

# KINDS OF EXPOSITIONS IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

BY

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

In Sanskrit literature the art of exposition is very old. Here we find different kinds of expositions with different characteristics. It appears that in ancient India, the composition of expositions became an art regulated by some principles. In the following pages an attempt is being made to compile these various types of expositions with examples and other related factors.

As to how there may arise various characteristics in the character of exposition for its only function is to explain the obscure expressions, it may be replied that exposition is made for the help of the pupils, and as such exposition is varied according to the capacity and necessity of students. This is why there arise various kinds of expositions from time to time.

The chief function of Vyākhyāna is to remove the doubts pertaining to the sense of words, as is aptly shewn in the Paribhāṣā व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्नाहि संदेहाद् अलक्षणम्. This Paribhāṣā clearly indicates that (a) there arises doubt regarding the verbal meaning, (b) a Śāstra cannot be regarded as futile, simply because its words are not always easily intelligible and (c) such doubts should be removed with the help of traditional expositions ( Vide Paribhāṣendusekhara, Paribhāṣā 1 ).

Now we are going to discuss about the definitions of expositions. Patañjali showed the character of Vyākhyāna, which is generally adopted in grammatical literature.' He said that the words of the rules do not constitute the exposition, but the examples, counter examples and the supplying of what is wanting in a sentence all these together constitute the Vyākhyāna.

This view is reproduced in the Prayogaratnamālā Vyākaraṇa. It says उदाहृतिः पदकृतिः पदार्थानां विवेचनम्, तन्त्राणां त्रिविधा व्याख्या शिक्षतां

---

<sup>1</sup> ' न केवलं चर्चापदानि व्याख्यानम् x x किंतर्हि, उदाहरणं प्रत्युदाहरणं वाक्याध्याहार इत्येतत् समुदितं व्याख्यानं भवति ' ( Paspasāhnikā ).

शीघ्रबोधिनी. Here उदाहृति means examples, पदकृति means the deduction of words from a Vākya and पदार्थविवेचन means to show their separate meanings.

In the Parāśara Upapurāna, an exposition is regarded as having five factors as under पदच्छेद; पदार्थोक्तिः विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना, आक्षेपस्य समाधानं व्याख्यानं पञ्चलक्षणम् ( 18 Adhyāya ). Here पदच्छेद is the deduction of words from the sentences. पदार्थोक्ति is to show the senses of words. विग्रह is to show the sense of compounds. वाक्य-योजना is to show the inter-relation of words so as to furnish one complete sense. आक्षेप is the raising of doubt and समाधान means the removal of such doubts. It can easily be understood that here Vyākhyāna is further developed from the said kinds for it comprises आक्षेप and समाधान which has no direct touch with the meaning of words.

Vyākhyāna is defined by Durga as 'अर्थस्य अप्रतीयमानस्य पर्यायाभिधानेन विभज्य प्रतिपादनं व्याख्या शब्दस्यापि व्युत्पादनं व्याख्या । एवमेते द्वे व्याख्ये तयोरर्थपरिज्ञानमेकस्याः कार्यम्, शब्दपरिज्ञानमेकस्याः' ( Beginning of the Nirukta commentary of 4th chap. ). Both these two kinds of व्याख्या will be discussed here.

From the above it appears that Vyākhyā is that statement which clarifies the import of words. Now, clarification can be made variously according to the need and capacity of students for whom an exposition is made. Thus we find that in Sanskrit various kinds of Vyākhyās were composed to disclose the sense of words. Not only we find various kinds of expositions, but we also find that some Śāstras were mainly composed for this purpose. In the following pages an attempt is being made to compile some chief kinds of such expositions as recorded in Sanskrit literature. We will only give definitions and examples of Vyākhyānas, paying no heed to their historical background, though it should be understood that there may be some historical causes for different characteristics.

Now I am appending below a list of various types of expositions with their respective characteristics and examples as under :—

( A ) Vṛtti :—The exposition which chiefly contains the meaning of the Sūtras is designated as Vṛtti, as is remarked by Haradatta सूत्रार्थप्रधानो ग्रन्थो वृत्तिः ( Padamañjarī ). It appears that the

वृत्तिस are the earliest attempts to show the sense of Sūtras. A Sūtra is considered as सोपस्कार<sup>1</sup> ( Vide Pradīpa 6-1-1 ) and उपस्कार means पूरण ( Vide Uddyota 1-4-13 ) i. e. a Sūtra does not necessarily contain all words which are needed to express the complete function of a Sūtra and as such there is necessity of the Vṛttis for the completion of सूत्रार्थ.

These Vṛttis contain many factors. It can reasonably be concluded that which was designated as व्याख्यान by Patañjali ( as shown above ) is identical with वृत्ति for the function of a वृत्ति is nothing but to disclose the सूत्रार्थ and there can be no सूत्रार्थ without उदाहरण, प्रत्युदाहरण and वाक्याध्याहार ( vide Paspasā ). In the Kalāpa Vyākaraṇa, a Vṛtti is defined as ' सूत्रार्थे विवरणं वृत्तिः ',<sup>2</sup> which practically coincides with the said view.

Besides these elements Vṛttis contained the following factors also.

( a ) Discussion on अधिकार ( province ) of topics, as is remarked by Kaiyaṭa ( वृत्तिकारास्तु, अधिकाराणां प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्ती व्याचक्षते ( Pradīpa 7-4-24 ).

( b ) Discussion on पदच्छेद. It has already been said that no direct exposition is possible without the पदच्छेद and hence it is absolutely essential for a Vṛttikāra to deduct the पद from the sentences. It is also found that in some cases, the पदच्छेदs made by different Vṛttikāras are not the same ( vide Pradīpa 6-3-76 ) and each पदच्छेद is accepted in a particular school.<sup>3</sup>

( c ) In Vyākaraṇa, it was one of the essential duties of Vṛttikāras to afford उदाहरण and प्रत्युदाहरण also. The उदाहरणs contained in all the वृत्तिस were called मूर्धाभिषिक्त ( Pradīpa 1-1-50 ). Examples of the Vṛttis were also called वार्त्त ( Pradīpa 1-1-56 ) which is defined in the Uddyota as वृत्त्युदाहरणानि.

<sup>1</sup> Similarly Bhartṛhari said ' सोपस्कारेषु सूत्रेषु वाक्यशेषः समर्थ्यते ( 3-14-467 ). Commenting on this stanza, Helārāja clearly showed the verbal character of a Sūtra as under— " इह सूत्रे वाक्यानां क्रियापदाश्रयणात् साध्याहारत्वम् अवसीयते, लक्ष्यानुगुण्येन च लक्षणप्रणयनात् यथायथं लक्ष्यभेदानुसारेण क्रियापदमभ्याहर्तव्यम् ".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the view of Rājasēkhara ' सूत्राणां सकलसारविवरणं वृत्तिः ' ( Kāvya-mīmāṃsā Ad. 2 ).

<sup>3</sup> Similarly there happens difference of opinion regarding the meaning of a Sūtra according to the different view-points of the Vṛttikāras ( vide Kāśikā 5-1-50 and 5-1-94 ).

Kumārāśa showed what should not be done by a Vṛttikāra as under :

प्रसिद्धहानिः शब्दानाम् अप्रसिद्धे च कल्पना, न कार्या वृत्तिकारेण सति सिद्धार्थसंभवे (1-1-1 Tantra Vārttika). It says that a Vṛttikāra should confine himself to disclose the sense of the Sūtras without going to any hairsplitting discussion on any subtle theme.

(B) The second type of Vyākhyā, is वार्तिक. Sureśvara defined it as उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तादिचिन्ता यत्र प्रवर्तते तं ग्रन्थं वार्तिकं प्राहुः वार्तिकज्ञा विपश्चितः (Sambandha Vārttika). Rājasekhara also accepted this definition (उक्तानुक्तदुरुक्तचिन्ताकारि वार्तिकम्—Kāvyaṁimāṁsā Adhyāya 2).

Regarding the topics to be discussed by a Vārttikakāra, Viṣṇudharmottara says :— ' प्रयोजनं संशयनिर्णयो च, व्याख्याविशेषो गुरुलाघवं च, कृतव्युदासोऽकृतशासनं च, स वार्तिको धर्मगुणोऽष्टकश्च ' (3-6) i. e. a Vārttika should contain these eight factors. प्रयोजन is the use of a Śāstra, as is found in the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana on the Pāṇinian system (vide the Vārttika रक्षोहागमलघ्वसंदेहाः प्रयोजनम् (Paspasā). संशयनिर्णयो mean to raise a doubt and its refutation. In the system like Nyāya, the Vārttikakāra sometimes refutes the views of the Bhāṣyakāra and other teachers of different schools. But in Pāṇinian system the Vārttikas are composed to criticise the view and the Sūtras of Pāṇini absolutely. व्याख्या-विशेष is to establish the view of the Sūtra by discovering a hidden sense of any Sūtra. गुरुलाघवं means the discussion on the verbal brevity of the Sūtras. कृतव्युदास is the refutation of what has been established by the Sūtrakāra (उक्तचिन्ता acc. to Sureśvara). अकृतशासन is a new statement not expressly said in the original work (अनुक्तचिन्ता acc. to सुरेश्वर ).<sup>1</sup>

Some say that those characteristics are not of वार्तिक but of वृत्ति. According to this view, वार्तिक of this verse means वृत्तौ भवः i. e. these characteristics are found in the वृत्ति. But this view is untenable for a वृत्ति simply explains the verbal form of a Sūtra, and hence

<sup>1</sup> In the Nyāya Vārttikatātparyāṭikā, we find the following remarks regarding the function of a Vārttika. (a) वार्तिककारः सूत्रतात्पर्यमाह (Page 266) (b) तदाक्षिप्य वार्तिककारः समाधत्ते' (P. 267) (c) तदेतद् भाष्यकारीयमुदाहरणं दूषयित्वा स्वकीयमुदाहरणमाह (P. 282) (d) ' सूत्रव्याख्यानपरं वार्तिकम् ' (P. 352 Kashi edition ).

these factors cannot necessarily come under the province of a Vṛtti at all.

Kaiyaṭa showed what is not to be done by a Vārttikakāra. While commenting on the Mahābhāṣya नैतदन्वाख्येयमधिकारा अनुवर्तन्ते । he said वार्तिककारेण नैतदन्वाख्येयं सर्वाधिकाराणाम् अन्वाख्यानप्रसङ्गात् (Pradīpa 7-4-21). Thus it is clear that discussion on अधिकार is out of the scope of वार्तिक. It appears that वार्तिकs are composed after the वृत्तिस for unless the सूत्रार्थ is completely shown by the Vṛttikāra there can be no criticism of the Sūtras.

(C) Another famous type of Vyākhyā is called 'Bhāṣya', which is defined by Haradatta as 'आक्षेप-समाधानपरो ग्रन्थः (Padamañ-jari). This shows the chief characteristic of a Bhāṣya. In the Parāśara Upapurāṇa, it is again defined as सूत्रस्थं पदमादाय पदैः सूत्रानु-सारिभिः, स्वपदानि च वर्णयन्ते भाष्यं भाष्यविदो विदुः (18th Adhyāya). A Bhāṣya is also designated as a विवरण. Thus Kaiyaṭa says भाष्यकारो विवरणकारत्वात्, (Beginning of Pradīpa):<sup>1</sup> What is exactly meant by विवरण is still to be determined.

Now we will consider the materials, contained in a Bhāṣya. It is the secondary duty of a Bhāṣyakāra to show the सूत्रार्थ in particular cases, though not in all the cases.

The second factor of a Bhāṣya is स्वपदवर्णन. This is the chief characteristic of the Bhāṣya not found in the वृत्तिस or in the वार्तिकs. A Bhāṣya can introduce a new topic or can use new terms and as such it can explain its own verbal expressions, while there is no such attempt in the Vārttikas. This characteristic can be found in the beginning of the Mahābhāṣya, where the proposition अथ शब्दानुशासनम् is discussed by Patañjali himself. In the beginning of the Nyāyabhāṣya we also find the same style. This स्वपदवर्णन sometimes causes doubt whether a particular statement is of Bhāṣyakāra or of Sūtrakāra and such doubts are to be removed through the help of traditional teachings.

The third factor of Bhāṣya is आक्षेप-समाधान. This differentiates a Bhāṣya from the Vṛttis. In the Pāṇinian system the Bhāṣya

<sup>1</sup> Though Bhāṣyakāra shows सूत्रार्थ, yet the putting of उदाहरण etc. originally belongs to वृत्तिकार. Thus Kaiyaṭa says 'प्रत्युदाहरणादिचिन्ता वृत्तिकाराणाम् उचिता, नतु भाष्यकृतः' (Pradīpa on 1-1-56). It appears that the distinction of all kinds of व्याख्याs were not followed strictly in all the Śāstras.



criticises the views of the former Vārttikas and generally supports the Sūtrakāra, though in some cases, the Bhāṣya refutes the views of Pāṇini. In the Yoga-Vārttika, there is no attempt to refute any view of the Bhāṣya, but in the Nyāya-Vārttika there are many places where the Vārttikakāra criticises the views of Gotama and Vātsyāyana. The only difference between the आक्षेप-समाधान of Vārttika and that of Bhāṣya is that the Vārttikas have direct touch with its own tradition, while the scope of Bhāṣya is more extensive.

(D) The particular kind of exposition, which attempts to clarify the sense of obscure portions only was called पञ्जिका, as is said by Hemacandra पञ्जिका पदभञ्जिका. The word पदभञ्जिका is further explained by him showing its chief characteristic as पच्यन्ते व्यक्तीक्रियन्ते पदार्थाः, × × विषमाण्येव पदं भनक्ति. In the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, we also find the same remark (विषमपदभञ्जिका पञ्जिका—Adhyāya 2).

(E) Similarly टीका was the most familiar style of exposition. It is defined as टीका निरन्तरा व्याख्या i. e. Tīkā explains each word of the original text without any exception, as is further remarked by Hemacandra सुगमानां विषमाणां च निरन्तरं व्याख्या यस्याम्. These definitions clearly show that the chief duty of a टीका<sup>1</sup> is to explain each word without leaving any word but at the same time it is devoid of आक्षेप-समाधान or introduction of any subtle topic. टीका is not found in ancient period and it can reasonably be presumed that the वृत्तिस took the part of modern टीकाs, though as a matter of fact, the वृत्तिस were more precise and authoritative in comparison to these Tīkās. Moreover a वृत्ति deals with Sūtras only, while a टीका can be composed on other types of works. Again a टीका is supposed to be composed for beginners while a वृत्ति is of a higher standard.

(F) It can be said that पस्पश was also a kind of exposition. Mallinātha defines this kind of exposition as शास्त्रारम्भसमर्थकः उपोद्घातसंदर्भग्रन्थः (Śisupāla 2-112) and Ballabha says पस्पशः प्रयोजनग्रन्थः. In the Uddyotana commentary of the Mahābhāṣya, Annambhaṭṭa defined पस्पशव्याख्या in a very clear manner. He says शास्त्रारम्भसमर्थकोपोद्घातसंदर्भस्य पस्पशशब्देन वैर्द्धव्यत्रहारात् and further quotes a verse

<sup>1</sup> In the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, we find that a टीका is defined as यथासंभवमर्थस्य कानिटीकात् (Adhyāya 2).

showing that उपोद्घात and पस्पश are indentical ( शास्त्रस्यारम्भको ग्रन्थ उपोद्घात इतीरितः स एव ग्रन्थसन्दर्भः पस्पशः कथितो बुधैः ).

( G ) Some regard that उपोद्घात is also a particular kind of exposition. They define it as स्थानं निमित्तं वक्ता च तथा भोतृप्रयोजनम्, संबन्धायभिधानं च ह्युपोद्घातं विदुर्बुधाः ( Māthara Vṛtti Page 1 ). It shows that उपोद्घात not only describes the प्रयोजन or शास्त्रारम्भ समर्थन but also स्थान, निमित्त etc. Anyhow we can accept that this उपोद्घात is not a different kind of exposition, but a further development of पस्पश.

In the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, Kārikā is also accepted as a kind of व्याख्या, ( अर्थप्रदर्शनकारिका कारिका ' — Adhyāya 2 ).

Some hold that चूर्णि and न्यास are also different kinds of expositions. They say that चूर्णि means that type of expositions, which mainly refutes the views of opponents ( चूर्णयति शतशः खण्डयति परमतानि इति चूर्णिः ) while न्यास mainly supports the views of the original author ( न्यस्यते स्थाप्यते दृढीक्रियतेऽनेनेति न्यासः ). But due to the want of stronger proofs, we are at present unable to accept these views as valid.

( H ) Rājasekhara showed some other kinds of expositions as under ' सूत्रवृत्तिविवेचनं पद्धतिः × × अन्तर्भाष्यं समीक्षा, अवान्तरार्थविच्छेदश्च सा ( Kāvya-mīmāṃsā Ad 2 ). We at present are unable to assert which book was composed in accordance with the principle of पद्धति. समीक्षा is not a different kind of exposition but a particular portion of the Bhāṣyas, where a Bhāṣyakāra shows सूत्रार्थ.

Now we will show how many Śāstras were composed for expositions only. As a general truth, it can be decidedly asserted that all the Śāstras came into being to explain the Vedas only. But still arises a question as to in which manner each particular Śāstra attempted to explain the verbal forms of Vedic expressions. Though this subject needs a separate paper yet we will try to show briefly the characteristics of some of the great Śāstras, which are deemed as composed for वेदव्याख्या. Here we will furnish a few instances to comprehend the characteristic of Śāstra only without going to any detail. We have defined व्याख्यान as a means to comprehend the import of verbal expressions and as such a Śāstra can rightly be presumed as a particular kind of Vyākhyāna, if it helps us to understand the verbal imports.

Thus we observe that the Vedic Recensions (शाखा) may be regarded as a particular kind of exposition. Broadly speaking these Śākhās are mainly composed for Veda-Vyākhyāna as is expressly remarked by Harisvāmī<sup>1</sup> and others. The character of Vyākhyāna of these Śākhās is nothing but to put a more intelligible word in place of an obscure one. As for instance we find a Mantra in Yajurveda as भ्रातृव्यस्य वधाय (1-18), which is explained in the Kānva Śākhā as द्विषतो वधाय (1-2-6), the word द्विषत् being more intelligible.

In some cases, the Śākhās determine or regulate the subtle meaning of a word used previously in the original Veda. We read in the Yajurveda as एष वो अमीराजा(9-40), and the sense of अमी is regulated in later period as is found in the Kānva-Samhitā as एष वः कुरवो राजा (11-3-3). Thus it is clear that the Śākhās help us to comprehend the verbal sense of original Vedic expression.

Here we have treated the character of this particular exposition in the most general way without going deeply and in a forthcoming paper this matter will be dealt with at length.<sup>2</sup>

Not only the Śākhās, but the Padapāṭhas can also be deemed as a particular kind of Vyākhyā. We can rightly hold that the Padapāṭhas are the available oldest attempt to discover the sense of Vedic expressions. The main function of the Padapāṭhas is to analyse the words in a very general manner. In this exposition we find that the Upasargas are deducted from the धातुs and words of compound are shown distinctly with other factors. No doubt that this attempt of the Padakāras helps us to comprehend the verbal meaning of Vedic expressions to a great extent.

Apart from showing the factors like Upasarga etc., the Padapāṭhas regulate the meaning also i. e. according to the difference of

<sup>1</sup> Thus Harisvāmī says in his Śatapatha Bhāṣya 'वेदस्यापौरुषेयत्वेन स्वतः-प्रामाण्ये सिद्धे तत्त्वशास्त्रानामपि तद्वेतुत्वात् प्रामाण्यमिति बादरायणादिभिः प्रतिपादितम्'. Venkaṭamādhava says 'अद्यवस्यन्ति मन्त्रार्थानिर्वं मन्त्रान्तरेरपि । शास्त्रास्वन्यासु पठितैर्विस्पष्टार्थैर्मनीषिभिः' (Anukramaṇī P. 77).

<sup>2</sup> In the Śākhās, we generally find that the sense remains unchanged though the verbal structure differs. Thus Durga says 'स एवार्थः केवलं शास्त्रान्तरमन्यत्' (Nirukta Commentary 10-5).



Padas, as shown by Padakāras, different meanings are to be accepted. As for example we can take the Padapāṭha of the word मासकृत्. According to one Padakāra, it is analysed as मास + कृत् and according to other it is मा + सकृत्. Thus the meaning of the word is varied according to the difference of पदपाठ.

Here this should also be noted that there is close relation between Vyākaraṇa and Padapāṭha. We can doubtlessly say that Vyākaraṇa is a further development of Padapāṭha for Vyākaraṇa analyses word with much subtlety.

In the six Vedāṅgas, Śikṣā, Chandas, Nirukta and Vyākaraṇa chiefly deal with verbal expressions. They also help us to understand the verbal meaning and as such they should also be looked as different kinds of expositions. Here we are showing the chief characteristic of each of them briefly.

If we have a close perusal on 'Śikṣā Śāstra' we will find that in some cases it helps us to comprehend the meaning of verbal expressions. Here we are taking Śikṣā with the Prātiśākhya. In these, there are clear references to the particular utterance according to which a word will be taken to denote a particular meaning. Thus these Śāstras are no doubt helping instruments for the comprehension of verbal meaning.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly Chandas Śāstra may be deemed as a helping instrument for verbal knowledge. Though it appears that Chandas has no direct touch with verbal meaning, but in some cases it is clearly found that Chandas has got direct influence on determination of verbal meaning, and thus this Śāstra also furnishes a kind of exposition.

As for instance we can take the Mantra त्वमग्ने यज्ञानां होता विश्वेषां हितः, देवेभिर्मानुषे जने ( Rgveda 6-16-1 ). There are two separate metres applicable here. According to the Rksarvānukramaṇī, here the metre is Vardhamānā Gāyatrī ( Akṣara parimāṇa being 6+7+8 ), but according to the Nidāna Sūtra, the metre is Pipilikā madhyā. ( Akṣaraparimāṇa being 8+5+8 ). Now according to the first view the अन्वय would be त्वमग्ने यज्ञानां—होता विश्वेषां हितः, while according to the second view, अन्वय would be त्वमग्ने यज्ञानां होता—विश्वेषां हितः. As a result of these two kinds of अन्वय, meaning of the Mantra

<sup>1</sup> Sense of a verse is changed according to the difference of स्वर. A capital example of this kind is shown by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya ( Paśpaśā ).

would naturally be different for the reason that two different अन्वयस will regulate two different meanings, the word होता being related to two different words.<sup>1</sup>

Thus it is clear that छन्दस् can also determine the sense of words and as such it is doubtlessly a kind of exposition.

Now we will see in which manner Vyākaraṇa and Nirukta explain the words. It is quite reasonable that the two Śāstras disclose the sense of words not in the same manner.

In Vyākaraṇa, correctness of words is discussed. The character of the function of Vyākaraṇa is described as under 'व्याकरणे एतच्च चिन्त्यते गोशब्दः सास्त्रादिमन्थये साधुः' (Pañjikā commentary on Pāṇinian Śikṣā verse 1). Vyākaraṇa shows the correctness of words only, and as such it is rightly reckoned as लक्षण-प्रधान as is remarked by Durṅacārya 'व्याकरणं तु लक्षणप्रधानमिति विशेषः' (Nirukta commentary). Durga further clearly pointed out the character of the exposition of Vyākaraṇa as under एवं व्याकरणेऽपि लक्षणप्रधाने सति अर्थवशेन लोपागमौ विपरिणामश्च शब्दानां दृष्टः. This proposition shows that though Vyākaraṇa has direct touch with शब्दसाधुत्व (which was also pointed out by Bhartrhari) yet it does not neglect the अर्थ. The following sentence of Durga in this connection is worth noting 'अर्थो हि प्रधानं, तद्गुणः शब्दः, स चेतरेषु व्याकरणादिषु चिन्त्यते.' (Nirukta commentary)

Now the exposition of Nirukta is discussed. Durga showed the characteristics of Nirukta showing its difference from Vyākaraṇa as under — यथा शब्दलक्षणपरिज्ञानं सर्वशास्त्रेषु व्याकरणात् एवं शब्दार्थनिर्वचनपरिज्ञानं निरुक्तात्. Though Nirukta does not ignore the principles of Vyākaraṇa yet it is a different Śāstra (तस्मात् स्वतन्त्रामवेदं विद्यास्थानमर्थनिर्वचनम् — Nirukta-commentary) for it mainly considers the प्रकृति while Vyākaraṇa shows both प्रकृति and प्रत्यय. Again Nirukta has no intention to show शब्दसाधुत्व, while it is the only function of a Vyākaraṇa.

Besides these, there are other kinds of expositions, which are not very important and as such we have not compiled them in this paper. In a forthcoming paper we will try to show the historical background of all these expositions, so that we will be able to judge the value of each of these Vyākhyānas.

<sup>1</sup> As to whether the sense of a verse will differ according to the change of metre, we are submitting here the comment of Tataprasada, a commentator on the Chandoviciti. On the said Mantra (Rk 6-16-1) he says— "हेतौत पदस्य पूर्वान्वयमुपगम्य द्वितीयः पादः पञ्चाक्षर इत्याह । आचार्यशौनकस्तु हेतौतस्य विश्वेषाम् इत्यत्र अन्वयमुपेत्य सप्ताक्षर इत्यवोचत् । अर्थवशेन पादस्य व्यवस्थेति न्यायविदः". Thus it is clear that the sense may differ according to the अन्वय of words and the अन्वय is determined by the Chandas.