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PREFACE

In the present monograph an attempt has been made to study the origin and development of the Nirukta or the Science of Etymology, of which Yāska's treatise remains the sole extant representative, from a critical and historical viewpoint. Oriental scholars have studied Yāska's work with much critical acumen and there are numerous papers written by eminent scholars dealing with the various aspects of that work—viz. historical, philological, textual and so on. Professor Sköld's treatise entitled "The Nirukta: Its place in Old Indian Literature" is mainly devoted to the discussion of the etymologies recorded in the Nirukta and as to how far those can be traced to the Brāhmaṇa-texts. Yet no attempt has been made, so far, to give a complete and unified picture of the pre-Yāska stage of the etymological science and an account of the eminent Etymologists (Nairuktas) who were the first originators of that branch of study, though stray articles have appeared at intervals. Here is presented a sustained historical study pooling all possible and available data bearing on the contributions of Yāska's predecessors. Incidentally the problem of authorship of the Nighaṇṭu has been dealt with. It has also been endeavoured to show that the first germs of the etymological science are contained in the Brāhmaṇa works themselves—a fact which is admitted by Yāska himself by his frequent quotations of Brāhmaṇa passages in support of his etymologizings. The character of the lost and anonymous work called the Niruktavārttika has also been discussed threadbare by utilizing all the
available data. In the last section a comparison has been made among the three principal schools of Vedic exegesis—viz. the Aitihāsika, the Ādhyātmika and the Nairukta, showing how the adoption of any of these views would entail a corresponding difference in the interpretation of Vedic mantras. Some portions of the present monograph were published as separate articles in different oriental journals. It was awarded the Griffith Memorial Prize in Letters for 1947 of the Calcutta University.
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I. YĀSKA'S NIRUKTA

Of the six ancillary sciences the Nirukta or the Science of Etymology, as it is commonly designated, is very important, and, as Yāska states, it is almost a hopeless task to make out the sense of Vedic mantras without a thorough acquaintance with the Nirukta and its methods. It supplements the grammatical science which goes only a half way towards the proper understanding of the Vedas. Of this important branch of literature, however, all other works have been lost save this work of Yāska, which seems to have been the product of a later period of development of that science. It is apparent after a perusal of Yāska's work that the author has utilised the labours and findings of his famous predecessors. Yāska frequently mentions the names of older authors and quotes their views either in his support or to show their divergence. We would later on cite the names of the authors and schools occuring in Yāska's work.

It is generally held that Yāska preceded Pāṇini, the great grammarian, on the strength of the sūtra Yaskādibhyo gotre (II. 4. 63) occurring in the latter's Aṣṭādhyāyī, in which the formation of the patronymic Yāska is taught. But this
sūtra alone cannot prove the anteriority of Yāska, for it cannot be held with certitude that Pāṇini had in view the author of our Nirukta in framing his aphorism, and there might have been other Yāskas. The conclusion based on the evidence of the above sūtra can at most be tentative in nature. Prof. Goldstücker in his Panini and his Place in Sanskrit Literature observes, "such, I hold, is afforded by the fact that Pāṇini knows the name of Yāska, for he teaches the formation of this word and heads a gaṇa with it. And as we know at present of but one real Yāska in the whole ancient literature, a doubt as to the identity of the author of the Nirukta and the family chief adduced by Pāṇini, would have first to be supported with plausible arguments before it could be assented to." At the end of the fourteenth chapter of the Nirukta there is a salutation to Yāska, which goes to prove that the author of the Nirukta is not the only Yāska. He had ancestors of the same name. But such a conclusion, though plausible at the first sight, cannot be stressed too much in view of the fact that modern researches have proved the spurious character of the last Book of the Nirukta, which has not been commented upon by Durgācārya, whose gloss breaks off with Chapter XIII.

There are however some points to be noted
with regard to the chronological relation between Yāska and Pāṇini though it is apparent on the face of it that the science of grammar and linguistics had made great strides during the period between these two great teachers. There can be very little room for doubt that Yāska preceded Pāṇini from the consideration of philological and linguistic grounds. But it may not be absolutely useless to discuss some points which appear to have some bearing on their exact relation.  

Of the five important rules which occur in Pāṇini’s Asṭādhyāyī and which form as it were the ‘keystone’ of his Grammar, as Professor Goldstücker remarks, the first is tadaśīvam samijnā-pramāṇatvāt (I. 5. 53), which we should consider carefully. After having taught the formation of such words as varaṇāḥ, pāncalāḥ, kuravaḥ etc. when they refer to “the countries inhabited by varaṇas, pancālas, and kurus etc.”, by the rule lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane (I. 2. 51), Pāṇini says in the rules above quoted that “Or rather, the rule I. 2. 51 need not be taught for the formation of such words as varaṇāḥ etc., as these are conventional names or samijnās and they are bound to take such and such genders and numbers according to usage”.  

Patañjali the author of the Māhābhāṣya has commented on this sutra which we cite in our
notes for reference. Prof. Goldstücker in his work already cited draws certain important inferences from Patañjali's comments on this sūtra, which are of far-reaching importance. They are:

"(1) That its Grammar does not treat of those samjñās or conventional names which are known and settled otherwise.

"(2) That this term samjñā must be understood in our rule to concern only such conventional names as have an etymology.

"(3) That such terms as ṭi, ghu, and bha were known and settled before Pāṇini's Grammar but that, nevertheless, they were defined by Pāṇini because they are not etymological terms."

"Having thus obtained", proceeds Prof. Glodstücker, "through the comment of Patañjali on the sūtra in question, a means by which to judge of the originality of Pāṇini's terms, we must feel induced to test its accuracy before we base our inferences on it; and the opportunity of doing so is afforded not merely by the technical symbols which Patañjali himself names,—we easily ascertain that Pāṇini has given a definition of them,—but also by another of these important five sūtras. The sūtra (1. 2. 56) says: Nor shall I teach the purport of the principal part of a compound (pradhāna), or that of an
affix (pratyaya), because they too have been settled by others (i.e. people know already from other authorities, that in a compound the sense of the word gravitates towards its principal part, and in a derivative word towards the affix)."

If this interpretation of Patañjali's coments be correct we are able to view the relation between Yāska and Pāṇini in quite a new light. Now, Yāska has used the term upadhā in his work in just the same sense in which Pāṇini uses it. The term upadhā occurs thrice in the Nirukta. The occurences are being cited below:

i. athāpyupadhālopo bhavati-jagmatur
   jagmur iti (II.1)

ii. athāpyupadhāvikāro bhavati-rājā
dāndīti (II.1)

iii. ādinā’bhyāsenā upahitena upadhām
    ādatte (IV. 12)

Similarly, the term abhyāsa also has been used by Yāska in the sense in which Pāṇini uses it. It occurs in Nir. II. 2, 3; V.12; X.42. The term abhyasta, a derivative of abhyāsa, is also met with in the Nirukta in II.12; III.10; IV.23, 25; and VI.3. The term guṇa is also found in Nirukta X.17 denoting the "strong grade" (e, o) of the vowels i, u, which is the sense Pāṇini attaches to it. Thus, if Prof. Goldstücker's deductions be accepted, these
evidences form to make a strong presumption in favour of the view that Yāska might have come after Pāṇini. For, the terms *upadhā, abhyāsa*, etc. are all derivatives, and if Yāska be held to be anterior to Pāṇini, it becomes difficult to explain why the latter should frame special rules for teaching their senses inasmuch as they had already been known from other sources. Though it is apparent on linguistic ground, as has already been remarked, that Yāska belongs to a much earlier period than Pāṇini, still the issue raised here demands special investigation before Yāska’s priority can be fully taken for granted.

**Notes**

1. athāpīdam antareṇa mantreṣu arthasampratyayo na vidyate—Nir.i.15.
2. tadidaṃ vidyāsthānam vyākaraṇasya kārtnyaṃ svārthasādhakaṃ ca—loc. cit.
3. It should be noted that in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* of the White Yajurveda Mādhyandina recension, the name of Yāska is met with several times. Vide *Sat.Br.* xiv. 5.5.21, 7.3.27 (Weber’s Edition).
5. namo Yāskāya—ibid.
6. The grammatical terms used by Yāska in his *Nirukta* are more or less descriptive whereas those used by
Pāṇini are in the majority of cases technical (yādṛcchika). Note for example—kārita, carkarīta, cikirsīta, nāmakaraṇa, nirvṛttisthāna, dviprakṛtisthāna etc., which are extremely simple and self-explanatory. Moreover, Yāska never uses such self-improvised symbols as ī, ghu, bha, etc. which are found in abundance in Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī. These are certainly evidences pointing to Yāska’s priority. As Dr. Belvalkar remarks: “Unfortunately the time of Yāska is by no means yet certain. It depends for the most part on the date that is to be assigned to Pāṇini, between whom and this great writer at least a century, if not more, must be supposed to have elapsed in order to account for all the advances in the matter and wording of the rules of grammar that are to be met with in the Aṣṭādhyāyī.”—Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, pp. 6-7. Vide contra: “The theory of Yāska’s priority to Pāṇini is accepted on a very superficial evidence, or rather without reasoning.”—Hannes Sköld: Papers on Pāṇini, p. 34.

7. tadaāśiṣyaṁ saṃjñāpramāṇatvāt; lub-yogāprakhyānāt; yogāpramāṇe ca tadabhāve’darśanaṁ syāt; pradhānapratyayārthavacanaṁ arthasyānyapramāṇatvāt; and kālopasarjane ca tulyam—P.I. 2. 53-57.

II. YĀSKA AND ŚĀKALYA

It is very interesting to investigate how far Yāska follows Śākalya—the author of the Padatext of the Rgveda, regarding the interpretaion of Vedic verses. That Śākalya preceded the author of the Nirukta and that the latter was quite aware of Śākalya’s text are plain, since Yāska mentions Śākalya by name in Nir. VI. 28. The text runs thus:

"‘vane na vāyo nyadhāyi cākan’ (RV. X. 29. 1 ; AV. XX. 76. 1) | vana iva | vāyo vēḥ putraḥ | cāyanniti vā | kāmayamāna iti vā | veti ca ya iti ca cakāra Śākalyah | udāttam tvevam ākhyātam abhavisvat | asusamāptas cārthah |"

Here Yāska criticises Śākalya for wrongly splitting up the single word vāyo into vā and yaḥ, for then the verb would be accented, though it is actually enclitic, being in a subordinate clause. What is more, the sense of the passage would then be incomplete. Śaunaka—the author of the Brhaddevatā, alludes to the interpretation of Yāska and seems to suggest that the author of the Nirukta had an erroneous conception regarding the accent of the verb adhāyi, thus defending Śākalya against Yāska’s attack. Professor Macdonell has been at a loss to make out from what standpoint Śaunaka was
criticising Yāska. As he states: 'If our author is criticizing Yāska, it does not appear what he means here by a misunderstanding of the accent.' But Skandasvāmin, whose gloss on the Nirukta has been edited by Professor L. Sarup, appears to defend Śākalya. According to him in the verse quoted above, viz. RV. X. 29. 1, the word cākan is a verb and not an inflexional form in the nominative, which as it is construed with the subject yah becomes unaccented, being in the principal clause. Thus there is nothing wrong even if we accept Śākalya's view and split up vāyah into vā and yah. Śaunaka, in the verse referred to, might have the same interpretation in view and thus it becomes quite evident why he should be criticizing Yāska, who completely misunderstood Śākalya. Professor Sköld in his treatise, however, interprets the text of the Brhaddevatā in quite a different way, which is not at all convincing. He remarks: 'BD accuses Yāska of misunderstanding the accent. Professor Macdonell l. c., p. 63, seems not to have caught the point of the criticism, which probably is, that, if vāyo (vāyas) were one word, meaning "bird", it would not have been stressed in that way, as the similar word for "bird" vayās, is differently accentuated.'

In the Brhaddevatā Śaunaka refers to another
mistake on the part of the author of the *Nirukta* in the splitting up of the *Samhitā* text.⁵ Here Yāska is accused of dividing the word *pūrusādāḥ* (*RV.* X. 27. 22) as *pūrusān adanāya* (i.e. *puruṣa|adaḥ*). But Śākalya in his *Padapāṭha* has done the same thing and it is difficult to guess why Śaunaka would be attacking Yāska. Neither Durga nor Skandaswāmin has referred to the view of the author of the *Bṛhaddevatā*. Thus Professor Macdonell observes: ‘Yāska in *Nirukta* II. 6 explains *pūrusādāḥ* as *pūrusān adanāya*, “in order to devour men”, but there is nothing in this to justify the criticism that he took *pūrusādāḥ* as two words’.⁶

Yāska, in his explanation of the *Ṛk* verse I. 195. 18—‘*arunō māsakṛt vykaḥ*’—also, goes against the *Padapāṭha*. Yāska explains *māsakṛt* as *māsānam kartā* thus treating it as a compound of the two words *māsa-kṛt*, while Śākalya shows them as two separate and uncompounded words *mā* and *sakṛt*⁷ Skandaswāmin in his commentary on *Nirukta* V. 21 observes that Yāska here followed some other authority in whose opinion the word *māsakṛt* is a compound and not Śākalya who views them as two distinct terms.⁸ Who this authority was it is not possible to find out. There might have been some other authors of *Pada* Texts besides Śākalya whose *Padapāṭha* alone is now extant. Professor Bhagavaddatta
in his *History of Vedic Literature* quotes a verse from the *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa* 1. 2. 34 in which Rathītara (Śākapūṇi) and Bharadvāja Vāśkali are mentioned as redactors of different recensions of the *Ṛgveda* besides Śākalya.9 Thus Yāska might have been following any of these recensions.

Skandasvāmin in his commentary on the *Nirukta*, makes some observations in a few more cases where Yāska and Śākalya either differ or agree. We might refer to these instances in order to bring into clear light the dependence of Yāska on Śākalya’s *Pada*-text.

I. In deriving āditya in *Nirukta* 11. 13 Yāska proposes several alternative explanations. The text runs as: ‘ādityaḥ kasmāt? ādatte rasān, ādatte bhāsam jyotīśām / ādīptto bhāsā iti vā / aditeḥ putra iti vā’. Thus according to the first three etymologies the word should be treated as a compound of the preposition ā- with ditya derived either from ā/ḍā or from ā/ḍīp, and as such should be shown in the *Padaṅgaḥ* divided by an avagraha. But if the last etymology be accepted, there need be no avagraha at all. Skandasvāmin remarks that Yāska here follows Śākalya and Ātreya on the one hand and Gārgya on the other—all authors of *Pada Texts*, the first two teachers regarding the word as uncompounded and the last, viz. Gārgya dividing it
by an *avagraha*, thus indicating his acceptance of any one of the first three etymologies as proposed in the *Nirukta*.\(^{10}\)

II. In explaining the Nighaṇṭu word *mehanā* (*Ngh.* IV. 1. 4) which occurs in *RV.* V. 39. l: ‘*yad indra citra mehanāsti tvādātam adriverh’*, Yāska refers to the two conflicting views of Śākalya and Gārgya, the authors of the Pada Texts of the Rk-Saṃhitā and the Sāma-Saṃhitā respectively. According to the former *mehanā* is a single indivisible word meaning *maṃhanīyam*, while in Gārgya’s opinion there is no such word, but as a result of the euphonic combination of the three words *ma-iha-na* we get *mehana*.\(^{11}\) Thus we find that Yāska refers to both the views as equally authoritative. A comparison of the different *Padapāṭhas* with Yāska’s exegesis would yield a good idea as to how far Yāska’s interpretations were conditioned by the varying methods of division of the Saṃhitā followed by the authors of the Pada Texts.\(^{12}\)

III. Another instance where Yāska seems to go against Śākalya is to be found in *Nirukta* IV. 25. Yāska here deals with the accent of the two words *asyāḥ* and *asya*. When they are used to stand for some principal word in the sentence, they retain their usual accent, but if they are used in a subordinate sense or anaphorically, they become enclitic. To illustrate the
use of \textit{asyāḥ} where it is usually accented, Yāska quotes \textit{RV. I. 138. 4}: \textit{asyā ā ṣu ṇa upa sātaye bhvvo' helamāno rarivā ajāśva}, and explains it as \textit{asyai naḥ sātaye upabhava}, thus suggesting that the correct Padapāṭha would be \textit{asyai/\textbar u} and not \textit{asyāḥ/\textbar u} as Śākalya has it. But Skandāsvāmin in his commentary remarks that this is not a proper procedure as this would be violating the Pada Text which expressly reads \textit{asyāḥ} in the genitive singular. So the proper reading of the \textit{Nirukta} would be \textit{asyāḥ naḥ sātaye}, the reading \textit{asyai naḥ sātaye} being spurious and unjustifiable.\textsuperscript{13}

IV. Yāska in \textit{Nir. V. 15} explains \textit{āritah} (\textit{Ngh.}) as \textit{pratyrtah}. Durga observes that in the word \textit{āritah}, ā is the preposition used in the sense of \textit{prati} and so Yāska explains it by \textit{pratyrtah (prati-ṛtah)}.\textsuperscript{14} But contrary to this Śākalya shows no \textit{avagraha} between ā and \textit{ṛtah} which ought to have been infixed had Yāska’s explanation been endorsed by Śākalya too. But we are to note that Skandāswāmin here offers a different interpretation. In his opinion, \textit{āritah} according to Yāska is the past participle derived from the frequentative stem of the root \textit{vṛ} ‘to go’. That Yāska explains it by \textit{pratyrtah} should not lead us to think that in \textit{āritah} ā is the preposition used in lieu of \textit{prati}, as some have been led to think. Thus, Skandāswāmin
sees no divergence in the views of Yāska and Śākalya.\textsuperscript{15}

V. In \textit{Nirukta} XI. 16 Yāska quotes RV. V. 57. 1, the last foot of which reads \textit{trṣṇaje na diva utsā udanyave}. Yāska explains it as: \textit{trṣṇaja iva diva utsā udanyave iti / trṣṇak trṣyater udanyur udanyateḥ}. Thus it becomes evident that in Yāska’s opinion \textit{trṣṇaje} occurring in the verse-foot already cited is in the dative of the stem \textit{trṣṇaj} which is a derivative of the root \textit{v trṣ}. But this is not the opinion of Śākalya, for in the Padapāṭha of the above verse \textit{trṣṇaje} is divided by an \textit{avagraha}, which indicates its composite character.\textsuperscript{16} Śākalya, thus, thought the word to be a compound of \textit{trṣṇa-ja}, the last member being evidently derived from \textit{v jan}. Accordingly, Yāska and Śākalya are at variance on this point too.

VI. Yāska in \textit{Nir.} XI. 25 cites RV. X. 108. 1: ‘\textit{kam icchanti saramā predam ānat dūre hyadhvā jaguriḥ parācaih / kāsmehitiḥ kā paritakmyāsit katham rasāyā atarah payāṃṣī‘}. In explaining the last foot Yāska states: ‘\textit{katham rasāyāḥ atarah payāṃṣīti / rasā nadē, rasateḥ sabdakarmaṇaḥ / kathamrasāni tāni udakānīt vā /’}. In the first explanation Yāska takes \textit{rasā} to refer to ‘a stream’, and the last foot would then mean: ‘How did you cross the waters of the Rasā?’ Thus here \textit{rasāyāḥ} is one indivisible word used
in the genitive. This is also the view of Śākalya, who splits up the words as: *katham / rasāyāḥ / atarah / payāṃsi*. But the second explanation offered by Yāska cannot proceed from Śākalya’s *Padapātha*. Yāska now takes *katham-rasā* as a compound form referring to *payāṃsi*. yā now would refer to *payāṃsi* with the accusative plural ending -ni dropped. The *Padapātha* in this view would be as follows: *katham-rasā / yā / atarah / payāṃsi*. The hiatus in *yā atarah* has to be accounted for by the optional character of euphonic combination in the Vedas. Skandasvāmin here remarks that the second explanation of the Bhāsyakāra (viz. Yāska) might have been in accordance with a different recension of the Rk-Saṃhitā.

VII. Yāska in *Nir. XII.46* explains *rodasī* as *rudrasya patnī* in the verse: *uta gnā vyantu devapāt nir indrāny-agnāyy-aśvinī rāt / ā rodasī varuṇāni śṛṇotu vyantu devīr ya ṛtur janinām / - RV. V. 46. 8.* But in the *Padapātha* it is followed by *iti* and treated as a *pragrhya* word which shows that according to Śākalya *rodasī* has the dual case-ending and refers to *dyāvā-prthivī*. Durga comments that Yāska follows the *Atharvaveda*, in which this verse occurs (cp. *AV. VIII. 49. 2*), where *rodasī* is not treated as a *pragrhya* word. Thus here evidently Yāska follows the
Atharvaveda tradition against Śākalya’s decree. Skandasyāmin does not fail to point out Yāska’s error, for rodaśi accented as it is on the first syllable can refer only to heaven and earth as Śākalya’s Padapāṭha justly suggests.20

VIII. In RV. IV. 32. 23: ‘kanīnakeva vidradhe nave drupade arbhake | babhrū yāmesu sōbhete’, which is cited by Yāska in Nir. IV. I, all the four words vidradhe, nave, drupade and arbhake are according to Śākapyāṇi locative singulars, which is also the opinion of Śākalya since in the Pada-text they are not followed by iti which is put after dual forms ending in ī, ā and e. But Yāska does not concur with this view of Śākapyāṇi. According to him the two words nave and arbhake are dual forms as they qualify kanīnake which is in the dual and not drupade as Śākalya and Śākapyāṇi contend. So in Yāska’s view these two words should be treated as pragṛhya in the Padapāṭha—i.e., they should be followed by the particle iti to denote their dual character. Thus, here too, Yāska differs from Śākalya.21

IX. Yāska in his Nir. IV. 12 quotes RV. I. 6. 7: ‘indrena samḥ hi ḍṛkṣase sanjagmāno abibhyuṣā | mandū samānavarcasā’ and explains mandū as madiṣṇu—nominative dual or instrumental singular, the first view being that of Śākalya as it is treated as pragṛhya in the
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Padapātha and the second of some other Vedic teacher, a Padakāra perhaps, who did not put iti after it, thus indicating that it was a singular form and not a dual one.22

It is highly probable that in Yāska's time more than one Pada Text of the Rgveda existed and that Yāska consulted them in recording the different interpretations to which a Vedic stanza might be subjected.

Notes

1. Cp. 'svarānavagamo’ dhāyi vane netyrci darśitaḥ'.

2. Bṛhaddevatā : Translation and Notes. Ibid.

3. We quote here the commentary of Skandasvāmin : ‘ya iti somasya uddeśaḥ cākanniti cākhyaṭam na nāmaśabdaḥ / api sampratyarthe (?) / tenāyam (iti) arthaḥ / tataś cāyaṃ yah somaḥ ātmanah pānaṃ kāmāyate / yacchabdaśruteḥ tacchabo'dhyāhāryaḥ / sa vane vanavikāraḥbhūte grahacamasādau sū (pū ?) -tabhṛtkalāśādau vā nyadhāyi ṛtvigbhir nihito yataś cāyate...cākanniti cākhyaṭam katham āgamyate iti cet “agnir varūtham mama tasya cākān” (RV. I. 148. 2) -iti mantrāntare dārsanāt / atāścaitad evamrūpam ēkhyātam— “ā no bhara suvitaṃ yasya cākan” (RV. X. 148. 1) iti yadvṛttāt (yadvrntta—?) sambandhāt nighātapratīśedhe sati udāttaśrutir na (?) bhavati / ’—The text is extremely corrupt. Durga commenting on the above text of the
Nirukta observes: 'evaṃ tasmin padadvaye sati yadetad ākhyātam nyadhāyiti etad udāttam abhaviṣyat / yadvṛttāt parasya nityam ākhyātasya nighāto na bhavatīti lakṣaṇavido manyante (cf. Paññini VIII. 1. 66 yadvṛttānnityam) / na cedam udāttam / tasmād yaḥ - iti nedaṃ yadvṛttam / kim tarhi / vāyah ityekam eva padam/'.

8. māsakṛd iti yasya etad ekaṃ padam tadabhiprāyena etad evaṃ Bhāṣyakāreṇa vyākhyātam / Sākalyasya tu dve eva pade / - Skandasvāmin, Vol. II, p. 366. Durga too seems to suggest that in some recensions the expression māsakṛ was treated as a compound, in others as two separate words. Compare: 'yeṣām mā sakṛ - ityetat padadvayaṃ bhavati teṣāṃ sakṛ mah dādarśa candramāḥ...... ityādī yojyam /


10. Comp. 'etadvutpattyabhāpṛayena Śākalya-Ātreya- prabhṛtibhir nāvagṛhitam / pūrvanirvacaṇābhī- prāyena Gārgyaprabhṛtibhir avagrhitam /...... vicitṛāḥ padakārāṇām abhiprāyāḥ / kvacid upa- sargaviṣaye' pi nāvagṛḥnanti / yathā Śākalyena
"adhirāsām" iti nāvagr̥hitam / Ātreyena tu "adhi-
vāsam" ityavagr̥hitam / tasmād avagraho 'nava-
graḥa-iti /

—Skandasvāmin.

11. yad indra citraṃ cāyaniyaṃ maṃhaniyaṃ dhanam
asti / yan ma iha nāstīti vā trīṇī madhyamāni
padāni - Nir. IV. 4. Comp. ekam iti Sākalyaḥ /
trīṇīti Gārgyaḥ / ......Śākalya- pakṣe maṃhaniyaṃ
dānārham /...Chandogānāṁ tu mehanā-śabdo
naivāsti.—Skandasvāmin.

12. Durga expressly states that in the case of doubtful
words we must consult the views of different
Padakāras. Comp. 'tadubhayaṃ paśyatā Bhāṣya-
kāreṇa ubhayoh Śākalya- Gārgyayoḥ abhiprayau
atānuvīhitau evamjātiyanirvacanopapradarśanār-
tham / ......evam atra viṣeṣalingābhāvāt viprati-
pattih / evam anyeṣvapi śākhāntarapadavikalpeṣu
anuvidhānam arthāvirodhena karttavyām'.

13. atra bhāṣye kecit asyā ū su ṣa - iti caturthyāḥ
ṣaṭṭhyāś ca api upabhuva-ityetena na sambadhyaṭe /
(The reading is corrupt). sātaye ityetena vyava-
dhānāt / nahi anantarasaṃbandhakalpanāyāṃ
satyāṃ vyavahitasaṃbandhakalpanā nyāyā / atathā
sātaye ityetenaiva sambadhyaṭe / asyāḥ iti ṣaṭṭhyan-
tam na caturtnyantam / tathā ca padakāraḥ ṣaṭ-
ṣṭhyantateva (—tvena) avadhṛtavān asyāḥ iti sthitih
sātaye ityetat tu aṅgavāt ṣaṭṭhyarthe kalpita-
caturthikam asyā- ityetasya samāṇādhikaranam
viṣeṣaṅaṃ caitat / sāmāṇādhikaranynyena balena asya-
-ityetasya caturthyavikalpanā ayuktā / tasmāt
asyāḥ naḥ sātaye iti pāṭhaḥ / asyai naḥ sātaye itya-
however makes no comment regarding the reading of the text.

14. ārita- ityanavagatam / prati ityasya sthāne ān / pratyṛta- ityarthaṁpratitiḥ / _loc. cit._

15. Cf. ārita ityanavagatam / ‘ṛ’ gatau ityasya / ṛṣater āṇpūrvasya niṣṭhāyāṁ idam rūpam iti kecit / Yāska-Parakārau tu pratyṛta iti vivaraṇāt avagraha- karaṇācca arter yañlugantasya idam rūpam iti manyete...tenānavagama āritaiti / ṛtaityavadgamaḥ / pratyṛta iti dhātupratyayayoḥ pradarśanānātram / —_ibid._, p. 353.

16. Compare Skandavāmin’s comments: “atha vā utsā iti prathama, udanyava iti caturthiṣīruter vyavahi- tasya āgamanasya idam upamānāṁ / yathā griśmānte divo dyulokā utsā meghā udanyava udakakāmasya janasya arthāya āgacchanti tadvat āgacchata / tṛṣṇaḥ-sabdanirvacanāt tṛṣṇaje-sabdāś caturthyaṁtaḥ. (The published text reads catulyah which makes no sense at all). udanyave ityanena samāndhikaraṇaṁ / pipāsāśīlasya udakakāmasya janasyārthāya yathā utsā āgaccheyus tadvad āgacchata iti bhāsyakārābhīprāyaḥ / evam tu vyākhyāyamāne...Śākalyasya tṛṣṇopapdasya janer adhikaraṇasādhanaḥ kartṛśādhano vā ḍa-praty- ayah / kuta etad—avagrahāt/” It should be noted, however, that Durga in his commentary omits the etymologies of both tṛṣṇak and udanyu. Pāṇini, however, in his aphorism: ‘svapi-tṛṣor najih’ (III.2.172) derives tṛṣṇak from the root ṛṣ-, thus falling in with Yāska against Śākalya. _Vide_ Sāyaṇa’s commentary on the Ṛk.

17. Cp. _śeṣ chandasi bahulam—Pāṇini, VI. 1. 70._
18. “athaśā katham-расā ity etāvad ekaṃ padaṃ prathamā- bahuvacanāntam / yā ity etad api padāntaram dvitiyā-bahuvacanāntam / katham-расāni kimprakāra-rasāni yāni tvam ataraḥ (payāmsi) udakānīti śākhāntarāpekṣam etad Bhāasyakārasya vyākhyānam draśṭavyam”—ibid. It is strange that Durga has no comment on this divergence of Yāska from Śākalya's Padapātha, though in explaining katham-расāni he takes it as a compounded form.


20. rodasīti rudrasya patnīvacano vyākhyātaḥ / tat kila nopapadyate yato’ntodātto rodasīśabdo rudrapatnīvacano dṛṣṭaḥ / ‘visitastukā rodasi’ (RV. VI. 50.5)—ityādau antodāttasya darśanāt / ādyudāttas tu—‘atapymāne avasāvantī anu śyāma rodasi devaputre’ (RV. I.185.4)- ityādau sarvatra dyāvāṛthivivacanah / tathā ca padakārena dvi- vacanāntatvam pradarśitam iti / ...Bhāsyakāras tu devapatnīprakaranānuvidhānena padakāram anavekṣya rodasi-śabdam rudrpatnī-vacanam udā- jahāreti—Op.cit. Šaunaka in his Brhaddevatā 11.143 refers to the Atharvaveda tradition where rodasi is treated as a singular form meaning rudrapatnī : Compare : rodasi devapatnīnāṃ atharvāṅgirase yathā.

21. Cp. ‘kanyayor adhiśṭhānapravacanāni saptamyā ekavacanānīti Śākapūṇiḥ / ...nave navajāte arbhake avṛddhe te yathā tadadhiśṭhāneshu śobhete evam babhrū yāmeṣu śobhete / babhrvār āsvayoḥ samstavaḥ’—Nir. IV. 15. ‘evam etāni kanyayor adhiśṭhānapravacananāni saptamībhuhvacanasaya
sthāne ekavacanānīti Śākapūnir manyate / Yāskastu kaninakeva iti kayayor dṛṣṭāntatvena upanyāsāt arthasāmarthayāt nave arbhake ityete dve kayayor viśeṣane / saptamyekavacane prathamādvacanānte iti manyate’—Skandasvāmin. Śaunaka in his Brhaddevatā endorses the view of Śākapūni, which is the view of Śākalya also, though he does not refer to Yāska’s opinion. Compare: Kaninakā sūktaśeṣo haryoh stutir ihocyate / catvāryataś ca vijñeyānyapragṛhyāṇi vidradhe—Op.cit., IV. 144. Professor Macdonell too in his notes on this verse makes no comment as to the opposite view held by Yāska.

III. YĀSKA—THE AUTHOR OF THE NIGHAṬTU?

We must now turn to another important topic concerning the authorship of the extant Nighaṭtu. The Nighaṭtu as it is now published consists of five chapters, the first three of which are called the Naighaṭṭuka section; the fourth chapter is known as the Naigama-kāṇḍa or Aikapadika-kāṇḍa, and the last chapter passes under the designation Daivata-kāṇḍa. Professor H. Sköld in his treatise has tried to establish that the term nighaṭtu at first applied to the first three chapters of the present compilation as it is evident from the sectional title Naighaṭṭuka-kāṇḍa, but later on it was extended also to the last two sections—viz. Naigama and Daivata-kāṇḍas, by a fallacy commonly known as pars pro toto. As he observes: 'How can the first Kāṇḍa of our Nighaṭtu have given its name to the whole work?.....I think by a sort of pars pro toto. There are reasons for believing that the Nighaṭṭuka-kāṇḍa is the earliest part of the Nighaṭtu. This, together with its being placed at the head of the work, leads to a later change of name. An atha nighaṭtavaḥ at the beginning of the MSS. of the Nighaṭtu may have been taken
to refer to the whole work, while the colophons at the end of the kāṇḍas preserved their old names. The fact, that in our days, not only the first kāṇḍa, but also the whole vocabulary bears the name of Nighaṇṭu can hardly be accounted for in any other way.¹

Yāska at the very beginning of the Nirukta states: "The list of words is finished. It is now to be explained. This list of words is called Nighaṇṭu."² On this Durga observes that the present collection of words had been compiled by various seers who culled from the Vedas obscure words with the purpose of grouping them together under definite sections.³ Durga also states that the term Nighaṇṭu is a conventional name, and it applies equally to those words which have not been compiled at all, to compilations other than the present one, as also to our list on which Yāska had based his Nirukta. Thus from Durga’s observation it would not be wrong to deduce that there were other Nighaṇṭus also, in which occurred vocables that were not to be met with in our text.⁴ This deduction is also confirmed by another observation of Durga where it is plainly stated that Yāska in his Nirukta explains not only those words which have been read in the extant Nighaṇṭu but also words which occurred in other Nighaṇṭu-texts as well. It might however be
legitimately objected: Why all those words have not been incorporated in the present text of the Nighanṭu? To this Durga answers by remarking that it would be a hopeless task to make a complete list of all possible vocables. The present Nighanṭu and the commentary thereon—i.e. the Nirukta, are merely intended to give an idea, howsoever insufficient, as to the methods and principles of etymology and Vedic exegesis, so that the students might be enabled to comprehend by themselves in the light of the teachings of the Nirukta the meaning of obscure Vedic passages.\(^5\) It is evident from the observations of Durga, cited above, that the Nighanṭu, on which Yāska commented, was existent long before the latter wrote his commentary thereon. Elsewhere in Nirukta IV. 18, where Yāska explains the two words dāvane and akūpārasya read in Nighanṭu (IV.1.32-33), Durga states explicitly that Yāska is quite a different person from the author of the Nighanṭu, since whereas in the Nighanṭu the above two words are read in the order shown above Yāska in his commentary explains them according to the sequence in which they occur in the verse of the Rgveda. Had Yāska been numerically identical with the author of the Nighanṭu, Durga observes, it would be difficult to account for as to why in the Nighanṭu he should be
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changing the sequence of these two words as observed in the mantra without any reason whatsoever. A similar instance, where Yāska does not observe the sequence of the Nighaṇṭu, is to be found in Nir. V. 15—where the two words vājapastyam and vājagandhyam are explained by Yāska. These considerations have led many scholars to hold that the authorship of the Nighaṇṭu has to be attributed to Yāska's predecessors. Professor R. D. Karmarkar, however, would go further and would not even concede that the Nighaṇṭu itself is the product of a single author. There are in the Nighaṇṭu various repetitions—viz., a word which occurs in the Naighaṇṭuka-kāṇḍa occurs in the Naigama-kāṇḍa as well, a word occurs in its derivative form even though its root is enumerated in the list, there being no semantic change noticeable. We might quote Professor Karmarkar's own words to make our point clear: "Nor does the Nighaṇṭu seem to be the work of only one author. Thus for instance, the author of the second section of the Fourth Adhyāya of the Nighaṇṭu is clearly different from the author of the first three Adhyāyas, as shown from the fact that the second section of the fourth Adhyāya gives certain words, the meanings of which have already been given in the first three Adhyāyas. Thus andhāḥ IV.2.6, varāhāḥ IV.
2.21, svasarāṇi IV.2.22, śaryaḥ IV.2.23, sinam IV.2.28, vayunam IV.2.48, are already explained in II.7.1, I.10.13, I.9.5, II.5.5, II.7.8, III.9.10 respectively. It is clear therefore that the author of the second section of the fourth Adhyāya was not aware of the first three Adhyāyas." Another reason for holding that the Nighaṇṭu is not the unified work of a single work is that there is a lack of homogeneity in the method of citation of words. As the same scholar has shown: "In the fourth Adhyāya of the Nighaṇṭu, there are eight pairs of consecutive words occurring in some Rgvedic passages, out of which (1) two occur in IV.1—dāvane akūparasya, IV.1.32, 33; and vidradhe drupade—IV.1.18, 89; (2) two occur in IV.2—bāhiṣṭhaḥ dūtaḥ, IV. 2.2, 3; and kūṭasya carṣaṇiḥ, IV.2.70-71; and (3) four occur in IV. 3 anavāyaṁ kimīdine, IV.3.43-44; śruṣṭi purandhiḥ, IV.3.50-51; canaḥ pacatā IV.3.64-65; sadānve śirimbiṭhaḥ, IV.3.119-120; In the case of the first section, the exact words occurring in the passage are taken, though the order is changed in the case of dāvane akūparasya. In the case of the second section bāhiṣṭho dūto in the passage has been reduced to its original bāhiṣṭhaḥ and dūtaḥ. But in the case of the third section, while anavāyaṁ kimīdine and canaḥ pacatā are taken unchanged, śruṣṭi purandhiḥ and sadānve śirimbiṭhaḥ are substi-
tuted for *purandhim* and *śirimbiṭhasya* of the original passage. If one can keep in tact *dāvane akūpārasya* in IV.1, one fails to understand why *śirimbiṭhasya* should lose its genitive or *purandhim* its accusative. It is clear therefore that the third section must not have been produced by the author of the first section of the fourth Adhyāya."

Durga too was aware of this repetition in the *Nighaṇṭu* and in some cases tried to justify the recurrence of certain vocables with somewhat strained arguments. For example, in commenting on Nir. V.1 in which *andhaḥ* (*Ngh. II.7*) is explained, Durga remarks: "Though this word is read as a synonym of *anna* in *Nighaṇṭu* II.7, still it is read here (*Ngh. IV.2.6*) on account of the variety of meanings it can yield." A similar observation is made by him under Nir. V.5.⁹

Professor Bhagavaddatta however has tried to establish, contrary to the opinion of Durga, that the authors of the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Nirukta* are numerically identical.¹⁰ In support of his theory, he cites the views of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī—the great Vedāntic teacher¹¹, and Dayānanda Sarasvatī, who held both the works viz. the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Nirukta*, to be the handiwork of the self-same Yāska. Professor Bhagavaddatta states that the basis of Durga's
theory concerning the difference in authorship of these two works is feeble. Durga's contention might have some force had both the words—dāvane and akūpārasya occurred in the Ṛk-verse cited by Yāska alone and nowhere else. But this is not the case. It is true that akūpārasya is met with only once in the RV.—viz. in the verse cited in the Nirukta, but the other word is very frequent. So there can be no point in the argument that when Yāska read the two words in the Nirukta, he had the Ṛk-verse V.39.2 in view. Yāska could have as well cited any of the numerous verses in which the word dāvane is found to occur. But he has cited only the above verse in view of the fact that this single verse would simultaneously serve as an illustration of the use of both the words. Thus the change in the order cannot point to the numerical difference of the authors, as Durga would have it.\footnote{12}

Durga, it seems, was led to uphold this mistaken view on the basis of a statement of Yāska himself in Nir. I.20, as the same Professor endeavours to show. The statement runs as:

“Upaḍēśāya glāyanto'vare bilmagrahaṇāya imam grantham samāmnāsiṣur vedaṃ ca vedāṅgāni ca.”

Durga held "this work" (imam grantham) to refer to the the extant Nighantū\footnote{13}, and this statement of Yāska, which prima facie alludes to the seers of
old as the compilers of the text of the \textit{Nigha\=ntu}, moulded Durga's view and was at the root of his confusion. But Yāska, by the expression \textit{imam\= grantham}, only meant "works of this genre", referring in general to the \textit{Nigha\=ntu} works that preceded him. That there were a good many \textit{Nigha\=ntu} works besides the present one has become plain from Durga's owo observations already cited in the notes, and it would be made more clear when we come to consider the evidences embedded in the text of the \textit{Nirukta} itself, which leave no doubt as to the conjecture that Yāska's \textit{Nigha\=ntu} was compiled after the model of other \textit{Nigha\=ntu} works. Besides, Yāska's own statement sets at rest all speculation regarding the authorship of the \textit{Nigha\=ntu}. In Nir. VII.13, Yāska states:

"\textit{athāto'bhidhanaih samyujya hāviś condyati—}
indrāya \textit{vṛtraghne / indrāya vṛtrature / indrāyāṁhomuce iti / tānyapyeke samāmananti / bhūyāṁsi tu samāmnānāt / yat tu samvijñānabhūtaṁ syāt prādhānyastuti tat samāmane / athota karmabhīr ṛṣir devatāḥ stauti—vṛtraḥ, \textit{purandaraḥ—iti / tānyapyeke samāmananti / bhūyāṁsi tu sāmāmnānāt}."14

Thus, in this passage, it is explicitly stated that some \textit{Niruktas} read in the \textit{Daivata-kāṇḍa}, besides the conventional names of the gods, also epithets that are usually applied to them. For example, besides \textit{Indra}, which is the
most widely known appellation of the chief deity of the atmospheric region, they compiled also such terms as vrtrahā, purandaraḥ etc., which are epithets of Indra. But such a procedure is not approved by Yāska. This would only swell the list. And so Yāska himself has included in the list of names of the deities such appellations alone as are conventional (samvijñānabhūtām)¹⁵ and by which they are addressed when an oblation is offered to them. This confession on the part of Yāska should leave not even the slightest trace of doubt as to the authorship of the Nighaṇṭu.

We might now sum up the conclusions arrived at in course of our discussion regarding the character and authorship of the Nighaṇṭu. (i) Firstly, the Nighaṇṭu, which is the designation under which the present compilation passes, is only a misnomer. As Professor Sköld has shown, Nighaṇṭu is only the name of the first kāṇḍa, in which is read synonymous vocables,¹⁶ but later on it was applied to the last two sections as well by the process known as pars pro toto. (ii) Secondly, when Yāska speaks—“tam imaṁ samāmnāyaṁ nighaṇṭava ityācākṣate”, “tad aikapadikam ityācākṣate”, or “daivatam ityācākṣate”, he thereby refers to the convention of the older teachers of the Nairukta school.¹⁷ (iii) Thirdly, Yaska’s own statement proves
that the *Nighantu* was his own compilation. (iv) Fourthly, there were other *Nighantu* works too that preceded him and quotations from which occur in Yāska's *Nirukta*. (v) Fifthly, the repetitions of certain vocables in the extant *Nighantu* cannot prove the thesis of multiple authorship as it is done with a definite object in view. (vi) And finally, every *Nighantu* work,—which is a generic appellation, previous to Yāska's own text, consisted of three *kāṇḍas* or sections—viz. *Naighantuca, Aikapadika* or *Naigama*, and *Daivata*, and Yāska was only following the traditional division instead of improvising new titles for his own work.

**Notes**


2. “samāmnāyaḥ samāmnātaḥ / sa vyākhyaṭavyaḥ / tam imaṃ samāmnāyaṃ nighaṃṭava ityācakṣate”


6. etasmin mantre akūpārasya dāvane ityayam anayoḥ padayor anukramaḥ / samāmnāye punaḥ ‘dāvane, akūpārasya’—iti mantrapāṭhavyatikramena anukra-


10. Note on the contrary Dr. Siddheswar Varma’s view, that the seer Kāyapa was the author of the Nighaṇṭu work on which Yāska wrote his Bhāṣya styled Nirukta. He has cited the following verses from the Mahābhārata: Mokṣadharmaparvan in support of his thesis:

“vrṣo hi bhagavān dharmaḥ khyāto lokeṣu bhārata / nighaṇṭukapadākhyāne viddhi māṁ vrṣam uttamam / kapir varāhaḥ śreṣṭhaḥ ca
dharmaḥ ca vṛṣa ucyate/tasmād vṛṣākapim prāha kaśyapo māṁ prajāpatiḥ //"... Yāska too is mentioned in the same place as the author of the Nirukta: "Yāske māṁ rṣir avyagro naikayajñēsu gītavān / śīpīviṣṭa iti hyasmāt guhyanāmadharo hyaham //... stutvā māṁ śīpīviṣṭetī Yāska rṣir udāradhīḥ / matprasadād adho naṣṭaṁ niruktam adhijagmivān /"


11. evaṁ nighaṇṭvādayo'pi vaidika-dravya-devatāmaka-padārtha-paryāyaśabdātmakā niruktāntarbhūtā eva / tatrāpi nighaṇṭusamjñakaḥ pañcādhyāyātmakā grantho bhagavata Yāskenaiva kṛtah // —Madhusūdana Sarasvati's gloss on the Mahimnastotra, verse 7. Madhusūdana's view is also corroborated by the statement of Veṅkaṭamādhava, a commentator of the Rk-Samhita, who in his gloss on RV. VII.87.4 observes: tatra ekaviśhatar nāmāni kaścita gaur bibhartiti prthivīṁ āha / tasya hi Yāska-paṭhītāni ekaviṃsatā nāmāni /

12. It is to be noted in this connection that Kautsavya in his Niruktanighanṭu (Atharva-Pariśṭiṣa) reads akūpyārasya alone and independently of dāvane which is not found there.


14. "Moreover, one offers oblation to the gods, having announced (lit. joined together) them with their characteristic appellations, as to Indra, the destroyer of Vṛtra, (to Indra, who excels Vṛtra), to Indra, the deliverer from distress, and so on. Some make a list of these also, but they are too numerous to be collected together in a list. I
enlist that appellation only which has become conventional epithet and with reference to which chief praise is addressed to the deity. Moreover, a seer praises deities with regard to their activities, as (Indra), the Vṛtra-slayer, or the city-destroyer, and so on. Some make a list of these also, but they are too numerous to be collected together in a list."—Dr. Laksman Sarup's Translation.

15. For a detailed discussion of the exact meaning of the terms sanvijñāta and sanvijñānahēta one should refer to the late Professor Gune’s article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLV., p.158, where he explains at great length the passage: “tad yatra svarasamkārau samarthau prādesikanavikāreṇa anvitaḥ svātām sanvijñātāṇi tāni—yathā gaurāvah pursuḥ hastiti”—Nir. 1.12. We should note that the term vijnāna without the prefix sam is met with thrice in Kātyāyana’s Vārttikas under Pāṇini’s Sūtras V.1.59, V.2.59, and VII.1.2 respectively compounded with prātipadika, and has the same sense as sanvijñāna—viz. a conventional name. Compare: “anārambho vā prātipadikavijñānāt yathā sahasrādiṣu”—Vārtika under V.1.59, Note also the gloss of Patañjali thereon: “anārambho vā punar vimśatādīnām nyāyyah / kathāṃ sidhyati? prātipadikavijñānāt / kathāṃ prātipadikavijñānam? vimśatādayo’vyutpannāni prātipadikāni / yathā sahasrādiṣu / tad yathā sahasrādiṣu / na cānugamaḥ kriyate, bhavati cābhidhānam”.

16. According to Sāyaṇa the term Nighanṭu refers to a collection of synonymous vocables, while Hemacandra explains Nighanṭu simply as ‘a collection of vocables’ (not necessarily synonymous). Comp:

17. (a) tad aikapadikam ityanena nāmnā *anye’pi ācāryāḥ* ācakṣate / nirūḍhā hiyam asmin prakaraṇe saṁjñā-ityabhīprāyaḥ—Durga on *Nir.* IV.1. (b) yāni nāmāni prādhānyastutūnāṁ agnyā- dināṁ devapatnyantānāṁ tad daivatāṁ prakaraṇam ityevam ācāryāḥ ācakṣate / nirūḍhā hiyam etasmin prakaraṇe saṁjñā ityabhīprāyaḥ—Durga on *Nir.* VII.1.
IV. EVIDENCES OF LOST NIGHANTAUS IN
YASKA'S NIRUKTA & OTHER VEDIC
EXEGETICAL WORKS

We have already stated in the preceding section that there were other Nirukta works besides the present Nirukta by Yaska and that every Nairukta author had an independent Nighanta text prefixed to his work which was based on the former. In compiling the vocables of the Nighanta, the authors were guided by their own discretion, and as such the number of vocables embodied in the different Nighantaus varied as a matter of course. Yaska in his Nirukta cites a good many vocables that are not embodied in the Nighanta that constitutes the basis of his Bhasya. That these vocables are taken from the lost Nighantaus is testified by the manner of citing them. Whenever Yaska cites a Nighanta word in his commentary he tags on to it terms like -nāman or -karman if the word be a substantive or a verbal form respectively. The following instances would make our point clear:—

(i) vavrir iti rūpanāma (Nir. II. 9)—vavri occurs in Ngh. III.7.

(ii) apna iti rūpanāma (Nir. III. 7)—vide Ngh. III. 7.
(iii) *brbükam ityudakanāma*—(*Nir* II. 22)—*vide Ngh. I. 22.*

(iv) *maṅhater dānakarmanāḥ* (*Nir.* I. 7)—*vide Ngh. III. 20.*

(v) *dāṅsater...dānakarmanāḥ* (*Nir* I. 7)—*vide Ngh. III. 20.*

But the following vocables which Yāska records in just the same way are not met with in the extant *Nighaṇṭu* :

(i) *matsara iti lobhanāma*—*Nir.* II. 5.

(ii) *vir iti šakunināma*—*Nir.* II. 6.

(iii) *prathama iti mukhyanāma*—*Nir.* II. 22.

(iv) *suḥ iti prāṇanāma*—*Nir.* III. 8.

(v) *svasti iti avināśanāma*—*Nir.* III. 21.

(vi) *rapo ripram iti pāpanāmanī*—*Nir.* IV. 21.

(vii) *śvātram iti kṣipranāma*—*Nir.* V. 3.

(viii) *śamba iti vajranāma*—*Nir.* V. 24.

(ix) *tura iti yamanāma*—*Nir.* XII. 14.

(x) *dakṣateḥ samardhayatikarmanāḥ*—*Nir.* I. 7.

(xi) *dakṣater utsāhakarmanāḥ*—*Nir.* I. 7.

(xii) *hrādateḥ šabdakarmanāḥ*—*Nir.* I. 9.


(xiv) *dadāter dhārayatikarmanāḥ*—*Nir.* II. 2.

(xv) *ksiyater nivāsakarmanāḥ*—*Nir.* II. 6.

(xvi) *braviteḥ šabdakarmanāḥ*—*Nir.* II. 22.

Not that Yāska’s Nirukta alone points to the existence of lost *Nighaṇṭus*. Evidences from other sources too prove the same thesis. The following vocables are not to be found in the
extant Nighaṇṭu in the sense which has been allotted to them by Uvaṭa, the commentator of the Yajurveda:

(i) eha iti aparādhanaṁ—IV. 29.
(ii) repa iti pāpanaṁ—V. 3.
(iii) sṛka iti āyudhānaṁ—XVI. 61.
(iv) gṛṇir iti dīptiṁaṁ—X. 10.

Similarly Bhaṭṭabhāskara in his Bhāṣya on the Taittiriya-Samhitā records new vocables that are not found in Yāska's Nighaṇṭu. Compare:

(ii) om, svāhā, svadhā, baṣat, nama iti pāṇca brhamano nāmāni.
(iii) matir iti stutiṁaṁ.
(iv) gartam iti ratnaṁaṁ.
(v) lekatir darśanakarmā.

If all the evidences strewn over the various Vedic works be collected together, we would be able to form an estimate as to the extent of the Nighaṇṭu literature that preceded Yāska and which formed the materials of Yāska's Nighaṇṭu, the only work of its kind now available to us.
V. THE BASIS OF THE NIRUKTA

We might now advert to another important topic. We know that the study of the Vedas along with the six ancillary sciences—viz. Phonetics (śikṣā), Ritual Codes (kalpa), Grammar (vyākaraṇa), Etymology (nirukta), Metre (chandas), and Astronomy (jyotiṣām ayanam), is laid down as a compulsory duty of every twice-born in the Brāhmanic injunction: Brāhmaṇena niṣkāraṇaṃ śaḍāṅgo vedaḥ dhṛṣṭo dhyaḥpayitavyaśca. Kumārila in his Tantravārttika under Jaimini-Sūtra 1.3.24: prayogotpattīyaśāstravāt śabdeṣu na vyavasthā syāt has a long discourse on the purport of the term śaḍāṅga as qualifying veda in the above quoted injunction. In course of the discussion he has quoted the views of the opponents who try to show the non-validity of the injunction on the ground that it makes no sense. The Nirukta of Yāska, the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini,—to name only the proto-types of two important ancillary sciences, are only the works of men who came at a much later period, while the Vedas are eternal. And it becomes prima facie implausible that the eternal and beginningless Veda should contain within its body reference to the auxiliary branches which are the handiworks of men and as such have a definite beginning. So the six
aṅgas referred to in the injunction do not concern any extraneous treatises not organically related to the Vedas—viz. man-made treatises. The Veda itself contains within its lore the germs of the above sciences and it is to them only that the injunction refers.\(^1\) It is only too often that instances of etymologizing are met with in the Brāhmaṇa texts.

From this dissertation it is evident that there was a school of opinion which regarded the Brāhmaṇa literature as the source of the science of etymology or Nirukta and for the matter of that of all other sciences. The individual treatises, as of Yāska, are only based on the Brāhmaṇas. There is no denying the fact that the method of etymologizing as followed in the Nirukta was largely inspired by the derivations in the Brāhmaṇa works, and if we can pool all the etymological evidences scattered over in the extant Brāhmaṇa works, notwithstanding the enormous loss of Brāhmaṇa literature, we would be able to grasp the extent in which pre-Yāska Etymologists (Nairuktas) like Śākapūṇi, Aupamanyava etc., and even Yāska himself, were indebted to these works.\(^2\) Yāska in his Nirukta frequently cites Brāhmaṇa passages in support of his etymologies and indicates their sources by stating iti vijñāyate or iti hi Brāhmaṇam. Professor Gune in his article Brāhmaṇa-quotations in Nirukta
published in the *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume* (pp. 43-45) had traced a good many citations in the *Nirukta* to their respective sources.

Under *Nir. 1.14* the contention is raised against the method of etymologizing as adopted by Śākaṭāyana, the reputed grammarian who split up a single word into its constituent syllables and derived each of them from different roots. This, the opponents argue, is fantastic and proceeding too far. In justifying Śākaṭāyana’s principle Durga cites a *Brāhmaṇa* passage, in which a word is derived from more than one root and as such lends support to the procedure followed by Śākaṭāyana. For example, in *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* XIV. 7.4.1 the trisyllabic word *ḥṛdaya* is derived from three different roots —*viz.* *ḥṛ* from the root *vṛhṛ*, *da* from *vṛdā* and *ya* from *vṛi*. So Śākaṭāyana cannot be blamed when he is following the *Brāhmaṇas* that constitute the greatest authority in such matters.

**Notes**

2. The present writer is engaged in collecting the instances of etymology as found in *Brāhmaṇa* Literature.

3. athāpi padebhyaḥ padetarārdhān sañcaskāra—Nir. II.

VI. THE NIRMUKTA—ITS RECEPTIONS.

Professor Laksman Sarup, in the introduction to his edition of the Nirmukta, has made it sufficiently clear that the Nirmukta text has undergone much interpolation and that two distinct recensions are discernible amidst the extant texts of the Nirmukta—the one longer and the other shorter, the latter being the basis of Durga's commentary. These two distinct versions can be traced even to Saunaka's Brhaddevatā. As Professor Sköld states: "Two of the passages quoted (viz. of the Nirmukta) deserve to be specially mentioned, viz. N. 6, 5—BD. 6, 183; N. 7, 10—BD. 2, 4—5. In the former case the Brhaddevatā follows the longer recension of the Nirmukta, in the latter case the shorter one."1 Apart from the question of relation between these two distinct recensions of the Nirmukta text, there is still another important problem which deserves to be carefully investigated. It is whether the extant Nirmukta is the genuine Nirmukta of Yāska. The topic gathers importance in view of the fact that certain views which are attributed to Yāska by Saunaka in his Brhaddevatā and in the anonymous Vārarucaniruktasamuccaya2 cannot be traced in the extant Nirmukta, and what more in some
places they are at variance with the opinions expressed in the extant Nirukta. Though Professor Sköld has already discussed the matter at some length, the materials of the Vārarucaniruktasamuccaya had been left unutilised by him inasmuch as this work was not published till then. So I think it would be no mere repetition if we deal with the topic afresh with all its bearing on the history of the Nirukta text. We have already referred to the criticism of Śaunaka directed against Yāska for his being not in conformity with the teachings of the author of the Pada Text. We would not, therefore, revert to that topic and would cite only those passages in the Bhaddevatā in which Yāska is referred to by name and discuss whether the opinion ascribed to him can really be traced in the extant Nirukta.

I. In Bhaddevatā I. 23ff. Śaunaka discusses the origin of names:

*tat khalvāhuḥ katibhyas tu karmaśhyo nāma jāyate | sattvānām vaidikānām vā yadvānyad iha kimcana || navabhya iti Nairuktāḥ purāṇāḥ kovayaśca ye | Madhūkaraś Śvetaketuś ca Gālavaś caiva manyate || nivāsāt karmaṇo rūpāt maṅgalād vāca āśīṣah | yadrechayopavasanaṭ tathāmasyāyaśca yat || caturbhya iti tatāhur Yāska- Gārgya-Rathitarāḥ | āśīṣo’thārthavairūpyāt vācaḥ karmaṇa eva ca ||.

^3
Thus Yāska, along with Gārgya and Rathūtara (i.e. Śākapūṇi), holds that names originate in four distinct ways as against the Nairuktas, who recognise nine different ways of the origin of Vedic and secular names. But in the present Nirukta there is no definite statement that can testify to this view of Yāska as referred to in the Brhaddevatā. We might, however, gather from the Nirukta that Yaska was inclined to hold that names usually originate from “action” (karman), the last of the four sources of the origin of names attributed in the Brhaddevatā verse to Yāska, Gārgya and Śākapūṇi. For example, in Nir. I.13. we meet with the form kārmanāmika derived from karmanāma meaning “a name arising out of action”. The Nirukta passage referred to above reads as follows:—

“athāpi ya eśāṃ nyāyavān kārmanāmikāḥ saṃskā-rah, yathā cāpi pratītārthāni syuḥ, tathā anvāca-
kṣirān / puruṣam puriṣaya ityācaksirān, aṣṭā
tyāsvam, tardanam iti tṛṇam |.”

Again, in Nir. V. 22 we meet with the expression āsīṁnāmakaḥ, which testifies to the view that Yāska also held that āsiḥ or “prayer” is one of the factors that give rise to various appellations—a view, which, as we have seen, is attributed in the Brhaddevatā passage already cited to Yāska, Gārgya and Śākapūṇi. Yāska here shows the etymology of the word kitava (gambler):—
"kitavaḥ kim tavāstīti ṣabdaṇukṛtyaḥ | kṛtavān vā āśīrnāmakah."

Durga, commenting on this passage, states:—
"athavā kṛtavān ayām yathā syāt—iṁyevam asau āśāsyate suhṛdbhir anyaiḥ kitavaiḥ sa hi tasmāt evam āśāsanāt āśīrnimittanāmakah kitava evāsau babhūva."

Thus, we find that of the four different sources of names, which Śaunaka refers to as being Yāska’s view, we can with certainty trace only two in the extant Nirukta, the other two sources being not at all recorded in it.

II. In Brhaddevatā II. 136-37, Śaunaka states:

"naḍīvat devatāvacca tatrācāryas tu Śaunakah | naḍīvat nigamāḥ ṣaṭ te saptamo netyuvāca ha / /
ambyekā ca dṛṣadvatyāṁ citra icca sarasvatī | iyam śuṣmebhīr ityetaṁ mene Yāskas tu saptamam / /"

Yāska states in his Nirukta that Sarasvatī is invoked in the Rgveda both as a stream and as a deity, but he does not enumerate the hymns in which Sarasvatī appears as a river of that name. Still it should be noted that the Nirukta cites the verse "iyam śuṣmebhīr" (RV. VI. 61.2) to illustrate that in the RV. Sarasvatī appears also as a river. From this it is difficult to infer whether Yāska viewed this verse as the seventh of that kind and regarded the other six verses
referred to in Śaunaka’s work as being addressed to the river and not to the goddess. But from the trend of Śaunaka’s assertion it seems plausible that Yāska did enumerate the hymns addressed to Sarasvatī—the river. If this hypothesis is accepted we must be led to the irresistible conclusion that Śaunaka was acquainted with some other version of the Nirukta text than what is presented before us, as it does not embody any such explicit enumeration.

III. In Brhaddevatā III. 100 Śaunaka refers to Yāska’s view that RV. I. 28. 1-4 have Indra and Ulūka as their deities. Kāttthakya, too, concurs with Yāska, while Bhāguri, contrary to the view of Yāska and Kāttthakya, thinks Indra to be the principal deity of the above four verses. Compare:

“parāś catasro yatreti Indrolūkhalaloyoh stutih / manyete Yāska-Kāttthakyan Indrasyeti tu Bhāg-urih /"”

But this view of Yāska is not traceable in the extant Nirukta, where however RV. I.28.5 is cited as a verse where Ulūkhalā (‘Mortar’) is invoked as the principal deity.⁶

IV. We now come to Brhaddevatā IV. 4-5ab where again Yāska is mentioned by name:

“athāgneye agim ityuttare yam pāñcaindranī pra tad aindavy-rgatra / yuvam tam indrā-parvatau
saha-stutau tvindram mena ıha Yāskaḥ pradhānam / / ṛksu stutah parvatavaddhi vajro dvivat stutāv aindram āhuḥ pradhānam /

Thus according to Yāska, as cited in the above Bṛhaddevatā extract, in RV. I. 132.6: yuvan tam indraparvata paroyudhā yo nāḥ īrtanyād apa tamamiddhatam / vajreṇa tamamiddhatam / though Indra and Parvata are together invoked7 in the expression Indrā-Parvatā in the dual, still Indra is predominant. But, strangely, neither the above verse is referred to anywhere in the Nirukta nor is there any reference as to the deity invoked therein.

V. The next instance where Yāska’s name occurs is to be found in Bṛhaddevatā, V. 8:

“vāyuḥ śunaḥ sūrya evātra siraḥ śunāsirau vāyu-sūryau vadanti / śunāsiram Yāska indram tu mene sūryendrau tu manyate Śākapūṇiḥ /

Here Śaunaka cites the views of different teachers on the meaning of the term śunāsirau—the dual form. Some explain śuna as vāyu and sira as ādītya, so that the compound śunāsirau refers to Sun and Wind. But, according to Yāska, if we accept the assertion of Śaunaka, śunāsīra (singular) means Indra alone, while Śākapūṇi explains śuna as Sūrya and sira as Indra. In the Nirukta (IX. 40) the first interpretation is recorded8, but there is no trace of the explanation which in the Bṛhaddevatā extract is
distinctly ascribed to Yāska. Professor Sköld remarks: "Śākapūṇi (not mentioned by the Nirukta in this connection) holds the dual to mean Sūrya and Indra, a view unanimously professed by the Vedic commentators." The latter part of his statement which has been shown by us in italics is not true, for the view recorded in the first half of the Brhaddevatā verse cited above, as also in the extant Nirukta, is held by other authors as well. The author of the Kāśikā on Panini’s Astadhyayī explains sunāśīrau as sunaḥ vāyuḥ/sīra ādityah—a view which is identical with that recorded in the Nirukta.9 It is interesting to note that the interpretation which is ascribed to Yāska in the Brhaddevatā, though it is not to be traced in the extant Nirukta, finds support in the statement of Āśvalāyana, who is quoted by Haradatta, the author of the Padamañjarī, a commentary on the Kāśikā of Vāmana-Jayāditya.10

VI. In Brhaddevatā V. 40 again Yāska is mentioned:—

"...pra suṣṭutir iti tvṛci (RV. V. 42. 14) / Saunakādibhir ācāryair devatā bahudheritā / idaspatim Śākapūṇih par janāyāgrā tu Gālavaḥ / / Yāsakas tu pūsanām mene stutam indram tu / Šaunakah / vaisvānaram Bhāguris tu... / /"

Here the author of the Brhaddevatā records the divergent views of Vedic teachers regarding the
deity invoked in RV. V. 42. 14. According to Yāska the verse is addressed to Pūṣan, but in the extant Nirukta the verse referred to is not noticed, so that we are not able to verify the statement of the Brhaddevatā.

VII. In Brhaddevatā VI. 87, we again come across Yāska’s name without the view ascribed to him being traceable to the extant Nirukta. The verse concerned is:—

“nipātam āha devānām dātā ma iti (RV. VIII. 65.10) Bhāgurīḥ | rcaṁ Yāskas tṛcāṁ tvetāṁ manyate vaisvadevatam / /”

Yāska’s Nirukta does not contain the triplet alluded to in the above verse.

VIII. Śaunaka in Brhaddevatā VI. 107 refers to the views of Yāska and Bhāguri according to whom the RV. hymn VIII. 91 embodies an ancient legend about Apālā, the female seer of the RV., while in Śaunaka’s opinion that hymn and the following two hymns (viz. RV. VIII. 92-23) as well glorify Indra. But it is strange that such a major point should not at all be touched upon in the Nirukta. It would be presuming too much if we hold that Śaunaka was misquoting. Most probably an earlier version of the Nirukta, to which Śaunaka had access, did contain some reference to the hymn in question. The verse referred to above runs as follows:
\[ \text{\textquote{\textsc{\textit{itihāsam idam sūktam āhatur Yāska-Bhāgūri}}
\textit{kanyeti Šaunakas tvainḍram pāntam ityuttare}} ca ye} / /
\]

It is interesting to note that Kātyāyana in his Sarvānukramaṇi records both these views without however alluding to the names of the respective teachers.

IX. Again, in Bṛhaddevatā VII. 38 Yāska is referred:

\[ \text{\textquote{\textit{sāvitrām eke manyante maho agne stavam param}}
\textit{ācāryah Šaunako Yāska Gālavā cottarām ṛcām}} / /
\]

In this verse Šaunaka states that according to Yāska and others Agni is invoked in RV. X.36.14. But this RV. verse is not cited in the Nirukta.

X. In Bṛhaddevatā VII.69 Šaunaka quotes the conflicting views of Vedic teachers regarding the meaning of the term pāṇca-janāh which is frequently met with in the RV. Yāska’s view is also quoted, which tallies with the assertion in the Nirukta, the only point of discrepancy being that the view of Aupamanyava as recorded in the Nirukta is ascribed to Śākaṭāyana in Šaunka’s work.

XI. In Bṛhaddevatā VII.92-93, Šaunaka cites the opinion of Yāska who thinks that the deity invoked in the last foot of the couplet RV. X.59.5-6(i.e. RV. X.59.6d) is Anumati, while others opine that in these two verses the
deity praised is Asunīti. Yāska does not comment on RV. X.59.6 though the preceding verse is explained by him in Nir. X.39 as one addressed to Asunīti.¹¹

XII. Śaunaka states that Yāska held the RV. hymn X.95 beginning with haye jāye to be a dialogue between Purūravas and Īrvasī. But though Yāska quotes verses from this hymn in his Nirukta, he nowhere mentions his view as to the character of the hymn. Śaunaka’s verses are:

“āhvānam prati cākhyānam itaretarayor idam/
 samvādam manyate Yāska itihāsam tu Śaunakah /
haya iti......” —Bṛhaddevatā, VII.153-54.

Professor Macdonell notes in his comments on these verses: “This view cannot be gathered from Nirukta V.13; X.46-47; XI.36.”

XIII. In Bṛhaddevatā VIII.65 Śaunaka asserts that Yāska considers Indra and Agni to be addressed in the hymn X.161. But in the Nirukta the hymn is nowhere cited. Compare:

“aindrāgnaṃ manyate Yāska eke lingoktadevatām”

—BD. VIII.65.

In the foregoing pages we have discussed the views which have been attributed to Yāska by Saunaka, and have shown that the extant Nirukta does not contain any statements that might correspond to these views. As Professor
Sköld has summed up: "What is thus taught about Yāska in the Bṛhaddevatā? In two cases (BD. I.126 and V.8) Yāska is opposed to the Nirukta or the Nairuktāḥ. In seven cases the doctrines attributed to Yāska are more or less traceable to the Nirukta, though three out of these cases are somewhat dubious (BD. II.111 sqq.; II.132 dubious; II.74b sqq.; III.112b B text; IV.18 B text, dubious; VII.7; VIII.11 dubious). In ten cases doctrines attributed to Yāska by the Bṛhaddevatā are not found in the Nirukta (BD. III.100; IV.4b; V.40; VI.87a; VI.107; VII.38; VII.68sqq; VII.93; VII.153; VIII.65a)."  

We must now discuss the nature of quotations from the Nirukta contained in the Vārarucaniruktasamuccaya.

(i) The author commenting on RV. V.39.6: "mitrasya carṣaṇīdṛtrah iti remarks: "mitro madhyamasthānadevatāsu paṭhitatvāt madhyamasthānapatvena niruktaḥ | dyaṣṭhāno'pi mitro'sti | sa iha nirucyate." Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, the editor of the work, notes that nowhere in the Nirukta Mitra is stated to be a deity belonging to the highest region. But this statement seems to have been due to an oversight on his part. For, though Mitra has been read in the Nighaṇṭu (V.4) as an atmospheric deity and not as a celestial one, still in the Nirukta we have explicit
assertions of Yāska himself that Mitra might be invoked as a deity of the celestial region. As he states in Nirukta II.13:

"evam anyāsām api devatānām ādityapraavādāḥ stutayo bhavanti | tad yathaitam mitrasya varuṇasyā'ryamno daksasya bhagasyā'mśasya—iti |
athāpi mitrāvaruṇayoḥ."

(ii) On the same verse the author states:—

"prakaraṇasāmarthyāt iha tejomayaḥ maṇḍalam ucyate | tathā ca-prakaraṇaśa eva viniyoktyā iti
Bhāsyakāravacanam."

Dr. C. Kunhan Raja comments on this statement: "Usually in the literature of Vedic interpretation, Bhāṣya means the work of Yāska beginning with samāmnāyah samamnātah. And Bhāṣyakāra is Yāska. But this passage is not found in the Nirukta." Dr. Raja has here perpetuated the mistake committed by Dr L. Sarup, the editor of the Nirukta with Skanda-svāmin’s commentary. For, the statement underlined above occurs with slight variations in Skanda’s commentary on Nirukta VI.22:

"āśvamedhika iti prakaraṇam anusārayati (anus-mārayati ?) | prakaraṇam api arthābhivyaktau alam ityabhiprāyah | tathā ca śāstrāntare vakṣyati‘prakaraṇaśa eva mantrā nirvaktavyā’—iti."

Professor Sarup notes in a footnote that the quotation underlined is not met with in the Nirukta or elsewhere. As he observes:
“anupalabdham idam.” The learned Professor was probably misled by the erroneous reading śāstrāntare, which should be śāstrānte. Had he cared to verify the authenticity of the citation he would have certainly been able to trace it to Nir. XIII.12 where the statement occurs verbatim:—

“na tu prthaktvena mantrā nirvaktavyāḥ / prakaraṇaśa eva tu nirvaktavyāḥ.”

The citation of the author of the Vāraruca-niruk-tasamuccaya has to be slightly emended so as to be in conformity with the actual statement of Yāśka-viz. tathā ca prakaraṇaśa eva nirvaktavyā iti Bhāsyakāravacanam.

(iii) On p.30 of the above work the author states:

“kṛṣṇena iti daśatayīsu pāthah / tathā sati kṛṣṇam kṛṣater nāsārthasya / tama-āder nāsayītā.”

This derivation of kṛṣṇa is not met with in the Nirukta, where it is explained as—“kṛṣṇam kṛṣyateḥ / nikṛṣto varṇah.” Most probably, the author is here quoting the view of some other Niruktakāra.

(iv) On p.32 again the author derives the term ātman :—“atfer dhātor ātma-sabdo niruktah”, “ātman has been derived from the root ād.” But by whom? Not by Yāśka. For in Nir.III.15, Yāśka notes the possible etymologies of the word in the following extract: “ātmā
atater vā, śāpter vā, api vā śāpta iva syat | yāvad-
vyāptibhūtah-iti.” But the derivation recorded
by the author of the above work is not to be
found there. Here, too, another Nirukta text
might have been the source of this derivation.13

(v) A very important case is to be found in
another statement of the Niruktasamuccaya :

“śūnaraḥ...padakāreṇa etat padam nāvagrhitam /
tathāpi bhāṣyakāravacanat padakāram anūdṛtya
etan niruktam.”

We fail to trace the word śūnaraḥ in the extant
Nirukta, and yet Bhāṣyakara in the above
extract certainly refers to Yāska as it has been
exemplified in other cases. This points to the
existence of a different version of Yāska's
Nirukta.

(vi) On p.67 the author cites another
statement of Yāska which too is not traceable to
the extant Nirukta :

“udakam api hiranyam ucyaite iti Bhāṣyakāra-
vacanāt.”

These evidences bearing upon the text of the
Nirukta can lead us to any of the following
alternative conclusions which have been noted
by Dr. Kunhan Raja: “It may be that there
was a larger recension of the Nirukta of Yāska
and these references may be from that recension.
Or it may be that the references are to other
Niruktas which were available to the author and
which are now lost to us. It may also be that the references are only to certain Vedic commentaries and not to Niruktas. Whatever be the position, the sources of these statements are not traceable now."

Notes

2. Edited by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja.
3. "As to that, indeed, they say: ‘from how many actions does a name arise, whether of Vedic beings or any other (name occurring) here?’ ‘From nine’, say the etymologists, and the ancient sages Madhūka, Śvetaketu, and Gālava think so too: (viz.) that which (comes) from abode, action, form, luck, speech, prayer, from accident, as well as addition and extraction. With regard to that (question,) Yāska, Gārgya, and Rathītara say, ‘from four: prayer, from the diversity of objects, from speech, and from action’ —Macdonell’s *Translation*.
4. Is it possible, as appears *prima facie* from the above citations, that Yāska was not a Nairukta teacher? Compare Sköld, *op. cit.*, on this question.
5. Compare: nādiyāt devatāvacca asyā nigamā bhavanti—Nirukta.
6. *See* Professor Macdonell’s note on this verse: “The Sarvānukramaṇi follows Bhāguri, as it makes no statement about these four stanzas (which means that Indra is the deity: *asya sūktasya anādeśa indro devatā, Saḍguruśiṣya.*)” —*loc. cit.*
7. We should here note that Parvata is invoked along with Indra. Compare Nirukta VII. 10, where he is mentioned along with many other deities who share common offerings with Indra: “athāsya sanstavikā devā agniḥ, soma, varuṇaḥ, pūṣa, bhṛṣpatir brahmaṇaspatiḥ, parvataḥ, kutoṣ, viṣṇur vāyuḥ.”

8. śunāśirāu / śuno vāyuḥ / śu eti antarikṣe / sīra ādityaḥ saranaṭ—loc. cit.


11. It is to be noted that Kātyāyana in his Sarvānu-kramaṇi does not refer to the view ascribed to Yāska in the Brhaddevatā, though the other view is recorded in the statement: “pra tārīti (RV. X. 59) daśarce castasro nirṇyaparanodanārtham je puṣ caturthyāṃ somaṃ ca stutavān mṛtyor apagamāya uttaraḥḥyāṃ devim asunītim…”


13. It is interesting to note that in Sureśvara’s Brhadāraṇyakabhaṣya vārttika, ātman is derived among others from the root y/ad also. Cp. “yaccāpnoti yadādatte yaccātti viṣayān iha / yācāsya santato bhāvas tena cātmeti giyate.”

VII. AUTHORS OF THE NAIRUKTA SCHOOL MENTIONED IN YĀSKA'S TEXT.

We have at the very outset referred to the fact that Yāska's is not the only Nirukta. Nay, if Durga's assertion is to be believed, there were fourteen Nairukta texts\(^1\) just as in the traditional view Grammatical Science has eight orthodox systems.\(^2\) We should now, in this section, try to collect as much information about Yāska's predecessors as would be permitted by the evidence of the Nirukta and other allied works. The names are arranged in alphabetical order.

I. ĀGRĀYĀṇA—He is quoted in the following cases:—

(i) karṇaḥ krṣntateḥ / nikṛttadvāro bhavati / rochater ity-Āgrāyaṇaḥ rocchantiva khe udagn-tām iti ha viṣṇāyate—Nir. 1.9.

(ii) nīsatyaus satyasya praṇetārau ity-Āgrāyaṇaḥ —Nir. VI, 13.

(iii) indra idaṃ karanat ity-Āgrāyaṇaḥ—Nir. X.8.

These three are the only references to Āgrāyaṇa in the extant Nirukta. The Brhaddevatā is totally silent about this author.

II. AUDUMBARĀYANA—This teacher is cited only once and in the very first section of the Nirukta:—
“indriyanityam vacanam ity-Audumbarāyaṇaḥ”
—Nir. I.1.

It is not possible to say with accuracy as to whether he was a Nairukta teacher or a philosopher of the Mīmāṃśa school.

III. AUPAMANYAVA—He is frequently cited by Yāska in the Nirukta. The cases of occurrence are being noted below :

(i) nighanta—“te nigantava eva santo nigamanāt nighantava ucyante - ity - Aupamanyavah”
—Nir.I.1

(ii) daṇḍaḥ—“damanāt ity-Aupamanyavah” —II.2.

(iii) paruse—“bhāsvati ity-Aupamanyavah”—Nir. II.6.

(iv) rsiḥ—“stomān dadarśa ity-Aupamanyavah”
—Nir.II.11

(v) pāncajanāḥ—“catvāro varṇāḥ - niśādaḥ pāncamaḥ ity-Aupamanyavah” —III.8.3

(vi) kutsaḥ—“kartā stomānām ity-Aupamanyavah”
—III.11.

(vii) kākah—“na śabdānukṛtir vidyate ity-Aupaman-
yavah” —III.

(viii) yajñāḥ—“bahukṛṣṇājina ity-Aupamanyavah” —III.19.

(ix) “śipivistō visñur iti visñor dve nāmanī bhavataḥ / kutsitārthiṣyaṃ pūrvam bhavati - ity-Aupamanyavah” —V.7.

(x) kāṇaḥ—“vikrāntadraśana ity-Aupamanyavah” —VI.30.
(xi) vikaṭaḥ—“vīkrāntagatiḥ ity-Aupamanyavaḥ” - VI.30.

(xii) Indraḥ—“idam darśanāt - ity-Aupamanyavaḥ” - X.8.

From these references it is not implausible to posit that Aupamanyava was a teacher of renown belonging to the Nairukta school. Probably he composed a separate Nighaṇṭu of his own, as it has been conjectured by Professor Bhagavaddatta on the strength of Nir. V.7, where it is explicitly stated that according to Aupamanyava Śīpivīṣṭa and Viṣṇu are the two appellations of the same deity, the first having pejorative significance. It is interesting to note that Aupamanyava was a radical etymologist and went even so far as to derive words which are commonly held to be onomatopoetic like kāka etc. from various obscure roots. Professor Bhagavaddatta notes that Dr. G. Oppert has recorded on p.510 of the second volume of his Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts a work entitled Nirukta by Upamanyu. It may be that future researches would bring into light the existence of such a work. The Caranaṭavyūha - a work on the Vedic schools also records a section of the Carakas (the Black Yajurveda sect) called “the Aupamanyavas”. It is possible that there might be some sort of connexion between this Black Yajurveda sect and the
author of the Nirukta as testified by Yāska's evidences.

IV. AURÑAVĀBHA—His name occurs in the following places:

(i) īravyah—ūrṇoteḥ / vṛṇoter ity-Aurṇavābhaḥ - II.26.


(iii) hotāram—hvātāram / juhoter hotā ity-Aurṇavābhaḥ - VII.1.

(iv) aśvinau—aśvair aśvinau ity-Aurṇavābhaḥ - XII.1.

(v) tridhā nidhatte padam—samārohaṇe viṣṇupade gayaśirasi - ity-Aurṇavābhaḥ - XII.19.

It appears from these references that Aurṇavābha had his own Nirukta where the etymologies (i) to (iv) were shown. The last citation points to the fact that Aurṇavābha also explained RV.I.22.17: "idam viṣṇur vicakrame". In the Brhaddevatā Aurṇavābha is referred to only once by Śaunaka:

"Aurṇavābh o dvyrce tasmin aśvinaumanyate stutau"

"According to Aurṇavābha Aśvins are the deities invoked in the two Rk. verses - viz. RV. X.85.18-19".

V. KĀTTHAKYA—All the references to Kāttthakya are contained in Chaps. VIII and IX of the Nirukta, where his view is cited regard-
ing the nature of the deities of the different Āprī hymns. There is no evidence however in the Nirukta that can testify to the view that Kāṭthakya was a Nairukta or etymologist. For, Yāska never cites him concerning the etymology of words. It would become plain from the citations below that Kāṭthakya was probably a great teacher versed in the sacrificial lore, for his interpretations that are actually referred to in the Nirukta are invariably in terms of rituals or ritualistic implements. Compare:

(i) idhmaḥ—yaśṛṇedha iti Kāṭthakyaḥ-
    Nir. VIII.5.

(ii) tanunāpāt—ājyam iti Kāṭthakyaḥ—VIII.5.

(iii) narāśaṃsah—yaśa iti Kāṭthakyaḥ—VIII.6.

(iv) dvāraḥ—yaśaṃ grhavāra iti Kāṭthakyaḥ-
     VIII.17.

(v) vanaspatih—yuṣpa iti Kāṭthakyaḥ—VIII.10.

(vi) devi jōṣṭrī—ṣasyaṃ ca samā ca iti
     Kāṭthakyaḥ—IX.41.

(vii) devi uṛjahuti—ṣasyaṃ ca samā ca iti
     Kāṭthakyaḥ—IX.42.

Kāṭthakya has been mentioned once in the Brhaddevatā along with Yāska. Cp. “parāś castro yatreti (RV. I.28.1-4) indro-lūkhalayostutiḥ /
manye te Yāska-Kāṭthakyau indrasyeti tu Bhāguriḥ / /”
-III.10. It is to be noted, as has been truly remarked by Professor Bhagavaddatta, that this verse too endorses the conjecture that
Kāthahkya was a Ritualist, for *ulūkhala* (‘mortar’) is a sacrificial implement.

VI. **KAUTSA**—Kautsa’s name is referred to by Yāska in *Nir.* I.15 in connection with the controversy as to whether Vedic *mantras* convey any meaning or not. Kautsa was an extremist and would not admit that Vedic *mantras* are significant. The arguments advanced by him are virtually the same as those put forth in Jaimini’s *Pūramīmāṃsā*, though Kautsa is not cited as the originator of that dispute in the latter work. Most probably Kautsa was a *Mimāṃsā* teacher and not an etymologist, for in no other place does Yāska cite his views.

VII. **KRAUŚṬUKI**—Krauśṭuki’s name is to be found only once in the *Nirukta* under VIII.2, where Yāska quotes his view in connexion with the interpretation of the term *dravīnodas*:

> “*tat ko dravīnodāḥ? Indra iti Krauśṭukiḥ*.”

Śaunaka also in his *Bṛhaddevatā* quotes Krauśṭuki in IV.137:

> “*soma-pradhānam etam tu Krauśṭukir manyate*”

> “*dvāś cit iti pañcarce somenendraḥ stutaḥ saha / /”*

> “Krauśṭuki regards this praise (viz. *RV.* IV. 28) to be chiefly addressed to Soma.”

There is a Paurānic tradition to the effect that Krauśṭuki was another name of the sage Bhāguri. The commentators of the *Saptaśatī*
too notices this tradition. So Krauṣṭuki-Bhāguri seems to have been the full name of Krauṣṭuki. But Yāska does not quote him as such, and though in Śaunaka’s Brhaddevatā Bhāguri is quoted, yet there is nothing to prove the identity of these two teachers.

VIII. GĀRGYA—Gārgya is cited three times in the Nirukta—

(i) uccāvacāḥ padārthā bhavanītī Gārgyāḥ-1.3. Gārgya holds against Śaṅkaṭāyana9 that prepositions (upasargas) like pra, parā etc. are significant and convey meanings independently of substantives and verbs.10

(ii) “tatra nāmāni ākhyātajāni iti Śaṅkaṭāyano nairuktasamayaś ca / na sarvāṇīti Gārgyo vaiyākara-ṇānāṃ caike.”—I.1211.

Yāska cites the objections which Gārgya advanced against Śaṅkaṭāyana’s theory of the radical origin of all substantives and then refutes them one by one.

(iii) “athāta upamāḥ / atat tatsadṛśam iti Gārgyāḥ / tad āṣāṃ karma.”

Gārgya, the celebrated author of the Pada-text of the Sāmaveda-Saṃhitā, is in the opinion of Professor Bhagavaddatta identical with the Nairukta teacher whom Yāska cites in the Nirukta. For, from the evidences gathered above we know that Gārgya thought the prepositions to be significant by themselves, and
the author of the *Pada*-text too must have entertained the same opinion inasmuch as in his *Padapāṭha* he throughout shows the prepositions as separate and independent words, while the author of the *Padapāṭha* of the Ṛk-Samhitā is not at all systematic in this respect. For example, Gārgya in his *Padapāṭha* shows viprāsaḥ as vi / prāsaḥ, sūnta as sū / nṛta, while both these words are left intact by Śākalya. Gārgya’s name occurs only once in Śaunaka’s *Bṛhaddevatā* in connexion with the origin of appellations:

“caturbhya iti tatrāhur Yāska-Gārgya-Rathītarāḥ / ābiso’thārthavairūpyād vācaḥ karmanā eva ca /”


Pāṇini in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* quotes Gārgya frequently. The sūtras in which he is recalled are: (i) “aḍ Gārgya-Gālavayoh” (VII. 3. 99); (ii) “oto Gārgyasya” (VIII. 3. 20); and (iii) “nodāta-svāritodayam a-Gārgya–Kāśyapa-Gālavānām” (VIII. 4. 97). In the *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa* I. Chap. 35, we read:—

“Bāṣkalistu Bharadvājas tisrah provāca samhitāḥ / trayas tasyābhavān chiṣyā mahātmāno guṇānvitāḥ / dhimāṁśca Tvāpanīpaṣ ca Pannāgāriṣca buddhimān / tritiyaś cārjavas te ca tapasa samśitavrataḥ / / vītarāgā mahātejāḥ samhitājñānapāragāḥ / / ityete bahucāḥ proktāḥ samhitā yaiḥ pravar-

*ttitāḥ* /”12
Here it is stated that Pannāgārika alias Gārgya was the disciple of Bāṣkali Bharadvāja.

IX. GĀLAVA—Gālava is referred to only once by Yāska under Nir. IV. 3. Here Yāska cites the divergent views of the different teachers like Śākapūṇi, Taitīki etc. concerning the meaning of the term sitāman, which according to Gālava means "omentum"—"sitimēnsato medastaḥ iti Galavah". Gālava is also quoted by Śaunaka in his Brhaddevata in four places:

(i) “tat khalvāhuḥ katibhyas tu karmabhyo
nāma jāyate /
sattvānāṁ vaidikānāṁ vā yad vānyad iha
kīncana /
navabhya iti nairuktāḥ purānāḥ kavayaś ca ye /
Madhūkaḥ Śvetaketuś ca Gālavaś caiva
manvate |—Brhaddevata, I. 24-25.

(ii) idaspatim Śākapūṇiḥ parjanyāgni tu
Gālavaḥ”—V. 30.

(iii) “pausnau preti pragāthau dvau manyate
Śākatāyanāḥ /
aindram evātha pūrvaṃ tu Gālavaḥ
pausnau uttaram /
”—VI. 43.

(iv) “sāvitram eke manyante maho agne stavam
param /
ācāryāḥ Śaunako Yāsko Gālavaś cottamām
rcam /
”
We are to note that in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali there are references to a Vedic school, probably of the *Sāmaveda*, called "the Gālavas", that might have originated after the name of the first teacher—Gālava, just as *Carakāḥ* was formed after Caraka alias Vaiśampāyana, the renowned preceptor of the Black Yajurveda school.¹⁶ For example, on *Vārttika* I7 under Pāṇini I. 1. 44: "ācāryadeśaśilane ca tadviśayatā", Patañjali comments: ācāryadeśaśilanena yad ucyate tasya tadviśayatā prāpnoti | "īko hrasvo'nyo Gālavasya" (P. VI. 3. 61), "prācām avṛddhāt phīn bahulam" (P. IV. 1. 160) iti Gālavā eva hrasvān prayuṅjīran prākṣu caiva hi phīn syāt." Some however interpret Gālavāḥ as referring to the followers of the grammatical system propounded by Gālava, but it is more natural to take this term to refer to the sect of Gālavas, just as allied terms like Sākalāḥ, Carakāḥ, Vāskalāḥ are taken to refer to the followers of a particular Vedic school. If this view is accepted, it becomes evident that Gālava was a very ancient teacher and the propounder of a distinct recension of the Sāmaveda. Gālava is also regarded as the author of the *Kramapātha* of the *Rgveda*. In the *Mahābhārata*, *Śāntiparvan*, Ch. 342: vv. 103-I04, we meet with the following information about the personality of Gālava:
“pañcālena kramaḥ prāptaḥ tasmāt bhūtāḥ sanātanaḥ /  
Bābhṛavyagotraḥ as babhau prathamaḥ krama-  
paragāḥ / /  
“Nārāyaṇād varāṃ labdhvā prāpya yogam  
anuttamam /  
kramaṃ prāṇīya śikṣāṃ ca prāṇayitvā sa Gālavaḥ / /”

Here we are also informed that the self-same Gālava was also the author of a work on Phonetics (śikṣā). That Gālava was the author of the Krama-text of the Rāk-Samhitā is also attested by a statement of the Rāk-Prātiṣakhya of Śaunaka :

“iti pra Bābhṛavya uvāca ca kramam”—Op. cit. XI 65.17

X. CARMAŚIRAS: this teacher is mentioned only once in Nir. III. 15: “vidhavā  
vidhātykā bhavati, vidhavanāt vā, vidhāvanāt va—iti  
Carmaśirāḥ”. In Śaunaka’s Byḥaddevatā his name is not to be found.

XI. TAIṬIKI—Yāska quotes twice Taiṭiki’s views in his Nirukta :

(i) śitāma—syāmato yakṛṭta iti Taiṭikiḥ—  
IV. 3.  
(ii) bīriṭam—Taiṭikir antarikṣam evam āha—  
V. 27.18

Śaunaka does not record any view of Taiṭiki.

XII. VĀRŚYĀYANI—Vārṣyāyaṇi is cited only once in the Nirukta in the first chapter in connection with possible modifications undergone by every being :
"ṣaḍ bhāvavikārā bhavanti—jāyate, asti, viparī- 
ṇamate, vardhate, apakṣyate, vināśyati iti / ato'nye 
bhāvavikārāḥ eteśām eva vikārā bhavanti iti ha 
smāha"—Nir. I. 2.

Patañjali in his Bhāṣya on P. I. 3. 1 quotes 
this passage verbatim except that he prefixes 
the honorific bhagavān before Vārṣyāyaṇi’s 
name, which shows that he was an ancient 
and much respected teacher.19

XIII. ŚĀTABALĀKṢA MAUDGALYA—He 
is cited in connection with the derivation of the 
term mṛtyu : "mṛtyur mārayatīti sataḥ / mṛtam 
cyāvavatīti vā Śatabalākṣo Maudgalyah"—Nir. XI. 
6. In the Bṛhaddevatā Maudgalya’s name is not 
found though Mudgala and Mudgala Bhārmyaśva 
are cited there :

"tasmāt sā devatā tatra sūryam eke pracaksate / 
Madgalaḥ Śākapūṇiḥ ca Ācāryaḥ Śākaṭāyānaḥ / |"

—VIII. 90

"Mahān Aindram pratnavatyām agnim vaiśvānaram 
stutam / 
manyate Śākapūnis tu Bhārmyaśvaḥ caiva 
Mudgalaḥ / /"—VI. 46.

XIV. SĀKAṬĀYANA—Śākaṭāyana, according 
to Yāska’s statement, was a grammarian.20 
As he states: "tatra nāmāni ākhyātajānīti Śākaṭāyano 
nairuktasamayaḥ ca"—I. 12. We have also noted 
above Śākaṭāyana’s view regarding the preposi- 
tions: "na nirbaddhā upasargā arthān nirāhur iti
Sākaṭāyanaḥ / nāmākhyaṭayostu karmopasaṃyogadyo-
takā bhavanti”—I. 3. That Śākaṭāyana was also the author of a Nirukta work is probable. For, in the Nirukta, in course of the dispute between Gārgya and Śākaṭāyana as to the radical origin of all vocables, it is stated:

“athānanvite’ṛthe aprādēśike vikāre padebhyaḥ
padetarārdhān saṃcaskāra Śākaṭāyānaḥ / eteḥ kāritaṃ
cā yakārādīṁ ca antakaraṇam, asteḥ suddham ca
sakārādīṁ ca”—I. 13.21

From this it becomes evident that Śākaṭāyana had composed an etymological treatise in which he showed the derivation of the term satya in the way recorded in the above extract. We may note in this connection that Śākaṭāyana in his list enumerated three more prepositions—accha, śrat, and antar, besides those commonly recognised as such-viz. pra, parā etc. Śaunaka in his Brhaddevatā II.95 has recorded this parti-
cular view of Śākaṭāyana:

“accha śrad antar ityetān nipātān Śākaṭāyanaḥ /
upasargān kriyāyogān mene te tu trayo’dhikāḥ /”
Pāṇini also did virtually recognise accha and antar as upasargas in terming them as gatis in the sūtras “accha gatyarthavadesaḥ”-I.4.69 and “antar aparigrahe”-I.4.65 respectively. Kātyāyana in his Vārttika under the latter extends the field of the indeclinable antar where it undergoes the operations that are enjoined in connection with
upasargas: “antahabdasyān-vidhi-ṇatvesūpasam-
khyanam.”22 Though Pāṇini had nowhere in his
system recognised śrat as a preposition,23
Kātyāyana in his Vārttika 5 under P.I.4.59
teaches the indeclinable śrat as an upasarga :
“śracchabdasypasamkhyānam”.

Śakaṭāyana has been frequently quoted by
Śaunaka in his Brhaddevatā. We cite below the
verses in which he has been mentioned by
name.

(i) āha caivāṣya dvau stomau āśrayau
Śakaṭāyanaḥ /
yās ca paṃcadaśo nāṁnā samkhyayā

Yāska in his Nirukta allocates the paṃcadaśa-
stoma to Indra, though he does not refer to
Śakaṭāyana’s view: “athaitāṁindra-bhaktiṇi......
paṃcadaśa-stomah”—VII. 10. In the following
section the triṇava-stoma too is referred to the
gods of the atmospheric region of which
Indra is the representative deity: “etesveva
sthanavyuḥsu ṛtu-cchandah-stoma-prṣṭhaya-bhaktiśeṣān
anukalpayita / ....hemantah paṅktiḥ triṇavastomah
śākvaram. sāma-ityantarikṣayatanāni / ”—VII. 11.

(ii) “Indreṇa jāyāpatyoṣcetihāsam dvṛce’smin
(RV. I. 126.6-7)

“Śakaṭāyana thinks that in this couplet there
is a story of a husband and wife (in connexion)
with Indra. (Bṛhaspati gave his daughter Romaśā by name to King Bhāvayavya).”

(iii) “divaś cit (IV.30.9-11) iti caitena
tṛcendraṇa samstutam /
Uṣasam madhyamām mene ācāryah
Śākaṭāyana, thus, thought that in the triplet -viz. RV. IV.30.9-11, Middle Dawn is praised along with Indra. Yāśka in his Niruka XI.47-48 cites the two verses RV.IV.30.10-11, and it seems that as Vāyu is described in these two verses, Uṣas here refers to the Dawn of the Middle region. Durga’s comments make the point clear:
“tasyā eṣā aparā bhavati / sā punah kimartham ?
uttamā (-pi) huyuṣā ādityasamśrayā bhavati / iyaṁ tu
madhyamā meghasamśrayā vāyoḥ samstavāt iti
madhyamasvabhāva-prāyovṛtyupapradarśanārtham”—
ibid. p.1094. Skandasvāmin has also similar observations. Thus it is evident that Yāśka here follows Śākaṭāyana though he does not explicitly mention his name.

(iv) “Pauṣṇau preti (VIII.4.15-18) pragāthau
dvau manyate Śākaṭāyanaḥ /
Aindram evātha pūrvam tu Gālavah

(v) “Yāskaupamanyavau eṭān āhatuh pañca
vai janān /
niśādapañcanāṁ varṇān manyate
We have already discussed the opinions of Vedic teachers concerning the implication of the compound *pañca-janah* so frequent in the Vedas, and how Yāska in his *Nirukta* confounds the two views of Aupamanyava and Śākaṭāyana, the latter’s opinion being ascribed to the former. *Vide Nirukta* III.8.

(vi) “*pretītihāsa-sūktam tu manyate*  
Śākatayanaḥ  
Yāsko drughaṇam aindram vā vaiśvadevaṁ  
tu Śaunakaḥ” — *Op.cit. VII.11.*

Thus, according to Śākaṭāyana the hymn X.102 is narrative in character, while Yāska explains it as one addressed to Drughaṇa (‘Mallet’) or Indra and Śaunaka to Vaiśvaveva. See *Nirukta* IX.23.

(vii) “āyaṁ gaur iti yat sūktam Sarparājñī  
svayam jagau  
tasmāt sā devatā tatra Śūryam eke praçakṣate  
Mudgalaḥ Śākapūṇiś ca ācāryaḥ Śākaṭāyanaḥ  
tristhānādhiṣṭhitām vācaṁ manyate pratyṛcaṁ  
stutām” — *Op.cit. VIII.89b-91a.*

Thus, Śākaṭāyana along with Mudgala and Śākapūṇi regards Vāc in all her three aspects—viz. terrestrial, atmospheric and celestial, as the deity invoked in each of the single verses of the hymn X.189. As Yāska does not cite any verse from this Ṛgведic hymn it is not possible to verify this statement of Saunaka.
XV. ŚĀKAPŪṆI—Śākapuni is the most frequently quoted Nairukta teacher in the *Nirukta*. There are numerous evidences to show that Śākapūṇi was the author of an etymological work. Besides the quotations from Śākapūṇi's Nirukta treatise cited by Yāska himself, external evidences too are not wanting that decidedly point to the conjecture stated above. Śākapūṇi had also a surname *Rathitara*, which is met with in the *Ṛhaddevatā*. The following quotations would leave no doubt as to Śākapūṇi's authorship of a Nirukta work, now lost:

(i) *pravāca saṃhitās tisrāḥ Śākapūṇi*

Rathitaraḥ

*Niruktam ca punaḥ cakre caturthaṃ*

dvijasattamaḥ

—Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa. Part I. XXXV. 3

and Vāyu-Purāṇa. LX. 65.

(ii) Rathitara niruktam ca punaḥ cakre
caturthakam —Vāyu-Purāṇa. LXI. 2.

(iii) Saṃhitātritayam cakre Śākapuṇi Rathitaraḥ

*Niruktam arakot tattu caturthaṃ*

munisattama

*Krauṇco Vaitūlakis tadvat Bālākaś ca*

mahāmatiḥ

*Niruktakṛt caturtho’bhūt vedavedāṅga-

pāragaḥ

Thus, besides being an author of a Nirukta work Śākapūṇi also commented on the three Vedic Saṃhitās.

Yāska cites Śūkapūṇi's views twenty times in the Nirukta. We record here these occurrences:

(i) tādit—vidyut tādit bhavaśīti Śākapūṇiḥ  
—III. 11.

(ii) mahān—mānena anyān jahātīti Śākapūṇiḥ  
—III. 13.

(iii) rtvik—rgyaśta bhavaśīti Śākapūṇiḥ—III.19.

(iv) sitām—yonih sitām iti Śākapūṇiḥ—IV. 8.

(v) vidradhe nave drupade arbhake—kanyayor adhiśṭhāna-pravacanānīti Śākapūṇiḥ  
—IV. 15.

(vi) sarve kṣiyatinigamā iti Śākapūṇiḥ (referring to the Rk verses X. 89. 3 ; IX. 107.9 ; and X. 28.4)—V.3.

(vii) apsarāḥ—spaṭam darśanāya iti Śākapūṇiḥ  
—V. 28.

(viii) accha—abher āptum iti Śākapūṇiḥ—V.28.

(ix) agniḥ—tribhyā ākhyātebhyo jāyate iti Śākapūṇiḥ—VII.14

(x) tredhā—prthivyām antarikṣe divīti Śākapūṇiḥ  
—VII. 28 and XII. 19

(xi) dravinodāḥ—ayam evāgnir dravinodāḥ iti Śākapūṇiḥ—VII. 3.

(xii) idhmaḥ—agnir iti Śākapūṇiḥ—VIII.

(xiii) tanūnapāṭ—agnir iti Śākapūṇiḥ—VIII. 5.

(xiv) narāśamsah—agnir iti Śākapūṇiḥ—VIII. 6.
(xv) dvārah—agnir iti Śākapūṇih—VIII.10.
(xvi) tvāstā—agnir iti Śākapūṇih—VIII.14
(xvii) vanaspaṭih—agnir iti Śākapūṇih—VIII.17
(xviii) vanaspaṭih—agnir iti Śākapūṇih—VIII.12.
(xix) yadeva viśvaliṅgam iti Śākapūṇih—XII.40
(xx) aksaram—om ityesā vāk iti Śākapūṇih—XIII.10.

From the above citations it becomes evident that Śākapūṇi in his Nirukta interpreted the terms āraviṇodāḥ, idhmaḥ, tanūnapāṭ, etc. as synonyms of Agni.

It has been already shown that every Nairukta teacher had his own Nighaṇṭu text on which his exegesis was based. As Śākapūṇi had his own Nirukta, it is plausible that it was based on a Nighaṇṭu text compiled by his own self. And this hypothesis is rendered certain if we consider some important external evidences pointing to the same direction:

I. Skandasvāmin in his commentary on Nirukta I. 4 observes: “dāsvān iti yajamānanāma Śākapūṇinā pāthitam”. This shows that Śākapūṇi read dāsvān as a synonym of “sacrificer” (yajamāna) in the Nighaṇṭu compiled by himself. Skandasvāmin in his commentary on RV.VI.62.3 follows Śākapūṇi’s view and regards dāsvān as another name of the yajamāna: dāsvān iti yajamānanāma.
adopted by the author of the *Nighantu* in enumerating the appellations of the deities of the atmospheric region (*antarikṣa-sthāna*). We quote here the following portion from Durga’s commentary:

“vyākhyātāni prthivisthāna-devatāpadāni | adhunā samāmnāyānukrameṇaiva madhyamasthānadevatāpadāni nirvaktavyāni | tadartham idam ārabhyate | athāto madhyamasthānā devatā iti | ..madhyamaṁ sthānam etāsām iti madhyamasthānā devatāḥ—väyvädayaḥ | vakṣyante iti vākyāsesāḥ | devatā iti bhuhvacanam bhedapakṣe | ekaiva | Nairuktānāṁ devatā-tritvābhityupagamāt ekasyaiva madhyamasya paryāyavacanāni etāni vāyvādīni rodasyantāni guṇaviśeṣato bhavanti | yathaiva uttamasya jyotiṣo drṣyante savitṛ-bhaga-prabhṛtīni | tāsām vāyuḥ prathamāgāmī bhavati | nanu indra iti madhyamasya sthānasya mukhyam abhidhānam | tat prathamaṁ samāmnātyam āsīt | na | madhyamasya varṣakarmopalakṣaṇatvāt varṣakarman śa ca vāyor adhikāraṁ prathamāṁ syāt | katham iti | vāyvātmanaiva hi madhyamāḥ ʿurjān māsāt parataḥ sārvardikam udakam upasāṁharan oṣadhi-vanaspāti-jalāśayebhya udakam antarikṣa-lokasya garbhām upacinti | sa māsāṣṭakena saṁbhṛto-dakagarbho vipakvāḥ prāvṛṣam prāpya prasavāyā prakalpate | taduktam—

“vānti parṇaśuṣo vātās tataḥ parṇamuc’ pare |
tataḥ parṇaruho vānti tato devaḥ pravarṣati | |

—iti |
"tadevaṁ varṣakarmaṇaṁ rāmbhe vāyvatmanaiṁ madhyamo vyāpriyate iti yuktam vāyubhidhanānam iha prathamaṁ samāmnātāṁ iti | itaś ca yuktam yaducya-te—tāsaṁ vāyuḥ prathamāgāṁ bhavati | sa eṣa saṁbhutadakagarbhāṁ vāyuḥ vivrṇan meghajālena nabhaṁ madhyamo Varuṇaḥ sampadyate | tato rudad Rudraḥ | tata irām dadat Indraḥ | tato rasāṁ prārjavaṁ Parjanyah | evamādir madhyamaṁ jaga-danugrahāya | varṣapradaṁ naśiddhaye gunojajanakramaḥ | anayaiva gunojajanakramānupūrvya Vāyuḥ, Varuṇaḥ, Rudraḥ, Indraḥ, Parjanyah—ityevamādyā samāmnāye devatānāṁ ānuṇpūrvī | tadevat sphutam dyusthāne guṇantaropajanānupūrvyaṁ jyotirmandalasya savitr-prabhṛtiṣū "".  

Most probably Durga took his cue from the now lost Nirukta of Śākapūṇi which embodied comments, on the evidence of the author of the Vārttika (i.e. the Niruktavārttika) cited by him, on the sequence of the vocables and appellations of deities as observed in Nighaṇṭu works.

We cite below those verses from Śaunaka's Brhaddeva where Śākapūṇi alias Rathītara has been distinctively mentioned:

(i) "tat khalvāhuḥ katibhyas tu karmabhyo
nāma jāyate /
sattvānāṁ vaidikānāṁ vā yadvānyad iha
kiścana \\n
caturbhya iti tatrāhur Yāska-Gārgya-
Rathītaraḥ /
II. We meet with the following statements in Skandasvāmin’s commentary on Nirukta III.10: “vyāptikārmaṇa uttare dhātavo daśa/ invati/ nakṣati/ ādayah/ Śākapūner atiriktā ete—vivyāka/ vivyāca/ uruvyacāḥ/ vivre/ iti vyāptikārmaṇaḥ.” Thus we have the testimony of Skandasvāmin, the earliest known commentator of the Nirukta of Yāska to the effect that Śākapūṇi in his Nighaṇṭu compilation enumerated four additional vocables, viz. vivyāka, vivyāca, uruvyacāḥ and vivre having the same meaning as invati, nakṣati etc. viz. “to pervade”, which have been embodied in Yāska’s compilation.

III. Ātmānanda in his Bhāṣya on RV. I.164.40 observes: “udakam iti sukhanāma iti Śākapūṇiḥ”

Durga in his commentary on Nīr. VIII.5 explicitly states that Śākapūṇi in his Nirukta gave arguments in favour of the necessity of observing the sequence followed in compiling the vocables of the Nighaṇṭu:

“Śākapūṇis tu prthivināmabhya eva upakramya svayam eva sarvatra kramaprayojanam āha/ taduktam Vārttikakāreṇa:

‘kramaprayojanam nāmnām Śākapūṇyupalakṣitam/ prakalpayet anyad api na praśnām avasādayet /’

—iti”

Again, in the beginning of his commentary on Nīr. X.1 Durga tries to justify the order
āśīṣo’ thārthavairūpyāt vācaḥ karmanā
eva ca / |”¹²⁶

(ii) “ekādaśyā tu nāsatyau dvādasyāgnim
       imaṃ punah /
prthak-prthak-stutidam tu sūktam āha
       Rathītarah |”¹²⁷

According to Rathītara Śākapūṇi the RV. hymn I. 15 consists of separate praises and is an invocation to the All-Gods, while in the 11th and 12th verses of this hymn Nāsatyau (Aśvins) and Agni are invoked respectively.

(iii) “Jātavedasyeti sūktasahasram eka
       Aindrāt pūrvam Kaśyapārśam vadanti /
Jātavedase sū tam ādyam tu teṣām
       ekabhūyastvam manyate Śākapūṇiḥ |”

“Some say that the thousand hymns addressed to Jātavedas (which come) before the (hymn) addressed to Indra (I.100) have Kaśyapa as their seer: the first hymn of these is ‘For Jātavedas’ (jātavedase: I. 99). Śākapūṇi thinks that they increase by one (in the number of their stanzas).”

(iv) “sampravādam Romaśayendra-rājñor
     ete rcau manyate Śākapūṇiḥ |”

According to Śākapūṇi the couplet consisting
of two verses—viz. RV. I. 126. 5-6, is a conversation between Romaśā on the one hand and Indra and King Bhāvayavya on the other.

(v) "śunāśiram Yāska Indram tu mene 
sūryendrāu tu manyate Śākapūnīḥ /

—Op. cit. V. 8.28

(vi) "Īdaspatim Śākapūnīḥ parjanyāgni tu 
Gālavaḥ."—V. 39.

In Śākapūnī's opinion Īdaspati is the deity invoked in RV. V. 42. 14, while Yāska and other teachers held different views.

(vii) "mahān aindram āpratnavatyaṁ agnim 
vaiśvānam śutam 
manyate Śākapūnis tu Bhārmyāśvaś 
caiva Mudgalaḥ / /"


In the verse 30 of the hymn RV. VIII. 6 beginning with the word āpratna Śākapūni and Mudgala think that Agni Vaiśvānara has been invoked. But other teachers opine that the hymn as a whole is an invocation to Indra.

(viii) "āyam gaur iti yat sūktam Sārparājñī 
svayam jagau / 
tasmāt sa devatā tatra sūRYam eke

pracākte / /

Mudgalaḥ Śākapūniś ca ācāryaḥ 
Śākaṭāyanaḥ /

tristhānādhishtīhitām vācaṁ manyate 
“As to the hymn ‘Hither this bull’ (āyam gauḥ : X.189), Sārparājñī sang of herself (in it). Therefore she is the deity in it; some declare Sūrya (to be the deity). Mudgala, Śākapūṇi, and the teacher Śākaṭayana, consider that Vāc, as occupying the three spheres, is (here) praised in every stanza.”

It is to be noted that though the former two views are recorded in the Sarvānukramaṇī, Śākapūṇi’s view has not been referred to in that work.

(ix) “Yāskaupamanyavau etan āhatuḥ pānca
    vai janān /
    niṣādapañcamān varṇān manyate Śākaṭayanaḥ //
    Ritvijo Yajamānam ca Śākapūṇis tu
    manyate ||”—VII.69-70

Thus according to Śākapūṇi the expression pāncajanāḥ, so frequent in the Vedas, refers to the four Vedic priests and the sacrificer himself.

(X) “āpāntamanyur ityaindryām stutāḥ somo’tra
dṛṣyate /
    sālokyaṭ sāhacaryāt vā stūyate soma eva vā / /
    nipūtabhājaṃ somam ca aṣyām Rathītaro’-

“In the stanza addressed to Indra, ‘He who gives zeal when imbibed’ (āpāntamanyuk : X.89.5), Soma is clearly praised. Soma is praised either because he belongs to the same world or because he is Indra’s companion.” Rathītara has said
that in this (stanz) Soma is incidental; for in (hymns) addressed to Indra there is here (such) incidental mention."^{32}

Thus we have exhaustively discussed the evidences bearing on the character of Śākapūṇi's Nirukta and the views expressed there in in so far as they can be gathered mainly from Yāska's Nirukta, Saunaka's Bhaddevatā and Durga's commentary on Yāska. But there are a few more facts that throw additional light on Śākapūṇi's work and we propose to discuss them below.

Skandavāmin in his Bhāṣya on RV. VI.61.2 observes:

"tathā ca Śākapūṇinā nadyabhidhāyinaḥ sarasvatī-
sabdasya parigaṇane—‘athaisā nadi | catvāra eva
tasya nigadā bhavanti—(i) drṣadvatyām manusā
apayayam sarasvatyām revadagre didihi (RV. III.
23.4) ; (ii) citra id rāja rājaka idanyake yake
sarasvatim anu (RV.VIII. 21.18) ; (iii) imam me
gange yamune sarasvati (RV. X.75.5) ; (iv)
sarasvati saranyūḥ sindhur ārmibhiḥ (RV.X.64.9) ;
pancamam apyudāharanti—(v) ambitame nadītame
(RV.II.41.16) | atrāyam na ṣaṣṭhaḥ parigaṇita
iti".

Thus Śākapūṇi regards only five verses—viz. III.23.4 ; VIII.21.18 ; X.75.5 ; X.64.9 ; and
II.41.16 as addressed to Sarasvati—the River,
while in all other verses she is addressed as a
deity. But Yāska thinks that RV.VI.61.2—"iyam śuṣmehir bisakhā ivārūjat", is an invocation to Sarasvatī—the Stream, and Śākapūṇi demurs on this point. Durga too while commenting on RV.VI.61.2 cited by Yāska in Nir. II.24 seems to repudiate Yāska's view, for he remarks:

"asyāḥ ṛ-i taviśebhir ūrmibhiḥ pārāvataghnim ityetad viśesaṁgaṇaḥ nadīsattvām paśyatā Bhāṣyakāreṇa "athaitannādiṇaḥ" ityuktvā iyam ṛgupātā sarasvatīśabdasya nadyabhidhāyakatve | iyaṁ punar Maitrāyanīyaṁ—"utasyānaḥ sarasvatī"—ityasya śaḍarcasya uttamā | etacca punah śaḍarcānukramena paśvanukramena ca—"sarasvatīṁ dhenuṣṭarīṁ ālabheta yaḥ kṣetre paśusu vā vivadeta"—ityetasya paśoh sampadyate | seyam anena prakāreṇa sūrasvatasya pasuḥaviṣo yājyā bhavati | evam ca satiyam api devatāvad ityeva samūpapadyate na tu adevatā ājyate | tad evam kṛtvā Bhāṣyakāreṇa yaduktam "tad devatāvad upariṣṭad vyākhyāyāmaḥ, athaitad naśiṭvā iti"—tad virudhyate | tatroket śaṁādhiḥ—vibhavo hi auupakṣiṇaṁsaktayo mantrasabdāḥ | pradarśanamātram etat kriyate | sarvathaiva mantrasabdānāṁ yo'rtha upapadyate sa yojyo yathāsambhavam iti | devatāpakte vinīyogānuvidhānabhiprāyena sarasvati mādhyanikā vāk | sā girināṁ meghānāṁ sānūni bhanjayatyūrmibhiḥ pārāvāre dyāvaprthivyāṁ hantīti yojaniyam|"33

Skandasvāmin also notes this discrepancy
between Yāska’s interpretation and the explicit ritual application that views Sarasvatī the Goddess as the deity invoked therein. Compare:

“yadyapi ceyam sārasvatasya paśoḥ sadyce ‘ā no dive’ (RV.V.43.11) ‘pāvīravi’ (RV.VI.49.7), ‘imā juhvanā’ (RV.VII.95.5), ‘yaste stanaḥ’ (RV. I.164.49), ‘sarasvatyabhī no neṣi’ (RV.VI.61.14), ‘iyam śuṣmebhiḥ’ (RV.VI.61.2) ityuttamā yājyā pāṭhitā, tayā devatā ijjyate / tathāpi codanāpra-
karaṇād devatānām ‘ūrmibhiḥ pārāvataagnīm’ iti nādirūpatvam lingāt / prakaraṇācca lingam
balavat—iti Bhāṣyakārābhīpṛāyaḥ / ato nādiru-
peṇānena sarasvatī stūyate....evaṃ tavannadiru-
peṇābhīdhānam / yadā lingād api viniyojakāsruti-
baliyastvāt yājñikapakṣe devatābhīdhānam, tadā
nadyā adhiṣṭhātṛi sarasvātyucyate / tulyam
nirvacanam”³⁴

Ātmānanda, a commentator of the Rk-Saṃhitā, states in his commentary on RV. I.165.14: “cakram jagaccakram bhramatīti vā caratīti vā karotīti vā cakram iti Śākapūṇīḥ”—which evidently points to the existence of Śākapūṇi’s Nirukta.

Professor Bhagavaddatta conjectures that Śākapūṇi was the author of another Vedic work besides the Nirukta, on the evidence of an observation of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, the renowned commentator of the Taittiriya Samhitā. Compare:
“dvitiyädi-naväntesu anuväkeśu namaskarädinam-
askäräntam ekaṃ yajur iti Śäkapūṇih.”

Śäkapūṇi’s son who is referred to as Räthitarä in Vedic exegetical treatises was also
a great Nairukta teacher. Yäska once cites his
name in the Nitruktä: āditya iti pütraḥ Śäkapūneg—
XIII. 11. He is also quoted by Śaunaka in his
Bṛhaddevatā in the following verse :

“prasaṅgād iha yathä sükte devattāḥ parikirttitāḥ /
tā eva süktabhājas tu mene Räthitarāḥ stutau /
”

XVI. STHAULÄŚTHĪVI—Sthauläsṭhīvi is
another Nairukta teacher mentioned by Yäska.
He is cited twice in the Nitruktä.

(i) agniḥ kasmāt? ....aknopano bhavatiti
Sthauläsṭhīviḥ / na knopayati na snehayati—Nir.
VII.14.

(ii) vāyuḥ....eter iti Sthauläsṭhīviḥ / anarthako

In Sthauläsṭhīvi’s opinion vāyu is derived from
the root vī—to go, with the sound v—inserted
at the beginning.

Sthauläsṭhīvi has not been referred to by
Śaunaka in his Bṛhaddevatā.

Notes
1. “vedäṅgānāṃ ekaikam anekaprabhedam / tadyathā-
niruktam caturdaśaprabhedam / vyākaraṇam
aṣṭaprabhedam”—p. 150 (BSS. Edm.). I.13. Also :
“kathaṁ punaḥ samāmnāsiṣuh / sukhagrahaṇāya
yāsena samāmnātavantaḥ / tadyathā ekaviṁśatidhā
bāhvṛcyam...vedāṅgānyapi / tadyathā—vyākaraṇam
aṣṭadhā / niruktam caturdaśadhā-ityevamādi /”

2. Comp : “Indraś Candraḥ Kāśakṛtsn-Āpiśali
Šākaṭāyanaḥ /
Pāṇiny-Amarā-Jainandrā jayantyaṣṭādiśāb- 
dikāḥ /”

3. Compare : “Yaśkaupamanyavāvetān āhatuḥ pañca 
vai janān /
niṣādapañcamān varṇān manyate Šākaṭāyanāḥ /”

—Bṛhaddevatā, VII.69.

4. Yaśka cites RV.X.58.19. In this verse the Moon is 
invoked, but some also hold that the second half 
of the verse is addressed to the Sun : ādityadaiva va 
dvitiyāḥ pāda ityake—two deities being thus praised 
in a single verse. It is to be noted that according 
 to some Āśvins represent the Sun and the Moon 
(sūryā-candramasau ityake). If this view be accepted 
the verse referred to would be really an Āśvina 
verse. But we should note that Aurnāvābha did 
not subscribe to this view.

5. Yadi mantrārthapratyayāya, anarthakaṃ bhavatiti 
Kautsāḥ.

Compare : “yathā kathā ca paraparigrahām 
abhimanyate steno ha bhavatiti Kautsā-Hāritau 
tathā Kāṇva-Pauṣkarasādi”.

7. “Mārkaṇḍeyena Krauṣṭukim Bhāgurim prati uktam 
stotraṁ Jaiminim prati pakṣirūpaiḥ muniputraiḥ 
uktam Markaṇḍeyapurāne”—Nāgēsa’s Prayogavidhi.

8. Bhāguri is not cited by Yaśka. Bhāguri is mentioned 
in the following places in the Bṛhaddevatā : III.
100 (see supra) ; vaiśvānaram Bhāguris tu—VI. 86cd ; itihāsam idaṃ sūktam āhatur Yāska-Bhāgurī—VI. 107ab.

9. “na nirbaddhā upasargā arthān nirāhur iti Śākaṭāyanaḥ / nāmākhyaṭayos tu karmopasaṃyo-gadyotakā bhavanti”—loc. cit. It seems that Patañjali was a follower of Śākaṭāyana in this respect, for he too holds that prepositions can convey meanings only when they accompany verbs etc. Compare ; “samo’ yam arthaśabdena saha samāsaḥ / sam copasargah / upasargās ca punareva-mātmaṅkāḥ yatra kaścit kriyāvācī sabdāḥ prayujyate tatra kriyāviśeṣam āhuḥ / na ceha kaścit kriyāvācī sabdāḥ prayujyate yena samaḥ sāmarthyaṃ syāt...” —Mahābhāṣya, Vol. I. p. 365. (Kielhorn’s Edition).


11. It becomes evident from this passage that Gārgya was a teacher of the Nairukta school. Compare the comment of Durga on the passage : “nairuk-tānaṃ caiṣa samayaḥ siddhāntaḥ sarveṣām, aviseṣaṇa Gārgya varjamb.” Also—“na sarvaṇīti Gārgya Nairuktaviṣeṣaḥ”—Skanda’s commentary.


13. Pannāgārāḥ, the patronymic in plural, is met with in the Kaṭikā on P. IV. 2. 66 : bhuvaca iṇāḥ prāyacabhara-tesu.

14. Bharadvāja is cited by Yāska only once under Nirukta, VI. 30.
15. We are to note that Yāska merely quotes here the different opinions without committing himself to any particular view. Compare Saunaka’s critique on this point: “padajātir avijñātā tvahpade’rthaḥ śītāmanī”—Bṛhaddevatā, II. 114.


17. See Uvaṭa’s comment thereon: “Babhuputraḥ-Bhagavān Pāṇcālāḥ.” “In Vātsyāña’s Kāmasūtra there is a reference to a school called Bābhraivyās: “dṛṣṭaṃcapūrṣaḥ nāgamyā kācidastiti Bābhraivyāḥ.” Jayamangala’s (sic) gloss thereon deserves notice: “ṛcāṃ daśatayināṃ samjñītatvāt ihāpi tadarthasambandhāt paṇcālasambandhāccac bahvṛcār eṣā pūjārtham samjñā kṛtā ityekā”. From these extracts it can be reasonably inferred that this Bābhraivyā was perhaps identical with the Bābhraivyā who is reputed to have arranged the Ṛgvedic Samhitā into Āṣṭakas. From the first citation it seems that it particularly refers to Draupadī who had five husbands. Draupadī’s another name was Pāṇcāli, as she was the daughter of the king of Paṇcālas. So the school of Bābhraivyās flourished perhaps in the country of the Paṇcālas.”—H. C. Chakladar: Studies in Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra.

18. Durga, who records every word of the Nirukta in his commentary, does not mention Taitiṣṭi in connection with the derivation of the word bīrīṭa. So the reading is dubious.

20. Compare also: “nāma ca dhātujam āha nirukte / vyākaraṇe śaṅkāṣṭasya ca tokam”—Mahābhāṣya. In the Kāśikā under P. I. 4. 86 Jayāditya gives—“anu Śākaṭāyanaṁ vaiyākaraṇāḥ” as an illustration. This also serves to show that Śākaṭāyana was held in high esteem by the ancient grammarians. We have noted that Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya as also Kātyāyana in his Vārttikas subscribes to the view of Śākaṭāyana that the prepositions are not capable of conveying any meaning independently.

21. “Again, Śākaṭāyana derived parts of one word from different verbs, inspite of the meaning being irrelevant, and of the explanatory radical modification being non-existent, e.g. (explaining satya) he derived the latter syllable regular from the causal form of (the root) i (to go), and the former syllable sat from the regular form of (the root) as (to be).”—Laksman Sarup’s Translation.


23. Haradatta in his Padamañjarī notes that the above-mentioned Vārttika can be dispensed with. For, though Pāṇini does not enumerate ṣrat as an upasarga still the formation of the word śraddhā by the suffix āṅ which is the sole reason for regarding ṣrat as an upasarga has indirectly been taught by Pāṇini himself as he uses the form śraddhā in the
gaṇa bhidādi and in the sūtra V. 2. 101; “praṇā-
śraddhā-rcāvṛttibhyo ṇah”. Cf. “bhidādipāṭhāt
praṇā-śraddheti-nipātanāt vā siddham”—Op. cit..

24. Kātyāyana in his Sarvanukramaṇī however notes:
“sārparājñī ātmadaivataṃ sauryaṃ vā”—the latter
view corresponding with that referred to in the
Bṛhaddevatā quotations by eke.


26. Vide supra.

27. Compare: Indraṃ somam ṛtavyam / tatra Aindrī
Māruti / tvāṣṭrī āgneyī aindrī maitrāvaruṇī catasro
draviṇodasa āśvini āgneyī ṛtudevatāḥ sarvatra /-
Kātyānana’s Sarvanukramaṇī.

28. Vide Supra.

29. Macdonell’s Translation.

30. Compare: sārparājñī ; ātmadaivataṃ sauryaṃ vā /-

31. Compare: “vāyuḥ somasya rakṣitā / vāyum asya
rakṣitāram āha / sāhacaryād rasāharanaṇādvā”—Nirukta,
XI. 5. It should be remembered that Vāyu and
Indra are identical according to Nairuktas. Vide
Nirukta, VIII.

32. Macdonell’s Translation.


34. Skandasvāmin’s commentary on Nir. II. 24. Vide
VIII. NIRUKTAVĀRTTIKA—A LOST TREATISE.

It is much to be regretted that the anonymous work Niruktavārttika, quotations from which so frequently occur in the commentaries of Durga and Skandasvāmin, is not extant. From the nature of the citations it is evident that it was a critical exposition (vārttika) of the Nirukta dealing with all the important problems of the text as well as a running commentary on it. Durga cites verses from this work with great deference, and it is quite apparent that the work was held as an authority in his days on all obscure topics relating to etymology. The discovery of the work would, no doubt, greatly facilitate the study of the Nirukta, which is so very abstruse, by throwing light on the history of etymological inquiries and on the proper construction and interpretation of Yāska’s text. We propose to discuss here all the available materials bearing on this important treatise.

(i) Durga in his commentary on Nir. I. 1 quotes the Vārttika in approval of the view that a substantive might be derived from as many roots as might bear resemblance—both in sound and in meaning, to it. Thus the term nighanta has been derived by Yāska in so many different
ways—viz. from ni-\(\sqrt{h}\)an, ni-\(\sqrt{g}\)am, ni-\(\sqrt{h}\)ṛ etc. inasmuch as all these roots can be shown to have some or other affinity with the resultant vocable. We cite below the relevant portion from Durga’s commentary:

“evam eṣa nighantu-ṣabdo gamer vā ekopasargāt
   hanti-haratibhyāṃ vā dyupasarvābhyāṃ niruktaḥ | āha
   —kimayāṃ punar atimahān yatna ekasmin abhidhāne
   anekadhātvarthanirvacankṛta iti | ucyate—iha tāvat
   sarvāṇi ākhyātajāni nāmāṇīti siddhāntaḥ | sati
   ākhyātajatve abhidheyasthā yā kriyā lakṣyate tadabhi-
   dhānasamarthe parokṣavṛtttau vā tadabhidhāyini
   rūḍhisabde vā dhātur upreksyate, sa ca punah svara-
   varṇa-kriyāsāmānya / tatraivaṃ sati rūḍhisabde
   yāvanto dhātavaḥ svalingam rūḍhigatam darsayanti
   tāvataḥ samgrhya sa rūḍhisabdo nirvācyah | kim
   kāraṇam ?—viśesalakṣaṇaṇavyavasthā’bhāvāt / nahi
   tatra viśesalakṣaṇaṇavyavasthā kācit asti yayā eko‘vatiṣ-
   θeta, anye vyāvartteran | api coktam Vārttikākarena—
   “yāvatām eva dhātunāṃ
   lingam rūḍhigatam bhavet |
   arthaś cāpyabhidheyasthas
   tāvadbhir guṇavidrahaḥ |”
—iti / . . . tā etas tisraḥ kriyāḥ nigamana-samāhanana-
   samāharanākhyāḥ nighantusu vidyante | tadabhidhā-
   yini ca rūḍhisabde nirucyamāne gamir hantir haratiś
   ca ahampūrvvikaṇa saṃnipatya vadanti—mamānu-
   rūpam, mayaitam nirbrūhiti | gamis tatra gakāram
   ātmiyam vyāpannam manyate ghamāram | tathā hanti-
harati hakāram vyāpannam ghakāram manyete | tasmāt
ayam anekair dhātvarhair nighanṭu-śabdo niruktah
evamjatiyābhidhāna-nirvacana-pradarśanāya |

(ii) The following verse, cited by Durga under Nir. 1.8, seems to belong to that work though there is no specific mention to that effect. Durga states:

"vyatyayaṃ cādhikṛtya ślokaṃ apyudāharanti—
ādimadhyāntaluptāni pracchannāpihitāni ca |
brahmanāḥ pariguptyartham vede vyavahitāni
cia | / - iti"

(iii) The following verse too appears to have been taken from the Niruktavārttika—

"uktam hi—
yas cānyāyena nirbrūyāt yas cānyāyena prcchati |
tayor anyataraḥ mṛtyum vidvesam vādhigacchati |
" (cited by Durga under Nir. II.3)—though it is a slight variation of Manu II. III1, which reads as:

"adharmeṇa ca yah prūha yas cādharmeṇa
prcchati |
tayor anyataraḥ praiti vidvesam vādhigacchati |
(iv) "naighanṭukāns tu yāṅchabdān pratyartham
ganāśah sthitān |
chandobhyo'vvisya tatvārthān nirbrūyād
yogatas tu tān |

The above verse appears in Durga’s commentary on Nir.II.9. It is probable that the verse is a citation from the Niruktavārttika, though it is not
decisive, since no such phrase as uktam ca or taduktam Vārttikakareṇa has been used to introduce it.

(v) The following quotation too cannot be traced to any definite source—

“śādvidho hi dhātuh—
‘prakṛtyantah sanantaś ca yāñanto yañlug eva ca /
nyanto nyantasanaṃtaś ca śādvidho dhātur
ucyate | /””—Durga on Nir. 11.28.

(vi) Durga in his commentary on Nir. IV.1 cites a verse without mentioning its source. But the form and content of the verse point to the lost Vārttika as its probable source. We quote below the following excerpt from Durga’s commentary in which it occurs :

“ekārtham anekaśabdam ityetaduktam / kimartham idam ucyate / na hi yadyadvṛttam tattad vaktavyam idam vṛttam idam varttiṣyate iti / yad yad vṛttam tattad anuktam api pratiṣyate, yacca vakṣyamāṇam iti / āha—samkṣepato nigamanāya yad uktam, yad vā vaktavyam pratiṣāntītha samāsavistarābhhyām hi sukham ādastyaṃ prakaraṇam avadhārayisyāmahe, grhītārthaṃ samkṣepācca vistareṇa uttaragrantham ucyamānam sukham ava bhotsyāmahe / api coktam anyatrāpi—
‘vistīrya hi mahāj jñānam rśiḥ samkṣepato’bravīt / ittham hi viduṣām loke samāsa-vyāsadhāraṇam / /” śṛṇu—samāsato yad uktam yacca vaktavyam / ekārtham anekaśabdam iti etat puṣṭāt sūcitam ‘etāvantah śabdakarmāṇo dhātavah, etāvantyaśya sattvasya
नामद्वेषे—ित्यानेन वायुनेन | यद तत ‘गौर इत्र व्रतिक्षा नामद्वेषे’ इत्यात अर्ध्यान नामाध्यातो-पारस्मर्गपतात्रम प्रपानचाम च तत्वव-भेदा-पर्याय-सावधान-संडीघद्धारणा-तन्निर्वाचारे-व्याख्याप्रविभागेन उक्तम सा एव नैगिन्तुकस्या प्रकरणस्या निगामनाव्यायेन सर्वाथा द्यार्थां सांक्षेप्तात उक्ताः साष्ट्रसांबन्धात्रे च एवम अनुरज्ञो भविष्यति प्रकराणस्या सावधान्यायाते सावधान संपुर्णतात प्रदर्शिता भविष्यतीयानेन भविष्णुप्रयेयेि ‘एकार्थम अनेकाशब्दम’ इत्युक्तम /”

(vii) As to the procedure adopted by the author of the Nirukta in explaining the vocables occurring in the Naigama-Kāṇḍa of the Nighaṇ्ठa, the author of the Vārtaṭika states—

“क्रिमलक्षणा पुनर्इहा व्याख्या इति ? तदुच्याते—
‘तत्त्वम पर्याय-विशदना व्युत्पत्तिः सा धवयो अपि /
निगमो निर्यायस्त्र तेि व्याख्यायम् नैगिने पादि /’”2

—Cited by Durgā under Nir. IV. 1.

(viii) The verses quoted in the following portion of Durgā’s commentary also seem to have been taken from the Niruktavārtaṭika :

“एवम् एसा सिद्धवास्तदो नवगताएिद्धेयो नवगतासावधकारोँ / एवम् एसरसम नवगताने अणि अनवगतासावधकारणीष्टुसिध्यि याद / उक्तम हि—
‘त्सवदारुपम पदार्थाश्च वुयुत्पत्तिः प्रकृतिर गुणाः /
सर्वम् एसद एकार्थम् दशानवागमणे गुणाः /’”3

—िति /”

कत्मे पुनर्इस्ति इति | पदांश्र्याब्धिहेय-स्वारसावधकार-गुणा-विभाग-क्रम-विशेप-ध्वाद्यार-व्याव-
adhānāni | tesu ca abhidheyam apekṣya nirvacanam
karttavyam | uktam hi—
‘dhātupasargāvayavagunasttvaṃ hi dhātu jam |
bahevkadhātujam vāpi padam nirvācyalakṣaṇam |
dhātujam dhātu jātām samarthārthajam eva ca |
vākyajam vyatikirṇam ca nirvācyam pañcadhā
 padam | |’—iti

(a) padajātyanavagataṃ ‘tva’ iti yathā nāma
 nipāto vā /

(b) abhidheyānava galam ‘sitāma’ iti yathā /

(c) svarānava galam ‘vane na vāyo’ iti yathā /

(d) samskārānava galam ‘īrmantāsaḥ’ iti yathā /

(e) guṇānava galam ‘karūdati’ti yathā /

(f) vibhāgānava galam ‘mehana’ iti yathā /

(g) kramānava galam ‘uparamadhvam’ me
 vacase’ iti yathā /

(h) vikṣepānavagataṃ ‘dyāvā naḥ prthivi’ iti
 yathā /

(i) adhyāhārānavagataṃ ‘dānamanaso na
 manusyaṃ’ iti yathā

(j) vyavadhānānava galam ‘vayus ca niyutvān’
 iti yathā /

(k) ekam api padam padadvitayaṃ kriyate—
 —‘pūrusādaḥ pūrusān adanaya’ iti yathā | padadvitayam api caikam padam kriyate ‘garbhanidhānim
 sanitur’ iti yathā | ākhyaṭam api ca nāma kriyate
‘sarvānindrasya dhanāni vibhaksyamāṇaḥ’ iti yathā |”

(ix) Another quotation from the Niruktavārttika occurs in Durga’s commentary on Nir.
VI. 31, and Durga explicitly states that it is a citation from the Vārṭṭika:

"idamyuḥ—ityanavagatam anekārtham ca | idam
ti yat kiṃcit abhipretam nirdiṣyate, tad yaḥ kāmayate
sa idamyur ityucyate | yur-ītyeṣa śabdo’prasiddhaḥ
kāmayeter arthe, tena anavagatam etat ‘nānādhiyo
vasūyavaḥ’ (Rv. IX. 112.3) ityanena gatārtham
manyamāno Bhāṣyakāro nigamaṇi brāviṭī |
Vārṭṭikakārenaṇāpyuktam—
‘nigamavaśād bahvartham
bhavati padam taddhitas tathā dhātuḥ |
upasargagunanipātā
mantragatāḥ sarvathā lakṣyāḥ |
’—iti ‘"

(x) The following verse cannot be traced to any definite source. It might have plausibly occurred in the lost Vārṭṭika:

"nānāvasthādārśanavad ākhyātṛṇāṃ paridevana-
nindādiśvapi cendrādīnāṃ kāmakāratas tadrūpam
avasthitānāṃ sā sā stutir eva na nindā | uktaṃ ca—
‘hīnā na nindā stutir eva sā’gryā
devān martyaḥ samyag abhiśṭuyāt kāḥ |
śaktikṣaye’pyadhayavasyanti śiṣṭāḥ
stotum na paśyanti gatim yato’nyām |
’—iti ‘"

Durga on Nir. VII. 7.

(xi) Durga cites another verse from the Vārṭṭika under Nir. VIII. 4 in order to show that Śākapūṇi, the renowned etymologist, gave arguments in his lost treatise in favour of the order followed in the Nighanṭu texts
regarding the compilation of the vocables. Compare:

“athaítā āpriyāḥ / āpriya idhmādini āprüśu
nirvaktavyāni / tāni punar amūni praiṣike āprüśukte
pāṭhakramanīyamād vivakṣitakramāṇīti dévatāpadā-
sāmāmnāye’pi grhyamānattvāt pāṭhakramaprayojanasya
vivakṣitakramāṇyeva / tatraītad bhavati / imāni agni-jā-
tavedo-vaiśvānara-prabhṛtīni kiṃ vivakṣitakramāṇī uta
yugapad abhidhānāsambhavāt arthata esāṃ krama iti /

“tatra vivakṣitakramāṇīti kecit / katham iti / iha
tāvat sthānāni bhūr bhuvah svar iti pāṭhānupūrvyaiva
niyatānti tatsthānām apyagnyādināṃ sa eva kramo
gṛhyate / sa gṛhyāno na nyāyya utṣraṭum iti /
apī ca, sati kramaprayojane agnih pṛthivīsthāno yasmād
atas tam pṛathamam vyākhyaśyāma iti hetuvacanam
upapadyate / uttaratra ca ‘teśām idhmaḥ pṛathamā-
gāmī bhavātiti’, ‘teśām aśvah pṛathamāgāmī
bhavātiti’, ‘teśām rathaḥ pṛathamāgāmī bhavātiti’
tatra tatra pṛathamāgāmī bhavātiti vacanām yathā-
pradhānām abhidhānām pūrvam sāmāmnātam ityasya
nyāyasāya upapradarśanārtham iti lakṣyate / itarathā hi
avivakṣitakramaṃśu pṛathamāgāṃvivacanam akṛtvai
yatkinicit padam upādadhyaś / tadetat pṛthivīsthāne
sarvatra kramaprayojanam ucyate / pāṛthivasya jyotiśo
yathā agniśabdena prasiddhatamaḥ sambandhaḥ, na
tathā jātavedah-śabdena, yathā jātavedah-śabdena na
tathā vaiśvānara-śabdena, yathā ca vaiśvānara-śabdena
na tathā dravīṇodaḥ-śabdena / tānyetāni gunā-vipra-
karṣāt prasiddhiviprakarsāc ca agniśabdād vipra-
क्र्यायनेऽ/ idhmādīnāṁ tu vyavadhānena agnyabhī-
dhānam ityatitarāṁ viprakarṣaḥ/ aśvaprabhṛttayas tu
sthānamātram agner bhajante iti idhmaprabhṛti-
bhyo’pi viprakṛṣyante/ teśām api ca uditapraṇāvṛttayo’-
sva-ṣakuni-maṇḍūkā iti prathamam/ anuditapraṇāvṛt-
ttayas tu aksādayas te pāścād ādvandvebhyaḥ/ ityevaṁ
sarvatra kramapravojanam upēkṣyam/ 

"Śākapūṇis tu prthīvīnāmabhya eva upakramya
svayam eva sarvata kramapravojanam āha/ taduktam
Vārttikakāreṇa—

‘kramapravojanāṁ nāmāṁ Śākapūṇyupalaksitam/
prakālayed anyad api na prajñām avasādayet/ /’

—iti’.

(xii) The verse occurring in the following
extract from Durga’s commentary is most
probably taken from the Vārttika, though not
explicitly stated as such:

"yaśasāmyogāt rājā stutim labheta/...rājasam-
yogāt yuddhopakaraṇāṇi/...sa ēṣa vyāpi stuti-
samkramanyāya ācāryenopadarśitaḥ/ tad yathā
yuddhopakaraṇāṇi rājasāmyogāt stutim labhante/
tasya tāni āṅgāni sambandhāt stūyante/ rājā’pi
yaśasāmyogāt, yajña’pi devatāsambandhāt, devatā api
ātmāsambandhāt/ so’yaṁ ātmāva aṅgapratyaṅga-
bhāvenāvasthitah sarvāvasthitah stūyate, ityāmasutir
eveyaṁ sarvā/ taduktam—

’sthāne sthāne stutīḥ sarvā sthānadhipatibhāgini/ 
ātmapratīṣṭhā boṛddhavyā tathopakaranaṇastutiḥ/ /'-iti/-
ēṣa stutisamkramanyāyaḥ sarvatropasandheyaḥ/ /’"
(xiii) The following citation too cannot be traced:

"taduktam—
‘vānti parṇaśuṣo vātās tataḥ parṇamuco’pare |
tataḥ parṇaruho vānti tato devaḥ pravarṣati |
"—iti"—Cited by Durga on Nir. X.1.

(xiv) The last citation from the Vārttika is found in Durga’s commentary on Nir.XI.13. Compare:

"athaśa madhyasthānā devaṇāḥ | . . . tēsāṁ marutāḥ prathamāgāmino bhavanti | kasmāt ? vāyur eva hi bhedena apeksyamāṇo marudabhidhāno bhuvacanabḥāg bhavati | tēsāṁ prathamāyam vāyuno vyākhyātam | etāvāmstu viṣeṣo | bahusādhyo karmanī bahudhā madhyamo bhavati | pṛthaktvena ca vijnātā marutāḥ sukrayotiśca citrāyotiś ca ityevamādayaḥ saptasaptakā devaṇāḥ māruteṣu gaṇeṣu sapta-
kapālesu | agnau purāṇe caita eva prasiddhāḥ saptadhā vāyuviśāriṇāḥ māriṇāt kāśyapāt adityāṃ ye jaṇīre | nairuktasamayas tu sārvā eva gaṇā marutāḥ | uktam ca Vārttike—
‘madhyamā vāk striyaḥ sarvāḥ punām sarvaḥ ca |
madhyamāḥ |
 gaṇāḥ ca sarve marutaḥ gaṇahbedāḥ pṛthakṛteḥ |
"—iti "/

Professor Rajawade states in his edition of the Nirukta (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series) that the Vārttika cited by Durga is identical with the Brhaddevatā of Śaunaka. The ground for this
assertion is that some citations of the Vārttika correspond exactly with the Bṛhaddevatā verses. That some verses attributed to the Vārttikakāra are not to be found in the present Bṛhaddevatā can be explained on the hypothesis that Durga had access to a different recension of the Bṛhaddevatā which contained some additional verses and was apparently larger than the extant text. We record below the following statements of Professor Rajawade—

(i) ayam śloko Bṛhaddevatāyām nopalabhyate / Bṛhaddevatākārāt nānyo Vārttikakāraḥ /

(ii) ayam śloko' dhunopalabdha-Bṛhaddevatāyām na vidyate /

(iii) Durgakāle Bṛhaddevatāgranthe bhinnāḥ pāṭhāḥ āsan | adhikāś ca ślokāḥ | ca-ṭa-pustakāyoh—
“sarvā strī madhyamasthānā pumāṇ vāyuṣ ca madhyamah | gaṇāḥ ca sarve marutaḥ iti vṛddhānuṣāsanam /”

—iti pāṭhāntaram prānte diyate /

But all these arguments of Professor Rajawade cannot stand in view of the fact that verses are quoted in a commentary called Gopālikā on the Sphoṭasiddhi of Maṇḍanamiśra, the great Mīmāṁsā-sist teacher, which are all ascribed to the author of the Nīruktavārttika, none of them being traceable to the extant Bṛhaddevatā. We quote here the following extract from the commentary Gopālikā for reference—
“yathoktam Niruktavārttika eva—
‘asāksātkrtadharmabhyas te parebhyo yathāvidhi |
upadeśena samprādur mantrān Brähmanaṃ eva ca |

upadeśaḥ ca vedavyākhyā | yathoktam—
‘artho’yam asya mantrasya brähmanaṃasyāyaṃ ityapi |
vyākhyayavātropadeśaḥ syāt vedārthasya

vivakṣitaḥ | ’—iti |

upadeśaḥ glāyanta iti | upadeśena grāhayitum
asakyā ityarthaḥ aperse dvitiyebhyaḥ nyūnā ityarthaḥ |
bilmagrahamāṇya upāyato vaśikaranāya |
imam granthāṃ vakṣyamāṇaṃ samāmnāsiṣuḥ
samāmnātavantaḥ ’ tam evāha vedam ca vedāṅgāni ceti |
āṅgasabdaḥ upāṅgāder api upalakṣaṇārthaḥ |
vedam upadeśaṃatrāt grahitum asaktāḥ

angāni ca samāmnāsiṣuḥ—iti | yathoktam—
‘asaktās tūpadeśena grahitum aperse tathā |
vedam abhyastavantās te vedāṅgāni ca

yatnataḥ ||’—iti |
bilmaśabdho hi anantaram eva tatra niruktam—
bilmam bhilmam bhāsanam iti | vyākhyaṃ ca—
‘bilmam bhilmam iti tvāha bibhartyarthavivakṣayā |
upāyo hi bibhartyartham upēyaṃ vedagocaram |

athavā bhāsanam bilmaṃ bhāsater dīptikarmaṇaḥ |
abhyāṣena hi vedārtho bhāṣyate dīpye spuṭaṃ |

............... yathoktam—
‘prathamāḥ pratibhāṇena dvitiyās tūpadeśaḥ |
abhyāṣena tṛtiyāś tu vedārthaṃ pratipedire ||”
All these six verses are evidently taken from the Niruktavārttika and taken together they constitute an exposition of Nir. I.20 which reads: “sāksātkṛtadharmāṇa ṛṣayo babhūvah / teśāk- sātkṛtadharmabhya upadeśena mantrānt samprāduḥ / upadeśāya glāyanto’vare bilmagrahaṇāya imaṁ gran- thanāṃ samāmnāsiṣuḥ vedāṃ ca vedāṅgāni ca / bilmāṃ bhīlamāṃ bhāsanam iti vā /

From the evidences noticed above it is quite obvious that the lost Vārttika was a highly valuable treatise, being at the same time an elaborate commentary as well as a critique on Yāska’s text, thus truly satisfying the traditional definition of a Vārttika—viz. “uktānukta- duruktacintā Vārttikam”.

Notes

1. The emendations might have been introduced by the author of the Vārttika to suit the context of the Nirukta.

2. The citation is most probably from the Niruktavārttika though Durga does not explicitly state it as such.

3. This verse is found in the Bṛhaddevatā of Šaunaka. Cf. BD. II. 108. But the two subsequent verses are not found therein. Thus it would not be sound to argue that the quotations are from the Bṛhaddevatā. Durga most probably cited all the three verses from the self-same work—viz. the Niruktavārttika. As to the question of correspondence between these two works vide ante.
4. Compare with the above extract from Durga Bhadddevatā II. 111 ff: “padam ekam samādāya dvividhā kṛtvā niruktavān / puruşādaĥpadam Yāsko vṛkṣe vṛkṣa iti tvṛci / / anekam sat tathā cānyad ekam eva niruktavān / aruño māsakṛṃnmantra māsakṛdvigraheňa tu / / padavyavāye’pi pade ekikṛtya niruktavān / garbham nidhānam ityete na jāmaya iti tvṛci / / padajātir avijñātā tvahpa-de’rthah śitāmanī / svarānagamō’dhāyi vane netyṛci darśitaḥ / / śunahśepam naraśaṃsaṃ dyāvā nah prthivīti ca / niraskṛṭetiprabhrītiṣvarthād āsīt kramo yathā / /”
IX. DIFFERENT SCHOOLS OF INTERPRETATION
OF VEDIC MANTRAS AS RECORDED IN THE
NIRUKTA OF YĀSKA

Yāska in his Nirukta frequently refers to
the Aitihāsikas and Ātmavādins besides the
Nairuktas as two principal schools of Vedic
interpretation. The former endeavour to esta-
blish the historicity of the Vedic deities and
consider the various incidents recorded in the
Vedas as authentic facts. Thus, according to
them the Aśvins, the twin-gods, were great kings
of yore. The fight that is so often related
in the Vedas between Indra and Vṛtra has,
according to the Aitihāsikas, a factual basis, and
should not be explained away as an allegory
as the Nairuktas would have it. But if the
view of the Aitihāsikas be adopted one great
difficulty presents itself before us. According
to the opinion of orthodox scholars the Vedas
are eternal and have no beginning. And the
acceptance of the position of the Aitihāsikas
would compromise the orthodox view. If the
fight between the gods and demons be accepted
as an historical incident, we must have to admit
that it took place at some definite place and
time, and this admission would strike at the
very root of the view upholding the eternal
character of the Vedas as the latter would be perforce subjected to a spatio-temporal limitation. This question engaged the attention of the Mīmāṃsāists at an early date, and they had to refute such hostile arguments by means of still stronger ones.¹ There is certainly room for doubt as to whether the Aitihāsikas shared the view of the orthodox scholars vouchsafing the ceaseless continuity of the Vedas. Skandasvāmin in his commentary on the Nirukta does not fail to note this important fact. He distinctly states that the Itihāsas or legends related in the Vedic mantras are to be interpreted figuratively, and the supposedly historical names should be understood to be standing for eternal cosmic phenomena. Yāska in Nir. II.10-12 explains the two verses—viz. RV. X.98.5, 7 from the Aitihāsika viewpoint as dealing with the legend of Devāpi and Şāntanu.² But Skandasvāmin offers an alternative explanation from the Nairukta standpoint that is in keeping with the eternal character of the Vedas. Compare:

“nityapakse rgyayasya anyathā arthayojanaḥ | 
ārṣṭiśenaḥ madhyamaḥ tatra bhavatvācca ārṣṭiśenaḥ 
vaidyutah, tasya pārthivātmāvasthitasya hotṛtvena 
devāpitvam / ...madhyamaprabhavatvāt devāpir 
vidyut, Śantanur udakam vṛṣṭilakṣaṇam / yat yadu 
devāpiḥ vaidyutah Śantanave vṛṣṭilakṣaṇasya udaka-
The following observations of Skandasvāmin should also be noticed in this connection:

(i) Nir. II. 25-27 deals with the dialogue between Viśvāmitra, the seer, and the Rivers, according to the Aītihāsikas. Yāska does not record the interpretation of the verses cited in this connection (viz. RV. VII. 33.5) from the Nairukta standpoint. But Skandasvāmin remarks:—


(ii) RV. I. 45.3 is quoted under Nir. III. 17 where Yāska states: “arciśi Bhṛguḥ sambabhūva”. But this is the Aītihāsika view. Skandasvāmin interprets the verse from the Nairukta standpoint:
"nityapakṣe tu satatapraśṛttayajñāḥ kaścit yajamānaḥ priyamedhā ucyate / tathā Bhriguḍayop'pi yajamānaviśeṣā eva / Bhriguḥ pañcatapaḥśpra-bhrītānā tapasā bhrīyamāṇo'pi na dehe / . . . ."—

(iii) RV. I. 108 according to the Aitihā-sikas is uttered by Trīta when he fell into the well. Compare: "Trītaḥ kūpe'vahitam etat sūktam āpratibabhau"—Nir. IV. 6. But Skandāsvāmin adopts the Nairukta view and explains it as follows:


(v) On the legend of Purūravas and Īrvasī Skanda observes:

"atra ca nityapakṣe kecit īrvasī vidyut vāyuḥ purūravā iti manyante / sa ca īru antarikṣam aṣnute prabhaya / iha tu itihāsapakṣam āsthāya

(vi) On the legend of Saramā and Paṇis (Nir. XI. 25 where RV. X. 108.1 has been cited) Skanda remarks—


(vii) RV. X. 85.10 has been explained by Skanda from the Nairukta viewpoint, though Yāska in Nir. XII.8 records the Aitihāsika exposition of the verse:


Thus in the view of the etymologists the so-called legends must have to be taken allegorically. The fight between Indra and Vṛtra is a cosmical phenomenon and not an historical incident representing as it does the release of
waters pent up within the clouds at sunrise or the removal of darkness by the effulgent rays of the sun. Yāska explicitly states: "tat ko vṛtraḥ / ....megha iti Nairuktāḥ / ..apām ca jyotīṣaś ca miśribhāvakarmano varṣakarma jāyate / tatropamārthena yuddharvarṇā bhavanti /"—Ntr. II. 16. It is interesting to note that in the Mahābhārata a very picturesque description is given of the fight between the gods and the demons from the Nairukta standpoint. We quote the following extract in the hope that it will serve as a happy illustration of Yāska's statement just cited:

"athāpaśyat sa udaye bhāskaram bhāskaradyutim /
 somaṁcaiva mahābhāgaman viśamānam divākaram /
 amāvāsyām pravṛttāyām muhūrtte raudra eva tu /
 "devāsuraṁ ca samgrāmaṁ so'paśyad udaye girau /
 lohitaiś ca ghanair yuktām pūrvāṁ sandhyāṁ

śatakratuh /
apaśyat lohitodaṅca bhagavān varuṇālayam /
bhrigubhiś cāṅgirobhiś ca hutam mantraiḥ

prthagvidhaiḥ /
havyam grhītvā vahnim ca praviśantam divākaram /
 parva caiva caturvimśam tadā sūryam upasthitam /
tathā dharmagatam raudram somāṁ sūryagatam

ca tam /
samālokyaiyatāṁ eva šaśino bhāskarasya ca /
samāvāyam tu tam raudram dṛṣṭvā śakro

'nvacintayat /"
sūryācandramasor ghoram dṛṣyate pariveśanam /
etasminneva rātryante mahad yuddham tu saṃsati /
sarit sindhur aḍīyam tu pratyasṛgvaḥhinī bhṛśam /
śṛgālīnyagnivaktrā ca pratyādityamā virāvini /
esa raudraś ca saṃgrāmo mahān yuktaś ca tejasā /
somasya vahnisūryābhīyām abhuto’yaṃ samāgamaḥ /"

—Mahābhārata : Vanapravāna. Chap. 223
(Skanda-prādurbhāvādhyāya), vv. 11-19.
(Vaṅgavāsī Edition. Calcutta.)

And yet it must be observed that the itihāsas or legends that the Legendarians or the Aitihāsika expositors read in the Vedic mantras were not the fabrications of their own imagination. All the legends are in the last analysis traceable to Brāhmaṇic arthavādas and as such are not self-authoritative, but they derive their authority from being construed with the respective injunctions. Skandasvāmin explicitly states under Nir. II. 16—“sarve itihāsāś ca arthavādāhāmūlabhūtāh / te cānyāparā vidhipratiṣedhāšeṣabhūtāh / tatas tān anādṛtya svayam aviruddhaṃ nityadarśanam upadvayannāha—megha iti nairuktāḥ”.—Op.cit., Pt. II. p. 93.

Dūrga too remarks that the itihāsas are inserted with the only object of conveying the ultimate truth and as such have to be taken cum grano salis and with proper discount :

“yāḥ kaścit ādhyātmika ādhiprāśita ādhikāraṇiko
vārtha ākhyātate diṣṭyuditārthāhavbhāsanārthaḥ sa itihāsa ucyate / sa punar ayam itihāsāḥ sarva- prakāro hi nityam avivakṣitāsvārthaḥ / tadartha- pratipattṛṇām upadesaparavatāt.'


Notes

1. Compare: Jaimini-Sūtra I. 1.28 which represents the view of the heterodox scholars: ‘anityadarśanāccha’—and Śabara’s comm. thereon: “janana-maraṇa- vantaś ca vedārthāḥ śrūyante / Babaraḥ Prāvāhaṇir akāmayata, Kusurubinda Auddālakir akāmayata—ity-evamādayaḥ / Uddālakasyāpatyaṁ gamyate Auddālakiḥ / yadyevam prāg Auddālaki-janmano nāyam grantho bhūtapūrvah / evam apianityata.” Jaimini refutes this view in the Sūtra I. i. 31: ‘parāṁ tu śrutisāmānyamātram’—which has been explained by Sabara as follows: “yacca prāvāhaṇir iti / tanna / Pravāhaṇasya puruṣasya asiddhatvāt na pravāhaṇasya apatyam prāvāhaṇiḥ / prāśabdaḥ prakarṣe siddhaḥ vahatiś ca prāpaṇe / na tvasya samudāyaḥ kvacit siddhaḥ / ikāras tu yathaiś- patye siddhas tathā kriyāyām api kartaṁ / tasmād yah prāvāhayati sa prāvāhaṇiḥ / babara iti šabdānukṛtiḥ / tena yo nityo’rthaḥ tam eva etau šabdau vadiṣyataḥ / ata uktaṁ parāṁ tu śrutisāmānyamātram iti /.”

2. Compare: “tatretiḥāsam ācakṣate / devāpiś cārṣṭi- ṣenāḥ śantanuś ca kauravyauḥ bhrātarau babhū- vatuh / sa śantanuḥ kānīyān abhiśecayāncakre / devāpiś tapaḥ pratipede / tataḥ śantanaḥ rājye
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