

YĀSKA'S CLASSIFICATION OF NIPĀTAS*

By

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

1. The sections 1.4–11 of the *Nirukta* deal with particles (*nipāta*). It appears that this treatment of particles was never meant to be exhaustive. Very common particles, such as *tu*, are not included.¹ What is more, the discussion on particles is opened with the word *atha* (see section 3 below). *Atha* is obviously a particle. But it is not dealt with in this discussion.² With respect to meanings Yāska (the author of the *Nirukta*) is hardly more complete. Of the three “ headings ” which will be discussed below, the second contains the particle *aha*, but clearly not in the sense ascribed to it in that very subsection. And Yāska mentions no other meaning. The same can be said of the particle *ha*, which is used repeatedly (two times in *Nir.* 1.9 : *iti ha vijñāyate*) in a sense which it has not been given in the *Nirukta*. Further, new meanings are given to some particles elsewhere in the *Nirukta* : *paribhaya* to *iva* (*Nir.* 9.30 : *ivaḥ paribhayārthe*), *saṃprati* to *na* (*Nir.* 7.31 : *asty upamānasya saṃpratyarthe prayogaḥ*).

Particles – so Yāska tells us in the beginning of the discussion – occur in various meanings. And indeed, no fewer than thirteen (if we add the expletives, *padapūraṇa*, fourteen) meanings are mentioned in what follows this remark (see Appendix). Yāska's commentators are agreed that the *Nirukta* gives a threefold classification of particles.³ The present article will make an attempt to show that they are wrong and to arrive at the originally intended classification.

The *Nirukta* is supposed to contain three headings, which govern, and introduce, the three kinds of particles. They are the following :

1. *teṣāṃ ete catvāra upamārthe bhavanti* (*Nir.* 1. 4) : “ Of them, the following four are used in the sense of comparison ” (Sarup).

* This article owes its present shape in part to the pertinent criticism by Dr. Catharina Kiehnle of an earlier draft of the same. I like to acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Kiehnle in this regard.

¹ Yāska's list of all in all twenty-four particles (this includes combinations of particles : see Appendix) cannot compare with the list of one hundred and ninety-five coming under Pāṇini's rule 1.4. 58 (Boehtlingk, 1887 : 113*).

² At *Nir.* 11. 44 the sense *idānim* “ now ” is given to *atha*, which itself seems to be a paraphrase of *atho* in the preceding mantra.

³ For a qualification of this statement with reference to the Sanskrit commentators and those who follow them see section 2, 1 below.

2. *atha yasyāgamād arthaprthaktvam aha vijñāyate na tv auddeśikam iva vighraheṇa prthaktvāt sa karmopasaṁgrahaḥ* (Nir. 1.4).

3. *atha ye pravṛtte'rthe'mitākṣareṣu grantheṣu vākyapūraṇā āgacchanti padapūraṇās te mitākṣareṣv anarthakāḥ* (Nir. 1.9) : “ Now the words which are used – the sense being complete – to fill up a sentence in prose, and a verse in poetic compositions, are expletives ” (Sarup).

While translating the third heading Sarup overlooked the word *anarthakāḥ*. We note that for Yāska expletives carry no meaning. The second heading has been left untranslated here. The reason is that no agreement exists as to its meaning.⁴ Fortunately we are not called upon to explain all its terms, but we cannot forgo having a closer look at it.

Of the above three headings, the first and the last fulfil their task admirably. The first one announces four particles, and says what they mean. The particles then make their appearance one by one, accompanied by instances of their use. They are : *iva*, *na*, *cit*, *nu*. It is worth remarking that where one of these four particles has some other meaning or meanings besides “ comparison ”, that other meaning (those other meanings) are given along with instances, and when the meaning “ comparison ” is illustrated, we are explicitly reminded of that. This occurs in the case of *na* (*durmadāso na surāyām iti upamārthityaḥ*), *cit* (*dadhi cit ity upamārthe*), *nu* (*athāpy upamārthe bhavati / vṛkṣasya nu te puruhūta vayāḥ / vṛkṣasyeva te puruhūta sākhāḥ*), all in Nir. 1.4.

The third heading leaves as little doubt as the first one as to which particles it applies to. Immediately following the heading they are enumerated : *kam*, *īm*, *it*, *u* (Nir. 1.9). A fifth one is added after the illustrations of the above four : *iva* (Nir. 1.10). Further specifications regarding the meaning we do not find here, for these particles have no meaning.

It is the second heading that causes difficulties. To begin with, it is a strange kind of heading. In reality it is a specification of the meaning of the word *karmopasaṁgraha*. We do not, at this moment, have to study exactly what meaning is assigned to *karmopasaṁgraha*. Let us, on the contrary, see what common meaning can be found in the particles that are placed under this heading.

This, however, brings us to the second problem. The meanings that Yāska ascribes to the particles belonging to the second group are almost as varied as the particles themselves. No fewer than ten meanings are assigned

⁴ For opinions, see Bhat (1959), Śarmā (1966) and Mehendale (1978).

to fourteen particles. It is true that the four particles which fall under the first heading also represent a large number of meanings (six according to Yāska), but then they all share the meaning “ comparison ”, a fact to which, as we know, attention is drawn in the text of the *Nirukta* by repeating the word *upamā* “ comparison ” in connection with the particles concerned. On the other hand, no such thing is done in the second group of particles. The word *karmopasaṁgraha* occurs in the heading, and nowhere else.

But if the particles of the second group have not one meaning in common, could it not be that the meaning of *karmopasaṁgraha* is so wide that it includes all the diverse meanings of the second group ? Everyone is free to try and find such a meaning, but more likely than not it will be so wide that it will be hard to explain why the sense “ comparison ” is not encompassed by it. In other words, *karmopasaṁgraha* would come to mean hardly less than “ everything except comparison.”⁵ It goes without saying that such a meaning does not fit the word *karmopasaṁgraha*, nor its definition in the *Nirukta*.

2.1 The definition of *karmopasaṁgraha* consists of two parts, the first one positive, the second negative. The positive part describes in general terms the meaning of *karmopasaṁgraha*, the negative part narrows down this description. Since it is not our aim here to come to a complete understanding of the difficult second “ heading ”, we may leave the negative part untouched and concentrate on the positive characterisation. It reads: *yasyāgamād arthapṛthaktvam aha vijñāyate ... sa karmopasaṁgrahaḥ*. Whatever be the exact significance of this passage⁶ clear is that where there is *karmopasaṁ-*

⁵ Bhat (1959 : 54) argues with respect to the particles of the second group : “ Whether a particle joins two or more independent clauses or inter-dependent clauses, its function is the same, namely, to join two or more things together (*karmopasaṁgraha*) ”. But this wide sense is also applicable to the particles of the first group, so Bhat continues : “ and while it does so, it also indicates that the things thus joined together are really distinct, as contrasted for example, with the case of an *Upamārthiya* particle, which indicates only a mutual comparison.” This, of course, does not help us much. [Śarmā (1966 : 71) calls it *vānmātram*]. Gune (1916 : 160) makes less fuss, saying simply : By [*karmopasaṁgraha*] is known a variety ... of senses. ” Similarly Mehendale (1978 : 54) : “ *karmo. nipāta* is that *nipāta* by the use of which separateness of meaning (i. e. a separate meaning for the different particles comprising this group and not the same for all of them) is indeed understood. ” Mehendale’s suggestion plunges him immediately into problems, which he tries to solve (without convincing result) in a footnote (fn. 7 to p. 54).

⁶ See note 2 above.

graha,⁷ there the separateness of certain items is understood.⁸ This, of course, is only possible where several, i. e. at least two, items are at hand to be separated. After our encouraging experiences with the expletives and particles meaning “ comparison ”, we hope to get some assistance from Yāska in identifying the items that are to be distinguished.

We are not disappointed. The first particle, viz. *ca*, is introduced with these words : *ceti samuccayārtha ubhābhyām samprayujyate* (*Nir.* 1.4) “ The word *ca* is used in the sense of ‘ aggregation ’, and is joined together with both ” (Sarup). An example further elucidates this remark : *aham ca tvam ca vṛtrahan iti* (*l. c.*) “ ‘ I and you, O slayer of Vṛtra ! ’ ” (Sarup).

Immediately follows the second particle : *ā*. It has exactly the same meaning as *ca*, and is used in a similar manner. The difference is that, whereas *ca* could be used twice, once with each of the items to be aggregated, *ā* can occupy but one of the two places ; the other one it must yield to *ca*. This is clear from the example that follows : *devebhyas ca pitṛbhyā ā* (*l. c.*) “ ‘ for gods and for manes ’ ” (Sarup).

The next particle is *vā*. It has two meanings, “ deliberation ” (*vicāraṇa*) and “ aggregation ” (*samuccaya*). There can be no doubt that the stipulation that the particle must be joined with both is still valid here. Two examples further confirm this : *hantāham pṛthivīm imām ni dadhānīha vaha vā iṭi* (*l. c.*) “ ‘ Ah, shall I put this earth here or there ? ’ ” (Sarup); further : *vāyur vā tvā mannr sā tvā iti* (*Nir.* 1. 5) “ ‘ Vāyu and thee, Manu and thee ’ ” (Sarup).

This same stipulation, however, is not valid in the particles that are going to be mentioned next, and Yāska makes it abundantly clear. The particles *aha* and *ha*, he tells us, have the sense “ mutual opposition ” and are joined with the preceding item (*aha iti ca ha iti ca vinigrahārthiyau*⁹

⁷ Most authors seem to take *karmopasaṃgraha* as an adjective qualifying *nipāta*, or even as the name of certain particles. The definition of this word (*yasyāgamād ... vijñāyate ... sa karmopasaṃgrahaḥ*) seems to justify this. In spite of that, I prefer to look upon it as a noun, which its form suggests it is. If we take it to refer to some kind of process or procedure (such as, perhaps, the “ bringing together of meanings ”; see, however, note 8 below), it may fit into the definition as well.

⁸ The literal meaning of the word *karmopasaṃgraha* is of no concern to us. The fact that Yāska deemed it necessary to include a definition in his text indicates that this literal meaning is likely to misguide us. (For a different view, see Śarmā, 1966 : 71).

⁹ So Roth's edition and Sarup's p. 31, fn. 16. Sarup's edition reads *vinigrahārthiyā*.

yūrveṇa samprayujyete ; l. c.). Examples again illustrate what is meant *ayam ahedaṃ karotv ayam idam* (l. c.) “ ‘ let this man do this, the other that ’ ” (Sarup) *idam ha kariṣyatīdaṃ na kariṣyati* (l. c.) “ ‘ this man will do this, not that ’ ” (Sarup).

After *aha* and *ha* comes the particle *u*. It has the same meaning as its two predecessors, but is used differently. Instead of being joined with the first item, like them, it is joined with the second (*athāpy ukāna etasmin-nevārtha uttareṇa*). As could be expected, the example following shows us two items, the particle *u* dutifully combining with the second : *mṛsema vadanti satyam u te vadantīti* (l. c.) “ ‘ these people tell a lie, those the truth ’ ” (Sarup). We finally learn that *u* can also be an expletive, but this we knew already and will not detain us.

I have dealt with Yāska's treatment of the above particles in some detail, because it is done in a manner that so well accords with our expectations. It is true that the definition of *karmopasaṃgraha* is not completely clear, but this is as much our fault as Yāska's. And the part which we do understand, viz. that *karmopasaṃgraha* involves separateness of items, made us look for, and indeed find, the items that were to be distinguished. Those items were referred to by means of nouns and pronouns in the case of *ca*, *ā*, *iva*; by means of sentences in the case of *aha*, *ha*, *u*. In short, we find here again the clarity which we appreciated so much in Yāska's treatment of expletives and particles meaning “ comparison. ”

Our appreciation has to suffer a set-back when we turn to the next particle on the assumption that that also is expressive of *karmopasaṃgraha*. This next particle is *hi*, which has, so we read, many meanings (*Nir.* 1.5). In which of those many meanings is it concerned with several items that are separate ? Clearly in none of the ones given by Yāska. Not only does he keep complete silence as to which item the particle *hi* is to be joined to ; the examples allow of no separating of items, be they referred to by nouns or by sentences.¹⁰ This applies not only to *hi*, but to the whole list of particles which ends with *sīm* (*Nir.* 1.7) We have to face the choice of assuming that Yāska was in a state of confusion¹¹ while writing about the particles from *hi* to *sīm* on the one hand, and accepting that the second “ heading ” does not cover these particles on the other. As ever, we reject

¹⁰ The particle *hi* has the following examples : *idam hi kariṣyati* “ therefore he will do it ”, *katham hi kariṣyati* “ how pray will he do it ? ”, *katham hi vyākariṣyati* “ how can he analyse it ? ”. In none of these are there items that could be separated. The same can be said of all the examples accompanying the particles that follow up to, and including, *sīm*.

¹¹ This is more or less what Rajavade (1940 : 237) accuses Yāska of.

the supposition that the author was confused. As a result we must abandon the idea that a threefold classification of particles is intended, and shall try our luck with a classification into four.

It is, at this point, worth noting that Durga and Skanda-Maheśvara, who wrote commentaries on the *Nirukta*, seem to have had difficulties similar to the ones which cause us to consider abandoning the threefold classification of particles. But they do not go to the same extent as we do. In their opinion the particles from *hi* to *sīm* have incidentally (*prasaṅgena*) been treated after the particles expressive of *karmopasaṁgraha*.¹² The remainder of our discussion will show that their scruples were not justified.

2.2 I shall, to begin with, list the particles given in the *Nirukta* in accordance with the newly proposed fourfold scheme. It is to be noted that the newly formed third category contains a variety of meanings. No single general meaning seems to encompass them all. Yāska, at any rate, does not give such a covering meaning, and we shall follow him by baptizing the third category " various ". The first and second categories will, of course, be named *upamā* and *karmopasaṁgraha* respectively.

The fourth class of particles, as we know, contains expletives, which, according to Yāska, have no meaning. This is noteworthy, for it brings to light a division into two of the four classes of particles. On the one hand, there are the particles with meaning, on the other, those without. This leads us to the following scheme :

With Meaning			Without meaning
A ₁ <i>upamā</i>	A ₂ <i>karmopasaṁgraha</i>	A ₃ <i>various</i>	B
<i>iva</i> <i>na</i> <i>cit</i> <i>nu</i>	<i>ca</i> <i>ā</i> <i>vā</i> <i>sha</i> <i>ha</i> <i>u</i>	<i>hi</i> <i>kila</i> <i>mā</i> <i>khalu</i> <i>śaśvat</i> <i>nūnam</i> <i>sīm</i>	<i>kam</i> <i>īm</i> <i>id</i> <i>u</i> <i>iva</i>

(*tva*, *net* and *na cet*, which are mentioned in the *Nirukta* but have not been included in the above scheme, will be discussed in section 2.3 below).

¹² The relevant quotations can be found in Mehendale, 1978 : 56.

The above 'diagram' contains a feature which constitutes additional evidence to prove that A_3 must indeed be looked upon as a separate category. A_1 and B have one word in common : *iva*. The reason is obvious. This particle can be used both to convey the sense "comparison" and as an expletive. Something similar can be said about *u*, which occurs both in A_2 and B. Remarkable is that no word occurs both in A_3 and B. Is this because none of the words listed in A_3 can be used as expletives ? Clearly not ! No fewer than three particles of A_3 can be used such. They are *khalu*, *nūnam* and *sīm* (see *Nir.* 1.5-7).

Reasons might be thought of to explain why the words of A_3 were discriminated against by Yāska. Certain is that they were treated differently. This suffices to show that they formed indeed a separate class.

2.3 Something must be said regarding the words, *tva*, *net* and *na cet*, which are mentioned in the section dealing with particles, but do not seem to fit in our scheme. The first one, *tva*, shares the meaning "mutual opposition" (*vinigraha*) with *aha*, *ha* and *u*, and might therefore be expected in A_2 . In spite of that it follows the particles of A_3 , i. e. it comes after *sīm*. The remaining two, *net* and *na cet*, have meanings which would qualify them for inclusion in A_3 . Indeed, *na cet* has the meaning "question" (*anuprṣṭa*), which it shares with *nu*, *hi*, *kila* (with *na* or *nanu*) and *śaśvat*. All these with the exception of *nu*, which also has the meaning "comparison", and is therefore in A_1 – are found in A_3 . *net* and *na cet*, however, come after the particles contained in B.

Of these two irregularities the first one seems to conflict with the scheme here adopted. It *tva*, which has a meaning which belongs in A_2 , nevertheless is placed at the end of A_3 , this seems to indicate that A_2 and A_3 are not two different classes, but only one.

The irregular position of *tva* is explained in the following manner. *tva* is no particle at all ! It is a *sarvanāman* (pronoun), or, according to some, an *ardhanāman*,¹³ (*Nir.* 1.7). Why then is it mentioned among the particles ? Because some think it is a particle.¹⁴ Not so Yāska. He is in a hurry to show that *tva* takes case-endings.¹⁵ He mentions this non-particle at the end

¹³ That *ardhanāman* is a technical term used to designate a class of words (like *sarvanāman*), has been argued by Mehendale (1965).

¹⁴ *Nir.* 1.8 : *nipāta ity eke*.

¹⁵ *Nir.* 1.8 : *dṛṣṭavyam tu bhavati | uta tvam sukhye sthirapītam ākuḥ | iti dvitīyāyām | uto tvasmai tanvaṁ vi śasre | iti caturthyām | athāpi prathamā-bāhuvacane | etc.*

of his discussion of meaningful particles, to dispose of this undoubtedly meaningful word before proceeding to the particles without meaning.

And why are *net* and *na cet* given such a queer position, after B ? Obviously because they are not single particles, but combinations of particles, which jointly express a certain meaning. Yāska takes pains to make this clear.¹⁶ He discusses them not until the single particles have all had their turn.

3. There is a possible objection that no doubt will be raised against the classification of particles proposed here. It is based on the sentence which introduces the discussion under study. It will be shown that this sentence allows of an interpretation which is in complete agreement with our classification.

In *Nir.* 1.4 we read : *atha nipātā uccāvaceṣv artheṣu nipatanti / apy upamārhte / api karmopasaṁgrahārthe / api pādapūraṇāḥ* / Sarup translates : “ Now the particles occur in various senses, both in a comparative sense, in a conjunctive sense, and as expletives.” Here then, so it might be argued, does Yāska tell us how he classifies the particles, and that is clearly into three classes : 1. those having a comparative sense, 2. those having the sense *karmopasaṁgraha*, 3. the expletives.

Let us, for the sake of argument, assume that Sarup (and everybody else who has written on the passage) interpreted the sentence correctly, and that indeed the first half gives a general statement, which is subsequently specified in the second half. That is to say, the various meanings announced in the first half are made explicit in the second half.

The shortcomings of this interpretation strike the eye. First of all, expletives have no meaning for Yāska. As a result, the announced “ various ” meanings turn out to be no more than two in number, “ comparison ” (*upamā*) and *karmopasaṁgraha* (whatever that may mean). If Yāska had wanted to show the multifariousness of the meanings of particles, other ways would have been open to him. Fourteen meanings are mentioned later in the discussion. They could have been enumerated here. Or better still, Yāska could have kept silence, and proceed to the next point to be dealt with, classification of the particles.

It cannot be maintained that this is what Yāska actually does. The sentence quoted above contains one, and only one, finite verb (viz. *nipatanti*)

¹⁶ *Nir.* 1.10 : *athāpi nety eṣa id ity etena saṁprayujyate paribhaye*; *Nir.* 1.11 : *athāpi na cety eṣa id ity etena saṁprayujyate'nuprste* /

and can as a result not be split into two. That is to say, either the latter half specifies the meanings announced in the former, or *the whole sentence gives a classification of particles*.

This last alternative is, of course, the one I propose for acceptance. The sentence then comes to mean : “ Particles occur 1. in various senses; 2. also in the sense ‘ comparison ’, 3. also in the sense *karmopasaṃgraha*, 4. also as expletives. ”

It is clear that this interpretation fits beautifully the classification of particles arrived at earlier by other means. Two small difficulties remain.

First there is the for classical Sanskrit rather peculiar use of *api*, which precedes the sentence-fragments with which it is connected, rather than coming after the first words of those. Moreover, three occurrences of this word *api* are used, (if the present interpretation is correct) to connect four (incomplete) sentences.

However, even though *api* does not normally precede what it is connected with in classical Sanskrit, in the Vedic language this is the rule (Delbrueck, 1888 : 525–26). And the Brāhmaṇas provide evidence that the number of occurrences of *api* does not have to be equal to the number of sentence-parts that are to be joined. An example is *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* 10, 2, 6, 5, which has the same structure as our sentence : *prajābhyo vi bhajaty apy oṣadhibhyo'pi vanaspatibhyaḥ* “ er theilt es den Geschoepfen aus, auch den Pflanzen, auch den Baeumen ” (Delbrueck, 1888 : 526).

This is not all that can be said in support of the new interpretation of our sentence. In the *Bṛhad-Devatā* (attributed to Śaunaka) are a couple of verses which do no more than restating Yāska's main points about particles. The first verse reads (ii. 89)

uccāvaceṣu cārtheṣu nipātāḥ samudāhṛtāḥ |
kārmopasaṃgrahārthe ca kvacic caupamyakāraṇāt ||

“ Particles are enumerated in various senses, and in the sense *karmopasaṃgraha* and occasionally for the sake of comparison. ”¹⁷

Instead of the nasty word *api* we find here *ca* with each of the three items mentioned. The fourth item, the expletives, is introduced in verse

¹⁷ Macdonell, no doubt misled by the incorrect interpretation of the corresponding *Nirukta* passage, translates : “ Particles are enumerated in various senses both for the purpose of connecting actions, and occasionally for the sake of comparison ”. It is not clear how he would account for the first occurrence of *ca* in this verse.

19 [*Annals, BORI*]

ii. 90-91a, after which the text continues (ii. 91b) *ye tv anekārthakāś ca te* " But (there are) also such (particles) as have various senses." (Macdonel).

What more could we dream of? The author of the *Bṛhad-Devatā*, who was infinitely much closer to Yāska in time than even the Sanskrit commentators on the *Nirukta* (that is, the ones whose works have survived until today), understood the sentence which introduces the section on particles in the *Nirukta* in the way that is being advocated here.

Remains the second difficulty. Why does Yāska in the introductory sentence mention the class " various meanings " first, but when actually classifying denote it to the third place ?

The answer is easy. The most important thing to be said about the meanings of particles is that they are various. Indeed, even many of the particles included in A_1 and A_2 have meanings different from the ones that caused their acceptance there (see Appendix). This circumstance also explains why the " various meanings " were not kept in front during the process of actually classifying. If they would have been, virtually no particles would have been left for the remaining classes.¹⁸ As it is, the particles of A_1 may, and really do, have " various meanings " besides " comparison."

That A_3 precedes B is because the particles of A_3 have meanings, and therefore belong to A, whereas the particles of B do not. Interesting is that what has once been mentioned in A_3 is not repeated in B, even if it can be used as expletive. This applies to *khalu*, *nūnam* and *sīm* (see above, section 2.2). This fact confirms our belief that the positioning of A_3 before A_1 and A_2 would have had disastrous consequences, especially for A_1 .

It may finally be remarked that Durga and Skanda-Maheśvara, in spite of their misgivings regarding the classification of particles (see above, section 2.1), failed to interpret Yāska's introductory sentence correctly.¹⁹

4. We conclude that the *Nirukta*, when correctly interpreted, announces, and then brings about, a fourfold classification of particles. The first three of these four classes contain meaningful particles, the fourth meaningless

¹⁸ To be precise, only *iva* would remain for A_1 (or not even that, on account of the meaning *paribhaya* ; see section 1 above). A_2 , on the other hand, would go unscathed, or so it seems.

¹⁹ Maheśvara on *Nir.* 1.4 (p. 46) : *ta uccāvaceṣu anekaprakāreṣu pratipādyeṣu artheṣu pratipāḍakatvena nipatanti vartanta ity arthah | teṣāṃ arthapradarśanārtham ucyate - apy upamārtha ityādi* | Durga on the same (pp. 36-37) : *uccāvaceṣu anekaprakāreṣu artheṣu nipatanti iti nipātaḥ | āha | katarne punas te ya eteṣāṃ iti | ucyate | apy upamārthe'pi karmopasaṃgrahārthe 'pi padapūranāḥ |*

ones. The meanings on the basis of which the meaningful particles have been classified are 1. "comparison", 2. *karmopasaṁgraha* (not fully clear, but concerns at least two items), 3. various meanings.²⁰

APPENDIX

The particles and their meanings

<i>iva</i>	: <i>upamā</i> , (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>na</i>	: <i>upamā</i> (V), ²¹ <i>pratiṣedha</i>
<i>cit</i>	: <i>upamā</i> , <i>pūjā</i> , <i>avakutsita</i>
<i>nu</i>	: <i>upamā</i> , <i>hetvapadeśa</i> , <i>anupīṣṭa</i>
<i>ca</i>	. <i>samuccaya</i>
<i>ā</i>	: <i>samuccaya</i>
<i>vā</i>	: <i>samuccaya</i> , <i>vicāraṇa</i>
<i>aha</i>	: <i>vinigraha</i>
<i>ha</i>	: <i>vinigraha</i>
<i>u</i>	: <i>vinigraha</i> , (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>hi</i>	: <i>hetvapadeśa</i> , <i>anupīṣṭa</i> , <i>asūyā</i>
<i>kila</i>	: <i>anupīṣṭa</i> (when with <i>na</i> or <i>nanu</i>), <i>vidyāprakarṣa</i>
<i>mā</i>	: <i>pratiṣedha</i>
<i>khalu</i>	: <i>pratiṣedha</i> , (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>śaśvat</i>	: <i>anupīṣṭa</i> , <i>vicikitsā</i> (Bh)
<i>nūnam</i>	: <i>vicikitsā</i> , (<i>padapūraṇa</i> (V))
<i>sīm</i>	: <i>parigraha</i> , (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>kam</i>	: (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>īm</i>	: (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>ti</i>	: (<i>padapūraṇa</i>)
<i>na ti</i>	: <i>paribhaya</i>
<i>na ca ti</i>	: <i>anupīṣṭa</i>

²⁰ Rajavade (1940 : 237) wrote : " Really speaking Yāska should have added another class of particles which having a variety of senses have nothing in common; he should have placed *api anyārtheṣu* after *api karmopasaṁgrahārthe* and before, *api padapūraṇāḥ*." Little did he suspect that this is, apart from the order exactly what Yāska did.

²¹ " V " indicates that according to Yāska, the particle is in this sense only used in the Vedic language; " Bh " indicates that this sense is only found in the classical language.

na kila : *anupr̥ṣṭa* (see above *kila*)
na nu kila : *anupr̥ṣṭa* (see above *kila*)

The meanings and their particles

upamā (“ comparison ”) : *iva, na* (V), *cit, nu*
karmopasaṃgraha : $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{samuccaya} \text{ (“ aggregation ”)} : \textit{ca, vā, ā} \\ \textit{vicāraṇa} \text{ (“ deliberation ”)} : \textit{vā} \\ \textit{vinigraha} \text{ (“ mutual opposition ”)} : \textit{aha, ha, u} \end{array} \right.$
pratiṣedha (“ negation ”) : *na, mā, khalu*
pūjā (“ respect ”) : *cit*
avakutsita (“ contempt ”) : *cit*
hetvapadeśa (“ reason ”) : *nu, hi*
anupr̥ṣṭa (“ question ”) : *nu, hi, na kila, na nu kila, śaśvat, na ca it*
asūyā (“ displeasure ”) : *hi*
vidyāprakarṣa (“ superiority of knowledge ”) : *kila*
vicikitsā (“ uncertainty ”) : *śaśvat* (Bh), *nūnam*
parigraha (“ totality ”) : *sīm*
[*padapūraṇa* (expletive) : *khalu, nūnam* (V), *sīm, kam, im, id, u, iva*]

REFERENCES

- Bhat, G. K. : 1959. “ *Karmopasaṃgraha*. ” *Journal of the University of Poona : Humanities Section*, 11, 51–57. Reprinted in : *Vedic Themes [Articles on Vedic Topics]*, pp. 111–19. Delhi; Ajanta Publications. 1978.
- Boehtlingk, Otto ; Editor and translator. 1887. *Paṇini's Grammatik*. Hildesheim ; Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1964.
- Delbrueck, B. : 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle a. S. ; Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Durga ; *Niruktavṛtti*. In *Durgācāryakṛtavṛttisametam Niruktam*. Part I. Edited by Vaijanātha Kāśinātha Rājavāḍe, Poona; Ānandāśrama. 1921.
- Gune, P. D. : 1916. “ Some notes on Yaska's Nirukta. ” *Indian Antiquary* 45, 157–50 and 173–77.
- Maheśvara : *Nirukṭatīkā* in *Fragments of the commentaries of Skandasvāmin and Maheśvara on the Nirukta*. Edited by Lakshman Sarup, Lahore ; University of Panjab. 1928.

Mehendale, Madhukar Anant : 1965. "Ardhanāman," *Indian Linguistics* 26, 203-06. Reprinted in : *Nirukta Notes*. Series II, pp. 5-8. Pune : Deccan Callege, 1978.

———. 1978. "Yāska's definition of the karmopasaṁgraha nipāta". *Nirukta Notes*, Series II, pp. 50-56. Pune, Deccan College.

Rajavade, V. K. : Editor. 1940. *Yāska's Nirukta*. Volume I. Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Śarmā, Virendra : 1966. "Karmopasaṁgraha-lakṣaṇa-vicārah", *Viśva-Saṁskṛtam* 3, 383-392; 4, 71-74.

Sarup, Lakshman : 1921. *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta : Introduction, English translation and notes* : Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass. 1966.

Śaunaka : *Bṛhad Devatā*, Edited and translated by Arthur Anthony Macdonell. Part I : Introduction and text and appendices. Part II : Translation and notes. Second issue. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass. 1965.

Yāska : *Nirukta*. 1. Edited by Lakshman Sarup. Second Reprint. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass. 1967. 2. Herausgegeben und erläutert von Rudolph Roth. Goettingen : Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung. 1852.