

## The word *pratyāṅga* in Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya

Ashok Aklujkar  
University of British Columbia

Some puzzlement as to what the word *pratyāṅga* occurring in the frequently cited Mahābhāṣya statement *akac-svarau tu kartavyau pratyāṅgaṁ mukta-saṁśayau* means seems to have been felt by modern scholars at least from the time of Franz Kielhorn. In his 1886 article “Notes on the Mahābhāṣya” published in *Indian Antiquary* 15: 80–84 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, 1969, pp. 202–206), Kielhorn stated the following: “... the word *pratyāṅga* (for *antar-aṅga*) which in this technical sense is found only in a kārīkā on P. 6.4.110, and in the Bhāṣya on P. 6.3.138, where Patañjali repeats a statement of other grammarians (Vol. III p. 1777, *ihānya ācāryās cau pratyāṅgasya pratiṣedham āhuḥ*.” The present paper will point out that there is no unanimous or invariable support in the traditional commentaries for taking *pratyāṅga* as *antar-aṅga*. The word does not come across as a technical term. The traditional commentators seem to have been puzzled by some of its occurrences as we would be. Moreover, they seem to waver between taking it as an *avyayī-bhāva* compound and as a noun. There is also one occurrence which Kielhorn (understandably) missed (given the absence of a Mahābhāṣya word index in his time). On this background, the paper will build its second part demonstrating that *pratyāṅga* is a noun in Patañjali's usage, that the verse half *akac-svarau tu kartavyau pratyāṅgaṁ mukta-saṁśayau* cited by Patañjali should have *pratyāṅge* as the reading and that the occurrences of *pratyāṅga* in a large number of texts belonging to a variety of genres establish that the meaning of the word should have the following features: (a) *aṅga* as explicit or implicit context. (b) A denotatum or group of denotata different from the contextual denotatum of *aṅga*, although the referent of *aṅga* can cover the referent or referents of *pratyāṅga*. (c) Individuality or further division. (d) A notion capable of conveying what words like “internal,” “subsumed,” “adjacent,” “facing,” “subsidiary,” “subsequent,” or “minor” convey but not identical with or confined to the meanings of any of these words. The meaning of *pratyāṅga* is not the same as that of *upāṅga*.