

Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa on *samāsaśakti*

James W. Benson John J. Lowe Adriana Molina-Muñoz Yiming Shen

AOS Annual Meeting— March 10th, 2023

1 Introduction

- The analysis of compounds is an important topic within the Indian grammatical tradition, and has even influenced modern Western linguistic terminology, *bahuvrīhi*, *dvandva*, etc.
- Patañjali devoted an entire *āhnika* of the *Mahābhāṣya* to just Pāṇini’s first rule on compounding (Aṣṭ. 2.1.1), the *Samārthāhnika* (Joshi 1968), and four further *āhnikas* to the remaining compound rules (Joshi and Roodbergen 1969, 1971, 1973, 1974). Bhartṛhari’s *Vṛttisamuddeśa*, the fourteenth and last *samuddeśa* in *Vākyapadīya* 3, is more than 600 verses long, approximately 30% of the entire length of the *Vākyapadīya*.
- Joshi/Roodbergen have comprehensively dealt with Patañjali, but later grammarians remain understudied. Exceptions: Murti (1974), a useful summary of various views on compounding found in the tradition; Joshi (1980–1981), summary of KB’s VB on compounds; Biswal (1995), an edition and notes on the relevant section of the VB.
- We present a summary of the theory of compounding presented by Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa (c. 1650 AD) in his *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*, *samāsaśaktinirṇaya*, and pick out some points of wider interest.

2 *Samāsaśaktinirṇaya* of VBS: summary

- *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* (VBS) comments on Bhaṭṭoji’s *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakārikā* (VSK).
- **Kārikā 28**: six-way morphological categorization: *sUP* with *sUP* (*rājapurusaḥ*), with *tiÑ* (*paryabhūṣat*), with *nāman* (*kumbhakāraḥ*), with *dhātu* (*kaṭaprūḥ*); and *tiÑ* with *tiÑ* (*pibatakhādatā*) and with *sUP* (*jahistambhaḥ*).

KB’s only interest is in technical details, esp. justifying *sUP* + *nāman* and *sUP* + *dhātu*.

- **Kārikā 29**: Four-fold categorization, roughly aligned with particular predominance relations.
 - *avyayībhāva*: first member predominant (*pradhāna*)
 - *tatpuruṣa*: second member predominant
 - *dvandva*: both members predominant
 - *bahuvrīhi*: external element predominant

KB notes that a few compounds do not fall under any of these headings. Also the association with predominance is not absolute: e.g. *unmattagaṅgam*, Abh. but external element predominant; *ardhapippalī*, Tatp. but first member is predominant, etc.

The labels *avyayībhāva* etc. merely refer to occurrence under the relevant heading in the grammar, and have no necessary semantic implications.

- **Kārikā 30**: Introduces two compounding processes:

- *jahatsvārthā vṛtti*: ‘The meaning is that there is meaninglessness of the words in a compound, just like sound segments in a word.’
- *ajahatsvārthā vṛtti*: ‘a process in which the words do not abandon their own meanings.’

Also three types of denotation, as something of a tangent for KB: *bheda* ‘differentiation’, *samsarga* ‘relation’ or *bheda + samsarga*.

- **Kārikā 31**: compounds have separate meanings from the sum of their members – *ekārthībhāva*.

samāsa here includes all *vṛttis*: *kṛt*, *taddhita*, *samāsa*, *ekaśeṣa*, and roots ending in *san* etc.

Argument 1: *pañkaja*. We have to assume a separate meaning for the word *pañkaja*, because we cannot get *padmatva* from the constituent elements. And we need the same thing for compounds generally.

Argument 2: if we have to derive compound meaning from the meaning of the parts, then various complications arise, such as excluding external modifiers of elements.

- **Kārikā 32**: The meanings of compounds like *dhavakhadirau* ‘dhava and khadira (trees)’, *niṣkauśāmbi* ‘one who has left Kauśāmbi’ require additional work if the meaning has to derive from the constituent elements.

Also, *lakṣaṇā* will not work in *prāptodaka* (and similar compounds), even if it could in *citrāgu*.

- **Kārikā 33**:

Aṣaṣṭhyartha bahuvrīhis are problematic for the *vyapekṣā* view: a different solution has to be found, so one might as well assume *ekārthībhāva* for all compounds.

Detailed account of why *lakṣaṇā* will not work for deriving compound meaning.

Discussion expands at this point, with further arguments: Term *prātipadika* would not come about, because *prātipadika* should be meaningful. And we need compound to be denotative otherwise problems when adding suffixes, and impossible to properly deal with the relations between compound members.

Various other arguments, and moving into a discussion of *vigrahas* and how closely they match the compound.

- **Kārikās 34 & 35**:

Mīmāṃsaka assumptions about how close the *vigraha* must be to the meaning of the compound are wrong. There is no reason to fault e.g. the grammarians’ gloss *citrā gāvo yasya* for *citrāgu*.

Allowance of the Mīmāṃsaka view that the Kdh. is the simplest interpretation of a compound, but the most important factor is *tātparya*.

3 Points of innovation/interest

3.1 *ekārthībhāva* and *vyapekṣā*

- KB presents a two-way view of the meanings of compounds, but in the earlier literature the situation is more complicated.
- The view of Kaiyaṭa interpreting Patañjali is that there are four possible approaches to compounding (Murti 1974):

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Nityapakṣa</i> | <i>Vṛtipakṣa/Kāryapakṣa</i> | | |
| | <i>Ekārthībhāva</i> | | <i>Vyapekṣā</i> |
| ↓ | <i>jahatsvārthā</i> | <i>ajahatsvārthā</i> | ↓ |
| ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ |
| View 1 | View 2 | View 3 | View 4 |

(Similarly Joshi 1968: 9–10, 51–52, but without mention of the *nityapakṣa*.)

- *Nityapakṣa / nityaśabdavāda*: compounds are independent units with underived meanings; derivation from sequences of words is a grammatical fiction. This view clearest in Bhartṛhari, unsurprisingly, but Murti also claims that Patañjali's 'predilection' is for the *nityapakṣa*.
- On the *vṛtipakṣa / kāryaśabdavāda*, compounds are modifications of syntactic units, and the compound meaning is derived.
- Under *ekārthībhāva*, compounds have a single unified meaning, i.e. the meaning of a compound is not just the sum of the meaning of the constituent members.
- With *jahatsvārthā vṛtti* the question is how the meanings of the words survive in such a way that the meaning of the whole is appropriate. With *ajahatsvārthā*, the subordinate member in a compound does not lose its meaning but retains it while also denoting the sense of the predominant member.
- *Vyapekṣā*: the meaning of a compound is essentially the same as the meaning of the syntactic phrase from which it derives. The combination in compound denotes the relation (which in a phrase is denoted by case endings etc.).
- As discussed by Murti (similarly Biswal pages 54–60), what we find in KB is an innovative approach, and an innovative interpretation of Patañjali, reducing the four views to two and aligning *jahatsvārthā* with *ekārthībhāva*, and *ajahatsvārthā* with *vyapekṣā*.

| | |
|--------------|---------------|
| Ekārthībhāva | Vyapekṣā |
| = | = |
| jahatsvārthā | ajahatsvārthā |

- KB rejects the *nityapakṣa* as a viable option, and explicitly argues that Kātyāyana did not hold this position. Also rejects *ekārthībhāva + ajahatsvārthā*.

3.2 2.1.11 and optionality of compounds

- Aṣṭ. 2.1.11, *vibhāṣā*: compounding is optional.
- Rule is established as a heading for most of the compound section by Patañjali, by *yogavibhāga*.
- Kātyāyana Vt.2 on Aṣṭ. 2.1.1 says that the *vāvacana* is not purposeful (*anarthaka*), and Patañjali appears to accept this.
- If the meaning of a compound is different from that of its corresponding phrase, then we do not need optionality.
- But elsewhere (e.g. on Aṣṭ. 2.1.11 itself, and on Aṣṭ. 2.2.17 and Aṣṭ. 2.2.19), Patañjali clearly accepts the optionality, and Kaiyaṭa does too.
- As a *nityaśabdika*, Bhartṛhari rejects the need for 2.1.11, also *nityam* in Aṣṭ. 2.2.17 (VP 3.14.41 in Rau), and 2.2.10 is unnecessary (VP 3.14.42). Logically, this means that Aṣṭ. 2.2.11–16 can also all be dispensed with.

- Essentially, the later authors appear to have a problem: they realise that the optionality is not necessary on their understanding of compound meaning, but they cannot get round the fact that Patañjali establishes 2.1.11 as a heading for the compound section.
- BD, KB and Nāgeśa deal with the problem in different ways.
- BD *Śabdakaustubha* on Aṣṭ. 2.1.1 says: “By the principle that ‘a quality whose own fitness for use has been brought about [is directed towards the predominant element]’ (*guṇaḥ kṛtātmasaṃskāraḥ [pradhānaṃ pratipadyate]*), the great option qualifies *sāmārthya*. This is because the meaning is that a word ending in the genitive case, which has become *ekārtha* through the option, is compounded, etc.”
- In the *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara*, Nāgeśa says: “And the statement of ‘*vā*’ is not a qualifier of *sāmārthya* (*eva*).” This is because *sāmārthya* itself is a qualifier. *Vibhāṣā* is necessary for the sake of those who do not know the meanings of words (*lakṣaṇaikacakṣuṣka*), but declared as unnecessary for those who focus on the final forms (*lakṣyaikacakṣuṣka*).
- Biswal claims that KB (as well as Patañjali and Kaiyaṭa) clearly rejects the need for 2.1.11. But in fact, KB is ambiguous, more so than BD and N.
- In the VB, KB does seem to accept *vāvacanānārthakyam* in a couple of places, but also explicitly accepts *vibhāṣā* in discussing bahuvrīhi formation.
- In the VBS he accepts that the ‘optionality’ follows naturally (*nyāyasiddha*) based on the different meanings of compound vs. phrase. But he does not follow through the conclusion that this makes the rule unnecessary, and he does not provide an alternative explanation of it in either the VB or VBS.

4 Conclusion

- The grammarians’ theories of compounding are rich, much more so than usually assumed.
- There is work to do tracing the differences between the later grammarians in particular, e.g. (but not only) with reference to the justification or otherwise of 2.1.11.

References

- BISWAL, BANAMALI (1995). *The Samāsaśaktinirṇaya of Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa: Chapter V of the Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa. Critically edited with introduction and exhaustive explanatory notes.* Allahabad: Padmaja Prakashan.
- JOSHI, S. D. (1968). *Patañjali’s Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya: Sarmarthāhnikā (P. 2.1.1)*. Poona: University of Poona.
- JOSHI, S. D. (1980–1981). ‘Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa on the meaning of compounds’. *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 44–45, pp. 369–389.
- JOSHI, S. D. and J. A. F. ROODBERGEN (1969). *Patañjali’s Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya: Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnikā (P. 2.1.2–2.1.49)*. Poona: University of Poona.
- JOSHI, S. D. and J. A. F. ROODBERGEN (1971). *Patañjali’s Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya: Karmadhārayāhnikā (P. 2.1.51–2.1.72)*. Poona: University of Poona.
- JOSHI, S. D. and J. A. F. ROODBERGEN (1973). *Patañjali’s Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya: Tatpuruṣāhnikā (P. 2.2.2–2.2.23)*. Poona: University of Poona.
- JOSHI, S. D. and J. A. F. ROODBERGEN (1974). *Patañjali’s Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya: Bahuvrīhidvandvāhnikā (P. 2.2.23–2.2.38)*. Poona: University of Poona. Introduction by S. D. Joshi. Text, translation and notes by J. A. F. Roodbergen.
- MURTI, M. SRIMANNARAYANA (1974). *Sanskrit compounds: A philosophical study.* Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.