

Reasons behind multiple additions in the *uṇādi-sūtra-pāṭha*

Vasantkumar M. Bhatt
Gujarat University, Ahmedabad

The *uṇādi-sūtrās* are framed to bring some light on Sanskrit word formation. But we do not find a single method of analyzing a word throughout the “*pañcapādī-uṇādi*”. And even Pāṇini has also pointed out this type of word-formation by the use of a peculiar word, viz. *bahulam*, pointing towards irregularities. The use of this word shows that he agrees with the word-formation, but halfheartedly.

Questions have been raised concerning the authorship of these *uṇādi-sūtrās*, and debates are going on still. Some scholars are of the opinion that Śākaṭāyana is the author/compiler of these *sūtrās*. Other scholars say that Āpiśali or Pāṇini himself might have written these *sūtrās*. But such intellectual debates are not useful to understand the nature of these *sūtrās* or their need in the field of grammar.

The question of its authorship would have been left aside if somebody had realized that there are more than one author involved in the amplification of these *sūtrās*. Looking to the various types of word-formation presented in *pañcapādī-uṇādi-sūtrās*, it is easy to infer about its multiple authorship.

Moreover, in ancient India, the form of grammatical discussion was confined to analyses about only a single word. It may be Śākalya a padapāṭhakāra, Śaunaka a prātiśākhya-kāra, Śākaṭāyana a grammarian. Or even Yāska an etymologist (a nirvacanakāra). None of them discussed the structure of a full sentence. It was only Pāṇini who gave us a sentence-producing grammar. So, he may not be a compositor of any of the *pañcapādī-uṇādi-sūtrās*.

Now if there are various methods of word-formation in the present *pañcapādī-uṇādi-sūtrās* one should try to analyze them, and one should also try to find reasons behind the amplification of these *uṇādi-sūtrās*. This paper aims to present this type of discussion.