

Compounding from a historical viewpoint

Bhagyalata A. Pataskar

Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala (Adarsha Sanskrit Shodha Samstha), Pune

Compounding is one of the important characteristics of the Sanskrit language. From the *padapāṭha* up to Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa (including *prātiśākhya*-s and also other grammatical traditions) all grammatical activities and grammarians have contributed to the theorization and thereby explanations of compounds and compounding.

The *padapāṭha* aims at giving the analysis of the *Samhitā*. For the *Prātiśākhya*-s *pada* is the *prakṛti*, hence in order to make different combinations of the *pada*, whether given expression is one *pada* or not is their prime concern. Hence for them *samāsa* being one *pada* and has one accent, is very much important.

Pāṇini's way of looking at compounding is completely grammatical and hence formal. He calls it 'padavidhi' a grammatical operation dealing with 'pada-s'. A condition laid down for this is *sāmarthya* (P.2.1.1 *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*). This condition deals with a minimum essential semantic condition. The *prātipadika* status of the compound, the *samāsānta* treatment in detail, the elaborate discussion of the accentuation of the compounds and above all the way in which he lays down the definitions of the compounds, suffice to reveal a viewpoint that is purely formal. Pāṇini has *nīyasamāsa* category, but this is restricted for a few compounds. However when Kātyāyana records *arthena nīyasamāsavacanāṁ, sarvaliṅgatā ca vaktavyā*, he intends to stress its syntactical function: the *tatpuruṣa* compound formed with the word *artha* functions like an adjective in the sentence (i.e. *anyapadārtha*). The *vārttikā*-s on the *sūtra*-s of compounding clearly reveal Kātyāyana's attempt to reconcile the form used with the meaning understood from it. The *Mahābhāṣya* discussion of two types of *sāmarthya* implies that Patañjali, considering the form of the compound, accepts different types of compounds, while he, considering the process of the compound, proposes that the compounding is parallel to the uncompounded expression (e.g. *rājapurūṣaḥ = rājñāḥ purūṣaḥ*).

Bhaṭṭojī has a still different way of looking at the compounds. He defines: *pūrvapadārthapradhāno 'vyayībhāvaḥ* etc. He is certainly stressing a meaning factor, which too is obtained through the 'analysis' of meaning.

Coming to philosophical texts such as *Vākyapadīya*, *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* and *Paramalaghumañjūṣā* etc., we clearly come to know that the stress in treating the compound is shifted onto the process how particular meanings, such as a relational meaning in the *tatpuruṣa* compound, *cārtha* in the *dvandva* compound, and *anyapadārtha* in the *bahuvrīhi* compound, are communicated.

The *Kātantra* school has a totally different way of looking at compounding, which can be described as uncompleted categorical view.

The present paper discusses this grammatical account of compounding from a historical viewpoint.