaṃ gataṃ saṃprati śocanīyatāṃ  
 samāgamaprārthanayā kapālinah— |  
 kalā ca sā kāntimatī kalāvatas,  
 tvam asya lokasya ca netrakaumudī. ||'*

**anubhūtavīṣayo yathā—**

2 anubhūtavastuviṣaya/anubhū-  
 taviṣaya

*'te locane pratidiśaṃ vidhure kṣipantī |'*

**iti.** tathā— [...] ||

**prakrāntaviṣayo yathā— [...] ||**

3 prakrāntavastu-  
 viṣaya/prakrāntaviṣaya  
 4 upāttavastuviṣaya (yad and  
 tad both absent)

ke cit punar upāttavastuviṣayatayopakalpitayor dvayor apy ākṣepād asya  
 caturtham api prakāram icchanti. yathā— [...] || atra [...] ity ubhayaḥ api  
 tayor arthād ākṣepaḥ.

VVR thereon (p. 17\*<sub>6–15</sub>): ekatara° [p. 40<sub>1</sub>] iti. kva cid **yacchabdenopa-**  
**krame tacchabdenopasaṃhāraḥ.** kva cit **tacchabdenopakrame yacch-**  
**abdenopasaṃhāraḥ** prasajyeta. etac ca dvayaṃ **śābdopakramopasaṃ-**  
**hārakrameṇodāhariṣyati.** [...].

śābdaḥ [p. 40<sub>4</sub>] iti. śabdenobhayaḥ saṃsparsāt. ubhayaḥ saṃsparsāb-  
 hāva ārthatvam. tatra dvayī gatiḥ— anyatarānupādānaṃ dvayor anupādā-  
 naṃ vā. anyatarānupādānaṃ api yattadāśrayabhāvena dvidhā. krameṇa  
 caitad udāhariṣyati. [...].

<sup>1</sup>upakramopasaṃhārakramo conj. ] upakramopasaṃhāro edn (p. 40<sub>3</sub>).

sā kaḷā [C, p. 40<sub>12</sub>] yā prasiddheti, sphuṭatvena pratīteḥ. kva cit tado 'pi vyapadiśyate, tasya yacchabdenaikaviśayatvāt.  
te [p. 40<sub>13</sub>] iti. ye mayaivānubhūte ity arthaḥ.

Cf. VV under 3.28 (p. 133<sup>\*7-12</sup>):

'utkampinī bhayapariskhalitāṃśukāntā  
**te locane pratidiśam vidhure kṣipantī |**  
krūreṇa dāruṇatayā sahasaiva dagdhā  
dhūmānvitena dahanena na vīkṣitāsi. ||'

ity atra te iti yo 'yam asamasauṇḍaryanidhānabhūtayor anubhūtayoḥ pu-  
raḥ parisphurator iva locanayoḥ parāmarśaḥ, sa hi [...].

Cf. VVR on VV under 2.7 (p. 18<sub>12-13</sub>): tad itthaṃ yattador upakramopasaṃhā-  
rakramo dvididhaḥ pariḥaṭitaḥ.

VVR on yattatsaṃbandha Cf. VVR §2 (p. 19<sub>14-17</sub>): saṃprati prāyeṇa vākyārthasamanvayavyāpinor  
yattador yo 'yaṃ nityābhisambandhatvenopakramopasaṃhāarakramaḥ, sa  
prasaṅgād vicāryate.

sa ca **puṣṭāpuṣṭaduṣṭabhedena trividhaḥ.**

puṣṭa (2 types and 8 subtypes) puṣṭo 'pi prathamam **śābdatvārthatvabhedena dvididhaḥ.**

śābda (2 types) **śābdo 'pi yacchabdopakramas tacchabdopakramaś ceti dvididhaḥ.**

ārtha (6 types) ārtho 'pi yacchabdamaṭrānupādāne **tacchabdasyopāttasya prasiddhānu-**  
tad only (3 types) **bhūtaprakrāntaviśayena yadābhisambandhāt trividhaḥ.**

yad and tad both absent (1 type) Cf. VVR §2 (p. 19<sub>19-20</sub>): ubhayānupādāne tu dvayor upāttavastuviśay-  
atākalpana eka eva bhedaḥ.

evam śābdo dvididha ārthaḥ ṣaḍbheda ity aṣṭavidho yattador upakramopasaṃ-  
hāarakramaḥ puṣṭaḥ.

KPr on yattatsaṃbandha Cf. KPr under 7.52.185–188 (vol. 1 pp. 126<sub>6</sub>–127<sub>2</sub>): **tathā hi prakrān-**  
tad only **taprasiddhānubhūtarthaviśayas tacchabdo yacchabdopādānam nāpe-**  
kṣate. krameṇodāharaṇam— [...] ||

‘dvayaṃ gataṃ saṃprati śocanīyatāṃ  
 samāgamaprārthanayā kapālinah— |  
**kalā ca sā kāntimatī kalāvatas,**  
 tvam asya lokasya ca netrakaumudī. ||’ 187  
 ‘utkampinī bhayapariskhalitāṃśukāntā  
**te locane pratidiśaṃ vidhure kṣipantī |**  
 krūreṇa dāruṇatayā sahasaiva dagdhā  
 dhūmānvitena dahanena na vīkṣitāsi. ||’ 188

Cf. *KPr* under 7.52.189 (vol. 1 p. 127<sub>8-10</sub>): dvayor upādāne tu nirākāṅkṣat- yad and tad both present  
 vaṃ prasiddham.

anupādāne ‘pi sāmartyāt kva cid gamyate. yathā— [...]. yad and tad both absent

Cf. *SD* §§5–5.1.1.2.1 (pp. 123–124): evamevaṃbhūtaṃ vākyaṃ kva cin §5  
 muktaka ekaṃ bhavati, kva cid dve vākya, kva cid bahūni vākyaṇi. pra-  
 bandhe tu bahūny eva vākyaṇi bhavanti. teṣāṃ ca vākyaṇāṃ paraspara-  
 sambaddhatopādeyā, na ced unmattavākya tvaprasaṅgāt. yathā— *kuṇḍam*  
*ajājinam palalam sphaiyakṛtasya putrah* iti.

parasparasambandhaś ca svaśabdanirdiṣṭārthamukhena vā bhavati, sarva- §5.1  
 nāmaparāmṛṣṭārthamukhena vā.

svaśabdanirdiṣṭārthamukhena samanvaye bahavaḥ prakārāḥ. tathā hi §5.1.1 SD on yattatsambandha  
 yattador upakramopasamhārakramarūpo nityam abhisambandhaḥ. sa ca  
**śābda ārthaś ca.**

**dvayor yattador upādāne sati śābdaḥ.** §5.1.1.1 śābda

**ekatarasyopādāne saty ārthaḥ.** §5.1.1.2 ārtha

yadi tasyārthasāmartyenākṣepāt **tacchabdasya kevalasyopādāne**<sup>1</sup> sa- §5.1.1.2.1 tad only (3 types)  
 ty ārthas triprakāraḥ, **prasiddhaprakrāntānubhūtavastuviṣayeṇa** yacch-  
 abdena<sup>2</sup> tasya sambandhāt.

Cf. *SP-SPS* 60–63 (pp. 208<sub>2</sub>–214<sub>5</sub>): idāniṃ vākyaṃ nirṇiya prakṛtam āha—

<sup>1</sup>kevalasyopādāne *conj.* ] kevalopādāne edn (p. 124<sub>7</sub>).

<sup>2</sup>viṣayeṇa yacchabdena *conj.* ] °viṣayeṇa ca, yacchabdena edn (p. 124<sub>8-9</sub>).

evaṃbhūtaṃ kva cid vākyam ekaṃ dve vā bahūni vā |  
vaktum arthaṃ samarthāni, saṃbandhaś cet parasparam. |  
anyathonmattatā *kuṇḍaṃ palālam* itivad bhavet. || SP 60

cet saṃbandhaḥ, tarhy arthaṃ vaktum samarthāni ity anvayaḥ. anyathā  
saṃbandhābhāve.

saṃbandho 'pi ca svaiḥ śabdair<sup>1</sup> adhyāhārir iti dvidhā. | SP 61AB

SP-SPS on yattatsaṃbandha  
śabda etad eva prapañcayati—

**upakramopasaṃhāra**kramarūpas tu yattadoḥ |  
yaḥ saṃbandhaḥ, sa **śābdo**. hi **dvayoḥ** śabdena kīrtanam. || SP 61CDEF

hi yasmāt. yathā— [...] || iti.

ārtha upādānaṃ bhaved yatra kevalasyaiva yattadoḥ, |  
ākṣepo nityasaṃbandhād anyasyārthaḥ sa ucyate. || SP 62

yattadoḥ madhyāt.

tad only (3 types) ākṣepo 'rthād yado yatra nopādānaṃ, **tadaś** tadā |  
ārthaḥ **prasiddhānubhūta**prakrāntaviṣayas **tridhā**. || SP 63

yathā—

*'dvayaṃ gataṃ saṃprati śocanīyatāṃ  
samāgamaṃprārthanayā kapālinah— |  
kalā ca sā kāntimatī kalāvatas,  
tvam asya lokasya ca netrakaumudī. ||'*

iti, [...] || iti, [...] || iti ca.

upāttavastuviṣaya (yad and tad  
both absent) Cf. SPS 64 (p. 220<sub>4-10</sub>): ke cit tūpāttavastuviṣayatayopakalpītayor ubhayor  
apy ākṣepād ārthaṃ prakāram icchanti. yathā— [...] || iti.

<sup>1</sup>Pāda A of this anuṣṭubh verse has a very rare—if not unmetrical—ta-ma-vipulā.  
Apparently the author intended syllable 5 to be light.

<sup>3P2</sup> yadaḥ kevalasyopādāne ... ārthaḥ pañcavidhaḥ puṣṭa eva. (= §§3.1.2.2–3.1.2.2) ]

Cf. VV under 2.7 (p. 41<sub>9–12</sub>): yadaḥ punar ārtho dviprakāraḥ sambhavati, yad only (2 types)  
**prakrāntavastukalpitatatkarmādiviṣayeṇa** tadā tasyābhisambandhāt.  
 yathā— [...] iti. yathā ca— [...] | ityādau [...].

VVR thereon (p. 18<sub>3–5</sub>): kalpitatatatkarmādi° [p. 41<sub>10</sub>] iti. kalpitaṃ  
 tat yacchabdānirdiṣṭaṃ karmādi viṣayaḥ asyeti. yacchabdārthaḥ kar-  
 makaraṇādityā viṣayatvenāsyā kalpita ity arthaḥ.

Cf. VVR §2 (p. 19<sub>17–19</sub>): **yacchabdasya** ca tacchabdānupādāne **kevalam** yad only (2 types)  
**upāttasya prakrāntaviṣayeṇa kalpitatatatkarmādiviṣayeṇa ca** tadāb-  
 hisambandhād **dvividhaḥ**.

Cf. VVR §2 (p. 22<sub>\*5–10</sub>): tathā (yatra)[sic] pūrvavākye yacchabdo nirdiṣṭaḥ, duṣṭa  
 uttaravākye tu (na)[sic] tacchabdo nirdiṣṭaḥ, tatra sākāṅkṣatvād duṣṭataiva.  
 yathā— [...] | iti.

uttaravākyagatatvena tu yacchabdaprayoge pūrvavākye tacchabdāprayo- puṣṭa  
 ge na duṣṭatvam, api tu prāk pratipāditam puṣṭatvam eva, sāmānyenopakra-  
 māt paścād viśeṣasyotthāpanāt. etadabhiprāyeṇa **kalpitatatatkarmādi-**  
**viṣayatvam** uktam. udāharaṇam tu [...].

Cf. KPr under 7.52.188–under 189 (vol. 1 p. 127<sub>3–7</sub>): yacchabdas tūttar- yad only  
 avākyārthagatatvenopāttaḥ sāmānyāyāt pūrvavākyārthagatasya tacchab-  
 dasyopādānaṃ nāpekṣate. tathā— [...] || prāg upāttas tu yacchabdas tacch-  
 abdotpādānaṃ vinā sākāṅkṣaḥ. yathā— [...].

Cf. SD §5.1.1.2.2 (p. 124): **yacchabdasya kevalasyopādāne** saty ārtho §5.1.1.2.2 yad only (2 types)  
**dvividhaḥ** samanvayaḥ, **prakrāntavastuviṣayeṇa kalpitatatatkarmā-**  
**di<sup>1</sup>viṣayeṇa ca** tacchabdena tasya sambandhāt.

Cf. SP-SPS 64 (pp. 214<sub>6</sub>–220<sub>3</sub>):

<sup>1</sup>kalpitatatatkarmādi° conj. ] kalpitakarmādi° edn (p. 124<sub>16</sub>).

yad only (2 types) yadā **yada upādānaṃ, prakrāntaviṣayaṇa** tat |  
 ārho **dvidhā kalpitatatatkarmādiviṣayaṇa ca.** || SP 64

tat tadā. kalpitam yat tatkarma tacchabdakarma. ādinā kartrādi.  
 kriyāyāḥ kartrādibhir avyabhicārāt kalpitatvam iti bhāvaḥ.

prakrāntaviṣaya tatra prakrāntaviṣayaḥ yathā— [...] || iti.

kalpitatatatkarmādiviṣaya karmakalpitatvam yathā— [...] || iti. [...]. yathā vā— [...] || iti. kartur  
 yathā—

**‘chātrāṇām anvaye siddhiṃ dadātu Gaṇanāyakaḥ, |  
 yasmin saṃmukhatām yāte vighnaḥ syād gaṇanāya kaḥ? ||’**

iti. ata evoktam anyaiḥ— ‘uttaravākyastho yacchabdas tacchabdam nāpekṣate’ iti. pūrvavākyastho yacchabdas tacchabdam cāpekṣata eva.

duṣṭa Cf. SP-SPS 66AB (pp. 226<sub>1</sub>–228<sub>3</sub>): evaṃ yacchabdasya dūṣaṇām āha—

ya ekasya yadaḥ pūrvam prayogo, duṣṭa eva saḥ. | SP 66AB

etadabhiprāyeṇaiva kaiś cid uktam— ‘uttaravākyastho yacchabdas tacch-  
 abdam nāpekṣate’ iti. tathoktam Mammatena— ‘prāg upātto yacchabdas  
 tacchabdopādānaṃ vinā sākāṅkṣaḥ’ iti. yathā— [...] || iti. yathā vā— [...] |  
 iti.

3T<sup>1</sup> <XXX>

3P<sup>3</sup> ata eva pratyakṣāyamānasya ... sā hi sarvāpadām padam. || (= §3.1.2.1.4) ]  
 Cf. VV 2.6–under 2.7 (p. 41<sub>1-9</sub>):

**yaś caikavākye<sup>1</sup> kartṛtvenokto, yaś cedamādibhiḥ, |**

<sup>1</sup> The VVR’s pratika reads slightly differently: «[...] yas tv ekavākye [...]» (p. 17<sup>\*2-3</sup>; the VVR passage is quoted below at the site of fn. 1 on p. 95). Cf. the editor

**tacchabdena parāmarśo na tayor upapadyate.** || 2.6  
yato 'dhyakṣāyamāṇo 'rthaḥ sa tebhyaḥ pratipadyate. |  
na cāsau tatparāmarśasahiṣṇur, asamanvayāt. || 2.7

tad yathā—

**'sa vaḥ Śaśikalāmaulis tādātmyāyopakalpatām |  
dvaitabuddhim apāsyemām! sā hi sarvāpadām padam. ||'**

atraiva imām ity atraitadadasoḥ prayoge tayor apy etad evodāharaṇam  
draṣṭavyam. atra ca 'aikātmyāya' iti,

'eṣā hi vipadām padam'

iti ca pāṭhau paṭhitavyau.

VVR thereon (pp. 17<sup>\*3</sup>–18<sup>3</sup>): tacchabdāt prayogātiprasaṅganiyamam prakā-  
śayan parihāryaviṣayam pradarsayati— yas tv ekavākye<sup>1</sup> [VV 2.6A, p.  
41<sub>1</sub>] iti. ekavākyagrahaṇena parāmṛśyasya **pratyakṣāyamāṇatoktā**. tatas  
ca vākyabhede na doṣaḥ.

karṭṛtvena [2.6A] iti prādhānyam sūcayati, aprādhānyasya parāmarśo  
na duṣyatīti khyāpanārtham.

saḥ [2.7B] ity arthaḥ parāmṛṣṭaḥ.

tebhyaḥ [2.7B] iti karṭṛtvavācakād idamādibhyaś ca.

asau [2.7C] tacchabdaḥ.

asamanvayād [2.7D] iti. tacchabdasya parokṣārthapratipādakatve samband-  
havirodhād ity arthaḥ.

tādātmyāya [B, p. 41<sub>6</sub>] iti. Śaśikalāmaulisvarūpatvāyety arthaḥ.

Cf. VVR §2 (p. 19<sup>\*6-8</sup>): tathā tacchabdasya parokṣāyamāṇārthapratyava-  
marśitvād **ekavākyasthapratyakṣāyamāṇa**pradhānabhūtārthapratyava-  
marśe duṣṭatvam. yathā—

**'sa vaḥ Śaśikalāmauliḥ'**

ityāda. pradhānagrahaṇena na karṭṛmātram nirdiṣṭam, api tu kārakān-

Gaṇapatiśāstrī's fn. ‡ on p. 17 of the VVR text: «'yas caikavākye' iti mūlakośayoḥ  
pāṭhaḥ.»

<sup>1</sup> Cf. fn. 1 on p. 94.

taram api prādhānyena vivakṣitatvāt pratyakṣāyamāṇam.

duṣṭa Cf. SP-SPS 65 (pp. 222<sub>1</sub>–224<sub>5</sub>): tatra tacchabdasya prayoganiyamam kartum dūṣaṇām āha—

**ekavākyasthakartuś ca nirdiṣṭasyedamādibhiḥ |  
tacchabdena parāmarśo na kāryaḥ kavibhiḥ kva cit. || SP  
65**

yathā—

**‘sa vaḥ Śaśikalāmaulis tādātmyāyopakalpatām |  
dvaitabuddhim apāsyemāḥ! sā hi sarvāpadām padam. ||’**

iti. atra imām ity atraitadadasoḥ prayoge tayor apy etad udāharaṇam draṣṭavyam. atra ca ‘aikātmyāya’ iti,

‘eṣā hi vipadām padam’

iti pāthe na doṣaḥ.

kartṛśabdenātra pradhānaṃ kārakāntaram api saṃgrhītam. tena [...] || ity atra [...].

<sup>3P4</sup> kim ca nairantaryeṇa sāmānādhikaraṇyena ... yacchabdasya na doṣaḥ. (= §3.1.2.2.4) ] Cf. VV under 2.7 (p. 41<sub>13–18</sub>):

**‘yat tad ūrjitam atyugraṃ kṣātraṃ tejo ‘sya bhūpateḥ, |  
dīvyatākṣais tadānena nūnaṃ tad api hāritam. ||’**

ityādau ca yady api tado dvir upādānaṃ sakṛc ca yadaḥ, tathāpi tatra yathoktasambandhadvaividhyānativṛttiḥ. tathā hi yadaḥ prakramṣyamānaviṣayaṇa tad api ity anena tadābhisambandhāc chābdaḥ. yat tad ity asya tu tadaḥ prasiddhatejoniṣṭhatayopakalpitena yadābhisambandhād ārtahaḥ.

VVR thereon (p. 18<sub>5–7</sub>): yat tad [p. 41<sub>17</sub>] iti. yacchabdasamīpe sāmānādhikaraṇas tacchabda upādīyamānaḥ śabdaśaktisvābhāvvyāt prasiddhavas-tuviṣayaṃ yacchabdam ākāṅkṣati. vaiyadhikaraṇyena vyavadhānena ca nirdeśe tu nirdiṣṭenaiva yadā samanvayaṃ bhajate.

Cf. VV 2.8 (p. 43<sub>3–4</sub>):

anuktvaiva parāmrśyaṃ prayogo yatra yattadoḥ |  
nirantaraḥ, punas tatra tayor uktir na duṣyati. || 2.8

VVR *thereon* (p. 19<sub>6-8</sub>): anuktvaiva [VV 2.8A, p. 43<sub>3</sub>] iti. yattadoḥ madhye parāmrśyaṃ anuktvā yatra nirantaraḥ prayogaḥ, yathā—

**‘yat tad ūrjitam’**

ityādau, tatra tayor yattador yathāyogaṃ punaḥ prayogo na duṣyati, yathā—

**‘nūnaṃ tad api hāritam’**

ityādau.

Cf. VVR §2 (p. 19<sub>20-21</sub>):

**‘yat tad ūrjitam’**

ityādau tu śābdasyārthasya copakramopasaṃhārakramasya<sup>1</sup> saṃkīrṇatvam iti nāsya pṛthagbhāvaḥ.

Cf. KPr *under* 7.52.193–*under* 194 (vol. 1 p. 128<sub>14-18</sub>): yacchabdasya hi nikaṭe sthitaḥ prasiddhiṃ parāmrśati. yathā—

**‘yat tad ūrjitam atyugraṃ kṣātraṃ tejo 'sya bhūpateḥ, |  
dīvyatākṣais tadānena nūnaṃ tad api hāritam. ||’ 194**

ity atra tacchabdaḥ.

Cf. SPS 66AB (pp. 228<sub>4</sub>–232<sub>2</sub>): ke cit tu **sāmānādhikaraṇyena nairantaryeṇa prayuktayor yattador doṣa** evety āhuḥ. yathā— [...] || iti. atra hi yaḥ saḥ iti padadvayam anuvādyavidheyārthatayā vivakṣitam anuvādyamātrapratitikṛd ity ato 'tra doṣaḥ. yacchabdasya hi sāmānādhikaraṇyena nikaṭe sthitas tacchabdādiḥ prasiddhiṃ parāmrśati. duṣṭa

<sup>1</sup>copakramopasaṃhārakramasya *conj.* ] copasaṃhārakramasya edn (p. 19<sub>21</sub>).

**‘yat tad ūrjitam atyugraṃ kṣātraṃ tejo 'sya bhūpateḥ, |  
dīvyatākṣais tadānena nūnaṃ tad api hāritam. ||’**

ityādaḥ na doṣaḥ. atra hi yat tat ity atra tat prasiddhaṃ yat, tad api hāritam ity anirantarasthena sambandhaḥ.

evam [...] || ity atrāpy adoṣaḥ.

- <sup>3P5</sup> puṣṭo vyākhyātaḥ. ... tava svarūpam. || iti. (= §§3.3–3.3.1) ] Cf. VV  
pūrvapakṣa *under 2.7 (pp. 41\*<sub>3</sub>–42\*<sub>3</sub>):* nanu kenedam uktam— yadaḥ kevalasyaivātra prayogaḥ, na tada iti, yāvata **tadabhinnārthaḥ** atrādaḥśabdaḥ prayukta eva— asau iti? ataś ca tadapekṣayā vākyārthaviśrānter na kaś cid ukta-doṣāvakāśaḥ.
- samādhāna sādho durāśaiṣā, tasya **tadabhinnārthatvāsiddheḥ**. tatsiddhau hi pratīter nirākāṅkṣataiva syāt, na tu vivādaḥ, yathā— [...] || ity atra. kiṃ ca **tadabhinnārthatve** 'syopagamyamāne [...] || ity atra muktake **yacchabda-parāmarśāpekṣā** prasajyeta, tasya yathoktavastuviṣayatvāsambhavāt. [...] || ity atra ca tacchabdaparāmarśasya **paunaruktyaṃ** syāt.
- pūrvapakṣa katham tarhi yattador viṣaye kavibhir idametadadaḥprabhṛtayaḥ śabdāḥ prayuktāḥ prayujyante ca? na hy asati<sup>1</sup> paryāyatve tasminn evārthe padāntaraprayogam ādriyante svasthacetasa iti prayogapravāhaprāmānyād eṣāṃ **tadabhinnārthatā parikalpyate**. na hi tam antareṇa śabdānāṃ tadatadarthatvaniścaya<sup>2</sup>nibandhanam anyat kiṃ cid utpaśyāmaḥ.
- samādhāna atrocyate. uktanayena tāvat teṣāṃ **tadabhinnārthatānupapattir** upapāditaiva. yadi tu tām apahnutyā gatānugatikatayā [...] || iti [...] | ityādiprayogadarśanamātrānurodhena teṣāṃ sā parikalpyate, tarhi yathādarśanam vyavahitānām eva avyavahitātve vā bhinnavibhaktikānām eva sā parikalpyatām! itarathā tu teṣāṃ tatparikalpanam anyāyyam eva. tatra hi pratyuta

<sup>1</sup>na hy asati ¶ ] na ca hy asati edn (p. 42<sub>13</sub>). Note that this reading of ¶ is reported not with the text on p. 42 but in the variant section (titled ‘pāṭhabhedaḥ |’; p. 11<sub>12</sub>) near the end of the edition.

<sup>2</sup>tadatadarthatvaniścaya° conj. ] tadarthaniścaya° edn (p. 42<sub>15</sub>), tadarthatvaniścaya° ¶ (p. 11<sub>14</sub> in the ‘pāṭhabhedaḥ |’ section). The conjectured «tadatadarthatvaniścaya°» is based on the VVR’s pratīka «tadatadarthatvaniścayaḥ» (p. 18\*<sub>8</sub>; the VVR passage is quoted below at the site of fn. 1 on p. 99). This has already been noticed by the editor Gaṇapatiśāstrī, who in his fn. ¶ on p. 18 of the VVR

sā tayos taditaraparāmarśavyapekṣā sutarām unmajjati. yathā— [...] iti, [...] | ityādau ca. na cāsāv ihāvaśyaṃ prayoktavyaḥ san prayukta iti tadavastha eva doṣāvakāśaḥ.

VVR thereon (pp. 18<sub>17</sub>–19<sub>3</sub>): tadabhinnārthaḥ [p. 41\*<sub>2</sub>] tacchabdābhinnārthaḥ.

tasya [p. 41\*<sub>1</sub>] adaḥśabdasya.

**tacchabdābhinnārthatve** 'daḥśabdasya dūṣaṇadvayam uktam— kevalādaḥśabdaprayoge [...] ityādau yacchabdākāṅkṣā syād ity ekam. yacchabdasaḥāyasyādaḥśabdasya prayoge [...] ityādau prayuktatacchabdākāṅkṣā na syād iti dvitīyam. [...].

tasya yathoktavastu° [p. 42<sub>6</sub>] iti. yathā avigānena śiṣṭaprasiddhipāraṃparyeṇa uktam vastu tacchabdārthavivikto viśayaḥ, tasya tanmate asaṃbhavaḥ. tvayā hy adaḥśabdasya tacchabdārthatvam ucyate. tatra yacchabda-parāmarśāpekṣāprasaṅgaḥ [p. 42<sub>6</sub>] ity arthaḥ.

parikalpyate [p. 42<sub>15</sub>] iti. prayogapravāhaprāmāṇyanyathānupapattiyā(vā?)*[sic]*yātayārthāpattiyety arthaḥ.

tam antareṇa [p. 42<sub>15</sub>] iti. tacchabdena prayogapravāhaḥ parāmrṣṭaḥ.

tadatadarthatvaniścayo<sup>1</sup> [p. 42<sub>15</sub>] vivakṣitāvivakṣitārthanīścayaḥ.

yadi tu tām [p. 42<sub>17</sub>] iti. **tadabhinnārthatānupapattiḥ** parāmrṣṭā.

gate 'nugataṃ yasya sa gatānugatikaḥ [p. 42<sub>17</sub>]. matvarthīyo 'tra ṭhaN-pratyayaḥ. yenaiva pathaiko gacchati, tenaivāvicāritenaiva yo gacchati, sa ity arthaḥ. tato bhāvapratyayaḥ. [...].

tatra hi [p. 42\*<sub>6</sub>] iti. idamādisahitaprayoge.

tayoḥ [p. 42\*<sub>6</sub>] iti. yattadoḥ.

taditara° [p. 42\*<sub>6</sub>] iti. yadṛcchayaikataraprayoge 'nyatarāpekṣety arthaḥ.

sutarām [p. 42\*<sub>6</sub>] iti. idamādisāhityena prayukto yacchabdaḥ svabhāvato vikāsitāsya eva tacchabdaṃ pratīkṣate, evaṃ tacchabdo 'pi yacchabdaṃ iti jñeyam.

Cf. VV 2.9–under 2.10 (p. 43<sub>5–9</sub>):

text says: «etatpratikapramāṇyān mūle 'tadatadarthatvaniścayanibandhanam' ity eva pāṭho 'vaseyaḥ, na tu 'tadarthanīścayanibandhanam' iti.»

<sup>1</sup> Cf. fn. 2 on p. 98.

tayor nirantaropātteṣv idametadadaḥsu ca |  
 tayos teṣāṃ ca nāpekṣā teṣv asatsv iva śāmyati. || 2.9  
 udāharaṇajātaṃ yat tatsāṃkaryasamudbhavam, |  
 tasya diṇmātram asmābhir uktaṃ vistarabhīrubhiḥ. || 2.10

iti saṃgrahaślokāḥ.

VVR *thereon* (p. 19<sub>8-13</sub>): tathā tayoh [VV 2.9A, p. 43<sub>5</sub>] yattador nirantara-  
 nirdiṣṭeṣv idamādiṣu satsu tayoh [2.9C] yattados teṣāṃ idamādināṃ ca  
 saṃghaṭitatvena sthitānāṃ yathāyogaṃ yattadoḥ pratyavekṣā na nivar-  
 tate. yathāprayukteṣv idamādiṣu kevalayoh pṛthagavasthitayor apekṣā  
 na nivartate, tadvat prayukteṣv apīty arthaḥ. [...].

tatsāṃkarya° [VV 2.10B, p. 43<sub>7</sub>] iti. yacchabdasya pṛthak, idamādisāhi-  
 tye, tacchabdasya ca pṛthak, idamādisāhitye, yattadoḥ parasparasāhitye  
 ca bahavo bhedaḥ. teṣāṃ udāharaṇeṣu diṇmātram darśitam.

apuṣṭa and duṣṭa Cf. VVR §2 (p. 19<sup>\*9-14</sup>): **apuṣṭasya** duṣṭamadhye prasaṅgena varṇay-  
 iṣyamāṇatvād idānīm duṣṭo vyākriyate.

duṣṭa tatra yattadoḥ sthāne tacchabdayacchabdanairantaryeṇa sāmānādhi-  
**karāṇyena cedamādināṃ prayoge duṣṭataiva**<sup>1</sup>, teṣāṃ atadarthatvāt,  
 tannikaṭe ca prayujyamānānāṃ prasiddhimātraparāmarśakatvāt. yathā—  
 [...] iti. evaṃ tacchabdasācivynedamādināṃ udāharaṇam ūhyam.

apuṣṭa viprakṛṣṭatvena saṃnikṛṣṭatve 'pi vaiyadhikarāṇyena vā teṣāṃ prayoge  
 na duṣṭatvam, nāduṣṭatvam<sup>2</sup> ity apuṣṭatvam eva. yathā— [...] iti, [...] iti  
 ca. evaṃ tacchabdopakrama udāhartavyam.

Cf. KPr under 7.52.184—under 185 (vol. 1 p. 126<sub>1-5</sub>): yathā vā—

'apāṅgasamsargi taraṅgitaṃ drśor,  
 bhruvor arālāntavilāsi vellanam, |  
**visāri romāñcanakañcukaṃ tanos**  
**tanoti yo 'sau subhage tavāgataḥ. ||' 185**

atra yo 'sau iti padadvayam anuvādyavidheyārthatayā vivakṣitam anu-  
 vādyamātrapratitikṛt.

<sup>1</sup>cedamādināṃ prayoge duṣṭataiva conj. ] cedamādināṃ duṣṭataiva edn (p. 19<sup>\*12</sup>).

<sup>2</sup>na duṣṭatvam, nāduṣṭatvam conj. ] na duṣṭaṃ nāduṣṭam edn (p. 19<sup>\*10</sup>).

Cf. *KPr* under 7.52.190–under 193 (vol. 1 pp. 127<sub>16</sub>–128<sub>13</sub>): evaṃ ca tacchabdānupādāne 'tra sākāṅkṣatvam. na ca asau [185D] iti tacchabdārtham āha. [...] || atra hi na tacchabdārthapratītiḥ. pratītau vā [...] || atra saḥ ityasyānarthakyaṃ bhavet. atha [...] || itīdamśabdavad adahśabdas tacchabdārtham abhidhatta ity ucyate, tarhy atraiva vākyāntara upādānam arhati, na ca tatraiva.

Cf. *SP-SPS* 66CDEF (pp. 232<sub>5</sub>–244<sub>2</sub>):

**tadabhinnārthedamādi**prayogo hi yadā bhavet |  
yadaḥ pūrvaṃ prayoge ca, na doṣo na guṇas tadā. || SP 66CDEF

atra hi yathā tacchabdena nirākāṅkṣatā yacchabdasya, tadvad yacchabdasya nirākāṅkṣatārtham kavibhiḥ prayuktānām idamādīnām prayoge na doṣaḥ. teṣāṃ tacchabdārthābhāvān na guṇaḥ.

yadi **tadabhinnārthatā** syāt teṣāṃ, tadā [...] || ityādāv idamaḥ, [...] || ityādau caitadaḥ, [...] || ityādau cādasahaḥ prayoge **yacchabdāpekṣā** syāt. tasmāt **tadabhinnārthābhāvād** [tadabhinnārthatābhāvād conj.] eṣāṃ prayoge na doṣaḥ [«prayoge doṣaḥ» (Ś2Ś3Nac) or rather «prayoge na guṇaḥ» (conj.)]. kiṃ ca yadi **tadabhinnārthatā** syāt, [...] || ityādau, [...] || ityādau ca tacchabdaparāmarśasya **paunaruktyaṃ** syāt. tado hy anubhūtārthaḥ, eṣāṃ tu pratyakṣārtha itī mahān bhedaḥ. [...] || yat tv eṣāṃ prasiddho 'rtho dr̥śyate, tat **tadabhinnārthatāparikalpanāt**.

evaṃ tacchabdārthābhāvāt pūrvaṃ yacchabdaprayoge idamādyapekṣayā-doṣaḥ [«idamādyapekṣayā doṣaḥ» or rather «apekṣayāguṇaḥ» (conj.)], prayogapravāhāprāmānyād [«pravāhāprāmānyād» (Ś2)] idamādiprayoge tacchabdaprayoga iva nirākāṅkṣatvāc cāguṇaḥ [«ca guṇaḥ» (Ś2) or rather «cādoṣaḥ» (conj.)] ity ata eva na guṇo na doṣaḥ ity uktam. yathā— [...] || iti. evam anyatra jñeyam.

yatra tu **sāmānādhikaraṇyena nairantaryeṇa prayogaḥ**, tatra pūrduṣṭa vavad **doṣa eva**. yathā— [...] || ityādau. [...].

etac cānyatra suvistīrṇaṃ nirṇītam anyair ity alam.

<sup>3P6</sup> tathā guṇakriyāyām svaśabdena ... tāsām eva bhūtaye. | iti yuktam. (=

duṣṭa *sentences 1–3 of §3.1.2.1.5*] Cf. VVR §2 (p. 21<sub>2–7</sub>): ekatrāpi vākye **guṇakri-**  
yādigataṃ kalpitaṃ bhedaṃ āsṛitya prakrāntaviṣayatacchabdaprayo-  
ge pradhānakriyāyāṃ parāmrśyasya pradhānatvād eva **svarūpeṇa nird-**  
**eṣe guṇakriyādiviṣaye tu tacchabdena parāmarśe nyāyye** yad viparyayakaraṇam,  
tad duṣṭam eva. **yathā—**

*‘prajānām eva bhūtyarthaṃ sa tābhyo balim agrahīt. |  
sahasraguṇam utsraṣṭum ādatte hi rasaṃ raviḥ. ||’*

iti.

*‘balim prajābhyo jagrāha sa tāsām eva bhūtaye. |’*

iti yuktaḥ pāṭhaḥ.

duṣṭa Cf. VVR §2 (p. 24\*<sub>10–11</sub>): kva cit pradhānakriyāyāṃ tadādi<sup>1</sup> sarvanāmnā  
parāmrśṭasya **guṇakriyāyāṃ svaśabdenopādānaṃ** duṣṭam eva. **yathā—**  
[...] iti.

<sup>3P7</sup> kiṃ ca prakramyamāṇasya tadā ... uttarato 'sya Gaṅgām | iti. (= §3.1.2.1.6) ]  
duṣṭa Cf. VVR §2 (p. 21<sub>13–21</sub>): tathā prakrāntaviṣayatve tacchabdasya vyavasthite  
tadviṣaye **prakramyamāṇa**vastugocaratvaṃ doṣa eva. **yathā—** [...]. etad  
vākyabheda udāharaṇam. ekavākya tu

*‘tirthē tādīye gajasetubandhāt  
pratīpagām uttarato 'sya Gaṅgām |’*

iti deyam.

<sup>3P8</sup> kiṃ ca parāmrśyasya ... Harismaraṇatatparaḥ | 46 (= §3.1.2.1.7) ] Cf.  
*Vallabhadeva's Kumārasaṃbhavapañcikā on Kumārasaṃbhava 2.36 (p. 50):*

<sup>1</sup>pradhānakriyāyāṃ tadādi° *conj.* ] pradhānakriyāyās tadādi° edn (p. 24\*<sub>10–11</sub>).

paryāyasevām utsrjya puṣpasambhāratatparāḥ |  
 udyānapālasāmānyam ṛtavas tam upāsate. || 2.36

[...]. **tatparaśabde** 'tra **tacchabdaprayogo** na tathā nyāyyaḥ, **parāmṛśyasya**  
**sākṣān nirdeśāt**. yathā— [...] ityādau. punaḥśravaṇād vāvadhāraṇam  
 pratiyate.

<sup>3T2</sup> *Harismaraṇatatparaḥ* ] DO's reading *harismaraṇatatparaṃ* is per se as good as U's reading *harismaraṇatatparaḥ* (fn. 1 on p. 62): both are grammatically sound and adequate for illustrating the point in question. I have adopted U's reading only because I can find an occurrence of it in another work (namely the *Padmapurāṇa*: see fn. i on p. 62), whereas I have not managed to trace DO's reading anywhere. ☒



## Chapter 3

# Appendices and Indices

### 3.1 Appendix 1. A clean reading text of the An- vayakalikā

No apparatuses. In Devanāgarī.

## **3.2 Appendix 2. Manuscript facsimile and transcription**

I moved this section to "msO.tex" on 20240503.

MS O: facsimile and transcription.

MS D: facsimile? and transcription? (ask Hugo or Graheli about permission).

MS U: no facsimile? and no transcription?

**3.3 Appendix 3. Traced quotations in the Anvayakalikā**

### **3.4 Appendix 4. Untraced quotations in the An-vayakalikā**

### 3.5 Appendix 5. A revised version of the SP-SPS with my added headings

In this appendix I reproduce the text of the SP-SPS from Hahn 2008b. (Just as Hahn 2008b appendix 8 provides a revised version of the SD edition in Slaje 1992, in the present appendix I provide a revised version of the SP-SPS edition in Hahn 2008b.) sandhi, punctuation, and spelling/orthography are mine. Any new reading I adopt is reported in the apparatus: e.g. *viṣeṣaṇa° em. ] viṣeṣaṇa°* Hahn 2008b (siglum: perhaps H (for ‘Hahn’)).

I provide my headings in the text. Justification: The SP-SPS text in Hahn 2008b has no indentation (apart from the centering of the verses) nor indication of topics. Lines of text (on the left side/even pages) are aligned with the German translation on the facing page (on the right side/odd pages), so that line spacing in the text does not have any bearing on/provides no information on the content or topic of the SP-SPS. Although Hahn 2008b contains a *Inhaltsübersicht* (pp. 90–92), it is arranged by SP verses and not by topics. In many cases several SP verses together with their SPS commentary treat one topic. Sometimes a topic starts in the middle of the SPS. The ongoing topics are thus not clear from the SP-SPS edn in Hahn 2008b/from Hahn 2008b. Therefore, topical sectioning will be helpful—my headings are based on such topical sectioning. (The SP-SPS edn in Hahn 2008b has only SP verse numbers; my present version has both SP verse numbers and topical heading numbers—so that the reader will know both which SP vs. is in question and which topic is being treated at any given site in the text.)

Hahn 2008b appendices 3 and 5 list passages untraced by him. I can, e.g. in a sixth appendix (e.g. ‘Appendix 6. Some untraced passages in the SP-SPS now traced’), present those passages that I have managed to trace. I may also point out which passages in Hahn’s appendices 3 and 5 are not necessarily quotations. I could in the same appendix provide a list of the passages found hitherto only in the SP-SPS and the AnK/only in the SD, the SP-SPS, and the AnK (i.e. the passages found only in the printed/known texts of the Samanvaya school).

## 3.6 Index

# Bibliography and Abbreviations

m. = masculine	f. = feminine	nt. = neuter
sg. = singular	du. = dual	pl. = plural
nom. = nominative	acc. = accusative	ins. = instrumental
dat. = dative	abl. = ablative	gen. = genitive
loc. = locative	voc. = vocative	
tr. = translation		

## PRIMARY SOURCES/TEXT EDITIONS

A = *Aṣṭādhyāyī*:

Otto Böhtlingk, ed. *Pāṇini's Grammatik Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen*. 2nd edition. 1st edition Bonn 1839–1840. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1887

*Anekārthasaṃgraha*:

Theodor Zachariae, ed. *Der Anekarthasamgraha des Hemachandra Mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare des Mahendra*. 1st edition. Quellenwerke der altindischen Lexikographie 1. Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1893

*Amaruṣataka*:

Richard Simon, ed. *Das Amaruṣataka in seinen Recensionen dargestellt mit einer Einleitung und Auszügen aus den Commentatoren versehen*. 1st edition. Kiel: C.F. Haeseler, 1893

*Ṛgveda*:

Barend A. Van Nooten and Gary B. Holland, eds. *Rig Veda A metrically restored text with an introduction and notes*. 1st edition. Harvard Oriental Series 50. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1994

K = *Kātantrasūtra*:

Julius Eggeling, ed. *The Kātantra With the commentary of Durgasiṃha*. 1st edition (all fasciculi). Bibliotheca Indica: New Series 297, 298, 308, 309, 396, 397. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1874 (fasciculi 1–4), 1878 (fasciculi 5–6)

*Kāvyaḷaṃkāra* of Bhāmaha:

Batuk Nāth Śarmā and Baldeva Upādhyāya, eds. *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra of Bhāmaha*. 2nd edition. Kashi Sanskrit Series 61. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 1981

*Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtra*;

*Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtravṛtti*:

Carl Cappeller, ed. *Śrīvāmanaviracitā kāvyāḷaṃkāravṛttiḥ Vāmana's Lehrbuch der Poetik Zum ersten Male herausgegeben*. 1st edition. Jena: Verlag von Hermann Dufft, 1875

*Kāśikā* = *Kāśikāvṛtti*:

Aryendra Sharma et al., ed. *Kāśikā A commentary on Pāṇini's grammar*. 1st edition (all volumes). Vol. 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2. Sanskrit Academy Series 17 (A. 14), 20 (A. 17), 23, 32. Volumes 1–2 edited by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D.G. Padhye; vol. 3.1 (indices) edited by B.R. Sastry and V. Sundara Sarma; vol. 3.2 (indices) edited by P. Sri Ramachandrudu and V. Sundara Sarma. Hyderabad: Osmania University, 1969, 1970, 1976, 1985

*Kirātārjunīya*:

Durgāprasād and Kāśināth Pāṇdurang Parab, eds. *The Kirātārjunīya of Bhāravi The commentary (Ghantapatha) of Mallinātha and various readings*. 3rd edition. Bombay: Nirnaya-sagar Press, 1895

*Kumārasambhava*;

*Kumārasambhavapañcikā* of Vallabhadeva:

Mulakaluri Srimannarayana Murti, ed. *Vallabhadeva's Kommentar (Śāradā-Version) zum Kumārasambhava des Kālidāsa*. 1st edition. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Supplementband 20.1. Unter der Mitarbeit von Klaus L. Janert. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1980

KPr = *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra*:

Rasiklal C. Parikh, ed. *Kāvyaḷaṃkāra of Mammaṭa with the saṃketa named Kāvyaḷadarśa of Someśvara Bhaṭṭa (son of Devaka of the Bhāradvāja*

family) Edited with introduction appendixes containing variant readings and indexes of verses names of authors works and important words etc. etc. 1st edition (both volumes). Vol. 1–2. Rājasthāna Purātana Granthamālā 46–47. Jodhpur: Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, 1959, 1959

KM = *Kāvyaṁīmāṁsā*:

C.D. Dalal and R.A. Sastry, eds. *Kāvyaṁīmāṁsā of Rājasēkhara*. 3rd edition revised and enlarged by K.S. Ramaswami Sastri Siromani. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 1. 1st edition 1916; 2nd edition 1924. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1934

*Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*:

Bruno Liebich, ed. *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*. 1st edition. Indische Forschungen 8–9. Breslau: Verlag von M. & H. Marcus, 1930

*Cāṇakyanīti*:

Ludwik Sternbach, ed. *Cāṇakya-nīti-text-tradition (cāṇakya-nīti-śākhā-sampradāyah)*. 1st edition (all volumes). Vol. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3. Vishveshvaranand Indological Series 27, 28, 29, 29(a), 29(b). Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 1963, 1964, 1970, 1967, 1968

*Tantrākhyāyika*:

Johannes Hertel, ed. *The Panchatantra a collection of ancient Hindu tales In its oldest recension the Kashmirian entitled Tantrakhyayika The original Sanskrit text editio minor reprinted from the critical editio major which was made for the Königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. 1st edition. Harvard Oriental Series 14. Cambridge Massachusetts: The Harvard University Press, 1915

*Tāpasavatsarāja*:

Samṣātkumāra, ed. *Anaṅgaharṣāparanāma śrīmātrarājapraṇītam tāpasavatsarājanāṭakam*. 1st edition. Bangalore: Samṣātkumāra, 1929

*Drṣṭāntakalikā* of Kusumadeva:

Durgāprasāda and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab, eds. *Kāvyaṁālā A collection of old and rare Sanskrit Kāvya, Nāṭakas, Champūs, Bhāṇas, Prahasanas, Chhandas, Alaṅkāras &c. Part XIV*. 2nd revised edition. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1938

DV = *Durgasiṁhavrṭti*:

See K.

DhĀ = *Dhvanyāloka*:

K. Krishnamoorthy, ed. *Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana Critically edited with introduction translation & notes*. 2nd edition. 1st edition 1974. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982

*Dhātupāṭha* <(Pāṇinian unless otherwise stated)>:

See A.

*Nirukta*:

Lakshman Sarup, ed. *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta The oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology, and semantics Critically edited from original manuscripts and translated for the first time into English, with introduction, exegetical and critical notes, three indexes and eight appendices*. 2nd reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967

*Pañcastavī*:

Gopi Krishna and K.N. Dhar. *Panchastavi (a pentad of devotional hymns to Super-Energy)*. 1st edition. The foreword and the English translation are by Gopi Krishna while the introduction and the explanatory notes are by K.N. Dhar. Srinagar: The Central Institute for Kundalini Research, 1975

*Padmapurāṇa*:

Shivprasad Dvivedi, ed. *Śrīmanmaharṣikṛṣṇadvipāyanavyāsaviracitaṁ śrīpadmamahāpurāṇam Hindi commentary with śloka index*. 1st edition (all volumes). Vol. 1–7. Chaukhamba Surbharti Prakashan 592 (all volumes). Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharti Prakashan, 2016 (all volumes)

*Paribhāṣābhāskara* of Haribhāskara:

See *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*.

*Paribhāṣāvṛtti* of Nilakaṇṭhadikṣita:

See *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*.

*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*:

K.V. Abhyankar, ed. *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha (a collection of original works on Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās) Edited critically with an introduction and an index of Paribhāṣās*. 1st edition. Post-graduate and Research Department Series 7. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1967

*Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga:

Jinavijaya, ed. *Prabandha cintāmaṇi of Merutuṅgācārya Part I Text in Sanskrit with variants an appendix and indices of stanzas*. 1st edition. Singhi Jaina Series 1. Śāntiniketan: Singhi Jaina Jñānapīṭha, 1933

*Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Siradeva:  
See *Paribhāṣasaṃgraha*.

Bh = *Bhāṣya* = *Mahābhāṣya* = *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya*:  
F. Kielhorn, ed. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali*. 2nd edition (all volumes). Vol. 1–3. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 28–30. Bombay: Government Central Book Depôt, 1892, 1906, 1909

*Bhūṣaṇasāra*:  
Kamalāśaṅkara Prāṇasaṅkara Trivedi, ed. *The Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa of Koṇḍabhaṭṭa With the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra and the commentary Kāśikā of Harirāma surnamed Kāla And with a critical notice of manuscripts, introduction, and critical and explanatory notes*. 1st edition. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series 70. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1915

*Raghuvamśa*:  
*sargas 1–12*:  
Csaba Dezső (vol. 2), Dominic Goodall (vols. 1–2), and Harunaga Isaacson (vols. 1–2), eds. *The Raghupañcikā of Vallabhadeva being the earliest commentary on the Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa*. 1st edition (both volumes). Vol. 1–2. Groningen Oriental Studies 17 (vol. 1) and Gonda Indological Studies 24 (vol. 2). Vol. 2 is made with the collaboration of Csaba Kiss. Groningen (vol. 1) and Leiden (vol. 2): Egbert Forsten (vol. 1) and Brill (vol. 2), 2003, 2025  
*sargas 13–19*:  
Csaba Dezső, Dominic Goodall, and Harunaga Isaacson, eds. *Kalidasa The lineage of the Raghus*. 1st edition. Murty Classical Library of India 38. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2024

*Rājataranṅiṇī* of Kalhaṇa:  
M.A. Stein, ed. *Kalhaṇa's Rājataranṅiṇī A chronicle of the kings of Kaśmīr*. Reprint of 1st edition 1900 (vols. 1–2) and 1892 (vol. 3). Vol. 1–3. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979, 1979, 1988

*Vākyapadīya*:  
Wilhelm Rau, ed. *Bhartṛharis Vākyapadīya Die Mūlakārikās nach den*

*Handschriften herausgegeben und mit einem Pāda-Index versehen.* 1st edition. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 42.4. Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner GmbH, 1977

*Veṅīsamhāra:*

Julius Grill, ed. *Veṅīsamhāra Die Ehrenrettung der Königin Ein Drama in 6 Akten von Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa Kritisch mit Einleitung und Noten herausgegeben.* 1st edition. Leipzig: FUES's Verlag (R. Reisland), 1871

vt. = *vārttika:*

See Bh.

*Vairāgyaśataka:*

See *Śatakātraya.*

VV = *Vyaktiviveka;*

VVR = Ruyyaka's commentary on the *Vyaktiviveka:*

T. Gaṇapatiśāstrī, ed. *The Vyaktiviveka of Rājānaka Mahimabhāta and its commentary of Rājānaka Ruyyaka.* 1st edition. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 5. Trivandrum: Printed at the Travancore Government Press, 1909

*Śatakātraya:*

D.D. Kosambi, ed. *The epigrams attributed to Bhartrhari Including the three centuries For the first time collected and critically edited with principal variants and an introduction.* 1st edition. Singhi Jain Series 23. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1948

*Śiśupālavadhā:*

Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhāta Shāstrī, eds. *Maghabāta's[sic] Shishupalavadhā With the commentary (Sandeha-vishaushadhi) of Vallabhadeva.* 1st edition. Srinagar: Printed at the Kashmir Mercantile Press, 1935

ŚP = *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa:*

Rewāprasāda Dwivedī and Sadāśivakumāra Dwivedī, eds. *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa (Sāhityaparakāśa) by Bhojarāja.* 1st edition (both volumes). Vol. 1–2. New Delhi and Varanasi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts and Kālidāsa-samsthāna, 2007, 2007

*Samdehaviṣauśadhi* of Vallabhadeva:

See *Śiśupālavadhā.*

*Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa:*

Sundari Siddhartha, ed. *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇam of king Bhoja (on poetics) Text and translation*. 1st edition (all volumes). Vol. 1–3. I.G.N.C.A. Kalāmūlāsāstra Series 55–57. Assited by Hema Ramanathan (all volumes). Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts and Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2009, 2009, 2009

*Sarvaṅkaṣā* of Mallinātha:

Āsubodhavidyābhūṣaṇa and Nityabodhavidyāratna, eds. *Śīsupālabadham mahākavi-śrīmāgha-viracitam mahāmahopādhyāya-kolācalamallināthasūrikṛtasarvaṅkaṣākhyayā vyākhyayā sametam*. 6th edition. Calcutta: Āsubodhavidyābhūṣaṇa and Nityabodhavidyāratna, 1920

*Sāhityadarpaṇa:*

P.V. Kane, ed. *The Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha (Parichchedas I–X) with notes on Parichchedas I, II, X and history of alaṅkāra literature*. 2nd edition. 1st edition 1910. Bombay: Pandurang Vaman Kane, 1923

*Subhāṣitāvali* of Vallabhadeva:

Peter Peterson and Durgāprasāda, eds. *The Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhadeva*. 1st edition. Bombay: Printed at the Education Society's Press, Byculla, 1886

SD = *Samanvayadiś:*

Walter Slaje. “Kuḍakas Samanvayadiś und die Folgeliteratur Materialien zu einer vergessenen lokalen Tradition der einheimischen indischen Grammatik (Miscellanea zu den Wiener Sanskrit-Handschriften 2)”. In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 36 (1992), pp. 105–126

SP = *Samanvayapradīpa;*SPS = *Samanvayapradīpasamketa:*

Oliver Hahn, ed. *Eine altindische Syntaxlehre Devaśarmans Samanvayapradīpa nebst Autokommentar Edition, Übersetzung und Studie*. 1st edition. Geisteskultur Indiens Texte und Studien 12. Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2008

*Harṣacarita:*

A.A. Führer, ed. *Śrīharṣacaritamahākāvyaṃ Bāṇabhaṭṭa's biography of king Harshavardhana of Sthāṇvīśvara with Śaṅkara's commentary Saṅketa Edited with critical notes*. 1st edition. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series

66. Bombay: Sold at Government Central Press, 1909

Hahn 2008b:  
See SP.

Slaje 1992:  
See SD.

Slaje's *Śāradā*:

Walter Slaje, ed. *Śāradā Deskriptiv-synchrone Schriftkunde zur Bearbeitung kashmirischer Sanskrit-Manuskripte Auf der Grundlage von Kuśālas Ghāṭakharpara-Gūḍhadīpikā und unter graphischer Mitwirkung von Eva Slaje*. 1st edition. Indische Schriften 1. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler, 1993

#### CATALOGUES

Clauson 1912:

Gerard L.M. Clauson. "Catalogue of the Stein Collection of Sanskrit MSS. from Kashmir". In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1912), pp. 587–627

Mironov 1914:

N.D. Mironov, ed. *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Indicorum qui in Academiae Imperialis Scientiarum Petropolitanae Museo Asiatico asservantur Fasc. I*. 1st edition. Catalogi Musei Asiatici 1. In Russian. Petropoli: Typis Academiae Caesareae Scientiarum, 1914

#### SECONDARY SOURCES

Bhattacharya 1991:

Gopikamohan Bhattacharya. "On paśya mṛgo dhāvati". In: *Pāṇinian studies Professor S.D. Joshi felicitation volume*. Ed. by Madhav M. Deshpande and Saroja Bhate. 1st edition. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia 37. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1991, pp. 65–74

Birwé 1958:

Robert Birwé. "Variae lectiones in adhyāya IV und V der Aṣṭādhyāyī". In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 108.1 (1958),

pp. 133–154

Chakravorty 1975:

Amiya Kumar Chakravorty. *Studies in Mahimabhaṭṭa A critical and comparative study of Mahimabhaṭṭa's Vyaktiviveka*. 1st edition. Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1975

Dvivedī 1940:

*Śrī merū[sic]tuṅgācāryaviracita prabandhacintāmaṇi Saṃskṛta granthakā hindī bhāṣāntara*. Trans. by Hajāriprasāda Dvivedī. 1st edition. Siṃghī Jaina Granthamālā 3. Ahamadābāda-Kalakattā: Siṃghī Jaina Granthamālā, 1940

Haksar 2007:

*Subhāshitāvali An anthology of comic, erotic and other verse*. Trans. by A.N.D. Haksar. 1st edition. Penguin Classics. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2007

Hultzsck 1926:

*Māgha's Śiśupālavadhā Nach den Kommentaren des Vallabhadēva und des Mallināthasūri ins Deutsche übertragen*. Trans. by E. Hultzsck. 1st edition. Leipzig: Verlag der Asia Major, 1926

Jha 1987:

Trilokanatha Jha. *An elucidation of poetic blemishes in the Vyaktiviveka*. 1st edition. Mithilā Institute Series 3 Studies 8. Darbhanga: Mithilā Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1987

*Laukikanyāyāñjali*:

G.A. Jacob. *Laukikanyāyāñjaliḥ A handful of popular maxims current in Sanskrit literature*. 2nd edition (all volumes). Vol. 1–3. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgara Press, 1907, 1909, 1911

Mālavīya 1974:

*Kāśmīrī kavi śrī vallabhadeva dvārā saṃkalita Subhāshitāvaliḥ hindī anuvāda ke sātha*. Trans. by Rāmacandra Mālavīya. 1st edition. Vārāṇasī: Ānanda Bandhu Prakāśana, 1974

Sankararamasastrī 1956:

*Kāvyaḷaṅkāra of Bhāmaha Paricchhedas 1 to 6 With English translation and notes on Paricchhedas 1 to 3*. Trans. by C. Sankararamasastrī. 1st edi-

tion. Sri Balamanorama Series 54. Madras: The Sri Balamanorama Press, 1956

#### DICTIONARIES

AP:

V.S. Apte. *The practical Sanskrit-English dictionary*. 2nd edition revised and enlarged by P.K. Gode and C.G. Karve (all volumes). Vol. 1-3. Poona: Prasad Prakashan, 1957, 1958, 1959