

***PŪRVĀPARAPRAJÑĀBHINANDANAM***  
**EAST AND WEST, PAST AND PRESENT**

**Indological and Other Essays  
in Honour of Klaus Karttunen**

EDITED BY

BERTIL TIKKANEN & ALBION M. BUTTERS



# STUDIA ORIENTALIA 110

## *PŪRVĀPARAPRAJÑĀBHINANDANAM* EAST AND WEST, PAST AND PRESENT

Indological and Other Essays  
in Honour of Klaus Karttunen

EDITED BY

BERTIL TIKKANEN & ALBION M. BUTTERS



Helsinki 2011

*Pūrvāparaprajñābhīnandanam – East and West, Past and Present*  
**Indological and Other Essays in Honour of Klaus Karttunen**  
**Edited by Bertil Tikkanen and Albion M. Butters**  
Studia Orientalia, vol. 110, 2011

Copyright © 2011 by the Finnish Oriental Society  
Societas Orientalis Fennica  
c/o Department of World Cultures  
P.O. Box 59 (Unioninkatu 38 B)  
FI-00014 University of Helsinki  
FINLAND

**Editor**

Lotta Aunio

**Advisory Editorial Board**

Axel Fleisch (*African Studies*)  
Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (*Arabic and Islamic Studies*)  
Tapani Harviainen (*Semitic Studies*)  
Arvi Hurskainen (*African Studies*)  
Juha Janhunen (*Altaic and East Asian Studies*)  
Hannu Juusola (*Semitic Studies*)  
Klaus Karttunen (*South Asian Studies*)  
Kaj Öhrnberg (*Librarian of the Society*)  
Heikki Palva (*Arabic Linguistics*)  
Asko Parpola (*South Asian Studies*)  
Simo Parpola (*Assyriology*)  
Rein Raud (*Japanese Studies*)  
Riikka Tuori (*Secretary of the Society*)

**Typesetting**

Lotta Aunio

ISSN 0039-3282  
ISBN 978-951-9380-76-6

WS Bookwell Oy  
Jyväskylä 2011

## CONTENTS

BERTIL TIKKANEN

Preface ..... xi

Select Bibliography of Klaus Karttunen 1980–2010..... xv

Tabula Gratulatoria .....xxiii

### I INDOLOGY

GREG BAILEY

“Him I Call a Brahmin”: Further instances of intertextuality  
between the Mahābhārata and some Pāli texts..... 3

HANS BAKKER

Origin and Spread of the Pāsupata Movement:  
About Heracles, Lakulīśa and symbols of masculinity..... 21

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Archetypes and Bottlenecks:  
Reflections on the text history of the Mahābhārata ..... 39

MANS BROO

Drama in the Service of Kṛṣṇa: Rūpa Gosvāmin’s Nāṭaka-Candrikā .....55

RAHUL PETER DAS

The Classical Āyurvedic Representation of Human Anatomy..... 67

MADHAV M. DESHPANDE

Ārṣa versus Anārṣa in Pāṇini and Allied Literature ..... 85

HARRY FALK

Die Kurus und Ihre Jungen Frauen..... 93

MASATO FUJII

The Recovery of the Body after Death:

A prehistory of the *devayāna* and *pitryāna* ..... 103

JAN MEULENBELD

Lakṣmaṇa's Yogacandrikā ..... 121

PATRICK OLIVELLE

War and Peace: Semantics of *Samdhi* and *Vigraha* in the *Arthaśāstra*..... 131

ASKO PARPOLA

The Three Ways of Chanting in a Sacrificial Laud: Chapter two of Jaimini-  
Paryadhyāya (Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra III) with Bhavatrāta's commentary:

Sanskrit text with an annotated English translation..... 141

RICHARD SALOMON

The Macedonian Month Xandikos in Gandhāran Inscriptions ..... 165

HENRI SCHILDT

Rare Mediaeval Kerala Murals at Kumbla, near Kasargode ..... 171

BERTIL TIKKANEN

Domaki Noun Inflection and Case Syntax ..... 205

## II CLASSICAL AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES

OUTI MERISALO

*In Horis Sanguinis:*Physiology and Generation in the Pseudo-Galenic *De Spermate* ..... 231

PETRI POHJANLEHTO	
Nasal Reduction in Late Luwian.....	243

JOUNA PYYSALO	
Fourteen Indo-European Etymologies in Honour of Klaus Karttunen.....	249

### III HISTORY OF ORIENTAL STUDIES

HARRY HALÉN	
Henrik Grenman and Olga Sederholm – Two unlucky Finnish Orientalists from the town of Vasa.....	273

TAPANI HARVIAINEN	
Syriac Poems Written by Finnish Scholars in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries .....	285

NADJA JOHANSSON	
Abraham Ibn Ezra on “The Scholars of India” – A twelfth century Jewish view of Indian astrology.....	297

KAJ ÖHRNBERG	
Georg August Wallin: An Orientalist between national and imperial orientalism .....	309

YAROSLAV VASSILKOV	
From the History of Indian Studies in Russia: Gerasim Lebedev and the Freemasons .....	317

## ĀRṢA VERSUS ANĀRṢA IN PĀṆINI AND ALLIED LITERATURE

*Madhav M. Deshpande*

Pāṇini uses the term *anārṣa* in rule P.1.1.16 (*sambuddhau śākalyasyetāv anārṣe*). This rule literally says: “According to Śākalya, a vocative singular in *-o* is termed *pragṛhya* when it is followed by an *iti* that does not come from a *Ṛṣi*.” A full consideration of this rule raises several interesting and important issues, and I would like to go over these issues in this paper.

The clearest elements of this rule are the terms *sambuddhau* “in the case of a vocative singular” and *itau* “before the word *iti*”. The terms *ot* (“ending in *-o*”) and *pragṛhya* are inherited from the preceding rules. The purpose of calling something *pragṛhya* is clear enough: the word does not enter into a sandhi combination with words that follow if they begin with a vowel (cf. P.6.1.125 *pluta-pragṛhyā aci nityam*).

However, the terms *śākalyasya* and *anārṣe* (modifying *itau*) raise important questions. The first term, *śākalyasya*, is understood by the tradition as a reference to the opinion of the scholar Śākalya. However, the tradition beginning with Kātyāyana assumes that Sanskrit is an eternal language. This concept does not allow for the restricted occurrence of words. Under the weight of this conception, Kātyāyana and his successors interpreted references to scholars and regions as mere signs of respect (*pūjā*), treating all such references as indications of general unrestricted options. With such an understanding, this rule would come to be understood as teaching a general option for a vocative ending in *-o* to enter or not to enter into sandhi with a following *iti* that does not come from a *Ṛṣi*. However, such an understanding of the rule completely effaces the historical reality of the actual referent of the rule.

Paul Thieme (1935: 4) and Deshpande (1978) have argued that these references to teachers’ names must be taken to reflect their opinions and practices. The specific reference to Śākalya and to the possibility of an *ārṣa* vocative in *-o* being followed by a non-*ārṣa iti* leads us to look at the Padapāṭha of the *Ṛgveda*, which was ascribed by tradition to Śākalya. Thieme (1935: 4) states unequivocally: “There can be no doubt that Pāṇini is alluding to Śākalya as the author of the RV Padapāṭha, in the same manner as Yāska (*Nirukta*, 6.28).” As this rule refers to



the contrast between the R̥gveda Saṃhitā and Śākalya's Padapāṭha, it can apply only to Śākalya's Padapāṭha.

In the last statement above, both the qualifications are important. This rule (P.1.1.6) is intended to apply only to the Padapāṭha, not to the Saṃhitā.<sup>1</sup> This is significant, considering that other rules of Pāṇini are not always restricted in this manner. For instance, consider P.1.1.13 (*śe*). This rule simply says that words ending in the suffix *-śe* (i.e. forms like *asme*, *yuṣme*, *tve*, and *me*) are called *pragṛhya*. Applicable in Vaidika as well as Laukika Sanskrit, the rule is not restricted to the context of *iti*. Thus, this rule can apply to the Vedic example *asmé indrabṛhaspatī* (RV 4.49.4), as well as to *yuṣmé iti*, *asmé iti*, *tvé iti*, and *mé iti*. Thieme (1935: 2) points out that while the Kāśikā calls these four latter examples *laukikam anukaraṇam*, “they are, however, taken from nowhere else but the Padapāṭha. Because the commentator did not know of any Saṃhitā passages that could illustrate *yuṣmé*, etc. being treated as *pragṛhya*, he had recourse to the analysed text, which had to mark them as such in any case by adding an *iti*. The Padapāṭha, however, was not recognized as a sacred text (*chandas*), but considered a profane work (*laukika*).” See also the note on CA 1.3.15.

While Thieme is undoubtedly right in saying that these four examples in the Kāśikā must be citations from the Padapāṭha, we need to recognize a basic fact that the rule itself is not restricted to the Saṃhitā and the Padapāṭha, but applies to all known Sanskrit. It is not restricted by a term like *śākalyasya* in P.1.1.16, and hence the doctrine taught in P.1.1.13 is a universal doctrine. Thus, while P.1.1.13 applies to all known Sanskrit without exception, P.1.1.16 applies to a restricted domain. Theoretically, one can think of four situations:

S<sub>1</sub> *ārṣa* vocative singular in *-o* + *ārṣa iti*

S<sub>2</sub> *ārṣa* vocative singular in *-o* + *anārṣa iti*

S<sub>3</sub> *anārṣa* vocative singular in *-o* + *anārṣa iti*

S<sub>4</sub> *anārṣa* vocative singular in *-o* + *ārṣa iti*

Since the rule (P.1.1.16) clearly states, “when followed by *anārṣa iti*”, it is obvious that it has nothing to say about the situations S<sub>1</sub> and S<sub>4</sub>, even if such situations were to occur in usage. While S<sub>1</sub> is illustrated by the VS example *brahmabandhav iti*, S<sub>4</sub> is rather difficult to think of. Clearly, the rule applies to situation S<sub>2</sub>.

1 It is difficult to find Saṃhitā examples of a vocative in *-o* followed by *iti*. The Caturādhyāyībhāṣya on CA 1.3.19 offers the example *brahmabandhav ity abravīt* from the Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā 10.6, where the vocative is not a *pragṛhya* and enters into sandhi with the following *iti*.

Theoretically, we cannot exclude situation S<sub>3</sub> from the application of this rule. Though it is the case that an *anārṣa* vocative singular in *-o* followed by an *anārṣa iti* does not occur in the Padapāṭha, one might wonder about *laukika* usage of Sanskrit. Is the term *anārṣa* in this rule meant to apply to all non-Vedic or *laukika* Sanskrit? Or does it apply to only the RV Padapāṭha of Śākalya?

While the term *anārṣa* could apply, in principle, to all linguistic usage that does not come from a Ṛṣi, it seems certain that it has a rather limited scope in its actual use. Pāṇini himself uses another term, *upasthita* (P.6.1.129 *aplutavad upasthite*), which is explained by Patañjali as *anārṣaḥ itikaraṇaḥ*. However, the clearest usage of *anārṣa* is found in RPR (3.23), where it is identical with *anārṣaḥ itikaraṇaḥ*. In any case, circumstantial evidence seems to suggest that the term *anārṣa* is not used to refer to all *laukika* usage of Sanskrit, but that it refers primarily to non-Saṃhitā elements added to the Padapāṭha and secondarily to other modes of Vedic recitation like Krama. Thus, P.1.1.16 would seem to apply only to specific sequences in the Padapāṭha. But, at the same time, we must keep in mind that Pāṇini is specifically referring to Śākalya's Padapāṭha of the Ṛgveda.

This specificity may be explored for the historical information it provides about Pāṇini's state of awareness about various Vedic and post-Vedic texts. Was Pāṇini only aware of Śākalya's RV Padapāṭha? Did he not know any other Padapāṭhas? Certainly, rule P.6.1.129 (*aplutavad upasthite*) seems to apply to the Padapāṭha sequences of an *ārṣa* word followed by the *anārṣa iti*, and yet the qualifying term *śākalyasya* seen in P.1.1.16 does not occur in P.6.1.129. This could possibly indicate that Pāṇini was at least aware of some other Padapāṭhas in which this phenomenon was present, and that in terms of this specific rule, there was no difference of opinion that he could observe. We have today no specific information on other Padapāṭhas known to Pāṇini. However, the doctrine taught in P.1.1.16, as far as Pāṇini's knowledge is concerned, was limited to the RV Padapāṭha of Śākalya.

Were all linguistic phenomena attributed by Pāṇini to Śākalya limited to his RV Saṃhitā and/or Padapāṭha? This is a difficult question to answer historically. Consider the following sequences:

*hare + ehi*

*viṣṇo + iha*

*śriyai + udyataḥ*

*gurau + utkaḥ*

In these sandhi sequences, P.6.1.78 (*eco'yavāyāvah*) teaches that *e*, *o*, *ai*, and *au*, when followed by a vowel, are replaced by *ay*, *av*, *āy*, and *āv*, respectively. Thus, we get the following results:

*haray + ehi > harayehi*

*viṣṇav + iha > viṣṇaviha*

*śriyāy + udyataḥ > śriyāyudyataḥ*

*gurāv + utkaḥ > gurāvutkaḥ*

These would seem to represent Pāṇini's basic dialect of Sanskrit. However, P.8.3.18 (*lopaḥ śākalyasya*) presents Śākalya's view that under the same circumstances, the final *y* and *v* of *ay*, *av*, *āy*, and *āv* are deleted (and there is no further recombination). This gives us the following results:

*haray + ehi > hara#ehi*

*viṣṇav + iha > viṣṇa#iha*

*śriyāy + udyataḥ > śriyā#udyataḥ*

*gurāv + utkaḥ > gurā#utkaḥ*

While P.8.3.18 gives us a Śākalyan doctrine, there is no mention of whether it applies to *ārṣa* or *anārṣa* usage. It would seem, therefore, that the rule is generally applicable to certain forms of Sanskrit. One could possibly assume that the RV Saṃhitā of Śākalya known to Pāṇini would have followed this doctrine of Śākalya. However, the RV Saṃhitā of Śākalya [of the Śaiśirīya subschool] known to the RPR (2.28–31), as well as to us today, does not seem to consistently follow Śākalya's doctrine as laid out in P.8.3.18. The RV Saṃhitā, as we have it, shows *vāyav ā* (< *vāyo+ā*, RV 1.2.1), but *vāya ukthebbiḥ* (< *vāyo+ukthebbiḥ*, RV 1.2.2).

In any case, we begin to make some important distinctions. Returning to P.1.1.16 (*sambuddhau śākalyasyetāv anārṣe*), let us assume that, as far as Pāṇini was concerned, this phenomenon was limited to Śākalya's RV Padapāṭha. This raises some important questions. Perhaps in later times, this phenomenon spread to other Padapāṭhas, though not to all of them.<sup>2</sup> For instance, CA 1.3.19 (*āmantritaṃ cetāv anārṣe*) teaches the same doctrine for the Padapāṭha of the Śaunakīya AV

2 As Thieme (1935: 4) notes, the Padapāṭhas of the Sāmaveda and the Taittirīya Saṃhitā do not show the practice of having vocative singulars in *-o* followed by *iti*. But the Padapāṭha of the Śaunakīya AV does show this feature. The Padapāṭha of the Kāṇva VS (2.1.9) shows *viṣṇo iti viṣṇo*.

without making any reference to Śākalya. One may assume that by the time the CA was composed, this doctrine was widely followed and there was no need to identify it with Śākalya any longer.

In any case, what is the source of these features in Śākalya's Padapāṭha? Where does Śākalya get this idea? Whitney, on CA 1.3.19 (= Whitney's APr 1.81), after discussing in detail the treatment of this phenomenon in the various Prātiśākhya, raises an important issue: "This whole state of things is something very peculiar. Why, when the *o* of *vāyo* is really no more exempt from change than the *e* of *agne*, should it be regarded by all the *pada*-texts as a *pragṛhya*, causing so much trouble to the different treatises to explain its treatment?" I have not seen in previous research, nor have I been able to come up with, a proper explanation for the origin of this phenomenon. My only suggestion is that peculiarities in Śākalya's Sanskrit dialect might be the underlying cause for this rule that applies to vocatives in *-o*, but not to vocatives in *-e*. On the other hand, it is clear that this rule (P.1.1.16) applies only to the combination of an *ārṣa* vocative in *-o* and an *anārṣa iti*. We know that it does not apply to purely Saṃhitā sequences. If it did apply within Śākalya's own dialect, one would have to note other differences between Śākalya's dialect and the Saṃhitā. Cardona (1991) has made an important contribution in this direction, explaining certain features of Śākalya's Padapāṭha to be forms of his dialect (cf. *dakṣi* of the RV Saṃhitā versus *dhakṣi* of the RV Padapāṭha). Cardona (1991: 126) says: "I think it proper to consider, with earlier scholars, that the types *dakṣ-* and *dhakṣ-* are respectively archaic and modern. Now, in Śākalya's dialect, as in the language that Pāṇini describes, the modern type *dhakṣ-* is the norm." However, Cardona does not extend the same dialectal explanation to account for the position of Śākalya expressed in P.1.1.16. There is too much that we do not fully know.

Finally, I would like to note that certain of Pāṇini's rules (like 1.1.16 and 6.1.129) refer to sequences in the Padapāṭha where an *ārṣa* expression is followed by the *anārṣa iti*, Pāṇini does not record the repetitions of the type *x iti x*, which occur occasionally in the Padapāṭha and more frequently in the Kramapāṭha. For example, consider:

From Jaṭā for AV 15.1.1: प्रजापतिमितिप्रजा०पति ।

From Jaṭā for AV 15.1.4: महादेवइतिमहा०देवः ।

From Jaṭā for AV 15.1.8: ब्रह्मवादिनइतिब्रह्म०वादिनः ।

In these sequences, the portion after *iti* almost looks like a new beginning for accentual marking, though there is no gap between *iti* and this portion. The

accentuation of such cases of segments after *iti* emerges as an important concern. While we have no idea how Pāṇini or Śākalya viewed such sequences, the RPR (3.23) presents Vyāḍi's view on this matter:

*parigrahe tv anārṣāntāt tena vaikākṣarīkṛtāt /*

*pareṣāṃ nyāsam ācāraṃ vyāḍis tau cet svarau parau //*

“Vyāḍi, however, maintains the usage of the Anudātta [or rather *sannatara* in our notation] accent for those syllables, which, in the Parigraha (= Parihāra) repetitions, either follow the *anārṣa* [word *iti*] or are euphonically combined with it, if [such syllables] are followed by either an Udātta or a Svarita [syllable].”

As I have noted earlier, here the word *anārṣa* itself is used as a short form for an *anārṣa-iti*, denoting the very restricted context in which the word *anārṣa* is used in these texts. It is not clear whether everyone followed Vyāḍi's doctrine. It seems to have been followed by the Jaṭāpāṭha of the Śaunakīya AV. However, repetitions in the RV tradition of *vikṛti* recitation do not seem to follow this doctrine, as seen in the following example (RV 1.1.1):

रत्नधातममिति रत्नधातमं, rather than रत्नधातममिति रत्नधातमं

From this brief description of the issues involved in understanding the historical context of rules like P.1.1.16, it seems clear that recitational variations like the Padapāṭha, as well as more complicated variations like the Kramapāṭha and Jaṭāpāṭha, produced linguistic expressions that required creative solutions. These synthetic linguistic expressions combined sub-segments that belonged to different historical periods, giving rise to important issues of linguistic performance and description. Rules dealing with the formation of Padapāṭha, Kramapāṭha, and Jaṭāpāṭha<sup>3</sup> demonstrate this complicated situation and the efforts of grammarians and reciters to deal with it. Historically, the very presence of synthetic expressions that combined linguistic material from different diachronic eras and the need to deal with such expressions add one more reason why the Sanskrit grammarians refused to take the diachronic dimension of language seriously. In their

<sup>3</sup> The Jaṭāpāṭha, which contains the *abbaab* ordering of the original Saṃhitā words *ab*, poses particularly difficult problems of how to recite segments with inverted order and how to integrate the inverted segment *ba* with the preceding and following *ab* segments. These reverse-order segments are termed *anārṣa* by Devasthali (Introduction to Vedavikṛtilakṣaṇasaṃgraha, p. xxi), though no traditional treatise uses this term to refer to these segments. For a detailed discussion, see Devasthali (Introduction to Vedavikṛti-lakṣaṇasaṃgraha), Deshpande (1994), and Introduction to Deshpande (2002).

own cultural world, they were faced with an exactly opposite situation: how to effectively control the recitational and ritual mixture of various diachronic (and derivational)<sup>4</sup> states of Sanskrit.

## REFERENCES

- ABHYANKAR, K.V. 1974. *Vedapadapāṭhacarā, with Upalekhasūtra*. (Post Graduate and Research Department Series) Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- CA = *Śaunakīyā Caturādhyāyikā*, ed. with three commentaries by Madhav M. Deshpande. (Harvard Oriental Series, 52) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- CAB = *Caturādhyāyībhāṣya*, see CA.
- CARDONA, George 1991. On Pāṇini, Śākalya, Vedic dialects and Vedic exegetical traditions. In: Madhav M. DESHPANDE & Saroja BHATE (eds), *Pāṇinian Studies, Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*, 123–134. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan.
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. 1978. Pāṇinian grammarians on dialectal variation. *Brahmavidyā, the Adyar Library Bulletin* 42: 61–114.
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. 1994. Grammars and grammar-switching in Vedic recitational variations. *Brahmavidyā, the Adyar Library Bulletin* 58: 41–63.
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. 2002. *Recitational Permutations of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda*. (Harvard Oriental Series, 61) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nirukta* by YĀSKA, with the commentary by Durgācārya. Ed. V.K. Rajwade. (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, vol. 88, pts I–II) Pune: Ānandāśrama, 1921, 1926.
- Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya*. Ed. Mangal Deva Shastri. Vol. I, Critical text of RPR, Banaras: Vaidika Svadhyaaya Mandira, 1959. Vol. II, RPR with Uvaṭa's commentary, Allahabad: The Indian Press, 1931. Vol. III, RPR in English translation (Punjab Oriental Series, No 24) Lahore, 1937.
- RPR = *Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya*.
- RV = *Ṛgveda*.
- Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya*. Ed. and tr. W.D. Whitney. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1871.
- THIEME, Paul 1935. *Pāṇini and the Veda, Studies in the Early History of Linguistic Science in India*. Allahabad: Globe Press.
- TPR = *Taittirīyaprātiśākhya*.
- Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya*, with commentaries by Uvaṭa and Anantabhaṭṭa. (University of Madras Sanskrit Series, 5) Madras: University of Madras, 1934.

4 It may be noted that often the forms given in the Padapāṭha and other modes of recitation are derivationally prior states of the Saṃhitā forms, and do not represent any dialectal or diachronic variation between the Saṃhitā and the Padapāṭha.

*Vedavikṣtilakṣaṇasaṃgraha*. A collection of twelve tracts on Vedavikṣtis and allied topics. Ed. K.V. Abhyankar & G.V. Devasthali. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1934.

VPR = *Vājasaneyīprātiśākhya*.

VS = *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā*.

WHITNEY, W.D. 1862. *The Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya or Śaunakīyā Caturādhyāyikā*. Text, translation, and notes. New Haven: The American Oriental Society.