

SANSKRIT USAGE

Śaṅkarācārya commenting on the first verse of the *Īśopaniṣad*:

*Īśāvāsyam idaṃ sarvaṃ yat kiñca jagatyāṃ jagat /  
tena tyaktena bhūñijthā mā ḡrdhaḥ kasyavid dhanam //*

offers two alternative interpretations of the fourth quadrant: *mā ḡrdhaḥ kasyavid dhanam*. He says: *mā ḡrdhaḥ ḡrdhim ākāṅkṣāṃ mā kāṅṣīr dhanaviṣayām / kasyavid dhanam kasyacit parasya svasya vā dhanam mā kāṅkṣīr ity arthaḥ / svid ity anarthako nipātaḥ / athavā mā ḡrdhaḥ / kasmāt / kasyavid dhanam ity ākṣepārtho, na kasyacid dhanam asti yad ḡrdhyeta*. Obviously the Ācārya regards the  $\sqrt{\text{ḡrdh}}$  as transitive for he says in the first instance *kasyavid dhanam kasyacit parasya svasya vā dhanam mā kāṅkṣīr*. Here he looks upon this quadrant as one single sentence. In the second instance he splits it up into two clauses: *mā ḡrdhaḥ, dhanam kasyavit*. Even then he persists in viewing the root as transitive for he remarks: *na kasyacid dhanam asti yad ḡrdhyeta*. The verse under reference is alluded to in the *Mahābhārata*:

*kasyedam iti kasya svam iti vedavacas tathā*<sup>1</sup>.

Evidently the *Mahābhāratakāra* splits the *Upaniṣadic* sentence in the same way as Śaṅkarācārya does. But this splitting by itself would clearly point to the intransitive nature of the root, precluding *dhanam* from standing as an object to *ḡrdhaḥ*. It is the Ācārya's obsession with the transitive nature of the root that leads him to supply *yad ḡrdhyeta* even in the second interpretation. Against this view of Śaṅkarācārya we have a mass of evidence which goes to show that  $\sqrt{\text{ḡrdh}}$  is almost invariably used intransitively. The impression that  $\sqrt{\text{ḡrdh}}$  is transitive has probably originated from the meaning assigned to it in the Pāṇinīya *Dhātupāṭha* which reads: *ḡrdhū abhikāṅkṣāyām*.

1. *Āśvamedhikaparva*, 32.16.

As it stands it would mean that the sense of  $\sqrt{grdh}$  is « to covet » for *grdhyati* would be paraphrased by *abhikāṅkṣati* which would require normally an object. That the root is intransitive is further evidenced by the use of *lubh* as intransitive. The *Dhātupāṭha* gives the meaning of *lubh* as *gārdhya*, covetousness. The nature of this root is not at all in dispute. Unfortunately we have very little use of this root as a finite verb (in *tiṅanta* form) though we have ample use of in the verbal derivative forms such as *grdhi*, *gardha*, *gardhanā*, *grdhnū* etc. in classical Sanskrit literature. The Vedas and the epics abound with the use of the root as a finite verb. The following few illustrations would suffice to prove the point:

- (1) *yasyāgrdhad vedane vājy akṣaḥ* /<sup>2</sup>
- (2) *nirāmiṇo ripavo 'nneṣu jāgrdhuḥ* /<sup>3</sup>
- (3) *mā grdho no ajāviṣu* /<sup>4</sup>
- (4) *durnāmā tatra mā grdhat* /<sup>5</sup>
- (5) *te patnīṣv eva gandharvā gardhiṣyanti* /<sup>6</sup>
- (6) *yadā grdhyet parabhūtau nṛśaṃsaḥ* /<sup>7</sup>.
- (7) *paravitteṣu grdhyataḥ* /<sup>8</sup>
- (8) *eṣa dharmāḥ paramo yat svakena rājā tuṣyen na parasveṣu grdhyet* /<sup>9</sup>
- (9) *anityaṃ yauvanaṃ rūpaṃ jīvitam ratnasañcayaḥ / aiśvaryaṃ priyasamvāso grdhyet tatra na paṇḍitaḥ* //<sup>10</sup>.
- (10) *anyonyam abhigarjanto goṣu grddhāḥ* /<sup>11</sup>
- (11) *grahane dharmarājasya bhāradvājo 'pi grdhyati* /<sup>12</sup>
- (12) *grdhyed eṣu na paṇḍitaḥ* /<sup>13</sup>
- (13) *snātānuliptagātre 'pi yasmin grdhyanti makṣikāḥ* /<sup>14</sup>

Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita in his *Siddhāntakaumudī* takes  $\sqrt{trp}$  of the IV conjugation to be transitive as well, leaning on Bhaṭṭi's use of it as a transitive verb: *pitṛn atārpsit*. The Sanskrit usage, however, negatives it positively. Not only is this root of the IV conjugation invariably intransitive, but also the root of the V conjugation is likewise as can be seen from the following examples:

2. *Rgveda*, X.34.4.
3. *Ibid.*, II.23.16.
4. *Atharva.*, XI.3.21.
5. *Ibid.*, VIII.6.1.
6. *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 3.9.3-20.
7. *MBH.*, *Udyogaparva*, 29.30.
8. *Ibid.*, *Udyogaparva*, 72.18.
9. *Ibid.*, *Vanaparva*, IV.7.
10. *Ibid.*, II.47.
11. *Ibid.*, *Virāṭaparva*, 32.3.
12. *Ibid.*, *Droṇaparva*, III.14.
13. *Ibid.*, *Strīparva*, II.25.
14. Caraka, *Indriyasthāna*, V.15.

- (1) *anukāmaṃ tarpayethām indrāvaruṇa rāya ā /*<sup>15</sup>
- (2) *indra somasya varuṇasya tṛṇuhi /*<sup>16</sup>
- (3) *hiranyavarṇā atrpaṇi yadāvaḥ /*<sup>17</sup>
- (4) *tṛpyantu hotrā madhvaḥ /*<sup>18</sup>
- (5) *vāg devī juṣānā somasya tṛpyatu /*<sup>19</sup>
- (6) *na hi tṛptā 'smi kāmānāṃ jyeṣṭhā mām anumanyatām /*<sup>20</sup>
- (7) *aharahaṇaḥ nayamāno gām aśvam puruṣaṃ paśum /  
vaivasvato na tṛpyati surāyā iva durmadī //*<sup>21</sup>
- (8) *cirasya dṛṣṭvā dāsārha rājānaḥ sarva eva tau /  
amṛtasyeva nātrpyan prekṣamānā janārdanam //*<sup>22</sup>
- (9) *atrptiś cānnasya /*<sup>23</sup>
- (10) *nāyuñjāno bhakṣyabhojyasya tṛpyet /*<sup>24</sup>
- (11) *kāmānām avitṛptas tvaṃ srñjayeha mariṣyasi /*<sup>25</sup>
- (12) *gavyasya tṛptā māṃsasya /*<sup>26</sup>
- (13) *nāgnis tṛpyati kāṣṭhānāṃ nāpagānāṃ mahodadhiḥ /*<sup>27</sup>
- (14) *avitṛptaḥ sugandhasya samantād vyacarad vanam /*<sup>28</sup>
- (15) *atrpto 'smy adya kāmānāṃ /*<sup>29</sup>
- (16) *madbāñānāṃ tu vegena hatānāṃ tu rañājire /  
adya tṛpyantu māṃsādāḥ... /*<sup>30</sup>
- (17) *apāṇi hi tṛptāya na vāridhārā svāduḥ sugandhiḥ svadate  
tuṣārā //*<sup>31</sup>
- (18) *athavā śreyasi kena tṛpyate /*<sup>32</sup>

Grammar lays down the rule that the object takes the genitive when in construction with a verbal derivative, Pāṇ. II.3.65. In contravention of this, the usage sanctions only the accusative. And this has the tacit approval of Pāṇini himself for he uses the accusative in construction with *arham*, a verbal derivative, in the *sūtra*: *tadarham*, V.1.117, e.g.,

- 
15. *Rgveda*, I.17.3.
  16. *Ibid.*, II.16.6.
  17. *Atharva.*, III.13.6.
  18. *Sukla Yajurveda*, 7.15.
  19. *Ibid.*, 8.37.
  20. *MBH.*, *Ādiparva*, 125.25.
  21. *Mahābhāṣya*, 2.2.29.
  22. *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, 2.1.3.
  23. *MBH.*, *Udyogaparva*, 29.6.
  24. *Ibid.*, 94.51.
  25. *Ibid.*, *Droṇaparva*, 55.36.
  26. *Ibid.*, *Karṇaparva*, 44.27.
  27. *Ibid.*, *Anuśāsanaparva*, 38.25.
  28. *Vāmanapurāṇa*, 21.32.
  29. *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, IX.18.37.
  30. *Rāmāyaṇa*, VI.57.18-19.
  31. *Naiṣadhacarita*, III.93.
  32. *Sīsupālavadha*, I.29.

- (1) *na parityāgam arheyam matsakāśād arindama* / <sup>33</sup>
- (2) *prthivīrājyam arho'yaṃ nāṅgarājyaṃ nareśvaraḥ* / <sup>34</sup>
- (3) *tasmāt pravāraṇaṃ pūrvam arhaḥ pārtho dhanañjayaḥ* / <sup>35</sup>
- (4) *arhas tvam asi dharmajña rājasūyaṃ mahākratum* / <sup>36</sup>
- (5) *tadā visargam arhāḥ syur itīdaṃ dhātṛśāsanam* / <sup>37</sup>
- (6) *naivārhaḥ paitṛkaṃ riktham* / <sup>38</sup>

According to the *Dhātupāṭha* √ *vad* (with or without *sam*) is *Para-* *smaipadin* but according to usage with *sam* it is invariably *Ātmanepadin*. The *Bhāṣyakāra* is merely upholding the usage when he employs the *Ātmanepada* termination in the expression: *vācikaśaḍḍikau na saṃvadete* <sup>39</sup>. We have in the *Ṛgveda* as also in the *Nirukta* the *Ātmanepada* use of *sam* + *vad*: *uta svayā tanvā saṃvade tat* <sup>40</sup>, *indra tvaṃ marudbhiḥ saṃvadasva* <sup>41</sup>, *devaśunīndreṇa prahitā pañibhir asuraiḥ samūda ity ākhyānam* <sup>42</sup>. The *Bṛhaddevatā* also reads: *sūkte preti tu nadyaś ca viśvāmitraḥ samūdire* <sup>43</sup>. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* too has it in *attha hāgnayaḥ samūdire tupto brahmacārī kuśalaṃ naḥ paryacārīt* <sup>44</sup>. So do have *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad* <sup>45</sup> and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* <sup>46</sup>:

- (1) *mṛṣā kila vai māṃ saṃvadiṣṭhā brahma te bravāṇīti* /
- (2) *sa hovācājātaśatrur mā maitasmin saṃvadiṣṭhā iti* /

Elsewhere also we come across, not infrequently, this use of the *Ātmanepada*. Thus:

- (1) *kumāraṃ jātaṃ saṃvadanta upa vai śuśrūṣate* / <sup>47</sup>
- (2) *devā vai brahma samavadanta* / <sup>48</sup>
- (3) *sa vai na sarveṇeva saṃvadeta* / ... *na vai devā sarveṇeva saṃvadante* / <sup>49</sup>

33. *Rāmāyaṇa*, I.53.12.

34. *MBH.*, *Ādiparva*, 19.12.

35. *Ibid.*, *Udyogaparva*, 7.17.

36. *Ibid.*, *Sabhāparva*, 13.32.

37. *Ibid.*, *Sāntiparva*, 267.15.

38. *Mānavadharmasāstra*, 9.144.

39. II.25.1.

40. *Rgveda*, VII.86.2.

41. I.170.5.

42. XI.25.1.

43. IV.99.

44. IV.10.4.

45. 4.18.

46. II.1.9.

47. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, 3.2.

48. *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, IV.1.1, *Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā*, 30.10.

49. *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, III.1.1.10.

As required by grammar *anurakta* and *anuvrata* should have either the Locative or the Genitive of the person or the thing to whom or to which one is devoted. And we have this use. But the Accusative preponderates, though it has no explicit grammatical sanction, for example:

- (1) *sātyakiḥ kṛtavarmā ca nārāyaṇam anuvratau* / <sup>50</sup>
- (2) *rājāno rājaputrāś ca dhṛtarāṣṭram anuvratāḥ* / <sup>51</sup>
- (3) *abhyagacchad adīnātmā damayanīm anuvrataḥ* / <sup>52</sup>
- (4) *ānvīkṣikīṇī tarkavidyām anurakto nirarthikām* / <sup>53</sup>
- (5) *alabhyam anuraktavān kim ayam ātmanārījanam* / <sup>54</sup>
- (6) *api vṛṣalam anuraktāḥ prakṛtayaḥ?* <sup>55</sup>
- (7) *Mahodadhim ivākṣobhyam ahaṇī rāmam anuvratā* / <sup>56</sup>
- (8) *rājyāc cyutam asiddhārtham rāmaṇ parimitāyusaṃ / kair guṇair anuraktāsi* / <sup>57</sup>.

The Kāśikākāra specifically limits the use of *rajasvalā* and *kārmuka* in the sense of « a lady in menses » and « a bow » respectively. In the Sūtra *tad asyāsty asmīn iti matup* (5.2.94) he says that *iti* is valid in all the following sūtras ordaining the possessive suffixes. And this *iti* limits the option of the speaker. Thus to convey the sense *rajo 'smīn grāme vidyate* we cannot say *rajasvalo grāmaḥ*. Now this is contradicted by usage:

- (1) *sarve vidhvastakavacās tāvakā yudhi nirjitāḥ / rajasvalā bhṛṣodvīgnā vīkṣamānā diśo daśa* // <sup>58</sup>.
- (2) *gadayā bhimasenena bhinnakumbhān rajasvalān / dhāvamānān apaśyāma kuñjarān parvatopamān* // <sup>59</sup>.
- (3) *paṅkadigdhan rajasvalān* / <sup>60</sup>.
- (4) *rajasvalam anityaṇ ca bhūtāvāsam imaṇ tyajet* / <sup>61</sup>.

In the case of *kārmuka* the Kāśikākāra says under Pāṇ. *karmaṇa ukāñ* (5.1.103) *kārmukaṇ dhanuḥ / dhanuṣo 'nyatra na bhavati / anabhi-*

50. MBH., *Ādiparva*, 63.5.

51. *Ibid.*, *Vanaparva*, 35.30.

52. *Ibid.*, 54.27.

53. MBH., *Sāntiparva*, 180.47.

54. *Mudrārākṣasa*, VI.16.

55. *Ibid.*, Act I, after verse 20.

56. *Rāmāyaṇa*, III.47.33.

57. *Ibid.*, III.49.14-15.

58. MBH., *Droṇaparva*, 32.3.

59. *Ibid.*, *Salyaparva*, 24.30.

60. *Ibid.*, *Sāntiparva*, 11.7.

61. *Manusmṛti*, VI.76.

*dhānāt*. This is not supported by usage. We have the use of *kārmuka* in the sense of « effective », in the *Caraka Saṃhitā*:

- (1) *na tu kevalaṃ guṇaprabhāvād eva kārmukāṇi bhavanti (dravyāṇi) /*<sup>62</sup>.
- (2) *bahuśo gulikāḥ kāryāḥ kārmukās syus tato 'dhikam /*<sup>63</sup>.

---

62. *Sūtrasthāna*, 26.12.

63. *Cikitsāsthāna*, 5.84.