Saussure's Reading of Pānini: The Case of Linguistic **Cannibalism**, Genitive Absolute, Umlaut and so on...[1]

Sharma, Sandeep
Govt College, Diggal (India)

Abstract: We, the Indian Teachers, are *lucky* enough to receive Prof Anant Ch Shukla's first ever English translation of Ferdinand de Saussure's rich PhD dissertation *On the Use of Genitive Absolute in Sanskrit*, in 2018. Now we turn to the luck itself: *luck* and speculations disrupt *karma* and *Karamyogis*. These cannot assimilate like the umlaut of Saussure. Saussure's other work *Course in General Linguistics* is a bit outdated and luckily (?) already made available in French/English but not in Sanskrit. *Sasthi **canādare*** (with and without the participle ca): The *being* of this rule, of the Sixth in *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, is disgrace in absolute. In this disgrace/complexities (a weird binary though!) dangers and imminent handi*capabilities* are already given not only for those who studied Sanskrit grammar or the metarule(s) proposed by Panini (? 350 BC) at the secondary levels (in early 1990s) and cannot understand French and Hindi but also for those colleagues who understand French and Hindi but cannot understand Sanskrit. In our classrooms of theory, Prof Shukla's act of English translation (in 2018) appears more meaningful than "Resurrection" (although we were expecting it to appear *first* in Sanskrit). This Resurrection of the contents, in English, brings forth the same threat which was initially brought to us by the first and subsequent translators, their interpretation of interpretations, their handless manga-like cartoons, their oversimplified sketches on white paper in classroom and so on of Saussure's notes. Reading/writing anything on Saussure (Structuralism) and Derrida (post-Structuralism) without understanding the depths of Sanskrit grammar and linguistics is impossible. There are also links which suggest the chain of Socrates, Alexander and Sanskrit literature (which Socrates possessed through Alexander) (Mishra, 2015, p. 83). Still in Platonic sense we can assume that the translation of Shukla is thrice removed from the real (Thought>Saussure/French>English) than the thrice or five times (if there is such proposition in syllogism, other than the postmodern logic) distant from the reality of the corpus-based study of Sanskrit absolutes by Saussure himself (Thought>Saussure>Students/Colleagues> French> English). Then is this act of translating, into English, by an author from India, really Resurrection? Or is it Cannibalism as Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi '*creatively*' claim in their "Introduction" to *Post-Colonial Translation*? I will also touch on Harish Trivedi's efforts in reading Dr Jaidev's *The Culture of Pastiche* and his inability (an error, an error of pastiche itself, an oversight, the *Divya*-sight turned into oversight, the oversight turned into blindness and so on) to quote Jaidev's monologue from where uproots the seed of fearsome cannibalism in translation in 1993 (in *The Culture of Pastiche*) and then the reverse directionality of same seed in 1996 (in Trivedi's book): *bhaksyami* --- the textual gesture of cannibalism of the seed, of the 'self-righteousness,' of the sight, of the text, of the pastiche of pastiche itself. I will consider the first translation of Saussure in English by Prof Shukla as the primary source for this paper. I will also try to re-read the grammatical rules in the contemporary English grammar such as the use of prepositional genitive vis-à-vis Sanskrit (in particular the grammatical rules of *Aṣṭādhyāyī*) and argue as to why there is a need to simplify its use. And finally some authors who disappeared like the ə (schwa).

Keywords: Genitive absolute, Pānini, Prepositional genitive, *Anādara*

athā[2]

I. Literature Review

I cannot be sure if or not Grammarians and linguists have sparingly touched on the issue of Genitive Absolute in Sanskrit and English before, during and after Saussure. But most brilliant amongst the contemporaries of Saussure and Indian writer in colony to work on Genitive Absolute in Sanskrit was Prof Vaman Shivram Apte who in his *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (1884) explains the nuances of Sanskrit grammar in simplified English to his students and to the curious colonizers: "The subject and the object of an absolute construction is not, repeated in the principal sentence, in any case except the Genitive" (Rule 125) (Apte, 1965, p. 84). In 1841, Max Müller (1823-1900) entered Leipzig University to study Sanskrit and Philology. Later, in the same university, Saussure (1857-1913) defended his PhD (which he had completed in 1876) in 1880. On the other hand, while the work was being written, Müller ensured to remain within the peripheral space of Prof Apte who politely mentioned his presence in his life in "Preface to the Second Edition" of his *The Students Guide to Sanskrit Composition* (1885): "I [Professor Apte] must thank Professor Max Müller, who was kind enough to suggest, among other things, this idea of giving an Index" (Apte, 1885, p. viii). Unfortunately, Prof Apte (1858-1892) died suddenly at 34. After him many great scholars like Seshagiri Prabhu, a contemporary of Apte continued to write without having much attention from the academia—yesterday, till today. Prabhu's *Vyakaranmitram for Schools and Colleges* (1904) and RG Bhandarkar's *First Book of Sanskrit* (1866) remain unknown and inaccessible works to date. We have brilliant works such as of Surendernath Dasgupta and his translation and commentary titled *The Mahabhasya of Patanjali* (which I have dealt with somewhere else, particularly at Footnote 2 of this paper). Edward H Spieker's "On the So-Called Genitive Absolute and its use especially in the Attic Orators" (1885) appeared just after Saussure's PhD thesis. This work deals exclusively with Genitive Absolute in Greek:"unequalled by the absolute construction of any language of the Indo-European family" (Spieker, 1885, p. 343). But there is neither the mention of Greek classics on the grammar of genitive absolute nor of Saussure in this work.

Many "officially" recognized works by the colonial masters on Sanskrit linguistics and grammar were written by the ones whose Mother Tongue was not Sanskrit. *Perhaps* this no way mitigates the efforts (in learning Sanskrit, mastering it and resultant authenticity or brilliance) of the works produced by those foreign authors whose Mother Tongue/Father Tongue (like many Indian Brahmins inherit from their Fathers) was not Sanskrit. Kielhorn wrote his *A Grammar of Sanskrit Language* (1888) for the Indian students with brief notes on grammatical rules. In this book a chapter on genitive under the heading "The Case of Nouns" Kielhorn offers markedly small commentary on the use of Genitive and Dative on page 284. He also wrote "The *Candra-*

---

[2] " *athā śabdānuśāsanam* " says Panini. For the elaboration of this comment see for example, the commentary of Surendranath Dasgupta on *The Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali* : "The object of grammar is directly specified here by the elaborator of grammar, Patanjali-*'atha'* etc. Now (follows) the instruction of words. The word *'atha'* is used to indicate the commencement of the topic. Though the topic of the instruction of words is a long process, the word *'atha'* indicates the commencement of such a topic." (Dasgupta, 1991, p. 01).

Vyakaranta and the *Kasika-Vritti*" on which Saussure had also made a passing reference in his dissertation. The title "The Role of the Particle *ca* in the Interpretation of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*" by Joshi appears very interesting but is unavailable except for in the references of other non-native scholars such as Bronkhorst's "Panini's use of *Api*" where he dexterously compares *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*. Both the papers deal with the participles (*api* and *ca*) having almost same meanings in Sanskrit; in *The Sanskrit Locative Absolute and its Syntactic Surroundings in Absolute Constructions in Early Indo-European* Rupel compares the function of absolute constructions with the classical languages such as Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. His chapter 4.8 "The Origins of the Western Perspective" is of particular interest to the present scholar. In *A Method of Linguistic Description the Order of Consonants According to Panini* Stall attempts to read Shivasutra's of Panini for which his primary source is the Sanskrit Alphabets given by WS Allen in his book *Phonetics in Ancient India* (1953); *Panini: His Work and its Traditions* by George Cardona is a multivolume book which offers Panini's works with critical commentary in English ; in *Absolute Clauses in English from the Systemic Functional Perspective: A Corpus-Based Study*, Yang and others exclusively deal with corpus-based study of absolute cases in English, *a la* Saussure and so on. On the other hand, today much work is done on the Computational Sanskrit and Machine Translation which perhaps cannot stand firm without the help of theoretical support from the ancient languages such as Sanskrit whose cardinal syntax does not entangle in the binaries of computational programming. Of some such works, these are the few: we have M H Choe's "Interlingua-based English-Hindi Machine Translation and Language Divergence;" Goyal Sinha's "Translation Divergence in English-Sanskrit-Hindi Language Pairs" and so on. There are very few books which deal with the problem or the ideological stance in relation to the directionality of translation by the Post-Colonial theorists. In this regard, Harish and Sussan's "Introduction" to *Post-Colonial Translation* and their observations on postcolonial theories of translation deserve special and specialized attention. For getting an overview of translation and ideologies of translation in different regions of the world I would prefer to re-read Sandeep Sharma's *Translation and Translation Studies*.

II. Cannibalism in Linguistics

> But in crisis situation created by an aggressive, almost cannibalistic [the Western Culture], alien culture, one has to posit Indian culture as a single entity.
> (Jaidev, x, p.1993)

One reads Harish Trivedi's idea of cannibalism, by the Postcolonial Translators, in his work of 1999 with wonder as there is no reference to Jaidev and his monologue *The Culture of Pastiche* (1993) and this quote, which I have given at the beginning, which sustains the idea of cultural cannibalism.   But the chronology demands so (Jaidev, 1993 and then Harish Trivedi, 1999). Also Harish Trivedi was a colleague of Dr Jaidev at the Indian Institute of Advance Study during the compilation of *The Culture of Pastiche*. We have to read that Jaidev in "Preface" offered his sincere gratitude to his scholarly colleague(s) at the Institute: " I am also very grateful to *Dr Harish Trivedi* for pointing out numerous errors in my translation of Hindi passages, and for offering many useful suggestions on the specific aspects of the work [*The Culture of Pastiche*] (xi). Harish Trivedi's efforts in reading Dr Jaidev's *The Culture of Pastiche* and his inability

(maybe an error, an error of pastiche itself, an oversight, the *Divya*-sight turned into oversight, the oversight turned into blindness and so on) to quote Jaidev's monologue from where uproots the seed of fearsome cannibalism in translation in 1993 (in *The Culture of Pastiche*) and then the reverse directionality of same seed in 1996 (in Trivedi's book) is problematic here: *bhaksyami* --- the textual gesture of cannibalism of the seed, of the 'self-righteousness,' of the sight, of the text, of the pastiche of pastiche itself. Now let us look into the flow, of directionality, of some passages in *The Culture of Pastiche* from the ST (Hindi) to the TT

मार्च की एक शाम थी, मैं नित्ति भाई के **घर** आया था, मैं गुसलखाने में खड़ा था, और वो मेरे कमरे में बैठे थे (56) *March ki ek shaam thi, mai Niti Bhai ke **ghar** aya tha, main ghusalkhane me khada tha, aur vo mere kamre me baithe the .(56)*	That March evening I had gone to the **office** of Niti Bhai, how I was standing in the bath, and how they were sitting in the room. (55)	Here the word ghar (घर) or **home** has drastically been translated as **office** in English. This ridiculously shows that in March the protagonist went to the office of Niti Bhai where he kept standing in the bath. This translation of one word (from home to office) changes the meaning of entire context.
हम समृति में **उसे** [the dead butterfly] पकडते हैं, जो मृत और मुर्दा है. (57) *Ham samriti mein **use** [the dead butterfly] ko pakadte hain, jo mrit aur murda hai. (57)*	We seize **something** in memory, and it goes dead. (57)	Here the translator translates butterfly (which is very important as a noun in the sentence) as "something" (indefinite pronoun) in English. The translation moves from the specific in SL to the vague, from the definite to the indefinite in TL marring the images of this text.

But it would be very mean of us to point out the oversight of Dr Jaidev (the writer and translator) and blame the one (that is Harish Trivedi) whose only fault was his grandness to 'point out errors in translation.' So, I decide to stop here and not quote other errors in translation of *The Culture of Pastiche*. But still we cannot just stop here the flow of history, the given and immortal question of cultural cannibalism from Jaidev to Harish Trivedi.

Hiu tagu increscere-iko, assumptionem abutan se potifull   originale es biju-nt quaestionem-da, antara-a magios surgere- apo-tod gwa-chalonge fra se apo-dem

se pēr sem- antara-cannibal, se-fra se sol- apo se kagh antara briche vallum-apo Okw.³

By writing the above quote I have attempted to go back to the main issue of this paper. Let's talk about Trivedi and cannibalism again. I have tried to disfigure the contemporary or conserve (as we say in environmental sciences nowadays) the original from his book. These redundant signifiers are composed either out of borrowings (in English, from other languages) or from PIE root words hence understanding it in one go is like *pulling teeth* (I have daringly used this cannibalistic idiom here!). The original form, from which I have disfigured/figured out the above quote, can be traced in the so called Contemporary English in "Introduction: of Colonies, Cannibals and Vernaculars" by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi. These authors give *a cold shoulder* to the questions raised by post-colonial writers:

> Today, increasingly, assumptions about the powerful original are being questioned, and a major source of that challenge comes from the domains of the **fearsome cannibals**, from **outside** the safety of the hedges and neat brick walls of Europe.⁴ (Bassnett & Harish, 1999, p. 02)

For Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi the Source Text of the colonized does the act of cannibalism by transforming itself into the powerful European Target Text (say English language)---which appears to me a strong metaphor (*or idiom disguised as metaphor*), uncanny metamorphosis.⁵ After *picking up the brain out* (although this also looks a bit cannibalistic!) of the theoretical implications of devouring a Catholic priest by a Brazilian tribe they continue right there: "it is unsurprising to find radical concepts of translation emerging from India, from Latin America, from Canada, from Ireland – in short, from former colonies around the world that challenge established European norms about what translation is and what it signifies" (Bassnett & Harish, 1999, p. 04).

---

³ Today (from Proto-Germanic *hiu tagu*); increasingly (from Latin *increscere*; -ly is from Proto-Germanic -iko), assumptions (from Latin *assumptionem*) about (from Old English *abutan*) the (from Sanskrit *se*) powerful (from PIE root *poti*; -ful from Old English -full) original (from Medieval Latin *originale*) are (probably a variant of PIE *es*)being (from Proto-Germanic *biju*; -ing from PIE *-nt-) questioned (from Latin *quaestionem*; -ed from Proto-Germanic -*da*-), and (from Sanskrit *antara*- "interior) a (From Latin –*al*; plural –*ae*) major (from Latin maior, earlier *magios*) source (from Latin *surgere*) of (from PIE root -*apo*) that (from PIE *tod*-)challenge (Old French *chalonge*) comes (from PIE root *gwa*-) from (from Old Norse *fra*) the domains (from PIE root *dem*)of (from PIE root *apo*-) the fearsome (fear is from PIE *pēr* and some is from PIE root *sem*-) **and cannibals** (from Spanish *cannibal)*, from outside (from PIE root *uidh* and side from PIE root *se*-) the safety (from PIE root *sol*) of the hedges (from PIE root *kagh*) and neat (from PIE root *nei*) brick (from Old French *briche*) walls (from Latin *vallum*) of Europe (from PIE root *okw*- "to see") (*Etymonline*, 2021)

⁵ See, for example, Sussan and Harish and their quote: "Once upon a time, in the sixteenth century, in what is now Brazil, members of the Tupinambà tribe devoured a Catholic priest. This act sent shudders of horror through Portugal and Spain, representing as it did the ultimate taboo for a European Christian. The very term 'cannibal' was associated with the Americas…it entered the English language… . The eating of the priest was not an illogical act …and may even be said to have been an act of homage. After all, one does not eat people one does not respect… Today, increasingly, assumptions about the powerful original are being questioned, and a major source of that challenge comes from the domains of the fearsome cannibals." (Susan, 1999, p. 1).

In the meantime, we can call it a coincidence that we come across a *Shaloka* (verse) in the PhD dissertation of Saussure quoting a Sanskrit text and a story of a great Indian Hermit Agastya who appeared, just once in lifetime, a very powerful cannibal (taken from *Ramayana*. III 16. 26):

Tatas tu kalpitam bhaksyam Vātāpim mesarūpiṇam

Bhajsayām āsa bhagavān Ilvalasya sa paśyatah. (Saussure, 1968, p. 11)

Saussure's focus is not on the concept of cannibalism (Agastya's eating Vatapi) and translation in the above mentioned quote.[6] Saussure helps us understand 'extreme degradation of *anādara*' in Sanskrit while using the genitive absolute. But, in the above Hindu mythical verse written in Sanskrit language, cannibalism is associated with eating the delinquent cannibal not by a cannibal *but by a vegetarian;* not as an act of respect for the stronger enemy (as Bassnett claims) but due to the Divine Compulsion to eat the worst, the ugly, the foul, the indigestible enemy; not the body of the one who is respected by the society but of the one who is considered evil; not the pious blood of Jesus but the impious, the dirty blood of a nasty demon. All these metaphorical adjectives I have proposed here show the reverse directionality, downstream, from TT to ST in which (the TT) is already and always cannibal, the colonizer and evil in this sense[7]. Then in that sense linguistic processes of assimilation (like umlaut), dissimilation, insertion, deletion, elision, metathesis and so on are also kinds of linguistic cannibalism.[8] These cannibalistic metaphors in linguistics are the sharp tools for eating away consonants, vowels (as we have rounded laryngeals which eat away the consonant), declensions, tones and so on of the ST. The authoritative sounds of the borrower bury the borrowed. Stress dislocates the major central points of the brain.

---

[6] Sage Agastya spent all his time meditating. Ilvala's brother Vatapi had the powers to transform himself into a goat. They invited Brahmins for *Shraddha*. Ilvala cooked Vatapi as food for the Brahmins and after they had eaten, Ilvala would call Vatapi to come out of their bellies. Upon hearing the words of Ilvala, the dead Vatapi would assemble himself and become alive. He would tear the stomachs of the Brahmins to come out thus killing the Brahmins. Ilvala requested the Sage to have lunch served by him. Ilvala then cooked his brother Vatapi, disguised the food and served it to the Sage and the kings. The Sage prevented the kings from eating the food and he consumed their share as well. Ilvala called,"*Vatapi atragacha*" (Vatapi come here). Immediately, Agastya passed his right hand over his stomach and said,"*Vatapi Jeernobhavā*" (Vatapi got digested) and in Gorriso's translation : "*gatasya Yama-sadanam*"(sent to the God of Death). Thus the Sage prevented Vatapi from bursting out of his belly. He therefore takes the three kings with him to obtain the eternal wealth from the Dhanava Ilvala. The five stars in Orion's head are also called Ilvala.

[7] Colonial India saw many 'natural' but early deaths. The scholars who did great research and translated Sanskrit texts into English went missing: Prof Sivram Apte who died at young age of 34; "Pandit Durgaprasad of Jeypore" mentioned and praised in "An Extract from Dr P Peterson's Paper on Courtship in Ancient India" (1891); Mr M Sheshagiri Prabhu of the Madras Presidency "was the first to suggest addition of Analysis and Synthesis of sentences" (although their texts cannot be traced on the web). However, he has been mentioned by Prof VS Apte in his "Preface to the Second Edition" of his *The Students Guide to Sanskrit Composition (*written on 24 Dec 1885) to name a few. This is how cannibalism in translation actually started in India. Sanskrit presses were closed by the order of the law. Macaulay's in his "Minutes" of 1835 proposed to ban all printing presses which printed Sanskrit texts as also stopped all translators from translating from Sanskrit into English.

[8] See, for example, Pulleyblank's comment: "Saussure's celebrated *Memoire sur le systeme primitif des voyelles dans les langues indoeuropeennes* appeared in 1878. It was essentially a structurally in a different category from the vowels proper and were to be regarded as vocalic forms of y and w, parallel in their morphology to the syllabic forms of the liquids and nasals … Saussure called these phonemes which could appear either in consonantal or syllabic form 'coefficients sonantiques' or simply 'sonantes.' This part of his analysis is incorporated in the classic Brugmannian synthesis of Indo-European but is partly obscured by the setting up as separate items of vocalic and consonantal forms of the sonants rather than treating them as a distinct category." (Pulleyblank, 1965, 87-88).

Location of the stress is one of the most important criterions for disappearance of the close vowel ə (schwa) (Pulleyblank, 1965, p. 94). Being the most neutral and easily digestible sound almost every native speaker pronounces schwa! The saliva of the Borrower is highly acidic. The borrowed words are quickly digested or left semi-digested. The Linguistic Cannibalism disfigures the victim sound before disappearing it completely or else assimilates the undigested disfigured figure. The original words which originate from the lungs of the native are eaten up or completely disfigured before reaching the final chamber of the organs of speech already seasoned with grounded spices called terminologies. With the movement of mouth, the closing and opening of the organs of speech there follows systematic disappearance of sounds/spellings and this is more prevalent in the languages spoken by the colonizers---the result is complete variation between what is spoken and what is written as also what was spoken and written *ab initio*. Finally, there is a loss of the facial gait, a Parkinson of harmony---speech and corresponding spellings fail to match: "That the Indo-European vowel system should be analysed as a two term close-open contrast which one can write as ə -a (which is the movement of the jaw, of the saliva, of digestion)" (Pulleyblank, 1965, p. 98). But in classical languages like Sanskrit we rarely find an example where sounds have disappeared.

As I have been talking about Saussure, the Father of Modern Linguistics and his PhD, we can notice that:

a) Saussure, frequently and almost always uses diacritics for Sanskrit quotes in his PhD dissertation. His transliteration of Sanskrit further helps the readers in understanding and digesting the sounds of the classical Sanskrit in the first go.

b) Saussure, on the other hand, does not use diacritics for other classical languages of Europe like the Greek, Latin and so on (Saussure, 2018, p. 03 and 05). This makes the reader helplessly stand at the threshold of speechlessness and indigestion. These Romance Languages remain inaccessible, incoherent making it indigestible for the brain of the reader who cannot make out designs out of the chains of alphabets/sounds.

c) Saussure does not attach any religious or national values to the other classical languages, its linguistics or grammar (other than Sanskrit).

d) Being a Linguist, Saussure boldly considers Sanskrit as the language of Hindus as he observes:"Although the '*anadare*' use, consecrated by the code of **Hindu** grammar" (Saussure, 2018, p. 07). In another instance Saussure *renames* Sanskrit Genitive Absolute as the "**Indian** Locative" (Saussure, 2018, p. 07). On the *other hand*, his intellectual seniors like Max Müller and others at Leipzig had claimed to have mastery over the subject and Sanskrit was taught, learnt and used in the university with much enthusiasm even before Saussure.

e) We should not try to find any chain of connections/rhythms (as I did with alphabets, linguistic sounds and cannibalism) between Prof Apte's premature death at the age of 34, Saussure's unawareness of Prof Apte's work on Genitive Absolute in Sanskrit and Müller's close association with Saussure (at Leipzig) and Prof Apte (in the colonized India).

III. The Genitive Absolute: From ST (Sanskrit) to TT (English)

The absolute formation in Sanskrit (ST) containing genitive case and its attached participle simultaneously agreeing with the subject in gender and number can be translated with parenthetical sentence in English (TT) (and this may be suitable for many other similar formations in Sanskrit syntax). On the other hand, the absolute formation looks appropriate when we translate it into another absolute formation as we have done here after placing the subject of the participle (which always and already functions as an adjective and a verb) in genitive case: 'Ignoring/disregarding, the advice of kids is not good.' But Saussure finds another innovative way to locate the degradation of Genitive Absolute:

.

> Jayamangala perceives in the clause an *anādara* (v.6), and remembering the prescription of Panini: *sasthi canadare*, he begins to campaign, in order to justify the presence of the locative *tasmin vadati*. *Anādara* is evident in effect, only it concerns *rusto'pi*, "although irritable" alone, and it is inadmissible to see in *tasmin vadati* the idea "although he spoke thus." (Saussure, 2018, pp.06)

Saussure criticizes Jayamanagla (who also is like the ə [schwa] whose commentary and biography is unavailable on the web and no further research is conducted on his works to date) for wrongly translating and incorporating the idea of "although" which Saussure believes belongs to Genitive Absolute. Perhaps Saussure could not understand the context which was the result of the transformation of idea from *tasmin vadati* to "although" (Hanuman spoke) (Saussure, 2018, pp.06). The problem, as per Saussure, is the addition of the conjunction "although."

We must see that in the rule II.3.37, that is *yasya ca bhaven bhavlakshnam, Bhava* in particular, has been used twice. Here the word *Bhava* act as *Kriya* or verb and also as emotive substance of the sentence as we have *anādara* in Genitive Absolute (the *sasthi* rule of *Vibhaktis* sometimes combined with the *locative seventh---*the *saptami*). In order to understand the use of objectionable "conjunction" by Jayamangala one should thus read the *Bhavas* of Hanuman as also the context which created these *Bhavas* (the emotive state) in Chapter 5; Sarga 30 of *Ramayana*:

> *yadi vaacam pradaasyaami dvijaatih iva samskritaam*
> *raavaNam manyamaanaa maam siitaa bhiitaa bhavishyati*
> *vaanarasya vishesena katham syaadabhibhaasanamm*
>
> ("Valmiki *Ramayana*: Sundar Kanda," 2005)

Hanuman knew that Sita can be consoled if he speaks the meaningful words of a human being (in Sanskrit). But here Hanuman was in doubt. Hanuman felt inferior because he was cursed by a sage in his early childhood. That is why he thought '(To console Sita) if I (Hanuman) use Sanskrit, the language spoken by the Brahmins then Sita may get frightened. She will think (will have doubts) as to how a monkey can speak the language of the humans.' Thereafter, Hanuman had to fight against his own *Bhavas* of inferiority and doubt which was not unfounded though. He thinks that if I, being a monkey, speak in Sanskrit language (the language spoken by the human beings) Sita might take me to be a messenger of Ravana. After much deliberations Hanuman spoke to Sita. Considering this context, Jayamangla might have reshaped *tasmin vadati* as

"although he (Hanuman) spoke." This is also justified by the Rule II.3.38 and its preceding rule II.3.39 which stresses on noticing the *Bhavas* in a sentence before reproducing it in structural form.

We already know that relationship is derived between the participle and the noun based on the use of conjunctions at the beginning of a Genitive Absolute in English. Whereas, in Sanskrit the case is just reverse. In Sanskrit, the *Bhava* is predominant and for which we cannot just blindly consider the use of "while," "although" proposed by Saussure.[9] Other than the conjunctions proposed by Saussure we can also use "when," "since" and so on. The question is not following the technicalities of grammar per *se* without having considered the entire context and its relevance which gave rise to the *Bhavas* of *anādara----* *anādara* is also a *Bhava*. Reading the readings of Saussure make us 'semi-believe' that he sometimes realizes the fact that *Bhavas* of *anādara* are subordinate to the participle and the relative conjunction. The strange fact about this criticism of Saussure is that Saussure was aware of II.3.39 when he states elsewhere in his thesis: "The truth is that *anādara* results from the context" (8).

IV. Reconsidering the use of Prepositional Genitive in English Grammar:

> Today we usually think of the genitive as an attributive adjective element modifying nouns or pronouns, but in Old English it was widely employed also to modify verbs and adjectives.... the genitive is still used after verbs and adjectives; but it survives here only in the form of *of*-genitive, which we here no longer feel as a genitive but now construe as a prepositional object, so that the old, once common, conception of the genitive as a modifier of verbs and adjectives has been lost. (Curme, 1931, p. 109)

Genitive (which indicates *Sambandha* or relation of the noun/pronoun) is not used as an independent word in Sanskrit. That is why genitive when taken absolutely is used with the *Saptami Kriya* or the Locative as suggested by Panini (II.3.39). Once the declensions are in order, Sanskrit can accommodate any possible reshuffling of words in a sentence. Perhaps, that is why Sanskrit is the most suitable language for Computational Linguistics. Let us take an example:

1. a. Tasyah purushah atra vasti.

1.b. Ghatasya rachhnah.

We can write 1.a. in any two or other many multiple ways:

a) *purushah tasyah atra vasti* b) *vasti tasyah purushah atra*

We can also reshuffle 1.b without changing its grammatical and linguistic sense.

The translated versions of the above sentences in English will be:

2. a 1.a as : Her/His man resides here.

2.b. 1.b as :The design of the pot.

---

[9] For the role of *Bhavas* in translation see, for example, Sandeep Sharma's "Nudité du traducteur."

Here we usually face these problems while translating the above Genitives from Sanskrit into English:

a) Unlike Sanskrit the sentence in English cannot be reshuffled as it will mar the meaning and grammatical structure of the sentence. The reason for this problem is that English is an analytic language and like Old English or other classical languages does not follow the rules of inflected languages.

b) Third Personal Pronoun Genitives (his, his, her, their) are indeclinable in English but declinable in Sanskrit. Hence, we can write *tasyah* which is a derivation or declinable form of *tad*.

c) We encounter a major problem in reshuffling 2.b in English as there is the use of prepositional genitive 'of' in a sentence. Although we are aware of the fact that: "The pure genitive could not have been used with prepositions" (Spieker, 1885, p 311). But the grammatical rule in the use of genitives is clear enough: we don't use apostrophe with non-living beings. This is another symptom of analytic language. But there is contemporary need (which arises out of the classical theory of declension taken from Sanskrit and Old English) to reconsider this rule and discontinue the use of prepositional genitive 'of' in English.

Conclusion

The significance of the study/how the research results influence real practices or future studies:

a) There is a need to do further research into the works written by Indian scholars of Sanskrit and Hindi like Prof Apte, Prof Jaidev, Pandit Durgaprasad of Jeypore; Mr M Sheshagiri Prabhu and Jayamangala and his commentaries.

b) There is a need to simplify the rule governing genitive cases in English grammar. The removal of prepositional genitive 'of' in English will further help simplify its usage and make it more comprehensible (say, for example, for computer programs).

c) The stature of Saussure is founded on one book alone, *Course*, which is not written by him. On the other hand, his other works which were produced by him remain underestimated. Now it is the time to revisit those works.

d) Saussure's PhD dissertation was written primarily in Sanskrit and French. We already have the French and English versions with us. In future, the world looks forward to seeing Sanskrit translation of this dissertation by the masters of Sanskrit.

e) We can find the traces of cannibalism in many modern languages like English. After borrowing, the Cannibalistic language uses the tools of Linguistic Terminology to devour the authenticity of the original.

f) It is difficult to read or understand Structuralism of Saussure without understanding Sanskrit grammar and linguistics---in particular Pānini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

References

Apte, Vaman Shivram (1965/2014). *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas.

Bassnett, Susan & Harish Trivedi. (1999). "Introduction: Of Colonies, Cannibals and Vernaculars." *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. eds. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi. Routledge, London, 1999.

Bauer, B. (1994) (2000). *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European : The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French.* De Gruyter Mouton 'New York and Berlin.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. (1988). "Panini's Use of Api." *Anandam Vijaniyat*: Aligarh. pp 124-126.

Cardona, George. (1998). *Panini: His Work and its Traditions*. Motilal Banarasidass: Delhi.

Choe, M.H (2001). "Interlingua-based English-Hindi Machine Translation and Language Divergence", *Machine Translation*, 16(4), pp: 251 – 304.

Curme, George 0. (1931). *Syntax.* Boston: D.C.Heath and Company.

Dasgupta, Surendranath (1991). *The Mahabhasya of Patanjali: 1st Four Anhikas, Translation with Annotations*. Delhi: ICPR.

Draeger, A. A. (1881). Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache, vol. ii, 2nd edn. Leipzig.

Frauzel, J. D. (1998). "Impersonal Absolutes in Indo-Iranian, Greek, Latin, Baltic and the origin of the Indo-European absolute construction." *Proceedings of the 7 Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference.* Los Angeles. pp 105–25.

Goyal, P. et all (2009). *Translation Divergence in English-Sanskrit-Hindi Language*.5406, Springer: Heidelberg.

Horn, F. (1918). *Beitrage zur Geschichte der absoluten Konstruktionen im Lateinischen*. Lund and Leipzig.

Jaidev. (1993).*The Culture of Pastiche*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Joshi, S. D. and Bhante, S. (1983), "The Role of the Particle *ca* in the Interpretation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī." *Proceedings of the International Seminar on Studies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini.*

Kielhorn, F. (1876) "The Candra-Vyakaranta and the Kasika-Vritti." *Indian Antiquary*, 15, pp 183-85.

Krisch, T. (1988). "Zur semantischen Interpretation von absoluten Konstruktionen in altindogermanischen Sprachen." *Scientia*. Retrieved from https://www.uni-salzburg.at/fileadmin/oracle_file_imports/2043323.PDF.

Misra, Kashinath. (2015). "New Facts about Alexander the Great." *IOSR-JHSS*. Pp 83-87.

Pulleyblank, E G. (1965). "The Indo-European Vowel System and the Qualitative Ablaut." Word 21 (1). pp 86-101.

Ramat, P. (1989). "On Latin absolute constructions." *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia. pp 259–68.

Rosen, H. (1988). "Der griechische 'dativus absolutes' und indogermanische 'unpersonliche' Partizipialkonstruktionen.'̈ *KZ.*

Ruppel, Antonia. (2013). *Absolute Constructions in Early Indo-European*. Cambridge University Press: UK.

Ruppel, Antonia. (2012). *The Sanskrit locative absolute and its syntactic surroundings in Absolute Constructions in Early Indo-European*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Serbat, G. (1979)."L'ablatif absolu." *Revue des etudes latines .́* 57. pp 340–54.

Sharma, Sandeep (2016). "Saussure's Handless Men: Signing with Phantom Hands." https://www.academia.edu/36714469/Saussures_Handless_Men_Signing_with_Phantom_Hands

Sharma, Sandeep. (2020). "Nudité du traducteur." *In Translation*. pp 123-131.

Sharma, Sandeep. *Translation and Translation Studies*. ICDEOL : Shimla, 2018.

Spieker, Edward H. (1885). "On the So-Called Genitive Absolute and its use Especially in the Attic Orators." *The American Journal of Philology*, 6 (3), pp. 310-343 .

Stall, JF. (1972). "A method of linguistic description the order of Consonants according to Panini." *Language,* 38. pp 1-10.

Saussure, Fredinand de. (2018). *On the Use of Genitive Absolute in Sanskrit*. Trans. Ananth Ch Skulka. Common Ground Publishing:London.

Valmiki Ramayan: Sundar Kanda. (2005, September).Retrieved from http://www.valmikiramayan.net/sundara/sarga30/sundaraitrans30.htm

Yang, Bingjun and Qingshun He. (2015). *Absolute Clauses in English from the Systemic Functional Perspective: A Corpus-Based Study*. Springer:London.