JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Meaning entries in Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha*

I

Pāṇini's grammar, as we know it, contains, among other things, a list of verbal roots, called "Dhātupāṭha". It is not certain whether Pāṇini himself composed this list of roots, or someone else. It is also not clear if the original Dhātupāṭha (Dhp.) contained all the roots we find in it today; some say there were less (Cardona, 1976: 161-64, 240-41). But one thing seems to be beyond doubt. Whatever its origin, whosoever its composer, some list of roots accompanied the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* from its beginning. This follows from the fact that such a list is referred to in P. 1.3.1: *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ* "what begins with *bhū* are roots".[1]

It is not possible to speak with the same degree of confidence regarding the question whether or not meaning entries formed part of the original Dhp. In the Dhp. as it is known to us meaning entries follow roots, or groups of roots, indicating the meaning of those roots. An example is *bhū sattāyām* "*bhū* in the sense 'being'", which, incidentally, opens the Dhp.[2] Probably the majority of students of Pāṇini's grammar today is of the opinion that these meaning entries were originally not part of the Dhp. The reason is that two modern scholars who made a close study of the Dhp. — I mean Bruno Liebich (1919: 47-53) and Gajanan Balkrishna Palsule (1961: 91 ff.) — have defended this point of view. They followed in this respect Kaiyaṭa and certain other Sanskrit commentators, as we shall see in subsection 5.1 below.

A different opinion is held by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr., pp. 6 ff.; 1973: II: 51 ff.). Mīmāṃsaka lists a number of arguments for meaning entries in the original Dhp. and subsequently a number of arguments against the same. He comes to the curious conclusion that from the beginning there were two versions of the Dhp., one with and one without meaning entries.

In what follows the question regarding meaning entries in the original Dhp. will be studied afresh. I shall thereby follow the order which corresponds, more or less, to the chronological order of the works from which the arguments derive. This has as a consequence

[1] Further reasons supporting the authenticity of the Dhp. can be found in Scharfe, 1977: 101.

that the weightiest arguments come first, for obviously any evidence regarding the original state of Pāṇini's grammar that [336] may be forthcoming from Pāṇini's own work has to be given more weight than whatever is of later origin. Such evidence will be discussed in sections 2 and 3. The evidence from Kātyāyana and Patañjali, which is only slightly less valuable than that from Pāṇini, will receive attention in section 4. Section 5 will deal with the evidence from later authors.

II

2.1.   Roots are mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, sometimes with, and far more often without meaning entries. This indicates that these meaning entries serve to restrict the applicability of the rules concerned to the roots *when used in those meanings.*

Suppose now that Pāṇini's Dhp. was identical with ours. A meaning entry in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* should then either be different from the ones given in the Dhp. for the same root, or identical with one out of several. In other words, identical meaning entries for the same root in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the Dhp. should then only occur in cases where the root has several meaning entries in the Dhp.

Seventeen pairs root + meaning entry occur in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with the same meaning entries which are found in the Dhp. A full sixteen of these roots have indeed more than one meaning entry in the Dhp. This can be seen from the following list, which is an amplified version of the list given by Palsule (1961: 100).

Aṣṭādhyāyī	Dhp.
1. *śliṣa āliṅgane* (3.1.46)	*śliṣA āliṅgane* (IV.77)
	śliṣA śleṣaṇe (X.38)
	śliṣU dāhe (I.734)
2. *āśiṣi nāthaḥ* (2.3.55)	*nāthṛ yācñopatāpaiśvaryāśīḥṣu* (I.7)
3. *vañcer gatau* (7.3.63)	*vañcU gatyarthaḥ* (I.204)
	vañcU pralambhane (X.163)
4. *sedhater gatau* (8.3.113)	*ṣidhA gatyām* (I.48)
	ṣidhŪ śāstre (I.49)
5. *tanūkaraṇe takṣaḥ* (3.1.76)	*takṣŪ tanūkaraṇe* (I.685)
	takṣA tvacane (I.695)
6. *mṛṣas titikṣāyām* (1.2.20)	*mṛṣA titikṣāyām* (IV.55; X.305)
	mṛṣU secane sahane (?) *ca* (I.739)
7. *nāñceḥ pūjāyām* (6.4.30;	*ancU gatipūjanayoḥ* (I.203)
cf. also 7.2.53)	*añcU gatau yācane ca* (I.915)
	ancU viśeṣaṇe (X.198)
[337]	
8. *prajane vīyateḥ* (6.1.55)	*vī gatiprajanakāntyasanakhādaneṣu* (II.39)
9. *gṛdhivañcyoḥ pralambane* (1.3.69)	see point 3 above

---

10. *divo 'vijigīṣāyām* (8.2.49)   *divU krīḍāvijigīṣāvyavahāradyutistuti-
                                                     modamadasvapnakāntigatiṣu* (IV.1)
                                                     divU parikūjane (X.166)
                                                     divU mardane (X.185)

11. *lubho vimohane* (7.2.54)   *lubhA vimohane* (VI.22)
                                                     lubhA gārddhye (IV.128)

12. *ghuṣir aviśabdane* (7.2.23)   *ghuṣIR aviśabdane* (I.683)
                                                     ghuṣIR viśabdane (X.187)

13. (*vadaḥ*) *vyaktavācāṃ samuccāraṇe*   *vadA vyaktāyām vāci* (I.1058)
(1.3.48)   *vadA saṃdeśavacane* (X.297)

14. (*hvaḥ*) *spardhāyām āṅaḥ* (1.3.31)   *hveÑ spardhāyām śabde ca* (I.1057)

15. *jāsiniprahaṇanāṭakrāthapiṣām himsāyām*   *jasU himsāyām* (X.130)
(2.3.56)   *jasU mokṣaṇe* (IV.102)
                                                     jasU tāḍane (X.178)
                                                     hanA himsāgatyoḥ (II.2)
                                                     krathA himsārthaḥ (I.838)

In order to get a precise idea of the significance of the above, I shall make an attempt to calculate the chance that this state of affairs is coincidental. For this purpose the roots *krath* and *han* (both enumerated under point 15 in the above list) have to be looked at more closely in order to decide whether they should be taken into account or not. The root *krath* is the only root which has in the Dhp. as single meaning entry the one which it also has in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.[3] According to the assumption made above (p. 336), this should not happen. The reason is with all probability that *krath* in P. 2.3.56 is mentioned along with four other roots, at least three of which (*jas*, *naṭ*, *piṣ*) ask for an explanation or a restriction within the context of Pāṇini's rule. We conclude that *krath* does not belong to the group of verbs with restricted meaning in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Of *ni-pra-han* we do not know whether it was considered synonymous with the simplex or not, so it is better to leave it out, too.

The Dhp. contains 964 roots which have only one meaning entry, 243 roots which have 2 meaning entries, 99 roots with 3 meaning entries, 25 roots with 4 meaning entries, 16 roots with 5 meaning entries, 4 roots with 6 meaning entries, 2 roots with 7 meaning entries, and 1 root each with 8, 13 resp. 18 meaning entries.[4] If we call a combination of a root with one of its meaning entries a 'unit', we arrive at a total of 964x1 + 243x2 + 99x3 + [338] 25x4 + 16x5 + 4x6 + 2x7 + 1x8 + 1x13 + 1x18 = 2004 units. Of these, 964 units correspond to roots that have no more than one meaning entry in the Dhp. We may look upon them as white marbles. The remaining 1040 units are black marbles. If we mix all marbles together, the chance of drawing a white one is 964/2004 = 241/501. The chance of drawing a black marble is 1040/2004 = 260/501.

---

[3] *krathA himsārthaḥ* (I.838) occurs in all the lists of roots that are extant (see below). A second occurrence of *krath* is not met with, but Sāyaṇa on Dhp. X.13 (*śratha prayatne*; p. 540) remarks: *krathim api kecid atra paṭhanti | sā maitreyādau na dṛśyate |.*

[4] These numbers are calculated on the basis of the list of roots in alphabetical order given by Katre (1967: 75-107). Roots are considered identical whenever there is a possibility of their being confused. On account of this the outcome of the following calculations will be too high rather than too low.

What Pāṇini did in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* amounts to drawing 15 black marbles and no white one. The chance that this happened[5] by coincidence is $(260/501)^{15}$. This turns out to be 0.000053, or 0.0053%. If one insists upon inclusion of *krath* and *han* in the calculation (which is not justified, see above), the chance becomes $17 \times (260/501)^{16} \times 241/501$. This is 0.000226, or 0.0226%. In either case these calculations indicate that the chance that the agreement between the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the Dhp. is due to coincidence, is negligible.

It is true that the outcome of these calculations may not be fully reliable. If it would be obvious in the case of each root how many, and which, meanings it has, and if, further, the meaning entries in the Dhp. would quite simply express these meanings (all of them), then we might expect in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* meaning entries which also occur in the Dhp. only in the case of roots which have several meaning entries in the Dhp., even if the meaning entries of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and Dhp. had been added in complete independence of each other. But neither of these two conditions is fulfilled. Saying how many meanings a root has, is largely a matter of individual choice. And that the meaning entries in the Dhp. are not exhaustive, but illustrative, was already well known to and expressed by the later commentators, e.g. Kaiyaṭa (see subsection 5.1, below). One example will make this clear. The root *bhū* has been given the sense 'be' (*sattā*) in the Dhp. (I.1). Among its other meanings particularly prominent is 'become' (*abhūtaprādurbhāva*; cf. e.g. *Mahābhāṣya*, vol. I, p. 256, ll. 13-14). But this meaning is not given in the Dhp.

In view of all this, we may conclude from the above calculations that the chance that the agreement between *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and Dhp. is due to coincidence, is negligible. In this way they provide us with an argument that Pāṇini used a Dhp. with meaning entries, which meaning entries, moreover, were in the main not different from the ones found in the present Dhp. The only alternative would namely be to assume that the person who supposedly added the meaning entries went out of his way to hide this fact.

[339]

2.2.   We now turn to the roots which are mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with a meaning entry that they do *not* possess in the Dhp. The most noteworthy feature here is that the meaning entries are sometimes connected, not with the single roots, but with combinations preverb + root. In a number of sūtras this is explicitly stated. An example is P. 1.3.46: *saṃpratibhyām anādhyāne* "[The endings called 'Ātmanepada' are used after the root *jñā*] when preceded by *sam* and *prati*, [but] not in [the sense] *ādhyāna*." Sometimes, however, meaning entries are to be connected with a combination preverb + root, although the sūtra concerned shows no sign that this is the case. P. 1.2.15 (*yamo gandhane*) is about the root *yam*, in the sense *gandhana*, before Ātmanepada endings. But this root *yam* takes Ātmanepada endings only when *upa* (P. 1.3.56), or *sam*, *ud* or *ā* (P. 1.3.75; 1.3.28), are prefixed to it. That is to say, P. 1.2.15, and

---

[5] The following calculations are based on the assumption that the total number of marbles, as well as the ratio of white to black marbles, remains the same during the process of drawing. This assumption can be made, because

therefore also the meaning entry *gandhana*, pertains to a combination preverb + root. The same can be said about P. 1.2.16 and the meaning entry *upayamana*. In these two cases the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself enables us to find out that a meaning entry belongs to the combination preverb + root, not to the single root. In other cases the *Kāśikā* suggests the same. In at least one case it says so explicitly. On p.1.3.44, which ascribes the meaning *apahnava* to the root *jñā*, the *Kāśikā* remarks (part I, p. 62): *sopasargaś cāyam apahnave vartate, na kevalaḥ* "This root *jñā* has the sense *apahnava* when together with a preverb, not when single". Far more often we learn that according to the *Kāśikā* combinations preverb + root are meant through the illustrations given.

The following list contains all those combined meaning entries and roots occurring in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* which were not discussed in subsection 2.1, above, i.e., which do not also occur in the Dhp. It is based on the list given by Palsule (1961: 99), but contains in addition the following symbols. 'pr' indicates that it is plain from the sūtra concerned that the meaning entry belongs to the combination preverb + root. '(pr)' indicates that according to the *Kāśikā* the meaning entry belongs to such a combination. In the cases where these two symbols are used, the preverbs are given along with the roots.

1. *anutāpa*	(√*tap*, 3.1.65)	
2. *apahnava*	(*apa*-√*jñā*, 1.3.44)	(pr)
3. *avakṣepaṇa*	(*ud-ā*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.32)	(pr)
4. *avana*	(√*bhuj*, 1.3.66)	
5. *ākrośa*	(√*kṣi*, 6.4.61)	
[340]		
6. *ācāryakaraṇa*	(*upa*-√*nī*, 1.3.36)	(pr)
7. *ādhyāna*	(*prati*-√*jñā*, 1.3.46)	pr
8. *ādhyāna*	(*sam*-√*jñā*, 1.3.46)	pr
9. *ālambana*	(*ava*-√*stambh*, 8.3.68)	pr
10. *ālekhana*	(*apa*-√*kṝ*, 6.1.142)	pr
11. *ālocana*	(√*dṛś*, 3.2.60)	
12. *āvidūrya*	(*abhi*-√*ard*, 7.2.25)	pr
13. *āvidūrya*	(*ava*-√*stambh*, 8.3.68)	pr
14. *āsevana*	(*nis*-√*tap*, 8.3.102)	pr
15. *āsyaviharaṇa*	(*ā*-√*dā*, 1.3.20)	pr
16. *utsañjana*	(*ud-ā*-√*nī*, 1.3.36)	(pr)
17. *udgamana*	(*ā*-√*kram*, 1.3.40)	pr
18. *udyamana*	(√*hṛ*, 3.2.9)	
19. *upamantraṇa*	(*upa*-√*vad*, 1.3.47)	(pr)
20. *upayamana*	(*upa*-√*yam*, 1.2.16)	(pr)
21. *upayoga*	(*pra*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.32)	(pr)
22. *upasambhāṣā*	(*upa*-√*vad*, 1.3.47)	(pr)
23. *ūrdhvakarman*	(*ud*-√*sthā*, 1.3.24)	pr
24. *kṛcchra*	(√*kas*, 7.2.22)	
25. *gandhana*	(*ud-, ud-ā*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.32)	(pr)
26. *gandhana*	(*ud-ā*-√*yam*, 1.2.15)	(pr)
27. *gahana*	(√*kas*, 7.2.22)	
28. *grantha*	(*sam-, ud-, ā*-√*yam*, 1.3.75)	(pr)
29. *cittavirāga*	(√*duṣ*, 6.4.91)	

the total number of marbles, as well as the number of black marbles, is far greater than the number of marbles drawn.

30. *jñāna*	(√*nī*, 1.3.36)	
31. *jñāna*	(√*vad*, 1.3.47)	
32. *tāyana*	(√*kram*, 1.3.38)	
33. *dainya*	(√*kṣi*, 6.4.61)	
34. *pādaviharaṇa*	(*vi*-√*kram*, 1.3.41)	pr
35. *prakathana*	(*pra*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.32)	(pr)
36. *prakāśana*	(√*sthā*, 1.3.23)	
37. *pratijñāna*	(*sam*-√*gṝ*, 1.3.52)	pr
38. *pratiyatna*	(*upa*-√*kṛ*, 6.1.139)	pr
39. *pralambhana*	(√*gṛdh*, 1.3.69)	
40. *prasahana*	(*adhi*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.33)	pr
41. *bhāsana*	(√*vad*, 1.3.47)	
42. *bhūṣaṇa*	(*sam*-, *pari*-, *upa*-√*kṛ*, 6.1.137)	pr

[341]

43. *bhṛti*	(*upa*-√*nī*, 1.3.36)	(pr)
44. *mantrakaraṇa*	(*upa*-√*sthā*, 1.4.25)	pr
45. *lavana*	(*upa*-√*kṝ*, 6.1.140)	pr
46. *vigaṇana*	(*vi*-√*nī*, 1.3.36)	(pr)
47. *vidhūnana*	(*upa*-√*vai*[6], 7.3.38)	(pr)
48. *vipralāpa*	(*vi*-*pra*-√*vad*, 1.3.50)	(pr)
49. *vimati*	(*vi*-√*vad*, 1.3.47)	(pr)
50. *vṛtti*	(√*kram*, 1.3.38)	
51. *vaikṛta*	(*upa*-√*kṛ*, 6.1.139)	pr
52. *vaiyātya*	(√*dhṛṣ*, 7.2.19)	
53. *vaiyātya*	(*vi*-√*śas*, 7.2.19)	(pr)
54. *vyaya*	(*vi*-√*nī*, 1.3.36)	(pr)
55. *śālīnīkaraṇa*	(*ud*-√*lī*, 1.3.70)	(pr)
56. *sammānana*	(√*nī*, 1.3.36)	
57. *sammānana*	(*ā*-√*lī*, 1.3.70)	(pr)
58. *samavāya*	(*sam*-, *pari*-, *upa*-√*kṛ*, 6.1.138)	pr
59. *sarga*	(√*kram*, 1.3.38)	
60. *sāhasikya*	(*pra*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.32)	(pr)
61. *sevana*	(*upa*-√*kṛ*, 1.3.32)	(pr)
62. *snehavipātana*	(*vi*-√*lā*, 7.3.39)	(pr)
63. *snehavipātana*	(*vi*-√*lī*, 7.3.39)	(pr)
64. *spardhā*	(*ā*-√*hve*, 1.3.31)	pr
65. *svakaraṇa*	(*upa*-√*yam*, 1.3.56)	pr
66. *hiṃsā*	(*upa*-, *prati*-√*kṝ*, 6.1.141)	pr
67. *hiṃsā*	(*ud*-√*naṭ*, 2.3.56)	(pr)
68. *hiṃsā*	(√*piṣ*, 2.3.56)	
69. *hiṃsā*	(*apa*-√*rādh*, 6.4.123)	(pr)

It is clear from this list that it cannot always be unambiguously decided whether a meaning entry in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* belongs to the single root or to a combination preverb + root. The *Kāśikā* has chosen for the second alternative in numerous cases, and we cannot be sure if all the remaining twenty meaning entries really belong to the bare roots. This makes an evaluation of these meaning entries very difficult. But in most of the remaining twenty cases it is possible to look upon the meaning entry given in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as covering part of the range covered by the corresponding meaning entry or entries in the Dhp. For example, the

---

[6] One of the eight Mss. used for the edition of the *Kāśikā*, as well as Liebich's unpublished edition of the same, take the root *vai* without preverb under P. 7.3.38. See *Kāśikā*, vol. II, p. 840, fn. 11.

meaning *anutāpa* 'repentance', ascribed to the root [342] *tap* in P. 3.1.65, is part of *saṃtāpa* 'affliction', the meaning ascribed to the same root in Dhp. I.1034. The meaning entry *hiṃsā* 'violence' accompanying the root *piṣ* in P. 2.3.56 refers to a derivative of the meaning referred to by *saṃcūrṇana* 'crushing', the meaning entry in the Dhp. (VII.15); *piṣ* means primarily 'crush', 'grind', but can secondarily convey the sense 'violence'. A third example is *vad*. This root means 'speaking clearly' (*vyaktāyāṃ vāci*) according to Dhp. I.1058. A more specialized sense is 'speak with authority', 'be eminent in'; the meaning entry *sammānana* 'homage' probably refers to this latter sense.

Three cases resist being looked upon in this manner. In all of them the meaning entries given in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and in the Dhp. are synonyms. They deserve being studied in some detail.

(1) The root *bhuj* has, according to Dhp. VII.17, the senses *pālana* 'protecting' and *abhyavahāra* 'taking food'. P. 1.3.66 (*bhujo 'navane*) says that this root takes Ātmanepada endings, but not in the sense *avana*. *Avana*, like *pālana*, means 'protecting'. There is no reason to doubt that the two words are synonyms.

(2) The root *dṛś* means *prekṣaṇa* 'seeing' (Dhp. I.1037). P. 3.2.60 (*tyadādiṣu dṛśo 'nālocane kañ ca*) enjoins suffixing of *KaÑ* or *KvIN* to this root, when *tyad* etc. are *upapada*, but not when the root has the sense *ālocana*. *Ālocana* also, like *prekṣaṇa*, means 'seeing'. That the two terms are synonyms can also be seen as follows. The forms to be derived with the help of P. 3.2.60, *tādṛśa* etc., contain the root *dṛś*, but obviously not in its ordinary sense. If it preserves its ordinary sense, the form will be *taddarśa* (by P. 3.2.1: *karmaṇy aṇ*).

(3) The root *dhṛṣ* has the senses *prasahana* (Dhp. X.306) and *prāgalbhya* (Dhp. V.22). P. 7.2.19 informs us that the past passive and active participle suffixes *ta* and *tavat* do not take the augment *iṬ* after *dhṛṣ*, when it means *vaiyātya*. *Vaiyātya* and *prāgalbhya* both mean 'boldness'. Possibly here again the two terms are full synonyms.

What these three cases suggest (the first two more clearly than the third) is that the Dhp. used by Pāṇini did not contain the meaning entries *pālana* (qualifying the root *bhuj*), *prekṣaṇa* (with the root *dṛś*), and perhaps *prāgalbhya* (with *dhṛṣ*). This seems to indicate that the meaning entries which the Dhp. used by Pāṇini contained, were not in all cases identical with the ones found in our present Dhp.

[343]

2.3.   The question of meaning entries in the original Dhp. can also be approached from another angle, as follows. Pāṇini's grammar is for people who know Sanskrit. This is obvious, for it is written in Sanskrit. Less obvious, but equally true, is that this grammar, in spite of its intricacy, demands from its reader no prior acquaintance with grammar. Technical terms (that is, technical *grammatical* terms) are introduced and defined, ostensively or otherwise. An example is the definition of the term *dhātu*, which was mentioned in section 1 above. All this makes clear that a knowledge of non-technical Sanskrit suffices to understand all (or almost all) of Pāṇini's grammar. Such being the case it cannot reasonably be supposed that the reader

of this grammar is expected to know and recognize verbal roots, especially not the way they occur in the Dhp. Even to recognize a root like *bhū* the reader must have pursued analytical activities on his own, and this is but one of the simplest cases. Not even a fluent speaker of Sanskrit with highly developed analytical capacities could possibly be expected to recognize roots like *ḍupacaṣ*, or even *hisi*, much less assign meanings to them, unless he had had prior training in Pāṇini's grammar. And even if we remove the markers (*anubandha*) — which is unjustified: they are there — the fact remains that no Sanskrit speaker untrained in grammar can be expected to recognize forms like *pac*, to say nothing about e.g. *ṇam*, or *ṣo*, or *bhrasj*, or *his*.[7] But if we assume that Pāṇini's Dhp. contained no meaning entries, we must accept that the reader of Pāṇini's grammar is supposed to have done right that in P. 1.2.45. This rule tells us that "what has meaning, but is not *dhātu*, nor *pratyaya*, is called *prātipadika*" (*arthavad adhātur apratyayaḥ prātipadikam*). This rule *presupposes* that the meanings of roots (*dhātu*) and suffixes (*pratyaya*) are known. This leads to no problem in the case of the suffixes. The suffixes are taught in the main body of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and in the majority of cases Pāṇini gives an indication as to their meaning. But in the case of roots this presupposition is made in spite of the fact that even a fluent speaker of Sanskrit would be at a loss to assign meanings to many, if not most, of them. Taking this into consideration one can say that the Dhp. used by Pāṇini *should* contain meaning entries. Together with what we learned in the preceding subsections, this strengthens our impression that it *did* contain them.

One difficulty remains. P. 1.2.45 not only presupposes that the meanings of roots and suffixes are known, it likewise presupposes that the meanings of nominal stems (*prātipadika*) are known. But the Gaṇapāṭha contains no [344] meaning entries, except for some few so-called gaṇasūtras. Why should roots and nominal stems be treated differently?

This question allows of a simple answer. There is an essential difference between verbal roots and nominal stems. We saw that even a fluent speaker of Sanskrit cannot possibly know the meanings of verbal roots if he has not undergone training in grammar, for verbal roots are not correct utterances of the Sanskrit language. The same is not true of the individual nominal stems. They are not unintelligible to the non-grammarian. Many nominal stems are, by themselves, correct words of the Sanskrit language. The particles, such as *ca* etc. (which are also *prātipadika* 'nominal stems') belong to this category, as do nouns like *garga* and *rājan*, which have this shape in the vocative singular. Other nominal stems occur unmodified in compounds: *go* in *gopālaḥ*, *hari* in *haricandanam*. Meaning entries in the Gaṇapāṭha would, in view of the above, be superfluous. (It is also possible that the Gaṇapāṭha is a later addition to

---

[7] This conclusion is further supported by Palsule's (1961: 11) observation that the "epoch-making discovery" of the verbal root "must have been a slow and tortuous process, starting with the concrete verbal forms, penetrating through these to the Present-stem, the grammatical acumen ultimately tearing open the bare abstract root !" Also p. 166: "Since the roots had been abstracted from the concrete words, they were not regarded as having a separate existence apart from the concrete words, except in the list of the grammarians. (…) according to the Hindu grammarians no root can appear in the actual language before it has taken on a suffix, real or imaginary." Finally, p. 216: "Even the best attested and most productive roots like *gam*, *kṛ* or *bhū* are equally as [*sic*] 'fictitious' and 'products of scholastic inventiveness' as, say, a root like *al*, for the simple reason that they just do

Pāṇini's grammar; see Scharfe, 1977: 102-04. In that case the difficulty mentioned above is non-existent.)

III

We now turn to the evidence from the Dhp. itself. Many roots are mentioned two or more times in the Dhp. They usually differ in conjugation. Sometimes, however, two occurrences of the same root belong to the same group and subgroup of the Dhp., i.e., they are identically conjugated. It can be argued — and Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr. pp. 10-11; 1973: II: 57) does so — that if the original Dhp. had no meaning entries, the double occurrence of the same root in one subgroup is inexplicable. At least three clear cases are found in all the versions of the Pāṇinian Dhp., i.e. in Maitreya Rakṣita's *Dhātupradīpa*, Kṣīrasvāmin's *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*, Sāyaṇa's *Mādhavīya Dhātuvṛtti*, and Liebich's edition of the Dhp. (1920). They are:

> *húḍI saṃghāte* (I.288); *húḍI varaṇe* (I.296).
> *vákI kauṭilye* (I.88); *vákI gatyarthaḥ* (I.95).
> *glépṚ kampane* (I.394); *glépṚ dainye* (I.390).

Of the last one already Sāyaṇa says (p. 177): *gleper arthabhedāt punaḥ pāṭhaḥ.*[8]

Unfortunately the versions of the Dhp. disagree much in the number of these cases. This makes it uncertain if the three cases listed above belonged to [345] the original Dhp. Nevertheless, taken together with what has been said about the evidence from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, they cannot but strengthen the suspicion that the original Dhp. did contain meaning entries.

IV

4.1. Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* contains a passage which has led most, if not all, who studied it, beginning with Kaiyaṭa (see subsection 5.1, below), to the belief that the original Dhp. contained no meaning entries. It reads: (vol. I, p. 254, ll. 11-12): *iyān avadhir dhātusaṃjño bhavatīti vaktavyam | kuto hy etad bhūśabdo dhātusaṃjño bhaviṣyati na punar bhvedhśabda iti ||.* Palsule (1961: 91-92) translates: "It should be taught that such and such unit gets the nomenclature dhātu; for how else (could it be determined) that the sound-unit *bhū* gets the nomenclature dhātu and not the sound-unit *bhvedha*?" Palsule thinks that this passage would be meaningless if the Dhp. had at the time of its utterance contained meaning entries.

---

not independently exist in the language like concrete things. The [Hindu] grammarians were fully conscious that the roots were merely abstractions."

[8] Similar remarks are made by Sāyaṇa repeatedly; e.g. on *luṭhI gatau* (p. 115), *cūrṇA saṅkocane* (p. 549), *jasU tāḍane* (p. 557).

However, Palsule translation is very free. A more literal rendering of the second part of the passage would be: "for on the basis of what [is it known] that the sound-unit *bhū* will be a *dhātu*, not the sound-unit *bhvedh*?" Here the one who puts the question knows very well that *bhū* is a root, but defiantly asks why it should be so ? The problem here raised is not a practical, but a theoretical one (see further below).

There is another reason to think that this interpretation of the *Mahābhāṣya* passage is the one intended. It is this, that *bhū* is one of the most common roots of the Sanskrit language. The question whether the first root of the Dhp. is *bhū* or *bhvedh* can therefore simply not arise. It cannot even be maintained that the sandhi form of *bhū* in *bhvedh* might confuse the reader, for the sūtra, to which the Dhp. is appended, reads: *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ* (P. 1.3.1). The form *bhūvādayo* has puzzled the commentators, but one thing is known from it without a trace of doubt: the beginning of the Dhp. is *bhū*, not *bhv*. If Patañjali wanted to speak about a practical problem, he might have taken one of the hundreds of roots in the Dhp. which are so rare that mistakes of the kind described are likely to occur.

What then is the problem Patañjali talks about? I think it is the following. P. 1.3.1 reads: *bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ* "what begins with *bhū* are called 'roots'". In this sūtra the term *dhātu* 'root' is introduced. That is to say, at this stage the reader of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* knows nothing about roots but that "what [346] begins with *bhū*" contains at least three roots. From the Dhp. we learn that *bhūvādayo* is short for *bhū-edha-spardha-gādhṛ-bādhṛ…* (itself short for a form which I shall not bother to write out). After applying sandhi this becomes *bhvedhaspardhagādhṛbādhṛ…* This substitution of *bhvedhaspardha…* for *bhūvādayo* is made *irrespectively of the question whether or not the Dhp. contains meaning entries*. And once this substitution has been made, or imagined, obviously guidelines are wanted to ascertain which parts of the long compound (or list) are the individual roots.

Patañjali's problem is a highly abstract one. Indeed, it is difficult to think of a way in which it can be solved in a theoretically satisfying manner. Where did he get it from? He makes his remarks while commenting upon a *vārttika* (vt. 1.3.1.2), and it is not impossible that Kātyāyana was the first who thought of this problem. However, it is not certain that Patañjali's interpretation of vt. 1.3.1.2 is correct.

The two vārttikas 1.3.1.1-2 read: *pāṭhena dhātusaṃjñāyāṃ samānaśabdapratiṣedhaḥ; parimāṇagrahaṇaṃ ca*. In view of the context, it is permissible to think that *pāṭhena* means *dhātupāṭhena* "owing to the Dhātupāṭha". The vārttikas can then be translated: "Owing to the Dhātupāṭha, [utterances] of the same sound-pattern [as verbal roots] are prevented from [assuming] the designation 'root'; and the measure [of the individual roots] is known."[9] If

---

[9] It is true that in the majority of cases the word *pratiṣedhaḥ* 'prevention', 'prohibition' in vārttikas is explained in the *Mahābhāṣya* as *pratiṣedhaḥ vaktavyaḥ* "prohibition must be stated". There is, however, a number of instances where this word, also according to Patañjali, is to be interpreted differently. Sometimes it means "there would be undesired prohibition" (*pratiṣedhaḥ prāpnoti / syāt*; vt. 1.1.10.1; 44.11; 2.4.83.3; 6.1.32-33.5). Sometimes also it means, as in the translation here proposed, "there is prohibition / prevention", or "the prohibition is…" (vt. 1.3.58.3; 2.2.14.2; 3.3.135.1; 4.1.55.4; 5.1.121.1; 6.1.3.1; 4.52.2). vt. 4.1.55.4 is closest in structure to our vārttika 1.3.1.1.

this translation is correct, the two vārttikas describe the advantages of having a separate Dhp., rather than a sūtra where all roots are given in the form of a huge compound or a long list. This interpretation of the vārttikas makes only sense if Kātyāyana knew a Dhp. *with* meaning entries. By virtue of these meaning entries it can be known that no non-roots are meant in the Dhp., and also of what length the individual roots are.

I do not wish to push this interpretation of the two vārttikas. The main thing is that Patañjali may have been led to his abstract problem by a vārttika which he had not correctly understood.[10] And if his understanding of the vārttika was correct, he took his abstract problem from Kātyāyana. Neither way does the Bhāṣya passage under study compel us to believe that Patañjali knew a Dhp. without meaning entries.

4.2.   Patañjali interprets vt. 1.3.1.1 (*Mahābhāṣya*, vol. I, p. 253, l. 14): *pāṭhena dhātusaṃjñāyāṃ samānaśabdānāṃ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ* "Because [roots] are listed, a statement must be made to prevent that [utterances] of the same sound-pattern [as verbal roots assume] the designation 'root'". [347] Examples are: *yā* can be root and feminine pronoun, *vā* root and particle, *nu* root and particle and suffix,[11] *div* root and nominal stem (*Mahābhāṣya*, vol. I, p. 253, l.. 14-16: *yā iti dhātur yā ity ābantaḥ | vā iti dhātur vā iti nipātaḥ | nu iti dhātur nu iti pratyayaś ca nipātaś ca | div iti dhātur div iti prātipadikam ||*).

Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr., p. 7; 1973: II: 51) argues that this passage from the *Mahābhāṣya* would make no sense if Patañjali knew a Dhp. with meaning entries. In that case, Mīmāṃsaka thinks, it would have been clear that the expression *yā* in the Dhp. was not to be confused with the pronoun, *vā* with the particle, etc.

I do not think that Mīmāṃsaka's argument is valid, for two reasons. First, Patañjali talks about the theoretical difficulty which arises after the long list of verbal roots has been substituted for *bhūvādayo* in P. 1.3.1. This has been explained in subsection 4.1, above. Second, Patañjali emphasizes repeatedly (once in the Bhāṣya on this same sūtra, vol. I, p. 256, l. 11) that "there are roots which have many meanings" (*bahvarthā api dhātavo bhavanti*).[12] This means that even if, say, the root *yā* had a meaning entry such as *prāpaṇa* in the Dhp. known to Patañjali, this would not for Patañjali exclude the possibility that it also has the meaning of the feminine pronoun *yā*. Again we must conclude that Patañjali's statement tells us nothing about the presence or absence of meaning entries in the Dhp. known to him.

---

[10] To suppose that Patañjali misunderstood a vārttika is not as outrageous as it may seem. On several occasions Patañjali refers to alternative interpretations of vārttikas (Mīmāṃsaka, 1973: I: 327-28). This shows that there was already in Patañjali's time not always unanimity regarding the exact meaning of vārttikas.

[11] The *kṛt* suffix *Knu* (see P. 3.2.140) is probably meant, or possibly the *uṇādi* suffix *nu* (see Uṇādi Sūtras 3.32-36 in the *Uṇādikośa* by Mahādeva Vedāntin, pp. 54-55).

[12] As Palsule (1961: 93, fn. 10) points out, this passage occurs thrice in the *Mahābhāṣya*, again in vol. III, p. 14, l. 11, and p. 36, l. 16. See also Palsule, 1961: 104.

4.3.   There are three more passages in the *Mahābhāṣya* which, according to Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr., p. 7; 1973: II: 53), show that the Dhp. known to Patañjali had no meaning entries. The first one occurs thrice in the *Mahābhāṣya*. It is about verbal roots, and says that their "meanings are not taught, that they are expressive of action is understood" (*na caiva hy arthā ādiśyante kriyāvacanatā ca gamyate*; vol. II, p. 19, ll. 6-7; p. 21, ll. 11-12; p. 27, ll. 17-18). The second passage occurs once, immediately following an occurrence of the first one: "Who indeed makes an effort to make *pac* etc. expressive of action?" (*kaḥ khalv api pacādīnāṃ kriyāvacanatve yatnaṃ karoti*; vol. II, p. 27, ll. 18-19). Finally the third: "Who is able to teach the meanings of roots, nominal stems, suffixes and particles?" (*ko hi nāma samartho dhātuprātipadikapratyayanipātānām arthān ādeṣṭum*; vol. I, p. 363, ll. 18-19).

Let us look at the last of these three passages. Among the forms whose meanings cannot be taught, we find the suffixes (*pratyaya*). But a suffix [348] is hardly ever introduced in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* without an indication as to its meaning. What then is meant by "teaching of meaning"?

Patañjali himself gives the answer, in the following passage: "But how can he say thus 'meanings are not taught' when he [himself] teaches meanings? Because the revered master has stated: *anekam anyapadārthe* (P. 2.2.24), *cārthe dvandvaḥ* (P. 2.2.29), *apatye* (cf. P. 4.1.92), *rakte* (P. 5.4.32), *nirvṛtte* (in P. 4.4.19). These are not teachings of meaning. Of these words, which are naturally endowed with these meanings, an explanation is given [by stating their respective meanings] as that what conditions [their being used] (*nimitta = pravṛttinimitta*)." (*kathaṃ punar arthān ādiśann evaṃ brūyān nārthā ādiśyanta iti | yad āha bhagavān | anekam anyapadārthe cārthe dvandvaḥ apatye rakte nirvṛtta iti | naitāny arthadeśanāni | svabhāvata eteṣāṃ śabdānām eteṣv artheṣv abhiniviṣṭānāṃ nimittatvenānvākhyānaṃ kriyate |* (vol. I, p. 363, ll. 9-12); the translation follows, with modifications, Joshi, 1968: Translation, pp. 66-67.) The sentence in the middle is important: *These are not teachings of meaning.* So adding meaning entries is not what Patañjali calls "teaching of meaning" (*arthādeśana*). Teaching of meaning for him seems to be assigning meanings to hitherto meaningless words. This, he opines, was not done by Pāṇini. We readily agree.

This time again we conclude that the passage considered contains no evidence that there were no meaning entries in the Dhp. known to Patañjali.

4.4.   The *Mahābhāṣya* contains twenty-five roots with a meaning entry. They have been collected by Liebich (1930: 245-46). The list is reproduced in Palsule, 1961: 102-03. In twelve cases the meaning entries are more or less identical with the ones in the Dhp. That is to say, in thirteen cases they are different.

I do not think that anything can be concluded from this situation. Patañjali knew the Sanskrit language, and he did not have to turn to Pāṇini to know the meaning of a verbal root. His independence in this respect is emphasized by his use of *-karman* and *-kriya* after

meaning entries in eleven cases. This is reminiscent of the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Nirukta* rather than of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, where none but locative case-endings are used to indicate meanings.

There are, however, three passages where the *Mahābhāṣya* seems to make a direct reference to the (or a) Dhp. In the first one Patañjali argues that the single marker *IR* does not also behave like the marker *I*, which causes augmentation of *nUM* (P. 7.1.58); this can be learned, he says, from Pāṇini's [349] own procedure, which reads *n* in roots that have the marker *IR*: "Or the procedure of the teacher makes known that a rule which pertains to [roots] that have *I* as marker does not apply to such [roots] (which have *IR* as marker), in that he (the teacher) reads some [roots] which have *IR* as marker with [the augment] *nUM*. [Cases in point are:] *UbundIR* in [the sense] 'perceiving', *skandIR* in [the senses] 'going' and 'drying'." (*Mahābhāṣya* vol. I, p. 264, ll. 7-9: *athavācāryapravṛttir jñāpayati naivaṃjātīyakānām ididvidhir bhavatīti yad ayam iritaḥ kāṃścin numanuṣaktān paṭhati | ubundir niśāmane | skandir gatiśoṣaṇayoḥ ||*.)

In the second passage Patañjali explains Kātyāyana's remark (vt. 3.1.26.3) that the root *kṛṣ* has several meanings. He says: "The meanings of [the root] *kṛṣ* are several. [This root] *kṛṣ* occurs certainly not only in [the sense] 'making a furrow'. What then? [It] also occurs in [the sense] 'precaution'." (*Mahābhāṣya* vol. II, p. 33, ll. 24-25: *nānākriyāḥ kṛṣer arthāḥ | nāvaśyaṃ kṛṣir vilekhana eva vartate | kiṃ tarhi | pratividhāne 'pi vartate |*.) Here the meaning *vilekhana* is not first introduced, but is taken to be known.

The third passage is similar to the second one, and comes soon after the latter. This time Patañjali explains Kātyāyana's remark (vt. 3.1.26.4) that the root *yaj* has several meanings: "The meanings of [the root] *yaj* are several. [This root] *yaj* occurs certainly not only in [the sense] 'pouring of an oblation'. What then ? [It] also occurs in [the sense] 'abandoning'." (*Mahābhāṣya* vol. II, p. 34, ll. 4-6: *nānākriyā yajer arthāḥ | nāvaśyaṃ yajir haviṣprakṣepaṇa eva vartate | kiṃ tarhi | tyāge 'pi vartate |*.)

Of the four roots mentioned in these three passages, three occur in the same form in the present Dhp.: *UbundIR niśāmane* (I.925), *skandIR gatiśoṣaṇayoḥ* (I.1028), *kṛṣA vilekhane* (I.1039). Only the fourth root, *yaj*, has different meaning entries in the Dhp. This seems to indicate that Patañjali knew a Dhp. with meaning entries, which meaning entries, moreover, deviated in certain cases from the ones in our Dhp.

Remains to say a few words about Liebich's (1930: 246-47) proposal, made on the basis of a single manuscript reading, that the meaning entries accompanying the roots *UbundIR* and *skandIR* were later interpolations in the text of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Clearly the evidence supporting Liebich's suggestion is extremely weak. Liebich, being the principal modern representative of the idea that the original Dhp. contained no meaning entries, saw everything in the light of this theory. Since the theory has now been shown to be of dubious value, we can discard Liebich's suggestion.

[350]

4.5.   Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr., pp. 8-9; 1973: II: 54) mentions another reason to believe that the Dhp. known to Patañjali contained meaning entries. On a few occasions Patañjali tells us that a certain root, though 'seen' (*dṛṣṭa*) in one meaning, 'occurs' (*vartate*) in certain other meanings as well. An example is the root *vap*, which is 'seen' in the sense *prakiraṇa*, but 'occurs' also in the sense *chedana*. (*Mahābhāṣya*, vol. I, p. 256, ll. 11-12: *vapiḥ prakiraṇe dṛṣṭaś chedane cāpi vartate*.) One may be tempted to conclude from this that the meanings 'seen' by Patañjali are the ones ascribed to the roots in the Dhp. known to him.

However, this would probably be incorrect. As Cardona (1976: 162-63) has pointed out, the context in which these statements occur allow us to consider "the term *dṛṣṭa* used merely with reference to roots seen to occur in certain meanings, not necessarily with reference to meaning entries in the *dhātu-pāṭha*".

4.6.   I have discussed all the passages from the *Mahābhāṣya* that have a bearing on the question we are investigating, as far as I am aware. They did not yield much positive evidence that the original Dhp. contained meaning entries. We found some in subsection 4.4, together with an indication that some meaning entries were originally different from what they are now. The interpretation of vt. 1.3.1.1-2 suggested in subsection 4.1 is also only possible if Kātyāyana knew a Dhp. with meaning entries. But the most important result of this section is this, that we now know that none of the evidence from the *Mahābhāṣya* that was supposed to prove that the original Dhp. had no meaning entries, is compelling.

<center>V</center>

5.1.   The first author whom we know to have stated that meaning entries were later additions to the Dhp., is Kaiyaṭa. In his *Pradīpa* on the Bhāṣya to vt. 1.3.1.2 he says: "And not do the meaning entries separate [the roots], for the [meaning entries] were not [given] by Pāṇini, because [they] have been accepted [in the Dhp.] by the learned as illustrative." (Vol. II, p. 178: *na cārthapāṭhaḥ paricchedakaḥ, tasyāpāṇinīyatvāt, abhiyuktair upalakṣaṇatayopāttatvāt*.) Nāgeśa explains the word "learned" (*abhiyukta*) further by mentioning the name of Bhīmasena (vol. II, p. 178: *abhiyuktair iti | bhīmasenenety aitihyam |*).

[351]

Kaiyaṭa's idea was accepted by many later authors. Palsule (1961: 91) and Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr., pp. 7-8; 1973: II: 53) quote passages from Haradatta, Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita and Nāgeśa which embrace this view. It is therefore worthwhile to find out whence Kaiyaṭa got his idea. Did it rest on a continuous tradition that went back to the time of Bhīmasena, the person who allegedly added meaning entries to the Dhp.?

5.2.   Arguments which rely on a supposed continuous oral tradition have not much to recommend themselves (Thieme, 1956: 18-20 (590-92)). We shall none the less consider the one according to which Kaiyaṭa was thus connected with Bhīmasena in some detail. The first question is: When were the meaning entries supposedly added to the Dhp.? In other words: When did Bhīmasena live?

The meaning entries found in the present Pāṇinian Dhp. are also found in the Dhp. of the Cāndra Vyākaraṇa, the grammar of Candra (Liebich, 1919: 50; Palsule, 1961: 92). Palsule (1961: 92) concludes from this that Bhīmasena lived before Candra, "sometime in the early centuries of the Christian era".

If this is true, we may expect that also Bhartṛhari and the authors of the *Kāśikā*, who all lived after Bhīmasena and before Kaiyaṭa, knew that meaning entries were later additions to the Dhp. I shall discuss both, beginning with the *Kāśikā*.

5.3.   The *Kāśikā*, as Liebich (1930: 214) points out, cites dozens, perhaps hundreds of roots from the Dhp., always together with the meaning entries which we also find in our present Dhp. The question is if the *Kāśikā* contains any indication that it considered those meanings entries original or not.

Such an indication is found in the *Kāśikā* on P. 7.3.34, drawn attention to by Mīmāṃsaka (1957: Intr., p. 9; 1973: II: 50). Here a question is raised concerning the words *udyama* and *uparama*, whose forms deviate from what the rules in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* would cause us to expect. The reply is: they are to be accepted because they are used in *aḍa udyame* (Dhp. I.380) and *yama uparame* (Dhp. I.1033) respectively. (Vol. II, p. 839: *katham udyamoparamau? aḍa udyame, yama uparame iti nipātanād anugantavyau.*) Obviously this reply can only be given by one who considers the meaning entries authoritative, and therefore added by Pāṇini. We may note that the commentator Haradatta was fully aware of this, for he writes in his [352] *Padamañjarī* (part VI, p. 39): *yeṣāṃ tu apāṇinīyo dhātupāṭhe 'rthanirdeśaḥ iti pakṣaḥ, teṣām atra saṃjñāpūrvako vidhir anityaḥ iti vṛddhyabhāvaḥ* "For those who think that the meaning entries in the Dhp. were not given by Pāṇini, the absence of *vṛddhi* [in *udyama* and *uparama* must be explained with the Paribhāṣā] 'a rule is not universally valid, when that which is taught in it is denoted by a technical term'."

5.4.   Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* contains the following verse (3.12.12): *anubandhaś ca siddhe 'rthe smṛtyartham anuṣajyate | tulyārtheṣv api cāvaśyaṃ na sarveṣv ekadharmatā ||* "Since the meaning is fixed, a marker is attached to aid memory. Moreover, [roots] which have the same meanings, do not necessarily all have the same properties."

What is under discussion is the use of markers (such as Ñ, Ṅ) which determine whether a root takes Ātmanepada or Parasmaipada endings. This choice can be made on the basis of the meaning which the root is to convey. What purpose is then served by these markers? The

first half of the stanza explains that the markers merely remind us of the exact meaning of the root concerned.

The second half of the stanza seems to contradict this. It speaks of roots which have the same meanings, but take different endings because they have different properties. I can think of only one satisfactory interpretation of this line. Here the word *artha* 'meaning' refers to meaning entries in the Dhp. The second half then means that roots which have the same, or synonymous, meaning entries in the Dhp., do not on that account necessarily take the same endings, for they may have different properties.

This interpretation is also the one accepted by the commentator Helārāja (*Prakīrṇaprakāśa*, part ii, p. 122). As an illustration he contrasts *yā prāpaṇe* (Dhp. II.40) with *ṇīÑ prāpaṇe* (Dhp. I.950). These two roots differ considerably in meaning: 'go' as against 'lead'. They have nevertheless been assigned a common meaning in the Dhp. In order to remind the reader of that part of the meaning which has not been given in the Dhp., the marker *Ñ* has been added to *ṇī*. (*yā prāpaṇe, ṇīÑ prāpaṇe iti tulye 'py arthanirdeśe yāteḥ prāptiḥ prāpaṇam arthaḥ, nayates tu prāpaṇā prāpaṇam iti saṃvidhānam artho 'vagamyate | evam anyeṣām api saṃvidhānārthatā svābhāvikī boddhavyā | tām eva sūcayituṃ ñakārādyanubandhaḥ smaraṇārthaṃ niveśyate |.*)

Bhartṛhari himself illustrates his statement in the immediately following [353] verse[13] (3.12.13) with the help of the roots *dṛś* and *īkṣ*. The Dhp. lists these roots as follows: *dṛśIR prekṣaṇe* (I.1037) and *īkṣA darśane* (I.641). Here the meaning entries are not the same, but synonymous. The two roots can be said to have the same meaning, but different properties on account of which they take different endings.

The above seems to show that, in Bhartṛhari's opinion, the markers attached to roots are supplementary to the meaning entries which those roots have in the Dhp. No one doubts that markers were attached to roots since Pāṇini. We may conclude that in Bhartṛhari's opinion also meaning entries accompanied roots since Pāṇini.

We now turn to the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, Bhartṛhari's incomplete commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*. In the first Āhnika of this work questions relating to what is known by the name *ūha* 'modification' are discussed. Mantras which are to be used in unaltered form in the so-called 'original' (*prakṛti*) rites, have to undergo modifications before they can be used in 'derived' (*vikṛti*) rites. One point under discussion is whether or not a modified mantra is itself a mantra. The followers of the view that modified mantras are also mantras, Bhartṛhari tells us, modify the verbal form *tapyadhvam* in *gharmasya tapasā tapyadhvam* (untraced) into *tapyasva* and *tapyethām*. (*Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* p. 7, ll. 5-7: *mantrāntarāṇy evaitāny ūhaviṣayāṇīty apare manyante | (…) tathāmnāye eva gharmasya tapasā tapyadhvam iti | tapyasva tapyethām iti kvacid ūho nirdiśyate |.*)

As far as I can see, this illustration only makes sense if we accept that *tapyadhvam* would *not* be modified into *tapyasva* and *tapyethām* in case modified mantras would *not*

likewise be mantras. *Tapyasva* and *tapyethām* are the singular and dual forms corresponding to the plural *tapyadhvam*. All the three forms are conjugated according to the pattern that belongs to the roots of the fourth gaṇa (*divādi*). The root *tap* occurs thrice in the Dhp., in the first (*tapA saṃtāpe*; I.1034), fourth (*tapA aiśvarye*; IV.51) and tenth gaṇa (*tapA dāhe*; X.275). We learn from this that the forms *tapyadhvam*, *tapyasva* and *tapyethām* are correct in the classical language, if only they express the sense *aiśvarya* "to rule". In the line *gharmasya tapasā tapyadhvam* the root *tap* does, in all probability, not mean 'to rule', so that, since it concerns a mantra, P. 3.1.85 (*vyatyayo bahulam*) must be made use of, according to which in the Vedic language verbal roots sometimes deviate from the conjugational pattern we would expect on the basis of their position in the Dhp.

[354]

To sum up, if modified mantras would not be mantras any longer, then *tapyadhvam* in the above Vedic sentence would, after modification, become *tapa* / *tāpaya* or *tapatam* / *tāpayatam*. But since modified mantras are mantras in their own right, *tapyasva* and *tapyethām* are permissible.

To accept this explanation of the passage from the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā*, we have to assume that Bhartṛhari made use of a Dhp. with meaning entries. What is more, we have to assume that these meaning entries were considered to be an integral, and therefore original, part of the Dhp.

5.5.   In view of the preceding subsections, it is hard to believe that Kaiyaṭa was connected with Bhīmasena through an uninterrupted oral tradition. Kaiyaṭa may have been the first to think that the original Dhp. contained no meaning entries. It is not hard to guess where he got the idea from: from his interpretation of the Bhāṣya on vt. 1.3.1.2, which Bhāṣya passage we studied in subsection 4.1 above.

<div align="center">VI</div>

The results of our investigation can be summed up in four points:

(1) The oldest works of the Pāṇinian school — i.e. Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and Dhp., Kātyāyana's vārttikas, and Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* — contain no clear and unambiguous evidence that the original Dhp. contained no meaning entries.

(2) Kaiyaṭa's belief that meaning entries were later added to the Dhp. is not based on an old tradition, but, as far as we can judge, on his own (probably incorrect) interpretation of a passage from the *Mahābhāṣya*.

---

[13] *dṛśīkṣyoḥ sadṛśe 'py arthe nābhedaḥ pratipūrvayoḥ.*

(3) There is, on the other hand, fairly strong evidence (mainly in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*) to show that the original Dhp. had meaning entries. These meaning entries were, moreover, probably identical with the present ones in most cases.

(4) However, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Mahābhāṣya* contain some evidence suggesting that the meaning entries in the original Dhp. were in some cases different from the ones known to us.

The fourth point allows for the possibility that someone, at some time in the history of the Dhp., on purpose introduced changes in the meaning entries. This person, for aught we know, may have been called "Bhīmasena". More than this relatively innocent activity on the meaning entries of the [355] Dhp. cannot be ascribed to the mysterious Bhīmasena mentioned by Nāgeśa.

One more point deserves mention. All versions of the Dhp. known to us have meaning entries. This in itself is reason to believe that those meaning entries were there from the beginning, unless strong counter-arguments are produced.

In conclusion I shall say a few words about the reason why scholars were so easily convinced that meaning entries were later additions to the Dhp. They probably thought that those meaning entries really play no role in Pāṇini's grammar. Palsule (1961: 92-93) is very explicit on this point. "The object of Pāṇini", Palsule maintains, "was only to resolve the words to the stems and endings, and so stating the meaning of the roots — the fundamental stems — was not in his line."

We have now come to think that the meaning entries were probably part of the Dhp. since its beginning. The question with which this paper must end is therefore: Is it possible that, after all, meanings play a greater role in Pāṇini's grammar than has often been supposed?

REFERENCES

Bhartṛhari. *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā.* Edited by K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1970.

Bhartṛhari. *Vākyapadīya.* Edited by Wilhelm Rau. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1977.

Cardona, George (1976). *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research.* The Hague: Mouton.

Haradatta. *Padamañjarī.* In: *The Kāśikāvṛtti.* 6 volumes. Edited by Dwarika Das Shastri and Kalika Prasad Shukla. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan. 1965-67.

Helārāja. *Prakīrṇaprakāśa.* In: *Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari with the Prakīrṇaprakāśa of Helārāja. Kāṇḍa III.* 2 volumes. Edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer. Poona: Deccan College. 1963-73.

Joshi, S. D., editor and translator (1968). *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya: Samarthāhnika.* Poona: University of Poona.

Kaiyaṭa. *Mahābhāṣyapradīpa.* In: *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣyam.* 5 volumes. Edited by Vedavrata. Rohataka: Harayāṇā-Sāhitya-Saṃsthānam. 1962-63.

Katre, Sumitra Mangesh (1967). *Pāṇinian Studies. I.* Poona: Deccan College.

Kṣīrasvāmin. *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī.* Edited by Bruno Liebich. Breslau: Marcus. 1930.

Liebich, Bruno (1919). *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft. II. Historische Einführung und Dhātupāṭha.* Heidelberg: Carl Winters.

Liebich, Bruno (1920). *Zur Einführung in die indische einheimische Sprachwissenschaft. III. Dhātupāṭha.* Heidelberg: Carl Winters.

Liebich, Bruno (1930). *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī.* Breslau: Marcus.

Mahādeva Vedāntin. *Uṇādikośa.* Edited by K. Kunjunni Raja. Madras: University of Madras. 1956.

Maitreya Rakṣita. *Dhātupradīpa.* Edited by Shrish Chandra Chakravarti. Rajshahi: Varendra Research Society. 1919.

Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira, editor (1957). *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī.* Amritsar: Rāma Lāl Kapūr Trust. Saṃvat 2014.

Mīmāṃsaka, Yudhiṣṭhira (1973). *Saṃskṛta Vyākaraṇa-Śāstra kā Itihāsa.* 3 volumes. Bahālagadha. Saṃvat 2030.

Nāgeśa. *Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota.* For the edition see under 'Kaiyaṭa'.

Palsule, Gajanan Balkrishna (1961). *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas: A critical Study.* Poona: University of Poona.

Patañjali. *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya.* 3 volumes. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Third Edition by K. V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1962-72.

Sāyaṇa. *Mādhavīya Dhātuvṛtti.* Edited by Dwarikadas Shastri. Varanasi: Prāchya Bhāratī Prakāshana. 1964.

Scharfe, Hartmut (1977). *Grammatical Literature.* A History of Indian Literature. Volume V. Fasc. 2. Pp. 77-216. Edited by Jan Gonda. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Thieme, Paul (1956). 'Pāṇini and the Pāṇinīyas.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76, 1-23. Reprinted in: *Kleine Schriften.* Teil 2. Pp. 573-95. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. 1971.

Vāmana-Jayāditya. *Kāśikā.* Edited by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande and D.G. Padhye. 2 volumes. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University. 1969-70.