

Nāgeśa's contribution to Philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar is very important from the point of view of philosophical thinking. His subtle vision and scholarship can be seen everywhere in the analysis of स्फोट, ध्वनि, शब्द, अर्थ, धातु, लकार, समास and वृत्ति. I have thoroughly studied the text and commentaries of PLM. However, the subject of my research was to study Nāgeśa's PLM from the logical as well as grammatical perspectives. I have studied viewpoints of Grammarians as well as Logicians without any bias in my mind. Apart from the opinion of Logicians, I also tried to study the viewpoints of Mīmāṃsakas. Because, at many places, Nāgeśa has refuted the viewpoints of them and propounded the principles of Grammarians.

I have learnt that the Sanskrit Grammar is not only about the subject to correct and incorrect word, but it is more than that. The perspective of speaker and listener both are considered for verbal understanding. Out of all the three मञ्जूषाs of Nāgeśa or I would say out of all the works of Philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar, PLM is the best to my knowledge. He has not only integrated all the aspects of Philosophy of Grammar in it, but has also tried to present them as simple as possible, which could not be possible in other philosophical works in Sanskrit grammar. In present time, PLM is highly popular among the scholars and students who specifically study Philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar. It can be considered as a ladder to study Philosophy of Grammar by climbing the thoughts of scholars like Bhartṛhari.

Apart from PLM, VSM and VSLM appear like a bottomless ocean to the readers. They also feel scared even to start studying those subjects. There is such an uncontrolled expansion of the topics covered that it is not easy to know what the author wants to say. Not only the texts but also their commentaries are written in

very terse style of writing with detailed explanation which is difficult to understand.

From the comparative study of few topics of PLM and VSLM, it can be seen at many places that those are more consistent and clearer in PLM than VSLM. The chapter of the meaning of roots and particles can be count in that.

It does not mean that both the मञ्जूषाs i.e., VSM and VSLM have no importance. To become fully proficient in Philosophy of Grammar, study of both those texts is mandatory. But in short, the formulation and support of the principles of Philosophy of Grammar and the refutation of the principles by naming the principles of Naiyāyikas and Mīmāṃsakas are not found in VSLM with the clarity with which they are found in PLM. Therefore, the usefulness of PLM for understanding the subject in detail is negligible.

When we ask someone if he/she knows about Sanskrit grammar, they will definitely say yes but if we ask if they know about philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar then they will confuse. So, in general it is less known school of philosophy and it is necessary to introduce this school of philosophy with such lucid way. While studying the tradition and time of scholars who provided excellence in Philosophy of Grammar, I found that there is a long gap in tradition and works. As I said, from Vyāḍi to Nāgeśa, there are many scholars who have contributed with original text on philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar. Though, if we see their timeline, we will get to know about a long gap between each work. For example, after Helārāj, who has written a commentary on Vākyapadīyam around 1000 AD, no original work is found on Philosophy of Grammar till 1600 AD. So, what was happened, why this school was neglected in this time, these questions are worth considering.

We have a good tradition of philosophy in our Sanskrit Vāṇmāya like Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Vedānta, Mīmāṃsā etc. and there are many original works as well as

commentaries that are available upon those schools of philosophy. In this tradition of philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar, from Vyāḍi (500 BC) to Nāgeśa (1730-1810 AD) there are many scholars like Kātyāyana, Patañjali, Vasurāta, Bhartṛhari, Helārāja, Kaundabhaṭṭa who have contributed with original works on Sanskrit Grammar. Though scholars like Patañjali & Kātyāyana have not any particular text on Philosophy of Grammar, they just indicated or discussed at some places of their texts. Scholars like Vyāḍi, Bhartṛhari, Kaundabhaṭṭa and Nāgeśa have given original works to this tradition. Though these are very few but it is a good thing that many commentaries are available to explain these works. So, I cover up all above topics in the first chapter. History and development of Sanskrit Grammar as well as Philosophy of Grammar is also described.

The second chapter is about life, date and works of Nāgeśābhaṭṭā. I tried to give a short comparative study of all three मञ्जूषाs. While studying all three texts and their commentaries, it is seen that the PLM is a summarized version of VSLM. Apart from the last two chapters i.e., निपातार्थ and समासादिवृत्त्यर्थ, all other chapters seem like a summary of chapters described in the VSLM. Nāgeśa has covered all the topics discussed in VSM and VSLM and described those with such a lucid way. For that reason, PLM is most celebrated text among the scholars.

The third chapter is about the study of perception of meaning, its auxiliary causes and word-powers. The topic शाब्दबोध is described in short and no views of Naiyāyikas regarding that are given. The auxiliary cause in verbal understanding i.e., आकाङ्क्षा, योग्यता, आसत्ति and तात्पर्य also described in short. Nāgeśa has logically proved that among these four, योग्यता and आसत्ति are not essential causes for verbal understanding. While studying word-powers, paradox is seen between VSLM and PLM. For example, Nāgeśā accepted लक्षणाशक्ति in the VSLM and he has refuted in the PLM.

The fourth chapter is about the study of the meanings of roots, tenses and case suffixes. The definitions of सकर्मक and अकर्मक are found many times in other chapters. It could be possible that, Nāgeśa wanted to present these topics clearly. He has described the views of Naiyāyikas regarding लकारार्थ at the end of the chapter धात्वर्थ and again he has also propounded separate chapters to describe that. It is seen that at some places, Nāgeśa has refuted the opinion of Bharṭṛahari and his followers regarding the meaning of roots. Nāgeśa has not presented the views of Naiyāyikas or Mīmāṃsakas regarding कारकार्थ.

The fifth chapter is about the study of स्फोट. The origin and development of स्फोट theory is discussed in detail. Since this is the cardinal principle of philosophy of grammar, there are no different opinions among all the scholars of grammar. Yes, in VSLM, taking the basis of Bharṭṛhai's opinion, स्फोट has been described as the reason for the origin of the universe. This description is found only in VSLM. In other मञ्जूषाs, it is said to be important only in providing knowledge of the meaning of the word. Rather explaining the eight types of स्फोटs, Nāgesā has only given names and described वाक्यस्फोट primarily for verbal understanding.

The sixth chapter is about the study of the meanings of particles, nouns and power in compounds. Last two chapters of PLM i.e., नामार्थ and समासादिवृत्त्यर्थ are a concise version of VBS. Nāgeśa also named these two chapters after the related chapter of VBS. Thus, looking at the similarity of these lines of both the texts at many places, it can be said that either these parts are interpolated or PLM is written or compiled by any scholar other than Nāgeśa. But it does not seem appropriate to reach any definite conclusion without study of all available manuscripts of both texts.

Among these three मञ्जूषाs, some subjects are discussed in detail so on other side some subjects are neglected at many places of these texts. Some subjects are

accepted so on other side those subjects are refuted. There are many translations available of all these मञ्जूषाs and other works of Nāgeśa in various regional languages but none of his texts have probably been translated into English. The ancient grammarians, who expanded the grammar philosophy, Nāgeśabhaṭṭa made it clearer and simpler. His मञ्जूषाs are very important works. He has significant contribution in the field of philosophy of Sanskrit Grammar. Out of all the original works regarding philosophy of grammar, PLM is to be considered distinctive work. Because the subject has been presented in such a lucid way which has not been done in any other work so far.
