DAṆḌIN'S *PASPAŚA*: THE INFLUENCE
OF THE SANSKRIT GRAMMATICAL TRADITION ON SANSKRIT POETICS

John Nemec
PhD (South Asia Studies), Professor
Department of Religious Studies
University of Virginia
326, Gibson Hall, 1540 Jefferson Park Avenue, Charlottesville, VA 22903, United States
nemec@virginia.edu

The thesis of this essay is straightforward, even if its implications are reaching: Daṇḍin knew Pāṇinian grammatical works, in particular Patañjali's <u>Mahābhāṣya</u>, and he wished conceptually to mirror and emulate the Sanskrit grammatical tradition in his own analysis of language while simultaneously opening a new dimension of linguistic analysis. Most simply put: Pāṇini and in particular Patañjali offered a model for Daṇḍin's treatment of language, a model that Daṇḍin self-consciously modified.

The evidence for this influence has always been to hand, but to see it requires one to read Sanskrit works across genres, this in a mode more accommodating to the curricular habits that were patterned in premodern South Asia than to those of the disciplinary mode of reading often, if not always, practiced today, which files subjects departmentally by mutually distinguishing philosophy, literature, linguistics, history, and the like. Reading Vyākaraṇa and the Alaṃkāraśāstra in parallel, one may recognize influences of the former on the latter in the introductory verses of the *Kāvyādarśa*, which seek to echo and borrow from Patañjali's *paspaśāhnika* – thus the title of the present communication: Daṇḍin's *paspaśa*: The influence of the Sanskrit Grammatical Tradition on Sanskrit Poetics.

Keywords: Daṇḍin, Pāṇini, Patañjali, Vyākaraṇa, Alaṃkāraśāstra, Sanskrit grammatical tradition, South Asia

The thesis of this essay is straightforward, even if its implications are reaching: Daṇḍin knew Pāṇinian grammatical works, in particular Patañjali's <u>Mahābhāṣya</u>, and he wished conceptually to mirror and emulate the Sanskrit grammatical tradition in his own analysis of language while simultaneously opening a new dimension of linguistic analysis. Most simply put: Pāṇini and in particular Patañjali offered a model for Daṇḍin's treatment of language, a model that Daṇḍin self-consciously modified.

The evidence for this influence has always been to hand, but to see it requires one to read Sanskrit works across genres, this in a mode more accommodating to the curricular habits that were patterned in premodern South Asia than to those of the disciplinary mode of reading often, if not always, practiced today, which files subjects departmentally by mutually distinguishing philosophy, literature, linguistics, history, and the like. Reading Vyākaraṇa and the Alaṃkāraśāstra in parallel, one may recognize influences of the former on the latter in the introductory verses of the *Kāvyādarśa*, which seek to echo and borrow from Patañjali's *Paspaśāhnika* – thus the title of the present communication: Daṇḍin's *paspaśa*: The influence of the Sanskrit Grammatical Tradition on Sanskrit Poetics.

Consider first of all *Kāvyādarśa* 1.6–7, where, at 1.6, Daṇḍin invokes use of the term "cow" to exemplify the proper use of language more generally[1].

> *gaur gauḥ kāmadughā samyak prayuktā smaryate budhaiḥ |*
> *duṣprayuktā punar gotvaṃ prayoktuḥ saiva śaṃsati || 1.6 ||*
> *tad alpam api nopekṣyaṃ kāvye duṣṭaṃ kathañcana |*
> *syād vapuḥ sundaram api śvitreṇaikena durbhagaṃ || 1.7 ||*

[The word] cow properly used is considered by the wise to be a wish-fulfilling cow; however, used badly, it is itself what announces the cow-ness of the one using it. Therefore, even a slight fault in poetry should not be overlooked in any way. [For:] A body, even if beautiful, is repugnant by virtue of one spot of white leprosy.

As is well known, Patañjali queries the meaning of the word "cow" in the very opening lines of his *Paspaśāhnika*, exemplifying as he does thereby the scope of his – and Pāṇini's – linguistic analysis (emphasis mine)[2]:

(Pas_1) KA_I,1.1–5 Ro_I,1–4 *atha śabdānuśāsanam. atha ity ayaṃ śabdo 'dhikārārthaḥ prayujyate. śabdānuśāsanaṃ śāstram adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam. keṣāṃ śabdānām. laukikānāṃ vaidikānāṃ ca. tatra laukikās tāvat:* **gaur** *aśvaḥ puruṣo hastī śakunir mṛgo brāhmaṇa iti.*

Next, the examination of words. The word "*atha*" is used [here] with the meaning of *adhikāra* or the commencement of the topic. What is to be understood is that the *śāstra* that is the examination of words has been commenced. [The examination] of which words? Of both colloquial and Vedic [words]. Among these, the colloquial, to begin with, are: **cow**, horse, man, elephant, bird, deer, [and] Brahmin.

What is more, Patañjali goes on in what immediately follows this to elaborate on his understanding of the nature of language, this again by way of an analysis of this very word "cow" and no other (emphasis again mine):

(Pas_2) KA_I,1.6–13 Ro_I,5–7 *atha* **gaur** *ity atra kaḥ śabdaḥ. kim yat tat sāsnālāṅgūla-kakudakhuraviṣāṇyartharūpaṃ saḥ śabdaḥ. nety āha. dravyaṃ nāma tat. yat tarhi tad iṅgitaṃ ceṣṭitaṃ nimiṣitaṃ saḥ śabdaḥ. nety āha. kriyā nāma sā. yat tarhi tac chuklaḥ nīlaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ kapilaḥ kapota iti saḥ śabdaḥ. nety āha. guṇo nāma saḥ. yat tarhi tat bhinneṣv abhinnaṃ chinneṣv acchinnaṃ sāmānyabhūtaṃ saḥ śabdaḥ. nety āha. ākṛtir nāma sā. kas tarhi śabdaḥ. yenoccāritena sāsnālāṅgūlakakudakhuraviṣāṇināṃ sampratyayo bhavati saḥ śabdaḥ. athavā pratītapadārthako loke dhvaniḥ śabda ity ucyate. tad yathā śabdaṃ kuru mā śabdaṃ kārṣīḥ śabdakāry ayaṃ māṇavaka iti. dhvaniṃ kurvan evam ucyate. tasmād dhvaniḥ śabdaḥ.*

Now, what is the word "**cow**" here? Is the word the form of the object (*artharūpa*) – what has a dewlap, tail, hump, hoof, and horn? No, he says. That is the substance (*dravya*). Then is the word the motion of the limbs, the behavior, the shutting of the eyes? No, he says. That is the action (*kriyā*). Then is the word the white, blue, black, brown, or the grey? No, he says. That is the quality (*guṇa*). Then is the word that which is undivided when there are divisions, unsegmented when there are segments, that which is common [to all]? No, he says. That is the class (*ākṛti*). What then is the word? By the uttering of which the understanding of those which are possessed of a dewlap, tail, hump, hoofs, and horns – that is the word. Alternatively, a word is said to be a sound (*dhvani*) whose meaning is known in the world. Thus, one says, "utter a word"; "don't utter a word"; [or] "this person uttering a word is a young man". One making a sound is discussed in this way. Therefore, a word is a sound [whose meaning is known].

The parallel use of the term *gauḥ* as an exemplar of (proper) language would not have been lost, I propose, on any premodern reader of both works. That the term is used to

exemplify *laukika* speech in particular in Patañjali's use of the term may find a parallel, as well, in Daṇḍin's usage, as noted below.

Closely following his exemplifying analysis of the word "cow", Patañjali invokes the notion that speech used properly produces merit, which as we have seen was stated also, if somewhat differently, in verse 1.6 of Daṇḍin's text, where he said the word "cow" properly used is a wish-fulfilling cow. Also present in the same passage of the *Paspaśā* is a binary division articulated by Patañjali, which distinguishes correct speech from incorrect speech, or *śabda* from *apaśabda*, also synonymously referred to as the distinction of *śabda* from *apabhraṃśa*. Daṇḍin, as we shall see, comments on the distinction as articulated in the latter's terminology at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.32.

First, consider Patañjali's presentation of these concerns (emphasis mine):

(Pas_4.4) KA_I,2.18–3.5 Ro_I,13–15 (4) *yas tu prayuṅkte. yas tu prayuṅkte kuśalo viśeṣe śabdān yathāvad vyavahārakāle* <u>so 'nantam āpnoti jayam paratra vāgyogavid du-</u>ṣyati cāpaśabdaiḥ. kaḥ. vāgyogavid eva. kuta etat. **yo hi śabdān jānāti apaśabdān apy asau jānāti.** yathaiva hi śabdajñāne dharmaḥ evam apaśabdajñāne 'py adharmaḥ. athavā bhūyān adharmaḥ prāpnoti. bhūyāṃso 'paśabdā alpīyāṃsaḥ śabdāḥ. ekaikasya hi śabdasya bahavo 'paśabdāḥ. **tad yathā gaur ity asya śabdasya gāvī goṇī gotā gopotalikā ity evamā-dayaḥ apabhraṃśāḥ**.

[This too is a use of the study of speech]: The one who uses [it]. And the one who, being skilled in the special property [of words], uses words properly in the [appropriate] moment of conduct (*vyavahārakāla*), <u>he, the one who knows the right method of words, obtains endless victory in the hereafter</u>, and is defiled by ungrammatical words. Who? The one who knows the right method of words and no other. Why is this so? **Because one who knows correct words (*śabdān*) knows grammatically incorrect words (*apaśabdān*), as well.** For in the very same way that there is merit (*dharma*) in knowledge of correct words, in the same way there also is demerit (*adharma*) in knowledge of grammatically incorrect words. Or rather, demerit obtains in greater supply. [For:] Grammatically incorrect words are many; correct words are fewer, because for each single correct word there are many [corresponding] grammatically incorrect words. **To wit – for the correct word "cow" (*gauḥ*) there are many grammatically incorrect words (*apabhraṃśāḥ*), including but not limited to: *gāvī, goṇī, gotā,* [and] *gopotalikā*.**

Mutatis mutandis, I propose, Daṇḍin's "wish-fulfilling cow" of *Kāvyādarśa* 1.6 parallels Patañjali's notion that the one skilled in the special properties of words, using them properly, obtains endless victory. If there is a difference between the two, apart from their manners of expression, it is this, that Daṇḍin promises no felicity *in the hereafter* as Patañjali does. Perhaps this is because the word "cow" (*gauḥ*) in the *Paspaśāhnika* and, by all indications, in Daṇḍin's understanding of proper language use, concerns only worldly or *laukika* speech and not the speech of the Veda. (Patañjali as we saw refers to *vaidika* and *laukika* speech with *gauḥ* being the first and most studied word exemplifying only the latter). That is, Daṇḍin addresses "worldly" language and self-consciously so, and may be taken to signal his interest in the same by using the term "cow" to exemplify the potential of poetic language-use, knowing as he would that the term presents in Patañjali an exemplar not of Vedic, but of *laukika*, language.

Now, having Patañjali's dichotomy of correct speech and incorrect forms of speech, of *śabda* and *apaśabda*/*apabhraṃśa*, in mind, Daṇḍin's mention of the binary of good and bad qualities of poetic speech in his introductory verses – his reference to *guṇa*s and *doṣa*s – may be read in a new light. This is so even while the same distinction appears also in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and elsewhere. For it is in *Kāvyādarśa* 1.8 that Daṇḍin refers to his binary of language, which immediately follows the syntactically linked pair of verses (1.6–7) cited above that refer to the use of language with the term cow and that praise

good speech as wish-fulfilling. Patañjali announces a binary division of language where he notes that proper language use is meritorious, and so does Daṇḍin. But Daṇḍin divides up language differently, not by languages – Sanskrit on the one hand, other languages on the other – but by the good or bad qualities of a number of to-be-named languages.

> *guṇadoṣān aśāstrajñaḥ kathaṃ vibhajate janaḥ |*
> *kim andhasyādhikāro 'sti rūpabhedopalabdhiṣu* || 1.8 ||

How can people who do not know the learned works (*śāstra*) distinguish qualities and faults? What qualification is there of a blind person in the perceptions of differences in form?

We may reiterate that a major difference distinguishes Daṇḍin's from Patañjali's binary classification, just as it is also well known that Daṇḍin treats poetic speech by analyzing both the good and deleterious qualities of the same. That his formulation echoes and transmutes Patañjali's own binary division of language, however, has to date passed without remark.

Elsewhere, the degree to which Daṇḍin evokes, cites, and responds to the grammatical tradition in defining the range of permissible languages for poetry has also passed to date without remark. Consider *Kāvyādarśa* 1.32, where Daṇḍin famously identifies four languages for poetic composition.

> *tad etad vāṅmayaṃ bhūyaḥ saṃskṛtaṃ prākṛtaṃ tathā |*
> *apabhraṃśaś ca miśrañ cety āhur āptāś caurvidhaṃ* || 1.32 ||

Thus, the trustworthy say that this, [poetic] speech, moreover, is fourfold: Sanskrit and Prākrit, and Apabhraṃśa and mixed.

Daṇḍin also lays claim to an even more inclusive view of language-use for works of literary art, this at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.38, which suggests with reference to "all languages" (*sarvabhāṣā*) that story narratives may be composed in a gamut of languages, more than is allowed even by the tetradic model of poetic languages of *Kāvyādarśa* 1.32.

> *kathādiḥ sarvabhāṣābhiḥ saṃskṛtena ca paṭhyate |*
> *bhūtabhāṣāmayīṃ tv āhur adbhutārthāṃ bṛhatkathām* || 1.38 ||

A narrative (*kathā*), e.g., is recited in all [other] languages, and in Sanskrit. And they say the *Bṛhatkathā* is comprised of the language of hungry ghosts (*bhūtabhāṣā*, i.e., in Paiśācī), its meaning being wonderous.

The context of these verses is such that, by following soon after Daṇḍin's introductory verses, they presuppose the paradigm shift there expressed, whereby Daṇḍin transmutes the binary of *śabda* and *apaśabda/apabhraṃśa*, which is based on the grammatical correctness of Sanskrit speech, into a classification of speech of various languages on the terms of its poetic qualities and faults.

While Daṇḍin may not be taken explicitly to refer to the grammatical tradition either at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.32 or 1.38, he does so at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.36, this with the term *śāstra* and in a manner which responds to the *śabda* – *apaśabda/apabhraṃśa* binary of the *Paspaśāhnika*. There, he says the following.

> *ābhīrādigiraḥ kāvyeṣv apabhraṃśa iti smṛtāḥ |*
> *śāstre tu saṃskṛtād anyad apabhraṃśatayoditam* || 1.36 ||

In the *kāvya*s, the speech of the cowherds, etc.[3], is traditionally understood as Apabhraṃśa, but in the *śāstra*[4] what is other than Sanskrit arises ungrammatically (*apabhraṃśatayā*).

The analysis of the term *apabhraṃśa* says it all: Daṇḍin states that in the Alaṃkāraśāstra it is a language proper of poetics, while in the grammatical tradition what are languages other than Sanskrit, including of course Apabhraṃśa, are uttered *apabhraṃśatayā* – ungrammatically and therefore in a manner that, while they may serve to communicate mundane concerns, convey no felicity to the speaker. In Daṇḍin, effective speech that serves as a "wish-fulfilling cow" in its use may occur in many languages, as well as Sanskrit, and he states this claim explicitly, I argue, by way of reference to the more strict, Sanskrit-exclusive formulation that Patañjali articulates in the *Paspaśāhnika*.

Kāvyādarśa 1.36 is intriguing for another reason, as well. It suggests that the semantic range of the term *śāstra* in the *Kāvyādarśa* may include *vyākaraṇa*; for at the least it does so in this instance. This is significant because the term is also deployed very early in Daṇḍin's text, in fact in the second of his introductory verses, at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2. While the commentators do not understand him there to refer to Pāṇini, Patañjali, or the grammatical tradition[5], I would like to propose that the resonance of the term *śāstra* would have evoked in Daṇḍin's audience a sense that grammar is among the traditions of learning that precede and guide the study of poetic language. This is so, I argue, for three reasons. First – and as already noted, – not only does the semantic range of the term *śāstra* include *vyākaraṇa* at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.36, but Patañjali also uses the term *śāstra* to refer to *vyākaraṇa* and this in the very opening passage of the *Paspaśā*, which Daṇḍin clearly echoes in his introductory verses. (Patañjali there says: *śabdānuśāsanaṃ śāstram adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam*). Second, one must consider the context of *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2, because what immediately follows it at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3, when read with *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2, presents a formulation regarding linguistic authority that is well-known in the grammatical tradition, a point to which I shall return momentarily.

Third, *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2 refers to the uses or *prayoga*s of the previous *śāstra*s, which echoes Patañjali's treatment of language in the opening passages of the *Paspaśā*.

> *pūrvaśāstrāṇi saṃhṛtya prayogān upalakṣya ca |*
> *yathāsāmarthyam asmābhiḥ kriyate kāvyalakṣaṇam || 1.2 ||*

Having drawn together the precedent *śāstra*s and having observed [their] uses, we [now] define poetry (*kāvya*) as we are able.

Daṇḍin here mentions prior *śāstra*s in a generic sense, just as he mentions the knower of *śāstra*s (*śāstrajña*) without specificity in verse 1.8. And yet, by referring explicitly to the uses (*prayoga*s) of the prior *śāstra*s, Daṇḍin may be taken also to allude to the opening lines of the *Paspaśāhnika*, wherein Patañjali queries at length the uses (*prayojanāni*) of grammar.

(Pas_3) KA_I,1.14–2.2 Ro_I,8–14 *kāni punaḥ śabdānuśāsanasya prayojanāni? rakṣohāgamalaghvasandehāḥ proyojanam*…

…(Pas_4.1) KA_I,2.3–9 Ro_I,11–12 *imāni ca bhūyaḥ śabdānuśāsanasya prayojanāni*. (1) *te 'surāḥ*, (2) *duṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ*, (3) *yad adhītam*, (4) *yas tu prayuṅkte*, (5) *avidvāṃsaḥ*, (6) *vibhaktiṃ kurvanti*, (7) *yo vai imām*, (8) *catvāri*, (9) *uta tvaḥ*, (10) *saktum iva*, (11) *sārasvatīm*, (12) *daśamyām putrasya*, (13) *sudevo 'si varuṇa iti*.

But what are the uses of the study of words? The uses are protection (*rakṣa*), modification (*ūha*), tradition (*āgama*), brevity (*laghu*), and certainty (*asandeha*)…

…These are additional uses for the study of words. (1) *te 'surāḥ*, (2) *duṣṭaḥ śabdaḥ*, (3) *yad adhītam*, (4) *yas tu prayuṅkte*, (5) *avidvāṃsaḥ*, (6) *vibhaktiṃ kurvanti*, (7) *yo vai imām*, (8) *catvāri*, (9) *uta tvaḥ*, (10) *saktum iva*, (11) *sārasvatīm*, (12) *daśamyām putrasya*, (13) and *sudevo 'si varuṇa*.

This evidence is perhaps circumstantial given the well-known binary of *śāstra* and *prayogā*[6]. But if we are right to understand Daṇḍin to allude to the *Paspaśā* in this manner, it should come as no surprise that he does so, given other obvious conceptual affinities between his poetics and the Pāṇinian system of grammatical analysis. Take, for example, the fact that the Alaṃkāraśāstra echoes a formulation of Sanskrit grammar in its fundamental and binary classification of the "ornaments" of language, the *alaṃkāra*s themselves. As is well known, Pāṇini draws a fundamental distinction of denotation in his grammar, wherein words normally refer to their own form in the *sūtra*s, excepting for technical terms, which denote their referents proper. This is famously expressed in a metarule or *paribhāṣasūtra* at *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.1.68:

> *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā* || 1.1.68 ||

> It is the very form of a linguistic element [that is referred to in the grammar], unless it is a *saṃjñā*, a technical term of the grammar.

The basic division of *alaṃkāra*s found in Daṇḍin, so too represented in Bhāmaha's *Kāvyālaṃkāra* and imported into the tradition subsequent to both authors, is that of distinguishing *śabdālaṃkāra*s, or adornments of sound, from *arthālaṃkāra*s, or adornments of meaning – in other words precisely the distinction expressed by the cited metarule of the grammar. Poetics and grammar both query the nature of language and have natural affinities, in other words, and therefore there is general reason to imagine *vyākaraṇa* as a *śāstra* of record for the Alaṃkāraśāstra.

There is also the aforementioned contextual reason to imagine grammar as one among the "prior *śāstra*s" mentioned by Daṇḍin at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2. Just as it is a principal of *vyākaraṇa* that *śabda* or correct speech is defined first by the strictures of the *śāstra* itself – the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (as properly understood with its authorized commentaries) – and only after this, where there are gaps or uncertainties left by the *śāstra*, by appealing to the speech-conduct of those who are well-learned, the Śiṣṭas (*śiṣṭācāra*), so in the same way Daṇḍin pairs reference to these two sources of authority by mentioning each, respectively, in *Kāvyādarśā* 1.2 and 1.3. Consider now the rather fascinating references to *śiṣṭa*s at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3, bearing in mind that it immediately follows reference to *śāstra*s at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2.

> *iha śiṣṭānuśiṣṭānāṃ śiṣṭānām api sarvathā |*
> *vācām eva prasādena lokayātrā pravartate* || 1.3 ||

> Here [in the world], the conduct of the people operates in every respect by the clearness of style of the very statements of those who have been educated by the Śiṣṭas (*śiṣṭānuśiṣṭānām*) and of the remaining [people], as well (*śiṣṭānām api*).

Immediately following reference to *pūrvaśāstra*s at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2, this verse clearly uses the term *śiṣṭa* twice and *anuśiṣṭa* once, evoking reference to and referring to the Śiṣṭas in doing so. At play is a punning on the double-meaning of the term *śiṣṭa*, which can refer either to the learned elders who are authorities in the use of language or can be understood by its literal meaning to refer to who or what is "left" or "remains". What is most interesting in Daṇḍin's repeated use here of the term *śiṣṭa*, moreover, is that it could be taken to present what is on Daṇḍin's own understanding a poetic *doṣa* or flaw. This is significant, for the error that may be corrected by avoiding the flaw requires one to shift one's sense of the meaning of the term *śiṣṭa* in *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3b, and the shift of meaning, from reference to the Śiṣṭas to a more literal understanding of the term *śiṣṭa* as referring to "remaining" people(s), reflects the shifts of focus that transpired in the analysis of language Daṇḍin offers and this by way of departure from that of the grammatical tradition. More simply put: *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3 uses poetics to require those hearing or reading

the verse to shift their understanding of the term in question, such that the meaning of the term as used by grammarians is discarded in favor of a semantics that reflects Daṇḍin's revised and more capacious understanding of which languages, and speakers, may find felicity in language-use.

To recognize Daṇḍin's semantic game, consider first the third of the ten poetic faults or *doṣa*s, what is *ekārtha* or *punarukta*, the repeated expression of the same word or the same meaning in the same verse. The flaw is explained at *Kāvyādarśa* 3.135–137 as follows.

> *aviśeṣeṇa pūrvoktaṃ yadi bhūyo 'pi kīrtyate |*
> *arthataḥ śabdato vāpi tad ekārthaṃ mataṃ yathā || 3.135 ||*
> *utkām unmanayanty ete bālāṃ tadalakatviṣaḥ |*
> *ambhodharās taḍitvanto gambhīrāḥ stanayitnavaḥ || 3.136 ||*
> *anukampādyatiśayo yadi kaścid vivakṣyate |*
> *na doṣaḥ punarukto 'pi pratyuteyam alaṃkṛtiḥ || 3.137 ||*

If what has been stated before is again made mention of without any difference either of meaning or word, that is understood to be *ekārtha* or forming only one notion [which is the third of the ten *doṣa*s identified herein]. For example: These deep water-bearers, possessors of lightning, thunderous ones, whose color is like that of her curls, cause longing in that longing girl. If [,however,] a certain preeminence of compassion or the like is wished to be expressed, [then] even what has been repeated in speech is not a fault. On the contrary, it is a rhetorical adornment[7].

By this poetic rule, the use of the term *śiṣṭa* in the second quarter (*pāda*) of *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3 cannot refer to the same Śiṣṭas by whom some are said to be taught in the first *pāda*, for the semantic repetition would be a poetic fault. (I see no way for this repetition to express "a certain preeminence of compassion or the like"). This surprises, because the more natural way of reading 1.3ab would be to understand it to refer to "those taught by the Śiṣṭas as well as the Śiṣṭas themselves". Indeed, I suggest that this interpretation would come first to the minds of the listeners or readers of the verse, for it is somewhat surprising to suggest the students of Śiṣṭas guide the conduct of people in the world, as do others, but this to the exclusion of the Śiṣṭas themselves. And yet, read in cognizance of this third poetic fault or *doṣa*, the sensible interpretation of the half-verse suggests it offers just this conspicuous exclusion of the Śiṣṭas from reference. We may note, moreover, that the commentators are very divergent in their interpretation of this verse, but none of them understands the term *śiṣṭa* in the b *pāda* to refer to the Śiṣṭas themselves[8].

The repeated use of the term *śiṣṭa* at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3, immediately following as it does reference to *pūrvaśāstra*s, thus evokes but modifies playfully a principal of hierarchical authority as understood in the tradition of grammar. It does so in a manner that, by way of this poetic word-play, alters that hierarchy by suggesting that *others* than those who know Sanskrit – those *other* than the Śiṣṭas – should be counted as persons of major concern in the world, their importance being founded on their clearness and graciousness of style in a speech that is of merit, whether that speech occurs in Sanskrit or another language poetically deployed.

Conclusion

This punning verse, playing as it does with Daṇḍin's own rules around poetic faults, supports the core thesis of this essay, that Daṇḍin evokes but modifies the views of the grammatical tradition in introducing his own study of language. So much, however, can only be seen if one reads deeply and broadly, *across* genres and not in a strict disciplinary manner as is sometimes practiced in the Modern academy. For Daṇḍin knows how *vyākaraṇa* conceives of language and organizes it conceptually, and he plays with

grammatical categories and deploys grammar's distinctions, this by way of distinguishing the forms of words from their meanings, by identifying both correct and erroneous forms of (poetic) language, by thinking of language-use as meritorious or beneficial in its proper usage, by evoking language use in general by way of reference to the use of the term "cow", by presenting his own analysis of language by way of referring to "previous *śāstra*s" in a manner that suggests *vyākaraṇa* should be included among them, and by evoking the notion that two forms of authority are to be found in matters of language use: *śāstra* and *śiṣṭācāra*. Daṇḍin, however, wishes not to limit proper and meritorious language-use to Sanskrit, nor therefore exclusively to the paragons of Sanskrit speakers, for he rather explicitly draws the lines of linguistic demarcation differently, by way of shifting focus away from correct Sanskrit speech to an evaluation of the poetic qualities of speech of various languages. Thus, he says in *Kāvyādarśa* 1.36 that he differs from the *śāstra* in his understanding of *apabhraṃśa/tā*. Simply put: It is well known Daṇḍin opens the lens of proper expression to languages other than Sanskrit; this essay argues that he does so by way of extensive reference to *vyākaraṇa* and to Patañjali's *Paspaśāhnika* in particular.

If Daṇḍin is innovative in expanding linguistic analysis to include multiple languages and communities of speakers, he also is conservative in this sense: the *śāstra* that is *vyākaraṇa* clearly has helped him to organize his thinking around language, its use, and its salutary effects. One thus should be careful not to define Daṇḍin in any unreserved manner as a voice for unequivocal inclusion. He nowhere condemns any elitism of the Śiṣṭas – even if he playfully displaces their unique authority – and he in fact echoes some of their core intellectual formulations around language-use, as I have scouted above. Nowhere, moreover, does he address the nature of Vedic speech in his *paspaśa* (or elsewhere to my knowledge), nor the acts associated therewith. And given the fact that the term he uses in parallel with Patañjali to refer to good speech – *gauḥ* – is meant to exemplify only *laukika* and not *vaidika* speech in the *Paspaśāhnika*, his silence on the matter of Vedic speech rather suggests an implied acceptance thereof (and thus of its values), rather than a wish to displace the same.

On the other hand, unlike Patañjali, who contrasts the term *gauḥ* with various Prakritic forms of the word, Daṇḍin twice uses this Sanskrit term to suggest it can exemplify *both* speeches of good and of faulty poetic quality. This is so, moreover, despite the fact that the term in both instances is correctly formed by the measure of the strictures of Sanskrit grammar. This suggests, in other words, that Daṇḍin can allow for a form of (worldly or *laukika*) Sanskrit speech that is full of faults and conveys no merit to the speaker, which in turn suggests a displacement of Sanskrit as not just a prestige language but as an innately efficacious one, as well – at the least at the *laukika* level of language-use.

And yet, Daṇḍin of course writes in Sanskrit, affirming its qualities thereby. And it was not just Sanskrit, but also Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa that were highly stylized languages, acquired only by a certain elite. The point I wish to make is that inasmuch as Daṇḍin values speech of quality that is expressed in a *range* of highly articulated languages, inasmuch as he avoids commenting on the place or value of Vedic speech, and inasmuch as even his punning on the term *śiṣṭa* only follows an affirmation of the value of the speech of those taught by Śiṣṭas (*śiṣṭānuśiṣṭa*) (and this after praising the value of "previous" *śāstra*s), one cannot read Daṇḍin as rejecting the authority of elite Sanskrit speakers, but only as modifying it by making space for felicitous language use in a greater range of linguistic forms and, evidently, by a greater range of speakers.

And yet Daṇḍin *is* a reformer in the sense that he opens a lens on language that self-consciously shifts emphasis away from the exclusive circle of the elite among Sanskrit speakers and does so by evoking and transmuting the structured analysis of language in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition. Indeed, the fact that Daṇḍin defines his own subject by way of echoes of the prestigious Brahmanical tradition of Sanskrit grammar, but only

while simultaneously expanding *both* the scope of those who can engage and represent the science of the study of language *and* the variety of languages that embody proper language use, may well help to explain the historical resonance of the *Kāvyādarśa* in so many linguistic and cultural contexts, such that it could deeply influence poetics across the world and in so many Asian and other languages. Thus, if it is true, as Daṇḍin says at *Kāvyādarśa* 1.4 (in a manner that like *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3cd perhaps echoes Bhartṛhari)[9], that the entire triple would be rendered a blind darkness without the light of speech, the speech he has in mind is not merely poetic speech of qualities and of various languages, but speech imagined and understood in light of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, which is to say that innovation in Daṇḍin is born from deep reflection upon and a certain conservation of a preexistent, elite, highly cultivated – and conservative – tradition. It is by transmuting and not merely dismissing that tradition that he opens a way to new language-use in the range of communities his poetics has reached over the centuries.

---

[1] All references to the *Kāvyādarśa* cite the edition of [Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) 1999].

[2] This and all following references to the *Mahābhāṣya* are cited from the e-text prepared on the basis of the edition by Franz Kielhorn (Bombay, 1880–1885), revised by K. V. Abhyankar (Poona, 1972–1996), and with additional references of the edition of Gurukuljhajjar, Rohatak (Rohtak): Hariyana sahitya samsthan, 1961–1963, 5 vols. Input of the e-text is by George Cardona, formatting thereof by Masato Kobayashi. The item, as is well known, is available for download on the Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages (GRETIL), available at: http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.html (accessed July 14, 2022). The furnished translations are my own. The structure of references offered there and replicated in this essay is as follows: KA_n,n.n = Kielhorn/Abhyankar edition_volume,page.line; Ro_n,n.n = Rohatak edition_volume,page.line; Pas_nn = *Paspaśāhnika*; Śs_nn = *Śivasūtra*; P_n,n.n.n = Pāṇini_*adhyāya,pāda.sūtra*.

[3] The *Ratnaśrī* commentary glosses *ābhīra* with *vāhika*, which is the name of a people. The *Hṛdayaṃgamā* glosses with *gopajātiviśeṣaḥ*, which is supported by the *Prabhā*'s glosses with the term *gopa*. See: [Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) 1999, *147–148*].

[4] The term *śāstra* refers to *śabdaśāstrādi*, according to the *Prabhā*; the *Vivṛti* understands it to refer to *vyākaraṇa*; the *Hṛdayaṃgama* says that the *śāstra*s in question are other than *kāvya* and include the Veda, etc. (*śāstreṣu kāvyātirikteṣu vedādiṣu*). See: [Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) 1999, *147–148*].

[5] All the early commentaries gloss *pūrvaśāstra* of *Kāvyādarśa* 1.2 by way of reference to earlier traditions of dramatic and aesthetic interpretation. The *Hṛdayaṅgamā* glosses *pūrvaśāstra* as a genitive *tatpuruṣa* compound as follows: *pūrveṣāṃ kavīnāṃ bharatādīnāṃ śāstrāṇi kāvyagranthān*. The *Prabhā* offers a similar analysis: *pūrveṣāṃ śilālibharataprabhṛtīnāṃ śāstrāṇi nāṭyasūtrādīni*. The *Vivṛti* glosses as follows: *pūrvaśāstrāṇi medhāvirudrabhāmahādiproktāni kāvyalakṣaṇāni*. See: [Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) 1999, *7–8*].

[6] On this binary see: [Pollock 1985].

[7] This translation is a slight modification of that of [Eppling 1989, *253–254*].

[8] The *Ratnaśrī* glosses *śiṣṭānuśiṣṭa* with *śabdānuśāsanakṛtaḥ pāṇiniprabhṛtayaḥ | tair anuśiṣṭāḥ saṃskṛtāḥ…* It glosses *śiṣṭānām api* with *śiṣṭānuśiṣṭebhyo bāhyāḥ śiṣṭāḥ pariśiṣṭāḥ*. The *Hṛdaṅgamā* glosses *śiṣṭānuśiṣṭānām* with *śiṣṭaiḥ dhīraiḥ maheśvarādibhiḥ…anuśiṣṭānāṃ sādhitānām, prakṛtipratyayādivibhāgena vyutpāditānāṃ saṃskṛtānām*. And it glosses *śiṣṭānām [api]* with *jātideśādivibhāgena siddhānāṃ pracalitānāṃ prākṛtadeśīyānām*. The *Prabhā* says this: *śiṣṭāḥ śabdaśāstrapravīṇās taiḥ pāṇinivararucipatañjaliprabhṛtibhir anuśiṣṭāḥ prakṛtipratyayavibhāgādibhir vyutpāditāḥ sādhvasādhujñāpanena śāsitā vā tāsāṃ saṃskṛtaprākṛtānām | tathā śiṣṭānām etaddvayāvaśiṣṭānāṃ prākṛtajanavyavahārāspadānāṃ deśīnām ity arthaḥ |*. The *Vivṛti* glosses *śiṣṭānām [api]* with *pariśiṣṭānāṃ bālagopālādīnāṃ* and as follows: *tathā śiṣṭānām api pariśiṣṭānāṃ ca prākṛtāpabhraṃśādīnāṃ bālādiprayuktānāṃ vācām eva prasādena lokayātrā pravartate |*. It understands the *śiṣṭa* of *śiṣṭānuśiṣṭānām* to refer to those who know Sanskrit grammar: *śiṣṭāś ca śabdārthasambandeṣv aparatantrāḥ sūtravārtikabhāṣyakārāḥ |*. Interestingly, it understands *anuśiṣṭa* as follows: *anuśiṣṭāḥ subandhudiṅnāgabhartṛhariprabhṛtayaḥ |*. See: [Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) 1999, *10–13*].

[9] *idam andhaṃ tamaḥ kṛtsnaṃ jāyate bhuvanatrayam | yadi śabdāhvayaṃ jyotir ā saṃsārān na dīpyate* || 1.4 ||. "This entire triple-world would be produced a blind darkness, if the light named speech did not shine unto Saṃsāra". The allusion to Bhartṛhari that perhaps is evident, may be to *Vākyapadīya* 1.131 in particular (cited in the commentary on *Kāvyādarśa* 1.3 in both the *Prabhā* and the *Vivṛti*): *na so 'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamād ṛte | anuviddham iva jñānaṃ sarvaṃ śabdena bhāsate* || 1.131 ||. The *Hṛdayaṅgamā* rather cites *Vākyapadīya* 1.165–167 in glossing *Kāvyādarśa* 1.4 [see: Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) 1999, *16–17*]: *sthāneṣu vivṛte vāyau kṛta-varṇaparigrahā | vaikharī vāk prayoktṝ̄ṇāṃ prāṇavṛttinibandhanā* || 1.165 || *kevalaṃ buddhyu-pādānakramarūpānupātinī | prāṇavṛttim atikramya madhyamā vāk pravartate* || 1.166 || *avibhāgā tu paśyantī sarvataḥ saṃhṛtakramā | svarūpajyotir evāntaḥ sūkṣmā vāg anapāyinī* || 1.167 ||.

REFERENCES

Abhyankar K. V. (1962–1972), *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, edited by F. Kielhorn, Third edition, revised and furnished with additional readings, references and selected critical notes, 3 vols, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. (In Sanskrit).

Eppling J. F. (1989), *A Calculus of Creative Expression: The Central Chapter of Daṇḍin's "Kāvyādarśa"*, Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Kielhorn F. E. (1885–1909), *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, Second Revised Edition, Bombay Sanskrit Series, Nos 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 26, Government Central Book Depot, Bombay. (In Sanskrit).

Pollock Sh. (1985), "The Theory of Practice and the Practice of Theory in Indian Intellectual History", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 105, No. 3, pp. 499–519. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/601525

Yogeśvaradattaśarmā (Pārāśaraḥ) (1999), *Ācārya Daṇḍī-Kāvyādarśa*, *Aneka Ṭikāoṃ Sahita*. *Prathama khaṇḍa*: 1. *Ratnaśrī*, 2. *Hṛdayaṅgamā*, 3. *Prabhā*, 4. *Vivṛti*, 4 vols, Nāg Publisher, Delhi. (In Sanskrit).

Дж. Немец

"Паспаша" Дандіна: вплив санскритської граматичної традиції на санскритську поетику

Хоча висновки з цього нарису можуть бути перебільшені, його теза проста: Дандін, автор санскритського трактату з теорії поезії "Кав'я-дарша" (VII ст.), знав граматичну працю Паніні ("Аштадг'яї" (бл. V ст. до н. е.)) і "Магабгаш'ю" (II ст. до н. е.) та коментар до неї Патаньджалі і прагнув у своєму власному аналізі мови концептуально віддзеркалити й наслідувати санскритську граматичну традицію, водночас відкриваючи новий вимір лінгвістичного аналізу. Простіше кажучи, Паніні й Патаньджалі запропонували модель трактування мови, на яку взорувався Дандін, свідомо модифікуючи її.

Докази цього впливу завжди були під рукою, але щоб їх побачити, потрібно читати різножанрові санскритські твори й робити це з увагою до сформованих у досучасній Південній Азії особливостей освітнього процесу, що значно відрізнявся від нинішнього вузькоспеціалізованого підходу до читання, згідно з яким часто, якщо не завжди, матеріал поділяється на розмежовані предмети: філософію, літературу, лінгвістику, історію тощо. Читаючи паралельно праці з давньоіндійської граматики (vyākaraṇa) та літературної майстерності (alaṃkāra-śāstra), можна розпізнати вплив першої на другу у вступних віршах "Кав'я-дарші", де є помітним намір автора запозичити та повторити дещо зі вступної (paspaśa) частини (āhnika) "Магабгаш'ї" Патаньджалі. Тому ця публікація дістала назву «"Паспаша" Дандіна: вплив санскритської граматичної традиції на санскритську поетику».

Ключові слова: Дандін, Паніні, Патаньджалі, в'якарана, аламкара-шястра, санскритська граматична традиція, Південна Азія