

## RAM KARAN SHARMA

### PĀṆINIAN METARULE GOVERNING PRIMARY DERIVATIVES\*

1. The meta rules and jurisdictions (*paribhāṣās* and *adhikāras*) play a very significant role in the Pāṇinian technique of linguistic description. An attempt is made here to present a detailed account of the relevant metarule<sup>1</sup> governing the formation of primary derivatives (*Kṛdanta*).

#### A. Organisational Background

2. The three chapters of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* III-V consisting of 1821 aphorisms (*sūtras*), deal, exclusively with affixes-conjugational (*tiṅanta*), primary derivative (*Kṛdanta*) and secondary derivative (*taddhita*, etc.). They all come under the jurisdiction of the first three *sūtras*<sup>2</sup>, as follows:

- i) all the operational statements upto the end of chapter V are to be designated as *pratyayas* (affixes);
- ii) they are all to be placed next to the relevant stem and
- iii) they are all, unless otherwise specified, to be accented on the first syllable.

3. The aphorisms that follow through Ch. III.1.90 deal with the

---

\* The paper is basically the same as it was presented during the Ninth World Sanskrit Conference at Melbourne, Australia, in January 1994.

1. *Va'sarupo'striyām*, Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A) Ch. III.1.94.

2. i) *Pratyayah*, ii) *paraś ca*, iii) *ādyudattaś ca id.* III.1.1-3.

conjugational affixes including desiderative (*Sannanta*) and denominative (*nāmadhātu*) formations. As a matter of fact, the entire Ch. III deals with verbal affixes. But the affixal operations that precede Ch. III.1.91 and those that follow, specially Ch. III.1.94 have the two distinctive features of their own.

4. Ch. IV.1 begins with feminine – forming operations (*Strīpratyayas*) including some of them listed as secondary derivatives (*taddhitas*)<sup>3</sup> ending with *Sūtra* 81. Ch. IV.1.82 through V.4.67, deal exclusively with secondary derivatives (*taddhita*); Ch. V.4.68-160 represent *Samāsānta* affixes.

5. The jurisdictional rule<sup>4</sup> governing the secondary derivatives (*taddhitas*), only states that the relevant affixes are to be placed next to the stem represented as the first item in the *Sūtra* concerned, provided that the stem is syntactically and logically related to the derivative semantic transformation intended, secondary derivatives, so formed, are generally optional in character. *E.g.* the son of Aditi is *Āditya* (*Aditi+an = Āditya*)<sup>5</sup> or *Aditer apatyam pumān*.

6. But as elsewhere, exceptions countermand the operation of general rules even in the context of secondary derivatives. *E.g.* the affix *an* is the generally acceptable secondary derivative component. But it is generally debarred in the jurisdiction<sup>6</sup> of the stems with a short/a/ending; *e.g.* the son of Daśaratha is *Dāśarathīḥ* (*Daśaratha+iḥ*). Here the exceptions are considered to be absolute. Forms like *Dāśarathaḥ* are not considered admissible under the rules, of course, the basic form, *daśarathasyā*, *patyam* or *daśarathasya sunuḥ* is admissible under the rules.

7. But in so far as the primary derivatives are concerned, even the exceptions to the general rule of operation are optional, provided they are heteromorphous and they do not come under the jurisdiction of

3. *taddhitaḥ*, *id.* IV.1.76.

4. *Samarthānam prathamād vā* IV.1.82.

5. *tasyā'patyam*, *id.* IV.1.92; *pragdivyato'n* IV.1.83.

6. *ata, iḥ* IV.1.95.

grammatically feminine affixal formations. That is what the relevant metarule III.1.94 governing the Primary derivatives enjoins. *E.g.* according to the general rule<sup>7</sup> the “primary derivatives of agent” from the verbal root *budh* “to know” are: i) *bodhakaḥ* (*budh* + *ṅvul* = *budh* + *vu* = *bodh* + *aka*) and *boddhā* (*budh* + *tṛc* = *budh* + *tar* = *budh* + *tā* = *bodh* + *tā* = *boddhā*) “one who knows”. Normally the specific rule<sup>8</sup> of exception enjoining *ka* affix for such primary derivatives from verb-roots, *inter-alia*, with *ik* (i, u, ṛ or ḷ) as a penultimate vowel should have debarred the application of the general rule leading to the above formations *bodhakah* and *boddha* and so the only admissible primary derivative formation of agent from the root *budh* would have been *budhaḥ* (*budh* + *ka* = *budh* + *a* = *budha*). But as explained above, the relevant metarule enjoins flexibility in this behalf and extends the jurisdiction of the general rule even in the sphere of the specific rules of exception providing heteromorphons affixal formations. So all the above three formations (*bodhakaḥ*, *boddhā* and *budhaḥ* are explained).

8. The metarule in question does not, however, allow this flexibility of optionality of the heteromorphons “exceptional” affixal operations coming under the jurisdiction of the jurisdictional cum operational rule<sup>9</sup> providing grammatically feminine primary derivative formations. *E.g.* according to this rule the affix *ktin* (*ti*) is applied to all the verbal roots in order to form a primary derivative to denote “the act of ...”. Thus *kṛtiḥ* (*kṛ* + *ti*) “the act of doing” is formed from the root *dukṛñ* = *kṛ*. But the specific rule<sup>10</sup> enjoining the affix *yuc* (*yu* = *ana* = *ana*) *inter alia* for all causative (*ṅyanta* or *ṅijanta*) verbs with the same primary derivative connotation absolutely debar the operation of the above general rule in the specific sphere of its own. So there is no scope for a formation like *kāṛiti*; from *kṛ* (caus.) the only admissible formation is *kāraṇā* “the act of causing to do” even though the affixes concerned (*ti* and *yu* = *ana*) are heteromorphons. Conversely,

7. *ṅvultṛcau*, *id.* III.1.133; cf. *kartari kṛt* III.4.67.

8. *igupadhajñāprikirah kah*, *id.* III.1.135.

9. *Striyam ktin*, *id.* III.3.94.

10. *ṅyasasrantho yuc* III.3.107.

as the metarule enjoins, this flexibility of optionality with regard to "exceptional" specific affixal zones is not admissible if both the general and "exceptional" affixes are homomorphons (Sarūpa) e.g. The primary derivative gerund from root *ci* "to collect is *ceyam* to be collected" ( $ci + yat = ci + ya = ceya$ ), as enjoined by the general rule<sup>11</sup> applicable to all verbs ending in a vowel. There is, however, a specific rule<sup>12</sup> that enjoins the affix *kyap* after specific verbal roots including quite a few roots with a vowel ending like *stu* "to admire, worship" giving rise to such primary derivative gerund forms like *stutyah* ( $stu + kyap = stu + ya = stu + t + ya = stutya$ ) "to be admired, worshipped" here the zero grade of the root vowel *u* remains intact and an infix *tuk = t* is added by force of the affixal markers *k* and *p* respectively. Being homomorphous in character, the general applicability of *yat* affix is debarred in the sphere of the "exceptional" *kyap*. So the metarule in question debar the principle of flexibility of "exceptionals" with regard to homomorphons affixes. The two affixes *kyap* and *yat* differ in respect of their markers and so they appear to be heteromorphons. But they are considered to be *de facto* homomorphons in as much as they both ultimately remain the same after their dissociation from their dissociation from their respective markers. Even otherwise markers are considered to be irrelevant from the point of view of determining homomorphons or heteromorphons status of affixes, notwithstanding the immutability of their value as transformers of morphophonemic structure in the Pāṇinian framework of linguistic description.

### B. Scholastic Discussions

9. The scholastic aspects of the metarule in question governing the Primary derivatives as expounded by Patañjali<sup>13</sup> Kaiyaṭa, Jayā-

11. *aco yat* III.1.97.

12. *etistus'āsvrdrjuṣaḥ kyap. id.* III.1.109.

13. Vide id. III.1.94 read with: -

i) Patañjali, *Mahābhāṣya* with Kaiyaṭas' Pradīpa and Nāges'as Uddyota;

ii) Jayāditya and Vāmana, *Kāśikā* with Jinendrabuddhis; Nyasa and Haradatta's *Padamañjarī*.

ditya and Vāmana, Haradatta, Jīnendrabuddhi and Nāgeśa are no less interesting.

10. There are three components of the *sūtra* representing the metarule governing primary derivatives: i) *Vā* ii) *Sarūpo* and iii) *striyam*. As regards the last component, its basic form *astriyām* is obvious. Had it been *striyām*, then the second component would have read as *Sarupaḥ* and not *Sarūpo* with *o* ending. But the second component itself creates a problem. Is it to be read as *Sarūpo* or *asarūpo*? In either case it will be read as *Vāsarūpo* ... in oral tradition (where no *avagraha* is discernible). In this connection it is pointed out that if the second component were *sarūpo*, the *sūtra* would have better been presented as *Sarūpo striyām vā* in the interest of unambiguity. So by implication the second component is to be read (basically) as *asarūpo* and not as *sarūpo*. The first component *vā* does not create any euphonic problem. So, *vā asarūpo astriyām* “optional heteromorphons in non-feminine” is the disjoined basic form of this *sūtra*.

11. The above three components create several problems of interpretation as well. The first one *vā* stands for optional operation. Of what type is the optional operation intended here? Is it of the same type as the optional operation in the secondary derivatives coming under the jurisdiction of the relevant *taddhita*<sup>14</sup> metarule? According to that metarule all the general and specific – exceptional affixal operations are considered to be optional and as explained above, the basic expanded syntactical forms are also optionally admissible. So is the optionality of this metarule also of the same type? Then what is it that is qualified by the epithet *asarupa* heteromorphons? Is it the generally stated affix or the specifically stated one or both? Again, what does the term *astriyām* convey? Are all the feminine formations of the primary derivatives excluded from the purview of optionality? Or is it that the affixally feminine primary derivatives alone are to be excluded?

The genesis of all these interpretational problems is that there is

---

14. Vide paras 5-6 above.

no clear indication – contextual or jurisdictional – about the nature of option or *operendum* or excluded feminine forms.

Let us see how the three components are explained in Pāṇinian tradition.

*vā*

12. It is pointed out that the term *vā* in this *sūtra* cannot be construed on the lines of *vā* in the *taddhita* jurisdictional *sūtra*. As regards optionality in *taddhita* (secondary derivative) formations, it is generally universal in character. *E.g.* it makes no difference if we call Rāma as *dāśarathi* (with a patronymic *taddhita* affix) or as *daśarathasyā patyam pumān* or simply *daśaratha – sūnuḥ* or *daśarathasya putraḥ*. Here even if the secondary derivative form is brought to its basic sentence level, each of the components of the sentence including the term *daśarathasya* with the sixth case ending has its Semantic element intact. The case of primary derivatives is quite different. Here, basic forms are nothing but the basic verbroots which do not represent even the basic meanings without being joined with the relevant affixes. *E.g.* the Primary derivative form *bhāvakaḥ* “one who becomes or is” from the root *bhū* conveys the sense of the agent of becoming or being. If following the analogy of *taddhita* (secondary derivative) optionality as explained above, this primary derivative of agent is restored to its basic position *bhū*, it will not, as a matter of fact have even the basic meaning “to be”, let alone the primary derivative of agent connotation. So this interpretation of *vā* (*utpattivikalpa* = universal application of optionality in the context of all general and specific affixes as in the case of secondary derivatives) is not considered tenable in the context of primary derivative formations. So optionality refers, here, to the general and specific rules of operation only.

*asarūpa*

13. The epithet *asarūpa* “heteromorphous” must necessarily qualify something. What does it qualify here? Patañjali<sup>15</sup> describes this

15. *utsargasya bādhakaviṣaye 'nivr̥ttyartham.*

*sūtra* as a *Paribhāṣā* (a guiding principle or metarule) aiming at the suspension of inoperability of general rules of operation in the sphere of specific operational rules of exception. Thus the epithet *asarūpa* implies that it must qualify an object which has something wanting. It is pointed out that there is nothing wanting in so far as the general rules are concerned. It is the specific rule of exception (*apavāda pratyaya*) which anticipates or apprehends the possible applicability of the general operational rules even in its own sphere and so obstructs their operability in its own restricted area. Thus the epithet *asarūpa* qualifies *apavāda* (specific affixal operation of exception representing “*apavādas’āstra*”). So this *sūtra* presents a general guiding principle to the effect that “a heteromorphous specific affix of exception (unlike the *taddhita* affixes) only optionally debar the applicability of the generally stated affixes (*asarūpo’pavādapratyaya utsargasya bādhako vā syat*) – of course barring a few exceptions.

14. The term *asarūpa* “heteromorphous” also need, explanation as to whether the markers attached to an affix can determine the mutually heteromorphous nature of any two affixes. *E.g.* one of the compound primary derivative forms connoting an agent is *kumbhakarāh*<sup>16</sup> potter (*kumbha + kṛ + aṅ = kumbha + kar + a = kumbhakarā*). The relevant *aṅ* affix is generally applicable in such cases with the preceding component having the connotation of an accusative (*karman*). According to another specific rule<sup>17</sup> of exception, the affix *ka* is to be applied to a verb ending in *ā* in a similar situation, *e.g.* *godah* “a donor of cows” (*go + dā + ka = go + da + a = goda*). Even though the two affixes *aṅ* and *ka* have different markers (*-n* and *k-*), both the affixes are “a” *de facto*. Are they to be regarded as homomorphous or heteromorphous? As stated earlier, they are not considered to be heteromorphous and so the optionality of an is debarred in the sphere of the specific affix *ka*. In this connection, it is pointed out that Pāṇini himself has clearly indicated his intention to the effect that the markers of affixes do not determine the heteromorphous nature of the affixes concerned in the context of this metarule governing pri-

16. vide *Karmany an* III.2.1.

17. *ato ’nupasarje kah, id.* III.2.3.

mary derivatives. This is evident from the clearly stated<sup>18</sup> optionality of the affix *śa* with regard to the primary derivative of agent from the root *dā* and *dhā* (e.g. *dadaḥ* “a donor”, *dadhaḥ* “a supporter”) as against the general rule<sup>19</sup> that provides the *ṇa* affix *inter alia* to all verbs ending in *ā* (e.g. *dāyah* “a donor”). Had the markers been acceptable as distinct determinants of heteromorphous nature for the two *śa* and *ṇa* affixes, there was no need providing optionality to the specific suffix *śa*. This, in fact, proves the dictum that the heteromorphous nature of two affixes cannot be determined on the basis of the variation in markers only (*nā 'nubandhakṛtam asārūpyam*). So the term *asarūpa* qualifies a specific rule of exception. The heteromorphous nature of two affixes is to be determined, not on the basis of markers but on the basis of their visible forms.

*astriyām*

15. What does the term *striyām* stand for? If it stands for the use of a primary derivative in the feminine gender, the optionality of a specific affix of exception is liable to be debarred in the forms like *peyā āpaḥ* (drinking water). Here the specific rule<sup>20</sup> would not allow the general rule<sup>21</sup> to operate and so use of the admissible optional form *pātavyhā āpaḥ* (drinking water) would be debarred. In case the term stands for the feminine affixes in general, the desired optionality in primary derivative forms like *vyāvakrośī* and *vyāvakruṣṭiḥ* “mutual abuse” with *ṇac*<sup>22</sup> and *ktin*<sup>23</sup> affixes respectively would also be debarred in view of the use of the term *striyām* in both the *sūtras*. So Patañjali concludes that the term *astriyām* in the metarule in question refers to the affixes coming under the jurisdiction of III.3.94 where it is mentioned with a circumflex (*svarīta*) accent and as a rule any term with this accent<sup>24</sup> constitutes jurisdictional force.

18. *dadātidadhātīyora vibhasa*, III.1.139.

19. *śyādvadyadhāsrusamsrvatiṇavasāvahṛlihaśliṣaśvasaś ca*, *id.*, III.1.141.

20. *aco yat*, III.1.97.

21. *tavyattavyānīyaraḥ*, *id.*, III.1.96.

22. *karmavyatihare ṇac striyām*, III.3.43.

23. *striyām ktin*, III.3.94.

24. *svaritenādhikāraḥ*, *id.*, I.3.11.



16. So this metarule is finally interpreted as follows: –

In this jurisdiction of *dhātu* that continues through the end of Ch. III, a specific heteromorphous primary derivative affix of exception will prevent the applicability of a corresponding general affixal operation only optionally (and not absolutely). This does not, however, hold good with regard to the affixal operations coming under the jurisdiction (*adhikāra*) of III.3.94, through III.3.111.

### C. Implications and Limitations

17. Ch. III of A (631 *sūtras*) exclusively deals with the affixes that render the verbroots meaningful (vide para 12), either conjugationally or derivationally. The first ninety *sūtras* deal with the conjugational aspects. The metarule in question is so placed (94) that it does not have jurisdiction over them. *E.g.* the aorist affix *cli*<sup>25</sup> and its replacement affix *sic*<sup>26</sup> are the generally stated conjugational components of this tense aspect. But there are twenty two subsequent specific replacement aorist affixes mentioned where the operability of the general replacement affix *sic* is absolutely debarred.

18. As explained by Patañjali and further interpreted by Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa, this metarule does not have its jurisdiction over any of the replacement affixes of the various conjugational aspects (*ladesa*). That this was intended by Pāṇini is clear from the relevant *sūtra*<sup>27</sup> that provides optional *lañ* (imperfect) aspect in the context<sup>28</sup> of the invisible perfect (*lit*) if the expression *ha* or *s'as'vat* is used in relation to the past action (*e.g.* *iti hā' karot; iti ha cakāra* 'so he did; *s'as'vad akarot; s'as'vac cakāra* "always he did"). The relevant rule enjoining the imperfect aspect, optionally, in the above specific situations would have become redundant if the "exception-optionality" metarule had its

25. *cli luñi*, III.1.43.

26. *cleḥ sic*, III.1.44.

27. *has'as'vatorlañca*, III.2.116.

28. *parokṣe liṭ*, III.2.115.

jurisdiction over such conjugational replacement affixes. So the dictum:

no exception – optionality in the context of the conjugational replacement affixes (*lādeśeṣu vā'sarūpavidhir nā'sti*).

19. Similarly there are quite a few other situations where the metarule in question has no jurisdiction. But the fact remains that but for this metarule most of the diversities in primary derivative formations would not have been explained.

20. The metarule is illustrative of the subtle and methodical descriptive skill (*sūksmekṣikā*) of Pāṇini.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, S.C. Vasu, Delhi 1962.
2. *Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣyam* of Patañjali with Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* and Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita's *Śabdakaustubha* and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's *Uddyota*, with the commentary "Rājalakṣmī" by Guruprasada Śāstri, Varanasi 1938.
3. *Kāśikā Vṛtti* of Jayāditya and Vāmana with Haradatta Mishra's *Padamāñjarī* and Jinendrabuddhi's *Vivaraṇapañjikā-Nyāsa* ed. S.N. Mishra, Varanasi 1985.
4. *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nageśabhatta with Sanskrit commentary and Hindi translation by H.N. Mishra, Delhi 1978.
5. Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita's *Vaiyākaranasiddhānta Kaumudī*, ed. Shri Krishna Swarup, Varanasi 1982.