NON-STANDARD USAGES IN THE PAÑCATANTRA[1] (TANTRĀKHYĀYIKĀ)*

Dinanath Sharma

The *Pañcatantra* (*Tantrākhyāyikā*) is a compilation of old Indian fables. As is known from the prologue, it was written by Viṣṇuśarman (c. A.D. 300) in order to educate politically the three sons of Amaraśakti, the then king of a South Indian state, Mihilāropya. It was originally written in the language of the educated court - circles of the time, the Sanskrit. But the original text of the *Pañcatantra*, however is not available; the work is known through its recensions, which are as follows : [1] The *Tantrākhyāyikā*, [2] The text that was translated into Pahlavi in about A.D. 570 [3] the Kashmīrian *Bṛhatkathā*, [4] the South Indian *Pañcatantra* and [5] the Nepalese Selection of Stanzas.

In respect of the text, these five recensions agree among themselves to such an extent that Hartel has rightly traced them to a common single source and, from their correspondences, he has drawn the conclusion that the *Tantrākhyāyikā* — the only complete Sanskrit text among these recensions — provides the best picture of the primary work; it thus stands next to the original *Pañcatantra*. Hence, generally speaking, it also holds that whatever may be said with regard to the *Tantrākhyāyikā* is largely valid for the primary work of the *Pañcatantra*[2].

For this reason I have preferred the *Tantrākhyāyikā* for my langual study.

The language of the *Pañcatantra* is phraseological and facile, but there are some usages which go against the discipline of the standard Sanskrit grammar, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by Pāṇini. This article is oriented to highlight those usages and justify them, if possible, from other sources.

They are as follows :

(A) अकस्माच्चानुषङ्गिकं देवगृहे वानरयूथमागतम् । कीलोत्पाटिवानरकथा, P-5, Line-4 :
(A flock of monkeys, incidentally came to the temple.)

(B) कुतस्त्वमस्मिन्नयोग्याधिवासे आगतः । मन्दविसर्पिणीमत्कुणकथा P-25, Line-16 :
(Wherefrom did you come in this improper dwelling ?)

(C) तदस्मिन्नेव न्यग्रोधपादपे आरूढो यामिनीं यापयामि । मित्रसम्प्राप्ति P-76, Line-8 :
(Then, I shall pass the night having climbed only on this banyan tree.)

According to Pāṇini, the verb denoting movement with physical activity should have its object either in accusative case or in dative case provided the object is not the path[3].

★ This article was presented in the Xth World Sanskrit Conference, Bangalore, held from 3 to 9 January 1997.

In the above sentences, the verbs -आगतम्, आगत: and आरूढ:, denote movement and therefore their objects, namely देवगृहे, अस्मिन्नयोग्याधिवासे and न्यग्रोधपादपे should not be as such i.e. in locative case. They should be in objective case i.e. देवगृहं, इमम् अयोग्याधिवासम् and न्यग्रोधपादपम्.

Now, we shall see these usages in light of the Prakrit grammar. According to Hemacandra[4], (द्वितीया तृतीययो: सप्तमी 8.3.135) sometimes locative case can be used in lieu of accusative and instrumental cases, v.g. नयरे न यामि (नगरे न यामि) (I don't go to the town.) etc.

2. श्रद्धेयवचनत्वाच्च दमनकस्य सादरमपृच्छत् Frame - story Lion and bull P-22, Line-8 :

(And the lion asked Damanaka respectfully for his speech was trustworthy.)

Pāṇini admits by the *sūtra* अकथितं च (1.4.51)[5] that if the speaker does not want to use the cases like ablative etc.,as such then those cases can be considered to be accusative case. Thus the verb of the sentence has two objects. There are sixteen such verbs which have two objects and पृच्छ् is one of them. For example- माणवकं पन्थानं पृच्छति । (One asks the pupil the way.) Here ablative case to the word माणवक is not required by the speaker, therefore the suffix of accusative case has been added to माणवक. Was it required to be in ablative case the word would be माणवकात् but not माणवकस्य i.e. in genitive case as is added to दमनक in the above sentence of the *Pañcatantra*.

Such usages are allowed in Prakrit languages by the *sūtra* क्वचिद् द्वितीयादे:[6]

(8.3.134) of Hemacandra in which he says -

In some usages sixth case is taken for second, third etc. cases. For example -- सीमाधरस्स वंदे (I pray Sīmādhara). Actually it should be सीमाधरं वन्दे in Sanskrit.

In the same respect follow another usages -

3. (a) अन्यदा त्वात्मभयात्तत्परै रक्षिपुरुषैरागत्य तस्य मृषोक्तम् Frame - story lion and bull P-3, Line-23 :

   (Once the securitymen, being afraid for their own sake, came and told him [Vardhamanaka] a lie).

   (b) ज्ञात्वा च देव: परिहस्य समुद्रस्येदमुवाच । Three fishes P - 38, Line-21 :

   (And having known the god spoke with smile to Samudra.)

ब्रू शास् are also in the same group of verbs which have two objects as earlier mentioned. The verb वच् of उक्तम् and उवाच in above sentences respectively falls in the same group of verbs with the help of अर्थनिबन्धनेयं संज्ञा[7] of the *Vaiyākaraṇa Siddhānta Kaumudī*, denoting the same as ब्रू and शास् do. Therefore, they too have

two objects. Thus तस्य and समुद्रस्य being objects of their respective verbs in the sentences, should not be as such; i.e. in genitive case. They should be तम् and समुद्रम्, i.e. in accusative case. But again these usages are justified by Prakrit grammar क्वचिद् द्वितीयादे: (8.3-134) which is already explained.

4. (a) सिंहेन च अस्य (ऊष्ट्रस्य) अभ्यवपत्तिरभयप्रदानं च दत्तम् । ऊष्ट्काकादिकथा, P-32, Line-9 :

   (The lion gave him (the camel) freedom to move around and fearlessness.)

   (b) यथासम्भवं ब्राह्मणत्रयस्य भोजनं दातव्यम् । The barber who killed the monks. P-134, Line-3 :

   (Food should be given to three Brāhmaṇas as per the possibility.)

The *sūtra* कर्मणा यमभिप्रैति स सम्प्रदानम् 1.4.32[8] of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* defines that that, before whom one goes by the act (of donation), is called सम्प्रदान which requires the fourth case ending.

The act of donation is of two kinds; one, in which the thing once given is never taken back; e.g. देवदत्त: ब्राह्मणाय गां ददाति (Devadatta gives a cow to the Brāhmaṇa) and the other, in which the thing given is taken back; e.g. देवदत्त: रजकस्य वस्त्रं ददाति (Devadatta gives cloth to the washerman). The object of the first kind of donation will have fourth case ending and that of second kind of donation, the sixth case ending, though Mahābhāṣyakāra Patañjali recognises fourth case for second kind of donation also[9].

Thus both the verbs of above sentences, denoting bestowal, should have their objects इदम् (अस्य ऊष्ट्रस्य) and ब्राह्मणत्रय in dative case, i.e. अस्मै (ऊष्ट्राय) and ब्राह्मणत्रयाय since freedom for moving around, fearlessness and food are given to the respective objects for ever and not to take them back in future. But both the objects are in genitive case, i.e. अस्य and ब्राह्मणत्रयस्य.

These usages have found solid ground in Prakrit grammar which admits sixth case mostly for fourth case[10]. (चतुर्थ्या: षष्ठी 8.3.131)

5. (a) अथ मत्कुणश्रुकितत्वाद्राजवचनं श्रुत्वा शयनादवतीर्य अन्यद्विवरमाश्रित:-यूकामत्कुणकथा P-26, Line 11 :

   (Thereafter the bug having heard the voice of the king with astonishment, got down from bed and sheltered another hole.)

   (b) चित्राङ्गोऽपि आत्मशङ्क्या तटमाश्रित: । Frame story P-82, Line-10 :

   (Citrāṅga also, being afraid took shelter of the bank.)

Pāṇini, by the *sūtra* गत्यर्थकर्मकश्लिष्शीङ्स्थासवसजनरुहजीर्यतिभ्यश्च 3.4.72[11], admits that the verbs denoting movement, intransitive verbs and certain other verbs, namely श्लिष्, शीङ्, स्था, आस्, वस्, जन्, रुह्, and जृ with the suffix क्त of past passive participle

can, though generally in passive voice, be used in active voice also. e.g. सः चलितः गतः म्लानः ।

The verb (आश्रितः (आ + श्रि + क्त + सु) of above sentences, is really transitive and used in active. It is neither गत्यर्थक nor does it fall into श्लिष्, शीङ् etc. group of verbs. It, therefore, cannot be in active voice.

6. अथवा तस्य युक्तमुपदेष्टुं यः सकृदुक्तं गृह्णाति   Frame - story P-52, Line-3 :

(Or proper is to instruct him who grasps [the instruction] spoken once only.)

In standard classical Sanskrit, the sixth case is introduced after a nominal stem when it denotes the agent (कर्तृ) or the direct object (कर्म) of the action signified by a verbal stem ending in a kṛt affix. (कर्तृकर्मणोः कृति-2.3.65)[12] e.g. हरेः कृतिः, जगतः कर्ता, etc. But the sixth case is prohibited when it denotes the agent or direct object of a verbal stem ending in the kṛt affix if it is a (a) l-substitute (लादेश), (b) U (उ), (c) Uka (उक), (d) indeclinable (अव्यय, (e) Niṣṭhā, (f) synonyms of Khal (खल्), and Tṛn (तृन्), (न लोकाव्ययनिष्ठाखलर्थतृनाम्) 2.3.69.)[13] उपदेष्टुम् in the above sentence is an indeclinable ending in तुमुन् affix, so its direct object, तद् (तस्य), taking the above rule into account, cannot be put in sixth case-ending. It should be second case-ending.

7. तदुपलभ्यताम् उत्पत्य यथावस्थितां चित्राङ्गवार्ताम् । Frame-story P-82, Line-29 :

(Then receive the whereabouts of Citrāṅga by flying up.)

The verb उपलभ्यताम् indicates that the sentence is in passive voice. Therefore, the object should be in nominative case while the objects यथावस्थितां चित्राङ्गवार्तां is in accusative case. If the object be so the form of verb should be उपलभताम् ।

8. ततश्च व्याधैर्दुरात्मभिर्जीवग्राहं गृहीत्वा क्रीडार्थं राजपुत्रायोपनीतः । Deer's Former Captivity
        P.85, Line-2 :

(Thereafter, the hunters, the wicked ones, having caught the deer brought to the prince to play with.)

The root verb नी is one of that group of verbs, Karman Kāraka of which can denote that Kāraka also which is not assigned by any other Kāraka like ablative (अपादान) etc. Thus such verbs have two objects as mentioned before[14].

The prince is the object of the verb उपनीतः in the above sentence. So the prince should be in accusative case or in sixth case षष्ठी शेषे - 2.3.50[15]. v.g. क्रीडार्थं राजपुत्रस्य उपनीतः or .... गृहीत्वा राजपुत्रायोपनीतः following the sūtra क्रियार्थोपपदस्य च कर्मणि स्थानिनः -2.3.14[16], which is explained as - the fourth case is introduced after nominal stem to signify the object of the verbal stem which is not actually used but serves as an upapada to the verbal stem actually used.

9. योद्धृचित्तः (of fighting mentality) द्रोग्धुबुद्धिः द्रोग्धुमतिः (having mentality to offend.) Frame-story P-27,28

According to Pāṇini तुमुन् affix is attached to the root verb when the action refers to the general future time (तुमुन् ण्वुलौ क्रियायां क्रियार्थायाम् 3.3.10)[17] and the *anusvāra* of तुम् is dropped when the verb precedes काम and मनस् and both come together (तुंकाममनसोरपि)[18] v.g. गन्तुमनस्, कर्तुकाम etc. But चित्त, बुद्धि and मति, though denoting the same as काम and मनस् do, cannot be preceded by तुम् ending verb. But in the *Pañcatantra*, it is so used.

Considering all these usages, it is very difficult to reach any solid grounds that have caused these deviations from standard Sanskrit discipline. Nevertheless some factors, to my mind, must have led astray the language of the *Pañcatantra*, which are as follows –

1. *Pañcatantra* has been more popular among common people, its fables being mostly in parlance among them than among educated people. It is, therefore, possible that the language of common people, Prakrit must have influenced the language of the *Pañcatantra*.

2. Scribes, while copying it from one manuscript onto the other, must have committed such mistakes, for, the scribes were generally ignorant of standard language, be it Sanskrit or Prakrit.

Whatever the reason may be, we can at the very least say about any work in general and about the *Pañcatantra* in particular, that the more the work is read the more deviations of the work from its origin are possible, at least in case of its language.

In sum, we can say in words of V. S. Sukthankar : "Ours is a problem in textual dynamics, rather than in textual statics.[19]"

REFERENCES :

1. The *Pañcatantra (Tantrākhyāyikā)* J. Hartel.

2. History of Indian Literature – Vol. III p.311.

3. गत्यर्थकर्मणि द्वितीयाचतुर्थ्यौ चेष्टायामनध्वनि–2.3.12 *Aṣṭā*, Vol I p. 281.

4. सि. हे. शा. पृ. २५१.

5. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* Vol. 1, p. 187.

6. सि. हे. शा. पृ. २५०.

7. वै. सि. कौ. पृ. ७०४.

8. Aṣṭādhyāyī Vol. 1, p. 180.

9.   वै॰ सि॰ कौ॰ पृ॰ ७३९.

10.   सि॰ हे॰ श॰ पृ॰ २४९.

11.   *Aṣṭādhyāyi* Vol. 2, p. 586.

12.   *Ibid,* Vol. 1, p. 302.

13.   *Ibid,* Vol. 1, p. 303.

14.   *See* example Nos. 2 & 3.

15.   *Aṣṭādhyāyi* Vol. 1, p. 296.

16.   *Ibid,* Vol. 1, p. 282.

17.   *Ibid,* Vol. 1I, p. 487.

18.   बृहद् अनुवाद चन्द्रिका पृ० ४३५.

19.   *Mahābhārata* – "Ādiparvan" Vol. 1, Prolegorum, p. 180.

BIBLIOGRAPHY :

1. *Pañcatantra (Tantrākhyāyikā),* Ed. J. Hartel, Harward Oriental Series No. 12, Harward 1915.

2. *History of Indian Literature Vol. III,* Ist Ed. M.Winternitz, English Tr. Subhadra Jha, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi 1963.

३. वैयाकरण सिद्धान्त कौमुदी,
    व्याख्याकार – गोपालदत्त पाण्डेय प्रथम भाग
    चौखम्भा सुरभारती प्रकाशन, द्वितीय संस्करण, वाराणसी १९९०.

४. सिद्धहेमशब्दानुशासनम् भाग-३,
    व्याख्याकार –पंडित बेचरदास दोशी,
    प्रथम आवृत्ति, युनिवर्सिटी ग्रंथ निर्माण बोर्ड, अहमदाबाद १९७८.

5. *Mahābhārata   Vol* - I Editor - V. S. Sukthankar, Bhāndārakar Oriental Research Institute, Pune 1993.

6. *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, Vols - 4*
    English Tr. - Śrīś Chandra Vasu; Pub. India Press, Allahabad 1891, 1894, 1897, and 1897.

७. बृहद् अनुवाद चन्द्रिका – चक्रधर नौटियाल'हंस' शास्त्री,मोतीलाल बनारसीदास, दिल्ली १९८८.