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0. The paribhāṣā or metarule asiddham bahiraṅgam antaraṅge, which is formulated by Pāṇiniyās, provides that the application of a bahiraṅga operation has not been established when an antaraṅga operation is to apply and hence that an antaraṅga operation applies in preference to a bahiraṅga operation. In his Paribhāṣenduśekhara Nāgeśa explains what is to be understood by the term अंगa as follows:

“What is understood by the term अंगa in the given paribhāṣā is just a cause (nimitta) [of an operation] which consists in an item’s own form that is referred to by the item terminating in a locative ending and so on (saptamyādyanta).”

The question arises whether a genitive ending is included in ‘a locative ending and so on’ Commentators on the text hold the opinion that a genitive ending is ruled out. But, in my opinion, the genitive ending should not be excluded from ‘a locative ending and so on’, since it is evident from Nāgeśa’s interpretation of the paribhāṣā kāryam anubhavan hi kāryī nimitatayā nāśriyate that he considers a constituent element referred to by a genitive form to be the cause of an operation.

I. According to Nāgeśa, what is called antaraṅga is a grammatical operation or rule that applies earlier in dependence upon the constituent element which arises earlier, while what is called bahiraṅga is one that applies later in dependence upon the constituent element which arises later. He says, moreover, that what is referred to by the term अंगa is a cause of an operation, which is well exemplified by the following derivation of patvya (paṭvi [paṭu + NiS + Tā] ‘a clever woman’, instr. sg.).

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{paṭu+ NiS} + \text{Tā} & (2) & \text{paṭv+ i} + \text{ā} & \text{P.6.1.77} \\
(3) & \text{paṭv+ y} + \text{ā} & & & \text{paṭvya}
\end{align*}
\]

At stage (1), two operations have the possibility of application. One is the yaN substitution for u in paṭu, provided for by P.6.1.77, the other is also the yaN substitution for NiS, provided for by the same rule. Since the constituents of paṭvya are intro-
duced in the order (1) *paṭu* → (2) *Niṣ* → (3) *Ṭā*, the *yaṇ* substitution for *u* whose *āṅga* is *i* (*Niṣ*) is *antarāṅga* with respect to the *yaṇ* substitution for *i* whose *āṅga* is *a* (*Ṭā*). Consequently the *yaṇ* substitution for *u* takes precedence over that for *i*.

The constituents *i* and *ā* in this derivation are those which are referred to by the locative form *aci* in P.6.1.77. What is more, they serve as the causes of the *yaṇ* substitution which applies at stage (2) and that which applies at stage (3). For they themselves create the possibility of the application of the *yaṇ* substitution. Thus it may be said that the term *āṅga* refers to the constituent of a derivative which is the cause of an operation in the sense that its introduction makes the application of an operation possible.  

2. Let us now discuss whether, as argued by the commentators, a genitive form is not included in 'a locative ending and so on'.

2.1. In the first place, Vaidyanātha, by saying that by 'and so on' (*ādi*) are meant an ablative ending and others, tries to avoid including a genitive ending. In the second place, Bhairava categorically refuses to include a genitive ending in 'a locative ending and so on'. According to him, a genitive form in a rule refers to what undergoes an operation and not to a cause for an operation.  

2.2. Nāgūsa's explanation of *kāryam anubhavan hi kāryā nimittayā nāśrīyate* in PiŚ, however, clearly shows that the referent of a genitive form in a rule can be the cause of the operation stated in the rule. Let us see how Nāgūsa explains it. He discusses the derivation of *adhyetā* (*adhik ‘learn’, 3rd sg. periph. fut. A).

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \text{ adhi+ } i + \text{IUT} & \text{P.3.3.15} \\
(2) & \text{ adhi+ } i + \text{ta} & \text{P.3.4.78} \\
(3) & \text{ adhi+ } i + \text{ta} + \text{ta} & \text{P.3.1.33} \\
(4) & \text{ adhi+ } i + \text{ta} + \text{Dā} & \text{P.2.4.85} \\
(5) & \text{ adhi+ } e + \text{ta} + \text{ā} & \text{P.7.3.84} \\
(6) & \text{ adhi+ } e + \text{t} + \text{ā} & \text{P.6.4.143} \\
(7) & \text{ adhy+ } e + \text{t} + \text{ā} & \text{P.6.1.77} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In stage (5), the *guna* substitution for the verb root *i* provided for by P. 7.3.84 applies. The verb root *i* is listed in the *Dhūtpāṭha* with the marker *ṅ*. P.1.1.5 is the prohibition rule which disallows the *guna* substitution when its cause is marked with *K*, *G*, *ṅ*. Consequently, the undesirable consequence follows that the *guna* substitution is prohibited by this rule. But if the *kāryam anubhavan hi kāryā nimittayā nāśrīyate* is taken into consideration, the prohibition rule does not apply. The reason is as follows. P.7.3.84 has the genitive form *āṅgasya* which recurs from P.6.4.1.
By P.1.1.3 guṇa is substituted for i Kartt of an item termed aṅga. In the present instance, by P.1.4.13 the verb root i is called aṅga with respect to the affix tās. This verb root is what is referred to by the genitive form aṅgasya and what undergoes the operation of guṇa substitution, so that it cannot be treated as its cause.

It is clear from the above that Nāgęśa considers that the verb root i with the marker N, which is referred to by the genitive form aṅgasya, serves as the cause of the guṇa substitution and at the same time has the possibility that it undergoes this operation. To explain Nāgęśa's idea, if a constituent makes the application of an operation possible, it is the cause for the operation; such a constituent, which is precisely what is meant by the term aṅga in the antaraṅgaparibhāṣā, can be referred to by a genitive form in a rule.

3. In order to prove this point, let us consider the derivation of gaudhera ('posterity of Godhā').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>godhā</td>
<td>dhraK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gaudh</td>
<td>eyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gaudhā</td>
<td>dhraK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>gaudh</td>
<td>era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>gaudhā</td>
<td>eyra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this derivation, the ey substitution for dh in dhraK at stage (3), provided for by P.7.1.2, is antaraṅga with respect to the y-lopa for y in eyra at stage (5), provided for by P.6.1.66. The constituents of gaudhera are introduced in the order (1) godhā → (2) dhraK. dh in dhraK is referred to by the genitive form phadhakhachagham in P. 7.1.2, while the constituents r in eyra are referred to by the locative form vali in P. 6.1.66. Comparing these constituents, we see that r occurs later than dh (ey). This shows that the ey substitution can be said to be antaraṅga with respect to the y-lopa, even if the constituent dh is referred to by the genitive form. If the constituent dh, which is referred to by the genitive form, were not the cause for deciding the status of antaraṅga/bahirāṅga, it would follow that we cannot discuss the status of antaraṅga/bahirāṅga of P. 7.1.2 with respect to P. 6.1.66. From the fact that Nāgęśa states that the ey substitution is antaraṅga with respect to the y-lopa, thus, it should be considered that the constituent referred to by a genitive form can serve as the cause or aṅga for deciding the status of antaraṅga/bahirāṅga.8)

4. As shown above, the term aṅga in the antaraṅga paribhāṣā refers to a constituent element whose introduction makes the application of an operation possible. Such a
constituent element can be referred to by any case form in a rule and is properly to be regarded as a cause of an operation. It is reasonable to suppose that when he says ‘a locative ending and so on’ in explaining what the term an̄ga means, Nāgėsa intends to imply that a genitive ending is included there.
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