2. THE MEANINGS OF ĀNGA

As we have seen (above, p. 5) the amount of explicit information Nāgeśa gives us regarding the meaning of āṅga ("cause") leaves much to be desired. If we had to depend exclusively on his explicit statements, there would be no way of getting away from this unsatisfactory state of affairs. Fortunately, another way is open to us. We can study exactly how Nāgeśa puts the BP to use in specific cases. This, we may hope, will yield the information which was withheld from us in a more straightforward manner. The passage to be studied for this purpose will be largely drawn from elsewhere in the PŚ (that is to say, not from Nāgeśa’s discussion of the BP) and from the LŚŚ. The first one is on Par. XCV.

PŚ 180. 1

mimārjīṣatītyartham ca | tatra vṛddheḥ pūrvam antaraṅgatvād dvitve ...

“Moreover (Par. XCV must be adopted) for (the correct formation of) mimārjīṣati (the desid. of mrj); when namely (mrj) has been reduplicated – and this must be done before Vṛddhi is substituted (for r by P. 7.2.114), because (the reduplication is) antaraṅga (in regard to the substitution of Vṛddhi) – , . . . ”. (K. p. 461.)

The passage is taken out of context, and may therefore remain somewhat obscure to the reader. But what becomes clear from it is that in the derivation of mimārjīṣati reduplication is antaraṅga with respect to the substitution of Vṛddhi.

The rules which prescribe these two operations are P. 6.1.9 (sanyānoḥ) and P. 7.2.114 (mrjer vṛddhiḥ), respectively. Let us look at these more closely, beginning with the latter.

P. 7.2.114 (mrjer vṛddhiḥ) does not, either by itself or by means of anuvṛtti, contain any term indicative of the cause of the substitution of Vṛddhi. In spite of that, the SK explains the sūtra (no. 2473) as follows: mrjer iko vṛddhiḥ syād dhātupratyaye pare, “Vṛddhi is substituted for the root-vowel of the stem mrj before any affix that is ordained after a root.” Nāgeśa, in the LŚŚ (Vāraṇasi ed., part II, p. 571) – which was written after
the \( P\bar{S} \), see Appendix III – expresses his consent in the following words: \( \text{dhatoh kāryam ucyamānam iti paribhāṣālabdham artham āha dhatupratyaye iti} \), “He explains the meaning (of the sūtra), arrived at by means of the Paribhāṣā \( \text{dhatoh kāryam ucyamānam} \ldots \), by saying ‘before any affix that is ordained after a root’.” NāgESA here refers to Par. LXXVIII of his own \( P\bar{S} \) (171.4), which reads in full: \( \text{dhātoḥ kāryam ucyamānām tatpratyaye bhavati} \), “When an operation is taught concerning a root, it takes place (only when the root) is followed by such an affix (as can be added to roots)”\(^2\) (cf. K. p. 429). With the help of this Paribhāṣā, P. 7.2.114 obtains a term indicative of the cause of the operation prescribed by this rule. Thus, once this meaning of P. 7.2.114 is accepted (and it clearly is by NāgESA), the cause of the substitution of Vṛddhi for \( r \), in the derivation of \( \text{mimārjīṣati} \) from \( \text{mrj-sa(n)-ti} \), becomes \( \text{san} \); for \( \text{san} \) is a following “affix that is ordained after a root”.

P. 6.1.9 (\( \text{sanyānoḥ} \)) is considered to consist of a compound with a genitive case ending. This can be learnt from the \( P\bar{S} \) itself, which says (14.5–6): \( \ldots \text{sanyānoḥ ity asya śaṣṭhyanatvāt} \ldots \), “The term \( \text{sanyānoḥ} \) in P. 6.1.9 being a genitive…” (K. p. 52). This rule prescribes reduplication of that which ends in \( \text{san} \). However, this reduplication is subject to some conditions, one of which is important for us at present. It is laid down in P. 6.1.1. (\( \text{ekāco dvē prathamasya} \)), and holds that only the first part of \( \text{mrj-sa} \) may be reduplicated, i.e., only \( \text{mrj} \). A result of this is that \( \text{san} \), though part of that which undergoes the reduplication, is itself not reduplicated. And such being the case, the restriction embodied in Par. X – according to which “that which undergoes an operation can, so far as it undergoes that operation, not be made the cause of the application of a grammatical rule” (K. p. 51) – does not affect the affix \( \text{san} \). In other words, it is quite possible that the cause of the reduplication of \( \text{mrj} \) is \( \text{san} \).

However, as soon as we assume that \( \text{san} \) is indeed the cause of reduplication in the derivation of \( \text{mimārjīṣati} \), we are confronted with difficulties. For we have seen above that \( \text{san} \) is also the cause of the substitution of Vṛddhi in this same derivation. That is to say, both reduplication and substitution of Vṛddhi would have one and the same cause, viz. \( \text{san} \). But then it would become unclear why reduplication should be \( \text{antarāṅga} \) with respect to the substitution of Vṛddhi: As both operations have one and the same cause, it cannot be said that the cause of one operation lies within the causes of the other, nor that the cause of one precedes the cause of the other. In spite of that, according to the present passage, reduplication is \( \text{antarāṅga} \).