THE *PARIBHĀṢĀ*, *YADĀGAMĀS TADGUṆĪBHŪTĀS TADGRAHAṆENA GṚHYANTE* IN THE PĀṆINIAN TRADITION



Yiming Shen

Wolfson College

A dissertation submitted to the University of Oxford in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity 2019

Abstract

The current work studies a *paribhāṣā* "metalinguistic rule" about āgama "augment" within the scope of the Pāṇinian tradition of Sanskrit grammar (*vyākaraṇa*). One of the forms in which this *paribhāṣā* ("the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā*") is found is *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* (e.g. #11 in *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*). The current work discusses various aspects of *āgama* (Chapter 2), translates and explains the texts found in the *Mahābhāṣya* and five Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* treatises that deal with the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā* (Chapter 3-8), and presents, based on the treatment of these texts, evaluation and remarks (Chapter 9). It argues that Pāṇini must have assumed the effect of the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā*, but he may not necessarily have assumed an additional *paribhāṣā* like *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* or *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhayate* to achieve this effect, because this effect can already be achieved through elements within the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself, i.e. *sūtra* 1.1.46 and 1.1.56. Therefore, such an additional *paribhāṣā* can be assumed, but is not necessary. The current work may thus contribute to a better understanding of: <1> the concept and function of *āgama* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system; <2> the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā*; <3> through the previous two points, the working of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system itself; and <4> the Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* literature, e.g. how a *paribhāṣā* is interpreted and argued about by the commentators.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii

Table of Contents iii

1 Introduction 1

1.1 *Vyākaraṇa* and the Pāṇinian tradition 1

1.2 The working of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system 1

1.3 Paribhāṣā 3

1.3.1 Explicit *paribhāṣā*s 3

1.3.2 Implicit *paribhāṣās* and the *paribhāṣā* literature 3

1.3.3 Sources of an implicit *paribhāṣā* 4

1.3.4 jñāpaka 5

1.3.4.1 The word jñāpaka 5

1.3.4.2 Two treatises on *jñāpaka* 6

1.3.4.3 Some *paribhāṣās* concerning *jñāpaka*: 6

1.3.5 An implicit *paribhāṣā*'s being mandatory (*nitya*) or non-mandatory (*anitya*) 7

1.4 *āgama* 8

1.5 A problem with *āgama* 10

1.6 A solution: the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā* (ypbh) 10

1.7 A problem with the solution 13

1.8 Purpose, method, structure, and significance of the current study 15

1.10 Some important works in the secondary literature 16

1.10.1 Thieme's "Bhāṣya zu vārttika 5 zu Pāṇini 1.1.9 und seine einheimischen Erklärer" (1935) 17

1.10.2 Wezler's *Paribhāṣā IV, V und XV* (1969) 17

1.10.3 Bhate's "Saṃnipāta*paribhāṣā*" (1984) 20

1.10.4 Ben-Dor's *The paribhāṣās arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya, lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam and ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* (2009) 21

1.10.5 Brill's "Paribhāṣās: metarules in Sanskrit grammar" (2013) 22

1.11 Conventions followed in the current work 22

2 Āgama 26
2.1 An attempt at answering the question: which items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have the name *āgama*? 26
2.2 My proposed criterion to determine whether an item in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has the name *āgama* 29
2.2.1 A few words about the meaninglessness of a substitute (*ādeśa*) and an *āgama* .. 29
2.2.2 My proposed criterion 30
2.3 A table of all the *āgamas* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 31
2.3.1 Some remarks 31
2.3.2 The big table 33
2.3.3 Special cases (in grey background) 53
2.3.3.1 *am* 53
2.3.3.2 *aiC* 55
2.3.3.3 *r* in 1.1.51 57
2.3.3.4 *rAM* 58
2.3.3.5 *ŚnaM* (not an *āgama*) 61
2.4 What can the table tell us? 62
2.4.1 The marker of an *āgama* 62
2.4.2 The case ending of the left context of an *āgamin* and of the *āgamin* 62
2.4.2.1 Abbreviations and conventions 62
2.4.2.2 The table 64
2.4.2.3 Remarks based on the table above 68
2.4.3 Concurrent cases 73
2.4.4 Others 76
2.5 A table of some other *āgamas* taught outside of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 76
2.6 Some other *paribhāṣās* that concern *āgama* 78
2.7 Philosophical discussion on *āgama* 79
2.8 *āgama* beyond the Pāṇinian school of Sanskrit grammar 79
2.8.1 *Cāndrasūtrapāṭha* and *Candravṛtti* 80
2.8.2 *Kātantrasūtra* and *Durgasiṃhavṛtti* 82
2.8.3 *Vīracōḻiyam*, a grammar of ancient Tamil 85
2.8.4 *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 85
2.8.5 *Nirukta* 86

2.8.6 Remarks on further exploration 86
3 The ypbh in *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20 *vārttika* 2-5 88
3.1 *Sūtra* 1.1.20 88
3.2 *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20.2-4 89
3.2.1 Text 89
3.2.2 Translation 90
3.2.3 Explanation 91
3.2.3.1 Vārttika 2 91
3.2.3.2 Vārttika 3 93
3.2.3.3 Vārttika 4 94
3.2.4 Comment 95
3.3 *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20.4-5 95
3.3.1 Text 95
3.3.2 Translation 96
3.3.3 Explanation 97
3.3.3.1 End of *vārttika* 4 97
3.3.3.2 Vārttika 5 98
3.3.3.3 End of *vārttika* 5 100
3.3.4 Comments 104
4 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣāsūcana* of Vyāḍi 108
4.1 On the work and the author 108
4.2 Text 108
4.3 Translation 111
4.4 Explanation 113
4.4.1 Text part 2a and 2b: 1.2.18 as a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh 113
4.4.2 Text part 3 *sarveṣām* 117
5 The ypbh in the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva 118
5.1 On Puruṣottamadeva 118
5.2 Text 119
5.3 Translation 122
5.4 Explanation 123
5.4.1 text part 1 and 3a: the establishment of the ypbh through logical principle (*yuktisiddhi*) 123

5.4.2 Text part 2a *kuṇḍā* 127
5.4.3 Text part 2b *sarveṣām* 129
5.4.4 Text part 3b: the *jñāpaka* in 1.2.18 129
5.4.5 Text part 3c: against the *jñāpaka* in 1.2.18 130
5.4.6 Text part 4 133
5.4.6.1 Comments on the relation between PuV 18 and VḌV 17 133
6 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita 135
6.1 On Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita and his *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* 135
6.2 Text and translation 136
6.3 Explanation 137
6.3.1 On the source of text part 2 in the *Bhāṣya* 137
6.3.2 On the source of text part 3 in the *Bhāṣya* 137
6.3.3 On the working of the argument in text part 3 137
6.3.4 On the source of text part 4 in the *Bhāṣya* and the identification of *Bhāṣya* sources in the current text 143
6.3.5 On the working of the argument in text part 4 143
Comment 145
7 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣābhāskara* of Haribhāskara 147
7.1 On the author and the work 147
7.1.1 On the author 147
7.1.2 On *Paribhāṣābhāskara* 148
7.2 Text 150
7.3 Translation 155
7.4 Explanation 156
7.4.1 Text part 2 *sarveṣām* 156
7.4.2 Text part 4a *bhūyāt* 157
7.4.3 Text part 5 three *jñāpakas* 159
7.4.3.1 *aniṭ* in 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi* 159
7.4.3.2 *neṭi* (7.2.4) 163
7.4.3.3 *adharāṇi* 163
8 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa 169
8.1 Text 169
8.2 Translation and explanation 171

8.2.1 Text part 1 (*avataraṇa* and the ypbh) 171
8.2.1.1 Text 171
8.2.1.2 Translation 172
Text part 2 Gloss and establishment through mundane principle (*lokanyāyasiddhi*). 172
8.2.2 Text part 2a (Gloss) 172
8.2.2.1 Text 172
8.2.2.2 Translation 172
8.2.2.3 Explanation 172
8.2.2.4 Comment 173
8.2.3 Text part 2b (*tadguṇībhūtāḥ* in the ypbh) 174
8.2.3.1 Text 174
8.2.3.2 Translation 174
8.2.3.3 Explanation 174
8.2.4 Text part 2c (Establishment of the *paribhāṣā* through a mundane principle [*lokanyāyasiddhi*]) 174
8.2.4.1 Text 174
8.2.4.2 Translation 175
8.2.4.3 Explanation 175
8.2.5 Text part 2d (*yam uddiśya … vihitaḥ*) 175
8.2.5.1 Text 175
8.2.5.2 Translation 175
8.2.5.3 Explanation 175
Text part 3 (The ypbh is non-mandatory) 176
8.2.6 Text part 3a (*pacamāna*) 176
8.2.6.1 Text 176
8.2.6.2 Translation 176
8.2.6.3 Explanation 176
8.2.6.4 Comment 177
8.2.7 Text part 3b (*didīye* and *jahāra*) 177
8.2.7.1 Text 177
8.2.7.2 Translation 177
8.2.7.3 Explanation 178
8.2.8 Text part 4 (a sound being a part of another sound) 179

8.2.8.1 Text 179
8.2.8.2 Translation 179
8.2.8.3 Explanation 179
8.2.8.4 Comment 180
8.2.9 Text part 5a (The ypbh also applies where the *āgamin* is a single sound.) 180
8.2.9.1 Text 180
8.2.9.2 Translation 180
8.2.10 Text part 5b (Reason #1) 180
8.2.10.1 Text 180
8.2.10.2 Translation 181
8.2.10.3 Explanation 181
8.2.11 Text part 5c (Reason #2) 184
8.2.11.1 Text 184
8.2.11.2 Translation 185
8.2.11.3 Explanation 185
8.2.11.4 Comments 192
8.2.12 Text part 5d (Reason #3) 194
8.2.12.1 Text 194
8.2.12.2 Translation 194
8.2.12.3 Explanation 196
8.2.12.4 Comment 197
8.2.13 Text part 6 (*neṭi* and *ṇer aniṭi*) 200
8.2.13.1 Text 200
8.2.13.2 Translation 200
8.2.13.3 Explanation 201
8.2.13.4 Comments 201
8.2.14 Text part 7 (Reconciling the teaching of *āgama* and the doctrine of changelessness of the speech-sound) 203
8.2.14.1 Text 203
8.2.14.2 Translation 203
8.2.14.3 Explanation 205
8.2.15 Text part 8 (The ypbh will not be rendered redundant by A 1.1.56) 209

8.2.16 Text part 8a (A 1.1.56 does not apply to an inferred substitute such as the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*) 210
8.2.16.1 Text 210
8.2.16.2 Translation 211
8.2.16.3 Explanation 211
8.2.17 Text part 8b (Corroboration of link 2 in 8a) 219
8.2.17.1 Text 219
8.2.17.2 Translation 220
8.2.17.3 Explanation 220
8.2.18 Text part 8c (1.1.56 can apply to 3.4.86 etc.) 224
8.2.18.1 Text 224
8.2.18.2 Translation 225
8.2.18.3 Explanation 225
8.2.18.4 Comment: a summarising table 228
8.2.19 Text part 8d (A 1.1.57 etc. can also apply) 230
8.2.19.1 Text 230
8.2.19.2 Translation 230
8.2.20 Text part 8e (Conclusion of text part 8) 231
8.2.20.1 Text 231
8.2.20.2 Translation 231
8.2.21 Text part 9 (The above commentary on the ypbh has its root in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20) 231
8.2.21.1 Text 231
8.2.21.2 Translation 232
8.2.21.3 Comments 232
9 Conclusion 234
9.1 A table summarising the ypbh commenatry in the five *paribhāṣā* works treated in Chapter 4-8 234
9.2 The effect of the ypbh must exist 237
9.2.1 A 4.1.32 *anta*rvatpativator nuk: *anta*rvatnī 237
9.2.2 A 8.2.7: pañcānām 238
9.2.3 A 1.2.9 *iko jhal*: *jhalādi san* 239
9.3 Different ways of achieving the effect of the ypbh 240

9.3.1 Approach A: a *paribhāṣā* not mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 240
9.3.2 Approach B: 1.1.56 (*sthānivadbhāva*) 240
9.3.3 Approach C: 1.1.46 ādy*anta*u ṭakitau 243
9.3.4 Comparing the three approaches A, B, and C 245
9.4 Final conclusion 247
Appendix 1 Some Sanskrit terms with their English counterparts 249
Appendix 2 Other ypbh-related passages in the *Bhāṣya* 251
11.1 The ypbh explicitly mentioned 251
11.1.1 Bh 6.1.186.3 251
11.1.2 Bh 6.1.192.0 251
11.1.3 Bh 6.4.3.0 252
11.1.4 Bh 7.1.33.0 252
11.1.5 Bh 7.2.82.1 253
11.1.6 Bh on 8.3.32.1 253
11.1.7 Bh 8.4.17.1 254
11.2 The ypbh implied 254
11.2.1 Bh 8.2.42.0 254
11.2.2 Bh 8.2.42.3-4 255
Bibliography and abbreviations 257
1 Primary sources 257
2 Secondary literature 267
3 Digital files 272
4 Other abbreviations 273

1 Introduction

(For conventions followed in the current work, see §1.11.)

1.1 *Vyākaraṇa* and the Pāṇinian tradition

Vyākaraṇa, or traditional Indian grammar, is one of the most ancient and most important traditional Indian sciences (*śāstra*). Its immensely deep and extensive corpus of literature witnesses the existence of a dozen different grammatical schools: *Sārasvata*, *Cāndra*, *Kātantra*, *Jainendra*, *Hemacandra*, to name just a few, and the Pāṇinian school is the oldest among them. The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A) of Pāṇini, dated circa 5th century BC, the oldest proper *vyākaraṇa* work as we know of, is the cornerstone of the Pāṇinian tradition, upon which a vast commentarial literature has been built over a period of more than two thousand years, and which in the meantime also serves as a model for the ground texts of many other grammatical schools. The Pāṇinian literature is the object of study of most of the modern scholarship on *vyākaraṇa* by far, and it is also the subject of the current work. Unless mentioned otherwise, discussions in the current work are to be understood as within the scope of the Pāṇinian tradition.

1.2 The working of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system

The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is a collection of nearly 4000 *sūtras*. Each *sūtra* encapsulates a grammatical rule, and these 4000 *sūtras* together build up an elaborate rule-based grammatical system describing the Sanskrit language in a predominantly derivational way. The method of description is roughly as follows: suffixes (*pratyaya*) are first added to forms, creating nominal and verbal stems (*aṅga*), and then both the suffixes and the stems undergo modification, thereby arriving at the desired forms found in actual usage. These two types of operations, i.e. suffixation and modification, are found in the operational rules (given in the *vidhisūtras*), which

comprise the core of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system, accounting for the actual working of the derivational process (*prakriyā*). There are also other rules that are not directly related to the derivational process, but rather prepare for it: they are ancillary rules, under which the naming rules (given in the *saṃjñāsūtras*) define the technical terms used within the system, and the interpretative rules (given in the *paribhāṣāsūtras*) explain how different *sūtras* should be interpreted, both valid throughout the whole *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system. The operational rules and ancillary rules, together constituting the whole *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system, work together and propel the derivational process forward, deriving the desired, actually used forms from the raw, abstract suffixes and stems. The following table would help to facilitate understanding:

types of rules	Operational rules		Ancillary rules	
	Suffixation rules	Modification rules	Naming rules	Interpretative rules
roughly speaking, found in aṣṭādhyāyī *adhyāya* #	3-5	6-8	1-2	

1.3 Paribhāṣā [1]

1.3.1 Explicit *paribhāṣā*s

As mentioned above, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* contains *paribhāṣāsūtras*, giving general interpretative rules that are valid throughout the system.[2] For example, *sūtra* 1.1.66 *tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya* is a *paribhāṣāsūtra*; it explains how a form ending in the locative case should be understood in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*: it refers to the right context of an operation. Since these *paribhāṣāsūtras* are stated explicitly in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *paribhāṣās* they give are explicit *paribhāṣās.*

1.3.2 Implicit *paribhāṣās* and the *paribhāṣā* literature

Apart from these explicit *paribhāṣās*, Pāṇini must have assumed other *paribhāṣās* for the working of his system. These implicit *paribhāṣās*, for their implicitness, have become a major concern of scholars both ancient and modern, and are also the focus of the current study. In the *Mahābhāṣya* (abbreviated as *Bhāṣya* or Bh), Patañjali and Kātyāyana have put forward many such implicit *paribhāṣās* that they argue have been silently accepted by Pāṇini while building his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system, so that many difficulties encountered in their discussion could be removed with the help of these implicit *paribhāṣās.* These proposed *paribhāṣās* are later commented upon by various commentators, their works forming the *paribhāṣā* branch of the Pāṇinian literature,[3] a rich and highly technical body of texts, taking the already complicated

[1] *Paribhāṣā* is not limited to the field of *vyākaraṇa*: see, for example, S.C. Chakrabarti, *The paribhāṣās in the Śrautasūtras* (1980) and G. Pellegrini, "Meanings out of rules. Definitions, functions and uses of paribhāṣās in Śrautasūtras, Gṛhyasūtras, Vyākaraṇa, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta", in *Asiatische Studien*, volume 72, issue 2 (2018): 445-655.

[2] Pāṇini himself did not use the word *paribhāṣā* in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. As far as we know, the first one to use it in the Pāṇinian school was Kātyāyana, in e.g. 1.3.11.3 *anyanirdeśas tu nivartakas tasmāt* ***paribhāṣā*** (1:272).

[3] The Pāṇinian literature could be divided into three main branches: 1) Technical literature (*prakriyā*), on the technical details of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system, e.g. *Kāśikā* and *Siddhāntakaumudī*. Most of the texts within the Pāṇinian literature belong to this category; 2) Philosophical literature

and technical *prakriyā* (derivation) as the basis of its discussion. If we place Vyāḍi before 700 AD[4] and thus take him as the earliest author in the *paribhāṣā* literature that we know of, and take V. S. Abhyankar, who wrote the *Tattvādarśa* commentary on *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* (PbhI) in 1889 AD (Abhyankar's Dictionary, p. 179), as one of the latest authors in the *paribhāṣā* literature, then the *paribhāṣā* literature would span at least more than one thousand years.[5] Some important questions the *paribhāṣā* literature addresses include: Should a *paribhāṣā* be accepted or refuted? If accepted, how is its existence established? What are the problems that one can solve with the help of a *paribhāṣā*, i.e. its purposes? What are the new problems the acceptance of such a *paribhāṣā* would create? Are there any limitations in the domain of application of a *paribhāṣā*?

1.3.3 Sources of an implicit *paribhāṣā*

When an implicit *paribhāṣā* is put forward and said to have been accepted by Pāṇini himself, one may legitimately ask, as Pāṇini did not say anything explicit on it, how is it known that this implicit *paribhāṣā* has been accepted by him? Commentators give mainly three answers:

The first is *jñāpaka* "indicator, clue": that Pāṇini, although he did not speak out explicitly, has indicated the existence of a *paribhāṣā* by using an otherwise redundant word in his *sūtra*. Since it is assumed that Pāṇini never says anything

(*arthavicāra*), that is philosophical speculation within the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* framework, e.g. *Vākyapadīya*. It is largely concerned with semantics, and unlike the other two branches, it is also closely engaged with the rival Indian intellectual traditions; and 3) *paribhāṣā* literature (*paribhāṣā*): cf. Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha, Introduction p. 3.

[4] According to Wujastyk's edition, vol. 2, p. xxvii, this is possible.

[5] Or, more safely speaking, the *paribhāṣā* literature spans at least more than 600 years: from Puruṣottamadeva's *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* in the 12th century (Abhyankar's Dictionary p. 330) to *Tattvādarśa* in 1889 AD.

unnecessary or redundant,[6] an apparently redundant word then must have a purpose - and it is exactly to indicate the existence of a *paribhāṣā*. A *paribhāṣā* that is established by a *jñāpaka* is <1> *jñāpakasiddha*.

The second answer is common sense: since an implicit *paribhāṣā* is but a refined, śāstric formulation of an everyday life principle (*lokanyāya*), it must have been accepted by Pāṇini himself, and moreover he has not found it necessary to spell it out explicitly. A *paribhāṣā* that is based on common life knowledge is <2> *lokanyāyasiddha*.

Thirdly, an implicit *paribhāṣā* may just be a śāstric formulation of a logical principle (*yukti* or *nyāya*), which Pāṇini must have accepted and has not found it necessary to spell out. Such an implicit *paribhāṣā* is then <3> *yuktisiddha* (= *nyāyasiddha*).

Finally, all the remaining *paribhāṣās* that cannot be traced to any of these three sources are <4> *vācanikī*, that is either based on / directly deduced from one or more *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtras*, or is entirely independent.[7]

1.3.4 jñāpaka

1.3.4.1 The word jñāpaka

The word jñāpaka is not found in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. In the Pāṇinian literature as we have it today, the oldest text witnessing the word jñāpaka is Kātyāyana's vārttikas: for example, 1.4.99.3 *sici vṛddhau tu parasmaipadagrahaṇaṃ* ***jñāpakaṃ*** *puruṣābādhakatvasya* (1:349.17); 3.1.91.10 *hetumadvacanaṃ tu* ***jñāpakam***

[6] E.g. PbhI 122: *ardhamātrālāghavena putrotsavam manyante vaiyākaraṇāḥ* "The grammarians celebrate the festival of [the birth of] a son because of the conciseness by half mora", that is, the grammarians rejoice over the saving of a half mora in the formulation of a rule like over the birth of a son.

[7] The fourfold classification here is based on pp. iv-v in the preface of F. Kielhorn, *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* (1874).

anyatrābhāvasya (2:75.4); 6.1.16.2 *na vā yakārapratiṣedho* ***jñāpako*** *`pratiṣedhasya* (3:24.14). In the *Bhāṣya* one finds many occurrences of the word *jñāpaka*.

Note that at least in Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* (e.g. the three examples given above), Patañjali's *Bhāṣya*,[8] and the PbhI[9] (and perhaps also in other texts), we have as nominative singular of the *prātipadika jñāpaka* both *jñāpakam* (i.e. neuter) and *jñāpakaḥ* (i.e. masculine), apparently depending on the gender of the coreferential (*samānādhikaraṇa*) word. In such cases, the word *jñāpaka* seems to be more of the nature of an adjective than a noun, and so should perhaps be understood in a more literal way (*x y-sya jñāpakam / jñāpakaḥ* would be translated as "x intimates / [is] indicative of y" rather than "x [is] an intimator / indicator of y", where the word *jñāpaka* is treated more like a noun). Where the word *jñāpaka* must act as a noun, it seems to have the neuter gender, e.g. *tulyajātīyāpekṣaṃ jñāpakam* and *prakaraṇāpekṣaṃ ca jñāpakam* (below in §1.3.4.3).

1.3.4.2 Two treatises on *jñāpaka*

Jñāpakasamuccaya of Puruṣottamadeva and *Jñāpakasaṃgraha* attributed to Nāgeśa (see the second paragraph in fn 169) are two collections of *jñāpakas* in the Pāṇinian system.

1.3.4.3 Some *paribhāṣās* concerning *jñāpaka*:

From *Jñāpakasamuccaya*:

> *tulyajātīyāpekṣaṃ jñāpakam.* (p. 98)
>
> *prakaraṇāpekṣaṃ ca jñāpakam.* (p. 100)

[8] For example, *uttarapadasyāntodāttavacanaṃ* ***jñāpakaṃ*** *parabhāvasya* (Bh on 2.2.36.2 [1:438.2]) and *śasidadyoḥ pratiṣedho* ***jñāpako*** *rūpābheda ettvavijñānasya* (Bh on 6.4.120.4 [3:218.18-19]).

[9] For example, *atra ca "pratyayottarapadayoś ca" iti sūtraṃ* ***jñāpakam*** (under #52, p. 53 line 15) and *"udīcāṃ māṅaḥ" iti nirdeśo `syā* ***jñāpakaḥ*** (under #7, p. 6 line 13).

Cf. *yogāpekṣaṃ jñāpakam* in the *Bhāṣya*.[10]

From the index in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (here including both Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian *paribhāṣās*):

#185 *jñāpakajñāpitā [vidhayo hy anityāḥ]*. (pp. ४७४-४७५)

#186 *jñāpakasiddhaṃ na sarvatra*. (pp. ४७४-४७५)

#187 *jñāpake `rtham anityam*. (pp. ४७४-४७५)

#505 *samāsāntāgamasaṃjñājñāpakagaṇa[naññirdiṣṭāny anityāni]*. (pp. ४९०-४९१)

1.3.5 An implicit *paribhāṣā*'s being mandatory (*nitya*) or non-mandatory (*anitya*)

That a *paribhāṣā* has been taken by most commentators to have been accepted by Pāṇini does not mean it could fit into the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system perfectly. On the contrary, very often it creates problems, leading to undesired forms. At this point, in order to justify the existence of a *paribhāṣā* even with the presence of its problems, commentators come up with the argument of a *paribhāṣā*'s being non-mandatory (*anitya*): that a *paribhāṣā* should indeed be accepted, only that it is not always or universally applicable: where it leads to desired forms, it is to be applied; where it does not and would yield wrong forms, it is then not in effect (*lakṣyānurodha*).[11] In

[10] I have, using Bh$_{\text{GRETIL}}$, found five occurrences of *yogāpekṣaṃ jñāpakam* in the Bhāṣya: 1:83.8 (Bh on 1.1.23.10); 2:81.13-14 (Bh on 3.1.95.2); 2:238.24-25 (Bh on 4.1.87.2); 2:347.13 (Bh on 5.1.24.0); 2:365.12 (Bh on 5.1.118.1).

[11] Cf. Bh on 1.1.39.16: *tasmād yāny etasyāḥ paribhāṣāyāḥ prayojanāni, tadartham eṣā paribhāṣā kartavyā, prativdheyaṃ doṣeṣu*. (1:100.3-4)

contrast to this idea, there are mandatory (*nitya*) *paribhāṣās*, i.e. those that are always and universally in effect.

1.4 *āgama*

In §1.2 I have sketched the way the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system works: suffixes are added to create stems (suffixation), and then both undergo modification (modification), arriving at the final desired form found in actual usage. Modification is necessary because in the vast majority of cases, the suffixes and the stems are identified in such a way that the mere combination of the two is still different from the actual utterance. There are two main types of modification: substitution (*ādeśa*) and augmentation. In the latter type, a meaningless sound(-group) is added to the suffixes and stems or parts of them. For example, to derive *gajānām* "of elephants", plural genitive of the *prātipadika gaja*, we first add the suffix *ām* to the stem *gaja* (suffixation), and then modify both (modification): first, we add the *āgama nUṬ*, that is a meaningless sound *n*, to the suffix *ām*; and then, we replace the final sound of the stem with a long vowel:

1	*gaja*	*ām*	
2	*gaja*	*nām*	*hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ* 7.1.54
3	*gajā*	*nām*	*nāmi* 6.4.3

In this way, we arrive at the final form *gajānām*.

In his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Pāṇini has given many items similar to *nUṬ*, for example *nUM* in forms like *kulāni* by 7.1.72, and *pUK* in forms like *dāpayati* by 7.3.36. Nevertheless, he has never given the name *āgama* to these items (in fact, in his

Aṣṭādhyāyī, he has not used the word *āgama* at all). Probably he has not felt the need to do so due to the lack of any functional purpose of such a name within his system. In the Pāṇinian tradition, it is Kātyāyana, in his *vārttikas*,[12] that first used the name *āgama* to refer to these items, and the tradition followed him in this practice. The tradition, e.g. *Bhāṣya* on *Śivasūtra* 7-8 (1:36.2), also uses the name *āgamin* to refer to that to which an *āgama* is added, e.g. the suffix *ām* in *gajānām*. In the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, an *āgamin* is usually put in the genitive case, and the *āgama* in the nominative case. For example, in 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* (translated and explained in §3.3.3.3.1), the *āgamin ārdhadhātuka* is put in the genitive case (together with its qualifier [*viśeṣaṇa*] *valādi*), and the *āgama iṬ* in the nominative case.

The *āgamas* are taught together with various markers (*it*). In the *āgama nUṬ*, there are two markers. The marker *U* is for facilitating pronunciation. The marker *Ṭ* is for indicating where the *āgama* should be added in the *āgamin*: for when we add the *āgama nUṬ* to the *āgamin ām*, we could have three different results depending on where *nUṬ* is added: *nām*, *ānm*, and *āmn*. Pāṇini clarifies this issue in 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau* and 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ*: *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ* or *K* are to be added before or after the āgamin (cf. §9.3.3), and *āgama*s marked with *M* are to be added after the final vowel of the *āgamin*. Accordingly, here *nUṬ* is added before *ām*, and so we get *nām*.

As far as I am aware, there are no dedicated studies on *āgama*, either within the tradition or within the modern academia, perhaps since arguably, *āgama* is only a minor element in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system. Nevertheless, there are still problems with it.

[12] For example, 1.1.20.5 *na vārthavato hy āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate yathānyatra*.

1.5 A problem with *āgama*

Here is a problem with *āgama*. To derive the *prātipadika lavitṛ* "cutter", an agent noun of the verbal root *lū*, we add the agent suffix *tṛ* to the verbal root *lū*. Then, we add the *āgama iṬ* to the suffix *tṛ:*[13]

1	*lū*		
2	*lū*	*tṛ*	*ṇvultṛcau* 3.1.133
3	*lū*	*itṛ*	*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* 7.2.35

At this stage, in order to obtain the desired form, we need the *guṇa* replacement of *ū* by 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* (translated and explained in §3.3.3.3.1), which teaches that when a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* suffix immediately follows, the final sound of an *aṅga* ending with *iK* (= *i*, *ī*, *u*, *ū*, *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ*) is replaced by *guṇa*. Although here we do have an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, i.e. *tṛ*, and an *aṅga* ending with *iK*, i.e. *lū*, 7.3.84 still cannot apply, because the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix is not immediately following the *aṅga*: the *āgama iṬ* is intervening between them. Is there any way to get around this difficulty?

1.6 A solution: the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā* (ypbh)

Similar problems as we have seen above in *lavitṛ* are present in many places within the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system. These problems, together with problems of other types, are solved by proposing the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā* (ypbh):

[13] This example is found in Bhāṣya on 1.1.20.5 (see §3.3.3.3.1).

yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante. (This is the wording in PbhI 11)

"*Āgamas* added to those (= *āgamins*), having become subordinate to those (= *āgamins*), are [also] referred to by what refers to those (= *āgamins*)." That is to say, the form denoting the *āgamin* also denotes the group of āgamin plus its *āgama*. Effectively, the group of *āgamin* plus its *āgama* will have whatever name applies to the *āgamin*.

With the ypbh, the group of āgamin plus its *āgama itṛ* will then have the name of the *āgamin tṛ*, i.e. *ārdhadhātuka*, and as a result, an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix now immediately follows *lū*, and so 7.3.84 can come into effect, and we have the replacement of *ū* by *o* (cf. fn 89). With one more step, i.e. the replacement of *o* by *av* by 6.1.78,[14] we arrive at the desired form:

1	*lū*		
2	*lū*	*tṛ*	*ṇvultṛcau* 3.1.133
3	*lū*	*itṛ*	*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* 7.2.35
4	*lo*	*itṛ*	*sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* 7.3.84
5	*lav*	*itṛ*	*eco `yavāyāvaḥ* 6.1.78

[14] 6.1.78 teaches that before a vowel the sounds denoted by *eC* (= *e, o, ai, au*) are replaced by *ay, av, āy, āv* respectively.

The form I have given above for the ypbh is in fact what we find in PbhI (#11). Apart from this, I have found five other forms of the ypbh in the Pāṇinian texts. Thus, all the six forms of the ypbh I have found are as follows:

A. *āgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

B. *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

C. *tadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

D. *āgamā yadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

One can represent ABCD as the following:

A-D. *(yad/tad)āgamās (yad/tad)guṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

E. *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*

F. *arthavata āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*

It seems to me that among these six forms of the ypbh, A-E have the same meaning or function. The ypbh in the form F, which I have only found in Bh 1.1.20.5, seems to have a different meaning or function from that of A-E. For more details, see §3.3.4.

Among the 18 *paribhāṣā* texts included in Abhyankar's *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, 9 belong to the Pāṇinian tradition; the distribution of the above six forms of the ypbh in these 9 Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* texts is as follows:

# in *paribhāṣā* saṃgraha	title	author	abbreviation in the current work	# of the ypbh in the text	form of the ypbh
1	*Paribhāṣāsūcana*	Vyāḍi	VḍV	17	E
2	*Vyāḍiparibhāṣāpāṭha*	Vyāḍi	VḍP	20	E
12	*Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti*	Puruṣottamadeva	PuV	18	D
12a	*Paribhāṣāpāṭha*	Puruṣottamadeva	PuP	12	B
13	*Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*[15]	Sīradeva	SīV	4	A
14	*Paribhāṣāvṛtti*	Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita	NīV	4	B
15	*Paribhāṣābhāskara*	Haribhāskara Agnihotri	HaV	4	A
16	*Paribhāṣenduśekharapāṭha*	Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa	PbhI	11	B
17	*Paribhāṣābhāskara*	Śeṣādrisudhī	ŚeV	11	C

As we can see in this table, the ypbh is found in all the 9 Pāṇinian texts included in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*. In fact, all the 18 texts in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* have it,[16] a fact pointing to its importance across traditions. One of the reasons why it has received so much attention may be that it is somewhat controversial: the ypbh is not a perfect problem-solving *paribhāṣā* - it also creates new problems, thus casting a shadow of doubt whether Pāṇini had really accepted it into his system.

1.7 A problem with the solution

Here is an example of a new problem that the ypbh creates. In the derivation of the *prātipadika pacamāna* "cooking for oneself", the present participle *ātmanepada* of the verbal root *pac* "to cook", we add the present suffix *LAṬ* to the verbal root *pac*, replace it with the suffix *āna*, add the suffix *a* to the verbal root, and then introduce

[15] With the subcommentary *Vijayā*, whose author is Mānaśarman.

[16] Here is the location of the ypbh in the remaining 9 texts of *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (# of text in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, followed by # of the ypbh in that text): 3-21; 4-7; 5-14; 6-32; 7-15; 8-22; 9-25; 10-63; 11-67.

the *āgama mUK* to the suffix *a* we just added (regarding the identity of the āgamin here, see fn 119):

1	*pac*			
2	*pac*		*LAṬ*	*vartamāne laṭ* 3.2.123
3	*pac*		*āna*	*laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv aprathamāsamānādhikaraṇe* 3.2.124
4	*pac*	*a*	*āna*	*kartari śap* 3.1.68
5	*pac*	*am*	*āna*	*āne muk* 7.2.82

At this stage, if the ypbh is in effect, then the group of āgamin plus its *āgama am* would be taken as the *āgamin a*, and we will have the coalescence of *a* and *ā* by 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (translated and explained in §6.3.5), which teaches that when a sound denoted by *aK* (= *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, *u*, *ū*, *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ*) is followed by a homogeneous vowel, both are replaced by a single long vowel:

6	*pac*	*ā*	*na*	*akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* 6.1.101

yielding the undesired form **pacāna* instead of the desired *pacamāna* (the current example is treated in more detail in §8.2.6).

That is to say, in order to reach the desired form *pacamāna*, here the ypbh should not be in effect. As in the above example *lavitṛ* the ypbh should be in effect, and here in *pacamāna* it should not, one may ask, can we know exactly when the ypbh should be in effect and when it should not? And after all, is the ypbh a part of

the original *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system as conceived by Pāṇini? If yes, then how to get around such problems as in *pacamāna*? If no, then how to account for such problems as in *lavitṛ*? Or should the wording of the ypbh be modified, so that it can cover all the cases and err in none?

1.8 Purpose, method, structure, and significance of the current study

The current study consists exactly in an attempt to answer these questions, through first discussing various aspects of *āgama* (Chapter 2), then translating and explaining the texts found in the *Bhāṣya* and five *paribhāṣā* treatises that deal with the ypbh (Chapter 3-8), and finally, based on my treatment of these texts, presenting my own evaluation and remarks (Chapter 9). Thus, the current work is structured in the following way:

MAIN PARTS AND THEIR CONTENT	CHAPTER AND CONTENT
1 Introduction	1 Introduction
2 A discusison about different aspects of *āgama*	2 *āgama*
3 Translation and explanation of the *Bhāṣya* and five *paribhāṣā* treatises on the ypbh	3 *Bhāṣya*
	4 *Paribhāṣāsūcana* of Vyāḍi (= VḍV)
	5 *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva (= PuV)
	6 *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita (= NīV)
	7 *Paribhāṣābhāskara* of Haribhāskara (= HaV)
	8 *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa (= PbhI)
4 Evaluation and conclusion	9 Conclusion

I wish this study could contribute to a better understanding of: <1> the concept and function of *āgama* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system; <2> the ypbh; <3> through the previous two points, the working of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system itself; <4> the Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* literature, e.g. how a *paribhāṣā* is interpreted and argued about by the commentators.

1.10 Some important works in the secondary literature

Some works in the secondary literature that I deem important in relation to the current work are:

#1 P. Thieme, "Bhāṣya zu vārttika 5 zu Pāṇini 1.1.9 und seine einheimischen Erklärer", in *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Philologisch-historische Klasse Neue Folge Fachgruppe III Nachrichten aus der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft 1. Band 1934-1937* (1935): 171-216;

#2 A. Wezler, *Paribhāṣā IV, V und XV Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der einheimischen indischen grammatischen Scholastik* (1969);

#3 S. Bhate, "Saṃnipātaparibhāṣā", in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Vol. 65 No. 1/4 (1984): 227-239;

#4 S. Ben-Dor, *The paribhāṣās arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya, lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam and ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat Studies on some metarules in Pāṇinian system* (2009);

#5 J. Brill, "Paribhāṣās: Metarules in Sanskrit grammar", University of Oxford MSt dissertation (2013).

#2, 3, and 4 are, as far as I am aware, the only works in the modern scholarship that treat individual *paribhāṣās* in detail trying to find out whether they were assumed by Pāṇini himself, and hence are closest to the current study in terms of methodology and goals.

1.10.1 Thieme's "Bhāṣya zu vārttika 5 zu Pāṇini 1.1.9 und seine einheimischen Erklärer" (1935)

Thieme's work is one of the earliest historical studies of a Pāṇinian topic. The article deals with the topic of the homogeneity of the sounds *ṛ* and *ḷ*, starting with Bh 1.1.9.5, and then going through *Kāśikā*, *Pradīpa*, *Padamañjarī*, *Śabdakaustubha*, *Siddhāntakaumudī*, *Uddyota*, and *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*.

1.10.2 Wezler's *Paribhāṣā IV, V und XV* (1969)

Wezler's work consists of two independent studies, one on the pair of *paribhāṣās anekāntā anubandhāḥ* and *ekāntāḥ* (the number of these two *paribhāṣās* in PbhI are respectively 4 and 5; henceforth I will refer to them respectively as *paribhāṣā* 4 and *paribhāṣā* 5) (*Erster Teil*), and one on the *paribhāṣā gauṇamukhyayor mukhye*

kāryasaṃpratyayaḥ (#15 in PbhI; henceforth *paribhāṣā* 15) (*Zweiter Teil*).[17] Through translation and explanation of excerpts from the *Bhāṣya*, *Pradīpa*, *Pradīpoddyota*, *Śabdakaustubha*, and *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* on the *paribhāṣās* in issue, he attempts to, while sketching out the history of interpretation of the *paribhāṣās* in issue, provide answers to the following two core questions: <1> who is the author of each *paribhāṣā*? (and in relation to it, how old is each *paribhāṣā*?) and <2> did Pāṇini himself know and consciously apply each *paribhāṣā*?[18] The answers to these questions, and other critical evaluations, are given in the last section (5 and 8 respectively) of each *Teil*, the preceding sections dealing with the translation and explanation of the texts.

In section 5 "*Diskussion und Auswertung des Materials zu paribhāṣā IV u.* [= *und*] *V*" of *Erster Teil*, Wezler evaluates the materials of Kātyāyana, Patañjali, Kaiyaṭa, and Nāgeśa one by one. Some of his findings are: Kātyāyana took the position of *paribhāṣā* 4 (p. 96 point 1), and he could be seen as the author of this *paribhāṣā* (p. 96 point 4); Patañjali adopted the view of *paribhāṣā* 5 (pp. 99-100 point 1), and he could be seen as the author of the related *paribhāṣās* 6, 7, and 8[19] (p. 100 point 3); according to Patañjali, Pāṇini knew and accepted *paribhāṣā* 5 (pp.

[17] It would be helpful if Wezler explained the reasons why he chose, out of the hundreds of *paribhāṣās*, these three *paribhāṣās* in particular for his study. I have not seen such an account anywhere in the work.

[18] "*Die vorliegende Untersuchung hat also zum Gegenstand 1) die Frage nach dem Alter und der Verfasserschaft der ‚Interpretationsgrundsätze', wie sie im Mahābhāṣya formuliert sind, und 2) die Frage nach der eventuellen bewußten Anwendung dieser Grundsätze durch Pāṇini. Darüber hinaus wird versucht, die Geschite der Interpretation der ‚Interpretationsgrundsätze' von Kātyāyana bis Nāgojībhaṭṭa zu skizzieren, und abschließend zu klären, ob diese paribhāṣās tatsächlich bei der Interpretation der Grammatik Pāṇini's angewendet werden müssen, bzw. können.*" (p. 17)

[19] PbhI 6 *nānubandhakṛtam anekāltvam*; PbhI 7 *nānubandhakṛtam anejantatvam*; PbhI 8 *nānubandhakṛtam asārūpyam*. (henceforth *paribhāṣā* 6, *paribhāṣā* 7, and *paribhāṣā* 8 respectively)

100-101 point 4). At the end of section 5, Wezler advances his own views. He tries to prove that the establishment by *jñāpaka* of *paribhāṣā* 6-8 does not work well (pp. 116-118), and the establishment by nyāya of *paribhāṣā* 5 also does not hold (pp. 118-119). Then, at the very end of section 5 and of the whole *Erster Teil* (pp. 119-120), he argues that Pāṇini himself took the position of *paribhāṣā* 4.

In *Zweiter Teil*, on *paribhāṣā* 15, some of the author's findings are: Kātyāyana did not know *paribhāṣā* 15 (p. 231) and Patañjali is the author of *paribhāṣā* 15 (pp. 230 and 245).

The method of this study is: first, a detailed investigation (consisting of translation and explanation) of the texts on a *paribhāṣā*, and then, evaluation and conclusion on the basis of such an investigation. This solid, down-to-earth method, in contrast to making mere general claims, has been advocated for in the *Einleitung*: "*Auch der europäischen Wissenschaft ist es bisher nicht gelungen, eine befriedigende Antwort auf die Frage nach dem Alter und der Verfasserschaft der grammatischen Interpretationsgrundsätze zu geben. Man hat sich im Wesentlichen darauf beschränkt, allgemeine Erwägungen anzustellen und Meinungen zu äußern, ohne eigentliche wissenschaftliche Hypothesen aufzustellen, da auf eine detaillierte Beobachtung von Tatsachen, durch die eine Hypothese herausgefordert wird, verzichtet wurde*." (p. 23) "*Ich glaube, daß wir auf allgemeine Erwägungen der Art, wie die gennanten Gelehrten sie angestellt haben, nicht angewiesen sind. Die vorliegende Arbeit ist aus der Einsicht heraus entstanden, daß die Frage nach dem Alter und der Verfasserschaft der paribhāṣās nur durch detaillierte Einzeluntersuchungen und genaue Beobachtungen beantwortet werden kann*."(p. 26) I fully agree with Wezler, and the method he follows has thus been a source of inspiration for the method followed in my current study of the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā*.

1.10.3 Bhate's "Saṃnipāta*paribhāṣā*" (1984)

Bhate's work (in Sanskrit) is an examination of the *paribhāṣā saṃnipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*[20] (*saṃnipātaparibhāṣā*), with the conclusion that this *paribhāṣā* should be rejected. In reaching this conclusion, she first discusses the examples where the *saṃnipātaparibhāṣā* helps lead to desired forms. Then she talks about the state of being non-mandatory (*anityatva*) of this *paribhāṣā*, where she argues that no non-mandatory *paribhāṣā* should be allowed in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system. Following this, she shows that for the same examples, besides the *saṃnipātaparibhāṣā*, there are other ways that one can resort to that can also help establish the correct forms, and she presents some faults not mentioned in the *Bhāṣya* etc. that would emerge with the acceptance of the *saṃnipātaparibhāṣā*. In her conclusion, she emphasizes that the *Bhāṣya* is not the highest authority - rather, the *Aṣṭādhyayī* is. What is incongruous with the *Bhāṣya* but is established by the *Aṣṭādhyayī* should be accepted. This article provides a good model of examining whether a *paribhāṣā* is a part of the original *Aṣṭādhyayī* system and hence is to be accepted or rejected. In it one also finds inspiring discussions on general topics like why we should examine a *paribhāṣā* (p. 227) and in what conditions we can say that a *paribhāṣā* has been accepted by Pāṇini himself (p. 232).

[20] #85 in PbhI. I quote here Kielhorn's translation: "(That which is taught in) a rule (the application of) which is occasioned by the combination (of two things), does not become the cause of the destruction of that (combination)." (F. Kielhorn, *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* [1874], p. 410)

1.10.4 Ben-Dor's *The paribhāṣās arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya, lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam and ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat* (2009)

Ben-Dor's work focuses on three *paribhāṣās* <1> *arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya*,[21] <2> *lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam*,[22] and <3> *ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat*[23] trying to provide an answer to the central question "Did Pāṇini presuppose these three *paribhāṣās* in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*?" through discussing the purposes, faults and *jñāpakas* of these *paribhāṣās*, mainly based on the texts *Bhāṣya*, *Kāśikā*, PbhI, and those of other later commentators. To my knowledge, this is the only work in the modern scholarship where the ypbh has been treated in detail. The section on the ypbh is from p. 296 to p. 321, being a part of Chapter III (beginning p. 233) which has as its main subject the *paribhāṣā ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat*. The discussion on the ypbh is intended as a supplement

[21] #14 in PbhI. I quote here Kielhorn's translation: "(A combination of letters capable of) expressing a meaning (denotes), whenever it is employed (in grammar, that combination of letters in so far as it possesses that meaning, but it) does not denote (the same combination of letters) void of a meaning." (F. Kielhorn, *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* [1871], pp. 81-82)

[22] #105 in PbhI. I quote here Kielhorn's translation: "(Whenever a term is employed which might denote) both something original and also something else resulting from a rule (of grammar), - or (when a term is employed in a rule which might denote) both something (formed by another rule) in which the same individual term has been employed, and also something else formed by a general rule, - such a term should be taken to denote, (in the former case) only that which is original, and (in the latter case) only that (which is formed by that rule) in which the same individual term has been employed." (F. Kielhorn, *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* [1874], p. 486)

[23] #37 in PbhI. I quote here Kielhorn's translation: "That which has undergone a change in regard to one of its parts, is by no means (in consequence of this change) something else (than what it was before the change had taken place)." (F. Kielhorn, *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* [1871], p. 179)

to this main subject (cf. p. 234). His conclusion is that Pāṇini has accepted the ypbh (p. 320). With this treatment, the author has made contributions by presenting in some detail the problems and arguments pertaining to the ypbh and endeavouring to decide whether this *paribhāṣā* has been presupposed by Pāṇini, all for the very first time in the modern scholarship as far as I am aware.

1.10.5 Brill's "Paribhāṣās: metarules in Sanskrit grammar" (2013)

Brill's work discusses, taking the 18 collections in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* as the basis, how the *paribhāṣā* texts are structured: how they begin, what they contain, how the *paribhāṣās* are ordered in each text, and how they end, with specific reference to SīV.

1.11 Conventions followed in the current work

1. When explaining the derivation of a form, I do not give the complete *prakriyā*: only what is relevant is given in a *prakriyā*.
2. In each step in a *prakriyā*, I put the *sūtra* which accounts for the next derived form on the right side of it.
3. Regarding *prakriyā*, the default *pakṣa* adopted in the current work is *krameṇānvākhyāna* (and not *vibhajyānvākhyāna*).

4. Any marker (*it*) is put in the capital letter.

5. In presenting a text (e.g. a *Bhāṣya* passage), I use क and ख, the first two letters of the Devanagari consonants, to mark the two sides of debate (*pakṣa*) in an argument.

6. a.b.c.d = *sūtra* a.b.c *vārttika* d (e.g. 1.1.20.5 = 1.1.20 vt 5).

7. On punctuation marks in a quoted Sanskrit text: I try to use as few punctuation marks as possible, but at the same time I also try to bring out maximal clarity. In any Sanskrit text I give, I use in total 11 punctuation marks:

1	,	2	.	3	?	4	/	5	//	6
“	7	”	8	‘	9	’	10	…	11	°

Here are some remarks:

1) ? marks a question raised within the text (e.g. in a dialogue in the *Bhāṣya*), and not my own doubt.

2) / and // only appear in verses. / marks the end of the first hemistich, // the end of the second.

3) The difference between … and ° is the following: if my quotation ends or begins in the middle of a word (e.g. a compound), then I use °; otherwise, I use …

8. In the presentation of any Sanskrit text from an edition, the punctuation marks are my own: unless necessary, I do not indicate any change in the punctuation marks I have made (i.e. from the edition).

9. On *anuvṛtti*: In giving the *anuvṛtti* of a *sūtra*, apart from my own judgment, I also consult *Kāśikā*, Joshi-Roodbergen’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, and, rarely, Sharma’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Unless necessary, any problem in *anuvṛtti* is not treated in the current work. Consequently, when the *anuvṛtti* of a *sūtra* is given without any remark or footnote, it does not mean that I think there is no problem behind it. In fact, *anuvṛtti* appears to me to be one of the most important, fundamental, and yet most complicated and problem-loaded aspects of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. In my current work, the *anuvṛtti* is thus only “assumed”, and the current work is built upon this assumption.

10. In the current work, whenever I say Pāṇini, I mean rather "Pāṇini", the assumed single author of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* text as we have it in Boehtlingk's Grammatik. I cannot say for sure whether this text has Pāṇini as its single author, or it has several authors dating from different periods. I believe for now it is best to assume that Pāṇini is the text's single author, that is to say, there is no interpolation in this text at all, so that one can make this assumption as a handy foundation and carry out various studies based on this foundation. Perhaps one day we could, reaching higher and higher from this basis, understand the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* system and other factors much better, so that we may come back to this basis-assumption and modify or even reject it. If, on the other hand, for now one assumes rather that Pāṇini was not the single author of this text, one has to, already now when there are already too many uncertainties, face the question which part of the text was authored by whom and at what time - this would make such an assumption, in my view, too complicated and thus not suitable to serve as the basis upon which to carry out different studies and to construct the theoretical superstructure.
11. In the current work, I have tried to avoid using the term "Patañjali", and in its place I have used e.g. "the author of the *Bhāṣya*", not only because of what I have just said above regarding Pāṇini, which I believe can also apply to Patañjali (and in fact to each and every author whose text's authorship is not completely clear to us), but also because it is difficult, in my view, to know which speaker in the dialogues of the *Bhāṣya* is Patañjali, or which view in a dialogue is Patañjali's. Patañjali may be only a recorder of the dialogues, so that none of the views in the *Bhāṣya* is Patañjali's; he may also be both speakers of a dialogue in the *Bhāṣya*: the entire *Bhāṣya* may just be the monologue of a single person, Patañjali, who loves arguing with himself, so that all the views in the *Bhāṣya* are Patañjali's. If one may propose the solution that in the *Bhāṣya*, the *siddhāntin* in any dialogue is Patañjali, then the difficulty is that it is not easy, in my view, to

know which view is the *siddhānta* and which view is the *pūrvapakṣa* or the view of an *ekadeśin*: a simple rule like "the view with which a dialogue in the *Bhāṣya* ends is the *siddhānta*" apparently does not work, because sometimes a dialogue in the *Bhāṣya* simply ends in the middle.

2 Āgama

2.1 An attempt at answering the question: which items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have the name *āgama*?

Since the ypbh deals with *āgamas*, a clear idea of what is expressed by the term *āgama* may contribute to a better understanding of the ypbh. An important question in this regard is: which items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have the name *āgama*? Or, which are the members of the set referred to by the name *āgama*? Such a question is not so easy to answer, because unlike the term *dhātu* (verbal root) or *taddhita*, whose referents are clearly given in the Dhātupāṭha or the *taddhita* section (4.1.76-5.4.160) in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the term *āgama* is not used by Pāṇini in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. As I have mentioned above, as far as we know, the first Pāṇinīya who used the term *āgama* to refer to a class of items is Kātyāyana, in his *vārttika*. Consequently, it is not possible to know which are the members of the set referred to by the term *āgama* according to Pāṇini himself. How can we then determine which items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have the name *āgama*? Would there be a criterion that could help us to determine whether an item in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is or is not an *āgama*, and thus lead to a set *āgama* whose members are all clearly identified? One may try the following alternatives.

First, there is the following sentence in the *Bhāṣya* that decribes *āgama*: *āgamaś* ca nāmāpūrvaḥ śabdopajanaḥ (found in e.g. Bh on 1.1.20.5 [1:75.9-10]). In this sentence, an *āgama* is described as an emergent sound(-group) (*śabdopajana*) that does not exist previously (*apūrva*). One may use this as the criterion to determine the set *āgama*. Following this criterion, not only an item such as *nUM* (#30 in the table in §2.3.2) will have the name *āgama*, but also any reduplicated syllable (*abhyāsa*), e.g. *ba* in *babhūva*, because a reduplicated syllable is also a sound(-group) that emerges and does not exist prior to that.

Second, there is another description of *āgama* in the tradition, which I have found in *Vijayā*, Jayadevamiśra's commentary on the PbhI: *āgamatvam avayavatvāvacchinnavidheyatāśrayatvam*. (*Vijayā* on PbhI, p. 88) This seems to be a definition of *āgama*. According to this sentence, being an *āgama* is being the substratum of the quality of being a *vidheya* (in an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra*; *vidheya*, literally "[what is] to be taught", roughly corresponds to the predicate of an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra*: it is the new thing that is taught with regard to / in the context of what is already known, the *uddeśya* - see e.g. Roodbergen's Dictionary, p. 383a-b, entry *vidheya*), and this quality is delimited by another quality, namely the quality of being a part. In other words, an *āgama* is both a *vidheya* (in an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra*) and a part of some other item. If we follow this criterion, then many items marked with *Ṭ* or *K*, for instance *aṬ* (#1 in the table in §2.3.2) and *tUK* (#21 in the table in §2.3.2), will have the name *āgama*, because they are both a part (either an initial part [*ādi*] or a final part [*anta*], in accordance with 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*) of some other item and are also found in the *vidheya* of an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra*. But an item marked with *M*, for example *nUM* (#30 in the table in §2.3.2), will perhaps not be able to have the name *āgama*, because there is, as far as I can tell, no way to call such an item a part: in particular, 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ* only teaches that such an item is added after the end of the final vowel of another item, and does not say that such an item is a part of another item.

Third, one may follow a full commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. (An incomplete commentary like *Bhāṣya* is probably not suitable, because there may be a few *sūtras* teaching *āgamas* on which we do not have any commentary in it.) One may adopt such a criterion, for example: if *Kāśikā* uses the word *āgama* to describe an item, then this item has the name *āgama*. If *Kāśikā* does not use the word *āgama* to describe an item, then this item does not have the name *āgama*. The prerequisite here is that *Kāśikā* is consistent in giving and not giving the term *āgama* in

describing an item, and that the manuscripts of *Kāśikā* can offer us a reliable text. Of course, instead of *Kāśikā*, one may also try e.g. *Bhāṣāvṛtti* or *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

Fourth, similar to the previous point, one may follow the opinions of a modern scholar, a modern commentary so to say. For example, one may follow Boehtlingk in the section *Erkärung der grammatischen Elemente* (pp. 146*-187*) in his Grammatik. If Boehtlingk uses the term *āgama* to describe an item there, then this item has the name *āgama*; if Boehtlingk does not use the term *āgama* to describe an item, then this item does not have the name *āgama*. It would also be good if Boehtlingk in his *Erkärung der grammatischen Elemente* is consistent and complete.

What I have done to answer the question which items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have the name *āgama* is the following. I have formulated my own sentence which serves as the criterion (see below §2.2): an item fulfilling this criterion has the name *āgama*; otherwise, it does not have the name *āgama*. To obtain items which I can test against this criterion, I have looked carefully through *Erkärung der grammatischen Elemente* in Boehtlingk's Grammatik and picked out all the items Boehtlingk describes as *āgama* (the actual word he uses is *Augment*). Among all these items, those which fulfill my criterion constitute group A. In addition, I have also found a few items that are not described by Boehtlingk as *āgama* in his *Erkärung der grammatischen Elemente* but nevertheless fulfill my own criterion. Such items constitute group B. Thus, the members of group A and the members of group B, put together, are all the items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that have the name *āgama* according to my criterion: this is the answer I give to the question which items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* have the name *āgama*.

Below in §2.3, I present all these items in a big table, shedding light on different aspects of each of them. This table thus gives all the items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that have the name *āgama*, according to my criterion. Although confident to some degree, I cannot guarantee that this table is exhaustive: there may be items that Boehtlingk has not described as *āgama* in his *Erkärung der grammatischen*

Elemente and have also eluded my attention. Note also that what I give in the big table below are *āgamas* according to **my** criterion. One can give different sets of *āgamas* following different criteria. These different sets of *āgamas* will, I believe, have a (large) group of overlapping elements, the core cases so to speak, and various peripheral elements that are not shared, the special (or perhaps even controversial) cases so to speak. In any case, I believe it is important that I have my own clear set of *āgama* as a point of departure - this set will serve as the basis of any of my analysis or study of both *āgama* and the ypbh: this is, I believe, especially important in the case of the special cases, where people's opinions differ.

2.2 My proposed criterion to determine whether an item in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has the name *āgama*

2.2.1 A few words about the meaninglessness of a substitute (*ādeśa*) and an *āgama*

Before presenting my criterion, I would like to first say something about the meaninglessness of a substitute (*ādeśa*) and an *āgama*.

In *sūtra* 1.2.45 *arthavad adhātur apratyayaḥ prātipadikam*, Pāṇini teaches that a meaningful item that is not a verbal root (*adhātuḥ*) nor a suffix (*apratyayaḥ*) is a *prātipadika*. Thus, one may infer that for Pāṇini, only three classes of items are meaningful: verbal root, suffix, and *prātipadika*. The following two classes of items are thus not meaningful, or meaningless: first, an *ādeśa* (substitute), which name Pāṇini has mentioned in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (e.g. in 8.3.59) but perhaps never defined or described directly, and second, an item referred to with the term *āgama* by the tradition beginning with Kātyayana.

In the case of a substitute, the situation of its meaninglessness may be more complicated. In a form like *ānīya* "having lead" (instead of **ānītvā*), the absolutive of the verbal root *nī* "to lead" preceded by the preverb (*upasarga*) *ā*, *ya*, taught as a

substitute (*LyaP*) in the place of the absolutive suffix *Ktvā* in 7.1.37 *samāse `nañpūrve ktvo lyap*, is not meaningless: it expresses arguably any meaning expressed by its substituend *tvā*, for example, the sense of agent (*kartari*: 3.4.67 *kartari kṛt*), through *sthānivadbhāva* (e.g. 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo `nalvidhau*). Thus, although the item *LyaP* taught in 7.1.37 is meaningless in itself, as no meaning has been taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* to the item *LyaP*, it can nevertheless become meaningful through *sthānivadbhāva*. Therefore, one may say that a substitute is meaningless in itself, but is not completely meaningless.

On the other hand, an *āgama* is completely meaningless. For example, in the *prātipadika lav-**itr***, the agent suffix *tṛ* with the *āgama iṬ* added to it (7.2.35; #9 in the table in §2.3.2), i.e. *itṛ*, expresses exactly the same sense as *tṛ* itself. In addition, we have synonymous forms like *ruṣṭa* (that is *ruṣ-ta*) and *ruṣ-**ita***, where the *āgama iṬ* is optional (7.2.28; #9 in the table in §2.3.2).

2.2.2 My proposed criterion

Now, here is my proposed criterion: **A sound(-group) that <1> is completely meaningless and <2> appears in the *vidheya* of an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra*, is an *āgama*.**

The point of "completely" in "completely meaningless" is to exclude any substitute (*ādeśa*), which, though found in the *vidheya* of an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra* and is meaningless in itself, is nevertheless not "completely maningless", as discussed above.

The point of <2> is to exclude any reduplicated syllable (*abhyāsa*), which seems also completely meaningless, but which is never explicitly found in a *vidheya* in an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra*. Instead of a specific sound(-group) being the bearer of the name *abhyāsa*, the *vidheya* in 6.1.1-11 seems to be only *dve*.

2.3 A table of all the *āgamas* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

Here is the table listing all the items in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that have the name *āgama*, according to my criterion.

2.3.1 Some remarks

Before giving the table, here are some remarks about conventions etc.

1. Column 2 "*āgama*"

   To each item in this column *Kāśikā* has applied the term *āgama*, except r (#42) and *rAM* (#43).

2. Column 2 "*āgama*" and Column 4 "*sūtra*"

   I have collected the *āgamas* and the *sūtras* in these two columns from the section *Erkärung der grammatischen Elemente* (pp. 146*-187*) in Boehtlingk's Grammatik.

3. Column 3 "*āgamin*"

   The *āgamins* are here given according to *Kāśikā* on each *sūtra*. The elements in square brackets are my own addition. I do not give the left or right context of any *āgamin*.

4. Column 5 "example"

a) In principle, any example given here is the first among the several examples given in *Kāśikā* on each *sūtra*. In some cases, I choose an example in *Kāśikā* that comes after the first example, because that example is clearer in structure. For example, under 3.4.92 I choose the second example *karavāva* in *Kāśikā* instead of the first example *karavāṇi*, because in *karavāṇi* there is the additional substitution of *ni* in the place of *mi* (3.4.89) and the retroflexion of *n*. In rare cases, when *Kāśikā*'s examples seem to be less good, I take the example from *Siddhāntakaumudī*. I always indicate this in a footnote (e.g. fn 25 and 29).

b) In any example, the *āgama* in issue is put in bold, and its *āgamin* is underlined. "-" connects *pratyaya* and *prakṛti*; "~" connects members of a compound; "="

connects an additional pair of *āgama* and *āgamin* that is found in the structure of the example but is not in issue.

c) As elsewhere in this work, ϕ = *lopa*; ϕ_1 = *luk*.

d) To better focus on the *āgamas*, I follow the following conventions -

For any *taddhita* derivate, I omit the "ϕ_1" in the place of a *sUP* after the *prātipadika* and before the *taddhita* suffix. For the only case of exception and relevant theoretical issues, see fn 43.

For any compound formation, I omit the "ϕ_1" in the place of a *sUP* at the end of each compound member.

Unless it is relevant, I do not analyse a word fully, e.g. into *kṛt* + *dhātu* or members of a compound.

5. An item in grey background is special. They are explained after the table.

2.3.2 The big table

#	*ĀGAMA*	*ĀGAMIN*	SŪTRA	EXAMPLE	REMARKS
1	aṬ	LEṬ	3.4.94	joṣ-i=s-**a**t (joṣiṣat)	*Vedic.*[24]
	áṬ	aṅga	6.4.71	**á**kār-s-ī=t (ákārṣīt)	
	áṬ	[aṅga]	6.4.75	mā … **a**vāp-s-us	*6.4.75 bahulaṃ chandasy amāṅyoge `pi.*
	aṬ	apṛkta sārvadhātuka [halādi]	7.3.99	a=rod-ϕ_1-**a**t	
	aṬ	apṛkta sārvadhātuka [halādi]	7.3.100	ā=ad-ϕ_1-**a**t (ādat)	
					Other sūtras concerning aṬ but not teaching the addition of aṬ: 6.1.136, 8.3.63, 71, 119, (these four concern the intervention [vyavāya] of aṬ) and 6.4.74 (a niṣedhasūtra).
2	aM	sṛj *or* dṛś *each being* dhātu	6.1.58	sr**a**j-tṛ-s (sraṣṭā)	
		ṛkāropadha dhātu *being* upadeśe anudātta	6.1.59	tr**a**p-tṛ-s (traptā)	*Optional (anyatarasyām).*
		catur *or* anaḍuh [*each being* aṅga]	7.1.99		

[24] According to *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 3.4.94: *leṭo `ṭ, āḍ etāv āgamau staḥ, tau ca pitau* (vol. 4 p. 393 lines 8-9), *aṬ* and *āṬ* are both *pit*. *Kāśikā* on 3.4.94 (p. 312), however, does not mention this (except that one manuscript, क, does have *apic ca*: see fn 7). Cf. Subodhinī on 3.4.94: *"āḍ uttamasya" iti sūtrān maṇḍūkaplutyā "pic ca" ity anuvartata ity āśayenāha,* ***"tau ca pitau"*** *iti. tatphalaṃ tu "vikrandasī urvarāsu brataite" ityādiṣu guṇaḥ.* (vol. 4 p. 393 lines 8-9 in Subodhinī)

				anaḍu**a**h-s (anaḍvan)[25]	
3[26]	am	ijanta ekāc [ajanta anavyaya]	6.3.68	go**am**~man-ya-a-s (gāmmanyaḥ)	*Concurrently taught with pratyayavatbhāva; am is pratyayavat.* *Other sūtras concerning am but not teaching the addition of am: 6.3.69.*
4	asUK	aśva, kṣīra, vṛṣa, *or* lavaṇa *each being* aṅga JasI (= Jas)	7.1.51 7.1.50	aśva-ϕ$_1$**as**-ya-a-ti (aśvasyati) brāhmaṇa-as**as** (brāhmaṇāsaḥ)	
5	āṬ	LOṬsaṃbandhin uttamapuruṣa[27]	3.4.92	kar-av-**ā**va	*āṬ is pit.*[31]

[25] This example is taken from *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 7.1.99 (p. 348 line 3). The two examples given in *Kāśikā* on 7.1.99, *priyacatvar* and *priyānaḍvan* (p. 796 line 2), are both compounds and are so in my view less good than *Siddhāntakaumudī*'s example *anaḍvan.*

[26] The grey background marks a special case: see §2.3.3.

[27] *Kāśikā*: *"loṭaḥ" ity eva. loṭsaṃbandhina uttamapuruṣasyāḍ āgamo bhavati* … Thus, the author of *Kāśikā* seems to take *loṭaḥ* (carried forth from 3.4.85) and *uttamasya* as *vyadhikaraṇa*, connected by the *saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī* in *loṭaḥ*. In my view, a perhaps simpler and more straightforward interpretation would be to take *loṭaḥ* and *uttamasya* as *samānādhikaraṇa* (which is possible because of 1.1.56), so that the *āgamin* would be just "*loṭ uttama(puruṣa)*".

[31] *Kāśikā* on 3.4.92, however, says … *sa cottamapuruṣaḥ pid bhavati* (p. 312). Thus, the author of *Kāśikā* seems to take the *pit* item to be *uttama(puruṣa)*, i.e. the *āgamin*, and not the *āgama āṬ*. I believe, judging from the wording of 3.4.92, that the sūtrakāra has rather intended the *pit* item to be the *āgama āṬ*, and consequently, I prefer the interpretation of *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 3.4.92: *loḍuttamasyāḍāgamaḥ syāt, sa pic ca* (vol. 3 p. 36 line 3), which seems to take the *pit* item to be the *āgama āṬ*, to that of *Kāśikā* on 3.4.92.

How would it work in the *prakriyā* if *āṬ* alone is *pit*? The *vigraha* of *pit*, the bahuvrīhi compound, would be *p(akāra) it yasya saḥ*. I take *yasya* here as an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*, so that *p* is an *avayava* (part) of *āṬ* (adopting the view *ekāntā anubandhāḥ* [#5 in PbhI]). Now, according to 1.1.46,

	āṬ	LEṬ	3.4.94	pat-a-**ā**ṯi (patāti)[28]	*Vedic.*[32]
	ā́Ṭ	[aṅga] ajādi	6.4.72	**ā́**īkṣ-a-ta (aíkṣata)	
	ā́Ṭ	[aṅga] anajādi	6.4.73	**ā́**naś-ϕ$_1$-ϕ (ā́naṭ)[29]	*Vedic (chandasi).*
	ā́Ṭ	[aṅga]	6.4.75	mā **ā**va=r-ϕ$_1$-ϕ[30]	*6.4.75 bahulaṃ chandasy amāṅyoge `pi.*
	āṬ	ṅit pratyaya	7.3.112	kumāra-ī-**ā**e (kumāryai)	

āṬ is *ādi* (initial part) of the *āgamin va*, so *āṬ* is an *avayava* of the *āgamin va.* Applying the nyāya *avayavāvayavāḥ samudāyāvayavāḥ*, *p*, the *it*, would be an *avayava* of *va*, so that *va* is *pit*. With the help of the ypbh, *āva*, the *āgama āṬ* plus the *āgamin va*, is then *pit*. Thus, the prohibition in 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca* will not apply, and rules like 7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* will be able to apply.

[28] *Nyāsa*: ***"padāti"*** *iti. "pada gatau" divādāv anudāttet, vyatyayena parasmaipadam, śappratyayaś ca. āṭā* sahākaḥ savarṇe dīrghatvam. tip.* (* āṭā] my conjecture; aṭā in the edition) (vol. 3 p. 226 last line and p. 227 first line in *Nyāsa*) Thus, the author of *Nyāsa* seems to have had in his *Kāśikā* text *padāti* instead of *patāti*, the example found in the *Kāśikā* edition I use (p. 312 line 14) as well as the *Kāśikā* text in the *Nyāsa* edition I use (vol. 3 p. 226 line 8). Regarding the reading *aṭā* in the *Nyāsa* edition (vol. 3 p. 227 first line in *Nyāsa*), I believe it is incorrect and should be corrected to *āṭā*, because if it were *aṭā*, then 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* would not be able to apply, but rather 6.1.97 *ato guṇe* would apply, and the derived form would be **patati*. Besides, *Subodhinī*, commenting on the example *patāti* quoted in *Siddhāntakaumudī*, also mentions *āṬ* and not *aṬ*: ***"patāti"*** *iti. patḷ patane, tip. āḍāgamaḥ.* (vol. 4 p. 393 last line in *Subodhinī* and p. 394 first line in *Subodhinī*)

[29] This example is taken from *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 6.4.73 (3545; vol. 4 p. 421 line 10). *Subodhinī* comments on the *prakriyā* of *ānaṭ*: ***"ānaṭ"*** *iti. naśer luṅi "mantre ghasa°" iti ler luk. "naśer vā" ity asyābhāve "vraśca°" iti ṣaḥ. jaśtvena ḍaḥ. tasya cartvena ṭaḥ.* (vol. 4 p. 421 lines 17-18)

[30] r results from 1.1.51 ur aṇ raparaḥ, and I regard it as an *āgama* (for the reason, see §2.3.3.3). *Kāśikā* discusses the derivation of *āvar* in its commentary on 6.4.73: *āvar iti vṛño luṅi "mantre ghasahvara°" iti ler luki kṛte ca bhavati* (p. 748 lines 15-16).

The form *ā́var* has been given by Whitney in his Grammar (p. 221 §585a).

[32] Regarding the view that *āṬ* is *pit*, see fn 24.

					Other sūtras concerning āṬ but not teaching the addition of āṬ: 6.1.90 (teaching ekādeśa) and 6.4.74 (a niṣedhasūtra).

6	ādUK [33]	eka	6.3.76[34]	eka**ād**~na~viṃśati-s (ekānnaviṃśatiḥ)	

[34] Incidentally, the wording of sūtra 6.3.76 *ekādiś caikasya cāduk* is remarkable, as it has two *cas* in one sūtra. This may perhaps be the only case of two *cas* in one sūtra in the entire *Aṣṭādhyāyī*? I think perhaps Pāṇini originally composed two separate sūtras: *ekādiś ca* and *ekasya cāduk*, and being recited continuously, these two sūtras later merged into one.

7	ānUK	indra, varuṇa, bhava, śarva, rudra, mṛḍa, hima, araṇya, yava, yavana, mātula, *or* ācārya *each being* prātipadika[35]	4.1.49	varuṇa**ān**-ī (varuṇānī)	*Concurrently taught with strīpratyaya ṄīṢ.*
8	ắM	catur *or* anaḍuh [*each being* aṅga]	7.1.98	catuắr-as (catvắras)	
9	iṬ	kaN [taddhita pratyaya]	5.1.23	tā-vat-**i**ka-s (tāvatikaḥ)	*Optional (vā).*
		tāsI, sIC, sya [*each being* ārdhadhātuka], or sīyUṬ	6.4.62	cāy-**i**sya-te (cāyiṣyate)	*Concurrently taught with ciṇvadbhāva.*
		niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) *being in the sense of* bhāva *or* ādikarman	7.2.17	med-**i**ta-s (meditam)	*Optional (vibhāṣā na).*
			7.2.28	ruṣ-**i**ta-s (ruṣitaḥ)	*Optional (vā na).*
		niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU)	7.2.29	hṛṣ-**i**ta-as (hṛṣitāni)	*Optional (vā na).*
		niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU)	7.2.35	lav-**i**tā-s (lavitā)	
		ārdhadhātuka valādi	7.2.41	vivar-**i**sa-a-te (vivariṣate)	*Optional (vā).*
		saN [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.42	var-**i**sī=s=ta (variṣīṣṭa)	*Optional (vā).*
		LIṄ *or* sIC [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.43	dhvar-**i**sī=s=ta (dhvariṣīṣṭa)	*Optional (vā).*
		LIṄ *or* sIC [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.44	svar-**i**tā-s (svaritā)	*Optional (vā).*
		ārdhadhātuka valādi	7.2.45	radh-**i**tā-s (radhitā)	*Optional (vā).*
		ārdhadhātuka valādi	7.2.46	nir~koṣ-**i**tā-s (niṣkoṣitā)	*Optional (vā).*
		ārdhadhātuka valādi	7.2.47	nir~kuṣ-**i**ta-s (niṣkuṣitaḥ)	
		niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.48	eṣ-**i**tā-s (eṣitā)	*Optional (vā).*
		ārdhadhātuka takārādi [valādi]	7.2.49	didev-**i**sa-a-ti (dideviṣati)	*Optional (vā).*
		saN [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.50	kliś-**i**tvā-s (kliśitvā)	*Optional (vā).*

[34] Incidentally, the wording of sūtra 6.3.76 *ekādiś caikasya cāduk* is remarkable, as it has two *cas* in one sūtra. This may perhaps be the only case of two *cas* in one sūtra in the entire *Aṣṭādhyāyī*? I think perhaps Pāṇini originally composed two separate sūtras: *ekādiś ca* and *ekasya cāduk*, and being recited continuously, these two sūtras later merged into one.

[35] The identity of the *āgamin* is not completely explicit in *Kāśikā* on 4.1.49.

		Ktvā *or* niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.51	pav-**i**tvā-s (pavitvā)	*Optional (vā).*
		Ktvā *or* niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.52	uṣ-**i**tvā-s (uṣitvā)	
		Ktvā *or* niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.53	añc-**i**tvā-s (añcitvā)	
		Ktvā *or* niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.54	lubh-**i**tvā-s (lubhitvā)	
		Ktvā *or* niṣṭhā (= Kta *and* KtavatU) [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.55	jar-**i**tvā-s (jaritvā)	
		Ktvā [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.56	śam-**i**tvā-s (śamitvā)	*Optional (vā).*
		Ktvā [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.57	kart-**i**sya-ti (kartiṣyati)	*Optional (vā).*
		asic ārdhadhātuka sakārādi [valādi]	7.2.58	gam-**i**sya-ti (gamiṣyati)	
		asic ārdhadhātuka sakārādi [valādi]	7.2.65	sasarj-**i**tha (sasarjitha)	*Optional (vibhāṣā na).*
		thaL [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.66	aad-**i**tha (āditha)	
		thaL [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.68	jagm-**i**vas-s (jagmivān)	*Optional (vibhāṣā).*
		vasU [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.70	kar-**i**sya-ti (kariṣyati)	
		sya [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.71	ā=añj-**i**s-tām (āñjiṣṭām)	
		sIC [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.72	a=stāv-**i**s-ī=t (astāvīt)	
		sIC [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.73	a=yam=s-**i**s-tām (ayaṃsiṣṭām)	*Concurrently taught with sAK.*
		sIC [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.74	sismay-**i**sa-a-te (sismayiṣate)	
		saN [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.75	cikar-**i**sa-a-ti (cikariṣati)	
		saN [ārdhadhātuka valādi]	7.2.76	rod-ϕ_1-**i**ti	
		valādi sārvadhātuka	7.2.77	īś-ϕ_1-**i**se (īśiṣe)	
		sārvadhātuka se [valādi]	7.2.78	īḍ-ϕ_1-**i**dhve (īḍidhve)	
		dhve *or* se *each being* sārvadhātuka [valādi]			*Other sūtras concerning iṬ but not teaching the addition of iṬ: 1.1.6; 1.2.2, 18-26; 3.1.45; 6.1.188, 196; 6.4.51-52, 64, 121-125; 7.1.62;*

					7.2.4, 8-16, 18--27, 30, 33-34, 36-40, 59-64, 67, 69; 8.2.28.
10	ithUK	vatU (= vatUP)	5.2.53	yāvat**ith**-a	
11	iM	tṛṇah *being* aṅga[36]	7.3.92	tṛ-nai**h**-mi (tṛṇehmi)	
12	īṬ	pit sārvadhātuka halādi[37]	7.3.93	brav-ϕ_1-**ī**ti	
		pit sārvadhātuka halādi	7.3.94	lālap-ϕ_1-ϕ_1-**ī**ti	*Optional (vā).*
		sārvadhātuka halādi[38]	7.3.95	ut tav-ϕ_1-**ī**ti	*Optional (vā).*
		apṛkta sārvadhātuka [halādi][39]	7.3.96	ā=as-ϕ_1-**īṭ** (āsīt)	
		apṛkta sārvadhātuka [halādi]	7.3.97	ā=as-ϕ_1-**īṭ** (āsīt)	*7.3.97 bahulaṃ chandasi.*
		apṛkta sārvadhātuka halādi	7.3.98	a=rod-ϕ_1-**īṭ**	
					Other sūtras concerning īṬ but not teaching the addition of īṬ: 8.2.28.

[36] *Kāśikā*: *tṛṇaha ity etasyāṅgasya im āgamo bhavati hali piti sārvadhātuke* (I have kept the sandhi as in the edition). Instead of ***tṛṇaha*** *ity*, I suggest reading ***tṛṇah*** *ity*.

[37] *piti* and *sārvadhātuke* in 7.3.87 are carried forth into 7.3.93, and there the case ending is changed to genitive i.e. *pitaḥ sārvadhātukasya*, by *ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyān* (#70 in PbhI). *hali* in 7.3.89, interpreted as *halādau* by *yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe* (1.1.72.29, found e.g. as #33 in PbhI, and translated in my explanation of sūtra 7.2.4 in §6.3.3), is carried forth into 7.3.93, and there the case ending is changed to genitive, i.e. *halādeḥ*, by *ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyān* (#70 in PbhI).

[38] *sārvadhātuke* in 7.3.95 is interpreted as *sārvadhātukasya* by *ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyān* (#70 in PbhI). According to *Kāśikā*, pit is cancelled and not carried forth in 7.3.95, since *sārvadhātuke* is, while it is carried forth from 7.3.87, mentioned again in 7.3.95: *"sārvadhātuke" ity anuvartamāne punaḥ sārvadhātukagrahaṇam apidartham, "stuvīta", "śamīdhvam" ity atrāpi yathā syād iti.*

[39] *apṛkte* in 7.3.96 is interpreted as *apṛktasya* by *ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyān* (#70 in PbhI).

13	uM	vaci (= vac) *being* aṅga	7.4.20	a=va**u**c-a-t (avocat)	
14	aiC (= ai *or* au)[40]	y *(for ai) or* v *(for au)* y *(for ai) or* v *(for au)* y *(for ai) or* v *(for au)* y *(for ai) or* v *(for au)*	7.3.3 7.3.4 7.3.5 7.3.9	v**ai**y~asana-a-s (vaiyasanam) d**au**vāra-ika-s (dauvārikaḥ) n**ai**y~ac~rodha-a-s (naiyagrodhaḥ) ś**au**vapada-a-s (śauvāpadam)	*Concurrently taught with the prohibition of vṛddhi.* *Optional (anyatarasyāṃ na).* *Other sūtras concerning aiC but not teaching the addition of aiC: 7.3.6-8.*
15	kUK	*Member of the gaṇa* vākina-ādi [*each being* prātipadika] *Member of the gaṇa* naḍa-ādi [*each being* prātipadika] vāta *or* atisāra [*each being* prātipadika] ṅ *being* padānta	4.1.158 4.2.91 5.2.129 8.3.28	vākina**k**-āyani naḍa**k**-īya vāta**k**-in prāṅ**k** śe-ϕ_1-te	*Concurrently taught with taddhita phiÑ.* *Concurrently taught with taddhita cha.* *Concurrently taught with taddhita inI.* *Optional (vā).*
16	ṅAM UṬ	aC[41]	8.3.32	pratyaṅ **ṅ**āste	*ṅAMUṬ refers to ṅUṬ, ṇUṬ, or nUṬ.*

[40] The only other item in this column containing a *pratyāhāra* is *ṅAMUṬ*.

[41] In giving the *āgamin* as *aC*, I am here following the interpretation of *Kāśikā* on 8.3.32: *hrasvāt paro yo ṅam, tadantāt padād uttarasyāco ṅamuḍ āgamo bhavati nityam. ṅaṇanebhyo yathāsaṃkhyaṃ ṅaṇanā bhavanti.* (p. 944) A different interpration of sūtra 8.3.32 is found in *Bhāṣya* on 8.3.32.1: *padāntasya ṅamo ṅamuḍ bhavati hrasvād uttarasyācīti.* (3:429.18-19) Under this interpretation, the *āgamin* is not *aC*, but *ṅAM padānta*, and the example I have given in the table, *pratyaṅ **ṅ**āste*, should accordingly be rewritten as *pratya**ṅṇ** āste*. I need to go deeper into this interpretation, which I am not able to do now. My current impression is that this interpretation is inferior to that given by *Kāśikā*, for in e.g. *kurva**nn** āste*, the first *n* will

17	jUK	vā [*being* aṅga]	7.3.38	upa vā**j**-ay-a-ti	
18	ṭUK	ṇ *being* padānta	8.3.28	va**nṭ** śe-ϕ$_1$-te	*Optional (vā).*
19	tamA Ṭ	ḌaṬ pratyaya [taddhita] ḌaṬ [taddhita pratyaya] ḌaṬ [taddhita pratyaya]	5.2.56 5.2.57 5.2.58	viṃśati-**tam**a-s śata-**tam**a-s ṣaṣṭi-**tam**a-s	*Optional (anyatarasyām).*
20	tithUK	bahu, pūga, gaṇa, *or* saṃgha [*each being* prātipadika]	5.2.52	bahu**tith**-a	
21	tUK	dhātu hrasvānta[42] hrasva āṄ *or* māṄ dīrgha	6.1.71 6.1.73 6.1.74 6.1.75	agni~ci**t**-s (agnicit) i**t**ch-a-ti (icchati) ā**t**~chāyā-s (ācchāyā) hrī**t**ch-a-ti (hrīcchati)	

risk being retroflexed to *ṇ* by 8.4.1. In *Kāśikā*'s interpretation, e.g. *kurvan **nā**ste*, the first *n* will not be retroflexted to *ṇ* thanks to 8.4.37 *padāntasya*. Considerations in this direction are found in Bh 8.3.32.1.

[42] *Kāśikā* on 6.1.71: *piti kṛti parato hrasvāntasya dhātos tug āgamo bhavati*. (p. 615) It seems that *Kāśikā* has provided in this gloss *dhātu* (*dhātos*) not by *anuvṛtti*, but by inference. Since what precedes a *kṛt* suffix (*kṛti* in 6.1.71) must be a *dhātu*, *dhātu* is inferred and with the help of 1.1.72 *Kāśikā* gives *hrasvāntasya dhātos*, which is here the *āgamin* of the *āgama tUK*. However, strictly speaking, the proper *āgamin* should be just *hrasva*, i.e. a short vowel, and not *hrasvānta dhātu* as given in *Kāśikā*, for not only does it appear clear from the wording of sūtra 6.1.71 alone, but also if *hrasvānta dhātu* were the proper *āgamin*, one would expect that the *āgamin hrasvānta dhātu* be carried forth into 6.1.73, which will result in undesired forms (*avyāpti*).

In the case of just 6.1.71, whether the *āgamin* is *hrasva* or *hrasvānta dhātu*, the effect seems to be the same, as a *hrasva* followed by a *pit kṛt* must be a part of a *dhātu* or a *dhātu* itself. So here under 6.1.71 by giving *hrasvānta dhātu Kāśikā* is perhaps aiming at more clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

In the table, I give "*dhātu hrasvānta*" as the *āgamin*, following *Kāśikā*, as usual.

		dīrgha padānta n *being* padānta	6.1.76 8.3.31	kuṭī**t**~chāyā-s (kuṭīcchāyā) bhavā**n**t śete (bhavāñc chete)	*Optional (vā).* *Other sūtras concerning tUK but not teaching the addition of tUK: 6.1.86; 8.2.2.*
22	tUṬ	ṭhaÑ [taddhita] pratyaya [śaiṣika] Ṭyu *or* ṬyuL *eaching being* pratyaya [taddhita śaiṣika] Ṭyu *or* ṬyuL *eaching being pratyaya* [taddhita śaiṣika]	4.3.15 4.3.23 4.3.24	ś=au=vas-**t**ika-s (śauvastikaḥ) sāyam-**t**ana-s (sāyantanam) pūrvāhṇa-i-**t**ana-s (pūrvāhṇetanam)[43]	*Concurrently taught with taddhita ṭhaÑ.* *Concurrently taught with taddhita Ṭyu and ṬyuL.*

[43] *i* in *pūrvāhṇa-i-*… is the locative case ending. In the current example, the *taddhita* suffix *Ṭyu* (= *ana*) is added after the *pada pūrvāhṇa-i*. Unlike the usual process where the case ending is replaced by *luk* by 2.4.71, here *i* is not replaced by *luk* in accordance with 6.3.17 *ghakālataneṣu kālanāmnaḥ*. As noted in d) under §2.3.1 point 4, in all other cases in the current table I have chosen not to present the usual *luk* (= ϕ_1) substituted in the place of the case ending after the *prātipadika* and before the *taddhita* suffix.

Regarding *taddhita* derivates, there are two conflicting views. According to the first view, a *taddhita* suffix is added after a *prātipadika*. According to the second view, a *taddhita* suffix is added after a pada (i.e. *prātipadika+sUP*). The following appear to me to be followers of the first view: *Kāśikā,* S.D. Joshi, and J.A.F. Roodbergen.

Kāśikā on 4.1.95: *akārāntāt* ***prātipadikād*** *iñ pratyayo bhavati*. (p. 344)

Kāśikā on 4.3.53: *"tatra" iti saptamīsamarthād* ***ṅyāpprātipadikād*** *"bhavaḥ" ity etasminn arthe yathāvihitaṃ pratyayo bhavati.* (p. 410)

Kāśikā on 4.3.54: *"diś" ityevamādibhyaḥ* ***prātipadikebhyo*** *yat pratyayo bhavati "tatra bhavaḥ" ity etasmin viṣaye.* (p. 410)

(As a sample, within *Kāśikā* on 4.3.51-60, *prātipadikāt* features in 4.3.51-56 and 59. It seems to me that *Kāśikā* is not consistent insofar as it does not always mention *prātipadikāt* [or in another number] wherever appropriate.)

Kāśikā on 5.2.48: *"tasya" iti ṣaṣṭhīsamarthāt saṃkhyāvācinaḥ* ***prātipadikāt*** *"pūraṇe" ity asminn arthe ḍaṭ pratyayo bhavati*. (p. 510)

Roodbergen: "Tradition is wrong. The reason is that *taddhita*-suffix[e]s are added directly to a non-inflected nominal stem (*prātipadika*) as required by P. 4.1.1. See AP IX, pp. 376-377. The addition of *taddhita*-suffixes after a *prātipadika* is not conditioned by the mention of *sUP*, unlike in the case of cp.-formation (P. 2.1.2-4)." (Roodbergen's Dictionary, p. 202a, point 5 under the entry "*taddhita*")

Joshi and Roodbergen: "According to P. 4.1.82, *taddhita* suffixes are added preferably after the nominal stem (*prātipadika*) signified by the first word - a variable standing for any *prātipadika*, like tasya, tena, tad - in the corresponding semantic paraphrase." (Joshi's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, vol. 9, p. 376, point 2 under 6.4.144)

~

Siddhāntakaumudī seems to follow the second view :

Siddhāntakaumudī on 4.1.92 (1088): ***ṣaṣṭhyantāt*** *kṛtasaṃdheḥ samarthād apatye `rtha uktā vakṣyamāṇāś ca pratyayā vā syuḥ*. (vol. 2 p. 286-287)

Siddhāntakaumudī on 4.1.95 (1095): *adantaṃ yat prātipadikam,* ***tatprakṛtikāt ṣaṣṭhyantād*** *iñ syād apatye `rthe.* (vol. 2 p. 302)

Siddhāntakaumudī on 5.1.50 (1716): *vaṃśādibhyaḥ paro yo bhāraśabdaḥ, tadantaṃ yatprātipadikam,* ***tatprakṛtikād dvitīyāntād*** *ity arthaḥ.* (vol. 2 p. 504)

I do not know enough about the *taddhita* derivations to give a confident conclusion, but for the time being I would adopt the second view, because, all the other arguments pro and contra each view aside, one sūtra, 6.3.17, provides, in my view, evidence strong enough for me to adopt the second view for the time being. 6.3.17 teaches the optional *aluk* of locative case endings before, among others, the *taddhita* suffixes referred to by

					Concurrently taught with taddhita Ṭyu and ṬyuL.
23	thAṬ	ḌaṬ [taddhita pratyaya]	5.2.50	pañcan-**th**a-as (pañcathāni)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
24	thUK	ṣaṣ, kati, katipaya, *or* catur [*each being* prātipadika] asyati (= as) *being* aṅga	5.2.51 7.4.17	saṣ**th**-a (ṣaṣṭha) ā=as**th**-a-t (āsthat)	
25	dUK	atṛtīyāstha anya aṣaṣṭhīstha anya[44]	6.3.99 6.3.100	anya**d**~āśis-s (anyadāśīḥ) anya**d**~artha-s (anyadarthaḥ)	 *Optional (vibhāṣā).*
26	dhUṬ	s s	8.3.29 8.3.30	śvaliṭ **dh**sāye (śvaliṭ tsāye) bhavān **dh**sāye (bhavān tsāye)	*Optional (vā).* *Optional (vā).*
27	nīK	abhyāsa	7.4.84	va**nī**vac-ya-a-te (vanīvacyate)	
28	nUK	antarvat *or* pativat [*eaching being* prātipadika] aṅga lī *being* in the sense of snehavipātana akārānta abhyāsa	4.1.32 7.3.39 7.4.85	antar-vat**n**-ī-s (antarvatnī) vi lī**n**-ay-a-ti ta**n**tan-ya-a-te (tantanyate)	 *Optional (anyatarasyām).*

gha, i.e. *taraP* and *tamaP* (1.1.22), and *tana*, that is the *taddhita* suffix *ana* (= *Ṭyu* or *ṬyuL*) plus the *āgama tUṬ* (*tana* may inherit the names *taddhita* and *pratyaya* from *ana* with the help of the ypbh). This indicates that there is indeed *sUP* after a *prātipadika* and before a *taddhita* suffix. I do not know how to reconcile what 6.3.17 teaches with the first view. (Of course, all this is under the assumption that the entire *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is the work of a single person, Pāṇini. One may argue that 6.3.17 is a later interpolation, the teaching of which is incompatible to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī taddhita* system that actually follows the first view. In this connection, one should perhaps check through the *aluk* section of 6.3 [6.3.1-24] and see whether there are other cases where *aluk* of a *sUP* is taught not before a *uttarapada*, but before a *taddhita*.)

[44] *Kāśikā* on 6.3.100: *arthaśabda uttarapade `nyasya vibhāṣā dugāgamo bhavati* (p. 722). Thus, it seems that for the author of *Kāśikā*, the *āgamin* is just *anya*. However, since the two modifiers *atṛtīyāstha* and *aṣaṣṭhīstha* (in *aṣaṣṭhyatṛtīyāsthasya* in 6.3.99) do not appear incompatible in 6.3.100 and there seems to exist no reason to discontinue them in 6.3.100, I think the *āgamin* should be rather "*anya [atṛtīyāstha aṣaṣṭhīstha]*".

		abhyāsa[45]	7.4.86	ja**n**jap-ya-a-te (jañjapyate)	
		abhyāsa	7.4.87	ca**n**car-ya-a-te (cañcūryate)	
29	nUṬ	ajādi uttarapada	6.3.74	a~**n**aja-s (anajaḥ)	
		ām	7.1.54	agni-**n**ām (agnīnām)	
		ām	7.1.55	ṣaṣ-**n**ām (ṣaṇṇām)	
		ām	7.1.56	śrī-**n**ām (śrīṇām)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
		ām	7.1.56	go-**n**ām (gonām)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
		aṅga dvihal	7.4.71	ā**n**aṅg-a	
		aśnoti (= aś) [aṅga]	7.4.72	vi ā**n**aś-e (vy ānaśe)	
		matU	8.2.16	akṣa-**n**vant-as (akṣaṇvantaḥ)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
		gha (= taraP *and* tamaP)	8.2.17	supathi-**n**tara-s (supathintaraḥ)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
					Other sūtras concerning nUṬ but not teaching the addition of nUṬ: 6.1.176.
30	nUM	idit dhātu[46]	7.1.58	ku**n**d-i=tā-s (kuṇḍitā)	

[45] Regarding why *akārānta* is not continued in 7.4.86, see the following in S.D. Joshi and J.A.F. Roodbergen, *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, vol. 13 (2007), p. 171, under 7.4.86 point 2: "The word *ataḥ* from P. 7.4.85 is discontinued on the basis of *sāmarthya* because, after the application of P. 7.4.60, the *abhyāsa* of *jap-*, etc. necessarily ends in short *a*." In view of this, I would tend to think the following: as there seems to exist no reason to discontinue *ataḥ* in 7.4.85, and the effect is in any way the same, perhaps we should carry forth *ataḥ* in 7.4.85 into 7.4.86 and the following sūtras that are relevant up to at least 7.4.92 inclusive? (There will be no problem with 7.4.90-92, because the *abhyāsas* there also end in *a* due to 7.4.66 *ur at*.)

[46] It does not appear completely clear to me whether *aṅga* should be carried forth into 7.1.58 from 6.4.1. *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 7.1.58 does not have *aṅga*, and *Kāśikā* on 7.1.58 also argues that the *nUM āgama* should be added in the very beginning, so perhaps implying that aṅga should not be there in

		Member of the gaṇa muc-ādi [*each being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.59	mu**n**c-a-ti (muñcati)	
		masji (= masj) *or* naśi (= naś) *each being* aṅga [dhātu]	7.1.60	ma**n**sj-tā-s (maṅktā)	
		radhi (= radh) *or* jabhi (= jabh) [*each being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.61	ra**n**dh-ay-a-ti	
		rabhi (= rabh) *being* aṅga [dhātu]	7.1.63	ā ra**n**bh-ay-a-ti (ā rambhayati)	
		labhi (= labh) [*being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.64	la**n**bh-ay-a-ti (lambhayati)	
		labhi (= labh) [*being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.65	ā~la**n**bh-ya-ā-s (ālambhyā)	
		labhi (= labh) [*being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.66	upa~la**n**bh-ya-ā-s (upalambhyā)	
		labhi (= labh) [*being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.67	īṣat~pra~la**n**bh-a-s (īṣatpralambhaḥ)	
		labhi (= labh) [*being* aṅga dhātu]	7.1.69	a=la**n**bh-i-ϕ_1 (alambhi)	
		ugit *being* aṅga dhātuvarjita *or* añcati (= anc) [*being* aṅga]	7.1.70	bhava**n**t-au	
		yuji (= yuj) *being* not in a samāsa [*and* aṅga]	7.1.71	yu**n**j-au (yuñjau)	
		ajanta *or* jhalanta *each being* napuṃsaka [aṅga]	7.1.72	udaśvi**n**t-as (udaśvinti)	
		aṅga iganta napuṃsaka [ajanta]	7.1.73	trapu**n**-au (trapuṇī)	
		śatṛpratyayānta napuṃsaka [aṅga][47]	7.1.79	dad-ϕ_1-a**n**t-as (dadanti)	*Optional (vā).*
		ŚatṚ	7.1.80	tud-a-a**n**t-au (tudantī)	*Optional (vā).*
		ŚatṚ	7.1.81	pac-a-a**n**t-au (pacantī)	

7.1.58: *ayaṃ dhātūpadeśāvasthāyām eva num āgamo bhavati …* (p. 786 lines 2-3 under 7.1.58) For the time being, I follow *Kāśikā* and do not give *aṅga* here.

[47] *Kāśikā* on 7.1.79: *abhyāstād aṅgād uttaro yaḥ śatṛpratyayas tadantasya napuṃsakasya vā num āgamo bhavati.* (p. 791) Despite this, the *āgamin* intended here is perhaps only *ŚatṚ*, if one considers the preceding and following sūtra i.e. 7.1.78 and 80. The apparent difficulty which may have lead the author of *Kāśikā* to adopting the quoted interpretation is that *napuṃsakasya* in 7.1.79 seems to be *samānādhikaraṇa* with *śatuḥ* (carried forth into 7.1.79 from 7.1.78), and it does not seem smooth to say that the suffix *ŚatṚ* is neuter. It seems that Pāṇini here has adopted a somewhat loose wording: a neuter *ŚatṚ* suffix means a neuter *aṅga* ending with the suffix *ŚatṚ*.

		aṅga anaḍuh dṛk, svavas, *or* svatavas [*each being* aṅga][48]	7.1.82 7.1.83	anaḍu=ā=**n**h-s (anaḍvān) ī~dṛ**n**k-s (īdṛṅ)	*Vedic (chandasi).* *Other sūtras concerning nUM but not teaching the addition of nUM: 6.1.173; 7.1.62, 68, 78; 8.3.58; 8.4.2.*
31	pUK	arti (= ṛ), hrī, vlī, rī, knūyĪ, kṣmāyĪ *each being* aṅga, *or* ākārānta [aṅga]	7.3.36	**ṛp**-ay-a-ti (arpayati)	*Other sūtras concerning pUK but not Ṇteaching the addition of pUK: 7.3.86.*
32	pUM	pati (= pat) *being* aṅga	7.4.19	a=pa**p**t-a-t	
33	mAṬ	ḌaṬ [taddhita pratyaya] ḌaṬ [taddhita pratyaya]	5.2.49 5.2.50	pañcan-**m**a-s (pañcamas) pañcan-**m**a-am (pañcamam)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
34	mUK	aT of an aṅga followed by āna[49]	7.2.82	pac-a**m**-āna-s	
35	mUM	arus, dviṣat, *or* ajanta *each being* anavyaya	6.3.67 6.3.70 6.3.71 6.3.72	aru**m**s~tud-a-a-s (aruntudaḥ)[51] satya**m**~kāra-s (satyaṅkāraḥ) śyena**m**~pāta-a-ā-s (śyainampātā) rātri**m**~cara-s (rātriñcaraḥ)	*Optional (vibhāṣā).*

[48] In view of the examples given in *Kāśikā* on 7.1.83: *īdṛṅ, tādṛṅ, yādṛṅ*, and *sadṛṅ* (p. 792), is it perhaps better to put as *āgamin* "dṛg**anta**, svavas, *or* svatavas *each being* aṅga" (applying 1.1.72)? Accordingly, for the time being, I have underlined *īdṛk* as the *āgamin* in the example I give.

[49] See fn 119.

[51] *Nyāsa* comments on the *prakriyā* of *aruntudaḥ*: ***"aruntudaḥ"*** *iti. arus tudatīti "vidhvaruṣos tudaḥ" iti khaś. saṃyogāntalopaḥ. tudāditvāc chaḥ. ato guṇe pararūpatvam* (vol. 5 p. 265 lines 2-3 from the bottom).

		satya *or* agada [*each being* anavyaya][50] śyena *or* tila [*each being* anavyaya] rātri [*being* anavyaya]			
36	yaK	Ktvā	7.1.47	dat-tvā**ya**-s (dattvāya)	*Vedic (chandasi).*
37	yāṬ	ṅit pratyaya	7.3.113	khaṭva-ā-**yā**e (khatvāyai)	
38	yắsUṬ	parasmaipadaviṣaya LIṄ	3.4.103	kur-ϕ-**yắs**t (kuryāt)	*In the case of vidhiliṅ / āśīrliṅ, yắsUṬ is ṅit / kit respectively.* *Other sūtras concerning yắsUṬ but not teaching the addition of yắsUṬ: 3.4.104; 7.2.79-80.*
39	yIṬ	iṣṭha	6.4.159	bahu-**y**istha-s (bhūyiṣṭhaḥ)	*Concurrently taught with the substitution of bhū for bahu..*
40	yUK	aṅga ākārānta śā, chā, sā, hvā, vyā, ve, *or* pā *each being* aṅga	7.3.33 7.3.37	a=dā**y**-i-ϕ_1 (adāyi) ni śā**y**-ay-a-ti (ni śāyayati)	
41	yUṬ	ājādi kṅit pratyaya	6.4.63	upa didī-**y**e	
42	r	aṆ (= a, ā, i, ī, u, ū)[52]	1.1.51	ka**r**-tṛ-s (kartā)	

[50] I think *anavyayasya* in 6.3.66 should be carried forth into 6.3.70-72, since there is no incompatible item that will cancel *anavyayasya*, even though whether *anavyayasya* is carried forth into 6.3.70-72 or not, the effect is the same, *satya, agada, śyena, tila*, and *rātri* being all by themselves already *anavyaya*.

[52] The identity of the *āgamin* is not explicit in *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 1.1.51: *uḥ sthāne `ṇ prasajyamāna eva raparo veditavyaḥ*. What I give here as *āgamin* is only my speculation.

43	rAM	bhrasj (with its r and s deleted, i.e. bhɸaɸj) [*being* aṅga]	6.4.47	bhɸa**r**ɸj-tṛ-s (bharṣṭā)	*Optional (anyatarasyām); a special case, see below §2.3.3.4.*
44	riK	abhyāsa abhyāsa	7.4.91 7.4.92	va**ri**vart-ɸ$_1$-ɸ$_1$-ti (varivartti)[53] ca**ri**kar-ɸ$_1$-ɸ$_1$-ti (carikarti)	
45	rīK	abhyāsa abhyāsa abhyāsa	7.4.90 7.4.91[54] 7.4.92	va**rī**vṛt-ya-a-te (varīvṛtyate) va**rī**vart-ɸ$_1$-ɸ$_1$-ti (varīvartti)[55] ca**rī**kar-ɸ$_1$-ɸ$_1$-ti (carīkarti)	
46	rUK	abhyāsa abhyāsa	7.4.91 7.4.92	va**r**vart-ɸ$_1$-ɸ$_1$-ti (varvartti)[56] ca**r**kar-ɸ$_1$-ɸ$_1$-ti (carkarti)	
47	rUṬ	aT jh*ādeśa* aT jh*ādeśa* *bahulam*	7.1.6 7.1.7 7.1.8	śe-ɸ$_1$-**r**ate sam vid-ɸ$_1$-**r**ate (saṃ vidrate) a=duh-ɸ$_1$-**r**a	 *Optional (vibhāṣā).* *7.1.8 bahulaṃ chandasi.*
48	lUK	aṅga lā *being* in the sense of snehavipātana	7.3.39	vi lā**l**-ay-a-ti	*Optional (anyatarasyām).*
49	vUK	bhrū [*being* prātipadika] bhū [*being* aṅga]	4.1.125 6.4.88	bhrau**v**-eya-s (bhrauveyaḥ) a=bhū**v**-ɸ$_1$-an	*Concurrently taught with taddhita ḍhaK.*
50	ṣUK	manu [*being* prātipadika] trapu *or* jatu [*each being* prātipadika]	4.1.161 4.3.138	mānu**ṣ**-a-s (mānuṣaḥ) trāpu**ṣ**-a-s (trāpuṣam)	*Concurrently taught with taddhita aÑ and yaT.*

[53] The *Kāśikā* edition (p. 879) gives the incorrect *varivarti*, which misses one *t*.

[54] In Boehtlingk's Grammatik, *rĪK* is not mentioned in the translation and the examples of 7.4.91 (p. 427), and 7.4.91 is not given under the entry *rĪK* in the section *Erklärung der grammatischen Elemente* (p. 178*a): so it seems that Boehtlingk does not think that 7.4.91 teaches *rĪK*. However, *Kāśikā* under 7.4.91 (p. 879) does mention *rĪK* (… *cakārād rīk ca*), and I have here followed *Kāśikā*.

[55] The *Kāśikā* edition (p. 879) gives the incorrect *varīvarti*, which misses one *t*.

[56] The *Kāśikā* edition (p. 879) gives the incorrect *varvarti*, which misses one *t*.

		bhī *being* in the sense of hetubhaya [aṅga]	7.3.40	bhīṣ-ay-a-te	*Concurrently taught with taddhita aṆ.*
51	sīyUṬ	LIṄ [ātmanepadaviṣaya][57]	3.4.102	kṛ-**sīy**a (kṛṣīya)[58]	*Other sūtras concerning sīyUṬ but not teaching the addition of sīyUṬ: 6.4.62; 7.2.79.*
52	sAK	yamA, ramA, namA *each being* aṅga, *or* ākārānta [aṅga]	7.2.73	a=yam**s**-i=s-tām (ayaṃsiṣṭām)	*Concurrently taught with iṬ.*
53	sUṬ[59]	takāra *or* thakāra *each being* liṅsaṃbandhin	3.4.107 6.1.137 6.1.138	kṛ-sīy=**s**ta (kṛṣīṣṭa) sam~**s**kartṛ-s (saṃskartā) sam~**s**kṛta-s (saṃskṛtam)	

[57] Cf. *yāsUṬ* (3.4.103).

[58] This form is found in *Kāśikā* 3.4.106 (p. 314).

[59] The way in which Pāṇini teaches *sUṬ* seems to be different from his usual approach of teaching *āgama.* At the beginning of the section teaching *sUṬ* (6.1.135-157), Pāṇini teaches an *adhikārasūtra* 6.1.135 *suṭ kāt pūrvaḥ*, and only after this he gives the various *vidhisūtras* teaching *sUṬ*, from 6.1.137 onward. 6.1.135 teaches explicitly the position of *sUṬ* as before the sound *k* (*kāt pūrvaḥ*), although *sUṬ* is also marked with *Ṭ*, which reminds one of 1.1.46.

In its commentary on the section teaching *sUṬ* (6.1.135-157), *Kāśikā* does describe *sUṬ* as an *āgama*, but remarkably only in two sūtras, 6.1.138 and 6.1.151. It does not mention *āgama* in the initial sūtras 6.1.135 or 6.1.137, where one may expect the presence of the word *āgama*. This appears to me strange and suspicious, and it may have to do with the *Kāśikā* edition I use. One needs to check more manuscript evidence to find out whether the author of *Kāśikā* considers *sUṬ* an *āgama,* if it is at all possible. Checked against my above proposed criterion, *sUṬ* taught in 6.1.135-157 should indeed have the name *āgama,* because it is completely meaningless and is found in the *vidheya* of 6.1.137 ff.

I need to study more deeply into *sUṬ* taught in 6.1.135-157, which I am not able to do now.

		k[60] k k k k k c *in* candra *being* uttarapada[61] ām	6.1.139 6.1.140 6.1.141 6.1.142 6.4.151 7.1.52	upa **s**kṛ-u-te (upa skurute) upa~**s**kī-am-s (upaskāram) upa~**s**kī-ta-s (upaskīrṇam) apa **s**kī-a-te (apa skirate) su~**s**candra-s (suścandraḥ) sarva-**s**ām (sarveṣām)	*Vedic (mantre).* *Other sūtras concerning sUṬ but not teaching the addition of sUṬ: 6.1.135-136, 143-150, 152-157; 8.3.5, 70-71.*
54	syāṬ	ṅit pratyaya ṅit pratyaya	7.3.114 7.3.115	sarva-ā-**syāe** (sarvasyai) dvitīya-ā-**syāe** (dvitīyasyai)	*Optional (vibhāṣā).*

[60] The identity of the *āgamin* is not explicit in *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 6.1.137: *"sam", "pari", "upa" ity etebhyo bhūṣaṇārthe karotau parataḥ suṭ kāt pūrvo bhavati.* (p. 631) This is also the case with 6.1.138-142. What I give here as *āgamin* is only my speculation.

[61] The identity of the *āgamin* is not explicit in *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 6.1.151: *candraśabda uttarapade hrasvāt paraḥ suḍ āgamo bhavati mantraviṣaye.* What I give here as *āgamin* is only my speculation.

2.3.3 Special cases (in grey background)

2.3.3.1 *am*

am is special, since it is without any *it*, and its position is determined by an ablative case (*pūrvapañcamī*) in the *sūtra*, like a suffix (see below). The *sūtras* that concern *am* are 6.3.68 and 69. Of these two rules, 6.3.68 teaches *am* explicitly, 6.3.69 being a *nipātanasūtra*. In what follows, I will focus on 6.3.68.

6.3.68 *ica ekāco `m pratyayavac ca* teaches two things concurrently: First, that *am* is added after an item that contains one vowel (*ekāc* in *ekācaḥ*) and ends with any vowel other than *a* or *ā* (*iC* in *icaḥ*), when the right context of such an item is a *uttarapada* marked with *KH* (*khiti* carried forth from 6.3.66). Second, the *am* thus taught is like the accusative singular case ending am (*pratyayavat*). This second teaching, an extension (*ādeśa*) in nature, enables some operations applying to the accusative singular case ending am to also apply to the am taught here in 6.3.68.

To illustrate 6.3.68, I present the following example. This is the first example given in *Kāśikā* 6.3.68, and thus also the example given in the table above. *Kāśikā* on 6.3.68 gives the pada *gāmmanyas* (*gāmmanyaḥ*), and here I will limit my discussion to the *prātipadika* therein, that is *gāmmanya*. The meaning of this *prātipadika* is "regarding [somebody or something] as cow". It is a compound: the first pada in this compound is the *prātipadika go* plus the accusative singular case ending *am*, together with the *am* taught in 6.3.68 (go**am**-am); the *prātipadika* in the second pada is *manya*, which can be analysed as the verbal root man "to think" followed by the *vikaraṇa ŚyaN* and the sārvadhātuka *kṛt* suffix *KHaŚ* (*man-ya-a*). The *prakriyā* relevant to *am* is as follows:

…

1 [*go* *am*] [(*man ya* *a*) *s*]

2	[*go*	ϕ_1]	[(*man ya*	*a*)	ϕ_1]	
3	[*goam*	ϕ_1]	[(*man ya*	*a*)	ϕ_1]	*ica ekāco `m pratyaya vac ca* 6.3.68
4	[*gām*	ϕ_1]	[(*man ya*	*a*)	ϕ_1]	*auto `mśasoḥ* 6.1.93

…

5 *gāmmanya*

At stage 3, 6.1.93 can apply because of the extension *pratyayavat* taught in 6.3.68.

The interpretation of 6.3.68 is not completely without problem. *Kāśikā* on 6.3.68: *ijantasyaikācaḥ khidanta uttarapade `m āgamo bhavati, ampratyayavac ca dvitīyaikavacanavac ca sa bhavati. am iti hi dvir āvartate.* (p. 715) Thus, *Kāśikā* on 6.3.68 treats *am* as an *āgama* and interprets *icaḥ* and *ekācaḥ* in 6.3.68 as both in genitive. I think interpreting *icaḥ* and *ekācaḥ* in 6.3.68 as both in genitive can be problematic, for the following reason. As *am* is not marked by *K*, *Ṭ*, or *M*, 1.1.46-47 will not be able to come in sight, and thus the proposed genitive in *icaḥ* and *ekācaḥ* will be understood as a *sthāneyogāṣaṣṭhī*, in accordance with 1.1.49 *ṣaṣṭhī sthāneyogā*, and combined with 1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*, one would obtain undesired forms: for example, in the derivation of the *prātipadika gāmmanya*, one would undesiredly substitute *am* in the place of *go* (and not after *go*, as desired).

Siddhāntakaumudī on 6.3.68: *ijantād ekāco `m syāt, sa ca svādyamvat, khidante pare.* (vol. 4 p. 76) Thus, Siddhāntakaudī on 6.3.68 interprets *icaḥ* and *ekācaḥ* as in ablative, which I would prefer to *Kāśikā*'s genitive interpretation. In this way, *am* is to be positioned after the *ijanta ekāc* element (e.g. *go*) in accordance with 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya* (like a suffix). In the meantime, note that *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 6.3.68 does not describe *am* as an *āgama*.

Under my above proposed criterion, *am* would obtain the name *āgama*, because *am* is completely meaningless (*am* does not express the *karman kāraka* of the *ijanta ekac prātipadika* in the *pūrvapada* of a compound, e.g. *go* in *gāmmanya*: this is, I think, rather expressed by the case ending *am* after e.g. *go*, which is replaced by *luk* by 2.4.71), and it is a part of the *vidheya* of 6.3.68.[62]

2.3.3.2 *aiC*

aiC is special for the following two reasons: First, it does not have an *it* indicating its position (e.g. *K*, *Ṭ*, or *M*), its position being taught explicitly in 7.3.3. Second, it is by itself a *pratyāhāra*, referring to the two vowels *ai* (added after *y*) and *au* (added after *v*).

The *sūtras* that concern *aiC* are 7.3.3-9. In what follows, I will focus on 7.3.3, where *aiC* is initally and explicitly taught.

In 7.2.117-118, it is taught that when an aṅga is followed by a *taddhita* suffix marked by *Ñ*, *Ṇ*, or *K*, the first vowel of such an aṅga is replaced by *vṛddhi*. To this 7.3.3 *na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyṃ pūrvau tu tābhyām aic* gives an exception. Under the same conditions, if the above vowel is preceded by *y* or *v* being end of a *pada* (*yvābhyām padāntābhyām*), then the *vṛddhi* taught in 7.2.117-118 will not apply (*na*); rather, *aiC* is to be added before the sound *y* or *v* (*pūrvau tu tābhyām aic*). To illustrate this, I present the following example. This is the first example given in *Kāśikā* 7.3.3. In the *prātipadika vyasana*, a compound consisting of the two

[62] Regarding the *sūtra* 6.3.68 itself, one may, in further research, explore and try to answer the following two questions: First, why does Pāṇini choose to teach *am* and its being like the accusative singular case ending *am* (*pratyayavat*), instead of teaching just the *aluk* of the case ending *am* after the *ijanta ekāc* item? Second, is it possible to interpret 6.3.68 in a different way, as follows: *icaḥ ekācaḥ [mum], [mum] ca ampratyayavat* - that is to say, to treat *am* in 6.3.68 as not independent, but a part of the *taddhitānta prātipadika ampratyayavat*, and to carry forth *mUM* from 6.3.67 to 6.3.68, so that the item taught in 6.3.68 is *mUM* rather than *am* (cf. *Kāśikā* on 6.3.68: am iti hi dvir āvartate).

members *vy* and *asana*, *y* is the end of a *pada*. Therefore, when the *taddhita* suffix *aṆ* is added after *vyasana*, *a*, the first vowel of the *aṅga vyasana*, will not be replaced by *vṛddhi*, but instead the sound *ai* will be added before the sound *y*, so that the derivative is *vaiyasana* and not **vyāsana*. Here is the relevant part of the *prakriyā* for deriving the *prātipadika vaiyasana*:

1	*vyasana*	*a*	
2	*vaiyasana*	*a*	*7.3.3 na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyṃ pūrvau tu tābhyām aic*
3	…		
4	*vaiyasana*		

Although *aiC* does not have an *it* that indicates where it is to be added, its position is taught explicitly in the *sūtra* 7.3.3. Or to put it in other words, since the position of *aiC* is taught explicitly in 7.3.3, there is perhaps no need to mark it with e.g. *Ṭ*, *K*, or *M*.

Both *Kāśikā* on 7.3.3 and *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 7.3.3 use the term *āgama* to describe *aiC*.[63] However, it seems to me that Boehthlingk does not consider *aiC* an *āgama*, since he does not mention *āgama* or anything relevant to *āgama* in the entry *aiC* (Boehtlingk's Grammatik p. 157*b lines 7-9), while he is, at least it appears to

[63] *Kāśikā* on 7.3.3: *yakāravakārābhyām uttarasyācām āder acaḥ sthāne vṛddhir na bhavati, tābhyāṃ tu yakāravakārābhyāṃ pūrvam aij* ***āgamau*** *bahavataḥ, ñiti, ṇiti, kiti ca taddhite parataḥ. yakārād aikāraḥ, vakārād aukāraḥ.* (p. 830)

Siddhāntakaumudī on 7.3.3 (1098): *padāntābhyāṃ yakāravakārābhyāṃ parasya na vṛddhiḥ, kiṃ tu tābhyāṃ pūrvau kramād aicāv āgamau staḥ.* (vol. 2 p. 304)

me so, consistent elsewhere in his *Erklärung der grammatischen Elemente* in mentioning the term *āgama* (the word he uses is *Augment*).

If we check *aiC* against my proposed criterion, *aiC* would get the name *āgama*, because it is completely meaningless, and it is a part of the *vidheya* of 7.3.3. What then would be the *āgamin* of *aiC*? It may perhaps be reasonable to assume that the *āgamin* of *ai* and *au* is *y* and *v* respectively.

2.3.3.3 *r* in 1.1.51

r taught in 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ* is special, because it is without the marker *K*, *Ṭ*, or *M*, and its position is taught explicitly in 1.1.51 as after *aṆ* (= *a, ā, i, ī, u, ū*).

Neither *Kāśikā* on 1.1.51 nor *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 1.1.51 mentions *āgama*. Yet one may find evidence that within the tradition there has existed the view that *r* is an *āgama*. One example is found in Dīpikā on Bh 1.1.20.3: *nanu cāgamās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante. syād etad evam, yady ayaṃ repho dāśabdasyāgamaḥ syāt. kasya tarhi? ṛkārasyāṇ raparo bhavati.* (Dīpikā vol. 2 p.23 lines 23-24) Another example is the following. In the case of *ar* / *ār*, Nāgeśa applies the ypbh to extend the name *guṇa* / *vṛddhi* from *a* / *ā* to *ar* / *ār*. Here is a segment from *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* on 1.1.51: *... "yadāgamāḥ" iti nyāyena viśiṣṭasya guṇavṛddhitvena rkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eveti niyamopapattiḥ* (p. 134); and here is a similar segment from Uddyota on 6.4.121.1: *yadāgamanyāyena viśiṣṭa eva guṇādisaṃjñaka iti bhāvaḥ* (p. 347a). Also see text part 5d and the example *jahāra* in text part 3b of PbhI 11 (treated below in §8.2.7). Unless Nāgeśa regards *r* in *ar* / *ār* as an *āgama*, he would not apply the ypbh in the way he does. Thus, one may infer that Nāgeśa regards *r* taught in 1.1.51 as an *āgama*.

Checked against my proposed criterion, r taught in 1.1.51 will be able to have the name *āgama*, because it is completely meaningless, and it is a part of the *vidheya* of 1.1.51.

2.3.3.4 *rAM*

rAM, taught in 6.4.47 *bhrasjo ropadhayo ram anyatarasyām*, is special, due to the difficulty in understanding what exactly 6.4.47 teaches.

Kāśikā on 6.4.47: *bhrasjo rephasyopadhāyāś ca ram anyatarasyāṃ bhavati. "ropadhayoḥ" iti sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdeśād upadhā rephaś ca nivartete. mittvāc cāyam aco `ntyāt paro bhavati*. (p. 743) According to *Kāśikā*, *ropadhayoḥ* ends in a *sthāneyogāṣaṣṭhī* (= *sthānaṣaṣṭhī*), and 6.4.47 teaches that *r* and *s* in the verbal root *bhrasj* are deleted (*upadhā rephaś ca nivartete*) and *rAM* is added after the final vowel of *bhrasj*, that is *a*, in accordance with 1.1.47 (*mittvāc cāyam aco `ntyāt paro bhavati*). All this is optional (*anyatarasyām* in 6.4.47). What *Kāśikā* on 6.4.47 does not explicitly mention but is also a part of the teaching of 6.4.47 is that the right context of the verbal root *bhrasj* is an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix (*ārdhadhātuke* from 6.4.46), and perhaps less importantly, that *bhrasj* is an *aṅga* (from 6.4.1). Thus, for example, to derive the *prātipadika bharṣṭṛ* "roaster", that is the verbal root *bhrasj* "to roast" followed by the *kṛt* suffix *tṛC* signifying an agent, we have the following relevant *prakriyā*:

1	*bhrasj*		
2	*bhrasj*	*tṛ*	
3	*bhɸarɸj*	*tṛ*	*bhrasjo ropadhayo ram anyatarasyām 6.4.47*
...			
4	*bharṣ*	*ṭṛ*	

Kāśikā on 6.4.47 mentions neither *āgama* nor *ādeśa* with regard to the identity of *rAM*. But one may at least infer from *Kāśikā*'s interpretation of *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* that *rAM* is regarded as an *ādeśa* by the author of *Kāśikā*. Its gloss of 6.4.47, *bhrasjo*

rephasyopadhāyāś ca ram anyatarasyāṃ bhavati, is not much different from the *sūtra* itself.

Siddhāntakaumudī on 6.4.47 (2535): *bhrasjo rephasyopadhāyāś ca sthāne ram āgamo vā syād ārdhadhātuke. mittvād antyād acaḥ paraḥ. sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdeśād ropadhayor nivṛttiḥ*. (pp. 350-351) Thus, *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 6.4.47 explicitly states that *rAM* is an *āgama* (*ram āgamaḥ*), and that it is in the place of both *r* and *s* (= *upadhā*) in *bhrasj* (*bhrasje rephasyopadhāyāś ca sthāne*). From his use of *sthāne*, one may also infer that in the eyes of the author of *Siddhāntakaumudī*, *rAM* is also a substitute (*ādeśa*).

To me, the interpretation offered by both *Kāśikā* on 6.4.47 and *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 6.4.47 appear unusual. Especially in the case of the interpretation of *Siddhāntakaumudī* on 6.4.47, it surprises me that an *āgama* is in the place of another item, and a *sthāneyogāṣaṣṭhī* is used together with an *āgama*.

Regarding the interpretation of *sūtra* 6.4.47, I would suggest the following. One may perhaps carry forth *lopaḥ* in 6.4.45 into 6.4.47, and understand *bhrasjo ropadhayor [lopaḥ], ram ca, anyatarasyām*. That is to say, *sūtra* 6.4.47 teaches two things concurrently. First, that *r* and *s* (= *upadhā*) in *bhrasj* are replaced by *lopa*. Second, *bhrasj*, that is to say the resulted *bhɸaɸj*, receives *rAM*, after *a*. Both these two operations have the condition that *bhrasj* has as its right context an ārdhadhātuka suffix. Moreover, one can either apply these two teachings and thus derive e.g. *bharṣṭṛ*, or, due to *anyatarasyām*, one could also choose not to apply these two teachings and thus derive *bhraṣṭṛ* (*bhraɸṣ-ṭṛ<=bhraɸṣ-tṛ<=bhraɸj-tṛ<=bhrasj-tṛ*). Accordingly then, one should perhaps read *sūtra* 6.4.47 as *bhrasjo ropadhayo ram* ***cā****nyatarasyām*: since *lopaḥ* can be carried forth from 6.4.45, one does need to state it explicitly in 6.4.47; but to show that two teachings are given concurrently in 6.4.47, *ca* is perhaps necessary (cf. §2.4.3). The advantage of my proposed interpretation is that one can avoid the apparently awkward *ropadhayoḥ*

ram and go for *ropadhayor [lopaḥ]* and *bhrasjo ram*, which seems more natural.[64] Of course, all this is only my speculation, and I am not completely confident of my interpretation. Much work needs to be done so that one may offer a more confident and safe interpretation. For example, one should familiarise himself with what the tradition has to say regarding this issue by reading through various commentaries and subcommentaries on 6.4.47 e.g. *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* and *Pradīpa*. One should also consider carefully whether the principles of *anuvṛtti* are violated when a new reading of the *sūtra* 6.4.47 is offered. One should study carefully the environment of 6.4.47, that is to say the *sūtras* surrounding 6.4.47, e.g. 6.4.45, from which the word lopaḥ may be carried forth into 6.4.47. One should also try to find out parallels, if there are any, to *sūtra* 6.4.47. None of these can be done by me now.

Thus, the difficulty in determining whether *rAM* is an *āgama* or not lies in the difficulty in understanding what exactly 6.4.47 teaches. Without understanding clearly the teaching of 6.4.47, one cannot make good judgements about the identity of the item *rAM*. For the time being, if I may follow my above proposed interpretation, *rAM*, checked against my proposed criterion, is then indeed an *āgama*, because it is completely meaningless (it is not a substitute in my proposed interpretation),[65] and it is a part of the *vidheya* of 6.4.47.[66]

---

[64] My interpretation here is inspired from what I have seen in *Bhāṣya* 6.4.47.0: *bhāradvājīyāḥ paṭhanti, "bhrasjo ropadhayor lopa āgamo ram vidhīyate" iti* (3:199.19) and Pradīpa: *bhāradvājīyā hi "sanaḥ ktici lopaḥ" ity ato lopagrahaṇam anuvartya ropadhayor lopaṃ ramāgamaṃ cānyatarasyāṃ vidadhati* (cited in fn 12 on *Bhāṣya* 3:199).

[65] If *rAM* may indeed turn out to be a substitute, then one may argue that *rAM* is not completely meaningless, because it is a part of *bharj*, which can be treated as a secondary subsitute (*ānumānikādeśa*) of the verbal root *bhrasj*, which is meaningful. Then, *rAM* is not an *āgama* following my proposed criterion.

[66] Incidentally, Boehtlingk does regard *rAM* as an *āgama*: see the entry *rAM* in *Erklärung der grammatischen Elemente* in his Grammatik, p. 177*b.

2.3.3.5 *ŚnaM* (not an *āgama*)

ŚnaM is taught in 3.1.78 *rudhādibhyaḥ śnam*. It is the character of the seventh class verbs, i.e. the *rudhādi* gaṇa. The marker *M* in *ŚnaM* indicates its position in accordance with 1.1.47. *ŚnaM* is perhaps the only item marked with *M* that is not an *āgama* (apart from the verbal roots marked with *M*). Because of the *adhikārasūtra* 3.1.1 *pratyayaḥ*, *ŚnaM* has the name *pratyaya*. The later tradition also calls *ŚnaM vikaraṇa*, a name that Pāṇini himself does not use in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

Within the tradition, there are voices that also call *ŚnaM āgama*. One example is from *Jñāpakasamuccaya* of Puruṣottamadeva: *"tṛṇaha im" iti nirdeśād* ***āgamasya śnamaḥ*** *pratyayatvam iṣyate, śakārasyetsaṃjñā yathā syāt, "tṛṇaddhi" iti*. (*Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 93) Another example is from *Kāśikā*. Although *Kāśikā* on 3.1.78 does not mention *āgama* and call *ŚnaM* a *pratyaya* (*rudhir āvaraṇe ityevamādibhyo dhātubhyaḥ śnam* ***pratyayo*** *bhavati* [p. 192]), in its commentary on 7.3.92 *tṛṇaha im*, *Kāśikā* says the following: *"tṛṇahaḥ" ity* ***āgataśnamko*** *gṛhyate, śnami kṛta im āgamo yathā syād iti* (p. 854). Thus, from the use of *āgataśnamka*, one may infer that the author of *Kāśikā* also regards *ŚnaM* as an *āgama*. Cf. *āgatanuṭka* and *āgatanuṭkagrahaṇa* in *Kāśikā* on 6.4.3 (p. 731 line 1 and 2 under 6.4.3 respectively), and *āgatanumka* in *Kāśikā* on 4.1.83 (p. 341 line 7). Here *nUṬ* and *nUM* are indeed *āgamas*.[67] One possible explantion how the authors of *Jñāpakasamuccaya* and *Kāśikā* regarded *ŚnaM* as an *āgama* is that for them any *mit* item is an *āgama*. See below §2.4.1.

Checked against my proposed criterion, *ŚnaM* is not an *āgama*, because it is not completely meaningless. The reason why it is not completely meaningless is the following. I follow Cardona (see his Pāṇini, p.440 §683) and regard *ŚnaM* as a cosignifer (*dyotaka*), which is also meaningful and not completely meaningless ("Both signifiers and cosignifiers are meaningful (arthavat) elements." Cardona's

[67] According to the tradition, the author of *Kāśikā* on 3.1.78 is Jayāditya, and the author of 7.3.92 is Vāmana. So one may at least say that Vāmana may have regarded *ŚnaM* as an *āgama*.

Pāṇini, §688 p. 443 lines 13-14). In this respect my understanding is still shallow, and I need to look deeper into the topic of the meaningfulness of a *vikaraṇa* by looking for and into the source of Cardona's theory in the Pāṇinian corpus itself.

2.4 What can the table tell us?

2.4.1 The marker of an *āgama*

Does an *āgama* necessarily have a marker (*it*)?

No, not necessarily. #3 *am* and #42 *r* do not have any marker.

Is an *āgama* necessarily marked with *Ṭ*, *K*, or *M*?

No, not necessarily. #3 *am*, #14 *aiC*, and #42 *r* are not marked with *Ṭ*, *K*, or *M*.

Is an item in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* marked with *Ṭ*, *K*, or *M* necessarily an *āgama*?

No.

The item *LyuṬ* taught in 3.3.115 is not an *āgama*. It is a *kṛt pratyaya*.

The item *Ka* taught in 3.2.3 is not an *āgama*. It is a *kṛt pratyaya*.

The item *ŚnaM* taught in 3.1.78 is not an *āgama*. It is a *pratyaya*. (see above §2.3.3.5)

2.4.2 The case ending of the left context of an *āgamin* and of the *āgamin*

The expected case ending of the left context of an *āgamin* and of the *āgamin* is the ablative and the genitive respectively (for more details, see below). The following table contains some exceptional cases.

2.4.2.1 Abbreviations and conventions

Before giving the table, I first give some abbreviations and conventions -

1. The different case endings and numbers are abbreviated in the following way:

nominative = 1 accusative = 2 instrumental = 3 dative = 4 ablative = 5 genitive = 6 locative = 7

singular = $_1$ dual = $_2$ plural = $_3$

I give, separating with a slash "/", all the case endings that appear to me as possible, and put my choice in bold.

2. A dotted underline marks the left context of an *āgamin*; a simple underline marks the *āgamin* (head or modifier).
3. An item in brackets "( )" is carried forth by *anuvṛtti*. Following this item and in subscript, I have given the number of the *sūtra* from which it is carried forth.

2.4.2.2 The table

#	*sūtra*	case ending of left context of *āgamin*	case ending of *āgamin*	*āgama*	remarks (for the meaning of the terms given here, see below)
1	6.3.74 tasmāṇ nuḍ aci[68]	5_1	7_1	nUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
2	6.4.63 dīṇo yuḍ aci kṅiti	**5_1** / 6_1	7_1	yUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
3	7.1.52 āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ	**5_1** / 6_1	7_1	sUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
4	7.1.54 hrasvanadyāpo nuṭ (āmi$_{7.1.52}$)	**5_1** / 6_1	(7_1)	nUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
5	7.1.55 satcaturbhyaś ca (āmi$_{7.1.52}$)	**5_3** / 4_3	(7_1)	nUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
6	7.1.56 śrīgrāmaṇyoś chandasi (āmi$_{7.1.52}$)	**6_2** / 7_2	(7_1)	nUṬ	os for bhyām ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti how?
7	7.1.57 goḥ pādānte (āmi$_{7.1.52}$)	**5_1** / 6_1	(7_1)	nUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
8	7.1.81 śapśyanor *nitya*m (śatuḥ$_{7.1.78}$)	**6_2** / 7_2	(**6_1** / 5_1)	nUM	os for bhyām
9	7.2.28 ruṣyamatvarasamghuṣāsvanām (niṣṭhāyām$_{7.2.14}$)	6_3	(7_1)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti how?
10	7.2.29 hṛṣer lomasu (niṣṭhāyām$_{7.2.14}$)	**5_1** / 6_1	(7_1)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
11	7.2.41 iṭ sani vā (vṛtaḥ$_{7.2.38}$)	(**5_1** / 6_1)	7_1	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti
12	7.2.42 liṅsicor ātmanepadeṣu (vṛtaḥ$_{7.2.38}$)	(**5_1** / 6_1)	**7_2** / 6_2	iṬ	

13	7.2.43 ṛtaś ca saṃyogādeḥ (liṅsicor$_{7.2.42}$)	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	(**7$_2$** / 6$_2$)	iṬ	
14	7.2.47 iṇ niṣṭhāyām (kuṣaḥ$_{7.2.46}$)	**(5$_1$** / 6$_1$)	7$_1$	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
15	7.2.48 tīṣasahalubharuṣariṣaḥ	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	7$_1$	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
16	7.2.49 sanīvantardhabhrasjadambhuśriṣvṛyūrnubharajñapiṣaṇām	6$_3$	7$_1$	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?
17	7.2.50 kliśaḥ ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	**7$_2$** / 6$_2$	iṬ	
18	7.2.51 pūṇaś ca (ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ$_{7.2.50}$)	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	(**7$_2$** / 6$_2$)	iṬ	
19	7.2.52 vaṣaṭikṣudhoṛ iṭ (ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ$_{7.2.50}$)	**6$_2$** / 7$_2$	(**7$_2$** / 6$_2$)	iṬ	os for bhyām ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?
20	7.2.53 añceḥ pūjāyām (ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ$_{7.2.50}$)	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	(**7$_2$** / 6$_2$)	iṬ	
21	7.2.54 lubhoṛ vimohane (ktvāniṣṭhayoḥ$_{7.2.50}$)	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	(**7$_2$** / 6$_2$)	iṬ	
22	7.2.55 jṝvraścyoḥ ktvi	**6$_2$** / 7$_2$	7$_1$	iṬ	os for bhyām ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?
23	7.2.56 uditoṛ vā (ktvi$_{7.2.55}$)	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	(7$_1$)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
24	7.2.57 se `sici kṛtacṛtacchṛdatṛdanṛtaḥ	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	7$_1$	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
25	7.2.58 gameṛ iṭ parasmaipadeṣu (se `sici$_{7.2.57}$)	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$	(7$_1$)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
26	7.2.65 vibhāṣā sṛjidṛśoḥ (thali$_{7.2.61}$)	**6$_2$** / 7$_2$	(7$_1$)	iṬ	os for bhyām ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?
27	7.2.66 iḍ attyartivyayatīnām (thali$_{7.2.61}$)	6$_3$	(7$_1$)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?

[68] Cf. 7.4.71 *taṣmāṇ nuḍ dvihalaḥ*, where *dvihalaḥ* is in **6$_1$** / 5$_1$.

28	7.2.68 vibhāṣā gamahanavidaviśām (vasu$_{7.2.67}$)	6_3	(luptavibhaktika)	iṬ	
29	7.2.70 rddhaṇoḥ sye	**6_2** / 7_2	7_1	iṬ	os for bhyām ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?
30	7.2.71 añjeḥ sici	**5_1** / 6_1	7_1	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
31	7.2.72 ṣṭuṣudhūñbhyaḥ parasmaipadeṣu (sici$_{7.2.71}$)	**5_3** / 4_3	(7_1)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
32	7.2.74 smipūṅrañjvaśām sani	6_3	7_1	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti how?
33	7.2.75 kiraś ca pañcabhyaḥ (sani$_{7.2.74}$)	**5_1** / 6_1 and **5_3** / 4_3	(7_1)	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
34	7.2.76 ruḍādibhyaḥ sārvadhātuke	**5_3** / 4_3	7_1	iṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
35	7.2.77 īśaḥ se	**5_1** / 6_1	luptavibhaktika	iṬ	
36	7.2.78 īḍajanor dhve ca (se$_{7.2.77}$)	**6_2** / 7_2	luptavibhaktika and (luptavibhaktika)	iṬ	os for bhyām
37	7.3.95 turuṣṭuśamyamaḥ sārvadhātuke	**5_1** / 6_1	7_1	īṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
38	7.3.96 astisico `prkte	**5_1** / 6_1	7_1	īṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
39	8.3.29 daḥ si dhuṭ	**5_1** / 6_1	7_1	dhUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti
40	8.3.30 naś ca (si$_{8.3.29}$)	**5_1** / 6_1	(7_1)	dhUṬ	ṣaṣṭhīpraklpti

2.4.2.3 Remarks based on the table above

2.4.2.3.1 Case ending of the left context of an *āgamin*

The expected case ending of the left context of an *āgamin* is the ablative, in accordance with 1.1.67 *tasmād ity uttarasya*.

In the above table:

if the number is singular, the case ending is always 5_1 / 6_1, i.e. *-as*;

if the number is dual, the case ending is always 6_2 / 7_2, i.e. *-os*;

if the number is plural. the case ending is either 5_3 / 4_3, i.e. *-bhyas*, or 6_3, i.e. *-ām*.

Thus, taking the ablative case as the case ending expected for the left context of an *āgamin*, there are two kinds of deviations. First, in dual number, one always has 6_2 / 7_2, i.e. *-os*. The expected case ending is 5_2, i.e. *-bhyām*. This phenomenon, if I may name it "*os* for *bhyām*", is also seen elsewhere in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* where no *āgama* is taught.[69] In the above table, all such cases are given

[69] For example, in 3.2.29 *nāsikāstanayor dhmādheṭ**oḥ***; 3.2.36 *asūryalalāṭayor dṛśitap**oḥ***; 3.3.127 *kartṛkarmaṇoś ca bhūkṛñ**oḥ***; 3.4.29 *karmaṇi dṛśivid**oḥ** sākalye*; 6.1.186 *tāsyanudāttenṅidadupadeśāl lasārvadhātukam anudāttam ahnviṅ**oḥ***.

If Pāṇini does intend to express the meaning of *-bhyām*, i.e. a *pūrvapañcamī*, using *-os*, one may perhaps then try interpreting 4.1.78 *aṇiñor anārṣayor gurūpottamayoḥ ṣyaṅ gotre* differently from *Kāśikā*'s interpretation. *Kāśikā* 4.1.78: *gotre yāv aṇiñau vihitāv anārṣau tadantayoḥ prātipadikayor gurūpottamayoḥ striyāṃ ṣyaṅ ādeśo bhavati*. (p. 338) Thus, *Kāśikā* on 4.1.78 seems to understand the *-os* in *aṇiñoḥ* as a *sthāneyogāṣaṣṭhī* (1.1.49), and interpret *ṢyaṄ* as an *ādeśa*. If *-os* in *aṇiñoḥ* could be understood as expressing the meaning of *-bhyām*, i.e. a *pūrvapañcamī*, then one may interpret *ṢyaṄ* instead as a *pratyaya* (at least a *taddhita pratyaya*, due to 4.1.76; but perhaps at the same time also a *strīpratyaya*, like ti taught in 4.1.77 [also cf. *Ṣpha* taught in 4.1.17]). Whether *ṢyaṄ* in 4.1.78 is an *ādeśa* or a *pratyaya*, the effect seems to be the same: the *ādeśa ṢyaṄ* in the place of final *a* / *i*, or the *pratyaya ṢyaṄ* added after final *a* / *i* and then *a* / *i* dropped by 6.4.148. Of course, I should go deeper into this issue, which I cannot do now. But

the tag "*os* for *bhyām*" in the "remarks" column. Second, in plural number, a few cases have 6_3, i.e. *-ām*, instead of the expected case ending 5_3, i.e. *-bhyas*. In both types of deviations, one may explain the genitive case as a genitive case indicating relation (*saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī*), a loose alternative of an ablative case in accordance with 1.1.67 (*pūrvapañcamī*), expressing the same idea: instead of saying an *āgama* is added to an *āgamin* **following** (*pūrvapañcamī*) its left context, it is stated that an *āgama* is added to an *āgamin* **related to** (*saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī*) its left context, that is to say, following its left context.

Therefore, coming outside of the table and considering all the cases of case ending of the left context of *āgamin*, one may say that it is either an ablative case (in the singular or plural number) in accordance with 1.1.67 (*pūrvapañcamī*), the expected case and the most numerous case, or a genitive case (in the dual or plural number) indicating relation (*saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī*), a loose alternative for *pūrvapañcamī*. Thus, Pāṇini does not always use the ablative case for a left context.

2.4.2.3.2 Case ending of the *āgamin*

a) Āgamin in the genitive case: the expected case ending

For the case ending of the *āgamin*, one would expect the genitive case. One reason is the following. Most of the *āgamas* are marked with *K*, *Ṭ*, or *M*. The *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ* / *K* is, according to 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*, an initial part / a final

---

my current impression favours the *pratyaya* interpretation: in 4.1.79-81 we have pañcamī, and perhaps it would be more natural to regard an item marked with *Ṣ* as a *pratyaya* than as an *ādeśa*.

The opposite pole of the phenomenon I call "os for bhyām" may be named "bhyām for os", where the expected case ending is *-bhyām*, a *pūrvapañcamī* in dual, and the actual case ending is *-os*, which may be interpreted as a *saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī* in dual. Arguably, the phenomenon "bhyām for os" features in 5.2.129: instead of the actual wording *vātātīsārā**bhyāṃ** kuk ca*, one may expect the wording *vātātīsāray**oḥ** kuk ca* - see §2.4.2.3.2d.

part (*ādi* / *anta*), and one would expect that the corresponding whole, i.e. the *āgamin*, is in the genitive case, or more precisely, a genitive case indicating a part-whole relation (*avayavaṣaṣṭhī*). The *āgamas* marked with *M* is, according to 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ*, added after the final sound. Whose final sound? The item after whose final sound a mit *āgama* is added is then expected to be in the genitive case, actually also an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*. This item is the *āgamin*. Thus, whether marked *K*, *Ṭ*, or *M*, one would expect an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* for the *āgamin*, and since most of the *āgamas* are marked with either *K*, *Ṭ*, or *M*, one may say in general that the case ending expected of an *āgamin* is the genitive case. I think this is also what we find in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*: most of the *āgamins* are put in the genitive case.

b) *Āgamin* in the locative case

The above table shows that it is also not rare that an *āgamin* is in the locative case in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. In all such cases in the above table, the *āgama* is marked with *Ṭ*. This is perhaps not a coincidence. Pāṇini may have, instead of stating that a *ṭit āgama* forms an initial part of the *āgamin* (in the genitive case), loosely stated that a ṭit *āgama* precedes an *āgamin* (in the locative case). In particular, in the section teaching *iṬ* (7.2.8-78), it appears that in each and every *sūtra* that directly teaches the addition of *iṬ* (i.e. all those I have presented in the table in §2.3.2, excluding the *niṣedhasūtras* and, if there are any, *nipātanasūtras*, which I have not looked closely at) the *āgamin* is or can be understood as[70] in the locative case, except in the great general rule 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*, where the *āgamin* "*ārdhadhātuka valādi*" is in the genitive case. This is curious. I cannot help ask what was in Pāṇini's mind when he taught this section following this particular pattern.

[70] "Can be understood as" here refers to #12-13 and #17-21, where the case ending is *-os*, which can be either 6_2 or 7_2. In all these cases, I have chosen to understand *-os* as 7_2, because of the context: all other unequivocal *sūtras* in the section teaching *iṬ* (7.2.8-78) in the above table has the locative case. Accordingly, in the table I present the case ending as "$\mathbf{7_2}$ / 6_2".

In this context, one may mention that the tradition has a *paribhāṣā ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyān*, found as e.g. #63 in *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva and #70 in PbhI. I have not looked deep into this *paribhāṣā*, but it appears to me that the effect of this *paribhāṣā* is the following. In a case where both a term ending in an ablative case and a term ending in a locative case are present, one may apply this *paribhāṣā* and turn the locative case into a genitive (*ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti*). Thus, in many cases in the above table where the left context of the *āgamin* ends in an ablative case and the *āgamin* itself ends in a locative case, one may obtain the expected genitive case for the *āgamin* by applying this *paribhāṣā*. All such cases in the above table are given the tag "*ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti*" in the "remarks" column.

However, there are also a few cases where the left context of the *āgamin* ends with a genitive case and the *āgamin* ends with a locative case. For such cases, I am not sure whether the *paribhāṣā* in issue is applicable. Perhaps the tradition has another *paribhāṣā* that can also turn such a locative case into a genitive case. In the above table, all such cases are given the tag "*ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti* how?" in the "remarks" column.

c) *Āgamin* in the ablative case

Apparently rarer than the locative case, there is at least one case where the *āgamin* is found in the ablative case. Not surprisingly, in this case, the *āgama* is marked with *K* (*tUK*). Here, instead of stating that the *āgama tUK* forms a final part of the *āgamin* (in the genitive case), Pāṇini may have loosely stated that the *āgama tUK* follows the *āgamin* (in the ablative case).

#	*sūtra*	case ending of right context of *āgaṃin*	case ending of *āgamin*	*āgama*
1	6.1.71 hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk	7_1	6_1	tUK
2	6.1.73 ṭhe ca (hrasvasya $tuk_{6.1.71}$)	7_1	(6_1)	(tUK)
3	6.1.74 āṅmāṅoś ca (ṭhe$_{6.1.73}$ $tuk_{6.1.71}$)	(7_1)	**6_2** / 7_2	(tUK)
4	6.1.75 dīrghāt (ṭhe$_{6.1.73}$ $tuk_{6.1.71}$)	(7_1)	5_1	(tUK)
5	6.1.76 padāntād vā (ṭhe$_{6.1.73}$ $tuk_{6.1.71}$)	(7_1)	5_1	(tUK)

~

What appears surprising to me here is the fact that although treating the same topic, Pāṇini suddenly changes the case ending for the *āgamin*. In 6.1.71 and 73-74, the *āgamin* is in the genitive case, but in 6.1.75-76, it is suddenly changed into the ablative case, although the case ending of the right context of the *āgamin* stays 7_1 unchanged and the *āgama* taught stays tUK unchanged. This leads me to suspect that for Pāṇini, the consistency in giving his case endings, a rational decision, is less important than his own feeling, his Sprachgefühl for the variety of the Sanskrit he used in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. He could well have uttered 6.1.75 *dīrgha**sya*** and 6.1.76 *padānta**sya** vā* (similarly, e.g. he could have well uttered *sārvadhātukasya* instead of the actual wording *sārvadhātuke* in 7.3.95); but perhaps he simply felt that it is more natural to utter *dīrghāt* and *padāntād vā* than *dīrghasya* and *padāntasya vā* in this occasion. To find out more about what is more and what is less natural for him, about his feeling and habits, about possible patterns he adopted, one may pick out all the occurences in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of a single *prātipadika*, and see in what cases this *prātipadika* has been used, and in what cases this word has not been used at all. When we know a bit better about Pāṇini's feeling, we could then also understand his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* better.[71] Perhaps

[71] For an example, see the case of the interpretation of 4.1.78 in fn 69.

Pāṇini is less consistent, less strict, and more humanly than what the tradition has thought of him.

d) Concurrent cases

The seven *sūtras* #1-#5, #9-#10 in the table of concurrent *sūtras* (in §2.4.3) share the following feature and may thus constitute one group. In each of these seven *sūtras*, to a *prātipadika* are taught concurrently a suffix (*strīpratyaya* or *taddhita*) and an *āgama*. The suffix would require the *prātipadika* to be in the ablative case, but the *āgama* would require the *prātipadika* to be in the genitive case. The *prātipadika*, of course, features only once in each *sūtra*. What then did Pāṇini do? As the table shows, in six among these seven *sūtras*, one can interpret that the *prātipadika* is followed by the genitive case. Only in #10, i.e. 5.2.129, an option of the genitive case is not possible and I would interpret the *prātipadika* to be in the ablative case. Instead of *vātātīsārābhyāṃ kuk ca*, which is the actual wording of 5.2.129, Pāṇini could have instead uttered *vātātīsār**ayoḥ** kuk ca*, and then there would be more consistency and one would be able to conclude that when a suffix and an *āgama* are concurrently taught to one and the same *prātipadika*, the force of the requirement of the *āgama*, i.e. a genitive case following that *prātipadika*, prevails over the force of the requirement of the suffix, i.e. an ablative case.

2.4.3 Concurrent cases

What does being "concurrent" mean? Here is my definition. Two items A and B are concurrently taught (*saṃniyogaśiṣṭa*, found in PbhI 86[72]), or briefly, concurrent, when they are taught as two different *vidheyas* in one and the same *sūtra*. All the concurrent cases in the table in §2.3.2 are collected in the following table. These should then constitute all the concurrent cases where one concurrently taught item is an *āgama* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

[72] PbhI 86 *saṃniyogaśiṣṭānām anayatarāpāya ubhayor apy apāyaḥ.*

#	*sūtra*	*āgama*	the concurrently taught item	case ending of *āgamin*
1	4.1.49 indravaruṇabhavaśarvarudramṛḍahimāraṇyayavayavanamātulācāryāṇām ānuk	ānUK	ṄīṢ$_{strīpratyaya}$	6$_3$
2	4.1.125 bhruvo vuk ca	vUK	ḍhaK$_{taddhita}$	5$_1$ / 6$_1$
3	4.1.158 vākināḍīnāṃ kuk ca	kUK	phiÑ$_{taddhita}$	6$_3$
4	4.1.161 manor jātāv añyatau ṣuk ca	ṣUK	aÑ$_{taddhita}$ and yaT$_{taddhita}$	5$_1$ / 6$_1$
5	4.2.91 naḍādīnāṃ kuk ca	kUK	cha$_{taddhita}$	6$_3$
6	4.3.15 śvasas tuṭ ca (ṭhaÑ$_{4.3.11}$)	tUṬ	ṭhaÑ$_{taddhita}$	(1$_1$)
7	4.3.23 sāyaṃciraṃprāhṇeprage`vyayebhyaṣ ṭyuṭyulau tuṭ ca	tUṬ	Ṭyu$_{taddhita}$ and ṬyuL$_{taddhita}$	1$_2$
8	4.3.24 vibhāṣā pūrvāhṇāparāhṇābhyām (ṭyuṭyulau tuṭ ca$_{4.3.23}$)	(tUṬ)	(Ṭyu$_{taddhita}$ and ṬyuL$_{taddhita}$)	(1$_2$)
9	4.3.138 trapujatunoḥ ṣuk	ṣUK	aṆ$_{taddhita}$	**6$_2$** / 7$_2$
10	5.2.129 vātātīsārābhyāṃ kuk ca	kUK	ini$_{taddhita}$	**5$_2$** / 3$_2$ / 4$_2$
11	6.3.68 ica ekāco `m pratyayavac ca	am	pratyayavadbhāva$_{ādeśa}$	**5$_1$** / 6$_1$
12	6.4.159 iṣṭhasya yiṭ ca	yIṬ	bahor bhūḥ$_{ādeśa}$	6$_1$
13	7.3.3 na yvābhyāṃ padāntābhyāṃ pūrvau tu tābhyām aic	aiC	na vṛddhiḥ$_{niṣedha}$	**5$_2$** / 3$_2$ / 4$_2$
14	7.2.73 yamaramanamātāṃ sak ca	sAK	iṬ$_{āgama}$	6$_3$

As the table shows, among the items that are concurrently taught with an *āgama*, the most frequent is a *taddhita* suffix; they constitute 9 (#2-#10) out of the total 14 cases. There is one case, #14 *sūtra* 7.2.73, where two *āgamas* are concurrently taught in one *sūtra*.

Each *sūtra* among the 14 *sūtras*, barring #1 and #9, has either an explicit *ca* (#2-#7, #10-12, #14), a *ca* that is carried forth (#8), or a *tu* (#13). To be consistent, I would expect *ca* also in #1 and #9, so that *sūtra* 4.1.49 would read *indravaruṇabhavaśarvarudramṛḍahimāraṇyayavayavanamātulācāryāṇām ānuk **ca*** (cf. *Cāndrasūtrapāṭha* 2.3.48 *indravaruṇabhavaśarvarudramṛḍānām ānuk **ca***) and *sūtra* 4.3.138 would read *trapujatunoḥ ṣuk **ca***. It seems to me that *ca* here has the function of marking the feature of being taught concurrently (*saṃniyogaśiṣṭatva*) in one *sūtra*.

I have to admit that my knowledge about concurrency or *saṃniyoga* is at the moment very scarce. In order to have a deeper understanding of *saṃniyoga*, I need to also check the other concurrent *sūtras* where no *āgama* is involved. Moreover, my theory of a *ca* marking *saṃniyogaśiṣṭatva*, or a *saṃniyogārtha ca*, should also be tested in these non-*āgama*-teaching concurrent *sūtras* and be checked against other theories in both primary and secondary sources. Commentaries on *paribhāṣās* related to *saṃniyoga*, e.g. PbhI 86,[73] should also be read. In addition, I should also try to obtain a better understanding of the function of the word *ca* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

To the above table one may also add the following entry, which involves an *uṇādisūtra*:

[73] PbhI 86 *saṃniyogaśiṣṭānām anayatarāpāya ubhayor apy apāyaḥ.*

#	*sūtra*	*āgama*	the concurrently taught item	case ending of *āgamin*
15	Uṇādi*sūtra* 1.156 sapyaśūbhyāṃ tuṭ ca (KanIN$_{1.154}$)	tUṬ	KanIN$_{uṇādi}$	(1$_1$)

2.4.4 Others

Āgama as a substituend: as mentioned in §1.4, the addition of *āgama* is a kind of modification. Does *āgama* itself also undergo modification? The answer is yes. I can find the following two cases. First, in 7.2.37-40, the *āgama iṬ* is taught to be replaced by *ī*: thus, the *āgama iṬ* is here a substituend (*sthānin*). Second, 1.1.6 *dīdhīvevīṭām* prohibits that an *iṬ* be replaced by *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* - would there be a case where *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* is / should be substituted in the place of another *āgama*?

Accent of *āgama*: as the table shows, in only 4 cases (*áṬ*, *áṬ*, *áM*, and *yáśUṬ*) Pāṇini teaches explicitly that an *āgama* is *udātta*. With the vast majority of the *āgamas*, Pāṇini does not say anything with regard to an *āgama*'s accent. One may perhaps then assume that except those 4 *āgamas* that have been explicitly taught by Pāṇini to be *udātta*, all the other *āgamas* are *anudātta*. Cf. the *paribhāṣā āgamā anudāttāḥ* (*bhavanti*), #5 in §2.6.

2.5 A table of some other *āgamas* taught outside of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

The teaching of *āgamas* is not limited to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself. The following table presents some *āgamas* that are found outside of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The quoted five *āgamas* are taught in Kātyāyana's *vārttikas* (*āK* and *āpUK*), the *Uṇādisūtra* (*tUṬ*), Patañjali's *Bhāṣya* (*v*), and *Siddhāntakaumudī* on the *Uṇādisūtra* (*vUK*).

āgama	place	example
āK	6.1.12.6 *caricalipativadīnām acy* ***āk*** *cābhyāsasya*	car**ā**car-ɸ$_1$-a-s (carācaraḥ) cal**ā**cal-ɸ$_1$-a-s (calācalaḥ) pat**ā**pat-ɸ$_1$-a-s (patāpataḥ) vad**ā**vad-ɸ$_1$-a-s (vadāvadaḥ)
āpUK	3.1.25.1 *satyasya kṛñy* ***āpuk*** *ca* 3.1.25.2 *ṇividhāv arthavedasatyānām* ***āpuk*** *ca*	satya**āp**-ay-a-ti (satyāpayati) artha**āp**-ay-a-ti (arthāpayati) veda**āp**-ay-a-ti (vedāpayati)
tUṬ	*Uṇādisūtra* 1.155 *sapyaśūbhyāṃ* ***tuṭ*** *ca*.[74] *Siddhāntakaumudī* thereon: *sapta. aṣṭa.* (vol. 4 p. 179 line 2)	sap-**t**an-as (sapta) aś-**t**an-as (aṣṭa)
v	*Bhāṣya* 1.3.1.0 *bhūvādīnāṃ vakāro `yaṃ maṅgalārthaḥ prayujyate. māṅgalika ācāryo mahataḥ śāstraughasya maṅgalārthaṃ vakāram* ***āgamaṃ*** *prayuṅkte*. (1:253.4-5)	bhū**v**ādi *in 1.3.1 bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ*
vUK	*Siddhāntakaumudī* on *Uṇādisūtra* 1.157:[75] *maha pūjāyām. hasya ghaḥ,* ***vug āgamaś*** *ca. maghavendraḥ.* (vol. 4 p. 180 line 6)	mahav-an-s (maghavā)

[74] The *uṇādi* suffix here is *KanIN*, carried forth from 1.154.

[75] *Uṇādisūtra* 1.157 *śvannukṣanpūṣanplīhankledansnehanmūrdhanmajjannaryamanviśvapsanparijjanmātariśvanmaghavann iti*. The *uṇādi* suffix here is *KanIN*, carried forth from 1.154.

2.6 Some other *paribhāṣās* that concern *āgama*

Apart from the ypbh, here are some other *paribhāṣās* (or *nyāyas*) that concern *āgama*.

#	paribhāṣā	source and remark
1	āgamaṭittvam animittaṃ ṅīppratyayasya	*Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 78.
2	āgamaśāstram anityam	*Kāśikā* on 7.1.1: *iha "yuvoḥ" iti nirdeśād dvandvaikavadbhāvapakṣe "**anityam āgamaśāsanam**" iti num na kriyate.* (p. 773 lines 6-7 under 7.1.1)
		Durghaṭavṛtti ad 3.2.124.
		PbhI 93.2 *āgama*śāstram *anitya*m - this is one of a group of *paribhāṣās* rejected by Nāgeśa in the PbhI.
		Cf. *Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 75: … *āgamaśāsanasyā*nityatāṃ *jñāpayati* …
3	āgamasaṃnidhāne kevalasyārthavattvaṃ nāsti	*Tattvādarśa* on PbhI 11: *paraṃ tu tatra pugāgame kṛta "**āgamasaṃnidhāne kevalasyārthavattvaṃ nāsti**" iti nyāyāt* … (p. 19 lines 2-3)
4	āgamasya śnamaḥ pratyayatvam iṣyate	*Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 93: *"tṛṇaha im" iti nirdeśād **āgamasya śnamaḥ pratyayatvam iṣyate**, śakārasyetsaṃjñā yathā syāt, "tṛṇaddhi" iti*.
5	āgamā anudāttāḥ (bhavanti)	*Bhāṣya* e.g. 2:7.17-18 (Bh on 3.1.3.6) and 2:8.7 (Bh on 3.1.3.7), cf. 3.1.3.6 *na vāgamasyānudāttavacanāt*;
		Jñāpakasamuccaya p. 77;
		Jñāpakasaṃgraha p. 60, where this seems to be rejected.
6	āgamā avidyamānavat (bhavanti)	*Bhāṣya* e.g. 2:8.14 (Bh on 3.1.3.7);
		Jñāpakasaṃgraha p. 60, where this seems to be rejected.
7	liṭy āmvidhāv āgamanimittāpi gurumattā samāśrīyate	*Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 71.
8	suṭo `bhaktatvam	*Jñāpakasamuccaya* p. 83.

2.7 Philosophical discussion on *āgama*

Apart from technical discussions, I have also seen one discussion about *āgama* that is more philosophical in nature. It is found in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20.5:

> *क: yuktaṃ punar yan nityeṣu nāma śabdeṣv āgamaśāsanaṃ syāt?*
>
> *ख: na, nityeṣu śabdeṣu kūṭasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavyam anapāyopajanavikāribhiḥ. āgamaś ca nāmāpūrvaḥ śabdopajanaḥ.*
>
> *क: atha yuktaṃ yan nityeṣu śabdeṣv ādeśāḥ syuḥ?*
>
> *ख: bāḍhaṃ yuktam. śabdāntarair iha bhavitavyam. tatra śabdāntarāc chabdāntarasya pratipattir yuktā.*
>
> *क: ādeśās tarhīme bhaviṣyanty anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakāḥ.*
>
> *ख: tat katham?*
>
> *क: sarve sarvapadādeśā dākṣīputrasya pāṇineḥ / ekadeśavikāre hi nityatvaṃ nopapadyate //* (1:75.8-14)

Here the doubt is raised that the teaching of *āgama* does not conform to the doctrine that sound is changeless (*nitya*), since an *āgama* is a sound(-group) that was not there previously, but then comes into being. The justification is then offered that one may look at an augmentation process as a substitution process, i.e. an item without an *āgama* replaced by an item with an *āgama*, and since with substitution the problem of changelessness of sound can be removed, one would also not have this problem with an *āgama*.

2.8 *āgama* beyond the Pāṇinian school of Sanskrit grammar

Both the word *āgama* and its idea are also found beyond the Pāṇinian school of Sanskrit grammar.

2.8.1 *Cāndrasūtrapāṭha* and *Candravṛtti*

As far as I can tell, the *Cāndrasūtrapāṭha* (C) does not contain the word *āgama*, like the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A). However, similar or identical items are taught in a few *Cāndra sūtras*, and these *sūtras* are also similar or identical to some *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtras*. The *Candravṛtti* (CV) does use the term *āgama* in apposition with these items. Here are some examples.

1. C 2.3.48 *indravaruṇabhavaśarvarudramṛḍānām ānuk ca.*

   CV: *indrādīnāṃ puṃyogāt striyāṃ vartamānānāṃ ṅīṣ bhavati, ānuk c**āgamaḥ**.* (p. 148)

   A 4.1.49 *indravaruṇabhavaśarvarudramṛḍahimāraṇyayavayavanamātulācāryāṇām ānuk*.

   #7. (This is the number in the first column of the table in §2.3.2.)

2. C 2.4.87 *dagukośalakarmāracchāgavṛṣād yuṭ ca.*

   CV: *daguprabhṛtibhyo `patye phiñ bhavati, yuṭ c**āgamaḥ**.* (p. 170)

   A 4.1.155 *kausalyakārmāryābhyāṃ ca.*

   vārttika 4.1.155.1 *phiñprakaraṇe dagukosalakarmāracchāgavṛṣāṇāṃ yuṭ ca.*

   Kāśikā on A 4.1.155: *tathā ca smṛtyantaram, "dagukosalakarmāracchāgavṛṣāṇāṃ yuḍ vādiṣṭasya" iti*. (p. 357)

3. C 2.4.91 *vākinādīnāṃ kuk ca.*

   CV: *"vākina" ityevamādīnām apatye phiñ vā bhavati, kuk c**āgamaḥ**.* (p. 171)

   A 4.1.158 *vākinādīnāṃ kuk ca.*

#15.

4. C 2.4.94 *manor jātau yat ṣuk ca.*

   CV: *manuśabdāj jātāv abhidheyāyām apatye yad bhavati, ṣuk c**āgamaḥ***. (p. 171)

   A 4.1.161 *manor jātāv añyatau ṣuk ca.*

   #50.

5. C 3.2.75 *śvasas tuṭ ca.*

   CV: *śvasaḥ śeṣe ṭhañ bhavati vā, tuḍ **āgamaś** ca*. (p. 201)

   A 4.3.15 *śvasas tuṭ ca.*

   #22.

6. C 4.2.126 *vātātīsārapiśācānāṃ kuk ca.*

   CV: *vātādīnām inir bhavati, kuk c**āgamaḥ***. (p. 281)

   A 5.2.129 *vātātīsārābhyāṃ kuk ca*; *Bhāṣya* on 5.2.129: *"piśācāc ca" iti vaktavyam.* (2:400.16)

   #15.

7. C 5.3.161 *iṣṭhe yi**k** ca.*

   CV: *iṣṭhe parato bahor bhūr ādeśo bhavati, yik c**āgamaḥ***. (p. 398)

   A 6.4.159 *iṣṭhasya yi**ṭ** ca.*

   #39.

8. C 5.4.170 *yamaramanamātāṃ sak ca.*

   CV: *yamādīnām ākārāntānāṃ cānantarasya sica iḍ bhavati, sak caiṣām **āgamaḥ***. (p. 424)

   A 7.2.73 *yamaramanamātāṃ sak ca.*

   #52.

9. C 6.2.124 *nu**k** cānekahalaḥ.*

CV: *ekahalo `nyasya liṭi parato dviruktau pūrvasyāder dīrgho bhavati, nuk c**āgamaḥ**.* (p. 462)

A 7.4.71 *tasmān nu**ṇḍ** dvihalaḥ*; (A 7.4.70 *ata ādeḥ*).

#29.

10. C 6.4.12 *ṅṇoḥ kukṭukau śari.*

CV: *ṅakārāntasya ṇakārāntasya ca padasya śari parataḥ* kuk ṭug ***āgamau** vā bhavataḥ.* (p. 489)

A 8.3.28 *ṅṇoḥ kukṭuk śari.*

#15 and #18.

11. Cf. also:

C 1.1.13 *ṭakitāv ādyantau.* (p. 7)

A 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau.*

C 1.1.14 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ.* (p. 7)

A 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ.*

Noteworthy are C *yi**k*** vs. A *yi**ṭ*** (case 7) and C *nu**k*** vs. A *nu**ṇḍ*** (case 9). In these two cases, it seems that C offers an analysis different from that offered in A. It may be interesting to explore possible causes behind the adoption of different ways of analysis.

2.8.2 *Kātantrasūtra* and *Durgasiṃhavṛtti*

In the *Kātantrasūtra* (K), the foundational text of the *Kātantra* school of Sanskrit grammar, I have found two *sūtras* that teach the fundamentals of *āgama*. These

are presented here, together with extracts from the *Durgasiṃhavṛtti* (DV), the commentary of Durgasiṃha on the *Kātantrasūtra*.

> K 2.1.6 āgama udanubandhaḥ svarād antyāt paraḥ.
> DV: *prakṛtipratyayayor anupaghāty āgamaḥ. āgama udanubandho `ntyāt svarāt paraḥ paribhāṣyate. padmāni, payāṃsi. ... udanubandha āgamasya liṅgam.*
>
> K 2.1.7 *tṛtīyādau tu parādiḥ.*
> DV: *āgama udanubandhas tṛtīyādau vibhaktau parādir bhavati. sarvasyai, sarveṣām, vṛkṣāṇām.* (p. 26)

Here are some preliminary remarks on the above quoted passage:

1. The term *āgama* is found in the *Kātantrasūtra* itself, unlike the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* or the *Cāndrasūtrapāṭha*.
2. The sentence *prakṛtipratyayayor anupaghāty āgamaḥ* in DV on K 2.1.6 seems interesting. It looks like a definition of the term *āgama*. Does it indicate that an *āgama* does not obstruct or harm (*anupaghātī*) "the identity of" a *prakṛti* or a *pratyaya*, that is to say, a *prakṛti* or a *pratyaya* with an *āgama* is still a *prakṛti* or *pratyaya*, so that one would arrive at an effect similar to that of the ypbh?
3. Being its signature, the marker *u* seems closely connected to *āgama* (*udanubandha āgamasya liṅgam* in DV on K 2.1.6): perhaps it is the case that any item marked with *u* is an *āgama*? If so, compared to the situation in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Kātantrasūtra* may be able to offer a clearer picture regarding which items have the name *āgama*.
4. In K 2.1.6-7, two possible positions of an *āgama* is mentioned: either after the final vowel (*svarād antyāt paraḥ* in K 2.1.6), or, in certain environments (*tṛtīyādau* in K 2.1.7), the initial part of a following item (*parādiḥ* in K 2.1.7).

As far as I can remember, these are the only possibilities of the position of an *āgama* taught in the *Kātantrasūtra*. This appears to me very interesting. The first position here would correspond to that of a *mit āgama* taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A 1.1.47), and the second position would correspond to, apparently, that of a *ṭit āgama* taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A 1.1.46). What about the position of a *kit āgama* taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, i.e. a final part (anta in A 1.1.46)? In fact, one could demonstrate that the set of *kit āgamas* taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is not absolutely necessary, because in the place of any *kit āgama*, Pāṇini could have instead taught either a *ṭit* or a *mit āgama*, achieving the same effect. That is to say, the set of *kit āgamas* taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* can be broken down and its members be relocated into either the set of *ṭit* or *mit āgamas*, without having a different result. How? An *āgamin* is either *ajanta* "ending with a vowel" or *halanta* "ending with a consonant". In the case of an *ajanta āgamin*, one can teach a mit *āgama* in the place of a *kit āgama*, and the effect is the same. (Consider for instance A 7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ* [#30 in the table in §2.3.2]: in the derivation of e.g. *padmā**n**-i*, the plural nominative of the neuter *prātipadika padma* "lotus", the *āgamin padma* can receive either an *āgama nUM* [which is the actually taught one] or an *āgama nUK*: either will lead to *padma**n***. [*padmāni* is an example given in DV on K 2.1.6.]) In the case of a *halanta āgamin*, instead of teaching a *kit āgama* to it, one can teach a *ṭit āgama* to the following item (which would then instead serve as the *āgamin*) (cf. *parādiḥ* in K 2.1.7). In this way, any *kit āgama* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* could have been be taught as either a *ṭit* or a *mit āgama*, and so Pāṇini could have taught only two positions, instead of three, to all the *āgamas*. The author of the *Kātantrasūtra* may have observed this and thus taught only two positions to any *āgama* in the *Kātantrasūtra*.

2.8.3 *Vīracōḻiyam*, a grammar of ancient Tamil

Vīracōḻiyam is a grammar of the ancient Tamil language written in that language and following to some extent the model of description of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition. It is dated to around 11th century AD. In *Vīracōḻiyam*, we find the term *ākamam*, a tamilised form of the Sanskrit word *āgama* and in a similar sense - for example:

mūṉṟoṭu nāṉkoṉpa tāmuyirp piṉṉuyir muntiṉaṭu

*āṉṟa yakāramvan t**ākama m**ākum …* (*Vīracōḻiyam* 1.1.13; p. 10)

This excerpt from *Vīracōḻiyam* 1.1.13 teaches the *āgama* (Tamil: *ākamam*) *y* (Tamil: *yakāram*) which appears between a preceding word ending in *i, ī,* or *ai* and a following word beginning with a vowel. For example, when we have the word *kai* "hand" followed by the word *ā* "cow", we would have *kai**y** ā*, where the sound *y* is an *ākamam*. This would remind one of e.g. the *āgama dhUṬ* taught in A 8.3.30, which is also a glide sound so to say, in e.g. *bhavān **t**sāye* (<= *bhavān **dh**sāye*).

2.8.4 *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*

Outside of the domain of grammar, in the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, the word *āgama* is also used. For example:

10.5.1: *ānupūrvyavatām ekadeśagrahaṇeṣv **āgama**vad antyalopaḥ syāt.* (p. 722)

The translator gives the phrase "like the incomers" for *āgamavat*. I quote his translation of *sūtra* 10.5.1: "On transference of a portion of those that come in order, the last one is omitted like the incomers." (p. 722)

In this example, if one follows the translation, the word *āgama* apparently does not refer to Veda, but perhaps in the sense of that which comes. This sense seems connected to the sense expressed by the word *āgama* in the Pāṇinian tradition; being more general in nature, this sense may even be the source from which the

Pāṇinian sense of the word *āgama* derives: a Pāṇinian *āgama* is also something, in this case a sound(-group), that comes.

2.8.5 *Nirukta*

Finally, one may mention the following example from *Nirukta* 4.7:

> *"kurutana" ity anarthakā* ***upajanā*** *bhavanti. "kartana", "hantana", "yātana" iti*. (p. ৬৬ penultimate line)
>
> Here is its translation: "The word *kurutana* (do), as well as the words *kartana* (do), *hantana* (kill), and *yātana* (go), have (*na*) as a redundant addition." (p. 59 lines 4-5)

kurutana seems to mean the same as *kuruta*, the imperative second person plural *parasmaipada* form of the verbal root *kṛ* "to do", and *na* in *kurutana* seems to be a meaningless sound-group. The word used in the quoted *Nirukta* passage is *upajana*, but the sense seems similar to that of the Pāṇinian *āgama*. In fact, in *Bhāṣya* on *Śivasūtra* 5 vt 15 we find the sentence *upajanaḥ āgamaḥ* (1:31.17), and so one may say that *upajana* is perhaps a synonym of *āgama*: it may even be an older synonym of *āgama*. The following segment in *Vijayā*, Jayadevamiśra's commentary on PbhI, also seems to point to the synonymity of *upajana* and *āgama*: … *"anapāyopajanavikāribhir" iti bhāṣya* ***āgamārthakopajanaśabdasya*** … (*Vijayā* on PbhI 11, p. 88) In addition, compare also the following sentence, found in e.g. *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20.5: āgamaś ca nāmāpūrvaḥ śabd**opajanaḥ.** (1:75.9-10)

Apart from *upajana*, what would be some other synonyms of the Pāṇinian *āgama*, in both Sanskrit sources and sources in other ancient Indic languages?

2.8.6 Remarks on further exploration

What I have given in this section are only some shallow illustrations. One may conduct a study of the (pre-*Aṣṭādhyāyī*) history of *āgama* by looking for materials in the older *Prātiśākhyas, Nirukta, Brāhmaṇas* etc. It will also be

interesting to explore whether there is a ritual or *Mīmāṃsā* predecessor of the idea of the Pāṇinian *āgama*, or at least a counterpart. Also, it would be interesting to see how the other Sanskrit grammatcial schools may offer analyses of a linguistic structure different from the Pāṇinian analysis: for example - what I have noted above - the *Cāndra yi**k*** vs. the *Aṣṭādhyāyī yi**ṭ*** and the *Cāndra nu**k*** vs. the *Aṣṭādhyāyī nu**ṭ***. Such alternative analyses are not only interesting and valuable in themselves - they could also help us to understand better Pāṇini's own approach. Outside of Sanskrit, it may also be interesting to explore ideas similar to the Pāṇinian *āgama* in the ancient grammars of e.g. the Dravidian languages, Prakrit, and Pali: would the multilingual Buddhist milieu generate new ideas in the topic of *āgama*?

3 The ypbh in *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20 *vārttika* 2-5

In this chapter, I translate and explain the passage relevant to the ypbh found in Bh 1.1.20.2-5. This is, as far as I can tell, the only passage in the entire *Bhāṣya* where the ypbh appears in a form close to what I have called the forms A-D in §1.6, i.e. *(yad/tad)āgamās (yad/tad)guṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*. For more discussion, see below §3.3.4.

3.1 *Sūtra* 1.1.20

1.1.20 *dādhā ghv adāp*

anuvṛtti None

translation *dā* and *dhā*, excluding *dāp*, are [technically named] *ghu*.

explanation

Kāśikā: *dārupāś catvāro dhātavo dhārupau ca dvau dābdaipau varjayitvā ghusaṃjñakā bhavanti*. (p. 12)

"The four verbal roots in the form of *dā* and the two verbal roots in the form of *dhā*, excluding *dāP* and *daiP*, have the technical name *ghu*."

The four verbal roots in the form of *dā* are: *dāṆ* (*dāne* "give", 1.977; *yacchati*[76]),[77] *deṄ*[78] (*rakṣaṇe* "protect", 1.1011; *dayate*), *ḌUdāÑ* (*dāne* "give", 3.9; *dadāti*), and *do*[79] (*avakhaṇḍane* "break into pieces", 4.40; *dyati*).

The two verbal roots in the form of *dhā* are *dheṬ*[80] (*pāne* "drink", 1.951; *dhayati*) and *ḌUdhāÑ* (*dhāraṇapoṣaṇayoḥ* "hold, nourish", 3.10; *dadhāti*).

dāP includes the following two verbal roots: *dāP* (*lavane* "cut", 2.50; *dāti*) and *daiP* (*śodhane* "purify", 1.971; *dāyati*).

So altogether six verbal roots get the technical name *ghu*.

3.2 *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20.2-4

3.2.1 Text

2 क:[81] ***samānaśabdapratiṣedhaḥ.***

क: *samānaśabdānāṃ pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ. pranidārayati, pranidhārayati. dādhā ghusaṃjñā bhavantīti ghusaṃjñā prāpnoti.*

3 ख: ***samānaśabdāpratiṣedho `rthavadgrahaṇāt.***

---

[76] By 7.3.78 *pāghrādhmāsthāmnādāṇdṛśyartisartiśadasadāṃ pibajighradhamatiṣṭhamanayacchapaśyarcchadhauśīyasīdāḥ*.

[77] The meaning and number of the *dhātus* in the *Dhātupāṭha* is from Boethlingk's Grammatik. Unless necessary, the meaning given by Boethlingk in brackets (e.g. *dāne ca* in brackets under 3.10 *ḌUdhāÑ* [p. 72*]) is not given here in the current work. In giving the third person singular present form I have consulted *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti*.

[78] *e* in *de* is replaced by *ā* by 6.1.45 *ād eca upadeśe `śiti*.

[79] *o* in *do* is replaced by *ā* by 6.1.45 *ād eca upadeśe `śiti*.

[80] *e* in *dhe* is replaced by *ā* by 6.1.45 *ād eca upadeśe `śiti*.

[81] As mentioned in point 5 in §1.11, I use क and ख to mark the two sides of debate (*pakṣa*) in an argument.

ख: *samānaśabdānām apratiṣedhaḥ. anarthakaḥ pratiṣedho `pratiṣedhaḥ.*

क: *ghusañjñā kasmān na bhavati?*

ख: *arthavadgrahaṇāt. arthavator dādhor grahaṇam. na caitāv arthavantau.*

4 ख: ***anupasargād vā.***

ख: *athavā yatkriyāyuktāḥ prādayas taṃ prati gatyupasargasaṃjñe bhavataḥ. na caitau dādhau prati kriyāyogaḥ.* (1:74.23-75.3)

3.2.2 Translation

2 क: A prohibition of those which have the same sounds.

क: A prohibition of [forms] which have the same sounds [as *dā* and *dhā* in 1.1.20] should be stated. [For example], [the forms] *pranidārayati* [and] *pranidhārayati*. [Since 1.1.20 teaches] that *dās* and *dhās* have the technical name *ghu*, the technical name *ghu* obtains [in the *dā* and *dhā* in these two examples].

3 ख: A purposeless prohibition of those which have the same sounds because of the reference to that which is meaningful.

ख: The prohibition of [forms] which have the same sounds [as *dā* and *dhā* in 1.1.20] is an *apratiṣedha*. An *apratiṣedha* is a purposeless prohibition.

क: Why is there no technical name *ghu*?

ख: Because of the reference to meaningful [forms]. [In 1.1.20] the meaningful *dā* and *dhā* are referred to. And these [*dā* and *dhā* in *pranidārayati* and *pranidhārayati*] are not meaningful.

4 ख: Alternatively, because [*pra* is] not an *upasarga*.[82]

ख: Alternatively, *pra* etc. get the technical names *upasarga* and *gati* in relation to that [verbal root] with whose action *pra* etc. are connected. And there is no connection with any action in regards to these [forms] *dā* and *dhā* [= the *dā* and *dhā* in *pranidārayati* and *pranidhārayati*].

3.2.3 Explanation

3.2.3.1 Vārttika 2

Regarding 1.1.20, क proposes that a prohibition should be made: all the forms that have the same sounds as *dā* and *dhā* but are not the six verbal roots mentioned above should be prohibited from getting the technical name *ghu*. Without this prohibition, 1.1.20 would apply in a broader range than it is intended to (*ativyāpti* "over-application") and may thus bring about undesired forms. For example, without this prohibition, we would have the undesired forms **praṇidārayati* and **praṇidhārayati*, instead of the correct forms *pranidārayati* and *pranidhārayati*.

The forms *pranidārayati* "[he] makes deeply respect" and *pranidhārayati* "[he] intensely makes remain" can be derived from the causative of the verbal roots *dṛṄ* (6.118, *ādare* "respect"; *driyate*) and *dhṛṄ* (6.119 *avasthāne* "remain"; *dhriyate*) respectively plus the two preverbs *pra* and *ni*[83]. I will take up *pranidārayati* here - its explanation also applies to *pranidhārayati*. The relevant stages in the *prakriyā* of *pranidārayati* is as follows:

---

[82] *anupasargāt* perhaps in the sense of *anupasargatvāt* (*prasya anupasargatvāt*).

[83] I follow Kaiyaṭa (Pradīpa: *dṛṁdhṛṁoḥ* … [vol. 1 p. 288a line 13]) in identifying the verbal roots as *dṛṄ* and *dhṛṄ*, and interpret both *pra* and *ni* as meaning "intensely, very much" (*pra* = *prakarṣeṇa*; *ni* = *nitarām*). Note that there are two *dhṛṄs* in the *Dhātupāṭha*, the other one being 1.1009, *avadhvaṃsane*; *dharate*.

1	*pra*	*ni*	*dṛ*				
2	*pra*	*ni*	*dṛ*	*i*			
3	(*pra*	*ni*	*dā*	*i*)			
4	*pra*	*ni*	*dār*	*i*	7.2.115 *aco ñṇiti*; 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*		
…							
5	*pra*	*ni*	*dār*	*ay*	*a*	*ti*	
6	**pra*	*ṇi*	*dār*	*ay*	*a*	*ti*	8.4.17 *ner gadanadapatapadaghumāsyatihantiyātivātidrātipsātivapativahatiśāmyatici notide-gdhiṣu ca*

8.4.17 *ner gadanadapatapadaghumāsyatihantiyātivātidrātipsātivapativahatiśāmyatici notide-gdhiṣu ca*

anuvṛtti *raṣābhyām no ṇaḥ* 8.4.1; *aṭkupvāṅnumvyavāye `pi* 8.4.2; *upasargāt* 8.4.14; *saṃhitāyām* 8.2.108

translation And *ṇ* replaces *n* - such a *n* that 1) follows *r* or *ṣ* that is in a preverb and 2) is a part of *ni* which precedes [the verbal roots] *gad, nad, pat, pad, ghu, mā* and [the finite forms] *syati, hanti, yāti, vāti, drāti, psāti, vapati, vahati, śāmyati, cinoti, degdhi*. [This takes place] in close junction [of sounds] and even when there is the intervention of *aṬ, kU, pU, āṄ,* and *nUM* [between *r* / *ṣ* and *n*].[84]

[84] In interpreting the *sūtra*, *upasargāt* from 8.4.14 in the ablative is changed into *upasarge* "in the *upasarga*" in the locative (*vibhaktivipariṇāma*). *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 8.4.17 is: *"ni" ity*

According to क, without the prohibition he proposed, in stage 5, *dā* would have the technical name *ghu* in accordance with 1.1.20, so that 8.4.17 can apply, and we would get the undesired form with the retroflex *ṇ* **praṇidārayati*. Therefore, in order to limit the scope of 1.1.20 to only the six verbal roots mentioned above and prevent its application in cases beyond this scope, a prohibition should be made. In this way, the fault (*doṣa*) of over-application (*ativyāpti*) can be removed.

3.2.3.2 Vārttika 3

Now ख objects, saying that the prohibition proposed by क is purposeless. The fault of over-application that क aims at removing with his prohibition does not exist in the first place, as 8.4.17 can not apply in *pranidārayati*. He gives two reasons. First, we have the following *paribhāṣā*:

> *arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya*. (#14 in PbhI)
>
> translation If [it is possible that a form can] refer to a meaningful [form], then [this form does] not [refer to a] meaningless [form].

The form *dā* in *sūtra* 1.1.20 can refer to both meaningful (e.g. the verbal root *dā*) and meaningless forms (e.g. *dā* in *mā bhū**d ā**śramapīḍeti* [*Raghuvaṃśa* 1.37 *pāda* a, p. १५]). The *paribhāṣā* above limits the referents of *dā* to only the meaningful forms. As *dā* in *pranidārayati* is meaningless, 1.1.20 will not apply here, and so we

---

etasyopasargasthān nimittād uttarasya nakārasya ṇakārādeśo bhavati, "gada", "nada", "pata", "pada", "ghu", "mā", "syati", "hanti", "yāti", "vāti", "drāti", "psāti", "vapati", "vahati", "śāmyati", "cinoti", "degdhi" ity eteṣu parataḥ. (p. 970)

will not get the technical name *ghu* for *dā* in *pranidārayati*, and thus 8.4.17 will not have a chance to apply.

3.2.3.3 Vārttika 4

The second reason is this: even if *dā* in *pranidārayati* can somehow get the technical name *ghu*,[85] 8.4.17 will still not apply. How?

> 1.4.59 *upasargāḥ kriyāyoge*.
>
> *anuvṛtti* *prādayaḥ* 1.4.58
>
> translation *pra* etc., when [they are] connected with an action, are [technically named] *upasarga*.

According to 1.4.59, *pra* etc. get the technical name *ghu* only in connection with an action, and therefore in connection with the verbal root that expresses this action. For example, in *pra gacchati* "[he] goes forward", *pra* gets the technical name *upasarga* in connection with the action of going, and therefore in connection with the verbal root *gam* that expresses this action. *Pra* has the technical name *upasarga* in relation to the verbal root *gam*. Now, in stage 5, in order for 8.4.17 to apply, we need, as required by the *sūtra* (see below §3.2.4), that *pra* has the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *ghu*. Here even if *dā* in *pranidārayati* somehow has the technical name *ghu*, *dā* is nevertheless meaningless, because it is only a part of the meaningful unit *dār*, from the verbal root *dṛ* (stage 4 in the *prakriyā* above). Since *ghu* here expresses no action at all, there will be no connection between *pra* and the

[85] *Pradīpa*: *abhyupagamya ghusaṃjñāṃ doṣaṃ pariharati*. (vol. 1 p. 288b lines 6-7)

action expressed by *ghu*, and so *pra* will not get the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *ghu*, and thus 8.4.17 will not be able to apply.

3.2.4 Comment

1 On *ghu praty upasargatvam* ("the state of being an *upasarga* 'preverb' in relation to *ghu*")

8.4.17 requires the technical name *upasarga*; it also requires a *ghu*. But does it really require an *upasarga* **in relation to** *ghu* (*ghu praty upasargatvam*)? It seems to me that this is not explicitly stated in 8.4.17: perhaps as long as we have an *upasarga* and a *ghu* following *ni*, 8.4.17 can apply, whether this *upasarga* is in relation to *ghu* or some other item. I think one should go deeper into this issue, through e.g. checking the commentaries and subcommentaries on 8.4.17 as well as the commentaries on the current *Bhāṣya* passage.

3.3 *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20.4-5

3.3.1 Text

क: *yady evam ihāpi tarhi na prāpnoti, praṇidāpayati, praṇidhāpayati. atrāpi naitau dādhāv arthavantau nāpy etau dādhau prati kriyāyogaḥ.*

5 ख: *na vā,* ***arthavato hy āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate, yathānyatra.***

ख: *na vaiṣa doṣaḥ.*

क: *kiṃ kāraṇam?*

ख: ***arthavata āgamas tadguṇībhūto `rthavadgrahaṇena gṛhyate****, yathānyatra. tad yathā, anyatrāpy* ***arthavata āgamo `rthavadgrahaṇena gṛhyate****.*

क: *kvānyatra?*

ख: "*lavitā", "cikīrṣitā*" *iti.* (1:75.3-8)

3.3.2 Translation

क: If so, then also here [the technical name *ghu*] will not obtain - *praṇidāpayati* [and] *praṇidhāpayati*. Also here these [forms] *dā* and *dhā* are not meaningful, and there is no connection with any action in regards to these [forms] *dā* and *dhā*.

5 ख: Or [rather] not, because an *āgama* added to a meaningful [form], having become subordinate to it, is [also] referred to by what refers to it, as elsewhere.

ख: Or [rather] this is not a fault.

क: Why?

ख: An *āgama* added to a meaningful [form], having become subordinate to it, is [also] referred to by what refers to [this] meaningful [form], as elsewhere. It is like [this] - elsewhere as well an *āgama* added to a meaningful [form] is [also] referred to by what refers to [this] meaningful [form].

क: Where else?

ख: [In the forms] *lavitā* [and] *cikīrṣitā*.

3.3.3 Explanation

3.3.3.1 End of *vārttika* 4

Now क argues back. He says that the two reasons given by ख in vt 3-4 are defective, because if they are to be accepted, 8.4.17 will fail to apply in the forms *praṇidāpayati* and *praṇidhāpayati*, yielding the undesired forms **pranidāpayati* and **pranidhāpayati*, just as we have *pranidārayati* and *pranidhārayati*; but this time, the forms with the retroflex *ṇ* are desired.

The forms *praṇidāpayati* "[he] makes intensely give" and *praṇidhāpayati* "[he] makes intensely nourish" can be derived from the causative of the verbal roots *ḌUdāÑ* (*dāne* "give", 3.9; *dadāti*) and *ḌUdhāÑ* (*dhāraṇapoṣaṇayoḥ* "hold, nourish", 3.10; *dadhāti*) respectively, plus the preverbs *pra* and *ni*.[86] As above, I will take up *praṇidāpayati* here - its explanation also applies to *praṇidhāpayati*. The relevant stages of the *prakriyā* of *praṇidāpayati* are as follows:

1	*pra*	*ni*	*dā*				
2	*pra*	*ni*	*dā*	*i*			
3	*pra*	*ni*	*dāp*	*i*	7.3.36	*artihrīvlīrīknūyīkṣmāyyātāṃ puṅ ṇau*	
…							
4	*pra*	*ni*	*dāp*	*ay*	*a*	*ti*	
5	*pra*	*ṇi*	*dāp*	*ay*	*a*	*ti*	8.4.17 *ner gadanadapatapadaghumāsyatihantiyātivātidrātipsātivahativapatiśāmyatici notide-gdhiṣu ca*

[86] Like above fn 83, I take both *pra* and *ni* to mean "intensely".

Following ख's first reason given in vt 3, as *dā* in *dāp* is not meaningful, and *dā* in 1.1.20 refers only to meaningful forms, 1.1.20 cannot apply and *dā* in *dāp* will not get the technical name *ghu*, so that 8.4.17 cannot apply.

Following ख's second reason given in vt 4, even if *dā* in *dāpi* can somehow get the technical name *ghu*, it is meaningless, and so *pra* cannot get the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *ghu*, so that 8.4.17 cannot apply.

Therefore, in the same way that we do not get the retroflex *ṇ* in *pranidārayati*, we will also not get it in *praṇidāpayati*. But this time the form with the retroflex *ṇ* is desired.

3.3.3.2 Vārttika 5

Now ख attempts to solve this problem with the help of the ypbh in the form as it appears in vt 5, i.e. *arthavata āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate* (I have named this form of the ypbh "F" in §1.6).

Regarding the first reason given in vt 3, according to ख, *dā* in *dāp* is not meaningless, but is indeed meaningful, as he uses the word *arthavat*. It follows then that 1.1.20 can apply and *dā* in *dāpi* will indeed get the technical name *ghu*.

Regarding the second reason given in vt 4, ख argues that we can indeed get the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *ghu* for *pra* in *pra-ni-dāp-ay-a-ti* in stage 4, with the help of the ypbh (in form F). How? In *pra-ni-dāp-ay-a-ti* there are two actions: one simple action (*śuddhakriyā*) of giving, expressed by *dāp*; the other the causative action (*prayojyakriyā*), expressed by *dāp-ay*, where *ay* is originally the causative suffix *ṆiC* (*ay* <= *e* <= *i*, by 7.3.84 and 6.1.78). Depending on the intention of the speaker (*vivakṣā*), one can choose to let the meaning "intensely" expressed by *pra* modify either the simple action - so that *praṇidāpayati* would mean "[he]

makes intensely give" - or the causative action - so that *praṇidāpayati* would mean "[he] intensely makes give". Now, if one decides for the former,[87] then *pra* is connected with the action expressed by *dāp*, and thus by 1.4.59 gets the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *dāp*. Now with the help of the ypbh (in form F), *dāp* can get the technical name *ghu*, so that *pra* does have the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *ghu*.

How does the ypbh (in form F) help *dāp* to get the technical name *ghu*? It is already established above that *dā* in *dāp* has the technical name *ghu*. In accordance with the following *sūtra*:

7.3.36 *artihrīvlīrīknūyīkṣmāyyātāṃ puṅ ṇau*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1

translation To [the verbal roots] *ṛ*, *hrī*, *vlī*, *rī*, *knūyĪ*, *kṣmāyĪ* - [all of them being] *aṅga* - and an *aṅga* [ending with] *ā*, when *Ṇi* follows [these], *pUK* is added.

the sound *p*, an *āgama*, is added to *dā*, which is an *aṅga* ending with *ā*. Since *dā* here is meaningful, we could now apply the ypbh (in form F): the *āgama p* added to the meaningful form *dā*, having become subordinate to *dā*, is also referred to by what refers to *dā*. *ghu* refers to *dā*, so *ghu* now also refers to *p*, and the result is that *ghu* now refers to *dāp* - in other words, *dāp* has now the technical name *ghu*.

[87] *Pradīpa*: *yadā ca prakṛtyarthaḥ preṇa viśeṣyate, tadāyaṃ parihāraḥ. ṇyarthaviśeṣaṇatve tu prasya dādhau praty anupasargatvāṇ ṇatvaṃ na bhavaty eva.* (vol. 1 p. 289a lines 6-8) Thus, if one decides for the latter option, the form will actually be *pranidāpayati*, as 8.4.17 cannot apply.

In this way, on the one hand, *dā* in above stage 4 of the *prakriyā* does have the technical name *ghu* (corresponding to ख's first reason given in vt 3); on the other, *pra* in stage 4 does have the technical name *upasarga* in relation to *ghu* (corresponding to ख's second reason given in vt 4). It follows then that 8.4.17 can now apply and we can obtain the desired retroflex substitute *ṇ* for *n* in *ni*, and thus the desired form *praṇidāpayati*. The problem proposed by क is now solved.

This is the end of the argument. Here is a summary of the entire argument in Bh 1.1.20.2-5: क proposes a modification of *sūtra* 1.1.20 in the form of a prohibition, so that the undesired form **praṇidārayati* by the false application of 8.4.17 will not obtain. Against क, ख argues that the proposed prohibition by क is purposeless, and gives two reasons why 8.4.17 will not apply and **praṇidārayati* will not obtain in the first place, even without this proposed prohibition. Against ख then क argues that following ख's argument with his two reasons we will also get * *pranidāpayati* instead of the desired **praṇidāpayati*. ख then solves this problem with the help of the ypbh (in form F).

To conclude, one may say that in the end ख's point in vt 3 that the prohibition proposed by क is purposeless holds, and therefore no extra prohibition for 1.1.20 should be made - 1.1.20 can stay as it is.

3.3.3.3 End of *vārttika* 5

Finally, beyond the above argument, ख mentions two more cases where the ypbh (in form F) can apply: *lavitā* and *cikīrṣitā*.

3.3.3.3.1 *lavitā*

lavitā is the nominative singular form of the *prātipadika lavitṛ* "cutter". *lavitṛ* can be derived from the verbal root *lūÑ* (9.13 *chedane* "cut"; *lunāti*) and the agent suffix *tṛC*. [88] The relevant stages of its *prakriyā* is as follows:

1	*lū*	*tṛ*	
2	*lū*	*itṛ*	7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*
3	*lo*	*itṛ*	7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*
4	*lav*	*itṛ*	

7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1

translation To an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] beginning with *vAL* (= all the consonants except *y*) and following an *aṅga*, *iṬ* is added.

explanation

1 On *ārdhadhātuka* suffix. Any suffix added to a verbal root is either *ārdhadhātuka* or *sārvadhātuka*. Roughly speaking, among such post-verbal(-root) suffixes, all except the verbal endings (*tiṄ*) and those marked with the letter *Ś* (*śit*) are *ārdhadhātuka*. See 3.4.113-117.

2 The *āgama* is *iṬ*; the *āgamin* is the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix in issue.

[88] *lavitā* can also be the third person singular *parasmaipada* periphrastic future (*LUṬ*) form of the verbal root *lūÑ*, "[he] will cut".

7.3.84 *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *guṇaḥ* 7.3.82

translation [The final *iK* (= *i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ, ḷ*)] of an *aṅga* that is followed by a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] [is replaced by] *guṇa*.

explanation

1 The substituend (*sthānin*) is not explictly given in the *sūtra* or the *anuvṛtti*. It is identified with the help of the two *paribhāṣāsūtras* 1.1.52 *alo `ntyasya* and 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*. According to the former *sūtra*, it must be a final sound; according to the latter, this sound is *iK*. I understand the genitive case (*ṣaṣṭhī*) in *aṅgasya* in the *anuvṛtti* as one expressing part-whole relation (*avayavaṣaṣṭhī*). The genitive case added to the substituend (*sthānaṣaṣṭhī*) necessary for the substitution operation is also understood from these two *paribhāṣāsūtras*.

In stage 1, the *āgama iṬ* is added to the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *tṛ*, the *āgamin*. Now, we need 7.3.84 to apply, but it cannot. Why? Because for the application of 7.3.84, we need an *aṅga* that is immediately followed by a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, but in stage 2, the *iṬ āgama* intervenes between the *aṅga lū* and the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *tṛ*. There is a problem.

This problem can be solved with the help of the ypbh (in form F). The *āgama iṬ*, added to the meaningful form *tṛ*, having become subordinate to it, is also referred to by what refers to *tṛ*, that is, in our case, the technical name *ārdhadhātuka*. It follows then that the technical name *ārdhadhātuka* can now refer to *itṛ*, or in other

words, *itṛ* can now have the name *ārdhadhātuka*. Therefore, we do have an *aṅga* that is immediately followed by *ārdhadhātuka*, and thus 7.3.84 can now apply.[89]

3.3.3.3.2 *cikīrṣitā*

The case of *cikīrṣitā* is similar to that of *lavitā*. *cikīrṣitā* is the nominative singular form of the *prātipadika cikīrṣitṛ* "one who wants to do".[90] *cikīrṣitṛ* can be derived from the desiderative stem of the verbal root *ḌUkṛÑ* and the agent suffix *tṛC*. The relevant stages of its *prakṛiyā* are as follows:

1	*cikīr*	*sa*	*tṛ*	
2	*cikīr*	*sa*	*itṛ*	7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*
3	*cikīr*	*sɸ*	*itṛ*	6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*

6.4.48 *ato lopaḥ*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 1; *ārdhadhātuke* 46

translation [The final sound] of an *aṅga* that [ends with] *a* [and] is followed by an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] [is replaced by] *lopa*.

[89] It appears to me that by applying the *sūtras* in a different order, i.e. 7.3.84 before 7.2.35 (*lū* + *tṛ* → *lo* + *tṛ* → *lo* + *itṛ* → *lav* + *itṛ*), we would no longer have the problem in issue and could smoothly derive the desired form *lavitṛ* without resorting to the ypbh at all. Under Bh 1.1.20 vt 5 (1:75) or in *Pradīpa* and *Uddyota* thereon (pp. 288b-289b), I did not find this alternative discussed. I think this issue needs to be clarified by further research.

[90] Like *lavitā*, *cikīrṣitā* can also be the third person singular *parasmaipada* desiderative periphrastic future form of the verbal root *ḌUkṛÑ*, "[he] will want to do".

In stage 1, the *āgama iṬ* is added to *tṛ*, the *āgamin*. In stage 2, in order that 6.4.48 can apply, we need an *aṅga* immediately followed by an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, and again we have the intervention of *iṬ* between the *aṅga cikīrsa* and the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *tṛ*. With the help of ypbh, *itṛ* can have the name *ārdhadhātuka*, so that now 6.4.48 can apply and the problem is solved.

3.3.4 Comments

1 In the *Bhāṣya* passage treated in the current chapter, i.e. Bh 1.1.20.2-5, we have three occurrences of the ypbh: the first one in *vārttika* 5 itself, and the remaining two in the *Bhāṣya* on *vārttika* 5 (all three are put in bold in §3.3.1). All these three occurrences can be said to be in the form *arthavata āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*, which I have named "F" in §1.6.

As is shown in Appendix 2, which contains the other ypbh-related passages in the *Bhāṣya* I have found, all the other occurrences of the ypbh in the *Bhāṣya* are, as far as I can tell, in the form of what I have called E in above §1.6, i.e. *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*. Therefore, in the entire *Bhāṣya*, we have, altogether, only the following two forms of the ypbh (as far as I can tell):

E: *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*
F: *arthavata āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*

It is thus interesting that the forms A-D, which seems to be the standard form of the ypbh in the later tradition (e.g. PbhI 11 has B; see below point 3), does not appear in the *Bhāṣya* at all.

2 The difference between F and forms A-D, i.e. *(yad/tad)āgamās (yad/tad)guṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*, lies in the additional *arthavataḥ* in F. I think this difference is a significant one: with its additional *arthavataḥ*, F can apply

only where the *āgamin* is a meaningful item,[91] whereas A-D can apply to *āgamin*s both meaningful and meaningless. If we assume that the forms A-D plus E, have the same domain of application, the domain of application of F should then be more restricted than that of A-E. Therefore, one can say that in terms of function, we have two different *yadāgamaparibhāṣās*, i.e. A-E and F: the current study focuses on the former, and the latter should be clarified by a separate study.

3 Above I have mentioned that the predominant wording of the ypbh in the *Bhāṣya* is E. In fact, as my table in §1.6 shows, the wording of the ypbh in Vyāḍi's two *paribhāṣā* works, i.e. *Paribhāṣāsūcana (*VḍV*) and Vyāḍiparibhāṣāpāṭha (*VḍP*)*, which are presumably the earliest among the Pāṇinian individual *paribhāṣā* treatises, is also E. As is shown in the same table, in the seven post-Vyāḍi Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* treatises starting with PuV, which is presumably the earliest, the wording of the ypbh is exclusively A-D i.e. *(yad/tad)āgamās (yad/tad)guṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*. Thus, we seem to have the following picture on the subject of the historical evolution of the wording of the ypbh in the Pāṇinian tradition: the older standard form (as evidenced in the *Bhāṣya* and the two *paribhāṣā* treatises of Vyāḍi)

[91] In a further study, one may compare this restriction, i.e. that the *āgamin* must be a meaningful item, with the following two other restrictions with regard to the effect of the ypbh. First, Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita in his commentary on the ypbh has argued that the *yadāgamaparibhāṣā* does not apply in *varṇagrahaṇa*, which I have understood as in cases where the *āgamin* consists of a single sound (see text part 4 in §6.2 and §6.3.5). A single sound is often, but not necessarily, meaningless. Second, in §9.3.2 I have argued that 1.1.56 can also achieve the effect of the ypbh. When 1.1.56 is applied to an inferred substitute (i.e. the group of the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*), the restriction in it, i.e. what is expressed by *analvidhau*, may have an effect that is similar (but perhaps not identical) to the effect of the above two restrictions.

of the ypbh was E,[92] and later, the wording A-D gained popularity and replaced E to be the new standard form of the ypbh.[93]

4 As mentioned above, PuV, with its wording *āgamā yadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* (i.e. D), is presumably the earliest among the 7 post-Vyāḍi Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* treatises that commented on the ypbh in its presumably younger form A-D *(yad/tad)āgamās (yad/tad)guṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* (and not in E, its presumably older form). Interestingly, at the end of his ypbh commentary in PuV, we find that Puruṣottama gives the following remark: *"tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena*

[92] The theory that the wording E, which does not contain the word *āgama*, is the older standard form of the ypbh also agrees with the fact that Pāṇini never uttered the word *āgama* in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Compared to E, A-D (as well as F) have also the additional hurdle in that one needs to clarify whether an item has the name *āgama*, which is not so easy: see the third paragraph in §9.3.4.

Moreover, it is also imaginable that being without the word *āgama*, E may be able to apply in a broader scope than A-D, so that E may even be functionally different from A-D: that is to say, we would have, in terms of function, not only two *yadāgamaparibhāṣās* as I have mentioned above, but three, i.e. A-D, E, and F. This is at the moment only speculative in nature, and should be clarified by further research on the difference between A-D and E.

[93] <1> One possible explanation for how A-D gained popularity in the later tradition is the following. It may be the case the later tradition, when studying the *Bhāṣya*, gave much more efforts to study the first nine *āhnikas* (*Navāhnika*) than to study what comes later in the *Bhāṣya* (this appears to me to be the case in the traditional way of learning today). Of the two forms E and F that we find in the *Bhāṣya*, the Navāhnika only has form F (i.e. *Bhāṣya* 1.1.20.2-5 treated in the current chapter); the form E of the ypbh occurs only in *Bhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* Adhyāya 6-8, as Appendix 2 shows. Thus, it may be the case that the later tradition was much more familiar with F than E. In order to broaden the domain of application of F, they dropped *arthavataḥ* in F, thus developping the forms A-D on the basis of F, and took A-D as the standard form of the ypbh.

<2> My speculation here is based on only the 9 Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* treatises collected in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* and the *Bhāṣya*. To get a more complete picture of the evolution of the wording of the ypbh in the Pāṇinian tradition, one should also check the works of those Pāṇinīyas dated between Vyāḍi and Puruṣottamadeva, e.g. Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa*.

gṛhyate" ity asyārthaḥ paṭhyate. na tu paribhāṣāntaram (text part 4 in PuV 18). Perhaps one reason why Puruṣottamadeva may have found it necessary to give this final remark in his ypbh commentary (which is, incidentally, also the only instance I have seen in a Pāṇinian text where a remark about the different wordings of the ypbh is given from within the tradition) could be that at his time, the wording *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*, i.e. E, was still the more prevalent and thus the more familiar one to his readers, whereas his wording, i.e. D, was relatively new.

4 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣāsūcana* of Vyāḍi

4.1 On the work and the author

Issues related to the *Paribhāṣāsūcana* and its author Vyāḍi have been discussed in at least the following two places: <1> Wujastyk's edition, vol. 2, p. xiii-xxix; <2> *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, pp. 11-16, sections 15-20.

Regarding the date of Vyāḍi, Abhyankar has argued in his *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* that Vyāḍi was pre-Patañjali:

> "In the light of what has been stated above, Vyāḍi can be said to have flourished about a hundred years or even more, after Pāṇini, but certainly before Patañjali, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*. There are a few additional points of this type of internal evidence which adduce a kind of support for saying that Vyāḍi lived before Patañjali." (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, Introduction, pp. 12-13)

Wujastyk is apparently more cautious. He says in his edition:

> "But not enough material survives of any of these Vyāḍis to make any probative identifications on grounds either of content or style. Until further evidence is forthcoming it is wisest to withhold judgment." (vol. 2, p. xxvii, section "summary", lines 5-8)

In any case, I think it is not too risky to say that Vyāḍi's *Paribhāṣāsūcana* may be the oldest extant *paribhāṣā* treatise in the Pāṇinian school.

4.2 Text

In "prefatory note" in his *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, Abhyankar writes the following:

> "While tracing the origin of the Vyākaraṇa Paribhāṣās and the source of the Paribhāṣenduśekhara, I found in the Bombay Government collection of Sanskrit manuscripts at the B.O.R.I., two copies of a work on Paribhāṣās wherein Vyāḍi was given as the name of the author." (p. 2 lines 9-12)

In section 15 of Introduction in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, Abhyankar writes:

> "The work of Vyāḍi on *Paribhāṣās*, which is printed in the present collection of *Paribhāṣās* for the first time, is named *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* in the colophon of **both** the manuscripts of the work which are used." (p. 11; I have made bold the word "both".)

From these two passages, one may infer that Abhyankar has made his edition of the VḍV in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* using two manuscripts. Further and more specific information about these two manuscripts I have not found in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*.

Wujastyk gives manuscript information in vol. 1, pp. xvii-xix. His edition is based on 4 manuscripts.

Except in one place (see fn 95), the texts in Abhyankar's edition (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. १०-११) and Wujastyk's edition (vol. 1 pp. 22-23) are identical.

17[94] *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*

1

[94] This is the number found in Abhyankar's edition (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. १०). In Wujastyk's edition (vol. 1 p. 22), the ypbh is numbered 14.

yo yasya bhaktaḥ sa tadgrahaṇena bhavati.

2a

क: kathaṃ jñāyate?

ख: yad ayaṃ "na ktvā seṭ" iti kittvapratiṣedhaṃ śāsti.

क: kathaṃ kṛtvā jñāpakam?

ख: atra hi vyavadhānād eva kiti pratiṣedho na bhaviṣyati. tasmān nārthaḥ pratiṣedhena. paśyati tv ācāryo `yam iḍāgamaḥ paraṃ kitaṃ bhaktaḥ kidgrahaṇena gṛhyata iti. tasmād vacanam.

2b

apara āhuḥ,

क: na seḍvacanaṃ jñāpakam. pratiṣedhavacanam eva.

ख: katham?

क: "devitvā sevitvā" iti sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ pugantalaghūpadhasya cocyate. na cāyam iṭ sārvadhātukaṃ nāpy ārdhadhātukam. yaś cārdhadhātukam asāv iṭā vyavahitaḥ. tasmād atrāsaty api kittve na guṇaḥ. nārthaḥ pratiṣedhena. paśyati tv ācāryaḥ ārdhadhātukabhakto `yaṃ ārdhadhātukagrahaṇena gṛhyate tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate iti. evaṃ sati iṭi guṇaḥ prāpnoti sa kitīti pratiṣidhyate. tasmāt kittvapratiṣedho jñāpakārthaḥ.

3

क: *kim etasyā jñāpane prayojanam?*

ख: *"sarveṣām" iti suḍāgamaḥ subbhaktaḥ subgrahaṇena*[95] *gṛhyate. tena "bahuvacane jhaly et" ity etvaṃ siddhaṃ bhavati.*

4.3 Translation

17 [What] is a part of that (= another item) is [also] referred to through the mentioning of that [item].

1 (Gloss)

[An item], being a part of [another item], is present through the mentioning of that [other item].

2 (A *jñāpaka* of the ypbh: the prohibition taught in 1.2.18)

2a

क: How is [it] known?

ख: Because this [teacher] (= Pāṇini) teaches the prohibition of the state of being marked with *K* [in the form of the *sūtra*] *na ktvā seṭ* (1.2.18).

क: How [is this] a *jñāpaka*?

ख: Because here, right because of the intervention [of *iṬ*], the prohibition [of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*] conditioned by [an item] marked with *K* that follows (1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*)

[95] I have adopted the reading in Wujastyk's edition (vol. 1 p. 23 lines 15-16). Abhyankar's edition (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ११) has *su**ḍ**bhaktaḥ su**ḍ**grahaṇena*, which I think is an error.

will not apply. Therefore the prohibition [of the marker *K* in *Ktvā* by 1.2.18 is] purposeless. But the teacher (= Pāṇini) sees that this *āgama iṬ*, being a part of [the item] marked with *K* that follows [it], is [also] referred to through the mentioning of [the item] marked with *K*. So [he (= Pāṇini)] says [*na ktvā seṭ*].

2b

Others say,

क: the term *seṭ* [is] not a *jñāpaka*. The statement of the prohibition alone [is the *jñāpaka*].[96]

ख: How?

क: [With regard to the forms] *devitvā* [and] *sevitvā*, [the *sūtra*] *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* (7.3.86) is stated [with the condition that] a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] follows. And this *iṬ* is not a *sārvadhātuka* [suffix], nor an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix]. And what is an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] is separated by *iṬ*. Therefore, here even if [*Ktvā*] is not marked with *K*, there is no *guṇa* [by 7.3.86]. The prohibition [of the marker *K* in *Ktvā* by 1.2.18 is] purposeless. But the teacher (= Pāṇini) sees that this (= *iṬ*), being a part of an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix], is [also] referred to through the mentioning of *ārdhadhātuka*, [by the *paribhāṣā*] "*tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*". This being the case, *guṇa* is substituted [by 7.3.86] when *iṬ* follows. It [= *guṇa*] is prohibited [by 1.1.5] because [it = *guṇa* is] followed by [an item] marked with *K*. Therefore, the prohibition of the state of being marked with *K* [by 1.2.18] is for the sake of [serving as] a *jñāpaka*.

[96] I have not understood the segment *apara āhuḥ, na seḍvacanaṃ jñāpakam. pratiṣedhavacanam eva* in the beginning of 2b. I feel that the argument beginning with *apara āhuḥ* should be one different from the argument in 2a, but somehow I cannot see a big difference between 2a and 2b.

3 (A purpose of the ypbh: *sarveṣām*)

क: What is the purpose in intimating this [*paribhāṣā*]?

ख: [In the case of] *sarveṣām*, the *āgama sUṬ*, being a part of *sUP*, is [also] referred to through the mentioning of *sUP*. As a result, the substitute e [taught in] *bahuvacane jhaly et* (7.3.103) is obtained.

4.4 Explanation

4.4.1 Text part 2a and 2b: 1.2.18 as a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh

The two examples mentioned by क in 2.2 are *devitvā* and *sevitvā*. *devitvā* "having played" is the absolutive form of the verbal root *divU* (4.1 *krīḍāvijigīṣāvyavahāradyutistutimodamadasvapnakāntigatiṣu* "play etc."; *dīvyati*); *sevitvā* "having sewn" is the absolutive form of the verbal root *ṣivU* (4.2 *tantusaṃtāne* "sew"; *sīvyati*). In what follows, I explain using the example *devitvā*.

1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*

anuvṛtti *guṇavṛddhī* 1.1.3; *na* 1.1.4

translation Also, *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* that is followed by [an item] marked with *K* or *Ṅ* [is] not [allowed].

explanation I have taken the locative case in *kṅiti* as a *parasaptamī*, different from KV's interpretation as a *nimittasaptamī*. See §5.4.5 and fn 108.

1.2.18 *na ktvā seṭ*

anuvṛtti *kit* 1.2.5

translation *Ktvā* accompanied by *iṬ* does not have *K* as [its] marker.

7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; sārvadhātuk*ārdhadhātuka*yoḥ 7.3.84; *guṇaḥ* 7.3.82

translation And *guṇa* [replaces the *iK*] of an *aṅga* that (1) is followed by a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] and (2) ends with *pUK* or has a *laghu* as its penultimate sound.

explanation

1 *iK = i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ, ḷ.*

2 On "[replaces the *iK*]" in my translation.

The substituend is not specified in the *sūtra* or the *anuvṛtti*. It is identified with the help of the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*. Accordingly, I supply *ikaḥ* and thus have "[replaces the *iK*]" in my translation.

1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*

anuvṛtti none

translation [In the case of] *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* [as substitute], [they are] in the place of *iK*.

explanation This *sūtra* teaches a *paribhāṣā*. It specifies that when the substitute is *guṇa* or *vṛddhi*, the substituend is to be understood as *iK*.

3 On *upadhā* "a penultimate sound".

1.1.65 *alo `ntyāt pūrva upadhā*

anuvṛtti none

translation [The sound] that precedes the final sound [is technically named] *upadhā*.

4 On *laghu* and *guru*.

Laghu is a short vowel that is not followed by a consonant cluster. *guru* is a short vowel that is followed by a consonant cluster or a long vowel.

1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*

anuvṛtti none

translation A short vowel [is technically named] *laghu*.

1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru*

anuvṛtti *hrasvam* 1.4.10

translation A short vowel that is followed by a consonant cluster [is technically named] *guru*.

1.4.12 *dīrghaṃ ca*

anuvṛtti *guru* 1.4.11

translation And a long vowel [is technically named] *guru*.[97]

In deriving *devitvā*, we add the absolutive suffix *Ktvā* to the verbal root *div*, and then add the *iṬ āgama* to *tvā*:

1 *div* *tvā*

2 *div* *itvā* 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*

Now, with the help of the ypbh, *itvā*, the *āgama* plus the *āgamin*, can have the name "*ārdhadhātuka*" belonging to the *āgamin tvā*. At the same time, *itvā* will also inherit the feature of being marked with *K* (*kit*) belonging to the *āgamin tvā*. Therefore, due to the prohibition taught in 1.1.5, the *guṇa* substitution of *e* for the vowel *i* in *div* according to 7.3.86 cannot take place. Now, by 1.2.18, *tvā* is no longer *kit*. With the help of the ypbh, *itvā* then will also no longer have the name *kit*. With *itvā* being *ārdhadhātuka* and not *kit*, 7.3.86 can now apply and we could obtain the desired form *devitvā*.

3 *dev* *itvā* 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*

[97] There is some ambiguity as to whether *laghu* and *guru* refer to a vowel or a syllable. The *sūtras* 1.4.10-12 themselves suggest that *laghu* and *guru* refer to vowels. However, KV uses the word *akṣara* "syllable" in its glosses of 1.4.10-1.4.12: *hrasvam* ***akṣaraṃ*** *laghusaṃjñaṃ bhavati* (1.4.10); *saṃyoge parato hrasvam* ***akṣaraṃ*** *gurusaṃjñaṃ bhavati* (1.4.11); *dīrghaṃ c****ākṣaraṃ*** *gurusaṃjñaṃ bhavati* (1.4.12). (p. 77) See e.g. Joshi-Roodbergen's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* vol. 4 p. 56 point 6 for a discussion on this issue. I do not intend to go deep into this issue here.

Without the ypbh, we would not be able to arrive at the desired form *devitvā*, due to the intervention by *iṬ*. We will instead have the undesired **divitvā*.

Now, **if the ypbh does not exist**, then, no matter whether *tvā* in *itvā* in stage 2 is *kit* or not *kit*, because of the intervention of *iṬ*, 7.3.86 will not apply in any way and we will not be able to obtain the correct form *devitvā*. **Therefore, 1.2.18, whose purpose is to make *tvā* in *itvā akit*, becomes purposeless and redundant** - the presence or absence of the marker *K* in *tvā* will not affect whether or not *i* in *div* is replaced by *guṇa* because of the intervention of *iṬ*. **Since no *sūtra* could be redundant, the ypbh must exist**.

The *jñāpaka* in the current case is the *sūtra* 1.2.18, or the prohibition taught in the *sūtra* 1.2.18.

4.4.2 Text part 3 *sarveṣām*

See the explanation in §7.4.1.

5 The ypbh in the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva

5.1 On Puruṣottamadeva

Puruṣottamadeva (early twelfth century) was the author of several grammatical works: *Bhāṣāvṛtti*, *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* (PuV), *Jñāpakasamuccaya*, and *Kārakacakra*. He was perhaps from Bengal (roughly the area of the Indian state of West Bengal and Bangladesh today).

Compared to other *paribhāṣā* treatise authors like Haribhāskara Agnihotrin and Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, there seems to be more secondary literature on Puruṣottamadeva.

In the introduction of *Paribhāṣāvṛtti Jñāpakasamuccaya Kārakacakra by Puruṣottamadeva*, edited by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya (1946), Bhattacharya discusses the various grammatical works of Puruṣottamadeva (pp. 23-31) and the date of Puruṣottamadeva (pp. 34-36). On pp. 32-33 he argues that Puruṣottamadeva belonged to Bengal and gives evidence.

Regarding the date (early twelfth century) of Puruṣottamadeva, see also section IV.2.2.1 (pp. 282-283) in George Cardona, *Pāṇini A survey of research* (1976).

In Malgorzata Wielinska-Soltwedel, "The Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā of Viśvarūpa, the first adhyāya and a detailed examination" (2006), §I.7 (pp. 38-51) is devoted to a discussion of Puruṣottamadeva. §I.7.2 (pp. 40-41) is on PuV.

One may also see Malgorzata Wielinska-Soltwedel, "The Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar", in *Berliner Indologische Studien* 19 (2010): 71-85.

5.2 Text

Three published works carry the text of the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti*: D.C. Bhattacharya's edition (*Paribhāṣāvṛtti Jñāpakasamuccaya Kārakacakra by Puruṣottamadeva*, edited by D.C. Bhattacharya, 1946), *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, and T. Bhattacharya's work (T. Bhattacharya, *Śrīpuruṣottamadevaviracitā Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, 2010).

T. Bhattacharya's work provides, besides the text itself, also a translation of each *paribhāṣā* and an explanation, both in Bengali. Perhaps this work could not be called an "edition", as I have not seen any manuscript information or variant readings given in it. The text of the commentary on the ypbh plus the ypbh itself in T. Bhattacharya's work (pp. 36-37) is identical with the established text in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition (p. 10), so I would assume that the text in T. Bhattacharya's work is a reproduction of that in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition - an assumption that could be confirmed only after an extensive comparison of the two texts, of course.

The text of the *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition is based on four manuscripts (A, B, C, and D), whose descriptions can be found in the preface of the work.

The edition in Abhyankar's *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (pp. 112-160) is, according to *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. 3 in the "prefatory note", lines 26-28, based on a printed edition ("P." in the footnotes of the text), not specified by Abhyankar but persumably D.C. Bhattacharya's edition,[98] and one manuscript in the Bhandarkar

[98] As far as the commentary on the ypbh is concerned (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. 120), the readings of the printed edition reported by Abhyankar (in footnotes 3 and 4) are the same as the readings in the established text in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition (p. 10).

Oriental Research Institute in Pune ("M." in the footnotes of the text), whose information I could not find in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*.[99]

The established texts of the commentary on the ypbh plus the ypbh itself in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition (p.10) and *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (p. 120) differ only in two places with minor importance, both indicated by Abhyankar (i.e. his footnotes 3 and 4). Below I reproduce the established text in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*.

[99] The manuscript D in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition, also from Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (D.C. Bhattacharya's edition, p. ii in preface), seems to be a different one from the manuscript used by Abhyankar, since one reading is different: Abhyankar's manuscript has the reading *kṅiti guṇapratiṣeḍho* (footnote 2 in Abhyankar's text), while D.C. Bhattacharya's manuscript reads *kṅiti ceti guṇapratiṣedho* (this is the established reading in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition, and no variant reading is given).

18 āgamā yadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante

1 *tatra ṭitkitor āgamayor ādyantāvayavatvam atidiṣṭam. mito `pi "mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ" ity atrāntagrahaṇānuvṛttyā antāvayavatvam.*

2a *tatra "kuṇḍā" ity atra numo dhātugrahaṇena grahaṇād "guroś ca halaḥ" ity akārapratyayo bhavati.*

2b *"sarveṣām" ity atra ca suṭaḥ subgrahaṇena grahaṇāj jhalādau supīty etvaṃ sidhyati.*

3a *"avayavasyāvayavigrahaṇena grahaṇam" iti yady api nyāyasiddha evāyam arthaḥ,*

3b *tathāpy atra "na ktvā seṭ" iti kittvapratiṣedhaṃ jñāpakam āhuḥ. yadi hi iṭ ktvāgrahaṇena [na] [100] gṛhyate tadā iṭā vyvadhānād eva "kṅiti ca" iti guṇapratiṣedho nāstīti kiṃ pratiṣedhena.*

3c *apare tu kṅitīti nimittasaptamītvāj jñāpakam idaṃ durbalaṃ manyamānā nyāyasiddhatvam evecchanti.*[101]

[100] Although none among D.C. Bhattacharya's edition, *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* edition, and T. Bhattacharya's work (see the beginning of §5.2) includes this *na* either in the established text or in the footnotes reporting other readings from manuscripts, I suggest adding this *na* here; otherwise, I do not know how to make sense of this passage. Accordingly, my translation and explanation below are based on the text with this na added.

[101] The established text in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition reads, instead of *icchanti*, *asyāśrayanti* (this corresponds to footnote 3 in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*). The reading *icchanti* is also recorded in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition (i.e. footnote 2). This is, incidentally, the only variant reading found in the text in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition.

4 *"tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate" ity asyārthaḥ* [102] *paṭhyate. na tu paribhāṣāntaram.*

5.3 Translation

1 (Establishment of the ypbh through logical principle [*yuktisiddhi*])

There,[103] the status of [being] a beginning part or an end part is extended to an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* or *K* [respectively]. Also to [an *āgama*] marked with m, since the term *anta* "end" is carried forth in [the *sūtra*] *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ* (1.1.47), the status of being an end part [is extended].

2 (Two purposes of the ypbh: *kuṇḍā* and *sarveṣām*)

2a There, in the case of *kuṇḍā*, since *nUM* is [also] referred to by that which refers to a verbal root (= the term *dhātu*), the suffix *a* [taught in] *guroś ca halaḥ* (3.3.103) is added.

2b And in *sarveṣām*, since [the *āgama*] *sUṬ* is [also] referred to by that which refers to a case ending (= the term sUP), the substitute *e* [conditioned by] the right context of a *sUP* beginning with *jhAL* is successfully obtained.[104]

---

[102] The established text in D.C. Bhattacharya's edition reads, instead of *asyārthaḥ*, *tv asyaivārthaḥ* (this corresponds to footnote 4 in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*).

[103] I am not sure what tatra, the first word of PuV 18, refers to, and so I have not given any exact referent here: see fn 105.

[104] Here I have not translated the *iti* in *supīty etvaṃ*, for the following two reasons. First, I find this *iti* hard to understand, its function appearing unclear to me. It does not serve for quotation, since although the wording *supi* is indeed found in 7.3.102, the wording *jhalādau* is not found anywhere in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 7.3.103 having only *jhali*. Second, in an almost identical sentence in SīV, we do not have this *iti*: we have *supy etvaṃ* instead of *supīty etvam*. I would prefer the reading without iti.

3 (Establishment of the ypbh through the *jñāpaka* in 1.2.18: for and against it)

3a Although this meaning is indeed established by the principle that the part is [also] referred to by that which refers to the whole,

3b nonetheless, [people] say that the prohibition of the state of being marked by *K* [taught in the *sūtra*] *na ktvā seṭ* (1.2.18) [is] a *jñāpaka* in this [meaning] (= of this *paribhāṣā*), for if [the *āgama*] *iṬ* is [not] [also] referred to by that which refers to *Ktvā* (= the term *Ktvā*), then the prohibition of *guṇa* [taught by the *sūtra*] *kṅiti ca* (1.1.5) does not apply right because of the intervention by *iṬ*, [and] so what is the point of prohibiting [*Ktvā*'s state of being marked by *K* by 1.2.18]?

3c But others, thinking that this *jñāpaka* [is] weak because [the locative case in] *kṅiti* [in 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*] is a *nimittasaptamī* "locative of cause", accept only that [the ypbh] is established through logical principle.

4 [In the current *paribhāṣā*,] the meaning of *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate* (= the wording in VḌV 17, see §4.2) is expressed. [It is] not a different *paribhāṣā*.

5.4 Explanation

5.4.1 text part 1 and 3a: the establishment of the ypbh through logical principle (*yuktisiddhi*)

Text part 1 appears to me very terse. In Sīradeva's commentary on the ypbh in his Bṛhat*paribhāṣā*vṛtti (SīV), there is a similar but more complete passage in the beginning, which I believe expresses the same idea as text part **1** and **3a** here in PuV

Here are these two sentences side by side, with the differences marked out:

PuV: *"sarveṣām" ity atra ca suṭaḥ subgrahaṇena grahaṇāj jhalādau supi ity etvaṃ sidhyati.*

SīV: *tena "sarveṣām" ity atra suṭaḥ subgrahaṇena grahaṇāj jhalādau supy etvaṃ sidhyati.* (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. १६६, lines 7-8 under *paribhāṣā* #4)

18. In what follows, I quote, translate, and explain this passage in SīV 4. Through this, text part **1** and **3a** here in PuV 18 could also be illuminated.

Text

(SīV 4 *āgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*)

“ādyantau ṭakitau” ity atrādyantaśabdayor avayavavacanatvāṭ ṭitkitor āgamayor ādyantāvayavatvam atidiṣṭam. “mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ” ity atrāpy antagrahaṇānuvṛttyā mito `py antāvayavatvam. “avayavāś cāvayavigrahaṇena gṛhyante” ity uktam. ataḥ siddheyaṃ paribhāṣā “āgamās tadguṇībhūtāḥ” iti. (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. १६६)

Translation

Since the words *ādi* “beginning” and *anta* “end” in [the *sūtra*] *ādyantau ṭadikau* (1.1.46) denote parts, the state of [being] a beginning part or an end part is extended to an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* or *K* [respectively]. And also, since the term *anta* “end” is carried forth in [the *sūtra*] *mid aco`ntyāt paraḥ* (1.1.47), the status of being an end part [is extended] also to [an *āgama*] marked with *M*. And [the following] has been stated: parts are [also] referred to by that which refers to the whole. Therefore, this *paribhāṣā āgamās tadguṇībhūṭās [tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante]* is established.

Explanation

1 On the source of the statement *avayavā avayavigrahaṇena gṛhyante* in the quoted SīV passage and *avayavasyāvayavigrahaṇena grahaṇam* in text part **3a** in PuV 18

I have not found the statement *avayavā avayavigrahaṇena gṛhyante* or *avayavasyāvayavigrahaṇena grahaṇam* in the index (p. 468) of *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, in *Bhāṣya*, *Kāśikā*, or *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*. I have also not found these two statements or any other statement expressing similar ideas in what precedes the sentence *avayavāś cāvayavigrahaṇena gṛhyante ity uktam* in SīV (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, pp. १६१-१६६).

2

In the quoted SīV passage, Sīradeva tries to establish the ypbh through logical principle (*yuktisiddhi*). The argument runs as follows. According to 1.1.46, an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* is the beginning (of an *āgamin*), and an *āgama* marked with *K* is the end (of an *āgamin*). Since the beginning is a part (of the whole), and the end is also a part (of the whole), an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* is a part (of the whole, which is the *āgamin*), and an *āgama* marked with *K* is also a part (of the whole, which is the *āgamin*). In 1.1.47, since the word *anta* "end" is carried forth from 1.1.46, an *āgama* marked with *M* is also the end (of an *āgamin*), and thus a part (of the whole, which is the *āgamin*). Now, the logical principle that parts are [also] referred to by that which refers to the whole has already been stated and established. Since the *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ*, *K*, and *M* are all parts (*avayava*) and their *āgamins* the corresponding wholes (*avayavin*), by deduction we get the following statement: *āgamas* are [also] referred to by that which refers to the *āgamin* (*āgamā āgamigrahaṇena gṛhyante*), which is in effect our ypbh. Therefore, the ypbh, being only a special case of the more general statement that parts are [also] referred to by that which refers to the whole, is established.

Now, coming back to text parts 1 and 3a in PuV 18, I think text part **1** in PuV 18, which is very similar to but more succinct than the two sentences in the

beginning of the quoted SīV passage, is aiming at the same idea as the quoted SīV passage. It may be possible that there were a few more sentences at the end of text part 1 in the ur-text, but they somehow got ommited, so that our current text part 1 appears terse even to the degree of being incomprehensible on its own.[105] If this is the case, it may be possible that Sīradeva has borrowed this argument of the

[105] In addition, it is possible that there is some element missing also at the very beginning of the ypbh commentary in PuV, because the word *tatra*, usually anaphoric, is here the very first word of PuV 18. If, as the first sentence in SīV 4 may suggest,* the word *tatra* refers to *sūtra* 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*, then my feeling is that *tatra* would be abrupt without any preceding element in the commentary. But if it turns out that there is really nothing missing in the very beginning, then perhaps *tatra* here refers to *āgamāḥ* in the *paribhāṣā* itself, that is to say, *tatra* is equal to *āgameṣu* "among the *āgamas*", in *nirdhāraṇasaptamī*, which goes with *ṭitkitor āgamayoḥ* ("among the *āgamas*, those marked with *Ṭ* or *K* …")? Or, alternatively, perhaps *tatra* is equal to *paribhāṣāyām* "with regard to the *paribhāṣā* (= the ypbh)", in *viṣayasaptamī*: but would then *atra* fit better here? I am not sure.

Furthermore, I feel that *tatra "kuṇḍā" ity atra*, i.e. the segment immediately following text part **1**, is also somewhat unsmooth, especially because of the word *tatra* in the beginning. The co-occurence of *tatra … atra* seems to me a bit strange, even though *atra* here seems to be justifiable.

All in all, there may be some textual problems in and after text part **1** of PuV 18, and a check through more manuscript evidence would turn out to be fruitful. Additionally, it would also help if one could get much more familiarised with Puruṣottamadeva's style, through reading much more of PuV.

* Here is the first sentence of PuV 18 and SīV 4 side by side, with the identical segments made bold:

PuV 18: *tatra* ***ṭitkitor āgamayor ādyantāvayavatvam atidiṣṭam.***

SīV 4: *"ādyantau ṭakitau" ity atrādyantaśabdayor avayavavacanatvāṭ* ***ṭitkitor āgamayor ādyantāvayavatvam atidiṣṭam.*** (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, p. १६६)

establishment of the ypbh through logical principle from Puruṣottamadeva. A check through more manuscript evidence may help to illuminate the situation here.[106]

5.4.2 Text part 2a *kuṇḍā*

7.1.58 *idito nuṃ dhātoḥ*

anuvṛtti none (cf. fn 46)

translation To a verbal root marked with *I*, [the *āgama*] *nUM* [is added].

explanation

1 The *āgama* is *n*, and the *āgamin* is the verbal root in issue (in the current case, *kuḍ*).

3.3.103 *guroś ca halaḥ*

anuvṛtti *pratyayaḥ* 3.1.1; *dhātoḥ* 3.1.91; *striyām* 94; *a* 102

[106] The argument of the establishment of the ypbh by logical principle in the above quoted SīV passage and thus text part **1** and **3a** (assuming text parts **1** and **3a** express the same idea as in the above quoted SīV passage) appears to me defective. First, the *anuvṛtti* of *anta* in 1.1.46 into 1.1.47 seems groundless. Second, even if *anta* can be carried forth from 1.1.46 into 1.1.47, and so any *āgama* marked with *M* is also a part, the argument has in sight only the *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ*, *K*, or *M*. There are *āgamas* which are not marked by any of these three markes, whether according to my proposed criterion (see §2.2) or according to *Kāśikā*. An example is the item *aiC* (#14 in the table in §2.3.2), which is an *āgama* according to both my proposed criterion and according to *Kāśikā* on 7.3.3. Such *āgamas* (#3 *am*, #14 *aiC*, and #42 *r*) should also be taken into consideration.

translation And in the feminine, after a verbal root that [ends in] *hAL* (= any consonant) and [has] a *guru*, *a* [is added]; [and *a* is technically named] *pratyaya* "suffix".

explanation

1 On *guroḥ* in the *sūtra*. In my translation, I have followed KV in interpreting *guru* as *gurumat*, so not "being a *guru*" but "having a *guru*", where the suffix *matUP* is understood, although I am not sure whether the phenomenon of a invisible *matUP* is common or whether *Kāśikā*'s interpretation is suitable or justifiable. At the moment, I cannot think of a better solution.

2 On *guru*, see point 4 under explanation of *sūtra* 7.3.86 in §4.4.1.

To derive the prātipadika *kuṇḍā* "burning"from the verbal root *kuḍI* (1.289 *dāhe* "burn"; *kuṇḍate*),[107] we first apply 7.1.58, so that the *āgama nUM* is added after *u* in *kuḍ*. Now, in order for 3.3.103 to apply, we need a verbal root that has a *guru*. *guru* is defined in 1.4.11 *saṃyoge guru* and 1.4.12 *dīrghaṃ ca* as either a short vowel followed by a consonant cluster or a long vowel. In *kunḍ* in stage 2, where *kuḍ* alone has the technical name "verbal root", *u* in *kuḍ* is not *guru*, since it is a short vowel and is followed only by *ḍ*, i.e. not by a consonant cluster. Thus we do not have a verbal root that has a *guru*, and there is a problem.

With the help of the ypbh, the *āgamin* plus the *āgama*, i.e. *kunḍ*, will have the name verbal root *(dhātu)*. Now, since *u* in the verbal root *kuṇḍ* is followed by a

[107] *kuṇḍā* may be derived from two other verbal roots: *kuṭI* (*kuḍI*) (1.345 *vaikalye*) and *kuḍI* (10.45 *rakṣaṇe*). For the latter, 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi* is applied so that *ṆiC*, added by 3.1.25 *satyāpapāśarūpavīṇātūlaślokasenālomatvacavarmavarṇacūrṇacurādibhyo ṇic*, is elided.

consonant cluster i.e. *nḍ*, it gets the name *guru*, and thus we have a verbal root (*kuṇḍ*) that has a *guru* (*u*). Therefore, 3.3.103 can now apply.

1	*kuḍ*		
2	*kunḍ*		*idito nuṃ dhātoḥ* 7.1.58
3	*kunḍ*	*a*	*guroś ca halaḥ* 3.3.103
…			
4	*kuṇḍā*		

5.4.3 Text part 2b *sarveṣām*

See the explanation in §7.4.1.

5.4.4 Text part 3b: the *jñāpaka* in 1.2.18

The argument in text part 3b is essentially the same as the argument in text part 2a-2b in VḌV. See my explanation there in §4.4.1. Here I give only a quick summary.

1	*div*	*tvā*	
2	*div*	*itvā*	
3	*dev*	*itvā*	7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*

If the ypbh does not exist, then *div-itvā* at stage 2 will consist of three compartments: the verbal root *div*, the *āgama iṬ*, and the *āgamin ārdhadhātuka* suffix *Ktvā*. 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca* will not apply at stage 2 because of the intervention by *iṬ*, and consequently,

1.2.18, which aims at cancelling the effect of the marker *K* in *Ktvā*, or in other words, cancelling the effect of 1.1.5, is purposeless, because 1.1.5 will not appy in the first place. But no *sūtra* can be purposeless, and so the ypbh must exist.

5.4.5 Text part 3c: against the *jñāpaka* in 1.2.18

What I have explained in the preceding section and in §4.4.1 in VḍV is based on the view that the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is a *parasaptamī* (see **translation** and **explanation** under 1.1.5 in §4.4.1). There is a different view, according to which the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is not a *parasaptamī* "locative of a following item", but a *nimittasaptamī* "locative of cause". This is the view of, for example, *Kāśikā* on 1.1.5:

> 1.1.5 *kṅiti ca*
>
> *Kāśikā*: *nimittasaptamy eṣā. kṅinnimitte ye guṇavṛddhī prāpnutaḥ, te na bhavataḥ.* (p. 7)
>
> **Translation** This (= the locative case in *kṅiti*) [is] a *nimittasaptamī* "locative of cause". The *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* that would obtain being conditioned by [an item] marked with *K* or *Ṅ* does not obtain.
>
> **Explanation** The essential difference between a *parasaptamī* and *nimittasaptamī* interpretation is, I think, the following. Under the *parasaptamī* interpretation, one would require that the item marked with *K* or *Ṅ* follow immediately the potential substituend of *guṇa* or *vṛddhi*. Under the *nimittasaptamī* interpretation, this is no longer required. As long as the item marked with *K* or *Ṅ* is a cause or condition (*nimitta*) of the *guṇa* / *vṛddhi* substitution, 1.1.5 will apply. Thus, under the *nimittasaptamī* interpretation, 1.1.5 can apply in cases where 1.1.5 is desired but cannot apply under the *parasaptamī* interpretation.

For example, to derive *kṛtta* "cut", the past passive partiple of of the verbal root *kṛt* "to cut", we add the suffix *Kta* to the verbal root *kṛt*.

1 *kṛt*

2 *kṛt* *ta*

Now, under the *parasaptamī* interpretaion, for 1.1.5 to be able to apply, we need that the item marked with *K* or *Ṅ*, here *Kta*, follows immediately *ṛ* in *kṛt*, the potential substituend of the *guṇa* substitute. But this is obviously not the case, because *t* in *kṛt* comes in between. The result is that 1.1.5 will not be able to apply, and thus 7.3.86 will be able to apply, resulting in the undesired form **kartta*.

*3 *kart* *ta*

Now, under the *nimittasaptamī* interpretation, it is no longer required that *Kta* follows immediately *ṛ* in *kṛt*. As long as *Kta* is a cause or condition (*nimitta*) of the *guṇa* substitution in the place of ṛ, 1.1.5 will be able to apply. According to 7.3.86, the cause of the *guṇa* substitution in the place of *ṛ* is a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* suffix that immediately follows the *aṅga*. In our case, *Kta* is an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, and it follows immediately the *aṅga kṛt*. So *Kta* is such a cause of the *guṇa* substitution in the place of *ṛ*, and so 1.1.5 will be able to apply, so that we will not have the *guṇa* subsittution in the place of *ṛ* in *kṛt*, and the desired form *kṛtta* can thus be obtained.[108]

[108] Although I do not know enough on this topic, my current opinion is that Pāṇini himself may have not intended the *nimittasaptamī* interpretation for the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 as offered by *Kāśikā*. The reason is the following. Pāṇini has taught explicitly the *parasaptamī* interpretation for any locative case in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in 1.1.66 *tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*, and he has not given any *sūtra* teaching the intepretation of *nimittasaptamī*. Accordingly, one should interpret any locative case in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as a *parasaptamī* in the first place, unless otherwise taught (e.g. 3.1.92 *tatropapadaṃ saptamīstham*). The intepretation of *nimittasaptamī* here offered by *Kāśikā* is

Now, with the above explanation in mind, the argument behind text part 3c runs perhaps in the following way. **First, let us assume that the ypbh does not exist**. Under the view of *nimittasaptamī*, at above stage 2 in the derivation of *devitvā*, 1.1.5 would still be able to apply, because the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is a *nimittasaptamī* and thus the intervening elements are no longer an obstacle, just like *t* in *kṛt* (above stage 2 in the derivation of *kṛtta*). And so **1.2.28**, which aims at cancelling the effect of 1.1.5, **is purposeful**. **Now, if the ypbh does exist**, *itvā* will get the name *ārdhadhātuka*, and 7.3.86 will be able to apply. 1.1.5, with its *nimittasaptamī* interpretaion, will also be able to apply, because *itvā* is the cause of the *guṇa* substitution in the place of *ṛ* and it is marked by *K*, and thus the *guṇa* substitute is one that is conditioned by an item marked by *K*, i.e. *itvā*. Consequently, **1.2.28**, aiming at cancelling the effect of 1.1.5, **is also purposeful**. **Therefore**, 1.2.28 cannot intimate the existence of the ypbh, because it is, like other *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtras*, always purposeful, whether the ypbh exists or not.[109]

---

apparently in order to solve problems like the one I have mentioned above in deriving *kṛtta*. Perhaps such problems can be solved in other ways, without resorting to a *nimittasaptamī* interpretation for *kṅiti* in 1.1.5. For a discussion on this topic, see e.g. Joshi-Roodbergen's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* vol. 1 p. 8 point 5.

[109] In fact, I do not regard as convincing the argument in text part **3c**, or at least my supposed argument here, which I assume to be behind the idea of text part **3c**. It appears to me that even if the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is a *nimittasaptamī*, 1.2.18 can still serve as a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh, because of the following. First, let us assume that the ypbh does not exist. Even if the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is a *nimittasaptamī*, 1.1.5 can still not apply at stage 2, because *Ktvā* is not a *nimitta* of the *guṇa* substitution for i in *div*: this is because of the intervention by *iṬ*. 7.3.86, the *sūtra* teaching the *guṇa* substitution here, cannot apply because it requires an *ārdhadhātuka* or *sārvadhātuka* suffix that immediately follows the *aṅga*, but here the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *Ktvā* is not immediately following the *aṅga div*, being intervened by *iṬ*. So *Ktvā* cannot be a cause, or in other words, the *guṇa* substitution conditioned by *Ktvā* will not take place in the first place, so 1.1.5,

5.4.6 Text part 4

At the end of his commentary, Puruṣottamadeva notes the wording *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate* and remarks that the *paribhāṣā* in this wording expresses the same meaning as the *paribhāṣā* in the wording *āgamā yadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*, i.e. the one he has commented on in PuV 18 - they are just two different wordings of the same *paribhāṣā* (i.e. the ypbh), and not two different *paribhāṣās*. See also point 4 in §3.3.4.

5.4.6.1 Comments on the relation between PuV 18 and VḍV 17

If we assume to be true Abhyankar's view of the chronological order of the different Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* texts, as e.g. reflected in the order in which these texts are arranged in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, Puruṣottamadeva comes next after Vyāḍi. In line with this, all the major elements in Vyāḍi's commentary on the ypbh have been discussed by Puruṣottamadeva in his commentary, i.e. the example *sarveṣām* as a purpose of the ypbh and the *jñāpaka* in 1.2.18. In addition to this, the ypbh in its form found in VḍV (#17) is explicitly mentioned at the end of Puruṣottamadeva's commentary (text part **4**). It is thus likely that Puruṣottamadeva had Vyāḍi's commentary on the ypbh in mind when he composed his commentary, where he also included new elements (the establishment of the ypbh through logical principle in text part **1**, the example *kuṇḍā* as a purpose of the ypbh in text part **2**, and text part **3c**, on *nimittasaptamī* in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5). This possible link between PuV and VḍV -

---

which aims at prohibiting it, will also not apply. Therefore, 1.2.28, which aims at prohibiting the effect of 1.1.5, is purposeless. Therefore, even if the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is a *nimittasaptamī*, if the ypbh does not exist, 1.2.28 will still be purposeless. Thus, even if the locative case in *kṅiti* in 1.1.5 is a *nimittasaptamī*, 1.2.18 can still serve as a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh.

for example, to what extent Puruṣottamadeva in his PuV supposedly depended on Vyāḍi's VḍV - should be clarified by further research.

6 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita

6.1 On Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita and his *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*

Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita is dated to the 17th century, perhaps earlier than Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa (also see fn 120). He is said to be the student of Jñānendra Sarasvatī, the author of *Tattvabodhinī* on *Siddhāntakaumudī*. He wrote other works on grammar, including commentaries on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *Mahābhāṣya,* and *Siddhāntakaumudī*. The relation between this Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita and the Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita connected with Appayya Dīkṣita should be clarified by further research.

The *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, presumably following the Pāṇinian tradition, contains the commentary on 140 *paribhāṣās*. The commentary on each *paribhāṣā* is generally short. As far as I know, two editions are available of this work: Sāstrī's edition = *The Paribhāshāvṛitti of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkshita,* edited by T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī (1915) (based on two manuscripts in Malayalam script, marked as क and ख) and *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (#14; based on presumably Sāstrī's edition [110] and one manuscript, further information of which I did not manage to find out).[111]

[110] On p. 4 in the "prefatory note" of *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, Abhyankar writes that "the text of this *vṛtti* [= *Paribhāṣāvṛtti*] has been based upon the printed edition, now rare, and one manuscript." I have not managed to find out in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* what this "printed edition" exactly refers to, and I presume the referent is Sāstrī's edition.

[111] The sources of the information I give in §6.1 are the following: Sāstrī's edition: "preface" and "*nivedanā*"; *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*: p. 4 in the "prefatory note" and pp. 30-31 section 48; Abhyankar's Dictionary: p. 226 entries "nīlakaṇṭha", "nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita or vājapeyin", and "nīlakaṇṭhamakhin". See these for more information.

6.2 Text and translation

The texts of the ypbh with the commentary in Sāstrī's edition (pp. 2-3) and *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (p. २९३) are identical in most places. Below is the reproduction of the text from these two sources together with the translation.

IV *yadāgamās*[112] *tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

> IV *Āgamas* added to [*āgamins* (= yad = tad)], being subordinate to [these *āgamins*], are [also] referred to by that which refers to [these *āgamins*].

1 *pradhānasyāvayavabhūtā āgamā avayavigrahaṇena gṛhyanta ity arthaḥ.*

> **1** The meaning is: *āgamas*, being parts of a predominant [item], are [also] referred to by that which refers to the whole.

2 *iyaṃ ca lokanyāyasiddhety "ādyantau ṭakitāu" iti sūtre bhāṣyam.*

> **2** And [according to] *Bhāṣya* on the *sūtra ādyantau ṭakitau* (1.1.46), this [*paribhāṣā*] is established through principles of ordinary life.

3 *"neṭi" iti niṣedho 'pi jñāpakaḥ. anyatheḍvati sici "sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu" ity asya prāpter evābhāvāt kiṃ tanniṣedhārthena "neṭi" iti sūtreṇeti spaṣṭam evākare.*[113]

> **3** Also the prohibition *neṭi* (7.2.4) is a *jñāpaka* (= a clue in a *sūtra* intimating the existence of a *paribhāṣā*). Otherwise (= if the ypbh does not exist), since

[112] Ms. ख in Sāstrī's edition has *tadāgamās*.

[113] *spaṣṭam evākare* is the reading in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* and ms. ख in Sāstrī's edition (the latter found in a footnote). Sāstrī has adopted and presented in his edition rather the reading *spaṣṭam ākare*, presumably the reading in ms. क.

before [the suffix] *sIC* with [the *āgama*] *iṬ* [the *sūtra*] *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* (7.2.1) will not apply in the first place, what is the use of the *sūtra neṭi*, which aims at prohibiting it (= *sūtra* 7.2.1)? This is indeed clear in the source (= *Bhāṣya*).

4 *iyaṃ ca varṇagrahaṇe na pravartata āne muko vidhānād iti "ur aṇ raparaḥ"*[114] *iti sūtre bhāṣye spaṣṭam.*

4 And [the following] is clear in *Bhāṣya* on the *sūtra ur aṇ raparaḥ* (1.1.51): this [*paribhāṣā*] does not apply when a [single] sound is mentioned [as the *āgamin*], because [the *sūtra*] *āne muk* (7.2.82) has been taught.

6.3 Explanation

6.3.1 On the source of text part 2 in the *Bhāṣya*

I cannot find any relevant passage in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.46 or by using Lahiri's Concordance (= P.C. Lahiri, *Concordance Panini-Patañjali* [1935]) (1.1.46 is on p. 2).

6.3.2 On the source of text part 3 in the *Bhāṣya*

I cannot find any relevant passage in *Bhāṣya* on 7.2.1 and 7.2.3 (there is no *Bhāṣya* on 7.2.4) or by using Lahiri's Concordance (7.2.1, 3, and 4 are on p. 94).

6.3.3 On the working of the argument in text part 3

[114] I have adopted the reading in Sāstrī's edition. *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* has, perhaps erroneously, *ur aṇ pare*.

7.2.1 *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1

translation [The final *iK* (= *i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ, ḷ*)] of an *aṅga* that is followed by *sIC* which is [itself] followed by *parasmaipadas* [is replaced by] *vṛddhi*.

explanation

1 On *sIC*. *sIC* is a suffix added to the verbal root when the aorist suffix *lUṄ* (or its verbal ending substitutes) follows. It is one of the most common suffixes or signs of the aorist, found in forms like *a-nai-ṣ-am* "[I] led" and *a-lāv-iṣ-am* "[I] cut". (In both cases, 7.2.1 is applied and *sIC* is replaced by the retroflex *ṣ*.[115])

7.2.3 *vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* 7.2.1

translation The *aC* (= any vowel) [of an *aṅga* that is (1) the verbal root] *vad, vraj*, or ends with *hAL* (= consonant) [and (2) followed by *sIC* which is itself followed by *parasmaipadas*] is replaced by [*vṛddhi*].

7.2.4 *neṭi*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ* 7.2.3; *sici vṛddhiḥ parasmaipadeṣu* 7.2.1

translation [The *aC* (= any vowel) of an *aṅga* that is (1) the verbal root *vad, vraj*, or ends with *hAL* (= consonant) and (2) followed by *sIC* that itself

[115] By 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ*.

begins with] *iṬ* [and is followed by *parasmaipadas* is] not [replaced by *vṛddhi*].

explanation

1 On *iṭi sici*. *iṭi sici* is interpreted as *iḍādau sici* "before *sIC* which begins with *iṬ*" with the help of the following *paribhāṣā*:

yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe. (#33 in PbhI)

translation When a term referring to [a single] *aL* (= any sound) [is in such a form as] "*yasmin*" (i.e. in the locative case), an operation [takes place] with [an item] that begins with that (= *aL*) serving as the right context.[116]

2 For convenience and ease of understanding, here is a rough summary of the working of 7.2.1, 7.2.3, and 7.2.4 -

[116] The translation here is tentative in nature. I wish to mention the following interpretational decisions that I made during my translation: 1) *algrahaṇe*: the locative case here is interpreted as a locative absolute (*satisaptamī*), the predicate here being *yasminn* [*iti*]; 2) *yasmin*: as *yasminn* [*iti*], so "in such a form as '*yasmin*'" (i.e. in the locative case). See for example Sīradeva on this *paribhāṣā* in his *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. 174): *yasminn iti saptamīnirdiṣṭe 'lgrahaṇe*… It then follows that *yasmin* here does not need to pair with *tad* in *tadādau*.

It may be possible to interpret this *paribhāṣā* in other ways, and I am not sure about the best way to take it. In addition, I think the word order of this *paribhāṣā* is remarkable: if *yasmin* really goes with *algrahaṇe*, why are they not put next to each other? (Incidentally, *yasmin vidhis tadādāv al* forms an odd *pāda* in the *anuṣṭubh* meter - is this only a coincidence?)

With the verbal root / *aṅga* followed by *sIC* which is itself followed by a *parasmaipada* (*sici parasmaipadeṣu*; e.g. -*s*-*am*), the vowel of the verbal root / *aṅga* is modified differently depending on the different shapes of the verbal root / *aṅga*:

shape of the verbal root / *aṅga*		vowel of the verbal root is replaced by	*sūtra*	example
Ending with *iK* (*iganta*)[117]		*vṛddhi*	7.2.1	*anai-ṣ-am* "[I] led"
Ending with a consonant (*halanta*)	*aniṭ* verbal root	*vṛddhi*	7.2.3	*abhait-s-am* "[I] split"
	seṭ verbal root (so *iṭi sici*)	no *vṛddhi*	7.2.4	*adev-iṣ-am* "[I] played" (*guṇa* substitute by 7.3.86[118])

As is clear from the above clarification of the three *sūtras* 7.2.1, 3, and 4, the target of the prohibition in 7.2.4 is not, as presented here by Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, the *vṛddhi* resulting from 7.2.1, but rather the *vṛddhi* resulting from 7.2.3. Despite this imprecise identification of the source of the *vṛddhi*, the actual working of the argument is not influenced. My explanation here builds upon this correction.

In deriving, for example, the aorist finite form *adeviṣam* "[I] played" from the verbal root *div*, we have the following stages of *prakriyā* that are relevant:

1	*div*	*s*	*am*	
2	*div*	*is*	*am*	*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* 7.2.35
3	*dev*	*is*	*am*	*pugantalaghūpadhasya ca* 7.3.86

7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*

[117] It can be inferred (e.g. from the above translation of 7.2.1) that the *aṅga* in 7.2.1 must be one ending with *iK* (*iganta*).

[118] 7.3.86 *pugantalaghūpadhasya ca*.

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *sārvadhātukārdhadhātukayoḥ* 7.3.84; *guṇaḥ* 7.3.82

translation And *guṇa* [replaces the *iK* (= *i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ, ḷ*)] of an *aṅga* that (1) is followed by a *sārvadhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] and (2) ends with *pUK* or has a *laghu* as its penultimate sound.

explanation

1 On "[replaces the *iK*]" in my translation. The substituend is not specified in the *sūtra* or the *anuvṛtti*. It is identified with the help of the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.3 *iko guṇavṛddhī*. Accordingly, I supply *ikaḥ* and thus have "[replaces the *iK*]" in my translation.

2 On *laghu*. *Laghu* is a short vowel that is not followed by a consonant cluster. See 1.4.10 *hrasvaṃ laghu*, 11 *saṃyoge guru*, and 12 *dīrghaṃ ca*.

If the ypbh exists and applies here, then under *sic* in *sici* in 7.2.3 (carried forth from 7.2.1) one would understand also *is*, i.e. the suffix *sIC* with the *iṬ āgama* added, and hence we will have an undesired *vṛddhi* substitution for the vowel in *div* by 7.2.3 -

*3 *daiv is am* *vadavrajahalantasyācaḥ* 7.2.3

leading finally to **adaiviṣam*.

With 7.2.4, this undesired *vṛddhi* substitution is prohibited. **Hence if the ypbh exists and applies, 7.2.4 has a purpose and is not redundant.**

If the ypbh does not exist, *sic* in *sici* in 7.2.3 can only refer to *s* and not *is*, and as in *div-is-am* the *aṅga div* is not followed by *sIC* due to the intervention of *iṬ*, 7.2.3 will not be able to apply, and there will not be *vṛddhi* substitution in *div-is-am* in the first place. Hence it does not make sense to prohibit it as in 7.2.4. The same applies in all the parallel cases. **Therefore, if the ypbh does not exist, 7.2.4 becomes redundant.**

Since no *sūtra* is redundant, the ypbh must exist.

6.3.4 On the source of text part 4 in the *Bhāṣya* and the identification of *Bhāṣya* sources in the current text

I cannot find any relevant passage in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.51 or by using Lahiri's Concordance looking for 7.2.82 (7.2.82 is on p. 97).

It is remarkable that none of the three *Bhāṣya* sources mentioned in the text can be identified (§6.3.1, §6.3.2, and §6.3.4). Did Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita know a *Bhāṣya* the text of which is different from that in Kielhorn's edition (1962-1972)?

6.3.5 On the working of the argument in text part 4

Text part **4** has not appeared clear to me. In what follows I try to bring to light how the argument may run. For this purpose, I first explain *sūtra* 7.2.82.

7.2.82 *āne muk*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *ataḥ* 7.2.80

translation The [*āgama*] *mUK* is added to [the sound] *a* that is a part of an *aṅga* that is followed by *āna*.

explanation

This *sūtra* accounts for the sound *m* in the middle and passive present participles ending with *māna* - for example, *pac-am-āna* "cooking for oneself", from the verbal root *pac* -

1	*pac*	*a*	*āna*	
2	*pac*	*am*	*āna*	*āne muk* 7.2.82

The *āgama* here is *m*, and the *āgamin* is the second *a* in *pac-a*.[119]

Now, **if the ypbh also applies in cases where the *āgamin* consists of a single sound (*varṇagrahaṇa*)**, then it will also apply in the context of *pac-am-āna*, where the *āgamin* is the single sound *a*. As a result, *am*, the combination of the *āgama m* plus the *āgamin a*, will be treated like the *āgamin a*, and so 6.1.101 will come into play, by which one would substitute *ā* for *am-ā* (treated like *a-ā*), and then arrive at the undesired form *pacāna*.

[119] My interpretation of 7.2.82 here follows that of the *Kāśikā* (p. 821). A problem with this interpretation may be the unspecifiedness of *a* - in forms like *pac-a*, it would also be possible to add *mUK* to the first *a*, which would then lead to undesired forms. Indeed, in *Bhāṣya* on 7.2.82 (3:303), we find discussions touching on the interpretation of the *sūtra* and the identity of the *āgamin*. If we interpret the *sūtra* in another way, translated as "The [*āgama*] *mUK* is added to an *aṅga* that ends with [the sound] *a* and is followed by *āna*", the *āgamin* would then be *pac-a* rather than *a*. But this interpretation is also not completely unproblematic, as discussed e.g. in *Bhāṣya* 7.2.82.1 (3:303). Thus the interpretation of the *sūtra* and the identity of the *āgamin* here seems to me an issue that cannot be immediately solved in a satisfactory way, and for the current context I think a temporary interpretation following the *Kāśikā* would suffice.

1	*pac*	*a*	*āna*	
2	*pac*	*am*	*āna*	*āne muk* 7.2.82
*3	*pac*		*āna*	*akas savarṇe dīrghaḥ* 6.1.101

6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*

anuvṛtti *saṃhitāyām* 6.1.72; *ekaḥ pūrvaparayoḥ* 6.1.84

translation In close junction of sounds, a single [substitute] being a long vowel replaces both [the *aK*] that precedes its homogeneous sound and [the homogeneous sound] that follows the *aK* (= *a*, *ā*, *i*, *ī*, *u*, *ū*, *ṛ*, *ṝ*, *ḷ*).

Consequently, ***sūtra* 7.2.82 becomes redundant**, because the *m* it teaches will invariably drop in such a way. **Since no *sūtra* is redundant, the ypbh does not apply in cases where the *āgamin* consists of a single sound (*varṇagrahaṇa*)**.[120]

Comment

To the above statement that the ypbh does not apply in cases where the *āgamin* consists of a single sound (§6.3.5), we can already find a counterexample in

[120] This argument here has been employed by Nāgeśa in his *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* on the ypbh to argue for a different point - that the ypbh is non-mandatory (*anitya*). See the following in PbhI 11: *āne mug iti mugvidhānasāmarthyād eṣā* [= ypbh] *anityā. anyathā pacamāna ity ādāv akārasya muky anayā paribhāṣayā* [= ypbh] *viśiṣṭasya savarṇadīrghe tadvaiyarthyaṃ spaṣṭam eva* (p. 9 lines 10-12).

Moreover, Nāgeśa may have had Nīlakaṇṭha's position in text part **4** in mind when he, a little bit further down from the above quotation, argued the following (p. 9 lines 15-16): *na coktajñāpakād* [= 7.2.82 *āne muk*] *varṇagrahaṇe 'syā* [= ypbh] *apravṛttir iti vācyam*…, where he seems to be directly refuting Nīlakaṇṭha's position in text part **4**.

adeviṣam discussed in §6.3.3. Here, at stage 2 of the *prakriyā*, in order that 7.3.86 applies, it seems that we cannot but resort to the ypbh, so that the *āgama iṬ* plus the *āgamin ārdhadhātuka* suffix *sIC* is taken together as having the technical name *ārdhadhātuka*. Otherwise, due to the intervention of *iṬ*, 7.3.86 would not be able to apply. Thus, the ypbh does apply here in a case where the *āgamin* consists of a single sound, i.e. *s* (also compare fn 120).

7 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣābhāskara* of Haribhāskara

7.1 On the author and the work

7.1.1 On the author

The four beginning verses (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३१७) and six concluding verses (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३७४) of the *Paribhāṣābhāskara*, together with the colophon at the end (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३७४), provide information about its author.

The author has called himself "Bhāskara" only,[121] and the colophon too records only "Bhāskara".[122] However, according to Abhyankar (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. 31), "his original name was Bhāskara, but he was called by the name Haribhāskara."[123] Accordingly, Abhyankar, in both *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* and his Dictionary, has consistently used the name Haribhāskara. In the current work I follow Abhyankar in using the name Haribhāskara instead of Bhāskara.

According to the colophon ("…***kaśyapānvaya***saṃbhavāgnihotrikula…"), the Agnihotrin family is in the lineage of Kaśyapa. Starting from his great-grandfather, Haribhāskara's lineage is: Puruṣottamabhaṭṭa Agnihotrin (concluding verse 2) → Haribhaṭṭa Agnihotrin (concluding verse 2) → Āpājibhaṭṭa Agnihotrin (concluding verse 4) → Bhāskara Agnihotrin (concluding verse 5).[124]

---

[121] *śrīgurūn pitarau natvāgnihotrī* ***bhāskarā****bhidhaḥ* (the beginning verse 2 *pāda* ab); *tanaya iha tadīyo `rīracad* ***bhāskarā****khyaḥ* (the concluding verse 5 *pāda* a).

[122] *…āpājibhaṭṭasūnu****bhāskara****viracitaḥ …*

[123] It would be better if Abhyankar had given a source for this statement.

[124] The name of the family is mentioned as Agnihotrin in the colophon (*…saṃbhav****āgnihotri****kula…*) and in the beginning verse 2 *pāda* b (*śrīgurūn pitarau natv****āgnihotrī*** *bhāskarābhidhaḥ*), but in the concluding verse 2 *pāda* b one finds … *agnihotr****a****kula…*

The main deity Haribhāskāra has mentioned in the beginning and concluding verses is the Sun.[125]

Abhyankar has also given some information that I did not find in the beginning verses, concluding verses, or the colophon of the6 *Paribhāṣābhāskara* - regarding Haribhāskara's place: "His [= Haribhāskara's] native place was Tryambakeshvara in the Nāsik District [in Maharashtra]; but he was educated at Vārāṇasī where he lived after he completed his educatoin";[126] and regarding his time: Haribhāskara "lived in the seventeenth century" (Abhyankar's dictionary, p. 444, entry "haribhāskara (agnihotrī)"), "within a few years after Nīlakaṇṭha [= Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, the author of Paribhāsāvṛtti - see §6.1]" (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. 31).

For the source of the above summary, and for more information, see *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. 31 section 49, p. ३१७ beginning verses 1-4, p. ३७४ concluding verses 1-6 and colophon; and Abhyankar's Dictionary p. 444 entry "haribhāskara (agnihotrī)".

7.1.2 On *Paribhāṣābhāskara*

Many manuscripts exist of the *Paribhāṣābhāskara* (NCC 11: 221). The published text is only found in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (#15, pp. ३१७-३७४), where two manuscripts

[125] The beginning verse 1, i.e. the very beginning of the whole work, is a praise of the Sun, and in the concluding verse 5 *pāda* cd, as I understood it, Haribhāskara said that he dedicated / offered (*ārpipat*) his work *Paribhāṣābhāskara* to the Sun. In addition, the concluding verse 1 includes a play on the two meanings of the word *bhāskara*: the name of the author and sun.

[126] Tryambakeśvarapurī is mentioned as the place where Puruṣottamabhaṭṭa, Haribhāskara's great-grandfather, lived (concluding verse 2 *pāda* a), and Kāśī the place where Āpājibhaṭṭa, Haribhāskara's father, lived (concluding verse 4 *pāda* c). I did not find any explicit mention of place in direct connection with Haribhāskara himself in the beginning verses, concluding verses, or colophon.

A and B, about whose identity I have found hardly any information,[127] are seen in the footnote section. Altogether 132 *paribhāṣās* are discussed in this edition.

The *Paribhāṣābhāskara* is not supposed to be an advanced *paribhāṣā* treatise, given the word *bālabuddhaye* "for the understanding of the beginners" in the beginning verse 2 *pāda* d.[128]

Abhyankar (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. 31 section 49) has pointed out the connection between the *Paribhāṣābhāskara* and Sīradeva's *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*, calling the former an "epitome" of the latter, for example - "in the *Paribhāṣābhāskara*, the *paribhāṣās* are arranged according to the order followed by Sīradeva" with some deviation, and "apparently, the aim of the author [= Haribhāskara] was to explain lucidly and briefly the work of Sīradeva [= *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti*] ..." This connection should be clarified by further studies.[129]

NCC 11: 221 records three commentaries on *Paribhāṣābhāskara*. Abhyankar (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. 31 section 49) has also mentioned that "there is a short commentary upon the work [= *Paribhāṣābhāskara*] written by a pupil of Haribhāskara."

---

[127] In *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* I have only found the following sentence that is relevant: "The text of the work [= *Paribhāṣābhāskara*] is based upon a manuscript copy at the B. O. R. I. [= Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune]" (p. 4 in the "prefatory note"). So to find out about the identity of A and B, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute may be a good place to start from.

[128] The whole verse reads: *śrīgurūn pitarau natvāgnihotrī bhāskarābhidhaḥ / bhāskaraṃ paribhāṣāṇāṃ tanute bālabuddhaye* // (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३१७)

[129] So far as the ypbh is concerned, I do not think there is much similarity between Haribhāskara's) .s commentaries'and Sīradeva*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. ३१९-३२० and १६६-१६७(respectively

7.2 Text

Below I give the text in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (pp. ३१९-३२०). Text parts **3** and **4b** do not directly engage with the topic of the ypbh, and so they are not treated in the translation and explanation sections below. To make the structure clearer, I have added my own indentations to the text.

IV *āgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

1 *tacchabdenāgamī gṛhyate.*

2 *tena "sarveṣām" ity atra "āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ" iti suṭa āmgrahaṇena graḥaṇād "bahuvacane jhaly et" ity etvam.*

3[130] *tathā*[131] *"ṣaṭ tsantaḥ"*[132] *ity atra dhuṭaḥ*[133] *parāditvāṭ ṭavargasya padāntatvena "na padāntāt ..."*[134] *iti ṣṭutvaniṣedhaḥ. ata eva "ḍaḥ si dhuk" iti nākāri.*[135] *manoramāyāṃ tv "ata eva vakṣyamāṇas tuk*[136] *ihaiva na kṛtaḥ"*[137] *ity uktam. tac ca "cayo dvitīyāḥ"*[138] *iti dvitīyādeśāpatter ayuktam iti kecit.*

---

[130] In this text part **3**, I have made many changes to the punctuation in Abhyankar's edition (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. ३१९-३२०).

[131] To get a better idea of how *tathā* here connects what precedes and what follows, and why text part **3** is here at all, I think manuscripts of this text should be checked.

[132] I have changed the original *santa* (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३१९) into *tsanta* (and added *ḥ* in the end), so that *dhUṬ* (→*t* 8.4.55) is here explicit.

[133] 8.3.29 *ḍaḥ si dhuṭ*.

[134] 8.4.42 *na pādāntāṭ ṭor anām*.

[135] 8.3.29 *ḍaḥ si dhuṭ*.

[136] 8.3.31 *śi tuk*.

[137] *Prauḍhamanoramā* 8.3.29 (p. 142 line 10 in the edition by Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri [1934]).

[138] 8.4.48.3 *cayo dvitīyāḥ śari pauṣkarasādeḥ*.

tac cintyam, "ata eva" [139] *ity evakārasya "śaṅkhaḥ pāṇḍura eva" itivad ayogavyavacchedārthatvāt.*

yady api śiromaṇimate dṛṣṭānte `py anyayogavyavaccheda eva "pārtha eva dhanurdharaḥ" itivad evakārārthas tathāpi daṇḍenaiva ghaṭa ityādāv anyayogavyavacchedārthāsaṃbhavam abhiprayatāṃ prācāṃ mate `yogavyavaccheda evakārārthaḥ saṃbhavaty eva.

ṣṭutvaniṣedhe tugakaraṇahetutvānyayogavyavaccheda eva vā prakṛtaivakārārtho `stu.

apyartho vaivakāraḥ.

tathā ca prakṛte tuko `karaṇahetvantarasattve `py akṣitiḥ, "upāyasyopāyāntarādūṣakatvāt" [140] *iti nyāyāt. uktaṃ hi bhartṛhariṇāpi "upeyapratipattyarthā upāyā avyavasthitā"*[141] *iti.*

etena "na saṃprasāraṇe saṃprasāraṇam"[142] *ity atra "ata eva jñāpakāt parasya yaṇaḥ saṃprasāraṇam"* [143] *iti grantho vyākhyātaḥ. anyathā śabdaparavipratiṣedhenāpi parasya yaṇaḥ saṃprasāraṇa evakārāsaṃgatiḥ.*

---

[139] *ata eva* here refers to the first two words in the above quotation from *Prauḍhamanoramā ata eva vakṣyamāṇas tug ihaiva na kṛtaḥ*.

[140] This quote is found in the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*, in Kauṇḍa Bhaṭṭa's commentary on Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's verse 14.9. (p. 501) *Pāda* cd of this verse is the next quote in the current text, see fn 141).

[141] I did not find this quote in the *Vākyapadīya*. In the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra*, it is *pāda* cd of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's verse 14.9. (p. 500)

[142] 6.1.37.

[143] ***antyasya*** *ata eva jñāpakād* I have not managed to trace this quote. The closest I have found is in *saṃprasāraṇam* ***pūrvaṃ*** *yaṇaḥSiddhāntakaumudī* 6.1.37 / 363 (vol. 1 p. 376 line 2).

yathāha "diva ut"[144] *ity atra rakṣitaḥ '"diu okasaḥ" iti sthite śabdaparavipratiṣedhād ukārasya yaṇi "divokasaḥ" iti'.*[145]

tathā '"paddan ..." [146] *iti sūtre prabhṛtigrahaṇaṃ prakārārtham ity uktam.*[147] *ata eva bhāṣye "māṃspacanyā ukhāyāḥ"*[148] *ity udāhṛtam'*[149] *ity api vyākhyātam, atrāpi hi "māṃsasya paci yuḍghañoḥ"*[150] *iti loparūpopāyāntarasattve `py evakārasyāyogavyavacchedārthatayā bādhakābhāvāt.*

---

[144] 6.1.131.

[145] *rakṣitaḥ* here probably refers to Maitreya Rakṣita, and this quote may be from his *Tantrapradīpa*.

[146] 6.1.63 *paddannomāshṛnniśasanyūṣandoṣanyakañchakannudannāsañ chasprabhṛtiṣu*.

[147] .Cf*Kāśikā* :6.1.63 *"śasprabhṛtiṣu" iti prakārārthe prabhṛtiśabdaḥ* ...(p. 612 lines 5-6 from bottom)

[148] This probably refers to *Bhāṣya* on 6.1.63.1.

māṃspacanyā ukhāyāḥ is found in several Vedic texts, e.g. *Ṛgveda* 1.162.13, in which verse it is a part of *pāda* a: *yan nīkṣaṇam māṃspacanyā ukhāyāḥ*. (vol. 1: 146; the meter is *triṣṭubh*.) I have not found *māṃspacanyā ukhāyāḥ* in the *Bhāṣya*, but I found *yan nīkṣaṇam māṃspacanyā* under 6.1.63.1 (3:41.22), and I think this is what is referred to by this *māṃspacanyā ukhāyāḥ* in the current text.

[149] I did not manage to trace this quote. Although I have put the first inverted comma (") after *ata eva* I am not entirely sure where the quote actually begins; but I think at least the part ,*tathā* .should be in the quote *bhāṣye ... ity udāhṛtam*

[150] Found in *Kāśikā* 6.1.144 (p. 633, last line in the commentary on 6.1.144). I have changed ***lyuḍ****ghañoḥ* in Abhyankar's edition (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३२०) to ***yuḍ****ghañoḥ*, which is the reading in *Kāśikā* 6.1.144. The reading ***lyuḍ****ghañoḥ* appears to me wrong, at least because it is unmetrical (*māṃsasya paci yuḍghañoḥ* constitutes *pāda* d in a verse in the *anuṣṭubh* meter).

ayasmayādigaṇapāṭhakalpanena [151] *saṃyogāntalopavāraṇaṃ* [152] *tu pakṣadvaye `pi samānam.*

na cākāralopapakṣe tatsthānivattvena saṃyogāntalopavāraṇād ayasmayādigaṇapāṭhakalpanaṃ na iti laghavam iti vācyam, "pūrvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivad"[153] *iti sthānivadbhāvābhāvād iti saṃkṣepaḥ.*

4a *nanu prakṛtaparibhāṣayā "bhūyād" ityādāv "ādyudāttaś ca" ity udāttatve labdhe punar yāsuṭa udāttavacanaṃ kimartham iti ced anyāgamānām anudāttatvajñāpakārtham iti gṛhāṇa.*

4b *ata eva "tásyāṃ suparṇā vṛṣaṇā"*[154] *ity ādau syāḍanudāttatvaṃ "sāv ekācaḥ ..."*[155] *iti vibhaktisvaraṃ bādhate iti kecit.*

tat "na gośvansāvavarṇa ..."[156] *iti niṣedhāsmaraṇanibandhanam.*

---

[151] 1.4.20 *ayasmayādīni cchandasi*. *Ayasmayādi* is a *gaṇa* found in the *Gaṇapāṭha* (#10 in Boehtlingk's Grammatik, p. 97*).

[152] 8.2.23 *saṃyogāntasya lopaḥ*.

[153] *purvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivat* is *paribhāṣā* #95 in HaV (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३६१), and is also found in several other Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* texts (PuV 112, SiV 92, NiV 128, and ŚeV 110), according to the index in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (pp. ४८०-४८१). (In all the above texts, the wording of the *paribhāṣā* is the same, i.e. *purvatrāsiddhīye na sthānivat*. In his index, Abhyankar has given for this *paribhāṣā* the wording ***pūrvatrāsiddhe*** *na sthānivat*, which is the wording found in *Jainendraparibhāṣāvṛtti* alone [#48, *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ९२].)

[154] *Ṛgveda* 10.114.3 *pāda*c (vol. 2418 :).

[155] 6.1.168 *sāv ekācas tṛtīyādir vibhaktiḥ*.

[156] 6.1.182 *na gośvansāvavarṇarāḍaṅkruṅkṛdbhyaḥ*.

vastuta āgamānudāttatvena vibhaktyudāttatvasya bādhane `pi ~~na~~ kṣatiḥ.[157]

"ekādeśa udāttenodāttaḥ"[158] *ity asya pravṛtteḥ. vede `pi hi dṛśyate "asyā́ ū ṣu ṇa upa sātaye"*[159] *iti. na cehāpi "... sāvavarṇa ..."* [160] *iti niṣedhaś śaṅkyaḥ. "ūḍidaṃpadādyappumraidyubhyaḥ"*[161] *ity asya jāgarūkatvāt.*

etena 'yāṭsyāḍvidhāyakasūtrayor yāṭsyāṭor [162] *ākārasthāne akārakaraṇe "ramāyai" ity ādau pararūpāpatteḥ. na cākāroccāraṇasāmarthyāt tannivṛttiḥ, "jñāyai" ity ādau vibhaktisvarabādhanārthatayopakṣīṇatvād akāroccāraṇasya' iti vidyāraṇyapañjikoktir apāstā.*

ata evoktaṃ manoramāyām "spaṣṭārthaṃ yāṭ kṛtaḥ"[163] *iti dik.*

5 *paribhāṣāyāṃ jñāpakaṃ "ṇer aniṭi" ity aniḍgrahaṇam iti ke cit. "neṭi" iti vṛddhiniṣedha ity anye. "adharāṇi" iti nirdeśa ity apare.*

---

[157] I would suggest reading *kṣatiḥ* instead of the original reading *na kṣatiḥ* (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३२०), since in what follows the author seems to be arguing **against** *āgamānudāttatvena vibhaktyanudāttatvasya bādhana*m.

[158] 8.2.5.

[159] *Ṛgveda* 1.138.4 *pāda* a (vol. 1: 127).

I have changed *sānaye*, the reading in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* (p. ३२०), into *sātaye*, the reading in the above-quoted *Ṛgveda* site (vol. 1: 127).

[160] 6.1.182 *na gośvansāvavarṇarāḍaṅkruṅkṛdbhyaḥ*.

[161] 6.1.171. On *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३२० the *sūtra* number is wrongly given as 6.1.**117**.

[162] I have changed the original *yāsyāṭor* (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ३२०) into the current *yāṭsyāṭor*.

[163] This quotation is found in *Prauḍhamanoramā* 7.3.113 (p. 309 lines 7-8 in the edition by Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri [1934]).

7.3 Translation

1 The word *tad* [in the *paribhāṣā*] refers to the *āgamin*.

2 (A purpose of the ypbh: *sarveṣām*)

Therefore, in the case of *sarveṣām*, since the *suṭ* [from the *sūtra*] *āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ* (7.1.52) is [also] referred to by that which refers to the genitive plural case ending (= the term *ām*), [one obtains] the substitute *e* by [the *sūtra*] *bahuvacane jhaly et* (7.3.103).

4a (A problem with regard to accent and a solution: the *āgama yā́sUṬ* in the form *bhūyā́t*)

But in *bhūyāt* etc, as the high-pitched nature [of *ā* in *yāsUṬ*] is [already] obtained by *ādyudāttaś ca* (3.1.3) with the help of the current *paribhāṣā*, why is there [then] the stating again that *yāsUṬ* is high-pitched [in 3.4.103]? - if [you argue] this, [then] understand that [stating again that *yāsUṬ* is high-pitched is] for the sake of [serving as] a *jñāpaka*[164] that the other *āgamas* are low-pitched.

5 (Three *jñāpakas*)

Some [say] that the *jñāpaka* with regard to [this] *paribhāṣā*[165] is the term *aniṭ* [in the *sūtra*] *ṇer aniṭi* (6.4.51). Others [speak of] the prohibition of *vṛddhi* [in the *sūtra*] *neṭi* (7.2.4). [Still] others [speak of] the term *adharāṇi* (1.1.34[166]).

---

[164] would be a better reading than *jñāpana* I think*jñāpaka* The translation would then be ."for ... ... the sake of indicating that"

[165] *paribhāṣāyā jñāpakaṃ* appears to me a better reading than what we have, i.e. *paribhāṣāyāṃ jñāpakaṃ*. The translation would then be "the *jñāpaka* of [this] *paribhāṣā*".

[166] 1.1.34 *pūrva-para-avara-dakṣiṇa-uttara-apara-**adharāṇi** vyavasthāyām asaṃjñāyām*.

7.4 Explanation

7.4.1 Text part 2 *sarveṣām*

7.1.52 *āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ*

This *sūtra* is explained in the explanation of *Bhāṣya* 7.1.33.0 (in explaning *sūtra* 7.1.33).

7.3.103 *bahuvacane jhaly et*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *ataḥ* 101; *supi* 102

translation *e* [replaces the final sound of an *aṅga* that ends with *a* and] is followed by [a *sUP* that is] *bahuvacana* [and starts with] *jhaL* (= all the consonants except *y*, *r*, *l*, *v*, *ṅ*, *ñ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *m*).

In deriving *sarveṣām* "of all", we have the *prātipadika sarva*, and the plural genitive suffix *ām*. The *āgama sUṬ* is added to the *āgamin ām* by 7.1.52:

1 *sarva ām*

2 *sarva sām* *āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ* 7.1.52

At this stage, to get the replacement of the final *a* in *sarva* by *e* by 7.3.101 *bahuvacane jhaly et*, one needs that *sām* has the technical names *bahuvacana* and *sUP*, two technical names possessed now only by the *āgamin ām*. With the help of the ypbh, *sām*, the *āgama* plus the *āgamin*, can have these two technical names, so that 7.3.101 *bahuvacane jhaly et* can apply and we get the substitute *e* in the place of the final *a* in *sarva*.

1	*sarva*	*ām*	
2	*sarva*	*sām*	*āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ* 7.1.52
3	*sarve*	*sām*	*bahuvacane jhaly et* 7.3.101[167]

7.4.2 Text part 4a *bhūyāt*

In the *prakriyā* of *bhūyāt* "may [it] be", active precative of the verbal root *bhū*, we replace the precative suffix *LIṄ* (*āśiṣi*) with the verbal ending *ti*, and then add the *āgama yāsUṬ* to *ti* by 3.4.103:

1	*bhū*	*LIṄ*	
2	*bhū*	*ti*	
3	*bhū*	*yās=ti* 3.4.103	*yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣūdātto ṅic ca*[168]

3.4.103 *yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣūdātto ṅic ca*

anuvṛtti *dhātoḥ* 3.1.91; *pratyayaḥ* 3.1.1; *liṅaḥ* 102

translation In the range of *parasmaipadas*, [the *āgama*] *yāsUṬ* [is added to *LIṄ* which is a suffix and follows a verbal root]; [this *yāsUṬ* is] high-pitched and has the marker *Ṅ*.

---

[167] → *sarveṣām* 8.3.59. This replacement of *s* by *ṣ* by 8.3.59 *ādeśapratyayayoḥ* also requires the application of the ypbh, so that *sām* gets the technical name *pratyaya* and *s* becomes a part of a *pratyaya*.

[168] → *yāϕ=ϕ=t-bhū* → 8.2.29 *yās=ϕ=t-bhū* → 3.4.100 *yās=s=t-bhū* → 3.4.107 *yās=s=ti-bhū* .8.2.29

Explanation

1 The *āgama* is *yāsUṬ*, the *āgamin LIṄ*.

In the current case, by *sthānivadbhāva*, *ti*, the substitute of *LIṄ*, is treated like *LIṄ*, and so 3.4.103 could apply, and the actual *āgamin* is *ti*. The *āgama* is *yās*.

3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*

anuvṛtti *pratyayaḥ* 3.1.1

translation And [a suffix] is high-pitched in its beginning (i.e. in its first vowel).

Now, by ypbh, the combination of the *āgama* and the *āgamin*, i.e. *yās-ti*, will have the technical name *pratyaya* of *ti*, and by 3.1.3, *ā* in *yās-ti* will be high-pitched. Then, is it redundant to teach again in 3.4.103 that *yāsUṬ* is high-pitched, i.e. the *ā* in *yāsUṬ* is high-pitched?

The answer is "no". It is argued that teaching again the high-pitched nature of *yāsUṬ* while it is already established is to set up a restriction (*niyama*) that **only** *yāsUṬ* is high-pitched, that is to say, all the other *āgamas* are low-pitched.[169]

[169] The idea here is reflected in the statement *siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*, found in e.g. *Kāśikā* 7.1.67 (p. 788), 7.2.63 (p. 816), and 7.2.67 (p. 817 line 3 in the commentary on 7.2.67) (these three places have been identified in Roodbergen's Dictionary, p. 461, entry *siddhe saty ārambho niyamārthaḥ*). This statement is not found in any of the Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* treatises listed in the index (pp. ४६६-४९३) of *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, but is found in several non-Pāṇinian *paribhāṣā* treatises, e.g. *Jainendraparibhāṣāvṛtti* (*paribhāṣā* #1, *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ८१) and *Kātantraparibhāṣāsūtravṛtti* of Durgasiṃha (*paribhāṣā* #59, in the form *siddhe saty ārambho niyam**āya***; *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ६५).

7.4.3 Text part 5 three *jñāpakas*

In text part 5 Haribhāskara mentions three *jñāpakas* of the ypbh in a brief manner. In what follows I will explain these one by one.

7.4.3.1 *aniṭ* in 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*

6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*

anuvṛtti 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*; 6.4.46 *ārdhadhātuke*; 6.4.48 *lopaḥ*

translation [In the place] [of the final sound] of [an *aṅga* that] [ends with] *Ṇi* [and] [is] followed by [an *ārdhadhātuka*] [suffix] without *iṬ*, [lopa] [is substituted].

explanation

1 On *Ṇi* in 6.4.51. I understand *ṇeḥ* in 6.4.51 as the genitive singular form of the *prātipadika Ṇi*. *Ṇi* is a general term (*sāmānyagrahaṇa*) for the two suffixes *Ṇi*C and *ṆiṄ*. *Ṇi*C is, among others, the suffix with which a causative verbal root is built (see e.g. 3.1.26 *hetumati ca*). *ṆiṄ*, rarer than *Ṇi*C, is taught in e.g. 3.1.20, where it helps to build denominatives.

There is a *paribhāṣā āgamā anudāttā bhavanti*, #105 in *Vyāḍiparibhāṣāpāṭha* (*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. ४२); it is not found in any other *paribhāṣā* text collected in *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, as per its index (pp. ४६८-४६९]). Using $Bh_{GRETIL,}$ I have found 8 occurrences of *āgamā anudāttā bhavanti* in the *Bhāṣya*. See also the following from *Jñāpakasaṃgraha*, a work attributed to Nāgeśa (regarding its authorship, see e.g. the section with the heading "jñāpakasaṃgrahasya kartā" on pp. vi-viii of the Jñāpakasaṃgraha edition):

> *ādyudāttaś ca. "yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣv apic ca liṅ" iti nyāsena siddhe "yāsuṭ parasmaipadeṣūdātto ṅic ca" ity āgamā anudāttā iti jñāpayati. idam evāgamā avidyamānavad ity arthasyāpi jñāpakam ity uktam. idaṃ dvayam apy ekadeśyuktiḥ.* (p. 60)

2 On aniṭi in 6.4.51. I understand *aniṭi* in 6.4.51 as the locative singular form of the *prātipadika aniṭ*. *aniṭ* is a compound, whose *vigraha* I would give as *iṭ na [vartate] yasya saḥ*, where the genitive case of *yasya* is an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī* found with an *āgamin*, so that *aniṭ ārdhadhātuka* would literally mean "an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] which does not have *iṬ* as its part", that is to say, roughly, an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix to which no *iṬ āgama* has been added (by e.g. 7.2.35).[170]

To illustrate *sūtra* 6.4.51, I will give below one example each of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix without *iṬ* and with *iṬ*.

a) First, here is an example of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix without *iṬ*, where 6.4.51 will apply.

To derive the *prātipadika kāraka* "he who makes do", agentive noun of the causative verbal root *kāri*, which is in turn from the verbal root *kṛ* "to do", we first build the causative verbal root by adding the suffix *ṆiC* to the verbal root *kṛ* and

[170] *Kāśikā* on 6.4.51: *aniḍādāv ārdhadhātuke ṇer lopo bhavati*. (p. 743) Thus, it appears that *Kāśikā*, glossing *aniṭi* with *aniḍādau*, has applied the *tadādividhi* (*yasmin vidhis tadādāv algrahaṇe*, 1.1.72.29, found e.g. as #33 in PbhI, and translated in my explanation of *sūtra* 7.2.4 in §6.3.3) in its interpretaion of *aniṭi*. I have not followed *Kāśikā* here, because I do not think it is necessary to resort to the *tadādividhi* here. One could achieve the same effect with just the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*. *aniṭ ārdhadhātuka*, with 1.1.46 in mind, would mean "an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix] not having an initial *iṬ*", that is to say, an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix not having *iṬ* as its intial part. The effect here is, I think, the same as interpreting aniṭ *ārdhadhātuka* as aniḍādi *ārdhadhātuka* using the *tadādividhi*, as *Kāśikā* on 6.4.51 does. So perhaps *Kāśikā*, with its interpretation, is here aiming at greater clarity (*vispaṣṭārtham*).

replacing *ṛ* with *ār*, and then add the suffix *ṆvuL* (to be replaced by *aka*) to the causative verbal root *kāri* thus built:

1	*kṛ*			
2	*kṛ*	*i*		
3	*kār*	*i*		
4	*kār*	*i*	*vu*	
5	*kār*	*i*	*aka*	

At this stage, since the suffix *ṆvuL* (here already replaced by *aka*) is an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix without *iṬ*, 6.4.51 applies, and we replace i in *kāri* with *lopa*:

6	*kār*	*ϕ*	*aka*	*6.4.51 ṇer aniṭi*

In this way, we derive the form *kāraka*.

b) Now, here is an example of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix with *iṬ*, where 6.4.51 cannot apply because of *aniṭi* in this *sūtra*.

To derive the *prātipadika* kārayitavya “to be made done / to do”, gerundive of the causative verbal root *kāri* of the verbal root *kṛ*, we add the suffix tavya to the causative verbal root *kāri* (see above in the example *kāraka* for the derivation of this causative verbal root). Then, the *iṬ āgama* is added to *tavya* by 7.2.35.

1	*kār*	*i*		
2	*kār*	*i*	*tavya*	
3	*kār*	*i*	*itavya*	*7.2.35 ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ*

Now, because the *lopa* substitution in 6.4.51 is conditined by an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix without *iṬ*, but here we have an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *tavya* having an initial *iṬ*, 6.4.51 cannot apply. The *prakriyā* proceeds forward without dropping the i in *kāri*:

4	*kār*	*e*	*itavya*
5	*kār*	*ay*	*itavya*

c) The difference between *kār-ϕ-aka* and *kār-ay-**i**tavya* is thus the following: since the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *aka* is without *iṬ*, *Ṇi*C is dropped by 6.4.51; whereas since the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *tavya* is with *iṬ*, 6.4.51 cannot apply and *Ṇi*C is not dropped - it is then modified to ay.

d) Now, let us come back to the ypbh. The question is, how can *aniṭi* in 6.4.51 be a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh? Here is my understanding.

If the ypbh does not exist, then, after we drop *aniṭi* in 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*, the newly phrased *sūtra* *6.4.51 *ṇeḥ* will achieve the same effect as the acutal wording *ṇeḥ aniṭi*, that is to say, *aniṭi* in 6.4.51 will be redundant. How? If the ypbh does not exist, and if we have only *ṇeḥ* as 6.4.51, we will have the following situations:

In the case of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix with *iṬ*, e.g. in above *kārayitavya*, since the *aṅga* ending with *Ṇi*, i.e. *kāri*, is not immediately followed by the *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *tavya* due to the intervention of *iṬ*, *6.4.51 *ṇeḥ* will not be able to apply, so that we will not have the *lopa* substitute in the place of i in *kāri*, and so we will have still *kārayitavya* in the end. This is the same as when we have the original wording 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*.

In the case of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix without *iṬ*, e.g. in above *kāraka*, *6.4.51 *ṇeḥ* will apply, so that we will have the *lopa* substitute in the place of i in *kāri*, and arrive at *kāraka* in the end. This is also the same as when we have the original wording 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi*.

Thus, we can see that if the ypbh does not exist, *6.4.51 *ṇeḥ* and 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi* will have the same effect, and so *aniṭi* in our acutal wording *ṇer aniṭi* will be redundant. But no word of Pāṇini can be redundant, and therefore, the ypbh must exist. This is how *aniṭi* in 6.4.51 *ṇer aniṭi* can serve as a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh.

7.4.3.2 *neṭi* (7.2.4)

See the explanation in §6.3.3.

7.4.3.3 *adharāṇi*

In the last sentence of text part 5, the term *adharāṇi* is mentioned. This sentence is very brief, and I think what is behind it is the following.

It is likely that *adharāṇi* mentioned in the last sentence of text part 5 is a part of the following *sūtra*: 1.1.34 *pūrva-para-avara-dakṣiṇa-uttara-apara-**adharāṇi** vyavasthāyām asaṃjñāyām*. The idea is perhaps: the fact that Pāṇini himself has uttered in one of his *sūtras* the form *adharāṇi*, which form is not possible to be derived without the help of the ypbh, shows that the ypbh exists. How?

In 1.1.34, *pūrva-para-avara-dakṣiṇa-uttara-apara-**adharāṇi*** is a neuter *dvandva* compound in nominative plural. *adhara* is the last among the 7 members of this *dvandva*. The reason why in text part 5 only *adharāṇi* and not the whole *dvandva* compound is mentioned is possibly that so far as the intimation (*jñāpana*) of the ypbh is concerned, there is no difference between *adharāṇi* and the long *pūrvaparāvaradakṣiṇottarāparādharāṇi*. In what follows, I also explain just *adharāṇi*. This would also apply to *pūrvaparāvaradakṣiṇottarāparādharāṇi*.

adharāṇi is the nominative plural of the neuter *prātipadika adhara* "lower". To derive *adharāṇi*, we add the plural nominative case ending *Jas* to the *prātipadika adhara*, and then, since we have the neuter gender here, replace *Jas* with *Śi*.

1	*adhara*	*as*
2	*adhara*	*i*

The next *sūtra* to be applied is A 7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ*:

7.1.72 *napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ*.

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *sarvanāmasthāne* 7.1.70; *num* 7.1.58.

translation [After the final vowel] of an *aṅga* that <1> is neuter, <2> [ends with] *jhAL* (= any consonant other than nasal and semivowel) or *aC* (= any vowel), [and] <3> is followed by a *sarvanāmasthāna*, *nUM* [is added].

Explanation

1 The part "[After the final vowel]" in my translation results from the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ*, since *nUM* is an *āgama* marked with *M* (*mit*).

2 On *sarvanāmasthāna*. The term *sarvanāmasthāna* is taught in A 1.1.42 *śi sarvanāmasthānam* and 1.1.43 *suḍ anapuṃsakasya*. The referents of *sarvanāmasthāna* are thus the substitute *Śi* and the five case endings *sU, au, Jas, am,* and *auṬ*. *Śi* is the substitute in neuter for nominative and accusative plural case endings *Jas* and *Śas*. One may roughly say that *sarvanāmasthāna* corresponds to the set of case endings added after strong stems, or strong case endings.

3 In 7.1.72, the *āgama* taught is *nUM*, and *āgamin* taught is a neuter *aṅga* ending with *jhAL* or *aC* (*napuṃsaka jhalajanta aṅga*): in the current case, the *āgamin* is *adhara*.

At stage 2 (*adhara-i*), *adhara* is an *aṅga* that is neuter, ends with a vowel, and is followed by the *sarvanāmasthāna Śi*. In accordance with 7.1.72, the *āgama nUM* is added after its final vowel *a*:

3 adharan i 7.1.72 napuṃsakasya jhalacaḥ.

Now, in order to substitute *ā* for the last among the three short *a*s in *adharan*, we wish to apply 6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsaṃbuddhau*.

6.4.8 *sarvanāmasthāne cāsaṃbuddhau*

anuvṛtti aṅgasya 6.4.1; *nopadhāyāḥ* 6.4.7; *dīrghaḥ* 6.3.111

translation Also, [in the place][of the penultimate] [vowel][of an *aṅga* that] [ends with] [*n*] [and] [is] followed by a non-vocative-singular *sarvanāmasthāna* [item], [the closest] [long vowel] [is substituted].

explanation:

1 On *saṃbuddhi*. The term *saṃbuddhi* is taught in 2.3.49 *ekavacanaṃ saṃbuddhiḥ*. It corresponds to the vocative singular case ending.

2 On the segment "[vowel]" in my translation. The segment "[vowel]" in my translation results from the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.2.28 *acaś ca*, according to which the substituend (*sthānin*) of a short (*hrasva*), long (*dīrgha*), or superlong vowel (*pluta*; see 1.2.27 *ūkālo `j jhrasvadīrghaplutaḥ*)[171] is a vowel (and not a consonant).

3 On the segment "[the closest]" in my translation. The segment "[the closest]" in my translation results from the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.50 *sthāne `ntaratamaḥ*. It is not that any one of the long vowels (*dīrgha*) can be substituted, but the closest, or the most similar, to the substituend: in the case of *adharan-i* (above stage 3), the substitute in the place of the final *a* of *adharan* is thus *ā*.

3 On *na* in *nopadhāyāḥ*. In my understanding, *nopadhāyāḥ* in 6.4.7 consists of two finite forms (*padas*): first, *na*, a finite form with its case ending dropped (*luptavibhaktika*) somehow; and second, *upadhāyāḥ*. I interpret *na* to have the meaning of *nasya*, that is to say, although the original genitive case ending has been dropped, its meaning stays. *na* is then a modifier of

[171] Incidentally, I agree with Boehtlingk's brief remark under 1.2.27: *Man hätte ū3kālo erwartet.* (Boehtlingk's Grammatik, p.15)

aṅgasya (carried forth from 6.4.1), and together with 1.1.72, we have "of an *aṅga* ending with *n*" (*nāntasya aṅgasya*).

Incidentally, regarding why we have the *luptavibhaktika* form na in 6.4.7, a possible explanation is as follows. Pāṇini may have originally uttered *sūtra* 6.4.7 as na *upadhāyāḥ*, where the first *pada* is *naḥ*, the genitive singular form of the *prātipadika n*. *naḥ* means the same as *nasya*, and together with *aṅgasya*, it yields "of an *aṅga* ending with *n*", like above. In the transmission, a further sandhi may have been applied to the original wording *na upadhāyāḥ*, so that we have the present *nopadhāyāḥ*, whose interpretation becomes slightly difficult and hence my resort to the *luptavibhaktika* interpretation above. (That in *nopadhāyāḥ* sandhi has been applied twice has already been mentioned in Joshi-Roodbergen's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, vol. 9, *sūtra* 6.4.7, point 2 [p. 14].)

However, there is a problem. In order for 6.4.8 to apply, an *aṅga* ending with n is necessary. At stage 3, i.e. *adharan-i*, *adhara* is the *aṅga*, and *adharan* does not have the name *aṅga*. So we have an *aṅga* ending with *a*, instead of an *aṅga* ending with *n*. Here the ypbh can help. The *āgama n* is, with the help of the ypbh, also referred to by that which refers to the *āgamin adhara*, here the name *aṅga*, so that *adharan*, the *āgama* plus the *āgamin*, can inherit the name *aṅga* from the *āgamin adhara*. Now that *adharan* has the name *aṅga*, we do have an *aṅga* ending with *n*, and thus 6.4.8 can apply, and we will have the following:

4	*adharān*	*i*	*6.4.8 sarvanāmasthāne cāsaṃbuddhau*
5	*adharāṇ*	*i*	

Thus, if the ypbh does not exist, 6.4.8 will not be able to apply at stage 3, and we will not be able to derive the desired form *adharāṇi*, which even Pāṇini himself has used in his *sūtra* 1.1.34 (rather we will derive perhaps **adharaṇi*). Therefore, the ypbh must exist. This is how the term *adharāṇi* can serve as a *jñāpaka* of the ypbh.

8 The ypbh in the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa

8.1 Text

Below I reproduce the established text on pp. 9-11 of *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part I The Sanskrit text and various readings*, edited by F. Kielhorn (1868).

1 *nanu "praṇidāpayati" ityādau dārūpasya vidhīyamānā ghusaṃjñā dāper na syāt, ata āha,*

XI yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante.

2a *yam uddiśyāgamo vihitaḥ sa* ***tadguṇībhūtaḥ*** *śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhito `tas* ***tadgrahaṇena*** *tadgrāhakeṇa tadbodhakena śabdena* ***gṛhyate*** *bodhyata ity arthaḥ.*

2b *tatra "tadguṇībhūtāḥ" ity aṃśo bījakathanam.*

2c *loke `pi devadattasyāṅgādhikye tadviśiṣṭasyaiva devadattagrahaṇena grahaṇaṃ dṛśyate.*

2d *"yam uddiśya vihitaḥ" ity ukteḥ "pranidārayati" ityādau na "dār" ity asya ghutvam.*

3a *"āne muk" iti mugvidhānasāmarthyād eṣānityā. anyathā "pacamānaḥ" ityādāv akārasya muky anayā paribhāṣayā viśiṣṭasya savarṇadīrghe tadvaiyarthyaṃ spaṣṭam eva.*

3b *tena "didīye" ityādau yaṇādi na, "jahāra" ityādāv "āta au ṇalaḥ" iti na.*

4 *na cākārāder varṇasya varṇāntaram avayavaḥ katham iti vācyam, vacanenāvayavatvabodhanāt. tasya cāvayavatvasādṛśye paryavasānaṃ bodhyam.*

5a *na coktajñāpakād varṇagrahaṇe `syā apravṛttir iti vācyam,*

> ***5b*** *"āne muk" iti sūtre bhāṣye `kārasyāṅgāvayavasya mug ity arthe "pacamānaḥ" ity atra "tāsyanudāttet" iti svaro na syād ity āśaṅkya, adupadeśabhaktas tadgrahaṇena grahīṣyata ity ukter asaṃgatyāpatteḥ,*
>
> ***5c*** *kiṃ ca ṅamantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt parasya ṅamo ṅamuḍ ity arthe "kurvann āste" ityādau ṅamo ṅamuḍāgame ṇatvaprāptim āśaṅkya, "yadāgamāḥ" iti nyāyenādyanasyāpi padāntagrahaṇena grahaṇāt "padāntasya" iti niṣedha ity anayā paribhāṣayāgamānām āgamidharmavaiśiṣṭyam api bodhyata ityāśayakaṅamuṭsūtrasthabhāṣyāsaṃgateḥ.*
>
> ***5d*** *kiṃ ca guṇāde raparatve rephaviśiṣṭe guṇatvādy eṣṭavyam. anyatha rkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eveti niyamo na syāt. tac ca varṇagrahaṇa etadapravṛttau na saṃgacchate. ata eva "radābhyām" iti sūtre bhāṣyaṃ "'guṇo bhavati', 'vṛddhir bhavati' iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate" iti.*

6 *ata eva "neṭi", "ṇer aniṭi" ityādi caritārtham.*

7 *anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakā ādeśā ity asya tv ayam arthaḥ.*

> *ārdhadhātukasyeḍāgama ity arthe jñāte nityeṣu śabdeṣv āgamavidhānānupapattyārthāpattimūlakavākyāntarakalpanena "iḍrahitabuddhiprasaṅge seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā" iti. evaṃ cādeśeṣv ivātrāpi bu ddhivipariṇāma iti na nityatvahāniḥ.*

8a *sthānivatsūtre ca nedṛśādeśagrahaṇam,*

sākṣādaṣṭādhyāyībodhitasthānyādeśabhāve cāritārthyāt.

kiṃ ca, evaṃ sati, sthānibuddhyaiva kāryapravṛttyā, "nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyā aprāptyā, aḍāgamasahitasya pibādyādeśāpattyā, lāvasthāyām aḍ[172] *iti bhāṣyoktasiddhāntāsaṃgatiḥ.*

8b *sthānivadbhāvaviṣaye "nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyāḥ pravṛttau "tisṛṇām" ity atra paratvāt tisrādeśe sthānivadbhāvena trayādeśam āśaṅkya, sakṛdgatinyāyena samādhānaparabhāṣyāsaṃgatiḥ.*

8c *"er uḥ" ityādau sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdeśāt tadantaparatayā paṭhitavākyasyaiva samudāyādeśaparatvenādeśagrahaṇasāmarthyāt tasya sthānivatsūtragrahaṇena na doṣaḥ.*

8d *ānumānikasthānyādeśabhāvakalpane `pi śrautasthānyādeśabhāvasya na tyāga iti "acaḥ parasmin" ityāder nāsaṃgatiḥ.*

8e *etena "yadāgamāḥ" iti paribhāṣā sthānivatsūtreṇa gatārthety apāstam.*

9 *etat sarvaṃ "dādhā ghv adāp" iti sūtre bhāṣye spaṣṭam.*

8.2 Translation and explanation

8.2.1 Text part 1 (*avataraṇa* and the ypbh)

8.2.1.1 Text

1 *nanu "praṇidāpayati" ityādau dārūpasya vidhīyamānā ghusaṃjñā dāper na syāt, ata āha,*

[172] *aḍ*] my conjecture; *āḍ* in the edition (p. 11 line 2).

XI yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante.

8.2.1.2 Translation

But in the case of [the forms] *praṇidāpayati* etc., *dāp* would not have the technical name ghu being taught to [an item] with the form *dā*. Hence [one] states:

***Āgamas* added to those (= *āgamins*), having become subordinate to those (= *āgamins*), are [also] referred to by what refers to those (= *āgamins*).**

Text part 2 Gloss and establishment through mundane principle (*lokanyāyasiddhi*)

8.2.2 Text part 2a (Gloss)

8.2.2.1 Text

2a *yam uddiśyāgamo vihitaḥ sa* ***tadguṇībhūtaḥ*** *śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhito `tas* ***tadgrahaṇena*** *tadgrāhakeṇa tadbodhakena śabdena* ***gṛhyate*** *bodhyata ity arthaḥ.*

8.2.2.2 Translation

The meaning [is]: [Since] an *āgama* that is added after targeting that (=an *āgamin*) has become subordinate to that (= the *āgamin*), that is to say, has been made known through the teaching (= *sūtra* 1.1.46) as a part of that (= the *āgamin*), therefore, [this *āgama*] is referred to, that is to say, is made known, by the reference to that (= the *āgamin*), that is to say, by what refers to that (= the *āgamin*), that is to say, by the word that makes that (= the *āgamin*) known.

8.2.2.3 Explanation

1 On *yam uddiśya āgamo vihitaḥ*, see below text part 2d.

2 On *śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhitaḥ*. The segment *śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhitaḥ* aims at explaining *tadguṇībhūtāḥ* in the ypbh. I think śāstra here refers to A 1.1.46, which teaches that an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* or *K* is the initial or final part

(of its *āgamin*), and so such an *āgama* is taught by 1.1.46 to be a part of its *āgamin* (*śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhitaḥ*). Consequently, such an *āgama* is subordinate to its *āgamin* (*tadguṇībhūtāḥ*).

Comments

1 A difficulty here is how an *āgama* marked with *M* can also be a part of its *āgamin*, as 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ* does not teach that such an *āgama* is a part (but it teaches rather that such an *āgama* is a following item, i.e. *para*).

2 Also, I think the relation between being subordinate (*guṇa*) and being a part (*avayava*) should be further reflected upon. Does being subordinate necessarily mean being a part? Or, how can being a part lead to being subordinate?

3 *ataḥ* in … *bodhito `tas tadgrahaṇena* ... results from the state of being a *bījakathana* on the part of the segment *tadguṇībhūtāḥ* in the ypbh: see text part 2b

4 On *tadgrahaṇena tadgrāhakeṇa tadbodhakena śabdena*. In Nāgeśa's gloss of tadgrahaṇena in the ypbh, the first word *tadgrāhakeṇa*, with its suffix *ṆvuL* (= *aka*), makes clear that the suffix *LyuṬ* (= *ana*, the *n* being here retroflexed) in *grahaṇa* in *tadgrahaṇena* expresses the agent (*kartari*) and not e.g. the instrument (*karaṇe*); the second word-group *tadbodhakena śabdena* makes clear further the meaning of the verbal root *grah* in *tadgrahaṇena* and restricts what *tadgrahaṇa* can be (i.e. a word [*śabda*], and not e.g. a gesture).

8.2.2.4 Comment

Cf. the following two excerpts from *Uddyota* and *Viṣamapadavyākhyā*, both supposed to be authored by Nāgeśa:

Uddyota: *yam uddiśyāgamo vihitaḥ sa tadguṇībhūtaḥ śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhito `tas tadgrahaṇena tadgrāhakeṇa tadbodhakena gṛhyate bodhyata* ***āgamaviśiṣṭa*** *iti paribhāṣārthaḥ.* (vol. 1 p. 269a)

Viṣamapadavyākhyā: "*yadāgamāḥ*" *ity asya ca yam uddiśyāgamā vihitās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyanta ity arthaḥ.* (p. 92 last line of the established text - p. 93 first line)

8.2.3 Text part 2b (*tadguṇībhūtāḥ* in the ypbh)

8.2.3.1 Text

2b *tatra "tadguṇībhūtāḥ" ity aṃśo bījakathanam.*

8.2.3.2 Translation

The part "*tadguṇībhūtāḥ*" there (= in the *paribhāṣā*) [is] a seed-statement (perhaps = a statement of cause).

8.2.3.3 Explanation

1 Nāgeśa in text part 2b explains that an *āgama*'s being subordinate or a part of its *āgamin* is the seed or cause of its being able to be also referred to by what refers to the *āgamin*. The logic behind it is perhaps similar to that mentioned in PuV text part 1 and 3a (see my explanation in §5.4.1): since an *āgama* is subordinate or a part and its *āgamin* is the whole, and since more generally, a part is also referred to by what refers to the whole, an *āgama* is also referred to by what refers to its *āgamin*.

2 On *bījakathana*. According to PbhI$_{\text{GRETIL}}$, in PbhI, *bījakathana* occurs only here, although the word *bīja* is used many times. I am not sure whether *bījakathana* simply means a statement of cause, or it has some more technical sense.

8.2.4 Text part 2c (Establishment of the *paribhāṣā* through a mundane principle [*lokanyāyasiddhi*])

8.2.4.1 Text

2c *loke `pi devadattasyāṅgādhikye tadviśiṣṭasyaiva devadattagrahaṇena grahaṇaṃ dṛśyate.*

8.2.4.2 Translation

[One] observes also in the real world that if the limbs of Devedatta are in excess (i.e. more than 4), only that which is characterised by that (= the excessive limbs) is referred to by what refers to Devadatta (= the term *devadatta*).

8.2.4.3 Explanation

In text part 2c, Nāgeśa tries to establish the ypbh through analogy with an example from the everyday life: If a person called Devadatta, who is the father of Yajñadatta, has three arms, the name "Devadatta", or the title "Yajñadatta's father", would refer not to the group of one head, one torso, two legs, plus two arms (i.e. the "normal body"), but only to the group of the "normal body" plus the excessive one arm.

In the same way, the name of an *āgamin* (counterpart to the "normal body") would refer only (*eva* in *tadviśiṣṭasyaiva*) to the group of *āgamin* plus the *āgama* (counterpart to Devadatta's one execessive arm), and not to the *āgamin* itself.

8.2.5 Text part 2d (*yam uddiśya … vihitaḥ*)

8.2.5.1 Text

2d *"yam uddiśya vihitaḥ" ity ukteḥ "pranidārayati" ityādau na "dār" ity asya ghutvam.*

8.2.5.2 Translation

Since "*yam uddiśya ... vihitaḥ*" is stated (i.e. in the beginning of the commentary), in the case of [the forms] *pranidārayati* etc., [the form] *dār* does not have the technical name *ghu*.

8.2.5.3 Explanation

The case of *pranidārayati* has already been explained in §3.2.3. Here the point is the following. In *pra-ni-dār-ay-a-ti*, even if *dā* can obtain the technical name *ghu*, *dār* cannot inherit this name from *dā* by the ypbh, because *r* (taught by 1.1.51) is not the *āgama* of *dā*, but of *ā* (regarding why *r* can be regarded as an *āgama*, see

§2.3.3.3) and thus *ār* can inherit a name from *ā* by the ypbh, but not *dār* from *dā*. If we interpret *yadāmagāḥ* in another way, e.g. if we understand the genitive case in *yasya āgamāḥ*, the equivalent phrase of *yadāgamāḥ*, to be just a loose genitive of relation (*saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī*), then since *dā* is also related to the *āgama r* (through *ā*), by the ypbh *dār* would then be able to inherit the name *ghu* from *dā*, which is however undesired.

Text part 3 (The ypbh is non-mandatory)

8.2.6 Text part 3a (*pacamāna*)

8.2.6.1 Text

3a *"āne muk" iti mugvidhānasāmarthyād eṣānityā. anyathā "pacamānaḥ" ityādāv akārasya muky anayā paribhāṣayā viśiṣṭasya savarṇadīrghe tadvaiyarthyaṃ spaṣṭam eva.*

8.2.6.2 Translation

Because of the purposefulness of the teaching of *mUK* [in the *sūtra*] *āne muk* (A 7.2.82), this (= the ypbh) [is] non-mandatory. Otherwise (= if the ypbh is mandatory), in the case of [the forms] *pacamānaḥ* etc., its (= the teaching of *mUK* in the *sūtra āne muk* [A 7.2.82]) purposelessness [is] indeed clear, given that after [the *āgama*] *mUK* is added to [the sound] *a* (= *ŚaP*), a homegeneous long vowel would be substituted in the place of [the sound *a*] qualified [by the *āgama mUK*][, that is to say, *am*] because of this *paribhāṣā* (= the ypbh).

8.2.6.3 Explanation

The issue related to *pacamāna* and **pacāna* has already been explained in §6.3.5. Below I give only a summary of the argument in text part 3a.

Nāgeśa argues in text part 3a that the ypbh is non-mandatory (*anitya*), or in other words, does not apply wherever it can. For this purpose, he gives an example related to 7.2.82, where the application of the ypbh will lead to an undesired form.

In deriving the form *pac-am-āna* "cooking for oneself", the *āgama mUK* is added to the *āgamin a* (the second in *pac-a*) by 7.2.82 *āne muk*. If the ypbh applies also here, then am will be treated like *a*, so that *am* is also *aK* (= *a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ, ḷ*). Consequently, 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* will apply to *am* and *ā*, resulting in the undesired form **pacāna*. Since *mUK*, first added by 7.2.82, is later dropped, 7.2.82 becomes redundant. Since no *sūtra* can be redundant, the ypbh cannot apply in the current case. This shows that the ypbh does not apply in each and every case, and is therefore non-mandatory.

8.2.6.4 Comment

One may draw different possible conclusions from the above case: for example, <1> that the ypbh is non-mandatory; <2> that the ypbh does not apply where the *āgamin* consists of a single sound (*varṇagrahaṇa*); or more wildly, <3> that the ypbh does not apply to *mUK*; <4> that the ypbh does not apply in the *prakriyā* of *pacamāna*. Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita in his NīV has mentioned <2> (see §6.3.5); Nāgeśa here has mentioned <1>, and has, a few lines later (in text part 5a), rejected <2>. As I have remarked in fn 120, Nāgeśa may have had Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita's commentary in mind when he wrote text part 3a and 5a. Further research, where both texts are read side by side, may help to show whether Nāgeśa in his PbhI has really relied on Nīlakaṇṭa Dīkṣita's NīV, and if yes, to what extent.

8.2.7 Text part 3b (*didīye* and *jahāra*)

8.2.7.1 Text

3b *tena "didīye" ityādau yaṇādi na, "jahāra" ityādāv "āta au ṇalaḥ" iti na.*

8.2.7.2 Translation

Because of this (= the ypbh's being not mandatory), in the case of [the forms] *didīye* etc., [the substitute] *yAṆ* and the like [will] not [occur]. In the case of [the forms] *jahāra* etc., [the *sūtra*] *āta au ṇalaḥ* (A 7.1.34) [will] not [apply].

8.2.7.3 Explanation

After in text part 3a arguing for the non-mandatory status of the ypbh, Nāgeśa in text part 3b gives two fruits of this non-mandatory status of the ypbh, or in other words, two more examples where the application of the ypbh will lead to undesired forms and so the ypbh should not apply.

The first example concerns *didīye* "[he] perished", the third person singular perfect *ātmanepada* form of the verbal root *dī* "to perish". In *didīye*, *y* is the *āgama yUṬ* added to *e*, its *āgamin*, by 6.4.63 *dīṅo yuḍ aci kṅiti*. Now, if the ypbh also applies here, *ye*, the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*, will be treated as *e*, so that *ye* can also be called *aC* (= any vowel) like *e*. Since *ī* in *didīye* is *iK* (= *i, ī, u, ū, ṛ, ṝ, ḷ*), 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci* will apply, so that we will have the undesired substitute *y* in the place of *ī*, leading to **didyye*. Therefore, the ypbh should not apply here, and hence it cannot be mandatory (*nitya*), that is to say, it is non-mandatory (*anitya*).

The second example concerns *jahāra* "[he] seized", the third person singular perfect *parasmaipada* form of the verbal root *hṛ* "to seize". In *jahāra*, *r*, which is arguably regarded by Nāgeśa as an *āgama* (see §2.3.3.3), is added to the *āgamin ā* by 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*. Now, if the ypbh also applies here, then *ār* will be treated as ā, and so *āta au ṇalaḥ* will be able to apply, so that the final *a* in *jahāra* is replaced by *au*, and we will get **jahārau*. If we apply the ypbh once again, since *ār* is treated as *ā,* we will get further **jahau* by 6.1.88 *vṛddhir eci*. Therefore, the ypbh should not apply here, and hence it cannot be mandatory (*nitya*), that is to say, it is non-mandatory (*anitya*).

8.2.8 Text part 4 (a sound being a part of another sound)

8.2.8.1 Text

4 *na cākārāder varṇasya varṇāntaram avayavaḥ katham iti vācyam, vacanenāvayavatvabodhanāt. tasya cāvayavatvasādṛśye paryavasānaṃ bodhyam.*[173]

8.2.8.2 Translation

And [one] should not say the following - how [can] a sound such as *a* have another sound [as] a part [of itself]? - since [Pāṇini] has taught with an [explicit] statement (= A 1.1.46) [that] [a different sound] is a part [of a sound such as *a*]. And [one] should understand [that] this (= being a part of something) amounts to being similar to being a part [of something].

8.2.8.3 Explanation

In above text part 3a and 3b, we have seen the three examples *pacamāna*, *didīye*, and *jahāra*. If we analyse these three forms and mark the *āgama* in bold and the *āgamin* with an underline, we will have *pac-**a**m-āna*, *didī-**y**e*, and *jah**ā**r-a*. Now, since an *āgama* is a part of its *āgamin*, one can say that *m* / *y* / *r* is a part of *a* / *e* / *ā* respectively. But apparently this does not make sense: one may say e.g. *m* is a part of *am*, but how can one say *m* is a part of *a* itself? In the face of such a question, Nāgeśa explains that *m* can be regarded as a part of *a* because Pāṇini has taught it explicitly with his *sūtra* 1.1.46, which teaches that an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* / *K* is an initial / final part (*ādi* / *anta*) (of the *āgamin*). Consequently, even if judging by

---

[173] Cf. *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*: *avayavatvaṃ vācanaikam eva tatsādṛśyabodhanaparyavasāyi. anyathā varṇasya varṇāntarāvayavatvaṃ "halantāc ca" iti sūtrabhāṣyoktarītyāsaṃgataṃ syāt.* (p. 134; on 1.1.51)

The beginning of the *Bhāṣya* on 1.2.10 *halantāc ca* runs: *ayukto `yaṃ nirdeśaḥ. kathaṃ hīko nāma hal antaḥ syāt, anyasyānyaḥ? kathaṃ tarhi nirdeśaḥ kartavyaḥ? "igvato halaḥ" iti.* (1:197.13-14)

common sense it does not make sense to say *m* is a part of *a*, śāstrically it makes sense to say so, simply because it has been taught by Pāṇini explicitly (*vācanika*).

8.2.8.4 Comment

Here, a difficulty which is similar to above (text part 2a, explanation point 2, comment point 1) is that an *āgama* marked with *M* is not taught by Pāṇini to be a part of the *āgamin*. Rather, 1.1.47 *mid aco `ntyāt paraḥ* teaches that such an *āgama* is a following item (*para*).

8.2.9 Text part 5a (The ypbh also applies where the *āgamin* is a single sound.)

8.2.9.1 Text

5a *na coktajñāpakād varṇagrahaṇe `syā apravṛttir iti vācyam,*

8.2.9.2 Translation

And for[174] [the following three reasons], [one] should not say the following: because of the said *jñāpaka* (= the teaching of *mUK* in 7.2.82), this (= the ypbh) does not apply when a [single] sound is mentioned [as the *āgamin*].

8.2.10 Text part 5b (Reason #1)

8.2.10.1 Text

5b *"āne muk" iti sūtre bhāṣye `kārasyāṅgāvayavasya mug ity arthe "pacamānaḥ" ity atra "tāsyanudāttet" iti svaro na syād ity āśaṅkya, adupadeśabhaktas tadgrahaṇena grahīṣyata ity ukter asaṃgatyāpatteḥ,*[175]

---

[174] "for" translates the force of the ablative case in below *asaṃgatyāpatteḥ* (at the end of the first reason) and *asaṃgateḥ* (at the end of the second reason).

[175] Reference is to the following in the *Bhāṣya*:

7.2.82 āne muk

8.2.10.2 Translation

[Here is the first reason.] In *Bhāṣya* on the *sūtra āne muk* (A 7.2.82), the following doubt is raised: if [one accepts] the meaning [with regard to A 7.2.82] that [the *āgama*] *mUK* [is] added to the sound *a* [which is] a part of the *aṅga*, [then], in [the form] *pacamānaḥ*, the [low-pitched] accent [taught in the *sūtra* beginning with] *tāsyanudāttet* (= A 6.1.186) would not obtain. Then, [in order to remove this doubt,] the following [statement is uttered:] [the item] that is a part of [an item] having *aT* (= *a*) as its original form will [also] be referred to by what refers to that (= the item having *a* as its original form). [It] would occur as an unwanted consequence [that] [this] statement is in disagreement [if the ypbh does not apply when a single sound is mentioned as the *āgamin*].

8.2.10.3 Explanation

1 The argument with regard to *pacamānaḥ*.

To derive the *prātipadika pacamāna* "cooking for oneself", present participle *ātmanepada* of the verbal root *pac* "to cook", we add *LAṬ* to the verbal root *pac*, replace it with *ŚānaC*, and then add *ŚaP* after *pac*, so that we have:

---

1 muki svare doṣaḥ.

muki sati svare doṣo bhavati. pacamānaḥ, yajamānaḥ. mukā vyavahitatvād anudāttatvaṃ na prāpnoti. nanu cāyaṃ mug adupadeśabhakto `dupadeśagrahaṇena grāhiṣyate. na sidhyati. aṅgasya mug ucyate, vikaraṇāntaṃ cāṅgam, so `yaṃ saṃghātabhakto `śakyo `dupadeśagrahaṇena grahītum. …

(3 ***parādau dīrghaprasaṅgaḥ)***

… yathānyāsam evāstu. nanu coktaṃ "muki svare doṣaḥ" iti. parihṛtam etat adupadeśabhakto `dupadeśagrahaṇena grāhiṣyate. nanu coktam "aṅgasya mug ucyate, vikaraṇāntaṃ cāṅgam, so `yaṃ saṃghātabhakto `śakyo `dupadeśagrahaṇena grahītum" iti. athāyam adbhaktaḥ syāt. gṛhyetādupadeśagrahaṇena? bāḍhaṃ gṛhyeta. adbhaktas tarhi bhaviṣyati … (3:303.3-8 and 14-18)

1 *pac* *a* *āna*

Now, we apply 7.2.82 *āne muk*, and add the *āgama mUK* to the second a in *pac-a*, which is here the *āgamin*:

2 *pac* *am* *āna*

A 7.2.82 has already been explained in §6.3.5. The interpretation of 7.2.82 and thus the identity of the *āgamin* taught in 7.2.82 is not completely unequivocal: see fn 119. In the current context, I take the *āgamin* to be the second a in *pac-a*, in accordance with *akārasyāṅgāvayavasya mug ity arthe* in text part 5b.

Now, in relation to the accent of *pacamāna*, the following *sūtra* should apply:

6.1.186 *tāsyanudāttenṅidadupadeśāl lasārvadhātukam anudāttam ahnviṅoḥ*

anuvṛtti none

translation [When] preceded by [the suffix] *tāsI*, [an item] having a low-pitched marker, [an item] marked with *Ṅ* excluding [the two verbal roots] *hnu* (= *hnuṄ*) and *iṄ*, or [an item] having *aT* (= *a*) as its original form, a *sārvadhātuka* [suffix] substituted in the place of *la* [is] low-pitched.

explanation

1 On *ahnviṅoḥ* in 6.1.186. I understand the *prātipadika* of *ahnviṅoḥ* in 6.1.186 to be ahnviṅ, which contains *hnu* and *iṄ* preceded by the negative particle *a*. *hnu* here refers to the verbal root *hnuṄ*, which is 2.72 in the

Dhātupāṭha, and *iṄ* here refers to Dhātupāṭha 2.37 *iṄ*. Since neither *hnuṄ* nor *iṄ* has a low-pitched marker (*anudāttet*) according to the Dhātupāṭha (pp. 71*-72*), and they cannot be the suffix *tāsI* or have *a* as their original form (*adupadeśa*), I think they are mentioned in 6.1.186 in order to be excluded from the set of the items referred to by *ṅit* in *tāsi-anudāttet-ṅit-adupadeśa*.

The case ending *-os* in *ahnviṅoḥ* is perhaps another case of the phenomenon I have called "*os* for *bhyām*", where the dual genitive / locative case ending *-os* is used instead of the expected dual ablative case ending *-bhyām* (see §2.4.2.3.1 and fn 69). In the current case, one would expect the *prātipadika ahnviṅ* to be in the ablative case (a *pūrvapañcamī*), in accordance with the ablative (*pūrvapañcamī*) form *tāsyanudāttenṅidadupadeśāt*. So instead of *ahnviṅoḥ* one would expect *ahnviṅbhyām*. Or alternatively, perhaps one could understand *ahnviṅoḥ* as ending in a locative of topic (*viṣayasaptamī*), so that *ahnviṅoḥ* may be translated as "not in the case of *hnu* and *iṄ*"?

In *pac-am-āna*, *āna* (*ŚānaC*) is marked with *Ś*, and so has the name *sārvadhātuka* by 3.4.113 *tiṅśit sārvadhātukam*. Also, *āna* is substituted in the place of *LAṬ* (by 3.2.124 *laṭaḥ śatṛśānacāv aprathamāsamānādhikaraṇe*). Therefore, *āna* is *lasārvdhātuka* "a *sārvadhātuka* [suffix] substituted in the place of *la*". The second a in *pac-a* has as its original form *ŚaP*, that is a without the markers. So this *a* is *adupadeśa* "[an item] having *aT* (= *a*) as its original form". Since the *āgama mUK* is intervening between this *a* and *āna*, *āna*, the *lasārvadhātuka*, is not immediately following *a*, the *adupadeśa*, so that 6.1.186, which requires that the *lasārvadhātuka* follows immediately the *adupadeśa* because of the ablative case (a *pūrvapañcamī* in accordance with 1.1.67) in *tāsyanudāttenṅidadupadeśāt*, cannot apply as wished, and so we have a problem.

This problem can be solved with the help of the ypbh. in *pac-am-āna*, am, that is the group of the *āgamin a* plus its *āgama m*, can inherit the quality *adupadeśa* from the *āgamin a* with the help of the ypbh, so that we now do have a *lasārvadhātuka* (*āna*) following immediately *adupadeśa* (now *am*). Thus, 6.1.186 can now apply as wished, resulting in the low-pitched accent in *ā* and *a* in *āna* (as opposed to *ā́na*, in accordance with 3.1.3 *ādyudāttaś ca*).

2 The argument in the current context (reason #1)

Since in the *Bhāṣya* passage mentioned in text part 5b (see fn 175) the ypbh does apply in a case where the *āgamin* is a single sound (that is, in the current context, the second *a* in *pac-am-āna*), the statement that the ypbh does not apply when a single sound is mentioned as the *āgamin* does not stand.

8.2.11 Text part 5c (Reason #2)

8.2.11.1 Text

5c *kiṃ ca ṅamantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt parasya ṅamo ṅamuḍ ity arthe "kurvann āste" ityādau ṅamo ṅamuḍāgame ṇatvaprāptim āśaṅkya, "yadāgamāḥ" iti nyāyenādyanasyāpi padāntagrahaṇena grahaṇāt "padāntasya" iti niṣedha ity anayā paribhāṣayāgamānām āgamidharmavaiśiṣṭyam api bodhyata ityāśayakaṅamuṭsūtrasthabhāṣyāsaṃgateḥ.*[176]

[176] Reference is to the following in the *Bhāṣya*:

(*8.3.32.1 ṅamuṭi padādigrahaṇam*)

... evaṃ tarhi ṅama evāyaṃ ṅamuṭ kriyate. katham? "padasya" iti vartate, "ṅamaḥ" iti ca naiṣā pañcamī. kā tarhi? sambandhaṣaṣṭhī. padāntasya ṅamo ṅamuḍ bhavati hrasvād uttarasyācīti. yadi ṅama eva ṅamuṭ kriyate, kurvann āste, kṛṣann āste "raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ samānapade" iti ṇatvaṃ

8.2.11.2 Translation

[Here is the second reason.] Moreover, [if the ypbh does not apply when a single sound is mentioned as the *āgamin*], the *Bhāṣya* [passage] located under the *sūtra* [teaching] [the *āgama*] *ṅAMUṬ* (= A 8.3.32) would be in disagreement. [In this *Bhāṣya* passage,] first a doubt is raised: if [one accepts] the meaning [with regard to A 8.3.32] that [the *āgama*] *ṅAMUṬ* [is] added to [such a] *ṅAM* [that is] a part of a *pada* ending with *ṅAM* [and] follows a short vowel, [then], in [the forms] *kurvann āste* etc., the substitute *ṇ* would wrongly occur in the *āgama ṅAMUṬ* (that is, the first *n* in *kurvann āste*) added to *ṅAM* (that is, the second *n* in *kurvann āste*). Then, [this doubt is removed in the following way]. A prohibition [of the substitute *ṇ* in the place of *n*] [by means of] [the *sūtra*] *padāntasya* (8.4.37) [applies], since with the help of the maxim [beginning with] "*yadāgamāḥ*" (= the ypbh), also the first *n* is referred to by what refers to the end of a *pada* (= the term *padānta*). [Thus,] [this *Bhāṣya* passage] has the following intention: this *paribhāṣā* (= the ypbh) teaches also [that] *āgamas* [alone] [are] qualified by the properties of [their] *āgamins*.

8.2.11.3 Explanation

1 Two interpretations (α and β) of 8.3.32

8.3.32 *ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam*

anuvṛtti *padasya* 8.1.16

translation [To] an *aC* (= any vowel) [that] follows [a *pada*] [ending with] *ṅAM* (= *ṅ*, *ṇ*, or *n*) [which] follows a short vowel, *ṅAMUṬ* (= *ṅUṬ*, *ṇUṬ*, or *nUṬ*) [is] invariably [added] [as] its [initial part] [respectively].

explanation

---

prāpnoti. padāntasya neti pratiṣedho bhaviṣyati. "padāntasya" ity ucyate naiṣa padāntaḥ. padāntabhaktaḥ padāntagrahaṇena grāhiṣyate. ... (3:429.17-22)

1) My adopted interpretation of 8.3.32, i.e. the interpretation α

The interpretation of 8.3.32 appears to me not easy. To show how I have interpreted 8.3.32 and reached my above translation, I wish to mention the following points regarding the interpretation of 8.3.32: The genitive case in *padasya* carried forth from 8.1.16 is changed into an ablative case (*vibhaktiviparin̤āma*), i.e. *padāt*, and *ṅamaḥ*, understood as ending in the ablative case, is taken as a modifier (*viśeṣaṇa*) of the resulted *padāt*. With 1.1.72 applied to *ṅamaḥ*, we have *ṅamantāt padāt*. *hrasvāt* is taken to be the left context of *ṅam* in the compound *ṅamanta*, so we have *hrasvāt ṅamantāt padāt*. The locative case in *aci* is changed into a genitive (*ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti*) - more precisely, a genitive case expressing part-whole relation (*avayavaṣaṣṭhī*) added to an *āgamin* - with the help of the *paribhāṣā ubhayanirdeśe pañcamīnirdeśo balīyān* (found as #70 in PbhI), since we have here *ṅamantāt padāt* in the ablative (although this ablative itself is not original but is the result of case transformation as explained above). So we have *hrasvāt ṅamantāt padāt acaḥ*, and with *ṅamuṭ nityam* in 8.3.32, we have finally *hrasvāt ṅamantāt padāt acaḥ ṅamuṭ nityam*. If I may call this interpretation α, then under the interpretation α, 8.3.32 *ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam* can be represented using the following supplemented Sanskrit sentence:

> α: *hrasvāt ṅam[anta*$_{1.1.72}$*]*~~*aḥ*~~*āt (padasya*$_{8.1.16}$*āt) ac*~~*i*~~*aḥ*$_{avayavaṣaṣṭhī\ \text{for}\ āgamin}$ *ṅamuṭ nityam*

In addition, here are a few more points about my translation. In my translation, the corresponding segments of *acaḥ* is “an *aC*” (for the meaning of the *prātipadika*) and “its” (for the meaning of the genitive case). “[initial part]” is the result of interpreting 8.3.32 with the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.46. “[To] … [is] … [added]” translates a supplemented “[*bhavati*]”, i.e. *ṅamuṭ nityam* [*bhavati*]. “[respectively]”

results from interpreting 8.3.32 with the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.3.10, as both *ṅAM* and *ṅAMUṬ* have three referents.

Kāśikā's gloss of 8.3.32: *hrasvāt paro yo ṅam tadantāt padād uttarasyāco ṅamuḍ āgamo bhavati nityam*. (p. 944) Thus, I think *Kāśikā*'s interpretation of 8.3.32 is not different from my interpretation α given above.[177]

Under the interpretation α, the *āgamin* taught in 8.3.32 is *aC*, i.e. a vowel. For example, we would have *kurvan* ***n*****ā***ste*, where the *āgamin*, underlined here, is *ā.*

2) Interpretation β

Nāgeśa in text part 5c has mentioned a different interpretation of 8.3.32: *ṅamantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt parasya ṅamo ṅamuṭ* "[the *āgama*] *ṅAMUṬ* [is] added to [such a] *ṅAM* [that is] a part of a *pada* ending with *ṅAM* [and] follows a short vowel". Under this interpretation, which I call interpretation β or simply β, 8.3.32 *ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam* can be represented using the following supplemented Sanskrit sentence:

> β *ṅam[anta*$_{1.1.72}$*]~~aḥ~~sya*$_{avayavaṣaṣṭhī}$ *(padasya*$_{8.1.16,\ avayavaṣaṣṭhī}$*) hrasvāt aci [ṅamaḥ*$_{\text{repeated, } avayavaṣaṣṭhī \text{ for } āgamin}$*] ṅamuṭ nityam.*

Here is how we can reach the above cited *ṅamantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt parasya ṅamo ṅamuṭ* (i.e. interpretation β). In this interpretation, *ṅamaḥ* is understood to be in the genitive case: with 1.1.72 applied to it, we get *ṅamantasya*, and with *padasya* carried forth from 8.1.16, we have *ṅamantasya padasya*. Since

[177] This interpretation of 8.3.32 reminds me of 6.3.74 *tasmān nuḍ aci* (#29 in the table in §2.3.2), which is similar: an item in the ablative case (*tasmāt*), *aci* transformed to *acaḥ*, and *nUṬ* is also *ṭit* (*nUṬ* is actually one of the referents of *ṅAMUṬ*).

the genitive case here is one expressing part-whole relation (*avayavaṣaṣṭhī*), we can supply the *prātipadika avayava*. Now, *ṅamaḥ* in 8.3.32 is repeated once (*āvṛtti*) and this new *ṅamaḥ* resulting from repetition also ends in a genitive case - more precisely, a genitive case expressing part-whole relation (*avayavaṣaṣṭhī*) added to an *āgamin*. Moreover, this *ṅamaḥ* is *samānādhikaraṇa* with the supplied *prātipadika avayava*, so that we get *ṅamantasya padasya avayava*sya *ṅamaḥ*. We can combine *ṅamantasya padasya* into a *karmadhāraya* compound, i.e. *ṅamantapadasya*; also, we can combine *ṅamantapadasya* and *avayavasya* into a *ṣaṣṭhītatpuruṣa* compound, i.e. *ṅamantapadāvayavasya*. Together with *hrasvāt* and *ṅamuṭ* in 8.3.32, we get *ṅamantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt ṅamo ṅamuṭ*. Because of the ablative case (*pūrvapañcamī* in accordance with 1.1.67) in *hrasvāt*, we can supply the *prātipadika para* to *hrasvāt*, and since *para* agrees with *ṅamaḥ* in genitive, we supply the finite form *parasya*. Thus, we reach finally *ṅamantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt parasya ṅamo ṅamuṭ*: this is exactly the same as the above cited sentence from text part 5c.

Under the interpretation β, the *āgamin* is *ṅAM*. For example, we would have *kurvann āste*, where the *āgamin* is the underlined *n*.

3) Comparing α and β

Now, to compare the two interpretations of 8.3.32 α and β, I reproduce the two supplemented Sanskrit sentences next to each other, preceded by the actual *sūtra* 8.3.32 with the item carried forth (*anuvṛtta*):

8.3.32 *hrasvāt ṅamaḥ* (*padasya*$_{8.1.16}$) *aci ṅamuṭ nityam*

α *hrasvāt ṅam[anta*$_{1.1.72}$*]~~ak~~āt (padasya*$_{8.1.16}$*āt) aci~~a~~aḥ*$_{avayavaṣaṣṭhī\ \text{for}\ āgamin}$ *ṅamuṭ nityam*

β *ṅam[anta*$_{1.1.72}$*]~~aḥ~~sya*$_{avayavaṣaṣṭhī}$ *(padasya*$_{8.1.16,\ avayavaṣaṣṭhī}$*) hrasvāt aci [ṅamaḥ*$_{\text{repeated, } avayavaṣaṣṭhī \text{ for } āgamin}$*] ṅamuṭ nityam*

Here are the differences between the interpretations α and β:

#1 *ṅamaḥ* is in α understood as ending in the ablative case, while in β it is understood as ending in the genitive case.

#2 *ṅamaḥ* is repeated once in β (*āvṛtti*), while it is not in α.

#3 The genitive case of *padasya,* carried forth from 8.1.16, is transformed into the ablative (i.e. *padāt*) in α (*vibhaktivipariṇāma*), while it is not in β.

#4 The locative case of *aci* is transformed into the genitive (i.e. *acaḥ*) in α, while it is not in β.

The above four points can be represented in the following table:

#	item	α	β
1	*ṅamaḥ*	understood as ending in 5	understood as ending in 6
2	*ṅamaḥ*	/	repeated once
3	(*padasya*$_{8.1.16}$)	6=>5, i.e. *padasya => padāt*	/
4	*aci*	7=>6, i.e. *aci => acaḥ*	/

So, what is special about α is that there are twice case ending transformation; what is special about β is that *ṅamaḥ* is repeated once.

Comment

My current feeling is that the interpretation α is more natural than β, because the repetition of a word in an *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtra* (*āvṛtti*) in its interpretation is, as far as I can tell, rare (#2), whereas the case transformation both of the type

vibhaktiviparin̤āma (#3) and of the type *ṣaṣṭhīprakḷpti* by PbhI 70 (#4) is, so far as my experience goes, not rare. In addition and perhaps more importantly, we have also the problem of the retroflexion of *n* in e.g. **kurvaṇn āste* if we follow β (see below), whereas such a problem does not emerge if we follow the interpretation α.

Also see Gadā: *"**kiṃ ca n̤amanta**°" iti.* ***arthe*** *`siddhāntabhūte* (p. 19 line 9 from bottom). Thus, Vaidyanātha, commenting on the word *arthe* in *n̤amantapadāvayavasya hrasvāt parasya n̤amo n̤amuḍ ity arthe*, also says that interpretation β is not the established view (*siddhānta*).

2 The argument regarding *kurvann āste*.

In text part 5c, Nāgeśa bases his argument on interpretation β of 8.3.32. So below I will explain text part 5c also following interpretation β of 8.3.32.

In applying external sandhi to the *pada kurvan* "doing" followed by the *pada āste* "[he] sits, [he] keeps [doing something]", we apply 8.3.32 (under the interpretation β) and get *kurvann āste* "[he] keeps doing":

1	*kurvan*		*āste*
2	*kurva**n**<u>n</u>*	*āste*	8.3.32 *n̤amo hrasvād aci n̤amuṇ nityam*

Here the *āgama* is the first *n* (in bold) in *kurvann*, and the *āgamin* is the second *n* (underlined) in *kurvann*. Now, 8.4.1 *raṣābhyām no ṇaḥ samānapade* can apply,

whereby *ṇ* is subsituted in the place of the first *n* in *kurvann*, so that we will get the undesired form kurvṇn *āste*.[178] There is a problem.

*3 *kurva**ṇ**n̲* *āste* 8.4.1

This problem can be solved with the help of the ypbh. But before applying the ypbh, we need to first twist its meaning a bit for its application in the current context. Above in text part 1 I have translated the ypbh as follows:

yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante.

Āgamas added to those (= *āgamins*), having become subordinate to those (= *āgamins*), are [also] referred to by what refers to those (= *āgamins*).

In this translation, I have supplied "[also]", which translates a supplied [*api*] in the ypbh, i.e. *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena [api] gṛhyante*. The reason why I do this is that the effect of the ypbh is expected to be, in most of the cases I believe, the extension (*atideśa*) of a name (*saṃjñā*), property (*dharma*) etc. from the *āgamin* to the group of *āgamin* plus its *āgama* (let me call this "effect #1"; see also the beginning of §9.2): thus, for example, *itṛ* in *lav-itṛ* will inherit the name *ārdhadhātuka* from *tṛ*, or, to use the everyday life example in text part 2c, Devadatta plus its third arm will be called Devadatta. Without this supplied [*api*], the effect of the ypbh will risk being the extension of a name, property etc. from the *āgamin* to the *āgama* itself (let me call this "effect #2"): thus, for example, *i* alone, i.e. the *āgama iṬ*, in *lav-itṛ* will inherit the name *ārdhadhātuka* from *tṛ*, or, to use the

[178] Because of 8.4.37 *padāntasya*, the second *n* in *kurvan* would not be replaced by *ṇ*.

everyday life example in text part 2c, Devadatta's third arm alone will be called Devadatta. To me, this sounds counter-intuitive.

In the current context, it is exactly this counter-intuitive effect #2 that we want to twist out of the ypbh, by taking the ypbh literally, without supplying [*api*] "also". This effect, i.e. the extension of a name, property etc. from the *āgamin* to the *āgama* itself, is, according to Nāgeśa, intended in the *Bhāṣya* passage under 8.3.32 cited in fn 176 (*anayā paribhāṣayāgamānām āgamidharmavaiśiṣṭyam api bodhyata ityāśayakaṅamuṭsūtrasthabhāṣya*°).

Now, with the help of the ypbh under this new interpretation, as the *āgama* alone will inherit the name, property etc. from the *āgamin* (effect #2), in the current context, the first *n* in *kurvann*, that is the *āgama* alone (and not *nn*, the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*), will inherit the property of being *padānta* from the second *n*, the *āgamin*. Now that the first *n* is also *padānta*, we can apply 8.4.37 *padāntasya* to it, so that the retroflexion is prohibited. In this way, we can derive the desired form *kurvann āste* without retroflexion.

3 The argument in the current context (reason #2)

Since in the *Bhāṣya* passage mentioned in text part 5c (see fn 176) the ypbh does apply in a case where the *āgamin* is a single sound (that is, in the current context, the second *n* in *kurvann*), the statement that the ypbh does not apply when a single sound is mentioned as the *āgamin* does not stand.

8.2.11.4 Comments

1 The problem of **kurvaṇn āste* discussed above will not emerge under the interpretation α of 8.3.32 (see above): under the interpretation α, the *āgamin* is *n*, and so we should write *kurvan nāste*, where the first *n* is protected against retroflexion by 8.4.37, and the second *n* cannot be retroflexed because of *samānapade* in 8.4.1 - the two *ns* here belong to two separate *padas*.

2 In text part 5c, Nāgeśa has argued for his point in text part 5a by showing that there will be disagreement or contradiction with a *Bhāṣya* passage if the opposite is true. However, the *Bhāṣya* passage here, i.e. the one cited in fn 176, is based on an interpretation of 8.3.32 (i.e. above β) that Vaidyanātha, Nāgeśa's direct pupil, calls *asiddhāntabhūta*. If this is also Nāgeśa's view, I wonder how strong Nāgeśa's argument in text part 5c can be. In my experience, Nāgeśa often argues for a point by showing that there is contradiction with a *Bhāṣya* passage if the opposite of the point is true: But can a *Bhāṣya* passage that does not contain the established view (*siddhānta*) also be used in such an argument? Is it that for Nāgeśa, no *Bhāṣya* passage should be contradicted at all, whether uttered by a *siddhāntin* or a *pūrvapakṣin / ekadeśin*?

3 On effect #1 and #2 of the ypbh

In the segment *anayā paribhāṣayāgamānām āgamidharmavaiśiṣṭyam api bodhyata ityāśayakaṅamuṭsūtrasthabhāṣya*° in text part 5c, Nāgeśa effectively means that effect #2 of the ypbh is intended in the *Bhāṣya*. To me, this may suggest that Nāgeśa also accepts effect #2 of the ypbh. In text part 2a, i.e. Nāgeśa's gloss of the ypbh, it appears to me that effect #2 of the ypbh is more intended than effect #1, or at least effect #2 is also possible from this gloss, because Nāgeśa does not supply a word like *samudāya,* which is what Vaidyanātha in his Gadā does,[179] or *api*, which I have supplied and rendered as "[also]" in my translation above. However, in text part 2c, that is the everyday life example of Devadatta, what is intended is clearly effect #1, because Nāgeśa uttered there *tadviśiṣṭasya*. So, perhaps for Nāgeśa both effect #1 and #2 of the ypbh are acceptable: one should resort to whichever effect can solve the problem, depending on the situation. And perhaps in text part 2a Nāgeśa has deliberatly not spellt out any element that may lead exclusively to effect #1. To me, as I mentioned above, effect #2 sounds counter-intuitive. But perhaps being counter-

[179] *Gadā*: *"**bodhyate**" iti. "sa samudāyaḥ" iti śeṣaḥ*. (p. 17 line 4 from bottom)

intuitive (to me) in this extraordinary *vyākaraṇa śāstra*, or at least in the tradition coming after Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, does not necessarily mean being wrong or being unacceptable. Has effect #2 also been accepted by Pāṇini himself (if he has accepted the ypbh at all)? Or has effect #2 been accepted in the tradition only from Nāgeśa onward? This important issue should be clarified by further research.

8.2.12 Text part 5d (Reason #3)

8.2.12.1 Text

5d *kiṃ ca guṇāde raparatve rephaviśiṣṭe guṇatvādy eṣṭavyam. anyatha rkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eveti niyamo na syāt. tac ca varṇagrahaṇa etadapravṛttau na saṃgacchate. ata eva "radābhyām" iti sūtre bhāṣyaṃ "'guṇo bhavati', 'vṛddhir bhavati' iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate" iti.*[180]

8.2.12.2 Translation

[Here is the third reason.] Moreover, after *guṇa* (i.e. *a* in this context) or the like (= *vṛddhi*, i.e. *ā* in this context) is followed by [the sound] *r*, the state of being *guṇa* or the like (= the state of being *vṛddhi*) is to be regarded [as] [residing] in [the item] qualified by the sound *r* (= *ar* or *ār* repsectively). Otherwise, [there] would not exist the restriction that the *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* of the sound *ṛ* [are] *ar* and *ār* [respectively] and nothing else. And this (= regarding the state of being *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* as residing in *ar* or *ār* respectively[181]) is not in agreement if this (= the ypbh) does not apply

---

[180] A similar segment in *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*: *... "yadāgamāḥ" iti nyāyena viśiṣṭasya guṇavṛddhitvena rkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eveti niyamopapattiḥ. ata eva "radābhyām" iti sūtre "thali ca seṭi" iti sūtre ca bhāṣye "'guṇo bhavati', 'vṛddhir bhavati' iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate" ity uktam.* (p. 134 [on 1.1.51])

Cf. also *Uddyota* on 6.4.121.1 (p. 347a): *yadāgamanyāyena viśiṣṭa eva guṇādisaṃjñaka iti bhāvaḥ*.

[181] ***"tac ca"*** *iti. viśiṣṭe tadeṣaṇaṃ cety arthaḥ.* (*Gadā* p. 20) See below §8.2.12.4*varṇagrahaṇa*.

when [a single] sound is mentioned [as the *āgamin*]. For this very [reason] (= that *ar* or *ār* is *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* respectively[182]), [the following] *Bhāṣya* [passage] under the *sūtra* [beginning with] *radābhyām* (A 8.2.42) [is in agreement][183]: "When [one says] 'there is *guṇa*' [or] 'there is *vṛddhi*', [the item] having the sound *r* [as its] latter part (= *ar* or *ār* respectively) turns out to be the bearer of the technical name *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* [respectively]".[184]

If the last two sentences (*tac ca varṇagrahaṇa* … and *ata eva radābhyām* …) are inverted in order (see below comment), the translation would be as follows:

---

[182] *Gadā*: ***"ata eva"*** *iti. viśiṣṭasya tattvād evety arthaḥ.* (p. 20) The author of *Bhairavī* has a different opinion: ***ata eva****, varṇagrahaṇe `pi yadāgamanyāyasya pravṛtter eva.* (p. 35)

[183] *Gadā*: *"bhāṣyam" ity asya "saṃgacchate" iti śeṣaḥ.* (p. 20)

[184] On *śiras* in *rephaśiras*: In Kielhorn's following translation:

> "… when speaking of Guṇa and Vṛddhi, we mean that the (letters अ and आ) if they have
>
> (i.e. r) on the top of them are (likewise) termed Guṇa and Vṛi[sic]ddhi (e.g. अर् and आर् in कर्तृ and कार्ति)." (F. Kielhorn, *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* [1871-1874], 60)

"the (letters अ and आ) if they have (i.e. *r*) on the top of them" corresponds to the word *rephaśirā* (sandhi undone *rephaśirāḥ*), and "top" corresponds to the *prātipadika śiras* in the (*ṣaṣṭhībahuvrīhi*) compound *rephaśiras* (nominative singular *rephaśirāḥ*). However, strictly speaking, in Devanāgarī *r* in such cases is not written on the top of *a* or *ā*, but on the top of the next syllable, as in the examples कर्तृ and कार्ति given by Kielhorn himself. More importantly, I am not sure whether he who uttered *rephaśirā* two thousand years ago knew writing at all, and if yes, whether the script he had in mind had also in such cases a *r* on the top like in the Devanāgarī. I have, in my translation, rendered *śiras* with "latter part", similar to the word *ūrdhva* in the sense of "in the later part, afterwards".

Exactly because of this (= the said restriction[185]), [the following] *Bhāṣya* [passage] under the *sūtra* [beginning with] *radābhyām* (A 8.2.42) [is stated]: "When [one says] 'there is *guṇa*' [or] 'there is *vṛddhi*', [the item] having the sound *r* [as its] latter part (= *ar* or *ār* respectively) turns out to be the bearer of the technical name *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* [respectively]". And this (= the quoted *Bhāṣya* passage) is not in agreement if this (= the ypbh) does not apply when [a single] sound is mentioned [as the *āgamin*].

8.2.12.3 Explanation

1 The argument in the current context (reason 3)

It is Nāgeśa's view that the *guṇa* of the vowel *ṛ* is only *ar* (and not *a*). How could *ar* obtain the technical name *guṇa*? By the ypbh: the vowel *a* obtains the technical name *guṇa* by A 1.1.2 *adeṅ guṇaḥ*. The sound *r,* added to *a* by A 1.1.51 *ur aṇ raparaḥ*, is regarded as an *āgama* by Nāgeśa (otherwise Nāgeśa would not resort to the ypbh here; see also §2.3.3.3). With the help of the ypbh, the combination of the *āgama r* plus the *āgamin a,* that is *ar*, will obtain the technical name *guṇa* belonging to the *āgamin a*. Since here the ypbh does apply in a case where the *āgamin* is a single sound (i.e. *a*), the statement that the ypbh does not apply when a single sound is mentioned as the *āgamin* does not stand.[186]

2 On *ṛkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eva*

Although *ṛkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eva* is found in *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*, another work of Nāgeśa (see fn 180), I have not managed to find this very phrase in the following pre-Nāgeśa works: *Bhāṣya* (Bh$_{\text{GRETIL}}$), *Kāśikā* (*Kāśikā*$_{\text{GRETIL}}$), Nyāsa

[185] Or alternatively, = regarding the state of being *guṇa* or *vṛddhi* as residing in *ar* or *ār* respectively, i.e. *(repha)viśiṣṭe tad(=guṇatvādi)eṣaṇam* - see the previous footnote and §8.2.12.4.

[186] For clarity's sake, I am here explaining using only the case of *guṇa* and *ar*. The same applies to the case of *vṛddhi* and *ār* (A 1.1.1 *vṛddhir ādaic*). Also, in both the case of *guṇa* / *ar* and *vṛddhi* / *ār*, the vowel could also be *ṝ*.

on 1.1.50 (pp. 170-174), *Padamañjarī* on 1.1.50 (pp. 170-175), *Siddhāntakaumudī* (*Siddhāntakaumudī*$_{\text{DIGITAL}}$), *Bālamanoramā* on 1.1.50 (pp. 45-49), and *Tattvabodhinī* on 1.1.50 (pp. 45-46). It is possible that this phrase is a paraphrase by Nāgeśa of some phrase in the *Bhāṣya*, but I have not yet managed to locate it.~

3 On *"guṇo bhavati", "vṛddhir bhavati" iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate*

The sentence *"vṛddhir bhavati", "guṇo bhavati" iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate* occurs twice in the *Bhāṣya*: 3:219.17-18 (Bh on 6.4.121.1) and 3:406.24 (Bh on 8.2.42.4). [187] Note that Nāgeśa in a similar sentence in *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* (see fn 180) mentions both sources, while the current sentence in PbhI mentions only the latter.~

8.2.12.4 Comment

1 On the word *tat* in *tac ca varṇagrahaṇa etadapravṛttau na saṃgacchate*

It appears to me not easy to identify what the word *tat* here refers to. An explicit foregoing referent seems to be missing. Vaidyanātha, commenting in *Gadā*:

> ***"tac ca"*** *iti. viśiṣṭe tadeṣaṇaṃ cety arthaḥ*. (p. 20)

[187]Note the inverted order *vṛddhir bhavati guṇo bhavati* at both sites in the *Bhāṣya* (plus another *vṛddhir bhavati guṇo bhavati* in 1:46.27 [Bh on 1.1.3.6] and zero occurrence in the *Bhāṣya* of *guṇo bhavati vṛddhir bhavati* [as shown by Bh$_{\text{GRETIL}}$]), as opposed to *guṇo bhavati vṛddhir bhavati* in PbhI (p. 10 lines 10-11), *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* (p. 134), and also Śeṣādrisudhī's quotation of *Bhāṣya* 3:219.17-18 in his criticism of the current passage (i.e. 5d reason #3) of PbhI (p. 391; see fn 192*Bhāṣya*). I have not found any variant reading in the *Bhāṣya* (pp. 501b-502a and 529b in the first edition*), PbhI (p. 10), *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* (p. 134), or ŚeV (p. ३९१) edition that carries the inverted order in each case. Nevertheless, I still take this sentence in PbhI as a direct quote from the *Bhāṣya*.

* The main edition I use, that is the third edition by Abhyankar, does not contain the section of variant readings.

takes tat as meaning *viśiṣṭe tadeṣaṇam*, refering back to the phrase *rephaviśiṣṭe guṇatvādy eṣṭavyam*,[188] which is not in the sentence immediately preceding *tac ca*, but in the one that precedes the latter.

In my view, inverting the order of the two sentences *tac ca varṇagrahaṇa etadapravṛttau na saṃgacchate* (A) and *ata eva "radābhyām" iti sūtre bhāṣyaṃ "'guṇo bhavati', 'vṛddhir bhavati' iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate" iti* (B) would offer us a better reading, even if the sequence A-B was probably already the one Vaidyanātha, Nāgeśa's direct pupil, had in his PbhI text[189] and none of the 5 books containing the text of PbhI I have used[190] records my proposed sequence B-A.

First, one could with ease identify the referent of *tat* as *bhāṣyam* in B, or more precisely, *"'guṇo bhavati', 'vṛddhir bhavati' iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate" iti*, which is in apposition to *bhāṣyam*.

Second, it would be good to have a structure in reason #3 parallel to that in reason #1 and #2, in that reason #3 also ends with *Bhāṣya*'s not being in agreement

---

[188] *eṣaṇa* is the corresponding action noun of the gerundive form *eṣṭavya*, the verbal root being *iṣ* (*icchati*).

[189] This can be inferred from the order in which Vaidyanātha makes his comments:

> ***"tac ca"*** *iti. viśiṣṭe tadeṣaṇaṃ cety arthaḥ. "yataḥ" ity ādiḥ. viśiṣṭe tattve saṃmatim apy āha,* ***"ata eva"*** *iti. viśiṣṭasya tattvād evety arthaḥ. "bhāṣyam" ity asya "saṃgacchate" iti śeṣaḥ. tad evāha,* ***"guṇaḥ"*** *iti.* (*Gadā* p. 20)

So that it may appear clearer to the reader how I have understood this paragraph, I put additional information in brackets:

> ***"tac ca"*** *iti. (repha)viśiṣṭe tad(=guṇatvādi)eṣaṇaṃ cety arthaḥ. ("tac ca" ity asya) "yataḥ" ity ādiḥ. (repha)viśiṣṭe tattve (= guṇatve / vṛddhitve) saṃmatim apy āha,* ***"ata eva"*** *iti. (repha)viśiṣṭasya tattvād (= guṇatvāt / vṛddhitvāt) evety arthaḥ. "bhāṣyam" ity asya "saṃgacchate" iti śeṣaḥ. tad (= bhāṣyam) evāha,* ***"guṇaḥ"*** *iti.*

[190] See *Bhairavī*, *Gadā*, PbhI, *Tattvādarśa*, and *Vijayā* in the bibliography.

(reason #1 ends: … *ity ukter asaṃgatyāpatteḥ*; reason #2 ends: °*bhāṣyāsaṃgateḥ*; reason #3 would end: *tac [= bhāṣyam] ca …na saṃgacchate*).

Third, one would no longer need to supplement one word in each of the sentence A and B, as Vaidyanātha does (in A: *"yataḥ" ity ādiḥ*, i.e. the word *yataḥ* at the beginning of A; in B: *"bhāṣyam" ity asya "saṃgacchate" iti śeṣaḥ*, i.e. the word *saṃgacchate* to the word *bhāṣyam* [both on *Gadā* p. 20]). The fact that Vaidyanātha needs to supplement one word in each of the sentence A and B may also suggest that the text in the sequence A-B is not completely smooth.

Fourth, it is interesting to note that in Śeṣādrisudhī's (perhaps 18th century) quotation of the current passage of PbhI in his *Paribhāṣābhāskara* (edition: *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. ३७८-४६५):

> *"kiṃ ca guṇāde raparatve rephaviśiṣṭe guṇatvādy eṣṭavyam. anyatha rkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eveti niyamo na syāt.*[191] *ata eva 'radābhyām' iti sūtre bhāṣyaṃ 'guṇo bhavati, vṛddhir bhavati, rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate'*[192] *iti."* (p. ३८७)

[191] In the edition (p. ३८७) there is the ellipsis mark "…" between the word *syāt* and the *daṇḍa*. I assume it was added by the editor Abhyankar, who may have used this sign to indicate that the sentence *tac ca varṇagrahaṇa etadapravṛttau na saṃgacchate*, which is found in all the five books of PbhI I have used (see fn 190), is missing in this quotation. Also, since Abhyankar does not give any footnote in this quotation, I assume that both manuscripts he uses (क and ख) agree in having the current reading.

[192] *Bhāṣya* 3:219.17-18 (Bh on 6.4.121.1) and 3:406.24 (Bh on 8.2.42.4). Note that at both these sites of the *Bhāṣya* and also in the PbhI edition (p. 10 line 11) we have *iti* after *vṛddhir bhavati*. The current reading without *iti* is found in two manuscripts of the *Bhāṣya* (on 8.2.42.4), as noted by Kielhorn in the variant reading section at the end of the first edition* of the third volume (p. 529b). See also text part 5d, explanation, point 3.

sentence A is completely missing, and sentence B[193] follows immediately the sentence *anyatha rkārasya guṇavṛddhī arārāv eveti niyamo na syāt* (Z). That is to say, Śeṣādrisudhī's PbhI text reads Z-B, as opposed to Z-A-B, the sequence transmitted to us in all the five books of PbhI I have used (see fn 190). This reading Z-B in Śeṣādrisudhī's PbhI text may give support to my proposed sequence (Z-)B-A insofar as the segment Z-B is common.[194]

In any case, in view of what I have presented above, even if one may not agree to my proposed sequence B-A, one should at least accept with caution the reading A-B as is transmitted to us in the various versions of the PbhI text.

8.2.13 Text part 6 (*neṭi* and *ṇer aniṭi*)

8.2.13.1 Text

6 *ata eva "neṭi", "ṇer aniṭi" ityādi caritārtham.*

8.2.13.2 Translation

Exactly because of this (= ypbh), [the *sūtras*] *neṭi* (A 7.2.4), *ṇer aniṭi* (A 6.4.51) and the like [are] purposeful.

---

* The copy of the main edition I use, that is the third edition by Abhyankar, does not contain the section of variant readings.

[193] In a slightly different version, in that the word *iti* after *vṛddhir bhavati* is missing.

[194] In a similar passage in *Laghuśabdenduśekhara* on 1.1.51 (quoted in fn 180), we also have the sequence Z-B with A missing. I have not yet managed to look deeper into the discussion there. One may mention another argument, albeit a weak one: the fact that the authors of *Gadā* and *Bhairavī* cannot agree on a uniform interpretation of *ata eva* in B (see fn 182) may also suggest that the text reading in the sequence of A-B is not smooth.

8.2.13.3 Explanation

neṭi (A 7.2.4) and *ṇer aniṭi* (A 6.4.51) are mentioned as *jñāpakas* in other ypbh commentaries: e.g. both in HaV, *ṇer aniṭi* in SīV, and *neṭi* in NīV. If the ypbh does not exist, *neṭi* and *ṇer aniṭi* are purposeless and redundant; if the ypbh does exist, they are purposeful. See my explanation in §7.4.3.1 and §6.3.3.

8.2.13.4 Comments

1 The word *caritārtha* here may remind one of the four steps of identifying a *jñāpaka* / establishing the *jñāpakatva* of an item: 1) *vaiyarthyam*, 2) *jñāpanam*, 3) *svasmiṃś cāritārthyam*, and 4) *anyatra phalam*.[195] 1) An item in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī sūtrapāṭha* appears to serve no purpose and thus to be redundant. 2) This item may intimate or serve as clue for a particular *paribhāṣā*. 3) Once this *paribhāṣā* is adopted, the item itself also becomes no longer redundant and serves a purpose (which should be one other than the mere intimation [*jñāpana*] of the *paribhāṣā* in issue). 4) In other cases, we may apply this *paribhāṣā* and solve problems. Only when all of these four steps are fulfilled can an item be identified / established as a *jñāpaka*. In fn 3, p. v, in the preface of *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes* (1874), Kielhorn mentions cases where step 3) is not fulfilled.[196]

In the current context, Nāgeśa points out that the *sūtras neṭi* (A 7.2.4), *ṇer aniṭi* (A 6.4.51) and the like do serve certain purposes (*caritārtha*) after the ypbh is adopted. Thus, above step 3) is here fulfilled. A 7.2.4 and A 6.4.51 are, if the ypbh does not exist, purposeless and redundant, and so above step 1) is fulfilled. They

[195] The names of these four steps are given under the entry *jñāpaka* on p. 163b in Abhyankar's Dictionary. I have not managed to find out anything about these four steps in a Pāṇinian work prior to (and inclusive of) Nāgeśa. I wonder in which work these steps are first mentioned and how old they are.

[196] Regarding the sequence of these fours steps, it seems to me that one could perhaps also go to step 4) first and then go to step 3), i.e. in the sequence of 1) 2) 4) 3).

intimate the existence of the ypbh, and so above step 2) is fulfilled (see my explanation of 7.2.4 and 6.4.51 in §6.3.3 and §7.4.3.1 respectively). The ypbh would apply and solve problems in other cases, and so step 4) is fulfilled. Therefore, one can say that the *sūtras* A 7.2.4 and A 6.4.51 are two *jñāpakas* of the ypbh.

2 However, one should perhaps be more cautious with what is just said (i.e. in the second paragraph in point 1 of my comments). I think it is noteworthy that in text part 6 Nāgeśa has not used the word *jñāpaka*. He simply says that *neṭi*, *ṇer aniṭi* etc. (*"neṭi", "ṇer aniṭi" ityādi*), because of the ypbh (*ata eva*), are purposeful (*caritārtham*) - this would correspond to above step 3) - without saying more. When commenting on other *paribhāṣās* in the PbhI, Nāgeśa does use the word *jñāpaka*.[197] Thus, perhaps one can infer that Nāgeśa does not think *neṭi* and *ṇer aniṭi* are *jñāpakas* of the ypbh, and since he does not identify any *jñāpaka* of the ypbh in PbhI 11, he does not think the ypbh can be established through *jñāpaka* at all. Although this argument is from silence and so may not be strong, we find support from Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa, Nāgeśa's direct pupil, who mentions that the ypbh is not established through *jñāpaka* (and other things) in the following passage in *Chāyā* on Bh 1.1.20.5: *nāsyā [= the ypbh] jñāpakasiddhatvam ity anyatra spaṣṭam. etena "ṇer aniṭi" ity aniḍgrahaṇam atra jñāpakam ity apāstam. nāsyā jñāpakasiddhatvam iti "bhūyāt" ityādau doṣābhāvasya sattvenoktarītyanyathokter asaṃbaddhatvāt* (vol. 1, p. 289, lines 1-4 from bottom in fn 1).

As mentioned above in my explanation of text part 6, authors of other *paribhāṣā* treatises (e.g. HaV, SīV, and NīV) do mention *neṭi* and *ṇer aniṭi* explicitly as *jñāpakas* of the ypbh. What would be the reason for which Nāgeśa (presumably) and Vaidyanātha (explicitly) do not take *neṭi* and *ṇer aniṭi* as *jñāpakas* of the ypbh? This issue should be clarified by further research.

[197] Here are two examples. PbhI 27: *"suptiṅantam" ity antagrahaṇam asyā jñāpakam* (p. 24 line 17). PbhI 73: *"ardhaṃ napuṃsakam" iti napuṃsakagrahaṇam asyā jñāpakam*. (p. 78 line 11)

8.2.14 Text part 7 (Reconciling the teaching of *āgama* and the doctrine of changelessness of the speech-sound)

8.2.14.1 Text

7 *anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakā ādeśā ity*[198] *asya tv ayam arthaḥ.*

> *ārdhadhātukasyeḍāgama ity arthe jñāte nityeṣu śabdeṣv āgamavidhānānupapattyārthāpattimūlakavākyāntarakalpanena "iḍrahitabuddhiprasaṅge seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā" iti. evaṃ cādeśeṣv ivātrāpi bu ddhiviparіṇāma iti na nityatvahāniḥ.*

8.2.14.2 Translation

And yet [the statement that] in place of [items] without *āgamas*, substitutes with *āgamas* [are substituted], has this (= the following) meaning [behind it][199]:

> After [one] has understood the meaning [of e.g. *sūtra* 7.2.35] that the *āgama iṬ* [is] added to an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix], because, given that speech-sounds are changeless, the teaching of *āgamas* is not appropriate, one conceives of another sentence, whose root is arthāpatti "presumption" (= one of the *pramāṇas*). [The sentence runs:] "in the context of understanding [an

---

[198] This perhaps refers to *ādeśās tarhīme bhaviṣyanty anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakāḥ* in the following *Bhāṣya* passage on 1.1.20.5: *yuktaṃ punar yan nityeṣu nāma śabdeṣv āgamaśāsanaṃ syāt?na, nityeṣu śabdeṣu kūṭasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavyam anapāyopajanavikāribhiḥ. āgamaś ca nāmāpūrvaḥ śabdopajanaḥ. atha yuktaṃ yan nityeṣu śabdeṣv ādeśāḥ syuḥ? bāḍhaṃ yuktam. śabdāntarair iha bhavitavyam. tatra śabdāntarāc chabdāntarasya pratipattir yuktā.* ***ādeśās tarhīme bhaviṣyanty anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakāḥ.*** *tat katham? sarve sarvapadādeśā dākṣīputrasya pāṇineḥ / ekadeśavikāre hi nityatvaṃ nopapadyate //* (1:75.8-14)

[199] I add "[behind it]" because I do not think what follows is the meaning proper of *anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakā ādeśāḥ*, but what follows appears to me to be rather an explanation of the ideas behind *anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakā ādeśāḥ*.

ārdhadhātuka suffix] without [the *āgama*] *iṬ*, [one] should understand [an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix] with [the *āgama*] *iṬ*". Through [the conceiving of such a sentence,] [the teaching of *āgamas* becomes appropriate].[200] And in this way, like in the case of substitutes, also in the case of these (= *āgamas*) the understanding [alone] changes. Consequently, the changelessness [of sounds] is not harmed.

[200] The analysis and understanding of the sentence *ārdhadhātukasyeḍāgama ity arthe jñāte ... seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā" iti* has turned out to be somewhat difficult for me. As my translation here shows, I have taken *"iḍrahitabuddhiprasaṅge seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā"* to be the referent of *vākyāntara* in *arthāpattimūlakavākyāntarakalpanena* - this I think is perhaps the best way. But the problem is that under this interpretation, the sentence in issue then appears rather elliptical, and one would expect something to complete °*kalpanena* at the end of the sentence. I have thus added in my translation "[the teaching of *āgamas* becomes appropriate]", which goes with °*kalpanena*, to complete the elliptical sentence. I am not sure whether the sentence in issue was in this form in the ur-text. One may check more manuscript evidence. Or, it may simply be Nāgeśa's style, about which I am not familiar enough to be able to make any responsible judgement. Without changing the text itself, I think the above is what I can offer at my best.

Now, if there has been really problems with the transmission of this sentence, and if I may make changes to the text itself, I would suggest deleting one *ne* of the two *nes* in *ārthāpattimūlakavākyāntarakalpa**nene**ḍrahitabuddhiprasaṅge*, so that we have °*kalpanā*, an action noun in nominative singular, which can be independent, instead of °*kalpanena*, an action noun in instrumental singular expecting something else, and so instead of "through the conceiving [of] …", we may translate "[there is] the conceiving [of] …" or "[one] conceives of …". In this way, the sentence in issue becomes arguably complete, and the meaning also suffers no major change.

All in all, I think it may help if one can check through more manuscript evidence, or to get oneself more familiar with Nāgeśa's style in his PbhI, through plenty of reading.

8.2.14.3 Explanation

1 On presumption (*arthāpatti*) and the argument in the sentence *ārdhadhātukasyeḍāgama ity arthe … seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā" iti.*

Presumption (*arthāpatti*) is one of the valid means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) besides e.g. direct perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), and analogy (*upamāna*).[201] In my understanding (which is currently not so deep), it works in the following way. When two statements, both true in themselves, conflict with each other and are mutually irreconcilable, one presumes through the *pramāṇa* presumption (*arthāpatti*) that a third statement exists. With this third statement, the first two statements become reconcilable; without this third statement, the conflict in the first two statements cannot be resolved (*anyathānupapatti*): since the first two statements should both make sense, this third statement must exist. A classic example in the tradition of presumption is *pīno `yaṃ devadatto divā na bhuṅkte, sa rātrau bhuṅkte* "This fat Devadatta does not eat during the day; [so] he eats at night". Here we have the following three statements:

1 *devadattaḥ pīnaḥ*. "Devadatta is fat."

2 *devadatto divā na bhuṅkte*. "Devadatta does not eat during the day."

3 *devadatto rātrau bhuṅkte*. "Devadatta eats at night."

[201] Roughly speaking, presumption is accepted by the scholars within the *Mīmāṃsā* tradition, but rejected by the scholars within e.g. the *Nyāya* tradition. I am not sure whether the Grammarians generally accept or reject this pramāṇa. One may argue that since Nāgeśa here mentions *arthāpatti*, he should probably have accepted this *pramāṇa*. However, this argument may not be strong, as this seems to be the only site in the entire PbhI where Nāgeśa utters the word *arthāpatti* (as a search in $\text{PbhI}_{\text{GRETIL}}$ shows).

There is an apparent conflict between statement 1 and 2, both true in themselves: how could Devadatta be fat, and at the same time he does not eat during the day? This conflict can and can only be resolved when statement 3 exists: because Devadatta eats at night. Otherwise, if statement 3 does not exist, statement 1 and 2 put together will not make sense (*anyathānupapatti*). Therefore, statement 3 must exist. Here the *pramāṇa* through which we obtain statement 3 is presumption (*arthāpatti*).

Now, using this example as a parallel, I will try to explain the idea in the sentence *ārdhadhātukasyeḍāgama ity arthe … seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā" iti*. First, to facilitate the understanding of what follows, I give a table showing the parallelism here:

statement 1	statement 2	statement 3 (*arthāpattimūlakavākyāntara*)
devadattaḥ pīnaḥ. "Devadatta is fat."	*devadatto divā na bhuṅkte*. "Devadatta does not eat during the day."	*devadatto rātrau bhuṅkte*. "Devadatta eats at night."
śabdaḥ nityaḥ. "Any speech-sound is changeless."	*ārdhadhātukasyeḍ āgamaḥ*. "The *āgama iṬ* [becomes] a part of an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix]"	*iḍrahitabuddhiprasaṅge seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā* "In the context of understanding [an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix] without [the *āgama*] *iṬ*, [one] should understand [an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix] with [the *āgama*] *iṬ*"

In the sentence *ārdhadhātukasyeḍāgama ity arthe … seḍbuddhiḥ kartavyā" iti*, we have the following two apparently irreconcilable statements, both true in themselves:

1 *śabdaḥ nityaḥ*. "Any speech-sound is changeless."

2 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ āgamaḥ* "The *āgama iṬ* [becomes] a part of an *ārdhadhātuka* [suffix]."

Why are these two statements irreconcilable? If statement 1 is true, i.e. any speech-sound is changeless, than it does not make sense to say that an *āgama* becomes a part of another item, because in saying this, we assume that this other item acquires a new part, that is to say, it undergoes increasement and so is no longer changeless. On the other hand, if statement 2 is true, then one cannot say any speech-sound is changeless, as in statement 1.

Now, with statement 3, the apparent conflict between statement 1 and 2 can be resolved, so that statement 1 and 2 can co-exist with each other. How? With statement 3, one gives statement 2 a new interpretation. On its surface statement 2 teaches adding the *āgama iṬ* to an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix (e.g. *tavya*, so *tavya* => *itavya*), but the real teaching of statement 2 is, according to statement 3, that one should understand an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix with *iṬ* (e.g. *itavya*) in the place of an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix without *iṬ* (e.g. *tavya*): that is to say, one shifts his mind or attention from e.g. *tavya* to *itavya*, and it is not that *tavya* receives an additional part *i* (*tavya* => *itavya*). In this way then, it is only one's understanding that changes: the speech-sounds themselves do not change. Thus, statement 1 will not be violated when statement 2 takes on this new interpretation, and we have resolved the apparent conflict between statement 1 and 2 with the help of statement 3. On the other hand, without statement 3, this conflict cannot be resolved, and therefore, since both statement 1 and 2 are true in themselves, statement 3 must exist. This is, in my understanding, how the *pramāṇa* presumption (*arthāpatti*) works here.

2 On the argument in *evaṃ cādeśeṣv ivātrāpi buddhivipariṇāma iti na nityatvahāniḥ.*

Above we have seen that through statement 3, the process of augmentation, that is, an *āgama* becomes a part of an *āgamin*, is re-interpreted to be only a process of the shift of one's understanding - that is, in the place of the *āgamin*, one understands the group of the *āgamin* plus the *āgama*. In this way, the speech-sounds do not need

to change in any augmentation process, as it is only our mind or understanding that changes. Thus, the teaching of *āgama* can be reconciled with the doctrine that any speech-sound is changeless. Nāgeśa has, in the sentence *evaṃ cādeśeṣv ivātrāpi buddhivipariṇāma iti na nityatvahāniḥ*, mentioned the case of substitution as a parallel (… *ādeśeṣv ivātrāpi* …). Below I will try to illustrate the case of substitution.

In augmentation, as shown above, we have the potential difficulty that an item (*āgamin*) acquires a new part and thus undergoes increasement, so that it is no longer changeless. In substitution, where the substituend is replaced by the substitute, the potential difficulty is that we have an item (substituend) that disappears and another item (substitute) that comes into being in its place, that is to say, we have some speech-sounds that are destroyed (substituend) and some speech-sounds that are produced (substitute). Thus, both the augmentation process and the substitution process share the common potential difficulty that a speech-sound may undergo changes. In the case of substitution, the solution is the same as that in the case of augmentation: it is not that the substituend disappears and the substitute appears in its place, but that we shift our understanding or attention from the substituend to the substitute, so that both the substituend and the substitute remain unchanged, and it is only our understanding that changes. In this way then, the doctrine of the changelessness of speech-sound is not violated.[202]

---

[202] Cf. the following passages:

12 anupapannaṃ sthānyādeśatvaṃ nityatvāt.

"sthānī", "ādeśaḥ" ity etan nityeṣu śabdeṣu nopapadyate. kim kāraṇam? nityatvāt. sthānī hi nāma yo bhūtvā na bhavati. ādeśo hi nāma yo `bhūtvā bhavati. etac ca nityeṣu śabdeṣu nopapadyate yat sato nāma vināśaḥ syāt, asato vā prādurbhāva iti. (*Bhāṣya* 1:137.3-6 [Bh 1.1.56.12])

14 kāryaviparinṇāmād vā siddham.

athavā kāryaviparinṇāmāt siddham etat. kim idam "kāryaviparinṇāmāt" iti? kāryā buddhiḥ, sā viparinṇamyate. ...

katham? buddhyā. tad yathā, kaś cit kasmai cid upadiśati "prācīnaṃ grāmād āmrāḥ" iti. tasya sarvatrāmrabuddhiḥ prasaktā. tataḥ paścād āha "ye kṣīriṇo `varohavantaḥ pṛthuparṇās te

8.2.15 Text part 8 (The ypbh will not be rendered redundant by A 1.1.56)

Text part 8 (i.e. 8a-8e) appears to me somewhat complicated. Perhaps it would be helpful to first show its structure:

Sub-thesis: ***8a*** *sthānivatsūtre ca nedṛśādeśagrahaṇam,*

Reason 1: *sākṣādaṣṭādhyāyībodhitasthānyādeśabhāve cāritārthyāt.*

Reason 2: *kiṃ ca,*

evaṃ sati =link1=> *sthānibuddhyaiva kāryapravṛttyā* =link2=> *"nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyā aprāptyā* =link3=> *aḍāgamasahitasya pibādyādeśāpattyā* =link4=> *lāvasthāyām aḍ iti bhāṣyoktasiddhāntāsaṃgatiḥ.*

Corroboration of link 2: ***8b*** *sthānivadbhāvaviṣaye "nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyāḥ pravṛttau "tisṛṇām" ity atra paratvāt tisrādeśe sthānivadbhāvena*

---

nyagrodhāḥ" iti. sa tatrāmrabuddhyā nyagrodhabuddhiṃ pratipadyate. sa tataḥ paśyati buddhyāmrāṃś cāpakṛṣyamāṇān nyagrodhāṃś cādhīyamānān. nityā eva ca svasmin viṣaya āmrāḥ, nityāś ca nyagrodhāḥ, buddhis tv asya vipariṇamyate.

evam ihāpy astir asmā aviśeṣeṇopadiṣṭaḥ. tasya sarvatrāstibuddhiḥ prasaktā. so `ster bhūr bhavatīty astibuddhyā bhavatibuddhiṃ pratipadyate. sa tataḥ paśyati buddhyāstiṃ cāpakṛṣyamāṇam bhavatiṃ cādhīyamānam. nitya eva ca svasmin viṣaye `stiḥ, nityo bhavatiḥ, buddhis tv asya vipariṇamyate. (*Bhāṣya* 1:137.12-14 and 18-26 [Bh 1.1.56.14])

Uddyota: *bhāṣye* ***"apakṛṣyamāṇān"*** *iti. tatra yathā buddher evāpakarṣa upadhānaṃ cāmreṣu nyagrodheṣu cāropyate, tathātrāpi buddhigatotpādavināśayoḥ sthānyādeśabhāvasya ca śabdeṣv āropa iti bhāvaḥ.* (*Uddyota* p. 454b [on 1.1.56.14])

trayādeśam āśaṅkya, sakṛdgatinyāyena samādhānaparabhāṣyāsaṃgatiḥ.

Against a possible objection: ***8c*** *“er uḥ” ityādau sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdeśāt tadantaparatayā paṭhitavākyasyaiva samudāyādeśaparatvenādeśagrahaṇasāmarthyāt tasya sthānivatsūtragrahaṇena na doṣaḥ.* ***8d*** *ānumānikasthānyādeśabhāvakalpane `pi śrautasthānyādeśabhāvasya na tyāga iti “acaḥ parasmin” ityāder nāsaṃgatiḥ.*

Thesis / Conclusion: ***8e*** *etena “yadāgamāḥ” iti paribhāṣā sthānivatsūtreṇa gatārthety apāstam.*

8.2.16 Text part 8a (A 1.1.56 does not apply to an inferred substitute such as the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*)

8.2.16.1 Text

8a *sthānivatsūtre ca nedṛśādeśagrahaṇam,*

sākṣādaṣṭādhyāyībodhitasthānyādeśabhāve cāritārthyāt. kiṃ ca,

evaṃ sati,

sthānibuddhyaiva kāryapravṛttyā,

“nirdiśyamānasya” iti paribhāṣāyā aprāptyā,

aḍāgamasahitasya pibādyādeśāpattyā,

lāvasthāyām aḍ[203] *iti bhāṣyoktasiddhāntāsaṃgatiḥ.*[204]

---

[203] *aḍ*] my conjecture; *āḍ* in the edition (p. 11 line 2).

[204] Reference is perhaps to the following in *Bhāṣya* on 6.4.22.5: *“upadeśe” iti vartate, tatropadeśāvasthāyām evāḍāṭau bhavataḥ* (3:188.13).

8.2.16.2 Translation

And in the *sūtra* [beginning with] *sthānivat* (= A 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo `nalvidhau*), such a substitute (= an *āgamin* plus its *āgama* e.g. *itavya*, i.e. the *āgamin* suffix *tavya* plus its *āgama iṬ*) is not referred to,

> because [the *sūtra* 1.1.56] attains its purposes in the substitution [that] is taught directly in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Moreover,
>
> if so (= such a substitute as above *itavya* is also referred to in A 1.1.56),
>
> > [then] any operation [involving a substitute] will occur necessarily through understanding [the substitute] [as its] substituend (= with 1.1.56 applied).
> >
> > > As a result, the *paribhāṣā* [beginning with] *nirdiśyamānasya* (= *nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavanti*, which is found e.g. as #12 in PbhI) will not apply [with regard to any operation involving a substitute].
> > >
> > > > Consequently, the substitute *piba* or the like (e.g. *jighra*) will wrongly occur in the place of [an item] with the *āgama aṬ* (= *apā* or the like e.g. *aghrā*),
> > > >
> > > > > [and] thus [the following] established view mentioned in the *Bhāṣya* will be in disagreement: that [the *āgama*] *aṬ* [is added] while *la* (= *lakāra*, here *LUṄ*, *LAṄ*, or *LṚṄ*) remains.

8.2.16.3 Explanation

Now, if, in order to preserve the changeless nature of the speech-sound, the process of augmentation is to be understood as substitution in the sense that the *āgamin* is replaced by the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*, one may argue that the ypbh will become redundant, because any of its purpose can be achieved through A 1.1.56, which

teaches that the substitute is like the substituend, that is, in the current context, the *āgamin* plus the *āgama* is like the *āgamin* - this is exactly what the ypbh teaches. In order to refute this view, Nāgeśa argues that the word *ādeśaḥ* mentioned in A 1.1.56 does not cover such an inferred (*ānumānika*) substitute as *āgamin* plus the *āgama* (e.g. *itavya*) and so A 1.1.56 cannot apply in such a case, for the following two reasons:

8.2.16.3.1 The first reason

The first reason is: A 1.1.56 applies to a substitute that is directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and not to an inferred (*ānumānika*) substitute like the current one.

An example of a substitute that is directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, is found in *sūtra* 2.4.42 *hano vadha liṅi*. Here, the substituend, which is put in the genitive case in accordance with A 1.1.49 (*sthānaṣaṣṭhī*), is *han*. The substitute is *vadha*, which is directly taught in A 2.4.52. A 1.1.56 can thus apply to the substitute *vadha*.

What is an inferred (*ānumānika*) substitute? In the current context,[205] under the view that the augmentation process should be understood as a sort of substitution, that is, in the place of the *āgamin* (understood as the substituend), one substitutes the *āgamin* plus its *āgama* (understood as the substitute), so as to preserve the changeless nature of the speech sounds, the *āgamin* plus its *āgama* is such an inferred substitute, since it is not directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as a substitute, but is only inferred as so indirectly, with a certain purpose in mind (here the purpose being the preservation of the changeless nature of the speech sounds). According to Nāgeśa, A 1.1.56 does not apply to such an inferred substitute.

8.2.16.3.2 The second reason

The second reason consists of a chain of reasoning with 4 links.

[205] There is another type of inferred substitute, e.g. *tu* in the case of the derivation of the form *pacatu*: see §8.2.18.

a) Link 1 (evaṃ sati => sthānibuddhyaiva kāryapravṛttiḥ)

Link1: If A 1.1.56 can also apply to such inferred substitues (*ānumānikādeśa*) as *āgamin* plus its *āgama* (e.g. *itavya*),

then any operation involving a substitute will occur necessarily through understanding the substitute as its substituend (i.e. with 1.1.56 applied).

Link 1 has not appeared very clear to me. Here is what I understand to be behind it. Any substitute is either direct (i.e. directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*) or inferred (*ānumānika*). Now, there is no doubt that A 1.1.56 can apply to the direct substitutes. If A 1.1.56 can also apply to inferred substitutes, then A 1.1.56 will be able to apply to all substitutes. That is to say, whenever an operation involving a substitute occurs, 1.1.56 will apply to it, so that any operation involving a substite will occur necessarily through 1.1.56, or through understanding the substitute as its substituend.

Comment

In my above explanation, there is a problem with the sentence "that is to say, whenever … substitute as its substituend." That 1.1.56 can apply to all substitutes does not mean that it will necessarily apply to each and every substitute. 1.1.56 is a *paribhāṣā*, not a *vidhisūtra*. A *vidhisūtra* in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, I believe, should apply wherever it can (cf. *parjanyaval lakṣaṇapravṛttiḥ*, found as e.g. #111 in PbhI). But 1.1.56, I believe, applies only when there is a problem to be solved (keeping an eye on the forms to be derived [*lakṣyānurodha*][206]), when its help is sought after, in the way described as *agatyā nu paribhāṣāśrīyate* (found as e.g. #119 in PuV). Therefore, even if A 1.1.56 **can** apply to all substitutes, it does not apply to

[206] Incidentally, I think among the three *pakṣa*s *lakṣaṇaikacakṣuṣka*, *lakṣyaikacakṣuṣka*, and *ubhayacakṣuṣka*, *ubhayacakṣuṣka* alone is to be accepted and followed. In the *ubhayacakṣuṣkapakṣa*, the attitude of *lakṣyānurodha* is justified.

each and every one of them, whenever one emerges in an operation, and so it is not correct to say that any operation involving a substitute will occur necessarily through 1.1.56, i.e. with 1.1.56 applied. After all, perhaps I have not understood correctly the force of *eva* in … *sthānibuddhy**aiva** kāryapravṛttyā* …

b) Link 2 (*sthānibuddhyaiva kāryapravṛttyā* => *"nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyā aprāptiḥ*)

Link 2: If any operation involving a substitute will occur necessarily through understanding the substitute as its substituend (i.e. with 1.1.56 applied),

then the *paribhāṣā nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavanti* (*nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā*) will not apply with regard to any operation involving a substitute.

This link has been corroborated by Nāgeśa in text part **8b**. See my explanation there.

c) Link 3 (*"nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyā aprāptyā => aḍāgamasahitasya pibādyādeśāpattiḥ*)

Link 3: If the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply with regard to any operation involving a substitute,

then the substitute *piba* or the like (e.g. *jighra*) will wrongly occur in the place of an item with the *āgama aṬ* (i.e. *apā* or the like e.g. *aghrā*).

I will, in what follows, use the finite form *apibat* to explain link 3. *apibat* "[he] drank" is the third person singular *parasmaipada* imperfect form of the verbal root *pā* "to drink". At the beginning of the *prakriyā*, we add the imperfect suffix *LAṄ* to the verbal root *pā*. Then, we add the *āgama aṬ* to the *āgamin pā* by A 6.4.71:

1	*pā*	*LAṄ*	
2	*apā*	*LAṄ*	6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣv aḍ udāttaḥ*

6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣv aḍ udāttaḥ*

anuvṛtti 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*

translation [To] [an *aṅga*] followed by *LUṄ* (= the suffix of aorist), *LAṄ* (= the suffix of imperfect), or *LṚṄ* (= the suffix of conditional), *aṬ*, [being] high-pitched, [is added] [as] [its] [initial part].

explanation

1 A note on the supplied elements in my translation. "[To] … [is added]" translates a supplied [*bhavati*] in aṭ [*bhavati*]. "[as] … [initial part]" is the result of intepreting 6.4.71 with the help of the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.46, according to which *aṬ* is an initial part (*ādi*). "[its]" refers to the *aṅga* in issue, and also translates the genitive case in *aṅgasya*, which is carried forth from 6.4.1.

2 The *āgama* taught in 6.4.71 is *aṬ*, and the *āgamin* is *aṅga*. Effectively, this *aṅga* is also a verbal root (*dhātu*). In the current case, the *āgamin* is *pā*.

That one should add the *āgama aṬ* before *LAṄ* is replaced by *tiṄ*, as what is done here, is according to the view that *aṬ* is added while *lakāra* (here *LUṄ*, *LAṄ*, or *LṚṄ*) remains (lāvasthāyām aṭ), i.e. before *lakāra* is replaced by *tiṄ*, which Nāgeśa mentions as the *siddhānta* in the *Bhāṣya* (*bhāṣyoktasiddhānta*). Perhaps reference is to the following in *Bhāṣya* on 6.4.22.5: *"upadeśe" iti vartate, tatropadeśāvasthāyām evāḍāṭau bhavataḥ* (3:188.13).

With a few more steps, we reach the following:

1 *pā* *LAṄ*

2 *apā* *LAṄ* 6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣv aḍ udāttaḥ*

…

3 *apā* *a* *t*

Now is the time for the following *sūtra* to apply:

7.3.78 *pā-ghrā-dhmā-sthā-mnā-dāṇ-dṛśi-arti-sarti-śada-sadāṃ piba-jighra-dhama-tiṣṭha-mana-yaccha-paśya-rccha-dhau-śīya-sīdāḥ*

anuvṛtti *aṅgasya* 6.4.1; *śiti* 7.3.75

translation [In the place] of [the entire] [*aṅga*] *pā, ghrā, dhmā, sthā, mnā, dāṆ, dṛśi (= dṛś), arti (= ṛ), sarti (= sṛ), śadA*, or *sad* [that is] [followed by] [an item] [marked with *Ś*], *piba, jighra, dhama, tiṣṭha, mana, yaccha, paśya, ṛccha, dhau, śīya,* or *sīda* [is substituted] [respectively].

explanation

1 On "[the entire]" in my translation. The supplied "[the entire]" in my translation results from interpreting 7.3.78 with the help of 1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*. Since here each substitute (*piba*, *jighra* etc.) has more than one sound (*anekāl*), the entire *pā*, *ghrā* etc. mentioned in the *sūtra* plays the role of the substituend.

2 On "[respectively]" in my translation. The supplied "[respecitvely]" in my translation results from interpreting 7.3.78 with the help of 1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*. Since both the group of substituends (*pā*, *ghrā* etc.) and the group of substitutes (*piba*, *jighra* etc.) have eleven items, there is a one-to-one correspondance in accordance with 1.3.10, and hence the supplied "[respectively]" in my translation.

To preserve the changeless nature of the speech sounds, one will, applying what is mentioned in text part **7**, view the augmentation process of adding the *āgama aṬ* to the *āgamin pā* as a sort of substitution where the *āgamin* plus its *āgama apā* is the substitute, and the *āgamin pā* is the substituend. Now, if A 1.1.56 can also apply to *apā*, an inferred substitute consisting of the *āgamin* plus its *āgama* (protasis of link 1), then 7.3.78, which involves a substitute (here *piba*), will occur necessarily with 1.1.56 applied (apodosis of link 1) and the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* will not apply with regard to 7.3.78 (apodosis of link 2). Since 1.1.56 is applied, *apā* will be viewed as *pā*,[207] and so *piba* will be substituted in the place of *apā*. Now, one may argue, using the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* (translated below in my explanation of text part 8b), that the substituend should be rather *pā*, because *pā*, and not *apā*, is the explicitly mentioned substituend in 7.3.78. But this is not possible here, as the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* cannot apply here. Thus, we will have *piba* wrongly substituted in the place of *apā*, an item with the *aṬ āgama* (apodosis of link 3).

Here is the corresponding *prakriyā*. With *piba* wrongly substituted in the place of *apā* (below stage*4), we will reach finally **pibat* instead of the desired *apibat*.

1 *pā* *LAṄ*

[207] It seems to me that this is not correct: 1.1.56 cannot apply here and so we cannot treat *apā* like *pā*. The reason is the following. Here to treat *apā* as *pā* seems to involve the extension of pure phonological properties, and the operation (in the current context, the substitution of *piba* in the place of *pā*) taught in 7.3.78 seems to be one that is reliant on the sound of the substituend (*sthānyalāśraya*, found in *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 1.1.56 [p. 22, line 2 under 1.1.56]), that is *pā* in the current context. Thus, because of the force of *analvidhau* in 1.1.56, 1.1.56 cannot apply here and so we cannot treat *apā* like *pā*.

2	*apā*		*LAṄ*	6.4.71 *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣv aḍ udāttaḥ*
…				
3	*apā*	*a*	*t*	
*4	*piba*	*a*	*t*	7.3.78, with 1.1.56
*5	*pibat*			

desired:

4	*apiba*	*a*	*t*	7.3.78
5	*apibat*			

d) Link 4 (*aḍāgamasahitasya pibādyādeśāpattyā => lāvasthāyām aḍ iti bhāṣyoktasiddhāntāsaṃgatiḥ*)

Link 4: if the substitute *piba* or the like (e.g. *jighra*) will wrongly occur in the place of an item with the *āgama aṬ* (i.e. *apā* or the like e.g. *aghrā*),

then the following established view mentioned in the *Bhāṣya* will be in disagreement: that *aṬ* is added while *lakāra* (here *LUṄ*, *LAṄ*, or *LṚṄ*) remains (*lāvasthāyām aṭ*).

In the above process of deriving the undesired form **pibat*, the *aṬ āgama* is first added to *pā* near the beginning of the *prakriyā*, i.e. at stage 2, and then disappears at stage *4. This would be in disagreement with the view that *aṬ* is added while *lakāra* (here *LUṄ*, *LAṄ*, or *LṚṄ*) remains (*lāvasthāyām aṭ*), i.e. before *lakāra* is replaced by *tiṄ*, because *aṬ*, intended in this view to be added early in the *prakriyā*, is later dropped, so that instead of this view, the author of the *Bhāṣya* should have stated as the established view (*siddhānta*) e.g. that *aṬ* is added late in the *prakriyā*, after 7.3.78 has been applied, whereby *aṬ* will not be dropped and we could derive the desired form *apibat*.

e) Comments

Nāgeśa could have already achieved his purpose to prove as wrong the protasis of link 1 with links 1-3 alone: since we will derive an undesired form e.g. **pibat* in the apodosis of link 3, the protasis of link 1 can already be proven wrong. That Nāgeśa nevertheless has not stopped by link 3 and continued to give link 4 to reach finally a conflict with the *Bhāṣya* (*bhāṣyāsaṃgati*) gives me the feeling that for Nāgeśa, compared to deriving an undesired form, violation of the statement of the author of the *Bhāṣya* constitutes a greater sin, and hence has greater force in refutation.

f) Summary of the second reason

To summarise, one can, through the above chain of reasoning, come from the protasis in link 1, i.e. if A 1.1.56 can also apply to such inferred substitues (*ānumānikādeśa*) as *āgamin* plus its *āgama* (e.g. *itavya*), to the apodosis in link 4, i.e. then the established view *lāvasthāyām aṭ* mentioned in the *Bhāṣya* will be in disagreement. Since no *Bhāṣya* passage should be in disagreement or discord with anything we state (thus believes Nāgeśa), the protasis in link 1 cannot hold - that is to say, the word *ādeśaḥ* mentioned in A 1.1.56 does not cover such an inferred (*ānumānika*) substitute as *āgamin* plus the *āgama* (e.g. *itavya*) and so A 1.1.56 cannot apply in such a case.

8.2.17 Text part 8b (Corroboration of link 2 in 8a)

8.2.17.1 Text

8b *sthānivadbhāvaviṣaye "nirdiśyamānasya" iti paribhāṣāyāḥ pravṛttau "tisṛṇām" ity atra paratvāt tisrādeśe sthānivadbhāvena trayādeśam āśaṅkya, sakṛdgatinyāyena samādhānaparabhāṣyāsaṃgatiḥ.*[208]

[208] This refers to Bh 1.1.56.26:

26 ***trayādeśe srantapratiṣedhaḥ***.

8.2.17.2 Translation

If the *paribhāṣā* [beginning with] *nirdiśyamānasya* applies in the scope of *sthānivadbhāva*, [then] the [following] *Bhāṣya* [passage] will be in disagreement. [This *Bhāṣya* passage] intends the justification by means of the *sakṛdgati*-maxim (= *sakṛd gatau vipratiṣedhe yad bādhitaṃ tad bādhitam eva* [#40 in PbhI]) after [the following] doubt is raised: in the case of [the form] *tisṛṇām* (genitive feminine of the *prātipadika tri* "three"), since [in the *sūtrapāṭha*] [A 7.2.99] comes after [A 7.1.53], [first] tisṛ is substituted [in the place of *tri*]. After [this], *traya* [should] be substituted [in the place of *tisṛ*] through *sthānivadbhāva*.

8.2.17.3 Explanation

After giving the entire chain of reasoning in the previous sentence, Nāgeśa now comes back to link 2 in this chain and tries to corroborate it. He tries to prove that the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply in the scope of A 1.1.56, in the following way.

In the derivation of the form *tisṛṇām* "of three (in feminine)", genitive plural of the *prātipadika tri* "three" in feminine gender, after one adds the genitive plural case ending *ām* to the *prātipadika tri*,

1 *tri* *ām*

the following two rules can apply:

---

trayādeśe srantasya pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ. tisṛṇām. tisṛbhāve kṛte "tres trayaḥ" iti trayādeśaḥ prāpnoti. naiṣa doṣaḥ. idam iha saṃpradhāryam. tisṛbhāvaḥ kriyatām, trayādeśa iti$_{apposition}$ *kim atra kartavyam? paratvāt tisṛbhāvaḥ. athedānīṃ tisṛbhāve kṛte punaḥprasaṅgavijñānāt trayādeśaḥ kasmān na bhavati? "sakṛdgatau vipratiṣedhe yad bādhitaṃ tad bādhitam eva" iti.* (1:140.13-18)

7.1.53 *tres trayaḥ*

anuvṛtti 7.1.52 *āmi*; 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*

translation [In the place] of [the] [entire] [*aṅga*] *tri* [that is followed by *ām* (= genitive plural case ending)], *traya* [is substituted].

explanation

1 On "[entire]" in my translation. The supplied "[entire]" in my translation results from interpreting 7.1.53 with the help of 1.1.55 *anekālśit sarvasya*. Since here the substitute *traya* has more than one sound (*anekāl*), the entire *tri* mentioned in the *sūtra* plays the role of the substituend.

7.2.99 *tricaturoḥ striyāṃ tisṛcatasṛ*

anuvṛtti 6.4.1 *aṅgasya*; 7.2.84 *vibhaktau*

translation [In the place] of the [entire] feminine [*aṅga*] *tri* or *catur* [followed by a case ending], *tisṛ* or *catasṛ* [respecitvely] [are substituted].

explanation

1 On "[respectively]" in my translation. The supplied "[respecitvely]" in my translation results from interpreting 7.2.99 with the help of 1.3.10 *yathāsaṃkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām*. Since both *tricaturoḥ* and *tisṛcatasṛ* contain two items, there is a one-to-one correspondance in accordance with 1.3.10, and hence the supplied "[respectively]" in my translation.

In Bh 1.1.56.26 (quoted in fn 208), A 7.2.99 is given priority over A 7.1.53, because A 1.4.2 *vipratiṣedhe paraṃ kāryam* teaches when there is a conflict between two rules, the rule that comes later in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* should be given priority. Thus, *tri* is first replaced by *tisṛ*:

1	*tri*	*ām*	
2	*tisṛ*	*ām*	7.2.99 *tricaturoḥ striyāṃ tisṛcatasṛ*

Now, under the effect of A 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo `nalvidhau*, the substitute *tisṛ* can be treated like the substituend *tri*, and thus one may apply now the previously inapplicable A 7.1.53. This is, however, undesired:

1	*tri*	*ām*	
2	*tisṛ*	*ām*	
*3	*traya*	*ām*	7.1.53 *tres trayaḥ*, with the help of 1.1.56

To prevent A 7.1.53's application here, in the *Bhāṣya* the following *paribhāṣā* is cited:

> *sakṛd gatau vipratiṣedhe yad bādhitaṃ tad bādhitam eva* (#40 in PbhI; *sakṛdgatiparibhāṣā*)
>
> translation When [two rules] can [simultaneously] apply [and] there is mutual prohibition, that (= one of these two rules) which is blocked once is blocked definitively.

Accordingly, since A 7.1.53 has already been blocked once by A 7.2.99 at stage 2, A 7.1.53 cannot apply again as in stage *3.

In the PbhI, Nāgeśa argues that this *Bhāṣya* passage shows that the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply in the scope of A 1.1.56.

nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavanti. (#12 in PbhI)

translation Substitutes are substituted [in the place] of [an] [explicitly] mentioned [substituend].

If the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does apply in the scope of A 1.1.56, then the doubt whether A 7.1.53 could apply to stage 2 should not arise at all, because by the force of the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā*, A 7.1.53 clearly cannot apply to stage 2, which does not contain the form *tri* stated in A 7.1.53. Or, if this doubt does arise, then it will be removed by the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā*, and not by the *sakṛdgatiparibhāṣā* as we actually see in the *Bhāṣya*. That in the *Bhāṣya* such a doubt does arise and the removal of the doubt is through the *sakṛdgatiparibhāṣā* shows that the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply here, or more generally, it does not apply in the scope of A 1.1.56.[209]

Finally, coming back back to link 2: since the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply in the scope of A 1.1.56, and any operation involving a substitute, whether direct (i.e. directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*) or inferred (*ānumānika*), occurs necessarily through 1.1.56, that is to say, lies within the scope of 1.1.56, therefore, the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply with regard to any operation involving a substitute. I think this is how link 2 works.

[209] *Gadā*: *"**asaṃgatir iti**". "nirdiśyamāna" iti nyāyena śaṅkāyā evābhāvāt. ajñānena tatkaraṇe `pi taṃ vihāya samādhyantarakaraṇāsaṃgatir iti bhāvaḥ.* (p. 22 lines 7-9)

8.2.18 Text part 8c (1.1.56 can apply to 3.4.86 etc.)

8.2.18.1 Text

8c *"er uḥ" ityādau sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdeśāt tadantaparatayā paṭhitavākyasyaiva samudāyādeśaparatvenādeśagrahaṇasāmarthyāt tasya sthānivatsūtragrahaṇena na doṣaḥ.*[210]

---

[210] Cf. the following passages in Bh 1.1.56.9-11:

9 ekadeśavikṛtasyopasaṃkhyānam.

ekadeśavikṛtasyopasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam. kim prayojanam? pacatu, pacantu. tiṅgrahaṇena grahaṇaṃ yathā syāt.

> *Uddyota*: *ānumānike `pi sthānivattvapravṛttir vaktavyety etadvārttikatātparyam.* (vol. 1 p. 451a lines 13-14)

10 ekadeśavikṛtasyānanyatvāt siddham.

"ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavati" iti tiṅgrahaṇena grahaṇaṃ bhaviṣyati. tad yathā, śvā karṇe vā pucche vā chinne śvaiva bhavati, nāśvaḥ, na gardabha iti.

11 anityavijñānaṃ tu, tasmād upasaṃkhyānam.

anityavijñānaṃ tu bhavati. nityāḥ śabdāḥ. nityeṣu nāma śabdeṣu kūṭasthair avicālibhir varṇair bhavitavyam anapāyopajanavikāribhiḥ. tatra sa evāyam, vikṛtaś cety etan nityeṣu nopapadyate, tasmād upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam.

> *Pradīpa*: ***"anityavijñānam"*** *iti. avasthite takāra ikārasyokāra ity anityatvaṃ śuna iva prāpnotīti bhāvaḥ. upasaṃkhyāne tu kriyamāṇe nāsty anityatvam, "er uḥ" iti sthānyādeśābhyāṃ tiśabdatuśabdayor anumīyamānatvāt teḥ prasaṅge tor vidhānāt. tatrādeśagrahaṇād vopasaṃkhyānād vānumānikasyāpy ādeśasya sthānivadbhāvaḥ siddhaḥ.* (vol. 1 p. 451b lines 15-20)
>
> *Uddyota*: *vastuto vacanārambhe `pi vikṛtatvabuddhimātreṇa tatsaṃgatir ity avaśyaṃ vācyam, anyathā "vikṛtasya" ity asaṃgataṃ syāt. tadā tayaiva rītyā lokanyāyapravṛttir api sūpapādeti. "anityavijñānaṃ tu" ityādy ekadeśyuktiḥ.* (vol. 1 p. 452a lines 1-4)

bhāradvājīyāḥ paṭhanti.

ekadeśavikṛteṣūpasaṃkhyānam.

ekadeśavikṛteṣūpasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam. kim prayojanam? pacatu, pacantu. tiṅgrahaṇena grahaṇaṃ yathā syāt. kiṃ ca kāraṇaṃ na syāt?

anādeśatvāt.

ādeśaḥ sthānivad ity ucyate, na cema ādeśāḥ.

8.2.18.2 Translation

In the case of [the *sūtra*] *er uḥ* (A 3.4.86) etc., [there will be] no fault resulting from the reference in the *sthānivatsūtra* (A 1.1.56) to it (= a group substitute), because the *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* (= a genetive case in the sense of "in the place [of another item]" in accordance with A 1.1.49) is used [in A 3.4.86 etc.][, and, as a second reason,] because the term "*ādeśa*" [in A 1.1.56] is purposeful. [This second reason is mentioned here] because the said sentence (= *er uḥ* etc.) alone (= without the help of any other *sūtra* e.g. 1.1.72) intends a group substitute (e.g. *tu*) on the grounds that [the said sentence] intends [an item] ending with that (that = the substitute that is directly taught in a *sūtra*, e.g. *u* in 3.4.86 *er uḥ*; the item ending with that = e.g. *tu* in the case of 3.4.86).

8.2.18.3 Explanation

The construction (anvaya) analysis and understanding of 8c has appeared difficult to me. I will present here what I have understood from it. Although in **8c** no concrete form is cited, I will, for clarity, explain using the form *pacatu*. *pacatu* "let [him] cook" is the third person singular *parasmaipada* imperative form of the verbal root *pac* "to cook". After the imperative suffix *LOṬ* is introduced to the verbal root *pac* and then replaced by *ti*, A 3.4.86 applies:

1 *pac* *ti*

2 *pac* *tu* 3.4.86 *er uḥ*

3.4.86 *er uḥ*

---

rūpānyatvāc ca.

anyat khalv api rūpaṃ "pacati" iti, anyat "pacatu" iti. (Bh 1:136.5-18 [Bh 1.1.56.9-11])

anuvṛtti *loṭaḥ* 3.4.85

translation [In the place] of *i* [which is a part of *LOṬ*], *u* [is substituted].

explanation

1 On *loṭaḥ* carried forth from 3.4.85. I have taken *loṭaḥ* as ending in a genitive expressing a part-whole relation (*avayavaṣaṣṭhī*), and hence I have given "a part of" in my translation. Since *LOṬ* does not have the sound *i* in it, *i* cannot be a part of *LOṬ* directly. It is a part of *LOṬ* indirectly, in that any substitute in the place of *LOṬ* can also be called *LOṬ* and *i* can be a part of such a substitute (e.g. *ti*), so that *i* is also a part of *LOṬ*.

2 On the sounds referred to by *eḥ* and *uḥ* in 3.4.86. In accordance with 1.1.69 *aṇudit sarvarṇasya cāpratyayaḥ*, *i*, the *prātipadika* of *eḥ*, can refer to both *i* and ī. Which one is then here referred to by *eḥ*? Since we have *LOṬ* carried forth from 3.4.85, and *ī* cannot be related to (or more precisely, a substitute or a part of a substitute of *LOṬ*) whereas *i* can, we infer that here *eḥ* refers to *i* and not *ī*.

Similarly, in accordance with 1.1.69, *u*, the *prātipadika* of *uḥ*, can also refer to both *u* and *ū*. I think perhaps the way to decide which one of these two is the referent of *uḥ* in 3.4.86 is to look at the actual forms derived (*lakṣyānurodha*): since we have *u* but never *ū* in the derived forms, *u*, and not *ū*, must be the referent of *uḥ* in 3.4.86.

Although the substitute directly taught in A 3.4.86 *er uḥ* is the sound *u* alone (and the substituend *i* alone), Nāgeśa argues that 3.4.86, despite its wording *er uḥ*, intends to teach rather a group substitute (*samudāyādeśaparatva*), that is to say, 3.4.86 intends to teach rather that an item ending with *u* (e.g. *tu*) is substituted in the place of an item ending with *i* (e.g. *ti*), and not simply that *u* is substituted in the

place of *i.* As 1.1.72 *yena vidhis tadantasya* cannot apply here to interpret ud*anta* out of *u* because *u* is not a modifier of any other item, it is not easy, in my view, to have the *tadanta* interpretation for 3.4.86. This is perhaps why Nāgeśa has here argued that 3.4.86, in its actual wording *er uḥ* (*paṭhitavākyasya*), alone (*eva*), that is without the help of any other *sūtra* e.g. 1.1.72, intends a group substitute (*samudāyādeśaparatva*) and can thus lead to the group substitute interpretation, simply because this is what is intended in 3.4.86 (*tadantaparatayā*).

Now, a natural question is, why do we need this twisting of the meaning of 3.4.86? Would there be any problem if we substitute just *u* in the place of *i* in e.g. above stage 1 *pac-ti* in the derivation of *pacatu*? A potential problem is perhaps the following. If we substitute just *u* in the place of *i*, any name belonging to the substituend *i* may be extended to the substitute *u* by 1.1.56, but any name belonging to *ti* cannot be extended to *tu* by 1.1.56, because *tu* is not the substitute and *ti* is not the substituend. Thus, we will have difficulty in transferring the name *tiṄ* from *ti* to tu, which we desire, because we want to call *pacatu* by the name *pada* by 1.4.14 *suptiṅantaṃ padam*. If we can twist 3.4.86, as Nageśa here does, to mean rather e.g. *tu* in the place of e.g. *ti*, than *tu* is the subsitute and *ti* is the subsittuend, and thus by 1.1.56 *tu* will be able to inherit the name *tiṄ* from *ti*, and so *pacatu* will be able to have the name *pada*. This is perhaps behind Nāgeśa's *tadanta* interpretation for 3.4.86.

Now, one may legitimately ask the following. Why is it that here (to extend the name *tiṄ* from *ti* to *tu*) we can apply A 1.1.56 to *tu*, which is in nature an inferred substitute (*ānumānikādeśa*), whereas in the case of the *āgamin* plus its *āgama* e.g. *itavya* viewed as a substitute, which is likewise an inferred substitute, A 1.1.56 cannot apply? This, in my understanding, is the answer: the difference between the current case of *tu* and the case of an *āgamin* plus its *āgama* e.g. *itavya* lies in the fact that in the former, we have a *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* mentioned in the *sūtra* (*sthānaṣaṣṭhīnirdeśāt*), *i*.e. *eḥ* in 3.4.86, whereas in the latter such a *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* is

missing (in the case of e.g. *itavya*, 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* teaches the process of augmentation and the genitive in *ārdhadhātukasya* is not a *sthānaṣaṣṭhī*, but an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*). Therefore, fundamentally, A 1.1.56 has the chance to apply in the former case, but has no chance to apply in the latter.

In addition, as I understand it, Nāgeśa here in text part 8c has also expressed the following idea. That A 1.1.56, normally referring and applying to only a directly taught substitute (see §8.2.16.3.1), can here apply to the inferred group substitute *tu* (*tasya [= samudāyādeśasya] sthānivatsūtre grahaṇena na doṣaḥ*), lies in Pāṇini's uttering the term *ādeśaḥ* in A 1.1.56 *sthānivad ādeśo `nalvidhau* (*ādeśagrahaṇasāmarthyāt*). Since the word *sthānin* is already mentioned in A 1.1.56, and it is a word that is closely related to another word (*saṃbandhiśabda*) *i*.e. *ādeśa*, we can already infer and understand the word *ādeśa* in *1.1.56 *sthānivad analvidhau*, *i*.e. 1.1.56 with its word *ādeśa* dropped, and hence *ādeśaḥ* in A 1.1.56 appears redundant. But it cannot be redundant (like any other word in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*), and this repeated explicit *ādeśaḥ* is for the sake of enabling A 1.1.56 to refer to, besides the substitutes directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, also those inferred substitutes, like *tu* in our current case.[211] (Note that the word *ādeśaḥ* in 1.1.56, however, does not enable 1.1.56 to also refer to an inferred substitute consisting of an *āgamin* plus its *āgama*, e.g. *itavya*, because in this case what is actually taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is augmentation and there is no substitution or *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* at all: see the table below.)

8.2.18.4 Comment: a summarising table

Here is a table comparing and summarising whether A 1.1.56 can apply to the following three situations and why: <1> A real substitution (*han* => *vadha*); <2> an inferred substitution with a real, related, substitution taught (*ti* => *tu*); <3> a purely

[211] *Gadā*: *"**ādeśagrahaṇa**°" iti. sthānivad ity uktyaiva saṃbandhiśabdamahimnādeśākṣepe siddhe punar ādeśagrahaṇasāmarthyād ity arthaḥ.*

inferred substitution (from a real augmentation) (*tavya* => *itavya*). All the columns except the last one are related to text part 8. The last column is related to text part 7, about how to save *śabdanityatva* in each of the three situations.

substituend	substitute	Are there *śrautasthānyādeśabhāva* and *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* (in bold)?	Is there *ānumānikasthānyādeśabhāva*?	Can A 1.1.56 apply?	How to preserve *śabdanityatva*?
han	*vadha*	yes: 2.4.42 *hano vadha liṅi*	no	yes	*buddhivipariṇāma*, understanding shifts from *han* to *vadha*
ti	*tu*	yes: *i* replaced by *u* (3.4.86 ***er uḥ***)	yes: *ti* replaced by *tu*	yes, by the force of *ādeśaḥ* in A 1.1.56	*buddhivipariṇāma*, understanding shifts from *ti* to *tu* (or *i* to *u*)
tavya	*itavya*	no: 7.2.35 *ārdhadhātukasyeḍ valādeḥ* teaches augmentation rather than substitution, and the *ṣaṣṭhī* there is not a *sthānaṣaṣṭhī* but an *avayavaṣaṣṭhī*	yes: *tavya* replaced by *itavya* (*anāgamakānāṃ sāgamakā ādeśāḥ*)	no, the force of *ādeśaḥ* in A 1.1.56 does not make A 1.1.56 apply to this case, because there is no *śrautasthānyādeśabhāva* and no *sthānaṣaṣṭhī*, that is no substitution at all	*buddhivipariṇāma*, understanding shifts from *tavya* to *itavya*

8.2.19 Text part 8d (A 1.1.57 etc. can also apply)

8.2.19.1 Text

8d *ānumānikasthānyādeśabhāvakalpane `pi śrautasthānyādeśabhāvasya na tyāga iti "acaḥ parasmin" ityāder nāsaṃgatiḥ.*

8.2.19.2 Translation

Even if [one] conceives of an inferred substitution, a substitution found [directly taught] in the authoritative work (= the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*)[212] is not abandoned, [and] hence *acaḥ* parasmin (A 1.1.57) etc. are not in disagreement.

[212] I take the *prātipadika śrauta* as the *prātipadika śruti* with the *taddhita* suffix *aṆ* added to it (A 4.3.53 *tatra bhavaḥ* and A 4.1.83 *prāg dīvyato `ṇ*), and *śrautaḥ* means *śrutau bhavaḥ* "being in the

8.2.20 Text part 8e (Conclusion of text part 8)

8.2.20.1 Text

8e *etena "yadāgamāḥ" iti paribhāṣā sthānivatsūtreṇa gatārthety apāstam.*

8.2.20.2 Translation

Through this (= text part 8a-8d) [the following] [view] is rejected: that the purposes of the *paribhāṣā* [beginning with] *yadāgamāḥ* (= the ypbh) are achieved through the *sthānivatsūtra* (= A 1.1.56).

8.2.21 Text part 9 (The above commentary on the ypbh has its root in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20)

8.2.21.1 Text

9 *etat sarvaṃ "dādhā ghv adāp" iti sūtre bhāṣye spaṣṭam.*[213]

śruti, found in the śruti". Regarding the meaning of *śruti*, I have interpreted it as "an authoritatve work (here referring to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*)", following the second meaning Abhyankar gives to the word *śruti* in his Dictionary: "(2) authoritative word; the word is sometimes used in connection with the utterances of the Sūtrakāras viz. the Sūtra" (p. 396b). Therefore, *śrauta* means "found in the authoritative work (here, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*)". (Incidentally, I am curious how often the word *śruti* is used to refer to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.)

[213] By the way, it is remarkable that Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa, the direct pupil of Nāgeśa, records a number of variant readings of the text of PbhI in his commentary *Gadā*. I would expect, as far as the text of PbhI 11 is concerned, fewer variant readings reported by Vaidyanātha, as he is supposed to be the direct pupil of Nāgeśa. Are these different readings the result of manuscript transmission, or Nāgeśa's own corrections, or some other factors? What happened between Vaidyanātha and Nāgeśa? Incidentally, did Nāgeśa also have any other direct pupil than Vaidyanātha? If not, why only Vaidyanātha? The relevant historical background appears to me to be a very interesting topic to explore. If Vaidyanātha does report a large number of variant readings of the PbhI, this may perhaps give support to the view that it was Vaidyanātha's son Bālambhaṭṭa who wrote some or all

8.2.21.2 Translation

All this (= everything above, *i*.e. text part 1-8 plus the *paribhāṣā* itself)[214] [is] clear in the *Bhāṣya* under the *sūtra dādhā ghv adāp* (= A 1.1.20).

8.2.21.3 Comments

1 At the end of his commentary on the ypbh, Nāgeśa claims that everything he has said in his commentary on the ypbh, plus the ypbh itself, has their root or basis in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20. This is perhaps for the sake of giving authority to his own commentary. Although some of Nāgeśa's points in his commentary on the ypbh are not found in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20 (e.g. that the ypbh is not mandatory [in text part 3]), Nāgeśa may have thought that those points which are not explicitly found in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20 must have also been accepted by Patañjali, though silently.

2 A summary of the content of PbhI 11:

content	text part
Introduction (*avataraṇa*)	1
Gloss and establishment through mundane principle (*lokanyāyasiddhi*)	2a-2d
That the ypbh is not mandatory (*anitya*) and it also applies where the *āgamin* is a single sound (*varṇagrahaṇa*)	3a-5d
neṭi and *ṇer aniṭi*	6
Reconciling the teaching of *āgama* and the changelessness (*nityatva*) of the speech-sound	7
That the ypbh will not be rendered redundant by A 1.1.56	8

of the grammatical works and attributed them to his father, in which case there was then actually a larger time gap between the authors of PbhI and its commentary *Gadā* than hitherto assumed. See J. Bronkhorst, *Tradition and argument in classical Indian linguistics* (2003), Conclusion, fn 3. (Incidentally, the identity and difference of Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa, Bālambhaṭṭa Pāyaguṇḍa [son of Vaidyanātha or another name of Vaidyanātha], and Bālakṛṣṇa Pāyaguṇḍa does not appear to me clear and should perhaps be clarified by further research, e.g. by looking more deeply into the works of Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍa, both published and unpublished.)

[214] *Gadā*: *idaṃ sarvaṃ samūlayati, "**etat sarvam**" iti. paribhāṣā tadvyākhyānam anāgamakānām ityādi sarvaṃ cety arthaḥ.*

That the above commentary on the ypbh has its root in *Bhāṣya* on 1.1.20	9

9 Conclusion

9.1 A table summarising the ypbh commenatry in the five *paribhāṣā* works treated in Chapter 4-8

chapter	text and # of the ypbh in it	form of the ypbh	gloss of the ypbh	establishment of the ypbh (siddhi)	purpose (prayojana)	fault (doṣa)
4	VḍV 17	E	yo yasya bhaktaḥ sa tadgrahaṇena bhavati.	jñāpaka: 1.2.18	sarveṣām; (devitvā, sevitvā)	none
5	PuV 18	D	none	jñāpaka: 1.2.18; yuktisiddhi	sarveṣām; kuṇḍā	none
6	NīV 4	B	pradhānasyāvayavabhūtā āgamā avayavigrahaṇena gṛhyante.	jñāpaka: 7.2.4; lokanyāyasiddhi	none	none
7	HaV 4	A	(tacchabdenāgamī gṛhyate.)	Three jñāpakas: 6.4.51, 7.2.4, and 1.1.34.	sarveṣām	the high-pitched accent in yāsUṬ in bhūyāt
8	PbhI 11	B	yam uddiśyāgamo vihitaḥ sa tadguṇībhūtaḥ śāstreṇa tadavayavatvena bodhito `tas tadgrahaṇena tadgrāhakeṇa tadbodhakena śabdena gṛhyate bodhyata ity arthaḥ.	(Two jñāpakas: 6.4.51 and 7.2.4); lokanyāyasiddhi	praṇidāpayati; pacamāna (accent); kurvann āste; the name guṇa / vṛddhi for ar / ār	pacamāna (*pacāna); didīye; jahāra

In connection with the third column "form of the ypbh" in the table, for convenience, I reproduce here from §1.6 all the six forms of the ypbh I have found:

A. *āgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

B. *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

C. *tadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

D. *āgamā yadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*

E. *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*

F. *arthavata āgamas tadguṇībhūtas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*

For a concrete example, here is what the *paribhāṣā* commentators say about the same example *sarveṣām*:

VḍV	*"sarveṣām" iti*	*suḍāgamaḥ subbhaktaḥ subgrahaṇena gṛhyate. tena*	*"bahuvacane jhaly et" ity*	*etvaṃ siddhaṃ bhavati.*	(text part 3)
PuV	*"sarveṣām" ity atra ca*	*suṭaḥ subgrahaṇena grahaṇāj*	*jhalādau supīty*	*etvaṃ sidhyati.*	(text part 2b)
SīV	*tena "sarveṣām" ity atra*	*suṭaḥ subgrahaṇena grahaṇāj*	*jhalādau supy*	*etvaṃ sidhyati.*	*Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* p. १६६ lines 10-11 from bottom
HaV	*tena "sarveṣām" ity atra*	*"āmi sarvanāmnaḥ suṭ" iti suṭa āmgrahaṇena graḥaṇād*	*"bahuvacane jhaly et" ity*	*etvam.*	(text part 2)

Thus, the discussion on *sarveṣām* in these four texts are generally similar.

9.2 The effect of the ypbh must exist

What is "the effect of the ypbh"? The extension (*atideśa*) of a name (*saṃjñā*), property (*dharma*) etc. from the *āgamin* to the group of *āgamin* plus its *āgama* (= what I have called "effect #1" under point 2 in §8.2.11.3).

I think the effect of the ypbh must have been assumed by Pāṇini. Apart from the items in column 6 "purpose (*prayojana*)" in the above table (i.e. *sarveṣām* etc.), I wish to present three more pieces of evidence I have collected.

9.2.1 A 4.1.32 *anta*rvatpativator nuk: *anta*rvatnī

In deriving *antarvatnī* "[a] pregnant [woman]", the feminine of *antarvat* "pregnant", we apply A 4.1.32 *antarvatpativator nuk*, which teaches the addition of the *āgama nUK* to the *āgamin antarvat* or *pativat*, and derive *antarvatn*:

1	*antarvat*	
2	*antarvatn*	4.1.32 *antarvatpativator nuk*

Now, in order to obtain the feminine suffix *ī*, 4.1.5 *ṛnnebhyo ṅīp* is to be applied. This rule requires a *prātipadika* (from 4.1.1) ending with *n*. In *antarvatn*, *antarvat* is *prātipadika*; if Pāṇini did not assume the effect of the ypbh, I do not think there is a way to let *antarvatn* obtain the name *prātipadika*. With the effect of the ypbh, *antarvatn*, the *āgamin antarvat* plus the *āgama n*, will be able to inherit the name *prātipadika* from the *āgamin antarvat*, so that we now do have a *prātipadika* ending with *n* (*antarvatn*), and 4.1.5 can now apply, leading to the desired form *antarvatnī*:

3	*antarvatn*	*ī*	*4.1.5 ṛnnebhyo ṅīp*

To summarise, without the effect of the ypbh, we would not be able to derive the desired form *antarvatnī*. Consequently, the effect of the ypbh must have been assumed by Pāṇini.

9.2.2 A 8.2.7: pañcānām

In deriving *pañcānām* "of five", the genitive plural of the *prātipadika pañcan* "five", we add ām to the *prātipadika pañcan*, the *āgama nUṬ* to *ām* (7.1.55), and then apply 6.4.7 to lenghthen the penultimate a in *pañcan*:

1	*pañcan*	
2	*pañcan*	*ām*
3	*pañcan*	*nām*
4	*pañcān*	*nām*

Now, in order to drop *n* in *pañcān*, 8.2.7 *nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya* is to be applied. This rule requires that *pañcān* is a *pada* (*padasya* carried forth from 8.1.16). I think *pañcān* can get the name *pada* only by 1.4.17 *svādiṣv asarvanāmasthāne*. For this, we need nām to be sv*ādi*. *ām* is sv*ādi*: now, if Pāṇini did not assume the effect of the ypbh, I do not think there is a way to let nām also be sv*ādi*, and so 1.4.17 will not be able to apply, *pañcān* will not be able to get the name *pada*, 8.2.7 cannot apply, and *n* in *pañcān* cannot be dropped. Consequently, we will derive the undersired form **pañcānnām*. With the effect of the ypbh, *nām,* the *āgamin ām* plus its *āgama n*, will be able to inherit the property sv*ādi* from the *āgamin ām*, so that 1.4.17 will be able to apply, *pañcān* will be able to get the name *pada*, 8.2.7 will be

able to apply deleting *n* in *pañcān*, and we will be able to derive the desired form *pañcānām*.

5 pañcāɸ nām 8.2.7 nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya

To summarise, without the effect of the ypbh, we would not be able to derive the desired form *pañcānām* (we would rather have **pañcānnām*). Consequently, the effect of the ypbh must have been assumed by Pāṇini.

9.2.3 A 1.2.9 *iko jhal*: *jhalādi san*

In 1.2.9 *iko jhal*, we have san carried forth from 1.2.8. How to understand *jhal* (*san*) in 1.2.9? I think Pāṇini has meant *jhal*[*ādi*] (*san*) here - I cannot think of an interpretation that is more likely than this one. If Pāṇini has indeed meant *jhal*[*ādi*] (*san*) in 1.2.9, then the effect of the ypbh must have been assumed by him. Without the effect of the ypbh, *jhalādi san* would not make sense, because *san*, beginning with s, is always *jhalādi* and thus there is no deviation at all (*vyabhicārābhāva*). Since *jhal san* (= *jhalādi san*) and *san* alone would then mean the same thing, *jhal* in 1.2.9 is then redundant. With the effect of the ypbh, *isan*, i.e. *saN* with the *iṬ āgama* added to it, can also be called *saN*, and thus we will have a *saN* that is not *jhalādi* (but *ajādi*), and so since there is deviation, saying *jhalādi san* in 1.2.9 would make sense. Consequently, *jhal* in 1.2.9 would not be redundant.

To summarise, without the effect of the ypbh, the intended *jhal*[*ādi*] (*san*) in 1.2.9 would not make sense, and so *jhal* in 1.2.9 would be redundant. Consequently, the effect of the ypbh must have been assumed by Pāṇini.

9.3 Different ways of achieving the effect of the ypbh

If Pāṇini did assume the effect of the ypbh, did he actually teach or hint at it in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*? How did he teach the effect of the ypbh, if at all? After all, what are the possible ways of achieving the effect of the ypbh? I think at least the following three ways or approaches are possible.

9.3.1 Approach A: a *paribhāṣā* not mentioned in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

To achieve the effect of the ypbh, one could of course formulate a *paribhāṣā* specially for this effect: for example, in the form of *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* (i.e. the wording of the ypbh in PbhI 11), or in the form of *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhayate* (i.e. the wording of the ypbh in VḌV 17). If Pāṇini did know, accept, and yet choose not to mention in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* such a *paribhāṣā*, it appears to me that it is more likely that this *paribhāṣā* is in the form *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate* than in the form *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*, as Pāṇini himself did not use the word *āgama* at all in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. But of course, that such a *paribhāṣā* was in the form *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* is also possible: it may be the case that Pāṇini knew the *paribhāṣā yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante*, but he chose not to use the name *āgama* in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

The current approach, i.e. A, can apply to all *āgamas*.

9.3.2 Approach B: 1.1.56 (*sthānivadbhāva*)

Using *sthānivadbhāva* or A 1.1.56 to achieve the effect of the ypbh has already been referred to in PbhI text part 8. The idea is to treat the augmentation process as a sort of substitution, that is to say, to treat the *āgamin* plus its *āgama* as a substitute in the place of the original *āgamin*, and then with the help of 1.1.56, since the substitute can inherit the name, property, etc. from the substituend, the *āgamin* plus its *āgama*

can thus inherit a name, property, etc. from the *āgamin* - this is exactly the effect of the ypbh.[215]

[215] <1> Nāgeśa in text part 8 of PbhI has, in effect, argued against using approach B to achieve the effect of the ypbh. I am not convinced by his argument there in text part 8, or probably I have not managed to understand deeply enough his words there. Nevertheless, I wish to present some of my thoughts on this subject.

First, *sākṣādaṣṭādhyāyībodhitasthānyādeśabhāve cāritārthyāt*, i.e. the first reason Nāgeśa gives in text part 8a (see my presentation of the structure of text part 8 in §8.2.15), needs, in my view, to be better supported: why can 1.1.56 only apply to the substitutes directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*?

Second, in Nāgeśa's second reason including 4 links (from *kiṃ ca, evaṃ sati* in text part 8a through *sakṛdgatinyāyena samādhānaparabhāṣyāsaṃgatiḥ*, i.e. the end of text part 8b), I doubt about the force of link 1 and link 2. As I have said in "Comment" under 8.2.16.3.2a (link 1), even if we accept that 1.1.56 **can** also apply to an inferred substitute and thus can apply to all substitutes (which consist of substitutes directly taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and inferred substitutes), we cannot say that 1.1.56 **must** apply to each and every substitute (*sthānibuddhyaiva kāryapravṛttyā*). 1.1.56 has the potential to apply in all substitutes, but it does not necessarily apply everywhere: rather, it applies only when there is a problem to be solved by it. In *apā-a-t*, we do not have such a problem in sight, and so we do not need to apply 1.1.56 here. Regarding link 2, which is corroborated in text part 8b, I cannot understand why, if the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* can apply in that context, the author of the *Bhāṣya* **must** use the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* to remove the doubt, and cannot remove the doubt in another way e.g. by using the *sakṛdgatiparibhāṣā*. So, in my view, that the author of the *Bhāṣya* has used the *sakṛdgatiparibhāṣā* to remove the doubt and not the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* cannot prove that the *nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā* does not apply in that context: the author of the *Bhāṣya* may have simply chosen one method of doubt-removal out of two or even many.

<2> Moreover, with approach B, i.e. 1.1.56, and in particular the word *analvidhau* in 1.1.56, we can also solve the three problems Nāgeśa has mentioned in text part 3a-3b in his commentary on the ypbh (PbhI 11). Due to the force of *analvidhau* in 1.1.56, the substitute cannot be treated like its substituend, that is to say, *sthānivādbhāva* cannot apply, if the operation to occur is one that is

reliant on the sound of the substituend (*sthānyalāśraya*, found in *Kāśikā*'s gloss of 1.1.56 [p. 22, line 2 under 1.1.56])

In the example pacamāna / *pacāna in text part 3a, the operation to occur, that is the operation taught in 6.1.101 *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ*, is indeed one that is reliant on the sound of the substituend (*sthānyalāśraya*), i.e. the second *a* in *pac-a*. Consequently, *sthānivadbhāva* cannot apply here, and thus 6.1.101 cannot apply, and we will not have the problem of deriving the undesired **pacāna*.

Similarly, in the first example didīye mentioned in text part 3b, the operation to occur, that is the operation taught in 6.1.77 *iko yaṇ aci*, relies on *aC*, which is the sound of the substituend *e*; in the second example *jahāra* mentioned in text part 3b, the operation to occur, that is the operation taught in 7.1.34 *āta au ṇalaḥ*, relies on *āT* (= *ā*), which is the sound of the substituend *ā*: therefore, *sthānivadbhāva* cannot apply in both examples, and there will be no problem in them.

Also cf. fn 207.

<3> Finally, I wish to quote the following passage in Śeṣādrisudhī's commentary on the ypbh in his *Paribhāṣābhāskara* (ŚeV 11):

> *atredam avadheyam. "tanmadhyapatitas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate", "tadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante", "ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavad bhavati" iti vacanatrayam idaṃ sthānivatsūtreṇaiva siddham. yāny atra jñāpakāni "nedamadasor akoḥ", "ṇer aniṭi", "āḍhyasubhagasthūla°" iti, tāni sthānivatsūtra ādeśagrahaṇena teṣāṃ grahaṇe jñāpakāni. evaṃ sati vacanatrayākalpanāl lāghavam. tadāgamaikadeśavikṛtaparibhāṣayor alvidhāv apravṛttaye jñāpakāntarānusaraṇam api na kartavyam, "analvidhau" iti niṣedhenaiva tatra tadapravṛtteḥ. alvidhau pravṛttiprayojanatrayaṃ tu prāg eva dūṣitam. tasmāt sthānivatsūtreṇeṣṭasiddhau vacanatrayam idaṃ na kartavyam iti.* (p. ३९४ lines 8-17)

Thus, Śeṣādrisudhī argues that 1.1.56 can achieve the effect of not only the ypbh, but also two other *paribhāṣās*. For the sake of economy, these three *paribhāṣās* need not be assumed (*evaṃ sati vacanatrayākalpanāl lāghavam*). Although I have not yet managed to look deep into Śeṣādrisudhī's

This approach can apply to all *āgamas*.

9.3.3 Approach C: 1.1.46 ādy*anta*u ṭakitau

Let me explain approach C using the example *vUK* in 6.4.88 *bhuvo vug luṅliṭoḥ*, which teaches that the *āgama vUK* is added to its *āgamin bhū*, conditioned by a right context that is not important here. With the help of the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau*, we know that *vUK*, having the marker *K*, is a final part (*vuk antaḥ*). Whose final part? I think the answer must be "*bhū*'s final part", so that we can say that *vUK* is a final part of *bhū* (*vuk bhuvaḥ antaḥ*), with the help of the *paribhāṣāsūtra* 1.1.46.

Now, if we look a bit more closely at the statement "*vUK* is a final part of *bhū*" (*vuk bhuvaḥ antaḥ*), we see a problem. It makes sense to say that *vUK* is a final part of *bhūv*, but it does not make sense (to me at least) to say that *vUK* is a final part of *bhū*. The final part of *bhū* is *ū*: we cannot say *vUK* is *ū*, or *vUK* becomes *ū*, whereby we would possibly have the undesired form **bhv*. Thus, the statement "*vUK* is a final part of *bhū*" (*vuk bhuvaḥ antaḥ*) does not seem to make sense, or more generally, it does not make sense to say that an *āgama* marked with *K* is a final part of its *āgamin*; in the same way, it also does not make sense to say that an *āgama* marked with *Ṭ* is a initial part of its *āgamin*: thus, since this is exactly what 1.1.46 *ādyantau ṭakitau* teaches, 1.1.46 does not appear to make sense. Now, of course we cannot simply accept that 1.1.46 is non-sensical and dismiss it, throw it aside, and then move forward, because our principle in interpreting Pāṇini is to try to make as

commentary on the ypbh (ŚeV 11), I think it is worth close scrutiny, as it seems to offer interesting counterpoints to Nāgeśa's commentary on the ypbh in PbhI 11.

much sense as possible out of the extant text (i.e. the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*). What sense can we then make out of 1.1.46, or what effect can we interpret it to have?

Up till now, we have only looked at the rules themselves (*lakṣaṇaikacakṣuṣka*). If we also take into consideration the actual forms in the derivation (*ubhayacakṣuṣka*, which is, incidentally, the *pakṣa* that I think should be accepted and followed), we can see that what 1.1.46 intends to teach, or the effect of 1.1.46, is that an *āgama* marked with *K* / *Ṭ* is added after / before its *āgamin*, so that 6.4.88 teaches that *vUK* is added after *bhū*. But now the question is, to achieve this effect, Pāṇini could have simply uttered *pūrvaparau ṭakitau* as 1.1.46, whereby we can also avoid the problem mentioned above: why did he then choose instead the apparently problematic wording *ādyantau* in 1.1.46?

To this question, there can be many different answers, or in other words, one can come up with many different explanations for Pāṇini's choosing *ādi* and *anta* in 1.1.46 instead of *pūrva* and *para*. For example, it may just be an arbitrary choice of words on the part of Pāṇini. Or, Pāṇini has indeed intended *pūrva* and *para*, but he somehow ended up using the words *ādi* and *anta*, in a loose or even imprecise way. All these explanations are of course possible, but to me, the explanation that sounds most likely and at the same time can keep Pāṇini most wise is the following. Pāṇini has chosen to utter *ādi* and *anta* in 1.1.46 instead of *pūrva* and *para*, because he aims at achieving not only the effect that *pūrva* and *para* can achieve (i.e. the addition of an *āgama* before / after its *āgamin*; let me call this effect α) but also a second effect (let me call this effect β), which is that an *āgama* marked with *K* or *Ṭ* is / becomes the final (*anta*) or initial (*ādi*) part of its *āgamin*. Let me explain this second effect β more closely, using the example *vUK* and *bhū* above. Since an *āgama* marked with *K* e.g. *vUK* is a final part of its *āgamin* e.g. *bhū*, and since *bhū* has e.g. the name *dhātu* "verbal root", *vUK* is then a part of *dhātu* (or to put it in another way, the *dhātu* ends with *v*), so that the name *dhātu* now does not refer to only *bhū*, but *bhūv*: here the name belonging to the *āgamin bhū* is extended to *bhūv*,

the *āgamin* plus its *āgama* - this is exactly the effect of the ypbh. Obviously, Pāṇini cannot achieve both effect α and β using just *pūrva* and *para*; to achieve both these effects, to utter *ādi* and *anta*, as what he actually did, is, in my opinion, perhaps the most elegant and simple way.

Therefore, since Pāṇini has possibly intended the effect of the ypbh in 1.1.46 by choosing the special wording *ādi* and *anta* (instead of e.g. *pūrva* and *para*), we can achieve the effect of the ypbh by 1.1.46. This is then approach C.

Finally, since 1.1.46 applies to only those *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ* or K, the current approach, i.e. C, can also apply to those *āgamas* only.

9.3.4 Comparing the three approaches A, B, and C

Since in approach C we do not need to resort to any elemnet outside of the topic of augmentation in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (e.g. 1.1.56 in approach B), let alone to phrase a new rule (e.g. a new *paribhāṣā* in approach A), approach C is perhaps the most economical, or minimal, among the three approaches A, B, and C. However, the defect with approach C is that it cannot apply to all the *āgamas*, but only to those *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ* or *K*.

Since with approach B we can reach all the *āgamas* and we do not need to resort to an element outside of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (e.g. a new *paribhāṣā* in approach A), approach B is ideal if we wish for a way to achieve the effect of the ypbh that can be consistently applied to all the *āgamas* and is at the same time also econominical (not requiring any extra effort beyond the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*).

With approach A, we can reach all the *āgamas*. However, we need to resort to something outside of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Also, if the formulation of such a new *paribhāṣā* contains the word *āgama*, like *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* (i.e. the wording of the ypbh in PbhI 11) or any one of the forms A-D and F mentioned in §1.6, then there is the additional hurdle to clarify what the term *āgama* exactly refers to or whether an item has the name *āgama*, which, as I have

shown in §2.1, is not clear according to Pāṇini himself. It may take a lot of efforts especially with an item that can be controversial: for example, is *r* taught in 1.1.51 an *āgama*? Or, *Kāśikā* (on 6.4.47) does not call *rAM* taught in 6.4.47 an *āgama*, while *Siddhāntakaumudī* (on 6.4.47) does: is *rAM* then an *āgama* or not? Only after the exact range of the referents of the term *āgama* has been settled can we know where exactly a *paribhāṣā* like *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* can apply: that is to say, if an item has the name *āgama*, then such a *paribhāṣā* can apply; if not, then such a *paribhāṣā* cannot apply to it. If such a *paribhāṣā* cannot apply to it, we may have further problems: what to do when the effect of the ypbh is nevertheless still wanted? Of course, if the formulation of the new *paribhāṣā* does not contain the word *āgama*, like *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhayate* (i.e. the wording of the ypbh in VḌV 17, which I have named E in §1.6), we will then be spared with this additional trouble.

Here is a table that summarises my words above:

approach	Can this approach apply to all the āgamas?	Do we need to resort to something outside of the Aṣṭādhyāyī?	Do we need to resort to something outside of the topic of augmentation in the Aṣṭādhyāyī?	features
A	yes	yes, i.e. an additional paribhāṣā	yes, as we already need something outside of the Aṣṭādhyāyī	the approach with most complexities (the "maximal" approach); possible additional hurdle concerning whether an item has the name āgama
B	yes	no	yes, i.e. 1.1.56	ideal if we want an approach that is both consistent and economical
C	no, only those āgamas marked with Ṭ or K	no	no	the most economical (minimal) way

The following table, essentially a presentation in a different way of the first two columns of the above table, answers the question: which approach can be applied to which *āgamas*? (For the pool of all the *āgamas* taught in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, see the table in §2.3.2.)

āgama	approach
marked with Ṭ or K	A, B, C
all the other āgamas	A, B

9.4 Final conclusion

Pāṇini must have assumed the effect of the ypbh, but he may not necessarily have assumed an additional *paribhāṣā* like *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* or *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhayate* to achieve this effect, because this

effect can already be achieved through elements within his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, i.e. *sūtra* 1.1.46 and 1.1.56. Therefore, if we adopt a minimalist attitude, an additional *paribhāṣā* like *yadāgamās tadguṇībhūtās tadgrahaṇena gṛhyante* or *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhayate* is not necessary: we can solve all the problems to be solved through such an additional *paribhāṣā*, or in other words, we can achieve the effect of the ypbh through either a combination of 1.1.46 (for those *āgamas* marked with *Ṭ* or *K*) and 1.1.56 (for all the other *āgamas*), i.e. the minimal approach, or through just 1.1.56 (for all the *āgamas*).[216]

[216] As a final remark, the following scenario is, in my view, also completely possible: that it did not occur to Pāṇini at all the potential problem in *sarveṣām* (see §7.4.1) or *lavitṛ* (see §1.5-1.6 and §3.3.3.3.1), or what I have called "the effect of the ypbh" (see §9.2), or using 1.1.56 (see §9.3.2) or an additional *paribhāṣā* (see §9.3.1) to achieve this effect, or perhaps most of my speculations about the ypbh and the *āgama* in the current work: in all these cases, he may simply have followed his feeling - yes, as a human being, and not a computer programme, he must have had his feeling (just like he cannnot have been perfectly consistent or error-free) - the feeling of a great master, of a *sūtra*-composer (while most of us who study him have not composed any *sūtra* and so probably cannot empathise enough with him), which can be much more precise, penetrating, and effective than any form of reasoning.

Appendix 1 Some Sanskrit terms with their English counterparts

anuvṛtta	carried forth (from, into)
ādeśa	substitute (the item); substitution (the process)
sthānin	substituend
it	marker
udātta	high-pitched
anudātta	low-pitched
upadhā	penultimate sound
upasarga	preverb
doṣa	fault
dhātu	verbal root
nitya	mandatory
anitya	non-mandatory
niyama	restriction
pratyaya	suffix
strīpratyaya	feminine suffix
ṣaṣṭhī	genitive case
avayavaṣaṣṭhī	genitive case expressing part-whole relation
saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī	genitive of relation
saptamī	locative case

nimittasaptamī	locative of cause
parasaptamī	locative of a following item
viṣayasaptamī	locative of topic
saṃyoga	consonant cluster
saṃhitā	close junction
saṃhitāyām	in close junction [of sounds]
saṃbuddhi	vocative singular (case)
savarṇa	homogeneous sound
sāmānyagrahaṇa	general term
siddhānta	established view
svara	accent
hrasva	short vowel
dīrgha	long vowel
pluta	superlong vowel

Appendix 2 Other ypbh-related passages in the *Bhāṣya*

Apart from Bh 1.1.20.2-5 that is treated in Chapter 3 of the current work, here are several excerpts from some other passages in the *Bhāṣya* that concern the ypbh, which is either explicitly mentioned or implied there.

11.1 The ypbh explicitly mentioned

In all of the following seven cases in §11.1, the ypbh can be said to appear in the form *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena grāhiṣyate,* which would correspond to form E *tadbhaktas tadgrahaṇena gṛhyate*: see §3.3.4.

11.1.1 Bh 6.1.186.3

(6.1.186 *tāsyanudāttenṅidadupadeśāl lasārvadhātukam anudāttam ahnviṅoḥ*)

3 क: *mukaś copasaṃkhyānam*

क: *mukaś copasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam. pacamānaḥ, yajamānaḥ. mukā vyavahitatvād adupadeśāl lasārvadhātukam anudāttaṃ bhavatīty anudāttatvaṃ na prāpnoti.*

ख: *nanu c**āyaṃ mug adupadeśabhakto `dupadeśagrahaṇena grāhiṣyate***.

(3:112.8-11)

(This passage is similar to the passage in below §11.1.5.

Cf. fn 175.)

11.1.2 Bh 6.1.192.0

(*6.1.192 bhīhrībhṛhumadajanadhanadaridrājāgarāṃ pratyayāt pūrvaṃ piti)*

क: *atha pratyayagrahaṇaṃ kimartham?*

ख: *pratyayāt pūrvasyodāttatvaṃ yathā syāt, āṭaḥ pūrvasya mā bhūd iti. bibhayāni.*

क: *na caivāsti viśeṣaḥ pratyayād vā pūrvasyodāttatve sati, āṭo vā. api ca* ***pidbhaktaḥ pidgrahaṇena grāhiṣyate***.

ख: *idaṃ tarhi prayojanam, pratyayāt pūrvasyodāttatvaṃ yathā syāt, āṭa eva mā bhūd iti.*

क: *etad api nāsti prayojanam.* ***pidbhaktaḥ pidgrahaṇena grāhiṣyate***. (3:114.9-13)

11.1.3 Bh 6.4.3.0

(*6.4.3 nāmi*)

क: *kimartham āmaḥ sanakārasya grahaṇaṃ kriyate, na "āmi dīrghaḥ" ity evocyeta?*

ख: *kenedānīṃ sanakārake bhaviṣyati?*

क: ***nuḍ ayam āmbhakta āmgrahaṇena grāhiṣyate***. (3:181.12-13)

(This passage is similar to the passage in the next section, i.e. §11.1.4.)

11.1.4 Bh 7.1.33.0

(7.1.33 sāma ākam)

क: *kimartham āmaḥ sasakārasya grahaṇaṃ kriyate, na "āma ākam" ity evocyeta?*

ख: *kenedānīṃ sasakārasya bhaviṣyati?*

क: ***āmaḥ suḍ ayaṃ bhakta āmgrahaṇena grāhiṣyate***. (3:252.16-17)

11.1.5 Bh 7.2.82.1

(7.2.82 āne muk)

1 क: *muki svare doṣaḥ*

क: *muki sati svare doṣo bhavati. pacamānaḥ, yajamānaḥ. mukā vyavahitatvād anudāttatvaṃ na prāpnoti.*

ख: *nanu c****āyaṃ mug adupadeśabhakto `dupadeśagrahaṇena grāhiṣyate.***

(3:303.4-6)

(Cf. fn 175.)

11.1.6 Bh on 8.3.32.1

(8.3.32 ṅamo hrasvād aci ṅamuṇ nityam)

(*1 ṅamuṭi padādigrahaṇam*)

क: *evaṃ tarhi ṅama evāyaṃ ṅamuṭ kriyate.*

ख: *katham?*

क: *"padasya" iti vartate, "ṅamaḥ" iti ca naiṣā pañcamī.*

ख: *kā tarhi?*

क: *saṃbandhaṣaṣṭhī. padāntasya ṅamo ṅamuḍ bhavati hrasvād uttarasyācīti.*

ख: *yadi ṅama eva ṅamuṭ kriyate, kurvann āste, kṛṣann āste, "raṣābhyāṃ no ṇaḥ samānapade" iti ṇatvaṃ prāpnoti.*

क: *padāntasya neti pratiṣedho bhaviṣyati.*

ख: "*padāntasya" ity ucyate, naiṣa padāntaḥ.*

क: ***padāntabhaktaḥ padāntagrahaṇena grāhiṣyate.*** (3:429.17-22)

(Cf. fn 176.)

11.1.7 Bh 8.4.17.1

(8.4.17 ner gadanadapatapadaghumāsyatihantiyātivātidrātipsātivapativahatiśāmyaticinotidegdhiṣu ca)

1 क: ner gadādiṣv aḍvyavāya upasaṃkhyānam

क: *ner gadādiṣv aḍvyavāya upasaṃkhyānaṃ kartavyam. praṇyagadat, pariṇyagadat.*

...

ख: *nanu c**āyam aḍ gadādibhakto gadādigrahaṇena grāhiṣyate***. (3:459.3-6)

11.2 The ypbh implied

11.2.1 Bh 8.2.42.0

(8.2.42 radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto naḥ pūrvasya ca daḥ)

क: *“radābhyām” iti kimartham?*

ख: *caritam, muditam.*

क: *nanu ca “radābhyām” ity ucyamāne `py atra prāpnoti. atrāpi rephadakārābhyāṃ parā niṣṭhā.*

ख: *na rephadakārābhyāṃ niṣṭhā viśeṣyate.*

क: *kiṃ tarhi?*

ख: *takāro viśeṣyate. rephadakārābhyām uttarasya takārasya no bhavati, sa cen niṣṭhāyā iti.* (3:406.2-5)

11.2.2 Bh 8.2.42.3-4

(8.2.42 radābhyāṃ niṣṭhāto naḥ pūrvasya ca daḥ)

3 क: vṛddhinimittāt pratiṣedhaḥ

क: *vṛddhinimittāt pratiṣedho vaktavyaḥ.*

ख: *kiṃ prayojanam?*

4 prayojanaṃ kārtikṣaitiphaullayaḥ.

क: *“kārtiḥ” iti vṛddhau kṛtāyāṃ “radābhyām” iti natvaṃ prāpnoti.*

…

ख: *athocyamāne `pi pratiṣedhe “vṛddhinimittāt” iti katham idaṃ vijñāyate? vṛddhir eva nimittaṃ vṛddhinimittaṃ “vṛddhinimittāt” iti, āhosvid vṛddhir nimittam asya so `yaṃ vṛddhinimitto “vṛddhinimittāt” iti?*

क: *kiṃ cātaḥ?*

ख: *yadi vijñāyate vṛddhir eva nimittaṃ vṛddhinimittaṃ "vṛddhinimittāt" iti, kṣaitiḥ saṃgṛhītaḥ, kārtir asaṃgṛhītaḥ.*

...

क: *yathecchasi, tathāstu.*

ख: *astu tāvad vṛddhir eva nimittaṃ vṛddhinimittaṃ "vṛddhinimittāt" iti.*

क: *nanu coktaṃ "kṣaitiḥ saṃgrhītaḥ kārtir asaṃgṛhītaḥ" iti.*

ख: *kārtiś ca saṃgṛhītaḥ.*

क: *katham?*

ख: "*vṛddhir bhavati", "guṇo bhavati" iti rephaśirā guṇavṛddhisaṃjñako `bhinirvartate.* (3:406.11-24)

(Cf. §8.2.12.)

Bibliography and abbreviations

1 Primary sources

A = *Aṣṭādhyāyī*: Boehtlingk's Grammatik = *Pāṇini's Grammatik*. Edited and translated by Otto Boehtlingk. Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1887. First Indian edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998.

Bālamanoramā: see *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

Bhairavī, commentary on the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*: *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara by Śrī Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa with the **Bhairavī** commentary by Śrī Bhairava Miśra and the **Tattvaprakāśikā** commentary by Pandit Śrī Lakshaman Sharma*. Edited by Sadashiva Shastri. Kashi Sanskrit Series (Haridas Sanskrit Granthamālā) 31. Benares: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1931.

Bhāṣāvṛtti: *The Bhasha-vritti by Purushottamadeva*. Edited by Srish Chadra Chakravarti. Rajshahi: The Varendra Research Society, 1918.

Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā, commentary on *Bhāṣāvṛtti*: *Bhāṣāvṛtti-pañjikā (pūrvārdham) of Viśwarūpopādhyāya.* Edited by Shashinath Jha. Darbhanga: Mithila Research Institute, 2001.

Bhāṣya = Bh = *Mahābhāṣya*:

1) Kielhorn's edition =*The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. 3 vols. 3rd edition by K.V. Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962 / 1965 / 1972. [I take this edition as the main edition of the text of the *Bhāṣya*. Any unqualified reference to or use of the text of the *Bhāṣya* should be understood as referring to this edition.] [Way of citation: x:y.z = volume x, page y, line z.][217]

2) *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. 3 vols. 1st edition. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot, 1880 / 1883 / 1885.

Boehtlingk's Grammatik: see A = *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

BŚŚ = *Bṛhacchabdenduśekhara*: Sītārāmaśāstrī (Ed.), 1960, *Brhat-Sabdenduśekhara by Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa Volume III*, Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya.

C = *Cāndrasūtrapāṭha*: see CV = *Candravṛtti*.

Candrakalā, commentary on *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*: see *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*.

Chāyā, commentary on *Uddyota*: See 1) under *Pradīpa*.

[217] Where necessary, I add my own remarks in square brackets.

CV = *Candravṛtti*: *Candra-vṛtti Der Original-Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra.* Edited by Bruno Liebich. Abhanglungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 14. Leipzig: In Kommission bei F. A. Brockhaus, 1918.

Dhātupāṭha: pp. 61*-84* in Boehtlingk's Grammatik.

Dīpikā = Mahābhāṣyadīpikā: *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā of Bhartṛhari Fascicule II: Āhnika V*. Edited by V.P. Limaye, G.B. Palsule, and V.B. Bhagavat. 2nd edition. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 2002.

Durghaṭavṛtti: *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva Volume I Fascicule 2: Adhyāya 1.* Edited and translated by Louis Renou. Paris: Société d'Édition «Les Belles Lettres», 1941.

DV = *Durgasiṃhavṛtti*: see K = *Kātantrasūtra*.

Gadā, commentary on the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*: *Vaidyanāthakṛta**gadā**ṭīkāsaṃvalitaḥ Paribhāṣenduśekharaḥ*. Edited by Gaṇeśaśāstrin Gokhale. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 72. Pune: Anand Ashram, 1913.

Gaṇapāṭha: pp. 95*-145* in Boehtlingk's Grammatik.

HaV[218] = *Paribhāṣābhāskara* of Haribhāskara Agnihotrin: *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* #15, pp. 317-374.

[218] This stands for *Haribhāskaravṛtti*.

Jñāpakasaṃgraha: *Jñāpakasaṃgraha of Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa with Vivṛti of N. S. Ramanuja Tatacharya*. Edited by N. S. Ramanuja Tatacharya. Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1972.

Jñāpakasamuccaya: *Paribhāṣāvṛtti Jñāpakasamuccaya Kārakacakra by Puruṣottamadeva*. Edited by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya. Rajshahi: Varendra Research Museum, 1946.

K = *Kātantrasūtra*: *The Kātantra.* Edited by Julius Eggeling. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1874-78.

Kāśikā = Kāśikāvṛtti: *Kāśikā*. Edited by Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D.G. Padhye. 2 vols. Hyderabad: Osmania University, 1969-70.

Laghuśabdenduśekhara: *Laghuśabdenduśekhara by Nāgojibhaṭṭa (Samāsādisvarānto-Part II) [With the commentary Candrakalā by Bhairavamiśra]*[219]. Edited by Narahari Śāstri Pendse, re-edited by Gopāla Śāstri Nene. 3rd edition. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 2001.

Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti: *The Mādhavīya Dhātuvṛtti*. Edited by Dwarikadas Shastri. Varanasi: Prāchya Bhāratī Prakāshana, 1964.

[219] I have given the information in the square brackets based on the Sanskrit title page: °*bhairavamiśraviracitayā candrakalayā ṭīkayā sametaḥ* rather than the English title page, which gives: "with *Lingānuśāsana Chandrakalā* by Bhairava Miśra".

Mīmāṃsāsūtra: *The Mīmāmsā sūtras of Jaimini*. Translated by Mohan Lal Sandal. The sacred books of the Hindus 27. Allahabad: The Panini Office, 1923.

Nirukta: *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta*. Edited and translated by Lakshman Sarup. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: second reprint 1967.

NīV[220] = *Paribhāsāvṛtti* of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita:

1) *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. २९३-३१६.

2) Sāstrī's edition = *The Paribhāshāvṛitti of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkshita*. Edited by T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī. Trivandrum: Printed at the Travancore Government Press, 1915.

Nyāsa: *Nyāsa or Pañcikā commentary of Ācārya Jinendrabuddhipāda and Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra on the Kāśikāvṛtti (commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini) of Vāmana-Jayāditya*. Edited by Dwarikadas Shastri and Kalika Prasad Shukla. 6 vols. Prachya Bharati Series 2-7. Varanasi: Prachya Bharati Prakashan (vol. 1-2); Tara Publications (vol. 3-6), 1965-67. Reprint, edited by Srīnārāyaṇa Misra: *Kāśikāvṛtti (Along with commentaries Vivaraṇapañcikā-Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi and Padamañjarī of Haradatta*

[220] This stands for *Nīlakaṇṭhavṛtti*.

Miśra). 6 vols. Ratnabharati Series 5-10. Varanasi: Ratna Publications, 1985.[221]

Padamañjarī: See *Nyāsa*.

Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha: Abhyankar, K. V. (Ed.), 1967, *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha (a collection of original works on vyākaraṇa paribhāṣās)*, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

PbhI = *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*: *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part I The Sanskrit text and various readings*. Edited by F. Kielhorn. Bombay: Printed at the Indu-Prakash Press, 1868. [I take this edition as the main edition of the text of the PbhI. Any unqualified use of the text of the PbhI should be understood as referring to this edition.]

Pradīpa = Mahābhāṣyapradīpa:

1) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Nāgeśa's Uddyota*. Edited by Bhārgavaśāstrin Jośī, *Śi*vadatta D. Kudāla, and Raghunāthaśāstrī. 5 vols. 5th edition. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press, 1912-51. [This is for *Adhyāya* 1-6.]

[221] Reprint vol. 1 p. (9) (in "*prastāvanā*") gives information about the edition on which the reprint is based (e.g. *tārāyantrālayīyaṃ prathamasaṃskaraṇaṃ tv asya saṃskaraṇasyopādānabhūtam eva ...*). I have not found this information in the title pages of any of the six volumes of the reprint edition.

2) *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya with Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's Śabdakaustubha and Nāgojibhaṭṭa's Uddyota with the commentary Rājalakṣmī by Pt. Guruprasad Shastri*. Edited by Nand Kishore Shastri. 8 vols. 1938. Delhi: Pratibha Prakashan, reprint 1999. [This is for *Adhyāya* 7-8.]

Prakāśa, commentary on *Prakriyākaumudī*: see *Prakriyākaumudī*.

Prakāśikā, commentary on *Prakriyāsarvasva*: see *Prakriyāsarvasva*.

Prakriyākaumudī: *Prakriyākaumudī by Śrīrāmacandrācārya Part-three with the commentary Prakāśa by Śrīkriṣṇa*. Edited by Muralīdhara Miśra. Part 3. 2nd edition. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, 2000.

Prakriyāsarvasva: *The Prakriyāsarvasva of Śrī Nārayaṇa Bhaṭṭa with commentary [Prakāśikā][222] Part I*. Edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī. Part 1. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 106. Trivandrum: Government Press, 1931.

Prauḍhamanoramā:

1) *Praudhamanoramā with its gloss called Laghu Śabdaratna by the author's grand son Harī Dīkshita.* Edited by Rāma Śāstrī Mānavallī. Second Half. Benares: Messrs. Braj B. Das & Co., 1888.

[222] According to NCC12 p. 225b, the commentary *Prakāśikā* is attibuted to Rudra Vāriyar (18th century).

2) *The Prauḍhamanoramā of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkshita (Avyayībhāvānta)*. Edited by Sadāshiva Sharma Shastri. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1934.

PuV[223] = *Laghuparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Puruṣottamadeva:

1) *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. 112-160.

2) D.C. Bhattacharya's edition: see *Jñāpakasamuccaya*.

Raghuvaṃśa: *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa with the commentary of Mallinātha*. Edited by Gopal Raghunath Nandargikar. 4th edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971.

Ṛgveda: *Die Hymnen des Ṛigveda*. Edited by Theodor Aufrecht. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Bonn: Bei Adolph Marcus, 1877.

Rūpāvatāra: *The Rūpāvatāra of Dharmakīrti*. Edited by Rao Bahadur M. Rangacharya. 2 vols (Part I and II). Madras: G.A. Natesan & Co. (Part I); Bangalore: printed at The Banglore Press (Part II), 1916-27.

Siddhāntakaumudī: *Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī bālamanoramā-tattvabodhinīsahitā*. Edited by Giridharaśarman Caturveda and Parameśvarānandaśarman Vidyābhāskara. 4 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, reprint 1995, 1997, 1989, 1987. [Vol. 1 is 1st edition 1961. Vol. 4 also

[223] This stands for *Puruṣottamadevavṛtti*.

contains the commentaries *Subodhinī*, *Laghuśabdenduśekhara*, and *Candrakalā*]

SīV[224] = *Bṛhatparibhāṣāvṛtti* of Sīradeva:

1) *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. १६१-२७२.

2) *Paribhāṣāvṛtti A treatise on Sanskrit grammar by Sīradeva*. Edited by Harinatha Dube. Benares: Messrs. Braj B. Das & Co., 1887.

Subodhinī: see *Siddhāntakaumudī* (vol. 4).

ŚeV[225] = *Paribhāṣābhāskara* of Śeṣādrisudhī: *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* #17, pp. ३७८-४६५.

Taittirīyasaṃhitā: *Die Tattirīya-Saṃhitā*. Edited by Albrecht Weber. 2 vols. Indische Studien 11-12. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1871-72.

Tattvabodhinī: see *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

Tattvādarśa, commentary on the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*: *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa edited critically with the commentary*

[224] This stands for *Sīradevavṛtti*.
[225] This stands for *Śeṣādrisudhīvṛtti*.

Tattvādarśa *of MM. Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar Part I*. Edited by K.V. Abhyankar. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962.

Uddyota = Mahābhāṣyapradīpoddyota: See *Pradīpa*.

Uṇādisūtra: see *Siddhāntakaumudī*.

Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra:

*Mārulakaropāhvaśaṃkaraśāstripraṇīta**śāṃkarī**vyākhyāsaṃvalitaḥ śrīmadbhaṭṭojīdīkṣitaviracitavaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakārikāvyākhyānabhūtaḥ śrīkauṇḍabhaṭṭaviracitaḥ Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāraḥ*. Edited by Śaṅkaraśāstrin Mārulakara. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 135. Pune: Anand Ashram, 1957.

Vārttikas of Kātyāyana: see *Bhāṣya* 1).

VḍV[226] = *Paribhāṣāsūcana* of Vyāḍi:

1) *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha* pp. १-३८.

2) Wujastyk's edition = *Metarules of Pāṇinian grammar The Vyāḍīyaparibhāṣāvṛtti*. Edited by Dominik Wujastyk. 2 vols. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1993.

[226] This stands for *Vyāḍivṛtti*.

Vijayā, commentary on the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*: *Paribhāṣenduśekharaḥ Mahāmahopādhyāyajayadevamiśraracita**vijayā**ṭīkāpariṣkṛtaḥ*. Edited by Duḥkhamocana Śarman. 3rd edition. Published by Śrīśrīkṛṣṇamiśra (Śrīśrīkṛṣṇamiśreṇa prakāśitaḥ), 1943.[227]

Vīracōl̲iyam, an ancient Tamil grammar: *Vīracōl̲iyam mūlamum Porundaivaṉār iyar̲r̲iya uraiyum*. Edited by Kovindarāja Mudaliyār. Chennai: Pavāṉandar Kal̲akam, 1942.

Viṣamapadavyākhyā, commentary on *Śabdakaustubha*: *Viṣamapadavyākhyā*. Edited by James W. Benson. American Oriental Series 97. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2015.

2 Secondary literature

Abhyankar's Dictionary = Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev and J.M. Shukla. *A dictionary of Sanskrit grammar*. 2nd revised edition. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1977. 3rd edition (reprint) 1986.

Belvalkar, Shripad Krishna. *An account of the different existing systems of Sanskrit grammar*. Pune: published by Shripad Krishna Belvalkar, 1915.

[227] I did not find a publication year in the title page. 1943 here is converted from what I found at the end of the "*Prākkathanam*" on p. (4) - "*saṃ* 1999".

Ben-Dor, Sharon. *The paribhāṣās arthavadgrahaṇe nānarthakasya, lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoḥ pratipadoktasyaiva grahaṇam and ekadeśavikṛtam ananyavat Studies on some metarules in Pāṇinian system*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2009.

Bhate, Saroja. "Saṃnipātaparibhāṣā". In *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. Vol. 65 No. 1/4 (1984): 227-239.

Bhattacharya, Tapanaśaṅkara. *Śrīpuruṣottamadevaviracitā Paribhāṣāvṛtti*. Kalikātā: Saṃskṛta Pustaka Bhāṇḍāra, 2010. [With Bengali translation and interpretation.]

Brill, Jo. "Paribhāṣās: Metarules in Sanskrit grammar". University of Oxford MSt dissertation, submitted 2013.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. *Tradition and argument in classical Indian linguistics The bahiraṅga-paribhāṣā in the Paribhāṣenduśekhara*. 1st Indian edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003.

Coward, Harold G. and K. Kunjunni Raja. *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies Volume V The philosophy of the Grammarians*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.

Cardona, George. *Pāṇini A survey of research*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

Cardona, George. *Recent research in Pāṇinian studies*. 2nd edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2004.

Cardona's Pāṇini = Cardona, George. *Pāṇini His work and its traditions Vol. 1 Background and introduction*. 2nd edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1997.

Chakrabarti, Samiran Chandra. *The paribhāṣās in the Śrautasūtras*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1980.

Hueckstedt, Robert A. *Nearness and respective correlation: a history of the interpretations of Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.1.77: iko yaṇ aci*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.

Joshi-Roodbergen's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* = Joshi, S.D., and J.A.F. Roodbergen. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. 13 vols. Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1991[228]-2007.

Kielhorn, F. *The Paribhāshenduśekhara of Nāgojībhaṭṭa Part II Translation and notes*. In three fascicules: [1] paribhāshās 1-37 and [2] paribhāshās 38-69 - Bombay: Printed at the Indu-Prakash Press, 1871 and 1873. [3] paribhāshās 70-122 - Bombay: Government Central Book-Depôt, 1874.

[228] I have not found a publication year in vol. 1. This is the year that appears in the acknowledgements in vol. 1.

Krishnamacharya. *Descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Adyar Library Vol. VI Grammar, prosody and lexicography*. Madras: The Adyar Library, 1947.

Lahiri's Concordance = Lahiri, P.C. *Concordance Panini-Patañjali (Mahābhāṣya)*. Breslau: Verlag von M. & H. Marcus, 1935.

NCC = Raghavan, V. et al. *New Catalogus Catalogorum: an alphabetical register of Sanskrit and allied works and authors.* Madras: University of Madras, 1949-. Revised edition, 1968-.

Pellegrini, Gianni. "Meanings out of rules. Definitions, functions and uses of paribhāṣās in Śrautasūtras, Gṛhyasūtras, Vyākaraṇa, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta". Special section edited by Gianni Pellegrini. In *Asiatische Studien.* Volume 72, Issue 2 (2018): 445-655.

Renou, Louis. "Le *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*". In *Études védiques et Pāṇinéennes.* Tome II: 132-149. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1956.

Roodbergen's Dictionary = Roodbergen, J.A.F. *Dictionary of Pāṇinian grammatical terminology*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 2008.

Sharma's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* = Sharma, Rama Nath. *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. 6 vols.[229] Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1999-2003.

Thieme, P. "Bhāṣya zu vārttika 5 zu Pāṇini 1.1.9 und seine einheimischen Erklärer". In *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Philologisch-historische Klasse Neue Folge Fachgruppe III Nachrichten aus der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft 1. Band 1934-1937* (1935): 171-216.

Wezler, Albrecht. *Paribhāṣā IV, V und XV Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der einheimischen indischen grammatischen Scholastik*. Bad Homburg v. d. H.: Verlag Gehlen, 1969.

Whitney's Grammar = Whitney, William Dwight. *A Sanskrit grammar*. 3rd edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd, 1896.

229

volume	edition	publishing year
I	2nd	2002
II	2nd	2000
III	2nd	2002
IV	1st	1999
V	1st	2001
VI	1st	2003

Wielinska-Soltwedel, Malgorzata. "The Bhāṣāvṛttivivaraṇapañjikā of Viśvarūpa, the first adhyāya and a detailed examination". Hamburg University PhD thesis, 2006.

Wielinska-Soltwedel, Malgorzata. "The Bengali tradition of Pāṇini's grammar". In *Berliner Indologische Studien* 19 (2010): 71-85.

3 Digital files

Bhāṣya$_{\text{GRETIL}}$ = Bh$_{\text{GRETIL}}$ = *Mahābhāṣya* in GRETIL

http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_*san*skr/6_sastra/1_gram/pmbhasuu.htm (date visited: 10 October 2019)

Kāśikā$_{\text{GRETIL}}$ = *Kāśikāvṛtti* in GRETIL

http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_*san*skr/6_sastra/1_gram/jvkasipu.htm (date visited: 10 October 2019)

PbhI$_{\text{GRETIL}}$ = *Paribhāṣenduśekhara* in GRETIL

http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_*san*skr/6_sastra/1_gram/paribhsu.htm (date visited: 10 October 2019)

Siddhāntakaumudī$_{\text{DIGITAL}}$

https://drdhaval2785.github.io/siddh*anta*kaumudi/ (date visited: 10 October 2019)

4 Other abbreviations

fn	= footnote
nirdiśyamānaparibhāṣā	= *nirdiśyamānasyādeśā bhavanti*
sakṛdgatiparibhāṣā	= *sakṛd gatau vipratiṣedhe yad bādhitaṃ tad bādhitam eva*
saṃnipātaparibhāṣā	= *saṃnipātalakṣaṇo vidhir animittaṃ tadvighātasya*
vt	= *vārttika*
ypbh	= *yadāgamaparibhāṣā*
ϕ	= *lopa*
ϕ_1	= *luk*
ϕ_2	= *ślu*
ϕ_3	= *lup*